UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 6

MARCH 20, 1969, TO APRIL 1, 1969
(PAGES 6921 TO 8378)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

XUM

XUM

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—*Thursday, March 20, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father of our spirits, we stand before Thee in the silence of this hour, knowing in the depths of our being we cannot live without Thee. Thou hast made us for Thyself, and nothing satisfies the longings of our souls but Thy presence. Rescue our wandering minds, our fugitive thoughts, our roving spirits, and call us back to Thee that we may think of Thee and of Thee alone. Spare us from slavery to desk pads and appointment calendars. Put us in tune with the infinite and eternal that we may know our true nature and our ultimate destiny. Give us grace to glorify Thee in daily duties and thus to know the "peace of those whose minds are stayed on Thee."

O Lord, our God, we commend our Nation, its leaders, and our lives to Thy gracious keeping this day.

In Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 17, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1058) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2669. An act to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations and certain claims of individuals;

H.R. 4297. An act to amend the act of November 8, 1966;

H.R. 7206. An act to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress;

H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969; and

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1058) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2669. An act to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations and certain claims of individuals; and

H.R. 4297. An act to amend the act of November 8, 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7206. An act to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Cave Run Dam and Reservoir, Ky.

A letter from the Secretaries of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of intention of the Departments to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on the Agricultural Conservation Program

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Council of Economic Advisers for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1969, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Transportation for "National Transportation Safety Board: Salaries and expenses" for the fiscal year 1969, had been apportioned on a basis which indicated the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation for increased pay costs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Proposed Legislation Providing Special Pay to Naval Officers

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the advisory committees which assisted him in carrying out his functions under the Social Security Act during the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

XUM

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on a survey of policies and procedures of the military liquidation section for disposal of U.S. property in France and the utilization of certain property removed from France (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the Economic Opportunity Programs, made pursuant to title II of the 1967 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, dated March 18, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the control over repairs of electronic components and assemblies, Department of the Navy, dated March 19, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the selection of purchasers of residential properties sold by the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated March 19, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Claims Settled by the Agency for International Development

A letter from the Acting Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims settled by the Agency under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, during the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Increase in Number of Grades GS–16, 17, and 18 Positions

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Proposed Construction or Alteration of Public Buildings

A letter from the Administrator, General Service Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses which propose construction or alteration of public buildings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Claims Settled by the Indian Claims Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on claims settled by the Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION OF BRISTOL COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Bristol County Farm Bureau at its annual meeting, October 14, 1968, representing 300 families, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas much harm has been done to our fellow farmers, the California Grape Growers, by the AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, and realizing that what happens to farmers in one section of the country will eventually be visited upon the farmers in another part of the country, be it

Resolved; that Bristol County Farm Bureau is opposed to all attempts to force farm laborers to unionize at all levels whether it be through boycotts of producers and growers or through legislation to bring farm employees under the control of the National Labor Relations Act.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 506

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider the abolition of zones within the national freight classification system and to eliminate the practice of permitting motor carriers to add arbitrary charges on less-than-truck load traffic to smaller communities in South Dakota

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

"Whereas, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution provides that 'the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes; and

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the Congress can by enactment preempt the entire field of regulation of interstate commerce and that the several states may only regulate in such areas as not covered by federal authority; and

"Whereas, the Congress by means of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 has authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate interstate transportation of passengers and property by motor carriers, a policy which the Congress has extended and reinforced by subsequent acts and legislation; and

"Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission has established national freight classification territories and subdivided these territories into zones for the purpose of regulation of motor freight rates; and

"Whereas, the system of zones lends itself to rate inequities between zones which are detrimental to the welfare and prosperity of some areas while providing a competitive advantage to other areas; and

"Whereas, the state of South Dakota has been arbitrarily divided so that parts of the state fall within three different zones which creates inequities in motor freight rates not only between the state and other states but also within the state itself; and

"Whereas, transportation considerations have done much to inhibit industrial growth in the state of South Dakota, and such growth is necessary to provide the state with more balanced economy less susceptible to the cyclical fluctuations in basic agricultural prices and production; and

"Whereas, many smaller communities of South Dakota which are already suffering from depressed agricultural prices are required to pay 'arbitrary' additional charges of twenty-five cents per hundred weight on freight for pickup or delivery of less-than-truck load traffic; and

"Whereas, similar communities in neighboring states are not required to pay such 'arbitraries;'

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate of the Forty-fourth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Congress of the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and the same are hereby, respectfully requested to give due consideration to the abolition of the present system of zones within the national freight classification territories; and

"Be it further resolved, that the Congress of the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and the same are hereby, respectfully requested to give due consideration to the elimination of the present practices which permit motor carriers to add 'arbitrary' charges to less-than-truck-load traffic originating in or destined for small South Dakota communities; and

"Be it futher resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate of the state of South Dakota to offices of the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the state of South Dakota, and the chairman and members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"James Abdnor,
"President o fthe Senate.
"D. H. Gunderson,
"Speaker of the House.
"Paul Inman,
"Chief Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 505

"A concurrent resolution, citing legislative opposition to, and complete reversal of, the proliferation of Federal Categorical Grants-in-Aid and the adoption of consolidated plans for dissemination of federal funds to the states, and support of the 'Consolidation of Federal Assistance Program Act'

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

"Whereas, there is today virtually universal agreement that the proliferation of federal categorical grants-in-aid must be reversed; and

"Whereas, it has been suggested that the consolidation of categorical grants into a manageable number of broad bloc grants is a superior method to the present bureaucratic maze of overlapping, complex, and inefficient program; and

"Whereas, to promote the better execution and efficient management of individual federal assistance programs within the same functional areas; and

"Whereas, to provide better coordination among individual assistance programs within the same functional area; and

"Whereas, to promote more efficient planning and use by the recipients of federal assistance under programs within the same functional area; and

"Whereas, consolidation of grant programs is not a partisan issue;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-fourth Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that a system of federal bloc grants would best solve the financial problems facing the state today, and be of great assistance in many areas of state government, the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby urged to adopt the necessary and desirable changes presented in the 'Consolidation of Federal Assistance Program Act.'

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Office of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the United States House of Representa-

XUM

tives, and to the South Dakota Congressional Delegation.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives February 4, 1969. Concurred in by the Senate March 8, 1969.

"DEXTER H. GUNDERSON,
"Speaker of the House.
"JAMES ABDNOR,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"PAUL INMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress to cease and desist the proliferation of Federal power

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States continues to expand the proliferation of federal control over our cities, counties and states, and

"Whereas, this proliferation of national government is contrary to the thinking of our founding fathers, contrary to the fundamental tenets of federalism, and

"Whereas, if such proliferation does not cease, our federal system, which once manifested a delicate balance between federal and state powers, will become a giant state engulfing monster;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 38th Legislature of the State of Utah, both houses concurring therein, that Congress be memorialized and respectfully requested to cease and desist from further encroachment on state and local powers reserved to the states under the Constitution of the United States;

"Be it resolved further that Congress immediately consider systematic withdrawal of many of the non-productive and expensive federal agencies which result in unnecessary taxation imposed upon citizens of this and other states, and allow states to appraise their own social and economic needs and levy and collect taxes to provide for these indigenous problems.

"Be it resolved further that the Secretary of State of Utah be, and he is hereby directed, to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to United States Representative Wilbur D. Mills, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress.

"HOMER J. BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"LORNE N. PACE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"QUAYLE CANNON, Jr.
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Attest:

"CHRIS R. HOPKINS,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Received from the Governor, and filed in the office of the Secretary of State this 13th day of March, 1969.

"CLYDE L. MILLER,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide jobs for certain unemployed persons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 713. A bill to designate the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, in the State of California (Rept. No. 91–97); and

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project (Rept. No. 91–113).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 742. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–98);

S. 743. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–99); and

S. 1011. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–100).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 348. A bill for the relief of Cheng-huai Li (Rept. No. 91–101);

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho (Rept. No. 91–102);

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Alunday (Rept. No. 91–103);

S. 927. A bill for the relief of Victor Abadi (Rept. No. 91–104);

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Francis Power (Rept. No. 91–105);

S. 1049. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Solar (Rept. No. 91–106);

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Wong Wah Sin (Rept. No. 91–107); and

S. 1123. A bill for the relief of Ah Mee Locke (Rept. No. 91–108).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Sein Lin (Rept. No. 91–109);

S. 537. A bill for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano) (Rept. No. 91–110);

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Charles Richard Scott (Rept. No. 91–111); and

S. 958. A bill for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy (Rept. No. 91–112).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Don Paarlberg, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

John H. Shaffer, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Reginald Norman Whitman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration;

Leo G. Vaske, and James L. Hassall, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard;

Larry A. Jobe, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and

Myron Tribus, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Carl L. Klein, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

Mitchell Melich, of Utah, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior;

Hollis M. Dole, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

Leslie Lloyd Glasgow, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior; and

James R. Smith, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard A. Dier, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nebraska;

Allen L. Donielson, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa; and

Richard W. Velde, of Virginia, to be an Associate Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report of the Special Committee on Aging be extended from March 15 to March 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1579. A bill to provide for an exclusion from gross income in the case of compensation for members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo;* to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, so as to remove the exemption from the reporting requirements thereof with respect to certain political committees and individuals operating in only one State and duly organized State local committees of political parties; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the second above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1581. A bill for the relief of Georgios Fotopoulous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1582. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BELLMON):

S. 1583. A bill to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1584. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine (Krystyna) Gorayska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1585. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to reduce the rate of duty on rods of molybdenum disilicide; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of Anacleto Aboyabor Dotollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson) (by request):

S. 1587. A bill for the relief of King County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Pell):

S. 1588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Church, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1589. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Moss):

S. 1590. A bill to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. Fulbright):

S. 1591. A bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE (for himself and Mr. Kennedy):

S. 1592. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brooke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PERCY:

S. 1593. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for periodic cost-of-living increases in monthly benefits payable thereunder;

S. 1594. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, in a series of steps, for the liberalization and eventual elimination of the provisions thereof which impose deductions in benefits payable to individuals under such title on account of income earned by them;

S. 1595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the widow's and widower's insurance benefits payable thereunder to individuals who have attained age 65;

S. 1596. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that each child entitled to a child's insurance benefit thereunder shall receive a benefit of at least $30 per month; and

S. 1597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a portion of the social security taxes paid by low-income individuals to be used as a credit against any Federal income tax due and to refund the balance of such portion to such individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Percy when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1598. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nicole Gille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 1599. A bill for the relief of Timber Structures, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. Dodd):

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Potenciano C. Quizan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1601. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act as amended by the Wholesome Meat Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1602. A bill to increase the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1603. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a person who first becomes entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit thereunder after attainment of age 65 to receive a benefit equal to 100 percent of the primary insurance amount of such person's deceased spouse, and to permit an actuarially reduced benefit to be paid to persons who become entitled to such a benefit prior to attaining such age;

S. 1604. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of actuarially reduced benefits thereunder at age 60;

S. 1605. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; and

S. 1606. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to lower from 72 to 65 the age at which certain otherwise uninsured individuals may be entitled to special minimum benefits thereunder, and otherwise to liberalize the conditions under which benefits for such individuals may be paid under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dole, Mr. Hart, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1607. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem veterans who were prisoners of war to have service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1608. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum nationwide eligibility standards; to operate the food stamp program in any political subdivision when local governing officials will not agree to operate a food assistance program for needy families; to enter into cost-sharing arrangements with States or their political subdivisions to cover the cost of local administration of the food stamp program; and, to remove current limitations on the appropriations authorized for the program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and Mr. Anderson):

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bellmon, Mr. Bible, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Harris, Mr. Mr. Hart, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1610. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-States cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 1611. A bill to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. Church, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1612. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bear the established name of the drug dispensed; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. Fannin, and Mr. Goldwater):

S. 1613. A bill to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1614. A bill for the relief of Hang Kwun Sze;

S. 1615. A bill for the relief of On Cheong Wu;

S. 1616. A bill for the relief of Yam Kam Yeung;

S. 1617. A bill for the relief of Shing-Leong Ho; and

S. 1618. A bill for the relief of Lin Chau Siu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1619. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1620. A bill for the relief of Andrew L. Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1621. A bill to provide for additional research and training pursuant to the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to solve the particular water resources problems in large river basins; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. Stevens):

S. 1622. A bill to be known as the "Vaccination Assistance Act of 1969"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1623. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary and when reported to the Committee on Finance, by unanimous consent.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1625. A bill for the relief of Gong Sing Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1626. A bill to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the second above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. Cranston, and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1627. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim the second Saturday in May of each year as a "day of recognition" for firefighters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Church):

S. 1628. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, and related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1629. A bill to include air traffic controllers within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of certain Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1580—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO REPORTING OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to close two loopholes in the present law relating to the reporting of political contributions.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, requires political committees which accept contributions or make expenditures for the purpose of influencing congressional or presidential elections to keep records and file reports of contributions and expenditures. However, the definition of the term "political committee" contained in section 302(c) of the Corrupt Practices Act excludes, first, committees—other than those which are branches or subsidiaries of national committees or organizations—which accept contributions or make expenditures for the purpose of influencing elections in only one State, and, second, any duly organized State or local committee of a political party. The bill which I introduce today would remove these two exclusions.

Section 306 of the Corrupt Practices Act provides that a person other than a political committee who makes expenditures—other than through a political committee—aggregating $50 or more in a calendar year for the purpose of influencing a presidential or congressional election in two or more States must file the reports required of political committees as described in section 305. This bill would also amend this provision by removing the two or more State requirements.

The reports required to be filed by political committees by section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act must contain with respect to the calendar year, first, the names and addresses of persons contributing $100 or more and the amounts of their contributions; second, the total sum of all other contributions received; third, names and addresses of persons to whom expenditures of $10 or more are made and the purpose of the expenditure; and, fourth, the total sum of all other expenditures made.

Mr. President, I consider that the changes proposed in this bill are minimum reporting changes which we must make if the purpose of Federal Corrupt Practices Act is to have any real meaning. I would hope that the Congress would take at least this one small step toward the improvement of our present system of reporting political contributions

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1580) to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, so as to remove the exemption from the reporting requirements thereof with respect to certain political committees and individuals operating in only one State and duly organized State local committees of political parties, introduced by Mr. Williams of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 1583—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce in behalf of myself, Senator Gale W. McGee, and several other Senators, a bill providing that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made without political considerations.

At the present time, postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third class are appointed in the competitive civil service by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. Postmasters at fourth-class post offices are appointed by the Postmaster General.

This bill changes present law and vests in the Postmaster General the authority to appoint all postmasters in the competitive civil service. Such appointments will be made either from within the postal service or from competitive examinations open to all applicants, both inside and outside the service. Senate confirmation would no longer be required for such appointments.

Other appointments in the postal service now made by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, will continue to be filled as presently.

On March 7, 1967, the Senate gave its approval to removing political considerations in postmaster appointments. By a vote of 75 to 9 the Senate passed S. 355, the congressional reorganization bill, which contained this provision. Unfortunately, no action was taken on that measure by the House of Representatives and it died when the 90th Congress adjourned sine die.

A number of bills, similar to this one, have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

President Nixon has given his strongest endorsement to this action and named it as one of his highest priority goals in his effort to improve our postal system.

The esteemed chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senator Gale W. McGee, is a cosponsor with me of this very important bill. I am hopeful that his committee will give speedy and favorable consideration to this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1583) to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness, introduced by Mr. Fong (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1587—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF KING COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the relief of King County, Wash. This measure relates to a contract entered into by the Federal Aviation Administration and the King County Airport located in King County in Washington State. The King County commissioners have asked me to introduce this bill so as to preclude the loss of very substantial funds to the airport.

The introduction of this measure will provide for a thorough evaluation of the problem by the Congress and the administration. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the King County commissioners be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1587) for the relief of King County, Wash., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

The letter, presented by Mr. Magnuson, is as follows:

> King County Commissioners,
> *Seattle, Wash., February 3, 1969.*
>
> Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
> *Old Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Re: King County's Request for Private Legislation Federal Aviation Administration Matter.
>
> Dear Senator Magnuson: The undersigned request your support in seeking the passage of private legislation, which in effect would relieve King County of its obligation to return to the Federal Aviation Administration $158,301.83, said sum being principal and interest on a grant-in-aid default.
>
> May we clarify that this is not an indebtedness in the way of an assessment to the Boeing Company, but rather it is pre-paid rent at a fixed annual rate of $25,000 on Boeing's leased premises at Boeing Field.
>
> As has been pointed out by the Acting Airport Manager John Tobin, King County is embarking on a vigorous campaign to upgrade the facility to make it a safer and more efficient operation and a source of pride to the community. This $25,000 will necessarily reduce the Airport Fund accordingly, and could seriously curtail these improvements. These monies are desperately needed, as King County Airport will not receive Federal Aid Airport Program (F.A.A.P.) grants in 1969.
>
> Thank you again for your interest. Any efforts made by you on behalf of King County are very much appreciated.
>
> Very truly yours,
> John T. O'Brien,
> *Chairman.*
> Ed Munro,
> John D. Spellman,
> *Commissioners.*

S. 1588—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MARINE MEDICINE AND PHARMACOLOGY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill would also authorize an advisory council on marine medicine and pharmacology similar to that of the National Cancer Advisory Council, National Advisory Heart Council, and other councils that advise and assist the Institutes of Health.

Two of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell) are cosponsors of the bill I am introducing today.

Mr. President, in the 90th Congress I proposed legislation similar to the bill I am introducing today, but the committee to which it was referred took no action on it. Since then, however, interest in creating a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology has quickened.

The Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, composed of notable representatives from industry, universities, and Federal and State government, in its recent report "Our Nation and the Sea" strongly recommended that such an institute be established.

> Practically no research is presently being conducted by government or industry on marine bioactive substances as possible sources of new commercial pharmaceutical products, the report states in part.
>
> So far, less than one percent of all sea organisms known to contain biologically active materials have been studied.

The Commission stated that active substances from the sea that are under study may be divided into two broad classes. These are:

> Antibiotics, which are used to control and destroy the organisms that cause diseases.
>
> Systematic drugs, which act directly on parts of the body to alleviate pain, stimulate or relax, promote healing, vary the speed of such biochemical reactions as blood clotting, influence the operation of certain organs, or act as antidotes to poisons.
>
> Antibiotics from the marine world—

The report elaborated—

> will become more important as the older drugs upon which medical practice has relied for the past 20 years become less effective against new generations of resistant germs.

Later the report states:

> Research among toxins for antitoxins has unearthed a host of fascinating pharmacological properties variously described as antiviral, antibiotic, antitumor, hemolytic, analgesic, psychopharmacological, cardio inhibitory, fungicidal, and growth inhibitory.
>
> A substance extracted from the primitive hagfish has been used experimentally to slow down the heart during open-heart surgery making it easier to operate. Antitumor and antimicrobial agents are present in such common organisms as clams and oysters. . . .
>
> There is a vast array of marine biochemical agents having potent biological activity, and many of them may be useful therapeutic agents.

The Commission on Marine Sciences, Engineering, and Resources concluded its statement on Drugs from the Sea with the following recommendation:

> The Commission recommends establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health to effect a methodical evaluation of the sea as a source of new and useful active substances. The new Institute should:
>
> Inventory presently known bioactive substances.
>
> Examine those factors which relate to the ecology of marine organisms and their pharmacology.
>
> Determine present pharmocological evaluation problems.
>
> Develop inexpensive screening methods.
>
> Institute a national system for information storage and retrieval.
>
> Provide regional facilities for collecting, storing, and distributing bioactive material to universities, research institutions, and industry.

An active proponent of this recommendation was Dr. George H. Sullivan, physician member of the Commission, who has had an unusual career as a naval officer, electrical engineer and medical doctor. A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy in 1948, he served as a line officer on the submarine U.S.S. *Wahoo* and later obtained his medical degree at Georgetown University Medical School. While with the Navy as an electrical engineer he was engaged in the design, development and operation of the electrical, steam and reactor control systems of the first and subsequent nuclear submarines.

When appointed to the Commission, Dr. Sullivan was director of life sciences of the Northrup Corp., where he was active in many ocean programs including the man-in-the-sea project, biomedical problems of survival in the sea environment, development of advanced protective and antiexposure garments, and studies of marine algae for human nutritive value. Dr. Sullivan is presenty a consulting scientist for the General Electric Co., specializing on reentry systems.

Recently he wrote me:

> Marine bioactive substances as a source of new commercial pharmaceutical products constitute an almost completely unexplored area of research. At the present time, there is not a single industrial organization or governmental agency that is making a continuous systematic exploration of new bioactive substances from marine creatures.

Mr. President, the Commission report is by no means the first expression of the need for extensive research into the medical promise and possibilities of the marine environment covering, as it does, 70 percent of the earth's surface.

In its 1966 report "Effective Use of the Sea," the Oceanography Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, stated, and I quote:

> The value of biochemical studies on the great diversity of marine plants and animals is indicated by the isolation of chemicals that have antiviral, antimicrobial, cancer-inhibiting, nerve-blocking or heart-stimulating properties in laboratory experiments . . . With development of biochemical analyses and refined techniques for cultivating many marine organisms that produce chemicals which may prove to be of medical importance, the time is now ripe for intensified research in marine biochemistry and pharmacology. Drugs are now derived primarily from terrestrial plants and bacteria or are synthesized in the laboratory. The great variety of plant and animal life in the sea offers abundant opportunities for study in many areas of biomedical research.

The Oceanographic Commission of Washington, created by statute and appointed by the Governor, last year unanimously adopted a resolution urging establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health.

That resolution states:

> Whereas, S. 2661 would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health; and
>
> Whereas, this bill would best enhance medical oceanography if the new Institute were to be located where there is a center of recognized combination of attainment in marine science and medicine; and
>
> Whereas, creation of this organization would be a pioneer program in education and would enhance and accelerate the growth of marine medicine research, which could achieve rapid developments in man's capacity to live with and extract from the sea;
>
> Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Oceanographic Commission of Washington unanimously endorse S. 2661, and further request that it be favorably reported out of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that the bill be voted into legislation.

This resolution was adopted while my previous bill to accomplish this purpose, S. 2661, was pending in the 90th Con-

XUM

gress. Already during the 91st Congress, however, the Chairman of that Commission, Mr. John M. Haydon, has written me on several occasions urging reintroduction of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, strong support for a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology has been expressed by the Subcommittee on Biomedical Oceanography of the Marine Technology Society of America.

The subcommittee was formed at a National Conference on Drugs from the Sea, held at the University of Rhode Island in August 1967, and attended by approximately 200 scientists and educators from 33 States and four foreign countries.

Subsequently the subcommittee submitted a 12-page report and recommendations to the Commissions on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, stating in part that—

> The Institute should be established for the purpose of conducting and supporting marine research with a view to advancing scientific knowledge in marine biochemistry, pharmacology, pharmacognosy, toxicology, nutrition, microbiology, epidemiology, physiology, taxonomy, ecology, pathology, ethnobiology, bionics, and technology as it may relate to the causes, diagnosis, prevention, treatment, and control of physical and mental diseases and other impairments of man.

Dr. Bruce Halstead, M.D., chairman of this subcommittee, in sending to me a copy of its recommendations to the Commission, stated with reference to my bill then pending in the 90th Congress:

> This bill which you are sponsoring is of momentous importance and affects the future health and welfare of all mankind.

The Marine Technology Society and its biology committee are scheduling a second conference to be held at the University of Rhode Island August 24 through 27. Mr. Earl H. Herron, Jr., of Scotch Plains, N.J., chairman of the committee, informs me that from 400 to 500 delegates are expected, more than double the attendance at the initial conference.

Greatly increased emphasis has recently been placed on biomedical oceanographic research on the university level. At the University of Rhode Island, according to Dr. Heber W. Youngken, Jr., provost for science, who for 15 years was a member of the University of Washington faculty, a new program has been created. And the University of Texas medical branch and Texas A. & M. University are jointly sponsoring a marine biomedical institute recently dedicated on the University of Texas campus.

I am gratified by the interest these universities, and a dozen others from which I have received letters in recent months, are taking in medical oceanography. All of them, I am sure, will contribute to knowledge that will ultimately enhance the Nation's health. To stimulate and assist them we need a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology.

Since 1960 the French National Institute of Health and Medical Research has maintained, at Nice, a Laboratory for Medical Oceanography. The work of this laboratory has been widely disseminated at meetings of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission in Paris, and a copy, which I have had translated, is indeed imposing. I also have copies of five extensive reports by the laboratory which have not been translated.

Much of the work of the laboratory has been on chemical and bacteriological pollutions. One of the important symposiums held there, in which several U.S. scientists participated, was on the antibiotic and self-purging power of the marine environment.

I will be happy to make this material available to the Senate committee to which the bill I am introducing today is referred, should that committee wish it.

A U.S. Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology, I am convinced, could make a contribution to world health unexcelled by that of any other nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1588) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1589—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing in the Senate the Hospital Emergency Assistance Act of 1969, a measure aimed at correcting a growing crisis in our hospitals—that of overcrowded facilities and inadequate services.

The Hill-Burton program has, for the last 20 years, constituted the chief means of assistance to our hospitals. Hill-Burton funds have provided 350,000 hospital and nursing home beds, helped 3,400 communities in building hospitals, nursing homes and health care centers, and brought modern medical services to millions of Americans. But this has not been enough.

State requests for new hospital beds amounted to 66,500 in 1965. Only 36,328 new beds were added that year—and only 3,195 of these resulted from Hill-Burton funds.

In the 5 years before medicare, the demand for services in our hospitals rose 13.1 percent. This same period, however, witnessed only a 1.4 percent increase in the number of facilities and a decrease in Hill-Burton construction by an average of 7.6 percent.

As of 1968, our general hospitals required the construction of 85,007 new beds and the modernization of 240,624 others. Hill-Burton funding will not even begin to meet this demand.

Today, thousands of unfortunate Americans die because of inadequate medical facilities. Thousands of others experience the pain and agony of waiting long hours before receiving the medical treatment they so urgently need. And thousands of other patients are forced to recuperate in hospitals constructed to meet the needs of 15 and 20 years ago. Such conditions must not continue to plague our sick and infirmed; further inaction on our part will only intensify a deteriorating and inexcusable situation.

The Hospital Emergency Assistance Act of 1969 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make direct emergency grants to qualified hospitals of up to 66⅔ percent of the total cost of any project providing critically needed medical facilities. One hundred million dollars would be authorized for such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. These grants would be patterned after the Hill-Burton formula except that aid would be given directly to the hospital by the Federal Government, instead of being distributed by the States.

In order to qualify as a critical hospital and thus receive needed assistance, four eligibility requirements would have to be satisfied under the provisions of this bill.

First. The average rate of occupancy or the demand for necessary and essential facilites and services of such a hospital must be found to so far exceed reasonable capacity that the community served is deprived of adequate health services.

Second. Full and effective use is being made of other health facilities in the community.

Third. The needed assistance is not available from private or public sources.

Fourth. The failure to provide needed services or facilities constitutes a threat to the health, welfare and safety of the community.

To aid those communities which lack adequate financial resources to fund the 33⅓ percent non-Federal portion, this bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make long-term, low interest loans of up to 90 percent of the non-Federal share of the construction cost. Interest on these loans would be 2.5 percent and would be repayable in 50 years. A total of $45 million would be authorized for this purpose.

It is an unfortunate commentary on American life that this, the wealthiest of all countries, cannot provide adequate medical care for many of her citizens. Such a situation cannot be tolerated. Further delay in this area will only doom additional thousands. The legislation introduced today would provide for large-scale emergency funding to allow hospitals to modernize their plants, extend their services, reduce the absurdly long waiting lines, and put a little more comfort into the painful process of medical recovery.

Franklin Roosevelt once wrote that the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Let us have no doubts regarding the seriousness of the situation in our hospitals. And let us move forward strong in the faith that what we begin here today will reduce untold suffering for many years to come.

XUM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1589) to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1590—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill extending the life of the National Commission on Product Safety in order to give the Commission 2 full years for investigation as Congress intended.

The National Commission on Product Safety, created by an act which I am proud to have jointly authored with Senator Cotton, has as its mandate the exploration of safety in home products. To fulfill its mandate it has conducted four sets of public hearings, each designed to look into a special phase of products and safety standards, and it plans important future hearings. In addition it has conducted staff evaluations of standards, codes and laws relating to product safety. It has planned special surveys in cooperation with insurance associations and received the approval of four medical groups to send questionnaires on product-related injuries to 85,000 physicians. I think the Commission is to be commended for its results to date.

The Commission has been successful in creating new awareness of the need for safety standards not only among consumers but within industry. Throughout its hearings attention has been focused on laxity as well as efficiency; on irresponsibility as well as responsibility.

Its successes, and it has some even though it has been functioning for less than a year, point up the welcome fact that many industries are often ready and eager to cooperate when the facts are revealed to them in public hearings. For example:

In January of this year the Commission held hearings on the dangers of using ordinary glass in patio doors. Subsequently, the FHA announced its intention to make safety glazing a requirement of its minimum property standards.

In December after hearings were held in Boston on hazardous toys, a manufacturer of a flammable toy tunnel voluntarily issued a recall for those still on the shelves of retail merchants. They will be flame proofed.

The Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers adopted voluntarily, a standard to require that doors of new freezers be designed to open from the inside, as refrigerator doors have been required to operate since 1958.

The American Gas Association, as a result of evidence given at hearings held in February of this year, has agreed to consider changing the standard for floor furnaces which are capable of serious burns, especially to children.

Underwriters' Laboratories upgraded a number of their standards and are exercising greater control over the use of UL seal.

The Commission is engaged in important work—work which should not be stopped prematurely. The resolution creating the Commission gave it life for 2 years starting from the date of passage of the resolution. Although the Commission was created in November of 1967, the Commissioners were not appointed until May 1968, and the Commission had no appropriation until October 13, 1968. In order to allow the Commission a full 2 years of operation, I have introduced a bill extending the Commission's life to June 1970. I feel such extension is more than justified because of its present significant accomplishments and the potential it offers as an important weapon in the arsenal of consumer protection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1590) to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(c) of the National Commission on Product Safety Act (Public Law 90–146, 81 Stat. 466) is amended by striking out "two years from the date of approval of this Joint Resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1970."

S. 1591—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO THE AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation, and for other purposes.

We in the United States are privileged to stand in the midst of a vast and varied cultural heritage. Not only does each American enjoy the distinctive ways of his own family, ethnic group, region, and occupation which comprise his traditional or folk culture, but he also shares with all Americans a common body of customs and traditions which is our national culture and heritage.

Within the folklife of the American people is a highly diversified accumulation of knowledge, including vast amounts of wisdom and art which have been transmitted orally or by imitation from generation to generation. Often, this transmission has occurred without the benefit of formal instruction or written sources. It may be found, for example, in the tribal dances and beautiful crafts of the American Indians; or in the ring of the banjo in a mountain cabin; or in the soulful sound of a Negro spiritual; or in the tall tales of the frontier West. Everytime a guitar player picks out "Wildwood Flower"; or a storyteller tells of Paul Bunyan, John Henry, Mike Fink, or Johnny Appleseed; everytime blankets are carefully woven in Arizona; everytime wood is whittled in North Carolina; everytime a haunting Elizabethan melody issuing in Appalachia; and everytime a lonesome cowboy on the western plains sings to quiet restless cattle—a story of America is told and retold, through the dynamic, living culture of its people.

There is a large body of material, including the jokes and tales, the myths, superstitions and beliefs, speech patterns, proverbs and riddles, as well as the musical material incorporated in songs, ballads, instrumental music and dance, that is graphically expressive of the American way of life. Many people, many traditions, many lands, and customs have combined to make up the distinctive American character.

Some remember listening in wide-eyed wonder to the tales of "Wicked John" or the "Brown Mountain Light." We remember hanging on every word, as we learned of the exploits of Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, or Francis Marion, the "Swamp Fox." And who can forget the toe-tapping rhythm of a mountain string band, or the joyous sound of a real hoedown. Some may even remember quilting bees, barn raisings, and country dinner on the ground.

Others have brought customs and traditions from their homelands. That is why the Irish jig, the Bavarian polka, the Hora, and the exuberant Yiddish song of life are all part of the American folklife. The American tradition is surely the richest in the world. Unfortunately, the systematic accumulation and study of the materials that make up this tradition have taken place only sporatically. We have sought to study various aspects of "the arts," but through different groups and organizations. Too often, we have tended to dissect and systematize the American cultural tradition to such an extent that we have lost the overall understanding of American folklife in general.

This is indeed tragic, for the study of our American folk culture and its accurate presentation through instruments of public education can shed important light on the nature of our complex society. Too often, we have depended on the resourcefulness of private citizens to preserve the quality of the folk tradition for us. I immediately think of Carl Sandburg, of John and Allan Lomax, of Woody Guthrie, Leadbelly, Frank Dobie, and Pete Seeger. We are deeply indebted to these and others for presenting our heritage to us—but we need to do much more to insure the preservation of our folk tradition.

The culture of the American folk is directly connected with life itself. It is the art which the people have made up from their own experiences and it mirrors the triumphs and trials of the human spirit. I refer to "culture" not merely as refinement of taste, but as the total way of life of a people. This complex whole includes the knowledge, beliefs, art, music, morals, law, customs, and habits acquired by a unique society—by our society.

In recent years, Americans have come to understand that we are a nation of many cultures whose preservation displays an admirable sense of individuality which has kept our people from becoming a mass. These diverse cultures stemming at times from ethnic backgrounds, or sometimes from occupational or geographic groupings, make up the fabric of which our Nation is composed.

American culture may be viewed as consisting of three strata existing concomitantly and interacting freely, constantly. Of these, the academic and fine arts culture, including the sciences and the arts, is supported by our educational system ideologically and by both the Government and the public economically. At the popular level, the culture, inseparable as it is from mass media, is supported by private enterprise; to a great degree, its direction is economically dictated. Folklife itself, deprived of support of any kind, is essentially dependent on oral tradition and limitation for transmission and upon its own intrinsic merit for existence.

It is its virtual independence from support of any kind which accounts for the fact that folk creation is, in a sense, purer than any other type of creative expression in our society today. A natural resource providing raw material for creativity at the popular and fine arts level as well as a viable form of expression in itself, folk art has suffered from the gradual process of erosion caused by mass media since the beginning of the century. This erosion process should be checked and this area of creativity encouraged through a long range program which is educationally, culturally, and economically oriented.

That is why, today, I am introducing a bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation. This Foundation, which will be an agency of the Smithsonian Institution and subject to the supervision and direction of a Board of Trustees, will seek "to develop and encourage a greater public awareness of American cultural diversity and the value of American traditional culture."

The Foundation will sponsor programs for research and scholarship in American folklife, make grants, award scholarships, support presentation of programs on American folklife, and generally seek to promote greater knowledge and understanding of the American tradition. It will be guided by persons who are involved in, and sensitive to, the dynamics of American folklife.

Mr. President, I believe that such a Foundation is necessary in order to assure the preservation and encourage the development of the various strains of American folklife. We owe it to ourselves and our posterity to insure the continuing presence of our rich and varied cultural heritage for all time to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation be printed in full at this point in the Record:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1591) to establish an American Folklife Foudnation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and Mr. Fulbright), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "American Folklife Foundation Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that each American enjoys the distinctive ways of his family, ethnic group, region and occupation which comprise his traditional or folk culture as well as sharing with all Americans a common body of customs and traditions which is our national culture and heritage;

(2) that the encouragement and support of research and scholarship in American folklife is a legitimate concern to the Federal government;

(3) that Federal support of research and scholarship should not be limited to the study of the development of economic, social and political institutions common to all the American people;

(4) that American folk traditions have persisted and lent strength to the people and to the Nation;

(5) that the diversity inherent in American folklife has contributed greatly to the cultural richness of the Nation and has created a sense of idenity and individuality;

(6) that the United States, as the oldest of the new nations, can effectively demonstrate by its example that to build a strong nation does not require the sacrifice of that nation's consituent cultural strands which are indeed its strength;

(7) that it is appropriate and necessary for the Federal government to support research and scholarship in American traditional cultures in order to contribute to an understanding of the complex problems of the basic desires, beliefs and values of the American people in both rural and urban areas; and

(8) that the task of recognizing and evaluating our differences is best served by the combined skills of scholars in sciences and the humanities;

(9) that in order to implement these findings it is desirable to establish an American Folklife Foundation in the Smithsonian Institution for the purpose of funding research and scholarship in American traditional cultures.

DEFINITION OF AMERICAN FOLKLIFE

Sec. 3. The term "American Folklife" is used in this act in the anthropological sense, i.e. the acquired characteristics of the American society and the milieu in which they change and thrive. The term not limited to the bounds accorded it by the humanities, takes on the broadest definition provided by the social sciences: the total way of life of a people. The terms "folk" or "traditional culture" as used herein include, but are not limited to, the culture transmitted either orally or by imitation from one generation to another, often without benefit of formal instruction or of written sources. The terms are understood to include the accumulation of technical knowledge, beliefs, lore, language, wisdom, music, and art of a given group such as family, ethnic, regional, religious, occupational, racial or any group of people sharing a common set of unifying folk-cultural traditions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution an agency to be known as the American Folklife Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) The Foundation shall be subject to the supervision and direction of a Board of Trustees (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of sixteen members, ten of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom three shall be appointed from among officials of Federal departments and agencies concerned with some important aspects of American folklife, and four shall be appointed from among individuals from private life who are widely recognized by virtue of their scholarship, participation in a folklife community, experience or creativity, as specially qualified to serve on the Board. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each appoint three members to serve on the Board. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Librarian of Congress, and the Director of the Foundation shall serve as ex officio members of the Board. In making appointments from private life, the President is requested to give due consideration to the appointment of individuals who, collectively, will provide appropriate regional balance on the Board.

(c) The term of office of each appointive trustee of the Foundation shall be six years; except that (1) the members first taking office shall serve as designated by the President, two for terms of two years, three for terms of four years, and two for terms of six years, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the reminder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(d) Members of the Board who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Foundation, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The President shall call the first meeting of the trustees of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve until one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter each Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of two years in duration. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect an individual from among the trustees to fill such vacancy.

(f) A majority of the trustees of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Sec. 5. There shall be a Director and a Deputy Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In making such appointments the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations submitted to him by the Board. The Director shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate pro-

XUM

vided for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, and the Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level IV of such Schedule. Each shall serve for a term of six years unless previously removed by the President. The Deputy Director shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may prescribe, and be acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

(b) The Director shall carry out the programs of the Foundation subject to its supervision and direction, and shall carry out such other functions as the Foundation may delegate to him consistent with the provisions of this Act.

AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Foundation is authorized to—

(1) develop and encourage a greater public awareness of American cultural diversity and the value of American traditional culture by the promotion of programs for research and scholarship in American folklife;

(2) initiate and support research and programs designed to strengthen the research potential of all areas of the United States in American folklife by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals, groups, and public and private agencies for such purposes;

(3) make grants to institutions for the establishment of programs in American folklife;

(4) award scholarships to individuals and institutions to strengthen scholarship in American folklife;

(5) support presentation programs of American folklife which meet standards of authenticity, which are of significant merit, and which without assistance would otherwise be unavailable in many areas of the United States by making grants to individuals, groups, or organizations;

(6) support regional, State and local workshops in American folklife, by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other arrangements) with institutions, and public and private agencies; and

(7) foster the collection and dissemination of information on American folklife by making grants to States, localities, and other public agencies for such purposes, and by establishing and maintaining a national center on American folklife.

(b) No payment may be made under this section except upon application therefore which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations and procedures established by the Board.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS

SEC. 7. (a) No payment shall be made pursuant to this Act to carry out any research or training over a period in excess of two years, except that with the concurrence of at least two-thirds of the trustees of the Foundation such research or training may be carried out over a period of not to exceed five years.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. (a) In addition to any authority vested in it by other provisions of this Act, the Foundation, in carrying out its functions, is authorized to—

(1) prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner in which its functions shall be carried out;

(2) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for the purposes of the Foundation; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the purpose of carrying out its functions;

(3) in the discretion of the Foundation, receive (and use, sell, or otherwise dispose of, in accordance with paragraph (2)) money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised to the Foundation with a condition or restriction, including a condition that the Foundation use other funds of the Foundation for the purposes of the gift;

(4) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating classification and General Schedule pay rates, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate prescribed for GS–18 in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem;

(6) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and noncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(7) enter into contracts, grants or other arrangements, or modifications thereof to carry out the provisions of this Act, and such contracts or modifications thereof may, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the Board, be entered into without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5);

(8) make advances, progress, and other payments which the Board deems necessary under this Act without regard to the provisions of Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529);

(9) rent office space in the District of Columbia; and

(10) make other necessary expenditures.

(b) The Foundation shall submit to the Smithsonian Institution an annual report of its operations under this Act, which shall include a detailed statement of all private and public funds received and expended by it, and such recommendations as the Foundation deems appropriate.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON AMERICAN FOLKLIFE

SEC. 9. (a) There is established an Advisory Council on American Folklife (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council") composed of twenty members appointed by the President from among individuals who are widely recognized by reasons of experience, education, scholarship or creativity as specially qualified to serve on such Advisory Council. In making such appointments, the President shall give due consideration to any recommendations submitted by the Board. At least two members appointed to the Advisory Council shall not have attained the age of thirty on the date of appointment.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Board on broad policy matters relating to the administration of this Act. The Advisory Council shall select its own Chairman and Vice Chairman.

(c) Each member of the Advisory Council who is appointed from private life shall receive a sum not to exceed $100 per diem (including traveltime) for each day during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Council. A member of the Council who is in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the Council shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 1592—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE MARINE SANCTUARIES STUDY ACT OF 1969

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the sea that surrounds us is one of our greatest natural resources. For generations the sea has served both as a protection and a means of conveyance. It has provided us with food, equalized our coastal climate, and contributed bounteously to our industry and trade.

However, as our population and technology have increased, the sea itself has been endangered by our progress. In all too many States, wet lands have been turned over to private developers who have built homes, marinas, and resorts but in the process have destroyed vital breeding grounds for waterfowl and fish.

Thirty of the States of the Union border the oceans and the Great Lakes. Their 100,000 miles of coastland contain some of the most diversified beaches, ports, estuaries, and mineral-producing areas to be found anywhere in the world. Yet wastes from our cities, from ocean liners, freighters, and factories, have polluted our harbors and shoreline, destroying the creatures that live in the sea and making our beaches unsuited for human recreation.

The dangers are very real: Whole species of wildlife could be eliminated, and the value of our coastlands for recreational purposes could be permanently impaired. Yet for far too long these coastal resources have been taken for granted, while academic and Government research have focused on deep-sea exploration.

In the meantime, oil drilling has been proceeding at a rapid rate, with the type of consequences which we witnessed recently in the Santa Barbara Channel. Drilling operations which once destroyed fish with their seismic explosions have now been brought under control, but underwater gear and drilling equipment still remain to plague the fisherman with his nets and lines.

In addition, it is deplorable and totally unnecessary that landing of fish by U.S. fishermen have remained constant for 30 years, and that this Nation, with one of the most extended coastlines and richest marine resources in the world, accounts for only 4 percent of the world's fish catch.

Better use of our natural resources is not only possible, it is imperative. It is for this reason that I introduce today, with the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) a bill to be known as the Marine Sanctuaries Study Act of 1969. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the possibility of setting aside certain of our Nation's tidelands as marine sanctuaries, to be used for recreation, conservation, and marine research purposes; and to consider the uses to which other areas of our coastland may legitimately be put while preserving our valuable natural resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD, and urge its prompt consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1592) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BROOKE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1592

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this bill shall be cited as "The Marine Sanctuaries Study Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. That Congress finds and declares that the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and land and waters of the Great Lakes are rich in a variety of natural, commercial, recreational, esthetic, and other resources of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans; that many of these areas are in danger of damage or destruction by commercial and industrial development; and that it is the policy of Congress, through a system of marine sanctuaries, to preserve, protect, encourage balanced use, and, where possible, restore, and make accessible for the benefit of all the people, selected parts of the Nation's natural tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and land and waters of the Great Lakes, which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, outdoor recreation, and scenic beauty.

SEC. 3. (a) In furtherance of this policy, the Secretary of the Interior shall study, investigate, and formulate recommendations on the most feasible and desirable means of establishing portions of the Nation's tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and land and waters of the Great Lakes as marine sanctuaries, including but not limited to the Georges Bank area adjacent to lower Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

(b) The Secretary shall cooperate and consult with other interested Federal agencies as well as other interested public and private organizations and shall coordinate his studies, to the extent feasible, with all other applicable planning activities related to the areas under consideration.

(c) In conducting the studies, the Secretary shall schedule hearings in areas contiguous to the proposed sanctuary sites, for the purpose of receiving views on the establishment of such marine sanctuaries.

SEC. 4. (a) Until such time as he submits the report required by section 5 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue or renew any license, permit, or other authorization for the exploration, development, mining, or other removal of any minerals (including gas and oil) from any part of the Outer Continental Shelf under study as a possible marine sanctuary.

(b) During such study period the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with all affected Federal, State, local, and international organizations in order that, until the completion of such study, a moratorium on the industrial development of any portion of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and land and waters of the Great Lakes under consideration as a possible marine sanctuary may be agreed upon by such interested parties.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress through the President within two years after the date of this Act a report of his findings and recommendations, including such legislation as he deems appropriate. The Secretary's report shall contain, but not be limited to findings with respect to: (1) the sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, scenic beauty, and marine ecological research values of such tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and land and waters of the Great Lakes; (2) the potential alternative beneficial uses of these waters, taking into consideration mining, agriculture, and transport activities and other public purposes, and the impact of these activities, including pollution, upon these regions; (3) the most effective means for reserving and developing properly these regions without endangering their esthetic and other values set forth in clause (1); (4) the most feasible and desirable means of creating a national system of marine sanctuaries.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Secretary of State regarding the need for international agreements where potential marine sanctuaries extend into internatioanl waters contiguous to the territorial waters of the United States, or lie wholly within internatioanl waters.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this Act:

(a) The term "tidelands" means bays, estuaries, land, and waters within the three-mile territorial limit of the United States.

(b) The term "Outer Continental Shelf" means land and waters extending from the three-mile territorial limit out to the two hundred meter depth contour.

(c) The term "seaward areas" means land and waters contiguous to and extending from the two hundred meter depth contour.

SEC. 8. There is to be authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,000,000 to carry out this Act.

S. 1593 THROUGH S. 1597—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS RELATING TO A NEW APPROACH TO SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk lately about "the forgotten American." I do not believe that our society is so callous or inhumane that it purposely ignores any group of Americans. But it is true that in certain times in our history some groups have been overlooked, and therefore have not shared in the richness of American life that most of us take for granted. And more than any other group today elderly Americans tend to be overlooked and forgotten.

We now have social security and medicare to help protect our elderly populations. But all too often these programs offer even less than the minimum necessary, rather than a continuing share in the economic growth and improving quality of life of the society these citizens helped to build.

There are more than 18 million Americans over the age of 65. Too often in the past these Americans have been treated as society's leftovers, to be confined to a quiet corner and cared for as resources and politics permit. They sense this attitude and deeply resent this kind of second-class citizenship. Their objection is valid. The fact is that 3 million of our older citizens are productively employed. Twenty-six percent of the American men over age 65 hold responsible full- and part-time jobs. Of those that are retired, the great majority have led and continue to lead full and active lives supporting themselves through savings, investments, and hard-earned pensions and annuities. They are concerned, active and articulate, about the problems facing not only retired Americans, but all Americans. Their continuing record of service to their communities is outstanding. For the most part, they ask their fellow citizens not for handouts and special consideration but for dignity and independence as well as a fair share and a fair return on their investment in the Nation.

We have made many promises to the elderly but too often those promises have been shallow ones. There are many things that must be done to bring fulfillment to our promises to the aged. The single most important way in which Congress can fulfill its responsibility to older citizens is through the protection of the value of the dollar. Inflation places a heavy burden on the finances of all Americans but that burden is disproportionately heavy for those who live on fixed incomes. This includes the annuities, pensions, and savings that constitute the major source of income of most retired persons. There is no greater threat to the economic security and independence of older people than the rising prices and higher taxes that are the fruits of inflation. Price stability can be achieved. Inflation can be controlled. Congress can and must make this the first priority in its pledge to respond to the legitimate concerns and interests of older Americans.

Another important area for change is the social security program. Social security benefits account for one-half of all retirement income. Social security has a remarkable record. It is one of the most effective and successful institutions ever developed in the United States. The social security system has paid out $180 billion to beneficiaries since its inception in 1935. Every month more than 15 million social security benefit checks are issued; 90 to 95 percent of all those reaching retirement age now are eligible for benefits.

Yet it is quite clear that all is not well. Each day my mail and the mail of other Members of Congress contain moving stories of distress. The 83-year-old widow whose sole source of income is a minimum benefit from social security explains how the 5-cent increase in bus fares presents an insurmountable addition to an indescribably meager monthly budget. The 24-year-old father of four whose monthly payroll tax far exceeds his Federal income tax questions the return on his social security dollar in comparison to a program of private savings or investment. These are questions Congress has a responsibility to answer. These are basic issues that cannot be easily solved. And yet they must be solved. In recent years, the social security system has been allowed to drift without the thorough study that is needed to assure equitable and just treatment for all. Instead, we continue to amend the program haphazardly and for each problem or inequity resolved, it seems that 10 new problems appear.

For years every responsible legislator has recognized the growing incoherence of our public policies and programs in the field of retirement income. Time and again Republicans in Congress have called for a comprehensive review of social security, private pensions, tax laws, and the general state of income maintenance for the elderly. In the thirty years since operation of social security began, there has never been a full review of its purposes, direction, and impact on the economy of the Nation and its people. My interest is seeing the strongest, most effective social security system possible. To do this, a thorough study of this program is needed. It is my hope that the Congress will authorize such a study during this session.

However, as we debate these basic issues and directions, there are immediate and responsible steps that can be taken to correct glaring inequities and respond to the very human needs of the millions who depend on social security. I rise today to present the following package of legislative proposals for consideration:

First. A bill to provide for automatic adjustment of social security benefits to corresponding changes in the cost-of-living.

Second. A bill to eliminate the social security earnings limitation.

Third. A bill to provide full benefits for widows.

Fourth. A bill to provide a $30 minimum benefit for each dependent.

Fifth. A bill to partially refund payroll taxes for low-income workers.

AUTOMATIC COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT

During the 90th Congress 15 Senators and 75 Members of the House of Representatives sponsored legislation to provide for the automatic adjustment of social security benefits to changes in the cost of living. A specific statement of commitment to such a program was included in the campaign platform of the Republican Party. I sponsored legislation in the last Congress which I introduce again today which will increase social security benefits whenever the consumer price index rises by 3 percent or more.

Experience has amply indicated that politics too often has dictated congressional action, and, therefore, increases in social security benefits have lagged far behind the rising cost of living. Congress has a responsibility not only to protect retired Americans who themselves have no control over the inflationary process but to assure those now paying into the social security system that benefits will consistently respond to changes in the purchasing power of the dollars they are investing in their future. Millions of American workers are covered by private pension plans that include a cost-of-living escalator which makes pensions responsive to cost increases. Surely Congress can do as well as American industry in protecting the retired.

THE EARNINGS LIMITATION

It is not difficult to understand the extensive opposition to the present level of the social security earnings limitation. Americans who have invested in social security through all of their working years reach 65 only to discover that the traditional value America places on industry and productive labor seems to be penalized as soon as a man reaches age 65. At the present time, a beneficiary who earns more than $1,680 a year receives a reduced social security benefit. I believe that there is no more basic a right than the right to work, and therefore it is wrong to penalize people who want to work and to keep from them social security benefits toward which they have contributed for years. It is a scandal to penalize persons who need to work to augment meager incomes. I am introducing legislation today that would immediately increase the earnings limitation to $2,400 and over a period of 7 years eliminate it entirely. This is a question of equity. Such a measure does far more than alleviate the financial pressures on the retired; it will also reassure them that our Nation encourages and values the continued productive participation of its older citizens.

FULL BENEFITS FOR WIDOWS

Dollar for dollar, no change in the present benefit structure would more effectively reach those at the margin of subsistence than elimination of the widow's discount. The Social Security Act grossly discriminates at the present time against widows and widowers of primary beneficiaries. Under existing law, a man can draw 150 percent of his monthly benefits if he is married. If he is a widower, he receives his full benefits—or 100 percent. But if he leaves a widow, she can receive only 82½ percent of his total allotment. This situation creates a serious injustice. A widow's expenses are hardly less costly than a man's. It is a cruel blow for a widow when she loses not only her husband on whom she depends for financial advice, but also loses almost half of her income at the same time. What does she do—for instance—to cut her housing expenses in half? Women who lived a decent, but modest, life with their husband while they both received social security, must often go on welfare when their husbands die. I am introducing legislation to correct this unfair discrimination. My bill will permit the surviving spouse of a primary beneficiary to receive 100 percent of the social security benefits.

MINIMUM DEPENDENT BENEFIT

Social security protects not only the retired. It is also the principal source of income for many families suffering the tragic loss of a wage earner. The benefit formula for surviving dependents is designed to take into account both the earnings record of the worker and the size of his surviving family. In most cases the balance provides an equitable replacement of income for the stricken family. But because of the fixed upper limit imposed by the family maximum, this is not true for the very large family. The costs of raising a family of four and a family of eight just are not the same, and under the existing formula large families do not receive any additional benefits to compensate for their size. I propose a simple formula through which this severe problem for a large family might be resolved. My bill would establish a minimum dependent benefit of $30 so that for each child an extra $30 a month would be added to the family benefit. This legislation is needed to reflect the added expenses which large families must incur to achieve the same living standards as smaller families.

REFUND OF THE PAYROLL TAX

The steady rise of social security benefits has been accompanied by a steady increase in both the taxable wage base and the payroll tax. While this process imposes an important fiscal discipline on the system it has, over the course of time, accentuated the regressive aspects of the payroll tax. We have as a nation committed ourselves to the elimination of poverty, yet the payroll tax annually consumes $1.5 billion of the incomes of those families whose incomes fall below the poverty line. For millions of low-income families, social security is an ever-present tax burden with benefits a far distant unreality. A country committed to the principle of progressive taxation finds that the social security payroll tax is increasingly regressive because the poor pay proportionately higher percentages of their incomes. For as income levels rise, relatively fewer and fewer Americans are being taxed on all of their wages.

It is an accepted principle of the income-tax system that income alone does not determine a man's ability to pay. This principle is implemented through the mechanism of deductions in our income tax code. In the design of the social security system we seem to have all but reversed this principle. The question of the structure and incidence of the payroll tax is one of the most basic issues that must be considered in a comprehensive review of public policy with regard to retirement income. I do not propose here to sidestep such a review but one fact is clear. The collection of $1.5 billion a year from families whose incomes fall below the poverty line is at odds with national policies directed toward the effective elimination of poverty.

While it would not be in the best interests of the poor themselves to exempt them totally from contributory participation in their future retirement incomes, I do believe that we might seriously consider the possibility that in the lowest income groups the payroll tax might be partially refunded. I am introducing legislation today that would establish a formula by which 90 percent of the payroll tax paid by workers in the lowest income groups would be refunded.

The formula which I propose takes into account the size of the family, as well as the family income. Single persons with incomes under $2,100 per year would be eligible for a 90-percent refund. A couple with income less than $2,800 would be eligible for a refund, while a couple with two children could earn as much as $4,000 and still be eligible for a 90-percent social security tax refund. The chart below indicates the adjusted annual income levels, the corresponding

XUM

refund that would be made to those eligible, and what the net tax obligation would be:

Adjusted income	Present payroll tax	Refund	Tax payment
$1,000	$44	$39.60	$4.40
$2,000	88	79.20	8.80
$3,000	132	118.80	13.20
$4,000	176	158.40	17.60
$5,000	220	198.00	22.00
$6,000	264	237.60	26.40
$7,000	308	277.20	30.80

Because the payroll tax is inequitable, the income tax law should be amended to provide a partial refund of social security taxes. These refunds would accrue almost entirely to households classified as living in poverty. While I do not claim that this formula is perfect, I do believe this is an important concept which should be incorporated into our social security laws, and therefore, offer this bill as a means whereby the Congress can consider and discuss its merits. Certainly, when the Nation is considering the feasibility of a negative income tax a more preferable step would be to first eliminate oppressive Federal taxation of the poor.

Mr. President, the bills that I introduce today cannot take care of all of the shortcomings of the social security program. They are, however, matters which have often been brought to my attention by my constituents, and I believe they deserve careful consideration by the Congress. Until some of these shortcomings in our social security law are corrected, social security will not adequately protect those citizens it was meant to protect. Only when we rectify some of the contradictory and self-defeating provisions in present legislation will we finally face up to our responsibilities to our older citizens and to our society as a whole.

The bills which I have introduced today would, if enacted, begin to remedy some of the present inequities in the social security system. However, as I have said before, an indepth, long-range study of the social security system should be undertaken by Congress. The demands on the system today are quite different than in 1935, when social security was first adopted. What was originally looked upon as a minimum benefit is now widely regarded as a retirement pension. We must determine whether the social security system can provide what is expected of it in the future. I call upon Congress to accept this responsibility and begin such a study without further delay.

Within the ranks of the elderly is to be found the experience and expertise which built our Nation and created the highest standard of living in the world. We would be an exceedingly ungrateful people if we did not allow those in our society who helped shape our Nation to also share in the fruits of that abundance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed legislative package be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills (S. 1593 through S. 1597), introduced by Mr. PERCY, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1593

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for periodic cost-of-living increases in monthly benefits payable thereunder

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Cost-of-living increase in benefits

"(w) (1) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'price index' means the annual average over a calendar year of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

"(B) the term 'base period' means the calendar year 1965.

"(2) As soon after January 1, 1970, and as soon after January 1 of each succeeding year as there becomes available necessary data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, the Secretary shall determine the per centum of increase (if any) in the price index for the calendar year ending with the close of the preceding December over the price index for the base period. For each full 3 per centum of increase occurring in the price index for the latest calendar year with respect to which a determination is made in accordance with this paragraph over the price index for the base period, there shall be made, in accordance with the succeeding provisions of this subsection, an increase of 3 per centum in the monthly insurance benefits payable under this title.

"(3) Increases in such insurance benefits shall be effective for benefits payable with respect to months in the one-year period commencing with April of the year in which the most recent determination pursuant to paragraph (2) is made and ending with the close of the following March.

"(4) In determining the amount of any individual's monthly insurance benefit for purposes of applying the provisions of section 203(a) (relating to reductions of benefits when necessary to prevent certain maximum benefits from being exceeded), amounts payable by reason of this subsection shall not be regarded as part of the monthly benefit of such individual.

"(5) Any increase to be made in the monthly benefits payable to or with respect to any individual shall be applied after all other provisions of this title relating to the amount of such benefit have been applied. If the amount of any increase payable by reason of the provisions of this subsection is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be reduced to the next lower multiple of $0.10."

S. 1594

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, in a series of steps, for the liberalization and eventual elimination of the provisions thereof which impose deductions in benefits payable to individuals under such title on account of income earned by them

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) (A) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$140" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

(B) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of such subsection (f) is amended by striking out ", except that of the first $1,200 of such excess (or all of such excess if it is less than $1,200), an amount equal to one-half thereof shall not be included".

(2) Paragraph (1) (A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$140" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

(3) The amendments made by this subsection (other than the amendment made by paragraph (1) (B)) shall be effective only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1968, and before January 1, 1972. The amendment made by paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1968.

(b) (1) Paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$140" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$250".

(2) Paragraph (1) (A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$140" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250".

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1974.

(c) (1) Paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$140" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$300".

(2) Paragraph (1) (A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$140" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300".

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1973, and before January 1, 1976.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsections (b), (d), (f), (h), (j), and (k) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are repealed.

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 203 is amended (1) by striking out "Noncovered Work Outside the United States or" in the heading, and (2) by striking out paragraph (1) thereof.

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 203 is amended by striking out "subsections (c) and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)".

(d) Subsection (i) of such section 203 is amended by striking out "subsection (b), (c), (g), or (h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c) or (g)".

(e) Subsection (l) of such section 203 is amended by striking out "or (h) (1) (A)".

(f) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (n) of section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "Section 203 (b), (c), and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 203 (c)".

(g) Paragraph (7) of subsection (t) of section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "Subsection (b), (c), and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subsection (c)".

(h) Paragraph (3) of section 208(a) of the Social Security Act is repealed.

(i) The amendments made by this section (other than subsection (h)) shall apply only with respect to benefits payable for months beginning after December 31, 1975, and the amendment made by subsection (h) shall become effective on January 1, 1976.

S. 1595

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the widow's and widower's insurance benefits payable thereunder to individuals who have attained age 65

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 202(e) (1) and (2) of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out (each place it appears therein) "82½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof ", in the case of a widow who has not attained age 65, 82½ percent, and in the case of any other widow, 100 percent,".

(b) Section 202(f) (1) and (3) of such Act are each amended by striking out (each place it appears therein) "82½ percent" and and inserting in lieu thereof ", in the case of a widower who has not attained age 65, 82½ percent, and in the case of any other widower, 100 percent,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1969.

S. 1596

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that each child entitled to a child's insurance benefit thereunder shall receive a benefit of at least $30 per month

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first and second sentences of section 202 (d) (2) of the Social Security Act are each amended by inserting immediately before the period the following: ", or, if greater, $30".

(b) The last sentence of section 203 (a) (3) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding immediately before the period the following: "; and except that if the total of benefits for such month includes any benefit payable to any individual under section 202 (d) which is reduced below $30, then the benefit to which such individual is entitled under section 202(d), notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, be increased to $30".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for months after the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

S. 1597

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a portion of the social security taxes paid by low-income individuals to be used as a credit against any Federal income tax due and to refund the balance of such portion to such individuals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Special credit for social security taxes paid by low-income individuals.

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to his low-income credit for the taxable year as determined under subsection (b).

"(b) Amount of Low-Income Credit.—

"(1) Married individuals.—In the case of a husband and wife, the low-income credit for the taxable year is an amount equal to—

"(A) 90 percent of the social security taxes of such husband and wife for such taxable year, reduced (but not below zero) by

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the combined total adjusted incomes of such husband and wife exceed $1,600.

If a husband and wife each file a separate return for the taxable year, their low-income credit shall be apportioned between them in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations.

"(2) Other individuals.—In the case of any other individual, the low-income credit for the taxable year is an amount equal to—

"(A) 90 percent of the social security taxes of such individual for the taxable year, reduced (but not below zero) by

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the total adjusted income of such individual for the taxable year exceeds $1,600.

"(c) Definitions.—

"(1) Total adjusted income.—For purposes of subsection (b), the total adjusted income of an individual (or of a husband and wife who file a joint return) for any taxable year is the adjusted gross income minus the deduction for personal exemptions provided in section 151.

"(2) Social security taxes.—For purposes of subsection (b), the social security taxes of an individual for any taxable year is—

"(A) the sum of—

"(i) the tax imposed by section 3101 which is deducted and withheld from the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year, and

"(ii) the tax imposed by section 1401 on the self-employment income of such individual for the taxable year, reduced by

"(B) the amount allowable under section 6413(c) as special refund of tax imposed on wages.

"(d) Treatment as Overpayment of Tax—

"For treatment of the credit allowed by this section as an overpayment of tax, see section 6401(b)."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Special credit for social security taxes paid by low-income individuals.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. Section 6401(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to excessive credits) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Excessive Credits Under Sections 31, 39, and 40.—If the amount allowable as credits under sections 31 (relating to tax withheld on wages), 39 (relating to certain uses of gasoline and lubricating oil), and 40 (relating to special credit for social security taxes paid by low-income individuals) exceeds the tax imposed by subtitle A (reduced by the credits allowable under subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1, other than the credits allowable under sections 31, 39, and 40), the amount of such excess shall be considered an overpayment."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 1602—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE BASIC PAY OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill to increase the basic pay of members of the uniformed services. I will have a comprehensive statement to make regarding the need for this bill within the next few days. However, in the interest of time, I am introducing it today and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. I, of course, welcome my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

As I have stated, I will speak at length on the measure in the near future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1602) to increase the basic pay of members of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

	Years of service computed under section 205														
"Pay grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,872.60	$1,938.70	$1,938.70	$1,938.70	$1,938.70	$2,012.80	$2,012.80	$2,167.30	$2,167.30	$2,322.40	$2,322.40	$2,477.20	$2,477.20	$2,632.00	$2,632.00
O-9	1,659.80	1,703.20	1,739.80	1,739.80	1,739.80	1,783.50	1,783.50	1,857.60	1,857.60	2,012.80	2,012.80	2,167.30	2,167.30	2,322.40	2,322.40
O-8	1,503.30	1,548.40	1,585.10	1,585.10	1,585.10	1,703.20	1,703.20	1,783.50	1,783.50	1,857.60	1,938.70	2,012.80	2,093.80	2,093.80	2,093.80
O-7	1,248.90	1,334.10	1,334.10	1,334.10	1,393.60	1,393.60	1,474.30	1,474.30	1,548.40	1,703.20	1,820.60	1,820.60	1,820.60	1,820.60	1,820.60
O-6	960.90	1,056.30	1,125.30	1,125.30	1,125.30	1,125.30	1,173.90	1,246.30	1,317.90	1,357.40	1,416.30	1,447.20	1,531.00	1,660.90	1,660.90
O-5	797.00	936.70	1,000.60	1,000.60	1,000.60	1,000.60	1,075.70	1,124.80	1,173.90	1,246.30	1,317.90	1,357.40	1,405.20	1,405.20	1,405.20
O-4	690.50	840.10	896.90	896.60	912.60	953.60	1,018.60	1,075.70	1,124.80	1,173.90	1,206.70	1,206.70	1,206.70	1,206.70	1,206.70
O-3 [2]	641.80	717.10	765.90	848.10	888.40	920.80	970.30	1,018.60	1,043.30	1,043.30	1,043.30	1,043.30	1,043.30	1,043.30	1,043.30
O-2 [2]	514.30	610.90	733.80	758.10	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00	774.00
O-1 [2]	461.30	510.50	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40	637.40

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,903.90 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

"[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN CREDITED WITH OVER 4 YEARS' ACTIVE SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER

	Years of service computed under section 205											
"Pay grade	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$848.10	$888.40	$920.80	$970.30	$1,018.60	$1,059.50	$1,059.50	$1,059.50	$1,059.50	$1,059.50	$1,059.50	$1,059.50
O-2	758.10	774.00	798.70	840.10	872.50	896.90	896.90	896.90	896.90	896.90	896.90	896.90
O-1	637.40	680.60	706.00	731.40	756.80	791.00	791.00	791.00	791.00	791.00	791.00	791.00

XUM

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$653.40	$700.90	$700.90	$717.10	$749.60	$782.50	$814.90	$872.50	$912.60	$945.50	$970.30	$1,002.30	$1,035.60	$1,116.00	$1,116.00
W-3	593.90	644.50	644.50	652.30	660.30	708.60	749.60	774.00	798.70	822.60	848.10	880.60	912.60	945.50	945.50
W-2	520.10	562.60	562.60	578.80	610.90	644.50	668.80	692.80	717.10	741.90	765.90	790.20	822.60	822.60	822.60
W-1	452.40	518.90	518.90	561.60	587.00	612.50	637.40	663.70	689.00	714.50	739.40	765.70	765.70	765.70	765.70

"ENLISTED MEMBERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9[1]							$774.60	$792.20	$810.80	$828.60	$846.70	$863.60	$909.20	$997.60	$997.60
E-8						$649.90	668.20	685.80	704.00	721.70	739.10	757.20	802.00	891.10	891.10
E-7	$442.50	$530.30	$549.90	$569.50	$588.80	607.60	626.90	646.90	675.70	695.00	714.20	723.60	772.20	868.80	868.80
E-6	396.00	480.90	500.70	521.20	541.60	561.10	581.60	611.40	631.00	651.00	661.40	661.40	661.40	661.40	661.40
E-5	342.00	421.30	441.30	460.90	491.30	511.20	531.20	550.70	561.10	561.10	561.10	561.10	561.10	516.10	561.10
E-4	298.20	373.90	394.70	425.70	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90	446.90
E-3	215.90	301.00	322.30	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90	342.90
E-2	177.80	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30	249.30
E-1	171.60	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20	228.20
E-1 (Under 4 months)	160.40														

"[1] While serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, or Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $1,212.80 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1970.

S. 1603—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL INCREASING WIDOW'S SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on March 13, 1969, I introduced a measure, S. 1541, to provide for an automatic cost-of-living increase in social security benefits. I announced then that I would be making a number of other proposals which would, together, modernize our social security system. Today I introduce another such measure—one that would increase widow's and widower's benefits.

The need to increase a widow's social security benefits has been recognized for a long time. Up to 1961, the benefit paid to a widow was only three-fourths of the retirement benefit which would have been paid to her husband. The arithmetic of this old provision was neat. A husband and wife got 1½ times the benefit paid to a single person, and a widow got one-half of the amount paid to a couple. It was obvious, though, that a widow could not live on one-half of what a couple did. As a result there were many proposals to increase the widow's benefit. And, in 1961 it was raised 10 percent to the level it is at today, 82½ percent of the husband's retirement benefit.

The inadequacy of the 1961 increase was quickly noted, and in 1963 the President's Commission on the Status of Women recommended that the widow's benefit be increased to the full amount that the husband would have received as a retirement benefit. In justification of this recommendation the Committee on Social Insurance and Taxes, in its report to the President's Commission, said:

> Widows should not be expected to live on less than what a single man gets.

I have the impression that the only reason this recommendation has not been adopted up to now is that either the funds were not available or it was thought desirable to use the available funds for some other change in the social security program. As for myself, I believe this is one of the more important changes which could be made. And I think this is the time to make the change. It would cost, on a long-range basis, about one-half of the currently available actuarial surplus reported in the latest report of the trustees of the social security funds.

Accordingly, the legislation I propose would provide for paying a widow at 65 the full retirement benefit which would have been payable to her husband at age 65. If the benefit begins earlier than 65, it would be reduced in the same way that a man's retirement benefit is reduced, but not below the present level of 82½ percent now payable at age 62 and later. The benefits which start between the ages of 60 and 62 would continue to be reduced as they are under present law.

Mr. President, I urge prompt action on this measure and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1603) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a person who first becomes entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit thereunder after attainment of age 65 to receive a benefit equal to 100 percent of the primary insurance amount of such person's deceased spouse, and to permit an actuarially reduced benefit to be paid to persons who become entitled to such a benefit prior to attaining such age, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1603

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 202(e)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, such widow's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to whichever of the following is the greater: (A) 82½ percent of the primary insurance amount of such deceased individual (determined without regard to subsection (q)), or (B) 100 percent of the primary insurance amount of such deceased individual, less any reduction provided under subsection (q)."

(b) Section 202(f)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Except as provided in paragraph (5), such widower's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to whichever of the following is the greater: (A) 82½ percent of the primary insurance amount of his deceased wife (determined without regard to subsection (q)), or (B) 100 percent of the primary insurance amount of his deceased wife, less any reduction provided under subsection (q)."

(c)(1) Section 202(q)(9) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(9) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'retirement age' means age 65."

(2) Section 202(q) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) Reduction of benefit amounts provided by the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any widow's insurance benefit determined pursuant to subsection (e)(2)(A) or any widower's insurance benefit determined pursuant to subsection (f)(3)(A)."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1969.

S. 1604—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO ACTUARIALLY REDUCED BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY AT AGE 60

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on March 13, 1969, I introduced legislation (S. 1541) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for an automatic cost-of-living increase and announced my intention of proposing additional amendments. Earlier today, I proposed a second amendment to increase widow's and widower's social security benefits. I now introduce a third proposal I believe necessary to assist in modernizing our social security system—a measure to provide actuarially reduced benefits under social security at age 60.

Back in 1935, when the Social Security Act was being formulated, very little was known about the ages at which people retired. Wilbur J. Cohen, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, devoted a whole chapter of a book describing how 65 was selected as the retirement age. The chapter is instructive. It starts with a sentence which says:

> The simple fact is that at no time did the staff or members of the Committee on Economic Security deem feasible any other age than 65 as the eligible age for the receipt of old age insurance benefits.

And almost at the end of the chapter he says:

> This brief account of how age 65 was selected in the old age insurance program in the United States indicates that there was no scientific, social, or gerontological basis for the selection. Rather, it may be said that it was the general consensus that 65 was the most acceptable age.

Now we know a little more about the ages at which people do retire. In 1961 men were permitted to accept reduced retirement benefits as early as age 62 and since then more than one-half of the men who have been actually paid retirement benefits have been under 65 at the time the benefit was first paid. And if we look at 1967, the latest full year for which I could get figures, we find that 61 percent of the people who were paid their first retirement benefit were under 65. This 61-percent figure includes both men and women. If we break it down by sex, the figures are 55 percent of the men and 71 percent of the women.

It seems to me the figures indicate that many people stop working for one reason or another well before 65. And, while I do not want to encourage the retirement of people who are willing and able to work, I think it only reasonable to provide benefits to those older people who are under 65 and unable to work. This includes people who have lost their jobs, and people with a disability that is not severe enough to qualify them for disability benefits.

I do not want to tire this body with a long explanation of my proposal. Most of us are familiar with the efforts of the gentleman from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT BYRD, to get the Social Security Act changed so that actuarially reduced benefits can be paid as early as age 60. Speaking in this Chamber on April 17, 1967, Senator BYRD said the provision:

> To permit men and women, otherwise eligible, to retire voluntarily at age 60, with actuarially reduced benefits is a logical and progressive step in updating our social security system.

On several occasions the Senate has sent legislation to do this to the other body only to lose it in conference. I hope that the next time we adopt this measure, it will still be in the bill that comes back. It is a worthy amendment, and, because it provides actuarially reduced benefits, it will have no longrun cost.

Mr. President, I believe that anyone reaching age 60, and covered under social security, should be provided the opportunity to retire with reduced benefits should they choose to avail themselves of the opportunity. For that reason I ask prompt action on my measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1604) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of actuarially reduced benefits thereunder at age 60, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 202(a)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "62" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(2) Section 202(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(3) Section 202(c) (1) and (2) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(4)(A) Section 202(f)(1)(B), (2), (5), and (6) is amended by striking out "62" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(B) Section 202(F)(1)(C) of such act is amended by striking out "or was entitled" and inserting in lieu thereof "or was entitled, after attainment of age 62,".

(5)(A) Section 202 (h)(1)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(B) Section 202(h)(2)(A) of such Act is amended by inserting "subsection (q) and" after "Except as provided in".

(C) Section 202(h)(2)(B) of such Act is amended by inserting "subsection (q) and" after "except as provided in".

(D) Section 202(h)(2)(C) of such Act is amended by—

(i) striking out "shall be equal" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall, except as provided in subsection (q), be equal"; and

(ii) inserting "and section 202(q)" after "section 203(a)".

(b)(i) The first sentence of section 202 (q)(1) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "husband's, widow's, or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "husband's widow's, widower's, or parent's", and (B) by striking out, in subparagraph (A) thereof, "widow's or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(2)(A) Section 202(q)(3)(A) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "husband's, widow's, or widower's" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's", (ii) by striking out "age 62" and inserting in lieu thereof "age 60", and (iii) by striking out "wife's or husband's" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife's, husband's, or parent's".

(B) Section 202(q)(3)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "or husband's" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof ", husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(C) Section 202(q)(3)(C) is amended by striking out "or widower's" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "widower's, or parent's".

(D) Section 202(q)(3)(D) of such Act is amended by striking out "or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "widower's, or parent's".

(E) Section 202(q)(3)(E) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "(or would, but for subsection (e)(1) in the case of a widow or surviving divorced wife or subsection (f) (1) in the case of a widower, be) entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit to which such individual as first entitled for a month before she or he" and inserting in lieu thereof "(or would, but for subsection (e)(1), (f)(1), or (h)(1), be) entitled to a widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit to which such individual was first entitled for a month before such individual", (ii) by striking out "the amount by which such widow's or widower's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount by which such widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit", (iii) by striking out "over such widow's or widower's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "over such widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit" and, (iv) by striking out "attained retirement age" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "attained age 60 (in the case of a widow or widower) or attained retirement age (in the case of a parent)".

(F) Section 202(q)(3)(F) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "(or would, but for subsection (e)(1) in the case of a widow or surviving divorced wife or subsection (f)(1) in the case of a widower, be) entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit to which such individual was first entitled for a month before she or he" and inserting in lieu thereof "or would, but for subsection (e)(1), (f)(1), or (h)(1), be) entitled to a widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit for which such individual was first entitled for a month before such individual", (ii) by striking out "the amount by which such widow's or widower's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount by which such widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit", (iii) by striking out "over such widow's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "over such widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit", (iv) by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60", and (v) by striking out "attained retirement age" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "attained age 60 (in the case of a widow or widower) or attained retirement age (in the case of a parent)".

(G) Section 202(q)(3)(G) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(3) Section 302(q)(5)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(4) Section 202(q)(6) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "husband's, widow's, or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's', and (ii) by striking out, in clause (III), (widow's or widower's and inserting in lieu thereof "widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(5) Section 202(q)(7) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "husband's, widow's, or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's"; and

(B) by striking out, in subparagraph (E), "widow's or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(6) Section 202(q)(9) of such Act is amended by striking out "widow's or widower's" and inserting in lieu thereof "widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(c)(1) The heading to section 202(r) of such Act is amended by striking out "Wife's or Husband's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Wife's, Husband's, Widow's, Widower's, or Parent's".

(2)(A) Section 202(r)(1) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "wife's or husband's" the first place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "wife's, husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's", and (ii) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or for widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits but only if such first month occurred before such individual attained age 62".

(B) Section 202(r)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "wife's or husband's" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife's, husband's, widow's, widower's, or parent's".

(d) Section 214(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A), by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting the following new subparagraphs (A) and (B):

"(A) in the case of a woman who has died, the year in which she died or (if earlier) the year in which she attained age 62,

"(B) in the case of a woman who has not died, the year in which she attained (or would attain) age 62,".

(e) (1) Section 215 (b) (3) of such Act is amended by striking out subparagraph (A), by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting the following new subparagraphs (A) and (B):

"(A) in the case of a woman who has died, the year in which she died or, if it occurred earlier but after 1960, the year in which she attained age 62,

"(B) in the case of a woman who has not died, the year occurring after 1960 in which she attained (or would attain) age 62,".

(2) Section 215 (f) (5) of such Act is amended (A) by inserting after "attained age 65," the following: "or in the case of a woman who became entitled to such benefits and died before the month in which she attained age 62,"; (B) by striking out "his" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her"; and (C) by striking out "he" each place after the first place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "he or she".

(f) (1) Section 216 (b) (3) (A) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(2) Section 216 (c) (6) (A) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(3) Section 216(f)(3)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(4) Section 216(g)(6)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

(g)(1) Section 202(q)(5)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "No wife's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "No wife's insurance benefit to which a wife is entitled".

(2) Section 202(q)(5)(C) of such Act is amended by striking out "woman" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife".

(3) Section 202(q)(6)(A)(i)(II) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "wife's insurance benefit" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife's insurance benefit to which a wife is entitled", and (B) by striking out "or" at the end and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or in the case of a wife's insurance benefit to which a divorced wife is entitled, with the first day of the first month for which such individual is entitled to such benefit, or".

(4) Section 202(q)(7)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "wife's insurance benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife's insurance benefits to which a wife is entitled".

(h) Section 224 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out "62" and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1969, but only on the basis of applications for such benefits filed after September 1969.

S. 1605—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL INCREASING AMOUNT OF EARNINGS ALLOWED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in recent days I have proposed a number of amendments, including four amendments I introduced today, which I believe necessary to bring about a much needed modernization of the Social Security Act. I have proposed an automatic cost-of-living increase, an increase in widow's social security benefits, and actuarially reduced benefits under social security at age 60 instead of the present age 62. Today I propose a fourth amendment to increase the amount of earnings permitted a beneficiary before a loss of benefits.

One of the more frequent complaints one hears about the social security program is that a beneficiary is not allowed to earn enough money to supplement his monthly benefit. The average retirement benefit is now about $1,200 a year, and if a person earns more than $1,680 a year he loses some of his benefits.

The present law says that a person who earns over $1,680 a year will have his benefits reduced by $1 for each $2 he earns between $1,680 and $2,880 and by $1 for each $1 he earns above $2,880. He can, however, be paid for any month in which he earns no more than $140 regardless of how much he earns in the year.

For example, take the average retiree who gets benefits of $1,200 a year. If he earns $2,880 he loses $600 in benefits, and if he earns $3,480, or more, he loses all of his $1,200 benefit.

Under this system there is little incentive for a great many people to go to work. I believe that if we would modify this provision a little, we would offer many older people a more realistic opportunity to work. As a result, they would not only have the additional income that goes with a job and making a contribution to the economic well-being of the Nation. Moreover, at a time when we are told there is a chronic shortage of skilled labor, it seems silly to discourage experienced and skilled people to live in idleness when they are willing and able to work.

Therefore, I propose that the law be changed so that full benefits can be paid to people who earn no more than $2,400 a year. Corresponding changes would be made in the related provisions so that a person who earns more than $2,400 would have his benefits reduced by $1 for each $2 he earns between $2,400 and $3,600, and by $1 for each $1 he earns above $2,600. Benefits would also be paid for any month in which a person earns no more than $200, regardless of the amount he earns in the year.

As the result of this change, the average retiree who gets $1,200 in benefits would lose only $600 in benefits if he earned $3,600 a year, and he would not lose all of his benefits until he earned at least $4,200.

In light of today's wages and prices, these seem like more reasonable amounts than those provided in present law.

This change would increase the cost of the social security program by about the same amount as the provision I introduced earlier to increase widow's benefits. However, as I have pointed out before, this is only about one-half of the actuarial surplus reported by the trustees of the social security funds. As a result, the program will remain financially sound even with the adoption of these proposals. We can actuarially afford this amendment, Mr. President, but we cannot afford not to enact it. I urge its every consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1605) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount of individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1605

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$140" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

(b) Paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$140" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

S. 1606—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL LOWERING FROM 72 TO 65 THE AGE FOR SPECIAL MINIMUM BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT FOR CERTAIN OTHERWISE UNINSURED INDIVIDUALS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I now introduce the fifth of a series of measures I am proposing to modernize our social security system. On March 13, 1969, I introduced a measure (S. 1541) to provide an automatic cost of living increase. Earlier today I proposed a measure to increase a widow's social security benefits (S. 1603). I propose actuarially reduced benefits under social security at age 60 (S. 1604) and I introduced a measure to increase the amount of earnings allowed social security beneficiaries (S. 1605). The measure I introduce now would lower from 72 to 65 the age at which certain otherwise uninsured individuals may be entitled to special minimum benefits under the Social Security Act, and otherwise to liberalize the conditions under which benefits for such individuals may be paid under the act.

Three years ago, after a very spirited debate, we voted to provide a special social security benefit to everyone age 70 and over who did not qualify for regular social security benefits. When the bill—the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—came back from conference the proposal was limited to those people who were 72 or who would be 72 before 1968. Quite frankly, I cannot understand why the benefit should not be paid to everyone who reaches retirement age without qualifying for regular social security benefits. Surely there is not some magic in reaching a specified age after a specified date that makes a person less deserving.

Absent magic, the logical thing is to provide, as my bill would, that whenever a person reaches 65, the age at which full social security benefits are payable without qualifying for a social security benefit, he will be paid the special benefit now paid only to those who reached 72 before 1968. This benefit is not very large; presently it is $40 a month for a single person and $60 a month for a couple. It can, however, be a significant part of an older person's income, particularly in areas where cash incomes are often low. I would not, however, change the provision which says, in effect, that if a person can qualify for a welfare payment which is financed in part with Federal funds, he cannot receive both the welfare payment and the special social security benefit. A person can choose which payment he will get, but he cannot get both.

At the time the 1966 amendment was being debated there was a great deal of concern that the provision would provide everyone in the world, from leaders of the Communist nations to retired Senators, with a social security benefit even though he had never worked under social security. The legislation enacted, however, did not provide for paying benefits to such a broad spectrum of people. Benefits are payable only to residents of the United States who are either citizens or lawfully admitted aliens. And people who are entitled to governmental pensions—retired Senators and schoolteachers, for example—have the special benefit reduced by the amount of their pensions. In trying to keep the Senators out, I think we went further than we should have. We should not have excluded all of the people who get public pensions. Accordingly, my proposal would permit people who have some social security coverage, at least four quarters, to receive the full special social security benefit if they do not have enough coverage to qualify for regular benefits. In this connection, I would remind you that this is not as great a change as it may seem to be, because in 1965 we provided benefits for some people who had as little as three quarters of coverage.

The cost of this proposal to blanket in people at age 65 would, like the provision in the present law which applies to those who were 72 before 1968, be paid out of general funds rather than out of the special social security funds. The method we adopted in 1966 is, to my way of thinking, rational when we consider that the people benefiting from the provision are those who pay income taxes but not social security taxes. Currently this provision would cost less than $100 million a year. I commend this measure to my colleagues and trust we can act on it in the foreseeable future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1606) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to lower from 72 to 65 the age at which certain otherwise uninsured individuals may be entitled to special minimum benefits thereunder, and otherwise to liberalize the conditions under which benefits for such individuals may be paid under such title, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 228 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every individual who—

"(1) has attained the age of 65,

"(2) is a resident of the United States (as defined in subsection (3)), and is (A) a citizen of the United States or (B) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (as defined in section 210 (i)) continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he files application under this section, and

"(3) has filed application for benefits under this section,

shall (subject to the limitations in this section) be entitled to a benefit under this section for each month beginning with the first month after September 1966 in which he becomes so entitled to such benefits and ending with the month preceding the month in which he dies. No application under this section which is filed by an individual more than 3 months before the first month in which he meets the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be accepted as an application for purposes of this section."

(b) Section 228 (c)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in subsection (i), the".

(c) Section 228 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"INDIVIDUALS EXEMPT FROM REDUCTION ON ACCOUNT OF GOVERNMENTAL PENSION SYSTEM BENEFITS

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), if at the beginning of any month an individual has not less than 4 quarters of coverage (whenever acquired), the benefit amount of such individual for such month under this section shall not be reduced on account of any periodic benefit under a governmental pension system for which he or his spouse is eligible for such month."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be applicable with respect to benefits payable under section 228 of the Social Security Act for months after the month following the month in which this Act is enacted, but only on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted.

S. 1607—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY RATINGS AND BENEFITS FOR POW'S

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a quarter of a century ago, in April and May of 1942, some 25,000 American servicemen began one of the greatest ordeals that man has been asked to endure. On April 9, 1942, Bataan was captured by the Japanese, and less than 1 month later on May 6, 1942, the bastion of Corregidor fell. These brave men had held out as America's only outpost in the Pacific against overwhelming enemy forces. But those dates began the horrible days of agony and suffering for all of these American brave. On bloodstained trails they were marched for days without food or water and under constant harassment and torture from their captors.

This was but one of the anxious days both the servicemen and a sorrowful and concerned citizenry had to endure. As late as the winter of 1945 another "death march" was taking place on the other side of the world. Six thousand POW's were marched for 86 days across the frozen grounds of Germany under similar circumstances. Before the war had ended over 120,500 Americans had been captured and subjected to imprisonment and suffering. Only 111,000 were returned after their ordeal; 9,500 had died in these prison camps and on the death marches.

Today, I am introducing legislation along with Senators DODD, DOLE, HART, MCCARTHY, STEVENS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH which will in a small way compensate for those great hardships they had to endure. I am proposing that every man who had served time in a prisoner of war camp for 180 days or more be recognized as having suffered severe disability from such inhumane treatment at the hands of the enemy. I am proposing that we authorize the Veterans' Administration to classify all such ex-prisoners of war from World War II, the Korean conflict and the present Vietnam war as being 100 percent disabled for the purposes of receiving disability compensation.

My bill further provides that in any case in which a veteran was held as a prisoner of war for a period of less than 180 days, the Administrator may assign such veteran a service-connected disability rating of such percent as he deems appropriate, but not less than 30 percent, if he finds that the mental and physical anguish suffered by such veteran was so severe as to warrant such rating.

My home State of New Mexico knows well the price that was paid by these prisoners of war. Some 1,800 officers and men of the New Mexico National Guard were stationed on Bataan and Corregidor and were forced into enemy confinement. Many have returned to the State; some died in the prison camps. Many of those who have returned are already receiving some form of compensation, but many others are deserving of this recognition.

Years behind the barbed wire of POW camps has left their imprint on these men. Their suffering has not been compensated for, and we as Americans owe them not only a great debt of gratitude but monetary recognition of their sacrifices.

I ask that you join with me in swift passage of this legislation in order that those who have given so much for our Nation may receive their just dues which we still owe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1607) to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem veterans who were prisoners of war to have service-connected disabilities, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 361. Disability rating for former prisoners of war.

"Any veteran who was held as a prisoner of war for a period of one hundred and eighty days or more, any part of which occurred during a period of war, shall, for the purposes of this title, be deemed to have a service-connected disability rating of 100 per centum. In any case in which a veteran was held as a prisoner of war for a period of less than one hundred and eighty days, any part of which occurred during a period of war, the Administrator may, for the purposes of this title, assign such veteran a service-connected disability rating of such per centum as he deems appropriate, but not less than 30 per centum, if he finds that the mental and physical anguish suffered by such veteran was so severe as to warrant such rating."

SEC. 2. The table of sections of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"361. Disability rating for former prisoners of war."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 1608—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ELIMINATE FLAWS IN THE FOOD STAMP ACT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a catchy song swept this country a few months back, defining what happiness is. Happiness, it explained, means different things to different people. While I make no claims to being a songwriter, I would like to suggest some additional lyrics to that song—namely that, to the needy, happiness means three square meals a day.

I find it shocking, Mr. President—indeed, downright embarrassing to this Nation and viciously cruel to the poor—that we have not yet taken sufficient action to permit our less fortunate citizens this one modest but essential ingredient of happiness.

It is ironic that Americans can rapidly mount massive relief efforts to combat a famine in India, and that starvation in Biafra triggers emotional compassion for urgent action, yet, here at home we shun with indifference or disbelief similar problems of hunger and malnutrition among millions of our fellow citizens. I am frankly appalled that too many Americans tend to place greater credence upon the indignant denial by some short-sighted public officials that people are going hungry, rather than acknowledge the mounting evidence of pitifully stunted minds and weakened bodies caused by persistent hunger.

The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs is performing a vital public service by thoroughly exposing the long-suppressed evidence of large-scale hunger and malnutrition. Needless to say, the evidence which this committee is bringing to the fore increasingly documents the fact that hunger and malnutrition abound in this country far worse than any of us originally conceived a year ago.

Mr. President, I do not intend to presuppose the outcome of the committee's efforts. Its findings will be invaluable in measuring precisely the full magnitude of the job that confronts this Nation. Nevertheless, there exists today a serious gap between words and action—and I for one cannot sit idly by knowing that this gap will continue for at least a year before the committee finishes its work while millions of Americans go hungry.

I am therefore introducing a bill today which will greatly intensify the current efforts to narrowing the nutrition gap. I am confident that this bill will in no way obviate either the committee's deliberations or its ultimate recommendations for long-range solutions.

The sole thrust of my bill is to eliminate four obvious legislative flaws in the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, which hinder effective implementation of the inherent purpose of that act. Specifically, my bill would:

First. Authorize the establishment of minimum nationwide eligibility standards for participation in the food stamp program;

Second. Permit direct operation by the Secretary of Agriculture of a food stamp program in any political subdivision of a State where local governing officials stubbornly refuse to provide a food assistance program for needy families;

Third. Provide for cost-sharing arrangements whereby the Secretary of Agriculture could contribute up to 50 percent of the administrative costs of local food stamp programs; and

Fourth. Remove needless constricting limitations on the appropriation of funds for operating the food stamp program in any fiscal year subsequent to 1969.

These are essential changes that must be made if the food stamp program is ever to become the effective weapon against hunger which Congress envisioned. For example:

A cruel dichotomy exists under the present program. In some States, because of limited resources or for other reasons, local welfare standards upon which eligibility is currently based are overly restrictive and preclude some needy families from qualifying for food stamps. Yet, needy families in identical circumstances, with identical incomes, can qualify in other States with more liberal standards.

Such discrimination would be abolished by establishing minimum nationwide eligibility standards. These standards would help stem the tide of needy persons moving to urban areas with liberal welfare programs, and thereby relieve some of the pressures on our already overcrowded ghettos. Needy persons—regardless of where they live—would thus qualify on an equitable basis, and receive sufficient food stamps consistent with their income to provide a minimally adequate diet. The present system of fragmented standards precludes this; we must abolish this discriminatory practice and put all needy persons on an equal basis.

Nearly one out of every five counties or independent cities—some 576 in all—does not have any type of food assistance program in actual operation today. While about 107 of these are planning programs for some unknown time in the future, the remaining 469 have to date refused to make any provisions to insure that their hungry citizens receive even a minimum diet. Many of these are wealthier counties, whose public officials choose to ignore the problem locally or steadfastly refuse to change their premeditated public policy of covering it up.

My proposal to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate direct operation of a food stamp program in any political subdivision of a State would be a major step toward ending this scandalous condition. It would guarantee that hungry people would be fed in spite of the indifference or obstructionist attitudes of some local officials.

Many communities—though they recognize that a serious problem does exist locally, and are willing to work toward its solution—simply do not have the resources available to cover the cost of administering an adequate food assistance program. In some cases, they cannot afford to begin to pay the administrative costs of starting a program locally; in others, their limited funds prevent expansion of existing programs to adequately reach out to all those who need it most. Thus, while food programs are now operating, or are planned for in communities where over 83 percent of the American people live, less than 6.5 million people of an estimated 30 million needy are now receiving food assistance.

My proposal to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into cost-sharing arrangements would greatly assist these resource-poor communities. It would permit the Secretary to contribute up to 50 percent of the administrative costs of these local programs. This would help to insure that the certification and issuance of food stamps could be carried out at locations more convenient to all needy persons, rather than at a few, hard-to-get-to sites as is now the case in many counties.

Removing the current limitations on the appropriation of food stamp funds is the most important key to instituting these and other administrative reforms that now prevent the food stamp program from effectively combating hunger. This provision in no way intends to lessen Congress' responsibility for appropriating and overseeing the expenditure of funds for food stamps, nor is it intended to provide the executive branch with a blank check. Rather, it provides a more realistic approach to fulfilling our congressional appropriations responsibility, and, at the same time, would help to dramatically show by actual deeds that we are truly committed to eliminating hunger wherever it exists in America.

Mr. President, the time has come for Congress and the Nation to match their words with deeds. We must face squarely degrading anomaly that chronic hunger within this land of plenty is a daily fact of life for millions of Americans.

XUM

I am well aware of the charges in some quarters that the "hunger" problem is a figment of the imagination to be exploited by civil rights or other "do-gooder" zealots. I know, too, of the allegations that the problem is merely one of ignorance, indifference or gross neglect on the part of the poor.

I categorically reject these theories. To such skeptics, I submit that people are hungry because they are poor or on severely limited incomes. White or black, poverty and hunger are no respecters of race. I commend to their reading the forthright and courageous testimony of my colleagues from South Carolina, Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS, during his recent appearance before the Select Committee on Nutrition. I am convinced that, after reading his testimony, those who are doubters will become believers.

I strongly urge all Members of this Congress to act now in support of my proposed legislation for the immediate relief of millions of hungry Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1608) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum nationwide eligibility standards; to operate the food stamp program in any political subdivision when local governing officials will not agree to operate a food assistance program for needy families; to enter into cost-sharing arrangements with States or their political subdivisions to cover the cost of local administration of the food stamp program; and, to remove current limitations on the appropriations authorized for the program, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the second sentence and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Such standards shall include income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally aided public assistance programs or with minimum income standards prescribed by the Secretary for eligible households, whichever are higher."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection: "(h) Notwithstanding the provision of subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized to directly administer the food stamp program in any political subdivision of any State when the appropriate governing officials of such political subdivisions will not agree to operate a food stamp program under the terms and conditions authorized by this Act, if the Secretary determines that such direct operation is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act. In the event that the Secretary undertakes the direct operation of the food stamp program in any political subdivision, he shall observe all the applicable terms and conditions of this Act and of any plan of operation that is approved by the Secretary for the State in which such political subdivision is located."

SEC. 3. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof except as provided for in subsection (b) of this section, the costs of carrying out the administrative responsibilities assigned to it under the provisions of this Act. Such costs shall include, but shall not be limited to, the certification of households; the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after their delivery to receiving points within the States; and, the issuance of such coupons to eligible households and the control and accounting therefor.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with State agencies by furnishing financial assistance for the payment of administrative costs set forth in subsection (a) above. The amount to be contributed to any State or political subdivision thereof by the Secretary under this section from Federal funds for any year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of the food stamp program to the respective State or political subdivision thereof, and the Federal funds shall be allocated among the States on an equitable basis. Such payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the food stamp program by the State or political subdivision thereof in a manner which the Secretary deems adequate to effectuate the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $315,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. For any subsequent fiscal year, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are determined to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

S. 1609—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO LONGER TERM LEASES OF INDIAN LANDS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARIES OF INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senator ANDERSON, a bill to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico.

The act of August 9, 1955, as amended (25 U.S.C. 415) which this bill seeks to further amend, authorizes leases of Indian lands to be made for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes for terms not to exceed 25 years, with an option to renew for one additional term of not to exceed 25 years. Grazing leases are limited to 10-year terms with no option to renew, and farming leases that involve the making of substantial improvements to the land are limited to 25-year terms with no option to renew.

The act also permits leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, and for farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the growing of specialized crops for not to exceed 99 years. This latter provision applied originally to a number of specific Indian reservations but was amended to include a number of Indian pueblos within New Mexico when the Congress adopted a bill which Senator ANDERSON and I introduced last session and is now Public Law 90–570.

The 99-year maximum lease authority of these reservations—and later for the pueblos—was granted because of the need for longer term leases as the basis for financing substantial developments on the land. Without a long term lease, construction or development loans could not be obtained by lessees from lending institutions.

Mr. President, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of the Interior have supported the past efforts to provide for longer term leases on Indian lands, and I am hopeful they will support this measure. As the Department pointed out to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by letter of August 29, 1968:

> Under present leasing authority, which permits the equivalent of a 50-year lease, a lessee cannot possibly comply with the minimum legal requirements of a substantial segment of the lending community.

The Department pointed out that after a long-term development lease is approved, time must be consumed in preparing development plans, securing requisite approval of those plans, negotiating financing, constructing developments, and marketing them. Under the National Housing Act, for example, mortgage insurance is available for residential housing loans based on a leasehold interest only if the lease has not less than 50 years to run from the date the mortgage was executed.

Leasehold loans by Federal savings and loan associations require a minimum unexpired lease term of 50 years when the loan is made. Laws and regulations governing leasehold loans by State savings and loan associations vary, some following Federal limitations. Insurance companies also follow restrictive policies that generally require leases to extend well beyond the loan amortization period—in some cases requiring 99-year leases.

Mr. President, it has already been recognized in the law that if the Indians of the specified reservations and pueblos are to realize the maximum return for the use of their lands, they must have the flexibility to offer leases with sufficient terms to satisfy the requirements of most lending institutions and to meet the varying market situations that may arise. The Department of the Interior indicated last session that only if the reservations and pueblos have the authority to negotiate leases with terms of up to 99 years will this flexibility exist.

Everything that can be said for the granting of 99-year lease authority to the individual reservations and pueblos is equally true of Indian trust or restricted lands outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in the State of New Mexico.

The Eastern Navajo Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, headquartered in New Mexico, for example, has jurisdiction over hundreds of thousands of acres of Indian trust or restricted lands to which the long-term leasing act should apply. However, on January 18, 1961, the

XUM

Albuquerque, N. Mex., field solicitor issued an opinion stating the long-term leasing act does not authorize leasing of trust or restricted lands outside the boundaries of the Navajo Indian reservations.

Like development of lands within the reservation, anticipated development of the off-reservation Navajo area will depend upon the ability of interested business firms to secure sufficiently long-term leases to justify construction of substantial buildings and improvements and permit borrowing for this purpose.

At a time when Congress is so concerned—and rightly so—with the economic development of underdeveloped segments of this Nation, it ill behooves us not to provide for the development of the above-described lands.

Mr. President, I urge prompt action on this measure and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1609) to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico, introduced by Mr. Montoya (for himself and Mr. Anderson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases", approved August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415), is amended by inserting immediately after "the pueblo of Zuni," the following: "Indian trust or restricted lands located outside the boundaries of Indian Reservations in the State of New Mexico,".

S. 1610—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO EXTENSION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR PERIODS OF SERVICE IN FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators Anderson, Bayh, Bellmon, Bible, Eastland, Fulbright, Gore, Harris, Hart, Hollings, Kennedy, Mathias, Mondale, Nelson, Pell, Sparkman, Talmadge, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of North Dakota, a bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State.

Mr. President, during the past 20 years Congress has considered legislation that would extend retirement benefits to Federal employees for periods of service in Federal-State cooperative programs. The Civil Service Commission has, itself, administratively extended retirement benefits to employees of one Federal-State cooperative program—State and county agricultural extension workers. This was a step in the right direction, but the Commission stopped all too soon. In extending these privileges to employees of one program, they simultaneously refused to extend the privileges to equally qualified employees of other similar programs.

Last year, after the 90th Congress had adjourned, the Commission refused a request in which 12 our colleagues joined me—including eight members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—to accord the same consideration to employees of other Federal-State programs. Under these circumstances legislation is apparently the only recourse for correcting this longstanding inequity.

This is not a new legislative concept, Mr. President. As I have indicated, the inequities which this legislation will correct have been the subject of numerous bills over the past 20 years in Congress. In fact, the Congress did enact a bill in 1955, S. 1041, which would have extended retirement privileges to former employees of six Federal-State programs—State rural rehabilitation corporations, agricultural experiment stations research and investigation, vocational education, agricultural extension, forest and watershed protection, and control of plant pests and animal diseases.

These six programs accounted for perhaps 95 percent of Federal-State personnel. President Eisenhower, however, vetoed the bill suggesting that it was discriminatory since it did not include Federal employees who had had experience with all types of Federal-State programs. Thus, the legislation which I introduce today is drafted in such a way as to provide coverage for employees of all possible Federal-State programs.

Mr. President, besides the agricultural extension workers, to whom the Civil Service Commission extended retirement privileges administratively, Public Law 568 enacted in 1960 provides for the extension of retirement benefits to another large group of employees, the employees of county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees. Other groups recognized for retirement purposes include milk market administrators; referees in bankruptcy proceedings and employees of such referees; and personnel of service canteens.

Federal agencies are experiencing increasing difficulties in recruiting qualified personnel. This situation is recognized and reflected in continuous recruitment programs. Despite these efforts, however, the Federal agencies are confronted with a chronic lack of available qualified personnel for positions in the Federal Government. The transfer of field personnel experienced in Federal-State programs would contribute to alleviation of this situation. Currently, with vocational programs envisioned together with other Federal personnel requirements it will be difficult, if not impossible, to provide adequate Federal staffing without the transferring of field personnel to Federal positions. The provisions of this bill would provide equal recognition in the form of retirement privileges to Federal employees for service in a wide range of Federal-State programs.

The provisions of this bill would include, but would not be limited to, former employees of the following Federal-State programs: Market inspection of farm products; State rural rehabilitation corporations; agricultural experiment stations and investigation; vocational education; cooperative forest management control of plant pests and animal diseases; public employment service; cooperative programs of highway construction; social security assistance; vocational rehabilitation; fish restoration and management wildlife restoration; marketing service and research; public health; aid to certain schools for the education of Indian children; geological survey; and air traffic control.

Mr. President, I think it is important to emphasize that this bill does not extend civil service retirement benefits to employees of Federal-State cooperative programs. All that is sought is the right of such individuals after 5 years of regular Federal service to secure credit toward Federal retirement for service in Federal-State cooperative programs. In order to receive such credit, the employee must pay into the Federal annuity fund, with interest, an amount equal to what would have been deducted from their salaries during their service in Federal-State programs.

The amount of annuity received from Federal retirement when added to the amounts received by the retiree from social security and State or local retirement programs will not exceed the amount which would have been received had he had all his experience in a regular Federal position, that is, it provides that the Federal retirement payments are to supplement annuities received from the above-mentioned sources.

I am informed that there are currently perhaps 8,000 active and retired employees who would take advantage of the provisions of this bill. Most of these came into the Federal service during the formative years of farm programs when their training and experience were essential to the success of the new and rapidly expanding programs. Many of these have retired and because of their limited life expectancy would not "pay up" and claim credit for their Federal-State time.

Future participation will depend on the need for local and State employees to fill key positions in the Federal service and their continuing in this Federal employment for at least 5 years. Officials responsible for staffing and administering Federal programs appreciate the need and necessity for the services of personnel with experience in Federal-State programs. Also these officials are of the opinion that the provisions of this legislation will encourage field personnel to accept Federal positions and thereby relieve a depressing personnel situation.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Congress will move quickly to meet up to its responsibilities to correct an inequity which the Civil Servce Commission seems to acknowledge exists but which the Commission claims it cannot correct administratively.

XUM

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1610) to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Subject to the conditions contained in this paragraph, any employee or Member who is serving in a position within the purview of this Act at the time of his retirement or death shall be allowed credit for all periods of service performed by him (unless the record shows he was certified as being eligible for relief) in the employ of a State, or any instrumentality thereof, primarily in the carrying out of programs authorized by act of Congress and financed in whole or in part by Federal funds (including, but not limited to, cooperative arrangements with Federal contribution in the form of licensing services or supervision); but only if—

"(1) the performance of such service is certified, in a form prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, by the head, or by a person designated by the head, of the department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States which administers the provisions of law authorizing the performance of such service, or is otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Commission;

"(2) the employee or Member shall have to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this Act, exclusive of service allowed by this subsection;

"(3) the employee or Member shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation during the period of service claimed under this subsection if during such period he had been subject to this Act, except this paragraph shall not apply to services covered in paragraph (4) below;

"(4) the annuity computed under this subsection is reduced by the amount of any State annuity which an employee is receiving, or may receive, toward which the employee contributed during such State service and to which he is entitled by reason of such State service. As used in this paragraph, the term 'State' includes Puerto Rico."

SEC. 2. The annuity of any person who shall have performed service described in subsection (k) of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act and who on or after June 30, 1942, and before the date of enactment of this Act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act then in effect, shall, upon application filed by such persons within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and compliance with the conditions prescribed by such subsection (k), be adjusted, effective as of the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, so that the amount of such annuity will be the same as if such subsection (k) had been in effect at the time of such person's retirement.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, benefits resulting from the operation of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

S. 1611—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO NATIONAL CENTER ON EDUCATIONAL MEDIA AND MATERIALS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped.

The unique characteristics of handicapped children; for example, the loss of vision, hearing, or the need for individualized instruction because of retardation or emotional disabilities, contribute to making educational programs for these children a prime target area for the development of educational media and materials. A decade of experience under the Captioned Films for the Deaf Act (Public Law 85–905) led to the expansion of this program in 1967 so that its benefits might be extended to all types of handicapped children.

Expert experience in specially designed educational programs for the handicapped is only slowly being developed and the emerging area of educational technology is following a similar course. Very few persons, whether educators or producers of instructional media, have such expert experience, although there are here and there across the Nation individual examples of excellent materials for the deaf, for the blind, and other handicapped. At present there is a great need to consolidate the resources which are available, to pool the existing knowledge, to bring together the best minds now working in this field, and to provide an environment where rapid growth in educational technology for the handicapped may take place.

The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped is proposed to fill this need. It will be developed by an institution of higher education in the Washington, D.C., area with specific responsibilities for coordination with the Model High School for the Deaf in Washington, D.C., and the media services programs of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, as well as with other model or innovative programs for handicapped children. The proposed national center will provide a focus for the necessary development in this area of education.

To insure some financial participation by the institution of higher education operating the media facility the bill does not authorize funds for the purchase of land. The selected institution of higher education will be required to make available sufficient land for the construction of a separate, self-contained, identifiable structure. The amount of real property necessary will be determined by the Secretary of HEW taking into consideration reasonable future expansion plans.

Today less than 40 percent of the Nation's handicapped children, or only about 2 million of the more than 5½ million such children, are receiving appropriate special education services. Only one teacher, speech and hearing specialist, or similar special educator is available for every 4 that are needed. To fill these voids there must be a systematic attempt to expand the teachers' resources by providing them with specially developed curriculums, media and methods so that we can move toward our national goal of educational opportunity for every child with no exclusion for the child who is handicapped. The National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped will provide a means to develop this specialized material.

Without objection, I request that the full text of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1611) to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 1611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85–905) is amended—

(1) in section 3, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education located in the National Captial Area for the establishment and operation (including construction) of a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, which will provide a comprehensive program of activities to facilitate the use of new educational technology in education programs for handicapped persons, including designing and developing, and adapting instructional materials, and such other activities consistent with the purposes of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe in the agreement. Such agreement shall—

"(A) provide that Federal funds paid to the Center will be used solely for such purposes as are set forth in the agreement;

"(B) authorize the Center, subject to the Secretary's prior approval, to contract with public and nonprofit private agencies for demonstration projects;

"(C) provide for an annual report on the activities of the Center which will be transmitted to the Congress;

"(D) provide that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in performance of work on any construction aided by Federal funds under this subsection will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 276c).

XUM

"(2) In considering proposals from institutions of higher education to enter into an agreement under this subsection, the Secretary shall give preference to institutions—

"(A) which have demonstrated the capabilities necessary for the development and evaluation of educational media for the handicapped; and

"(B) which can serve the educational technology needs of the Model High Schools for the Deaf (established under Public Law 89–694).

"(3) If within twenty years after the completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which such funds have been paid—

"(A) the facility ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or the agreement is terminated, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause for releasing the institution from its obligation, or

"(B) the institution ceases to be the owner of the facility,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated."

(2) in section 2, by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) The term 'construction' means the construction and initial equipment of new buildings, including architect's fees, but excluding the acquisition of land."

and

(3) in section 4, by striking out "and" after "1969," and inserting after "1970" the following: $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973".

S. 1612—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO GENERIC LABELING OF DRUGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill to amend the pure food and drug laws to provide that all labels on containers of prescription drugs sold or given to a patient bear the generic name of the drug or drugs being dispensed. This is the second in a package of bills I intend to offer to help modernize the Nation's food and drug laws.

Very little has been done to update the drug laws since our late colleague Senator Estes Kefauver fought through a host of amendments in 1962 against strong drug industry opposition. Since that time almost no progressive legislation has been passed by the Congress.

The simple change in the law I propose today is urgently needed and commands widespread support.

Drugs now are sold on the market under a multiplicity of trade names. In most cases, there is a proliferation of copyrighted trade names imposed on the same drug, leading to confusion, chaos, and in some cases to discomfort and severe illness. In fact, many drugs have so many different trade names as to make it virtually impossible for the physician to know them all—or even a fraction of them.

During the course of the hearings the Senate Small Business Committee's Monopoly Subcommittee has been conducting on competitive problems in the drug industry, expert witnesses have testified that the generic name provides the most precise and universal information about a drug.

A dramatic example of the kind of tragedy that results was illustrated by the testimony of Dr. Helen Taussig, world famous physician and developer of the famous "blue baby" operation, who deplored the jumbled drug-naming system.

Dr. Taussig had first identified the tranquilizer thalidomide as the culprit drug causing phocomelia—children born with incompletely formed limbs. Her action, coupled with that of the Food and Drug Administration, prevented the sale of the drug in this country, but not before the testing stage of the drug had caused some birth defects.

Dr. Taussig stated that even after the drug had been identified and taken off the foreign market, it was still sold under 50 to 100 different trade names making it impossible for doctors to know what they were prescribing.

Since the use of trade names may thus result in the continued availability of a drug that has been withdrawn from the market, Dr. Taussig said that she would strongly back any measure requiring the generic name on drug labels.

During a televised documentary on the drug industry, Dr. John Adriana, chairman of the Council on Drugs of the American Medical Association stated that all prescription drug containers should be labeled with the generic name "in large print."

And as recently as this past Tuesday, Dr. Edward R. Annis, past president of the AMA and presently a member of the board of trustees, presented the association's position on this matter in testimony before the Monopoly Subcommittee.

Dr. Annis said that the AMA's Council on Drugs believes that all physicians should adopt the policy of indicating on the drug label the names and strengths of the drugs they prescribe, making exceptions only when disclosure would be detrimental to the welfare of the patient.

The American Academy of Pediatrics forwarded to me the resolution of their committee on drugs in which they declared their support of my bill making it mandatory that drug labels contain the official name of the drug being dispensed. They wanted to go on record as being in favor of such a measure, anticipating that I might be introducing this bill again. I am grateful to them for their support and I ask unanimous consent that their resolution be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
Evanston, Ill., January 29, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: On August 8, 1968, you introduced for yourself and Mr. Long of Louisiana "a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers as dispensed to the patient bear the established name of the drug dispensed." (S–3290). This bill was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and no action was taken on it by the Senate.

Anticipating that this bill or a similar one would be reintroduced into the 91st Congress, I requested the Committee on Drugs of the American Academy of Pediatrics to review this proposed legislation and provide me with an opinion. This Committee has met and prepared the following report which has been approved by our Executive Board for transmittal to you:

"The Committee considered that the bill would be very useful for pediatric patients in that labeling would make the management of accidental poisoning in children more efficient. On the other hand, the Committee considered that the brand name should also be included on the label because of the problem of generic equivalency which currently exists. The Committee also felt that the amendment should not be so restrictive to require that all labels of drug containers, as dispensed to patients, bear the established name (and brand name) but rather that under certain circumstances the prescribing physician should have the prerogative of not labeling when this is for the patient's benefit.

"This summary of the Committee's discussion and action on this proposed legislation is passed on to you for appropriate dissemination and action on the part of the American Academy of Pediatrics."

I hope this action on the part of the Academy will assist you in implementing the passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,
STANLEY L. HARRISON, M.D.,
Secretary for Committees.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the widely publicized report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Task Force on Prescription Drugs" as a result of its study in this area recommended:

> That the Congress should enact legislation requiring that the containers of all dispensed prescription drugs be labeled with the identity, strength, quantity of the product, except where this is waived upon specific orders of the prescribers . . . It is frequently necessary for a physician to determine the nature and amount of a prescription drug which a patient has been taking. In some instances—as in the case of a suspected adverse drug reaction, or accidental or deliberate overdose—the rapid identification of a drug may be a matter of life and death.

The committee has heard testimony from many prominent medical authorities, all of whom declared their support of this measure.

Dr. Margaret M. McCarron, assistant medical director of Los Angeles County General Hospital—one of the largest in this country—told the committee that a single patient might be prescribed the same drug under three different names in three separate departments of the hospital, resulting in dangerous overdosages and severe reactions in the case of allergies.

Dr. George Nichols, Jr., Harvard Medical School, pointed out that generic labeling "would protect the patient and make the doctor's job easier."

Dr. Walter Modell, director of clinical pharmacology at Cornell University declared:

> Trade names are phony names which do not communicate any meaning. Some drugs may have as many as 30 or more such names . . . it fosters ignorance and confusion, may be dangerous and is not in the best interest of the health of our Nation.

Dr. Robert H. Moser, director of Walter Reed Medical Center suggested that the label carry the generic name of the company, if the doctor so desires.

Two physicians in private practice testifying on January 23 of this year expressed their unqualified support for this measure. Dr. Frank Ayd, of Baltimore, told the committee:

> I feel very strongly about this. . . . If a doctor is unaware of what a patient is taking he may add another drug which can really be tragic for the patient.

And Dr. Clinton McGill, of Portland, Oreg., said:

> The generic name of the drug on the prescription is something I always do myself.

We have received considerable praise from the pharmacy profession as a result of this bill which I originally introduced in the 90th Congress. A St. Louis druggist wrote that it "would be doing more for pharmacy and the consumer than any single piece of legislation" in his memory as a pharmacist.

Additionally, the committee has received a large volume of mail from private citizens commending our efforts in this connection. This simple, but important measure will help substantially the health and pocketbooks of the American people. I believe the time has come for the Congress to speedily enact this much-needed legislation.

I want to stress that this proposed law would not in any way affect the physician's right to prescribe the drug of his choice or to write the prescription in terms of trade names. It would also allow the name of the company manufacturing or distributing the drug to be affixed on the label following the generic name.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1612) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bear the established name of the drug dispensed, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1612

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 503(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)(2)) is amended by inserting immediately after the words "bears a label containing" the following: "the established name (as defined in section 502(e)(2) of this Act) of the drug or in the case of combination drugs the established name of the active ingredients of the drug".

S. 1613—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL CALLING FOR DESIGNATION OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER DAM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is my privilege to introduce today a bill that would rename the Glen Canyon Dam in honor of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Senators PAUL FANNIN and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, have joined me in sponsoring this legislation, which would honor one of the world's most admired and respected men.

Glen Canyon Dam is located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, 12.4 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona line. It is the key feature of the Colorado River storage project and one of the great dams of the world.

The idea for the "Eisenhower Dam" proposal originated with my fine friend and our former colleague, Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, who served with distinction on the Senate Interior Committee when the Upper Colorado project was authorized. Endorsement for Eisenhower Dam has already been provided by the Utah State Legislature. A resolution to Congress backing the name change passed unanimously in the Utah Senate and gained all but five of the house's 69 votes. In a letter to Senate President Haven J. Barlow, Senator Watkins recommended the resolution, seeking to have the dam name changed similarly as Boulder Dam was changed to Hoover Dam in behalf of a President.

The resolution's chief sponsors in the Utah Senate were Senator E. LaMar Buckner, Senator Richard V. Evans, and Senator W. Hughes Brockbank; however, on motion of Senator Buckner, all senators were included as sponsors.

As President, Dwight D. Eisenhower led the fight for the Upper Colorado River storage project. He put his personal position and prestige behind congressional authorization and appropriation for this four-State project which made possible a dream that had persisted for decades—the taming of one of the longest, wildest, and most savage rivers in the Nation, the Colorado.

With my former colleague, Senator Watkins, who fought so long and hard for the project, I was privileged to attend the ceremonies at the White House when President Eisenhower signed the legislation authorizing construction of the project on April 11, 1956. It is a multipurpose development, regulating the river, creating power, preventing floods, and making water available for use on land and in cities. The 710-foot-high, concrete Glen Canyon Dam was topped out in 1963 and storage of water began in that year. It is creating a reservoir extending 186 miles up the Colorado River and 71 miles up the San Juan River.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that in making this proposal, changing the name from Glen Canyon, we are not in any way slighting the memory or taking away anything from a Mr. Glen or the like. The dam was named after Glen Canyon in which it is situated. The Colorado River extends downstream from the mouth of White Canyon to the mouth of Pah Reah Canyon, Ariz., John Wesley Powell, the famous explorer of the Colorado River and after whom the lake behind Glen Canyon is named, consolidated two previously named canyons writing:

> . . . they now stand as Glen Canyon surrounded by red homogenous sandstone. It opened into many "glens and coves" and we decided to call it Glen Canyon.

The word "glen" is of Celtic origin, meaning "narrow valley."

It seems particularly suitable that this great dam be named after Dwight D. Eisenhower. Few men have served with so much distinction in the defense and preservation of freedom. This would be a fitting memorial to his long and distinguished career as President, General of the Army, and world leader. It would also be lasting testimonial to his faith in the development of the upper Colorado River Basin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1613) to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1613

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the outstanding service rendered by Dwight D. Eisenhower as President, General of the Army, and world leader, the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam, located on the Colorado River in Arizona, is hereby designated as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam.

SEC. 2. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam.

S. 1619—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO FIX A PERMANENT COASTLINE FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a measure which would fix the coastal boundary for the State of Texas at its historical place; that is, the coastline of the State when it entered the Union in 1846. This action is necessary because of a recent Supreme Court decision which upset the traditional boundary, which has long been recognized as the correct one.

The new boundary as outlined by the Court would be the coastline "as it exists currently or at any time in the future." Mr. President, I submit that this is too indefinite a definition for the State of Texas to accept. Under this definition, each time that there is a storm in the western Gulf of Mexico, the coastal boundary of the State of Texas will be changed. In order to intelligently regulate the leasing of off-shore land, the State must be able to fix its boundary precisely. The ever-changing formula expounded by the Court simply will not work.

My bill would permanently place the coastline at the position which it occupied when Texas entered the Union in 1846. Then there could be no doubt about the exact point from which the more

XUM

than three leagues of submerged lands belonging to Texas could be measured. This would end confusion and restore to Texas lands that have been recognized as belonging to her for over 120 years.

Mr. President, it is in the interest of justice that this measure be enacted and I ask the support of my colleagues in order to secure its passage. All that we are doing here is securing a boundary where it has been since 1846; the necessity for having a fixed rather than a "floating" boundary compels this action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1619) to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1621—INTRODUCTION OF THE RIVER BASINS RESEARCH ACT OF 1969

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for additional research and training under the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. This measure, if adopted, would help solve water resources problems in large river basins and would authorize increased opportunities for investigation, study and training in this important field. It is well known that there is great need for a large number of knowledgeable, experienced, and skilled personnel if we are to develop and maintain the complex facilities and conduct the intricate research required to combat growing water pollution control problems. This bill would attempt, at least in part, to help meet this need.

Although in the last few years Congress has taken the lead in encouraging the study of water quality control problems and the maintenance of desirable water standards, much yet remains to be done. The Water Resources Research Act of 1964, as well as the subsequent Water Quality and Water Resources Planning Acts, were all landmarks on the road toward improved pollution control. Similarly, the establishment last year of the National Water Commission, which is charged with reviewing national water resource problems, and the increased authorization in 1968 for the administrative functions of the Water Resources Council, should make significant contributions to the overall program. While authorizations for water resource research have been increased, the amounts authorized for this purpose have not been sufficient to cope with the challenge and the actual appropriations have fallen far short of total authorizations each year.

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 authorized grants to each State, starting at $75,000 for the first year but increasing to $100,000 annually after the third year, for the purpose of helping to establish and carry on the work of water resources research institutes at a college or university in that State. In addition the act authorized dollar-for-dollar matching funds equal to amounts made available to institutes by States or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken; total funds for this purpose, however, began at only $1 million in fiscal 1965 and were to increase an equal amount each fiscal year until 1969 and subsequent years when $5 million would be available annually. Title II of the same act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make additional grants to and finance contracts with educational institutions, private foundations, firms, or individuals to conduct water research projects, for which purpose $5 million was authorized for fiscal 1967 with annual increases of $1 million each year until fiscal 1972, when $10 million would be available for each year through fiscal 1976.

Unfortunately, Congress has not been willing or able to fund fully even these minimum appropriations for water research in the last few years. Although a total of $10 million was authorized for this purpose in the fiscal year 1968, only half of that amount was actually appropriated. The record for fiscal year 1969 is even worse; a total of $12 million was authorized but only $5 million was appropriated. For the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, the law permits a total authorization of $13 million but the amount requested in the Budget is again only $5 million.

These reduced sums cannot begin to meet the requests for assistance in water research made by State water resources research institutes, educational institutes, private foundations, firms and individuals. For example, I have been informed that 224 proposals requesting over $6 million in matching grants were submitted by institutes in fiscal year 1968 but only 101 of these could be funded with the $3 million available. Likewise, during the same year some 336 proposals requesting over $33 million for research grants and contracts were received from educational institutions and others under title II, out of which only 31 could be provided assistance from the $2 million appropriation. The present fiscal year is much the same; only 90 of the 244 proposals from institutes requesting matching grants totaling more than $8 million could be met from the $3 million appropriation, and again only 31 of the 352 proposals requesting more than $37 million from educational institutions and others under title II could be honored. Fiscal year 1970 appears at this point to be equally dismal; although a total of $13 million will be authorized under present law, the President's budget asks for only $5 million. Despite this, on March 10, 1969, 355 proposals from institutes seeking over $12 million in matching funds and 360 proposals from educational institutions and others requesting over $35 million in research grants and contracts had already been submitted to the Office of Water Resources Research.

The bill I am introducing today would supplement and provide additional means for implementing the present programs of water resources research. Its primary purpose is to focus attention on the needs and problems of large river basins and to provide additional authorization of funds for research and training. It would assure that in each large river basin there would be established a river basin institute whose primary function would be the careful study and analysis of that particular river basin as an entity. One expert has stated that water resource problems of large river basins are among the major impediments to effective water resources conservation and utilization. These problems are so complex that in many cases present technology is not capable of their solution. Substantially enlarged research efforts are needed to cope adequately with these problems.

Let me emphasize that the bill would not, however, lead to any duplication of facilities or services. The Secretary of the Interior would be directed, wherever possible, to arrange for the water resources research institutes established under section 100 of the 1964 act to serve as the institute for each particular large river basin. However, if none of those institutes were able to fulfill this function, then the Secretary could enter into arrangements with other nearby educational institutions for this purpose.

Mr. President, under the Water Quality Act of 1965 all States were required either to adopt water quality standards and implementation plans for their interstate waters or be subjected to standards imposed by the Secretary of the Interior. All 50 States as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have now submitted standards, and about one-third or so of them have been approved. The need for securing compliance with these standards by municipalities, industries, and rural operators will require greater knowledge of our rivers and streams as organic entities. For instance, it has been estimated there will be need for some 900 stream and 1,300 open-water sampling locations in the United States by 1972. I have been informed that the interaction of flows into a stream channel from both the cultural and physical sources has, as yet, never been completely defined for any major river or river system. Knowledge of the interrelationship of biological, chemical, and physical components in a flowing stream could enable more complete control over water quality while utilizing surface water resources for maximum benefits.

The bill would authorize an additional $5 million each year, beginning with fiscal year 1970, for large river basin institutes and for expanded research and training opportunities. If river basin research and training institutes are established in each large river basin, they could provide the facilities and staff necessary for study and evaluation of that river system and recommend specific measures for its control. Each river basin is marked by a different pattern of land use, industrial and commercial development, and human occupancy. Because no two rivers can be expected to respond identically to the varied landscapes through which they flow, no common pattern of control would result in equally desirable conditions of water quality. Increasing demands are being made on our surface water supply; in view of antici-

XUM

pated greater use, it is imperative that knowledge and understanding of river quality conditions keep pace. The large river basin institutes proposed in this bill, through specific programs designed for a river as an ecological unit, could provide the basis for future successful management of our invaluable water resources.

Scattered throughout many river basins are numerous small communities and small industries which, individually, may contribute only minor quantities of vast effluent. Collectively, however, they can have a major role in the deterioration of streams or rivers. The proposed river basin institutes would provide the means for evaluating existing conditions, would conduct research on what methods would best serve to protect these waterways from pollution, and would encourage the adoption of control measures.

The bill, if adopted and properly funded, would also help relieve serious personnel shortage in the water quality control field. Many States, local governments, and private industries have found it very difficult, if not impossible, to locate a sufficient number of adequately trained persons to serve in their water pollution control facilities. The bill would authorize both fellowships and short-training grants which would be administered through institutions of higher learning offering advanced degrees in the fields associated with water quality control. This would provide opportunities for needed research and for the training of skilled personnel, and it would permit the application of practical techniques and scientific procedures to existing problems in a realistic training situation.

Authorizing training grants would also permit local governmental units, as well as industrial and agricultural water users, to obtain much-needed in-service training for their employees. It has been reported to me that present demands for personnel in water quality control establishments have resulted in the employment of workers who have had little or no training for the job they must do. The general lack of opportunity for these employees to improve their competency and knowledge through additional training obviously is a deterrent to achieving better quality waters in our communities.

The institutes contemplated by this bill could serve as primary centers for the study and analysis of interrelated water resources problems in our major river basins. At the same time they could provide research opportunities not now sufficiently available for meaningful solutions to today's water control problems. Also, they would become reservoirs for the training of the large pool of skilled, experienced personnel which will be needed to man the extensive water resource and pollution control facilities our Nation must construct in the next decade. For these reasons I hope that serious attention can be given to this or some similar proposal in the near future.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, which is quite brief, be printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1621) to provide for additional research and training pursuant to the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to solve the particular water resources problems in large river basins, introduced by Mr. Bayh, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1621

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "River Basins Research Act of 1969".

Sec. 2. The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating section 307 as section 308 and by inserting after section 306 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 307. (a) It is the purpose of this section to provide additional research, investigations, and experiments and training as described in section 100(b) directed toward solving the particular water resources problems in large river basins, as defined by the Secretary for such purpose.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section in each large river basin the Secretary of the Interior shall make the necessary arrangements in such basin for one institute established pursuant to section 100 to serve as the river basin institute for such basin. In any large river basin where the Secretary is unable to make such arrangements with an institute established pursuant to section 100, he may enter into, pursuant to section 200, such a continuing arrangement with an educational institution in such basin, as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section (including training) in such basin.

"(c) In making arrangements pursuant to this section the Secretary shall authorize and encourage the educational institutions selected pursuant to subsection (b), whenever possible and appropriate, to use facilities provided and programs established, pursuant to this Act, to carry out research requested by a State or local government agency within the basin, a river basin commission established for the basin pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act, or other organizations within the basin, except that in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary an appropriate charge shall be made for such research whenever carried out at the request of a private organization.

"(d) The training authorized in subsection (a) may include such fellowships and short-term training as may be appropriate to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall coordinate his activities wherever possible and appropriate with river basin commissions established pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act.

"(f) There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each succeeding fiscal year for the purposes of this section. Amounts appropriated and expended pursuant to this section shall be in addition to amounts authorized pursuant to sections 100 and 200 of this Act."

S. 1622—INTRODUCTION OF THE VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens), the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1969.

Last year I introduced legislation to continue a most important health program—The Vaccination Assistance Act. This program is important not only in terms of those children's lives already saved—and they are many. It is important not only in terms of the normal, complete lives the program has guaranteed—for they number in the hundreds of thousands. It is important also because it has saved literally millions of dollars in health care expenses that would have otherwise been borne by our State governments and our private citizens.

My bill would extend the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962, the only health bill passed by the Congress during the 1962 session. Its purpose was to assist the States to provide necessary immunizations against polio, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough for the children of this country. In the 6 years this legislation was in effect, it was responsible for guaranteeing to millions of children the right to a life free from the infectious diseases which challenged and threatened the lives of children down through the ages.

Diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and smallpox in this country are diseases of the past. Polio was eliminated early in this decade, and all of these other diseases have been kept under control with the help of the Vaccination Assistance Act.

But we should now consider the diseases which are still with us, such as common measles. Before the newly discovered vaccines were made available to infants and preschool children by the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1965—an extended version of the 1962 act—nearly 5 million children were stricken by measles each year, leaving hundreds dead and many thousands more with apparent defects due to the complications of pneumonia, convulsions and encephalitis—all leading potentially to mental retardation.

In an average year in the 1950's, for example, 30,000 children were hospitalized for nearly 300,000 hospital days; those attending school missed 7½ million days of school, from measles alone. Over 5,000 children developed encephalitis, leaving over 1,600 of these children with permanent mental retardation. The disease caused 500 deaths each year.

But last year, because of the wide use made of measles vaccine by private physicians, city, county, and State health departments, there were not 5,000,000 cases of measles—but 220,000 cases, with a corresponding decline in the tragic complications of that disease.

More than 3 million children have been immunized against measles in single-day community campaigns throughout our country. The Vaccination Assistance Act provided the funds for the vaccine for pre-school children but the financing for immunizing school-age children has heretofore been provided by the States. Some States unfortunately, lacked the funds to include school-age children in immunization programs. But many of these campaigns to eliminate a number of physicians, nurses, and pharmacists administered the vaccine without charge. These individuals deserve our praise. In all of the campaigns, tens of thousands of other volunteer citizens came to the aid of their community in helping to man the immunization centers. They deserve our thanks.

During the last 3 years, the funds available to the States through the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1965 totaled $24 million. In this same period, over 8.5 million children did not contract measles, according to a recent issue of Medical World News, who might have been expected statistically to do so, largely because of the intensive national immunization program funded through the Vaccination Assistance Act. Thus, $24 million of prevention saved at least $280 million in medical expenses in the United States in the last 3 years, and $693 million in costs of predictable illness in years to come. These cost figures, of course, do not cover the untold anguish of the families whose children would have contracted the disease.

The Vaccination Assistance Act clearly demonstrates that a national program can assist State and local health officials to provide improved child health. It has been the principal legislative instrument in reducing a potential 5 million cases of measles per year to the 220,000 actual, or 22,000 reported, cases for 1968—a reduction of 96 percent.

Although more than 30 million children have been protected from measles, the job is not finished. Five million children remain unprotected against common measles alone, and an even more serious challenge faces us in this field today—the anticipated epidemic in 1970–71 of rubella.

Rubella, commonly called German measles, is a tragic illness to the pregnant mother and her newborn child. In the epidemic of 1964–65, over 30,000 children were born who were blind, deaf, or had heart defects because their mothers contracted German measles in their first 3 months of pregnancy. Studies cited at the recent International Conference on Rubella Immunization indicate that the eventual cost to the U.S. economy from this one epidemic will exceed $3 billion. Public Health officials advise us that the next rubella epidemic is expected in 1970–71. There are currently 50 million children and women of child-bearing age who are unprotected against this disease.

This predicted epidemic can be virtually eliminated through an effective immunization campaign. This is why I propose to extend a Vaccination Assistance Act for another 4 years. Rubella vaccines are soon to be licensed, and we should have available the machinery to move swiftly into an immunization campaign. Many other infectious diseases can be attacked in a similar manner, as immunizing agents become available in the future, and my bill will provide a base for eliminating them also.

My proposal would cost only $11 million per year. If we do not act now to provide the funds for immunization programs, we will have to appropriate 20 times this amount in the future for long-range institutional care and rehabilitation for the victims of the unnecessary and controllable diseases. Thus, I think we should act now.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will ask that a number of tables and articles be placed in the RECORD, along with a copy of the bill I am today introducing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2 at end of speech.)

Mr. KENNEDY. The first table shows the incidence of the various infectious diseases, and their decline over the past 10 years as the immunizing vaccines became readily available.

The second table shows the costs of the measles cases which still crop up every year, largely because we have not pursued aggressively enough a blanket immunization campaign.

Next is a letter to me from the president of the Massachusetts Medical Society, Dr. John Norcross, and a memorandum detailing the decline of measles cases in Massachusetts.

An article in the November 29 edition of Medical World News discussed the need for legislation of the type I am today introducing, and put the need for it into the context of the predicted rubella epidemic in 1970–71.

An article in the March 11, 1969, New York Times, describes a report by a number of eminent scientists describing their discovery of a definite link between a measles virus and a deadly disease attacking the brain and central nervous system. This link between measles and mental retardation has been increasingly discussed in the scientific and technical press, and I am sure we will see more conclusive evidence of this link in the near future.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 1.—REPORTED INFECTIOUS DISEASES IN UNITED STATES

Year	Polio		Diphtheria		Tetanus		Whooping cough		Measles	
	Cases	Deaths	Cases	Deaths	Cases	Deaths	Cases	Deaths	Cases	Deaths
1958	8,425	255	918	74	445	303	32,148	177	763,094	552
1959	5,787	454	934	72	445	283	40,005	269	406,162	380
1960	3,190	230	918	69	368	231	14,809	118	441,703	380
1961	1,312	90	617	68	379	242	11,468	76	423,919	434
1962	910	60	444	41	322	215	17,749	83	481,530	408
1963	449	41	314	45	325	210	17,135	115	385,156	364
1964	122	17	293	42	289	179	13,005	93	458,083	421
1965	72	16	164	18	300	181	6,799	55	261,904	276
1966	113	9	209	20	235	158	7,717	49	204,136	261
1967	41		219		263		9,718		62,705	
1968	57		243		159				22,527	

TABLE 2—MEASLES—FINANCIAL AND MORBIDITY COSTS

Measles Incidence in an Average Year Before Vaccines, United States

Expected measles occurrence	5,000,000
Hospitalized with complications	20,400
Hospitalized without complications	9,600
Average hospital stay—days	9.5
Total hospital days	285,000
Child schooldays absent	7,500,000
Encephalitis	5,000
Mentally retarded	1,667
Deaths expected	500
Total hospital costs	$10,000,000
Physician fee in hospital—estimate	1,667,000
Total medical and physician cost (measles patient at home)	47,000,000
Cost of schooldays absent	2,250,000
Gamma globulin supplied to contacts	1,133,000
Direct costs	62,050,000
Lifetime care for mentally retarded	166,700,000
Total cost	228,750,000
Estimated cost of immunizing all susceptible children in mass measles program	7,500,000

THE MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Boston, Mass., March 6, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Because of your great interest in the measles immunization program being conducted in Massachusetts by private physicians in cooperation with local boards of health I am enclosing a copy of the latest measles incidence report for your background information.

You may also be interested in knowing that officers and legislative councilors of the Society are planning a visit to Washington, D.C. on Wednesday, April 30th. I hope that your busy schedule will permit us to visit with you on that day so that we may discuss health programs in Massachusetts that are our mutual concern.

With every good wish and kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. NORCROSS, M.D.,
President.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boston, Mass., February 18, 1969.

To Local Boards of Health:

This is our report to you on the status of measles in Massachusetts for the year 1968. You will recall that the statewide Measles Eradication Program was launched in January 1966, with emphasis on the immunization of preschool children. For the year 1967, the objective was to immunize every susceptible school child. The program in 1968 was geared to the immunization of any preschool child missed in the previous two programs. With the support of the Massachusetts Medical Society and the assistance of clinical and public health medicine, measles is on its way to extinction.

Tabulated below are the measles cases reported in Massachusetts for the calendar years 1965–1968 (see enclosed graph):

1965	19,512
1966	853
1967	420
1968	385

As you will observe, from 1965 to 1967 there was a 97.9 per cent reduction in measles. In 1968, there was a further reduction of eight per cent. Thus, in three years, a 98.1 per cent reduction in measles was achieved. Clinical and public health medicine can be proud of this record.

There is another aspect of the Measles Eradication Program which will interest you. As a consequence of the marked reduction in measles, not only were children saved from having the disease with its dreaded complications of encephalitis, mental retardation, convulsive disorders, etc., but the people of Massachusetts also realized a substantial dividend on their investment.

The following table illustrates the direct cost of medical care for measles in Massachusetts. These costs do not include any losses of income by parents or other indirect costs, and do not include what it would cost

XUM

the Commonwealth to support and educate a child who has become retarded because of measles encephalitis.

APPROXIMATE DIRECT COSTS FOR MEASLES IN MASSACHUSETTS

[Based on USPHS formula—MMWR—Apr. 15, 1967]

	Number of patients	Medical expenses
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	19,512	$343,020.96
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1966	853	14,995.74
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1967	420	7,383.60
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1968	385	6,793.28

If we did not have the measles vaccine or an immunization program, the direct cost of caring for measles in Massachusetts from January 1, 1966 to December 31, 1968, based on the annual number of cases expected in Massachusetts (5-year median), would have been in excess of $999,890.00. Each year which follows will further increase the savings realized by the people of Massachusetts.

Both clinical and public health medicine may justifiably be proud of their efforts to eradicate measles.

Very truly yours,

Nicholas J. Fiumara, M.D., M.P.H.
Director, Division of Communicable Diseases.

Approved:
Alfred L. Frechette, M.D., M.P.H.
Commissioner, Department of Public Health.

Approved:
John W. Norcross, M.D.
President, Massachusetts Medical Society.

SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES

Counties	1965	1966	1967	1968
Barnstable	167	6	15	1
Berkshire	1,453	22	13	3
Bristol	1,359	64	27	41
Dukes	2	1	1	3
Essex	3,230	40	39	27
Franklin	194	11	4	3
Hampden	1,535	26	12	3
Hampshire	379	20	13	4
Middlesex	3,323	274	91	78
Nantucket	0	0	0	0
Norfolk	1,107	19	29	17
Plymouth	2,376	14	20	20
Suffolk	2,138	108	97	29
Worcester	2,194	176	36	140
Military	55	72	23	16
Total	19,512	853	420	385

[From Medical World News, Nov. 29, 1968]

VACCINE IS COMING BUT WILL WASHINGTON BE READY?

The rubella vaccine, now slated for U.S. licensing by next spring, is already being hailed as one of the major research developments of the decade. Its initial clinical impact, however, is in danger of being blunted by bureaucratic footdragging in Washington.

Epidemiologists around the country are tallying up the vaccine's safety and effectiveness score in final clinical trials (MWN, Nov. 8), and manufacturers are already moving into full-scale production so that substantial supplies will be ready for the injection guns next year. The current flurry of activity has a single immediate target: If enough children are vaccinated soon enough, the resulting "herd immunity" may thwart the next rubella epidemic—expected in 1970 or 1971 on the basis of past cyclical resurgences—and may thus prevent birth defects in thousands of their as-yet-unborn brothers and sisters. The last epidemic, which was responsible for nearly 50,000 birth defects, was in 1964.

But now there is fear that a recent reshuffle of grant programs in Health, Education, and Welfare may have put this 1970 target almost beyond reach. Last year HEW decided to allow the Vaccination Assistance Act—the standard-bearer in the fight against polio and measles—to expire without request for renewal. HEW policy now calls for support of immunization programs under the new Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Program. But to some critics, this is beginning to look like a case of too little, too late. The money isn't in the till, and if state and local health departments don't know funds are coming they may not have vaccination campaigns ready to go when children go back to school next fall. Effective immunization levels might be delayed in some parts of the country until well into 1970.

Because of this possibility, national voluntary health organizations are applying concerted pressure on HEW to set up a separate program for rubella immunization. And Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) says he will introduce legislation to revive the Vaccination Assistance Act.

To Washington bureaucracy-watchers, one of the most significant aspects of the current immunization brouhaha is that the plea for separate immunization funds represents the first serious challenge to the highly touted concept of comprehensive health planning and health services. Approved by Congress two years ago, this Johnson Administration program has a federal-to-state decentralization emphasis that puts it in line with what is expected from the incoming Nixon regime. Its purpose is to give state and local authorities more discretion in planning health activities that truly meet local needs. These activities would then be supported by a few broad, flexible federal grants, rather than a multiplicity of rigid "categorical" grants earmarked for specific diseases or projects. The categorical programs were to be phased out.

At the time, public health officials by and large endorsed the change. But now the new scheme's ability to support a national attack on a specific disease is being viewed more skeptically. The chips are down, and health leaders outside the federal government are clinging to the old categorical grant programs for federal aid. Experts say that to get a foot in the door in the fight against rubella would probably cost $10 million. Perhaps 35 million to 40 million children would have to be immunized to halt the spread of the disease to susceptible women.

In the fiscal 1969 comprehensive health services budget for project grants, there is not enough money to carry out such a massive effort. If funds under this program do not increase, "it will not be possible to mount an effective national rubella immunization program," says Dr. Russell Teague, president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers and Kentucky health officer.

Until three weeks ago, HEW had no plans for a crash rubella immunization campaign for children. Now, pressure from voluntary health associations and foundations has begun to pay off. Top HEW officials have come up with a possible compromise that amounts to an interim extension of the Vaccination Assistance Program. "We will probably apply to Congress for enough money to initiate some German measles vaccine programs in 1970, or at least to buy the vaccine for the states," HEW's Dr. Leon Jacobs says.

Dr. Jacobs, who is science policy aide to HEW Assistant Secretary Philip R. Lee, explains that the supplemental appropriation of about $10 million would be earmarked for rubella immunization programs under the comprehensive health services program, not under an extension of the Vaccination Assistance Act. Other HEW sources indicate that the grants would actually be administered by HEW's immunization assistance program at the National Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, and that they might be used to buy vaccine for the poor and to help the states in the mechanics of conducting immunization programs. Then, to keep the program in operation, HEW may request additional earmarked funds in its fiscal 1970 budget that will be sent to Congress early in 1969.

"This is just too hot for anyone to ignore," comments Dr. F. Robert Freckleton, chief of the NCDC immunization program. Massachusetts' senior senator is expected to ask for more than $10 million for fiscal 1970 to get the ball rolling. Both Senators Kennedy and Lister Hill (D-Ala.) introduced vaccination bills in the 90th Congress. Neither saw action.

Nonfederal public health officials will be behind Senator Kennedy, according to a survey by the senator's office. Of 80 state and local health officers who answered, 76 indicated they wanted the program extended. In addition, 75 said that states should be allowed to use vaccination grant funds to purchase vaccine for school-age children as well as preschoolers. The vast majority said they favored adding rubella and mumps.

Such overwhelming support is not surprising. The Vaccination Assistance Act has produced impressive results since its establishment in 1963. By next June, when the funds run out, the immunization assistance program will have spent $53.1 million to control polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles.

In 1965, when Congress extended the act to cover measles campaigns, 261,904 cases of the disease were reported in the U.S. In 1968, only 21,000 are expected. NCDC estimates that in this 1965–1968 period, vaccination has prevented 8.5 million cases of measles, 850 deaths from such complications as encephalitis, 2,800 cases of mental retardation, half a million days of hospitalization, and 17 million days of absence from school.

With the $2 million in fiscal 1968 funds which remain unspent, the immunization assistance program at NCDC is supporting 74 projects in areas encompassing 90% of the U.S. population. The money is used to buy vaccine for preschool children, to hire personnel to plan and manage immunization campaigns, to improve local laboratory and epidemiologic surveillance, and for health education and promotional purposes. For schoolchildren and adults, states and localities pay for the vaccine. They also hire the technicians who do the actual immunizing.

The Vaccination Assistance Act "has been an important stimulus in getting state and local health departments involved in achieving high immunization rates in their areas," says Kentucky's Dr. Teague. "This is no time to taper off on such an effective program. Rubella immunization may be even more difficult than getting people immunized against polio."

NCDC's Dr. Freckleton agrees. "Controlling rubella will require a massive public education program, because the real problem is the congenital abnormalities resulting when pregnant women contract the disease. Convincing unimmunized women that they can protect themselves by having their children vaccinated against a relatively harmless childhood disease isn't going to be easy."

The most effective means of attacking the problem is through community-based campaigns involving health departments, medical societies, voluntary health associations, and the news media, says Dr. James Bowes, consultant to the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation. "When measles immunization programs were conducted mainly in physicians' offices," he says, "we got a 20% turnout of susceptible children. Health department campaigns brought a response of 40% to 50%. But when you see a cooperative program between the medical society, the health depart, and the voluntaries, accompanied by strong publicity, you can expect an 80% to 90% turnout."

And rubella isn't the only worry. Existing vaccination programs must not be allowed to erode, health officials say. Otherwise, there will be new outbreaks of polio, measles, and other communicable diseases.

Dr. Bowes, who also is director of medical service for the Pitman-Moore division of Dow Chemical Co., says Texas is a case in point. An ominous 21 of the first 54 polio cases in the U.S. this year have occurred in Texas, he says. But recently, Texas health officials have stepped up their attack on pockets of polio susceptibles, particularly along the Mexican border say NCDC officials.

Measles is also showing an increase, Dr. Bowes adds, noting that Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Illinois, and Indiana have reported more cases of measles in 1968 than in 1967. "I am sure that fully one third of the states won't put as much money into immunization programs under the comprehensive health program as they are now doing under the Vaccination Assistance Program," he says. But HEW officials firmly believe that the comprehensive health planning and service program can handle the rubella immunization program, and do a better job. Dr. James Cavanaugh, the talented 31-year-old administrator who guided the comprehensive health program through its early days, says immunization programs "will be helped, rather than hindered, by being freed from the categorical disease grant shackles." He maintains that once states get a viable planning mechanism under way, they will be able to develop disease immunization and surveillance programs that are far more sophisticated and better able to reach the remaining pockets of susceptible persons.

NCDC's Dr. Freckleton notes that the comprehensive health grant money will be more flexible than vaccination assistance funds. "These funds are not restricted from buying vaccines for all ages." Unless HEW lays down limitations to the contrary, the money could also be used to buy clinic supplies and equipment and to pay the personnel who actually administer the vaccine.

Many public health leaders admit that ultimately the comprehensive health services program may be the best way to fund immunization programs. But with a rubella outbreak coming, they aren't yet ready to give up the tested vaccination assistance machinery that Congress and HEW have discarded.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1969]

SCIENTISTS ESTABLISH A LINK BETWEEN FATAL BRAIN DISEASE AND THE MEASLES VIRUS

(By Harold M. Schmeck Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Scientists have reported finding nearly conclusive proof that measles virus sometimes causes a deadly, mysterious disease that attacks the brain and central nervous system.

The disease is rare, but always fatal. It is believed to kill about 100 American youngsters a year.

Virus experts have long suspected that some widespread diseases of the nervous system such as multiple sclerosis may be caused by viruses acting in a fashion entirely unlike an ordinary virus infection.

The new research accomplishment, therefore, is thought to offer an important avenue for studying not only the obscure brain disease itself but also some of the other more common ailments that are suspected of developing in a similar fashion under the influence of different viruses.

One of the authors of the new report said, for example, that viruses would be sought in brain tissue of multiple sclerosis patients through research using the same method that proved successful with the other, rare, disease.

The obscure disease that scientists now believe is linked to measles has several names. The two that seem to be the most common are subacute sclerosis panencephalitis and Dawson's inclusion encephalitis.

Dr. James R. Dawson Jr. of the University of Minnesota did pioneer studies of the disease about 25 years ago and suggested at that time that a virus might be involved.

He could not then name the virus or explain its mode of action.

Now scientists at the National Institutes of Health and the University of Indiana have reported the actual recovery and growth of measles viruses from brain tissue taken from victims of the rare disease.

The report is carried in the latest issue of Nature, a British scientific publication. The authors are Dr. John L. Sever, Dr. Luiz Horta-Barbosa and Dr. David A. Fuccillo of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, a unit of the National Institutes of Health and Dr. Wolfgang Zeman of the University of Indiana Medical Center, Indianapolis.

Previously it was not possible to grow virus directly from brain tissue of the rare encephalitis victims, although this had been attempted.

The American scientific team was able to coax the measles virus into showing itself unmistakably by mixing cells from the brain specimens with human cancer cells of a type called hela cells.

Scientists have been growing hela cells in laboratory tissue cultures for years. They are known to be receptive to measles virus. The technique of using a mixture of two types of cells in tissue culture to bring forth complete viruses has been widely employed in recent years.

The purpose is to find and release viruses that may be infecting one cell type but that remain incomplete and therefore undetectable.

Specimens from three patients' brains were tested and measles virus was found in each case. Similar tests with brain tissue from patients suffering from other diseases revealed no measles virus.

Since late in 1965 scientists in the United States and elsewhere have been finding more and more circumstantial evidence linking measles virus with the rare brain disease. Commonly the patients had measles several years before the brain disease became evident, but their level of antibodies against measles virus remained abnormally high.

Structures called inclusion bodies were a factor in the disease, although this did not indicate the identity of the virus. Electron microscope pictures also showed particles that looked like measles virus and there was other evidence as well, but it all fell short of being conclusive.

The bill (S. 1622) to be known as the "Vaccination Assistance Act of 1969," introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. STEVENS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT 2

S. 1622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vaccination Assistance Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1969, subsection (a) of section 317 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each of the next four fiscal years, to enable the Secretary to make grants to the States and, with the approval of the State health authority, to political subdivisions of instrumentalities of the States under this section. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1975, shall be available for making such grants during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year. Such grants may be used to pay that portion of the cost of immunization programs against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, measles, and rubella which is reasonably attributable to (1) purchase of vaccines needed to protect such groups of children as may be described in regulations of the Secretary upon his finding that they are not normally served by school vaccination programs, and (2) salaries and related expenses of additional State and local health personnel needed for planning, organizational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs, including studies to determine the immunization needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs, and personnel and related expenses needed to maintain additional epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance occasioned by such programs. Such grants may also be used to pay similar costs in connection with immunization programs against any other disease which the Secretary finds represents a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future."

S. 1626—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on February 18, I introduced S. 1068, a bill to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia. That measure is identical to S. 1864, passed by the Senate last year.

I have subsequently been informed that several changes are desired in the language of the bill to correct some questions regarding professional activities common to both psychologists and psychiatrists. I am introducing a new bill drawn up to reflect these modifications and ask that it be appropriately referred for study.

The bill proposes to safeguard District residents against unqualified persons claiming to practice psychology. It would require an individual to have a Ph. D. degree plus 2 years' experience before being licensed to practice. A grandfather clause would cover those already ethically engaged in practice and reciprocal endorsement is provided for psychologists moving into the District from jurisdictions with standards equivalent to those in the bill.

Members of other disciplines doing work of a psychological nature would not have to be licensed, provided they do not call themselves psychologists. Neither will licensing be required of psychologists employed in institutional settings within the District.

A board of psychologist examiners would administer the act in the name of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The costs of administration will be covered by the fees allowed for in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1626) to regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

XUM

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 845), the ammunition amendment to the Gun Control Act of 1968.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1251) a bill to remove discriminatory provisions of the Social Security Act applying to blind and permanently and totally disabled persons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1179), the Airline Special Services Act of 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), I further ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 50), the Federal Revenue Sharing Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. At the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1297) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. At the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1198), to permit a compact or agreement between the several States relating to taxation of multistate taxpayers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 60) the Program Information Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 740) to establish an Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) calling for measures to strengthen the Tokyo Convention on Hijacking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PARTICIPATION IN THE NINTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON HIGH-SPEED PHOTOGRAPHY

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

S. CON. RES. 12

Whereas high-speed photographic techniques can magnify the time scale of scientific phenomena revealing parameters for research, engineering, and testing that are extremly important to every nation; and

Whereas the First and Fifth International Congresses on High Speed Photography were held in the United States of America, as organized and conducted by the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers; and

Whereas the Fifth International Congress on High Speed Photography in 1960 was supported by the Federal Government, as expressed in the S. Con. Res. 75 in 1959; and

Whereas other meetings were held in Paris, London, Cologne, The Hague, Zurich, and Stockholm, and in each instance these meetings have received the recognition and the support of the governments of the respective host countries; and

Whereas with each meeting the International Congress on High Speed Photography has grown in prestige and stature, and attracts more countries in a continuing growth pattern; and

Whereas the importance of high-speed photography is reflected in nearly all of the physical sciences, including medical, biological, space, and many other fields; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers is once again sponsoring the International Congress on High Speed Photography in Denver, Colorado, in August 1970 and is desirous of representing the United States of America as the host country in the best possible light; and

Whereas the Congress is fully appreciative of the importance of assuring this international scientific meeting is conducted in a manner which will bring credit and enhanced prestige to the United States of America; and

Whereas it is the belief of the Congress that—

(1) the democratic environment of the free world is the best environment for the achievement in science; and

(2) scientists and engineers have special advantages and opportunities to assist in achieving international understanding since the laws and concepts of science cross all national and ideological boundaries; and

(3) high-speed photography is a universal tool in science, important to nearly all sciences internationally, and the International Congress on High Speed Photography is an excellent means of disseminating the advances in technology; and

Whereas the Congress is interested in (1) promoting international understanding and good will; (2) enhancing the excellence of American science, both basic and applied; and (3) furthering international cooperation in science and technology by creating the necessary climate for effective interchange of ideas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that all interested agencies of the Federal Government should participate actively to the greatest practicable extent in the Ninth International Congress on High Speed Photography to be held in Denver, Colorado, in August 1970, under the sponsorship of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HALIBUT WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim the week beginning May 18, 1969, and ending May 24, 1969, as "National Halibut Week." In addition, the resolution calls upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I have regularly presented this proposal upon request of the Halibut Fishermen's Wives' Association, based at Seattle, Wash., so that all interested may pay honor to this natural marine wealth from the sea and also pay proper and due respect to those who harvest and process this excellent protein from the north Pacific Ocean.

Strong leadership for this celebration has been given by the wives' association as well as the other organizations concerned, including crewmen, vessel owners, and the Halibut Association of North America.

Few segments of our fisheries have been beset with more difficulties—from conflict with foreign fleets on the fishing grounds to unfair competition in the marketplace—but these fishermen and those who market their products have continued to produce good qualities of

XUM

high-protein, low-fat resources from the sea. In addition, the good efforts of the International Pacific Halibut Commission in returning this resource to its maximum sustainable yield is a world-recognized accomplishment in the realm of ocean conservation.

I take pleasure in introducing this resolution and in saluting all of those who participate in the harvest and celebration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 13

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period beginning May 18, 1969, and ending May 24, 1969, as "National Halibut Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 20, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1058) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I announce that on Thursday and Friday, March 27 and 28, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the subject of administrative practices and procedures utilized in the exercise of rulemaking and other functions implementing Executive Order No. 11246, relating to equal opportunity in Federal employment, and related laws, regulations, and constitutional provisions.

Witnesses who wish to testify may notify the clerk of the subcommittee in room 3214, New Senate Office Building, extension 5617.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE IMPACT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 25 and 26, and Tuesday, April 1, 1969, on the impact of high interest rates on the economy.

The hearings will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these bills should notify Miss Henrietta S. Chase, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225-7391.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues and the press, I wish to announce at this time that on April 15 the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am chairman, will begin extensive and in-depth hearings on the quality and quantity of health care which is now available or which should be available to the citizens of this country.

In my opinion it is time that this subcommittee inquire into a wide range of health problems, including questions of the adequacy of our delivery systems of health care, health costs, our medical manpower needs, and the need for medical treatment facilities at all levels of care. The subcommittee will also examine the Federal health programs which are now in existence, including medical research programs, in order to determine whether additional legislation is needed and what, if anything, can be done to enhance Federal activities to improve the quality and availability of health care.

The task which I have outlined for the Health Subcommittee is indeed gigantic but I believe that it is time for us to do all in our power to alert the country to the need for a national dedication toward the goal of better health care for all.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Thomas O. Paine, of California, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Thomas O. Paine, of California, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In commenting on the nomination of Mr. Paine, I wish to mention again, as I have in the past, the work of James Webb, who for many years held the position of Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. Webb, I believe, is one of the ablest and most dedicated officials of our Government. He has now retired to private life. He is a man who has served his Nation well.

As I support today the nomination of his successor, Dr. Paine, I wish to mention again the services rendered to our Nation by Mr. Webb.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE BUILT-IN BLACKOUT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, history will be made next Sunday. For the first time, a television network will carry a documentary about the electric power business.

This program, produced by Public Broadcasting Laboratory of National Educational Television, is scheduled to be shown at 8 p.m. over 160 educational television stations, including channel 26 locally.

I am seldom surprised, anymore, by the extraordinary actions which officials of investor-owned utilities will take in order to keep from public view those details of their business which they regard as private, despite their public service nature. Yet I must admit surprise at reading, in yesterday's New York Times, George Gent's account of the efforts of the industry to keep the PBL program off the air.

I have not seen the program. Apparently, the power company officials have not seen it, either. Yet, around the country, the companies are calling stations and writing letters about it. As Mr. Gent's story states, one TV station—WGTE in Toledo—may have lost a $20,000 grant from Toledo Edison as a result of its decision to carry the program.

Mr. President, I think Public Broadcasting Laboratory should be commended for leadership, rather than criticized by an industry which for too long has exercised a monopoly on projection of its images as well as sale of its product.

PBL has been doing an outstanding job in trying to present a composite picture of the problems of America. This is as it should be.

Inevitably, someone will take issue with anyone—be he economist, sociologist, or historian—who is seeking solutions to the complex problems we face. This, too, is as it should be. Far from open debate and discussion, we derive the facts upon which prudent action is based.

One area of legitimate public concern is that of the electric power industry. Some ask if our electric utilities have grown too large; some wonder if these

XUM

utilities are in fact regulated in the public interest. The Federal Power Commission seeks to administer the wholesale power and reporting phases of the electric power industry. In most States, State regulatory commissions are laboring with inadequate and underfinanced staffs to handle a crushing workload ranging from regulation of grain warehouses to intrastate transmission of power. Grave questions have been raised as to the effectiveness of such regulation, and whether or not we should have regulation at all.

PBL has gone into this area with the program entitled "The Built-In Blackout." The electric industry is trying to prevent this program from being shown.

This is an outrageous breach of the doctrine of open decisions based upon open discussion. It is an outrageous attempt by the industry to conceal anything about the power business except the material which the industry chooses to use in house organs, advertising or furnish to schools.

Mr. President, the activities of the power companies in relationship to the TV stations which plan to use this documentary may be of special interest to members of the Committee on Commerce and to others interested in the free flow of public information. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Mr. Gent's article of March 19, "Show on Utilities Prompts Concern," and Robert C. Maynard's article, "Film on Power Failures Stirs Row Between NET, Utilities," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1969]

Show on Utilities Prompts Concern—Companies Inquire About Program Set for Sunday

(By George Gent)

A study of public utilities, scheduled for Sunday night on the Public Broadcast Laboratory of National Educational Television, has prompted expression of concern from the nation's power companies and some of the educational network's affiliates.

Entitled "The Built-In Blackout," the program will study future forms of public power, including atomic power, and the location for such installations, the question of state regulation of utilities and the probability of large-scale blackouts, such as the one in November, 1965. The segment will take 50 or 55 minutes of the 90-minute telecast on N.E.T., including Channel 13 here, at 8 P.M.

An informed source, who asked not to be identified, said that Public Broadcast Laboratory and National Educational Television had received more than 30 phone calls and a dozen letters from power companies and N.E.T. affiliates, inquiring about the telecast and that "the calls are becoming more frequent."

Frederick M. Bohen, executive editor of P.B.L., said he was aware of the 12 letters, some of which requested an advance screening of the program. However, he declined to describe them as exerting pressure.

WITHDRAWAL OF A GRANT

But at least one station—WGTE in Toledo, Ohio—may have lost a $20,000 grant as a result of its decision to carry the program.

Mrs. Helen Davis, general manager of WGTE, confirmed the report yesterday. "We thought our request for a grant from the Toledo Edison Company had been practically approved but I was contacted yesterday by an official of the company and told that support had been withdrawn."

"The Edison official told me the company was very upset about the P.B.L. broadcast and that support was being withdrawn "because of it," Mrs. Davis said. "They asked me what we were doing lobbying against the utilities. However, they never asked me to cancel in so many words, something I wouldn't have done anyway."

The manager of public information for Toledo Edison, Donald Terrell, said the company "has objected" to the contents of the program as gleaned from publicity releases, but that "consideration of the grant to WGTE will be made separately."

Mr. Bohen said the letters to P.B.L. expressed fears that the program would support legislation against utilities. "It does not," he said. The program merely examines the public utilities field, Mr. Bohen added.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1969]

Film on Power Failures Stirs Row Between NET, Utilities

(By Robert C. Maynard)

John F. White, president of National Educational Television, charged yesterday that private electrical power companies were told to launch a nation-wide campaign against the coming Sunday night edition of Public Broadcast Laboratory.

The 50-minute program, "The Built-In Blackout," charges that another great blackout—similar to the power failure of Nov. 9, 1965, in the Northeast—is possible.

White charged that many of the 160 NET stations that carry PBL were pressured not to carry the show by representatives of the power companies in their communities.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Edwin Vennard, managing director of Edison Electronic Institute, denied that his association had attempted to pressure NET, PBL or any local station.

"If it's a balanced show," we have no objection," Vennard said yesterday, adding that his organization wanted to know beforehand what PBL would say about the utilities.

But the story that NET and PBL officials tell is different. White and several of his aides in telephone reviews told of reports from local educational television stations that their managements were contacted by representatives of power companies expressing concern over the content of the program.

SCREENING SOUGHT

Although no one outside of PBL has been permitted to preview the program, the power companies are fearful that it supports a bill introduced recently by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) that calls for a system aimed at preventing recurrences of the Northeast blackout.

But the producer of the program, John Wichlein of PBL's Washington office, said the bill—National Electrical Reliability Act of 1969—"won't do the job, and the program says so."

PRESENT—ONE SIDE

Vennard, the Electric Institute official, stated the association's position in a letter to PBL demanding a screening of the program. Copies of his letter were sent to Rosel H. Hyde, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and Frank Pace, chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

"It is our belief," Vennard's letter said, "based on attached news releases, that the program has been produced or edited in such form as to present only one side of what is a controversial public issue."

Vennard, in addition to asking for a copy of the program, requested "a list of the NET stations which are receiving prints of the program film for broadcast purposes . . . so that we may facilitate direct communication with these stations by those members of electric utility companies who may wish to request the opportunity to present an opposite or more balanced view."

Frank Bohen, a White House aide during the Johnson Administration and now a PBL executive producer, said PBL produced neither film nor list to the Electric Institute.

Although the NET outlet in Toledo, Ohio, WTGE, was threatened with possible loss of a grant from a local utility, White said no station has opted to drop out of PBL Sunday night.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin Vennard, managing director of Edison Electric Institute, which is a publicity organ for the utilities, said, "If it's a balanced show, we have no objection." But a balanced show, so far as the Edison Electric Institute is concerned, is a biased, prejudiced, and nonobjective show; and to demonstrate that it is not a balanced show, he has asked for a copy of the program and for a list of the TV stations which are going to carry the program.

This program reportedly discusses a problem regarding which legislation has been proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, on blackouts in the Northeast. I have not seen the program. I have been consulted by persons working for Public Broadcasting Laboratory and discussed it with them. I know that the electric utilities have had free and open discussion. But this outrageous attempt, without seeing it, to prevent a program from being broadcast and to censor such a program is indicative of the fear that the electric utilities have of free, frank, and open discussion.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate today.

The article which the Senator has asked to have printed in the Record refers to legislation I have introduced—and which I discussed in a speech last Tuesday, in Atlantic City, before the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In that speech, I received some observations I have made in studying the problems we face in the Northeast and throughout the country in terms of providing reliability, low cost, and assurance to the consuming public that they will be given the kind of consumer protection they should receive.

There are points I mentioned in the course of my speech. These are vital questions which should be discussed and debated. They are questions which quite appropriately are of interest to the Senate and to the public. Certainly, public presentation of these matters would in no way prejudice the rights or the positions of the utilities. To attempt to block the discussion of these issues and questions does not add to the illumination of the American people in trying to guide us in making correct and appropriate decisions.

Mr. President, when we realize the millions of people in New England who suffer from blackouts because of unreliability in terms of the power they re-

XUM

ceive, when we think also of those people in the New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey markets who have suffered in the last 2 or 3 years in blackouts, when we think of the inconvenience and danger to citizens across the Nation; and when we think of the senior citizens in nursing homes who suffer when electricity is turned off, people who are unable to get out and who are terrified at night—it is not unreasonable for us to give the Federal Power Commission authority to assure the public a certain amount of reliability that is not going to increase significantly the cost of power.

Mr. President, in another area, I know the Senator shares my concern about the ecological implications of the development of new atomic energy and other large power sites and what this will do to the rivers of our country. We should be able to establish some guidelines so we will not add to the pollution of our streams with thermal heating and other causes of pollution.

Mr. President, these are questions in the public domain. They should be discussed and considered. As I understand the matter, that is what the television program referred to is attempting to do.

I think the Senator has performed an extremly important service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I think it was an extremely unfortunate act on the part of some of the utilities to try to block the kind of discussion and debate I understand the television program is trying to present.

I believe the Senator is to be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I think his comments are well taken.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I would hope our committees with jurisdiction over freedom of information and over the television industry at large will have these controversial issues presented without interference from utilities on the one side, or my point of view on the other side, but with full discussion that will stimulate other discussions and conferences and lead to the solution of these problems in the American way, and which results from public disclosures.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING, VIENNA, AUSTRIA—APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in accordance with title 22, United States Code 276, appoints the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting, Vienna, Austria, from April 7 to 13, 1969: Senators Sparkman, chairman, Yarborough, Young of Ohio, Hart, Jordan of North Carolina, Williams of New Jersey, Hollings, Allott, Thurmond, Mathias, and Scott.

NINTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 86–420, appoints the following Senators to attend the Ninth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, in three cities in Mexico, from April 2 through April 8, 1969: Senators Mansfield, chairman, Hartke, Dodd, Montoya, Nelson, Bayh, Gravel, Allen, Aiken, Fannin, Miller, Murphy, and Saxbe.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the March issue of City East, a magazine published in New York, contained a very interesting article entitled "Senatorial Spotlight: The Senator from Georgia." The article, which is very readable, is about the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Russell.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATORIAL SPOTLIGHT: SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

(By George Douth)

Richard B. Russell is considered the foremost authority in Congress on military matters and is a forceful champion of a strong military defense for the nation and the free world.

Senator Russell relinquished his chairmanship on the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 3, 1969, to become Chairman of the vitally important Senate Appropriations Committee which was left vacant upon the retirement of the Senator from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

On the Appropriations Committee, Russell also serves as Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee which is responsible for providing money for all of the nation's military activities—about one-half of our total annual budget.

EXPERTISE IN MILITARY AFFAIRS

Russell, who headed the Armed Services Committee at the time the new draft law was whipped into shape, recommended action by Presidential order to shift priority for service to the younger age group. He also proposed continuing deferments for students through the college undergraduate level.

The Senator stated, "There has been a great deal of discussion about the practicality of ending the draft. I recognize that the draft is imperfect in its operation, but until now, no one has suggested a practical alternative. Although the number of young men actually inducted through the draft is relatively low, the existence of the draft causes thousands of enlistments in all the armed forces. If the draft can be ended without endangering the strength of our armed forces, no one would be more pleased than I, but I must state frankly that I am skeptical whether it is safe to end the draft in the foreseeable future."

Richard B. Russell did not command full national attention until 1951 when, at the height of the Korean War, President Truman fired General Douglas MacArthur as Far East Commander. The General's admirers were so resentful they began to murmur of impeachment. Russell, newly chosen chairman of the Armed Services Committee, suggested a Joint Congressional Investigation to help restore national unity by allowing both sides to be heard.

The handling of the investigation was a classic of legislative skill, judicial impartiality. Though held behind closed doors, the proceedings were censored on the spot and transcripts released within minutes. This examination wound up justifying both parties to a considerable degree and defused what might otherwise have exploded into a full-scale national crisis.

Time and again, Russell has declared his opposition to any program of disarmament, prohibiting testing of nuclear devices, or their use as weapons, whether partial or complete, that did not provide for onsite inspections, adequate in number and scope. To him it seems to be the height of folly to adopt any other policy.

It was a matter of profound regret to him that he had reached the conclusion that he could not in good conscience vote his consent to the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963.

Russell commented, "I supported the original proposal because I believed that it included adequate safeguards. But it was rejected by the Soviet Government."

"I have followed as best I could the long series of negotiations with the Soviet Union looking to a Nuclear Agreement. There have been times when hopes have been high. But in every case, the Russians have, in the last analysis, refused any agreement of any kind that contained a practical, foolproof method of detection of treaty violations."

Senator Russell has warned that the nation must not become complacent as to the continued communist danger to our national security.

Russell gave President Johnson invaluable support on Vietnam. In 1954, when the expulsion of France from Southeast Asia presented President Eisenhower with the question of whether to send U.S. Military Advisers to South Vietnam, Russell was firmly opposed. And he spoke his mind with characteristic candor: "If you send 200 advisers now, you'll send 10,000 before it's over."

Since then, the size of the U.S. forces in South Vietnam has confirmed this prophecy. Senator Russell has taken the stand that, once committed, the United States should make its commitment good.

The Senator has underlined that we learned long ago that military might and strength speak with a language that all people understand.

He contends that our military strength is firmly based on the maintenance of a variety of forces and upon what the military calls a "mix" of weapons that will permit us to respond to any given situation.

"I cannot, as of today," Russell declared, "report that we still hold a clear margin of superiority over the Soviet in the field of strategic missiles, because I do not know that to be the case, and I think there is a very grave doubt about it."

The Senator emphasized that our own defense planning has been based on the assumption that the Chinese Reds eventually would become a nuclear power. But the time is now at hand when we must make certain that our defense programs are adequate, and our arsenal of weapons sufficient, to meet any new threat that may be posed by China's entry into the "nuclear club."

Russell stated, "I want to satisfy myself that those charged with our national security are taking every action that may be needed as a result of this new development. I believe that the American people are entitled to this assurance."

FAMILY OF DISTINCTION

Richard Brevard Russell was born at the Russell family home near Winder, about 45 miles east of Atlanta, on November 2, 1897, the fourth of 15 children. He springs from an old and distinguished Georgia family that long has been identified with the public life of the State.

His father, the late Richard Brevard Russell, Sr., was Chief Justice of the Georgia Supreme Court when he died in 1938.

Russell's mother, who was Miss Ina Dillard, was named Georgia's "Mother of the Year" in 1949. She died in 1953.

Russell was raised with Bible-reading Calvinist discipline. He received his early education at public schools of Winder, the Agricultural and Mechanical School of Powder Springs, and Georgia Institute in Barnesville, Georgia. He enrolled at the University of Georgia at Athens and received his Bachelor of Laws degree from there in 1918. He is a member of the American and Georgia State Bar Associations.

Russell began his political career at the age of 22 when he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1920. He served ten years as a member of that body; the last four years, from 1927 to 1931, were spent as House Speaker.

In 1930, Russell was elected Governor of Georgia and took office while only 33 years old—the youngest Chief Executive ever chosen by his State.

He served as Governor during the depths of the great depression of the 1930's which brought a financial crisis to Government at all levels as well as to private firms and individuals. Russell brought Georgia's State Government through the crisis by adopting a rigid austerity program. One of his first economy moves was to reduce his own salary by $3,950.00.

Under his leadership as Governor a model higher education program was established through the consolidation of the independently-administered state-supported colleges into a unified University System under a single board of regents. Russell's reorganization plan laid the foundation on which the present university system of Georgia is built.

During the final year of Russell's term as Governor, United States Senator Robert Harris died in office and Russell was elected to succeed him. He replaced Senator Robert LaFollette as the youngest member of Senate.

Richard Brevard Russell entered the Senate on January 12, 1933, and his continuous service since then has made him ranking member of that legislative body in point of seniority—only two other Senators in history have served longer than Russell. On January 3, 1969, he was elected President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

Senator Russell, a lifelong bachelor, is frequently described as "a Senator's Senator." He twice has been voted the most effective member of the Senate in polls conducted by national publications.

Since there is unanimous agreement that Russell is the quintessential Senator, perhaps the simplest way to describe a full-fledged member of the Club is to describe him, although few others of the Inner Group have all of his characteristics. Russell has immense seniority, he is the chairman of a potent committee, he is a Southerner. Personally he is courtly and unostentatious; his word is good; he lives and lets live; his dignity is both seen and felt.

The critical requirement that he fulfills so grandly—the sine qua non for real membership—is a lifetime of never putting anything ahead of the Senate.

However, there was a time when he aspired to be the number one man of the nation.

Russell was put forward for the Democratic Presidential nomination at the 1948 Democratic National Convention. He received 263 votes for the nomination. Four years later, he received 294 votes on the second ballot, many of them cast by delegates from 27 states outside his native South. He had solid support in the South and some support in the West. But civil rights had become a major issue in national politics. Russell failed and the Democratic Presidential nomination went to Adlai Stevenson.

President Truman later wrote that Dick Russell would have succeeded if he had been from a western state.

The Georgian was one of the persons President Johnson called on the tragic night he flew into Washington to take over the reins of government after the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas.

"He called me at my apartment and talked for 10 minutes, telling me what had happened," the Senator stated.

He and Johnson have been close friends for 30 years.

Soon after Johnson moved from the House of Representatives to the Senate in January 1949, he and Russell were working together closely.

Russell backed Johnson for Democratic Leader of the Senate in 1953.

The Senator and President Johnson were on opposite sides of the 1964 civil rights legislation.

A STATES RIGHTER

Russell served as leader and Chief Strategist of the Southern Bloc of Senators who opposed the so-called civil rights bills of 1957, 1960, 1964, 1965 and 1968. Russell's opposition to these proposals was based primarily on his conviction that they were contrary to the Constitution, politically-inspired, and punitive in nature against the people of the South.

On March 16, 1964, the Senator from Georgia introduced a bill that would get away from all the political implications of the so-called Civil Rights issues, "by affording the underprivileged of both races an opportunity to better their lot in life."

In the very best faith, and in an effort to take at least a step forward toward a permanent solution of racial differences, he proposed a workable and realistic means of easing the problem by bringing about a more equitable distribution of the white and black populations throughout the United States by a purely voluntary and thoroughly democratic relocation program.

Russell contends that it would go further to implement the President's campaign to abolish poverty than all the temporary plans and proposals that are now in process.

Senator Russell said, "The Federal Government should provide Federal financial and technical assistance to effectuate a more equal distribution of the races throughout the country.

"By perusing the purpose and objective of the proposal, the distribution and equalization of the population of our two main solid groups would not be confined merely to adjustments between States, but the states of their own accord—and as a States Righter, I would not have it otherwise—would create commissions that would attempt to cure the imbalance of the population within the States."

As a Senator from an agricultural State, he is interested in farm problems. Senator Russell is given credit for the Farmer's Home Administration Law and the salvation of thousands of small farmers during the great depression of the late 1930's.

He is the author of the school lunch program and considers this to be one of the proudest achievements of his Senate career.

Senator Russell has pioneered a number of agriculture conservation and forestry programs and was floor manager in the Senate for the 1936 Act that created the rural electrification administration. He is a vigorous proponent of full development of water and river resources.

FREEDOM OF DEBATE

Russell has stressed that there is continued need for thorough discussions, dialogue, and debate in the United States Senate.

The Senator said, "For the greater part of our history, the right of full and free debate in the U.S. Senate has stood as a vital safeguard over the right of the minority to protest against legislation it believes to be injurious or oppressive.

"The issues that have generated prolonged debates or filibusters (the term used often depends on which side of the question one is on) cover a vast range of economic, political, and constitutional conflicts. The filibuster is not the exclusive weapon of any philosophy, party, or section. Distinguished Senators of both parties, representing every shade of political thought and every area of the country, have taken part on occasion in extended debates in support of a minority position.

"The present rule of the Senate that allows a high degree of freedom of debate is the natural outgrowth of the peculiar position that the Senate occupies under our constitutional system. Indeed, the right of an individual Senator to insist on full discussion of any question or issue is the essential element which distinguishes the Senate as the greatest deliberative body yet devised."

Russell contends that under gag rule, Senators would serve little other purpose than to act, in effect, as additional members of their State's delegation to the House of Representatives. For once the Senate yields the right of its Members to express themselves fully, it undoubtedly would be only a matter of time before Senators would find themselves begging for the privilege of speaking for five minutes—as can and does happen under the rules of the House.

It also is probable that the loss of freedom of debate in the Senate would be followed by an attempt to abolish the Senate's time-honored right of amendment, the other principal characteristic that distinguishes the Senate, in Gladstone's description, as "the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics."

The right of free speech in the Senate is particularly important because the Senate is the only institution of the Federal System in which the smaller States exercise an equal influence over the conduct of the affairs of the Nation.

Senator Russell commented:

"Without freedom of debate in the Senate, the United States eventually will go the way of the unlimited democracies; we will reach the stage where a misguided majority can destroy the liberties and rights of individual citizens in the name of some currently popular cause.

"I cannot, therefore, escape the conclusion that those who advocate restricting the rights of the minority by curtailing freedom of speech in the Senate may be sowing the seeds of their own downfall on some future question of burning national interest."

DAVID K. E. BRUCE—AMERICAN PATRIOT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after serving longer in England than any previous American Ambassador to the Court of St. James, today Ambassador David K. E. Bruce is retiring to private life. His retirement brings to a close, for the time being, an exceptionally distinguished career in the service of his country.

Ambassador Bruce had a first, brief taste of diplomatic life when, in 1926, he went to Rome as vice consul. Resigning from the career Foreign Service in 1928, Mr. Bruce returned to the United States and spent most of the remaining interwar years in business and farming.

David Bruce has the unique record of having served in two State legislatures. He was a member of the Maryand House of Delegates from 1924–26; thereupon, on the eve of World War II, he was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates. In 1941 he went to London as chief representative in Great Britain for the American Red Cross. Later, when his country went to war, he directed from London the European operations of the Office of Strategic Services.

XUM

In the early postwar years, Ambassador Bruce filled a variety of posts within the Federal Government, including that of Administrator of Marshall plan aid to France. This was followed by his appointment as Ambassador to France in 1949.

Before coming to Britain as Ambassador, David Bruce also served as our Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. He therefore has the distinction—shared by no other American in our history—of having been Ambassador to France, Germany, and Great Britain. While he has served in these posts as a noncareer Ambassador, it is the opinion of career diplomats as well as all of us who are familiar with his work that he has been one of the greatest professional diplomats this country has produced.

Those who know David Bruce can testify to his wisdom, experience, and ability. They are unlikely, however, to stop after mentioning only those qualities. His friends speak also of his courtesy and his kindness, his understanding and his modesty.

No recounting of the career of David Bruce would be complete without mention of his wife, Evangeline. A woman of notable beauty, poise, and intelligence, Evangeline Bruce has been an outstanding representative of her country in her own right. David Bruce would be the first to agree that his success has been due in no small part to the assistance of his wife.

I know my colleagues in the Senate join with me in expressing gratitude to David Bruce for his years of devoted service to his country. We hope we may continue to have the benefit of his counsel in the future and wish him and his wife every happiness in the years that lie ahead.

THE PRESIDENT'S ABM DECISION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last Friday the President of the United States in a nationally televised news conference announced to the people of this country his decision regarding the modified Sentinel ballistic missile defense system.

The President, in the press conference, indicated that he had carefully considered all the alternatives and had thoroughly reviewed the program, which had been initiated by the previous administration. On the basis of that review and those considerations, he reached the decision to substantially modify the program in such a way that its "defensive intent" is unmistakable.

I have in the past supported the funds for research and development for the ABM but have on two other occasions opposed the expenditure of funds for massive large-scale deployment. Since the safeguard deployment is free of the objections I had to the earlier Sentinel proposal, I can support it.

Mr. President, I believe that this proposal, as now submitted by the White House, is one which can provide and maintain, for some time to come, the security of our people and our Nation without arousing the alarm which the earlier suggestions generated.

I was also glad to see that the President's statement contains a statement that the program will be reviewed annually. I think this is most important as the presence of these options will permit the President to diminish or enlarge the means for our protection as diplomatic and military developments permit.

On March 15, The Philadelphia Inquirer published an editorial entitled "Safeguard Program for ABM," and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFEGUARD PROGRAM FOR ABM

In any discussion for or against the proposed antiballistic missile system, national security has to be the paramount issue. It is on the basis of that security that President Nixon has made his decision to go ahead with a modified and flexible ABM program.

His decision, arrived at only after the most searching examination of all options open to him, from massive and ever-increasing deployment of antimissile sites to abandonment of the whole defensive program as worthless, was not an easy one, as he told the members of the press at his televised news conference on Friday.

But the decision was his to make, and he would not submit to the easy "out" of delaying action one way or the other, for further "research," leading to postponed deployments of a year of more—which could prove to be too late.

What President Nixon proposes is a "safeguard" system which is intended to guard against any Communist Chinese nuclear attack that can be foreseen over the next 10 years. The changed Sentinel program would primarily assure the security of the nation's missile and bomber forces and would provide protection against any irrational or accidental attack of less than massive magnitude from Soviet Russia.

The first two ABM sites are scheduled to be in North Dakota and Montana to protect Minutemen missile bases. The Nixon proposal will require a budget of about $800 million originally, compared with the $1.8 billion the Johnson Administration's would have initially cost. Ultimate expenditure is expected to reach about $6 billion to $7 billion, as more sites are added.

Opposition to any ABM system has already been widespread and vociferous, and the President looks for a close vote on his proposal in Congress. But he presented his case well at the news conference, and his conviction, earnestly expressed, that "this system is the best we can provide for our nation's security," is bound to have great weight, in Congress and out.

NEED REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, wheat is the most widely traded food grain in the world. About a fourth of total world production moves in world trade. Wheat is also America's leading agricultural export commodity, accounting for more than 60 percent of total domestic production and approximately 20 percent of total U.S. agricultural exports.

As many of my Senate colleagues know, Kansas is our ranking wheat State. In fiscal 1968 when U.S. wheat exports totaled approximately $1.2 billion, Kansas' pro rata share equaled $177.6 million, $105 million under Government programs and $72.6 million in commercial sales.

Wheat exports are as important to the entire American agricultural economy as they are to the State of Kansas because production so greatly exceeds domestic demand. Thus, the strength of the domestic wheat economy depends largely upon export outlets. Stated differently, if our domestic wheat economy is to prosper, we must depend upon exports as outlets for substantial portions of annual production because we have the capacity to produce so much more than we can consume domestically. Export volume is a means of clearing the market at satisfactory price levels to avoid rigid limitations on production.

FORECAST: LOW WORLD WHEAT TRADE

Because wheat exports are so important to the United States and Kansas, it is particularly distressing to note that, based on current indications, 1968–69 world wheat trade will be the lowest since 1964–65 and possibly the lowest since 1962–63:

Year	Million metric tons	Million bushels
1962–63	43.7	1,604.6
1963–64	56.4	2,074.0
1964–65	50.7	1,864.2
1965–66	62.4	2,292.4
1966–67	26.1	2,061.8
1967–68	52.4	1,926.6

Source: USDA–ERS "Wheat Situation," February 1969, p. 8.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, prospects for the current year are dim because "at least for the current year the world not only has more than enough wheat for its needs, but the grain is so adequately distributed that trade expansion is not expected."

THE U.S. EXPORT SITUATION

The unhappy prospect that there will be no wheat trade expansion this year contradicts strong U.S. interests in increasing export earnings to protect the balance of payments and the stability of the dollar. Based on current indications, we are now projecting only 600 to 625 million bushels in U.S. wheat exports for the current marketing year ending June 30. This would compare with 761 million bushels exported last year and an original export target of 750 million bushels this year. It would also be the lowest U.S. wheat export year since 1959–60 when 510 million bushels were exported.

Exports of Hard Red Winter wheat, the kind grown in Kansas, account for one-half of the reduction in U.S. wheat exports for July 1 through February, compared to the same period last year. But, what most concerns me is that commercial exports of Hard Red Winter wheat since July 1 are down 43 percent, more than any other class or type of wheat exported from the United States. This clearly tells me that we are not competitive on Hard Red Winter wheat exports at our traditional gulf ports, where the International Grains Arrangement bases its fixed price differentials.

WHILE IN OTHER COUNTRIES

With U.S. wheat exports apparently sharply reduced this year, I was distressed to read recently that the U.S. Department of Agriculture forecasts Australian wheat exports this year at 281 million bushels, an increase of 35 percent over last year and the second highest export year in Australian history. The Department also forecasts wheat export increases in Canada by 19 percent and in France by 13 percent over last year. French exports are projected at an all-time high of 203 million bushels.

Viewed through the eyes of my wheat producer constituents whose prices are the lowest since before World War II, forecasts for a wheat export decline in the United States contrasted with increases in Australia, Canada, and France is rather anomalous in view of our overriding interest in wheat export expansion.

It is only reasonable to ask why.

WHAT IS THE IGA?

World wheat trade is prescribed by terms of the International Grains Arrangement. The arrangement became effective July 1, 1968, and is to remain in force for 3 years. It replaced the International Wheat Agreement of 1949. The International Grains Arrangement has two parts: a wheat trade convention and a food aid convention. The former sets forth minimum and maximum prices for 14 major wheats traded in world markets and attempts to convert their respective values to a U.S. gulf port basing point.

GROWING CRITICISM OF IGA

Since the International Grains Arrangement became effective, there has been increasing criticism that it is a major impediment to wheat trade expansion.

Since last Thursday, IGA member Canada has dropped its Atlantic export price of the Manitoba No. 3 wheat by 10 cents a bushel. This is the type of Canadian wheat that most competes with U.S. Hard Red Winter wheat, as well as with similar types from Australia, Russia, Eastern Europe, and Argentina. This Canadian move puts their prices clearly below the IGA minimum, while the United States is lagging way behind in the export of our equivalent-type Hard Red Winter wheat.

RECOMMENDATION: IGA REVIEW

Several persons—myself included—have recommended a review of the U.S. position in the IGA.

PRODUCERS EXPORT CO.

Upon returning from a U.S. wheat mission to Western Europe last November, Ralph J. Crawford, executive vice president of Producers Export Co., Kansas City, observed that U.S. wheat exports had not been helped by the International Grains Arrangement. He and other members noted that during their mission several U.S. wheats were not competitive at specified minimums with wheat being offered in Europe by other exporters, including both members and nonmembers of the International Grains Arrangement. It was Mr. Crawford's view that IGA minimum prices placed the United States in an untenable position in world markets. The mission urged that our Government ignore these minimums if others refused to accept adjustments necessary to make U.S. wheat fully competitive in world markets.

SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

Also in November, the Senator from Minnesota, Senator **WALTER F. MONDALE**, recommended to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association:

> The International Grains Arrangement . . . should be examined to determine if it is actually working as anticipated.

USDA OFFICIALS

On December 12, Clifford G. Pulvermacher, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Commodity Operations in the USDA Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, told a wheat quality conference sponsored by the Crop Quality Council in Minneapolis that the International Grains Arrangement might be one of the causes for decreasing U.S. wheat exports. He said that if a satisfactory solution to the problems in the arrangement could not be reached, it might be desirable to consider some basic modifications or revisions in some of its provisions.

In an address to the North Carolina State University Agriculture and Trade Conference that preceded his recent appointment to the Department of Agriculture, Dr. Carroll G. Brunthaver, of Cook & Co., cited four reasons for considering the International Grains Arrangement "the major impediment facing the U.S. wheat merchant today."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Brunthaver's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

CONTINENTAL GRAIN CO.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in a recent address before the Colorado Grain and Feed Dealers Association, James R. Good, vice president of the Continental Grain Co., observed that—

> The fastest, most effective and simplest way to eliminate many of the current defects of the International Grains Arrangement would be to lower the minimums, at least to the equivalents of the old International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Good's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

MY REMARKS AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on December 4, I had the honor to address the first annual Senator Frank Carlson Symposium on the World Population and Food Supply at Kansas State University.

At that time, I recommended a complete review of the U.S. position under the IGA. In light of growing evidence that the United States may not be faring well under the arrangement, it seems the time has come for such a review. Accordingly, I have recommended to the Secretary of Agriculture a complete review and evaluation of the International Grains Arrangement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

U.S. WHEAT EXPORT MEETING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in this regard, I am pleased to learn that the Department of Agriculture will convene a meeting on April 2 to review the progress of U.S. wheat exports since July 1, 1968, under the IGA. I understand the purpose of the meeting is to discuss U.S. wheat exports as they are influenced by the IGA price schedule and its supporting provisions. That meeting should provide a useful opportunity for representatives of producer, trade, and exporter organizations to discuss improvements in the IGA that will best serve strong U.S. interests in preserving producer income and increasing export earnings.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF CARROLL G. BRUNTHAVER

In any organized discussion of barriers to trade expansion it is appropriate that the subject of nonpolicy barriers be held last since it is, in my estimation, the least important barrier to U.S. agricultural exports.

I wish to comment briefly on what I consider to be the types of barriers which confront U.S. grain merchants so that the nonpolicy discussion will be in its proper perspective.

The most important barrier to increased sales of grain may be the lack of organization, technology and capital in a major part of the world to develop an efficient and productive livestock and poultry industry. The production limitations co-exist with the absence of effective demand for livestock products in this large area of the world.

The affluent West European consumes approximately one-half the supply of feed grains in the form of livestock and livestock products per capita as does the U.S. citizen. In Pakistan, India, Russia, China, and nearly every other country (with the exception of Australia and Canada) the per capita demand for feed grains in the form of livestock is but a fraction of what we enjoy in this country.

In the U.S. this year we will feed approximately 137,000,000 tons of feed grains to supply meat, milk, and eggs for a population of slightly over 200,000,000 people. This represents approximately two-thirds of a ton per person.

HUGE POTENTIAL FOR FEED GRAIN

If every person in the world were to consume livestock products at this rate, the demand for feed grains would exceed 2,200,000,000 tons, or over five times the current world production. In terms of world trade, we could theoretically project an increased demand of 1,800,000,000 tons, compared with current world trade in feed grains of only 43,000,000 tons. So if only one-tenth of the increased demand were reflected in increased import demand, the volume of feed grain demand would increase from 43,000,000 to 223,000,000 tons.

This example is purely hypothetical; people do not share a common desire to consume livestock and livestock products even if the income problem could be solved. But the example does illustrate, as does our experience in selling feed grains to Japan following World War II, that the potential demand for feed grains in the world is very large. The primary barrier for U.S. grain merchants in reaching this market goal is the lack of livestock production technology, organization, capital, and effective demand.

QUESTION SELF-HELP EMPHASIS

The "self-help" provisions of the current P.L. 480 legislation are mainly concerned with increasing indigenous production of food grains. This may or may not be a worthy goal. It may not be if scarce resources are expended on such production which would earn a higher return in other ventures. This may be true especially if the resource allocation results in surplus production of a commodity already in excess supply.

The misallocation problem becomes more acute when countries strive to produce for a high priced export market at the expense of developing a domestic milling and livestock production industry, then find that the high export prices are declining because of burdensome world supplies.

SHIFT TO MORE LIVESTOCK AID

It may be time for our aid and "self-help" effort to be directed toward the development of livestock and poultry operation in aid-recipient nations. Such efforts may help increase employment opportunities, lower the cost of food, and help increase the demand for grain in the world.

Provision for such an aid effort is included in the P.L. 480 Act and an attempt is being made to assist in the development of a livestock economy in Spain and Korea. This effort deserves renewed attention and, perhaps, extension to other aid recipients.

I know that our A.I.D. mission in Brazil has confronted the problem of keeping grain in the interior production areas where livestock production can occur. Once the grain has left the production area because of lack of storage, tradition, high export price, or for other reasons the cost of bringing it back to the interior for feeding is prohibitive.

Certain commercial firms are attempting to spur livestock production in Pakistan and this may be the most efficient way to make progress in this area.

LIMITED BY HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS

The second type of barrier is the high price supports which encourage uneconomic production and limit consumption throughout the world.

U.S. feed grain sales into Western Europe have declined from 16,600,000 tons in 1966 to approximately 9,000,000 tons this year, despite the fact that feed grain consumption in Western Europe has increased from 78,000,000 tons to 86,000,000 tons during this period of time. It is difficult to compete with a farmer in France who is guaranteed $2.40 per bushel of corn. At that price he can add irrigation, abandon livestock production, and still make a satisfactory income.

BARRIER NOT REMOVED BY IGA

The Kennedy Round and the resulting International Grains Arrangement did not come to grips with this important barrier to trade, even though the barrier was recognized. The Trade Expansion Act of 1965 was specific in its requirement that agriculture be included in the negotiations in a meaningful way.

John Schnittker, writing in the January 6, 1969, issue of *Foreign Agriculture*, reminds us that: "One of the major issues to be dealt with when the Kennedy Round began was the reduction of incentive for inefficient production. This action could be the primary means of trade expansion in agriculture. All the major trading nations said they were prepared to face up to this issue. None were."

And what should be added is that the U.S. did not insist that this major issue be dealt with. In fact, we did not even seize upon the opportunity to limit further incentives to inefficient production which were implemented by the E.E.C. before the agreement was even ratified.

Before leaving the subject of high price support systems as a form of barrier, allow me to comment further on the I.G.A. and some of the problems this agreement presents to the U.S. exporter. Some of these are policy, but some of the operational type problems become non-policy.

ONLY UNITED STATES WILLING TO LIMIT CROP

In effect, the I.G.A. is the major impediment facing the U.S. wheat merchant today. It is an impediment because:

(1)—The guaranteed world price level stimulated wheat production in the world, and to date the U.S. is the only country that shows any willingness and, perhaps, ability to curtail production because of mounting world surpluses.

Whenever you attempt to guarantee a price level for any product you must have a means of limiting production.

Allow me to use an example. In 1950 when I graduated from high school my folks bought me a good watch for approximately $50. Sixteen years later I replaced that watch with the following improvements: shockproof, waterproof, self-winding, with a sweep second hand plus a gismo that indicates the day of the week and the day of the month plus a stainless steel band costing several times the amount of the leather band on the old watch.

And I bought this watch after 16 years of inflation at a price of $30 from some watchman in Japan. Now, can you imagine how many of the old $50 watches would be owned by the government if they had attempted to guarantee at $50 the type of watches produced in 1950?

HUGE RISE IN WHEAT PRODUCTION

The producers of the world are an ingenuous lot. In response to the impetus of high world wheat prices Australia has cleared or otherwise shifted to wheat production 9,300,000 acres of land since 1961 (approximately equal to the wheat acreage in Kansas). Canada has added nearly 5,000,000 acres to wheat production since 1961. Wheat producers have learned to add bus per acre to the point that we are faced with a carryover of 800,000,000 bus in Canada, 150–200,000,000 bus in Australia, over 100,000,000 in France and over 700,000,000 in the U.S.

Had not the U.S. taxpayer paid to hold U.S. acreage out of production during the past 15 or so years, these surpluses would have long ago forced wheat producing countries to reevaluate their production incentive programs.

Canada cannot afford to increase her carryover of wheat much above current levels. Australia physically will have difficulty handling a large crop on top of this year's expected carryover.

The pressure on these countries to either break the agreement or find ways to circumvent the minimum pricing provisions will become so intense in the months ahead that I believe the agreement can hold together only because of U.S. efforts to curtail production (estimated down 14% this year) and because of limitations on U.S. export sales.

NO GUARD ON NONMEMBER PRICING

(2)—The second reason the I.G.A. represents an impediment is the lack of protection from non-member competition. The Sino-Soviet Bloc are not members of the Arrangement, but importing countries may purchase varying percentages of their needs from non-members. As a result, Russia is under no minimum pricing restrictions and since the Arrangement came into effect has simply priced their wheat slightly under the I.G.A. minimums.

CHECK ON COMPETITIVE PRICING

(3)—The third reason the agreement represents a barrier is related to the United States' right to price competitively. Despite Secretary Freeman's assurance, as a practicality, there is little effective means of protecting the competitiveness of U.S. wheat when other members undercut the minimum prices and we continue to live up to our treaty obligations, as we have.

A member Prices Review Committee is detailed to periodically review world trading in wheat and to "consult" with member nations in an effort to restore prices when their individual sales appear to have been made at levels below the minimums. When the committee is unable to accomplish this, the matter is referred to the Wheat Council for additional "review."

The council may decide whether any provisions of the arrangement shall be suspended, and if so, to what extent. However, this suspension requires the two-thirds vote of all exporter and importer members of the convention.

On the basis of past experience, it is not hard to envision the difficulty we would have in persuading the dominant exporting nations to vote to suspend the minimum price provisions so that U.S. wheat could compete in all markets again, or to persuade the importers, on the other hand, to vote for restoration of higher prices once the minimums were breached.

It is clear, in fact, from the testimony of our negotiators before the Senate subcommittee last March and April that they returned from Geneva with no specific, automatic, and reliable mechanism for restoring U. S. competitiveness. Quite on the contrary, it is evident from the written reply submitted to the Senate subcommittee that the Executive Branch relied on their ability to deal with this most sticky future problem by moral suasion and the mechanics of the Arrangement itself are only a cumbersome adjunct.

EXEMPTION FOR SOME SELLERS

Of even greater concern to us, however, is a provision whereby E.E.C., Sweden, Greece, and Spain have apparently been granted an exemption which, in effect, excludes them from the minimum pricing provisions of the agreement. This provision allows these countries to reduce the minimum price of their wheat by part of the transportation cost from U. S. Gulf to their respective load ports.

For example, on a recent Turkish commercial tender for wheat of any world origin, French wheat was sold for $57 per metric ton, delivered Turkey. The I.G.A. minimum for French wheat is $1.50 per bu, or $55.11 per metric ton f.o.b. U.S. Gulf, compared to $1.60 per bu, or $58.79 per metric ton, for U.S. soft red winter wheat. Our freight brokers estimated the freight rate from U.S. Gulf to Turkey as being about $6.40 per metric ton; thus, the I.G.A. minimum for French wheat would be, say, $61.50 delivered Turkey (or so we assume) and the sale by France is $4.50 per metric ton (12¼c per bu) under the established minimum.

But through an interpretation of the fine print of the agreement we find that France is allowed to reduce their minimum price of $55.11 by $5 per ton, i.e., the freight from U.S. Gulf to Marseilles, making it $50.11 plus the freight from Marseilles to Turkey of $4, or a minimum price c.i.f. Turkey or $54.11 as opposed to the U.S. minimum of $58.79 plus freight of $6.40, or $65.19. This difference of $11.08 (which includes $3.75 per ton quality differential) is still enough to exclude us from every sale that comes along until France, Sweden, and Greece under this interpretation sell every bu they offer.

COMPLETE MOCKERY BY FREIGHT

There is almost no destination in the world where French wheat would not sell at less than its Gulf I.G.A. minimum. This is true because even to the most distant markets of Far East Asia we cannot envision a freight rate situation where the freight rate from France to the destination would be more than, say $2 at 2.50 per ton over the rate from U.S. Gulf to the same destination—far less than the rate from France to the U.S. Gulf. This, of course, makes a complete

XUM

mockery of the agreed upon I.G.A. minimums.

This means that we are allowing France to dispose of her wheat, minimizing the cost of her price support and storage program so that the funds can be used to maintain her system of high price supports.

PRICES A CHECK ON CONSUMPTION

4—The fourth reason that the I.G.A. represents a deterrent to U.S. trade is that higher prices retard consumption. In the developing nations of South America, Africa, and the Far East, price has a significant influence on consumption. The higher prices embodied in the new I.G.A. cannot help but retard the growth of our sales to the very areas where we should be concentrating on building new markets.

We have been taught by long experience that when world wheat production and surplus are small, prices will rise without artificial agreements; when they are large, price flexibility is absolutely necessary to protect our share of world markets, as well as to help increase the total market.

CARGO RULES AS SELF-DEFEATING

Let's discuss for a moment the nonpolicy barriers relating to East-West trade. Over the past five years the United States has erected certain ocean freight barriers to East-West trade, the origin and classification of which are difficult to fix. They are, in effect, "non-policy" policies. They exist partly in law, but more generally in interpretation and extension of executive ruling. They lack any clear-cut purpose and have most often led to weirdly self-defeating ends.

On Oct. 10, 1963, President Kennedy, in announcing an intended sale of wheat to Russia, stated *inter alia*, ". . . an added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by ships of other countries as required. . . ."

Not only do our cargo preference laws make no such requirement, but the President's advisors at the time had not bothered to consult the Maritime Administration as to the general effects of such a condition or even inquired as to whether it was physically and economically workable. It wasn't, but in the struggle to somehow make it work, a nonpolicy interpretation that at least 50% of most U.S. grain sold for cash to the Soviet bloc nations must move on American flag vessels has evolved.

The cost of ocean carriage in a U.S. flag vessel is very substantially higher than that of an identical vessel operating under a foreign flag. First, the cost of building and repairing the vessel in the U.S.—a flag prerequisite—is higher than almost anywhere else in the world; and secondly, the operating labor cost in direct wages and benefits for American crews is three to four times higher than the cost of operating the vessel under a "foreign" flag. Additionally, lower tax bases, minimal registry requirements, and greater latitude in operating practice combine to further lower the foreign owner's ton-mile costs.

U.S. FLAG SUBSIDY IN PUBLIC LAW 480

Starting with Public Resolution 17 of 1934 and subsequent federal statutes including the Cargo Preference Act of 1954, it has been required that all shipments from the U.S. financed, donated, or loaned by our government shall be made on U.S. flag ships. The Maritime Administration originally, and other departments and agencies subsequently, have interpreted the law to be satisfied if at least 50% of the shipment was made in U.S. vessels, and the balance in flags of the recipient's choice. In the case of agricultural goods, the requirement has meant very little to the recipient since the U.S. government paid the extra cost of "differential" between the American flag rate and the foreign. The delivered cost to the buyer is the same as if all foreign flags were used. In other words, the U.S.D.A. simply subsidizes the use of U.S. flag vessels in connection with U.S. financed agricultural exports.

In speaking of sales to the Soviets and the Soviet Bloc nations, however, we are not talking about U.S. financed sales. We are talking about normal commercial sales for dollars.

To give effect to President Kennedy's 1963 condition, Maritime Administration simply "borrowed" the 50% concept and ruled that it would apply on Soviet sales even though these were for cash. The rule is still in force.

As a specific example of the U.S. flag premium, Maritime Administration "guideline" (i.e., maximum) U.S. flag rates to Russia contrasted with the approximate current foreign flag market shows:

U.S. GULF TO BLACK SEA—ODESSA

	Vessel capacity		
Long tons	10,000	15,600	Over
Voyage rates per long ton	15,500	30,000	[1] 30,000
American	$22.53	$18.03	$13.00
Foreign (estimated)	$9.50	$8.50	$7.75
American (premium)	$11.00	$9.53	$5.25

[1] Maritime Administration has not published "guideline" rates for the over 30,000-ton size American vessels, leaving them open to negotiation and the $13 is only our own educated guess.

ADDED COST TO RUSSIA OF $2.72

Thus, a sale of wheat to Russia today under the 50% rule (basis this estimate) would cost $2.72 per ton more delivered Odessa by virtue of the U.S. flag requirement, and this assumes the use of only the largest and most economical American vessels. The Russians would thus have to pay for the American flag subsidy if they bought our wheat. Not unreasonably however, they have said that they will leave that privilege to the U.S. government and will continue to buy Canadian wheat and Mexican corn, etc.

To this basic idea of using U.S. vessels have been appended some incongruous complications. For example, a Commerce Department license is required to export U.S. grain to East Germany. If the grain is wheat, 50% of it must be carried on a U.S. flag vessel. If the grain is corn, however, no U.S. flag is required provided some portion (the exact portion, incredibly, being unknown to the Commerce Department but generally rumored to be about 10–15%) of the cargo on that vessel is first delivered to a Western European destination.

If Poland is the buyer of either wheat or corn, however, no license or U.S. flag is required, and, in fact, the Department of Agriculture encourages dollar exports to Poland by including this country under concessional barter program sales. However, Poland is not an acceptable "Western" destination under an export license of corn to Czechoslovakia, but Yugoslavia is. No license or U.S. flag is required to export U.S. grain to Rumania, but both are required for Bulgaria, and so it goes.

INVOLVED AND CUMBERSOME LIMITS

The barrier or problem created by the part-cargo rule embodied in the "Western" destination requirement is that it most frequently raises the delivered price to the buyer through increased freight charges for taking a vessel to two ports of discharge. Licensing, as such, is an impediment in that the Commerce Department requires that a trade actually be made and its terms approved by themselves before a license is issued. While the Department takes this sale under advisement, the exporter is obviously prevented from protecting himself from interim market risks such as freight rate changes, futures market fluctuations, and changes in applicable subsidies. The whole process is involved and cumbersome to any merchant who is working with a combination of rapidly shifting values.

As one might suppose, an exporter who has wound his way through this thicket is forced to reflect on whether these manifold and contradictory restrictions have any central purpose or useful goals and what in the world these might be. If there were an outright prohibition against food exports to any communist nation, that situation could be argued on its merits. But the idea that by the means of licensing red tape and/or by adding a 5–10% export "flag tax" on wheat and feed grains we are thereby inhibiting the spread of communism is absurd.

This "tax" since its very inception has been completely self-defeating. It has had only one single effect—to prevent the sale of U.S. farm goods and surplant them by sales to the Soviet Bloc from Canada, Australia, France, Mexico, and other free world nations.

NO POSSIBLE REASON TO CONTINUE

In itself, this is bad enough, but since 1963 not one American vessel owner nor any American crew has benefited from cargoes which could not be sold in the first place. If the U.S. flag "tax" cannot aid the group for whose benefit it was intended, what possible reason is there in continuing it?

In 1965 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended that this U.S. flag requirement be dropped, but no action has been taken.

It is time now that the new administration begin an immediate review of these self-imposed handicaps. The U.S. farmer not only should, but must, be allowed to compete with other farmers among the exporting nations of the free world. It seems very little to ask that this particularly senseless obstacle be banished.

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS OF JAMES R. GOOD

The subject of "International Wheat Prices" is not only an interesting one, but, more important, of vital impact upon all of us. Whenever we speak of price we immediately have two distinct sides, that of the consumer who normally contends it is too high and that of the producer who always find it too low.

Before we analyze international wheat prices, it might be well to review the world supply-demand situation. Let us look back a couple of years, take a pulse of the present and a most important look ahead to see some problems and hopefully propose some solutions.

GOOD SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE CROP

The Southern Hemisphere is presently in the midst of completing the 1968–69 harvest. The wheat bins in Australia are bulging with the record crop which will exceed 500,000,000 bus. Growing and harvesting conditions were nearly ideal to permit the Australians to stock the shelves with a wide range of good quality.

In Argentina, the mid-November early-December drouth caught the crop at the critical state. The most recent official and trade estimates forecast final production to be about 217,000,000 bus. Early deliveries have indicated a good quality of better than average protein.

Most other countries in the Southern Hemisphere have fared well also. South Africa, which for any years was an importer, will enjoy its second year of total self-sufficiency. The only country suffering from weather hazards is Chile, which is expected to import higher than normal amounts. Inflation plagued Uruguay, finally returning to supply side again and expected to be a small exporter.

FAVORABLE FOR NORTHERN HARVEST

In the Northern Hemisphere as a whole, last summer the crop had good growing conditions. In North America, both Canada and the United States had harvest weather problems which reduced final outturn. Canada

XUM

produced 650,000,000 bus of spring and winter wheat, which, added to the 670,000,000-bus carryover, makes available the highest amount in history at 1,320,000,000 bus. Mexico, which has been a recent entry to the exporter group, has only produced its domestic requirements.

After years of surplus problems, the United States entered the crop year with a carryover of 537,000,000 bus and produced 1,570,000,000 for a total supply of 2,100,000,000. Our domestic consumption is expected to increase to 750,000,000 bus due to higher livestock feed usage resulting from harvest damage and relative low prices in some areas. At the end of December the government controlled 640,000,000 bus. Assuming exports at 600,000,000, total July carryover will be 160,000,000.

In Europe the major producing country is France, which last summer harvested 545,000,000 bus. Since almost all of the French wheat is a soft variety, quality determines its domestic usage whether animal feed or milling. Of the 1967 crop, 336,000,000 was used domestically and 177,000,000 exported, so it is reasonable to assume France could export a record near 200,000,000 this year.

The Communist Bloc of Eastern Europe was estimated to have produced 850,000,000 bus which was 7 to 8% less than 1967 due to spring drouth. It is very difficult to forecast the amount available to the world market but conditions of winter wheat in Rumania are reported to be excellent.

MORE RUSSIAN TO FREE WORLD

The Soviet Union was estimated to have produced 2,400,000,000 bus, an increase of 150,000,000 from 1967. The spring drouth in the hard wheat areas was more than offset by increased production of spring wheat. With higher production in Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia, we can expect the Russians to export more to the free world.

In summation of the world wheat supply at the end of 1968, the four major exporting countries—the United States, Canada, Argentina and Australia—had for export and carryover at the end of their respective crop years 2,324,000,000 bus, an increase of 18%, or 352,000,000 bus, from 1967.

LITTLE CHANGE IN WORLD DEMAND

Very little change in demand is seen throughout the Southern Hemisphere during the crop year. In South and Central America domestic production in the normal importing countries appears about unchanged, except for Chile. Brazil, the largest importer, is expected to equal last year's 90,000,000-bu requirement.

The European demand has shown little change from last year, except the quality requirements changed somwhat to stronger wheats to offset the lower quality of the crop. The British harvest weather increased their demand by about 35,000,000 bus, which was largely filled by Spain and Rumania after the price increase of United States wheat under I.G.A.

EGYPT AND TURKEY AS IMPORTERS

In the Middle East, Egypt is likely to import around 50,000,000 bus. Turkey, like its neighbors, suffered from spring drouth and, after two years of self-sufficiency, imports are likely to be around 25,000,000. Iran for the first time in many years was a small exporter. Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia all enjoyed good harvests. Their imports will be down by rather high percentages.

CROP RISE IN INDIA, PAKISTAN

The major change in the demand picture focused on India and Pakistan. After the disasters of the mid-1960's, India, with good rainfall, improved technology and new seed varieties increased its 1968 production by 47% to a record of 625,000,000 bus. Neighboring Pakistan, under similar conditions, produced 230,000,000 bus, an increase of 45%. Needless to say, this had a very direct effect upon the United States and Canada since these two countries were importing around 300,000,000 bus.

Japan, which has become one of the major world importers over the past decade, shows signs of leveling off. The reason in part is due to record rice production which is now a domestic surplus problem.

To finish the demand picture we must try to peek behind the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. Because of the size of the purchases, the Chinese impact upon the world market can often be considerable. Just recently they signed the largest contract ever negotiated with Australia for 81,200,000 bu. to be shipped by March, 1970. Prior to this, China bought 55,000,000 from Canada to be shipped by July, 1969, while France, a China supplier for the past few years, is currently negotiating a trade. Total trend of Chinese imports has been downward the past two years.

Russia, which staggered the international market from 1963 to 1966 with sizable imports, has successfully rebuilt the system to return to export ledger. They have a one-year balance on a three-year purchase commitment with Canada for 150,000,000 bu., which the Russians are unlikely to take during this crop year. Usually they shipped Canadian wheat to Cuba, but the Spanish are reported to have sold 15,000,000 bu. to the Castro regime.

RISING RATE FOR WORLD USAGE

World consumption of wheat has been increasing at the rate of about 200,000,000 bu. per year. This is due to the increasing world population, the substitution of wheat for rice, especially in Asia, and food aid, particularly P.L. 480, which has converted need into demand.

FREE DEMAND DOWN 50,000,000 BUSHELS

The total free world wheat import demand for the 1968–69 crop year is expected to decline by around 50,000,000 bu. This forecast, of course, can change rapidly during the next four months should any drastic weather changes occur in the Northern Hemisphere.

Having looked at both the demand and supply sides of the equation, we can now better evaluate world prices. From what we have seen so far, it certainly appears to be a buyers' market. Looking forward to next year there is little doubt but Australia is faced with a potential record carryover of 300,000,000 bu. by the end of this year; an amount double any previous crop.

Of the exporting group, it appears Canada may have the most serious problem when come August the carryover may well exceed 750,000,000 bu. Amazing and frightening was a Feb. 8 *Toronto Globe and Mail* headline, "Increased Output Held Farmers' Solution," which was based on a report prepared by the Federal Task Force on Agriculture. The report contends supply management should not be relied on to solve the problems of agriculture until all other possible approaches have been tried.

BASIC RULES DICTATED BY IGA

Having analyzed the world situation let us now confine our subject of international wheat prices by looking at it from the viewpoint of the United States. Since the world market price is not dictated by the free forces of supply and demand, we must know the rules and regulations established by the governments of the world. The basic rule book is called the International Grains Arrangement which became effective July 1, 1968, and is to remain in force for three years. Generally known as IGA, it replaced the 18-year old International Wheat Agreement.

The IGA negotiations setting forth the ground rules were completed in August, 1967, following two years of discussions in Geneva, Switzerland, and essentially covered the provisions reached in the Kennedy Round cereals negotiations. The IGA consists of two parts: wheat trade convention and food aid convention. It is important to note IGA was conceived during a period of time when the world was overly concerned about its food supply and many feared Malthus' theory was about to be proven.

PRICE BASIS CHANGED TO GULF

The important provision of the Wheat Trade Convention sets forth the minimum and maximum prices for 14 major wheats moving in world trade. Prices were generally raised about 23c per bu over the former IWA minimums and the maximums were raised 40c. IWA prices used as its basis only Canadian No. 1 Northern Manitoba in store at Fort William/Port Arthur with other types and origin of wheat calculated on quality differences as agreed between importing and exporting countries. IGA changed the price basing to f.o.b. U.S. Gulf ports and set the min-tax prices for Canadian Manitoba Nos. 1 and 3, Argentine Plate, Australian f.a.q.. European Common Market standard wheat, Swedish, Greek, Mexican, two types of Spanish and four varieties of U.S. wheat—dark northern spring 14% protein, No. 2 hard red winter, No. 1 soft red winter and No. 1 western white. Since the agreement went into effect, two grades of Australian hard wheats have been added.

The Food Aid Convention provides for contributions in the form of wheat, coarse grains for human consumption or cash equivalent to be made to the lesser-developed countries of the world. The annual yearly pool is to consist of the equivalent of 165,000,000 bus to which the United States contributes 42%, or 69,400,000 bus. Our grants under P.L. 480 now apply against this commitment. Other major country contributions include the European Common Market, 23%; Canada, 11%, and United Kingdom, Australia and Japan, 5% each.

DIFFICULT TO ABBROGATE TREATY

The I.G.A. has been in effect only eight months and already we hear many demands for the United States to either withdraw or to immediately renegotiate various provisions. Much as many of us might like to abandon the whole idea, we need to keep several things in mind. First, the I.G.A. is a three-year international treaty. A responsible world power does not abrogate treaties lightly. Second, we need to be fair to those who negotiated the I.G.A.; it was conceived in a period when many responsible people were forecasting a worldwide food shortage and food prices were high. I.G.A. has been implemented during a period of world wide food surplus and falling world wide food prices. From the beginning of the 1961 crop year to beginning of the 1966 crop year, carryover stocks of the United States, Canada, Australia, Argentina and France went from 2,162,000,000 to 1,080,000,000. My guess is the 1969 crop carryover will be above 1,800,000,000.

MUST SEEK REVISIONS BY 1969–70

Realistically, we should keep the I.G.A., but work vigorously to revise it as soon as possible, hopefully by the beginning of the 1969–70 crop year. Those countries most dedicated to the idea of international commodity agreements should be willing to accept changes, because the longer a cumbersome and inequitable arrangement persists, the less likelihood it can be revised and extended past its scheduled termination.

We have a new administration, with a new policy group in the Departments of State and Agriculture. Let us challenge and encourage them to change the I.G.A.

MINIMUM PRICES AS "TOO HIGH"

What are the problems of the I.G.A. from the U.S. viewpoint? The first and most obvious is that the minimum price is too high. I recognize that many of you will contend that a minimum price which equates to about $1.35 per bu for ordinary wheat in Colorado is not too high. But in all candor I have yet

XUM

to learn any way to define a "fair and just price." In the final analysis, perhaps the best test is that nothing is too high if you can sell it and nothing is too low if you can buy it. Another test is whether farmers are anxious to produce it at these prices. Acreage increases in Australia, Canada, and the U.S. Delta indicate they are. Perhaps the best *prima facie* evidence that the I.G.A. minimum is too high is that nearly all major grades of wheat on the international market are trading at the fringes of the minimum. I say on the fringes because every subterfuge is being used to cut prices to or below the minimum. During the 18 years of the International Wheat Agreement it was free of criticism only when it traded well below the maximums and well above the minimum prices, that is closer to the middle of the range.

The fastest, most effective, and simplest way to eliminate many of the current defects of the I.G.A. would be to lower the minimum at least to the equivalents of the old I.W.A. Perhaps it would be wise to have minimums and maximums set by a pre-determined formula based on ratios of wheat supplies in the 5 leading countries as a percent of world wheat trade. As supplies increase as world wheat trade decreases the range of I.G.A. prices would be lowered and vice versa.

TAXING U.S. FARM EFFICIENCY

From the very day I.G.A. was implemented, we have been forced to impose an export certificate, or more appropriate a tax, to raise the U.S. price of most wheat classes to agreed world levels. During last September, this tax reached 48c per bu for soft red winter wheat and 27c per bu for ordinary hard winter wheat. By taxing exports of U.S. wheat to higher world prices, we are indirectly subsidizing our competitors, the producers in the five other major I.G.A. exporter countries. We are taxing the efficiency, the technology and know-how of U.S. agriculture through a high world price that gives incentive to increased production in all other countries whether importer or exporter.

By agreeing to higher world prices, we simply raised a higher umbrella over all producing areas and invited more competitors to the demand area. It is difficult to understand the approach of higher prices of I.G.A. as related to humanitarian concept of feed the world. I am sure Madison Avenue would have difficulty selling the slogan, "Eat more—Pay more," even in our country, let alone the developing countries.

HELPING SOVIET BLOC NATIONS

The last extension of I.W.A. included Russia as an exporting member. So far, the Russians have chosen not to join, neither have the Eastern European countries which are normal wheat exporters. The present I.G.A. is tailored for their not being a member. Are we not also indirectly subsidizing their agriculture with high world prices as well as giving access to all our customers?

Let me quote in part two recent cables. From our Rotterdam office came:

"Hard winter 13.5% protein. Dutch mills did not buy any hard winters since September, 1968. Since then their mills have changed grist completely by using Australian prime hard, also f.o.q. and Russian and later Argentine. To make mills change their grist it takes primo overly attractive levels and secundo some assurance that hard winter 13.5% will be available at realistic prices over an extended period. For transshipment U.K., Swiss, Belgium market and German Rhine picture essentially the same."

An Oslo cable reads:

"Re spring wheat: had expected State Grains would be a buyer this week but understand they negotiating with Russians for SKS 14 wheat and they will in no case do anything until such negotiations completed. There is definite possibility that U.S. spring wheat will be rendered uncompetitive by Russia's SKS 14."

WORK FOR RUSSIAN MEMBERSHIP

How can an International Grains Arrangement be effective if one major exporter is not a member? During the past election campaign and in the present Congress, we hear much about a nuclear arms treaty with Russia. If we were able to get the Russians to join I.W.A., should we not be negotiating with them to continue as an I.G.A. member also? Can we not combine or in some way tie these negotiations together?

MUST CONSIDER ACREAGE ASPECT

The national wheat acreage allotment of 51,600,000 acres for 1969 is a reduction of 13% from last year with further reduction expected from the signup through March 21 under the voluntary acreage diversion program. Contrast this with our exporting I.G.A. partners when in the last decade the Canadians have expanded acreage more than a third and the Australians more than doubled wheat acreage. Is the United States to carry the burden alone for attempting to control the world supply? A revised I.G.A. must consider the acreage aspect.

NIGHTMARE IN PRICE EQUIVALENTS

Another I.G.A. aspect that has proved detrimental to the United States is the spelling out of all our grades and classes of wheat. With the exception of two grades of Canadian wheat, all other wheats are simply identified by country, leaving a lot of latitude for trading on quality specifications. The equating of all prices to f.o.b., U.S. Gulf ports has proven to be a nightmare in trying to police or translate prices of competing origins to the buyer's discharge port. Continuing changes in ocean freight technology and port facility improvement have left the exporter members at constant odds, not only on how to interpret prices but to arguments and charges of violating the agreement. By lowering the minimum prices and leaving the world price to seek its trading level, we will eliminate these technical difficulties.

MAY HAVE PROBLEM OF HYBRIDS

Another challenge I.G.A. may well be confronted with during its three-year lifetime is hybrid wheat. The president of a major U.S. seed company announced that 1,000 bus of seed of 15 different hybrids were placed in farmers' hands last fall. Commenting to this in his Feb. 14 newsletter to the National Association of Wheat Growers, Glen Hofer, executive vice-president, made this excellent statement:

"It is hard, as a farmer, not to be excited about breakthroughs like that, but if you can stand being solidly realistic—each production research success is digging us a little deeper into the supply situation that is smothering us now. No one could be heartless enough to criticize the life-saving aspect of the dramatic increase in food self-sufficiency made possible in India and Pakistan through the use of new wheat varieties developed largely with U.S. funds. No one can be so inhuman as to complain about the insistence of our government on self-help provisions in many PL–480 agreements which force agricultural reforms in the recipient countries. No farmer is going to resist a new fertilizer, a new machine, or a new variety if he is convinced it will grow him another bushel, but we had better believe that all of these factors are likely to combine eventually into a pretty painful reorganization (from our point of view) of U.S. agriculture's productive resources."

HALF-TRUTHS IN MANY OPINIONS

On the subject of price, it is well to remember that an untruth is not as dangerous as a myth or a half-truth. The often used statement that price does not affect the United States' ability to gain access to markets is a half-truth. It is truth that with a variable levy as exists in the Common Market, we cannot effectively compete pricewise with indigenous supplies. But we sure can compete with Russia, Canada, Australia, and the rest if we are not hampered by I.W.A.'s, I.G.A.'s etc.

Also, a half truth is that price does not really matter when competing with Spain, Greece, Mexico, etc. because they will sell their surplus regardless of price. This is true in the short run, that is, after the crop has been produced. But it is untrue for the long run as land resources will be diverted to other crops when farmer or government costs become too burdensome.

There are many other aspects to international wheat prices from the viewpoint of the United States, such as political. Our trade restrictions with Red China, our requirement of 50% American flag ocean vessels to certain countries are just a few examples why we cannot compete for one-sixth to one-quarter of world wheat trade.

The name of the game is competition. Other wheat exporters are going to try to increase their exports even if the United States does not. And with high international wheat prices, importers are going to try to increase domestic grain production and import less.

CITES PROBLEMS OF RAILROADS

There is a good example of an industry which administered prices above a level at which others are willing to perform the service. The U.S. railroads, with rates set by the Interstate Commerce Commission, have lost a great share of their business to airlines, to truckers and barge operators who were able to perform the service at lower cost and still make a profit. The railroads can compete and are competing. But they are finding it a lot harder to win back business than it would have been to avoid losing it in the first place.

The U.S. can compete in the world trade. It needs to have the rules altered to allow it to compete. We have the resources. Do we have the will?

EXHIBIT 3

MARCH 14, 1969.

Hon. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was distressed to see in the February Wheat Situation that the USDA is now projecting only 600–625 million bushels of United States wheat exports for the current marketing year ending this coming June 30. This would mean the lowest U.S. wheat export year since 1959 and compares with 761 million bushels exported last year and an earlier export target of 750 million bushels for this year. I was, however, more than shocked to read in the March 10 issue of Foreign Agriculture that the USDA forecasts Australian wheat exports for this year at 281 million bushels, an increase of over 35 percent over last year and the second highest export year in Australian history.

Upon further investigation I have found that in the February Wheat Situation the USDA also forecasts wheat export increases this year by Canada of 19 percent, and by France of 13 percent over last year, with French exports projected at an all time historic high of 203 million bushels.

Wheat farmers are complaining bitterly that wheat prices received this year are the lowest since before World War II and are for the first time in five years below current price support loan levels. It is obvious, since we are dependent upon export markets for sale of more than 50 percent of our wheat production that strong exports are essential to wheat farm income and a successful farm program at acceptable public cost.

I noticed as well on page 13 of the March 10 issue of Foreign Agriculture that Russia, as well as Australia, is offering wheat in Rotterdam at prices undercutting our U.S. Hard

Winter and Hard Spring wheat prices. This is distressing and leads me to question very seriously what is happening to our wheat export position as a result of the International Grains Arrangement, which was entered into last July and which, I understand, prescribes specific terms of trade on our wheat exports.

In recent weeks there have been several stories in the press pointing out a greater degree of flexibility under the IGA in calculating or accounting for ocean freight costs by both Australia and France in pricing their wheats in the prime European and Japanese markets. Is this a result of the basing point of the IGA being placed at our Gulf ports, or is it a result of the fixed differentials between wheats from competing countries specified in the Agreement, or is it both? Russia is not a member of the IGA. What effect is that having, in light of lower Russian wheat prices quoted recently in Western Europe? Also, of equal importance, is what effect will IGA price levels have on otherwise uneconomic wheat production and the substitution of other food grains for wheat in consuming countries?

In light of the foregoing, I believe that a complete review and evaluation of the IGA is called for, in order to regain our competitive position in world wheat markets. If this requires amendment of, or withdrawal from, the IGA then that determination must be made as soon as possible. I believe you would agree that this situation is serious and of utmost importance to our balance of trade and our wheat export interests. Time is of the essence since less than four months remain of this marketing year and less than that before a new U.S. wheat crop will begin to be harvested.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Dole,
U.S. Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations at the desk which were reported earlier today, and which have been cleared on both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply want to note for the Record that I am fully aware of the necessity for timeliness on these nominations and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement of printing be waived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the following nominations:

James R. Smith, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Reginald Norman Whitman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

John H. Shaffer, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Leslie Lloyd Glasgow, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

Hollis M. Dole, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Carl L. Klein, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mitchell Melich, of Utah, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Leo G. Vaske of the U.S. merchant marine to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Regular Coast Guard with grade of lieutenant; and James L. Hassall, of the U.S. merchant marine to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Regular Coast Guard with grade of lieutenant, junior grade.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Myron Tribus, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Larry A. Jobe, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Don Paarlberg, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senate has just confirmed various nominees to be Assistant Secretaries of the Interior.

These nominations have moved with very great deliberation and yet with some speed.

I merely want to express to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson), my own appreciation and my compliments to him for the speedy way in which he has handled the hearings on these nominations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following conclusion of its business today until Monday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive and appropriately refer messages from the President and the House of Representatives; and that committees be authorized to file their reports, together with any minority, supplemental, or individual views, as desired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 35 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FIRST 60 DAYS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 20, 1969, just 2 short months ago, at noon of that day, Richard Milhous Nixon became the 37th President of the United States. A new administration had begun. How well I remember other Presidents under whom I had served and their administrations: Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Each different from the other but each striving in his own way to set a course that he felt best met the needs and filled the aspirations of the country as they existed at that particular time in our history.

Each President met the responsibilities of his office in a different fashion and each left to his successor a different legacy. Before looking at the first 60 days of this administration and its accomplishments, let us review the legacy that constituted Richard Nixon's inheritance.

No decade in American history began with greater hope and promise than did the 1960's; and few decades in America have seen the first 8 years end in such doubt and despair. The people were bewildered and afraid, not knowing what to believe or expect from their Government.

When Dwight Eisenhower rode for the last time down Pennsylvania Avenue, there was peace and tranquillity in the United States in an uneasy world. Eight years later, America was a Nation bitterly divided between the races and between the generations. The spillover of street crimes from the slums into cities and suburbs of America had made "freedom from fear" a vital concern of Americans unlike anything that had existed in their history.

When Richard Nixon, Eisenhower's Vice President, returned to Washington, this is the condition in which he found the world's most productive economy:

First. The prices people pay for food and clothing and housing were rising at close to 5 percent per year—the highest rates since the Truman years.

Second. Interest rates that families must pay for mortgages on their homes were the highest since the Civil War.

Third. The tax burden on the American people was the heaviest in the history of this country.

Fourth. The cost of living had risen 16 percent since 1960.

Fifth. The Federal Government had spent $70 billion more than it had been able to earn.

Sixth. Forty percent of the American gold supply had been carted off by foreign bankers and foreign speculators who had lost confidence in the ability of the United States to manage is own affairs.

Seventh. Confidence in the American dollar had never been lower in foreign capitals since the bottom of the depression.

Eighth. The international monetary system was being shaken by two and three crises a year—the question of its collapse had become the subject of speculation in the capitals of Europe.

Ninth. The domestic budget of the U.S. Government had expanded by 90 percent, the Federal payrolls ballooned by 30 percent, and yet the population who had to pay for both had grown by only 12 percent.

Tenth. For the last 3 years, the pay of the average American wage earner in manufacturing had not increased a dime in real terms. The American laborer was on a Federal treadmill. Every pay raise he had won was taken away by inflation and taxes to pay for the programs which the Federal Government was buying.

In those same 8 years, the United States was washed over by the worst crime wave in the history of a civilized and democratic people. Crimes increased by 89 percent since 1960. The rate of crime growth over these years was close to seven times the growth of the population, and it was not just crime against individuals that flourished; mob violence became something of a hallmark of American society. When Dwight Eisenhower left office, America was a peaceful Nation; when Richard Nixon returned to Washington, he assumed the leadership of a Nation that had experienced the worst domestic violence since the War Between the States.

Partially in reaction to the terrible unrest, the Federal Government launched a war on poverty. Billions of dollars were spent, millions of words were spoken, and hundreds of grandiose promises were made. And what was the result? Two and a half million Americans were added to the relief rolls. Fraud, corruption, waste, and self-aggrandizement burgeoned in the war's bureaucracy; the poor who had been promised Utopia were left in anger and despair.

And what of the country folk?

In the 8 years since Dwight Eisenhower left office, one in every four farms in America was shut down. Three and one-half million Americans left the farms to drift or to join earlier migrants in overcrowded cities. Farm prices plummeted to 74 percent of parity—the lowest level since the depression. But the bureaucracy prospered. In 1960, the Department of Agriculture had one employee for every 29 farmers. While 3½ million farmers left the farms, 30,000 more bureaucrats were added to the Department's payroll.

And labor? The absence of any real gain in income by American workingmen and the loss of substantial savings through inflation helped to produce the new unrest in the labor movement. More man-hours were lost through strikes in 1968 than in any other year in the decade. The previous years had seen the arrival of the "public strike" on the American scene—walkouts by public employees, teachers, police and firemen, and even garbage collectors, strikes in effect against the public's right to health and safety.

And how did America stand abroad when Richard Nixon took the oath as President of the United States?

In the 8 years since the end of President Eisenhower's administration, more American installations abroad were bombed or assaulted than in all the previous decades of the Republic. Confidence in the United States dropped to its lowest ebb in our history. The system of alliances forged by the United States in the 1950's was in crucial decline.

NATO, the cornerstone of Western security, was cracked and threatening to crumble. Many of America's former close allies and friends were suspicious and disillusioned. In Latin America, the vaunted Alliance for Progress was in a state of failure.

When Dwight Eisenhower left office, he left an enormous military superiority over any and all potential adversaries on the face of the earth. At that point in time, America possessed an 8-to-1 superiority in strategic missiles and bombers; but since that time, the Soviets have almost completely closed the gap in offensive weapons.

We started this decade in peace, and now we are struggling in the longest war in our history. We started this decade first among nations in military power; now we are in a new and dangerous state of "parity." We started this decade with alliances strong; now we found them in serious disarray. We started this decade with the confidence of the free world in American leadership; now we found that confidence vanishing and a go-it-alone mood rife in the Western World. We started this decade as the undisputed leader of the world, and now we found our leadership challenged everywhere.

This, then, was the patrimony left Richard Nixon on the assumption of office.

But all that is history, just as this administration is now history, for it cannot escape history, neither the Nixon administration nor the 91st Congress can escape it, for what together we do we will be remembered, but how we will be remembered will depend on what we do. We now hold the power and we bear the responsibility of governing. But to govern well, this administration must be one in which all people have a part. The way in which this administration has begun convinces me that all will have a part.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. President, this administration has been in power for 2 months, so let us look to see what has been done in the first 60 days.

There are those who cry out for action—now—action for the sake of action. They should be reminded, as it is written in Ecclesiastes, chapter III, verse 1, that "To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the Heaven." And how appropriate that is today. This is not a time for a hundred days or a thousand days, but a time for reexamination of what has been proposed, consolidation of programs already in progress, and review of programs for the future. The time for phrases and slogans is past.

There is a time in the life of nations when success must be measured not in terms of how much but in terms of how good. This is such a time. The first 60 days have given the American people the basic structure of the Nixon approach; quality not quantity; programs which will operate as good in practice as they do in theory, words chosen to stand for facts, and not for fantasies.

Contrast this administration with the man who builds his house upon the rock with the man who builds on shifting sands. This administration is building on solid rock—and it works, and will therefore withstand the wind and the waves.

The first 60 days have been a time for laying the foundations. This is not an administration which rushes in with the roof and with readymade walls before the foundation is in place. Those will come in their time—and so will the furniture and rugs.

But I can report that the foundation stones are already moving into place on—and even ahead of—schedule.

And what are the building blocks in this foundation?

First, there is trust. The President used that word to sum up his trip to Europe—I use that word to sum up his success at home. How good it is to live again in a country which trusts its President.

That trust is in part a product of a second element: Candor. This is an administration which respects the people's right to know. Consider the directive which ordered that statistical material from all agencies be written objectively, released promptly, and not used for political purposes. Consider the news conferences, the press announcements, the visits by Senators, Congressmen, Governors, foreigners, and private citizens.

A third element is expressed in the word "quality." The administration has restored the proper relationship between quality and quantity in Government. There has been an unfortunate tendency in recent years to ask not how well are we doing, but rather, how much are we doing. There has been too much concern for the number of actions taken or bills passed or dollars spent, and too little concern for the skill of those actions, the wisdom of those bills, or the impact of that money.

It was said long ago that "perseverance is more prevailing—and many things which cannot be overcome when they are together, yield themselves up when taken little by little." And this ad ministration understands that it is better to do 10 things well, and get them done, than to do 100 things poorly which will later need undoing. It understands that it is better to appoint 10 extraordinary men and then turn them loose than to appoint 100 mediocre men who will need constant supervision.

Fourth, I would point to the new quality of humility in the Government—and what an important ingredient that will be in future successes. For this is not an administration which claims that it knows all the answers or that it can provide all the solutions. It has enough confidence in its strengths that it can be realistic about its limitations. How encouraging it is that President Nixon has already won a reputation as a good listener—both at home and abroad. How well received were his visits to all the departments of Government—to tell the career employees that there was little he could accomplish except as they helped him. How commendable is his strong encouragement for nongovernment efforts to meet social challenges.

This administration does not say, "we can handle everything if you just stop 'bugging' us." Rather it says—"come in with your questions, your problems, and your suggestions, and then go out again sharing with us the burden of responsibility."

Fifth, I would mention the quality of discipline. Now, I do not just mean the fact that the President gets to work early every morning, but the fact that he is bringing a disciplined approach to all the processes of the Government. Decisions are made in a disciplined way. Programs are developed in a disciplined way. Action is implemented in a disciplined way.

Discipline has been defined as "giving up the freedom to do as you please, in order to attain the freedom to do your best." It means refusing to act on whims, not overreacting to criticism, restraining one's day-by-day emotions. It requires a kind of double vision; a long-range view of goals, and a short-run ability to focus on the infinitely detailed work which is required to achieve them.

Only as Government becomes a model of discipline can we restore discipline to our society—from college campuses to the streets of our cities.

There is a time to plant and a time to harvest. Now it is the spring of the year—the time for planting.

Mr. President (Mr. ALLEN in the chair), I interject that yesterday morning I went out and looked at my tulip beds. I looked at the forsythia and the daffodils. I saw the japonica buds and the lilacs so ambitiously wanting to burst forth. The dogwood pips are swelling; and the resurrection of spring is visible over the earth.

The administration is planting well—planting good seeds in good soil—and tending to them carefully. The harvest will testify to its skill and wisdom. But the worst thing it could do would be to unnecessarily hurry the pace. For that would be comparable to the child who grows impatient after planting his vegetable seeds—and then keeps pulling the young plants out by the roots because they are not shooting up fast enough.

The new administration has been moving with a combination of determination and care, recognizing that after a period of sometimes too-hasty experiment, the time has come when the things the Government does have got to be right.

Precisely because our domestic needs are so urgent, and precisely because the problems of our cities are so vast and difficult, the need is greater now than ever to measure carefully what we know and what we do not know, what we can do and what we cannot—and not waste our precious energies and resources on the pursuit of the impossible or the impracticable.

One of the first essentials of today is to restore the faith of the American people in the decisionmaking processes. By establishing a sense of order, by arranging the mechanisms of decision, by leaning down the rhetoric to promise no more than can be delivered and to deliver whatever is promised, the new President has gone a long way in restoring that faith.

Actually few administrations have accomplished so much in their first 60 days in office. But if this is to be appreciated, people have to be made aware of things that have happened undramatically—and also of the fact that the lack of drama has been part of the achievement.

The undramatic aspect of this achievement is a reminder of the days when President Woodrow Wilson refused to authorize raising a division in World War I under the command of Theodore Roosevelt. Wilson's answer was simple and direct. He said:

> The business in hand is undramatic.

What a great line from a great President.

A free society is held together by mutual trust. Only by reestablishing that trust can we create the conditions in which progress is possible.

In a situation that centers on a crisis in human relations, style is substance.

Among the first moves of the new administration were those that reorganized the decisionmaking machinery. This was more than just form. The President's intention from the start has been to shift emphasis from crisis management to crisis prevention: these new and revived organs of Government—the National Security Council, the Urban Affairs Council, the various subcommittees—are all aimed in part at facilitating that intention.

By moving first on organization, the administration was putting first things first: setting up the decisionmaking process before the decisions were made, and preparing for the crises before they arose.

The European trip was another example of putting first things first; moving swiftly to recement the alliance, to open discussions, to establish the conditions in which further progress could be made in an atmosphere of increased trust and greater understanding.

The people of America are developing trust in their Government again. The closed doors have been opened. Decisions are discussed in public before they are made. In his press conferences, the President has spelled out the considerations that will go into choices still pending. He and the whole administration have sought to be responsive, both to the press and to the public. Conflicting points of view are aired; dissenting opinions are sought out; the process is shared with the people.

Let me describe some specific problem areas of national importance and the manner in which this administration is moving on each.

First is spending. The President is determined that this country's budget after having gotten completely out of control over the past 8 years will once again be brought back under control. In other words, spending except for essential national needs will not be tolerated. In meeting after meeting with the leaders of Congress he has repeated his determination to hold spending to essentials and to an amount we can afford. In the budget reviews no area nor no program has been regarded as immune from examination and possible reduction, and very soon the President will submit his recommendations to Congress. There will be no sacred cow. Further, this President has manifested a receptivity to expenditure ceilings enacted by Congress—as a matter of fact, it was discussed only last week or earlier this week at the leadership meeting at the White House. This is further proof of his intense commitment to fiscal integrity.

Then there is the matter of taxes. Again in meetings with the leaders the President has expressed his dissatisfaction with our present tax laws and particularly with the heavy burden that has been placed upon the middle-income taxpayers over the last 8 years. He has sought congressional advice and the advice of private individuals. And based on that advice and on the recommendations of Treasury, he is now preparing a revenue proposal for submission to Congress. But it is being prepared carefully and surely and is designed to provide the maximum possible benefits for the taxpayer while at the same time producing sufficient revenues to meet the essential needs of Government.

In the field of national security the President has already acted to insure the security of our vital nuclear defensive system by recommending the deployment of antiballistic missiles around those sites so as to safeguard them from possible enemy destruction. The Secretary of Defense, at the direction of the President, has already concluded his inventory so as to establish priorities for needed new weapons that will insure the security of this Nation. These recommendations will soon be sent to Congress.

One further area is that of foreign trade with all of its problems and potentials. In meeting after meeting with the leaders of Congress and with the leaders of industry and labor, the President has expressed his intention of placing foreign trade on a truly reciprocal basis. What was formerly a healthy surplus in trade has now dropped to an actual serious deficit.

This trend, the President has assured us, must and will be reversed. Very soon the Secretary of Commerce will be going to Europe to discuss common trade problems with our Western allies in an effort to develop mutually satisfactory solutions. Later, after discussions with our

XUM

other trading partners, legislation will be submitted to Congress. But not until a thoroughly realistic solution has been decided upon.

Theory is always easier than practice. One great question confronting the new President was this: How—in practice—do you reverse the flow of power so that it moves from Washington back to the States and localities. On February 14, 1969, the President took an historic step in that direction when he signed an Executive order creating a new Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

The immediate supervisor for this new Office is the distinguished Vice President, and through this instrument he will work to better coordinate Federal, State, and local activities. The Office, which is already very active, will provide a two-way street for communications between Washington on the one hand and the statehouses and the city halls on the other. Most importantly, it will provide the machinery for what the President called "a broad and relevant dispersal of authority."

Or take another area which the President talked about a great deal in the campaign: that of giving greater business opportunities to members of minority groups. Again, he has carefully created the right machinery and has set it in motion. In this case, the instrument is called the program for minority business enterprise, created by Executive order on March 5, 1969. The program works primarily through the Department of Commerce and a new information center established within it—coordinating public and private activity, collecting information, gathering opinion, implementing decisions, and recommending further action. It will draw particularly on the suggestions of a new Advisory Council for Minority Enterprise which was also established by the President's order.

There is one other specific example of administrative action which will have major implications in the years ahead. I refer to the reorganization of the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration—announced on March 13 by the President. This is a division of Government which spends $2 billion per year—and yet one which was badly in need of a major overhaul. The Nixon administration is providing that overhaul—decentralizing and streamlining the Manpower Administration, clearing up confused lines of authority, eliminating duplication, and strengthening the regional offices. As the President said when he announced the reform:

> If there is one area of government that should serve as a model for the best use of manpower, it is the Manpower Administration.

Only if faith is restored in the process of decision will people have faith in the decisions themselves. And by showing its faith in the people, the new administration is rapidly winning the faith of the people.

Now let me review what has taken place in foreign affairs in these 60 days.

On the part of our adversaries in the world, on the part of our allies abroad and on the part of our people here at home, there is a new assessment of the leadership in the United States. Around the world there is the feeling that there is a firm hand on the rudder of our ship of state.

Our adversaries know that in Richard Nixon they have a man who can be negotiated with, but cannot be coerced; they sense both a firmness of purpose and a flexibility of approach.

Our allies have seen a new area dawn in relations with the United States. They no longer feel the danger of neglect or the danger of domination; they are listened to and respected, and as a result they are far more likely to work closely with us on our common purposes. Shakespeare's words certainly apply:

> O, it is excellent to have a giant's strength;
> but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.

Our people at home have gained a new sense of confidence for two reasons: First, because the President has spoken out clearly and plainly on the great issues facing us. No bombast, no slogans, no unattainable promises; if anything, the President has been super-cautious about building false hopes. This is refreshing, and makes the Presidency more credible. And, if there is one overriding expectation of our people today from this administration, it is a craving for credulity.

And the second reason for the new confidence at home has simply to do with the quality of leadership. The people, in their wisdom, sense that their President is proceeding according to plan; that he cannot be pushed or panicked or pleaded into hasty actions now that lead to regrets at leisure.

We can observe how this new confidence has gained momentum: the President's carefully prepared trip abroad built new respect for the United States in Europe; Americans at home felt a new pride at the European reaction; and that added confidence—a people united behind a President's search for peace—adds to our strength at the negotiating tables with our adversaries.

We can see how it all interrelates; we can see what once was a vicious circle now changed into a new forward momentum.

We do not know exactly how much ground was gained in this new spirit of trust among our allies. As the President noted:

> You do not build confidence by breaking confidences.

But we do know that fresh thinking is the order of the day, and that new long-range strategies are being devised that fit the new needs of the future.

In 60 days, shooting has not ended in Vietnam, nor do we feel the warmth of detente, but a start has been made on the road to peace. We cannot travel that road alone; a willingness to negotiate must exist on the other side. But the world now knows that we stand ready to do our part, to take new initiatives—and that is a great deal of accomplishment in a very short time.

This administration will take no action for which it will not willingly be responsible—action based on reason, on humanity, and on justice.

For nearly two decades, one administration after another has been identified with a description of its purpose. When I came to Congress 36 years ago, it was the New Deal. Later it became the Fair Deal. Later it became the New Frontier, and then it became the Great Society. How, then, shall we characterize the Nixon administration? If it were given to me to select an appropriate term, I would like to think of it and to refer to it as the "Responsible Society."

Churchill once said that no one can guarantee success in a given effort—but he can conduct himself so as to deserve success. On the basis of the first 60 days, I cannot guarantee that this administration will be a success, but I can say it is well begun; and I conclude that it deserves success and, I confidently predict that it will have success.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of Senators as they have referred to the first 60 days of the Richard Nixon administration. For, as this is a new administration, I am a new Senator and I come from a new State, Alaska.

I was especially interested in the remarks made by the esteemed minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), while he was noting the atmosphere of the Eisenhower administration during the turn of the decade. It was just prior to 1960, on January 3, 1959, that Alaska was admitted to the Union with all of the rights and privileges accorded a State. I remember so well the excitement in Alaska at the time: the eagerness we all had to participate, not to change or alter, Mr. President, but to participate.

Senator Bartlett and Senator Gruening had this sense of participation and did much for my State and the Nation. As a new Member of the Senate, I look forward to participating also and contributing to my State and our Nation within the traditions of the Senate.

As a new Senator, I have looked to the Nixon administration for leadership—and found it. I have called on the Richard Nixon administration for guidance—and received it. In 60 days I have seen the groundwork lain for the return to peace, and understanding, and practical deliberate Government with all of the imagination that will move us ahead.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION STUDY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 8438.

XUM

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate H.R. 8438, an act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969, which was read twice by its title.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ATTACK ON CRIME BY NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, I wish to commend our able minority leader for his thoughtful analysis of the first 60 days of the Nixon administration and for his perceptive treatment of the legacy with which this administration took up the task of governing America.

I would like to comment about one aspect of the Nixon administration which I find most gratifying. That is its realistic and vigorous attack on crime. For much too long crime was like the weather; everyone talked about it, but precious little was done.

We see a refreshing change in that attitude under Attorney General Mitchell. Consider what has transpired in just 60 days: First, the President announced, only 11 days after taking office, a comprehensive program to fight crime in the District of Columbia. The plan was realistic—it established goals within reach. It was balanced—it called for a strengthening of criminal justice and an attack on root causes of crime. It was right on target.

The response of the District in support of the message was heartening. Mayor Washington pledged his full support and that of the District government. The Washington Evening Star commended the President for making an excellent start on efforts to curb crime. The Washington Post described the program as a comprehensive attack.

It was, indeed, a comprehensive attack and forecasts the approach of the Nixon administration in the war on crime. Included in the message were calls for additional judges, prosecutors and court facilities. He urged reform of the bail procedures and improvement in correctional institutions. Juvenile delinquency and narcotics merited special attention and the President instructed the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to increase significantly its efforts in the District of Columbia.

Steps were taken also to rebuild devastated areas of the city. Within 24 hours of submission of the plan, Secretary Romney approved a $29.7 million neighborhood development plan for the Shaw area. A major portion of the Seventh Street neighborhood damaged in the riots was included in this program. This is what has been begun in the District.

On a national basis the Attorney General established for the Department of Justice the following priority: "protection for the law-abiding citizen from street crime and organized crime." It is refreshing to witness the type speech which was given by Judge Curran of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, which was published in one of the newspapers of the District of Columbia under the headline "Nice People Have Rights Too." In fulfilling this commitment, he began by choosing forceful and competent men to assist him. Will Wilson, former district attorney and former attorney general of Texas is leading the Criminal Division. He is a man with the reputation for enforcing the law. Charles Rogovin, Administrator of the key Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, who is presently under consideration for confirmation by this body, is a proven crime fighter and the Associate Administrator, Richard Velde, is an expert on anticrime legislation.

The Attorney General has authorized the use of wiretapping in the war against organized crime. In doing so he has demonstrated his intention to make full use of the tools Congress provides him to sap the growing strength of La Cosa Nostra. I am sure most of my colleagues, who supported title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, agree with me that using this congressionally approved power, is a logical action. Compared with the previous administration's attitude, however, it becomes a major indication of the direction to be taken by President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell.

Another major event was the Attorney General's call for a volunteer citizen's war on crime. There are more than 1 million independent volunteer organizations in the United States. Yet there had been no effort to utilize this manpower before the Attorney General's action. He acted within 14 days of assuming office. The potential for such a program is almost incalculable. A nationwide poll estimated that 61 million adults could contribute 254 million man-hours each week to volunteer activities. That manpower can be put to good use in the fight against crime.

Attorney General Mitchell has testified before the Criminal Laws Subcommittee, of which I am a member, on this problem of organized crime. His cooperation and willingness to commit his Department to this critical effort was heartening.

This administration is not interested in concentrating crime programs in the Federal Government. They do not belong there. On this point the positions of both the President and the Attorney General are clear.

I might add that that point is reaffirmed in the substance, spirit, and legislative history of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. The Federal Government can, however, offer guidance and assistance to State and local law-enforcement agencies. Great progress in retarding crime can be made through coordinated efforts of all levels of government. That spirit of cooperation, rather than domination, have characterized the President and the Attorney General.

The ideas are present: a National Council on Law Enforcement, a National Crime Information Center, townhall meetings on the crime problem. The Nixon administration has been in office only 60 days. Despite the short time, major steps have been taken to meet the crime threat; much more is to come.

I commend President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell for their dedication, effectiveness, and leadership, and I look forward to a continuation and intensification of that type effort.

RETIREMENT OF AMBASSADOR DAVID K. E. BRUCE

Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia. Mr. President, today our Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Mr. David K. E. Bruce, is retiring to private life. Ambassador Bruce had a very unusual career. He is the only man in the history of our Nation to have served as Ambassador to France, Great Britain, and Germany.

I have visited him in the Embassy in Paris and also in the Embassy in London. He has rendered unusual service to his Nation.

Incidentally, Mr. Bruce served as a member of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland and, subsequently, as a member of the House of Delegates of the State of Virginia.

We in Virginia are very proud of the valuable service Mr. David K. E. Bruce has rendered the United States.

AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the casualties in Vietnam. For 3 years now, it has been my practice—almost weekly—to attempt to present to the Senate and to the American people these casualty figures.

During the 2½ months of 1969—January, February and through the 15th day of March, the United States has suffered more than 17,000 casualties—that is dead and wounded—in that brief period of time.

This past week, U.S. casualties in Vietname totaled 1,700. To me, the significant part of that figure is this: During the past 3 weeks, the United States has suffered more men killed in Vietnam, and more men wounded there, than during any other 3-week period in the long history of that war.

It will be a week ago tomorrow that President Nixon made this statement:

> If we conclude that the level of casualties is higher than we should tolerate, action will take place.

Of course, Mr. President, I do not know what figure the President regards as "higher than we should tolerate," but I point out once more, as I have pointed out time after time in this Chamber, that the war in Vietnam will not go away by our ignoring it.

Since the Paris peace talks began on May 10 or 13 of 1968, the United States has suffered 74,000 casualties in Vietnam. I suggest that we have been lulled into a false sense of security as a result of these talks. I fear that our men in Vietnam have become the forgotten men.

I take this occasion to comment on the testimony given yesterday before the Armed Services Committee by Secretary of Defense Laird. He discusses Vietnam, and my feeling is that he has placed the Vietnam situation in its proper perspective. My own conclusions as well as his testimony yesterday are that he gave the committee, the Senate, and the American people a more accurate appraisal of the

XUM

actual conditions existing in Vietnam than we have heretofore received.

I want to bring out several points the Secretary made. By and large it was not an optimistic report. That is why I think it is an accurate report, because the best he can determine—and I have been trying to keep in touch with this for a long time—is, it is nothing to be optimistic about, insofar as bringing the Vietnam war to an early conclusion is concerned.

The Secretary said:

> I regret to report, however, that I see no indication that we presently have a program adequate to bring about a significant reduction in the U.S. military contribution in South Vietnam. The current operating assumption as stated to me is that even the currently funded modernization program for the South Vietnamese forces will equip the South Vietnamese forces only to withstand the VC insurgents that would remain after all North Vietnam forces had been withdrawn to North Vietnam. Also, the presentation given to me by the MACV Staff was based on the premise that no reduction in U.S. personnel would be possible in the absence of total withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops. Our orientation seems to have been more on operations than on assisting the South Vietnamese to acquire the means to defend themselves.

Mr. President, I feel that while Secretary Laird's comments and his appraisal of conditions are not optimistic, I am convinced he puts the situation in Vietnam in an accurate perspective.

General Cushman, who has just returned to the United States after being in command of the I Corps of the Marines, was quoted by Secretary Laird as having informed him that an additional 2 years would be required before we could see the situation as being satisfactorily in hand.

Thus, I suggest again that the war in Vietnam, the way it has been handled, and the way in which it is being conducted now, is a long way from being over.

I am pleased that the Secretary of Defense has given a frank appraisal of the Vietnam situation.

Incidentally, I spent 2 days with the Secretary of Defense—yesterday and today—and while I am not prepared to take a position in support of—or in opposition, for that matter—to his ABM program, I do want to say that I am convinced the American people have in Melvin Laird, our Secretary of Defense, as well as in David Packard, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, two extremely able individuals.

As a Senator from the State of Virginia, and as an American, I think we can be reasonably sure the Defense Department is in the hands of two able and capable men, two men who, I am convinced, will be frank with the American people and present the facts as they are.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in connection with the comments of the able Senator on the report of the distinguished Secretary of Defense, I invite his attention to an entirely different assessment and an entirely different report to the American people.

Shortly before the current Vietcong offensive began, Adm. John S. McCain, commander in chief, Pacific, was quoted in the Reader's Digest as follows:

> We have the enemy licked now. He is beaten. . . he cannot even mount another offensive.

Mr. President, there is a very sad lesson in this story of self-deception. A revolutionary, political war in Asia cannot be won by white westerners with acceptable risks and losses. Secretary Laird has indeed brought to the Senate and the country a grim report, and I think he must have foreseen great difficulty.

Our military and economic power, as great as it is, has been unable to stop the tide of history which long ago ended the possibility of western control over Asia's political life.

In that connection, I wish to call to the attention of the able Senator a statement by former Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer as follows:

> Asian countries cannot be controlled from abroad, even though communism or any other ideology.

And I would like to add, on my own, that I doubt if an Asian country can be controlled by proxy.

I raise these questions because the able Senator has made some very interesting and eloquent remarks.

I wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times, which was published today, on the question of the phased withdrawal. I believe that this is the long-range plan of the Pentagon. In fact, since early last February, hints of incremental withdrawal of U.S. troops, as the South Vietnamese troops improve, have come out of Saigon and out of the Pentagon.

The President of South Vietnam was quoted on February 28 as saying that—

> One and possibly two United States divisions can leave South Vietnam during the last six months of 1969.

I wish to say to the able Senator that one day this week I read an Associated Press dispatch which stated that a delegation of so-called congressmen from South Vietnam was in Washington and had dispatched to President Nixon a wire recommending a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops and a South Korean-like occupation and support of the South Vietnamese Government by U.S. troops.

I find all this very disturbing, because, to me, a phased, drawnout withdrawal of U.S. Forces is not a formula for peace, but, rather, for prolonged war and indefinite involvement.

I would like to ask unanimous consent, if the Senator would consent, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter which I addressed to the editor of the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIORITY IN VIETNAM

TO THE EDITOR: A phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, the long-range plan being advocated by both the Pentagon and the Saigon regime, avoids the crucial issue: how to reach a political settlement, which is the only means by which the United States will be able to extricate itself from Vietnam.

Despite the current troop requirements, the Pentagon planners envision a withdrawal of United States troops over a period of several years, leaving a Korea-like force to back up the South Vietnamese forces.

This is not a formula for peace but of prolonged war and long-term involvement.

If we are to have peace in Vietnam soon, President Nixon must soon decide that American interests and those of the South Vietnamese regime do not necessarily coincide; that we are not committed to holding out for a settlement which will insure continuation of the Thieu-Ky Government; that our repeated offer to withdraw United States forces has a quality of immediacy, leaving the South Vietnamese people free to work out their own system without outside interference.

ROOM TO MANEUVER

Unhampered by ties to past policy, as was President Johnson, President Nixon has room to maneuver in charting a new course for United States policy. It is imperative, however, that he act decisively before events foreclose his options. These options are being foreclosed rapidly by actions in South Vietnam, by inaction in Paris, and by indecision in Washington.

If progress is to be made in Paris, the President must make the willingness of the United States to accept a compromise political settlement more credible. Indeed, this should be our first goal. (Why not, for example, repair to the Geneva accords?)

Yet there is a growing chorus from those who believe in military solutions to political problems, urging a hold-fast, no-compromise stance in Paris, and a fight-it-out policy in Southeast Asia—the trap that ensnared President Johnson.

The political turmoil of the last four years, brought about by the steady escalation of a war which the Congress has not declared, has subsided. But the American people will not, and should not, be content to sacrifice indefinitely our youth and our treasure for a Government which muzzles folk singers who sing of peace, which shuts down newspapers which dare suggest talks with the N.L.F., which locks up Buddhist priests and politicians who have the audacity to call for peace.

Of course, we would like to see a democratic republic in South Vietnam, the more in our own image the more to our liking. But this is a matter of ideological preference, not of our security.

Whether there be one Vietnam or two, whether the Government of either or both be democratic or autocratic, Communist or non-Communist, no genuine threat to our security is involved.

Our broadest interest, I am convinced, would more surely be served in Vietnam by a neutralist, nationalistic order determined by indigenous people than by any Government of our patronage. A long drawn-out, phased withdrawal would more likely defeat than assure this.

Our national interest, then, must neither be bound to our ideological preferences, nor equated with the fortunes of the Saigon military government. A political settlement must have first priority.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

Three years ago high officials in the Defense Department gave very optimistic reports that the war would be over very shortly. Two years ago reports coming out of Saigon and Vietnam were optimistic, both by South Vietnamese officials and officials here in Washington. Last year they were optimistic.

So I am not very much of a mind to accept optimistic reports regarding Vietnam after the 3 years that we have been getting these reports and it turns out to be just the opposite. That is why I think the new Secretary is wise to put the cards on the table.

In my judgment, Vietnam is the No. 1 problem facing our Nation. It is the No. 1 problem, one that should have first attention. There should be a sense of urgency in getting this war over with.

I am hopeful that, as the new team takes over, they will direct prime attention to Vietnam.

I want to point out again—because I think it is significant—that the United States during the past 3 weeks has suffered more casualties in Vietnam than during any other 3-week period in the history of that long and tragic war.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's additional time has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to an extension of 5 minutes? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his comments and for his generosity in yielding to me.

I do not understand the able senior Senator from Virginia to be speaking critically of the President or of the Secretary of Defense. I do not have such motive in mind, either. In that spirit, I wish to join him in urging that peace in Vietnam be given top priority and consideration. Perhaps it is, but progress is nowhere to be found.

Our Ambassador to South Vietnam is en route home now, according to press reports. According to other reports, a review of Vietnam policy and strategy is now underway.

I have raised these questions, not to be critical, but in the hope of making a contribution. I think it would be a sad and lamentable error to adopt the policy of trying to make of South Vietnam a replica of South Korea. This is not a satisfactory conclusion. It seems to me the first priority in Vietnam is a political settlement. That is the only way the United States can extricate herself from that morass. It is a political war, a civil war, in which we, unfortunately, injected ourselves, and a political settlement is called for.

Compromise will be necessary. Time after time the United States has proposed, through her President, through her Secretary of Defense, through her Secretary of State, that she, the United States, is willing to withdraw her troops from South Vietnam if North Vietnam will withdraw her troops from South Vietnam, thus leaving the people of South Vietnam to work out their own will in their own way, and be the masters of their own fate. Yet certain other conditions have attached.

I hope that President Nixon will let it be known that there is a quality of immediacy about this; that we would prefer this over what is now being propagandized from Saigon—a phased withdrawal and the involvement of American troops there for an indefinite number of years to prop up a government which has not yet demonstrated its capacity to provide the kind of leadership to attract the loyalty and support of the Vietnamese people.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee. I know, from the exchanges we have had on the floor during the past 3 years, that he has had a very deep interest in the tragedy in which we find ourselves in Vietnam. He has raised his voice many times in this regard.

Let me make just one additional comment. The Senator mentioned the possibility of a plan in the Defense Department. If there is a plan there now, it is the first time there has been a plan in the last 3 years. I am not convinced there is a plan, but, I repeat, if there is one now, it is the first time there has been one in the last 3 years. I hope the Senator is correct, and that there is one now.

A KEY ISSUE IN CRIME

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on March 18, 1969, there was published in the Washington Daily News an editorial entitled "A Key Issue in Crime." The editorial comments were on the decision rendered by the District of Columbia Circuit of Appeals on March 14, 1969, in the case of Frazier against United States—Docket No. 21426.

This editorial is quite illuminating, and I believe should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It reads as follows:

> If the courts (that is, some judges) keep on bollixing up the rules of evidence in criminal cases, it may not be long before the administration of justice is immobilized.
>
> This is the trend of a dissenting opinion by Judge Warren E. Burger of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District in a recent case.
>
> The Appeals Court sent back to the trial court a holdup case in which a food market had been robbed because, Chief Judge David L. Bazelon said, there was some "implication" that the police, on arresting the suspect, did not make clear than an "oral" confession, as well as a written confession, could be used against him.
>
> The robber was convicted by a jury after one of his victims had clearly identified him.
>
> The case was returned to the trial court to determine if the convicted man's oral confession was wholly voluntary.
>
> Judge Burger, in dissent, said there was "not a scintilla of evidence" that the confession was coerced, and summed up the whole issue in this recent trend of nitpicking, hair-splitting court rulings which have freed convicted criminals or sent back their cases for another go-round in the trial courts.
>
> "Guilt or innocence," said Judge Burger, "become irrelevant in the criminal trial as we flounder in a morass of artificial rules poorly conceived and often impossible of application."
>
> The whole purpose of criminal trial is to determine guilt "beyond doubt" or innocence; not whether all the nice technicalities the courts recently have been inventing have been precisely met.
>
> "The seeming anxiety of judges," wrote Judge Burger, "to protect every accused person from every consequence of his voluntary utterances is giving rise to myriad rules, sub-rules, variations and exceptions which even the most alert and sophisticated lawyers and judges are taxed to follow.
>
> "Like the hapless centipede on the flypaper, our efforts to extricate ourselves from this self-imposed dilemma will, if we keep it up, soon have all of us immobilized."
>
> And, we would add, paralyzed in the effort to combat the crime wave.

Mr. President, I have read the report of this decision with deep concern. Apparently the majority of the Court said, "Well, we do not know; this fellow might not have understood that if he made a confession, it would be used against him."

The record reflects that the arresting officer immediately gave him the Miranda warning. The record further reflects that after he got to the police station, where they were processing him by fingerprinting and doing the routine things that are done in such cases, there was again read to him the Miranda warning, and he was asked if he understood it. He said he did. He said he wanted to waive the right not to make a statement, and also the right to have an attorney.

And, Mr. President, not only did those two incidents occur, but they gave him the printed warning, had him read it aloud, and asked him the question, did he understand it? He said he did, and that he still waived his rights. Thereupon he began making statements, not about the case for which he had just been arrested, but about four other robberies that he said he had participated in or that he had committed, among them the one for which he was here tried. He had not been asked a single question about it—not one. All they asked him—and this was after he confessed—was to identify the place, the particular marketplace, that he said he had robbed. He gave all of the information voluntarily. And, as if that were not enough, he then proceeded to walk out and demonstrate how the robberies took place. But the Court said, in reversing the case, "Well, we do not know whether he understood that his confession could be used against him."

He went even further. He then signed a written waiver—a written waiver, mind you—of the Miranda rule. But the court said, "Well, we do not know whether he understood what he was doing," and reversed the case.

Mr. President, the court's opinion also indicates that defendant did not raise at his trial the voluntary confession question considered by the appellate court. The question was never raised in his trial; the confession was voluntary. Thus the appellate court not only sought to penetrate the mind of the defendant to determine, without evidence in the record for support, that the defendant might not have understood the repeated warnings, "Anything you say may be used against you in court," but it also relieved the defendant and his counsel of the burden of preparing their case properly for the trial. No question was raised as to whether defendant's counsel had the needed access to his client to develop a defense; therefore, we must assume that he had full opportunity to do so.

None of these questions was raised, Mr. President. This case is an outstanding example of the lengths some of our judiciary will go to protect the fictitious and alleged rights of criminals, in this instance the rights of a confessed, without coercion in any form, four-time robber.

He confessed to four robberies voluntarily, with no coercion—there was not the slightest bit of evidence anywhere, even on cross-examination of the witness, that there was any coercion used. Yet they found excuses to remand the case for a determination of whether the confession was voluntary.

With hindsight and imagination, the court is acting as counsel for the defendant, even going so far as to conjure up technicalities for the defense and to suggest lines of action to be taken by the defendant after the case was remanded—page 13, footnote 36. Thus, if the ruling in this case stands; if the Supreme Court should adopt this doctrine and it should become the law of the land—and as of now it is the law of the land in the District of Columbia; a defendant will have two trials and two sets of counsel, the second with the benefit of hindsight made by a judge who may pass on whether counsel for the defendant properly presented his case the second time—if indeed a case can be made out. Presumably if the attorney does not, the higher court will give him yet another chance.

This is the kind of decision that has outraged citizens across the country; this is the kind of decision which has made the streets of Washington unsafe for the law-abiding citizen; this is the kind of decision which results in overcrowded courts; and this is the kind of decision that makes a mockery of the word "justice" as applied to our judicial system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Court and the dissenting opinion of Judge Burger be printed at this point in the RECORD so that those who read it may know that the comments I have made are absolutely justified.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, NO. 21,426; EUGENE R. FRAZIER, APPELLANT v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLEE, APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DECIDED MARCH 14, 1969

Mr. Ira S. Siegler (appointed by this court) for appellant.

Mr. Joel M. Finkelstein, Assistant United States Attorney, with whom *Messrs. David G. Bress,* United States Attorney, and *Frank Q. Nebeker,* Assistant United States Attorney, were on the brief, for appellee.

Before BAZELON, *Chief Judge,* and BURGER and ROBINSON, *Circuit Judges.*

ROBINSON, *Circuit Judge:* This is an appeal [1] from a conviction for the armed robbery [2] of the Meridian Market on August 24, 1966. The Government's proof against appellant consisted of in-court identifications by the proprietor and an employee of the market, and an oral confession by appellant while detained by the police after his arrest. Appellant offered no evidence in his own behalf. He now argues, as he did at trial, that the presiding judge should have excluded both the confession and the identifications, and thus left the Government with a case no better than his defense.

Both confessions and identifications made while an accused is in police custody without benefit of counsel are constitutionally suspect.[3] Appellant's contentions on this appeal thus not atypically invoke doctrinal considerations that would have a vitiating effect on each prong of the Government's presentation unless exempted by special conditions. Accordingly, we must examine closely the circumstances surrounding appellant's confession and identifications in order to determine whether they pass the strict tests for admissibility which have been judicially prescribed.

I

Appellant was arrested at 4:15 p.m. on September 7, 1966, pursuant to a warrant issued in connection with a robbery at Mike's Carry Out, and was taken to a precinct station. Upon arrival at about 4:30 p.m., the arresting officer immediately telephoned Detective Sergeant Robert T. Keahon, of the Robbery Squad, who instructed him to book appellant and bring him directly to the Robbery Squad office at police headquarters. At a pretrial hearing, held to pass upon the admissibility of the confession, Keahon testified that all arrestees brought to a precinct station are subsequently conveyed to headquarters for processing, that is, fingerprinting, photographing and completion of the "line-up sheet." In addition, Keahon stated that he was personally in possession of appellant's arrest warrant, "was familiar with the case, and . . . was going to handle the case. . . ."

The arresting officer called in a police wagon from the streets and, when it arrived, drove appellant through closing hour traffic to police headquarters, and presented him to Keahon at 5:20 p.m. Keahon ascertained that appellant had been advised of his rights by the arresting officer, and read to him from a form which gave the *Miranda* [4] warnings in some detail. Appellant said he understood the contents of the form, did not want a lawyer, and would obtain one the next morning if necessary. He then signed a statement to the effect that he knew his rights and did not desire the assistance of counsel.

Keahon then "started talking to him about the Mike's Carry Out," the offense for which he had been arrested, but before he could utter more than a few words, appellant exclaimed, "I don't care, I want to clear Ted. Teddy didn't do it. . . . Teddy didn't shoot that woman in the High's store or rob her. I did." "Teddy," it developed, was one Theodore Moore, who had been arrested for a robbery at a High's Market. With that, appellant proceeded to confess, without prompting, to a series of other recent crimes, the fourth of which was the Meridian Market holdup for which he was convicted in this case. Keahon testified that he asked appellant no questions whatever about that affair except to identify the market appellant was admitting he had robbed.

The Meridian Market confession was made at 5:45 p.m. When appellant finished confessing to various other offenses, Keahon brought in witnesses to identify him.[5] Formal processing was completed at about 7:30 p.m., and appellant was taken before the United States Commissioner on the following morning.

II

Appellant contends that his confession was inadmissible under *Mallory* v. *United States* [6] because it was obtained during a period of unnecessary delay in his presentment before a judicial officer. The Government denies a *Mallory* violation and argues that, even if there was one, the confession is admissible under Title III of the so-called District of Columbia Crime Bill.[7] We think the record raises a substantial question as to whether appellant's transfer from the precinct station to police headquarters was an unnecessary delay in terms of contemporary judicial construction of Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.[8] We do not, however, reach that question, or the sensitive issues concerning the applicability [9] and constitutionality of Title III which lurk behind it, because the case is properly resolvable on another basis.

Appellant attacks his confession on *Miranda* [10] as well as *Mallory* grounds, alleging that he did not effectively waive his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Our decisions have recognized the importance of inquiry as to whether the accused was effectively apprised of his rights when the admissibility of a confession under *Mallory* is at stake.[11] And as we recently observed in *Naples* v. *United States,*[12] which involved a pre-*Miranda* confession, the evolution in our understanding of *Mallory* has "paralleled the visible movement by the Supreme Court towards the application of Fifth and Sixth Amendment considerations to the pre-arraignment period. That movement culminated, of course, in *Miranda,* in the shadow of which Rule 5(a) now resides and which has probably made academic problems of the kind we confront on this record." [13]

Now we must consider directly the effect on *Mallory* of a *Miranda* that has come of age.

Although not explicitly premised on constitutional grounds, *Mallory* has been ultimately concerned with effectuation of Fifth and Sixth Amendment protections against the dangers of involuntary self-incrimination in stationhouses and with the other evils inherent in police interrogation of an accused in secret.[14] [T]he delay [in presentment before a magistrate]," *Mallory* admonished, "must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession." [15]. Its parent opinion, *McNabb* v. *United States,*[16] rested on the proposition that—

> "[l]egislation [comparable to Rule 5(a)] . . ., requiring that the police must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons, constitutes an important safeguard—not only in assuring protection for the innocent but also in securing conviction of the guilty by methods that commend themselves to a progressive and self-confident society. For this procedural requirement checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the 'third degree' which, though universally rejected as indefensible, still find their way into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret interrogation of persons accused of crime." [17]

Mallory itself has stood guard against not only the "third degree," but also "the pressures in a Police Station upon prisoners under secret interrogation without counsel, relative or friend." [18] These, of course, are precisely the concerns of *Miranda.*

The *Mallory* solution for these iniquities was enforcement by an exclusionary rule of the requirement that the accused be brought "before a judicial officer as quickly as possible so that he may be advised of his rights. . . ." [19] But this remedy was at best imperfect because some delay in presentment is unavoidable and, as *Mallory* concedes, additional delays for some purposes may be justifiable.[20] Such postponements are, of course, as susceptible to abuses as any others, and experience has exemplified the difficulty inherent in ascertaining either the real purpose of a challenged delay or the actual nature of interrogations carried out behind closed stationhouse doors.[21]

In *Miranda,* the Supreme Court eschewed this uncertain detour through Rule 5(a) and attacked the problem of custodial interrogation directly. It held that the accused is entitled to the assistance of counsel before he is questioned and, in effect, that any confession he makes while in exclusive police custody prior to arraignment is presumptively inadmissible under the Fifth and Sixth Amendments. Such confessions can stand if, but only if, the accused affirmatively and understandingly waives his rights, and the

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

Government bears "a heavy burden" in attempting to show such a waiver.[22]

Thus, absent convincing evidence of waiver, no confession may be admitted, regardless of the dispatch with which the accused is presented before a magistrate. Conversely, should the Government carry its burden, we think it follows that the confession is not inadmissible solely on the ground that the accused was not taken before a magistrate at the earliest possible moment. A valid *Miranda* waiver is necessarily, for the duration of the waiver,[23] also a waiver of an immediate *judicial* warning of constitutional rights.[24] And what *Miranda*, as a constitutional interpretation, leaves an accused at liberty to yield, he may, we believe, forego equally under *Mallory*.[25] Provided the exacting standards for waiver are met, the overriding purpose of *Mallory* has been served.[26]

By no means is this to say that unjustified delay in compliance with Rule 5(a) has no bearing on the admissibility of a confession forthcoming during a period of such delay. As *Miranda* made clear, "[w]hatever the testimony of the authorities as to waiver of rights by an accused, the fact of lengthy interrogation or incommunicado incaceration before a statement is made is strong evidence that the accused did not validly waive his rights. In these circumstances the fact that the individual eventually made a statement is consistent with the conclusion that the compelling influence of the interrogation finally forced him to do so. It is inconsistent with any notion of a voluntary relinquishment of the privilege." [27]

Thus, the greater the tardiness in presentment prior to a confession, the heavier the Government's already "heavy burden" of showing effective waiver. Certainly some conceivable delays are so long that no subsequent confession could be deemed the product of voluntary waiver. And nothing in *Miranda* affects the admissibility *vel non* of evidence of any sort obtained during detention following an illegal arrest.[28]

III

Thus the vital question here is whether appellant voluntarily and understandingly waived his *Miranda* rights. If he did not, his confession was inadmissible under *Miranda*. If he did, the confession was admissible even if the purpose inspiring his transfer to police headquarters was interrogation for the production of evidence.[29]

The record discloses that appellant objected when, as he began his string of confessions, Sergeant Keahon started to take notes on his confession. How strenuously he objected does not appear, but it is noteworthy that Keahon stopped writing at that point. He testified entirely from memory to the details of the confession, which was made a year before the trial began, explaining that "at the beginning of his admission, I started to write notes, and he stopped me and said: Don't write anything down. I will tell you about this but I don't want you to write anything down." [30]

The strong implication is that appellant thought his confession could not be used against him so long as nothing was committed to writing. If, as his avowed motive for confessing suggests, he was brooding over a guilty conscience while the warnings were being given, he might well have failed to absorb their message. Or he may simply have been laboring under the common misapprehension that the police could not use in court anything he said unless they were able to introduce a written statement. Whatever the reason, the evidence raises a serious question as to whether he intelligently waived his right to remain silent.[31]

Appellant was given the *Miranda* warnings in their entirety. He signed what purported to be an express waiver. If there were no other evidence in the record, the Government would have discharged its burden, and no further inquiry would be necessary. But while "[a]n express statement that the individual is willing to make a statement and does not want an attorney followed closely by a statement *could* constitute a waiver," [32] *Miranda* teaches that in many circumstances it does not.[33] Here, Sergeant Keahon's testimony suggests powerfully that the waiver was not understandingly made; in addition, the hour appellant spent in custody before the ceremonial "waiver" casts doubt on whether it was voluntarily made. Since the Government offered no evidence to dispel these doubts, we cannot say on this record that it carried its "heavy burden . . . to demonstrate that the defendant knowingly and intelligently waived his privilege against self-incrimination. . . ." [34]

The Government argues, however, that because the question was not raised below, appellant should not be allowed to present it here. We disagree. Appellant's counsel [35] was initially confronted with the signed waiver and what appeared to be a spontaneous confession. It is scarcely surprising that he prepared a *Mallory*, not a *Miranda*, argument. The evidence connoting that appellant did not understandingly waive his rights did not develop until the direct examination of Sergeant Keahon. Defense counsel then made an apparent attempt to raise the issue in a general way, but the matter was lost in the *Mallory* argument he was pursuing. We do not demand more of appellants as a condition to litigation of issues fundamental in the criminal process.

Nonetheless, because the Government had no clear warning that it would need to produce more evidence, we are reluctant to reverse for a new trial. Appellant's ban on note-taking inveighs against intelligent waiver, but this inference might be overcome, for example, if Sergeant Keahon admonished him that even an oral confession would be used against him, and appellant replied that he knew that but still did not want anything written down. Absent some additional evidence, comparable in quality, of understanding waiver, however, his confession cannot stand. Accordingly, we shall remand this case to the District Court for an evidentiary hearing and findings of fact on the validity of appellant's purported waiver.[36]

IV

Appellant also contends that the trial judge erred in permitting two eyewitnesses to the Meridian Market robbery to identify him at the trial as a participant. His argument is that these in-court identifications were products of prior extrajudicial identifications made in circumstances so unnecessarily suggestive and promotive of faulty recognition as to impinge on due process of law.[37] We deferred our disposition of this case to enable evaluation of appellant's claim in the light of the recent *Clemons* [38] decision by the full court.

One, but only one, of the pretrial episodes complained of falls within the area of constitutional condemnation. More than a month after appellant's arrest, Louis I. Reznick, the owner of the market, and William Simpson, an employee, both of whom were present when the holdup occurred, viewed appellant while confined in a cellblock. Appellant was the only person they were shown, and both witnesses knew at the time that appellant had confessed. As the Government now itself characterizes the incident, this single-suspect cellblock confrontation was "indeed suggestive"; so much so, we hasten to add, as to render it offensive to due process.[39]

The Government, however, did not rely upon the out-of-court identifications at the trial.[40] The question, then, is whether the in-court identifications had a source sufficiently independent of the cellblock exhibition as to be free from its taint.[41] The trial court found that there was no taint, and we deem the evidence adequate to support that finding.[42]

Reznick and Simpson each testified at trial that they remembered appellant from impressions received at the time of the robbery. The offense was perpetrated by two men during daylight hours over a period of several minutes during which both Reznick and Simpson had excellent opportunities to scrutinize the two robbers. Afterwards, they gave the police detailed joint descriptions of the culprits, one of which depicted appellant reasonably well. In addition, Reznick selected appellant's photograph out of "a box of pictures" given him by the police shortly after appellant's arrest. This evidence, we hold, was sufficient to support the finding that Reznick's identification was not tainted by the cellblock confrontation.[43]

As to Simpson, who made no prior photographic identification, the proof on independent source on his in-court identification included a very significant event. On the night of appellant's arrest, Simpson was brought to police headquarters to identify him. According to the uncontradicted testimony of Detective Keahon, "when Mr. Simpson walked into the office, he saw Frazier and he said: There's the man that approached me in the back and stated, this is a hold-up. And at the same time the Defendant Frazier shook his head; and I asked him what did he mean by shaking his head; and he said: Yes, that is the man that was behind the meat counter."

Ordinarily, an identification arising out of so suggestive a confrontation would itself be constitutionally dubious.[44] Here, however, not only did Simpson identify appellant, but appellant also identified Simpson. There can be no doubt on the record that by "the man that was behind the meat counter," appellant referred to Simpson's presence there at the time of the robbery. At this juncture, his urge to confess was so strong that he even acted out one of the other holdups to which he had confessed in order to convince hesitant eyewitnesses to that crime that he had indeed been the perpetrator. His statement, however, is relevant here, not because it is evidence of guilt and thus, indirectly, of the reliability of Simpson's identification, but rather because it tends directly to confirm the existence of an independent source for the challenged identification. And, with this, there could hardly be any "substantial likelihood of irreparable mistaken identification."[45]

We remand the case to the District Court for proceedings consistent with this opinion.

REMANDED.

BURGER, *Circuit Judge*, concurring in part and dissenting in part: I agree that the identification testimony was properly admitted under the principles recently set forth by this court in *Clemons* v. *United States*, No. 19,486 (D.C. Cir., Dec. 6, 1968) (*en banc*), but I do not agree with those parts of the majority opinion relating to the inadmissibility of statements which Appellant made to the police.

(1)

The sole issue separating me from the majority is whether *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966) required Appellant's statements to be excluded from the evidence. In answering this question affirmatively the majority leans heavily on *Mallory* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 449 (1957), the standing of which has been drawn into serious doubt by recent Congressional enactments.[46] The majority's cognizance [47] of the message that this series of legislation bears for *Mallory* and their apparent agreement with the lower court's finding that *Mallory* was not violated here,[48] belies *Mallory's* true significance to the issues at hand. Moreover it is unsound to treat *Mallory* and *Miranda* as closely related; the former is a quantitive test of time delay, the latter is a qualitative test of the circumstances of the interrogation.[49]

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

Of more concern is the majority's expansion of *Miranda* into a *per se* exclusionary rule, thereby transcending the Fifth Amendment requirement that only those statements elicited through *compulsion* be excluded from evidence. Indeed, *Miranda* itself cannot be read as going beyond the language of the Fifth Amendment.[50] Any lingering doubts on this score were resolved by a recent exposition on the subject by the Supreme Court. In discussing the scope of *Miranda* the Court pertinently noted in *Hoffa* v. *United States*, 385 U.S. 293, 303–04 (1966), that, "since at least as long ago as 1807, when Chief Justice Marshall first gave attention to the matter in the trial of Aaron Burr, all have agreed that a necessary element of compulsory self-incrimination is *some kind of compulsion*". (Emphasis added) (footnote omitted)

In *Miranda* the Supreme Court held that certain warnings must be given to a suspect before "custodial interrogation" could be conducted. The underlying assumption was that these warnings were necessary to prevent the subversion of trial rights at unsupervised pretrial confrontations between an accused and the State. Whereas pre-*Miranda* cases had alternately invoked the Fifth and Sixth Amendments[51] *Miranda* made clear that the Fifth Amendment was the central value at stake. The articulation of a stringent waiver requirement was merely a device through which the Court sought to ensure that Fifth Amendment guarantees were not unduly impaired at pretrial interrogations. The guidelines set forth in *Miranda* were means servicing constitutionally prescribed ends; as artifices of implementation they are subordinate and only incidental to the rights they were designed to secure. By postulating a waiver concept the Court did not intend to eclipse the threshold inquiries into the presence of compulsion and the quality of police conduct attending the making of inculpatory statements. This is the background of controlling legal principles on which this case ought to be decided. I do not agree that they give rise to a plausible claim of improper police tactics amounting to coercion requiring reversal or remand.

(2)

Frazier was presented to Officer Keahon at headquarters at 5:20 P.M. Their meeting was prefaced by Keahon's reading the *Miranda* warnings to him from PD–47 (a form card which all police officers carry and which had previously been read to Frazier by Officer Sandy upon his arrest). He repeated these warnings to Frazier when he read PD–54, a form which advised him of his Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights[52] and contained a statement of an intention to waive his right to remain silent and his right to counsel. Thereafter, at 5:30 P.M., Frazier himself read this form, orally stated that he understood its meaning,[53] and signed the waiver.

Officer Keahon testified that he then read the arrest warrant relating to the robbery of Mike's Carry Out Shop and started to question Frazier on that robbery. But, after Keahon had spoken but a few words, Frazier blurted out his desire to clear a third person who had been arrested for the robbery and shooting at a High's Store. Within minutes Frazier, by way of exculpating others, admitted to his involvement in the robberies at the High's Store, at Mike's Carry Out Shop, at the Dodge Market, and at the Meridian Market—the last robbery being the one for which he was convicted in this case. During this discourse Frazier objected to Officer Keahon's taking written notes. Keahon testified: "At the beginning of his admission, I started to write notes, and he stopped me and said: 'Don't write anything down. I will tell you about this but I don't want you to write anything down.'" [Tr. 72.]

The admission of the Meridian Market robbery was unsolicited and appears to have been volunteered. Officer Keahon testified that he did not ask Frazier whether he participated in the Meridian Market robbery and that the only questions asked in relation to that robbery during the initial confession were for the purpose of corroborating the identification of the market. Thus it seems that the confession was totally spontaneous and voluntary.

Following the statements Frazier was retained in the robbery squad office for nearly two hours, where he was quizzed in detail about the four robberies, reiterated his confessions, was displayed to several witnesses, and reenacted several of the robberies. Thereafter he was placed in a cell for the night because a Commissioner was not available and was presented the following morning.

(3)

The record demonstrates entirely reasonable police activity satisfying the deterrent purposes underlying the *Miranda* rule. There is not a scintilla of evidence suggesting that what had been forthcoming from Appellant's lips was the result of unreasonable or improper police conduct. The fact that Appellant may not have desired the statement to be transcribed does not compel the conclusion that he was being subjected to the kind of police activity found unconscionable in *Miranda*. The most that can be said from Appellant's statements is that he may have *unintentionally* incriminated himself. The Fifth Amendment, however, serves neither to discourage nor to prohibit self-incrimination, it militates only against *compulsory* self-incrimination. The record does not even remotely suggest that Appellant was being compelled to incriminate himself, no less compelled to utter any words at all. There is not the slightest indication that Appellant was unaware of his rights or labored under a misbelief that his failure to speak could be used against him as evidence of guilt. There is no intimation that the environment would have neither permitted nor honored a non-waiver.

In fact, no issue is even purportedly raised as to Appellant's willingness to make the statements that were eventually used against him. Indeed, evidence of his volition may be inferred from his voluntary participation later that evening in a series of identification procedures. In view of the obvious spontaneity surrounding its making, the statement could plainly have been used as a threshold oral confession.[54]

In this regard it also bears noting that the "plus factors" so frequently contributing to a rejection of a confession are not present in this case. Frazier was repeatedly told of his right to counsel and his right to remain silent; he confessed immediately and without prior denials; he never repudiated his confession and he did not make any allegations of coercive threats or physical abuses.[55]

By equating Frazier's insistence that the police not write notes with a desire not to incriminate himself, the majority engages in sheer speculation of Appellant's thought processes which places a premium on the capacity of judges to probe Appellant's mind. This approach bears an unfortunate resemblance to the sophistry engaged in by the courts which labored under the albatross of *Betts* v. *Brady*.[56] Indeed, the rule requiring courts to peer through kaleidoscopes in search of constitutional violations inevitably deteriorated into measuring the constitutional right in terms of the suspect's need and invariably a horribly guilty suspect at that. Although this theory received currency during the era of "special circumstances," twenty years of inconsistent application which produced no judicially manageable standards eventually persuaded the Supreme Court in *Miranda*[57] to turn to an essentially *objective*[58] mode of analysis.

Since the underlying purpose of *Miranda* was to curb police improprieties, the use of objective criterion provided courts with a more workable method of evaluating the reasonableness of police conduct. The unhappy theory holding the police accountable for environmental and personality beyond the pale of police perception came to rest in the shadow of an exclusionary rule grounded in deterrence. Indeed, the Supreme Court in *Johnson* v. *New Jersey*[59] confirmed the essentially deterrent underpinnings of *Miranda* and thereby placed its imprimatur on an interpretation focusing on the reasonableness of police conduct instead of the vagaries of human nature.

Miranda did not set down a *per se* proscription against pretrial questioning; it was addressed primarily to abusive and unwarranted tactics designed to subvert constitutional rights. Even if Frazier unwittingly incriminated himself, the police should not be held accountable in the absence of some evidence of deceit or misconduct on their part. Here, of course, there is no such evidence. Indeed, the majority clothes Appellant's remarks with a significance bearing no relationship to the record or to ordinary human experience. Throughout the majority opinion is circumspect avoidance of any discussion relating to coercion or improper police conduct. To the extent Appellant's utterances may be construed as indicating a misunderstanding of the consequences of his making incriminatory statements the majority has failed to supply a nexus between this and the presence of improper police conduct amounting to coercion.

I have difficulty perceiving the basis for the majority's argument that it was unreasonable for the police to proceed with questions *after* Frazier made an apparently valid waiver. Although this waiver was not irrevocable,[60] there is nothing to show that Frazier indicated "in any manner, at any time prior to or during questioning, that he wish[ed] to remain silent" or that he wanted an attorney. *Miranda* v. *Arizona, supra* at 473–74.

Having complied with the postulates of *Miranda,* it was the absolute duty of the police as law enforcement agents to investigate promptly the circumstances of the crime and the suspect's possible participation. I am somewhat at a loss to know what more the Government could or should have done to comply with the directives of *Miranda*. Even if Frazier did not understand the privilege against self-incrimination, the majority's approach is unrealistic and goes beyond the mandates of any decided cases. It seemingly expects the police to detect indications of misunderstanding and lack of knowledge which are so subtle that not even judges would recognize the problem.

The seeming anxiety of judges to protect every accused person from every consequence of his voluntary utterances is giving rise to myriad rules, sub-rules, variation and exceptions which even the most alert and sophisticated lawyers and judges are taxed to follow. Each time judges add nuances to these "rules" we make it less likely that any police officer will be able to follow the guidelines we lay down. We are approaching the predicament of the centipede on the flypaper—each time one leg is placed to give support for relief of a leg already "stuck", another becomes captive and soon all are securely immobilized. Like the hapless centipede on the flypaper, our efforts to extricate ourselves from this self-imposed dilemma will, if we keep it up, soon have all of us immobilized. We are well on our way to forbidding *any* utterance of an accused to be used against him unless it is made in open court. Guilt or innocence becomes irrelevant in the criminal trial as we flounder in a morass of artificial rules poorly conceived and often impossible of application.

The record raises the possibility that the only statements put into evidence were those made *prior* in time to Appellants alleged equivocations.[61] Police who act reasonably on facts presently in their possession should not be ascribed a taint by virtue of subsequent utterances of a suspect which might be said

---

Footnotes at end of article.

to exhibit qualities forbidden by *Miranda*. The use of such a relating-back theory does violence to *Miranda*[62] and brings us beyond the point of diminishing return in enforcing an exclusionary rule grounded in deterrence of proscribed police conduct.[63] The Constitution does not prohibit, and surely the majority holding will not help, deter the police from continuing to question a suspect once there has been—as there was here—an apparent waiver of rights; but the majority holding will baffle policemen as it will many judges.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Heard together with No. 21,427, *Bryson* v. *United States*, now pending before this court, which is an appeal from a conviction for the same offense.

[2] D.C. Code § 22–2901 (1967 ed.), since amended (Supp. I 1968).

[3] As to confessions, *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966); see also *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964). As to identifications, *United States* v. *Wade*, 388 U.S. 218 (1967); *Gilbert* v. *California*, 388 U.S. 263 (1967); *Stovall* v. *Denno*, 388 U.S. 293 (1967).

[4] *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3, 384 U.S. at 467–73.

[5] This aspect of the case is discussed *infra*, pt. IV.

[6] 354 U.S. 449 (1957).

[7] 81 Stat. 734, 735–36 (1967). Title III in pertinent part provides:

"Sec. 301(a) Any person arrested in the District of Columbia may be questioned with respect to any matter for a period not to exceed three hours immediately following his arrest. Such person shall be advised of and accorded his rights under applicable law respecting any such interrogation. . . .

"(b) Any statement, admission, or confession made by an arrested person within three hours immediately following his arrest shall not be excluded from evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia solely because of delay in presentment."

[8] "An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. . . ." F.R.Crim.P. 5(a).

[9] The question is whether the statute operates retroactively to require admission of a confession obtained prior to its enactment in the course of an unnecessary delay in presenting an accused before a judicial officer.

[10] *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3.

[11] See *Naples* v. *United States*, 127 U.S.App. D.C. 249, 258, 382 F.2d 465, 474 (1967), and cases cited in n. 10. In *Alston* v. *United States*, 121 U.S.App.D.C. 66, 67–68, 348 F.2d 72, 73–74 (1965), Judge McGowan, in his separate opinion, deemed the fact that appellant "was not, prior to his interrogation, informed of his right to remain silent or of the fact that such answers as he chose to give might be used against him" at trial a "decisive consideration" in his conclusion that *Mallory* required barring of the confession.

[12] *Supra* note 11.

[13] 127 U.S.App.D.C. at 258, 382 F.2d at 474.

[14] *Spriggs* v. *United States*, 118 U.S.App.D.C. 248, 251, 335 F.2d 283, 286 (1964).

[15] 354 U.S. at 455.

[16] 318 U.S. 332 (1943).

[17] *Id*. at 343–44.

[18] *Spriggs* v. *United States*, *supra* note 14, 118 U.S.App.D.C. at 250, 335 F.2d at 285.

[19] 354 U.S. at 454. *Mallory* and its progeny have also voiced concern at the possibility that police may interrogate, or otherwise use a delay in presentation before a magistrate, to obtain probable cause to support the arrest. Whenever it appears that an arrest was made without probable cause, a question may arise independently of *Mallory* as to whether evidence subsequently obtained in violation of Rule 5(a) must be excluded as fruit of the illegal arrest. See *Adams* v. *United States*, No. 20,547 (D.C. Cir., June 21, 1968); *Bynum* v. *United States*, 104 U.S.App.D.C. 368, 262 F.2d 465 (1958). *Mallory*, however, which applies regardless of the legality of the arrest, and which has been read to exclude only testimonial evidence, see cases cited in *Adams*, *supra*, at 5 n. 4, is ill-suited for more than incidental impact on that problem.

[20] 354 U.S. at 455. Se also *Alston* v. *United States*, *supra* note 11, 121 U.S. App. D.C. at 68, 348 F.2d at 74 (opinion of Judge McGowan).

[21] Compare the majority with the dissenting opinions in, *e.g.*, *Coor* v. *United States*, 119 U.S. App. D.C. 259, 340 F.2d 784 (1964), *cert. denied* 382 U.S. 1013 (1966); *Muschette* v. *United States*, 116 U.S. App. D.C. 239, 322 F.2d 989 (1963), *vacated on other grounds* 378 U.S. 569 (1964); *Heideman* v. *United States*, 104 U.S. App. D.C. 128, 259 F.2d 943, *cert. denied* 359 U.S. 959 (1958). This case itself is illustrative of the difficulty: the police practice of processing at headquarters persons arrested at the precinct may or may not be essential to efficient police administration; if it is essential, it nonetheless presents obvious opportunities for improper interrogation.

[22] After the warnings have been given "[i]f the interrogation continues without the presence of an attorney and a statement is taken, a heavy burden rests on the government to demonstrate that the defendant knowingly and intelligently waived his privilege against self-incrimination and his right to retained or appointed counsel. . . . This Court has always set high standards of proof for the waiver of constitutional rights, *Johnson* v. *Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938), and we re-assert these standards as applied to in custody interrogation." *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3, 384 U.S. at 475.

[23] A valid waiver ceases to be effective whenever the accused indicates in any manner that he wishes to remain silent or that he wants an attorney. *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3, 384 U.S. at 473–74.

[24] *Miranda* implicitly assumes that it is possible for the police to convey to the accused sufficient understanding of his rights to enable him to make an intelligent waiver. A police warning, to be effective, must be given with proper solicitude for actual understanding. Moreover, a waiver made in the coercive atmosphere of police custody is less likely to be voluntary than one made before a commission. Thus the Government carries such a weighty burden of providing waiver in cases involving confessions to the police. But irrespective of who gives the warnings or takes the confessions, the ultimate question is whether the waiver is voluntary in the full sense of the word. If an accused did not understand what a magistrate told him, an ensuing confession would not be rendered admissible because he had been advised of his rights by a judicial officer. Similarly, under *Miranda*, a waiver may be valid even though made on the basis of police warnings.

[25] We do not conclude, however, that in waiving his right to remain silent, the accused also impliedly waives his right to complain of a *prior* violation of Rule 5(a). Rather, we construe *Mallory* not to require exclusion of an otherwise admissible confession because of a brief delay in obtaining a *Miranda* waiver.

[26] Rule 5(a) also confers upon the accused a prompt opportunity to persuade a magistrate, at a preliminary hearing under Rule 5(c), that there is no probable cause for holding him. While, of course, that policy remains in force, see *Adams* v. *United States*, *supra* note 19, at 10, *Mallory* has enforced it only coincidentally, since it has no effect if no incriminating evidence is obtained as a result of the delay, and since it has been read not to apply where the unnecessary delay in presentment to a magistrate occurs *after* a confession. *Coor* v. *United States*, *supra* note 21, 119 U.S.App.D.C. at 260, 349 F.2d at 785; *Bailey* v. *United States*, 117 U.S.App.D.C. 241, 328 F.2d 542, *cert. denied* 377 U.S. 972 (1964); *Lockley* v. *United States*, 106 U.S.App.D.C. 163, 270 F.2d 915 (1959); *Porter* v. *United States*, 103 U.S.App.D.C. 385, 258 F.2d 685, 692 (1958), *cert. denied* 360 U.S. 906 (1959); and see *United States* v. *Mitchell*, 322 U.S. 65, 70–71 (1944).

If probable cause is found, Rule 5(a) still serves to promote early consideration of an accused's admission to bail. This function of the rule has taken on added importance with the enactment of the Bail Reform Act, 80 Stat. 214 (1966), 18 U.S.C. § 3146 *et seq*. But for the same reason that *Mallory* has little relevance to the goal of assuring expeditious determination of the existence of probable cause, it is not a significant antidote to the problem of delays in bail hearings.

Rule 5(a) also serves to provide early warning by a magistrate of the right to counsel, which may be important in protecting an accused's interest at a line-up. See *Williams* v. *United States*, No. 21,269–70 (D.C. Cir., Dec. 20, 1968). Thus, identification evidence obtained in the absence of counsel may be excluded independently of the rules of *United States* v. *Wade*, *Gilbert* v. *California*, and *Stovall* v. *Denno*, all *supra* note 3, if it is obtained during an "unnecessary delay" in presentment. If the right to counsel has been validly waived under *Miranda*, however, this issue will not arise. Moreover, even in the absence of a waiver, if counsel was in fact present at the challenged confrontation, and if the resulting identification is otherwise admissible, *Mallory* does not require its exclusion because of a violation of Rule 5(a). *Williams* v. *United States*, *supra*, at 9 n. 9.

[27] 384 U.S. at 476.

[28] See note 19, *supra*.

[29] *Cf*. *Naples* v. *United States*, *supra* note 11.

[30] We cannot agree with our dissenting colleague (*infra* p. 24) that "[t]he record raises the possibility that the only statements put into evidence were those made *prior* in time to Appellant's alleged equivocations." The confession at issue was the fourth in a series made by appellant to Sergeant Keahon, who testified that appellant put a stop to note-taking "[a]t the beginning of his admission," when he was narrating the first robbery in the series. If Sergeant Keahon was not admonished about note-taking until after the challenged confession was given, we must disbelieve his explanation as to why he had no notes concerning it.

[31] The thrust of *Miranda* is that in order to permit "a full opportunity to exercise the privilege against self-incrimination, the accused must be adequately and *effectively* apprised of his rights. . . ." 384 U.S. at 467 (emphasis added). Specifically included among the warnings the Court found essential to an *adequate* appraisal is notice of the fact that "anything said can and will be used against the individual in court" *Id*. at 469. This warning is needed in order to make him aware of the consequences of foregoing his privilege not to speak. "It is only through an awareness of these consequences that there can be any assurance of real understanding and intelligent exercise of the privilege." *Id*. And as this explanation suggests, a warning is not *effective* if it is not understood. Thus contrary to the thesis of the dissent, incriminating statements may be involuntary, and thus "compelled" within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment, even where the police are not at fault. *Cf*. note 24, *supra*. See *Procter* v. *United States*, No. 21,569 (D.C. Cir., Oct. 10, 1968) at 2–3.

[32] *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3, 384 U.S. at 475 (emphasis added).

[33] *Id*. at 475–76.

[34] *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, *supra* note 3, 384 U.S. at 475.

[35] Not his counsel on this appeal.

XUM

[36] Appellant, of course, may wish to testify at that hearing. See *Simmons* v. *United States,* 390 U.S. 377, 389–94 (1968); *Bailey* v. *United States,* —— U.S. App., D.C. ——, 389 F. 2d 305 (1967).

[37] See *Stovall* v. *Denno, supra* note 3, 388 U.S. at 302; *Simmons* v. *United States, supra* note 36, 390 U.S. at 384; *Wright* v. *United States,* No. 20,153 (D.C. Cir., Jan. 31, 1968) at 5–9. Since the pretrial identifications occurred before the decisions in *United States* v. *Wade* and *Gilbert* v. *California,* both *supra* note 3, the fact that appellant was then unrepresented by counsel does not establish a constitutional violation. *Stovall* v. *Denno, supra* note 3, 390 U.S. at 300.

[38] *Clemons* v. *United States,* No. 19,846 (D.C. Cir. *en banc* Dec. 6, 1968).

[39] *Id.* at 16, 25, 32–33.

[40] The jury did hear a reference to the cell-block confrontation during the direct examination of Reznick. However, even if Reznick's reference amounted to an unintentional introduction into evidence of the out-of-court episode, there was no error if this identification, like its in-court sequel, had an "independent source." *Clemons* v. *United States, supra* note 38, at 30.

[41] *United States* v. *Wade, supra* note 3, 388 U.S. at 240; *Gilbert* v. *California, supra* note 3, 388 U.S. at 272; *Clemons* v. *United States, supra* note 38, at 9; *Wright* v. *United States, supra* note 36, at 9.

[42] In *Clemons* v. *United States, supra* note 38, at 8, 18, we emphasized the importance of the trial court's considered judgment on this question in the absence of further enlightenment by the Supreme Court. See also *id.*, opinion of Judge Leventhal at 37.

[43] The reliability of Reznick's in-court identification is additionally supported by appellant's concession that Simpson had correctly identified appellant as a participant in the Meridian Market robbery. See the text *infra* at note 45.

[44] Compare *Clemons* v. *United States, supra* note 38; *Wright* v. *United States, supra* note 37, at 3, 5.

[45] *Simmons* v. *United States, supra* note 36, 390 U.S. at 384; *Clemons* v. *United States, supra* note 38, at 34.

[46] Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 82 Stat. 197 (1968); District of Columbia Crime Bill, 81 Stat. 734 (1967).

[47] *See* majority opinion at notes 7–9 and accompanying text. The majority mentions only the District of Columbia Bill, but the Omnibus Act is also relevant. Its Title II substantially incorporates Title III of the District of Columbia Crime Bill. *See generally,* Note, *Title II of the Omnibus Crime Control Act: A Study in Constitutional Conflict,* 57 GEO. L.J. 438 (1968). *And see* Bell v. Maryland, 378 U.S. 226 (1964), dealing with the question of legislative retroactivity.

[48] In *Mallory* the exclusion of confessions rested on supervisory powers, not on the Constitution. Mallory v. United States, 354 U.S. 449 (1957); *see* McNabb v. United States, 318 U.S. 332, 340 (1943).

[49] Herman, *The Supreme Court and Restrictions on Police Interrogation,* 25 OHIO L.J. 449, 451 (1961). In any event, *Mallory* has never been interpreted as requiring the police to terminate an interview for purposes of arraignment when a suspect wants to make a confession of guilt. In Fuller v. United States, — U.S. App. D.C. —, — & n. 13, — F.2d —, — & n. 13 (1967), *reheard en banc on other issues* Fuller v. United States, No. 19,532 (D.C. Cir., decided September 26, 1968), Judge Leventhal noted: "Rule 5(a) did not require that the detectives break off the interview and try to arraign appellant rather than allow him to make an immediate elaboration of the mere assertion of guilt". (Citing Walton v. United States, 334 F.2d 343, 347 (10th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied sub nom.* Comley v. United States, 379 U.S. 991 (1965).)

[50] The *Miranda* Court expressly disclaimed any intention to traverse beyond the strictures of the Constitution. At the outset of its opinion the Court stated, "We start here . . . with the premise that our holding is not an innovation in our jurisprudence, but is an application of principles long recognized and applied in other settings". 384 U.S. at 442.

[51] *Compare* Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478, 491 (1964) *and* Massiah v. United States, 377 U.S. 201 (1964), *with* Ashcraft v. Tennessee, 322 U.S. 143 (1944) *and* Brown v. Mississippi, 297 U.S. 278 (1936).

[52] The warning reads as follows:

"You are under arrest. Before we ask you any questions, you must understand what your rights are. You have the right to remain silent. You are not required to say anything to us at any time or to answer any questions. Anything you say can be used against you in Court. You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advise [*sic*] before we question you and to have him with you during questioning. If you cannot afford a lawyer and want one, a lawyer will be provided for you. If you want to answer questions now without a lawyer, you will still have the right to stop answering questions at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer."

[53] Officer Keahon testified as follows: "He [Frazier] stated that he did understand the form and that he did not want a lawyer. . . . He stated 'If I need a lawyer, I will get one in the morning.'" [Tr. 63–64.]

[54] *E.g.,* United States v. Mitchell, 322 U.S. 65 (1944); Bailey v. United States, 117 U.S. App. D.C. 241, 328 F.2d 542 (1964) (Miller, J.); Jackson v. United States, 114 U.S. App. D.C. 181, 313 F.2d 572 (1962) (Edgerton, J.); Metoyer v. United States, 102 U.S. App. D.C. 62, 250 F.2d 30 (1957) (Burger, J.).

[55] *Compare, e.g.,* Greenwell v. United States, 119 U.S. App. D.C. 43, 336 F.2d 962 (1964) (allegations of coercion); Spriggs v. United States, 118 U.S. App. D.C. 248, 335 F.2d 283 (1963) (prior denials; repudiation of the confession).

[56] 316 U.S. 455 (1942), in which the "special circumstances" doctrine was evolved to determine the necessity for counsel in non-capital offenses.

[57] By the time of *Miranda, Betts* had already been overruled by Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), holding the right to counsel universally applicable at trial in felony cases without regard to "special circumstances". In Cicenia v. Lagay, 357 U.S. 504 (1958), and Crooker v. California, 357 U.S. 433 (1958), the *Betts* analysis had been directly transposed on the determination of the admissibility of a confession. Both of these cases were distinguished and partially overruled in Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478, 491–92 (1964), and were completely overruled in *Miranda, supra* at 479 n.8. Of special interest is the discussion and rejection in *Miranda* of the "special circumstances" into which the rule of *Betts* necessitated an inquiry. *Id.* at 468–69 & n. 38.

[58] Analogously, in the arrest area a suspect's testimony of his understanding of the events would not be decisive but would be material. *Compare* United States v. McKethan, 247 F. Supp. 324, 328–29 (D.D.C. 1965), *aff'd by order* (D.C. Cir. No. 20059, 1966), where Judge Youngdahl states "the test must be not what the defendant himself . . . thought, but what a reasonable man, innocent of any crime, would have thought had he been in the defendant's shoes, . . . a reasonable man, interpreting these words [of the detective] and the acts accompanying them. . . ." *McKethan* has recently been cited with approval in Hicks v. United States, — U.S. App. D.C. —, — F.2d — (No. 20240, July 7, 1967).

Fuller v. United States, — U.S. App. D.C. —, — n.11, — F.2d —, — n.11 (1967) (Leventhal, J.), *reheard en banc on other issues* Fuller v. United States, No. 19,532 (D.C. Cir., decided September 26, 1968).

As Judge Bazelon's dissent in Hall v. United States, No. 20,711 (D.C. Cir., decided February 24, 1969) indicates, he too would subscribe to "reasonableness" of police conduct as the touchstone of exclusionary rules. Judge Bazelon said there, echoing a multitude of judicial holdings:

"It is not searches and seizures as such which the Fourth Amendment enjoins, but only 'unreasonable searches and seizures,' and the reasonableness of police conduct under the Fourth Amendment is ordinarily gauged by what the police reasonably and in good faith believed to be the facts at the time of the action. Thus, an arrest made on probable cause is not invalidated because the police were in fact mistaken in their good faith reasonable belief. * * *

"I fail to see how admission of the fruits of such police conduct could sully the integrity of the judicial process. Here was no shocking affront to the dignity of a citizen, *cf.* Rochin v. California, 342 U.S. 165 (1952), no police 'contempt for law,' no 'flagrant disregard' of prescribed procedures, no 'willful disobedience of (the) . . . Constitution. . . .'" (slip op. at 6, 9)

Although the *Hall* case involved the Fourth Amendment everything said in the dissent relates equally to the exclusion of reliable evidence under the Fifth Amendment; *see* Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616, 630 (1886), where the Court noted that "the Fourth and Fifth Amendments run almost into each other." *Compare* Note, *Consent Searches: A Reappraisal After Miranda v. Arizona,* 67 COLUM. L. REV. 130 (1967).

Just as reasonableness has been the guidepost for protecting privacy, it also serves as the basis for determining the existence of compulsion. In assessing the legality of an arrest the question is framed in terms of whether the police officer had probable cause to believe a crime had been committed; similarly, in determining the admissibility of a confession, the question is whether there was sufficient reason for the police to believe that the suspect had consented to being questioned. In both instances the judicially declared objective of the rules is to prevent the police from reaping the benefit of official misconduct. Here Appellant is unable even to allege any police misconduct, hence the underlying predicate of the exclusionary rule is totally absent. In such circumstances there can be no justification for suppressing the evidence.

[59] 384 U.S. 719 (1966), holding *Miranda* not retroactive.

[60] Miranda v. Arizona, *supra* at 444–45.

[61] Although the majority argues that the record unambiguously demonstrates the contrary, *see* note 30 of majority opinion, it is unnecessary to resolve their speculation since the precise moment of these equivocations is not crucial either to the majority's or to my theory of the case. The majority neither claims nor are they able to demonstate how the precise moment of equivocal utterance is relevant for determining the breadth of Appellant's understanding of his rights. Similarly, since the police would have been acting well within the bounds of reason by questioning the suspect *after* he had equivocated, *a fortiori* it would have been proper for them to question him before. That the moment of equivocal utterance is totally unrelated to determining the *reasonableness* of police conduct is further indicated by the majority's careful abstention from any discussion of the one issue on which this case turns.

[62] *Cf., e.g.,* cases cited in note 9, *supra.* In these cases the Court held that "unnecessary delay" occurring *after* a confession does not retroactively infect the confession. *See also* Bayer v. United States, 331 U.S. 532 (1947).

[63] *Cf.* Thornton v. United States, —— U.S. App. D.C. ——, ——, 368 F.2d 822, 827–28 (1966), holding that an unconstitutional seizure is not a proper ground for collateral attack; Amsterdam, *Search, Seizure, and Sec-*

XUM

tion 2255: A Comment, 112 U. Pa. L. Rev. 378, 389–90 (1964). *See also* the dissenting opinion of Judge Bazelon in Hall v. United States, No. 20,711 (D.C. Cir., decided February 24, 1969) where he states: "Even if a search that was reasonable *when made* can be retroactively invalidated under the Fourth Amendment, such a search does not taint either its fruits, or, through them, the judicial process." (Slip. op. at p. 9) (emphasis added).

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have here the past criminal record of this defendant. I find that in 1965 this defendant was fined for disorderly conduct.

In 1965 he was again convicted, this time of petty larceny, and given 90 days.

On March 23, 1966, he was convicted for assault with a deadly weapon, a gun.

He was on probation for that offense at the time these robberies were committed. On November 7, 1966, prior to this decision, he was indicted again for robbery.

On November 15, 1966, he was indicted again.

He was convicted for carrying a deadly weapon.

On January 5, 1968, he was convicted for robbery and sentenced to from 2 to 7 years in the penitentiary. He was out on probation, I understand, from a conviction at the time he committed these four robberies to which he confessed, and for one of which he was convicted after being given every warning, having made the confession and having signed the written agreement that he had read the warning and understood it. Yet, this man is turned loose to prey again on society.

I simply ask the question: Can any civilized society protect itself with that quality of justice being administered by its courts? I do not think it is possible to do it.

If this doctrine becomes the law of the land, I would not be surprised to find the entire front page of the daily newspaper covered with stories of crime. Much of the newspaper is taken up now by the reporting of crime in the District of Columbia.

This is a trend. Our courts, with decisions like this, are lending impetus to the trend. They are giving encouragement to it. As long as our criminals, robbers, and thieves, such as this one, can receive assistance from judges who are willing to simply ignore the proper rules of justice and the proper rules of evidence in order to turn them back on the streets to prey upon other victims, we will have a continued increase in crime in the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I commend and compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas for the fine speech he has made. I regret that I did not hear every bit of it. I assure the Senator that I will read it very carefully.

He is certainly the Nation's greatest fighter in this battle. The Senator knows that I share his sentiments in this general field. We have joined together on many bills and in committee hearings before.

I commend him for his continuing efforts.

I think that America does greatly need to heed the words he has so wisely and effectively and forcefully stated.

I commend him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I get no pleasure out of criticizing any court. There is no comfort in it. Instead, there is anxiety when it becomes necessary time and time again to point out what is happening in the courts of justice in our land with respect to the imbalance of justice as between the law-abiding citizens of this country and the robber and the rapist and the murderer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for the very fine statement he has made today. It is appropriate that the statement be made at this time for a number of reasons.

One reason that occurs to me is that only last week Chief Justice Warren made a statement to the effect that Congress had been unwilling to appropriate as much money as the Chief Justice felt should be appropriated to the Supreme Court and to the Federal courts of our land.

It is very difficult to appropriate as much money as would be needed to meet the increase in the cost of combating crime caused by Justice Warren and the other members of the Court who agree with him.

The Senator knows that they have succeeded in fixing things so that governments have to prosecute a man several times. Cases must be tried over and over again in order to overcome all the technicalities that the Supreme Court, and Chief Justice Warren, have set as impediments to effective law enforcement.

When all of these impediments have been overcome by repeated trials of a man over and over again, while the court continues to grant writs of habeas corpus and the appellate courts follow the procedure recommended by the Supreme Court, the criminals are oftentimes turned loose by the Supreme Court of the United States, so that they are encouraged to stay in that sort of business.

It has been pointed out to me that the most profitable business in the District of Columbia nowadays is burglary. The Supreme Court of the United States has made it virtually impossible for policemen to do the jobs they are intended to do.

That being the case, the criminal element is being given great encouragement in this country. There has been a tremendous increase of crime in the District of Columbia alone. The Senator from Arkansas is very familiar with that.

This has occurred because the court itself has created the problem and has contributed to the tremendous increase in crime and the virtual impossibility on the part of a prosecuting attorney to bring a culprit to justice as speedily as the law is intended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, the expressions of the Chief Justice, to me, are a very feeble and untenable alibi for the lack of proper administration of justice in this country. Certainly, there are congested dockets in metropolitan areas such as Washington, D.C., to the extent that Congress has not created more judges and provided ample funds for them. To some extent, Congress may be to blame. But I believe we have followed, as I recall, the full recommendations of the Chief Executive of the Nation with respect to the number of judges and the amount of funds. I do not recall having cut any funds for the Department of Justice in these areas. We have constantly increased the number of judges where this was deemed advisable.

I realize that more judges are needed in the District of Columbia, and I am going to support the authorization for the creation of more judges and more auxiliary officials to help them enforce the law.

But I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. The conditions that prevail are in part attributable to the quality of justice, or lack of it, that is reflected by Supreme Court decisions in criminal cases.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, Chief Justice Warren indicated that he was interested in retiring last year, provided that one would name a successor satisfactory to Chief Justice Warren who would take his place in the event the Chief Justice retired.

The Senator well knows that four of the nine Justices on the Court have on a number of occasions voted contrary to Chief Justice Warren, in trying to uphold effective law enforcement as it has been in the past. May I suggest to the Senator that there would not be a need for so much money to try to apprehend the criminals and bring them to justice if Chief Justice Warren would carry out his desire to retire, so that the President could appoint someone who would undertake to construe the law the way four judges on the Court have said it should be construed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That issue was thrashed out in the Senate, in an effort for some kind of arrangement which I thought was contemplated, whereby the Chief Justice would resign and an Associate Justice who was nominated would succeed him. But that issue was fought out in the Senate, and it was resolved in the last session of Congress. That is past. We are looking to the future.

Mr. President, I simply am trying to emphasize the impact that decisions such as this are having on the deterioration of law and order and on the safety of American citizens.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell me the extent to which crime has increased in the District of Columbia during the last year?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My recollection is that crime is up 21 or 27 percent.

Mr. BIBLE. It is a very high percentage, and it is in that range.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Twenty-seven or 28 percent. It is more than 25 percent.

Mr. LONG. In just 1 year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During the past year, according to the FBI reports, which

XUM

we accept generally as being the best information available.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I feel it incumbent to advise the Senate that I have today transmitted by letter to President Nixon a resolution adopted by our committee expressing serious concern about the future independence of the American small businessman's spokesman on the national level—the Small Business Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution and the transmittal letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BIBLE. There are persistent and recurring reports, published and otherwise, that an Executive reorganization is under consideration that would merge or, shall we say, "submerge" the Small Business Administration into the Department of Commerce. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has been quoted as saying at the National Press Club, in Washington, D.C., on March 5, that the Small Business Administration "by definition belongs in the Department of Commerce."

Of course, I must disagree completely and unequivocally with Secretary Stans because that statement flies in the face of the language of the Small Business Act of 1953 itself which established the agency. The law reads that the SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

Mr. President, it is my judgment that this country's almost 5½ million small businessmen view the Small Business Act of 1953 and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 as two of the outstanding legislative achievements of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. Certainly, Congress and the administration must have felt at that time that the specific language setting forth that SBA was not to be affiliated within any other agency or department represented a strong mandate. It represented a conviction that the small businessman was entitled to a strong, clear, independent voice in his Government—a voice free from the pressure and influence of big business special interest groups whose competitive purposes would not be dedicated to serving the small business community.

It was important for SBA to speak independently for the small businessman during the Eisenhower-Nixon years of the 1950's. It was equally important for SBA to remain independent during the succeeding Democratic Kennedy-Johnson administration, during which at least one abortive merger effort was shot down before it became airborne. Today, it is even more urgent that SBA remain an independent agency during a difficult economic cycle for small businesses marked by high interest rates, shortage of capital, fiscal uncertainties, and the march of corporate giantism, mergers of small businesses into big business, and the advent of the conglomerate umbrella. These have and do provide real threats to the small businessman as a viable force in protecting himself in the world of competition.

The Nation's 5½ million small businessmen must retain their spokesman—SBA—at the national level if they are to continue to provide employment for 40 million people and contribute approximately 40 percent of the country's gross national product of $808 billion annually.

It is my deep hope that these published and increasingly recurrent reports about a proposed SBA merger or submerger with the Commerce Department continue to be only from the rumor mill.

In my letter to the White House transmitting the Small Business Committee's resolution, I have urged upon the President, as the son of a small businessman himself, to keep the executive agency voice of the small businessman alive and let the Small Business Administration continue to do a commendable, outstanding job.

Certainly, this subject would not be complete without an in-depth examination of the background of congressional attentiveness to the small businessman and the great force he represents in our daily economic life.

Over the past three decades, Congress has taken many initiatives in order to build a series of small business institutions in this country. This movement began with the creation of the Smaller War Plants Administration, and the Small Defense Plants Administration during World War II, and the Korean war. In 1950 the Senate and House Committees on Small Business were established. Then, in 1953, the Small Business Act was enacted by the Congress and signed by President Eisenhower. This established the Small Business Administration as a permanent independent Federal agency, with its Administrator reporting directly to the President. For the first time there existed a national policy in favor of smaller business in this country, as follows:

> It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise . . . and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

This was followed by the passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which also gained the approval of the Eisenhower administration, of which President Nixon was a part. The 1958 act chartered small business investment companies through which Government and private capital were imaginatively united in the task of building a true "venture capital" industry in this country.

Associated with this small business program have been some of the most distinguished names in American political life: Leaders in the Senate have included the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN); the former majority leader, President Johnson; the former assistant majority leader, Vice President Humphrey; the chairman on the Finance Committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG); the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), the present chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE); the distinguished Senators from New York, Illinois, and Texas (Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. TOWER), and many distinguished former Members of this body, such as Senators Saltonstall, Smathers, Bartlett, and Morse. Senators John F. Kennedy and BARRY GOLDWATER distinguished themselves as members of the Senate Small Business Committee.

Thus, the advocacy and support for small business has transcended parties, regions, and political philosophy. The impulses for this work are deep rooted. They arise and are nourished by the concern for the little man, the independent, and the entrepreneur who dares to risk his money and his career in the founding and building of his own business.

As we come increasingly into the age of giant national and international corporations, expanding Government action on all levels, the recurrence of international crises, and the rapid advance of technology, the problems of small and independent business have proliferated. That is a fancy word, but I believe it expresses the feelings of small businessmen who must contend with seemingly ever-mounting demands of bookkeeping, reports, taxation, and regulation, in addition to more rigorous competition in domestic and foreign markets.

As I have said on a number of occasions, the lawmakers whom I have mentioned were among the first to perceive changes in our economy which required a special focus for attention to the problems and potentials of small business. They then pioneered in writing a response to these changes into the law of the land.

These labors have benefited the entire economy, in which 5½ million small businessmen provide 40 percent of the national product and one-half of all the jobs. But most of all, this work has benefited the less affluent, and more remote areas of the Nation, the places where capital and management expertise are most scarce, the areas visited by natural and economic disasters, and those of individuals in this country who put their beliefs in the free enterprise system to the daily test of establishing and maintaining their own small businesses.

During my years in the Senate, I have been proud to be associated with these efforts. I should point out that during much of this time, small business advocates have been fighting an uphill battle against several of the most formidable enemies in the world—special economic interests, bureaucracy, and indifference. For example, it was only in 1966 that a piece of small business leg-

XUM

islation received the formal sponsorship of the executive branch for the first time. Programs of the Small Business Administration have been beset with periods of financial stringency stemming from natural disasters, tight money, and budget cutting of various kinds.

However, the record of accomplishment on the statute books and in the annual reports of the Small Business Administration, in spite of these obstacles, deserves the highest praise which the Nation can bestow on dedicated public servants who made it possible.

Central to this story is the Small Business Administration: a little, and in the past often little-noticed agency, which in 15 years has turned in one of the most remarkable performances of any governmental agency.

Since 1953 it has made over 85,000 business loans totaling nearly $4 billion; it has been on hand to make about 75,000 disaster loans totaling nearly $750 million; small communities have received almost 2,000 local development company loans approaching $500 million; and the small business investment companies have in addition made about 30,000 loans aggregating about $1.4 billion.

Each of these loans represents more than a statistic—it is a vital factor in the life and fulfillment of men and families. The establishment and growth of these firms has made the promise of the free enterprise system and the American dream into reality, not only for the 200,000 businesses directly involved, but for the Nation as a whole.

Now would be the time to build upon this record and to extend it in areas of need and opportunity so that the momentum of success can be maintained.

It is unfortunate, instead, that the picture has become clouded in recent days. Reference can be made to reports in the newspapers that the Secretary of Commerce feels that the Small Business Administration "by definition" ought to be part of the Commerce Department.[1] Additional credence is lent to these reports by the action of President Nixon on March 5 in signing an Executive order which transfers the coordination of programs on minority business enterprises from the Small Business Administration, where it had previously been, to the Department of Commerce. For the information of all concerned, I ask that articles on this subject published in the Washington Post, the Washington Evening Star, the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Times, together with the Executive order of March 5, 1969, be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BIBLE. Although it does not appear in the press reports, it appears from the Executive order that the function of coordinating Advisory Councils on minority enterprise are to be transferred from the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce. The order also states that the Department of Commerce shall "provide the managerial and organizational framework through which joint or collaborative undertakings with Federal departments or agencies or private organizations can be planned and implemented" and that "the head of each Federal department and agency shall keep the Secretary informed of all proposed budgets, plans, and programs of his department or agency affecting minority business enterprise."

Further, Mr. Stans informed a reporter of the Wall Street Journal that his department could "conceivably" end up absorbing many functions now placed elsewhere.

These statements raise substantial questions about the role of the Small Business Administration. What is clear, however, is that instead of continuing on the highroad of SBA's success, the Nixon-Agnew administration is placing SBA and Small Business programs at a cross roads. No one can be sure at this point whether we are going ahead, going off at right angles, or doubling back the way we came.

Mr. President, the position of the Select Committee on this matter is clear. Our committee resolution strongly supports the existence of an independent Small Business Administration. The language of the Small Business Act of 1953 should be before us. Section 4(a) states:

> In order to carry out the policies of this Act there is hereby created an agency under the name 'Small Business Administration' . . . which Administration shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government.

This language was deliberately conceived by the Congress to safeguard an independent voice in Washington for the small businessman. This independence was required because experience had demonstrated that small business matters would not be given appropriate attention within the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, or the other departments, agencies, or offices of the Federal Government which had long been in positions of influence over the destiny of small business. The historical record is clear on that point. It was the subject of extended debate in the Senate, which was summarized by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) as recently as February of 1966.[2] This legislative history, which is certainly no reflection upon the current Secretary of Commerce, establishes that the lack-luster record of the Department of Commerce in the field of small business prior to 1953, was a major reason for the grant of independent status to the SBA.

Accordingly, any reversion to the Department of Commerce of small business functions will almost surely represent a stride backward into a past where the distinctions between small business and giant business become increasingly blurred. It would be a retreat to an era when the Congress and the Nation were asked to believe that the problems of small, local, independent, and family enterprises were no different from those of multibillion-dollar, multi-national, conglomerate corporations. It would be a throwback to a time when Government spokesmen for small business were required to have their policies, statements, and budgets cleared by several layers of officials in the Department of Commerce who might have very little interest in the small businessman.

There has been considerable splendid comment by the new administration about the participation of the private sector in necessary programs. The record of the SBA on private participation is clear and positive. There have been intensive efforts to involve the private banking industry and the trade and other private associations in the loan participation and guaranty programs, especially in the creation of minority entrepreneurship in order to maximize the private role in these areas. There has been considerable achievement in these endeavors. This does not mean that more could not be done. And in doing more, the assistance of the Department of Commerce or any other department or agency could be helpful and would certainly be welcome. But, assistance is not the same as control.

Mr. President, I believe that I can assure all who are concerned with the small businessman that Congress will not stand by and allow this kind of retrogression. To the extent that the administration undermines, in law or in fact, the authority and programs of the Small Business Administration, not only will they incur the opposition of our committee, but also, I believe the great majority of Congress will make its voice be heard loudly and clearly.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE, SELECT COMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1969.

RESOLUTION

Whereas in 1953 the Congress established the Small Business Administration as an independent agency "under the general direction and supervision of the President," and provided specifically that the Small Business Administration "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government"; and

Whereas a new Administration has assumed control of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and a new Administrator of the Small Business Administration has been appointed; and

Whereas printed and other reports persist that the future of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency may be in doubt; and

Whereas any departure from absolute independence for the Small Business Administration as a government agency would be contrary to the stated intent of Congress, and would patently abrogate the legislation creating the Small Business Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government, and would lessen considerably the effective voice at the Federal level of the Nation's five and one-half million small businessmen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate strongly favors the continuation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and strongly recommends that its function not be transferred to, or assumed by, any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

---

[1] See article entitled "Foreign Investment Rules To Be Waived, etc.," Wall Street Journal, March 6, 1969, page 3:2.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 2, pp. 2124–2145.

Alan Bible, Nevada, chairman; John Sparkman, Alabama; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey; Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin; Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico; Fred R. Harris, Oklahoma; Thomas J. McIntyre, New Hampshire; Mike Gravel, Alaska; Jacob K. Javits, New York; Mark O. Hatfield. Oregon; Robert Dole, Kansas, Marlow W. Cook, Kentucky.

U.S. Senate, Select Committee
on Small Business,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: May I call your attention to the enclosed resolution adopted this week by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business strongly favoring continuation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and opposing any proposal to merge it with or subordinate it to any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

The Committee's affirmative action stems from persistent and recurring reports, published and otherwise, that such an Executive reorganization proposal is under consideration. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has been quoted as stating at the National Press Club on March 5 that the Small Business Administration "by definition . . . belongs in the Department of Commerce".

It is my judgment that this country's almost 5½ million small businessmen view the Small Business Act of 1953 and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 as two of the outstanding legislative achievements of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration. The former specifically provided that SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

Certainly, Congress and the Administration must have felt at that time that such language clearly represented a strong mandate that the small businessman was entitled to a strong clear, independent voice in his Government—a voice free from the pressure and influences of big business special interest groups not dedicated to serving the small business community.

It was important for SBA to speak independently for the small businessman during the Eisenhower-Nixon years of the 1950's. It was equally important for SBA to remain independent during both succeeding Democratic Administrations during which at least one merger effort was discouraged. Today, it is even more urgent that SBA remain an independent agency during a difficult economic cycle marked by high interest rates, shortage of capital, fiscal uncertainties and the march of corporate giantism, mergers of small businesses into big business and the advent of conglomerates. These have provided real threats to the small businessman as a viable force in protecting himself.

The Nation's nearly 5½ million small businessmen must retain their spokesman—SBA—at the national level if they are to continue to provide employment for 40 million people contributing approximately 40 percent of the country's gross national product of $808 billion annually.

As the son of a small businessman yourself, you must be appreciative of the concern of the country's small business community about any proposed merger of the Small Business Administration with the Executive Department charged primarily with assisting and supervising big business—the Department of Commerce.

I sincerely hope you share this Committee's concern, and, as Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I respectfully urge your support for the continued independence of the Small Business Administration.

Cordially,

Alan Bible,
Chairman.

Exhibit 2

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1969]

Minority-Business Office Set Up—Nixon Signs Order To Aid Enterprises

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Nixon yesterday signed an executive order establishing an Office of Minority Business Enterprise to promote and expand business ownership by minority groups.

The new office, which will be established in the Commerce Department, will help fulfill Mr. Nixon's promise to promote "black capitalism" and also enterprises by Mexican-Americans and other minority groups.

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, who will supervise the operation of the new office, said that "we are trying to abandon the term 'black captialism' in favor of the minority business enterprise because there are other minorities entitled to the benefits of this program."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 5, 1969]

Nixon To Create a "Minority" Business Post

(By Philip Shandler and Richard Critchfield)

President Nixon reportedly will centralize in the Commerce Department the administration's effort to help "minority business enterprise."

The President soon will create a new Commerce post of special assistant to the secretary of minority enterprise, with a staff of about 10 borrowed specialists, and will establish a citizen advisory council, sources said.

The steps would be the first major administrative action to implement Nixon's pledge to help Negroes and other minority-group citizens get a bigger "piece of the action" in business.

The action is expected to stir negative reaction from some Negroes and government officials outside Commerce, however.

NO STATEMENT

The President is not expected to accompany his announcement with a statement of what kinds of help and how much of it he intends to give, leaving much of this for Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans to recommend. And some officials in other agencies do not see Stans as properly oriented to the need.

The President was to meet today with Stans, other Cabinet members, several Negro leaders and Hilary J. Sandoval, the Mexican-American head of the Small Business Administration.

The White House described today's session as "two-way discussion on minority business enterprise."

The Negro leaders planning to attend are Roy Innis, director of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The Cabinet members were to include George W. Romney, John A. Volpe, Clifford M. Hardin, Robert H. Finch and George P. Schulz, the secretaries, respectively, for Housing and Urban Development; Transportation; Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare, and Labor.

MOYNIHAN, FARMER

Also to be present were Nixon's urban affairs adviser, Daniel P. Moynihan, and Assistant HEW Secretary James Farmer, founder of CORE.

Nixon pledged during the presidential campaign to help develop "black capitalism." Last week, however, Stans said the administration's new slogan is "minority enterprise."

The shift from "black" to "minority" reflects a sensitivity to the feelings of Puerto Ricans, Indians and Mexican-Americans, as did the naming of Sandoval to head SBA.

But liberals within the administration are not convinced that the switch from "capitalism" to "enterprise" reflects a commitment to the kind of economic-development help they think is needed.

Nixon has not yet taken a position, for example, on legislation embodying a $1 billion CORE plan for the creation of community-development corporations, in which residents of target areas would be able to buy stock and share in the enterprise.

And the first minority-enterprise effort by the administration, announced last week by Stans, is to implement a program of tax assistance to a Watts corporation—a project launched by the Johnson administration.

These liberals believe Stans is too bound to the traditional "capitalism" approach—that is, help to individual entrepreneurs or partnerships, rather than to community-based enterprise.

They would prefer, therefore, that direction of the program be vested in what they regard as a more socially-conscious agency, such as HEW or the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A prospectus prepared for the President by Commerce, however, calls for that department to have the power to coordinate 116 separate programs conducted by "21 Cabinet departments and executive agencies."

"SPEAK EFFECTIVELY"

The "focal point" would be Stans and the new assistant, "to speak effectively and convincingly to government agencies, the business community, minority business, labor, foundations and other economic and social groups."

"Efforts should be made to get many of the staff on long-term loan from industry, foundations and financial institutions," the paper says.

The National Advisory Council on Minority Business Enterprise would serve as "a communications link with all relevant non-federal groups, a coordinating link in the evolution of strategy, a vehicle for generating new ideas, and an external sounding board for new program proposals."

A key question not expected to be answered immediately is what will happen under the anticipated reorganizataion to agencies such as SBA.

Stans reportedly wants to absorb SBA into Commerce; several congressmen want to keep it independent, although some, troubled by the Negro oriented activities of former SBA head Howard Samuels, may prefer to put it under what they regard as Stans' suitably conservative wing.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1969]

Nixon Sets Up Office To Further Minorities Entry Into Business—Commerce Chief Heads New Unit That Will Seek To Coordinate Efforts of 116 U.S. Programs

Washington.—President Nixon established an office of Minority Enterprise, headed by Commerce Secretary Stans, to help disadvantaged groups become part of the mainstream of American business.

The new office, equipped with a staff of 10 professionals, will perform a coordinating function—attempting to sharpen the focus of some 116 programs, operated by 21 different Federal agencies, that currently support the development of new business enterprises either by loans, grants, guarantees or contracts.

In addition, the new office will attempt to draw upon the resources of private industry,

XUM

voluntary organizations and foundations to help minority-group members become businessmen. The Presidential order also created an Advisory Council for Minority Business Enterprise, to comprise experts from the banking, business, foundation and other fields, that will give advice. And the order established an information center to collect examples of successful minority-business ventures.

"I have often made the point that to foster the economic status and the pride of members of our minority groups we must seek to involve them more fully in our private enterprise system." Mr. Nixon declared in a statement. "Black, Mexican-American, Puerto Ricans, Indians and others must be increasingly encouraged to enter the field of business, both in the areas where they now live and in the larger commercial community, and not only as workers, but also as managers and owners," he said.

Mr. Nixon's Executive Order was significant for several other reasons:

It laid to rest the term "black capitalism" that the President had used so extensively during his election campaign. The Nixon Administration wants to appeal to a broader spectrum of minority groups, not just the black population. So "black capitalism" has become "minority enterprise" and Mr. Nixon addressed his statement to "blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, and others."

It costs the inflation-conscious Administration no budgetary expense, except for staff salaries; nor does it call upon Congress for new legislative programs. Mr. Stans, at a news conference, said that if new funds or legislative authority is deemed necessary, that will be decided later on. He added that the use of new tax incentives to stimulate new business and jobs in the slums, as advocated by Mr. Nixon during his campaign, was a matter still "under study." He said it was "premature" to discuss whether such incentives would be proposed to Congress.

It doesn't propose any transfer of Federal programs or agencies. Mr. Stans said that the new office wouldn't operate any programs of its own, but would seek to persuade those agencies that do operate programs affecting minority business to make extra efforts in that direction. The Commerce Secretary won't have formal, direct power over other Federal agencies, but will have the force of Mr. Nixon's policy order behind him.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1969]

Foreign Investment Rules To Be Waived for "Hundreds" of Small Firms, Stans Says

Washington.—The Nixon Administration is moving toward exempting "many hundreds" of relatively small companies from controls over foreign direct investment, Commerce Secretary Stans said.

At a National Press Club luncheon, Mr. Stans added that some form of relief also is in the works for large corporations, reiterating an earlier comment that he hopes for action in about 30 to 60 days.

While Mr. Stans didn't go into detail, the relief for small companies presumably would be in the form of raising the current $300,000 ceiling on dollars that may be dispatched in 1969 to foreign subsidiaries without regard to the mandatory regulations on investment abroad.

This cutoff point was originally set at $100,000 when the controls were imposed by President Johnson on Jan. 1, 1968, and was raised to $200,000 last August. Under consideration now, it's understood, is an increase in this "minimum investment quota" to a level that might well exceed $500,000.

To help larger corporations, the department is believed to be weighing an increase in the "incremental earnings" quota. Instead of the standard formulas limiting the investment outflow according to past activity in a base period, a company this year can instead have investment quotas equal to 20% of the 1968 earnings of its foreign affiliates in each of the three specified geographic areas. The simplest form of liberalization, analysts say, would be for the department to raise the percentage to, for instance, 25% or 30%.

President Nixon appears willing, Mr. Stans said, to take the "calculated risk" that the projected easing of controls—which currently apply to about 3,200 companies—will to a "slight degree" worsen this year's expected overall balance-of-payments deficit. Such a deficit, which occurs when foreigners acquire more dollars than they return in all dealings, could be "very substantial" this year anyway, he warned.

Thus, Mr. Stans emphasized, the controls that Mr. Nixon criticized sharply in his campaign can't be removed altogether without risking "a crisis for the dollar" internationally. But Mr. Stans said he agrees with businessmen who are pressing him "to get rid of those damn controls" on the ground that they would be "self-defeating" if retained indefinitely. He said the controls are "destructive" of opportunities for U.S. companies to build plants in foreign markets that would result in gains in exports and earnings.

The major weak spot in the payments situation, Mr. Stans said, is the shriveling in 1968 of the U.S. surplus on exports over imports to the lowest level since the late 1930s. In this context, Mr. Stans expressed sympathy for U.S. textile companies faced with an "unbelievable" increase in imports of synthetic fibers and textile products. If this continues, he said, it could do "great harm" to the industry.

While emphasizing that "at heart, we are free traders," Mr. Stans expressed hope that the Administration will be able to persuade foreign synthetic fiber companies to accept "voluntary" limits on their sales to the U.S., akin to the steel-import limits which, he said, were "pretty well resolved" on a voluntary basis late in the Johnson Administration.

Whether textile quotas will be discussed on his trip to Europe in April hasn't yet been decided, Mr. Stans said. He suggested that a separate negotiating team might tackle this later so as not to "interfere with free and open discussion" on broader trade matters. Also undecided is whether Agriculture Secretary Hardin may accompany him or go later, Mr. Stans said as he expressed hope that textiles wouldn't get tangled with a Common Market move toward a special tax that could severely hurt U.S. soybean exports. The U.S. hopes for textile pacts with Japan, Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan and other non-European nations as well, Mr. Stans added.

PROTECTIONIST MOVES

Discounting suggestions that his trip could trigger greater protectionist moves by Europeans, Mr. Stans said nontariff barriers are already spreading in Europe to an extent that "all of the supposed benefits of the Kennedy Round" of tariff-cutting could be lost before the rate reductions are fully implemented. He complained that the proliferation of "taxes on value added" in Europe pose a "very serious" danger to the U.S., which is "defenseless" because international rules permit such levies to be applied against imports and rebated on exports.

The question of whether the U.S. should institute such a tax—which basically applies to the difference between what a company pays for materials and the price it gets for its finished products—is one that will shortly be studied, Mr. Stans said. But he cautioned that it will be "several years" before a position could be taken. Asked about Japan's limits on operations by U.S. auto makers, Mr. Stans said it would be "better to ask Japan to impose barriers" on its own exports of autos to the U.S. But he quickly withdrew the remark as "facetious."

Disavowing any intent to be an "empire builder," Mr. Stans said that Federal reorganization efforts conceivably could end up with a transfer from the White House to his department of the functions of special ambassador for trade negotiations and special assistants for consumer protection and telecommunications. Certain oceanographic functions might also be logically added to his department, he said, adding that "by definition" the Small Business Administration ought to be part of the Commerce Department.

Stressing that he hasn't taken any position on such possible transfers, Mr. Stans said he is aware that there has been "some decline in the prestige" of the Commerce Department since the time Herbert Hoover was secretary. The department shouldn't try to be the "voice of business" in Washington nor should it have the role of communicating the Administration's wishes to the business community, Mr. Stans said. Its goal, he said, should be sponsoring "growth and strength" in the economy, a role that would be implied if its name were the "Department of Economic Development."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1969]

Stans To Promote a Minority Business Enterprise—Commerce Chief To Set Up New Department To Direct Programs for the Poor

(By Walter Rugaber)

Washington, March 5.— Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans was named today as the Nixon Administration's main promoter of capitalism for the nation's Negroes and other minority group members.

President Nixon assigned the job to Mr. Stans and the Commerce Department when he signed an Executive order at a White House ceremony attended by 37 Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and Indian leaders.

The Secretary, who said he would establish an office of minority business enterprise within the department, indicated later at a news conference that the new operation would work largely on coordinating Government and private efforts.

Mr. Stans declared that his office would not conduct programs of its own, would not take funds from other agencies, and would not direct other Federal offices on how to spend their money.

Mr. Stans said the new office would have a "limited group of perhaps 10 experts in various fields," such as banking, business, philanthropy and agriculture.

CONCERN IN LIBERAL CIRCLES

There was some concern in liberal antipoverty circles that Mr. Stans, who has a reputation as a conservative, might interfere with minority business development efforts to other agencies.

The Secretary's move to portray his new unit as an administrative and coordinating group appeared to mollify several of these sources only partly.

"It still means that if O.E.O. [the Office of Economic Opportunity] wants to make grants to black business in Watts or Bedford-Stuyvesant it's got to check with Stans," one observer said. "It's just another layer of clearance."

"They will still run their own programs," Mr. Stans insisted at his news conference. "The money in O.E.O. will stay there and the money in the S.B.A. [Small Business Administration] will stay in the S.B.A."

There are 116 Federal programs that might help minority group members go into business for themselves, Mr. Stans said, administered by 20 different departments and agencies.

"Some have done a poor job and one or two may have done a pretty good job," Mr. Stans said. "The point is, we want to focus

XUM

their attention and stimulate their activity in the field of minority enterprise to a degree that has not been possible before."

None of the appointees to the new office were named. Mr. Stans disclosed that the director would not be a minority group member but that some Negroes and Mexican-Americans would work on the staff.

Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, were invited to the White House but did not appear.

Mr. Wilkins and other civil rights leaders have criticized the "black capitalism" concept that President Nixon put forth during the campaign on grounds that building "Negro" business would tend to perpetuate ghettos.

The White House identified the persons attending today's meeting as follows:

T. M. Alexander, Courts & Co.

Richard Allen, Economic Resources Corporation.

Mrs. Margaret L. Belcher, National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

John Belindo, executive director, National Congress on Indian Opportunities.

Senator Edward W. Brooke, Republican of Massachusetts.

Berkeley Burrell, president, National Business League.

Sammie Chess Jr., president, Friendly-Leader Manufacturing Company.

John Clay, Business Development Corporation.

Clifford Coles, director of urban affairs, American Management Association.

Wardell Croft, president, National Insurance Association and Wright Mutual Insurance Company.

John Davis, Commerce, Labor, Industry Corporation of Kings.

The Reverend Walter-Fauntroy, Micco, Inc.

Charles B. Fisher.

Joe Gomez, United Steel Workers of America.

William Hamilton, president, National Association of Real Estate Brokers.

Mrs. Dorothy Height, president, National Council of Negro Women.

Judge Alfred J. Hernandez.

Norman Hodges, president, Green Power Foundation.

Roy Innis, national director, Congress of Racial Equality.

Dr. Edward Irons, executive director, National Bankers Association.

John H. Johnson, president, Johnson Publications.

Napoleon Johnson, National Urban League.

Joe Kirven, president, Abco Building Maintenance Company.

Representative Manuel Lujan, Republican of New Mexico.

Luis Nunez, executive director, Aspira, Inc.

Mrs. Myrtle Ollison, National Association of Colored Women's Club.

Robson B. Reynolds, the Philadelphian Apartments.

Eliu Rumero, Taos, N.M.

George E. Sandoval, Tucson, Ariz.

Dr. John Torres, Bronx Terminal Market.

Clarence Townes Sr., Richmond, Va.

Mayor Walter E. Washington of Washington.

Johns Wheeler, president Mechanic and Farmers Bank.

Charles William, National Business League.

John Wooten, executive director, Black Economic Industrial Union.

Dr. Harding Young, dean, School of Business Administration.

[From the office of the White House Press Secretary, Mar. 5, 1969]

THE WHITE HOUSE EXECUTIVE ORDER PRESCRIBING ARRANGEMENTS FOR DEVELOPING AND COORDINATING A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Functions of the Secretary of Commerce.* (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) Coordinate as consistent with law the plans, programs, and operations of the Federal Government which affect or may contribute to the establishment, preservation and strengthening of minority business enterprise.

(2) Promote the mobilization of activities and resources of State and local governments, businesses and trade associations, universities, foundations, professional organizations and volunteer and other groups towards the growth of minority business enterprises and facilitate the coordination of the efforts of these groups with those of Federal departments and agencies.

(3) Establish a center for the development, collection, summarization and dissemination of information that will be helpful to persons and organizations throughout the nation in undertaking or promoting the establishment and successful operation of minority business enterprises.

(b) The Secretary, as he deems necsssary or appropriate to enable him to better fulfill the responsibilities vested in him by subsection (a), may—

(1) Develop, with the participation of other Federal departments and agencies as appropriate, comprehensive plans of Federal action and propose such changes in Federal programs as may be required.

(2) Require the submission of information from such departments and agencies necessary for him to carry out the purposes of this order.

(3) Convene for purposes of coordination meetings of the heads of such departments and agencies, or their designees, whose programs and activities may affect or contribute to the purposes of this order.

(4) Convene business leaders, educators, and other representatives of the private sector engaged in assisting the development of minority business enterprise or who could contribute to its development to propose, evaluate, and coordinate governmental and private activities in furtherance of the objectives of this order.

(5) Confer with and advise officials of State and local governments.

(6) Provide the managerial and organizational framework through which joint or collaborative undertakings with Federal departments or agencies or private organizations can be planned and implemented.

(7) Recommend appropriate legislative or executive actions.

Sec. 2. *Establishment of the Advisory Council for Minority Enterprise.* (a) There is hereby established the Advisory Council for Minority Enterprise (hereinafter referred to as "the Council").

(b) The Council shall be composed of members appointed by the President from among persons, including members of minority groups and representatives from minority business enterprises, knowledgeable and dedicated to the purposes of this order. The members shall serve for a term of two years and may be reappointed.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as the Chairman of the Council.

(d) The Council shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

(e) The Council shall be advisory to the Secretary in which capacity it shall—

(1) Serve as a source of knowledge and information on developments in different fields and segments of our economic and social life which affect minority business enterprise.

(2) Keep abreast of plans, programs and activities in the public and private sectors which relate to minority business enterprise, and advise the Secretary on any measures to better achieve the objectives of this order.

(3) Consider, and advise the Secretary and such officials as he may designate on, problems and matters referred to the Council.

(f) For the purposes of Executive Order No. 11007 of February 26, 1962, the Council shall be deemed to have been formed by the Secretary.

(g) Members of the Council shall be entitled to receive travel and expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5701–5708) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(h) The Secretary shall arrange for administrative support of the Council to the extent necessary including use of any gifts or bequests accepted by the Department of Commerce pursuant to law.

Sec. 3. *Responsibilities of other Federal departments and agencies.* (a) The head of each Federal department and agency, or a representative designated by him, when so requested by the Secretary, shall, to the extent permitted by law and funds available, furnish information and assistance, and participate in all ways appropriate to carry out the objectives of this order.

(b) The head of each Federal department or agency shall, when so requested by the Secretary, designate a senior official to have primary and continuing responsibility for the participation and cooperation of that department or agency in matters concerning minority business enterprise and activities as required by this order.

(c) The head of each Federal department or agency, or his designated representative, shall keep the Secretary informed of all proposed budgets, plans, and programs of his department or agency affecting minority business enterprise.

Sec. 4. *Construction.* Nothing in this order shall be construed as subjecting any function vested by law in, or assigned pursuant to law to, any Federal department or agency or head thereof to the authority of any other agency or officer, or as abrogating or restricting any such function in any manner.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1969.*

INDEPENDENCE OF SBA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, recent articles in the press have raised some doubts about the continued independence of the Small Business Administration.

The concern which these reports have caused, in the Senate, is reflected by Senator BIBLE dispatching to the White House today a resolution in behalf of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business which strongly restates the position that the agency should remain independent.

I support the committee's position. I hope the status of the Small Business Administration does not become a partisan matter or a controversy.

A Democratic Congress and a Republican administration united in 1953 to make the SBA a permanent and independent Federal agency, as a voice for the 5½ million small business owners throughout the country. Its importance to New England has been demonstrated by the strongly bipartisan support received from the former Senator from Massachusetts and longtime ranking minority member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business Mr. Saltonstall, the present chairman of the Legislative Small Business Subcommittee (Mr. McIntyre) and another consistent and vigorous advocate of small business, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty). The Smaller Business Association of New England, probably the leading regional association of small firms in the Nation, has strongly and consistently defended SBA independence.

Mr. President, the large national and multinational corporations, backed by blue-ribbon law firms, public relations firms, and often representation in National and State capitals, have little difficulty in obtaining a hearing within the Government. To balance the scale somewhat has required that all of the friends of small business work and stand together. It has been this spirit of cooperation which has made possible the accomplishments in the past 15 years in the small business field.

What differences in judgment existed about the independent status of SBA were fully debated in 1953. At that time, President Kennedy, then the junior Senator from Massachusetts and later a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, said:

> If such an agency is to be of real help to small business in providing technical assistance, long-term capital, and procurement opportunities, all of which are of primary importance in expanding the economies of New England and the United States, the following defects must be corrected:
>
> First, such an agency must be truly independent and not subject to the veto power of the Commerce and Treasury Departments. Experience has shown that such independence is necessary to give small business an effective voice in the Government.

It was, thus, after mature deliberation and positive action by the Congress that SBA independence was established. The factors that were weighed in that decision have been summarized on several occasions, and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) did so on February 4, 1966, Congressional Record, volume 112, part 2, page 2124. Senator Sparkman's presentation has convinced me that nothing has changed to alter the validity of the congressional judgment of 1953 that the Small Business Administration must be truly independent to be an effective voice and helping hand for our small business community.

I feel it would thus be unnecessary and regrettable to reopen the question at this time.

EXPERIENCE FAVORS RETENTION OF INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there has been increasing concern in recent days about the independence of the Small Business Administration. From what I have read in the newspapers recently, I share this concern with my colleagues in the Senate and the business community in my State.

For instance, an article on page 3 of the Wall Street Journal of March 6 quoted the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, as saying:

> Federal reorganization efforts conceivably could end up with a transfer . . . to his Department of the functions of the special ambassador for trade negotiations, and special assistants for consumer protection and telecommunications . . . adding that by definition "the Small Business Administration ought to be part of the Department".

An article on the following page informed us further that the Office of Business Minority Entrepreneurship had been set up to "coordinate" minority business programs and that it was to have a staff of about 10 experts. Then on March 9, the Washington Post carried a statement:

> The new office in the Commerce Department will begin operations with a small staff, probably not more than twenty or thirty people.

This reported growth of 100 to 200 percent in 4 days must surely be one of the fastest growth rates ever seen in this country and raises serious doubts about what the Department of Commerce and the administration intend to do in this field. If these activities continue to expand with the same speed, it can safely be predicted that the Department of Commerce could absorb SBA completely, leaving few traces other than a dispossessed and demoralized community of 5½ million small firms in this country.

Before this happens, I think it would be well for the Senate to closely analyze the logical basis which has been stated for the proposition that important functions such as protection of the consumer and the small businessman be made the responsibility of the Department of Commerce.

It is gratifying to me that the Senate Committee on Government Operations will shortly begin hearings on my bill for the creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs. It has been my experience as developed over several years in both Madison, Wis., and Washington, D.C., in holding hearings on many subjects such as drug prices, automobile tires, and other practices of car manufacturers, that there is a significant divergence of interest between the consumer and the businessman and that no man or department can adequately serve both of these masters. In the field of small business, I have been privileged to serve as the Chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. On March 15, 1967, we heard the following testimony about business trends from Dr. Willard F. Mueller, then Chief of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission:

> Another disquieting development is the growing aggregate *concentration* and *conglomeration* of American industry. The current merger movement has created vast industrial complexes which operate across numerous industries. . . . By 1963, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations accounted for as large a share of business activity as did the top 200 in 1947. . . . Growing conglomeration raises some rather fundamental questions . . . concerning the future character of the competitive process in our market economy. Because a conglomerate enterprise operates across many different markets, it is not subject to the competitive discipline of any one market. This may pose serious competitive problems for the business enterprise, especially the small company, whose fortunes depend entirely on its success in a particular market.[3]

Mr. Mueller also pointed out:

> The high degree of concentration of financial resources in American manufacturing . . . (where) the 10 largest companies held 18 percent of all manufacturing assets (and) the approximately 400,000 smallest companies with assets below $5 million accounted for only 15 percent of the total."[4]

It was because of these and other such trends in the economy that the Congress determined in 1953 that the Small Business Administration should be an independent agency as a spokesman for the Nation's smaller business firms. Beyond the facts and figures, however, Congress also considered the intangibles such as the sympathy, sensitivity, and depth of commitment which an independent agency dedicated to the small businessman would have in carrying out the declared congressional policy that—

> The Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as it is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise . . . and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.[5]

It is my judgment that another intangible which has a direct influence on keeping our economy dynamic and competitive is the incentive to invent and innovate and to create a business which will bring these new products and services to the public. It has been pointed out to the Senate on several occasions that small business makes a disproportionately high contribution in this area. For instance:

> An intensive study by the U.S. Department of Commerce published in 1967 indicated that, despite the approximately $100 billion spent on research and development in this country in the past two decades, much of it by big business with advanced facilities and organized teams of professions, more than half of the technical and business innovations in our country are still coming from individual inventors and very small companies.[6]

It seems to me that both the tangible information and the intangible factors which are part of my experience confirm the points which have been ably made by Senator Bible and Senator Sparkman. If anything, they add additional weight to the judgments of 1953 based upon the developments which we have seen in our economy since then.

Accordingly, I would like to express my strong support for the Small Business

---

[3] "Status and Future of Small Business" hearings before the Select Committee on Small Business, 90th Congress, First Session. Part 2, Page 485.

[4] "Status and Future of Small Business" *loc cit*, Page 468.

[5] "Small Business Act of 1953," Sec. 2(a).

[6] "The 15th Anniversary of the Small Business Administration—A Milestone for Free Enterprise." Remarks on the Senate Floor by Senator Wayne Morse, Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 18, p. 24156. The report referred to was "Technical Innovation: Its Environment and Management," by the Panel on Invention and Innovation, Robert A. Charpie, Chairman, U.S. Department of Commerce, January 1967.

XUM

Committee resolution recommending continued independence of the SBA. I intend to do all that I can to have this position sustained by the Congress and the executive branch and to advance the cause of the small businessman throughout the country.

ASSURING A FUTURE FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THIS COUNTRY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, recent statements and actions give rise to the disturbing possibility that the Nixon administration intends to downgrade or perhaps even dismantle the traditional program and independence of SBA.

I feel that those of us in the Senate who are familiar with small business matters should make our views known for the information and whatever guidance the executive branch may wish to derive from them.

Mr. President, small business is not some kind of ornament on the corporate society, like a piece of fancy operational equipment on one of the big-three model automobiles. The small business community accounts for 40 percent of our gross national product and one-half of the 80 million jobs that support our population. Small business is thus central to U.S. economy.

There is a further myth that most small businesses are a kind of historical anachronism, like the buggywhip. The truth is that the corner grocery store and the neighborhood restaurant have been transformed somewhat and have now emerged as the "7-11 store," the carry-out, the franchised hamburger, roast beef, chicken or hotdog drive-in. These businesses which provide a varying but considerable measure of small business ownership and control are among the fastest growing enterprises in the country.

The classic neighborhood small businesses have also been receiving increased attention because of their value to the inner city in improving the availability of goods and services, reducing prices, providing jobs and offering realistic opportunities for ownership by minority businessmen.

Beyond these fields, we have seen breakthroughs in the technology of space and the ocean, transportation and communications, electronics and data processing. These have come in the wake of the $100 million in research and development funds spent in the United States since World War II, much of it coming directly from the taxpayer. These areas offer spectacular opportunities for small business, especially when it is recalled that even though over 90 percent of the research and development has been done by big business, 50 percent of the inventions and innovations continue to come from small business and individual inventors. Examples cited last year, by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, includes jet engines, the automatic transmission, the helicopter, the catalytic cracking of petroleum, penicillin, polio vaccine, air conditioning, the polaroid camera, FM radio, and the Xerox process.[7] Not only are these discoveries of great value to society as a whole, but they are significant to small business. This is because the large amount of brainpower and relatively low amounts of capital needed to make a start in many of these fields make them ideally suited for the small and new business enterprise.

I know that my colleagues on the Senate Small Business Committee, particularly the chairman (Mr. BIBLE) and subcommittee chairmen, Senator RANDOLPH and Senator NELSON, are as interested as I am in seeing that as many of these technical and management benefits as possible become and remain available to small business.

So if our economy is properly understood there is a great potential profit for small business as well as for the economy if the Federal Government is careful to see that the avenues to enterprise remain open.

However, even more important than the material benefits that can result, are the social, psychological, and political benefits of expanding the small business area to all elements of society, especially those who have been disadvantaged in the past.

A recent nationwide study by the Bank of America indicates that one of every 10 families in this country is involved in a small business. The survey revealed that more than one-half of the small business owners rated job satisfaction as the prime factor in their vocation, with money being mentioned first by 27 percent. The small business community has always been the vehicle for self-reliant, venturesome, and independent Americans. The few examples which I have cited above of their accomplishments, as well as the general affluence of this country, are eloquent evidence that it is worth while to labor to keep the advantages of the free enterprise system open to all of our citizens.

We have recently become aware of the extent of the "ownership gap" that occurs because minorities which constitute 12 percent of our population own only 3 percent of our business.[8]

In the course of trying to close the ownership gap, we have uncovered other shortcomings in institutions which are in a position to furnish financial assistance to minority business. Of the Nation's 14,000 banks, perhaps as few as 50 to 150 have any kind of program for lending to business in the intercity ghetto.[9]

The efforts to resolve the complex of problems surrounding the ownership gap is one of the highest priority items of our society.

President Nixon is to be commended for his early attention to the matter, but he should not overlook the great reservoir of experience and expertise of the specialization which the SBA has developed in the area of fostering all new and growing business including minority enterprise.

One of the pressing problems in the minority entrepreneurship field is that of management assistance. It came something of a surprise to me, to learn of the scope of SBA's efforts in this area, as summarized by the following table:[10]

Small businessmen assisted by SBA management assistance programs

[From beginning of program until 1966]

Attendance at workshops	7, 500
Individual counseling	178, 000
Counseling under SCORE programs	12, 000
Attendance at courses and conferences	235, 000
Contacts through intra-industry management programs	350, 000
Publications sold or distributed in response to requests	33, 000, 000

Since these figures are now 3 years old, the totals have undoubtedly risen since then.

In addition to these SBA strong points, some of the others have been touched upon in remarks of my colleagues, including the record of the agency in the loan programs, procurement assistance and technical assistance.

A review of these accomplishments, together with the historical record, leave little doubt in my mind that whatever the Department of Commerce may have done for small business during the last 50 years, the achievements of the SBA during the last 15 have been brilliantly effective, by comparison and otherwise.

I agree with my colleagues that a large part of the reason for this is SBA's independent status. The agency has been dedicated solely to the well-being of the small business community. It has been in daily contact with its problems and in periodic consultation with those in the executive branch and in the Congress who are concerned with small business matters.

The combination of the interaction and the focus for small business leadership has made progress possible in the past and is needed to make further progress possible in the future.

To downgrade SBA would be to downgrade the position of small business and the free enterprise system in the country. And, to diminish the horizons of small business restricts the outlet for the vision, hopes, and energies of our people. It limits their choice of a career and the other choices which follow from this decision to the extent we allow the trend toward giant corporations to remain unchecked and pass up opportunities to encourage the expansion of small business. We are allowing the balance to swing in the direction of the jobs in a big bureaucracy for all. These factors are especially important to the minorities in our country, who need the self-respect and the independence of ownership more than anyone else.

Mr. President, I hope we can convince all who are concerned with this matter that the public interest as well as the small business interest lies with an independent SBA with the full backing of the President, the Urban Affairs Council and all of the departments of the Government including the Department of Commerce. If we are unsuccessful in this attempt, we will have to consider what our future course will be in this matter.

---

[7] "The 15th Anniversary of the SBA—A Milestone for Free Enterprise," remarks on the Senate floor by Senator Morse, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 18, p. 24156.

[8] "SBA Plan to Aid Ghetto Merchants—New Program to Rely on Private Financing," by Paul G. Edwards, Washington Post, August 14, 1968.

[9] "SBA Plan, etc." Loc Cit; "Aiding Black Capitalism, SBA Aims to Boost Negro Ownership of Ghetto Business by Backing More Bank Loans," Newsweek Magazine, August 26, 1968.

[10] See "Assuring a Future for Small Business and the SBA," remarks on Senate floor by Senator Wayne Morse, February 25, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 3, p. 4143.

"TO AID, COUNSEL, ASSIST, AND PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it seems that one of the periodic seasons on the American political calendar is the "small business chill."

Because the Nation's smaller firms do not possess the economic power and influence of the giant corporations, there is a constant temptation to allow their needs to be neglected by the Federal Government. At such times, SBA loans dry up, Government procurement opportunities drift to the larger firms on an increasingly less competitive basis, clouds of doubt gather over the Small Business Administration, and a layer of frost envelops the institutions of the Federal establishments which are in a position to be helpful to beleaguered small businessmen.

I have detected the onset of the small business chill season again. When we were threatened with a similar situation 3 years ago, some of us were quite active in attempts to bring relief to the Nation's small business community. I, for one, took the Senate floor on January 27, February 18, March 2, and March 9, 1966, to speak on the future and programs of the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration retained its independence and its programs were strengthened by amendments to the Small Business Act in 1966 and preliminary amendments to the Small Business Investment Act in 1967 which were sponsored by the executive branch, as well as the Congress, and brought great economic and social benefits to our small business community of 5½ million firms in this country.

Unfortunately, Capitol Hill is once again feeling some icy and ill winds blowing down Pennsylvania Avenue which can have the effect of putting small business into a deep freeze.

I refer to remarks made on more than one occasion by the new Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, that the Small Business Administration logically belongs somewhere inside of his department. These statements were quoted in the Wall Street Journal of March 6 and also, I understand, formed part of Mr. Stans' appearance before the National Press Club on March 5. I am among those in the Senate that respectfully disagree with the position of the Secretary of Commerce. It would be helpful, I believe, for me to restate some of my reasons in the hope that the Secretary of Commerce may change his views, or at least that if the administration desires to proceed with this matter, it will do so with the full knowledge of the consequences.

Mr. President, Rhode Island is a small State with a business community that is predominantly small business. We have, in fact, about 26,000 firms in the State, and 94.8 percent are considered small business by the Small Business Administration.

From the time that the Small Business Administration was established as a permanent independent agency in 1953, Rhode Island small business has received over 1,000 loans totaling more than $33 million. In an area of the country which was in the process of experiencing an exodus by one of its major industries, textiles, this loan assistance was invaluable and formed a significant factor in the economy of our State. This is equally true of the procurement and management assistance which the SBA has extended to Rhode Island firms at times of need and opportunity over the last decade and a half.

Although I did not serve in Washington in the years prior to 1953, I will accept the judgment of the leaders of the Senate as summarized by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) that raises substantial doubt about whether Rhode Island business would have received such sympathetic assistance if the Small Business Administration were a small part of a large department with many other responsibilities.

In the years since 1953 the competitive life of the marketplace has become even tougher for the small businessman. He faces heightened competition not only from established giant corporations in this country and abroad, but new conglomerate corporations which have become a disquieting factor in this country in recent years. I was most interested in the analysis made of conglomerate competition against small business by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), who is chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee. I agree with Senator NELSON that large conglomerates, which can draw profits from several kinds of markets, can subsidize the operations of one of their affiliates against a small businessman who must operate in a much more limited way.

I would like to make it clear, however, that I am not making a blanket condemnation of all mergers. There are, indeed, some large multimarket corporations that are soundly financed, and well managed that do not indulge in forced takeovers of small businesses, nor resort to unfair competitive practices against small businesses. Nevertheless, the incidence of such unfair practices and takeovers is far too great.

There are two points that I wish to add to the Senate's consideration of this matter. The extent to which this merger trend has gone is indicated by the fact that between 1948 and 1965 the 200 largest manufacturing corporations made at least 2,692 acquisitions of companies with combined assets of $21.5 billion. This volume of resources was greater than the total of all assets held by the 150 companies ranking 51 through 200 in 1948. To put it another way, the 200 largest companies acquired assets through merger equal to 25 percent of all manufacturing assets in 1948.

It is apparent to me and should be apparent to any Administration that the merger trend that we are in, and the concentration that it is bringing, constitutes one of the greatest threats to the treasured values of individualism and business ownership in American life. These trends also have profound effects on our social structure as youth, preparing for its careers, realizes that its choices may be more and more confined to a large bureaucracy, and whether this big, highly structured organization is in the field of manufacturing, finance, education or government, it has roughly similar effects on a person's freedom of action and personality. Accordingly, it seems to me that a priority matter in the quality of American life is to strengthen small business opportunity in every way.

Another priority item in making the small business climate more congenial is improving the small businessman's access to the lifeblood of capital. Two factors are now converging to put a capital squeeze on a small business community. The first is tight money in the commercial money markets. As the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee (Senator PROXMIRE) has aptly described, interest rates across the whole spectrum of Government and business loans and investments have risen to the highest levels in 100 years. The prospects are that these interest rate levels will not subside in the near future and might possibly even rise higher.

The Washington Post recently reported Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., as saying that the Federal Reserve System will "keep interest rates high and credit tight for as long as necessary to wring the inflationary psychology out of the American economy." This has already begun to affect the day-to-day operations of many small companies, although some commentators are citing the moderating effect of the tax deductibility of interest charges. I would suggest that such a deduction is both minimized and delayed for small firms and should not be a justification for preserving record high interest rates which commonsense and experience confirm damage consumers and small business far more than they do large corporations which have multiple sources of credit.

The second reason for the money squeeze on small firms is that the Small Business Administration, which was created as a lender of last resort for the small businessman in such tight money situations, has been operating on what may be described as an extremely limited basis.

Mr. President, the primary purpose of the SBA is to make direct, participation or guarantee loans to small firms in times of stringency. It is well known that SBA's loan programs have not been expansive in the recent past and the details of this posture are becoming increasingly known.

Rather than making an issue of this at this time, I only make this point to demonstrate that a strong and independent Small Business Administration is needed to secure the funds necessary to sustain the establishment and growth of small business and new business firms in this country. In the governmental battles that are waged for budget funds, it is vital to our 5½ million small businessmen that the SBA have a strong voice and absolute freedom of action rather than deferring its claims, its statements, and its policies to a Department which is obliged to consider its other responsiblilities.

If the small business deep freeze is not immediately dispelled, it will be the task of Congress, pursuant to its mandate in the Small Business Act of 1953 to "aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as it is possible, the interests of small business concerns" to consider what steps are called for.

I would like to assure everyone in my State that I will do everything I can to be of help to the small business community in this matter.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND ITS PROGRAMS ARE VITAL TO THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in active support of the resolution for Small Business Administration independence which the Small Business Committee has transmitted to President Nixon, and which the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) has presented to the Senate today.

The basis for the Committee's action initially was a series of articles in the American press reflecting the attitude of Secretary of Commerce Stans that the Small Business Administration logically belongs within the Department of Commerce. Then, on March 5, the President issued an Executive order transferring coordination of minority business programs, including advisory councils for minority business, to the Department of Commerce.

Further information was contained in the internationally known London Economist, which the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) made available to the Senate. Another relevant document is the statement which President Nixon made at the signing of the Executive order. I ask unanimous consent that this statement on minority business enterprise be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it should be noted that the following comment, which went unreported in the press, is a part of President Nixon's statement:

> Recently, the Small Business Administration launched a program for the stimulation of minority group enterprise. This program has been well received, and deserves continuing support. With better coordination, a broader range of government resources and assistance can be made available.

I commend President Nixon for including this recognition of the Small Business Administration's minority enterprise program in his remarks. By all reports, SBA's "Project Own" has been successful in tripling the volume of minority loans. It has enlisted broad support from private trade associations, banks, and other elements of the private sector in providing real momentum to minority business ownership in this country. President Nixon's reference to this is important and should be part of the record.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, there are serious questions which remain unanswered.

However, many minority business enterprise programs there may be in the Government, there is little question that the Small Business Administration has been the vigorous leader in this movement. The least which President Nixon's action has done is to transfer the initiative, the coordination, and the Advisory Council function from the Small Business Administration to another agency, the Department of Commerce. The statement indicates that this was implemented "as recommended by the Urban Affairs Council."

The President is certainly entitled to seek and to adopt recommendations from any quarter. It may be that the Urban Affairs Council referred to is the same as the "Council on Urban Affairs" announced on January 23, to be composed of the Vice President, several Cabinet members and White House staff members. This announcement also described the formation of several subcommittees of the Council, including one on Minority Business Enterprise, to be chaired by Secretary of Commerce Stans. If this is in fact the Council which made the recommendation, there does not appear to be any evidence that the Small Business Administration was represented at any stage of the deliberations.

Mr. President, it is clear that the Congress is obliged to exercise its judgment in these matters, and the Congress begins with knowledge of a substantial record of accomplishment by the Small Business Administration in this as well as many other areas.

At this time, several possibilities emerge with regard to the status of SBA. Either the transfers of function under Executive Order No. 11458 are intended to be limited; or they may be the first of several transfers; or, if Mr. Stans' position is adopted, they may signal the intention of the administration to do away with the Small Business Administration entirely and relocate its functions within the Department of Commerce. Considerable confusion has been engendered over what course the new administration desires to follow in this field.

Because of this, I believe it is quite understandable that we in the Senate would react strongly. The historical record as reviewed by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt that the small businessman is benefited more with an independent Small Business Administration, than with a program under the Department of Commerce. It would seem to me unfortunate if the administration's policy is to be a lack of support for the Small Business Administration.

In our State of West Virginia, I know that the small businessman has been well served by having an agency that he may call his own. The loan programs, particularly the community development loans, are vital for our towns and cities. The financial assistance, procurement contracting and subcontracting programs, and the possibilities of transferring some of the new technology to small businesses are vital to the future of my State.

As a member of the Procurement Subcommittee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Technology of the Senate Small Business Committee, I can give specific examples of the advantages of having small business in an independent rather than a subordinate position. During the 1966 proceedings on this matter, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) quoted an editorial from the Washington Evening Star on March 1966, as follows:

> Sponsors of the SBA's independence fear that tucking it in some cranny of Commerce, where big business enjoys major influence, will in effect kill the agency. There is some historical justification for this view. During World War II a couple of small precursors of the SBA did an ineffective job. The Division of Contract Distribution, created in 1941, and a subsequent small business unit within Commerce, were both largely paper organizations.

The figures for the SBA procurement assistance program demonstrate that this has been an effective tool in encouraging awards to smaller business firms. In fiscal year 1967, the Small Business set-aside program was responsible for $1.9 billion worth of defense contracts and $310 million worth of civilian contracts being awarded to small firms. This represented approximately 4½ percent of all procurement dollars during that year.[11] The value of this program was further demonstrated during recent years when the role of small business specialists was restricted by the Defense Department in 1966 and 1967. The ratio of set-aside to total defense procurement declined substantially, and the situation was not corrected until the joint set-aside program was revived and small business specialists were reassigned to their previous duties.

Another procurement program which has aided smaller firms in obtaining new Government contracts is the "certificate of competency" which allows a small businessman, whose low bid is rejected by the Government because of supposed shortcomings in capital or credit, to appeal to SBA for such a certificate. Since 1953 SBA has processed over 5,000 applications for COC's, and has issued more than 2,000 with a value to the small firms of approximately $429 million and savings to taxpayers of about $33½ million.[12]

Additionally, the benefits of transferring new science and technology to small businesses hold significant promise and the assistance of SBA in the initial stages of how this may be accomplished has been invaluable.

Mr. President, I am among those who doubt that all of this would take place without the special assistance, special

---

[11] See 18th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, Senate Report No. 1155, 90th Congress, second session, at page 20.

[12] 1967 Annual Report of the Small Business Administration, at page 17.

XUM

focus, and special concern of an agency dedicated to the small businessman of this country. It is my hope that President Nixon will resolve the existing uncertainty by stating his strong and active support for an independent SBA. However, if he does not, the Members of Congress who feel keenly of responsibilities toward the small businessman, will continue to advance small business interests, with or without this support.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Mar. 10, 1969]

MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

(Statement by the President upon signing an Executive order providing for a national program, March 5, 1969)

I have often made the point that to foster the economic status and the pride of members of our minority groups we must seek to involve them more fully in our private enterprise system. Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, and others must increasingly be encouraged to enter the field of business, both in the areas where they now live and in the larger commercial community—and not only as workers, but also as managers and owners.

Providing better job training and making more jobs available is only part of the answer.

We must also provide an expanded opportunity to participate in the free enterprise system at all levels—not only to share the economic benefits of the free enterprise system more broadly, but also to encourage pride, dignity, and a sense of independence. In order to do this, we need to remove commercial obstacles which have too often stood in the way of minority-group members—obstacles such as the unavailability of credit, insurance, and technical assistance. Involvement in business has always been a major route toward participation in the mainstream of American life. Our aim is to open that route to potentially successful persons who have not had access to it before.

Encouraging increased minority-group business activity is one of the priority aims of this administration.

The Federal Government has long been involved in various programs to support the development of new business enterprises, and to help struggling new ones become more stable. By one count, there are now 116 such programs, operated by no less than 21 different departments and agencies. These are largely uncoordinated.

Recently, the Small Business Administration launched a program for the stimulation of minority group enterprise. This program has been well received, and deserves continuing support. With better coordination, a broader range of Government resources and assistance can be made available.

Many private, voluntary organizations, and many major corporations, have done outstanding work in assisting the development of new business enterprises among minority groups. Often, however, their efforts have not had the Government support that they deserve.

As recommended by the *Urban Affairs Council*, I intend to establish within the Department of Commerce an Office of Minority Business Enterprise. Under the leadership of Secretary of Commerce Stans, this new office will be the focal point of the administration's efforts to assist the establishment of new minority enterprises and expansion of existing ones. It will seek to concentrate Government resources, and also to involve the business community and others in order to enlist the full range of the Nation's resources.

This new office will be headed by an Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and it will have the direct, personal attention of the Secretary. On its own, it will seek to develop new business opportunities. It will coordinate the efforts of other government agencies in encouraging minority enterprise. It will mobilize financial and other resources, both public and private. It will provide the centralized leadership which in the past has not been sufficiently evident. It will seek to provide a better focus of government programs at the local level, in order to give them the impact intended. It will constantly review both existing and possible new programs for the encouragement of minority business enterprise, and will make recommendations for further executive and legislative action as appropriate.

I have today issued an Executive order directing the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate Federal programs related to the strengthening of minority business enterprise, and authorizing him to take the necessary steps to do so effectively. The order also provides for the creation of an Advisory Council for Minority Business Enterprise, and for the establishment by the Secretary of Commerce of an information center for the compiling and dissemination of information on successful minority business enterprise programs.

This is not a substitute for the many other efforts that continue to be needed if we are to make headway against the ravages of poverty. It is a supplement, dealing with a special but vital part of the broader effort to bring the members of our minority groups into full participation in the American society and economy. Its success will be measured by tangible results, not by the volume of studies.

What we are doing is recognizing that in addition to the basic problems of poverty itself, there is an additional need to stimulate those enterprises that can give members of minority groups confidence that avenues of opportunity are neither closed nor limited; enterprises that will demonstrate that blacks, Mexican-Americans, and others can participate in a growing economy on the basis of equal opportunity at the top of the ladder as well as on its lower rungs.

KEEP SBA INDEPENDENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on February 26, 1969, I had the privilege, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, to question Mr. Hilary J. Sandoval, Jr., the then nominee to be Administrator of Small Business Administration, at some length. Traditionally, the subcommittee has always been quite interested in the commitment and resolve of any future SBA Administrator to "fight the good fight" for the Agency and for the American small businessman. Most of us are aware of the periodic attempts to dilute or water down SBA by placing it within the Department of Commerce or some other agency of the Federal Government.

So it was quite natural for me to discuss SBA's independence in some detail with Mr. Sandoval. On three separate occasions I raised this matter with the nominee, and each time I was unable to tell by his answers the extent of either his commitment or his resolve to protect the independence of SBA. I made my position quite clear and concluded Mr. Sandoval, being very new to Washington, was perhaps suffering from a mild case of stage fright.

You can imagine my surprise when, on March 6, just 8 days later, I read where Secretary of Commerce Stans had stated that "SBA, by definition, ought to be part of the Commerce Department."[13]

It then began to appear as though a move was underway again within the executive branch to strip SBA of its status as an independent Federal agency and place it within the Department of Commerce. Printed and other reports continue to bear this out.

Mr. President, this body well knows how I feel about an SBA-Department of Commerce merger. Along with Senator SPARKMAN, Senator SMATHERS, and Senator BIBLE, I assisted in our successful effort in 1965 to prevent such a merger. It was not wise to weaken SBA then. It is even less wise now.

SBA is a small agency, as Federal agencies go. But I consider this smallness as one of its best assets. This is the key to SBA's effectiveness. If some larger, cumbersome agency were to swallow up SBA, as is now being discussed, SBA's effectiveness and capabilities would be muted, if not strangled and destroyed. It could no longer remain a viable agency, responsive to the needs of the American small businessman.

Mr. President, SBA today serves as the spokesman for over 5 million small businesses which employ over 40 million people. Small business contributes 33⅓ percent to our annual gross national product of over $808 billion.

Small business, then, is small only in terms of store size and number of employees. But it is not small in the impact it has on our economy and on our free enterprise system.

Small business requires and deserves the same services and the same recognition on an equal basis with other important interest groups operating within our economy. SBA, at the executive level of Government, is the only strong and effective advocate for small business.

In 1953, Congress created SBA as an independent agency of the Federal Government. SBA was designed to serve the small businessman as a one-stop shop center, an agency where he could receive assistance of a personal, responsive nature, free from big business influence. Over the years, SBA has proved to be a very effective spokesman for small business. SBA's record is quite good.

During the first decade and a half since the creation of SBA, that agency made over 85,000 regular business loans to small concerns. The total dollar volume of these loans was over $4 billion.

During this same period, over $19 billion in Federal procurement awards were set aside for small businesses.

Since 1953, SBA has distributed over 41 million management publications and conducted over 10,000 management assistance courses.

This fine record exemplifies one word: "service."

Mr. President, I submit that any departure from complete independence for SBA will damage irreparably this service and may cause distress and difficulty in the overall economy.

---

[13] See article entitled "Foreign Investment Rules To Be Waived, The Wall Street Journal, March 6, 1969, page 3.

XUM

Certainly, SBA needs to remain independent now more than ever before—during this period of corporate giantism, conglomerate mergers, high interest rates, and fiscal stress—all resulting in a shift of credit availability from small business to big business.

I told Mr. Sandoval on February 23, and I quote:

> If somebody starts pushing you around . . . , you have a lot of friends up here on the hill . . . , you get on the telephone or come running up here.

That states my position quite clearly. I think Mr. Sandoval got the message, which is that this is no time to downgrade SBA by making it subordinate to any other agency or department. This is no partisan matter. I sincerely believe that the vast majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress support the full independence of the Small Business Administration.

SBA'S INDEPENDENCE AGAIN THREATENED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I rise in behalf of the Small Business Administration and the American small businessman. That agency's independence once again is being threatened. Printed and other recent reports indicate a movement is apparently underway within the executive branch which would strip SBA of its statutory independence as the Nation's spokesman for the small businessman at the Federal level. SBA, for at least the third time since 1965, is facing absorption within another agency of the Federal Government, most likely the Department of Commerce. For instance, on March 6, 1969, the Secretary of Commerce said SBA "by definition" ought to be part of the Commerce Department.[14]

SBA was created as an independent agency in 1953 during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was passed during the second Eisenhower-Nixon administration. Both of these legislative landmarks recognized the real, urgent need of the American small businessman to enjoy direct, responsive, and realistic representation in Washington. Under the Small Business Act of 1953, the Administrator of SBA reports directly to the President of the United States. Mr. President, I submit there is no better representation than that.

I further submit that, if SBA's independence is watered down, the result will be diminished activity in the small business sector which will be felt throughout the land.

Mr. President, the small business community is 5½ million small firms. These businesses contribute nearly 40 percent of our gross national product of $800 billion annually. They provide employment for 40 million people and support for the families of these small businessowners. Should we deny this bulwark of our free enterprise system independent representation at the Federal level?

If we do, then we apparently believe that the problems and needs of the small, independent businessman are just the same as the problems and needs of General Motors or any other American corporate giant.

Mr. President, commonsense tells us that this line of reasoning just is not so. President Nixon's father was a small businessman. He owned and operated a small service station and grocery store in Whittier, Calif. I seriously doubt if he regarded himself "in the same boat" with any of our better known corporate giants. And neither does any other small shopowner or storekeeper.

During the decade and a half since SBA was created as an independent agency, SBA has served the small entrepreneur well. Some 85,000 small firms have borrowed over $4 billion; small communities have received nearly one-half billion dollars in local development company loans, which, in turn, have created, or saved, 94,850 jobs; and small business investment companies have made approximately 30,000 loans totaling about $1.4 billion.

These figures clearly show the extent to which SBA has served the small business community, the free enterprise system, and the Nation.

Mr. President, while I am quite proud of the fine job done by SBA over the years, it can do an even better job for the country's small businessman in the years immediately ahead. SBA has perhaps the best economic development tools of any agency of the Federal Government. These are proven "working tools," not "pie-in-the-sky" theories. These tools have been honed to a keen edge of effectiveness.

To put it in the vernacular of many of today's young people, SBA has been "doing its own thing," and I might add, it continues to do it very well.

Now is not the time for us to tamper with a proven program. High interest rates, shortage of funds and other fiscal uncertainties are the benchmarks of today's business world. It is therefore urgent and very necessary that SBA remain an independent spokesman for the small businessman during these difficult times.

Recently, Senator ALAN BIBLE, the very able and alert chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, circulated a committee resolution expressing strong support for the continued independence of SBA. As ranking Democrat on the Small Business Committee, I was pleased to place my signature just below Senator BIBLE'S. This marks the second time in 3 years I have signed such a resolution and at least the third time in 3 years that I have taken the Senate floor to discuss this matter.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of February 4, 1966, be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement. My remarks were appropriate then, and they are even more so now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not feel that it is necessary for me to belabor this point. The record is quite clear. There exists a great deal of opposition in both Houses of Congress to any plan or proposal which jeopardizes the independent status of SBA. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will study this issue carefully and will not be easily led into a course of action that is clearly detrimental to the future success of the American small businessman.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, Feb. 4, 1966]

THE RUMORED PROPOSAL THAT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BE PLACED WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there was an article in this morning's Washington Post by Jerry Kluttz saying that the administration has under active consideration a recommendation that the Small Business Administration be stripped of its independent status and placed within the Department of Commerce. Rumors that such a move might be in the making have persisted for several weeks.

Mr. President, I have been concerned about these rumors, and now that they are being reported publicly in the news media, my concern has deepened to the extent that I feel it necessary, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, as a member of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, and as one who has, down through the years, taken an active interest in matters affecting the 4½ million small businesses of America, that I speak out on this subject.

Mr. President, I would be amazed if serious consideration is given to allowing the Department of Commerce to absorb the Small Business Administration. When this agency was first created there was considerable debate in the Congress on this very question. The matter arose in the form of a conference report submitted to the Senate. The legislation provided for the creation of the Small Business Administration, to be governed by a board comprised of the Secretary of the Treasury, as Chairman, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration as members. During the debate on this conference report, those in the Senate who were sensitive to the needs of the Nation's small businesses and who were sympathetic to meeting those needs, spoke out on this subject.

Among those who stood up for a Small Business Administration independent of the policies and influence of other departments of the executive branch of the Government was the then senior Senator from Texas, now President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson had long been a champion of the small business firms of this country and, during that debate, the President said:

"This bill would place the Small Business activities of the Government under two major Departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a small business agency cannot be effective unless it is independent."

Another distinguished Member of this body, who later served as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, was the late President John F. Kennedy, then junior Senator from the State of Massachusetts. President Kennedy said:

"The Small Business Administration which is proposed by the pending legislation is deficient in several respects. If such an agency is to be of real help to small business in providing technical assistance, long-term capital, and procurement opportunities, all of which are of primary importance in expanding the economies of New England and the United States, the following defects must be corrected:

"First, such agency must be truly independent and not subject to the veto power of the Commerce and Treasury Departments. Experience has shown that such independence is necessary to give small business an effective voice in the Government."

---

[14] See article entitled "Foreign Investment Rules to be Waived," the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1969, page 3.

Another recognized champion of small business, who served as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee from June 1, 1950, until December 29, 1964, and who was serving as chairman of its Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices Subcommittee at the time of his election to the high office of Vice President of the United States, and who now serves in that office, was Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. Senator Humphrey said:

"I say we are not going to have the friendship of small business if we allow the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to have too much to say about the definite standards to be set with respect to small business, because I do not believe either one of them is particularly noteworthy as a champion of small business enterprise. That is not their record. They have competence in other fields, but not in this one.

"I am delighted the committee has come forward with a bill that gives the Administrator of the Small Business Administration powers unto himself, that makes him the chairman of the loan policy board, and that restricts of activities of the Secretary of Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to being advisers. Let the record be clear. An adviser does not mean a proprietor. The Administrator can take advice, or he can reject it. The advisory board is exactly what its name implies. It is to advise.

"I suggest that Congress keep a very careful, watchful eye upon how the advisers act. I think we shall have an opportunity to see whether the activities of the Small Business Administration will be in the spirit of truly helping small, competitive business enterprise."

The senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Saltonstall, who serves now as the ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee, also spoke out on this subject. Senator Saltonstall said:

"The Small Business Administration provided for by S. 1523 would be a completed independent agency. This, in the opinion of the many Massachusetts businessmen who have written to me on the subject, is a very important feature. A small business agency should have as its primary responsibility the assistance of small business. The experience of the last 10 years has made that inescapably clear. I am glad, therefore, that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has corrected the feature of the Hill bill which was recently before us and which would have made the head of the Small Business Administration subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce. The present bill wisely confines their advisory functions to the field of loan policy."

Mr. President, I had the privilege of participating in that debate and I said this at that time:

"The second difference between the Senate bill and the House-approved bill relates to the advisory board. It will be recalled that when the conference report on the defense production bill was before the Senate, many Senators objected to the provision relating to the advisory board, on the ground that it became not simply an advisory board, but actually a governing board. Instead of the governing authority being in the Administrator, the authority was vested in a board, of which the Administrator was not even the chairman; the Secretary of the Treasury was the chairman.

"In the pending bill, as has been so well explained today by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the board is advisory, the Administrator is chairman, and it is not intended in any way that the board shall administer the business of the agency or shall govern the agency itself. I believe those two changes are significant and material, and make the Senate bill a decided improvement over the House bill."

Mr. President, I feel just as strongly today as I felt then that the Small Business Administration can operate effectively in the interest of the Nation's small business firms only as an independent agency of Government.

Those who have been charged with the responsibility of serving as Administrator of the Small Business Administration have likewise recognized the need of independent status for the agency. Of course, John Horne, who served as Administrator from 1961 until 1963, was serving as my administrative assistant at the time the SBA was created as an independent agency. He actively assisted me in the debate which led to the creation of the agency and the establishment of its independent status. The fact is that John Horne's position on the question of independence for the SBA was so well-known that I have been unable to recall, that, during his tenure as Administrator he was ever questioned on the subject. Had he been, however, I know what he would have said because I know that he believed in the independence of the agency as strongly as any person in Government. When John Horne was moved to the Home Loan Bank Board in 1963, President Kennedy nominated Mr. Eugene P. Foley to replace him as Administrator.

At the time of his nomination, Mr. Foley was serving as deputy to the Secretary of Commerce, and since the question of the independence of the agency versus placing it under Commerce had been of such concern to the Congress originally, it was only natural that the Congress would inquire into his views on this matter. It was my privilege to make that inquiry during the course of the confirmation hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on July 30, 1963. I said to Mr. Foley at that time:

"There was discussion originally and there were proposals that the Small Business Administration * * * be a part of the Department of Commerce. One of the fights we had in setting up the Small Business Administration was whether or not it should be an independent agency * * * This was a plan that was worked out by this committee and a plan which I think has functioned quite well."

I then asked Mr. Foley, "You subscribe to this idea don't you, of an independent agency?" His reply was, "I do wholeheartedly, Senator. I assure you that as far as it is within my power there will be no change. I don't expect a change."

Mr. President, in view of the history of this controversy, the highlights of which I have tried to recite above, I just cannot believe that the report which appeared in the Washington Post this morning is accurate in saying that a proposal to place the Small Business Administration within the Department of Commerce is being seriously considered by the administration. I certainly hope that it is not accurate, because I do not believe that this controversy should again be a subject of lengthy debate before the Congress.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REMAIN INDEPENDENT

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I would like to add my comments on the resolution submitted today by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator BIBLE.

This resolution, in my opinion, was justified by the reports which have circulated not only in our national press, to which the Senator has referred, but in some international journals as well. For example, the London Economist of March 1, 1969, reports on certain statements by the Secretary of Commerce and others in the Nixon administration which, in the opinion of the reporter, "would impinge directly on SBA's Project Own." For the information of those concerned, I ask unanimous consent that the brief article be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, there are some opinions in this article which I would not share. The record is clear, for instance, that the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, under a distinguished series of chairmen—Senators SPARKMAN, Smathers, and BIBLE—has been in the forefront of every small business matter, and that this body has done so out of an abundance of concern for advancing the interests of all of the Nation's small businessmen. It would be accurate, I believe, to say that the combined efforts of the Senate and House were successful in preventing SBA programs from "disappearing into the maw of another Government agency" in recent years.

Mr. President, the State of Alaska has for many years, been represented on the Small Business Committee. I am proud to follow in the footsteps of Senator E. L. "Bob" Bartlett in this regard. During my career it has been brought home to me forcibly that the desire among Americans to own their own businesses is very deep and very widespread. The surveys available in 1964 indicated that fully half of all American wage earners either attempt to go into business for themselves or intend to do so some time during their lives.[15]

Senator BIBLE has described how the SBA has turned this dream into a reality for 200,000 small businessmen. The Economist article points out how the SBA has been extending this effort to minority groups with the so-called Project Own. The article states that SBA loans and guarantees to aspiring minority businessmen for the last quarter of 1968 rose to more than $31 million, more than triple the amount granted in the same months of 1967. According to official Government estimates, the loan approvals under this program are to rise from $32 million in 1968 to $306 million in fiscal year 1970, an increase of 856 percent.[16]

Said the Economist:

> Significantly some three-fifths of all these (1958) loans were made by private lending institutions with guarantees up to 90 percent from the SBA (allowing) the SBA to increase its activity among Negroes and other racial minorities without running up against the budgetary ceilings on its lending and spending powers.

Thus, it seems to me that SBA has been a notable success, not only in its recent attempts to foster minority business ownership, but in its historic venture of assisting all small businessmen in our cities and countryside to survive and ex-

---

[15] "Can Small Business Survive," by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Regnery Co., 1964, p. 3.

[16] The Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1970, U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1969.

XUM

pand, and consequently to provide a growth factor in the economy.

My information is that small business accounts for 40 percent of the gross national product and about 50 percent of all the jobs in the United States. It is thus a major factor throughout the country, and especially in my State. The record of the Small Business Administration in Alaska has been exemplary. Within hours of the Good Friday, 1964, disaster, SBA had a team of personnel en route to Alaska, and within 6 months 490 business disaster loans and 455 home disaster loans had been granted. As Senator Bartlett said last year:

> Thanks in no small measure to this help, Alaska now has a healthy and expanding economy.[17]

As the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) has pointed out, small business has also been a surprisingly potent force in innovation and competition in the United States during recent years, even in the teeth of the growth that we have seen in giant corporate business. This competition and innovation play a direct role in furnishing alternative and substitute products and services, and thus tending to keep price levels down and exercising a restraint on inflation—a function which the traditional free market can perform with great benefits to all.

Mr. President, I hardly need to point out that inflation remains one of our most urgent concerns. During the last 6 months the prime interest rate has risen from 6¼ to 7½ percent and the Federal Reserve discount rate from 5¼ to 5½ percent. Other market rates have escalated proportionately, bringing interest rates to their highest levels in 100 years.

These credit pressures, of course, tend to fall most heavily upon small businessmen.[18]

It therefore seems to me that what we need is to have more support, more assistance, and more funds for the Small Business Administration. The independence of this agency has demonstrated its worth over the last 16 years and its programs, including Project Own, have proven their worth. A transfer of functions, and a consequent undermining or destruction of the Small Business Administration, in my opinion would constitute a definite step backward. I am therefore glad to join in expressing my support of the resolution presented by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) and restating my support for SBA programs of assistance to American small businessmen.

EXHIBIT 1

WHOSE BLACK CAPITALISM?

WASHINGTON, D.C.—After a patronage struggle between Senators Dirksen and Tower, President Nixon has at last decided in favour of the latter's candidate to head the Small Business Administration. He is Mr. Hilary J. Sandoval, a businessman of Mexican descent, a political figure in his home country of west Texas but little known in Washington. "We do not yet know," confessed an SBA spokesman, "how to pronounce his name."

Mr. Sandoval is walking into the centre of a debate inside the Nixon Administration over how to implement the President's campaign to promote "black capitalism." In his half-year at the SBA, the outgoing Democratic administrator, Mr. Howard Samuels, bade fair to transform it into an agency for such capitalism, with an effort which he called Project Own. SBA loans or guarantees of $31 million given to aspiring black businessmen between September and December last year were more than triple the amount granted in the same months of 1967. Significantly some three-fifths of all these loans were made by private lending institutions with guarantees of up to 90 per cent from the SBA; this allowed the SBA to increase its activity among Negroes and other racial minorities without running up against the budgetary ceilings on its lending and spending powers.

By October Mr. Samuels was in trouble. Following hearings that month the conservative Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives warned him that "discrimination (in favour of minority groups) in the business loan programme cannot be permitted." Had Mr. Samuels retained his job, says one member of the committee, "we would have caught up with him by March." The SBA, according to congressional critics, was created under President Eisenhower not as a welfare agency but to foster a tenet of white America: that the little local businessman should prosper. In December the incoming Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Maurice Stans, laid claim all but openly to Project Own's activities when he said that "one of the first decisions" for him would be whether to absorb some of the SBA's activities into the Department of Commerce. Early in February the President told the department's employees that they would be given new responsibilities to provide "all people" with a chance "to become owners and managers in this great private enterpirse system of ours."

Debate in the Administration has not stopped there. When the President wrote to Congress last week about the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity one sentence in the message read:

"It is also my intent that the vital Community Action Programmes (CAPs) will be pressed forward, and that in the area of economic development OEO will have an important role to play, in co-operation with other agencies, in fostering community-based business development."

The idea now, according to one member of the Administration, is "to convert CAPs to capitalism."

This would impinge directly on the SBA's Project Own. So also would the idea of a national Community Development Bank being put forward vigorously by Mr. James Farmer, the Negro leader from New York, who is shortly to join as an Assistant Secretary yet another, more muscular arm of the administration, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Such a bank would lend or guarantee loans to local development banks and businesses, just as SBA has been doing. Meanwhile the House Small Business Committee is preparing to fight (as it did most successfully under President Johnson) to prevent any SBA programme disappearing into the maw of another government agency; in this case the programme in question is disliked by the committee which, for this very reason, wants to keep it under its thumb.

A decision on how to deal with black capitalism is promised by the White House in "weeks rather than months." The President's Counsellor, Mr. Arthur Burns, who is presiding over the whole uncomfortable debate, believes in devolving the project as much as possible on to private business through tax and other incentives. But he has to make peace among the departmental warriors who are determined to corral Mr. Nixon's social solutions into their own empires.

SOME SUGGESTIONS REGARDING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the administration of President Nixon is in the process of making up its mind about the status of the Small Business Administration.

As an indication of the concern that any action affecting SBA's independence would bring in the Senate is the resolution presented today by the chairman of the Small Business Committee (Mr. BIBLE).

This, however, is only a preliminary indication of what would surely be a wider and deeper concern that would follow an attempt to put the SBA in a subordinate position inside the Department of Commerce or any other Department.

When the Select Committee on Small Business was established in the Senate in 1950, I was appointed as one of its original members, along with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota, Vice President Humphrey. I have thus participated in the deliberations of the last 18 years, including those surrounding the enactment of the Small Business Act of 1953 and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I have witnessed the steady growth of small business institutions in this country, which Senator BIBLE has described. As a member and then chairman of the Committee on Finance, I have had further opportunities to consider many tax bills affecting small business and free enterprise and to make some contribution to the advancement of both through the Small Business Tax Amendments Act of 1958, the Revenue Reduction Act of 1964, and other small business tax legislation. During the 89th Congress, as assistant majority leader, I was involved when the Johnson administration carefully considered and then rejected the possibility of changing the status of the SBA.

It may be, therefore, that my observations would add something to the present discussion of this matter.

As I recall, the formality of Federal assistance to small business began in 1941 when a "Small Business Unit" was established in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the U.S. Commerce Department and directed to study problems encountered by smaller firms because of their size and to plan a program of assistance. During the ensuing years of World War II, several of the ideas developed by the Commerce Department Unit were absorbed into the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was created as a part of the War Production Board on June 11, 1942, to broaden small business participation in military procurement. The scope of these efforts was, of course, restricted to manufacturing and to defense work, until the SWPC was abolished by Executive order as of January 1946.[19] In the early years of the Korean war, the small business functions were first made a part of the National Production Authority[19] and then, by unanimous congressional action, conferred upon the Defense Plants Administration in 1951.[20]

---

[17] "Small Business and SBA pass important milestones," remarks on the Senate floor by Senator Bartlett, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 19, p. 25431.

[18] See for instance, "Changes in Administered and in Market Rates," research letter of Salomon Brothers & Hutzler, March 3, 1969.

[19] Executive Order No. 9665, December 27, 1945.

Then in 1953 the Small Business Administration was established as the first independent agency of the Government specifically charged with the responsibility of fostering the interests of all of the small business community. So, it was not until the Small Business Act of 1953 and the Small Business Investment and Tax Acts of 1958 that small business institutions in this country reached the takeoff point.

I do not believe that anyone would seriously contend that small businesses do not have unique problems because of their size. President Eisenhower, who had a good record on small business, recognized this fact on several occasions with active efforts to identify these problems and attempts to resolve them. For instance, in setting up a Cabinet Committee on Small Business in May of 1956 the President stated, as part of his mandate:

> (T)he conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small business . . . To that end I am establishing (the said committee).

In the first progress report of August 7, 1956, the Cabinet Committee made 14 recommendations for the betterment of small business conditions, many of which have since been enacted, including No. 8 which called for the continuation of the Small Business Administration as a permanent and independent agency of the Government.

Another example is that Small Business Administrator Wendell Barnes, writing in the winter of 1959, about the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, stated:

> This legislation is designed to fill a gap in small business financing. Equity capital and long-term loans for growth and development purposes have never been readily available to small business. Commercial banks furnish short and intermediate-term loans, but not venture capital and long-term credit. Existing institutions which could provide venture capital are not able to assist smaller firms, since the cost for public sale of securities is disproportionately high to small business issuers.
>
> The Small Business Administration, under its regular lending program, can assist small business concerns with intermediate-term loans, but cannot provide the long-term funds needed for growth and development. As a result, there has been no institutional source to which small business could turn to meet its capital needs. It is this so-called institutional gap which the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is designed to fill."[21]

It seems to me that every administration over the years has recognized that small business has these special problems, and that it is especially vulnerable to economic reverses during periods of recession and tight money, and that small companies take longer to recover from these reverses than large national corporations.

One of the notable features of this history is the seeming absence of any outstanding accomplishments, or even decisive initiatives in behalf of small business by the Department of Commerce. After 1941, when the President or the Congress wished to move ahead in this field, they turned to special agencies, the White House Committee and, ultimately, as the SBA gained in stature, to that agency. The measure of stature which this little agency has attained was well summarized on the occasion of its 15th anniversary last year by several Members of this body.[22]

It is my feeling that SBA's greatest achievement has been to bring the Federal Government closer to many of the people of this country. I know that this has been the case in my own State of Louisiana. An outstanding example followed hurricane Betsy, when the SBA mobilized its resources and concentrated them throughout the State to deal with the widespread needs for loans to rebuild the damaged businesses and homes. I have been at numerous conferences on procurement contracting and subcontracting opportunities, or lease guarantees, on management assistance, and other programs developed by the Small Business Administration. These, as well as the funds from the loan programs, have brought countless small businesses of my State into the economic mainstream of this country. The assistance of SBA has been the difference, in many business situations, between success and failure, between ownership and going to work for another man.

These individual and aggregate accomplishments of SBA are not just a matter of the quantity of activity; they are matters of its quality—the willingness of the local and national representatives of SBA to extend their resources, their time, and their best thoughts for the benefit of the little businessman. These commitments do not arise out of organizational charts or logical syllogisms. They are intangibles, like self-respect or job satisfaction or independence. These intangible values are deep in the bones of the people of Louisiana and of this country.

The livelihood of one family out of 10 depends upon the welfare of a small business. As the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) has pointed out, about half of our working people would like to be in business for themselves if they could find a way to do so.

Over the years we have found a way for more than 200,000 of these people to make that American dream into a reality. They have come to the SBA as an agency which they feel can help them realize these goals. The business community of this country has come to think of the SBA as their agency. They feel that its independence strengthens their independence, and they are right.

To diminish the SBA in stature by making it a small part of any large department would, in my judgment, not only be a symbolic but an actual downgrading of small business values within the Government and throughout the country. An independent Small Business Administrator can talk with the President of the United States about small business needs. He can, and often does, testify before the Congress. He can devote his full time and energy and that of his staff and organization on what is best for the small businessman.

If SBA is made a part of the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administrator can do only what the Secretary of Commerce tells him he can do, after waiting around to hear from the Secretary about whether he can do it or not.

I do not say this as any reflection upon the present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, or upon any previous Secretary. It is just naturally a part of the character of bureaucracy.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed by the statements of some people within the administration who do not seem to be familiar with our experience in these matters.

I have become concerned over actions transferring the coordination of certain programs, and the advisory councils on these minority business enterprise problems, from the SBA to the Department of Commerce. I cannot help but note that the council, and the subcommittee set up to deal with urban problems and minority business enterprise problems, does not include the Office of the Small Business Administrator. I believe that it would be in the public interest, as well as in the interest of the 5½ million small businessmen in this country, for those who are in control of the executive branch to do some further thinking about these problems.

In addition, I might suggest that there be some visible encouragement to the Small Business Administration to carry forward its excellent record of achievement, to provide it with adequate funds for its programs, and to give it its rightful place in the councils of Government. By taking steps in this direction, the new administration can assure that SBA can continue in the work that it has pioneered, and has done so well.

Mr. President, I hope that these recommendations may be of some value, and that this matter can be worked out rather than fought out. As in the past, the junior Senator from Louisiana is ready to follow either course where the interests of the small business community of my State and Nation are involved.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON ABM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, since the announcement by the President of his decision to recommend moving ahead

---

[19] 64 Stat. 798(1952).

[20] 65 Stat. 131(1951).

[21] "What Government Efforts Are Being Made to Assist Small Business", by Wendell Barnes, Law and Contemporary Problems, winter, 1959, page 18.

[22] "The 15th Anniversary of the Small Business Administration—A Milestone for Free Enterprise," remarks on the Senate floor by Senator Wayne Morse, Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1968, page S9756; "The Small Business Administration's 15 Years of Help to American Business," remarks by Senator BIBLE, Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 2, 1968, page S10101; "Small Business and SBA Pass Important Milestones," remarks by Senator E. L. Bartlett, Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22, 1968, page E7549.

XUM

with a limited deployment of a modified "thin" ABM system, the usual cacophony of extremist headline seekers, assisted by the hyperbole of a few like-minded columnists and editorialists, has made its contribution to public confusion and emotionalism.

One would hope that all citizens would be sufficiently concerned over the security of our Nation to, at least, give this subject the careful, objective, and scholarly attention it merits. When this responsibility is not met, and when a writer or speaker, instead, undertakes to cast doubt on the integrity of the President and his advisers, to appeal to emotion rather than to intelligence, and to twist facts to suit his own purpose, he may receive some publicity; but these tactics merely betray the weakness of his position.

When the President of the United States, with the benefit of the highest and most complete intelligence information available to any American citizen plus the counsel of the National Security Council and the staffs of the members, confides in the people that—

> The safety of our country requires that we should proceed now with the development and construction of the new ABM system in a carefully phased program.

The burden of proof on those who are contrary-minded is very great. Even granting that this might have been a close decision, that a mistake might be made, if a mistake is to be made, one has a duty to the people to assure them that any mistakes are being made on the side of their security, and never against it.

It is unfortunate, I believe, that some Members of Congress did not do the President the courtesy of refraining from making up their minds on this question until after they had the benefit of his decision and the powerful reasons he advanced in its support.

Although urged by some to speak out before the President's decision, I publicly declared I would reserve my judgment until after the President had made his decision and I had an opportunity to study his arguments. The decision was not unexpected by me, and the arguments advanced fully measure up to information I already possessed—information, I might add, which, unfortunately, in some measure cannot be made available to the public.

The President, for example, fully met the old gratuitous argument that deployment of any ABM system would spur on another round in the arms race. So did the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) on a recent nationally televised program, when he wisely pointed out that to follow this argument would eventually leave our country "naked" against aggressive military power.

Our chief U.S. disarmament negotiator, Gerard C. Smith, said he does not believe deployment would block efforts to start arms-control talks. Soviet reaction to President Nixon's decision was treated factually, according to all reports, with no alarm being sounded and, in fact, Soviet press emphasis was on the defensive nature of the ABM. If the Soviets thought it was offensive, the reaction would have been different.

Nevertheless, while the Soviet press reaction may be a straw in the wind for the good, if the Soviet Union continues to increase its military power, are we to throw away our security by standing still? Even one of the most vocal scientists opposed to the ABM deployment, the Nobel Prize physicist, Dr. Hans Bethe, conceded that the system as planned by President Nixon may be needed some time in the future to defend the Minuteman force and it could do the job effectively. As quoted in the Washington Post of March 16, Dr. Bethe, while feeling it would be a mistake to deploy the ABM now, said:

> Protection of the Minuteman is sensible, it is stabilizing. It is a good answer if the Soviets develop MIRV (multiple warheads), but they have only just started.

Mr. President, if it is conceded that someday the system may be needed, is it not better to develop and deploy this defensive system before the MIRV's are fully developed and operational—instead of waiting until the Soviets have placed them in operation? It would appear that Dr. Bethe was asking to close the barn door after the horse has fled.

Is it not better to bargain from a position of relative strength—both defensive and offensive—than to do so from a position of weakness? Any real expert on negotiations with Communists will warn that such is the case.

One is reminded of the argument used against development of the H-bomb. The most influential opponent was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who claimed that the H-bomb was not feasible. Later, Oppenheimer admitted he was wrong. The respected columnist, Joseph Alsop, asked him why he was wrong, and the reply was:

> I guess I concluded it wouldn't work, because I wanted it so much not to work.

Fortunately, what Dr. Oppenheimer wanted did not take place, and the wise decision of President Truman to go ahead, costly though it was, prevented the Soviets from obtaining this weapon before the United States. One shudders to think of where our people might be today if Dr. Oppenheimer's advice had been followed.

It is argued that the Soviets are abandoning their own ABM system, because they have found it unfeasible. Our best intelligence information is to the contrary; that, if there has been a slowdown, it is probable that this is because a more advanced system is being developed by the Soviets.

It is argued that the Sentinel system would be too costly, and, besides, it might not work anyway. Capable scientists believe it will work, and the same discredited arguments were made about the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

It is argued that going ahead with the Sentinel system would negate our ratification of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. But the two cannot really be tied together. Did the signing of the Test Ban Treaty in 1963 stop the Soviets from its subsequent missile buildup? Did not the Soviets support the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, while at the same time embarking on their own ABM system? And the mild reaction from the Soviets regarding President Nixon's decision indicates that they do not think the two are tied together. Finally, we were assured by our highest Government officials during hearings on the Nonproliferation Treaty that it would not inhibit deployment of an ABM system.

I believe the ABM decision is basic to the strength of the U.S. position in any future dealings with the Soviet Union in the area of arms control. If the Russians demonstrate their good faith—and Czechoslovakia is not the way—then, and then only, can we begin to think in terms of arms control and limitation.

I believe we must move toward talks with the Soviets in an effort to achieve some degree of stability in the arms race. I am confident most Americans agree. This is why I was reassured by President Nixon's statement that the ABM program will be periodically reviewed to take into account the status of talks on arms limitation which all of us hope will be characterized by more "good faith" than has heretofore been shown by the representatives of the Soviet Union.

But we must never forget that it takes two sides to talk and two sides to agree.

We must not be so irresponsible as to ignore the militancy of the Soviets in building up their nuclear striking power. We cannot afford to let down our defensive guard in the mere hope that, by doing so, the Soviets will negotiate a meaningful agreement on arms control.

Several recent editorials and columns have placed in perspective this issue. One of the most astute was the editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of February 23. After examining the pros and cons, the editorialist cut to the heart of the issue by stating:

> As a responsible President, however, Richard Nixon cannot indulge in politicking on this question. If he is persuaded, as we think he will be, that our national security requires him to give the go-ahead signal on the Sentinel program, he should grasp that painful nettle—just as Harry Truman did two decades ago. If the legislators want to block the program by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds, let them take the responsibility—and let them also be held accountable for the consequences of what could be a disastrous decision on their part.

I ask unanimous consent that several editorials and columns, written prior to and following President Nixon's decision, be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Sentinel—Let's Give It the Green Light," Washington Star, February 23.

"Chief ABM Task: To Score Bargaining Point," a column by Crosby Noyes, Washington Star, March 8.

"Excellent ABM Advice," Washington Star, March 10.

"Excellent ABM Compromise," St. Louis Globe-Democrat, March 15–16.

"Nixon Puts Safety of United States First," a column by Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star of March 15.

"Opposition to the ABM System Recalls Dispute Over H-Bomb," a column by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post of March 17.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 23, 1969]

SENTINEL: LET'S GIVE IT THE GREEN LIGHT

A bit more than 20 years ago a "great debate" was under way in this country's scientific community.

The question was whether it was possible to build an H-bomb and, if it was possible, whether it was desirable to do so. The opposition arguments ran along several lines: It was not technically feasible to produce an H-bomb. In any event it would be morally wrong for the United States to create this hideous threat to mankind. With our large stockpile of A-bombs, what purpose would be served by arming ourselves with vastly more powerful weapons? Assuming the capability, if we should push ahead with the H-bomb development, would not Russia feel compelled to do likewise? And so on.

This debate continued behind closed doors for weeks and weeks. But then Dr. Edward Teller, sometimes called the "father" of the H-bomb, came up with a "brilliant invention" which settled one aspect of the argument. It *was* technically possible to build the more powerful weapon. Armed with this, proponents took their case to President Truman. Back from the White House came the word: Build it.

The United States can count itself fortunate that it then had a President who was willing and able to make hard decisions. For shortly after we had tested our first thermonuclear device, the Russians successfully tested theirs. Life for us in the 1950s might have been quite a different matter if the Soviet Union, and only the Soviet Union, had had the H-bomb in its armory.

A somewhat similar debate is under way in this country today. But this time the debate has to do with defense. Is it technically possible to develop and deploy an effective anti-ballistic missile system? If the answer is yes, should we get off the dime and start work on a "thin" ABM system, popularly known as Sentinel?

Opposition is mounting in Congress, especially on the part of self-appointed military experts on the Foreign Relations Committee. There is also opposition by some scientists and among some other people who, for various reasons, do not want Sentinel deployed in or near the cities in which they live.

The word from the White House is that the Sentinel system as envisioned in the Johnson administration is under review. It will not be surprising if some modifications are proposed. But there is strong indication that the final decision, expected around the middle of March, will be to push ahead with an ABM system.

It is important to keep in mind what could and what could not be expected from the deployment of a thin system. No one in the present state of the "art" thinks that a thin, or any other system, could provide meaningful protection for the United States in event of a massive first strike by the Soviet Union. Many millions of Americans would be killed and our major cities laid waste. Our shield against this threat has to be the maintenance of an assured capability to strike back on such a scale, after absorbing the initial blow, that the cost to the Russians of a surprise attack would be prohibitive. If this is not an especially reassuring prospect should a Soviet attack come, it is the best that can be offered as of today.

The pro-Sentinel people are confident, however, that a thin system could give very substantial protection in four and perhaps five other situations. They believe, for one thing, that it would provide an important safeguard against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is expected to be able to launch by 1975–77.

There has been considerable skepticism concerning any threat from Red China. What this comes down to is a suspicion that the real purpose in proceeding with Sentinel would be for the United States to have at least a start on deployment as a card to play in missile negotiations with the Kremlin, if and when that stage of nuclear arms limitation is reached. But such a purpose, if it exists, would not necessarily be without merit. Our intelligence people know that the Russians have started work on what is apparently a rather primitive ABM system of their own. And Defense Secretary Laird told the Foreign Relations Committee last week that the Soviet Union has begun testing a new and "sophisticated" ABM system. Common sense suggests, or so it seems to us, that the United States would be in a weaker position at the arms negotiating table if the Russians were going forward with a sophisticated ABM program while we were standing still.

The Communist Chinese threat, however, apparently is not something to be lightly brushed aside. Laird, originally one of the skeptics, now says that he has changed his mind, that on the basis of information which has come to him as Secretary of Defense he thinks Peking can have from 15 to 25 nuclear-tipped intercontinental missiles capable of hitting the United States by the mid-1970's. In his last report as Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford said: "We believe it is both prudent and feasible on our part to deploy the Sentinel ABM system designed to protect against this (the Chinese) threat." Without the Sentinel ABM system, he went on to say, "we might suffer as many as 23 million fatalities from an attack by a Chinese intercontinental ballistic missile force. With the Sentinel, we might be able to hold fatalities to 1 million or less." These informed opinions, coming from two secretaries of defense, impose a heavy burden of proof on those who scoff at the Chinese threat or who are simply against the deployment of Sentinel, period.

The Sentinel proponents also contend that the thin system would be effective protection in case of an accidental launch of a few missiles against the United States from any source, that for several years after its deployment it could cope with missiles fired against us from submarines, and that it could destroy a missile or missiles fired from an orbiting platform, if this weapon should be developed. The fifth possible benefit would be to provide some protection for our underground ICBMs in event of a Soviet attack, thereby enhancing our strike-back capability.

The Sentinel system, as planned, would consist of long-range Spartan missiles and short-range Sprints placed in some 15 to 20 antimissile complexes. The cost estimate is from $5 to $6 billion, and it might go as high as $10 billion. Congress has already invested about $4 billion in this project, and the request in the 1970 fiscal year defense budget is for $1.8 billion.

Some opponents say it would be better to spend new Sentinel money on rehabilitating slums instead of investing it in what they call an unreliable ABM system. Others profess to fear that for the United States to do what the Russians are doing in missile defense would serve only to escalate the arms race. Further opposition comes from local groups who, without any real basis in past experience, fear a missile complex explosion; still others who say that a site near the city in which they live would invite an enemy attack, and this despite the fact that our major cities in any event probably would be targets. Finally, there are some who simply don't want to give up the real estate (some 200 acres) that each missile complex would require.

Congressional opponents, especially in the Senate, are claiming that they have or will have the votes to block any further appropriation for Sentinel. Perhaps they have. It is always easy for a politician to stand on the side of the angels, to be for spending to aid the poor and against spending for defense, and to capitalize on the apprehensions of many people as they contemplate any enlargement, offensive or defensive, of our nuclear capability.

As a responsible President, however, Richard Nixon cannot indulge in politicking on this question. If he is persuaded, as we think he will be, that our national security requires him to give the go-ahead signal on the Sentinel program, he should grasp that painful nettle—just as Harry Truman did two decades ago. If the legislators want to block the program by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds, let them take the responsibility—and let them also be held accountable for the consequences of what could be a disastrous decision on their part.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 6, 1969]

CHIEF ABM TASK: TO SCORE BARGAINING POINT

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

One fervently hopes that President Nixon's forthcoming statement on plans for a defensive missile system will put an end to the controversy that has been raging over the problem for so many months. For this debate has produced some of the weirdest logic from eminent political and military sources heard in a long time.

No one can quarrel very much with the idea of spending a few billion dollars on a defensive missile system that might offer some degree of protection against a nuclear attack from Communist China over the next few years. But unfortunately there is a great deal more than this involved in the minds of many people when it comes to the deployment of the Sentinel ABM system in the United States.

In fact, the Chinese nuclear threat argument for Sentinel was something of an afterthought. The real impetus for building an ABM system was—and still is—the discovery that the Soviet Union had begun deploying missile defenses near Moscow.

So far as many supporters of the Sentinel system are concerned, its real importance lies in its relevance to the nuclear balance between the United States and Russia. And it is in this area of the debate that the logic of the argument becomes most confused.

Almost everyone starts from the premise that the existing nuclear stalemate between Russia and the United States should not be upset—or at least that it should not be upset in favor of the Soviet Union. There is fairly general agreement that the major deterrent to a nuclear war is the disagreeable fact that each country can destroy the other, regardless of which side strikes first.

The development of defensive missile systems obviously does have relevance to maintaining this balance.

If the Russians should succeed, for example, in building a defensive system they believed capable of protecting them effectively against a full-scale nuclear attack, there is no doubt that the danger of a nuclear war would be increased enormously. Even if they were mistaken about the effectiveness of their defenses, the risk of a confrontation would be very great.

The real question is, therefore, how to convince the Russians that they have not built and cannot build a defensive system, having such protective capability.

As Defense Secretary Robert McNamara argued at the outset, the way to do this—and the only way—is to maintain our offensive nuclear striking power at such a level that no defensive system would be credible. It was his belief—and also that of many military experts—that in nuclear war the offense always will have a decisive advantage over any defensive system that could be devised.

The worst possible way of convincing the Russians that their defenses will not protect them would be to set about building a mas-

XUM

sive system of our own. To have any credibility at all, competition with the Russians in such a "thick" defensive system would be virtually unlimited. The cost has been estimated at anywhere from $40 billion to $400 billion.

The real irony, however, is that the result of such a competition might also greatly increase the danger of nuclear war.

If both we and the Russians became convinced that we had effective nuclear defenses—that is to say, defenses that would reduce the devastation of a nuclear exchange to "acceptable" limits—much of the deterrent value of the present nuclear balance would be gone. In this situation, the danger of a confrontation again would be far greater than it is today.

In spite of these quite evident facts, there is still strong support for an all-out competition with the Russians in nuclear defenses, including most of the military brass and some powerful figures in Congress.

Fortunately, neither President Nixon nor Defense Secretary Melvin Laird seems to share their views. From the evidence so far, their major interest in the Sentinel project is largely in its value as a bargaining-point in negotiating an agreement with the Russians on limiting nuclear defenses, if not abandoning them entirely. It is likely that this hope will be reflected in what Nixon has to say on the matter next week.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 10, 1969]

Excellent ABM Advice

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, California's Representative Chet Holifield is in a much better position than most of us to appraise the merits of the proposed "thin" anti-ballistic missile system. But he is not yet ready to say, at least not publicly, whether he is for or against the project.

After listening to five hours of closed-door testimony given his committee last week, however, he did not hesitate to admonish his congressional colleagues against staking out premature positions on the issue. The sensible thing, he said, is for all members of Congress to wait until they can study the relevant information—highly technical information—before committing themselves one way or the other. This is very sound advice, especially so since the voting on whether to provide the needed additional funds is expected to be close.

Some members of Congress have been subjected to considerable pressure from constituents who have raised a variety of objections to the thin, or, as it is better known, the Sentinel ABM system. The complaint most often heard comes from people who do not want the necessary ABM missile complexes located near the communities in which they live. Some say the system will cost too much money. Others contend it cannot be effective in the present stage of development. And one senator has objected because the taking of land needed for a missile complex near a city in his state would interfere with plans for industrial development. The proponents, of course, strongly urge that deployment of Sentinel should begin without further delay, and, on the basis of the information available to us, we share this view.

It should never be forgotten that the decision on going forward with Sentinel or calling a halt is one that bears directly on the security of the United States. And this could be as important as the controversy over building the H-bomb some 20 years ago. Fortunately, despite the arguments of the opposition, President Truman gave the go-ahead signal then, and the Russians, who were hard at work, came in second in the race for that awesome weapon.

The Sentinel program is now under intensive review. President Nixon is expected to announce a decision in the immediate future. Pending this report, plus further congressional hearings, minds should be kept open, not closed.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 15–16, 1969]

Excellent ABM Compromise

President Richard M. Nixon again showed his uncanny knack for coming up with an acceptable compromise as he announced his decision to move ahead on a modified anti-ballistic missile defense system.

The new plan should gain Congressional approval in spite of opposition from the forces of Sen. Edward Kennedy and Sen. J. William Fulbright.

By revising the Lyndon Johnson system to move missile and radar sites away from cities and to concentrate ABM defenses around two Minutemen missile bases, the President removed much of the steam from his critics' arguments.

As in all compromises, something had to give. In this case it was the plan for a thin defense of cities. Moving the shorter-range Sprint missiles further from cities will leave the main job of defending city populations to the longer-range Spartan missiles. The power of Spartans should prove capable of throwing a defense screen that could give considerable protection over the entire nation.

Mr. Nixon indicated the main effort will be to protect our land-based missile deterrent, at least until further review.

The President explained it is imperative that work on a United States ABM begin now in order to deploy ABM launchers by 1973. To allow a further delay, would mean the nation would have no missile defense at that time, when Red China is expected to have an operational intercontinental ballistic missile system.

We know that the militant doves, particularly on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will scream and beat their breasts and will make all sorts of exaggerated emotional charges against the modified ABM plan.

But President Nixon can't indulge in these extravagances.

As Commander-in-Chief he must take into account all defense contingencies, not just those that Democratic liberals consider thinkable.

He cannot afford to guess that there will be no need for defensive missiles by 1973. If he guesses wrong, our nation could be mortally vulnerable to nuclear attack.

Nor can Mr. Nixon ignore the fact the Russians already have deployed their own ABM system around Moscow, are developing an orbiting nuclear weapon, and are continuing to deploy large missiles capable of destroying our hardened Minutemen missile force.

We are naked to such a first strike.

As the man most responsible for trying to gain a freeze on nuclear weapons, both offensive and defensive, President Nixon must take into account the best course of action to persuade the Soviets to agree on equitable nuclear arms limitations.

In our opinion he has chosen the best option. The Soviets are far more likely to negotiate when they know the United States is moving ahead on developing an ABM defense capability.

If President Nixon had acceded to the demands of foes opposing any ABM start, there would have been almost no chance Russians would ever accept arms reduction.

Mr. Nixon wisely has stipulated the plan will be reviewed annually from the point of view of technical developments, the threat of attack and the status of talks on arms limitations.

In sum, it was a wisely conceived compromise. It is one that will enhance the security of the nation and have an excellent chance of winning Congressional approval.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1969]

Nixon Puts Safety of United States First

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Nixon has boldly told the world and the peace-at-any-price people in this country he puts the safety of the United States first. At the same time he insisted this is a move for peace—for without our safety there will be no peace.

His decision to go ahead with the deployment of an ABM system, known as the Sentinel, with important changes, announced at yesterday's press conference, he described as a protection of our nuclear deterrent. As such it is designed to prevent, not encourage, war. It will help preserve the peace.

He admitted frankly that the ABM deployment faces a hard fight in Congress—particularly in the Senate. But he expects to win the fight after the issue has been thoroughly debated.

And so Nixon has come to grips firmly with his first major problem in foreign policy. In addition, he showed himself determined to deal equally firmly with the Vietnam war, now being escalated by the Communists of the North and the Viet Cong. Hanoi's front in the South. He told the press that his practice is not to repeat a warning. His warning delivered a week ago was he would take "appropriate" steps. What action he will take in response to the present Communist offensive he declined to reveal at this time, and if he retaliates he will do so without announcing his move in advance. He still believes the Paris talks will be effective and produce peace in the end.

He announced he proposed to deploy the Sentinel ABM not around our cities, as provided in the Lyndon Johnson proposal enacted by Congress last year, but in country areas; that it will be a "phased" system rather than a fixed one, subject to annual review, designed particularly as a defense against a possible Chinese Communist attack during the next ten years, but having its implications for the Russian Communists, too.

In a measure, Nixon has departed from precedent, for the history of the United States since World War I and the days of Woodrow Wilson has been a series of magnificent gestures for world peace. Wilson's League of Nations, though rejected, by a group of hard-nosed members of the Senate, was the first.

In every instance real peace has been blocked by Fascists, Communists, and whatever, down to the present day. This, however, has not prevented America's search for the most elusive bird in the world—the bird of peace.

President Harding, who followed Wilson in the White House, called the Washington Arms Conference, designed to put an end to wars through the limitation of naval armaments. The strong nations of the world were urged to limit or do away with those naval vessels used for offensive war.

No one who was present at the opening of the Washington Arms Conference will ever forget the moment when Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes announced the intention of the United States to do away with and to halt building the greatest and most powerful Navy the world had ever seen, as its earnest of peaceful intentions. It was indeed, a magnificent gesture—but doomed in the end to failure. Calvin Coolidge and his Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellog, did their best too for peaceful international agreements.

Although the German Kaiser passed out of the picture and a National Socialist republic was set up in Germany, the war hounds came to the front again when Adolph Hitler grasped power, overthrowing the government and setting the Germans on another effort to conquer the world. The great depression hit the world, including the United States, and we had other things to think of beside world peace.

We were rudely jolted, along with the rest of the world, when Hitler finally made his move and with air power, panzer divisions and submarines overran Belgium and France and struck terribly at Great Britain.

Franklin D. Roosevelt at Yalta made his plays for peace after war, conceding much to Stalin at that conference and to the Russians when he held back and permitted them to take Berlin.

Harry S. Truman hosted the United Nations conference in San Francisco where the charter was written which was to establish world peace. He later sponsored the Marshall plan under which we poured out billions of dollars to permit the warring nations, both friend and foe to rebuild. And to prevent a third world war Truman refused to let our air forces bomb the Chinese Communists and their supplies beyond the Yalu River in the Korean war.

Gen. Eisenhower was a persistent searcher for peace—and he kept it. He held back, however, from rooting out Castro in Cuba allowing the Communists a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. John F. Kennedy followed suit. Lyndon Johnson sought peace in Vietnam always, although building up our forces there, even to the extent of withdrawing from the presidential race in 1968.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 17, 1969]

Opposition to the ABM System Recalls Dispute Over H-Bomb

(By Joseph Alsop)

As everyone knows, President Nixon has decided on what may be called a timid development of anti-ballistic missiles. He had no alternative.

He would frankly have preferred to put off the whole problem for another year. Yet the scientists and other experts whom he trusts the most told him, quite plainly, that further delay might jeopardize the future defense of the United States. He was convinced, and being convinced, he did his duty as a President.

Thus we have an interesting first test (and it really has been the very first test) of the kind of President that Nixon is going to be. All those on both sides of the ABM controversy ought to be relieved that Nixon has passed the test, but this, of course, is a vain hope.

The controversy itself, meanwhile, has produced strong arguments, alas, for the strictest secrecy in all defense-scientific decisions of this character. To understand why, you need only look back in time, to the secrecy-muffled governmental debate about going forward with development of the H-bomb.

In that debate, the prime arguments against the H-bomb that were used by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer were precisely the arguments now being used by the ABM's scientist-opponents. Oppenheimer said: (A) That the H-bomb would not work; (B) that it would be inordinately expensive to develop; and (C) That development would only increase the instability of the world balance of power.

Robert Oppenheimer was then regarded as an infinitely greater authority than Dr. Edward Teller. As anyone can now see, he was nonetheless dead wrong on all three points. Later, he admitted as much.

This reporter was one of the tiny band who came whole-heartedly to Oppenheimer's defense when this republic dishonored itself by removing the greater scientist's security clearance. Later, during a visit to the Oppenheimers in Princeton, the opportunity arose to ask him why he had been so dead wrong, especially about the feasibility of the H-bomb.

"I guess I concluded it wouldn't work," said Oppenheimer wryly, "because I wanted it so much not to work."

Yet if that long-ago debate about the H-bomb had not been so secrecy-muffled, there is no doubt at all that Oppenheimer could have rallied to his cause a large majority of the scientific community, plus huge numbers of the same sorts of non-scientific people who are now aroused against the ABM. It is always easy to arouse wishful people to kick against the pricks of this dreadful new world, in which fate has condemned us all to live.

The suspicion cannot be banished that scientists' guilt and other quite extraneous considerations have again played a huge role in the present controversy, as happened with Oppenheimer and H-bomb. There is the case, for instance, of Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who is probably the leading organizer of scientific opposition to the ABM.

Senators and other scientific illiterates are heard on every side, solemnly quoting Dr. Wiesner on the utter impossibility of effective defense in the present high-technical age. Yet in the 1950s, Dr. Wiesner was a leader in the Lincoln project, which developed the theory and technology of the first U.S. air defense system.

At that time, the shoe was on just the other foot. Dr. Wiesner clamored for spending on air defense. The air staff, meanwhile, was bitterly opposed. In reality, this was because spending on a defensive system was expected to compete with spending on the Strategic Air Command; but the air staff instead said that defense was wholely impractical.

The chief of air staff, General Hoyt Vandenberg, even called this reporter to his office, to suggest that the proponents of the air defense system were "under Communist influence." And Dr. Oppenheimer's support for Dr. Wiesner, far more than his opposition to the H-bomb, was what earned him the bitter and unfairly damaging enmity of the Air Force leaders.

The evidence suggests, to put it bluntly, that Dr. Wiesner and most of the others like him are now saying one thing and really thinking, inwardly, about quite another thing, just as Oppenheimer did in the H-bomb argument. For there is a great deal of evidence in the past record to show that Dr. Wiesner is, above all, motivated by his unshakable conviction that agreement on arms limitation will be made much easier if the U.S. does not proceed with ABM deployment.

On this point, just about every experienced expert on Soviet affairs, in or out of government, quite flatly disagrees with Dr. Wiesner. Dr. Wiesner would have a right to be a mite huffy if Ambassadors Thompson or Bohlen tried to teach him physics. And it just could be that physicists are equally incompetent guides to the best way to negotiate with the Soviets.

OBSERVANCE OF FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the national youth organization, Future Homemakers of America, founded June 11, 1945, is an incorporated, nonprofit organization supported by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economic Association which will observe National FHA Week March 23–29, 1969.

During that week, more than 600,000 members in over 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico will carry out projects and activities to give exposure to what the youth of the country is doing in a positive way to promote the principles of good citizenship.

This year, the theme for the National Future Homemakers of America Week is "Focus on Positive Action."

This national organization of home economics students in junior and senior high school classes provides opportunities for developing individual and group initiative in planning and carrying out activities related to the home and community. Throughout the country, members contribute to the community by working as volunteers. They assist in local Headstart programs or with the mentally retarded and handicapped through county health and welfare departments. They organize reading classes and tutorial programs for migrant and underprivileged children. They visit and assist the elderly or work with other groups on community service projects such as anti-litter, March of Dimes, and UNICEF. They serve as hospital candy-stripers, hold career seminars, survey for job opportunities for youth, conduct sessions on preparation for marriage, hold morals and manners discussions, and carry out many other projects which give practical application to their classroom learning.

There are some 18,000 members of Future Homemakers of America located in 443 high school chapters in the State of Florida that I have the honor to represent in part. Miss Jody Niedenthal, a high school student, of Fort Lauderdale is president of the Florida State FHA Association and Miss Frances Champion of Tallahassee is the Florida State FHA adult adviser.

I am particularly pleased that another Floridian, Miss Deborah Williams, a senior at Okeechobee High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Haynes E. Williams of Okeechobee, who has held local chapter, district, and State offices in FHA, in addition to having been sophomore and junior class president along with many other high school honors, is also national vice president of projects of the Future Homemakers of America.

Mr. President, I commend this fine organization of youth of our country and wish for them not only great success during National FHA Week but in all their undertakings.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations at the desk, which were reported earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The bill clerk read the nomination of Allen L. Donielson, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice James P. Rielly, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Richard A. Dier, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years, vice Theodore L. Richling, resigned.

XUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Richard W. Velde, of Virginia, to be an Associate Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, for the past several years I have had the benefit of the advice and counsel of Richard W. Velde, Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. He has been my close and trusted aide.

I do not know of anyone more qualified for this position than Pete Velde. He was intimately involved in the deliberations and final passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. More than anyone else, he is aware of the intent of Congress in this legislation which he will now be charged with implementing. The bloc grant concept, which is at the foundation of this law, is one in which he believes firmly. In my judgment, the bloc grant approach is in keeping with our democratic traditions which places the responsibility for law enforcement at the State and local level.

As Associate Administrator, Pete Velde will have to deal with the problems of our entire criminal justice system, the police, courts, and corrections. In large measure, his work for us on all the major anticrime legislation has prepared him admirably for his duties. His background encompasses overall law enforcement, juvenile delinquency and corrections. For the rest, I can assure you that, as an intelligent and diligent worker, he will quickly acquire whatever specific law enforcement knowledge he may lack.

In my opinion, Pete Velde is an outstanding lawyer and an exemplary individual. I am genuinely sorry to have him leave my staff. But, I welcome his appointment and wish him well in fulfilling his important new duties.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to join Senator Hruska in urging the approval of the nomination of Richard W. Velde to be an Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

For the past 2½ years, Mr. Velde has been minority counsel to the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedure, of which I am a member. In my association with him in connection with the work of that subcommittee, I have found him to be an extremely able and diligent attorney, dedicated to the improvement of law enforcement. His experience in assisting with the many important crime proposals that have been processed by the subcommittee during his tenure on the staff has admirably prepared him, in my opinion, for the position for which he has been nominated. Particularly important in that regard is his experience with and knowledge of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 which established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Mr. Velde was a key staff member throughout the committee and Senate deliberations on that bill, and, as a consequence, I am confident that there are very few who are more familiar with the provisions and background of the act and the critical problems the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was created to help solve.

There can be little question that crime is one of the most critical domestic problems confronting us in the coming years and that improving law enforcement at all levels is a vital necessity if we are to make any permanent inroads on the volume of crime. We are fortunate, I believe, to have a man of Mr. Velde's experience and dedication to share the task of administering the new agency charged with the responsibility for channeling vast sums of money to the States and localities to enable them to make long overdue improvements in their law enforcement techniques and to further research in crime prevention and control.

I urge the Senate to approve the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the Senate have an order to adjourn until noon of Monday next at the conclusion of business today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is correct. There is an order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY M. JACQUES CHABAN-DELMAS, PRESIDENT (SPEAKER) OF THE FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the United States has a distinguished visitor in its midst at this time in the person of M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, who is the President—Speaker—of the French National Assembly, and a member of the Democratic Union for the Republic parliamentary group. He is also the mayor of Bordeaux, and has been since 1947.

M. Chaban-Delmas was born in Paris on March 7, 1915. He has a law degree and diploma of political sciences from the University of Paris.

He was an active leader of the Resistance during the occupation of France in World War II. He became a member of the military delegation of the Provisory Government of the French Republic in 1943, and a national delegate for the coordination of military operations on the French territory in 1944. He was made a brigadier general in June of 1944.

M. Chaban-Delmas was elected to the French National Assembly as Deputy of Gironde in 1946, and has always been reelected since that time. He has been President of the National Assembly since 1958.

M. Chaban-Delmas was a member of French governments, Minister of Public Works, Transport and Tourism from 1954 to 1955, as Minister of State from 1956 to 1957, and as Minister of Defense from 1957 to 1958.

He is chairman of the Economic and Social Development Committee for Aquitaine, a region in the southwest of France. He is a Commandeur of both the French Legion of Honor and the Legion of Merit of the United States.

M. Chaban-Delmas has been a guest at a luncheon given by the Committee on Foreign Relations. At the present time, he is in the office of the Vice President discussing matters of mutual interest with the President of the Senate.

In behalf of the Senate, I wish to say that it is a distinct pleasure to have had the opportunity to meet this outstanding statesman and parliamentarian, this outstanding leader, this man who has contributed so much to the welfare of his country, as well as to a better understanding between France and the United States.

S. 1623 AND S. 1624—INTRODUCTION OF TWO BILLS AIMED AT ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in my remarks on organized crime on March 11, I indicated my intention to introduce additional bills aimed at racketeering. Today, I have two bills which I send to the desk. The first of these measures, the Criminal Activities Profits Act, seeks to strengthen the defense of legitimate business against takeover by organized crime. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1623) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the second bill, the Wagering Tax Amendments of 1969, is a wagering tax bill which reinstitutes the tax and penalties imposed on gambling revenues. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and that, after the committee acts on it, it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1624) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; thereafter to be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, for some time, the matter of racketeer infiltration of legitimate business has been of very particular and very deep concern to me. We are all familiar with the nature of this problem. I need not reiterate everything that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), set forth last week on the subject, but I would like to focus on one very fundamental point he expressed which is quite relevant to the first bill I have proposed.

> Often the organization, using force and fear, will attempt to secure a monopoly in the service or product of a business. When the monopoly campaign is successful, the organization begins to extract a premium price from customers. Purchasing by infiltrated businesses are always made from specified allied firms. With its extensive infiltration of legitimate business, organized crime thus poses a new threat to the American economic system. The proper functioning of a free economy requires that economic decisions be made by persons free to exercise their own judgment. Force or fear limits choice, ultimately reduces quality, and increases prices. When organized crime moves into a business, it usually brings to that venture all the techniques of violence and intimidation which it used in its illegal businesses. Competitors can be effectively eliminated and customers can be effectively confined to sponsored suppliers. The result is more unwholesome than other monopolies because the newly dominated concern's position does not rest on economic superiority.

It is tragic for the public to permit racketeers to own and operate ostensibly legitimate businesses. The notion that individuals who are purveyors in murder and mayhem are at the same time dealing in lawful products and services for law abiding citizenry is inherently offensive. All the more so then, does racketeer infiltration of the legitimate business community become offensive when the broader aspects of the phenomenon are considered.

The power of organized crime to establish a monopoly within numerous business fields is, without a doubt, a grave threat to our entire economic system. It is as grave a threat as the conventional forms of business monopolies that have occupied the attention of our antitrust laws since the turn of the century because of the methods by which the monopoly power is acquired, exercised, and perpetuated. This power, moreover, is concentrated in the hands of predators more rapacious than any legendary robber-barons at whom the antitrust laws were originally aimed.

Not only will organized crime bring to a business venture all the techniques of violence and intimidation which it used in its illegal business, but it is also a foregone conclusion that those individuals who have made a career of cheating and stealing will continue to do so in their new roles. The consumer public will suffer from inflated prices, shoddy goods, and outright frauds.

And what of the honest businessman who is forced to compete with a racketeer dominated venture? Even if he is not intimidated or physically abused he cannot compete on an even basis when we recall the racketeers' penchant for underreporting income and evading taxes. Just this element of routine tax evasion gives the hoodlum businessman an enormous economic advantage over his law-abiding competitors. In short, this entire matter of racketeer infiltration of legitimate business inevitably creates unfair competition. It is a situation made to order for the application of the Federal antitrust powers that have been in existence for many years.

With this in mind, Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill entitled "The Criminal Activities Profits Act." This bill is aimed specifically at racketeer infiltration of legitimate business and it is premised principally upon our existing antitrust laws. In the 90th Congress I sponsored two bills, S. 2048 and S. 2049, which were essentially similar to the bill I introduce today. Identical bills were sponsored in the other body by the able Congressman from Virginia, RICHARD POFF. The bill is a synthesis of both of those bills, incorporating all of their features into a unified whole. It attacks the economic power of organized crime and its exercise of unfair competition with honest businessmen on two fronts—criminal and civil.

The criminal provisions of the bill prohibit the investment, in any business which is conducted in or which affects interstate commerce, of income which either has not been reported for Federal income tax purposes or has been derived from carrying on certain specified criminal activities. These activities are the type generally associated with organized crime like gambling, loan sharking, narcotics trafficking, and so forth.

In addition to this criminal prohibition, the bill also creates civil remedies for the honest businessman who has been damaged by unfair competition from the racketeer businessman. Despite the willingness of the courts to apply the Sherman Anti-Trust Act to organized crime activities, as a practical matter the legitimate businessman does not have adequate civil remedies available under that act. This bill fills that gap. Patterned closely after the Sherman Act, it provides for private treble damage suits, prospective injunctive relief, unlimited discovery procedures and all the other devices which bring to bear the full panoply of our antitrust machinery in aid of the businessman competing with organized crime.

Last year, Mr. President, the American Bar Association examined the two earlier bills, S. 2048 and S. 2049, and endorsed the principles and objectives of both. In order to avoid what was felt to be an undesirable commingling of criminal enforcement goals with the goal of regulating competition, however, the ABA stated a preference for placing the enforcement and discovery procedures in a separate statute rather than within the existing framework of the Sherman Act, as was the case with the earlier bills. As a result of the ABA recommendation, the single new bill has been drafted as an amendment to title 18 of the United States Code with self-contained enforcement and discovery procedures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the report of the antitrust section of the American Bar Association on S. 2048 and S. 2049.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in order to properly evaluate the need for this legislation, one must first put into perspective the size of the problem with which it deals. Based upon the estimates of experts, most notably the President's Crime Commission, the "take" or profit organized crime derives from its illegal activities seems to be considerably in excess of $10 billion a year. Not all of this finds its way into legitimate businesses, of course, but nevertheless the availability of such a staggering sum represents enormous danger to the American economy.

The Criminal Activities Profits Act, is a new approach to the war against organized crime. However, I am not wedded to any provisions of the bill. Standing alone, the criminal provisions may not be necessary. In fact, the criminal provisions are intended primarily as an adjunct to the civil provisions which I consider as the more important feature of the bill.

The principal utility of the Criminal Activities Profits Act may lie in the fact that it will inevitably promote the establishment of a Federal program against racketeer infiltration of legitimate business. There has never been a program, as such, aimed at the phenomenon itself. I believe such a program is needed, and I believe the provisions of this bill lay a good foundation for such an approach.

This bill provides new jurisdictional bases upon which a host of investigations may be undertaken that are not authorized under present law. For example, it is particularly difficult currently to find a basis for investigating the entire matter of cleansing racket money through numbered accounts in foreign banks. A new law such as this will be helpful, particularly because of its civil discovery procedures.

Despite the number of articles written on the subject, despite the hearings of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, despite other investigative efforts, we know very little about the infiltration of legitimate business. Both the Congress and the Department of Justice are hampered by this lack of knowledge. The Criminal Activities Profits Act can make a substantial contribution in this area.

I view the bill as a vehicle by which the Department of Justice can determine what businesses are involved, the amount of money controlled, the amount of profits earned, the amount of capital invested, the distribution of earnings, and all the other data necessary to enable the Government to assess the problem and draw plans to meet it.

Finally, I believe that the time has arrived for innovation in the organized crime fight. The bill is innovative in the sense that it vitalizes procedures which have been tried and proven in the antitrust field and applies them into the organized crime field where they have been seldom used before. Hopefully, experts on organized crime will be able to conceive of additional applications of the law. The potential is great. For these reasons, the bill is worthy of careful consideration.

The second bill that I have introduced today is entitled the "Wagering Tax Amendments of 1969." The same measure has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished Representative from Virginia, RICHARD POFF. Illegal gambling is organized crime's most lucrative source of income. Profit from this activity alone runs to $7 billion a year. A little more than a year ago the Federal antigambling program ran into a serious problem. In *Marchetti* v. *United States,* 350 U.S. 39 (1968) and *Grosso* v. *United States,* 390 U.S. 62, the Supreme Court overruled two of its own decisions, *United States* v. *Kahringer,* 345 U.S. 22 (1952) and *Lewis* v. *United States,* 348 U.S. 419 (1952), which had previously sustained the constitutionality of the wagering tax laws. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas pointed out last week:

> These two new decisions will result in the loss of 1,616 pending prosecutions, and unless Congress takes action to amend the laws, a question which must be considered in our coming hearings, it will result in the destruction of a law enforcement program that paid for itself, for since 1952 the wagering tax laws have yielded $117,406,000, but cost only $27,021,000 to administer.

The wagering tax amendments are aimed at precisely that problem. The bill revitalizes the wagering tax laws both as law enforcement measures and as revenue-producing measures for the U.S. Treasury. First enacted in 1950 as a result of the Kefauver hearings, the wagering taxes have always been considered primarily revenue measures. At the same time they have also been highly valuable as Federal law enforcement tools in the gambling field, particularly where the numbers racket is involved.

At present there are two separate wagering taxes on the books. The first is a registration or occupation tax of $50 imposed annually on persons who accept wagers. The second is an excise tax of 10 percent imposed on gross wagers accepted. Compliance was enforced through the general criminal sanctions of the Revenue Code: Section 7201 imposing up to 5 years in prison for willful evasion of taxes; section 7203 imposing 1 year for willful failure to file return; and through a special provision, section 7262, making it a misdemeanor to fail to file returns where a duty to file existed.

The late Robert Kennedy estimated that fully 60 percent of the racketeer convictions obtained during his tenure as Attorney General resulted from investigations conducted by the Internal Revenue Service. Most of these were wagering tax violations. The effect of the Supreme Court decisions has been the sharp curtailment of the jurisdiction of the Revenue Service in the organized crime drive. The loss of this highly skilled agent manpower from that drive has been considerable.

The elimination of effective wagering tax laws has robbed the Federal Government of its own few weapons against the numbers racket. It is generally agreed that at least half of organized crime's profit from illegal gambling, about $3.5 billion a year, comes from numbers operations, which I use, incidentally, as a generic term embracing all lottery schemes irrespective of their specific form.

Almost all of this money is being taken out of the hands of those who can least afford it—the urban poor who are the principal customers and victims of numbers operations. It is an anomaly that at just the time in history when the most concern is being voiced about the plight of the urban poor, suddenly we are without the means at the Federal level to cope with one of the activities that can only increase their poverty.

When the Supreme Court rendered the Marchetti and Grosso decisions, it did not strike down the taxes themselves, but it did debilitate their enforcement. The law did not restrict the use the Federal Government or any State government could make of the information required to be filed. Because the gambler could well be in violation of State or other Federal laws, the Court found the registration requirement to be in violation of the fifth amendment right against self-incrimination. The effect of the decisions has been to bar prosecutions for failing to register and pay taxes.

The Court indicated, however, that a carefully drawn restriction on the use to which the compelled information may be put would satisfy the fifth amendment. Such a use restriction is at the heart of the bill I have introduced, and it is my belief that it meets all the requirements laid down by the Court.

If Congress does not act favorably upon this bill, the result will be that persons whose activities are illegal have immunity from taxes while those whose activities are legal do not. That is an impossible result.

The bill provides for a 10-percent excise tax on gross wagers accepted. This is similar to the present tax. In addition, it increases the annual registration tax—wagering occupational tax—from $50 to $1,000 for principals of gambling operations and those who actually accept wagers, and it creates a new $100 tax liability for certain other employees of such operations who have been exempt. The President's Crime Commission estimated that as much as $50 billion a year is wagered illegally in the United States. Assuming the accuracy of that figure, the potential in revenue recovery to the Government is in the neighborhood of $5 billion a year. It would be naive to expect that the actual revenue will be anywhere near that sum, of course, but if only a tenth were recovered in taxes, this would amount to one-half billion a year.

The wagering tax will have several results. It is almost a certainty that many gamblers will simply go out of business because the price for them will be too steep. That is all to the good. Others will continue in business but without complying with the law at all. Many of them will be prosecuted for the failure to comply. That is also to the good. Others will continue in business but will only partially comply with the law—they will cheat on their return and evade part of their taxes. From them the Government will obtain revenue and that, too, is all to the good.

The Criminal Activities Profits Act and the Wagering Tax Amendments of 1969 are two additional weapons to be added to the arsenal needed to fight organized crime. It is my hope they can be carefully considered in hearings, and that legislation can be reported to the Senate floor for favorable action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the bills be set forth at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this week there were hearings before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, chaired by the senior Senator from Arkansas, at which the Attorney General was present, and he testified during the course of those hearings.

At that time this Senator indicated his intention to introduce those bills on today and requested of the chairman that, promptly upon reference of these bills to the committee, they would be transmitted to the Attorney General for his consideration, analysis, and comment.

It is my hope that, in due time, there will be consideration of the proposition embodied and incorporated in these bills, and that there will be incorporated these provisions, or so many parts and portions thereof as will be thought beneficial and helpful, as amendments to the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas on March 11, which is remarkably adapted and intended to deal with other aspects of this particular field of criminal activity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT OF ANTITRUST SECTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

REPORT ON S. 2048 AND S. 2049

S. 2048 and S. 2049 are bills designed to combat and penalize organized crime, particularly in its attempt to infiltrate and take over legitimate businesses by means of money illegally obtained.

Provisions of bills

Both bills utilize the machinery of the antitrust laws to accomplish the desired end. S. 2048 is framed as an amendment to the Sherman Act and would replace § 8 of that Act. S. 2049 is drafted as an independent piece of legislation, but includes in its provisions the discovery and enforcement procedures of the antitrust laws.

S. 2048 amends the Sherman Act to make it a violation of the antitrust laws to invest intentionally unreported income in any business enterprise.

In essence, S. 2049 makes it a criminal offense to apply the income received from enumerated criminal activities to any business enterprise.

To aid in enforcement, S. 2049 authorizes the issuance of injunctions at the request of either the government or a private party. Persons injured due to the application of income derived criminally in legitimate businesses may bring treble damage actions, and a criminal judgment would be *prima facie* evidence in any treble damage action.

S. 2049 also authorizes nationwide service of process and grants immunity from prosecution to witnesses testifying in proceedings instituted by the United States under this statute.

Need for legislation

The evidence is clear that organized crime, which takes billions of dollars—mostly in cash and mostly untaxed—annually from the American public, has broadened its operations by infiltrating and taking over legitimate businesses. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement concluded, "The cumulative effect of the infiltration of legitimate business in America cannot be measured. Law enforcement officials agree that entry into legitimate business [by organized crime] is continually increasing and that it has not decreased organized crime's control over gambling, usury and other profitable, low-risk criminal enterprises." The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p. 190 (1967).

Organized crime, therefore, is a major threat to the proper functioning of the American economic system, which is grounded in freedom of decision. When organized crime moves into a business, it customarily brings all the techniques of violence and intimidation which it used in its illegal businesses. The effect of competitive or monopoly power attained this way is even more unwholesome than other monopolies because its position does not rest on economic superiority.

The magnitude of the problem makes it clear that all legitimate methods of combating organized crime must be utilized. According to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, "law enforcement's way of fighting organized crime has been primitive compared to organized crime's way of operating. Law enforcement must use methods at least as efficient as organized crime's." The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p. 200 (1967).

Application of antitrust principles to organized crime

The time tested machinery of the antitrust laws contains several useful and workable features which are appropriate for use against organized crime.

Thus, in addition to making combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade, as well as monopolizations and attempts to monopolize, illegal and punishable by criminal penalties. 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2, the antitrust laws provide for civil enforcement. Private parties injured by conduct violative of antitrust laws may bring actions to recover treble their losses plus their attorney's fees. 15 U.S.C. § 15.

In a private damage suit, the fact of a prior government judgment involving the same conduct may be used as *prima facie* evidence that the antitrust laws have been violated. 15 U.S.C. § 16.

Witnesses testifying before a grand jury about antitrust violations are given immunity from prosecution for offenses discussed in his testimony. 15 U.S.C. § 32.

The antitrust laws also provide for discovery of facts by means of the grand jury process in a criminal investigation and by means of a civil investigative demand by the Justice Department in civil actions. 15 U.S.C. § 1312.

Some of the conduct of organized crime in legitimate businesses can be, and has been, reached by the existing antitrust laws. Thus, for example, in *United States* v. *Bitz,* 282 F. 2d 465 (2d Cir. 1960), the Court of Appeals sustained an indictment under § 1 of the Sherman Act. In this case, the antitrust laws were used to combat activities of racketeers who were engaged in an unlawful combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade in the wholesale distribution and sale of newspapers and magazines in the metropolitan New York area. The conspiracy operated by means of strikes and strike threats to coerce distributors to pay the conspirators sums of money. Those who refused had their shipments of newspapers and magazines interfered with. Convictions were subsequently obtained and the defendants sentenced to jail terms. See also, e.g. *United States* v. *Pennsylvania Refuse Removal Association,* 357 F. 2d 806 (3d Cir.), *cert. denied,* 384 U.S. 961 (1966) (Criminal convictions of conspiracy to restrain trade in refuse removal by means of the coercion of non-conspirators affirmed); *Los Angeles Meat and Provision Drivers Union* v. *United States,* 371 U.S. 94 (1962) (Antitrust laws used in a civil proceeding to attack and enjoin a conspiracy in the sale of yellow grease which was enforced in a coercive manner).

Other activities of organized crime in legitimate business may or may not be subject to the antitrust laws. Thus, some extortion tactics and business take-overs by organized crime might not be reached under the antitrust laws, particularly if they affected only the victimized business rather than resulted in a lessening of competition in an entire line of commerce.

Still other activities of organized crime in connection with legitimate businesses are clearly not subject to the existing antitrust laws. These include such techniques as the loan of money on condition that a racketeer be appointed to the recipient's board of directors, or an investment of concealed profits acquired from illegal activity.

As described above, S. 2048 and S. 2049 extend the use of the antitrust machinery as a weapon against organized crime.

The Antitrust Section agrees that organized crime must be stopped. It further agrees that the antitrust machinery possesses certain advantages worthy of utilizaiton in this fight. It therefore supports and endorses the principles and objectives of both S. 2048 and S. 2049, and similar legislation.

However, it prefers the approach of S. 2049. By placing the antitrust-type enforcement and discovery procedures in a separate statute, a commingling of criminal enforcement goals with the goals of regulating competition is avoided.

S. 2048, on the other hand, by inserting in the Sherman Act a provision which does not have as its primary objective the establishment or maintenance of free competition, may result in an undesirable blending of otherwise laudatory statutory objectives. Criminal conduct which violates existing antitrust laws can be proceeded against under those laws. Additional conduct sought to be reached should be attacked under separate legislation.

Moreover, the use of antitrust laws themselves as a vehicle for combating organized crime could create inappropriate and unnecessary obstacles in the way of persons injured by organized crime who might seek treble damage recovery. Such a private litigant would have to contend with a body of precedent—appropriate in a purely antitrust context—setting strict requirements on questions such as "standing to sue" and "proximate cause."

Conversely, the placing of this legislation in the body of the antitrust laws could have an undesirable and inappropriate impact on the administration of the antitrust laws in their normal context. Thus, faced with litigation between private citizens and members of the organized criminal hierarchy, there may well be a natural inclination to weight the balance heavily in favor of the private citizen. Such an imbalance, while defensible in this context, is inappropriate in the normal antitrust litigation context.

For the foregoing reasons, the Section of Antitrust Law recommends that the House of Delegates adopt the attached resolution endorsing the principles and objectives of S. 2048 and S. 2049, and all similar legislation having the purposes of adapting the machinery of the antitrust laws to the prosecution of organized crime, but recommending that any such legislation be enacted as an independent statute and not be included in the Sherman Act, or any other antitrust law.

EXHIBIT 2

S. 1623

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Criminal Activities Profits Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "criminal activity" means (A) any act involving murder, kidnaping, extortion, bankruptcy fraud, or the manufacture, importation, receiving, concealment, buying, or otherwise dealing in narcotic drugs or marihuana which is punishable under any statute of the United States; (B) any act which is punishable under any of the following provisions of title 18, United States Code: section 201 (relating to bribery), section 224 (relating to sports bribery), sections 891–894 (relating to extortionate credit transactions), sections 471, 472, and 473 (relating to counterfeiting), section 1084 (relating to the transmission of gambling information), section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice), section 1952 (relating to racketeering), section 1954 (relating to welfare fund bribery), and chapter 117 (relating to white slave traffic); and (C) any conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

(2) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce within the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or between any place in a State and any place in another State, or between places in the same State through another State.

(3) The term "foreign commerce" means commerce between any State and any foreign country.

(4) The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and American Samoa.

(5) The term "person" means any individual, and any partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity.

(6) The term "income" means any income which is required by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to be reported as such for purposes of income taxation.

(7) The term "intentionally unreported income" means any income of any person which is subject to income taxation under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, but which with intent to evade the requirements of such code is not reported by such person as income within the time prescribed by such code.

PROHIBITION

SEC. 2. (a) Whoever, being a person who has received any income derived directly or indirectly from any criminal activity in which such person has participated as a principal within the meaning of section 2, title 18, United States Code, applies any part of such income or the proceeds of any such income to the acquisition by or on behalf of such person of legal title to or any beneficial interest in any of the assets, liabilities, or capital of any business enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce shall be guilty of a felony and shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being a director, officer, or agent of a corporation who has authorized, ordered, or performed any act which constitutes in whole or in part a violation of subsection (a) by such corporation, shall be guilty of misdemeanor and shall be fined not

XUM

more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(c) Whoever (1) invests directly or indirectly any intentionally unreported income derived by such person from a proprietary interest in any business enterprise in any pecuniary interest in any other business enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, or (2) uses any such income to establish or operate any such other business enterprise, shall be fined not more than 10,000, or imprisoned for not more than ten years or both.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 2.

(b) Under the direction of the Attorney General, it shall be the duty of United States attorneys, in their respective districts, to institute proceedings to prevent and restrain such violations. In any action by the United States under this section, the court shall proceed as soon as may be to the hearing and determination thereof. Pending final determination thereof, the court may at any time enter such temporary restraining order or prohibition as it shall deem proper.

(c) Any person (other than the United States) may institute action under this section, in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, to prevent and restrain threatened loss or damage to such person from a violation of section 2. In any such action, relief shall be granted in conformity with the principles which govern the granting of injunctive relief from threatened loss or damage in other cases. Upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing of immediate danger of irreparable loss or damage, a preliminary injunction may be issued in any such action before a determination thereof upon its merits.

ACTIONS FOR DAMAGES

SEC. 4. (a) Any person who is injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of section 2 may institute a civil action in a district court of the United States, without regard to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages sustained by him, and the cost of the action, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

(b) Whenever the United States is injured in its business or property by reason of any violation of section 2, it may institute a civil action in a district court of the United States, without regard to the amount in controversy, and shall recover the actual amount of the damages sustained, and the cost of the action.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by section 5, any action under this section shall be barred unless it is commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued.

EFFECT OF JUDGMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) A final judgment or decree entered in any civil or criminal proceeding instituted by the United States under this Act to the effect that a defendant has violated section 2 of this Act shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant, in any action brought by any other party against such defendant under this Act, as to all matters with respect to which such judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto. This subsection shall not apply to any consent judgment or decree entered before any testimony has been taken, or to any judgment or decree entered in an action under section 4(b).

(b) Whenever any civil or criminal action (other than an action under section 4(b)) is instituted by the United States to prevent, restraint, or punish any violation of section 2, the running of the period of limitations prescribed by section 4(c) with respect to any private right of action arising under this Act which is based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in such action by the United States shall be suspended during the pendency of such action by the United States and for one year thereafter. Whenever the running of such period of limitations is so suspended with respect to any right of action arising under section 4(a), action thereon shall be barred unless it is commenced within such period of suspension or within four years after the accrual of the cause of action.

VENUE AND PROCESS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, any civil or criminal action or proceeding under this Act against any person may be instituted in the district court of the United States for any district in which such person resides, is found, or has an agent, and any such action or proceeding against a corporation also may be instituted in such court for any district in which such corporation transacts business.

(b) In any action under section 3(b) of this Act in any district court of the United States in which it is shown that the ends of justice require that other parties residing in any other district be brought before the court, the court may cause such parties to be summoned, and process for that purpose may be served in any judicial district of the United States by the marshal thereof.

(c) In any civil or criminal action or proceeding instituted by the United States under this Act in the district court of the United States for any judicial district, subpenas issued by such court to compel the attendance of witnesses may be served in any other judicial district, except that in any civil action or proceeding no such subpena shall be issued for service upon any individual who resides in another district at a place more than one hundred miles from the place at which such court is held without approval given by a judge of such court upon a showing of good cause.

(d) Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, all process in any action or proceeding under this Act against a corporation may be served in any judicial district in which such corporation is an inhabitant or is found.

EXPEDITION OF ACTIONS

SEC. 7. In any civil action instituted by the United States in any district court of the United States under this Act, the Attorney General may file with the clerk of such court a certificate stating that in his opinion the case is of general public importance. A copy of that certificate shall be furnished immediately by such clerk to the chief judge (or in his absence to the presiding circuit judge) of the circuit in which such action is pending. Upon receipt of such copy, such judge shall designate immediately three judges of that circuit (of whom at least one shall be a circuit judge) to hear and determine such action. The judges so designated shall assign such action for hearing at the earliest practicable date, participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and cause such action to be expedited in every way.

EVIDENCE

SEC. 8. (a) In the taking of depositions for use in any civil action instituted by the United States under this Act, and in the hearings before any examiner or special master appointed to take testimony therein, the proceedings shall be open to the public as freely as are trials in open court, and no order excluding the public from attendance at any such proceeding shall be made or enforced.

(b) No individual who gives testimony under oath, or produces documentary evidence under oath, in obedience to a subpena issued in any action or proceeding instituted by the United States under this Act may be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he testifies, or produces documentary or other evidence, in such action, except that no such individual shall be exempt from prosecution or punishment for perjury committed while so testifying.

APPEALS

SEC. 9. In every civil action instituted by the United States in any district court of the United States under this Act, an appeal from the final judgment of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court.

S. 1624

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Wagering Tax Amendments of 1969."

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO INSURE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND FACILITATE COLLECTION.

(a) AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 35.—Chapter 35 (relating to taxes on wagering) is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER A—TAX ON WAGERS

"Sec. 4401. Imposition of tax.
"Sec. 4402. Cross references.

"SEC. 4401. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"(a) WAGERS.—There shall be imposed on wagers, as defined in section 4421, an excise tax equal to 10 percent of the amount thereof.

"(b) AMOUNT OF WAGER.—In determining the amount of any wager for the purposes of this subchapter, all charges incident to the placing of such wager shall be included; except that if the taxpayer establishes, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, that an amount equal to the tax imposed by this subchapter has been collected as a separate charge from the person placing such wager, the amount so collected shall be excluded.

"(c) PERSONS LIABLE FOR TAX.—The following persons shall be liable for the excise tax imposed by this subchapter:

"(1) PRINCIPALS AND PUNCHBOARD OPERATORS.—Each person who is a principal or a punchboard operator, as defined in section 4421, shall be liable for and shall pay the tax under this subchapter on all wagers placed with him or in a pool or lottery conducted by him.

"(2) AGENTS.—Each person who is an agent, as defined in section 4421, and who fails to register under section 4412 shall be liable for and shall pay the tax imposed by this subchapter on all such wagers received by him.

"SEC. 4402. CROSS REFERENCES.

"For penalties and other administrative provisions applicable to this subchapter, see sections 4421 to 4424, inclusive; and subtitle F.

"SUBCHAPTER B—OCCUPATIONAL TAX

"Sec. 4411. Imposition of tax.
"Sec. 4412. Registration.
"Sec. 4413. Certain provisions made applicable.
"Sec. 4414. Cross references.

"Sec. 4411. Imposition of Tax.

"(a) Persons Liable for Tax.—There is hereby imposed—

"(1) Principals and agents.—A special tax of $1,000 per year to be paid by each person who is a principal or an agent.

"(2) Pickup men, employees, and punchboard operators.—A special tax of $100 per year to be paid by each person who is a pickup man, an employee, or a punchboard operator.

"(b) Rate of Tax.—Whenever a person is liable for the special tax under more than one of the rates applicable under subsection (a), such person shall be liable for only one such tax payable at the highest applicable rate.

"Sec. 4412. Registration.

"(a) Registration Requirements.—Each principal, agent, pickup man, employee, and punchboard operator shall register with the official in charge of the internal revenue district in which such person is principally engaged in the activity which makes him liable for tax under this chapter. The form of the registration and the information to be provided by such person shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate in such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) Firm or Company.—Where subsection (a) requires the name and place of residence of a firm or company to be registered, the names and places of residence of the several persons constituting the firm or company shall be registered.

"(c) Supplemental Information.—In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, he or his delegate may require from time to time such supplemental information from any person required to register under this section as may be needed for the enforcement of this chapter.

"Sec. 4413. Certain Provisions Made Applicable.

"Sections 4901, 4902, 4904, 4905, and 4906 shall extend to and apply to the special tax imposed by this subchapter and to the persons upon whom it is imposed, and for that purpose any activity which makes a person liable for special tax under this subchapter shall be considered to be a business or occupation referred to in such sections. No other provision of sections 4901 to 4907, inclusive, shall so extend or apply.

"Sec. 4414. Cross References.

"For penalties and other administrative provisions applicable to this subchapter, see sections 4421 to 4424, inclusive; and subtitle F.

"SUBCHAPTER C—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 4421. Definitions.
"Sec. 4422. Applicability of Federal State laws.
"Sec. 4423. Disclosure of wagering tax information.
"Sec. 4424. Territorial extent.

"Sec. 4421. Definitions.

"(a) Wager.—For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) In General.—The term 'wager' means—

"(A) any wager with respect to a sports event or a contest placed with a person engaged in the business of accepting such wagers,

"(B) any wager placed in a wagering pool with respect to a sports event or a contest, if such pool is conducted for profit, and

"(C) any wager placed in a lottery conducted for profit.

"(2) Exceptions.—The term 'wager' does not include—

"(A) any wager placed with, or any wager placed in a wagering pool conducted by, a parimutuel wagering enterprise licensed under State law,

"(B) any wager placed in a coin-operated device with respect to which an occupational tax is imposed by section 4461, or any amount paid in lieu of inserting a coin, token, or similar object, to operate a device described in section 4462(a)(2), if an occupational tax is imposed with respect to such device by section 4461, or

"(C) any wager placed in a sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery—

"(i) which is conducted by an agency of a State acting under authority of State law, and

"(ii) the ultimate winners in which are determined by the results of a horserace, but only if such wager is placed with the State agency conducting such sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery, or with its authorized employees or agents.

"(b) Lottery.—For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) In general.—The term 'lottery' means the numbers game, policy, and similar types of wagering.

"(2) Exceptions.—The term 'lottery' does not include—

"(A) any game of a type in which usually—

"(i) the wagers are placed

"(ii) the winners are determined, and

"(iii) the distribution of prizes or other property is made, in the presence of all persons placing wagers in such game; and

"(B) any drawing conducted by an organization exempt from tax under sections 501 and 521, if no part of the net proceeds derived from such drawing inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(c) Principal.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'principal' means any person (other than a punchboard operator) who is engaged in the business of accepting wagers or who conducts any wagering pool or lottery.

"(d) Agent.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'agent' means any person who is engaged in receiving wagers for or on behalf of a principal.

"(e) Pickup Man.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'pickup man' means any person who knowingly is engaged in transmitting in any manner wagers, or information, records, or payments relating to wagers, between any principal, agent, pickup man, employee, or combination thereof.

"(f) Employee.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employee' means any person (other than an agent or pickup man) who knowingly is employed to assist in any capacity in an activity which makes another person liable for special tax as a principal, agent, or pickup man.

"(g) Punchboard Operator.—The term 'punchboard operator' means any person who accepts wagers only in the form of chances on a punchboard, 'five card draw game,' or similar gaming device for profit, either on his own behalf or on behalf of another person.

"Sec. 4422. Applicability of Federal and State Laws.

"The payment of any tax imposed by this chapter with respect to any activity shall not exempt any person from any penalty provided by a law of the United States or of any State for engaging in the same activity, nor shall the payment of any such tax prohibit any State from placing a tax on the same activity for State or other purposes.

"Sec. 4423. Disclosure of Wagering Tax Information.

"(a) General Rule.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, neither the Secretary nor any other officer or employee of the Treasury Department may divulge or make known in any manner whatever to any person—

"(1) any original, copy, or abstract of any return, payment, or registration made pursuant to this chapter,

"(2) any record required for making any such return, payment, or registration, which the Secretary or his delegate is permitted by the taxpayer to examine or which is produced pursuant to section 7602, or

"(3) any information derived, directly or indirectly, from any such return, payment, registration, or record.

"(b) Permissible Disclosure.—A disclosure otherwise prohibited by subsection (a) may be made in connection with the administration or civil or criminal enforcement of any tax imposed by this title. However, any document or information so disclosed may not be—

"(1) divulged or made known in any manner whatever by any officer or employee of the United States to any person except in connection with the administration or civil or criminal enforcement of this title, nor

"(2) used, directly or indirectly, in any criminal prosecution for any offense occurring prior to the effective date of this Act.

"(c) Use of Documents Possessed by Taxpayer.—Except in connection with the administration or civil or criminal enforcement of any tax imposed by this title—

"(1) any stamp denoting payment of the special tax under this chapter,

"(2) any original, copy, or abstract possessed by a taxpayer of any return, payment, or registration made by such taxpayer pursuant to this chapter, and

"(3) any information derived, directly or indirectly, from any such document,

shall not be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose against such taxpayer in any action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding.

"(d) Inspection by Committees of Congress.—Section 6103(d) shall apply with respect to any return, payment, or registration made pursuant to this chapter.

"Sec. 4424. Territorial Extent.

"The taxes imposed by this chapter shall apply only to wagers accepted in the United States, or wagers placed by a person who is in the United States—

"(a) with a person who is a citizen or resident of the United States, or

"(b) in a wagering pool or lottery conducted by a person who is a citizen or resident of the United States."

(b) Repeal of Public Disclosure Requirement.—Section 6107 (relating to list of special taxpayers for public inspection) is hereby repealed.

(c) Repeal of Posting Requirement.—Section 6806 (relating to posting occupational tax stamps) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6806. Posting Occupational Tax Stamp.

"Every person engaged in any business, avocation, or employment, who is thereby made liable to a special tax (other than the tax imposed under subchapter B of chapter 35 or under subchapter B of chapter 36), shall place and keep conspicuously in his establishment or place of business all stamps denoting payment of such special tax."

(d) Clerical Amendments.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 61 (relating to miscellaneous provisions) is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 6107. List of special taxpayers for public inspection."

(2) Section 6110 (relating to cross references) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) For prohibition on disclosure of wagering tax information, see section 4423."

Sec. 3. Criminal Penalties.

(a) Unauthorized Disclosure by Government Officials.—Section 7213 (relating to unauthorized disclosure of information) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Wagering Tax Returns.—Any officer or employee of the United States who violates section 4423 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more

XUM

than 1 year, or both, together with the cost of prosecution; and the offender shall be dismissed from office or discharged from employment."

(b) ELIMINATION OF MANDATORY MINIMUM FINE.—Section 7262 (relating to violation of occupational tax laws relating to wagering—failure to pay special tax) is amended by striking out "be fined not less than $1,000 and not more than $5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 months, or both, together with costs of prosecution."

(c) FAILURE TO POST TAX STAMPS.—Section 7273 (relating to penalties for offenses relating to special taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7273. PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES RELATING TO SPECIAL TAXES.

"Any person who shall fail to place and keep stamps denoting the payment of the special tax as provided in section 6806 shall be liable to a penalty (not less than $10) equal to the special tax for which his business rendered him liable, unless such failure is shown to be due to reasonable cause. If such failure to comply with section 6806 is through willful neglect or refusal, then the penalty shall be double the amount above prescribed."

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5692 (relating to penalties relating to posting of special tax) is amended by striking out "section 7273(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7273."

(2) Section 7609(a) (relating to inspection of books, papers, records, and other data) is amended by striking out paragraph (5) and redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

SEC. 4. IMMUNITY FOR WITNESSES IN TAX MATTERS.

(a) GRANTS OF IMMUNITY.—Chapter 75 (relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER E—IMMUNITY

"SEC. 7351. IMMUNITY FOR WITNESSES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Whenever in the judgment of a United States Attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States relating to the administration or civil or criminal enforcement of any tax imposed by chapter 35 of this title, is necessary to the public interest, the United States Attorney, upon the approval of the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any criminal penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled nor evidence so produced be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecutions described in subsection (b)) against him in any court.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—No witness shall be exempt under the provision of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 75 (relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subchapter E. Immunity."

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Monday, March 17, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) addressed the 50th anniversary convention of the Associated General Contractors of America here in Washington, D.C.

His message outlines the serious problems confronting our national defense. As a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as chairman of the Military Construction Authorization Subcommittee, there are few men more qualified to speak on the subject than Senator JACKSON.

I commend the address to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE MYTHS THAT BESET US

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

It is a pleasure and an honor to have this opportunity to talk with you.

The longer I work at the problems of national security, the more I come to share Josh Billings' view: "It isn't ignorance that causes so much trouble; it's what people know that isn't so."

For it is harder to deal with *error* than with *ignorance*. Error, after all, is a child of our own minds and we love it as our very own.

We live in a restless and risky world, where a fresh crisis arrives as regularly as the morning paper. Faced with complex issues and understandably hoping for simple answers, it is not surprising that convenient but false myths work their way into some people's thinking.

If the American people are to come to grips with the real dangers and the real problems, some prevalent myths need to be dispelled.

I

Myth Number One is that the Soviets are on a fixed course toward more peaceful and moderate policies, and are ready to leave their neighbors alone.

A Czech citizen might be permitted some doubts. Or a Yugoslav.

I believe that the truth is exactly contrary to this reassuring notion. I do not know how to assess the Soviet adversary except as a dangerous, opportunistic, unpredictable opponent—with a military capability whose reach is expanding.

In military terms, the Soviet thrust into Czechoslovakia proved what they can do. It was a vivid demonstration of Soviet capability for rapid, selective mobilization, for efficient movement of large combat and support forces over extensive distances, and for the establishment and testing of effective lines of communication in support of military operations far from the Russian homeland. The Soviet capability that was exercised so impressively in Czechoslovakia is available for employment on other tasks.

Moreover, the Soviets are moving fast toward parity with us in terms of nuclear missiles. By the end of this year Moscow will have deployed as many—or more—land-based ICBM's than we will have, and with a substantially greater megatonnage. The Soviets are deploying the Fractional Orbital Bombardment System (FOBS)—which is a first-strike oriented weapons system. The Soviets are producing Polaris-type nuclear submarines on a series, assembly-line basis, each with 16 ballistic missiles. Meanwhile, we are witnessing a far-ranging expansion of other Soviet naval activity, and the Soviet Navy is quite evidently in the Mediterranean to stay.

Even when it has been in a state of admitted strategic inferiority to U.S. power, the Soviet Union has periodically pressed forward policies designed to advance its political interests and to undermine the security of the West. This restless ambition has been illustrated in the recurrent campaigns of harassment and restrictions in Berlin and the Cuban missile adventure, and in the strong backing given to the militant Arab forces in the very serious Middle East crisis of June 1967.

In each of these probings the strategic inferiority of Soviet power has set definite limits to the extent of the risks that the Politburo was willing to run. But once the Kremlin is confident of possessing an equality or a preponderance of overall nuclear capability, I believe it will be tempted to accept a far wider range of risks to pursue its purposes, especially in areas like central Europe, where it has a local superiority of conventional forces.

However sanguine anyone may have been about Soviet policy, the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia should have been a sobering experience. In its aftermath, the Politburo invented the ominous *Brezhnev doctrine* of limited sovereignty for communist-run countries.

The leopard does not change his spots. The occupation of Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev doctrine are vintage Russian imperialism.

Some people have seen the point. President Tito, who for twenty years has fought Soviet attempts to control his party and country, warned that if the Soviets invaded Yugoslavia they would be mired in a long and bitter guerrilla war. Tito denounced the Brezhnev doctrine as either a "diktat" or an "unprincipled compromise" which attempts, he said, "to justify even the open violation of the sovereignty of a socialist country and the adoption of military force as a means of preventing independent socialist development."

The Italian Communists saw the point, too. They condemned the intervention in Czechoslovakia only hours after the Soviet troops had crossed the Czech frontier. Lugi Longo, leader of the Italian Communist Party, forcefully condemned the doctrine of a "guide state" or "guide party", demanding instead full respect for the "autonomy and sovereignty of every Communist party and socialist state."

Others have gotten the message too. Communist leaders in Rumania, Austria, Spain, Japan, and Great Britain have rejected the doctrine of limited sovereignty.

The significant point, I believe, is not so much that the Soviets have tried to invent a rationalization for what they did in Czechoslovakia, but that they have consciously and deliberately laid the basis for political pressures, blackmail and possible military adventures elsewhere.

We cannot be confident that a Soviet Union that invades Czechoslovakia will not use military force to achieve its purposes on other fronts, when it thinks this can be done without running unacceptable risks.

II

Myth Number Two is that the Soviet rulers are becoming progressively more liberal and civil-rights conscious, and are about ready to rejoin Western society.

The plain fact is that in the past year or two there have been increasing signs in the Soviet Union of a move to the right—a move toward the hard-liners.

Obviously, the shaping forces of the modern world have not altogether bypassed the Soviet Union. Soviet leaders seem to have some understanding of the need to prevent nuclear accidents or failures of communication that could lead to catastrophe for So-

XUM

viet society in a general nuclear war. The vigorous development and application of science and technology have not only multiplied the Soviet capacity to wage war but also the capacity to produce consumer goods and services. The demand by Soviet citizens for improvements in living standards have thus been encouraged. These same advances in science and technology have brought about a somewhat wider diffusion of power internally.

But how are the Soviet rulers responding to the living economic and intellectual forces? The response of the present rulers is to strengthen the old political controls and to try to suppress the vital forces involved.

I find nothing "liberal" in Moscow's current war on the intellectuals, and the attacks on Jewish authors and poets. The present Politburo is more ugly toward intellectuals than Khrushchev ever was. Writers and scholars are now subjected to vicious and violent campaigns of denunciation. The fact is there are more intellectuals incarcerated in Soviet prisons today than at any time in the history of the Soviet Union.

Beyond this, Stalin's image is being refurbished as the great military leader of World War II. This not only has the effect of strengthening the Stalin-line among the Russian generals. At the same time, it encourages the neo-Stalinist intellectuals and it stimulates harsher attacks on the liberal students and writers.

As to the outlook in Moscow which prompted the invasion of Czechoslovakia, we need only say that such actions are not undertaken by rulers confident of the stability of their regime. The Politburo's sharp admonition to other socialist parties and states to stay in line—or else—suggests a deep Soviet concern over the kind of urge toward freedom that appeared in Czechoslovakia and that could spread to the USSR itself. It suggests a concern in the Kremlin that the whole so-called "socialist commonwealth"—as well as their own control over the Soviet Union—might come unglued.

Given this situation we cannot discount the likelihood of further shifts toward the hard-liners. Nor can we dismiss the danger that an harassed leadership, fearful of its hold on the reins of power, may take undue risks, and make gross errors of judgment, in its conduct of foreign affairs.

I might add that the uncertainties are further compounded by the difficulty, if not the impossibility, for anyone on the outside to know whether the Soviet leadership, at any given moment, is in a cautious or risk-taking mood. Nothing is more guarded than the discussions that take place within the Kremlin. In the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, until the moment of attack, the political signals of Soviet intentions were at best ambiguous. The lightning-like drive into Prague took almost everybody by surprise.

III

Myth Number Three is the idea that it is the United States that is responsible for heating up the arms build-up.

The evidence decisively refutes this notion.

The Soviets acted first to develop long-range intercontinental surface to surface missiles;

The Soviets acted first to test-fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear-armed missile (in 1962) and they are the only nation to have done this.

The Soviets acted first to develop and test a 60 megaton bomb—and they are the only nation to possess anything like that size bomb;

The Soviets acted first to develop and deploy a fractional orbital bombardment system (FOBS), a first-strike oriented weapon—and they are the only nation to have developed or deployed such a system;

The Soviets acted first to deploy an ABM set-up and they have been testing, improving, and updating the system ever since. Today, they have over 60 anti-ballistic missiles deployed on launch pads. We, on the other hand, have not yet deployed an ABM set-up of any shape or form.

The current campaigners against the ABM say that when the United States acts to deploy an ABM *we* are "escalating the arms race." I have never heard one of those people say that because the *Soviets* were first to deploy an ABM, *they* were the ones that escalated the arms race.

Fortunately, the American people, if they get the facts, are able to recognize this obvious double-standard—crudely biased against their own country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Soviet Premier Kosygin has explicitly rejected the proposition that deployment of a defensive missile system heats up the arms race or is "destabilizing."

At a London press conference on February 9, 1967, Premier Kosygin was asked:

"Do you not share the opinion that the development of the Soviet anti-missile system is a new step in the arms race?"

Premier Kosygin replied: "Which weapons should be regarded as a tension-factor—offensive or defensive weapons? I think that a defense system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No weapons system, of course, is or will be perfect. Our *offensive* weapons aren't perfect, and our *defensive* arrangements won't be either. But that doesn't mean we refuse to deploy them when we believe they can perform a useful and important task well enough to make a substantial contribution to the over-all deterrent.

I commend President Nixon for his determination to proceed with the phased deployment of a thin ABM system, and I believe all Americans should now support their President in his statesmanlike decision. It would make no sense to leave this country altogether "naked" to enemy missile attack. And it is important to steady and fortify our President's hand in this very unsteady world. I am a Democrat. But I am proud that over the years I have supported my President—whether he was a Democrat or a Republican—in the critical decisions to safeguard the national defense and to protect the future of individual liberty.

IV

Myth Number Four is the notion in some quarters that the only way to manage our problems with the Soviet Union is "instant negotiation." We are told by some well-known columnists, among others, that "there is no alternative to an immediate summit meeting with the Kremlin."

This is, of course, silly, and it shows an utter lack of sophistication about the negotiating process. A "summit meeting" is a highly mobile adversary operation conducted in the spotlight. Such a meeting needs to be approached with the most prudent exploratory preparations and skillful groundwork.

To many Americans international negotiations are so completely means for *ending* conflict that they are blind to the fact that they may be and, in the hands of experts are, equally adapted to *continuing* conflict. In the present century Moscow has perfected the use of negotiation as a method of protracted conflict—as a means of buying time to build up its own military forces, or of bringing a sense of relaxation and good will before instigating some energetic offensive on a new front. This is straight from the gospel according to Lenin and Stalin.

I am personally convinced that there is only one safe way to negotiate with Moscow. That is, to have strong positions to bargain from.

As Sir William Hayter, former British Ambassador to Moscow put it:

"The Russians are not to be persuaded by eloquence or convinced by reasoned arguments. They rely on what Stalin used to call the proper basis of international policy, the calculation of forces. So no case, however skillfully deployed, however clearly demonstrated as irrefutable, will move them from doing what they have previously decided to do; the only way of changing their purpose is to demonstrate that they have no advantageous alternative, that what they want to do is not possible."

As I see it, in relations with the Soviet Union the free world must pursue two consonant courses of action: on the one hand, we should try to work with them where interests converge, and, on the other hand, we should maintain the strength and the resolve to discourage adventurism by them and to encourage them to join us in serious negotiations of the explosive and difficult issues.

A favorite quotation of mine is one from Reinhold Niebuhr:

"If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

V

Myth Number Five is the latest version of the devil theory of history—some people have conjured up what they call a "military-industrial complex."

All too often in history men have invented scapegoats. For Marx it was the capitalist. For Hitler it was the Jew. As the frustrations of our many problems pile up, some people are blaming their troubles on the so-called "military-industrial complex."

Who started the cold war? Who compels us to spend so much of our income on national defense? Who blocks progress toward disarmament? To some Americans the answer is: a conspiracy of some sort between the military and industry.

And, I might note, this fiction is not just the property of a bunch of sensational alarmists. It has also crept into the thought of persons in responsible positions in our national life: TV commentators, journalists, political leaders, ministers, educators, and others—there are some in each of these groups whose talk tends to parallel the fictions of the most sensational alarmists.

All this recalls Senator Nye and his attacks on the "munitions makers." In the 1930's Americans so nearly persuaded themselves that a munitions lobby had caused the first World War that they almost ignored Hitler and the Nazi threat.

Today some people talk as though the reason for our big defense program is some treacherous plan by American generals and industrialists.

Patently, this view ignores the three great factors which have compelled the United States, for the first time in our history, to create and maintain a large permanent military establishment—the expansionist drives of Soviet and Red Chinese communism, the historic shift of world power westward to the United States and eastward to the Soviet Union; and the continuing scientific and technological revolution.

Obviously, the price of national security these days is high. Obviously, too, we rely mainly on private industry to do most of the research and build most of the new weapons systems needed for national defense. I don't think any of us would want it otherwise.

I favor making some budget savings by cutbacks and deferrals in the less critical defense programs. Some weapons we might like to have are not essential and we can do without them. Some non-strategic projects can be left on the shelf for awhile without hazarding our basic posture of deterrence. Certainly, money can be saved by reductions in the proliferating, Pentagon civilian staffs, and in some of the top-heavy staffs in the military departments or in some U.S. military headquarters abroad.

But are we going to make American foreign and defense policy by hysterical editorials, emotionally-charged TV news comment, and by local protests and sign-carrying demonstrations? Not if I can help it!

Let us debate the real issues on the merits.

Americans have a right to speak their minds, but a President and a Congress are charged under the Constitution with the most solemn responsibilities as protectors of the Republic and as guardians of the peace. Public officials have an over-riding responsibility to the American people to make the most careful, balanced judgments on the critical issues of national safety and survival.

In conclusion, let me add just this:

Obviously, the nation's resources are limited. Our capabilities must be committed with discrimination and prudence. We have some very urgent, vital, costly tasks on the home front also.

But unless Americans are prepared to accept the responsibilities of a great nation in the fateful and difficult years ahead, the problems can become worse and worse and the international crises finally unmanageable.

Winston Churchill said the right words to us:

"The price of greatness is responsibility."

PRESIDENT NIXON STRESSES NEED FOR RURAL-URBAN BALANCE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, one of the great challenges which we as a Nation face in the latter part of the 20th century is the achievement of a reasonable rural-urban balance. If present trends continue a majority of our people will be crammed into five super strip cities by the year 2000. Given the magnitude of the urban crisis today one cannot look forward to such a prospect without a great deal of foreboding.

Unfortunately, it is only fairly recently that we have begun to appreciate fully the fact that today's rural problems are the urban problems of tomorrow. For too long we have assumed that little or nothing could be done to modify the economic forces which have been working to depopulate our farms and small towns on the one hand and to swell the population of our overcrowded and overburdened cities on the other hand.

The challenge we face will not be easily or quickly overcome. Therefore, it is particularly encouraging that President Nixon is keenly aware of the need for a better rural-urban balance. I know that his administration will provide imagination and forceful leadership in this area.

Some of the President's views on this subject are outlined in an article appearing in the magazine Rural America. His stress on the need to improve rural educational and economic opportunities and his assertion that we need not be the "helpless objects of blind economic forces" are particularly noteworthy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Equal Opportunity; Our Policy for Rural America," written by President Nixon, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—OUR POLICY FOR RURAL AMERICA

(By Richard M. Nixon)

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey . . ." was written of the English countryside nearly 200 years ago. But it might be written of rural America today.

Our rural areas are being depleted of people. Since 1960 the farm population has been declining at an annual rate of about 6 percent. From 1960 to 1967 the farm population declined by 4,818,000. The Department of Agriculture anticipates further out-migration.

This out-migration from our small towns and rural areas is largely the result of an agricultural revolution. Inadequate and unwise farm policies have contributed to the trend. Witness the lowest wheat prices in 26 years. Our farm population has fallen from 18 per cent of the total population two decades ago to about 5 per cent today.

What becomes of these people? Most of them move into our great cities. Without necessarily desiring it and almost by default we are becoming an urban society. Seventy per cent of our people now cluster in cities that cover one percent of our land. If present trends continue unchecked, by the year 2000, 80 per cent of our people will be living in urban areas and most of them will be crammed into five super metropolitan areas.

By generating a kind of "urban crush," this creates problems in the cities to which they go. By de-populating the countryside, this creates problems in the rural areas and small towns.

But move they must, if there are no nearby jobs.

Seemingly, almost everything has conspired to prevent the creation of jobs in rural areas:

Federal farm programs have cut our cotton crop to 10 million acres, compared with 43 million acres before the programs begin. Tobacco acreage is now only half as great as 35 years ago.

Local communities have not had the resources, the services and utilities needed to attract industry.

Industry, which has been urban-minded, has not sufficiently sought to decentralize.

The rural labor force lacks the wide range of federal employment services available to urban workers.

Education policies have discriminated against the poorer areas. For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides more than twice as much help per pupil to the counties ranking *highest* on the index of rural well-being as it does those ranking *lowest* ($350 as against $157). (Manpower Report of the President, April 1967, Page 116.)

WE MUST EXPAND OPPORTUNITY

Today's rural problems are the urban problems of tomorrow. The American people want a better balance between the rural and the urban sectors. There should be expanded opportunity for those who wish to live in the country to find decent work there, to have access to good education and health services, and to pursue a way of living that gives diversity and balance to our economy.

What the American people really want and will work for, they can have. We are not the helpless objects of blind economic forces; we are capable of shaping our own future.

The future vitality of our small towns and rural areas depends largely on sound planning. Our states and localities should make a greater effort to develop land use plans based on the community's available human and natural resources. This is an essential first step to diversify and to strengthen the economic base of our rural areas.

IMAGINATION AND PLANNING

Imaginative and comprehensive land use plans will open the way to the location of new industries in small towns and rural areas. Local, state and national tax policies can also provide realistic and effective conomic incentives to attract industry. Improved transportation facilities, better schools, and more extensive public utilities in rural areas will also serve the same goal. The Federal Government can help in a very direct way by placing more emphasis on the dispersal of Government contracts to small towns and rural areas wherever possible.

An essential ingredient for broadening the economic base of small towns and rural communities is an improvement in the skills and education of the rural citizen. This creates an economic inducement to industry as well as a wider economic opportunity for the individual. In practice, it means better education of all kinds, at all levels: elementary, secondary and advanced; vocational, technical and academic; continuing education for adults, apprenticeship, retraining and all the rest. It means on-the-job training as proposed in the Republican-sponsored "Human Investment Act."

What is here proposed is not a blueprint for the economy, with a certain calculated number of people on farms or a carefully computed balance between rural and urban areas. Rather, I propose that we redress the imbalance in education and opportunity which has worked to the disadvantage of the rural areas and threatens to make America predominantly urban.

To undertake the action I propose does not introduce a rural bias; rather, it would overcome the neglect that has contributed to rural deterioration that in turn has contributed to the urban bias, largely unintended, that has been allowed to develop. I propose that we provide the equality of opportunity which will give our people a chance to develop the kind of society they want. If this is done, we can safely leave with the people themselves the decision as to the balance between rural and urban living.

JIM LOVELL—A DOWN TO EARTH SPACE VOYAGER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin is very proud indeed of her favorite son-in-space, Capt. James Lovell, who was one of the first three human beings to see the moon's surface from a spaceship orbiting that satellite. Now Captain Lovell has staked out his claim back here on the earth as well by taking charge of a $4.5 million summer day camp program that will give sports opportunities to 75,000 young people from the Nation's ghettos.

The program, as announced last Monday, will be administered by the National Collegiate Athletic Association under contract to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Jim Lovell, who directs staff activities for the President's Council on Physical Fitness, will supervise the program.

I cannot think of a better choice for this important task. Jim Lovell has to be an inspiration to us all, but the awe that his exploits have inspired in the Nation generally is multiplied in its significance to the younger generation. The space age is their age. And Jim Lovell is their hero. With this base of admiration and support I know that he will do a superlative leadership job in working with the disadvantaged young men and women participating in the day camp program.

I know I speak for all Senators when I wish him the very best.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the day camp program, published in the New York Times, together with materials on the program released from the White House be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTRONAUT WILL DIRECT PROGRAM OF GHETTO YOUTH SUMMER CAMPS

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Vice President Agnew announced today that Navy Capt. James A. Lovell, the astronaut, would head a $4.5-million day camp sports program for 75,000 ghetto youths this summer.

"The program will enable disadvantaged youngsters in 40 metropolitan areas across America to attend summer day camps, which will be held on the campuses of 120 colleges, universities and junior colleges," Mr. Agnew said.

Captain Lovell, one of the three Apollo 8 astronauts who flew around the moon last December, appeared with Mr. Agnew at the White House for the announcement. The astronaut is staff director of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

The program will provide a minimum of two hours sports activity at least four days a week for five weeks from June 1 through Sept. 1 for both boys and girls 12 to 18 years old. They will live at home and be taken to and from the camps each day.

Among the activities available will be track and field, basketball, swimming, touch football, baseball, gymnastics and even fly casting and basket weaving, Mr. Agnew said.

"The 40 metropolitan areas have been chosen on the basis of population, size and percentage of poverty-level families," Mr. Agnew said. "Our prime target is to reach the inner-city youngster who has no recourse but the streets during the long hot summer."

The youth sports program will be administered by the National Collegiate Athletic Association under contract to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Department is providing $3 million, with $1.5 million supplied by private contributions.

The estimated daily cost for each youth is $2.40.

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON THE NATIONAL SUMMER YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM

Captain James A. Lovell has joined me today to announce a new program on earth rather than in space. While most Americans are familiar with astronaut Lovell's part in the successful Apollo 8 mission, he has another role and another mission as the President's Consultant on Physical Fitness and Sports. We believe he will be equally successful here.

Today I am pleased to announce the establishment of a national summer youth sports program which will provide summer day camp experience for an estimated 75,000 young people living in urban areas.

The program will enable disadvantaged youngsters in 40 metropolitan areas across America to attend summer day camps which will be held on the campuses of 120 colleges, universities and junior colleges.

Colleges will contribute their gymnasiums, swimming pools, tracks, playing fields and special purpose rooms as well as a full-time program director and capital sports equipment at a cost of $1.55 million.

The balance of the program's cost will be financed through a transfer of $3 million in OEO funds to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which will assume responsibility for the program.

The program will be administered by the National Collegiate Athletic Association under contract to the Department of HEW. The President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports which I chair as Vice President, has been assigned by HEW Secretary Finch to supervise the program. Captain Lovell directs staff activities for the Council.

This national program is modeled after the highly successful summer sports program conducted last year at the University of Southern California for youngsters from the ghetto area near its campus.

The 40 metropolitan areas have been chosen on the basis of population size and percentage of poverty level families. Our prime target is to reach the inner city youngster who has no recourse but the streets during the long, hot summer.

Obviously we cannot reach every child we want. We hope to reach many in the heart of these cities' poverty areas to provide at least a 5 week respite of recreation and relaxed education.

This is a beginning. We are tapping resources heretofore unused and reaching youngsters heretofore unknown. As Captain Lovell knows from experience, you cannot reach the moon on the first flight. But you can never reach the moon if you will not try.

This year's success will pave the way for greater participation and expand horizons of hope where hope is most needed—right here at home.

FACT SHEET ON THE NATIONAL SUMMER YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM

OBJECTIVES

To provide expanded opportunity during the summer for the youth of the community to participate in competitive sports and benefit from sports skills instruction.

To enable the institutions and their personnel to participate more fully in community life and contribute to the solution of community problems.

To help young people learn good health habits and become better citizens through utilization of the personnel and facilities of higher education.

To provide a combination of employment and on-the-job training in sports instruction and administration to older students.

PROGRAM PARTIES

1. U.S. Government: Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports designated as the Secretary's program representative).
2. National Collegiate Athletic Association (Kansas City, Mo.) as prime contractor to the U.S. Government.
3. 120 higher education institutions, both members and non-members of the NCAA, who will be sub-contractors to the NCAA for this program.

PROGRAM DETAILS

Number of metropolitan areas in program: 40 (list attached).

Basis of selection: combination of population size, numbers of poor, percentage of poor, facilities availability.

Youth participating: Up to 75,000; 12–18 year old. Boys and girls. 80% or more per program must meet poverty criteria. Inner-city youth the target. 200 youth minimum per participating institution.

Program period: 1 June–1 September 1969 (5 weeks minimum, 6 weeks recommended). 2 sports activity hours minimum per day (excluding changing time), minimum 4 days per week.

Program activities: 2 or more sports activities offered, including track and field, basketball, swimming, gymnastics, soccer, touch-football, volleyball, hockey, or special activity singular to the area. Choice to be based on youth interest and institution's capability. Not less than one girls' activity required.

Educational component, stressing health, nutrition, etc. required periodically.

Nutrition service: Strongly urged that one meal or meal supplement be provided each enrollee per day, if at all possible.

Transportation: To be provided wherever necessary to reach target youth and area.

Individual fees or incidental charges to enrollee: None.

Resources:

Colleges and universities provide: facilities (pools, playing fields, etc.), non-expendable equipment (hurdles, gymnastic equipment, etc.), full-time Program Director.

U.S. Government provides funds for: professional personnel staffing, medical screening and referral, insurance (medical and liability), support services (custodial, etc.), nutrition service (where rendered), transportation (where rendered).

NCAA provides, at no cost: full-time Program Director, program management, administrative services.

PROGRAM FUNDING AND COSTS

Expected maximum: $3,000,000.

Source: Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mechanism: Delegation to the Secretary, HEW, from OEO.

Estimated unit costs: $2.40 per Youth Day.

List of metropolitan areas expected to participate in the national summer youth sports program:

New York, Newark, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Houston, San Antonio, Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, St. Louis, Washington, D.C., Dallas, San Francisco, Oakland, Boston, San Diego, El Paso, Phoenix, Norfolk, Tampa.

Cleveland, Atlanta, Columbus, Ohio, Birmingham, Cincinnati, Miami, Pittsburgh, Oklahoma City, Milwaukee, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Mo., Fort Worth, Buffalo, Louisville, Ky., Seattle, Portland, Dayton, Tallahassee, Anaheim.

TV STATEMENTS BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON THE RAY CASE AND FEDERAL FUND CUTOFF TO CAMPUS RIOTERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on March 18, 1969, I made a statement for television regarding unanswered questions about the James Earl Ray case.

On March 20, 1969, I made a statement for television regarding the cutoff of Federal funds from those involved in campus disorders.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcripts of these statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD DISTURBED OVER RAY CASE

I have been disturbed by the fact that the full story concerning the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has not yet been learned.

The sentencing of James Earl Ray without a trial has stirred too much speculation that a conspiracy may have been involved. If other people did play a part, then justice has not yet been served.

Ray's own words and the comments of others have created questions that ought to be answered.

I was not an admirer of Dr. King, but the assassination of anyone is a despicable act and the suspicion should not be allowed to remain that there were individuals other than Ray who participated in King's assassination. If there were such persons, then they, too, should be punished. I have contacted the FBI to urge that it renew its efforts to get to the bottom of the case.

CAMPUS FUND CUTOFF

The President will have my support in enforcing the laws to cut off federal funds from students involved in campus disorders. For the government to continue to lend financial assistance to those who foment unrest, rebellion, and violence is utter stupidity—and grossly unfair to the taxpayer. The Attorney General has promised to enforce the laws against agitators who cross state lines to incite riots. Such action is well overdue. It is useless to have laws on the books if they are not going to be en-

XUM

forced, and I am glad to see someone moving at last to enforce them against the insurrectionists who have been having things pretty much their way too long.

RURAL AND URBAN AMERICA: A TWO-WAY STREET—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, earlier this week I had the honor of addressing the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. At the same meeting, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS delivered an impressive speech entitled "Rural and Urban America: A Two-Way Street."

Congressman BRADEMAS discussed the many accomplishments of the NRECA in developing rural areas of this Nation. He noted the progress made for all Americans in the form of far-ranging consumer legislation which has been given more and more attention by Congress. And he pointed out the contribution which rural electric cooperatives and the NRECA have made to meeting the problems of our cities. For only with a healthy rural-urban balance can we stem the flow of dissatisfied and unemployed citizens out of rural areas to our overcrowded cities.

Mr. President, because of its important discussion of these and other critical rural-urban issues, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Congressman BRADEMAS be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL AND URBAN AMERICA: A TWO-WAY STREET

(Address of Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, at annual meeting of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, March 18, 1969, Atlantic City, N.J.)

I am deeply honored and pleased to address this annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

First, I want to salute all of you as leaders of rural electric cooperatives across the country. You represent a long and proud tradition in rural America and your work today is part of a continuing movement dedicated to improving the quality of life in our society.

More than 30 years after President Franklin D. Roosevelt successfully pressed for the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, rural electrification is still a vital force for progress, the symbol of a better life in rural America.

Three decades ago, only 10 percent of the farm families of America enjoyed electricity. Today less than two percent are without it, and the expansion of rural electrical service continues. Nearly 25 million people now receive the benefits of electrical and telephone service through systems financed by REA. Far from having outlived its usefulness, the program is still pioneering new ground, moving steadily toward its goal of low-cost electricity for all farm families.

I am, of course, most familiar with the rural electric program in my own state of Indiana. Under the outstanding leadership of the Indiana Statewide Cooperative and its general manager, Dave Mueller, 42 REA-financed electric systems serve over 190,000 rural consumers in the state. Most important, fully 99.5 percent of the farms in Indiana are now electrified compared with 11.7 percent in 1935 when REA was born. Ninety percent have telephone service provided through REA support.

Two rural electric cooperatives have their headquarters in my own Congressional district. They are both successful private enterprises jointly owned by close to 8,000 member-consumers. These two cooperatives maintain a sizable staff and payroll, and pay their share of taxes—well over $100,000 in 1967. They are a vital part of the communities they serve.

A MIRACLE OF THE MODERN ERA

The rural electrification story is one of the miracles of the modern era. Electricity in rural areas is still a miracle today. Without the efforts of rural electric cooperatives, most farmers would still be in the dark ages of the candle and the kerosene lamp. Yet we tend to take rural electrification for granted now. In these rapidly changing times, we live in a world where miracles are commonplace, and we cease to marvel at what we have created.

Rural electrification was a crusade two and three decades ago, and many members of Congress rallied to its support. Today other issues crowd the Congressional agenda and demand priority attention.

I know you are fully aware of the great changes that are taking place in the areas where your electric cooperatives provide service. Nationwide, the number of farms has been dwindling by more than 100,000 a year. Our total farm population has dropped to less than seven percent of the nation's total. The rural areas, where REA was the greatest thing that ever happened, now comprise only a small percent of the voting strength of the American people.

All rural-oriented organizations face the dilemma of how to use most effectively their diminishing political power in order to achieve their legitimate legislative goals. Rural electrification, like most measures to improve farm income, must have support from Congressmen who have never seen an electric milking machine or an electric pig brooder.

Such broad-based support is absolutely essential if the rural electrics are to come to grips with the challenges immediately ahead. You will be discussing some of these challenges this week, and paramount among them, of course, is the increasingly difficult problem of securing adequate capital for future growth.

Rural electric cooperatives are being called upon to serve some 150,000 additional consumers each year. Rural power requirements will triple over the next 20 years. These needs, added to those of rural telephone cooperatives, call for an estimated $11 billion in new capital by 1980, an amount double that provided in Congressional appropriations for two percent REA loans during the 15-year period prior to 1965.

To meet this growing demand for capital, rural electrics must look to both government and the private money market. You will be voting later this week on the proposal developed by the NRECA Long-Range Study Committee to establish a self-help financing institution with the capability of drawing upon sources of private capital. But the success of this forward-looking plan, should it be adopted, will depend upon continuation and adequate funding by Congress and Federal government of the REA two percent interest loan program.

Another matter of tremendous importance to rural electric cooperatives is access to large-scale power supply. Much more must be done to enable the rural electrification program to participate in the current technological developments in the power industry offering economies of size—huge generating plants, high voltage transmission lines, and regional and inter-regional power pools. Rural electric cooperatives need facilities big enough and advanced enough to enable them to share in the savings enjoyed by other segments of the power industry.

RURAL ELECTRICS NEED HELP FROM URBAN CONGRESSMEN

To achieve these and other goals, rural electrics must be able to count on the cooperation and support of non-rural, nonfarm interests; the rural farm constituency by itself simply no longer has the votes in Congress to go it alone.

Fortunately, there are Congressmen who, although they have no rural electric systems in their districts, vote regularly for REA appropriations, support Federal multiple purpose power projects, and approve funds for the Federal power marketing agencies. They recognize the contribution that rural electrification makes to the entire economy.

But just as Congressmen have had to broaden their interests, so your Association, the NRECA and other organizations—both rural and urban—have broadened the scope of their concerns. Given our highly complex social and economic structure, there is very little legislation proposed today that does not reach well beyond the persons or the areas toward which it is primarily directed.

Thus while the NRECA is concerned first with the immediate and serious needs of the REA program, its attention should also be directed to the broader interests of our society as a whole—to national needs which cut across both rural and urban America.

Let me, therefore, explain my message to you today. I want to assert that the problems of our cities and the problems of our rural areas are more closely intertwined than ever before. If we are to deal with these problems effectively, greater mutual understanding and new patterns of alliance between leaders of rural and urban America are essential. Rural America needs the support of urban America—and urban America requires the help of rural America.

We must, then, broaden the street that leads from the center of the city into the countryside. It is a two-way street and we must build additional lanes on both sides. Instead of more "city limits" signs, we need more rural-urban cooperation—unlimited.

I want to suggest today two areas in which I believe such cooperation is particularly important and where the rural electrics can and, I believe, should take a lead. One is the protection of the American consumer. Second is the overall effort to achieve a better balance in rural-urban growth.

THE CONSUMER REVOLUTION

Rural electrics have a natural role in the field of consumer protection. At last year's annual meeting in Dallas, your Association adopted a resolution supporting bills aimed at strengthening the consumer's position in the marketplace, and this action is certainly in line with the strong consumer identification throughout the rural electrification program. Your NRECA resolution gives meaning to the statement that the rural electric cooperatives are consumer-owned.

And, after all, we are all consumers—all 200 million of us. Fortunately for all of us, we are witnessing in America today something of a consumer revolution. It's a peaceful revolution to be sure, but it's a revolution nonetheless.

The American consumer is much less willing than ever before to accept maltreatment and fraud in the marketplace. He is beginning to assert his rights and is organizing to make his voice heard by both government and business.

Early in 1968, partly as an outgrowth of the Consumer Assembly which has become an annual forum in Washington, a new organization of national scope was created—the Consumer Federation of America. You are familiar with the Assembly and the Federation because rural electric leaders have been active in both undertakings.

With all the special interest groups and lobby organizations that have stalked the U.S. Capitol throughout the years, this is the first successful attempt to organize an effective and responsible voice in Washington for the interests of individuals as consumers of goods and services.

The mobilization of consumer interests is having a major impact all across the country, and of course much opposition has been heard from some segments of business. But the business community is responding in positive ways too. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, has set out to close the "communications gap" between sellers and buyers through the establishment of joint business-consumer committees by local Chambers of Commerce. These committees are supposed to identify consumer problems and determine priorities for cooperative action at the local level. The Chamber speaks of a need for business to "act positively . . . to demonstrate that it can and will deal effectively with the consumer questions and problems."

THE 90TH CONGRESS: THE CONSUMER CONGRESS

Congress and the Federal government have also responded, in a variety of ways, to the new consumer awakening. Indeed, more has been achieved in legislation to protect the consumer during the past five years than in any comparable period in our history. The 90th Congress stands as one of the most consumer-conscious Congresses we have ever had, passing 28 consumer protection laws in 1967 and 1968 alone.

Underlying the new legislation is a recognition that today's consumer faces problems he simply cannot handle by himself. Our economy has become so complicated, its products so complex and its services so vast, that the consumer needs more protection, more information, and more assistance then he has ever needed before.

The individual consumer today is faced with products of such complex chemical or electronic composition that he is often incapable of making knowledgeable purchases. Moreover, the market is flooded with new drugs, synthetics, cosmetics, processed foods and complicated equipment—some of which present real health and safety problems.

In other words, the swift pace of technology, which has brought abundance to the American consumer, has also exposed him to new hazards—car insurance plans that are cancelled for no apparent reason or don't pay off after an accident, misleading warranties and guaranties that leave the purchaser with a worthless product, deceptive and unfair lending and sales practices . . . to name only a few.

To solve some of these problems, Congress has enacted a wide range of legislation. Here are just some of the measures Congress has passed in recent years:

Protection against impure and unhealthy meat and poultry through tighter inspection standards;

Curbs on deceptive packaging and labeling;

Safety standards for automobiles to stem the carnage on our nation's highways;

Regulation of fire-prone fabrics such as baby blankets and household draperies;

Protection against fraud and swindling in interstate land sales;

Protection of children against hazardous toys and medication;

Truth-in-lending, and a long list of others.

Practically every one of us, whether we live in city, suburbs, small town or open countryside, will benefit from some of these measures passed by recent Congresses. Rural electric cooperatives and their members are consumers, and as such they share a common interest with all Americans, regardless of how they earn a living.

Unfortunately, consumer protection has sometimes been interpreted in rural America as meaning a "cheap food" policy for the benefit of urban America. This is not the goal of consumer protection legislation, nor has any consumer bill resulted in pushing down prices paid to farmers. What consumer protection laws can do is to protect farmers, as well as other people, against abuses practiced by a relatively few dishonest and careless sellers of goods and services—abuses which victimize rural and urban buyers alike.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN CONSUMER PROTECTION

There remains for the 91st Congress a great deal of unfinished business in consumer protection.

Some of the bills which are being introduced early in the present session hold special interest for rural electric cooperatives. There is the issue of electric power reliability—the need to minimize the possibility of massive power blackouts by establishing and enforcing minimum reliability standards, requiring interconnections among neighboring utilities, and by licensing extra-high-voltage transmission lines.

Last year's NRECA meeting went on record with an endorsement of the Electric Power Reliability Act sponsored by Congressman John Moss of California. A revised version of this legislation has been introduced this year by another of your convention speakers today, Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and a large group of cosponsors, including myself, in the House and the Senate.

Another bill which NRECA endorsed last year was introduced by Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, to establish an Office of Utility Consumer Counsel to represent consumer interests before state and Federal regulatory agencies and to make publicly available all information on utility system operation necessary to make such representations effective. The Senator has reintroduced the bill this year and hearings on it are now in process.

Besides such consumer-oriented legislative proposals which are so clearly in your interests, there will be many others needing your consideration and support.

We need a bill that will set standards to insure clean and wholesome fish products similar to the meat and poultry inspection laws passed by the 90th Congress. Millions of pounds of uninspected fish are eaten in this country every year and the conditions under which these products are processed often pose serious health problems.

We also need—vitally need—a law to curb sales racketeering. Most of us have heard countless stories of fast-talking salesmen who travel door-to-door passing off shoddy and unwanted goods at cleverly concealed prices, then slip out of the community before the consumer knows what has been done to him. We need legislation regulating door-to-door selling that would put an end to such abuses.

We need legislation to insure that warranties and guarantees say what they mean and mean what they say, that they are as binding as their language implies, that they can be understood by the average consumer, and that there is service readily available to carry out their provisions.

We need to do something in the way of reforming automobile insurance—to do something about the problems of settlements that are too low and too late, of cancellations and premium increases that are unfair.

We need to pass legislation to require a stronger warning of the health hazards of smoking on all cigarette packages and advertising materials.

And there are many further areas of legislation essential to the protection of the American consumer which I have not mentioned.

Your interest in and recognition of the importance of consumer protection measures are a natural outgrowth of the continuing battles which have characterized the rural electric movement from its very beginning. Rural electric cooperatives, as consumer-owned and consumer-oriented organizations, can and must provide a means to amplify the voice of the consumer. They can help to make the consumer's interest and concern heard.

RURAL ELECTRICS CAN HELP REVITALIZE RURAL AMERICA

Finally, let me turn to another area where rural electrics must become more deeply involved. I want to suggest here that perhaps the overriding challenge for rural electrification in the years ahead lies in its broad potential for accelerating the diversified economic development of rural America. Indeed, I believe that rural electric cooperatives across the country can play a key role in revitalizing the economy of our rural areas and in stemming the movement of people and jobs to the overcrowded cities.

One of the most critical underlying issues that America faces in the next thirty years is the balance between rural and urban growth. The country-to-city population shift is nothing new, but its extent is often overlooked. Today 70 percent of our population live on the one percent of the continental land mass classified as "urban." As our population moves toward 300 million by the year 2000, only a generation away, it will become ever more necessary that we shape a more balanced rural-urban growth. I beleive that it will also become clear that this balance can be achieved only by providing greater economic opportunity and by improving the quality of life in rural America, making it competitive with the attractions of the city.

The challenge, I submit, rests with leaders such as yourselves in the rural and farm communities. Electric and telephone cooperatives should seek to stimulate a new movement to develop local industry and create jobs in order to counteract the migration of rural people to employment centers in the urban areas. The local system, working with its statewide coop, is the keystone in the rebuilding effort.

The NRECA's recent policy statement, "An Agenda for Rural America," echoes this theme. In the words of this statement:

"The 1,000 rural electric systems and the pattern of government-local people partnership they have established, represents, we believe, an extremely valuable asset that the nation can utilize in revitalizing rural areas. These systems have considerable resources, including thousands of highly-skilled employees, a close working relationship with millions of rural people, long experience in dealing with government, and an impressive record of getting difficult jobs accomplished."

SOLVING CRISIS OF OUR CITIES DEPENDS PARTLY ON IMPROVING QUALITY OF LIFE IN RURAL AMERICA

I very much hope that the Nixon Administration will embrace the specific policy recommendations urged in the NRECA's "An Agenda for Rural America," and I hope that you, as rural electric leaders, will act upon this mandate for leadership in the revival of rural America.

I should note that many rural electrics across the country have already begun to respond to the challenge. Since 1961, rural electric and telephone systems financed by REA have sponsored over 2,700 industrial and other projects aimed at improving the local rural economy. The results have been impressive: more than 216,000 new jobs opened up; new markets for crops, livestock and forest products; hundreds of community facilities built; recreation projects ranging from large resort industries to overnight camping facilities.

In addition, a number of projects supported by rural systems assist low-income groups. I am especially pleased to note, for example, the fine contribution by the Kosciusko County REMC in my own congressional district, which has helped start an effective VISTA project to aid poor families who have recently migrated from Appalachia.

But I think we must all agree that the

efforts so far in rural area development have only scratched the surface. Much, much more is required if we are to combat effectively the economic erosion of rural America and the marked imbalance of rural and urban growth. The long-run solution to the crisis of our cities depends a great deal more than many of us realize upon the revitalization of our rural regions.

The challenges I have suggested for rural electrification—in amplifying the voice of the American consumer, in leading the effort to revive rural America—are formidable. The burden of responsibility upon you, as leaders in the rural electric cooperative movement, is heavy.

But, as the distinguished general manager of your national association, Robert Partridge, has said, "There has never been any shortage of guts among the people who make up the rural electrification program . . . (You have) . . . a great reservoir of strength and courage to draw upon when you make up your minds to move."

Moreover, the genius of the rural electrification program has been its adaptability to change and its achievement in the face of new obstacles. It is my hope—it is my faith—that rural electrification will always be equal to the challenge at hand.

SECRET INFORMATION LEAKED FROM PENTAGON TO RIGHTWING EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently, publications have been brought to my attention which indicate clearly that one or more officials in the Pentagon have "leaked" highly classified information to propagandists for lunatic rightwing extremist organizations such as the John Birch Society. It is obvious that many facts concerning the *Pueblo* incident were furnished to these rightwing publications prior to the time they were revealed to the Naval Board of Inquiry investigating the affair.

On Saturday, December 21, the Rev. Paul D. Lindstrom called a press conference in Chicago to report the United States and North Korea had come to terms for the release of the 82 members of the *Pueblo* crew and that the announcement was imminent. The official announcement of the release of the *Pueblo* crew was not made until the next day, December 22, when Lindstrom's taped comments were then broadcast on nationwide television. Among those comments was severe criticism of the U.S. Government for making deals with "Commie pirates and bandits."

Lindstrom refused to reveal how he obtained the information before the news services did, but stated that it was from "a good source" in Washington. He, if not actually a Birchsap himself, is most assuredly a supporter of that lunatic group. He is proprietor of the so-called Church of Christian Liberty in suburban Chicago, and the Chicago Sun-Times has reported that six trustees of this organization are members of the John Birch Society. He was also chairman of the Remember the *Pueblo* Committee, a rightwing outfit with ties both to the ultraextremist Liberty Lobby and Carl McIntire's rightwing complex.

Mr. President, the timing of this announcement was such to lead anyone to believe that someone in the Defense Establishment leaked the news to Reverend Lindstrom for purposes not compatible with the best interests of our Nation.

Furthermore, in the August 15 edition of the Washington Observer, another publication of the lunatic right, it was reported that Commander Bucher's written request for self-destruct mechanisms was refused, and the question was then asked, "Who are the traitors entrenched within the executive department who are working—almost openly now—to surrender the United States to the Soviet Union?" This report and other allegations in the Washington Observer were subsequently repeated in columns by Tom Anderson, one of the founders of the John Birch Society and a member of its 24-man policy council.

Mr. President, frankly, I for one cannot believe that these rightwing propagandists are clairvoyant. It is clear that they receive their advance information from rightwing sympathizers holding sensitive jobs in the Defense Department. The John Birch Society and other organizations of its ilk then used this information to further convince their members and sympathizers that the Nation is being governed by traitors. They would have Americans believe that we lost the *Pueblo* as part of a conspiracy between Washington and Moscow to get secret electronic equipment into Russian hands. As David O. Woodbury bluntly concluded in the February issue of American Opinion, a John Birch Society magazine:

> The *Pueblo* was a delivery wagon ferrying a gift to the Communists as per arrangements previously made by the White House and State Department in secret conclave with McNamara, Rostow and other civilians.

Mr. President, the real traitors, or those who are doing a disservice to their country, are in reality those who supplied this highly secret information to private individuals or groups. I know that it is virtually impossible to determine the source of these security "leaks." However, Secretary Laird and top Defense Department officials must make a more serious effort to root out those responsible for passing on this information to rightwing organizations and to prevent further such flagrant abuses of security. Should they continue, I intend to urge the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis), to request a thorough investigation by the Armed Services Committee, if necessary, that will reveal the culprits. Let the guilty parties be forewarned, and let them be reminded that treachery, though at first very cautious, in the end betrays itself.

FORT RILEY, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Fort Riley has played a dramatic role in the history of Kansas and today has a significant impact on the economy of our State. This impact was well described recently by a distinguished Kansas newspaper, the Junction City Daily Union. It is appropriate that the article appear in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that it be so entered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Impact of Fort Riley

How big of an operation is a military post such as Fort Riley? Does it hold its own slot in the economy of Kansas or would it be quickly forgotten if it disappeared from the map tomorrow?

Located between Junction City with a population of 18,700 and Ogden with a population of 1,780, Fort Riley itself has a population of approximately 26,300 military personnel and dependents.

The population of the area, military and dependent wise, is approximately 40,000. There are more than 23,000 military personnel assigned to the Post with 6,700 dependents living on the Post and more than 9,800 residing off of the Post, the last figure including the 3,100 dependents located at Schilling Manor Sub-Post near Salina. Approximately 1,000 retired military personnel also reside in the area.

An estimated $103,000,000 a year is passed out in salaries to the military personnel assigned to Fort Riley and in turn, most of this is spent in the nearby communities.

In addition to the military connected with the Post, there are more than 3,000 civilians employed at the Fort with a total of $17,000,000 divided among them in salaries. Civil Service employees total approximately 2,200 with the remaining civilians working for the Post Exchange and concessionaires; nonappropriated funds, public schools and contractors working on the Post.

Salaries for the Post Exchange and concessionaires total about $1,120,000 with approximately $750,000 worth of local purchases made by them.

Non-appropriated fund organizations include the Fort Riley Officers Open Mess (FROOM), Noncommissioned Officers Open Mess (NCOOM), Rod and Gun Club, Bachelor Officers Quarters (BOQ's), Central Post Fund and the Central Accounting Office.

The FROOM averages yearly salaries of $122,000, purchases of $325,500 and other expenses of $81,500. The approximate $1,127,350 that are expenses of the NCOOM include $296,500 for salaries, $587,500 for purchases and $243,350 for other expenses such as insurance, laundry, bingo prizes, breakage, etc. The Rod and Gun Club expends $141,000 in purchases and $6,750 in salaries yearly, while the BOQ's have salaries of $12,000 yearly, Central Post Fund, $125,000 and the Central Accounting Office, $80,000.

More than 100 civilians are employed by the Post schools and an additional 75 work for contractors who have jobs on the Post.

Fort Riley's Purchasing and Contracting Division accomplished a total of 40,660 actions, spending approximately $17,270,000 for contracts and purchases during the past calendar year.

Construction cntracts cost the Post budget more than $2,964,300; supply contracts, $831,250; service contracts, $790,625; and educational (teacher) contracts, $90,150.

A breakdown of the annual expenditures at Fort Riley, including everything except salaries, are approximately as follows: utilities and related services, $1,500,000; transportation and movement services, $2,500,000; subsistence, $9,200,000; petroleum oil and lubricants, $300,000; supplies and equipment, $8,900,000; equipment maintenance, $10,000 and facilities maintenance, $1,900,000.

So, to answer the question "What economic impact does Fort Riley have on the State of Kansas?" just ask yourself "What effect does $145,000,000 have on the economy of a state?"

RESEARCH FOR LOW-COST HOUSING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in central Wisconsin a unique page of housing history is being written. A Winnabago Indian grandmother is preparing to move into a house built for her under the rural

XUM

low-income clauses of the Housing Act of 1968. Mrs. Helen Cloud is the first to benefit in rural Wisconsin from that act with a loan granted by the Farmers Home Administration at 1-percent interest.

But that is not the only unique aspect of the event. Another is the cost of this two-bedroom-and-bath home. The loan is for a shade more than $7,000. All materials and labor costs amount to about $6,750. In the era of spiraling housing costs, this is a truly unique achievement. Last year the average cost for a three-bedroom farm home financed by the Farmers Home Administration was about $19,000.

Credit for this unique cost breakthrough goes to the Forest Products Laboratory, a Forest Service unit maintained by the Department of Agriculture at Madison, Wis. Although the house is small—576 square feet overall—it will be a vast improvement for Mrs. Cloud. Indoor plumbing, full bath, central heating, and a kitchen with sink and built-in shelves, were all lacking in the one-room home she occupied nearby for 27 years and in which she reared her children.

This is, I am sure, a vitally important first step toward solving a domestic crisis such as we have not hitherto known. The housing crisis is not limited to the urban ghettos that have commanded the bulk of our attention. It extends into the remotest rural regions of our Nation. Some of its harshest urban manifestations can be traced to causes rooted in our seldom noticed rural slums.

The solution of this festering sore spot of our society constitutes a challenge to many of our industrial and governmental institutions. One of the institutions already reacting productively to the challenge is the Forest Products Laboratory. Not only has it produced the design and specifications for that house in the flat cranberry bog country of central Wisconsin, it has produced three others—for farmers with up to 12 children. It is at work on a fifth design. These plans are developed as part of a crash program to meet current needs with readily available wood materials and following simple, conventional building practices. They will soon be widely distributed by the Agricultural Research Service at Beltsville, Md., and the Farmers Home Administration in its various offices throughout the Nation. Though small and frill-less, these houses are efficiently engineered to meet basic housing needs. They represent the best that existing technology can offer with wood or low-cost housing.

But the Forest Products Laboratory researchers recognize that their responsibility does not end with these house designs based on past research. None more than they are aware of the limitations placed on wood utilization by existing technology. Gross inefficiencies still exist and the resultant waste will only be eliminated by concentrated research aimed at unearthing fresh basic knowledge and evolving new design concepts.

Therefore the men and women of the Forest Products Laboratory are pushing long-term research aimed at better and more economical systems of housing construction with wood. That research is oriented toward the rural phase of that crisis. But its results will certainly contribute to the alleviation of urban housing needs. It is research the Forest Products Laboratory is uniquely qualified to perform. For the Laboratory has a long history of housing research achievements that have greatly influenced existing technology, with pioneering developments, efficient structural design, prefabrication techniques, and processes that broaden and extend the serviceability of wood products.

The development of new housing concepts is imperative. For our shrinking timber resource, we must meet the ever-expanding needs of a growing population. We cannot tolerate much longer, for example, structural design concepts with wood that permit us because of ignorance to utilize only part of the potential strength of wood, allowing large "safety factors" that are really ignorance factors. These factors, call them what we will, handicap our efficient utilization of lumber, plywood, laminated wood, and even the new fiberboards, and other wood-base materials that help reduce construction costs and make full use of the wood resource. That is the goal of the long-term housing research underway at the Forest Products Laboratory. It is research that must be included among the most important scientific enterprises we now have going for solutions to our domestic crisis in housing, both rural and urban, if we are to alleviate the poverty that haunts millions of our people like Mrs. Cloud.

THE FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING ACT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, I introduced the Federal Sharing Act (S. 50).

On the day I introduced the bill, I placed a statement in the RECORD explaining its purposes and provisions. Today, I would like to describe in somewhat greater technical detail how the bill works.

BASIS OF REVENUE-SHARING PAYMENTS

Section 3 of the proposed act would appropriate for revenue-sharing purposes a stated percentage—3 percent for fiscal 1970 and 1971, 4 percent for 1972, and 5 percent for 1973—of the total receipts from Federal individual income taxes in the preceding fiscal year.

A proviso states that in no case will the amount appropriated for revenue-sharing in any given year be less than the amount appropriated for that purpose in the prior year. The proviso would protect States and localities from a cutback resulting from a recession or future Federal income tax reduction.

On the basis of present estimates, the bill would allocate about $2.42 billion for revenue-sharing in fiscal 1970, the first year of the program. It would allocate somewhat over two-thirds more than this amount in fiscal 1973, the last year for which money is appropriated under the bill.

ALLOCATION AMONG THE STATES

Section 4 of the act allocates 90 percent of these revenue-sharing moneys among the States according to a formula based on population and tax effort. The tax effort factor is measured by the ratio of all State and local taxes collected within a State to the total personal income for that State.

The use of the tax effort factor in the formula provides a bonus to States which maintain or increase their tax efforts. It thus serves as a deterrent against States reducing their own taxes in expectation of receiving revenue-sharing assistance.

Section 5 of the act would allocate the remaining 10 percent of revenue-sharing moneys to the 17 States having the lowest per capita income. The number 17 is selected as representing the poorest one-third of the States. These States generally are those most in need of Federal aid to strengthen their fiscal base. The formula for these States would be based on population and per capita income, and would be designed to provide a larger proportional share to those States having the lowest per capita income.

These 17 States eligible for special assistance under section 5 are Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Louisiana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Georgia, South Dakota, Idaho, Utah, Maine, and Oklahoma.

PAYMENTS TO CITIES AND URBAN COUNTIES

Section 6 of the act requires States to pay over to cities and urban counties of 50,000-plus population a substantial portion of revenue-sharing payments they receive. The formula in the bill for these payments by States to metropolitan governments was based on the work of the National Advisory Commission on Urban Problems, headed by former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois.

Under the formula in the bill, the amount a State would be required to pay to a city or urban county would depend on the latter's local tax ratio. A city's or urban county's local tax ratio would be defined as the ratio between, first, its revenues from its own local tax sources, and, second, the total revenues from all State and local taxes in the State.

Specifically, the State would be required to pass through to cities and urban counties the following portion of its revenue-sharing payments:

First. For each city or urban county of 100,000-plus population, two times its "local tax ratio" as defined above; and

Second. For each city or urban county of 50,000 to 99,999 population, the product of (a) times the percentage by which that local government's population exceeds 50,000.

It is estimated that on a nationwide basis, this formula would allocate 22 percent of revenue-sharing payments to cities, 13 percent to urban counties, and the other 65 percent to the State governments.

The formula was designed with the following considerations in mind:

First. Basing the formula on local taxation would allocate the largest share to the most populous and most "active" metropolitan governments. It would, moreover, restrict the amount of payments to urban governments which are relatively "dormant"—that is, which impose few taxes and provide few services.

XUM

Second. The formula would take into account the variation in State-local fiscal relations throughout the Nation. The shares it would allocate between the State government and metropolitan governments in a given State would depend upon their relative shares of the total burden of State and local taxation.

Third. The formula serves automatically to allocate payments between cities and urban counties which have overlapping boundaries.

Fourth. Providing a graduated scale of allowances for cities and urban counties with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 avoids the possibility of drastically different treatment for local governments just below and just above the minimum population of 50,000.

RELATIVE SHARES OF STATES, CITIES, AND URBAN COUNTIES

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the relative amounts that States, cities, and urban counties would receive of each billion of revenue-sharing dollars distributed under section 4 of the bill.

The table does not include the amounts distributed to the 17 poorest States under section 5.

Column (b) of the table shows the additional or reduced percentage a State receives as a result of the inclusion of a tax effort factor in the formula of section 4 of the bill.

It is to be noted that the table shows how much States, cities, and counties would receive of each billion dollars distributed. Thus to calculate the amount they actually would get, it is necessary to multiply the figures in the tables by the number of billions—for example, 2.4 for the 1970 fiscal year—distributed under the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLOCATION OF EACH $1,000,000,000 OF REVENUE-SHARING MONEYS DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEC. 4 OF THE FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING ACT (S. 50)

States	Total allocation		Amount, by type of government (thousands)			Percent, by type of government		
	Amount (millions) (a)	Relative effort adjustment (percent) (b)	States (c)	Cities (d)	Urban counties (e)	States (f)	Cities (g)	Urban counties (h)
United States, total	$1,000.00		$660,537	$218,147	$121,107	66.1	21.8	12.1
Alabama	16.00	−11	12,214	1,944	1,792	76.4	12.4	11.2
Alaska	1.25	−11	996		254	79.4		20.6
Arizona	10.10	+21	7,262	1,562	1,276	72.0	15.4	12.6
Arkansas	9.49	−5	9,078	242	170	95.7	2.5	1.8
California	112.76	+16	63.866	18,516	30,378	56.7	16.4	26.9
Colorado	11.46	+14	8,300	1,914	1,246	72.5	16.7	10.8
Connecticut	12.91	−13	9,132	3,778		70.8	29.2	
Delaware	2.44	−7	1,954	298	188	80.3	12.1	7.6
District of Columbia	3.38	−18		3,380			100.0	
Florida	30.87	+1	21,850	3,630	5,390	70.9	11.7	17.4
Georgia	20.82	−9	16.222	1,962	2,636	78.0	9.4	12.6
Hawaii	4.76	+28	2,610	2,150		54.9	45.1	
Idaho	3.67	−14	3,572		98	97.4		2.6
Illinois	44.79	−19	31,802	9,432	3,556	71.1	21.0	7.9
Indiana	24.41	−4	19,048	2,432	2,930	78.1	9.9	12.0
Iowa	14.50	+4	12,468	980	1,052	86.1	6.7	7.2
Kansas	12.05	+4	9,952	844	1,254	82.6	7.0	10.4
Kentucky	14.61	−10	12,430	1,368	812	85.2	9.3	5.5
Louisiana	20.47	+10	16,036	3.022	1,412	78.4	14.7	6.9
Maine	4.96	+1	4,366	218	76	94.1	4.4	1.5
Maryland	18.34	−2	5,870	5.454	7,016	32.1	29.7	38.2
Massachusetts	29.53	+7	17,884	10,666	980	60.6	36.1	3.3
Michigan	41.39	−5	30,528	6,822	4,040	73.9	16.4	9.7
Minnesota	21.27	+17	16,480	2,230	2,560	77.6	10.4	12.0
Mississippi	12.62	+5	11,458	658	504	90.8	5.2	4.0
Missouri	20.69	−12	14,652	4,672	1,366	70.9	22.5	6.6
Montana	3.80	+8	3,690	14	96	97.2	.3	2.5
Nebraska	6.50	−11	5,116	902	482	78.8	13.8	7.4
Nevada	2.35	+6	1,712	62	576	73.0	2.6	24.4
New Hampshire	3.10	−12	2,702	334	64	87.3	10.7	2.0
New Jersey	31.34	−12	18,774	6,192	6,374	60.0	19.7	20.3
New Mexico	5.62	+10	4,828	644	148	86.0	11.4	2.6
New York	116.58	+25	31,432	73,724	11,424	27.0	63.2	9.8
North Carolina	24.07	−6	18,784	1,718	3,568	78.1	7.1	14.8
North Dakota	3.39	+5	3,346		44	98.7		1.3
Ohio	41.46	−22	30,324	7,040	4,096	73.3	16.9	9.8
Oklahoma	12.71		11,010	1,190	510	96.7	9.3	4.0
Oregon	10.53	+4	8,594	974	962	89.7	9.2	9.1
Pennsylvania	53.00	−10	37,864	11,034	4,102	71.5	20.8	7.7
Rhode Island	4.29	−7	2,868	1,422		66.9	33.1	
South Carolina	12.04	−9	11,296	282	462	98.9	2.3	3.8
South Dakota	3.82	+12	3,680	46	94	96.5	1.1	2.4
Tennessee	17.98	−9	10,124	4,296	3,560	53.3	26.9	19.8
Texas	47.66	−14	84,468	9,056	4,136	72.4	19.0	8.6
Utah	5.84	+12	4,546	510	784	77.9	8.7	13.4
Vermont	2.40	+14	2,392		8	99.7		.3
Virginia	20.34	−12	10,959	5,659	3,722	53.9	27.8	18.3
Washington	16.68	+6	13,604	1,512	1,564	81.7	9.0	9.3
West Virginia	8.86	−3	8,346	260	254	94.3	2.9	2.8
Wisconsin	24.23	+14	18,050	3,102	3,078	74.5	12.8	12.1
Wyoming	2.01	+25	1,998		12	99.4		.6

FIVE-PERCENT SHARE FOR EXECUTIVE STAFF

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, section 6 of the bill would generally require a State to allocate 5 percent of its revenue-sharing payments—exclusive of the amount it is required to pass on to cities and urban counties—for executive staff and management.

One of the most compelling issues for many States today is the improvement of State executive and management functions. Some States have lagged in these fields, often because of a lack of funds. Pressures for higher spending for education, health, welfare, and urban development have overshadowed the development of executive staff machinery and the improvement of State management services.

This feature of a revenue-sharing plan would put emphasis on the need for active, well-staffed State budget offices; qualified executive planning personnel in such fields as fiscal planning, development planning, and policy formulation and coordination; and sufficiently high salaries for top-level management personnel to attract and hold capable people in State government.

UNCONDITIONAL NATURE OF REVENUE-SHARING PAYMENTS

Except for the 5-percent share for State executive staffs, the revenue-sharing payments allocated to State governments and to city and urban county governments would be unconditional. These State and local governments would have full discretion to spend the moneys in the manner they thought most fit.

COUNCIL ON REVENUE-SHARING

To avoid any possibility of Federal administrators imposing conditions, controls, or excessive administrative paperwork, the revenue-sharing program would be administered by a Council on Revenue-Sharing appointed by the President. Five members of the Council would be Governors, five would be mayors or chief executives of cities or urban county governments, and five would be chosen from private life. No more than three persons in each of these categories could be members of the same political party. The Council would determine forms and procedures with a requirement that they be kept as simple as possible. Only the Council could withhold funds for failure of State and local officials to comply with established procedures. Any decision to withhold funds would be subject to judicial review in a Federal Court of Appeals. The Council would also be charged with responsibility for assessing the impact of the revenue-sharing program and making recommendations to Congress for changes.

SOFTWOOD LUMBER STANDARDS AND ENGINEERING DATA FOR STRUCTURAL LUMBER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, since the subject of availability of lumber and increasing lumber prices is a current topic of concern, the proposed new softwood lumber standard presently being processed by the Department of Commerce takes on added significance.

I was impressed—as I am sure others were—with the cogent remarks in the Senate on February 7 by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee (Mr. SPARKMAN) on the proposed lumber standard. Of particular significance, as noted by Senator SPARKMAN, is the fact that the new standard relates size of lumber to the moisture content of wood. It is my understanding that in bringing about this equating of lumber sizes, they have also been tailored more closely to consumer requirements so that the proposed new sizes will permit almost 4 percent

XUM

greater utilization of green lumber and as much as 11 percent greater utilization of dry lumber. This means that the yield of softwood lumber from our entire softwood timber resource can be increased by as much as 4 to 11 percent simply by the implementation of the new standard.

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) rightly stressed the need to correct the deficiencies in the old softwood standard. He indicated that a special panel operating under the Department of Commerce found that the present softwood lumber standard should be revised for the protection of users and consumers.

A review of the features of the proposed new standard reveals that it will not only provide for better utilization of our Nation's supply of softwood timber but also incorporates many new features of benefit to the designer and user of softwood lumber. Among these are—

First. A system of related sizes for green and dry lumber which results in comparable strength, stiffness and wood content for both products.

Second. Simplification of lumber use by the designer, through standardized strength and stiffness values for species and groups of species having similar characteristics.

Third. A national "grading rule" for softwood dimension lumber which applies to all species and all regions.

Fourth. A restructuring of the American Lumber Standards Committee under the procedures of the Department of Commerce to provide for uniformly strengthened enforcement of lumber grading rules.

Fifth. The requirement that actual lumber dimensions be included on all invoices and orders.

Of major importance to the construction industry and to those who design with lumber, the proposed lumber standard also provides for the most accurate strength and stiffness values ever assigned to softwood lumber. In view of the questions relating to earlier assignment of stress values to lumber which have been raised by Representative JOHN DINGELL, the Federal Trade Commission, and the press, it is particularly significant to note that the engineering data under the proposed new lumber standard will be developed in accordance with the latest established standards of the American Society for Testing and Materials—ASTM. These ASTM standards were revised as late as last year. They reflect the results of a comprehensive survey of the properties of standing timber conducted by the U.S. Forest Service with the cooperation of the lumber industry at the cost of approximately three-quarters of a million dollars.

In addition to the ASTM standards governing the assignment of engineering data to softwood lumber when graded by visual methods, the proposed new standard provides for the use of machine grading and other procedures which may be developed as they are found acceptable by the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory and the National Bureau of Standards.

It is my belief that Members of Congress should be aware of this background. There are a few who may be expected to oppose the promulgation of any improved new standard, even when the standard is in the public interest and in the long-term best interest of the industry involved. Such minority opposition has been voiced. Since it tends to question the adequacy of ASTM standards referenced in the proposed new lumber standard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement a general description of the procedures for establishing ASTM standards, particularly those relating to lumber.

It is possible that an attempt will be made to stop or delay this worthy standards effort. But I feel that Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who studied Senator SPARKMAN's statement will agree that our lumber industry has suffered enough as a result of minority opposition. The required new lumber standard should be implemented without delay.

It is my hope that Members of Congress will question very carefully any efforts to seek their assistance in actions which might serve to impede the processing of this improved and much needed standard for a major building product.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON PROCEDURES OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS

The American Society for Testing and Materials has a long and distinguished record. Founded in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1898, the Society now has approximately 16,000 members consisting of 12,000 individual engineers, scientists, researchers and educators; 2,700 companies, associations and research institutes; plus 1,300 governmental agencies and departments. Within the Society are more than 100 main technical committees (2,500 including subcommittees and sections) which have developed more than 4,000 standards. All of these standards are published, widely distributed, and used.

Several years ago, the standards-making procedures of ASTM were reviewed by the Federal District Court in Philadelphia and were found to be entirely within the antitrust laws. In fact, the Court commended the Society on its procedures and the care with which its technical committee regulations were administered. An important part of those regulations specifies that the number of producers on a committee may not exceed the number of nonproducers (consumer and general interest) and that the committee chairman may not be a producer.

Another important part of the regulations provides for Society membership to all interested parties and committee membership to all Society members who are qualified to participate in the work of the committee. All committee recommendations on standards are subject to letter ballot approval of committee members and all negative votes must be reviewed by the committee.

One of the oldest ASTM technical committees is Committee D–7 on Wood. It was organized in 1904 and is credited with the development of 73 standards applicable to wood and related products. According to the 1968–69 ASTM Yearbook, Committee D–7 has 167 voting members of which 75, or less than half, are wood products producers. It would be extremely difficult to find a group more knowledgeable on the subject of wood and related materials than the 167 engineers, researchers and scientists who comprise the membership of Committee D–7.

The importance of the work of Committee D–7 is demonstrated in the wide use of the standards it has developed. For example the assignment of strength and stiffness values to structural lumber by the various lumber grade-writing agencies is based entirely on standards developed by this committee. The benefits of this work to the designer and user of wood, as well as to the producer, are well recognized.

The writing of an ASTM standard involves many of the problems encountered in writing a legislative act. All those who have an interest must have the opportunity to be heard, the evidence must be analyzed and a decision made by those competent and responsible for doing so. The usual result is a technical compromise representing the best combined judgment of the specialists who comprise the various committees.

It is very apparent from the published regulations of the American Society for Testing and Materials that each technical committee is required to support its recommendations for action on any standard with a substantial affirmative vote and that each negative voter be provided full opportunity to explain his position and to try to persuade other members to join him. However, opposition of a small minority—vocal as it may be—if it is found to be of questionable validity, is not permitted to negate the affirmation of a substantial majority.

NIXON'S CASE FOR A MODIFIED ABM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I feel it is important to note that President Nixon's recent decision for a modified ABM system provides the flexibility needed to keep a number of options open. Since the emphasis is on defense, not offense, the President's decision should not hinder arms talks or the possibility of a summit meeting with the Russians.

The President was faced with his first major decision. After carefully considering the alternatives, he chose to proceed in the interests of national security.

Mr. President, my sentiments are expressed in a March 15 editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S CASE FOR A MODIFIED ABM

President Richard M. Nixon's decision in favor of a modified antiballistic missile system was difficult to make and probably will result in vigorous congressional debate but it is based on three acceptable selling points:

It stresses the defensive objective of the system which is designed to deter outside aggression.

It is realistic, facing squarely the unhappy but hard fact that it would be impossible to protect all or any large cities completely in case of enemy attack.

It attempts, by compromise, to avert an out-and-out battle with the Senate group which regards the antiballistic missile project as too expensive, too ineffective and too provocative.

The choice puts the accent on defense. Mr. Nixon would modify the Sentinel ABM system proposed by President Johnson's administration and concentrate on protecting, first, the United States missile and bomber force from a quick knockout. Initial defensive installations reportedly would be in Montana and North Dakota.

XUM

Admittedly the decision was in the damned-if-you-do and damned-if-you-don't category, even though it is classified as a minimum program geared for 1973 operation and subject to change. However, the President heard all sides and all shades of political, scientific and military opinion before making up his mind. It cannot be said he wasn't well informed or did not avail himself of all knowledge on the subject.

In announcing his decision to advocate spending between $6 and $7 billion for anti-ballistic missile deployment, Mr. Nixon made it plain he is counting on the Soviet Union to recognize the defensive nature of ABM and not to consider it a reason for increasing its own arsenal of weapons. He admitted this is in the nature of a calculated risk taken "in the interest of peace throughout the world."

Red China, he said, is a potential military threat to world peace which keeps the U.S. and the Soviet Union wary.

He was candid in saying that although "every instinct motivates me to provide the American people with complete protection against a major nuclear attack, it is not now within our power to do so." This is patently true. A massive city defense system would have to be perfect to be effective in cutting civilian losses significantly in case of nuclear attack. The President's best advice was to push for a missile defense that would do the basic job of protecting this nation's retaliatory power against sneak attack.

Any armament decision today is perilous but choices must be made. A president cannot duck them. The President, in the case of ABM, made a reasonable conclusion.

FARM TAX INEQUITIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on January 22 I reintroduced a bill, S. 500, which is designed to remove inequities between legitimate farm operators and the tax-dodge farmers who are in the business of farming mainly because of the tax advantages that serve to put their nonfarm income in a lower tax bracket.

The problem with which the farmer is faced is that many high-bracket taxpayers, individuals as well as corporations, whose primary economic activity is other than farming, have entered in farming because by doing so they can then come under exceptions intended only for legitimate farmers. The tax-dodge farmer then elects special farm accounting rules that enable him to deduct as farm losses items that are not true economic losses from his other high-bracket income. This results in large tax savings. As a matter of fact, the tax savings can be so large that this form of investment is dangled in front of prospective clients of cattle or citrus management firms as an enticement to jump on the bandwagon.

At present, a bipartisan group of 26 other Senators have joined with me in sponsoring this bill. In the House the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Culver, has introduced companion legislation, H.R. 4257 and H.R. 7575, with a bipartisan group of 28 cosponsors. In addition, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Patman, has introduced H.R. 7336, which is also identical to the bill which I introduced early this session.

Aside from congressional support, the principle of this legislation has the full support of all those who are sincerely interested in the working farmers of our Nation. For example, the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers Organization, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, the Farmland Industries Cooperative, the Midcontinent Farmers Association—formerly known as the Missouri Farmers Association—the AFL–CIO, the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, the United Steelworkers, the South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Inc., the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, and the Farmers Grain Dealers Association, have all called for action to be taken now.

On March 19 the Wall Street Journal carried on its front page an excellent indepth analysis of the whole problem of tax-dodge farming. The article starts out with a parody of a 1930's tune that goes like this:

I'm a rich cowhand, of the Wall Street brand,
And I save on tax, to beat the band,
Oh, I take big deductions the law allows,
And I never even have to see my cows,
Yippie-i-o-ki-ay!

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Ronald A. Buel, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

City Cowboys: Big Investors Round Up Tax Savings on Cattle They Often Never See—Herds Yield Huge Deductions While Management Firms Take Care of the Details—Treasury Proposes a Curb

(By Ronald A. Buel)

"I'm a rich cowhand, of the Wall Street brand
And I save on tax, to beat the band
Oh I take big deductions the law allows
And I never even have to see my cows
Yippie-i-o-ki-ay!"

A growing number of investors could sing that parody of a 1930s tune ("I'm an Old Cowhand From the Rio Grande"). They're customers of agricultural management companies, which help them round up huge tax savings from investments in farming, sometimes fruit and nut groves but most often cattle.

The basic idea is familiar. A high-income taxpayer ($50,000 a year is the minimum to get much benefit from the plan) buys cattle. He then takes generous deductions permitted to farmers—even part-time farmers—writing them off against nonfarm income that otherwise would be taxed at rates up to 70%.

There are some disadvantages, though, for a taxpayer who tries to do this himself. He has to go to the bother of inspecting a herd or a whole ranch, negotiating a purchase, hiring a manager and keeping the books. If his inexperience results in mismanagement, he might even lose enough money on the cattle to cancel the tax benefits.

A DEDUCTIBLE VACATION

Now, for a fee—itself tax-deductible—a farm management company will take over the annoying details. It will buy cattle, arrange for professional ranchers to raise them, negotiate eventual sale of the herd and do the bookkeeping. A client who finds the nontax aspects of cattle boring doesn't even have to go look at the beasts. (A client who buys a citrus grove, however, might as well look it over during a Florida vacation; he can then deduct much or possibly all of the travel cost as the expense of a trip to inspect his property.)

Some of the bigger management companies even guarantee the investor against a loss of more than 3% or 10% (the amount varies with the type of investment) on their farm property. They make the rancher or grove manager who handles the property absorb any greater loss. A rich investor can shrug off a 3% or even 10% loss; it probably will be offset many times over by tax savings on his nonfarm income. Indeed, a small farming loss has its own tax advantage; it can be deducted from taxable nonfarm capital gains, such as stock-market profits.

As of now, all this is perfectly legal. The Internal Revenue Service requires only that a nonfarmer taking farm-expense deductions aim at making an eventual profit out of his sideline agriculture. To run afoul of this provision, an investor would have to show suspiciously large losses for a suspiciously long period or do something as stupid as forgetting to harvest his crops.

TREASURY SEEKS A LIMIT

But the Treasury now is trying to limit farm deductions against nonfarm income to $15,000 a year per person. Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.) calculates this proposal—one of a package of tax-reform ideas now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee—would bring in $200 million to $400 million a year in taxes that sideline farmers now legally escape paying.

The proposal's fate is uncertain, however, and it hasn't stopped the rush of nonfarmers into agricultural investments. At least eight corporations, plus dozens of individual farmers who also manage farm property for a fee, now handle well over $100 million of investments for more than 5,000 people. Oppenheimer Industries Inc. of Kansas City, the oldest and largest of the companies, has doubled its clientele to 400 in four years. In December, it was managing 220,000 head of cattle for them and had orders for another 20,000 head it couldn't fill immediately.

Oppenheimer, the principal subsidiary of Atlas Acceptance Corp., Kansas City, began managing cattle in 1952, mostly for movie stars. Over the years, though, the focus of its appeal has shifted to Wall Street; stockbrokers and investment counselors now outnumber the Hollywood figures, such as Jack Benny, who still dot its client lists.

The tax savings these clients can make on cattle purchases compare favorably with the profits they can make on most stock-market investments. Consider, for example, the Kansas City broker for whom Oppenheimer bought a herd of "breeding cattle"—cows used to produce beef cattle—two years ago.

A 90-PERCENT LOAN

The broker paid $3,000 of the $30,000 purchase price in cash, borrowing the other 90% on a loan Oppenheimer arranged. This is a frequent practice for Wall Street cowboys; it allows them to get the full tax savings on a large herd without tying up too much of their own capital. Also, interest on the loan—in this case, $4,400 in two years—is tax-deductible.

The broker by now has paid out $32,000 in cash to cover various expenses of running the herd and deducted all of it from his nonfarm taxable income; at this point, the farm operations themselves have produced no profit. Besides interest, the deductions include a $5,050 management fee paid to Oppenheimer, $2,550 paid for use of bulls or artificial insemination for his cows—and a whopping $20,000 paid to purchase in advance several years' supply of feed.

This last deduction illustrates a special tax advantage of farming: Farmers are allowed to keep their books on a "cash" basis, rather than the "accrual" basis most businesses must use. That means, among other things that they can deduct the full purchase price of feed in the year it is bought, rather than having to spread the deduction over the years in which the feed is consumed. This benefit was written into the tax laws because most farmers were assumed to have neither the time nor the accounting expertise to keep accounts on an accrual basis, but it applies to sideline farmers who are thoroughly familiar with involved bookkeeping methods.

Farmers also are allowed to take depreciation deductions on some kinds of cattle; in the broker's case, depreciation came to $5,000. That brought his total deductions to $37,000—saving $25,900 in taxes he otherwise would have had to pay at the 70% rate applying to the top slice of his nonfarm income.

That saving, it's true, may eventually be reduced by capital-gains taxes and possibly a paper loss on the sale of the cattle. But the broker still figures to come out way ahead.

If he had Oppenheimer sell his cattle at today's prices, for instance—and he may—the broker would receive about $58,000, or about $4,000 less than he would need to recoup his cash outlays and repay the purchase loan. Also, he would have to pay capital-gains tax on $33,000, representing the excess of the $58,000 sale price over the cattle's $25,000 book value (the $30,000 purchase price less the $5,000 depreciation). At the top capital-gains rate of 25%, this tax would be $8,250.

RETURN OF 39 PERCENT IN 2 YEARS

Subtracting this tax payment and the $4,000 paper loss from the $25,900 he has saved in income taxes, however, would leave the broker still $13,650 ahead on the deal. That's a two-year return of 39% on his total cash outlay of $35,000—a return not many stockmarket investments can match.

Lucrative as this deal was, it still doesn't illustrate all the advantages of cattle ownership. Investors in dairy cattle get the benefit of greater depreciation deductions than the Kansas Citly broker took, combined with greater income from their herds.

Modern Dairy Farms Inc., Fort Madison, Iowa, now has 120 investors in its tax-shelter program, compared with 35 two years ago. One client, a clothing executive in the 50% tax bracket, bought a herd four years ago for $160,000, half of which he borrowed. He already has written the herd's value down to $60,000, saving $50,000 in taxes in four years through the $100,000 of depreciation deductions alone.

SPLITTING MILK INCOME

In addition, he receives income of $40 per cow per year, or $16,000 annually, on his herd of 400 head. (An equal revenue from milk sales goes to Modern Dairy Farms as a management fee; the farmer who raises the cattle keeps any remaining milk income.) With other deductions on the herd offsetting taxes on his milk income and then some, the investor figures to repay his $80,000 purchase loan out of milk revenues in five years, increasing his potential profit on eventual sale of the herd. This investor went to see his cows once; he recalls "slogging through the manure in the rain to take a look at the little beasts."

The permission for farmers to keep books on a cash basis also enables sideline agriculturists to take especially big deductions in years when their nonfarm income, and thus their potential tax liabilities, is highest. An example is one Oppenheimer client who bought a herd of cattle being fattened for slaughter for $17,684—95% of which he borrowed—in November of a year in which he knew his top tax rate on nonfarm income would be 70%. He imediately paid out $7,000 for a huge supply of feed. Other expenses brought his immediate deductions to $7,925, saving him $5,548 on that year's taxes.

Early the next year this investor made a planned switch to a new nonfarm job that he knew would depress his income enough at the outset to reduce his top tax to 35%. So he had Oppenheimer take advantage of favorable prices and sell the cattle in April. He received enough to recoup his cash expenses, repay the purchase loan and leave a nominal profit of $510.

A FIVE-MONTH BONANZA

Since he had held his cattle only five months, the investor paid ordinary-income, rather than capital-gains, tax on the excess of the purchase price over the sale price. But at a 35% rate, that tax came to only $3,351. Subtracting this sum from the total of his profit and previous year's tax savings left him $2,137 ahead on a cash outlay of $8,810—a return of almost 25% in five months. And that was without the benefit of depreciation deductions, which aren't permitted on feeder cattle.

Not every investor who signs up with an agricultural management company does that well, of course. Some apparently have been taken by small companies that don't guarantee their clients against large losses and sometimes mismanage their cattle or groves.

The reputable companies take extensive precautions to protect their clients. To begin with, they set minimums on the investments they will accept to keep away would-be investors with incomes and tax rates too small to benefit much from agricultural property. Oppenheimer won't accept any amount less than $10,000, and Black Watch Farms, a subsidiary of Bermec Corp., an Englewood, N.J., truck-leasing concern, specifies a $100,000 minimum. Black Watch manages registered breeding cattle, whose lineage can be traced; it now manages 18,000 such cattle for investors, against 9,000 last June 30 and 1,900 at the end of 1965.

RESTRICTIONS ON RANCHERS

To make sure its clients' cattle are well cared for, Oppenheimer will make contracts to raise the cattle only with ranchers who have been successful enough to accumulate a net worth of at least $250,000. To prevent the ranchers from getting its clients' cattle mixed up with their own, it insists each investor's cattle bear a "personalized" brand.

Oppenheimer won't give any rancher contracts to raise more than 10,000 of its clients' cattle. It tries to scatter each client's herd over two or three ranches "so that," explains a spokesman, "if an investor gets hit by a drought in New Mexico, he's unlikely to get hit by a blizzard in Montana, too." The 220,000 head of cattle Oppenheimer's clients owned in December were roaming over more than 100 ranches or feed lots scattered across 17 states.

Despite these restrictions and its insistence that ranchers pick up any losses on an investor's cattle in excess of a guaranteed maximum, Oppenheimer has no trouble finding willing ranchers. Leonard H. Purdy, who currently raises 600 Oppenheimer cattle along with 1,700 of his own on a 39,000-acre spread in Picabo, Idaho, says that dealing with Oppenheimer gives him "something of a guaranteed market." He means that he can count on Oppenheimer to buy some of his cattle regularly for its clients at prices he considers reasonable.

Even Oppenheimer, however, concedes that finding ranchers who are capable as well as willing is difficult. "Neglectful ranchers" who don't take proper care of a client's cattle "are our biggest problem," says Garrett Cole, Oppenheimer's Midwest sales manager.

The much greater problems that an investor who signs up with a less careful management company can run into are illustrated by the case of Tenn-Tex Land & Cattle Co., Dallas. This company some years ago took mail orders and cash for $900,000 of cattle from more than 300 investors. It won enough attention to be recommended at one point by a prestigious national investment letter.

SECURITIES BOARD'S FINDINGS

The Texas State Security Board, however, eventually found that Tenn-Tex had no reserve account to replace lost cattle as it had advertised, that it hadn't purchased all the cattle ordered, that the land upon which its clients' cattle "were being grazed was overstocked and that a large number of such cattle had died and were dying from starvation." The board ordered the company to stop soliciting investments and Tenn-Tex went into receivership. Its president, Leighton G. Dotsom, pleaded guilty to mail fraud in April 1965 and was sentenced to a three-year jail term, with two and a half years of the sentence suspended.

There are some dangers in grove investments, too. The investor who goes into this type of agriculture "had better be sure he knows how his groves are being managed," says John Tobias, executive director of American Agronomics Corp., one of the biggest management companies specializing in groves. "There are plenty of people still out to make a quick buck."

(American Agronomics itself has posted an enviable growth record; it now has over 2,000 clients investing in orange groves, more than double the number two years ago. It is getting increasing competition, though, some of it partly financed from Wall Street. Hayden Stone Inc., a big stock brokerage firm, owns the majority interest in Jasmine Groves Co., which started up in December.)

WOE FOR THE MIDDLING RICH

Even the management-company client whose investments are carefully handled can't always count on getting much benefit from farm property. For the only middling rich, such investments sometimes don't yield enough tax savings to make the outlay worthwhile.

A retired St. Louis investment banker, for example, has laid out $58,700 since 1964 for the purchase price and expenses of a cattle herd that now numbers 340 head. His deductions against nonfarm income (mostly from stock trades) came to $40,000 in the first four years, but since he is "only" in the 50% tax bracket, he saved only $20,000. Last year his nonfarm income dropped, and he had unusually high nonfarm deductions, including large medical expenses, to offset it almost entirely. As a result, he got "almost no tax benefit" from cattle deductions, since he didn't need them.

If he sold his herd now, the St. Louisian figures he would just about get back his purchase price and cash expenses and have to pay about $12,000 in capital-gains taxes. Subtracting that from his income-tax savings would leave him only $8,000 ahead on the investment—a five-year return of less than 14%, or less than 3% a year, on his cash outlay. "I undoubtedly would have done better putting the money into the stock market," he says.

Why then did he bother investing in cattle? "Some of my smart friends have cattle programs, so I figured I'd better have one too," he replies.

HOW CONFIDENTIAL IS THE INFORMATION IN CREDIT BUREAUS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, spokesmen of the credit bureau industry frequently assert that the information in the files of credit bureaus is kept strictly confidential and is furnished only to bona fide creditors.

This argument was drastically punctured by the "CBS Evening News." In order to find out how easy it would be to obtain confidential information from a credit bureau, a CBS news team formed a bogus company complete with letterhead, mailing address, and telephone answering service at a cost of $15 a month. CBS then proceeded to select 20 names at random from the tele-

XUM

phone books in 20 different cities. Under the letterhead of the fake company, CBS then wrote to the credit bureaus in those 20 cities asking for a complete credit report on the names they had selected.

Despite the so-called safeguards and procedures which credit bureaus claim to follow, 10 of the 20 credit bureaus responded with a complete credit report on the individuals selected.

Mr. President, this brief example once again underlines the need for protective legislation in the field of credit bureaus. I have introduced S. 823, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, which would require credit bureaus to preserve the confidentiality of the information in their files. The CBS experiment should demonstrate once and for all that public safeguards over credit bureau activities are long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the CBS Evening News for March 17 concerning the CBS report on credit bureaus be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CBS Evening News With Walter Cronkite

Cronkite. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut declared today that the "time is long overdue" for President Nixon to pay more attention to the U.S. consumer. Ribicoff was one of several Democratic Congressmen who took the President to task at a Senate subcommittee hearing on legislation to create a Federal Department of Consumer Affairs. One area of recent concern to many people is the question of credit ratings and the invasion of privacy. CBS News Correspondent Mike Wallace investigated that question.

Woman. May I help you?

Wallace. Yes, please. My name is Wallace and I'm starting a small business. We're not going to have an office to begin with, and I understand that you take telephone calls.

Woman. Oh, you want to use our address and telephone number?

Wallace. Exactly.

Woman. Oh, yes, of course, we can arrange that. Do you know what the rates are?

Wallace. No, I don't.

Woman. They are $15 a month for both, and the only thing that you . . .

Wallace. For, for both?

Woman. For both, mail and telephone service, per month.

Wallace. I can have my mail sent here and my calls received here.

Woman. Exactly. That's right.

Wallace. $15 a month.

Woman. Right. The only thing that's required is that you fill out a form from the Post Office that permits us to act as agents and accept mail for you.

Wallace. Understood.

This is where the experiment began, a building at 200 West 57th Street, in New York City. That is the home of Accurate Secretarial Service. The firm provides a business address for small enterprises that don't want to rent their own offices. We signed a standard Post Office form permitting delivery of mail through an agent. We filled in the name of our non-existent company, Transitair Systems, and the nature of the business, systems consultants.

Woman. And would you also like some business cards?

Wallace. Uh huh.

Woman. Just letterheads. That's 20, that's 24.15 for the letterheads.

Wallace. So Transitair Systems was in business, an office, a telephone number, and a letterhead. What we wanted to find out was this: Is it possible for a small, unknown firm having nothing to do with credit to obtain supposedly confidential credit ratings? How easy is it to crack the files of local credit bureaus around the country?

There are more than 2100 local credit bureaus in the United States. They collect and file information on the finances of persons living in their localities, information obtained from a variety of sources, from banks, department stores, employers, court records, to name a few. The local bureaus are joined together in a national organization. They exchange information among themselves and sell that information to clients, those clients being firms that are considering granting credit. According to industry spokesmen, that information is not available to outsiders.

John Spafford, Executive Director of Associated Credit Bureaus of America, talked with Reporter Norman Glubok.

Glubok. Could anyone who's interested buy a credit report on anybody?

Spafford. No, sir, they could not. First of all, as I mentioned earlier, they have to be a bona fide creditor, and by that I mean they have to be in the business of extending credit to individual consumers. They go make an application to become a member of the local credit bureau. The local credit bureau will investigate them to find out that they are in the business of extending credit, and if they find they meet the qualifications of that bureau, they will sign a contract with that individual credit granter. And then, and only then, do they have access to credit information in the files of that bureau.

Glubok. Then in your opinion a person down here in Houston couldn't write to Chicago, for example, and ask for information about some Chicagoan—would he receive that information?

Spafford. No, he would not. He would not.

Wallace. Transitair Systems, of course, had nothing to do with granting credit, because in fact it did no business at all. But we sent off letters to 20 credit bureaus around the country, bureaus picked at random from an industry directory. In each case, we asked for a credit report on an individual, a name picked, again at random, from the local telephone book. We said we were considering granting credit to that person. Under the industry guidelines we should have been told to contact our local New York credit bureau, which could then have checked out our credentials.

That isn't exactly the way it happened. Out of that mailing of 20 letters, we received, without further question, full credit reports on ten individuals. We received them directly from credit bureaus in Norwalk, Connecticut, in Corbin, Kentucky, Huntington, West Virginia, Belvedere, Illinois, Fort Smith, Arkansas, Greenville, Mississippi, Bismarck, North Dakota, Blytheville, Arkansas, and Bowling Green, Kentucky.

Two other local bureaus offered to send information if we would sign a contract with them. Three others reported they had no file on the individual requested. Four did not reply. Only two of the 20 referred us to our local credit bureau, the procedure ostensibly required by the industry code. So on that first mailing of 20 letters, we batted an even .500, in spite of assurances that it could not be done.

Glubok. And in your opinion it's not easy for people who are not entitled to information to get it?

Spafford. It's impossible.

Wallace. Perhaps you'd like to see what a credit report looks like. This is a composite. We typed up a report using entries from several of the reports that we received, and of course we changed the names and addresses so as not to identify the subjects.

The top half of the form gives general information, name, address, employment, income, size of family, that kind of thing. But the bottom half gets down to the crux of the matter, credit history. This column on the left shows the kind of credit involved, B for bank loan, F for finance company, D for department store, and so on. The form shows the highest amount of credit involved in each transaction, the amount remaining, the amount past due, if any. But perhaps the most significant column is over here at the right, terms of sale and usual manner of payment. Here, for example, I stands for installment payments, $129 per payment, and the last number, one, is a code. It means the subject usually pays within 30 days. That's pretty good. But here, a code number, two, 30 to 60 days. Down here, O stands for open account, and the code number, three, payments more than 60 days but not more than 90 days late. You'll notice the higher the code number the higher the credit risk, so this worst number of all, nine, is usually reserved for deadbeats. This man would have a hard time getting credit.

Then there is a section called public record. Here we show a collection agency record, a couple of lawsuits, and the fact that the subject was divorced and remarried. Up here, in small type, is a warning that the information is confidential. But in one case, the report from Greenville, Mississippi, there was an additional warning. It says right there in red ink under no circumstances should the subject be allowed to see or have possession or knowledge of this report or a copy of it.

We decided to try one more mailing, but to make it a little more difficult. There were three differences this time. First, we no longer stated that we were thinking of granting credit. We simply asked for a full credit report with no explanation why. Second, we no longer chose individuals at random. Instead, we chose persons who had complained to congressional investigators about their credit problems. And third, although we didn't know it at the time, the industry had just issued new, tougher guidelines. They state that local credit bureaus must require contracts with clients in which the client certifies that inquiries will be made only for purposes of granting credit. This time we sent out 28 letters, and, as expected, we had a tougher time. Only one-fourth of the credit bureaus sent us reports directly. This one came from Boston, Mass., this one from Alma, Michigan, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, Rice Lake, Wisconsin, Austin, Texas, Dallas, Texas, and this one came from Peoria, Illinois. The Peoria report had another of those special warnings attached. "Strictly confidential," it said, "don't subject yourself to libel suits."

But there were some bright spots. This time 12 credit bureaus referred us to the New York bureaus, and one flatly refused to help us at all. Five did not reply, but three others said that they would help us if we'd fill out application forms and sign contracts. In one case we decided to see what would happen. The credit bureau of Dalton, Georgia, asked us to sign a written contract affirming that we are intending to grant credit and agreeing to keep the information confidential. We did so. The letter also asked us to advise what type of company we were. We replied, "We are a systems company." We mailed that off and within a few days received the credit report that we'd requested. It would seem that signing a written contract is not much of a safeguard; all the client has to do is lie. But seven of the 28 bureaus provided us with credit reports without even that precaution.

Glubok. What about your members who violate your rules, who give out information to people who are not entitled to it? Do you have any penalties?

Spafford. We have some 30-odd membership qualifications and requirements, and any member who is found to be violating these and is, does not correct the violation, their membership is subject to cancellation, and we do cancel them on occasion.

Glubok. About how many members have you cancelled over the years?

Spafford. Over the years I couldn't tell you; I would say it might average ten to 15 a year.

Glubok. Out of 2,200.

Spafford. Uh huh.

Wallace. We found more violations than that just by mailing out 48 letters. Perhaps things will be better as the industry's new guidelines receive more attention. One would certainly hope that things will be better. In the meantime, Transitair Systems has been quietly phased out of the credit business. Mike Wallace, CBS News, New York.

Cronkite. And that's the way it is, Monday, March 17th, 1969. This is Walter Cronkite, CBS News. Good night.

Announcer. Direct from our newsroom in New York, in color, this has been the CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite.

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO CONGRESS ON HIS REVIEW OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I sponsored the 1967 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act which required the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of the poverty programs. On Tuesday, March 18, Comptroller General Staats issued this report.

A problem that concerns me as much today as it did in 1967, Mr. President, is that relating to the legislative oversight function of all our committees. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee alone authorizes billions of dollars in expenditures for each fiscal year. Despite the dedication of all members of our committee and the able and conscientious work performed by members of the committee staff, it is a physical impossibility to adequately and properly discharge our legislative oversight function in the many areas of our jurisdiction.

Two years ago I emphasized that the first and guiding principle to be met must be to determine the impact of each of the poverty programs in providing economic security for a poor person and his family. I said then that we must always ask "To what extent are the needs of the poor being met?" because of my conviction that the value of any particular program can only be demonstrated by the contribution it makes to the education, employability and income of individual participants.

The extensive hearings conducted by our committee here and in the field, Mr. President, did not provide the answers to these questions. Accordingly, I offered the amendment on the floor of the Senate which was adopted to direct the General Accounting Office to conduct an independent investigation in order to furnish us with the facts surrounding these programs and an evaluation as to their effectiveness.

It was and is inconceivable to me how Congress could be asked to legislate intelligently on this multibillion-dollar poverty legislation without having the facts relating to administration and results of the program available to us. My amendment, therefore, was designed primarily to obtain facts necessary to permit Congress to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, rather than to merely provide a fiscal audit of OEO's programs.

I congratulate the Comptroller General and the members of the General Accounting Office who worked on this project for having put together a report to Congress containing a clear, precise, and balanced factual account of programs operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In my opinion, this report will result in our being able to put many matters in clear perspective as they relate to those members of our society who are living in poverty. For example, funds from all Federal programs being used to combat poverty will amount to over $24 billion in fiscal 1969 and over $27 billion in fiscal 1970, although the funds made available to the Office of Economic Opportunity will amount to less than $2 billion for each of these years. In this regard I think we should also note that there are currently 10 Federal departments and agencies involved in administering these programs and that probably close to $20 billion additional is spent annually to combat poverty by innumerable State, local, and private agencies.

Thus these facts already point up the broad spectrum of poverty assistance and the fact that this country's attempts to help its less fortunate citizens go far beyond the jurisdiction of the Office of Economic Opportunity. A major conclusion which I think perhaps may be drawn from this is that we should take a new look at how we intend to combat poverty in this country with the hope of coming up with an overall approach which would combine such programs as welfare and social security as parts of an integrated plan.

I intend to study this report carefully, Mr. President. While I may not agree with all the recommendations made in this report, I believe that the Comptroller General has performed a distinct service for members of our committee and for all Members of Congress by making these facts available to us at a time when we are about to consider legislation extending and possibly modifying the Economic Opportunity Act.

COMMENDATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the consideration by the Senate of Senate Resolution 46, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, the text of a resolution sent to me by Mr. Harold E. Stringer, director of the legislative commission of the American Legion. The resolution, approved by the American Legion at its national convention in New Orleans last September, is commendatory of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which would be financed during the year ahead with funds to be provided under the terms of Senate Resolution 46.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Approved at the 15th annual national convention of the American Legion, New Orleans, La., September 10, 11, 12, 1968]

S. Res. 59

Subject: Commend Senate and House Committees in exposing Communist Conspiracy within the United States

Whereas, The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security have effectively investigated and exposed the tactics, methods and objectives of the Communist Party of the United States for the purpose of recommending remedial legislation to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, The aforesaid Committees have enlightened the American people as to the great danger of the Communist conspiracy; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By The American Legion in National Convention assembled in New Orleans, Louisiana, September 10, 11, 12, 1968, that it hereby commends these Committees and urges that no Congressional action or legislation be undertaken that would destroy the present organizational structure or make-up of these vital investigative bodies; and be it further

Resolved, That it petition the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to enable these Committees to extend and expand their activities.

SEVEN KEYS TO THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a new book entitled "Seven Keys to the Rocky Mountains," written by Richard M. Pearl, professor of geology at Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.

The book describes the mountain world of both the old West and the new. The seven keys refer to the geologic foundation or the land, the geologic framework or water and air, the fields and forests, the animal life, the original settlers of the regions, today's inhabitants and finally, the future of the Rocky Mountain area. Included in the Rocky Mountain area are the Rockies in New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah, and Arizona, plus a large part of Nevada and small corners of South Dakota, Washington, and California.

It is the first modern regional publication of this nature to appear in a quarter of a century.

I recommend this book. It is an outstanding piece of work, and Professor Pearl is to be commended.

EMMA LAZARUS FEDERATION RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for 20 long years the human rights convention outlawing the crime of genocide has been before the Senate. We have conveniently forgotten the enormity of the crimes that have been committed against entire peoples in the historic past and relegated this treaty to the dustbin.

Fortunately the conscience of the people of the United States has not been so easily stilled. The latest indication of strong support for U.S. ratification of the genocide convention has come from the Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs in a letter to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee dated March 18. This letter refers to a petition bearing more than 60,000 signatures—an earnest indication of the deep approbation given by Americans to the genocide convention.

I would like to quote a few representative statements from the letter for the information of Senators:

XUM

We have always unreservedly and with pride identified ourselves with the Bill of Rights of our American Constitution. The Bill of Rights, now just, a few years from its 200th anniversary, served as a legal model and moral inspiration for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—which in turn led to twenty major human rights conventions adopted by the United Nations over the past twenty years.

Yet, throughout these two decades, we have, but two exceptions (the Conventions dealing with slavery and refugees) not moved to guarantee the noble goals of the United Nations Universal Declaration, reflecting the very rights which our thirteen colonies fought for two centuries ago, in establishing this country and its revolutionary freedoms.

Chief Justice Earl Warren said recently "We have failed ourselves. We as a nation should have been the *first* to ratify the Genocide Convention and the Race Discrimination Convention." Yet it is conceivable that we may well be among the *last* of the member nations of the United Nations to ratify the Genocide Convention which was signed and sent to the Senate by President Harry S. Truman, nearly twenty years ago.

As Jewish women, we especially feel that it is our profound obligation to call upon our nation to inscribe its name to the Genocide Convention.

The memory of six million Jews and the millions of other peoples who were victims of the Hitler Holocaust demands that we join the rest of humanity in outlawing this most heinous of crimes. This was the crime which the third United Nations General Assembly outlawed unanimously in Paris, December 9, 1948.

President Truman signed the recommendation of Ambassador Warren Austin, his representative to the United Nations, that the United States ratify the Genocide Convention. Since that time some eighty countries have ratified the Genocide Convention (even countries not belonging to the United Nations have signed it). The Genocide Convention has the largest number of ratifications of any international Treaty.

Mr. President, these paragraphs speak for themselves. I hope that they will play a part in persuading the Foreign Relations Committee to report the genocide convention to the Senate, where I am sure that it would receive early approval.

THE PRESIDENT'S ABM DECISION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the Cleveland Press newspaper on March 15 ran an editorial analyzing President Nixon's decision on the anti-ballistic-missile system, citing the dilemma in which nuclear-age man finds himself. The editorial concluded the President's course "is as prudent a choice as he could make."

At the same time, the editor recognized that the controversy over the ABM is not over and that there will be a great debate in Congress this year.

While the President's bobtailed ABM proposal appears reasonable and consistent with our Nation's security, I plan to continue to study all the pros and cons on this major issue, which has such great import for the future and such widespread ramifications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRUDENT CHOICE ON ABM

President Nixon's decision to proceed with an Anti-Ballistic Missile system is a historic event. The ABM issue involves so many complicated and controversial technical, strategic, financial and even moral implications that they could not possibly be covered in his accompanying statement or a 30-minute news conference given to other subjects as well.

So, a great debate will follow. Conducted on a high plane, it can answer some unanswered questions, fill in some gaps of knowledge and make the final congressional disposition of the President's proposal solidly based.

As Mr. Nixon said, his uppermost aim is to assure the security of the United States against nuclear threats now seen and those not yet real, but possible. He made a point of seeking to avoid a provocation toward our fellow super power, Russia. He advocated an initially limited ABM deployment, not a grand one, and he pledged to proceed by stages determined by annual review. He obviously considered all the options and, with his aides, is prepared to advocate and defend his case.

The debate probably will not be just about the ABM at 12 missile sites by 1975 or a six to seven-billion-dollar outlay. It will involve such matters as competition among rival politicians and, deeper than that, widespread public concerns about the overhanging threats of nuclear war, rising military spending, ever-increasing taxes, the needs of our cities, domestic problems and national security. In short, it will be an emotion-heated debate about the state of the nation and of the world, as well as a discussion about a particular weapon.

The starting point ought to be the question: How well will the ABM work? The testimony of many scientists is that it will work against an accidental or small and simple nuclear attack. There are doubts whether any present ABM system can handle an enemy barrage of missiles massively complicated by decoys, balloons, radar-confusing "chaff," electronic countermeasures and nuclear blast "blackouts." To date, the Pentagon has said these "penetration aids" in U.S. hands can overwhelm Russia's ABM system around Moscow.

As a defense against Communist China, President Nixon's "safeguard system" presumes Peking will achieve and consider using a limited force of unsophisticated intercontinental ballistic missiles. This is possible, though such an attack would result in history's first national suicide.

As a defense against a single missile accidental attack, the ABM most probably would be welcome insurance. The question is: Would it be worth the cost, not only in money, but in the probability, based on the past history of the nuclear arms race, of another spiral of other monsters?

It is the possibility of this sort of thing that shocks us into recognition of the horrendous posture the human race, ourselves included, has twisted itself into. In advocating an ABM system President Nixon is acting in good conscience. He is not rattling rockets. But we still have the question: Will it work? Do we need it? Is this the way up and out of the nuclear pit, or does it get us all in deeper?

On balance of evidence now before us, the President's course is as prudent a choice as he could take.

RESOLUTION OF THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON REGULATION OF DRUG ADVERTISEMENTS ON TELEVISION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation banning the airing of drug commercials on television when children's programs are being aired.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION H1453

Resolution memorializing Congress to regulate drug advertisements on television

Whereas, Some drug advertisement commercials seek to appeal to the public by portraying the medication as candy; and

Whereas, Children are oftentimes influenced by what they view on television; and

Whereas, Congress should enact proper legislation to omit such drug commercials when programs for the entertainment of children are being aired; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the state of Rhode Island through its general assembly, now requests the congress of the United States to enact such appropriate legislation to ban airing of drug commercials when children's programs are being aired; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to enact such appropriate legislation to protect children from harmful drug advertisement commercials; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress.

COMPATIBILITY OF WASHINGTON AND BALTIMORE TRANSIT SYSTEMS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recent press accounts in Washington and Baltimore have indicated that both county and State officials in Maryland agree that Baltimore should construct its rapid transit system so that it will be compatible with the system which will soon be underway in Washington.

This development is most encouraging. I have long questioned the advisability of these two major metropolitan areas, which are obviously converging, going their separate technological ways with respect to rapid transit.

As I noted in an address before the Third International Conference on Urban Transportation last year, the Congress does not wish to get into the position of dictating what kind of system a local community chooses to build. However, when Federal funds are granted for planning, or even construction of the system, we have the responsibility to see to it that the money is wisely used.

In the case of Baltimore, there was a question as to how wisely Federal funds would have been invested, had their announced plans become reality.

In that Pittsburgh speech, I noted:

In 1963, some $320,560 in 701 planning funds was granted to Baltimore for a transportation and land use study. After two years, a leading engineering firm recommended a combination rail rapid transit and express bus system for the Baltimore area.

Just recently, over four years later, the Federal Government has now approved a $900,000 technical study grant for prelimi-

XUM

nary engineering and feasibility of a rapid transit system for Baltimore. Rather than updating the earlier study, the new set of consultants elected to start from the beginning. The two studies now appear to be competitive rather than complementary. This is an example of Federal participation in two different studies for the same purpose. In addition, it is now indicated that the Baltimore study will recommend a system which will not be compatible with Washington's system. This is an important consideration in this situation, because as Megalopolis continues to develop, Washington and Baltimore will be part of the same metropolitan area. A whole new community, Columbia, is being planned roughly half way between Washington and Baltimore and will be oriented toward both cities. Conceivably branches from both systems may serve this area. Without telling communities what type of system to build, I think our Committee must consider such factors in examining the operations of the urban transit program.

Also last year, when the Department of Transportation appeared before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, I directed questions at DOT on the compatibility matter.

While the Federal officials were not as responsive as I had hoped on this matter, I am happy to see that the local officials, who in the long run must make the crucial decisions on rapid transit, have come to a commonsense conclusion and one which, I might add, I feel is most appropriate under the circumstances and is in accord with my long-expressed view on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that two recent editorials published in the Washington Post and the Washington Star, which comment on this subject, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 25, 1969]

REGIONAL CONFUSION

Several lines of the Washington area's proposed rail transit system strike north toward Baltimore. And parts of a somewhat similar rapid transit network now being planned for the Baltimore region likewise point to Washington. It is inevitable, of course, that one day the two will meet. The growth of population will take care of that.

While meeting is one thing, however, merging is another. The incredible fact is that as presently planned, a logical, foreseeable merger of the two systems would be impossible. For Baltimore has been planning to use smallish cars riding on rubber tires, while Washington's trains are to have steel wheels on standard railroad tracks.

All, however, is not lost. At an Annapolis hearing the other day, the political officials of Baltimore and its environs, backed up by Governor Mandel, unanimously urged the Maryland planners to make their 71-mile system "compatible" with Washington's. To fail to do so, said Baltimore County's executive, would be "irresponsible," if not an act of "rank stupidity." Said another: "We must plan for what we know is coming."

The logic of Maryland's adapting to Washington's system, rather than the other way around, rests on the fact that the Washington program is much further along—and Baltimore's suburban politicians deserve a loud hurrah for bowing to reason.

This is what political maturity is all about. And we see all too little of it.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1969]

TRACKS TO AND THROUGH BALTIMORE

The officials planning a subway system for the Baltimore area have wisely decided to make their mechanical equipment compatible with that being developed for the Washington Metro. The two metropolitan areas are growing rapidly toward each other and every projection of future development indicates that before long they will merge into one long urban sprawl. When that happens, the transportation systems in the two cities ought to be able to work together so that jobs and housing will become even more interchangeable than they are now.

On the same day that some Maryland officials were urging this progressive step, however, others were threatening the Penn Central railroad with lawsuits if it goes through with proposals to run nonstop trains from Washington to New York City. The railroad is now making all the right noises in attempting to rebuild the passenger service it had almost given away to the airplanes and the buses. It would be the height of parochialism for Baltimore-oriented officials to attempt to block what promises to be a major step in shifting traffic back to the railroads. Baltimore stands to benefit as much as Washington by major improvements in rail transportation around the Eastern seaboard and if some trains that don't stop there are a part of a comprehensive package, Baltimoreans will just have to watch them go by.

PROLIFERATION OF STATE TAXATION RULES ON INTERSTATE BUSINESS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on March 10 the Wall Street Journal commented editorially on the problems of proliferating State taxation rules on interstate business. The editorial recognizes the need for broad, commonsense regulations to lighten the tremendous administrative burden borne by small and middlesized firms attempting to do business in more than one State.

Last month I introduced the Interstate Taxation Act (S. 916) which would provide Federal guidelines in this area. The bill would bring order out of a chaotic situation without disturbing the ability of States to tax firms which legitimately do business within their borders.

The Journal editorial provides a thoughtful commentary on the need for this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAXING TAX PROBLEM

Neither the members of Congress nor the states seem to be able to agree on rules for state taxation of interstate business. As a result, the courts still have to handle the problem on a costly, case-by-case basis.

The latest case involved a North Carolina photography firm, Dunbar-Stanley Studios, Inc. Through an agreement with J. C. Penney Co., the concern sends photographers to take children's pictures at Penney stores throughout the country.

In Alabama, state officials decided Dunbar-Stanley was a "traveling photographer," subject to the state's levy of $5 a week for each city in which it took pictures. The state also imposes a tax on photographers with fixed-location studios in the state.

Dunbar-Stanley protested the tax. It reasoned that it should be exempt since it had no property or inventory in Alabama and its business there was solicited by Penney, not Dunbar-Stanley. But Alabama's highest court held that the levy was proper, and the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously agreed.

The Supreme Court stressed that the state tax was imposed on "photography in Alabama," an activity in which Dunbar-Stanley undeniably was engaged. We would add that an exemption for the North Carolina firm would give it an unfair competitive advantage over purely local photographers in Alabama.

Until the presently confused status of interstate taxation is clarified, however, such advantages (and disadvantages) will continue. The House did pass a bill in 1968 to spell out rules in the area, but the Senate failed to act on the legislation.

The states, for their part, have long been trying to draw up rules of their own, but so far less than one-third of them have agreed to the proposed compact. It would seem preferable for the states to solve their own problems, but if they can't Congress surely should act.

Besides permitting various inequities for businesses and states, the current confusion impedes expansion of multistate firms. The situation is so taxing for all concerned that it should be intolerable.

AMY PRATT ROMNEY HONORED

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, outstanding individuals are often the byproduct of outstanding parents. One such parent, Mrs. Amy Pratt Romney, mother of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, is being honored this month by both the American Association of Retired Persons, and the Utah Council of Aging.

The story of the rise to prominence of my good friend, Secretary Romney, is well known to millions of Americans. I believe the background of his mother, who is national vice president of the AARP, will also be of general interest.

The following article from the March newsletter of the Utah Council on Aging tells of Mrs. Romney's many contributions to society. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. AMY PRATT ROMNEY

Our salute this issue is to a grand lady who has donated much of her time and talents to the field of aging—Mrs. Amy Pratt Romney. Inasmuch as Mrs. Romney was born March 16, 1890, it seems most apropos that March 20th has been chosen by the American Association of Retired Persons to honor her at their regular Chapter meeting, and that we salute her too, during the month of March. Mrs. Romney is National Vice President of the AARP and an old friend of Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, the founder of that organization.

Mrs. Romney was born on the Cliff Ranch in the State of Chihuahua, old Mexico. She was the seventh child of Helaman and Dora Wilcken Pratt.

Amy's father, Helaman Pratt, served as the president of the Mexico LDS Mission and died in 1909, prior to the Mexican Revolution in 1912. During this period in Mexico, Mrs. Romney taught school in Dublan Caloria, Mexico.

After moving to Salt Lake City in 1912, Mrs. Romney taught school several years in Davis County; later attending the Library

XUM

School in Chautauqua, New York. She came back to establish the first library in Kaysville, Utah. Following this, she spent five years as Assistant Librarian in the Agricultural College at Logan.

Following the death of her sister, Anna Pratt Romney, she married Anna's husband, Gaskell Romney, who had six boys and one girl. The members of this fine family are: four living children, twenty-six grandchildren, forty-nine great grandchildren and twenty-seven great-great grandchildren. Of her children, Mrs. Romney said, "all are wonderful, fine people; all having excellent and equal integrity."

Her son, George Romney, who is the former Governor of Michigan and now is Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Nixon Cabinet, "always knew what he wanted to do and did it," said Mrs. Romney.

EDITORIAL SUPPORTS DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, with Senator HATFIELD and more than a dozen other cosponsors, I introduced on February 7 a bill to create a new Cabinet department, a Department of Peace. It is a second version with what I believe is improvement on the similar bill I introduced last October as S. 4019. Like that one, the new bill, S. 953, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, who has approximately 60 cosponsors from among his colleagues.

Day after day, Mr. President, the unfolding of contemporary history—which is what the daily news of press and television encompasses—gives evidence of the useful role such a new department could assume. Its potential cannot be denied by anyone who studies the proposal thoughtfully, in my opinion. Certainly it should not be brushed aside, as President Nixon did so cavalierly at a recent press conference, with the remark that the Department of State and the Department of Defense can adequately serve us as a Department of Peace. Of course we are all interested in peace, and I am gratified at some of the efforts Mr. Nixon and the new administration are exerting in that direction. But the Hartke-Halpern bill, spelling out in 25 pages the substance of our thought, deserves the fullest of consideration. I have written Senator FULBRIGHT to urge that the Foreign Relations Committee, to whom the bill was referred on the chairman's suggestion by unanimous consent, hold early hearings on the proposition. I hope it will be possible for him to do so.

Recently the Terre Haute Tribune appraised the idea in its lead editorial. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial from the February 17 edition of that paper, may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

The old concept of a Cabinet-level Department of Peace has been dusted off and submitted to Congress in the form of a specific legislative proposal. The idea, which has been broached off and on since the earliest days of the Union, deserves to be considered. Some sort of counter-weight to the growing influence of the military-industrial-scientific complex in the formulation of policy is clearly needed. A Department of Peace might fill the need.

Several dozen members of the House of Representatives and 15 senators have joined in sponsoring a bill to create such a department. Under its aegis there would be an International Peace Institute to train Americans in promoting international peace. A congressional Joint Committee on Peace and International Cooperation also would be established. Furthermore, the bill would incorporate such existing agencies as the Peace Corps, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Agency for International Development in the new department.

It would be naive to expect great things of such a structural change in our government within a short time. We have been committed for so long to emphasis on "defense"—to the extent that 40 per cent of the national budget is thus earmarked—that a massive shifting of gears would be required. There would have to be a certain balancing of powers not only as between the Department of Defense and the proposed Department of Peace, but also in relation to the Department of State. Time would be needed for new working relationships to emerge.

Establishing of a Department of Peace would accomplish one thing of the greatest importance, however—it would substitute a unified program for the present rather haphazard and poorly coordinated effort to achieve lasting world peace. It would tend to give our foreign policy, if not precisely a new direction, at least new impetus in the direction of creating international conditions favorable to peace.

A PROGRAM FOR LOWER INCOME HOMEOWNERSHIP

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to share with you and my distinguished colleagues the import of a newly available study concerned with finding solutions to the housing crisis facing this Nation. Entitled "Lower Income Home Ownership Through Urban Rehabilitation: A New Venture for Private Business," this study documents a test program conducted by the National Gypsum Co., of Buffalo, N.Y.

Mr. Colon Brown, chairman and chief executive officer of the company, accurately identifies a basic problem facing the housing industry. In the introduction to the study, he states that while many corporations, including his own, are currently "investigating new systems and techniques which may in time produce low-cost housing, these approaches are some distance away and the need is now."

Mr. Brown and the National Gypsum Co. believe that something has to be done immediately to alleviate, at least in part, this pressing need:

We felt—

Says Mr. Brown—

if we could conceive of at least one practical approach to the problem, perhaps the groundwork might be laid for other private business interests to follow our lead and benefit from our experience.

After extensive research into existing programs and efforts, Mr. Brown says that National Gypsum decided to investigate "low-income ownership through the rehabilitation of the millions of deteriorated one- and two-family homes scattered throughout our Nation's cities." According to the 1960 census figures, there are in innercity areas more than 3,500,000 such houses that are still structurally sound.

It was apparent from the outset—

Says Mr. Brown—

that no one corporation, no matter how large, could meet the challenge on the large scale required to effect results. Rather, it would require the effort of private enterprise on the local level.

So, with two successful and able businessmen in Columbus, Ohio, National Gypsum formed TownHomes, an affiliate corporation, and began a program designed to test their ideas on the hard realities of dollars and cents.

Under the TownHomes banner, Mr. Lee Skilken, a local builder, and Mr. Lawrence Schaffer, a local realtor, began acquiring, rehabilitating and merchandising these "new" homes.

According to the study:

The project placed constant emphasis . . . on creating safe, sanitary, comfortable, environmental pleasantness which will have immediate consumer appeal. Foremost among the improvements TownHomes requires of itself are:

1. Completely new heating systems.
2. New plumbing wherever and whenever needed.
3. Up-to-date electrical systems to accommodate modern appliances (meaning, in most instances, completely new wiring and fixtures throughout the homes).
4. The refurbishing of walls, ceiling, floors, roofs, siding, porches and sidewalks and thorough decorating throughout, including the additions and replacements of hardware, wall coverings, floorings and paint.
5. Completely modern kitchens with all-new and more cabinets than required.
6. Completely rejuvenated, modern bathrooms including ceramic tiling, sink vanity tops, and combination tub and shower units.

If this complete rehabilitation treatment of a home sounds like it would automatically make the selling price out of the range of any low-income group, the following brief statistics will be enlightening.

One of the houses TownHomes acquired was a 2,000 square foot, eight-room house of frame construction and wood shingle exterior. There are four large rooms downstairs, three bedrooms and a sitting room on the second floor and an attic. The exterior was a shambles and required repainting, repair on the roof, new sidewalks, and new supports and shoring in several places. The interior was in no better condition and the kitchen had been gutted by fire.

TownHomes acquired the house for $2,153.75 total and invested $7,029.26 in rehabilitating it. The house sold for $11,900. Terms of the sale were a downpayment of $400 and monthly payments, including insurance, taxes, and such of $86. According to the study:

The average rent paid for six to seven room living quarters (in this Columbus neighborhood) was $102.00 per month, and some rents were as high as $120.00.

The results of this initial phase of the Columbus project have been very encouraging to all concerned. TownHomes is continuing its activity and is scheduling other urban rehabilitation projects totaling approximately $1,500,000 within the next 12 to 15 months.

There is a word of caution, however, and it comes from Mr. Brown.

It should be understood—

He readily admits—

that the experience documented in this manual in no way presumes either a single or final answer to meeting the Nation's ever-growing shortage of low-cost housing.

Nonetheless, he does express the hope that "many of the readers of this report will be encouraged to begin local programs of their own."

Indeed, the facts and figures presented in this fine study indicate that private enterprise can profitably participate in the solutions of one of our Nation's most pressing crises. In presenting a great challenge to businessmen to help their less fortunate fellow citizens, this program offers a vast opportunity for American business to do what it is best at doing: Solving problems quickly, economically, and profitably.

The National Gypsum Co., TownHomes, Inc., and members of the Columbus community who participated in this project deserve our commendation and sincere best wishes for continued success in the future.

STANTON P. SENDER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no matter how we might try to fool ourselves, the work product of the Senate and especially of our committees can never reach the high quality and high standards to which we aspire without a gifted and deeply knowledgeable staff. Such men are never easy to find and when they leave us, the loss to the Senate as an institution is a significant one. Such a man and such a loss is Stanton P. Sender, who served us as transportation counsel on the Committee on Commerce for the last 2 years and as a member of the committee staff since 1963.

Of course, to those of us who worked with and relied upon Stan, his leaving comes not only as a professional loss but as an end to a close daily working relationship. Stan goes to Sears, Roebuck as transportation counsel, and we envy Sears their gain. Personally, I am glad to see Stan remain in Washington, where we and the staff can seek him out for counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Daily Traffic World, reporting Stan's move, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sender, Transport Counsel for Senate Commerce Unit, To Join Sears Roebuck

Stanton P. Sender, transportation counsel for the Senate commerce committee for the last two years and a member of the committee staff since 1963, has resigned his post to accept appointment as transportation counsel for Sears, Roebuck and Co., with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Sender, long regarded in the industry as one of the top experts on transportation law and legislation, played a key role in consideration and final drafting of the high-speed ground transportation act which led to the recently inaugurated Metroliner rail project in the Northeast Corridor, and of such other laws as the illegal motor carriage act and legislation to combat freight car shortages.

Senator Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the commerce committee and Mr. Sender's boss, loaned his top staff counsel to the government operations committee several years ago to assist in the preparation and enactment of the necessary legislation to establish the Department of Transportation.

In a letter to Mr. Sender, in which he accepted Mr. Sender's resignation, Chairman Magnuson stated:

"It is with sharp regret that I receive your letter of February 5 resigning from the committee on commerce. You have served well all the members of the committee. But in my role as chairman, I have particularly had a chance to work closely with you, and I know your mastery and your vision in the field of transportation.

"I also know that you have been looking for additional challenges. I am glad that the opportunity you have taken is one that is a natural follow-through of your work here.

"Speaking on behalf of the committee, we will all miss you and I hope you will stay in personal contact with me in the years to come."

Prior to joining the commerce committee staff in 1963, Mr. Sender had served as a trial attorney in the office of the general counsel of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Previously, he had served as counsel to the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission.

Mr. Sender, whose resignation is effective February 28, is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School. He has been admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, the Washington State Bar, the Interstate Commerce Commission. He is a member of the Federal Bar Association.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Youngstown Vindicator of March 15 contains a thoughtful editorial on President Nixon's decision to deploy a modified anti-ballistic-missile system. So that all Senators might have the opportunity to read the column, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Mar. 15, 1969]

Mr. Nixon's Modified ABM

From the viewpoint of winning friends and influencing people it would have made little or no difference whether President Nixon had said either Yes or No to the anti-ballistic missile system.

President Nixon didn't quibble in making known his views yesterday on the ABM system. He could have done nothing at all or he could have placed the responsibility in other hands. It is to his credit that he chose to make the decision himself even though it probably will not prove popular with the anti-ABM scientists and others who have offered negative opinions in the last few weeks.

Since taking office, President Nixon has avoided sharp controversy but neither he nor anyone else can expect this kind of political dream world to continue indefinitely.

Mr. Nixon obviously has not made his decision on the basis of snap judgment. He has taken into account virtually every viewpoint, consulted advocates both for and against and has weighed the costs and the political consequences. He could have ended the suspense and turned the responsibility over to someone else. But he didn't. He chose to make it a "command" decision. He didn't really have to make a decision now because it could be a year or more before a single missile could be produced and deployed.

The President now is on record as advocating a "substantially modified" anti-ballistic missile system, unmistakably defensive. To protect U.S. land-based retaliatory forces against direct attack; to defend the American people against any nuclear attack by either the Soviet Union or the Communist Chinese; and to safeguard against any accidental missile firings from any source. The cost would be $6 billion to $7 billion.

Unless all signs fail, the President will face heated criticism from the so-called peace groups and particularly those liberals forming around the peace movement to make war on other weapons systems and the Pentagon budget in particular. They undoubtedly will challenge both the Pentagon and the para-military industry, hoping at the same time to embarrass the Nixon administration and lay the ground-work for a liberal and Democratic comeback in 1972. In other words, they will strive to make political hay while the sun shines.

The matter of domestic needs will be emphasized and no one is more aware of such needs than Mr. Nixon and undoubtedly he has weighed the ABM against all other national needs, at home and abroad.

In his news conference yesterday, Mr. Nixon said, "I am deeply sympathetic with the concerns of private citizens and members of Congress that we do only that which is necessary for our national security. This is why I am recommending a minimum program for our security. It is my duty as President to make certain that we do no less."

It would be foolhardy to place dependence on treaties or negotiations with the Soviet Union, or the Red Chinese for that matter. Treaties or agreements, where vital issues are concerned, mean nothing to the rulers in the Kremlin who respect power above principle.

Mr. Nixon, whatever either his friends or foes decide to say about his decision, has done what he believes is best for the American people and he has acted without undue concern for Soviet reaction, and with minimum regard for political effect.

GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, A SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, when a dedicated public servant leaves the Government after years of highly successful service, the event should not pass unnoted, and therefore I invite the attention of Congress to the departure from office of the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky as Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Governor Paiewonsky was appointed by President Kennedy in the early days of the New Frontier. He was a native Virgin Islander, the son of an immigrant from the Baltic who arrived in the Virgin Islands when they were under Danish rule and who himself made substantial contributions to the economy of the community.

Ralph had been a successful businessman and had served for a number of years as head of the local legislature—then the highest elective office in the Virgin Islands. He also served on a national scale as Democratic National Committeeman from the Virgin Islands.

In March 1961, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held comprehensive public hearings on Ralph's nomination by President Kennedy, and a number of Virgin Islanders from all walks of life and social and economic conditions supported the appointment. The nomination was reported favorably to the Senate and he was confirmed later that month.

Thus, Governor Paiewonsky has served

XUM

as the chief executive officer in the Virgin Islands longer than any Governor since the islands came under the American flag in 1917, by purchase from Denmark. His nearly 8 years in office have been marked by very substantial economic, social, and political progress. The statistics of the advances made under his leadership are highly impressive:

When he assumed office, the population of the territory was approximately 32,000. Today it is about 62,000—almost double. During the same period, per capita income in the islands has increased from about $1,000 annually to about $2,200 annually. Bank deposits have increased from about $40 million to about $150 million. Annual government expenditures for public purposes have increased from $17 million to over $70 million.

Tourism is the major industry of the Virgin Islands, and during the years of the Paiewonsky administration tourists visiting the territory increased from about 200,000 to over a million each year. Annual revenues from tourism rose from $30 million to over $100 million. In addition to the phenomenal growth of the tourist industry, these years also saw the establishment of new industries in the islands. A multimillion dollar aluminum processing plant, and a major oil refining installation were built on St. Croix, and light industries such as watch assembly and textiles became important elements in the Virgin Islands economy.

Economic progress and the population boom brought with them, of course, many new, complex problems. Vastly increased educational needs, housing needs, medical needs, public works needs, and social service needs were all to be met. Governor Paiewonsky rose to these social challenges with the same vigor and imagination that he applied to the economic problems.

One of the earliest acts of his administration was the establishment of the College of the Virgin Islands, making higher education available at home for the first time to Virgin Islanders who could not travel to the mainland for this purpose. The Governor and his family have made very substantial contributions to the college. The public school population of the Virgin Islands more than doubled during the years he was Governor, and new school rooms and school buildings were constructed to meet the demand. At the same time, the quality of the education given in the schools has been upgraded, with the help of stateside educational experts.

Housing programs have been designed to serve all economic levels of the community, with emphasis on homes for sale to individual owners. The financing of many of these projects has been unique and imaginative, and could serve as a model for many other communities. Medical facilities of the territory have also been enlarged and improved. Recently the hospitals of the Virgin Islands became fully accredited for the first time, as a result of the upgrading which Governor Paiewonsky was instrumental in bringing about.

Politically, a new era of political life can be said to have begun in the Virgin Islands during his administration. Although appointed by President Kennedy and retained in office by President Johnson, Governor Paiewonsky was a leader in bringing about greater autonomy for the islands. Laws giving the Virgin Islands Legislature the right to apportion itself, subject only to the usual constitutional safeguards, and to set its own sessions, salaries and expenses were passed by Congress at his urging. He vigorously pressed for the right of his people to choose their own Governor, and in 1970 the Virgin Islands will hold their first gubernatorial election in nearly 500 years of recorded history.

Mr. President, in the economic, social, and political fields, the accomplishments of Ralph Paiewonsky will be written large upon the history of the Virgin Islands. We salute him now, as he leaves office, for a job well done. He leaves office at this time as a result of political fortunes over which neither he nor the Virgin Islands people have had any control. As a result of his efforts, this is the last time that the territory will have such an experience. From 1970 onward, the Governor of the Virgin Islands will be a man chosen by the people of the Virgin Islands. Ralph Paiewonsky is not a man who will cease to concern himself with the problems of the Virgin Islands simply because he no longer carries the responsibilities of the governorship. He has stated and it is surely true, that he will continue to be concerned with the problems, goals and aspirations of his people, and that he will continue to speak out on the issues. When the people of the Virgin Islands finally speak out next year to name their own choice for a leader, we should not be surprised if we again hear the name of Ralph M. Paiewonsky.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the popularly elected legislature of the Virgin Islands, passed March 3, 1969, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution To Commend and Honor Ralph M. Paiewonsky, a Devoted Public Servant, a Progressive Governor and an Outstanding Virgin Islander

Proposed by Committee of the Whole.

Bearing in mind the recent resignation of Governor Ralph M. Paiewonsky after nearly eight years of tireless service as the Chief Executive Officer of the Virgin Islands; and

Noting that the name Ralph M. Paiewonsky has become synonomous with prosperity for these Islands; and

Recalling proudly his service and leadership during a momentous period in the history of these Virgin Islands, let us recount eight years of solid accomplishments, which have included better homes, more jobs, increased health and social services, vastly improved education for our children and a better life and higher standard of living for all our people; and

Predicting that the programs of progress initiated by Governor Paiewonsky will prove to be the foundation for the continued social and economic prosperity of the Virgin Islands; and

Knowing that Governor Paiewonsky will continue to work for and on behalf of all of the people of the Virgin Islands to insure the continued development of the programs of progress initiated during his tenure in office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

That through this Resolution, the Legislature—

1. Expresses its sincere gratitude on behalf of all Virgin Islanders to Ralph M. Paiewonsky for his leadership and tireless efforts to insure a better life for all people of the Virgin Islands.

2. Proudly hails the unprecedented record of social, economic and political progress achieved during the administration of Governor Paiewonsky.

3. Commends the Board of Trustees of the College of the Virgin Islands in voting to name its new library in honor of Ralph M. Paiewonsky whose vigorous and enthusiastic support made the College a reality.

4. Directs the President of the Legislature to present a framed copy of this Resolution to Governor Paiewonsky during the dedication ceremonies of the Ralph M. Paiewonsky Library at the College of the Virgin Islands.

5. Finally, speaking with one voice on behalf of all of the people of the Virgin Islands, thank you Governor Paiewonsky for a job well done; and we salute a great Governor, a man of his people, a true Virgin Islander.

INSPECTION OF IMPORTED FOODSTUFFS

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, the importation of foodstuffs into this country is increasing regularly. This creates two potential hazards: First, the possibility of unwholesome, contaminated or disease-carrying products being offered to the consumer, and second, the unfair competition to the domestic producer and processor from foreign suppliers operating under standards of health and sanitation far less stringent that those in this country and inspection services that may be only nominal.

The Consumer and Marketing Service Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture claims that it is monitoring the inspection service in 1,250 packinghouses scattered over 40 foreign countries with 13 veterinarians employed by the USDA. It feels that the 13 veterinarians overseeing approximately 100 plants each, scattered over a wide geographical area, do this job well enough to permit the products to move freely in interstate commerce in the United States. If this is true, in my opinion, we had better take a long, hard look at the type of supervision they propose for State inspection in the United States where the product produced in these plants is limited to intrastate movement.

Presently, there are circumstances under which foodstuffs may enter this country with nothing more than a State Department certification that the health, sanitation, and inspection requirements under which it was produced is equal to those of the United States.

There are also instances of varying standards. For example, South American beef may enter this country only as a cooked, processed product because of animal health conditions there. This creates the possibility that individual carcasses may be used in these products and sold in this country for human consumption that would not be permitted in pet food if domestically produced.

Conditions such as these must be corrected not only to protect the health and welfare of American consumers, but also to insure the maintenance of an ade-

XUM

quate domestic producing and processing industry. Therefore, I would recommend the following:

First. The investigation, evaluation and certification of the laws, regulations, standards, and inspection of the exporting country should be the sole responsibility of the same Federal agency that has this responsibility over the domestic supply. The same rules, regulations, and standards of identity must apply in both instances. Consumer and Marketing Service should use the same procedures and criteria in evaluating the meat and poultry inspection service of a foreign country that they use in certifying a State service "at least equal to" Federal inspection under the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. Penalties for violation and condemnations should apply equally.

Second. A system of product inspection, sampling, and analysis should be used at port of entry adequate to insure not only the absolute wholesomeness of the product, but also to provide a sound basis for judgment of the effectiveness of the conditions of health, sanitation, and inspection under which it was produced.

Third. The cost of these services should be assessed to the exporting country as it is their responsibility to insure the adequacy of inspection service and the wholesomeness of their product.

A UNIQUE AND UNPRECEDENTED AUDIT OF THE OEO

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, with the strong support of three consecutive Presidents of the United States, the Nation is waging a war on poverty. This is a difficult assignment, which puts our economic system and our vast system of local, State, and Federal Government to the supreme test.

In order to make impact on poverty, which has continued to hold millions of Americans in its grip despite the general affluence of this Nation, Congress created a special agency in 1964 and called it the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Last year Congress specifically directed the Comptroller General to make a broad review of the war on poverty and to report back to the Congress with recommendations on how this effort could be improved.

Congress received the Comptroller General's report this week. It contains not only the Comptroller General's evaluations but also the comments of the Office of Economic Opportunity itself which cooperated fully in the audit.

This audit by the General Accounting Office can be a valuable tool for use by the Congress in strengthening the war on poverty.

We are making some progress. As the OEO points out in its comments on the audit, more than 11 million Americans have climbed above the poverty level since the war on poverty began in 1964. Economic expansion has been an important factor in that climb. But the fact is that people have been climbing above the poverty level for the past 4 years at a rate 2½ times faster than ever before.

I am pleased to note that the House Committee on Education and Labor will begin to hold hearings next week on the continuation of the war on poverty. I am pleased that the new administration has asked that the present program be continued pending completion of the administration's long-range proposals for future improvements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of items relating to the Comptroller General's audit of the OEO.

First of all, my own comment on the audit, dated March 19; second, the OEO response to chapter 2 of the GAO report; third, the four pages of "principal recommendations" made by the Comptroller General's audit; and fourth, a letter to me from W. P. Kelly, Director of the Job Corps program, dated February 27, 1969, which outlines the specific work which has been done by Job Corps trainees.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT BY SENATOR NELSON ON GAO AUDIT OF OEO

(NOTE.—Senator NELSON is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty.)

The Comptroller General points out that the audit of OEO was "unique and unprecedented," because Congress directed him to go far beyond a mere financial audit. He was instructed to make a sweeping judgment as to whether OEO was enabling this nation to lift its poor citizens out of poverty—even though, as the Comptroller General himself says in the audit, it is very difficult to assess "accomplishments that cannot be measured in terms of dollars expended, miles of road built, or pieces of mail delivered."

In weighing the Comptroller General's audit, it is important to remember its "unique and unprecedented" nature. Few public programs have been subjected to this kind of scrutiny. What if the Comptroller General audited our vast array of agricultural programs, not to see if all the dollars were accounted for but to see whether the real interests of the American family farmer were being served? What if he audited our state and local prison systems to see if they are helping in the real fight against crime? What if he audited our educational programs to see if they were producing truly educated, responsible citizens? I think everyone can imagine the highly critical reports which might emerge if we subjected other programs to this same kind of "unique and unprecedented" scrutiny.

In this challenging assignment, the Comptroller General and his staff have done a highly professional job, providing Congress with invaluable data to use in the sweeping review of the poverty program which we intend to conduct this year.

Some enemies of the war on poverty apparently had hoped that this report would justify a surrender of this under-financed, late-starting effort to help millions of Americans escape from poverty. It does no such thing.

It simply tells the White House that fighting poverty is such a big task that it must be supervised by the President and that the fight must be coordinated throughout the vast Federal bureaucracy. It tells the Congress that programs cannot function if appropriations are withheld or seriously delayed. It tells both OEO and the many agencies—Federal, state and local—with which it works that meticulous record keeping and evaluation are vital if the poverty program is to achieve its objectives.

The heart of the Comptroller General's report is four pages of "principal recommendations." With the possible exception of the very general language regarding Job Corps camps, these recommendations are constructive, forward looking suggestions aimed at strengthening the program. Congress and the Executive Branch should consider these recommendations carefully, and quickly implement those which will make the programs more effective.

As the Kerner Commission, the highly respected Urban Coalition, and many other concerned organizations have already told us, the scandal of poverty is creating an increasingly serious crisis in America's cities and some of its forgotten rural areas. The Comptroller General's audit of OEO shows that we have made some commendable progress in facing up to this long-neglected crisis, but that we have just begun the fight. This audit should bring a new sense of urgency to the Congress and the Executive Branch, and any concerned citizen reading it could only conclude that our government must immediately get on with the job.

OEO RESPONSE TO CHAPTER 2 OF THE GAO REPORT

The Office of Economic Opportunity responds to the 15-month study of its programs by the General Accounting Office with a certain degree of ambivalence.

On the one hand, we appreciate the great amount of work and time that has gone into the preparation of the report. Essentially, Chapter 2 seeks to present a calm, objective discussion of a complex problem. Many of its criticisms and recommendations have merit, and we are in concurrence with GAO that remedies are in order. Throughout the study, GAO has been able to count on the cooperation of OEO officials and staff in supplying full and complete information. We believe we have benefitted from the need to respond to the questions of GAO's investigators and contractors.

On the other hand, however, we find ourselves somewhat restricted in responding to but a single chapter of the document. While we had an opportunity to review an initial draft of the remaining chapters, we have not seen them in their revised and final form. Therefore, we do not know the extent to which revisions and suggestions given the GAO by this agency are incorporated in the final document.

GAO's Summary Chapter 2 defines the context within which the study was conducted in these words: "Our reviews properly and inevitably focuses on problems, shortcomings, and recommended improvements." The GAO thus confined itself largely to areas of deficiencies, and while it lists many of the factors that contributed to the agency's problems, the overall result is necessarily on the negative side.

It is with this aspect of GAO's focus that we have our greatest difficulty in viewing the report as a definitive study and evaluation of the antipoverty program. By concentrating on "problems, shortcomings and recommended improvements," the report largely omits the accomplishments of OEO programs over the past 4½ years. As a result, it lacks a balance that we feel is important for the objective reader.

Furthermore, we are not convinced that all the conclusions reached by GAO properly flow from the relatively small sample of each of the OEO programs studied in depth. A more comprehensive study, based on a larger sample, may well have modified or altered criticisms and recommendations.

In its section called "overall perspective," GAO lists a large number of conditions which have contributed to the agency's difficulties in carrying out its mission. We can only concur in and embellish this catalogue of vicissitudes. For example, the reference to the delays and uncertainties in obtaining Con-

XUM

gressional authorizations and appropriations only touches the surface of the problems this situation induces. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, OEO did not receive its authorization until December and its appropriation until January 1968, after more than half its operating year had passed. Community Action Agencies, particularly, have suffered from these funding problems which must contribute, in large measure, to the GAO's conclusion that community action has achieved its ends "in lesser measure than was reasonable to expect in relation to the magnitude of the funds expended."

Actually, since 1966, no local community action program has been given sufficient money to expand appreciably beyond its first-year levels of operation. Since these local programs were initiated in the belief that they were "pilot" efforts designed to expand to an operational "war on poverty," it seems remarkable that OEO was able to keep interest and enthusiasm alive, to stimulate the quest for other sources of funding, to enlist the energies and resources of private enterprise and public and private agencies, and to maintain as well as we have the faith and participation of the poor.

While the course we have followed has been largely uncharted, while we acknowledge our mistakes and accept criticism, it is the positive which we feel must be given at least equal emphasis.

We have deep pride and satisfaction from much that OEO has accomplished. There are the indisputable community action achievements of institutional change, the enlistment of the largest peacetime army of volunteers in history, the mobilization of community resources, and the pioneering involvement of the private sector in social welfare programs. Head Start, Upward Bound, Foster Grandparents, Legal Services and Neighborhood Health Centers were created and developed by OEO.

We find great significance in the stationing of U.S. Employment Service personnel in ghetto offices; in the location of welfare workers in OEO's neighborhood centers; in the more than 50 law schools which have incorporated courses on poverty law into their curriculum; in the "participation of the poor" principle adopted by almost every Federal agency concerned with domestic programs; in the increasing proportion of United Fund efforts that are directed toward the poor; in the adoption by the military services of Job Corps-developed techniques for educating hardcore youth, and in the public school systems which are utilizing Head Start practices of employing non-professionals as classroom aides.

It is an incontestable achievement that 500,000 Americans have served as volunteers to Head Start; that 50,000 volunteers work in community action agencies; that 30,000 persons serve without compensation on CAA boards; that 20,000 volunteers actively work with Job Corps enrollees; that 45,000 volunteers have dedicated their time and energies to other antipoverty programs.

It is also worthy of mention that more than 500,000 people in 389 counties were eligible for OEO Emergency Food Programs in 1968; that multi-purpose neighborhood centers have cared for the diverse needs of 3½ million poor people; that Neighborhood Health Centers have a capacity to give free and full health care to one million residents of impoverished neighborhoods; and that Legal Services Programs have brought justice to over one million people who otherwise would not have known it.

It is noteworthy that OEO has brought together for discussion and decision-making, all segments of each of the communities it serves—groups which in many instances had never before engaged in dialogue—much less united action.

Now, at every program level the poor are deeply involved and participating in a broad spectrum of activities. They comprise one-third of all CAA boards. Eighty thousand are employed in CAP programs on a year-round basis with another 80,000 during the summer. Seventy percent of all Head Start programs utilize parents as staff members. (We do not understand GAO's criticism in this regard.) And the poor even comprise the membership of one of OEO's national advisory committees. Four million dollars in grants are currently earmarked for training residents for participation in the Model Cities programs. And through the impetus of the OEO's "new careers" approach, more than 100,000 poor people are now employed in public service capacities in schools, hospitals, recreation and conservation programs.

OEO's relationships with public officials, not always smooth, nevertheless have achieved a significant degree of understanding and accommodation. In 1968, when local officials had the opportunity by law to take over the operation of Community Action Agencies, fewer than two percent exercised their option to restructure the CAAs in their communities as public agencies.

Many recommendations for improvements in the performance of all OEO programs—CAP, Job Corps, VISTA and the delegated manpower programs—are constructive and appear valid. Within the limitations of available staff and resources OEO has itself recognized its shortcomings and conducted ongoing self-improvement programs to make its efforts more effective and more susceptible to audit, analysis and evaluation.

OEO believes, however, that GAO's question of whether the Job Corps is "sufficiently achieving the purposes for which it was created" might not be asked if there was a greater understanding of the program's mission and accomplishments. The purpose of the Job Corps is to help the hardest core youth receive the education, training and motivation necessary for employment and constructive citizenship. Considering that the young men and women eligible for the Job Corps have been for much of their lives 100 percent dropouts, the score of 70 percent placed in jobs, school or military service would certainly seem a sufficient achievement.

The GAO report considers the problems of coordination. We certainly agree that the hoped-for degree of coordination among the large number of Federal agencies and programs affecting the poor has not been achieved, nor as the report states, can it "under the existing organizational machinery." The validity of this statement, however, should not obscure the significant advances that *have* been made in coordination and cooperation. By virtue of its role as an innovator and operator of programs, and as a funding and policy source of programs administered by other Federal departments, OEO has broken new coordination ground through example and persuasion. Agencies and departments at all levels of government have devoted an increased share of their resources to the poor and have altered their administrative procedures to dovetail with that objective. In many specific instances such as hardcore training and employment programs, neighborhood centers, health centers, and Indian and migrant programs, resources have been combined and strong interagency cooperation has been developed.

Additionally, OEO was the first agency at the Federal level to develop, set up and live by a system of interagency delegation agreements. These agreements have involved such programs as Neighborhood Youth Corps (Labor), Rural Loan Program (Agriculture), Work Experience (HEW), Adult Basic Education (HEW) and Economic Loans (SBA). And through its "check-point" procedure of program signoff, OEO has successfully established cooperation between local officials which otherwise would not have taken place.

None of these efforts has worked perfectly. But a significant start has been made. As a result of its experience, OEO has long advocated a recommendation in the GAO report for the establishment of a separate high level unit in the Executive Office of the President to handle overall coordination and planning of antipoverty efforts. GAO correctly notes that the Economic Opportunity Council, with which OEO was to "share" coordination responsibilities, has not existed for the past 15 months.

Finally, we would comment on the accelerated speed with which the poor are coming out of poverty. While we have agreed that there is a lack of criteria with which to determine "success," we believe the ultimate criterion is the contribution of the programs to the net decrease in the number of those in poverty.

Since 1964, as GAO mentions, more than 11 million Americans have come out of poverty. While GAO recognizes an "important" contribution from the social programs, it nevertheless attributes the reduction in large part to a healthy and expanding economy. We agree that economic expansion has played a big part in this reduction. However, the rate of economic growth has not accelerated sufficiently to account for the fact that since the inception of OEO, Americans have come out of poverty at a rate 2½ times faster than ever before. It cannot account for the fact that nonwhite Americans are emerging in numbers a thousand percent greater than the average for the years prior to 1964. OEO believes that much of this progress is due to the specific programs it has instituted, the climate of concern it has generated, the additional resources it has called forth, the opportunities it has provided, the influence it has had on other agencies and the mobilization of private individuals and businesses that it has spearheaded.

The foregoing discussion has been, necessarily, a brief comment on a summary. Consequently, it makes no attempt to address to many specifics which will be contained in the overall GAO report. We anticipate that questions regarding specific conclusions and recommendations contained elsewhere in the report will be directed to OEO by Members of Congress and others. We will, of course, attempt to respond to any such inquiries as fully and completely as possible.

Meanwhile, OEO will continue its own close study of the recommendations in the report, seeking to respond positively to all those which it finds valid and which are within its power to implement.

Until poverty is eliminated in this Nation—a goal which we believe has been proved obtainable—there can be no letup in dedication or in effects to perform the task more efficiently and effectively. As long as there is an Office of Economic Opportunity, we will continue to improve our contribution toward that objective.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe that, to provide more effective means for achieving the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act, revisions are needed in the programs and organization through which the effort to eliminate poverty has been outlined in the act. Accordingly, we offer the following recommendations.

PROGRAMS

Community Action, chapter 4

1. Community Action Agencies and OEO should institute efforts to:

a. Improve the planning of local projects.

b. Generate greater cooperation among local public and private agencies.

c. Stimulate more active participation by the poor.

d. Develop means by which the effectiveness of programs can be evaluated and require periodic evaluations to be made.

e. Strengthen the capability of the neighborhood centers to carry out their functions of identifying residents in need of assistance in the target areas and of following up on referrals made to other units or agencies for rendering needed services.

2. OEO should consider including income among the eligibility requirements for those component programs, such as education and manpower, which are directed to individuals or families and involve a significant unit cost and for which income is not now an eligibility requirement.

3. OEO should give greater emphasis to research and pilot projects that offer promise of alleviation of poverty in rural areas and should encourage Community Action Agencies in rural areas to broaden the range of activities that will contribute to economic development.

4. The Congress should consider whether additional means are necessary and desirable to assist residents of rural areas that cannot build the economic base necessary for self-sufficiency, to meet their basic needs.

Manpower, chapter 5

5. The Secretary of Labor should take further steps to ensure that:

a. Full use is made of the existing facilities and capabilities of the State employment security agencies in connection with CEP operations.

b. CEP operations are coordinated fully with the JOBS program.

6. The Congress should consider whether the Job Corps program, particularly at the conservation centers, is sufficiently achieving the purposes for which it was created to justify its retention at present levels.

7. The Congress should consider:

a. Redefining and clarifying the purposes and intended objectives of the NYC in-school and summer work and training programs authorized for students in section 123(a) (1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

b. Establishing specific and realistic goals for programs authorized and relative priorities for the attainment of such established goals.

8. The Congress should consider merging the NYC out-of-school program, currently authorized in section 123(a) (2) for persons 16 and over, with the MDTA program.

9. The Secretary of Labor, to make the WIN program effective, should give close and continuing attention to the problem of enrollee absenteeism, and ascertain the causes of early terminations and absenteeism and how these causes may be alleviated or eliminated through additional services, modification of program content, or other means.

Health, chapter 6

10. The Director, OEO, through his cognizant program office, should define the circumstances under which health centers may finance costs of hospitalization, establish more appropriate and equitable criteria to be used in determining the eligibility of applicants for medical care, and in accordance with grant conditions require centers to claim reimbursement from third parties.

11. Increased attention should be given by both the Director of OEO and the Secretary of HEW to the coordination of the agencies' health efforts and the development of uniform standards for evaluating health projects and programs, including family-planning programs, both during the development phase and on a long-range basis.

Education, chapter 7

12. The Director, OEO, should direct and assist local Head Start officials to make further efforts to involve more parents of Head Start children in the program in order to enhance the opportunity for developing the close relationship between parents and their children that is so vital to the child's social and educational growth.

13. The Director, OEO, should improve procedures for the recruitment and selection of participants in the Upward Bound program.

14. The Director, OEO, should require, as prerequisites to funding locally initiated education programs:

a. Determinations as to whether the program will conflict with existing programs directed to the poor and whether it could be financed with other than OEO funds.

b. The identification of available resources and facilities which could be used in the program to reduce the expenditure of limited OEO funds.

c. The identification of complementary education programs through which further educational assistance could be afforded to OEO program graduates.

Other programs, chapter 8

15. The Director, OEO, should:

a. More clearly define program objectives and major goals to the Legal Services project directors and instruct them on the methodology of engaging in activities directed toward economic development and law reform.

b. Make efforts to develop and implement measures of the extent to which Legal Services projects are achieving national program priorities and objectives.

16. To improve procedures leading to the assignment of selected applicants to the VISTA regional training centers, the Director, OEO, should give consideration to the feasibility of requiring that applicants be interviewed and given aptitude tests before they are considered eligible for VISTA training.

17. The Director, OEO, should require, with respect to the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers program, that:

a. Systematic employability plans be prepared whereby participants' handicaps can be identified at the time of enrollment so that an appropriate curriculum may be developed to meet such needs.

b. Participants' progress in the program be periodically reviewed.

c. Data on participants' postprogram experience be maintained.

18. The Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, should:

a. Conduct a study primarily aimed at:

1. Establishing minimum standards with respect to the amount of supervisory assistance that should be given borrowers under the Economic Opportunity Loan Program in order to ensure that they receive adequate guidance.

2. Determining, consistent with the foregoing standards, the quantity and types of supervision needed, and the loan activity level which can be sustained within the supervisory capabilities available.

b. Revise its instructions as to loan eligibility to require appropriate consideration of net assets and the recording of the circumstances considered to justify the making of loans to applicants whose income and/or assets exceed specified amounts.

Coordination and organization, chapters 9 and 10

19. A new office should be established in the Executive Office of the President to take over the planning, coordination, and evaluation functions now vested by the act in the Economic Opportunity Council and OEO.

20. OEO should be continued as an independent operating agency outside the Executive Office of the President, with responsibility for administering the Community Action Program and certain other closely related programs.

21. Funding and administration of certain programs now funded by OEO should be transferred to agencies which administer programs that have closely related objectives.

22. The proposed new office in the Executive Office of the President should have responsibility for ensuring coordination of activities of local Cities Demonstration Agencies and the Community Action Agencies. If this new office is not established, consideration should be given to placing this responsibility under the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

23. The Congress should direct that a report be submitted on longer term actions required to coordinate and to maximize the use of community action and citizen participation efforts in federally assisted antipoverty programs.

The evaluation function, chapter 11

24. The recommended new office in the Executive Office of the President should further develop the evaluation function with respect to antipoverty programs.

General, chapter 12

25. The responsible Federal agencies should give particular attention to providing for more frequent and comprehensive audits of all antipoverty programs.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Congratulations on your recent appointment as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. Your record in the area of problems of the disadvantaged youth makes you an ideal choice.

As you may know, aside from giving thousands of young men and women the opportunity for substantial jobs and individual human renewal, the Job Corps has done more than its share in making our nation a more decent place to live. For example, in Fiscal Year 1967 and 1968 over 4,000 Job Corps youths spent 406,710 hours in emergency service. Job Corpsmen have also performed conservation work worth $66,755,142. These contributions include:

a. Emergency Service: 333,300 hours suppressing fires, 34,126 hours on search and rescue missions, 11,300 hours on tornado cleanup, 10,816 hours on flood cleanup, 4,800 hours on pine beetle eradication, 10,000 hours gathering dead fish from our shores, 768 hours on lake cleanup, 800 hours on duck rescue from oil washed to our shores, and 800 hours on duck burial.

b. Public camping and picnic facilities—27,265 family units (5 people per unit) including:

	Each
Picnic shelters	432
Comfort stations	133
Toilets	717
Stoves	9, 329
Tables	17, 351
Boat ramps	58
Water systems (drinking, cooking, etc.)	43

c. Public land access: Roads and hiking trails (3,707.8 miles) including: roads, 2,471.9 miles; road bridges, 72 each; trails (includes 1 used by the blind), 1,235.9 miles; trail bridges, 28 each; and parking areas, 26.5 acres.

d. Wildlife habitat establishment and improvement: Game, fish and fowl, 39,524 acres.

e. Public land improvement and development: Tree plantings, watershed structures, livestock range improvement (59,422 acres) including: Pipeline, 173 miles; water supply systems, 84 each; stock water tanks, 126 each; fencing, 2,671 miles; cattle guards, 1.487 each; timber stand improvements, 25,065 acres; and seeding, planting, vegetation control, 34,357 acres (approximately 1.6 million trees).

f. Public service facilities and administrative structures, 3,543,616 square ft.

g. Fire suppression, 2,315 man-months.

h. Fire break trails, 675 miles.

These young men have willingly and with a sense of pride performed these tasks because they, too, care not only for their personal environment but for the environment of their fellow citizens throughout our land. And this is the Job Corps story—building and training concerned young men and women who want to help themselves develop into productive and respectable citizens and who want to help others make this country a better place to live for all of us.

XUM

If I can be of any assistance to you, please let me know.

With every best wish,
Sincerely,
W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps.

COMPENSATION OF RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a memorial introduced in the New Mexico House of Representatives which has been meeting in its 29th legislature, first session, "Requesting the Congress of the United States to require railroads to treat military service of its employees as compensated service in computing earned vacation time and pay."

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

House Memorial 16

A memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to require railroads to treat military service of its employees as compensated service in computing earned vacation time and pay

Whereas, employees who are called to serve their country in the armed forces risk their lives, health and economic status and defer employment of the amenities of family and social life to protect and secure for the people of this country an orderly and organized society within which to engage in industry, commerce and business; and

Whereas, an orderly and organized society affords property, business, commerce and industry the protection and security without which gainful occupation would be impossible; and

Whereas, employees who remain in private employment automatically earn vacation time and pay; and

Whereas, under collective bargaining agreements between railroads and their employees, employees qualify for vacation time and pay only by rendering compensated service; and

Whereas, railroads do not treat military service as compensated service in computing earned vacation time and pay; and

Whereas, collective bargaining agreements between railroads and their employees supersede state law under the Railway Labor Act; and

Whereas, in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the Congress of the United States intended to preserve for returning veterans the rights and benefits that would have automatically accrued to them had they remained in private employment; and

Whereas, railroad employees called to serve their country in the armed forces should not be penalized for involuntarily leaving their employment to serve their employers in a different capacity; and

Whereas, the congress of the United States representing the people of this country has assisted the development of railroads through land grants and subsidies and has protected railroads from conflicting state interference through federal regulation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico that the congress of the United States is asked to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to specifically require railroads to treat military service as compensated service in computing earned vacation time and pay; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the leadership of the congress of the United States, to the members of New Mexico's delegation to the congress of the United States and to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY EUGENE ROSTOW

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Prof. Eugene Rostow, formerly Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, recently spoke in San Francisco on a number of foreign policy issues facing this country.

His speech is thoughtful and timely. Professor Rostow combines experience, knowledge, and intelligence into a thought-provoking essay on our Nation's role in world affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Rostow's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Battle of the American Mind

(Address before the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals March 1, 1969, San Francisco, Calif., by Eugene V. Rostow, Sterling Professor of Law and Public Affairs, Yale University, formerly Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs (1966–69))

It is right that an association of educators include a speech on foreign policy in the program of its convention. In a democracy, and especially in our country, an opinion about foreign policy is among the most urgent responsibilities of every citizen. To make that opinion sober and informed is above all a problem of education, and particularly of American education.

The challenge of education for responsible citizenship in foreign policy is not an easy one for our dispersed educational system. The elective principle permits many students to emerge from high school and college with rudimentary training, or none at all, in the hard questions of power and peace. The absence of a sense of history, and of its weight in human affairs, is, in my view, the greatest weakness of American education and of the American outlook towards foreign policy. We tend to be sensitive to our own history, but constantly surprised that others cannot write on a clean slate.

Until a much larger part of our people become familiar with the nature of the problem of peace, American opinion on foreign affairs will continue to be vulnerable to slogans of illusion and wishful thinking.

I therefore recommend, with all the earnestness at my command, that the issue become a matter of active concern among you. I am certain that if you devote yourselves to the problem, you will find solutions compatible with the free spirit which is the genius of our educational system.

For the first lesson of my recent experience in the State Department, and the main theme of the book I have written about it,* is that the most important battle for peace in this nightmare world has to be fought and won in the mind of America.

There is no hope for peace without patient, steady, American leadership in the great effort which the nation has pursued since 1945 to establish a new system of order in the world—a frame for world politics. The system we have sought to establish is rooted in the Charter of the United Nations; it is tolerant of diversity among social systems, and dedicated to assuring the opportunity for progress to all nations, each in its own way, free of the fear of conquest or coercion. Only in such a world, a reasonably stable world of wide horizons, disciplined to accept the idea of peace, can the United States expect to remain an open, democratic society, dedicated to the ideals of its own social code.

This is our national interest in world politics—an interest in establishing a system of order within which we could pursue our democratic destiny. That interest does not require us to be the universal policemen of the world. We need not intervene in every conflict, nor try to right every wrong. We are not embarked on an ideological crusade, to remake the world in the American image. But we have been concerned, and we must be concerned, to intervene with force if necessary when the balance of world power is threatened.

American leadership in this quest for peace cannot be sustained, and will not be credible, both to our friends and to those who would be our adversaries, until the American people come finally to accept the facts of life in the twentieth century, and abandon their recurrent yearnings to escape into the isolation of our past.

All peoples face an endless conflict between the present and the past, between reason and memory, between reality and hope. For us, the contest is peculiarly important, and peculiarly difficult.

It is important because the power and influence of the United States is, and must continue to be, the cornerstone of any conceivable program of peace.

And it is difficult because our national outlook towards the outside world was decisively shaped by the experience of more than a century before 1914, when we lived in a condition of safety guaranteed by the British fleet. Our collective unconscious is dominated by that fact. But in an age of ballistic missiles, our two broad oceans are less than moats. Britain and France are no longer in a position to conduct the orchestra of world affairs. They are regional powers, not world powers. And a new Europe, which could join us as an influence for harmony in world affairs, has not yet been born. Nor has Japan fully completed its re-entry into world affairs as our associate in all the tasks of peace and progress.

We accept these facts with our minds. But we still feel as immune from danger as we did in the days of sail.

From 1815 to 1914, the United States lived safely within a world-wide system of order maintained by the nations of Europe. It was not always a just order. We viewed it with hostility and suspicion, as evidence of the prevalence of evil in the Old World from which we had happily escaped to the freedom and virtue of the New. But it was a system of order nonetheless, which permitted us to devote our principal energies to the conquest of the American continent, and the consolidation of the Union.

This experience had a tenacious grip on our outlook. Most of us still feel that it represents the rightful order of nature, the condition to which we should soon return.

We have never lacked men with a deeper perception of world politics. But in the nineteenth century, they never dominated American opinion. Almost by instinct, we began quite early in our history to reach for a place in the wider world. Commodore Perry was sent on his famous mission to Japan. And, at the turn of the century, President Theodore Roosevelt and his friends tried to alert the nation to the coming changes in the magnetic field of world politics. The balance of power was changing, he observed, and with it, the problem of peace. Russia, China, Japan and the United States had new dimension. Policy took on more threatening overtones. As for Empire, it was clear sixty years ago, at the zenith of its power, that it could not survive indefinitely, nor indeed very long.

The majority opinion dismissed President Theodore Roosevelt as a romantic, a dreamer, and a bit of a jingo as well. But he prodded many Americans to think.

---

*"Law, Power, and the Pursuit of Peace," University of Nebraska and Harper & Row (1968).

XUM

His efforts did not come soon enough, however, nor were they followed up strongly enough, to persuade America to change its policy in time—in time, that is, to prevent the First and Second World Wars. These were the catastrophes which led to all the other unspeakable events of this brutal century. They weakened the fabric of social and political life, and the taboos and restraints that define civilization. We participated briefly in the final stages of the First War, but without fully realizing what was at stake. As President Johnson recently commented, "Our slogans rallied the nation to fight tyranny and make the world safe for democracy. But we were really fighting to protect a national interest most Americans at the time did not understand—our interest in the balance of power." And in the years of suicidal blindness between the Wars, we withdrew from responsible participation in world politics, and neglected our vital national interest in its course.

We have debated these issues at intervals since 1918. One round concerned our membership in the League of Nations, and it influenced the election of 1920. Another turned on the threat of Hitler and his alliances to our security, thirty years ago. A third was addressed to President Truman's policies in Europe and Asia. Last year witnessed an intensive and turbulent stage of this debate, directed to Viet-Nam. It reached its climax in the release of a national election.

With the election behind us, it should be possible again for men and women of differing views to examine these difficult problems dispassionately, and in an atmosphere of mutual respect. It is of great importance to the nation that we do so in every home and forum of the nation. For we shall face hard choices in foreign policy in the months and years ahead. Manifestly, it is vital that the nation's foreign policy have its source in an informed public opinion, and that it be understood, and supported, by the largest possible majority of the American people.

II

The old system of peace, on which the safety of the nation depended for so long, had begun to crumble in 1914. It had gone irrevocably by 1945. In the euphoria of victory, we turned to contemplate a task for Hercules—to help create a new constitution for world politics, to replace one which was in ruins around us. Man and human society had survived the War, more or less, in knots and aggregations. But the links among the groupings of men were weakened, and many were cut. We were further away than ever from the ideal of a single world community, based on a shared code of shared values, and accepted rules as to the limits of rivalry.

The stupidity, madness and evil of the generation between 1914 and 1945 did much more than wreck a political system. It profoundly affected the minds of men. Since the heady days of the Enlightenment, at the end of the nineteenth century, civilized man had believed in reason, and in reasonable and automatic processes of science and natural law, which assured the general peace, and the progress of mankind towards justice and virtue. No man can hold such views today. We know now, and know in our bones, that there is no guarantee of progress, no silent law of natural harmony at work, to govern the course of history. We cannot remind ourselves often enough that the two wars of this century were unnecessary, as Churchill has argued so correctly, and that wise and foresighted policy could have prevented them. But men are fallible, and foolish. They often hesitate when they should act, and act when they should hesitate. And their folly can release the most evil impulses of our nature, and turn us into Calibans, and to use a word we avoid in this psychotic age, or worse. Some men are evil. Hitler's mad career had more impact on the course of history than all the books and legions of Marx. What has been lost in this century, as a critic has recently remarked, is "not so much a belief in the Christian heaven above the skies" as confidence in the inevitability of "a republic of heaven upon earth." This Faith in the benevolence of reason, science and progress, he wrote, "held the field from the French Revolution at least until the First World War and, with many, until Hiroshima." Today we cannot be sure that even titanic leaders, governors in the stamp of Churchill—if we could find them—could guarantee a decent future for man on earth, although we have no choice but to try.

III

At the end of the War, in 1945, the American nation confronted "a world without a frame." The European concert, which had helped guide the course of world politics for more than a century, had vanished, leaving hardly a rack behind. Europe and Japan were prostrate, exhausted by war, defeat and occupation, and in some instances, by the disturbing realization as well that their societies were capable of cruelty and tyranny. The nations of Europe were beginning their retreat from Empire, a slow and trying process, full of trouble. And the great centers of Communist power, the Soviet Union and later China, began to push outward in the name both of national and of ideological ambition.

The first goal of our post-war foreign policy was to continue our wartime relationship with the Soviet Union. On that basis, we sought to organize a universal community of nations through the United Nations. To that end, on several occasions we offered post-war reconstruction aid to the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe. We offered to put the atomic weapon under international control. And, for some years, we hesitated to react when the Soviet Union violated the promises it made at Yalta and Potsdam of free elections, and free choices, for the people of Eastern Europe.

But we finally had to accept the fact that the Soviet Union had other ideas. It paralyzed the United Nations as a peace-keeping agency. And it began to push outward in Europe and the Middle East, and later in Korea. It was in response to these pressures that President Truman established the broad lines of the foreign policy we have followed ever since. He promulgated the Truman Doctrine, which in effect told the Soviet Union, "thus far, but no farther." Then President Truman and President Eisenhower organized regional security arrangements, consistent with the United Nations Charter, to help stabilize Europe, Asia and the Middle East. In Western Europe, NATO was formed, and the Marshall Plan proved a dazzling success. We encouraged the movement of European unity, and the re-entry of Germany and Japan into the world community. Through the Point Four program, we established a model for aid to the developing nations which has now become a great international effort. And we participated actively in a series of steps which restored the convertibility of currencies, reduced barriers to trade, and created an active and unified free world economy, the foundation for the extraordinary economic recovery and growth of the free world since 1945.

While President Truman was the focal point for vehement criticism during his tenure in Office, the basic lines of his foreign policy have until recently been generally accepted by American and world opinion as prudent steps, necessary to make possible the recovery of Europe and Japan, and the beginnings of development in the Third World. His stand, costly as it was, arrested a slide towards chaos that could easily have engulfed the world in a new and bitter war. It provided a shield behind which we and our friends tried to establish stable and progressive regional coalitions, strong enough to deter and withstand external pressure.

But there is controversy in the country today as to whether the approach of the last twenty years is still necessary and desirable, and whether changes in the situation since the late Forties require or permit basic changes in the nature and structure of our relationship with the Soviet Union and China, and with Europe, Japan, and the other nations of the free world. This stirring of opinion was heightened by Viet-Nam, but it is not confined to the rightness or wrongness of our course in Viet-Nam. Men ask why we have troops in Japan, Korea and Germany, and why we should care about the possibilities of war in the Middle East, the Asian Sub-Continent, Africa, or the center of Europe. They oppose aid legislation and severely restrict aid programs, out of fear that aid will lead to involvements that could lead in turn to more Koreas and more Viet-Nams.

I want to comment briefly on some of these controversies today, in the perspective of my recent experience in government. The view of the world from the State Department is not very different from that of any other citizen. Except for a few details of information, it differs in only one way: In government, one is bound by an Iron Law of responsibility. One cannot escape from the implacable choices of reality by complaining about mistakes made ten years earlier, or making eloquent speeches about Utopian solutions that are not available.

IV

First, let me say a word about the subjects being discussed on President Nixon's trip to Europe. They are an excellent illustration for the main themes of this talk: the necessity for better education on the problems of peace, and the inescapable character of reality.

Our relationship with Western Europe is manifestly central to our hopes for peace. We have a vital national interest in the independence of Europe. In almost every realm—in trade and monetary affairs, technology, education, security arrangements—Europe is our indispensable partner. But the nature of our relationship with Europe should be more sharply defined.

President Johnson recently remarked that "the maintenance of peace requires the continued knitting together of the three great power centers of the Free World: Western Europe, Japan, and the United States. Here are the reservoirs of strength and skill on which our hopes for order and prosperity depend. If these three work together to deter aggression and to promote peaceful advance, I believe that sooner or later China and the Soviet Union will decide to accept our patient offers of peaceful cooperation. But if we fail to weld our present cooperation into a true coalition, the future will become dangerously uncertain."

I believe that President Nixon shares this judgment and its policy implications. Indeed, his European trip is a symbol of his desire to deepen and strengthen our methods of consultation with our European partners. As he said this week in his speech to the North Atlantic Council, "In its original purpose, NATO has been a resounding success. Europe and America, the Old World and the New working together, have proven that the dream of collective security can be made a reality . . . As NATO enters its third decade, I see for it an opportunity to be more than it has been before: a bulwark of peace, an architect of new means of partnership, and an invigorated forum for new ideas and new technologies to enrich the lives of our peoples."

Much has been done in this direction. But much remains to be done. As often happens, the common cliches obscure the issues. It is a commonplace that the United States has "neglected" Europe in recent years because of Viet-Nam. But the United States has not "neglected" Europe. Europe has been the most active and in many ways the most productive theatre of our diplomacy. The Ken-

XUM

nedy Round; the reform of the International Monetary Fund and of NATO; NATO's new program of political initiatives; the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the problem of NATO force levels and their financing; consultations about the Middle East and Africa—these are a few of the issues which have required sustained consideration and agreement between Europe and ourselves before reaching fruition.

Of course, many forward steps that might have been taken have been delayed or rejected. But these decisions do not represent the will of the United States. It was not the United States, or its distraction because of Viet-Nam, that has prevented British, Danish, Norwegian and Irish membership in the Common Market or the development of the Common Market as a European political entity. It was not an American decision that killed the European Defense Community and the project of a European caucus in NATO. It was not American positions that have held up agreement on force levels in Europe, and on methods of financing their balance of payments costs.

These are intensely difficult problems, with political and emotional overtones. Many go deep into history. It is no wonder that they do not yield to a magic wand. Some European governments face a confused and divided public opinion on questions of defense. In several, there are large Communist parties. In all, there is a minority opinion, as there is here, which takes the view that detente is upon us, and that defense is no longer necessary. And in one instance, a government has made it both a principle and a policy to differ with the United States and its allies on as many subjects as possible, to demonstrate its independence.

It is no wonder that on many, many issues, our Allies in Europe can move only slowly, or not at all.

It is, however, worth calling attention to one set of recent NATO decisions which should facilitate President Nixon's mission, and make it possible to move forward toward his high purposes.

In 1966 and 1967, the United States and its Allies reached unanimous agreement on the future tasks of the North Atlantic Alliance as a continuing factor for a durable world peace. This decision rests on a year-long study of the future of the Alliance which was thoroughly considered by all the governments. The report and resolution embodying these decisions are generally indentified with the name of M. Pierre Harmel, the brilliant and perceptive Foreign Minister of Belgium, who was a leader in this effort. The Allies decided that detente was a condition to be sought, not assumed, and that the NATO defense system had to be maintained and strengthened, until it could be reduced through agreement with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. The Allies resolved to convert the Alliance into an instrument for considered political initiatives in the interest of peace, in addition to its function as a defense arrangement. They decided to intensify and improve their procedures of political consultation on a wide range of issues. They also decided that the Alliance, or some of its members, should seek to harmonize policy on Mediterranean problems, and other problems which affect the security of the Allies, but stretch beyond the area covered by the Treaty.

These basic and far-reaching decisions provide the background for President Nixon's important and welcome pledge in Brussels on Monday to consult with our Allies, in the interest of unity, before and during any negotiations with the Soviet Union on matters which directly affect them, and indeed on the full range of our common concerns.

One result of the Harmel Study and Resolution was the proposal NATO made publicly last June to initiate talks with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe on the possibility of balanced and mutual force reductions in Europe. From such talks, we have said, no topic would be excluded. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia set back the hopes represented by this proposal. But they cannot alter our purpose. Those proposals represent the only road to peace. They have been the steady aim of American policy since 1945.

Other approaches are in the air about the pattern and policies of the Alliance. Some Americans complain that Europe does too little, and that we should bring our troops home, forcing Europe to unite, and take care of its own defense. Some Europeans complain in turn about American dominance, or hegemony. On the other hand, they also contend that since the defense of Europe depends upon the American nuclear weapons, and since the United States, in their view, hardly favors European nuclear power, this is no reason for Europe to follow the politically difficult and unpopular course of increasing its conventional military effort. It is almost equally difficult for Americans to understand the brutal logic of nuclear deterrence—that American nuclear power could hardly be expected to deter on a mail-order basis; that in an age of nuclear balance, no one would wish to see the President of the United States without any choices but the nuclear choice in the event of new turbulence in Europe or the Mediterranean; and that American nuclear weapons abroad have to be protected by American troops.

The equally bleak fact is that hostilities in Eastern Europe could release forces whose outcome no man can control or predict. The United States has a profound national interest in the course of such events. It must do everything in its power to prevent such occurrences, and to participate with its allies in policies to control them.

These are among the reasons why British Defense Minister Healy, and other Europeans, have sought confirmation from President Nixon that in this critical regard American policy will remain firm.

Thus, one by one, beyond the mutual irritations implicit in the situation, men find the alternatives to our present pattern of Atlantic relationships unconvincing. No European entity could soon acquire the nuclear capacity to deter the huge Soviet arsenal. No one wants the formation of Europe to destroy the unitary world economy twenty years of patient work has built. Only trans-Atlantic cooperation can solve technological and educational problems, and build a sound foundation of knowledge for the future. It is therefore reassuring that President Nixon's remarks in Brussels on February 24 echo, almost word for word, one section of President Johnson's speech of October 7, 1966.

We are left with the traditional prescription about making haste slowly. But that rule, sage as it is, does not, and cannot, mean immobility. Our Atlantic institutions do need strengthening, and they do need change. The nature of many problems requires some reforms—in the field of monetary policy, for example, where in my judgment existing patterns of cooperation should become institutional. Nothing less can concert and harmonize policy and contain dangerous pressures towards protectionism and fragmentation. And other steps are required in the political life of NATO to achieve equal responsibility in the relationship between Europe and America. The procedures and the precedents exist, if there is enough will to use them. The Allies have passed formal resolutions, expressing their determination to consult each other intensively and at a high level in the making of policy. It is time to put those resolutions to work, so that here too, cooperation will become a matter of institutional strength.

But we must not expect magic results from President Nixon's useful trip. It dramatizes the vital American interest in the independence and integrity of Western Europe, and in its development as our partner in the quest for peace. It should permit the President to give impetus to the Atlantic dialogue. But it will take a long time before Allied political policy is fully harmonized. For the cross-currents of the nuclear problem, and attraction of pursuing contradictory policies for the sake of contradiction, will mean that progress towards strengthening the Atlantic Community will, at best, be slow.

But the forces of unity are very great. And their pressure on events is real. The next few years may see important opportunities for progress in this direction: in monetary policy, where a prompt consolidation of reserves would be desirable and useful; in developing habits of political cooperation in accordance with the recommendations of the Harmel Resolution; in moving through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development towards a much tighter and more disciplined trading system for all the countries who belong to O.E.C.D., and their regional systems.

V

I might conclude with another case to illustrate my argument: The Middle East. Like our relationship with Europe, the Middle Eastern crisis is a tangled skein of history, of feelings, of fears, and of rivalries. It is even more intractable, and even more immune to Utopian solutions, than the organization of the Atlantic Community.

With the erosion and then the disappearance of British and French positions in the Mediterranean and the Near East after 1945, the United States faced a series of challenges to its national interest. We have deep ties to many of the Middle Eastern states. With the Soviet Union, we played a positive and responsible role in the establishment of Israel.

The resources to the Middile East are vital to the world economy. And in hostile hands, its space could threaten the security of Europe, of Africa, of Iran and the Asian Sub-Continent. It is no wonder that we, and some of our Allies, have repeatedly pledged our support to the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states of the region, and that in 1957, and again in 1961, Congress authorized active programs of military and economic assistance to nations in the area, and authorized the use of force as well to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against "armed aggression from any country controlled by international Communism."

I shall not burden you today with reviewing the Arab-Israeli conflict and its ramifications. But I might offer a few comments on the present stage of the effort to achieve peace.

You will recall that after months of skirmishing, the Security Council of the United Nations passed a unanimous Resolution on November 22, 1967, calling on the parties to reach an agreement which would definitely settle the Arab-Israeli controversy, and establish conditions of just and lasting peace in the area. That agreement, the Security Council said, should establish secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and its neighbors, to replace the armistice demarcation lines established in 1949, and the cease-fire lines of June, 1967. The Israeli armed forces should withdraw to such lines. The agreement should also establish guarantees for maritime rights in the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran, embody a fair settlement of the refugee problem, and assure the right of every nation in the region to live in security and peace. It was provided that the Secretary General should appoint a representative to consult with the parties, and assist them in reaching the agreement required by the Resolution.

For more than fifteen weary months, the Secretary General's personal representative, Ambassador Gustav Jarring, has sought to bring about an agreement of the parties in

XUM

accordance with the principles and provisions of the Resolution. The United States has tried in every way open to it to facilitate this result, by seeking to preserve those elements of the situation indispensable to the possibility of peace, and by urging all the parties to the conflict to more towards meaningful negotiations. While we have differed with all the parties on one or another aspect of the problem, the basic obstacle to peace has been the continuance and intensification of terrorist activities, supported or condoned by some Arab governments, and the policy embodied in the Khartoum formula—"no negotiations, no recognition, no peace."

Terrorist activities violate the cease-fire resolutions, and international law. They are designed to prevent peace, and force another war. There is a risk, though not a great one, that they could succeed.

So far as negotiations are concerned, the government of the United Arab Republic bears primary responsibility at this time for the stalemate in the Jarring Mission. It says it is ready to implement the Security Council Resolution "as a package deal" in all its parts. But thus far, at least, it has not made clear its willingness to implement the provision of the Resolution requiring it to make an agreement establishing peace, nor is acceptance of any practical procedure for reaching such an agreement with Irsael. We must keep in mind that the Security Council Resolution is not self-executing. It requires the parties to take responsibility for peace, and to solve a number of problems in connection with peace: demilitarization and other security arrangements; agreement on secure and recognized borders; guarantees of maritime rights; and the refugee problem.

The hope of the government of the U.A.R., frequently and openly stated, is that the United States will undertake to repeat the procedure it followed in 1957—of negotiating with Israel in behalf of Egypt, so that an Israeli withdrawal could be obtained without peace. It failed to persuade President Johnson to follow this course. I have no doubt it is now trying its proposals on President Nixon.

American opinion needs no warning against this trap. We acted as Egypt's broker once, only to find that it violated every provision of the understanding it reached with us, with Israel, and with the whole international community, stage by stage, until it closed the Strait of Tiran in May, 1967. This time, the United States has said, there must be peace—a definitive end to twenty years of warfare which has become a burden to world peace. And the parties must take public responsibility for the agreement establishing a condition of peace.

The purpose of American policy in the Middle East has been to protect important—indeed vital—long-range interests of the United States and of its Allies. So far as the parties are concerned, it has been a fair and even-handed policy. We agree with Israel that circumstances require peace. But we do not believe that the absence of peace is in the Arab interest, or that any state—any member of the United Nations—has a legitimate interest in claiming the right to destroy another. To insist on peace is not to oppose the rightful interests of any Arab state. Nor is it a position contrary to Arab interests to insist that every member of the United Nations accept and fulfill the provisions of the unanimous Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967. On many other problems—territorial changes, refugees, Jerusalem, and the like—we have taken stands which we believe would protect the interests and dignity of all the parties, and permit them to make a just and balanced peace.

Such a peace is possible, I am convinced, if the parties want peace. The next few weeks should show whether peace will come pursuant to the Resolution of November 22. I am confident the United States will not repeat the error it made in 1957, in negotiating a settlement which failed to end conditions of hostility in the area, and establish peace.

VI

I have said nothing about Viet-Nam in this talk, for there is little to add at this tense moment, as we watch the bitter fighting in the area, and hope for good news from Paris and Saigon. Here, too, I have no doubt, President Nixon is being tested, and much turns on the outcome, in South East Asia and elsewhere.

In the perspective of my argument today, we should view these problems—in Europe, in the Middle East, and in Viet-Nam—as aspects of a single process—our efforts, and that of our friends, to strengthen and consolidate a system of peace. Collapse on any front could endanger all. Such stability as the world has known for twenty years rests on the deterrent power of American commitments, backed by the staunch patience of the American people.

We have pursued a steady course in foreign affairs for more than twenty years. Political philosophers have thought that such continuity in foreign policy was impossible for the volatile public opinion of a democracy. Despite its costs, and the mistakes that have been made, much has been achieved.

There are risks ahead. The Soviets and the Chinese have not yet accepted the logic of coexistence. And conflict can still be triggered by the irresponsible rulers of small states. But the greatest risk of general war could come from an American return to isolation:—a pulling back from Europe and Asia that could precipitate far worse troubles than those which followed our withdrawal from Korea in 1949. For war comes with panic when the world seems to be slipping its moorings. Strong isolationist voices are heard in the country preaching such a course.

For that disease, the best cure is the quiet and thorough study of the problem of peace in our schools, in our universities, and in every forum of the nation where policy is debated.

Hence, my appeal to you today.

ALL OF WISCONSIN CAN BE PROUD

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a remarkable woman has taken over the governmental helm of Israel, and I am confident that under Mrs. Golda Meir's leadership great strides will be made toward solving the complex problems of her country.

Mrs. Meir ranks among the outstanding public servants of Israel, having served in various capacities throughout her long career. With a sense of pride, many Wisconsinites watched Mrs. Meir emerge as one of the truly outstanding world figures. She emigrated to Milwaukee when she was 8, grew up there and graduated from the Teachers' Training College in 1917. For several years thereafter, Mrs. Meir taught school in Milwaukee and was active in local Jewish affairs.

Compelled by her desire to see a home created for the Jewish people, she left Milwaukee in 1921 and moved to Palestine to begin working on her dream. In 1948 the years of sweat and tears bore fruit and the sovereign state of Israel became a reality.

Although difficult decisions face Premier Meir, I am sure that the Israeli nation will be carefully guided under her wise counsel.

I wish Premier Golda Meir success in her challenging new role and hope that the future will bring a lasting peace to the Middle East.

An article tracing Mrs. Meir's life in America recently appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. MEIR'S LIFE HERE TRACED

(By Robert W. Wells)

When Israel's new premier was a girl, she shared two rooms with her parents and younger sister, worked for 20 cents per hour at the library and led the life of an immigrant's daughter in pre-World War I Milwaukee.

The premier is now Mrs. Golda Meir, who has been chosen to lead her nation in a period of crisis. Then she was Goldie Mabowehz, who came to Milwaukee from her native Russia in 1906 when she was 8 years old. She remained here during most of the next 14 years, formative ones for the distinguished career which followed her departure in 1920.

After she became a world figure, Milwaukee proudly identified Mrs. Meir as its own, but surprising little has been recorded about her time here—and much of that, it seems, has been inaccurate.

She is often identified as a former Milwaukee schoolteacher and is regarded as one of the most distinguished graduates of what is now the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee. But a check of records and the recollections of her old friends here indicate that she never taught in the public schools and she did not graduate from what was then Milwaukee Normal school.

Mrs. Meir was born May 3, 1898, in Kiev, of Jewish parents. Her father, Malehz Mabowehz, a carpenter, soon moved his family to Pinsk. It was there, when she was 4 years old, that she participated in her first protest.

Forty-five Russian Jews had been massacred. Various Jewish communities in the czar's realm declared a day of fasting to mourn the dead. Children of her age were exempt, but Goldie insisted on joining in the fast.

In an era of pogroms and discrimination, many of those in Russian ghettos fled to America. There is some indication that Mabowehz came to Milwaukee first, sending for his family later.

Goldie was one of eight children, but by the time the family migrated the five sons had died. Only the three daughters were left—an older girl, who soon married and moved to Denver, Goldie and a younger sister, Clara.

In 1907, Mabowehz was operating a small grocery store at 615 W. Walnut st., then the main business street of a predominantly Jewish neighborhood which included the area between 4th, 10th, Vliet and Walnut sts.

Two years later, the city directory identifies Mabowehz as a grocer at 623 W. Walnut and his first name, which had been Malehz, is now given as Morris.

FAMILY MOVES

By 1913, the family had moved to 748 10th st., where it operated a delicatessen called Miller and Mabowehz. Goldie was included in the 1914 city directory, when she was 16, and was reported to be in sales work. The family address was then listed as 750 10th st.

Two years later, the directory indicates, she was clerking at Schuster's. She, her parents and Clara were still living in the two rooms behind the small grocery store on 10th st.

The sales and clerking jobs were presumably part time because Miss Mabowehz was also going to school. She had gone to the 9th Street elementary school and attended North Division and a high school in Denver, where she visited her older sister, before enrolling at Milwaukee Normal in October, 1916.

REMEMBERS GOLDIE

Isadore Tuchman, 80, of 3774 N. Sherman blvd., a retired vice-president of the Consolidated Waste Paper Co., was then one of a number of young Milwaukeeans participating in the Labor Zionist movement. When Goldie came back from Denver, he recalled, she was not interested in Zionism but was chairman of a women's organization to fight tuberculosis.

"We had a Hebrew school on Sundays at Lincoln House, which was across from the 9th Street school," Tuchman said. "I met her at a lecture and we felt that this girl, who was going to teachers' college and knew a little about Judaism, could do a lot of good with the children.

"She spoke nice Yiddish, which you don't see much in this country."

Tuchman persuaded Miss Mabowehz to become one of about a dozen volunteer teachers at the school, which met for several hours on Sunday mornings and later on Saturday afternoons. It was, he said, a cultural school, concentrating on preserving the Jewish heritage for children of immigrants.

HAD SELF-CONFIDENCE

When he first met her, Tuchman said, Goldie had a great deal of self-confidence and "was sure she was much above the average girl," but actually she knew very little.

"In that environment, with a group of laymen who were interested in Jewish culture and the Jewish faith, there's where she grew up," he said.

Records of Miss Mabowehz's career at UWM's predecessor are scanty. A document signed by Richard E. Krug, their principal of North Division, recommended her for admission to Milwaukee Normal on Oct. 5, 1916. She apparently stayed only until Mar. 15, 1917, when she took a job with the Milwaukee public library as a library assistant. A notation dated Feb. 3, 1917, indicated that she was then in college but would be free to take the job on Mar. 15.

It was then possible to be certified to teach in a rural school after only one school year at Milwaukee Normal. But the records indicate Miss Mabowehz was enrolled in the "primary grammar" division, a two year course of study.

COMPLETED TWO SEMESTERS

Semesters were then only 12 weeks, so it seems likely that she completed two such semesters before leaving school for the library job. One of her old friends recalled that in those days married women were not allowed to teach and Goldie's mother opposed her choice of teaching as a profession for fear this would mean she would not marry.

While she was in Denver, the Milwaukee girl had met Morris Myerson—the name has sometimes been spelled Meyerson. Goldie's maiden name is sometimes spelled Mabowitz, but the Myerson and Mabowehz spellings were used in Milwaukee city directories.

Myerson first appears in the 1919 directory, when he was listed as a sign writer for Aultman, Inc., 458 Jefferson st.

MARRIED IN 1917

Myerson and Miss Mabowehz were married here in 1917.

"He was a first class man," Tuchman said.

By then, Goldie was a leader of the local Labor Zionists, who were part of a worldwide movement which envisioned a Jewish homeland in what was then called Palestine. Street corner meetings were held on Walnut st., with the young woman among those making speeches.

Her biographers have said that Mabowehz, who was then working as a carpenter for the Milwaukee road, objected at first to his daughter's speech-making. He went to one of the street corner rallies to order her to stop.

But his daughter was so persuasive that he changed his mind.

"What a tongue," he said, proudly. "What a spirit."

Tuchman remembers attending meetings at Mabowehz home, with young Labor Zionists crowding into the two rooms to talk of weighty matters.

ALL WERE POOR

"There was no washroom in the House and no electricity—just gas lights," Tuchman said. "All of us were poor. Mabowehz was making 20 or 25c an hour and his work wasn't steady.

"There weren't jobs enough in the city of Milwaukee. People would be peddlers or would go out with a cart and pick up rags. I myself was working 60 hours a week at 15c an hour—$9 a week, that was very good.

"We would have meetings at the Mabowehz house two or three times a week. The father, mother and two daughters grew up with us. Mabowehz was poor as far as money's concerned but he was a smart man.

"In those two little rooms, we talked about all the world's troubles."

Tuchman said that the Labor Zionists often backed the Milwaukee Socialists, who elected Emil Seidel and later Daniel W. Hoan to the mayoralty and sent Victor Berger to congress.

"We were working with them," he said, "but they never recognized us as a Socialist movement."

MAJOR INFLUENCE

Later, he said, Berger sometimes addressed the Labor Zionists. Eugene V. Debs, the Socialist candidate for president, also spoke here in an era when Milwaukee's Socialists were a major influence on public affairs.

The future Israeli premier heard Debs and Berger speak and shared some of their ideas. It seems possible that a movement which has become history in Milwaukee may have had some influence on the leader of a nation that did not exist when Berger regarded the Labor Zionists as unworthy of much notice.

After Myerson and Miss Mabowehz were married in 1917, they made plans to go to Palestine. There is a story—Tuchman had heard it but cannot vouch for its truth—that before Goldie would marry Morris he had to promise to go there.

PLEDGED SUPPORT

It was in 1917 that Arthur James Balfour, British foreign secretary, pledged British support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, then under British control.

Tuchman and Mrs. Myerson were named as the Milwaukee delegates to a Labor Zionist convention in Philadelphia. After that, the young woman began traveling around the country making speeches. She made a national tour to raise money for a newspaper the organization was starting.

It was in 1920, Tuchman said, when the Myersons and several other young Labor Zionists left Milwaukee for what was later to become Israel.

"Before they left, some friends of ours had a wedding," he said. "At night, they had a party for close friends. There were a couple of dozen of us, including Mrs. Meir. We were dancing together and having a good time—that was nearly 50 years ago, and we were young.

"When we parted after the party, we said good-by. They were leaving soon for Palestine. We didn't expect ever to see each other again."

It didn't turn out that way, of course. The Myersons joined a kibbutz, an agricultural cooperative settlement, and for a time the future premier from Milwaukee was in charge of raising chickens. Later, she held numerous government posts, traveling widely.

She visited Milwaukee numerous times, often staying with Tuchman and his wife. He said the Israeli navy got its start in his house. Mrs. Meir bought the first two ships from Canada while she was staying there.

Myerson died some years ago. After she became foreign minister, his wife Hebraicized her name—at first to Mayer, than to Golda Meir.

"She is a very remarkable person," Tuchman said. "She is not only the prime minister of Israel. She knows America. She loves America.

"She won't get stuck up because she's prime minister. She's a plain woman who still remembers her friends."

LENNOX, S. DAK., WINS NATIONAL CLEAN-UP AWARD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, having reached the age where we are confronted daily with the many problems of our great urban centers, it is refreshing to note achievements of small towns which remain the "backbone of American society."

I am proud to call attention to the outstanding achievements of Lennox, S. Dak., a town of 1,400 people in the southeastern part of my State which has again called attention to the All-American small town. Few cities of any size in the United States can boast a more impressive record than Lennox, which recently won its fifth award in 6 years in the National Clean-Up Contest. Lennox was the smallest town to receive a trophy award at the 1969 National Congress on Beautification, which was held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington last month.

I congratulate the citizens of Lennox who have proved to all of us that unity and hard work behind a common cause can reap great results regardless of size. Every citizen of Lennox was an active participant in the campaign to keep their town among the cleanest in America. This kind of spirit deserves the attention of all of us who are interested in replacing decay with progress in the urban areas of this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles noting the achievement of the people of Lennox.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux City Journal, Feb. 24, 1969]

LENNOX, S. DAK., TO RECEIVE NATIONAL CLEAN-UP AWARD

(By Marianne Courey)

LENNOX, S. DAK.—Whatever the formula or knack for remaining among the top trophy award winners in the National Clean-Up Contest each year, this southeastern South Dakota Community has certainly kept South Dakota in the select list in great style during the last six years.

Few cities of any size can boast a more impressive record—five awards in six years—for being among the trophy winners in this nationwide competition, of which the National Clean Up-Paint Up-Fix Up Bureau in Washington, D.C. is sponsor.

Listed at 1,353 in the 1960 census, Lennox will be the smallest in population receiving a trophy award at the 1969 National Congress on Beautification at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington on Tuesday.

It will highlight the three-day event (Sunday through Tuesday), according to R. H. (Dick) Hackendahl, director of the national bureau in Washington.

In a recent telephine conversation Mr. Hackendahl advised Lennox Mayor Fred Courey the city of Lennox's entry was one of 181 submitted in its category—cities up to 25,000 in population.

XUM

Judging in the national contest is based on the year-round campaigns, showing projects and activities, participation and results in community beautification, property improvements, youth activities and miscellaneous (including promotional). In addition to the pride and progressiveness of individuals, Mayor Courey attributes much of the Lennox success to interested city officials and personnel, the great number of Lennox organizations, groups and churches that are active and retain interest, and the splendid support of Lennox business and professional men.

In conjunction with his recent board position with Mikota Opportunities Inc.—area industrial and economic development group—and the Southeastern South Dakota Community Action Agency, Inc., Mayor Courey sent out letters to board members, mayors and town board presidents and chairmen of other civic groups such as chambers of commerce and development corporations, encouraging participation in area and nationwide competition.

In commenting at one time on the establishment of the area industrial and economic development organizations, Mikota Opportunities, Inc., National Director Hackendahl said, "This area-wide approach is becoming very common throughout the United States as individual cities and towns recognize that in order to grow and prosper they must look at themselves as a part of a total area. Certainly I would think one of the first steps that his organization can undertake is to develop a civic improvement and beautification program in every city and town that is represented . . ."

In extending his congratulations earlier, Hackendahl said, "I am sure that you are most excited with this national recognition, particularly in view of the fact that the competition was keener this year than ever before.

"A beautifully engraved trophy will be presented to your city's representative at an elaborate Awards Ceremony."

"As a trophy winner, your city will be in competition for the National Award of Excellence—the Trigg Trophy—which is the highest honor any city can receive for clean up, beautification and civil improvement. The recipient of this award will be announced as the concluding highlight of our Awards Ceremony on Tuesday.

"On behalf of the Bureau and our judging panel, again, our most sincere congratulations," he concluded.

While the National Clean Up-Paint Up-Fix Up Bureau had its inception in 1912, the February conferences and awards presentations were started in 1964. Mayor Courey has attended each of these annual events except 1967, receiving Lennox's award on three occasions while Tony Groebner, then Lennox Commercial Club president, receiving the trophy in February a year ago.

[From the Sioux Fall Argus-Leader, Feb. 3, 1969]

Lennox Achieves Splendid Record

The alert and wholesome community of Lennox has occasion again to be bursting with pride.

The reason is its designation for the fifth time in the past six years as one of the top ten among the trophy winners in the national Clean Up, Paint Up and Fix Up campaign in cities of less than 25,000 population.

To enter this select company of communities once is in itself a notable event. To do so five times in six years is an extraordinary achievement.

The top winner is to be selected in late February. If Lennox wins, it will be a great honor. Even if it doesn't, its cup of joy should be overflowing in the recognition already achieved.

An honor such as this just doesn't come about because of good luck. It is the result primarily of a desire on the part of the people to have a pleasant, beautiful and clean community. That's the kind of a community the people of Lennox want and that's the kind they have. We're proud to be their neighbor and we share with them the satisfaction that accrues from this national distinction.

[From the Lennox Independent]

Legislature Passes "Lennox" Resolution

Wendell Leafstedt, who serves Lincoln and Union counties in the South Dakota Senate, recently introduced a resolution in that legislative body calling attention to the fact that the city of Lennox was again selected as one of ten trophy winners among cities of under 25,000 population in the annual National Clean Up Contest.

The concurrent resolution was read and passed by both houses of the state legislature and a copy of it was forwarded to Lennox city officials.

In remarks pertaining to the resolution, Mr. Leafstedt made the following observations:

"In this contest Lennox was the smallest city in the finals of this national contest. Also, I want to add they have been among the winners in this contest for five of the past six years. It is a city with a population of 1400 located 20 miles southwest of Sioux Falls being five miles west of Interstate 29.

"Some of the principal achievements which helped them to win this award are continuing program of hard surfacing streets, new street lighting fixtures, rebuilding and beautification of a new $85,000 golf course, a new Post Office building to be built soon. They have a modern large nursing home and are making plans for a new low-rent housing unit of 30 units as a home for elderly citizens. They have spent more than $800,000 in the past few years in city improvements and beautification of their city.

"This week the Mayor of Lennox, Mr. Fred Courey, is in Washington where they will award the trophy for the overall winner from the final 30 contestants and we hope Lennox will receive further recognition there.

"The fact that Lennox is the smallest city to win this award is all the more reason that we should recognize their winning of the award. Gentlemen, I feel that we should join in congratulations to the city of Lennox for bringing national recognition to South Dakota."

STATEMENTS MADE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record statements made by eminent Americans before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Prof. Hans A. Bethe at the Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs, March 6, 1969

I have no criticism of the components of the Sentinel System as they were presented in the testimony from the Defense Department. In fact, I believe they are well designed, and I assume that they will work as designed. Nor am I troubled by the safety aspects of the nuclear weapons deployed in the system.

I am worried about the possibilities of penetrating the system, and I want to quote former Defense Secretary McNamara:

"It is important to understand that none of the ABM systems at the present or foreseeable state of the art would provide an impenetrable shield over the United States . . . Let me make it very clear that the (cost) in itself is not the problem: the penetrability of the proposed shield is the problem."

1. BALLOONS

I shall discuss the penetration aids which the offense can use with their ICBM.

The first such aids are balloons. They can be made very thin, e.g. of mylar, and thus can be made to weigh only one or a few pounds. The outside surface has to be coated with metal, such as aluminum, but the coating need not be very perfect. The coating is to make the balloon reflect the radar waves so that the balloon appears to the radar like a reentry vehicle. If the shape of the object makes a difference to the radar the R V itself could be surrounded by a balloon after the missile completes the ascent.

The balloons would all be folded in small packages while the missile goes up through the atmosphere and would then be released and inflated. If they are simply released, they will follow the same trajectory as the reentry vehicle. To provide confusion for the radar, it is necessary to disperse the balloons so that they make well separated targets for the radar. The Chinese would have to learn this technique, but they could do so by using their medium range ballistic missile for launching the balloons.

Balloons have a somewhat bad name among missile experts because it is rather difficult to put them accurately on a specific trajectory to hit a specific target. This however would not be necessary in the case of Sentinel. The doctrine of Sentinel as far as I understand, is to protect the entire country and this means intercepting any threatening object. This would mean that any balloon, no matter what trajectory it follows must be considered a target by Sentinel, and a Spartan missile must be sent against it. This would soon exhaust the supply of Spartan missiles. In fact, one could imagine the Chinese making an attack in which they only send over balloons, no warheads. The balloons would draw the Sentinel fire, exhaust the Spartan batteries and could then be followed by the real attack with warheads.

This possibility forces us immediately to retreat from the doctrine of protecting the whole country. We then may choose to protect only cities and their suburbs. As soon as we do this however, the Chinese could send over reentry vehicles with live warheads, directed to places some tens of miles west of cities. When these explode on the ground, the prevailing winds would carry the radioactivity into the city, at least in many cases.

2. BETTER DECOYS

The offense can make decoys more sophisticated than balloons. They might consist of a sturdy frame, and some wires carefully arranged to give the same radar cross section as the R V. This requires some skill, and the radar cross section must be carefully investigated. But this again can be done in the laboratory, and does not need to wait for the Chinese ICBM capability. Decoys can again be made to weigh a few pounds and still to penetrate some distance into the atmosphere.

3. CHAFF

A particularly effective means of penetrating ABM defenses is chaff. This consists of very thin metal wires cut to a length of about half a wave length of the radar. But the exact length is not important, a chaff wire will also be effective against shorter wave lengths. For instance, one may think of copper wire 1 mil in diameter: 100 million such wires, cut to work against UHF radar, will weigh only 400 pounds. This can easily be

XUM

carried by the ICBM. The only problem is the dispersal of these chaff wires, and this is indeed a tricky one. But if a country learns to disperse chaff, it can make a cloud of chaff hundreds of miles long, spread along the trajectory of the ICBM. This chaff cloud will simply look black to the radar, and any R V or decoy can be concealed within it. If the defense wishes to hit the R V above the atmosphere, they must send a considerable number of antimissiles against the cloud.

4. ECM

It is possible to design vehicles which emit radio waves of about the same frequency as defense radar, which will then jam that radar.

5. BLACKOUT

This is my favorite penetration aid. The ABM system involves the explosion of high yield nuclear weapons at high altitude. Any such explosion ionizes the atmosphere, that is it tears the electrons of the air atoms away from the rest of the atom. These electrons are powerful reflectors of radio waves. In fact the ionosphere which is permanently around the earth, and is responsible for radio propagation around the world, consists of of just such electrons torn off from atoms by sunlight. An atomic explosion would produce a much higher concentration of electrons, and would thus reflect radio waves of much higher frequency than the ionosphere. This gives radar blackout for a certain length of time after the explosion as has been observed in our high altitude nuclear weapons tests.

We know something about this blackout from the actual tests performed. A lot of additional information has been obtained by theoretical calculations since 1962. A megaton explosion at high altitude will cause blackout of UHF waves which are to be used in the PAR radar, for several minutes. This blackout will not cover the whole sky, but it may easily cover an area of 100 miles diameter or more. There are two blackout regions; one arises from the "fireball", i.e. the air that was originally heated by the nuclear explosion: this usually rises to quite high altitude, 100 miles or more. The second is due to the beta rays which are emitted by the radioactive fission fragments left over from the explosion. This beta ray blackout is concentrated at altitudes from 30 to 40 miles. Blacking out a region of 100 miles diameter at this altitude covers a large part of the sky.

Blackout can be caused by the explosions of our own Spartan. For this reason, the amount of fission in the Spartan warhead is kept to a minimum. Also a doctrine can be developed where and when to fire the Spartans so as to cause minimum blackout troubles. In addition the enemy however may purposely explode weapons at high altitudes over our radar. He will of course employ *maximum* fission yield as to cause maximum blackout. Behind the shield of such a "precursor blackout" he may then send any further missiles which our radar cannot see. Of course this is done at the expense of some of his warheads.

The enemy can further increase the effectiveness of blackout by sending his missiles on a trajectory which reenters the atmosphere at a low angle. This costs him more energy, so that it reduces the payload of his missiles, but it makes his RVs visible to our radar only much later than if he used the normal trajectory, and it thus helps penetration even in the absence of blackout.

6. POSSIBLE CHINESE DEVELOPMENTS

What are the Chinese likely to do about ICBM? Our Intelligence had predicted a Chinese ICBM test for late 1967. It obviously has been postponed at least 1½ years. When it will actually happen I cannot predict. Nor can I predict when they will be able to deploy an ICBM system. The estimates of the Defense Department seem to me reasonable.

If we deploy Sentinel this may have various effects on the Chinese ICBM plans. They may give up ICBM altogether but his is not very much like their normal behavior. They may build ICBM in a straight-forward manner without developing pen aids. In this case Sentinel will be effective against the Chinese ICBM until they have quite substantial numbers. As a third alternative, they may develop pen aids at the same time as they develop the ICBM itself, and may be ready with pen aids very soon after the first deployment of ICBM.

It seems to me entirely logical for them to do so. Moreover their history in atomic weapons development makes such a course likely. You will remember that they tested their first H-bomb only two years after their first A-bomb. I interpret this as meaning that they must have done a lot of theoretical work on the H-bomb before their first A-bomb was ever exploded. You can do a lot of theoretical work and laboratory work before you have the industrial capacity to put the hardware into the field. In the last 20 years, we have gone mostly the other way, testing hardware very quickly, but during the war, at Los Alamos, we were forced to use the method which I think the Chinese have used. The Chinese are clearly weak industrially but they are quite strong in brain power. It seems to me entirely credible that they would develop one or more systems of penetration aids in the laboratory before they have an ICBM operational capability.

In this case, Sentinel ability to stop a Chinese missile attack will only last for a short time after the first Chinese ICBM deployment. They need to deploy only a small number of ICBM to penetrate our defenses. Studies of this problem have been made which I believe to be essentially correct.

It is for your committee to judge whether a few years of protection against the Chinese missile attack is worth the price of the Sentinel System. In forming that judgment you will certainly take into account that any Chinese ICBM attack on this country in the foreseeable future would be totally suicidal, without accomplishing much of military value against the United States. We have, and we shall continue to have, overwhelming strategic superiority over Communist China. China has not shown any suicidal tendencies in its military policy toward other nations. They may have suicidal tendencies in the conduct of their internal politics but this is a different matter altogether.

Our great superiority over China is predicated upon the political separation of China from the Soviet Union. It is difficult to predict whether this separation will persist, and you are obviously more competent to judge the prospects of the United States to do everything in our power to preserve this split in the Communist world. This is a diplomatic problem, not a military one. It does not seem to me that Sentinel is a useful instrument for this purpose.

7. ARMS RACE AND RUSSIAN REACTION

If we accept the hypothesis that the Chinese will deploy their ICBM system in the most effective manner compatible with their limited resources, the question will arise what our reaction should be. If we deploy the Sentinel system we shall probably be tempted to improve it in quality and to increase the number of our anti-missiles so as to keep up with the developing Chinese threat. I believe that it would be possible for us to engage in such a race, and to stay ahead of the Chinese ICBM capability for a long time. This would probably be costly but would certainly be within our financial capability.

However, in the course of this race, our ABM system would be built up to a point where it would appear threatening to the Soviet Union. We must remember that any prudent defense planner will tend to be conservative. When we race the Chinese, we will make a high estimate of the prospective number of their missiles and of their capability in pen aids, and we shall therefore tend to deploy 3 to 5 times as many antimissiles as are actually needed. The Soviets, seeing this, will in turn overestimate our building plans, as well as the capability of our ABM. To preserve their assured destruction capability they will then build again 3 to 5 times as many ICBMs as are actually necessary to penetrate our defenses. In this manner a relatively minor Chinese missile buildup may easily lead to a Soviet buildup of ten times that number. This in turn will cause us to respond in kind with an increase of our ICBM force.

In saying this I assume that the Russians do not feel threatened by the Sentinel plan as now conceived. Whether this is actually the case remains to be seen.

8. ABM TO DEFEND MINUTEMAN

A completely different concept of ABM is to deploy it around Minuteman silos, and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme.

My main reason is that such deployment would stabilize the situation rather than the opposite. You are all familiar with the theory of the stable deterrent in which both the Soviet Union and the United States can absorb an initial attack by the other, and are still able to retaliate. Thereby the chance of such an initial attack is greatly diminished, certainly as long as neither party wishes to commit suicide. In this framework, and I do not know any reasonable substitute for this framework, it is vital to preserve our retaliatory capability. This is well assured at present. But if the MIRV concept can be developed to its ultimate conclusion, and if the MIRV can be aimed with very great accuracy, our land-based missiles may some time in the future be in jeopardy. For such an eventuality ABM defending our Minuteman silos would be a very sensible countermove. It is not the only one possible.

I believe that the Sprint missile and the MSR are good components for defense of our Minuteman silos and of command and control centers. Perhaps the Department of Defense would want to modify them somewhat for this specific purpose. It is not clear to me that the rest of the Sentinel system is needed for this type of ABM deployment. Absence of the rest of the system, and deployment of ABM only around our strategic forces, would give the Russians better assurance that we are not seeking to deny them their second strike capability.

Statement by J. P. Ruina, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., Before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs, Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 6, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Senators: I welcome this opportunity to state my personal views today to the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament. My views in no way reflect views held at M.I.T. or any of its laboratories where there is a spectrum of opinion on this issue.

I have been involved in one way or another in the concerns about large defensive systems since I worked as a civilian in the Department of Defense from 1959–1963. For most of that time, I was Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, an agency which had as one of its major responsibilities research and exploratory development of BMD. The actual development of Nike-Zeus, Nike-X, and Sentinel was, however, not the responsibility of ARPA but was assigned to the Army. Since 1963, I have followed closely the technical developments in this field.

The national debate on Sentinel is the first example I know of a military system becoming a matter of intense public debate, not confined to small groups of experts or advocates of a special cause. I think it is significant that we have such a public discussion, it speaks well for the democratic process. I suppose that up to now the highly technical and classified nature of key issues involved in military systems precluded public involvement. But, also, because almost all military programs were given high national priority, they received little critical questioning by Congress or the press. However, we are fortunate that within the executive branch and within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military programs are carefully examined and reviewed for technical feasibility, necessity, and costs—and indeed many programs which initially seemed attractive were curtailed after study. But I think that it is healthy to have questions of defense enter the public arena whenever possible and be judged in relation to other national issues and commitments. I think that on the matter of Sentinel we can have meaningful public discussion without involving ourselves with classified information.

However, public scrutiny brings with it certain pitfalls. Issues can look black or white and are sometimes simplified beyond useful recognition in order to influence public opinion or to assure broad comprehension of sometimes very complex technical and strategic questions. Also, in the passion of debate, evil motives are attributed to both sides; and it becomes increasingly difficult to sort out the significant issues.

Advocates of Sentinel deployment are not part of a military-industrial conspiracy. Critics are not necessarily advocating unilateral disarmament of the United States. Expressing skepticism about need for a specific military system is not disloyal. Honest differences of opinion exist on the technical and strategic nature of the Sentinel system and its effectiveness.

I am also deeply disturbed that the argument about Sentinel has resulted in objections from some quarters to any efforts in Ballistic Missile Defense—even research to help us gain knowledge about the technical issues involved. How can we make decisions about our own system and how can we assess what is going on in other countries without a deep immersion in all aspects of the technology? I believe that it is mistaken to view research, development, and evaluation as necessarily escalating the arms race. It is true that all of these are preliminary to development of any military system, but they are, also, preliminary to wise consideration of arms limitation.

One reason why it is possible to consider withholding Sentinel deployment (and for that matter the thick Nike-X deployment) and limiting our offensive forces, is that as a result of our intense R&D program we are very knowledgeable about the technology involved in both the penetration and defense fields.

When intercontinental ballistic missiles were first developed in the mid-50s, they were considered by the public as the ultimate weapon against which there was no defense. However, after examining the technical situation, the Army developed a ballistic missile defense system called Nike-Zeus.

The system concept for Nike-Zeus was similar to that of Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules—two successful air defense weapons. The basic unit of the Nike-Zeus was a battery consisting of radars, interceptor missiles, and computers all located in the vicinity of the area to be protected. Many such batteries were to be deployed around the United States, mainly to defend cities.

Nike-Zeus represented a magnificent piece of engineering, fully exploiting the technology of the day. It successfully met the challenge of being able to intercept and destroy an incoming re-entry vehicle. But the challenge to a ballistic missile defense system is more than being able to "hit a bullet with a bullet." A technologically sophisticated opponent like the Soviet Union could, and almost certainly would, develop a variety of penetration aids to confuse the system, increase the size of his force to saturate the system, or aim his missiles so that the nuclear explosion occurs outside the range of Nike-Zeus, thereby destroying population centers by nuclear fallout. So that in spite of the fact that Nike-Zeus was an engineering tour-de-force, its high cost and low effectiveness made it unattractive for deployment.

In the early 1960's technology had progressed to the point where a greatly improved system could be developed. The Army discontinued further development on Nike-Zeus and started on Nike-X, a system utilizing the same basic system concept as Nike-Zeus but with vastly improved radars, intercepting, missiles, and computers. The result was again a remarkable engineering development. The full Nike-X is intended to handle a far larger and more complex attack than Nike-Zeus.

However, as defense system technology improved, the technology of the offense also progressed. Again because of the high cost of the system and our estimates of the relative ease with which the Soviets could penetrate the system, the Government has not deployed Nike-X. It is interesting, however, that a new argument entered the debate on Nike-X deployment; namely, that since any ballistic missile defense system that we or the Soviets are capable of building can be penetrated, it was almost certain that the opposing side would build his strategic offensive forces to have assurance of this capability. Deploying ballistic missile defense on either side therefore would escalate the arms race, encourage possible miscalculations, increase arms cost, and yet provide neither country with any additional military security.

Sentinel—the system that has been authorized for deployment to protect us against a possible Chinese ICBM attack, is a by-product of Nike-X. It uses some of the components of Nike–X, but it uses them sparsely—thus it is a "thin" system. It is thin in the number of components it uses; it is thin in cost (relative to Nike–X); and it is thin in capability. But the missile force it is designed to protect against; i.e., the Chinese threat, is presumed to be thinner still.

I think it should be made very clear that deploying Sentinel against the Chinese may have some merit, but I believe that there is universal agreement that deploying it to protect our population against a possible Soviet attack makes no sense at all.

Other reasons given for deploying Sentinel are that it can offer some protection of Minutemen sites against Soviet attack and that it can protect us against an accidental Soviet or Chinese missile launch. I would, however, like to spend the rest of my time on the main reason given for deployment—population protection against a Chinese nuclear armed intercontinental ballistic missile force.

At this point in time we do not need a ballistic missile defense system against China—they do not have any intercontinental ballistic missiles. There is general agreement that eventually the Chinese will have the capability of penetrating Sentinel with relative ease. It may be anywhere from 3–10 years (depending on who judges) from the time that the Chinese have a deployed nuclear force to the time that they can discount the existence of Sentinel. Of course this judgment includes a judgment of the intensity of the likely Chinese efforts. Let us examine the usefulness of Sentinel in this interim period.

The system is designed to provide area defense; that is, about 15 batteries can protect all of the United States and not only specific geographic areas within the country. It can do this because it utilizes a long-range Spartan interceptor missile, capable of intercepting attacking ballistic missiles hundreds of miles away. But the system suffers one great disadvantage, it cannot effectively use the earth's atmosphere to help sort and classify incoming objectives. The result is that it is relatively easy for an opponent to deceive, exhaust, or otherwise penetrate the Sentinel system, and I believe Dr. Bethe, a witness here today, will elaborate on this major problem of the system.

This is not to say that the Chinese after they get a reasonable missile force, will have an easy time neutralizing Sentinel. For them to design missiles which have high confidence of nullifying Sentinel would require a very extensive development and testing program. This is far more difficult than achieving low or medium confidence of penetration.

If you accept this assessment of the capabilities of Sentinel, then the judgment you must make is whether the depolyment of the system gives sufficient advantage in our dealings with the Chinese to warrant the cost of the system. For example, during a transitional period in Chinese missile deployment they might be able to launch 40 missiles, perhaps with crude untested penetration aids. Because of the existenec of Sentinel, it might be possible to protect ourselves against all but five—with, of course, some probability that more or fewer might penetrate. What differences might this make for U.S. policy and security if damage denial cannot be counted on.

Another possible reason for Sentinel is that during its period of effectiveness, it would offer a kind of "damage limiting" insurance in the chance that the Chinese do attack the United States with intercontinental ballistic missiles. But the probability of a Chinese attack, which would be suicidal considering the size of our missile force, must be weighed together with the degree of protection offered and its cost.

You will also want to consider very carefully the implications of any U.S. deployment of ballistic missile defenses for the viability of a future agreement controlling the arms race in general. The current ballistic missile defense system around Moscow is sufficiently minor in its capabilities so that it will not significantly unsettle the calculations of conservative U.S. planners. But were the Soviet Union to insist on deploying a system equivalent to Sentinel, U.S. agreement on an offensive weapon limitation would be more difficult to attain. Thus the risks of deferring a U.S. system with a significant number of interceptors should be weighed against the complications that deployment might pose for our arms negotiators.

Finally it should be noted that the authorized Sentinel system is intended to defend against ICBMs but this is not the only way the Chinese can deliver nuclear weapons on U.S. targets. Low flying aircraft, submarine, or ship launched ballistic or cruise missiles may be in the Chinese inventory in the next decade. An effective defense for one kind of weapon provides incentive for the offense to develop other strategic systems which may have easier entre. If ballistic missile defense has merit, it must be considered in the context of a balanced defense.

I have tried to outline what I think are some of the key issues involved in Sentinel deployment. I hope that my views are helpful to you in your deliberations.

I will be happy to try to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Statement of Gerard C. Smith, Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 6, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: As the newly appointed Director of the Arms Control Agency, I am impressed with the soundness of the premise in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act which provides that "arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole". Also under that Act, the Agency has a mandate to study both "the arms control and disarmament implications of foreign and national security policies of the United States", and "the national security and foreign policy implications of arms control and disarmament proposals"

Today's hearings clearly involve such considerations, and I would like to contribute what I can to clarification of such of the issues involved in the ABM decision as relate to arms control, and particularly to the proposed talks on strategic arms limitations.

Perhaps it would be helpful at the outset to review exchanges with the USSR that have taken place with regard to such talks.

The initiative for the strategic arms limitation talks originated in late 1966 with several informal exchanges between senior U.S. officials and Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington. Formal exchanges began in early 1967 and, as you recall, President Johnson, at his press conference on March 2, 1967, announced that he had received a reply from Chairman Kosygin to his letter of January 27 confirming "the willingness of the Soviet Government to discuss means of limiting the arms race in offensive and defensive nuclear missiles". Both the President and Secretary McNamara raised this subject during the Glassboro meetings in June 1967.

On July 1, 1968, President Johnson and Chairman Kosygin issued similar statements indicating agreement to discuss "the limitation and eventual reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defense against ballistic missiles". The USSR had informed us shortly before the Czech invasion that it was prepared to begin talks between special representatives. The Czech invasion delayed the opening of these talks. The Soviets have continued to show strong interest in pursuing this subject, as evidenced by the Tass article on Inauguration Day indicating their willingness and readiness to begin talks.

President Nixon indicated at his press conference last Tuesday that, although he thinks that both the interests of the United States and the Soviet Union would not be served by simply going down the road on strategic arms talks without, at the same time, making progress on resolving political differences, he did not intend to leave the impression that we say to the Soviet Union that, unless they do this, we will not have talks on strategic arms. The Executive Branch is reviewing on a priority basis the overall U.S. strategic force posture, including both offensive and defensive systems. This review includes arms control considerations. And I would like to say that my Agency, among others, is actively engaged in this review and in preparation for talks, and that I have devoted a good part of my time to this subject since taking office.

It is important to note that these negotiations would relate to both offensive and defensive systems, and not just to ABMs. This is so because of the inter-action of the two. The Soviets are not interested in talking *only* about ABMs.

The objective is to prevent an escalation of the arms race. Such escalation takes place when one side reacts to a move by the other. Thus, for example, if we were to deploy a "thick" ABM system, the Soviets might well react by increasing their offensive capabilities in order to penetrate it. But if we could reach a satisfactory agreement, putting limitations on both offensive and defensive strategic systems, we might avoid this action-reaction phenomenon, which would entail a great expenditure of effort and resources without any net gain to U.S. security.

At this point I might comment briefly on foreign attitudes toward ABM deployment and the proposed strategic arms limitation talks. These attitudes were ascertained prior to the President's recent trip to Europe.

Informed opinion abroad, and particularly in Europe, views the ABM problem as one primarily affecting the U.S. and USSR. There is a general feeling, shared by all our allies, that U.S.-Soviet negotiations involving ABMs as well as offensive systems, would be desirable. Our allies want us to consult with them regarding progress of any such negotiations and we have assured them we shall do so.

Let me turn now to the question of ABMs. Under the budget cycle, the new Administration has to make its decision with respect to fiscal 1970. This review should be completed in the near future. My Agency is participating in the review, and in the deliberations of the National Security Council. Before the review is completed, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on it. What I can say is that arms control considerations are being given serious attention.

I assume that you are primarily interested in hearing from me today about the possible impact on the strategic arms limitation talks of any decision which might be made on the U.S. ABM program as a result of this review. For the reasons I have indicated, I must confine myself to general observations.

Let us assume, as one possible example, resumption of the Sentinel deployment program along the lines recommended by the previous Administration. This program was announced in September 1967 after the U.S. had advised its allies and the Soviet Union. As stated at that time, the basic purpose of the Sentinel deployment was primarily to limit possible damage from minor strategic threats. Great effort was made to prevent this decision from being misconstrued and becoming a stepping stone to a new upward spiral in the strategic arms race between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. I would think that a decision to resume some such deployment at this time would not prejudice the prospects for strategic arms limitation talks.

We cannot, of course, know what the Soviet reaction was to this previous Sentinel decision since we don't know in sufficient detail what motivates Soviet programming. U.S. ABM programming is only one of many factors which influences their strategic plans. It should be noted that there was essentially little public Soviet reaction to the original Sentinel announcement. However, since the 1967 ABM decision the Soviets have continued to expand their strategic offensive systems, probably to be confident of maintaining their deterrent, or "assured destruction", capability in light of the overall U.S. threat. Furthermore, as former Secretary Clifford pointed out in his presentation of the fiscal 1970 budget, the U.S.S.R. is pushing vigorously ahead with an R & D program for an advanced ABM system, although their ABM deployment around Moscow is probably somewhat smaller than originally projected. Thus it is likely that a Soviet military reaction, if any, to a Sentinel-type deployment is probably already in train and should not be affected by my hypothetical example of a decision to proceed with that type of system.

In June 1968, the Soviets indicated that they were prepared to begin talks to limit both offensive and defensive strategic arms. This was some eighteen months after President Johnson had originally proposed them, and some nine months after the announced Sentinel deployment decision. This timing would not necessarily suggest a direct relationship between Sentinel and the talks. The Soviet agreement to talks followed closely on the U.N. Resolution endorsing the Non-Proliferation Treaty which includes a provision (Article VI) in which parties to the Treaty would undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms rate as well as other disarmament issues.

Since June 1968, the Soviets have been pressing for initiation of these talks, despite the fact that the U.S. was, until last month, proceeding with the full Sentinel program. On the other hand, there has been no slackening of the Soviet interest during the past month while the ABM deployment decision has been under review. In light of these factors, it would be my judgment that the assumed example to proceed with Sentinel would have little, if any, impact on the Soviet interest in negotiating strategic arms limitations.

It is my personal judgment that to proceed with a greatly enlarged, or so-called "thick", ABM system, would have a harmful effect on the outcome of strategic arms limitation talks. It would be looked on as an escalation of the strategic arms race started after the Soviets had agreed to proceed with the talks. They would probably wish at the very least to review their decision to go ahead and might decide to back out until such a time as they had deployed sufficient offensive forces to insure penetration of such a "thick" U.S. system.

The effect of actual ABM deployment on the outcome of the negotiations would depend on the scope and characteristics of the system, the timing of the negotiations, and the types of armaments which would be involved in any agreement. After all, it would be some years before any U.S. ABM system could be operational. It should not take many months of negotiation to determine if strategic arms limitations appear to be negotiable.

I hope the Committee will realize that present circumstances may make it somewhat difficult for me to answer some of your questions in a fully responsive way.

I am operating under three constraints. First, newness at the job—I have yet to receive my first paycheck. Second, I am a principal participant in the current Presidential review of the ABM matter and therefore under certain wraps. Third, I expect to have a role in strategic arms limitation negotiations which I believe are upcoming and as such should try not to telegraph our present thinking about negotiations to the Soviet Union. But I do appreciate the importance of better public understandings of this very important issue facing the United States and, subject to the above constraints, I will do my best to be a responsive witness.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my prepared statement. Thank you.

Statement by Daniel J. Fink at the Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs, U.S. Senate, March 6, 1969

Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is indeed a privilege for me to appear before your Committee on this very important topic of Ballistic Missile Defense. During the years 1964 through 1967, working first for Dr. Brown and then for Dr. Foster, I was the Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering, responsible, among other things, for our Ballistic Missile Defense Research and Development Program. It is my hope this morning that I can draw upon this experience, and about a year's reflection on the outside, during which time I have not been associated with the Program, to describe for you the U.S. BMD program and some of the decisions and rationale for evolving this program over the years, leading ultimately to the Sentinel decision in 1967.

Before initiating the description of our program, I believe a few general definitions are in order. All of the systems which we shall be discussing have two principal components: radars and interceptor missiles. The functions of the radars are to detect and acquire the incoming enemy ICBM warhead, to track this object with sufficient accuracy that we know where it is going and can thereby intercept it, to discriminate the real nu-

XUM

clear tipped re-entry vehicles from any other objects which may inadvertently or purposefully be accompanying it, and to track our own interceptor missile so that we know where it is is precisely located during its flight and can be guided accurately to intercept. The interceptor missile itself is the second component of our systems and its function is to carry and detonate a nuclear warhead close enough to the incoming enemy warhead to guarantee destruction of the enemy's weapon. All of the systems we have ever considered seriously deploying have been of this nature. Approximately four billion dollars of research and development have been devoted to these programs during the past thirteen years.

We have considered both terminal and area defense systems as well as combinations of the two, and I believe it would be useful to define these terms. A terminal defense system is one designed to protect an area a few tens of miles in diameter, quite representative of a metropolitan area. Looking at a map of a section of our country (Chart 1) the circles drawn around the various cities show the areas that would be defended if a defense site were located at each of these cities. A defense site, by the way, would normally consist of a radar and a set of interceptor missiles. An area defense system, on the other hand, is designed to provide defense by a single defense site over an area some hundreds of miles in diameter providing a defense "footprint" as shown on the right-hand side of the chart. It would take about a dozen or so area defense sites to provide some protection over the entire continental United States.

The U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense program got its real start in 1956 when the Nike Zeus system received its go-ahead. It is interesting to note that we started this defense system before any real offensive threat had yet appeared but with the clear recognition that an ICBM was feasible and if we could do it so could our potential enemies. The technical problems appeared extraordinarily formidable at the time and raised such questions as "can a bullet hit a bullet"? How does one intercept a missile coming at you at four miles per second with another one travelling at about one mile per second? The system took the form of the assemblage of components shown on Chart 2. Each defense site would have consisted of separate radars to do each of the various functions I previously described and a number of Zeus missiles to perform the intercepts. As an R&D system it was successful in the sense that by 1962 the first ICBM target launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California was intercepted by a Nike Zeus missile launched from the research and development site at Kwajalein atoll in the Marshall Islands. While successful in performing a number of such intercepts, the development process revealed, however, two fundamental limitations. First, the relatively slow speed of the Zeus missile made it necessary to commit an interceptor while the incoming offensive threat was quite far out. This meant that although it was a terminal defense it could not take advantage of the atmosphere to filter out even the lightest objects such as fragments of the booster.

Second, it used separate mechanically slewed radars, such as we're used to seeing around our airports, for each of the separate functions. Such radars take seconds to move their beams across the sky from object to object—a very long time considering the speed at which things would be happening. Since there could be many objects arriving, the system almost required a separate radar for each object aimed at a city. Thus a typical defense site might contain as many as thirty radars and could still be easily saturated. I think it is worth pointing out that while a negative development decision was made on technical grounds the development was extremely useful from an R&D standpoint. As a matter of fact, many of these radars are still used at Kwajalein atoll to test the efficacy of our own offensive missiles.

In the early 1960's several technological developments were occurring which showed promise of eliminating the deficiencies of the Nike Zeus system. First, a new type of radar called the phased array radar had been invented. With such a radar it is possible to generate many beams simultaneously and steer them electronically across the sky in a matter of microseconds, thereby permitting a single radar to handle a huge amount of traffic. Secondly, vastly improved data processing technology was becoming available and finally, a small very high acceleration missile called Sprint was conceived which, because of its speed, could withhold fire until the atmosphere filtered out most of the light objects. This technology was assembled into the Nike X system which was officially initiated in 1963. The Nike X system (Chart 3) would consist of a very large phased array radar called the Multi-function Array Radar (MAR) which could handle all the functions of acquisition, discrimination, and target and missile tracking. Because such a radar is very expensive it was to be supplemented with a simpler phased array radar called the Missile Site Radar or MSR to handle some of the more routine tasks. The primary interceptor was now the Sprint missile although Zeus was still retained to provide some defense in depth.

Throughout this period I would say that the primary objective of our BMD development program was to come up with a system that could provide major damage limiting capability against the Soviet Union. More than that, we were not designing a system against a threat existing at that time but, rather, we wished to be able to handle any penetration aid that we could conceive of as a means of defeating the system. The resultant NIKE-X system was one that the technicians could well be proud of, but yet it became increasingly clear that such a system would not be approved for deployment. The reasons were several-fold, but at least included the following: It was a very expensive terminal defense system which for a given amount of money could provide protection to some number of cities but leaving many totally unprotected, and it suffered the flaw of any terminal defense system—namely, that every piece contributes to the cost but the enemy can choose where to attack and only a small part of the system can be brought to bear to counter such an attack.

At the same time the threat that the U.S. was facing was changing in a number of ways. During the 1965–66 period the Soviet missile force was starting to grow at a rapid rate, giving us concern that not only could our cities be targets for attack but perhaps various elements of our strategic retaliatory force as well. At the same time the Chinese were making dramatic progress with their nuclear program and it appeared that they would embark on an ICBM effort. Clearly if one was to defend against the Chinese during a period in which their missile force might be small, one would not wish to defend a few sites very heavily but rather would wish to provide some protection over the entire country. As a result, the idea of spreading the defense over the country, leaving no free ride into undefended cities, took hold and the area defense concept evolved quite naturally.

Two new components were introduced into our development program to provide this capability: first, a long range interceptor missile, now called Spartan, which could fly several hundred miles carrying a nuclear warhead with a yield in the megaton range and thereby defend a rather considerable area; and, second, a new phased array acquisition radar that could pick out an attack essentially as far away as the radar horizon. For an ICBM this is over 1500 miles, which gives us some ten minutes to launch the Spartan—a very long time for today's computers. Let me illustrate how these components are put together to provide an area defense system. Chart 4 shows a profile of an area defense engagement. It can be seen that the acquisition radar now called PAR detects the incoming re-entry vehicle at a distance of about 1500 miles. It tracks this vehicle long enough to predict its trajectory, at which time a Spartan missile is launched and is guided to intercept by the Missile Site Radar. The Spartan/MSR combination provides an ability to defend an area several hundred miles in diameter, as I indicated on Chart I. To provide coverage over the entire U.S. we deploy a number of the PAR radars across the northern tier of the country to provide the total acquisition capability and a sufficient number of Spartan/MSR sites so that their overlapping coverage covers the entire U.S. A schematic of such a deployment is shown on Chart 5.

This now leads us to the Sentinel deployment decision made by Secretary McNamara in 1967. Chart 6 indicates how Sentinel evolved from its predecessors—Nike-Zeus and Nike-X. Specifically Sentinel consists of a few Perimeter Acquisition Radars as depicted in the previous chart. Since these radars are important to maintain the full area coverage they are provided extra protection by Sprint missiles located in their immediate vicinity. In addition, there are sufficient Spartan/MSR defense sites located around the country to provide total area coverage. I believe that sixteen such sites have been announced to date. This system was sized by a potential Chinese ICBM threat; namely, there were to be sufficient Spartan missiles to intercept a Chinese force of about seventy-five ICBM's that could be targeted any place across the country. In addition, an option was included to deploy additional Sprint's around our Minuteman ICBM sites if and when desired.

Let me further note a couple of other considerations that were brought to bear at the time of the Sentinel decision. First, a review was made of our total research and development program to ascertain whether there was any development on the horizon that could make a major shift in our defense technology, for example, the way the phased array replaced mechanical radars in going from Nike Zeus to Nike–X. No such possibility was foreseen in the immediate future. Second, we reviewed how we would handle an anticipated evolving Chinese threat. The decision was made not to follow in the tracks of Nike–X where we put every counter counter measure we could think of in the initial defense deployment to handle any conceivable penetration aid. Rather, Sentinel was designed to handle likely initial attempts at penetration; for example, the high yield warhead of the Spartan missile has an adequate kill volume to negate the deployment of penetration aids in the vicinity of the re-entry vehicle. Similarly were the radar characteristics developed. This is not to say that the Sentinel system as originally deployed could not be defeated, but rather we reviewed the entire stable of penetration aids that we could think of and were satisfied that we could upgrade the defense technologically to handle them if and when they appeared. We believed that we would know of the existence of such threats and only with a Sentinel system deployed in the field could our reaction time be short enough to incorporate the necessary product improvement.

Let me finally address the Sentinel system vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, since I know this is important to your considerations. The Spartan missiles in the Sentinel system could be launched to intercept ICBM's emanating from the Soviet Union as well as those from China, and, as a matter of fact, one of the stated objectives is to handle an accidental launch by the Soviet Union. What then might

XUM

the Soviet reaction be to such a deployment? Even if Sentinel worked perfectly there is simply not enough of it to threaten the Soviet deterrent. They could still exact tens of millions of U.S. fatalities. Because their force is now so large I believe their reaction, if any, would be in the form of penetration aids rather than in the addition of more and more destructive power.

On the other hand, mustn't they worry about a numerical growth in our defenses? In this regard, I can only say that unlike offense, which presumably works at any level, there is general agreement within the defense community that defenses cannot grow into larger and larger systems with any certainty of success at limiting fatalities to low levels. Thus there are strong technical arguments to limit the size of defense systems. Is there any value then to a light defense such as Sentinel facing a very large offense? One aspect of my concern is that the lack of any defense might encourage the outbreak of conflict. During the last few years the Soviet ICBM force has grown in numbers and presumably can become more accurate. Therefore, we must worry about all military applications of such force whether it be directed at our retaliatory forces, our missiles, our bombers, our command and control structure, or our ability to deploy forces overseas. Such attacks might become more attractive if we are totally unprotected. A light defense complicates this picture and could provide assurance that adequate forces survive as well as the time needed to protect our ability to retaliate. In this regard the defense could have a stabilizing influence of reducing the likelihood of such wars.

Gentlemen, that completes my description of the evolution of our Ballistic Missile Defense program. I should be very pleased to answer any of your questions.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently I cosponsored S. 809, the Youth Camp Safety Act, the purpose of which is to protect and safeguard the health and well-being of the youth of our Nation attending camps by establishing Federal standards and Federal assistance to the States in developing programs for implementing safety standards for these youth camps.

The identical bill was introduced in the 90th Congress; however, it did not reach the Senate floor for a vote. I am optimistic that this will not be the case in the 91st Congress for this bill is urgently needed not only to protect the young campers but also to provide assurance to parents and interested citizens that youth camps meet minimum safety standards.

Until such time as the bill becomes law, the parents of young campers must rely upon their own initiative in order to determine the safety standard of a particular camp.

An excellent article entitled "Choosing a Summer Camp," published in the March issue of the Washingtonian magazine, undoubtedly will prove to be a valuable aid to many of them. It details several tips and guides which will serve as a necessary temporary protection until the "Youth Camp Safety Act" becomes law.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOOSING A SUMMER CAMP

(By Truman Temple)

The consumer revolt of the 1960's against defective cars, hazardous drugs, and hidden interest charges has an unlikely new target this spring: summer camps.

Led by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff of Connecticut and Representative Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey, Congress is showing interest in a flurry of camping bills that would hand new investigatory powers to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and open the subject to full public gaze.

Hearings conducted last year by Congressman Daniels armed the legislators with some powerful statistics. Among them:

Although camps have been in business for a century and will be attended this year by six million children, only a few states have comprehensive health and safety regulations governing them. Many states approach the subject in haphazard fashion, satisfied if the camp food and waters are pure.

In nineteen states there are no camp regulations at all.

The American Camping Association (ACA), which endorses the legislation, does require inspections of its accredited camps—but it represents less than twenty-eight percent of the nation's 11,200 camps.

The hearings last year unearthed a couple of genuine horror stories. In one, a fifteen-year-old boy was drowned when his YMCA camp counselor led a canoe expedition down a river made extra hazardous by pulpwood logs. The camp was located in upstate New York, the river in Maine. According to testimony, the counselor had not been on the river before. In another case, four children and a counselor were killed and fifteen injured when a flatbed truck in which they were riding (driven by a counselor) somersaulted on a California expressway.

Some camping groups are issuing material aimed at "keeping government out of camping," but as the *New York Times* editorialized last year, camping has become nationwide and a serious need exists for national safety standards.

Kids also need camps more than ever. Those nights under the stars offer a never-forgotten experience to the youngster who all year is surrounded by the city's fumes and concrete. So while waiting for Congress to clean up the bad camps, what is a parent to do? And how can he find good ones?

Industry sources generally agree that if a camp is accredited by the ACA or the smaller Association of Private Camps, it's a good sign. These associations maintain standards. In the ACA's case, more than 100 items are checked by inspectors to make sure, for example, that campers aren't herded into cramped quarters or supervised by underage counselors.

But authorities stress that parents should not be satisfied with just an association listing. They urge a personal investigation, including an interview with the camp's director. Not only can parents get a better idea of facilities, but intuition comes into play. The mood and atmosphere of a camp often is the reflection of a director's personality.

Mrs. Wilma Miles, a veteran camp inspector, has high praise, for example, for one sailing camp in Maine called Frye's Leap, located on an island in Lake Sebago. "I had a feeling of peace when I visited it," she observes. "Things were well-regulated, but it also was a happy camp." Not the least of this organization's assets is the fact that its director, Joseph B. Earnhardt, is a physician. (I was pleased to hear Mrs. Miles' judgment; I had sent my own sons there and found it reassuring to have a doctor in charge.)

Another useful approach is to read the camp directories. The ACA publishes an annual Directory of Accredited Camps, obtainable from the Capitol Section in Washington (telephone 362–7534) for $1.70. Also recommended is the *Parents' Guide to Summer Camps* by Charlotte M. Shapiro and Lore Jarmul, published in 1968 by Harper & Row at $6.95, which gives detailed information, including fees, for more than 400 camps in New England and Middle Atlantic states.

These directories are particularly valuable for the Negro family, for they list the interracial camps. The Shapiro-Jarmul book also gives something of the philosophy of the camp directors.

Mrs. Miles, whose wit can be as sharp as that of Alice Roosevelt Longworth, once expressed her irritation with a well-known sailing camp in North Carolina that proclaimed across the cover of its brochure that it was for white children only. Noting that many Washington families found this offensive, she asked the camp director why he flaunted his racism.

"Well, this is the way we feel," he said.

"But do you have to advertise it?" she asked. "When someone asks you on the street how you feel, do you reply, 'Fine—except for my hemorrhoids'?"

History has not recorded his reply.

A number of camps specialize in certain activities such as horseback riding, music instruction, foreign languages, and so forth. But neither Mrs. Miles nor a colleague, Mrs. Ruth Seward, a camp advisor for thirteen years with the Jarvis School Bureau in Washington, are enthusiastic about so-called obesity camps specializing in taking weight off children.

"I'm a nutritionist," Mrs. Miles declares, "and if these camps are any good they're horribly expensive. Maybe one out of eight youngsters will follow through on the dieting after returning home. If you have gobs of money, okay. But if there isn't at least one psychiatrist and one doctor plus nurses in attendance, it's not worth it. Any good lively camp program with no in-between meals is just as good—and cheaper."

Mrs. Seward also warns of the overly-permissive camp, where the reins are not only slack but sometimes nonexistent "Kids *want* direction," she emphasizes "They think they don't, but the average youngster really doesn't enjoy lolling around all summer."

Price and social status, incidentally, are not foolproof indexes of a camp's excellence. Mrs. Miles relates that she once visited a foreign-language camp patronized by prestigious families and found the place filled with tension. "Everything was perfection," she relates. "The girls danced ballet in tutus, rode in red coats, and the camp imported its riding instructors from England. But the kids were nervous, screaming, and bumping into each other. There was a list of twenty-five things you had to accomplish in water skiing. The management really rode the help—and this is one thing to look for. It communicates the strain to the children." Another reason why the alert parent should visit a camp in person.

There are camps for every taste. For those interested in exposing their children to authentic woodsmanship plus liberal social experience, the five Farm and Wilderness Camps for various ages operated by Kenneth and Susan Webb near Rutland, Vermont, are distinctive. A quiet, steady Quaker philosophy permeates them. They are open to all races and creeds, and the Indian lore taught there is authentic.

Camp Pocono for boys, near Hawley, Pennsylvania, draws upon a somewhat more affluent clientele, with many youngsters from the Washington area, but the same Quaker philosophy is present. It is both international in scope and interracial. (Ralph Bunche's son went there.) The director, Chauncey Paxson, a former headmaster, has no less than forty-seven years' camp experience.

For girls, a typical well-rounded camp offering riding, waterfront activities, and dances with neighboring boys' camps is Camp Wyoda, near Ely, Vermont. It has been under the same family ownership since 1916, and a co-director is Mrs. Cyril O. Bratley of Bethesda. More than fifty percent of the campers return each year, another good sign that parents should look for.

Among the music camps, some of the best-known are Indian Hill, a coed camp near Stockbridge, Massachusetts, offering serious instruction and visits to the famed Tanglewood performances; Amherst Summer Music Center, near Portland, Maine, also coed; and Camp Encore, near Bridgton, Maine, where boys can enjoy both sports and music. Such camps feature amphitheaters in the woods, pianos by the dozen, and that reassuring feeling for parents that the kid isn't losing the musical skills so laboriously acquired during the school year.

If the camps all survive the Ninety-first Congress—and I think the good ones will—parents should be able to breathe a little easier knowing that Junior is in good hands up there in Toad Hall.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ANNOUNCES REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SPACE AVAILABLE TRAVEL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Friday, March 14, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird announced the removal of the restrictions on space available travel for military personnel on active duty and their dependents, as well as for retired military personnel and their dependents.

Secretary Laird's lifting of these restrictions will be a tremendous morale booster to military personnel since most space available travel has been denied them for more than a year. Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara had based his restrictions on the fact that this means of travel was detrimental to the U.S. balance of payments. However, Secretary Laird stated on Friday that a thorough review of all of the factors presented had shown that the impact on the morale throughout the Defense Department and on retired service personnel more than offsets the infinitesimal amount of balance of payments involved. Space available travel has been available to active and retired personnel for many years and Secretary Laird's action in restoring this privilege unquestionably indicates his deep concern and regard for the morale and welfare of our military personnel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Laird's announcement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ANNOUNCES REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SPACE AVAILABLE TRAVEL

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird announced today that restrictions previously imposed by the Department of Defense on space available travel have been removed.

Travel overseas by active and retired servicemen—and their dependents—has been affected by the ban, which was imposed more than a year ago in an effort to help alleviate the country's balance of payments problems. In making the announcement, Secretary Laird said "I took this action after a thorough review of all the factors. The balance of payments expenditures involved were minute but the morale impact throughout the Department of Defense—and on retired service people—was widespread and substantial. Further, since such travel has been available to active and retired service people for many years, I believe its restoration is both reasonable and fair."

The policy change, which is effective now, will not cause any additional expenditures by the Department of Defense. The DOD transportation facilities concerned are being notified immediately, and that portion of the DOD directive which imposed the restriction is being amended to incorporate the new policy.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, next week Future Homemakers of America in more than 12,000 communities will observe National FHA week. During this observance, all of America will have an opportunity to review the efforts of the 600,000 members of FHA in helping others improve their personal, family, and community lives.

This year FHA has chosen as its theme, "Focus on Positive Action," and many local chapters will be placing special emphasis on their local community projects and activities—such as assisting local Headstart programs, caring for the mentally retarded and handicapped, tutoring migrant and underprivileged children, and helping with the March of Dimes and UNICEF. Through projects like these, FHA members are showing what American youth can do in a positive way to promote the principles of good citizenship.

Founded in 1945 as a nonprofit organization supported financially by membership dues, FHA is cosponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association. It strives to provide experiences that broaden the home economics program in the high school. All of its activities are youth oriented. National officers are elected and policies and goals are discussed and determined at annual meetings by the members themselves. In the State of Wisconsin alone there are 15,000 members of FHA, including the national vice president of the central region, Marilyn Drew, of Rice Lake. Beth Monson, of Hammond, Wis., is the president of the Wisconsin State FHA Association.

Their work is volunteer. Through their concerns, leadership and citizenship, they demonstrate clearly that youth does know, youth does care, and youth can do in a positive and constructive way.

AMBASSADOR BRUCE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, some men who have the good luck to be born into an illustrious family and who are granted by fortune the boon of a famous name spend their lives resting on the oars that have been thrust into their hands. When a man seizes the oars and uses them to advance the progress of his Nation and in the highest sense to enrich his own birthright, he not only justifies his own life, but he justifies the hope and expectations that have been entrusted to him. Such a man is David Bruce.

Ambassador Bruce has been called to sit with the statesmen of the world and to participate in events that govern the issue of war or peace and, in consequence, the issue of human survival. His preparation for the service was both thorough and typical.

His earlier public service included his membership in the Maryland House of Delegates and in many local and State activities. The spectrum of his career has comprehended nearly every form of full participation in the concerns and interests of his time.

As he returns from London, at the successful conclusion of another brilliant mission, we all welcome him with deep appreciation and genuine affection.

PARTIAL INCREASE IN MILK SUPPORT WILL NOT BE ENOUGH

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there are growing indications that the Nixon administration may propose only a partial increase in the present milk price support and will fail to restore it to 90 percent of parity, where former Agriculture Secretary Freeman set it a year ago. An action of this nature would shortchange the Nation's dairy farmers.

Last spring, 90 percent of parity was $4.28 per hundred pounds of milk, or about 9 cents per quart. But, with production costs increasing 6 percent or more over the past 12 months, the support price is now only 84 percent of parity and approximately 30 cents below the highest authorized figure.

The new milk price support must be announced by April 1, when the dairy marketing season begins. I hope that Secretary Hardin will set the price support at 90 percent of parity as former Secretary Freeman did a year ago.

With many dairy farmers entirely dependent upon the price support for the exact price they get for their milk, it would be a sham if the new administration failed to increase the price support to the full 90 percent of parity that Congress has authorized.

Every available economic indicator supports the need for the full restoration of the milk price support. Milk production and cow numbers are substantially down while both milk consumption and production costs are increasing. It appears that the failure to increase the price support at this time may lead to a milk shortage in the fall.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture usually bases its decisions for milk price supports on its projections of milk production for the next marketing year. But over the past 5 years the Department's preseason projections have been between 1 and 6 billion pounds too high every year.

These inaccurate projections have resulted in low price supports that have forced thousands of farmers out of dairying and have caused milk production to decline 10 billion pounds in the past 5 years.

LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on February 9 it was my privilege to address a luncheon in Washington commemorating the 51st anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Among those with whom I shared the platform was the distinguished Chargé d'Affaires of Lithuania, Mr. Joseph Kajeckas.

Recently I had occasion to read through the text of Mr. Kajeckas' re-

XUM

marks. I was so impressed by them that I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD. I invite attention in particular to Mr. Kajeckas' closing statement:

> Today, all Lithuanians join with their friends in liberty in reiterating their determination: we will never give up; freedom will always triumph over slavery; we will win—we shall overcome!"

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSLATED EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH IN LITHUANIAN DELIVERED BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGE D'AFFAIRES OF LITHUANIA, AT THE WASHINGTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT A COMMEMORATION ON FEBRUARY 9, 1969, OF THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We have gathered today to commemorate the 51st anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuania is not a nation that emerged only in the 20th century, but a state whose independent status was universally recognized as long ago as the age of King Mindaugas, over 700 years ago. And the political and ethnic status of the Lithuanian people stretches back into prehistory, even before the time of the Roman historian Tacitus, who mentions the ancestors of present-day Lithuanians in his writings. So we may indeed speak of the Declaration of Independence of February 16, 1918, as an Act that did not create a new state, but instrumentally restored independence to a nation that had for many hundreds of years cherished the ideals of freedom.

Through all the vicissitudes of the formation of modern Europe, the Lithuanian people never lost sight of their dream of preserving their national identity and political and territorial sovereignty, even during the dark days that ensued after Lithuania fell under Russian czarist domination in 1795. Generations of Lithuanians continued to struggle for a rebirth of freedom, and their efforts reached a crescendo in the late 19th century. The nationalist movement late in that century, adorned with the devotion and courage of countless thousands of Lithuanian patriots, was crowned with success by the Act of February 16, 1918. But even after the momentous Declaration of that date, which asserted Lithuania's independent status, Lithuanian patriots had to defend their new status against heavy odds. Victory was theirs—a tragically short-lived victory of only 22 years' duration.

Many brave and dedicated people contributed to that shining moment in the history of human freedom. One of them was Petras Klimas, who died several weeks ago, and who was a signatory of the 1918 Declaration of Independence. For long years afterwards, he contributed vitally to the progress of independent life in Lithuania, and, after the Soviet Union cruelly and barbarously seized Lithuania in 1940, he underwent untold sufferings for championing the just cause of his beloved homeland. Within the last several months, the Lithuanian-American community has also lost one of its most devoted leaders: J. Bachunas had given his whole life to Lithuania, and his countrymen all over the world had been inspired by his absolute devotion to the cause of once again restoring freedom to a suffering homeland.

These men, and many thousands who have shared their energy and their bravery, are now at rest. But their works live after them, just as the works of Mindaugas, of Gediminas, and of Vytautas live on.

To those who would say, "What chance can the captive nations possibly have?", I would answer—look at Hungary, look at Czechoslovakia, and look at the long history of Lithuanian resistance to the Soviet imposition of a totalitarian regime. To those who want to deal with "realities" I would suggest that the most constant reality with regard to the history of human beings is the drive *not* to be a pawn, not to be a slave, not to be a machine. The Magna Carta, the Boston Tea Party, the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the determination of West Berliners—all of history points to the fact that freedom buries its own undertakers. And if William Faulkner—and history—are correct, Man will not only endure; he will prevail. Those who try to dehumanize free and spontaneous modes of human political construction are destroyed by their own dehumanism. If you want to think back, not as far as the Athenians at Thermopylae but just a few years, remember that Khrushchev did it to Stalin, and history did it to Khrushchev. Nothing in history is stranger or more wonderful than what is often loosely called The Human Spirit—and that Spirit of full humanity is synonymous with freedom.

The Lithuanian people will not let their torch of freedom die; their courage and their will has been proven by the tests of centuries. In the present conflict, they are grateful to the friends of freedom, such as Senator Thomas Dodd, who is our featured speaker this morning. He has unrelentingly espoused the cause of Lithuania's just aspirations to regained independence, as have all American governments since that dark day in 1940 when the Soviet Union began to make the Baltic States into a heinously illegal paradigm of colonialist imperialism in the 20th century. The American people have always been among the staunchest champions of the liberty of others; President Nixon reiterated the American commitment to the ideals of liberty last year when he said, "No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not."

Today, all Lithuanians join with their friends of liberty in reiterating their determination: we will never give up; freedom will always triumph over slavery; we will win—we shall overcome!

SALT LAKE CITY BECKONS PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, last week the Inter-American Coordinating Committee of the Partners of the Alliance, together with the committee chairmen who will preside over the six working sessions at the Fourth Inter-American Partners of the Alliance Conference in Salt Lake City, met in Washington, D.C.

The main purpose of the meetings last week was to develop working papers for each delegate prior to the sessions to be held in Utah and to insure that there will be no time lost at the meetings May 10–14 in Salt Lake City. It also guarantees that the focus of the Utah conference will be on specific projects and programs.

On Thursday of last week the entire group held a luncheon in the Presidential Room of the Capitol, and it was my pleasure to be able to welcome them to Washington and express the delight of the people of Utah that the partners conference is to be held in my State. I indicated that their meetings coincide with the centennial of the driving of the golden spike which completed the transcontinental railroad. I know that Utahans look forward to the presence of visitors from all over the hemisphere representing 74 partners committees and that they will find the celebration of the Golden Spike Centennial an added attraction in the capital city of Utah.

We are proud to be able to host private citizens from throughout the hemisphere who are giving freely of their time and talents to help improve relationships of understanding and friendship.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEADSTART CUT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the recently announced cutback in OEO funding of the 1969 District of Columbia summer Headstart program, is not merely cutting the financing of a program, but is depriving 1,775 children of education and health facilities that they so desperately need.

For example, last year, the District Headstart program treated over 1,300 children for dental defects, and another 484 children were treated for major medical problems such as cardiac difficulty, skin disease, orthopedic problems, hernia and mental retardation.

We are not talking in abstract figures; we are talking about children who need medical attention, who need an extra lift in education so they can start on an even level with children who have had more advantages than they.

Only 3,225 children will be accommodated by the 1969 summer program compared with 5,000 children in 1968.

The cutback effects go even deeper. There are already 2,085 children of mothers who are on welfare who will be eligible for this summer's Headstart program. And there are, in addition, an estimated 6,000 to 8,000 eligible children who fall within the poverty category.

The cutback in OEO funds was attributed to an alleged shortage of summer Headstart funds and the "conviction that the program quality could be improved by focusing available resources."

The argument that funds could be better focused, evolved from a hasty 2-week evaluation of the District Headstart program last July and August by OEO. The survey's conclusions were administrative in nature and did not criticize the educational quality of District of Columbia Headstart. The District of Columbia Headstart program is administered by the District of Columbia Public Schools, a delegate agency of the United Planning Organization.

The United Planning Organization was not notified of the criticisms in this report until December 1968. And in January, OEO held a news conference announcing the cutback in the summer program without first giving UPO the chance to respond to the survey report.

The OEO report criticized UPO in four areas holding that UPO was not giving proper consideration to the Headstart standards of age, income, parental employment, and teacher qualification.

In regard to age, the District school system policy is that children must be 5 years old by December 31 to be eligible for school in September. OEO held one-third of the children did not meet the required standards. UPO pointed out that all children in their program met the general age requirements of the Headstart program, 4 to 6, and most were eligible to begin school in the fall. There were only a few cases where incomplete records had resulted in cases where children did not meet the public school requirements for September enrollment.

The District school system judges the income level on the number of children in a family as opposed to the number of persons in the family as required by OEO guidelines. If the OEO standards were used very few would have not qualified and those who did not would have fallen within the 10-percent leeway provided for in OEO guidelines.

UPO agreed with the OEO criticism that they had not met with the standards for employing the children's parents within the program but felt this could easily be corrected.

In regard to teacher qualification, OEO held the majority of Headstart teachers did not have early childhood education qualifying certificates, but UPO pointed out that 240 of these teachers had participated in orientation and in-service training with the Headstart program since 1965 and were qualified by experience to teach in Headstart.

Headstart is not just concerned with the present; Headstart is concerned with the future. What it does today for the children of the District will determine the educational standard for the citizens of tomorrow. The least we can do is to maintain the 1968 Headstart funding level. We should be doing better.

THE AMERICAN POSITION IN VIETNAM PEACE TALKS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Prof. George McTurnan Kahin, director of Cornell University's Southeast Asia program and coauthor of "The United States in Vietnam," recently sent me a paper outlining what he felt should be the basic components of the American position in the Vietnam peace talks.

I recommend Professor Kahin's views to Senators. His suggestions are rational and well thought out. But most important, they are based on the right premise: that an American military victory is not possible in the long run and that our objective should be a political settlement acceptable to all South Vietnamese. The United States cannot design this settlement any more successfully than we can fight their war for them.

Particularly unique is Dr. Kahin's proposal concerning the introduction of an international presence to help to insure the political settlement. His proposal recognizes the difficulty of inducing all sides to accept the presence of an international body on Vietnam soil and deals with this problem in a most creative way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Kahin's paper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC COMPONENTS OF AN AMERICAN APPROACH TO A VIETNAM SETTLEMENT

PART I: THE ESSENTIAL FORMULA

A. The phased, incremental withdrawal from South Vietnam over a twelve months period of all U.S. forces (including the Korean, Australian, New Zealand and Thai allies) coupled with a withdrawal during this period of all remaining North Vietnamese troops.

B. Concurrently, a political accommodation to be worked out within one year between the major South Vietnamese factions, and to be undertaken by them *alone* without any outside interference.

C. Establishment of a cease-fire in as wide an area as possible as soon as feasible.

A and B should be carried out even if C cannot be executed immediately (i.e., these parts of a settlement should not be dependent upon achievement of a cease-fire, and even if a cease-fire once established should break down, efforts to achieve A and B would continue).

PART II: DESIRABLE, BUT NOT ESSENTIAL

Introduction of an international presence which would help ensure that the processes in Part I are effectively carried out. Part I need not be dependent upon Part II, but if II is undertaken soon after I is begun, it could help ensure more effective consummation of all three components of Part I. Any one of its several aspects could be useful in this respect. (Even if not adopted or accepted only in minor part, the proposal could be useful in the process of bargaining attending negotiations).

PART I: A AND B

Central to the American position is a reiteration of, but greater emphasis upon, the proposition of *self-determination* for all the South Vietnamese. This objective constitutes a common denominator in the public positions of each of the four parties, and it holds the prospect of honorable disengagement for both the United States and Hanoi.

The first two components of Part I (A and B) are unqualifiedly necessary and interdependent. The formula, which should be kept as simple as possible, provides for the concurrent, phased military disengagement from South Vietnam of Hanoi and the United States, while during this period the political elements indigenous to South Vietnam are expected to work out exclusively among themselves a political accommodation giving the broadest possible representation to the whole of the population. The modalities of this accommodation cannot be prescribed by either the United States or Hanoi. They must issue from Saigon and the NLF and also, as much as possible, from those numerous elements in the South which are currently denied any genuine political representation.

The present extreme polarization between the Saigon military leadership and the NLF in effect disenfranchises most of the South Vietnamese people, permitting them no voice in determining their own political destiny. Consequently, U.S. interests in securing a viable settlement and achieving any legitimate limitation of the NLF's role require that we endeavor to ensure scope for political representation of this presently voiceless majority.

The sanction for bringing Saigon to face up to the realities of accommodation would be the clearly visible ongoing, phased withdrawal of American forces. The departure of remaining North Vietnamese troops might produce a somewhat similar effect on the NLF leadership.

As they viewed the continuing departure of American and North Vietnamese troops, the Saigon military leadership and the NLF could be expected to become increasingly serious and pragmatic in their efforts to arrive at an accommodation roughly reflecting local political realities. The probability would be considerable that each of the present poles of leadership—Saigon and the NLF—would at an early stage endeavor to attract additional support so as to strengthen its bargaining position.

This process could be expected to set in motion political pressures in Saigon which might well bring about a change in leadership, producing an administration likely to be more representative than that of General Thieu and more inclined to countenance the kind of compromises necessary if a settlement in South Vietnam reflecting political reality is to be achieved.

PART I: C

Points A and B cannot be dependent upon a cease-fire in the South, because, irrespective of the good faith of Washington and Hanoi, both Saigon and the NLF would unilaterally have the capacity to disrupt the efforts of North Vietnam and the United States to set the terms of their disengagement. Although it is possible that an accord between Hanoi and Washington on the withdrawal of their troops would lead to a general cease-fire in the South, it is more likely that sporadic fighting would continue for a considerable time. Possibly fighting would continue between the diminishing forces of the United States and North Vietnam, but in much of South Vietnam it would almost certainly continue between Saigon and NLF military units at least until these two parties had made significant progress toward a political settlement.

Parallel with efforts to promote a country-wide cease-fire, the U.S. should support the consolidation of those de facto *local* cease-fire arrangements already worked out between a number of Saigon's military elements and the Vietcong in parts of the delta and some other areas of South Vietnam. The U.S. should encourage the spread of this pattern of de facto regional accommodation. Extension of such local cease-fire arrangements would serve to narrow the scope of ongoing military conflict in the South, thus supporting the overall objective of de-escalating the conflict. Insofar as concurrent attempts by Saigon and the NLF to reach an overall political accommodation were encountering success, a more suitable context would exist for local efforts to arrive at cease-fire agreements.

PART II

There is a possible second part to this settlement strategy which merits serious consideration. It should be regarded as autonomous from the above-described military and political components. If effectively developed, it could contribute to the success of the overall pattern of settlement. On the other hand, should efforts to promote this complementary action break down, the success of Part I should not be seriously prejudiced.

This third, autonomous contribution to a settlement would be the *introduction of an impartial international presence* designed to facilitate military withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese troops, maintenance of local cease-fires, and political accommodation between southern elements. This force could provide a relatively effective supervision of the military withdrawal and cease-fire arrangements while at the same thing acting as a catalyst to political accommodation between the NLF and Saigon. Moreover, its presence would help insure that currently non-represented elements of South Vietnamese society could make their voices heard.

Plans calling for the introduction of an impartial international supervisory presence into Vietnam on a country-wide basis would probably be impractical because of the large number of personnel required. But on a *provincial* basis—one or two provinces at a time, it should be feasible to provide sufficient qualified administrative and military manpower for supervising withdrawal of North Vietnamese and U.S. forces, a ceasefire and local political accommodation.

It would be the responsibility of this international agency, as it concentrated its personnel in a particular province, to ensure not only that all North Vietnamese and American troops departed, but also that all NFL and Saigon forces were either disarmed or withdrawn to other provinces where the international supervisory presence had not yet begun to operate. Through the use of such international task forces it would be easier to insure that Hanoi's troops were actually being withdrawn (and not left behind to masquerade as Vietcong). These task forces would also be in a position to adjudicate local cease-fire violations, and by their presence would make it more likely that previously unrepresented local Vietnamese elements would have an opportunity to exercise political influence independent of pressure from the NLF and Saigon.

It must be recognized that both Hanoi and the NLF have come to regard suggestions concerning the injection of an international presence with suspicion. This distrust is not limited to the United Nations, which they regard as an orgnization wherein great powers make deals at the expense of smaller ones and where they see the influence of the United States as generally dominant. They fear that even neutralist states which might contribute personnel to an international supervisory body in Vietnam might yield to the United States' power and pressure with the result that such a body would not be impartial and might serve as an instrument for securing American objectives not attainable on the battlefield.

Thus, a major condition for the acceptance of such an international presence by Hanoi and the NLF would be their certainty that the United States will definitely leave South Vietnam by a stipulated date (both its troops and bases) and that it will refrain from interfering in efforts by the South Vietnamese to work out a political settlement among themselves. If convinced that this was, in fact, the United States' intent, Hanoi and the NLF might accept an international task force with functions as described above, particularly since it would be operating on a province-by-province basis. Thereby they would be able to assess its objectivity at the outset on the basis of its performance in the first few provinces in which it functioned.

In other words, *the international task force's initial operations—in the first province or two—would provide an earnest as to the objectivity of its subsequent conduct in the other 40 odd provinces.* If its initial actions were significantly partial towards Saigon and the United States, then the NLF and Hanoi could protect their interests in the remaining 95% of the provinces of South Vietnam by refusing to cooperate with the international task forces that tried to function there.

Thus while at the country-wide level the progressive withdrawal of American and Hanoi forces could be expected to stimulate Saigon and the NLF to arrive at an overall political accommodation, at the same time locally, on a province by province (or district by district) basis, South Vietnamese political elements would be encouraged to work out an accommodation as representative as possible of the actual balance of political forces. Optimally this would be done under the aegis of a non-partisan international task force; however, this would not be a necessary condition for the effort. In any case, attempts at political accommodation at the local level and an overall country-wide effort could be mutually supportive.

There are various ways by which such an international presence operating in province could exercise its good offices to bring pro-Saigon, pro-NLF, and neutral elements together to work out a political accommodation. The preferable way would be via local elections (or, conceivably, referenda) wherein it might be agreed that the international teams could take a major role in supervising the preparations for and execution of such efforts to ascertain the public will. Thereby previously nonrepresented elements of Vietnamese society would have an opportunity to secure representation or at least have a significant influence on the resolution of important questions of immediate concern.

Provincial representative bodies, whether formed on the basis of elections or otherwise, could at a later stage send delegates to a national assembly which could serve as a provisional government for all South Vietnam. This latter function could, of course, be undertaken only after the process of local political accommodation had taken place in at least a large majority of the provinces.

Meanwhile, after North Vietnamese and American military forces had departed from a province, those local Saigon and NLF forces which were as yet unwilling to be disarmed would be obliged to withdraw to those remaining provinces—steadily decreasing in number as disengagement took place—where a local political accommodation had not yet been worked out. Eventually, as the process encompassed an increasing amount of territory, NLF and Saigon military forces would come to be concentrated in a few provinces (perhaps half a dozen), with the remainder of South Vietnam being free of both foreign (North Vietnamese and American) and indigenous (Saigon and and NLF) troops.

The final stage in this process would involve supervision by the international presence of the withdrawal of any remaining U.S. and North Vietnamese forces from these remaining provinces and, in cooperation with the provisional government, the disarming of the residual indigenous forces, or their rationalization and integration into a single army. The political and military tasks of accomplishing the latter would be immensely eased once Saigon and the NLF both had real assurances that their political following would actually be fairly represented in the new government, and consequently that neither could easily be betrayed. It would be up to this provisional government, representing initially some 85–90% of South Vietnam's provinces, to work out those final arrangements necessary to disengage and disarm, or integrate the rival military forces concentrated in the remaining provinces.

This having been achieved one could say that the United States had provided the South Vietnamese with the opportunity to work out among themselves their own political destiny with a minimum risk of military pressure.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Members of Congress a report, entitled "The Mexican American: Quest for Equality," recently issued by the National Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education.

Last year we funded for the first time the Bilingual Education Act of 1967. It was a meager funding at that for we had authorized a total of $45 million for the 2 fiscal years of 1968 and 1969 and appropriated only $7.5 million. And even today, we are still awaiting the first project to be funded under this program. The pace of our efforts to meet the special needs of those of our children with language barriers is, to say the least, excessively slow.

We must move at an accelerated pace. We cannot delay. We have authorized $40 million for funding the Bilingual Education Act for fiscal year 1970 and I for one shall do everything I can to see that Congress does not fall down in its duty to appropriate that amount.

It is for this reason that I feel this report is especially timely in that it points out how we have failed the Spanish-speaking child and what we must do if we are to attack the problems involved in teaching this individual. I think it is significant to note that while we have appropriated the miserly sum of $7.5 million for 2 years and have authorized $40 million for fiscal year 1970, the report recommends—among other things—a minimum funding of $150 million for fiscal year 1970 for the Bilingual Education Act. This is certainly food for thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN: QUEST FOR EQUALITY

A WASTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Failure to provide education to hundreds of thousands of people whose cultural heritage is "different" has resulted in shameful waste of human resources. The melting pot ideology that we speak of so proudly has not produced a moral climate in which all citizens are accepted on the basis of individual worth.

Educators, especially, must search their consciences for an answer to the question: Is only a monolingual, monocultural society acceptable in America?

Never before has the need for equal opportunity for all Americans been so sharply put into focus. And no group is in greater need of equal educational opportunity than the Mexican Americans.

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN: HOW HAVE WE FAILED HIM?

There are more than five million Mexican Americans in the United States, 80 per cent of whom live in California and Texas. Most of the others are found in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio. In excess of four million of these people live in urban areas.

The Mexican American is the second largest minority group in the United States and by far the largest group of Spanish-speaking Americans. The fact that most of them have learned Spanish as their first language and that millions are not fluent in English makes them no less Americans. Their interests, attitudes, and aspirations differ little from those of other Americans.

Yet they have been denied the opportunities that most other Americans take for granted. Suffering the same problems of poverty and discrimination of other minority groups, the Mexican American is additionally handicapped by the language barrier. The typical Mexican American child is born of parents who speak little or no English, and thus Spanish becomes his only language. When he reaches school age, he is enrolled in a public school where only English is accepted. Bewildered and ashamed of his "backwardness," the Mexican American child is quickly discouraged and drops out within a few years, enlarging the ranks of the uneducated, unskilled, and unwanted.

Let's look at some shocking statistics.

The average Mexican American child in the Southwest drops out of school by the seventh year. In Texas, 89 per cent of the children with Spanish surnames drop out before completing high school!

Along the Texas-Mexico border, four out of five Mexican American children fall two grades behind their Anglo classmates by the time they reach the fifth grade.

A recent study in California showed that in some schools more than 50 per cent of Mexican American high school students drop out between grades 10 and 11; one Texas school reported a 40 per cent dropout rate for the same grades.

Mexican Americans account for more than

40 per cent of the so-called "mentally handicapped" in California.

Although Spanish surnamed students make up more than 14 per cent of the public school population of California, less than ½ of one per cent of the college students enrolled in the seven campuses of the University of California are of this group.

These facts give tragic evidence of our failure to provide genuine educational opportunity to Mexican American youth; and today there are nearly two million of these children between the ages of 3 and 18.

It can't be said that nothing has been done for these youngsters. The Federal Government, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), has given a good deal of financial aid to schools for the purpose of improving the education of Mexican Americans. Although a few millions of dollars have been spent, hundreds of millions still need to be spent—and for hundreds of thousands of Americans it is even now too late. State and local agencies have spent respectable sums of money—and even more energy—in behalf of the Mexican American but none has given the problem the really massive thrust it deserves.

Money is only one problem. Perhaps an even more serious one is the problem of involuntary discrimination—that is, our insistence on fitting the Mexican American student into the monolingual, monocultural mold of the Anglo American. This discrimination, plus the grim fact that millions of Mexican Americans suffer from poverty, cultural isolation, and language rejection, has virtually destroyed them as contributing members of society.

Another problem is that we have not developed suitable instruments for accurately measuring the intelligence and learning potential of the Mexican American child. Because there is little communication between educators and these non-English speaking youngsters, the pupils are likely to be dismissed as "mentally retarded." Common sense tells us that this is simply not so. The chasm that exists between the teacher and the student in the classroom is even wider between the school and the home, where there is virtually no communication. Such lack of understanding soon destroys any educational aspiration the pupil might have or that his parents might have for him.

SIX CRITICAL ISSUES

The Committee believes there are six critical issues in the improvement of Mexican American education:

Issue No. 1: The existing educational programs for the Mexican American have been woefully inadequate and demand serious evaluation.

Issue No. 2: Instruments are lacking for measuring intelligence and achievement potential of Mexican Americans.

Issue No. 3: A very small percentage of Mexican American students who could qualify for college actually enroll.

Issue No. 4: Legal restrictions in various states discourage instructions in languages other than English.

Issue No. 5: There is an exceedingly high dropout rate of Mexican Americans in public schools.

Issue No. 6: Society has not recognized, or at least accepted, the need for a multilingual, multicultural school environment.

HOW CAN WE ATTACK THE PROBLEM?

The Mexican American Affairs Unit of the U.S. Office of Education has identified four imperatives for educational success of the Mexican American:

1. Preparation of teachers with the skills necessary to instruct Mexican American pupils in such a manner as to insure success. This includes bilingual capability.
2. Instruction in both English and Spanish so that the mother tongue is strengthened concurrent with the pupil learning a second language, and then using both languages. This bilingual instruction must occur in all curriculums, and at all grade levels until the student is thoroughly at home with his second language.
3. Instruction to preschool Mexican American pupils so that they are more nearly ready to take their place with others by the time they enter school.
4. Complete programs for adults in both basic education and vocational education.

The vehicles for achieving the foregoing imperatives already exist:

1. Teacher preparation: Educational Personnel Development Act, Bilingual Education Act, Title I, ESEA
2. Bilingual education: Title VII, ESEA, Bilingual Education Act
3. Early childhood education: Headstart and Followthrough, Title I, ESEA
4. Adult basic and vocational education: Amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act

BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

Once we have faced up to the critical issues and recognized the imperatives, the Committee recommends specific action on several fronts.

General

1. We must immediately begin to train at least 100,000 bilingual-bicultural teachers and educational administrators.
2. We must make use of current knowledge and encourage further research to assist in creating educational programs that promise learning success for the Mexican American.
3. We must agitate for priority funding by the U.S. Office of Education to develop educational programs immediately.
4. We must see that testing instruments are developed that will accurately measure the intelligence and achievement potential of the Mexican American child.
5. We must promote programs to assist state legislatures in taking the necessary action to permit instruction in languages other than English.
6. We must help the various states to recognize the need for statewide programs in bilingual education.
7. We must provide assistance, through Federal funds, to Mexican American students in pursuit of a college education.
8. With the leadership of the Federal Government, we must increase the adult basic education and vocational programs, to equip the Mexican American adult with skills and knowledge necessary to become a partner in our economic society.
9. We must encourage parental involvement programs at the state and local levels.
10. We must encourage state and local education agencies to use more effectively the Mexican American personnel on their staffs.
11. We must foster a joint effort of the Federal Government and private enterprise to produce instructional materials that are designed expressly for Mexican American students.

Federal legislation

1. Increase the funding of Title VII, ESEA, minimum of $100 per child for relevant educational services for the Mexican American.
2. Increase the funding of Headstart and Followthrough by 10 per cent, to provide a sufficient financial base to meet the needs of many Mexican Americans not presently served by these programs.
3. Continue the present funding level of the Migrant Education provision of Title I, ESEA.
4. Continue Title VII, ESEA, as a discretionary program administered by the U.S. Office of Education.
5. Continue Title VIII, ESEA, Dropout Prevention Act, as a discretionary program, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, and increase its funding for 1970 to $50,000,000.
6. Increase the funding support of Title IV–A of the Higher Education Act, Educational Opportunity Grants, by 15 per cent, to be directed toward college enrollment of Mexican Americans.
7. Establish a Land Grant College, with specific responsibility for programs and research related to the bilingual-bicultural student.
8. Amend Title I, ESEA, to permit the use of funds for the education of Mexican Americans whose income may not qualify him, or as more often is the case, whose children may not qualify because of cultural attitudes toward depending on public welfare support.

State legislation

1. Remove legal barriers to instruction in the public schools in languages other than English.
2. Appropriate and identify supplementary funds for support of specialized programs for the Mexican American.

Administration—U.S. Office of Education

1. Expand the responsibility of the Mexican American Affairs Unit of the Office of Education to include all Spanish-speaking programs.
2. Continue to press for employment of Mexican American professionals and supporting personnel in all units of the U.S. Office of Education.
3. Allocate specific funds for determining the most effective direction in research for the Mexican American.
4. Develop an intensive program of information on the educational needs of the Mexican American.

Administration—Chief State school officers

1. Seek out and employ Mexican Americans in policy and administrative positions in state departments of education, and encourage similar programs in local education agencies.
2. Set up a unit for coordinating and encouraging the development and operation on programs for the Mexican American.
3. Develop a statewide program for bilingual education.
4. Promote the redirection of priorities in the use of Title I, ESEA, funds, to focus on bilingual-bicultural programs.
5. Promote the increased involvement of the Mexican American in advisory committees in local educational programs.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Dr. Miguel Montes, *Chairman*, Doctor of Dental Surgery, San Fernando, California.

Edward E. Booher, President McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, New York.

Clayton Brace, Vice President and General Manager, Time-Life Broadcast, Inc., San Diego, California.

Reverend Henry J. Casso, Vicar of Urban Affairs, St. John's Seminary, San Antonio, Texas.

Jack P. Crowther, Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

Ernestine D. Evans, Secretary of State, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Nick Garza, Principal, Sidney Lanier High School, San Antonio, Texas.

Ralph Guzman, Director, Mexican American Center, Los Angeles State College, Los Angeles, California.

Alfred J. Hernandez, Judge, Corporation Court, Houston, Texas.

Dr. Frank Hubert, Dean, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.

Leonard C. Lane, New York, New York.

Eloy Martinez, HELP, Espanola, New Mexico.

Jesse G. Stratton, Farmer/Chairman, Executive Board, Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Clinton, Oklahoma.

Maria Urquides, Dean of Girls, Pueblo High School, Tucson, Arizona.

Administrative Director: Armando Rodriguez, Chief, Mexican American Affairs Unit, U.S. Office of Education.

XUM

DULLES TRAFFIC GAINS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I was heartened to receive this week a report from the Federal Aviation Administration showing an increase in passenger traffic at Dulles International Airport. The FAA said that 39 percent more passengers used Dulles during January than during the preceding January, making the first month of this year the fourth highest in the history of the airport.

The FAA pointed out that some of the increase in airline passengers could be attributed to the inaugural ceremony for President Nixon. However, most of it was traceable to an increase in airline schedules, including some international service. While Dulles was enjoying a 39 percent growth ir air carrier passengers, the comparable figure for Washington National Airport was only 2.8 percent. I realize that National already was overcrowded before January, and therefore any increase in traffic at that facility puts a squeeze on an already overcrowded airport.

Furthermore, percentages do not tell the whole story. The actual total of airline passengers at Dulles in January this year was 165,707, while over at National, the passenger level was 776,004. So, despite the growth at Dulles, which I applaud, the problem of overcrowding at National and the underutilization of Dulles remain with us.

During 1968, Washington National handled 10 million passengers. Since it was designed to accommodate only 4 million, the degree of overcrowding is immediately apparent.

The recent report prepared for the FAA by Vincent G. Kling & Associates recommended a major expansion of National. This is not the answer to the air traffic problem in this area. Architects can expand the terminal facilities at National, but they are powerless to create more airspace over that airport, and that airspace is already alarmingly full.

Dulles was built specifically to provide for the day when National became overcrowded, and it is clear that that day has come.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12:00 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20, 1969:

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE

John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of tne United States of America to Ireland.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Randolph W. Thrower, of Georgia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Otto F. Otepka, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1970, vice Edward C. Sweeney, deceased.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Anthony J. P. Farris, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas for the term of 4 years vice Morton L. Susman.

Joseph O. Rogers, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Carolina for the term of 4 years vice Klyde Robinson.

Charles S. White-Spunner, Jr., of Mobile, Ala., to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years vice Vernol R. Jansen, Jr.

U.S. MARSHALS

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years vice George A. Bukovatz.

James E. Williams, of South Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Carolina for the term of 4 years vice Walter N. Lawson, Jr.

Donald W. Wyatt, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years vice Peter J. Foley.

Charles E. Robinson, of Washington, to be U.S. Marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years vice Donald F. Miller.

Gaetano A. Russo, Jr., of Connecticut, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Connecticut, for the term of 4 years vice Joseph T. Ploszaj.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

Stewart Lamprey, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairman of the New England Regional Commission.

OZARKS REGIONAL COMMISSION

E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal Cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Louis B. Robertshaw, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William H. Booth, O302516.
Brig. Gen. Milton A. Pilcher, O363806.
Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Thorne, O384897.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Leo V. Anderson, O1643783, Transportation Corps.
Col. Wilford L. Bjornstad, O1292117, Infantry.
Col. James R. Compton, O409922, Medical Corps.
Col. Constant C. Delwiche, O392240, Infantry.
Col. John J. Dorsey, O532303, Medical Corps.
Col. James O. Freese, O397056, Artillery.
Col. David W. Hanlon, O1301993, Infantry.
Col. Leslie W. Lane, O376606, Infantry.
Col. Ripon W. LaRoche, O1736763, Medical Corps.
Col. Charles S. LeCraw, Jr., O377683, Transportation Corps.
Col. Wilbur F. Munch, O1012308, Artillery.
Col. James J. O'Donnell, Jr., O392412, Artillery.
Col. Nicholas W. Riegler, Jr., O1775484, Medical Corps.
Col. Leo R. Weinshel, O360282, Medical Corps.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John C. Baker, O368365.
Brig. Gen. Glynn C. Ellison, O1171133.
Brig. Gen. Nicholas P. Kafkalas, O1287540.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Benjamin F. Compton, O1303590, Infantry.
Col. J. Frank Cook, O1168608, Artillery.
Col. O'Neil J. Daigle, Jr., O519675, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Richard L. Dunlap, Jr., O2017377, Armor.
Col. William S. Lundberg, Jr., O947030, Artillery.
Col. Curtis E. Meland, O411178, Infantry.
Col. Floyd W. Radike, O1288616, Artillery.
Col. Charles H. Starr, Jr., Jr., O390764, Artillery.
Col. John R. Stephenson, O1294215, Infantry.
Col. Edwin V. Taylor, O1167248, Artillery.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Laurence B. Adams, Jr., O396901.
Brig. Gen. Floyd L. Edsall, O555952.
Brig. Gen. Charles H. Wilson, O485619.

To be brigadier general

Col. Laurence M. Blaisdell, O1042237, Artillery.
Col. Sylvester T. DelCorso, O358188, Adjutant General's Corps.
Col. Robert R. Goetzman, O388349, Artillery.
Col. Francis J. Higgins, O1054286, Judge Advocate General Corps.
Col. James J. Lison, Jr., O445442, Infantry
Col. Roy C. Martin, O386175, Artillery.
Col. LaClair A. Melhouse, O1174381, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Harold R. Patton, O1329739, Infantry.
Col. Felix L. Sparks, O386497, Artillery.
Col. Thomas K. Turnage, O440557, Armor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 1969:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Thomas O. Paine, of California, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

XUM

Commodity Credit Corporation

Don Paarlberg, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Department of the Interior

Carl L. Klein, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Hollis M. Dole, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

James R. Smith, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Leslie Lloyd Glasgow, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

Mitchell Melich, of Utah, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Department of Commerce

Larry A. Jobe, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Myron Tribus, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Federal Aviation Administration

John H. Shaffer, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Federal Railroad Administration

Reginald Norman Whitman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

U.S. Coast Guard

The following licensed officers of the U.S. merchant marine to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated:

Lieutenant

Leo G. Vaske.

Lieutenant (junior grade)

James L. Hassall.

Department of Justice

Richard W. Velde, of Virginia, to be an Associate Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

Richard A. Dier, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Nebraska for the term of 4 years.

Allen L. Donielson, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 20, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Vasil Kendysh, pastor of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, Highland Park, N.J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Almighty Father, Thou art our Creator, Teacher, and Judge. We beseech Thee, guide us in every step of our life, free us of all human weakness and imperfections.

Eternal God, bless this august House of Representatives of the United States of America. Strengthen the minds of its Members with wisdom, fortify their hearts with love, and their deeds with courage and justice.

Merciful God, we pray Thee on this 51st anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Byelorussia, have mercy upon her people. Strengthen their faith in Thy infinite goodness, support them in their sufferings, restore their freedom.

O God, accept this humble prayer of ours, bless the United States of America. Bless Byelorussia and her oppressed people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REVEREND VASIL KENDYSH

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Father Vasil Kendysh of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church of Highland Park, N.J., is a member of the Byelorussian American group in my district. He gave the opening prayer in the House today.

These people, Mr. Speaker, yearn for freedom from Communist Russia, as do many of the other captive nations. I can assure the Members that the Byelorussians who live in my district are very intelligent, hard-working and wonderful people. They have doctors, lawyers, dentists, and other professional men among them. They are always a complete asset to America. Ethnically they regard themselves as separate and apart from Russia.

The Byelorussian area was between Moscow and Poland. For 500 years they were a free country. Only recently has Communist Russia recognized these people and appointed a Prime Minister for Byelorussia.

Mr. Speaker, I have found these people very interesting and I have greatly enjoyed their company. This is just another illustration of a great people who yearn for freedom from the Russian militarism.

LEANDER H. PEREZ, 1892–1969

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana and the Nation has lost a champion of individualism with the lamentable passing of Leander H. Perez on March 19.

His devotion to the constitutional system and his loyalty for this country were unparalleled.

Judge Perez earned his fame and fortune in the true American free enterprise way. He was the seventh son of 13 children of a small Louisiana planter. He worked his way through college and became an attorney. In 1919 he was elected district judge in Plaquemines Parish—the first in a long line of positions he held while serving his people in public life.

The judge's reputation is one of courage and tenacity. He would never back down when he thought he was right, which is one of the many reasons the colorful "Judge," as he was known, had the confidence of his friends and the respect of his foes.

His passing removes from us a man of dynamic personality and conspicuous achievement—a man of fortitude and determined leadership for his people.

Mrs. Rarick and I extend deepest sympathy to his survivors and friends.

LEANDER H. PEREZ

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the passing of one of Louisiana's most colorful citizens, Judge Leander Perez, Sr. At times Judge Perez was somewhat controversial, but indeed he was forthright and one of Louisiana's best known citizens. Judge Perez was respected by friend and foe alike. He was known to have possessed one of the greatest minds among the legal fraternity, and doubtless he was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers known to the South. His contributions to his home Parish of Plaquemines, to his own State, and to his fellowman were well known. History will be kind to Judge Leander Perez. His thousands of friends indeed know that this world is a better place in which to live for Judge Leander Perez' having lived in it.

I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

REPEAL THE GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in response to clearly justified dissatisfaction and disenchantment, voiced by many of my constituents and, I do not doubt, uncounted citizens across the land, relative to the Gun Control Act of 1968, I am introducing today a bill to repeal that ill-advised and basically repressive law. It has been made abundantly clear today after only a few months of its creation, even to those who suffer with the gun control syndrome, that the act does not serve to keep dangerous weapons from the hands of criminals and incompetents as its proponents claimed, but rather works unnecessary hardships on the law-abiding and peaceful citizen who has legitimate uses for firearms. Furthermore it has come to my attention that Treasury officials, in their zeal to enforce the Gun Control Act, have used this unfortunate law to extend their authority over the legitimate and peaceful traffic in arms and ammunition in clear and direct violation of the spirit and letter of the legislation and in highhanded conflict with the obvious congressional intent of the bill. Such executive usurpation of legislative functions demands action of the Congress to redress the honest and extremely well-founded grievances of the American people who labor under the weight of an unjust law which should never have been passed in the first place. I ask my colleagues serious consideration of this bill which seeks to correct an injustice committed in fear and panic. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE HOUSE TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Interparliamentary Group of the United States, the Honorable John Sparkman, U.S. Senator, it is my privilege to announce the appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives to the American delegation for the upcoming conference at Vienna: Alexander Pirnie, of New York; Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut; Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois; Ross Adair, of Indiana; W. R. Poage, of Texas; John S. Monagan, of Connecticut; Robert McClory, of Illinois; Jim Wright, of Texas; and John Jarman, of Oklahoma.

CONGRESSMAN BLANTON INTRODUCES A BILL TO REPEAL THE GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968 AND TO REENACT THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT OF 1938

(Mr. BLANTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce a bill to repeal the present Gun Control Act of 1968 and to reenact the Federal Firearms Act of 1938.

Having conferred with a number of private citizens and public officials in Tennessee and throughout the country, I find the intent of the Gun Control Act of 1968 is being abused and inaccurately enforced by the Treasury Department. Since passage of the 1968 act, the crime rate in this country has increased rather than decreased. Our law-abiding citizens are being harassed by the Treasury Department as they usurp their authority by thwarting the intent of Congress in requiring the registration of firearms that was specifically excluded in the act.

It is my feeling that we should repeal this law in order to protect our constitutional rights to own and bear arms for the protection of our homes and loved ones.

I opposed this bill last year and warned my colleagues that the Treasury Department was using a foot-in-the-door approach to total firearms control. My fears were not unfounded and I now urge immediate consideration and passage of this repeal.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 337

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight, March 21, to file a report on the bill H.R. 337.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5554

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight, March 22, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

March 17, 1969.

Hon. John M. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby tender my resignation from the House Administration Committee.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,
Robert J. Corbett.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 331) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 331

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania.

Committee on House Administration: Orval Hansen, of Idaho.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING OF CHILDREN'S FOOD SERVICE PROGRAMS

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 330) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 330

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, and all points of order against the provisions contained in section 3 of said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'Neill) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Latta).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 330 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 515 to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act. The resolution also provides for waiving points of order against section 3 of the bill because of a transfer of funds in that section—page 4, line 10.

H.R. 515 amplifies present language in the National School Lunch Act which requires meals without cost or at a reduced cost to children unable to pay the full cost of the lunch. The bill requires that such children be determined by a systematic plan applied to all families on the basis of need criteria. The bill adds provisions specifically prohibiting the identification of any child or children participating in the school lunch program or any food program under the Child Nutrition Act by the use of such devices as special tokens, tickets, or published lists of names.

The States and school districts are currently in the process of developing and publishing the eligibility standards so that every family will know whether a child should be receiving a free or reduced-price meal.

State matching requirements are provided in the bill and a nutrition training program is authorized.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to take a hard look at some of the competition to the balanced meal offered within schools and service institutions and the bill provides flexibility to the Department and to the States as they move toward providing a fully adequate food service for children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 330 in order that H.R. 515 may be considered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. In the gentleman's opening remarks he referred to the waiver of points of order in the House resolution, and said it applied to section 3 of the bill made in order. That is the section of the bill that is entitled "Nutrition Training and Education." I believe the gentleman's explanation justifying the waiver of points of order was, that there was a transfer of funds involved. Can the gentleman in his wisdom advise if such action reflected the decision of the Committee on Rules for waiving points of order. Frankly, I have read and reread that entire section, which is all one long quotation, and it involves about 32 subordinate clauses. I do not have the least idea in the world where we are transferring funds from and to, or indeed what section 3 means.

I just wonder if this was brought out in the hearing before the Committee on Rules, and if the waiver of points of order, which, of course, takes away our individual prerogative as elected legislators, was at the request of the chairman, the suggestion of the Parliamentarian, or the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was at the request of the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), and partly at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian. The gentleman from Kentucky is on his feet, and I yield to him so that he may answer the question.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the first school lunch program we have ever had in this country was established by section 32 funds, pursuant to an act of Congress in 1935 to promote the sale of agricultural products to help the farmers in this country. We utilized it all during World War II until we enacted the School Lunch Act in 1946. We are still utilizing section 32 funds for the purpose of buying commodities and donating them to the States.

Here we have funds that are appropriated, and therefore it was necessary to ask for a waiver of points of order because we would utilize those appropriated funds. It was for that reason that we asked the Rules Committee to waive points of order only as to section 3.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman mean to imply that all of these relative clauses in this very composite and quoted sentence to which I referred, applies only to section 32 funds?

Mr. PERKINS. Additionally, the amendment applies to two acts. It applies not only to the National School Lunch Act but also the Child Nutrition Act.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that, and I want it clearly understood that, first of all, I was strongly in favor of the distribution of surplus commodities and their use for the youth and their nutrition, and I have no objection to further study of the nutritional state of our children or of our foods, whether they be surplus or not. But is it not true also that in at least five different instances in this paragraph under section 3 that certain percentages of income from different acts or funds are designated for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to use, in his wisdom, administratively, and therefore that in effect becomes an open ended call on these various funds, and that is why we are asked to waive points of order? Is such not an incorrect charge against one department, with the other given the implementing authority?

Mr. PERKINS. No; we have limitations on the appropriations, but the real reason we are waiving points of order is that we cannot utilize appropriated funds of a previous year because they would revert to the Treasury. Unless we have a waiver of points of order, you could make a point of order against it.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I say to the distinguished chairman I am well aware of that. That is why I want to clarify this point before we give unanimous consent to consider it, or whether we ought to bring it before the House, or perhaps vote down the previous question, et cetera.

The gentleman is stating for the benefit of the Members, that we are not only getting authority to transfer funds, but we are also carrying over funds from prior year appropriations?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

I compliment the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) for his great assistance in connection with this program through the years. There has been no greater, more stanch supporter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding. I oppose these waivers of points of order, and I question this derivation of funds.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements just made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

I wish to report I have no requests for time.

I support the rule. I support the bill. The administration supports the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act to: First, insure advanced funding for the programs included in the acts; second, institutes a policy to insure that the States will participate in the programs on a cash payment basis; and, third, prohibits any identification of those children who are being assisted under the two acts.

Last year Congress provided, in the amendments to the Vocational Education Act, that all educational programs administered by the Office of Education were granted advance funding authority. The committee believes the same reasoning applies to the food service programs. H.R. 515 will provide for advanced funding in order that school administrators may formulate plans before the school year begins.

According to the fiscal year 1970 budget submitted in January, funding requests for these programs will total $367,466,000. This includes, in addition to the regular school lunch program, some $90,000,000 for especially needy children, $10,000,000 for the school breakfast program—still almost a pilot project, $10,000,000 for purchase of food service equipment, and $20,500,000 for the nonschool food program. This total will be an increase of $121,191,000 over fiscal 1969 estimated expenditures. In addition to these expenditures, the Commodity Credit Corporation will contribute some $250 million in commodities to the program in fiscal 1970.

The bill also requires that in both fiscal 1970 and 1971 a State must appropriate funds to be used in the programs equal to at least 4 percent of the Federal funds. This is to be increased by 2 percent each year until a permanent figure of 10 percent is reached and then maintained. This requirement will not apply to programs conducted in nonprofit private or parochial schools.

Finally, the bill clarifies existing language in the School Lunch Act to insure that lunches are served to poorer children either at no cost or below cost. Such children are not to be singled out or identified in any public manner, such as lists or special tickets or tokens.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) has submitted additional views. He supports the bill and wants to add two amendments. To the section requiring State funds participation of 10 percent, he wants to add language to insure that the States will have an incentive to do this from their revenue sources—as required—rather than have some States drop out of the programs. The amendment would provide incentive to the States in the form of commodities for use in the programs. A second amendment to be offered will try to insure more cooperation between HEW and Agriculture, both of which are involved in funding the programs covered by the acts.

I support the rule and the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) 2 minutes.

MR. HOPE'S INDISCRETION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night a very distinguished American humorist, Bob Hope, committed what was, in my judgment, a most unfortunate indiscretion during his appearance at Constitution Hall.

I yield to no one in my admiration of Mr. Hope. I have admired and enjoyed him all these years. But I must take objection to the fact that yesterday, in order to get some laughs, Mr. Hope used two Polish jokes—two very old, tired, and not very funny, Polish jokes.

Worst of all, to add insult to injury, Mr. Hope kept referring to "Poles" as "Polacks." I would hope we have outlived that era when in this country we refer to ethnic groups by slang names.

I think Mr. Hope owes Americans of Polish descent a public apology. It is my hope he will avoid similar indiscretions in the future. Mr. Hope is too highly respected and has too much real talent to have to rely on such Polish jokes to sustain his repartee.

I can tell my colleagues one thing: Bing Crosby would never be caught with this kind of indiscretion.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 515), to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 515, with Mr. OLSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, a bill in substance like H.R. 515 passed the House last year unanimously under a suspension of the rules. This bill, to my way of thinking, makes a great improvement to one of the greatest programs that this Congress has ever enacted, the national school lunch program.

We are opening our debate here today on H.R. 515, a bill to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts, in the midst of a growing public consensus that hunger and malnutrition shall be eliminated from this country. The essential points in this bill are almost identical to those in H.R. 17873, a measure we approved unanimously last year in a rollcall vote.

I am proud of the work we have done in the House Education and Labor Committee to improve nutrition among children and I am just as proud of the all-out endorsement we have received from the Members of this House each and every time we have come before you with proposals to strengthen child feeding programs.

H.R. 515 carries the full support of the last administration and the new administration—both have testified as to the need for this measure. The details of this bill were developed in full cooperation with the State school lunch directors who are charged with administration of food service in schools. They need and want this measure as is. The language, the proposals, the details were developed by those who know what they need from us; by those who live with these programs day in and day out and who are responsible for operating sound and effective food service programs for children.

And these proposals also reflect the thinking of private groups who were consulted fully on their views as to how to strengthen these programs. I cannot praise too highly the work of the dedicated women's groups who analyzed, in depth, the effectiveness of the food service programs and whose recommendations appeared just about a year ago in a widely praised publication, "Their Daily Bread." They did not just issue their report and then turn to other subjects. They have stayed with the problem—advising, counseling—providing the kind of solid grassroots support so essential if we are to really get on with the job of improving nutrition among children.

There may be some Members who are not familiar with all we have done in recent years to structure sound food service programs for children and this is an appropriate time for a review of where we stand.

First. The basic legislation is, of course, the National School Lunch Act, passed in 1946. This legislation grew out of congressional concern about the nutritional level of children in school—not just some children—all children. Through the national school lunch program, Federal support is provided in the form of cash and donated foods to public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools that agree to operate a nonprofit food service that meets specified nutritional requirements. These nutritional requirements are based on tested nutritional research and are designed to meet at least one-third of a child's daily nutritional needs. The schools also agree to serve meals free or at reduced price to those children that cannot afford the full cost of the lunch.

The lunch program is now operating in schools with almost 80 percent of all children enrolled in public and nonprofit elementary and secondary schools. The national average rate of reimbursement is about 4.5 cents per lunch in cash and 10 to 12 cents in the form of donated foods. The average cost of getting that lunch on the table was about 57 cents in the 1967–68 school year.

For most schools, this level of Federal support is just barely enough to operate a viable program and maintain the charge to the youngsters at a reasonable level. However, in a number of situations, the support provided is not adequate to underwrite the full need for free and reduced price meals.

It was in recognition of this that we added Section 11 to the National School Lunch Act in 1962. Section 11 carries its own apportionment formula and its own funding authority. It authorizes a higher level of support for lunch programs in low-income area schools. We enacted the legislation but it took us 3 years to get around to providing any funds at all for this section and then the amount appropriated was totally inadequate to do the job.

Second. In 1966, we passed the Child Nutrition Act that authorized a pilot school breakfast program for low-income area schools and remote rural schools where the children travel long distances. The Child Nutrition Act also authorized assistance to low-income area schools in the acquisition of equipment for food service.

And this measure also provided:

> Authority for the conduct and supervision of Federal programs to assist schools in providing food service programs for children is assigned to the Department of Agriculture. To the extent practicable, other Federal agencies administering programs under which funds are to be provided to schools for such assistance shall transfer such funds to the Department of Agriculture for distribution through the administrative channels and in accordance with the standards established under this Act and the National School Lunch Act.

Third. Just last year, we enacted Public Law 90–302 that locked into place the final bit of hardware to complete our capability for reaching children in groups of any age, year-round with food service. That legislation authorized assistance for food service in day-care centers, settlement houses, and summer day-care activities, particularly those for children of low-income families.

The proposal before us today does not launch any bold new initiatives—this part of the job has already been done. What H.R. 515 does essentially is to tidy up some loose ends and authorize some assistance in a long-neglected area—nutrition education and training. It is a bill that does not cost the Federal Treasury a nickel. H.R. 515 provides the following:

First. It strengthens the statutory requirements and responsibilities with respect to the criteria for the serving of free and reduced price meals. This section outlines some of the things the State and local education officials shall take into consideration in developing a policy and plan to assure equitable treatment for all who should be receiving a free or reduced price meal. It also provides that the policies and plans shall be announced publicly so that everyone knows the rules.

Second. It spells out several things that shall not be done in order to avoid publicly identifying those children who are receiving free meals. Special tokens or tickets for these children are prohibited as is the publication of lists naming the children who are receiving free or reduced price meals.

Third. The State matching requirements are changed so that State tax funds must be used to meet a portion of the present matching requirements. The change would be very gradual on a biennium basis, reaching the equivalent of 30 cents for each Federal dollar in fiscal year 1977. As matters now stand, only a handful of States provide direct program funds for school food service. Most rely far too heavily on children's payments to meet the matching requirement.

H.R. 515 authorizes that Federal appropriations for child nutrition programs may be made a year in advance. This is an important feature because it is becoming increasingly difficult for the State and local education officials to plan sound, sensible, and effective food assistance programs when they may not know until well into the school year how much Federal support will be forthcoming. As a practical matter, schools need to establish a meal price before school opens and a price that will sustain the program throughout the school year. School food service programs operate on the thinnest of margins and if they are forced to raise prices in the middle of the school year, they can lose their clients by the dozen.

Any housewife with two or three youngsters in school will think twice about laying out that breakfast or lunch money five days a week if it represents too much of a squeeze. And here we are talking about the great majority of participating children—the children in families of fairly modest circumstances. After all, this is the bulk of our population and they need this small help they get through school food service.

Fourth. One major feature of H.R. 515 has very important long-range implications for this Nation's nutritional well-being. It provides that up to 1 percent of the funds appropriated for school food service may be used for nutrition training and education both for those directly involved in the operation and management of school food service and for the children benefiting from these programs.

It has become very clear over the past several years that all too many of our people have little understanding of the importance of good nutrition and what it takes to eat wisely and well. Good nutrition is a life-long need—even more essential in an area when we are greatly reducing the incidence of diseases that killed thousands of youngsters.

Fifth. The remaining amendments essentially clear up or clarify some technical points that State food service officials would like to see clarified. One, for example, would permit the States some flexibility in the use of funds appropriated for food service. Some States have virtually every school equipped for food service. These States then, on the basis of an approved plan, could concentrate on serving more free or reduced price breakfasts and lunches. This is essentially what has been done this year with the additional funding which was provided from section 32 money. It all goes to feeding youngsters—particularly the needy youngsters—but this approach allows the States to exercise some options to get food service to as many needy children as possible as quickly as possible.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize, I want to reiterate, that we are now in a position to move rapidly to reach more millions of children with food service. And I mean all children. This is the best route we have to show a dramatic improvement in the health and well-being of our young children and our school-age children. Reaching these children in group situations can do much to offset what may be inadequate nutrition at home whatever the family's financial status.

Let us always bear in mind that these are food service programs for children—all children.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to go over this program with no one on the floor. I am going to make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. It is obvious a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Utah
Camp
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chisholm
Collier
Conyers
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dowdy
Eckhardt
Erlenborn
Esch
Findley
Flowers
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gray
Hagan
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Johnson, Pa.
Karth
Kirwan
Leggett
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McCloskey
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Mailliard
Mann
May
Meeds
Michel
Mollohan
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nichols
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pirnie
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Sandman
Scherle
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Springer
Stephens
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Teague, Calif
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wold
Wydler

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Rooney of New York) having assumed the chair, Mr. Olsen, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 515 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Perkins) was addressing the Committee when the quorum call commenced. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Adair
Adams
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Celler
Chappell
Chisholm
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Conyers
Culver
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dowdy
Eckhardt
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Flowers
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gray
Hanna
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hicks
Holifield
Johnson, Pa.
Kirwan
Leggett
Lujan
McCarthy
McCloskey
McEwen
Mailliard
Mann
Michel
Montgomery
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruth
Sandman
Scherle
Scheuer
Scott
Shriver
Smith, Calif.
Stafford
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Waggonner
Watkins
Weicker
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wold
Wydler

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Rooney of New York) having resumed the chair, Mr. Olsen, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 515 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 326 Members responded to their names a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Perkins) is recognized for 27 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. GOODLING. Prior to the interruption, Mr. Chairman, you made the statement that there is $600 million involved in this bill. To whom is this $600 million charged?

Mr. PERKINS. I made the statement that the entire school lunch bill cost last year about $623 million. We have in the budget this year for the school lunch programs $643 million. These funds go for the purchase of donated commodities and to reimburse the States for the school lunches served throughout the Nation at about 4.5 cents per school lunch served, and the donated commodities at about 10 cents, which totals about 14.5 cents. In other words, it cost about 57 cents last year to serve one of these lunches. That is where it goes.

Mr. GOODLING. I do not really think that the gentleman has answered my question. Perhaps he did not understand the question. My question is from what department does this $600 million come?

Mr. PERKINS. Some of it comes out of section 32 funds of the Department of Agriculture, some of it comes out of section 416 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, some of it represents direct appropriations from this Congress here—most of it. That is where most of the funds come from.

Mr. GOODLING. One further question: This morning the Committee on Agriculture reported out the school milk bill. Why is it that the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction of the school milk bill and the Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction of the school lunch program? I think that many Members would like to have that jurisdictional question explained.

Mr. PERKINS. I know that the gentleman is perturbed about the school milk program and, likewise, in my opinion it is a mistake to omit the special milk program from the budget for fiscal year 1970. I believe it was a mistake. I am of the opinion that the Committee on Appropriations will do something about that, especially in view of the fact that

XUM

we extended the authority for the school milk program through 1970 and increased it up to $120 million annually. So, we have done everything in our power—the Committee on Education and Labor—all through the years to support this special milk program.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, was not this jurisdiction just changed about a year ago—the school lunch program?

Mr. PERKINS. No, the school lunch program jurisdiction—and I have worked on the school lunch program in the Committee on Education and Labor—we rewrote the act in 1962.

It is true that back in 1946 the Committee on Agriculture had this jurisdiction but after the Reorganization Act the Education and Labor Committee has had the School Lunch Act. In recent years the School Lunch Act has been lodged, for all intents and purposes, in the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GOODLING. I just wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman, that I do not want to see the farmers of America charged with an expenditure over which the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly do not want to invade the prerogatives of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 515 strengthens the criteria for serving free or reduced price meals, and this determination of free lunch or breakfast has always been made by local school authorities, and we expressly prohibit discrimination through identification of children receiving free or reduced price meals such as an overt identification of children by segregation, physical segregation, use of special tokens or tickets, or announcing or publishing lists.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly concerned about this point that the gentleman has just been making. As the gentleman knows, there are some States, including my own, where I believe the original congressional intent was somewhat flaunted in terms of this identification of the children. I introduced a bill and made a statement before the gentleman's committee in my concern.

For example, one of the things done in Illinois was that the superintendent of public instruction required written application from the parents of children, and required identification of those as public aid recipients before being eligible for school lunch programs.

Do I understand the statement contained in H.R. 515, which the committee, chaired by the gentleman in the well, has reported out, would mean that such written application requirements would be contrary to the congressional intent in authorizing this program? Would I be correct in that statement?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. And we have tried for several years to eliminate this discrimination, or to prohibit these children being identified, but in certain school systems throughout the country this situation is still prevalent, and we feel that this language will do the job. That is the reason why we strengthened the language in this bill. I am very sure that this language will take care of the situation prevailing in Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. For the purposes of the record, I had suggested some language at one time that said "No information shall be required by local school authorities from any child which shall identify him to his peers as the recipient of free or reduced-price school lunches, nor shall any child's family be required to provide personally to local school authorities information which is available from other public agencies regarding the family's income and public assistance or welfare status."

May I assume that the committee feels that the language of H.R. 515 already covers and prohibits the practices which I have suggested?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that assumption.

Mr. MIKVA. Through the kind indulgence of the gentleman in the well, I wonder if it would be possible to insert my statement in the RECORD at an appropriate time on the discussion of this bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I might point out that on page 2 of the committee report the statement is made:

> The States and the school districts are currently in the process of developing and publishing the eligibility standards so that every family will know whether a child should be receiving a free or reduced-price meal.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that the language on page 2 is so clear, and also that on top of page 3, that I feel that the situation the gentleman refers to is already taken care of.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman are there any safeguards in here to prevent abuse of this program by some well-to-do people, for example, being permitted to take advantage of the free lunches for their children, even though the family can well afford to pay for their child's lunches?

Mr. PERKINS. Of course, we provide and set up certain safeguards here in the law; and to my way of thinking, we have adequate safeguards in this legislation, and I just do not believe that will happen.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would draw the attention of the gentleman to page 3 of the report wherein there is outlined an increase starting out at 4 percent of matching requirements, and increasing it 2 percent until it reaches 10 percent in 1976.

As I understand it, there is no requirement at the present time that the State matching this is taxed in any manner whatsoever?

Mr. PERKINS. That is absolutely correct. The cost of the school lunch program by and large is being borne by children's payments outside of the Federal Government contribution and there is no requirement on the part of the State.

It does not say that the States presently contributing—and that is the reason we require matching in a way that would not work a hardship on the States.

We start in at a low cost and gradually go up.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If a State, as such, fails to provide percentages outlined up to 1976, would that result in any school districts within the State losing their money?

Mr. PERKINS. I cannot visualize any State rejecting or failing to cooperate because the evidence was so clear that all the States were willing to make a reasonable contribution here.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That State—or may I ask the gentleman—my State, in my congressional district, the city and county of Denver——

Mr. PERKINS. Let me interrupt the gentleman to say this—that we only got one derogatory telegram on this matter and that came from the gentleman's chief State officer in Colorado.

The chief State school officers otherwise unanimously endorsed this legislation—outside of the gentleman's own State.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, as an example, if the State of Colorado did not come forward as provided by this, and provided the necessary money, is it possible then for the school district No. 1, that is the city and county of Denver, then to negotiate directly with the department?

Mr. PERKINS. The school districts could then possibly negotiate directly with the Department of Agriculture for the use of any available section 11 funds where no matching is required.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If my school district then had to proceed in this fashion, then what would the situation be—as to the State?

Mr. PERKINS. Your district would have to deal with the State, but let me remind the gentleman that all State or local matching is required under section 11 funds.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

XUM

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. May I ask if the effect of this bill is to reduce the price of the lunch to the child who buys it or is the effect intended to be that additional children, who are not now being served school lunches, will be served?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me state that last year, until we got an extra $50 million, we only were serving 2.7 million needy schoolchildren free or reduced-priced lunches.

Now we are up to approximately 4.1 million.

The effect of the State matching requirements will either be an expanded program within a State or reduced prices for school lunches in such State.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Would not the real effect of this bill be, in my State, for example, that the wealthy suburbs of the State would be able to buy the school lunches at these reduced prices?

Mr. PERKINS. I will state to the gentlewoman from Michigan that a survey was made by a consortium of prominent national women's organizations. The report that they made was published and called "Their Daily Bread." That survey was very comprehensive and it recommended continuation of our present school lunch program and, on top of that, it recommended that something be done about the low-income groups, the schoolchildren from the low-income families of this country. That is what we are really trying to do. But we do not want school lunches for moderate-income families to be priced so high that in a few years the students will resort to snack bars and forget about the type A lunch which they are presently receiving in the school.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But the answer is that this measure will apply to all schools.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct; and I want to thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to get back to the same subject the chairman was discussing with the gentleman from Colorado; namely, the provision in the bill which will require the States to pick up the share that has been paid previously by the schoolchildren. I wanted to ask the chairman if he would clarify for me whether that provision would mean mandated funds insofar as the State is concerned.

Mr. PERKINS. The bill is very clear in stating that commencing with fiscal year 1871 at least 4 percent of the local and State matching must be derived from State tax revenues. These funds do not have to be earmarked by the State legislature and may come from any funds made available to State and local educational agencies from tax revenues.

Mr. HORTON. I wish to commend the chairman and the committee for trying to improvise a bill and a program which is going to give the school districts advance time so that they can make their plans accordingly. But the thing I am concerned about is the mandate of tax funds by the Federal Government in this bill upon the States.

Mr. PERKINS. Does not the gentleman think that it is reasonable where several States are making a big contribution, to require the other States that are receiving benefits, to contribute? The States now contributing are Louisiana, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Hawaii, Utah, Delaware, Minnesota, West Virginia, District of Columbia, Vermont, Indiana, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa.

We are not trying to put a harsh requirement on the States. It is very reasonable. We held really comprehensive hearings on this legislation, and all the experts and people throughout the country, the school lunch people, unanimously from the various States thought that these recommendations were reasonable, and this bill emerged from the committee.

Mr. HORTON. I understand. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield for one additional question.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not being critical. I am trying to understand. In the State of New York, for example, would it be required to appropriate additional funds in order to carry out this phase of the program?

Mr. PERKINS. The State of New York, for instance, in my judgment is now appropriating more than would be required the first biennium or maybe the second biennium under this bill. We are just trying to put the school lunch program in order, so it will be solvent in the future, by reasonably requiring the States to make a reasonable contribution without penalizing any State. I do not think any State legislature in the whole country will object, and it will not do it unless we place this requirement in the law. All the States are going to take advantage of the school lunch program; we all know that.

Mr. Chairman, as we discussed the requirement on the part of the States, we all know that today under the National School Lunch Act the requirement is for $3 in local money to $1 from the Federal Government. These payments in the past have been mostly met from children's payments, and that is the real reason for this requirement in this bill.

Then another really important aspect of this bill is the nutrition education and training. We provide that 1 percent of the funds shall be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman I, have taken too much time, but before I conclude, I must compliment the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), and all the Members on that side of the aisle who have worked so diligently in helping to write the bill last year and this year.

Last year this bill came out of the committee unanimously, and with the enthusiastic support we are all giving this measure, I hope the bill will pass the House unanimously this year.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 515, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children and to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 6½ million children who need a free or reduced price lunch, and the Department of Agriculture expects to reach about 3½ million of those children this year. If Congress appropriates the amount requested for the school lunch program in the 1970 budget and in addition funds for the special milk program the remainder of the children should be reached next year. This bill contains the following provisions which would make the program more effective:

Local school authorities shall make determinations as to eligibility for participation in the program in accordance with a publicly announced policy and plan applied equitably, on the basis of criteria which must include level of family income, the number of persons in the family, and the number of children attending school.

There is to be no overt identification of children participating in the program through the use of special tokens, tickets, or published lists of names. It is hoped that this will prevent discrimination against or embarrassment to the children involved.

The bill authorizes advanced funding authority for the school lunch program, to facilitate planning, and requires that State-appropriated funds for the school lunch program made up from tax sources must equal at least 4 percent of the matching requirements in fiscal years 1970 and 1971. In the past, many States have relied almost entirely on children's payments to meet the matching requirement, and the intent of this bill is to avoid the practice of increasing the price of lunches to the children to make up the State share of the cost. This provision must be closely monitored to insure that all children in fact receive free or reduced-price lunches.

The bill authorizes a program of nutrition training in education, and provides flexibility to the States as they attempt to provide a fully adequate food service to their children. Some States need equipment before they can begin a full-scale food service program and other

XUM

States need money for free or reduced-price meals. This legislation would meet both needs.

Although the fiscal 1970 budget request for child nutrition programs has been increased over previous levels, it is important to note that the special milk program has been eliminated. The "increase" is therefore not an overall increase, but represents a shifting of funds from one program to another. Although the flexibility which the Department of Agriculture seeks through this move may be desirable, it would be unthinkable to discontinue the special milk program, since such action would end assistance to many children in summer camps, and it is essential that steps will be taken to prevent this.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this bill, which would authorize programs which are vital to our efforts to eradicate hunger in America.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the school lunch program, H.R. 515. I have been in contact with the superintendents of schools throughout my district, and all favor the enactment of this bill. In many mountainous counties of Appalachia, I am told by these reliable people that the only good food many of the children get is that which is given them at school. They state further that within a month after many of the children have entered school they take on a healthier appearance, they are more alert and are more interested in their work.

The school lunch program has been greatly helpful to all the people of southeastern Kentucky. I strongly support the enactment of this bill which has been developed by the committee of which my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Perkins), is chairman. I wish to compliment the chairman and also each member of the committee on their excellent work.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good bill. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Education and Labor; it does have the support of both the majority and minority members of the committee; it is nearly identical to a bill that was passed unanimously by this House last year.

At the time that this bill was considered by the committee, I attempted to offer an amendment which was turned down. My amendment touched on the problem that the gentlewoman from Michigan raised. In the form that this bill reported to this House for consideration, the requirement that there be State tax money either appropriated or utilized specifically for the school lunch program in no way gives any guidelines to the States concerning the purposes for which this money may be used.

The gentlewoman from Michigan is correct in saying at this time that the new revenue, using the budget figures for fiscal year 1970 as presented by President Johnson, would equal approximately $21,964,920, or 4 percent of the total matching requirements. The bill as approved by the committee provides very little guidance as to how this money will be used.

Let me suggest to the Members of this House that this bill is not an appropriation bill. It is nothing more than an important piece of legislation which does provide a series of technical amendments to the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 which the Committee on Education and Labor and school people and educators throughout this country support. It does require that there be no segregation or identification of those receiving free or reduced-price lunches. It does emphasize—and I want to stress the importance of that emphasis—the need for nutritional education.

In addition, H.R. 515 provides for a minimum level of support for the program from State appropriated or utilized funds. The existing law requires that States match each dollar of Federal money received under sections 4 and 5 of the act with $3 collected from sources within the State, including State and local appropriations and the funds collected from children in the local schools. H.R. 515 as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor would require the States to pick up a minimum of 4 percent of the total matching requirement from State tax revenues, either specifically appropriated or utilized to support the school lunch program. H.R. 515 further provides for a biennial 2 percent increase in the portion which must come from State tax sources reaching a maximum of 10 percent of the total matching requirement beginning on July 1, 1976.

This provision is specifically aimed at those States which now pass on the major costs of the program to the children who participate. In at least one State, the children pay 100 percent of the total matching requirement, and in a good many others, the State now provides less than 1 percent of the matching requirement. A few States have taken it upon themselves to pay a substantial part of the cost. Louisiana pays 36 percent of the matching requirement.

The State of New York provides 20.9 percent and the State of Utah provides 19.9 percent. The State of Missouri provides 20.4 percent. In many of the other States, however, it is quite clear very little is being provided through State tax revenues. This bill does not touch the special milk program. A number of Members have asked, both the majority and the minority, about the effect of this legislation on the special milk program. There is no impact whatever. The issue of the special milk program stems from the budget proposals of Mr. Johnson. He recommended eliminating that program in fiscal year 1970 and transfering those funds into section 11 of this act. This bill does not have an effect on the special milk program. We will have to face that issue when we consider the budget.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman while he is discussing the school-lunch program, but you used the expression a moment ago of nutritional education. This raised a problem in my congressional district. The gentleman placed great emphasis on this as a positive aspect of the bill in terms of education. Do you mean that this would be in terms of education of the children partaking of food and learning the value of a balanced diet or nutritional education in terms of the people serving the food and learning something in the process of doing that?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I would answer by saying that the stress of the legislation as it comes to us is in terms of the people serving the meals. An amendment I intend to offer will clarify these provisions, focusing on the development of curricula, materials and training programs for professionals and paraprofessionals involved in nutrition, as well as make these materials available to local schools upon request for teaching schoolchildren about nutrition. If my amendment is adopted, the bill will provide nutrition education for students, teachers and food service personnel.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I had some discussion with the chairman of this committee and I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin and the other Members of this House for bringing this bill out again.

This is an important contribution and it has far-reaching effects which will be very helpful toward resolving the problem of malnutrition in our young people.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that the goals of H.R. 515 to improve the national school lunch program and strengthen its focus on children of low-income youngsters are very sound.

The provisions of this bill set strong guidelines for school authorities, mandating that free and reduced price lunches be distributed on the basis of need, and that there shall be no overt identification of children receiving free or subsidized meals.

These get to the very heart of glaring defects of the present program.

Also, I support the emphasis this bill gives to nutrition training and education in our Nation's schools. The need for help in this area was well illustrated last year in a television documentary on "Hunger in America" which showed how many thousands of Americans are living on nutritionally backward diets.

What disturbs me about this bill is that it requires the States to up their ante to meet the matching requirements of the program. While it is true that many States have contributed very little to the school lunch program, outside of money paid by youngsters for their lunches, the reasons for meager State contributions from tax revenue may not lie in the lack of enthusiasm for the lunch program.

The fact is that State and local governments in America today are extremely hard pressed for tax and budget dollars.

Part of the State's problems are traceable directly to the Federal Government.

Over the past few years the Federal Government has promised high levels of dollar participation in many of these programs. These promises have gone partially unsatisfied in many areas because of the Vietnam war and the need for Federal budget restraints.

The burden in each case has fallen to the States which are already saddled with high and unpredictable welfare and education costs.

Most States need the full-potential of their taxing and borrowing powers just to keep up with the demands of program and population growth.

Like the Federal Government, State and local governments face growing demands for improved and expanded services in education, in welfare, in economic development, in pollution control, in transportation, and in social programs. Like the Federal Government, they face skyrocketing salary and construction costs, in fact, rising costs on every front.

This bill requires States which are not already pulling their weight, to make a higher level of tax dollar expenditure for the school lunch program, but gives them little promise of greater Federal responsibility in return.

I am supporting this bill, but with the strong reservation that we at the Federal level must take a very sympathetic and helpful view of the fiscal problems of States and localities. It is unrealistic from any standpoint for the Federal Government to pile more responsibility on these lower levels of government when there is no prospect that they can be handled there under present circumstances.

I am interested in these things insofar as it will affect the State of New York. Will the gentleman please comment on that situation and what this bill does with regard to mandating expenses to the State?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. In specific reference to the State of New York, it already provides funds in excess of the requirements of this bill. It now provides, according to the latest data available, 20.9 percent of the matching funds from State tax revenues. That, then, is double the maximum that would be required by H.R. 515. So your State will not have the problem that other States may have in terms of this new requirement.

In my additional views, to the committee report as the gentleman, I know, is familiar, I intended to try to find a way which would ease the burden to the States by providing an incentive or bonus formula with reference to the commodities available from the Federal Government.

Let me say that the Department of Agriculture representatives and I spent quite some time trying to work out a system to accomplish this. However, it was not possible within the limited period of time I had to work on it with them and I had to drop that idea. I hope to pursue it. Because of the strain on State resources I feel it would be appropriate to make use of the incentive concept.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further. I do want to commend him for his study in this area. He has made an important contribution toward an incentive for those States who will find this a hard burden, especially when they find these expenses mandated requiring additional tax revenues to participate in the program.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is there any requirement in this bill that if a State provides a school lunch program for some children that it must also provide a school lunch program for all children?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No. The distinguished gentlewoman might discuss that matter with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I shall appreciate hearing the comments of the chairman on that question.

The amendment that I have proposed is essentially one which would require that the new State tax revenue be utilized solely for the purposes of sections 9 and 11 of the School Lunch Act.

Section 9 of the act relates to the provision of free and reduced price meals to children from low-income families and section 11 provides special assistance to schools in areas having a high concentration of children from low-income families.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide some guidance as to how the additional funds are to be used at the State and local level. It would focus our effort more precisely on those individuals and schools who most urgently need to participate in the program, but are unable to at the present time either because they must pay the full costs of the meals or because the schools themselves do not have food service facilities and equipment.

All of the evidence accumulated to date indicates that approximately 3 million needy students, as defined by the Department of Agriculture, are not now able to participate in the program. Our inability to reach this group with the school lunch program has led many schools to seek funding under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to feed disadvantaged children. Some $34 million of ESEA funds are now being spent annually to feed children who should be fed under the auspices of the national school lunch program. This money could be well used for additional educational programs for disadvantaged children, but school officials have found that undernourished children cannot learn no matter how effective the educational program.

At the present time the children who most urgently need the program attend schools in low-income areas which lack the resources to participate in the program. The budget requests of the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1970 seek additional funds to expand the program in these areas, and the bill, H.R. 515, provides for additional funding to be supplied by the States. My amendment simply provides guidelines for the States, so that the funds required by the bill as reported by the committee will be spent in an effective manner.

My amendment will not have any impact on those States which are already making a substantial effort, nor will it require any State to make a contribution any larger than that required by H.R. 515 as reported by the committee. It would require that these additional funds be focused on the areas of greatest need as is presently the case with Federal spending under the provisions of sections 9 and 11 of this act.

That may not be acceptable to the chairman. However, the gentleman from Kentucky and I have discussed this at some length.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Section 5 of the bill provides for the additional money with which to meet the requirement on the part of the States.

On page 3 of the bill, commencing on line 5 we say:

> For each of the two fiscal years beginning July 1, 1970, State tax revenues appropriated or utilized—

Those two words are in your amendment—

> specifically for program purposes in the schools or to defray the cost of intrastate distribution of federally-donated commodities to the schools shall equal at least 4 per centum of the matching requirement.

That is as far as we felt we should go. We did not feel that we should limit the space any further. We felt if we did, as this amendment proposes to do, that some school districts would be able to receive free or reduced-price school lunches while others would not receive free or reduced-priced school lunches.

Also, if the gentleman can find any administrator in Government, especially those in the Department of Agriculture who have had anything to do with this school lunch program, that will state that the gentleman's amendment will work effectively, I certainly would accept the amendment on my part as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. However, everyone with whom I have talked tells me that it is completely unworkable. In addition to that, this formula, this requirement on the part of the States, was placed in here to keep the school lunch program solvent for all of the schoolchildren in America.

Now, section 11—the one you are talking about—the needy youngster, the needy school child, I think the members of the committee know that we are all interested in them and should give preference to the needy schoolchild.

Some money has been taken out of the specialty program, and I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, I believe that was a mistake, and I do not know whether it was put in section 11, but we have additional money in section 11. But I still say there is not nearly enough money in section 11. But we have all the authority in the world we need to do something for the needy schoolteachers in section 11, and in the Nutrition Act where we provide free breakfast and

XUM

equipment for the needy schoolchildren. But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will disrupt the whole school lunch program overall for all the schoolchildren in America, and throw the whole thing out of gear.

The amendment originally—the matching requirement—was put in there to keep the whole school lunch program up.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman taking my time to oppose my amendment. I only would say to the gentleman that it is quite clear, the record is there, and the record of the hearings of the committee both of last year and this year. There are some 100,000 schools in the country; 75,000 of the schools have the program; 25,000 do not. Of those 25,000, a substantial number are located in areas where the need is greatest.

I am trying to utilize the limited funds that are available to service the largest possible number of needy children which I believe is the goal we are all striving for.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the time of the Committee at this point to go into any further detail.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding on that point.

Mr. Chairman, I am not always in favor of evangelical zeal to extend a sociological program to the nth degree, to the end result of all arithmetical progression, but I believe I perhaps would be in this case, for the milk program for children.

Be that as it may, I have taken considerable interest in this program, and I have visited on National School Lunch Day various schools, junior high schools, high schools, grade schools, schools at the elementary and secondary levels throughout the district that I am privileged to represent. I believe they do a good job. I know there is a lot of pride on the part of the people who prepare and serve the lunches.

As a physician I am not particularly worried about the nutritional aspects because these people have been feeding their families, by and large, for a long time.

My question is pertaining to some rumors that are coming back to me by mail that maybe they are going to throw all of these people out who have been preparing these lunches for years, who have made the program a success, who have such pride in it, and who are doing a good job—and this can be seen in the complexions and faces of the children who partake of the school lunches—and contract it out to profitmaking organizations.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we can even do that. In the second place, I believe and I know that it would immediately raise the cost of the school lunch program. And in the third place, I have literally less the zeal to spread this to the point of no return, including all. I believe a pilot program for mercenaries to feed our children, rather than the cooperative effort of school boards to do this, will fall on foul play and do more damage to the program than it does good.

I wonder if the gentleman could make a few remarks about the school pilot project where we have been hiring Hot Shoppes, or Stokeley-Van Camp, or someone else to come into the schools and actually susbidize the schools in an effort to hire the so-called mercenaries—and I have nothing against an honest profit, but I just do not believe it applies here when we started this program out on the basis of getting rid of surplus foods, and nourishing foods that we have in our national warehouses.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Missouri is correct in saying that there are, at this point, something like six pilot programs whch have not yet been started. No contracts have yet been signed. None are in operation as of today.

The six that they have proposed, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri, are only directed at schools in which there are no facilities for serving hot lunch programs. We have had a serious problem, particularly in cities like Cleveland, Ohio, and Detroit, Mich., where a vast number of older schools have no kitchen facilities. They are going to try to find out whether it is economically feasible and effective to utilize profitmaking concerns to serve meals in those schools.

Mr. HALL. My premise, if the gentleman will yield further—my premise that it is the zeal and the enthusiasm to spread the program into needy areas produces these spurious telegrams.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, sir. I do not think that is correct. The Department of Agriculture in testimony before the committee—did not see changes in this bill to allow the Department to go into the profitmaking area.

I, for one, support the Department in its effort to explore the feasibility of using the resources of the private sector.

Mr. HALL. Whether it is called zeal or equity or whatnot. I think this is a sound program and I would not want to, speaking for myself, see it die by its own weight.

Would it be better to teach or to train people in these schools, even if they have to pay for their own services—as happens in Army bases and camps—where they could bring in a setup on the playground in order to have a school lunch program or have it taken over by the school board or the PTA and let them handle it locally?

I strongly hope and recommend that this project not go any farther and that it die in travail unborn.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman if at any time the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the question and answer period, was there anything brought out about the amount of imported cheese and powdered milk or beef of any kind being used in the school lunch program?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. To the best of my knowledge the question may have been asked and the answer was that only very little, if any at all, of the obviously inferior imported dairy products are being used in this fine program.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I know that the gentleman has been greatly interested in the dairy products that are used and brought into this country—products that are imported and that they had increased by 300 percent. On the dairy imports in this case, I think we want to be aware of the fact that we are not furnishing a program just to promote that kind of operation when it comes to beef and cheese and things of that nature. I think it should be looked into in depth.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I concur with the gentleman and I am sure the committee will be very watchful when it comes to that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS).

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, with real reluctance I would support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, it is almost a hypocrisy to say that we are feeding the children of America. The children of America that need to be fed are not being fed by the school lunch program. We are feeding moderate- and high-income children a meal that is subsidized by the Federal Government.

Under this bill, we are attempting to get up to 10 percent of the cost from the States. I would like to point out to you that many of these States really cannot afford this and the local school districts cannot afford to equip a school to feed children who need to be fed.

I have introduced into this Congress a bill, H.R. 8585, which would feed every child in America, at cost for those who could pay; for those who could not afford to pay, would be at the expense of the Government. I would feed them not one but three meals a day 52 weeks a year. The total cost of that program would be approximately $2.5 billion over that which is now being spent. That bill is my answer, really, to a guaranteed annual income. I am for guaranteeing that children under 16 years of age have a decent diet.

I would like to point out to you that at the present time the Agriculture Department has a program set up to teach people how to eat and how to cook. They are going to hire 5,300 people by the first day of July at a cost of $1.98 per hour—I figured that out to amount to almost a half million dollars a week—to go to 200,000 families and teach them how to cook.

I would like to point out to you that I know how to cook. In order to be able to cook a decent, nutritious meal you have to have available to you a wide selection of foods. You have to have a constant source of heat. You have to have a constant source of refrigeration. And you have to have transportation to a market.

We are not going to put into a guaranteed income, nor any welfare program, sufficient money to cover such expenses and the Department of Agriculture is not going to, according to their figures, is not going to guarantee the things that are necessary to cook a nutritious meal. It would be cheaper for everyone if we would simply take the children in the school system and feed them. Those children can be relied upon to teach their parents. But of all the bills that can be introduced into this Congress—the bill now before you works most unfairly against the big-city schools.

I would like to point out that in Minneapolis, Minn., only nine elementary schools out of a total of 71 participate in the school lunch program—51 percent of the children in the city are excluded because they go to schools with no facilities.

In Detroit, Mich., 79 out of 224 elementary schools participate. But of those not participating, 78 are located in the slums.

In Springfield, Mass., one-third of the elementary schools are eliminated from the school lunch program because they have no facilities.

I would also like to point out on behalf of the South that while these statements go uniformly across northern cities, the investigators found that in the Southern States, in big cities there was no uniform exclusion of children. They uniformly fed them a school lunch.

I am for a bill that guarantees that those who do not now eat, those who are the hungriest, those who are the poorest, be fed. What we are going to do in this bill is to require that your State now pay at least 10 percent of the lunch bill for those in moderate to well-to-do circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the committee chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me compliment the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) for offering her school lunch program. I am the first to admit that we are not doing enough in this country for the children really in need. We wrote section 11 into the school lunch program and it went for 3 years and we did not get a dime of money to concentrate on the needy schoolchildren in the ghettos and the real rural areas where they needed it.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. In the first place, may I say to the gentleman, the school lunch program really is a welfare program. It is entirely possible many parents would not like to admit this, but more than 25 percent of this bill is being paid by the Federal Government. Perhaps in the strata to which the lunch program is extended, we should refer to it as a subsidized program, but this program should be under the control of the welfare department. It is a very big problem to the school system. They do not want to go into the problem of who needs the lunch. They do not want to see to it that children are protected who are receiving free lunches. They do not try to set up a program that gives a parent with several children in the school a reduced price on these lunches.

So in reality when this program is passed, Bloomfield Hills, which has a very high income, and also Grosse Point, Mich., will be getting subsidized school lunch programs, but in the ghettos of Detroit, nobody will be fed.

I make these points because I feel that the average person in this country believes that every child can get his lunch at school. I am sure that Americans are not willing that children go hungry; nor that a subsidized program be available only to a limited number of children.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) such time as he may consume.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as one who in the past has voted for the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, I rise in support of H.R. 515, which would strengthen and clarify these two outstanding programs to aid the children of America.

When the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 was being considered by this body on September 1 of that year, I urged the enactment of that measure as a logical sequel to the two then existing programs, the national school lunch program and the special school milk program, both of which were, and they still are, highly acclaimed for their valuable contributions to the health and well-being of boys and girls in elementary and secondary schools. We were more concerned then with the goals we sought to reach than with the means to be used in their attainment. A hungry schoolchild, we said, is a child in need of adequate amounts of good wholesome food. By means of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, we agreed such food would be provided these hungry and malnourished schoolchildren.

We were not seriously concerned then, but we are deeply concerned today, with respect to the possible adverse psychological effects upon the children these programs are designed to benefit. There is ever present the possibility that irreparable harm might unwittingly be inflicted upon a recipient child who may smart under the stigma, real or imagined, that he is somehow different from his schoolmates who are not beneficiaries under any of the programs.

H.R. 515 recognizes that a child in need may also be a proud and self-respecting individual. It therefore not only spells out the basis of need criteria, but it also does something which I believe is of equal if not greater importance. H.R. 515 specifically provides that the anonymity of the participating school child shall be preserved.

Another provision of the legislation that is particularly noteworthy is the concept of granting advance funding authority which Congress adopted in the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. Its inclusion in H.R. 515 ought to insure the continuity and reliability of the children's food service programs presently in operation.

The aim of these programs clearly is to provide nutritional meals to children. This aim would be thwarted if the participating children are served meals that are not well-balanced and nutritious. Nutrition education activities on the part of personnel involved in the several programs are therefore essential, and H.R. 515 meets this need by authorizing nutrition training in connection with the school food service programs.

Mr. Chairman, these and other provisions in H.R. 515 make it a necessary implementing vehicle to strengthen our existing children's food service programs. It deserves our unanimous vote.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, there are several features of the bill before us today which I believe are particularly important. The first of these is the provision that States shall begin to put up some money from their own resources to meet part of matching requirements under the school lunch program. There has been a matching formula in the National School Lunch Act since that measure was passed in 1946. That matching formula requires the States to put up $3 for every dollar of Federal cash reimbursement provided for the regular lunch program. There has never been any problem for the States in meeting these matching requirements, frequently without putting up a dime of State tax money except for State administrative expenses. This has been and is possible because children's payments for the lunches served have always counted toward the matching requirement. Very few States have put in substantial amounts of money to assist in expanding the lunch program for their children.

We are not eliminating children's payments as a State asset in meeting the requirement. We are just saying that all States—and not just some States—must begin to put up some money to help feed youngsters in the school lunch program. To facilitate adjustment to this, we are providing that the child nutrition programs may be funded a year in advance. In this way, the States will know well ahead of date how much they will need to appropriate as their share. And perhaps even more important, the States will be able to plan ahead for program expansion. Local schools will be able to set meal prices with confidence at the beginning of the school year because they will know what level of Federal and State support they can count on.

The bill before us also strengthens provisions prohibiting identification of children unable to pay the full cost of lunches and authorizes grants to States for nutrition training in connection with school food service programs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of these provisions to amend and strengthen the National School Lunch Act. I do not think anyone questions the value of this program. We have witnessed its success; we are aware of the need to continue the program and to make it available to more needy children. The school lunch program is one of the most effective means of reaching children in poverty areas—both urban and rural—and of providing every schoolchild with at least one nutritious meal a day.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, while I support today, as I have in the past, continued improvements in the children's food service programs, I am deeply concerned about the implications of section 2(b) of H.R. 515, the legislation before us today.

This section requires that beginning in fiscal year 1971—about 15 months from now—the State appropriated funds must equal at least 4 percent of the matching requirements of the school lunch program. In fiscal 1973, the matching requirement will rise to 6 percent, in fiscal 1975, to 8 percent, and after fiscal 1977, it will rise to 10 percent.

In my State of Ohio, schoolchildren benefit from $5.5 million in Federal funds for the school lunch program. This is matched by some $16.5 million in local funds, with the State picking up certain administrative expenses. This will mean that in 15 months, the State of Ohio will have to come up with an additional $670,000 in educational funds to allow continued participation in this vital program.

Ohio is a rich State, and I have long deplored its failure to provide more educational assistance for the hard-pressed local school districts of the State. The past year has seen dozens of local levies and bond issues for the support of schools defeated in Ohio. Services and actual schooldays in the major city of Youngstown have been curtailed. A number of smaller cities and villages have suffered a "taxpayers revolt" against school taxes. What is needed is to remove some of the tax burden from the local levels. And yet the tax situation on the State level, the burden of taxes, and perhaps, the inability of many of the States to tax themselves to provide for needed services is also one of the greatest problems facing the Nation.

This is not the time to require the States to pick up 4 to 10 percent of the program cost. It would be my hope, in fact, that the Federal Government could provide a larger proportion of the funding of the program, thus relieving the States and local communities of this special burden.

At this very time of general concern over hunger and malnutrition in America, it would be tragic to jeopardize the success of the school lunch program.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 515, is designed to make needed permanent changes in the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act to provide better use of the funds authorized.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 515 in and of themselves do not affect the authorizations of appropriations.

As the report on the bill indicates, H.R. 515 was supported by the former administration and is supported by the present administration.

So this bill is a bipartisan bill supported by the present Republican administration and the preceding Democratic administration and is supported by the members, majority and minority, of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The purpose of the legislation is to make sure that we are discharging our responsibility to provide the framework so that if the Congress, wearing its appropriations hat, provides the necessary financing, no child will have his learning ability impaired because he or she is hungry.

As a result of the rather extensive hearings conducted in 1968 by the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as a result of House approval of three bills, one of which was substantially the same as the present bill, the Department of Agriculture was given for fiscal year 1969 an additional $43 million for support of school food services being extended to hungry children. In the current fiscal year that $43 million is supporting the provision of free or reduced-price meals to 1,000,700 who were not receiving the service last year.

Currently, school food service programs, administered by the Department of Agriculture, are reaching a total of 19,400,000 children, of whom 4,100,000 are receiving free or reduced-price meals. This means that slightly more than one out of every five meals being served under Department of Agriculture assisted programs is going to a needy child.

As good as that record is it must be better. The best estimate that we have is that the total number of children in need of free or reduced-price meals is in the neighborhood of 6.5 million so we are falling short by about 2.5 million children.

The budget request for fiscal year 1970 adds about $291 additional million for school feeding purposes of which approximately $111 million is proposed for section 11 purposes.

This is a section added to the School Lunch Act in 1962 which provides special assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist for the purposes of helping such schools to meet the requirement of section 9 of this act concerning the service of lunches to children unable to pay the full cost of such lunches.

We have the testimony of former Secretary Freeman and of those designated to speak for Secretary Hardin that these will enable the Department to achieve the goal of this House that there shall be no hungry child attending school or in an institutional environment any place in the United States.

I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I would hope and urge that this House speedily approve this measure before us, H.R. 515, designed to improve and expand the provisions of the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

The provisions in this present measure will clarify the responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and prevent discrimination against children. The bill's provisions will also and more equitably revise the current program's State fund matching requirements and consolidate and strengthen the nutrition training and food service programs for all the children in our schools and service institutions.

In other words, this bill is proposed and designed, based upon the experience of previous legislation, to make the food service programs for school children in the country totally effective.

The foods to be provided to our children under these programs will be guaranteed to contain nutrients essential for good health; they will give the schoolchild a healthy start each morning for a wholesome day of the fullest accomplishment and instruct each individual in the formation of proper diet habits. It is axiomatic that a healthy child is a happy child and that a well-nourished child learns better than an undernourished child.

In brief, this bill represents a most prudent investment in the future of America through the encouragement of a healthy, well-nourished, wholesome American youth in the best educational environment we can devise. Let us approve this patriotic investment without further delay.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, this statement is a revised copy of my testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee on H.R. 515. I am happy to note that Chairman Perkins has said that the unfortunate situation in the State of Illinois described in my statement is covered by the new provisions of H.R. 515 and will preclude any further misunderstandings of that sort.

The statement referred to follows:

Statement of Abner J. Mikva of Illinois to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives in Support of H.R. 4832, To Amend Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to have the opportunity to submit this statement for inclusion in the Committee's hearings on amendments to the National School Lunch Act. My reason for submitting this statement is to explain to the Committee, and to its distinguished Chairman, the need for my bill—a need which has been demonstrated by an unfortunate situation in my home State of Illinois.

Before I describe the circumstances which gave rise to H.R. 4832, I should note how delighted I was to find that my bill coincides in intent, if not in detail, with proposals of the Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Perkins. I have seen that section 1 of the Chairman's bill, H.R. 515, is designed to incorporate into the statute more specific procedures by which local school authorities will determine eligibility for free or reduced-price school lunches. Section 1 will also incorporate into the law safeguards on the anonymity of children who are intended to benefit from the school lunch program. My bill, H.R. 4832, would also attempt to safeguard the anonymity of benefiting children, but would do so in a more explicit way than the language contemplated in section 1(b) of H.R. 515. The reason I believe this more explicit protection is necessary is described below.

Last October, the Department of Agriculture, in an attempt to rationalize the procedures by which eligibility for the Free School Lunch Program is determined, published amendments to its regulations governing the program. These regulations required that local school authorities establish a written policy for determining which children at schools under its jurisdiction would qualify for free or reduced price lunches and which would not. The idea was obviously to make certain that eligibility was being determined on a fair basis, and that no irrelevant factors were being considered in determining such eligibility. The new Department of Agriculture regulations specified that such criteria as "level of family income (including welfare grants), the number in the family unit, and the number of children in the family in attendance," should be considered.

The new Agriculture regulations were not intended to require that families of children who are free school lunch recipients identify themselves, or that the families be required to file detailed written applications which negate the protection of the children's identity. In fact the new regulations specifically required that the new policies "protect the anonymity of the children receiving free or reduced price lunches in order that such children shall not be identified as such to their peers."

This Committee is certainly familiar with these two requirements of the Agriculture regulations—the written policy and the protection of recipients' anonymity—since some of the regulations' language is included in section 1 of H.R. 515. What the Committee may not be familiar with is how these regulations were misinterpreted by state education officials, and how this misinterpretation placed local school officials in the embarrassing position of asking families of free school lunch recipients to apply for benefits under the program. I can testify to this misinterpretation and this embarrassment, because it happened in the State of Illinois.

Upon receipt of the Department of Agriculture requirements, the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction prepared a lengthy letter to all school authorities who were then participating in the National School Lunch Program. This letter described the written policy requirement of the new Agriculture regulation, but apparently overlooked completely the provision to protect the anonymity of the children involved. Superintendent Page's letter included a sample policy statement for local school boards to use, and a sample application statement for families of free school lunch recipients. Although the letter stated that "a written application is not mandatory," it went on to add that "we believe that the use of such an application will ease the task of the person responsible for the determinations." In other words, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of administrative convenience the express safeguard of the child's anonymity in the Agriculture regulations was ignored. How would it be possible for a child's family to submit a written application for free school lunches and still have the anonymity of the children involved be protected? I submit that it is not possible.

The Superintendent's letter is attached as Exhibit 1 to my statement. I believe that anyone who reads it will agree that it was a fair interpretation to say that the State was encouraging local school authorities to require applications from families of potential free school lunch recipients. Thus the Board of Education of the City of Chicago felt helpless to do anything except require the onerous and distasteful "application for free school lunches" which the State had recommended. I include as Exhibit 2 a copy of a news story from the Chicago Daily News which describes the dismay of some Chicago School Board members at having to "require" families to "apply" for free school lunches for their children.

Mr. Chairman, mandatory applications for free school lunches are completely at odds with Congress' express intent in passing and funding the National School Lunch Act. Both the Act and the Department of Agriculture regulations make clear that beneficiaries of the program are not to be identified. The worthy goals of the Department of Agriculture in attempting to rationalize the selection procedure for free school lunch recipients should not be allowed to cloak a procedure which will surely result in the identification of the children receiving free or reduced price lunches. The information on family income and welfare status which the Agriculture regulations contemplate is available from city and State welfare agencies—there is simply no need to require parents to furnish this information. No need, that is, except administrative convenience.

Unfortunately the misinterpretation of Congressional intent which the Illinois State requirements demonstrate was not remedied by the new Secretary of Agriculture. Hoping that the unhappy situation which arose in Illinois might be corrected by administrative action, I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture to ask that he clarify the import of Agriculture's October change in National School Lunch regulations. To my regret, Mr. Chairman, Under Secretary Phil J. Campbell answered by letter in a most unresponsive way. I have included Under Secretary Campbell's letter with my testimony as Exhibit 3, but I quote the following crucial sentences to make a point:

"Amendment 8 to the regulations was not intended to prohibit school boards from requesting financial information from free lunch applicants. In fact, a school board needs financial information on families who are applying for free or reduced price lunches."

The point, as I tried to explain in my letter to Secretary Hardin, is not that the boards need information on a family's financial status—I certainly agree. The point is: where will the board get this information? Mr. Campbell seems to assume that if a local board is to have the information, it must come from the family itself. This is not so. The information is available from other public agencies. What is more, Mr. Chairman, if the school board does require "financial information from free lunch applicants," as Under Secretary Campbell says they may under Department policy, then I say the anonymity of free lunch recipients which Congress so carefully sought to maintain will inevitably be destroyed.

The situation I have just described is what led to the introduction of my bill, H.R. 4832. Having carefully reviewed H.R. 515, I feel that in order to guarantee that there are no repetitions of what happened in Illinois and Chicago, this committee should satisfy itself that the language contained in section 1(b) of H.R. 515, is strong enough. After all, Mr. Chairman, if the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Illinois could misinterpret the Agriculture regulations, it seems to me he might misinterpret the statutory language proposed in H.R. 515. Only if the committee feels that the existing language of H.R. 515 already includes the new sentence which my bill adds to Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act, and only if it feels that H.R. 515 would eliminate all doubt about the Congress' feeling on the matter of "applications for free school lunches," should it report H.R. 515 as it now reads.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the strongest argument which I can make against "written applications" and requiring parents to disclose their welfare status is that these requirements run the risk of endangering the central purpose of the free school lunch program. What I am saying is that the kind of application requirement which the State of Illinois has told local school authorities they must establish will ultimately deprive many needy children of the benefits of the free school lunch program. When families that are already degraded by the demeaning tests and oaths which unfortunately form part of our present welfare systems are now asked to apply for free school lunches for their children, many of them simply will not do it. Contrary to the popular image, many of these families are proud, and will suffer no more humiliation than they must to receive the meager welfare benefits we now confer upon them. The free school lunch application would be just one more indignity to add to the rest—and I submit that many families would not apply even for the benefit of their own children.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

FREE AND REDUCED-PRICE MEALS

(a) Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751) and section 4(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771) are each amended by inserting after the second sentence, a new sentence: "Such determinations shall be made by local school authorities in accordance with a publicly announced policy and plan applied equitably on the basis of criteria which, as a minimum, shall include the level of family income, including welfare grants, the number in the family unit, and the number of children in the family unit attending school or service institutions."

(b) Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act is further amended by inserting before the period at the end of the former third sentence, and section 4(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and section 13(f) of the National School Lunch Act are further amended by inserting before the period at the end of the former fourth sentences of each the following: "nor shall there be any overt identification of any such child by means such as special tokens or tickets or by announced or published lists of names".

(c) Section 13(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting after the second sentence, a new sentence: "Such determinations shall be made by the service institution authorities in accordance with a publicly announced policy and plan applied equitably on the basis of criteria which, as a minimum, shall include the level of family income, including welfare grants, the number in the family unit, and the number of children in the family unit attending school or service institutions."

APPROPRIATION AND MATCHING

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof: "Appropriations to carry out the provisions of this Act and of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 for any fiscal year are authorized to be made a year in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the funds will become available for disbursement to the States."

(b) Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence of the section the following:

"For each of the two fiscal years beginning July 1, 1970, State tax revenues appropriated or utilized specifically for use for program purposes in the schools or to defray the cost of intrastate distribution of federally-donated commodities to the schools shall equal at least 4 per centum of the matching requirement; for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, at least 6 per centum of the matching requirement; for each of the subsequent succeeding two years, at least 8 per centum of the matching requirement; and for each fiscal year thereafter, at least 10 per centum of the matching requirement."

(c) The first sentence of section 10 and section 12(d)(5) of the National School Lunch Act are amended by striking the words "preceding fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "latest completed program year immediately prior to the fiscal year in which the Federal appropriation is requested".

NUTRITION TRAINING AND EDUCATION

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755) is amended by striking the entire first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The funds appropriated directly or by transfer from other accounts for any fiscal year for carrying out the provisions of this Act, and for carrying out the provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, other than section 3 thereof, less not to exceed 3½ per centum

XUM

thereof which per centum is hereby made available to the Secretary for his administrative expenses under this Act and under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, less the amount apportioned by him pursuant to sections 4, 5, and 10 of this Act less the amount appropriated pursuant to section 11 and section 13 of this Act and sections 4, 5, and 7 of the Child Nutrition Act, and less not to exceed 1 per centum of the funds appropriated for carrying out the programs under this Act and the programs under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 other than section 3 which per centum is hereby made available to the Secretary to supplement the nutritional benefits of these programs through grants to States and other means for nutritional training and education for workers, cooperators, and participants in these programs and for necessary surveys and studies of requirements for food service programs in furtherance of the purposes expressed in section 2 of this Act and section 2 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, shall be available to the Secretary during such year for direct expenditure by him for agricultural commodities and other foods to be distributed among the States and schools and service institutions participating in the food service programs under this Act and under the Child Nutrition Act in accordance with the needs as determined by the local school and service institution authorities."

INCLUSION OF TRUST TERRITORY

Sec. 4 (a) Section 12(d) (1) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking the word "or" that precedes the term "American Samoa" and by adding at the end of the sentence the following: "or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(b) Section 15(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking the word "or" that precedes the term "American Samoa" and by adding at the end of the sentence the following: "or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(c) The National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act of 1966 are amended by inserting the phrase, "and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" after the term "American Samoa" wherever that term appears in such Acts other than in the sections amended by subsection (a) and (b) of this section and other than the proviso in section 11(b) and in section 4 of the National School Lunch Act.

EQUIPMENT RENTAL

Sec. 5. Section 5(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting at the end thereof "through purchase or rental."

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Sec. 6. (a) Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting in the first sentence following the phrase "its administrative expenses", the following: "or for the administrative expenses of any other designated State agency", and by inserting after the phrase "the local school districts", the words "and service institutions".

(b) Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is further amended by inserting at the end of the second sentence the following: "including additional activities undertaken in the distribution of donated commodities."

REGULATIONS

Sec. 7. (a) Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence: "The Secretary is authorized to prescribe terms and conditions respecting the use of commodities donated under said section 32 and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as will maximize the nutritional and financial contributions of such donated commodities in schools receiving such commodities."

(b) Section 10 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "and the National School Lunch Act, including regulations relating to the service of food in participating school and service institutions in competition with the programs authorized under this Act and the National School Lunch Act. In such regulations the Secretary may provide for interchange of funds by any State between the programs authorized under this Act and the National School Lunch Act on the basis of an approved State plan of operation for the use of the funds and may provide for the reserve from the apportionments to the States of not to exceed 1 per centum of available funds for special developmental projects."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 16, after "appropriated" insert "or utilized", and strike out "for use".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin: On page 3, line 24, immediately after the period insert: "The State tax revenues, made available pursuant to the preceding sentence, shall be expended, to the extent the State deems practicable, proportionate to the State's allocation of Federal funds for programs authorized under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act, section 4(a) as amended, and section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not do what I would like to have done as I stated earlier. It does, however, meet with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

I should be quite honest with the members of this committee in telling them that my concern is if we do not adopt something along this line, we will have defaulted in our responsibility to assure that those children in greatest need of nutritional supplements do in fact receive them.

This amendment, very simply, would say that the new State tax revenue required by H.R. 515 shall be expended, to the extent practicable, proportionate to the State's allocation of Federal funds for programs authorized under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act, section 4(a), as amended, and section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am altogether in accord with the purposes that the gentleman is seeking to accomplish. I know later on all of us will have the opportunity to support legislation for the most needy school youngsters.

But, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, the amendment now reads:

> The State tax revenues, made available pursuant to the preceding sentence, shall be expended, to the extent the State deems practicable, proportionate to the State's allocation of Federal funds for programs authorized under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act, section 4(a), as amended, and section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

Is that the exact wording of the gentleman's amendment which he is now offering?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. It is.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to that amendment, and I do not think anyone on this side of the aisle has any objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Steiger).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin: On page 7, after line 18, insert:

"COORDINATION OF EFFORT

"Sec. 8. Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate in a coordinated effort (1) to develop curriculums, training programs, and materials to be made available to educational institutions for the improvement of training and education in nutrition for professional and paraprofessional persons engaged in school food service, and to be made available to State and local school systems upon their request for use in nutrition education and training for students; and (2) to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of food programs conducted under the authority of various acts administered by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in meeting the nutritional and health needs of schoolchildren (including children in preschool programs).' "

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, personally I entertain some reservations about this amendment, because I think the coordination is presently taking place between HEW and OEO and the Department of Agriculture, but at the State level I am wondering if the wording of that amendment would interfere with the distribution of the commodities or any reimbursable funds that are made available to the various local school lunch programs. What is the gentleman's response to that?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to your question by saying that this in no way affects anything at the State or local level. The amendment quite clearly states the Secretary of Agriculture, who in the end has responsibility for this program, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate in a coordinated effort: First, to develop curriculums, training programs, and materials to be made available to educational institutions for the improvement of training and education in nutrition for professional and para-professional persons engaged in school food service, and to be made available to State and local school systems upon their request for use in nutrition education and training for students, and Second, to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of food programs conducted under the authority of various acts administered by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in meeting the nutritional and health needs of school children, including children in preschool programs.

The amendment would insure the cooperation of the secretaries and would: First, make available to the Department of Agriculture the knowledge now in HEW about the state of the Nation's health and nutritional needs, in order to provide for more realistic program evaluation; second, make available to those administering the school lunch program sufficient expertise to insure a proper emphasis on the educational benefits of the program; and third, make abundantly clear the desire of the Congress that the agéncies expending funds under title I of ESEA and the School Lunch Act work together to insure benefits for all who qualify while keeping duplication of effort to a minimum.

Mr. PERKINS. One further question. Does the gentleman's amendment in any way affect the Department of Agriculture in the procurement, distribution, and donation of the various commodities to the States and local educational agencies? Is that your interpretation of the amendment? It does not affect it in any way?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. It in no way affects procurement, distribution, or donations of commodities.

Mr. PERKINS. Then, the sole purpose of the gentleman's amendment, I take it, is to coordinate at the Federal level with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture to make sure that no funds are thrown out or wasted. Is that correct?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. That is correct with one exception, the Office of Economic Opportunity is not included in the amendment. It is designed to insure that there is cooperation between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PERKINS. Now another question. Your amendment does not in anywise, I take it, interfere with the training programs presently going on and inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture under the State extension service?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, sir.

Mr. PERKINS. And under the Cooperative Educational Act; is that correct?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, if in the event of a dispute about the distribution of commodities or dispute about the reimbursement of funds would the gentleman's amendment as presently written prohibit the Department of Agriculture from making any determination, assuming that everyone did not go along in the manner in which they should?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, sir.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a member of the committee which brings this bill to the floor; is he not?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. A moment ago the gentleman introduced an amendment which was agreed to by the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor. He said he knew there was no objection to that amendment on that side of the aisle.

Now we have an amendment which has been introduced here in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and apparently there was not any disagreement on this one.

I would like to ask the gentleman why these amendments were not brought up in the committee before this bill came to the floor.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. In response to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, I must say that every effort was made to get this bill out onto the floor for consideration as quickly as possible. The chairman of the full committee, at the time this bill was considered, wanted to have it brought to the floor under a suspension of the rules on the Suspension Calendar, with 20 minutes of debate for each side with no amendments allowed. I objected to that procedure because I felt there were amendments which could be considered and would improve the program. Furthermore I wanted to protect the rights of the Members of the House to work their will.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would it have taken any longer in the committee to consider these amendments as it now takes on the floor to consider them?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Not necessarily.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman's committee sometimes confuses me in its deliberations. It seems to me that each time one of these bills comes to the floor from the Committee on Education and Labor it has to be rewritten on the floor. It makes me wonder when a bill comes from the Committee on Education and Labor and is considered on the floor, they expect the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to automatically put a rubberstamp on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The principal thrust of the changes which the gentleman from Wisconsin is seeking is to endeavor to do is more along the line of issuing free or reduced-priced lunches in order to see that they will go to those whose need is the greatest in the school districts and areas where the need is greatest; am I correct on that?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. That was taken care of in the amendment that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union just adopted. The one which we are now considering is to establish cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have just looked at some of the figures which indicate the failure of the school lunch program as presently administered in many States to reach many of the children whose need is really acute. And, I must say that it was an eye opener to me in the case of my own State as well as in a number of other States as to the condition which now exists.

Will the gentleman's amendment as offered substantially improve that situation?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Only if it is coupled with companion bills now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor and the appropriation of funds in the administration's agricultural budget requests for fiscal year 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HALL) was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I simply have a question of information, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask the gentleman if his second amendment, or the so-called coordinating amendment would, if adopted, coordinate some of the projects and school lunch programs being operated by the OEO along with the Secretary of the Agriculture and the Secretary of HEW?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, sir; the amendment reflects my concern for the development of nutrition education programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity is outside the purview of the amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman stated awhile ago, however, in answer to a query during the colloquy on the floor that the intent of this vocational training was directed toward the purveyors of food to the children and not to the children themselves as to the manner in which the food is being conveyed to children at the various schools who do not have the OEO program.

I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman could well stand the in-

XUM

clusion of these vicarious operations of the OEO.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The point raised by the gentleman from Missouri is well taken. I appreciate his contribution on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Steiger).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Aspinall) having assumed the chair, Mr. Olsen, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, pursuant to House Resolution 330, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Aspinall). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 515) just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS AND 63 COSPONSORS PRESENT THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing major legislation to help parents, students, and community officials learn more about drugs and their abuse.

Joining with me as cosponsors of this bipartisan bill are the following Members of the House of Representatives:

Mr. Perkins, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Dent, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Brademas, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Carey, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hathaway, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Ashbrook, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Ruth, Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Pelly, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mrs. May, Mr. Foley, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Adams, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. King, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Howard, Mr. Pryor of Arkansas, Mr. Boland, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Corman, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Rees, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Brock, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Burton of Utah, Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Waldie, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Symington, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Córdova, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Gude, Mr. Podell, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Fisher.

DRUG ABUSE: A HUNDRED FLOWERS OF OPINION

Mr. Speaker, we humans react strangely to the unknown. Often we fear and attack it blindly. Sometimes we worship it irrationally.

American attitudes toward drugs reflect much of this myth and mystery. For those of us in the "over 30" group, drugs are drugs. Period. We easily conjure up images of dope addicts, pushers, criminals, psychopaths, and the Mafia.

But for many young people, drugs are a source of growing fascination. Certain drugs, they claim, are not only "safe" but desirable. This attitude is fostered partially by culture figures who identify drugs with love, truth, beauty, and peace. While adults have been going to work, paying taxes, and mowing their lawns, an entirely new subculture has developed around drugs.

Too often, I have found, both sides of the generation gap are reluctant to let facts interfere with opinions when it comes to discussing the effects of these drugs.

In 1962 the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse stated that:

> The general public has not been informed of most of the important facts related to drug abuse and, therefore, has many misconceptions which are frightening and destructive. This situation is due to many causes, among which are the failure of the schools to recognize the problem and provide instruction of equal quantity and quality as that provided for other health hazards.

Misconceptions can interfere with sensible talks between parents and their children. A father may tell his son that marihuana is bad, and the youngster may ask how and why it is different from the alcohol or tobacco used by the parent.

How many parents can talk with their youngsters about "cannabis psychosis," the medical term describing the mental effects of marihuana smoking? How many young people know the relationship between LSD and birth defects? How does a police officer handle a person suspected of drugtaking?

LSD, marihuana, "speed," hashish, peyote, STP, DMT—these are just a few of the bewildering drugs circulating among more and more youngsters. They are generally classified into four categories: opiates, depressants, stimulants, and hallucinogens.

And they are all illegal.

DRUG ABUSE: THE LAW AND BEYOND

The Congress has approved several laws punishing those who sell, manufacture, and possess narcotics. The most familiar ones are the Harrison Act of 1914, the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, and the 1965 and 1968 statutes punishing sale and possession of barbiturates, amphetamines, LSD, and similar compounds. Federal law is very tough, even for possession. The penalty for possessing marihuana is 2 to 10 years imprisonment, on the first offense.

Federal laws banning the importation of dangerous drugs have been on the books since 1909. Our Government officials have been very active in this area, as the statistics show. In 1963, for example, they seized 6,432 pounds of marihuana at the borders of the United States. In 1966, they confiscated 23,260 pounds of it. And the figures have been rising since then. In the United States itself, dozens and dozens of illegal laboratories have been raided.

Most of the States have enacted their own drug laws, nearly all of which are very stringent. In Washington State the penalty for the first offense of possessing narcotics is 5 to 10 years in the State penitentiary, plus a fine of $10,000. If you offer a marihuana cigarette to another person in Georgia, and that person accepts it, the State requires a mandatory death penalty for the second offense.

Our local police are working harder than ever to combat the drug traffic. As of October of 1968, for example, more than 25,000 persons in California had been arrested for selling marihuana.

All of us are anxious to crack down on what former President Johnson termed "the sale of slavery to the young." Justice must be dealt firmly and swiftly to those who manufacture and sell harmful drugs.

But despite the stringent laws and the vigilance by the Government, we must admit that drug usage is continuing to increase.

In early 1968 a Gallup poll taken at 426 college campuses revealed that 6 percent of the students had used marihuana on one or more occasions and that 1 percent had used LSD.

Dr. Stanley Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, testified last year that 20 percent of the college youths polled in the NIMH surveys admitted experience with marihuana. Dr. Yolles cautioned that these surveys were made in areas of reported high use and added that there is a definite geographical pattern in drugtaking. States such as

California and Florida have abnormally high incidence of drug abuse.

It would be incorrect to assume that the laws have failed. Rather, we must assume that they need to be supplemented by widespread and comprehensive educational programs.

DRUG EDUCATION: WHERE WE STAND

Throughout the past several years there has been a proliferation of literature and films discussing drugs and their abuse. Some of these teaching materials are excellent, such as the FDA's film "The Mind Benders," "Drugs and the Nervous System," by Churchill Films, and "Drug Abuse: Escape to Nowhere," a book published by the National Education Association. Unfortunately, there have also been many publications containing factual inaccuracies, distortions, and ineffective sermonizing.

Responsible and constructive drug education has been hampered by at least three factors: First, lack of effective teacher training; second, uncertainty about and unavailability of the "right" teaching materials; and, third, community resistance to drug education, a reflection of fear and controversy I discussed earlier.

Expensive books, films, and pamphlets are of little use to an educator who is uncomfortable with the subject. Lacking sound preparation, many teachers will naturally avoid the delicate and controversial matter of drugs and their abuse.

Yet, the role of the educator is underlined again and again by the unfortunate atomization of the American family structure, and by the lack of parental expertise on drugs. Let us discuss briefly what the teacher must seek in effective drug education.

First, he must be prepared to correct misconceptions, distortions, and fallacies about the drugs.

Second, the teacher must know what is appropriate to say at a specific age and grade level.

Third, the educator must be competent in deploying the right curriculum, in developing a sensible unit outline, in using audiovisual techniques, in calling upon other community resources, and in devising class projects.

Fourth, the teacher should be able to detect possible student drug use through sound working knowledge of symptoms.

Fifth, the educator must stress the medical, sociological, and psychological aspects of drugtaking. To do this he must also be aware of community customs and mores.

At a time when all of us are concerned about the spiraling cost of education, it is natural that school districts should concentrate on the basics. Funds for drug education would probably be regarded as one of those "extras" that principals and superintendents must explain at meetings of concerned or irate taxpayers.

But as the specter of drug abuse begins to haunt "nice" kids living in "model" neighborhoods, many parents are demanding that something be done.

Panic is no substitute for factual data. Preaching and sermonizing to young people is notoriously ineffective, especially in this age of intellectual sophistication.

Dr. Randolph Edwards, professor of health, physical education, and recreation at Temple University in Philadelphia, observed last year that:

> A vital ingredient to effective drug-abuse education is the establishment of authoritative teachable curriculum for all grade levels. There is voluminous material available (medical and law enforcement in particular) but it must be made useful and practical to the trained and knowledgeable teacher. They desperately need a structure for information and teaching, particularly for this new subject of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Let me stress again that we must have authoritative curriculums which have been validated by experts. Young people want to learn more about drugs, but they want the facts, not the assumptions or the myths. And, the educators themselves must be prepared to answer delicate questions from students and be prepared to respond constructively to probes from the uncertain community.

To bridge the generation gap separating parents and youngsters and their attitudes toward drugs, many communities are conducting "drug alert" and similar programs. But many are not. Lack of funds and continuing uncertainty result in inaction. And parents and students succumb to further polarization in their beliefs.

"What can I do? How can I help?" These are sentiments expressed in letters I have received from concerned parents in the Seattle suburbs. Today we are presenting legislation intended to help the schools and the communities educate persons about drugs.

THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Shortly after the 91st Congress convened in January I began working with experts from the Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education and the National Institute of Mental Health. Spokesmen for private groups also participated.

All of us shared a common goal: to fashion a well-coordinated program in which funds and assistance would be available for effective and meaningful drug education.

The legislation introduced today establishes an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education. The 21 members of the Committee, seven of whom will be nominated by the Attorney General, will review the administration of the act, will make recommendations concerning priorities and improvements in the act, and will evaluate programs and projects funded under the act.

The Commissioner of Education will approve applications for funds only after each application has been submitted for review and comment to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and to the National Institute of Mental Health. Likewise, the Commissioner may not approve an application unless he notifies the State educational agency and gives it time to submit comments or recommendations on the proposal.

The authorizations are as follows: $3 million for fiscal year 1970; $7 million for fiscal year 1971; $10 million for fiscal year 1972; and $12 million for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Funds administered under the act may be used to—

First, help educators, law enforcement officials, counselors, and community officials attend short-term or summer institutes on drug education;

Second, provide assistance and funds to school districts or local communities who wish to sponsor drug abuse seminars for parents and others in the community;

Third, make grants available to colleges, universities, and private groups to develop teaching materials about drugs;

Fourth, establish a program for evaluating existing drug abuse curriculums and educational projects;

Fifth, help local school districts set up demonstration projects in drug education; and

Sixth, allow the Commissioner of Education, upon request by the local and State educational agencies, to distribute curriculums and evaluation of curriculums.

The American educational system must throw light upon the intensifying and terrifying aspects of drug abuse in our country. For communities alarmed by increased drugtaking, there must be more cooperation and less combustion. Educators and public officials must pursue the subject openly, frankly, and practically.

New drug education programs in the schools and hard-hitting seminars for parents and other adults will furnish no overnight respite to the drug problem. But our schools and communities cannot afford to stand by idly and allow young people to experiment blindly with their own self-destruction. Yes, the lure of the unknown and the forbidden will remain fascinating. But knowledge tempered by restraint may serve to avoid many future tragedies which transform the sparkle of youth into a hideous nightmare.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON ABM

(Mr. GILBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to note how disappointed I am in the President's decision to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system, however modified it is in conception from the system his predecessor proposed to us last year.

I do not want to dwell on the technical shortcomings of such a system. We have heard ample scientific testimony to convince us that the system may be of little or no worth to the Nation's security. I do not think it adds credibly to our deterrent capacity.

But I will say with conviction that we have set a grievously bad example to the world. We are currently asking our neighbors on this globe to desist from acquiring their own nuclear weaponry. We have heard from the Soviet Union that it is willing to discuss across-the-board nuclear disarmament. From Bucharest to Tokyo, we seem to be going into an era in which the old ideological animosities between East and West have

XUM

little meaning. Yet we have rejected the counsels of caution and, in my view, intensified the cold war.

Mr. Speaker, I had looked to our new President for statesmanship. Instead, I fear I see fresh evidence of submission by the Presidency to pressures from the military chiefs. I think the time has come when we must reject the prophesies of doom that come from the Pentagon. We have had enough of the military's mistakes. It is time to strike out for new high ground. I urge the President now to reserve the decision on the ABM, to reject the false sense of security it brings, and to launch an aggressive effort to bring real peace through mutual understanding and worldwide disarmament.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish, on a permanent basis, the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

You will remember that in June 1967 President Johnson, by Executive action, established such a committee. Serving on it were the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; the latter, Hon. Vicente Ximenes, served as chairman of the committee.

The purpose of this committee was to focus attention on the problems of the approximately 10 million Spanish-surnamed citizens in the United States. While the committee title refers to "Mexican Americans," its concern was with all Americans of Spanish surname, whether from Puerto Rico, Spain, Central America, or Latin America. These persons share a common language and tradition, and they face problems common to minority people whose customs, language, and training have not yet won them fair and equal advantages in our country.

One of the committee's most important efforts was a series of hearings in El Paso, Tex., in October 1967. These hearings were attended by committee members, high-ranking Federal Government officials, and some 1,500 Mexican Americans from all over the country. Launched by Vice President Humphrey, the meetings dramatized for the participants the extent of help that was needed by Spanish-speaking Americans and, in turn, made them aware of the diversity and breadth of Federal programs that could be of help in minority communities.

Chairman Ximenes, in summarizing the work of his committee, reports that:

> The most vital—and somewhat intangible—function of the Inter-Agency Committee has been that of education. (It) has found a great lack of knowledge and understanding within the agencies in regard to the Spanish-surnamed American. It also found a great willingness among the Government and private sector officials to learn and to communicate with the Spanish-speaking people of our nation.

Much has been done—in job placement, in research, in dissemination of public information, in program and project assistance in bilingual education—but much more needs to be done to assure to all Mexican Americans the advantages and protections of full citizenship and participation in our society. For this reason, I urge approval of the effort to give statutory status to the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AND ESTUARY SYSTEM ENDANGERED BY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion, at the invitation of the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, to address the members of that distinguished body on the problems of water quality that confront the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin Delta area.

In that address, I pointed out that the unwise planning involved in the California water plan will result in the export of desperately needed fresh water flow to southern California and that the decreased outflow from the Delta would have consequences to the ecological system of the Delta and San Francisco Bay that as yet, are not fully appreciated or understood.

I further pointed out that because of the commitment of the State of California Department of Water Resources to sell the resource that it is charged with conserving; namely, the water of our State, it is impossible for an area of the State which does not buy water from the Department of Water Resources to receive any consideration from that Department when its water needs conflict with the great customer of the State, the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles.

I include the text of those remarks:

THE RAPE OF NORTHERN WATERS

(Address by Congressman JEROME R. WALDIE)

I find the timing of this speech topic, The Rape of Northern Waters, to be somewhat ill-timed what with the recent record rains, the Sierra snowpack, their anticipated runoffs and the fact that some flooding has occurred here in the North.

It becomes quite apparent, in fact, that we in the northern part of the State have an abundant supply of water.

It is to the credit of this State's Water Resource Planners and Dam Builders that the facilities of the California Water Project and the Central Valley Project have prevented even more loss of life and dollar damage from flooding during this extremely wet winter.

However—I have not come before you today to praise the California Water Project. As a matter of fact I have no intention of even being kind to it.

I have come to bury the water project as it is today and to call on the State of California to make drastic changes in its outlook and its water export project so that the northern part of the State, and particularly the magnificent and varied waters of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuarine System, so blessed with a sufficiency of fresh water, will not become in fact a biological desert.

I fear that without more regard for—and some means of protection for—the Life Systems of the North—in particular the San Francisco Bay Estuarine System—the State will knowingly and by design sacrifice this unique and irreplaceable resource in order to meet its contractual and statutory water export requirements.

The most frustrating aspect of this entire problem is that there is no place to go in California, outside the courts, to get an even reasonably fair hearing on matters affecting the allocation of water resources. There is no administrative or quasi-judicial body, commission or agency in California that allocates water or adjudicates water controversies, that is not carefully contrived to arrive at predetermined judgments advancing the overall plan to export Delta water to the South.

I seek to prove to you today that if an area involved in a water controversy is not a customer purchasing water from the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Project—that area will not find relief or assistance from any State Agency or Board, when it is in conflict with a customer area.

I will show you how the role of the Department of Water Resources has changed from a conservation agency to a State-operated utility which is in the business of selling the State's Water Resources—a role which is unique in all the fifty states.

I also intend to show how every State project affecting the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuarine System is designed solely to benefit the Southern users of the California Water Project—customers, if you will—of the Department of Water Resources—with only incidental benefits to the Bay-Delta area.

Let us first examine the most unusual and highly questionable role of the Department of Water Resources. Until empowered by the Burns-Porter Act of 1959 to do so—the Department never engaged in the act of marketing what it was constitutionally charged with protecting—the State's precious water resources.

With the passage of the Burns-Porter Act by the Legislature, and I was one who voted against it—the Department of Water Resources was mandated by the Legislature to *sell*—not protect—these resources. This change in mandate has resulted in the Department becoming totally customer-oriented. Thus we see the Department stooping to such indignities as suppressing reports of such agencies as the Department of Fish and Game if those reports in any way cast doubts on the means or plans designed to attain the Department's single goal of providing the contracted amount of high quality water to its customers in the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California.

The estrangement between the Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Water Resources began soon after the placing of all the natural resource agencies of the State under the all-encompassing Resources Agency.

It became apparent that the Resources Agency was aiding and assisting the Department of Water Resources in its export business when budget time came around.

Studies for fish and wildlife enhancement and preservation in the Delta were bluepenciled whereas State monies for unauthorized projects essential to the export business of the Department of Water Resources such as the proposed Peripheral Canal, were approved.

One budgetary axing in particular is indicative of how strongly the Department feels

XUM

about its obligation to export Delta water to its Southern customers even though adverse consequences may thereby ensue to the Bay-Delta area.

In October of last year a preliminary study by Fish and Game Department biologists discovered a sharp correlation between salinity and fresh water outflow and the mortality of young striped bass in the Delta area.

The study revealed that the number of striped bass young surviving in midsummer is directly linked with water outflow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers—and the relationship has a significant implication for water development programs in the Delta such as the Peripheral Canal.

In short, the Fish and Game Department concluded that the reduced outflow and resultant higher saline content of the waters would result in a drastic and intolerable reduction in the striped bass fishery.

Seeing the great significance of this finding, the biologists attempted to enter the preliminary report in the already prepared task report of the Bay-Delta Study—part of which was being written by the Department of Fish and Game.

However—this most important finding was not included in the preliminary report text—even though it was a new facet of the Bay-Delta ecology with dramatic new possibilities for further study.

Shortly afterwards the Department of Fish and Game learned that a further study of the effect of reduced outflow on the striped bass fishery was slashed from the Department's budget by the Resources Agency and the Department of Fish and Game was forced to apply for funds from a federal agency and a private foundation. It would appear, then, as if the State of California does not want to learn whether or not its water exportations via the Peripheral Canal will devastate a thriving sports fishery and recreational facility—despite indications that this could very well occur.

The Fish and Game Department was given a stunning rebuke by the Water Resources Director just recently when three fish and wildlife experts from the State of Washington were hired to conduct a study on how to operate the Peripheral Canal to protect the fishery—despite months of negotiations with the State Fish and Game officials on the same matter—negotiations which broke down after the Department of Water Resources refused to accept facts that would jeopardize its export plans.

It is my feeling that the Department of Water Resources and its Director, Mr. Gianelli, have stacked every major decision making Water Agency of importance in the State with persons having direct allegiance to water customers of the Department—especially the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles.

As an example of this contention, since the creation of the California Water Plan, the State Water Rights Board and the Water Quality Control Board were lumped together as the State Water Resources Control Board.

Thus the single most important agency for resolving disputes as to the allocation of the State's water resources is no longer impartial—and we have learned from repeated experiences before that Board that a non-customer of the State cannot expect to get a fair shake before it if his dispute involves a water customer of the State.

In my opinion one only has to look at the background of the men who comprise this Board to see the built-in conflicts of interests that must result.

Let us first consider the Chairman, Kerry W. Mulligan. Mr. Mulligan, although admittedly a Northern Californian, was until January the Executive Officer of the Board. His complete allegiance to the water export policies of the Department are very well known.

Board Member, Edward F. Dibble, another appointee of Governor Reagan, was, at the time of his appointment, Manager of the San Gorgonia Pass Water Agency—a customer of the State—and Engineer and Manager of the San Bernadino Valley Water Conservation District—another area to receive northern waters. He has served as President of the California Water Resources Association—a leading agriculturally oriented organization supporting the shipment of good water at low prices to the undeveloped south.

Board member Norman B. Hume was another appointee of Governor Reagan with Southern California water user roots. At the time of his appointment, Mr. Hume was serving as Director of the Bureau of Sanitation of the City of Los Angeles.

William A. Alexander joined the newly-formed Water Resources Control Board at its inception in 1967, having formerly served on the State Water Rights Board since 1961. An Engineer, Mr. Alexander had been employed by the Department of Water Resources, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers. He has served as Chief Engineer, Manager and Consultant to a number of lower San Joaquin Valley Water Districts.

Lastly we have George B. Maul, an appointee of Governor Reagan, who voluntarily stepped aside as Chairman of this important and powerful Board to make way for former staff member Kerry Mulligan after the only voice of the San Francisco Bay Area, Ralph J. McGill, was not reappointed to the Board. Maul, an Attorney has served as General Counsel for the El Dorado Irrigation District and has provided legal services for other irrigation and water service districts.

One can readily see the difficulty of arguing the cause of the non-customer Bay Area for retention of Bay-Delta waters when such a decision would limit the ability of the Department of Water Resources to export Delta water to its customers—or—would increase the cost of export waters to its customers.

Our problems here in the San Francisco Bay Estuarine System are further compounded by the fact that every facet of the California Water Plan affecting this system is designed not to protect the Bay-Delta system but to speed high quality Delta water to the South with the utmost efficiency at the cheapest cost and with little regard for the consequences of this policy on the Bay-Delta system.

Let us use, for example, the proposed Peripheral Canal—the Canal, a 43-mile long, unlined conveyance facility, will divert a major portion of the Sacramento River near Hood and transport water along the eastern periphery of the Delta, and terminate in the Clifton Court Forebay in the southeastern corner of Contra Costa County.

The menace of the Peripheral Canal, as far as we in Contra Costa County are concerned, lies with the fact that the Canal is a physical facility which gives virtual control of the entire flow of the Sacramento River and Delta to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and/or worse, the State Department of Water Resources.

We have been assured by Mr. Gianelli and others that the Canal was principally designed to convey high quality water to the project pumps at Clifton Court, at the same time protecting the Delta fishery by reducing the pumping of free floating striped bass eggs and fingerlings directly from Delta channels during the spawning season.

This is what we have been told—but there are a growing number of persons who are understandably worried over the assurances of the Department on this or any other matter. In fact, there are those of us who believe the Canal has no benefit for the Delta but is solely for the benefit of Los Angeles.

You see, the fishery problem will not be solved by the Canal unless adequate releases are made out of the Canal westerly and into the Sacramento River.

To date the Canal is a nebulous thing without operational agreements with the Department of Fish and Game, without an assignment of responsibility as to whether the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Water Resources will operate it—and most importantly—without statutory provisions guaranteeing fresh water releases to meet an as yet unsettled water quality criteria—even though contractual commitments with downstream water users would have to be sacrificed in dry year cycles.

We fear that almost the entire flow of the Sacramento River will be diverted southward and that once the tap is turned on for Southern California, we in the Bay and Delta areas will not be able to turn it off—with tragic consequences to the Bay-Delta area.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has evaluated the proposed Canal and concludes that it will materially downgrade the quality of Delta water.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration report warned that if the Canal were operated at water quality criteria proposed by the State and the Bureau of Reclamation it would have a very significant detriment to the Delta's agriculture and also its fishery. When we talk about water quality we *really* are talking Delta outflows.

There is great concern as to what effect the diversion of a tremendous amount of existing fresh water outflows will have on the life systems within the San Francisco Bay Estuarine System.

I am especially troubled because State Officials and Engineers preparing the Bay-Delta Study Report, with rare candor, admit that they themselves do not know what will happen to estuary ecology given decreased Delta fresh water outflow.

Certainly the wetlands of estuaries such as the San Francisco Bay-Delta system don't appear to be a great natural resource with their smelly and musky marshes. As one writer put it, "They have neither the majestic grace of towering pines nor the stark beauty of a desert."

This is one reason they are so readily squandered—nobody loves a swamp.

The dangers to estuaries such as our own Bay-Delta estuary, from activities such as filling and pollution with industrial and sewer wastes is well known, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission has alerted the public to these dangers.

But there is a third and no less important threat to the bay and the estuarine system that supports it—that of the diminution of fresh water outflows caused by the state exports of Sacramento River water to the south.

This is especially dangerous as the intricate current system within estuaries is produced by the balance of river discharges and the contribution of the sea. With decreased river flow the current system can be so altered that shoaling and scouring can set up completely foreign physical conditions.

The most important hydrobiological parameter in an estuary is salinity—if river flow is restricted by upstream diversions, the salinity level in the receiving estuary may increase to the detriment of estuarine biological communities.

Marine life, much as freshwater life, lives precariously close to the doorstep of death. The slightest change in the environment often spells doom for an entire species; in estuaries the chemical content of the water has critical and narrow limits.

Important fluxes occur in the estuarine ecosystems during the high flows of spring and fall including flows of vitamins and other dissolved organic compounds, nutrients, lowered salinity by the addition of fresh water and flushing and mixing influences.

Looking at the proposed reductions of fresh water outflows planned by the State, we

XUM

can only deduce that the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuarine system is in for a drastic change.

The present flows into the bay are comprised of 70 per cent from the Sacramento River, 20 per cent from the San Joaquin River and 5 per cent from other tributaries—outflows now total some 17.8 million acre feet per year on an average.

Under the provisions of the State Water Plan this figure will be reduced to 9.4 million acre feet by 1990 and 7.2 million acre feet by the year 2020. These are Department of Water Resources figures.

Other statistics furnished by the Contra Costa Water Agency reveal that this outflow could be reduced to as little as 2.5 million acre feet in a dry year cycle.

Not only is this 60 to 70 percent cut in the quantity of fresh water entering the bay a factor in ecological change—but the manner by which the cut will be implemented should have a profound and probably adverse effect on the bay life systems.

Fresh water outflows will amount to a steady, regulated, unvarying meager 1,700 cubic feet per second nine months out of the year with only January, February and March seeing anything even remotely approaching the normal fluctuations that now characterize the estuary outflows.

The effect of this artificially induced regularity will have on marine life accustomed to the variance and diversity of present fresh water outflows can be assumed to be of considerable impact and mostly negative. Life in an estuarine system is wonderfully complex—to "Harness" that complex diversity is to risk its serious alteration, if not its extinction!

The reduction of outflows can also be expected to cut down the flushing action of the North Bay as well as allowing harmful saline water intrusion into the western Delta area.

The best flushing action presently in the bay is in the northern section where Delta outflows contribute necessary oxygen bearing waters to aid in the reduction of waste and hydraulic circulation.

The worst flushing is in the South Bay where the absence of inflows and circulation leaves waters rocking up and down as if in a tub with very little movement of pollutants. The result has been the occurrence of frequent eutrophication, or algae blooms, which absorb already scarce oxygen and results in death of fish and other marine life.

I have just made some assumptions on the effects of diminished fresh water inflows into the San Francisco Bay Estuarine System—assumptions based on available data that indicates such diminutions would have a detrimental effect on existing life systems.

May I point out the Department of Water Resources and its Director, Mr. William Gianelli, have also made some assumptions as to what will occur with a reduction in fresh water outflows. His assumptions—however—are that these drastic changes will not have detrimental effects.

I would suggest that if the full effects of such a change in the most important biological factor of a huge and diverse life system is unknown—then we should proceed with all due caution and restraint.

I suggest that we experiment on the side of caution and see if our experimentation results in detrimental effects. If so then we can proceed without destroying all present life.

To do the opposite—as I fear is the intent of the Department of Water Resources—would be a great error. And one that may not be reversible.

I am in favor of a moratorium on water development and the proposed shipment of water to the southern part of the State until we know through new research and study what effects this proposed export of northern water will have on the ecological system of the north—especially the San Francisco Bay Estuary.

I wholly concur with the results of the recent vote taken by this club where an overwhelming majority favored increased control over utilization of San Francisco Bay and also favored retention of the present boundaries of the Bay.

I propose that the State Legislature authorize a completely new water resource and development agency. An agency with statutory checks and balances to provide the ground work for workable development and careful protection of environments and ecology systems.

This agency would carefully inventory our water resources and determine where they would best be used. It would by law be charged with the responsibility of conserving and protecting our water resources—not exploiting and selling them. It would be above the political entanglements that have seen such agencies as the Metropolitan Water District stretch out over vast areas of the State and control the water resources of that area for the use of its customers.

I propose that the State Legislature also constitutionally create an independent agency formed along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority to act as the purveyor of state waters. I am convinced that the State should not be in the business of selling water. The evils of the present situation in Sacramento are apparent—they should not be permitted to continue.

I propose that the State Legislature amend the Burns-Porter Act so that the aforementioned changes in the structure of the Department of Water Resources can be implemented as soon as possible.

I propose that with a review of the California Water Project the state work to meet its contractual requirements to the south and its moral requirements to the north not by the further rape of North Coast waters—but by improved technology.

The use of reclaimed water is one method eyed as a substitute for the uneconomical and wasteful transmission of water over 500 miles for domestic use.

Workable desalinization of sea water is within our grasp. Costs will be high at first—but this is the way of the future. I have no doubt in my mind that this will be the cheapest way to provide fresh water for coastal urban centers before 1990.

Water-reclaimed from sewage in Southern California has been developed at a cost comparable to water of the California Water Project and of better quality than that shipped from the Colorado River.

Are we to ignore the technology of the present and the future for the plumbing of the past?

I think not.

We must act now to protect our own environment, our Bay, our Delta and our North Coast from the ruinous plans of the water hungry South and their minions in Sacramento.

I pledge to you here today that we in Contra Costa will continue our lonely fight to assure adequate water quality in the Bay-Delta System. I would hope others would join us.

We—the extremists as Mr. Gianelli refers to us—will do everything possible—including a massive suit that could tie up the water project for years—to make certain that our unique estuarine system does not turn into a black biological desert.

We will continue the struggle to protect the waterfowl, the wildlife and the fisheries of our Bay and Delta and of the marvelous wild rivers of the North Coast.

We have seen what an active and aware public can do for conservation. I refer to the outstanding work of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission and its efforts to alert the public to the threats of bay fill.

We need a similar agency to protect the environment of the entire Bay-Delta system—not just from fill and sewerage—but from all the ill effects of mankind upon his own environment.

We now see the people of the Santa Barbara Coast rightfully enraged over the spill of oil from approved off-shore drilling operations. Operations approved because the west coast allegedly needs more crude oil—but operations that were known to be taking place in an area of high seismic activity. The tragedy of that administrative act has yet to be fully calculated.

But it will be only miniscule as compared to the ultimate effects of the California Water Plan—quite possibly the most costly and dangerous environmental disaster occurring in our State.

Let us take stock and then proceed—but we must not blindly go on—we may not survive such a mistake.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take to the floor on matters that are past and done. Members of the Committee on Education and Labor—like other Members of this House—have more than enough to keep them busy with the concerns of the present and the future. We need not harry the past for the raw materials of controversy.

There is, however, an item in the press today which I must clarify and correct. I do this because failure to speak out on it might be construed as agreement or consent.

I refer to the published report that suggests great disagreement between the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and the ranking majority Member, the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

For my part, there is nothing but the greatest respect and cordiality, and the greatest willingness to be cooperative with the gentlelady who makes such a valuable contribution to the Nation through her work on the Committee on Education and Labor. We have long been friends. When I am away from the committee, she carries my proxy. When she is away, I often carry hers.

Two years ago, the last time the Economic Opportunity Act was up for extension, Mrs. GREEN and I went right down the line together. I doubt she had a stronger ally than I in her own major effort to amend the act. That was the Green amendment to assure participation in the community action agencies by the local, elected, responsible public officials.

That cooperation continued last year, as we worked together to win passage of the landmark Higher Education Act of 1968. And I expect that cooperation to continue for years to come.

She has been most helpful to me. And I might say that the poor people of this country, those who have benefitted from the programs developed under OEO, owe a great debt to the intelligence, industry, courage, and leadership of EDITH GREEN.

Now, having disposed of that matter once and for all, I trust, I turn to an-

XUM

other press report containing the unfortunate inference that former President Lyndon Johnson and I were at cross-purposes during congressional action on the OEO amendments of 1967.

This is obviously a misunderstanding. Those of us charged with the responsibility for getting those amendments before the Congress know that the President and his staff battled shoulder to shoulder with us all the way.

We were in daily communication with the White House during the critical periods—just as I am sure my friends on the other side of the aisle will be in communication with the White House this year.

It is an idle exercise to assign gradations of credit for passage of legislation 2 years ago. It is enough to say that the bill was passed by a cooperative effort of all the people who believed in its objectives.

If we can be assured of the same kind of cooperation from the White House this year, the poor of this country need have no fear that their Government will abandon them.

On another point, I wish to make it perfectly clear that hearings beginning Monday on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969 do not constitute an attempt to stampede or get the jump on anyone—in any branch of government.

If the Committee on Education and Labor did not move at this time, we would be derelict in our responsibility. I think any responsible chairman would move now, because the act expires June 30. We have no time to lose. These hearings will not be concluded before the first or second week in May. All Members will have an opportunity to come in and express their views.

I thought I should make this statement, Mr. Speaker, for clarification.

VALUE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention the following statements which indicate the value placed upon the legislation affecting our elementary and secondary schools by some of the local school officials who testified recently before the Committee on Education and Labor during hearings on H.R. 514.

EVALUATIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Julian D. Prince, superintendent of schools for McComb, Miss., in his testimony on H.R. 514, proposing a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, said:

> The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most exciting thing that has ever happened in education.

Mr. Prince's endorsement of and enthusiasm for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was shared by other school officials appearing with him on the last day of hearings during which local school officials were invited to testify.

Archie F. Simmons of the Leflore County School District, Greenwood, Miss., said:

> Passage and continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has had a profound effect on education in our district.

Dr. Fred W. Kirby, assistant superintendent of schools for Columbus, Ga., said:

> I think this whole program (ESEA) has been beautifully conceived.

And Julius Truelson, superintendent of schools of Fort Worth, Tex., indicated that he felt it was "imperative" that ESEA be extended for 5 years and commented further:

> I wish there were some way I could adequately tell you what ESEA funds mean to the public schools, and more than that, to the future of countless children, their opportunities, their ability to compete, their responsible citizenship, and their success or failure in the American way of life. The ultimate value of ESEA funds in the lives of children is really beyond calculation.
>
> For these extra funds, we in the public schools are eternally grateful. I submit that reductions or cutbacks simply cannot even be considered. The question is not, "Should these funds be increased?", but, "How much should these funds be increased?"
>
> Education is not expensive, it's priceless.

Dr. Truelson stated:

> We have learned so much, we are on the threshold of being able to wipe out some of the problems that have plagued this country throughout the years. We have found some of the most exciting things going on, it is almost unbelievable.

As I have indicated in previous statements, a great number of local school officials have presented testimony on H.R. 514, during the 22 days that the Committee on Education and Labor conducted hearings. With the appearance of the school officials listed above, approximately 120 local school officials presented testimony on the bill.

An earlier insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—February 24, page 4180—contained some of the testimony of witnesses appearing during the first days of our committee's hearings. Today I should like to share with my colleagues portions of the testimony presented by the school officials from whom I have just quoted because I feel these are very eloquent and persuasive statements in support of a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and therefore merit a wide audience.

Julius Truelson, who is superintendent of schools of the Fort Worth Independent School District, Forth Worth, Tex., had the following comments to make:

> We have about 5300 pupils involved in our Title I program alone—nearly 6 per cent of our total enrollment.
>
> Fort Worth receives $1,915,099 in ESEA funds in Title I, II, and III. This amounts to just under 4 per cent of our total annual budget of $55 million.
>
> We want and need ESEA funds.
>
> I heartily recommend your approval of House Bill 514. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act through the years has furnished important monies to the local school districts but most especially those funds made available to assist the disadvantaged youngsters in every community who really need special help. As you well know, the larger cities have greater concentrations of children of the various minority groups—Negroes and Mexican-Americans especially in our section of the country—who are both culturally and educationally deprived.
>
> Our experience with ESEA has been extremely rewarding thus far. The financial boost has helped us to bring innovation and better education to thousands of indigent youths in our area—the children who need it most. You know, although all American children are born "equal," they begin to get unequal rapidly, for a variety of reasons. This is why we in Fort Worth budget the majority of our ESEA funds in preschool programs to better prepare these children to meet the competition in the first grade.
>
> In the secondary, the balance of our money goes, for the most part, into remedial reading, an after-school tutorial program, visiting (home-school) teachers, and a unique "Summer Club" program.
>
> Our program is not perfect, far from it. But we have learned some things and really have had some outstanding successes:
>
> A comparison of pre-test and post-test results on a group of 2454 students in our preschool program showed an average gain in mental age of nine months in a seven-month period.
>
> I should point out that normally they show a three-month gain because of these lack of opportunities for enrichment expenses.
>
> In a similar comparison of youngsters in our secondary remedial reading program, pupils showed a vocabulary growth of twelve months, an increase in comprehension ability of 13 months, and an increase in speed and accuracy of 14 months in a 9-month period. It is also interesting to note that these students' average educational growth previously was only eight months a year.
>
> In the five-week summer club program this past summer, the participants had an average reading growth of six months and an increased math proficiency of four months.
>
> We think this is one of our most outstanding programs.
>
> Our fourteen visiting teachers, through home visitation and personal counseling, were able to readmit 30 per cent of our hardcore Title I dropouts.
>
> And, although every dime we have received in federal money has gone into a supplementary and/or enriched program, these new monies are "pump-priming" in their side benefits to the entire school program.
>
> By that I mean we have learned so many things that we can encompass in our regular program with our own local funds.
>
> Good ideas, inspired by the injection of federal funds, have a lot of "carryover" value; and we already see many improvements in our overall school program, in terms of a modified curriculum, staff development, student motivation, and parental involvement in the educational process, to name but a few.
>
> I can only say that there is much good in this Act. I particularly like the language of this legislation, which allows wide latitude on the part of local educational agencies to meet the particular needs of their individual communities and which gives educators unique opportunities to solve their own educational problems through locally designed programs and projects.
>
> The problems of education in this country today are extremely complex. The extension and expansion of ESEA will not solve all these problems, but ESEA will most certainly aid in their solution. Money isn't everything in education these days; but, gentlemen, it's way ahead of whatever is in second place.

Dr. Fred W. Kirby, assistant superintendent of schools for Columbus, Ga., testified as follows:

The purpose of the following remarks is to request your support of H.R. 514 providing for a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Let me tell you how it has helped in Muscogee County, Columbus, Ga., a school district which contains 42,000 pupils and over 1,700 teachers and principals.

For many years, in the southeastern region, Columbus, Ga., has been reputed to have a good school system. As an earmark of that reputation the Columbus schools have contained free public kindergartens since 1905. Despite such a reputation and despite such a history, local and State financial efforts were simply inadequate to support the compensatory education programs which were needed. This was true in a school system that provided pupils with all the normal materials they needed even to the point of furnishing paper and pencils.

There was a group of children for whom the schools were unable to afford the type of education they required. These were the pupils who entered school with severe handicaps—limited vocabularies, restricted cultural background, poor self concepts. This type of pupil is expensive to educate. Oral presentations mean relatively little to this child. His environmental horizon has been so limited that he is unable to visualize or conceptualize. Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have allowed us to begin to help these children.

With an awareness of the inadequacy of mere spoken words to carry the desirable depth of meaning to these children, the schools sought ways of reinforcement for those words. Seeking a multi-sensory aid, the idea of an instructional materials center containing such aids was conceived.

Combining local, state, and federal funds, the District established an Instructional Materials Center. From this center, teachers may request the supplementary materials they need from a collection of six thousand educational films, ten thousand filmstrips, several thousand slides, maps, globes, media kits, tape recordings, records, transparencies, and any of a myriad of other such materials. The requested material will be delivered to the teacher at her school within a few hours.

This Center has strengthened our program for the disadvantaged child. Had it not been for Title I, ESEA, it would not exist.

The Muscogee County School District recognized that many of the disadvantaged pupils were handicapped by reading disabilities. It presently operates a Diagnostic Reading Center to which pupils with reading disabilites are referred.

The staff at the Center diagnoses the difficulty and seeks to provide therapy. Pupils are transported from school to Center and return by small station-wagon type buses. The capacity of the Center is 500 pupils. Attendance is either two times weekly or three times weekly for one hour per visit.

This Center is well-equipped and well-staffed. Material and equipment run the gamut from a small children's book given to the child when he reads it (cost eight cents) to a sophisticated machine commonly referred to as a "Talking Typewriter" (cost $40,000). This program is supported entirely by Title I, ESEA.

The third major facet of our compensatory program is a summer tutoring program. Under this program eligible children who are having difficulty in reading, mathematics, English, science, or social science are recommended for tutoring.

For 30 days during the summer each of the pupils will be tutored individually for one hour daily by a teacher who has exhibited unusual ability to teach the subject. The teacher is requested to ignore the grade level of the child but to find the level at which he is capable of functioning. Once this level has been located, she is to begin there and carry the child as far as he is able to go.

This has proved to be a highly successful program. It is quite expensive. Title I, ESEA funds make it possible. The three programs you have just heard described are not particularly glamorous nor are they highly innovative. There are school systems in this nation who were operating similar programs prior to the advent of the Elementary and Secondary Act, but such programs were beyond our financial reach until federal funds became available.

We have found Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act quite helpful. Our project is entitled "Fine Arts and Archeology." Briefly it is a cooperative effort between the school system, the local museum, and the local symphony orchestra.

It has resulted in the preparation of a mobile unit travelling to our 67 schools displaying the results of geological and archeological discoveries in the region with printed and taped descriptions.

Experiences in both sciences and in music were new to many pupils. As evidence of the success of the Title III project, we have noticed a heightening of interest in both geology and archeology, and we have been required to increase our instructional staff teaching stringed instruments. We have two new Title III proposals in the hands of state department personnel at the present. One proposal is for a new program for educable mentally retarded pupils; the other is for a new method of teaching nineteenth century sociological history.

Both Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are having significant impact on public education. Title I has enabled us to provide the type of services we have long known children needed but have been unable to afford; Title III has required us to innovate, to look for new methods to solve our educational problems.

There are recommendations with respect to Title I, ESEA which need to be considered. They are as follows:

1. Fund this program to the fullest extent the economy will permit. We are presently unable to reach but approximately 25 per cent of the children who need specialized services with the amount of funds presently available.

2. Project the program by a commitment for a longer period of time such as the five-year period contemplated in H.R. 514 in order that planning may be for a longer period of time than has been possible in the past.

With respect to Title III, our sole request is that the amount of funding be increased. This would prevent many excellent ideas from going untried and untested for lack of funds.

Dr. Kirby stated that his school district could "most readily" utilize twice as much money as he is now receiving under title I and put it to good advantage. With funding at the present level, he indicated that they are only able to reach 25 percent of the children who need specialized services, but with full funding, they could reach all of these children.

In response to the question, "Have you in the course of your test and measurement of the progress developed any results that can point to some objective means of measuring the advancement that these children have made under these programs?" Dr. Kirby replied:

We have used objective tests in all of our programs. On our tutoring program we could show you some phenomenal results. . . .

On the change in the diagnostic reading program we could show you some substantial results but not as starting results as the tutoring program, and we could show you some less substantial objective measurement on the instructional materials center. It is difficult to measure cultural environment, I mean enhancement of cultural environment. I can measure when a child performs better in mathematics. I can measure when he performs in a subject area. This is easier for me to measure.

I think for these children perhaps the most important thing may not be in academic performance, I think for most of these children it is developing a wholesome self-concept and a belief that somebody does care. I think maybe this is more important than any academic gains because I think the academic gain grows out of this, once you have developed this.

Archie F. Simmons, administrative assistant and coordinator of Federal programs of the Leflore County School District in Greenwood, Miss., testified in the following way:

The passage and continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has had a profound effect upon education in our district. Education has been stimulated by Title I and has become an exciting challenge for innovative and exemplary programs. Like all rural school districts, the educational problems in Leflore County have been great and financing inadequate, but with the continuing assistance of Title I, we visualize the day that our educational system will succeed in the primary goal of providing a rewarding and successful educational experience for all of the children of our district.

Gentlemen, to be brutally frank, prior to the time of Title I, Leflore County was operating a school system where we had some rundown buildings and a classroom with a teacher with 40 to 45 children and a textbook.

I am happy to report that that is no longer true as a result of Title I of ESEA.

I have no equivocation whatsoever in stating that we would still be in the same position, if not worse, had it not been for Title I.

Now we receive a large allocation from Title I as a result of the number of children that we have. Of the 6449 children, I believe it is, over 5800 of these children are qualified for participation in Title I, indicating the degree of poverty in our school district.

Now we have taken our Federal funds that have been allocated to our district and we have approached our problem, the problem that we knew existed, we recognized it but we could not do anything about it. Standardized testing revealed to us that out of approximately 5000 children in our district (Grade 1 to 6), 72 per cent of them read on either the first or second grade reading level. Out of the 5000 or so that were tested, 43 children read on the 6th grade reading level. After we had completed our testing program we saw that whatever we had been doing in the past had failed.

With Title I we were able at last to employ some expertise in helping us with our problems. We employed supervisory personnel, people who held certain skills in certain areas to assist us in upgrading our program. We commenced almost immediately with the agreement and enthusiasm of our teachers, and we started working with new programs, we started piloting new approaches to this problem of reading that we had.

Last year we piloted nine different approaches to reading, trying to find a system that would help our children in their reading, trying to close the gap between our norms and the national norms. After a child started to school without this background of help from parents or anyone else, they quickly

> fell at least a year behind and as much as two and a half or three years behind by the time they approached the 6th grade.
>
> As a result of that we found one program to be highly successful in teaching these children from the economically and socially deprived homes, and we are using that program.
>
> Now. because of our situation in Leflore County we have so many children, and especially our Negro children, who have a tendency to drop out of school. We do not have a compulsory school law there and the dropout rate is high. We have tried to provide activities within our school that would help to keep these children in school and to encourage some of the dropouts to come back. We have vocationally geared our program. We have developed and we now have in operation an industrial arts vocational type program that extends from the first grade through the 12th grade. We have developed complete programs in this.
>
> We are working with the first six grades on a very simple industrial arts program where we teach tool technology, the use of simple tools, arts and crafts, and we are doing this for a purpose, not to give these children something there particularly but trying to build up an interest there that will carry forward when they reach the 7th, 8th, 9th grades to where we can go into an exploratory type program under industrial arts, trying to single out an area of interest in here so that by the time the child reaches the 10th or 11th, or 12th grade we are then prepared to give him a comprehensive vocational education to prepare him for a skill trade that he might use when he leaves our school. If he is not going on to college we will have provided him a means for making a living. We have been most pleased with our program in the industrial arts and the vocational education.
>
> We have received quite a bit of publicity on it and school districts all over the nation are requesting information on this program, and they are placing it into their schools.
>
> If you will extend this thing five years and give us some more money we want to go back and put it in the pre-school program.

Asked his opinion regarding the length of extension which should be given the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Mr. Simmons said:

> If you will extend this thing five years and give us some more money, we want to go back and put it in the pre-school program. I can see where, if you drop ESEA, Leflore County is right back where we started, and we won't have anything. And we are doing something now.

Mr. Simmons commented further regarding the results they are achieving under the ESEA legislation:

> This is the grandest thing that has ever happened to Leflore County, and we want to stay in it.
>
> One of the most satisfying results that we have obtained from Title I is our in-service training program. Now that may look a little strange in that it is not directed toward the children, but indirectly they are receiving the greatest benefits that can be offered to a child.

Julian D. Price, Sr., superintendent of schools for McComb, Miss., said, in his statement:

> My school district has profited under all of the titles of this Act, more under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act than any other area. Because we realize that our education in the past had not been adequate and under testing as Mr. Simmons described, we found not in all of our schools, but particularly at that time they were all Negro schools, we found some very severe educational problems and the same problems were true in those schools where the white children who came in from the rural areas.
>
> We found this same type of deprivation there, severe, regardless of race. Since this time we have tried to find ways of measuring the educational progress of our children. This led us in an extensive counseling program, computer oriented technology under Title III, and then what we found out distressed us and that led us into an instructional enforcement program in an attempt to help administrators in other school districts in our area discover the nature of their own educational program in the hopes that they too would get excited from improving education.
>
> From that that led us into computed assisted technology with the idea that a computer can do in instruction what the very best school teacher who writes the program for that thing can do, and so as a result we have become quite highly oriented towards computer technology in the classroom, in mathematics, and in the area of reading we are going into in another year.
>
> The reasons that I do favor the present approach instead of the so-called block grant approach is that the initial development of the bill, rather than being a broadbrush approach, was pointed towards apparently some of the worst, or the most severe problems that we have had in education, and there was an effort on the part of the Federal Government to direct the development of these programs constructively in the various school districts.
>
> I think it has been beneficial to us because maybe some minds better than ours have helped us develop some portions of our program, whereas we might not have had this help had there not been some string attached to the proper development of the program in the way that the legislation was written.
>
> I definitely feel that the funds which are being distributed to us under the present formula here are being utilized by our school district to meet the most pressing educational needs. I feel if we did not have these funds, the quality of the education program in our school district would be materially lowered.

Mr. Prince went on further to stress the tremendous impact which Federal assistance to elementary and secondary school systems has had in nearby Leflore County, Miss., as follows:

> The Leflore County schools represents the most exciting impact of Title I of anywhere I know in the Nation. I don't know any other school district as well as I know them, because we serve them with our regional data processing center. They are nearly 200 miles from us and yet we are in contact with them educationally every day that the sun rises. What they have been able to do in that school district is more than just sound, it is exciting. They are taking youngsters who have absolutely no opportunity to go anywhere or to do anything other than migrate, and given them a chance to become a real productive part of our society. I just can't say enough about what they are trying to do with their Title I money.
>
> I would say Title I has materially slowed the out-migration from Leflore County because the parents there are beginning to get the idea that their children can get a good education there in Leflore County. We have seen the drop in their pupil enrollment slow down in the last year.

Not all of the school officials who were anxious to appear before the committee were able to do so. A good number did supply statements for the hearing record, however. I should like, Mr. Speaker, at this point to include a number of these statements.

> CHARLESTON, S.C.
>
> DEAR MR. PERKINS: This letter is in reference to your Committee's hearings on H.R. 514, a bill which would extend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of five years. As you are well aware, this legislation is of critical importance in order to make workable future funding.
>
> It is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to inform you concerning our attitude toward the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, along with the Impacted Funds program, has been the most important factor in the School District's operation in my memory. Both programs bring in a total of approximately $5 million to this school system out of a budget of about $20 million. Hence you can see their importance to us.
>
> Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has given us the opportunity of providing the services to disadvantaged children that would otherwise have been impossible. For those school districts which do not participate in the Impacted Areas program, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most important piece of legislation concerning their operation. In our District, both programs are of equal importance.
>
> Under Title I, ESEA, some children have gotten lunches for the first time. Many have had physical examinations for the first time. Class size has been reduced in order to make education a more personal process for these children. We have been enabled to institute preschool preparation for the first grade and compensatory programs in basic reading for the first time. Although this District is striving to use its local and state funds on an equitable basis for all children, equitable funds will not solve the severe academic problems of disadvantaged children, and Title I funding is imperative. Unless this District receives these funds for disadvantaged children, their future will be dark indeed. Excluding ESEA programs, we spent an average of $345 per child this year, and approximately 21% of our 60,000 students are disadvantaged.
>
> This District received quite a blow from the United States Congress this year when Title II, ESEA, programs were funded at approximately 50% of their previous level. Our State Accreditation Standards specify that elementary schools in the State should have a minimum of 10 volumes per pupil. We have many schools in our District which are individually short 5,000 volumes. Our only hope of providing library books for our students is through the continued funding of Title II, ESEA.
>
> Title III, ESEA, has brought many innovations in education to our South Carolina schools. The school districts of South Carolina voluntarily organized themselves into six regions for the purpose of operating Title III, ESEA, programs. As a result of the regional leadership under Title III, ESEA, we have seen a new climate for educational improvement established for South Carolina, and now local citizens are beginning to become concerned with handicapped students, students who will not go to college, and others which they have typically ignored.
>
> In South Carolina, the other Titles of ESEA are typically run by the South Carolina State Board of Education and are basically State operations. I am not involved in these programs closely enough to comment.
>
> Aside from the funding levels of the programs, our basic problem in their operation is the delay of funding of these programs. In the past we have found that after school opened we were funded large sums of money, and of course it was too late to hire person-

nel, etc. I do hope that Congress sees fit to give advanced funding of these programs so that our programs can become more efficient and effective. The funding patterns of Congress over the previous years have made efficiency almost impossible.

Mr. Perkins, it is my opinion that any cessation or reduction in ESEA or the Impacted programs would constitute a crisis for this School District. The people of my District want quality schools for their children. We are increasing our local effort by a tremendous amount this year (from 43 to 80 mills). However, their children's future depends as much on what Congress does with these programs as it does on their own efforts, because we are a relatively poor geographical area.

Thank you for your time in hearing our views on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and for your untiring efforts to improve the future of our boys and girls.

Sincerely,

Gordon H. Garrett,
County Superintendent of Education, Charleston County School District.

Taylor, Tex.

Dear Sir: I welcome the opportunity to express to you my views on H.R. 514, a bill, as I understand, on which hearings are presently being conducted that will extend and expand the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

There is widespread agreement in our community that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has made a valuable contribution to education in both the funds it provides and in the sound educational principles and procedures suggested in the accompanying guidelines. Without this financial assistance we would be unable to expand and improve educational programs designed to meet the special needs of the educationally deprived children of the low-income families of this school district. We feel that the benefits derived from this program far outweigh the problems encountered from the late funding and the short time permitted for program planning.

However, as you are presently conducting hearings on H.R. 514, I would heartily recommend to you that the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 be extended for a period of five years, and that appropriations and actual allocation of Federal funds be made at least one year in advance. I feel that forward funding will help the program planners of the local school districts devise a more effective, workable educational program for the educationally deprived. We feel our inadequacies when we play the role of "instant" planners.

May I add that we have not experienced an undue amount of discomfort in administering the federal program as directed by the present guidelines. We realize that this program, though categorical in nature and directed at particular needs, is nevertheless extremely flexible in application and allows state and local authorities wide discretion. At no time have we felt any unreasonable attempt by personnel of the Texas Education Agency to control our program.

I earnestly solicit your careful consideration of the views that I have submitted.

Respectfully yours,

J. F. Townley,
Superintendent of Schools, Taylor Independent School District.

Ocala, Fla.

My Dear Mr. Perkins: It is my understanding that your Committee on Education and Labor is now working on bill H.R. 514 pertaining to extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has meant a great deal to education in Marion County, Florida, and without it we would have had serious problems in our task of educating boys and girls. We urge you and your committee to continue its efforts in supporting this very worthy and basic program for education for an extended five years.

In order to make the use of federal funds more effective we would urge that appropriating and allocating of federal monies be made one year in advance to eliminate confusion and make for continuity in project operation. We would also like to go on record that there should be a simplification in guidelines with a corresponding reduction in paperwork.

It is a pleasure for us to add our support to bill H.R. 514 extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of five years.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Dunwoody,
Superintendent.
Donald J. Kearsley,
Coordinator of Federal Programs, Board of Public Instruction, Marion County.

Columbus, Ga.

Dear Sir: As the House Education and Labor Committee conducts hearings on H.R. 514, I would like to comment on the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for another five years.

The appropriations which have been allocated to the Muscogee County School District have been invaluable in upgrading the educational, cultural, and health of the large segment of underprivileged pupils in our school district.

It is my prediction that the worth so far accruing to the three aspects mentioned above will pay large dividends in the years to come.

Do all you can to continue this far reaching legislation.

Sincerely,

G. Nathan Hunter,
Treasurer, Muscogee County School District.

Lubbock, Tex.

To the Honorable Carl Perkins:

May I make some comments concerning H.R. 514 Bill which is to come before your Committee on Education and Labor?

This school district is a rural district bordering the Lubbock (population 175,000) City School District. For the past several years, there has been an overflow of families in the Lubbock District moving out into this district. Also, we have the Childrens Home of Lubbock with some ninety school children which is a church supported, non-tax paying institution for delinquent children. We are located on the East side of Lubbock which happens to be settled largely by Negroes, Mexicans, and low-income Whites. Our present school enrollment shows the following percentages of ethnic groups: Negroes 15%, Mexicans 21%, Students from Childrens Home of Lubbock 8.5%, and other Whites 55.5%.

From the above facts, you can readily see that we are overly burdened with educational disadvantaged pupils in our school. Also, the above type pupils do not come from parents who pay their share of the taxes, leaving this burden largely to the farmers. Without Head Start, ESEA Titles I, II and III, NDEA Titles III and V, and similar Programs, we just could not do justice toward educating so large a number of disadvantaged children. At present, through these Federal Programs, we are helping them so very much through pre-school training, remedial teaching, lunches, medical care, Vocational training, and above all we are reaching many of the parents by making them feel that someone does really care about their children's education. The school attendance for these disadvantaged children have increased immensely.

To operate these Programs to their fullest potential, we need to know that the funds will be available at least one year in advance. I believe that the greatest weakness in our Federal Programs has been the uncertainty of funds from year to year.

I ask you to please help the disadvantaged children by supporting H.R. 514.

Very truly yours,

Marvin Williams,
Superintendent, Roosevelt Public Schools.

Walhalla, S.C.

Dear Mr. Perkins: It is my understanding that the House Education and Labor Committee is conducting hearings on H.R. 514. It is my hope that Congress will extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of five years. The benefits of this act have been great but could have been greater if we in our school district had more time to plan. It has been difficult for us to employ personnel because of not knowing in sufficient time the amount of funds that would be available to us.

I have noted, with interest, your dedication and interest in the field of education. I want to express my appreciation to you and the Committee, of which you are Chairman, for this work you are doing. I think I realize the problems your committee is confronted with, but I hope you are successful in getting the desired monies for school programs at least one year in advance of the time they will be needed.

Please call on us at any time that we can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Fred P. Hamilton,
Superintendent, Oconee County Schools.

El Campo, Tex.

Dear Chairman Perkins: It is my understanding that at the moment the House Education and Labor Committee is conducting hearings on H.R. 514, which, if passed, will extend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of five (5) years.

While it is impossible to adequately communicate the full impact of ESEA programs upon the school children of the El Campo Independent School District of El Campo, Texas, I feel that the ESEA of 1965 is one of the best happenings to public school education in this century. We have concrete evidence of (1) Improved school attendance, (2) Improved general health of low-income students, (3) More individual instruction for students due to use of teacher aides, lower pupil-teacher ratio, and use of materials commensurate with the abilities of slow learners and (4) Successful implementation of school desegregation.

The above mentioned progress has been greatly enhanced by many provisions of the ESEA and we strongly urge the continuance of the ESEA for a minimum period of five (5) years. We are also very much in favor of legislation that would permit *forward funding*. If we are to have time to adequately plan for effective programs it is mandatory that we know how much money we will have available at least one year in advance.

We appreciate the excellent work that your committee has done in the past and we are confident that you will continue to act in the best interest of the school children of our land.

Sincerely,

Geo. E. Thigpen,
Superintendent, El Campo Independent School District.

Fort Payne, Ala.

Dear Congressman Perkins: May I take a minute of your time to tell you how valuable I feel the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been to Fort Payne City Schools.

We have profited greatly from Title I and

XUM

Title II funds. These moneys have given us an opportunity to put into our program remedial and enrichment courses that we feel have been of tremendous help, especially to those of the lower economic groups.

By actual test scores we have been able to improve the achievement level of many students. For example, in our reading program we have been able to reach students who otherwise would have been lost, as far as reading was concerned, without these Federal funds.

Your continued support of these programs would be deeply appreciated and I trust that your committee will be able to work out the program of appropriating and allocating Federal moneys at least one year in advance of the time that they would normally be available. This is most important in order to properly plan. Planning is the key to getting the most from your money, whether it be Federal, State, or local.

Those of us, who work daily toward giving every student a better opportunity, appreciates the efforts of men such as you at the national level.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. Israel,
Superintendent of Education.

Sandersville, Ga.

Dear Mr. Perkins: We very definitely need a five-year extension of the Federal funds used in the elementary and secondary education programs. It would be impossible for us to offer the type of educational advantages we now offer without these funds.

With the approximately $500,000 received in Federal funds annually we are able to provide some excellent programs including:

1. An unexcelled reading program.
2. Vocational programs:
   - (a) Industrial Arts.
   - (b) Auto Mechanics.
   - (c) Auto Body Repair.
   - (d) Brick Masonry.
   - (e) Electrical Construction.
   - (f) Distributive Education.
   - (g) Home Economics.
   - (h) Vocational Agriculture.
3. Music.
4. Art.
5. Kindergarten and Reading Program in the summer for about 600 children.
6. Free and reduced price lunches for low-income children.
7. A Basic Adult Education Program.

The continuance of these funds is a MUST for Washington County to continue the quality of education for all its citizens we now have.

Sincerely,

W. B. Ouzts, Jr.,
Superintendent of Education,
Washington County.

Washington, N.C.

Dear Mr. Perkins: Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds have served useful and needed purposes in the Beaufort County Schools. Improvements have been made in the quality of instruction and the services of the schools that otherwise would not have been available without the ESEA funds. Some of the improvements are listed below:

1. A program to strengthen learning in the language arts with emphasis on reading in grades kindergarten through eight has been instituted. Over 80% of the children who qualify for participation in the ESEA program had reading levels below the national norms.

2. Some innovations and supplements that the ESEA funds have made available are:

a. The employment of teacher aides. They render valuable assistance to the teachers.

b. The acquisition of audio visual equipment and materials.

c. Purchase of library and supplementary instructional materials.

d. The institution of a kindergarten program.

e. The institution of an in-service training program to upgrade the professional qualifications of teachers.

3. The incorporation of supportive services for economically deprived children with ESEA funds to compliment the language arts program includes:

a. Food and clothing.
b. Medical and dental services.
c. Guidance services.
d. Speech therapy.
e. Free lunches (The free lunch program has been an immense amount of help in relieving many of the children of malnutrition.)

I wish to strongly urge the appropriation of funds to continue the ESEA program. With these funds we have made great improvements in the instructional services for the children who have the greatest deficiencies in their cultural achievements.

Yours very sincerely,

W. F. Veasey,
Superintendent, Beaufort County Schools.

Mount Pleasant, Tex.

My Dear Mr. Perkins: We are writing to express our support for H.R. 514, the bill which would extend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of five years, and which would also make possible the appropriating and allocating Federal monies for school programs one year in advance of the time that they would normally be available.

As you well know, funds made available to public schools through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act make it possible for us to provide for a segment of youth that would otherwise be neglected. These programs are all educationally oriented; however, some segments such as health, nutrition and culture development programs are auxiliary, but are all developed with the accomplishment of educational objectives foremost in our minds.

Annual evaluations have proven the value of these programs to the economically and educably deprived youth of our district. This is evidenced by the fact that we are able to raise the achievement level one or more years beyond grade placement.

Further, it would be most advantageous to local educational agencies if monies were appropriated and allocated a year in advance, as it would allow for a much more systematic procedure in planning, both from the standpoint of programs to be offered as well as obtaining superior staff to carry through with the programs in terms of meeting overall and specific educational objectives.

You can rest assured that any help you might be able to give in assuring the continuation of this act, as well as securing advanced funding, will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Terrell W. Ogg,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. Speaker, as is obvious from the above statements, local school officials clearly support the 5-year extension of education programs proposed in the committee-reported bill, H.R. 514. Many more of the school officials from the Southern and Southwestern States have communicated their enthusiasm for recent Federal education enactments in their responses to the school superintendents questionnaire circulated by the committee last fall.

In another statement which I plan to insert in the Congressional Record next week, I will share with my colleagues some of the specific comments of these school officials.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. ANDREWS, DISTINGUISHED DEAN OF THE ALABAMA DELEGATION

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, March 21, 1969, marks a significant milestone in the distinguished career of the dean of our Alabama delegation, the Honorable George William Andrews. On this date, Congressman Andrews records his 25th year of service to his country.

Since his election on March 21, 1944, the voters of Alabama's Third Congressional District have returned Congressman Andrews to Washington to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Congressman Andrews is the third ranking member of the powerful Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and serves on its subcommittee which appropriates funds for defense. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and was recently appointed to serve on the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations.

While my distinguished colleague from Union Springs, Ala., is, without question, one of the most powerful and influential men now serving in the Congress, he has consistently placed the needs and well-being of his country far above any personal ambition or recognition.

It has been my good fortune to receive the advice and counsel of Congressman Andrews for many years now, and I consider it a distinct honor and privilege to call him my friend.

During my service in the Alabama State Legislature, I was privileged to serve with Congressman Andrews' late brother, the Honorable L. K. "Snag" Andrews, who was also a highly skilled dedicated public servant.

Congressman Andrews—by his dedication to the principles which have made this Nation great and his determination to look out for the welfare of every American—has become known as one of the most hard-working and knowledgeable Members ever elected to this body. Throughout these years of service, he has been strengthened and supported by his lovely wife, Elizabeth, and his son, George, and daughter, Jane Andrews Hinds.

An attorney by profession, Congressman George Andrews served as district attorney in the Third Judicial Circuit of Alabama for 12 years until he joined the Navy in 1943. He was at Pearl Harbor when the voters of the Third Congressional District elected him to Congress to fill the vacancy created by the death of the Honorable Henry B. Steagall.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join with my colleagues in the House in recognizing the lasting contributions Congressman Andrews has made to his district, State, and Nation.

XUM

As he completes his first quarter century of service, we pause to recognize his many accomplishments, then we look to the future and the continued outstanding service of this great American.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1944, 25 years ago, the Honorable GEORGE WILLIAM ANDREWS, beloved dean of our Alabama delegation took the solemn oath of office as a new Member of the U.S. Congress from Alabama.

He was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Henry B. Steagall. At the time of his election to Congress, he was serving as a lieutenant, junior grade, in the U.S. Navy. Lieutenant ANDREWS was stationed at Pearl Harbor, and had been in active duty in the Navy for some 14 months. He was released from active duty by the Navy Department to serve in the Congress.

For 14 consecutive terms, the voters of Alabama's Third Congressional District have returned Congressman ANDREWS to represent them in these hallowed Halls of Congress. Representative ANDREWS is many things to many people—to his lovely wife, Elizabeth Bullock Andrews, and to his son, George, and daughter, Jane Andrews Hinds, he is a devoted father; to every member of the armed services stationed throughout the world he is a stanch friend and a strong supporter in his dedication to strengthen the military posture in behalf of a free America; to his many constituents throughout his district and among friends who know him and respect him throughout the State of Alabama, he is the proverbial watchdog of the Treasury—a recognized conservative and a sturdy defender of preserving the rights of individual States as granted in the Constitution.

But whatever else he may be, Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS is indeed a remarkable Member of this body. As chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of Appropriations and as a member of the subcommittee acting on all appropriations related to the Department of Defense and public works throughout the country, he is one of the most powerful men in the House of Representatives. In fact, one of the national magazines recently listed him among the most 10 influential Members of the entire Congress.

Despite his strong posture in shaping the affairs of this country, our dean has no desire to become a nationally known political figure nor does he have a great host of press agents pouring out copy about him. The Congressman is willing to do his job as a member of the House Appropriations Committee without fanfare or blaring of trumpets, though he is indeed, in seniority, now the third ranking member of this powerful committee.

During his first few years in the House, the Congressman was assigned to a series of committees, including the Veterans' Committee. But he was quickly selected for the Appropriations Committee, where he has chaired the Legislative Subcommittee. Most of his work, in a 10- to 14-hour workday, is as a member of the vital Defense Subcommittee. This is the committee which is charged with spending most of our budget for the protection of the American people.

As a member of this subcommittee, GEORGE ANDREWS becomes a party to the Nation's top military secrets. Some of the greatest American scientists are not privy to what is discussed in front of Congressman ANDREWS' subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, as a junior Member of this Congress, I shall always remain grateful for the counsel and good advice Congressman ANDREWS gave me when I was a newly elected Member and I visited him in his lovely home in Union Springs, Ala. He is a tireless worker, getting to his office early and staying late. We are indeed proud of him as the dean of our delegation and wish to extend our personal congratulations on the completion of his first quarter century in the U.S. Congress.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be granted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the 25th anniversary of service of my colleague, Congressman ANDREWS of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

RAMON ROSALES, STOREKEEPER THIRD CLASS

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask your indulgence, and that of my colleagues, for just a few moments to speak about a young man who, in my opinion, is a great American. I single him out from his buddies for no other reason except that he is a Texan from the border country where I come from—a product of the heritage and culture peculiar to this little corner of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know when we will have a complete and thorough report on the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, or whether we will ever be able to make an intelligent decision on the right or the wrong of that operation, but we do know of the individual acts of courage and great valor of many of the survivors. This is one of them. Mr. Speaker, I speak of Ramon Rosales, storekeeper third class, of El Paso, Tex.

Allow me to quote from some of the testimony given by Storekeeper Rosales to the Navy Board of Inquiry:

> We had lectures with a guy we called "Specs" on decaying American democracy and religion. He'd always get mad at me. He'd always say there was no God and I would stand up and tell him there was a God.

What a beautiful statement, Mr. Speaker, from one who was under threat of death at any minute. And just listen to this young man from the border of Texas explain the presence of God:

> He asked me if I saw Him. I told him I saw Him every day in the flowers and trees. I told him that God was life.

What an eloquent statement in its simplicity. Can you not, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, imagine just for a moment the scene—a rough, arrogant Communist, indoctrinated perhaps all his life with the theory of a godless world, being confronted by a 20-year-old young man from our border country of Texas, a young man who perhaps did not have all the advantages which other Americans had and he stood there, looking the whole Communist world in the face, saying to them: "There is a God." What a simple and yet so moving confrontation. No wonder the Communist, in the words of Storekeeper Rosales, "got kind of shook up."

Again, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, listen with me to the genuine eloquence, to the inherent faith of this young man when asked what most helped him survive those 11 months of hell. He said:

> I think it was my faith in God and my country and the decisions of my commanding officer.

Indeed, we have here the expressions of a true child of God, of a patriot and a sailor, worthy of his uniform. As a further example of his explicit faith in his country, Mr. Speaker, when asked if he were a South Korean or a Filipino, he answered them, "I am an American." He used no prefix, no suffix, just pure and simple, he said, "I am an American," and then not being able to convince them, he spoke in Spanish to them and eventually convinced them so that they called him "Mexico."

Storekeeper Rosales was severely ill during the time he was imprisoned and was denied medical attention according to some of the testimony, and yet through all of this he withstood the attempts of the Communists to break his will. All Americans should be extremely proud of this young man, of his family who instilled in him such faith in God and such devotion to this country. I hope that throughout our border country of Texas of which he is a product, all Americans join in paying tribute to this young man in appropriate visits and ceremonies.

I respectfully ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all my colleagues, to join with me in extending to Ramon Rosales, storekeeper third class, U.S. Navy, our best wishes and our commendation for his behavior in the face of the enemy, and our strong support of the faith and devotion which he professed for God and country and in extending to his family and his friends our felicitations for having given our country and the world what we should proudly call "a man."

NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT OF 1969

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and, to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision prohibiting a joint operating venture by two Tuscon newspapers demands immediate attention and action by the Congress. The 20th century has witnessed not the

XUM

growth, but the gradual demise of the newspaper industry, as many of our Nation's papers have been unable to cope with rising production costs and the competition with other media for advertising revenue.

In an attempt to resolve these economic factors, newspapers in 22 cities across the country have entered into joint operating arrangements, whereby only the commercial functions are merged but competing news and editorial voices are maintained.

The role of the press has become increasingly important in our society. Newspapers have continually demonstrated their ability to affect policy decisions at the local, State, and Federal levels. We have been fortunate in this country to foster and maintain differing editorial opinions and I believe there is untold advantage in continuing to make all views available to the public. Our democracy was founded on the precept that every man should have a voice in determining the direction his country progresses. As the United States has continued to grow to a nation of 200 million people, the press has performed valuably in reporting and commenting on the news of the day for the benefit of the American citizenry. The opportunity to read and hear diverse opinion on current issues of importance is vital to every American. What I fear is that such an opportunity will be lost to the people in the 22 cities across this Nation who presently benefit from two newspaper voices operating under a joint arrangement. Thomas Jefferson once said:

> The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left for me to decide whether we should have government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

While I do not feel it was the intention of our former President to advocate either course of action, the poignancy of his remarks is not unrelated to the situation facing us today as a result of the Supreme Court's decision.

Every citizen should have access to all shades of news and if this decision is sustained, thousands of people will be limited to one newspaper voice in their cities. The divergent reportorial efforts and subsequent commentaries of two newspapers in a community must not be allowed to die.

In Cleveland we are privileged to have the outstanding services of the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard publication, and the Cleveland Plain Dealer published by Newhouse. In their efforts to promote social causes, both papers are invaluable not only to me but to our mutual constituencies. It would be a disaster for Cleveland if we were faced with the loss of one of these voices.

I believe we in the Congress have a duty not only to support but to encourage the participation by the press in forming public opinion and in determining governmental policy decisions. Accordingly, I have joined several Members of the House in introducing the Newspaper Preservation Act of 1969 to allow two newspapers which have entered into a "joint newspaper operating arrangement" to be treated as a single entity under the antitrust laws. I am convinced of the need to act promptly to preserve competition in news and editorial policies of papers that, affected by the Supreme Court decision, may be forced to merge or fold.

THE HIGH PRICE OF LUMBER AND PLYWOOD

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I need not define for the House here today the nature of the tremendous crisis facing the Nation's housing program.

This House Committee on Banking and Currency has already announced hearings to look into that matter. Our concern is known.

But I would today like to ask this House to consider the opportunities inherent in this crisis, not only for solutions to the problems immediately at hand, but for initiating one of the most dynamic conservation programs of all times.

You are familiar with the housing goals we have already established. In the Housing Act of 1968 we set our national goal at 26 million housing units in the next 10 years—or an average of 2.6 million new homes every year, with 6 million of the total to be built for our disadvantaged citizens.

Other nations who look to us for part of their raw materials have set similar goals. Japan hopes to build nearly 2 million housing units this year, more than it has ever built in any 1 year any time in its history.

Tragically, though, as far as this country is concerned, these goals will not be met. Economists had forecast 1.6 million new home starts in the Nation this year, a whole million less than we had hoped for. But now—as a result of the price crunch that alarms us all—the experts predict we will fall 200,000 units short of that.

It is clear we cannot permit the program to properly house Americans to become stalled. The urban unrest we feel in this country is real. We must provide the means and the material to meet our housing goals. We must have good housing. And we must have it soon.

All building material prices are certainly an important part of the problem we face, but they are only part.

Mortgage rates also have gone up. Land costs have increased. Labor costs have climbed. And combined, they have imposed a serious burden on the Nation's homebuyer in every income bracket, but most particularly in the low- and middle-income groups.

I am not now going to attempt to discuss all the factors behind the increases except to say that we need to be concerned with each of them. But I can tell you that the reason behind the material price increase, particularly as it applies to lumber and plywood products, can be linked to the very basic functions of supply and demand.

The soaring costs, quite simply, can be traced directly to a shortage of raw material and, therefore, can be eliminated only if we remove the problems causing the shortage.

The forest products industry has been doing its utmost to meet material demands from uncommitted log supplies, that is, log available for domestic processing into lumber and plywood.

Last year the industry produced a record 14 billion square feet of plywood, and more than 30 billion board feet of softwood lumber, with a large percentage of both consumed by residential construction.

This year, both industries expect to produce more, but not as much as the market will require.

The plywood industry, for example, estimates it will produce 15.9 billion feet this year, while the demand will exceed 16.2 billion feet at February price levels.

It would take an estimated 8 billion board feet of additional lumber and plywood just to fill the gap between what the homebuilding industry expects to build at 1.6 million units, and the ideal goal of 2.6 million set in the 1968 Housing Act. The impact of the shortage on the price of raw material has been most severe.

Log prices in the woods of Oregon have soared to frightening heights.

From 1962 to early 1968, stumpage prices roughly quadrupled. In the 12 months between the last quarter of 1967 and the last quarter of 1968 the stumpage prices for west coast Douglas-fir rose from $42.70 to $92.90 a thousand board feet.

An excellent example of the intense competition to obtain scarce softwood lumber for processing occurred this week in my district. The timber was 70 to 80 years old and of a type found in the BLM's "Tillmook Intensive Young Growth Project." It was a thinning sale being offered by the BLM on Bell Mountain. The BLM cruisers had estimated the thinning to contain 1.3 million board feet of timber. Industry's estimate was 1.1 million. The appraisal price of $58 per thousand on BLM's volume estimate was the minimum acceptable in this Government timber sale. After intense competition, this sale finally sold for approximately $120 per thousand. Additional road costs, harvesting, and so forth, will make this thinning material delivered to the mill cost $170 to $180 per thousand before it ever is manufactured into lumber or plywood. And this from thinnings that do not produce the quality veneers needed for our best grades of sanded plywood.

I find this—as my State finds it—one of the most alarming aspects of the entire situation. Mills face the frightening possibility that should market prices fall they will be unable to use the high-cost material they have already agreed to purchase.

But what of the challenges and the opportunities I spoke about?

It is obvious, I think, that if we are to relieve the shortage, we must in some way find additional raw material, for added raw materials would not only relieve the pressure on prices bid for new

XUM

materials but permit the industry to supply all of the building material necessary to house Americans.

We in Congress have talked in terms of short-range solutions for many, many years. And there is a need to talk about them today. Such Federal timber selling programs as high-cost, low-return salvage and thinning sales, made possible by the extreme shortage of timber for processing and the usually high product market for sales and in currently underdeveloped Rocky Mountain forests, are needed and welcomed. But they beg the solution to the total problem. It is a Band-aid approach to a deep gash.

Most desperately needed is a long-term solution to the problem. One, that, as I said, could become the most dynamic conservation program of all time.

In reality, I suggest nothing new. What I propose here has been tested and proven by private industry and Government in the timber producing Pacific Northwest.

I speak, of course, about the introduction of the most modern forest management techniques into the operation of our national forests. I speak of high intensity forest management known by some as the management of the high yield forest, by others as the management of the dynamic forest and by all, as a means of producing more timber within a shorter span of time.

It is modern forestry, involving precommercial and commercial thinnings—reforestation with super trees, genetics, and fertilization—using every known method of making trees grow more rapidly.

The concept is not new. We pioneered such developments in agriculture years ago. And, as a result, we have new varieties of corn and wheat and new breeds of pork and beef which attest to the validity of the effort.

The increases in production that we could get in timber from our national forests by adopting such a program could be enormous. They could be more spectacular than anything of this kind ventured by Government before.

Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, told the Senate Small Business Committee last November that allowable cuts could in time be increased about at least two-thirds by such practices on the more productive portions of the national forests.

Some foresters in my home State of Oregon have predicted even more substantial gains.

Oregon, as I have told all of you many times, is the Nation's No. 1 forest State. Forest products bring $1.5 billion into the State's economy every year. The State's forest industry has an annual payroll of $600 million and provides more than 85,000 jobs.

And we produce a quarter of all the softwood lumber and half of the softwood plywood in the entire Nation.

And in Oregon, we must rely for most of our timber supply on Federal lands. Federal agencies control 57.8 percent of the 26.6 million acres of forests and almost 65 percent of the softwood timber volume in our State.

It should be obvious, then, that Oregon's ability to help the Nation meet its housing needs will depend, in large part, on just how the Federal Government manages the lands its controls.

At the Senate Small Business hearings, Mr. Wesley Rickard, an independent forest consultant and economist, said that the annual allowable cut in the national forests of the region, in his opinion, could be increased anywhere from 60 to 136 percent by the adoption of the high-yield program.

He estimated we could harvest 340 million board feet of timber more than is being harvested now on one of our Oregon national forests and as high as an additional 320 million board feet on another.

The State of Washington's Department of Natural Resources originated several years ago as a result of Washington State legislative action during the time one of our colleagues, then a member of that body, ably guided its creation. That department of natural resources now under the direction of Lands Commissioner Bert Cole also has been able to increase its harvest from 469 million board feet in 1959 to 774 million board feet for the 1970 decade, with the adoption of similar sound forestry practices.

And the Weyerhaeuser Co., which is intensifying forest management on its lands through a high yield forestry program, expects to increase growth by more than one-third.

It seems to me that we have no alternative but to adopt the same type programs on our Federal lands. Needs of the Nation and the conditions of the raw material pressures on our forests make such a program imperative.

The effort, of course, will require adequate funding. It will require a businesslike management approach. But it will not call for a big spending program. In fact, it will involve, in most instances, simply a compression of expenditures that would have been necessary even if such a program were not adopted.

We would simply require immediate funds for reforestation, for low-cost, minimum-standard access roads, for concentrated fertilization, thinning, all of the techniques that modern forestry practice should require anyway.

I do not mean to infer here that adoption of a high-yield program for a national forest will solve every ill immediately. We need to review the present timber sale policies of the Forest Service to make sure that timber ready for sale and available for sale is, in fact, put up for auction.

We must remedy any manpower shortages which may hamper sales efforts. At the same time new and better efficiencies in manpower utilization in Federal timber management agencies might be devised. We must help where we can in making certain that railcars are available for shipping products produced, listing only a few of the immediate problems that will also need our consideration. The recent ICC order is an important step in alleviating the perennial boxcar/flatcar shortage and the ICC should be commended for finally having acted to resolve this year's shortage.

I have not yet touched on changes in log export regulations for I feel that first we must look at and resolve the biggest problem in our timber supply question—that of achieving a high level of forest management on our public forest lands and a high level of harvest commensurate with management. Certainly with Americans investing greater sums in high intensity forest management in their public forests they have a right to expect the higher returns in wood products suitable for American homes.

It, therefore, becomes increasingly evident that some further accommodations must be achieved with the overseas users of our softwood logs. Further joint clarification and effort is needed to determine the quantity of softwood products available for export but certainly the volume should not be at the expense of our Americans in need of proper housing. I believe the present high softwood log price situation may temporarily have relieved export pressures.

Today's high priced logs are probably less attractive to export buyers than they were in months past. However, we will find the big crunch occurring this summer when the log export buying interests again enter the timber buying market in the West and this time possibly in the southeastern pine forests of the United States.

I would like to close my plea today for the establishment of high-yield forests on national forest lands, with an additional plea to conservationists to join the fight. The youth and his family in the ghetto to whom we have been promising adequate housing has every bit as much a vested interest in our national forests and its products as a naturalist and recreationist who wants the pristine wilderness of that forest all for his own personal enjoyment. The great national forests belong to every person and every segment of our country.

I am proud of my record as a conservationist and for my support in obtaining wilderness and recreation areas for the use of the many who find the Nation's forests and its wilderness their particular type of enjoyment. I am not advocating nor have I ever advocated a policy of cut and run. Those days are gone forever. What I am advocating is that some of the income derived from the sale of timber products from our national forests be applied to paying for the intensified forest management on the Federal lands. Private industry is doing this most profitably and successfully—the State of Washington is doing this profitably and successfully. The U.S. Department of Defense is doing this profitably and successfully. While this will require some more Federal dollars now, it is an established fact also that for every dollar spent today in high-level intensified forest management several additional dollars are returned to the Federal Treasury.

The result of each increased investment in our Federal forest management during the past several years has been a substantial increase in wood production and a substantial profit in dollars plus the wise use, not the wasteful disuse, of a renewable resource.

In the outgoing administration's budget it was estimated that the cash receipts from our national forests would be $237.6 million. Largely because of the increased price of stumpage, the Forest Service now testifies that there will be an additional $100 million of revenues received by the Government over and above the estimate previously made and contained in the Johnson budget. Even a small portion of this additional money plowed back into intensive management with assurances for necessary additional regular financing in the future would permit very substantial increases in our Forest Service timber harvest. The program announced by the White House yesterday for a small supplemental request for the Forest Service, plus a very few million dollars additional moneys for fiscal 1970 is encouraging evidence of the concern over the supply of raw material. It is, however, totally inadequate to have any meaningful effect on the current high prices of lumber and plywood and I would like to be confident that this is only the first short step toward really resolving this problem.

It is about time the Federal forests are managed in a real businesslike basis and that the public agencies we are charging with this management are not subjected to the almost impossible handicaps inherent in the present Bureau of the Budget and appropriation policies and procedures.

Again, I emphasize for each of my colleagues that this program can be adopted easily within the framework of the sustained yield concept. In other words, our forests can be maintained profitably under this program without a reduction in the number or the size of our forests. My friends in the conservation movement should realistically be aware of the fact that the intelligent promotion of this plan will provide more recreation areas, more wildlife, and more access to those wishing to use our forests for recreation—national forests belonging to every citizen in our country.

OUTLOOK FOR OUR AVIATION AND AVIATION INDUSTRIES

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the toughest problems we face in the continued growth of our country concerns the outlook for our aviation and aviation industries.

The day used to be that aviation was the dedicated hobby of only a few venturesome souls, but this is now far from the situation. Aviation has become one of the most dynamic moving forces in keeping our country on the move, and this growth, while it has been good, has also presented us with many problems.

Probably the single greatest need in development of our airports and air systems is that of reconciling the need for tremendously expanded technical development, with the desirability for keeping aviation open to as many enthusiasts as possible. This problem comes to us at a time which is critical and important, because of the tremendous demands and congestion recently being seen at many of our leading airports.

These problems of congestion are not important simply because they cause greatly lengthened delays to the passenger and wasted utilization of our air equipment. They are also important because of the very serious and critical challenges they make to aviation safety.

As we have heard the term so ominously expressed before, many of our major airports already have reached the point of saturation. This is an apt and telling description of the probable consequences of letting the problem go unchecked. Because if we allow the manner of handling air traffic in and out of our major population centers to progress as we have done in the past, then we will go beyond the point of saturation and will literally see a flood of devastation and disaster fall upon us.

Already we have reached the point at which control requires upward of a dozen tiers of circling traffic patterns. It does not take much imagination to realize the danger inherent in such a situation and sadly enough, we have a grim history of the type of failures I mention. Perhaps the single most shocking crash was the collision several years ago between two airliners over Metropolitan New York City.

We simply must get started on ways to provide broad-based planning and action to get the airports we need, and to get them in convenient but safe locations. We must work to improve safety procedures in the use of airways and air systems. And we must do this in such a way to promote fair and equitable access by all users.

The problem is going to get worse before it gets better. One regrettable fact in the development of airport and air systems is that a 2- or 3-year leadtime is required to bring about remedies to the needs which already exist.

To attack the problem on the scale necessary to get us back on top of our advance in technology will require the efforts of the Federal Government and of all aviation users.

It is against the backdrop of this critical series of problems that I am introducing today and in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), a package of legislative remedies, designed to find the approaches which will provide the greatest possible measure of self-help in the field of aviation.

I am introducing a package of bills—one to create and levy a reasonable number of taxes on most segments of the aviation industry; and the other to utilize these taxes in a newly created aviation trust fund. It is my goal in sponsoring this legislation to tap all possible sources of aviation use, in order that each segment bear some portion of the tremendous cost needed for aviation development over the coming years.

It is my feeling that each part of the industry will have to pay its fair share, and I am hopeful that this approach will meet with the approval of the groups and individuals involved in this complex and interwoven field.

At this point, I would like to go over the first of the two bills I am introducing, the tax measure. This bill calls for revenues from the following sources:

First, a tax of 2 cents a gallon on fuel and gasoline used in commercial flights, with the provision that half of this amount shall be granted back to the airports served by the scheduled carriers to be applied toward the operation and maintenance expenses of those airports;

Second, a tax of 8 cents a gallon on fuel and gasoline used in other types of flights—another provision in the second bill allows a refund of 4 cents a gallon to the State in which the retail sale occurred in order that the State might improve its own general aviation programs and services;

Third, an increased passenger tax on commercial flights from 5 to 8 percent; and,

Fourth, a new tax of 3 percent on airfreight.

Mr. Speaker, another source which probably should be tapped is in international air travel. We have heard a lot about a passenger tax and in all probability, I will offer an amendment to these bills calling for a tax of $1 or $2 per person on all international air travelers departing or coming into the United States. I understand that $1 tax probably would raise about $45 million annually, and this might be one of the areas to be considered in our committee deliberations on a fair allocation of the costs.

Fifth. At this point, I would also like to note that the second bill provides for an authorization of U.S. Treasury appropriations of up to $300 million annually into the airport and airways trust fund.

You can see this approach calls on all parties to make a contribution to improvement of the system: general aviation; commercial aviation; airline passengers; air shippers; and the Federal Government.

All of the revenues and appropriations marked from the above sources are, pursuant to the second bill, pooled into the airport and airways trust fund.

In setting these proposals out, however, I wish strongly to note that I am not, in suggesting tax levels and percentages, attempting to make a hard and fast judgment about the relative level of contributions to be obtained from each of the sources mentioned. Instead, I am simply trying to draw a rough approximation as to what would be a fair distribution of the cost, and I would hope that hearings on this measure would provide clearer evidence as to how many dollars of revenue we are speaking of when we mention, say, a tax of 8 cents a gallon.

In contemplating the intricate forces at work in aviation, I came to the conclusion that the Commerce Committee or the Ways and Means Committee would have difficulty in making a final judgment about how to allocate the costs without the benefit of some kind of history under taxes and revenues at various levels. It is for this reason that the second bill contains a provision under which the Secretary of Transportation shall undertake a 2-year study "respecting the appropriate method for allocating the cost of the airport and airway system among the various users and shall identify the costs for the Federal Government."

In commenting on this second bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed to a more detailed explanation of its provisions.

As indicated earlier, the bill creates a trust fund, much like the Federal highway trust fund. The name of this fund is to be the airport and airways trust fund, and it will be administered under the Department of Transportation. All of the taxes specified in the tax measure will be earmarked for this fund. Moreover, there is a provision for allowing contributions by the Federal Government.

Moneys from the trust fund shall be available for expenditure of grants authorized to be made by the provisions of the Federal Airport Act.

Also, the bill authorizes trust fund expenditures to acquire, establish and improve ~~air~~ navigation facilities and for a ~~number~~ of other activities, including the operation and maintenance of air navigation facilities and research and development activities as they relate to safety.

In addition to the authorized expenditures, the Secretary of Transportation, as manager of the trust fund, is empowered to guarantee airport development loans. The type of loan covered by this provision is a "hard" loan which affords a reasonable assurance of redemption or repayment.

Moreover, the loans must be made under such terms as the Secretary deems are necessary to assure that the airport development made pursuant to such loans does have adequate financial backing for its completion.

The maturity of loans which may be guaranteed under this portion of the bill is a maximum of 30 years, and the total amount of loans outstanding at any one time may not exceed $1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the new tax of 8 cents a gallon imposed on all flights other than scheduled and supplemental carriers is subject to a refund of 50 percent to the State in which the retail sale occurred in order that such State might improve its general aviation programs.

Once the State has qualified and received this refund, it shall be used only to carry out a comprehensive State aviation program which is designed to promote, encourage and develop civil aeronautics in that State, "properly adapted to the present and future needs of such State for an air-transportation system, and not inconsistent with the promotion, encouragement, and development of a national air-transportation system."

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned briefly earlier, the revenue provision calling for a 2 cents a gallon levy on commercial aviation fuel and gasoline is also subject to a provision whereby half is earmarked for a specific use.

In order to assure that there is a balanced approach on the issue of providing services back to the various aviation users, my bill includes a provision for airport operations grants to those airports served by commercial carriers. Specifically, the Secretary of Transportation is directed to grant half of the 2-cent commercial fuel tax to the "sponsors of public airports and [such funds] shall be available for expenditure solely for expenses (not otherwise eligible for Federal financial assistance) directly related to the operation or maintenance of a public airport providing services to air carriers engaged in air transportation."

In establishing a formula for making such operations grants, the Secretary shall take into consideration the number of air carriers serving the airport concerned, including the equipment, accommodations, facilities and services provided the public by the carriers at such airport. Also, he shall consider the immediate and future needs for airport services at such airport, and the geographic distribution of operational grants as they will promote the development of a national airport system.

Mr. Speaker, the final major portion of the Airport and Airways Development Act deals with an extension of the Federal Airport Act, to authorize appropriations totaling $665 million over a 5-year period. This extension is of those grant provisions which have already provided a greatly improved standard of service at airports all across the country. Moreover, there is an authorization of $15 million over a 5-year period for carrying out the Federal Airport Act in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. There is also a specific section calling for an authorization of $70 million over a 5-year period for the purpose of developing "airports, the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion of airports having high-density traffic serving other segments of aviation."

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I believe the main thrust of these bills should be clear. The message is that if we are going to continue to have an air system which can respond to the demands of all users, then we should create a system by which each user bears his pro rata share of the cost.

I have attempted in this bill to reach out as far as possible to tap those sources of revenue which legitimately should bear a portion of the cost. I have attempted to create a permanent system which has the flexibility to grow in the same way we all know that aviation will grow in this country.

In the long run, I believe we cannot ignore this problem a moment longer. Already, we are seeing evidence that the system is saturated to the point at which some of the users are being relegated to different roles—not by conscious choice, but simply because there is now no other alternative safely to handle the situation.

I say this situation cannot last much longer, and I am hopeful that we can obtain quick hearings on these measures, and on others to achieve this same goal.

OUTLOOK FOR AVIATION AND AVIATION INDUSTRIES

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) and join in coauthoring the legislation that he just explained to the House.

I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, J. J. PICKLE, in cosponsoring legislation today to create a national airport and airways trust fund and to advance the "coordinated national plan of airport and airways systems."

Many here will recall that in August of 1967, I addressed this chamber on the subject of "The Growing Crisis of the Lack of Airports," under a 1-hour special order.

In those remarks, I outlined my general impressions of the aviation situation in America as follows:

First. The United States is facing an airport crisis of immense proportions.

Second. There is no concentrated and coordinated comprehensive program of airport improvement in this country.

Third. It is my strong and carefully considered opinion that the present national airport plan is out of date even before it is completed.

Fourth. The economic growth of this country can never reach its full potential unless and until we update our airport and transportation systems.

Fifth. The political leadership in this country must immediately embark on a program to establish a coordinated national plan of integrated airport systems.

In addition, I said that two basic requirements were needed—adoption of a "coordinated national plan of airport and airways systems," and a recommended method of financing such a plan.

In regard to financing, I have long advocated establishment of an airport and airways trust fund similar to our trust fund for highways so as to permit each of these modes of transportation to go forward together in the most efficient, coordinated, and integrated manner.

The legislative package which Mr. PICKLE and I have coauthored and are introducing today is designed to indicate and suggest ways and means the necessary funds can be acquired to carry out the creation and development of a "coordinated national plan of airport and airway systems."

This legislative "package" contains two bills.

The first creates revenues from various aspects of the aviation industry, as follows:

First. A 2-cent tax per gallon on fuel and gasoline used for commercial air flights,

Second. An 8-cent tax per gallon on fuel and gasoline used in other types of flights,

Third. An increased passenger tax on commercial flights from 5 to 8 percent, and

Fourth. A new tax of 3 percent on air freight.

The second bill provides for a U.S. Treasury authorization of up to $300 million annually into the newly created airport and airways trust fund.

XUM

Mr. PICKLE has already outlined the details and intricacies of each of these bills so I will not duplicate what he has said.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that there are many diverse views on how best we can and should finance an airport and airway system and I am certain that many aviation groups and interests will not fully agree on every aspect of this proposed legislation.

However, time is running out. Perhaps the only way we can expect to arrive at a successful conclusion, will be through the deliberative process and one of primary objectives of this legislation is to get us pointed in that direction without any further delay.

Quite frankly, I believe hearings should be scheduled soon to consider this and other legislative proposals that have been advanced to help resolve the serious airport and airway crisis that is worsening with each passing day. In this regard, I am hopeful that the Aeronautics and Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will also consider some of the excellent recommendations recently made by the aviation industry itself.

One of the most recent proposals to evolve comes from a group of leading general-aviation airplane, engine, and avionics manufacturers, as follows:

First. Airways user charges: For general aviation, an avgas and jet fuel tax of 8 cents per gallon for the first year, 9 cents for the second year and 10 cents for the third. For the airlines, 6 percent on domestic and overseas passenger tickets; 2 percent on international tickets; 3 percent on domestic and international freight.

Second. Pro rata shares of total charge for airways use: Airlines, 50 percent; general aviation, 20 percent; and Government, 30 percent.

Third: Airports: Trust fund, would be set up with its source an additional 2-percent tax on airline domestic passenger tickets and $2 per head on international passengers. Federal aid to airports, would be continued on same 50–50 basis. Its funds would go principally to small hubs, general aviation airports and V–STOL facilities and would include ILS.

I further believe the airlines transportation industry has some excellent improvement recommendations to make. They are concerned over the fuel and gasoline tax but tend to support the "ticket tax" approach. The committees should carefully evaluate each of these "alternative" proposals.

The Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association and the American Association of Airport Executives have both advanced very intriguing and exciting proposals for airport development that merit close consideration. The AOPA has recommended formulating a public corporate entity similar to the telephone and Comsat approach.

In addition, I urge Congress and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to carefully review the recent paper prepared and distributed by the AOPA regarding the development of an integrated airport and airway system similar to that which I have advanced.

Mr. Speaker, in this legislative package, Mr. PICKLE and I have attempted to make one message crystal clear, and this is the message—if the United States is to have a truly effective and visionary airport and airways system that is responsive to the needs of all users, then each user should bear a pro rata share of the cost. But there is one other very definite fact of life—the general public will benefit tremendously by the implementation of this airport system. Therefore, they should pay an equitable portion of the airway system operating and maintenance costs.

While we can and should study, debate, and if necessary modify the formula that is ultimately conceived—the overwhelming need for such a fund is abundantly clear and totally justified.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we in the Congress must now attack the airport and airway crisis problem in America on a scale that will permit our knowledge and expertise to catch up with the lag that now exists. The safety of our skies and the full economic growth potential of our Nation is at stake.

This legislative package, in my judgment, is a giant step forward in that direction. I hope that all Members will join in taking the initiative—we need everyone's ideas and recommendations.

Frankly, the name calling and bickering that exists in the entire aviation community must come to a halt. I have a favorite expression that I would like to share with my colleagues, "progress is born as a result of a clash of ideas mutually dedicated to a common goal."

Today, we have submitted an idea, legislatively, toward a common goal—the best balanced, coordinated, and integrated airport system in the world.

Far reaching? You bet. But, not too big for a great nation made up of big men.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

(Mr. RUMSFELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing another copy of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969, which carries the names of 17 additional cosponsors. This brings the total of cosponsors of this legislation to 92, testifying to the broad support in Congress for self-reform.

Change and self-renewal have become a theme of our times, and the need to update, modernize, and adapt is as pressing a problem for the National Legislature as for other institutions. The case for congressional reorganization is particularly pressing in that it has been more than two decades since we last retooled our legislative machinery. The 92 cosponsors of this legislation are committed to legislative reform in this session of the 91st Congress.

It is my hope that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, members of both parties, will commit themselves to the reform movement by cosponsoring bills providing for legislative reorganization.

The following statement of March 4 by the House Republican policy committee clearly reiterates our party's commitment to bring the rules and procedures of the Congress into the 20th century:

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

"Congress itself must be reorganized and modernized as a co-equal branch of government." (Republican platform, Aug. 7, 1968.)

"The awesome problems of today and the challenges of the 70's demand an efficient and effective Congress. Unless Congress is strengthened and new procedures and techniques developed, there is grave danger that the historic role of Congress as an essential check on the massive power of the Executive may be dangerously diluted. Legislation is needed to update and modernize Congress." (Republican policy committee statement, May 10, 1967.)

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives are determined to bring the rules and procedures of Congress into the 20th Century. Only by accomplishing legislative reorganization, only by equipping itself with the machinery fitted to the times, can Congress succeed in shaping laws that cope with the complex problems of modern society.

The bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, established by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate in the 89th Congress, has thoroughly studied the organization of the Legislative Branch. Its report sets forth numerous recommendations for improved structural changes and operational procedures of the Congress. In light of these recommendations, legislation has been introduced which proposes the following major improvements:

1. The establishment of a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with continuing authority to study the structure and procedures of Congress and to recommend additional reforms and changes.

2. The protection of the rights of the minority through the provision of additional committee staff, the right to file minority views in committee reports, the provision of equal time on conference reports, and the right to schedule witnesses during at least one day of committee hearings.

3. The authorization of measures designed to assist Members of Congress in the performance of their Congressional duties. Such measures would include enlarging committee staffs, strengthening and improving the Legislative Reference Service, and authorizing committees to employ consultants on an interim basis in order to take advantage of expertise in various fields of knowledge.

4. The implementation of fiscal controls and budgetary reforms that would include (1) a greater utilization of the General Accounting Office, (2) a multiple-year financial projection of programs, (3) the updating of the budget on June 1 of each year, and (4) the requirement that responsible Executive Department officials testify before the Appropriations Committee of each House within 30 days after the budget is presented to Congress.

5. The requirement that each standing committee upgrade its oversight function by the review and study, on a continuing basis, of the regulations, procedures, practices and policies of the Government, pertaining to the application, operation, administration and execution of the laws which are within the jurisdiction of the committee.

6. The more thorough supervision of lobbying activities.

7. The establishment of a Bill of Rights for committees that would require announcement of record votes, permit a majority to compel the filing of a report or a bill, prohibit the use of proxies, and require the printing of committee rules at the beginning of each session.

Republicans have long urged Congres-

XUM

> sional reform. Their dedication to the improvement of the legislative branch is reflected in: (1) the establishment of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing during the 89th and 90th Congresses, (2) the House Republican Policy Committee Statement of May 10, 1967, cited above, (3) the Policy Committee Statement of October 10, 1966, (4) the resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the House Republican Conference on October 11, 1967, and (5) the Congressional reform plank in the National Republican Platform of 1968.
>
> The need for a modernized Congress has never been more urgent than today.
>
> The House Republican Policy Committee reendorses the recommendations of its May 10, 1967 statement and urges the prompt enactment of legislation to modernize and improve the Legislative Branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the list of cosponsors of this legislation demonstrates that the Republican commitment to legislative reorganization is broad in terms of both geography and seniority. Sponsors of this legislative reorganization legislation as of this date number 92 and include:

John B. Anderson, of Illinois;
J. Glenn Beall, Jr., of Maryland;
Edward G. Biester, Jr., of Pennsylvania;
Benjamin B. Blackburn, of Georgia;
W. E. "Bill" Brock, of Tennessee;
Donald G. Brotzman, of Colorado;
Garry Brown, of Michigan;
James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina;
John Buchanan, of Alabama;
J. Herbert Burke, of Florida;
George Bush, of Texas;
Daniel E. Button, of New York;
John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin;
William T. Cahill, of New Jersey;
Don H. Clausen, of California;
James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire;
Barber B. Conable, Jr., of New York;
Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts;
R. Lawrence Coughlin, of Pennsylvania;
Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska;
John R. Dellenback, of Oregon;
David W. Dennis, of Indiana;
John J. Duncan, of Tennessee;
Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey;
Jack Edwards, of Alabama;
John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois;
Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan;
Edwin D. Eshleman, of Pennsylvania;
Paul Findley, of Illinois;
Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York;
Louis Frey, Jr., of Florida;
James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania;
James R. Grover, Jr., of New York;
Charles S. Gubser, of California;
Gilbert Gude, of Maryland;
Seymour Halpern, of New York;
Orval Hansen, of Idaho;
James Harvey, of Michigan;
James F. Hastings, of New York;
Craig Hosmer, of California;
Edward Hutchinson, of Michigan;
Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts;
Thomas S. Kleppe, of North Dakota;
Dan Kuykendall, of Tennessee;
John Kyl, of Iowa;
Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah;
Manuel Lujan, of New Mexico;
Donald E. Lukens, of Ohio;
Robert McClory, of Illinois;
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., of California;
James A. McClure, of Idaho;
Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota;
Catherine May, of Washington;
Thomas J. Meskill, of Connecticut;
Robert H. Michel, of Illinois;
Chester L. Mize, of Kansas;
F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts;
Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland;
Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio;
Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota;
Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington;
Jerry L. Pettis, of California;
Alexander Pirnie, of New York;
Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota;
Tom Railsback, of Illinois;
Ogden R. Reid, of New York;
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., of Michigan;
Howard W. Robison, of New York;
William V. Roth, Jr., of Delaware;
Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois;
Philip E. Ruppe, of Michigan;
Charles W. Sandman, Jr., of New Jersey;
John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania;
Herman T. Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania;
Fred Schwengel, of Iowa;
Keith G. Sebelius, of Kansas;
Garner E. Shriver, of Kansas;
J. William Stanton, of Ohio;
Sam Steiger, of Arizona;
William A. Steiger, of Wisconsin;
Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio;
Fletcher Thompson, of Georgia;
Guy Vander Jagt, of Michigan;
Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., of Connecticut;
Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio;
G. William Whitehurst, of Virginia;
Larry Winn, Jr., of Kansas;
John Wold, of Wyoming;
Wendell Wyatt, of Oregon;
John W. Wydler, of New York;
Roger H. Zion, of Indiana; and
John M. Zwach, of Minnesota.

EXAMINATION TO BE MADE OF CONTROVERSIAL CENSUS QUESTION ISSUE

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are well aware, there is considerable controversy surrounding the approaching 1970 census.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, I intend to undertake a complete examination of the controversial census question issue. This investigation will commence at a hearing scheduled for 10 a.m., Monday, March 31, 1969.

This issue is of vital importance. The 1970 census will directly involve every household in this country. The American public is concerned regarding the content and number of questions that are contemplated for the 1970 census forms. It is clear that a comprehensive review of the program must be initiated.

These hearings, Mr. Speaker, will be the first comprehensive hearings on the census dispute. Furthermore, I hope to hold some of the subsequent hearings in key areas around the country, in order that our committee might hear firsthand what various public officials, educators, and businessmen have to say about the census. My objective will be to determine whether the procedures, questions, and use of the information obtained by the Census Bureau is honestly beneficial to our people, or simply a convenience to various special interests.

Congressman Betts, along with others among my colleagues, has raised questions which have placed doubts in our minds as to the need of threats of a jail sentence for not answering census questions, the need to make the answering of all questions mandatory, and the need for asking certain questions that seem to be of a very personal nature. While I do not necessarily agree with all the statements Mr. Betts has made or all the conclusions he has drawn, we are indebted to him for the contribution he has made in raising the issue.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I plan to do whatever is necessary to formulate census procedures that meet the needs of our National, State, and local governments without invading the privacy of our citizens.

DOOR-TO-DOOR FRAUD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Halpern) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a Jamaica, N.Y., housewife was told by a door-to-door salesman that she could keep a set of encyclopedias to show her husband—no obligation—just sign here.

A Queens Village woman was given a low-key sales pitch by a door-to-door salesman selling magazines. When she indicated she was not interested, he said he was working for an antipoverty program and accused her of refusing to help the poor "get ahead in life." Intimidated, she subsequently purchased $100 in magazines she neither wanted nor needed.

A Bayside housewife bought a vacuum cleaner from a door-to-door salesman at what she thought was a bargain price. She later found out that she was obligated, over a 2-year period, to pay an amount three times the department store price for the same item.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of fraudulent sales practices which many door-to-door solicitors engage in, in order to dupe the unsuspecting housewife into buying their product.

I have long believed that we must protect the housewife, who is unprepared for the high-pressure deceptive techniques employed by the professional salesman when he appears uninvited and unannounced at her door.

After hearing his sales pitch, she may sign a contract for what initially appears to be a bargain price, only to learn later that she has been grossly misled. By then, however, it is too late, and she and her family are saddled with large payments on unwanted and excessively costly items.

In an attempt to tighten controls on these and other such door-to-door sales frauds, I am today introducing legislation to provide a "cooling off period" during which the consumer can reconsider his purchase. Under this proposed legislation, the customer can rescind the sale if he acts within a reasonable period of time.

The buyer would have the right to do so, if he notifies the seller of this desire in writing, either by letter postmarked no later than midnight of the second business day following the initial purchase, or by letter hand-delivered to the office of the seller not later than midnight of the second business day following the purchase.

The seller would also be required to inform the customer in clear, precise terms, of his right to rescind the contract within that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill has an excellent chance of passage in the 91st Congress because it is long overdue, and because of the increased public awareness of the need for consumer protection legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support.

RACKETEER INFILTRATION OF LEGITIMATE BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, there is no graver threat to our competitive, free-enterprise economic system than racketeer infiltration of legitimate business. Apparently this phenomenon is growing. The State of New York Commission of Investigation has been conducting a continuous inquiry into the influence of organized crime in that State and yesterday the chairman of the commission testified before a subcommittee in the other body as follows:

> Despite all the efforts thus far made by various law enforcement agencies, it must be acknowledged that organized criminal activities continue. Much has been and is being accomplished by Federal and local authorities to slow the growth of organized crime. Nevertheless, it is plainly still very much alive and moving out in new directions. From gambling, narcotics and loan sharking it has extended its tentacles into the field of commerce and industry. It has utilized its vast resources to infiltrate diverse kinds of legitimate businesses. In our investigations, the Commission has found that the means used by racketeers to penetrate and to gain control of legitimate business, or simply to engage in extortion, ranged from old fashioned muscle and violence to such more sophisticated techniques as using a big underworld name as a salesman, or merely mentioning such a name as being connected with a particular company, or "borrowing" money with no intention of ever repaying the "loan." Of course, many other techniques were utilized.

Another witness made this point. In this context, the term "legitimate business" is really a misnomer. Once the racketeers move into a business, however legitimate the product or service, the business ceases to be run legitimately. It could hardly be otherwise. These men have been outlaws all their lives. They will continue to practice all their habits of violence and intimidation in competition with lawfully run businesses and they will continue to cheat and steal wherever they can with the law-abiding consumer public as their principal victims.

Last year I collaborated with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, ROMAN HRUSKA, in fashioning two bills which aimed specifically at racketeer infiltration of the legitimate business community. Their principal thrust was the utilization of already existing antitrust machinery to attack the potential monopoly power of the hoodlum-dominated business and its inherent exercise of unfair competition with lawfully run businesses in the same field. Earlier in this session I reintroduced both bills—H.R. 326 and H.R. 327, 91st Congress, first session.

The antitrust section of the American Bar Association has endorsed the principles and objectives of both bills. The section has also made some helpful recommendations which have resulted in redrafting. The changes have not been substantial but the two earlier bills have now been consolidated into one which I have introduced here today and which the Senator from Nebraska is concurrently introducing in the other body.

The bill is entitled the "Criminal Activities Profits Act of 1969." I view it as the perfect vehicle to promote a Federal program against racketeer infiltration of legitimate business. It is innovative in that it vitalizes procedures which have been tried and proven in the antitrust field and applies them in the organized crime field where they have seldom been used before.

In my view the bill is eminently worth while. I earnestly commend it to the attention of the Judiciary Committee for prompt and full consideration.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN HIGHWAYS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Public Participation in Highway Development Act of 1969. This legislation would enact into positive law parts of the regulations proposed on public hearings—later substantially modified by the Federal Highway Administration—including the appellate review provision. It would require State highway departments to provide citizens organizations and individuals with full, complete, and timely information pertinent to any aspect of the location and design of a proposed highway. It would also allocate 3 percent of Federal revenue authorized for highway construction to citizens organizations for the hiring of professional expertise in connection with a proposed highway.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce this measure today to further the objectives expressed in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 that the economic, social, and environmental effects of a proposed highway system be taken into account in its location and design. This object cannot be achieved through the simple passage of a law with the expectation that the highway bureaucracy will immediately and fully carry it out. The obstacles are substantial. They may generally be characterized as inertia, the professional orientation of the highway engineer, and the dominant position of what has come to be called the highway lobby.

I. OBSTACLES TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF HIGHWAYS

For years, the only thing with which highway engineers have concerned themselves was the cost and location of the highway. It has only been in the last 10 years that road builders have learned that highways have a profound effect on the neighborhoods around them. There is thus much inertia to overcome.

More significant than mere inertia is the professional orientation of highway engineers. Critics of highway engineers suggest that they are concerned solely with the cost of construction and the price of land, regardless of the consequences. They are trained to deal with gradients and drainage problems, not social costs or esthetics. Or, as Lewis Mumford declares:

> The engineer regards his own work as more important than the other human functions it serves.

Unfortunately, these characterizations appear to be true. A columnist for the Christian Science Monitor discovered that highway engineers do fit the image conjured up by their critics, saying:

> If they are not wholly numb to the issue of the freeways social costs . . . at least they rank this factor far below the primary goal: meeting the construction schedule.

The divergence in orientation between this kind of orientation and the principles expressed in the 1968 Highway Act are well documented by a study undertaken in Chicago. The routing of a proposed highway through the central part of the city was analyzed on the basis of, first, engineering aspects; second, impact upon existing communities; and third, potential land-use improvements. The routings resulting from a separate consideration of each of these three factors were, not surprisingly, radically different. This is used as an illustration of the wide divergence between engineering orientation and national policy in the field of highways.

If inertia and an adverse professional orientation were not sufficient obstacles to full and effective consideration of economic, social, and environmental factors in highway development, the existence of the highway lobby is. The highway industry, composed of State highway departments, concrete, and asphalt road construction companies, oil, trucking and auto trade associations reap good size profits from the construction of highways. As long as highways continue to be built and the society depends on the automobile, these industries will prosper. Their size and prosperity make them a potent force, with which to be reckoned. They are considered next to the military-industrial complex to be the most powerful lobby in the United States. The main thrust of their activities is to build as much highway as possible. Consideration of economic, social, and environmental factors slows down this process.

XUM

II. LACK OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNMENT

The sure way to achieve a full consideration of the economic, social, and environmental implications of a highway proposal is to bring the citizens of the affected communities into the decision-making process. People living near a proposed highway have a strong interest in the economic, social, and environmental impact of that highway and, given half a chance, will make sure these factors are being adequately considered.

Unfortunately, citizen involvement in highway development up to now has been minimal. The hearings requirement of the highway law has been little more than a mockery serving as little more than a vehicle to give the highway department an opportunity to tell the public where the new highway is to be located and what its design is to be. The citizen can nod approvingly, or do nothing, it makes little difference in the ultimate decision. The Senate Committee on Public Works made this point in its report on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968:

> The public hearings held by the States, under the requirements of Section 128, title 23, United States Code, have been less than adequate in performing the intended functions of informing the public and allowing those affected to adequately voice their opinions, recommendations and suggestions.
>
> The policy of the Federal government has been merely to require the States to certify that a public hearing was held.

The highway is but a symbol of the feeling of helplessness of our society, where the human being is lost in the complexity and size of his environment; unable to impact on it, indeed, lost in it. Richard Goodwin pinpointed this as "the malaise which has eaten its way into our society evoking an aimless unease, frustration and fury." It is to this feeling of helplessness that he credits much of the rebellion in society today. Nor does he limit this characteristic to the poor and the minorities. It is most characteristic, he suggests, of the American majority—those who are neither poor nor black.

This feeling of helplessness extends as well into the society's institutions, particularly its governmental institutions. He says:

> The unexciting and envy-producing tone of the non-poor citizen's private life is heightened by the growing remoteness of public life. The air around him is poisoned, parkland disappears under relentless bulldozers, traffic stalls and jams, airplanes cannot land, and even his own streets are unsafe and, increasingly, streaked with terror. Yet he cannot remember having decided that these things should happen, or even having wished them. He has no sense that there is anything he can do to arrest the tide. He does not know whom to blame. Somehow, the crucial aspects of his environment seem in the grip of forces that are too huge and impersonal to attack. You cannot vote them out of office or shout them down. Even when a source of authority can be identified, it seems hopelessly detached from the desires or actions of individual citizens.

A prime example of this is the Lower Manhattan Expressway in New York City. Everyone appears in favor of it except the people of New York. Yet, it proceeds in spite of this.

Given this context, the regulations proposed last October by the FHA requiring separate public hearings on the locations and design of a highway system well in advance of the making of the decisions on these questions was most welcome. Such hearings were to consider the social, economic and environmental impact of the highway as well as alternative means of transportation which might serve the public better than the planned highway segment. The citizen was to be given an opportunity to participate in the dialog which would result in a highway decision. But most significant of all, the public participation in such hearings was meant to be more than ritualistic involvement. The provision for appellate appeal guaranteed the participants that the views they expressed would be considered and weighed in decisions relating to highway location and design. These hearings, according to the Senate Public Works Committee, would produce more than a public presentation by the highway department of its plans and decisions.

The highway lobby, unfortunately, did not relish the prospect of citizens hearings placing a further obstacle in the path of highway construction and vociferously opposed the adoption of the proposed regulations. They produced before the FHA hearing State highway officials, associations of contractors, auto manufacturers, and truckers, something called the "good roads Federal," chambers of commerce, and from Iowa alone, the full range of materials suppliers: Limestone Producers, Asphalt Pavement Association, Concrete Paving Association. The man from Indiana Highways for Survival came to say that survival of the American economy depended on the good health of the contracting business in which, he complained, profits are "razor thin." The opposition fielded a few big-city majors or their representatives, conservationists, planners, architects, and some urban citizen groups. The hearings made clear that the lobby's opponents were outgunned. They did not have much artillery to begin with and many on their side were absent: who was going to pay their way to Washington?

The pressure from the highway lobby brought retreat; and the regulations finally published in the Federal Register were not only downgraded to the level of a policy and procedure memorandum, but the provision requiring consideration of other forms of transportation at the public hearings was dropped and, most significant of all, the right of appeal was eliminated.

Even this emaciated version published on January 18 faces the prospect of being repealed. A spokesman for the American Road Builders Association pronounced himself satisfied: the regulations had been gutted of any threat to the lobby.

III. REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Public Participation in Highway Development Act of 1969 for the purpose of putting the Congress on record in favor of citizen involvement in highways, placing a firmer foundation under the hearing procedure and broadening the current procedure to include discussion of alternative means of transportation and establishing the appellate appeal procedure.

First, this legislation would make clear that Congress stands behind the people and not the bureaucrats or highway industry. The first part of the declaration of policy declares:

> The Congress hereby declares that it is in the national interest to take into full account social, economic, and environmental effects in the development of Federally-aided highways, and that this can best be accomplished by guaranteeing effective public participation in the consideration of highway location and design proposals by highway departments before submission to the Secretary of Transportation for approval, and by providing effective means for administrative appeal.

Second, this legislation would place a firmer foundation under the hearing procedure by enacting it into positive law and thus protecting it from administrative elimination and giving it the greater authorty positive law enjoys over administrative edict.

Third, this legislation would significantly broaden the scope and impact of the current hearing procedure by requiring alternative means of transportation to be discussed at the public hearings, require a separate hearing for location and design in all cases where the highway segment would go through a community of 5,000 or more persons, and require that public notification of hearings not be limited to those on a specific mailing list, but go to all interested persons.

Fourth, this legislation would reestablish the appeal procedure, without which the opinions expressed at the hearings could be totally ignored. Without the suspensive appeal procedure, the hearings become totally meaningless.

IV. REQUIRES FULL, COMPLETE AND TIMELY INFORMATION

The public participation in Highway Development Act of 1969 also requires State highway departments to provide full, complete, and timely information pertinent to any aspect of the location and design of proposed highways: to any organization or individual requesting it; and that such information shall be provided in sufficient time prior to the holding of any public hearings as to afford full opportunity for preparation for that hearing. This section carries out the spirit of the Freedom of Information Law. In the words of the President of the United States:

> A democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the nation permits. No one should be able to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest.

The general rights and desirability of participation in the democratic process by the citizens is clear. The problem is the practicality of that participation. If citizens in this society are to have an input to the decisions of government, they need more than a guarantee that their opinions will be listened to, they must know what that government is planning and doing. Without information on the problems, the alternatives, and an actual opportunity to express views, the superstructure of our system is without foundation. Any degree of participation in decisions of government is meaningless unless the participants are informed.

Unfortunately, much is kept from the public by the highway engineer as those associated with Gunston Hall in Virginia could tell you. The Virginia Highway Department announced that a highway was planned through the property of the historic home of one of the Founding Fathers. When the board of Gunston Hall tried to find out the specific routine, they met with the response that the details of the route had not been completely formulated and thus the information was not available. Yet, the State highway department was going to the neighboring jurisdiction to secure legal approval for the routing of the same road.

V. ALLOCATES FUNDS FOR HIRING PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE FOR CITIZEN GROUPS

Finally, the public participation on Highway Development Act of 1969 allocates funds to citizens' organizations for the purposes of hiring professional expertise including engineers, planners and architects in connection with a proposed highway. The amount would be 3 percent of the funds authorized for highway construction, and such funds would be available only so long as no final departmental determination had been made on the highway. The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of HUD and the Director of OEO, would identify neighborhoods having substantial interest in a proposed highway project and establish criteria for the recognition of citizens' organizations which are broadly representative of the interests and needs of the respective neighborhood. He would also establish professional standards to be met by any professional hired by a citizens' organization under the program.

Society has become increasingly professionalized and relies on the expert to provide the authoritative analysis. In the field of highway construction, Government holds a near monopoly on the expertise, thus it is difficult, if not impossible, for laymen to effectively participate in decisionmaking unless they are provided with comparable expertise. An excellent example of the power this monopoly gives the highway department is again found in connection with the Lower Manhattan Expressway. The engineers originally justified the need for it in terms of high suburban need; 80 percent of use, they said, would be suburban. When the citizens of New York rebelled against giving up their homes for the benefit of suburbanites, the department came right back with a study demonstrating 80 percent of the traffic would be local. This it was hoped would help overcome the opposition to sacrificing for suburbanites.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

At this time we have no legislative business for Tuesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week we have the following:

H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children, which is subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 337, to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, which is subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 7757, to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, which is subject to a rule being granted; and

Miscellaneous committee funding resolutions from the Committee on House Administration.

I might add that there is a possibility of a supplemental appropriation bill being brought up next week, although we do not yet have assurance sufficient to place it on the program. We will announce any other program later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have finished the legislative business for this week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ONE SET OF TAX LAWS FOR THE RICH, ANOTHER FOR THE POOR

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a double standard dominates the American tax system. Under it there is a rich man's tax law and a poor man's tax law. There is a corporation's tax law and a middle-class citizen's tax law.

A time has arrived for reform. Not the false act of pasting a band-aid over a cancer, but meaningful reform with teeth in it for evaders and relief in it for the sufferers.

There are 21 Americans who earned over $1 million in 1967 and paid nothing at all in Federal tax. And 134 others who each earned over $200,000 paid nothing, either. These are the wealthy who ride for nothing in the heavy wagon pulled so painfully and so far by so many of us.

We must seal off the escape hatches through which these wealthy tax evaders slip, clutching their profits so tightly. Certainly we could easily shut those tax loopholes through which passes the same $9 billion the surtax is collecting from all of us.

We must tax capital gains untaxed at death and eliminate unlimited charitable deductions. We must eliminate special tax treatment for stock options as well as the tax exclusion on the first $100 on dividends.

We certainly must eliminate benefits derived from breaking up one business into a number of separate parts for tax purposes.

Let us remove the tax exemption on municipal industrial development bonds, while taxing income from municipal bonds, but aiding municipalities with Federal subsidy to compensate for higher borrowing costs.

Let us do away with the oil depletion allowance altogether, as well as reduce other allowances on certain minerals. We must establish the same rate for estate and gift taxes, while limiting hobby farmers use of farm losses to offset other income. Let us further eliminate depreciation deductions by real estate speculators and repeal the 7-percent investment tax credit.

Cumulatively, these accumulated evils have had the effect of undermining the faith our citizens are supposed to have in the Nation's tax system. If the institution that is this Congress remains unresponsive to the obvious massive desire by the people for many of these reforms, we shall fail in our duty to those who elected us. Nor will a package of make-believe reforms be acceptable. We must be responsive to the demands of the people.

THE TFX-F-111 DEBACLE—AUSTRALIAN PHASE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the more I delve into the multifaceted world of the TFX-F-111 series, the more fascinating become the revelations. Because many of our free world allies became involved in one way or another with the plane, I have sought to find out what they have to say on the subject. Among them are the Australians, who were not able to cancel the plane outright, as the British did.

Accordingly, I have obtained some actual debates which have taken place in the Australian Parliament on the TFX-111C, the version of that plane sold them in 1963.

Originally, their price was supposed to be in the area of $125 million. As of now, these same costs have skyrocketed to the $300 million area. Our Australian friends have yet to place one of their promised 24 F-111C's into active, com-

XUM

bat-ready service. Further, we sold them a multipurpose plane supposedly possessing major attack capacity. Partially influenced by this promise, the Australians have begun expansion of their Asian military commitments. Nondelivery of a plane which turns out to possess a less than expected attack capacity poses a threat to Australia's military credibility in that ever-volatile area of the world. This situation is further compounded by Britain's imminent military withdrawal from the area.

A significant portion of Australia's National Legislature is increasingly out of patience with nondelivery, nonperformance, and soaring costs, which a smaller nation such as Australia can ill afford. In effect, F-111 costs have partially unhinged Austrialia's defense expenditure potential.

These debates, Mr. Speaker, are quite enlightening, offering information and opinions of major interest. In the debate of October 10, 1968, we are informed that the chief test pilot for the major TFX contractor informed a member of the Australian Parliament during a plant tour that 26 Australian crews had been through a 6-month course in how to fly the plane. These crews are still, to my knowledge, in Australia, twiddling their thumbs and thumbing training manuals.

Members of the Australian Parliament have not minced words in debates, particularly that of October 10, 1968. Comments of Messrs. Barnard, Whitlam, Crean, Stewart, Connor, and Bryant are particularly pungent regarding the status of the F-111C's. I commend their comments to Members of this House. Australia is a close ally of ours, and she is being sorely tested because of her faith in America's technology. Even now she is paying dearly at high rates of interest for aircraft she has not received.

Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate my original call for a grounding of all F-111's, and the commencement of a major, painstaking congressional investigation. It is highly indicative that the Secretary of Defense has just made a major cutback in procurement of the FB-111, bomber version of the TFX. There are certain pointed questions that are long overdue for the asking. It is time we began to ask them here in this House.

EARL WARREN BLAMES CONGRESS FOR WHAT HE SET IN MOTION

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Earl Warren has engaged in an ironic bit of crying on the shoulder of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

To no one's surprise, the object of Mr. Warren's curious complaint was the Congress with the FBI thrown in for good measure.

Warren claimed that part of the increasing problem of crime stemmed from congressional failure to give him an extra law clerk for each justice and a messenger for the library.

His jibe at the FBI came when he complained that, "the FBI budget is infinitely higher than the whole Federal court system."

If the Supreme Court, or our entire judicial branch, has a case to be presented to the Congress there is a better way in which to do it than for Mr. Warren to engage in what would appear to be sympathetic headline seeking via broad, highly unspecific complaints and charges which, if leveled against a defendant in his Court, would not be permitted to stand.

In fact, under all of the rather well-established circumstances, Earl Warren is an unfortunate advocate of judicial relief and remedy, his exalted position notwithstanding.

Looking back over the angry and costly history of the past 15 years, Mr. Warren and the peculiar philosophy which he has applied to the Constitution, crime and punishment, has done little to win admirers and champions in the Congress.

I would doubt, frankly, if it would come as a surprise even to Mr. Warren that many of us in the Congress are something more than weary and concerned that his philosophy has emasculated and destroyed law after law which the Congress has so carefully studied, developed and enacted for the purpose of protecting this country against its enemies from within, whether individually criminal or internationally conspiratorial.

I would doubt whether it would come as a shock even to Mr. Warren that many of us in the Congress are something more than dismayed and concerned that, in case after case, the Warren ideology has dominated the highest court in our land with a philosophy and conduct wherein the Court has brazenly transgressed the boundaries of judicial responsibility and jurisdiction to usurp the power of the Congress with whim-born, theory-ridden decisions which, in fact, have proved legislation by fiat or decree.

I would doubt whether it would come as much of a surprise even to Mr. Warren to hear it said that many of us in the Congress find cause to fear the unleashing of forces of permissiveness and scofflaw, disrespect and disdain, crime and violence, to the point where, today, the rights of the criminal are infinitely greater, and better protected, than those of his victim—and the rights of the subversive and conspirator are infinitely greater than the right and responsibility of the Nation to defend itself.

No, the Warren effort to blame the Congress for that which he, his philosophy and conduct have set in motion against this country, its institutions and its people is as transparent as it is unseemly.

In short, more and more the rights of the majority, even to protection from criminal attack and violence, have become more and more subordinated to the Warren court-supported rights of a crude, vocal minority which, with court-protected abandon, dashes into public streets and institutions—and onto public campuses—preaching anarchy, crying for revolution, and rendering violence against law, order and the majority.

That the courts are overcrowded, there is no question. But justices, judges, and court personnel are not nearly so overworked, nor indeed so harassed and put upon, as law-enforcement officers from the FBI down—thanks to the incredible burdens, restrictions and frustrations imposed upon them by the "be kind to the criminal" theatrics of Earl Warren in his self-assigned role as the Nation's No. 1 dove in the war on crime.

It seems to me that what Mr. Warren is really saying, but refusing to admit, even to himself, is that the sick chickens of libertinism which he and his judicial coterie have unleashed upon our society have finally come home to roost.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am one of 43 House Members who have introduced legislation to lower the voting age in the 91st Congress, and I am confident that our numbers will continue to grow.

One of our senior colleagues has recently questioned the "maturity" of the Nation's young people in citing his opposition to legislation to lower the voting age, and I think he has erred about the maturity of today's youth.

An "adult reader"—unfortunately, the letter was not signed—of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune Democrat, recently made some thought-provoking comments about the future of our young people which I wish to share with you. The Nation's young people, according to the article, "will assume control of your cities, States, and Nation." What better way to prepare for the orderly transition of the passing of that control from our hands to new hands than to have our youth take part in the process?

The article follows:

YOUTH

EBENSBURG, R.D. 1, March 8.—A youth is a person who is going to carry on what you have started. He is going to sit where you are sitting and, when you are gone, attend to those things which you think are important.

You may adopt all the policies you please, but how they will be carried out depends on him. He will assume control of your cities, states and nation.

He is going to move in and take over your churches, schools, universities and corporations.

All your books are going to be judged, praised or condemned by him.

The fate of humanity is in his hands.

So it might be well to pay him some attention.

AN ADULT.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEMOLAY

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, nothing gives me greater pleasure than to salute the organizations that help build the leaders of tomorrow. One such group, the International Order of DeMolay, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this week, and I want to add my congratulations to the "goingest" group of young men around.

As recently described, the Order of DeMolay, is "on the go." It is active young men busy with social activities, public service projects, and athletic competitions. It is dedicated young men, taking vows of respect for parents, love of God, comradeship, fidelity, and patriotism. It is promising young men, learning to become future leaders of communities and Nation. It is busy young men, engaged in worthwhile occupations with their spare time through a balanced program of DeMolay activities. It is fraternal young men 66,000 strong in 2,500 DeMolay chapters all over the free world. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Order of DeMolay and the men it produces, is our hope for the future.

We see and hear too much about the radical minority of young people in this day and age who seem bent on destruction and depravation. One rarely hears about the young people of our land who live by ethical and moral codes of conduct truly worthy of future leadership. The "Code of Ethics" of the Order of DeMolay is one such code and we should thank God that there are hundreds of thousands in the world living by this code. As a tribute to the organization, and the men it produces, I ask that the DeMolay code be reproduced here:

A DEMOLAY'S ETHICS

A DeMolay serves God
A DeMolay honors all womanhood
A DeMolay loves and honors his parents
A DeMolay is honest
A DeMolay is loyal to ideals and friends
A DeMolay practices honest toil
A DeMolay's word is as good as his bond
A DeMolay is courteous
A DeMolay is at all times a gentleman
A DeMolay is a patriot in peace as well as war
A DeMolay is clean in mind and body
A DeMolay stands unswervingly for the public schools
A DeMolay always bears the reputation of a good and law-abiding citizen
A DeMolay by precept and example must preserve the high standard to which he has pledged himself.

GEN. FRANK S. BESSON

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Frank S. Besson is the epitome of the dedicated, selfless professional soldier. His achievements through the years and his response to challenges never before faced have marked him as one of the "forgotten men" of his time. It is time that this august body singled out this spartan servant of his country and insure that the people of this great Nation recognize the caliber and fiber of this outstanding gentleman, quietly giving them truly magnificent service in behalf of the defense of their country.

On March 10, General Besson relinquished command of the U.S. Army Materiel Command, which he had headed since its activation in 1962, in response to his appointment by the President to become Chairman of the Joint Logistics Review Board, reporting to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Army Materiel Command was formed in 1962, during a major reorganization of the Army, with the mission of developing, producing, supplying, and maintaining weapons, aircraft, equipment, and other materiel for the Army. With a nationwide network of more than 190 military installations and activities, and an annual budget of approximately $14 billion, it employs more than 160,000 civilian personnel, in addition to its military complement of 14,000.

As its first commander, General Besson was charged with consolidating six Army technical service organizations into a single command without disrupting effective materiel support for the Army. His success in accomplishing this was cited in the Merit Award of the Armed Force Management Association which was presented to him in 1963.

This award highlighted his "outstanding contributions to defense management" and his "superior leadership, imagination, and management skill" with which he directed the consolidation:

> This major change in the Army's logistics system was not only accomplished efficiently, but also with significant savings and improvements in management. It stands as an achievement in military management of the highest order.

Effectively and efficiently organized, and led by General Besson, an outstanding logistician, transportation authority, and military manager, the contribution of the Army Materiel Command to the national defense during its first 7 years of operation range across the full spectrum of materiel support and supply management.

There were early innovations of procedural and economic importance, such as consolidation of procurement operations, increasing markedly the use of price competition and incentive type contracts for materiel and services.

Under General Besson's direction, there were early accomplishments in developing and fielding of materiel, such as breakthroughs in electronic microminiaturization; provision of new, lighter, more mobile, more effective artillery pieces; supply of a new family of cargo trucks, personnel carriers, and utility vehicles; development of rotary-wing aircraft as troop and cargo carriers, fighters, and special purpose vehicles; and provision of a variety of new weapons and equipment for the individual soldier. These achievements revolutionized the Army's tactical and combat communications systems and provided for air, land, and water mobility to an extent previously conceived only in science fiction.

In its 7 years of effective service under General Besson, the Army Materiel Command, as the "arsenal for the brave," has effectively responded to the urgent requirements of the Cuban crisis in 1962, the Dominican Republic stability operations in 1965, and of the Vietnam war from 1965 to the present; continued its worldwide supply support of our Army and its allies; and has established new levels of effectiveness and economy.

The effective logistics support of our Army Forces in Southeast Asia has been the Army Materiel Command's most important single accomplishment. In the first year of the Southeast Asia buildup, AMC responded through draw-down of existing stocks and through expedited provision of urgently required standard and nonstandard items. The command responded with construction equipment and supplies to build bases, ports, airfields, and communications centers. It built up the world's second largest aircraft fleet. It provided movable piers which greatly accelerated port construction. And, it proved the utility and versatility of cargo containers for use in transporting cargo, and for providing temporary storage and office and working space.

Beginning late in the first year of the buildup and accelerating in the second and succeeding years, large volume deliveries from procurement by AMC provided the M–16 rifle, the M–79 grenade launcher, the 2.75-inch rocket, bombs and ammunition, radios, batteries, helicopters, vehicles, missiles, and a variety of troop and combat support equipment. Newly procured repair parts were speeded to using units in Southeast Asia through the Red Ball Express. New water purification, petroleum supply and electric generating equipment were fielded. AMC developed and supplied new target acquisition, tactical and night vision, and detection equipment. New defensive devices, mines, protective equipment, defoliants, tunnel destruction, and individual protection equipment were put in the hands of troops.

As the volume of equipment in the hands of troops increased, the problems of materiel maintenance, status reporting, communication, inventory, and customer assistance mounted. AMC assisted in the development and operation of a closed loop maintenance system, in setting up automatic data processing systems for materiel reporting, in establishing communications links, and in providing customer assistance in inventory, requirements, maintenance, engineering, and other fields. The command also provided a floating aircraft maintenance facility, an innovation in flexible response to the requirement for keeping aircraft flying.

During his 7-year tenure as head of the Army Materiel Command, General Besson has guided AMC in accomplishing outstanding feats. He has streamlined the command so that its efficiency is established and well known. Industrial cooperation and relations with AMC under his leadership have been excellent. Over the 7-year period, he has delivered billions of dollars of materiel to our troops, over the longest distances and in the shortest possible time ever known in the history of our Nation. Since its inception, the command has received the highest award of the National Safety Council on four occasions and the second highest award on two occasions. This award is granted based upon improving on a prior year's safety record, and its presentation in successive years is indicative of an inspired quest for excellence. This record is particularly noteworthy

XUM

considering the increased tempo of support operations in general, but particularly in ammunition production, assembly, and delivery, and in accelerated maintenance operations. His outstanding efforts and work have earned for him the respect, confidence, and support of the Members of Congress. He has performed the task in an unobtrusive manner. His only desire has been to meet the needs of our soldiers, for whom he has a deep personal interest, and to insure their safe return.

General Besson's prescription for success in the military and in all walks of life is personal integrity. To young officers about to embark on their first tour of duty in uniform, General Besson's advice has been "to honestly serve those you lead." Specifically he tells young officers:

> If you aspire to be the kind of officer our American youth deserve, you will reap two great satisfactions, from your military service—the respect of your brethren in arms, and the knowledge that you are an essential element of the strength so necessary to insure that the freedom and ideals for which your forefathers, and fathers and brothers fought and died; that these freedoms and ideals so dearly bought will surely endure.

These principles have guided General Besson during his 37 years of service to our Nation, beginning with his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy in 1932. General Besson's early career was noted for the role he played in the development of portable military pipelines, steel airplane landing mats, and steel treadway bridges. He is credited with the studies which led to the Army's adoption of the Bailey Bridge, which was used extensively in all theaters during World War II.

As director of the 3d Military Railway Service in Iran during 1944 and 1945, General Besson was charged with insuring the vital flow of war materials to the Russian forces through the Persian Corridor. While in this assignment, he was promoted to brigadier general, becoming at 34, the youngest general officer in the Army Ground Forces.

Toward the end of World War II, General Besson held a key position as deputy chief transportation officer of Army Forces in the Western Pacific, and when the collapse of Japan was imminent, was ordered to assume complete control of railroads in Japan. During the first year of occupation, General Besson directed the rehabilitation of the Japanese rail system, and moved more than 200,000 troops of the 8th Army and 150,000 tons of supplies in the first 2 months of the occupation.

This accomplishment caused Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, 8th Army commander, to comment that General Besson's "supervision of the operation of the entire Japanese rail system during the first year of our occupation was the greatest single factor in the results we attained."

Subsequent assignments included a tour in Europe as Assistant Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe, where General Besson formulated logistic plans and overall programs to meet the complex requirements of the 15 nations of the NATO alliance. His efforts in instituting a system for "costing out" 5-year programs, thereby bringing force goals into consonance with available resources, earned him the first Distinguished Service Medal to be awarded at SHAPE headquarters.

A lifelong pioneer of many transportation innovations, General Besson stimulated both military and commercial adoption of containerization and improved water terminal practices. He introduced the roll-on/roll-off technique for the rapid loading and discharge of wheeled and tracked vehicles. He is known throughout the national transportation fraternity as the "Father of Containerization and RO/RO." He further refined these concepts upon assuming command of the Transportation Center and School at Fort Eustis, Va., in 1963.

General Besson became chief of transportation, U.S. Army, in March 1958, a post he held until April 2, 1962, when he took charge of the U.S. Army Materiel Command.

In September of last year, Army Chief of Staff, William C. Westmoreland, awarded the Distinguished Service Medal—First Oak Leaf Cluster—to General Besson for his dynamic leadership, his knowledge, and experience. The citation reads as follows:

> For exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility: General Frank S. Besson, Jr., United States Army, distinguished himself by eminently meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service in a position of great responsibility as Commanding General, United States Army Materiel Command from May 1962 to August 1968. General Besson's rare management talents, dynamic leadership and exceptional organizational ability guided the United States Army Materiel Command from its inception in 1962 to its present global responsibilities in developing, processing, storing and issuing military equipment and materiel to all Army forces. He overcame, with calmness and certainty, based upon a solid foundation of logistical knowledge and experience, seemingly insurmountable logistical problems in providing essential equipment and materiel support to the Army buildup in Southeast Asia, while maintaining continuous effective logistical support to the other Army Commands located throughout the rest of the world. General Besson's personal concern that individual soldiers be properly supplied with the equipment and materiel needed on a day to day basis to accomplish the mission, led him to establish a world-wide system of Customer Assistance Offices. These offices provided timely information which allowed General Besson and his staff to minimize potential logistical problems and to sustain the Army in the field. The command's motto—"Arsenal for the Brave"—has been General Besson's hallmark of outstanding performance and achievement which continues the finest traditions of the military service and reflects the highest credit upon himself and the United States Army.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal, General Besson holds eight other top citations and decorations, including the Legion of Merit, and the Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

I proudly salute General Besson personally and the members of the Army Materiel Command for their 7-year record of solid achievement, and for their indispensable contributions to the Army and our country.

FROM BIRTH IN RELOCATION CAMP TO DEATH IN VIETNAM—THE SAGA OF 1ST LT. GRANT HENJYOJI

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, recent Vietnam casualty reports bore the name of a young Army officer whose life, beginning, and end bore the indelible imprint of the U.S. Government. His name was Grant Henjyoji, son of the Reverend and Mrs. Daiyu Y. Henjyoji, of Portland, Oreg.

Grant was born in 1943 amidst the spartan surroundings of a so-called relocation camp, more accurately a concentration camp, to which his parents had been sent by our Government during World War II. He was to share his claim to this unusual American birthplace with a brother who was born there 2 years later.

However, the remarkable thing about Grant Henjyoji is not the fact that he called the camp at Minidoka, Idaho, his birthplace. It is the fact that, despite the predetermination by the Government as to where he was to be born, Grant, while living, was completely free of any feelings of bitterness against a Government which had committed a serious blunder in the handling of a minority group. The crime of which his parents were found summarily guilty and shipped to Idaho for internment, was that they were of Japanese descent.

It is a testimonial to the greatness of this country that it has citizens of Grant Henjyoji's caliber. After his family returned to the west coast, Grant grew up like any other normal American boy. After his graduation from the University of Oregon in 1967, Grant, as a commissioned officer in the Reserves, was called to active duty, and was later sent to Vietnam.

On March 8, 1969, 1st Lt. Grant Henjyoji gave his life to his country while he and his unit were engaged in heavy ground action with the enemy.

So ended the life which began at the Idaho relocation camp 25 years ago.

The body of Grant Henjyoji will be laid to rest at the Arlington National Cemetery on March 24, 1969, but I am convinced that somehow his spirit will live on. It is often said that laws are above men. Grant was able to show, by his own example, that sometimes men are able to rise above the harsh laws of their country.

Americans everywhere would do well to pause a moment and reflect on the life and death of this young Army officer, whose name has given added luster to the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MANN (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Poff (at the request of Mr. Foreman), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Olsen), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Perkins to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Passman and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Madden and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Foreman) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Córdova.
Mr. Pettis in two instances.
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. Bell of California in two instances.
Mr. Conte in two instances.
Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin in two instances.
Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Gross.
Mr. Morse in two instances.
Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Nelsen in two instances.
Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Talcott in two instances.
Mr. Schwengel in four instances.
Mr. Collins in four instances.
Mr. Zwach in three instances.
Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Carter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Olsen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Farbstein in three instances.
Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Murphy of New York in three instances.
Mr. Rarick in four instances.
Mr. Mikva in two instances.
Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Purcell in two instances.
Mr. Pike in two instances.
Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Tiernan.
Mr. Gonzalez in six instances.
Mr. Córdova.
Mr. Miller of California in five instances.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Moorhead in two instances.
Mr. Boland.
Mr. Bennett in two instances.
Mr. Griffin in two instances.
Mr. Roybal in six instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1058. An act to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1968, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

Office of the Secretary
of Transportation,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1969.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: In accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of Public Law 85-804 (50 U.S.C. 1434) the Department of Transportation reports herewith one action taken during calendar year 1968 under the authority of that Act:

Name of contractor: The American Shipbuilding Company.

Cost involved: $4,450,000 net after Federal income taxes or $8,800,000 gross contract price increase.

Description of property or service: The contract covers the construction of seven medium endurance Coast Guard cutters (WMEC), 210 feet in length.

Action taken and justification: The Department denied the company's application for extraordinary relief under Public Law 85-804 insofar as the application is grounded upon essentiality and mistake. The justification is included in the decision of the Department of Transportation Contract Adjustment Board, Docket No. 85-804-3, copy enclosed.

Sincerely,

Alan L. Dean.

[From the Department of Transportation Contract Adjustment Board, Washington, D.C.]

Application of the American Ship Building Company—Docket No. 85-804-3

DECISION

American Ship Building Company (hereinafter "AmShip" or "the Company") has applied for extraordinary relief under Public Law 85-804 (72 Stat. 972, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1431 to 1435), seeking an increase in the price of Coast Guard Contract No. Tcg-04204-A. The contract provided for the construction of seven medium endurance (WMEC), 210-foot cutters at an initial price of $18,076,707. The specific relief sought by AmShip is a $4,450,000 increase in contract price net after Federal income taxes.[1]

Jurisdiction to grant extraordinary relief under Public Law 85-804 under Coast Guard contracts was transferred to the Secretary of Transportation by Section 6(b)(1) of the Department of Transportation Act (Public Law 89-670, 49 USC § 1655(b)(1)), and delegated by the Secretary to this Board. In considering P.L. 85-804 applications, this Board follows the guidelines of the applicable General Services Administration Regulations, Part 1-17 of the Federal Procurement Regulations (41 CFR 1-17.00 *et seq*). AmShip's petition requested relief upon three different grounds recognized under those regulations.[2]

First: AmShip requested an amendment without consideration, upon the ground that its continued operation is essential to the national defense and that it has incurred an actual and threatened loss under its contract, which loss endangers its future ability to function as an essential source of supply.

Second: AmShip requested correction of a mistake in the Company's initial bid, which mistake was either a mutual mistake as to a material fact or a mistake on the part of the Company which was so obvious that it was, or should have been, apparent to the Contracting Officer.

Third: AmShip requested relief because its losses resulted from improper Government acts which, irrespective of any Government legal liability, so increased the cost of performance that considerations of fairness require an adjustment of the contract price.

At the time of the filing of the petition, there were pending before the Department of Transportation Contract Appeals Board five appeals by AmShip from decisions of the Contracting Officer under the same contract, denying some $4,995,333 in claims. AmShip moved the Contract Appeals Board to stay its proceedings on those appeals pending decision on this application for extraordinary relief. The Board which is considering this application is also the Department's Contract Appeals Board, which will consider the pending contract appeals.

At a meeting of the Board with the parties, it was determined that the "Government acts" cited in connection with AmShip's third request for extraordinary relief were the same acts which are the basis for AmShip's contract appeals. The Board was anxious to avoid possible prejudice to those appeals by a prior consideration of identical issues under the less formal procedural rules applicable to extraordinary relief applications. In addition, it was noted that the regulations provided that no extraordinary relief action was authorized unless "other legal authority within the (Department) is deemed to be lacking or inadequate,"[3] and the Board felt that insofar as relief might be available to award up to $4,995,333 for the Government acts in connection with the contract appeals, such "other legal authority" did exist. Under the circumstances, upon AmShip's request, it was decided, the Coast Guard concurring, that the third ground set forth in the petition for extraordinary relief, the request based on government acts, would be severed and considered later, after the contract appeals had been considered. It was decided, further, that the Board would first consider the two other grounds set forth in the petition—the requests based on "essentiality" and "mistake"—then, if necessary, consider the appeals, and finally, the extraordinary relief application based on "Government acts."

Our present consideration is, consequently, limited to AmShip's request for extraordinary relief based on "essentiality" and "mistake."

The Coast Guard has submitted its views upon the essentiality of the Company to the Coast Guard's procurement mission and factual evidence upon the alleged bid mistake. In addition, the views of the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration upon the question of the Company's "essentiality

---

[1] The Company's request upon the ground of "essentiality" seeks $4,450,000 based upon the assumption that an amendment without consideration is exempt from income taxation; the request premised on the correction of mistake ground, assumes taxability and, therefore, requests a gross award of $8,800,000 to yield the same amount after taxes.

[2] FPR 1-17.204-3.

[3] FPR 1-17.205-1(b)(2).

XUM

to the national defense" have been solicited and received.

A full factual report has been received from the Coast Guard including detailed statements and data submitted by AmShip. The Coast Guard has recommended against the granting of any relief on this application.

THE PETITION

Upon the opening of bids in May, 1965, for the construction of 210-foot, medium-endurance cutters, the Coast Guard found that the bid of AmShip was lowest for each of the quantities (2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 vessels) for which bids had been invited. The second low bidder, Gunderson, was low for quantities of vessels up to 4 but did not bid on 5 or more vessels. AmShip's low bid for 5 vessels was $13,175,584. Next was Aerojet General Shipyards with a bid of $15,394,276, and the high bid of $17,544,000 was given by Bethlehem Steel Company. At the time, the Coast Guard had funds available for only 5 vessels, although it wanted to procure two additional vessels.

On June 15, 1965, the contract was awarded to AmShip for 5 vessels. At that time discussions were had with the then president of AmShip, Mr. W. H. Jory, and the Government obtained an option for two additional vessels, to be exercised within 60 days. On July 28, 1965, the Coast Guard exercised its option for the two additional vessels, bringing the total contract price for 7 vessels to $18,076,707, or $2,582,387 per vessel.

At the present time, 5 cutters have been completed and delivered. The sixth is expected in November, 1968, and the last is expected in December, 1968.

The present contract price, as amended, is $18,598,624.09. AmShip states that as of March 31, 1968, its performance expenditures totaled $20,842,907. The Company's projected cost to complete the contract by December 31, 1968, is estimated at an additional $6,423,992, bringing the total cost of completion to $27,266,899. On this basis, the Company projects an actual and anticipated loss of approximately $9 million.

In October, 1967, the management and ownership of the AmShip changed. The new management has attempted to make a realistic determination of its loss position on the Coast Guard contract and to set aside appropriate amounts to cover the actual or projected losses.

AmShip claims that losses of the magnitude presently estimated endanger the continued operation of the Company as an essential source of supply for new vessel construction and for vessel repair work in the Great Lakes region. AmShip operates three major ship construction and repair yards in Lorain, Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, and Chicago. It states that the losses place a severe drain on the Company's cash position and maintenance of its working capital. The new management claims that AmShip's bid was grossly lower than those of either of the other two bidders and that the Coast Guard had (or should have had) knowledge that the realistic cost of construction of the vessels was substantially more than AmShip's bid.

ESSENTIALITY TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under the applicable regulations, essentiality to the national defense may be determined in two contexts—impairment of a contractor's productive ability to continue the performance of present defense contracts, or impairment of a contractor's ability to continue operation as a source of supply for future defense contracts (FPR § 1–17.204–2 (a)). In the present case, AmShip has indicated there is no serious threat to the completion of the seven Coast Guard vessels.[4] Similarly, the Company expects to complete one Navy vessel and one Maritime Administration vessel, now in progress, with its own resources. Essentiality, therefore, must be found on the basis of the Company's potential as a future essential source of supply.

In this connection, AmShip states, its three major ship construction and repair yards, located in Lorain, Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, and Chicago, Illinois, comprise 63% of the present shipyard facilities on the Great Lakes and 100% of the new ship construction facilities. In its presentation, AmShip points out the importance of the Great Lakes shipping fleet to this nation's industrial capacity and the vital connection of Great Lakes shipping with the steel industry. AmShip also notes that the Great Lakes shipping fleet played a significant part in furnishing defense material during World War II and the Korean Conflict; that the Great Lakes fleet has been declining in recent years; and that the average age of vessels sailing in the Great Lakes fleet is approximately 42.1 years. The company concludes, therefore, that the Great Lakes shipping industry is dependent upon annual major shipyard repair and reconstruction.

These facts in the Company's presentation provide only an indirect justification for concluding that it is an essential source of defense products. AmShip is not significantly involved in supplying, directly, items critical to national defense. A large part of the Company's business has been in the repair and servicing of Great Lakes commercial shipping, and the major portion of the Company's new construction facilities is devoted to the construction of commercial vessels.[5]

The Coast Guard challenges the Company's claim of essentiality. Insofar as new construction facilities on the Great Lakes are concerned, the Coast Guard says there is at least one Great Lakes shipyard of equal capability and a second company is now building a new and very large facility for construction of the largest ore carrier vessel for the Great Lakes trade. The Coast Guard advises that its foreseeable vessel construction requirements can be adequately handled by the Coast Guard yard at Curtis Bay or by other private shipyards, and that there are an adequate number of private shipyards in the Great Lakes area which have sufficient capacity to handle its repair work for the foreseeable future. Recent bid abstracts for 210-foot Coast Guard cutters disclose that at least 15 other shipyards in the United States have offered to furnish this type of vessel. In the last several years, two private shipyards, one of which is on the Great Lakes, have delivered four vessels of this class, while the Coast Guard's own yard has built three such vessels. From this we conclude, contrary to AmShip's contention, there is no shortage of shipyard facilities in the fields in which AmShip is a source of supply.

The Department of Defense states that AmShip is currently working on one vessel for the U.S. Navy, but that there are numerous other shipyards in the United States capable of performing the same type of work. The Defense Department advises that it knows of no specific shipbuilding capability unique to this company upon which it would depend for the supply of its present or future critical needs. Similarly, the Maritime Administration states that AmShip is constructing one oceanographic research vessel for it, but the Maritime Administration does not consider the Company as essential to any of its new shipbuilding programs. The Maritime Administration, however, does note its belief that the repair capability of AmShip's yards is essential for the repair and servicing of Great Lakes commercial vessels. The Maritime Administration pointedly stated that the "dry dock facilities operated by [AmShip] are an essential source of supply for the repair of Great Lakes vessels." This is something less than saying, as we must find to grant relief on this ground, that AmShip is a source of supply essential to the national defense."[6] A company providing service to an important industry is not *ipso facto* essential to the national defense. More to the point, as we shall see in our discussion of the financial impact of AmShip's loss under the Coast Guard contract, there is no danger that the yards presently operated by AmShip, will be lost as repair facilities. The only claimed threatened impairment of the Company's productive ability is in the shipbuilding field—in which, we are advised by the knowledgeable Government departments, AmShip is not a source of supply essential to the national defense.

LOSS IMPACT AND IMPAIRMENT OF PRODUCTIVE ABILITY

The regulations governing extraordinary relief condition award to those circumstances, *inter alia,* "where an actual or threatened loss, however caused, will impair the productive ability of a contractor . . ." (FPR § 1–17.204–2(a)). Hence, these criteria require us to determine the contractor's loss, its impact on the Company's operations, and whether or not the loss will impair the contractor's productive ability.

AmShip has furnished the Board with accounting data which depicts the Company's present and past financial status. The Company has also furnished projections to December 31, 1968, designed to measure the total actual and threatened loss. The Board has had the benefit of an accounting analysis of the submitted data performed by the Secretary's audit staff.

AmShip states that the loss on the Coast Guard contract has already caused and will cause a substantial reduction in the Company's working capital.[7] That the Company will incur a substantial loss on the Coast Guard contract is clear. The Company estimates the total anticipated loss on the contract will be in excess of $9 million; the accounting data indicates that the loss will run between $8 and $9 million. This, of course, might change if the final run-out costs of completion were to be significantly different from present projections.

A considerable portion of the loss has already been absorbed by the Company. At least $5.7 million has been written off through the creation of appropriate reserve accounts. There are, therefore, some $2 to $3 million of remaining loss to be absorbed.

Significantly, the loss on the Coast Guard contract is not the only factor contributing to the decline in the Company's working capital position. A 50% expansion in the Company's level of operations beginning in Fiscal Year 1965 accounts for some deterioration in the working capital position. In addition, the new management has embarked upon an acquisition program designed to diversify the sources of the Company's income. This also has had an adverse effect upon the level of working capital. More recently the Company has commenced a facilities construction program, which has contributed to the general decline of its working capital. During the life of the Coast Guard contract, the nature of the Company's shipyard activities has been changing. Several years ago an overwhelming proportion of the Company's shipyard business was in repair and conversion of ships. More recently, the largest proportion of the Company's shipyard work has been directed towards new ship construction.

---

[4] The Coast Guard contract is protected by a performance bond assuring completion of the work.

[5] Recently, the Company's Lorain yard was awarded a contract to construct a new super-bulk cargo carrier by the U.S. Steel Corp.

[6] On this question, the Maritime Administration states, following the words we have quoted, "However, we express no opinion as to whether the maintenance of the company's repair facilities would depend upon or warrant the granting of extraordinary relief by the Coast Guard under its construction contract with the company."

[7] Accountants define working capital as the excess of current assets over current liabilities, or the capital in current use in the operation of a business. Kohler, "A Dictionary for Accountants," Second Edition (1957).

While the loss on the Coast Guard contract has been considerable and there has been some decline in the Company's working capital position, the Board notes that during the last five years, there has been no loss of company-wide aggregate net income. Losses on the Coast Guard contract and other shipyard contracts have been more than offset by gains made by the Company on other business, including the activities of its subsidiaries. The Board also notes that during the life of the Coast Guard contract, the stockholders' equity position also has improved, and dividends have been paid on a fairly regular basis.

There is no evidence that the Company is in serious financial trouble. While the loss on the Coast Guard contract should not be minimized, the fact is that the Company has already absorbed the largest part of that loss and that the overall business of the Company adequately offsets such loss. The Board, therefore, concludes that the contractor's future productive ability will not be significnatly impaired by the loss.

For these reasons, the Board finds that an amendment without consideration would not be justified upon the ground that the loss under the Coast Guard contract will impair AmShip's defense productive ability.

MISTAKE-IN-BID

AmShip's second request for relief rests on a claimed mistake in its original bid. The Company states that there was a bidding mistake on the contractor's part which was so obvious that it should have been apparent to the Coast Guard's Contracting Officer (FPR 1-17.204-3(a)(2)). Alternatively, the Company asserts that there was a mutual mistake as to a material fact. AmShip notes that at present the total actual and anticipated cost to complete the vessels exceeds $27,300,000. The Company says that this overrun, approaching 50% more than its bid price, is a margin so wide between estimated cost and actual cost "that only a fundamental mistake by the bidder can account for it."

AmShip claims that the Government must be presumed to have had actual or constructive notice of the Company's mistake-in-bid because:

1. AmShip's bid was grossly lower than either of the other two bids;

2. The Coast Guard knew or should have known of the realistic cost of construction based on its prior experience for this type vessel with several other private shipyards; and

3. The Coast Guard was aware that the cost of building such vessels was much higher than AmShip's bid, based upon the in-house construction costs at the Coast Guard yard for the "CGC Confidence" (WPC 619), which was under construction when the Company's bid was accepted.

The Company's bid was submitted by its former management in May, 1965; present management did not assume control until October, 1967. The Company was requested to furnish evidence to the Board of the precise nature of the mistake or error that was made in the bid. AmShip's only answer was that the mistake in bidding resulted from the vagueness, ambiguity, and misleading character of the bid specifications and working drawings furnished by the Coast Guard. AmShip states that only after contract award did the Company learn that the Coast Guard interpreted the contract documents in a manner which imposed costly additional and unanticipated requirements on the work. The Company's detailed explanation, however, indicates that the extra work items involved are the same five items which form the subject matter of the contract appeals. As noted, these same circumstances furnish the basis for its request for extraordinary relief based upon "Government acts." In the spirit of the understanding reached, between the parties and the Board, to defer any consideration of those issues on this initial consideration of AmShip's application, the Board will limit its present consideration of the mistake-in-bid question to other issues. If, later, it is found that the facts on these deferred issues have a bearing on the mistake-in-bid question, we will reconsider our decision in that respect. Our determination as to the claimed bid mistake, therefore, principally depends upon comparing the company's gross bid with other bidding and cost data. The same comparisons also furnish insight into the question of whether or not the Coast Guard had constructive knowledge of the erroneous bid.

Comparing the percentage difference between the accepted low bid and the next low bid is one of the most frequently used tools in analyzing mistake-in-bid claims. The Comptroller General, the federal courts, and the various agency contract adjustment boards all use this measure—principally to determine whether or not a contractor's unilateral bid mistake should be found to be so obvious that the Contracting Officer should have had knowledge of it. Attached as an appendix are two compilations of Comptroller General decisions made in 1962 which show the range of differentials which make up the "obviousness" test in resolving the issue of constructive notice.[8] These tables show that lowest-bid-to-next-low-bid differentials ranging from 5% to 38% have been held to be insufficient to place the Contracting Officer on notice of bidding error; whereas the opposite conclusion follows when the disparity runs from 35% to 300% or more. More recent Comptroller General decisions have been consistent with those reported in the compilation.[9] And the various agency contract adjustment boards also follow the same criteria.[10]

In this case the differential between AmShip's bid and the next low bid could be considered to be either about 11 or 15%, depending upon whether the comparison is made with the next lowest bid for any quantity, or with the next lowest bid for the quantity actually ordered. A comparison to the next lower bid of Gunderson Bros. Engineering Corp. (which bid on quantities of 2, 3, and 4 vessels only) shows:

Quantity	AmShip	Gunderson	Differential (percent)
2	$5,593,237	$6,165,000	10.22
3	8,113,961	9,071,000	11.79
4	10,671,835	11,882,000	11.33

No constructive notice found: Comp. Gen. B-154125, May 21, 1964 (20%); *Minneapolis Scientific Controls Corp.*, ASBCA, 65-1, BCA ¶4541 (25%); Comp. Gen. B-165032, Oct. 14, 1968 (6%).

A comparison to the next lower bidder for quantities of 5 and for the 7 vessels actually ordered shows:

Quantity	AmShip	Aerojet General Shipyards	Differential (percent)
5	$13,174,584	$15,394,276	16.84
7	18,076,707	20,832,972	15.24

No constructive notice found: *International Data Systems, Inc.*, NASACAB No. 30, Dec. 8, 1967 (25%).

There are no cases in which constructive notice has been found and relief granted solely on the basis of a difference between low and next-to-low bids, as narrow as that percent in this case. In one case, relief was granted upon a 15% difference between the low bid and the next low bid, but there was evidence of a mechanical mistake in addition apparent on the face of the bid. *Philco Corp.*, ACAB No. 1005, April 19, 1960. In another case, relief was granted on a 9% difference because there was a 59% difference from the second to the third low bid. *Amphenol Electronics Corp.*, AFCAB No. 100, Jan. 4, 1960. Neither of the above factors is present here.

Another test for bid error is a comparison between the low bid and the Government's estimate. Similarly, comparing a bid with previous bid prices on prior procurements for the same item is also used as a test. The following table compares AmShip's bid with the Coast Guard's budget estimate per vessel and with the prior successful bids.

WPC No.	Vessel name (U.S. Coast Guard cutter)	Contractor	Bid date	Initial bid (per vessel)	USCG budget estimate (hull)
615	Reliance	Todd	August 1961	$1,942,904	$2,805,000
616	Diligence	do	do	1,942,904	2,805,000
617	Vigilant	do	September 1962	1,922,898	2,800,000
618	Active	Christy	October 1963	1,998,103	2,200,000
621	Valiant	AmShip	May 1965	2,582,286	2,300,000
622	Courageous	do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000
623	Steadfast	do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000
624	Dauntless	do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000
625	Venturous	do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000
626		do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000
627		do	do	2,582,386	2,300,000

As can be seen from the table, AmShip's bid for this contract was higher than any of the low bids previously received by the Coast Guard for this type of vessel. In addition, it should be noted that in each of the prior procurements, the successful bid was lower than the Government's estimate, whereas for this procurement AmShip's bid exceeded the estimate. In some cases a large differential between a successful bid and the Government's cost estimate has been held to be sufficient to provide constructive notice to the Government of a mistake, but invariably in those cases the bid is substantially below the Government estimate and not, as here, above it.[11]

---

[8] The two tables were taken from Cecil T. Lakes, *Extraordinary Contractual Remedies*, Doctoral Dissertation No. 5877, George Washington University Law Library.

[9] Constructive notice found: Comp. Gen. B-156291, April 6, 1965 (approx. 50%); 40 Comp. Gen. 321 (1960) (50%); Comp. Gen. B-158235, Jan. 27, 1966 (33%); Comp. Gen. B-158765, April 8, 1966 (17-32%); Comp. Gen. B-165090, Sept. 10, 1968 (54%); Comp. Gen. B-165127, Oct. 3, 1968 (27%).

[10] Constructive notice found: *C & M Associates*, AFCAB No. 175 June 2, 1965 (63%); *Servo Corp.*, AFCAB No. 161, Sept. 6, 1963 (58%); *T. W. Frierson, Inc.*, AFCAB No. 101, Feb. 1, 1960 (24%); *Singer Bridgeport*, ACAB No. 1040, May 25, 1962 (48%); *Unit Rig & Equip. Co.*, ACAB No. 1045, Aug. 3, 1962 (17%); *Meyers Corrugated Box Co.*, ACAB No. 1035, Feb. 21, 1962 (30-34%); *Blaw-Knox Co.*, ACAB No. 1019, Oct. 6, 1969, 1960 (23%); *Wolverine Tube Div. of Calumet & Hecla, Inc.*, NCAB, May 23, 1966 (44%); *Belilove Co.*, NASACAB, No. 2, Sept. 22, 1960 (almost 40%); *Mitchell Electric Supply Co.*, NASACAB No. 1, May 17, 1960 (32.02%).

[11] Comp. Gen. B-154166 (August 5, 1964), constructive notice found where bid was approximately one-third of Government estimate; Comp. Gen. B-157742 (Oct. 11, 1965) constructive notice found where bid was less than one-half of Government esti-

XUM

In support of its claim that its bid was substantially below the Government's estimate, AmShip cites the testimony of Admiral Roland, the Coast Guard Commandant, at hearings held in January, 1964, before the House Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey in connection with H.R. 9640, "A Bill to Authorize Appropriations For Procurement of Vessels . . . for the Coast Guard." Admiral Roland testified that five medium endurance cutters were under construction with previous appropriations, and that the budget for Fiscal Year 1965 included funds for five more vessels. The indicated cost contained in the appropriation estimate for the five vessels was $18,750,000 or $3,750,000 per vessel. AmShip suggests that the Coast Guard's budget figure was based upon its experience with the construction of the five preceding vessels. This, AmShip says, demonstrates that the Government estimate was, at the time of the Company's bid, very substantially above that bid. The budget estimate, AmShip observes, compares very closely to its actual cost of construction. There is a very simple answer to this apparent inconsistency in the Coast Guard's position. The budget figures for each of the vessels included much more than the estimated basic construction cost for the hull, which was all that was to be paid for under any ship construction contract. It was necessary for the Government to budget for machinery, electronics, ordnance and outfitting, as well—none of which was to be purchased from the shipbuilding company which would build the hull. The Coast Guard's detailed estimate for each vessel was:

Hull	$2,300,000
Machinery	900,000
Electronics	200,000
Ordnance	50,000
Outfitting	300,000
Total	3,750,000

This tends to confirm, rather than detract from, the Coast Guard's claim that its pre-bid estimate for this procurement was $2,300,000 per vessel—about 10% less than AmShip's bid.

Another claim by AmShip is that the Coast Guard should have known that the Company's bid was too low because of its own contemporary experience in building a similar vessel, the CGC "Confidence" (WPC 619), at the Coast Guard shipyard. Construction of this vessel was begun by the Coast Guard yard in November, 1963, and completed in February, 1966, at a cost (for the hull) of $3,621,650. Since then the Coast Guard yard has completed two other vessels of this class (WPC 620, 628) at approximately the same cost. But these other vessels were not built until after the first vessel was completed. AmShip contends that the Coast Guard should have known of the error in AmShip's bid because of its knowledge of the in-house construction cost for the "Confidence." The Coast Guard notes that in May, 1965, when AmShip's bid was opened, the "Confidence" was only 50% complete and that neither the Coast Guard nor the Contracting Officer had knowledge of the cost of completion of the vessel at that time.

The Coast Guard argues that, in any event, it is not really fair to compare the unit price bid by a private yard for 5 or 7 vessels with the final construction cost to build one vessel at the Coast Guard yard. The Coast Guard points out that, historically, commercial shipyard vessel construction costs are lower than the costs incurred at the Coast Guard yard, and they should be even lower on a multiple ship basis as opposed to single vessel construction costs.

According to the Coast Guard, there are a number of reasons why its facility is a high-cost yard. It must accept all work, including unplanned and emergency work, without regard to cost factors or profitability. Also, Government personnel policies such as personnel ceilings, overtime limits, and a generally higher wage level, impose higher labor costs upon the Coast Guard yard.

The Coast Guard notes that in building the CGC "Confidence," the Coast Guard yard expended 268,320 productive man-hours on construction. AmShip's detailed submission to the Board shows that the Company estimated it would expend 203,690 man-hours on its first vessel (WPC 621), but that it actually used 427,460 man-hours to complete the vessel. Other data in the contractor's submission show that there was no appreciable learning experience effect on construction costs for the first three vessels under the contract. Also contributing to the loss was a Company decision to move the third vessel under the contract (WPC 623) to its Toledo yard from the Lorain yard, where the rest of the contract was being performed. This move had a substantial adverse effect on costs.

We conclude that the Coast Guard had no knowledge, actual or constructive, at the time it accepted AmShip's bid that the Company's bid was, as claimed, substantially below the probable construction costs. Since we have found—

1. That there was not a substantial differential between AmShip's bid and the next low bid;

2. That AmShip's bid was higher, not lower, than the Government's estimate; and

3. That there were no other circumstances to put the Government on notice of an error in AmShip's bid;

we conclude that there is no basis, in terms of the controlling precedents, for adjusting the contract price because of the claimed mistake in bid.

CONCLUSION

In summary, insofar as the application of American Ship Building Company for extraordinary relief under P.L. 85–804 is grounded upon "essentiality" and "mistake," the application is denied; consideration of that portion of the petition relating to "Government acts" is deferred until the Department of Transportation Contract Appeals Board takes final action on the applicant's appeals.

Dated: November 12, 1968.

D. L. SIEGEL,
Chairman.
GERSON B. KRAMER,
A. S. FREVOLA,
E. P. SNYDER,
Members.

APPENDIX 1

In the following cases the Comptroller General held that the disparity and pattern of bids was insufficient to put the contracting officer on constructive notice of error:

Case	Accepted bid	Next low bid	Differential: Amount	Differential: Percent	Number of bids
1. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–137200 (Sept. 11, 1958)	$76.74	$80.75	$4.01	5.2	9
2. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–159438 (May 25, 1959)	1,798,985	1,897,442	98,457	5.5	3
3. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–138912 (Mar. 18, 1959)	3,153.12	3,470.80	317.68	10.7	4
4. 39 Comp. Gen. 36 (1959)	223.97	250.00	26.03	11.6	8
5. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–133951 (Oct. 11, 1957)	17,248	19,721	2,473	14.3	6
6. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–138583 (Feb. 25, 1959)	4.06	4.68	.62	15.2	6
7. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–136436 (July 2, 1958)	.6381	.739	.1009	15.8	5
8. 17 Comp. Gen. 815 (1938)	33,778	39,267	5,489	16.3	17
9. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–138804 (Mar. 13, 1959)	2,538	2,980	442	17.4	10
10. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–138079 (Dec. 16, 1958)	8,894	10,750	1,856	20.9	6
11. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–139245 (Apr. 15, 1949)	.401	.493	.092	22.9	4
12. 6 Comp. Gen. 815 (1927)	26.00	36.07	10.07	38.8	7

Source: Taken from Cecil T. Lakes, "Extraordinary Contractual Remedies," Doctoral Dissertation No. 5877, George Washington University Law Library.

APPENDIX 2

Other cases where the Comptroller General held that the disparity and pattern of bids was sufficient to put the contracting officer on constructive notice of error are:

Case	Accepted bid	Next low bid	Differential: Amount	Differential: Percent	Number of bids
1. 36 Comp. Gen. 585 (1957)	$0.34	$0.46	$0.12	35.3	6
2. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–139897 (June 26, 1959)	140.80	196.80	56	40.0	3
3. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–135594 (Apr. 3, 1958)	1,192	2,258	1,066	89.4	5
4. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–137083 (Sept. 26, 1958)	.75	1.83	1.08	144.0	20
5. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–133870 (Oct. 1, 1957)	27.77	69.45	41.68	150.1	4
6. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–134604 (Dec. 17, 1957)	3,068	8,753	5,685	185.3	3
7. Ms. Comp. Gen. B–138272 (Jan. 19, 1959)	.9980	4.12		312.8	2

Source: Taken from Cecil T. Lakes, "Extraordinary Contractual Remedies," Doctoral Dissertation No. 5877, George Washington University Law Library.

---

mate. Comp. Gen. B–165032, Oct. 14, 1963, no constructive notice where bid was 10% below Government estimate. A variant is *Allied Contractors, Inc.* v. *U.S.*, 159 Ct. Cl. 548 (1962) where the court denied relief; the low bid was 2½ times below the next bid, but was about the same as the Government's estimate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

602. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the selection of purchasers of residential properties sold by the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

603. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of the Agricultural Research Service program for screw-worm eradication, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

604. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

605. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Administration, transmitting a report of action taken during the calendar year 1968 under the authority of Public Law 85–804 (50 U.S.C. 1434), pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on deceptive programing practices (Rept. No. 91–108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7757. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5554. A bill to provide a special milk program for children (Rept. No. 91–110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 337. A bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 91–111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9268. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9269 A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 9271. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such costs within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9273. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9274. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9275. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage landlords to meet minimal housing standards by disallowing the depreciation deduction to a landlord who has been convicted of violating a housing code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 9276. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9277. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9278. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9279. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9280. A bill to provide relocation housing for persons displaced by federally conducted or federally aided acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9281. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9282. A bill to provide for public participation in the development of federally aided highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 9283. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 9284. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish rural electrification and telephone loan accounts, to provide for insured loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 9285. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 9286. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9287. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9288. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9289. A bill to assist in the protection of the consumer by enabling him, under certain conditions, to rescind the retail sale of goods or services when the sale is entered into a place other than the place of business of the seller; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Button, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Carter, Mr. Conable, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Derwinski, Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. Fish, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gude, Mr. Horton, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McDade, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Whalen, and Mr. Zwach):

H.R. 9290. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9291. A bill to provide for employee-management relations between the U.S. Government and its employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9292. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9293. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9294. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9295. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9296. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to permit certain payments to enable children whose parents are employed on our outlying bases to attend boarding schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9297. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide day care for children of low-income families in order to enable their parents or relatives to choose to undertake vocational training, basic education, or employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9298. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9299. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes certain periods of service in the Armed Forces of a government-in-exile allied or associated with the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9300. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the present dollar limits on the amount allowable as a child-care deduction, to eliminate all income limits on eligibility for such deduction, and to increase the maximum age of a dependent child with respect to whom such deduction may be allowed; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 9302. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9303. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. Hosmer) (by request):

H.R. 9304. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the western interstate nuclear compact, and related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9305. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Dingell, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Fraser, Mrs. Griffiths, Mr. Karth, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin, and Mr. Zablocki):

H.R. 9306. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9307. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9308. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9309. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9310. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9311. A bill to declare that certain lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. Perkins, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Dent, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Brademas, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Carey, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hathaway, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Ashbrook, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Ruth, and Mr. Hansen of Idaho):

H.R. 9312. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. Pelly, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mrs. May, Mr. Foley, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Adams, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. King, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Howard, Mr. Boland, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Corman, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Rees, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Brock, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Burton of Utah, Mr. Pollock, and Mr. Pryor of Arkansas):

H.R. 9313. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Symington, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Córdova, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Gude, Mr. Podell, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Fisher):

H.R. 9314. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 9315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain moving expenses of students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 9316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,500 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9317. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 9318. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9319. A bill to amend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 relating to library resources to permit the use of funds provided thereunder for the acquisition of bookshelves and the hiring of additional personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9320. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9321. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9322. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9323. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 9324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself and Mr. Don H. Clausen):

H.R. 9325. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, and improvement of air carrier and general-purpose airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, to promote a coordinated national plan of integrated airport and airway systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on aviation fuel, to increase the tax on transportation of persons by air, and to impose a tax on transportation of property by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 9327. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9328. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9329. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Esch, Mr. Fraser, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Mikva, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, and Mr. Bob Wilson):

H.R. 9330. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Button, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Gubser, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Keith, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. McClure, Mrs. May, Mr. Pirnie, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Shriver, and Mr. Winn):

H.R. 9331. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9332. A bill to protect the public health from the distribution of drugs manu-

XUM

factured in establishments not meeting current good manufacturing practices by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 9333. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9334. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 9335. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9336. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9337. A bill to provide a standard for the determination of obscene matter deposited in the mails and a procedure for the return of such matter to the sender by the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9338. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 9339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9340. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9341. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9342. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9343. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 574. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 575. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 579. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 580. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT (for himself and Mr. Buchanan):

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as "Fire Service Recognition Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution, Biafra: The need for an immediate cease-fire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. Wylie, and Mr. Blanton):

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the return from the Government of Peru of the U.S. destroyer *Isherwood*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution on a Commission for Economic Development of the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution on the arms race in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Mr. Mailliard):

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on participation in the Ninth International Congress on High Speed Photography, to be held in Denver, Colo., in August 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution in support of captured American fighting men; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 332. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a study and investigation of magazine sales promotion practices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. Waggonner, and Mrs. Griffiths):

H. Res. 333. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the retirement benefits available to Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 334. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a study and investigation of magazine sales promotion practices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H. Res. 335. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

83. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to including water quality control as a nonreimbursable operating provision in dam and reservoir projects under the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9345. A bill for the relief of Catalino Boragay Flores, his wife, Teresita, and children, Leesito and Thelee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9346. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9347. A bill for the relief of Cesare Vitale and his wife, Rosario Vitale (nee Como); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie E. Gebauer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9349. A bill for the relief of Young Hoon Park, his wife, Eurnhi Park, their minor daughters, Myong Ok Park and Nam Ok Park, and their minor son, Soo Jin Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9350. A bill for the relief of Tom Hong Yee Felix, also known as Felix Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9351. A bill for the relief of Chin Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9352. A bill for the relief of Castrenze Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9353. A bill for the relief of Wai Tong Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9354. A bill for the relief of Timber Structures, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SS "HOPE"

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the city of Spokane, Wash., has long been an entusiastic supporter of the humanitarian hospital ship, the SS *Hope*.

It has provided the *Hope* with equipment and personnel. Dr. Stanley E. Mayall, who has served on many of the ship's missions of mercy to underprivileged countries, established the ship's dental program. I have been honored to work with Dr. Mayall and the Spokane committee over the years.

When the *Hope* returns from its 10-month stay in Ceylon on March 22, Mrs. Virginia R. Smith, secretary of the Spokane Committee for the Project Hope, will be in Philadelphia to greet the vessel. Two Spokane residents, Kay Williams and James Windust, will be returning from service in Ceylon.

Harriet J. Connor, in her column Chroniscope published in the Spokane Daily Chronicle March 14, tells of past and present Spokane activities in behalf of the *Hope*. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONISCOPE

(By Harriet J. Connor)

TWO-SHIP FLEET FUTURE PLAN

Project Hope has a lot going for it right now—beside the hopes for a better life and better help it gives to peoples of developing nations.

The S.S. Hope—hospital and medical and dental training center—will arrive back in Philadelphia on March 22 from a 10-month stay in Ceylon.

Mrs. Virginia R. Smith of Spokane and Newman Lake, secretary to the Spokane committee of Project Hope, will be on the dock to greet the vessel. She will be holding a 36-inch sign saying "Welcome Kay Williams and Jim Windust."

Miss Kathleen Williams, surgical nurse, and James R. Windust, who is in charge of the medical stores of the ship, are from the Spokane area. They have served on several voyages.

News of proposed expansion and additional facilities will also greet the returning Hope staff.

"Project Hope seeks to add a second hospital ship," Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project Hope, informed Dr. Stanley E. Mayall. Dr. Mayall has served on numerous of the ship's tours of duty and inaugurated the dental program.

"With the hope that the war in Vietnam may soon end, we have made initial provision for the expansion into a second vessel," Dr. Walsh said.

SHIP'S NEXT STAY TO BE TUNISIA

Project Hope has had 24 invitations for a visit of the hospital ship from countries anxious for the medical teaching services.

Toward the end of May, after refitting and refueling, the Hope will visit Tunisia for a year. Dr. Mayall plans a tour of duty with the ship sometime during that stay.

The people of the Inland Empire—and this includes children and high school students—have given a number of auxiliary vehicles to the Project Hope for use ashore in the countries the ship visits.

The Spokane committee proposes to purchase another vehicle and this will be discussed by Mrs. Smith with Dr. Walsh during a visit she will make in Washington, D.C.

A supply of children's pajamas and bathrobes will be sent to the ship for the next trip from the Spokane Mothers of Twins Clubs. The members started the annual project after reading an interview with Miss Williams in the Chronicle of the need for these articles of clothing for the young patients.

Mrs. Harold Hermence of the Mothers of Twins Clubs reports that 300 pairs of pajamas and 50 bathrobes have been made or collected by the mothers of twins. These will be packed for shipment to the Hope warehouse and will be sent there March 21.

STANDARDIZATION IS PLANNED

What will Mrs. Smith's role be in Philadelphia with the ship and in the Washington, D.C., headquarters of Project Hope?

She plans to learn the details of the Hope operation as thoroughly as possible—"from top to bottom" especially how the project works "from the inside out." She will meet with the comptroller and other officials.

Now all the field offices of Project Hope are being standardized including the Spokane office at W508 Sixth. In the beginning the Hope organization here "just grew."

The George E. Jewett Foundation has been a booster and large contributor to Project Hope, Dr. Mayall said.

The ship's return from a 40-day voyage from Ceylon around Cape Horn will be celebrated March 22 at a homecoming party at the Time-Life Building in Philadelphia, which Mrs. Smith will attend.

An invitation has been sent to U.S. Rep. and Mrs. Thomas S. Foley. Foley visited the hospital ship in Ceylon in December. The Foleys were married in Colombo where Mrs. Foley's parents, Mr. and Mrs. D. Alan Strachan, reside.

The original Spokane sponsor of the Hope fund drives was Dantis Club which continues with support and contributions—lately donating $150.

Ferris High School students collected $1,192.88 for Hope in 1968. Their goal for 1969 is $1,200.

At Ferris homeroom competition is the key to the success of the drives. In these 75 rooms all manner of contests, projects and fines, develop to spur on the funds collected. Athletes are even fined if they lose games and the homerooms give donations if the athletes win.

The Hope committee presented the school with a brass plaque engraved with a sketch of the ship as a symbol of appreciation.

Lewis and Clark High School students also contributed as did students of other schools.

STUDENTS HAVE STRONG REACTIONS

"I am really gung ho for the kids," Mrs. Smith enthused—and that means grade through high school.

"When they see how other children live they realize how fortunate they are," she said, is the reaction after seeing films about the Hope and the patients. "They are a lot happier with their parents, their homes and surroundings.

"When they see the picture of a child with his first drink of milk it just takes their breath away," she noticed in audiences of grade school children.

Mrs. Smith "feels strongly" that other schools will be interested in helping.

She has plans to promote activities in behalf of Hope in the Tri-Cities area where she formerly lived.

HOME GARDENS

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CUTHBERTSON REALTY CO.,
Ferriday, La., March 15, 1969.

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR OTTO: I have been watching with interest Sen. McGovern's portrayal of the hunger areas of the U.S. Perhaps this is an actual fact and also it may be widespread. I know of none in the Parishes bordering the Mississippi River.

What strikes me is that in no instance did I see any sign that there was any effort to raise a home garden—even in the rural areas where certainly there was land available for a patch of turnips and mustard greens.

As you know one of the high costs of vegetables is gathering. It is emphasized that those suffering from malnutrition are also idle. They should have plenty of time to raise a good garden and thus contribute to their own welfare and be thus less of a burden to the taxpayer.

During World Wars I and II, I can well remember the effort put forth to encourage everyone to have a home garden. I saw some fine ones and there was a great deal of pride taken in them. Why not a concerted effort to go to even greater lengths to encourage a similar program in the war on poverty? This program could be supervised by the Dept. of Agriculture and get some of those deadheads off the farmer's back and really do something constructive.

When I was on Guam during World War II—we always seemed short of personnel for work details. It finally occurred to us that the 12-man guard detail on the Food Dump was unnecessary—who was going to steal "C" Rations.

In this war on poverty why not place food dumps at strategic points and let everyone help themselves? This would apply to all Americans—rich, poor, and just plain lazy. If I lose my shirt in a poker game and have to put my family on an austerity program I would be entitled to "C" rations too. I will guarantee that after a steady diet of "C's" my family will be plenty healthy, but the old man won't be playing poker again soon. Perhaps this treatment would encourage reliefers to seek enough remunerative work to at least earn enough to supplement it with some goodies.

What's good enough for the lads on the firing line should be good enough for anyone. Dehydrated potatoes, milk, and eggs—meat and bean stew may not be strip sirloin but will fill that belly.

This year's income tax is murder, but I'd feel a lot better about borrowing the money to pay it if some sort of self-help program were initiated to get some of those leeches off their hindparts for a part of the day at least.

Getting back to the home garden idea. When I was in Scotland, I was very much impressed by the fact that evidently the town, or someone, had set aside, perhaps a city block or two, in an otherwise waste area on which were numerous very tiny garden patches. These were highly cultivated—evidently after working hours—and were producing abundantly a great variety of luscious vegetables and fruits. Although evidently a hobby it was a most rewarding one.

I hate to write you every time I have a bitch, but I do believe I have written once or twice commending you for the wonderful benefits you have provided for this area. N.E. La. is fast becoming a major part of the breadbasket of America and I am sure you are proud of the large contribution you have made.

With kindest personal regards, I remain
Sincerely,
WILLIAM CUTHBERTSON.

P.S.—I speak from experience. I have a little 2 x 4 garden on side of house and raise more tomatoes, cucumbers, lettuce, onions, etc than we can possibly eat.

DRUG INDUSTRY'S CONTRIBUTIONS NOTED

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was pleased to note that a number of Pennsylvanians were in Washington this past week for a conference of the National Association of Retail Druggists.

Although we tend to think most often of its contribution to the Nation's health, the fact remains also that the drug industry is a major contributor to the national and State economies as well. This point is well documented by a recently released Temple University study which showed that the pharmaceutical industry is a key spender and tax source in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I was especially interested in the reports of this study published in the Philadelphia Inquirer under the headline "Drugs Called Major Industry" and in the Allentown Sunday Call-Chronicle under the heading "Drug Firms Give Boost in Economy." So that others may acquaint themselves with this development, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Feb. 20, 1969]

DRUGS CALLED MAJOR INDUSTRY

The pharmaceutical industry is a key spender and tax contributor in Pennsylvania's economy, a Temple University study revealed Tuesday.

In 1967 the nine drug firms surveyed spent more than $80 million for goods and services and paid more than $10 million in state taxes.

The Temple report also revealed the combined annual payrolls of nine state-based firms soared 126 percent during the decade ending in 1967 to $100 million.

NEW JOBS

"At this rate the pharmaceutical firms were helping to support almost as many additional workers in the state as they employed directly," the report stated.

The report was prepared by Michael H. Moskow, director of the Department of Economics, and William Murray, of the Department of Economics and Temple's Bureau of Economic and Business Research.

The researchers said the pharmaceutical industry was responsible for two of every seven new manufacturing jobs created in Pennsylvania during the 1957–1967 period.

The nine firms boosted their work force by 41 percent in that period, in contrast to the 1 percent gain registered in all manufacturing jobs in the state.

In addition to paying $10 million in state revenues—$8.5 million in corporation taxes and $1.5 million in real estate taxes—the nine firms withheld more than $1 million from its employees in Pennsylvania taxes and more than $17 million in Federal taxes for 1967.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

The study also revealed that in 1967 the firms:

—Spent more than $50 million on research and development.

—Contributed $5.3 million for voluntary pension, insurance, education, stock and savings plans for their 14,000 employees.

—Contributed $225,000 in corporate funds to civic, educational and community organizations.

—Contributed $800,000 through company foundations to state colleges, hospitals and civic, cultural and charitable institutions.

Participating in the survey were Lambert-Hudnut Manufacturing Laboratories, Lemmon Pharmaceutical Co., McNeil Laboratories, Inc., Merck, Sharp & Dohme, the National Drug Co., William H. Rorer, Inc., Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Vicks Manufacturing, and Wyeth Laboratories.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Sunday Call-Chronicle, Feb. 23, 1969]

DRUG FIRMS GIVE BOOST IN ECONOMY

The pharmaceutical industry was responsible for two out of every seven new manufacturing jobs created in Pennsylvania in the decade ending in 1967, Temple University's Bureau of Economic and Business Research has reported.

During this time, nine pharmaceutical firms increased their work force in Pennsylvania by 41 per cent, a sharp contrast to the one per cent gain registered in all manufacturing jobs in the state during the same period.

The Temple report, based on a survey of nine firms' Pennsylvania operations and federal and state government statistics, also revealed that annual payrolls in the pharmaceutical field increased 126 per cent during the decade to climb above the $100 million figure. This almost tripled the 43 per cent payroll growth recorded by all manufacturing firms in the state during the same period.

Pharmaceutical manufacturing in Pennsylvania also represents a major base for economic growth through research and development, the report states. Reporting pharmaceutical firms expended more than $50 million on research and development in 1967 alone, representing close to ten per cent of all such expenditures by Pennsylvania industry.

At the same time, the firms purchased more than $80 million of goods and services within Pennsylvania. "At this rate," according to the report, "the pharmaceutical firms were helping to support almost as many additional workers in the state as they employed directly."

The firms' activities also represent one of the most important sources of tax revenue for the state. In 1967, reporting firms paid $8.5 million in state corporation taxes plus $1.5 million in real estate taxes on Pennsylvania property.

In addition to State revenue, reporting pharmaceutical firms also withheld more than one million dollars in income taxes from its Pennsylvania employes for local governments while withholding more than $17 million from its Pennsylvania employes for the federal government.

AMEND SECTION 2 OF THE AUTOMOBILE DISCLOSURE ACT

HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend section 2 of the Automobile Information Disclosure Act specifically to extend and remove any question about the applicability of this consumer protection law to Puerto Rico.

It is clear the law—often called the Monroney automobile labeling act covers foreign cars imported into Puerto Rico. But whether it applies to automobiles made in the United States and sold in Puerto Rico has been the subject of conflicting opinions.

However, I am certain that Congress never intended Puerto Rican car buyers to be treated as second-class consumers. Next to a home, an automobile is probably the most expensive purchase for most people during their lifetime. The prospective new-car buyer in Puerto Rico, like his counterpart in the 50 States, is entitled to accurate price information.

The Monroney Act helps protect the consumer in this respect by requiring that every new car display a list showing the manufacturer's suggested retail price and additional charges such as transportation and the price of optional equipment.

Confusion over the applicability of this law to Puerto Rico has created an undesirable situation. Many salesmen will not give the customer the necessary information, because dealers think they are not required to do so by law. New car prices are often grossly inflated and sales talks baited with absurdly generous trade-in allowances and discounts. This practice is harmful to all parties involved in a sale—the buyer, the financing institution, and, in the long run, the dealer.

There being no objection, I would like to introduce into the RECORD two articles written by John Roman, business editor of the San Juan Star newspaper discussing the problems resulting from the different views on the Monroney Act.

The articles follow:

[From the San Juan (P.R.) Star, Feb. 7, 1969]

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS SUBJECT CUSTOMERS TO PRICE GAME

(By John Roman)

A year ago, the Star ran a series of articles stating that only one local dealer—Volkswagen—had the price of its cars labeled on the car.

As of January, 1969, Volkswagen was still the only dealership showing the price being asked on every new and used car.

In the U.S., the Information Disclosure Act, passed in 1958, requires that every dealer list the manufacturer's suggested retail price and such additional charges as shipping and optional equipment costs.

According to federal authorities here, the Monroney Label Act—as the 1958 law is called—does not apply in Puerto Rico.

An official for the Consumer Services Administration explained that a law requiring the posting of such a label have had been introduced in the Legislature "a few years back but it was shelved."

The effect that the lack of a labeling law for cars has had here is to convert automobiles salons into "price casinoes."

This reporter went to at least eight dealers in the local area and the average conversation between prospective customers and salesman went something like this:

"That's nice looking new car. What's the price?"

"Yes, it comes fully equipped."

"What's the price?"

"Where's your trade-in?"

"I don't own a car."

"Are you sure?"

"Sure I'm sure, I know if I own a car."

"Then the price is—, but don't show up with a trade-in because that won't be the same price then."

What many local dealers do is hike up their estimate on the customer's trade-in and then hike up the price of the new car to make up for the price-packing on the trade-in.

According to Myron B. Deily, general manager of Volkswagen del Caribe, "this practice has the unfortunate effect of creating a very bad image for car dealers and hurts the entire trade."

He explained that all cars shipped to Puerto Rico from the U.S. have the Monroney stickers on them, but these are generally removed when they get here.

Although you can sometimes find a Monroney label on a car here, there is no set policy to keep them on by any dealership with the exception of Volkswagen dealers, as far as the STAR could determine.

Deily explained that in the states a dealer is forbidden to remove the sticker and is fined $1,000 a day per car from which the sticker was removed.

"Volkswagen determined early that we were going to be in Puerto Rico permanently and decided to build our image accordingly." Deily said. He added that Volkswagen del Caribe paid for a private legal opinion two years ago on the applicability of the Monroney Act in Puerto Rico. He was told that the law did apply and the stickers have stayed put on all Volkswagens.

Deily added that another effect of the price-packing is to increase the rate of repossessions of cars since false equity is being created.

"Honest dealers in Puerto Rico," Deily said, "are suffering as a result of this practice. Some dealers have asked me how we can continue our policy when no one else is doing it."

NONENFORCEMENT OF CAR PRICE LABELING LAW

(By John Roman)

The reason local car dealers do not show the listed price on new cars as the federal law stipulates is that the U.S. attorney here, Francsico A. Gil, Jr., refuses to prosecute, the Star has learned.

In August, 1968, the then assistant attorney general of the U.S. Fred M. Vinson Jr., informed the local Better Business Bureau office that the Automobile Information Disclosure Act "is applicable to Puerto Rico."

The 1957 act—better known as the Monroney Act—requires car dealers to show the price of the car and accessories on a label attached to the car—known as the Monroney label.

As far as could be determined the only dealership exhibiting the labels faithfully is Volkswagen.

The lack of enforcement locally has given rise to the practice of "price packings," which leads the customer to think he's getting a better deal than he expected.

A dealer will estimate a used car being given on a trade-in at a much higher value than it's worth and hike up the price of the new car accordingly.

"What they are doing," said Anthony Lombardo, manager of the local Better Business Bureau, "is allowing the dealer to get a used car free."

In an attempt to put an end to the practice, Lombardo wrote a letter to Gil asking for an opinion on the application of the Monroney Law locally.

After a two-month wait, Gil wrote to Lombardo, stating:

"The regulations of the Department of Justice preclude us from formulating opinions in any matter whatsoever."

In the meantime, Lombardo has received a letter from Clark D. Anderson, special agent in charge of the local FBI office stating that his office would not arrest dealers violating the act because "Mr. Gil advised that it is the policy of his office not to prosecute alleged violations of the aforementioned act . . ."

"This is a ridiculous situation," Lombardo said, "because all Gil has to do is state that he intends to carry out the law and the practice would stop overnight. I can't understand why he doesn't do something about this."

When asked Gil's office for an opinion on this matter and whether or not the law applied in Puerto Rico, he was told: "The U.S. Attorney's office cannot give opinions to anyone who is not an employe of the U.S. or Puerto Rican government."

In his letter to Lombardo, Vinson states:

"The Department of Justice feels that the Automobile Information Disclosure Act is applicable in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Section 734 of Title 48, United States Code provides that "the statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable . . . shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States."

AN ERA OF PERMISSIVENESS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a thought-provoking editorial entitled "An Era of Permissiveness," was published recently in my hometown newspaper, the Aiken Standard and Review.

Publisher and Editor Samuel A. Cothran draws attention to the recent Supreme Court decision which upholds the rights of high school students to conduct symbolic protests provided such action does not disrupt discipline or infringe upon the rights of others.

The effect of the decision will be to move to our high school campuses demonstrations and other social protests which are presently changing the scene and atmosphere at colleges across America.

In a 7-to-2 decision Justice Hugo Black, long an outspoken advocate of freedom of speech, filed a dissenting opinion as one of the two voting in the minority.

Justice Black realizes that high school administrators will now be faced with frequent decisions as to which various types of protests disrupt discipline or infringe upon the rights of others.

Thus, we are likely to see an acceleration of protest activity on our high school campuses, and also a flurry of cases coming to the Supreme Court in this area.

In his March 3, 1969, editorial Editor Cothran agrees with the minority opinion of Justice Black which recognizes that this decision simply moves us further in the "era of permissiveness" under the guise of "freedom of speech."

Mr. President, recent history offers support for the view of Justice Black and Editor Cothran that the judiciary has helped to foster this permissiveness.

Reports in the press clearly indicate that the trend toward disorder on the campus of educational institutions is moving from the college to the high school scene. Unfortunately, the movement is given a boost by the Supreme Court under the time-honored right we all cherish—freedom of speech.

In years past our high schools and colleges were more concerned with educating our young people for the awesome responsibilities of a technological age. Now it seems that the more important thing is to allow everyone all the freedom possible to "do their thing."

Mr. President, I have noted with pleasure that the American press—long an advocate of freedom of speech has not fallen prey to the trends in our "era of permissiveness." I think the editorial in the Aiken Standard and Review is an example of the wisdom with which the press is viewing this movement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ERA OF PERMISSIVENESS

In ruling that high school students have the right to conduct symbolic protests if they do not disrupt discipline or infringe on the rights of others, the U.S. Supreme Court has opened the door to more troubles on the nation's educational front. The effect of the 7–2 ruling may well be the spread of demonstrations—and accompanying violence—from the colleges to the secondary school campuses.

Writing the majority opinion, Justice Abe Fortas held that the constitutional right of freedom of speech was involved in a Des Moines case in which three students were barred for wearing black arm bands of mourning for Vietnam war dead. A high school student, according to Justice Fortas, may express his opinions when he is in a school cafeteria or on the playground or on the campus.

However, the majority of justices ruled, student conduct that "materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others is, of course, not immunized by the constitutional guaranty of free speech."

The high court decision, therefore, can be expected to produce test cases. It will, in all probability, encourage confrontations by young activists who are supported by such organizations as the college-level Students for a Democratic Society. SDS already has begun recruiting and advising on high school campuses.

If such protests materialize in appreciable numbers, the Supreme Court decision will have had the effect of putting high school administrators to the same test which university presidents and other administrators have faced. High school principals will be faced with the decision of whether the actions of three or three dozen protestors "materially disrupts classwork" or "involves substantial disorder." The degree of disorder is a matter of opinion on which administrators and protestors could scarcely be expected to agree. Resultant disagreement is sure to spark further disorder of greater intensity.

XUM

The thrust of the decision is such that it stirred the wrath of Justice Hugo Black, one of two dissenters. Justice Black, long an outspoken advocate of freedom of speech, was moved to assert that the ruling subjects every public school "to the whims and caprices of their loudest-mouthed, but maybe not their brightest students."

We are inclined to agree with Justice Black when he declares:

"One does not need to be a prophet or the son of a prophet to know that after the court's holding today that some students in Iowa schools and indeed in all schools will be ready, willing and able to defy their teachers on practically all orders.

"This is the more unfortunate for the schools since groups of students all over the land are already running loose, conducting break-ins, sit-ins, lie-ins and smash-ins."

Justice Black sees the decision as the "beginning of a new, revolutionary era of permissiveness in this country fostered by the judiciary." We see it not as the beginning but as the continuation of a deplorable trend which the judiciary fostered months and years ago.

LET THE CONSUMER DECIDE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a letter from an old and very good friend, Shelby Southard, of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. Mr. Southard included with his letter a speech recently delivered by Charles Y. Lazarus, president of the American Retail Federation. I think Mr. Lazarus' comments on the growing interest in "consumerism" in this country are worth pondering. It is my pleasure to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Lazarus' speech entitled "Let the Consumer Decide":

LET THE CONSUMER DECIDE

(Address of Charles Y. Lazarus, president, American Retail Federation; president, the F. & R. Lazarus & Co., Columbus, Ohio; vice president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., to members of the California Retailers Association and the Central City Association California Club, Los Angeles, Calif., March 11, 1969)

Somewhat to my surprise, I found the timeliest thesis for these remarks in a document that is almost ten years old.

The document is called "Goals for Americans, Programs for Action in the 1960's." You may remember it as the title for a report by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals.

Some time ago, prompted first by my appointment to the Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy under a Democratic administration and then by the election of a new Republican administration, I began rereading this report, curious to know how much of it might still be relevant. By way of cuing us to the main points I hope to make today, I would like to read a few excerpts. I quote:

"The paramount goal of the United States was set long ago. It is to guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity . . . Our enduring aim is to build a nation and help build a *world* in which *every human being* shall be free to develop his capacities to the fullest. We must rededicate ourselves to this principle and thereby strengthen its appeal to a world in political, social, economic, and technological revolution.

"The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities . . . and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice. From this concern . . . comes our insistence on a widely distributed political and economic power, on the greatest range of free choice in our economy, and on the fair and democratic exercise of public and private power."

I hardly need tell you, things have changed since 1960. As you in Los Angeles have special reason to know, it has been a decade marked by protest and violence. Our cities have exploded in riots. Our campuses have been rocked by student revolts. All our institutions, as the price of survival, have been shocked into what in a different context the late John Foster Dulles called an "agonizing reappraisal."

So general has been the discontent and so shrill the conflicting cries for attention—and yes, so incoherent and frequently terrifying have been the demands of the outraged—as to pose a deep and perplexing question:

Does all this add up to a petition from history that the American system be discarded and some new system, as yet undefined, be put in its place?

Or do these events merely represent an insistence, largely on the part of those whom society has heretofore neglected or ignored, that the system be made to work better . . . that its imbalances be corrected . . . that the rights of citizenship and the rewards of participation in the system be extended to *all* Americans . . . that, in short, we reorganize for the fulfillment of the promise implicit in the very basic idea of America?

Granted that we are in crisis; granted that whatever one does in times like these is necessarily an act of faith. What we have been seeing is not evidence of a revolt against the American system but only a new episode in what began at Lexington in 1775 and has been evolving ever since.

What we have been seeing, I insist, is not the submergence of individuals but, on the contrary, an enlargement of the very concept of the individual.

What has happened, quite simply, is that more and more individuals have organized to stake their claim in the democratic process. Sometime during the 1930's, so the story goes, a Labor Department official is supposed to have said, when confronted by Eleanor Roosevelt, "But Mrs. Roosevelt! It's not that we've discriminated against women. We just never thought about women." Simply put, our society and the men we have made leaders have now been forced to think about everybody. And for this new reality we have to thank the American Negro, the American poor, and that remarkable abstraction, the American consumer.

It is mostly about this American consumer, and with the importance of the consumer movement to us as retailers, businessmen, and citizens, that I want to speak today.

To most retailers, the consumer movement figures as a series of quite specific bits of Federal legislation — Truth-in-Packaging, Truth-in-Lending, the Flammable Fabrics Act, for example—the intent of which is to protect or inform our customers. "I hope that this Congress will go down in history as the consumer-conscious Congress," President Johnson said in his message to Congress a year ago. And indeed it did. Ten months later, 28 pieces of major consumer-oriented legislation had become law.

Now, in case any of us is inclined to dismiss this impressive performance as an act of Congressional catharsis that ended with the retirement of Lyndon Johnson, a moment's reflection on events since January 20th should set us straight.

A raft of new consumer bills has been introduced. One would establish a Department of Consumer Affairs at cabinet level. Of perhaps equal significance, the year-old Consumer Federation of America has now established a secure claim to having achieved what President Eisenhower's Commission recommended ten years ago: "There is need for more private interest groups which represent broader interests such as consumers." At its second annual Consumer Assembly, the Federation reported an increase in membership from 56 to 136 organizations. What's more, its opening-night reception attracted 150 Congressmen. On the floor above a trade association was holding a similar reception—and I might add a much more lavish one. In attendance were all of five Congressmen.

So consumerism is much more than so many skeptical ladies with shopping lists. Though Senator Warren Magnuson was undoubtedly right when he wrote "Politicians have 'discovered' the American consumer" consumerism is also considerably more than a body of Congressmen who know a good thing when they see it.

It is important I think that we try to understand some of its deeper implications.

For one thing the emergence of consumerism as a phenomenon of the sixties clearly reflects the shift from a producer-oriented to a service-oriented economy. The technological revolution has created vast numbers of new service-type jobs, in occupational settings far removed from factories and the traditional symbols of production. The effect of this has been to increase enormously the numbers of Americans who identify psychologically with the processes of distribution and consumption, and to de-emphasize, comparatively, those who are still emotionally tied to the assembly line. The effect has also been to expose far greater numbers to the frustrations of a marketplace that is too often impersonal.

It would be a serious error to assume that consumerism will have an impact only on legislative programs to improve the quality and safety of merchandise. It will be felt, inevitably, on marketing operations as well.

Of more fundamental importance, the consumer interest has now become the new standard for public policy. After centuries of being lost and unidentified in the loud traffic of special interests, the consumer has now appeared not merely as a new element in the political mix but as the symbol of the common interest. As one Washington editorialist recently said, "The thing about consumers is that everybody is one." Suddenly, the American consumer is Everyman. For the "individual" whose advancement has always been our paramount national goal, you can now write "consumer," for in the new language of Washington they have become one and the same.

It would be naive to believe that this new focus on the individual-consumer will put an end to special-interest thinking. I am, however, encouraged to believe that if the trend continues, social problems will soon be pushed to a new and higher level of visibility. The result will be not only a more generally comprehensive approach to problem solving. Policymakers operating at this new level will be almost forced to take into account all the cause-and-effect, life-and-death relationships that are likely to be disturbed or set in motion if a proposed action is taken. With the new knowledge to be gained from this higher and broader point of view, I think it only natural to assume that one's immediate, short-range interests will come to be seen in a different and less persuasive perspective.

On a somewhat modest scale, I saw something like this process at work last year as

XUM

one of 34 members of the President's Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy.

Our committee represented a fair cross-section of those private interests normally presumed to be affected by the import-export business. Our purpose was to confer with the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in the conduct of a study of long-range U.S. foreign trade policy. From the beginning, this effort was marked by an insistence that the problem be viewed in its entirety and as a retailer I took it as my natural responsibility to represent the consumer.

As you know, debate on U.S. trade has traditionally centered on the broad issues of economic growth and foreign relations. To my knowledge, this was the first time that any formal analysis of our trade policies ever took seriously into account the effect of these policies on the purchasing power of the American consumer.

I'd like to share with you a few of the things I learned in the course of this study, drawing on two position papers that I wrote for consideration of the President's Special Representative. First, a statement of rationale.

It seems elementary to me that foreign trade policy recommendations should be developed in a way that would advance our primary national goal. In terms of trade, this means necessarily those policies that offer the individual a high standard of living, with a maximum freedom of choice. It seems only logical therefore that what America should seek is to accommodate—not negate—world-wide enjoyment of the fruits of world-wide economic opportunities. Not to recognize this in long-range foreign trade policy recommendations could result in legislated self-interest for special groups, and thus do violence to our main national goal. That goal, let me remind you, is not to enrich a few individuals but to do the greatest good for the greatest number of all individual Americans.

A trade policy that shields special-interest groups is not in our best national interest, long-range. Imports and exports move in such precarious balance that it is virtually impossible for the United States to protect a single industry through tariffs or quotas without inviting retaliation from foreign governments, to the inevitable detriment of some other American industry. I believe, therefore, that the individual citizen, that is the consumer, should be the final decision-maker on the amount of goods we import. Neither tariff barriers nor non-tariff barriers should be allowed to protect producers indefinitely at the expense of the individual citizen.

To me, it seems self-evident that the consumer's interest in international trade is best served by policies which—

1. Save him money.
2. Bring him a larger selection of fashions and styles.
3. Satisfy his demands for merchandise not otherwise available from domestic suppliers; and
4. Maintain the competitive impact of imports on domestic prices, product efficiency, innovation, and fashion.

But to what extent tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers might be inimical to the consumer interest on these four points is something we do not yet know. Therefore, in an effort to fix some guidelines for future research, last fall I asked a few associates to examine the sales records on a group of selected apparel lines and to talk with key executives in three department stores—one in New York, one in Washington, and a third in Chicago.

What they found was that on some of our most in-demand imports present trade barriers are costing the consumer in sheer dollars and cents as much as 40 percent on price.

For example, a man can buy an imported cashmere sweater for $25. He would have to pay $35 for a comparable U.S.-manufactured product. With present trade barriers removed, the retail price of the imported sweater would be roughly $21.

An imported boy's winter coat made of synthetic fiber retails for $28. If we had no trade barriers, that same coat would cost $23. (The price for a comparable U.S.-manufactured coat is $30.).

A lady's cotton dress glove costs $3 under present trade barriers; without them it would most $2.50. A comparable glove manufactured in the United States sells for $5.

And so on.

But the value of imports, as we well know, does not lie in price alone. Of the senior department store buyers interviewed, all agreed that imports make an equally important contribution by giving consumers a wider choice of styles, fashions, and craftsmanship. In fact, many imported items (for example, high-fashion dresses and gowns, high quality furniture or housewares, rugs and tapestries) are higher priced than their U.S. counterparts. In an expanding economy like ours, however, they find ready buyers among upper and middle income Americans because of their distinctive fashion and design features.

Our study focused also on the indirect costs to the consumer of tariffs and quotas. There is, for instance, the very real, though as yet imprecisely measured, effect of increased capital costs for plant and equipment because of tariffs and quotas, costs that are compounded and passed on to the retailer and consumer in increased distribution costs of finished goods.

It is clear, too, that the consumer suffers indirectly from government Buy America policies. While no one questions the need to keep those industries efficient that are essential to our national defense, there is, it seems to me, a reasonable question as to whether all the industries protected by this policy are in that category. In any event, there is no doubt that the Defense Department's procurement policies have increased the cost of government operations by billions of dollars since passage of the Buy America law in 1933 and the administration's action of the early 1960's. Statistics tell us the inflationary effect of increased government costs. Hence, increased taxes amount to many billions of dollars a year to American consumers.

Our research, admittedly, was spotty and incomplete. Our main contribution to the Committee's deliberations was to introduce the consumer's stake as a valid and largely unexplored subject of inquiry, in all aspects of world trade. More specifically, we identified the need for more thorough research into the effect on the consumer of restrictive trade practices on 1) direct imports, 2) capital costs, and 3) government procurement. I earnestly hope that the Nixon administration will undertake such research and present its findings to the appropriate government agencies for action.

All of this, it seems to me, assumes special relevance in the light of the recent move by the new administration to negotiate with foreign governments for the imposition of quotas on the import of textiles and apparel items.

For the past four years, we have been increasing imports of all textiles and apparel items at an average rate of 25 percent a year. Under the proposed "voluntary" quotas—assuming they follow the textile industry's recommendations of last year—this growth rate would be reduced to 5 percent a year and kept there, regardless of the continuing increase in consumer demand.

I think it most important that before the administration consummates any agreements it take into account the serious inflationary effect of quotas on consumer purchasing power. I think it equally important that whatever relief may be necessary by industry, or by company within industry, be very temporary in nature.

We're talking about added costs to the consumer that would run into hundreds of millions of dollars!

Plainly, if we're going to protect the consumer's purchasing power—which now represents 60 percent of our Gross National Product—we retailers have to be able to buy the right goods at the right price at the right time in a global economy, regardless of where these goods are produced. This should be our long-range goal, and we should not forget it.

This does not mean, however, that we should be indifferent to companies and workers that might actually be experiencing injury due to imports. All of us are having to learn how to adapt mobility in capital and labor to the demands of a global economy, and in the process some of us will undoubtedly be hurt. I personally favor a more liberalized escape clause in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act that would provide meaningful temporary relief in such cases—but only to those who actually have been injured. I also favor adjustment assistance—retraining, low-cost loans, moving expenses—that would enable companies and workers to adapt to competition from imports. Such assistance would be used whenever feasible, not only to maintain competitive world trade, but as a way of preventing windfalls to those larger companies that are in no need of relief, and of insuring that benefits go to those smaller companies who may in fact be in real trouble.

All this acknowledged, I remain convinced that in the long run the best policy for both retailers and consumers is the one advanced in 1960 by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals: "The healthiest world economy is attained when trade is at its freest."

There is, I am more than ever persuaded after my service on the Advisory Committee, a direct connection between free men and free trade. I was especially encouraged, therefore, when President Nixon told one of his earliest press conferences: "I believe that the interests of the United States and the interests of the whole world will best be served by moving toward freer trade rather than toward protection. I take a dim view of this tendency to move toward quotas and other methods that may become permanent, whether they are applied here or by nations abroad."

I began these remarks with an emphasis on the individual. Yet I have been talking mostly, and on the whole optimistically, about policy-making in Washington and the power of big and diverse organizations—things that are commonly thought to diminish the utility of individual action. As contradictory as it may appear, what I have in fact been trying to do is to make clear the need for increased individual involvement—particularly at the level of the local community, and most particularly by businessmen. Let me explain.

I am convinced that the processes by which national policy is now being formed, though still woefully inefficient, are nevertheless more likely than ever before to accommodate the needs and concerns of all our citizens. From the evidence of the past 51 days, I would judge that Mr. Nixon means to encourage these processes. Everything considered, the President has indicated that he is a man who intends to look at all the levers before he pulls any one of them. For this he deserves our commendation and support.

But, it must be recognized, policies are one thing and effective administration is quite another. To make policies work, programs are required, Regrettably, the intent of some of our most enlightened policies is often defeated by the overlap in functions, the corrosive jealousies, and the institutionalized resistance to change that characterize so many of the organizations on which the administration of these programs depends. One example will illustrate: According to the National Commission on Urban Problems, as of 1967 our metropolitan areas were served by 20,745 local governments. Chicago has 1,113 different and often competing local authorities; in the Philadelphia metropolitan area there are 876 separate municipal governments.

If I knew nothing about the problems of getting things done in my home town, these figures alone would convince me of the need for basic institutional change.

Now, the simple and inescapable fact is that if this needed change is to occur—which is almost to say, if the American system is to endure—it is absolutely imperative that there be more local initiative, as well as more enlightened local response to Federal initiative and more enlightened Federal response to local initiative. Reforms must take place at the level where people are.

There is no hope that such needed reforms can be accomplished—certainly no hope that they can be accomplished rationally and orderly—unless businessmen like those of us in this room today participate ever more personally and ever more positively in the affairs of our communities.

I take issue with those among us who argue that the responsibility of business is only to make a profit for our shareholders and who would delegate to others—mostly others in government and to paid professionals in our trade associations—the problems of housing, employment, transportation, education, civil rights, and politics. It should be clear beyond doubt by now that our failure to solve our social problems has added directly to the cost of doing business and that these costs cannot be reduced merely by attending to the internal affairs of corporate management. We must, more and more, assume responsibility for the environment in which business operates.

In today's world, like it or not, it is through big organizations that Americans get things done. Over the past several years, however, we have learned that the job to be done is too big even for our biggest organizations, public or private, acting alone and apart. As a consequence, we are seeing the formation of new alliances, particularly between business and government, of such potential as to constitute a new kind of federalism.

These new coalitions offer great promise but they also pose a great challenge. The challenge is to keep them responsive both to the people who created them and the people they are supposed to serve. And the fact is, the only way this challenge can be met is for the people affected by these big coalitions to participate thoughtfully and actively in the policies and programs of their member organizations.

Which gets me around to the job that we retailers have been doing through our own organizations.

I am pleased to report that our record is improving. I have been especially heartened by your performance in California. You have, as a matter of fact, set a standard for the rest of us, particularly when it comes to getting your top leaders to accept a personal responsibility to work with government.

We now have fifty state retail organizations, whereas only three years years ago we had thirty-seven. We've begun to act more concertedly and more positively, with a result that doors are opening to us, not only in Washington but in state houses all over the country. In short, we have set the stage for the fulfillment of what I have come to regard as the retailer's logical mission in an increasingly urban society—to be one of the consumer's respected and most effective advocates in the highest councils of government.

But, obviously, we need to do more. I would urge you to give more support to your agents in Washington, meaning the American Retail Federation. During my tenure as president, I have been particularly impressed with the need for more substantive research and for more sustained communications, to our membership as well as to key policymakers. Without these, our staff finds it extremely difficult to develop, and offer to Congress at the opportune time, recommendations for action that are both innovative and feasible.

Too often in the past, because we have had time and resources only to react to threats of damaging legislation, we have been forced on the defensive, leaving a distinctly negative impression in the minds of our most influential Congressmen. We now need to move into a secure position of advocacy. To do this, and thereby create a more positive image, we definitely need to expand our programs in research and communications.

We retailers have the knowledge, the money, and the numbers to become an important presence in Washington.

Tackling the problems in our own communities, we can also make an important contribution to the solution of the all-pervasive urban crisis.

Finally, I suggest that we will be most effective, at both the national and local levels, if we bear this constantly in mind: within the American system our job as retailers is to preserve and improve the economic position of our customers—collectively, the consumers of America who constitute our rightful constituency.

If we do this, we can be confident that our activities as an association of retailers are in step with what has always been this nation's paramount goal—"To guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity."

The Consumer's Stake in International Trade

(Note.—The table that follows is drawn from a study initiated last fall by Charles Y. Lazarus, president of The F & R Lazarus & Company, of Columbus, Ohio, while serving as a member of the President's Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy. The findings are based on an examination of sales records for selected apparel lines in three typical U.S. department stores—one in New York, one in Washington, and a third in Chicago.)

PRICES PAID BY THE AMERICAN CONSUMER AS A RESULT OF IMPORT BARRIERS

Merchandise	Retail prices to the consumer with no trade barriers (1)	Retail prices to the consumer with present trade barriers (2)	Retail prices today of a comparable U.S. manufactured product (3)
Boys' wear:			
Boys' winter coat, wool	$16.15	$20.00	$22.50
Boys' winter coat, synthetic fiber	23.00	28.00	30.00
Boys' winter wool coat, pile lining (English or German)	28.85	35.00	40.00
Boys' winter wool coat, ornamental tufted construction	37.45	45.00	(1)
Boys' hooded terrycloth robe, quality fabric	14.00	15.00	20.00
Boys' Helenca fabric stretch ski trousers	13.60	18.00	(1)
Boys' Helenca velour fabric shirt, stretch collar	8.60	11.00	(1)
Boys' fisherman's sweater, individually hand knit	8.50	11.00	(1)
Boys' cardigan (individually hand knit)	9.20	12.00	(1)
Boys' wool ski sweater, bulky type weave	10.60	14.00	(1)
Ladies' shoes:			
Pump, 16/8 leather upper, leather sole, bow trim	14.60	17.00	24.00
Sandal, 4/8 stack heel, leather upper, leather sole	8.70	10.00	14.00
Sandal stripping, 12/8 covered heel, leather upper, leather sole	14.80	17.00	21.00
Men's sportswear:			
Men's cashmere sweater (English)	20.85	25.00	35.00
Men's V-neck lambs wool sweater (English)	14.00	17.00	21.00
Men's cowhide leather coat (Swedish)	138.00	150.00	200.00
Men's fisherman's wool sweater, individually hand knit (Italian)	14.85	18.00	(1)
Men's hand loom wool coat (English)	29.40	35.50	(1)
Ladies' gloves:			
Ladies' cotton dress gloves	2.50	3.00	5.00
Ladiss' kid leather gloves, fabric lined	12.50	15.00	(1)

[1] Not available in United States or supply of comparable product inadequate to meet consumer demands.

BUSINESS AND AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an article which recently appeared in the magazine Sales/Marketing Today. The article was written by Mr. J. W. Goss, vice president of the Continental Investors Corp. of Boston, Mass. He is an outstanding leader in the field of sales marketing and is vitally concerned with the continued progress of his profession. In this connection, he has some unusually cogent remarks to address to the youth of our country, and this he does most effectively in the article which I now ask be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Business as a Career

(By J. W. Goss)

Marketing is an adventure. It is, or should be, challenging to the mind and satisfying to the soul. Business, meaning private enterprise, is at the heart of the American system. To be sure, in some instances, business has been greedy, grubby, grim. But basically business has been good for the nation and its citizens.

Try telling this to the youth of America and chances are you'll get the old raspberry—as grandpa used to say. Modern-day young men and women in this country say they have no or little use for selling, for merchandising, for business, even for profits. "Tell it like it is, man," the kids urge their parents and their peers, implying they doubt the sales pitch—can't buy it, can't dig it, can't understand why marketing and business are so important and so pivotal in our system.

It does little good for either side to pass off these reactions as passing fancies. It does little good for a business executive, regardless of his industry, to sneer at today's young. Rather, it behooves a businessman to use his proved research and his human understanding to learn what's really bugging the kids.

For one thing, today's youths are tomorrow's customers, tomorrow's market. In the second place, sales marketing needs manpower, and in many respects, the best manpower—the persons with the most imagination, initiative, drive, incentive—are the young. One survey shows that by 1975 one out of every five persons will earn a living by buying and selling—by working, in short, in the very field being shunned by today's youngsters. If this prediction is anywhere accurate, business must today start out wooing youth, recruiting college graduates and tell them how it really is in the business world. Business faces a selling job.

On almost all college campuses today business is viewed as too dull, as demanding too much conformity, as being short on opportunity and long on drudgery. In 1968, business got only two college graduates for every three it needed. Many companies bragged that they reached their recruitment goals; but did they really recruit the type of young man and woman they wanted, the ones with the most talent? Probably not.

A basic reason for the alienation of the young is the affluence of the nation. In today's economy, most persons—young and even middle-aged—have little fear of unemployment; quit one job and another comes along. Such a situation leads to a minimum of corporate allegiance and appreciation. Then too, today's youth has less incentive than its elders to begin working at a career; hundreds of thousands of young men and women elect to continue their education, at daddy's expense, instead of looking for a job. Once again, diffidence toward business, maximum interest in education or, as cynics might contend, continued "goofing off." With interest in private enterprise low, interest in education, Government, research, protest, Peace Corps and VISTA remains high. But give the young their due: They are more intelligent (42 per cent of today's high school graduates go to college, vs. 15 per cent in 1938), they are inquisitive, they are perceptive. But they are also wrong.

The young say they want excitement; business—especially marketing, or selling—is exciting. The young say they want a challenge; business—especially marketing—is challenging. The young say they want to become "involved" in society; business—in some aspects more so than Government—is becoming involved in the nation's problems. In the world's problems.

This isn't just idle talk from a satisfied businessman. Consider my industry: securities, investments, mutual funds. In the fund field, there are more than 400 competitors, each striving to outdo the other in their own fashions. There are thousands and thousands of salesmen, marketing men, seeking to persuade millions of potential customers to buy their product—and at the same time build for family and individual security. This is no sham; equity savings are an integral part of American life. There is no hypocrisy in marketing securities. There is more hypocrisy in Government and in politics, perhaps even in some classrooms. Chances for advancement? Opportunity for initiative? The investment industry is replete with both. Too much conformity? Not true! Most businessmen are more interested in what goes on in a young man's brain than the length of his mustache, beard or sideburns. Got any new ideas for mutual fund sales techniques, as long as they are completely and honestly ethical? Go to it, man! Sock it to 'em!

Marketing, selling if you will, can be as adventurous as a man wants to make it. The vast majority of American products are useful to mankind, important for his future, vital to the functioning of the country. Few bosses ask their employees to sacrifice principles and ideals; bring them along and take them to the job.

Yes, but how can business get this story across? We need to beef up our efforts in several areas:

We must persuade colleges and universities to improve their business courses, to make them more relevant, to update textbooks, to rewrite economics texts which more often than not treat this unexact but exciting social science as dishwater dull.

We must convince college professors of economics that profit is not a dirty word. This type of fuzzy thinking has been attacked by some Deans of Schools of Business Administration and some business leaders. More help is needed on this front.

We must get secondary school books and courses to tell a fuller and more accurate story of the private enterprise system, of how it functions and the role it plays in society—even at a time when government is itself growing. In housing, employment, pollution, human welfare. Look at what the National Alliance for Businessmen is doing about finding jobs for the "hard core": More than 40,000 persons put to work in less than six months.

We must lose our fears of having employees become involved on their own. We must encourage workers to get into politics, into neighborhood organizations. More and more business executives themselves are jumping into the political arena; as proof, recall the full-page newspaper ads from "Businessmen for McCarthy", "Businessmen for Humphrey", "Businessmen for Nixon". And, on a different plane, there are buinessmen supporting our policies in Vietnam and businessmen for peace now in Vietnam.

There is one assuring note in all this for businessmen: Today's swinging youngsters may be 'way underneath, more conservative than we and they sometimes think. One survey found that young employees prefer working for themselves rather than someone else, think a couple should buy a home before their fifth year of marriage, prefer to provide for their old age rather than rely on Social Security and have little objection to being identified by number. In all these things, the young aren't different from mom and dad.

The same survey found that young people think of the stock market as dynamic and "masculine". Eighty-two per cent of male college graduates have savings accounts. Asked what they would do with a financial windfall, the bulk of young men said they would invest the money—not go on a spending spree. Again, just like the older generation.

There was a news story the other day of a 21-year old college student who had started a successful investment counseling firm. He was also seeking to buy a mutual fund. A 21-year old! And his clients were all affluent elders. The reporter—already an oldie at 26—commented that marketing men should use such a yarn as one way of selling the excitement of their work to the American youth.

One articulate college senior had this to say: "People are sold products—they rarely buy them. Business has never really sold itself to us. And when we don't buy business as a career—they criticize our long hair or our sandals. The time they spend clucking away at us could be better spent using their great marketing skills to sell us on their business as our business, too."

There is also room for the protester in business, for the guy who wants to market a different product or an old one in a different way. Competition breeds initiative, innovation, imagination—the very things today's youngsters assert are lacking in the sales marketing profession.

John Brooks, the author, put it this way: "Business, like other games, needs rules and umpires to restrain the exuberance of the competitors, and I should think—good Lord, I should hope—there always will be a few competitors who will spend their time complaining about the rules at the top of their lungs."

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AT PLAY—A CASE HISTORY

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 last year in the debate on the military procurement authorization, I called to the attention of the Members a particular procurement for a particular helicopter called the Cheyenne, manufactured by Lockheed. I reminded them that this was an Army procurement, that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development at the time the R. & D. contract was awarded had come from Lockheed, and 3 months after the research and development contract was awarded to Lockheed, he returned to Lockheed.

At one point he executed a paper which said that "the 5-year force structure and financial plan for the AAFSS—now the Cheyenne—to include avionics, currently reflects $81.5 million fiscal year 1966 through fiscal year 1970." The date of that paper was January 29, 1965. A similar plan today would reflect more than 10 times that amount. At about this time last year, in our committee hearings, the Army told the Armed Services Committee that this was a firm fixed price contract. Ho, ho, ho.

I asked the Army a year ago what the firm fixed price was, and they could not tell me because it was still being negotiated. As we debated the procurement on the floor of the House last July, the figure they had given us for procuring these helicopters was $1.5 million each, except that they really did not know what the figure was because they really had not negotiated the price with Lockheed yet. The $1.5 million figure for each helicopter—total 375 helicopters—did not include the research and development costs which now total almost $200 million.

On February 20 of this year I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Army asking whether it might not now be possible to find out what the firm fixed price of these helicopters is that we had a firm fixed price contract on a year ago. After 4 weeks of scurrying around I received a letter dated March 17, 1969, which says in part:

> Since negotiations are still in progress the Army is not in a position to provide a firm figure.

They also said:

> The final price and ceiling have not yet been reached in the negotiations.

They did give me a figure which is their current best estimate. Of course, they classified the figure which they gave me as their current best estimate. Their current best estimate is almost exactly 50-percent higher than their current best estimate was in July. Of course, they have not finished negotiating yet.

THE 1970 CENSUS

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "The 1970 Census," published in the Vicksburg Evening Post. I know I did not know, and I am satisfied that most Members of Congress did not know, that we ever voted for a census record such as outlined in the editorial in the Vicksburg Post.

I have received considerable mail in the last 60 days protesting this census, and I think I can see the clouds of a gathering storm of indignation that is going to sweep this country, and I think rightfully so, when these census forms hit the masses of the people.

Congress has provided for industrial and commercial censuses entirely separate and apart from the decennial census, and in my opinion the two different purposes should not be merged as the Bureau is attempting to do in these forms in which they inquire about industrial products, housing, income, and so forth. There might be a place for both censuses, but they should be separately authorized when need is shown.

The decennial census is required by the Constitution for the purpose of a population count upon which to adjust representation in the House of Representatives. When we inquire under penalty of $1,000 fine to know who a person shares his bathroom with, whether or not he has a television set, washing machine, or an outhouse, I think we are going entirely too far.

Mr. President, I need not remind Members of Congress that 1970 is an election year, and this needless irritant is not going to do Congress any good. I think we should move, and move now, to restore the sanity and commonsense and use the decennial census for what it was intended to be, and that is a count of the population.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1970 CENSUS

Every ten years, by law, a census is taken and in 1970 it will be time for another. But this one will be different—that is, unless the people of America solidly protest the invasion of their privacy which is proposed for the census next year.

Possibly you are not aware of it, but here are some of the questions which will be put to each American by the census takers:

1. Income, dollar by dollar, from all sources including public assistance, alimony, unemployment and disability insurance, pensions and investments;
2. The value of property or amount of rent paid;
3. Educational, marital, employment and military history;
4. With whom bathroom and kitchen facilities shared;
5. A long list of household items including dishwasher, television, radios, automobiles, and second home; and
6. Where each person and his parents were born.

Now, if these questions were on the form and a citizen asked to answer them that might not be so bad, even though some of the questions are quite private in nature. BUT, we are to be told we must answer the questions in full, and failure to do so would subject the citizen to a $1,000 fine and/or 60 days in jail.

This follows the usual procedure of the bureaucrats—making rules and laws which are not backed by legislation, and imposing penalties for failure to accede to their whims. The decennial census, as provided by law, is for the purpose of counting the people in the country, and for the allocation of representation. That has been its function in the past, and nothing has been added to it to force compliance with the demand for information of a private nature. For this reason it is necessary that every citizen make his protest known to his senators and representative, to the end that this Washington bureau is nipped in the bud, and that no citizen would be faced with a fine or jail sentence for not complying with the demands of the bureau. There are many other avenues through which information is gathered, but not with a penalty attached, and there is no earthly reason why the Census Bureau has taken such a step. More than that, when representations have been made to revert to the real function of the census, these have been met with stubborn resistance.

A criminal, about whom evidence has been found, but without a search warrant, is protected in his privacy, even though the evidence is complete and damaging. But the luckless citizen's privacy, violated by the census taker, still faces the penalty, unless enough pressure is put on the Congress to curtail the Census Bureau.

So, it is important that every citizen deluge the Congress with protests. And don't wait—do it now.

OUR POSTAL SYSTEM

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing considerable lately about changes in the operation of our postal system. I can only speak for my own congressional district regarding the efficiency of our local mail service to the postal patrons.

I do not believe I have received a half a dozen letters of criticism regarding the delivery or the dispatching of mail in my congressional area during the last one-half dozen years. I have received many commendations on the efficiency of the work of our postmasters and postal employees in the Calumet region of Indiana.

I wish unanimous consent to incorporate a letter which I received from the Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, and also a resolution adopted by their council setting out their position on some of the proposed changes in our postal system:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYES
COUNCIL—AFL-CIO,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1969.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: In the months ahead, Congress may consider the issue of transforming the Post Office Department into a government corporation.

The enclosed resolution, which was endorsed unanimously by delegates attending the February, 1969, meeting of the Council, reflects the attitude of 35 AFL-CIO unions representing more than 1 million postal and other Federal employes.

These workers have a keen interest in the proud heritage of the postal service in the United States. As citizens and as government employes they are vitally concerned that the mail move promptly and efficiently. They desire to point to our country's postal system as the best in the world.

If serious deficiencies exist, we believe they can be corrected without changing the basic philosophy of maintaining postal functions as a Cabinet level department—a tradition founded in the roots of our democratic society and incorporated in the Constitution of the nation.

We trust you will remain aware of the sincere conviction expressed in the enclosed resolution, and that it will help if it becomes necessary for you, as a member of Congress, to act on this vital issue.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN A. MCCART,
Operations Director.

POSTAL CORPORATION RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYES' COUNCIL OF THE AFL-CIO

Whereas the postal service of the United States is the basic means of communication in our nation, and is therefore too important to the economic, social and political health of the populace ever to be removed from the control of the people through their elected representatives in Congress, and

Whereas the proposals for the abolition of the Post Office Department and the creation, in its place, of a Postal Corporation would give the Directors of that corporation absolute and arbitrary control over postage rates, postal salaries, and the extent and quality of the postal service, and

Whereas such absolute control over our most vital form of communications, as well as over the lives and welfare of those who work in it, is not in the best interests of the nation and violates the principle of checks and balances so carefully written into the Constitution of the United States,

Therefore be it resolved that the Government Employes' Council disapprove wholeheartedly the proposal to turn the Post Office Department into a Government-owned Corporation, and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Postmaster General, to every member of Congress, and to the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO.

Unanimously approved at the regular meeting of the Government Employes' Council, AFL-CIO, February 11, 1969.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I support the National Future Homemakers of America Week, which has been designated as March 23 to 29, 1969.

The Future Homemakers of America organization was founded on June 11, 1945, and serves more than 12 million high school youth. These young people practice the principles of good citizenship, and help the underprivileged. The

XUM

organization also encourages a good family life, stimulates the study of home economics and provides wholesome individual and group recreation. By working toward these goals, a better America will develop.

A succinct analysis of the FHA Week is contained in a recent release published by the U.S. Office of Education. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK, MARCH 23 TO 29, 1969

Focus on positive action is the theme of National Future Homemakers of America Week, March 23–29, 1969. During this week more than 600,000 members in over 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico will carry out projects and activities to give exposure to what youth is doing in a positive way to promote the principles of good citizenship.

National President, Estelle Hunter, a high school senior at Sunbury, Ohio, had this to say about National FHA Week: "The overall objective of Future Homemakers of America is to help individuals improve personal, family and community living. With this objective in mind we have chosen Focus on Positive Action as the theme for our National FHA Week. During this week FHA members across the country will stress constructive activities which show that we are dedicated to improving life in America as we move toward new horizons in the future."

This national organization of home economics students in junior and senior high schools provides opportunities for developing individual and group initiative in planning and carrying out activities related to the home and the community. As an integral part of home economics education in the secondary school system, the Future Homemakers of America program is focused on the family, and the effect of the family unit on the community.

FHA members are identified by the red and white octagonal emblem showing a house supported by two hands suggesting that the future homes of America are in the hands of youth. Rays extending to and from the house indicate the influences of the home and the community on each other. The emblem bears the FHA motto "Toward New Horizons."

The young men and women who are members of Future Homemakers of America believe that the homes of the future *are* in the hands of youth. Through their concerns for better homes for a better America and through their activities and projects, they translate into meaningful perspective the concepts they learn in many phases of their educational experiences. Leadership and citizenship responsibilities take on new dimensions, and as they proceed toward their new horizons they are proving that youth does know, youth does care, and youth can do in a positive and constructive way.

Throughout the country members contribute to the community by working as volunteers. They assist in local Head Start programs or with the mentally retarded and handicapped through county health and welfare departments. They organize reading classes and tutorial programs for migrant or underprivileged children. They visit and assist the elderly or work with other groups on community service projects such as anti-litter, March of Dimes, or UNICEF. They serve as hospital candy stripers, hold career seminars, survey for job opportunities for youth, conduct sessions on preparation for marriage, hold morals and manners discussions, and carry out many other projects which give practical application to their classroom learning.

Future Homemakers of America was founded June 11, 1945 as an incorporated, non-profit organization supported by membership dues. Nationwide in membership and effort it is co-sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association and was developed for the purpose of providing experiences that broaden the home economics education program in the high school.

Activities at all levels—national, state, and local are youth directed. Twelve national youth officers elected yearly help develop and promote the national program of work and plan and preside over the annual national meetings. The FHA members themselves decide on their goals and purposes, and plan their own activities and projects. This provides an opportunity to develop leadership, express creativeness, and become aware of approaching responsibilities as adult citizens.

High school home economics teachers, members of the state home economics education staff, and leading home economists serve as advisers to chapter, state, and national youth officers, giving guidance and counseling to the program.

In its twenty-four years of existence Future Homemakers of America has served more than twelve million high school youth. One measure of FHA's success is the effect the program has had on individuals. A former FHA National Officer explains the organization this way:

"FHA is a way of life and a way of thinking about life. It is an organization in which girls and boys become young adults and in which common interests in home economics are shared, values are realized, friends are made, and family bonds are strengthened. It is a testing ground for the requisites of effective living; patience, determination, endurance, self-discipline, work, confidence, love and faith."

National headquarters of Future Homemakers of America are located in the U.S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C.

BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES ANSWERS THE WASHINGTON POST

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am including with my remarks a statement from the Burlington Industries who have excellent plants in my congressional district and throughout North Carolina in answer to an article which appeared in the Washington Post dated Thursday, March 13.

Our country is in a sad condition when articles of this nature can be circulated among people who do not reside in the States of North and South Carolina where Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens operate numerous industrial plants. I have known hundreds of employees employed by both of these companies all my natural life and I have never heard one of these employees state that any discrimination was made against any person if he was qualified to work as an employee in these industries.

I am certain we would have had a difficult time in furnishing necessary clothing, blankets, sheets, and other necessary material for our Armed Forces during World War II and during the time we have been maintaining an Army of 2½ to 3 million people if it had not been for the foresight and managerial ability of these two great industries.

I am certain that not only Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens, but all industries in this country will be happy to employ any person who can qualify for work in their plants whether it be in South Carolina, North Carolina, or North Dakota.

I believe this country has gone much too far in trying to insist on employment agencies and great industries in this country to employ people who are not qualified for any type of industrial work.

Again I want to congratulate Burlington Industries and the other fine industries in my State for the wonderful service they have rendered our country during World War I, World War II, and the Korean and Vietnam wars and the unbiased manner in which they have handled all their public affairs including recruiting additional personnel.

A telegram to the Washington Post from Burlington Industries follows:

GREENSBORO, N.C.,
March 13, 1969.

Mr. B. F. HENRY,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.:

Statements in your editorial today "The Pentagon Dispenses Southern Comfort" are not supported by the facts as they apply to Burlington Industries. In reply to similar charges by Senator Mondale, we made public the following statement February 27:

"The charges reported in the press, attributable to Senator Mondale of Minnesota, that Burlington Industries practices discrimination in employment are not true. Burlington believes in and practices equal employment opportunity, does not discriminate: and actively pursues a policy of non-discrimination in its operations.

"In addition, Burlington Industries filed some time ago a plan of affirmative action with the Defense Supply Agency in connection with government textile procurement. We have been engaged in continuing discussions with government contract compliance representatives for many months, in order to develop an affirmative action program which will meet all federal requirements in the field of equal employment opportunity. The plan as filed by Burlington with the Defense Supply Agency has not been disapproved, and in our judgment meets the legal requirements.

"Employment of minority groups by the company has risen substantially in the last several years. In southern plants particularly, the increase has been from approximately 4 percent five years ago to 14 percent. The minority work force in many plants is substantially higher, ranging from 20 percent to 50 percent, and including male and female employees.

"At the same time there has been significant up-grading of job levels held by minorities, including those who have moved into supervisory and clerical positions."

To our knowledge this reply was not published in the Washington Post. And we believe it only fair that you be aware of it.

In the editorial today, the statement that our "affirmative action plan" had not been "committed to paper" is incorrect. We have worked closely and continuously with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, Defense Supply Agency, and sometime ago submitted in writing a plan. We believe our plan is substantially in compliance with their requirements.

Our Company has proceeded in complete good faith to eliminate any vestige of discrimination in its operations, and has made

XUM

very substantial progress. It is thus a shock and a disappointment that we have somehow failed to communicate these efforts in a way that the Washington Post and other news media would be cognizant of them.

It will be deeply appreciated if you could carry this telegram in your Letters to the Editor column, or use it as a subject for editorial comment.

CHARLES F. MYERS, Jr.,
Chairman and Chief Executive, Burlington Industries, Inc.

ARTICLES BY ANTHONY HARRIGAN, CHARLESTON NEWS & COURIER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Anthony Harrigan, of the News & Courier, Charleston, S.C., has recently completed an excellent series of articles on the Mediterranean area.

Writing from such places as Carthage, Rome, Athens, the U.S.S. *Forrestal*, and the U.S.S. *Talbot*, Mr. Harrigan has drawn a fascinating parallel between the rich, violent history of the area and the present-day situation, thus giving us a perspective on the continually developing contest between the super powers of this century.

Mr. President, in reading these articles we can get an idea of who our friends are in the Mediterranean as well as those who may be hostile. The strengths and weaknesses of many of the principal areas as well as their relationships with each other are well brought out in Mr. Harrigan's series.

Throughout the articles, we can see the importance of the 6th Fleet to the peace and security of the Mediterranean area, and the author emphasizes the necessity of maintaining and providing it with our most modern equipment.

Mr. President, this series by Mr. Harrigan would be of great interest and benefit not only to us but to the general public as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VIEW FROM CARTHAGE: THE MEDITERRANEAN: COCKPIT OF HISTORY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

CARTHAGE, TUNISIA.—Since the dawn of history, peoples, empires and ideologies have clashed in the Mediterranean. Today, the United States is concerned about the Soviet "eskadra" (naval squadron) in what has been virtually an American lake since the late 1940s when the 6th Fleet was formed.

The Soviet naval presence carries an implication of possible hostilities later this year or in the 1970s. The Russians, simply by establishing their naval forces, have set the stage for a new cold war contest.

A visit to the ruins of Carthage is a good way to gain perspective on this developing contest between super-powers of the late 20th century. Two super-powers of antiquity—the Carthaginian and Roman empires—fought their decisive battle on this spot. The Romans won, and the shape of history was decided for centuries.

Standing on a Punic tomb on the hillside, it is easy to envision the final Roman assault on Carthage: galleys closing the beach only a half-mile distant and legionnaires smashing their way, block by block, through the city of 50,000.

The Roman sentence on Carthage was as pitiless as the post-World War II Soviet transportation of entire communities of Balts to Siberian slave labor camps. The Carthaginian population was condemned to slavery. The city was methodically destroyed.

Complete and total obliteration of nations is a centuries-old feature of conflict in the Mediterranean world. Hundreds of years of Roman and Byzantine rule of what is present-day Tunisia ended in 430 A.D. as a result of a gigantic amphibious operation by the Vandals. In 642 A.D., invading Arab armies swept across this land, cutting it off from Europe for over a thousand years.

Not all the decisive battles took place centuries ago. American soldiers buried in the United States military cemetery only a few miles from Carthage played a major role in ending Hitler's dream of a Thousand Year German Reich. Today, other Mediterranean nations—Israel, for instance—could be obliterated if the Soviets are allowed to inherit America's position of naval dominance in this historic sea.

The Romans had very good reasons for destroying Carthage. Rome and Carthage were rivals for domination of the Mediterranean. A Carthaginian general, Hannibal, crossed the Alps and invaded Italy. A "detente," or easing of tensions, was impossible. With the crushing of the Carthaginian empire, and with Africa Proconsularis firmly under the control of the Third Augustan Legion, Rome's southern flank and her sea communications throughout the Mediterranean were secure for a long time.

The United States isn't faced with any such imperial necessity. Its commitment of a fleet to the Mediterranean stems from the overall American objectives of curbing Soviet aggression against free, independent nations and preventing growth of a monopoly of Russian power in the world.

The situation in the Mediterranean has changed drastically since the 6th Fleet was formed more than 20 years ago. Then the Med with its two control points—Gibraltar and Suez—was the lifeline of the British empire. France, America's oldest ally, held Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The Med was the vital artery in the movement of oil to Western Europe.

Today, both the British and French empires are gone. The Suez Canal is closed. Oil reaches Europe by the route around the Cape of Good Hope at the southern tip of Africa.

But 99 per cent of the trade of three NATO allies—Italy, Greece and Turkey—moves by ship through the Med. Without the 6th Fleet, all the pro-Western and non-aligned Mediterranean countries would be vulnerable to direct Soviet pressure. The Soviet naval forces in this sea indicate that the USSR hopes to insert its influence everywhere in the Mediterranean world. The U.S., in the interest of peace, has to be in a position to apply naval countermeasures to seaborne Soviet assaults or to attacks by revolutionary Arab states under cover of Soviet rocket cruisers.

A dual naval presence in the Mediterranean—Soviet as well as U.S.—will be a fact of international life in the 1970's. The continued U.S. presence is needed to inhibit the Russians, restrain their adventures and discourage offensive action by their proxies in the Arab world. The existence of the 6th Fleet is a deterrent to the Soviets who may be thinking about projecting their new naval power into the South Atlantic. Finally, the 6th Fleet virtually underwrites the continued independence of a country such as Tunisia which, otherwise, would be cruelly exposed to Egyptian and Algerian revolutionary pressure.

In conquering Carthage, Rome turned the Mediterranean into virtually a closed sea. The Soviets, a thousand years later, undoubtedly would like to achieve a repeat performance. A decade ago Russian military penetration of the Mediterranean world was negligible. Now it is a major factor. The U.S. 6th Fleet is what prevents Soviet power from becoming the deciding factor—from turning the Mediterranean into another Caspian Sea.

REPORT FROM GREECE: POLITICAL CHANGE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD

(By Anthony Harrigan)

ATHENS.—Three powerful units of the 6th Fleet, at anchor in the port of Athens, are a reminder to the Greeks that America is still their protector against aggression. The ships' presence also illustrates Greek friendship towards the United States at a time when some Mediterranean nations are cooling.

Those who would have the United States break with Greece because it is ruled by a military junta are extremely short-sighted. While Americans may wish that a coup had not taken place in this country, usually described as the cradle of liberty, they can take comfort in the fact that the current leaders of Greece are strongly pro-American and anti-communist. They took over from a regime that was moving leftward at an alarming pace. This leftward move was not in accord with the sentiments of the Greek people, if their evident friendship towards Americans is any indicator.

It hasn't hurt Greek-American relations for the United States to elect a Vice President of Greek ancestry. The man in the street, and in the small villages, knows that Spiro Agnew, son of a Greek immigrant, is the No. 2 man in the United States. Of course, this fact has an adverse effect in Turkey. It is impossible to convince the Turks, who for historical reasons hate their Greek allies in the NATO alliance, that the U.S. doesn't have a Greek Vice President.

The Greek junta deserves close attention in the U.S., for it may be the model of other such regimes in friendly countries. If the communist-socialist alliance in Italy comes close to taking power, the Italian army, in collaboration with conservative elements, might block the outcome. In Spain, where Gen. Franco's worsening health soon may lead to a change in government structure, decisive power is in the hands of Gen. Tomas Garcia Rebull, commander of Spain's crack armored division the "Guadarrama No. 11," which is stationed outside Madrid. The division is equipped with Sherman tanks and recently carried out seize and hold maneuvers in and around the capital city. Another general who may become a major figure in Spain is Gen. Manuel Diez Alagria Gutierrez. He is said to command the loyalty of many of the younger generals.

It also would be foolish to imagine that the influence of the French army has come to an end. Last spring, at the time of the Paris riots, President de Gaulle had to appeal for Army help in keeping power. Ironically, he turned to Gen. Jacque Massu, French commander in Algeria in 1958 who later was sent into obscurity by De Gaulle before being rehabilitated and given a new command.

The French Foreign Legion, whose regiments were disbanded by President de Gaulle, has been reconstituted. For the first time since 1959, the Legion has units in metropolitan France. History-minded Frenchmen may smile at the news that a Foreign Legion regiment is based in Corsica, birthplace of Napoleon Bonaparte. The Legion is described by American military personnel as an enormously professional organization under superb discipline. If De Gaulle should collapse,

XUM

or go too far in his anti-Americanism, the Legion could be the spearhead of a military coup in France.

It is a fact that the French military are bitterly opposed to De Gaulle's anti-American position. Military men try to get around Gaullist policies as much as possible, sometimes authorizing cooperation with the United States when De Gaulle isn't looking.

Here in Greece, the military government displays the virtues and deficiencies of a military regime. Corruption has lessened, but censorship of the press has begun. The censorship is mild, as any Greek who reads English—and there are many thousands who do—can purchase a copy of the international Herald Tribune or a London newspaper at a newsstand and read comments critical of the junta.

Outwardly, the impact of the junta on Greek life is hard to detect. In the small towns, there are banners proclaiming the greatness of the April 21 military revolution.

Little else is apparent that indicates change. The head of the junta now wears civilian dress.

In time, I am told on good authority, King Constantine will be permitted to return to Greece, though with reduced powers. If the junta has its way, his role will be strictly ceremonial.

The government is at pains, however, to remind both Greeks and foreigners that Greece is still a monarchy. After the junta took power, pictures of the king and queen were taken down. But the junta ordered them put back on the walls of hotels, offices and stores.

The principal political task of the government is to moderate its policies somewhat and to win a greater measure of international acceptance. Only the Nordic countries seem intent on isolating Greece and damaging her economy by discouraging tourism. But Greece contains great attractions for tourists. Moreover, there's public order here, which isn't the case in some parts of the U.S., and the people are friendly. If there is intense oppression and unhappiness, as critics of Greece insist, it wasn't apparent during the huge pre-Lenten carnival when huge crowds turned out in costume to watch parades and enjoy themselves.

In judging Greek political developments, Americans can't allow themselves to forget that Greece and other friendly nations in southern Europe have severe, continuing security problems—communist infiltration within and Soviet threats without.

Even the Chinese Communists aspire to a position of power in the Med. Only a few weeks ago, little Albania—Red China's client state in Europe and Greece's neighbor to the northwest—announced a 40 per cent increase in her defense expenditures. The spending will go for a naval base and other military installations. These preparations, carried out with Chinese economic and technical assistance, are designed to establish a military foothold for Communist China in the Mediterranean.

Greece also has to be concerned about the Yugoslav and Bulgarian borders. If the Soviets should intervene in Yugoslavia, as they did in Czechoslovakia, or if they dispatch large combat formations in Bulgaria, the danger to Greece would soar. Attack could come in the form of a blitz or a Vietnam-type guerrilla war such as took place in Greece in the 1940s. It is important, therefore, that U.S. military aid to the Greek armed forces continue.

Actually, security in the Mediterranean is a seamless garment. To keep the peace in this part of the world, the United States needs airfields from Crete—a Greek island—to Spain. Long-range aircraft are needed to fly reconnaissance flights that produce vital information on the Soviet fleet and the forces of Russia's client states in the Middle East.

Even more important than equipping the armed forces of friendly nations, however, is the modernization and strengthening of the U.S. 6th Fleet. The fleet is the heart of America's total peace-keeping and security operation in one of the most strategically important regions of the world.

Stable Tunisia Looks to the West

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Tunis, Tunisia.—The smallest of the North African countries, Tunisia has been described as the Cinderella of the Mediterranean. But like the ill-treated servant girl in the fairytale, Tunisia has special qualities that command attention.

Since gaining independence from France in 1956, Tunisia has acquired a solid reputation as a stable, pro-Western, though nonaligned, nation. Stability is the word that Tunisians emphasize. President Habib Bourguiba has guided his country's destiny for the last 13 years, stressing economic development and avoiding foreign entanglements.

Development has been difficult because nature has not been generous with Tunisia. She lacks the oil that has been a bonanza for Libya, to the east, and the variety of resources, including natural gas, that Algeria possesses. Tunisia's 4.5 million people live on agriculture, tourism and very limited extractive industries. Neither agriculture nor industries, however, have fully recovered from the departure of 200,000 French settlers in the years after independence.

Tunisians, however, are perhaps the ablest of all the North Africans. Racially, they are a mixture of many peoples—ancient Berber stock, Phoenicians who settled Carthage, Romans, Vandals and Arabs. They are regarded as sophisticated people, without the emotionalism and capacity for delusions that characterize the Egyptians and other Arab peoples. They are said to have a kind of love-hate complex regarding the French. The departure of the French from the naval base at Bizerte caused intense bitterness. But Tunisia's cultural and economic links with France are still very strong.

Le Monde, the Parisian daily, is read by many educated Tunisians. Frenchmen make up approximately half the faculty at the national university here. Many upper class Tunisians have French wives. In the armed forces, Tunisian officers continue to attend French military training schools.

The Pattern of Tunisian policies and development seems fixed for the decade ahead. This is a one-party state with no significant internal opposition or factionalism. If President Bourguiba were to die in the near future, the likelihood is that power would be shared by a triumvirate consisting of Bahi Ladgham, secretary of state; Habib Bourguiba Jr., foreign minister, and Ahmed ben Selah, minister of education. Selah is viewed as the strongest personality with the most grassroots understanding and support.

Such internal stress as exists is connected with the agriculture and commercial cooperatives. These were formed in the first instance to incorporate the lands of the former French settlers. The pace of collectivization has been deemed excessive by some Tunisians, including the former minister of defense, Ahmed Mastire. The cooperative system is being extended to retail business enterprises. Tourism remains the only area where foreign investment is feasible.

Tunisia's basic pro-Western orientation has paid off in a practical way. In the 1960–66 period, Tunisia received $443 million in foreign aid from the United States. This amounts to the highest per capita assistance for any African country.

Tunisia also has received a substantial loan from Bulgaria for development of the phosphate industry. A new Tunisian-Czechoslovakian trade pact has just been signed. In addition, Tunisia recently obtained an $8.5 million World Bank loan to improve the ports of Goulette, Bizerte and Sfax.

Soviet merchant ships are regularly visitors to these ports. Two handsome new Soviet vessels now are at Goulette.

While Tunisia wants to avoid excessively close identification with the United States or the NATO countries, its government is concerned about the possibility of threats from Egypt and Algeria. It is feared here that the Egyptians one day may sweep across thinly populated Libya next door. Algeria's massive military build-up and the presence there of several thousand Soviet technicians also gives them alarm.

The government is not unmindful that Radio Cairo, with its inflammatory appeals, is heard by many Tunisians. The only time the Egyptian radio seems to have had an impact, however, was at the time of the Six Day War in June, 1967, when mobs attacked a synagogue and Jewish stores. President Bourguiba strongly condemned these attacks. Shortly thereafter, the Tunisian government formed two battalions of specially-trained riot police to cope with such disorders. In general Tunisia does not have a repressive policy in dealing with Jews, many of whom have French citizenship. The community is declining in numbers, however, through immigration to France, not Israel.

The biggest single item in the Tunisian budget is education, with 30 per cent of the budget allocated for this purpose. Many of the schools in the capital city are modern and attractive. Schoolboys wear blue smock-shirts as a kind of classroom uniform. Tunis is not typical of the country, of course. In many rural areas, conditions are primitive. The chief need is for more water. The U.S. aid program has featured drilling of deep wells.

While there are extremes of poverty in Tunis, as in cities of every underdeveloped country, the traveler gets a favorable impression of public order and general cleanliness. The Medina, or old city, is far cleaner than the old part of Jerusalem, formerly under Jordanian rule. There are the inevitable sights of youngsters selling flashlight batteries and combs, but no signs of desperation. The visitor gets the impression that the ordinary people of Tunis are doing pretty well by their own standards.

In the circumstances, Tunisia's capacity for financing national defense is limited. Only 6 per cent of the national budget is spent on defense.

Currently, the U.S. has a limited military assistance program in operation to aid the 20,000-man Tunisian army. The Tunisian navy consists only of coastal defense boats. The immediate U.S. objective will be to give the Tunisians reasonably modern ground support aircraft. The Egyptians and Algeria, however, have the latest model Soviet jet fighters. The U.S. Navy also makes periodic show-the-flag calls at Tunisian ports, though the demonstrations of naval strength are low-keyed in character. Tunisian defense officials have been in sea aboard a U.S. aircraft carrier, however. Tunisian army officers also are trained each year at U.S. military centers.

In the past Tunisia has not stood high in America's strategic scale, though diplomatic relations between the two countries have been excellent, it is possible that in the next few years Tunisia may figure more importantly in U.S. plans to preserve peace in the Mediterranean. As a stable, well-administered, well-intentioned country it is deserving of a new measure of interest on the part of the Nixon administration.

Unrest in Italy: Communist-Socialist Power Is Growing

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Rome, Italy.—Though the U.S. 6th Fleet protects Italy against Soviet sea-based threats, this country continues to face grave

XUM

dangers. The Italian Communist Party—biggest in the West—continues to gain strength and influence through cooperation with the Socialist Party. If the Soviet Union were to intervene in Yugoslavia, the way it invaded Czechoslovakia, Italy would find Soviet divisions on its northeast border.

Italy has been a source of concern to the United States for more than 20 years. In the late 1940's, the possibility of a communist takeover was very real. Under the leadership of Pope Pius XII, a resolute anti-communist, the Christian Democratic Party held the line in this heartland of Western civilization. The Christian Democrats were weakened during the pontificate of Pope John XXIII, who welcomed the so-called "opening to the left." Today, the Catholic Church is in disarray because of a crisis over papal authority and is in no position to present a solid front against the Left in Italian politics.

The Christian Democratic Party is split into seven quarreling factions, several of them leftwing. Earlier this year, the Christian Democratic leftwing elements bolted the party to join with the Socialism and Communist Parties in insisting that police be barred from carrying deadly weapons. "Disarm the police" slogans are chalked on many walls in Rome. The goal of disarmament of police forces is an international communist objective.

The new measure of communist influence was revealed in December, when Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni, a Socialist in the coalition government, announced that Italy had decided to recognize Communist China. This, too, is a longtime communist objective in Italy. In the past, the Christian Democrats opposed recognition, but they proved too weak to resist effectively this time. The fear is that recognition of Hanoi will be the next achievement of the communists and socialists.

Foreign Minister Nenni has said the country will continue to be loyal to the NATO alliance, but only with reservations. What he means is that the Socialist Party wants to isolate Greece which is ruled by a military junta.

Italy has experienced severe disorders in its universities. A number of administrative changes are being made to ease student resentment. The government also is planning to establish several new universities. But there are many other troubles ahead.

There has been considerable labor violence and numerous strikes. The Italian working man has real grievances. The cost of living continues to soar, and wages don't catch up. As in many other countries, there is a flight from the farm. In the last eight years, 2.6 million workers left agricultural pursuits. Only 1.5 million new non-farm jobs were created in the same period. Squalor is still a way of life for many Italians. Conditions in the traditionally backward South are especially bad. The government announces plans, but they frequently result in nothing but talk and shuffling papers.

Italians are badly in need of more educational opportunities. Fifteen per cent of the farm labor is illiterate. Sixty-seven per cent have only an elementary school education.

The public debt is immense. Rome is the most debt-ridden capital in the world, owing more than $2 billion and borrowing money to pay interest on its debts.

In Italy, there's always some comic relief. For example, lawyers are threatening to strike. Many Italians may be tempted to shout "hurrah."

Not everything is bleak. There is a big demand for Italian labor in Germany. Steel power generating capacity. The shipbuilding situation is improving. One yard received an order recently for four big container vessels. Genoa, the nation's top port, had a record year. Tourism is increasing and brings in between 10–15 per cent of the country's income.

On the political front, the cheering news is that the Italian Communist Party has blasted Moscow for the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But Enrico Berlinguer, the party vice secretary, hedged by saying that the Italian Party did not intend any open split with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The danger here is that labor strife will increase, the economy will lag and that the resulting chaos will lead to rule by the communists or to a Communist-Socialist coalition government. If that happens, the U.S. will have to reappraise its entire commitment to Italy. Another possibility is that the specter of a communist takeover could cause the armed forces to intervene and form a military government along the lines of the junta now in power in Greece.

The primary need in Italy is for a new degree of order and direction. Under the existing system, the government lacks the authority and initiative to achieve significant progress.

Sixth Fleet Shortages: Inadequate Funding Hinders Peacekeeping

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Gaeta, Italy.—Here in this old Roman port, where galleys once embarked on missions of war and trade, the guided-missile cruiser Little Rock, flagship of the U.S. Sixth Fleet, lies at anchor.

The vessel is the nerve center of a fleet routinely described as consisting of approximately 50 ships, 25,000 men and 200 aircraft. Flying his flag in the Little Rock is Vice Adm. David C. Richardson, commander 6th Fleet. Adm. Richardson commands one of the two key fleets in the U.S. Navy, the other being the 7th Fleet in the Western Pacific.

In many ways, command of the 6th Fleet must be the more difficult task these days, for the Mediterranean is a continuing crisis area where a naval confrontation with a Soviet squadron could take place at any time. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that while war in the Middle East could break out again, the 6th Fleet has been allowed to run down.

Short of funds, the Navy has been forced to take ships and skilled men from the 6th Fleet—indeed from the entire Atlantic fleet—in order to carry out combat missions assigned to the Navy in waters off Vietnam.

As a result, the readiness of the 6th Fleet is not what it should be. This is no fault of the 6th Fleet commander or higher ranking naval officers. The fault lies with the failure of former Secretaries of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Clark Clifford to request sufficient funds to provide the skilled naval personnel and ship maintenance necessary to keep 6th Fleet vessels in a condition of C–1 readiness, meaning "fully operational."

If the U.S. public wants the 6th Fleet to be completely ready for any emergency that may arise in this part of the world, it will have to call on Congress and the new administration to provide the wherewithal for such readiness.

The fleet faces several major difficulties. First of all, warships have not been overhauled at the proper intervals. Many of the ships of the 6th Fleet, as in the Navy as a whole, are 20 years old or more. When they aren't overhauled, they break down. Mechanical casualties are frequent, thereby impairing the overall efficiency of the fleet.

Getting spare parts for old ships and older aircraft is another problem. A lot of equipment that's required is no longer manufactured. Spare parts have to be obtained by "cannibalizing" other ships and planes. McNamara also let inventories run down, without furnishing money for replacement parts. Thus the 6th Fleet frequently has to wait two or three weeks for needed spare parts.

This kind of funding was extremely shortsighted. The country can be thankful that no string of emergencies occurred in the Mediterranean at a time when mechanical problems were at a peak. But the fleet can't live on luck. The need is to provide the money—and the parts—as early as possible.

People are just as important to the 6th Fleet as mechanical items. The best radar in the Navy won't attain maximum performance without skilled radarmen. Skill means experienced personnel, the kind siphoned off for the 7th Fleet in the Pacific. To meet the overall personnel needs means bigger training programs. A failure in radar could lead to a tragedy even bigger than the Pueblo affair. The United States simply can't take the risk of second-rate performance in a vital operation in a major danger area.

Beyond this, the 6th Fleet needs to be augmented by more and newer ships and aircraft. Currently, the 6th Fleet is operating without an anti-submarine aircraft carrier, a deficiency that could prove extremely dangerous in a confrontation with the Soviets.

Moreover, it is questionable whether the two attack carriers in the 6th Fleet are adequate to respond to threats, that could occur at any number of points between Gilbraltar and the waters off Israel. Had the U.S. possessed more carriers in the Pacific, Pueblo might have been covered and the towing of the vessel into a North Korean port might never been accomplished. Thus the United States already has paid heavily for failure to construct more carriers in the last eight years.

Even the carriers in the 6th Fleet are not equipped with all of the latest planes such as the Grumman A–6 aircraft for all-weather and night flying. This plane is a vital piece of equipment for use against an enemy with sophisticated air defenses. If it were necessary to commit 6th Fleet aircraft in a limited war in the Middle East, against a country possessing advanced Soviet equipment, the A–6 could have a marked effect on operational success. Certainly, it is reasonable to suppose that the U.S. public wants the 6th Fleet to have the best aircraft available for all types of missions.

The 6th Fleet also could use more long-range Lockheed Orion anti-submarine tracking aircraft. The fleet has some of these planes but also ASW planes that have been in service since the early 1950s.

None of these deficiencies adds up to a breakdown in the fleet, but tends in that direction. Moreover, the weak points means that the 6th Fleet's capabilities are not as credible as they should be.

Messrs. McNamara and Clifford may have concealed from the U.S. public the critical lack of funding for important equipment and personnel, but they surely didn't conceal the facts from the Soviets.

Impairments in the 6th Fleet's readiness or equipment constitute an invitation to the Soviets to take chances they otherwise would not. To keep peace in the Mediterranean, it is vital to keep the 6th Fleet in a condition of peak readiness.

Needed in the 1970's: A Hard-Nosed Policy Toward Weak Allies

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Naples, Italy.—More than 20 years ago, the Truman administration committed the United States to the defense of the weak countries of Southern Europe, the lands that form what Winston Churchill called the "soft underbelly of Europe." Each administration since that time has renewed the American commitment. But it surely is not out of order for the Nixon administration to reassess that commitment and to examine anew whether the results are worth the cost.

Reassessment, of course, almost certainly would lead to renewal of the commitment. Nevertheless, the rationale for U.S. policy in the Mediterranean should fit the facts of 1969, not of 1949 or 1959. Italy's situation is a case in point. In the 1940s Italy was a sick nation. The U.S. hoped it would be in blooming health within a decade or so. But things

XUM

haven't turned out that way. In some areas, Italy has advanced remarkably; in others, its progress is almost completely stalled.

Here in the south of Italy it is easy to discern the hard core, hopeless aspects. The farther south from Rome, the more depressing the land becomes. Italy is really two nations—one above Rome, one below it. It is no exaggeration to say that in southern Italy the people are incorrigible and problems are insoluble.

The Italian government's Cassa per il Mezogiorno (Fund for the South) has spent almost $3 billion since 1965, but with exceedingly limited results. There is a brutalization of life in Naples, for example, that is extraordinary, and not merely the sordid aspect of a hardened seaport community. This is a city where prostitutes line main roads during daylight hours. Slums are vicious.

The situation is even worse in Sicily. A census in Palermo showed only one bed for every 2.58 persons. Thousands of grown men, heads of families, earn their living as street vendors, selling nuts and shoelaces and bits of candy at Christmas. What new wealth exists in the south simply doesn't trickle down to the people in the foul-smelling slums.

The reason for these conditions is clear enough. Southern Italy has been a battleground—a devastated area—from the time of the earliest Greek colonies in Sicily or long before the Roman Empire emerged. Southern Italy has been attacked and occupied by Greeks, Normans, Arabs, Spaniards, Turks and other peoples.

It is no wonder that the people have been brutalized, that the Mafia has spawned in Sicily, and that this region exported the human material for gangsterism in the United States. Ironically, the only time the Mafia seriously lost ground in modern times was during Mussolini's era. His political apparatus proved more efficient than the native hoodlumism of this region. With the return of the democratic form of government, the Mafia regained strength.

If Southern Italy is backward and corrupt, and very possibly hopeless, does it make sense for the United States to spend so much money to defend it against a communist takeover? Is it worth the trouble? Such questions should be considered by the American people and government. And there are other lands in southern Europe that come close to being hopeless. What about them?

No doubt Americans should be more candid with themselves about the real character of some of the areas they are defending at high cost. The U.S. should be much tougher with some of America's supposed "friends."

This is not to say that it is rational to abandon the 20-year commitment to defense of southern Europe. If withdrawal to a Fortress America were a feasible course of action, then ending the commitment would make sense, for several allies or areas simply don't have sufficient intrinsic value to warrant virtually permanent American involvement.

The commitment to southern Europe only makes sense, really, because this region is a part of the overall system of defense against the Soviet Union. It is impossible to defend the important productive, useful allies of Northern Europe—Germany being the key ally—without also defending the southern flank. The U.S. can't allow the Russians to preempt all the space, to control the seas, and to occupy or dominate the backward lands of the southern rim of Europe. The U.S. couldn't allow the Nazis to control the Mediterranean. The same rationale applies to the Soviets.

What may be specially important for the 1970s is that the U.S. revise and update its rhetoric concerning "allies." The NATO allies on the southern flank—Italy, Greece and Turkey—have serious internal problems. Their military contributions to a united defense front are likely to diminish because of disorders and divisions within. As they grow more fearful of the Soviet Union, with its strong naval presence in the Mediterranean, their cooperativeness also may decline.

What seems in order in the Mediterranean is a new realism and a hard-nosed policy towards allies on the southern flank. Having suffered much from strong powers, they respect toughness. In the 6th fleet, the U.S. has a powerful military instrument. But the fleet is only as effective as the diplomatic policy and national understanding underlying its use. For the Nixon administration, the real opportunity is to increase the effectiveness of the fleet by scrapping alliance myths and casting a cold eye on friends as well as enemies.

NEW PLANES NEEDED: 6TH FLEET EQUIPPED WITH AGING AIRCRAFT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

ABOARD U.S.S. "FORRESTAL" IN THE AEGEAN SEA.—Steaming at night through a maze of Greek Islands southeast of Athens, this 80,000-ton super carrier is the embodiment of the 6th Fleet's peace-keeping power in the Mediterranean. Together with the smaller carrier, Shangri-La, currently in the Western Mediterranean, this great warship is the spearhead of the Attack Carrier Striking Force (Task Force 60) Commanded by Rear Arm. Pierre N. Charbonnet Jr. Other units in the striking force are destroyers and two missile armed cruisers.

The approximately 80 aircraft aboard the Forrestal provide the 6th Fleet's real punch in the Eastern Mediterranean.

For years, the 6th Fleet, built around the Striking Force, has been the principal deterrent to aggression in this region. For many of these years it was accurate to say that because of the 6th Fleet, the United States had undisputed air superiority in the Mediterranean. The basic assumption of the U.S. public has been that the 6th Fleet and its component parts couldn't be challenged effectively.

It is time to examine this assumption. What was true in 1959 may not be true in 1969.

Over the last eight years the U.S. failed to modernize the 6th Fleet. In the same period, the Soviet Union created a strong, modern naval squadron in the Mediterranean and turned over to its client states in North Africa and the Middle East powerful formations of high performance jet aircraft. As a result, the power balance in the Mediterranean has shifted. The Russians surely realize it though the U.S. public may not.

The air wing aboard the Forrestal is a case in point. Though the air wing is rich in officers with experience in the Vietnam air war, its aircraft are old.

In plain language the Forrestal has a 1961 model air wing in 1969.

Let's spell that out.

The Phantom jets on board are the B model, which went into service in 1961. The more advanced models are available in the Pacific, and are needed in the Med as well. Old airplanes, like old cars, are uneconomical to maintain.

Cost factors aside, in a combat situation in the Middle East, the Soviets and their clients would be flying more advanced aircraft than the Phantom F4B. The 6th Fleet thus would be at a qualitative disadvantage.

The attack squadrons aboard the Forrestal are equipped with the A–4 Skyhawk which went into service in the mid-1950s.

Because the Skyhawks have limited range, the Forrestal must devote valuable space and crew to tanker planes.

The 6th Fleet hasn't received any of the A–6 and A–7 attack aircraft that have performed so well in Vietnam. Ten A–6s can carry more bombs than 30 Skyhawks. With A–6s on board, the Forrestal wouldn't need the tanker planes. Its overall striking power would be enormously increased.

The combat capabilities of the Striking Force are based on a number of readily discernible factors, including range of aircraft, bombload, speed and endurance in the air. Obviously, re-equipping the Forrestal and the Shangri-La with today's high-performance aircraft would give the 6th Fleet striking power in a new order of magnitude.

If hostilities commenced today, one can be sure that the existing air wing would be equipped with superb professionalism and zeal. But these qualities are not substitutes for modern material.

If the 6th Fleet is going to continue to be a credible deterrent to Soviet aggression, the U.S. government will have to invest in new aircraft for the fleet. The Russians know the age of the embarked aircraft. The U.S. can't afford the risk of the Soviets judging that the balance of power in the Med has shifted sufficiently in their direction to justify a major military gamble.

SOVIET FLEET IN MED: RUSSIAN WARSHIPS MAKE THEIR PRESENCE FELT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

ABOARD U.S.S. "TALBOT" IN THE SEA OF CRETE.—Though the news tells about Soviet naval vessels in the Med, it is still a surprise to see a Russian warship in the midst of a U.S. task force.

Aboard the *Forrestal*, the loudspeaker in the carrier combat intelligence center blared: "Russian man of war five miles to the north." When I went on deck for a helicopter transfer to the destroyer escort *Talbot*, a powerful Soviet Krupny class missile destroyer was slightly astern on the port side. She was a fine, modern vessel, newer and more heavily armed than most of the destroyers in the *Forrestal's* screen. She was behaving circumspectly, unlike some of the Soviet warships that frequently veer back and forth among U.S. formations or cut across a carrier's bow as it prepares to turn to recover aircraft.

The *Forrestal* is always ready for emergencies. She is equipped with Sea Sparrow missiles for point defense against missile-armed patrol boats such as sank the Israeli destroyer *Elath*. Five Phantom jets always are on deck, with pilots strapped in their cockpits.

Rear Adm. Pierre Charbonnet, the task force commander, has a standing rule, according to the pilots: No Soviet overflights. By this, he means there will be no surprise overflights of his carriers by Soviet reconnaissance planes. As soon as a Russian plane is spotted, Phantoms are launched and escort the Russian while he is in the area.

The squadrons aboard the *Forrestal* continually take part in air warfare exercises. Tactics learned in the skies over Hanoi are practiced by such outstanding squadrons as VF–11, the famous "Red Rippers."

Aerial warfare has changed radically in the last decade. The Navy's Tactical Data System (NTDS) uses computers to process information at fantastic speeds. On the newest carriers equipped with the latest aircraft, it is possible for the NTDS system to launch aircraft, move them into position, fire airborne missiles at targets, and bring the planes back to the carrier's deck—all by computer, without the pilots touching their instruments or pulling a trigger. The NTDS system aboard the carrier gives accompanying ships (if they are equipped with receiving gear) the same visual and printed information available on the carrier. The skipper of every NTDS-equipped ship knows the track, and thus the position, of all task force ships at all times. Another computer system gives the task force commander completely integrated intelligence data.

XUM

Within a decade, naval warfare will be computerized to a fantastic degree. All conceivable naval missions and contingency plans undoubtedly will be programmed on computers. Thousands of decisions now made by individuals, such as the type and amount of ordnance on an aircraft for a particular mission, will be programmed and available, at a second's notice, on a printed readout from a computer. Entire war plans, such as a major amphibious operation, will be stored in computers for instantaneous use. The naval officer of the future will have to be as much a computer programmer as a shiphandler.

Everything becomes more difficult as the years pass. The Soviet naval presence in the Med, and the presence of Soviet-built airforces and armies ashore, will require the United States to modernize its forces in this sea.

With the Soviets, politics underlay all military actions. A Russian destroyer lying off a Sicilian town last year proved to be a useful aid to the communists during the election. The evidence here is that the world is only seeing the beginning of political use of the Soviet fleet. Russian ships currently are operating around the western bulge of Africa in the Gulf of Guinea. While numbers of Soviet ships in the Med fluctuate (more are sent into the area to monitor U.S. and NATO exercises) the size of the Soviet squadron is gradually rising.

The USS Talbot, which I am riding as she heads for a rendezvous with the USS La Salle, is one of the most modern ships in the 6th Fleet. Cmdr. Don E. Crawley, the Talbot's captain, is naturally proud of this 3,400-ton vessel armed with the Tartar missile, the Asroc anti-submarine missile and other weapons. But only three of the eight destroyers operating with the Forrestal are missile ships. It is dismaying for an American to see a powerful, modern Soviet missile ship towering above a weary, World War II-type U.S. destroyer.

In the Mediterranean, where old nations have survived for a long time and want to continue to live, many people are watching the new Soviet ships and noting that many U.S. vessels are old. It is important for political reasons, as well as for combat readiness, that the U.S. maintain a truly modern 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

REALTORS WORK TOWARD A BETTER AMERICA

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Davenport Times-Democrat recently featured a guest editorial by Mr. Charles A. Ruhl of Davenport. Mr. Ruhl is president of the Iowa Association of Realtors. Mr. Ruhl's guest editorial explains the excellent program which the National Association of Real Estate Boards established in 1968 called "The Make America Better Plan." They are to be commended for this fine program, and I commend Mr. Ruhl's editorial to my colleagues:

HELP MAKE AMERICA BETTER

(By Charles A. Ruhl)

Realtors, specialists in housing, realize that the problems of housing and rehabilitation cannot be overcome unless we find solutions for the many related ills including the causes of neighborhood decay and city blight.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards early in 1968 formulated six major objectives called The Make America Better Plan to be placed in the hands of the 50 state associations, 1,500 local real estate boards, and 87,000 members for study and expansion into workable programs—programs that would invite action from all levels of government, supported by many persons and organizations including civic clubs.

A short time ago the National Association was notified that it had been selected to receive an honor medal award of the Freedom Foundation for its Make America Better program.

In capsule form the six objectives of the program are:

1. Encourage widespread rehabilitation and construction, with emphasis on private housing, through the use of tax incentives, subsidies for low income families, code enforcement, and expanded mortgage financing programs.
2. Provide for education and training of families in living habits which will avoid excessive property destruction that discourages both private and public investment.
3. End restrictive practices that unduly increase costs of construction and inhibit employment therein.
4. Require exploratory courses and provide incentives so that elementary and high school pupils who may be vocationally inclined will receive an appropriate balance between academic courses and vocational and technical training.
5. Rededicate the nation to the observance of law with emphasis on reducing crime, vandalism and juvenile delinquency, strengthening law enforcement, and improving rehabilitation and parole procedures.
6. Further appropriate programs to assist property owners in marketing housing on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Many member boards of the National Association of Realtors are already active in sponsoring programs related to the six objectives. It is interesting to note that only two relate directly to housing. Realistically, however, housing will be a great loser if further decay of our cities is permitted.

It is not a time for dialogue or confrontation or just talking about someone else doing it. For our urban housing to develop, solutions must be found for the deep-rooted economic and sociological crises in our cities.

To encourage widespread rehabilitation and construction, the first of the objectives is to call upon financial institutions to provide adequate funding for programs in the core areas; to promote the utilization of rent supplement programs for rehousing; to request incentives so that industry will remain in the central city to aid the unemployed or underemployed; to stop the endless city defeating flight of people and job opportunities to the suburbs.

It is necessary to train some persons in the basic rudiments of housekeeping and care of their domicile if there is to be progress in construction and expansion of housing facilities for the underprivileged. Lopsided welfare laws have directly resulted in driving many rural poor to the cities where they are unable to cope with city living. Extensive educational and training facilities should be utilized in the Quad-Cities if we are to enjoy expanded housing facilities.

Restrictive practices that unduly increase the cost of housing can and must be eliminated. In Washington the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has set a goal of 26 million new housing units over the next 10 years, with six million of it designed for low income families. Currently we are adding less than 1½ million units a year. Some of our self-serving labor practices and building codes discourage the use of newly-developed materials and construction methods. We must have a new attitude in this sector including the elimination of featherbedding practices that restrict productivity. Organized labor could play a large part in such corrections.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards does believe that something can be done to stem the rise of crime and delinquency and in a small way is proving it. One project evolving from the Make America Better program is the Light the Night activity started by the Denver Real Estate Board. It is a program to awaken the community to the value of lighting as a weapon against crime. Lights went on in crime-plagued areas and crimes have been reduced. The program has been expanded with much success in many communities.

In Iowa, the Greater Des Moines Board of Realtors gave a $40,000 building to disadvantaged young people to use as a recreation and study center. The Miami Board of Realtors sparked a program to provide several downtown centers for youths.

The last of the realtors' objectives is directed to the sale and rental of property on a nondiscriminatory basis, a matter on which many association members have been quietly working for years. Last June the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the Jones vs. Mayer case which re-emphasized a 100-year-old law establishing that there shall be no discrimination in the sale or rental of property on the basis of race.

It is on the basis of this decision that equitable and effective efforts may be made, rather than the confusing mirage of legislation which could become as repugnant to the Constitution as discrimination itself. Emphasis is being placed by realtors upon establishing and fostering a climate of understanding and acceptance to promote open occupancy on a voluntary basis.

It will cost us far less to solve the problems facing our cities and our country than to pay the tab for our failure to solve them. Citizens and citizen groups of the Quad-Cities are invited to join this campaign.

DEATH OF W. W. WARD, ALTOONA, PA.

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, when Mr. W. W. Ward passed on, Altoona, Pa., lost a great civic leader. But he was a loss for the whole Commonwealth because of the immense contribution he made to so many aspects of life in central Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks an article and an editorial published in the Altoona Mirror of March 15, 1969.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM W. WARD, 62, DIES IN FLORIDA HOME

William W. Ward, 62, of Box 37, Frankstown Road, Sylvan Hills, board chairman of the Ward Trucking Corp. he created, died unexpectedly of a heart attack at 2 a.m. today in his Florida home, 216 Bal Bay Drive, Bal Harbour.

Mr. Ward had not previously been ill. Through his interest in the restoration of the Mishler Theater he had flown back to Altoona for its reopening last week.

He was born in Altoona on Oct. 23, 1906, a son of William and Isabella (Kerr) Ward, and married Dorothy Craig. Surviving are his wife, three sons, G. William of Sylvan Heights Drive, J. Richard and Michael E. of Frankstown Road, and nine grandchildren.

Also surviving are a brother and two sisters, James K. and Mrs. Sarah Miller of Altoona and Mrs. Jane Ernest of Ardmore.

Mr. Ward's body is being returned to the city for funeral services and interment, but no detailed information was available early this afternoon.

His interests and participation in city, state and national activities were numerous. He was a member of the First EUB Church, now the Trinity United Methodist; the boards of trustees of Altoona Campus, Pennsylvania State College, and of St. Francis College, Loretto.

Mr. Ward was a director of Mid-State Bank & Trust Co., Blair Hotel Co., Pennsylvania manufacturers Casualty Insurance Co., Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, Pennsylvania Development Credit Corp.

Director of the Blair County Branch, Pennsylvania Economy League, Inc.: Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, Altoona Community Chest, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce and Transportation Association of America, a director and past president of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce.

OTHER SERVICE

He served also as chairman of the board of Altoona Enterprises, Inc., chief of transportation of the Altoona-Blair County Civil Defense and as a member of the National Defense Transportation Association, as a director and president of the Middle-Atlantic Conference and on the board of the American Trucking Association.

Mr. Ward headed the Jobs for Joes campaign as chairman in 1954–64, was chairman of the Altoona-Mercy Hospital's building fund campaign 1957–58, vice chairman of the Republican Finance Committee on Pennsylvania from 1957 and a member of the executive committee of the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania.

He was honored in 1954 as Kiwanis and Optimist Man-of-the-Year, was the Jaycee Boss-of-the-Year in January 1959, received an American Legion citation for Meritorious Service in May 1959, Silver Beaver award of the Boy Scouts of America in February 1960 and held the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

The Ward Trucking Co. was originated in 1931 as a partnership, and under the direction of Mr. Ward grew steadily to its present magnitude. Mr. Ward served as chairman of the boards of both the Ward Trucking Corp. and the Ward Corp. of Pennsylvania, as president of Ward Terminals, Inc., and Ward Enterprises, Inc.

DEDICATION

When civic leaders of the stature of the late W. W. Ward pass on, the entire area experiences a state of shock. "Who will help us now?" is a common greeting among those who have worked with such a man and knew of his ability and willingness to help the community. Bill was wonderful and he had many important contacts outside the local community. He used his phone, his car and his time to enlist their aid when it was needed.

In his lifetime among us many a gloomy session turned brighter because of his ready smile and his "let's-get-after-it-now" attitude. He and the late Bill Wade, George Gable and George Kelchner were a quartet of ambassadors without equal when interviewing or being interviewed by prospective industrialists looking for sites.

Way back, when Tommy Dobson was the running quarterback for the Altoona team and M. A. Miller was the coach for the entire squad, these men and many others were in there running interference. Only the coach remains among the living of those mentioned above.

They had one thing in common—dedication. They had witnessed a town in its agony struggling to stay alive as an industrial center and they, along with about 50 others, dedicated their lives to its rebuilding. There sprung up among them an eager and willing group of recruits. Each year has witnessed the enlistment of others in this cause we call Altoona. It outgrew the city and became the Altoona area and now it is in truth Central Pennsylvania.

Death has taken its toll and it is not the objective of this editorial to plunge us into a state of gloom by naming the Bert Leopolds, the King McFarlanes and all those others who have crossed the river or the Stan Ruths, Gwin Dodsons and others who have moved to new communities. Neither is it our purpose to list the loyal and talented and dedicated living members of the pioneer group and their early recruits.

Our purpose today is to enlist dedicated young men who will in time have a responsibility that grows with each passing year. Like the Olympic torchbearers of old, each man must some day come to the bank of the river, and before crossing over, throw his lighted torch to another, secure in the knowledge that it will be carried through to the finish line; that their love for their home community and its folks will never die.

All men are mortal and each has his appointed time. We are sure that if our late departed friend were to write this next line he would say, "That's the problem; let's get with it."

A great many things have happened here in these past three and a half decades. The shop whistles summon less than half as many men to work each morning in that great complex of 59 separate shops of the great PRR system. The more than 17,000 workers have been cut to just about half that number. But the great out-migration of the early Thirties has stopped.

Today more than 30 diversified industries are training men and women in new skills. They are growing. Other new industries are still to come. We are even brave enough to tear down many of the old buildings that once upon a time held us together, by thin threads at times, and to start to build new ones to take their place.

The college campus that was once but a dream is here and growing. The veterans hospital has been functioning for years and the state hospital has been serving our commonwealth for quite a few years. Even the library that was but a hazy dream to most of us is built and will soon open its doors and its books to a new generation of those who seek the treasures stored in books.

This past week we have heard several of W. W. W.'s friends say: "Thank God, he at least had the joy of seeing the reborn Mishler."

The best tribute to his memory and to the memory of those who, like him, kept a better Altoona always in their sights as they traveled the last miles of their sojourn here, is to keep building, to keep remembering: "This is our city, our county, our state and our nation."

Let our lives help make it better than we found it, always keeping in mind it was a pretty good place when we found it.

A $1 BILLION GIFT REFUSED BY U.S. GOVERNMENT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFTTHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article written by L. Richard Caveney. Mr. Caveney is in private industry and is an expert in Federal Government purchasing. I am sure everyone will enjoy his timely remarks:

A $1 BILLION GIFT REFUSED BY U.S. GOVERNMENT

(By L. Richard Caveney)

I have one billion dollars which the Federal Government refuses to accept as an outright gift, and this during a fiscal crisis!! Incredible, isn't it? And where did I find this billion? Right inside the Government itself. To keep up with the rise of daily operating costs and meet the additional expenses of the Vietnam war, our Government has not only slapped a 10% surtax onto our individual income tax, but it has also imposed an almost "across the board" 6-billion dollar cut on many essential Federal programs. As part of the surcharge act—which experts agree will continue past its July 1, 1969 expiration date—major deactivation of our Vietnam forces must be made, or the number of U.S. employees must be cut back to the 1966 level.

THE PAINFUL CUTTING PROCESS

Thus, the Federal Government started the "painful cutting process" toward proposed "economies". However, I, for one, feel that these "savings" are not "savings" at all, but are merely the transfer of some Government expenditures to the private sector as increased business operating costs and as reduced services to the average U.S. taxpayer. The present Federal approaches toward these reductions have long-term effects far more damaging to this country than responsible citizens generally suppose. Further, major economies, not now sought, could be realized in many areas by the proper application of advanced management techniques coupled to new technology. The present cutting approach applies restrictions across the board without regard for inefficiencies and waste. It is this present approach that requires an urgent call for understanding by the public, and the press if either expects to affect, in any way, major decisions regarding the utilization of our tax dollars.

THE TRANSFER OF COSTS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Let us examine how these "savings" transfer operating costs to the private sector. Restricted expenditures by the Federal Aviation Agency have precipitated an airline crisis. In the "golden triangle" the airlines are losing $1 million dollars a day in increased operating cost. The Government's solution is to restrict flights and appoint a committee to report by 1970 while wives now spend countless hours seated in over-heated cars with fretting children, while their husbands sit in airplanes waiting for clearances.

R. & D. ECONOMIES

The greatest "economy" is to be exacted from this country's Research and Development activities which accounts for about half the controllable part of the budget. R & D was reduced 563 million dollars in the President's 1969 budget—a whopping 35 percent. The cuts came not only from space and research facilities but sixteen private medical colleges are in danger of closing while the nation faces a critical shortage of physicians—how can this type of retrenchment be called "economical"? Present cuts will diminish the ranks of future scientists and engineers as President Eisenhower's Science Advisor, Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, stated: "the cuts may simply take many extremely promising students out of the scientific stream for good". Dael Wolfe, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science prophesies that, "for years to come the nation as a whole will pay the price because we will have fewer scientists and engineers for colleges and industry". Stated another way, it means this country will possess less future knowledge.

In a restive world which daily is changing in so many technological ways, the best advice this country receives from the pinnacle of the Federal Establishment is to squander our scientific youth and to surrender our world leadership in science.

Aside from the national security aspects of these courses of action, what has a conservative businessman to worry about? Plenty ! ! ! When basic research dries up, so does the source of new applied technology. In a recent article, Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of th National Academy of Science, predicted, "the rate at which we put new ideas into technology will slow down. I see it already in lasers, people are having trouble getting new ideas going. The new materials field was having trouble staying afloat; now it will collapse."

The businessman suffers short-term and long-term effects from these policies. Firstly, the Research and Development (R & D) slow down represents an under-utilization of existing research capabilities, such as atom-smashers, computers, and telescopes which represent a national capitalization of many hundreds of scientific man years and many millions of dollars, a research investment that this country has already made, which these policies will allow to lay fallow. MIT's Provost, Dr. Jerome B. Weisner, President Kennedy's science advisor, observes, "we have spread our research so thin in many applied fields, advantage will be yielded up to other nations unless we soon change. . . ."

Secondly, companies selling to Research and Development (R & D) organizations will find that the word is out: Buy nothing, particularly no equipment or instruments you can survive without. Instrument companies are aware they have been in the trough of an economy wave for some time. As a group, instrument manufacturers have had a significant reduction in orders over recent years, particularly since the Federal R & D leveled off in 1964. Since then, the United States R & D budget has increased only three percent per year—not enough to keep up with inflation. Conservative estimates place this decrease in real research buying power at 20 to 25 percent. This year's (FY 69) loss alone in R & D is 35 percent below the 1968 level.

These "economies" have their effect on the manufacturers, their suppliers and others in the economy. Important too, is the fact that as a group these policies tend to dry up "risk capital" for new ideas or for the implementation of new instrumentation techniques. Allied operations, such as magazines, catering to the scientifically-oriented communities, find their advertising revenues down, and thus their employment is down.

The long-term effects of such R & D cuts can only be as Dr. Weisner has stated, "in nuclear physics and radio astronomy, we will fall by the wayside." Many experts agree the leadership in elementary particle physics will soon pass from the U.S. to western Europe and Russia. These basic studies have led—usually unexpectedly—to transistors, atomic power, radar, lasers, computers and other well-known applied techniques and products that sustain our economy and provide the highest standard of living ever known. Instead of exploiting our multi-million dollar research investment systematically and tirelessly with all the means available, particularly the intellectual resources, this administration has said R & D must be cut because R & D accounts for about half the "controllable" part of the budget. Apparently, things such as paying quasi-farmers not to grow corn have higher national priorities. This intellectual attitude is stuck when corporation after corporation has had the experience of seeing its product mix change as much as 80 percent in a decade. Most new technical products, now in common usage, just weren't around 10 years ago. Where are the next ten years going to come from?

Assuming the business world survives these policies, there are grave doubts that many private universities can long survive. "The way things are" said one George Washington University Dean, "a turndown of one project can close a department."

THE INDIVIDUAL'S CUT—REDUCED SERVICES

The individual taxpayer will bear the scars of these budget cuts. Aside from the elimination of social and educational programs which effect the general population's well-being, we find: Proposed cut backs in maintaining parks, roads and trails and in the development of outdoor recreation facilities; road construction; Head Start programs, disadvantaged youth programs, and manpower programs are to be hard hit along with National Defense.

The individual American's largest cut is less jobs, lower standard of living, and increased deaths due to starvation coupled with larger bites by governments.

WHY THESE CUTS?

These cuts will come in less service to the average citizen, both public and private, because the organized bureaucracy—which means primarily the Bureau of the Budget, and the hierarchy of agency and bureau administration which report to it and whose administrative policies it controls—organized bureaucracy has exerted its great power to prevent any change whatsoever in the status quo.

HOW ARE THE CUTS MADE?

It is the Executive Branch's business to look at the present nakedly and audaciously fiscal crisis and to deal with it on the basis of the most probable events and techniques of the near and long-term future, rather than with techniques of the familiar past. This is not the way real "bureaucratniks" work. They simply cut people on a percentage basis, even in revenue-producing activities; and cut as deeply as possible into the "controllable" part of the budget—new technology, new instrumentation and new ideas. The cuts should be accompanied by the efficient management of existing men, money and materials coupled to the rapid implementation of new ideas from within and without the Federal Establishment. The cuts should also be accompanied by a sharp reappraisal of procurement procedures.

Few, if any, of these things are taking place. Procurement realities, that imbue profit-oriented organizations, have little force within the Federal Establishment. "Cost-effectiveness" is a dirty word, not a rigorous, penetrating method to most effectively allocate resources to military and international programs at a cost that will still make possible the achievement of our domestic goals. The problems in technical procurements are especially acute. In a day when an engineering education's relevance to burgeoning technology holds for less than decade, we have many government "managers" making decisions on major equipment procurements whose latest training predated World War II. In the accelerated technology of today, the instrumentation of twenty years ago is useless: computers have only come in to currency within the last 15 years; lasers, solid state physics, communications satellites and instantaneous video tape TV replays are more examples of the changes that the immediate past has wrought. Pre-atomic AM–78 RPM trained minds that deal with the solid state, AM/FM TV (black/white and color), 16, 33⅓, 45 stereo magnetic tape, video tape reply, sixteen speaker Mach IV sound and science of today—Can they understand the nanosecond specifications the salesman rattles off? Can they evaluate engineering differences, or the complex interrelations that exist between existing equipment and the proposed purchases? Or do they say "I'll take that one" because they recognize a familiar manufacturer's name, or is it something much more than this?

THE WATCHDOG ROLE OF CONGRESS

This is compounded by the fact that although Congress will not appropriate funds without providing for supervision of their disbursements, the individual member of Congress has come to feel insecure in his own technical knowledge and hesitates to "take-on" a line-up of agency "experts" particularly in public session. Congressional Committee staffers in general are not technically trained either and wonder about the conflicting experts' "advice" they receive—frequently unsolicited. The result is purchasing anarchy, sometimes referred to as the right of "free choice". The agencies have for all practical purposes, complete, unsupervised control of any purchases for any program, no matter how technical. U.S. Senator H. M. Cannon has charged the U.S. Army with "questionable procedures" in awarding contracts for stepped-up production of the M–16 rifle. A House Committee has made similar charges. A recent article suggests 25 million dollars as the level of waste in the M–16 procurement.

Parade magazine's recent article on the Surplus Give-away Scandal by Jack Anderson notes that 144 million dollars worth of defense equipment has been declared surplus in Vietnam. We will be told the Administration will "save" eight cents on the dollar by this sale of the total "procurement". I say we have sustained a 92 percent loss.

Waste due to procurement concepts of this sort can only become larger because the total procurements are larger and no effective force has yet been applied to review procurements *before* award. I agree a lot of discussions, hearings, in short talk, but little if any action.

THE ESTABLISHMENT'S PROCUREMENT POSITION

As modern science produces a revolutionary environment, which is part and parcel of the haunting problems that beset the people of this nation, the bureaucratic position remains: There must be no outside review or control over the procurement practices of the Federal Government, and there must be no "third-party intervention" by any board or panel or expert on matters of federal policy regardless of how many lives and resources of any sorts are involved. In short, all effective power must be reserved to "Big Brother", the Federal Establishment.

The starkly etched needs of our domestic society are being sacrificed to the emotional need of the upper echelons of government's managers to be comfortable, because as an office of the President spokesman has written, to change "would require complete revision of our present concepts of . . . procurement."

THE FEDERAL SUGGESTION SYSTEM

In an era of instant change, some Federal employees hope to modify or alter the winds of Federal procedures through the Federal Employees Suggestion Program.

Suggestions submitted in the Federal Establishment are reviewed by the group that formulated the procedure or policy then in use. They decide whether they have made the wrong choices and can rebuff any effort to change the system of equipment and for procedures they have instituted. That's like having the defendant act as judge and jury in a civil court case. As you would guess, the plaintiff (suggestor) loses the majority of the cases. In fact, as the chairman of a Department of Business Administration recently confided, "you are considered some kind of nut if you try to effect a change via the government's suggestion program."

There is no rebuttal for a turned down suggestor. Disapproval letters in my possession show a complete disregard for submitted facts supporting change and in general are non-responsive to the suggestion's specifics.

For example, one of the Government's largest computer users turned down an extraordinarily detailed and documented million dollar suggestion regarding a newly marketed computer tape drive with the comment, "We had already witnessed a demon-

XUM

stration of the tape unit of which you informed us. . . ." There was no refutation of the cost figures which showed a 33½ percent increase in efficiency with a decrease of 29.7 percent in cost; in fact, no reference was made to any of the cost-effective specifics but this million dollar suggestion was disapproved.

A simple phrase "I would like to thank you for the interest you have shown" by a minor official is enough to squelch any suggestion no matter how large the potential savings, no matter how concrete the suggestor's cost analysis. There is no rebuttal capability, no higher "third-party" for review of major suggestions—no "court of appeal."

CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN THE SUGGESTION SYSTEM

As the Congress has an interest in the maximum utilization of appropriated funds, I contacted the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the U.S. House of Representatives. A staff member there said they "frequently" had government employees call regarding rejected suggestions, but that they could do very little as they had no personnel or funds for the purpose of evaluating suggestion turn-downs. "That would take the full-time capability of a couple of people," he noted. He forwarded a copy of their May 16, 1968 report covering "examples of improved management reported by the 26 largest departments and agencies in the Federal Government for the period July through December, 1967", some of which were "the result of putting into effect employee's suggestions," with the following examples:

ADP "COST CUTTING TIPS"

You will go from that "cost cutting tip" to another in the field of automatic data processing, where the Government's hardware expenditures are estimated to be about 2 billion dollars annually. In this field, GSA suggests, "Save on use of the character "Ø" on typewriters." They note that, "the character "Ø" is now widely used in data processing and for other purposes. In many instances this character is now imposed by typing the letter "O", backspacing and then adding the diagonal slash "/". These three steps are time consuming in instances where usage of the character is very frequent." They have arranged that any standard typewriter can be ordered to include the character at $3.00 increase in cost. What could be the monetary impact of this?

While savings of this value were filtering about the GSA, through Congressional Committee to publication and distribution, several valid suggestions on ADP valued by outside experts as bordering on a one billion dollar a year savings are either turned down due to incompetent review or are not responded to at all. Manufacturers of computer peripheral equipment, such as magnetic tape transports, are attempting to get on GSA schedules (license to sell to the U.S. Government) and thus create price competition. And yet the Federal Government loses the ability to reapportion its resources toward its domestic tasks.

NEW INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

In this Congressional publication one learns that the AD Hoc committee responsible for such "Tips" has decided to make itself permanent and to call itself the Interagency Committee for Improvement in Procurement and Management of Property, "to consider all proposals by the President, the Congress, Committee members, or other sources as determined appropriate (sic) by the Committee which are designed to improve the efficiency and economy in Government procurement, supply and property management operations; and collectively determine the appropriate course of action for achieving these objectives." One would hope that the focus of this group could be raised above a typewriter character. Granted this government AD Hoc committee is better than nothing but we have enough of "better than nothing" elements in Government—what is needed is a complete overhaul—change.

AIR FORCE SAVINGS

On page 6, the U.S. Air Force proudly proclaims its "standardization of Air Force base level automation" with projected 6-year "savings" of $17,550,000.00 beginning in 1969. They hope to accomplish this "with a standard electronic data processing equipment (EDPE) configuration". They do not mention that the Phase II contract initially let by the Air Force to IBM had to be renegotiated after the uproar by major computer corporations and other groups at a savings to the Government of approximately 50 million dollars. The next computer manufacturer, the renegotiated winner, will supply a minimum of about 130 computer systems, with each computer system having two or three $200,000 large capacity memory storage units. They also do not mention that testimony given to the Congress in November, 1967, proved that for one typical $900,000 government owned computer configuration, that independent manufacturers' peripheral devices would have reduced the purchase cost by about $400,000.00.

That is a 44 percent cost avoidance at the outset, which extended over the Air Force's 130 EDPE minimal basic configurations could total at least another $40 million dollar savings. Additional savings in floor space, spare parts and maintenance time and manpower would have added substantially to these savings. Such savings, about $40 million dollars, would buy a tremendous amount of "system responsibility".

Since that testimony was published to the Congress. *No* changes have been made in that procurement nor has any GSA procurement been let in which a fair amount of independent peripheral manufacturers products are bid as individual units; in fact GSA should get out of the computer and computer peripheral procurement business as GSA is just a waste of good tax dollars while in the ADPE procurement cycle. An April 25, 1968 Bureau of the Budget letter explains "to provide for direct bidding of magnetic tape units, or other computer system components, as separate pieces of equipment in all procurements would require complete revision of our present concept of EDP systems and procurement."

THE FACTS BE DAMNED

In other words, although expert written testimony has been given to a Congressional Committee, the problem is just too big to contemplate, and please be gentlemen enough not to bring it up again because we in the Budget Bureau are too busy trying to cut 6 billion dollars from needed programs to think of modifying our procedures to effect savings by cost-avoidance.

Nor does the Air Force mention the fact that the Phase II contract may put a second computer at most Air Force bases, worldwide. My understanding is the existing Phase I Univac 1050's now handling the supply activities will not be compatible with the Burroughs computers now being acquired and so cannot act as back-up units; nor can they share the Phase II personnel and financial activities. Clearly, is the ground being laid for the integration of Phase I and II somewhere in the Pentagon at this moment?

An interesting fact, Associated Press indicated that according to the General Services Administration (GSA), the Pentagon lost $160 million dollars by acquiring new computer equipment, even as computers it already owned or leased stood idle with this idle computer time amounting to an additional loss of $250 million dollars; not a bad loss—only $410 million dollars. If Government were rated by how much it wasted in tax dollars it would be the most efficient Government in the world.

Former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, said in his White House letter dated February 19, 1948, when he signed into law H.R. 1366, which granted unprecedented freedom to the Executive Branch from specific procurement restrictions during peacetime, that this bill had a hidden danger. This freedom, he said, was given to permit the flexibility and latitude needed in national defense activities. The basic need, he said, however, remains to assure favorable price and adequate service to the Government. To the degree that restrictions have been diminished, he said, therefore, responsibility upon the Executive Branch of Government, which includes the Defense Establishment, has been increased. The danger, he said, is the natural desire for flexibility and speed in procurement will lead to excessive placement of contracts by negotiation and undue reliance upon large concerns, and this he said must not occur. It has and is. In a sense, this law gives certain human beings a license to practice collusion and if not collusion—stupidity—at the taxpayers expense.

Did former President Truman have the foresight to put forth the first warning shot concerning the huge military-industrial complex which has been forged and nurtured by the misused procurement law, H.R. 1366? About 1960, the former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, also warned the American people of such a merger and suggested this country beware. It appears, based on all the technological procurement waste of the taxpayer's dollar and the lack of efficient management in Government seems to support the fact, that both former Presidents' representing both major political parties, were right. Congress should act expeditiously to place the proper controls over the Executive Branch in order to provide for the proper funding for all programs and decrease the possibility of any such future fiscal crisis.

"IMPROVED" MANAGEMENT

As one pursues this part-comic, part-tragic enumeration of "savings" he wonders "What is 'management' in these activities now, if these examples represent 'improved management'?"

BIGGER "BIG GOVERNMENT"?

The solution is not more administration, but more efficient management practices. As John Kenneth Galbraith has pointed out in the "New Industrial State", one can favor technological bigness and oppose administrative bigness without inconsistency. In fact, advanced technology tends to streamline activities; it also makes them less subject to bureaucratic whims.

TOM'S

What the Federal Government needs are TOM's—technically oriented managers. People with an understanding of technology, who are able to understand the technical language and concepts of the various sciences. Only a properly trained, management-oriented individual can properly manage technical programs vital to this nation's economic and social well-being. The ability and will to manage is at least as important as the technical background. These people cannot be like the Postmaster quoted when asked how he managed his operation. He replied "I don't manage it, I simply administer it."

TOM'S IN GOVERNMENT

There are some TOM's in Government, but they are layered within the bureaucracy so as to have very limited power over operations and programs; their role should be larger in this period of technological revolution.

THANKS, BUT NO THANK YOU

Seminal, incisive ideas will not become part of the American dream if we continue to allow the bureaucratic blanket to cover these TOM's to smother new ideas. From one such TOM I have one billion dollars from

XUM

just one valid technically unimpeachable suggestion in my possession which has been disapproved by Establishment spokesmen who will not change existing procedures because, "to change would require an entirely new concept . . ." if one citizen, acting independently, can find one billion dollars, what would a government wide program produce?

WHAT PRODUCES A BILLION DOLLARS IN REVENUE?

In today's world the terms "billion, trillion, million" have become fuzzy concepts. What does it take to produce a billion dollars in Government revenue? It takes the combined yearly corporate taxes from about four of the world's largest corporations—General Motors, Gulf Oil Corporation, Ford Motor Company, and Litton Industries. That is, the combined economic power represented by about 1,276,322 employees plus the combined assets of these four major corporations, supplied in the form of tax revenue to the Federal Establishment in 1967, has been nullified by the Administration's failure to act on federal employees' suggestions in my possession.

THE REVENUE PRODUCERS

The Government's revenue agency, Internal Revenue Service, was one of the agencies that failed to implement one of these suggestions, although the IRS spokesman reviewing it stated, "(it) is a good suggestion." Management's inability to act on this suggestion alone, polled experts agree, has cost about 15 million dollars in government revenue over the past three (3) years. I wonder if IRS officials are prepared to have their salaries garnished for this amount in the same way one issue of Reader's Digest pointed out they proceeded against a 62 year old, heart-attack victim, owing the Government $19.00. Instead of practicing better management, the IRS response to proposed cutbacks has been to suggest that cuts in its budget are "destructive".

Former IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen notes that cuts in the Internal Revenue Service's budget will produce ultimate geometric cuts in the budgets of other departments by denying them the revenue funds they need. This occurs, as Senator Ralph Yarborough (D. Tex.) has pointed out, because IRS's enforcement staff collects about $8 for every $1 of its costs. This is true, but one must point out that inefficient use of its present budget by IRS will also penalize other agencies geometrically.

THE POLITICAL "OUT"—POST OFFICE

The Post Office's response to the Congressional roll back has been to force the Administration to back-off on attempted cutbacks in money and personnel. The Post Office proposes to meet new needs by adding to its 740,000 employees. Had the Bell System responded to its expanding market in this way, most women in the United States would be sitting in front of a telephone switchboard today.

Frederick R. Kappel, retired board chairman of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company told Parade magazine, "The Post Office is a 19th century establishment trying to do a 20th century job. What it cries out for is modern management techniques."

Kappel, as chairman of President Johnson's commission on Postal organization, reported: "The Post Office has not only failed to take advantage of the technology of other industries, but has not fully exploited the mail processing equipment already in use in some of its own facilities."

They claim "Postal costs can be reduced at least 20 percent if normal investment and operating practices used in private industry are made available to postal management." In the face of these findings, the Post Office yearly budget of 6.6 billion dollars was made exempt from the budget cuts.

Potential gains to be realized by implementation of this Commission's findings, which advocate use of technological and modern management techniques, could offset the entire Post Office's deficit of $1.2 billion dollars—the largest in history.

A TIME OF CHANGE

The times cry out for swift and effective institutional changes—but the enormous bureaucratic mess the U.S. Government has become can only be moved by great political pressure. The inertia built into government activities, of all sorts, and at all levels, is such that it requires extraordinary political effort to change our institutions even slightly. Each of us must be concerned; each of us must stand up and be counted.

IT CAN ONLY GET WORSE

We must be concerned because this is not a unique event or point in time; we are in a rapidly enlarging world amidst a burgeoning technology and Government's financial requirements can only enlarge.

We must all support promising approaches that offer a good probability of lowering costs while increasing efficiency. It is action that is the strength of the American system—it's the ability to develop corrective alternatives, and act upon them that keeps American industry in the forefront of the world economy.

I have been trying to transplant some of that thinking into the bureaucratic environment, but it is clear that organizational changes are required and the political pressure of the average U.S. citizen must be applied to overcome governmental inertia.

These facts have been gathered in my attempt during the recent years to establish the right of certain members of the computer industry to bid direct to the Federal Government on a competitive basis and to provide multi-million dollar savings to the Government and thus to the taxpayer.

A STANDARD OF MEASUREMENT

We have not acted to redress known grievances. What we need to establish is a standard of measurement in management and technology. We must also provide for third-party expert review and a continuing surveillance of major governmental activities—particularly as they relate to the underutilization of technology.

A CENTER FOR TECHNOLOGY—ACT

I propose the establishment of a Center for Technology (ACT), composed of individuals from the exact and inexact sciences in the Legislative Branch. Recently developed evidence on the M-16, F-111 and Air Force Phase II computer contracts suggests that such a center could more than pay its own way by reducing procurement waste of tax dollars. The Center director to report directly to the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate or to the President. This center would have two objectives: 1. Act as a court of appeal for government employees who have had their technical suggestion turned down by the chain of command with the Executive Branch and to allow suggestions from individual taxpayers and the academic and business communities to be given proper attention. This would eliminate the problem of ultimate review of the Federal suggestion program by officials who have been at best reluctant in its support and, at worst, an obstacle to progress. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt who said, "New ideas cannot be administered successfully by men with old ideas, for the first essential of doing a job well is the wish to see the job done at all." 2. Such a center would put a brake on present procurement practices for major technological purchases. It would provide sophisticated analysis of agency positions and present them to the Congress and the President in layman's terms. It would be an expert objective audio-visual unit for Congress and the President that would act as a counter-balance to the tables-full of agency witnesses Congressmen now see.

Congress would still appropriate funds, but the Executive Branch could not make a contract award for major technological items without all proposals and contract award recommendations being first reviewed by the "Center" and explained to the appropriate committee of Congress or the President. At this time, there are inadequate controls on technological procurements before the contract is awarded and without proper control waste of tax dollars will increase and cause increased taxation and this be the case it would definitely be "taxation without representation".

It is up to each of us to bring the full range of advanced management techniques to bear on this country's problems.

We must all demand an affirmative and constructive spirit regarding institutional changes within Government. We must also encourage the development of those attributes within the governmental service that will steadily push the frontier of knowledge farther into the area marked unknown while managing in a manner that will evoke the best from those that labor at all levels of Government.

This country must settle for nothing less! Above all we can never accept a Government which is by the Government and for the Government nor a Government for a few people and by a few people but we must insist on a Government for all the people and by all the people.

NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is considerable discussion, comment, and speculation going on today concerning a volunteer force to replace the Selective Service System. It should be emphasized that the administration is only studying this matter and that a firm legislative proposal has not been made to Congress by the President. It is also noted that a proposal probably will not be made until after the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, I have noted a great many editorials against trusting our national security to a volunteer force. I was especially impressed with a recent editorial in the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C. The editorial points out some fatal flaws in the volunteer force concept. It raises some vital issues that will have to be considered if a proposal is made. I quote one:

> If we have learned anything at all from our involvement in two World Wars and lesser conflicts, it is that a nation, despite the hopes of patriots and the words of poets, cannot spring to arms overnight.

I commend the editor of the State for his thought-provoking editorial. I recommend it to Senators for their review and ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For National Security

The notion that the United States should rely on a volunteer force to maintain the nation's security is not only fallacious and fanciful, it is downright dangerous.

President Nixon's moves in the direction thus far have gone no further than tentative utterances about the possibility of seeking a volunteer army after the Vietnam war is settled, and the call for of a study of the factors involved. For the sake of the President's own reputation as well as the safety of the nation, we hope he goes no further.

As an abstraction, the idea of a defense force made up altogether of volunteers sounds both laudable and plausible. But as a practical approach to genuine security in such troubled times, the scheme is preposterous, if for no other reason than the likelihood that volunteers would not be obtained in sufficient number to do the job. Pollsters confirm the natural suspicion that the young men who are most vocal in calling for a volunteer army admit that they would not serve in it.

But even if enough volunteers were attracted by increased pay and other benefits, the concept still holds fatal flaws. The most serious of these would be the ultimate dissipation of any reservoir of trained, or even partially trained, men in a reserve force. If we have learned anything at all from our involvement in two World Wars and lesser conflicts, it is that a nation, despite the hopes of patriots and the words of poets, cannot spring to arms overnight.

And with the increased sophistication of warfare and weapons systems, it becomes all the more difficult to convert large bodies of raw men into skilled soldiers. Despite the disadvantages of having a constant turnover of officers and men under our present combination of selective service and reserve officer corps, the system provides a constant supply of relatively well-trained individuals within the general populace.

If total war were to erupt, the availability of these men for immediate recall to duty could well mean the salvation of the nation. Unless the nation is prepared, financially as well as philosophically, to support a truly massive regular establishment, it is essential that the civilian sector embrace a substantial pool of men who have had some degree of military training.

Furthermore, we doubt that the American people are willing to accept the concept of an exclusively professional military establishment. We have career men and women in all of our armed services today, and they are true professionals in every technical sense of the word. But they are simply a part, and not the largest part, of an armed force which is intimately identified with the American people because it has links with and representatives from every community and every class in the land.

Our men and women in uniform deserve adequate pay, privileges and recognition—but as Americans in the service of their country, not as mercenaries.

HEREDITY VERSUS ENVIRONMENT: LYSENKO RESURRECTED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the once-famous Soviet scientist, Lysenko, made a decision that heredity had nothing to do with life—that environment controlled all. By ordering into practice his theory that environment could change ordinary wheat to winter wheat, the Supreme Soviet tolerated millions of Russians to die from famine. The wheat refused to comply with Lysenko's theory.

And, in Russia, it was still the rankest heresy for any party member even to suggest that winter wheat was inherently different from ordinary wheat and that controlled environment would not change this fact—not even when assisted by decree from the Supreme Soviet.

Such is the story of Dr. Jensen's scientific research report on human genetics and intellect.

Some of our commentators dare approach heresy to acquaint the people with new facts.

But still in our land we find those who refuse to believe airplanes can fly, that the world is round, or that human capability does not pend only on environment.

Differences of opinion are healthy—but no man can deny facts except at his own peril.

Mr. Speaker, I place Mr. Kilpatrick's column of March 18, an editorial from the Shreveport Times of March 14, and a column of Joseph Alsop for March 14, accompanied by a program on the anniversary of the Kerner report, listing the participants, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1969]

Doctrine of Equal Racial Aptitudes Questioned

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

One treads up to this topic on tiptoes: The time may have come, at long last, for thoughtful public discussion of a concept that has been effectively suppressed for the past 40 years. Put most simply, it is the proposition that inherent differences exist among the races in intellectual aptitudes.

As Joseph Alsop has remarked, even to speak of this possibility is to speak the unspeakable; it is to mention the unmentionable. Yet a Berkeley professor of educational psychology, Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, has dared to challenge the old taboo. His long article in the winter issue of the Harvard Educational Review has dropped with explosive impact on the educational scene. Boldly, but with impressive scholarship, he expresses his conviction that genetic factors have an importance that has been too long ignored in the learning process.

Now, this is heresy. In anthropology, psychology and education, as in organized religion, a kind of authoritarian theology develops. Articles of faith are propounded. To violate them—even to question them publicly—invites excommunication. And no article of religion has been more fiercely defended than the proposition that white and Negro intellectual aptitudes are inherently identical.

The dogma was laid down as far back as 1928 by Franz Boas, whose influence controlled an entire generation of social anthropologists. His disciples spread the gospel: Melville Herskovits of Northwestern, Otto Klineberg, Ruth Benedict, Ashley Montagu. Their view, that race is a myth, became the dominant view. In May of 1957, the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry saw the matter as closed: "The fact is, of course, that the Negro possesses the same capacities and potentialities as does the white."

It is this "fact, of course," that Dr. Jensen has challenged. He is no segregationist, no racist, no Kluxer. He is simply a scholar who is unwilling to conceal his own findings, however greatly these findings may contradict the conventional wisdom.

He concludes that environmental factors cannot fully explain the sharp differences in the scores of white and Negro children on carefully conducted educational tests. When it comes to "cognitive" learning—that is, to abstract reasoning—the typical black child, in Dr. Jensen's view, suffers from an inherent disadvantage.

From the shock waves set off by Dr. Jensen's paper (summarized fully in U.S. News of March 10), you might suppose that no one else had ventured such heresies before. Actually, the testing of Negro intelligence goes back at least to 1897. Elaborate tests were conducted on white and Negro recruits in World War I and again in World War II.

Professional literature abounds with experiments. Dr. Frank C. J. McGurk, of Villanova, analyzed 63 such studies between 1935 and 1950; in all 63, the test scores of Negroes averaged significantly lower than the test scores of whites.

The response of the Boas disciples was to denounce such studies out of hand: The experiments were biased in favor of white environment; the experiments were conducted by white researchers who had no affinity for Negro children; the experiments unfairly emphasized skills that Negroes had had no opportunity to acquire. Scholars who dared to dissent became professionally untouchable.

Well, nearly 15 years have passed since the Supreme Court put an end to segregated schools in the South and elsewhere. The differences in aptitude and achievement remain, even in Northern schools where white and black have been subjected to identical learning opportunities. Is it not time, Dr. Jensen asks, to question the old basic assumptions? Have the policy-makers of American education been attempting to teach black children the wrong way?

These are questions of profound importance. They raise the strong possibility that unwittingly, with the best intentions, the liberal educational hierarchy has imposed a cruel wrong upon the black child. It may be that not only compensatory education, but a different approach to education, is required. The genetic concept has to be actively considered and this is not "racism." It is no more than common sense.

[From the Shreveport Times, Mar. 14, 1969]

A Tale of Two Scientists

While the federal hunger-hunt rages even into Florida and while more and more cases of deprived people (mainly Negro) have been uncovered, the Nixon Administration has been persuaded to commence a free-food program for the unfortunates—largely on the argument that centuries of neglect and suppression of the Negro have presented us with a moral burden that we must "work off" by unstinted generosity.

It is remarkable that, against this background, two names of prominent scientists figure in contrasting ways. One is Dr. William Shockley, a Nobelist in physics, who in recent years has been absorbed in genetics—human heredity—and who has been all but excommunicated for suggesting that whites and Negroes are unequal in ability and that poverty of whatever color is breeding a population whose intelligence is deteriorating.

The other is Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, vice president of the American Educational Association, who, as Times columnist Joseph Alsop says, has "spoken the unspeakable." What Dr. Jensen says—in no less prestigious a publication than the Harvard Educational Review—is that IQs of white Americans average 15 points higher than Negroes. The disadvantage, he says, is an inborn one and not the result of discrimination or repression on the part of the whites.

Dr. Jensen is, in effect, saying much the same thing as Dr. Shockley. Both men tend to correlate poor achievement with low IQ.

Dr. Shockley believes that the "dependent classes," of whatever color, are losing ground genetically. Dr. Jensen asserts that the proportion of low IQs (below 75) as one goes down the social-economic scale is very much greater among Negroes than among whites. Thus, as among poor people of what Dr. Jensen calls "class two," the proportion of whites, in a given sample, possessing IQs of under 75 is only 7.8 percent as against 42.9 percent for Negroes.

But the really remarkable thing about the Jensen report is not that it presents staggeringly new scientific evidence. Far from it. The extraordinary thing is that Dr. Jensen has found an outlet at the very top of the educational world for free racial science and that a liberal columnist, Mr. Alsop, while differing with his conclusions, concedes the force of the statistics.

In other words, debate is out in the open—it is respectable, something that it hasn't been. The word "racist" does not occur in Mr. Alsop's critique as it has always occurred when Dr. Shockley has opened his mouth or when Carleton Putnam, author of "Race and Reason," has written in much the same terms.

As for Dr. Shockley, Times columnist Holmes Alexander reports that the "hunger committee" now taking congressional testimony on what centuries of white repression have done to Negroes, hasn't had time to hear Dr. Shockley's arguments that low IQ rather than prejudice, and deterioration of intelligence and ability because of long dependency are the real reasons for poverty. Send us a tape, the committee said.

Perhaps Dr. Shockley will send them Dr. Jensen's critique.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1969]

STUDY LINKING INTELLIGENCE WITH HEREDITY IS ASSESSED

(By Joseph Alsop)

A leading American educationist has now said what none has dared to say before. He has said, first, that human intelligence mainly depends upon heredity instead of environment. And he has said, second, that black Americans suffer from a detectable average handicap in this respect, as compared with white Americans.

It would be nice to be able to denounce these statements as mere ugly racist bosh. But one cannot do this with the formidably buttressed paper just published in the Harvard Educational Review by Dr. Arthur Jensen, professor of educational psychology at Berkeley and vice president of American Educational Research Association.

This is, in fact, a paper that has to be taken very seriously indeed. It is in line, too, with the accumulating evidence one finds in other learned journals, that differences of history and culture frequently produce quite dramatic genetic differences between human breeding populations.

To illustrate, there are the Masai, the African warrior tribe whose members live almost exclusively on meat, blood and milk products. The diet is so high in cholesterol that all Masai should in theory die of hardening of the arteries before the age of 40. Instead, Dutch reearchers have just discovered that natural selection has provided the Masai—but not their nearest neighbors, the Kikuyu—with a unique, still unexplained metabolic mechanism that somehow suppresses cholesterol.

Yet Dr. Jensen need not be taken seriously, thank God, when he blandly dismisses "compensatory education" as a possible remedy for the grave problem he describes. This part of his paper is by no means marked by the careful sifting of all evidence, that sustains the main argument.

For example, Dr. Jensen includes the conventional educationist's sneer at the ill-success of New York City's Higher Horizons program in the high schools. He does not say, however, that Higher Horizons was the starveling, misbegotten offspring of the decidedly successful Demonstration School Project. And he does not point out, either, that one failed where the other had got results, because of a very drastic cut in the per pupil investment.

The truth is, you cannot say that "compensatory education" is no remedy, for the very simple reason that systematic, radical school improvement—a much better description—has never really been tried anywhere in the United States. High costs have been one main reason. We shall never have ghetto schools that really educate, until the Federal Governmnet pays most of the bill for them.

Another reason, considerably more discreditable, has been the doctrinaire hangups of ultra-liberal educationists. School integration was their unique remedy, until just the other day. While that lasted, ghetto school improvement was openly sabotaged, as a supposed enemy of integration.

Belatedly, these doctrinaire liberals were then forced to face the cruel facts of our urban demographic patterns. Whereupon they leaped straight from integration to advocating a system of "community control" that might be made to order for George C. Wallace.

Typical of the sabotage above-mentioned was the outrageously slanted report condemning the more effective schools program, comprising 21 New York primary and elementary schools. Because of the saboteurs, it is now adrift and leaderless, though there are now reasons to hope that it will soon be rescued.

Even the MES program had obivous and grave faults, moreover, for instance, there were no rules changes to prevent the enormously high rates of pupil turn-over that are common in ghetto schools. And even MES was no more than a small initial experiment.

Truly systematic, overall school improvement should begin at the beginning, with diet supplements for pregnant women living in deep poverty, to insure full brain development of their babies. In the worst neighborhoods, the actual school experience should then start in pre-kindergarten, or even in pre-pre-kindergarten; for the younger the children are, the easier it is to overcome their language handicaps.

School improvement should extend, too, from primary and elementary school all the way to high school. It should include new text books, using the plain old teaching methods, which Dr. Jensen rightly remarks work better with ghetto children—McGuffey's Readers, let us say, with appropriate emphasis on black history. And it should also include a maximum of enriching after-school experience.

If rightly done and generally done, all this will cost billions a year. But no price is too high to pay to equip the next generation in the ghettos to compete on equal terms in American society.

SYMPOSIUM ON THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS

(Sponsored by Georgetown University and the S. & H. Foundation, Washington, D.C., March 4–5, 1969)

"The Response of Local Governments to the Report," Mr. Frank Mankiewicz, press secretary to the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, syndicated columnist.

"Our Schools and the Kerner Report," Mr. Joseph Alsop, syndicated columnist, author.

"Psychological Blocks to the Implementation of the Report," Dr. John Spiegel, director of the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University.

"The Civil Rights Movement and the Kerner Report," Rev. Calvin Morris, associate director of Operation Breadbasket.

"Promises and Realities," Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, initiator of the noted Montgomery bus boycott, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, leader of the Poor Peoples March 1968.

"One Year After," Mr. Donald Canty, director of the Urban Information Center, Urban America, Inc.; author of "One Year After," the follow-up study on the Kerner Report.

[From the McGraw-Hill "Encyclopedia of Russia and the Soviet Union"]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF TROFIM DENISOVICH LYSENKO

Lysenko, Trofim Denisovich (1898–), biologist and agriculturist. Fellow, Ac. of S., Ukrainian SSR (1934), All-Union Ac. of Agricultural S. (1935); fellow and member of the executive board, Ac. of S., USSR (1939). Hero of Socialist Labor (1945). Since 1937, member of the Supreme Soviet and vice chairman of the Council of the Union. Graduate of the Poltava School of Horticulture (1917) and the Institute of Agriculture (1925) in Kiev. Associated with the Kirovabad Experimental Selective Center (1925–29); head of the All-Union Institute of Genetics in Novorossiysk and of the Institute of Genetics, Ac. of S. (1940), President of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences (1938). A disciple of V. I. Michurin, L became known for his vernalization process of seeds of spring wheat which, he claimed, endowed it with characteristics of winter wheat. L's doctrine that characteristics acquired through environmental influences are inherited has become a highly controversial subject. He opposed and rejected the theories of heredity accepted by most geneticists ("Weismanism-Mendelism-Morganism"). Being in line with the Marxian ideology, he won the support of the party. The teaching of biology in the USSR was adjusted to L's theories. The peak of L's power was reached in 1948, when a great conclave was summoned at the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences on July 31 to "consider the situation in the biological sciences." Stalin gave his personal support to L and, at the time, any scientist who was opposed to L's doctrine became subject to reprisals. His most renowned opponent, Nikolay I. Vavilov, the leading geneticist in the Soviet Union, died in a Siberian concentration camp during World War II. Presently, L has moved to the background and other theories are officially accepted. Author of *Heredity and Its Variability* (1943; English, 1946); *The Science of Biology Today* (English, 1949); *Problems of Genetics, Selection, and Seed Processing* (6th ed., 1952); *Stage Development of Plants* (1952). Stalin prizes (1941, 1943, 1949), six Orders of Lenin, Order of the Red Banner of Labor, and others. (*See also* GENETICS.)

ATTACK ON INSECTICIDES AND PESTICIDES IN OUR WATER

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President. I have been concerned for some time over the potential danger that the use of insecticides and pesticides may have on the waters of our country.

A recent newspaper article from western Michigan tells the story of 145 cases of coho salmon being impounded by health authorities because traces of an insecticide were found in the salmon.

That incident, plus the action of the

XUM

Pennsylvania State Senate in passing a bill to ban the use of DDT, and my own concern in this area, caused me to write a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), asking that the subcommittee undertake a study to determine the effects of insecticides and pesticides as a potentially dangerous source of pollution.

I am gratified that in a letter to me dated March 10 Senator MUSKIE indicated that he has directed a technical staff member to undertake such a study and that, on the basis of that study, hearings will be heard.

Senator MUSKIE also indicates his concern "over the potential danger to the alteration of our water environment from the persistent chemicals used in pesticides and insecticides."

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maine for his leadership in the field of water pollution and express my appreciation for his favorable response to my suggestion that studies be undertaken and hearings held on this potentially dangerous problem.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. CHARLES

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, two Air Force installations in my district—Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino and George Air Force Base in Victorville—and March Air Force Base in nearby Riverside, are continuing to play an extremely vital role in our Nation's defenses. All have been deeply involved in the conflict in Southeast Asia, and the people of my district are very much aware of the contribution these bases have made to our efforts there. The Honorable Robert H. Charles, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations and Logistics, recently spoke at the Armed Forces Day banquet in conjunction with the National Orange Show in San Bernardino. He explained the part played by these three bases in the Air Force's overall program, especially as it pertains to the Vietnam conflict and to the future of the Air Force. I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues:

HON. ROBERT H. CHARLES

This occasion tonight provides a fitting opportunity to discuss the role which our military forcs play in achieving national objectives, and to talk about our future Air Force. I find in this audience many people who are knowledgeable on military affairs—Congressman Pettis, the always-informed members of the American Legion and, of course, these many be-ribboned officers.

Seeing these Officers gives me an opportunity to discuss my several visits to Southeast Asia and my observations of our combined forces in action. On one such visit a year ago, I was departing Bangkok for Saigon when the Viet Cong attacked the United States Embassy there. I called General Momyer, the Commander of the 7th Air Force in Saigon, and asked if I should proceed to Saigon. He allowed as how he did not need any policy decisions at that time!

I went on to Guam, from which we were then conducting continuous B–52 bombing assaults in support of our ground forces, including those at Khe Sanh. This tactical mission was a new and distinctive role for B–52's, which were designed only for strategic missions.

Let us examine for a moment the siege of Khe Sanh.

The full panoply of airpower made it an allied victory. It made possible the determined stand of a force of less than 6,000 U.S. Marines and South Vietnamese rangers besieged by at least 20,000 North Vietnamese regulars. After 10 weeks of systematic destruction from the air, the enemy withdrew.

During that 73-day air campaign, our aircraft flew 24,449 sorties. Air Force pilots dropped 73,765 tons of the 95,430 total bomb tonnage. Of this, 59,542 tons were dropped from B–52's. Navy aircrews dropped 7,941 tons and Marine Corps pilots 13,724.

One enemy regiment lost 75 percent of its men to a B–52 strike, according to a prisoner's testimony.

Without airpower the siege of Khe Sanh would have ended differently. The turnabout from a much-needed enemy-anticipated victory to their defeat was a major milestone in the Vietnam War. History may show it to have been a significant turning point.

The B–52's have played a central role in suppressing and blunting the enemy effort in Southeast Asia. Both as citizens and neighbors, you can be proud not only of the part the B–52's on alert at March and other Air Force bases have played and will continue to play in our nation's strategic defense—their primary role—but also of SAC's role in action for which it was not originally intended.

To shift emphasis to Norton, I would like to discuss the importance of airlift to our national objectives. The evolution of airlift, with its varied applications, is perhaps the least publicized but one of the most important aspects of our military capability.

Like most technological revolutions, the one that has taken place in military airlift had evolutionary roots. During the First World War, most military planners considered the airplane a toy. The term airpower did not exist, and the potential of the airplane as a logistics tool, a transporter of persons and cargo, was considered, but not seriously.

In the Second World War, airpower became a meaningful term, related primarily to the destructive power of airborne weapons. But airlift, in that war, and even in the Korean conflict, involved the delivery of relatively small, high priority items in support of forces whose mobility was supplied predominantly by surface transport.

It was not until the 1960's that long-range airlift began to come into its own. A little over a year ago, in Operation Eagle Thrust, the Air Force airlifted two Army brigades with their equipment, 10,000 troops and 5,300 tons of cargo, from Kentucky to Vietnam. This operation required only 400 flights—mostly C–141's and a few C–133's and—if total elapsed time had been a critical factor—could have been completed in a week, even under non-emergency conditions. The recent exercise in Western Germany demonstrated to all concerned our capability to react quickly to a crisis in Europe, or elsewhere. Today we have 14 squadrons of C–141's—over 230 aircraft, and within a year we will be receiving C–5's into the active inventory. Eventually, our entire strategic airlift force will consist of C–141's and C–5's. This means that Norton will continue to perform a mission of the greatest importance to the present and future security of this nation.

I would now like to discuss the C–5, in another context. During the past several months you have undoubtedly heard stories and read accounts, mostly critical, concerning the high cost of new systems, particularly the C–5. We are all concerned with these high costs; but it is indeed curious that the C–5 program should be singled out in this manner. As taxpayers and as community leaders, I believe you should know the facts concerning that program.

Let's look at the record.

First, with respect to technical performance—which is what we are really after. On other major aircraft programs, actual performance has averaged less than 90% of promised performance. Somewhat better, but still well below proposed performance, is the record on the highly successful C–141—like the C–5, a subsonic jet transport designed and built by the same division of the same company.

Now let's look at the C–5, which involved a considerably greater technical advance than the C–141, and therefore has been more difficult to achieve. All flight test and other data now available (3½ years after contract go-ahead and after 8 months of flying) indicate that actual performance will come to 101% of promised performance—it will actually *exceed* promised performance by 1%. This is in contrast to performance *degradations* of over 10%.

With respect to costs on the C–5, we are of course disappointed. But again, let's look at the record. According to independent studies, actual costs on other defense systems have exceeded their estimated costs by up to several hundred percent. A large portion of these increases resulted from legitimate program changes caused either by technological advances during the period of development and production, or by shifting military requirements. A substantial amount, however, was due to the fact that most contracts for major systems were on a cost-plus basis which provided little if any motivation for economy, and were not awarded price-competitively. Of 12 systems reviewed in a Harvard Business School study, only one involved an "overrun" of less than 100%.

Cost pressures, particularly in aircraft, have been notably severe in recent years for two specific reasons:

First. What in 1964 was a relatively minor involvement in Southeast Asia turned into a major conflict and greatly increased the demand for military aircraft. For example, on June 30, 1964, we had 21,000 military personnel in Southeast Asia. Two years later, that figure had grown to 322,000, and by December 1967, had reached 588,000.

Second. There was an unprecedented boom in the commercial aircraft market. In 1964, orders for commercial jet transports totaled $1.132 billion. For the next three years, they more than tripled, averaging $3.813 billion in each of those years. In 1967, for the first time in history, commercial aircraft deliveries, in pounds of manufactured hardware, exceeded military aircraft deliveries.

Either of these causes, both of which occurred after the beginning of the C–5 program, would have brought about a significant disruption in the aircraft market. Their concurrency created a major upheaval. Even in the non-aircraft field, it has been great. For example, the estimated cost of 68 escort ships planned for the 1970's recently rose from $3 billion to $5 billion in one year. On a more modest scale and one close to home, only last week a club in Washington came out with a letter to its members indicating that renovation costs estimated at $1,600,000 last year would now come to $2,750,000, an increase of 66% in one year.

Now let's compare all this with the C–5 program, which is not cost-plus, and was awarded price-competitively. The current estimated cost to the Government of $4.328 billion is 25% more than the Air Force estimate made in 1964 at the beginning of the program, adjusted to reflect the current size of the airplane. That 1964 estimate was in constant 1964 dollars; it made no allowance for general economic inflation. Including inflation, the current estimate exceeds the adjusted 1964 Air Force estimate by $382 million, or less than 10%. Over the 6½-year period of this contract, the increase comes to less than 1½% per year.

What the C–5 critics have failed to do is to ask the most critical question of all, namely, "compared to what?" I suggest they try to find any major aircraft program in the last 10 or 20 years in which the actual technical performance exceeded either the contractor's proposal or his contractual commitment (both of which are happening on the C–5) and in which the cost to the Government is expected to be within 25% of the Air Force's original estimate, excluding inflation, and within 10%, including inflation. Do those critics prefer 90% technical performance to 101% performance? No one is pleased with a 10-to-25% cost increase, but do those critics prefer one several times that amount?

It is unfortunate that the publicity surrounding the recent Congressional hearings on this matter did not present an accurate picture of the C–5 program.

Now perhaps it is time to touch upon the future, where as Charles Kettering put it, "we will have to spend the rest of our lives."

One of your neighbors here is the Space and Missile Systems Organization, commonly known as SAMSO, at El Segundo. This organization oversees the development and acquisition of space hardware for the Air Force as well as the Air Force support role in the national space effort. Of special significance these days are the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, the Defense Satellite Communications System which presently consists of 19 satellites and 30 ground terminals world-wide, and Project START—which is short for "Spacecraft Technology and Advanced Reentry Tests." Under this latter program, the Air Force is working towards the vehicle that can fly both in space and in the earth's atmosphere. Hopefully, a high-performance reusable spacecraft such as this could provide significant mission flexibility as well as reduced operational costs. If both the MOL and the START programs should develop successfully, future astronauts could perform a number of different missions, such as inspection and repair of satellites, exchange of space crews, space rescue, and then enter the atmosphere in a lifting body and land at a designated airfield. A rather exciting future!

There are several other new programs under various stages of development within the Air Force with which you should be familiar.

There is AWACS, the Airborne Warning and Control System. AWACS is a vital defense system which will perform a dual role: a survivable early warning command and control center to detect enemy aircraft, track them, and direct defensive weapons against them. It will also function as a command and control system for rapid deployment of tactical forces and their initial operations until ground-based radar/communications networks can be established. If the decision is made to procure this system, it will be operational in the mid-70's.

Our continuing study of the manned bomber requirement during the last year has re-enforced our previous conclusion that the principal problem is penetration capability, more specifically, the ability of the force to survive in a much more advanced Soviet air defense environment in the mid-1970's. In such an environment, new penetration aids and weapons are needed. One of these new weapons, the Short-Range Attack Missile (SRAM) is now well along in development and will be entering the forces in the early 1970's. Development will be initiated in FY 1970 on still another new weapon, the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD). Work is also continuing on a variety of improved electronic warfare countermeasures equipment.

We are proceeding with the design of a proposed replacement for the B–52 in the 1978 and later time period. This new bomber, known as the "Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft," or AMSA for short, would carry both the SRAM and the SCAD as well as nuclear and conventional gravity bombs.

Air Superiority against a first-rate airpower continues to be the most important mission of the Tactical Air Force, in which your neighbor, George Air Force Base, plays such a distinguished role. In the cast of characters in the drama of combat flying, the spotlight unerringly falls upon the fighter pilot. The image of man and his aircraft alone in combat—the tradition of individualism which characterizes this breed of men is their hallmark—their code—and their monument. You know all too well their achievements in the air war in North Vietnam.

In the mid-1970's, the F–4 will be the only aircraft in the Air Force fighter and attack force primarily designed to achieve and maintain control of the air. A new Air Force aircraft, the F–15, is needed to provide and maintain air superiority over the battlefield in any future war.

The F–15 will be a single-place, twin-engine jet fighter which should be operational in the mid–1970's. It will have an extremely high power-to-weight ratio and low wing loading, thus providing great maneuverability, a high rate of turn, and rapid acceleration. Although designed to provide and maintain air superiority, the F–15's avionics and fire control systems will give it a substantial air-to-ground capability as well.

One final remark. So many of our young people who have served their nation and have returned to civilian life, and so many of our young men and women in the Service today represent a new breed—university-trained, courageous, proficient—professionals in every sense.

Young Americans like those I have met throughout the Air Force have been called upon to face the rigors and horrors of war and are meeting these tests with a maturity and a dignity which is a credit to themselves and to Americans everywhere. These are not hippies. These are not the uneducated who would presume to educate our educators.

We are indeed fortunate to have such talent among us.

TORNADOES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we are again approaching that season of the year when tornadoes will take another frightening toll of lives and property. While my own State is not usually subjected to the full impact of these death-dealing devices of nature, still a city of some 3,000 people within my district witnessed the firsthand effects of such a tornado. After personal inspection of the ravages and damages done by this storm, I am convinced that a greater effort must be made on our part to learn more about the origin, the causes, and the methods of controlling, or dissipating them in order to save lives and property.

I have introduced a bill today which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research programs in an effort to fill the knowledge gap about tornadoes. The bill also calls for the establishment of a national sewer storms service.

If this bill can prevent just one tornado from hitting an area, this project will have been proven economically feasible. I urge my distinguished colleagues to join me in seeking enactment of this legislation.

MINK IMPORTS STILL IMPERIL U.S. PRODUCERS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, mink imports have plagued the American mink industry to the point where over half of the mink ranchers in America have been forced out of business since 1962. Just 7 years ago, there were 7,200 domestic producers. One year ago, there were only 3,159, a loss of 56 percent. The situation has not appreciably improved and many more ranchers have been forced out of business in the past 12 months.

In the face of foreign imports, the price of mink pelts has fallen to approximately $14.50. For most U.S. producers, this price is below the cost of production. Hoping for relief, hundreds of mink farmers have put their production into storage, and have subsisted on loans on those pelts, at the extremely high interest rates now prevailing.

The Library of Congress has prepared a report for me which shows that imports of mink furskins in calendar 1968 totaled 4,477,751. This figure represents over half of the total mink used in America last year.

I join many other Members of the House today in introducing a proposal to stem the flood of mink imports while preserving a fair segment of the domestic market for foreign producers.

The bill is necessary to compensate for the unfair advantages foreign producers possess. Low costs of labor, feed, and capital have resulted in a situation where producers in many nations can ship pelts to our shores at less than the cost of production in America.

It is my hope that this Congress will institute the needed regulations so necessary to the preservation of the American mink industry.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) schedule 1, part 5, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting after item 123.50 the following new items:

"	Whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed (see headnote 5 to this subpart):		
123.60	In each calendar year before the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the number of such skins which equals 40% of the domestic consumption of such skins during that year, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture under headnote 6 to this subpart	Free	Free
123.62	In each calendar year after the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the number of such skins which equals 40% of the domestic consumption of such skins during that year, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture under headnote 6 to this subpart	50% ad val.	50% ad val. "
123.65	Plates made of two or more whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed	50% ad val.	50% ad val.

(b) The headnotes for schedule 1, part 5, subpart B of such Schedules are amended by adding at the end thereof the following headnotes:

"5. The aggregate number of dressed whole skins of mink which may be entered under item 123.60 during each calendar year after 1969 shall not exceed the average annual number of such skins which were imported into the United States during the 5 calendar years preceding each such year. The Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1969, shall, before the beginning of such year, determine, publish, and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the average annual number of dressed whole skins of mink which were imported into the United States during the 5 calendar years preceding such year. In making such determination for any calendar year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use estimates for any portion of the immediately preceding calendar year for which final statistics are not available. Determinations made by the Secretary of Agriculture under this paragraph shall be final.

"6. The Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1969, shall, before the beginning of such year, estimate, publish, and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the number of whole skins of mink that will be domestically consumed during such year. Estimations made by the Secretary of Agriculture under this paragraph shall be final."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1970.

BENEFICIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to allow the full-time students a tax deduction for expenses of moving to a new place of full-time study. This bill does not create a tax loophole, but establishes parity between full-time students who are forced to change their principal places of abode in order to continue their studies and employees who must move to a new place of employment. Employees already receive this favorable tax treatment under section 217 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It is my feeling that the same treatment should be accorded to the moving expenses of full-time students.

The policy behind my proposal is simply that the moves which a full-time student must make are out of his control to the same extent that an employee's moves are. Moreover, a student's reasons for moving are socially just as constructive as are the reasons of a new employee. In this day of high specialization, it is not unusual for a man or woman still to be a full-time student after he or she has family responsibilities and an entire household to move. I feel that it is no more fair to require a full-time student to bear the costs of such moves to a new place of study, than it is to ask a new employee to bear the cost of moving to a new place of work. If anything, students, most of whom receive no regular compensation while they are studying, are in a worse position to meet the often very high expenses of moving themselves and their families than are regularly salaried employees.

The bill I have submitted, Mr. Speaker, contains several safeguards to insure that only the legitimate moving expenses of full-time students are deductible. In general, the bill is modeled on the present section 217, and follows the structure and reasoning of that section wherever possible. Thus the statement of a general rule is followed by sections which define moving expenses, state the conditions for allowance, and enumerate the rules for application of these conditions. The bill follows section 217 in disallowing moving expenses which are reimbursed to the taxpayer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should mention that my bill would not allow the deduction of summer or other vacation travel expenses of students. For one thing, the student's move must be "in connection with the commencement of study by the taxpayer as a full-time student at a new place of study." Moreover, the taxpayer must be a full-time student for a specified minimum time following the move before he can qualify for the moving expenses deduction established here. Thus all in all, I feel the bill strikes a good balance between the present provisions of the income tax law which allow no moving expenses to new students, and a proposal which would allow students to deduct all of their moving expenses. The strongest argument for the bill, it seems to me, is that moving expenses deduction is already allowed to new employees in connection with commencement of work at a new place of employment. It is time to give the full-time student, who often has household and family responsibilities comparable to those of a new employee, the same beneficial tax treatment.

NEW CONTROLS NEEDED ON OIL AND VESSEL POLLUTION

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I have cosponsored S. 7, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, introduced by the junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE).

The proposed legislation is designed to continue the fight against pollution of our rivers and streams by controlling two sources, oil and vessel, which to date have not been subject to control.

The recent disastrous oil leakage that occurred off the Santa Barbara coast in California, with the resultant damage to fish and wildlife and to the shoreline, dramatically highlights the need for this legislation.

Also, the increase in the use of our waters by boating enthusiasts as well as commercial boatowners makes it imperative that we consider controls over the discharges from these vessels.

I believe that the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 will go a long way toward controlling these two sources of pollution and I urge its early enactment by Congress.

HOGS ARE BEAUTIFUL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last year an advertising campaign designed to "Keep America Beautiful" depicted hogs in a very derogatory light. Now this surely was not done deliberately; however, it did offend the pork producers of Iowa, one of the greatest pork producing States in the Nation. My district, the First District of Iowa, is one of the biggest pork producing areas in the world. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a story by Don Muhm in the Des Moines Register about steps taken by the Iowa pork producers to eliminate any adverse image created by the "Keep America Beautiful" campaign:

SEEK IMPROVED IMAGE FOR SWINE

(By Don Muhm)

A "Hogs Are Beautiful" campaign is being waged by the National Pork Producers Council, a Des Moines-based commodity organization vitally interested in the image of hogs and pork products.

The chief thrust of the campaign so far is in the circulation of lapel buttons, which carry this three-word message: "Hogs are Beautiful!"

Rolland Paul, executive vice president of the pork council, got the idea last year following the campaign by the "Keep America Beautiful" national committee which used hogs in television commercials to make the point that people shouldn't be pigs, and shouldn't litter beaches, roadways, parks, etc.

So far, about 2,000 of these green and yellow pins have been distributed by the pork council. The first big give-away came at the pork council's annual meeting held in Omaha, Neb.

Paul and some of his co-workers objected to the use of hogs in the "Keep America Beautiful" campaign, and said so publicly.

"This is a serious thing," Paul said a year ago.

"Pork producers in many states have been financing their own campaigns to improve the image of pork. They (the "Keep America Beautiful" workers) could have used goats, buzzards or skunks instead, and still have made the point they're trying to make with our pigs."

It was during a meeting of pork producers in Chicago, Ill., that Paul got the inspiration for the counter-attack.

"I was in a novelty store in the loop when I saw a box of different buttons all printed with different messages on them," Paul related.

"As I looked at the buttons, all of a sudden one stood out from the rest.

"This button—the only one of its kind in the store—said simply, 'Hogs are Beautiful!' And I told myself, 'Heck, yes, they are beautiful.' "

Paul queried the manager of the Chicago store, and found out where the buttons were manufactured.

The result of that Chicago experience was an order to Marvic Advertising Corp., Brooklyn, N.Y., and 1,000 "Hogs are Beautiful!" buttons delivered at the pork council's Des Moines office at a total cost of $61.

The buttons were at first worn by a select few individuals, such as officers and directors of the National Pork Producers Council.

The response was so great, a second order for another 1,000 buttons was made, and the council voted to give the buttons away to anybody who would wear one.

About 2,000 of the buttons were made available at the council's Omaha meeting earlier this month, where pork producers from 27 states gathered.

"We had 825 people register for the (Omaha) meeting, and we gave out nearly 2,000 of the buttons," Paul said.

He reported that all kinds of people—hog farmers, feed salesmen, drug company representatives, meat packers—grabbed up the buttons until the convention supply was exhausted.

"I don't know how much good these buttons are going to do for the image of pork," Paul said. "But I do know they're being used, and we're getting a lot of favorable comment."

One state pork queen, Claudia Arndt of LaCrosse, Ind., even ordered a batch of the hog buttons to take with her on a trip to Europe.

"We just put in an order to Brooklyn for 2,000 more," said Paul. "And we know they won't last."

CRIME WAR?—WHAT CRIME WAR?

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 14, the Washington Daily News published a front page editorial on the current crime problem facing the Nation's Capital. In light of current FBI crime statistics showing Washington under a spectacular assault from criminal forces, I think the editorial particularly appropriate.

According to FBI figures we have seen a 9.5-percent increase in murder in the District between 1968 and 1967, a 56-percent increase in forcible rape, a 50-percent increase in robbery, a 1.3-percent decrease in assault, a 22-percent increase in burglary, a 10.5-percent increase in larceny, and a 33.5-percent increase in car theft. With the single exception of the category of assault, every other major crime category in Washington shows a significant and, in some cases, terrifying increase.

Mr. President, it is abundantly apparent that something must be done, and done quickly, if Washington is to stop short of becoming a completely ungovernable city.

I ask unanimous consent that several of the daily tabulations of crime—called the Crime Clock—appearing in the Washington Daily News, along with the editorial which I have previously mentioned and the text of a speech by U.S. District Judge Edward M. Curran, be printed in the Record:

Mr. President, these statistics, along with the remarks by Judge Curran, constitute some of the best evidence I have seen supporting the enactment of my bill, S. 327, which would make prison sentences mandatory for those employing firearms in the commission of a crime in the District. I shall have more to say about this in days to come, but I am disheartened to see that the District Committee has not so far even scheduled hearings on my bill.

Mr. President, the situation grows worse every day—almost by the hour. I intend to continue to press for the enactment of this legislation to immediately help relieve the crime situation in the District. I am hopeful that other jurisdictions will enact similar laws and I believe that there are some helpful steps we can take on the national level to assist in the immediate solution to the problems of rising crime.

The time for wringing of hands is past. Now it is time for action before we are completely overrun. I hope we shall see some public support and immediate action on the proposals before us for protecting the citizens of our National Capital City from complete abandonment to the forces of disorder and darkness.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Crime War?—What Crime War?

If only half of the growing list of allegations of failure by the D.C. government to act against crime are true, our mayor and City Council have a powerful lot of explaining to do to the citizens of this beleaguered city.

While businessmen—from bankers to corner merchants—fret themselves into multiple-ulcers over the robberies and loss of business resulting from fear of unsafe streets, our city government has failed, or refused, to take a number of actions that should have been taken. And we find it hard, if not actually impossible, to justify this inaction.

We have some very serious questions about some very disturbing matters:

First, why has the District government failed——or neglected, or refused, as the case may be—to appoint a commission to qualify the city for Federal help under the Safe Streets Act?

There is still time to do this, and we can still get the funds—if the city acts—as soon as anyone else gets any. But every other jurisdiction in the United States has already qualified and has an appointed group presumably hard at work preparing a program of action. Why don't we?

The District government has apparently ignored—or spurned, or snubbed—the Council of Governments' sub-committees concerned with the crime war, and has not sent a representative to meetings which were held to discuss crime problems of the metropolitan area. The District government has not even appointed a representative, and thus has blocked attempts of the COG to prepare an area-wide anti-crime program.

The District government apparently has failed to make any decision on how to use new data processing equipment to increase the efficiency of police information centers.

The D.C. Crime Commission (now defunct) appointed by President Johnson for a specified year-long study of crime here came up with a number of very valid recommendations. The head of that commission now says the District has failed to implement most of its recommendations. He rather bitterly said there has been "an absolute abysmal failure to meet and take on the crime problem and solve it to the satisfaction of this city."

All of these charges were made in the past few days in testimony before the Senate District Committee. And we haven't heard any reply, in explanation, that makes any sense.

A press conference was set up Wednesday afternoon, ostensibly to give some explanations, but Mayor Washington wasn't there. His office said he was "officially unavailable" and sent four representatives who were unable to provide any satisfactory answers.

Add to all this the fact that the city's post of public safety director, which was considered so highly important to the government's operation a year or so ago, has been vacant now for eight months, and there doesn't seem today to be any inclination to fill it.

Why? What's the delay?

Does all this—and we probably haven't heard the last of the charges of "abysmal failure"—add up to an ignorance of what was needed, or a failure because of inexperience on the part of our neophyte city government, or (perish the thought) a deliberate unwillingness to act?

Our police force—and we mean the men themselves, the individuals, the cops-on-the-beat—have been doing a tremendously dedicated job. We can thank them for the small improvement in the crime situation which has appeared in recent weeks. Apparently, this is largely the result of over-time hours worked by the men. We aren't faulting them, in this. Rather, we feel much indebted to them, and we'd like for them to get the help, the backing, the augmentation that can be provided. And we'd like to know why they haven't gotten it.

Somebody had better come up with some good answers. The citizens of this city—of the entire metropolitan area—are fed to the teeth with rampant crime and they aren't going to take all this lightly, or quietly.

Crime Clock

Here is the Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today, March 14, 1969.

9:30 a.m.: Jonas Whitmore, Negro, owner of Bishop White Variety Store, 702 8th-st ne, was robbed of $15 by three Negroes, two carrying guns.

11:15 a.m.: George Maisel, 49, white, truck driver, was sitting in his truck at Water and Otis Streets, when he was robbed of $115 by two armed Negro bandits.

1:20 p.m.: George Maisel, the same man as in the 11:15 a.m. "Crime Clock" item was in his truck at 1634 North Capitol-st. when he was robbed for the second time. Mr. Maisel told the lone Negro gunman. "This is the second time today." The bandit, he said, replied, "Things are tough all over," and took $60, $15 of it his.

2:50 p.m.: Algene Walker, 20, Negro, a clerk at the High's store, 5002 First-st nw, said two Negroes took $40 from the cash register at gunpoint.

3 p.m.: Betty O. King, 48, Negro, a clerk at the Community Market, 3320 Brown-st nw, was held up by two Negroes carrying pistols. They got away with $50.

5:20 p.m.: Owen Jenkins, white, of Baltimore, said he was sitting in his truck at First-st and Florida-av when a man flung the door open and demanded money. Mr. Jenkins gave the Negro gunman $150 or $200.

7 p.m.: Ronald Wallace, 13, Negro, of northeast said he was in the 1200 block of H-st ne, when a Negro man approached him and said, "If you have any money, I'll take it." The bandit, who had his hand in his pocket as tho he had a gun, took 35 cents.

7:15 p.m.: Stephen Drogin, 26, white, of Greenbelt was inside 826 S-st ne, when two

XUM

Negroes shoved him into a corner, pointed a gun at him and demanded money. They got $11.

8:57 p.m.: Irving Pincus, 59, white, owner of the Brookland liquor store, 3000 12th-st ne, was robbed of an undetermined amount of money by two armed Negroes.

10:35 p.m.: Lang Young, 49, Chinese, owner of Chang Ho Restaurant, 1557 Benning Road ne was shot in the right side by a Negro who walked into the store, said nothing, fired one shot and walked out. Mr. Young was taken to D.C. General Hospital.

1:50 p.m.: David Jones, 23, white, owner of a carry-out shop, 4407 South Capitol-st, was held up by two Negro bandits, carrying revolvers.

2:15 a.m.: Howard Davis, 30, Negro, manager of the American Service Station, 306 Rhode Island-av nw, lost $150 to two Negroes armed with shotguns.

Crime Clock

Here is the Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today, March 17, 1969.

8:30 p.m.: Jim Young, 30, white, manager of the Seven-11 store at 3509 Wheeler Road se, said three Negro bandits entered the store and said "This is a holdup." They took an unknown amount of money at gunpoint.

8:55 p.m.: Cleo Gaston, 37, Negro, of Northwest, was entering the rear of his home, at 1448 Girard-st nw, when he was shot in the back by an unknown Negro assailant. Mr. Gaston is in satisfactory condition at the Washington Hospital Center.

8:55 p.m.: Joseph Whitaker, 48, Negro, of Northwest, was in the 400 block of N-st, when four Negro bandits, knocked him down, kicked and beat him and took $45.

10:25 p.m.: Geneva Boyd, 19, Negro, clerk at the High's store, 302 Riggs Road ne, was held up by a lone Negro gunman. He got away with an unknown amount.

Crime Clock

Here is the Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today, March 18, 1969.

10:40 a.m.: Two Negro gunmen walked into the Drive-In Liquor Store, 6525 Georgia-av nw and forced owner Nathan Zimmerman to hand over $350.

1:10 p.m.: Herbert Cedar, 40, Negro, a soda truck driver was making a delivery near 14th and Park Road nw when a Negro gunman took an undetermined amount of money from him.

3:20 p.m.: Boyler Whited, 48, white, a bakery truck driver, was making a delivery near 17th and Gales streets ne when two Negro men took $60 from him at gunpoint.

5:25 p.m.: Mike Pappas, 40, white, was walking near N. Capitol-st and Florida-av nw when three Negro men, one armed with a gun, took $80 from him.

6:16 p.m.: George Merrian, 73, white, was in his Southeast apartment when a Negro man forced his way inside, beat him and took $60. He was treated at Cafritz Hospital and released.

8:05 p.m.: Agnes Ladd, white, the cashier at the Naylor Theatre 2834 Alabama-av se said a Negro gunman walked up to the window and forced her to hand over $59.

9:40 p.m.: Mabel Pannell, 47, Negro, was walking near 13th and Peabody-streets nw when two Negro men took $2 from her at gunpoint.

11 p.m.: Hermosinda McRor, 41, white, and her daughter, Maria Alverez, 18, were shot by a Negro man, who argued with them after entering their home at 1712 Kilbourne Place nw. Mrs. McRor, shot in the chest and stomach, is in critical condition at Washington Hospital Center and Miss Alvarez is at the Hospital Center in serious condition with a head wound.

12:20 a.m.: A 73-year-old Negro woman was dragged into an alley in the 1300 block of Monroe-st by a Negro assailant who tried to assault her. The man took $75 and fled.

12:30 a.m.: A 26-year-old Negro woman was in the 1400 block of Newton-st nw when she was approached by an armed Negro, who told her to take off her clothes. When the woman ran, the man shot her in the leg and back of her head. She was treated at the hospital center and released. The suspect was believed to be the same one who tried to assault a woman 10 minutes earlier.

3:40 a.m.: Michael Dushaw, 65, white, of Pittsburgh, Pa., was in the basement of the Greyhound bus terminal, 11th-st and New York-av where he was beaten and robbed of $150 and his watch by two Negro men.

Crime Clock

Here is The Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today, March 19, 1969.

12:40 p.m.: A Negro man entered the Charles Cleaners, 5553 South Dakota-av ne and took $68 from clerk Inez Johnson, 27, Negro, at gunpoint.

3 p.m.: George Wright, 53, white, was in his cab near 300 M-st sw when three Negro men hailed him. As the car approached the curb, one of the men jumped into the cab and demanded money. He escaped with a transistor radio and no money.

5:05 p.m.: Albert Graviton, 61, white, was walking near 18th and E. Capitol-streets se when two Negro men grabbed him from behind and a third Negro man took his wallet containing $3.

5:20 p.m.: Joe Singleton, 26, Negro, a clerk at the Safeway International, 11th and F-streets nw, was making a night deposit at a bank at 1203 E-st nw when two Negro men took an undetermined amount of money from him at gunpoint.

8:30 p.m.: A 28-year old Negro woman was raped and robbed of $5 by a Negro man while she was in the rear of 3500 Minnesota-av se. She was treated at D.C. General Hospital and released.

9:08 p.m.: A Negro gunman walked into the Burger Chef Food Shop, 5200 Georgia-av nw and forced Harry H. Johnson, 18, Negro, manager, to hand over an undetermined amount of money.

9:25 p.m.: Charles H. Adler, 56, white, was walking near 6th-st and Massachusetts-av nw when a Negro man, armed with a knife took $10 from him.

11 p.m.: Naim Aminah, 27, white, was in his taxicab near Union Station when two Negro men took $10 from him at gunpoint.

Nice People Have Rights, Too

(By Edward M. Curran)

In the Nation's Capital, on the walls of the magnificant stone edifice that houses the Department of Justice, is carved the following inscription:

"Justice is the great interest of man on earth—wherever her temple stands there is a foundation for social security, general happiness and the improvement and progress of our race."

One of the great problems facing this country today is the crime problem. We cannot conquer crime by any simple formula. We cannot eliminate crime, but we can reduce it. We must apply against it the same painstaking research, the same willingness to sacrifice pre-conceived notions, the same high-minded dispassionate spirit that we would gladly apply to the control of an even less destructive plague.

One of the aims of democratic governments is achieve justic in a true sense. That no man should be condemned without being given his day in court and without being proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt are the basic principles of criminal justice. We try to achieve speedy justice, but the safeguards that are placed around the accused bring irritating delays in securing their conviction. This crime problem has become so acute that President Johnson, in signing the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, declared. "The control of crime is a major target of this Administration."

President Nixon has recognized the seriousness of the crime problem in the District of Columbia and has made plans to combat crime. He said, "A meaningful assault on crime requires action on a broad array of fronts; but in the midst of a crime crisis, immediate steps are needed to increase the effectiveness of the police and to make justice swifter and more certain."

He has advocated the erection of a new courthouse, an increase in the number of judges, an increase in the number of Assistant United States Attorneys, an increase in the number of police, and amendments to the Bail Reform Act whereby dangerous criminals could be held in temporary pretrial detention. He has also urged the establishment of the Office of Public Defender.

Organized crime in its present form, in my opinion, is the result of an increasing intellegince on the part of the criminal classes. Crime is as ancient as civilization and begins at a time older than recorded history. A competent history of organized crime, carried thru to the development of the movement under present-day conditions, with its underlying sources and philosophy, would require a treatise dealing with human relationships over the centuries.

It would concern the feudal system, the feats of the old buccaneers, the slave traders, the caravan highwaymen of the Far East, the smugglers, the Molly Maguires of more recent times, and many other of their ilk.

It would concern not only the material but the spiritual, with consideration of religion, environment, and geographical mobility; the passions and the greed of men; and it would lead logically to those operations of criminal groups which we face today. I believe that widespread lawlessness is a symptom of widespread paganism, and a growing paganism could prostrate the soul of America.

There is no more sinister force in the United States than that of the millions who are engaged, by day and night, in the commission of felonies which occur every few seconds. Nearly 3 million serious offenses are committed every year. These offenses continue with five serious offenses being recorded every minute. There is a crime of violence every two and one-half minutes; a robbery every five minutes; a burglary every twenty-eight seconds; and fifty-two automobiles are stolen every hour.

The annual crime bill of the nation is estimated to be in excess of $20 billion. As the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, once said, "There is not a family in America which is not, in one form or another, paying this continuing taxation, levied by the assessors of the underworld."

There are many causes of crime. Poverty is one; unemployment is one; slum areas are one; lax parents are one; and lenient courts are another and the trend of leniency keeps growing. Constitutional rights are all right, but in these days there often are criminal cases in which it appears that the main concern of some courts is for the rights of the perpetrator of the crime and not for the rights of the victim or society.

In thousands of cases the parents are at fault. There is a breakdown of the family unit. It is in the home that respect and authority must first take shape. I feel that the solution of the crime problem to a great extent lies with the family, the schools, the church and the community.

Why is it that some parents do not try to understand their children? Why is it that they are not interested in the difficulties and problems which their children may run across?

I think it is very necessary that parents perform their duty in attempting to raise their children with the idea of obedience and respect for them, for, as they grow older, such obedience and respect will develop into respect and obedience for the law. In this day anad age, parents cannot afford to be lax in dealing with their children, for disrespect for parents results in disrespect for authority and sometimes that disrespect turns into actual enmity. Parents should be interested in where their children are and what kind of company they keep.

There lingers in the memory of many the sight of a grief-stricken mother's face and the sound of her soul-shaking sobs as a jail door clanks between her and a son or daughter for whom she once held happy hopes.

The school is an important factor in our civilization, for today our teachers are more qualified and better fitted than ever before in the nation's history. It is not necessary, however, that a curriculum should be laid down to apply to all children alike, because if this is done, the handicapped boy or girl would not receive the proper training and his education would go for naught.

In the New York City schools there have been shocking cases—assaults on teachers, vandalism and displays of vicious attacks. Facing such a situation, the teachers are helpless. I believe that it is necessary that those in the teaching profession should deal more in individuals, rather than in groups.

You cannot ignore the church as an important part of our everyday life. Today is the age of irreverence and criticism. This is a world of greed, lust and power; a world besmirched and bedraggled by the most brazen carnival of materialism that ever blackened the reputation of self-respecting people; a world which knows not God's commandments; a world which needs a panacea in the recount of moral values. The churches of all denominations should awaken the spiritual appreciation of living.

Years ago parents attended church, and children attended Sunday School, where they were taught the underlying principles of morality and character. Today parents are less prone to attend, and the children attend Sunday School intermittently or not at all. If this pace keeps up, the church is bound to lose the influential place it held, in days gone by, as an effective weapon in crime prevention.

The community, being a part and parcel of American life, is most important in this ever increasing problem. Neighborhoods of various kinds and characteristics bob up thru this country of ours with all types of families, foreign and domestic, rich and poor, educated and illiterate—neighborhoods where one is not content; regions where one is dissatisfied; residences where there exists ill influence.

In the slum areas, there are too many broken homes, too many working mothers, too many children running loose in the streets, learning about liquor, narcotics and crimes, such as mugging, yoking, purse snatching, gang assaults, and violence just for the sake of violence. Conditions existing such as these do not offer much encouragement to the boy or girl who may desire to live an exemplary life.

There are four important elements to be considered in the crime situation. They are the public, the police, the prosecuting agencies and the judiciary. These, functioning together, become an effective instrument in the suppression of crime. Operating independently, they hearten the criminal element to the detriment of the law-abiding citizen. Sometimes they may work at cross purposes; sometimes they may criticize each other; and sometimes they may not be interested in harmonizing their differences to the end that the commonwealth might be best served. I believe that there should be a better understanding among them, in order that we may have a closer co-operation as a bulwark of defense in this war on crime.

And the time has come when we must recognize that society has certain rights, as well as the accused. You have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. As a distinguished Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the Honorable Wilbur K. Miller, once said, "Nice people have rights, too."

Since 1960, the yearly total of crimes has increased by 47 per cent, and crime is growing six times as fast as our population.

Your wife has the right to walk down the street without fear of being raped or molested. Your family has the right to feel secure in your home. Putting it bluntly, the law-abiding citizens of this country have the right to be left alone, and when some of the judges in this country realize that the rights of society should be balanced against the rights of the individual, then law enforcement will be more effective.

As the distinguished Bishop of Rochester, the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, has said, crime is increasing because of a "false compassion" for criminals. He defines false compassion in these words, "A pity that is shown not to the mugged, but to the mugger; not to the family of the murdered, but to the murderer; not to the woman who is raped, but to the rapist."

The Bishop deplored "social slobberers" as those "who insist on compassion being shown to the junkies, the dope fiends, the throat slashers, the beatniks, the prostitutes, the homosexuals, and the punks. Today the decent man is practically off the reservation."

I think a study should be made to determine whether or not court decisions are causative factors in the commission of crime. I say this because it is clear to me that some appellate court decisions have unduly tipped the scale in favor of the criminal and against society's rights to be protected.

There is no substitute for swift, certain and impartial justice, with less attention paid to the technicalities which appear aimed at the protection of the criminal and not society.

Respect for law and the maintenance of order are among the bulwarks of our Republic.

Morality, law and order, and other great principles of our heritage, are fighting for their very existence. They are under attack from certain influences which, if not stopped, will wreck every trace of decency and orderliness in our society.

It is even argued by some groups that profane verbal abuse directed at the police is a Constitutional right.

The best interests in this country lie in a law-abiding and orderly society. The citizens of America cannot live with lawlessness, vulgarity, obscenity and blasphemy.

The time has come for us to cease being led toward the hole of self-destruction by certain do-gooders and to get on with the perpetuation of those self-evident truths which have served our country so well.

The only way to fight these organized crusaders of filth, immorality and crime is to get tough.

Liberty cannot exist without law, for the law protects liberty. We should remember, however, that liberty is not absolute but relative, for no person may infringe or transgress on the liberty of another.

The most effective deterrent to crime is the apprehension and punishment of criminals. If the factor of punishment is ignored, then there can be no deterrent.

The courts of this country are courts of justice—not courts of mercy. A trial should truly represent an enlightened search for truth, so that deception, surprise, technicalities, and delays will be obliterated. The atmosphere of some courtrooms is still polluted by some jurors, who close their minds to the evidence before them, and some of our judges seek out technicalities rather than guilt or innocence.

Forty odd years ago an experienced attorney and jurist in New York issued this strong warning, "It is not the criminals, actual or potential, that need a neuropathic hospital. It is the people who slobber over them in an effort to find excuses for their crime." What we need today, in attempting to minimize crime, are jurors with conscience and vision, judges with courage and fortitude, and penitentiaries which are neither country clubs nor health resorts.

In this war on crime, we stand as men and women in the ranks of humanity, who are under the law of duty that allows us no stopping place short of our utmost capabilities. Whatever in human nature is hopeful, generous, aspiring—in love of God and trust in man—is arraigned on one side, and on that side, let us stand.

STUDENTS "SWEEP THE AIR" FOR POLLUTION FACTS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the many problems in combating air pollution has been to obtain a measure of the amount and direction of pollution. Often this seemingly simple task turns out to be quite an intricate and expensive operation. However, at the Clara Westropp Junior High School in Cleveland, some teachers and students have developed a most ingenious method of measuring pollution with a simple homemade apparatus.

The school also recently held a week-long conference on air, water, and land pollution. At a time when so much of the news from our schools and universities is of violence and destruction, it is indeed heartening to see such positive action being taken by some to combat one of the problems of our Nation.

An interesting article from the West Parker of February 27, 1969, details the activities of the ingenious students and teachers at Clara Westropp Junior High:

STUDENTS "SWEEP THE AIR" FOR POLLUTION FACTS

(By Denise Rochford)

Most people think that a scientific experiment demands the latest and most sophisticated equipment but forget that many of the greatest discoveries were made with very crude, home-made types of apparatus. Today, some ingenious students and teachers at Clara Westropp Jr. High, 19101 Puritas, have devised a simple—yet dramatic—method of collecting air pollution and measuring amounts of it from various directions around the school.

The system consists of a vacuum cleaner donated by Ray Gladys, which draws outside air into a pipe. After running the machine for an hour each morning a filter is removed, and studied. Data is recorded to be used in preparing a report. Each day the data is charted on a large graph display located in the school's cafeteria.

XUM

The air pollution station is located in the courtyard near the school's weather station. Equipment is enclosed in a wooden case 10 inches wide and three feet long.

Another attempt at studying air pollution is also being carried out. This experiment consists of a suspended air pollution unit. A board one foot wide and three feet long has been covered with cotton to catch the dirt particles in the air. The cotton is divided into five parts—one for each day of the school week. After exposure to the air for one day, the cotton is covered, and another wad is exposed. Each piece of cotton is then placed on a piece of black paper, and covered with glass. Light is beamed through the cotton and glass, and the amount of light penetrating the cotton is measured and recorded, to determine the percentage of pollution trapped in the cotton. At the end of the week the parts are compared and data recorded to determine the amount of pollution found in the air.

The air pollution information is then compared with the weather, temperature, barometric readings and humidity for the week to determine what effect these have on the level of pollution.

This information may eventually lead the students to offer a daily prediction of the air pollution level, along with the daily weather forecast.

Richard Wohl, science teacher at the school, listed these objectives in his air pollution experiment:

(1) to develop an awareness in the community about pollution problems;

(2) to demonstrate a method of detecting and measuring pollution;

(3) to probe possible sources of pollution.

The school will hold a week long water-air and land pollution program from Feb. 25th to March 4th. A speaker from the water pollution agency and from the air pollution department will talk to students. Displays of water and air pollution materials and data gathered in the students' experiment will be set up in the lobby.

Social studies and science classes are participating in the program, and students from the art classes are providing posters and mobiles. Hopefully, the adults of the community will be interested enough to stop in and see what's up, Mr. Wohl said.

The Pace Association was so impressed with the idea of this pollution study that Clara E. Westropp Jr. High was awarded a "mini-grant" of $100 to develop the experiment.

A BILL TO CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF "AMMUNITION"

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference, a bill to change the definition of "ammunition" for purposes of chapter 44 under title 18 of the United States Code. The present definition reads as follows:

> The term "ammunition" means ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in any firearm.

My bill would change this definition to read:

> The term "ammunition" shall include only ammunition for a destructive device and pistol or revolver ammunition. It shall not include shotgun shells, metallic ammunition suitable for use only in rifles, or any .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will eliminate a completely unreasonable, unnecessary burden which the Gun Control Act of 1968 placed on our law-abiding citizens, both sportsmen and businessmen. Regulations promulgated by the Treasury Department under President Johnson now require the seller of all types of ammunition to obtain the following information from the buyer: First, date; second, manufacturer; third, caliber, gauge or type of component; fourth, quantity; fifth, name; sixth, address; seventh, date of birth; eighth, mode of identification, driver's license or other.

In the first place, I believe that this regulation represents a misinterpretation of the requirements of the Gun Control Act, which state under section 922(b)(5) as follows:

> It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector to sell or deliver—(5) any firearm or ammunition to any person unless the licensee notes in his record, required to be kept pursuant to section 923 of this chapter, the name, age, and place of residence of such person.

We now see that these three requirements have been expanded to eight through the regulations imposed by the Treasury Department.

Of obvious concern is the fact that we have a situation where the Secretary of the Treasury has exceeded the authority granted him under the act. But our concern must go a step further. The Senate-House conference report issued on the bill just prior to its approval as the Gun Control Act of 1968 stated that it was not the purpose of the bill to "place any undue or unnecessary Federal restrictions or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to the purposes of hunting, trapshooting, target shooting, personal protection, and any other lawful activity."

The forcing of this type of registration on all purchasers of rifle, shotgun, and .22 caliber ammunition is, in my mind, placing both "undue" and "unnecessary" restrictions on those citizens. I feel, and I know that many Minnesotans feel, the enforcement of such regulations will not be a significant factor in reducing the incidence of crime in the area concerned. The harassment and inconvenience to both the buyer and the shopkeeper who is required to keep such records, is not justified by a reasoning that this is a necessary crime control measure. The great, great majority of weapons used in the commission of a crime today are pistols and revolvers. Ammunition for these types of guns would continue to remain under the control requirements of the act, if my bill is approved. But those other types of ammunition used almost exclusively by the law-abiding American sportsman would not be so controlled and a proper brake will have been placed on the bureaucratic excesses which have arisen under this act.

Lastly, I should also point out that the provisions of my bill are identical with the provisions of the Gun Control Act as it passed the House of Representatives last year, but which, of course, were changed in the Senate-House conference. I urge support to correct what I believe is a cumbersome, unwise section of the statute as now on the books.

A NOBEL LAUREATE VIEWS THE UNIVERSE

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Dr. Walter H. Brattain, a Nobel Prize winning scientist from my State, recently authored an article entitled "A Nobel Laureate Views the Universe" published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer's Northwest Today Sunday supplement of March 9, 1969.

Dr. Brattain won the Nobel Prize as coinventor of the transistor. His discovery, which has made so many of our modern achievements possible, was the product of research in the Bell laboratories.

A native of Walla Walla, Wash., he has returned to his hometown and is presently a member of the faculty of his alma mater, Whitman College.

Dr. Brattain's article on the universe is scholarly and delightful. His perception of the human condition in relation to the universe is refreshing in contrast to the deadly earnestness with which we daily pursue elusive solutions to our myriad problems. His observations are both thoughtful and thought provoking. I recommend Dr. Brattain's article to your attention and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOBEL LAUREATE VIEWS THE UNIVERSE

(By Walter H. Brattain)

For the purposes of this discussion let us forget for the moment that we are human beings. Let us just be intelligent observers and look at what we can see.

First, let's consider man, question how did he develop? The anthropologist, of course, is the person most qualified to answer this and, in paraphrase, an anthropologist would probably tell you that the first event that occurred to our ancestors that began to separate them from the rest of the animal kingdom was the fact that they were probably chased into the trees by their enemies. This had certain very definite effects upon their development.

One was that the sense of small that most animals use, almost to the exclusion or at least better than any of the other senses, was not of any particular value in the trees. Sense of smell is only valuable if one can have his nose close to the ground.

Being in the trees, swinging from branch to branch, if you will, there was a premium on binocular vision. It was nice for him to see where he was going to land. Also, in grasping limbs, it made sense to have a thumb opposable to the rest of the four fingers, and since he did not need particularly his nose or his snout, since he could now feed himself with his hand that had developed along with the opposable thumb, it allowed that part of his brain cavity that had been devoted previously to the sense of smell, to recede somewhat in function and leave room for other mental functions, those connected with his binocular vision and with his use of his hands and so on.

XUM

So this particular animal that we are observing, when he decided to come back down out of the trees could learn to walk erect. He didn't need to keep his nose to the ground. He had developed a hand ideally suited for future craftsmanship and the development of tools. He was probably the first animal to use a tool other than the simple picking up of a stone to throw it, and few other animals can even do this.

His brain case expanded proportionally, leaving room for other mental functions as they developed. He eventually learned to talk and to communicate with his fellow creatures. He learned to write and with the talking and writing, it became possible for him to pass on to future generations his experience in his short span of life.

Of course, this led to the development of what we call culture. Along with this came what most anthropologists consider most important, that is the delayed development and care of the young. In the hierarchy of the animal kingdom the anthropologist measures the animals' development, their rank, by the length of time it takes the young to mature. The result of all this was man, the curious animal with a highly developed imagination.

If one wishes, one can say that he does not believe this story. I suggest to you, however, that we intuitively, in the things we say, accept this explanation without thinking about it. You are all familiar with such expressions in our language as: "to get your nose out of the gutter" or "to see beyond your nose." Some of us have difficulty doing this. In another context one says "lift up thine eyes and see." The evidence that is in our language from expressions of that kind make us realize that we may not yet be quite emancipated from our nose and give tacit acceptance to the fundamental part of this story.

Man is characterized primarily in my mind and in the minds of others by his inherent desire to use his imagination to construct a picture of both how and why things happen. Man the mythmaker. Now please do not think that I am using myth in a derogatory sense. I am using it in the context that the students of myth like to use it. To emphasize this point, I quote from Mark Schorer in a book entitled "William Blake:" "A myth is a large controlling image that gives philosophical meaning to the facts of ordinary life."

Now, of course, as man began to talk, every man was free to create his own myth. We are still probably free today and probably do, each and every one of us, create our private myth in this respect. However, some of the myths obtain such response from large groups that they obtain general acceptance. There was a long process of revision and refinement of these myths. The main criteria as to their essential correctness were, however, the response of individuals and the number of individuals who treasure certain ones of general acceptance. There was a long process of revision and refinement of these myths.

Those who have studied the myths that have been created and have received general acceptance are quite impressed with the similarity of these myths that were created by man and accepted regardless of what part of the world or what group of men originated them. They are all quite similar. This was for a long time the only means which man had to explain his existence and life on this planet.

It was when man realized that while most myths attempted to explain both the why and how of existence, that if he were willing to restrict himself to the question how, how things happen, how things took place, that then he had better criteria than just general public acceptance or emotional response. There was, as Bridgemen has put it, an operational method by which he could come to a conclusion as to how certain things took place. He could observe phenomena, make hypotheses to explain these phenomena, develop theories, and having developed a theory, make predictions.

This was a process by which he, as an observer, could reach certain conclusions. Conclusions that another observer in another part of the world could reach by the same process, without question. Moreover, this system worked. Having done this, having created these particular and disciplined rational myths, they worked to the extent that they gave him a better control of his environment.

However, it was not just his desire to control his environment that inspired man to create these concepts. It was ever so much more the satisfaction that man obtained from the understanding that these concepts gave him of how things happen.

Now with the method which we call science, he is in a position to consider his physical surroundings. Let's trace it from the standpoint of considering the centers of his interest. Of course, at the beginning the center of the universe was where he was. It was a personal center. He soon developed, when he learned to talk, the concept that maybe he wasn't the center of the universe, that perhaps there was a geographical center. The world was apparently flat and surrounded by mountains and water and the center of civilization, as he knew it, was the center of the universe.

But, as he went along, refining and applying his methods, his science, trying to understand how things are or how things happen, he finally decided that the world was not flat after all. It was round and, of course, insofar as he was confined to the surface of the earth, there wasn't exactly a center there. When he realized this, however, he still thought for awhile that the sun was going around the earth.

One of man's next steps was to conceive of a center around which both the earth and the sun were going. This was a center he could not see because his part of the earth was always turned away from it. This center was thought to be the central fire from which the sun and the stars derived their light.

Finally he realized that the picture would be much simpler if he assumed the earth was going around the sun. So, the sun became the center of his universe. Then as he went on and observed some more, he realized that the sun was just one of a system of stars of which there were many, many more and that these stars were apparently a part of a system and were rotating around a center, the sun and the other stars doing likewise. He found as he developed his means of measurement that the nearest star to his sun was quite a distance away. To illustrate how far, let us assume that in this age of ballistic missiles we could possibly hope to achieve half the speed of light. If we did achieve this speed, it would take us about eight years to get to the nearest star. But if we considered traveling throughout our particular stellar system, it would take us at this speed one or two hundred thousand years. So, the center of his universe is now the center of the stellar system.

But he kept looking; his curiosity was not satisfied. He learned to make aids to his eyes, to make big telescopes, to gather in a lot of light and peer further and further. He slowly came to the conclusion that his particular stellar system, the one which encompassed his sun or star, was only one of many such systems and that there were many, many more such stellar systems.

To get to this stellar system at the same speed as I suggested before would take a million years. Man also found that for some peculiar reason, all these galaxies, all these separate systems of stars, were running away from each other, and when he studied and analyzed this situation, he found that he had again lost his center. There was no more center.

It is hard to see this in the three dimensional world because we are three dimensional creatures and can't get out of that, but we can observe what could happen in a two dimensional world. If you will picture randomly distributed spots on the surface of a balloon and consider what happens to them in relation to each other as you blow the balloon up, you see that as the surface expands, each spot runs away from all the others, and it doesn't matter from which spot you choose to observe this. All spots are equal in this regard.

On the two dimensional surface of this balloon with the spots representing the galaxies there is no center, and in that sense, and in the best thinking today, there is no center to the universe. It is all relative.

Now let's really be observers. Let's go outside of our particular galaxy and see if we can find this little planet called the Earth and the rest of its co-planets going around our average sun. It is going to be a difficult job. It is going to be just as hard to find this planet as it would be for us to try and find a planet around a similar sun in our nearest neighbor galaxy, Andromeda. It is even at present almost impossible for us to find a planet around one of our neighbor stars in our own stellar system. Are there such planets? There is evidence that some stars have dark companions!

The latest concepts about how our planet and our planetary system around our sun came into existence indicates that this is a fairly unusual occurrence and that there are probably even in our own galaxy, our own stellar system, a very large number of other such stars with planets. At least a fairly large number of these other stars may have planets somewhat like the earth at about the same distance from their sun so that the environment at least on these other earths would be very similar to our own. Man should be very humble in view of these considerations, and should, at least, temper his feeling of self importance. He may not be alone in this universe and he may not be the most intelligent living being in it!

Ours is at most, in a sense, a restricted sample. It's a restricted sample in respect to size. The more we develop our ability to see far out into space, the more we see. Man is so constituted that it is difficult for him to think of the end of space. This is a concept that he gets from his experience and it is hard for him to think of an end. He can also go in another direction that I won't consider here.

He can look to the smaller things. He can build microscopes and see things that are too small to see with his naked eye, and he can refine this.

But he is limited again in this observation of how things happen. He is limited in time. He is most sure of the things that are happening right now. He has some idea and some sureness in regard to what he is told and has been told about happenings in the immediate past. He can remember reasonably well over his own life span, and he can read what has been written back to the beginning of recording. He does not necessarily have to believe this; he can believe that those writings just happened.

He can predict, because of his ability to construct a reasonably good picture and a reasonably good theory, what will happen in the immediate future with some sureness. The further he projects this into the future, however, the less sure is his prediction. If he had a perfect theory, if he really understood, he could predict presumably to the end of time and look back to the beginning of time. Since he started to make myths he has always had concepts of beginnings and endings, and since these come under the category of how things happen not why, he is in a position today to extrapolate back in time. He can make this extrapolation in many ways.

He can consider these stellar systems that are rapidly running away from each other, measure the rate, compared to other ways of measuring time, that they are moving away, and he can ask how far back in time would he have to go until they were all together, until they started, if everything continued as fast as it is going on now.

He can examine the rock formations, as the geologist does, on this earth and ask what the oldest rock is. He has even recently found that there is buried in this rock an atomic clock whose rate does not vary no matter what he does to it in the present so that he can assume that this clock has been running this way ever since it was laid down in these particular rocks. By examining what went on in these rocks and the condition of this clock, he can estimate when things began on this earth. The age of the universe is now thought to be 10 or 20 billion years and the age of our solar system about 5 billion years.

Now I would like to point out that there is to the working scientist (the man who studies these things) an emotional as well as rational appeal obtained from any essential understanding that he can get from the study of his universe, even if it only concerns the question of how things happen. Understanding one's self and one's environment is, to my mind, the highest aim which man can hope to obtain.

I would like to consider man's attempt to make monistic theories, or myths, if you will. He is forever frustrated in this. Instead of coming out with a monistic theory, he runs into essential dualities. The most accepted myth of our way of life and our democracy was the one that arose from the work of Descartes and Newton's discovery of gravitation and the development of the mechanistic theory of how things happened. In pursuing this, the philosophers came up with the concept that there was an essential duality, there was matter and there was mind.

It was not a monistic theory, it was a dual one, and it was this concept that was the whole philosophical basis of our Western way of life. It was the acceptance of this idea of the essential difference between mind and matter by practically all of us that made our republic possible.

Students of this matter, professors and scholars, claim that it is not possible for other societies to develop our type of government unless they have similar basic philosophical ideas. Another duality, one somewhat more physical and concrete, that we continually run into is whether or not nature, or our external world that we are talking about here, is discrete or continuous. Can you take a piece of it and divide it into parts and then take that piece and still keep on dividing it into parts or if you keep dividing far enough, will you come to indivisible parts that you can divide no more?

This in a sense is tied up with what the physicists call the duality principle that is basic and is a quandary right now. Matter acts both as if it were particlelike and wavelike. In regard to light, the illumination by which we see, some investigators at first thought light was a stream of particles and some investigators just thought it a wave motion, like waves on the surface of the water in which the particles of water don't move but the wave is transmitted.

In recent times investigators thought this was settled since they could make light defract and interfere and behave in a way in which only waves would behave. But as they pursued this further, they found that they also had to accept the fact that light was a particle and one can only explain all the phenomena of illumination and of light by assuming that it had both of these qualities. Then still more recently, they were surprised when they found, for something they always thought had no wave nature whatsoever but was particlelike matter, that in order to explain its behavior, they had to assume that it also had wave properties. So, here is another duality we can't get away from.

Finally, to top things off, the real question is whether what I've been telling you is reality or a myth. That is the last and the biggest duality. Is reality what we have been talking about, namely just man's rational theoretical construction, or is reality just our momentary sense perceptions.

(Those who might be interested that the present scientific concepts of how things happen are excellently summarized in Doubleday Anchor paperback "Knowledge and Wonder," by Weisskopf.)

FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK OF PROVIDENCE, R.I., HOLD THEIR 69TH ANNUAL CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this past March 17, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Providence, held their 69th annual celebration. We were honored this year to have as one of our guest speakers, the distinguished Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission, the Honorable George H. Hearn.

All of us who are familiar with George know that he is a man of many talents. One of his foremost talents, as was evidenced by his speech on St. Patrick's Day, is that of a chronicler of Irish folklore.

George's address to the Friendly Sons follows the great tradition of previous addresses. Our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, my colleague, Congressman Carey, of New York, and the distinguished Representative of Massachusetts' Eighth Congressional District, Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, who some say is a direct descendant of St. Patrick himself, have addressed this group.

I am sure that all of my colleagues would be interested in reading Commissioner Hearn's remarks and I insert them in the Record at this point:

GREETINGS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN

It is a pleasure and a profound honor for me, the son of a Mayo man, to have the privilege of responding to the toast, "The day we celebrate", at the 69th annual St. Patrick's Day celebration of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Providence, Rhode Island.

This delight is further enhanced by the realization that by accepting the invitation to address you I join an illustrious group of Rhode Island men at a function which has been addressed by so many men of renown in the past. In recent years at least two friends of mine have enjoyed the experience of sharing this grand evening with you.

I am reminded that our beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy addressed you ten years ago this very night and that my own distinguished congressman, Hugh L. Carey, had the pleasure in 1965. Tonight, sharing the program with His Excellency, Bishop McVinney and Boston's own Congressman Tip O'Neill, who has so ably succeeded John F. Kennedy in representing Massachusetts' eighth congressional district, is a happy experience, indeed.

As a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, an independent regulatory agency and an arm of the Congress, I would like to pay my respects to your outstanding congressional delegation.

I should like to mention in passing that while speaking to Senator Pastore last week in Washington, he informed me that today is his birthday. I am sure our good friend, Tom Meehan, will convey our happy returns of the day to John O'Pastore.

I am particularly pleased to see my good friend, Congressman Bob Tiernan, here this evening, from all observations and reports, Bob is doing a fine job in representing his district; and all America benefits because of your wise choice of a representative. I also take pleasure in saying "hello" to Senator Pell and Congressman St Germain. Thank the Lord that I am not in New York or California where the delegation listing resembles the litany of the saints.

I harbor a particular admiration and affection for Rhode Islanders, who, like most Irishmen, display such virtues as kindliness and generosity, especially with their time. It was my good fortune to have one of your famous sons take me under his wing, adapt me to Washington life, and instruct me in the principles of transportation. I refer to your own Robert T. Murphy, vice-chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In 1961 Congressman Carey and I arrived in Washington together, and while we were roommates, I observed how Congressman John Fogarty, of happy memory, instructed Hughie on the ways of Congress and on the Washington scene in general. Some of Congressman Fogarty's instruction rubbed off on me and I shall always be grateful to both he and Bob Murphy. Since I am an Irishman from Long Island, Brooklyn, my home, being the most western extremity of the island, it seems fitting to express these sentiments in Rhode Island on the night we celebrate the feast of the patron saint of all Ireland—Padriac himself.

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

It may seem somewhat redundant to stand before this august group of historians of Irish lore and tradition and reiterate the glories and wonders associated with our patron, Saint Patrick, but the merits of such reflection are evident when we view this zealous and god-like apostle of the fifth century in light of his actual and potential influence on contemporary times. One feels that the ageless story of Saint Patrick is of particular relevance today.

We ask ourselves how it is that a man about whose early life so little is known can command such universal acclaim by all nationalities particularly on this "the day we celebrate". The answer can doubtless be found in the inspiration we garner from the life and character of the saint himself.

Patrick was born about 387 in Roman Britain and was captured by Irish raiders in his early teens and taken as a slave to Ireland where for six years he tended the flocks of a druid high priest and chieftain, it seems that this period of servitude afforded him the time to reflect on the pagan and chaotic conditions that existed in Ireland at the time and he became imbued with a missionary zeal to plant the seeds of his native Christianity in his land of exile.

Patrick managed to escape to the continent where he entered the monastery at Lerins in order that he might prepare himself for the priesthood. His dream to return to Ireland as a missionary was realized when Pope Saint Celestine the First sent him as his personal emissary to carry the gifts of faith and freedom to the spiritually neglected souls of Ireland.

Today, in these troubled times, we must be ever vigilant lest those gifts of faith and freedom slip from their venerated perch. As Patrick suffered great opposition from the established religious cults but did not allow himself to become discouraged, so must we of the 20th century not succumb to the opposition of the disestablishment.

Although he lived in daily expectation of murder, treachery or captivity, Patrick never lost his zeal to bring the faith to the Irish. His love of freedom has remained implanted

XUM

in the breasts of all good Irishmen through the centuries.

Patrick's missionary activities led finally to the great event of lighting the Easter fire on the hill of Slane overlooking Tara. That was his greatest mortal and spiritual triumph, because of this deed King Loghaire allowed him to freely convert the Irish. He fixed the See of the Roman Catholic Church at Armagh and spent many days fasting and meditating at Croagh Patrick in County Mayo.

The faith founded by Patrick in Ireland flourished there until about 700 when the Baton was successfully passed to the great Irish monk, Columbanus, who was inspired to carry on the teachings of Patrick.

Born of a spiritualism ignited by Saint Patrick and kept burning by Columbanus, the Irish heart has enabled Irishmen to endure and overcome many hardships and periods of darkness. The light has often flickered, but it has never been extinguished. In this age of the machine, we must feed the flame of Patrick's spirituality so that today's and tomorow's discontented and oppressed will feel the warmth of the faith and freedom Patrick lived to imbue in the hearts of men.

A verse from the pen of John Greenleaf Whittier emphasizes this aspect of St. Patricks' life:

"St. Patrick, slave of Milcho of the heards of Ballymena, sleeping, heard these words:
'Arise and flee out from the land of bondage and be free.'
So went he forth but in God's time he came to light in Uilline's Hills a holy flame and, dying gave the land a saint that lost him as a slave."

No better example can be found of the effort we must pursue than in the period from 1691–1829. The Irish were then under the heels of tyrants, and were forbidden to exercise religion, receive education, to take a profession or to hold office, not only could an Irishman not hire a Catholic teacher to school his children, but he was forbidden to send his child abroad for an education, or in dying could not leave his infant children under Catholic guardianship.

In these dark hours how did the fire of faith and the flame of culture first lighted on the Hills of Slane survive in Ireland? We have the answer in the lines about the real heroes of Ireland:

"THE HEDGE SCHOOLMASTER

"(By Seumas MacManus)

"When the night shall lift from Erin's hills,
'Twere shame if we forget
One band of unsung heroes whom freedom owes a debt,
When we brim high cups to brave ones then,
Their memory let us pledge
Who gathered their ragged classes behind a friendly hedge.

"By stealth they met their pupils in the Glen's deep-hidden nook,
And taught them many a lesson never in English book,
There was more than wordy logic shown to use in wise debate,
Nor amo was the only verb they gave to conjugate,
When hunted on the heathery hill and through the shadowy wood,
They climbed the cliff, they dared the march, they stemmed the tumbling flood,
Their blanket was the clammy mist, their bed the windswept bent,
In fitful sleep they dreamt the bay of bloodhounds on their scent,
Their lore was not the brightest nor their store, mayhap, the best
But they fostered love, undying in each young Irish breast.

"And through the dread, dread night, and long, that steeped our island then
The lamps of hope and fires of faith were fed by these brave men,
The grass waves green above them, soft sleep is theirs for aye,
The hunt is over, and the cold, the hunger passed away,
O hold them high and holy, and their memory proudly pledge,
Who gathered their ragged classes behind a friendly hedge."

The work of the Hedgerow scholars was such that a century later Irish shepherd boys in the hills were quoting Horace and Ovid, passing on the classics by word of mouth from generation to generation. No wonder that Irish martyrs spoke as scholars as they gave their lives in saintly sacrifice.

In this manner did the great writers and poets of Ireland preserve for antiquity the glorious deeds of Irishmen of bygone days. The pens of those men not only recorded but spurred on the glorious deeds of their countrymen, O'Reilly, Yeats, Wilde, Keats and Mangan will be long remembered.

As we hopscotch through Ireland's history I would like to pause at one other period of adversity. The great exodus brought about by the potato famine of 1848 and '49 gave birth to an idea dramatized by Yeats in his play, "Cathleen ni Houlihan", a traditional personification of Ireland. As indicated in the words of "Mother Ireland," many Gaels would have to leave the land of their birth because they could not accept the tyranny which prevailed in the Ireland of that day:

"It is a hard service they take that help me. Many that are red-cheeked now will be pale-cheeked; many that have been free to walk the hills and the bogs and the rushes will be sent to walk hard streets in far countries; many a good plan will be broken; many that have gathered money will not stay to spend it; many a child will be born and there will be no father at its christening to give it a name. They that have red cheeks will have pale cheeks for my sake; and for all that, they will think that they are well paid.

"They shall be remembered for ever.

"They shall be alive for ever.

"They shall be speaking for ever.

"The people shall hear them for ever."

The marvelous qualities that endear a man to his fellow men were possessed in abundance by Saint Patrick. He exemplified a supernatural faith, held aloft as an exalted ideal for which he would gladly die, a love of others which was so great that he would sacrifice all his possessions for their well being, he had a touching humility and an earnestness of purpose through which there gleamed a transparent sincerity of truthfulness, and in the end a complete reliance on God for whatever strength he had and for whatever good he was able to accomplish.

Although I have gone lightly into the past to recall the greatness of Saint Patrick, to remind ourselves of the deprivations, discrimination, sacrifices and self-denial made by Irishmen for their faith and freedom over the many centuries; and as we revel in the glories of Saint Patrick and Ireland, I think that we, as followers of Saint Patrick, should make a firm resolve here tonight that before we gather again to honor our Saint we will have done something for the benefit of human kind, as Saint Patrick did for our forebears.

Let us here, in the city of Providence, look about us to see how we might exemplify Patrick and how we may emulate his many marvelous qualities in our every day lives, so that others around us might take an example. There need not be the outward manifestation, such as the lighting of the bonfire at Tara, for us to go out into our neighborhoods and spread the good word and give enlightenment to projects that will alleviate the hardship of the sick and the poor, the uneducated, and the deprived.

Possibly we can help the Irish people in Ireland today, particularly those in Northern Ireland who are suffering ignominies and deprivation because of their religion, which are far greater than those suffered now in the inner cities of the United States.

The point is that the age of Saint Patrick was one in which the ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigned in the minds of men. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it, the political structure of the civilized world. Fear and uncertainty was everywhere in that chaotic time. Into his part of the world Patrick brought, in my opinion, two greatly related ideas—faith and freedom. He was first and foremost an apostle of the Christian faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland before him but he made the country dominantly Christian and so thoroughly so, that Ireland became, for the next 700 years, a center of learning and a center of missionary activity from which missionaries went to Scotland and northern and central Europe.

At the same time, and quite logically so, Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been a slave. Now he endeavored to make people free. Look around us and see on the day we celebrate the particular relevance to 1969 of the day of Saint Patrick. Is this not a chaotic age when the old structure, political and otherwise, on which humanity rests is attempting to be changed by the forces of unrest and revolt? Fear and uncertainty reign supreme and, moreover, there is a great and powerful, concerted attack on the very standards and virtues for which Saint Patrick stood. To practice these virtues in the spirit that others, particularly the young, would admire would be Saint Patrick's work were he alive today.

I take leave of you with this challenge and this Irish blessing:

"May the saints protect ye
And sorrow neglect ye
And bad luck to the one
That don't respect ye.
And top of the morning—
To all that belong to ye
And long life to your honor—
That is the end of my song to ye."

To which I add: Beannact De Lib Go Leir. God Bless You All!

EQUAL MAIL SERVICE FOR RURAL RESIDENTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to provide an equality of public service to our rural residents. My bill would extend driveway mail service to every farm. This bill in no way deprives anyone from the present mail service they are getting. It only provides that all rural residents receive equal service.

As you know, there is no distinction between the costs of mailing a letter between neighbors, even though one can have an answer to his letter delivered to his driveway, while the other neighbor may be forced to make a round trip of 3 or 4 miles in order to pick up his reply.

I am the first to admit that farms are getting larger and thus distances between rural neighbors in the Midwest is be-

XUM

coming farther, but I also would quickly point out that this increase in size has no relationship with the need for equality of mail service with other businesses who may be located in an urban area.

Several administrative rulings have been made over the past 10 years to provide additional service to our rural residents. The most recent ruling by the Post Office Department was to decrease the requirement of having two families per mile, down to three families per 2 miles. This small change did benefit an additional 59,000 farm families, but there are other thousands who are still having to make this daily trek down to the nearest location on a highway to get their mail. Often, these boxes are located 1½ to 2 miles away and many cases have come to my attention of personal mail having been lost, or packages opened, or contents removed.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY VISIT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, March 17, we were very proud to have as a distinguished visitor at the Hibernian Society's St. Patrick's Day banquet in Charleston the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. John N. Mitchell.

The Hibernian Society's banquet is an outstanding historical occasion and is unique among such St. Patrick's Day banquets around the country. We were most pleased to have the Attorney General as our guest of honor.

Mr. Mitchell was also welcomed to the city by an editorial published in the Charleston News and Courier which praises Mr. Mitchell as one of President Nixon's strongest appointments. I am much pleased that Mr. Mitchell received such a fine reception. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Welcome Visitor," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME VISITOR

Charleston is honored today by a visit from John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Mitchell is in the city to address the Hibernian Society's St. Patrick's Day banquet.

In our judgment, Mr. Mitchell is one of President Nixon's strongest appointments. Before taking on the duties as the nation's chief legal officer, he had a distinguished career in the law, specializing in bond matters. As Charleston is a Navy town, it is worth noting that Mr. Mitchell was commander of a flotilla of PT boats in World War II. John F. Kennedy served under him. The Attorney General is not without ties to this community. His daughter is married to a Charlestonian and has visited here.

We hope that Atty. Gen. Mitchell will find many occasions in the future to return to Charleston. We know that the Hibernians and their guests will find him an interesting speaker, occupying, as he does, one of the most important and sensitive posts in the federal government.

FORGERY AND ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, each minute of every working day forgers lift $1,500 out of the American economy. Forgers defraud banks of more money in a week than holdup men obtain in a full year. Forgery crimes, according to the FBI have increased 106 percent in the last decade alone and organized crime has played a key role in this ominous rise. Now for the first time we can look behind the statistics and into the intimate world of "The Forgers." E. Patrick McGuire, a dedicated journalist and author working in cooperation with the FBI, the U.S. Secret Service and the U.S. Postal Inspectors, takes the reader into specific case histories of forgery in his new, hard-hitting book, "The Forgers," published by the Padric Publishing Co. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following revealing excerpts from Mr. McGuire's exceptional book:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE FORGERS"

(By E. Patrick McGuire)

FORGERY AND ORGANIZED CRIME

"La Cosa Nostra is the largest organization of the criminal underworld in this country, very closely organized and strictly disciplined. They have committed almost every crime under the sun."—J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Inevitably, when one discusses organized crime and its possible relationship to forgery operations, one quickly uncovers a familiar group of doves and hawks. The doves belittle any attempt to link organized crime, and in particular the La Cosa Nostra, to large scale organized operations. The hawks, on the other side of the debate, wish to attribute a very large portion of all forgery operations to organized crime-connected influences. In reality, the truth lies somewhere between these two positions. In the course of preparing this study, I have had some well intentioned and serious law enforcement people, who certainly should know better, comment that they did not observe organized crime operating in the field of forgery. One wonders about their powers of observation.

To build the case for direct links between organized crime and major forgery operations we must not simply consider the plain fact that acknowledged La Cosa Nostra members have been apprehended and convicted for forgery operations. Rather, we might better look beyond this truism to compare the characteristics of the organized crime operation and its striking resemblance to the needs of the professional forger.

To begin with, organized crime is located in all of the major urban areas. The crime of forgery is primarily committed in large urban centers. Here the anonymity and centralized financial resources of the city make a most tempting target for the professional forger. And the cities are where the La Cosa Nostra is. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice conducted a survey of 71 U.S. cities. The police departments in these cities were questioned regarding the existence of organized crime within their cities. In 80% of the cities over one million residents, organized crime was active, in 20% of the cities with populations between 500,000 and one million, and in 20% of the cities with populations between 250,000 and 500,000 organized crime was also present. In over 50% of the cities between 100,000 and 250,000 police indicated that organized crime existed in their cities. Therefore, organized crime is obviously well entrenched in the same hunting grounds that the professional forger utilizes. (Task Force Report; Organized Crime—1967).

Next, we know that the professional forger must have detailed technical knowledge of how legitimate business operates. He is familiar with banking operations, channels of commerce, etc. The ordinary burglar or holdup artist does not have this kind of knowledge. Organized crime also has a good working knowledge of both banking and legitimate business operations. The reader will remember when, in 1957, 75 of the nation's leading organized crime figures were apprehended at a meeting in Apalachin, N.Y. Quite naturally, all of these gentlemen were in illicit businesses. But in addition, at least nine of them were in the coin machine vending business, sixteen were in garment manufacturing businesses, ten owned retail grocery stores, seventeen owned bars or restaurants, eleven were in the olive oil and cheese importing business and nine were in the construction business. The remainder were involved in such diverse industries as automobile agencies, coal companies, entertainments, funeral homes, race tracks, laundry services, trucking, waterfront activities and bakeries. (Select Committee On Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, *Final Report*—U.S. Senate Report no 1139, 86th Congress, 1960, Page 487–488). Therefore it is obvious that organized crime is well entrenched in legitimate businesses and has a good working knowledge of the technical aspects required for forgery schemes.

But of even greater significance is the fact that organized crime has the two "C"'s. These are *contacts* and *cash*. Both are essential to large scale forgery operations. Such operations frequently require the setting up of fronts, the purchase of printing equipment, the corruption of banking and financial firm employees, etc. And as far as cash is concerned organized crime certainly has its share.

It is estimated that illegal gambling, the mainstay revenue source of organized crime, provides an annual intake of at least $20 billion each year. The profit to organized crime on this gross intake is somewhere between $6 and $7 billion each year. In the words of the Kefauver Commission Report "These profits provide the financial resources whereby ordinary criminals are converted into big-time racketeers, political bosses, pseudo-businessmen and alleged philanthropists." The author might append that it also provides the revenue to finance the most intricate of forgery schemes. Narcotics is the other principal source of organized crime revenue and it produces, on the heroin trade operation, approximately $350 million annually of which $21 million are probable profits to the LCN Group. (McClellan Committee Narcotics Report, S. Report #72, 89th Congress, First Session 120 (1965)).

The other half of this equation is the "contacts" side. Here organized crime, by its very nature, has what large scale forgers desperately need. Once credit cards, traveler's checks, corporation checks, etc. are forged, time becomes of critical importance. The credit card company, bank, enforcement agency, etc. will race against time to alert all possible acceptors of the forged instrument to the possibility of its misuse. In this case it becomes a race between the two groups. Unfortunately, organized crime often wins this race. They are not hindered by bureaucratic red tape and in some cases may have more pressing motivations to quickly move the illicit merchandise. To understand how the contact side of this equation works, we might digress into some basics about the organized crime organization.

At the present time there are between 2 and 4,000 hard core "family" members of La Cosa Nostra operating in 24 separate "families". These families are located in the major cities of the United States. Most cities have at least one organized crime family, although New York is known to have at least five. Each of these families has authority to engage in a full range of organized crime activity. Like its legitimate counterpart, organized crime has well defined staff and functional positions. At the top of each family is a "Boss" or "Don". Immediately beneath him is an "Underboss" or "Sottocapo". Next in line, and of special interest to the student of forgery is a staff vice president or counselor, designated the "Consiglieri". Further down the line we have lieutenants or "Caporegima" and then the "Soldati" or "Button" men.

In some of the cases cited later in this volume, it will be shown that organized crime families in one city, for example New York, have been able to move a large quantity of forged instruments within literally hours to other parts of the country and to obtain distribution before banks, hotels, or enforcement officials could be notified of the original theft.

One of the most valuable functions that credit card forgery provides to organized crime is the so-called "funding operation". By this, we mean that various operatives of organized crime families can utilize stolen, forged or fraudulent credit cards to pay for their everyday travel and living expenses as they travel throughout the world on "business" trips. For example, a courier smuggling in heroin from Turkey might utilize the credit card to pay for his air line ticket, hotel expenses, meals, car rental, etc. Since the card is stolen, or fraudulent, it will be difficult to trace the movement of the individual during the trip. The card in effect provides not only the means of financing the trip, but also a false identity which masks the operative's movements.

It is well known in Federal law enforcement circles that most of the persons in the upper echelons of organized crime, and this includes the first three or four levels of the organization chart, are under close surveillance by U.S. agents. The latter group is most interested in determining the expenditures of these various mobsters in order that they may confront them with a discrepancy between their reported income and actual living expenses.

A few years ago, in an attempt to complicate the life of the IRS surveillance teams, the mob switched over to an extensive use of cash. However, IRS agents were still able to trace many of the travel and entertainment expenses regardless of the fact that they were paid for in cash. Now, the mob has switched to the use of credit cards (stolen). The fraudulent credit cards allow them to live high without any direct record of their expense. The expense appears in the name of a third party who later renounces the charges when he discovers that his card has been fraudulently used. This scheme has been used extensively during 1965, 1966 and 1967. However, recently, the New York organized card group ran into one small problem.

Federal agents discovered that a Long Island and Brooklyn, New York, group was stealing late model Cadillacs and ferrying them to Atlanta, Georgia. In Atlanta, they were transferred to a local madam for resale and distribution in the South. The couriers who drove the cars from New York to Atlanta utilized stolen or fraudulent credit cards. One of these couriers was recently arrested in Atlanta on a charge involving $200-$300 worth of fraudulent credit card charges. He pleaded guilty and to his surprise was given a 5 year sentence. Within a few days, a private jet arrived in Atlanta and produced $25,000 bail for this individual while his case is before the Appeals Court. This is just typical of the operations of organized crime utilizing these cards.

IRS agents have been so successful in their approach to organized crime that over 60% of all criminal convictions of organized crime figures, between the years 1961 and 1965, resulted directly from tax investigations conducted by the Internal Revenue Service. Contrast this record with a typical enforcement record gained on gambling arrests and convictions. Cook County, Illinois, provides a graphic example of the latter problem. Between 1963 and 1966, gambling arrests in Cook County outside of the Chicago area, produced 11,158 arrests. Of these arrests 76.2% were dismissed and only 16.3% resulted in any conviction at all. Only 17 jail terms were imposed and only 4 of those were in excess of 30 days. (Blakey—Unpublished Report on Local Law Enforcement Response to Organized Crime—January, 1967—Task Force Report; Organized Crime 1967).

Although the author does not have statistical validation of this point, my impression after interviewing many police officers, federal agents, prosecutors, etc. is that the record for forgery conviction of organized crime figures, is not much better than the gambling arrests and prosecution record. The number of convictions may be higher but the length of the jail sentences is in no way commensurate with the value of money obtained or with the fact that it is part of the pattern of organized crime.

In the past organized crime has been concerned with "traditional" crime sources of revenue and these sources have proved lucrative as previously noted. However, one must not delude oneself into believing that because lucrative areas already exist, such as gambling and narcotics, that organized crime will not be interested in similarly lucrative areas such as forgery and counterfeiting. This is certainly not the case and recent arrests and convictions confirm this point.

One argument made by the "doves" on this subject is that the lower scale "Soldati" or "Button" men have made their own personal decision to get into large scale forgery operations and that the people at the top of the family have been unaware or disinterested in this type of crime. Nothing could be further from the truth. To begin with the organization of the La Cosa Nostra does not allow for this type of free enterprise. Cressey, in one of the best studies in this area, points out that "because of the illegal character of organized crime, a leader's fame and fortune can be seriously damaged if improper decisions are made at a lower level. Decision-making is therefore concentrated at the top of the hierarchy" (the Functions and Structures of Criminal Syndicates—Donald R. Cressey—Task Force Report; Organized Crime—1967). These "Button" men had to have the approval of their superiors in order to engage in and execute some of the forgery operations for which they have been apprehended and convicted. Indeed, lately the Federal Bureau of Investigation has even been successful in apprehending some of the higher echelon in connection with forgery cases and has brought conspiracy statutes to bear in these cases.

Organized crime, like most present day social organizations, is undergoing steady change. As with business organizations, technical competence will become the yardstick of rank in the near future. Organizational positions will not automatically go to those who have spent an apprenticeship in slum condition petty thefts. Highly technical skills and familiarity with complex business operations will be an absolute necessity. In fact, this phase of the change has already occurred. The family members of organized crime are most cognizant of this need and they are busily training their blood relatives to prosper in the new technical economy. The sons and daughters of crime family members are increasingly college educated. Even here, the clanishness of the Cosa Nostra shows a particular organization quirk. It is known, for example, that one particular U.S. college has in its enrollment a very large representation of the sons or close relatives of La Cosa Nostra family members (Task Force Report; Organized Crime—Page 56—1967). These young men are being trained in the latest business administration, accounting and legal techniques. When these "students" are returned to the La Cosa Nostra we can expect an even greater emphasis on crimes of fraud, such as forgery and counterfeiting. Forgery is a "cleaner" crime than many others. And these second generation family members have been educated to a "cleaner" environment, be it on a social basis or on a crime preference basis.

In the following chapters, you will have an opportunity to observe some incidents involving organized crime and forgery. Through many of these cases run a common thread of modus operandi. The thread begins with a "money mover" who recognizes the potential for illicit gain through large scale fraud involving forgery. The money mover apparently calls such an opportunity to the attention of the family "counselor." Operational groups then prepare for the actual execution of the plan. In many cases, it follows a recognizable pattern. The seed of the pattern is the corruption of one or two key individuals. These individuals may range from lowly route postman to a financial vice president or a water commissioner. Regardless of their position, they have key access to financial documents which can be forged, misrepresented and then redeemed for cash.

The organized crime group is not niggardly in spending. They will set up extensive fronts to complete a forgery operation. Nor are they adverse to becoming partners with skilled professional forgers. While La Cosa Nostra is strictly an Italian or Sicilian organization, they do not discriminate against business connections with entrepreneur forgers of other nationalities. In many cases they provide the distribution mechanism for the illicit fruits of a particular forger or counterfeiter's labor.

Consider some of the interesting "coincidences" that link organized crime to some of the major forgery operations that have occurred during the past few years. The $407,000 theft of American Express Traveler's Checks, separately reported in this volume, was accomplished by the nephew of New York Mafia Boss, Joseph Colombo. This nephew, Maurice Savino, was joined by one Vincent Potenza, listed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a member of the Carmine Tramunti "family.", successor to the late Thomas Luchese. In the course of the investigation of this case, one prospective government witness, John Anthony Panarello, was wiped out by the mob before he could testify in the conspiracy. His car was burned and Panarello was found shot twice in the head in a Catskill Mountain roadside ditch.

In another case, still under investigation at the time of this writing, three suspects, all with organized crime links, have been indicted in an American Express Card counterfeiting operation. One of these defendants is the relative of a Revere, Massachusetts, member of the organized crime syndicate.

The Brooklyn, New York District Attorney's Office strongly suspects that in the J. W. Mays case financing for the operation came from Buffalo, New York. In fact, one of the convicted members of the conspiracy was an alleged courier for the Buffalo, New York "family".

In Chicago, the local organized crime branch had a specific "financial department". This department dealt in crimes such as forgery, fraud, and embezzlement. The head of this department was arrested on federal charges and is now serving a federal sentence. In the Chicago credit card fiasco, reported separately in this volume, Postal Inspectors had ample evidence that lower echelon organized crime members were involved in

XUM

"scam" or "bust-out" operations in collusion with local merchants.

Another example of the direct link between organized crime and major check forgery operations occurred late in August of 1968. The U.S. Secret Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation working together, uncovered a scheme which allegedly could have produced a million dollar pay-off. In this particular scheme, it is alleged that organized crime figures, specifically the "banker" of the Brooklyn Mafia, arranged to set up a checking account using the name of a Wall Street brokerage house. The scheme involved the theft of incoming checks from the brokerage house and their subsequent deposit in the fraudulent account opened in the name of the broker. The checks deposited to this fraudulent account were then subsequently drawn out of the account. It relied on the cooperation of an employee at the legitimate stock broker's office who apparently would steal random checks as they arrived at the brokerage.

In this particular case, the conspirators are charged with a conspiracy to transport and actually transporting a stolen $17,000 check from New Jersey to New York. The defendants were arrested in the case and they are known to have direct link with organized crime in the Brooklyn area. This particular case is interesting because it highlights the fact that organized crime does have "banking or financial specialists". These are individuals who operate specifically in areas such as embezzlement, fraud, forgery, and counterfeiting.

Elsewhere in this report, as the reader observes how airline tickets stolen on one coast soon appear on the opposite coast, how stolen trading stamps all seem to come to rest in one city, how airline tickets stolen in three separate sections of the country come to be on the person of a single individual and this individual in turn connected with organized crime, one can hardly escape the conclusions previously noted. It might then seem a simplification to say that organized crime is responsible for professional forgery and that the destruction of organized crime would remove most professional forgers from the scene. However, this would be a delusion because, considered against the mass of forgery, organized crime can contribute only a small portion. While this portion is an important portion, it is far from a majority. It has been estimated that 55 to 60% of all forgeries are committed by "amateurs", the remaining 40% involve some small gangs, entrepreneurs, lone wolf operators and finally organized crime. It is difficult to put a figure on what portion organized crime contributes to the total dollar volume of forgery losses. However, an educated guess would probably put this figure around 10% of the total forgery loss in the United States.

However, even in the world of crime things are seldom static. With the advent of a checkless society and the proliferation of credit cards, we can expect to see organized crime play a much larger role in forgery type fraud. There are several reasons for this anticipated increase in activity. First, a forgery is a non-violent crime which is likely to produce relatively small sentences and not arouse too much public outcry. It is also the conspiracy type of crime which is ideally suited to organized crime operations. In addition, it is the type of crime where much of the arrest risk can be delegated to pushers and lower echelon members of the syndicate.

One of the most important tools for the prevention of this type of criminal expansion lies within the provisions of the new "Omnibus Crime Bill". This bill, with its major emphases on the prosecution of organized crime on a local or statewide level, will provide a major impetus toward the detection and prosecution of the "financial" end of the organized crime syndicate.

Another promising sign in recent days has been the appearance of select federal "Task Forces" specifically designed to combat organized crime. One of the first locations established for these forces was Brooklyn, N.Y., in the heart of Mafialand. This task force has been particularly effective and was in fact cited for its excellent work by the Republican Party task force on crime, in the preparation of its report for President Nixon. At the time of this writing there are five task forces in full operation with new groups coming on stream each month.

Basically, the task force consists of a special group of Justice Department lawyers aided by supervising agents from many federal agencies whose jurisdiction involves Mafia-type crimes. There are agents from Internal Revenue, Narcotics, Immigration, etc.

The Task Force moves into a specific geographic area. The area usually coincides with the boundaries of a Federal Judicial District. An intelligence estimate is prepared on all organized crime activities within that area. From this report certain key activities, or more properly individuals, are selected. By coordinating the interests and jurisdictional capacities of the many federal agencies it is often possible to find a specific area where a local crime figure has inadvertently stepped across the line into public illegality. When this step is discovered the Task Force pounces and another member of the "family" disappears from circulation.

At the present time the Task Forces, because of limited manpower, are concentrating their up-tight surveillance on the first two or three levels of the organizational structure. As Congress appropriates more funds (the department has asked for 100 additional Assistant U.S. Attorneys) the Task Force will turn their attention to ever lower levels of the structure. When this happens, then maybe, the promise of the doves that organized crime has little connection to forgery will be realized.

AN AMERICAN REJECTS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE FOR HIS RACE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the defense of liberty and freedom knows no color barrier. This was proven this week when Attorney John C. Harris, of Alexandria, argued before the U.S. Supreme Court that:

> It would be giving Negroes special rights if it forced all white private clubs to accept Negroes as members.

The attorney is a Negro.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a news clipping from the Washington Evening Star for March 19 followed by a memorandum, "Does the 13th Amendment Convey Superior Rights to the Black Man Over All Other Races?"

The material follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

COURT GETS CLUB PLEA ON NEGRO ENTRY

An Alexandria lawyer has told the Supreme Court it would be giving Negroes superior rights if it forced all-white private clubs to accept Negroes as members.

John C. Harris of Alexandria made the point yesterday in defending the whites-only policy of Little Hunting Park swimming and tennis club in Fairfax County.

The club's policy has been challenged as illegal by Paul E. Sullivan, who says the club refused to admit a Negro family that had been renting a home from Sullivan in a housing development near the club.

Sullivan has contended that an 1866 civil rights law gives Negroes an equal right to obtain membership in private clubs.

But Harris, in his reply, said the result would actually be a superior right for Negroes, since the 1866 law is designed only to protect Negroes.

"It would follow," Harris said, "that a Negro would be entitled to membership on the basis of his race alone, whereas white persons would be subject to acceptance or nonacceptance on other grounds."

The court will indicate later, perhaps next month, whether it will hear the challenge against Little Hunting Park.

DOES THE 13TH AMENDMENT CONVEY SUPERIOR RIGHTS TO THE BLACK MAN OVER ALL OTHER RACES?

The Supreme Court has passed on the 13th Amendment before. In the case of *Hodges* v. *United States*, the defendants were convicted by the federal courts in Arkansas of conspiring to prevent some Negroes from working for a certain employer. This was a crime under a law passed by Congress under the enforcement clause, on the theory that freedom of contract was an essential part of non-slavery. The Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional, and in doing so analyzed the meaning and effect of the Amendment in the following language:

"That prior to the three *post bellum* amendments to the Constitution the national government had no jurisdiction over a wrong like that charged in this indictment is conceded; that the 14th and 15th Amendments do not justify the legislation is also beyond dispute, for they, as repeatedly held, are restrictions upon state action, and no action on the part of the state is complained of. Unless, therefore, the 13th Amendment vests in the nation the jurisdiction claimed, the remedy must be sought through state action and in state tribunals.

"The meaning of this [the 13th Amendment] is as clear as language can make it. The things denounced are slavery and involuntary servitude, and Congress is given power to enforce that denunciation. All understand by these terms a condition of enforced compulsory service of one to another. While the inciting cause of the Amendment was the emancipation of the colored race, yet it is not an attempt to commit that race to the care of the nation. It is the denunciaion of a condition, and not a declaration in favor of a particular people.

"The logic [of the Government's theory of the case] points irresistibly to the contention that the 13th Amendment operates only to protect the African race. This is evident from the fact that nowhere in the record does it appear that the parties charged to have been wronged by the defendants had ever been themselves slaves, or were the descendants of slaves. They took no more from the amendment than any other citizens of the United States.

"It is for us to accept the decision, which declined to constitute them wards of the nation, or leave them in a condition of alienage where they would be subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, but gave them citizenship, doubtless believing that thereby in the long run their best interests would be subserved, they taking their chances with other citizens in the states where they should make their homes."

Thus, by this decision, the Supreme Court of another day very clearly and sensibly rejected the theory that the Thirteenth Amendment created a specially privileged class of American citizens. It held squarely that legislation for that purpose was without any Constitutional authority. *And this decision was squarely overruled* last June in *Jones* v. *Mayer*.

XUM

SUSSEX SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on Friday evening, March 14, 1969, I attended the annual meeting of the Sussex Soil and Water Conservation District in the high school at Georgtown, Del. Nearly 400 district cooperators and their distinguished guests were at this banquet to commemorate their 25th anniversary of the conservation district that so ably serves Sussex County, and the State of Delaware.

The chairman of the district governing board, Mr. Alden P. Short of Georgetown, Del., was in charge of the program. Mr. Earl White of Bridgeville recalled some of the milestones of the district's 25-year history. Mr. Cashar Evans of Selbyville presented awards to Mrs. Frances Bahn, secretary, Sussex County extension staff, cooperative extension service; and Mrs. Betty J. Ellingsworth, secretary, soil conservation service, Newark, Del.

The associate administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, Norman A. Berg, climaxed the program with an address that I think is worthy of a wider audience. He stressed the effective partnership of local, State, and national organizations over the past quarter century that together have met the challenge of conservation and have translated conservation needs into action.

Now, more than ever, resource conservationists need to unite in their efforts to assure an environment with quality. This will increasingly require dedicated teamwork of both rural and city people. Finally, career conservationist Berg forecast the broadened conservation mission conservation districts will face in the next 25 years. This can also have a direct effect on our work.

Mr. White, in his brief remarks, told of the remarkable achievements of the Sussex County Soil and Water Conservation District in the 25 years of its existence. This group, in Delaware's southernmost county, has a record we in Delaware are proud of—a record of innovation and initiative which has served well the people of Sussex County and of the State of Delaware. They are to be congratulated on this record.

Mr. President, I ask consent to place the remarks of Mr. Berg and Mr. White in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY NORMAN A. BERG, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

I'm pleased to be in Georgetown tonight to help you celebrate your 25th anniversary as a soil conservation district. We in the Soil Conservation Service are proud to have shared these years with you. Together we have met the challenge of conservation, and have translated the conservation need into accomplishment.

Delaware district supervisors have been active and effective in their work with the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Earl White, Isaac Thomas, and Elwood Tucker, as members of the NACD Council, and long-time friend Cashar Evans, past director of NACD, among others, have performed outstanding service.

I would like to leave with you tonight a deep feeling of partnership with those of us in the Federal service whose job it is to help meet local needs through national programs.

SCS help can be applied effectively only on local terms. Our technicians will help you determine what those alternative terms are, from a conservation standpoint. But it is your land, your water, your county, and your economy. It is a complex mix of needs, potentials, and special interests. It takes a lot of sound common sense, a good salting of understanding, compromise, and cooperation, in recognizing the essential needs, in making the most of the potentials, in accommodating the many and varied interests, public and private, for the general good.

Even in Delaware, Washington can seem a long way off. We need to understand the nature of our partnership. In this respect, SCS has an advantage over many other Federal agencies. We have conservationists in each of the States and in every conservation district. You have someone right at home to turn to. And in Washington we have an all-important liaison with every part of the country.

We in SCS prize this relationship. We appreciate its importance in a time of growing pressures on land and water resources.

Now, more than ever, resource conservationists need to unite in their efforts to assure an environment with quality. Accomplishing this will require dedicated teamwork involving both rural and city people and organizations, with strong support from government at all levels.

According to the updated Conservation Needs Inventory, about 90 percent of Delaware's land is privately owned or owned by local government agencies. Urban uses still take only about 7 percent of the land space. Sussex is the least urban of all Delaware's counties.

In the last 10 years urban buildup in Delaware increased by about 17,000 acres. Urbanization has been moderate in Delaware. The State remains, and probably will remain for some time to come, except for Wilmington and Dover, predominantly rural. But you are in the mainstream of the growing urbanizing pressures from Boston to Richmond, in fact all along the East Coast.

These facts emphasize the continuing major role assigned to the soil and water conservation districts.

A high percentage of private ownership of land requires broad understanding and cooperation at the district level. There must be continuing, meaningful local dialog so that all legitimate long-term interests are served.

When SCS entered into its first memorandum of understanding with the Sussex district in 1944, the primary needs were technical assistance and heavy earth moving equipment to continue and expand the work most recently done by the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In cooperation with other district leaders, you enlisted the aid of private citizens, the county government, and the State. Tackling the drainage problem, you persuaded the county and State to help underwrite the cost of Tax Ditch projects. You re-wrote the State Drainage Law and helped create the office of the State Drainage Engineer. One of Sussex's most distinguished citizens, Senator John J. Williams, is generally credited with having water disposal included as a purpose for P.L. 566 watershed projects.

As a result of all this you have made excellent progress in solving the drainage problem.

One of the Soil Conservation Service's first assignments in Delaware was the completion of the engineering survey and design of the Pocomoke River project. At the time it was described as the largest drainage project east of the Mississippi. The Sussex district coordinated the massive effort needed to accomplish the job.

The Pocomoke River project is an early example of the effective partnership between SCS and the Sussex District.

State Conservationist Bill Ratledge has reminded me of the vital role the districts have also played in establishing suitable beachgrass on the coastal dunes.

SCS has benefited, too, in helping out with plant selection and testing to find better strains of beachgrass at our Plant Materials Centers at Beltsville, Maryland, and at Cape May, New Jersey. This work is still going on. And it is not limited to the dunes. It extends to stabilizing ditch and road banks, heavily used recreation areas, and the banks of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

SCS cooperation with the districts in plant materials, soil survey and other conservation work has brought conservation needs to the attention of many State and County agencies. We welcome this interest on a broad conservation front.

Amendment of the basic District Act in 1963 and updated memorandums of understanding with the U.S. Department of Agriculture have made it possible for Delaware districts to extend their services to all segments of the community. Through district channels, SCS assistance is provided to areas undergoing rapid changes in land use. The approach to soil and water conservation, the tools we have available, apply wherever our mission takes us and whatever the purpose.

In fiscal year 1968, SCS allocated over 3,000 hours to working with 255 non-farm people, groups and official agencies in Delaware. Most of the services related to soil survey interpretations for planning boards, developers, engineering firms and others.

The classification and mapping of the soils of Delaware have been a cooperative program of conservation districts, SCS, and the Delaware Agricultural Experiment Station over the past 24 years.

The Sussex County survey is about 85 percent complete. We estimate that about 2 man-years of work will be necessary to complete the 90,000 acres remaining to be mapped. Soils information in the county is geared to highway, recreation, and urban-type land use planning, as well as for agricultural needs. The SCS compilation "Soil Survey Interpretations of Delaware," published by the State Planning Office, is being used by State agencies and planning offices. State planning officials are working with the Sussex County Planning Commission and SCS in community development based on soils information for Seaford and Lewes.

The Delaware conservation districts are to be commended for their help in extending SCS soils interpretations to community planners, engineering firms, land developers, and other non-farm interests. Delaware's Senator J. Caleb Boggs played a leading role in the enactment of a bill, S–902, 89th Congress, clarifying the use of soil surveys for non-agricultural purposes.

Delaware has an outstanding guide for future development in the Preliminary Comprehensive Development Plan prepared recently by the Delaware State Planning Office. The Plan is an excellent analysis of Delaware's assets and potentials. The introduction to the Plan states that it is also "a strategy for long range physical development, geared to the needs of the people and cognizant of the land on which they live. This strategy will be of use to decision makers, public and private, and to the public in general." It goes on to say that the Plan "is designed to guide growth toward the kind of environment Delaware citizens want."

You are more familiar with the Plan than I am; but I was struck by the concern for open space around planned urban develop-

XUM

ment, and for recreation and conservation facilities. This is gratifying to a professional career conservationist.

Sussex County, with more than 250,000 acres of forests, provides prime areas for income-producing recreational development. Vacation farm enterprises are another possibility. As these developments take place, and as Delaware's beach resorts and facilities move inland to accommodate an increasing flow of vacationers, and part-time and full-time residents, this comprehensive development plan will be an invaluable guide to countryside and community development.

Every conservation program, every change in land use, should be considered in relation to the total needs and potentials of the community.

You conservation district leaders, in cooperation with other conservation-minded citizens, have a heavy responsibility in assuring that this is done. The future environment of Sussex County depends upon how effectively your mission is carried out.

Environment is the key word.

You will be interested in the attention given to the environment at the latest meeting last October of the Secretary of Agriculture's Public Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation.

The Advisory Committee observed that "the modern concept of conservation is as broad as the whole out-of-doors." And "that to be effective the conservation job must be done under local leadership with State and national government serving as working partners."

That plans and programs of all public agencies—Federal, State, anl local—involving both rural and urban land use—should be fully coordinated and integrated to achieve a high quality environment for all the people.

That regional planning and development of natural resources on private lands in rural and urban areas are needed now.

That investment of more private talent and capital in the field of conservation must be strongly encouraged.

That State and local governments should accelerate their financial support for increased soil, water, and related conservation efforts.

That conservation districts are "logical catalysts for bringing together within local communities all interested individuals, groups, and agencies—both rural and urban—who will benefit from the results of conservation efforts."

That local soil and water conservation district governing bodies should include representation from the general public as well as agricultural interests.

These thoughtful and challenging guidelines should inspire us to greater effort and broader cooperation.

These virtues have made the conservation district movement the outstanding success that it is throughout our country.

Assuring an environment that satisfies the needs of the human spirit as well as the material needs of the individual, requires a lot of down-to-earth understanding, a willingness to compromise, and a desire to cooperate.

I know the people in the agricultural areas are wondering how well their interests may be represented in any partnership with the more populous and economically stronger urban community. You farmers may well ask whether the Department of Agriculture will continue to operate at the old stand, serving agricultural interests as well in the future as in the past.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin, at the recent National Agricultural Outlook Conference, said: "It is quite evident that the Department of Agriculture is going to continue to be involved, as it has been through all the years, with farm programs and all of the activities associated therewith."

Secretary Hardin pointed out that the Department—in its assistance programs—among other responsibilities must place emphasis on improving the quality of living in rural America.

The quality of living—or the environment—in rural America is directly related to much overcrowding of our cities. If we can provide economic opportunity and the other amenities in the spacious countryside, urban overcrowding can be relieved and prosperity can be brought to the neglected rural areas.

In his Outlook Conference talk, Secretary Hardin said: "We are going to be increasingly involved in the whole area of things that we call rural America—activities outside the metropolitan areas."

The Secretary said it is the intention of the Department of Agriculture that the economic development of rural America doesn't "get lost in the shuffle" as government and the private sector become increasingly preoccupied with the problems of the large cities.

Secretary Hardin spoke of the need to establish new "growth points" throughout America—in our smaller cities, county seat towns, and new cities. This is the plausible alternative to more influx into the Nation's larger cities where the added numbers cannot easily be absorbed in an acceptable way of life.

You will be interested that Secretary Hardin is a member of two Executive-level councils which are concerned with national growth and prosperity: the Urban Affairs Council and the Council on Economic Development. In those councils there is a strong commitment to active partnership of rural and urban America.

The SCS-District partnership always has stressed conservation as a dynamic process that embraces consumption and renewal of resources as well as protection.

The challenges we face together now emphasize the dynamic nature of our conservation mission.

Together, over the years, we have accomplished water management on thousands of acres; brought greater value to the land and profit for the land owners through assistance in proper land use practices; provided information on soils for proper land use planning, and on conservation plants for erosion control. And in many other ways we have contributed to the improved quality of the environment in rural Delaware.

Now, as we broaden the conservation mission, your continuing assistance is needed to:

Accelerate erosion control on agricultural lands not adequately treated.

Provide technical assistance and guidelines to counties and municipalities in soil interpretation, site selection and erosion control.

Work with local officials and individual landowners to attack erosion problems on critical sediment source areas such as roadbanks and streambanks.

Give dynamic leadership in developing water storage and distribution projects for municipal, industrial, and recreation uses.

Unite with other agencies and organizations in drawing the greatest possible benefits from water and related land resources as a local community effort.

The American success story is based as much on cooperative community action as it is on rugged individualism. The colonists who huddled on a strange and fearsome shore had to unite if they were to survive. The pioneer relied on his neighbor, and communities were founded, and the Nation grew on the strength of united dedication, determination, and effort.

I hope the American people will never fully satisfy the zest for personal attainment in pioneering new frontiers. But, the complex relationships in our modern society require cooperative and coordinated pursuit of common goals if we are to make the most effective use of our talents, skills, and natural resources.

I hope I have helped to define here tonight the vital role of the soil and water conservation districts in assuring a quality environment for Delaware and the Nation.

Working together, I am confident we can achieve our loftiest goals.

Remarks by Earl White, Member, District Board of Supervisors, Sussex Soil and Water Conservation District

As we pause here tonight for a few moments, to observe the 25th Anniversary of our District, there are many accomplishments that could be mentioned to the credit of the Disrict program.

I shall mention only a few, to illustrate the progress that has been made by our District in the conserving and wise use of the natural resources here in Sussex County. I shall call them milestones of progress.

The first was the organization of our Sussex County Soil Conservation District in 1944.

Second, the loan of a used surplus dragline to the District by the Federal Soil Conservation Service in 1945.

Third, the loan of the money needed to purchase our first new dragline by Mr. Norvil Pepper in 1946. This money was repaid as the dragline worked. This demonstrated the soundness of this procedure and provided the basis for securing state funds, on loan, to be used for purchasing equipment and to be repaid as the equipment worked. Today the District owns 6 draglines, 6 bulldozers, a tile trencher and a power grader—all purchased in this manner and paid for as they operate.

Fourth, through the years our District has worked with more than 100 tax ditches in the County providing improved drainage. This has resulted in greater efficiency for the production of agricultural crops.

Fifth, in 1958 the Bearhole Watershed Project was started in our District, the first watershed in the United States. It was completed in 1961. Since that time two additional watershed projects have been approved in the District and much of the work has been completed on them. They are the Nanticoke Watershed and the Marshyhope Watershed.

Sixth, this year our District is cooperating with the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in a Water Quality Research Project for Delmarva. We have provided a mobile home to be used as an office and laboratory for this work. It is located at the Agricultural Substation and work on the project should start by April first of this year.

Seventh, there are 1,600 cooperators in our District; we have dug 1,400 miles of ditches, including outlets and farm ditches; we have provided conservation plans for all cooperators; we have worked with other groups and agencies concerned with conservation of our natural resources. Our District publishes a bi-monthly newsletter which is mailed to all cooperators and many other interested people.

Tonight we—your District Board of Supervisors—say "thank you" for coming and helping to make this 25th Anniversary meeting a success. We hope the next 25 years will be even more exciting and our District will contribute even greater things in the work of conservation here in Sussex County.

QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF MINK

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today having to do with the establishment of quotas on imports of mink. This industry is an important one for the State of Minnesota. In 1967, nearly 10 percent of the entire total production came from Minnesota and were raised on 429 ranches. This number of ranches had declined by nearly one-fourth in just 1 year. There is no denying that the flood of nearly unrestricted foreign pelts has been the material factor in forcing bankruptcy on our American producers.

In the 90th Congress, a total of 86 Congressmen authored this type of legislation indicating the real concern and the extent of damage that is done to our local industry from these lower priced imports. I sincerely hope that this Congress will take action on this needed legislation in this session.

HEARINGS OF THE MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a growing number of my colleagues in the Congress are becoming more and more concerned over the depressing "shrinkage" of the projected post-Vietnam fiscal dividend. The President's Cabinet Coordinating Committee of Economic Planning for the End of the Vietnam Hostilities estimated a fiscal dividend of $19 billion at the end of 10 quarters. Now Secretary of Defense Laird announces that $7 billion is a more realistic estimate.

This is the latest evidence of what economists refer to as the "defense expenditure ratchet," a set of inertial forces that prevent defense spending from falling back to its initial level once the original rationalization for increased spending is no longer valid.

Although the main purpose of our hearings is to determine the necessity of a commission on government procurement, I think an equally important objective of our committee is to examine how procurement decisions are actually made. By this I mean what assumptions, data, and analyses are these decisions based on, especially as they concern major new weapons systems.

A second, and possibly more critical question is whether the President is being given an independent analysis of these Defense requests by someone who is able to look at the Defense Department objectively in light of other departmental budget considerations?

My research into the budget interplay between the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget has left me quite disturbed over what appears to be the inability of the Bureau of the Budget to scrutinize the Defense Department to the same extent that it reviews non-Defense spending.

This is the result of both inadequate manpower and the nature of the Defense budget process itself.

For example, there was one BoB examiner assigned to the Headstart program, and one examiner assigned to the anti-ballistic-missile system. There is something basically wrong when a government gives equal Budget Bureau attention to an ABM system, with projected expenditures of anywhere from $6 billion to $50 billion and the Headstart program which has an estimated expenditure of $338 million in fiscal 1970.

Of course, I am not advocating that there be a 1-to-1 ratio dollarwise, but pointing up the fact that there presently seems to be a severe imbalance with only 10 percent of the Bureau professional staff examing nearly half the budget.

Furthermore, domestic agency budgets are given different and more intense scrutiny than the Defense budget. In all departments of Government, except for the Defense Department, budget examiners conduct an independent analysis and review which is submitted to the Director of the Budget. In Defense, budget examiners work not independently, but with their Defense counterparts, and the analysis and review are submitted first to the Secretary of Defense rather than to the Budget Director. Only after the Secretary has approved it, is the review submitted to the Budget Director. The result of this procedure is that whereas other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of Defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to overrule the Secretary.

This process, of course, shifts the whole budget process power structure and renders the Bureau almost impotent as a force for independent analysis of military procurement programs.

Edwin Dale, writing in the New York Times on March 17, said:

> The Budget Bureau in its normal role, does not exist only to make operations more efficient or to save pennies, but to challenge entire concepts and programs.

Again on Wednesday, March 19, the New York Times on its editorial page discusses the phenomenon saying:

> One of the advantages that the military establishment exploits in pressing for ever larger budgets is the reluctance of outsiders to challenge the effectiveness of its programs. Sloganeering patriotism is used to silence potential critics.

On the same day, the Wall Street Journal, editorialized:

> Certainly the time has come for Congress to insist that the Bureau of the Budget give more thorough and skeptical analysis to the defense budget. Inexcusably, the military has too often evaded the public accountability normally required of other government agencies.

At this point, I should like to include the full text of the Dale article and the two editorials in the RECORD:

CLOSE LOOK URGED AT DEFENSE FUNDS: CONGRESS FINDS SCRUTINY BY BUDGET BUREAU IS SLIGHT

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—A growing number of members of Congress have made a new discovery that concerns them: The Budget Bureau does not scrutinize and criticize the defense budget as it does the budget of every other agency of Government.

Both the House and Senate heard speeches on the matter last week. The new director of the budget, Robert P. Mayo, is aware of the issue and giving thought to it.

The Congressional concern reflects a new mood of skepticism about military spending that has emerged this year.

In the end, there could be a major change, with the Budget Bureau becoming a far more challenging and independent critic of the nation's defense policy, and defense spending, than it is now.

Of the 300 officers in the Budget Bureau, only about 30 are assigned to the defense budget, which is more than half the total budget, excluding Social Security and other trust funds.

AGREE WITH PENTAGON

Unlike the budget review of other agencies, the Budget Bureau officers agree with their Pentagon counterparts and submit recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, not to the Director of the Budget.

Thus, as Representative William S. Moorhead, Democrat of Pennsylvania, told the House last week, the "appeal to the President" procedure in defense is different from that of every other program.

"The result of the procedure," Mr. Moorhead said, "is that whereas other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to overrule the Secretary."

Other officials make clear he seldom does so.

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, saying "the time of the blank check is over," told the Senate, "We must have a much sterner and more critical review of the military budget by the Budget Bureau itself."

NOT IN GREAT DETAIL

He quoted Charles J. Zwick, former Budget Director, as conceding. "We obviously do not get into as great detail in that department as we do in some other departments."

'The Budget Bureau, in its normal role, does not exist only to make operations more efficient or to save pennies, but to challenge entire concepts and programs. Thus any effort by it to scrutinize defense spending more closely would inevitably involve it in the entire issue of military strategy and the requirements of national security.

But, in addition, Senator Proxmire has emphasized what he called waste in military methods of procurement, poor performance by contractors and frequent "overruns" of estimated costs. These, too, could be the subject of Budget Bureau challenge if the present system were changed.

Mr. Mayo will probably be questioned on the issue soon by a House Government Operations subcommittee looking into the issue of Government procurement, and defense procurement in particular.

CUTTING OUT DEFENSE FAT

President Nixon's decision to reduce the Johnson Administration's request for defense spending by $2.5-billion is a small, but important step in the right direction. Defense Secretary Laird will provide details on these economies when he testifies before a Congressional committee today, but apparently the revision of the Sentinel system will account for almost one billion dollars of the reduction.

One of the advantages that the military establishment exploits in pressing for ever larger budgets is the reluctance of outsiders to challenge the effectiveness of its programs. Sloganeering patriotism is used to silence potential critics. But times are changing. The present debate over ABM deployment is accompanied by increased questioning of other components of the huge defense budget.

Writing in The Washington Monthly before Mr. Nixon's last news conference, Robert

XUM

S. Benson, who used to work in the comptroller's section of the Pentagon, argued that more than $9 billion could be safely trimmed from the Johnson defense budget. Mr. Benson noted that $1.8 billion could be saved this year by halting all work on the Sentinel system. Other economies would be realized by abandoning dubious projects, eliminating duplicative programs and reducing waste and inefficiency in the deployment of personnel and the procurement of goods and services.

The Bureau of the Budget is nominally empowered to scrutinize charges of waste such as Mr. Benson advances. But Representative William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania has contended on the House floor that that watchdog agency cannot deal effectively with the Pentagon. In all other government departments, Budget Bureau examiners conduct independent reviews of requests for spending authority. But in defense matters, Budget examiners work with their Pentagon counterparts and their "reviews" are first sent to the Defense Secretary before they go to the Budget Director.

The result, Mr. Moorhead reports, is that whereas "other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of Defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to have him overrule the Secretary."

A tight rein must be kept on the growth of Federal spending to combat inflation. Simultaneously, budget priorities must be realigned to meet the needs of the cities. Cutting the fat out of the defense budget offers the best hope of achieving both goals.

REVIEWING THE MILITARY

The new tendency in Congress and in the public at large to question growing influence of the military—most recently exhibited in the Sentinel controversy—is, it seems to us, a healthy development. A rigorous civilian review of the role of the military in national life is long overdue.

The military, surely, is not immune to current criticisms which have proved valid for other major institutions. A list of its failings have a familiar ring: It has held an exaggerated view of its own power; it has relied too much on technology when complicated social and political aspects of military problems can no longer be ignored; it has unwisely and wastefully committed huge sums of money.

It is this last point which has caused Congressional antimilitary sentiments to burst into public dialog. Sen. William Proxmire, for example, charged in a recent speech that former President Eisenhower's warning against the excessive influence of the "military-industrial complex" no longer refers to the future. "There is today unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex resulting in excessive costs, burgeoning military budgets and scandalous performances," Sen. Proxmire said in calling for greater control over military spending.

Dissatisfaction with these failings is fanned by public frustration with the Vietnam war and growing domestic unrest. The feeling of many that the individual no longer participates in Government decisions that directly affect his life can be traced in large part to increasing draft calls and the tax requirements of a distant, unpopular war pursued in the face of urgent troubles at home.

Certainly the time has come for Congress to insist that the Bureau of the Budget give more thorough and skeptical analysis to the defense budget. Inexcusably, the military has too often evaded the public accountability normally required of other Government agencies.

In one recent case, Army officials pleaded "security reasons" in refusing to discuss in public a $1.5 billion program in which mass production of tanks was ordered though no ammunition had been developed for their weapons to fire. We tend to agree with the chairman of a House Armed Services subcommittee investigating the matter, who concluded "this censorship is indeed an attempt to hide bumbling ineptness rather than to protect vital security data."

The most important goal of civilian review, however, should be to determine what sort of military system best suits U.S. participation in modern world politics. If future foreign policy is to be more selective in its commitments—as we think it should be—then a professional volunteer army, limited in manpower but technically expert, would be a more acceptable and effective instrument of policy. By requiring Congress to debate and approve a new draft law to support any massive new commitment, it would also insure public participation in such a major question of military policy, forestalling later controversy.

Only since World War II, with the emergence of the U.S. as a major power, has a military organization of the current magnitude seemed necessary. Now more than ever there is need for the civilian vigilance Mr. Eisenhower recommended. By its size alone the military has gained profound influence on the economy, and perhaps less apparently, on the formation of foreign policy, since policy often depends on the tools available to implement it.

A large, inflexible military organization unchecked by strong civilian review can lead only to a self-perpetuating drain on national treasure, a demoralized citizenry, and foreign policies dangerously irrelevant in a world moving rapidly away from traditional forms of war and diplomacy. In the truest sense, national strength results not from a large military, but from a military subordinate to the needs of sound civilian government.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY POST-HIGH-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people this interesting letter from the assistant superintendent of the Allegheny County schools in Pittsburgh, Pa., which outlines the post-high-school activities of the 1968 graduates from high schools in the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

We in Allegheny County are certainly proud of this fine record.

The letter follows:

From: James S. Snoke, Assistant Superintendent.

Date: March 15, 1969.

Subject: Statistical Summary of Post-High School Activity of 1968 Graduates.

We are pleased to submit this statistical summary of the post-high school activity of all the 1968 graduates of Allegheny County high schools. We express our appreciation to the individual high school principals for submitting the data for the respective high schools.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY PUBLIC AND PAROCHIAL HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

[1968 Post-High-School Activity,[1] Mar. 15, 1969]

	Allegheny County		Pittsburgh public		Pittsburg diocese		All schools,[2] total		State[3] (percent)	County deviation
	Number	Percent	Number	Percen	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
College or university outside Pennsylvania	2,081	13.6	481	10.7	539	13.1	3,101	13.1	8.9	+4.2
Community college	1,086	7.2	313	7.0	292	7.1	1,691	7.1	4.2	+2.9
Junior college	438	2.9	45	1.0	110	2.7	593	2.5	2.5	
The 14 State colleges[4]	1,881	12.4	207	4.6	622	15.1	2,710	11.4	10.2	+1.2
Other college or university	2,470	16.4	644	14.3	904	22.0	4,018	16.9	12.9	+4.0
Higher education subtotals	7,956	52.5	1,690	37.6	2,467	60.0	12,113	51.0	38.7	+12.3
Vocational or technical school	809	5.4	265	5.9	202	4.9	1,276	5.4	5.2	+.2
School for nursing	347	2.3	65	1.5	137	3.3	549	2.3	2.6	–.3
Business school	308	2.0	140	3.1	109	2.6	557	2.4	3.2	–.8
Other schools	469	3.1	106	2.4	48	1.2	623	2.6	2.7	–.1
Postgraduates	17	.1	27	.6	10	.2	54	.2	.3	–.1
Business—nursing—vocational—technical subtotals	1,950	12.9	603	13.5	506	12.2	3,059	12.9	14.0	–1.1
Armed Forces	866	5.5	296	6.5	99	2.4	1,261	5.4	6.6	–1.2
Sales	500	3.5	265	5.7	56	1.3	821	3.5	3.9	–.4
Office employment	1,317	8.5	405	9.1	599	14.5	2,321	9.7	9.7	
Factory work	330	2.5	95	3.1	42	1.0	467	1.9	5.5	–3.6
Trades	133	.9	157	3.2	18	.4	308	1.3	2.8	–1.5
Apprentice training	116	.8	29	.4	20	.5	165	.7	1.3	–.6
Agricultural	9	0	1	0			10	0	.8	–.8
Other employment	741	4.9	328	7.2	189	4.6	1,258	5.3	6.4	–1.1
Employment subtotals	4,012	26.6	1,576	35.2	1,023	24.7	6,611	27.8	37.0	–9.2
All others	1,210	8.0	611	13.7	129	3.1	1,950	8.3	10.3	–2.0
Total	15,128	100.0	4,480	100.0	4,125	100.0	23,733	100.0	100.0	

Footnotes at end of table.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY PUBLIC AND PAROCHIAL HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES—Continued

[1968 Post-High-School Activity,[1] Mar. 15, 1969]—Continued

	Allegheny County		Pittsburgh public		Pittsburgh diocese		All schools,[2] total		State[3] (percent)	County deviation
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Graduates:										
1969	16,291		4,989		4,124		25,404			
1970 (estimated)	17,424		5,221		4,197		26,842			

[1] Compiled by James S. Snoke, 345 County Office Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

[2] Private academic schools not included. Estimated graduates, 500 annually.

[3] Prepared from data obtained from department of public instruction.

[4] Includes Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

SOME OBSERVATIONS

The 1969 Class is 7% larger than 1968.

The 1970 Class is 13% larger than 1968; 6% larger than 1969.

Percent of all Allegheny County high school graduates—

A. Entering institutions of higher education (51.0%) is 12.3% higher than State;

B. Enrolling in Business-Nursing-Vocational-Technical School—1.1% less than State;

C. Entering Armed Forces—1.2% less than State;

D. Obtaining employment after high school—8% less than State;

E. Enrolling in Out-of-State Colleges—4.2% higher than State;

F. Enrolling in Community College—2.9% higher than State;

G. Enrolling in 14 State Colleges—1.2% higher than State;

H. Enrolling in Other Colleges in State—4.0% higher than State;

I. All others—2% less than State, indicating better follow-up of high school graduate than State average;

J. Office employment is exactly as State average;

K. Entering 2 Year Community or Junior College Program—approximately 10% annually or 2,500 students. These, together with an estimated 12% attrition during the first college year from other institutions of higher education or 3,000, would suggest an annual potential of 5,500 Community College students from current graduates.

Each reader will be able to make other observations according to the individual interest. Your comments or reactions will be helpful in making future Comparative Studies.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was 30 years ago that the allowance of a $600 personal income tax exemption for each dependent was established. Since that time just about everything possible has gone up but that tax exemption. Inflation has not had its effect on this item.

We are in a situation where the American taxpayer is faced with a totally unrealistic tax allowance for dependents that needs urgent and immediate attention. With this in mind, I am, today, reintroducing a bill I have sponsored for the past 6 years in the hope that this year will bring relief to the already overburdened taxpayer. This legislation would raise the present $600 personal tax exemption to $1,200. Favorable action on this bill will certainly be a bright spot on the tax horizon for the millions of taxpayers who have long hoped for such action by Congress.

SPACE AVAILABLE TRAVEL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Friday, March 14, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird made an announcement of vital importance to the morale of the active and retired military personnel and their dependents. Restrictions on space available travel for them were removed by the Secretary.

More than a year ago the Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced that all space available travel would be suspended until further notice. He gave as his reason that such travel was detrimental to the U.S. balance of payments.

In restoring this benefit, Secretary Laird said he took the action after a thorough review of all the factors. The balance-of-payments expenditures involved were very small compared to the adverse morale impact on military personnel and their families. He further stated that such travel had been available to active and retired service personnel for many years. He believes its restoration is both reasonable and fair.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary for this decision. I feel that this decision is but one of many that will be taken throughout the forthcoming administration's term to further enhance the morale and welfare of our military personnel and their dependents. In the past the morale has been severely eroded by shortsighted policies. I also feel that it is another sign of the outstanding team that the President has joined together to head our Department of Defense.

Mr. President, in view of the significance and importance of the Secretary's decision, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Laird's announcement be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ANNOUNCES REMOVAL ON RESTRICTIONS ON SPACE AVAILABLE TRAVEL, MARCH 14, 1969

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird announced today that restrictions previously imposed by the Department of Defense on space available travel have been removed.

Travel overseas by active and retired servicemen—and their dependents—has been affected by the ban, which was imposed more than a year ago in an effort to help alleviate the country's balance of payments problems. In making the announcement, Secretary Laird said, "I took this action after a thorough review of all the factors. The balance of payments expenditures involved were minute but the morale impact throughout the Department of Defense—and on retired service people—was widespread and substantial. Further, since such travel has been available to active and retired service people for many years, I believe its restoration is both reasonable and fair."

The policy change, which is effective now, will not cause any additional expenditures by the Department of Defense. The DOD transportation facilities concerned are being notified immediately, and that portion of the DOD directive which imposed the restriction is being amended to incorporate the new policy.

MR. BOB HOPE: HOPE FOR AMERICA

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, during preliminary remarks at the opening of today's session, a reference was made regarding Mr. Bob Hope. On the floor of Congress everyone is entitled to an opinion—hopefully it is an opinion that speaks well for America.

I know that the heart of America speaks well for Bob Hope. To our fighting sons abroad, he has brought the true spirit of Christmas. He has repeatedly sacrificed a Christmas at home to bring a little bit of "home" to others at Christmas.

Okinawa to Vietnam, "The Bob Hope Christmas Special" has brought special hope to Americans abroad.

When you need to raise funds to build a hospital or school or camp for the less privileged—yours is a special hope: Bob Hope. Bob Hope will be there with you giving America his time, his energies, his thought, his humor—giving to America from the very bottom of his heart.

When you are planning a civic drive or civic benefit—you will benefit first with America's "hearty" headliner: Bob Hope. No other man in our time has contributed more to the welfare of Americans in need than Bob Hope.

Bob Hope helps us look at ourselves as we really are, and he understands the heart and humor of America. Wherever Bob Hope goes—he goes for America, and the world of nations knows Bob Hope as a symbol of American compassion and understanding.

Some men shout, some men cry, some men lecture—Bob Hope asks you to laugh and understand. Bob Hope's art is subtle, so subtle that some men might overlook it: Hope comes to humor and never to harm. And America knows the difference.

Just yesterday, Bob Hope brought his special humor to the Members of Con-

XUM

gress. In commenting on the Nixon campaign, Hope said:

> I used to think that when Nixon held up the two fingers he was symbolizing the "V" for victory sign. But now I found out that those two fingers really meant two—the $200,000 he would get in a salary increase.

And Congress roared. Bob Hope had taken a sensitive controversy and changed it into a sincere chuckle. Congress laughed and understood.

You know, Will Rogers was a great man in his own time because he was able to bring Congress, the Supreme Court, the President, and many others off their "high horses" and back with the people of America.

Today I am thankful that we have Bob Hope. For when Bob Hope speaks he is in step with the great Will Rogers. And it is Hope for America.

NEED FOR OMBUDSMAN NOTED BY AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association a few weeks ago adopted a resolution commending the institution of the ombudsman as a way of improving the means by which individual citizens can voice dissatisfaction with governmental action and inaction. In their resolution the bar association urged that State and local governments consider establishing ombudsman systems, and further urged that the Administrative Conference of the United States experiment with the ombudsman idea for limited areas of Federal activity and that the administrative conference encourage such experimentation by particular agencies of the Federal Government.

I am very encouraged to note the recognition and support of this institution on the part of the American Bar Association. The resolution on the ombudsman, I feel, merits attention from all public servants whose concern it is to assure quality government that is responsive to citizens. Submitted here for the information of my colleagues is the resolution which closely parallels the recommendations which were set forth by the American Assembly on the Ombudsman in October 1967:

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends:

1. That states and local governments of the United States should give consideration to the establishment of an ombudsman authorized to inquire into all administrative action and to make public criticism.

2. That each statute or ordinance establishing an ombudsman should contain the following twelve essentials: (1) authority of the ombudsman to criticize all agencies, officials, and public employees except courts and their personnel, legislative bodies and their personnel, and the chief executive and his personal staff; (2) independence of the ombudsman from control by any other officer, except for his responsibility to the legislative body; (3) appointment by the executive with confirmation by a designated portion of the legislative body, preferably more than a majority, such as two-thirds; (4) independence of the ombudsman through a long term, not less than five years, with freedom from removal except for cause, determined by more than a majority of the legislative body, such as two-thirds; (5) a high salary equivalent to that of a designated top officer; (6) freedom of the ombudsman to employ his own assistants and to delegate to them, without restraints of civil service and classification acts; (7) freedom of the ombudsman to investigate any act or failure to act by any agency, official, or public employee; (8) access of the ombudsman to all public records he finds relevant to an investigation; (9) authority to inquire into legality, fairness, correctness of findings, motivation, adequacy of reasons, efficiency, and procedural propriety of any action or inaction by any agency, official, or public employee; (10) discretionary power to determine what complaints to investigate and to determine what criticisms to make or to publicize; (11) opportunity for any agency, official, or public employee criticized by the ombudsman to have advance notice of the criticism and to publish with the criticism an answering statement; (12) immunity of the ombudsman and his staff from civil liability on account of official action.

3. That for the purpose of determining the workability of the ombudsman idea within the federal government, the Administrative Conference should (a) experiment by constituting itself an ombudsman for limited areas of federal activity, and (b) encourage and study experimentation by particular agencies with the ombudsman idea.

4. That establishment of a federal government-wide ombudsman system, whether or not designed to assist congressmen in handling constituents' complaints about administration should await findings based upon the experimentation recommended.

Be it further resolved, That the Section of Administrative Law is authorized to present the views of the Association and to encourage the establishment of ombudsmen in accordance with the provisions of this Resolution, by all necessary and appropriate means.

AN AMERICAN'S PRAYER—BY HELEN BENDIT

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, Helen Bendit, the 14-year-old daughter of Jack Bendit, a member of my staff, was, along with other members of the eighth grade at St. Michael's Parochial School, Annandale, Va., instructed to write a patriotic essay recently. Her reply, "An American's Prayer," more than fills that assignment. I wish to share her thoughts with Senators. I ask unanimous consent that her remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN'S PRAYER

(By Helen Bendit)

Please, God, make our country free
 From hunger, crime and war;
So that its citizens can be
 Safe from harm for ever more
Help us see no wrong in others
 Though their skin be not as ours
You have made them all our brothers
 And blessed us with His mighty powers.

KNOWLEDGEABLE, RESPONSIBLE EDITOR COMMENTS ON OUR ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM AND THE PARIS PEACE TALKS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, partisanship was expected to surface certain detractors of any ABM System proposed by President Nixon.

Col. Allen Griffin, editor of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, of Monterey, Calif., is a longtime, perceptive observer of international affairs with special experience and knowledge of Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. Griffin's recent editorial provides extraordinary perspective to the duties, methods, and responsibilities of President Nixon and also of the President's critics.

I insert the editorial of March 17, 1969, and urge every Member to take the time to read it:

TORRENT LOOSED, NIXON CRITICS INESCAPABLE

The conventional phrase is that "the honeymoon is over." That means that the torrent has been loosed, which is what the partisan and other enemies of President Nixon were waiting for and longing for since the day of his election.

Even the press was longing for it, because the President had been adroit enough to frustrate the reporters and pundits by not producing howling headlines and "challenging" programs for them. For eight years the White House had been producing visions, slogans, wars and crises under the late President John F. Kennedy and his successor; and it seemed awfully dull to sit before a skillful expositor who refused to take off into the wild blue.

Then the ABM decision, forced upon the President chiefly by the clamor of his opponents, gave the loud boom. Whatever the decision, however clever or passionate the emphasis, the boom was sure to take place. If it wouldn't be one set of critics it would be another.

The only beneficiary is the Soviet Union. It knows what to do with critics. It has already installed part of its ABM.

The Nixon critics are baying on the trail of the other problem the President inherited from his two predecessors, the ones who started, augmented, and escalated the tragic land war in Vietnam.

It has been no news that the peace talks in Paris have bogged down, nor is it news that the Nixon administration has been seeking the good graces of President Charles de Gaulle and the Soviet Union to assist in bringing the meetings in Paris to the point of discussion.

There is every reason to believe that De Gaulle would like to bring the tragedy to an end; but there are good reasons to believe that the Soviet Union is highly satisfied with the advantages the Vietnam war has brought to it. It has never had a freer hand for its activities in the rest of the world.

The United States has long given up the thought of a military victory. The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong have not given it up. The enemy negotiators in Paris are waiting it out. There seems to be no hope yet for a truce whereby the blood-letting would stop.

This is no simple thing except to those professors, students and a few equally irresponsible politicians whose solution is, "just get out of the place." The French did that in defeat. But the Vietnamese people who did not want Communist rule had another place to go—to South Vietnam. Now there is no place to go but to wait for the firing squads unless a decent peace may be secured.

This certainly is no time for revengeful partisan politics. The President clearly has his inescapable duties: to improve, where needed, the defense of the United States; to support the armed forces that are in the field, to protect the honor of his country. Methods may be debatable; the conditions of his responsibilities are not.

CALIFORNIA FIRM RECEIVES TOP ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM LOS ANGELES AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of Southern California Business, the official weekly publication of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, featured an article on one of the outstanding business enterprises in the 30th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

The article disclosed that this firm, Max Factor & Co., of Hollywood, now celebrating its 60th year in business, had received the chamber's 31st Gold Shovel Award for "significant contributions to southern California's economic growth."

The full text of the article appearing in Southern California Business follows:

GOLD SHOVEL AWARD GOES TO MAX FACTOR

Max Factor & Company, the nation's third largest cosmetic manufacturer, has received the Chamber's Gold Shovel Award for its multimillion dollar investments in Southern California.

Max Factor president Alfred Firestein accepted the award for his company, this year celebrating its 60th year in business.

The company now employs over 1500 people in the Los Angeles area, at its general offices in Hollywood, its manufacturing plant in Hawthorne and its distribution centers throughout the area.

Chamber president John V. Vaughn said, "Max Factor & Company has not only contributed importantly to the area's economy, it has helped make Southern California known everywhere as the beauty capital of the world."

Max Factor & Company's sales last year exceeded $150 million, and the firm paid over $13 million in federal income taxes alone. The company is the 31st recipient of the Gold Shovel Award for "significant contributions to Southern California's economic growth."

1969 marks the 60th anniversary year of Max Factor & Co., the internationally-known Los Angeles based cosmetic manufacturer. Down through the years, the company has been influential not only in creating good will for the United States, but in helping to make our country and the state of California, as well as Los Angeles and Hollywood known to the people in the 143 countries of the world where its products are sold.

Since its founding in 1909 by the late Max Factor, Sr., the firm has grown from a tiny make-up and hairgoods business in downtown Los Angeles to one of the world's leading American cosmetic companies. It is the third largest in the United States. In California and the international field it is the largest.

Today, its major United States manufacturing plants, western distribution center, and make-up salon, as well as executive and general office headquarters for its United States and International Divisions are all located in the Los Angeles areas of Hollywood, Hawthorne, and Gardena. These facilities, alone, provide steady employment to more than 1500 people locally—and to more than 10,000 people throughout the world.

UNIQUE CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the custom of sending Christmas cards and letter greetings has greatly expanded in recent times. Many of these "messages of remembrance" are unique and impressive.

For many years, Maurice H. Thatcher, the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and a former five-term Member of Congress from the old Louisville and Jefferson County, Ky., district has sent to friends Christmas greeting cards or letters, bearing greetings and good will in the form of poems of his own pen. These have been of high excellence and are but a few of the many poems written during a long and useful life of public and beneficial service. Some of these poems have appeared in anthologies, newspapers, and magazines in the United States and Panama; also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Thatcher's Christmas letter for 1968 carries a poem, believed to be one of the best in his Christmas series, which is timely, pertinent, and inspiring.

In the course of a very busy and useful life, Mr. Thatcher has found time to write a considerable body of poems of character and worth. Many of these have also been published in newspapers and magazines in this country and in Panama. Thus his versatility is shown. Meantime, he maintains his interest in and, tirelessly and objectively, labors for national parks and parkways, conservation, just benefits for employees of the Panama Canal, and research touching the cause and prevention of tropical disease, thus serving not only the Isthmus of Panama, but the entire world as well.

In and out of Congress, Mr. Thatcher has achieved much for these and other causes of public interest. He is secure in his reputation as lawyer, legislator, executive, patriot, author, and benefactor. His life and deeds are exemplary.

The indicated poem was written last December when the author was more than 90 years of age, and this fact is further evidence of his unabated mental vigor and his grasp of world conditions. Indeed, he is yet active in rendering gratuitous service for national parks and parkways; for just retirement benefits for employees of the Panama Canal, as well as aiding research touching upon the cause and prevention of tropical disease, as previously stated.

Notwithstanding the inclement weather, Mr. Thatcher, now very near a century in age, attended the inaugural ceremonies of President Nixon at the Capitol. All in all, he attended the inaugural ceremonies of seven Presidents; namely, Taft, Coolidge, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and, of course, Nixon. And he yet closely follows the course of public affairs, both domestic and foreign.

It is indeed a privilege and high honor to insert at this point in my remarks the Christmas letter previously mentioned so that my colleagues and the people of the Nation may have an opportunity to read this inspirational message of this very remarkable, outstanding, fine public servant, and patriotic American:

CHRISTMAS, 1968

Upon this Day we should recall
That Earth was made for each and all,
And not alone for two or three
Who strive to rule in tyranny
Altho the stars might quake and fall.

Mankind must not be held in thrall,
Nor evil ones the good forestall.
Let's ponder well what we should be—
Upon this Day.

None is too great, and none too small,
On this ensanguined astral ball,
To share the quest for Liberty,
As fixed by Heaven's own decree.
May Freedom's strength be as a wall—
Upon this Day!

With greetings, regards, and best wishes,
MAURICE H. THATCHER.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

DONALD JACKSON'S NEW JOB

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I learned of President Nixon's appointment of Donald Jackson to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Don was my predecessor in the Congress and I would like to join his former colleagues in welcoming him back to Washington. The high esteem in which Don is held is well expressed in an editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook which I would like at this time to commend to the attention of the House:

[From the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook, Feb. 27, 1967]

DONALD JACKSON'S NEW JOB

The appointment by President Nixon of Donald L. Jackson to a vacancy on the Interstate Commerce Commission will be applauded by the many friends of Mr. Jackson, one of the most popular citizens of the Santa Monica Bay Area who ever served in Congress.

Elected as representative of the old 28th Congressional District in 1946, after distinguished World War II service in the Marine Corps, Donald L. Jackson served six terms, and might easily have won re-election in 1960, had he not refused to run. During this 14-year period he was an outstanding member of the GOP delegation in the House and also of the Committee on un-American Activities.

Always a fine public speaker, Jackson in recent years has starred on radio and TV programs which unfortunately could not reach a national audience.

With such a background of Washington experience and with long knowledge of the more important government commissions,

XUM

Donald Jackson should make a valuable member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. His appointment will not change the party lineup on the commission (6 Democrats and 5 Republicans) since he will fill the unexpired term of another Republican, Grant E. Syphers, for four years.

It is gratifying that President Nixon, who entered Congress in the same year as Donald Jackson, wants this old friend of his congressional days to return to government service in Washington.

THE AMERICAN LEGION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a proud time for a great American organization—the American Legion, and I am indeed happy to pay tribute to an organization which has done so much for this country and continues to serve the veterans, their widows, and children.

The American Legion was conceived at a caucus held in Paris, France, by the members of the American Expeditionary Forces on March 15 to 17, 1919. Two months later, at St. Louis, Mo., another caucus adopted a tentative constitution.

The American Legion was chartered by an act of Congress on September 16, 1919, and its present membership is drawn from all walks of American life. It is from these roots in the community life of America that the American Legion draws its immeasurable strength, vigor, and public support. The people of these communities know of the American Legion's good local works and they stand behind it.

Only last week, I had the great honor to present a fellow New Jerseyan, William C. Doyle, of Vineland, to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of which I am a member. Mr. Doyle is the national commander of the American Legion, the first Jerseyite so honored by this great organization. Because of this, the 50th anniversary of the American Legion is of particular significance to the legionnaires of New Jersey.

On the occasion of this golden jubilee, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in this House, an article which appeared in the Sunday Star Ledger on March 9, 1969, written by Barbara Kukla, on New Jersey's observance of the birth of the American Legion. The article follows:

Jersey Helps Salute Legion's 50th Birthday

(By Barbara Kukla)

It's a long way from the battlefields of World War I in France to those of Vietnam, but veterans of both wars as well as the two in between are in the midst of honoring the American Legion on its 50th anniversary.

While 2.6 million Legionnaires throughout the nation are sponsoring numerous observances, the golden jubilee year is particularly notable for New Jersey. For the first time in the Legion's history, the national commander is a Jerseyan—William C. Doyle of Vineland.

Doyle will preside next Saturday—the anniversary date—at the Legion's annual dinner for Congress in Washington, D.C.

REMOTE CONTROL

As the national organization's anniversary gift to the nation, Doyle, by remote control, will light the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier from the dinner at the Park-Sheraton Hotel.

In commemoration of the Legion's founding, a six-cent postage stamp, depicting the organization's insignia in red, white and blue, will be issued the same day and dedicated at the dinner.

Heading the New Jersey contingent, representing 75,000 members and 420 posts, will be Jack W. Kuepfer of Clifton, state commander. William Huggard of Newfoundland is the state anniversary chairman.

New Jersey also boasts 24,000 auxiliary members, headed by Mrs. Franklin Sickle of Long Valley.

FREEDOM TREES

At home, a series of programs and dinners 'round the state will be capped with the presentation April 13 of 22 Freedom (cherry) trees to the state, one for each county and one for the state organization. The trees will be planted at the new state complex in Trenton.

In addition, most county organizations are presenting gifts such as trees and flagpoles to county governments. Individual posts are holding dinners and awarding special citations to 50 year members and veterans of World War I.

The anniversary theme, "50 Years of 100 Per Cent Americanism," focuses on the many programs which the Legion has sponsored to inspire patriotism and to assist veterans, their families and youth.

KEEPS PACE

"The principles of the organization as stated in our preamble will never change," says Kuepfer. "But our programs are continuously changing to keep pace with the times."

From its inception, a major concern of the American Legion has been the plight of the disabled veteran. Instrumental in passage of much legislation, the Legion has continuously sought to provide better care and rehabilitation for the disabled.

The auxiliaries, too, have concentrated efforts on rehabilitation, sponsoring parties and social events at veteran's hospitals.

Closely allied with the same concern is the Legion's interest in the welfare of the children of deceased veterans, at first assuring the care and protection of veterans' children and later seeking to improve conditions for all children.

At the core of the youth program is the American Legion Child Welfare Foundation, Inc., founded in 1954. It has made innumerable grants in the fields of juvenile delinquency, retarded children, mental health, education and physical medicine.

Another major project, central to the Legion's motto—"For God and Country"—is its commission on Americanism, whose efforts are channeled into educational programs and citizenship activities for youth.

Through the work of the commission, millions of American children have gained a better understanding of the Constitution of the United States as participants in the national high school oratorical contests.

Thousands of other youngsters have taken part each summer in workshops on government, known as "Boys State." The workshop, which has been held annually in New Jersey at Rutgers University has outgrown facilities there and will move this June to Rider College in Lawrenceville.

Each year hundreds of thousands of American boys improve their physical fitness and develop a keener sense of sportsmanship, citizenship and fair play through participation in American Legion baseball, which has been in existence since 1926.

To support outstanding citizenship, the Legion also presents awards to 27,000 schoolchildren annually and has been affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America, as troop sponsors, since 1922.

In addition, the Legion also operates citizenship schools for aliens.

GI BILL

But perhaps its greatest single achievement was the enactment in 1944 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, more popularly known as the GI Bill of Rights.

Extended in the 1950s to benefit veterans of the Korean War, the GI Bill provides for the hospitalization, education and employment of veterans as well as for loans for home, farm and business.

In New Jersey, one of the projects in which Legionnaires take great pride is the memorial chapel at the United States Naval Air Station in Lakehurst.

Informed of the lack of facilities and furnishings for worship at the station in 1928, Legionnaires conducted a drive and arranged for construction of the chapel. The cornerstone was laid in 1932, but the depression and curtailment of personnel at the base, postponed its completion and dedication until Oct. 26, 1947.

All of this and more is the result of a meeting of 20 servicemen, who met in Paris in 1919 to discuss some sort of program to keep their colleagues occupied following the end of World War I.

Led by young Theodore Roosevelt Jr., who is considered the "Father of the American Legion," the men decided that the fraternity should include all who has served in the armed forces during wartime, whether at home or abroad.

A month later at a caucus in Paris, the American Legion received its name. Plans for a more permanent policy, however, were left for a later and more representative meeting in the United States.

Thus, it was in early May of 1919 that a general caucus was held in St. Louis and the blueprint for the American Legion was drawn.

In New Jersey, the state organization received its permanent charter on Aug. 1, 1920. It was issued by the national headquarters and signed by Franklin D'Olier, the first national commander. A Pennsylvanian, D'Olier later became president of the Prudential Insurance Company in Newark.

Originally headquartered in Newark, the Legion moved its state offices to Trenton in 1922 and since 1932 has operated out of the War Memorial Building there.

And further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert as part of my remarks an article from the Herald-News of March 12, 1969, on the activities of Jack W. Kuepfer, of Clifton, the State Legion commander in connection with the State's participation in the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

The article follows:

Clifton Man, as State Legion Head, Plays Major 50th Anniversary Role

Trenton.—Jack W. Kuepfer, of Clifton, state legion commander, presented a 50th anniversary plaque to Governor Richard J. Hughes, who is serving as honorary chairman of the Legion's 50th Anniversary Advisory Committee. This state committee is similar to a national committee of 100, headed by former President Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Just prior to the presentation, Governor Hughes signed a proclamation, designating March 15–22 as American Legion Week and the remainder of 1969 through Nov. 11 as

XUM

the American Legion Golden Anniversary Year. He asked all citizens in the state to pay tribute to the good works of the American Legion as a token of public appreciation of wartime and peacetime services Legionnaires have given to the community, state and nation.

Kuepfer announced today that the American Legion counties and posts all over the state are now in the process of developing or completing community projects and activities as part of their contributions to the anniversary observance, because "The American Legion is a special interest group—and our special interest is America. Legionnaires will continue to give their time, effort and money to every aspect of the existence of the community, state and nation, so as to contribute to a stronger, and better America."

Kuepfer further stated, in connection with the Legion's 50th Anniversary—That . . . "during this golden anniversary observance, Legionnaires everywhere will take time to look to the future and prepare themselves for a second half century of meaningful service."

The State Legion planning of the Golden Anniversary observance is under the direction of William R. Huggard, past state commander, now of Newfoundland and a former Bergen County resident.

TO CORRECT A MISTAKE

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week the Armed Services Committee heard testimony from members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This testimony was designed, in part, to familiarize the members of the Armed Services Committee with the current situation with respect to major defense issues and problems preliminary to the initiation of our hearings later this month in connection with the fiscal year 1970 procurement authorization request. This testimony was taken in executive session and no members of the press were admitted.

I was dismayed to learn that since that testimony was taken, members of the news media made irresponsible and inaccurate statements concerning the testimony given to our committee. Specifically, I refer to reports that on the "Huntley-Brinkley" show of Thursday, March 13, and the "Today Show" of the 14th, it was alleged that General McConnell, the Air Force Chief of Staff, had told our committee that he favored a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

As I have stated, the testimony of all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was given to our committee in executive session.

I do not know the source of the statements made by these television commentators to the American public, and it is not my purpose here today to engage in a witch hunt. Rather, my purpose is solely to correct the record with respect to the testimony of the general. It is not my intention to state at this time what the general said—but I do want the record to clearly reflect that these commentators have inaccurately reported the facts. In so doing, these men have done a disservice and injustice to General McConnell.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the statement by Dr. Richard Barnet on the alternatives before the Nation with regard to the Vietnam war which I yesterday placed in the RECORD, I note that the Washington Post today contains an editorial which also emphasizes that it is time for a decision. The Washington Post editorial advocates a revision in the present military strategy and a reduction in U.S. troop strength in Vietnam as the first steps toward achieving a genuine deescalation of the war.

Secretary of Defense Laird's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday has left many doubts as to just what the administration's "objectives," as Secretary Laird termed it, are in Vietnam. Less than 2 weeks ago, in Saigon, Secretary Laird stated that he thought it would be possible to bring 50,000 American troops home from Vietnam within the next year. Yet yesterday, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary Laird reported that he saw "no indication that we presently have a program adequate to bring about a significant reduction in the U.S. military contribution in South Vietnam." He further stated that the MACV—Military Assistance Command, Vietnam—had told him that "no reduction in U.S. personnel would be possible in the absence of total withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops."

These comments simply do not square with the almost universal agreement during last year's political campaign—and, indeed, President Nixon's own statements as a candidate—that the war must be speedily terminated. If the administration's "objectives" in Vietnam continue to call for the indefinite presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam, it is up to the Congress to make it clear to the President that these objectives are no more acceptable now than when they were advanced by the Johnson administration. As the Washington Post today urges, the administration must recognize that "it is not a war to be won but a problem to be solved. In other words, the solution is not military but political; and this administration ought to take the first step in acknowledging that."

I insert at this point in the RECORD the editorial from March 20, 1969, Washington Post:

THE NECESSITY FOR CHOICE

The talks drag on at the Hotel Majestic in Paris, as each side waits for the other to modify an old position or propose a new one. The Saigon regime, growing in its confidence, sees to it that the militant Buddhist youth leader, Thich Thien Minh, receives a ten-year prison sentence (five of it in solitary confinement) on a charge of "harboring rebels, and concealing weapons and illegal documents." The killing continues, 400 American dead two weeks ago, 300 last week, in the episodic savagery of the war. On Tuesday, some 10,000 American and South Vietnamese troops launched an offensive near the Michelin plantation north of Saigon, where enemy divisions were said to be massing for a new assault. The American command calls its latest offensive Operation Atlas Wedge. So the killing will continue, while the waiting game proceeds at Paris.

The President and his advisers appear to believe, on what basis it is unclear, that there is time, perhaps as much as eight months' time, to come to terms in Paris. They appear to believe that the public will sit still for a strategy of talk-and-fight. It has been that way for some time, not only before the election but during the interregnum and after it. In November there were 664 battalion-sized offensive operations by the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN), and 89 by U.S. forces; there was one enemy battalion-sized offensive. In December, there were 824 ARVN operations, and 84 U.S. operations. The number of enemy battalion-sized offensive operations in these two months is, for some mystifying reason, classified. It is true, as the Pentagon has pointed out, that American battalion-size operations are down this year from last (129 in January 1968 vs. 84 in January 1969), and the ARVN way up—a demonstration, according to the military, of Saigon's increasing capacity to take care of itself. It ought also to be noted that American battalion-sized offensives are down because General Creighton Abrams, the American commander in South Vietnam, has decided to de-emphasize them; the emphasis is now on the small-unit patrol. Thus, while battalion-sized maneuvers may be down, the level of violence is not.

The general American offensive went on and lately the enemy has retaliated with its now-customary assault at Tet. It is problematical whether Hanoi or the National Liberation Front would have ceased and desisted if the Americans and Saigon had ceased and desisted, and in any case irrelevant: neither side did. Monotonous on television, relegated to the inside pages of the newspapers, the war is largely forgotten by the public.

It requires more than a cry of "Stop the killing!" to end a war; and it takes two sides to reach an agreement. But the Nixon Administration ought to understand that its period of grace is not limitless, that the silence from the war critics, in Congress and out of it, will not enduré indefinitely. Senator McGovern's speech Tuesday is only a foretaste of what is to come; the Nixon Administration, McGovern said, lacks the courage to reverse President Johnson's "tragic course" in Vietnam. It must now be clear to everyone that it is in the national interest to positively de-escalate the war, and that *stasis* is not a policy. Secretary Laird's grim assessment of the war is a startling example of this Administration's naivete. What he is saying essentially is that the allies cannot win (or, anyway, that they are not winning now), and that Saigon is not ready to assume its share of the struggle. Those are facts which everyone has known for three years or more. Change has been marginal, where there is any at all.

The White House is now proceeding with its own review of the war, and from that will assemble a new estimate of the situation on the ground in Vietnam. A new round of escalation is not only unthinkable, but from all the available evidence unnecessary (the two have not always gone together). It is all very well to be cool and guarded in press conferences, to issue warnings only once, to evince concern, to appear in control, and build public support. But at some point the Administration is going to have to choose: and the President and his associates should not mistake the current silence from the critics as acquiescence in the pres-

XUM

ent course. The firebrands, along with the rest of us, are waiting and watching for some sign that the new men in power understand the realities of the Vietnam war. First among them is that it is not a war to be won but a problem to be solved. In other words, the solution is not military but political; and this Administration ought to take the first step in acknowledging that. For openers, it might revise the rules of engagement in South Vietnam; and next, it might begin the process of reducing the American expeditionary force. Secretary Laird, in his posture statement, indicated that a troop reduction would not be possible because the South Vietnamese could not handle the insurgency. If Mr. Laird reads the record of the Vietnam war, he will find skeletons everywhere of men who pleaded for a bit more time, a bit more effort to convince the Saigon generals that this or that ought to be done. It is nonsense, of course. The Saigon government will never undertake its share of the war until it is forced to do it, and the only way to force it is for the Americans to begin the process of disengagement.

FLYING IS SAFER, NOT MORE DANGEROUS

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a new book was recently published which I believe merits the attention not only of the public and the Government agencies directly involved, but of the Members of Congress and other branches of Government.

The title of the book is "Loud and Clear," by Robert J. Serling. It probes deeply every aspect of aviation safety today—how crews are trained, what planes can and cannot do, what happens and why in fatal accidents and what is being done to forestall such accidents in the future.

It seems to me that in a world that depends so much on the quality of its transportation—and to an increasing degree, on the quality of its air transportation—Mr. Serling's frank and knowledgeable treatment of flight safety is both timely and significant. Mr. Serling is well qualified for the task he set for himself, being the author of several earlier books on aviation safety. He is thus well acquainted with the men and the world behind the airline scene. Mr. Serling is also a former aviation news editor of the UPI in Washington.

I was impressed by the review of Mr. Serling's book by Arnold B. Crank, which appeared in the Kansas City Star last month. It is so good that I thought it should be shared by my colleagues. For that reason I have asked the review be preserved for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Feb. 4, 1969]

FLYING IS SAFER, NOT MORE DANGEROUS

(By Arnold B. Crank)

Like the blast of cold, clear air following a fast moving cold front, Robert J. Serling's *Loud and Clear* cuts through the murk surrounding the state of safety in the air at the end of a decade of operations in the jet age.

Seeking neither heroes nor goats, he keeps straight on course with the chips of special interest flying where they may in a lucid and fair exposition of an often emotion-ridden subject.

Serling's *Probable Cause*, published in 1960, contained many of the elements of this book, but in more uncertain, immature ways. Experienced might be a better description of *Loud and Clear*. He always moved with certainty in the Washington hearing rooms where air crash investigations were underway. Now he has an expanded, more complete overall view with a better grasp and explanation of technical problems in air operations.

A searching view of air safety statistics reduces their seemingly overwhelming (underwhelming?) low accident death rate to something more believable and at the same time adding luster to a completely outstanding safety performance by the U.S. airlines. He shows how a fine-performing new airliner can lure a few of its pilots into a dangerous state of over-confidence, with others performing near incredible feats of skill in impossible-appearing emergencies.

The Federal Aviation Administration—he both pats and pans as he does Washington lawmakers who scream for air safety in public and sneak in a "no" vote when funds are needed to correct the very same situation they screamed about.

Fire is the "prime enemy of air safety," Serling points out. "The problem is simple. When a plane crashes, impact forces can tear open fuel tanks. The fuel thus is released in large quantities. This sudden and massive release results in rapid vaporization into a fine mist as the fuel instantly mixes with oxygen. All that is needed is an ignition source—and this is supplied with deadly ease. Just a spark generated by the friction of torn metal scraping a runway or other metal. Or the enormous heat from engines that have been operating at high temperatures, these white-hot components coming in contact with the fuel spray at impact."

"It is plain, therefore," he continues, "that prevention or suppression of fire after impact theoretically could have saved at least nine out of every 10 lives lost in previous crashes." He adds:

"It is to aviation's discredit—airline and government alike—that so little has been done in the past to conquer post-impact fire. Up until three years ago, there was very little research under way in this vital area . . .

"But if past research was dilatory, lackadaisical and even feeble, current efforts are not. There is almost as much attention being paid to the fire problem today as in prevention of air collisions. There has been no real break-through, but the outlook is promising and optimistic."

Serling looks to the very near future in an analysis of the safety engineering of the new "airbus" family of jumbo jets, one of which is the Boeing 747, a 450-passenger, 700,000-pound, 600-plus miles an hour transport. The ship is no dream; it nears test flights and perhaps for the first time designers seriously made safety a prime concern before rather than more or less an afterthought.

With a ship of this size and a price tag of 20 million dollars and up, mostly up, the result of an accident could shake the entire manufacturing, airline and insurance business to say nothing of the possible 400 or so dead passengers and crew.

Every component going into the ship is approved by five hand-picked, nit-picking safety experts who can overrule any or all of the 2,500 designers working on the 747 project, if any single design raises the slightest safety question. Similar close attention is being paid to the other current airbus designs, the McDonnell-Douglas DC-10 and the Lockheed 1100. Serling believes the result will be the safest airplanes ever built.

If the book serves only one purpose, it will be well worth the effort. In referring to many given situations, an easy way of communication is the "label" or "catch phrase." One such facile nothing-teller is "the crowded skies." Its use is easy for anyone who wishes to quickly indicate his complete ignorance of an extremely complex subject.

Serling adds more understanding by pointing out the "crowded skies" are limited not only to a relative handful of terminal areas, but to periods of the day when (1) air traffic peaks in these areas and (2) weather is bad. The FAA's air traffic control system then will not accept traffic which it cannot handle safely, and he concludes the inadequacies of air traffic control result in delays far more than in danger.

He points out, however, the present system is saturated and projected traffic increases must be met with funds, engineering, technical sophistication and continued effort by all in the universally accepted goal of complete aerial safety.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, composed of patriots and dedicated to God and country, recently celebrated its 50th anniversary. As a member of Moody-Davis Post No. 122, Utica, Miss., for 23 years, I was happy to join my fellow Legionnaires in commemorating this historic event Saturday evening here in Washington at the annual congressional dinner.

At the dinner, President Nixon, on behalf of his countrymen, accepted the American Legion's gift to the unknown soldiers of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

In a moving ceremony, President Nixon turned on the lights at the tombs of the Unknown at Arlington Cemetery, shortly after 9 p.m., March 15, 1969. Henceforth, Mr. Speaker, the tombs of these valiant men, symbolic of all Americans who have made the supreme sacrifice for freedom, will never be in darkness.

The earthly remains of these three men entombed in Arlington represent the bravery and courage of millions of Americans, both dead and alive, who were, and are, willing to protect and defend this great Nation.

In a fitting tribute to Mississippi Legionnaires, an editorial was published in the March 16 issue of the Clarion Ledger-Daily News, Jackson, Miss. It follows:

LEGION'S VITAL WORK TOLD IN 50TH YEAR OBSERVANCE

A salute goes today to the American Legion, a patriotic organization of war veterans that performs so many public and civic services that it would take seven legal-sized pages to innumerate them. The Legion is celebrating the 50th anniversary this year with the specific dates of March 15–17 marking a half century since the organization was formed in Paris in 1919.

The American Legion of Mississippi has grown from 1,000 members in 1919 to an average membership each year of 30,000, and nationally the Legion is the largest veterans organization with an average membership of 3,000,000 and a record of impressive influence in national, state and community affairs.

The story of the founding of the Legion in Mississippi is an interesting one. The sparkplugs of the movement began work in April 1919, after the order was formed in Paris only one month earlier.

The guiding lights of the Legion who gave unselfishly and unstintingly of their time, money and efforts. They traveled during any kind of weather over roads that at times were almost impassable if there was a chance of forming a Legion post.

It is to these men that the veterans of today owe an unrecorded debt of gratitude.

The names of most of these men exist only in the minds of some of the older members, but the results of their work has been written, and is still being written, into the history of this state and nation.

Alexander Fitz-Hugh of Vicksburg might be called the Father of the Legion in this state, because he called the meeting of ex-servicemen in April here in Jackson to form a temporary organization and elect delegates to the national caucus in St. Louis, May 12, 1919, to complete the national order's formal organization.

The temporary organization elected Fitz-Hugh as chairman; Major Frederick Sullens, colorful editor of the Jackson Daily News, was vice chairman and John M. Alexander of Jackson as secretary.

The following delegates were elected to attend the meeting at St. Louis; Alexander Fitz-Hugh, Fred Sullens, J. M. Alexander, A. B. Clark of Indianola, J. S. Fleming, Jr. of Natchez, W. T. Adams, Jr., Corinth, George C. Haskins of Brookhaven, R. Burnett, Vicksburg, Arthur Dunn, Vicksburg, C. R. Dalbey of Jackson, Paul Chambers of Jackson, and James H. Price, Jr. of McComb. These men were some of the founders of The American Legion.

We join all patriotic Mississippians in tribute to these men and salute the American Legion on its anniversary with the wish that they continue their fine services of their three vital programs under the Americanism Council, the Rehabilitation Council.

Their work is massive, running from baseball training teams to Boys State to widow's pensions and rehabilitating and getting a job for a crippled brother.

EDUCATOR RETIRES

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, not often does an individual pass through our lives whose very existence exemplifies the true meaning of dedication and service. I am proud that we in the First District have such a man in the person of Mr. A. H. Gnann, who has retired after 46 years as an educator, 23 of them as superintendent of the Burke County schools.

Mr. Gnann was born at Stillwell, Effingham County, Ga., on July 26, 1899, the son of Alvin Osgood Gnann and Lena Exley Gnann, who passed away on March 1 of this year.

Mr. Gnann attended and graduated from Effingham Academy in Springfield, Ga., and his first teaching assignment was at Stillwell Elementary School. From there he went to his second assignment, Effingham Academy, where he had been a student.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is an article which appeared in the True Citizen, Waynesboro, Ga., about this outstanding educator, whose vital part in the First District's public school system is unparalleled:

Educator To Retire After 46 Years

A career school man for 46 years, and the superintendent of Burke County schools for 23 of them, retires this year.

A. H. Gnann, who saw the county school budget go from $260,000 in 1945 to a proposed $2,400,000 for 1968, will not seek reelection to an office he's held for six consecutive terms.

He was born in the little town of Stillwell in Effingham County of parents who will celebrate their 70th wedding anniversary this year. His father, a school teacher for 20 years and a farmer, is 101 years old; his mother is 94.

Mr. Gnann attended Mt. Pleasant Collegiate Institute, has an AB degree from Newberry College in South Carolina and an MA degree from the University of South Carolina. He was principal three years at Chapin High School in South Carolina, then came to Sardis as principal of the school there in 1928. He and Mrs. Gnann, the former Miss Pearl Frick of Chapin, S.C., came to the Burke County town as bride and groom. She also taught in the Sardis school for a year.

"In the '30's, a principal did almost everything," he remembers. "I was coach, teacher, janitor, secretary, typist, ran the lunch room and kept records, all in my capacity as principal." He said when the school needed some extra money, and they often did, the faculty got together and put on a play in which they were actors, directors and producers. One he remembers netted $55 after weeks of work.

In 1945, after 17 years as principal of the Sardis school, he was appointed by the county board of education to fill the unexpired term of Frank Palmer who died just as he was beginning his fourth term in the office. Mr. Gnann has run successfully for the post since that time, with opposition only once.

Active in church and professional organizations, he was elected to honorary lifetime membership in the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers. He was a member of Pi Kappa Delta fraternity in college, has served as president of the First District Music Association, First District High School Association and district director of the State School Board Association. He was one of three men appointed by the State Board of Education to work with the state department to develop a curriculum program for all the state's schools. He is currently a member of the district and state County Superintendents Associations and is a former president of the county chapter of the Georgia Education Association.

A Sunday School teacher since college days, he is now a member of the board of trustees of the First Methodist Church of Waynesboro, is former chairman and secretary of the board of stewards and church charge leader. He currently teaches the adult men's Sunday school class.

Through the years he has been active in Boy Scout, Easter Seal and Red Cross work. He is a charter member and first president of the Sardis Lions Club, a former president of the Waynesboro Civitan Club and now president-elect of the Waynesboro Rotary Club. He is a member of the county board of health and the county library board and is listed in "Who's Who in the South and Southwest" and in "Georgia's Coastal Plain History" published by Lewis Historical Publishing Company.

Mr. and Mrs. Gnann have three children. Elaine, Mrs. Rabun O. Smith, formerly worked with the Department of Family and Children Services here and in Marietta. Heyward is a teacher in Gainesville. Mrs. W. R. Whitley Jr. (Shirley) is a former teacher in Newnan and at Ft. Benning. Her husband, Major Whitley, is a career Army officer.

He's seen remarkable changes occur in Burke County's schools in 23 years. For example, when he first became superintendent, there were 86 schools in the county. Currently there are 10 sites, 11 divisions. He was a principal during the depression years when teachers earned $45 a month. "Often workers on the campus grounds were earning $3.25 a day, while teachers were getting $2.25 a day," he said.

The county school budget was $260,000 for the 1945–46 school year, when Mr. Gnann first took over as principal. The proposed budget for the 1968–69 year is $2,400,000.

"These are the greatest changes", he said. He noted that enrollment figures have not changed greatly during the years and attributes that to the out-migration of Negro population due to farm mechanization.

He points with pride to the improvement of the certification of teachers, quality of instruction and better curriculum.

He believes some of the schools' greatest needs, "in addition to the big need, more money," include an overall county-wide institutional supervisor, reading specialists, more in-service training for teachers, a program to care for the needs of students who could better use vocational rather than academic training, more classes for the retarded, and a kindergarten tied in with the school program.

"The biggest problem through the years has been in financing, attracting and holding good teachers," he said. "We need the money to go out and find the best and make them feel secure; we've had to fill places, rather than seek teachers," he continued.

'Better educated young people come out of today's high schools than did 20 years ago; better is offered, of course, and they seem to realize that the need for better educated people is greater today than ever before," he said.

"I have always been interested in the growth and development of boys and girls and will miss my contacts with them when I retire. I've seen many changes and will follow with interest the future educational course of the county."

With those words, a dedicated professional with nearly a half century of service to education, retires.

A HEARTENING DEVELOPMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, just recently press accounts reported that a favorable development would soon be forthcoming in the case of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department security officer who gave documents to a Senate subcommittee to refute false testimony against himself rendered by one of his superiors. Specifically, it was reported that Mr. Otepka would be offered a position with the Subversive Activities Control Board, a quasi-judicial body which hears cases involving organizations and individuals charged with activities in the field of subversion.

Yesterday, the press accounts were proved to be true with the announcement from the White House that President Nixon was sending the nomination of Mr. Otepka to the Senate for confirmation as a commissioner of the SACB. This is certainly a reassuring turn of events in a case which saw two State Department officials resign in the face of possible perjury charges while Otto

XUM

Otepka gave nothing but truthful testimony throughout this case of over 5 years' duration.

During this long and arduous conflict, the power of the press was used to its fullest by Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune, who did yeoman work in keeping the American public aware of the latest developments over the years. I include the article, "Nixon To Ask Senate To OK Otepka for Subversive Board," by Mr. Edwards, and appearing in the Chicago Tribune of March 20, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

NIXON TO ASK SENATE TO OK OTEPKA FOR SUBVERSIVE BOARD

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington, March 19.—The White House today announced that President Nixon was sending to the Senate the nomination of Otto F. Otepka as a member of the subversive activities control board.

Acclaim for this action came from both Democrats and Republicans. Swift Senate approval was predicted, thus writing a triumphal climax to one of the most celebrated legal struggles against government harassment in modern history.

"Justice has triumphed," said Chairman James O. Eastland [D., Mi.] of the Senate judiciary committee which will consider the Otepka nomination. He said he saw no obstacles to speedy committee and Senate indorsement of the appointment.

HAILED BY DIRKSEN

"The nomination is Otepka's vindication after years of persecution," said Sen. Dirksen (R., Ill.), minority leader, also a committee member. "It gives justice to a man badly treated for conscientious performance of his duties."

Otepka, notified of the Presidential nomination by his attorney, Roger Robb, agreed that the nomination constituted vindication and "complete refutation of the charges against me by the state department" under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

TELLS HIS AIMS

Noting that he had been stripped of security duties by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Otepka said:

"I am particularly happy and grateful to President Nixon for his expression of confidence in returning me to a position properly related to my experience and background in the security field.

"I intend to devote to my new duties the same industry and conscientious effort to advance the cause of national security and to improve the merit system which characterized my entire service."

Ronald Ziegler, White House press secretary, was asked if the President regarded the nomination as "vindication for Otto Otepka."

Noting the White House statement which recited Otepka's 35 years in government service which gained him the high rank of deputy director, office of security, in the state department under the Eisenhower administration. Ziegler replied:

"The appointment speaks for itself because Mr. Otepka is experienced in subversive activities. He is well qualified to fill the vacancy on the subversive activities control board."

TOP U.S. AGENCY

The board is a top federal agency, exercising a quasi-judicial authority in ruling on individuals and organizations accused by the attorney general of subversive operations.

Members of the five-man board receive a $36,000 annual salary. The term to which Otepka was appointed expires Aug. 9, 1970, but the chairmanship will be vacant before then and Otepka's supporters in Congress are urging that he be given that post.

In November 1963, Otepka was fired by Secretary Rusk on charges of conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

As the state department's top security officer, Otepka had refused to waive security investigations for high officials appointed under the Kennedy administration. He had also given candid testimony to the Senate internal security subcommittee about lax security in the department, furnishing evidence which forced the resignation of two officials detected in false testimony under oath.

His ordeal was described by the subcommittee, after four years of investigating, as "extraordinary and calculated harassment" of a government employe for performing his duties. It included isolation, surveillance, phone-tapping, and planting of evidence to justify trumped-up charges.

Otepka never surrendered. He fought back in hearings before a state department panel and the Civil Service commission. Rusk was forced in December, 1967, to drop most of the charges and cancel the discharge.

RUSK CUT SALARY

But Rusk ordered a severe reprimand noted on Otepka's hitherto unblemished record and demoted him a grade, cutting his salary from $20,000 to $14,000. He also forbade him to engage in security work.

Dirksen noted that Otepka's restoration to security duties was highly significant.

"It places Otepka in a role where he can carry on in a high capacity to improve the security of the nation," he said.

NO CHINA STRATEGY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, economists turned nuclear war strategists have suggested to our Foreign Affairs Committee that we have no strategy to follow in case of war with mainland China and described any possible use of nuclear force against Red China as "witless and tragic."

Perhaps what the economists were really trying to tell the country is that we have no blueprint for war—all our plans have been predicated on surrender, we just cannot decide to whom. The Chinese Reds cannot even decide who is running Red China.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a news release by Mr. Orr Kelly of March 19 from the Evening Star for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, March 19, 1969]

U.S. STRATEGY FOR CHINA WAR CALLED LACKING

(By Orr Kelly)

It would be both "witless and tragic" for the United States to use against China nuclear force with which it has threatened the Soviet Union for the last 20 years, a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee has been warned.

Dr. Thomas Schelling, professor of economics at Harvard and a nuclear war strategist, told the subcommittee yesterday that the U.S. has neglected to develop a strategy that it could follow in case of war with mainland China.

"I dislike mentioning this, because it sounds too warlike, and I do not feel warlike towards Communist China," Schelling said. "My worry is that the Vietnamese war or a Korean crisis or another crisis over Taiwan or another attack on India might possibly escalate into something involving the Chinese mainland.

"And I would not like to see our nuclear behavior towards China guided by some concept, like 'assured destruction,' as were developed over the years in relation to a very different kind of adversary and a very hypothetical war.

SEES ALLY TO UNITED STATES

"I like to remind myself from time to time that every Chinese civilian is a citizen of a country allied to the United States, and one of our responsibilities in case of war is to protect them and their homeland.

"Punishing virtually millions of Chinese for the sins we impute to a usurping authority that we do not even recognize as their government, and doing it merely because this is what for 20 years we essentially threatened against Russia, and because for 20 years this is the way we equipped ourselves, would be both witless and tragic."

Another witness, Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute and a prolific writer on the problems of thermonuclear war, agreed with Schelling on the problem but said he thought that more attention had been given to it than Schelling indicated.

WOULD LIMIT CASUALTIES

Both men agreed that, in event of war with China, the United States would want to keep civilian casualties among the Chinese to a minimum while striking at the Chinese war-making potential through bombing or even seizure of some part of Chinese territory.

"We should be particular in avoiding civilian loss," Kahn said. "We don't want to kill 100 million Chinese and then discover we didn't have to. . . . One thing we can't do is kill 100 million or 200 million Chinese for relatively frivolous reasons."

Schelling and Kahn both told the committee they favored the President' decision to deploy a missile defense system although Schelling said he had been violently opposed to the Sentinel system.

"We have been give a reasonable—perhaps the best—schedule and deployment of a ballistic missile defense," Schelling said.

MAFIA POSTAL OPERATION

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I note with satisfaction the action of a Federal grand jury in New York City which yesterday indicted four Post Office Department officials and the members of a Mafia-connected firm that was leasing mail delivery trucks to the Department.

This incredible contract, whereby the U.S. Government was doing business with racketeers and thugs, went on for 3 years.

Further—and equally disturbing—these underworld characters got loans of hundreds of thousands of the taxpayers' dollars from the Small Business Administration to finance their trucking company.

This latter deal has yet to result in grand jury action, but I am confident that a thorough Justice Department investigation will result in the opening of yet another atrocious misuse of Federal funds.

I include for the RECORD at this point a newspaper article outlining the charges brought by the grand jury against this firm and the Post Office Department officials who dealt with them:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 20, 1969]

ALLEGED MAFIA MEMBER, OTHERS ARE ACCUSED OF POST OFFICE FRAUD—MASIELLO, ANR LEASING, AND FOUR POST OFFICE OFFICIALS NAMED IN BRIBERY-CONSPIRACY INDICTMENT

NEW YORK.—A Federal grand jury indicted a reputed member of the Genovese Mafia family, his son, an official of one of the companies he controls, and four U.S. Post Office officials on charges of bribery, conspiracy to defraud the U.S. Post Office Department, and violation of the Federal antiracketeering statute.

Also named as a defendant in the 19-count indictment was ANR Leasing Corp., one of the companies controlled by John A. Masiello, the reputed soldier in the Vito Genovese Mafia family. Randen Trucking Co., a "shell" company allegedly created by Masiello to secure a Post Office contract, was named as a co-conspirator, but not as a defendant.

Last week, in testimony before the New York State Investigation Commission, it was disclosed that Masiello, who also has been identified as a prominent loan shark in the New York area, received $466,000 in Small Business Administration loans for his companies. The matter currently is being investigated by Federal authorities.

Testimony during the State Investigation Commission hearings on organized crime's infiltration into business also disclosed that Masiello received $292,000 and 25,000 shares of Nylo-Thane Plastics Corp. common stock from the company's chairman, who said he paid out $458,000 and 65,000 shares of stock for protection "to keep the hoodlums of Long Island off my back."

Indicted with Masiello, who is 49 years old, were his son, John A. Masiello Jr., 22, and Thomas A. McKeever, 48, an ex-convict who is vice president and secretary of ANR Leasing. According to State Investigation Commission, the ANR Leasing, a Bronx, N.Y., truck and car leasing company, is part of Masiello's Setmar Holding Corp.

The Post Office officials indicted were Isidore Kihl, 67, superintendent of vehicle operations for the New York Post Office; Andrew T. Daly, 52, assistant superintendent, Joseph A. Maisto, 49, tour superintendent, and Michael J. Albanese, 52, administrative assistant to the superintendent.

Robert M. Morgenthau, U.S. Attorney here, said that ANR Leasing provided the Post Office with trucks and tractors from April 1965 until June 1968 on a lease basis. The contracts were secured through competitive bidding, Mr. Morgenthau said. According to authorities, the contracts were valued at about $2 million.

When ANR Leasing's contract was canceled by the Post Office in June 1968 because of Masiello's "lack of suitable integrity," Mr. Morgenthau said, Masiello relet the same equipment to the Post Office through Randen Trucking, the corporate shell. According to the indictment, the postal officials concealed from their superiors the fact that the two Masiellos and McKeever owned and operated Randen.

While the contracts were in effect, Mr. Morgenthau said, the postal officials received "favors" ranging from $200 cash to paid expenses at the Montmarte Hotel in Miami Beach for overlooking complaints about Masiello and the service he was providing and for concealing Masiello's interest in Randen.

The indictment also charges that the two Masiellos and McKeever paid two of Mr. Kihl's Miami hotel bills amounting to a total of more than $1,000, and obtained a color television set for him at a reduced price. Mr. Daly was paid $650 over a three-year period, according to the indictment, and Mr. Maisto was paid $150. Hotel bills totaling $750 also were paid for Mr. Maisto and Mr. Albanese.

James D. Zirin, the assistant U.S. Attorney who presented the case to the grand jury, said that Masiello, his son and McKeever, if convicted, could each receive a maximum of 95 years' imprisonment and be fined $130,000 each.

Mr. Kihl could be sentenced to a maximum of 45 years in jail and fined $70,000, he said, and Mr. Daly could receive 50 years' imprisonment and a $70,000 fine. Mr. Maisto, if convicted, could be sentenced to 40 years in jail and fined $60,000, and Mr. Albanese could be imprisoned for 25 years and fined $40,000.

LEVI ESHKOL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Emanuel Neumann, the chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency, presented an inspiring and fitting eulogy to Prime Minister Levi Eshkol of Israel. Dr. Neumann has been associated with Zionism and the State of Israel since World War I, having performed such important tasks as serving as the president of the Zionist Organization of America and is presently chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency. He was involved in the negotiations with the U.S. Department of State and offered testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the crucial days prior to the rebirth of the State of Israel, and also appeared before the United Nations during the deliberations on the Palestine partition plan.

As a man long associated with the State of Israel and a personal friend of the late Prime Minister of Israel, it was appropriate that Dr. Neumann offer the tribute to Levi Eshkol at the national memorial service held in New York. Just as Levi Eshkol worked diligently throughout his life for the cause of Israel, so has Dr. Neumann devoted his formidable talents to the cause of his fellow Jews.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Neumann's eloquent tribute follows:

LEVI ESHKOL—A EULOGY

(By Dr. Emanuel Neumann)

We are met today to join with our brothers and sisters in Israel and throughout the world in mourning the passing of Levi Eshkol, Prime Minister of Israel. It is fitting that we do so, both because of the exalted office he has occupied and because of himself: the man, the pioneer, the builder of a new nation and a new society.

His career was exemplary in its inner harmony, its integrity and the classic purity of its outlines. There was not a year, not a month, hardly a day that he did not devote to the central objective of his life: the recreation of a free Judea as the seat of a free and flourishing Jewish civilization.

Levi Eshkol came to Palestine as an eighteen year old, as part of the Second Aliyah. He came determined to put into daily practice all that he had learned and accepted of the purposes and principles of Halutziut. He settled in Degania, a mother and model of halutz settlements. It was there in Degania that his love for the soil of the Homeland deepened into a consuming passion which glowed within him throughout life and illuminated his personality. Within a few years he blossomed out. It became his ambition and appointed task to assist and direct other groups of would-be settlers to find themselves, to strike root, wherever it might be, throughout the land. In the end there was hardly any part of the country that did not bear the mark of his care and concern.

He loved the soil; but soil also meant water! Water was the critical factor in increasing the fertility of an area, and therefore also its absorptive capacity. This truth led him into that great and determined quest for water, wherever it could be found. It was a quest which filled years of his life before and during World War II, and involved him deeply in the great Water Company, Mekorot.

While soil and water were thus at the core of his Zionist concerns, he could not insulate himself from other aspects of the life and problems of the Yishuv. Foremost among these was physical security. And again Eshkol placed himself, as necessary, at the disposal of the Haganah. He became Ben-Gurion's right-hand man in matters of defense and especially in arming and equipping Haganah units.

Throughout his manifold endeavors and his steady rise, Eshkol retained his simplicity, his natural modesty and his remarkable ability to remain close to people, to relate to them and their problems, personally, and in comradely spirit.

For many years Eshkol was a leading Member of the Jewish Agency Executive, as its treasurer and as head of its Agricultural Settlement Department. Those of us who were privileged to sit on that Executive can never forget with what love and devotion he applied himself to those responsibilities. At the same time he was in growing demand, so far as the government was concerned. He finally joined the Cabinet, officially as Minister of Finance—and unofficially—also as the trusted friend and counsellor of the Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion. In those capacities he carried many crushing burdens on his shoulders. When he wound up as Prime Minister, this honor appeared to come as the climax and crowning glory of the long and adventurous journey. But it was not so, for he was to face the greatest challenge of his life in the Spring of 1967 and the Six Day War.

That he headed the government during that grave crisis, that he surmounted and survived it, that he led his people in triumph and lived to see that great outpouring of devotion, of generosity, of identification with Israel which swept through the Jewish communities of the world and has not spent its force to the present day—these are things for which we should be grateful, things that can serve to assuage our grief.

Over the years Eshkol had built up and maintained an ever closer relationship with our people in this country. He visited and revisited America, ever weaving the web of partnership in our common endeavor. We, all of us, were of the family.

Indeed, to many of us, to most of us here, Levi Eshkol has been a real friend; and we part from him now in warm friendship. He was deeply human. His was the kindly eye, the witty saying, the apt quotation, the quick sympathy, the helping hand, the understanding heart. He was generous of spirit, viewing friend and foe alike, without malice. He sought to allay tensions, to reduce the distances that separated man from man and group from group. He was essentially the peacemaker. Constantly he would seek the healing effect of compromise.

All of his qualities, including the notable absence of searing faults, his complete dedication, his tenacity of purpose, his perseverance, his all-embracing love—these and many other gifts—raised him high in the esteem and affection of his people. Certain it is that he will continue to live on in our midst; and certain it is that he has won for himself an honored place in the annals of our people, where his name will be forever noted as that of a great builder of Israel. May his memory be a blessing!

XUM

BETTY KLARIC HONORED FOR ANTIPOLLUTION EFFORTS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, clean water should be the right of every U.S. citizen. Since her first assignment for the Cleveland Press, this has been Miss Betty Klaric's motto as in the true spirit of Susan B. Anthony and Jane Addams, she has spent the past 5 years crusading vigorously for clean air and water. In her efforts to arouse public interest and awareness of the critical pollution problems facing our Nation's cities and Cleveland in particular, Miss Klaric has demonstrated the powerful influence of the press in affecting vital policy decisions.

Her influential role in affecting passage of the city's $100,000,000 antipollution bond issue is a well-acknowledged fact, as she launched her campaign last year to "Save Lake Erie Now."

Miss Klaric's enthusiastic and tireless endeavors have won her a distinguished tribute from the Scripps-Howard Foundation. In recognition of her outstanding contributions in the field of conservation, Miss Klaric was recently honored as the first prize winner of the Edward J. Meeman Awards.

I would like to congratulate Miss Klaric on this occasion and urge her, in behalf of the Cleveland community, to continue her excellent work. As one who shares her commitment to clean air and water for every American, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the following article from the Cleveland Press commending Miss Klaric:

[From the Cleveland Press, Mar. 7, 1969]

BETTY KLARIC WINS POLLUTION AWARD

Betty Klaric, The Press' and Cleveland's crusader for clean water and air, today was named winner of a $1000 first prize by the Scripps-Howard Foundation's Edward J. Meeman Awards.

The Meeman Awards are for reportorial efforts in the cause of conservation. They are named for the late editor of the Memphis Press-Scrimitar and Scripps-Howard conservation editor.

Since Miss Klaric was assigned to report the pollution problems of this community five years ago she has won many awards and honors, national and local, for making the public aware that water and air pollution are critical urban ailments.

There is little doubt that her anti-pollution writings effectively set the stage for voter approval of a $100,000,000 bond issue to transform the city's anti-pollution program from talk to action.

Miss Klaric was cited today for her year-long 1968 crusade to arouse public support in her "Save Lake Erie Now" campaign.

Second prize of $750 was awarded to Robert H. Sollen of the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press. Months before the disastrous Pacific Ocean oil well leak, he wrote a series warning that oil spills from offshore drilling could ruin Santa Barbara shore environment.

Five $500 third prizes went to Seymour Marks, Long Island Press; William V. Shannon, New York Times; Dave Otto, Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette; Lou Grant, Oakland Tribune, and Alton Blakeslee, Associated Press.

Three $250 fourth prizes went to Andrew Sparks, Atlanta Journal-Constitution; David A. Zarkin, Boise (Ida.) Statesman, and John Hanchette, Niagara Falls Gazette.

LIFE

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following poem entitled "Life," which was written by 10-year-old Kathi Starkey, of route 306, Monsey, N.Y., while she was a patient in Good Samaritan Hospital in Suffern, N.Y.

Kathi may face further hospitalization. In addition, her twin sisters, age 6, have both been stricken with cerebral palsy which may serve to explain the remarkable outlook and knowledge of this little girl which should serve as an inspiration to all of us during these difficult days.

The poem follows:

LIFE

(Written and composed by Kathi Starkey)

Life can be joyful—Life can be sad,
The times had, can be good,
And at times, it may be bad.
Yet, life still goes on.

These are the things I think from my heart,
We should be one nation and not apart,
People should walk, hand in hand
And help each other to the Promised Land.

All you hear is war, war, war
And when you ask people to help, they slam the door.

I look up at the sun, over the tree
And I think, how lucky "I" am, that God made me.
But, some people can't see these things,
Some people can't walk outside, to see the sun,
And some people can't talk—to anyone.
Now, these wars are sad, but these are only a few
And I think it's a shame, if you think of only You.
People say, "What can I do?
Just think though
The only person that can help is you!

We can't be smart
We don't use our head,
And we don't use our heart
To really care about anyone, until he is dead.

But, if you stop and help right now,
Constructive work—not asking "How".
Then in your heart, something happens there—
You have stopped being selfish and began to really care.

This isn't as easy, as it may seem
But this is my prayer, this is my dream,
"That people lacking the pleasures—
Can someday gain these little treasures."

Why do You think, God sent us down?
But to help in our country and here in our town.
Some people yet, don't realize this
And the whole point of life—is what they miss.

I do pray, these wars turn out all right,
Why can't we be free?
Free, from all these fights.
Don't you agree?

(NOTE.—My thoughts in this poem is taken from my everyday life. The "wars" I refer to, are the wars I read about and hear about now. I also think that "war" means, the integration problem, the sick, the poor, the aged, the handicapped, every hurt in life is war, these are my thoughts.)

STARVATION IN BIAFRA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the international effort to eliminate starvation in Biafra, the United States has offered to the International Red Cross the use of eight cargo planes which will be able to deliver 300 tons of food to Biafra each day.

We have given over $23 million in relief assistance—surplus food, medical supplies, and other materials necessary to combat manmade famine.

Hundreds of thousands of Biafrans, most of them children, have already died of hunger. While our efforts and those of the international relief mission may slow the death rate, they will not stop it.

We should make every effort to eliminate this human misery and, although we have taken great steps forward in this effort, we are now confronted by another problem—the lack of local food to complement our shipments.

In connection with this new problem of aiding Biafra, I include an excellent article written by Desmond O'Grady as a special report to the National Catholic Reporter, a weekly newspaper published in Kansas City and distributed throughout the United States.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and urge that it be given serious thought with the hope that we can take some action which will further intensify our efforts to aid the starving people of an embattled country:

NEW CRISIS LOOMS IN BIAFRA

(By Desmond O'Grady)

ROME.—The soaring starvation rate in Biafra has leveled off, at least temporarily, but there's another crisis dead ahead.

That's the gist of the report Father Anthony Byrne brought to Rome this month when he reported to Caritas Internationalis on the Biafran airlift. Father Byrne, 36, is an Irish Holy Ghost missionary who is in charge of the relief flights from the island of Sao Tome.

"During Christmas week in Biafra, I saw the first results of the relief flights; the spread of kwashiorkor disease (malnutrition) among the children, has been arrested," he told an interviewer. "Instead of the children being listless with swollen bellies and scabies, they have begun smiling again and their skin is healing.

"The morale in Biafra is much higher now than three months ago, but another acute crisis is brewing."

The crisis will be caused by a lack of local food, he said.

He explained that the mercy flights have been bringing concentrated protein into Biafra, and the shipments are mixed with local foods. However, the food shortage last year was so acute that hardly any of the yams—Biafra's staple food—were kept for their seeds and new crops were not planted.

XUM

As a result, in a few weeks there will be scarcely any local foods to mix with the proteins.

This means the mercy flights will have to somehow include carbohydrates as well as proteins, Father Byrne explained.

The four U.S.-supplied Globemasters may solve even this problem, he added. The priest calculated that when the giant cargo planes go into operation next month they will triple the average of 100 tons of supplies delivered to Biafra nightly.

On the night of Jan. 2–3, church operation (involving Caritas Internationalis, U.S. Catholic Relief services and two European Protestant agencies, Diakonische Werk and Nordchurchaid) completed its thousandth flight since they began in March, 1968.

Flights have become progressively more difficult. Nigerian gun boats and radar-guided land batteries have intensified their activity. Since November, relief planes have been followed to the improvised airport and bombed after landing. Two planes have been hit and one destroyed.

Toward the end of 1968 Caritas began to move some children from Biafra. It established a hospital for them on the island of Sao Tome. Some 150 are being treated there and care is assured for another 750, in Gabon.

But the problem seems less urgent with the establishment in Biafra of more than 900 feeding centers serving more than 200,000 meals per month. For the moment most of the children are being fed. Those rehabilitated in Sao Tome return to Biafra and their place is taken by others.

But whether the slight improvement in the Biafran food situation will be maintained depends in the short-term on the employment of the Globemasters alongside the six planes of the joint church aid group and the International Red Cross craft.

It also depends on the flow of aid. Caritas officials in Rome admit the difficulty of convincing people that the Biafran situation remains dramatic.

"We have always been wary of sensational figures," said Father Nicholas Frank of the Caritas secretariat, "but people are dying of starvation there and we can be involved in an even greater tragedy in coming months. Nobody thought it would continue this long and, inevitably, people begin to lose interest. But the problem is still there."

"It is a pity," said Father Byrne, "that the effort could not have gone into development work."

Instead, $2,318,992 has gone into keeping an emergency operation going. The joint church effort is spending $1,000 daily just to get the supplies, most of which are donated, into Biafra. Funds at the moment are sufficient to cover flights for little more than a month.

The future of Biafra is obscure, but it seems likely that relief for the area torn by this civil war will continue for many years. Both voluntary agencies and governments have to estimate the repercussions of their immediate aid on future relations with Nigeria

The Nigerian government protested against the U.S. initiative in providing four Globemasters for the joint church operation and another four for the International Red Cross. The Red Cross relief flights from Fernando Po have been blocked since December while an agreement with the island's new government is being negotiated

The Lagos *Post*, on Dec. 30, described the U.S. grant of the planes as "a hostile act."

"We know," the paper said, "the United States government works through several agencies such as the CIA, the International Committee of the Red Cross, church organizations like Caritas, and even private individuals in the guise of business tycoons."

The tone of the editorial showed that although the Nigerian bishops, after their visit to Rome in December, rejected the accusations that the Pope and Caritas were aiding the Biafra secessionists, the suspicion persists.

Statements like this ignore Caritas' $1 million worth of aid to Nigeria as well as the $1.5 million to Biafra in the last quarter of 1968. But they indicate the bitterness which will remain even if the shooting stops.

WESTERN ELECTRIC CO. TO LOCATE IN NEWARK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent decision of Western Electric Co. to build an 18-story office building in the city of Newark, in the 10th Congressional District which I have the privilege to represent.

I welcome wholeheartedly this decision and I hope that Western Electric's example of confidence in the future of the city will spur other businesses and industries to share in the revitalization of this great but ailing city whose tax ratables have suffered in recent years.

Physically, the new $20 million structure will enhance the Newark Plaza project. And equally important is the help that Western Electric will provide the city in revenue to assist in balancing the city's declining ratable base.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the "vote of confidence" that Western Electric has given to Newark, and I include in the Congressional Record the excellent editorial from the Star-Ledger of March 18, 1969, describing Western Electric's heartening and enlightened action.

A Vote of Confidence

The decision of Western Electric Co. to build an 18-story office building in Newark could provide a significant economic impetus for a city that is undergoing radical changes in a massive redevelopment program.

The new structure, which could enhance the Newark Plaza project already under way, represents a move in a constructive direction for a municipality that must look toward a revitalization of its property tax base.

Newark's ratables have suffered from a steady attrition in recent years; a large chunk of valuations has been removed from the tax rolls by tax-exempt construction that includes the Rutgers-Newark College of Engineering complex, the State College of Medicine and Dentistry and the site for the proposed Essex County Community College.

The $20 million W.E. building will be a welcome addition to the city's reduced valuation, and along with the Plaza project should do much to reverse the downward trend. In a land-scarce built-up urban community, high-rise commercial structures constitute highly desirable assets.

The new structure not only will help the revitalization of an area that deteriorated radically in recent years but it will complement the general physical character of the section, which will include office buildings, bank, theater, motel and stores. It is the nucleus of an entirely new business center for Newark.

It is the kind of positive corporate affirmation that a re-building city sorely needs as an impetus to attract other large capital investments by business and industry. An economic expansion of this type would provide a healthy offsetting revenue producing balance that would aid materially in broadening the city's ratable base.

RETALIATION—CONTRASTS IN WORLD LEADERSHIP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our policymakers and advisers give greater weight to so-called world community opinion than to the lives of American fighting men and their families.

Yet, in the Mideast four Israeli soldiers are killed by a mine, and what happens—their government orders a swift retaliation by air strikes against guerrilla positions in Jordan.

On a desolate island between Soviet Russia and Red China, a few loud-mouthed Communists exchange words, get into a "cuss fight," then a shootout. What happens—the Soviet command is now threatening the Red Chinese with atomic missiles.

Even Britain will bristle, as shown by her majestic military strength being thrown against little Anguilla, an island just off the coast of the United States with a population of 6,000.

The Peruvian Government orders its warships to fire on U.S. fishing vessels and in final retaliation captures our men and boats.

Our diplomats' excuse is that regardless of U.S. losses we must refrain from retaliation because the Soviets and other countries might not sign the Nonproliferation Treaty.

Have we so deescalated ourselves that we have retreated from a "no win" policy to a "no defense" policy? What American really subscribes to any theory that self-defense is not permissible because it may offend a mythical "world community opinion?"

I place several articles from the Evening Star for March 19 at this point in the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

Israeli Jets Pound Arabs in Retaliation for Attack

Tel Aviv.—Israeli jets streaked across the Jordan River today for the third time in four days to hammer Arab guerrilla positions at the foot of the Gilead Mountains.

Flames and smoke rose as about four warplanes alternately strafed and bombed.

The raid followed a mortar attack on Israeli forces near Neve Ur, nine miles south of the Sea of Galilee. The army said there were no casualties in that action.

On Monday, Israeli jets hit three major Arab guerrilla bases in Jordan, one only six miles from Amman, the Jordanian capital. Today's action appeared concentrated at Al-Manshiya, just south of the Sea of Galilee.

The Israeli radio reported that four soldiers were wounded today when their vehicle ran over a mine at Khan Yunis, on the Mediterranean Coast.

In Amman, a Jordanian military spokesman said Jordanian forces wounded three

XUM

Israeli soldiers during a 25-minute clash in the northern Jordan valley today.

He said the Israelis started the fighting by firing machine guns and mortars on Jordanian forces at Noshan. The fire was returned and the Jordanians suffered no losses, he said.

In Beirut, the Lebanese newspaper Al Jarida speculated that King Hussein of Jordan might abdicate if the Middle East crisis is not resolved soon. The paper said Hussein told President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt and Saudia Arabia's King Faisal he found his situation "intolerable" and planned to convey the same message to President Nixon.

"Hussein has made certain arrangements pertaining to him personally and to his family in preparation for any possible step," said Al Jarida.

In Jerusalem, Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir said yesterday she would be glad to talk about peace in the Middle East with Hussein if he is interested.

"It depends entirely on the king," Mrs. Meir told her first news conference. She added she had only one question for Arab leaders: "Are you prepared to live in peace with Israel?"

In 1947, the former Milwaukee schoolteacher slipped secretly into Jordan to meet Hussein's grandfather, King Abdullah, in a vain attempt to prevent an Arab-Israeli war when the British gave up control of Palestine.

(In Cairo, the semi-official Egyptian newspaper Al Ahram said today Israel was massing missiles for an attack on Arab positions along the Suez Canal, United Press International reported.

(Al Ahram said Egyptian artillery gunners inflicted severe losses on the Israelis in that battle despite Israel's use of moving tanks and armored cars firing from deep within the Sinai Peninsula.

("All reports indicate the enemy might try to engage us again using mobile rocket launchers he is massing at great distances inside Sinai," the newspaper warned.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

Soviets Broadcast A-Threat to China

(By Victor Zorza)

London.—The Kremlin has implied the threat of nuclear retaliation against China in the event of serious trouble on the border.

The threat was made in Moscow broadcasts to China, which claim to be replying to the "display of might on our border." The Moscow reply said that "the whole world knows that the main weapons of the Soviet armed forces are their missiles" with nuclear warheads of an "unlimited" destructive power.

They could hit targets with pinpoint accuracy, the radio said, and also could be launched from nuclear submarines or aircraft.

NO NUCLEAR WARHEADS

The Chinese language broadcast also carried, as a separate item, the recent Soviet note to Peking which said that Russia would give a "crushing rebuff" to Chinese attempts to violate Soviet territory.

What forces could Mao Tse-tung muster? The radio broadcast asked. "Does he have rockets capable of carrying warheads? As we know, the Chinese armed forces have no such weapons," it said.

As against Soviet aircraft that could fly at very high altitudes at twice the speed of sound, the broadcast said, China has only "a limited number of fighters," very much out of date, and greatly inferior to Soviet aircraft in speed, ceiling and firepower.

China's ground forces, too, rely on out-of-date equipment, while the Soviet army's "great combat strength" is based on tactical nuclear missiles. Its mobility enables the Soviet army to maneuver with lightning speed and to mount operations in his rear, the broadcast said.

One such "rear area," presumably is Sinkiang, in the western sector of the Sino-Soviet frontier, whose native population has strong links with the nationalities on the Soviet side.

Soviet broadcasts, which often had sought to stir the people of Sinkiang against their Chinese rulers, have been beaming dangerously provocative propaganda to Sinkiang since the island incidents on the Ussuri River.

They tell the Sinkiang Kazakhs that they are being "shamelessly exploited" by the Chinese.

The broadcasts say that fresh Chinese forces which are being moved into Sinkiang, under the pretext of border trouble with Russia, now number some 400,000 men.

These troops were "suppressing" the local people, deporting them from the border areas, forcing them to leave their fertile soil" for sterile, barren lands, and "exterminating" the non-Chinese nationalities.

PHOTOGRAPHS PUBLISHED

"The people of Sinkiang," said the broadcast, "are no longer masters of their birthplace," and the Chinese military administration established in their area was "now ready to proclaim a state of war."

The Soviet warning to China shows how seriously the Kremlin regards the danger of escalation. But the Russians also may contribute to the very escalation which they fear.

Today's Moscow newspapers again speak of the continuing buildup of forces on the Chinese side of the border, while Peking papers published photographs of the "crime" committed by Soviet troops in infringing the Chinese border.

A poem by Evgeni Evtushenko, the popular Soviet poet, reminds the Russian people of Chinese designs on their land, and rejects Chinese dreams of ruling over Russian people.

Peking's own propaganda is more restrained than it has been for some days—but this looks very much like the quiet before the storm.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

British Land on Anguilla, Meet With No Opposition

(By Smith Hempstone)

London.—British paratroopers landed on the rebel Caribbean island of Anguilla shortly before 6 a.m. today. They encountered no resistance from President Ronald Webster's breakaway regime, a Foreign Office spokesman said.

Webster late last night had appealed to the islanders to submit if there was an invasion, saying: "There's no use in shedding blood foolishly."

Two groups of paratroopers paddled ashore from the frigates Minerva and Rothesay. A third group landed by helicopter, the spokesman said.

The Foreign Office said about 200 men participated in the three landings in the operation, officially named Sheepskin but dubbed by many here as the Bay of Piglets.

SECEDED IN 1967

There were no reports of the whereabouts of Webster or of the so-called "Mafia-style" elements whom the British claim are supporting him. The island seceded from the St. Kitts-Nevis Federation on May 30, 1967, and declared itself a republic earlier this year.

Apparently no opposition to the landings was put up by the "Mafia" elements nor by cousin John Webster's 250-man Anguillan home guard.

The name of John Holcom, a former Miami policeman, has been mentioned by the British in connection with the unsavory elements around "President" Webster. Between 6 and 24 Americans, black and white, have been reported on the island, which has a population of 6,000.

PROCEEDED PEACEFULLY

British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart told the House of Commons this afternoon that the occupation "had proceeded peacefully."

Stewart said that the invasion, made under the authority of a Royal Order in Council made yesterday, is "in accord with the United Nations Charter and our legal responsibilities."

He said that he expected the military occupation to be "very brief" but that a British commissioner, who will act on instructions from London, not St. Kitts, may remain on the island for "a number of years."

Stewart said that the commissioner, Anthony Lee, "will assemble an advisory council (of Anguillans) and put this as soon as possible on an elective basis."

The troops were flown from England yesterday to the neighboring island of Antigua in three Royal Air Force VC10 jet transports. They were greeted with jeers of "Go to Rhodesia" by the Antiguans as they boarded the frigates in St. John's harbor.

Ian Smith's equally illegal white settler Rhodesian regime has maintained its independence in Central Africa for three years without armed British intervention, although London has imposed a trade boycott. Rhodesia is relatively strong and certainly would resist British intervention.

A third British frigate, HMS Rhyl, also is standing by off Anguilla. It may be used later today to land a special force of 40 Scotland Yard constables who were flown out to Antigua yesterday. They are "the police" mentioned in the leaflet distributed by British troops on their arrival on Anguilla this morning.

The three frigates each carry a helicopter, a complement of marines, and a small naval landing party that could be used to reinforce the paratroopers should the need arise.

The landing force is under the command of "SNOWI," senior naval officer West Indies.

British aid was cut off in February after Webster asked for the recall of Lee, who had been the commissioner on the island for a year. He had been seeking a solution to Anguilla's secession. Anguilla had sought incorporation into Britain or the United States. When this failed the island declared itself an independent republic.

Lee accompanied the troops landing today, the Associated Press reported.

It was about this time the British say, that Webster began to fall under the influence of gangster elements. The British infer that they have considerable evidence of such influence from both the U.S. and other Caribbean governments.

In addition to this concern, the other associated states, which have their own problems with secessionist-minded smaller islands—St. Vincent with Bequia, Sr. Lucia with Cariacou, Antigua with Barbuda—were fearful that Anguilla's example might be followed within their own borders.

As evidenced by the breakup of the West Indian Federation in 1962, the entire Caribbean is an area of considerable political instability.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

Tearful Anguillans Yield to British Paratroops

Anguilla.—British paratroopers wearing the red berets of the Red Devil regiment moved quickly, on landing here, to check the people for weapons. The troops landed without resistance on this rebellious island today.

The island population yielded quietly and with some tears.

The paratroopers, carrying automatic arms, invaded at several points.

They searched island residents for possible weapons and checked their identification. Then they released them, with the warning that they must remain near their homes.

XUM

A number of men and women wept as the British rounded them up. But there was no shouting or insults.

The whereabouts of President Ronald Webster and other leaders of the rebel government was not known.

The whirring of helicopters awakened sleepers and most of the people on this 35-square-mile coral island were outside their homes when the paratroopers landed. Two other groups of paratroopers landed on the island's beaches.

The Anguilla airport, the only link with the outside world, remained open and planes were allowed to land.

However, the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration advised pilots against flying to Anguilla and said it could not be responsible for their safety.

Before the landing, many of the 6,000 Anguillans had conceded privately that they could not hope to repel British troops. But their comments for publication, made to scores of newsmen who converged on the island were defiant.

"We are prepared to fight," said Webster yesterday. "The people of Anguilla have contemplated the possibility of armed invasion for the past 21 months and have prepared themselves accordingly."

But he added: "It is difficult for us to believe that England, as a world power of respected integrity, would proceed contrary to its own stated policy."

Later last night Webster appealed to the islanders to submit if there was an invasion, saying: "There's no use spilling blood foolishly."

Small groups of volunteers had kept watch at several potential landing beaches, armed with an assortment of ancient rifles and a Napoleonic cannon. Apparently they were not used.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

Peru Warship Seizes U.S. Fishing Boat

A Peruvian warship reportedly boarded and seized one American fishing boat 23 miles off the coast of Peru today and took the vessel in custody to the port of Talara.

There is an unconfirmed report that a second U.S. tuna boat also was seized at about the same time and place, the State Department said.

The report of the seizure came from the American Tuna Boat Association in San Diego, Calif., which has direct radio contact with the vessels of the South Pacific fishing fleet, and was relayed to the State Department by Rep. Thomas M. Pelly, R-Wash.

State Department officials said the embassy in Lima had not heard of the incident, but has sent a naval attache to Talara to investigate.

According to August Felando, president of the Tuna Boat Association, the intercepted vessel was the San Juan. He said Peruvian torpedo boat No. 22 made the interception about 23 miles northwest of Point Sol at 5:50 a.m. EST.

Felando said he was awaiting confirmation that a second tuna fisher, the Cape Anne, also was seized.

The San Juan was attacked by the same warship Feb. 14 with machine guns and .50 mm gunfire. More than 50 holes were counted in her hull and superstructure.

Capt. John Virissimo on that occasion fled into waters claimed by Ecuador and took refuge in the port of Salinas.

When Ecuadorian officials announced they intended to fine the San Juan for fishing in waters claimed by that country, Virissimo sailed his vessel out of port under cover of darkness and escaped.

Peru and Ecuador, as well as Chile, claim 200 miles of sovereignty off their coasts. The United States and most world powers recognize only 12 miles.

The seizure of the San Juan comes at a delicate moment in U.S.-Peruvian relations. Ambassador John Irwin, a special representative of President Nixon, is now in Lima attempting to find a solution to a controversy which started nearly six months ago when the military government of President Juan Velasco Alvarado expropriated properties of the American-owned International Petroleum Co. and announced it would not pay or negotiate settlement.

The United States is bound by the Hickenlooper Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act to cut off all aid and premium price sugar purchases if Peru fails to comply with the requirement to enter into meaningful discussions toward settlement.

If an agreement is not reached, aid will be cut off on April 4 and sugar purchases on April 9. Peru would lose about $65 million.

SEEKING SOLUTION

"This latest provocation by Peru, while our presidential emissary John Irwin is in their country seeking solutions to these problems, clearly indicates their lack of sincerity," Pelly said.

"I have consistently sought negotiations with the Peruvians and the Ecuadorians to achieve agreement on fisheries in the Eastern Pacific, but to take military action against Americans on the high seas at a time when attempts are being made to establish those negotiations is an insult to our emissary, the American President and to the American people," he said.

Pelly said there have been nearly 80 illegal seizures of American tuna boats off some Latin American countries since 1961. Costs and fines imposed on the boat owners, he said, have totaled more than $675,000.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

U.S. Drive in Vietnam Called a Counterattack

Nixon administration officials characterize the new offense moves by U.S. forces in South Vietnam as a counterattack rather than an escalation of our war effort to punish the Communists for their shelling of cities and base areas.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler made this view clear when asked late yesterday if the U.S. offensive is the "appropriate response" that the President was speaking about in his March 4 press conference.

Nixon said then that he and his aides were examining the enemy offensive very carefully to determine whether it violated the understanding on which former President Johnson stopped American bombing of North Vietnam.

That understanding was to the effect that the bombing halt would be difficult to maintain if the enemy shelled South Vietnamese cities or violated the demilitarized zone.

The President warned that "an appropriate response to these attacks will be made if they continue."

Ziegler evaded a direct reply to the question about whether the current U.S. offensive is the "appropriate response" Nixon had warned about. But the tenor of his remarks indicated it was not.

"I would characterize the counterattack," Ziegler said, "as being an integral part of our over-all military effort in South Vietnam and as being specifically designed to disrupt and defeat the enemy's offensive plans in the Saigon area."

He then referred newsmen to the President's press conference last Friday, in which he said that any escalation of the war in Vietnam has been the responsibility of the enemy and "if the enemy de-escalates its attacks, ours will go down."

Ziegler also pointed out that Nixon emphasized that "we are trying to do everything we can in the conduct of our war in Vietnam to see that we can go forward toward peace" in the negotiations in Paris.

The President's schedule today included a conference with Dean Acheson, who was secretary of state in the Truman administration. Ziegler said Nixon wanted to seek Acheson's views on major world issues, including Vietnam and problems in Europe.

THE SCREAMERS AND SHOUTERS NEED TO LISTEN

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the critics of President Nixon's decision to go ahead with a modified antiballistic-missile program have done a lot of screamnig and shouting the past few days. If public reaction were measured in terms of decibels only, one would conclude that there are many more opponents than proponents of the ABM decision.

The fact is, of course, that the screamers and shouters are much more vocal than numerous and constitute a relatively small group, both on Capitol Hill and elsewhere. Happily, among all the din the voices of commonsense can still be heard. One of those voices belongs to Richard Wilson, whose column entitled "Democrats May Blunder in Challenging Sentinel," appeared in last night's Washington Star. Mr. Wilson points up very well some of the problems the screamers and shouters are creating for themselves, and, in the event some of them may have been too busy making noise to have seen it, I take this opportunity to draw it to their attention.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1969]

Democrats May Blunder in Challenging Sentinel

(By Richard Wilson)

"If Nixon goes ahead with the ABM he will have signed his own political death warrant and we'll elect a president in 1972," said one of the most prominent Democratic leaders:

Nixon has gone ahead, on a modified basis, with the multi-billion dollar anti-ballistic missile program. Congress will probably approve his slow beginning. And the Democratic leadership may find that it has picked the wrong issue at the wrong time.

The political consequences of the modified Sentinel decision were carefully weighed as perhaps the single most important factor. This led to the modification of moving the launching sites away from the cities, except for Washington, and positioning these sites to protect hardened missile bases.

But the beginning is being made in somewhat different form than in the Johnson administration, and once begun the deployment of this missile defense system is not likely to be ended soon.

There are several reasons, why the Democratic leadership may be making a serious blunder in opposing deployment of the ABM. Nixon's proposal for an initial outlay of $800 million was coupled with an announcement that the total defense budget will be reduced by $2.5 billion. The argument that the ABM is robbing urgent domestic programs therefore becomes harder to sustain.

Even harder to sustain may be the argument that deployment would be a hostile act driving the Russians away from negotia-

XUM

tion on nuclear arms limitation. Nixon has apparently correctly judged the Russians on this point. They want negotiation on nuclear arms limitation for urgent reasons of their own. What is to be talked about is not destroying or dismantling existing offensive and defensive weapons systems. The subject of negotiation will be limiting future offensive and defensive weapons systems. Both sides desire limits beyond which neither will go.

On another point the Democratic leadership may encounter a rough road. It is harder to prove that the anti-ballistic missile system won't work than to establish a prima facie case that it will work, especially since the Russians have already deployed 67 of their missiles.

The Democratic fault runs deeper because it is based not alone upon the ABM deployment but on the general proposition that unless Nixon pulls back on nuclear arms, gets us out of Vietnam and reduces American commitments all over the world he will have misjudged the reasons for his election and will lose public support.

Unless Nixon acts soon in Vietnam, the argument goes, Johnson's war will become Nixon's war and he will suffer as much politically from it as Johnson, and perhaps even more. This argument, too, is difficult to sustain in view of the North Vietnamese spring offensive while peace negotiations are going on. The offensive illustrates clearly that U.S. forces cannot do what the war critics call for, a static remaining in place of our forces there and a steady reduction in the level of fighting. The North Vietnamese will not permit that. If they accepted that condition they would have to abandon their war objective of preventing the formation of a stable South Vietnamese government under the unharassed protection of American arms.

The alternative of a phased, unilateral American pull-out leaving a weak South Vietnamese government to the mercies of the Northern Communists is not acceptable, either, to the rational war critics. In the end their dilemma is as great as Nixon's. They can describe an ideal condition but they do not know how to create that condition without the cooperation of an enemy who shows no disposition to cooperate.

Nixon is in a position to initiate a peace offensive and he undoubtedly will do so when the time is right. If such an initiative proves again that the North Vietnamese will not stop fighting, their refusal to stop will be hard to blame on Nixon, although, of course, he will be blamed for it by people who also do not know how to stop the war.

Reducing our commitments in the world, limiting nuclear arms, getting out of Vietnam—these are all easily stated objectives which lose plausibility when the time comes to act. When presidents are called upon to act they make decisions like Nixon's on the ABM, and they do not significantly back away from the continuous policy of worldwide involvement of the past 25 years.

ROLE OF AFRICA IN TODAY'S WORLD

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Ghana's Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable R. M. Akwei, delivered an address on the problems and the potential of the economic development of Africa.

The African view of its own situation is, I think, a vital part of our understanding of these new nations, and should be taken into consideration in our efforts to devise the most meaningful and effective approach to assist them in the task of nation building.

Closing the gap between the "have" and the "have not" nations of the world is a difficult and slow-moving endeavor, and often without tangible or immediate gratification of our efforts, but we must move forward in this direction if we are ever to see progress toward our goals of international cooperation and peace throughout the world.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs African Subcommittee, and the Anglo-American Parliamentary Conference on Africa, and one who has long been concerned with the process and problems of development, it is an honor to present Ambassador Akwei's comments here for the interest and consideration of my colleagues:

ROLE OF AFRICA IN TODAY'S WORLD FROM THE ECONOMIC POINT OF VIEW

(Text of address by H. E. Ambassador R. M. Akwei of Ghana, Chairman, Second Committe on Economic Affairs, 23d session of the United Nations General Assembly, delivered February 27, 1969, to a seminar on Economic and Social Development in Africa, convened by Church Women United, held at the Church Center at the United Nations, New York City)

PARADOXES IN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I feel especially honored and privileged to have been invited to deliver the closing address of this seminar on the Role of Africa in today's international economic development. It is perhaps hardly surprising that you should have chosen the economic development of Africa as the subject of your seminar, for Africa today finds itself in the paradoxical situation of being petentially the richest continent in the world and yet the poorest in terms of economic development. My address will therefore be oriented towards this end.

NECESSARY TRANSITION FROM UNDERDEVELOPMENT TO DEVELOPMENT

I am convinced that Africa can contribute towards the realization of the solemn pledge enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". This she can do by making as quickly as possible the transition from a state of under-development to one of development and thus in the process forge a much-needed atmosphere of tolerance and good neighborliness among the multi-racial societies of this continent. But I am equally convinced that this transition which is so earnestly desired by us all cannot be made by Africa alone. The efforts of the African countries must be accompanied by the concerted and active support of the international community.

Let us examine the foundations and tools for this transition. The foundations for the economic transformation of the African continent are already laid in its rich and abundant mineral, agricultural, and industrial primary resources, and in its energy potential. The continent is more than three times the size of the United States; it forms 20 percent of the landmass of the world and has a population of 300 million which is larger than that of the United States; 65 percent of the world's gold supply; 96 percent of the world's diamonds and at least 25 percent of its known copper reserves. In addition, large deposits of offshore oil have been discovered along the west coast of Africa. Guinea and Ghana possess some of the world's richest sources of bauxite, from which aluminum is made. It is estimated that between the years 1945 and 1955, Western firms exported from the Congo alone, copper, rubber, cotton and other goods valued at $2,773 billion, and that from South Africa (which I shall discuss separately) Western gold mining companies drew a profit of $814 billion. A great deal of the uranium, which is used for nuclear power, of the copper for electronics, of titanium, of iron and steel, and of other mineral resources come from Africa.

In the field of agriculture, Africa possesses a vast unused potential. Africa's uncut forest area is twice that of the USA and her arable and grazing land greater than that of the Soviet Union. It is reckoned for example, that the Congo basin alone can produce enough food crops to satisfy the requirements of nearly half the population of the whole world.

The continent's energy potential is almost unlimited. The Sahara desert which was thought barren is now uncovering its rich stores of petroleum. Africa has vast resources of coal, and its potential hydro-electric power is estimated at 42 percent of the world's total.

It is these natural resources and their future exploitation and development that Africa's role in the world, already an important one, will depend upon. In the midst of such enviable and abundant natural wealth, however, African countries remain poor. It is estimated that the combined gross domestic product of thirty-nine out of the forty-one developing independent African states, excluding the Republic of South Africa, is less than two-thirds that of Italy. Only seven countries have a per capita income of $200 per annum while for 15 countries per capita income is less than $70. Against this may be measured the per capita income of about $1,320 for Western Europe and $3,272 for the United States of America. It has been estimated that at current rates of development, if the United States were to stand still, it would take the developing African countries 343 years to catch up with the U.S.A.

The reason for this paradox is not difficult to find. It lies largely in the lack of capital and technical know-how. But its historical causes lie in the prolonged period of European domination of Africa, when our continent supplied the raw materials needed for the industries of the rapidly expanding economies of Europe. The emergence from colonial rule by many African countries has hardly changed this traditional role. Today, the economies of these countries to a large extent still follow the pattern of colonial times. There is, therefore, little diversification, and in hardly any of these countries is there a single integrated industry based on its natural resources. This state of affairs is aggravated by the fragmentation of the continent into small non-viable states, making it impossible to achieve economies of a scale which are essential for transforming the economy of the continent.

TOOLS FOR DEVELOPMENT

What are the tools with which to effect the transition from poverty to affluence? The three indispensable tools for economic development are *Human Resource, Capital, Technical and Managerial Know-how.* The first one Africa has in abundance but not the last two.

However, before these tools can be effectively used and their advantages fully realized, African countries must undertake the structural and *social transformations* which are essential for rapid economic growth. Some of these changes relate to the system of *land tenure.* To say this is not to urge the dispossession of anyone's land. But it is known that in some countries the system of land tenure is unfavorable for rapid industrialization because of the communal system of land ownership. Moreover, for industrialization to take the necessary roots, it is necessary, for example, to adjust the ratio of the population engaged in agricultural production to that engaged in industry. This

may in turn entail the establishment of larger farm settlements than those which prevail now so as to produce food more economically and efficiently to feed the industrial population.

Economic planners used to think of development solely in terms of capital and projects. It is only recently under the impact of the thinking of such enlightened men as George Woods and McNamara of the World Bank that this Institution has ventured into the arena of social investment and infrastructure—schools, roads, bridges, housing, water supply and agricultural improvement. For until the human reserve of a country is educated and healthy it will be a drag on its development. However, the same intrusion into the social sphere of development has generated an opposite theory which has resulted in a delicate concept of artificial population control which as far as Africa is concerned seems to me exaggerated, with the possible exception of the United Arab Republic. What Africa needs in terms of human resource is not population restriction but intensification of development of her economic potential.

INTRODUCTION OF EFFECTIVE TAX SYSTEM

In many African countries there may also have to be changes to introduce more effective tax systems. While the tax systems should not be such as to turn away private investors, assuming that there was scope for the private sector in a given country, they should also be such as to give the Government the necessary resources. The tax system can be effectively employed to accelerate economic growth, but it may also act as a brake on such growth. In many African countries, largely under the influence of such international organizations as the World Bank, the OECD and individual governments, liberal tax holidays of up to 10 years or so have been adopted in order to attract, as the theory goes, foreign private capital into the country. In Ghana, for example, it is estimated that we are subsidizing the Valco to the tune of some one million £s annually in the purchase of hydro-electric power. You therefore have the curious situation of the poorer country bribing the shareholders of the richer country to undertake any industrialization at all. A more equitable balance must be struck somewhere, I submit, to the advantage of the poorer nations in this whole area of tax holidays and incentives. Such imbalances almost always lead to demands for nationalization in the developing country concerned with all the consequent political problems flowing from such acts.

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

In many of the African countries development planning and plans are a recent phenomenon, and the past few years have been a period of learning and experiment. However, more attention ought to be paid to *development planning*. Too often plans have existed only on paper. Sometimes the cause of this has been quite beyond the control of the country concerned. There is little that a country can do to prevent a sudden deterioration in the price of the primary product on which it depends, or a bad harvest. But at other times these plans have lacked the degree of realism that would make their implementation possible. There have been plenty of targets without carefully considered policies or strategies for attaining them.

There is an increasing awareness among African countries like other developing countries, that the acceleration of their economic growth will require a more effective mobilization of their domestic resources. It is necessary that we should adopt effective policies to realize the necessary domestic savings, but where income levels are so low it is hardly to be expected that any substantial domestic savings can be generated unless more income-generating production is stimulated in the country concerned.

I have discussed largely the industrial sector but it is important for African countries to realize that without sacrificing the drive for industrialization, agricultural improvement and diversification may perhaps yield quicker economic development if properly planned. It is estimated that the present level of crop production can be multiplied many times over by the use of mechanical implements, by improved methods of water control, by using fertilizers and insecticides and by bringing more areas under cultivation. This is where agricultural education and pilot farm schemes can prove of direct benefit to the economy.

Madam Chairman, I have mentioned some of the measures that African countries may take in order to promote their economic growth, given the necessary resources and technology. *These measures so far involve African countries on an individual basis.*

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

However, it seems to me that while we make these efforts we cannot afford to neglect the wider issue of economic integration of our continent for our accelerated economic development.

The principal objective of such integration is to enable the countries participating in it to achieve both individually and collectively, higher rates of progress than could be attained in isolation. Efforts in this direction took a new turn in 1965 when the Economic Commission for Africa decided to set up at an early date at the sub-regional level, inter-governmental machinery which would be responsible for the economic and social development of the sub-regions. Unfortunately, progress towards integration has been slow and uneven and specific projects for cooperation have yet to be elaborated and implemented.

A series of meetings were held in the West African sub-region in 1967 and 1968 in an attempt to bring into closer economic cooperation the various English-speaking and French-speaking countries of the sub-region, perhaps through a common market, or a customs union. But these meetings have not led to any significant or concrete action on account of the difficulties that have been encountered. A major difficulty involved in the formation of a West African Economic Community is the unwillingness of the French-speaking African countries to give up the preferences that they enjoy in their trade with the industrial countries of the European Economic Community and the mischievous desire of the European Economic Community countries, at least some of them, to retain client states in Africa where they enjoy reciprocal trade preferences with those states to the detriment of inter-African trade.

In Central Africa, the Equatorial African Customs Union, which is a closely-knit trading group established in 1966 on the basis of pre-independence relationships, has yet to attract to its membership the Democratic Republic of the Congo which is the largest and perhaps the richest country of the sub-region.

The East African Common Market which embraces Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, barely provides a viable basis for many branches of industry. For this reason there appears to be a real possibility that it will be enlarged to include a number of other countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, Somalia and Zambia, which need to be associated with the Common Market in order to break out of their economic isolation and the constriction on their economic progress due to their small size.

In North Africa, the four countries Algeria, Libya, Morocco, and Tunisia which had established in 1964 a system of joint institutions with a view to coordinating their development agreed in 1966 with the Sudan and the United Arab Republic to explore jointly the possibilities of extending cooperation within the framework of the Magreb institutions to all six countries of the sub-region.

Apart from the creation of machinery for economic cooperation at the subregional level, a number of institutions have been established on a continental scale. These include the African Development Bank, the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning, the Conference of African Statisticians and the Conference of African Planners.

One of the most important questions which economic integration raises is the equitable distribution of the benefits of integration, for the benefits of integration tend to concentrate on the more developed countries of the integrated group. Besides, some countries may lose from integration although the area taken as a whole may gain. It is obvious that the losers would not long continue to adhere to a union which instead of bringing them benefits deprived them of some sources of income which they had before union. Furthermore, each state participating in economic integration is politically committed to the rapid economic development and advancement of its peoples. If economic growth is concentrated in some states while others remain backwaters, considerable strains may be created and the weaker countries may prefer to go it alone however uneconomic. Thus whether an economically integrated African continent endures or not might well depend on the equitable distribution of the benefits of integration. The economic integration of the African continent, however desirable, cannot be achieved overnight. But this should not be used as a pretext to withhold the tools for development from African countries. Even when integration is achieved capital and technical know-how will still be needed to achieve the rapid development of our continent.

CAPITAL

Let us consider the second tool for development, capital. Capital may be obtained in a number of ways—through the transfer of resources, through trade, and through domestic savings which I have already mentioned. The transfer of resources from the developed to the developing countries was one of the measures that was considered essential for the realization of the objective of the current United Nations Development Decade. It was proposed that the economically advanced countries should endeavor to supply to the developing countries financial resources of a minimum net amount approaching one percent of their aggregate national incomes. The first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which was held in Geneva in 1964 recognized the inadequacy of the growth of the developing countries and stepped up this amount. In spite of these exhortations the "leveling off" of the total net amount of capital flow to the developing countries which started in 1961 continues. Over the six years from 1961–1966 the net outflow of resources, from the developed market economies to the developing countries and to international institutions that provide financial and technical assistance increased from $8.4 billion to $9.1 billion. But as a percentage of the gross national product of the developed market economies the flow receded from 0.86 to 0.63. No significant progress was made during 1967 or 1968. The situation would not be so desperate perhaps if some of these transfers did not flow back to the developed countries in the form of income from investment, and in the form of interest on these loans. Indeed it is estimated that if the present trends of borrowing and repayments continue, net lending would be negative by 1970.

There is perhaps a glimmer of hope in the fact that when the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development agreed in New Delhi in February/March of last year, that the developed countries should endeavor to transfer one percent of their gross national product to the developing countries, there were assurances from a number of countries that this target would be

XUM

achieved by 1970. However, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, two of the main donors, were unable to give any such undertaking, pleading balance of payments difficulties. The Socialist countries of Eastern Europe have unfortunately not yet been able to commit themselves to the one percent target established by the second UNCTAD.

It has been estimated that a net inflow of resources of $18 billion of public and private capital will be needed annually by the developing countries by 1975 and could be absorbed by the developing countries. This level could readily be achieved if only the advanced countries were to transfer resources amounting to one percent of their gross national product.

MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING TARGETS

It seems to me that there are various *measures that could be taken by the developed countries to help them meet* the target more easily. One of the most direct measures would be to earmark revenue for foreign assistance. This is the practice in Norway, where a direct tax a quarter of one percent on personal income was introduced in 1964 for the explicit purpose of development aid. Another measure would be the institution of tariffs on imports from developing countries, and on the investment income payments and the reimbursement of capital from the developing countries. A third method would be to earmark savings on military expenditures, in the event of disarmament or even in the slowing down in the growth of defense expenditure following a reduction of international tension. A fourth method which would be radical would be for the international community to institute an international tax system which would be a machinery for making substantial and growing transfers without repayment obligations—transfers that can be relied upon to support general long-term development plans.

It is not only important that the flow of financial resources should be increased and more assured, but also that these resources should be made available on favorable terms and conditions. The terms and conditions are as important as the volume of aid. The tendency of aid-tying is increasing among the donor countries. By aid-tying I mean the limitation of financial aid by a donor to a specific project and/or the requirement by the donor that the equipment needed should be procured from its country. In this way, the real value of aid may be diminished as the project may not necessarily occupy a place of priority in the development of the recipient country, and the equipment may be more expensive in the donor country than elsewhere. Quite apart from this, more transfers should be made on interest free terms. Ghana has been fortunate enough to receive a few of such loans.

The international trade of the African countries is also an important source of capital. The share of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America in world trade has steadily declined from just under 31.2 percent in 1950 to 19.1 percent in 1966. If petroleum exports are excluded the decline over the same period was from 24.4 percent to just under 14 percent. Moreover, the share of primary commodities on which most African countries depend for their foreign exchange earnings has continued to diminish while those of manufactured products have maintained an upward trend. Ghana, for example, is the world's biggest producer of cocoa and depends on cocoa for about two-thirds of her foreign exchange earnings. Besides cocoa, African countries also depend on groundnuts, oilseeds, coffee, cotton, sisal, etc. Many developed countries are also manufacturing synthetics to take the place of the primary commodities produced by the African countries, thus depressing further their already dwindling share in world trade.

The progress of UNCTAD so far has fallen short of the expectations of the developing countries. No new commodity agreement has yet been concluded on account of the lack of cooperation from the consumer countries. The attitude of the consumer countries is typified by the lobbies established in London and Washington against an international cocoa agreement. It is imperative that an agreement should be reached on cocoa as soon as possible. Such an agreement should be workable and should benefit both producers and consumers. An agreement on cocoa would open the way for agreements to be reached on other primary commodities on which African countries and other developing countries depend.

The conclusion of international commodity agreements is not the only measure that may be taken to assist the developing countries. At the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi, agreement was reached on the early establishment of a mutually acceptable system of generalized non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory preferences which would be beneficial to the developing countries. But the Conference was not able to go much beyond this. While the developing countries insisted that if such a preferential system was to be meaningful it had to cover processed agricultural products which constitute the bulk of their manufactured exports, the developed countries were unwilling to include such products and wished to see the system cover highly sophisticated manufactures over which they have a monopoly. It is urgent that a generalized system of preferences should be worked out as soon as possible, not only to encourage the manufactures of the developing countries, but also to help restore to them a fair share of international trade.

The period in which African countries can achieve the transition from their present state to a state of affluence depends on the speed of progress. Happily the world today is a treasure-house of technology. African countries, like other developing countries of Asia and Latin-America, therefore, need not go through an experimental period. So much can easily be adopted and assimilated from the accumulation of technological know-how. But this will only be possible if the developed countries, and the more developed among the developing countries place their most modern technological know-how at the disposal of African countries, and share their experiences with them.

It is this third tool of economic development which has lagged behind the first two. A debate is said to be now proceeding in the new Nixon administration as to whether greater concentration should not be put on transfer of skills rather than on spectacular economic projects. In the long-run it is probably the transfer of skills which will prove basic but this can be effective only when it is widely distributed on the continent, through a network of technical schools and institutes and colleges. The volume of aid presently spent on hiring foreign experts could better be spent in establishing local technical institutes on the spot.

The measures I have discussed above, those to be taken by African countries, and those to be taken by the international community as a whole could find their place in an international development strategy for the second United Nations Development Decade. The necessity for such a strategy which would be the mainspring of economic action by the developing countries, the developed countries and international bodies is gradually gaining acceptance. The target rate of development in such a strategy should be bold and realistic. Cautious targets which are not different from performance that can be expected from present trends would frustrate the very concept of a Development Decade, which entails a special effort on the part of all to accelerate the economic growth of the developing countries. On the other hand, impossible targets would bring discouragement and despair. The target rate of growth should be supported by measures to be taken by the developing and developed countries, and the international community as a whole for achieving them. There should also be firm commitments on the part of all to carry out these measures and supervise such implementation measures.

This leads me to a discussion of the political will. The progress that we make now or during the second Development Decade depends on the political will of the African countries, the developed countries and the international community as a whole to achieve that progress. The old saying that "where there is a will, there is a way" is as true today as when it was first said. It is not sufficient to state that the political will exists. This must be demonstrated by translating that will into concrete and meaningful action. The economic integration of Africa which is so desirable and even necessary depends on the political will of the African countries to make it succeed. A striking feature of the second session of UNCTAD, for example, was the unwillingness of the world community to take the resolute steps to translate into practical action the lofty aims of UNCTAD set forth at its first session in 1964. Thus a major opportunity for advancing these aims and the development of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America was lost. Similarily a development strategy for the second United Nations Development Decade, however perfect, will remain a dead letter unless it is founded on the will to achieve its objective. In the final analysis it is the political will which constitutes the mainspring of international action.

PROBLEMS OF APARTHEID AS RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT

Madam Chairman, a discussion of Africa's role in international economic development would be incomplete without mention of the problems of colonialism and apartheid in Southern Africa for these have a direct impact on the economic development of the continent of Africa. The entrenched forces of colonialism and racism in Angola, Mozambique, Namibia (South West Africa), Southern Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa have set these countries apart from the rest of our continent. Economically, the Republic of South Africa is for the moment the richest and most developed country of the African continent, but her inhuman policy of apartheid designed to suppress and stifle millions of indigenous Africans has rendered it impossible for African states to enter into economic relations with her. It is doubtful whether such economic power can endure for there is an ever-increasing danger of conflict in that unhappy country. Similarly, the prosperity of the racist and illegal regime of Southern Rhodesia cannot endure. Added to this are the allied problems of Namibia, formerly called South West Africa, the problem of Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea where Portugal, under the ridiculous theory that these African countries are extensions of her territorial boundaries, is only interested in despoiling their natural wealth without any regard for the interest or welfare of the indigenous people; much less any attempt at serious economic development of these territories. The developed countries of Europe and America have the means to end this appalling situation in Southern Africa through economic and trade sanctions against the oppressive and inhuman regimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal. Unless this is done the countries of Southern Africa will remain outside the mainstream of African economic development and it would be impossible to enter into mutual and fruitful economic cooperation with them.

XUM

More particularly economic resources which should normally be nationally spent in the African countries for the development of their peoples would be spent on training freedom fighters, buying military equipment for them, promoting painful international political alliances to support them, even deliberately destroying economic projects which would otherwise be useful for the further economic development of Africa, all for the sole purpose of destroying a political myth—apartheid. Of course these efforts on the part of nationalist independent African states will generate counter measures from South Africa and her allies, driving more resources into useless destructive armaments rather than economic development. The stage is being set, ladies, for more costly Vietnams in the future of Africa. Can we learn from history? In this connection responsible voices have been raised concerning how the $30 billion annual expenditure on the Vietnam war could be spent more usefully on urgent domestic socio-economic problems. The present trading partners of South Africa must assist in eliminating apartheid before they become involved in an economically wasteful war there against nationalist Africans.

Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, in a shrinking world such as ours, African countries together with other developing countries cannot remain backwards while the rest of the world progresses, undisturbed by our poverty and state of under-development. The fast means of communications—the written word, radio, television—enable the poor countries to see how much better off people in the developed countries are. Thus the poor countries are even more dissatisfied with their plight. If we are to have lasting world peace the international community must take resolute steps to accelerate the economic development of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The international community is capable of rising to the challenge.

In the long run the economic resources of the African continent, when fully developed, will act as a point of polarization in both international trade and politics, between the West and East, thus accentuating the already important role of the continent in the world. If the dangers of this polarization are to be avoided in the world's politics then there can be only one basic imperative for the means of deploying these tools of development—they should be channeled on a multilateral basis, with no political motive but solely for the creation of economically viable, self-sustaining communities exchanging their wealth in a free system of international trade.

TWO DISTINGUISHED SOUTH CAROLINA LADIES RECEIVE HONORS

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, two of the most remarkable ladies it has ever been my privilege to know, received honors of singular distinction this past weekend in South Carolina. They are Mrs. James F. Byrnes, of Columbia, wife of South Carolina's elder statesman, and Mrs. James F. Risher, Sr., of Bamberg.

Mrs. Byrnes was named honorary Mother of the State of South Carolina, and Mrs. Risher received the Mother of the Year award for 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to inform the Congress and the Nation of these events, since Mrs. Byrnes and Mrs. Risher have received on untold occasions the affectionate commendations and heartfelt thanks of grateful Americans everywhere.

In addition, I am honored and very proud that these ladies are my constituents.

Both of these lovely, charming, dear ladies have unselfishly given of their very valuable time to assist youth everywhere. Mrs. Byrnes and her husband, the beloved former Secretary of State, U.S. Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Governor of South Carolina, James F. Byrnes, has made it possible for almost 400 youth who were orphans to receive a college education. Mrs. Risher and her distinguished husband, Col. James F. Risher, have been instrumental in preparing thousands of young men to meet the challenges of the future at Carlisle and Camden Military Academies in South Carolina.

As we all know, Governor Byrnes has been confined in the hospital for more than a month now. Americans everywhere have been praying for a rapid recovery, and it is my understanding that he is showing much improvement, especially for a man 89 years of age. Mrs. Byrnes also entered the hospital this week, and at present we have no word of her condition. I am sure that all of us wish for her a speedy recovery. Certainly, no two people have ever been more dedicated to each other, and their marriage these many years has been an inspiration to us all. I know that this latest honor conferred upon Mrs. Byrnes will be heartening to the Governor.

Likewise, the Rishers are a couple whose lives reflect great devotion to each other. Some of our colleagues know one of their six children, Gene Risher, one of the most outstanding and respected newsmen in this country. Another son, Bill, is among my dearest friends. He is headmaster of Carlisle Academy and his brother, Lanning, is headmaster of Camden Academy. These two military preparatory schools are among the finest in America.

Colonel Risher is a former grand master of the Masonic Order in South Carolina, and is one of the most sought after speakers in our State despite recent illnesses which have curtailed some of his appearances. Just recently, The Citadel, one of the greatest military institutions in the world, awarded Colonel Risher the honorary doctor of laws degree.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no two ladies more deserving of such magnificent tributes than Mrs. Byrnes and Mrs. Risher. Therefore, as a part of my remarks I include the following Associated Press story about these awards as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Mar. 16, 1969]

SUMTER (AP)—Mrs. James F. Risher Sr. of Bamberg who has six children and helped minister to the needs of countless others at Carlisle Military School, Saturday was named South Carolina Mother of the Year for 1969.

At the same time, Mrs. James F. Byrnes of Columbia, wife of South Carolina's elder statesman, was named honorary mother of the state.

The selections of Mrs. Risher and Mrs. Byrnes were announced by Mrs. James C. Cuttino Jr., of Sumter, chairman of the state mothers committee.

Mrs. Risher has worked with Carlisle Military School since she and her husband came to Bamberg in 1931. Later they opened Camden Military Academy to take care of the many applicants.

Mrs. Risher is still active as supervisor of the mess hall at Carlisle. Her husband is president of the school.

One of their sons, William Risher, is headmaster of Carlisle. Another son, Lanning, is president and headmaster of Camden.

Another son, Eugene, is a newsman for a wire service in Washington, D.C., with reporting experience in Vietnam.

A daughter, Mary, is married to Col. John M. Tatum of Washington.

Mrs. Risher has two step-children. James Risher is a retired Air Force colonel and now personnel director for an Atlanta life insurance company. Her stepdaughter, Sara, teaches music in the Pageland public schools.

Mrs. Byrnes has been active in the James F. Byrnes Foundation, established by her husband in 1948. Since then the foundation has helped finance the college education of nearly 400 young men and young women who were either orphans or without one parent.

Byrnes, former U.S. secretary of state, U.S. Supreme Court justice and South Carolina governor, established the foundation with royalties from his book about experiences in government.

Mrs. Byrnes joins Mrs. Irvine Belser Sr. of Columbia and the late Mrs. J. R. Westmoreland, mother of Gen. William Westmoreland, as honorary state mothers.

Mrs. Risher, the former Emma Jane Varn, will be presented a pin by Gov. Robert McNair in ceremonies in the governor's office at Columbia, April 22. Mrs. Risher and the other state mothers will be honored at a conference beginning in Los Angeles April 29.

The national mother of the year will be named May 3.

CALL FOR HELP ANSWERED IN ATTLEBORO: LA SALLETTE HOUSE BECOMES REHABILITATION CENTER FOR DRUG ADDICTS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, nationwide concern is now focused on the persistent and increasing problem of drug abuse, especially by our young people. A number of approaches have been suggested for helping those who have become physically and psychologically dependent upon drugs.

As the search for cures progresses, we must never lose sight of the human element. To be sure, drug addiction contributes to the problems of society as a whole; however, the real tragedy occurs on the individual level, where a person's life becomes a trial of agony. I believe that progress in this area must be measured primarily in terms of the individual's benefit.

One step in the direction of rehabilitation has been taken in Attleboro, Mass., where members of the La Sallette missionary order provided accommodations to a group of young people seeking help. I call to the attention of my colleagues an account of this act of compassion:

[From the Attleboro (Mass.) Sun. Mar. 10, 1969]

CALL FOR HELP ANSWERED IN ATTLEBORO: LA SALETTE HOUSE BECOMES REHABILITATION CENTER FOR DRUG ADDICTS

(By Yolande Murphy)

On a cold and dreary day last December, 40 men and women reached Marathon House on Fish Pond Road in Coventry, R.I.

"We're tired; we're hungry; we need help," they told Jim Germano, the executive director, "They've closed Day-Top and we've no one to turn to but you."

Thirty-year old Jim knew from what depths the cry for help was coming. He was a "graduate" of Day-Top—he had made it.

In the sea of faces before him was mirrored the nine years that he had been hooked on drugs, beginning at age 13. He knew the desperation that had kept this band together on the better than 150-mile trek from New York City during the almost blind search for Marathon House, somewhere off a country road.

Still physically weak from the pangs of withdrawal, it could have gone the other way. Anyone or all could more easily have settled for temporary euphoria. But, the realization that they couldn't make it alone was the driving force.

"Come on in, share our table," pressed Jim, but thinking, "Where am I going to put them? We have 40 acres of this state-owned land, but the temperature is below freezing; we can't improvise for the night out there—and the two dorms are overflowing with the 34 that are undergoing rehabilitation. There isn't enough to feed all of them; we've got to find some other way."

Help sometimes comes from out of the most unexpected chance meetings.

A week earlier Jim, through Dr. Joseph Kerrins Jr., medical director of Progress for Providence, had been introduced to a missionary of the La Salette Order in Attleboro. "Don't hesitate to call on us if you need help," was the missionary's parting remark.

Well, if there ever was a need to take up the offer, it was now.

A call to Attleboro, and Jim was assured that the Day-Top group could be housed in the five-story building which until recently had served as a seminary for a group now on campus at Ottawa

"But neither we nor they have money," warned Jim. "So, they need shelter now," was the reply, "get them here and we'll find a way."

The night of Dec. 4, thirty-four arrived at what is known now as the La Salette Provincial House, each carrying his personal possessions only. The one thing they didn't need at the time was the heralding of their arrival, and the priests respected their right for privacy.

The group mostly in the 18 to 35 age bracket, didn't enter the missionary house for religion, nor do the missionaries impose their way of life upon them. However, there are no sub-divisions in the house; the 12 priests and seven brothers occupy the same quarters as they did heretofore.

The Rev. Rene Lemoine local chapter superior, says, "It was a matter of people being without a home. Ours is vast, with many rooms to spare; we are sharing.

"It is certainly unique for a religious house to have become a rehabilitation center for drug addicts, while yet remaining a religious house. Both groups function simultaneously and smoothly, although not without a few inconveniences.

"They call themselves a 'family,' and so do we; we have much to learn from each other. Furthermore. We share a common objective. They seek reconciliation with themselves, with one another, and with society. Our existence as a religious community is to carry out works of reconciliation, although primarily, those favoring a reconciliation of man with God. Only insofar as a person becomes aware of his human dignity can he accept the relationship that God wishes to establish with him."

The Rev. Raymond Isabelle, treasurer, takes a practical, indeed necessary view: "We are happy to have been able to help our new friends. But, as you can well imagine, our food bill alone has soared since December and we, who depend on charity for our own sustenance, are finding it more and more difficult to meet these additional ones. The important thing is that we were able to meet emergency, and now we will seek the means."

RANKS OF OUR MILITARY ARE A TRIBUTE TO YOUTH

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very capable columnist in the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express, Mrs. Anne McIlhenney Matthews, recently visited several Federal installations, including Redstone Arsenal, Ala., Fort Bliss, Tex., and the Air Force Academy.

She came back with some very strong impressions about our youth of today as exemplified by those on duty in the service of our country.

She talked with both young men and officers, and summarized her findings in a column which merits wider circulation.

Following is the text of her March 16 column:

GI RANKS A TRIBUTE TO YOUTH

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

Fort Bliss, Texas—Fear Not!

The student riff-raff who made a shambles out of the well-intentioned drug meeting at UB two weeks ago are just the scum on the surface of a pot of fine stock that will well nurture the body of America.

One afternoon at Redstone Arsenal in Alabama; one day visiting basic training units in Fort Bliss in Texas; one briefing by Lt. Gen. George V. Underwood, Jr., at Aradcom headquarters in Colorado Springs; one tour of the adjacent Air Force Academy, made this an irrefutable fact.

The nine Western New Yorkers from the Niagara Falls area (plus me from Buffalo) who toured these places last week as the latest in a group of people to engage in "Operation Understanding" of the activities and capabilities of the Army's Air Defense Command, returned last Saturday saying "I saw it with my own eyes!"

They were briefed in a series of staccato sessions at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., by a group of polished, erudite, articulate, superbly motivated, and magnificently trained young lieutenants, most of whom had returned from active service in Vietnam. They "knew" the weapons they took apart and explained inch by inch because these had spelled survival for themselves and improved models will do the same for many other Americans who will face baptisms of firepower in the future.

After this impressive series of performances, the Buffalo-Niagara group visited Delta company at Fort Bliss and were given an exhibition of the end result of eight weeks of drilling and classes to "Learn to Survive". This had as features a display of the brawn needed to swing along a ten foot high horizontal ladder for a record number of rungs in a record number of minutes; a lightning movement along a furrow in an "alligator walk" simulated for cover under fire, also timed; and a performance of dramatic close-order drill. Later, each member of the party dined in a typical mess hall with soon-to-be graduates and talked about how they felt to be voluntarily or involuntary inductees.

General Richard T. Cassidy had sketched in their backgrounds in a welcome session.

"In 1968 we trained 40,000 young men here", he said. Of this number, 800 were discharged after basic training. Of the 800, 700 were released for 'administrative' reasons such as hardship at home, family problems, or medical reasons. There were just 100 discharged for punitive reasons and I think this is an unbeatable percentage."

"This is an outstanding tribute to the young men of America."

The youths each escorted a civilian in the mess line and were instructed to say anything they liked to the touring groups. I polled the "guests" afterwards and I heard none whose GI escorts "didn't like it just fine."

One told Mayor Donald L. Creasey of the City of Tonawanda that he had been in trouble before he joined up. He declared:

"This sure straightened me out."

Most had selected the branch of the service in which they wanted advanced training and quite a few said that they would make a career out of military service.

All were puzzled about what "those creeps on campus are demonstrating about.

"If they don't want an education why don't they just move out and make way for those who do?", the two Texas youths at my table stated.

Later in the week, Lt. Gen. George V. Underwood Jr., commanding general of the Army Air Defense Command, who had been in charge of Fort Bliss and who now commands all Army units committed for air defense of the continental U.S., was to paint the "other side of the picture." In a speech of indoctrination at Colorado Springs, he declared that these youths who return from foreign service are given short shrift by a shamefully apathetic public.

"Unfortunately, our country has been so preoccupied with debate over whether we should be in Vietnam, how we became involved, and how we might disengage, that the exploits and sacrifices of the American fighting man have not been recognized as widely and enthusiastically as in former wars. It seems to me that in some segments of our society, frustration over this war may have translated itself into a form of indifference toward the man who is called upon to carry the colors. At any rate, the serviceman in Vietnam is having an experience that is new in our country, at least in this century. He is learning what it is like to fight a war for a country that is not solidly behind the war. And he is undergoing the painful experience of returning from Vietnam to find in general that the many expressions of welcome and appreciation come only from his family and immediate friends," he said.

"The soldier is used to being forgotten in peacetime, but it is unusual for him to be overlooked in wartime.

"So I suggest that each citizen and civic organization, in their own way, find a way to let this fine Vietnam returnee know that while as a nation we may disagree over many political aspects of the war in Vietnam, we are strongly united in our respect and appreciation of the superb performance that the American fighting man has given on behalf of his nation and his fellow Americans.

"I would suggest, too, that we demonstrate to the returning combat veteran of Vietnam that there is more to America than white power, black power, student power, flower power and the rest. Show him that America has also generated 'patriotic power.' He will need proof of this fact as he reenters civilian life and finds that some elements of our society consider patriotism an outmoded word. He will welcome evidence of 'patriotic power' as he encounters the unwashed, psuedo-intellectual who thinks it is the 'in' thing to be against every manifestation of anything of value in America.

"Patriotism is not the special obligation of the man in uniform. It is also the shared obligation of every citizen who cares about our country and our way of life.

"I would also like to strike a public blow on behalf of the much maligned younger generation. In three consecutive command assignments over the past three years involving 75,000 soldiers in Europe and the United States, I have served closely with this fine young American.

"I tell you the indisputable truth that the American Army never had young officers and soldiers like those coming into the Army these days. They are smarter and better educated than those who entered the Army in my time. They are better informed. They are better physical specimens. And, most importantly, they have high morale and strong motivation. I do not claim that they are all delighted to be in the Army—far from it. But although many are serving involuntarily, almost all are determined to do their best while under arms. And their best is mighty wonderful!

"The American youth is not getting the credit he deserves for being as good as he really is. Unfortunately, the way our society operates, excessive attention is focused on the youth who is out of step, who is fighting the problem, who is shirking his obligation, who is loudly and even violently protesting. As a result, the misdeeds of what is actually a small minority are emphasized out of all proportion to their true importance.

"This younger generation will in its time write a superb record of accomplishment that will disprove the gloomy prophesies spawned by the antics of the yippies, the hippies and other odd dissenters. I would expect much of this record to be written by the mature veterans of Vietnam as they become participating citizens and as they take charge of their generation."

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jewry is a matter of deep and growing concern on the part of members of the academic community. This fact was recently brought to my attention by an ad that appeared in the New York Times. The ad was signed by 2,000 professors from over 100 major universities, including Nobel laureates and Pulitzer Prize winners.

The plight of Soviet Jewry should be a matter of deep concern to all of us, not just the members of the academic community. For that reason I submit the academic appeal that appeared in the Times on January 31, 1969, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1969]

WE APPEAL FOR THE JEWS OF SILENCE

Soviet Jewry, three million strong, constitutes the last great remnant of the vital, creative East European community destroyed by the Nazis. It is the inheritor of no less noble and illustrious a cultural tradition, and an even more ancient one, than that of any other people residing on Soviet territory—a tradition of learning and idealism, of cultural vitality and moral grandeur.

And yet, fifty years after the October Revolution, Soviet Jews, alone among the multitude of Soviet nationality groups, remain deprived of virtually every institutional opportunity to perpetuate their cultural, religious and communal life, despite legal and constitutional guarantees of such rights, which all other groups in fact enjoy.

Hence, gravely concerned with the current situation of Soviet Jewry, the undersigned call upon the Soviet government to demonstrate its wholehearted adherence to the humanitarian ideals incorporated in the Soviet constitution, and:

1. To embark upon a systematic educational campaign to combat antisemitism. The resurgence of "anti-Zionist," i.e., anti-Jewish, propaganda in the wake of the Six-Day War represents a clear violation of the principles laid down by Lenin in the early 1920's.

2. To enable Soviet Jews who so desire to lead culturally fulfilled lives as Jewish Soviet citizens by restoring to them the necessary educational and publication facilities in Yiddish and Hebrew, as well as Russian. There is a manifest need not only for printed works in such fields as Russian Jewish historiography and textbooks, as well as belles lettres and the arts, but for advanced scholarly research.

3. To support newspapers and periodicals of Jewish interest in Yiddish, Hebrew and Russian.

4. To sponsor professional repertory theatres in Moscow and the other great centers of traditional Jewish culture and population.

5. To facilitate the formation of clubs and centers where Jewish youth and students may come together for cultural, educational and social purposes.

6. To provide channels comparable to those assured other Soviet nationalities through which Soviet Jews may maintain close cultural, intellectual and communal ties with Jewish communities in other countries.

7. To secure for the large Soviet Jewish religious community the same kinds of institutions and prerogatives accorded all other religions—for contact and communication among congregations at home and with religious bodies abroad, for the education of rabbis and other religious functionaries, for the production and distribution of religious publications and materials.

8. To open the door to the emigration of those many thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living in the United States, Israel and elsewhere, families that were shattered in the ghettoes and extermination camps of the Nazi era, and for those who would choose Israel as their national homeland.

This appeal goes beyond mere institutions, beyond even the values of language, literature, culture, religion and history. It goes to the very heart of human dignity, to the right of the Jews to live as Jews.

FREE FOOD STAMPS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a recent letter to the New York Times from my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. REID).

I want to associate myself with the views of Mr. REID with regard to the distribution of free food stamps and the urgent need to reassess our laws and priorities so that there need be no hunger and malnutrition in the world's most affluent society.

The gentlemen from New York's 26th District has made many significant contributions to the fight against poverty and deprivation, both here and abroad. His comments deserve our careful consideration.

The letter follows:

FREE FOOD STAMPS

WASHINGTON, *March 7, 1969.*

To the EDITOR:

The recent decision of the Agriculture Department to go over the heads of local officials to issue free food stamps in two pilot counties in South Carolina signals an important advance in the nation's fight against hunger. [News story March 4.]

In the past, the Federal Government's effort to combat hunger have been severely obstructed by the indifference of local bureaucrats. Whether this indifference has had its genesis in ineptitude or in calculated cruelty is irrelevant. The poor went hungry and the Federal Government did nothing.

It is most commendable that the Government has now shifted its order of priorities, to set the needs of people above the whimsy of bureaucrats. But the pilot program in South Carolina is only a start.

According to the Department of Agriculture, there are one and a quarter million persons living in 476 counties in the United States who are eligible for Federal food assistance, but have no programs available to them. In all, it is estimated that fourteen million of the nation's 22 million poor are, for whatever reasons, receiving neither food stamps nor commodities.

We in the North have, perhaps, deluded ourselves into thinking that hunger, if it exists at all, is limited to a few areas of the rural South. The fact is that there is a hunger problem in our own back yard, about which we have been doing little. This callousness must not continue.

I trust that, without undue delay, the Agriculture Department will extend its own program into every county that gives no food asistance to its hungry. I also trust that the Federal Government will effectively monitor those counties where programs ostensibly exist, but where the poor, somehow, still do not get fed.

I believe, furthermore, that Congress must reappraise our laws, so that the United States—the greatest agricultural country in the history of the world—does not pay for the curtailment of food production while its citizens go hungry.

OGDEN R. REID,
Member of Congress.

ANOTHER STEP TOWARD THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Hotz, in an editorial of March 17, 1969, in Aviation Week & Space Technology, reviews the outstanding accomplishments of Astronauts McDevitt, Scott, and Schweickart in the flight of Apollo 9. This outstanding demonstration of man and machine in space is well summarized by Mr. Hotz. As he so aptly points out in the editorial, the need for major decisions in our national space program is now upon us and I urge Members of Congress, the executive agencies, and the American people to heed his words on the need for national decisions at an early date on our national space effort.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER STEP TOWARD THE MOON

The success of the Apollo 9 mission marks another major step toward putting men on the moon this summer. In a steady progression, beginning with the Apollo 7 mission last October and continuing with the spectacular Apollo 8 circumlunar flight in December and the 10-day exercise of Apollo 9, the U.S. manned space flight program has been marching inexorably and successfully toward its goal of landing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth. Rebounding from the tragedy of the 1967 fire, Apollo has been demonstrating a technical and management capability that is truly astounding the world and capturing its imagination.

Although Apollo 9 lacked some of the public appeal of a lunar mission, it was actually the most technically complex and difficult mission yet flown by man in space. Col. James McDivitt, mission commander; Col. David Scott, command module pilot, and Rusty Schweickart, lunar module pilot, took the Apollo system over this most difficult hurdle so far with a flawless flight. It is perhaps ironic that the only serious glitches in Apollo 9 were not in any of its complex mechanical systems but in the frailty of man and the uncertainties of the weather.

MAGNIFICENT PERFORMANCE

The colds of the crew that delayed the Apollo 9 launch by three days and the stormy Atlantic weather that postponed its recovery for 90 min. could not detract from the magnificent performance of the first complete lunar landing spacecraft system, its crew and the ground support establishment. In fact, the delay moving the recovery area farther south into calmer seas gave the world its most dramatic view to date of a manned spacecraft floating down on its main chutes to splash down within television camera range of the Navy aircraft carrier Guadalcanal.

Biggest achievement of Apollo 9 was, of course, the flight testing of the Grumman lunar module through its full range of lunar maneuver requirements short of actual landing. The performance of the LM on this initial test flight was remarkable, for it represents a fourth generation of manned spacecraft and the first specifically designed to operate solely in the environment of space. It was also the first test in space of the lunar landing suit and portable life-support system with which the Apollo 11 astronauts are scheduled to walk and work on the lunar surface. These systems, too, established the validity of their design and operational concept for the tasks ahead.

Less spectacular than the Apollo flights, but equally impressive, is the manner in which the Kennedy Space Center team is operating its vertical assembly and checkout complex. Even before Apollo 9 had completed its flight, the Apollo 10 stack, mounted on its mobile launcher, was dragged by the gigantic crawler out of the Vehicle Assembly Building, (VAB) into position for launch from Pad 39B. Meanwhile, the stack of Apollo 11 hardware is already well into assembly and can be ready soon for launch from Pad 39A. This smooth and swift assembly and checkout operation has proved the validity of the original vertical assembly concept—a daring innovation when it was first proposed nearly a decade ago. It also has given NASA the operational flexibility to speed the lunar landing by launching Apollo 11 before No. 10 if this appears prudent after the data from the recent flight is analyzed. Without the two launch pads and the capacity of the VAB, NASA would have no choice but to follow in sequence no matter what advantages might accrue from a reshuffle:

DECISIONS NEEDED

It should be apparent to the American public and its Congress now that the Apollo program has built a vast technical foundation for space exploration and operations that extends far beyond a lunar landing mission. The facilities at the Kennedy Space Center, Houston and Huntsville, plus the vast industrial and scientific network that supports them, have grown into a unique major national resource that simply didn't exist anywhere in the world at the beginning of this decade.

Even while its attention is riveted on the spectacular flights of Apollo carrying man out of his terrestrial environment, this nation must decide what it will do with the enormous capability it has developed as a result of these missions.

The present pinnacle of space exploration was reached as a result of decisions made seven and eight years ago. The decisions on where we go beyond the lunar landing should have been made several years ago. Instead, they have been postponed until now the need is so acute that, despite the success of Apollo the nation's speace program faces the prospect of sterile decline in the decade ahead.

Some small but significant decisions must be made immediately in the Fiscal 1970 budget now before Congress to avoid the inevitability of decay in the next decade. These are simply finger-in-the-dike types of emergency funding to keep key development programs afloat. They cannot wait for the Agnew-DuBridge-Laird-Paine program to emerge next fall for the Fiscal 1971 budget.

The past leaders of this nation had the foresight and courage to lay a bold and sound foundation to achieve pre-eminence on this vast new frontier of technology. Those now exercising leadership must make the decision whether to build on these foundations or to let them crumble and decay into an historical relic of what this nation might have been.

ROBERT HOTZ.

BAR FEDERAL AID TO INSTITUTIONS PERMITTING SEGREGATED "BLACK STUDIES" AND HOUSING

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have sent to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, expressing my opposition to the extension of Federal aid to any institution of higher education which permits racially segregated courses of studies and housing accommodations for black students only.

The text of my letter follows:

MARCH 19, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you with respect to the implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by your Department. I am particularly concerned with the establishment of separate programs for minority group students in institutions of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance.

As you may know, I sponsored the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and managed its passage through the House of Representatives. Enactment of Title VI of that Act marked the culmination of many years of arduous and dedicated work by those who firmly believe that the Federal Government cannot financially support segregation and other discrimination on racial grounds. The Constitution precludes direct racial discrimination or segregation by Federal, State or local governments. Title VI prohibits indirect support of such discrimination by the Federal Government.

The operation of the Afro-American Studies Institute at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, challenges the national policy expressed in Title VI. In his letter of February 19, 1969, to your Department, the President of Antioch College, James P. Dixon, acknowledges that the Afro-American Studies Institute is not open and available to all students without regard to their race or color. He also indicates that racial restrictions favoring black students to the exclusion of white students have been applied to dormitory accommodations to those enrolled in the Institute program. In addition, President Dixon makes the following statement in replying to your request for information explaining the policy of Antioch College in this matter:

"We are dealing here with a delicate and crucial question. I have no doubt that a literal interpretation of the Civil Rights Act, without taking into account the special context of an educational institution and particularly one that is experimental, might have the result that black students would be denied the specification of their educational needs because they were black. For this interpretation to hold, in my view, would be a great tragedy and a genuine intrusion of public policy into the academic community."

President Nixon's reply obviously fails to meet the legal objections of Title VI. This conclusion is manifest if one would consider a similar course of instruction open and available solely to white students. Similarly, separate housing in a university or college receiving Federal aid in which only whites could be assigned and all blacks excluded further demonstrates the basic conflict with our national goals.

You have done well to give officials of Antioch College another chance to rectify this situation. The national policy, as expressed in Title VI, is opposed to the fostering of two separate societies, black and white, by means of Federal financial assistance. In 1964 the Congress recognized that "separate but equal" can never be equal. I am confident that you will implement the clear statement of national purpose expressed in present Federal law. Indeed, I believe duty compels you to do so.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

CALIFORNIA LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTE

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the April 1 issue of Look magazine includes an article relating to a California labor-management dispute which has assumed national implications. Mr. E. L. "Ted" Barr, Jr., of Sanger, Calif., president of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League, has wired the editors of Look magazine in response to their article, and has sent me a copy of his telegram. At the request of Mr. Barr and constituents of my district I am placing the contents of this telegram in the RECORD at this point:

It is a frightening and shocking thing when, in the face of the record, a responsible national magazine such as *Look* gives the credibility it does to the false "non-violent" preachments of Cesar Chavez.

It is equally shocking that *Look* would permit the use of its columns for Mr. Chavez to challenge the integrity of the President of the United States and the government itself.

But the editors of *Look* do not bear the sole responsibility for Mr. Chavez' latest diatribe because Mr. Chavez has been hacking away with his phony campaign for so long now that thousands of people have come to believe him notwithstanding the falsity of his crusade. Those who have not yet been taken in by Mr. Chavez, however, might expect that responsible editors would check their facts for themselves.

The Chavez interview in *Look* is a falsely pious disclaimer from violence which just doesn't stand up in view of the terror tactics visited upon the grocery outlets of this nation which handle California table grapes.

For example, last October 24, *The New York Times* reported that three A & P food stores in the greater New York area had been fire bombed the previous night by unknown vandals. Two store employees were burned, one seriously. The city's chief fire marshal was quoted as saying that the one fact which linked all these and two earlier bombings was that all were selling California table grapes, all had been picketed and all had been warned not to sell the grapes.

In addition, Mr. Chavez and UFWOC, by their own admission, are totally allied in their boycott and organizing efforts with the Students for a Democratic Society and the Third World Liberation Front axis now tearing apart college campuses across the country. Normal democratic processes are not good enough for these radical organizations, and they aren't good enough for UFWOC either.

Mr. Chavez' challenge to the President is even more irresponsible, if that is possible, because it comes at a time when President Nixon has asked his Secretary of Agriculture and his Secretary of Labor to assemble the facts on the farm labor dispute in order that his Administration might participate in seeking a just solution to the problem.

Mr. Chavez doesn't want a solution, however, unless it is on his terms. He doesn't want a Presidential Task Force involved because he doesn't want the truth known by the American people and their law making representatives.

We hope that the editors of *Look* will delve a bit deeper into the story and bring to their readers the real truth about the California table grape industry and its workers.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the issues involved to the national consumer economy, and in the interest of fairness, it is to be hoped that the matters discussed in Mr. Barr's telegram be studied, not only by the editors of Look, but by Members of Congress and the general public.

DeMOLAY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the youth of our Nation and our world are exposed to serious criticism because of dissident minorities, I think it fitting and proper to call attention to the young people whose ideals and behavior merit strong recognition. The International Order of DeMolay, which this week celebrates its 50th anniversary, is composed of just this type of outstanding young men.

The International Order of DeMolay was founded on March 18, 1919, by Frank S. Land. Beginning with a membership of only nine teenagers, its strong foundation and goal of building better citizens enabled it to grow to an organization of great size and status. It now enjoys a membership of 166,000 young men of ages 14 to 21 in over 2,500 chapters throughout the world.

This continued growth of the DeMolay has been greatly aided by the Masonic bodies who sponsor the individual chapters, and provide advice and facilities for the members to utilize. It was a Mason, Frank Marshall, who wrote the impressive ritual which composes the initiatory and DeMolay degrees, providing the participants with a sense of fidelity and an appreciation of the virtues upheld by the order.

The ideals which are grasped by DeMolays—loyalty and service to God and their fellow man—create in them a stability and purpose, and help them to become responsible and confident citizens.

I am happy to say that in my own State of New Hampshire there are 23 active DeMolay chapters performing vital services for their communities through self-improvement and good citizenship. I salute and congratulate them for their efforts, and thank them for their interest in the welfare of their communities, their State, their Nation, and their world.

STRENGTHEN THE U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am glad to call to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people the statement, "Strengthen the U.S. Foreign Assistance Program," of the AFL–CIO executive council.

It is heartwarming to read this statement of support for the U.S. efforts to assist the developing nations.

It is a pleasure to include these views and recommendations of the AFL–CIO executive council in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STRENGTHEN THE U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council, Bal Harbour, Fla., Feb. 24, 1969)

The security and freedom of our country requires a variety of efforts—political, diplomatic, economic, military, cultural, and humanitarian. In this realization, Democratic and Republican Administrations alike have recognized the necessity of rallying our nation for generous assistance in various forms, particularly to the developing countries. Without the successes which have been achieved in the pursuit of this course, important areas, now centers of economic progress and advancing social justice, would today be pockets of political chaos and pawns in the hands of aggressors bent on world domination.

Over the years, mistakes have been made and shortcomings manifested in carrying out the nation's vast foreign assistance program. Certain lessons could be learned only through practical experience. By and large, little time was lost in improving administrative procedures and reducing the chances of misuse of help to a minimum. On the whole, the AID program and its humanitarian endeavors have been a great credit to the American people.

Last year, the U.S. contributed more than any other country to help the developing nations get on their feet. Thus, India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Turkey were enabled to have harvests. Every one of the fifteen nations which received 84% of AID's economic assistance last year can attest to its effectiveness in helping them achieve self-sustaining growth—economic progress, advances in health, education and the building of democratic institutions.

Moreover, in helping others, our country has also helped itself. Last year, 98% of AID's commodity requirements were American-purchased and 91% of its total expenditures were made in the U.S. P.L. 480 appropriations, which are a rather substantial part of the development assistance program, have been a source of significant support for the income of our nation's farmers.

Despite these constructive results, recent years have witnessed considerable criticism and opposition to the continuation of our country's development assistance program and projects. Much of the criticism has no basis in fact and is unfair.

For instance, it has been falsely charged that AID has discouraged private investments in development assistance. The fact of the matter is that, in regard to the developing countries, American private investors have not been in step with the "wealth and vigor" of our country's financial community. In order to improve this picture, AID's Private Resource Development Service has been encouraging and supporting with guarantees a number of private undertakings in the developing countries. Setting up a new, separate and parallel agency to foster such private investments would only lead to confusion and conflict. We must realize that, though private investment can and should play a vital role in the developing countries, it can only be supplemental to and not be a substitute for the government assistance program.

Some have argued that the very success of this assistance program makes its continuation unnecessary and that its mission has been fulfilled. Others, embittered by the failure of our Allies to help us in the Vietnam conflict, have turned to neoisolationism. Still others are demanding that our country reduce drastically its world responsibilities and stop helping others in view of the magnitude and urgency of some of our domestic problems.

Just as America cannot long enjoy peace and freedom in a world ridden with totalitarian dictators bent on global conquest and domination, so our country cannot long remain prosperous in a world steeped in poverty, ignorance, and disease. No one can deny that famine and poverty are still a massive peril in many parts of the world. What is more, by now it should be clear to everyone that poverty is not necessarily due to lack of natural and human resources, but is rather the result of a failure to use adequately and effectively the potential resources at hand. On a world scale, 80% of the natural resources and 90% of the human resources are today untapped. In this situation, our country with its great technological expertise and industrial capacity can render enormous assistance to the expansion of world economic development and human well-being. There is no better road to the elimination of

XUM

poverty, disease and ignorance which are so assiduously exploited by the Communists in their drive for world power.

The U.S. has provided only 0.85% of its national income for overseas economic assistance—a lower proportion than the 0.93% expended on the average by the sixteen industrially developed countries which constitute the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Hence, no one can reasonably maintain that our foreign assistance program has been a drain on our nation's resources and capacities for dealing with its pressing urban and other domestic problems. No doubt, our country can do much more in the realm of development assistance while improving our domestic conditions.

We of the AFL–CIO are not particularly concerned with what new name the new Administration might give our nation's development assistance agency. There is no reason to chase novelty for the sake of novelty. Sound improvements can be made only on the basis of experience and without hesitation to take new steps for meeting changed or new situations. However, the Executive Council will oppose vigorously all moves—regardless of their guise—to sap the strength or to alter the basic nature of AID by "restructuring" it in such a way as to deprive it of its vital functions. We hope, in this connection, that President Nixon will utilize the great opportunity he has to exercise energetic initiative and leadership in overcoming the tacit and explicit lack of concern in certain sections of our population for the less developed countries.

Towards enabling our country to fulfill ever more effectively its world role and responsibilities in promoting freedom, peace, and social justice, the AFL–CIO Executive Council urges that:

(1) Regardless of the new name which the overseas development assistance program will have, the organization should pursue the essential purpose and preserve the basic structure of AID so as not to divest it of its vital functions.

(2) The overseas development assistance program should be given greater authority and stability of funding through biennial Congressional appropriations.

(3) The Director of the new organization should be made an Under-Secretary of State for Economic Assistance Cooperation in order to strengthen its authority, enhance its mobility of operations, and reduce the frustrations of bureaucratic red tape.

(4) The new agency's career service should be improved by according its working staff the same status and prerogatives as enjoyed by the Foreign Service personnel of the Department of State.

(5) For reasons "both of national interest and humanitarian concern" and also "for the practical mutuality of its benefits", the Congressional appropriations for the foreign assistance program should equal no less than one percent of our national income.

(6) In line with the aims and spirit of Title IX of the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act it should be so amended as to provide help to democratic institutions and social projects (education, research, cultural exchanges, cooperatives, trade unions, etc.) even after countries become economically viable, that is, self-sustaining with respect to capital assistance on liberal terms.

(7) To insure that the great mass of the people, rather than any privileged minority in the developing countries, are the primary beneficiaries of American assistance, increasing emphasis should be put on expanding the activities of organizations like the AIFLD, AALC, and AAFLI which promote the building of democratic institutions (free trade unions, cooperatives, private local impact projects, etc.)

(8) Military assistance and aid for economic and social development should be separated from each other by legislative enactment.

NATIONAL BOYS' CLUBS WEEK, MARCH 16–22, 1969

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the eight branches of the Boys' Clubs of Greater Washington now serving 7,000 youngsters in the Metropolitan Washington area will celebrate National Boys' Club Week March 16 through 22.

A member of Boys' Clubs of America since 1923, the Boys' Clubs of Greater Washington is only one of 800 clubs throughout the Nation who will honor their youth for participation in "juvenile decency"—the very opposite of delinquency; the sum total of all the positive things that Boys' Club members accomplish through the leadership and guidance of their local Boys' Club. These youngsters practice juvenile decency everyday but you do not hear about them—they do not get into trouble.

Boys' Club Week is just one reminder that while, indeed, there is such a thing as a bad boy, they are relatively few. And, more important, we should also remember that there are many millions more who are "good kids."

From the White House on down to State and local government, officials will join in the tribute, while leaders of business and many fields will add their applause.

In a recent speech, President Richard M. Nixon, now BCA honorary chairman who actively served 4 years as BCA board chairman, had this to say about Boys' Clubs:

> Of all the things I have done, nothing has been more heartwarming, nothing has meant more to me than to be chairman of the Boys' Clubs of America.

Jot down the dates on your calendar: National Boys' Club Week, March 16 to 22. It is a time worth noting.

And, a cause worth supporting.

SECRETARY SHULTZ STREAMLINES MANPOWER ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPROVE SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when a major Federal agency, on its own, takes important steps to improve management, and thereby efficiency, through the elimination of duplication and consolidation of functions, it certainly deserves praise from Congress.

Such was the action taken last week by the Department of Labor in the reorganization of its Manpower Administration. In announcing the plan, the new Secretary of Labor, George P. Shultz, noted that the revised organization should "eliminate diffusion of authority, duplication of effort, and unnecessary layers of administration and reporting practices that have tended to insulate national officials from field operations."

These are commendable objectives, these are ambitious objectives, they are important objectives—objectives that should be reemphasized. I, therefore, under unanimous consent place into the RECORD Secretary Shultz' statement on the reorganization of the Manpower Administration, a story from the Washington Post by Frank Porter, a story from the New York Times by Robert B. Sample, Jr., a column from the Washington Daily News by John Herling, and an article by Stephen E. Nordlinger in the Baltimore Sun:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY

The Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor is being reorganized to provide effective manpower services to the Nation through a sound system of management and improved communications.

The new Manpower Administration will decentralize its functions, give more authority to regional offices, and eliminate excessive lines of communication between Washington and the field.

The new plan of action should eliminate diffusion of authority, duplication of effort, and unnecessary layers of administrative and reporting practices that have tended to insulate national officials from field operations and to delay effectiveness of the program.

These revisions should speed the delivery of services costing over $2 billion to the persons and organizations that the Manpower Administration is designed to serve.

For example, suppose the Manpower Administration here authorizes a job training project in a certain State. Under the prior arrangement the authorization would typically go through a national bureau, two separate regional directors, a district office, and then to the State.

Under the new Administration, the authorization will begin at one regional office and then pass directly to the State.

It is logical to integrate training and employment. That is being done. A new unit, the United States Training and Employment Service, is assigned responsibility for the employment, work-experience, and training programs in the Department.

That combines the functions of the Bureau of Work Training Programs and the United States Employment Service.

We further strengthen the Manpower Administration by vesting daily operating responsibility in the Manpower Administrator, thereby permitting the Assistant Secretary to give greater attention to policy formulation and to executive direction of the Manpower Administration.

There will be no change in the functions of the Unemployment Insurance Service, Veterans Employment Service, Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service, and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

The reorganization will be effective on Monday, March 17, in Washington, and in the regions on March 21.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1969]

JOB PLACEMENT REORGANIZATION SET BY SHULTZ

(By Frank C. Porter)

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz announced a structural overhaul of the $2-billion-a-year Manpower Administration yesterday to facilitate better delivery of its services to the Nation's disadvantaged and hardcore unemployed.

A similar though far from identical reorganization plan was offered by Shultz's predecessor, W. Willard Wirtz, last fall. It was rebuffed by President Johnson after strong opposition developed at the state and local level.

As a result, Wirtz offered to resign. There were reports that the opposition had been encouraged by Mr. Johnson.

The Shultz plan incorporates the most controversial feature of the earlier proposal by merging the job placement activities of the Bureau of Employment Security (BES) with the Bureau of Work-Training Programs. The combined operation will be called the U.S. Training and Employment Service.

Where Wirtz had stirred the enmity of a Federal-state BES bureaucracy jealous of its relative autonomy, Shultz apparently won acquiescence and support through a series of discussions with leaders from Congress, executive agencies, Employment Security workers, labor, employers and veterans' groups.

The other half of BES, the Unemployment Insurance Service, will now operate as a separate entity reporting directly to the Manpower Administrator.

The new plan consolidates both a multiplicity of staffs at the top of the organization and a variety of bureaus at some 2000 locations throughout the country.

The result, said Shultz, is "a single line to the field" from Washington and one-stop centers where the whole range of Manpower Administration programs can be tailored to the individual rather than vice versa.

In a separate statement, President Nixon said the reform "opens the door to reorganization of the Job Corps and an elimination of those phases of the program which have proved both inefficient and ineffective in meeting the problem of job training."

The Job Corps presently is operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity but the President has indicated it will be moved to the Manpower Administration as part of his policy to consolidate training programs within a single agency.

Shultz declined to specify what changes might be made in the controversial Job Corps program, saying that they are still under study.

Shultz said everyone, including Wirtz and former Manpower Administrator Stanley Ruttenberg, felt the present system is unworkable and should be reorganized.

He produced an organizational chart of the present manpower setup—a baffling maze of boxes and lines—and observed that Arnold Weber, the Assistant Secretary for Manpower, had said it looked like "a wiring diagram for a perpetual motion machine."

A chart of the revamped organization Shultz also furnished looked cleaner and simpler although some reporters professed skepticism about the difference.

Shultz said his plan differs from the Wirtz proposal in that it provides both an Assistant Secretary for Manpower and a Manpower Administration, the first to serve primarily as a policymaker and the latter as operational head.

Another difference, he said, is the special attention given to veterans and farm labor by assigning separate staff functions to both areas.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1969]

NIXON APPROVES CONSOLIDATION OF U.S. MANPOWER PROGRAMS

(By Robert B. Sample, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—President Nixon announced today a major overhaul of the Labor Department's manpower services in an effort to sharpen his Administration's attack on poverty and hard-core unemployment.

The principal architect of the reorganization was Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, who explained the changes at a White House briefing this morning.

Mr. Shultz has thus succeeded where his predecessor. W. Willard Wirtz, failed. Mr. Wirtz tried to bring order to the Government's scattered manpower retraining programs, but his plans, similar in many respects to those announced today, were blocked by President Johnson after a bitter dispute last November. Mr. Wirtz offered to resign shortly afterward.

GOAL OF REORGANIZATION

In general, the changes are aimed at improving the "delivery" of the Government's manpower programs to those who are supposed to benefit from them—business and labor organizations, local and state governments and, ultimately, the unemployed. The reorganization is intended to reduce red tape, paperwork and the number of bureaucratic steps that must be taken to build effective manpower programs on the local level.

There are more than a dozen manpower programs spending $2–5 billion annually, funded separately by Congress and scattered among five different Federal agencies. Today's reorganization encompasses only the manpower efforts of where the Department of Labor, where the bulk of the retraining programs are concentrated, and does not affect those in other agencies.

The three most important moves would do the following:

Give the department's manpower Administrator full operational authority for all manpower programs—authority that he divided with an Assistant Secretary of Labor under the old arrangement;

Eliminate several more administrative layers by establishing a single line of authority between the Manpower Administrator and the department's field offices in eight geographic regions and the District of Columbia:

Establish a single new office—to be called the United States Training and Employment Service—to oversee the activities of eight separate training programs as well as the recruitment and job-placement functions of the old United States Employment Service, which has now been eliminated.

Officials are particularly hopeful that the new "direct line" between the bureaucracy here and the field offices will do much to improve morale locally and to speed the execution of manpower programs.

Under the old system, for example, a manpower project in, say, Kentucky would not only require authorization from the Manpower Administration in Washington but, typically, from the now-abolished Bureau of Work-Training Programs here, from two separate regional directors and from a district office. Only then would the state be able to start actual retraining.

Under the new plan, the Manpower Administrator in Washington would continue to issue general policy guidelines, but regional administrators would have full authority to approve and undertake specific retraining projects with state and local officials.

Accordingly, state government, state employment services and antipoverty community action agencies seeking Federal help in providing jobs for the poor would have for the first time, a single line of communications to Washington.

The establishment of the new United States Training and Employment Service is vewed by officials as an equally important step. The object of the move is to bring under one roof, again for the first time, the programs that train a man for a job and the agencies that find a job for the man.

Among the programs incorporated into the new unit are the Manpower Development and Training Act; New Careers; Operation Mainstream; the Neighborhood Youth Corps; the Work Incentive Program; Apprenticeship Outreach; the concentrated employment program for hard-core slum areas, and Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, which is administered in conjunction with the National Alliance for Businessmen.

[From the Washington Daily News]

MANPOWER SHUFFLE

(By John Herling)

With the full power of the White House behind them, Labor Secretary Shultz and Assistant Secretary Arnold Weber have achieved a reorganization of the $2 billion Manpower Administration.

The Shultz-Weber plan differs in no essential respect from that proposed by Labor Secretary Wirtz and Stanley Ruttenberg last fall under the previous administration. Unfortunately, however, Messrs. Wirtz and Ruttenberg not only lacked the support of President Johnson, but LBJ's personal displeasure with the Labor Secretary last fall led to his undercutting the plan. This scandalous performance had been hinted at in January, but in the two months since, Mr. Johnson's curiously destructive role has been as nearly confirmed as such things can be.

At any rate, the fact that the Wirtz-Ruttenberg plan had been proposed despite its eventual abortion by LBJ, somewhat simplified the task of Messrs. Shultz and Weber. The latter not only could refine what had been previously proposed, but could profit by the experience of their predecessors with the various interest groups involved.

President Nixon and the new Manpower Administration "will decentralize its functions; a single line of authority from Washington to the field will be established; the regional offices will assume greater responsibility; the overlapping of functions among various bureaus will largely disappear."

An important administrative difference between the Shultz-Weber plan and the Wirtz-Ruttenberg proposal is the creation of a Manpower Administrator, separate from but under Assistant Secretary Weber. As a result, the latter will be able to give greater attention to policy formulation and to executive direction of the Manpower Administration.

The newly created Manpower Administrator becomes director of field administration. It will be headed by Nicholas Peet, formerly Oregon's Commissioner of Employment, who supported the original Wirtz-Ruttenberg plan.

Both plans had arranged for the dissolution of the peculiar bureaucratic empire, known as the Bureau of Employment Security, (BES), long administered by Robert Goodwin. Functions previously centered in BES have been separated out among the following: Office of Controller (in charge of Trust Fund, Budget and Financial Control); the Unemployment Insurance Service; the U.S. Training and Employment and the Office of Policy and Evaluation. This dissolution of BES is considered indispensable to the success of the reorganization.

For many years, Mr. Goodwin's close liaison with the organization known as the Interstate Conference of Employment Security, Administration—financed out of BES administrative funds—had undermined efforts at organization and policy change, dating at least back to Labor Secretary Mitchell. In his last interview with me Mr. Mitchell said the thing he regretted most about his term in office was not to have cracked down on Mr. Goodwin's BES. Labor Secretary Goldberg, tho doubtless chafing, could do nothing about BES. Finally, in the sweep of the great changes in departmental responsibility in the manpower field, Messrs. Wirtz and Ruttenberg, and now Messrs. Shultz and Weber, made their move.

At the White House, Mr. Shultz was asked to account for his success in overcoming the historic obstacles to the changes he has now effected. Said he: "I can only say that in developing our ideas and talking about them we did consult widely with the Interstate Conference group, with members of the Congress who know an awful lot about this, and with people in the Urban Affairs Council and, of course, with the governors."

XUM

It appears that Secretary Shultz is very persuasive as well as competent.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 14, 1969]

Nixon Reorganization Plan on Job-Training Outlined

(By Stephen E. Nordlinger)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—The Nixon administration announced today a major reorganization of the Labor Department's manpower programs as part of its attack on poverty and hard-core unemployment. The reorganization mainly establishes anew the United States Training and Employment Services, which will consolidate the vast array of programs dealing with on-the-job training, recruitment, counseling, testing and placement.

A total of $2 billion a year is involved in the operation of these programs under the department's Manpower Administration.

The reorganization follows the lines announced but quickly suspended last fall by the Johnson administration because of protests by governors and other state officials.

Cancellation of the program by President Johnson led W. Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor, to offer his resignation in the closing weeks of the administration.

Labor department officials disclosed that some careful consultation with governors and other state officials had won over the former opponents. This effort to ease the way to the reorganization had not been taken before the Johnson administration announced its plan last October, it was reported.

EYE ON JOB CORPS

President Nixon, in a statement on the reorganization, indicated that the change might lead to a revamping of the controversial Job Corps, which he has ordered transferred to the Labor Department from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"This administrative reform opens the door to reorganization of the Job Corps, and an elimination of those phases of the program which have proved both inefficient and ineffective in meeting the problem of job training," the President said.

George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor, told a news conference at the White House that the fate of the Job Corps within his department had not yet been decided.

Mr. Shultz joined President Nixon earlier for a 70-minute meeting with George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. According to the secretary, the discussion covered a broad range of subjects including foreign policy, the need for more housing and labor-management relations.

Under the reorganization, which takes effect Monday at the Washington office and March 24 in the field offices, the major programs of the United States Employment Service and Bureau of Work-Training Programs will be transferred to the major new office, the U.S. training and Employment Service.

The office will administer on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act as well as such programs as New Careers, Operation Mainstream, Neighborhood Youth Corps, work incentive programs and Job Opportunities in the Business Sector with the National Alliance of Businessmen.

KILLING OUR MERCHANT MARINE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have been addressing the Members of this House during the past 10 years on the misbegotten philosophy that shapes our foreign trade policy.

This policy of freer trade has been at cross-purposes with our domestic economic policy by exposing our industries, mines, farms, and their workers to foreign competition that derives its advantage almost entirely from low wages. While we strove to lift our own economy to higher levels through a variety of enactment that placed higher cost burdens on our industries and reduced their ability to compete, we tore down our tariff, as if free trade would deliver us into the promised land. We reduced the effectiveness of our tariff an average of about 80 percent, from roughly 50 percent to just above 10 percent, during the past 35 years.

Today we are being swamped by imports of consumer goods. Industry after industry is feeling the bite. Not only textiles and steel, but numerous other products, such as glass, footwear, meat, vegetables, pottery, household goods of all kinds, consumer electronics, typewriters, sewing machines, automobiles.

Our balance of trade has suffered much more than the Department of Commerce press releases would have us believe. Instead of an export surplus of some $700 to $800 million in 1968, we suffered a deficit of more than $3 billion. The official outgivings count our AID and food-for-peace shipments and other giveaway transactions. If these were omitted, as they should be if our trade balance is to reflect our competitive muscle, our weak position would be shown in its true light.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length over the past decade on the folly and shortsightedness of our foreign trade policy; and what I predicted in past years we now see coming true.

There is one sector, however, that has not received the attention that it should have. Those Members of this body who come from our great seaport cities are aware of the plight of our maritime industry and the inexcusably low state to which we have permitted it to fall. Others are not sufficiently aware of the facts.

Because ships are not imported and because merchant shipping is a service and not a commodity our merchant marine has not come under the scope of our foreign trade policy. Yet it is directly affected by that policy as a little exploration will show.

Our maritime industry provides us with a perfect example of what would happen to many of our other industries under free-trade conditions. The industry would have been sunk without a trace had we not come to its rescue in order to preserve a completely barebones vestige of it. As it is, ships that fly the American flag carry only about 6 percent of our total imports and exports; and it would carry a zero percentage if it were not subsidized in both its ship construction and ship operation enterprise. Our costs, by actual Federal wage surveys both here and abroad, are a little over 100 percent above the foreign costs. That this is not a matter of relative inefficiency is shown in the study that I will offer for the RECORD shortly.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the maritime industry could be marked "Exhibit A" as evidence of what free trade would do to our industries.

Let me be clear about it. Our inability to compete does not arise from a lower degree of productivity in our industries than in the foreign. I know of no manufacturing industry in which our output per man-hour or man-year is not higher than that of our foreign competitors. Very often we cannot compete because our lead in productivity is not as far ahead of our competitors as our wages stand above theirs. Our lead is not long enough to cancel the lower foreign wages; but we are ahead in point of absolute efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, without going into greater detail I offer a study of our treatment of our maritime industry that will be an eye opener to many of us. We have turned a deaf ear to an industry that is actually deserving of national gratitude for its service in two World Wars and its readiness at all times to come to our rescue. I insert at this point in the RECORD a study of the comparative treatment of our merchant marine prepared by O. R. Strackbein who is chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy:

Killing Our Merchant Marine

(By O. R. Strackbein, March 13, 1969)

The American merchant marine has been victimized by the nation it serves as perhaps no other legitimate industry has been mistreated in the history of the republic.

So incredible is the true story of the discriminatory treatment of the merchant marine that only incontrovertible facts can sustain the charge. The American public is not remotely aware of the mistreatment inflicted on our merchant fleet and the shipbuilding industry; and it seems fair to say that the Government is also unaware of the degree of discrimination. Only a few members of Congress have a notion of how deeply the unfair usage runs.

To bring to view the supporting facts that will sustain the above charge, it will be desirable to examine relative treatment of certain other industries in comparison with that accorded the merchant marine.

First in the order of treatment we may examine the subsidies extended to certain other industries and to the maritime industry. The basis of the subsidies will be examined later.

Secondly, the additional support extended to other industries but not to the maritime industry to enable them to cope with foreign competitors will be examined.

Third, the relative degree of foreign competitive exposure imposed on the maritime industry in contrast with that of other industries will be brought into the open.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

The largest single subsidy paid by the Federal Government is in support of our agriculture. In 1967 this was in the magnitude of $5½ billion. The largest single item was that of price support which was some $3½ billion.

The Federal Aviation Agency received an estimated $510 million and the Civil Aeronautics Board some $66 million. The Department of Labor dispensed an estimated $598 million, nearly all of which went into unemployment trust fund administration. Public housing and urban renewal received an estimated $641 million. The postal service was given an estimated $504 million. The Maritime Administration received $185 million for ship operation subsidies and administration. The Department of Commerce dispensed $71 million for merchant ships and "other". The Coast Guard, navigation aids and "other", absorbed $300 million. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, Table 548, pp. 394–5.)

Aviation and rail transportation have enjoyed further extensive subsidization in the form of special appropriations for development of the supersonic air plane and fast railway transportation.

Total subsidies set forth in the table were estimated at $8.04 billion for 1967. The amount received by the merchant marine was a relatively minor item. The direct subsidy was about $255 million, while the indirect aid was an indeterminate part of the $300 million dispensed in behalf of the Coast Guard and navigational aid. Agricultural subsidies alone exceeded the maritime outlay by more than ten to one.

DIFFERENTIAL IN OTHER ASSISTANCE

The merchant marine received no assistance in the form of an import duty. There is no tariff on ships bought from foreign sources. A ship provides a service but does not pass through the custom house into the country.

The average duty on dutiable imports is about 11%. The merchant marine does not participate in that style of protection. In 1966 total duty collections were $2.6 billion, none of which benefited the merchant marine.

WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR

Beyond receiving a subsidy in the form of price supports, which enables the wheat farmers to compete in foreign markets at world prices, wheat farmers and flour millers, enjoy the protection not only of a tariff but of a highly restrictive import quota that delivers some 99% of the domestic market to them.

The American merchant marine enjoys no restriction on foreign competition, with the exception of cargo preferences. These are minor privileges compared with the import quotas on wheat and flour.

RAW COTTON

American cotton producers also enjoy price supports in the form of a subsidy that enables them to sell in the world market. Beyond that raw cotton is also protected by a tight import quota. This assures the domestic cotton growers over 95% of the American market.

Again, the merchant marine enjoys no such guarantee of a high share of incoming and outgoing ocean cargo, with the strictly minor exception of cargo preferences on military and foreign aid shipments.

CIVIL AVIATION

The civil aviation industry beyond enjoying subsidies in excess of those paid to the merchant marine, also enjoys virtual monopoly of air travel within the United States.

The merchant marine engaged in foreign trade enjoys no analogous or remotely comparable support.

The value of reserving the domestic market as a virtual monopoly to the industries cited can hardly be exaggerated. It permits a reasonable basis of profitable operation, free from the extreme pressure that low-cost foreign competition would provide.

What is said about the other subsidy programs is not offered in a critical sense. Without the subsidies the domestic industries in question might be in the same desperate straits as the merchant marine.

THE MERCHANT MARINE'S NARROW STRAITS

The unconscionable difference in treatment extended to the other industries cited and the merchant marine becomes all the more apparent if the share of the domestic market enjoyed by these industries is compared with the lot of our ocean shipping.

The share of the domestic market available to the wheat growers, flour millers, cotton growers and civil aviation is upwards of 95%. Our merchant marine, flying the American flag, carries only some 6% of our total imports *and* exports. This means the same as 12% of *half* of our trade. Since imports and exports combined represent our total trade, we could expect to carry only a half of it, leaving the other half for other countries.

This is a case then of 12% vs 95% or more. The ratio is about 8 to 1 against the merchant marine!

LIMITATIONS ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

Aside from the free-trade status of the merchant marine so far as tariff protection is concerned, the size of the American flag merchant fleet is limited by what is estimated by the national defense agencies to be the minimum tonnage needed for the national security. This, as it has shaken down is, as noted above, about 6% of the tonnage needed to carry all of our world trade or 12% of half of it.

Were other industries placed under an effective ceiling that would limit their output or service to the defense needs, many of them would also be on the edge of extinction. Assume that the production of the textile industry, the shoe industry, the automotive industry, the meat industry, or the steel makers were limited to the needs of the national defense! Such a limitation would be regarded as senseless and suicidal.

What then is the philosophy behind the reasoning that restricts the merchant marine to this level? The question has not had an answer.

THE NATURE OF THE MERCHANT MARINE LIMITATION

There is indeed no law against the building and operation of merchant ships or passenger vessels beyond the amount supported by the Federal subsidy. The limitation is nevertheless as certain and as tight as if it were illegal to build and operate tonnages beyond these limits.

The proof is not far to find. The cost of building ships in this country and of operating them under the American flag is slightly more than double that of building in foreign yards and operating with foreign crews. This ratio of over 2 to 1 is arrived at through surveys conducted by the Federal government under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The ratio has indeed widened somewhat instead of narrowing in the past ten years. Since foreign wages are from 25 to 40% of ours the 2 to 1 ratio of our costs reflects our higher productivity or efficiency.

Therefore, the right of our shipyards to build more ships than the construction subsidy supports is a pure mockery; and the same is true of ship operation under the American flag.

So great is the difference between domestic and foreign costs of ship-construction that if a ship is built in an American yard it cannot compete with a foreign-built ship operated by a foreign crew even if the American ship could be operated without a crew!

The cost of a ship is measured not only by the work applied in the shipyard. This is not much more than an assembly operation. Most of the cost has already been incurred in the production of all the materials and equipment that go into the ship. All of this material (with the exception of some imported items) is produced at the American wage level and this generally is of a level comparable to that prevailing in our shipyards, and in some cases higher.

Again, if a ship were built in a foreign yard it could not be operated with an American crew and hope to compete with a foreign-built ship operated by a foreign crew. Competitively it would be beaten the moment it put into effect domestic wage rates and instituted American crew standards and safety regulations. Yet maritime wages are demonstrably no higher than wages in comparable occupations in other industries.

The upshot is that the extent of the Federal subsidy effectively and de facto limits the tonnage of the American flag fleet. Except as a heavily losing venture not a single ton of nonsubsidized shipping could be built and operated.

This means that the American merchant marine is straitjacketed by the limits of the Federal support—as no other industry in this country is straitjacketed. The merchant marine is unique along the whole industrial front in its confinement to the trusses provided by the government.

For this there is no justification in economic policy, public policy or equitable and equal treatment. The merchant marine industry has committed no crime. It has responded to every call of war with promptness and readiness to serve; and it has served well on each occasion.

Much of the blame must be attributed to public ignorance which in turn arises from apathy and failure to be concerned about the misfortunes of a highly necessary and useful industry. There is also a nearly total failure to understand the source of the high costs that produce complete dependency on the subsidy. It does not rest on wages that are out of line with wages in general.

FURTHER SHORT TREATMENT

The merchant marine industry suffers from yet other forms of inequality of treatment; and, again, the unfair treatment may be unconscious and wholly without malice.

Official import statistics record the amount of imports of merchandise and products of all kinds. If a foreign-made aircraft is imported it is recorded as an import; and it pays a duty. It passes through the customs formalities. If a locomotive is imported it is also recorded as an import. The same is true of other transportation equipment, such as automobiles, trucks and buses. These incoming products are all recorded as imports into the country.

Foreign built ships ordered by an American owner, on the other hand, are not regarded as an import unless they are registered under the American Flag; and this is a most rare occurrence, if it occurs at all. The foreign-built American-owned ships may and do touch our ports, load and unload cargo the same as an American flag ship, and may, as indeed they do, compete directly with the American maritime industry the same as any other imported product competes with the American industry; but they (the foreign-built ships) are not recorded as imports!

The explanation is that foreign built ships for American ownership do not pass through the custom house. There is no tariff classification for such ships, nor is there a statistical classification for them in our import statistics. They are treated as private foreign investments!

From our import statistics it would therefore appear as if our shipyards had no competition from abroad. From the point of view of maritime labor it also appears as if it suffered no competition from foreign investment, whereas it means something close to a hundred per cent exclusion! American labor is not employed in foreign yards nor is it usually hired by ships of American ownership built abroad and registered under a foreign flag. This explains the virtual exclusion of American labor. Yet American-owned ships built abroad exceed the tonnage built in American shipyards by a wide ratio. In recent years the ratio has been 3 or 4 to 1. In 1966 United States yards built 146,000 gross tons to 538,000 built for American companies abroad. The ratio is widening alarmingly, not shrinking, in recent building contracts. This foreign building has the same competitive effect on the American industry as import penetration produces in other industries.

Consider for example, what would be the competitive effect should the American automobile industry be limited de facto, not by law, but by insuperable competitive reality, to supplying 12% of the domestic market (call it 12% in place of the present 6% inas-

XUM

much as our merchant marine at the maximum would be entitled to carry only 50% instead of 100% of inbound and outbound ocean cargo). Of a 9-million annual car market our own manufacturers producing in this country would supply only 1,080,000 cars!

The domestic automobile industry would shrink to a mere shadow of itself, even as the maritime industry has progressively shrunk!

Assume further that direct private investments of the American automobile companies in foreign countries were at least as large as those existing in this country (since foreign flag vessels of American ownership now slightly exceed in tonnage those flying the American flag and employing American crews). Imports from these sources would then be in the magnitude of 1,080,000 automobiles or as many as were manufactured here and they would pay no duty. The remaining 7,920,000 automobiles needed to fill out the consumer market for 9,000,000 cars would all be imported! This would be comparable to the situation in which our merchant marine finds itself trussed and frustrated.

As it is, imports of automobiles reached about 1,020,000 units in 1967 or a little over 10% of the total market. These imports included those shipped to this country by American-owned foreign plants. This penetration of 10% corresponds to the analogous penetration of 88% suffered by the American merchant marine industry.

COMPARISON WITH PETROLEUM, TEXTILES, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

The petroleum industry is protected under the national security provision of the Trade Expansion Act (Sec. 232) through an import quota. Under this limitation petroleum imports represent 12.2% of domestic consumption.

The contrast, though not as sharp as in the limitations on importation of wheat and cotton or the restriction on foreign aircraft operation in this country, previously cited, nevertheless looms incredibly against the 88% pentration allowed in the shipping industry: as 12.2 is to 88: while the maritime industry is subjected to an oppressively low ceiling.

Import penetration of textiles, which is regulated by the equivalent of an import quota (with the exception of man-mades and woolens) in 1966 was just below 5%, although the penetration (share of the market supplied by imports) was indeed much higher in some important items. Again, the less than 5% penetration in textiles compares with the 88% suffered by merchant shipping. Moreover, textile imports pay a duty. Foreign-built American ships, as we have observed, pay none; nor does shipping. The government justifiably rescued the cotton textile industry, while the maritime industry cannot develop beyond its present atrophied condition. Without the rescue the textile industry would be in a similar state.

In the case of dairy products the market penetration by imports has been severely limited by an import quota imposed under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 22 was enacted in 1935 to prevent imports from rendering various agricultural programs ineffective. Similar concern and care was not extended to shipbuilding and ocean shipping.

THE GREAT DISPARITY

Enough has been said to show the shocking degree of discrimination practiced in fact against the American merchant marine industry. It is a blot on the honor of the American system that prides itself on equality of treatment and equal protection of the law.

In one industry after another, with a market penetration of imports that is from 1/7 to 1/50 as extensive as in the maritime industry, import quotas have been instituted.

It does not seem possible that such a disparity in treatment could survive public knowledge of the contrast!

Yet, under the budgets submitted to Congress in recent years, funds for shipbuilding reflected no concern over the desperate state of our maritime industry. Only one conclusion is logical—the final phasing out of the merchant marine as a viable industry on the American scene unless the policy is reversed.

NINTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON HIGH-SPEED PHOTOGRAPHY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to have the opportunity today of joining with my good friend and fellow colleague from California, the Honorable WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 178, to express the sense of the Congress that all interested agencies of the Federal Government should participate actively to the greatest practicable extent in the Ninth International Congress on High-Speed Photography to be held in Denver, Colo., in August 1970, under the sponsorship of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers.

As members of the California congressional delegation, Mr. MAILLIARD and I are happy to coauthor this resolution because of the close and historic association of the State of California with the development of modern photography.

Today, especially, as we see unfold the wonders of our Nation's new era of space exploration, Americans are justly proud of the vital role in that vast endeavor being played by high-speed photography.

The Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, whose membership comprises among others the photography experts of the motion picture and television industries, has since 1952 been an active participant in the biennial congresses on high speed photography.

The Ninth International Congress, which is to be held in Denver, Colo., in August of 1970, is to be sponsored by the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers.

Preceding Congresses were held in Washington in 1952, in Paris in 1954, in London in 1956, in Cologne in 1958, in Washington in 1960, in The Hague in 1962, in Zurich in 1965, and in Stockholm in 1968. All of these conferences have been endorsed and assisted by the government of the country in which they were held.

The Washington meeting of 1960 was preceded by the adoption by the 86th Congress in August 1959, of a concurrent resolution endorsing the meeting and urging active participation by the Federal agencies most concerned with the subject.

It is our hope, therefore, that our jointly sponsored resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178, will also receive similar favorable consideration from the present Congress.

Because of its importance to international understanding and good will, I would like to include the text of House Concurrent Resolution 178 in the RECORD at this point:

H. CON. RES. 178

Whereas high-speed photographic techniques can magnify the time scale of scientific phenomena revealing parameters for research, engineering, and testing that are extremely important to every nation; and

Whereas the First and Fifth International Congresses on High Speed Photography were held in the United States of America, as organized and conducted by the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers; and

Whereas the Fifth International Congress on High Speed Photography in 1960 was supported by the Federal Government, as expressed in the S. Con. Res. 75 in 1959; and

Whereas other meetings were held in Paris, London, Cologne, The Hague, Zurich, and Stockholm, and in each instance these meetings have received the recognition and the support of the Governments of the respective host countries; and

Whereas with each meeting the International Congress on High Speed Photography has grown in prestige and stature, and attracts more countries in a continuing growth pattern; and

Whereas the importance of high-speed photography is reflected in nearly all of the physical sciences, including medical, biological, space, and many other fields; and

Whereas the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers is once again sponsoring the International Congress on High Speed Photography in Denver, Colorado, in August 1970 and is desirous of representing the United States of America as the host country in the best possible light; and

Whereas the Congress is fully appreciative of the importance of assuring this international scientific meeting is conducted in a manner which will bring credit and enhanced prestige to the United States of America; and

Whereas it is the belief of the Congress that—

(1) the democratic environment of the free world is the best environment for the achievement in science; and

(2) scientists and engineers have special advantages and opportunities to assist in achieving international understanding since the laws and concepts of science cross all national and ideological boundaries; and

(3) high-speed photography is a universal tool in science, important to nearly all sciences internationally, and the International Congress to High Speed Photography is an excellent means of disseminating the advances in technology; and

Whereas the Congress is interested in (1) promoting international understanding and good will; (2) enhancing the excellence of American science, both basic and applied; and (3) furthering international cooperation in science and technology by creating the necessary climate for effective interchange of ideas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that all interested agencies of the Federal Government should participate actively to the greatest practicable extent in the Ninth International Congress on High Speed Photography to be held in Denver, Colorado, in August 1970, under the sponsorship of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers.

CHARLES D. ROCHE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride, tinged with sadness, that I rise today to pay tribute to a friend, former White House aide Charles D. Roche, who recently enlisted in the ranks of private enterprise.

Pride, because Chuck Roche played a major role in both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations in securing passage of some of the most progressive, important, and needed social legislation in three decades. Unquestionably, he was one of the most articulate and persuasive advocates on Capitol Hill in behalf of those two great Presidents, the Democratic Party, and the Nation that he served.

Sadness, because Chuck Roche's comradeship and experience will be missing from Capitol Hill.

Chuck is a product of Boston, Mass., and Harvard College. He earned his basic training in politics as a journalist and editor before signing on as an invaluable aide in John F. Kennedy's 1960 campaign for the Presidency.

After President Kennedy's victory, Chuck became a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee where he saw his labors rewarded with the successful election of a tide of Democratic Congressmen throughout the Nation.

And from there he went to the White House, where he toiled tirelessly until the end of last year as an adviser to the President for congressional relations.

Although repeatedly lauded for his liaison work with Congress in assisting in the passage of important legislation, Chuck is proudest of his lovely wife and nine healthy, wonderful children—all Democrats.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and most important, Chuck Roche is a close personal friend whose guidance and counsel I consider invaluable. His knowledge of the workings of the Congress is encyclopedic. His experience will be missed on Capitol Hill.

I wish him the best of luck in his new endeavors, and I hope he will return to the Hill often to say hello to his many friends.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: THE EXPORT PROBLEM

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the soaring prices of lumber and wood products have reached the point of a national crisis, as I am sure all my colleagues are aware.

This is a many faceted problem that has developed from a simple focal point—the lack of supply to satisfy demand. One aspect of the situation which is immediately correctable is the drain on domestic timber by foreign purchasers.

A recent column by Gerry Pratt, business editor of the Portland Oregonian, deals with this aspect of the lumber crisis. I would like to commend it to my colleagues in the Congress so they may have a more complete understanding of the entire picture. Here, then, is Mr. Pratt's article:

LOG PRICE "CRUNCH" EXPECTED IN SPRING

(By Gerry Pratt)

A log exporter, with between 70 and 100 million feet of logs in inventory, looked with covetous eyes on his timber this week and admitted: "If we could have turned that inventory loose on the domestic log market we could have retired to Palm Springs."

His dilemma? "We have 11 log ships under charter. You have got to keep this wood coming for them." The charters, he adds, were set up on a seven-year basis, but not so hard and fast that they cannot be changed, before the seven years run out.

Now this is a year of decision as far as the Japanese are concerned. Their problem will be to decide whether to continue to buy wood here or somewhere else and it depends on the economics of the situation, log exporters admit. So far, the economics are good.

That's how you come to a situation reported in the Forest Research News this past week showing log export volume up more than 50 per cent in January over January a year ago, up 24.9 per cent over December's exports. Oregon and Washington's log exports to Japan reached a new monthly high of 199 million board feet, 33.4 per cent above what this area exported in December.

WHAT ABOUT U.S. CURBS?

What happened to the federal government's restrictions?

The facts are that this country exported more than 2 billion feet of logs to Japan last year and will export more than 2 billion feet to Japan this year, despite restrictions that limit federal timber to be exported at 350 million feet a year.

Chuck Caffal, president of Caffal Brothers, 40 years in the log export business and one of the major shippers, says logs are coming from the "pipeline" of timber already purchased by the Japanese in this country.

"We will start going ahead and operating just as any other year this spring shipping logs again. We have another 1.5 to 2 years of shipments in the pipelines already bought for export. But a lot of Japanese companies are going to feel the pinch this year. They are going to have to back off or meet the price. I am not a bit optimistic about the Japanese being able to meet the present stumpage prices we are seeing today."

STUMPAGE PRICES SOAR

The Forestry Research figures reported that Douglas fir in the January export figures had cost the Japanese an average of $104 a thousand. Other softwood shipped averaged $96.98 a thousand. Since the days when that timber was bought, stumpage prices alone have increased more than 50 per cent. What the logs would cost at shipside would be more like a 100 per cent increase.

That is why Caffal can lament that if he were free to turn the logs in his "pipeline" loose to the highest bidder, they would probably go for a 100 per cent profit and to American mills, now paying the highest timber prices in history just to keep in business.

Exporters admit, too, that some Japanese exporters, not committed like Caffal to a sailing schedule of chartered ships, are turning their logs bought for Japan back into the domestic American market. At Coos Bay, Caffal says, export logs have already been stopped at the dockside by the lure of higher profits in the U.S. These have been reloaded onto trucks and shipped to mills in the Eugene area, sold by the Japanese to the Americans.

What of the "glut" that we have heard exists on the Japanese domestic log market, a glut built up by the frenzied buying before the Morse amendment restricting log exports took hold.

JAPAN "GLUT" TO FADE

"A surplus? That is rapidly becoming not true," according to Caffal. "And by spring it will be not true. But I don't think we are through with this export trade."

Caffal claims there is not a single sale on the books of Japanese log export history with prices as high as the domestic American mills are paying today. "I think," Caffal adds, "that the Japanese are going to be in here on a manufactured basis. They are going to have to buy some form of manufactured wood."

"Log ships are designed to carry squares as well as the round product. The main deterrent is that some installed capacity in Japan has got to go down the drain when this starts to happen. This is as unpalatable to them as it would be to us."

Meanwhile, the outlook for the big private timber holders such as Weyerhaeuser, the largest exporter of logs; G-P, which ships mostly cedar, and Crown Zellerbach, and the holders of federal government timber that comes under the export allowance, the prospect is for a profitable spring.

Somewhere between the time when Japan decides that the American prices are too high for them to survive, is going to be a cliff-hanging period on log prices. The Japanese still feel American timber prices may break. They won't back off without a scramble to stay in the bidding.

In finance, the word for a squeeze such as that is now called a "crunch." This spring we should see the "crunch" on log prices.

FREE GUIDE SERVICE FOR THE CAPITOL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last year and again this year I have introduced a bill that, if passed, would provide for a free guide service to the people who visit the Capitol Building. It is my feeling and belief that there is no better place in the world where people can come and learn about representative government and about the history of a Government that deals with freedom. People who come here and pay taxes for all of the Government programs should not be forced to pay a fee as they are now to be given a guided tour of the building. So, it is my hope that the committee will act on my bill or Mr. FRIEDEL's bill so it can be presented to the House so we may have the opportunity to vote on this bill to provide free guide service for the millions of free citizens of our country and from all over the world.

Recently, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey on WMAL Radio spoke of the problem eloquently and effectively and his statement follows:

TODAY IN CONGRESS

(By Joseph McCaffrey)

For years, the capitol guides have been struggling, to little avail, to get themselves on the legislative pay roll. And unlike other trends at the Capitol these days, they are willing to take a pay cut to do it.

At present the guide force is an independent group, deriving its salary from a small charge to tourists. In past years business has been good, but not always.

Last year's riots, for example, hurt business, and sharply reduced their income.

Not only that but if a guide is sick, he or she gets no pay while off work. If a guide was at retirement age, the only thing he has to

XUM

look forward to is social security. He pays the full cost of his hospitalization.

Although he is the spokesmen for Congress to thousands and thousands of tourists, he is not adequately taken care of.

Once again in this congress the guides seek legislation which would put them on a fixed salary, give them retirement benefits, similar to those paid other Hill employees, sick leave, and most of all, free tours for the taxpayers, instead of the present charge.

Bills have been introduced by Senator Dirksen, Congressman Sam Friedel of Maryland and Fred Schwengel of Iowa to improve the guides positions. And this year, there is hope there will be action taken on them.

EXPERT HELP FOR DOT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed pleased to learn of President Nixon's recent nomination of Secor D. Browne to the position of Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Department of Transportation. He is one of the most knowledgeable men in the field, having been a transportation consultant, an associate professor of air transport, and a widely recognized authority in civil aviation and aircraft engineering.

In Browne, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe will find an able assistant in his efforts to solve the Nation's air transportation problems.

The following articles from the Boston Herald Traveler speak highly of Browne's capabilities, and, under unanimous consent, I place them at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Feb. 28, 1969]

EXPERT HELP FOR DOT

President Nixon's nomination of Secor D. Browne of MIT to be Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Department of Transportation is a welcome development in the administration's effort to confront the nation's deepening air transportation problems.

John A. Volpe, the Secretary of Transportation, said recently that the aviation crisis is "the most serious problem" facing his department. In Browne, he will have the assistance of one of America's most knowledgeable men in the field of civil aviation technology.

In addition to teaching at MIT, where he has been on the faculty since 1958, Browne has administered a series of Flight Transportation Seminars in the Institute's Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, has been a frequent consultant on aviation matters and for three years has been chairman of the board of governors of Flight Safety Foundation, Inc., a respected non-profit organization devoted to flight safety. He also has served as president of Browne and Shaw Co., Inc., of Waltham, and corporate vice president of Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., of Cambridge.

Moreover, his witty, and straightforward manner should serve him well in bringing together the various—and not always compatible—factions of the commercial aviation community, which includes governmental agencies, aircraft manufacturers and airline and airport operators.

Browne's approach to the problems of aviation, on the governmental level, may have been foretold in a special article he did for the Herald Traveler in November. In it, the Lincoln resident emphasized the need for more thorough planning and co-ordination among all aviation groups, and among both public and private agencies, to achieve a total air transportation system.

Vital elements in such a system, he said, should be modernization of the airways control network and the expansion and development of airports, including "satellite" general aviation airports and downtown STOLports for the coming generation of short-take-off-and-landing aircraft in the busy transportation corridors. All this would be aimed at getting the most efficient utilization of both airspace and ground facilities.

In short, Browne indicated, the problems created by the growth of aviation must be dealt with directly and realistically, and with adequate funding, and should not be papered over with stopgap measures.

Three weeks ago, Secretary Volpe announced the appointment of Dr. Paul W. Cherington, a Harvard professor and nationally known transportation expert, as his Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, and of Charles D. Baker, vice president of a Boston consulting firm, as Deputy Undersecretary of Transportation.

With the selection of Browne, whose nomination should be speedily approved, Volpe's team has been enhanced by the addition of still another fellow Bay Stater.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Feb. 28, 1969]

VOLPE CALLS PROFESSOR BROWNE, OF MIT, A "REAL IDEA MAN"

WASHINGTON.—Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe yesterday formally introduced MIT Prof. Secor D. Browne as "a real idea man" to be his new Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology.

Volpe, still experiencing some pain from a pinched neck nerve which hospitalized him for several days last week, said the 52-year-old Browne is well suited "as a widely-recognized authority on transportation" for his new post.

Browne, a resident of Lincoln, has been Associate Professor of air transport at MIT since 1958 and is a graduate of Harvard.

It was the former Massachusetts Governor's first news conference since being confirmed by the Senate as head of the Transportation Department.

Volpe said his recommendation on the controversial supersonic transport (SST) program would go to President Nixon by the end of March.

Nixon must decide whether to construct the $1.4 billion aircraft or continue further studies.

Volpe also said he had not had time to keep abreast of developments on the testing of the New York to Boston high speed train. He said he did not know when the train would be put in service and added:

"Boston is a place, I understand, where they are having a little bit of snow and that train in service might be quite helpful."

SOVIET TANKS AND WORLD BANK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, the Indian Government became concerned about a delivery of Soviet tanks to Pakistan.

The following day, the World Bank announced a $40 million loan to Pakistan.

No one would believe the U.S. taxpayers' money is buying Soviet tanks for Pakistan—especially since our U.S. arms policy prohibits arms to either the Indians or Pakistanis. But we do know how funds earmarked for one account can release funds for other purposes.

Under unanimous consent I submit the clippings from the Los Angeles Times for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET TANKS FOR PAKISTAN STIR INDIA

(By William J. Coughlin)

NEW DELHI, March 18.—India is greatly concerned over news that the Soviet Union has delivered an initial shipment of about 50 tanks to Pakistan.

Russian aid to Pakistan, first announced last year, hitherto has consisted of vehicles and communications equipment, according to reliable sources.

Reports of the tank deliveries were front-page news here and Foreign Minister Dinesh Singh was subject to questioning in Parliament. He confirmed the reports, as did other diplomatic sources here.

This raises anew the question of U.S. arms policy for the subcontinent.

Ever since the Indo-Pakistani conflict of 1965, in which both sides employed American-supplied arms, the U.S. has followed a hands-off weapons policy toward both countries. Military aid missions in both Pakistan and India were withdrawn. The only direct military aid now supplied consists of spare parts and certain non-lethal items.

India's military aid now comes from the Soviet Union. Pakistan gets arms from both China and Russia.

High Indian government officials are uncomfortable about the situation. That concern was made plain earlier this month to Soviet Defense Minister Andrei Grechko during a visit here which preceded a tour of Pakistan. Grechko's visit was before news of tank deliveries to Pakistan was confirmed.

In fact, it is probable that one purpose of his mission to New Delhi was to assure the Indian government that Pakistan would not be permitted to use Soviet-supplied arms against India.

That argument does not set very well here because it is the same one the U.S. used and which proved false in the 1965 flareup over Kashmir. The Kashmir question is touchier than ever here now because of the political uncertainty within Pakistan.

Russia has gotten itself into the same uncomfortable position from which the United States succeeded in extricating itself. As a result of the decision to provide military aid to Pakistan, the Russians have reaped considerable ill-will here.

WORLD BANK TO LOAN PAKISTAN $40 MILLION

KARACHI, March 19.—The economy of Pakistan was bolstered today by news that the World Bank has approved a $40 million loan, the largest in the nation's history.

Coming when Pakistan is torn by political dissent and plagued by strikes which have brought many industries to the verge of paralysis, the World Bank decision is regarded here as an expression of confidence that Pakistan will surmount its troubles.

The previous high in World Bank loans to Pakistan had been $25 million in 1967. The latest loan brings the World Bank total here to $183 million.

XUM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 24, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.—Galatians 6: 7.

Our Heavenly Father, grant unto us once again the assurance of Thy sustaining presence as we bow in this circle of prayer. Inspire us with a firmer trust in Thee and with a sympathetic outreach of good will toward all the children of men.

Give to each one of us the realization that Thy power is at work in the world moving in the direction of justice, peace, and love among all nations and in the hearts of all men. Thou art always with us—do Thou help us always to be with Thee.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and as a people make us mindful of Thy presence and ever eager to do Thy will.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 20, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 19, 1969, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 497. An act to amend section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday, March 25, for the House to consider a House joint resolution making appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas notifying me in advance that this request might be made—and at some considerable trouble to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I might add.

However, I have just had available in the last half hour the proposed committee print and the proposed committee report. As I understand it, this will be a supplemental appropriation, not for authorizing increased borrowing authority, and it will also mean reprograming—I am sorry, I do not mean "reprograming" in the ordinary sense of the word, but reprograming of our schedule so we may consider this in the program tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Commodity Credit Corporation is out of both borrowing authority and the funds in order to meet its commitments based on various authorizations we, as a legislative body, have granted it in the past, so they must have this supplemental appropriation which will make the 1969 deficit look worse and the 1970 projected budget perhaps look a little better, if we do not have additional requirements. This is, in fact, based on unexpected yields of principal crops of America and the lowered ceiling price and perhaps the imbalance of trade and the unusually heavy borrowing on the Commodity Credit Corporation toward the restoration of the ever-normal granary.

Mr. MAHON. One of the important factors is the nationwide dock strike, which has slowed down export shipments and created market uncertainties which have slowed down the demand. According to department officials, the permanent loss of markets will exceed $200 million. The effect on the domestic market is even more serious.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that additional information.

I believe it should be brought to the attention of the Congress that so long as we continue to vote subsidies for maybe those who need them least, and subsidize on the basis of bushels produced or purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation and put in the ever-normal granary, so to speak, rather than on restoring the soil and giving the farmer an option to voluntarily withdraw his production, in this day of hydroponics and increased production of our God-given resource, the soil, then we will always be in this situation.

Certainly if we subsidize the producer and the worker and agribusiness as well as the consumer, the Commodity Credit Corporation will increase not only its output in loans but also will increase the interest it pays on its over $14.5 billion now borrowed in order to meet and defray these expenses.

And we are actually not getting at the root of the evil.

But I see no point at all in delaying the gentleman's unanimous-consent request to consider this measure, although I hope the Members will be notified, inasmuch as it was originally announced there would be no business on the floor either today or tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the agriculture appropriation bill was up last year some of us made the forecast that the amount provided for restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation was well short of what it should be and that we would quickly be in a crisis with the new year. Here it is March, and I guess the crisis has been put off somewhat.

My purpose in reserving the right to object is to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if the printed hearings on the supplemental request are available so that they could be examined overnight in preparation for consideration of the measure tomorrow?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. The hearings are available, and they are very concise and to the point, and unusually understandable. They are available now, across the corridor at the office of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. The hearings are in print and available to any Member at this time?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight tonight to file a report on the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

TWENTY-FIVE CONGRESSMEN SPONSOR WATER POLLUTION DISASTER FUND BILL

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, on behalf of myself and 24 other Members of this body, legislation to provide for the creation of a $100 million "Water Pollution Disaster Fund." Under this bill, the Department of the Interior would be authorized to make 90-percent grants to local governments and low-interest loans to industries for the construction of waste treatment plants, sewer lines, and other devices to halt pollution in areas judged in danger of becoming ecological disaster areas.

Without releasing polluters from their liabilities, the legislation would also provide for use of the funds in immediate cleanup of pollution accidents, such as the recent massive oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel. Cleanup costs would then be recovered after determination of liability.

The present legislation being considered by the House and Senate Public

XUM

Works Committees continues the grant and contract program for local waste treatment systems. But these proposals do very little to meet the massive pollution problems of our great river basins, the Great Lakes, and the special problem of Lake Erie.

The Lake Erie problem is national in scope. It is interstate and international. It cannot be solved in a piecemeal pattern. It is beyond the capacity of local governments or the State governments which are in the lake basin.

In my own time, I have witnessed the deterioration of Lake Erie. This phenomenon of waste threatens the fresh water supplies of millions of people.

As we continue to pour pollutants into our Nation's waters, other waterways will face the same disaster. Lower Lake Michigan is in serious trouble. Lake Ontario will receive Lake Erie's waters, and it, too, will be destroyed.

A special fund should be established to attempt to deal with these potential disasters on a priority basis. The legislation we are introducing today attempts to do that. Admittedly, $100 million is an inadequate sum, but it is a start—and we must start, and start today.

The sponsors of this legislation are as follows, Mr. Speaker. It is my hope that other Members of this body will support this legislation and feel free to indicate their support by sponsoring this bill: The sponsors are Mr. Vanik, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Adams, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Boland, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Gonzalez, Mrs. Griffiths, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Madden, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Patten, Mr. Podell, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Rosenthal, and Mr. Stokes.

A $3.6 BILLION TAX LOOPHOLE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, tax-exempt State and municipal bonds constitute one of the largest loopholes in the Nation's tattered tax structure. Like other tax-law failings, this one is utilized by those who are least in need of financial assistance; commercial banks, fire and casualty insurance companies, and individuals whose income is well over $25,000 a year. As a matter of fact, the average tax bracket for those purchasing these tax-exempt bonds is 48 percent. Purchases of State and local securities by commercial banks take on the appearance of being a thinly veiled farce when it is recognized that the banks could not exist without the financial support supplied by the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the need to help State and municipal governments to obtain funds for vitally needed public facilities and other projects affecting the welfare and future of our people. By the same token, I do not think that maintaining a tax loophole is either the best or the only way of providing assistance. An alternative to the present situation was presented in my statement to the House Ways and Means Committee now considering tax reform proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I include a part of that statement in the Record:

Statement by Representative Wright Patman to the House Ways and Means Committee on Tax-Exempt Bonds

Mr. Patman. Mr. Speaker, less than two years ago former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, in a letter to me, estimated that the loss of revenue to the Federal Government through all outstanding tax exempt securities in just one year is about $3.6 billion. It goes without saying that since then this total has grown appreciably larger. As an example: almost $11 billion in new tax exempt municipal securities were issued in 1967. If the exemption status had been removed from these securities the Federal Government would have collected about $264 million in that year alone.

Most tax exempt securities are issued by municipal governments and most of these bonds are purchased by commercial banks and other large investors who diligently and successfully find ways of avoiding the payment of taxes. Eighty-two per cent of all municipal bonds are now being purchased by commercial banks. Last year it was 94 per cent. Most of the remainder are purchased by fire and casualty insurance companies and individuals whose income averages well over $25,000 per year. All of us are aware that substantial numbers of taxpayers in upper brackets completely escape payment of any Federal income taxes through various tax exemptions. As a matter of fact, the present situation regarding these securities alone makes it possible for investors with enough funds to purchase tax exempt bonds in such quantities that their entire income is exempt from Federal income taxes.

I do not mean to impugn the purposes for which these bonds are given tax exempt status or question the necessity of allowing municipal and state governments to have an advantage in the sale of securities. But as you know, Mr. Chairman, I feel the present method, which amounts to establishing and maintaining a tax loophole, is neither the only nor the best one open to municipal governments, particularly since this loophole is going to rapidly expand in the years ahead.

It is also indicated by the fact that commercial bank purchases of municipal tax exempt bonds amounted to an average of 67 per cent during the years 1963–1967, but that in 1967 alone commercial banks, as I mentioned earlier, purchased 82 per cent of all tax exempt municipal securities.

This prospect is dramatically indicated by the fact that bonds sold by state and local public bodies grew from $7.2 billion in 1960 to $14.3 billion in 1967.

Three months ago former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, testified before the Economic Progress Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee and gave the following projections:

Between 1968 and 1972 the public schools of the nation are going to need 770,500 new classrooms just on the elementary and secondary levels.

Preschool programs will require 108,200 new classrooms.

Junior and Community Colleges need to expand their facilities by 83.2 million square feet.

Expenditures planned at nearly 1800 colleges and universities between 1965–1970 total $17 billion.

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters estimates that at least $310 billion in non Federal capital funding will be needed between 1971–1975.

The 1967 Hill-Burton State Plans show that $8 billion is needed to modernize hospitals. More than 100 new hospitals need to be constructed, primarily in suburban areas, to provide 75,000 beds.

Hill-Burton State Plans also disclose the requirement for 2,000 new long term care facilities with 149,000 beds. Capitalization requirements are estimated at $7.2 billion.

During the ten years from 1966–1975 more than $2 billion will be needed to expand and establish community health centers.

A non-Federal investment of $1.1 billion is needed for health research facilities over the same ten year period.

Capital needs to 1975 for medical, dental, nursing and other medical-health profession schools is placed at $6.5 billion.

These figures, although far short of representing total public facility investments that will have to be made by state and municipal governments in the near future, suggest the enormity of the task and the vast sums of money required. If the present situation remains unchanged, a major portion of these capital outlays will be made through the sale of tax exempt bonds. By the same token, if the present situation remains unchanged, the tax loophole provided by these securities will needlessly change from cavernous to crater-like dimensions.

The responsibility of making such capital investments in the welfare and future of our people is now being stymied by current high interest, tight money conditions. As a result, during the last six months, issuance of more than $550 million in tax exempt bond issues have been postponed either because legal interest rate ceilings on these securities were too low or because local government agencies refused to drastically reduce the value of these bonds by allowing interest rates to be increased. During this time the bond buyers index of local government bond yields went up as high as 5.19 per cent, the highest level since 1934. By comparison the index was at a level of 4.07 per cent during the preceding seven months.

Moreover, commercial banks, according to estimates made by Sidney Homer and Henry Kaufman, credit market analysts for Salomon Brothers and Hutzler, are expected to purchase only $4.4 billion in municipal bonds this year, little more than half the volume these institutions took up last year.

The daily reports on the bond market make up what amounts to a description of how the advantage designed to be given state and local government bonds through tax exemption and lower interest rates is being destroyed. I know this is looked on as a temporary situation and that the bond index is expected to return to a more favorable level. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the present cyclical difficulties in marketing these bonds and the tax loophole they create are both equally needless.

Mr. Chairman, I think the solution to both problems is provided in my bill, H.R. 2115, and a similar measure introduced in the upper chamber by Senator Proxmire. The legislation provides state and municipal governments with the alternative of either continuing the practice of issuing tax exempt bonds or removing the tax exempt status of these securities and replacing it with a Federal subsidy that would reduce by one-third the interest cost on these securities by the issuing government. Studies conducted over the past two years by the Economic Progress Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee show that the cost of subsidizing the interest rates on municipal securities would be substantially less than the tax revenue that would be collected by the Federal Government.

These studies show that not only are most municipal securities purchased by commercial banks, insurance companies and wealthy individuals, but that these investors have

XUM

an average tax bracket of 48 per cent, hardly the category that needs much help.

For the sake of illustration, I refer back to the $11 billion of tax exempt municipal bonds sold in 1967. Removal of their tax exempt status would have produced, as I mentioned earlier, about $264 million in Federal tax revenue, based on interest payments totaling $550 million. Under H.R. 2115, a subsidy of $183.3 million would have been extended to municipal governments to reduce debt payment cost—which is to say to reduce the real interest rate on the securities owed by municipal governments. This, in turn, would have allowed the Federal Government to collect $367 million in taxes from the interest income of the investors.

I wish to stress that passage of this legislation does not in any way prevent state and municipal governments from continuing to issue tax exempt securities. It would be left to them to choose between the two approaches to raise funds.

By the same token, it is unrealistic to assume that all municipal governments wishing to market securities will automatically take advantage of the provisions of H.R. 2115 once they become law. Studies conducted by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee show that the Treasury would receive a net gain in revenue under the plan if it was utilized for taxable obligations that amount to 16.3 per cent of state and local government borrowing. The study indicated that in all probably at least 22 per cent of all state and local bonds issued would be marketed on a guaranteed, taxable basis.

I think the advantages presented to state and municipal governments through this legislation are apparent. Securities could be marketed with higher interest rates which would make them more attractive to a much greater range of investors. Yet the provision of an interest subsidy could maintain actual debt payment costs at the present or even lower levels.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the lack of uniform rating procedures applying to the issuance of municipal securities, constitutes a burden on all but the largest and best known of the nation's communities. The absence of overall coverage in rating has meant that the small municipal governments experience not only needless difficulty but higher debt retirement costs as well in marketing their securities. This problem is reflected by interest rates applied to state and municipal securities isued in 1967 which ranged from 4 to 6 per cent.

The legislation which I have introduced offers a solution to this problem because it would create a Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation. The Corporation would be authorized to provide a comprehensive report detailing the municipal's economic and fiscal resources, including:

All the elements that make up a community's economy.

Examination of revenue trends, expenditures, tax levies, property valuations, Federal and State aids.

Establishment of appropriate economic, fiscal and financial ratios, averages and indices and comparisons of such measures with national and regional averages.

In effect those municipals which channel the marketing of their securities through the Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation would receive the benefits of what amounts to a bond rating service and this in turn will make lower interest rates possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think H.R. 2115 constitutes the best possible approach to eliminating what amounts to one of the largest loopholes in the nation's tax structure while, at the same time, offering a way for municipal governments to maintain a vitally needed advantage in the sale of securities. I strongly urge you to incorporate the elements of the bill in the comprehensive legislative proposals you are developing to deal with the entire scope of needless revenue losses to the Federal Government.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION SHOULD STRENGTHEN ITS HOLDING COMPANY BILL

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Nixon administration sent to the Congress legislation on the one-bank holding company issue which is scheduled for hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee Tuesday, April 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to strengthen its one-bank holding company bill by applying the standards of the 1956 Holding Company Act across the board to all bank holding companies.

Such an extension of the 1956 law would provide even-handed justice for all bank holding companies and avoid the opening of a Pandora's box of new loopholes. The rewriting of major provisions of the 1956 act poses grave dangers to the effective regulation of multibank as well as one-bank holding companies.

In the past few days I have discussed the legislation in detail in conferences with high administration officials.

These officials have assured me that they want to control the growth of the bank holding companies and I am hopeful that we will be able to convince them of the need for a stronger version of this legislation during the forthcoming hearings. It is essential that we have a holding company bill this session and I hope that we will have strong bipartisan support when this legislation is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy the Nixon administration has now formally joined in the fight for regulation and I am pleased that some of the administration's bill has been strengthened from the original drafts to recognize findings of the Banking and Currency Committee's report on one-bank holding companies published on February 11.

Despite this, the administration bill has crippling defects right at the nerve center of this entire legislative effort. I am appalled these were not corrected before the bill was sent forward to the Congress. I am particularly disturbed about these points:

First. The administration's rewriting of the 1956 Holding Company Act to broaden the areas of nonbanking activities in which a holding company may engage. The 1956 act limits the activities to those "closely related to banking." But the Nixon administration's proposal would broaden this to allow activities related to finance in nature and would eliminate the language "closely related to banking." This, for instance, would mean that a large bank could acquire a huge insurance operation with immunity.

Such a definition would greatly expand the scope of existing multibank holding companies and would only partially restrict the activities of the new one-bank holding companies.

The administration's language is extremely loose and administrative interpretations under this section could destroy the purpose of the legislation.

Second. The Nixon administration's decision to spread the enforcement jurisdiction over three agencies—the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the Comptroller of the Currency. The administration makes much of the point that its bill would require unanimous agreement by all three agencies on the broad guidelines governing the regulation of the bank holding companies. However, the acquisitions of new enterprises by the holding companies would be handled by the individual agencies and would not require unanimous approval of the three agencies. Thus each agency would be left free to interpret the "unanimous" guidelines as it saw fit.

This jurisdiction should be left to the Federal Reserve which has fairly administered the 1956 act. No evidence has been brought forward to support the claim that this authority should be removed from the Federal Reserve and spread piecemeal among the agencies.

On the other hand, there is very strong evidence that none of this jurisdiction should fall to the Comptroller of the Currency who has taken a consistent attitude that the national banks should be allowed to enter any business, anywhere, and at any time. The Comptroller has distorted many of the existing banking laws against the public interest and his treatment of the holding company regulation would be no different should Congress be foolish enough to give him authority in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am also opposed to the insertion of a "grandfather" clause which leaves one-bank holding company acquisitions prior to June 30, 1968, untouched. The 1956 act required the multibank holding companies to divest themselves of their acquisitions without the protection of a "grandfather" clause. A study of these holding companies and their former subsidiaries shows that there has been no adverse economic impact from the divestitures.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Nixon administration will give attention to other areas, particularly those involving antitrust and anticompetitive issues, as the hearings develop.

I have informed the administration officials personally that I will call any witnesses they desire and that I will work with them in any way possible. The important thing is that we get a good solid bill that will fully regulate these holding companies on an equitable basis.

CONGRESSMAN OLSEN SALUTES THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA AND THEIR PRESIDENT, TONY BOYLE

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 1, coal miners throughout the United States will lay down their tools to take a day off. This is in accordance with their contracts with the coal operators. They will celebrate the 71st anniversary of the winning of the first 8-hour day by a labor organization in American industry.

It was on the 1st of April, 1898, that the United Mine Workers of America, then 8 years old, won by agreement with the coal operators of the Central Competitive Field of Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, a shortened workday. The leader of this great American organization, the United Mine Workers of America, was, in those days, one Michael B. Ratchford.

There are several interesting matters that should be noted in connection with this celebration by the United Mine Workers of America.

First and foremost, perhaps, is the fact that this shortened workday, won nearly three-quarters of a century ago, was proposed by the coal miners' union primarily because it would bring greater health and safety to the coal miners. The men felt, and rightly so, that with a shorter workday they would be less fatigued and thus less apt to have accidents and illness in the coal mines that could kill or maim them.

Another interesting matter that should be called to the attention of my listeners is that Mr. Ratchford was the fourth president of this great union of coal miners which was established in Columbus, Ohio, on January 25, 1890. Every one of the men who have led the United Mine Workers of America has been an underground coal miner in his time. From John B. Rae, who led the union at its founding in 1890, to my fellow Montanan and personal friend, W. A. "Tony" Boyle, who is presently the international president of the United Mine Workers, they have all been men who have never forgotten the pit from which they were digged, as the saying goes.

The 91st Congress is currently considering legislation that is designed to bring better health and safety to the Nation's coal miners. I feel that it is appropriate on this occasion and in recognition of the 71st anniversary of the 8-hour day in the Nation's coal mines to relate some of my personal knowledge of these matters that are of vital concern to this Congress and to all Americans.

I quote from a recent editorial in the United Mine Workers Journal concerning the record of the union on coal mine safety matters:

> This Union, since establishment in 1890, has had as its No. 1 objectivity the protection of lives and limbs of the men who mine the nation's coal. The United Mine Workers of America has never let down the guard for 78 years.
>
> We have not, of course, achieved perfection. The fight for mine safety has been an uphill struggle all the way.
>
> This Union was responsible for the establishment in 1911 of the United States Bureau of Mines. This Union was responsible, in 1941—30 years later, for finally getting the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal Coal Mine inspection law. This Union was responsible, in 1952, for finally getting the Congress to pass a Federal Coal Mine Safety Act with teeth in it. The law was, as finally passed, inadequate as we said at the time and as the then President Harry S. Truman said. But it was better than no law.
>
> President W. A. Boyle was responsible, in 1966, for getting the Congress to tighten up the existing Federal law so that all coal mines could be inspected and Federal inspectors would have the authority to shut down any hazardous coal mines.
>
> This Union was responsible, in 1946, after a bitter struggle with the coal industry and the Federal government, for establishing the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund which, for the first time in coal mining history in the United States, offered some relief to sick and injured coal miners and some compensation to their families when the men's lives were lost.
>
> This Union was responsible for pushing through action on establishment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Code when it became clear that the Federal law, as enacted by Congress, was not an adequate law. This Union was responsible for making that Code a part of its contract with the coal industry so that the code could be enforced by the Union shutting down unsafe coal mines where necessary and when state and Federal inspectors could not act because of inadequate laws.
>
> This Union has been responsible for pushing model coal mine safety laws through reluctant and uninterested state legislatures.
>
> This Union has safety committees, elected by the coal miners, in every coal mine under contract with the industry throughout the United States.
>
> This Union was responsible for establishing under contract with the industry, the Joint Safety Committee.
>
> This Union was responsible for pushing through Congress the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.
>
> This Union has a full-time, expertly staffed Safety Division, now headed by Lewis Evans, an experienced coal mine safety man and former head of the Department of Mines and Mineral Industries of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
>
> Have we done enough?
>
> Probably not.
>
> We have not reached the point in our never-ending struggle, where it can be said that there is any such thing as a safe coal mine. There is not now and never has been a safe coal mine. Such matters are relative. Some mines are not as hazardous as others. But they are all dangerous.
>
> We have not been able to get the Congress and the Budget Bureau to permit appropriation of sufficient funds to enable the Bureau of Mines to carry on its safety work with the maximum effectiveness.
>
> We have not been able to prevail on all coal mining states to enact model coal mine safety laws.
>
> But we have not given up and we never shall as long as there is a United Mine Workers of America.
>
> Safety first is more than a motto in the coal mining industry. It is an essential goal of this Union now as it always has been.
>
> We have no magic answer to the problem of coal mine safety. The only realistic solution to the continuing problem of hazards in coal mines is a vigilant never-ending fight by this Union and all elements involved in the coal industry for complete and realistic cooperation to save the lives and protect the bodies of the men who mine the nation's coal.
>
> Let me say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that to my personal knowledge the record of the Nnited Mine Workers of America and its president, "Tony" Boyle is crystal clear on this matter of safety in the coal mines.
>
> I am proud to be able to say that I was once a mining man. I was not a coal miner. But I worked in the hard rock mines of my native State of Montana. One of the mining men whom I met in those days was my good and long-time personal friend, "Tony" Boyle.
>
> "Tony" is one of those coal miners about whom that great former leader of America's coal miners, John L. Lewis, said:
>
> > "The public does not know that a man who works in a coal mine is not afraid of anything except his God . . .
> >
> > "He is not afraid of injunctions, or politicians, or threats, or denunciations, or verbal castigations, or slander . . .
> >
> > "He does not fear death."
>
> I have personal knowledge of the fact that "Tony" Boyle does not fear anything except his God.

"Tony" and I both worked in the hard rock mines of Montana. I went on in my career to become the attorney general of Montana and then to be elected to Congress. "Tony" went on in his career to work in Montana's coal mines and to be elected to every office in his local union, in his UMWA district organization, and in his international union, except that of international secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, "Tony" Boyle worked at every coal mining job that a man can work at. And every one of those jobs was an underground job.

"Tony" and I had our closest association when we labored together in the State Capital of Montana to bring about an up-to-date State coal mine safety law in 1949.

And I can recall when "Tony" earlier in his career was fighting the good fight in behalf of Montana's coal miners. He did not always win the tough labor-management and legislative battles. But he never gave up.

"Tony" Boyle started battling for safety legislation for coal miners in the 1930's and he has carried that fighting spirit with him to the Nation's Capital where he is still—and now again—engaged in a new battle to win for his members and all coal miners the safe and healthful conditions to which they are entitled.

I recall when the international union sent him back to Montana in 1949 to work for a new coal mine safety law for that State. "Tony" Boyle and his associates literally rewrote the entire coal mine safety law of Montana.

I was able to be of some assistance in my position as attorney general of the State. And I am proud of the small role that I played in bringing into effect in our State a model coal mine safety law. It was then the best coal mine safety law in existence in any of the 25 coal-mining States.

That law was known as a "model" State coal mine safety law. It was copied by other coal mining States. It was enacted before the Congress passed its first effective Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in 1952. That Montana law, enacted because of the dedicated leadership of "Tony" Boyle before the State legislature, could still serve today as an inspiration in the never-ending struggle to get better health and safety laws for coal miners.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me here today hail America's coal miners, among whom there is a bond and a fraternity and a sense of brotherhood that cannot well be understood by the public that does not work underground.

And let me pay my respects to my

friend, "Tony" Boyle, a dedicated representative of the Nation's coal miners who has devoted his entire adult life to fighting for his brother coal miners to win for them safer conditions and better health; to win for them the highest industrial wages paid in the world today, and to help them realize the best and most efficient welfare and retirement program in any industry in the Nation—or any other nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President's statement on campus disorders, and the letter written to college administrators by HEW Secretary Robert Finch, are at least a step in the right direction if not as firm as many of us had expected of the new administration.

The President has correctly stated that order on the campus is the primary responsibility of college administrators, and the local police authorities charged with enforcing State and local laws. The Secretary has appropriately informed administrators of the laws enacted by Congress requiring a cutoff of funds to any student convicted of participating in a disorder while receiving Federal educational aid.

My concern, however, is that the real revolutionaries are simply using the campus as a sanctuary for their terror activities. The pattern is well developed in other nations, and there is mounting evidence that it is spreading across America.

As an example, this morning's mail brought copies of a study outline for a revolutionary program taught by student extremists at Santa Barbara, Calif. The University Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara, was seized by a student mob on February 17. Activists then began new classes of their own in the building, one of which was on the tactics and practice of guerrilla warfare.

This class outline indicates that strategies and drills would be held so students could learn how:

First. To hold a building against police attack.

Second. Conduct hit-and-run missions.

Third. Defend yourself from police harassment.

Fourth. To sabotage military-industrial-police functions.

Fifth. To get community involved through terrorism.

There can be no question of the motive of this training program. The class information sheet, given to those attending the first session on March 7, stated:

> The purpose of this class is not to enlighten people into a revolutionary consciousness or to argue that our present government is capable of responding to the people: it is the purpose of the class to give the people who are already convinced that this government needs to be overthrown a method for overthrowing it!

The class study outline includes sabotage of "military-industry-police functions, and community terrorism." Clearly these activities are beyond the scope of legitimate campus activities aimed only at college reform. They are clearly violent revolutionary programs aimed, as the group itself proclaims, at the overthrow of the Government by force.

I am asking the Attorney General of the United States for action against this particular group at Santa Barbara, which itself proclaims is not just advocating, but actively pursuing the overthrow of the Government—a most serious violation of Federal law.

From the President's statement, I am not sure the administration has recognized the real threat, which goes beyond the borders of the college campuses. This Nation thrives on dissent, and grows strong through orderly change and progress. It cannot afford college sanctuaries which protect professional revolutionaries whose real purpose is to deprive us of our liberties.

THE SEAPOWER GAP

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week there was a great deal of talk in Washington about President Nixon's plans for the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile system. His program for the ABM seems realistic to me as the best course of action in the interest of our national security.

However, an even more vital need of our national security could, in the long run, be something entirely different. I refer to American seapower, including Navy, merchant marine, fishing capacity, and oceanographic exploration.

Unfortunately this whole matter of security on the sea receives far too little attention. Far too few Americans, in Washington and elsewhere, are aware of the threat to our national security which presents itself in the form of reduced American control on the seas of the world.

Last week, for example, two more American tuna boats were illegally seized by Peru at the very time our Government's special representative was arriving there to discuss problems between the two countries.

And the *Pueblo* case is a constant reminder that we allowed the U.S. Navy to be humiliated by North Korea, a fourth-rate naval power, when they boarded the ship on the high seas and we did nothing about it.

Our merchant marine is still another aspect of this problem. We all know that our country sells a lot of goods abroad and that we buy a lot from other countries. But how many realize that of all these goods flowing through American ports only 5 percent are carried in American ships?

This country not so long ago was the world's leading shipbuilder. Today we are 10th. In 1968 our total American ship production was only 2½ percent of Japan's.

In other words, Japan is building 40 times more ship tonnage than we are, barely 20 years after the war in which our sea strength was at a peak and Japan's was badly defeated.

And Russia is continuing to build seapower in all ways: merchant fleet on a long-range program, naval power extending to all oceans of the world, and expansion of fishing capacity and oceanographic exploration.

There is no question but that while the Russian merchant fleet is carrying a greater and greater share of the world's sea freight the Kremlin considers also that her merchant ships double as part of her navy.

With the help of her merchant navy Russia already has every ocean route under permanent surveillance. In the case of a worldwide emergency many of Russia's merchant and fishing ships could become a real threat to Western shipping.

Congress is not blind to this problem. Many of us have proposed that the Federal Maritime Administration be lifted out of its bureaucratic oblivion and be given independent status.

This move would give it the "clout" it needs as a means of bringing more Government weight to bear on the entire merchant marine program. It was approved by Congress last year, vetoed by former President Johnson, and now proposed again this year.

Also, the House Armed Services Committee has set up a new subcommittee on seapower. This group intends to consider the lag in shipbuilding and to try to come to grips with the whole sorry mess of our failing American seapower.

It is unfortunately true that the American public has generally forgotten about our national sea-going capability which somehow cannot compete for attention with other national needs.

This makes the task doubly hard for those of us in Congress who want to restore American sea-going respectability.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to exaggerate the importance of this issue. Whether we like it or not, world events are still likely to be determined on the basis of tactics and strategies of power.

And seapower, as surprising as this may be to many Americans, is still as vital as it ever was to the basic economic and military realities which determine power, or the lack of it.

Our considerations of national security must account for this concept of seapower.

UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM VIETNAM

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a moment—one which will pass quickly—President Nixon has the best conceivable opportunity to decide in favor of withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

If military policies, with or without escalation, inherited from President Johnson are continued much longer, they will become Nixon policies. Turning back

XUM

will become increasingly difficult as the Nixon team encounters the necessity of defending military action, and the conflict will soon become Nixon's war in substance as well as appearance with all the grim consequences this entails.

The justification for withdrawal is plain: The United States made a fundamental mistake in committing troops in the first place; the rational corrective action is to withdraw, rather than to continue to compound the original error.

It has been said, and I believe accurately, that in 1961 and again in 1964 the United States had unique opportunities to review options in Vietnam, because on those occasions a new President had just taken office.

In 1961 President Kennedy had occasion to review options and involvement, such as it was, in Vietnam. In 1964 President Johnson likewise had the opportunity to reconsider policies.

Now in 1969 President Nixon has the same opportunity, but it is an opportunity which will quickly pass.

This week U.S. deaths in Vietnam as the result of hostile action will surpass those of the Korean war. Vietnam has cost more lives from hostile action than any other foreign war excepting only the two World Wars. And if the present rate of battle deaths continues in Vietnam, the toll will surpass those killed in World War I before the end of the year.

Neither a satisfactory military nor negotiated end is in prospect.

A decisive military settlement, at a price the American people will support, is not attainable. It is time to look beyond a natural tendency to rationalize and admit that 8 years, 32,000 lives, 175,000 other casualties and over a hundred billion dollars are convincing.

Hanoi will concede nothing of importance at the negotiating table. The troops of Ho Chi Minh have survived nearly 20 years of persistent and determined opposition from modern military air, ground, and sea forces. More of them have died fighting than aggregate American losses in all our foreign wars. Nevertheless, their military position is today stronger than at many times in the past. From this position of strength and with a vivid memory of Fontainebleau and Geneva, where he believed himself sold out by the West, Ho is well situated to hold out indefinitely at Paris.

Peace negotiations in Paris have not reduced battle deaths for the United States. In fact almost a third of our troops killed in hostile action have died since the peace offensive began on March 31, 1968.

President Nixon can turn what appears to be an inevitable military and diplomatic disaster to the best advantage by moving swiftly to correct a colossal inherited error. The boldness, courage, and candor of the action will elevate him and the country he leads to a pinnacle of worldwide respect, honor, and gratitude America has not enjoyed for years.

By quickly putting this corrective action behind him, the President's administration will achieve the maximum opportunity to deal effectively with other pressing matters at home and abroad.

Critics of my proposal may say it degrades or belittles those who have fought bravely for their nation. Nothing could be further from my objective. Rather, in the name of those thousands of young men who have been killed and injured, I urge our new President to correct an inherited mistake before it engulfs still more thousands.

Great nations, like great men, must have the courage to admit error. In committing troops to the war in Vietnam, the United States erred. It was perhaps the most grievous error in our history. The admission of error is long overdue. So is its correction.

We were mistaken, because the assumptions on which we justified military action were faulty. The leading faulty assumptions were:

That we responded to the invitation of a sovereign government seeking help to repel an invasion by forces of another nation.

That we were committed to send troops by treaty obligations and agreement of past administrations.

That our policy of containing communism required our intervention against Ho Chi Minh.

That with a little more effort and national unity the war would soon be over.

These assumptions formed the basis for the war policies of President Johnson. If they are not soon rejected, they will inevitably become the basis for the war policies of President Nixon.

The war was ill-conceived from the start. It violated basic American traditions, principles, and our most cherished cultural heritage.[1] In broad terms we reduced ourselves to the law of the jungle, because we used our power outside the context of law and reason. We thus undertook the grave risk of corrupting the good we originally might wish to have achieved, as well as corrupting much of our Nation itself.[2]

I accept part of the responsibility myself. My service in Congress began almost exactly on the day the Department of Defense began to publish lists of Vietnam casualties. Too often, I was a passive bystander, serving, as was the case with many of my colleagues in the Congress, more in the role of a supply sergeant to military needs than in the primary role of decisionmaker on questions of war and military policy as prescribed by article I of the U.S. Constitution.

Although 2 years ago I began to challenge openly war policies and attempt through the amendment and other legislative processes to give force to my challenge, this work on my part began after Congress had permitted the executive branch to move decisively and substantially into a war footing in Vietnam.

In the recital of the dreary events which led us to our present unfortunate position, I therefore reserve to myself a measure of accountability.

The pressing question today is not so much what went wrong and why in the past—although that is important; rather, what can now be done to face and correct the error.

The most immediately responsive center of authority, of course, is the White House where President Nixon, as Commander in Chief can, if he will, begin withdrawal of our combat forces.

In order to provide what I believe to be a solid historical justification for withdrawal from Vietnam, I feel it is necessary to examine the assumptions that led us into Vietnam in the first place.

FALSE ASSUMPTION

Americans were led to believe, for example, that we entered Vietnam at the invitation of a sovereign government which requested our help in repelling an invasion by the armies of another nation. If this were true, our involvement could be explained, but it was not. Granted, the historical background in Southeast Asia is complicated; it is well worth our study. Unless we understand the errors that led us into Vietnam, we are unlikely ever to find our way out.

What is now called Vietnam was in modern times, up until 1954, part of the French colony of Indochina. The French colonial policies were far from enlightened. Colonial capitalism spread the negative effects of modern labor exploitation over a vast number of people. The guiding principle of French economic policy in Indochina was to put immediate profit ahead of any other concern. The controlling position in the economy's capitalist sector was always held by the French with a minor role by the Chinese. On top of this, the structure of the French administration in Indochina offered no channel through which popular discontent could be translated.[3] The effect of all this, still being felt today, is the absence of a strong, educated middle class and the other institutions necessary for nationbuilding.[4]

Another, more immediate effect of French colonial rule was the readiness of many peasants to listen to any party whose leaders were willing to make the plight of the poor and the landless their chief concern. As early as 1925 Ho Chi Minh understood that only active resistance with the support of the people could rid the country of the French. In that year, while still calling himself Le Thuy, he founded the Revolutionary League of the Youth in Vietnam. This was to become the nucleus of the future Communist Party of Indochina.[5]

All Vietnamese, whether monarchist, mandarinal, authoritarian, reformist, republican constitutionalist, or revolutionist wanted to be rid of an alien master.[6] Again, Ho Chi Minh was able to capitalize on the situation because he and his followers demonstrated that they were able to conduct the fight for independence with the greatest prospect of success, and thus became the accepted leaders of that fight.[7]

---

[1] David Schoenbrun, "Vietnam, How We Got In, How To Get Out," 1968, p. 5.

[2] Marcus G. Raskin and Bernard B. Fall, "The Viet-Nam Reader," 1965, p. xv.

[3] Ellen J. Hammer, "The Struggle for Indochina 1940–1955," 1967, p. 79.

[4] Frank N. Trager, "Why Viet Nam?" 1966, p. 9.

[5] Joseph Buttinger, "Vietnam: A Political History," 1968, p. 160.

[6] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 60.

[7] *Op. cit.*, Buttinger, p. 178.

The Communists were superior to all other nationalist groups in two ways: They were trained in revolutionary activity, and they possessed a workable political strategy for mass action; that is, anticolonialism and nationalism. They related every issue, no matter how seemingly unimportant, to foreign rule. They spoke of the need for lower taxes, land redistribution, higher wages and better medical care for workers, and the right to organize unions. They succeeded in convincing the peasants and workers that those who wanted independence understood their problems and grievances. For the nationalist middle-class leaders, anticapitalism was an acceptable, if not welcome ideology.[8]

Thus by combining an appeal to the downtrodden, as well as to the nationalists, Ho Chi Minh was able to do what other nationalists had failed to do. By the outbreak of World War II he was the outstanding leader of the independence movement.[9] The thrust for independence was so great that even the majority of the 2 million Vietnamese Catholics made common cause with him. The four Vietnamese bishops appealed to the Pope to support Vietnamese independence under the rule of Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh government.[10]

When the Japanese conquered Indochina during World War II, Ho Chi Minh became the principal rallying agent for the underground factions. Both the United States and Nationalist China openly recognized Ho as the leader of the free Indochina movement during World War II. We supplied Ho's forces with arms and advisers. American officers operating with Ho's Vietminh went so far as to tell them the United States would support Vietnam's aspirations for independence once the war was ended.[11] Toward the end of the war, alarmed by the growing strength of the independence movement, Japan set up a puppet Vietnam Government under the Emperor of Annan, Bao Dai.[12]

On September 2, 1945, following the Japanese collapse, Ho Chi Minh proclaimed the independence of all of Vietnam. He read to a mass meeting in Hanoi:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And, as the crowd cheered with wild enthusiasm, he ended, "Vietnam has the right to be free and independent."[13]

There is little doubt that during World War II the United States favored the idea of eventual independence for the states of Indochina. Franklin D. Roosevelt repeatedly and openly had indicated his hopes for these states, but his death ended this phase of American policy.[14]

Vietnamese independence was not to come easily. The forces of Ho Chi Minh were to be thwarted for years to come. British occupation forces under Maj. Gen. Douglas Gracey proceeded first to rearm, and then to use defeated Japanese troops to throw representatives of the newly proclaimed independent Vietnam Government out of Saigon.[15] Commenting on this action, General Douglas MacArthur said:

> If there is anything that makes my blood boil, it is to see our Allies in Indochina and Java deploying Japanese troops to reconquer the little people we promised to liberate. It is the most ignoble kind of betrayal.[16]

In September of 1945, the British allowed the French coup d'etat, returning Vietnam to its colonial position under Paris rule.

Despite this "ignoble betrayal" Ho Chi Minh agreed in 1946 to negotiate, thereby setting himself up unknowingly to an arrangement under which his expectations for independence were subverted a second time by the West. As a result of the agreement eventually signed in March 1946, at Hanoi, France recognized the Republic of Vietnam as a "free state" within the French Union under Ho Chi Minh, with its capital at Hanoi. It should be emphasized at this point that this agreement included all of Vietnam, not just the north. At that time no political division had been made.

In return, Ho agreed to the stationing of French troops in Vietnam with the understanding that they would be withdrawn by 1951. The French agreed to permit a referendum as to whether all of Vietnam would become a unified independent state within the French Union. France abided by neither promise. Troops were not withdrawn, nor were elections held; Ho Chi Minh had been taken again by the West.[17]

And a bloody war began.

During the years immediately following World War II, the United States was content to let England and the Netherlands take the lead in establishing better relationships with their former colonies.[18]

Since France was absolutely vital to the success of NATO and was a permanent member of the United Nations, we found it inappropriate to nudge her on the matter of colonialism as we did with the Dutch in Java.[19] With great inconsistency and with complete lack of regard for the reality of the situation within Vietnam, the United States, under President Truman, supported the French effort to remain in its colonial territory.[20]

We did this because the French ostensibly redefined their war aims and secured their acceptance in Washington. These aims had now become a crusade against communism and the establishment of Vietnam as the barrier in Southeast Asia. From then on, France, whose leadership then was not as enlightened as it is now in the question of the third world, pursued colonialism of the worst sort, but presented itself as the sentinel of the free world.[21]

Perhaps an excuse can be made that the events in mainland China and Korea and domestic concern with communism warped our own judgment. In any case, we came to accept this new heroic French stance and have, to the tragedy of our Nation, never been able to shake it.

For the first time in our history except for brief ventures in the late 19th century, America, once a colony herself, alined herself with colonialism. Americans—engaged in a cold war with Russia—could not admit that Vietnam communism could possibly be more popular than a colonial policy we supported. We could not and still cannot admit that it is possible for communism to be a popular force anywhere.[22] The French realized this and took advantage of our blindness. Actually fighting alongside the French would have jeopardized our image in the world, so we confined our aid to equipment and supplies. We financed a good portion of the French military budget. Our total contribution to this colonial venture was at least $1¼ billion.[23]

Ironically, the colonialist French became inclined to abandon Indochina, whereas America, historically the anticolonialist power, did everything possible to keep them there.[24]

By 1954 the French sacrifice of its manhood and its treasury became unbearable. Their military situation was a catastrophe and the Laniel government fell. The humiliation at Dienbienphu was merely the coup de grace. When the French negotiator came to the Geneva conference table on the day he received news of the fall of Dienbienphu, all he was able to do was sit with tears in his eyes and deliver a eulogy to the thousands of young Frenchmen who had perished there. In all, the French suffered nearly 200,000 casualties and were defeated. Victory had not come easily to Ho Chi Minh. The Vietminh suffered well over one-half million casualties on the battlefield with another 350,000 civilians the victims of the fighting.

Again it appeared that his sacrifices had at least gained control of Vietnam. Again Ho went to the bargaining table where for a third time he believed himself sold out by the West—and ironically also by the Soviet Union, which had promised France to effect a compromise in return for French defeat of the proposed European Defense Community.

It should be noted that only two parties signed the Geneva accords, France, the colonial power, and the Vietminh. The leaders of the French-sponsored government in Saigon refused to sign. The accords provided for the withdrawal of foreign troops and for the temporary partitioning of Vietnam along the 17th parallel until general elections could be held in July 1956. These were to be held under the supervision of the International Control Commission. According to the cessation of hostilities agreement, the Commission would bring about the unification of Vietnam. During the 300 days assigned to military regroupment and exchanges, civilians were able to exercise the right to move north and south as they chose.

---

[8] *Op. cit.*, Buttinger, p. 178.

[9] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 14.

[10] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 140.

[11] Robert Scigliano, "South Vietnam: Nation Under Stress," 1963, p. 191.

[12] Senate Republican Policy Committee, "The War in Vietnam," 1967, p. 6.

[13] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 69.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 6.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[18] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 12.

[19] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 8.

[20] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 12.

[21] Jean Lacouture, "Vietnam: Between Two Truces," 1966, p. 9.

[22] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 31.

[23] Victor Bator, "Vietnam, A Diplomatic Tragedy," 1965, p. 182.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

The one passage taken from the final declaration of the Geneva accords is by far the most pertinent to this discussion. It reads:

> The military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

On these words the argument of those who claim that the Vietnam war involves the invasion of one nation by another crumbles. Separate entities of North and South Vietnam simply have no historical or diplomatic basis. The areas were intended as two temporary zones to aid in cease-fire efforts and nothing more. That the past U.S. administration completely ignored this fact in all pronouncements on Vietnam is inexcusable.

Ho Chi Minh and his lieutenants agreed to the temporary partitioning because above all they wanted to obtain peace, a final renunciation on the part of France of all colonial ambitions, and the departure of the French Army, and possibly even some form of economic cooperation with Paris and the West.[25]

In accepting the temporary partitioning, the Vietminh were agreeing to accept control of only about half of the territory of which revolutionary forces already controlled three-quarters. The West had set itself objectives of this kind at Geneva but had not dared hope to attain them.[26] Ho Chi Minh made these concessions in return for the general elections which he expected would be held and won by the Vietminh.[27] As it turned out the elections were never held because the Diem regime, the ruling faction in the southern zone, refused to hold them, knowing it would lose. Diem announced that he would consent to the election prescribed in the Geneva Accords only upon the unrealizable condition that the Communists abandon the government in the north.[28] The justification given at the time and repeated later by the Johnson administration was that with the Communists involved, free elections would be impossible. The fact is there was little if any reason for Ho Chi Minh to have felt it necessary to coerce the population or rig the election because, as the father of Vietnam liberation, he was easily the most popular figure throughout Vietnam.[29]

President Eisenhower noted in his book "Mandate for Change, the White House Years."

> Possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader.[30]

If a Vietminh majority was anticipated by everyone, even President Eisenhower, it should be manifest that Ho Chi Minh had a very serious interest in holding the 1956 elections and that he would do everything he could to bring it about. To say that the Vietminh had interest in permitting free elections is not to say that Communist governments in general would permit them or even that the Vietminh in the future would allow them—only that they probably would have allowed them in 1956 because they were confident of victory.[31]

Again, Ho Chi Minh appeared to have been denied what he had been promised. He eventually returned to the battlefield, but not until 1960 when he began large-scale assistance to a national liberation movement, already long established in the south.

To pave the way for eventual reunification of Vietnam and to supervise the military truce, the Geneva accords established the International Control Commission composed of representatives from Canada, India, and Poland. Over the next 14 years, the ICC was able to be one of the few objective reporters of what was happening in Vietnam. At first, its work proceeded normally and the objectives of the Geneva accords were fulfilled. Then, the Commission began to have trouble. It may surprise many Americans to know that it was South, not North Vietnam which was the principal source of trouble.

On July 20, 1955, a demonstration against the Geneva agreement and against the Commission occurred in Saigon. Papers, clothing, cars, and equipment of Commission members were seized by the demonstrators and destroyed. The Diem government did little to prevent this action. In April 1957, the ICC charged the South Vietnam Government with violations of the provisions on democratic freedoms and the introduction of fresh military personnel and equipment. South Vietnam remained silent and refused to permit of the deployment of the Commission's mobile teams. B. S. N. Murti, Indian Chairman of the Commission, wrote in "Vietnam Divided" that as a result the Commission felt South Vietnam had a "systematic plan to violate the provisions of article 14 of the Geneva Agreement."

This is not to say that North Vietnam was without fault. On several occasions the Commission made pointed reference to failure of cooperation from Hanoi. But, during this period, Hanoi's intransigence paled before that of Saigon.

FIGHTING FORCES FROM SOUTH

The fighting that soon began in the south was begun by troops from the southern zone, not northern. A number of southern revolutionaries had stayed in the southern zone after the Geneva partitioning. They buried their weapons and laid low for 2 years, expecting to win the elections 2 years hence and reunite Vietnam.[32] The southern underground workers expected to play a decisive role in the elections that never came off. Ho Chi Minh's followers in the south had largely refrained from any effort to retain a military hold on southern areas they had controlled for as long as 10 years.[33] But when Diem canceled the elections their only future was in subversion.

Thus the group whose existence the Johnson administration refused to recognize, the National Liberation Front, came to life. This group was branded by the Diem regime as the Vietcong, a name which stuck. Of this group it is estimated that 80 to 90 percent were southerners.[34] Even the most favorable American official statistics conceded that at the end of 1965 North Vietnamese components of the Vietcong amounted to 10 percent of the total enemy force, and as of 1966 the Vietcong were still recruiting at least 3,500 men a month inside South Vietnam.[35] Thus the Johnson administration's argument that the war in Vietnam was initiated by northerners going over the border into the south, even if one assumes a legitimate border existed, is absurd.

It should be noted that in this same year, 1965, President Johnson committed nearly 150,000 troops to the battle. The Johnson administration was inclined to explain away the high rate of Vietcong recruitment in the south by attributing it to terror tactics and intimidation. Yet it is interesting that if one follows through on the Pentagon's figures for the year 1966, for example, they show that 64,000 NLF troops somehow forced 173,000 more to join them. This is especially interesting in view of the fact that on the side of the Government of South Vietnam, 600,000 troops were unable to prevent the desertion of 93,000 men during the same period.[36] Some newspapers, including the Washington Post, put the figure at 116,000 deserters.

The Johnson administration also made the claim that much of the material support for the National Liberation Front came during the early 1960's from the north. Again, the Pentagon's own figures show the weakness of this argument. As far as weapons go, it would seem more were supplied to the Vietcong by the United States itself. During 1962–64 we lost a total of 27,400 weapons to the Vietcong. What is even more revealing are the weapons captured by our side. During one 18-month period 7,500 weapons were captured. Of these, 179, or 2.5 percent were Communist made.[37] Even this 2.5 percent is not conclusive proof of outside intervention. Communist weapons can be bought throughout the world, even in the Pentagon's backyard, Alexandria, Va.[38]

There can be no denying that troops from the north did eventually enter the fray on a large scale, but only after the United States had committed over 100,000 men and billions of dollars trying to prop up the Saigon government. For 7 years following the Geneva accords, Ho Chi Minh and his men were still kept in the small areas north of the 17th parallel, which did not produce enough rice for a population whose annual growth exceeded 3 percent, and therefore was dependent on the Communist powers, particularly China. For all these years they remained parked in a political subdivision which was politically and historically unjustified as well as economically disastrous for those in the north.[39]

---

[25] *Op. cit.*, Lacouture, p. 35.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[27] Franklin B. Weinstein, "Vietnam's Unheld Elections," 1966, p. 17.

[28] *Op. cit.*, Bator, p. 138.

[29] *Op. cit.*, Weinstein, p. 47.

[30] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 13.

[31] *Op. cit.*, Weinstein, p. 47.

[32] *Op. cit.*, Weinstein, p. 25.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[34] *Op. cit.*, Lacouture, p. 196.

[35] Bernard B. Fall, "Viet-nam Witness 1953–66," 1966, p. 343.

[36] *Op. cit.*, Fall, p. 312.

[37] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 157.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

During all this time the United States willingly adopted the French stance as guardian of the free world in Southeast Asia. Though our motives, based on a fear of communism, were certainly far better than the colonial French, the effects of our actions were by no means more desirable.

Because the United States was primarily concerned with security, it was willing to give in to the South Vietnamese Government on most other issues. Because it has viewed security largely in military terms, it has in the past misunderstood both the political nature of the Communist guerrilla war and the importance of political reform as a means of countering the Communist challenge.[40] No matter what the shortcomings of Diem's regime, as long as it seemed effective in combating communism, he remained a hero in the eyes of most Americans.[41] Under Diem, instead of confronting the totalitarian North with evidence of freedom, the South had slipped into an inefficient dictatorship.[42] Diem did not see that Vietnam's national revolution could be completed and the last vestiges of colonialism wiped out only through economic and social reforms.[43] He pursued his one goal, the eradication of communism, with tactics copied from or identical to the Communists.[44] For our part, we were obsessed with the containment of communism in any form and we overlooked the shortcomings of the 11 different governments we have supported in Vietnam during the past 15 years. Secretary McNamara once called Diem "one of the greatest leaders of our time," and Lyndon Johnson in 1961 likened Diem to Winston Churchill.[45] This is the same Diem whose government:

First. Tapped the telephones of U.S. officials.

Second. Allowed no freedom to the domestic press.

Third. Censored dispatches of American correspondents.

Fourth. Raided pagodas and killed or jailed all the monks and nuns in sight on numerous occasions.

Fifth. Outlawed dancing, beauty contests, cock fighting, and a number of other such institutions dear to the hearts of many Vietnamese.

Sixth. In 1963, banned sentimental songs in order to promote the war effort.

His government was characterized by abuse of power, nepotism, corruption, contempt for inferiors and disregard for the needs of the people.[46]

Inevitably the Diem regime fell to be replaced in succession by 10 other governments. To this day, neutralist parties are outlawed and newsprint is a government monopoly. Anticommunism alone is not enough. America's position must be expressed in what we support, not simply what we reject.

There is some question of whether in backing the succession of governments in Saigon against the National Liberation Front we were even on the side that was most popular with the people of South Vietnam.

Take for example the problem of land distribution. From the very beginning of the independence movement in Vietnam this was a major issue that drew the peasants to the side of the Vietminh. At the time the French left Vietnam in 1954, wealthy landlords and Chinese moneylenders who constituted 3 percent of the population owned about 50 percent of the Mekong Delta rice lands.[47] It would seem logical that any regime in the South, with any hope of popular support, would have had to make some efforts to redistribute the land. The succession of governments we have supported have failed to do so. Saigon's land reform program, so vital to the aspirations of peasants, has never been put in motion.

In secure areas, tenant farmers, which means 70 percent of all farmers in the delta, still are forced to pay up to 50 percent and more of their rice crops to absentee landlords who have absolutely no obligation in return. A law on the books since 1955 set the limit at 25 percent.[48] This is a sharp contrast to the period before 1954 when large areas in the south were controlled by the Vietminh, who put into effect a drastic land reform that really took the land away from the landlords and gave it to the peasants who tilled it. When Diem replaced the Vietminh in 1954, about 85 percent of the land that had been given to the landless peasants was forcibly taken back and given again to the landlords.[49] American aid has only functioned to accentuate the distinction between the well-off and the masses. The huge pouring into Vietnam of consumer goods which are for the most part available to the more prosperous in the urban areas has had the unfortunate effect of further alienating the peasants and making them easier targets for Communist ideology.[50]

Considering the popular reaction to our presence in Vietnam and our shoring up of a series of governments there, it must be remembered that it is fairly clear that most of the Vietnamese, North and South, want to avoid being dominated by any outside force, Communist or non-Communist. Most of them see Communist China, as well as the United States, as a threat to their independence. However, in Vietnam perhaps more than in any other developing country, Communists have succeeded in fusing communism and nationalism. The long and finally victorious struggle against the French was conducted essentially under Communist leadership by peasants who regarded their leaders more as patriots than as Communists.[51] This concept is one we must at long last reckon with when we oppose Communist efforts in Vietnam. The Communists have also succeeded in establishing themselves as proponents of reunification, with the southern government as the obstacle to reunification. It has been North Vietnam which has put forward all proposals for reunifying Vietnam and short of reunification, for establishing normal trade and other relations between the two zones.[52] By associating ourselves with the Saigon government, in the eyes of the peasants we run the grave risk of assuming the imperialist role formerly played by the French.

Certainly the Vietnam populace is far from enthusiastic about our cause. This is evidenced by the remarkable military success of the Vietcong against enormous obstacles. It seems unlikely that such success could have been achieved without fairly widespread popular support. It is certainly true that the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong are a compensating factor in their battles with greater numbers of far better equipped troops. But, what is sometimes forgotten is that tactical advantage exists to this high degree only when guerrillas have the active support of the people in helping them to conceal themselves, in feeding them and supplying them with the intelligence they need in order to have the full advantage of surplus.[53] The contention of the Johnson administration that this is all achieved through intimidation seems greatly exaggerated. It only takes one government-oriented peasant to inform on the movements of the Vietcong, one peasant who escapes the "intimidation" and is able to supply intelligence to the government. That one individual has been notably lacking in much of South Vietnam.[54]

In line with the theme of Vietcong intimidation, much is made of the Vietcong brutality in their dealings with villagers. That members of the NLF forces have committed numerous atrocities cannot be denied. On the other hand, the sheer amount of violence inflicted on the peasants by the government and its American allies has been much greater than the amount inflicted on them by the Vietcong.[55]

There are two reasons for this. Even though there has been a real effort to minimize civilian casualties, the present process of using American firepower and mobility to break the back of guerrilla forces has caused a large amount of killing and maiming of villagers where the Vietcong are believed to be hiding.

---

[39] *Op. cit.*, Lacouture, p. 34.

[40] *Op. cit.*, Scigliano, p. 214.

[41] *Op Cit.*, Buttinger, p. 437.

[42] *Op Cit.*, Hammer, p. 351.

[43] *Op cit.*, Buttinger, p. 436.

[44] *Ibid*, p. 439.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 464.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 447.

[47] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 39.

[48] *Op cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 79.

[49] Ralph K. White, "Misperception and the Vietnam War," in "The Journal of Social Issues," July, 1966, p. 27.

[50] *Op. cit.*, Scigliano, p. 126.

[51] *Op. cit.*, White, p. 22.

[52] *Op. cit.*, Scigliano, p. 158.

[53] *Op. Cit.*, White, p. 30.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

The less familiar reason for the preponderance of violence being inflicted by our side is that in the conduct of counter-guerrilla operations, it is necessary to obtain intelligence as to the identity of the guerrilla fighters and where they are hiding. This has been interpreted by the South Vietnamese soldiers—though, thankfully, not by the American troops—as justifying a large-scale use of torture to obtain information not only from captured Vietcong prisoners themselves, but also from wives and relatives of men suspected of being in the Vietcong. One observer, Malcome Browne, is quite specific. He writes:

> There is a small American field generator used extensively in Vietnam for power pack radios. The 'ding-a-ling' method of interrogation involves a connection of electrodes from the generator to the temple of the subject or other parts of the body. The results are terrifying and painful, but subjects are not permanently damaged. Some of the forms of torture are more sinister in that they maim or disfigure. Many a news correspondent or U.S. Army military advisor has seen the hands whacked off prisoners with machetes."[56]

In summary, to claim we are in Vietnam to protect the South Vietnamese at their invitation is at best a gross oversimplification. It would appear even that a large portion of the population would have sufficient reason not to appreciate our efforts. Nevertheless, the Johnson invasion assumption lived on.

DIPLOMATIC DARWINISM

Many of the irregularities in the invasion assumption have been explained away or at least excused by another of the Johnson themes: that we were committed to sending troops to Vietnam by treaty obligations and past administrations' commitments. This has been called Diplomatic Darwinism. By this, President Johnson asserted that whatever he did was but a steady evolution from commitments made by earlier Presidents, particularly President Eisenhower.[57]

This gambit is erroneous for two reasons: first, it denies that a President has the ability to direct foreign policy; second, because the steps taken by the Johnson administration were simply not a logical continuation of the Eisenhower years.

President Johnson was in the habit of brandishing a letter written by Eisenhower to Diem in October 1954, as evidence of a sacred Eisenhower commitment. In fact, this well-thumbed document was not a commitment at all. In the letter, Eisenhower told Diem that he had instructed the American Ambassador to "examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid is supplied."

Note the Eisenhower qualifications: he refers only to the "present hour of trial," not to any long-term program. He aims only to "serve to assist," a role remote from any direct responsibility; finally Eisenhower adds two severe qualifications that remove any thought of a commitment, in the words, "provided that" and in the conclusive qualification, "in the event such aid is supplied." In other words, it is clear that President Eisenhower was considering only a limited emergency service and only on condition that Diem responded with specific assurances.[58]

The Republican policy on Vietnam was quite specific during all of the Eisenhower administration. He did not once violate the basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was to be political and not military insofar as the United States was concerned. The Republican policy can be summarized in five points:

First. No American armies in Asia; no land war in Asia.

Second. No commitment to aid colonialism or to suppress nationalism in Asia.

Third. In any event, no unilateral military intervention, a resort to force only under some international sanction, in particular, the U.N.

Fourth. Any multilateral commitment to force should be in a specific area, for a limited purpose in order to keep the conflict localized.

Fifth. Specifically in South Vietnam, the supplying of aid was to be money, supplies, arms—but not U.S. armies.

These fundamental precepts were not altered until 1961 when the Democratic administration took over.[59]

Secretary of State Dulles said at one point:

> If the United States sent its flag and its own military establishment, land, sea, or air, into the Indochina war, then the prestige of the United States would be engaged. We cannot afford thus to engage the prestige of the United States and suffer defeat, which would have worldwide repercussions.[60]

Unfortunately, in later years we did not follow this advice and our prestige has sustained a tragic blow.

President Eisenhower is reported to have remarked at one point on Indochina:

> The Free World must understand that our most effective role did not lie in furnishing ground troops.[61]

He has been proven correct. Eisenhower wrote later in his memoirs:

> I would never agree to send our ground troops without Congressional action.[62]

General Mathew B. Ridgway, the Army Chief of Staff during the Eisenhower administration, wrote in his memoirs:

> To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened I would add the Indochina intervention.[63]

General Ridgway wrote too soon.

In 1961 President Kennedy had the same options President Eisenhower had in 1953. He could continue economic or military aid with the same emphasis on a political settlement; he could increase aid; cut in; or, phase it out.[64] Despite the fact that Kennedy said in 1956:

> A war in Indochina could well be more exhausting, less conclusive than any war we have ever known.[65]

He more than tripled the number of American troops in Vietnam during the first year of his administration. During the second year, American troop commitments in Vietnam reached a level 12 times the greatest number ever under the Eisenhower administration. Thus, under President Kennedy, Eisenhower's commitments and counsel were not the guide. Rather, he chose to escalate his predecessor's economic aid to military aid.[66]

Despite this, President Johnson was still not without options when he assumed office. When he became President he could deal with an altogether new government in Saigon. He was not obliged to deal with the Diem family. It had just been overthrown.

He chose to take the final, tragic third step in Vietnam. He chose to make it an American war. By the end of his years in office more than 500 times as many troops were in Vietnam as during the Eisenhower years.

The question is what step President Nixon will take. How will he commit himself and his country? Let us hope it is in the spirit of Eisenhower.

Another aspect of President Johnson's Diplomatic Darwinism is the claim that our intervention in Vietnam was necessitated by our obligations under the SEATO pact. This claim is as faulty as the rest. It is interesting to note that until late 1966 no one in a high position made any mention of SEATO as a commitment justifying intervention in Vietnam. By then so many years had gone by that practically everyone except a few Senators had forgotten what had happened and hardly anyone now reads or refers back to the treaty itself or the testimony in the Senate.[67]

The true fact is that the United States has had no obligation to South Vietnam or anyone else under the SEATO Treaty to use its own Armed Forces in the defense of South Vietnam.[68] This position is supported by these facts:

First. The specific events calling for direct action have not occurred. The two operative defense provisions of the SEATO Treaty appear in article IV. They are set in motion by two different kinds of events and call for two entirely different kinds of action by the parties. Paragraph I comes into play when there is "aggression by armed attack." The obligation on each party is to "meet the common danger in accordance with constitutional processes." Paragraph II applies

---

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[57] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 8.

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 29.

[60] *Op. cit.*, Bator, p. 221.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 216.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[63] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 18.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[65] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 112.

[66] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 5.

[67] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 45.

[68] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 101.

XUM

when "the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any—covered area—is threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area." In this event, the only obligation is that "the parties shall consult in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense." The Vietnam situation should be considered of course under the latter paragraph, but neither section would justify the action taken by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Second. No measures have been agreed upon by the SEATO powers. Under paragraph II, a series of meetings of the pact members has occurred, but course of action has yet to be decided upon.

Third. Any Southeast Asia Treaty Organization obligation to defend South Vietnam is inoperative as long as the other signers fail to recognize such an obligation. The heart of international law is reciprocity. It must be remembered that our obligation under the treaty does not run to South Vietnam. South Vietnam is not a party, and indeed on its part agreed to nothing. The commitment of the treaty runs to the other signers. As long as the other signers acknowledge no obligation to us to send troops in the present circumstances, we have no such obligation to them.[69]

For further demonstration of the fallacy of the commitment assumption, one has only to examine Senate Committee hearings on the SEATO ratification. At one point, for example, Senator Green asked the Secretary of State whether the treaty obliged us to put down a revolutionary movement. Dulles, the virtual author of the pact, answered:

> No, if there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or in Thailand, we would consult together as to what to do about it. . . . That is an obligation for consultation. It is not an obligation for action.[70]

REQUIRED BY CONTAINMENT POLICY?

Was Ho Chi Minh simply the tool of international communism, and the war in Vietnam required by our policy of containing the spread of communism? There can be no denying that Ho has long been a committed Communist. He joined the French Communist Party in 1920.[71] Likewise, there can be no doubt that his organization, the Vietminh, from the very day of its formation, was an instrument of the Vietnamese Communist Party, but it was not identical with the party. It expressed the political aspiration, namely nationalism, of the Vietnamese as no one else did.[72] Furthermore, it cannot be denied that Ho has alined himself with the Communist bloc and accepted their aid. But again, it is another thing to show that he is doing this for the sake of international communism and not for the sake of the independence of Vietnam.[73] In other words, Ho Chi Minh is both a Communist and a nationalist. Tito of Yugoslavia and Ceausescu of Rumania have shown that this combination need not be incompatible.

Ho Chi Minh was studying Communist philsophy and was a party member when the Soviet Union was in its infant stage, when Communist China was 25 years from being a reality and the concept of Communist expansionism was yet to be considered in the East or West. In furthering his efforts to bring independence and a Communist system to Vietnam, to whom was Ho to look? To the West, which he believed had sold him out after World War II? Even the aid from the Communist bloc was limited. Chinese aid was made up of relatively limited supplies of arms and material. It was economic, including such items as machinery and tools, as well as military. With the substantial exception of coal, most of the mineral resources of North Vietnam during the war against the French were in the hands of the Vietminh, which nationalized them. Various materials were sent to China in at least partial payment for Chinese aid. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this aid was not the increase in strength that it brought to the Vietminh, but rather what it failed to bring. Most conspicuously lacking was Chinese help in building and supplying a Vietnamese air force, without which each Vietminh offensive was bound to end in a bath of blood.[74] At this point the Soviet Union was of even less assistance. Russia did not even recognize Ho's regime until 1950. Since there was no Red China during 1946–49, Ho's fight against the French imperial armies was a lonely one indeed.[75] It was during those years of nationalism and loneliness that Ho consolidated this grip on the patriotic elements of his country. Even today, at the height of a war against the most powerful nation in the world, Ho has not called upon the Chinese or Russians for troops. He receives rice and light arms from China, and some coolie work forces in the north, plus heavy arms, planes, and antiaircraft guns from Russia. But such material help is more than counterbalanced with what the Vietnamese in the north and the NLF in the south are doing by and for themselves.

The State Department and the Pentagon acknowledge that Ho is still independent today, which could never be said of the regime in Saigon, dependent today upon the United States as it was dependent upon France yesterday. Saigon is heavily dependent on U.S. troops, whereas there are no non-Vietnamese troops fighting for the NLF.[76] Ho Chi Minh has had one goal, the unification and communization of Vietnam without Chinese and Russian aid if possible, and with it if necessary.[77]

It is ironic that the United States in its fumbling efforts to check the spread of Chinese and Soviet influence has forced Ho to accept just such influence. The need for military equipment drove Ho toward a satellite relationship with China in the first place; more American escalation forced him further in that direction and to heavy dependence on Soviet arms.[78] If there is anything we should learn from Vietnam it is that the surest way to invite a strong and effective Communist involvement in situations of this nature is to involve ourselves heavily, particularly in a military way.[79] The struggle has grown to the point where it has been described as a fatal test of will between communism and freedom. That this has happened is most unfortunate. One of the few things uniting the 35 million Vietnamese is a strong common tradition of fighting outsiders.[80] The Chinese for thousands of years have been feared, envied and mistrusted by the Vietnamese.[81] The profound attachment of the Vietnamese to their independence from China cannot be better expressed than in the classic proclamation issued as early as the beginning of the 15th century by the Emperor Le Loi:

> Our people long ago established Vietnam with its own civilization. We have our own mountains and rivers, our own customs and traditions, and these are different from those of the foreign country to the north (China) . . . We have sometimes been weak, and sometimes powerful, but at no time have we suffered from a lack of heroes.[82]

The leaders in liberating Vietnam from the Chinese are to this day the heroes of Vietnamese history. It should be remembered that the heroes of tomorrow's efforts at preventing Chinese domination would not be alone. The Soviet Union is just as concerned with preventing the expansion of Chinese military power as we are.[83] She has declared herself the protector of the smaller "Socialist" states.[84] If we were to reconcile ourselves to the establishment of a Titoist government in all of Vietnam, the Soviet Union might successfully compete with China in claiming credit for it and surreptitiously cooperate in maintaining it.[85]

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

We must decide what is our true and proper objective in Vietnam. We must also determine whether we have a right, the responsibility, or even the ability to establish in Asia a form of government that is to our liking. Can the United States be an arbiter of basically internal disputes? There was a tendency in the Kennedy administration to believe that everything could be fixed in Vietnam if the right American was sent there to fix it.[86] To attempt to superimpose Western democratic institutions quickly on the ancient Vietnamese culture is pointless at best. There exists no truly democratic nation in all of Southeast Asia.[87] To a large extent our efforts to bring Western

---

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[70] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 44.

[71] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 77.

[72] *Op. cit.*, Buttinger, p. 232.

[73] W. Macmahon Ball, "Nationalism and Communism in East Asia," 1952, p. 81.

[74] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 253.

[75] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 17.

[76] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 18.

[77] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 339.

[78] *Op. cit.*, Bator, p. 12.

[79] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 16.

[80] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 8.

[81] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 10.

[82] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 324.

[83] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 40.

[84] Frank Armbruster, *et al.*, "Can We Win in Vietnam?" 1968, p. 133.

[85] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 40.

[86] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 30.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

XUM

democracy to Vietnam are similar to the earlier French attempts to introduce their own form of administration, their own brand of civilization, their own laws and customs—all superior by definition and decree to the indigenous variety.[88] We have been operating under the assumption in Vietnam that our benediction could somehow transform synthetic governments into real ones.[89] Some Americans seem to feel that the happiness and progress of other peoples depends on the degree to which their manners, morals, and political systems conform to the American mold.[90] The result has been that American presence in this alien environment has often been devastating, disintegrating, and explosive. Vietnamese family institutions, once a cornerstone of society, are threatened. Ten-year-old boys who shine shoes and wash cars for Americans are able to make three times what their fathers do at traditional work.[91]

All this has been justified in the name of containing communism. One wonders, though, whether our actions in Vietnam are really consistent with the intentions of the containment doctrine as advanced by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

The cause of preventing Soviet and Chinese aggression against neighboring countries is a noble one. That of attempting to eliminate completely Communist influence or preventing countries from adopting, through internal processes, violent or nonviolent, a Communist form of government is something else. The United States can no more contain Chinese influence in Asia by arming South Vietnam and Thailand than China can contain American influence in the Western Hemisphere by arming Nicaragua and Costa Rica.[92] Furthermore, an obsession with monolithic communism should not blind us to the possibility of communism in Asia adapting itself to nationalism. The establishment of a Communist government in Asia should not be immediately construed as all Southeast Asia falling to the Communists. The "fall" of one piece, one bastion, or one country does not mean the destruction of all other countries in the area. To see this, we need remember only the spectacular recovery of Western Europe and Japan, the new vigor of the Philippines, or the recent self-assertion of the European satellites, not to mention the conflicts between Russia and China, and China and India.[93] This is not to say that the Communist powers are above aggression. Russia demonstrated its capabilities in this regard in Czechoslovakia last fall. No doubt we must commit ourselves to contain naked acts of expansionism and aggression. But, containment need not require placing ourselves militarily in opposition to all wars of "national liberation," Communist or otherwise. As in 1848, this is the age of revolution. It is the task of statesmanship to refrain from opposing what cannot be opposed with a chance of success.[94] To do so is to permanently aline ourselves with the status quo.

Rather, we must analyze each situation separately and dispassionately in order to decide on a correct and feasible course of action consistent with our national interest. Our tendency of late has been to view every international situation in the same way, with disregard for distinctive differences. The past administration failed to make any note of the vast "gray areas" of international diplomacy. For example, one got the distinct impression that cooperating with the North Vietnamese was "appeasement" and we were reminded of the lesson learned from Chamberlain at Munich. Is Ho Chi Minh really comparable to Adoph Hitler? [95]

In like manner there was an implication that our involvement in Vietnam was just an extension of what we did in Korea. The two situations are simply not comparable. Such a comparison ignores that in Korea:

First. A distinct conventional invasion occurred, with troops crossing frontiers.

Second. We were fighting under a U.N. flag.

Third. Chinese troops subsequently engaged in the fighting.

Fourth. We had a stated and specific goal; that is, restoring the territorial in- that in Korea:

Fifth. The North Korean invaders were not, by the wildest stretch of imagination, seen in the South as the standard bearers of Korean nationalism.

Our involvements in Greece and Turkey under President Truman are also claimed to be precedents for our involvement in Vietnam. This ignores the fact that Greece was an independent nation with clearly established and defined borders, and an internationally recognized government. It was being attacked by Greek Communists who were based and financed from abroad. There was no popular internal revolution in progress, no fight by the Greek people for freedom from foreign domination. The Greek Government requested help. Britain responded. Then the United States responded with money, arms, and advisers, but no American troops.

Turkey too was also a long-established nation with a recognized government whose border was threatened by the Soviet Union. The government requested help and we responded with money, arms, and training advisers.[96] If Greece and Turkey set a precedent for anything, it is for a policy we failed in Vietnam to follow, that is, contributing material aid, but not troops, to offset the Communist bloc contribution.

It is late but not too late to bring reason to our Vietnam policy. There is no reason that the South Vietnamese troops, who substantially outnumber the Communists, cannot if they have sufficient spirit, fight their own battle aided by our material support as the Turks and Greeks did before them. In numbers and equipment, the South can outmatch Ho's forces. The unknown quantity is will.

Let us not forget the incident of January 2, 1963, when a South Vietnamese force of 2,500 men equipped with automatic weapons and armored amphibious personnel carriers and supported by bombers and helicopters failed to defeat a group of 200 guerrillas, who, after inflicting heavy casualties on the Saigon forces and shooting down five helicopters, managed to escape almost intact.[97]

Those who associate our presence in Vietnam with our efforts to stop the spread of international communism and honor our alliances should note how our actions in Southeast Asia during the past decade have had the very opposite effect:

First. The peoples of the nonalined nations have watched as we used our incredible might to attempt to crush what in many ways can be seen as a popular revolution. Our contribution may become the best ally of communism.[98] Like it or not, our actions speak louder than our good intentions.

Second. Rather than strengthen our alliances, our Vietnam involvement has been a major element in their deterioration. It has been a significant irritant in our relations with France, not to mention various countries in SEATO such as Pakistan who deplore our actions in Vietnam. None of our NATO allies fight at our side.

Third. It has weakened us militarily to a point where we are less able to meet our commitments in the world. One wonders whether we could have responded adequately in Czechoslovakia when the Russians invaded had we wanted to. Our inability to respond to the seizing of the *Pueblo* was a clear indication of the depletion of our Armed Forces.

If our allies come to doubt our commitments, it will be not because we withdrew from Vietnam, but rather because our strength—moral as well as military—was sapped and dissipated in a mistaken, hopeless venture there.

VICTORY ALWAYS JUST AHEAD

To a large extent we continued in our Vietnam blunder because of another assumption advanced by the Johnson administration; namely, that if national unity prevailed, a determined effort by the United States would end the war in short order. As early as 1950, we were told that with $146 million in U.S. aid, the Vietminh could be defeated in 6 months.[99] So far the war has cost over $80 billion, but the optimistic predictions have never ceased.

In May of 1962, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara stated:

> Progress in the last eight to ten weeks has been great. . . . Nothing but progress and hopeful indications of further progress in the future. . . . There is no plan for introducing combat forces in South Vietnam.

In January of 1963, he said:

> The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel.

In March of 1964, he stated:

> The situation can be significantly improved in the coming months.

---

[88] *Op. cit.*, Trager, p. 35.

[89] *Op. cit.*, Armbruster, p. 153.

[90] *Op. cit.*, Ball, p. 192.

[91] New York Times, May 6, 1968, p. 1.

[92] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 38.

[93] *Op. cit.*, Bator, p. 59.

[94] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 42.

[95] *Op. cit.*, Armbruster, p. 149.

[96] *Op. cit.*, Senate Republican Policy Committee, p. 12.

[97] *Op. cit.*, Butlinger, p. 461.

[98] *Op. cit.*, Raskin, p. 276.

[99] *Op. cit.*, Hammer, p. 273.

XUM

Even as late as November of 1967, U.S. military officials were claiming that the "fighting efficiency" of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops had progressively declined in the last 6 months. Furthermore, they claimed to have 600 documents that attested to the fact that the Communist morale was "sinking fast."

Ten weeks later the celebrated Tet offensive of 1968 occurred, costing the lives of hundreds of American troops, striking a crippling blow to our prestige and returning nearly 2 million persons to contested or Vietcong controlled areas.

Since 1962, the record of the skeptics and pessimists has been excellent. Skepticism was continually met by the Johnson administration with inferences that to question policies was to undercut our Nation in its hour of need. Too often the absolute obligation to support our fighting men was confused with an obligation to support the mistaken policies which committed these men to a tragic and unnecessary war. President Johnson stated at one point that he was surprised that "any person would feel toward his country in a way that is not consistent with the national interest."[100]

To depend unquestioningly on those who "have access to the privileged facts and who are doing the best they can" is folly. Criticism and skepticism in both foreign and domestic policies is a necessary ingredient of a healthy democracy.

There is a psychological process that works to distort the perceptions and judgments of public officials when others outside of Government discover a mistake has been made. As one long-time commentator wrote:

> The advocates of a wrong policy have been in charge and are deeply committed to their error. When things go wrong, they redouble their efforts, which inevitably makes things twice as bad.[101]

There is no task for a political leader more difficult—or more important than to admit when he has sent his constituents' sons into battle mistakenly or that a war he has launched or supported cannot be won.[102]

Outside criticism, the sort that Johnson would have preferred to muffle, is a necessity. It should be remembered, too, that such outside criticism has not been confined to the "left," as many people believe. General Shoup, former Marine Commandant and Congressional Medal of Honor winner; General Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff; Lieutenant General Gavin; Brigadier General Hester, veteran of MacArthur's command in the Pacific; Rear Admiral True, hero of Midway; General Griffith, a hero of Guadalcanal and a series of other retired high-ranking officers have spoken out against our Vietnam policies. Their judgment and that of numerous other public-spirited Americans from all walks of life should not be ignored.

President Nixon should take the step to withdraw American troops before it becomes his war, before he, too, is unable to listen to the critics.

Some will criticize what I am advocating. They will point to the new, optimistic statements on the course of the war. I direct their attention to the optimistic statements of the past 9 years. There has been a persistent tendency to substitute wish for reality. We could well be guilty of it again.[103]

After all, U.S. headquarters announced recently that the first 2 weeks of the current Communist offensive have taken a higher toll in American dead and wounded than the first 2 weeks of the Tet offensive in 1968. This does not sound like progress. Even if we overlook this and accept the new wave of optimism, the lesson should not be "now that we are on the edge of victory, don't throw it away." What the allies have managed to do, if these new estimates are accurate, is avoid defeat.

What better time, when we are strong, to take the forthright action which the Vietnam situation demands. Unlike the French negotiator who came to the bargaining table with tears in his eyes, we would be acting with our head up, ready to correct a wrong. If we wait until there is a major reverse in the fighting, the option will no longer be ours.

PARIS UNPROMISING

Others will ask, why not wait and see what we can gain through negotiations? This has its price, a grim one. Each added month of waiting for a breakthrough at Paris likely means another 1,000 Americans killed, 5,000 injured, and expenditure of $2 billion or more.

It also means another month of decisions in support of military action by the Nixon administration, bringing that much closer the point of no return when it becomes Nixon's war.

Does waiting really bring opportunity? Not enough, in my view, to justify its price. Why should Hanoi concede anything of substance? Just having launched an extensive attack, with major forces near Saigon, its military position can hardly be considered desperate.

The Vietcong have survived many years and many battles and many formidable forces. They remain strong. From this position of strength and with the memory of previous disappointments after negotiations, Ho Chi Minh's representatives doubtless will persist in an uncompromising line.

If, on the other hand, we are the ones to compromise and paper over a sell-out, ultimately the facts will come to light. Instead of being saved, our face will be red. In those circumstances, we will be accused of forcing a political settlement on an unwilling ally. Surely, it would be more honorable to withdraw and leave the field of battle to the forces we have trained and equipped, than to bargain away their destiny in Paris.

Critics of withdrawal also will speak of national honor. Can honor be preserved dishonorably—by perpetuating military action based on false assumptions?

So far we have dropped about 250 pounds of explosives for every person living in North and South Vietnam—25 tons for every square mile of territory. Will more bombs, more firepower advance the honor of the cause? French honor and prestige certainly did not suffer—they were greatly enhanced—by President de Gaulle's courageous action liquidating the Algerian war.

So far our efforts to save face have actually lost face, and much more than just face. In addition to lives lost and scarred and money spent, our Nation has suffered alienation and bitterness at home and abroad. We have experienced monetary crisis, high interest rates, inflation. Our presence in Vietnam for 1 more month—or 1 more year—will not help these problems. On the other hand, withdrawal will measurably help to remedy each of these problems.

The execution of a decision to withdraw will take time. It can take any of several forms. In this statement I make no attempt to evaluate, or even list the alternative forms for withdrawal.

The most important and urgent thing, it seems to me, is not the form but the fundamental decision to withdraw. It is essential that President Nixon make the fundamental decision in favor of withdrawal, and do it quickly, before this miserable quagmire becomes Nixon's war.

Today it is possible for him to correct President Johnson's mistake. Tomorrow it will be next to impossible for him to correct his own.

Correcting a mistake of this magnitude is a responsibility unparalleled in American history. It is also an opportunity without parallel.

Faced squarely, explained with the candor that President Nixon has already demonstrated so admirably, the correction of the error symbolized in the word Vietnam would exalt the name America. It would show, as never before, rare qualities of honesty, realism, and commonsense on the part of the militarily most mighty nation in all history.

But time is running out.

"PEACE PROTESTERS" BREAK INTO OFFICES OF DOW CHEMICAL CO.

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's incident in Washington where a group of "peace protesters" broke into the offices of Dow Chemical Co. and did a great deal of damage has raised questions in some quarters.

Aside from the fact that the object of their wrath is totally wrong—Dow's sales of napalm, which has gained it the title of war profiteer among the New Left, accounts for only one-quarter of 1 percent of its total sales, and all of its entire Government business is less than 5 percent of total business—it has come to the attention of some that it seems there was very quick TV coverage of the whole affair.

---

[100] Arnold S. Kaufman, "The Radical Liberal," 1968, p. 33.

[101] *Ibid*, p. 39.

[102] *Op. cit.*, Schoenbrun, p. 27.

[103] *Op. cit.*, Armbruster, p. 151.

XUM

Was there a tipoff in advance by these people to the news media that they were going to stage their demonstration—which demonstration has resulted in charges of breaking and entering?

And if someone was tipped off, why was it not passed on to the police?

MAIL FROM CONSTITUENTS REFLECTS CONCERN ABOUT WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my mail continues to reflect concern about the war in Vietnam. Constituents want us to either take offensive action to win the war or withdraw our troops.

In recent days, it does appear that our troops are taking the offensive and the Nixon administration apparently does intend to remedy the situation. I commend the administration's efforts and venture to hope that we will go a step further and destroy the source of supplies in the north if we are to continue in this war.

It just does not make sense to have our young men in the south shot at by the enemy in a no-win war.

A typical letter follows for the information of the membership and the administration:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
March 7, 1969.

Congressman WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: I am writing to you in hopes that I can express to you my feelings on the situation of the Viet Nam War. I wrote to you about a year ago on the same subject and received an appreciated letter in return, but the war in Viet Nam isn't getting any better as far as an end in sight, or less killing of American men, or better still, no killing of American men, in Viet Nam.

I believe that we must stop sitting around in Paris, (all we are doing in Paris is running up a staggering expence account for the U.S. taxpayers to pay off) and not only in Paris but right here in Washington, D.C., where the whole, or maybe I should say, the majority of the orders are dictated to our military force that is doing all the dirty work for our government officials now in office. It must be clear to the U.S. Government by now, that we cannot talk sense with the North Viet Nam Government. How many more Americans must die before we give our ground troops full air support and whatever else we can give them so that it is a complete victory for our fighting forces with fewer lives on our part, or get out of Viet Nam completely.

Four hundred and fifty three American men lost their lives in the Viet Nam War last week, isn't that shocking? I know that is shocking.

It has been just over a year since President L. B. Johnson stopped the bombing of North Viet Nam. How can parents of these men who have already lost, and will continue to lose their lives, believe that their son has justly given his life for the cause of freedom, or whatever these men are told they are fighting for. How can the American government wait around so long while our young men are being slaughtered day after day, week after week, and year after year.

We, the American people, are doing amazing things in this world today in space, science, medicine and many other fields, but we can't come to some general agreement on Viet Nam such as, fight with all we can give our men to fight with, or get out. We should know by now that we cannot talk with the North Viet Nam government.

I am not a military tactician, Congressman Scott, and I am not a hippie or just another war demonstrator that one would find in the streets or around Howard University or any university in this country. I am just a serious-minded tax-paying citizen in this country.

In closing, I am in hopes that you, Congressman Scott are and will continue to do all you can to help bring this Viet Nam War to a close in the near future.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD P. MACDONALD.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNCAN INTRODUCES BILL TO EXTEND AND MAKE PERMANENT LABELING OF CIGARETTES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given point in the RECORD and to include expermission to extend his remarks at this traneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend and make permanent the labeling of cigarettes.

There are several reasons why I think we should adopt this legislation. First, it seems that the tobacco industry is being attacked by some Federal officials in view of the proposed ban on radio and television advertising of cigarettes. I am not and do not wish to debate the health issues here, but merely want to point out that I am against discrimination against one industry.

Furthermore, if we let the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission completely police and dictate to an industry, somewhere along the line the principles of representative government are trampled. The people elect their Representatives and Senators to legislate for them.

As my colleagues will recall, in 1965 the FTC announced that it would require warnings on all cigarette packages and advertising that the use of cigarettes can cause cancer and other diseases.

Congress questioned the authority of the FTC to do this and after conducting its own hearings voted to require only a warning on cigarette packages that smoking may be harmful to health.

Now the FCC has decided that it too can issue an order banning all advertising of tobacco on radio and television, another example of a Federal agency stepping out of its jurisdiction. The banning of advertising of a fully legal manufactured product amounts to censorship, and I think the Congress must take action to prevent this infringement of the right of free speech.

Nothing in the Communications Act grants to the FCC the right or power to prohibit cigarette commercials. Indeed the language of section 326 specifically prohibits the Commission from censorship of any radio or television transmission of a licensee or to interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication.

If Congress were to allow these agencies, and others who would follow, to establish such restrictions, the tobacco industry would be greatly crippled.

Congress is the source of power for the commissions; it set up the commissions to do a specific job; they should not be able to take jurisdiction over areas never delegated to them.

The tobacco industry is a great contributor to our economy nationwide and certainly in my congressional district. Most of the tobacco growers in my district are allotted small plots, but tobacco is often their best and major cash crop and the market pays off at the end of the year when a small farmer is faced with the additional seasonal debts and when other crops are long gone.

I urge my colleagues to support the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969 so that on July 1, 1969, when the present law expires we can be assured of continuity for the tobacco industry.

JAG AND SUBMARINE OFFICER PAY LEGISLATION

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest that last week the Secretary of the Navy forwarded to the Congress a request for legislation to provide special pay to naval officers qualified in submarines. It is designed to increase the retention rate of naval officer specialists who perform highly technical tasks on our nuclear submarines. It is needed, according to the Navy, because the retention rate of these officers is less than 50 percent. In his letter transmitting this legislation, Secretary Chafee said:

> Although historically the retention of nuclear submarine officers has been greater than 75%, the number of resignations now in hand indicates the retention rate will plummet to less than 40% in the immediate future.

Certainly, this is a serious situation and I want to take this opportunity to applaud the Navy for its forthright approach to the problem. I plan to support the legislation which the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has introduced to improve the situation. I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Besides highlighting a major problem with which the Navy is currently faced relative to submarines, Secretary Chafee's letter also served to underline another problem in which I have long been interested; namely, the retention of career military lawyers. While the submariners situation is serious, I think most will agree that the retention problems of the Judge Advocate General sections of the uniformed services is likewise, at best, critical. Although the retention rate of submariners is expected, according to the Navy, "to plummet to less than 40 percent in the immediate future," the JAG retention rate for all the uniformed services is at a disaster level. For example, since 1960, the Navy has retained only 12 percent of its uniformed lawyers and last year that rate plummeted to 7.5 percent. As late as October of last year, the Navy had only 38 regular lieutenants out of some 630 lawyers on active duty and, it has been projected that in the absence of immediate remedial relief, by 1972, 75 percent of all the uniformed lawyers in the Navy will have less than 5 years of military experience.

It should be noted that the other services are in essentially the same fix. The Army's retention rate is about 12½ percent and the Air Force is currently retaining 19 percent of its lawyers. In light of these figures, I am sure all the services would be encouraged if their retention percentages for JAG's were equal to the 40 percent figure now predicted for submariners. Surely we can no longer ignore the gravity of the lawyer retention rate in the services any more than we can refuse to provide the necessary incentive to retain qualified nuclear submarine officers.

On January 23, I introduced H.R. 4296, which will offer an approach to insure a higher retention rate for uniformed lawyers. It would authorize professional pay and a continuation bonus—similar in concept to the one advocated for submarine officers—to uniformed lawyers. I am pleased to advise that the measure has received wide and favorable response both from JAG lawyers throughout the world and from those in the civilian sector who are interested in the problem. In addition, the following Members of the House have joined in cosponsorship of the measure: Representatives Wolff, Patten, Railsback, Gonzalez, Schwengel, Pollock, Whalen, Erlenborn, McKneally, and Tiernan. I appreciate their support and encouragement as well as the indication of interest from other Members who have taken appropriate action to assist in this effort.

The measure I have proposed is important for a number of reasons, but one must be stressed. Simply stated, unless some realistic, meaningful incentive is adopted to retain military lawyers, our servicemen will be denied the competent legal services they not only require but deserve. In considering this statement, we must all keep in mind that during the last Congress we passed the Military Justice Act of 1968, which extends to service personnel the right-to-counsel guarantees which the Supreme Court, in recent years, has granted criminal defendants in civilian courts. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines estimate that collectively an additional 700 military lawyers will be needed to fulfill the mandates of this new law, which becomes effective in August of this year. In light of this, we must act now to provide the services with the means to comply with this requirement. My bill seeks to be that means.

H.R. 4296 is an embodiment of the recommendations made by a Department of Defense study group which conducted an indepth investigation of lawyer retention problems last year. This study concluded that professional pay, coupled with a continuation bonus, was the most sound approach to the problem.

It should be pointed out that neither of these benefits is new or untried. At the present time, doctors, dentists, and veterinarians receive professional pay and doctors are offered a continuation bonus. More specifically, two types of career incentives are authorized for enlisted personnel. The first is "proficiency pay" which was designed to provide a differential pay incentive for retention in the service of enlisted personnel with military specialties which require relatively long and costly training and, without which, the supply of qualified career personnel would be inadequate to meet service needs. This is very similar to the professional pay concept embodied in H.R. 4296. In fiscal year 1970 the Department of Defense expects that 223,800 enlisted personnel will qualify for this type of benefit at a total DOD cost of $151.38 million. While the amounts of this pay vary from a low of $30 per month to a high of $150, it should be noted that some 484 specialties and skills are included.

The second type of incentive pay utilized to retain enlisted personnel is the variable enlistment bonus which is similar to the continuation bonus in H.R. 4296 and the special pay incentive proposed by the Navy in behalf of submarine officers. Some 121,000 enlisted persons will take advantage of this bonus during the current fiscal year.

Therefore, it is fair to conclude that the means proposed in my bill are both proven and meaningful and no one can argue further study of the methods is required. In light of the submariners proposal, it is clear that the Department of Defense has once and for all abandoned the notion that officers—unlike enlisted men—should not be specially compensated for special skills in those vital areas where retention is a grave problem. The time has come for us to consider these problems not as separate and unrelated to one another, but as different spokes on the same wheel. I am, therefore, hopeful that the Department of Defense will favorably comment on my proposal as it has on the submarine pay bill in order that the House Armed Services Committee on which I serve can deal with the pressing problems both present.

I would like to include at this point in the Record a resolution endorsing H.R. 4296, which was passed last Saturday by the Judge Advocates Association. I think it accurately summarizes the position regarding retention of uniformed lawyers:

Resolution in Support of H.R. 4296, Introduced by Congressman Alexander Pirnie of New York To Provide for the Procurement and Retention of Judge Advocates and Law Specialists Officers for the Armed Services

Whereas, our Armed Services and servicemen require the availability of high caliber legal advice and representation for their multitudinous activities and important work;

Whereas, new statutory authorizations and limitations, sociological pressures of modern American life—military and civilian, and Court decisions have placed tremendous burdens on uniformed lawyers;

Whereas, the Armed Forces are unable to compete for the best lawyers on a career basis in the limited market and, in fact, the market is draining the best lawyers away from the Armed Forces and career retention is a mere fraction of what it should be;

Whereas, important Armed Services legal work which deserves experienced well-rounded lawyers is being done by new graduates to the profession on obligated service tours, and this situation will be substantially accentuated when the Military Justice Act of 1968 takes effect this August;

Whereas, the Armed Forces need career incentives to capitalize on the investment in training it is giving and must give its young lawyers; and

Whereas, H.R. 4296 provides modest special pays and also bonuses at critical periods in a uniformed lawyer's career to encourage his continued retention on active duty;

Be it therefore resolved, that the Judge Advocates Association, at a regular meeting of its Board of Directors in Washington, D.C., March 22, 1969, gives its support and urges the early adoption into law of H.R. 4296 to ameliorate the present critical situation involving the uniformed lawyers.

Capt. Hugh H. Howell, Jr., N.S.N.R.,
President, Judge Advocates Association.

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month, the first meeting of the American Legion was held in the American Club 4 Rue Gabriel, Paris. It was 4 months and 4 days after the Armistice of November 11, 1918. Those attending were officers and enlisted men on active duty overseas; they met to form a veterans' organization for the purpose of protecting the rights and interests of those that had borne the brunt of battle.

We know today, 50 years and several wars later, that they set in motion those forces which have since performed important and distinguished public service. The American Legion has fostered patriotism, high ideals and morality, and justice for our Nation's veterans. It has served as a testament to the virtues of the American system—its continuing existence and strength attest to the fundamental truth that Americans will not forget the widow and the orphan. America will never forget the sacrifices of its veterans, nor will she ever forsake the principles for which they gallantly fought.

KANSAS HAS MADE IMPORTANT LEGION CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to note the Legion golden anniversary—an anniversary of a bond between the Legion and just causes—for my State of Kansas has provided many great Legion leaders. The late Ralph T. O'Neil served as national commander during the 1930–31 term, the Honorable Harry W. Colmery was national commander in 1936–37, and Mary H. Koger was national Auxiliary President, 1962–63.

Harry Colmery is revered in Legion circles for his contribution to the Legion's fight to pass the GI bill of rights. He was named to a special committee in November of 1943 to mount the major push for legislation to assist veterans of World War II. He will always be remembered as the one who wrote in longhand the initial draft of the first GI bill of rights. The enactment of the major provisions of that proposal stands as a monument to the members of the special committee, and especially to Harry Colmery, for their efforts in securing recognition from a grateful nation.

My distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable Keith Sebelius, was our State commander in 1955–56. His contributions to the Legion during his command, and the contributions of our two national commanders during their terms of office, reflect widespread support and affection for the principles of the Legion throughout Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, during these times of noisy protest in America, during these times of confusion over national priorities and national goals, I should think the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion would be a safe port in the storm for Americans who want to find appropriate words of guidance. The preamble follows:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY WE ASSOCIATE OURSELVES TOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the Great Wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, state and nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored last Saturday as a special guest at a birthday celebration sponsored by the Capitol Post No. 1, Topeka, Kans. On that occasion I was reminded again of the inspiring words of the preamble. I shall continue to commend them to the attention of young people in search of a way of life.

The principles of the Legion have served the past nobly; they will serve the Nation, through its trials, equally well in the future. As the Legion starts its second half-century, it can depend on Kansas and its legionnaires and its auxiliary for the same dedication and devotion and the same unstinting leadership.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO CALL HALT TO FEDERAL "SNOOPING"

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is about time that the Members of Congress call a halt to Federal "snooping." I have no objection to Government requests for information which is in the best interest of our country. I do object to any effort on the part of Federal agencies treating law-abiding citizens as criminals if they fail or refuse to provide information which is personal in nature and has no relationship to the national interest.

I have received scores of letters from the Fifth District of Kansas protesting against the type of questions which are allegedly to be asked by the Census Bureau. I have not seen the questionnaire. However, I do think that because of the alarm that has been expressed the Congress should look into the matter. I am, therefore, joining a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation to limit the categories of questions to be answered under penalty of law. Let the Census Bureau appear before a congressional committee and prove its case.

OIL SEED AND OIL PRODUCTS THREATENED BY RECOMMENDATION OF COMMISSION OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, last year our trade in the oil seed and oil products totaled $500 million. That market is being threatened by the recent recommendation of the Commission on European Community to place a tax of $60 per metric ton on vegetable oils and $30 per metric ton on meals.

Should the membership of the European Common Market accept this recommendation the result would do irreparable damage to those who grow soybeans. To my city breathren, I suggest they ponder over the effect such action will have upon our balance of payments.

I think that the President, through the Department of Agriculture, should protest vigorously any such action on the part of the European Common Market. I think the executive department should make our position loud and clear that any such action by them will result in retaliatory action on our part.

I am today joining my colleague Congressman CHESTER MIZE, by introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to be that the proposed consumption tax of the European Economic Community on oil products would be disastrous to our economy and such action should be treated accordingly. I urge my colleagues to file similar resolutions. The Department of Agriculture should know of our support.

TUESDAY'S PROGRAM FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed that tomorrow the House will consider House Joint Resolution 584 involving additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The report on the bill and the hearings on the bill are available.

Under my earlier unanimous-consent request I will extend my remarks in order to give Members a brief capsule of what is involved in the resolution together with certain excerpts of information in order that such information may be readily available early tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, as per unanimous consent which has been granted today, the House will have before it tomorrow House Joint Resolution 584, making additional appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow funds from the Treasury to meet its obligations in an amount not to exceed $14.5 billion. The Corporation has reached the limit of its authorized spending authority, or will reach such limit within the next few days.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has stocks on hand to which it has title, together with stocks held as collateral for loans, totaling in excess of $5 billion. The disposition of these stocks of agricultural commodities has been drastically restricted by the dock strike and resulting market uncertainties. It is estimated that the probable permanent losses in export sales by the Corporation will be in excess of $200 million by reason of the dock strike alone. Of course, the effect on domestic markets is even greater.

There are other factors involved in the problem which make it necessary for Congress at this time to provide additional borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. These factors were explored in a hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations under its able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN). As heretofore stated these hearings are now available to Members. The major factors as summarized in the committee report are as follows:

1. INCREASED CROP PRODUCTION

Production of feed grains, wheat and soybeans has increased substantially above the levels projected in the 1969 and 1970 budgets. The following figures indicate the magnitude of these increases and their demand on the Corporation's funds:

	Production increase	Additional investment (millions)
Feed grains	1.1 million tons	$481
Wheat	60 million bushels	387
Soybeans	30 million bushels	375

2. DECREASE IN LOAN REPAYMENTS

The dock strike and other market uncertainties have encouraged farmers to leave their commodities under loan longer than usual. As a result, loan repayments have fallen far below normal. Through last January 31, loan repayments were only 37 percent of the year's total as compared to 47 percent a year earlier. The following table indicates the situation for the major commodities:

Item	Repayments—Fiscal year 1968			Repayments—Fiscal year 1969		
	Through January (millions)	Total (millions)	Percent	Through January (millions)	Total estimate (millions)	Percent
Feed grains	$113	$211	53	$102	$285	36
Wheat	53	144	37	68	192	35
Soybeans	112	266	42	106	324	33
All commodities	477	1,021	47	465	1,246	37

3. OTHER FACTORS

Cotton production is about 2.1 billion bales less than originally projected. However, the absence of an expectation of an increase in market prices has reduced domestic and export demands. This has resulted in Commodity Credit Corporation loans on an extra 2.3 million bales with an additional investment of $215 million by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

XUM

With larger crops requiring an additional 258.8 million bushel capacity, farmers are making greater use of storage facility loans with additional Commodity Credit Corporation loans of $98 million. Other increased program investments are: tobacco, $110 million; rice, $48 million; oils, $20 million; and interest expense, $62 million. These are partially offset by $167 million less for dairy products.

Further, the recent decision to continue a 50-percent advance payment to participants in the feed grain program, found to be necessary to support this year's farming operations, rather than the 25-percent payment contemplated in the original 1970 budget, will add $168 million to Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures during the present fiscal year. This will be offset by a comparable reduction in fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a statement submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by Assistance Secretary Clarence Palmby last week in regard to this problem:

General Statement of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Clarence D. Palmby

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you today to request a supplemental appropriation of $1 billion to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue operations during the rest of fiscal year 1969. Projections now indicate that the Corporation's borrowing power will be exhausted shortly and it will be forced to cease operations. The law does not permit borrowings to exceed $14.5 billion and we are just about at that point. First, I would like to discuss briefly the general situation.

I am advised that at the time the 1969 and 1970 budgets were prepared, it appeared that there would be sufficient funds to finance CCC operations under the then existing assumptions. Most of these operations are for programs that are mandatory by law and are uncontrollable.

Since initial preparation of the estimates, economic conditions regarding supplies, exports, and domestic use of major commodities (cotton, feed grains, wheat, and soybeans) have changed drastically; greater production and lower market prices have resulted in more loans made than expected and in lower anticipated loan repayments. Also, the dock strike has aggravated the situation by causing uncertainty in the market and has slackened the demand for agricultural commodities.

About 1½ billion bushels of the 1968 crops of feed grains, wheat and soybeans are being placed under loan. Because of the conditions mentioned above, this is about 600 million more than was estimated in the 1969 budget. Without price support, this 1½ billion bushels would have been thrown on the market, and would have resulted in catastrophic prices. The resulting drop in farm income would have adversely affected not only the farmer, but his community and the entire Nation. The holding of this large quantity off the market during and immediately following harvesttime through the price support program materially assisted in the orderly marketing of these large crops. It gives farmers the opportunity to obtain the money so desperately needed to operate the farm without having to throw their entire production on the market at disastrous prices. The increased prices received by farmers is adding to farm income. A large proportion of the expenditures will be recovered in future years by farmers redeeming the loan when supplies are needed to meet domestic and export requirements.

The conditions discussed have caused significant program increases totaling $1,686 million from the 1969 budget. Of this total, $973 million occurred prior to development of the 1970 budget and $713 million additional since that time.

Now, I will mention specific details on individual major commodities and programs which account for the increased program needs since preparation of the 1969 budget. These apply principally to the 1968 crops for which most financing occurs in fiscal year 1969.

For feed grains, there was an increase in production of 1.1 million tons (from 167 to 168.1 million tons) while exports are now projected at 3.1 million tons lower (from 24.6 to 21.5 million tons). The estimated season average price for corn has been reduced from $1.17 to $1.05 per bushel, a drop of 12 cents per bushel. This combination of factors resulted in an estimated increase in CCC loans made of 7.4 million tons and lower repayments of 2.7 million tons, causing increased funding needs of about $481 million.

In the case of wheat, production was 60 million bushels more than anticipated (from 1,510 to 1,570 million bushels) while exports are now expected to fall about 190 million bushels below earlier expectations (from 790 to about 600 million bushels). Moreover, this has been only partially offset by an estimated increase in domestic use (mostly feed) of 64 million bushels (now projected at 750 million bushels compared to an earlier estimate of 686 million bushels). The season average price originally estimated at $1.40 per bushel now is expected to be 18 cents less, or $1.22 per bushel (excluding the value of certificates). These factors have resulted in an increase of 190 million bushels in loans made (from 250 million bushels to an estimated 440 million bushels), 10 million bushels lower repayments (from 170 to 160 million bushels), and over 40 million bushels less sales (from 75.5 to 32.3 million bushels). Total increased funds are estimated at $387 million.

Cotton estimated domestic use and exports, earlier projected at 13.3 million bales are now expected to total about 11.4 million bales, a drop of 1.9 million bales. This is offset by the 2.1 million bales smaller crop (from 13 to 10.9 million bales). However, due to absence of expectation of an increase in market prices, the trade has reduced their stocks below expectations. This is evidenced by CCC loans made on 2.3 million more bales (from 2 to 4.3 million bales) with estimated increased funds of $215 million.

In the case of soybeans, production increased 30 million bushels (from 1,050 million bushels first estimated to 1,080 million bushels now expected). Estimated domestic use and exports are 59 million bushels lower than originally expected (from 990 to 931 million bushels). Season average price is estimated at 3 cents less (from $2.45 to $2.42 per bushel). These factors indicate revised CCC loans made of 90 million bushels (from 250 to 340 million bushels) coupled with 60 million bushels lower repayments (from 190 to 130 million bushels). Estimated increased funds for this commodity would be $375 million.

With the larger crops than earlier projected, farmers are taking greater advantage of the storage facility loan program than was previously estimated. Current estimates indicate that net storage facility loans will be $98 million greater than shown in the 1969 budget with increased bushel capacity of 259 million (from 41 to 300 million).

Other programs account for the rest of the increased funds; mainly tobacco up $110 million; rice $48 million more; oils up $20 million, and interest expense $62 million higher. These are offset partly by $167 million less dairy expenditures. In view of the critical problem on CCC borrowing authority, steps have been taken to use about $111 million of available section 32 funds to purchase CCC-owned commodities, principally dairy products, rather than using CCC funds, for donation of these products under section 416.

Another major factor contributing to the current situation is the timing of receipts from loan repayments. Marketing conditions currently would indicate that loan repayments on 1968 crops will be less during the 1969 fiscal year than earlier estimates. While many may still occur, they are likely to be shifted into the next fiscal year. In view of the uncertainty of the market demands, farmers have also been encouraged to reseal eligible commodities and to hold them off the market until prices become more firm. Therefore, actual repayments are far below expectations.

Feed grain repayments last year were made on about 53 percent of the year's total by January 31. This year, through January, only 36 percent has been collected (based on preliminary data). In the case of wheat, 37 percent of last year's repayments came in by January 31 compared with 35 percent this year. Through January 31, 1968, 42 percent of the total year's soybeans repayments were received, while this year so far it is down to 33 percent.

On all commodities, repayments last year through January 31, 1968, totaled $477 million or 47 percent of the year's total of $1,021 million. However, through January 31, 1969, based on preliminary data, the $465 million collected amounted to only 37 percent of the projected total of $1,246 million. This means that by June 30, this year, about $781 million of collections must be received. We hope this will happen, but our current estimates, based on the market outlook for the remainder of this fiscal year, do not support such results. This is one main reason why it is felt a $1 billion supplemental is needed in case some of these projections fail to materialize or differ from the assumptions made.

As you know, the decision was made to continue, for 1969, the practice followed in recent years making available a 50 percent advance payment to participants in the feed grain program. This was done because it was felt the Government had a moral obligation to honor this implied commitment. Initial announcement of the 1969 feed grain program on December 26, 1968, did not indicate any change in the way advance payments were to be made to farmers. The budget submitted to the Congress on January 15, 1969, stated that the advance payment rate was being reduced from 50 to 25 percent in 1969, and that no advance payments would be made for the 1970 program.

A great many feed grain producers have been cooperating with this Federal Government program for crop diversion over the years. We feel farmers are entitled to proper and sufficient notice about any change in the ground rules on such payments. Many of them had already begun to sign up for the program. As you know, Mr. Chairman, these payments are charged to current CCC borrowing authority and will total an estimated $336 million. This is $168 million more than was anticipated when the 1970 Budget was submitted. Therefore, by making advance payments for the 1969 program at 50 percent, it will reduce expenditures in the 1970 budget by a corresponding amount. We plan to later appraise the need for advance payments on the 1970 program.

Last fall, the Congress was advised of the situation concerning additional CCC expenditures after the September crop reports. Favorable growing weather caused an overrun in anticipated prduction. This, coupled with lower market prices, indicated more CCC loans for farmers, fewer loans repaid and smaller sales. As a result, in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1969, CCC was given an exemption of $907 million from the overall ceiling established under the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. While relieving the spending ceiling, this in no way gave the corporation any increase in its borrowing authority.

XUM

Thank you, gentlemen. My colleagues and I will be glad to answer any questions you may have and furnish any additional information you may desire.

This supplemental request was forwarded to Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on February 20. The committee has delayed its consideration, hoping that a way could be found to avoid action on the request. However, it has now become clear that these additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation must be provided prior to the Easter recess of the House.

Other supplemental items for many agencies and departments of the Government are being processed by the committee. It is expected that Congress will be able to take action on these items soon after the Easter recess. But the urgency of this item dictates the necessity of bringing in this resolution encompassing only the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL ACTIVITY UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL DISASTER ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–89)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the annual report of federal activity under authority of the Federal Disaster Act (Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended). Such a report is required by Section 8 of that law.

Funds which have been used to support these activities are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 24, 1969.*

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 9385.

Thirteen years ago, when President Dwight Eisenhower signed the Holding Company Act of 1956, he noted that the legislation did not go far enough, and that further attention of the Congress would be necessary to control evils which could result from the exemptions in that act.

The time has come for Congress to remove the exemptions.

The 1956 act provided for the regulation of all holding companies owning 25 percent or more of the stock of two or more banks. This means that a one-bank holding company is immune from the act, particularly the central provision which, in keeping with American tradition, prohibits the mixing of banking and commerce within one corporate structure.

For a decade, the 1956 act worked satisfactorily. Although the 117 one-bank holding companies in existence when the act was passed were joined by more than 400 new ones, most of them were small.

By 1968, however, President Eisenhower's warning of 12 years before was proven to have been accurate; the situation had become a clear and present threat to the American economic structure.

By the end of last year, a surge of formations had brought the number of one-bank holding companies to approximately 800. Much more significant is the fact that these 800 companies controlled nearly a fourth of all bank deposits in the Nation.

Clearly the situation has changed markedly in just the past year.

The trend is unmistakable.

Corporate conglomerates have expressed an increasing interest in acquiring banks, and some of the bank-dominated one-bank holding companies have expressed interest in diversifying into nonfinancial lines. If such acquisitions are permitted to continue, and if, as seems eminently reasonable, there is a growing number of mergers between large banks and large nonfinancial companies, the ultimate outcome seems clear:

Within a few years, unless this trend is halted, we could witness a fundamental restructuring of our economy, from one in which economic and financial power is widely dispersed, into a structure dominated by some 50 or 75 huge centers of economic and financial power. Each would consist of a corporate conglomerate controlling a multibillion-dollar bank or a multibillion-dollar bank controlling a large nonfinancial company.

Historically, the principles that maintain the separation between financial power and industrial-commercial power were laid down in the Banking Act of 1933 and bolstered by the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. To rebuild that wall the proposed Bank Holding Company Act of 1969 aims mainly at amending the earlier legislation to extend Federal regulation of bank holding companies to those companies which control only one bank.

The legislation is timely: the mixing of banking and commerce must be prohibited. H.R. 9385 insists that the definition of permissible bank related activities take into account anticompetitive effects, and in this connection the banking agencies would have to apply anticompetitive and banking standards similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act of 1960, as amended in 1966.

I strongly believe in this legislation. President Nixon has given his strong endorsement. I urge that this Congress act promptly and effectively. This legislation is in the best interests of our economy and our Nation.

Following my remarks is an analysis of H.R. 9385, Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, and then followed by comparative type showing changes in existing law made by proposed bill:

H.R. 9385: ANALYSIS BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

The first section would designate the Act as the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969.

Section 2 is divided into eight subparagraphs, all of which would amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The amendments are as follows: Paragraph (1) would amend section 2 containing definitions. It would redefine "bank holding company" to include any company which owns or controls one bank, and to include any company which in fact has power to control the management of any bank; it would provide a definition of "appropriate banking agency"; finally, it would make clear that the Act is not intended to have extraterritorial application.

Paragraph (2) would provide that any company which wishes to become a bank holding company may do so with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency if it seeks to acquire a national bank, with the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation if it seeks to acquire a nonmember insured bank, and with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board for any other bank acquisition. It would also require retroactive approval for any acquisition of one bank by any company (other than a bank holding company) made after March 1, 1969, and before the date of enactment.

Paragraph (3) would amend the Act to permit any company which under the Act would become a one-bank holding company to continue to engage in any businesses or activities in which it was engaged on June 30, 1968.

Paragraph (4) would amend section 4(c) in several respects. It would make a technical amendment to insure that bank holding companies would have to get the same type of approval as national banks for the acquisition of corporate shares that national banks are permitted to acquire. It would require federal approval for the acquisition after December 31, 1968, of the shares of any bank organized in a foreign country and engaged in the banking business outside the United States. It would permit one-bank holding companies to keep other companies which they owned on June 30, 1968, so long as those companies did not engage in new businesses. It would provide that foreign subsidiaries of bank holding companies could retain and acquire shares in other foreign corporations which do not operate in the United States. It would permit a one-bank holding company to retain or acquire shares in any company until June 30, 1971, provided that it disposes of its banks no later than that date. This period of time could be extended by the appropriate banking agency for an additional three years, but no extension could be for more than one year at a time.

Paragraph (4) would also permit bank holding companies to retain or acquire shares in other companies engaged exclusively in activities that have been determined by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board to be financial or related to finance in nature or of a fiduciary or insurance nature, and to be in the public interest when offered by a bank holding company. (This would not include engaging in the securities business.)

The retention or acquisition of shares under this authority would have to be approved by the appropriate banking agency, which would be the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a bank holding company having primarily national banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of a bank holding company having primarily nonmember insured banks, and by the Federal Reserve in all other cases. The approval authority would have to be exercised under guidelines established by unanimous agreement of the three bank supervisory agencies. In the establishment of the guidelines consideration would have to be given to potential anticompetitive effects, and the guidelines could include limits based on size either of companies or banks involved or of communities involved. Also, in considering applications the banking agencies would have to apply anticompetitive and banking standards similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 as amended in 1966.

Paragraph (5) would make technical changes in the sections of the Bank Holding Company Act dealing with administration. All bank holding companies, including one-bank holding companies, would have to register with the Federal Reserve Board, but the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would each have access to necessary information, and each would be authorized to issue regulations and orders, to require reports under oath and to make examinations.

Paragraph (6) would extend criminal penalties contained in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, to violations of any regulation or order issued by any of the three bank supervisory agencies.

Paragraph (7) would provide for judicial review of any order issued by any of the three agencies.

Paragraph (8) would require that the Attorney General be notified of any application for the acquisition by a bank holding company of shares in any company other than a bank; and would require that each application approved be described in the agency's annual report.

Section 3 of the bill would prohibit tie-in arrangements which would condition the furnishing of any service on the obtaining of any other service. The district courts would have jurisdiction to restrain violations of this provision and suit for that purpose could be brought by the Attorney General.

H.R. 9385: COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL—THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED (70 STAT. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841 ET. SEQ.)

(Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets and new matter is italicized:)

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) "Bank holding company" means any company (1) that directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of [each of two or more banks] *any bank* or of a company that is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of this Act, or (2) that controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of [each of two or more banks] *any bank, or (3) that has the power directly or indirectly to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of any bank;* and, for the purposes of this Act, any successor to any such company shall be deemed to be a bank holding company from the date as of which such predecessor company became a bank holding company. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (A) no bank and no company owning or controlling voting shares of a bank shall be a bank holding company by virtue of such bank's ownership or control of shares in a fiduciary capacity[.] except *where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in subsection (b) of this section, or* as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (g) of this section, (B) no company shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its ownership or control of shares acquired by it in connection with its underwriting of securities if such shares are held only for such period of time as will permit the sale thereof on a reasonable basis, and (C) no company formed for the sole purpose of participating in a proxy solicitation shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its control of voting rights of shares acquired in the course of such solicitation.

(b) "Company" means any corporation, *partnership,* business trust, association, or similar organization, or any other trust unless by its terms it must terminate within twenty-five years or not later than twenty-one years and ten months after the death of individuals living on the effective date of the trust, but shall not include [(1)] any corporation the majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or by any State[, or (2) any partnership].

(c) "Bank" means any institution that accepts deposits that the depositor has a legal right to withdraw on demand, but shall not include any organization operating under section 25 or section 25(a) of the Federal Reserve Act, or any organization that does not do business within the United States. "District bank" means any bank organized or operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

(d) "Subsidiary", with respect to a specified bank holding company, means (1) any company 25 per centum or more of whose voting shares (excluding shares owned by the United States or by any company wholly owned by the United States) is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by such bank holding company, or is held by it with power to vote; [or] (2) any company the election of a majority of whose directors is controlled in any manner by such bank holding company*; or (3) any company, whose management or policies such bank holding company has the power directly or indirectly to cause the direction of or direct.*

"Total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks" as used in subsection (h) of this section shall include assets held by the bank holding company if it is a bank.

(e) The term "successor" shall include any company which acquires directly or indirectly from a bank holding company shares of any bank, when and if the relationship between such company and the bank holding company is such that the transaction effects no substantial change in the control of the bank or beneficial ownership of such shares of such bank. The board may, by regulation, further define the term "successor" to the extent necessary to prevent evasion of the purposes of this Act.

(f) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(g) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) shares owned or controlled by any subsidiary of a bank holding company shall be deemed to be indirectly owned or controlled by such bank holding company;

(2) shares held or controlled directly or indirectly by trustees for the benefit of (A) a company, (B) the shareholders or members of a company, or (C) the employees (whether exclusively or not) of a company, shall be deemed to be controlled by such company; and

(3) shares transferred after January 1, 1966, by any bank holding company (or by any company which, but for such transfer, would be a bank holding company) directly or indirectly to any transferee that is indebted to the transferor, or has one or more officers, directors, trustees, or beneficiaries in common with or subject to control by the transferor, shall be deemed to be indirectly owned or controlled by the transferor unless the Board, after opportunity for hearing, determines that the transferor is not in fact capable of controlling the transferee.

(h) "Appropriate banking agency" means (1) The Comptroller of the Currency with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are national banks or district banks exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System and exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System; (2) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered nonmembers of the Federal Reserve System but whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System; (3) The Board with respect to any bank holding company not included under paragraphs (1) or (2) hereof.

[(h)] (i) The application of this Act and of section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371), as amended, shall not be affected by the fact that a transaction takes place wholly or partly outside the United States or that a company is organized or operates outside the United States: *Provided, however,* That the prohibitions of section 4 of this Act shall not apply to shares of any company organized under the laws of a foreign country that does not do any business within the United States, if such shares are held or acquired by a bank holding company that is principally engaged in [the banking] business outside the United States.

ACQUISITION OF BANK SHARES OR ASSETS

SEC. 3. (a) [It] *A company which is not a bank holding company may, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, become a bank holding company with respect to a national bank, or with the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, become a bank holding company with respect to a state bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation but which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System. Except as provided in the preceding sentence it* shall be unlawful, except with the prior approval of the Board, (1) for any action to be taken that causes any company to become a bank holding company; (2) for any action to be taken that causes a bank to become a subsidiary of a bank holding company; (3) for any bank holding company to acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any bank if, after such acquisition, such company will directly or indirectly own or control more than 5 per centum of the voting shares of such bank; (4) for any bank holding company or subsidiary thereof, other than a bank, to acquire all or substantially all of the assets of a bank; or (5) for any bank holding company to merge or consolidate with any other bank holding company. *It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1971, for any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, to retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any bank or bank holding company acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of such Act, or of 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of any bank or bank holding company any part of which was acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, unless such retention is approved in the manner prescribed in the two preceding sentences.* Notwithstanding the foregoing this prohibition shall not apply to (A) shares acquired by a bank, (i) in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b) and except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(g), or (ii) in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith, but any shares required after the date of enactment of this Act in securing or collecting any such previously contracted debt shall be disposed of within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired; or (B) additional shares acquired by a bank holding company in a bank in which such bank holding company owned or controlled a majority of the voting shares prior to such acquisition.

(b) Upon receiving from a company any application for approval under this section, the Board shall give notice to the Comptroller of the Currency, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired is a national banking association or a District bank, or to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired is a State bank, and shall allow thirty days within which the views and recommendations of the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority, as the case may be, may be submitted. If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority so notified by the Board disapproves the application in writing within said thirty days, the Board shall forthwith give written notice of that fact to the applicant. Within three days after giving such notice to the applicant, the Board shall notify in writing the applicant and the disapproving authority of the date for commencement of a hearing by it on such application. Any such hearing shall be commenced not less than ten nor more than thirty days after the Board has given written notice to the applicant of the action of the disapproving authority. The length of any such hearing shall be determined by the Board, but it shall afford all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to testify at such hearing. At the conclusion thereof, the Board shall by order grant or deny the application on the basis of the record made at such hearing.

(c) [The Board shall not approve] *Neither the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, nor the Board shall approve—*

(1) any acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize or to attempt to monopolize the business of banking in any part of the United States, or

(2) any other proposed acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section whose effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any manner would be in restraint of trade, unless it finds that the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

In every case, [the Board shall take] *there shall be taken* into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted on the effective date of this amendment or the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication. For the purposes of this section, the State in which the operations of a bank holding company's subsidiaries are principally conducted is that State in which total deposits of all such banking subsidiaries are largest.

INTERESTS IN NONBANKING ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, no bank holding company shall—

(1) after the date of enactment of this Act acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank, or

(2) after two years from the date as of which it becomes a bank holding company, or, in the case of any company that has been continuously affiliated since May 15, 1955, with a company which was registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, prior to May 15, 1955, in such a manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of that Act, after December 31, 1978, retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank or a bank holding company or engage in any [business other than that of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank of which it owns or controls 25 per centum or more of the voting shares] *businesses or activities other than (i) those of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank with respect to which it is a bank holding company, (ii) those specified under clause (8) of subsection (c) of this section subject to all the conditions specified therein, or (iii) those in which it was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968, and in which it has been continuously engaged since that date.*

The [Board] *appropriate banking agency* is authorized, upon application by a bank holding company, to extend the period referred to in paragraph (2) above from time to time as to such bank holding company for not more than one year at a time, if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest, but no such extensions shall in the aggregate exceed three years.

(b) After two years from the date of enactment of this Act, no certificate evidencing shares of any bank holding company shall bear any statement purporting to represent shares of any other company except a bank or bank holding company, nor shall the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any bank holding company be conditional in any manner whatsoever upon the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any other company except a bank or bank holding company.

(c) The prohibitions in this section shall not apply to any bank holding company which is a labor, agricultural, or horticultural organization and which is exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and such prohibitions shall not, with respect to any other bank holding company, apply to—

(1) shares of any company engaged or to be engaged solely in one or more of the following activities: (A) holding or operating properties used wholly or substantially by any banking subsidiary of such bank holding company in the operations of such banking subsidiary or acquired for such future use; or (B) conducting a safe deposit business; or (C) furnishing services to or performing services for such bank holding company or its banking subsidiaries; or (D) liquidating assets acquired from such bank holding company or its banking subsidiaries or acquired from any other source prior to May 9, 1956, or the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later;

(2) shares acquired by a bank in satisfaction of a debt previously contracted in good faith, but such bank shall dispose of such shares within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired, except that the Board is authorized upon application by such bank holding company to extend such period of two years from time to time as to such holding company for not more than one year at a time if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest, but no such extensions shall extend beyond a date five years after the date on which such shares were acquired;

(3) shares acquired by such bank holding company from any of its subsidiaries which subsidiary has been requested to dispose of such shares by any Federal or State authority having statutory power to examine such subsidiary, but such bank holding company shall dispose of such shares within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired;

(4) shares held or acquired by a bank in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b) and except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(g);

[(5) shares which are of the kinds and amounts eligible for investment by national banking associations under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes;]

(5) shares acquired and held in the manner, kinds and amounts specifically permissible for national banks under provisions of Federal statute law and regulations issued pursuant thereto;

(6) shares of any company which do not include more than 5 per centum of the outstanding voting shares of such company;

(7) shares of an investment company which is not a bank holding company and which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, which securities do not include more than 5 per centum of the outstanding voting shares of any company;

[(8) shares of any company all the activities of which are or are to be of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature and which the Board after due notice and hearing, and on the basis of the record made at such hearing, by order has determined to be so closely related to the business of banking or of managing or controlling banks as to be a proper incident thereto and as to make it unnecessary for the prohibitions of this section to apply in order to carry out the purposes of this Act;]

(8) shares retained or acquired with the approval of the appropriate banking agency in any company (other than a company engaged principally in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution at wholesale or retail or through syndicate participation of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes or other securities) engaged exclusively in activities that have been determined by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board (1) to be financial or related to finance in nature or of a fiduciary or insurance nature, and (2) to be in the public interest when offered by a bank holding company or its subsidiaries.

No retention nor acquisition may be approved under this clause except pursuant to and in accordance with guidelines established by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board. In establishing such guidelines consideration shall be given to any potential anti-competitive effects of a bank holding company engaging in any proposed type of activity, and limitations on permissible activities may be established on the basis of any relevant factors, including size of bank holding company or its subsidiary banks, the size of any company to be acquired or retained, and the size of communities in which such activities should be permitted.

The appropriate banking agency shall not approve—

(a) any retention or acquisition under this clause which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any com-

bination or conspiracy to monopolize any part *of trade or commerce in any part of the United States, or*

(b) any retention or acquisition under this clause whose effect in any line of commerce in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any other manner would be in restraint of trade.

In every case, the appropriate banking agency shall take into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

[(9) shares of any company which is or is to be organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is or is to be engaged principally in the banking business outside the United States; or]

(9) shares lawfully acquired and owned on December 31, 1968, any company organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged principally in banking or other financial operations outside the United States;

(10) shares lawfully acquired and owned prior to May 9, 1956, by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries[.];

(11) shares lawfully acquired and owned on June 30, 1968, by any company (or subsidiary thereof) which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, so long as the company issuing such shares is not engaging and does not engage in any business or activities other than those in which it or the bank holding company (or its subsidiaries) was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968;

(12) shares lawfully acquired and owned by a subsidiary of a bank holding company if both the subsidiary and the company issuing, the shares are organized under the laws of a foreign country and do not operate in the United States; or

(13) shares retained or acquired by any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, but which ceases to be a bank holding company no later than June 30, 1971, or such other date not later than June 30, 1974, as may be fixed by the appropriate banking agency in the manner prescribed in subsection (a) *of this section.*

(d) With respect to shares which were not subject to the prohibitions of this section as originally enacted by reason of any exemption with respect thereto but which were made subject to such prohibitions by the subsequent repeal of such exemption, no bank holding company shall retain direct or indirect ownership or control of such shares after five years from the date of the repeal of such exemption, except as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (a). Any bank holding company subject to such five-year limitation on the retention of nonbanking assets shall endeavor to divest itself of such shares promptly and such bank holding company shall report its progress in such divestiture to the Board two years after repeal of the exemption applicable to it and annually thereafter.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) Within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, or within one hundred and eighty days after becoming a bank holding company, whichever is later, each bank holding company shall register with the Board on forms prescribed by the Board, which shall include such information with respect to the financial condition and operations, management, and intercompany relationships of the bank holding company and its subsidiaries, and related matters, as the Board may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Board may, in its discretion, extend the time within which a bank holding company shall register and file the requisite information. *Information received by the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be made available to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(b) The Board is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable it to administer and carry out the purposes of this Act and prevent evasions thereof. *The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are each authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(c) The Board from time to time may require reports under oath to keep it informed as to whether the provisions of this Act and such regulations and orders issued thereunder have been complied with; and the Board may make examinations of each bank holding company and each subsidiary thereof, the cost of which shall be assessed against, and paid by, such holding company. The Board shall, as far as possible, use the reports of examinations made by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the appropriate State bank supervisory authority for the purposes of this section. *The authority granted herein to the Board is hereby granted also to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(d) Before the expiration of two years following the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter in the Board's annual report to the Congress, the Board shall report to the Congress the results of the administration of this Act, stating what, if any, substantial difficulties have been encountered in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and any recommendations as to changes in the law which in the opinion of the Board would be desirable.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS TO STATES

SEC. 7. The enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof.

PENALTIES

SEC. 8. Any company which willfully violates any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued [by the Board] pursuant thereto, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000 for each day during which the violation continues. Any individual who willfully participates in a violation of any provision of this Act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Every officer, director, agent, and employee of a bank holding company shall be subject to the same penalties for false entries in any book, report, or statement of such bank holding company as are applicable to officers, directors, agents, and employees of member banks for false entries in any books, reports, or statements of member banks under section 1005 of title 18, United States Code.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 9. Any party aggrieved by an order [of the Board] *issued* under this Act may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals within any circuit wherein such party has its principal place of business, or in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, by filing in the court, within thirty days after the entry of the [Board's] order, a petition praying that the order [of the Board] be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted to the [Board] *agency issuing the order* by the clerk of the court, and thereupon the [Board] *agency* shall file in the court the record made before [the Board] *it*, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have the jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify the order [of the Board] and to require the [Board] *agency issuing such order* to take such action with regard to the matter under review as the court deems proper. The findings of the [Board] *agency* as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

* * * * *

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 11. (a) Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct, except as specifically provided in this section.

(b) The Board shall immediately notify the Attorney General of any approval by it pursuant to this Act of a proposed acquisition, merger, [or] consolidation *or other* transaction, *by which a bank holding company acquires a bank (hereinafter referred to as a "bank acquisition*), and such [transaction] *a bank acquisition* may not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day after the date of approval by the Board. Any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of an [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* shall be commenced within such thirty-day period. The commencement of such an action shall stay the effectiveness of the Board's approval unless the court shall otherwise specifically order. In any such action, the court shall review de novo the issues presented. In any judicial proceeding attacking any [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* approved pursuant to this Act on the ground that such transaction alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), the standards applied by the court shall be identical with those that the Board is directed to apply under section 3 of this Act. Upon the consummation of an [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* in compliance with this Act and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed in this section, or upon the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein, the transaction may not thereafter be attacked in any judicial proceedings on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), but nothing in this Act shall exempt any bank holding company involved in such a transaction from complying with the antitrust laws after the consummation of such transaction.

(c) In any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of any acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction approved by the Board pursuant to this Act, the Board and any State banking supervisory agency having jurisdiction within the State involved, may appear as a party of its own motion and as of right, and be represented by its counsel.

(d) Any acquisition, merger, or consolidation of the kind described in section 3(a) of this Act which was consummated at any time prior or subsequent to May 9, 1956, and as to which no litigation was initiated by the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this amendment, shall be conclusively presumed not to have been in vio-

XUM

lation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2).

(e) Any court having pending before it on or after the date of enactment of this amendment any litigation initiated under the antitrust laws by the Attorney General with respect to any acquisition, merger, or consolidation of the kind described in section 3(a) of this Act shall apply the substantive rule of law set forth in section 3 of this Act.

(f) For the purposes of this section, the term "antitrust laws" means the Act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 1–7), the Act of October 15, 1914 (the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 12–27), and any other Acts in pari materia.

(*g*) *The appropriate banking agency shall notify the Attorney General of any application received by it under section 4(c) (8) of this Act.*

(*h*) *Each appropriate banking agency shall include in its annual report to the Congress a description and a statement of the reasons for approval of each transaction approved by it under section 4(c) (8) of this Act during the period covered by the report.*

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

NEW LAW—BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

Sec. 3. (*a*) *No bank holding company or subsidiary of a bank holding company may in any manner extend credit, lease or sell property of any kind, or furnish any service, or fix or vary the consideration for any of the foregoing, on the condition, agreement, or understanding.*

(*A*) *that the customer shall obtain some other credit, property, or service from the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company; or*

(*B*) *that the customer shall not obtain credit, property, or services from a competitor of the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company.*

(*b*) *The district courts of the United States have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of subsection (a) of this section, and it is the duty of the United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. The proceedings may be by way of a petition setting forth the case and praying that the violation be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of have been duly notified of the petition, the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case. While the petition is pending, and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as it deems just in the premises. Whenever it appears to the court that the ends of justice require that other parties be brought before it, the court may cause them to be summoned whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not, and subpoenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.*

(*c*) *In any action brought by or on behalf of the United States under subsection (a) of this section, subpoenas for witnesses may run into any district, but no writ of subpoena may issued for witnesses living out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than one hundred miles from the place of holding the same without the permission of the trial court being first had upon proper application and cause shown.*

(*d*) *Any person who is injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in subsection (a) of this section may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.*

(*e*) *Any person, firm, corporation, or association may sue for and have injunctive relief, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, against threatened loss or damage by violation of subsection (a) of this section, under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity, under the rules governing such proceedings. Upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.*

(*f*) *Any action to enforce any cause of action under this section shall be forever barred unless commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued.*

UNDERSEA HABITAT READY FOR OCCUPANCY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIPLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, Tektite I officials announced recently that the undersea habitat which will be home and laboratory for four aquanaut-scientists for 60 continuous days, has been put in place on the ocean floor and is ready for occupancy; the announcement was made after the aquanauts completed a few hours "live in" in the habitat as a prelude to their long undersea stay. Emplacement was made at a depth of 45 feet in the waters of Great Lameshur Bay off the coast of the Virgin Islands National Park on St. John Island.

Tektite I is the first "scientist-in-the-sea" program in which four scientists will conduct marine research while living on the ocean bottom for 2 months. This is the longest undersea stay ever attempted by a group of aquanauts, and will be the longest known saturation dive. The program, under the technical management of the Office of Naval Research, is a joint Government-industry effort by the Navy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of the Interior, and the General Electric Co.

The habitat, designed, built, and furnished to the program by GE's missile and space division, Valley Forge, Pa., was placed on the bottom by a Navy Seabee detachment out of Little Creek, Va. The Seabees used a specially designed pontoon barge which is flooded to lower the habitat to the sea floor. They also constructed a semipermanent base camp near the site for the support operation.

The habitat consists of two vertical cylinders mounted on a base and connected in the center by a tube 4½ feet in diameter. Each cylinder is about 18 feet high and 12½ feet in diameter and contains two compartments, one above the other. On top of one cylinder is a 5-foot high cupola for observation purposes.

The dual objective of the Tektite program is to conduct extensive marine science experiments on the ocean floor and to study and observe individual and group behavior of a small crew engaged in a mission of long duration while confined to a relatively hazardous environment.

The four aquanaut-scientists, all from the Department of the Interior, will be in virtual isolation during their stay. Food for the 60-day mission has been stored in the habitat. There will be no visits to the habitat made by topside personnel. Air, water, power, and communications will be furnished by umbilicals from the topside command and support barge. The scientists will be monitored constantly by closed-circuit television, both inside—four cameras—and outside—two cameras—the habitat, and open microphones inside the habitat.

Three of the men are from Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. They are Richard A. Waller, 34, oceanographer and team leader; Conrad V. W. Mahnken, 31, oceanographer; and John G. Van Derwalker, 32, fishery biologist. The fourth man, Dr. H. Edward Clifton, 34, is a geologist with Interior's Geological Survey.

The aquanaut-scientists will study the distribution, feeding habits, daily migrations, reproduction patterns, growth, survival, and other important factors in the life cycle of many marine organisms. Such observations are extremely difficult to make from the surface and long-term, continuous observation has not been possible before. This information will be useful in harvesting the food supply of the sea without overexploiting it. One of the organisms to be studied is the spiny lobster, the source of what is commonly known as "lobster tails" and a different species from the Northern or Maine lobster.

In addition, there will be continuous observation of the geological structure of the sea bottom in Lameshur Bay. Analysis of sediments, studies of reef formation and destruction, reworking of the sediments by marine organisms, and similar studies will provide clues for eventually locating and recovering mineral resources from the sea.

The behavioral studies are designed to gather a multitude of data ranging from the amount of food consumed by the aquanauts to subtle changes in their moods at different times. In addition to television observation, behavioral data will be obtained by recording their brain waves while they sleep as well as analyzing work performed. These data will be useful in the selection and training of crews for future long-term, undersea, and space missions.

POSTAL WORKERS LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will give to all postal employees a fair chance for proper representation and improved employee-management relations.

This bill expresses a similar goal to legislation previously introduced by my distinguished colleague (Mr. Dulski) and I would like to join him in seeking favorable action from Congress.

President Kennedy issued an Executive order on January 18, 1962, recognizing Federal employee unions for purposes of representation of worker grievances and other labor-management concerns. Since this time, although the goals of this Executive order were accepted as being eminently reasonable and worthwhile, Congress has failed to insure the permanent establishment of the policy embodied in the President's statement by enacting legislation. The time has come to establish labor-management relations on a legislative, statutory basis.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the bill would require the Post Office Department to grant recognition to employee unions submitting a membership list of over 50 percent of the total number of employees within the unit. It states the rights of these unions to bargain, sets up a code of fair labor practices, and provides for an independent Postal Labor-Management Relations Panel with power to make rules, to investigate and to afford relief in labor-management disputes.

Participation of postal employees, through labor organizations, with management in decisions which affect them is not merely in furtherance of our democratic ideals, but contributes significantly to the effective conduct of the business of the Post Office Department.

I urge the Congress to give early acceptance to this legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Pettis), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Shipley (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pettis) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Wyatt in five instances.
Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Berry.
Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Quillen in four instances.
Mr. Watson in two instances.
Mr. Cramer in two instances.
Mr. Hosmer in two instances.
Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Miller of Ohio.
Mr. Mize.
Mr. Bray in two instances.
Mr. Scherle in two instances.
Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Patten) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Jones of Alabama in two instances.
Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Annunzio in two instances.
Mr. Baring.
Mr. Rees in two instances.
Mr. Vanik in two instances.
Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Rarick in four instances.
Mr. Flood in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 25, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

606. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, fiscal year 1968, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 91–90); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

607. A communication from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Salaries and expenses," Agricultural Research Service, for the fiscal year 1969, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a further supplemental estimate of appropriation because of circumstances constituting an emergency involving the protection of property, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (e) (1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended to the Committee on Appropriations.

608. A communication from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions," for the fiscal year 1969, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a further supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

609. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that various appropriations were exempted by the President from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of section 512 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

610. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate for the quarter October 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 519 of Public Law 90–580; to the Committee on Appropriations.

611. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Army on contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 804 of Public Law 90–408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for savings by increasing transfers of excess property among Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

613. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the donation of surplus mercury for educational and public health purposes, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

614. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the followup review of per diem payments to prospective crew members of ships under construction in New Orleans, La., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

615. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the policies and procedures for recommending emergency area designations by the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

616. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel expenses of applicants invited by an agency to visit it in connection with possible employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

617. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 34th annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–112). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Permit for landfill in Hunting Creek: A debacle in conservation (Rept. No. 91–113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 514. A bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 9355. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide for the awarding of a "Supreme Sacrifice Medal" to relatives of members of the Armed Forces killed in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9356. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9857. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a

XUM

new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 9359. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglas home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9360. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9361. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9362. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9363. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 9365. A bill to provide specific and additional penalties for the use or carrying of firearms in the commission of crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9366. A bill to change the limitation on the number of apprentices authorized to be employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9367. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 9368. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 9369. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9370. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9371. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 9372. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9373. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9374. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent, across-the-board increase in annuities and pensions thereunder (with a minimum retirement annuity of $80 a month), to provide for subsequent automatic increases in such annuities and pensions based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9375. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent, across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder (with a minimum primary benefit of $80 a month), to provide for subsequent automatic increases in such benefits based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9376. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9377. A bill to provide for an exclusion from gross income in the case of compensation for members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo;* to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9378. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of material harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9379. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9380. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9381. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Adams, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Boland, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Gonzalez, Mrs. Griffiths, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Madden, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Patten, Mr. Podell, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Rosenthal, and Mr. Stokes):

H.R. 9382. A bill to establish a pollution disaster fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9383. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall end on the first Sunday following the first Monday of September of each year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 9384. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9385. A bill to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution designating February as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 586. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 587. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (for himself and Mr. Shriver):

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution expressing the profound concern of the Congress to the proposed consumption taxes of the European Economic Community on oilseed products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution urging the United States to continue opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

84. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to equal rights for the membership of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

85. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Federal interference with State administration of welfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 9386. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Lyle G. Frost, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9387. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Perez Camarena; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California.

H.R. 9388. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Ambeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9389. A bill for the relief of Maria Athanassiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9390. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Olin G. Smith against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 9391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Socorro Bolick de Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9392. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elmo Moscoso Gayoso and his wife, Dr. Ofelia Gonzales Loot Gayoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9393. A bill for the relief of Seth J. Edwards, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9394. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shuhsien Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9395. A bill for the relief of Joao de Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9396. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Onofrio Milazzo and their children, Angela and Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9397. A bill for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 9398. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Del Castillo, Jr., and his wife, Mercedes Del Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9399. A bill for the relief of Ivy May Budhai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9400. A bill for the relief of Rogelio Antonio Anglin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9401. A bill for the relief of Arrindell Oswald Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 9402. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert W. Stewart, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9403. A bill for the relief of Genoveffa Siano Ruocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, March 24, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, who hast brought us to the beginning of another week, we thank Thee for the changing beauty of the world about us and for the silent spaces of the soul within us. We thank Thee for those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, which belong to the pure in heart who know Thee. Help us, O Lord, to meet Thee not only in the moment of prayer, but in the call of duty and the toil of the day. Confer upon each Member of this House a full measure of Thy spirit—a wise mind, a just conscience and a loving heart. Keep us loyal to every hallowed memory of the past and open to every high vision of the future.

O Thou, who has made and preserved us a nation, grant that our strength may be in righteousness and justice, and fit us to be the servant people of all mankind.

In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 20, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 20, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 20, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nomination received on March 20, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, March 24, 1969.)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES IN 1968 UNDER THE FEDERAL DISASTER ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the annual report of federal activity under authority of the Federal Disaster Act (Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended). Such a report is required by Section 8 of that law.

Funds which have been used to support these activities are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 24, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business, I be recognized for a period not to exceed 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that immediately upon the conclusion of my remarks, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be recognized for 1 hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

XUM

THE GRIM REALITY OF VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that we may be preoccupied with other matters in the United States does not give us leave to forget that several hundred American men are dying weekly in the war in Vietnam and that, in this conflict to date, the total of American deaths is at the 33,000 level. To the family of a serviceman in Vietnam, his presence in a battle zone serves as a constant reminder of a grimness of this barbaric war. To others, the death in Vietnam of a friend, a neighbor, or a hometown boy brings the war close. However, the brutal reality registers with us, more and more, it touches all.

Recently, the Independent Record of Helena, Mont., published a story about the return of one young man who was killed in Vietnam, Sgt. Tom Grose. This lad worked for the Record before being called by his Government to serve in a distant land. He lost his life when his helicopter was shot down. It is a story heard almost every day in Vietnam. Yet the death of Tom Grose is not an everyday story in Helena. The newspaper account of his tragic homecoming made his sacrifice for the Nation a part of the lives of an entire community. It was a poignant reminder to all of us of the grim reality of the war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent Record, Mar. 12, 1969]

Helena Boy Comes Home

A Helena boy came home from Vietnam.

And they were all there—his family, his relatives, his neighbors, his friends . . . so many friends.

It wasn't a reception. They were there to say good-by.

They didn't come to see the handsome, dark-haired, good-natured boy who left Helena a year and a half ago.

They came to see a coffin, draped with the flag of the country he volunteered to serve and for which he died—a coffin first surrounded by flowers in a funeral chapel, then lowered into the snow-covered ground in the Helena Valley.

He came home a hero. A dead hero.

He had received the Distinguished Flying Cross a month or so earlier, for dashing from his helicopter to rescue two wounded men at a place most people never heard of, Ding Tuong. He earned his sergeant's stripes, but the word hadn't gotten to him when his helicopter was shot down two weeks ago.

So they came to mourn him Tuesday afternoon in Helena.

They came to hear the soloist sing "The Impossible Dream." The words were especially meaningful: ". . . to fight for the right without question or pause . . . The world will be better for this . . ."

They came to hear a chaplain say, "Years are a poor criteria for the measurement of life." And that the young soldier died "in defense of freedom and that which is good in the world . . . one of the heroes who gave his life that others may live—live in freedom, live in the sense of victory." And to tell his parents, "You gave a priceless gift to mankind . . ." and urge them to "lean on God in your sorrow."

They came to hear a father's poetic tribute, written before his soldier-son died: "He heard his country's duty call . . . A gallant young American of heritage, unafraid to die . . . With the blessings of our Savior, he will come winging home again." It was signed: "With pride and humility, your Dad."

They came to stand in the snow on a brilliant but cold winter afternoon; to watch a formation of five Army helicopters fly over the gravesite in tribute; to hear the crisp commands of the military honor guard, the sharp crack of the rifles fired over the casket.

And the bugler sound "Taps."

"Taps" always brings a lump to the throat. This time it had a deeper meaning—a deeper impact.

Similar ceremonies have occurred in Helena before and are occurring every day throughout the nation. But this one was closer to us at The Independent Record because we knew Tom Grose. His dad works with us, and so did Tom before he put on a uniform and went away to fight and become a hero and die in a faraway land in an "unpopular" war which some others of his age are protesting by rioting, by desecrating the flag he fought under and by threatening to destroy the freedoms he died for.

We knew how close Tom and his dad were, what pals they were, how proud his dad was of him.

As his dad said just the other day:

"We raised him a man, and he died a man."

He was 20 years old.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during the Annual American Legion banquet held Saturday evening, March 15, in the Sheraton-Park Hotel, President Nixon accepted the American Legion's gift to the Nation and pushed a button turning on the lights at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington Cemetery.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of President Nixon made at this moving ceremony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President at the American Legion's 50th Anniversary Dinner, March 15, 1969

Commander Doyle, all the Distinguished Guests at the Head Tables, and all the Distinguished Guests at this dinner in Washington, which the American Legion has been giving for so many years to honor Members of Congress:

The Commander has apologized for what he is wearing. What do you think of what I am wearing?

I assure you that, as I told the Commander as we were coming in, only the fact that I had agreed several months ago to attend the annual Gridiron Dinner, where I am to speak later this evening and that is to be a white tie affair at the Statler Hotel, only that has made it impossible for me to be with you at this dinner. But if you come back next year, I promise that this one will come first and the Gridiron will come second.

If I may be permitted a few brief words before returning to the dinner at the Statler, I should first like to express a recollection: It is rather hard for me to realize that I have been a member of the American Legion going back to the year 1946, and also hard for me to realize that I have attended—and I think, Commander, that you will find this is the case—18 of these dinners in Washington, D.C., and I think perhaps I have spoken to the American Legion Convention more than any other living American.

I won't make the same speech tonight. But I feel very much at home here. I feel very much at home because I know so many of you. I have visited your States. I know what you stand for. I know of your strong convictions. And right now, incidentally, I want to express my appreciation for some resolutions that you passed today supporting my national defense policy—our national defense policy.

Having spoken to that policy, may I say a word with regard to the very moving ceremony in which I have just participated?

Fifty years ago this organization was founded, and through 50 years it has served the Nation well. It has served it in so many ways that many Americans are not aware of, but particularly in a way that I am particularly aware of, and that is in the cause of keeping the Nation strong—strong militarily, strong spiritually, strong in every way, so that America could lead in the cause for peace.

I think that sometimes we fail to understand that only through strength can this great Nation lead for peace, and it is that kind of strength that we want.

As I tried to emphasize, when I was announcing the very difficult decision, a decision on which many, with great honesty, have disagreed with me—perhaps some in this room—a decision with regard to the anti-ballistic missile—the purpose of our strength is not in any sense a threat to any other nation, but I know that the strength of America is so essential for those who will be meeting with others in various parts of the world over the next few years in conferences that will determine whether we will have war or peace.

My friends, whoever is President of the United States, whether it is the man standing before you today, or whether it is his successor, let us be sure that whenever our President sits at a conference table with any other nation, the United States is never a second-rate military power.

This is not said with any belligerence. It is said only in the sense that a strong Nation can speak of its beliefs and of what it is willing to do in order to protect those beliefs and to stand for them.

Now a word about the ceremony: A few years ago, as Vice President of the United States, I participated in the occasion when the Unknown Soldier from World War II and the Unknown Soldier from Korea were buried at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

I will never forget that day and the thoughts that ran through my mind on that occasion. On my recent trip to Europe, I laid a wreath on behalf of all the American people at the Tomb of an Unknown Soldier in London, another at the Tomb of an Unknown Soldier in Rome, and another at the Tomb of an unknown Soldier at the Arc de Triomphe in Paris.

I thought of all of them and of all of ours. And I realized how great our responsibility was—yours and mine—to see to it that this great Nation meets its responsibility in the world to maintain our strength so that we can negotiate the differences between nations, thus possibly avoid another war, and thereby see to it that the day will come when it will not be necessary for us to bring home men, whether unknown or known, after they have fought and died in the Nation's wars. We feel that way particularly about our own.

But also, as Americans, we feel that way about every other person in the world. It is tragic to think of young men—and I have seen them in Korea, 18, 19, 20—so young—with all their hopes and ideals, and all their lives ahead of them, suddenly to have life snuffed out. That is true whether they be American boys, French boys, and Italian boys or Russian boys.

Whoever the boy is, we want to create the kind of world in which he can grow up in peace with all other peoples.

That is what I believe. That is what the Legion stands for. That is why you are for strength. I pledge to you that, backed by the strong positions you have taken, we will maintain America's military strength;

XUM

and from that position of strength, not with arrogance, not with belligerence, we will attempt to develop new channels which lead to peace. I believe it is possible.

I thank you for the opportunity to be here, even though briefly, to share my thoughts with you and to tell you that when I joined the Legion—and I was young then, in 1946—I ran for Congress that year—I was proud to be a member of the Legion. I have been proud of my membership ever since. And I will be proud to be with you at your convention next year.

Thank you.

REAPPOINTMENT OF SENATOR PROUTY TO THE NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the provisions of Public Law 87-758, reappoints the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) to the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

THE SPANISH BASES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, tomorrow, negotiations between the United States and Spain are scheduled to resume with respect to the renewal, for 5 more years, of our rights to use the military facilities we constructed in that country some 15 years ago.

While there could be no doubt the executive branch has the responsibility for determining policy in such a matter, there can be no disagreement that any decision which requires the United States to pay Spain additional money for the use of these facilities, through either military or economic assistance, will require the approval of Congress.

The substance of the scheduled talks for tomorrow, therefore, involves both the executive and legislative branches of this Government.

It is no secret that for some time responsible people, both in and out of this Government, have become increasingly disturbed at the number and cost of U.S. military locations in foreign countries. They are troubled, therefore, not only by the political commitments and agreements which are consistently exacted in return for these facilities, but also by the resulting steadily increasing dollar drain.

Not the least of their worries is the fact that in some cases it would appear the Defense Department rather than the State Department has been the decisive agency in determining foreign policy.

This is one reason why last month the Senate Foreign Relations Committee authorized the establishment of a Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad. This subcommittee has only begun its fact-finding efforts; but because recent press stories have discussed these Spanish base negotiations in some detail, we have inquired so as to determine the positions of the various executive agencies in this matter.

So far it has not been possible to obtain copies of the negotiating directives given to the representatives of the United States prior to their talks with the Spanish. We expect this information any minute.

In the meantime, let us note that the decision by Spain to exercise its option under the original 1953 agreement, and renegotiate renewal terms for the use of these facilities, does not and should not mean that the cost of the bases to the United States goes up automatically; and although it is our understanding the United States did not seek these new negotiations, the latter now offer us an opportunity to make basic reassessments of the need of the facilities in question.

This country does not have the financial resources necessary to continue leasing military installations which were constructed originally under defense policies that now appear obsolescent to the point of being obsolete.

Actually, we believe a case could be made for the bases being more important to the Spanish Government—politically, financially, and militarily—than to the United States.

In any case, we are confident everyone agrees that the question of U.S. involvement in this case should now be reviewed before this Government commits itself to the outlay of additional hundreds of millions of dollars.

The taxpayers of this Nation are now supporting some 430 military establishments overseas; therefore, because of the current unprecedented requirements for additional taxes, conveniences can no longer be permitted to continue to masquerade as necessities.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial published in the Washington Post on March 17, an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on March 19, editorial published in the Washington Daily News of March 22, and an editorial published in the New York Times of March 23.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1969]

THE SPANISH BASES

This week Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Castiello Maiz arrives in Washington to conduct the final round of negotiations for the continued American occupancy of four bases in Spain, whose lease expires March 26. These bases—three Air Force, one Navy—have quite a history. They were established in 1953, in the most frigid years of the Cold War as part of the defense system that ringed the Soviet Union, from Spain and Morocco to Turkey. In return for the leased land, the United States pumped $1.2 billion in economic and military assistance into Spain over the next ten years. In 1963 the lease was renewed for five years in return for $100 million in military aid. Last summer the Spanish came back with a demand for $1 billion for the next five years, a sum that was later scaled down to $700 million in military aid. There were other Spanish demands as well, among them a commitment that the United States come to Spain's defense in case of attack—presumably, and incredibly, from North Africa. The American Government's position on all this has been far from clear, in part because the Johnson Administration apparently authorized a major general to do its diplomatic business in Spain, and it is not at all certain that his views coincide with the Government's. The notion now is that the United States will settle for a five-year extension at $100 million.

It is an astonishing business. No one, not even the Air Force, contends that the three air bases in Spain—in this, the age of the ICBM—are essential to American defense. "Desirable" is about the strongest word one can in good conscience extract, and that largely on the basis that the Department of Defense, the bureaucratic proof of the validity of the territorial imperative, never voluntarily gives up its turf, in this case three air bases. The naval base, useful for the servicing of Polaris submarines, is not essential either; it is marginally less expensive to service the subs in Rota, rather than the Eastern United States, and that is about all. So there is little in the way of persuasive military argument for retention of the bases and the 10,000 men who man them, particularly at a $700 million price tag.

The objections to extension of the lease, however, go way beyond $100 million or $1 billion and four obsolete and obsolescent bases. It is that the money in military aid will go to the Franco regime at precisely the time when it is under heaviest fire from its critics—left, right and center, from anarchist to monarchist—for reinstating the repression so characteristic of "the system" in the years immediately following the civil war. To conclude this agreement now would be to place the weight of Washington behind the generals in Madrid, no matter how many explanatory speeches, statements and backgrounders came from the White House. Beyond that, and not very far beyond it, is the inadvertent stake we acquire in a country once we establish bases and staff them with American soldiers. Diplomacy follows the flag. Who rules in Madrid becomes important not for political reasons but for military ones: What will they do to the bases? It would be interesting to know how the Administration is sorting out these questions. Which comes first: politics or military security, in this case—by most of the evidence—a dubious military security.

In short, this agreement appears to have very little to recommend it. It does not appear to be favorable to American interests on any grounds, military, political or economic, and in fact would tend to bring this country into disrepute with exactly those elements, in Spain and out of it, who should be our allies. A persuasive case for renewal of the leases has yet to be made.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 19, 1969]

BASES WE DON'T NEED

Unless the agreement under which the United States maintains two air fields and a Polaris submarine base in Spain is renewed by March 26, we will have to evacuate them within a year. And that is just what President Nixon ought to plan to do. President Johnson left the renewal negotiations to a general—Gen. David Burchinal—who tentatively accepted obligations to defend Spain beyond those of the agreement made in 1953. And Gen. Franco wants $700,000,000. The bases hardly are worth the price, militarily or politically.

In the cold war era and before we had B 52s and other long-range aircraft, they may have been deemed necessary. But today even our submarines could be berthed in American harbors without serious loss of effectiveness. This, in itself, ought to be decisive. Every unjustifiable military establishment ought to be closed, regardless of empire-builders in the Pentagon. The political case is even more conclusive. Gen. Franco has ended a slight trend toward more liberal policies by declaring a "state of exception" under which virtually all freedoms have been suspended. Censorship and arbitrary arrest again are the rule in Spain. And we may well lose the respect of Spaniards, not to mention others, by providing a military prop for such a government. Washington should have no illusions about partnership with a tyrant.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 22, 1969]

U.S. Bases in Spain

Next Wednesday is the deadline for the U.S. Government to make a new agreement with Spain for the three American air bases and one submarine base there. This is an opportunity for the Nixon Administration to retrench, to cut back in at least one country America's overcommitted, overextended, overpriced and frequently overaged system of global military bases.

With taxes sky-high, the Federal budget in chronic deficit, our balance of payments still in serious trouble and the Pentagon spending $80 billion yearly, it's time for spring pruning in Spain.

The air base agreement dates back to 1953—16 years ago—when the Cold War was raging in Europe and long-range missiles were in their infancy, making long-range bombers the era's "ultimate weapon."

Today, one of the bases, at Zaragoza, is officially on "caretaker," meaning inactive, status. No. 2, at Moron, near Seville, houses a small air rescue unit. No. 3, at Torrejon near Madrid, is base for a fighter wing. There is nothing done at these bases that could not be done by the Air Force units in Italy, West Germany and Britain, or by carriers of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

The Navy base in Spain is a Polaris nuclear submarine base at Rota near Cadiz. It is believed to be useful though not essential, since maintenance could be done at the Polaris base at Holy Loch, Scotland, or Naples or at slightly higher cost at Charleston, S.C.

In contrast to the low benefit of these bases, the Spanish government's price is astronomical. Over the last five years the U.S. has given $100 million in military goods, bringing total U.S. aid to Spain over the $2 billion mark. Last year, when negotiations began for renegotiation of the agreement, Madrid plunked down a bill for $1.2 billion.

Later Spanish negotiators cut that down to $700 million, and the U.S. moved up to $140 million. The question before the taxpayer is why pay anything for facilities whose usefulness is headed toward zero?

So much for the American reputation for being shrewd businessmen!

President Nixon would be doing us all a great favor by phasing out the Spanish bases.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

Coincidence in Madrid

One need not be overly cynical to suspect that more than coincidence connects two news items announced in Madrid the other day. One report revealed Spain's Foreign Minister will visit Washington this week for top-level talks aimed at renewing the agreement on American bases in Spain which expires next Wednesday. Almost simultaneously the Franco regime announced that the present "state of exception" will end next Tuesday, a month ahead of schedule, thus terminating the Spanish Government's special powers of arrest and censorship.

The suspicion must arise that the Franco regime's decision to drop its recent totalitarian domestic controls is inspired by hopes of removing a possible obstacle to renewal of the bases agreement. It is well known that the Madrid authorities' recent repressive measures have given new arguments to Americans who oppose that pact's extension.

Spain's easing of totalitarian controls is welcome, but it does not make the bases agreement automatically acceptable. Certainly if the Spanish air and submarine facilities are essential for American and Atlantic security, the need is for renewal of the agreement at minimum possible cost. But if technology in this era of intercontinental missiles has made these bases obsolete, this country should withdraw its military forces from Spain as soon as possible. The latter course is particularly desirable because of the spur United States bases give to anti-American sentiment in Spain. The burden of proof is on those who would keep the existing arrangements intact despite the vast increase in the nation's missile capacity since the original 1953 agreement.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able assistant majority leader.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I wonder if the Senator would enlighten us on how we fix the amount we are going to pay for these bases. The figures which have been outlined here seem to be exceedingly high. How do we establish what the rate will be in terms of payment to the Spanish Government or to other countries having these bases?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in reply to the inquiry of the distinguished assistant majority leader, we are attempting to find out the reasons for what we understand are going to be heavy payments that the United States is being asked to make, to have the right to continue to defend freedom in Spain.

Mr. KENNEDY. Am I correct in assuming that this rental has been increasing over the past few years?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It has been a high rental, an arrangement I believe started in 1953, and has been extended. We understand the original request was for many hundreds of millions of dollars more than finally agreed upon. But why should we now increase the already heavy payments to the Spanish Government for the right to have some mutual defense?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Missouri for his interest and the interest of his committee in reviewing this subject. When I saw reported again this morning in the newspapers the extraordinary budget requested for the military, it occurred to me that the American people will want to know why we are considering spending hundreds of millions of dollars for bases around the world when it appears that these bases, as pointed out by the Senator, are to protect the security of other countries, Spain, in this instance, or, in other cases, Libya, or other countries.

I think the Senator has performed a great service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to the assistant majority leader. With his usual perspicacity, he noted in the press this morning that the Federal budget will be larger this year than ever before. That is one reason I desired to make this short statement this morning; so that those who are starting the negotiations tomorrow will bear in mind congressional apprehension about the serious financial situation currently faced by the United States.

SENATOR RUSSELL'S ILLNESS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we all extremely regretted to learn last week that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, my warm friend and colleague, Dick Russell, has developed a tumor on his left lung that is possibly malignant.

Senator Russell's illness shocked not only his beloved State of Georgia, but the entire Nation as well. Our prayers go out to Senator Russell at this difficult time, and all the Nation hopes for his full and complete recovery.

There have appeared editorials in the Georgia press, as well as an article by the respected columnist William S. White, in well-deserved praise of Senator Russell. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Congressional Record.

There will no doubt be additional editorial tribute to Georgia's great Senator, and from time to time I will offer them for the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Mar. 21, 1969]

A Man of Quality

The news that Sen. Richard B. Russell may be seriously ill is distressing but the word that he will remain in the Senate is reassuring.

Sen. Russell is in his 36th year in the U.S. Senate and is a man of intelligence, quality and integrity. We shudder to think of his successor if he should resign.

His seniority plus other attributes mean a lot to Georgia. It is a good thing for the state that he decided to stay at his post. Public servants of Sen. Russell's quality don't come along often. He is a man with convictions plus courage and while his convictions don't please everybody there is no valid reason why they should.

The Atlanta Journal wishes the senator the best of luck in his effort to regain his health.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Mar. 19, 1969]

Our Senator's Senator

U.S. Senator Richard Brevard Russell undoubtedly is Georgia's greatest single human resource. For years he has been considered one of the most powerful and effective members of the Senate. Now that he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the fact that he is the U.S. Senate's most powerful and influential member is unquestioned.

Recently someone from Massachusetts wrote this question to nationally-circulated Parade Magazine: Who is the most powerful man in the U.S. Senate, Mike Mansfield, Everett Dirksen, or Ted Kennedy? Parade's matter-of-fact answer was: "Most powerful man in the Senate is Georgia Democrat Richard Russell, ex-head of the Armed Services Committee and now head of the appropriations committee . . ."

What makes our senior senator so influential? First, it's experience. Sen. Russell, a bachelor, has served in public office since he was 23 when first elected to the Georgia Legislature.

From 1927 to 1931, just four years after he was elected to the Legislature in the first place, Sen. Russell served as Speaker of the House. Then in 1931 Richard Russell was elected governor, while only 33 years old—the youngest chief executive ever chosen by his state. Therefore his immense ability revealed itself in a dramatic way at a very early age.

The vast power that Sen. Russell holds doesn't show itself in the form of headlines (although whenever he chooses to make a public statement, he does indeed make headlines), rather it is a quiet sort of power emanating from his personal brilliance, his legislative expertise and impeccable integrity. Word is that even the most influential in that august body yield to the bywords: "Clear it with Dick Russell."

Considering that the 72-year-old senator suffers from the lung ailment, emphysema, which from time to time requires specialized treatment, the senior senator seems to be getting along reasonably well.

Last weekend the powerful voice of Sen. Russell publicly supported President Nixon's newly announced program to develop the "safeguard" missile defense system. The weight of his utterance, it seemed, pretty well cooled the anti-missile debate.

This senator's senator is now serving his seventh full term in this country's leading deliberative body. He entered the U.S. Senate on Jan. 12, 1933 following a special election to fill the unexpired term of the late William J. Harris.

Few have achieved the national stature of Sen. Russell—probably no one not elected to the presidency itself. It should be a source of pride for all of us that this giant of American government is a fellow Georgian.

NORTHERNERS' PREJUDICE KEPT SENATOR RUSSELL FROM PRESIDENCY

(William S. White)

The calm, patrician disclosure of Richard Brevard Russell that he is in the cold grip of a wasting lung tumor brings a sense of elegy to the Senate and to the country the beginning of the end of an American tragedy.

For this, one of the greatest Senators of his era and the highest embodiment of a Southern tradition of aristocratic and large-minded public service, has acted for his Nation with a gallantry and a generosity which that Nation has in fact repaid with a petty discrimination against him and all his kind.

The personal disaster that has overtaken this authentic gentleman of politics, this able and devoted guardian of true national interest, is cause for general sorrow and for more than personal sorrow. If no man is an island to himself, true it is, too, that when the great ones pass from the scene all are thereby left diminished; all are thereby left impoverished.

So it is that if grief for a man must now run high among those who know his personal value, higher yet should run grief for all the implications of a political life so cramped and cribbed and confined by needless and surely outmoded sectional prejudice.

For here has not been simply a Senator from Georgia but rather, in the best and highest meaning of that old-fashioned term, a Senator of the United States of America. On every single ordinary and rational test of performance, of competence, and of private and public honor; no politician in his time has more clearly and more repeatedly earned consideration for the highest office of them all. No one who understands the Senate can doubt that for many years he has towered there. But the trouble for Richard Brevard Russell has not been that he ever lacked the ability to be an outstanding President but only that he had himself born in the wrong place at the wrong time and thus was forever denied even a chance at that elevation which otherwise could hardly have been refused to him.

In a word, the door to the White House was locked and nailed up against him because he was "a Southerner" and thus a member of a lesser breed without the law. More than any other qualified man, he has been absurdly the victim of a kind of reverse "discrimination" which we might all usefully examine. For the ugly coin of bias has two sides, though we usually talk as though it had only one, and in Richard Russell's case the coin has always fallen into heads I win and tails you lose.

The bleak, the undeniable and the foolish unfairness of the facts of his career surely presents some opportunity for national second thoughts; surely in elementary justice requires political criteria of this country.

Granting if one wishes a thousand sins by a South long dead and gone, how long should this Nation go on and on punishing its present Southern men of talent for what went on, or is supposed to have gone on, in its long, long yesterdays? How many times must Fort Sumter be avenged and reavenged? How many times must "Northern liberals" in their inner awareness of their professional inferiority to such Richard Russells as still survive, reassure themselves by seeing to it that every Richard Russell is kept firmly in his place? How long can the Nation afford all this?

It used to be said, and truthfully, that it was the South which would not allow the Civil War to be forgotten. But is it not now—and has it not long since been—the other way round? When the Senate says farewell to Richard Brevard Russell, something much more than the Senate will have been deprived. So, too, will have been the United States of America.

Perhaps, just perhaps, it may be that his last service will not after all be that stout leadership for a strong American defense posture to which so long he has contributed so much. Perhaps it will instead be to recall a Nation to common sense, if not to a sense of ordinary justice, so that the Civil War may be ended in politics, too, and so that qualified men may be allowed to contend for the Presidency, whatever the section of their birth.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Mar. 21, 1969]

BEST WISHES, SENATOR RUSSELL

It is with deep regret that we learn that Senator Richard B. Russell must undergo treatment for a lung tumor which the senator says it is "fair to assume is malignant."

At the same time, we are pleased he has seen fit continue his service in the United States Senate, where he is a tower of strength. He has served Georgia and his country long and well, and continues to do so.

It is to be hoped, of course, that the senator's medical treatment will arrest the condition for which it is given, and that he is soon restored to a greater measure of health.

And we hope, as a result, that he will be enabled to continue to serve in the Senate, giving that body the benefit of sound judgment and wise counsel.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald Mar. 22, 1969]

OUR BEST TO SENATOR RUSSELL

All Georgians will share in the general dismay at learning that Sen. Richard B. Russell has been beset with an illness that could prematurely end his lengthy and distinguished career in the U.S. Senate.

Hopefully, it will not. When the senator called a special news conference to announce that he soon would be undergoing cobalt treatment for a possibly malignant lung tumor, he said he still felt fit and would continue to serve in the Senate, of which he is unquestionably the most powerful and prestigious member.

It is our most sincere hope that the treatment will prove successful and that Sen. Russell will be restored to good health. His advice and good counsel are much in need by his state and by his nation.

We wish him the very best, confident that the wish is shared in by all who hold this great and good servant in our own high level of esteem.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am sure that the people of Missouri would desire that I join the able Senator from Georgia in his statement with respect to one of the great public servants of our time, the able and distinguished senior Senator, whose very name is synonymous with character and ability. We all pray for his early and complete recovery.

I thank the able Senator for yielding.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to join the distinguished Senator from Georgia in praising the remarkable senior Senator from Georgia. Certainly, if there has been a leader in the Senate for many, many years, it has been the great Senator from Georgia. I disagreed with him on some questions and agreed with him enthusiastically on other questions. He is a man with great honor, dignity, and ability. He has elevated the respect for the Senate throughout the Nation.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was with feelings of extreme sadness that Senators learned that our distinguished colleague, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, has been afflicted with probable cancer.

We hold him in the highest admiration. Senator RUSSELL has truly been one of the great American statesmen of our generation. I know that all of the people of the United States and all Members of the Congress feel very sorrowful over his present affliction, and we hope for the best. All of us have reason to hope that due to the tremendous advances in the science of medicine during recent years that our dear friend and highly respected colleague, without doubt our best beloved colleague, will achieve a complete recovery.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended in order that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for yielding.

I cannot add much to what has been said already about Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia. I speak of him as a great Senator of the United States over the years. I have known him intimately for 32 years, since I first came to Congress. He has been my seatmate for 20 years. I have known him as a personal friend and adviser.

I suggest to Senators today that over the years we have helped, sometimes taken the initiative, in the field of health pertaining to the affliction that has fallen upon our friend from Georgia. We have done great things in the field of research. The senior Senator from Georgia supported those programs when they came before the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish to add a little hope. Marvelous things are done today in the field of health. I am sure if there is anything in medical research or medical progress that can be helpful, it is because Senator RUSSELL, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, has helped thousands of Americans in the same way. I have some hope that with these treatments, whatever they may do, he will come out all right. We all pray that he will.

I speak of him as a friend. Our friendship has extended over a quarter of a century.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington. We all join in the prayer that modern medical science, highly developed as it is, may effectuate a speedy cure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is the men who are the strength of the state. While ours is said to be a government of laws and not men, nevertheless it is by the strength of those who provide leadership and character, the men who stand the tallest, who command respect because of the nature of their being, because of their inward character, which establishes, as well, their high reputation, that we are led sometimes to rise beyond ourselves and above ourselves.

Such a man is our beloved Senator RUSSELL, who in a moment tinged with great courage, and at the same time in a matter where sympathy and concern of all of us is so deeply enlisted, has made a statement of an illness which causes all of us to grieve with him and to be much moved by this unhappy disclosure.

Mr. President, the prayers of his colleagues, the prayers of the people of Georgia, and the prayers of the people of the United States rise as one for the well being and complete recovery of this greatest—if I may say so—of our statesmen in this body.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Pennsylvania, all of whom have paid high tribute to the great senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL).

Although I am young to the Halls of the Senate, I have had the privilege and the pleasure of knowing Senator RUSSELL for many, many years. As a young man, I recall when he was elected Governor of Georgia in the early thirties, and then coming to this august body in January of 1933.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama regard the two Senators from Georgia as also being Senators from Alabama. We greatly admire them. We admire their service to the South and to the Nation.

In 1952, I had the honor to cast the first vote cast in the Democratic National Convention of that year for Senator RUSSELL for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. Senator RUSSELL would have made a great President. Think how history might have been changed had he been elected, as many millions of Americans feel he should have been elected to the Presidency of the United States. Mr. President, the people of Alabama hope and pray for the full and complete recovery of Senator RUSSELL. Certainly it would be the prayer of every person in the Nation that he return to the Senate to render his full and valuable services here.

Thus, it is with a heavy heart that we in Alabama hear of the illness of Senator RUSSELL. To a man, the people of Alabama pray for his recovery.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank my distinguished friend, neighbor, and colleague from Alabama for the generosity of his remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I, too, want to express my feelings on the illness which has beset our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I know that every Member of this body shares the feelings which have been so eloquently expressed by Senator RUSSELL's colleague, Senator TALMADGE, and by others who have spoken on this matter today.

May I say, also, that I am not on my feet at the moment to deliver a eulogy. I simply wish to express the hope that before too long, as a result of the treatments which our colleague will receive, he will be fully recovered and able to assume to the fullest extent his chair as the Presiding Officer of this body in the absence of the Vice President, and his functions as the chairman or member of the various committees on which he serves. It is heartening to know that in the meantime he will continue to give us the inspiration, the advice, and the counsel which mark him so much a man apart and yet a man among us.

In this respect, I am delighted to know that the doctors have told him, despite the treatments which he is now undertaking, that he should remain on the job as much as possible.

I am also happy to note, of course—although not surprised—that immediately upon receipt of the knowledge that he would have to undertake these treatments, Senator RUSSELL kept the pledge he made to the people of his State and notified them immediately, so that there was no room and no time for rumors to spring up and be distributed about.

So our prayers go out to Senator RUSSELL in the hope of his full recovery, because he is one man whom we very much need in this body.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished majority leader. Let me say that Senator RUSSELL is on duty today, having taken treatments over the weekend at Walter Reed Hospital. He expects to continue to perform his duties as long as he is physically able to do so—which we hope will be a long, long time in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia may proceed for another 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate in 1963, I heeded some worthwhile advice that my older brother, President Kennedy, gave to me, which was to go down and visit with the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). My brother said that I could gain from Senator RUSSELL some impressions about conduct in the Senate, an insight into its workings and its functions, and thereby obtain a better grasp of its direction and purpose.

Mr. President, I did seek out Senator RUSSELL, and he was extremely kind and generous in taking his time to talk to me. The time I spent with him was informative and delightful and among the most profitable I have spent in the Senate. I gained from that experience. One of the things I gained was an early realization of and considerable respect and admiration for the character of this distinguished Senator who represents his State and the Nation so well.

There have been times when the Senator from Georgia and I have looked at the issues in different ways and with different lights and have taken different sides; but I realized, and I think that everyone who has come to the Senate realizes, that Senator RUSSELL established a true senatorial code of conduct; that he, perhaps as much as anyone else ever has, is attuned to the spirit in this body. He characterizes all that all of us believe the Senate should be.

Mr. President, his contributions to this body, and to the country, have been and will be written in the history books. He has established a tradition and a tone which will continue for many years beyond the time of his service to the Senate.

This past Saturday, it was my opportunity to visit at length with the Senator from Georgia, and, as I always am, I was benefited and lifted up by our conversation. His spirit is excellent, his determination firm, and I believe he has the ability to win this struggle.

So I rise and join my colleagues in paying a special word of tribute to the Senator from Georgia. What has been significant here this afternoon has been the tone of the comments, the recognition that Senator RUSSELL is a fighter for the things in which he believes, whether in or out of the Senate.

Now that he has one of the hard and difficult fights of his life ahead of him, I am sure he will give his full energies, efforts, and enthusiasm, which have been so characteristic of his service in this body and to the Nation, to overcome his illness.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH).

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia very much.

No man can claim greater stature in the Senate than Dick Russell; long recognized as the foremost statesman of the South, he also has been, in the best sense of the term, a great Senator of the United States.

The whole country has reacted to the news of his illness with genuine grief. I know that his is going to be a hard fight, but as one who suffered a malignancy 20 years ago and found a cure through deep therapy, I simply want to say it need not be a hopeless fight.

I shall not only pray for his recovery, but I shall do so with hope that he will eventually conquer his malady and come back again, with his health restored, for further years of service in the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank my distinguished friend from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allen in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is probably more than 25 years that I first came to know Dick Russell quite well. At that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House of Representatives. He was the chairman of the companion committee in the Senate. At some point in time during the session, it became necessary to have the so-called conference confrontation between the House and the Senate on the differences in the bill. I quickly learned that in any kind of a tussel with Dick Russell, you should be very sure that you had done your homework, because he always did his homework well, and there was nothing in that bill as to which he was not forthright at all times in defending the Senate position. So I was enriched by those experiences, and I think it had something to do with my doing my homework, also.

Out of that relationship, there ripened an intense friendship. We used to banter a little, as we went along in life, and particularly when I came to this body. I recall when we had a discussion out in the foyer about our relative ages. Perhaps I was complaining that day. He said, "What are you squawking about? You are just in three-cornered pants compared with me."

"Well," I said, "my friend from Georgia, you ought to take a look at the Congressional Directory sometime."

After that there was no more discussion about age, because he discovered I was older than he. And I demanded that he respect his seniors around here, even though my age difference was not too great.

If I were to say one thing about Dick Russell, it would be his jealousy in guarding the image and the status and the reputation of this body, the U.S. Senate. He did, in season and out; and glory be his name that he had much to do, I think, with preserving the status of this body and the respect of the people for it.

Long ago someone asked me, "Who do you think is the most consistent man among the statesmen of contemporary history?" And I puzzled for a moment. Finally I said, "William Jennings Bryan." I was asked "Why?" Then, of course, I had to assign the reasons. I must say he was consistent in his entire public life. But if I were to name a contemporary statesman today who has been almost religiously consistent in his views, in his expressions, in his utterances, that man would be Richard Brevard Russell, of Georgia.

The whole country respects him even as this body respects him, and so our prayers go with him. I know the difficulties he has been through, because I have been in Walter Reed Hospital a good many times when he has been there. So, as hospital inmates, we used to visit back and forth and take a little comfort in each other. I wished him well then, and I pray for his recovery now, because it is within the compass of medical science to arrest even a malignancy.

May he live and flourish and prosper and do what he has said to me, not once, but half a dozen times, since this session began, he wanted to do. He said, "I want to live out my term." I said, "Dick, I want to live out my term too, and if I can give you some comfort and assistance, I shall do so." And the same words of comfort came from him.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join with the junior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Talmadge) and other Members of the Senate in expressing the hope and prayer that our beloved colleague, Senator Richard Russell, will find relief and speedy recovery from a serious ailment which has plagued him for several years.

Few people could have carried on their work as usual as our friend Dick Russell has in spite of his lung condition. This is so typical of the courageous and dedicated person he is.

If the good wishes and prayers of friends will help his health situation, he could not help but get well soon. No one in the Senate in my time has more friends and admirers than the senior Senator from Georgia.

I hope and pray that he will recover from this illness and be with us for many years to come.

THAT POWERFUL MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the United States today is the world's largest military-industrial complex. Our Armed Forces total more than 3,605,000 men. We have more than 6,000 military bases within our borders. More than 1,531,000 American servicemen are stationed in more than 350 additional installations in Western Europe, Asia, Africa, and throughout the entire world. Ten percent of the American labor force is involved in either military or defense-related employment. Approximately 22,000 of our largest manufacturing corporations are prime military contractors, while more than 100,000 firms contribute some type of output to defense production.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of munitions. Our annual expenditures for defense purposes, so called, far exceed the total amount spent for welfare, education, and poverty programs.

Still, the pressures of the military-industrial complex for costlier, more intricate defense systems go on—the most recent examples being the proposed ABM system, which will cost anywhere from $6 billion to more than $100 billion and be obsolete before completion, as were all missile systems already constructed at a cost of more than $19 billion.

Meanwhile, most of our cities, where approximately 70 percent of our population live, are suffering and in deep trouble. Some of the largest have been termed dying cities. Crime, congestion, squalor, misery, and pollution of the air our people breathe are prevalent in nearly every American city. There are shameful slum areas which should no longer be tolerated. At the same time, the military-industrial establishment is given a virtual blank check for more guns and more armaments with hardly a serious thought given as to whether these are actually needed for our defense.

Few Americans question the need for maintaining our armed strength in sufficient size and quality to guarantee our security. All Americans want the United States to continue to be the strongest nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God. However, that is not to say that we should continue to spend money for armaments we do not need. We must not condone waste and inefficiency in the purchasing of those armaments, nor ignore the deleterious effects of the power of the military-industrial complex on our society.

On January 17, 1961, 3 days before he left office, President Eisenhower, himself a product of the American military system, startled Americans by forthrightly speaking out about the dangers of the "military-industrial complex."

President Eisenhower warned:

> This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in American experience.

He said its "total influence, economic, political, even spiritual, is felt in every city, statehouse, every office of the Federal Government." President Eisenhower in his farewell television and radio address to the American people uttered a somber warning of the power and arrogance of the military-industrial complex as a threat to our free institutions and our American tradition and way of life.

Yet, as our military power and our Defense Establishment have rapidly expanded, Americans generally have given scant consideration to the social and political implications of a huge military establishment on a democratic society; of the economic overdependence on Federal contracts for a community engaged in defense production; of the possibility that somehow basic American values and attitudes are being subtly perverted or destroyed.

It is with a feeling of sadness that I report it is taken for granted in Washington and among Senators and Representatives in Congress that when an officer of our Armed Forces—a commander

XUM

or captain in the Navy, a colonel or a general of the Army or Air Force or Marines—retires following 20 years or somewhat more of active service to receive the generous retirement pay for the remainder of his life, this former officer in the prime of life, in his forties or fairly early fifties, immediately announces that he is now a vice president or technical adviser or occupying some extremely high salaried official position of a well-known corporation thriving on so-called defense contracts. More than 3,600 former officers of our Armed Forces immediately following their voluntary retirement became associated with corporations of this huge military-industrial complex at high salaries. Of these officers, more than 2,000 were colonels or generals in the Army, Air Force, and Marines, and captains or admirals in the Navy. In addition, approximately 1,600 majors and lieutenant colonels of the Army, Air Force, and Marines and commanders or lieutenant commanders of the Navy retired and immediately were given lucrative positions in corporations with fat contracts for defense work. All this is so commonplace and routine that the slogan "Join the Navy and see the world" should be supplanted by "become an officer in Uncle Sam's Armed Forces, retire with assured income after 20 years, and become a captain of industry."

Doubtless, arrangements had been made before they announced their retirement and placed their uniforms in mothballs. May I pause for a moment while I wipe a tear over the plight of Gen. Curtis LeMay, who lost his $50,000 per-year industrial-military complex job when he became George Wallace's candidate for Vice President.

Before World War II the military held an honored but not a primary role in our society and in the policymaking functions of Government. Since World War II and the advent of the cold war the rapidly increasing influence of the military establishment and its allies in that huge portion of the industrial establishment dedicated to huge profits from war contracts has brought forth a new element in American life. Never in our history have we had such a prolonged period of involuntary conscription. Never in our history have we devoted for such a sustained period of time such a large percentage of our gross national product on expenditures for our Armed Forces. Never in our history have the voices of the generals and admirals carried such weight in the formulation of our national and our foreign policy, and in many of the basic institutions of our society.

It is high time that Americans reconsider just what are our national goals, the priorities that should be established toward reaching them, and the role that the military should play in that context.

As more Americans become concerned over the possible dangers of the military-industrial complex, certain facts emerge. As a Senator of the United States from one of the largest States in the Union in population and one of the foremost industrial States I am doubly concerned with the effects of military spending and the military-industrial complex. Last year Ohio corporations received more that $1,600 million of the military contract pie, an amount exceeded only in five other States. Those States were Texas, of course, California with its huge population and size and salubrious climate, and the other three States were New York, Pennsylvania, and Missouri.

Many authorities believe the existence of this mighty military-industrial complex may result in a setback for industrial diversification. Furthermore, the gigantic operations of industry whose sole business is production of materials for war and destruction is undoubtedly draining off the resources, the brains, and the skills that are actually needed to cure our domestic ills and to develop industry which will be more meaningful in respect to our long-term economic growth.

Unfortunately, Pentagon propagandists frightening the public with utterly false claims of threatened destruction from Communist China and pressuring for the need of spending billions of dollars for defensive ABM's are a current example of conscienceless public relations for the benefit of war profiteers.

The presence of the defense complex in a community often inhibits or sets back needed social reform. In many areas of the Nation a situation has been created whereby the local economy would virtually collapse if major military or so-called defense procurement were to end. If the political and social attitudes of a community do not conform to the philosophy of officials of the Defense Department, that community may suddenly find itself without defense contracts and with hundreds or thousands of jobless men and women hitherto employed in corporations with Government defense contracts, so called. An excuse or reason seems always to be advanced by Defense Department officials for their actions and decisions, frequently made without any preliminary warning.

Slowly, imperceptibly, and unconsciously, Americans are becoming conditioned to the acceptance of regimentation, wiretapping, and snooping by large defense-related investigative agencies. Slowly, Americans are accepting as natural an invasion of their individual privacy that their forefathers would have rebelled against. Unfortunately, security investigations, background reports, questioning of attitudes and opinions have become a part of our way of life.

Every facet of public life from politics to elementary and secondary school education to what is shown on motion picture screens is beginning more and more to be influenced by the growing power of the Pentagon. Our children are being subtly taught not to question the views of their military leaders, but to accept them as gospel. The military has been glorified on television and in motion pictures to the point where it is considered subversive by many citizens to criticize the Pentagon or the actions and statements of military leaders.

Through research and development grants to colleges and universities, the Pentagon has established a strong stranglehold on academic research and on the academic establishment. This has become a real threat to academic freedom. Through the power of research grants and defense contracts, there have emerged powerful coalitions of interest to maintain specific Government defense programs—a pervasive economic influence that is not always in the best interests of the Nation. This economic influence undoubtedly is translated into political influence in local, State, and National Government. Americans have witnessed this time after time over the past 20 years.

Furthermore, it has been proven over and over again that the unwarranted influence of the military-industrial complex has resulted in excessive costs, procurements scandals, and skyrocketing military budgets. Quite often taxpayers do not receive the weapons and productions for which excessive prices were paid with their tax dollars. With 25 corporations receiving nearly 50 percent of prime defense contracts, with important officials in the Defense Department willing to accept serious delays, changing project deadlines, and adding charges well above original estimates, defense contractors are under little pressure to perform efficiently. This fact and the startling lack of competition for defense contracts have cost taxpayers billions of dollars in excess of original estimates. Also, unfortunately, this results in astounding inefficiency on the part of defense contractors. It results in a small "in" group of favored corporate officials more interested in promoting new business and acquiring new contracts than in successfully completing obligations of contracts entered into previously. As the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, recently pointed out, there is no adequate machinery either in the executive or legislative branch of our Government to control the total amount spent or the way in which military funds are disbursed or not to adequately supervise the operations of this huge broadbased military-industrial complex.

Defense Department officials have for years given only lip service or ignored with impunity laws such as the Truth-in-Negotiating Act in connection with defense contracts. The slightest example of waste and inefficiency in welfare payments, or some maladministration in an antipoverty program, or the payment of high salaries to employees immediately becomes front page news. Maladministration should always be exposed. Unfortunately, it seems that, like Moses on Mount Horeb, one is treading on holy ground if properly denouncing the operations and power of the military-industrial complex.

Mr. President, it is ironic that, with a supply of weaponry that could destroy the world, we occasionally find ourselves in the position of Goliath facing David—a giant so laden down with armaments that we cannot respond to military incidents where only minor amounts of force or deterrence are required. This was clearly the case during the seizure of the *Pueblo*, when our nearest warplanes—some less than half an hour flying time—could not come to its defense or make an adequate demonstration over international waters because they were laden with nuclear weapons only and unable to exert the minor force of tactical weapons necessary to rescue the *Pueblo*, as the changeover, it is said, would have consumed another hour.

Mr. President, it is obvious that defense spending has grown out of control. It is manifest that the power of the military-industrial complex to write its own ticket and dictate its own terms is one of the most serious and pervasive threats to our Republic and to the future economic well-being of the Nation. It is clear that our national security depends not only on awesome military power but also on the strength of our economic system and on the wholesomeness of our social and political life. A much greater effort than ever before must be made to bring the mad armaments race under control and to curb the power of the military-industrial complex.

I report, Mr. President, that in the last session of the Senate I voted against the Defense Department supplemental appropriation bill appropriating $71,800 million for fiscal 1969. This was the largest single Defense Department appropriation bill in the history of our Nation. It was larger by some billions of dollars than any single Defense Department appropriation bill at any time during World War II. I considered there was at least $8 billion utterly and uselessly wasted included among the items in that bill. Now we are told that the Defense Department appropriation for fiscal 1970 will call for spending of even more taxpayers' money.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Salaries and expenses," Agricultural Research Service, have been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Department of Defense Appropriations Exempted by the President From Certain Provisions of Their Appropriation Act

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, appropriations exempted by the President from certain provisions of the Department's Appropriation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Value of Property, Supplies, and Commodities Provided by the Berlin Magistrat

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrat for the quarter ended December 31, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Department of the Army Contracts for Military Construction Awarded Without Formal Advertisement

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department on contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement for the period July 1 through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Bank Holding Company Act of 1969

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 34th Annual Report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of the District of Columbia City Council

A letter from the Chairman, City Council, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the First Annual Report of the District of Columbia City Council (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Proposed Legislation Relating to Income Tax Treatment of Certain Distributions Pursuant to the Bank Company Holding Act of 1969

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969 (with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on Finance.

Proposed Increased Participation by the United States in the International Development Association

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Proposed Payment of Travel Expenses in Connection With Possible Employment

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel expenses of applicants invited by an agency to visit it in connection with possible employment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, fiscal year 1968, Department of Agriculture dated March 20, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the donation of surplus mercury for educational and public health purposes, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated March 21, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the Agricultural Research Service Program for Screwworm Eradication, Department of Agriculture, dated March 20, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a follow-up review of per diem payments to prospective crew members of ships under construction in New Orleans, La., Department of the Navy, dated March 24, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on policies and procedures for recommending emergency area designations by the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated March 24, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Third- and Sixth-Preference Classifications for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third- and sixth-preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to change the method of judicial review of convictions under State laws concerning obscenity and pornography

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring:

"Section 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation placing the final review of all questions of fact and law involving convictions for violations of state law concerning obscenity and pornography by the Supreme Court of each of the several states.

"Sec. 2. Upon concurrence of the House of Representatives the Secretary of the Senate is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each member of the Indiana Congressional delegation and to the Principal Clerk of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

"Charles B. Kleinkort,
"Senator."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on March 15, 1970, the 300th anniversary of the founding of the first permanent settlement in the State of South Carolina will occur. This event will be celebrated throughout the year under the supervision of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. On March 6, 1969, the South Carolina Legislature passed a concurrent resolution calling for the Congress of the United States to provide for the striking of medals in commemorating with the 300th anniversary of the founding of the State of South Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution, which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record:

S. 178

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to take such action as may be necessary for the passage of H.R. 6269, "a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the State of South Carolina"

XUM

Whereas, the State of South Carolina, one of the original Thirteen Colonies, was founded on March 15, 1670, when the colonists who established its first permanent settlement landed near the present site of Charleston; and

Whereas, the event is one of great importance in the history of the United States, leading to the conquest not only of the territory of South Carolina but also that of the other States which lie to the south and to the west as far as the Mississippi River; and

Whereas, the three-hundredth anniversary of this event will occur in the year 1970 and will be celebrated throughout that year under the supervision of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission in ways that will serve best to remind our people of their heritage; and

Whereas, Congressman Mendel Rivers of South Carolina introduced in the Ninety-First Congress H. 6269, "A Bill to Provide for the Striking of Medals in Commemoration of the Three-Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the State of South Carolina".

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary for the passage of H.R. 6269, "A Bill to Provide for the Striking of Medals in Commemoration of the Three-Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the State of South Carolina.", which was introduced by Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator and Congressman from South Carolina.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 714. A bill to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California (Rept. No. 91–115).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles H. Rogovin, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1630. A bill for the relief of Gurton Baird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. Tower, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, and Mr. Packwood):

S. 1631. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal reclamation laws relating to the furnishing of water service to excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Murphy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Cannon):

S. 1632. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Stevens when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1633. A bill for the relief of Stamatios G. Stamoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. Bellmon, Mr. Cook, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dole, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Percy, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Tower):

S. 1634. A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Baker when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1635. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1636. A bill to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to the criteria for establishing eligibility for tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1637. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of air carrier and general purpose airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1638. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend from 22 to 26 the age limit for the receipt of child's insurance benefits thereunder by individuals attending school, and to permit reduced child's benefits to be paid to individuals attending school on a part-time basis; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to extend from 22 to 26 the age limit for the receipt of a child's insurance annuity thereunder by individuals attending school, and to permit a reduced child's insurance annuity to be paid to individuals attending school on a part-time basis; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lily Prizant Blufstein and son, Manuel Blufstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1641. A bill for the relief of Shu Sum Fan, also known as Chun Fen;

S. 1642. A bill for the relief of Georgio A. Michalopoulos; and

S. 1643. A bill for the relief of Tin Tai Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Tower):

S. 1644. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chu Yang; and

S. 1646. A bill to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1647. A bill to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1648. A bill to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk;

S. 1649. A bill to allow income tax deductions to insurance companies for reserves required by State law for losses attributable to riots or other catastrophes, or attributable to insolvencies of other insurance companies; and

S. 1650. A bill to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide double indemnity coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for members of the uniformed services assigned to duty in a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1651. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. Brooke):

S. 1652. A bill to designate certain lands in the Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge, Barnstable County, Mass., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Hart):

S. 1653. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 1654. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1655. A bill to change the limitation on the number of apprentices authorized to be employed by the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miriam Mathe;

S. 1657. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Sylvana (Maria Mattozi);

S. 1658. A bill for the relief of Miss Veronica D. Canos;

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Miss Gloria B. Casumpang;

XUM

S. 1660. A bill for the relief of Miss Violeta F. Panis;

S. 1661. A bill for the relief of Eufrsina Garrido; and

S. 1662. A bill for the relief of Miss Hedva Haimson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1663. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for adult education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Sparkman):

S. 1664. A bill to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1665. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 1666. A bill for the relief of Edward Regan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1667. A bill for the relief of Kin Ping Fong;

S. 1668. A bill for the relief of Tsui Fong; and

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Filippo Sebastiano Saglimbeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1670. A bill for the relief of Loi Hing Man;

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Hau Fan Ip;

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Lat Huen Lam; and

S. 1673. A bill for the relief of Muk Hing Tsui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Miller, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Percy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Griffin when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1631—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today, in behalf of myself and my distinguished colleagues, Senator Tower, Senator Fannin, Senator Hansen, and Senator Packwood, I introduce a bill to correct the unrealistic, uneconomic, unjust, and obsolete provisions of reclamation law which require that beneficiaries of irrigation projects limit their land holdings to 160 acres per individual.

Basically, the bill provides the following modifications of the existing law:

First. An immediate increase in the number of acres in one ownership eligible for interest-free financing to at least 640 acres, with provision for further increase in the limitation every 10 years if economic or technological changes indicate that an increase is appropriate and consistent with the public interest.

Second. Immediate adoption of the "Engle formula" which would provide that a landowner with lands in excess of the 640-acre limitation could obtain water for his excess lands, but that in the determination of the price of this water to him, he could not be given the benefit of the interest-free provision of reclamation law.

These provisions are in line with recommendations of the task force on the acreage limitation problem which was appointed by Gov. Ronald Reagan to investigate this matter and which reported its findings to the Governor last year.

This task force was under the guidance of Mr. Earl Coke, director of the California Department of Agriculture, and Mr. William R. Gianelli, director of the California Department of Water Resources.

The members of the task force were Burnham Enersen, chairman; Richard D. Andrews, William H. Jennings, James F. Sorensen, and Breckinridge Thomas.

Mr. President, I submit the report of this task force as well as accompanying supporting material identified as "exhibit A," and I ask unanimous consent that this material be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURPHY. When the reclamation law was enacted in 1902, it followed the philosophy of the earlier homestead laws in seeking to encourage the settlement of land, and it applied this philosophy to the West by recognizing the fact that much of our western land was so arid that irrigation would have to be provided if settlers were to be attracted.

Still following the philosophy of the earlier land-settlement legislation, the Congress sought to direct its aid to so-called family-size farms and thus established a limit of 160 acres per person for land which could come under the provisions of the act.

In other words, the legislation of 1902, like many of the bills passed by Congress, was designed to reflect specific conditions at a particular time in our Nation's history.

Those conditions, Mr. President, have changed dramatically during the past 67 years.

The law has not kept pace.

True, it has received patchwork modifications over the years, but the fundamental provisions still stand today as relics of an era in which agricultural planning was based mainly on the concept of the dawn-to-dusk farmer and his one and only horse.

It is certainly understandable and, in fact, quite proper that there is in our land a great deal of deep nostalgia for these one-horse farms from which sprang so many of our family traditions, our agricultural knowledge, and our regional development.

But nostalgia must not blind us to reality.

On lands where old dobbin once plodded his straight and steady path, huge tractors now pull a variety of machinery which sometimes seems to be as intricate and sophisticated as the hardware we send to the moon.

Chemists continue to produce increasingly effective fertilizers.

Crop specialists announce new techniques almost daily.

The effect is that the so-called family farms and, in fact, all of our farms are faced with the stark fact that they simply cannot operate at top efficiency under programs and procedures designed for the turn of the century.

In other words, if a farmer is to make the best possible use of today's expensive new machinery and the advanced technology which is available to him, he must have greater flexibility and scope than is provided to him under the 160-acre limitation.

This fact is demonstrated clearly in the material contained in the task force report and "exhibit A," so I shall not dwell on it any longer at this time.

Instead, I want to point out briefly but most emphatically that there is another side to this coin, too, and it is the way in which the consumer is affected by those regulations which impede businesslike farming operations.

According to experts who have studied this matter, the cost per acre of operating a farm unit of 160 acres is usually much higher than for larger units.

The result, therefore, is that the costs to the small farmer are higher, and he, in turn, must pass along these greater costs to the consumer.

I want to stress this point as strongly as posible for it is very definitely to the advantage of the consumer, too, that remedial action be taken in this important matter.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to go on record as stating that although I am firmly committed to the goals of the bill I am introducing today, I am not wedded to the specific language.

Rather, I am presenting this proposed legislation as a starting point.

It is a good starting point since it was prepared by a group of knowledgeable, sincere individuals, but I know that other approaches and other formulae have been suggested, and it might well be that some of these other possibilities might be desirable to make this measure effective in areas confronted by special problems.

These things can be worked out.

The important consideration is that we start to work on the overall problem as soon as possible, and toward this end I shall ask that action on my bill be expedited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1631) to amend and supplement the Federal reclamation laws relating to the furnishing of water service to excess lands, introduced by Mr. Murphy, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and

referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXHIBIT A

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON THE ACREAGE LIMITATION PROBLEM

(By Earl Coke, State of California director of department of agriculture; and William R. Gianelli, State of California director of department of water resources.)

JANUARY 4, 1968.

Re Acreage Limitation Task Force.
Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
Governor of California,
State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR REAGAN: This Task Force was appointed by you in April, 1967 to formulate and submit to you recommendations for possible modification of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal Reclamation Law. The members of the Task Force are Richard D. Andrews of Fresno, Burnham Enersen of San Francisco, William H. Jennings of San Diego, James F. Sorensen of Visalia, and Breckinridge Thomas of Fresno.

After careful study and consideration of the matter, in the course of which we have enjoyed the excellent cooperation and assistance of Director William R. Gianelli and Chief Counsel P. A. Towner of the Department of Water Resources, Director Earl Coke and Economic Advisor Elmer W. Braun of the Department of Agriculture, and Professor of Agricultural Economics J. Herbert Snyder of the University of California at Davis, together with several of their colleagues, we have concluded our assignment and submit this report, which is unanimous.

THE BASIC LAW

The basic Reclamation Law was adopted by the Congress upon recommendation of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902 for the primary purpose of encouraging and facilitating the settlement and development of the vast areas of public lands in the semi-arid regions of the Western States (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, 43 U.S. Code 391). The act provided for the development of irrigation water supplies and for the sale of such water to the settlers on the land.

Taking a precedent from the homestead laws, the act provided that no person could make an entry upon public land within any reclamation project in excess of the limit, to be established by the Secretary, representing "* * * the acreage which, in the opinion of the Secretary, may be reasonably required for the support of a family" (§ 4). The Secretary was also required to establish the amount of the charges to be paid by the entrymen and private landowners in not exceeding ten annual installments so as to return to the reclamation fund the estimated cost of the construction of the project (§ 4). (The ten years have since been increased to forty years [43 U.S. Code 485b], plus a ten-year development period [43 U.S. Code 485f].) There was no provision for the payment of interest, and none is charged, upon the deferred installments. Section 5 of the act provided, among other things, that privately held land within a project area could not receive a right to use water for more than 160 acres in any one ownership.

Thus, the essence of the provisions of the 1902 Act with regard to private land was that the private landowner could obtain water for no more than 160 acres from the project, and in return he was obligated to pay his share of the construction costs in interest-free annual installments over a period of years. It has frequently been said that the interest-free financing of construction costs represented a governmental subsidy in favor of the private landowner. The 160-acre limitation provision confined the enjoyment of this subsidy to tracts of not more than 160 acres in a single ownership. The acreage limitation as applied to private lands was the *quid pro quo* for the financial assistance afforded by the freedom from an interest burden on the deferred installments of the repayment obligation.

Another provision, added several years later but itself now ancient, is that, regardless of whether it has ever received Federal project water in the past, land in excess of 160 acres per owner within a Reclamation project loses any right to receive project water when sold, before one-half of the construction charges against such land are fully paid, if the sale price of the land is not specifically approved by the Secretary of the Interior to ensure that it does not reflect any increase in value attributable to the construction of the project (Omnibus Adjustment Act, May 25, 1926, 44 Stat. 636, Sec. 46; 43 U.S. Code 423e). Thus, any buyer of "excess land," no matter how small an operator he himself may be, may lose the right to Federal project water if he pays a price which might include increments of value attributable to the availability of Federal project water. This is the so-called "anti-speculation" provision. It might also be called the "anti-sale" provision, for obviously it imposes a severe restraint upon the sale of such lands. No landowner wants to sell his land for less than he knows it is worth, and no buyer wants to pay full value if after he buys the land he cannot obtain the water necessary for its use. In consequence, sales are impeded. Furthermore, the provision is unfair because the owner of the excess land has usually paid assessments levied upon the land to pay for the Federal water supply, yet he is forbidden from recouping such costs as part of his sale price.

INTEREST-FREE FINANCING AS A FINANCIAL SUBSIDY

The privilege of paying construction costs of a project on a long-term installment basis without paying interest on the deferred installment basis without paying interest on the deferred installments does represent a substantial financial subsidy. The government borrows the money to build the project, and pays interest on the resulting debt, but the land-owner pays no interest on the deferred installments as he (through his local irrigation district) repays the government for his share of the cost of the project. If one assumes that the government's borrowing rate is 4% per year and that the installments extend over a forty-year period, then the landowner's obligation to reimburse the government for the irrigation portion of the construction cost in annual, interest-free installments over the forty-year period has a present value to the government of about 50% of the total obligation. In other words, the landowner's obligation to pay a certain sum of money in forty equal annual installments *without* interest has a present economic worth of about one-half of that of an obligation to pay the same annual installments over the same period *with* interest on the deferred installments compounded at 4% per year.

Landowners in a reclamation project who take advantage of these interest-free installment contracts do not reimburse the government for its interest expense, and to that extent the landowners are not repaying the government the full cost of the project. Thus, the landowners receive a substantial and direct financial subsidy. They are getting the water supply at less than the government's actual cost. As has been noted, this financial subsidy is generally regarded as the consideration received by the landowners in return for their submission to the acreage limitation provisions of the reclamation law.

Some defenders of the acreage limitation provisions contend that there are other "subsidies" to landowners in Federal Reclamation Projects, such as the use of Federal credit and the use of revenue from electrical power sales. These are not true subsidies, however, and such contentions are rejected as not supported by the facts. Interest-free financing is the only true subsidy which is recognizable as a purported justification for the acreage limitation provisions of Reclamation Law.

There is nothing unique about governmental subsidies in favor of private industries in this country. Such subsidies exist in great numbers and have enormous impact upon the economy of the United States. They are provided because a significant public benefit is believed to flow from such subsidization.

Probably the greatest and best-known of all government subsidies is the Post Office Department, the huge annual operating deficit of which is paid from the general funds of the United States. The federal taxpayers provide this subsidy for the benefit of all who use the mails—without limitation on the amount of their use. Another illustration is the public highway system, portions of which are subsidized to some extent by use of general tax revenues. Harbors, inland waterways, airways and navigational aids are all supplied to the operating industries without cost, because government policy dictates that these facilities should be supplied at government expense for the benefit of all who can use them. The Agriculture Department administers enormous subsidies for farmers to support the agricultural economy and provide the nation with needed supplies of food and fiber. Countless other subsidies exist, and, like the interest-free financing of reclamation projects costs, they redound directly to the benefit of private interest in the economic system.

But none of these other subsidies so far as we know is restricted in its application by imposing an artificial maximum limit upon the size of the business or enterprise which may qualify to receive the full subsidy, or upon the amount of the subsidized service which any one person may use or receive. In this respect, the interest-free financing of reclamation projects is absolutely unique. The benefits of this one subsidy are limited to an artificially established maximum area of irrigable lands in single ownerships.

In contrast, the postal subsidy is available without limit to, and is fully enjoyed by, the largest mail order house, the magazine with the largest circulation, and the corporation with the greatest volume of mail just as it is to a single individual or a small business operation. There is no limit on the size of a business which may enjoy the Post Office subsidy, or on the extent to which any one business enterprise may use the mails at uniform, subsidized rates. No one is told he may mail only 160 letters or magazines per day or per week because the service is subsidized, nor is he charged more for higher volume usage. Neither is any limitation placed upon the number of vehicles or the daily mileage of any user of the highways. No limitation is imposed upon the number of barges which a single barge company may operate on our subsidized inland waterways. There is no limitation upon the amount of acreage in single ownership which may receive the agricultural subsidies. (The "crop allotments" are based upon each landowner's history of crop production, without any maximum limit upon the area which may qualify.)

It is only in the case of the subsidy to farmers who want to buy an irrigation water supply from a federal reclamation project that the subsidy is limited. There is neither logic nor justice in any such discrimination. In view of the huge subsidies available to the largest as well as the smallest enterprise in all other fields of endeavor throughout the country, this discrimination against farmers who receive a subsidy under the reclamation laws is not only unprecedented but unjust.

The imposition of the acreage limitation upon the farmers in reclamation projects is contrary to the very spirit and purpose of the free enterprise system. Every businessman seeks to expand his operation to the fullest possible extent so as to increase his profits and enlarge his economic values. A farmer in a reclamation project, however, is restrained by the workings of this artificial federal law from expanding his land ownership beyond the rigid limit imposed by Congress 65 years ago. What possible logic, justice or public benefit is there in holding a farmer down to a size of operation which will supply only a bare existence for himself and his family? Why should a farmer who makes a success of his business and who wants to expand his holdings be effectively forbidden from doing so by an antiquated federal law which prevents him from buying water for additional land?

Furthermore, the acreage limitation provisions are contrary to the public interest. They are economically stifling. They are contra-incentives. They impede growth. They perpetuate "subsistence farming" and inhibit efficient and progressive farm production. They increase the cost and decrease the quantity of agricultural output in reclamation projects. They aggravate agriculture's financial problems and tend to frustrate other governmental programs designed to strengthen the farm economy. They hamper this nation's efforts to meet the future food and fiber needs of a burgeoning world population.

THE ENGLE FORMULA

A logical alternative to the present absolute limitation would be to allow excess landowners to be relieved of the limitation by giving up the benefits of the subsidy represented by interest-free financing. Since the acreage limitation is a limitation upon the enjoyment of the governmental subsidy, there is no basis for applying the limitation to those who do not receive the subsidy.

Congress has already adopted the alternative of "no interest-free financing, no acreage limitation" in a reclamation law of general application and in at least three specific reclamation project authorization acts.

The general law embodying this principle is the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 introduced and sponsored by the Honorable Clair Engle, then a member of the House of Representatives and later a United States Senator from California (Act of August 6, 1956, 70 Stat. 1044; 43 U.S. Code 422a–422k). This statute provides for the financing of small reclamation projects under the general reclamation laws but, instead of requiring all lands in excess of 160 acres in a single ownership to be sold (or subjected to "recordable contracts" requiring ultimate sale) in order to receive project water, this statute specifies that interest shall be paid to the United States, at the then current government bond interest rates, upon that portion of the repayment obligation which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits to lands within the project in private ownerships of more than 160 acres per person (43 U.S. Code 422e(c)).

This provision for the payment of interest in lieu of the acreage limitation has become known as the "Engle Formula." It is a very simple provision whereby the benefit of the subsidy represented by interest-free financing is limited to 160 acres per owner, and is denied to acreage in excess of 160 acres per owner. In addition to paying his share of the construction costs, each owner of more than 160 acres is required to reimburse the government in full for the interest cost attributable to water service for his excess acreage. In return he is allowed to keep his excess lands and purchase project water for the irrigation thereof.

This same "Engle Formula" has been incorporated in at least three specific acts authorizing reclamation projects:

1. The Washoe Project in Nevada and California authorized August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 775).

2. Mercedes Division, Lower Rio Grande Rehabilitation Project, Texas, authorized April 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 82).

3. La Feria Division, Lower Rio Grande Rehabilitation Project, Texas, authorized September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 641).

Thus, in a general law and in at least three special acts the Congress has recognized and applied the principle that the acreage limitation is the *quid pro quo* for the financial subsidy represented by interest-free installment financing, and has adopted the Engle Formula whereby excess landowners who forego the financial subsidy by paying interest upon their share of the deferred repayment obligations are not subject to the acreage limitation provisions.

The Engle Formula can be viewed as a corollary to the "pay-out principle," under which the 160-acre limitation, although initially applicable, ends when the construction charges payable under a contract with the United States are fully satisfied. This "pay-out principle" was recognized and applied by the Bureau of Reclamation for more than 50 years. (See "Excess Land Provisions of the Federal Reclamation Laws and the Payment of Charges," Department of the Interior, May, 1956.) It has been rejected by the Bureau only in recent years, and is the subject of present litigation between California water user organizations and the United States in *United States* v. *Tulare Lake Canal Company and Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District*, No. 2483, Federal District Court for the Eastern District of California.

These Congressional and administrative precedents, as well as the very clear dictates of logic, compel the conclusion that the reclamation law should be amended so as to permit those excess landowners who wish to do so to relieve themselves of the burden of the acreage limitation by paying interest upon the portion of the deferred installments which is attributable to their excess lands.

There are some Reclamation contracts, called "9(e) Contracts," which do not have fixed capital sums to be paid but instead are "utility-type" contracts calling for payment of water service charges on a per-acre-foot basis. Since they contain no principal sum upon which interest can be computed, they are not directly responsive to the Engle Formula. By a simple analogy, however, the principle of the Engle Formula can be applied to such contracts: As shown above, the value of the interest-free financing on a forty-year term is roughly equal to about 50% of the total obligation; in other words, those who pay interest pay approximately twice the total amount paid by those who do not pay interest. Under "utility-type" contracts, therefore, the results of the Engle Formula can be accomplished by doubling the water charges for lands in excess of the established limit per owner for those who wish to forgo the subsidy and thereby avoid application of the acreage limitation provisions. Thus, for Class I water service under some current Central Valley Project Section 9(e) contracts, the charge for excess lands freed from acreage limitations would be $7.00 per acre-foot instead of $3.50, and for Class II service it would be $3.00 instead of $1.50.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

Although the early projects under the Reclamation Act embraced predominantly public lands, the later projects have included more and more private lands. In recent years relatively little public land has been included in reclamation projects. Most of the problems growing out of the acreage limitation provisions in California and elsewhere have arisen by reason of the fact that large areas of private lands, already fully developed for irrigated agriculture and requiring only a supplemental water supply, have been affected by federal reclamation projects in recent years.

Because of its latter-day impact upon private land holdings, some supporters of acreage limitation have sought to justify it as a "land reform" measure. Certainly that was not any part of the purpose of the original limitation provision of the 1902 Act, for that statute was aimed primarily at developing and settling the public lands. If "land reform" has been a purpose of any of the subsequent additions to the body of acreage limitation law, that purpose has not been expressed by the Congress. "Land reform" as such was never a Congressional purpose or objective in enacting the acreage limitation provisions of Reclamation Law. It is only an afterthought on the part of those who seek some justification for perpetuating these anachronistic provisions.

If and to the extent that "land reform" may be a proper subject of national policy (a question as to which we express no opinion), it should be faced squarely and dealt with forthrightly by the Congress in laws of general application on a nation-wide basis. It should not be treated by implication or inference in laws dealing primarily with other matters. And certainly a subject of such national importance must not be read into laws about water supplies in a fragmentary part of only about one-third of our 50 States.

We reject, therefore, any suggestion that the acreage limitation provisions are a part of a national "land reform" policy and that they should be retained as such.

The imposition of the artificial acreage limitation upon fully developed, privately owned, already irrigated farm lands has created a welter of problems, both economic and political. These problems have been greatly intensified by the dramatic change in the nature of the farming industry during the 65 years since the reclamation law was first enacted. During this period, the horse has virtually disappeared as a source of power for the operation of agricultural implements, and in place of the horse, vast numbers of costly and complicated machines have been developed and are now a necessity for the planting, cultivation and harvesting of agricultural products. These machines require large capital investments which cannot be justified unless the operating units contain a sufficient acreage to employ the machines efficiently.

As a result of these and other factors, the *average* size of farms in the United States today is about two and one-half times what it was when the 1902 Act was passed, and the *optimum* size is greater than the average. We believe the full subsidy should be at least available to such minimum size of farm as is large enough for operation at maximum efficiency. What is that size?

At our request, the California Department of Agriculture has caused a paper to be prepared on the economic impact of the 160-acre limitation upon modern agriculture. It is entitled "Economic Brief on 160-Acre Limitation for Irrigation Water—Modification Needed." A copy is attached hereto. It was prepared by Mr. Elmer W. Braun, Economic Advisor of the California Department of Agriculture, and Professor J. Herbert Snyder, Professor of Agricultural Economics in the University of California at Davis, with the collaboration of several of their colleagues. The paper is an excellent summary of the economic factors involved in this problem with well-documented references to several specific areas in California and in other states, as well as in Mexico. The paper concludes, among other things, that the fixed 160-acre limitation "is grossly outdated" and that the public interest of the United States "would be better served" if the limitation were eliminated. If elimination proves not to be feasible, the paper concludes that the provisions of the law should be updated and adjusted to present-day economics with a practicable degree of flexibility to fit future conomic changs.

The Economic Brief points out that by reason of the need for capital investment in costly machinery and by reason of the in-

XUM

creased costs of farm labor, the minimum size of efficient operating units has greatly increased throughout the agricultural economy. Using many specific illustrations, the brief shows that the cost per acre of operating a farm unit of 160 acres is much higher than for larger units, with the result that the 160-acre unit cannot compete with the larger units having lower operating costs per acre.

In Yolo County, for example, a farm of 600 to 700 acres is required for maximum efficiency according to a 1960 study by the University of California. In Kern County, according to a 1963 study by the University, the operation of at least 640 acres as a farm unit is required to obtain the maximum net revenue per acre. On the east side of the San Joaquin Valley, a 1963 University study shows that 640 acres was the minimum unit which could be operated efficiently, and that additional economies could be realized by operating not less than 1280 acres as a unit. For orchard crops, such as peaches, a 1963 University of California study indicated that a 300-acre unit at medium yields and medium prices would barely "break even," and, obviously, a substantially larger unit would be required in order to realize an operating profit.

The pattern is similar in other states. A 1965 study published by Texas A & M University showed that in the Texas high plains the maximum efficiency for a one-man operation required at least 440 acres. In the wheat-pea area in Eastern Washington and North Central Idaho, a 1967 study published by Washington State University indicated that the optimum was 1600 acres per unit. A 1966 study published by Iowa State University showed that in the highly fertile area of the State of Iowa, the cost per acre for a 160-acre farm was about 62% *higher* than the cost per acre of a similar operation for a farm of 560 acres, thus showing that the operator of the smaller tracts could not possibly compete in the same markets with the operators of the larger tracts. A 1966 study of Purdue University showed a similar pattern in West Central Indiana where the maximum efficiency and lower operating cost could not be obtained on less than the 640-acre units.

The need for expansion of the size of farm units in order to achieve efficiency and maintain a competitive position in the agricultural economy is emphatically stated in the recent (July, 1967) "Report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber" at page 240:

"These changes (in capital requirements and farming technology) not only make it *possible* for the individual farmer to increase his volume of operations—they make it *necessary* for him to do so. *He must expand his investment and then spread costs over more units of product to remain competitive.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Thus, it is all too obvious that the 160-acre limitation is not only unrealistic, uneconomic and obsolete but also grossly unfair to the farmer who must comply with it. The limit forces the farmer to operate a very inefficient farm with disproportionately high costs per acre. He is compelled to sell his crops in a market where he competes, or tries to compete, with producers having much lower costs per acre resulting from the economies of their large-scale operations. In truth, the 160-acre farmer is in many cases prevented by the limitation from making any profit at all, because his costs exceed his gross revenue. Many farm families are forced to seek supplemental, non-farm employment. Since the reclamation subsidy is supposed to benefit the farmer, and enable him to make enough profit to support a family, it defeats its own purpose by freezing the farmer into a rigidly limited unit from which he cannot hope to realize a profit. The "family-size farm" of 160 acres is a snare and a delusion.

It is appropriate to point out here the curious anachronism of this repressive and regressive 160-acre limitation remaining in the Reclamation Laws at a time when we are faced with a worldwide population explosion and dire predictions of worldwide famine. Instead of fostering more efficient farm sizes and greater production, the Reclamation Laws seek to preserve inefficient farm units, and even to break up large and efficient farms. Slavish adherence to the symbolic 160-acre farm limit adopted in vastly different circumstances 65 years ago is so out of keeping with the government's general awareness of changing times and changing public needs that we believe the Congress should, and will, respond to a demand for a "new look" at the acreage limitation provisions. It is to be hoped that the Congress may be convinced, as we are, that these 65-year-old rules are not only obsolete and outmoded but actually unwise and unsound in the present-day agricultural economy.

The Economic Brief also quotes the following statistics taken from the publications of the Bureau of Census as to the average size of all farms throughout the United States:

1910	138. 5
1964	351. 5

This nationwide average of the size of operating farms is one possible measure of the effect of changing economic conditions upon the agricultural industry. All combinations of economic factors are automatically brought to bear upon the determination of average farm sizes. The fact that the average size throughout the country has increased from 138.5 acres in 1910 to over two and one-half times that area, or 351.5 acres, in 1964 shows very clearly that during the period since the enactment of the 160-acre limitation in 1902, the economics of the agricultural industry have caused farmers to acquire larger and larger holdings and consolidate smaller holdings. This plainly shows the impact of these changing economic conditions upon farming methods and practices.

This dramatic increase in the average size of farms on a nationwide scale clearly demonstrates the long overdue need for an adjustment of the 160-acre limit. If 160 acres was a reasonable limit for the "support of a family" in 1902, when the countrywide average was somewhat less than that figure, then the present limit ought to be increased to a size which is at least proportionate to the recorded increase in the average farm size throughout the country since 1902. The average size has increased to over 250 percent of its 1902 level. If a porportionate increase should be applied to the 160-acre maximum size for a subsidized reclamation project farm, then the 160-acre limit would be increased to at least two and one-half times that area, **i.e., to 400 acres.**

The data contained in the attached Economic Brief demonstrate, however, that even 400 acres is not an adequate size to obtain efficient and competitive farm operations. In most areas at least 640 acres is needed, and more is required in some localities. We believe the public interest requires that the limit (if there is to be one) upon the number of acres in one ownership which can receive the interest-free financing should be related to efficiency and economy of farm operations and not to some symbolic and arbitrary number of acres. This principle leads to the conclusion that the maximum subsidized area should be at least 640 acres per owner, and that there should be provision for administrative increase in the maximum whenever future changes in economics or technology indicate that an increase is appropriate.

It is our opinion, therefore, that if the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law are to be retained at all, then they should be amended so as to change the 160-acre figure to a number of acres which is consistent with modern requirements for efficient farm operations. Provision should also be made for reappraisal of that figure at least every ten years and for its upward adjustment to keep in step with future changes in agricultural technology and economics.

A change from 160 to 640 acres per owner would go far in correcting the inequities which the rigid 160-acre limitation has created as farm sizes have increased and capital requirements and labor costs have risen to the point where smaller farm units are being forced out of business and larger units are required in order to conduct profitable farming operations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the considered and unanimous conviction of all of the members of your Task Force that the acreage limitation provisions of Federal Reclamation Law are antiquated and obsolete and very much in need of modernization. A majority of the members also believe these provisions are wrong in principle, and should be repealed.

Upon the assumption, however, that outright repeal of these provisions is not likely to be accomplished at an early date, we unanimously recommend the following modifications which we think will go far toward solving the most serious problems without actually repealing the provisions in their entirety:

1. An immediate increase in the number of acres in one ownership eligible for interest-free financing to at least 640 acres, with provision for a further increase in the limitation every ten years if economic or technological changes indicate that an increase is appropriate and consistent with the public interest.

2. Immediate adoption of the Engle Formula providing that the acreage limitation shall not apply in any existing or future project to those lands in single ownership which are in excess of the limitation but on behalf of which interest on the allocated share of all deferred installments of construction costs is paid in full.

RICHARD D. ANDREWS.
WILLIAM H. JENNINGS.
JAMES F. SORENSEN.
BRECKINRIDGE THOMAS.
BURNHAM ENERSEN,
Chairman.

ECONOMIC BRIEF ON 160-ACRE LIMITATION FOR IRRIGATION WATER: MODIFICATION NEEDED

(Prepared by Elmer W. Braun, economic adviser, California Department of Agriculture, and J. Herbert Snyder, professor of agricultural economics, University of California, Davis, with the collaboration of professional colleagues named on concluding page)

ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Through its Reclamation Service, the United States Department of the Interior limits the sale or delivery of water, provided by means of its facilities for irrigation purposes, to farming operations not in excess of 160 acres under single ownership. Except in special cases, such limitations have applied since 1902, under federal legislation and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

In enacting the Reclamation Law of 1902, the Congress drew the 160-acre standard for it from an earlier law relating to homesteading. Homesteading had been authorized by the Homestead Act of 1862 to encourage family settlement of public lands then still available.

Congress adopted the Homestead Act primarily for land receiving cultural moisture from natural precipitation. The Reclamation Act was adopted to encourage family settlement of public lands in the arid West, through government financed irrigation projects. The provisions of the Reclamation Act were designed to provide financial inducements in the form of low-cost water rates to small units of land not in excess of 160 acres, and to prevent undue individual or speculative gains.

Congress no doubt intended to be consistent in the basic objectives of the Homestead Act and the Reclamation Act. The implementation and economic impact through time, however, is quite different for the two acts. The impact of the 160-acre limitation under the Homestead Act was ended when ownership procedures under it were completed, and ownership in fee simple granted. From that time forward the owner was free to buy or sell land in the open market as he wished. Farm sizes, therefore, even in heavily homesteaded areas, are the result of normal economic forces.

The impact of the 160-acre limitation under the Reclamation Act is regulatory rigidity. It is not dynamic. It is not consistent with changed economic conditions through time. For land otherwise arid a limitation established by Congress, and expressed in area terms for the availability and application of water, is a fixed standard to be changed only by Congress, or by administrative or judicial interpretation. None of these have occurred in a manner sufficiently practical to be acceptable. The result is that farmers are coping with a regulation that is long outdated. The regulation is inconsistent and impractical in the economic environment in which it regulates.

In an economy based upon profit and loss and freedom of enterprise, changes in unit size to meet changes in economic conditions must be permissible. Only if farm operators, seeking to maximize net income returns, have freedom to make such shifts, can they adjust to changes in economic conditions. If such changes are restricted arbitrarily by law or by regulation, inefficiencies and economic losses result. Some inefficiencies and losses may be clearly apparent; others may be hidden. Farmers who are restricted as to acreage are prevented from adopting optimum technology in machinery and equipment. Modern equipment and management capabilities could be more efficiently combined with larger land units. To be prevented from doing so means that land, labor, management and captial are not being used in the most efficient combination. In an economic sense resources are being wasted, and the general welfare is impaired.

Modern living standards call for a higher net income than in the past. An adequate net income is conditioned upon a favorable relationship between the gross income from products sold and the production costs of such products. That this relationship should be a favorable one is a commonly accepted concept. It cannot be achieved if gross returns are artificially limited because of the size of the producing unit. Nor can the relationship be favorable if unit costs are high. Unit costs tend to be high on the small producing units because of the uneconomic combination of producing inputs, as compared to the more efficient combination of producing inputs on a larger producing unit.

The 160-acre limitation therefore discriminates against those farmers subject to it. The gross income of producers limited by the regulation is low, as compared with the gross income of producers not so limited. The unit costs are higher for the producers so regulated than the unit costs for producers not subject to the regulation. Net income is impaired by a relatively low gross and a relatively high cost.

The impact of the regulation in a broad sense is a lesser gross income, a higher cost of production, a lesser total production of food and fiber products, and higher consumer prices than would otherwise be the case.

Economic principles centering around economies of scale apply not only in the field of agricultural production; they relate to many other kinds of economic activity. It is general knowledge that operating structures used in manufacturing have undergone a wide range of changes as to size since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. The same is true of transportation, warehousing and distribution. Could one even imagine what our transportation system would be like, if trucks were limited to a single size utilized in 1910 or 1920? Could the regulation of the size of trucks in one segment of the trucking industry be rationalized or justified? To do so would be unthinkable.

The 160-acre limitation upon producers served by federal irrigation projects must be modified or eliminated, if land use is to be maintained in accordance with changes in economic conditions. Restrictions on producers now subject to limitation need to be relaxed, so that they may compete effectively with producers not so limited.

It is often contended that making public financed water available to farm units larger than 160 acres would be an undue "public subsidy" in the form of "unearned increment". This point, used in support of existing limitations, tends to be overstated. In making the contention the full difference between raw land value and developed land value is attributed to the availability of water. In actual practice the water input is only one of the inputs. There are other inputs such as leveling, ditching, piping, buildings, and often long-term plantings, such as alfalfa or tree crops. Also, taxes and interest payments may have been made for extended periods before water became available.

The inputs of capital, management and labor are just as important in the total development as is the availability of water. The availability of water would have little value in the absence of other inputs. Water is an essential input item, but by no means the only one that contributes to value. To be realistic, value and returns should be attributed to such inputs, as well as to water. With such proper allocation the value increment from water as a public subsidy would be much less than is often asserted in an overstated sense. Furthermore, the government water facilities are more in the nature of a community development investment than a subsidy to individuals.

By economic considerations the 160-acre limitation should be set aside. If elimination of the limitation is not feasible for political reasons, then the fixed standard should be updated and provision made for sufficient flexibility to meet changing economic conditions through time.

Findings are here presented focusing attention on the economics of income and production costs in relation to farm size. The findings are presented in support of the need for a substantial change in or elimination of the 160-acre limitation. Considerations presented proceed from those relating to California to the broader regional, national, and international considerations.

CALIFORNIA

Farm management considerations are especially important to agricultural producers in California. California producers operate in a high-cost environment with respect to land values, farm worker wage rates, custom built equipment, production supplies and taxes. Furthermore, California producers must compete not only in local markets, but in distant domestic and foreign markets. High transportation expenses, therefore, also become a part of the high-cost environment. Under conditions of high costs and relatively low market prices, efficiency in producing operations is of paramount importance.

The Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of California has made a number of studies relating to the economics of farm size. References to these studies are made with respect to points pertinent to the 160-acre limitation.

1. Imperial Valley

A report entitled "Cost-Size Relationships for Cash-Crop Farms in Imperial Valley, California" is a comprehensive study of cost-size relationships in the production of vegetable and field crops on farms located in the Imperial Valley.

A pertinent finding of the study is: "Substantial cost advantages are realized by field crop operations up to about 1,500–2,000 acres, but thereafter cost economies are very slight." For various cultural reasons vegetable crop farms also grow field crops. The typical practice in the Imperial Valley, therefore, is a multiple cropping pattern. Under these conditions an operating unit limited to 160 acres, or even to 320 acres, would be an uneconomic unit. Application of such limitations in the Imperial Valley would grossly modify the cropping patterns, or eliminate entirely the cropping patterns natural for the area.

Multiple cropping patterns are necessary to control plant pests and diseases, to achieve soil conditioning, and for other farm management reasons. To attain appropriate operating efficiencies a multiple cropping pattern requires a farm operating unit large enough to properly accommodate the several crops in the producing pattern.

The study here referred to is based upon conditions of 1959. There have been further advances in technology since that time. Economies of size would therefore call for a larger operating unit now than in 1959.

Reference: "Cost-Size Relationships for Cash-Crop Farms in Imperial Valley, California", by Harold O. Carter and Gerald W. Dean, University of California, Division of Agricultural Sciences, Giannini Foundation Research Report No. 253, May, 1962.

2. Yolo County

As already indicated, this study was made in Yolo County during 1960. It is entitled "Cost-Size Relationships for Cash-Crop Farms in Yolo County, California".

Yolo County is in the southern area of the Sacramento Valley.

Among the pertinent conclusions of this study is the following: "Machinery costs per acre decline sharply up to about 600–700 acres, but only gradually (about $1.00 per acre for each additional 100 acres operated) thereafter".

As already indicated, this study was made in 1960. A current study would indicate a larger acreage for efficient operations, rather than smaller.

The limitation of 160 acres would not be practical for agricultural operations in the area, by a wide margin.

Reference: "Cost-Size Relationships for Cash-Crop Farms in Yolo County, California", by Gerald W. Dean and Harold O. Carter, University of California, Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Mimeographed Report No. 238, December, 1960.

3. Kern County

A third study bearing specifically on the matter of acreage limitations is entitled "Economies Associated with Size, Kern County Cash-Crop Farms." Results from the Kern County study are consistent with the earlier study made in Yolo County.

A significant conclusion from this study is: "The effect of the variable product mix, combined with technical economies, is that the largest *net revenue per acre* is obtained by a 640-acre farm unit. Net revenue increases as farm size increases up to 640 acres, as the effect of the reduction in cost from technical economies is greater than the reduction in total revenue resulting from the variable product mix. For farms larger than 640 acres the effect of the product mix is greater than the effect of technical economies on net revenue".

The study carries a further significant statement: "The analysis indicates that, under the present state of technology available and used by farm operators in Kern County, the technical economies are nearly exhausted by a farm unit of 1,000 acres. However, in the future it is quite conceivable that substantial technical economies will exist for farms larger than 1,000 acres".

XUM

A limitation of 160 acres is not practical or realistic for farm operating units in the Kern County area.

Reference: "Economies Associated with Edwin Faris and David L. Armstrong, University of California. Giannini Foundation Research Report No. 269, December, 1963.

4. San Joaquin Valley, east side

Another study dealing with ". . . . . On-Farm Irrigation Water Availability and Cost . . . . ." applies to farmers located in what is generally known as the San Joaquin Valley Eastside.

Data were compiled on the characteristics of farms in the area ranging from 80 to 1,280 acres. The characteristics were then reflected in five farm models for economic analysis.

The general conclusions of this study are ". . . farmers can improve efficiency, reduce average total cost per unit and increase profits . . ." by operating production units of sufficiently large size. Specifically, unit costs consistently declined under the long-run cost curve, as size increased from 80 to 1,280 acres. Farm profits per unit of production also increased with farm size due to increasing volume per farm, as well as a widening spread between prices and costs of production. The rate of decrease in unit cost and the rate of increase of profit were most significant as farm size increased to 640 acres, but continued benefits were possible through the 1,280 acres size of operation.

Another conclusion of this study supports the importance of the economies of size as they relate to the ability of the farm to pay for irrigation water. The larger size farms could break even, even though the price per acre foot of water was nearly twice what the smaller operations needed in order to break even. The ability of the larger farms to pay higher prices for irrigation water relates to their lower fixed costs per unit.

This study of the Eastside Area of the San Joaquin Valley identifies and confirms for the San Joaquin Valley the same basic relationships between farm size increases in acres and reducing costs per unit as are found in the Sacramento and Imperial Valleys. An additional study of other sub-areas in the San Joaquin Valley demonstrates that farm organization and resource uses are similar. It may be assumed that the same size-cost relationships also hold.

Reference: "Economics of On-Farm Irrigation Water Availability and Costs, and Related Farm Adjustments," by Trimble R. Hedges and Charles V. Moore, University of California, Division of Agricultural Sciences, Giannini Foundation Research Report No. 263, June, 1963.

Related and supporting studies on the relationship of costs, returns and farm size by the same writers are Giannini Foundation Research Report No. 257, September, 1962, and Report No. 286, December, 1965.

5. Orchard crops

If there is any type of intensive crop production that might be profitably carried out on 160-acre units, it would conceivably or theoretically be fruit crops. From the standpoint of economics and marketing, fruit production patterns of land utilization should not be imposed by an arbitrary regulation such as the 160-acre limitation. Production patterns and land utilization should come about by normal competitive economic forces. The arbitrary approach results in an improper combination of economic resources, leading to economic waste.

In the light of modern technology, and incomes, even intensive orchard production needs producing units larger than 160 acres. At medium yields and medium prices, peach producers would break even or exchange dollars with a 300-acre operating unit. It would require better than medium prices to be assured of a management or profit income on 300 acres, with medium yields per acre.

Farm Management Specialists of the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of California are of the view that 160 acres is too small a unit for other orchard crops, as well as for peaches. Present day income needs require a larger acreage.

The conclusion, therefore, is that even for orchard farming a limitation of 160 acres is too restrictive.

Reference: "Economies of Scale in California Cling Peach Production," by G. W. Dean and H. O. Carter, California Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 793, University of California, February, 1963.

FARM SIZE AND INCOME IN OTHER STATES

Studies made in other states relating to the size of farms and farm income reveal results similar to the findings made in California.

Texas

Texas A & M University, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, made a detailed study of the relationship of the size of irrigated cotton farms to farm costs and income in the Texas High Plains area, located in Western Texas.

The primary objective of the study was to examine the efficiency and profitability of various sizes of cotton farms in the Texas High Plains. A secondary objective included determination of the economies achievable within the limits of a family farm business.

It was found that a one-man farm could operate efficiently; however, to attain highest efficiency it was necessary for the one man to operate 440 acres with effective equipment. With respect to other farm sizes the findings were: "Recent trends indicate that the cotton farms in the Texas High Plains are extending their acreage beyond the least-cost point at 440 acres of farmland. In moving to larger sizes, farms do not achieve lower average costs or greater efficiency. But they do achieve greater profit."

A limitation of 160 acres would be too restrictive for irrigated cotton farms in Western Texas.

Reference: "Economies of Size on Irrigated Cotton Farms of the Texas High Plains", by J. P. Madden and R. Davis, Texas A & M University Bulletin 1037, June, 1965.

Washington-Idaho (wheat-pea area)

An area in eastern Washington known as the Palouse Area, and extending into north-central Idaho, is especially adapted to the production of wheat and peas, primarily wheat and dry peas. Other crops also commonly grown in the area are barley and alfalfa.

Washington State University, in collaboration with the United States Department of Agriculture, made a detailed study concerning the relationships of costs, incomes and farm sizes for this area. The study drew data from farms participating in federal price support programs, and from farms not participating in such programs. A number of farm size classifications were included in each group.

Findings of the study especially pertinent to this brief are:

1. The optimum size of wheat-pea farms was found to be 1,600 acres. The 1,600 acre size was found to be optimum for farms not participating in the federal price support programs, as well as for farms participating therein.

2. In the area under study, a representative farm had increased in size from 444 acres in 1945 to 605 acres in 1964.

3. Significant ratios for different farm sizes are:

Size (acres)	Participating		Nonparticipating	
	Profit per acre	Cost per gross dollar	Profit per acre	Cost per gross dollar
600	$2.35	$0.964		
800	6.68	.899	$2.83	$0.956
1,200	10.08	.847	6.28	.904
1,600	12.39	.812	9.36	.859
1,900	11.25	.831	7.18	.892

It is to be noted that the profit per acre for farms participating in federal commodity programs is higher than for farms not participating. The lowest cost per dollar of gross and the highest profit per acre occurs at the 1,600-acre size for both participating and non-participating farms. It is clear that 600-acre farms and smaller farms have difficulty competing with 1,600-acre farms in either case.

While the study does not specifically show it, it is obvious that a farm size of 160 acres would not be an economically feasible unit in the wheat-pea area of Washington-Idaho.

Reference: "Economics of Farm Size in the Washington-Idaho Wheat-Pea Area", by E. L. Michalson, Washington State University, Technical Bulletin 52, May, 1967.

Iowa

Some of the most fertile agricultural areas of the United States are located in the State of Iowa. Even in Iowa farms as small as 160 acres cannot compete successfully with larger farms. A study issued in Iowa by the Agricultural Extension Service of the Iowa State University reflects the following with respect to production costs in relation to size of farms:

Total cost per acre, including operator and family labor by size of farm:

Acres:	*Cost per acre*
160	$90.99
240	79.11
320	67.23
440	63.07
560	55.59

Costs per acre decrease sharply from a 160-acre size to a 320-acre size, and less sharply for larger sizes.

A 160-acre farm would have difficulty remaining competitive under current operating conditions.

Reference: "1965 Costs and Returns on Iowa Farms", FM1517, Iowa State University, Cooperative Extension Service, November, 1966.

Indiana

In a study of the factors affecting cost of production on farms in West Central Indiana, Purdue University economists noted the importance of farm size in reducing the cost of operation, and in providing profit to management. Significant findings are:

1. "With average-level management, the average cost per $100 crop production decreased from $109.22 on 80 acres to $82.77 on 240 acres. As size increased to 640 acres the average cost decreased slowly to $72.22."

2. "The differences in costs of production associated with increasing farm size are important, but even more important is the combination of lower costs and greater volume. For the average manager, as size increased from 160 to 320 to 640 acres, returns to management after all costs increased, respectively, from $1,379 to $5,655 to $15,579."

The importance of size in this study is significant, when one compares the above returns to the estimates of what would be an adequate income for a farm family in that region. Purdue economists believe that a $7,000 to $9,000 management income would be required. To attain a level of income in these amounts would require an operation in excess of 400 acres.

Reference: "Factors Affecting Cost of Crop Production in West Central Indiana", R. Hubele, J. E. Kadler, P. Robbins, and R. Kemper, Purdue University Research Bulletin No. 822, December, 1966.

AVERAGE SIZE OF FARMS—A SIMPLE AND PRACTICAL GAUGE

A further measure to gauge the need for a modification of the 160-acre limitation is the average size of farms in the United States, as reported by the Bureau of Census of the United States Department of Commerce.

Census data on farm size changes over the years reveal that farms of 160 acres varied much more widely from the average farm size in the United States in 1964 than in earlier years. In fact, they indicate that if average size is a reasonable indication of the size that farms should be in order to function as economic units, then the 160-acre size has fallen farther and farther behind over the years.

It is recognized that the average size of farms is not a precise measure for gauging a water limitation statute or regulation. It is a general guideline, and does reflect direction and scope of change.

The average number of acres per farm in the United States for relevant census periods are:

1910	138.5
1920	148.5
1959	302.8
1964	351.5

It is to be noted that in 1910 the average number of acres per farm amounted to less than 160. Under conditions then prevailing, 160 acres was a convenient and reasonably acceptable standard for purposes of furnishing irrigation water.

In 1964 the average number of acres per farm was 351.5. Application of the 1910 ratio in a physical sense to the 1964 average would result in 405 acres, as a comparable limitation in current times. This would include all patterns of farming. To be practical, it would need to be adjusted for different types of farming and for monetary considerations as well.

The average size of farm for California as of 1964 was 458 acres. Application of the United States ratio of 1910 to the California average of 1964 would reflect a limitation of 530 acres. Again, to be practical the 530 acres would need to be adapted to different patterns of production. In very broad terms different patterns of production would be orchards and vineyards, vegetable crops and field crops.

A ratio derived from a time period earlier than 1910 would indicate an even greater total as a current standard.

INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

A treatment of the population and competition aspects of the 160-acre water limitation would not be complete without calling attention to an important international consideration.

In Mexico the Government has been and is supporting the development of irrigation projects. Legal ownership limitations in terms of hectare units for receiving water are the equivalent of 247 acres, a substantially larger unit than the 160 acres established in the United States. The economic advantage of the larger unit becomes even greater when account is taken of the much lower farm worker wage rates in Mexico as compared to those in the United States.

Mexico exports a number of agricultural products to the United States that are directly competitive to products produced on irrigated land in the United States.

It has been pointed out above that the 160-acre limitation imposed for federal projects in the United States results in the inefficient use of economic resources. It also encourages the flow of capital, technical knowledge and management from the United States and elsewhere to Mexico, to further develop agricultural production there.

Augmentation of production in Mexico augments the shipment of products to the United States for distribution and consumption. Such products are competitive with products produced in the Western States. Under more favorable competitive conditions much of the production increase could be developed in the United States, rather than elsewhere.

A modernization of the 160-acre limitation would lay the foundation for more favorable competitive conditions.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act of 1902 carried foward a 160-acre standard adopted in 1862 for the Homestead Act. Due to economic changes, even as early as 1902 a size standard designed for the arid West should have been more than 160 acres, to adjust to the time span of 40 years.

2. In the light of farm management principles and economic studies of modern cultural practices, the fixed 160-acre limitation is grossly outdated. The standard needs to be updated and made sufficiently flexible to meet economic changes that occur from time to time.

3. To continue and maintain an arbitrary and restrictive standard continues to generate and carry forward inefficiencies in production and income. These come from the improper combination and use of the economic resources of land, labor, management, and capital investment. The fixed standard of a 160-acre limitation, therefore, results in a waste of economic resources by a distortion of competitive forces.

4. The public interest of the United States would be better served if the Congress would eliminate the 160-acre standard. Should Congressional lifting of the limitation in its entirety not be feasible, then the Congress should initiate and adopt an updated standard adjusted to the economics of present day agriculture and its markets. Provision should also be made for a practical degree of flexibility to fit economic changes through time.

Professional colleagues who assisted the writers in the preparation and review of this brief include: Professor T. R. Hedges, Professor H. O. Carter, Professor G. W. Dean, and Assistant Professor W. E. Johnston, Department of Agricultural economics, University of California, Davis; B. B. Burlingame and L. T. Wallace, Agricultural Economists and Farm Management Specialists, Agricultural Extension Service, University of California, Berkeley; and W. L. Portello, Assistant Agricultural Economist, California Department of Agriculture, Sacramento.

The writers are grateful for the assistance so generously given.

S. 1632—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) and the junior Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), I am introducing a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

This bill was introduced in the last Congress by my good friend and former Senator from the State of Alaska, Ernest Gruening. His bill was cosponsored by our late Senator, Bob Bartlett. It passed the Senate but failed to obtain approval of the House of Representatives.

The bill provides that property which has been declared excess to the needs of Federal agencies, will be made available to State and local agencies before such property could be obtained by the Agency for International Development.

Much of the equipment now acquired by AID is stored for long periods until a foreign government requests it. And in many other cases, valuable equipment is given to a foreign government that is unable to use it or unable to maintain it. In any event, our American State and local agencies will be able to make good use of much of the surplus property, at a lower cost to the American taxpayer than now exists.

Considering the grave situations, both social and monetary, that exist in many of our States, I feel that our own problems and people should have the first option on the use of excess Federal properties. These properties were purchased with the taxpayers' money in the first place and it is unfair and unwise to expect them to pay again for items identical to those already sitting in Federal warehouses, awaiting shipment overseas.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1632) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 203(j)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling and, with respect to excess property described herein, costs of transportation and repair) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which—

"(i) shall have been determined to be surplus property; or

"(ii) shall have been determined to be excess property and is being held under section 608 of Public Law 87-195 (75 Stat. 424) approved September 4, 1961, as amended, which property shall be offered to designated State agencies, as herein defined, before being offered to any other eligible donee; and

"(iii) shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for such purpose."

S. 1635—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL EXEMPTING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM SERVICE IN A COMBAT ZONE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the manpower demands of our present conflict in Vietnam are unique. Of those eligible to serve, many are able to defer their military service for the period of their college education and longer. Others enjoy exemptions on the basis of family support. Often however these deferments result in de facto exemptions. Yet under the circumstances of this war, which is not legally considered a national emergency, such exemptions are necessary.

Nevertheless, it is paradoxical that, when so few must bear the burdens of so many, some families are assuming double risk and suffering, while other families remain virtually untouched by the tragic conflict. There have been instances in my own State of Hawaii where two men within a single family were killed as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Also, there have been cases where two brothers were seriously wounded

XUM

while serving concurrent tours of duty in the combat area. I am sure that in each State these situations can be duplicated and multiplied.

At the present time, Department of Defense regulations offer two bases for deferment of military service in a combat area:

First. When one or more members of a family have been killed, or have died from injuries incurred in a combat area, the sole surviving son will be exempt from combat duty if he so requests.

The member of the military service must initiate the action by giving this information to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he may sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be removed from the combat area.

Second. No two members of the same family are to be sent into a combat zone at the same time, provided one of the two members requests to have his service delayed.

But this serviceman must initiate the action by submitting an application to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he must sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be transferred out of the zone for the length of time the other member of the family is serving there.

At the present time, the Department of Defense does not keep records which would reveal death of the next of kin, or concurrent duty of a next of kin.

My proposal would deny any surviving member of a family in which one or more members have been killed or died, as a result of injuries incurred in a combat area, the option of serving in a combat zone.

Third. The bill would forbid the assignment of a second member of the same family to concurrent duty in a combat area unless the two specifically volunteered for such service.

I believe the requirement that the surviving serviceman initiate the application for noncombatant duty is an unfair obligation to assume. I am sure all of us understand how a young man filled with esprit de corps after training with his unit might easily sign a waiver to enable him to stay with his buddies. He could, of course, refuse to sign the waiver and by so doing avoid combat. But he might fear that others would view his leaving as a cowardly act.

Also, a young serviceman is often motivated by a deep sense of service and patriotism. Each of these are pressures which constrain him from exercising his rights as now delineated in Armed Forces regulations.

Not only his interests but the interests of his loved ones are involved. Part of the right to make a decision must be freedom from coercion. With a decision of such far-reaching implications as this, and in view of the ready availability of replacements, no coercion should be permitted. Out of consideration, therefore, for his family and the young man himself, I am introducing with 35 other Senators this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the measure and the list of cosponsors be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and list of cosponsors will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1635) to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Inouye (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1635

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1041. Limitations on assignments to combat zones

"(a) Except during a period of war or a national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of enactment of this section—

"(1) No member of the armed forces whose father or brother or sister was killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, shall be assigned to duty in a combat zone.

"(2) No member of the armed forces shall be assigned to duty in a combat zone at any time when a father, brother, or sister of such member is serving in a combat zone, unless such member volunteers for such duty.

As used in this section the term 'combat zone' means any area which the President by Executive order designates, for purposes of this section, as an area in which the armed forces are engaged in combat; the term 'brother' includes a half brother; and the term 'sister' includes a half sister.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be administered under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Sec. 2. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1041. Limitations on assignments to combat zones."

The list of cosponsors of Senate bill 1635, presented by Mr. Inouye, follows:

Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 1636—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This legislation will serve the interests of both labor and industry by making more accessible urgently needed assistance and relief from the economic hardships posed by increasing foreign imports. The bill revises the escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions which, as set out in the 1962 act, have proven far too restrictive to be meaningful. It will insure greater flexibility in our trade laws without reneging on our basic commitment to freer international trade.

Mr. President, it is time we faced up to the fact that several of the provisions of the landmark Trade Expansion Act have fallen far short of their intended goal.

In the 1962 act we reaffirmed America's longstanding goal of more liberal international trade laws. At the same time, however, the Congress realistically recognized that changes and growth in international trade can, and often do, cause serious distress to businesses and individuals alike. Therefore, contained in the Trade Expansion Act, are several important provisions authorizing the use of various means of Federal relief when domestic industry or labor were threatened by rapidly increasing foreign imports.

No one questions that an influx of foreign products can have a serious impact on our economy. Cheap imports can throw American employees out of work; businesses can fail, and entire communities suffer. These hardships are the rightful concern of government and society. We must have adequate provision in our laws to assist those who are adversely affected by the changing patterns of international trade.

The fact is, however, that the legislative efforts to provide this assistance to industry and labor have been dismal failures. The 1962 act called for various types of assistance, including tariff adjustments and tax relief for industry, and readjustment and relocation allowances and job training assistance for labor. But the law, as drafted, is so restrictive as to make this assistance unavailable as a practical matter.

This problem is well known. Last year in a memorandum to all members of the President's Public Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade Policy, I stated the necessity for "a fair and just procedure by which domestic industries and workers who are suffering the consequences of a sudden and sharp growth of imports could receive relief." Under the present laws no such procedure is available.

The recent report of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations also clearly states the need to revise our present legislation affecting the escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions. More recently, both the former Special Representative, William Roth, and the new Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, have repeated this advice. In fact, I believe it is fair to say that both political parties support meaningful and substantive changes in these provisions.

The reason is simple. Since 1962 foreign imports into the United States have more than doubled. Our traditional favorable balance of trade has disappeared. In the wake of this influx, a number of vital and hard-pressed American industries have protested the inability of our present trade legislation to meet this crisis. The present demands for import quota legislation which now fills the Halls of Congress, reflect the failure to provide a reasonable solution.

In 1962, the Trade Expansion Act set out criteria for short term, industrywide relief under section 301—the so-called escape clause. Escape clauses are generally recognized by international trade agreements. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—permits a nation to invoke escape clause remedies such as import restrictions, under the threat of serious injury to domestic producers from increased imports.

But section 301 does not work. It fails because the criteria for invoking its benefits are too rigid. Under these strict standards not one case brought under the escape clause since 1962 has resulted in relief to an American industry—in spite of the well-recognized and documented increase in foreign imports.

Congress must enact a more workable escape clause. This bill will establish new and far more reasonable criteria for relief under section 301. First, the Tariff Commission, in an escape-clause action, will only have to find that increased imports were caused in any part by past tariff concessions. Under the present standards, tariff concessions had to be the major cause of increased imports. Second, increased imports must be a substantial factor in causing serious injury rather than the presently required major factor. Additionally, the definition of domestic industry is amended to provide increased protection to workers and producers of a distinct product line where injury does not extend to the entire industry.

This bill will also change the present criteria for permitting adjustment assistance to individual firms and establishments as well as workers. It is commonly recognized that these provisions, first adopted in 1962, also have failed. In 1968 President Johnson called for revision in the law to "make our adjustment assistance program fair and workable." So far, no change has been adopted.

It is plainly ridiculous to have a useless provision in our trade law structure. The proposed bill will alter the established criteria in the present law which are so restrictive that no petition for assistance to workers or industry has ever been approved since the law was enacted.

This legislation will remove the necessity of proving a causal relation between tariff concessions and increased imports to obtain adjustment assistance for workers. In its place, this bill will require only that increased imports cause unemployment or underemployment of a significant nature.

Similarly, the criteria for adjustment assistance to firms and establishments will be altered to provide only the requirement that increased imports cause serious injury to the firm.

Additionally, individual establishments within a firm will be allowed to apply for relief. Under present law, the Tariff Commission must look at the entire firm to ascertain serious injury. This fails to recognize that whole communities may rely on the continued good health of a single business establishment. Such an establishment might be seriously injured by imports without affecting the whole firm.

Mr. President, I believe this bill represents a significant step forward in our efforts to deal with the problems of increasing foreign imports into the United States. The operation of a more effective escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions will be selective. Only those firms, industries, and groups of workers, which can show demonstrable need for protection will be able to avail themselves of the relief afforded. Nevertheless, it will provide urgently needed protection which presently is unavailable under our laws.

This legislation will provide many benefits. It will help to relieve Congress of the constant pressure for legislatively imposed quotas on certain goods. It will insure fairness to those industries which do not have the legislative muscle to obtain quotas under the present haphazard system. It will mean the continued growth of world trade and our share of it because it will not penalize our export industries by inviting foreign retaliation as quota legislation will do. Finally, it will help to protect us from the ravages of inflation which is enhanced by legislation forbidding foreign competition in the domestic marketplace.

Mr. President, I would like to include as part of my statement, a memorandum which I have prepared detailing the problem and proposed remedy more precisely. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the memorandum be included in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1636) to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to the criteria for establishing eligibility for tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1636

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (b) and (c) of section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. § 1901) are amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon its own motion, or upon the filing of a petition under subsection (a) (1), the Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation to determine whether, as a result in any part of concessions granted under trade agreements, an article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry producing an article which is like or directly competitive with the imported article.

"(2) In making its determination under paragraph (1), the Tariff Commission shall take into account all economic factors which it considers relevant, including idling of productive facilities, inability to operate at a level of reasonable profit, and unemployment or underemployment.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1), increased imports shall be considered to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry concerned when the Tariff Commission finds that such increased imports have been a substantial factor in causing, or threatening to cause, such injury.

"(4) No investigation for the purpose of paragraph (1) shall be made, upon petition filed under subsection (a) (1), with respect to the same subject matter as a previous investigation under paragraph (1), unless one year has elapsed since the Tariff Commission made its report to the President of the results of such previous investigation.

"(c) (1) In the case of a petition by a firm for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under chapter 2, the Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation to determine whether an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by the firm is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to such firm. In making its determination under this paragraph, the Tariff Commission shall take into account all economic factors which it considers relevant, including idling of productive facilities of the firm, inability of the firm to operate at a reasonable level of profit, and unemployment or underemployment in the firm.

"(2) In the case of a petition by a group of workers for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under chapter 3, the Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation to determine whether an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, unemployment or underemployment of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision."

Sec. 2. Section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) For purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'firm' includes, with respect to petitions under subsection (c) (1) and adjustment assistance under chapter 2, a separate establishment of a firm, if the firm so elects, and

"(2) the term 'group of workers' includes with respect to petitions under subsection (c) (2) and adjustment assistance under chapter 3, a group of workers of a separate establishment of a firm, if the group so elects."

Sec. 3. Section 351 (a) (2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1981) is amended to read as follows: "(2) If the President does not, within 60 days after the date on which he receives such affirmative finding, proclaim the increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction on such article found and reported by the Tariff Commission pursuant to section 301 (e)—

"(A) he shall immediately submit a report to the House of Representatives and to the Senate stating why he has not proclaimed such increases or imposition, and

"(B) such increase or imposition shall take effect (as provided in paragraph (3)) upon the adoption by both Houses of the Congress (within the 60-day period following the date on which the report referred to in subparagraph (A) is submitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate), by the yeas and nays by the affirmative vote of a majority of those members present and voting in each House, of a concurrent resolution stating, in effect, that the Senate and House of Representatives approve the increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction on the article found and reported by the Tariff Commission.

XUM

For the purposes of subparagraph (B), in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die. The report referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be delivered to both Houses of the Congress on the same day and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House of Representatives is not in session and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session."

SEC. 4. Section 351 (a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is amended by striking out paragraph (4).

SEC. 5. Section 405 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. § 1806) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) The term 'domestic industry' means, with respect to any imported article, a substantial portion of those firms or appropriate subdivisions thereof which produce the like or directly competitive domestic article. In a multi-establishment firm, each establishment producing the domestic article shall be considered an appropriate subdivision. Where the domestic article is produced in a ~~distant~~ part or section of an establishment ~~such part~~ or section shall be considered an appropriate subdivision."

The memorandum, presented by Mr. RIBICOFF, follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ESCAPE CLAUSE AND ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE CRITERIA CONTAINED IN SECTIONS 301 (b) AND (c) OF TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

THE NEED FOR A REVISION

There is a manifest need for a revision of the escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Since 1962, imports have increased from $16.2 billion to over $33 billion, or by over 100 percent. Our favorable trade balance has disappeared. When subsidized foreign aid-financed exports are eliminated from total exports and the cost of insurance and freight is added to our imports (as it is computed for most industrialized countries) our trade deficit in 1968 reached a magnitude of $4.6 billion.

In spite of the tremendous growth in imports and the consequent effect on employment in this country, not one case under section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act has resulted in relief to American industry or labor. Twenty-five investigations were made under that section, and twenty-five times relief was denied.

SUPPORT FROM BOTH PARTIES

In submitting recommendations for modifying the adjustment assistance provisions of the 1962 Act, President Johnson in May, 1968 recognized that section 301 must be revised. He stated: "Unfortunately this program has been ineffective. The test of eligibility has proved to be too rigid, too technical, and too complicated." He went on to say, "As part of a comprehensive trade expansion policy, I propose that we make our adjustment assistance program fair and workable. I recommend that Congress broaden the eligibility for this assistance. The test should be simple and clear; relief should be available whenever increased imports are a substantial cause of injury."

While President Nixon has not yet specifically endorsed the Johnson recommendations on section 301, the Republican platform of 1968 recognized that: "A sudden influx of imports can endanger many industries. These problems, differing in each industry, must be considered case by case. Our guideline will be fairness to both producers and workers, without foreclosing imports. . . . We also favor the broadening of governmental assistance to industries, producers, and workers seriously affected by imports. . . ."

More recently, the former Special Trade Representative, Ambassador William Roth, submitted a report to the President on the *Future United States Foreign Trade Policy,* which specifically recommended liberalizing the escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act.

It is fair to say therefore that the substance of the modifications recommended in this bill are blessed by both parties and widely recognized as a vital, first step in the adoption of a realistic foreign trade policy.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

The present drive for mandatory import quota legislation is symptomatic of the failure to provide a workable means of escape from the occasionally injurious consequences of our trade expansion program of recent years.

The basic policy concept was, and is, to stimulate a long-term expansion of world trade by the gradual dismantling, on a reciprocal basis, of tariff and other trade barriers. Implicit in the concept, however, is "escape" from harmful, short-run dislocations of particular industries by rising imports. Since 1962, no effective means of "escape" has been available to American industry.

Most trade agreements to which the United States is a party contain escape clauses. Typical and of most general effect is Article XIX, 1. (a) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.[1]

The United States implemented an escape clause by legislation in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which Act predicted eligibility for relief on an increase in imports resulting in whole or in part from a trade agreement concession and that such increased imports had contributed substantially toward causing or threatening serious injury.

During the eleven years of section 7, the Tariffs Commission instituted 135 investigations at the behest of American industries and completed 113. A commission majority recommended relief in the form of import restrictions in 33 cases and were equally divided in 8. The President proclaimed restrictions in 15 instances.

The escape clause was radically restructured in the Trade Expanision Act of 1962, and especially the criteria of eligibility for tariff adjustment, to accord with the innovation first introduced at that time of adjustment assistance to firms and workers adversely affected by increased import competition. Under the 1962 escape clause, only 12 industries have made application for relief; in not one of these cases has the Tariff Commission found the petitioning industry to be entitled to tariff adjustment.

The President in his message to the Congress on May 28 proposed an easing of the criteria of eligibility for adjustment assistance to individual firms and groups of workers. The President characterized the present adjustment assistance tests, which are identical with the escape clause criteria for tariff adjustment, as "too rigid, too technical, and too complicated" and ask that the adjustment assistance program be made "fair and workable." That would be the result of this bill.

A workable program of adjustment assistance is desirable in those instances where it is the occasional firm or group of workers which for individual reasons is unable to withstand the competition of increased imports.

When, however, the adverse effect extends to entire industries, "adjustment assistance" is not the proper remedy. Unfortunately this was not foreseen in 1962. To employ adjustment assistance in these circumstances would be tantamount to providing unemployment compensation on a grand scale as a substitute for tariff adjustments. It is difficult to understand how such subsidization can be in the public interest. It is therefore necessary to refashion the escape clause and thereby create an effective safety valve, equitable to both American industry and to America's trading partners.

The unworkability of the present escape clause derives from the virtually insurmountable obstacles posed by the "major part" and "major factor" tests. In order for the Tariff Commission to find an industry eligible for "tariff adjustment"—i.e., withdrawal or suspension of concession duty rates, limitation of imports by quotas, or negotiation of orderly marketing agreements, or certification of the firms and workers constituting the industry as eligible for adjustment assistance—it must be found that a trade agreement concession was the major cause of an increase in imports, and that the increased imports were the major factor in causing, or threatening to cause, serious injury.

In practice, it is virtually impossible for the Tariff Commission or any other objective institution to find that tariff concessions per se have been the major cause of increased imports and that increased imports have been the major factor in causing, or threatening to cause, serious injury to an industry. The phrases "the major cause" and "the major factor" have been interpreted to mean a cause greater than all other causes combined, which clearly is an impossible task, and contrary to the purpose of having an escape clause in the first place.

It was not the intent of the Congress in enacting the major part and major factor tests to create an impossible obstacle to escape clause relief from injurious import competition; quite the contrary, this language was intended to prevent overly restrictive interpretations by the Tariff Commission and the President in applying the section.[2]

The proposed amendment would restore to the escape clause the original Congressional intent. The criteria of eligibility for tariff adjustment here proposed are similar to those proposed in the President's Message to the Congress of May 28 for adjustment assistance, modified to satisfy GATT obligations.

New subsections 301(b) (1) and (3) of the

---

[1] If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effects of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under this Agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that contracting party in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting party shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession."

[2] The Senate explained its insertion of the major cause criteria, concurred in by the House, as follows:

"The bill as it came to the (Finance) committee might have made it difficult for industries which felt that they had been injured to prove their case under the escape clause. The language of the bill could have been interpreted to mean that the increased imports as a result of concessions were the sole cause of the injury. While this may not have been the intent of the bill, the amendment makes it clear that the Tariff Commission need find only that the tariff concessions have been the major cause of increased imports and that such imports have been the major cause of the injury." S. Rep. No. 2059, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., page 5.

Trade Expansion Act would provide that the Tariff Commission shall determine whetner imports have increased in any part as a result of trade agreement concessions, and whether such increased imports have been a substantial cause of serious injury, or threat of such injury, to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The term "increased quantities" of imports is intended to require that, if quantities of imports in a recent period reflect an absolute increase over quantities of imports in a representative base period, the total quantity of imports in such recent period shall be taken into account. Thus, if quantities of imports in a representative base period were 8 million units and the quantities in a recent period were 10 million units, the quantities of imports to be considered would be 10 million units.

The "directly competitive" imported article is intended to mean either an article which is like the domestic article and is therefore necessarily directly competitive with it, or one which is unlike the domestic article but nevertheless competes directly with it.

In cases where there is more than one directly competitive imported article, it is intended that the quantities of imports of the several imported articles shall be taken together for purposes of determining whether there have been increased quantities of imports.

By the use of the words "have been," it is intended that the increased quantities of imports shall have occurred in the recent past.

With respect to the causal relationship between increased quantities of imports and injury, or the threat thereof, the term "substantial factor in causing" is intended to require the demonstration of an actual and considerable cause. A substantial cause in any specific case need not, however, be greater than all other causes combined nor even greater than any other single cause.

It is intended that the term "industry" shall be co-extensive with those firms or appropriate subdivisions thereof which produce the domestic article in question. In a multi-establishment firm, that establishment producing the article shall be considered that appropriate subdivision. Where the article is produced in a distinct part or section of an establishment (whether the firm has one or more establishments), such part or section may be considered an appropriate subdivision.

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

The "innovation" of adjustment assistance adopted in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act has not worked. While it cannot be a substitute for industry-wide relief under an escape clause proceeding, whenever such relief is justified by the facts, there is nevertheless a place for adjustment assistance in our tariff laws. The effects of import competition are not always, or even often, uniform across a given industry. Special assistance may be warranted for those firms whose smaller size, lesser product diversification and more limited financial resources make them more vulnerable than the stronger firms in the same industry.

It may be difficult to achieve the objective of providing help to these smaller firms within an industry if the relief remedies available are restricted to a higher tariff or quota under the escape clause. Indeed, there is the possibility that escape clause relief in such circumstances would benefit only the larger firms within the industry who may not be suffering from imports without aiding the smaller firms who may be suffering from import competition as well as competition from these larger firms. Under such circumstances, selected, pinpointed relief to these smaller firms may be the answer.

The adjustment assistance provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provide for assistance to firms in the form of technical assistance, financial assistance, and tax relief. The provision of this bill will not change the nature of this assistance, but will make it possible for injured firms to receive such relief.

It achieves this objective by eliminating the "rigid, technical and complicated" test of eligibility in the 1962 Act. Under the proposed bill a firm would be eligible for adjustment assistance if imports were causing or threatening to cause serious injury to such firm. The imports would not have to result from tariff concessions and would not have to be "the major cause" of the injury. Establishing a causal relationship between the increased imports and injury would be left to the unfettered judgment of the Tariff Commission.

Similarly, in the case of groups of workers who applied for adjustment assistance, the rigid language of the 1962 Act would be removed, and in its place a causal relationship between imports and unemployment or underemployment would be established.

Relief in the case of groups of workers would take the form of "trade readjustment allowed," "on the job training" and other benefits as provided by Sections 322, 326, and 328 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

SECTION 2

Section 2 of this bill would make adjustment assistance available to individual establishments and groups of workers of such establishments.

SECTION 3

Section 3 of this bill would amend section 351(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act so as to make it possible for a majority vote of those present in both Houses of Congress to "override" a President's decision not to act positively on a finding of injury by the Tariff Commission under an escape clause proceeding. Under present law, the Congress can so "override" a President's decision on an escape clause only if a majority of the authorized membership of both Houses agreed to do so. This clearly makes it virtually impossible for the Congress to act in concurrence with a Tariff Commission recommendation as it would require 51 positive votes in the Senate and 218 in the House of Representatives.

SECTION 4

Section 4 of the bill would eliminate subsection 351(a)(4) of the TEA completely, as an inequitable protraction of the time in which the President must act following a Tariff Commission recommendation for tariff adjustment.

Under section 301(f)(2), the Tariff Commission must complete its investigation and report to the President within 6 months from the date of filing of the petition. In practice, the Commission takes the full 6 months.

After receipt of the Commission's report and recommendation, the President has under section 351(a)(2) 60 days within which to act.

However, section 351(a)(4) permits the Prsident as a matter of discretion within the 60 day period to request additional information from the Tariff Commission, which body has then a further 120 days to supply the requested information, following which the President again has a further 60 days within which to take final action.

This succession of time periods permits the postponement of final action up to 14 months from the date of filing of the original petition. It is felt that 6 months for investigation and report by the Tariff Commission plus an additional 2 months for consideration and final action by the President affords adequate time to serve the purposes of the statute. Prolongation of final action by another 6 months can only be inequitable to industries which merit escape clause protection.

SECTION 5

Section 5 of this bill redefines "domestic industry" as discussed previously.

S. 1637—INTRODUCTION OF THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS DEVELOPMENT BILL OF 1969

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the airport and airways development bill of 1969.

Mr. President, one of the most pressing and at the same time most perplexing problems confronting the Nation today is the disappointing failure of our airports-airways system to meet the increasing demands of Americans for air transportation.

It is ironic that the United States, the most air-minded nation in the world, is fast developing airliners capable of whisking passengers across the Atlantic in 3 hours but at the same time our system is often unable to transport people from Washington to New York in the same amount of time.

The people of the United States know and appreciate the greatest degree of personal mobility ever known to men anywhere. To a large extent this mobility has been brought about by the advent of the airplane. And this freedom of movement without barriers, this unmitigated trade and commerce which has resulted is in large part taken for granted. As our people's horizons broaden—as they become more educated, more affluent, and as they have increasing leisure time, they are going to expect more and greater mobility. And for better or for worse they are going to look to the airplane to provide it. The airplane is going to be as much an integral part of the lives of the next generation as the automobile is to the present generation.

And yet the Nation's airports-airways system, glutted, confused, sometimes dangerous, and increasingly prone to delay—will not accommodate the growth expected even in the next 12 years. In other words, the system is now feeling the strain imposed by years of willy-nilly growth and the scant attention paid by us to the need for long-range coordinated transportation planning.

What really should concern us is that time has almost run out—indeed, in some segments of the air transportation system the dread day is here.

Yet if we fail to respond now, that failure to provide for the demands of our citizens for mobility will exact stringent penalties on our society. We will become growth-limited—a frightening prospect for an economy whose health depends on growth.

The inhibitions to growth sometimes are staggering. Our hub airports have in many cases reached the saturation point in terms of providing more aviation services to more people. When the next generation of jet airplanes goes into service later this year, the hubs will be strained and strapped even further. And yet we have done very little other than to expand, piecemeal, these great jetports, keeping a step or two ahead of the jaws of disaster. We have failed to make adequate plans and provisions for the totally new facilities and concepts that we will need in just a few short years.

The situation facing general aviation is every bit as bleak. Many seem to forget the astronomical growth in business

XUM

and pleasure flying which will put nearly a quarter of a million airplanes into our system by 1980. Their sheer numbers, will swamp our present airways and swell our already bulging airports.

And with the tremendous growth in the number of people and airplanes flying comes the increasing din for quieter and cleaner airplane engines. In many communities today the jet airplane and the airport are no more welcome than are garbage dumps and sewage treatment plants.

The Nation's overworked and overstrained air traffic controllers are nearing the point at which they can no longer control safely and efficiently the dozens of new airplanes which enter the system each day, vying for air space, ground space, and other support facilities. The skies are crowded and will get more so as more and more of our people take to the air, and yet the present system for controlling the air is hopelessly outmoded for even today's traffic.

And yet where are the answers as to how we are going to meet this burgeoning growth? Is it going to stifle and eventually strangle our great air system?

That is the challenge facing us today.

The airport and airways development bill of 1969, is, I believe, a step forward toward meeting our responsibility. The bill is the product of 2 years of hearings before the Aviation Subcommittee and represents our best present judgment about where to begin. In its present form the bill may not meet all the objectives which we wish to set forth but it is a proper beginning—if you wish, a working paper on which the Commerce Committee may build a program that will meet the requirements needed in the future for air transportation. The time for studies, additional dialog, and more delay is past—it is a time for action and I believe that this bill will establish a firm foundation for moving ahead now.

The Commerce Committee finds that most authorities are in agreement that the major dilemma facing the Nation's airports and airways today is a severe shortage of funds which would allow the expansion and modernization of the system.

In the past, the funds for support of our airports and airways have been appropriated by the Congress from year to year to meet current and pressing needs. The amount of money available has not been sufficient to meet the long-range growth needs of aviation and therefore each year we have seen the system slip further behind.

The time is now past when the American public can be expected to continue to pay out of general Treasury funds the vast amounts of money needed to bring us up to date. The schedule of national priorities and the shortage of money makes it impossible to support the system at an adequate level from general revenues.

Because of this glaring fact we must ask and expect the primary beneficiaries and users of the airport-airways system to bear a greater share of the burden of providing the funds to meet these pressing needs.

This bill will provide the statutory vehicle to assure that we begin the development of a safe and efficient national airport and airway system.

Basically, my bill creates an airport and airways trust fund, similar in concept to the highway trust fund, into which would go the receipts from the present user taxes on aviation and receipts from new taxes which the Congress may enact.

The bill earmarks from the trust fund annually $150 million for airport development and $250 million for the acquisition and installation of air navigation facilities. The balance of money remaining in the fund would be used to pay for other FAA costs, such as research and development and the maintenance and operation of the airways system.

The bill extends for another 5 years the existing Federal Airport Act which provides for 50-50 matching grants for publicly owned airports for landing area development and increases the annual expenditure authorization to $150 million, financed from the trust fund rather than from general appropriations.

The bill further amends the Federal Airport Act by authorizing a $1 billion guaranteed loan program for terminal area development at publicly owned airports. Such loans could be used for development of airport access roads, parking facilities and other terminal needs in addition to advance acquisition of land for noise buffer zones.

This bill declares that there is a general public benefit in having a safe, efficient airways and airport system beyond the military's actual use of the system and asserts that the civil users of the system should not be required to pay the cost of the system attributable to military use and the general public benefit. These costs would be paid out of general appropriations.

Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of Transportation would be required to conduct an extensive review of the method of allocating costs of the airport-airways system among users to determine the appropriate share attributable to the general public benefit and the method that should be used in allocating costs among the military, commercial aviation, and general aviation. The civil users would specifically be given an opportunity to participate, on a consultative basis, in this review.

Mr. President, the urgency of the dilemma facing the Nation's system of air commerce and transportation demands action now. Late last year the FAA found the situation so serious at five of the Nation's most important airports that it ordered severe restrictions limiting the number of hourly takeoffs and landings which are to begin this spring. Artificial constraints on the system such as the new regulation should not be necessary in a nation which has always prided itself on its remarkable aviation superiority. Restrictions are not an acceptable answer to the problems of crowded airports and airways in the United States. If we act soon, then, we may hope that such repugnant measures will be short lived and that, as the United States need for air transportation increases, our airports and airways will be equipped to handle this need.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1637) to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of air carrier and general purpose airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1637

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Airport and Airways Development Act of 1969"

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the Nation's airport and airway system is inadequate to meet current and projected growth in aviation and that substantial expansion and improvement of the system is required to meet the demands of interstate commerce, the postal service and the national defense. The Congress finds that the civil users of air transportation are capable of making a greater financial contribution to the expansion and improvement of the system through increased user fees. The Congress finds, however, that the civil users should not be required to provide all of the funds necessary for future development of the system and that revenues obtained from the general taxpayer will continue to be required to pay for actual use of the system by the military and for the value to the national defense and the general public benefit in having a safe, efficient airport and airway system in being and fully operational in the event of war or national emergency.

COST ALLOCATION STUDY

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall conduct a study respecting the appropriate method for allocating the cost of the airport and airway system among the various users and shall identify the costs to the Federal Government that should appropriately be charged to the system and the value to be assigned to the general public benefit. In conducting the study the Secretary shall consult fully with and give careful consideration to the views of the users of the system. The Secretary shall report the results of the study to Congress within two years from the date of enactment of this Act.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS TRUST FUND

SEC. 4. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the airport and airways trust fund (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "trust fund"), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated, credited, or transferred to the trust fund as provided in this section.

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury after   , 1969, and before   , 1975. under subsection (c) of section 4041 (taxes on aviation fuel) and under sections 4261 and 4271 (taxes on transportation by air) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and (2) amounts determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury after   , 1969, and before   , 1975, under section 4081 of such Code with respect to gasoline used in aircraft. The amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) On July 1, 1970, all unexpended funds which have been appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act and for the purposes of making expenditures under programs authorized by sections 307(b) and 312(c) (as it relates to safety in air navigation) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, shall be transferred to the trust fund.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund such additional sums as may be required to make the expenditures for the purposes for which funds shall be allocated in subsection (f).

(e) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the trust fund, and (after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation) to report to the Congress not later than the 1st of March of each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during subsequent fiscal years. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the trust fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. The interest on, and proceeds from the sale of, any obligations held in the trust fund shall be credited to and form a part of the trust fund.

(f) On or before July 1, 1970, and on or before July 1 of each fiscal year thereafter, the aggregate amount which will be made available in the trust fund pursuant to subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section during the then current fiscal year shall be allocated as follows:

(1) $150,000,000 of the trust fund shall be allocated for expenditure for grants authorized to be made by the provisions of the Federal Airport Act.

(2) $250,000,000 shall be allocated for expenditure to acquire, establish, and improve air navigation facilities under subsections (1) and (4) of section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

(3) The balance of the moneys available in the trust fund shall be allocated for the necessary administrative expenses incident to the administration of programs for which funds are to be allocated as set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection, and for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and the conduct of other functions under section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, not otherwise provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and for research and development activities under section 312(c) (as it relates to safety in air navigation) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

(g) Amounts in the trust fund shall be available as provided by appropriation Acts for making expenditures after June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1975, to meet the obligations of the United States heretofore and hereafter incurred under the Federal Airport Act approved May 13, 1946, as amended, and under section 307(b) and 312(c) (as it relates to safety in air navigation) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and administration expenses incidental thereto.

(h) No moneys shall be available for expenditure from the trust fund before July 1, 1970.

GUARANTY OF AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT LOANS

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to guarantee as an obligation of the United States, subject to such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, any lender against loss of principal or interest on any securities, obligations, or loans issued to finance any public airport development as defined in subsection (c) of this section, if he finds that—

(1) There is reasonable assurance of redemption of the securities or obligations or repayment of the loan;

(2) The amount of the financial assistance, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the financial assistance is made available; and

(3) The entity requesting the financial assistance will comply with such standards, terms, and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe concerning the uses, physical characteristics, and features of the airport and related facilities.

(b) The maturity date of any such securities, obligations, or loans, including all extensions and renewals thereof, shall be no later than thirty years after their date of issuance. The Secretary shall prescribe and collect a reasonable annual guarantee fee in connection with any guarantee under this Act. The total amount of loans guaranteed by the Secretary of Transportation may not exceed $1,000,000,000 at any one time.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "airport development" means the construction, alteration, improvement, or repair of airport hangars; airport passenger or freight terminal buildings and other buildings required for the administration and operation of an airport; public parking facilities for passenger automobiles; roads within the airport boundaries; and any acquisition of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a public airport, including any interest therein, or any easement through or any other interest in airspace, for the purpose of assuring that activities and operations conducted thereon will be compatible with normal airport operations.

(d) Receipts under this section shall be credited to a special account in the United States Treasury, and be available together with such appropriations as may be made from time to time by Congress for expenditure for necessary administrative expenses and other costs incident to the program authorized by this section.

AUTHORIZATION FOR AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 6. Section 5(d) of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) For the purposes of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $665,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of five fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $133,000,000 shall become available for obligations, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, and shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(11) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate of $15,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of five fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph $3,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, and shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amount 40 per centum shall be available for Hawaii, 40 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico, and 20 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands.

"(12) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density traffic serving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $70,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of five fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $14,000,000 shall become available for obligations, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, and shall continue to be so available until expended."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 7. (a) Section 6(a) of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(a)) is amended by striking out "or 5(d)(7)" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "5(d)(7), or 5(d)(10)"

(b) Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "and 5(d)(7)" and inserting in lieu thereof "5(d)(7), and 5(d)(10)" and by striking out "and 5(d)(9)" and inserting in lieu thereof ",(5)(d)(9), and 5(d)(12)".

S. 1638 AND S. 1639—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AMENDING THOSE PARTS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT WHICH PERMIT BENEFITS TO STUDENTS BEYOND THEIR 18TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce two bills, with similar amendments to the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act, for appropriate reference. Amendments to both acts apply to the present programs which permit the administering agencies to pay the child's benefit to a child of deceased or disabled parents after he is 18 if he continues as a full-time student. These bills, first, permit half-time and three-quarter-time students to be eligible for these benefits; second, increase the maximum age at which these benefits may be received from the 22d birthdate to the 26th birthdate—with the benefit terminating in the first month after age 22 that the student becomes eligible for a baccalaureate degree—and, third, permit the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board to notify persons who are potentially eligible for those benefits no later than their 14th birthdate.

Since 1965 the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board have provided benefits to children of disabled or deceased parents beyond their 18th birthday if they remain full-time students. Much of this aid has gone to college students. At the end of fiscal year 1968, 341,000 undergraduate students were receiving aid from the Social Security Administration. Their av-

XUM

erage benefit payment was $71.97 per month or $864 per year. The Railroad Retirement Board was also paying benefits to 8,000 undergraduate students. Their average benefit payment was $95 per month, or $1,140 per year.

Neither of these agencies knows how many of the students it has aided during the last 4 years would have been able to continue their education if they had not received these benefit payments. Since they are the children of dead or disabled parents, however, it is reasonable to conclude that a sizable number are in college today who, without this aid, would not have continued their education.

I think that a few changes in these programs will make them more flexible and, therefore, more capable of responding to the educational needs of potentially eligible students who cannot or do not presently receive these benefits. The changes do not contemplate costly new practices. But they will make it possible for many to receive benefits who do not now do so.

The purposes of these amendments are outlined as follows:

PERMIT PART-TIME STUDENTS TO RECEIVE BENEFITS

The present programs of the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board permit child's benefits after age 18 only to full-time students. This bill will permit half-time and three-quarter-time students to receive benefits. For students attending school with a three-quarters course load, their full-time benefit equivalent will be reduced by one-fourth. Students attending school who are carrying a half-time load will be eligible to receive a benefit equal to one-half of their full-time benefit. This means that, although students may be eligible to receive benefits over a longer period of time, their total benefit will not be any higher than it would have been had they been full-time students. This provision permits students more flexibility in arranging their schedules in order that they may engage in more part-time work.

This change is based on the assumption that there may be many students potentially eligible for this program who cannot afford to attend school full time. But they could work half time, receive their benefit, and attend college.

Paying benefits to part-time students is not a new concept in direct government aid to college students. The Veterans' Administration GI bill permits reduced payments to half-time and three-quarter-time students. This is what I propose for the social security and railroad retirement programs. A number of the present participants in the GI bill program take advantage of these provisions. According to information supplied to me by the Veterans' Administration only 49.6 percent of the students receiving college aid through its programs are full-time students.

When one considers that the students eligible for social security and railroad retirement child's benefits are the children of deceased or disabled parents it is not difficult to conclude that many are from families with low incomes. Many must assist their families in meeting living expenses. These are precisely the students who need help the most and who would most benefit from a provision which would permit them to attend school part time and earn additional income in order that they can attend school at all. This country must not deny these students the opportunity of a post-secondary or higher education experience because of a rule which does not take account of their particular circumstances.

INCREASE MAXIMUM AGE

There are two reasons for increasing the maximum age for students to whom benefits under these programs may be paid. First, according to the 1960 census the median high school graduate is 18.1 years of age when he graduates. This means that half of the high school graduates cannot finish college before their 22d birthday even if they attend full time. Indeed, 19 percent of all students who receive social security benefits are still in school at age 22, when they are dropped from the program. Thus, we need to raise the maximum age of the program simply because many of the present eligibles fail to complete their education by age 22.

The second reason for raising the maximum age is that other changes offered by this bill permit part-time students to receive benefits. If we permit this we must also permit students to be eligible for a longer period of time. It would be unjust to the student whose family income was such that he had to work long hours at a part-time job in order to attend college half time to tell him at age 22—when he has completed the equivalent of 2 full years of college work—that he was no longer eligible. It would also be unjust to the high school graduate who works for a year or two and then goes to college to tell him at age 22 that he is no longer eligible. There are many children of hard-working parents who fall into these categories. I think the provisions of these very good programs should recognize this fact.

This bill raises the maximum age at which students can receive benefits under these programs to the 26th birthdate. After age 22 any qualified student may participate in any educational program for which he was eligible before age 22, except that his benefit will terminate in the month in which he first becomes eligible for a baccalaureate degree. The reason for permitting benefits until age 26—as compared with age 24, for example—is that if we permit students to attend school half time or three-quarter time—with a reduced benefit—it might take them until this age to graduate from college. There may also be students who decide several years after high school graduation that they would like to begin vocational or college work.

REQUIRE NOTIFICATION

Decisions to continue education after high school are usually made early in the high school years. At that time students must decide what courses to take in order to meet the requirements for further work. If the high school senior finds that he has not chosen the correct courses for college work he may be discouraged from making application and attending because he believes he is inadequately prepared. He may also find that he has not taken courses which permit him to meet the entrance requirements of institutions to which he wants to apply.

The decision to attend college also involves financial calculations. The cost of attending college is rising—and it is expected to increase even faster over the next few years. The Office of Education estimates that the tuition, room, and board cost for attending a 4-year public institution in 1968–69 is $1,183 per year. For 4-year private institutions the comparable cost is $2,443. These figures do not include even the costs of books, let alone the many other expenses incurred by the college student. It is not surprising that the decision to attend college often hinges on the availability of finances. Many students who have the ability and desire to do college work do not attend college simply because adequate finances are not available. The Project Talent research project sponsored by the Office of Education, and executed by the University of Pittsburgh, for example, found that 92 percent of the young men in the highest achievement quartile from families in the highest income quartile enter college in the year following graduation. But for young men of equal ability, from families in the lowest income quartile, the figure is only 61 percent.

The dropoff is even more dramatic for young women—from 87 percent to 42 percent. For men and women together, these percentages mean that high ability students—as measured by achievement—from families with the lowest incomes are only about half as likely to enter college as students of equal ability from families with the highest incomes.

For all of these reasons, it is not surprising that numerous authorities believe that the early high school years are the critical years when decisions to attend college are made. The recent Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report to the President, entitled "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education," says:

> There is some evidence that changes in the cost of college have a greater impact upon college attendance if these changes are made known to students early in their high school careers. If there were a fundamental improvement in the method of financing student's education, it is likely that the long range impact of this change would be to remove some of the barriers to college attendance which we identify as "motivational" in the short-run.

The Veterans' Administration which administers a program which aids the sons and daughters of deceased and disabled veterans notifies potential eligibles at age 13. The agency does this on the advice of its psychological consultants who say that this information is critical in the early high school years in order that students may make the financial calculations and course decisions that are crucial for college attendance.

At the present time the Railroad Retirement Board notifies those who will be eligible for a child's benefit beyond age 12, if they are full-time students, 90 days before their 18th birthday. The Social Security Administration makes its notification 5 months before the 18th birthday. By this time many students have already graduated from high school. They may have already begun work or made other commitments which prevent them from attending college. They may not have taken the proper courses to prepare them for college work or to meet the requirements of the institution they wish to attend. And they may have believed that the cost of college was beyond their means. The additional money available from these programs might have made the difference between their attending and not attending college. Their decision not to attend is an incalculable loss of resources to this country. And it will likely have a profound influence on the life of the individual who has made the decision.

The purpose of the amendment requiring the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board to notify potential eligibles at age 14 that they may be able to continue receiving a child's benefit after age 18, if they continue to remain eligible, is to make certain that this information is known when they make the decisions related to attending or not attending college. We all make our decisions on the best information that is available. There is no reason why this Government cannot make certain that the best possible information related to college attendance decisions is available.

I have recently corresponded with the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board concerning the need for an earlier notification date in their programs. I am pleased that the Railroad Retirement Board has agreed to begin a notification practice similar to that of the Veterans' Administration. I am nevertheless including this amendment. I do this because I want to underscore legislative intent in this area. I also want to make certain that succeeding administrators continue the enlightened practices that will soon be implemented.

Mr. President, these amendments will improve the capacity of these programs to cope with the educational needs of the students which the present programs are designed to serve. I think these changes should be made now. These bills deserve the attention of both Congress and the executive branch.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these measures be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills (S. 1638) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend from 22 to 26 the age limit for the receipt of child's insurance benefits thereunder by individuals attending school, and to permit reduced child's benefits to be paid to individuals attending school on a part-time basis, and (S. 1639) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to extend from 22 to 26 the age limit for the receipt of a child's insurance annuity thereunder by individuals attending school, and to permit a reduced child's insurance annuity to be paid to individuals attending school on a part-time basis, introduced by Mr. Mondale, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance (S. 1638) and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (S. 1639), and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 202(d)(1)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "full-time student and had not attained the age of 22" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student and had not attained the age of 26".

(2) Section 202(d)(1)(E) of such Act is amended by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(3) (A) Section 202(d)(1)(F)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(B) Section 202(d)(1)(F)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "22" and inserting in lieu thereof "26".

(4) (A) Section 202(d)(1)(G)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(B) Section 202(d)(1)(G)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "22" and inserting in lieu thereof "26".

(b) Section 202(d)(6) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "22" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "26", and (2) by striking out "full-time student" each place it appears therein and by inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(c)(A)(i) The first sentence of section 202(d)(7)(B) of such Act is amended (I) by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "full-time student, or part-time student, as the case may be," and (II) by striking out "full-time attendance" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "full-time or part-time attendance, as the case may be,".

(ii) The second sentence of section 202(d)(7)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "full-time attendance" and inserting in lieu thereof "full-time or part-time attendance, as the case may be,".

(B) Section 202(d)(7) of such Act is further amended by adding after subparagraph (C) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) A 'qualified student' is an individual who—

"(i) is a full-time student or a part-time student, and

"(ii) is determined by the Secretary (in accordance with regulations prescribed by him) to be making satisfactory progress in the courses of study pursued by him in the educational institution in which he is enrolled;

except that no individual who has attained age 22 shall be a qualified student after the date he first becomes eligible for a baccalaureate degree from an educational institution in which he is or has been enrolled.

"(E) A 'part-time student' is an individual who is in attendance at an educational institution (as defined in subparagraph (C)) and is carrying a course load as determined by the Secretary (in accordance with regulations prescribed by him) which, in light of the standards and practices of the institution involved, is not less than one-half the course load which would be carried by a full-time student in such institution, except that no individual be considered as a 'part-time student' if he is paid by his employer while attending an educational institution at the request, or pursuant to a requirement, of his employer."

Sec. 2. Section 203 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Deductions from Child's Benefits of Part-Time Students

"(m)(1) Deductions, at such time or times as the Secretary shall determine, shall be made from any child's insurance benefit (under section 202 (d)) to which an individual is entitled for any month in which such individual is a part-time student (as defined in section 202(d)(7)(E)), if such individual would not have been entitled, under section 202(d), to such a benefit for such month except for the fact that he was a qualified student (as defined in section 202(d)(7)(D)) during such month. For any month in which such individual is a part-time student carrying a course load in the educational institution in which he is enrolled of not less than three-fourths of a full course load (as determined by the Secretary under regulations prescribed by him), the deduction from the child's benefit of such individual shall be equal to one-fourth of the amount of such child's benefit, and, for any other month, the deduction from the child's benefit of such individual shall be equal to one-half of the amount of such child's benefit.

"(2) An individual referred to in paragraph (1) shall report to the Secretary such information as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe to enable the Secretary to make deductions from such individual's benefits in accordance with such paragraph.

"(3) Whenever any individual, without good cause, fails or refuses to make any report required pursuant to paragraph (2), the Secretary may (in accordance with regulations prescribed by him for such purpose) make penalty deductions from the child's insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled. Any such penalty deduction shall not exceed the amount of the child's insurance benefit to which such individual is entitled for one month, and not more than one such penalty deduction shall be made for any one such failure or refusal."

Sec. 3. Section 222(b) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "22" and inserting in lieu thereof "26", and (2) by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

Sec. 4. The last sentence of section 225 of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "22" and inserting in lieu thereof "26", and (2) by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

Sec. 5. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this Act shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after the month which follows the month in which this Act is enacted; except that, in the case of an individual who was not entitled to a child's insurance benefit under subsection (d) of such section for the month in which this Act is enacted, such amendments shall apply only on the basis of an application filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Sec. 6. Section 205 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"NOTIFICATION OF RECIPIENTS OF CHILD'S INSURANCE BENEFITS OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO STUDENTS

"(r) The Secretary shall establish and put into effect procedures designed to provide notification to individuals receiving child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the provisions of such section relating to eligibility for such benefits in the case of individuals who have attained age 18 and

XUM

are qualified students. In the case of individuals who are receiving child's insurance benefits for the month in which they attain the age of 14, such notification shall be provided in such month, or, if that is not feasible, at the earliest time thereafter that is feasible. In the case of individuals who first become entitled to child's insurance benefits for a month after the month in which they attain the age of 14, such notification shall be provided in the month in which they first become entitled to such benefits, or, if that is not feasible, at the earliest time thereafter that is feasible."

S. 1639

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That (a) section 5(1)(1)(ii)(B) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out "twenty-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six", and (2) by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(b)(1) The ninth sentence of section 5(1)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of paragraph (7) of section 202(d) of the Social Security Act (defining the terms 'full-time student', 'educational institution', 'qualified student', and 'part-time student') shall be applied by the Board in the administration of this section as if the references therein to the Secretary were references to the Board."

(2) The tenth sentence of section 5(1)(1) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "full-time student" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student", and (B) by striking out "22" and inserting in lieu thereof "26".

(3) The eleventh sentence of section 5(1)(1) of such Act is amended (i) by striking out "twenty-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six", and (ii) by striking out "full-time student" and inserting in lieu thereof "qualified student".

(c) Section 5(1)(1) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "'The provisions of section 203(m) of the Social Security Act (relating to deductions from child's benefits of part-time students) shall be applied by the Board in the administration of this Act as if the references therein to the Secretary were references to the Board and as if references to individuals receiving a child's insurance benefit were references to individuals receiving a child's insurance annuity."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to annuities under section 5(c) of the Railroad Retirement Act for months after the month which follows the month in which this Act is enacted; except that in the case of an individual who was not entitled to an annuity under section 5(c) of such Act for the month in which this Act is enacted, such amendments shall apply only on the basis of an application filed in or after the month in which this act is enacted.

SEC. 3. Section 10(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) The Board shall establish and put into effect procedures designed to provide notification to individuals receiving a child's insurance annuity under section 5(c) of the provisions of this Act relating to eligibility for such annuity in the case of individuals who have attained age 18 and are qualified students. In the case of individuals who are receiving a child's insurance annuity for the month in which they attain the age of 14, such notification shall be provided in such month, or, if that is not feasible, at the earliest time thereafter that is feasible. In the case of individuals who first become entitled to a child's insurance annuity for a month after the month in which they attain the age of 14, such notification shall be provided in the month in which they first become entitled to such annuity, or, if that is not feasible, at the earliest time thereafter that is feasible."

S. 1652—INFORMATION OF THE MONOMOY ISLAND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964 brought over 9 million acres of forest lands under wilderness status. In addition, Monomoy Island, a small island located off the coast of Cape Cod, has been found by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to be highly qualified for wilderness preservation, and was the first such area to be proposed for inclusion by the Bureau in accordance with the Wilderness Act.

Last May, my colleague Senator Brooke and I introduced legislation to make Monomoy Island a national wilderness area. Hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the bill was passed by the Senate. Unfortunately, the House Interior Committee did not have an opportunity to act before Congress adjourned.

Monomoy is an uninhabited, unspoiled, sparsely vegetated island where dunes and sand flats, meadows and marshes serve as an ideal refuge for wildlife. Monomoy has been managed as a national wildlife refuge since 1944, and has provided enjoyment to fishermen, sportsmen, naturalists, artists, and other outdoor enthusiasts.

Wilderness area status for this 2,600 acre barrier-beach island will aid in preserving forever its unspoiled nature. It would prevent future generations from encroaching upon and spoiling one of the few natural island areas remaining in our country.

Located within a day's drive from the major centers of population in the Northeast, Monomoy Island would be the only wilderness preservation within 200 miles.

Designating the island as a wilderness area would not infringe upon the rights of anyone who presently enjoys the resources available there. No private roads would be allowed; but there are no such roads there now, and the island is unconnected with the mainland. No private landholdings would be allowed; but, at the present time, only 2 acres of the total land area are privately held.

There could not be a more fitting complement to the Cape Cod National Seashore, which I have long supported, than the preservation of Monomoy Island as a wilderness area. It is with particular pleasure that I introduce this bill with Mr. Brooke to insure the preservation of Monomoy as it is today. Together we join with the people of Chatham and adjoining towns, the elected officials of Barnstable County, the Cape Cod Planning and Economic Development Commission, and other recreation-conservation interests in seeking speedy enactment of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1652) to designate certain lands in the Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge, Barnstable County, Mass., introduced by Mr. Kennedy (for himself and Mr. Brooke), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1653—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE SHIPPERS WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO RECOVER REASONABLE ATTORNEY'S FEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in the case of successful maintenance of an action to recover damages sustained in the transportation of property.

The purpose of this bill is to put the shipping public, be he a household moving his personal possessions, or a small grain or vegetable shipper, in a more equal bargaining position with carriers in settlement negotiations for recovery of damages sustained in the transportation of property. This bill would accomplish this purpose by permitting a successful shipper in a court suit to recover his attorney's fees under certain circumstances.

Existing law places the small shipper at a disadvantage because his only recourse when the carrier refuses to settle a claim is to proceed with litigation at a cost which often substantially exceeds the claim. The effect is that the shipper as a practical matter finds himself in a poor bargaining position and has no legal recourse of which he can avail himself.

Small shippers throughout this country, whether they be shippers of grain, fruits and vegetables, or manufactured items, are confronted with severe obstacles in collecting damage claims. While every kind of shipment seems to be involved, the problems experienced by shippers of perishables in the handling of delay claims by the eastern railroads, and the problems experienced by grain shippers in the handling of "clear record" cars by the eastern carriers seems to be the most pressing.

Until a few years ago railroads assured shippers that their products would be carried to their destined markets with reasonable dispatch, which the courts have interpreted as meaning "without unreasonable delay."

In 1964, however, the eastern railroads took the position that they would not guarantee delivery of perishable freight at destinations to meet previously agreed upon "cutoff" times. Subsequently the evidence has mounted that service has deteriorated on western perishables moving to eastern markets.

Undue delays in handling perishables impose a hardship not only on the shipper but also on the consumer who is entitled to receive fruit and vegetables fresh and in good condition.

During the 90th Congress the Commerce Committee heard testimony or received statements in support of this legislation from the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, the American Feed Manufacturers Association, the Truck Line Grain and Products Council, the National Industrial Traffic League, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists, the National Wool Grocers Association, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the Northwest Horticultural Council, the American National Cattlemen's Association, the Southern Traffic League, the Western Growers Association, the National Grange, the Corn Refiners Association, the Western States Meatpackers Association, and the National Independent Meat Packers Association.

The difficulties faced by commercial small shippers are shared by householders who ship their household goods. The Commerce Committee has received letter after letter from householders complaining about the practices of certain household moving companies. The committee is continuing to review this matter. The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission has advised me that the Commission is conducting field investigations of certain moving companies, and is prepared to take action against those carriers who are in violaation of the laws or rules or regulations of the Commission. The Commerce Committee will vigorously pursue this matter until those few carriers who believe they can thumb their noses at the moving public have changed their practices. This bill should provide some relief to householders on one of the important problems, the settlement of claims for damage.

If a carrier refuses to honor a legitimate claim of a shipper, the shipper will no longer in practical effect be precluded from bringing a court action by the cost of attorney's fees which may far exceed the amount of the damage claim. In addition, in my opinion, the measure will provide an economic incentive to the carriers to offer just settlements and fair claim handling practices to the public.

This measure provides that if the plaintiff shall finally prevail in a property damage claim action, he shall be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee, to be taxed and collected as part of the suit. This is the language we have sought for many years to enact into law. The Senate Commerce Committee reported an amended version of this bill last year. I am hopeful that the 91st Congress will finally enact this much needed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1653) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 11 of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 20, par. 11) is amended by inserting at the end of the fifth proviso and immediately before the sixth proviso the following: "*And provided further,* That if the plaintiff shall finally prevail in any action, he shall be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee, to be taxed and collected as part of the suit:".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 83—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to a joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

The proposed amended joint resolution has been requested by the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the amended joint resolution be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letters from the Assistant Secretary of State dated January 16 and March 13, 1969, and the memorandum accompanying the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, letters, and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 83) to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 83

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 89–646, Eighty-ninth Congress, approved October 13, 1966, is amended by striking out "$90,300" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000" in Section (1) and adding "(3) the sum of $386,050 for payment by the United States of its assessed annual contributions for the period beginning July 1, 1964 and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1969."

The letters and memorandum, presented by Mr. Fulbright, are as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1969.
Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The draft legislation concerning the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (copy enclosed) which was referred to your Committee on January 21, 1969, has been favorably reviewed by the Department of State in the light of the policies of the present Administration. It would be greatly appreciated if the proposed legislation could be given early consideration.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of this Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this letter reaffirming our support for this proposal.

Sincerely yours,
William B. Macomber, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Department of State,
Washington, January 16, 1969.
Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to the Joint Resolution as previously amended, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

S.J. Res. 108, enacted as PL 89–646, raised the authorization for the annual United States contribution to the Institute from $50,000 to $90,300. It also provided for financing the activities of the United States National Section of the Institute. Although the legislation provided for a higher contribution than previously permitted, the authorization still fell short of the full United States assessment of $151,350.

The $200,000 authorization provided for in the accompanying legislative proposal would enable the United States to pay in full its current annual quota assessment in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. This figure is based on the Institute's present financial requirements plus a margin to cover anticipated wage and price increases over the next five years estimated at 4 to 5 percent per annum. The margin would eliminate the necessity for annual requests for new legislation to enable the United States to pay its assessment, yet would maintain a ceiling that would require legislative approval in the event of any appreciable program increase.

The proposed legislation would authorize payment of United States arrearages to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History in the amounts of $101,550 for fiscal year 1965, $101,350 for fiscal year 1966 and $61,050 for fiscal years 1967, 1968 and 1969.

A memorandum describing the Institute, its work and the proposed draft amendment is enclosed.

The Department was advised by the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969 that from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
William B. Macomber, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Memorandum To Accompany Proposed Amendment to the Joint Resolution Providing for Membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History

The Pan American Institute of Geography and History was created by a resolution of the Sixth International Conference of American States in 1928. In 1949 it entered into

XUM

an agreement with the Organization of American States, whereby it became an inter-American specialized organization. It is composed of twenty-one member countries of the OAS (present government of Cuba excluded from participation) and Canada. Operating through a General Secretariat, three Commissions (representing all members), and a large number of committees, subcommittees and working groups, the Institute draws together the efforts of over 400 geographers, cartographers and historians. The United States has played a leading role in the Institute since joining in 1935, and a prominent United States geographer, Dr. Arch C. Gerlach, is currently First Vice President.

The Institute activities are carried out through a small headquarters secretariat in Mexico City, very small Commission staffs in Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, and Mexico City, National Commissions of the member countries and elected officers of the Institute. Its work consists of promoting and publishing studies, meetings and occasional field projects in cartography, geography, history, and in the geophysical sciences. Its meetings and publications serve member government agencies by providing a means for the exchange of technical information, developing scientific studies requested by the member governments, securing agreement on standards and symbols for use in maps, organizing cooperative regional projects, and publication of historical studies.

The Institute's recent accomplishments include completion of a geodetic network tie between Argentina and Chile, advisory services rendered to the Dominican Republic concerning natural resource development, advisory service given to Costa Rica during the eruption of the volcano, "El Arenal", the holding of photointerpretation courses in Mexico and the organization of many seminars and meetings. The Institute has been extremely active in organizing regional projects requiring the cooperation of specialists from various member governments. The Institute has played an important role in the Hemisphere, in that it has filled the need for an *inter*-American agency to carry out activities which are multinational in nature.

Of immediate pertinence to the budget increase adopted by the Directing Council for fiscal years 1965 through 1969 is the Institute's proposal to undertake, as funds become available, more than a score of specific projects which will directly benefit the economies and the technical capabilities of the member states. Illustrating the types of projects to be given priority are the following: geographic studies of renewable natural resources, pilot study of sub-Andean valleys, special subject maps (population, land use, climatic phenomena, transportation, etc.), exchanges of teachers and students, extension of geodetic control networks, rectification of leveling in Southern Chile, and magnetic determinations in Central America.

In recent years, the Institute has developed its work to a point where additional resources can be used with good effect. In Fiscal Year 1965, the annual budget was increased to $250,000 and an assessment system based on the "Pan American Union formula", modified by the inclusion of Canada, was adopted. PL 89–646 of the 89th Congress gave partial recognition to this change by raising the dollar authorization of the annual United States contribution to the Institute from $50,000 to $90,300. This figure was arrived at by applying the new percentage (although 60.2 percent was used rather than the actual assessment percent for that year of 60.62) to the former annual budget of $150,000. Because an invalid percentage figure and an outdated budget total were used in setting the present authorization, the United States is unable to meet the full United States assessment of $151,250.

The $200,000 authorization provided for in the accompanying legislative proposal would enable the United States to pay in full its current annual quota assessment in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. This figure is based on the Institute's present financial requirements plus a margin to cover anticipated wage and price increases over the next five years estimated at 4 to 5 percent per annum. The margin would eliminate the necessity for annual requests for new legislation to enable the United States to pay its assessment, yet would maintain a ceiling that would require legislative approval in the event of any appreciable program increase. The proposed legislation would also authorize payment of United States arrearages to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History in the amounts of $101,550 for Fiscal Year 1965, $101,350 for Fiscal Year 1966, and $61,050 for Fiscal Years 1967, 1968 and 1969. The payment of these arrearages would enable the Institute to carry out certain non-continuing projects already approved but held up for lack of funds.

The Department of State believes that experience over the past years has demonstrated that the Institute is an effective instrument for promoting scientific research development throughout Latin America, and that passage of the proposed legislation would give the Institute an opportunity to implement a series of valuable projects. The Institute's technical activities contribute to the general economic development of the area by disseminating information and techniques. The Institute, with its Hemisphere-wide membership and support among professionals, stimulates scientific progress in Latin America and furnishes a useful complement to the larger United States programs of technical and financial assistance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 84—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO A NEW POLICY FOR U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of cosponsors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to revise the policy of the United States with respect to our territorial limits. Joining with me as cosponsors of this resolution are Senators Allott, Bennett, Bible, Boggs, Cotton, Dodd, Dominick, Eastland, Fong, Gurney, Hansen, Hruska, Jordan of Idaho, Mansfield, Miller, Montoya, Mundt, Murphy, Nelson, Percy, Prouty, Randolph, Schweiker, Thurmond, and Young of North Dakota.

I introduced a similar resolution last year, and, at that time, remarked:

> Mr. President, in the wake of the *Pueblo* incident, a serious question arises as to the wisdom of maintaining only a 3-mile jurisdictional limit off our shores—while most Communist nations insist upon 12 miles.
>
> It is about time we changed our policy and insisted upon reciprocity. It makes no sense to allow Communist ships within 3 miles of our shores while we carefully observe the 12-mile limit claimed by Communist-bloc countries.
>
> The *Pueblo* affair only underscores the fact that for a long time we have been handing the Communists a significant espionage advantage.

Mr. President, I propose that the United States lay down a new policy with respect to our territorial waters, based on the principle of mutuality. We should notify nations such as Russia and North Korea that, so long as they claim a 12-mile limit, we shall insist that their ships stay at least 12 miles from our shoreline.

At the same time, our traditional 3-mile limit should continue to apply to those countries which reciprocate by recognizing a 3-mile limit as to their own territorial waters.

Mr. President, although our Nation adheres to the traditional 3-mile limit for purposes of sovereign territorial jurisdiction, the United States asserts exclusive fishing rights in waters extending 9 miles beyond. Thus, the United States claims a 12-mile limit for the purposes of our own domestic fishing industry.

Recent events have emphasized the need for a reexamination of the present policy with respect to our territorial waters—particularly in light of our claimed 12-mile fishing zone.

Illustrative of the problem is the fact that, on February 8, the Coast Guard intercepted a fleet of 60 Communist-bloc fishing trawlers off the Virginia coast. The trawlers had been observed fishing within our claimed territorial fishing waters. No action was taken against these vessels other than to warn them that a further violation of our 12-mile fishing zone would subject the vessels to boarding and seizure.

Perhaps the ludicrous nature of our present policy is best illustrated by the simple fact that, had these 60 vessels been "spying" rather than fishing, they could have moored with immunity but 3 miles off our shore.

On February 15, a U.S.-owned tuna boat was hit by more than 50 bullets by a Peruvian gunboat while fishing 26 to 50 miles from the coast of Peru. Peru and its coastal neighbors claim exclusive control over adjacent waters extending 200 miles into the Pacific.

As the New York Times commented on February 17, 1969:

> The fishing boat incidents last week were merely the latest explosions in a long series arising from the claim by Peru and its coastal neighbors to exclusive control over adjacent waters extending 200 miles into the Pacific. This is an extremely serious international question which transcends the immediate grievances of American fishermen.

And just last week, Peru again seized two American tuna boats, which were fishing 50 miles from its coast. The boats were released only after paying $2,000 fines.

This most recent incident certainly underscores the need for a new international agreement respecting territorial waters. The New York Times concluded on February 17, 1969, that—

> [t]hese problems can only be solved by international agreement through the United Nations. The sooner this is done the better.

Mr. President, section 3 of the resolution reflects the sense of Congress that the President should take appropriate steps, through the United Nations or other means, to convene an international conference for still another attempt to establish a uniform seaward limit to be recognized by all nations of the world. As in the past, I believe we should continue to seek such an agreement despite the fact that past efforts have been less than successful.

In 1958 and 1960, international conferences were held in Geneva. Although the participating nations failed to reach agreement on a uniform territorial limit,

XUM

significantly, there were indications of a general consensus that no nation should claim a territorial limit in excess of 12 miles.

Mr. President, the joint resolution offered today is consistent witn customary principles of international law. I believe the joint resolution, if adopted, will encourage further international negotiation looking toward agreement on this fundamental issue.

But until such time as international agreement is reached, there is no justification for blind adherence on our part to a rigid policy which no longer serves our national interests.

The fact is that our 3-mile limit has become an open invitation to espionage—a giveaway intelligence advantage for our adversaries.

There are those who will argue that the 3-mile limit is sacrosanct. But in fact this policy is not a declared or customary rule of international law.

In his text, "International Law," Prof. D. P. O'Connell writes as follows:

> The most that can be said is that the 3-mile limit is not a rule of customary international law at the present time for the adequate reason that not sufficient maritime states adhere to it. Indeed, it is doubtful if it ever was one.

In surveying a compilation of practice throughout the world, it becomes quite clear why the 3-mile limit lacks the character of law. Only 29 out of 98 nations with a coastline are now observing the 3-mile territorial limit. The rest all insist upon wider territorial waters, with the largest number of countries claiming 12 miles. In fact, at the present time, a plurality of coastal nations adhere to a 12-mile limit.

Mr. President, even if the resolution introduced today is not a perfect answer, it is, at least, a constructive step in the right direction focusing attention upon the need to reshape our present policy.

Mr. President, there can be little question that uniformity and agreement among coastal nations has been a contributing factor in precipitating a number of international incidents. It is interesting, for example, that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in his testimony concerning the Gulf of Tonkin incidents before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made the following statement:

> Prior to the first attack, on August 2, the *Maddox* had been engaged on its patrol since July 31. At no time during the conduct of this patrol did the *Maddox* depart from international waters. It had been instructed to approach the North Vietnamese coastline no closer than 8 nautical miles and any offshore island no closer than 4 nautical miles. *Maddox* adhered scrupulously to these instructions. When the patrol resumed with *Maddox* and *Turner Joy*, the ships were instructed to remain *at least 11 miles from the coast.* (emphasis added) The United States recognizes no claim of a territorial sea in excess of three miles. . . .

Subsequent to the Gulf of Tonkin incidents, North Vietnam stated that its "territorial sea is 12 miles."

I do not wish to reopen the question whether the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* were within North Vietnam's territorial waters—or whether the United States was wise in acknowledging only a 3-mile claim. But it is significant that after recognizing only a 3-mile limit in the case of North Vietnam, we later observed, in connection with the *Pueblo* incident, a claim by North Korea of a 12-mile limit.

The objective of my resolution is to correct—or at least contribute to the correction of—a state of confusion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution as well as my three earlier statements on it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 84) to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 84

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the territorial sea of the United States is hereby established as extending three nautical miles from the coastline of the United States: *Provided,* That in the case of any coastal country (including ships and nationals thereof) which claims a territorial sea extending more than three nautical miles from its coastline, the territorial sea of the United States shall be equal in distance to that claimed by such other country, but not to exceed twelve nautical miles. Any extension of the territorial sea beyond three nautical miles pursuant to this section shall not result in any extension of the fisheries zone established pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to establish contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States", approved October 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 908).

SEC. 2. If the President of the United States determines that any portion of the territorial sea as extended by this joint resolution conflicts with the territorial sea of another country he may make such modifications in the seaward boundary of such portion as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. It is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States consider taking appropriate initiative through his representative at the United Nations, or through other means, to convene an international conference for the purpose of establishing a universally recognized seaward boundary for the territorial seas of all coastal countries.

The statements, presented by Mr. GRIFFIN, are as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 31, 1968]

THE "PUEBLO" AND THE 3-MILE LIMIT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in the wake of the *Pueblo* incident, a serious question arises as to the wisdom of maintaining only a 3-mile jurisdictional limit off our shores—while most Communist nations insist upon 12 miles.

It is about time we changed our policy and insisted upon reciprocity. It makes no sense to allow Communist ships within 3 miles of our shores while we carefully observe the 12-mile limit claimed by Communist-bloc countries.

The *Pueblo* affair only underscores the fact that for a long time we have been handing the Communists a significant espionage advantage.

Mr. President, I propose that the United States lay down a new policy with respect to our territorial waters, based on the principal of mutuality. We should notify nations such as Russia and North Korea that, so long as they claim a 12-mile limit, we shall insist that their ships stay at least 12 miles from our shoreline.

At the same time, our traditional 3-mile limit should continue to apply to those countries which reciprocate by recognizing a 3-mile limit as to their own territorial waters.

Mr. President, I am currently preparing legislation which would give effect to such a change in U.S. policy.

It is true, Mr. President, that our Nation has observed the 3-mile limit since the days of President Jefferson. The United States has long stood in the forefront of those promoting the ideal of freedom of navigation and freedom of the seas. Throughout history, the 3-mile limit has been the most generous accommodation to the interests of other maritime powers.

But there is no justification for blind adherence on our part to a rigid policy which no longer serves our national interests.

The fact is that our 3-mile limit has become an open invitation to espionage—a giveaway intelligence advantage for our adversaries.

There are those who will argue that the 3-mile limit is a sacrosanct. But in fact, this policy is not a declared or customary rule of international law.

In his text, "International Law," Prof. D. P. O'Connell writes, as follows:

"The most that can be said is that the three-mile limit is not a rule of customary international law at the present time for the adequate reason that not sufficient maritime states adhere to it. Indeed, it is doubtful if it ever was one."

In 1958 and 1960, international conventions at Geneva were unable to agree on a uinform, universal norm as to the extent of the territorial sea. They did succeed, however, in establishing that a country's exclusive jurisdiction should not extend beyond 12 miles.

In surveying a compilation of practice throughout the world, it becomes quite clear why the 3-mile limit lacks the character of law. Only 29 out of 98 nations with a coastline are now observing the 3-mile territorial limit. The rest all insist upon wider territorial waters, with the largest number of countries claiming 12 miles.

Mr. President, I have in hand a country-by-country survey on this question, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the intelligence advantage enjoyed by the Russians becomes evident when we examine the nature and activities of the Soviet spy fleet, which is composed of more than 30 trawler-type vessels.

Russian ships now work so close to our shoreline that they nearly scrape bottom.

Their crews can augment intelligence data gathered electronically with visual and photographic evidence.

Mr. President, I am talking about Soviet AGI activity. Translated, AGI means "naval auxiliary, intelligence collector."

The Soviet AGI is a trawler-type ship especially configured for intelligence collection—primarily electronic intelligence. This is not a fishing vessel or an oceanographic survey ship, although fishing sometimes is used as a convenient cover.

The collection of intelligence is the sole mission of these ships. They have sophis-

XUM

ticated, extensively electronic equipment—and they are readily recognizable.

At least since August 1956, the Soviets have utilized AGI's in intelligence collection operations against U.S. naval bases, individual ships, and carrier task groups. They have continually expanded these operations to include any area of U.S. naval activity as well as both the east and west coasts of the United States plus world trouble spots.

AGI's are attached to each of the four Soviet fleets—North, Baltic, Black Sea, and Pacific.

Mr. President, I think it is of interest to note the characteristics of the AGI.

Their size and capabilities vary according to class. The size in gross registered tons is between 265 and 700 tons. The speed varies between 8 and 16 knots. The average length of the ships is 165 feet.

The AGI's have distinctive identification features. They are bristling with antenna installations, electronic intercept antennas, radomes, direction-finding antennas often more than one radar, and numerous communication whip and dipole antennas.

They have the capability to remain on station 30 to 60 days without replenishing. Deployments often last as long as 3 to 4 months.

Their mission is to collect intelligence on U.S. naval units and tactics, communications and radar frequencies, shore-based signals and missile launching sites, and flight patterns of early warning aircraft.

And, Mr. President, permit me to stress a point about the personnel of the AGI. Unlike our men on the *Pueblo* who wore Navy uniforms, the Soviet AGI personnel normally wear civilian clothing.

Mr. President, permit me to turn now to the specific locations of the operations of Soviet AGI trawlers. They have certain continuously manned stations and provide continuous intelligence collection operations offshore from a number of U.S. naval submarine installations throughout the world. These installations include the east coast of the United States, particularly Charleston, S.C.; Rota, Spain; the British Isles vicinity of Holy Loch, Scotland, and Guam.

The AGI manned stations also provide continuous intelligence collection operations in the South China Sea where the United States conducts carrier operations off Vietnam, and the Mediterranean Sea where the U.S. 6th Fleet is in operation.

Additionally, the AGI provides periodic coverage of the U.S. west coast and Hawaii.

Needless to say, Mr. President, these AGI trawlers report to the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics all the information they can obtain, particularly on the movements of aircraft carriers and Polaris submarines.

There also is another important aspect of AGI operations.

Soviet naval ships, and AGI's in particular, have been guilty of numerous incidents of harassment of U.S. Navy units in the open sea.

In 1 year alone, 1965, AGI's were involved in 16 harassing episodes.

Mr. President, I have the details of nine specific harassment incidents which have occurred since 1961, and I request that this material be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, what I have related here should leave no doubt as to the advantage which our 3-mile limit hands to Soviet intelligence efforts. I believe our commitment to the 3-mile limit is outmoded in an age of electronic wizardry—especially when the nations which penetrate our shores for undercover work apply different ground rules to our vessels.

It is high time to recognize, Mr. President, that we need a new policy—one which is based upon mutuality—one which is realistic and serves our national interest.

"EXHIBIT 1

"BREADTH OF TERRITORIAL SEA AND FISHING JURISDICTION CLAIMED BY MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

"The following information is based on the synoptical tables concerning the breadth and juridical status of the territoral sea and adjacent zones prepared for the 1958 and 1960 Geneva Law of the Sea Conferences, and additional information available to the Department of State (April 1, 1967).

"Country	Territorial sea	Fishing limits	Other
AFRICA			
Algeria	12 miles	12 miles	
Biafra (Eastern Nigeria) (June 8, 1967).	12 miles, all purposes.		
Botswana	No coast		
Burundi	do		
Cameroon	18 miles	18 miles	
Central African Republic	No coast		
Chad	do		
Congo (Brazzaville)	Not available		
Congo (Kinshasa)	do		
Dahomey	3 miles	12 miles	May also apply to territorial sea.
Ethiopia	12 miles	do	
Gabon	do	do	
Ghana	do	do	Undefined protective areas may be proclaimed seaward of territorial sea, and up to 100 miles seaward of territorial sea may be proclaimed fishing conservation zone.
Guinea	130 miles	130 miles	
Ivory Coast	6 miles	12 miles	
Kenya	3 miles	3 miles	
Lesotho	No coast		
Liberia	12 miles	12 miles	
Libya	do	do	
Malagasy Republic	do	do	
Malawi	No coast		
Mali	do		
Mauritania	12 miles	12 miles	
Morocco	3 miles	do	Exception 6 miles for Strait of Gibraltar.
Niger	No coast		
Nigeria	12 miles	12 miles	
Rwanda	No coast		
Senegal	6 miles	6 miles	Plus 6 miles contiguous zone.
Sierra Leone	12 miles	12 miles	
Somali Republic	do	do	
South Africa	6 miles	do	
Sudan	12 miles	do	
Tanzania	do	do	
The Gambia	3 miles	3 miles	
Togo	12 miles	12 miles	
Tunisia	6 miles	do	Territorial sea follows the 50-meter isobath for part of the coast (maximum 65 miles).
Uganda	No coast		
United Arab Republic	12 miles	12 miles	
Upper Volta	No coast		
Zambia	do		
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC			
Australia	3 miles	Decision announced for 12 miles fishery limits.	
Burma	12 miles	12 miles	
Cambodia	5 miles	do	Continental Shelf to 50 meters, 9 including sovereignty over superjacent waters.
China	3 miles	3 miles	
Indonesia	12 miles	12 miles	Archipelago concept baselines.
Japan	3 miles	3 miles	
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC—Continued			
Korea	Not available	20 to 200 miles	Continental Shelf, including sovereignty over superjacent waters.
North Korea	12 miles		
Laos	No coast		
Malaysia	3 miles	3 miles	
Mongolia	No coast		
New Zealand	3 miles	12 miles	
Philippines			Waters within straight lines joining appropriate points of outermost islands of the archipelago are considered internal waters; waters between these baselines and the limits described in the Treaty of Paris, Dec. 10, 1898, the United States-Spain Treaty of Nov. 7, 1900, and United States-United Kingdom Treaty of Jan. 2, 1930, are considered to be the territorial sea.
Singapore	Not available		
Thailand	12 miles	12 miles	
Vietnam	Not available	20 kilometers (10.8 miles).	
EUROPE			
Albania	10 miles	12 miles	
Austria	No coast		
Belgium	3 miles	12 miles [1]	
Bulgaria	12 miles	do	
Byelorussia S.S.R	No coast		
Czechoslovakia	do		
Denmark	3 miles	12 miles [1]	
Greenland		do	
Faroe Islands		do	
Federal Republic of Germany.	3 miles	(2)	
Finland	4 miles	4 miles	
France	3 miles	12 miles [1]	
Greece	6 miles	6 miles	
Holy See	No coast		
Hungary	do		
Iceland	Not available	12 miles	
Ireland	3 miles	do [1]	
Italy	6 miles	do [1]	
Luxembourg	No coast	(2)	
Malta	3 miles	3 miles	
Monaco	Not available		
Netherlands	3 miles	(2)	
Norway	4 miles	12 miles	
Poland	3 miles	3 miles	
Portugal	No claims	12 miles [1]	
Rumania	12 miles	do	
Spain	6 miles	do [1]	
Sweden	4 miles	do [1]	
Switzerland	No coast		
Ukrainian S.S.R	12 miles	12 miles	
U.S.S.R	do	do	
United Kingdom	3 miles	do [1]	
Oversea areas	do	3 miles	
Yugoslavia	10 miles	10 miles	

Footnotes at end of table.

"Country	Territorial sea	Fishing limits	Other
NORTH AMERICA			
Canada	3 miles	12 miles	
United States	do	do	
SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN			
Argentina (Dec. 29, 1966)	200 miles	200 miles	Continental Shelf, including sovereignty over superjacent waters.
Barbados	Not available		
Bolivia	No coast		
Brazil	6 miles	12 miles	
Chile	50 kilometers	200 miles	
Colombia	6 miles	12 miles	
Costa Rica	3 miles		"Specialized competence" over living resources to 200 miles.
Cuba	do	3 miles	
Dominican Republic	do	15 miles	
Ecuador	200 miles	200 miles	
El Salvador	do	do	
Guatemala	12 miles	12 miles	
Guyana	Not available		
Haiti	6 miles	6 miles	
Honduras	12 miles	12 miles	
Jamaica	3 miles. Decision announced for 12 miles territorial sea.		
Mexico	9 miles	12 miles	
Nicaragua	3 miles	200 miles	Continental Shelf, including sovereignty over superjacent waters.
SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN—Continued			
Panama	200 miles	do	Continental Shelf, including sovereignty over superjacent waters.
Paraguay	No coast		
Peru	200 miles	200 miles	
Trinidad and Tobago	3 miles	3 miles	
Uruguay	6 miles	12 miles	
Venezuela	12 miles	do	
SOUTH ASIA AND NEAR EAST			
Afghanistan	No coast		
Ceylon	6 miles	6 miles	Claims right to establish conservation zones within 100 nautical miles of the territorial sea.
Cyprus	12 miles	12 miles	
India	6 miles	100 miles	
Iran	12 miles	12 miles	
Iraq	do	do	
Israel	6 miles	6 miles	
Jordan	3 miles	3 miles	
Kuwait	12 miles	12 miles	
Lebanon	Not available	6 miles	
Maldive Islands	do	do	
Nepal	No coast		
Pakistan	12 miles	12 miles	Plus right to establish 100-mile conservation zones
Saudi Arabia	do	do	
Syria	do	do	Plus 6 miles "necessary supervision zone."
Turkey	6 miles	do	
Yemen	12 miles	do	

---

[1] Parties to the European Fisheries Convention which provides for the right to establish 3 miles exclusive fishing zone seaward of 3-mile territorial sea plus additional 6-mile fishing zone restricted to the convention nations.

[2] Signatories of the European Fisheries Convention.

"EXHIBIT 2

"SOVIET AGI HARASSMENTS

"1. Vega incident—AGI Vega nearly collided with a U.S. destroyer off of Long Island when the Soviet vessel attempted to recover a Polaris exercise missile which had been fired by the FBM submarine *George Washington*.

"2. Fall of 1961. AGI's monitored the North American Air Defense Command's Skyshield II exercises.

"3. 7 February 1965—AGI *Vertikal* approached the USNS survey ship *Dutton* from astern while the *Dutton* was engaged in oceanographic survey. *Vertikal* came within 75 feet and purposely severed *Dutton's* magnetometer cable.

"4. 20 May 1965—AGI *Reduktor* turned toward and closed the FBM submarine USS *Andrew Jackson* when she was returning to port. *Reduktor* passed down *Jackson's* starboard side at 150 yards then fell in astern and followed at 500 yards for 5 minutes. She then increased speed and passed up *Jackson's* port side.

"5. December 1965—AGI *Gidrofon* was involved in six separate harassing incidents against U.S. naval units operating off Vietnam in the South China Sea. Harassing tactics were employed against carriers involved in flight operations, units alongside and replenishing underway, and ships involved in submarine exercises. These gross actions resulted in a stiff note of protest to the Soviet Government from the U.S. Government.

"6. In February 1966 the AGI *Repiter* monitored the U.S. amphibious exercises held at Vieques Island.

"7. In April 1966 the AGI *Ekholot* took station on the carrier *Independence* while it was conducting flight operations and was able to observe and monitor a complete aircraft launch and recovery sequence. Two months later, in June, the *Ekholot* trailed and monitored the amphibious task group participating in Exercise Beach Time while enroute to the Vieques exercise area. The *Ekholot* even managed to pass through the entire formation.

"8. 24 June 1966—Soviet AGI *Anemometr* forced a collision with USS *Banner* (AGER) while harassing *Banner* in the Sea of Japan.

"9. 18 December 1967—Soviet AGI *Gidrofon* caused a collision with USS *Abnaki* which was shielding a US aircraft carrier from *Gidrofon's* attempts to cut across the carrier's bow. This took place in the Gulf of Tonkin.

"Such activities are highly dangerous to both ships and personnel; they evidence poor seamanship and a flagrant disregard for the International Provisions for Prevention of Collision at Sea (Rules of the Road). United States naval ships have been directed to adhere to these rules and strictly comply with them in any encounter with Soviet AGIs. The rights and privileges of the AGIs have been scrupulously observed."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 5, 1968]

A NEW POLICY FOR U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of cosponsors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to revise the policy of the United States with respect to our territorial limits. Many Senators have indicated that they wish to join me in sponsoring the resolution. At this point, they are: Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, CASE, CARLSON, COTTON, DODD, DOMINICK, EASTLAND, FONG, HANSEN, HRUSKA, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MANSFIELD, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MILLER, MUNDT, MURPHY, NELSON, PERCY, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, SPONG, THURMOND, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. President, since the days of President Thomas Jefferson, we have traditionally recognized a 3-mile territorial limit off our shores. As a leading advocate of freedom of the seas, the United States has gone to great lengths to try to promote among all the nations of the world recognition of the 3-mile limit.

Of course, the United States and other nations often apply different standards with respect to customs authority, fishing rights and natural resources. But, as I said on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, a serious question arises in the wake of the *Pueblo* incident—a question as to the wisdom of maintaining our traditional 3-mile limit with respect to all nations of the world while most of the Communist nations claim—and we dutifully observe—a 12-mile limit as to their shores.

In my view, it makes no sense to allow the ships of Communist nations to come to within 3 miles of our shores, while they, the Communist nations, insist that we stay 12 miles from their shores.

I believe it is about time that we changed our policy and brought more realism into this basic area of international relations. The joint resolution offered today is one step in that direction.

In essence, the joint resolution provides that our traditional 3-mile limit will be continued but only as to those nations which reciprocate by also observing a 3-mile limit with respect to their shores; and nations which claim a wider territorial limit as to their shores will henceforth be expected to observe a corresponding territorial limit with respect to our shores, up to 12 miles.

It should be noted that the resolution does not purport to change the policy on territorial limits of any nation other than the United States. Of course, there would be no way that we could do so by such a resolution. But our insistence upon some reciprocity may well encourage the adoption of fair and mutual standards.

In matters of this kind, I believe we have the right to expect reciprocity. As the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), said in endorsing the purpose of the joint resolution last week:

"We ought to operate on a tit-for-tat basis."

If we follow the advice of the Senator from Montana in this respect, I am convinced that we would command much more respect around the world.

Throughout our history, the United States has observed the 3-mile limit. But that is no justification for blind, rigid, adherence to a policy which falls short of serving our national interest.

Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate last Wednesday, I undertook to point out the significant intelligence advantage which is handed to the Communist bloc by our present policy.

In a nationwide television appearance yesterday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk remarked that the Soviet Union now has some

18 intelligence ships scattered around the world, some of them operating close to our own coasts.

Based on information which has come to my attention, I would venture to observe that the Secretary of State was being extremely conservative, because I understand that the number of Soviet ships performing an espionage function is probably closer to 30.

Mr. President, I wish to focus attention upon section 3 of the resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that the President consider taking appropriate steps, through the United Nations or other means, to convene an international conference for still another try to establish a uniform seaward limit to be recognized by all nations of the world. As in the past, I believe we should continue to seek agreement among the nations of the world upon an uniformly recognized territorial limit.

In 1958 and 1960, such international conferences were held in Geneva, but they failed to reach agreement, although there was an understanding that no nation should claim a territorial limit in excess of 12 miles.

The joint resolution offered today is consistent with the customary principles of international law. I believe that the joint resolution, if passed, will encourage further international negotiation looking toward agreement on this fundamental issue.

I wish to emphasize that the joint resolution is in no way offered as a substitute for the commendable efforts underway to obtain release of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew. In light of these efforts and other considerations, the appropriate committees and the leadership would have to judge as to when such a joint resolution might properly be considered and brought to a vote in the Senate.

The resolution may not be perfect in every respect but I believe it should, at the very least, serve to focus attention upon the need to reshape our policy. In addition, I confidently believe that the resolution will serve to strengthen the President's hand at this critical hour.

I am glad to say that I have already received assurances from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], that this committee will give the proposed legislation sympathetic consideration.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am happy to join as a cosponsor in this resolution to establish a principle of mutuality concerning our territorial waters and the territorial waters of other nations.

It seems only fair and logical that we should require other nations to respect our shores to the same degree that they require us to respect theirs. The most obvious result of the institution of this territorial limitation by the United States would be to require that Russia keep its ships at least 12 miles from our shores, since that is the limit which Russia requires us to maintain.

While the 3-mile limit has been traditional with our Nation and has been maintained since the early 19th century, it is a fact worth noting that only 29 out of 98 nations with a coastline are now observing the 3-mile territorial limit. The remainder have wider limitations, and most of these are 12 miles.

While passage of this resolution would have no effect on the incident involving the *Pueblo*, it would serve to afford additional future protection for our country and hopefully would lead to eventual establishment of a worldwide agreement on the question of territorial waters.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] for his leadership in this area.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 3, 1968]

A NEW POLICY FOR U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, more than 2 months have elapsed since the *Pueblo* and its crew were seized off the shore of North Korea.

More than 3 years have passed since the *Maddox* and the *Turney Joy* were attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin.

As recently as March 20, 1968, an American-owned tuna boat, the *Taramount*, was seized while navigating 46 miles off the coast of Ecuador.

In each of those cases the issue arose as to whether U.S. vessels had operated in international waters or had penetrated the territorial waters of another nation.

Each of those situations also suggests a fundamental question as to whether the existing policy of the United States regarding our territorial sea makes sense in this last third of the 20th century.

Earlier this year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 136, which has been cosponsored by 31 Senators and 85 Representatives.

The amendment I offer now to the pending bill, S. 2269, would accomplish the objectives set forth in my earlier resolution. In brief, it provides that our traditional 3-mile limit will continue in effect as to those nations which claim a 3-mile limit with respect to their shores.

However, foreign countries which claim and require us to respect a wider jurisdiction with respect to their shores, will henceforth be required to recognize a corresponding territorial limit with respect to our coastline, but not to exceed 12 miles.

The amendment would also express the sense of Congress that the President consider taking necessary steps to convene a new international conference with a view toward establishing a universally recognized seaward boundary.

Mr. President, I believe that the time has come for the United States to adopt a more realistic policy with respect to our territorial sea—a policy based on the principle of mutuality.

It makes no sense to adhere rigidly to a self-imposed limitation which no longer serves our national interests—which no longer accords with international practice.

Of course, it goes without saying that this amendment will not secure the release of the *Pueblo* and its crew. It will not turn back the clock on the Gulf of Tonkin affair. And it will not necessarily remove all risks to which U.S. naval and commercial ships are being subjected.

However, this measure will make certain that potential enemies shall not enjoy special privileges which are denied by them to our own fleet.

A 1966 survey, updated by the Department of State, indicates that a majority of coastal nations now claim a territorial sea of more than 3 miles.

And yet, Mr. President, the State Department seems to suggest that the 3-mile limit represents international law. If it does represent international law—which it does not—why do we require our ships to remain at least 12 miles off the coastline of such countries as North Korea?

In defense of our 3-mile limit, State Department officials usually contend that any further extension of jurisdiction on our part would threaten freedom of the seas.

But they overlook the fact that while the United States has been holding the line on the 3-mile limit, most of the maritime nations of the world have long since abandoned this as a standard—and insist upon a wider territorial claim.

To pretend that our stubborn, rigid, adherence to the 3-mile limit is preventing a proliferation of seaward claims on the part of other countries is not keeping with the facts of history. Moreover, the definite trend is toward a 12-mile limit.

The strategy of clinging to the 3-mile limit has failed, both with respect to preserving freedom of the seas and in regard to achieving commonly recognized standards.

It should be recognized that the United States already exercises certain limited rights beyond its 3-mile limit. In 1966, Congress enacted legislation establishing a 12-mile fishing zone. The Coast Guard enforces domestic immigration and customs laws beyond the 3-mile limit.

Of course, those who first formulated our 3-mile limit policy did not contemplate the modern-day intelligence-gathering technology.

Spy ships represent a new reality which cannot be ignored.

I understand that the Russians maintain over 30 spy ships, known in the trade as AGI's. They are stationed continuously in the vicinity of our Polaris submarine bases. Capable of navigating for up to 40 days without replenishing, AGI's also patrol world trouble spots and tail U.S. naval task forces.

A description of Soviet AGI activity was included in my speech to the Senate on January 31, 1968.

I understand that Soviet AGI trawlers normally operate between 3 and 5 miles from U.S. ports. Such close penetration gives the Soviet ships a decided advantage over American vessels—which are instructed to remain at least 12 miles from the shores of the Soviet Union and of most other Communist countries.

While intelligence ships are mainly engaged in electronic surveillance, the visual and photographic observation of port activity and amphibious operations is also important. Such observation, of course, is more effective as a ship goes closer and closer to shore.

Mr. President, there is no reason why the United States should continue to hand Communist nations a significant intelligence advantage. Under the present arrangement, the Communists have everything to gain and nothing to lose if we just go on adhering to our self-imposed 3-mile limit. Our unwavering commitment to the 3-mile limit only makes it possible for the Soviets to "have their cake and eat it, too."

The amendment now before the Senate would make it possible for the United States to deal with other countries on a "tit for tat" basis.

Mr. President, there is a myth which should be unmasked; it is the assumption that our 3-mile limit, when first proclaimed in the days of Thomas Jefferson, was intended as a declaration of policy, binding upon future generations.

In truth, when Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson first undertook to communicate our Government's initial views on this subject to France and Great Britain, he took pains to explain that the newly proclaimed 3-mile rule was minimal and tentative in nature.

Diplomatic manuscripts reveal that Jefferson was reluctant to commit the young Nation to the 3-mile limit; in fact, he did so provisionally only because of the outbreak of war between France and Great Britain in 1793, which threatened American neutrality.

Later on, in 1805, John Quincy Adams records in his memoirs that Jefferson, then the President, reserved the right to claim a wider territorial limit whenever new conditions might warrant it.

Interestingly, there is no law on our statute books which explicitly proclaims the breadth of our territorial sea. Rather, the present policy is based only on custom and tradition.

Mr. President, the origins of the American 3-mile limit are rooted in the political expediency and diplomatic liturgy of a previous age.

The time has come to adopt a new approach consistent with the facts and realities of a new age.

The time has come to shed old myths, and to pursue a new course. I believe that a new policy predicated upon mutuality would encourage the negotiation and acceptance of a uniform standard with respect to territorial waters.

I believe the policy indicated in my amendment would provide the impetus, the incentive which could lead to meaningful agreements, not only as to seaward boundaries but also as to the right of innocent passage through international straits, legitimate American rights, and toward the establishment of a more meaningful international law of the sea.

Mr. Fulbright. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Griffin. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. Fulbright. Mr. President, I think this proposal has a great deal of merit. It is a matter in which the Committee on Foreign Relations is deeply interested.

I recall that a number of years ago we made a very strong effort to reach agreement among all principal nations and that we came within one vote of achieving agreement on provisions with regard to the territorial seas. But we failed.

The Senator's resolution has been submitted to the department for comment. It is possible that another conference may be called which would be the proper way to solve the problem the Senator is talking about and the problem posed by the bill now before the Senate. I strongly favor an approach through an international conference. It is the regular approach. I think the Senator's proposal has much merit, although I have not had an opportunity to study it closely. I hope that he will not press unilateral action in the Senate while there are still prospects for reaching an international agreement. To be effective we have to get an agreement among the maritime nations on this subject. It is getting more and more complicated, as the Senator rightly points out.

Mr. Griffin. I appreciate very much the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Let me respond by saying that I quite agree it is most desirable for the nations of the world to reach an agreement on a universally recognized limit. However, the fact is that several conferences have been held and they have failed. In the meantime, there is, in effect, no international law.

I quite agree that the State Department has a very deep interest and concern in this matter. However, I should like to suggest that the Senate, and particularly the Committee on Foreign Relations, should also have a deep interest in this subject. I would hope that the committee would not merely await some action on the part of the State Department. I should like to suggest and urge that the Committee on Foreign Relations, should undertake to reexamine and reevaluate the existing policy of the United States, which has been in effect so long and which now is of questionable validity.

I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the committee could give the junior Senator from Michigan any assurance that the Committee on Foreign Relations will look into this policy question and examine it.

Mr. Fulbright. Yes. I will say that the committee is in the process of doing so. I have a response from the general counsel of the Department of Defense in a letter of April 2, 1968. The committee is looking into it. Both the Department of State and the Department of Defense are very interested in this problem because it involves matters of great importance. There are some 100 international waterways, more or less. One of the most critical straits recently played a part in the controversy in the Middle East, as the Senator knows.

This matter has to be straightened out. The committee is interested in finding a solution, as I have said. If the Senator has not seen the letter from the Department of Defense, he is perfectly welcome to read it. They are pushing to try to get a settlement. I can assure the Senator that the Committee on Foreign Relations will follow through and keep after the departments to try to work it out. The conference I mentioned a moment ago, which came within one vote of reaching agreement, was only about 7 or 8 years ago. In the intervening time, we have had the war in Vietnam and other things which have distracted us and made it almost impossible to make any headway in a conference of that kind.

Mr. Griffin. If the chairman of the committee and other members of his committee would carefully examine the resolution which I have introduced, and if there were hearings held on the resolution and other related proposals, I believe they would come to the same conclusion that I have; namely, that the resolution in no way interferes with the effort underway to achieve an international agreement.

In fact, it is my firm opinion that the adoption of such a resolution would encourage, stimulate, and help us to achieve such an agreement. I am hoping that the committee will do more than just communicate with the State Department, that perhaps some hearings will be held on the subject, hearings which would at least include consideration of the resolution which I have introduced.

Mr. Fulbright. I can convey to the Senator, I believe, without any reservation whatever, that we will have hearings on the resolution and we will consider what he has said. I must say that the departments do not believe that the exception here in which we seem to abandon a multilateral approach to get general agreement, but only the unilateral—in other words, it is just between us and any one country with which we are able to make an agreement—they believe would mitigate against an agreement. I have no basis on which I can prove that.

Mr. Griffin. I am aware of the position which they are taking but I believe it is subject to challenge and argument. I would hope that the committee would examine the arguments on both sides and try to help in arriving at a judgment.

Mr. Fulbright. I can assure the Senator that we will do that.

Mr. Griffin. I appreciate those assurances from the chairman.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 335) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife on parts thereof into the United States, and to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased by the bipartisan support which has been given my bill, S. 937. This bill, if enacted, would allow congressional employees to participate in the numerous programs of the Federal Employees Training Act. The Training Act has been most helpful to Federal agencies. Its seminars, courses and meetings have served to keep employees abreast of the developments in their field and to provide the cross fertilization of ideas that comes from interdisciplinary discussions.

The program has been most successful, and I believe congressional employees should participate in its benefits. Other Senators share this belief. I am delighted by their support of S. 937, and I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of this bill the following names may be added as cosponsors: The Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cooper), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Talmadge), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Bible).

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1433), the Draft Reform Act of 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1054) to increase the amount of the deduction of each personal exemption to $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1106) to establish a Commission to study workmen's compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. Muskie) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) proposing a constitutional amendment that relates to the election of the President of the United States should his election become the prerogative of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project.

XUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 73) to amend the Constitution to allow 18-year-olds to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 74) providing for the designation of the first calendar week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1520) the Newspaper Preservation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION 14—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT AMONG MAJOR DAIRY-PRODUCT-PRODUCING COUNTRIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am submitting on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution urging the President to seek an international dairy agreement to resolve the world marketing problems facing the dairy-producing nations of the world.

The time has come for the United States and the dairy countries of Western Europe and elsewhere to sit down at an international conference and seek the best way of disposing of our common dairy surpluses without driving down world prices.

Although milk production in the United States has dropped nearly 10 billion pounds since the early 1960's, milk production on a worldwide basis has increased by more than 70 billion pounds. In Western Europe alone, it has risen 30 percent in the past 10 years.

But world milk consumption has not increased as rapidly and too much of the surplus is being dumped through subsidized exports on the markets of the United States and other countries.

The international dairy community as a whole would benefit through a program that distributed surplus dairy products to underdeveloped nations outside the normal commercial markets for these commodities.

This would serve the dual purpose of providing nutritious dairy products to areas of the world where hunger and starvation are still unchecked while strengthening the world market for dairy products.

Instead of nations spending vast sums of money for export subsidies and storage costs, these funds would be redirected where they will really accomplish something positive for the entire world.

The 18th International Dairy Congress to be held in October 1970, in Sidney, Australia, might be the ideal forum for the initial world conference on this proposal.

Under this resolution, the international dairy agreement could include provisions to cover: first, strengthening and stabilizing world dairy prices by providing for the donation or other disposition of surplus dairy products to needy countries in a manner that will not adversely affect normal commercial trade; second, effective protection of domestic dairy price support programs of member countries; third, establishing a maximum rate which each member country would be permitted to pay for the purpose of subsidizing the exportation of dairy products from such country into commercial world trade; fourth, establishing minimum prices for basic dairy products below which member countries will not permit their products to be exported in commercial trade; fifth, the development and expansion of new international markets for dairy products; and sixth, the development of international sanitary standards for milk production and processing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the President should take immediate action to seek an international agreement among the major dairy product producing countries of the world in order to provide for the orderly and equitable disposal of surplus dairy products without disrupting world markets.

SEC. 2. It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that the President should, in negotiating any such international agreement referred to in the first section of this resolution, insist on including in such agreement provisions for—

1. Strengthening and stabilizing world dairy prices by providing for the donation or other disposition of surplus dairy products to needy countries in a manner that will not adversely affect normal commercial trade;
2. Effective protection of domestic dairy price support programs of member countries;
3. Establishing a maximum rate which each member country would be permitted to pay for the purpose of subsidizing the exportation of dairy products from such country into commercial world trade;
4. Establishing minimum prices for basic dairy products below which member countries will not permit their products to be exported in commercial trade;
5. The development and expansion of new international markets for dairy products; and
6. The development of international sanitary standards for milk production and processing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 167—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A SPEECH REINFORCEMENT SYSTEM FOR THE U.S. SENATE CHAMBER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91–114)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 167), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar and the report (together with illustrations) was ordered to be printed:

S. RES. 167

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol in conjunction with the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be authorized to install a speech reinforcement system and auxiliary appurtenances in the Chamber of the United States Senate subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration; and that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 168—RESOLUTION RELATING TO STUDENT INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today I am submitting for the consideration of the Senate a resolution asking for a joint study by the Finance and Labor and Public Welfare Committees to determine the most expeditious means of financing higher education.

I believe that early in the 91st Congress is the appropriate time for such a study to be conducted, because the new administration and, particularly, the incoming Commissioner of Education, will be in a position to benefit from and hopefully act upon, the recommendations of Congress.

The Nation's needs for higher education are growing at an accelerating rate. Yet, due to the increasing costs of education, institutions of higher learning are more desperately in need of assistance than ever before despite numerous existing Federal and State assistance programs. The need for a college education in this day and age of complexities is undisputed. However, inflation and rising institutional costs result in an increased cost to the student.

Because of the increased cost of education, there exists a basic inequity in the higher educational system which has been exacerbated rather than alleviated over the past decade. I refer, Mr. President, to the fact that a college degree has been, and remains, more easily attainable by a student from a high-income family regardless of his scholastic ability or achievement than by a student from a low-income family.

In 1960, 76.6 percent of the children of white collar workers who had graduated at the top of their high school classes were enrolled in college, while only 41.8 percent of the similarly talented children of other workers were enrolled. In

XUM

1968, 95 percent of the top-ability students coming from families in the highest socioeconomic quartile were able to enter college, while only 50 percent of those in the lowest socioeconomic quartile could do so. It is becoming increasingly clear that considerable talent is lost simply because numbers of youth cannot afford to attend college.

NDEA fellowships and loans, the GI bill, and equal opportunity grants have enabled millions of students—who would not ordinarily be able to do so—to finance a higher education. These programs, however, have been limited in their impact in relation to the need. Further, I am convinced that even a greater financial input into the existing structure of fellowship and loans will not be sufficient to meet the universe of need.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I am submitting this resolution. Hopefully, a joint study will facilitate a thorough consideration of the problems of financing higher education and lead to a complete restructuring of the loan and fellowship efforts as supported by the Federal Government.

I am not ready at this time, Mr. President, to make specific recommendations about all the types of new programs which should be considered. I hope to do so at a later time as the hearings and study progress. However, there is one proposal which I feel deserves special consideration. It is a suggestion which has been advocated previously by such notable academicians as Charles Killingsworth of Michigan, Kingman Brewster of Yale, and most recently by the prestigious Carnegie Commission on Higher Education chaired by Clark Kerr. I have consequently mentioned this specifically in my resolution as an idea meriting discussion and study.

I refer, Mr. President, to the proposal that the Federal Government establish a contingent loan fund for which students would be eligible. Such a fund could be administered by the individual educational institution—or a nonprofit Govment-chartered corporation. However, as I envision it, regardless of how it is administered, the contingent loan fund would have several unique characteristics.

First, any student could borrow an amount equivalent to the total cost of his 4 years in college, including both subsistence and tuition on a year-to-year basis.

Second, in contracting for this loan, the student would agree to pay back a fixed percentage of his income per a certain amount of the debt for a number of years during his productive working career. As Dr. Charles Killingsworth noted several years ago in a statement before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

> The basic idea of the contingent repayment loans is that the borrower should pledge a fraction of his future income—however large or small—in return for this type of loan. The percentage contribution rate to which the individual would commit himself might be compared to the social security tax.

Since the payment comes after the benefits are enjoyed, however, it is in reality social security in reverse.

Such a plan, the details of which could be worked out by the appropriate committee, would have several advantages. First, it would make a substantial contribution toward the goal of equalizing educational advantage. Second, after an initial outlay of funds, the program would be self-sustaining since it would be replenished continually. Third, the method of repayment through a tax mechanism would reduce the risk inherent in many loan contracts. Finally, this type of loan program would enable many college students to independently finance their education.

I do not believe that enactment of a contingent student loan program would by itself alleviate all the problems in the financing of higher education. However, I think that this program in combination with others would represent a considerable step forward.

Education is essentially an investment in human capital. I am hopeful that we will find ways to make it possible for all qualified Americans to finance a higher education. The result will be a stronger and wealthier America.

Mr. President, I submit my resolution, which I have named the Student Investment Act, calling for a study of ways to finance higher education; and I ask unanimous consent that it be jointly referred to the Committees on Finance and Labor and Public Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD, directly following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received; and, without objection, the resolution will be jointly referred to the Committees on Finance and Labor and Public Welfare and will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 168) reads as follows:

S. RES. 168

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, acting jointly, shall conduct a thorough study of the most expeditious means of financing higher education in the United States. Such study shall particularly include a thorough exploration of the following:

(1) various means by which a loan fund may be established to assist students to defray the expenses of higher education;

(2) the feasibility of repayment by students of such funds through the device of an increase in Federal income tax rates during their more productive years.

SEC. 2. (a) In making the study under this resolution, the committees shall hold such public hearings as they deem necessary.

(b) Each meeting of the committees under this resolution, whether for the purpose of holding public hearings or otherwise, shall be held alternately under the chairmanship of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or their designee.

SEC. 3. The committees shall report the results of the study under this resolution, together with their recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SENATE RESOLUTION 169—RESOLUTION TO PRINT A REPORT ENTITLED "EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY WITH REGARD TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, I submit a resolution to print a report, entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity With Regard to Federal-Aid Highway Projects," as a Senate document.

This report and its recommendations constitute a reaffirmation of our commitment to a strong, realistic, and effective equal employment opportunity effort on the part of those involved in the Federal-Aid highway program.

In essence, these suggestions urge on the Secretary of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration and the State highway departments a broad scale attack on the problems of job discrimination. These recommendations place major responsibility on the State highway departments individually and as partners in the Federal effort to develop by the earliest possible date workable and meaningful programs designed to implement this important national policy.

I discussed the recommendations and the report in a conference with the Secretary of Transportation on March 10, 1969. The Secretary, in carrying out his equal employment opportunity responsibilities, announced on Monday, March 17, the issuance of a new order relating to employment practices in Federal-aid highway construction work. As a result of some misunderstandings with respect to the intent of the changes contained in the new order, the Secretary issued an additional statement on March 18, 1969, which fully explains the Secretary's desire to make this program workable.

My discussions with the Secretary and the position taken by him as set forth in the Department of Transportation news release on March 18, 1969, have confirmed my understanding of his deep commitment to positive equal employment programs. The Secretary fully understands the importance the Subcommittee on Roads attaches to the program and has assured me that the recommendations will be carried out to their fullest. The Secretary of Transportation has already given evidence to the State highway departments that he expects actual compliance with the requirements set forth in section 22 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

Concern has been expressed on the part of some persons that a change in procedure at this time might adversely affect the attitudes of those involved in carrying out the program. It has been suggested that the Secretary's action, together with our critique of the program, might be interpreted by those who actively support civil rights efforts as well as those who oppose them as an attack on the underlying policy of equal employment opportunity. This interpretation is neither intended nor implied. The critique, to the extent that it calls prior agency efforts to task, concerns itself with designating procedural mistakes to be avoided in the future. Our avowed purpose is to strengthen the role of those employees of the Federal Highway Administration and the State highway departments who are responsible for carrying forward the program.

The report recognizes that the program under review is new and relatively untested and that its success rests on ef-

XUM

fective administration. If the recommendations contained in it are implemented, it will be possible to have as many as 2,000 compliance reviews performed at the State level and another 750 by Federal employees. Under the program which we reviewed, there could have been only the 750 Federal reviews. Under the Department of Labor regulations less than 200 compliance checks were made in the highway field during calendar year 1968. The subcommittee report states:

> In the last analysis, it is the caliber of action and not the quality of words which will have the greatest impact. The success of this program rests on the training programs which the Act requires and on the compliance reviews conducted by State Agencies and the Federal Highway Administration.

I recommend this report to all Senators and Representatives in the Congress and to all who are interested in this important matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, together with certain recommendations, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and recommendations will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 169), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 169

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate Document the report by the Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity with Regard to Federal-Aid Highway Projects", relating to the implementation of Section 22, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The recommendations, presented by Mr. RANDOLPH, are as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the State highway departments as the supervising government agencies, have a leadership responsibility in carrying out positive equal employment opportunity programs; therefore, the employment practices of these agencies themselves should reflect the highest level of performance. Minorities should be employed in all categories and grade levels of agency activity for which they are qualified. In the event that few qualified applicants are available, these agencies must undertake training programs which will enable unemployed and underemployed people to participate in the overall program. The hiring of minorities in the administration of equal employment opportunity work alone is not sufficient.

2. In keeping with the partnership concept of the Federal-aid highway program, each State must develop a comprehensive program as required by P.L. 90–495 designed to secure effective equal employment opportunity activities by contractors bidding on Federal-aid highway work within the State. Such State programs shall be developed with the active participation of the Federal Highway Administration, contractors or organizations representing contractors, labor unions, and persons or organizations who are experienced in methods of expanding employment opportunity. Other State agencies which have expertise, knowledge, or experience in this area, should also be brought into the discussions so that they may contribute to achieving workable and realistic programs. In keeping with normal Federal-aid procedures, it will be incumbent upon the Federal Highway Administration to develop sufficiently definitive criteria to assist the States in meeting their responsibilities. In this regard, the general criteria established by interim order 7–2 would serve well as a start.

3. In order to demonstrate the importance attached to equal employment opportunity efforts and to facilitate their proper administration at the national level, the officer charged with carrying forward these responsibilities must be a direct assistant of the Federal Highway Administrator. He should also have experience to qualify him for his duties and his office should be so staffed that technical assistance can be rendered to the States. It will be necessary, in view of the limited numbers of people now in the field, to establish a training program for Federal employees, and this training program should be made available to States which wish to take advantage of the training being offered. A trained equal employment opportunity officer should be assigned to each division office so that daily contact may be maintained with counterpart officials in the State highway department. Such field people, together with regional Federal Highway Administration office employees charged with similar responsibilities, should participate in compliance reviews conducted by State highway departments and from time to time, as is normal with regard to other aspects of the highway program, conduct such reviews directly for the Federal Highway Administration.

4. A State should be enabled, if it desires, to require contractors to subscribe to a particular program as a means of prequalifying, if that is the procedure which the State wishes to adopt. Or a State may include in the advertised bids, specifications regarding equal employment actions which will be required on projects for which bids are being taken. A great deal of work is devoted in planning each highway segment and preparing the bid specifications for each job. The subcommittee believes that this process offers full opportunity to develop an equal employment opportunity program to be set forth in the bid specifications, including analysis of the local labor force, training needs, schools, and other sources of employees to be contacted, which media should be used, and other appropriate requirements.

5. The State's overall equal employment opportunity program should provide for adequate staffing and financing so that frequent compliance reviews can be made. Federal employees should periodically take part in such reviews in order to judge the effectiveness of the State procedures and the degree of contractor performance. Violations noted by Federal employees should be forwarded to the State highway department for action; and where violations are found, the State's enforcement effort must be sufficiently strict to insure their immediate correction.

6. While a number of witnesses requested that interim order 7–2 be stayed pending corrective action, the issuance on January 28, 1969, of sample affirmative action programs pursuant to a request by the committee chairman, clarified many questions.

As of February 17, 1969, 5,496 prequalification statements had been received by the States. Of these, 4,600 had been acted on by the States and 3,903 had received the approval of the division offices of the Bureau of Public Roads.

At the time of the hearings, 4,352 prequalification statements had been submitted by contractors. Of that total, 3,318 had been acted on by the States and 2,419 had been approved by divisions offices. The improvement of the review system and the increased contractor participation has corrected some of the shortcomings of the original procedures.

The subcommittee, therefore, urges that the program be carried forward vigorously and that administrative changes to conform to these recommendations be made as quickly as possible.

7. The subcommittee requests that the Federal Highway Administration submit a report prior to July 1, 1969, and annually thereafter, on the status of the equal employment opportunity program, its effectiveness, and progress made by the States and the Administration in carrying out section 22 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

Following receipt of the first of these reports, the Subcommittee will undertake an examination of the performance of the States and industry and others in achieving compliance with the goals of the Equal Employment Opportunity Program. Based on this review, the Subcommittee may make additional recommendations and suggestions for action.

SENATE RESOLUTION 170—RESOLUTION TO PRINT A REPORT ENTITLED "REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 170); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 170

Resolved, That a report entitled "Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on March 17, 1969, be printed as a Senate document; and that two thousand six hundred additional copies of such document be printed for the use of that Committee.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being none, the Senator may proceed.

OVER 2,000 RETIRED HIGH RANKING MILITARY OFFICERS NOW EMPLOYED BY 100 LARGEST MILITARY CONTRACTORS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I asked the Department of Defense for a list of certain high ranking retired military officers employed by the 100 companies who had the largest volume of military prime contracts. I did this in connection with the hearings of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee.

In fiscal year 1968 these 100 companies held 67.4 percent of the $38.8 billion of prime military contracts, or $26.2 billion.

The Defense Department has now supplied to me the list of high ranking military officers who work for these 100 companies. They include the subsidiaries. In one case, that of the 35th ranking contractor, four firms were involved in a joint venture.

I asked only for the names of those retired military officers of the rank of Army, Air Force, Marine Corps colonel or Navy captain and above. Excluded are all officers below those ranks. I asked for only retired Regular officers and not Reserve officers, although in a very few cases the Reserve officers may be included.

TOP 100 COMPANIES EMPLOY OVER 2,000 RETIRED OFFICERS

The facts are that as of February, 1969, some 2,072 retired military officers of the rank of colonel or Navy captain and above were employed by the 100 contractors who reported. This is an average of almost 22 per firm. I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD as exhibit A of my statement a list of the 100 companies, ranked according to the dollar volume of their prime military contracts, and the number of high ranking retired officers they employ.

TEN COMPANIES EMPLOY OVER 1,000

The 10 companies with the largest number on their payrolls employed 1,065 retired officers. This is an average of 106 per firm. These 10 companies employed over half the total number of high ranking former officers employed by all the top 100 defense contractors. These companies, listed according to the number of retired officers employed by them, are given in table 1, as follows:

TABLE 1.—TEN MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTORS EMPLOYING LARGEST NUMBER OF HIGH RANKING RETIRED MILITARY OFFICERS, AND VALUE OF THEIR FISCAL YEAR 1968 CONTRACTS

Company and rank by number of high-ranking retired officers employed	Number employed, Feb. 1, 1969	Net dollar value of defense contracts, fiscal year 1968
1. Lockheed Aircraft Corp	210	$1,870,000,000
2. Boeing Co	169	762,000,000
3. McDonnell Douglas Corp	141	1,101,000,000
4. General Dynamics	113	2,239,000,000
5. North American Rockwell Corp	104	669,000,000
6. General Electric Co	89	1,489,000,000
7. Ling Temco Vought, Inc	69	758,000,000
8. Westinghouse Electric Corp	59	251,000,000
9. TRW, Inc	56	127,000,000
10. Hughes Aircraft Co	55	286,000,000
	1,065	9,552,000,000

KEY ABM CONTRACTORS EMPLOY 22 PERCENT OF TOTAL

Among the major defense contractors involved in producing the key components of the anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—nine of them employ 465 retired officers. This is an average of 51 each.

In 1968 they held contracts valued at $5.78 billion and, of course, will receive many billions more if the ABM system is deployed. These companies and the number of retired officers they employ are given in table 2, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Major prime contractors involved in ABM system and number of high ranking retired military officers employed by them*

1. McDonnell Douglas	141
2. General Electric	89
3. Hughes Aircraft	55
4. Martin Marietta	40
5. Raytheon	37
6. Sperry Rand	36
7. RCA	35
8. AVCO	23
9. A.T. & T	9
Total	465

COMPARISON OF 1969 WITH 1959

Mr. President, almost 10 years ago in connection with hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on the extension of the Renegotiation Act, former Senator Paul H. Douglas asked for and received a similar list from the Pentagon. We can, therefore, make comparisons over a decade as to what has happened with respect to the employment of high ranking retired military officers by the top 100 defense contractors.

In 1959, the total number employed was only 721—88 of 100 companies reporting—or an average of slightly more than eight per company.

In 1969 the 100 largest defense contractors—95 of the 100 companies reporting—employed 2,072 former high military officers, or an average of almost 22 per company.

In 1959 the 10 companies with the highest number of former officers employed 372 of them.

In 1969 the top 10 had 1,065, or about three times as many.

Some 43 companies which reported were on both the 1959 and 1969 list of the top 100 largest contractors. There were several more who were on the list in both years but failed to report in one or the other year. But we can compare the 43 companies. These 43 companies employed 588 high ranking former officers in 1959. In 1969 these same companies employed 1,642 retired high ranking retired officers.

In each case where a comparison can be made; namely, in the total number of former high ranking officers employed by the top 100 contractors, the top 10 contractors employing the largest number, and the number employed by firms reporting in both 1959 and 1969, the number employed has tripled. It has increased threefold.

Roughly three times the number of retired high ranking military officers are employed by the top 100 companies in 1969 as compared with 1959.

SIGNIFICANCE

What is the significance of this situation? What does it mean and what are some of its implications?

First of all, it bears out the statement I made on March 10 when I spoke on the "blank check for the military, that the warning by former President Eisenhower against the danger of "unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex," is not just some future danger.

That danger is here. Whether sought or unsought there is today unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex which results in excessive costs, burgeoning military budgets, and scandalous performances. The danger has long since materialized. The 2,072 retired high-ranking officers employed by the top 100 military contractors is one major facet of this influence.

NO CONSPIRACY OR WRONGDOING

Second, I do not claim nor even suggest that any conspiracy exists between the military and the 100 largest defense contractors. I do not believe in the conspiracy theory of history. I charge no general wrongdoing on the part of either group.

In the past many of the officers have performed valiant and even heroic service on behalf of the United States. The country is indeed grateful to them for their past service and for their patriotic endeavors.

We should eschew even the slightest suggestion of any conspiracy between the Pentagon, on the one hand, and the companies who hire former employees, on the other. There is not a scintilla of evidence that it exists.

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST

But what can be said, and should properly be said, is that there is a continuing community of interest between the military, on the one hand, and these industries on the other.

What we have here is almost a classic example of how the military-industrial complex works.

It is not a question of wrongdoing. It is a question of what can be called the "old boy network" or the "old school tie."

This is a most dangerous and shocking situation. It indicates the increasing influence of the big contractors with the military and the military with the big contractors. It shows an intensification of the problem and the growing community of interest which exists between the two. It makes it imperative that new weapon systems receive the most critical review and that defense contracts be examined in microscopic detail.

I am alarmed about this trend not because I question the integrity or the good will of the retired officers who have found employment with military contractors but because I believe that the trend itself represents a distinct threat to the public interest.

DANGERS WHEN COUPLED WITH NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Third, this matter is particularly dangerous in a situation where only 11.5 percent of military contracts are awarded on a formally advertised competitive bid basis. It lends itself to major abuse when almost 90 percent of all military contracts are negotiated, and where a very high proportion of them are negotiated with only one, or one or two, contractors.

Former high-ranking military officers have an entree to the Pentagon that others do not have. I am not charging that is necessarily wrong. I am saying that it is true.

Former high-ranking officers have personal friendships with those still at the Pentagon which most people do not have. Again, I charge no specific wrongdoing. But it is a fact.

In some cases former officers may even negotiate contracts with their former fellow officers. Or they may be involved in developing plans and specifications, making proposals, drawing up blueprints, or taking part in the planning process

XUM

or proposing prospective weapon systems. And they may be doing this in cooperation with their former fellow officers with whom they served with and by whom, in some cases, even promoted.

With such a high proportion of negotiated contracts there is a great danger of abuse.

In addition, there is the subtle or unconscious temptation to the officer still on active duty. After all, he can see that over 2,000 of his fellow officers work for the big companies. How hard a bargain does he drive with them when he is 1 or 2 years away from retirement?

This danger does not come from corruption. Except in rare circumstances this is no more prevalent among military officers than among those with comparable civilian responsibilities.

MUTUAL INTERESTS—UNCRITICAL VIEWS

The danger to the public interest is that these firms and the former officers they employ have a community of interest with the military itself. They hold a narrow view of public priorities based on self-interest. They have a largely uncritical view of military spending.

As a group they have what has been termed "tunnelvision." But in this case their narrow training can be fortified by self-interest. In too many cases they may see only military answers to exceedingly complex diplomatic and political problems. A military response, or the ability to make one, may seem to them to be the most appropriate answer to every international threat.

SUMMARY

When the bulk of the budget goes for military purposes; when 100 companies get 67 percent of the defense contract dollars; when cost overruns are routine and prime military weapon system contracts normally exceed their estimates by 100 to 200 percent; when these contracts are let by negotiation and not by competitive bidding; and when the top contractors have over 2,000 retired high-ranking military officers on their payrolls; there are very real questions as to how critically these matters are reviewed and how well the public interest is served.

That, Mr. President, is the point. That is why I think it important that there be public disclosure of these facts so that the American public can know more about the community of interests involved in our huge defense contract spending.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the 100 largest defense contractors and the number of highranking officers they employed in early 1969 be printed in the RECORD as exhibit A;

That a similar list of the 100 largest military contractors and the number of high-ranking former officers they employed in 1959 be printed in the RECORD as exhibit B;

That a list of the 100 largest military contractors for fiscal year 1968, and the dollar value and percent of military contracts each held, be printed as exhibit C; and

That a list of the names of the former high-ranking officers employed by the 100 largest defense contractors in February 1969 be printed as exhibit D.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

A list of the 100 largest companies ranked by 1968 value of prime military contracts and number of retired colonels or Navy captains and above employed by them, February 1969

1. General Dynamics Corp	113
2. Lockheed Aircraft Corp	210
3. General Electric Co	89
4. United Aircraft Corp	48
5. McDonnell Douglas Corp	141
6. American Telephone & Telegraph	9
7. Boeing Corp	169
8. Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc	69
9. North American Rockwell Corp	104
10. General Motors Corp	17
11. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp	31
12. AVCO Corp	23
13. Textron, Inc	28
14. Litton Industries, Inc	49
15. Raytheon Co	37
16. Sperry Rand Corp	36
17. Martin Marietta Corp	40
18. Kaiser Industries Corp	11
19. Ford Motor Co	43
20. Honeywell, Inc	26
21. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp	3
22. Northrop Corp	48
23. Ryan Aeronautical Co	25
24. Hughes Aircraft Co	55
25. Standard Oil of New Jersey	2
26. Radio Corp. of America	35
27. Westinghouse Electric Corp	59
28. General Tire & Rubber Co	32
29. Int'l Telephone & Telegraph Corp	([1])
30. IBM	35
31. Bendix Corp	25
32. Pan American World Airways	24
33. FMC Corp	6
34. Newport News Shipbuilding	6
35. Raymond/Morrison, etc.[2]	6
36. Signal Companies, Inc. (The)	9
37. Hercules, Inc	13
38. Du Pont, E. I. de Nemours & Co	3
39. Texas Instruments, Inc	7
40. Day & Zimmerman, Inc	1
41. General Telephone & Electronics Corp.	35
42. Uniroyal, Inc	6
43. Chrysler Corp	11
44. Standard Oil of California	6
45. Norris Industries	2
46. Texaco, Inc	4
47. Collins Radio Co	3
48. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	6
49. Asiatic Petroleum Corp	0
50. Sanders Associates, Inc	17
51. Mobil Oil Corp	([1])
52. TRW, Inc	56
53. Mason & Hanger Silas Mason	5
54. Massachusetts Institute of Technology	5
55. Magnavox Co	3
56. Fairchild Hiller Corp	7
57. Pacific Architects & Engineering	16
58. Thiokol Chemical Corp	3
59. Eastman Kodak Co	15
60. United States Steel Corp	([1])
61. American Machine & Foundry	7
62. Chamberlain Corp	3
63. General Precision Equipment	23
64. Lear Siegler Inc	4
65. Harvey Aluminum, Inc	4
66. National Presto Industrial Inc	0
67. Teledyne, Inc	8
68. City Investing Co	4
69. Colt Industries, Inc	4
70. Western Union Telegraph Co	5
71. American Manufacturing Co. of Texas	0
72. Curtiss Wright Corp	1
73. White Motor Co	([1])
74. Aerospace Corp	6
75. Cessna Aircraft Co	0
76. Emerson Electric Co	3
77. Seatrain Lines, Inc	4
78. Gulf Oil Corp	1
79. Condec Corp	1
80. Motorola, Inc	3
81. Continental Air Lines, Inc	4
82. Federal Cartridge Corp	1
83. Hughes Tool Co	13
84. Vitro Corp. of America	25
85. Johns Hopkins Univ	([1])
86. Control Data Corp	14
87. Lykes Corp	0
88. McLean Industries, Inc	2
89. Aerodex, Inc	5
90. Susquehanna Corp	7
91. Sverdrup & Parcel Assoc., Inc	9
92. States Marine Lines Inc	0
93. Hazeltine Corp	7
94. Atlas Chemical Indus., Inc	0
95. Vinnell Corp	0
96. Harris-Intertype Corp	4
97. World Airways, Inc	4
98. International Harvester Co	6
99. Automatic Sprinkler Corp	3
100. Smith Investment Co	0
Total	2,072

[1] Not yet reported.

[2] Raymond Int'l. Inc.; Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc.; Brown & Root, Inc.; and J. A. Jones Construction Co.

EXHIBIT B

The 100 largest companies ranked by 1958 value of prime military contracts and number of retired colonels or Navy captains and above employed by them, June 1959

1. American Bosch Arma Corp.: None.
2. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.: 1.
3. Asiatic Petroleum Corp.: None.
4. Avco Corp.: 4.
5. Bath Iron Works Corp.: 2.
6. Beech Aircraft: Not available.
7. Bell Aircraft Corp.: 3.
8. Bendix Aviation Corp.: 14.
9. Bethlehem Steel Co.: 8.
10. Blue Cross Association: None.
11. Boeing Airplane Co.: 30.
12. Brown-Raymond-Walsh: None.
13. California Institute of Technology: None.
14. Cessna Aircraft Co.: 1.
15. Chance Vought Aircraft Inc.: 6.
16. Chrysler Corp.: 11.
17. Cities Service Co.: 4.
18. Collins Radio Co.: 5.
19. Continental Motors Corp.: 2.
20. Continental Oil Co.: 2.
21. Curtiss-Wright Corp.: 4.
22. Defoe Shipbuilding Co.: None.
23. Douglas Aircraft Co. Inc.: 15.
24. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.: 1.
25. Eastman Kodak Co.: 12.
26. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp.: 7.
27. Fairbanks Whitney Corp.: 4.
28. Firestone Tire & Rubber Corp.: 3.
29. Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.: 6.
30. Ford Motor Co.: 5.
31. The Garrett Corp.: 2.
32. General Dynamics Corp.: 54.
33. General Electric Co.: 35.
34. General Motors: Survey being taken.
35. General Precision Equipment Corp.: Not available.
36. General Tire & Rubber Co.: 28.
37. Gilfillan Brothers Inc.: None.
38. B. F. Goodrich Co.: 1.
39. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: 2.
40. Greenland Contractors: Not available.
41. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.: 1.
42. Hayes Aircraft Corp.: 3.
43. Joshua Hendy Corp.: None.
44. Hercules Powder Co. Inc.: 1.
45. Hughes Aircraft Co.: 7.
46. International Business Machine Corp.: 3.

XUM

The 100 largest companies ranked by 1958 value of prime military contracts and number of retired colonels or Navy captains and above employed by them, June 1959—Continued

47. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.: 24.
48. The Johns Hopkins University: 16.
49. The Kaman Aircraft Corp.: 1.
50. Peter Kiewit Sons Co.: 1.
51. Lear, Inc.: 2.
52. Lockheed Aircraft Corp.: 60.
53. Marine Transport Lines, Inc.: 1.
54. Marquardt Aircraft Co.: 2.
55. The Martin Co.: 15.
56. Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Not available.
57. Mathiasen's Tanker Industries, Inc.: 1.
58. McDonnell Aircraft Corp.: 4.
59. Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co.: None.
60. Motorola, Inc.: Not available.
61. Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.: 6.
62. North American Aviation, Inc.: 27.
63. Northrop Aircraft Inc.: 16.
64. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.: 6.
65. Oman-Farnsworth-Wright: None.

The 100 largest companies ranked by 1958 value of prime military contracts and number of retired colonels or Navy captains and above employed by them, June 1959—Continued

66. Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc.: 1.
67. Pan American World Airways, Inc.: Not available.
68. Philco Corp.: 17.
69. Radio Corp. of America: 39.
70. The Rand Corp.: 14.
71. Raytheon Mfg. Co.: 17.
72. Republic Aviation Corp.: 9.
73. Richfield Oil Corp.: 4.
74. Ryan Aeronautics Co.: 9.
75. Shell Oil Corp.: None.
76. Sinclair Oil Corp.: 1.
77. Socony Mobil Oil Co.: 1.
78. Sperry Rand Corp.: 12 (Gen. Douglas MacArthur not included).
79. Standard Oil Company of California: Not available.
80. Standard Oil Company of Indiana: Not available.
81. Standard Oil of New Jersey: 1.
82. States Marine Corp.: None.
83. Sundstrand Machine Tool Co.: Not available.

The 100 largest companies ranked by 1958 value of prime military contracts and number of retired colonels or Navy captains and above employed by them, June 1959—Continued

84. Sunray Mid-Continent Oil Co.: None.
85. Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.: 6.
86. Temco Aircraft Corp.: 6.
87. Texaco, Inc.: None.
88. Thiokol Chemical Corp.: 8.
89. Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.: 6.
90. Tidewater Oil Co.: 3.
91. Tishman (Paul) Company, Inc.: None.
92. Todd Shipyards Co.: 2.
93. Union Carbide Corp.: 4.
94. Union Oil Company of California: None.
95. United States Lines Co.: None.
96. United Aircraft Corp.: 15.
97. Westinghouse Air Brake Co.: 42.
98. Westinghouse Electric Corp.: 33.
99. The White Motor Co.: None.
100. System Development Corp.: 2.

Total: 721.

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, 1959, pp. 11044–45. Statement by former Senator Paul H. Douglas.

EXHIBIT C

100 COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS

[Fiscal year 1968 (July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968)]

Rank and name	Thousands of dollars	Percent of U.S. total	Cumulative percent of U.S. total
U.S. total[1]	38, 826, 625	100. 00	100. 00
Total, 100 companies and their subsidiaries[2]	26, 171, 192	67. 41	67. 41
1. General Dynamics Corp	2, 231, 488		
Dynatronics, Inc	27		
Stromberg Carlson Corp	7, 782		
United Electric Coal Co	42		
Total	2, 239, 339	5. 77	5. 77
2. Lockheed Aircraft Corp	1, 858, 363		
Lockheed Shipbuilding Construction	11, 834		
Total	1, 870, 197	4. 82	10. 59
3. General Electric Co	1, 485, 096		
General Electric Supply Co	3, 611		
Total	1, 488, 707	3. 83	14. 42
4. United Aircraft Corp	1, 320, 991	3. 40	17. 82
5. McDonnell Douglas Corp	1, 087, 660		
Conductron Corp	5, 372		
Hycon Manufacturing Co	7, 805		
Total	1, 100, 837	2. 84	20. 66
6. American Telephone & Telegraph Co	161, 405		
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co	13, 018		
Illinois Bell Telephone Co	38		
Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Co	1, 872		
New England Telephone & Telegraph Co	549		
New Jersey Bell Telephone Co	529		
New York Telephone Co	152		
Northwestern Bell Telephone Co	235		
Ohio Bell Telephone Co	601		
Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone	160		
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co	225		
Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph	2, 178		
Southwestern Bell Telephone	1, 197		
Teletype Corp	22, 591		
Western Electric Co., Inc	571, 177		
Total	775, 927	2. 00	22. 66
7. Boeing Co	762, 141	1. 96	24. 62
8. Ling Temco Vought Inc	50, 011		
Altec Services Co	58		
Braniff Airways Inc	46, 304		
Continental Electronics Manufacturing Co	4, 238		
Jefferson Wire & Cable Corp	151		
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	695		
Kentron Hawaii, Ltd	8, 549		
L T V Electro systems	123, 592		
L T V Aerospace Corp	487, 762		
L T V Ling Altec, Inc	886		
Memcor, Inc	25, 883		
National Car Rental System	11		
8. Ling Temco Vought Inc.—Continued			
Okonite Co	1, 656		
Wilson & Co., Inc	8, 299		
Wilson Pharmaceutical & Chemical Corp	16		
Wilson Sporting Goods Co	150		
Total	758, 261	1. 95	26. 57
9. North American Rockwell Corp	668, 482		
Remmert-Werner, Inc	159		
Total	668, 641	1. 72	28. 29
10. General Motors Corp	629, 515		
Frigidaire Sales Corp	95		
Total	629, 610	1. 62	29. 91
11. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp	629, 197	1. 62	31. 53
12. Avco Corp	583, 648	1. 50	33. 03
13. Textron, Inc	18, 438		
Accessory Products Co	133		
Bell Aerospace Corp	478, 691		
Bell Aerosystems Co	100		
Bostitch, Inc	14		
Camcar Screw Manufacturing Co	80		
Fafnir Bearing Co	1, 501		
Fanner Manufacturing Co	66		
Talon, Inc	332		
Textron Electronics, Inc	993		
Townsend Co	297		
Waterbury Farrel	102		
Total	500, 747	1. 29	34. 32
14. Litton Industries, Inc	28, 752		
Aero Service Corp	822		
Allis (Louis) Co	1, 318		
Alvey Ferguson Co	130		
Clifton Precision Products Co	27		
Eureka X-Ray Tube Corp	33		
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp	277, 289		
Kimball Systems, Inc	22		
Litton Precision Products, Inc	6, 829		
Litton Systems, Inc	150, 386		
Monroe International, Inc	43		
Profexray, Inc	27		
Royal Typewriter Co., Inc	13		
Total	465, 691	1. 20	35. 52
15. Raytheon Co	431, 241		
Amana Refrigeration, Inc	18		
Machlett Laboratories, Inc	19, 350		
Micro State Electronics Corp	125		
Raytheon Education Co	926		
Seismograph Service Corp	94		
Total	451, 754	1. 16	36. 68
16. Sperry Rand Corp	447, 197	1. 15	37. 83

Footnotes at end of table.

XUM

EXHIBIT C—Continued

100 COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS—Continued

[Fiscal year 1968 (July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968)]

Rank and name	Thousands of dollars	Percent of U.S. total	Cumulative percent of U.S. total
17. Martin Marietta Corp	357,642		
Amphenol-Borg Electronics, GMBH	286		
Bunker Ramo Corp	35,526		
Total	393,454	1.01	38.84
18. Kaiser Industries Corp	97		
Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Co	5,615		
Kaiser Jeep Corp	295,803		
Kaiser Steel Corp	52,836		
National Steel & Shipbuilding Co	31,983		
Total	386,334	1.00	39.84
19. Ford Motor Co	76,771		
General Micro-Electronics, Inc	170		
Philco Ford Corp	304,403		
Total	381,344	.98	40.82
20. Honeywell, Inc	351,625		
Computer Control Co., Inc	57		
Total	351,682	.91	41.73
21. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp	329,415	.85	42.58
22. Northrop Corp	182,150		
Hallicrafters Co	33,467		
Northrop Carolina, Inc	26,183		
Page Communications Engineers, Inc	67,934		
Secda, Inc	493		
Warnecke Electron Tubes, Inc	29		
Total	310,256	.80	43.38
23. Ryan Aeronautical Co	133,751		
Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp	39,142		
Continental Motors Corp	111,891		
Wisconsin Motor Corp	8,374		
Total	293,158	.76	44.14
24. Hughes Aircraft Co	285,858		
Meva Corp	251		
Total	286,109	.74	44.88
25. Standard Oil of New Jersey	148		
American Cryogenics, Inc	251		
Enjay Chemical Co	93		
Esso A.G	1,310		
Esso International Corp	114,905		
Esso Ptrol Co., Ltd	92		
Esso Research & Engineering Co	1,164		
Esso Standard Eastern, Inc	340		
Esso Standard Italiana	2,035		
Esso Standard Oil Co., S.A	2,584		
Esso Standard S.A.F	119		
Esso Standard Thialand, Ltd	124		
Humble Oil & Refining Co	121,212		
Total	274.377	.71	45.59
26. Radio Corp. of America	254,961		
RCA Defense Electronics Corp	39		
RCA Institutes, Inc	12		
Total	255,012	.66	46.25
27. Westinghouse Electric Corp	247,664		
Thermo King Corp	1,466		
Thermo King Sales & Service	66		
Westinghouse Electric Supply Co	1,319		
Westinghouse Learning Corp	524		
Total	251,039	.65	46.90
28. General Tire & Rubber Co	11,636		
Aerojet-Delft Corp	979		
Aerojet-General Corp	210,232		
Batesville Manufacturing Co	24,182		
Fleetwood Corp	10		
Frontier Airlines, Inc	21		
General Tire International Co	996		
Total	248.056	.64	27.54
29. International Telephone & Tel Corp	135,713		
Amplex Corp	67		
Barton Instrument Corp	37		
Consolidated Electric Lamp Co	11		
Continental Baking Co	2,194		
Federal Electric Corp	65,499		
ITT Electro Physics Laboratories	2,715		
ITT Gilfillan, Inc	34,809		
ITT Technical Services, Inc	521		
Total	241,566	.62	48.16
30. International Business Machines Co	223,023		
Science Research Associates, Inc	199		
Service Bureau Corp	439		
Total	223,661	0.58	48.74
31. Bendix Corp	214,398		
Bendix Field Engineering Corp	7,426		
Bendix Westinghouse Automotive	175		
Dage Electric Co., Inc	13		
Fram Corp	1,017		
Mosaic Fabrications, Inc	195		
P & D Manufacturing Co., Inc	331		
Total	223,555	.58	49.32
32. Pan American World Airways, Inc	205,652	.53	49.85
33. FMC Corp	175,860		
Gunderson Bros. Engineering Corp	9,406		
Total	185,266	.48	50.33
34. Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co	181,248		
Nuclear Service & Construction Co., Inc	61		
Total	181,309	.47	50.80
35. Raymond Morrison Knudsen (JV)	176,000	.45	51.25
36. Signal Cos., Inc.:			
Dunham Bush, Inc	465		
Garrett Corp	114,620		
Mack Trucks, Inc	48,407		
Signal Oil & Gas Co	5,792		
Southland Oil Corp	2,287		
Total	171,571	.44	51.69
37. Hercules, Inc	170,242		
Haveg Industries, Inc	1,119		
Total	171,361	.44	52.13
38. du Pont, E. I. de Nemours & Co	30,662		
Remington Arms Co	193,907		
Total	170,569	.44	52.57
39. Texas Instruments, Inc	169,271	.44	53.01
40. Day and Zimmerman, Inc	166,240	.43	53.44
41. General Telephone & Electronics Corp	93		
Automatic Electric Co	9,682		
Automatic Electric Sales Corp	1,829		
General Telephone and Electronic Lab	273		
General Telephone Co., of Southeast	151		
Hawaiian Telephone Co	4,626		
Lenkurt Electric Co., Inc	8,650		
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc	133,706		
Total	159,010	.41	53.85
42. Uniroyal, Inc	154,163		
Uniroyal International Corp	136		
Total	154,299	.40	54.25
43. Chrysler Corp	146,586		
Factory Motor Parts Co	14		
Total	146,600	.38	54.63
44. Standard Oil Co. of Calif	71,462		
Caltex Asia, Ltd.[3]	1,853		
Caltex Oil Products Co.[3]	61,766		
Caltex Oil Thailand, Ltd.[3]	1,995		
Caltex Overseas, Ltd.[3]	379		
Caltex Philippines, Inc.[3]	436		
Chevron Asphalt Co	50		
Chevron Chemical Co	797		
Chevron Oil Co	2,153		
Chevron Oil Co. of Venezuela	1,610		
Chevron Shipping Co	1,297		
Standard Oil Co., Kentucky	2,297		
Standard Oil Co., Texas	122		
Total	146,217	.38	55.01
45. Norris Industries	139,064		
Fyr Fyter Co	202		
Total	139,266	.36	55.37
46. Texaco, Inc	45,404		
Caltex Asia, Ltd.[3]	1,853		
Caltex Oil Products Co.[3]	61,766		
Caltex Oil Thailand, Ltd.[3]	1,995		
Caltex Overseas, Ltd.[3]	379		
Caltex Philippines, Inc.[3]	436		
Jefferson Chemical Co., Inc	105		
Texaco Antilles, Ltd	88		
Texaco Export, Inc	22,561		

Footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT C—Continued

100 COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS—Continued

[Fiscal year 1968 (July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968)]

Rank and name	Thousands of dollars	Percent of U.S. total	Cumulative percent of U.S. total
46. Texaco, Inc.—Continued			
Texaco Puerto Rico, Inc	2,451		
White Fuel Co., Inc	984		
Total	138,022	0.36	55.73
47. Collins Radio Co	134,754	.35	56.08
48. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	55,358		
Goodyear Aerospace Corp	76,201		
Motor Wheel Corp	2,046		
Total	133,605	.34	56.42
49. Asiatic Petroleum Corp	132,796	.34	56.76
50. Sanders Associates, Inc	130,830		
Mithras, Inc	481		
Total	131,311	.34	57.10
51. Mobil Oil Corp	128,065	.33	57.43
52. TRW Inc	126,363		
Globe Industries, Inc	348		
International Controls Corp	672		
Ramsey Corp	14		
United-Carr, Inc	70		
Total	127,467	.33	57.76
53. Mason & Hanger Silas Mason Co	127,064	.33	58.09
54. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (N)	124,143	.32	58.41
55. Magnavox Co	123,100	.32	58.73
56. Fairchild Hiller Corp	121,165		
Burns Areo Seat Co., Inc	94		
Total	121,159	.31	59.04
57. Pacific Architects & Engineers, Inc	120,895	.31	59.35
58. Thiokol Chemical Corp	119,363	.31	59.66
59. Eastman Kodak Co	117,566		
Eastman Chemical Products Corp	51		
Eastman Kodak Stores, Inc	706		
Total	118,323	.30	59.96
60. United States Steel Corp	108,322		
Reactive Metals, Inc	161		
United States Steel International, Inc	7,679		
Total	116,162	.30	60.26
61. American Machine & Foundry Co	108,871		
Cuno Engineering Corp	1,052		
Total	109,923	.28	60.54
62. Chamberlain Corp	104,441	.27	60.81
63. General Precision Equipment Corp.:			
American Meter Controls, Inc	29		
Controls Co. of America	377		
General Precision Decca Systems	90		
General Precision Systems, Inc	86,361		
Graflex, Inc	1,571		
Industrial Timer Corp	15		
National Theatre Supply	16		
Strong Electrical Corp	3,605		
Tele-Signal Corp	9,686		
Vapor Corp	2,194		
Total	103,944	.27	61.08
64. Lear-Siegler, Inc	74,000		
American Avitron	43		
L S I Service Corp	27,526		
Transport Dynamics, Inc	685		
Verd A Ray Corp	18		
Total	102,272	.26	61.34
65. Harvey Aluminum, Inc	25,048		
Harvey Aluminum Sales	74,045		
Total	99,093	.26	61.60
66. National Presto Industries, Inc	96,886	.25	61.85
67. Teledyne, Inc	77,173		
Adcom, Inc	309		
Amelco, Inc	4,146		
Continental Device Corp	27		
Crystalonics, Inc	13		
Electro Development Co	50		
Geotechnical Corp	25		
Getz William Corp	128		
Gill Electric Manufacturing Corp	517		
Hydra Power Corp	1,017		
Irby Steel Co	59		
Isotopes, Inc	802		
Landis Machine Co	22		
Micronetics, Inc	346		
Microwave Electronics Corp	30		
67. Teledyne, Inc.—Continued			
Milliken, D. B., Co., Inc	1,024		
National Geophysical Co., Inc	92		
Ordnance Specialties, Inc	24		
Packard Bell Electronics Corp	6,504		
Penn Union Electric Corp	11		
Pines Engineering Co., Inc	158		
Rodney Metals, Inc	11		
Wah Chang Corp	26		
Total	92,514	0.24	62.09
68. City Investing Co.:			
American Electric Co	35,966		
Hayes Holding Co	49,002		
Rheem Manufacturing Co	1,857		
Wilson Shipyard, Inc	164		
Total	86,989	.22	62.31
69. Colt Industries, Inc	2,258		
Chandler Evans, Inc	10,087		
Colts, Inc	68,989		
Elox Corp	194		
Fairbanks Morse, Inc	4,582		
Pratt & Whitney, Inc	436		
Total	86,546	.22	62.53
70. Western Union Telegraph Co	79,299	.20	62.73
71. American Manufacturing Co. of Texas	76,552	.20	62.93
72. Curtiss Wright Corp	74,799		
Comet Tool & Die Co	350		
Zarkin Machine Co	275		
Total	75,424	.19	63.12
73. White Motor Co	15,976		
Hercules Engines, Inc	58,610		
Minneapolis Moline, Inc	394		
Total	74,980	.19	63.31
74. Aerospace Corp. (N)	73,541	.19	63.50
75. Cessna Aircraft Co	71,834		
Aircraft Radio Corp	1,076		
Total	72,910	.19	63.69
76. Emerson Electric Co	63,776		
Pace, Inc	68		
Rantec Corp	31		
Ridge Tool Co	26		
Supreme Products Corp	8,807		
Wiegand (Edwin L.) Co	134		
Total	72,842	.19	63.88
77. Seatrain Lines, Inc	42,039		
Commodity Chartering Corp	1,667		
Hudson Waterways Corp	22,547		
Transeastern Shipping Corp	4,348		
Total	70,601	.18	64.06
78. Gulf Oil Corp	66,934		
Goodrich Gulf Chemicals Inc	81		
Gulf Oil Trading Co	259		
Pittsburgh Midway Coal Mining Co	104		
Total	67,378	.17	64.23
79. Condec Corp	65,162		
Consolidated Controls Corp	1,587		
N J E Corp	155		
Total	66,904	.17	64.40
80. Motorola Inc	65,715		
Motorola Overseas Corp	218		
Total	65,933	.17	64.57
81. Continental Air Lines Inc	64,523	.17	64.74
82. Federal Cartridge Corp	64,519	.17	64.91
83. Hughes Tool Co	62,353	.16	65.07
84. Vitro Corp of America	59,674		
Vitro Minerals Corp	1,471		
Total	61,145	.16	65.23
85. Johns Hopkins University (N)	57,674	.15	65.38
86. Control Data Corp	50,225		
Associated Aero Science Labs, Inc	1,891		
CEIR, Inc	852		
Control Corp	142		
Electronic Accounting Card Corp	723		
Pacific Technical Analysts, Inc	1,705		

Footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT C—Continued

100 COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS—Continued

[Fiscal year 1968 (July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968)]

Rank and name	Thousands of dollars	Percent of U.S. total	Cumulative percent of U.S. total
86. Control Data Corp.—Continued			
TRG, Inc	1,264		
Total	56,802	0.15	65.53
87. Lykes Corp	55,247		
Gulf South American Steamship Co	683		
Total	55,930	.14	65.67
88. McLean Industries, Inc			
Equipment, Inc	5,902		
Gulf Puerto Rico Lines, Inc	259		
Sea-Land Service, Inc	49,751		
Total	55,912	.14	65.81
89. Aerodex, Inc	55,345	.14	65.95
90. Susquehanna Corp	2,415		
Atlantic research Corp	51,452		
Xebec Corp	886		
Total	54,753	.14	66.09
91. Sverdrup Parcel Association Inc	1,396		
Aro, Inc	53,165		
Total	54,561	.14	66.23
92. States Marine Lines, Inc	54,015	0.14	66.37
93. Hazeltine Corp	53,781	.14	66.51
94. Atlas Chemical Industries, Inc	53,574	.14	66.65
95. Vinnell Corp	51,609	.13	66.78
96. Harris-Intertype Corp	913		
Gates Radio Co	796		
PRD Electronics, Inc	20,613		
Radiation, Inc	29,156		
Total	51,478	.13	66.01
97. World Airways, Inc	51,358	.13	67.04
98. International Harvester Co	51,271	.13	57.17
99. Automatic Sprinkler Corp. of America	50,395		
Badger Fire Extinguisher Co	38		
Total	50,433	.13	67.30
100. Smith Investment Co.:			
Smith, A. O. Corp	40,323		
Smith, A. O. of Texas	9,998		
Total	50,321	.13	[4] 67.43

---

[1] Net value of new procurement actions minus cancellations, terminations, and other credit transactions. The data include debit and credit procurement actions of $10,000 or more, under military supply, service and construction contracts for work in the United States plus awards to listed companies and other U.S. companies for work overseas. Procurement actions include definitive contracts, the obligated portions of letter contracts, purchase orders, job orders, task orders, delivery orders, and any other orders against existing contracts. The data do not include that part of indefinite quantity contracts that have not been translated into specific orders on business firms, nor do they include purchase commitments or pending cancellations that have not yet become mutually binding agreements between the Government and the company.

[2] The assignment of subsidiaries to parent companies is based on stock ownership of 50 percent or more by the parent company, as indicated by data published in standard industrial reference sources. The company totals do not include contracts made by other U.S. Government agencies and financed with Department of Defense funds, or contracts awarded in foreign nations through their respective governments. The company names and corporate structures are those in effect as of June 30, 1968, and for purposes of this report company names have been retained unless specific knowledge was available that a company had been merged into the parent or absorbed as a division with loss of company identity. Only those subsidiaries are shown for which procurement actions have been reported.

[3] Stock ownership is equally divided between Standard Oil Co. of California and Texaco, Inc; half of the total of military awards is shown under each of the parent companies.

[4] Does not agree with percentage shown on 2d line at beginning of table due to rounding.

EXHIBIT D

RETIRED OFFICERS AT OR ABOVE THE RANK OF COLONEL, OR THE EQUIVALENT, WHO ARE OFFICIALS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE NAMED COMPANIES

Aerodex Inc. (5): Randolph E. Churchill, Burl B. Davenport, Harold V. Pletts, Clare Bunch, Roy Z. Peck.

Aerospace Corp. (6): Charles A. Brown; James H. Cox, Jr.; Lawrence D. Ely; Manley C. Osborne; John G. Urban; Curtis F. Vossler.

American Machine & Foundry Co. (7): Carl J. Baldick, John A. Bartol, R. Q. Brown, Leonard T. Coupland, John R. Leeds, George A. Roll, Allan W. Stephens.

American Manufacturing Co. of Texas: none.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (9): B. E. Shumate; Forrest M. Price; William C. Bishop; C. Unnevehr; R. E. Van Liew, John H. Schulte, M.D.; James H. Weiner; E. A. Kenny; W. W. Sturdy.

Asiatic Petroleum Corp.: none.

Atlas Chemical Industries Inc.: none.

Automatic Sprinkler Corp. America (3): Allen W. Glienke, Preston J. Hundley, L. T. Shuler.

AVCO Corp. (23): James R. Kerr, Lawrence B. Ocamb; Jackson Dew; Ben Legare; Beverly Warren; Elmer T. Dorsey; Arthur C. Cox; George A. Tuttle; John D. Edmunds; Loran J. Anderson; E. David Reynolds; John M. Ferris; John A. Anderson.

David W. Stonecliffe; Yale H. Wolfe; Edward J. Cleary; Edgar R. Kay; D. McAneney; John E. Heath; Evan F. Bourne, Jr.; Ted Hodgkins; Gordon Newell; T. Kirkpatrick.

Bendix Corp. (25): Emery E. Bellonby; Dr. Laurence J. Legere; Frederick Kenneth Nichols; Jack D. Koser; John M. Chapman; Donald Kirkpatrick, Jr.; Raymond H. Bass; Eugene I. Malone; Herbert K. Anderson; Winfred A. Ross; Andrew M. Sinclair; John F. Miller, Jr.

George A. Dugas; Charles F. H. Begg; John W. Wise; C. W. Stelle, M.D.; C. F. Watkins; E. E. Matchett; L. F. Mathison; Donald A. Briola; Franklyn E. Moffitt; Lucius A. Perry; William R. Poindexter; Frederick N. Russell; Richard C. Shangraw.

Boeing Co. (169): Donald C. Almy; George L. Bennett; Eugene A. Blue; Charles W. Boedeker; Robert V. Bowler; Loyd W. Brenneman; Harvey S. Browne; Thomas W. Brundage; Roy T. Bucy; Edward S. Burns.

Elbert S. Churchill; William A. Clark; Peter V. Colmar; Emmett V. Conkling; Leslie W. Cowan; John W. Crosby; Henry Cushman; John H. Dacus; Stanley A. Dallas; Frederick E. Dally.

Lorin R. Dedrickson; Francis R. Delaney; Nicholan S. Detolly; Donald B. Diehl; Leonard F. Dow; Gordon R. Egbert; Donald A. Elliott; Richard M. Fernbaugh; Earl R. Finney, Jr.; Joseph O. Fitzgerald.

Oscar F. Fowler; Gilbert F. Friederichs; Max S. George; Ritchie B. Gooch; Donald E. Good; Timothy J. Guinan; Charles H. Haase; Robert H. Hahnemann; George W. Haney; Felix M. Hardison.

Richard D. Harwood; William P. Hawley; Harold T. Henderickson; Max W. Henney; Jesse G. Henry; Joseph M. Hermanson; Theodore R. Hikel; Lauri J. Hillberg; Francis R. Hoehl; Robert Irvine.

Albert W. James; Ervin L. Keener; John G. Kneeland; Sanford Knotts; Donald F. Krick; Nathan L. Krisberg; Raymond J. Lacombe; Porter Lewis; Stanley C. Lewis.

Edwin Loberg; John N. Longfield; Henry M. Marshall; Frederick W. Maxwell, Jr.; James L. McCallum; William F. McLaren; Howard E. Michelet; John R. Middleton; Frank J. Muller; Edmund E. Novotny.

Homer R. Oldfield; John Palowez; Robert R. Perry; Daniel A. Ranney; Orville H. Rehmann; Robert H. Richard; William E. Ruark; Mills S. Savage; William Scarpino; F. D. Schwartz.

John D. Seaberg; John R. Smith; Houck Spencer; Raymond M. Staley; Clyde B. Stevens, Jr.; Robert R. Stewart; Roy A. Tate; Paul Van Leunen, Jr.; Thomas R. Waddleton; Paul E. Wallace.

Floyd Wikstrom; Sherman Wilkins; David M. Williams; Robert J. Wilson; Richard A. Zais; Heber J. Badger; Louis K. Bliss; Clingmon E. Bowman; Merle C. Brown; Gerald L. Cameron.

Thomas J. Colley; Joseph A. Coppola; Ercla De Tenley; John M. Devane, Jr.; Frank H. Drake; Robert G. Ellis; Jack Fitzgerald; Louis W. Ford; Robert F. Harris; Paul F. Helmick.

Donald E. Hillman; James L. Jacobson; Lionel F. Johnson; Albert L. Jones; George A. Kirsch; Arthur M. Lien; Tyler R. Matthew; Anthony J. Maurel; David W. McFarland; Kenneth G. Miles.

Robert W. Millar; Arthur J. Mills; James S. Muzzy; Marshall W. Nicholson; Guy E. Oneil, Jr.; Samuel P. Parsons; Jesse C. Peaslee; Howard B. Seim; Gordon K. Sherman; Robert W. Siegismund.

Gregory J. Skinner; Donald D. Steele; Charles B. Stewart; Raymond D. Swett; David A. Tate; Raymond S. Thompson; Harlan C. Wilder; Robert M. Wray; James B. Burrow; Weston H. Price.

Phillip G. Cobb; Joe G. Duvall; Frank J. Malloy; James F. McRoberts; Reginald W. Wagner; Hugh D. Wallace; Victor W. Alden; Ira K. Blough, Jr.; John F. Carey; Robert L. Cochran.

William M. Davis; Glen O. Goodhand; David W. Hassemer; Orville Hegseth; Leroy P. Hunt, Jr.; Bruce K. Lloyd; James R. Locher, Jr.; John H. Martin; Harold Mitchener; Edward L. Nielsen.

John T. Pierce, III; Barclay T. Resler; Robert T. Simpson; Charles S. Tanner; Clyde D. Gasser; Robert A. Hartnett; William J. McGinty; G. L. Meyers; E. M. Parker; J. S. Russell.

Cessna Aircraft Co.: None.

Chamberlain Corp. (3): John M. Ulrich; William G. Kussmaul; O. D. Moore.

Chrysler Corp. (11): Arthur J. Schultz, Jr.; Parnag Adamian; John W. Guerin, M.D.; William J. Parsons; Joseph J. Schmidt; Gerald E. Moore; Frederick O. Rudesill; John L. Hornor, Jr., William T. Weissinger; William G. Johnson; James M. Nifong.

City Investing Co. (4): Russell B. Sell; George B. Hooker, Jr.; I. R. Mollen; R. W. VanWert.

Collins Radio Co. (3): R. G. Bounds, Jr.; Richard A. Hansen; J. B. Yakeley, Jr.

Colt Industries, Inc. (4): Edward J. Hale, Thomas E. Bass, Gilbert Schumacher, Joseph Rinehart.

Condec Corp. (1): Lucas V. Beau.

Continental Air Lines Inc. (4): George P. Caldwell, Phil Parrott, M. P. Barnwell, F. W. Scheible.

Control Data Corp. (14): Stanley W. Phillips, C. A. Ousley, S. P. Steffes, Joseph Hannah, Frederick J. Karch, Ward T. Shields, Ralph F. Bishop, Cleland Early, Francis J. Berry, Charles W. Turner, Edgar Doleman, W. H. Fleming, Merlin Olson, Earle L. Lerette.

Curtiss Wright Corp. (1): John Condon.

Day & Zimmerman Inc. (1): Augustus M. Minton.

Dupont, E. I. De Nemours & Co. (3): Philip J. Smith, Charles K. Morris, Thomas J. Sharpe.

Eastman Kodak Co. (15): K. C. Raynor, H. D. Parmelee, W. Herrington, R. E. O'Neill, J. F. Reinhard, D. L. Willis, C. LaPorte, E. K. Smith, W. M. Steele, G. P. Carter, K. D. Gallinger, H. Hickman, J. R. Hoff, R. Koch, J. A. Newton.

Emerson Electric Co. (3): Ralph J. Nunziato, Lester Personeus, Robert L. Morris.

Fairchild Hiller Corp. (7): C. G. Botsford; T. M. Ashton; J. C. Stockett, Jr.; J. Pfaff; J. W. Gurnow; C. Bussey; J. Colovin.

Federal Cartridge Corp. (1): Howard L. Bartholomew.

F. M. C. Corp. (6): Wood B. Kyle, W. Paul Johnson, Barney D. White, Michael J. Sisul, Henry H. Wishart, Millard B. Hodges.

Ford Motor Co. (53): Dr. Carroll Hungate; R. C. Hyder; P. N. Gillon; A. Whitley; G. O. Hackett; E. Dreiss; S. S. Jack; B. O. Norman; C. E. Rankin; Dr. R. L. Weir.

D. H. Yielding; J. W. Bensen; W. R. Ewing; E. S. Garner; G. G. Getz; E. G. Kar; W. E. Kooken; Dr. C. E. Mack; W. Minton; G. D. Moore; L. B. Sarnham.

R. Miller; W. E. Smith; R. Taylor; G. N. Wilcox; W. P. Ennis; W. G. Hipps; R. T. Herget; N. B. Gibson; J. D. Luse; R. W. McNamee, Jr.; R. E. Smith.

C. W. Abbitt; N. D. Burnside; V. F. Creighton; E. E. Crowell; C. L. Elder; W. Hagin; A. A. Kurz; A. Martin; T. N. Natt; H. L. Norwood; A. R. St. Angelo.

General Dynamics Corp. (113): R. P. Alexander; Charles F. Alfano; Stanley E. Allen; H. T. Alness; E. Arentzen; L. C. Baldauf; Roger Banner; George E. Botswick; P. Branson; Willima Budding, Jr.

Berton H. Burns; Luther W. Burns; William R. Calhoun; Walter E. Chambers; C. W. Cecil; Ovie D. Clark; E. P. Coffey; Charles Cushman; L. P. Daniels; Charles Daval, Jr.

J. P. Dawley; Alfred J. Diehl; Donald G. Dockum; R. Evans; J. S. Fahy; H. Field; Lawrence G. Forbes; A. E. Freedman; Terrence A. Freeman; A. P. Gandy.

Philip Glennon; G. P. Gould; Edward Hamby; Otha B. Hardy, Jr.; J. T. Hayward; Charles E. Healy; J. B. Hess; Blish Hills; Florian A. Holm; C. F. Horne.

W. Jeancon; James K. Johnson; W. M. Kasper; H. Kay; J. W. Kelly; C. S. Kingston; S. B. Keonig; R. V. Laney; D. L. Lassell; C. P. Lessig.

E. M. Link, Jr.; William A. Looney; Frank Lynch; J. M. MacInnes; Herbert Mandel; W. J. Mang; W. C. Manicom; William Marchesi; William H. Markos; Wallace S. Martin; F. N. Masuen.

J. P. McCann; B. J. McCarrol; C. C. McCutoheon; F. A. McGee; Howard J. McIntire; R. E. L. Michie; Leo C. Moon; H. W. Moore; H. E. Moose; Robert E. Morris; Lawrence Mowell.

Daniel C. Mulloney; James R. Munro; O. B. Nelson; P. Niekum; James D. Nutt; Frank L. O'Brien; J. Oldfield; Robert Page; C. Palmer; A. C. Perry.

R. H. Prothero; Harold A. Radetsky; A. W. Reed; Henry G. Reed; Vendor H. Reeder; Arthur C. Reinhart; H. Reiter; James Reynolds; Elmer W. Richardson; J. B. Robinson, III.

C. I. Ross, Jr.; Columbus Savage; Fred C. Schmidt; John Schmidt; T. S. Sedaker; R. M. Sewall; L. E. Shea; W. M. Shewbart; Shyrock, W. H.; Peter Smenton.

George Smith; R. E. Soper; I. Sykes, Jr.; M. Tremaine; Russell F. Trudeau; S. J. Veneziano; Willima Weisert; Harold A. Wilging; R. L. Wolf; John F. Yoder; M. R. Yunk.

General Motors Corp. (17): Francis Box; L. R. Braswell, M.D.; W. C. Chapman; E. H. Eddy; L. C. Freeman, Jr.; G. G. Garton; E. Gray; T. W. Howell, M.D.; R. P. Klein; E. L. Knapp; A. E. Lancaster; C. Momsen, Jr.; W. Moore; W. F. Patient, M.D.; A. J. Shower; J. L. Wagner; G. H. Minor.

General Precision Equipment Corp. (23): George Le Breche; Robert J. Lynch; Guy B. Richardson, Jr.; Russell Gardinier; George J. Keithley; Robert Wilson; Thomas Dickens; J. A. Scott; Raymond Du Bois; Scott Lathrop; John O'Halloran.

Donald Olson; H. F. Duffey; Williard W. Smith; Wayne O'Hern; William Romberger; Richard Horridge; Edward Penneybaker; Ward Witter; Frank Mears; Norman Jungers; A. E. Kraps; H .E. Fry.

General Telephone & Electronics Corp. (35): A. B. Newhouse; George W. Carrington, Jr.; Harold E. Bieau; Cecil V. Broadway; Martin E. Wilson; John Becker; Harry Jost; Carl D. Broein, Jr.; Dr. William L. Smith; James Cochran; George Newton.

Elliot Wilson; Alexander G. Evanoff; William C. Golladay; Dave O. Sprankle; C. M. Christensen; G. W. England; L. E. Swope; O. W. Miller; W. C. Newbauer; P. A. Gugliotta; T. H. McKenzie; C. H. Bowen.

S. Trusso; P. E. Greenlee; F. N. Miller; E. D. Vaughan; L. Loken; M. L. Cripe; J. R. Blackburn; G. R. Trimble; Norbert Miller; William Scandrett; Francis D. Walker; Robert B. Keagy.

General Electric Co. (89): Names not yet provided.

General Tire & Rubber Co. (32): L. F Ayres, F. N. Lebershall, W. J. Robinson, L. H. Schofield, James M. Farrin, William Willman, John A. Martin, Francis F. Parry, Douglas S. Barker, Sam Burno, George N. Eisenhart.

Arthur Bouvier, John E. Hausman, Arron L. Johnson, George Y. Jumper, Warren E. Oliver, Harry C. Smith, Robert A. Thompson, Ed Hribar, Albert C. Wells, Walter W. Woodard, Solomon J. Zoller.

Arthur J. Barrett, Donald J. Iddins, Robert L. Kelly, W. F. Raborn, R. B. Pirie, B. A. Schriever, Clyde Eddleman, Ed O'Neil, Fred Hayden, F. F. Everest.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. (6): F. G. Selby, W. F. Cassidy, P. L. Dixon, P. S. Peca, M. E. Galusha, H. H. McIntosh.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. (31): John Breehl; Herbert Mosca; Paul Hoeper; Emerson Fawkes; Francis Gabreski; Richard Centner; John Courtney, Jr.; Charles Michaels; Alan Strock; James Moore.

Dave Dillard; Jack Nicholas; John Shinkle; Gus Macri; Tom Meritt; Dean Swain; Widmer Hansen; Roy Voris; William Spiegel; Frank Edwards; Boyd McElhany.

William Ditch; Loys Satterfield; Elbert Stever; Ross Mickey; Fred Schroeder; Joseph Rees; Fred Oliver; John Koch; William Clampet; Arthur Warner, Jr.

Gulf Oil Corp. (1): H. W. Blackwood.

Harris-Intertype Corp. (4): A. W. Sissom, M. F. Skinner, Grayson Merrill, F. A. Escobar.

Harvey Aluminum Inc.: Joseph Metzger, Homer G. Barber, Alfred Kaufman, Ed Miller.

Hazeltine Corp. (7): N. K. Dietrich, R. I. Olson, A. J. Stanziano, S. M. Thomas, Oswald S. Colclough, Jennings B. Dow, John Slezak.

Hercules Inc. (13): Charles E. Jordan; Leland S. McCants, Jr.; Robert S. Kittel; John W. Sevareid; Walter J. Fellenz; James H. Traul; W. M. Pierce; Joel W. Salter; Lewis A. Jones; Frank C. Tyrrell; Homer H. Nielsen; Jay V. Chase; Kenneth J. Latimer.

Honeywell Inc. (26): W. C. Bergstedt; G. E. Chalmers; J. W. Cunnick, III; C. L. Davis; M. Esch; H. Gorman; J. Hardy; B. Harris; W. T. Herring; K. C. Houston; B. Jones; J. Jones; F. H. LaMurre.

J. P. Laurin; W. D. McDowell; J. G. Merz; A. Poehler; C. Putman; L. J. Rasmussen; D. Schweitzer; L. Sherman; C. F. Spencer; E. B. Stansbury; J. J. Wermuth; J. L. Wilson, Jr.; P. Wyman.

Hughes Aircraft Co. (55): J. A. Barrett; F. W. Coleman, III; G. E. Erb; C. H. McKinney; M. L. Martin; J. H. Allen; L. V. Barr; J. L. DeBoer; G. Guy; V. Hayes.

J. E. Holligan; M. W. Kernkamp; W. L. Schreiber; W. R. Shanahan; L. Tamanian; E. R. Vanderburg; R. W. Worthington; R. R. Yeaman; W. H. Baynes; H. J. Blanchard; R. L. Bothwell; M. W. Boyer.

J. R. Brown; R. H. Caldwell; E. S. Davis; J. E. Davoli; J. L. Dickson; G. A. Doersch; C. B. Downer; J. G. Foster; C. H. Gerlach; G. P. Gibons; J. F. Greco; S. W. Heinonen.

R. S. Hill; J. W. Hiney; B. H. Hinton; R. Hogg; J. W. Hough; W. G. Jackson, Jr.; S. W. Josephson; D. F. Logan; G. E. Marcus, Jr.; H. Reich; R. W. Rood.

C. U. Ruzek, Jr.; J. G. Sliney; R. M. Smith; P. Sowa, Jr.; L. F. Upson, Jr.; P. B. Woodward; H. H. Green; R. W. Lindgren; E. H. Beverly; V. R. Woodward.

Hughes Tool Co. (13): E. R. Eastwold, G. H. Whisler, A. G. Russell, C. C. Bliss, N. R. Hoskot, R. W. Hanson, Clark W. Ecton, John R. McQueen, William F. Borellis, Merle G. Coombs, L. T. Ryhlick, E. H. Nigro, Jerome Triolo.

International Business Machines Co. (35): R. W. Arthur, S. F. Balaban, R. M. Brewer, J. S. Carpenter, D. M. Clark, J. T. Cockrill, E. M. Collins, E. F. Comstock, R. W. Curtis, T. A. Daffron, J. E. Dyar.

H. B. Ferrill, C. W., Glassen, H. H. Greer, R. Hatch, W. Hussey, M. M. Kovar, H. A. Lazott, T. H. Lewis, IV, M. Lind, H. T. Neal, E. O'Connor, T. C. Odom.

J. E. Schwager, R. B. Smith, C. H. Strong, W. B. Stubbs, R. W. Swanson, T. M. Taylor, H. C. Weadler, F. J. Wesley, R. C. Whittman, S. C. Wilson, B. H. Witham, J. F. Wood.

International Harvester Co. (6): Donald I. Thomas, Bud K. Beaver, Richard K. Margetts, Roger E. Strasburg, A. J. Norris Hill, Robert Etzkorn.

International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.: Not available at the time of preparation.

Johns Hopkins University (11): Not available at the time of preparation.

Kaiser Industries Corp. (11): Stanley J. Benkoski, Stirling S. Cook, M.D., J. G. Capka, F. W. Hastings, F. T. Matthias, E. G. Peacock, E. J. Stann, D. C. Christensen, F. A. Gunn, A. K. Romberg, J. B. Conners.

Lear Siegler Inc. (4): John K. Gerhart, Charles A. Roberts, V. L. Anderson, Frank A. Koszarek.

Ling Temco Vought Inc. (69): Herbert George Bench; Chester Arthur Briggs; George Budway; Francis Taylor Cooper; Marshall Pierce Deputy, Jr.; L. R. Bell; G. B. Kaiser; George Hundt, Jr.; F. S. Grutze, Jr.; E. S. Hartshorn, Jr.

H. B. Hardin, Jr.; D. F. Starr; R. P. Brett; G. P. Disosway; Alex Wilding; A. H. Perry; W. B. Taylor; J. E. Arnold; C. R. Eldredge; E. C. Ethell; G. E. Frency; Jr.

P. D. Green; C. B. Grimm; G. W. Jackson; C. C. Kennedy; H. E. Lucas; W. B. Packard; R. W. Priest; M. E. Riley; A. E. Shook; T. E. Stewart.

H. A. Templeton; O. O. Turner; P. H. Van Sickle; E. F. Klinck; G. B. Lotridge, M. Blaylock; J. B. Cline; A. B. Conner; D. E. Dressendorfer; R. P. Field.

W. C. Gammon; A. C. Holt; W. W. Kitts; C. A. Knight; R. W. Windsor; C. A. Yontz; J. K. Dill; A. B. Galatian; E. M. Hargrave.

XUM

H. G. Russell; F. R. Ulrich; M. J. Piatnitza; O. S. Kincannon; D. R. Schultze; B. D. Wood; M. G. Haines; R. E. Baker; F. B. Frost; R. W. Stanley.

V. Kellan; R. C. Gales; H. W. Russell; B. K. Sams; W. J. McIntyre; E. B. Gladding; Herman Rumsey; Claude Duke; R. C. Drum.

Litton Industries, Inc. (49): Albert B. Scoles; Norman F. Garton; Rue Green; John B. Rawlings; H. S. Isaacson; Richard D. Dick; Donovan P. Yeuell, Jr.; James H. Courtney; Ben Wade.

G. L. McKee; Millard J. Smith; Roy W. Ballard; Earl Paules; A. Barney Oldfield; John D. Prodgers; Harry C. Cox; John W. Gilluly; Olav Njus; Carl H. Stober.

Richard R. Bradley, Jr.; Leonard Erb; Francis P. Cuccias; G. M. McHaney; Van Beck; Alfred Gallant; J. R. Reeves; J. L. Reed; Philip R. Deubler; David McIntosh.

Robert F. Pope; Charles J. Schroder; Joseph L. Brack; Everett M. Glenn; Arthur W. Johnsen; Dr. F. D. Minerva; Peter E. Romo; Thomas C. Gurley; Floyd B. Schultz, Ken Huff; P. L. Freeman.

Kenneth C. Boyce; C. B. Curtis; Lawrence Vivian; Lewis O. Smith; H. L. Kubel; W. O. Roemer; T. Melusky; Kenneth M. Beyer; Edgar B. Gravett.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (210): L. C. Craigie; L. I. Davis; W. W. Dick, Jr.; D. L. Lay; E. M. Lightfoot; E. L. Robbins; J. H. Sides; B. E. Steadman; R. A. Trennert; W. R. Tuck.

W. P. Abdallah; J. Y. Adams; R. C. Anderson; J. O. Appleyard; N. C. Appold; C. F. Bailey; F. E. Bardwell; J. A. Barker; R. O. Beer; J. E. Bennett.

J. S. Blais; J. M. Bowers; G. M. Boyd; C. W. Brigham; N. S. Brooks; K. E. Brown; P. Brown; R. F. Buckley, Jr.; C. C. Cain; D. C. Campbell.

E. A. Carter; J. W. Chapman; S. E. Clark; W. A. Cloman, Jr.; R. L. Colligan, Jr.; T. L. Conroy; G. S. Curtis, Jr.; H. E. Day, Jr.; H. O. Deakin; V. Deitchman.

R. L. Denig, Jr.; A. W. Dill; J. C. Dillow; N. G. Doukas; W. Dubyk; J. M. Elliott; C. L. Ewald; M. H. Floom; T. P. Floryan; J. E. Fox.

B. C. Fulghum; B. I. Funk; A. J. Gardner; V. M. Genez; R. R. Gideon; W. J. Giles, Jr; F. E. Gorman; J. B. Green; H. J. Halberstadt; F. L. Harris.

W. A. Hasler, Jr.; B. W. Heckemeyer; F. G. Henry; P. J. Heran; H. J. Heuer; S. W. Hickey; J. B. Honan; E. F. Hoover; D. A. Hornby; M. H. Hubbard.

J. F. Johnston; R. D. King; J. F. Kinney; E. F. Klinke; J. B. Koenig; C. H. Kretz, Jr.; B. A. Lawhon; B. L. Lubelsky; J. H. Mackin; R. H. Maynard.

R. C. McGlashan; R. B. McLaughlin; F. J. Mee; R. M. Metcalf; E. W. Miles; G. C. Moore; L. W. Morefield, Jr.; W. E. Moring; J. F. Mullen, Jr.; E. G. Mulling, Jr.

S. Neman; J. R. Nickel; F. C. E. Oder; E. G. Osborn; G. L. Ottinger; W. B. Parham; R. A. Paton; P. B. Peabody; R. W. Peterson; J. J. Preston.

K. J. Prim; J. J. Randazzo; Q. A. Riepe; W. H. Rowen; E. A. Sandor; L. Saxton; M. S. Schmidling; M. J. Senn; M. W. Shea; W. A. Sheppard.

J. L. Shoenhair; J. E. Shuck; C. C. Smith; H. J. Smith, Jr.; V. C. Smith; W. R. Smith, III; B. F. Such; W. A. Sullivan; P. E. Summers; W. L. Tagg.

J. H. Terry; H. F. Thompson; R. C. Thorburn; P. E. Villars; A. H. Walton; V. E. Warford; I. E. Wetmore; E. R. White; R. K. Worthington; N. C. Anderson.

C. H. Andrews; M. H. Austin; B. Battino; J. Beyer; H. G. Bradshaw; J. R. Brown; F. D. Buckley; L. K. Carson; R. F. Cassidy; R. R. Catterlin.

L. D. Coates; V. J. Coley, Jr.; S. H. Dodge; D. J. Gehri; D. Gordon; M. B. Hammond; D. E. Huey; L. E. Ireland; K. J. Kirk, Jr.; A. L. Logan.

J. Lynn; T. L. Macleod; R. McMillan; M. W. Munk; R. A. Neale; J. L. Neefus; J. A. Seargeant; R. A. Shane; R. Steinbach; J. H. Voyles, Jr.

E. Watts, Jr.; J. Arnold, Jr.; J. F. Brewer; G. K. Crain; H. C. Krim, Jr.; L. W. Congdon; R. N. Davie; R. A. Erdin; E. F. Estrumse; W. A. Harmon.

C. E. Harris; H. B. Heyer; C. C. Hoffman; L. R. Hopper; R. P. Loughrey; W. M. Massengale; R. K. McDonough; B. H. Meyer; W. L. Moore, Jr.; H. L. Parris.

J. W. Perry; O. K. Reynolds; W. W. Riser, Jr.; H. S. Sabatier; R. C. Sears; L. G. Sidwell; L. A. Tenold; J. W. Tooley; E. A. Waterfill; K. S. Wilson.

D. H. Christensen; R. H. Fagan; J. M. Jones; G. E. Price; E. C. Wittenbach; C. L. Clay; A. J. De Angelis; F. C. Forsberg; W. S. Kohlhagen; K. W. Mitchim.

D. T. Morse; Ralph A. Smith; H. F. Bunze; G. Cechmanek; F. V. Genetti; R. Hundevadt; H. W. Robbins; M. L. Shumaker; Walter Weddle; R. F. Toliver.

Lykes Corp.: None.

Magnavox Co. (3): James H. Schofield, Jr.; R. Bruce Crane; George F. Smith.

Martin Marietta Corp. (40): Allen Abt; Harry Cruver; William Norton; B. J. Reilly; J. S. Reynaud; Gerald Brockman; R. H. Foltz; C. J. Odendhal; T. W. Ackert; L. R. Anderson.

H. V. Bastin, Jr.; H. F. Boone; F. X. Bradley; M. B. Chandler; D. A. Clark; R. H. Cooke; P. R. Cornwall; H. E. Davidson, Jr.; C. E. Dunlap, Jr.; D. W. Forbes, Jr.

W. R. George; F. N. Green; S. A. Hall; N. M. Hadenick; J. M. Henschke; B. B. Hovell; V. W. Harvard; C. D. Lang; M. G. Megica; W. W. Quinn.

J. B. Sanders; F. D. Selbie, Jr.; R. F. Sellars; J. G. Sheridan; D. M. Simpson; W. A. Stellenwerf; A. J. Walker; H. B. Wells; D. K. Yost; V. L. Zoller.

Mason & Hanger Silas Mason Co. (5): Joel G. Holmes; Lawrence H. Prather; Foster L. Furphy; George E. Davis; Jesse L. Pennell.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (5): James Gormley; Robert F. Scofield; C. Warren Smalzel; Lewis Larson; Robert Millard.

McDonnell Douglas Corp. (141): John C. Kane, Jr.; David M. W. Lindquist; George B. Sloan; Clyde H. Parmelee; R. W. Fellows; M. Kauffman; Joseph W. Antonides; E. M. Beauchamp; William D. Cavness; Edward M. Day.

John G. Glover; Laverne F. Houston; Richard F. Kane; William C. Lemke; Haydon L. Leon; Arthur A. McCartan; Richard S. McConnell; Thomas W. Ownby; Arnold T. Phillips; Eugene W. Phillips.

Charles C. Sanders; Robert W. Shick; Siegfried H. Spillner; Robert C. Starkey; Vernon E. Teig; Frank T. Watrous; J. D. Blanchard; R. L. Cormier; R. E. Cutts; J. Desmond.

J. G. Hedrick; A. N. Jones; R. J. Lavery; R. A. Lowcock; W. T. Luce; T. B. Payne; R. V. Porter; R. E. Schleeh; J. A. Thomas; J. A. Sullivan.

J. F. Daniels, Jr.; A. S. Pitts; K. W. Longnecker; J. Morrissey; J. J. Davis; F. D. Turnbull; F. M. Goode; N. Garrett; R. L. Towne; L. L. Sailor.

K. K. Kelley; G. M. Clarke; H. W. Heber; K. A. Harcos; M. F. O'Donnell; W. W. Waters; K. Herman; R. D. Coffee; K. K. Lewis; L. C. Rochte.

R. L. Baseler; A. J. Walden; R. M. Tunnell; W. C. Adams; Ford E. Alcorn; Carl Arnold; L. R. Ash; P. H. Best; H. H. Bowe; R. H. Bowen.

W. D. Brady; R. S. Buchanan; R. H. Bull; W. C. Bumm, F. B. Carlson, M. B. Chatfield; R. A. Clendenin; E. L. Cole; M. R. Collins, Jr.; W. J. Collum, Jr.

H. D. Courtney; C. D. Dalton; S. P. Dillon; R. C. Dineen; J. G. Duncan; C. B. Evans; G. B. Felton; P. L. Fishburne; R. W. Fletter; C. H. Greene, Jr.

S. Greene; Jack Guy; L. R. Hall; K. T. Hanson; Robert J. Hanson; B. T. Hemphill; R. M. Herrington; J. B. Herweg; J. A. Hewitt; P. L. Hill.

David E. Honodle; A. L. Hopwood; K. H. Houghton; E. F. Hutchins; R. K. Jacobson; C. R. Johnson; William R. Jones; D. Klein; B. A. Miles; Wilton B. Moats.

R. L. Neyman; W. C. Nielsen; Paul A. Noel, Jr.; R. Nudenberg; J. A. O'Leary; C. W. Pangburn; Joseph A. Patalive; J. R. Penland; C. A. Peterson; J. Pietz.

Richard S. Quiggins; R. C. Randall; E. S. Rice; G. M. Rice; O. J. Ritland; J. M. Rouse; G. J. Schaffer; M. C. Smith; S. D. Stooksberry; R. D. Stowell.

R. B. Sullivan; A. J. Walden; P. S. Walker; L. Q. Westmoreland; R. V. Wheeler; S. Yarchin; William B Taylor; William C. Armstrong; Edward J. Gujer; L. Boyd Kendall; Phillip O. Robertson.

McLean Industries, Inc. (2): John E. Terrell, Leon A. Michaelis.

Mobil Oil Corp.: (Not available at time of preparation.)

Motorola Inc. (3): Bradford Smith, John Parham, Jr., Roy Klein.

National Presto Industries Inc.: None.

Newport News Ship Building & Dry Dock Co. (6) J. S. Bethea, P. K. Taylor, J. H. Lofland, Jr., L. D. Bellinger, L. G. Richards, D. E. Fairchild.

Norris Industries (2): Fred A. Wheeler, Melvyn H. McCoy.

North American Rockwell Corp. (104): W. A. Davis; R. E. Greer; C. W. Schott; E. B. Gallant; W. M. Garland; H. W. Powell; W. W. Wilcox; C. G. Allen; W. A. Anderson; J. E. Andres.

J. L. Armstrong; R. E. Barton; J. E. Bicknell; E. L. Bishop; R. W. W. Booth; W. B. Cannon; Armando Caseria; R. E. Cathcart; C. A. Culpepper; B. C. Dunn.

S. E. Ellis; M. E. Fields; C. D. Fisher; S. G. Fisher; W. S. Ford; J. H. Foster; J. M. Foxx; W. H. Frederick; C. R. Gregg; W. B. Henderson.

H. D. Hewett; W. K. Horrigan; C. Houck; B. W. Humphries; H. E. Johnson, Jr.; J. H. Kellerman; C. D. Kester; I. F. Larkey; D. R. Longino, Jr.; J. Maddalena, Jr.

H. C. May; J. B. Miller; R. S. Nye; V. R. Parker; W. V. Paul; J. G. Perry; P. D. Pohlon; L. G. Russell; D. C. Sloan; C. A. Smith.

G. T. Smith; J. J. Smith; O. W. Snodgrass; P. W. Toomey; H. E. Wardon; R. J. Watson; W. T. Wilborn; D. J. Yockey; E. B. Young; G. Crum.

G. A. Aubrey; W. P. Brooks; E. R. Gillespie; H. R. Greenlee; J. B. Jeffords; R. M. Kelly; J. H. Lattin; W. M. Smith; J. E. Stone; J. P. Condon.

W. V. Crockett; H. Hansen, Jr.; F. E. Hollar; J. S. Holmberg; E. W. Johnston; A. C. Lowell; W. D. Roberson; L. E. Roberts; J. L. Smith; E. H. Vaughn.

S. W. Carpenter; R. N. Clark; J. L. Melgaard; K. A. Aho; F. P. Anderson; R. S. Chandler; T. W. Collins, Jr.; L. E. Flint, Jr.; R. E. Harris; F. E. Hayler.

J. S. Hill; F. Larsen; H. N. Larson; W. L. Nyburg; J. F. Parker; F. D. Pfotenhauer; E. S. Quilter; C. E. Robertson; W. M. Shifflette; J. Steinberger; F. Turner; D. S. Walton; H. C. Weart; R. M. Wilson.

Northrop Corp. (48): J. T. Bradley; R. M. Elder; W. H. Gurnee, Jr., H. J. Jablonsky; M. C. Johansen; W. C. Mahoney; Y. A. Pitts, Jr.; L. Shapiro; J. R. Anderson; M. M. Coons.

M. M. Dupre; J. L. Fisher; R. W. Fox; C. R. Heffner; J. H. Jennette; D. M. Lynch; R. W. Parks; J. C. Schofield; R. C. Works; R. Carlson.

N. A. Severson; G. A. Barclay; V. A. Cherbak, Jr.; D. K. Dean; J. F. Enright; A. Herron; J. W. Koletty; J. Duganne; H. Haszard; A. Jackson.

K. Buchak; A. Burke; J. A. Buzzell; R. Canny; T. F. Collins; R. S. Drake; W. A. Haycock; W. M. Hodges; H. Hughes; E. Lavier.

N. Misenheimer; F. T. Pomeroy; R. Sansone; A. Sullivan; K. M. Welborn; F. T. West; R. M. Bell; G. A. Peters.

Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. (3): Richard E. Johnson, E. A. Lovingood, Kenneth W. Brewer.

Pacific Architects & Engineers Inc. (16): William J. New, John Francis Wolf, Robert H. Calahan, William A. Cunningham, James S. Greene, Hugh B. Grundvig, Charles E. Houston, Frederic G. Miller, Richard L. Moody, George O. Pearson, Louis P. Pressler, Cecil P. Rice, Harry G. Roller, Tolson A. Smoak, John H. White, Edwin F. Woodhead.

Pan American World Airways Inc. (24): S. G. Ashdown; J. C. Grain; R. D. Dean; A. V. Dishman; V. J. Donohue; G. C. Fleming; R. Lamoreaux; W. L. Leverette; L. Lipscomb, Jr.; R. B. Madden; C. E. McClure; O. G. Quanrud.

F. P. Stainback, Jr.; R. L. Stell; R. S. Van Benschoten; H. P. Wagner; K. Withington; Robert Bell; Lawrence Kuter; C. A. Lindbergh; Maurice Fitzgerald; Robert Sandford; Dr. J. K. Cullen; Leland Johnson.

Radio Corp. of America (35): Z. R. Glocheski, E. W. Fuller, P. B. Foote, B. D. Hale, G. E. Pinkston, R. S. Maloney, J. E. Stevens, M. Williamson, G. Dawson, C. V. Johnson, J. Brandt, L. W. Van Antwerp, J. H. Brockway, S. L. Miller, H. Harnly, H. C. Henry, W. Heard.

L. W. Pflanz, T. P. Ross, F. K. Smith, G. P. Williams, T. N. Chavis, F. P. Henderson, W. H. Kreamer, B. F. McMahon, M. L. Ogden, P. T. Preuss, E. E. Roberts, P. N. Shamer, J. H. Wergen, J. Boning, A. C. Gay, R. E. Hogan, L. J. McNulty, R. K. Saxe.

Raymond Morrison Knudsen—Raymond International, Inc.; Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc.; Brown & Root, Inc.; & J. A. Jones Construction Co. (Joint venture) (6): Jean E. Bush, Robert R. Helen, Kenneth Kermit Anderson, Luther E. Bell, L. B. Wilby, Andrew D. Chaffin, Jr.

Raytheon Co. (37): Rolland D. Appleton; Alfred R. Bauch; William V. Beach; John B. Bond; Ernest V. Cameron; Charles E. Collins, Jr.; Erling J. Foss; Albert P. Hilar; Archie T. Madsen; Francis G. McBride; Charles R. Moulder; Charles C. Roberts; Eldon W. Schmid; Eldon D. Sewell; John B. Maher; Benjamin E. Moore; Gill M. Richardson; Henry E. Bernstein.

Curtis W. Bunting; Arthur H. Damon; Royal K. Joslin; William R. Kurtz; Robert V. Lange; James T. Lay; Francis R. O'Brien; James G. Prout, Jr.; Leslie S. Robinson; Poyntell C. Staley; Donald N. Yates; Harry L. Evans; Alan R. K. Burton; David M. Crabtree; John D. Crisp; Henry M. Harlow; Bernard R. Muldoon; Joseph J. Pellegrini; Walter H. Williamson.

Ryan Aeronautical Co. (25): C. Bogner; T. A. Ahola; D. C. Emrich; W. W. Forehand; J. N. Highley; J. H. Owens; R. Pollack; L. M. Ryan; H. L. Wood; W. E. Clasen; A. D. Gomez; V. M. Bennett.

N. B. Davis, Jr.; W. R. Harman; R. S. Johnson; W. Mercer; O. F. Meyer; J. H. Tripp; G. T. Peterson; H. Cox; W. L. Drennen; W. H. King; J. T. Shephard; J. F. Thorlin; J. G. Cornett.

Sanders Associates Inc. (17): Barry Atkins; James Casler; William J. Caspari; Donald A. Detwiler; John Doll; Stephen H. Gimber; Rolland A. Helsel; Ralph Lamond; Douglas B. Lapierre; Brainard Macomber; Ralph J. Mattus; Jesse P. Moorefield; John G. Pallo; Raymond W. Raines; Charles Register; Ferrer Regni; Orville J. Schulte.

Seatrain Lines Inc. (4): F. T. Voorhies; C. P. Bellican; W. Savidge; C. R. Hamblett.

Signal Companies Inc. (The) (9): Mark E. Bradley, James R. Cumberpatch, William Barnes, Raymond Deitsch, Keith G. Lindell, Aubrey Lyons, James J. Treacy, Innes Robert Lee White, Ray J. Sherry.

Smith Investment Co. None.

Sperry Rand Corp. (36): L. Armstrong, A. Baker, D. H. Baker, J. J. Benshoff, R. J. Billado, R. L. Brown, D. Buntine, W. Campbell, V. H. Castle, M. A. Connor, H. Cowart, F. H. Cunnare, P. C. Droz, P. Folsom, H. S. Foote, T. L. Gaines, R. P. Gentry, J. A. Gloriod.

G. Gunderman, C. A. Heath, G. C. Higginbotham, F. R. Kaspereen, J. Keiper, R. R. Lynn, H. W. Maw, S. D. B. Merrill, R. Mugg, J. R. Payne, K. Pryor, J. A. Rice, J. M. Richardson, I. Robinson, O. L. Robinson, A. B. Roby, S. Schesinger, R. F. Sladek.

Standard Oil Co. of California (6): C. M. Clifford, J. E. Fratis, A. C. Bonnycastle, W. T. Kelly, R. E. Morandes, G. R. Deits.

Standard Oil of New Jersey (2): Eric Barr, J. H. Bowell.

States Marine Lines Inc. None.

Susquehanna Corp. (7): W. O. Blandford; W. M. Burgess; J. Carter; J. B. Cochran; D. L. Evans, III; H. W. Norton; N. Schramm, Jr.

Sverdrup & Parcel & Associates, Inc. (9): L. J. Sverdrup; E. J. Peltier; W. J. Ely; P. Z. Michener; Samuel T. Wallace; Lowell W. Shallenberg; Samuel F. Miller; Charles B. Alexander; George M. Gans.

T.R.W. Inc. (56): Richard C. Snyder; John Kooken; Richard Broberg; James Foster; E. J. Arakelian; J. J. Baranowski; Edward Blum; George W. Bollinger; E. L. Brady; M. C. Brennan.

C. T. Campbell; H. B. Chrissinger; Howard Cook; H. S. Croyts; T. B. Dabney; J. O. Davenport; H. H. Eichel; L. A. Franz; H. K. Gilbert; J. J. Gilchrist; G. A. Gilliland; C. W. Griffing.

Lacey C. Hall; H. B. Hansell; Bruce B. Hammond; J. F. Harris; Carson Hitler; R. L. Huber; L. J. Hutton; Cam Knox; W. A. Kruge; C. J. Lemmon; Stan R. Mason; R. M. McMahon.

C. Medinnis; J. O'Connor; R. E. O'Denning; D. Pilliod; Elmer G. Prohaska; E. C. Pruett; J. Ruebel; Oliver M. Scott; James S. Seay; S. L. Siler; R. P. Sims; S. H. Sherrill, Jr.

J. W. Smith; R. J. Speaks; Lester L. Stone; J. B. Summers; R. Trauger; J. A. Urban; L. E. Vandeveer; H. E. Walters; R. W. Yundt; John E. Zink; Andrew J. Kelley.

Teledyne Inc. (8): Dr. Kenneth C. DeGon; Dr. George Stead; Herman J. Mecklenburg; Elby D. Martin; John Hyerle; Robert Williams; Joseph Neely; Roy Nelson.

Texaco Inc. (4): Violas Bishop, Henry F. Bell, Albert Benjamin, J. A. Obermeyer.

Texas Instrument Inc. (73): Harlan Freeman, Ovitt Wells, Francis Thompson, Fred Ramsey, Charles R. Bond, Bob Kirsten, Robert J. Baxter.

Textron Inc. (28): J. A. C. Andrews; J. Clapper; J. F. Gill; J. V. Hearn; B. J. L. Hirshorn; R. M. Hurst; D. McKee; H. C. Newcomer; D. R. Ostrander; J. Otts; J. M. Schweizer, Jr.; W. B. Stevens; D. Wilson; H. R. Archibald.

S. J. Clark; C. Coates; E. McGrane; C. A. Mette; A. Niemi; H. R. Smith; W. Tetley; W. M. Boyd; H. H. Howze; J .W. Oswalt; R. W. Van Orne; W. J. Yates; R. L. Ramsey; Roy Southworth.

Thiokol Chemical Corp. (3): Harry M. Murray, Willard L. Nielsen, Paul C. Trammell.

Uniroyal Inc. (6): W. M. Coy, George P. Nichols, Edward A. Nunn, S. A. Meyer, Karl F. Moessner, A. C. Hamilton.

United Aircraft Corp. (48): R. L. Duncan; H. W. Everett; J. P. Keegan; G. A. Palmer; T. A. Sims, Jr.; Strouther B. Hardwick; Albert R. Weldon; Joseph M. Silk; Marc M. Ducote; John F. Quinn; Donald N. Alexander; L. V. Marchbanks, Jr.

Paul Steinle; Milton Waltcher; Harold J. Larson; George A. Linko; Eugene Tatom; Richard L. Long; Herbert S. Brown; Robert R. Corey; E. C. Dyer; Alexander Rankin; Allen C. Miller; James G. J. Kellis.

William E. Kenna; Murlin W. Alley; Clarence R. Easter; Robert D. Dearth; Robert D. Bowers; George P. Gould; Herbert G. Hoover; Norair M. Lulejian; Arthur Pfeiffer; Frederick B. Tucker; W. C. Erlenbusch; E. T. B. Sullivan.

W. J. Corcoran; C. R. Doerflinger; J. H. Mallett; Robert Morris; E. A. Swanke; John Amann; George Kronmiller; E. S. Ligon; D. L. Putt; E. N. Hall; H. A. Arnold; R. B. Laning.

United States Steel Corp.: Not available at time of preparation.

Vinnell Corp.: None.

Vitro Corp. of America (25): Paul C. Murphy; L. E. Andre; H. H. Miller, Jr.; W. F. Keating; W. E. Antle, Jr.; N. B. Atkins; H. G. Doyle; S. E. Ellison; L. S. Eubanks; J. B. Gay, Jr.; R. J. Ramsbotham; G. A. Reaves, III.

R. J. Rudolph; P. S. Savidge; J. B. Wallace; J. K. Fyfe; N. S. Chase; D. J. Freund; S. Gassett; C. J. Harrison; J. B. Jacob; S. J. Mancuso; C. A. Merkle; E. J. Quashnoch; H. W. Swan.

Western Union Telegraph Co. (5): J. W. Davis, H. Dorfman, R. F. Flynn, J. A. Moore, R. M. Perry.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. (59): T. S. Bond; C. F. Burch; F. W. Campbell; W. D. Coyne; A. Creal; P. W. Crutchfield; R. K. Cunningham; P. C. Davis; R. W. Dickerson; J. L. Dickey.

D. K. Ela; S. W. Fitzgerald; W. J. Foley, Jr.; J. A. Garath; T. E. Harper; J. W. Henry; M. E. Hinden; J. E. Hoker; H. J. Islev-Peterson; C. D. Jeffcoat.

M. Kadick; E. S. Keats; T. K. Kimmel; C. B. Lindstrand; R. B. Linnenkin; J. E. Mahon; J. E. Miller; R. T. Miller; J. E. Mills; C. H. Morrison, Jr.

J. Munholland; E. D. Northrop; P. L. M. Packard; H. J. Pence; H. E. Skinner; W. M. Smith; R. W. Soderberg; J. K. Sun; J. T. Traylor; W. E. Underwood.

K. O. Vandayburg; G. W. Albin; W. M. Braley; V. P. Carlson; W. J. Germershausen; J. E. Hammerstone; C. J. Heath; J. W. Losch; C. Wiedman; W. L. Kabler.

W. A. Dolan, Jr.; R. S. Froude; J. D. Frye; J. C. McCawley; A. M. Prentiss; Roy G. Moore; William T. Shealy; A. Wermuth; J. A. Woodbury.

White Motor Co.: Not available at time of preparation.

World Airways Inc. (4): Harry G. Adam; Herbert E. Greuter; Jack Reiter; Robert I. Johnson.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WALT COBURN, OF MONTANA, AUTHORITY ON THE OLD WEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the latest accomplishment of one of Montana's well-known sons, Walt Coburn, nationally known Western storywriter and authority on the old West.

Walt Coburn's latest book, "Pioneer Cattleman in Montana," the story of the Circle-C Ranch, is the story of this famous writer's pioneer family and their early struggles in Montana. Walt Coburn, who will celebrate his 80th birthday later this year, is an authentic Montana cowpuncher turned author. For more than a quarter of a century, he wrote a story a week for Western Story magazine, and he has numerous authentic western books to his credit.

The Circle-C Ranch was one of the pioneer cattle ranches in the State of Montana, and the Coburn family was composed of pioneers who had the foresight and courage to make Montana the great State that it is today. Montanans are grateful to Walt Coburn, the son of a famous Montana man, for telling his story and putting this early Montana history on paper for posterity.

REPORT OF CONSUMER FRAUD UNIT, NEW YORK CITY AREA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the U.S. attorney's office in the Southern District of New York has recently created a small consumer fraud unit which has been extremely active in combating some of the more flagrant consumer deception schemes in the New York City area. Despite rather limited statutory support, this small unit, through vigorous criminal prosecution, has not only dealt severely with a small number of fraudulent operators, but it has undoubtedly helped considerably in deterring others from launching similar deceptive schemes.

Recently I have received a copy of a report of this consumer fraud unit. The report, which consists of items on public record, has already been furnished to some community agencies concerned with consumer fraud. Since it is of general interest, however, as a source of factual information relevant to consumer protection, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON WORK OF CONSUMER FRAUD UNIT

(By Richard A. Givens, chief, consumer fraud unit)

During the work of the consumer fraud unit to date, convictions have been obtained in each of the trials conducted for fraud against consumers during this period, totaling five trials involving seven defendants. A significant number of important investigations are currently in progress. Investigations in other cases have also led to voluntary charges in methods of operation.

I. BASES OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IN CONSUMER FRAUD CASES

The primary federal statute, apart from administrative remedies, applicable to fraud against consumers is the mail fraud statute, Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341, which provides:

"Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises . . . for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do . . . knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon . . . any matter or thing . . ." shall be guilty of a crime.

Other applicable statutes include the prohibition of fraud by wire, radio or television (18 U.S.C. § 1343), the prohibition of false use of the initials "U.S." and similar names by collection agencies (18 U.S.C. § 712), the prohibition of mailing of threatening communications (18 U.S.C. § 876), the Truth in Lending Act, federal laws dealing with standards for food, drugs, and biological products and other items, the criminal provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and other laws.

Under the mail fraud statute, any scheme to defraud or to obtain money by false representations is covered if the mails are used. The false pretenses themselves need not be contained in anything sent by mail. It is enough if the mails are used in any respect for the purpose of executing the scheme or attempting to do so. For example such use in collecting money from victims of fraud has been held covered. These basic legal principles have been repeatedly upheld in past cases and have been applied in the trials covered in this Report.

The Post Office Department, under the leadership of the Postal Inspector in Charge in the New York metropolitan area, Mr. Robert J. Hickey, together with a large number of his Inspectors, deserve a major portion of credit for the results achieved.

II. TYPES OF PRACTICES COVERED IN CONVICTIONS OBTAINED

Several types of fraudulent practices have been dealt with in the convictions obtained this year in the consumer fraud effort.

A. Fraud in health services

In a trial lasting one month, evidence was introduced concerning an establishment at 126 West 42nd Street handling some 20,000 new patients annually and processing approximately 160 persons per day. Evidence indicated that telephone solicitations to the public were made on more than 30 telephones, offering free help and stating that "the Chiropractic Information Service" was calling as a "public service."

Witnesses testified that after arriving at 126 West 42nd Street they were told that they needed treatments, in one case, or the witness would die shortly, and in another case, would end up in a wheelchair shortly. Thereafter, they were given contracts to sign which required them to pay for future treatments whether they took these treatments or not. Employees of the establishment testified that if a patient requested to talk to his or her spouse before signing, the matter was taken up with higher authorities in the office. Evidence indicated that treatments sometimes lasting two or three minutes were given, for which the standard charge of $6 was made.

Exhibits which testimony indicated were given to lay solicitors stated:

"This is Dr. —— of the Chiropractic Center * * *. We have visiting us a professor from Germany, who specializes in your condition. He has a new treatment that has helped thousands of 'hopeless' sufferers. He has discussed your case with us and advised us how to give you immediate relief . . . There is no other treatment for your case."

Printed solicitation material said that the establishment offered "free help" and used "proven methods" which had "immediately and promptly relieved thousands."

". . . You have actually hesitated long enough and further delay could be very dangerous . . ."

"Free help by licensed doctor of chiropractic . . ."

"Arthritis may cripple you!"

"Concentrate on this coupon and spell arthritis slowly . . . Now you are hypnotized."

If patients did not pay they received printed notices containing such statements as:

". . . You will have to appear in court and lose time and money from your job. In Court, the judge will declare you guilty. Do you want such a court record of guilty, to damage your reputation? You have only 5 days to still plead not guilty and protect your good name and reputation by paying your past due account . . ."

". . . We are notifying . . . the stores from which you buy on credit, your family, your friends, your neighbors, your lawyer, your bank, your job, your employer, your church, etc."

"Please write . . . why do you gamble losing your life and health by not continuing to let me help you . . . God wants me to help you. Why not let me help you? God has chosen me, in his mysterious way to help you get well."

Mailings were also made to employers of patients headed "Notice to Employer for Garnishment Proceedings."

During this trial, a witness located by Postal Inspectors in Puerto Rico testified that he had been paid $1,000.00 by a defendant to leave the continental United States and to pay off another witness.

A former patient also testified that she saw a Spanish-speaking woman screaming for her husband while an employee of defendant's sought to remove her from an elevator (which was being held by another employee pressing the elevator button). Former employees also testified that X-rays of persons other than the patients were shown to patients as their X-rays.

In this case and the other cases covered in this Section with one exception, the Government filed an affidavit with the Court placing on public record the principal facts developed in its investigation. A copy of the affidavit was served on defense counsel prior to sentence. This apprised defense counsel of its contents, which would not have been available to the defense had it merely been contained in a confidential presentence report.

The Government also called the Court's attention to a unanimous report of the Committee on Criminal Law of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut which stated that the principal factors relevant in sentencing included:

"(1) The extent to which the defendant abused a position of responsibility entrusted to him by society; (2) the extent to which he sets an example for others because of his position, and (3) the large-scale influence which his conduct may have on others because of a pivotal relationship which he has voluntarily assumed in society and as a result of which his actions could have wide ramifications." *Criminal Law Bulletin*, Vol. 3, p. 682, 684 (Dec. 1967).

The Honorable Harold R. Tyler, Jr., sentenced the principal defendant in this case to a term of four years, and two co-defendants to lesser terms (*United States* v. *Zovluck, et al.*). A co-defendant was also convicted in a separate trial of assaulting federal marshals executing a search warrant and an arrest warrant at the premises.

Instrumentalities of the offense charged were seized under federal search warrants when the indictment was filed. The warrants were upheld by the Court in *United States* v. *Zovluck*, 273 F. Supp. 385 (S.D.N.Y.). In its opinion the Court pointed out that defendants appeared to continue the activity charged in the indictment even after the indictment was filed. Convictions were obtained under a separate indictment covering such subsequent acts.

The case parallels in importance another prosecution brought in the field of health fraud in which a conviction for false labeling of human blood plasma and conspiracy to manufacture it without a license was upheld in 1964, and a conviction also obtained for changing dates on labels of blood bottles. *United States* v. *Steinschreiber*, 219 F. Supp. 373 (S.D.N.Y.) *affirmed* 326 F.2d 725 (2d Cir. 1964), *cert. denied*, 376 U.S. 962 (1964); see also *United States* v. *Calise*, 217 F. Supp. 705 (1962).

B. "Chain referral" swindles

In two cases convictions were obtained for "chain referral" swindles in which purchasers of merchandise who paid from several hundred dollars up to $1,200, were told that they could obtain the items at no cost by furnishing names of other potential customers. Evidence indicated that customers were falsely promised that they could receive the merchandise at no cost because commissions they would receive on sales to persons they recommended would easily more than cover the price charged.

It is mathematically impossible for such promises to be true for the average customer.[1] To get enough commissions to pay for the full cost of his purchase the customer must make on the average several successful referrals to other customers, each of whom receives the same promises and in turn must make several successful referrals for the promises made to them to come true. Thus, a rapidly expanding number of customers must buy in order for the scheme to work as represented. In such a geometric progression, astronomical numbers are very quickly reached, and for this reason a witness in one of the cases described such a referral program as a "bubble."

In both cases, sales were completed by salesmen calling on prospects at home where they remained in some cases for long periods of time to obtain the required signatures.[2]

In *United States* v. *Rubin Sterngass*, the evidence indicated that eight different corporations were used in a chain referral program involving central vacuum systems, color television sets and broilers which were represented as helpful in preventing cancer, and that for the scheme to work as promised, one billion customers would have had to be involved by the ninth step. Exhibits given to customers asked "How would you like to earn some extra money. . . ?" A sentence of 18 months was imposed by the Honorable Inzer B. Wyatt. The conviction in this case was unanimously affirmed from the bench by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on December 18, 1968 (Dkt. No. 32704).

Another chain referral case, *United States* v. *William J. Armantrout* involved sales of nylon carpeting at $27.50 a square yard to some 500 customers in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut who paid amounts averaging $1,000 to $1,200 each for the rugs after receiving booklets stating:

"A Public Service Bulletin—Your Magic Carpet Plan.

"This brochure has been designed to help you attain your goal of earning the entire cost of your luxurious carpeting. By working closely with our public relations director you can and will achieve this goal quickly . . . The public relations man . . . is the proven, time tested key to your success . . . hundreds of very satisfied customers before you have had great success by using our proven method . . ."

"Why you will be successful: Because you are on the plan. You know it must be good . . .

When the firm went out of business customers were left with notes owing to a bank. The firm also left a bill of some $18,000 owing to the company which had supplied the carpets.

The owner of the firm was found guilty of mail fraud,[3] and a sentence of one year was imposed by the Honorable Walter R. Mansfield.

C. Charity fraud

Another case involved fraud by solicitation of charitable contributions purportedly for philanthropic use. The indictment charged that these representations were false. During the trial testimony was received that the defendant had called an Internal Revenue Service tax exemption obtained by a foundation of which he was executive director a "license to steal." An official of a bona fide charity testified that half a million dollars of pharmaceuticals donated to the organization involved could not be traced. The defendant was sentenced by one year and one day imprisonment after being found guilty.[4]

D. Auto insurance fraud

In *United States* v. *Lopez*, tried for the Government by Assistant United States Attorney John H. Doyle III, a conviction was obtained for fraud involving the obtaining of $50 deposits from Spanish-speaking automobile insurance applicants and then substituting bad checks sent to the insurance companies, while falsely using the name of another insurance broker to conceal the fact that the defendant had no valid license.

E. Fraudulent collection methods

Several cases have involved fraudulent collection methods.

In the health fraud case discussed previously, the indictment charged defendants with sending misleading forms to patients, stating among other things, that a judge would find the patient "guilty" if he did not pay. Separate convictions of each of the three defendants in that case were also obtained for false use of the initials "U.S." Evidence introduced at the trial indicated that collection forms sent bore the legend "U.S. Credit Rating & Reporting Agency," which was merely a name used by defendants and not in fact a Government agency. This was held to violate Title 18, United States Code, Section 712, which prohibits misleading use of names purporting to refer to a federal agency. The defendants were each sentenced to imprisonment for one year on this charge.

Other fraudulent collection methods, discussed in greater detail below, involved fraudulent use of financing procedures to mislead customers.

F. Fraudulent use of financing procedures

In *United States* v. *Sterngass*, the evidence indicated that many contracts obtained from customers under a chain referral scheme were sold to a finance company owned principally by the defendant's wife, and then resold to other financing agencies, in some cases with arrangements that (a) an attorney for defendant would sue customers in the name of the financing agency, and (b) if the customer did not pay, defendant's companies or his wife's finance company would lose certain reserve funds. Despite this, there was proof that letters were sent to customers stating:

"This contract . . . is in the hands of the finance company which paid value to us for this contract. Your obligation is to that finance company, to meet your monthly terms as you have contracted to do . . .

"In the event that you breach your contract with the finance company they will sue you and ultimately get a judgment . . .

"You also have an opportunity by which you can earn commissions for sales that result from recommendations of yours . . . It is this opportunity part of our contract that really makes your purchase a successful one for you."

A separate indictment is also pending against a finance company and its officers for mail fraud. The indictment charges among other things false pretenses that the finance company was acting independently from the seller of the merchandise involved, whereas in fact the finance company had a secret interest in the sales.

G. Office supply sales

In *United States* v. *Regent Office Supply Co.*—F. Supp.—(68 cr. 798, 2/28/69, S.D.N.Y.), Judge E. J. Dimock found two corporations guilty of mail fraud where salesmen posing as doctors or lawyers falsely told purchasing agents office supplies were on distress sale due to the death of a friend, and the mails were used to bill the purchasers. The fact that the buyers did not lose money was held irrelevant since false representations were used in the telephone solicitation.

III. VOLUNTARY TAKEN ACTION AS A RESULT OF FEDERAL INVESTIGATIONS

In other instances, the mere fact of the institution of federal investigations resulted in voluntary action changing practices under inquiry, without any commitments as to prosecution being given.[5]

A. Health insurance solicitation

Complaints were received concerning large scale mailings into New York by an out-of-state insurance company purporting to have selected the recipient as a member of a particular "good risk" group, when this was in fact without foundation. The mailings similarly failed to point up clearly certain significant exclusions from coverage under the policies. After federal investigation was instituted, the company voluntarily modified its mailings to eliminate these objectionable features.

B. "Bait and switch"

The advertising of meat at extremely low prices, representing a fraction of those normally charged, without disclosure that the meat in fact was of a quality which was acceptable to very few, was the subject of investigation. Customers arriving at the premises of the seller and filling out a credit application would then be "switched" to more expensive products. After the institution of mail fraud investigation, these methods were voluntarily abandoned.

C. Misleading collection practices

In addition to the prosecutions described above involving misleading collection practices, voluntary steps have been taken in several cases involving abandonment of the following practices in this District.

The practice of contacting employers directly to threaten garnishment where no legal action has actually been taken.

Use of threats of a "Stop Credit Order" which supposedly would block credit to the customer within a 50 mile radius.

Use of an official-looking form postmarked Washington, D.C. purporting to direct the customer to appear at a distant point to explain failure to pay alleged indebtedness.

Use of several names of collection agencies containing the words "United States" or the initials "U.S." without equally bold disclaimers making it clear that no Government agency was involved.

Notices stating that attorneys' fees would be added to bills unless payment was made within a fixed time even if suit was not instituted.

D. Bringing of collection suits in distant locations

Investigations reveal that consumers frequently suffer default judgments even where they may have valid defenses of fraud. This occurs chiefly for three reasons: (a) lack of ability to retain counsel, (b) failure to be notified of the suit, discussed below, and (c) the fact that suits are often brought in distant locations.

Investigations of a repeated practice of bringing suit in a county where a finance company is located even though the sale was made elsewhere and the buyer lives elsewhere, led to voluntary discontinuance of this practice. The investigation was based on

---

[1] See *Nickles* v. *United States*, 381 F.2d 258 (10th Cir. 1967); *United States* v. *Blachly*, 380 F.2d 665 (5th Cir. 1967); *Fabian* v. *United States*, 358 F.2d 187 (8th Cir. 1966); Smith, "Saga of The Little Green Pig," The Reporter, 11/3/66, p. 39.

[2] See S. Rep. No. 1417, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (1968); Report of Committee on Federal Legislation of New York County Lawyers Ass'n, New York Law Journal, 8/19/68, p. 1, cols. 1–2.

[3] A pretrial decision is reported in *United States* v. *Armantrout*, 278 F. Supp. 517 (S.D. N.Y. 1968).

[4] A pretrial decision is reported in *United States* v. *Roth*, 285 F. Supp. 364 (S.D.N.Y. 1968).

[5] Names or equivalent identifying details are not mentioned in this or in the following Part IV in order to avoid prejudice to trials or to persons not indicted.

XUM

the possibility that such a practice, depriving customers of their constitutional rights to a day in Court by causing state action, violated the Civil Rights Act prohibiting conspiracies to violate constitutional rights.

This matter is also discussed by the Committee on Legal Assistance of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in a unanimous report recommending changes in venue laws to restrict collection actions to the county where the purchaser lives, lived at the time of the purchase, or made the purchase. "Does a Vendee under an Installment Sales Contract Receive Adequate Notice of a Suit Instituted by the Vendor?" 23 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 263 (April 1968).

E. Miscellaneous

A large number of individual complaints were satisfactorily resolved once inquiry was made.

IV. LARGE-SCALE ABUSES

Since numerous investigations are in progress, only a few which have disclosed widespread abuses can be mentioned here.

A. "Sewer service" of process

"Sewer" or "gutter" service of process is a term used to refer to the practice of bringing suit without ever giving notice of the suit until after a default judgment is obtained. This evil is discussed by the Committee on Legal Assistance of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in "Does a Vendee Under an Installment Contract Receive Adequate Notice of a Suit Instituted by the Vendor?" 23 *Record of N.Y.C.B.A.* 263 (April 1968), and by that Committee together with the Committee on Grievances in "Improper Collection Practices." 23 *Record of N.Y.C.B.A.* 441 (June 1968). Intensive investigations of this matter are being pressed under Assistant United States Attorney Frank M. Tuerkheimer.

One difficulty in dealing with these abuses is the lack of adequate record-keeping by agencies which serve papers on people who are being sued. Such process serving firms generally receive a flat fee from the attorney for serving papers on each person being sued. The agency in turn usually pays a flat fee to the individual process server for each paper he is willing to sign an affidavit that he served.

There are no statutory qualifications or licensing procedures for process servers, other than that they be of proper age and not parties to the action.

Most process serving agencies keep no records of the names or addresses of persons served and by whom service was made. The only record kept is the affidavit of service itself which is executed by the process server in return for his fee. This is turned over to the attorney bringing suit and thereafter filed in Court, where it usually becomes the basis for a default judgment. See Caplovitz, *The Poor Pay More: Consumer Practices of Low Income Families*, Ch. 12 p. 70 et seq. (1963). Only after the judgment is entered does the person sued often first learn of the suit against him—in many cases, he first learns of the suit when he gets a notice of judgment through the mail or when his employer receives through the mail a notice of garnishment requiring him to deduct amounts from the employee's pay.[6] If process serving agencies were required to keep more detailed records, this would help to defer false statements by process servers as well as to facilitate investigations of fraud in service of process.

Indictments against several process servers are pending. These cases were presented to the Grand Jury by Assistant United States Attorney Frank M. Tuerkheimer. The indictments charge violation of the Civil Rights Act. The basis of use of the Civil Rights statute is simple—default judgments obtained by false affidavits of service of process constitute state action depriving the victims of property without due process of law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment because of the fraud committed by the process servers. The applicability of the statute was upheld by the Honorable Edward Weinfeld in *United States* v. *Barr on* January 30, 1969. — F. Supp. — (68 cr. 888, S.D.N.Y. 1969).

B. Used car repossessions

Investigations have disclosed a pattern of sales of certain used cars at many times their original cost, followed by a cycle of repossession, repurchase of the car at a low price at auction and further resale at many times that price to new customers, who in turn are frequently sued by finance agencies and often claim to have received no notice of the suit. The inquiry indicated that in certain cases some used car dealers know in advance that there will be a complaint regarding each and every automobile sold and that many customers will give up the car and default because they feel it cannot be made to work. Investigation of possible federal violations is continuing.

C. Credit sales of future services

Complaints have been received from members of the public who signed contracts for services (e.g. self-protection training, dance lessons, etc.) which turned out to appear to obligate them to pay in the future for a long series of appointments whether or not they canceled the remainder of the series. This was also a feature of the health fraud case discussed previously. In one case a lady signed up for a lengthy series of self-defense lessons and her doctor advised her to quit because she might be injured. She paid a large sum to be released from her contract to pay for lessons she did not take.

Where services are involved the customer cannot generally "inspect" what he is buying before signing the contract. Further, if the consumer seeks to cancel, our inquiry indicates that payment in full is often demanded even though the consumer does not receive the benefit of the balance of the services.

The law concerning damages for breach of contract generally permits a seller to obtain only actual damages (such as in the case of a sale of goods, the difference between their value at the date of the contract and on the day of breach). This would not permit a seller of future services to recover from the customer the full contract price of a long series of future services.

However, the mere threat of suit induces many consumers to pay because they do not know their rights and cannot afford an attorney to defend such an action.

D. Magazine sales methods

Numerous complaints have been received that magazine salesmen have made varied misrepresentations to members of the public including (a) that the amount to be charged is less than the written contract actually provides for, (b) that the customer is merely signing a receipt, when it is in fact a contract, and (c) that magazines will be furnished at only the cost of postage, etc. The most appropriate way to deal with this problem in the absence of proof of a concerted scheme on the part of the firms employing the salesmen involved remains open.

E. Food freezer plans

Complaints have also been received that customers have been told that if they buy a food freezer it will cost them nothing out of pocket because they will save enough on the food covered by the plan to pay for the full cost of the freezer, whereas in fact there are no such savings and the food may be insufficient and of poor quality. Investigations in this field are continuing.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A. The role of law enforcement

Consumer fraud is an important ingredient in the crisis of our cities.

It provides particularly inflammable tinder for urban conflagrations because consumer fraud is not merely passive but actively reaches out to take away some of the small amount of money the victim may have.

The bulk of consumer fraud affects the poor. However, consumer fraud affects all in every geographic area. In the health service case described previously the chief victims were residents of the core city, including many Spanish-speaking citizens. In the carpet referral scheme most victims were suburban homeowners.

The good reputation to which honest business is entitled suffers whenever fraudulent conduct is practiced. Further, fraudulent operators also secure an unfair competitive advantage over the legitimate businessman who refuses to indulge in these methods.

In many instances fraud has been effected under the forms of law. Numerous citizens are subjected to default judgments and garnishments without previously being notified that they are being sued. Others who may have legitimate defenses to payment because of fraud fail to obtain a day in Court because they cannot afford a lawyer to fight a lawsuit. Collection suits are also brought in distant locations making it impossible for the consumer to present a defense if he has one.

Effective law enforcement in this field is an important means of protecting the rights of all and avoiding conditions productive of violence. It is necessary for the protection of every group in our society.

The principal weapon of federal law enforcement against consumer fraud is the mail fraud statute, Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341. Title 18, United States Code, Section 876, concerning threatening communications sent through the mails is also important in the field of fraudulent collection practices. It provides in part:

> "Whoever with intent to extort from any person any money or other thing of value, knowingly . . . deposits or causes to be deposited [in the mail] any communication . . . containing any threat to injure the property or reputation of the addressee or of another . . . " is guilty of a crime.

Threats to injure the credit or the reputation of the addressee or to cause harm in his relations with his employer fall within the category of threats to injury to reputation. It has been held irrelevant under the statute whether the threats are to make truthful or untruthful statements about the recipient. *United States* v. *Pignatelli*, 125 F. 2d 643 (2d Cir. 1942), *cert. denied*, 316 U.S. 680. Similarly, it has been held immaterial under the Section whether a person subjected to improper threats actually owed the money sought to be obtained from him. *United States* v. *Guy Eiselstein*, Crim. No. 10215, N.D. Ohio (West Div.) (Frank Kloeb, D. J., 6/21/55). The thrust of these decisions is that the courts—where both sides, including any proper defense, can be heard—and not threats to reputation are the proper recourse where requests for payment go unheeded.

An unresolved problem concerns prevention of continued criminal conduct after indictment and before trial. See *United States* v. *Zovluck*, 274 F. Supp. 385 (S.D.N.Y.). There is presently no authority for injunctive or other interim relief in such cases (nor indeed for injunctive relief even after a finding of guilty as part of a judgment of conviction).

Another unresolved problem is the impact of 15 U.S.C. § 49 which confers complete and automatic immunity from prosecution on a witness subpoenaed before the Federal Trade Commission even if he does not invoke the privilege against self-incrimination or refuse to answer.

---

[6] The employer may then press the employee to pay in full to be rid of the garnishment.

B. Role of community agencies and the public

There is need for coordination of effort by community agencies in the field of consumer protection. With such coordination, information concerning fraudulent practices could be more effectively brought to bear and referred to the proper agencies, civic, local, state or federal.

An alert public is of course the key to all efforts to prevent consumer fraud. It is only where the public brings facts to the attention of law enforcement authorities, directly or through community agencies, that the facts can be brought to the attention of the courts for appropriate action.

The combined efforts of citizens working together for common aims in this as other fields can lead to better communities for the benefit of all.

EXPORT CREDIT SEMINAR TO BE HELD IN BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, next Monday, March 31, the Export-Import Bank of the United States will sponsor a 1-day seminar on export credit. The seminar will be held at the International House in Boston.

The purpose of the meeting is to explain to exporters and bankers the recent changes that have been made in the Bank's programs. These changes are designed to enable exporters to sell abroad on deferred credit terms without undue risk. Mr. Gilbert H. Lochrie, the Business Liaison Officer of the Export-Import Bank, will be the chairman of the meeting. Other participants will include Mr. Richard Crofton, of the Federal export Credit Agency's Guarantee and Insurance Division, and Mr. Donald Hood, Production and Services Manager of the Foreign Credit Insurance Association.

Exporters and bankers, as well as businessmen considering entering the export field, have been invited to attend the seminar. I understand that the public response to the seminar has been good, and that the meetings will be attended by a number of the most prominent exporters, manufacturers, commercial banks, and shipping firms in the State.

As background for the seminar, the Export-Import Bank has prepared a brief statement of its history and operations, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Export-Import Bank of the United States, Its History and Operations in Brief

The Export-Import Bank of the United States, widely known as Eximbank, was first established by Executive Order in February 1934. At that time, the United States had only recently extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union. It was hoped that credit from Eximbank would help develop trade between the two countries. In addition, the United States was embarking on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, which could have required financing to make it a success. Finally, there was the desire to "prime the pump" with exports as a means of alleviating the impact of the Depression.

Shortly thereafter, a second Export-Import Bank was established, also by Executive Order. Its purpose was to finance trade between the United States and Cuba. The first Bank never entered into a credit agreement with the Soviet Union, largely because of continuing delays in settling debts between the two countries and their nationals. The second Bank initially financed Cuban purchases of silver which were minted into Cuban coins at Philadelphia. Later the two banks were merged.

Throughout its 35-year history, Eximbank has consistently been engaged in financing the foreign trade of the United States. However, as the domestic and world situations have changed, Eximbank has changed its methods in order to provide the maximum benefit to the United States.

In the late 1930's, the course of international trade followed closely the course of international politics. As Europe prepared for war, many countries could no longer import from their traditional sources. It was at this time that overseas buyers began to request assistance of Eximbank. Up until then, Eximbank had dealt with U.S. exporters almost exclusively.

During World War II, Eximbank financed a number of key activities. Perhaps the one for which Eximbank is best remembered is the steel industry of Brazil. Possibly more dramatic, however, was a $25 million loan to Universal Trading Corporation, acting as agent for the Government of China, which was used to finance construction of the Burma Road.

The next major challenge to Eximbank came in 1945, when Lend-Lease Operations were coming to a close. At that time, Eximbank's legislative authority was renewed, and the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 was signed on the same day as the Bretton Woods Agreement Act symbolizing America's determination to participate fully in international trade and finance in concert with other countries.

In the immediate post-war period, Eximbank extended some $5 billion of loans to Europe and China, covering purchases in the U.S. of equipment needed to reestablish economic activity. With the establishment of the Marshall Plan in 1948, Eximbank's responsibility for reconstruction was reduced. The Banks resources, like those of the Government as a whole, were called upon to a greater extent to help finance projects in the developing world.

In the late 1950's, when the viability of the economies of other developed countries had become established, Eximbank, and indeed the U.S., was confronted with the still-present problem of a persistent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. Increased exports were and are one way of coping with this problem.

Eximbank today recognizes more than ever that credit availability is as important a competitive tool as price, quality, or service. If American exporters are provided with facilities at least as good as those made available to exporters in other countries by their governments, U.S. exporters are free to compete in world markets solely on the basis of their products, their prices, their salesmanship, and their service.

As a result, Eximbank is determined that no U.S. exporter is going to lose a sale for want of credit, if the sale is sound. There are four Eximbank programs which assist the exporter: direct credits to foreign borrowers, export credit guarantees, export credit insurance, and discount loans. Eximbank continues to make direct loans to overseas buyers of U.S. goods and services. And Eximbank sometimes keeps trade channels open by making special foreign trade loans to foreign governments suffering temporary dollar shortages. The facilities of the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, a group of commercial insurance companies formed at Eximbank's instigation to provide credit protection for exporters, are used by firms of all sizes but are particularly helpful to small firms with limited experience. Policies issued by FCIA cover sales or can be used as collateral for bank loans. Under a program similar to that of FCIA, Eximbank guarantees repayment to commercial banks which finance medium term transactions for exporters. It also issues guarantees to exporters covering service contracts, leases, and other special situations. To assist commercial banks in increasing their financing of exports, Eximbank operates a "discount" facility. Under this program, commercial banks may borrow from Eximbank in amounts and on terms related to the portfolio of eligible export obligations held by the commercial bank.

Since its inception, Eximbank has authorized a total of some $22 billion of credits, guarantees, and insurance, all to assist U.S. exports. In 1968, some $3.5 billion was authorized by Eximbank in several thousand separate transactions. This total included $2.5 billion of direct loans, $290 million of commercial bank guarantees, and $716 million of FCIA insurance policies.

Collections of principal and interest on direct loans during 1968 contributed $952 million to the balance of payments, and an estimated additional balance of payments benefit of over $750 million resulted from the insurance and guarantee programs.

Each transaction in which Eximbank participates directly benefits U.S. industry and helps maintain economic prosperity. Abroad, more nations are able to raise their economic sights because U.S. equipment, services, and technology are available to them. Without the credit facilities of Eximbank, U.S. exporters would in many instances require cash payment from the foreign buyer, which is not possible for many countries or not feasible from a competitive standpoint.

Funds for Eximbank's operations are derived from a number of sources. Capital stock and accumulated reserves used in the business of the Bank provide over $2 billion in funds. Although the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, authorizes Eximbank to borrow on a revolving basis up to $6 billion from the U.S. Treasury, such borrowings have been relatively small in recent years. Instead, Eximbank has sold certificates of participation in its portfolio, debentures, and short term discount promissory notes—all in the public money market. A further source of funding, which has the added advantage of improving the U.S. balance of payments, is the sale abroad of certificates of beneficial interest in individual loans.

Recent legislation has had an important impact on several aspects of Eximbank activity in 1968 the life of the Bank was extended to June 30, 1973, and its overall commitment authority was increased from $9 billion to $13.5 billion. The same law prohibited the Bank from participating in financing sales to communist countries unless the President determines it is in the national interest for it to do so (at present the only such determination relates to Yugoslavia). In no case may Eximbank participate in assisting credit sales to or for use in North Viet-Nam, or countries the governments of which assist North Viet-Nam, so long as U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities there. Eximbank also may not participate in credit sales of military equipment to less developed countries.

Another recent piece of legislation permits Eximbank to participate in higher risk transactions to assist the balance of payments and the commercial interests of the U.S. This act established the so-called "export expansion facility," authorizing the Bank to assist export transactions which offer a "sufficient likelihood of repayment to justify the Bank's support in order to actively foster the foreign trade and the long term commercial interest of the United States", as contrasted to the Bank's traditional statutory requirement of "reasonable assurance of repayment."

XUM

SPECIAL TRADE REPRESENTATIVE SHOULD BE APPOINTED TO REPRESENT THE ENTIRETY OF AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, during the past several weeks there has been a persistent rumor that the President intends not to appoint a special trade representative, but to turn over the responsibility for negotiating foreign trade agreements to the Department of Commerce.

Clearly trade negotiations are of concern to the entire U.S. economy and cannot be the responsibility of only one department of the Federal Government. The Department of State is vitally interested in trade negotiations. So, too, the Departments of the Treasury, Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture are equally concerned with the results of trade negotiations.

I believe that most people realize that all Western countries are in constant need of reappraisal of their trade policies, both at the national and the international level.

If further imbalance and difficulties are to be avoided, countries must not act in isolation, but rather each country must share in the development of constructive international policies.

I believe that the White House Office of the Special Trade Negotiator is necessary if we are to pursue an enlightened policy toward international trade.

As you know, the position of special representative for trade negotiations was authorized by section 241 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—Public Law 87-794.

The agricultural community, in particular, fears that, should a shift in jurisdiction occur, its right to adequate representation will be impaired.

I believe that this fear is not without some justification.

Agriculture, including the producing farmers, together with agribusiness firms which supply them and which process and market farm products, has a tremendous stake in the future of trade negotiations.

One out of every four acres of land our farmers harvest produces for export.

Approximately seventy-one million acres of U.S. farmland produced for export in fiscal 1968, about 25 percent more than the 1958-60 average.

The agribusiness effort that underlies these exports provides an estimated one million jobs.

In fiscal 1967, two-thirds of our milled rice was exported; over half the wheat; nearly half the cotton; more than a third of the grain sorghums, soybeans, and tobacco; and more than one-fourth of the flaxseed.

In recent years exports of farm products have contributed increasingly to our favorable balance of trade.

Secretary Freeman, speaking in January 1968, said:

> Four years ago agricultural exports accounted for only 29 percent of our favorable balance of trade, but currently they are accounting for over 50 percent. The achievement is even more impressive in view of the fact that agricultural shipments make up only 22 percent of total exports.

The gain in agricultural exports in recent years has been the result of a series of coordinated activities—trade negotiations, more competitive pricing, and export promotion.

In was a historic step forward when the members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade agreed to include agricultural trade problems in the Kennedy round trade negotiations which concluded in the spring of 1967.

As a result of these negotiations, we gained in our trading position in fruits and vegetables, oils, tobacco, variety meats, tallow, and some others. Other countries cut their import duties an average of 40 percent on products accounting for $700 million of our annual agricultural exports. Reciprocally, we cut our duties on average of 39 percent on about $500 million of the agricultural products we import. We also negotiated a new International Grains Arrangement which is helping all free world wheat exporting countries in this period of overly large world grain supplies.

Agriculture is especially vulnerable to retaliation, in addition to facing many other problems intricately involved in international trade.

I fear that should the office of special trade negotiator be shifted to the Department of Commerce, agriculture will not receive the attention or consideration it needs and deserves.

I wish to emphasize that I would be as vehemently opposed to shifting the special trade negotiator to the Department of Agriculture as I am over its impending switch to the Department of Commerce.

I believe that it will be a sad day for the U.S. position in international trade when the special representative for trade negotiations is demoted from his present position as a direct representative of the President to that of the head of an agency within any specific department.

For these reasons, I have joined with Senators SYMINGTON, BAYH, BURDICK, HUGHES, MCGOVERN, METCALF, MONDALE, HART, NELSON, and PROXMIRE in sending an open letter to the President which expresses our concern over the rumored change in jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that several letters and telegrams from various groups concerned about this matter be printed in the RECORD following the letter to the President.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are disturbed by continuing rumors that it is your intention not to appoint a Special Trade representative, but to turn responsibility for negotiating foreign trade agreements over to the Department of Commerce.

The Office of Special Trade Representative was created by Congress in 1962 for the specific purposes of insuring that all sectors of the American economy would be fairly represented in any trade negotiations, and that agreements resulting from such negotiations would reflect an optimum use of our export potential. If this function is now turned over to the Department of Commerce, we fear that an industrial bias will develop in our trade agreements, and that the great export potential of American agriculture may be wasted.

Agricultural products now account for about 25 per cent of America's gross annual gold earnings. As you know, however, this important element in our balance of payments is extremely vulnerable to retaliation, particularly in Europe and Japan, if the United States seeks relatively more favorable treatment for industrial goods at the expense of agriculture.

The American agricultural community, and, we believe, all Americans interested in maximizing our export earnings, would like to be reassured that you will fulfill this intent of Congress by placing responsibility for American trade negotiations in the hands of a competent and objective Special Trade Representative.

Sincerely,

BIRCH BAYH, QUENTIN N. BURDICK, HAROLD E. HUGHES, GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, LEE METCALF, WALTER F. MONDALE, PHILIP A. HART, GAYLORD NELSON, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, STUART SYMINGTON, THOMAS F. EAGLETON.

MARCH 5, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

We urge that you give highest priority to the naming of a special trade representative to insure that coordination of critical national trade policy issues is accomplished through appropriate balancing of broad foreign policy, agricultural and other commercial interests.

Recent reports from Europe appear to reconfirm the values of trade negotiations at the highest possible executive levels, to minimize misunderstandings which could jeopardize American foreign markets and world trade patterns.

American agriculture would be dealt a particularly serious blow by any narrowly-conceived action, here or abroad, which failed to consider all implications for trade and international relations. The office of the special trade representative, directly responsible to the President, is uniquely qualified to perform this service in a way which harmonizes the interests of the various executive departments with our highest goals for national welfare.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.
KENNETH D. NADEN,
Executive Vice President,
National Council of Farmers Cooperatives,
TONY DECHANT,
President, National Farmers Union.
JOHN W. SCOTT,
Master, National Grange.

MARCH 6, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

We are gravely concerned over the erosion of prestige of the Office of the Special Trade Representative, at a time when trade issues are of crucial and immediate importance for American agriculture and our national balance of payments.

We urge that every effort be made to name promptly a strong, permanent replacement for former Ambassador William Roth, in order that our international trade affairs can be handled with fairness to all U.S. interests and at the highest possible executive level. Any failure to coordinate our trade affairs in this fashion will result in damage not only to immediate U.S. trading interests out to our prestige and effectiveness in future international trade negotiations.

Chet Randolph, Executive Vice President, American Soybean Association; Carl Dumler, President, Great Plains Wheat, Inc.; Fred V. Heinkel, President, Midcontinent Farmers Association; E. L. Hatcher, President, National Association of Wheat Growers; Milan D. Smith, Executive Vice President, National Canners Association; Kenneth D. Naden, Executive Vice President, National Council of Farmers Cooperatives; Oren Lee Staley, President, National Farmers Organization; Tony Dechant, President, National Farmers Union; Bruce J. Hendrickson, Executive Secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives; John W. Scott, Master, National Grange; Sheldon J. Hauck, Executive Director, National Soybean Processors Association; Glenn H. Pogeler, President, Soybean Council of America; John D. Palmer, President, Tobacco Associates, Inc.; Alan T. Rains, Executive Vice President, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association; John Thomsen, President, Western Wheat Associates; A. F. Troyer, President, Soybean Growers of America.

AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATION,
March 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association wishes to apprise you of the importance its members attach to certain observations and recommendations on the future administration of United States foreign trade policy which were presented in a report to the President submitted by the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations on January 14, 1969. Executives of two of the Association's member companies, Mr. Arjay Miller, Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors, Ford Motor Company and George Russell, Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors, General Motors Corporation, participated in the preparation of the Special Representative's Report as members of the Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy.

At this time the Association's members wish to call attention specifically to that Report's observations (page 83) with respect to where the trade policy and negotiating functions should reside, to wit:

"The diversity of considerations that must be taken into account in promoting the commercial interests of the United States makes no one existing department appropriate for this important task . . . On balance, therefore, a separation of the trade policy and negotiating functions from the regular departments is desirable."

The Association's members concur with this view and recommend that the formulation and coordination of the United States trade policy be the responsibility of a statutory agency within the Executive Office of the President and reporting directly to the President.

Respectfully,
THOMAS C. MANN,
President.

COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE
POLICY, INC.
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We respectfully urge you not only to maintain the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the Executive Office of the President, but to strengthen the STR (1) by appointing as Special Representative someone who believes in genuinely freer trade and is capable of coping effectively with the complex economics and politics of this issue at home and abroad, and (2) by providing an adequate budget to ensure a professional staff of the highest rank and capability.

STR's primary purpose should be not only to organize the most effective U.S. effort against seriously restrictive trade barriers abroad, but also to assume primary responsibility under your direction for charting long-range U.S. trade policy. Keeping STR in the Executive Office is essential if there is to be any hope of the United States maintaining a coherent, consistent trade policy in the total national interest—one that adequately takes into account the multitude of economic and political factors that bear heavily on decision-making in this field. This kind of trade policy function cannot be exercised by any one of the regular Departments, not even by an inter-agency committee chaired by a regular member of the Cabinet.

President Kennedy recognized the importance of an independent STR in the Executive Office, not only to serve as the U.S. chief negotiator in international trade consultations, but also be the coordinator of inter-agency activity in this field. This was clearly the sense of Congress. This conception of the Office was admirably reflected in the appointment of Christian A. Herter as the first Special Representative. It was continued by President Johnson in the appointment of Governor Herter's deputy, William M. Roth, upon Governor Herter's death.

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this issue with you or any officials you designate. It is no exaggeration to say that our feelings in this matter are very strongly held, and we know they are widely shared throughout the country.

As you may remember, having participated in our 1958 rally in support of the Trade Agreements Extension Bill of that year (President Eisenhower was the dinner speaker at the close of the conference), our Committee has had a leadership role since 1953 in stimulating and organizing nationwide support for genuinely freer world trade. This is the kind of trade policy that best serves the total national interest. We are convinced that an independent STR in the Executive Office is essential to maintaining and strengthening this kind of policy.

Respectfully yours,
CARL J. GILBERT,
Chairman.

NATIONAL SOYBEAN
PROCESSORS ASSOCIATION,
March 7, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The soybean industry is gravely concerned about the future of the Office of Special Trade representative. At a critical period when EEC soybean markets stand threatened, no top-level spokesman is available to speak for U.S. interests.

We strongly urge you to appoint a strong, permanent replacement for former Ambassador Roth, and maintain this important office at its proper executive office level. It is critical that trade negotiations be continued at the highest level possible.

SHELDON J. HAUCK,
Executive Director.

MARCH 7, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Special Trade Representative position created by the Congress in 1962 was established because of the need to have an independent unit attached to the White House which could coordinate the many interests of all facets of our economy which are affected by the Trade Policy of the United States. That need still exists.

The consumer interest is one which is not ordinarily represented by a single Federal Department or Bureau, but which is seriously affected by United States Trade Policy. The National Consumers League, therefore, urges you to speedily name a replacement for Ambassador Roth so that we can be assured of effective coordination of the differing views of the various Departments, as well as the Consumer viewpoint, in the continuing development and planning of United States Trade Policy.

Sincerely yours,
SARAH H. NEWMAN,
General Secretary.

LEAGUE OF WOMAN VOTERS OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The League of Women Voters of the U.S. urges you to retain the office of special representative for trade negotiations and to appoint the special trade representative at the earliest possible date. We strongly recommend that STR serve as the agency primarily responsible for formulating and coordinating the full range of U.S. foreign trade policy and for conducting U.S. trade negotiations.

In our judgement the overall public interest is best served by having these trade functions performed by a coordinating agency within the executive office rather than by the commerce or state department or any other of the existing departments.

Mrs. BRUCE B. BENSON,
President.

AMERICAN IMPORTERS ASSOCIATION,
New York City, March 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge the continuance of the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and the appointment of a successor to Ambassador Roth at an early date. Placing the functions of trade policy formulation and negotiation in any existing department would make them subject to the over-riding goals of that department. As part of the Executive Office of the President, a special representative will assure that trade issues will be given the importance they deserve. Coordination of United States trade policy in any other way will seriously affect U.S. prestige and ability to negotiate.

GERALD O'BRIEN,
Executive Vice President.

TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1969.

Re Office of the Special Trade Representative.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Tobacco Associates is an organization representing more than 200,000 farmers in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida. Its primary function is to maintain and expand exports of tobacco grown in these states. During the past five years, such exports have represented 46% of production.

Tobacco production abroad has jumped fivefold since World War II with concomitant competition for us in the world market. The vital necessity for trade negotiations that will protect our share of that market is obvious. From our own almost day-to-day collaboration with the STR, we know that the office has done an outstanding job in that respect. We feel strongly that it should be continued as presently established.

Future trade negotiations could well be more important than in the past. As far as tobacco is concerned, the European Common Market is a case in point. Determined efforts have been underfoot for years to drastically reduce the $125 million annual market we now enjoy in the six countries. To a very

XUM

large degree these attempts have been contained through the efforts of the STR, and we are convinced that the office would be vastly more effective in preserving that position than any of the departments. Permit us, Mr. President, to strongly urge that you name a highly qualified successor to Ambassador Roth.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN D. PALMER,
President.

MARCH 7, 1969.

Strongly urge that the office of STR be retained and strengthened. This activity is too important to be buried in some other Department such as State, Commerce or Agriculture and if it were placed in any one of those would lose its impartiality and be governed by the viewpoint of the particular department it was in.

W. H. FRANKLIN,
President, Caterpillar Tractor Co., former Member of Public Advisory Committee for U.S. Trade Policy.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS: GENOCIDE—XXVIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I wish to urge the adoption of the Genocide Convention, whose major objective is to preserve man's most precious right—the right to live. Genocide is defined as the deliberate destruction or persecution of national, racial, religious, or ethnic groups. It is therefore obviously contrary to the founding spirit of this Nation, as embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

In 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations requested the Economic and Social Council to undertake the necessary studies in order to draw up a draft convention on the crime of genocide. At the request of the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary General prepared a first draft of the convention and circulated it to member states for their comments in 1947. The Secretary General was at this stage assisted by an impressive group of international law experts, including the late Dr. Raphael Lemkin, who in 1944 had coined the term "genocide." During the Paris session of the General Assembly, this draft was debated by the Legal Committee and eventually adopted by the General Assembly on December 9, 1948. Mr. President, the United States voted for its adoption.

The text of the convention confirms that genocide is a crime under international law, whether committed in time of peace or war. Of even greater importance, the convention states that all persons committing genocide shall be punished, be they constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, or private individuals. Though genocidal crimes are not to be confused with political crimes, those guilty will be subject to the rulings of their competent national court, or, if possible, an international penal tribunal.

Mr. President, over 70 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention since 1948, including Canada, France, Italy, India, and Russia. However, in the United States, the Genocide Convention has languished in the Foreign Relations Committee for 20 long years. We can no longer tolerate the possibility of a reenactment of any inhumane annihilation such as that carried out by the Nazi government of Germany during World War II. We can no longer tolerate the hideous crimes against humanity seen today all over the world.

Mr. President, we can no longer afford not to ratify this Genocide Convention at the earliest possible date.

A NEW "ANTHOLOGY" ON THE AUTO INDUSTRY IS PUBLISHED BY THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate Small Business Committee today is publishing a new and very exciting anthology on the automobile industry in general and General Motors Corp. in particular.

That is the way I would describe a 1,091-page book that is being released today and that will also be placed on sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at $4.75 a copy.

The formal title of this very important new book is "Hearings Before Subcommittees of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, Second Session, on the Question: Are Planning and Regulation Replacing Competition in the American Economy? The Automobile Industry as a Case Study."

Bearing also the short title "Planning, Regulation, and Competition: Automobile Industry—1968," this volume includes the complete testimony of Ralph Nader, auto industry critic, at 2 days of hearings last summer; an extensive written rebuttal by General Motors; papers by several university professors commenting on the Nader and GM presentations; and over 200 letters, articles, charts, and tables submitted for the record as exhibits by Nader, by GM, and the other auto manufacturers, or by the subcommittees themselves.

A computer print-out of certain unit-cost data from a Ford assembly plant, presented to the subcommittees by Mr. Nader, occupies 43 pages of the record.

The table of contents and list of exhibits alone are 14 pages long—see exhibit 1. While the volume is being published at this time without a topical index, we are exploring the possibilities of having one prepared and published separately at a later date. With such an index, this book will not only be an anthology on the auto industry, it will be something close to an encyclopedia.

CENTRAL QUESTIONS

The question in the title of the hearings—Are planning and regulation replacing competition?—first came under study by two subcommittees of the Senate Small Business Committee in 1967. The joint project was undertaken by the Subcommittee on Monopoly, which it is my privilege to chair, and the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices, then presided over by former Senator Wayne Morse.

At a panel-session hearing held by the two subcommittees in June 1967, Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith was questioned by fellow witnesses and by Senators about his views on the "inevitability" of markets coming under the domination of giant corporations. Another witness, Michigan State Prof. Walter Adams, had asserted that market power of the large corporations was both excessive and unnecessary and could be avoided by a Government policy more forcefully favorable to competition. Both professors had cited the automobile industry in illustration of their points.

Our 1968 hearings, which we publish today, were intended to explore with witnesses from and critics of the automobile industry the issues raised by Galbraith and his critics. But, when industry witnesses were informed that they would be expected to join a panel of which Ralph Nader would be a member, we encountered a unanimous disinterest in participation. The Big Four auto makers, the Automobile Manufacturers Association, and tiny Checker Motors Corp., all declined the subcommittees' invitations to join a witness panel that would also include Mr. Nader. Accordingly, Mr. Nader was the only witness to appear before us in person.

Subsequently, the big three auto companies again received and declined invitations to appear before the subcommittees and respond to Mr. Nader's testimony, although each of them did answer in writing some—not all—of the questions we put to them in writing. In the case of General Motors, the written materials submitted to us take up 256 pages of the printed record, and they are, as far as they go, extremely interesting and helpful.

SECRECY A MAJOR ISSUE

Despite its length, the statement by General Motors failed to answer the questions the subcommittees thought most important. Not only GM but the other auto majors refused to supply data on divisional sales and profits, and on unit costs of production.

GM did try to refute an allegation that the unit labor cost of a medium-priced car does not exceed $300. To do so, the company applied the percentage of its total sales dollar paid to employees—as revealed in its 1967 annual report—to the average wholesale price of its cars. The exercise resulted in the figure $1,000 as the "approximate" direct and indirect labor cost of a GM car.

For my part, I found the exercise unconvincing and the number that it produced unworthy of serious attention. I made that view known to officials of General Motors; nevertheless, they continued to trumpet their break with the industry's secrecy tradition in having revealed this "confidential" information on the labor cost of building a car. When General Motors' Chairman J. M. Roche gave that figure to a Newsweek reporter, and the magazine carried it as an example of "new candor" from GM—see exhibit 2—I was constrained to respond.

In a letter to the editor of Newsweek—see exhibit 3—which was carried in the February 17, 1969 edition, I said, in part:

> Using this same method and annual-report figures, we could ascertain that Mr. Roche and a GM factory floorsweeper each received approximately $6,700 in salaries in 1967.

I might add that the Ford cost data that were given to our subcommittees by

XUM

Mr. Nader indicated that the direct labor costs of assembly of 19 models of 1966 Fords ranged from $54.51 to $78.82. I inserted the factory cost data and related materials and analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 25, 1968.

IMPASSE REACHED

So the subcommittees and the automobile companies found themselves reduced in this impasse: the subcommittees felt—and I continue strongly to believe—that we had to have divisional profit and unit-production-cost data to know whether or not Galbraith and Nader were right in their assertions about the demise of competition and the existence—and misuse—of the market power. The companies insisted—and they continue strongly to maintain—that their market power was so tenuous, and competition in their industry so fierce, that to reveal the requested information would have grave competitive consequences for each of them.

General Motors went so far as to entitle the lengthy paper it delivered to the subcommittees: "The Automobile Industry: A Case Study in Competition."

GALBRAITH COMMENT

For suggestions and broader insights, we sent the Nader and GM presentations to a number of economics professors, requesting comments. Five responded.

One of the shortest and harshest of the five commentaries included in the hearings volume is by Professor Galbraith. He expressed incredulity that the GM statement could actually have been prepared by GM. The Harvard professor began:

> That it could come from a wills and deeds lawyer in the most remote boondock would be surprising. As the defense of the nation's largest industrial firm on an important issue, it is simply not to be believed.

In attempting to refute the whole model of oligopoly—industries having only a few firms—as one important form of existing industrial organization, and maintaining that the auto industry provides real, classical—as opposed to oligopolistic—competion, GM was defying almost all economic analysis, not just his, Galbraith argued. He wrote:

> For General Motors does not refute my case by putting itself where virtually all economists who dissent from my view would place it. Oligopoly as a category is not even mentioned. It leaps back thirty-five years to the unbelievable claim that General Motors conforms to the competitive model. * * * Faced with the contention that the world is not quite round, GM goes unhesitantly back to the argument that it is flat.

INTENSIVE STUDY SEEN REQUIRED

In a paper entitled "Statement Regarding Competition in the Automobile Industry," Associate Professor of Economics Mark Schupack, of Brown University, contends:

> Despite the arguments submitted by General Motors Corporation, * * * competition in the automobile industry is not as satisfactory as it might be from the point of view of the consumer and society as a whole.

Professor Schupack urged a "comprehensive study of the automobile industry aimed at developing the necessary data to propose policy action." He argued that, while such a study might cost $2 to $5 million, it could save American consumers $1 billion a year if it resulted, as it quite conceivably could, in a 5 percent average price reduction in cars.

Sidney L. Carroll, assistant professor of economics at Louisiana State University, wrote the subcommittees that "the materials submitted by General Motors may raise more questions than they answer." He proceeded to list some 26 such questions as a sample, ranging from points on the alleged economies—and some real diseconomies—of scale to "why does not GM give expense account information to stockholders?"

CORPORATE POLITICAL POWER

Prof. Douglas F. Dowd, of Cornell's economics department, suggested that the most important area for further inquiry might be the "political power held by those corporations that possess concentrated market power." He criticized the passivity about the issue of market power that is displayed by the U.S. Government in general and the Justice Department's Antitrust Division in particular.

In a joint paper, Prof. Samuel M. Loeschler and Associate Prof. Lloyd D. Orr, of Indiana University's economics department, argued for reduction of concentration as the ideal solution, but acknowledged that "currently this is probably not feasible for a variety of political and, occasionally, technological reasons." The next-most-useful policy that Government might adopt, they said, would be a requirement of regular, detailed disclosure of divisional operations data from giant firms.

SUBCOMMITTEE PLANS

Mr. President, we have only scratched the surface of this question on the planning and regulating of our lives and the economy by giant corporations. My Subcommittee on Monopoly will be continuing to explore the subject this year and quite possibly for several years to come. We are now planning the first few of a lengthy series of panel-session public hearings at which the experts whose papers appeared in the RECORD, and others, can be interrogated by Senators and by one another.

Our aim for now is to promote constructive dialog among all the major contending views on the role and future of the giant corporation. We are especially interested in adding to the dialogue voices from some of the disciplines other than economics and law. I suspect that the cultural anthropologist, the historian, the sociologist and the diplomat, for example, can give us insights that will provide new perspectives on the arguments that anciently have raged among economists and antitrust lawyers.

For the present, I am not going to try to force the issue of divisional accounting and unit-cost data with the auto makers, but I emphasize those words, "for the present."

PARTIAL CONTENTS OF HEARINGS

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask permission to insert in the RECORD the complete table of contents and list of exhibits of this remarkable hearings volume; but I should also like now personally to inform Senators of some of the more important items. A partial list of the materials includes:

Oral testimony of Ralph Nader at 2-day hearings in July 1968, with over 100 supporting exhibits.

A letter from RSL Corporate, of Cleveland, on its plans to introduce a new American motor car—committee exhibit 31, page 42.

A statement of the subcommittee's purposes and concerns in the hearings—exhibit 40, page 93.

A summary of all antitrust actions by the Justice Department against General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—exhibit 16, page 19.

A summary of all Federal Trade Commission actions against major automobile manufacturers—exhibit 17, page 24.

Comments of the major automakers on the Justice and FTC summaries—exhibits 18, 19, and 20, beginning page 29.

Complete texts of the certificate of incorporation and the bylaws of General Motors Corp.—exhibits 47 and 48 beginning on page 109.

Internal-audit standard-unit-cost data from a Ford assembly plant, and analysis of apparent Ford markups over factory costs included in the wholesale prices of certain 1966 cars and optional accessories—exhibits 75 through 77, beginning on page 268.

Correspondence between Ford Motor Co. and the subcommittee concerning the committee staff's analysis of Ford's apparent markups over factory costs in 1966—appendix III, D, E, and F, beginning on page 603.

Questions the subcommittees most wanted General Motors, page 607; Ford, page 600; Chrysler, page 594; and American Motors, page 591, to answer, after hearing Ralph Nader's testimony.

Complete text of General Motors' statement, "The Automobile Industry: A Case Study of Competition"—pages 617-728.

General Motors' responses to the subcommittees' questions—pages 729-749—and supporting exhibits—pages 750-890.

Ralph Nader's 59-page bibliography on General Motors—pages 974-1032.

Commentaries on the General Motors statement and responses by Prof. Sidney L. Carroll, Louisiana State, page 906; Prof. Douglas F. Dowd, Cornell, page 910; Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard, page 910, Profs. Samuel M. Loeschler and Lloyd D. Orr, Indiana University, page 913; Prof. Mark B. Schupack, Brown University, page 917; and Ralph Nader, page 933.

DESCRIPTION OF EXHIBITS

Mr. President, three exhibits are a part of my statement. Exhibit 1 is the complete table of contents—including the list of exhibits—of the hearings on "Planning, Regulation, and Competition: Automobile Industry, 1968." Exhibit 2 is an article from Newsweek magazine of January 27, 1969, in which General Motors' chief executive, Mr. Roche, is reported to have again made the claim that GM had disclosed some new and confidential information on its costs to subcommittees of the Senate Small Busi-

XUM

ness Committee. Exhibit 3 is my letter to the editor of Newsweek, commenting on that claim.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three exhibits be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

(From hearings on "Planning, Regulation and Competition: Automobile Industry—1968")

CONTENTS

Statement of— Page
Nader, Ralph, Washington, D.C 98
—Resumed 427

APPENDIXES

I. CORRESPONDENCE WITH AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.
A. Letter dated July 16, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Roy D. Chapin, Jr., board chairman and chief executive officer, American Motors Corp 591
B. Letter dated July 22, 1968, from Frank S. Hedge, vice president, American Motors Corp., to Senators Morse and Nelson 592
C. Letter dated July 26, 1968, from Raymond D. Watts, associate general counsel, Senate Small Business Committee, to Frank S. Hedge 593
II. CORRESPONDENCE WITH CHRYSLER CORP.
A. Letter dated July 16, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Virgil E. Boyd, president, Chrysler Corp 594
B. Letter dated July 23, 1968, from Virgil E. Boyd to Senators Morse and Nelson 595
C. Letter dated July 26, 1968, from Raymond D. Watts, associate general counsel, Senate Small Business Committee, to Virgil E. Boyd 596
D. Letter dated October 17, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Virgil E. Boyd 597
E. Letter dated October 29, 1968, from Virgil E. Boyd to Senator Nelson 598
F. Letter dated November 15, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Virgil E. Boyd 599
III. CORRESPONDENCE WITH FORD MOTOR CO.
A. Letter dated July 16, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Rodney W. Markley, Jr., vice president-Washington staff, Ford Motor Co 600
B. Letter dated July 22, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., to Senators Morse and Nelson 602
C. Letter dated August 16, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., to Senators Morse and Nelson 602
D. Letter dated October 1, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., to Senator Nelson 603
E. Letter dated October 3 1966, from Senator Nelson to Rodney W. Markley, Jr 604
F. Letter dated October 14, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., to Senator Nelson 605
G. Letter dated October 17, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Rodney W. Markley, Jr 606
H. Letter dated December 9, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., to Senator Nelson 606
IV. CORRESPONDENCE WITH GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND: "THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY: A CASE STUDY OF COMPETITION—A STATEMENT BY GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION"
A. Letter dated July 16, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to J. M. Roche, chairman of the board, General Motors Corp 607
Enclosure: Appendix A—General Motors Corp., divisions and subsidiaries 609
B. Letter dated July 19, 1968, from J. M. Roche to Senators Morse and Nelson 610
C. Letter dated October 17, 1968, from Senator Nelson to J. M. Roche 611
D. Letter dated December 13, 1968, from J. M. Roche to Senator Nelson 612
E. General Motors press release of October 21, 1968 613
F. Letter dated October 18, 1968, from J. M. Roche to Senators Morse and Nelson, transmitting the next two documents, G and H 615
G. THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY: A CASE STUDY OF COMPETITION—A STATEMENT BY GENERAL MOTORS CORP., dated October 18, 1968 617
Introduction and Summary 621
I. The background of competition in the auto industry 631
II. Competition in products 640
A. The automobile buyer 641
B. The suppliers of automobiles 644
1. American manufacturers 645
2. Foreign manufacturers 651
3. Used cars 653
C. The competition of other transportation services 657
D. Competitive innovation 659
III. Competition in prices 663
A. The manufacturer's suggested price 663
B. The price the customer pays 669
C. Pricing considerations in product development 671
IV. Competition in marketing 675
V. The benefits of the auto industry 682
A. Product variety and versatility 682
B. Price trends and price levels 684
C. Vehicles and the changed face of America 686
D. Expansion of opportunities for small business 689
E. Other benefits 690
VI. Profits and competition 692
VII. Size, concentration, and competition 701
A. Size and competition 701
B. Concentration and competition 705
C. No artificial barriers to entry 711
Conclusion 716
Appendix A—Early failures 718
Appendix B—1969 model changes—Chevrolet Impala 720
H. RESPONSES OF GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION TO THE ELEVEN POINTS STATED BY SENATORS MORSE AND NELSON, dated October 18, 1968 729
(Exhibits to responses: see list of exhibits, Nos. 200 to 207).
V. MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS, MATERIALS AND CORRESPONDENCE
A. Ford Motor Co., excerpts from 1967 annual report:
(1) Financial review 872
(2) Corporate structure of Ford Motor Co 884
B. Statement of Raphael Cohen, chairman, Metropolitan Independent Dodge Chrysler Dealer Association, Inc., July 25, 1968 885
C. Letter dated July 27, 1968, from Albert G. Fonda, president, American Society of Inventors, to Senate Small Business Committee 887
Enclosure A—"The Patent Office, an adventure in novelty," article in "a major company's employee newspaper" 890
V. MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS, ETC.—Continued
C. Letter dated July 27, 1968, etc.—Continued Page
Enclosure B—Boeing Co. employee invention agreement 891
Enclosure C—Giannini Controls Corp. patent agreement 893
Enclosure D—Typical quitclaim given to inventor 893
Enclosure E—American Society of Inventors, employment disclosure agreement 894
Enclosure F—Excerpt from Armed Services Procurement Regulation, "Rights granted to the Government" 895
D. Securities and Exchange Commission, "Notice of proposed amendments to forms S-1, S-7, and 10," dated September 4, 1968 897
E. Securities and Exchange Commission, "Extension of time for submitting comments on proposed amendments to forms S-1, S-7, and 10," dated September 23, 1968 901
F. Letter dated October 9, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Hon. Ben Burdetsky, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics 901
Enclosure: "Quality Rise in 1969 Cars Put at $1 by U.S. Agency," New York Times, October 8, 1968 902
G. Letter dated October 17, 1968, from Hon. Ben Burdetsky, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, to Senator Nelson 902
Enclosure: U.S. Department of Labor press release No. 9994, dated October 7, 1968, "Preliminary report on prices of new passenger cars" 903
H. Memorandum dated October 24, 1968, from Mary Ann Keeffe, economic analyst, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, to Blake O'Connor, Senate Small Business Committee 904
Enclosure: Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles press release of April 1968, "Vehicle Involvement Study," with tables:
Massachusetts passenger motor vehicle registration and traffic-accident involvement rates by make of vehicle—all accidents, 1966 905
Same, fatal accidents, 1966 905
I. Sidney L. Carroll, Assistant Professor of Economics, Louisiana State University, "Observations and questions concerning materials submitted by General Motors," a commentary on appendix IV–G and IV–H, supra 906
J. Letter dated November 24, 1968, from Douglas F. Dowd, professor of economics, Cornell University, to Senate Small Business Committee, commenting on General Motors materials 910
K. John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg, professor of economics, Harvard University, "Memorandum on The Automobile Industry: A Case Study in Competition—A statement by the General Motors Corp." 910
L. Samuel M. Loescher, professor of economics, Indiana University, and Lloyd D. Orr, associate professor of economics, Indiana University, "Economic Competition and the Dimensions of Pluralism—A Response to the General Motors Material Presented for the Written Record of Hearings on Planning, Regulation, and Competition: The Automobile Industry" 913
M. Mark B. Schupack, associate professor of economics, Brown University, "Statement Regarding Competition in the Automobile Industry," October 22, 1968 917
N. Donald F. Turner, professor of law, Harvard University, "Reflections on Antitrust and Related Economic Policies," address delivered to the New York City Bar Association on November 14, 1968 926
O. Letter dated July 5, 1968, from Gaylord B. Kidwell to Senators Morse and Nelson with enclosure 932
P. Letter dated November 13, 1968, from Ralph Nader to Senators Morse and Nelson, with enclosures (see list of exhibits, Nos. 208 to 227, for description of enclosures) 933

EXHIBITS

Committee exhibits:
No.
1. Letter dated May 28, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Ralph Nader 4
2. Letter dated May 28, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to J. M. Roche, chairman of the board, General Motors Corp 5
3. Letter dated June 7, 1968, from J. M. Roche to Senators Morse and Nelson 6
4. Letter dated June 17, 1968, from Senator Nelson to J. M. Roche 7
5. Letter dated June 28, 1968, from J. M. Roche (by George Russell, vice chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.) to Senators Morse and Nelson 8
6. Letter dated June 13, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Henry Ford II, board chairman and chief executive officer, Ford Motor Co 8
7. Letter dated June 18, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., vice president, Washington staff, Ford Motor Co., to Senators Morse and Nelson 9
8. Letter dated June 21, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Thomas C. Mann, president, Automobile Manufacturers Association 9
9. Letter dated June 28, 1968, from Thomas C. Mann to Senators Morse and Nelson 11
10. Letter dated June 21, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Virgil E. Boyd, president, Chrysler Corp. (Identical letters to Roy D. Chapin, Jr., board chairman and chief executive officer, American Motors Corp.; and Morris Markin, president, Checker Motors Corp.) 13
11. Letter dated July 1, 1968, from V. E. Boyd, Chrysler Corp., to Senators Morse and Nelson 13
12. Letter dated June 28, 1968, from Roy D. Chapin, Jr., American Motors Corp., to Senators Morse and Nelson 14
Enclosure: "High Court Rebuffs FTC in Case Involving American Motors' Discounts on Applicances," Wall Street Journal, April 9, 1968 15
13. Letter dated July 3, 1968, from Morris Markin, Checker Motors Corp., to Senators Morse and Nelson 16
14. Letter dated May 15, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Hon. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice 18
15. Letter dated May 15, 1968, from Senator Nelson to Hon. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission 19
16. Letter dated May 31, 1968, from Hon. Donald F. Turner to Senator Nelson 19
Enclosure: Memorandum summarizing antitrust actions by the Government against General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co., and Chrysler Corp 20
17. Letter dated June 19, 1968, from Hon. Paul Rand Dixon to Senator Nelson 24
Enclosure: Memorandum summarizing Federal Trade Commission actions against automobile manufacturers 25

XUM

Committee exhibits—Continued

No. Page

18. Letter dated June 10, 1968, from J. M. Roche, General Motors Corp., to Senator Nelson 29
19. Letter dated July 3, 1968, from George Russell, General Motors Corp., to Senator Nelson 30
20. Letter dated June 28, 1968, from Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Ford Motor Co., to Senator Nelson 30
21. Letter dated June 24, 1968, from Senators Morse and Nelson to Hon. Ramsey Clark, Attorney General of the United States 32
22. Letter dated June 27, 1968, from Hon. Edwin M. Zimmerman, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, to Senators Morse and Nelson 32
23. through 29. Reserved exhibit numbers.
30. Senate floor statement by Senator Morse, "Would it be good for the country to break up General Motors?" Congressional Record, November 2, 1968 35
    Exhibit: Louis M. Kohlmeier, "Antitrust Bombshell: A Proposed Suit Aimed at Breaking Up GM Poses Perils for LBJ," Wall Street Journal, October 31, 1967- 36
    Exhibit: "Justice Agency Says Suit to Break Up GM Won't Be Filed Soon," Wall Street Journal, November 1, 1967- 40
    Exhibit: Eileen Shanahan, "Justice Leaders Rejected a Plan to File Trust Suit Against GM," New York Times, November 1, 1967 41
    Exhibit: Richard Harwood, "Admits Existence of 'Draft Complaint'—Justice Denies GM Suit Report," Washington Post, November 1, 1967 42
31. Letter dated January 2, 1968, from Richard Luntz, chairman, R S L Corporate, Cleveland, Ohio, to Senator Morse 42
32. Letter dated June 17, 1968, from David Housman, president, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., Melrose, Mass., to J. M. Roche, chairman, General Motors Corp 44
    Enclosure: Letter dated July 12, 1967, from John S. DeMetrick, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., to Chevrolet Motor Division, General Motors Corp 46
    Enclosure: Letter dated August 31, 1967, from John S. DeMetrick to Chevrolet Motor Division 46
    Enclosure: Letter dated September 8, 1967, from R. J. Talbot, general auditor, Chevrolet Motor Division, to Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., attention J. S. DeMetrick 46
    Enclosure: Letter dated September 15, 1967, from John S. DeMetrick to Chevrolet Motor Division, attention R. J. Talbot 47
33. Letter dated June 28, 1968, from David Housman, president, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., Melrose, Mass., to L. A. Townsend, chairman, Chrysler Corp 47
    Enclosure: Letter dated July 12, 1967, from John S. DeMetrick, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., to Chrysler-Plymouth Division, Chrysler Corp 49
    Enclosure: Letter dated August 31, 1967, from John S. DeMetrick to Chrysler-Plymouth Division 49
    Enclosure: Letter dated September 1, 1967, from E. D. Vosburgh, manager, Engineering Standards and Data, Chrysler Corp., to Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., attention John S. DeMetrick 49
34. Letter dated July 19, 1968, from Ross L. Malone, general counsel, General Motors Corp., to Senators Morse and Nelson, with copy to David Housman, president, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc 50
    Enclosure: Letter dated February 2, 1966, from Aloysius F. Power, general counsel, General Motors Corp., to Senator Hart 52
    Enclosure: Letter dated March 2, 1966, from Aloysius F. Power to Senator Hart 53
    Enclosure: Letter dated February 9, 1968, from O. W. McAfee, customer relations manager, Chevrolet Motor Division, to James E. Linville, Jr., Kansas City, Kans 56
    Enclosure: Letter dated January 24, 1968, from James E. Linville, Jr., to Custome ıService Department, Chevrolet Motor Division 57
35. Letter dated July 22, 1968, from Paul A. Heinen, associate general counsel, Chrysler Corporation, to David Housman 57
36. Letter dated December 5, 1968, from David Housman, president, Automatic Radio Manufacturing Co., Inc., to Senators Morse and Nelson, with copy to Ross L. Malone, general counsel, General Motors Corp 58
    Enclosure: Statement of David Housman at hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, on distribution problems affecting small business, 89th Congress, second session, part 2 (1966) 62
37. Additional correspondence relating to Automatic Radio Mfg. Co 92
    Editorial note 92
    Letter dated February 3, 1966, from H. L. Hosford, president, A. D. Anderson Chevrolet, Inc., Baltimore, Md., to Senator Philip Hart, Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly 92
    Letter dated February 3, 1966, from Sidney J. Weiner, president, West Ford Sales, Inc., Newton, Mass., to Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly 93
38. and 39. Reserved exhibit numbers.
40. Joint statement by Senators Morse and Nelson, "Planning, Regulation, and Competition," Congressional Record, July 1, 1968 93

Ralph Nader's exhibits:

41. General Motors organization chart (facing page) 103
42. "The Massive Statistics of General Motors," Fortune, July 15, 1966 103
43. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Corp.: Miscellaneous Data on Scope of Operations" 103
44. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Products Manufactured by General Motors Corp." 104
45. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Corp.: Distribution of Ownership and Ability of Management to Gain Overwhelming Proxy Support for Position It Urges" 106
46. Excerpts from the 1967 annual report of General Motors Corp. (omitted: cited to exhibit 200, *infra*) 107
47. Certificate of incorporation of General Motors Corp., as amended through May 24, 1968 109
48. Bylaws of General Motors Corp., as amended through June 1968 127
49. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Acceptance Corp. operation" 146
50. Senate floor statement by Senator O'Mahoney, "Prevention of Manufacturers of Motor Vehicles From Financing Sales of Their Products," Congressional Record, February 2, 1959 147
51. "Automobile financing, insurance, and the cost of a new car," excerpt from Consumer Reports (1965) quoted in Macaulay, *Law and the Balance of Power* (1966) 151
52. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "GMAC—Prudential Insurance Co. Credit Life Insurance" 152

Ralph Nader's exhibits—Continued

No. Page

53. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Shaking up local dealers," quoting from Macaulay, *Law and the Balance of Power* (1966) 155
54. Wesley Marx, "Your Right to a Car Bargain," The Nation, March 9, 1963. 157
55. Opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States* v. *General Motors Corp. et al.*, 384 U.S. 127 (1966) 160
56. Department of Justice press release, June 2, 1966 184
57. Hon. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, "Advertising and Competition," speech prepared for delivery June 2, 1966 185
58. Andrew Barr, Chief Accountant, Securities and Exchange Commission, "Need for Product-Line Reporting," speech presented November 13, 1967 200
59. Memorandum by Mr. Nader introducing and quoting in full the opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, in *Hewlett-Packard Company et al.* v. *United States*, 385 F. 2d 1013 204
60. Press release of the Ford Division, Ford Motor Co., September 29, 1956 208
61. "Prices of 1957 Ford Cars Adjusted To Bring Them Nearer to Chevy's," Wall Street Journal, October 22, 1956 210
62. Excerpts from Gardiner C. Means, "Pricing Power and the Public Interest," in Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, *Administered Prices: A Compendium on Public Policy* (1963) 214
63. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Evidence That GM's Profit Target Is Related to Less Than 180 Days' Production" 217
64. Donaldson Brown, vice president, General Motors Corp., "Pricing Policy in Relation to Financial Control—'Tuning UP General Motors'," the last three of four articles in *Management and Administration:*
    A. Article II—February 1924 218
    B. Article III—March 1924 223
    C. Article IV—April 1924 229
65. Letter dated January 25, 1968, from Senator Hart to Ralph Nader 238
66. Memorandum by Mr. Nader introducing excerpt from Joseph Bain, *Industrial Organization* (1959), on entry barriers in automobile industry 240
67. Department of Justice, "Merger Guidelines," 1968:
    A. Introductory comment by Mr. Nader 242
    B. Department of Justice press release announcing guidelines, May 30, 1968 242
    C. Text of the guidelines 243
68. Federal Trade Commission, "Resolution Directing an Investigation of Acquisitions and Mergers," July 2, 1968 251
69. Federal Trade Commission press release, July 9, 1968, "Federal Trade Commission Announces In-depth Investigation of Conglomerate Merger Movement" 251
70. Excerpt from Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, *Administered Prices: Automobiles* (1958), with introductory comment by Mr. Nader 252
71. "Antitrust Bombshell: A proposed suit aimed at breaking up GM poses perils for LBJ" (omitted because included elsewhere as a part of exhibit 30, supra) 254
72. John Esposito, "Former Professor Tackles Antitrust," Harvard Law Record, December 8, 1966 254
73. Richard S. Morse, "A Suggested Program for Government and Industry in Solving the Automotive Emissions Problem," speech presented January 8, 1968 257
74. Excerpts from New York Department of Motor Vehicles, "Feasibility Study, New York State Safety Car Program—Final Report," by Republic Aviation Division, Fairchild Hiller 261

Committee exhibit:

75. Senate floor statement by Senator Nelson, "Automaker's Cost Data Reveal High Markups," Congressional Record, September 25, 1968 268

Ralph Nader's exhibit:

76. Development cost of production—Proof of ending inventory, 1966 model Ford, July 29, 1966. [Exhibit edited and annotated by professional staff of the committee in consultation with Mr. Nader. This exhibit was also exhibit 1 to Senator Nelson's floor statement of September 25, 1968, exhibit 75, supra.] 277

Committee exhibits:

77. Ford Division, Ford Motor Co., 1966 Ford passenger car prices (Excerpts from Ford's price list to its dealers in the summer of 1966. This exhibit was exhibit 2 to Senator Nelson's floor statement of September 25, 1968, exhibit 75, supra.) 321
78. Manufacturer's markups on 1966 Ford Galaxie 500 four-door sedan, and selected options. (This exhibit was exhibit 3 to Senator Nelson's floor statement of September 25, 1968, exhibit 75, supra:) 330

Ralph Nader's exhibits:

79. Albert Z. Carr, "Is Business Bluffing Ethical?" and "The Executive's Conscience," excerpt from Clarence B. Randall, "The Executive in Transition," both from Harvard Business Review, January-February 1968 334
80. Resolution by the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, on air pollution problem, January 28, 1965 341
81. "Steaming Along on Steam," Life, May 10, 1968 343
82. Charles B. Camp, "Steamer Dreamers: Senate to Study Steam Cars as a Solution For Air Pollution; Detroit Likes Status Quo," Wall Street Journal, May 27, 1968 344
83. Letter dated June 15, 1968, from Dr. Robert U. Ayres, Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C., to Ralph Nader 347
84. General Motors Corp., Ternstedt Division advertisement, on GM power windows (omitted: cited to substantially identical advertisement in exhibit 206) 351
85. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration press release No. 166, dated May 19, 1968, "Auto Power Windows Evoke Warning" 351
86. Department of Commerce, Office of the Secretary press release No. G 67-66, dated March 10, 1967, "Dr. Haddon's Reply to Ralph Nader" 352
87. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Innovation or Emulation," introducing and presenting excerpt from testimony of Dr. John M. Blair, chief economist, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, in hearings before that Subcommittee on Economic Concentration (pt. 3, 1965) 355
88. Excerpt from U.S. Department of Commerce, *Technology Innovation; Its Environment and Management* (1967) 357
89. Associated Press wire report, "Minicar," November 29. 1967 368
90. Ralph Nader, "The Engineer's Professional Role: Universities, Corporations, and Professional Societies," Engineering Education, February 1967 368
91. Isidore Silver, "The Corporate Ombudsman," Harvard Business Review, May-June 1967 374
92. Walter Pincus, "Advertising Agency Requests: Guides Asked on Political Gifts," Washington Post, May 11, 1968 386
93. Walter Pincus, "'Chrysler Executives' Checks Cross Party Lines: Political Gifts Revealed," Washington Post, May 18, 1968 387
94. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Some Shareholder Questions for General Motors." 388
95. L. L. L. Golden, "Public Relations: Full Disclosure," Saturday Review, October 12, 1963, with introductory comment by Mr. Nader 389

XUM

Ralph Nader's exhibits—Continued

No. Page

96. Excerpt from the testimony of Hon. William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, at hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on Economic Concentration (pt. 2, 1965) 393
97. Remarks of Senator Philip A. Hart to Antitrust Section, American Bar Association, Washington, April 4, 1968 394
98. Press release on and text of address by Senator Philip A. Hart to Michigan Gasoline Dealers Association, May 14, 1968 397
99. Press release from the office of Senator Phliip A. Hart on consumer's interest in antitrust enforcement, July 1, 1968 399
100. John F. A. Taylor, "Is the Corporation Above the Law?" Harvard Business Review, March 1965 400
101. Excerpt from Peter Drucker, "The World of Alfred P. Sloan," Fortune, July 1961 (review of Sloan's *My Years With General Motors*) 411
102. Anthony Lewis, "U.S. Aide Suggests GM Give UP Unit—Barnes Offers, Without Any Advocacy, a Step To Ease Undue Concentration," New York Times, March 9, 1956 413
103. Excerpt from the testimony of George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on the need to limit the maximum size of large corporations, at hearings on Administered Prices: Part 6, Automobiles (1958) 414
104. "Justice Agency Says Suit To Break Up GM Won't Be Filed Soon; Department Confirms Proposed Litigation Has Been Prepared; White House Disclaims Role,'' Wall Street Journal, November 1, 1967. (Text of article omitted here because included, in full, as a part of exhibit 30, supra.) 428
105. Charles N. Stabler, "The Conglomerates—Even Accountants Find Some Financial Reports of Combines Baffling—LTV Gives Four Per-Share Net Figures; SEC Pushes for Detailed Disclosures—'Hidden Value' in Aquisitions,.. Wall Street Journal, August 5, 1968 431
106. "Were 'Golden Fleece' Earnings Per Share $3.14 or $1.99? Well * * *," Wall Street Journal, August 5, 1968 435
107. Statement of Hon. Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on product-line financial disclosure by conglomerate corporations, September 20, 1966 436
108. Address by Chairman Cohen of the SEC before the Financial Analysts Federation, New York, May 24, 1966 439
109. "Disclosure of Profit Sources by Products Urged by SEC for Registration Forms," Wall Street Journal, September 5, 1968 445

Committee exhibits:

110. Editorial, "On Warranty Problem * * * Why Secret Meetings by FTC-Makers?'' Automotive News, July 15, 1968 450
Ralph Nader's exhibits:
111. Federal Trade Commission letter and staff report no automobile advertising on "speed" and "power" themes:
A. Letter dated April 14, 1967, from Hon. Joseph W. Shea, Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, to each automobile manufacturer 452
B. Staff report dated November 15, 1966, by Chalmers B. Yarley, director, Bureau of Industry Guidance, and Charles A. Sweeney, director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices; to the Commission 453
112. Letter dated September 18, 1968, from Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, to Hon. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, regarding automobile warranties 464
113. Letter dated September 25, 1968, from Chairman Dixon of the FTC to Chairman Magnuson of the Senate Commerce Committee 464
Enclosure: Separate statement of Commissioner Elman 465
Enclosure: Separate statement of Commissioner MacIntyre's position regarding the Commission's letter to Senator Magnuson in response to his letter of September 18, 1968 466
114. Federal Trade Commission press release dated November 18, 1968, releasing summary and text of staff report on Automobile warranties, and announcing public hearings to begin January 9, 1969 466
115. Federal Trade Commission, "Notice of Public Hearing on Automobile Warranties," released November 18, 1968 468
116. Edward Daniels, claim manager, Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange, "Design versus Repair," paper presented October 2, 1968, to American Society of Body Engineers 471
117. Tom Kleene, "Car Designers Are Blamed for High Cost of Repairs," Detroit Free Press, October 3, 1968 474
118. Bob Irvin, "Hidden Wipers Hit as Auto Hazard," Detroit News, October 2, 1968 475
119. "Warning: Gremlins at Work," Consumer Reports, April 1966 475
120. "A Look Behind the Slogans," Consumer Reports, January 1967 476
121. "Defective Slogans," Consumer Reports, February 1967 477
122. "Ready-to-Run?", Consumer Reports, March 1967 478
123. "What Went Wrong With This Month's Test Cars," Consumer Reports, May 1967 479
124. "More Assembly-Line Gremlins," Consumer Reports, June 1967 480
125. "More Assembly-Line Gremlins," Consumer Reports, July 1967 480
126. "Defects, Defekte,Difetti, Defauts, Tansho," Consumer Reports, August 1967 481
127. "Defects: A Sadder Story This Year," Consumer Reports, January 1968 483
128. "Defects: Another Bumper Crop," Consumer Reports, February 1968 483
129. "Autos 1968—Still Not Good Enough," Consumer Reports, April 1968 485
130. "Defects: The Art of Partial Assembly," Consumer Reports, May 1968 487
131. "Frequency-of-Repair Records: 1962 to 1967 Models," Consumer Reports, April 1968 488
132. "Defects," Consumer Reports, June 1968 492
133. "Defects and Deficiencies: Many Built In," Consumer Reports, August 1968 493
134. "Defects in Design and Assembly," Consumer Reports, September 1968 494
135. "Design and Assembly Problems," Consumer Reports, October 1968 495
136. Dan Cordtz, "Car Pricing—How Auto Firms Figure Their Costs to Reckon the Price Dealers Pay—Industry's Accounting Ways Shed Light on Why Tags on New Cars Keep Rising—Focus on Profits, Pay Gains," Wall Street Journal, December 10, 1957 497
137. Press release of the UAW dated September 21, 1966, "Reuther assails Ford's price increases; urges Congress to investigate" 504
138. Press release of the UAW dated September 22, 1966, "Auto price increases inflationary, Reuther says; demands U.S. inquiry" 505
139. Press release from the offices of Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Walter F. Mondale dated July 31, 1967 506
140. Senate Floor statement by Senator Mondale, "Safety improvements and 1968 automobile prices," Congressional Record, August 3, 1967 507
Exhibit: Letter dated May 29, 1967, from Senators Magnuson and Mondale to Virgile E. Boyd, president, Chrysler Corp 508
Exhibit: Letter dated June 21, 1967, from W. V. Luneburg, American Motors Corp., to Senators Mondale and Magnuson 509
Exhibit: Letter dated June 2, 1967, from Virgil E. Boyd, Chrysler Corp., to Senators Magnuson and Mondale 509

Committee exhibits—Continued

No. Page

Exhibit: Letter dated June 28, 1967, from F. G. Secrest, Ford Motor Co., to Senators Magnuson and Mondale 510
Exhibit: Letter dated June 8, 1967, from James M. Roche, General Motors Corp., to Senators Magnuson and Mondale 512
Exhibit: Letter dated July 28, 1967, from Senators Mondale and Magnuson to Hon. Arthur M. Ross, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics 513
Exhibit: Arthur M. Ross, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Statement on Automobile Price Indexes," September 22, 1966 516
Exhibit: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "BLS Procedures for Estimating the Market Value of a Quality Change in New Automobiles" 517
Exhibit: Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Major Changes in Quality of Different Makes of Automobiles Considered by Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1959 to 1966 Models" 518
Exhibit: Charles R. Plumb, "Chrysler To Skip Some Safety Items on Early 1968's—Expected to Gain Price Advantage Until January 1 Deadline," Automotive News, July 17, 1967 522
Exhibit: "Some Devices Required on January Cars Won't Be on Earlier Models—Late Safety Deadline Confuses Pricing of 1968 Autos; Extent of Expected Rise Is Debated" [Newspaper article—source and date not indicated] 523
141. "GM News—Legislative Statement," General Motors Corp. report [to stockholders] for first quarter 1968 524
142. Excerpts from hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Senate, on violations of free speech and rights of labor, part 45, supplementary exhibits, "The Special Conference Committee," 76th Congress, first session (1939), and introductory comment by Mr. Nader 525
143. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Proposed Revised Guidelines for Adjustment of New Automobile Prices for Changes in Quality of Product," dated July 19, 1968 528
144. Norman C. Miller, "Car-Price Charade—In Marking Up Tags, It Doesn't Pay To Be Straightforward," Wall Street Journal, October 5, 1965 531
145. "Chrysler's 1968 Model Retail Prices Probably Will Rise by at Least $125," Wall Street Journal, August 31, 1967 533
146. "Chrysler, GM Units Quietly Raised Prices on Trucks Last January 2—GMC Truck and Coach Boosted Light Vehicles $9; Dodge Increased All Series an Average of $14," Wall Street Journal, January 18, 1968 533
147. "GM, After 17 percent Rise in Profits, Votes a Special Dividend of 25 cents," New York Times, May 7, 1968 534
148. "GM Says It Is Raising 1969 Model Prices by 1.6 percent; Move May Force Chrysler To Reduce 2.9 Percent Increase," Wall Street Journal, September 24, 1968 534
149. "Detroit Likely To Delay Part of Price Rise on 1969 Autos Until Headrests Are Required," Wall Street Journal, September 16, 1968 538
150. Letter dated September 6, 1968, from Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, to Hon. Arthur M. Okun, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers 540
151. Letter dated September 11, 1968, from Chairman Okun of the Council of Economic Advisers to Chairman Magnuson of the Senate Commerce Committee 541
152. Letter dated January 10, 1968, from Ralph Nader to Hon. Gardner Ackley, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers 542
153. Letter dated August 12, 1968, from Ralph Nader to Hon. Arthur M. Okun, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers 544
154. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Corp.: Outside Directorships" 546
155. "Management—Justice limits interlocking boards—Justice Department extends prohibitive law to include cases where competition is not all that clear. Sixteen companies cited agree to break up interlocking directorships," Business Week, July 6, 1968 548
156. Department of Justice press release dated June 27, 1968, announcing elimination of interlocking directorates involving 16 companies 550
157. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Corp.: Bylaw Allowing Interlocking Dealings Between General Motors and Other Corporations and Between General Motors and Its Directors, Officers or Stockholders" 551
158. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "General Motors Corp.: Interlocks With Banks" 551
159. Drew Pearson, "Big 3 Boycott Bidding on U.S. Cars," Washington Post, February 16, 1968 555
160. Jerry Burns, "Auto Lobby Killing BART, Alioto Says," San Francisco Chronicle, June 28, 1968 557
161. Walter Rugaber, "Auto Executives Criticize Transit—Voice Concern Over Efforts To Downgrade Role of Car," New York Times, November 20, 1966 557
162. Ronald A. Buel, "In Transit With the Road Lobbyists," Wall Street Journal, June 27, 1968 558
163. Ronald G. Shafer, "Freeways and Cities—Efforts Grow To Ease Disruption From Roads Through Urban Areas—Federal Officials Are Prodding Baltimore, New Orleans To Revise Planned Routes—Merging With Racial Issue," Wall Street Journal, June 27, 1968 560
164. "A special report on new systems of transportation: There are better ways to get around," Washington Report of the UAW Community Action Programs Department, August 19, 1968 563
165. Jack Eisen, "Express Buses Will Speed Domestic Workers," Washington Post, July 4, 1968 564
166. Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, "A second reason why we still have hunger existing alongside of plenty is lack of transportation," excerpt from an address delivered before Lutheran Women, Chicago, August 13, 1968 565
167. Letter dated February 12, 1968, from "A steel user in Michigan" to Ralph Nader 565
Enclosure: Letter dated October 3, 1967, from Barrand S. Pazan, American Motor Lines, Inc., Detroit, to the commissioners, Michigan Public Service Commission, protesting discriminatory motor freight rates for steel favoring General Motors and Ford 565
Enclosure: Circular (open) letter to the public dated January 30, 1968, from Barrand S. Pazan, American Motor Lines, Inc., Detroit, enclosing copy of excerpts from Michigan Public Service Commission's Notice of Hearing on American Motor Lines' complaint 567
168. "GM Set to Enter Small-Car Derby as Rival of Ford, AMC, and Fast-Selling Imports," Wall Street Journal, September 11, 1968, with introductory comment by Mr. Nader 571
169. "GM Agrees to Repay Nearly All $9.9 Million Claimed by Uncle Sam—Payment is $14,962 Less Than U.S. Claimed in Plane Pricing Case; GM Says It Started Proposal" and related article, "GM Comments," both from Wall Street Journal, January 5, 1959 577

Committee exhibits—Continued

No. Page

170. Excerpts from "Report to the Congress of the United States—Review of Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33(038)-18503 With General Motors Corp., Buick-Oldsmobile-Pontiac Assembly Division, Kansas City, Kans., by the Comptroller General of the United States," dated July 19, 1957 578

171. George Lardner, Jr., "Representative Kyros Accuses Army of Aiding GM," Washington Post, April 15, 1968 580

172. Excerpts from report of the Special M-16 Rifle Subcommittee of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, on "Additional Procurement of M-16 Rifles," 90th Congress, second session (committee print, September 4, 1968) 581

173. Peter Milliones, "Riders in Two Foreign Cabs Here Describe Vehicles as 'Terrific'," New York Times, July 21, 1968, with introductory comment, by Mr. Nader 587

General Motors Corporation's exhibits:

174. Chart: Distribution of U.S. new car production, 1921 633

175. Chart: GM, Ford and Chrysler—Percent of U.S. passenger car factory sales, 1909–41 637

176. Chart: GM new passenger car factory sales—United States, 1909–68 638

177. Chart: Industry new car retail sales the United States and ratio of used to new car sales, 1957–67 641

178. Chart: New car buyer loyalty, selected makes, 1964 and 1965 643

179. Chart: Percent of industry new car registrations accounted for by selected product groups, 1958–68 645

180. Chart: Competitive position of U.S. passenger car manufacturers, 1946–68. 647

181. Chart: Range of competitive positions of manufacturers in the U.S. new car market by States, 1967 648

182. Chart: Competition within selected new car product groups—Percent of industry registrations by company, 1967 649

183. Chart: Buick new car registrations as percent of total United States, 1946–68 650

184. Chart: 1967 passenger car unit volumes by purchase price intervals 654

185. Chart: Summary of 1969 model list price changes—1969 versus 1968 models. 664

186. Chart: Change in General Motors list prices for selected four-door models—1969 versus 1968 666

187. Chart: Wholesale price index, 1959–68 677

188. Chart: Wages (all manufacturing concerns), cost of living and car prices, 1959–68 668

189. Chart: New lower price makes offered by U.S. manufacturers—By model years, 1960–68 671

190. Chart: Percentage of industry registrations accounted for by new domestic lower price makes, 1960–68 672

191. Chart: Marketing and sales incentive programs conducted by Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth, 1968 model year 679

192. Chart: Number of industrywide marketing and sales incentive programs in effect during each month of the 1968 model year 680

193. Chart: Months of income required to purchase a new car, 1959–67 684

194. Chart: Personal consumption expenditures for new cars as percent of disposable income versus new car registrations, 1959–67 685

195. Chart: Percent change in new car prices and selected consumer goods and services, August 1968 from 1957–59 base period 686

196. Chart: U.S. passenger car manufacturers' percent return on capital, 1955–67 693

197. Chart: Profit ranking of U.S. auto manufacturers—Based on Fortune's 500 largest industrials, 1956–67 696

198. Chart: Business classifications where one-quarter of all firms had profit rates exceeding that of General Motors, 1966 697

199. Chart: Percent of total new car registrations accounted for by three largest U.S. manufacturers—Includes imports, 1922–68 706

200. General Motors Corp. annual report, 1967 750

201. Press release of General Motors Corp., September 23, 1968 799

202. Statement of Edward N. Cole, executive vice president, operations staff, General Motors Corp., before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, April 20, 1967 804

203. Pamphlet of General Motors on efforts to reduce auto thefts 809

204. General Motors Corp. notice of annual meeting of stockholders to be held May 24, 1968, and attached proxy statement 813

205. General Motors Acceptance Corp. statement on consumer credit insurance, by Oscar A. Lundin, president, GMAC, before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, December 18, 1967 844

206. General Motors Corp. report for second quarter 1968 849

207. Statement of Lawrence R. Hafstad, vice president, research laboratories, General Motors Corp., at joint hearing before the Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, and the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, May 27, 1968 865

Ralph Nader's exhibits:

208. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "The Automobile Industry: A Case Study of Competition, A Statement by General Motors Corporation" (a commentary on the GM statement) 935

Ralph Nader's exhibits—Continued

No. Page

209. Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "Additional Memorandum on GM's Alleged Response to Subcommittee Inquiries" 943

210. Robert W. Irvin, "General Motors Plans New Identity Campaign," Washington Post, June 14, 1968 953

210A. Tim Metz, "GM To Change Signs of Dealers To Stress Name of Corporation—Some See 10-Year, $275 Million Plan as Evidencing a Switch to Centralized Management," Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1968 953

211. Charles B. Camp, "Selling With Speed—Auto Industry Renews Stress on 'Hot Cars' To Win Youthful Fans—Safety Critics Are Appalled by Ads That Depict 1969's as 'Mean' Racing Machines—'Just Meeting Competition'," Wall Street Journal, October 31, 1968 954

212. "Jury Says Auto Design Is Factor In Accident Cases," National Observer, 1968 (month and day not supplied) 957

213. "Suit Asks $12 Billion From GM," (Wilmington, Del.) Evening Journal, August 8, 1968 957

214. Excerpt from "The Periscope" column, "Wheeling the Delegates Around," Newsweek, August 5, 1968 958

215. Kenneth C. Field, "The Auto Companies Scramble To Keep Up With Tastes in Color—As Long-Favored White Slips, Beige, Blue Surge to Fore: Stylists Follow High Fashion," Wall Street Journal, July 22, 1968 958

216. "GM Transfers Six Plants From Chevy Unit; Move Could Impede Any Bid to Split Firm," Wall Street Journal, November 5, 1968 959

217. "Campus paper says GM drafted strike-aid pact for auto firms," Washington Post, 1968 (month and day not supplied) 961

218. Excerpt from Walter Reuther's statement before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, May 1966 961

219. Press release of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. dated July 22, 1968, with appended table of members' percentage support for and opposition to legislation to curb conglomerate mergers 962

220. Correspondence between General Motors Corp. and E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. regarding safety glass, 1929–32 964

  Letter dated August 6, 1929, from Lammot du Pont, president, Du Pont, to Alfred P. Sloan, president, General Motors 964

  Letter dated August 7, 1929, from Alfred P. Sloan to Lammot du Pont. 965

  Letter dated August 7, 1929, from Alfred P. Sloan to William A. Fisher, president, Fisher Body Corp 965

  Letter dated August 9, 1929, from Lammot du Pont to Alfred P. Sloan 966

  Letter dated August 13, 1929, from Alfred P. Sloan to Lammot du Pont 966

  Letter dated August 20, 1929, from Lammot du Pont to Alfred P. Sloan 967

  Letter dated April 11, 1932, from Lammot du Pont to Alfred P. Sloan. 967

  Letter dated April 15, 1932, from Alfred P. Sloan to Lammot du Pont. 967

  Interoffice memorandum dated November 28, 1932, from Alfred P. Sloan to Donaldson Brown, General Motors 968

221. Arthur Selwyn Miller, "Business Morality: Some Unanswered (and Perhaps Unanswerable) Questions," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1966 969

222. Ralph Nader, "A Bibliography on General Motors Corp." 974

223. Letter dated November 11, 1968, from Ralph Nader to Hon. Edwin A. Zimmerman, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice 1033

  Enclosure: Memorandum by Mr. Nader, "The Anti-Trust Laws and the 'Safety Activities' of the Automobile Manufacturers Association" 1034

223A. Subsequently submitted exhibit: Bob Irvin, "The Auto Industry—Competition Becomes a Merger When Smog Speech Is Used," Detroit News, December 1, 1968 1037

224. Excerpts from testimony on steam engines by Dr. Robert Ayres and Dr. Richard Morse at joint hearings before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, May 1968 1038

225. Excerpt from report of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, "Administered Prices—Automobiles," 85th Congress, second session, part III—costs, demand, and price policy; ch. 5—costs (1958) 1059

226. Excerpt from testimony of Albert Bradley, executive vice president, General Motors Corp., at hearing before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, on "A Study of the Antitrust Laws—Part 7—General Motors," 84th Congress, first session (Dec. 6, 1955) 1065

227. Franklin M. Fisher, Zvi Griliches, and Carl Kaysen, "The Costs of Automobile Model Changes Since 1949," the Journal of Political Economy, October 1962 1075

HEARING DATES

July 10, 1968: [1]

  Morning session 1

July 23, 1968:

  Afternoon session 425

---

[1] Note changed date. Originally announced (by letter) for July 9.

EXHIBIT 2

[From Newsweek, Jan. 27, 1969]

AUTOS: FRESH AIR AT GM

As the world's largest manufacturing company, General Motors Corp. produces a truly staggering share of its wealth. From 1949 through 1967, GM sales were $236 billion—equal to the gross national product of many of the nations of the world over those same nineteen years. In 1967, a typical year, GM paid out $230,000 in taxes every hour of every day in the year. Ever hour of the day it also paid $730,000 in wages, and $1.1 million to its suppliers for parts.

Yet, for all that contribution, General Motors over the years has often seemed to neglect its public image. It has always soft-pedaled its bigness for fear of drawing fresh attention from the trust busters in Washington. It has often seemed imperiously insular; few Detroit reporters can forget that when President Kennedy was eyeball to eyeball with the Russians during the Cuban missile crisis, all of Detroit's leading automakers publicly and anthusiastically endorsed the President's actions except GM, which offered only a brusque "no comment." Its public-policy strategy has sometimes been inept, as in 1966 when it was discovered that giant GM had hired a private detective to shadow a young attorney named Ralph Nader, whose documented charges of unsafe GM cars eventually led to much of today's auto-safety legislation.

But in recent weeks and months, General Motors has been opening a wider window to the world, thanks primarily to James C. Roche, who moved up from president to chairman of the board last year. Last week, James C. Jones, Newsweek bureau chief in Detroit and a veteran of eighteen years on the automobile beat, visited Roche in his leathery fourteenth-floor office in the General Motors Building and the two talked about GM's new public posture. Here is Jones's report:

"If anything we've been too reserved in the past," Roche conceded early in our hour-long interview. "We've operated a lot on the basis that if we do the kind of job we should in serving our customers, then by our deeds we would be known." Yet, Jim Roche—more than any other GM chief executive in my experience—knows that deeds are not enough. "We're all living in an entirely different world now than in the past," he said, "and the vastly improved communications in the world have given an organization such as ours a visibility that perhaps it didn't have before. The public obviously has a great deal of interest in GM; otherwise, the press wouldn't spend the time and space on us that it does. It was perfectly obvious that we had to, and wanted to, adjust the company's system."

NO MONK

Adjusting that system has involved a number of GM's traditionally good, gray ways of doing things. For example, while some of Roche's predecessors lived almost like monks in the GM Building, commuting by shuffling down the hallway from their offices to living quarters on the fourteenth floor, Roche is assuming an increasingly bigger role as a public figure. He is an active member of New Detroit, Inc., and deals regularly with black militants and white establishment leaders alike in an effort to improve Detroit's sorry race relations. He also heads the U.S. savings-bond drive, a job that requires a great deal of travel, and the Radio Free Europe fund-raising campaign. Both are chores that previous GM chief executives might have ducked.

But it is in corporate activities that Roche has worked the biggest changes. Instead of shrinking in horror from any mention of its astronomical size, General Motors is now stoutly defending it. Last month, Roche hammered at that theme in delivering a thoughtful essay entitled "The Key to Government-Business Cooperation" to the Illinois Manufacturers Association.

"I wanted to beef up this presentation and make two strong points," he told me last week. "One, we live in a big world, with big government, big labor and big business. Bigness per se is not bad. On the contrary, it is constructive and it made possible much of our national economic progress. And two, business not only has a responsibility, but it is anxious to work with government when it can make a contribution. I've been very gratified by the response to that talk."

GM pulled two other surprises last fall. The first came when two Senate subcommittees, investigating competition in the auto industry, asked for information from GM. The company not only submitted a remarkably candid and well-documented 98-page report on how competitive the industry really is, but it broke a historic precedent by pinpointing some of its major costs (about $1,000 for labor and $134 for tooling on an average car). The second surprise came when GM released its price list on 1969 cars. Normally, company press agents dump the lengthy lists and accompanying press releases on editorial desks and allow reporters to find their own way through the bewildering thicket of numbers. However, this year Roche, president Edward Cole and a group of other GM executives called a news conference, offered a twelve-page explanatory statement on prices and then submitted to questioning on the firm's price structure. As Roche recalled proudly last week: "For a change, we tried to answer questions in advance of the release of prices so as to help the reporters to have the facts as we saw them. We got a better interpretation than ever before."

UNDERSTANDING

Why the change at GM—and why wasn't it made before? Understandably, Roche refuses to blame any of the men who preceded him at the top. But unlike the last chairman, Frederick Donner, who was a financial man, or former president John Gordon, an engineer, Roche did have public-relations experience while serving as general sales manager for Cadillac Division. "I've been fortunate in that respect," he said, "I think I understand some of the media's problems and I think they understand some of mine."

To longtime observers of both GM and Jim Roche there was a turning point for both the company and the man, and it came on March 22, 1968. On that day, Roche sat before a Senate subcommittee and delivered a genuinely sincere and personal apology to Ralph Nader and the U.S. Senate. As it turned out, Roche learned along with the general public that a GM subordinate had assigned a private detective to tail Nader. It was a soul-shattering experience for Jim Roche, to whom integrity is everything. As he told me that somber day: "I've been at General Motors for 38 years and nothing like this has ever happened. This is the worst experience I've had." Last week, I left his office feeling certain that it was also an experience from which Roche and General Motors have both benefited.

Exhibit 3

[From Newsweek, Feb. 17, 1969]

A Question of Candor

Washington, D.C.

In his laudatory report on an interview with General Motors chairman James M. Roche (Business and Finance, Jan. 27) Newsweek's Detroit bureau chief James C. Jones refers to GM's having been "remarkably candid" in its dealings with two Senate subcommittees "investigating competition in the auto industry." As chairman of one of those committees, I must regretfully differ.

In the first place, GM declined an invitation from us for Mr. Roche (or any other top officer or representative) to appear in person at our public hearings and participate in open discussion of the issues. (So did all the other auto companies and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.) In the second place, after Ralph Nader's testimony had pinpointed a number of areas of real concern, GM submitted a 98-page statement containing interesting and valuable—but often irrelevant—information, and another 72 pages of careful non-answers to the questions we thought most important.

I was disappointed to find Mr. Roche referring, in his talk with your reporter to GM's "disclosure" of its labor and tooling costs . . . as an example of "candor," for that was the prize example of a non-answer to an important question. On its cost of building a car, GM came up with a squishy-soft $1,000 reply, reached in this fashion: GM's annual report (1967) "reveals that 31¾ cents of each sales dollar went to employees for payrolls, employee benefit plans, etc. Since the average wholesale price of GM cars is slightly over $3,000 (including optional extras), this means that the labor costs (direct and indirect) would be approximately $1,000 per car." Tooling-cost figures were similarly reached.

Using this same method and annual-report figures, we could ascertain that Mr. Roche and a GM factory floorsweeper each received approximately $8,769 in salaries in 1967.

I do not think that GM's board of directors would settle for that kind of "candid" labor-cost accounting, and I do not think that our subcommittees—and the public and GM's stockholders—should continue to do so.

Gaylord Nelson,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Monopoly, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate.

GOLDEN SPIKE CENTENNIAL: 100 YEARS LATER, THE NATION ONCE AGAIN AWAITS WORD FROM UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on May 10, 1969, ceremonies at the Golden Spike National Monument at Promontory, Utah, will celebrate one of our great American dreams—the completion of the first transcontinental railroad. On that date 100 years ago, President Leland Stanford, of the Central Pacific, and Vice President Duran, of the Union Pacific, drove a golden spike to climax the road building race, joining twin bands of steel stretching from ocean to ocean.

The railroad engineers conquered Indians, sweltering heat, subzero weather, and the seemingly unassailable ramparts of the towering Rockies and Sierra Nevadas. A heterogeneous host of workmen was used—including brawny Irishmen, pigtailed Chinese, and industrious Mormons. Success was achieved only by a miracle of organization and teamwork, and by the unbelievable endurance of the men who laid the rails.

The "Marriage of the Rails" fulfilled the dream of Columbus for a shorter route to the Orient, insured possession of the entire West to the United States, and began a new era of development for the Nation.

In 1961, I introduced the first Golden Spike National Monument bill, and I was deeply gratified in 1965 when legislation authorizing the development of a fitting memorial at Promontory, Utah, was enacted. The National Park Service will dedicate the visitor center museum at the Golden Spike National Historic Site on May 10, and a number of commemorative events are planned throughout the country. So that Senators may be fully aware of these plans, I ask unanimous consent that two articles published in the New York Times of Sunday March 23, 1969, be printed in the Record. The first is by my friend Jack Goodman, the excellent New York Times correspondent in Utah, who has written a great many travel-page stories on my State. His article is entitled "100 Years Later, the Nation Once Again Awaits Word from Utah."

The other story is entitled "Rail Fans' Pilgrimages to Promontory."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

100 Years Later, the Nation Once Again Awaits Word From Utah

(By Jack Goodman)

Promontory, Utah.—The redolent sagebrush, the desolate ranges skirting Great Salt Lake, the great sweep of high-country sky are just as they were a century ago—before the iron rails met here.

Curlews, wild ducks and herons wing north across the salt-edged marshes. Topping an occasional gravelly hillock in his comfortable sedan, the wayfaring stranger can easily see 50 miles across the glinting inland sea to the snow-tipped, 11,000-foot-high Wasatch Range closing off the far horizon.

He must peer hard and sharp, however, to spot signs of man's handiwork: a tottering telegraph pole, weathered by the never-ceasing wind and glaring sun of this upland desert country; a distant, yellowing stand of winter wheat contrasting with the gray-green sage; some splintered wood pilings, remnants of trestle work hewn 100 years ago.

On May 10 at this remote spot, the joining, 100 years ago, of the nation's first transcontinental rails will, at long last, be properly memorialized. To mark the centennial of an event that is pictured in most grade-school history books and promptly forgotten, the National Park Service will dedicate a visitor center museum at Golden Spike National Historic Site. Its attractions will include a mile of restored track and two period-piece locomotives.

THE PRECISE TIME

At 1:47 P.M., Mountain Daylight Time, precisely a century after Leland Stanford, president of the Central Pacific Railroad (now the Southern Pacific), and former Governor of California, swung his silver maul at a golden spike imbedded in a tie hewn from laurel, a troupe of collegiate actors, local residents and servicemen from nearby military establishments will re-enact the events of May 10, 1869. Historically, the time is re-

XUM

corded at 12:47 P.M., for Daylight Saving Time was not then in use.

Governors of states that were territories when the rails were first moved west will speak in praise of the hard-handed pioneers, and President Nixon may be on hand for some speechmaking. But a telegraph key, hopefully the same one used a century earlier, will click out three dots, representing the hammer blows, and a terse "done" before repeating over Western Union wires the announcement of completion that was sent to President Grant and a waiting nation.

A LARGER CROWD

About 3,000 spectators are expected for the re-enactment, twice as many as there were at the proceedings in 1869. But none of them will reach Promontory by train, for you cannot get here by train anymore.

The spot where the Central Pacific Railroad's Jupiter and the Union Pacific's No. 119 clanked their snouts together 100 years ago lies 30 miles from the present transcontinental railroad route. Only when the wind is precisely right does the sound of a diesel locomotive's horn break the silence of Promontory Summit.

Because of its isolated locale 80 miles north and west of Salt Lake City, Promontory has never been a lure even for the history-minded or for railroad enthusiasts. But with the improvement of Golden Spike National Historic Site, vacationists traveling to Yellowstone, Grand Teton, Zion or Bryce Canyon National Parks are expected to swing off Interstate 15 and detour over State Route 83 to a setting that once swarmed with Irish and Chinese gandy dancers, mule skinners, bewhiskered surveyors and card sharpers.

North of Ogden, Utah's second-largest city and the junction of the present-day Union Pacific and Southern Pacific mainlines, the highway hugs the benchland and meadows beneath the peaks of the Wasatch. Dairy barns, old Mormon stone houses, irrigated orchards and railroad tracks are left behind at tiny Corinne, a "sin city" to pious Mormons of the rail-laying era but a community that the region's Gentiles envisioned as a bustling transfer point between trains and steamboats then operating on the Bear River and Great Salt Lake.

Beyond this semi-ghost town, Route 83 swings westward for about 25 miles, following the rail-less embankment of the long-abandoned pioneer line. Beginning in 1869, and continuing for 32 years, this was the route of countless chuffing locomotives hauling equally countless trainloads of immigrants to alluring, mushrooming California.

MAINLINE REROUTED

In 1903, this single track to Promontory and the green groves across the Sierra Nevada lost its mainline status with the opening of the $8,300,000 Lucin Cutoff over Great Salt Lake. The cutoff, over rock-fill and trestles, slashed 44 miles and the steep grades of Promontory Summit from the transcontinental run.

From 1903 until 1942, the old route through Promontory was a somnolent Southern Pacific branch serving a few ranch communities. Then its rails were ripped up for wartime scrap, and local souvenir hunters pried rusted spikes from the weathered ties for use as paperweights.

Today's thoughtful voyager on the two-lane state asphalt paralleling the historic rail line can appreciate the labors of the thousand or more men who blasted, graded, shoveled, tamped ties and laid track at better than two miles a day across quicksand, gravel and salt marshes. Rounding the 5,000-foot-high shoulders of the Promontory Range, he comes face to face with more ridges, more marshlands, more rock—more miles of empty upland.

Suddenly, after a final downhill dip, the road divides at a newly marked junction, and a five-mile-long National Park Service road curves toward the handsome fieldstone-and-wood visitor center being completed at the scene of 1869's big event. A roadbed bearing light rails freshly spiked to hand-hewn, noncreosoted ties, a simple rock-and-cement pyramid, a flagpole bearing the Stars and Stripes—these are the chief ingredients of Golden Spike National Historic Site at Promontory. These and a pair of fairly early specimens of the locomotive builder's art.

ORIGINAL ENGINES SCRAPPED

As pilgrims to Promontory soon learn, the diamond-stacked Jupiter and the slimmer No. 119 went to Valhalla long before historians began searching out 1869 artifacts and railroadiana to mark the passage of an era. The National Park Service and the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission valiantly shopped as far away as Central America for sisters of the much-pictured Union Pacific and Central Pacific locomotives. But for this year, at least, railroad enthusiasts who come to Promontory must make do with two turn-of-the-century engines.

The visitor center has authentic photographs, maps, drawings and assorted railroad-building items on display.

From the visitor center, self-guiding tours lead to remnants of original trestles, sidings, station foundations, hillside cuts, roadbed and grade. Included is the spot where the Central Pacific's Chinese crews laid 10 miles of rail, drove 55,000 spikes and fastened 14,000 bolts in a record-setting day, much to the chagrin of the Union Pacific's predominantly Irish construction team.

From about Memorial Day through Labor Day, there will be daily film showings and talks by ranger-historians at the visitor center, and each afternoon starting about 1:15, a costumed cast will re-enact the spike-driving ceremony that fixed Promontory in the pages of history and geography books.

THE MAJOR CELEBRATION

The most full-blown re-enactment will occur, of course, May 10. On that day, a host of dignitaries is scheduled to make the Salt Lake City-Ogden portion of the pilgrimage to Promontory behind a mammoth new Union Pacific Centennial-model diesel locomotive, with the railroad's last serviceable steam locomotive, No. 8444, as a pacesetter.

Limousines and buses will haul officials, bearded actors and troops garbed in the blue uniforms of the Indian-chasing 21st Infantry to Promontory, where a thousand or so descendants of the pioneer railroad builders, many of whom live in Brigham City and Corinne, will be on hand to help dedicate the visitor center-museum.

Steam whistles of the near-replicas of the Jupiter and No. 119, trucked to the spot, will wail a mournful note. Someone still to be named will swing carefully at the original golden spike, and a telegrapher will again tap out the message that went to Grant:

"Sir, we have the honor to report the last rail is laid. The last spike is driven. The Pacific Railroad is completed. The point of junction is 1,086 miles west of Missouri River and 690 miles east of Sacramento City, Calif."

The telegram was signed by Stanford for the Central Pacific, and by T. C. Durant, Sidney Dillon and John Duff for the Union Pacific.

Shortly after the dedication ceremony the golden spike, which is now the property of Stanford University, will be returned to its owner, but hopefully not until at least a few thousand visitors to Promontory have pondered its inscription.

"May God continue the unity of our country as this railroad united the two great oceans of the world."

Rail Fans' Pilgrimages to Promontory

Salt Lake City.—Railroaders, rail enthusiasts, historians, Federal officials and curious travelers will be crowding trains—and planes—destined for Utah this spring and summer to join in Golden Spike Centennial events commemorating the completion of the nation's first transcontinental railroad.

The attention of most of the historians will focus on Promontory Summit. There, a visitor center-museum will be dedicated at Golden Spike Monument Historic Site on May 10, and the driving of the golden spike will be re-enacted on that day and then daily from about Memorial Day through Labor Day.

However, the attention of railroaders and rail fans will be on rolling stock, excursions and displays of equipment. In the center of the spotlight will be a mammoth steam locomotive of World War II vintage, the Union Pacific's No. 8444, which on May 10 will haul celebrators from Salt Lake City to Ogden, as close as mainline rails now reach toward lonely Promontory.

Beginning May 11 and continuing at least through May 14, the Union Pacific will operate the same 4–8–4 class engine in daily excursion passenger service between Utah's capital and Ogden. On this round trip of some 80 miles at a fare of $2.23, thousands of visitors are expected once again to ride behind, see, hear and photograph a representative locomotive of a nearly vanished breed. The one-way fare will be $1.22.

LONG-DISTANCE TRIPS

Those who can afford it are going even farther in their efforts to mark the Golden Spike Centennial. Several long-distance excursions are planned from various parts of the nation, the most extensive and expensive being a $995 two-week round trip between New York and Ogden. Much of the way, it will be powered by steam.

The tour, which is being arranged by the High Iron Company, Inc., P.O. Box 200, Lebanon, N.J. 08833, is being billed as the "steam trip of the century." A special train, the Golden Spike Centennial Limited, will consist of air-conditioned coaches with a capacity of 150 passengers, a twin-unit dining car, a parlor-dome car and two observation cars. It will depart from Grand Central Terminal on May 3.

A Penn Central electric locomotive will pull the Centennial Limited as far as Harmon, N.Y., where the train will be coupled to another World War II-vintage steam locomotive, No. 759, a 2–8–4 type once owned by the Nickel Plate Road. The train will continue under steam power to Kansas City, Mo.

From Kansas City to Salt Lake, the train will be pulled by the newest, most modern diesel-electric locomotive operated by the Union Pacific, a newly designed, 6,600-horsepower unit dubbed the Centennial model. The High Iron Company's steam locomotive will be left in Kansas City because the Union Pacific now lacks watering, coaling and steam-engine service facilities on its Nebraska-Wyoming-Utah main line, the route built in 1869.

UNDER STEAM AGAIN

Union Pacific's No. 8444 will pick up the High Iron train in Salt Lake City on May 10 and haul it as far as Ogden. There, buses will be used to complete the pilgrimage to Promontory.

On the return trip, No. 8444 will be utilized between Ogden and Salt Lake City. The Union Pacific's Centennial-class diesel-electric will pull the special back to Kansas City, where the High Iron train will be rejoined to No. 759. Steam power will be used as far as Baltimore, and then another Penn Central electric locomotive will haul the train into Pennsylvania Station in New York on May 18.

No Pullman facilities will be provided, but hotel accommodations and transfers are included in the fare of $995. Overnight stops westbound are planned in Buffalo, Cleveland, Decatur (Ill.), Kansas City and Denver. Eastbound, the stops will be in Rawlins

XUM

(Wyo.), Denver, Kansas City, St. Louis, Lima (Ohio), Pittsburgh and Hagerstown (Md.).

MEALS WILL BE EXTRA

Meals are not covered by the fare, but passengers will be treated to two banquets—one in Salt Lake, where a two-day layover is scheduled, and the other on the last night of the trip. Also included in the price are grandstand seats for the ceremonies in Promontory and snacks and cocktails aboard the train. In addition, each passenger is promised a reclining seat by a window.

Cooperating with the High Iron Company are the Penn Central, the Norfolk & Western, the Union Pacific, the Western Maryland, the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio, the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission and the Association of American Railroads.

OTHER EXCURSIONS

Excursions are also scheduled from Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco, but these trips will be diesel-powered. The Illini Railroad Club, P.O. Box 62, Champaign, Ill. 61820, has announced plans for a special train to depart from Chicago on May 8. The coach price for the escorted package tour, which includes meals and hotel accommodations, is $240. Pullman fares start at $280.

Sponsors of the trip from Los Angeles are the Orange Empire Trolley Museum and the Pacific Railroad Society, Inc. A 21-car, all-Pullman Gold Spike Centennial Special, with a capacity for 350 passengers, is scheduled to leave Los Angeles at 8 P.M. on May 8. It will use Southern Pacific tracks north to Sacramento and east to Ogden; the train will return over Union Pacific tracks by way of Las Vegas, arriving in Los Angeles at 6:30 P.M. on May 11.

The round-trip fare, including meals, grandstand seats and a banquet in Ogden, is $195. More information can be obtained from E. J. Von Nordeck, P.O. Box 146, Perris, Calif. 92370.

Two excursions from San Francisco, one called the Golden Spike Special and the other the Centennial Plaque Special, are planned by the Pacific Coast chapter of the Railway & Locomotive Historical Society, Inc. The Golden Spike Special will carry coach and Pullman cars; it will depart on the morning of May 9 and return on May 12.

ALL-INCLUSIVE FARE

Details are still being worked out, but the round-trip coach fare is expected to be $150, and Pullman accommodations are expected to begin at $195. Included in the price are meals aboard the train, transfers, grandstand seats, a box lunch, a ride behind No. 8444 between Salt Lake City and Ogden, a banquet in Ogden, commemorative medals, a badge and a copy of the book "Iron Horses to Promontory," by Gerald Best.

More information on this trip can be obtained from Arthur Lloyd, 974 Pleasant Hill Road, Redwood City, Calif. 94061. Capacity will be limited to 375 passengers.

The Centennial Plaque Special, which will precede the Golden Spike Special by about 15 minutes, will run only as far as Truckee, Calif. It will stop en route to allow passengers to participate in ceremonies and plaque dedications at various communities, such as Rocklin, Newcastle, Auburn and Colfax, which owe much of their existence to construction of the former Central Pacific line across the Sierra Nevada. The Plaque Special will return to the Bay Area later in the day on May 9.

The round-trip fare from San Francisco is set at $17.50; from Sacramento, $11.50. Tickets for this one-day excursion can be obtained from Don Thrall, 610 Arlington Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. 94707, or from R. A. Miller, Southern Pacific Company, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

PRIVATE CARS JOINING IN

A number of private railroad cars are expected to arrive in Ogden and Salt Lake City in time for their owners and their owners' guests to attend the centennial events in Promontory on May 10. Arrangements to accommodate eight such cars in Ogden have already been made.

Travelers from the Omaha area interested in attending the Promontory ceremonies are being advised by the Union Pacific to reserve space on the line's regular passenger trains, since no special service is being originated in Nebraska.

Throughout the West, various communities are planning observances. Parades are scheduled in San Francisco on May 3 and in Sacramento on May 8. Three days of celebrating, reminiscent of the three days of spontaneous merrymaking that erupted in 1869, are scheduled in Sacramento, and luncheons, art exhibits, banquets and balls are planned in both Sacramento and San Francisco during the week preceding the anniversary.

In Sacramento on May 10, ceremonies will be held at the first headquarters of the Central Pacific Railroad. Torn down to make way for a freeway, the structure is being restored. It was originally the Huntington & Hopkins Hardware Store, the second story of which was turned into C. P. offices.

BIG FOUR BUILDING

Later, the store became known as the Big Four Building, so named for the four men who were instrumental in pushing the western segment of the transcontinental rail line: Leland Stanford, C. P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins and Charles Crocker.

Centennial visitors to Utah are expected to have an opportunity to view a museum train touring the lines of the Union Pacific. It will carry a vintage locomotive and tender, a period-piece passenger car and baggage cars mounted aboard several flat cars. Several modern display cars containing maps, photographs, rail-building tools and other artifacts are to be included.

MILITARY EXHIBIT PLANNED

Another train due for display in Salt Lake City and Ogden during and after the May 10 celebration is to be made up of military equipment furnished by the Army.

A number of other Golden Spike Centennial events, among them musical programs and art exhibits, are planned in Utah from May 6 through Sept. 15. In charge of coordinating the events is Nathan H. Mazer, executive director, field operations, Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission. Offices are in the Federal Building in Ogden.

Tickets for the steam excursion between Salt Lake City and Ogden can be obtained from J. G. Seegmiller, district passenger and ticket agent, Union Pacific Railroad Company, 417 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

HISTORIC SITE RESTORED

At Promontory, where rails were removed for steel scrap at the start of World War II, National Park Service historians, working with officials of Box Elder County and the State of Utah, have done everything possible to restore the site of the rail link-up to the scene shown in 1869 photographs. A mile-long section of hand-hewn ties, similar to the sort floated down the Green River to construction camps, has been installed on the old roadbed. Also, lightweight rails have been relaid on the former Central Pacific and Union Pacific routes hacked out a century ago by sweating Chinese laborers, Irish immigrants and Civil War veterans.

Near replicas of the long-scrapped Jupiter and No. 119 locomotives that met in Promontory in 1869 will touch pilots (cow-catchers) on the restored trackage adjacent to the visitor center. And on May 10, the original golden spike will once again be tamped into a laurel tie while an old-type telegraph key, linked to a restored line, chatters out news of the spike-driving re-enactment, just as the new-fangled telegraph did when the West was won.—J.G.

THE LATIN AMERICAN CHALLENGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Washington Post has just concluded a very interesting five part series of articles written by John M. Goshko, its Latin American correspondent on U.S. business in Latin America. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, U.S. investment in Latin America amounts to $10 billion. It produces a significant percentage of Latin American foreign exchange earnings and tax revenues, as well as employment. It runs the gamut from petroleum and mining through manufacturing and retail sales.

It finds itself in a climate of increasing nationalism which frequently has anti-American overtones. At the same time, American business operates under the handicap of a public image inherited from the earlier days of dollar diplomacy.

Most American business firms in Latin America, especially the larger ones, have long since abandoned the practices of this earlier era and are now concerned with improving their public relations and with being good citizens of the country where they operate.

One of their most difficult current problems stems simply from their size in the aggregate. Many Latin Americans feel that the control of their own economies is inextricably slipping away from them into the hands of foreigners. This is much the same reaction which J. J. Servan-Schreiber described so well with respect to Europe in his book "The American Challenge."

One way to meet this problem, as Mr. Goshko points out, is through the greater use of joint ventures—that is, partnership arrangements between American and foreign business. These joint ventures have the advantage of giving U.S. business in Latin America a local coloration by identifying it with local interests.

The author also suggests an expanded program of U.S. Government guarantees of investments in Latin America.

All in all, Mr. Goshko and the Washington Post have performed a public service in calling these matters to our attention, and I commend the articles to the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

PART I—THE LATIN AMERICAN CHALLENGE: NEW NATIONALISM HITS U.S. INVESTMENTS

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES.—French Journalist Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber, addressing Europeans in his book, "The American Challenge," wrote that "the power, the speed, the pervasive nature of American investment are a warning and a challenge to us. What kind of future do we want?"

He predicted that the third greatest industrial power soon might be "not Europe but *American Industry in Europe*.

XUM

Now, like fallout from a nuclear explosion, Servan-Schreiber's warning has drifted across the Atlantic to Latin America, where U.S. business casts perhaps its longest shadow.

Direct private U.S. investment is estimated at more than $10 billion. That is less than in Canada or in Europe, but Latin America is underdeveloped—with little home-grown industry. On this limited economic landscape, U.S. business looms large.

U.S. business directly employs almost 2 million Latin-Americans, and there is no estimating the number indirectly dependent on this investment. It accounts for 10 per cent of the total output of goods in Latin America and pays one-fifth of all taxes.

American business produces a third of all Latin-American exports. In countries like Chile or Venezuela, dependent on mining activity requiring a high degree, the basic means of national livelihood is controlled by firms owned in whole or in part by U.S. investors.

Even where this is not the case, the American presence intrudes prominently on the business scene.

For example, the largest country, Brazil, earns its living from such agricultural products as coffee, and the agricultural sector of the economy is almost entirely in the hands of Brazilian citizens.

However, in recent years, Brazil has built up a sizable industrial base that produces for internal consumption, and here the picture is considerably different. Of the 30 largest companies in Brazil, six are controlled outright by Americans (Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Union-Carbide, Firestone, Anderson Clayton).

Thus, it is that "The American Challenge" is probably the most widely read and talked about book in Latin America today. In Servan-Schreibers warnings about the impending decline of Europe as an independent economic form many think they see the story of what has already happened to Latin America.

In some countries, if a man is of the upper or middle class, the corn flakes he eats for breakfast and the refrigerator from which he takes the milk were made by American firms. Afterward, he is apt to drive to work in a car manufactured or assembled in an American-owned plant.

Along the way, he may drop his wife at an American supermarket. In the evening, they will probably relax in front of an American-made television set or go to see an American film released by an American distributor.

The worker in manufacturing, mining, or the growing of commodities like bananas or sugar, frequently will have an American employer. He may even live in a house and send his children to schools provided by that employer.

Whatever the worker grows or refines at some stage it will pass through a machine or process invented by American technology and brought in by American business. If the product is exportable, the chances are that its ultimate sale will take place in the U.S. market.

OVERALL, AN IMPACT

All this activity has had an impact fully as important as the influence of such powerful home-grown institutions as the military and the Church.

On the surface, at least, that impact looks like an unrelieved plus.

Wherever American investment is at work, the results usually can be measured in terms of a higher gross national product and increased prosperity for formerly depressed communities. It has meant better wages, working conditions, fringe benefits and social mobility for thousands who would otherwise face bleakest poverty.

At the same time, the onslaught of U.S. investment has played a big part in producing the political and social ferment that is the story of modern Latin America. Frank Tannenbaum, the dean of U.S. scholars specializing in Latin America, points out that much of this ferment is directly caused by the "consumer revolution propelled by the United States" which has done much to make Latin Americans dissatisfied with the existing order.

"Americans," Tannenbaum says, "are unaware of their role as the gravediggers of class-ridden and stratified societies. They are merely selling toothpaste, fountain pens, and modern plumbing. In fact, however, they are undermining the stratified society characteristic of Latin America."

Ironically, U.S. business now is the target of the ferment that it helped to create, and it may thus soon face the most serious threat since Fidel Castro expropriated the sizable private U.S. interests in Cuba.

In part, this is because the American business community here has been identified in Latin eyes with the most intractable elements of the "stratified society." Foreign investment is thought of as part of the old order, and is vulnerable to attack from those who would end the old ways.

NEW NATIONALISM

In addition, in recent months Latin America has been subjected to a strong new tide of nationalism that looks with hostility on all foreign influences. It is a nationalism that finds many elements on the political right—long regarded as the staunch ally of foreign investment—joining forces with the left to shout that outside business interests must be curtailed or even expelled.

Last October, for example, a nationalistic outcry against the status of a U.S.-owned oil company in Peru triggered a military coup, the nationalization of the company and a severe crisis in U.S.-Peruvian relations.

In the face of this hostility, U.S. companies are increasingly reluctant to make new investments. David Rockefeller, board chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, sums up the feeling of investors: "People don't want to invest their money if their property may be taken away from them, even if they get their money back."

Latin America, in turn, is now finding it harder to compete with other areas in attracting foreign investment. Over the last five years, the net inflow of new U.S. investment to Latin America has remained relatively stable, while in such areas as Europe and Canada there have been large annual increases.

These are the cross-currents that preoccupy Latin American leaders as they ponder the question posed by Servan-Schreiber: "What kind of future do we want?"

Is Latin America to continue as an underdeveloped area producing raw materials for industrial nations? Or can it break the restraints of underdevelopment and become a modern industrial consumer society like the United States and Europe?

Does progress imply an even greater abandonment of the Latin business sphere to American firms with the money and technology to create new industries? Would it be better to make a clean break—to cast out not only foreign investment but also the region's traditional capitalist structure and go it alone with new forms of statist control over the economy?

Or does the solution lie in some middle group? Can American business be brought into new forms of partnership with both private and public Latin American capital—partnerships in which the Latins would eventually become the principals and reassert control over their own economic destinies?

There are the elements of the debate in a region groping for both modernity and an independent identity.

Those who remain confident that foreign investment can not only survive but can actually expand its role, base their thinking on many factors—not the least of them being the change of administrations in Washington.

The shift from the Democrats to the Republicans, it is argued, provides a convenient time to reexamine the Alliance for Progress. Until now, the Alliance has given almost exclusive emphasis to development through governmental action, and U.S. assistance has concentrated on government-to-government lending.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Recently, however, there has been a growing conviction on all sides that the Alliance is failing to do the job for which it was conceived. The U.S. Congress last year showed its disenchantment by slashing U.S. Alliance contributions.

Now, the United States has a Republican President who is not expected to be as willing as his Democratic predecessors to go to the mat with Congress over foreign aid appropriations. As a result, it seems unlikely that U.S. Alliance contributions will again reach the $1-billion-a-year level.

During his campaign, President Nixon spoke of the need for "new approaches" to the Alliance, and many students of the aid problem are now suggesting that these approaches should follow the same lines proposed by Mr. Nixon for the solution of domestic problems—turning a big share of the burden over to private business.

To many people, including most Latin government leaders who have been in the forefront of fighting to affect Alliance or Progress reforms, this has some alarming implications. They hear that increased emphasis on business investment gradually would become a substitute for government-to-government lending and an excuse for the United States to make less and less of a direct foreign aid contribution to Latin America.

It is true that many U.S. business leaders take the simplistic view that private enterprise alone can solve the problems of Latin development and that large-scale foreign aid is not needed. But there are others who, while continuing to believe that first emphasis should remain on governmental aid, also see an urgent new role for private investment.

Because of disenchantment with the Vietnam war and other factors, they contend, the United States is going through an internal reappraisal of its foreign commitments. The increasing hostility within the U.S. Congress to foreign aid is only one symptom.

However, they point out, world events will not stand still while the United States completes the process of redefining foreign policy goals, deciding where it will put its future priorities and where it will make some measure of disengagement. During the interim, it is necessary to erect temporary structures that will provide some element of continuity and allow a transition to whatever new directions emerge in U.S. foreign policy.

Where the problems of third-world development are concerned, private U.S. foreign investment would seem to lend itself to use as such a temporary structure. By accelerating its tempo and changing some of its emphasis, it could keep alive the spark of development in underdeveloped areas while the United States gropes toward new approaches to foreign aid.

Among the world's underdeveloped areas, it is Latin America where U.S. business has its most sizable commitment. Therefore, according to this argument, it is in Latin America where the idea of foreign investment as a temporary—or even permanent—solution to development problems can best be tested.

Such a proposal turns on premises that Latin America's problems are mainly due to a lack of capital, and that development of the region would be hastened if there were more local and U.S. private investment.

This argument can be faulted on the grounds that it tends to concentrate on economic considerations and slights the need for reform of outmoded political and social institutions.

The importance of capital is denied. Castro lectures on the error of "geographic fatalism" that had tied Cuba's economy to the United States. But Castro, too, needs capital, and has simply traded the U.S. source for the Soviet.

Yet, even when it is concluded that Latin America has a critical need for capital, the problem remains of how to attract it at a time when the tendency of potential investors is to shy away from the area.

In the past, this problem was overcome in one of two ways: by offering a profit return so high that investors were willing to take the risk of going into an unstable situation, or by creating what businessmen like to call a "favorable investment climate"—often a euphemism for a business-oriented, right-wing dictatorship.

The first answer represents one of the chief reasons why so many Latins regard foreign firms as exploiters. The second runs counter to the Alliance for Progress goal of fostering democratic, equitable governments.

It is because business relied so heavily on such inducements and safeguards in the past that the current wave of Latin nationalism finds so many converts.

RISK VERSUS REFORM

The problem then becomes one of finding a way to overcome the high risk of investing in Latin America and still allow the Latins to engage in political and social reform. Those who believe in the need for increased foreign investment advocate changing the focus of U.S. foreign aid to provide subsidies, incentives and safeguards to American capital.

Among suggested measures are eliminating the tax on repatriated earnings from investments in Latin America, tax credits on initial investments, and insurance to protect investors against expropriation and other forms of political penalty. Without such measures, businessmen and government officials often agree, there is no hope for any substantial increase of private U.S. investment in Latin America within the foreseeable future.

Peter T. Jones, who dealt with Latin-American problems as a Commerce Department official under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and who now works for International Telephone and Telegraph as a vice president of its Latin-American division, states the argument this way:

"The problem of introducing jobs and progress into a poverty-stricken area like the Northeast of Brazil is the same as the problem we have at home in Appalachia. There's no reason why business should want to go in there unless you give it special incentives. Either you subsidize it, or it just doesn't grow."

Jones and others who advocate more emphasis on private enterprise within the foreign aid program call for vigilance against a return to the laissez-faire days before the Alliance when benefits went largely into the pockets of a small group of businessmen and their cohorts in government.

To prevent this. they say, any private business subsidies and incentives built into the aid program should concentrate on investments that would be clearly beneficial to large numbers of Latin Americans. In this category, they advocate a priority status for "joint venture" investments that would give local Latin capital the chance to get in on the action by associating with U.S. financial and technological resources.

In the view of most Latin American businessmen and economic analysis, joint ventures represent the key to whether foreign investment will continue to be an important force in Latin America.

They warn that unless indigenous Latin capital is allowed to have a share of the region's future economic development—indeed, eventually to control this development—foreign investors will find themselves increasingly threatened by the nationalistic argument that they represent an alien, exploitative force.

To prevent this, they say, any private business subsidies and incentives built into the aid program should concentrate on investments that would be clearly beneficial to large numbers of Latin Americans. In this category, they advocate a priority status for so-called "joint venture" investments that would give local Latin capital the chance to get in on the action by associating with U.S. financial and technological resources.

In addition, they add, incentives are needed for investments that will create jobs, promote the tourism and exports on which Latin America relies for foreign exchange, modernize backward technology, and help bring private enterprise into a bigger role in community and national development.

This is a tall order, and even the most enthusiastic partisans of the idea do not pretend that private enterprise on its own will be able to complete the development process.

PUBLIC SECTOR

Most concede that continued large-scale governmental planning and spending will be necessary to cover many areas that business investment cannot reach. This means that the aid program, however it is changed, would still have to provide long-term development loans on a government-to-government basis.

There is also the need to expand Latin America's foreign trade opportunities—a need which many Latin leaders consider even more important than increased investment.

In short, almost everyone agrees that no matter how much capital is supplied or saved through increased foreign investment, additional hard currency obtained through trade and aid would be needed to sustain a satisfactory rate of growth.

Advocates of government incentives to spur investment also point out that Latin America is a good place to test the idea because it is the least underdeveloped of the world's emerging areas. Since Latin America already has the beginnings of a substantial industrial base, it can benefit readily from a shift in emphasis from public to private development.

If the idea worked in Latin America, the experience gained could be applied to Africa, Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

But would the Nixon Administration regard the incentive approach as worthy of being included in its foreign-aid proposals, and would Congress, in turn, be willing to appropriate the needed money and sacrifice the tax revenues? And could enough private investors even then be found to give the idea a real test?

Would American business find the inducements attractive enough? Would it be willing to change its traditional methods of operation and combat Latin hostilities by engaging in more joint ventures and more involvement in the non-business activities of the Latin community?

And, perhaps most important, what would be the reaction of the Latin American governments and peoples to such an initiative by the American business community? Would they see the advantages of working with foreign investment on a new, more equitable basis?

Or have the appeals of nationalism and statist-oriented ideas already made such inroads that the proposed changes in investment emphasis are doomed?

These questions will be answered only when the Latin Americans decide how to answer Servan-Schreiber's question, "What kind of future do we want?"

All that is certain today is that the nature of foreign investment in Latin America will have changed drastically a decade from now.

PART II—THE LATIN AMERICAN CHALLENGE: U.S. COMPANIES STRIVE FOR NEW IMAGE

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES.—From the time of Córtes and his gold-seeking Spanish conquistadores, no subject has aroused greater bitterness in Latin America than "economic exploitation."

Today, this bitterness is directed against the group that many Latins regard as the modern equivalent of freebooters like Córtes the foreign investors who have been prominent since the 19th Century wars of liberation.

To help pay for these wars, leaders like Simon Bolivar granted concessions to foreigners for the extraction of mineral wealth. After independence, the new nations, lacking money and technical expertise, continued to abdicate development of resources to investment capital from abroad.

After 150 years of seeing what Latins regard as their patrimony in pawn, they have become increasingly frustrated. Inevitably, this emotion focuses on the vast U.S. business investment—a $10-billion stake that represents roughly one-third of all the foreign capital in the area.

David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank and of the U.S. business-sponsored Council for Latin America, summarizes the case made against private U.S. interests by their enemies in Latin America:

"North American capitalists, they say, are out to exploit resources and markets to the detriment of the host nations; the capitalists want to keep the people in poverty so they can take over their minerals and metals; they are obsessed with excessive profits and have no concern for the land or its inhabitants."

Rockefeller dismisses the charges as "largely without foundation." Still, there is no question that allegations of economic exploitation lie at the root of almost every grievance that Latin Americans have against the United States.

Even the Brazilian economist, Roberto Campos—a man so thoroughly pro-American that his countrymen call him "Bobby Fields" after the English translation of his name—cites the "overwhelming influence exercised by American private interests" as the chief cause of Latin America's "reactive tensions." History offers evidence of at least some truth in the Latin indictment.

In the old days of "dollar diplomacy," the United States frequently sent troops to protect American investments. More recently, business pressures have prompted the White House and the State Department to drop up reactionary governments because of fear that social reform would prejudice investments.

Yet, even after allowance is made for all these justifiable complaints, U.S. business in Latin America is not nearly so exploitative or monolithic as many critics contend.

In recent years, it often has been a generous employer, honest taxpayer and all-around good citizen. It even has started learning how to live with the new breed of social reformers and central planners in many Latin governments—although it still regards them uneasily and feels more comfortable with traditional right-wing regimes such as those in Argentina and Brazil.

NEW INTERESTS

It also has expanded into many economic vacuums created by a continuing shortage of home-grown capital and technology. This has brought in modern methods, stimulated local industry, given work to thousands. helped train a technical and managerial class, improved living standards for the small consumer and contributed to the beginnings of a modern industrial plant.

XUM

It has failed to make these accomplishments understood or appreciated by the great mass of Latin Americans. As David Rockefeller and other corporation executives readily admit, the U.S. business community suffers from an image problem rooted in its past excesses.

These excesses are part of a story that began a century ago with such unregenerate adventures as Henry Meiggs, the "Yankee Pizzarro" who parlayed his skill at building railroads across the Andes into a financial empire founded on corruption and intrigue. In his time, Meiggs virtually owned every leading politician in Peru from the president on down and maintained what was almost a private harem of wives and daughters of Lima's leading families.

Meiggs eventually died broke and discredited, but others built more enduring monuments to ambition and business acumen.

GRACE'S BEGINNINGS

Also in Peru at that time was a young Irish immigrant ship's chandler, William Russel Grace, who quickly spotted the possibilities of chartering and servicing ships engaged in the guano fertilizer trade. From this modest enterprise, its headquarters later transferred to New York, grew what are today the many-faceted, world-wide activities of W. R. Grace and Co.

And there was Henry Meiggs's nephew, Minor Cooper Keith, who in Costa Rica forged the first rails across the Central American isthmus. Seeing that his railroad could not prosper without freight, Keith began bidding for control of the "green and gold empire," the then infant banana trade.

Acquiring lands the size of Rhode Island, Keith embarked on a bitter, 30-year war with rivals. By 1889, most competitors were ready to consolidate. The result was the United Fruit Company—the organization that more than any other would symbolize the U.S. business presence in Latin America during the first decades of this century.

From the company's board rooms in Boston, Keith, together with such associates and successors as Andrew Preston and Samuel ("Sam the Banana Man") Zemurry, exercised a hegemony greater than any government over vast areas around the Carribbean. Keith was known as "the uncrowned king of Central America."

The atmosphere created by United Fruit in its domains was that of a gigantic company store. Thousands of farmers were coerced into selling bananas exclusively to United Fruit at prices set by the company; hired thugs enforced cooperation and Latin governments either pocketed "subsidies" and looked the other way or they didn't last very long.

COUP FOR SALE

Toward the end of his life, Zemurry, who openly admitted having "bought" one coup in Honduras, told an interviewer that he had done many things in the early years of the company that he didn't like to think about "in the dark hours of the night."

Because these things were done with the tacit approval of successive administrations in Washington, the impression grew that the United States promoted dictatorships to further the aims of United Fruit. This cry was heard as recently as 1954, when the CIA incited right-wing military elements in Guatemala to overthrow a popular but leftist government.

Actually, the 1954 incident was prompted mainly by Cold War fears of a potential Communist takeover. However, one of Washington's conditions for aiding the coup leaders was a promise to eliminate a land reform program that had offended United Fruit; a former United Fruit executive acted as an intermediary between the CIA and the rebel military officers.

SEEKS BETTER IMAGE

United Fruit, which remains an important force in the economies of the banana-growing countries, has tried hard in recent years to project a more progressive image. But among Latin Americans, who have long memories, the effort has largely been unavailing.

In Mexico last year, for example, the news that United Fruit was planning to buy a well-known local grocery chain touched off a full-scale furor including a congressional debate about why the government was allowing the company into the country. And in Ecuador, the taint of association with United Fruit once played a big part in destroying the presidential ambitions of Galo Plaza Lasso, now secretary general of the Organization of American States.

Plaza, who had been president in the late 1940s and who is generally regarded by outside observers as the outstanding Ecuadorian leader of this century, ran for a second term in 1960. But he had written a book that praised United Fruit for housing and educational benefits provided its plantation workers.

During the campaign, his opponents attacked him for "selling out." He ran a poor third.

As United Fruit was establishing its hold over the banana trade, other American firms were making their presence felt.

VENEZUELAN OIL

The discovery of oil in Venezuela quickly brought that country's economy under the control of such organizations as Gulf, Royal Dutch Shell (a European firm) and, most prominent of all, the Creole Petroleum Corp.—a Standard Oil of New Jersey subsidiary that is said by industry sources to be the largest and probably the most profitable petroleum-producing company in the world.

Kennecott, Anaconda and Cerro de Pasco were digging copper and other minerals out of Chile and Peru. International Telephone and Telegraph was controlling telephone and cable facilities, and in the power utility field, the dominant names were those like American and Foreign Power Corp.

This concentration formed the basis of present-day Latin American resentments toward U.S. investment. Yet, although about 60 per cent of the total U.S. investment is still in these fields, the main thrust of American business here has been changing radically.

Over the past two decades, American investment has been going through a second-stage development—one powered by rising demand for American-style consumer goods. With orders for their products increasing, more firms established subsidiary manufacturing facilities in the area.

NEW INVESTORS

The names that intruded most prominently became General Motors, Ford and Chrysler in automobiles, Merck and Parke Davis in drugs, General Electric and Westinghouse in electronics, Goodrich and Firestone in rubber products, Sears Roebuck in retailing.

It was an expansion that touched all but the tiniest Latin countries. In Mexico, Brazil and Argentina it laid the foundations for a large national industrial base.

The depth of the new U.S. involvement is evidenced by the fact that since World War II, direct U.S. investments soared from less than $3 billion to the present $10 billion—almost one-fourth of total U.S. investments abroad.

At the end of 1967 (the last year for which complete figures are available) the largest share of American investment was in Venezuela, with $2.5 billion. Of this, $1.8 billion was in the petroleum industry. Since Venezuela is not expected to renew the concessions of foreign oil companies when they run out during the next decade, the present U.S. stake in Venezuela appears to have hit its peak.

In fact, U.S. investment in Venezuela actually showed a small decline between 1966 and 1967. Unless the current stake in petroleum is replaced by other types of investment, this trend can accelerate rapidly in the years ahead.

MANUFACTURERS IN MEXICO

In contrast is Mexico, where U.S. investment is put at $1.34 billion, the second highest total. Mexico had relatively little U.S. investment at the end of World War II. The once-large American holdings in basic industries were expropriated or expelled during the 1920s and 30s.

In the post-war period, though, Mexico has been the most successful of all Latin countries in attracting American capital to consumer manufacturing activities. The outlook there is for U.S. firms to continue putting in money.

The same is true of the countries in third and fourth place, Brazil with $1.32 billion and Argentina with $1 billion. The big upsurge of American investment there has come within the last decade and has been concentrated almost exclusively on manufacturing.

Even some of the old-line American firms have started to move in this direction. ITT, for example, has gradually been disengaging from telephone operators to concentrate on service activities like hotels.

SOME ENCOURAGEMENT

In contrast to the hostility directed against the mining, petroleum and utilities companies, this new wave of investment is one that sophisticated Latin Americans are generally inclined to encourage.

They have read "The American Challenge," Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber's analysis of the impact of American investment in Europe, and they have perceived its applications: to become a modern industrial region, Latin America must rely on the Americans, in the short run at least, to supply the capital and teach the management and technological methods that it cannot generate from its own resources.

They regard this as especially urgent because Latin America's decade-old boom in manufacturing is fast approaching its outer limits. Concentrated on the production of import substitute consumer goods that exist behind tariff protection, industry is getting close to saturating available markets.

To grow further, either its consumer market must be broadened—through creation of the long-stalled Latin common market and incorporation of population now outside the money economy—or the changeover must be made to manufactured goods that can compete as exports to world markets. Eventually, this would presuppose an attempt to shift the industrial base toward manufacturers employing the raw materials produced in Latin America.

But that involves industrial activity far more sophisticated than the current import-substitute industries. So far though, U.S business—the only force really capable of leading Latin industry to this next stage—has been unwilling to invest the necessary money and technology.

ANTI-BUSINESS FEELING

One of the most compelling reasons, from the potential investor's point of view, is the increasing anti-business feeling.

To be sure, all but the most doctrinaire of the Latin leaders make clear distinctions between what they regard as "good" and "bad" investment—between what it is politically expedient to say they want to get rid of (the old-line extractive investments) and what it is economically imperative to woo (new-style manufacturing ventures).

Such distinctions frequently get blurred in an emotional atmosphere. When the Latin masses constantly have it dinned into their ears that a particular American company is bad, they are unable to understand why the indictment does not extend to all American firms.

XUM

The military regime in Peru expropriated a large American oil company while trying to explain that this was a special case—and that it really was anxious to have other kinds of American investment come in.

INVESTORS DISCOURAGED

What it got instead was a climate of mutual recrimination, threatened reprisals and a fanning of public sentiment against "imperialist exploiters" that currently is discouraging potential investors in Peru. Yet, Peru needs new investment if it is to shake out of the fiscal depression of the past two years.

As David Rockefeller says, "One of the most formidable barriers to private investment abroad, in my judgment, is the barrier existing in the minds and emotions of those who need foreign investment most."

This barrier was built by the greed and excesses of American business. But what keeps it high and forbidding today is the failure of Latin Americans to realize that many old prejudices are no longer valid.

PART III—THE LATIN CHALLENGE: PERU GAINS WIDE SYMPATHY IN U.S. OIL DISPUTE

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES.—On April 4, President Nixon may be forced to make a decision that could determine the course of U.S. relations with Latin America for years to come.

At issue is the expropriation of an American-owned oil company by the military regime that seized power in Peru last October. And what Mr. Nixon must decide is whether to invoke against Peru certain financial sanctions prescribed by U.S. law.

That decision will touch every aspect of U.S. interests in Latin America. But none will be affected more than the $10 billion of direct private investment held by U.S. corporations in Latin America.

In Peru alone, sanctions undoubtedly will bring retaliation by the government against the substantial and varied private U.S. interests remaining there. Peruvian officials have considered courses ranging from a ban on the remittance of profits to the United States to further expropriations.

REACTION EXPECTED

Invoking of U.S. sanctions is certain to touch off wide-spread sympathy for Peru elsewhere in Latin America and fan the economic nationalism crackling through the continent.

Since U.S. investments represent more than a third of the foreign capital in the area, they have been the favorite target of this nationalism. Peru's expropriation of the oil company is only the most dramatic of the many recent incidents.

After almost a century of entrusting outside interests with the development of their petroleum resources, several other Latin countries have joined Peru in shouting, "The oil is ours."

In Bolivia, there has been rising demand for expropriation of the concessions held by Gulf Oil Corp. In Brazil, the president recently vetoed a decree permitting foreign firms to explore in competition with the state-owned company, Petrobras.

On Jan. 2, Peru decreed that all banks must be at least 75 per cent owned by nationals within a year. Two weeks later, Argentina took similar steps to curb foreign bank expansion.

HOME-OWNED PHONES

In international telecommunications, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Panama and Mexico have frozen private companies out of plans for satellite earth stations. In most cases a government monopoly will be established over international cable services that have been run by private firms like International Telephone and Telegraph.

Such broad-gauge attacks on foreign investment are hardly new in Latin America. They stem from deep-seated resentment of control exercised by outside interests.

During the past two decades, this indignation has been boiling over with increasing frequency. Many observers foresee the virtual elimination of foreign holdings in most Latin basic industries by the end of the century. In almost every case, they will be replaced by government ownership.

TRANSITION TREND

Most electrical power services and internal telephone and telegraph facilities already have made the transition—usually with disastrous results in service and efficiency. Now the trend is the same on other basic industries, particularly petroleum.

Looked at in strictly economic terms, a good case can be made that such nationalism does a disservice to Latin hopes for development. As Servan-Schreiber points out in "The American Challenge":

"To nationalize U.S. industries in response to increased American investment is a typical reaction of an underdeveloped country and ignores the real nature of the problem. Even if the newly nationalized firm managed to keep American-developed techniques, it would nevertheless be cut off from the flow of creatives from the parent company" . . .

"Governments which committed such acts of folly would have to close their frontiers to shut out scientific advances made elsewhere. Nationalization may be tempting, for it spares us the effort of thinking and seems to offer an easy answer. But it is a weapon that would only work against our own development."

STATE OIL MONOPOLIES

Nothing would appear to prove his contention more pointedly than the record of Latin American state-owned monopolies in petroleum, for example. Although such state companies have been a great source of pride, their economic performance has been one of almost total inefficiency.

Mexico's nationalization of the oil industry in 1938 provided the basis for the first important Latin oil monopoly, Pemex. After 30 years, however, Pemex has been a consistent money loser, riddled with graft and political patronage. It is quietly importing oil from Venezuela to meet domestic demand.

Argentina, whose state monopoly has never been able to get a drop of oil out of the ground, brought in American companies in the late 1950s. Within a year, the country not only was self-sufficient in many types of fuel oil but was exporting.

Yet the nationalistic outcry of "sell-out" was so great that in 1963 President Arturo Illia summarily threw out all foreign firms. Two years later, with production entirely in the hands of the state's YPF company, Argentina was importing $100 million worth of petroleum annually to meet domestic needs as well as incurring huge operating losses.

LED TO COUP

The failure of his oil policy was one of the factors prompting the military coup that overthrew Illia in 1966. Argentina's current military regime has moved against the trend in neighboring Latin countries and has invited the foreign companies back in hopes of again making the country self-sufficient in petroleum.

Current Latin nationalism is of such an intensity that many foreign businessmen are frankly fearful about its long-range implications. Most sophisticated investors long ago were reconciled to the fact that Latin Americans intend to reassert control over basic industries; and as a result, the main thrust of recent U.S. investment here has been directed toward activities like manufacturing, retailing and service.

These are the fields in which many Latins say they need and welcome foreign capital. Now, however, there is fear that the new economic nationalism—with mistrust of all things foreign and preoccupation with state ownership—will eventually extend to all areas of private enterprise.

This sentiment is no longer confined to the left of the political spectrum. The right, chief bulwark of the capitalist system in South America, has been moving toward an identification with nationalist aspirations and statist ideas.

The trend is apparent in such formerly monolithic guardians of the status quo as the Catholic Church, the entrepreneurial class and the officer corps of the powerful Latin armed forces. For the most part, the change in the thinking of these key institutions is still a minority sentiment. But it is growing.

For example, the two countries of South America currently having the greatest success in attracting foreign investment are Argentina and Brazil. Both have military-backed governments whose policies aim at bringing about rapid national development and industrialization by pursuing laissez-faire economics favorable to big business and foreign investment.

However, in both countries, there is also increasing pressure from important groups in government, business and the armed forces that want a far greater government control over the economy.

PERUVIAN SHOWDOWN

Within the Peruvian armed forces—the stanch allies of foreign investors during past periods of military rule—this showdown already seems to have taken place. From the evidence of the regime's expropriation of the International Petroleum Co., the victory appears to have gone to the nationalists.

The growing consensus of right and left on nationalistic economics was vividly underscored by a four-hour meeting recently in Lima.

On one side were Gen. Miguel Angel Valdivia Morriveron, the Finance Minister, and his chief deputy. Both are men with reputations for coolness toward foreign capital and a belief in state control of basic resources.

On the other side were a number of Chilean intellectuals, some with ties to the Chilean Christian Democratic Party, which is regarded by many not only as the most important force on the Latin non-Marxist left but also as the antithesis of military government.

Yet, these seeming opposites discussed seriously the formation of an over-all statist-oriented oil policy for Peru. They also explored the possibility of state-owned oil and steel entities throughout Latin America that would combine forces to increase their leverage with regard to freight rates, supplies and services.

HISTORIC DEPENDENCE

The seductive appeal that such ideas hold for such widely disparate forces is traceable to the historic dependence of their respective economies on foreign investment. For a long time, the life blood of Chile, its vast copper deposits, were under the exclusive control of American mining companies; the same was true of Peru's more varied resources.

In Chile, the 1964 presidential campaign almost saw election of a Marxist candidate calling for nationalization of copper and virtually all other foreign holdings. The actual winner was the Christian Democrat, Eduardo Frei, who enjoyed the backing of the United States for his much more moderate stance.

Frei proposed "Chileanization" of copper—a process now being implemented that calls for the government to buy into partnership with the U.S. copper companies, which were also to make new investments. For the rest, Frei's official policy was to favor continued foreign investment.

However, Frei, whose term as President ends next year, has been losing control of the Christian Democratic Party to its left-wing, avowedly statist, factions.

As a result, foreign investment in Chile outside the copper sphere has come almost to a standstill. Most firms already on the scene have shied away from expanding; and at least one, W. R. Grace and Co., long an important force in Chilean distribution and manufacturing activities, is liquidating most of its holdings.

In Peru, the seizure of International Petroleum was only the outward symbol of an atmosphere that foreign businessmen find increasingly worrisome.

On the day of the coup that ousted civilian President Fernando Belaunde Terry and brought Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado to the presidency, every political party and all but one of Lima's newspapers roundly denounced the unconstitutional takeover. One week later, all of them—together with the rest of the nation—were loudly applauding the IPC expropriation.

Even before the coup, there were signs that Peru was preparing a radical break from its past hospitality toward foreign capital. The law restricting foreign holdings in Peruvian banks, put into effect by the Velasco regime, actually was the culmination of a move started prior to the coup by Belaunde's finance minister, Manuel Ulloa.

AMASSED FORTUNE

For most of his adult life, Ulloa has been identified with U.S. corporate and banking interest, amassing a personal fortune in the process. But he was planning to become a candidate in the presidential elections that would have taken place next November.

His reading of public opinion told him that attacks on American investors were good politics, and the banking law was the result. Also prior to the coup, Ulloa was preparing another openly nationalistic measure—one relating to the fishmeal industry—that the military government is expected to adopt.

Fishmeal, the country's largest single earner of foreign exchange, made Peru the world's front-ranking fishing nation and created a strong sense of national pride because it was built up primarily by Peruvian initiative and capital. Foreign investors also took part, but the major achievement was clearly Peruvian.

FISHMEAL DECLINE

With success, however, came over-expansion of fleet and factory capacity. Costs rose, increased competition came from other fishmeal-producing countries and from alternate kinds of animal feeds, and the industry two years ago went into severe recession.

The inevitable result was consolidation. Inefficient factories and fleets operated by under-capitalized companies began going under. These were almost always Peruvian-owned.

Foreign companies, often better financed and with more modern equipment, weathered the recession and began to control an increasing share of the industry. Some also were subsidiaries of parent companies that made large-scale use of fishmeal, and Peruvians began charging that the subsidiaries were trying to depress the world market price in order to benefit their parent companies.

At the time of the coup, the Peruvian congress, supported by important segments of the local business community, was considering legislation limiting foreign ownership of any fishmeal company to one-third of the equity.

The present U.S.-Peru collision course over the oil seizure has put the rest of the U.S. investment stake in Peru, estimated at about $600 million before the IPC seizure, in somewhat the same position as the U.S. business community in Cuba at the time of the 1959 revolution. What happened in Cuba—the eventual expropriation of all U.S. holdings—could now happen in Peru.

If the Peruvians, aided by the Soviets, were able beneficially to exert their independence of the United States, the example would be taken up by other countries' nationalists clamoring for a showdown with foreign investment.

PART IV—THE LATIN CHALLENGE: U.S. BUSINESSMEN TRY TO ADAPT TO NEW REALITIES

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES.—He is a familiar figure in the financial districts of every big Latin American city—his close-cropped hair, natural-shoulder suit and brisk step setting him apart from the Latins around him.

He works long hours, broken only by forced adoption of the local custom decreeing a two-hour-lunch. Efficient, tireless and frequently impatient with the slower Latin pace, he seems the perfect model of that American whom a European once described as "born to make transatlantic calls and jump aboard international jets."

At night, he goes home to an elegant house or apartment in a foreign colony suburb. There, he spends his leisure hours complaining about the plumbing, trading cocktail invitations with his neighbors and arranging the foursome for his weekend of golf.

He may be a plant manager, an engineer, a financial analyst, a sales manager. And he is in Latin America as the proconsul entrusted by the great North American corporations to oversee the $10 billion worth of private investment that they have put into the region.

To Latin Americans, he is the visible symbol of that massive U.S. economic presence. In the past, he usually seemed to them a remote figure walled off behind the suburban American enclaves he has created in their midst.

Now, half a century after he and others like him began arriving here in significant numbers, he is trying to change this image.

FACES THREAT

It is an effort born of necessity. With a strong new tide of nationalism sweeping through the region, U.S. business finds itself facing its greatest threat in a decade—one that poses dangers both for existing investments and for the future of U.S. interests in the Latin American marketplace.

As a result, there is great emphasis these days on developing what home office directives call "an effective message."

Basically, it reads like this:

American corporations are neither robbers nor exploiters but simply expanding organizations seeking new outlets for their products and services. They ask reasonable profits; in exchange, they offer Latin America the chance to develop and prosper, to acquire new industries and technology and to raise the living standards of its masses.

Among American firms with substantial interests in Latin America, the spreading of this message lately has become almost a creed. Nowhere is it talked about with more missionary fervor than by the Council for Latin America, an organization of more than 220 U.S. companies that has achieved almost institution status as the spokesman for American business on Hemispheric affairs.

ROCKEFELLER STATEMENT

In its literature, the Council describes its purpose as "assisting the business community in discharging its environmental responsibilities in Latin America." What this means was spelled out in a recent speech by David Rockefeller, board chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank and the chairman of the Council.

"If the intent of the Council and its members can be expressed in a single sentence, it is that we are citizens first, and businessmen second," Rockefeller said. He then offered this ambitious summary of the organization's aims:

"The Council must seek acceptance of its convictions and its goals into the standard operating procedure of as many U.S. business enterprises in Latin America as possible. This means that we shall seek to have companies formally embrace, as a matter of routine, responsibilities for the success of the environment in which they operate fully as intensively as they accept responsibility for the success of their own operations.

"This acceptance, in turn, implies that company chief executives will consciously divide their time and energy between coping with environmental issues and problems of their own business; that labor relations executives will devote time not only to in-plant labor relations but also to the strengthening of the free labor movement as a whole; that executives charged with recruiting and training skilled personnel for management will also concern themselves with the health of the universities, the schools and the vocational training institutions . . ."

It is a very tall order. And many people familiar with the Latin scene are frankly skeptical about the ability of the U.S. business community within Latin America to make such changes.

Their skepticism is understandable when one considers the neanderthal attitudes of some "old Latin hands"—particularly those who grew up in such long-entrenched extractive industries as mining and petroleum. They are men whose thinking was conditioned by a time when Latin America was ruled largely by old-style dictators.

In those days, the game was played according to simple if brutal rules: the dictators got their under-the-table payoffs; in exchange they provided a firm hand to keep the natives in line, and the foreign companies were free to go about the business of mining or drilling for oil.

Despite David Rockefeller's warning that "business must attune its ear anew to the democratic clamor in Latin America," there is no question that most U.S. firms retain a marked preference for investment in the stable environment provided by traditionalist, strong-man regimes.

The two most prominent of these—the military dictatorships in Brazil and Argentina—have no more enthusiastic boosters than the U.S. Chambers of Commerce in Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires. And, of all the countries in South America, these are the two that business currently regards as offering the most "favorable investment climate."

OTHER FACTORS

Nor are politics the only impediments to business's efforts to build a new image for itself.

One management consultant, referring to "an invisible barrier" which exists between Americans and the country in which they live and work, observed that the nationals are largely unseen at cocktail parties, dinners and golf matches hosted by Americans; that the Americans often isolate themselves from the country's cultural activities and that they frequently have a "Man Friday" to deal with national officials.

Eventually, the American is promoted back to the States, the acknowledged "company expert," who all too often extends his ignorance of the Hemisphere at home.

Yet, despite the prevalence of this pattern, corporate leaders remain optimistic that it can be broken by putting time and effort into creation of a new breed of managers and field executives. Increasingly, many firms are attempting to recruit new personnel from among young men who have served in Latin America as Peace Corps volunteers or who have made studies of the area's language, culture and history.

The president of one big corporation's Argentine subsidy sees signs that the effort already is beginning to pay off. Says he:

"It's the rare American who's going to become 'criollo' (the local term for 'going native'). But there definitely is greater bridging of cultures. Twenty years ago, if

XUM

you went to a party given by one of our younger executives, everyone there would be American. Today maybe 40 to 50 per cent of the guests will be Latins; and there'll be as much Spanish spoken as English."

In addition to its efforts in the personnel area, American business also is spending more time on public relations activities, on becoming active in local trade associations and non-business groups and in lending its considerable resources to development problems.

American enterprise has also introduced some imaginative and effective innovations. These include organizations like ADELA, an investment company capitalized by contributions from U.S. and European firms that provides financial backing for Latin American businessmen trying to launch new enterprises.

In the five years it has been in business, ADELA has put money into everything from a packing house in Guayaquil, Ecuador, to a tourist hotel in Managua, Nicaragua.

A ROCKEFELLER PROJECT

And, there is the International Basic Economy Corp. (IBEC), started by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and dedicated to the proposition that private business can introduce new ventures to underdeveloped areas for a profit and for the good of the host country at the same time.

Although IBEC usually has lost money on its operations, it has had unquestionable impact on the countries where it does business. Among its accomplishments have been the revolutionizing of the growing and distribution of hybrid corn in Brazil and the introduction of the American-style supermarket to Venezuela and Peru.

Yet, in the long run, everyone agrees, the battle will be won or lost by individual companies and the impression that they create in the Latin community through their normal, day-to-day operations.

Historically, the picture presented by many American firms was one of oppressive bigness, of rapacious spoiling of natural resources, of hunger for excessive profits, of unwillingness to hire Latin Americans for responsible positions. From this came the present nationalistic demand for expropriation and curtailment of American interests.

To be sure, there are firms that have found the key to operating successfully in Latin America and whose names do not arouse widespread resentment.

HOUSEHOLD NAME

Sears Roebuck, for example, has become a household name in many areas of Latin America where it has introduced American mass-retailing methods. Sears has further ingratiated itself with Latins by making the bulk of its purchases from local factories (many of which did not exist before Sears came on the scene) and by introducing such benefits as stock and profit-sharing for its employes.

Perhaps no American firm has better adopted the formula for working successfully and harmoniously in the Latin environment than one of the oldest, W. R. Grace and Co., which began its corporate life more than 100 years ago with shipping activities in Peru.

Although Latin America now accounts for only a minority percentage of Grace's far-flung activities, it still has extensive holdings in several Latin countries. Nowhere is this more true than in Peru, the country where the firm was born and where Casa Grace (the name by which it is locally known) reaches into every corner of the national economy.

With its two enormous plantations at Cartavio and Paramonga, Grace is Peru's largest producer and processor of refined sugar. It manufactures 70 per cent of the paper products produced in Peru and is also the country's leading manufacturer of textiles, industrial chemicals and quality paints.

It is active in the production of fishmeal and the trading of ore concentrates. It makes candy, cookies and flour, gin, vodka and rum. It imports, sells and services machinery and appliances.

So extensive are its interests that there is hardly a Peruvian within the money economy who does not eat, wear or use something processed, manufactured or imported by Grace. With between 11,000 and 15,000 people on its payroll, Grace is Peru's second largest private employer and one of its biggest taxpayers.

ENJOYS IMMUNITY

Yet, in a country where nationalist feeling against foreign economic influence runs very deep, no one seems to harbor any resentments toward Casa Grace. Other American companies in Peru are constantly under attack but Grace continues to make money while staying out of trouble.

In large measure, this is because Grace did not follow the road to expansion taken by most of the early American firms in Latin America, namely the production of raw materials for marketing in the industrial areas of the world. Instead, it was the first to venture into the local manufacturing of consumer goods for distribution in the local market.

This early concern for and attention to the basic internal needs of the country quickly set Grace apart from most old-line foreign enterprises in South America. Where the others were thought of as plunderers, Grace developed the reputation for being "almost Peruvian" in its integration with the local economy.

Then too, over the years, Grace has developed a style of operating carefully designed to keep Pruvian sensibilities in mind.

In most of its venture, Grace operates through a network of wholly or partly-owned subsidiaries whose connections to the parent company are not paraded before the attention of the public. Thus, when a Peruvian buys a bottle of Wolfschmidt Vodka or a package of Arturo Field biscuits or a General Electric refrigerator, he generally is unaware that the article was made or imported by Grace.

EMPLOYS NATIONALS

The same muted tone about the company's size and foreign connections is evident in its employment policies. Although Peruvian law allows up to 20 per cent of all personnel in business enterprise to be foreigners, Grace's employment of non-Peruvians is less than one per cent of its total staff.

Moreover, Grace was among the first American firms in this part of the world to open the doors of top management to Latin Americans. The general manager of all Grace activities in the country is a Peruvian, as are most of the heads of the divisions under his control.

Officially, the company says it has no set policy other than to fill jobs with the best men available. However, some Grace executives say privately that there is an unwritten law decreeing that the top job in Peru (and in the other Latin countries where Grace operates) be filled by a national of the host country.

Similarly, most North Americans working for Grace in Peru are regaded as in training for higher responsibilities in the parent company's overall operations and are not competing with Peruvians. As a result, Grace has become known in Peruvian business circles as a firm that posts no barriers to the advancement of Peruvians to top jobs.

The few Americans that the company has assigned to Peru are expected to take active part in community affairs, to cultivate the friendship of Peruvians and have an extensive command of Spanish.

A PACE-SETTER

Grace has also been among the pace setters in Peru regarding wage scales and fringe benefits it provides its workers.

Despite its sizable investment in this area, the company is sometimes criticized for taking an overly paternal approach that promotes what Latin sociologists call a "compound" or "stockade psychology." One critique of the brick-and-stone housing blocks built by Grace at its plantations contained this observation:

"One may question whether these plans have fully taken into consideration the problems of the agricultural and rural highland dweller who is in transition. To him, inside plumbing, concrete floor and glass windows may be much less important than land for a garden and shelter that is not a part of large block units."

Nevertheless, the company does seem willing to admit it has things to learn in the social welfare field. From time to time, it employs social anthropologists to evaluate its worker benefit projects and advise how they can be more effective.

In any case, whatever its shortcomings, Grace was among the first foreign or domestic companies in Latin America to involve itself in social programs. Here, as in so many other areas, it has demonstrated such activities add up to a good image, and therefore to good business.

PART V—THE LATIN CHALLENGE: "JOINT VENTURES" LINK NATIONALISTS AND U.S. FIRMS

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES.—The businessman set down his coffee cup, swung his desk chair slightly to the side and gestured toward the wide, tinted-glass windows looking out of his penthouse office. "You want to know about American investment?" he asked. "Well look out that window. From here, I could show you ten, perhaps fifteen buildings that have Amreican companies inside."

The scene was Sao Paulo, the sprawling, booming hub of Brazil's financial and industrial world. But it could have been any other big city in Latin America.

The man speaking was a former cabinet minister who is now a director and consultant of several large Brazilian corporations. What he said applies to all the Latin countries where U.S. enterprise is at work.

"It's a big thing. Certainly, it's important to your country because you have a lot invested here. It's even more important to us, because our economies depend on it for much of the nourishment that makes them grow.

"But there is a question about whether it will continue to be important. If our development is to continue its dependence on American capital, there will have to be some changes in your thinking. Your government will have to change, and the men who sit in Wall Street and run your corporations will have to change."

Increasingly, there is agreement that the $10 billion U.S. business investment, if it is to remain, must change its structure.

CHOICE IS RISKY

Such change entail risks that most corporate leaders would find hard to justify before their stockholders. Many may drop out, a trend already felt. It is alarming the Latin business and governmental leaders who see the region's hope for prosperity in capitalism and who believe that U.S. investment is the seed money on which much business activity depends.

Faced with a growing ultra-nationalist trend toward statism, the Latin entrepreneurial class is nervous about its own survival. As a result, there is a growing awareness of the need to reduce the frictions attendant upon foreign investment.

Guarantees often are mentioned as a means of calming investors' anxieties about political instability, inflation and other monetary ups and downs. But lack of financial resources and political inhibitions often restrict what Latin governments can offer.

Now there is talk about the U.S. government attempting to spur increased private investment by building incentives and guarantees into the U.S. foreign aid program.

Even assuming that this were done and that private U.S. business was willing to respond to these incentives, there is the question of whether Latin public opinion will allow foreign capital to continue with as much control over their economies as in the past.

An American firm may provide excellent wages and fringe benefits, pay heavy taxes and reinvest most of its profits. It may lend its resources to the solution of critical national problems.

Yet, if ownership remains in U.S. hands and policy direction comes from New York or Detroit, a firm will be regarded as controlling resources and profits that should belong to Latin Americans.

JOINT VENTURES

What can U.S. business do to overcome this essentially political hostility? Among leaders of the Latin business and governmental establishment, an answer is "joint ventures"—under which foreign money works in partnership with Latin capital to establish or expand businesses.

Like their European counterparts, Latin American business leaders look with a mixture of fear and admiration at the managerial and technological superiority of U.S. business. They would like to apply this superiority to their own development, but they do not want to be dominated by it.

They think the joint venture would bring in American capital, technology and administrative technique yet would allow Latin business to share in the profits, acquire know-how and eventually gain control.

This last consideration is all-important. As the Colombian government says: "It cannot be allowed that the commanding heights of our economy remain forever under the control of outsiders."

The trouble is that most American firms are unconvinced that such a system holds out any special benefit to them. They argue that many businesses are not adaptable to the joint venture approach, and that a number already in effect have not worked.

They dislike divided control, especially when the American firm is making the biggest contribution and is expected to be the minority member.

These arguments have focused interest on two countries that have made joint ventures governmental policy. The approaches are known as "Mexicanization" and "Chileanization."

MEXICO CASE

Mexico has bounced among various extremes in its efforts to take advantage of foreign investment yet be master in its own house.

During the revolutionary ferment of the 1920s and 30s, Mexico drove out most foreign interests that previously had controlled its natural resources, transportation, communications and utilities.

More recently, Mexican governments have followed a policy of pushing rapid industrialization on the theory that creation of a domestic capitalist class will eventually provide benefits for the entire country.

Since the end of World War II, Mexico has welcomed foreign investment. However, as one Mexican government official phrases it, the welcome is a provisional one that limits key sectors of the economy to the exclusive ownership of the state (petroleum, petrochemicals, electricity) or of Mexican nationals (banking, publishing, insurance).

Foreign investment is wanted where Mexican businessmen have neither the capital nor the technology to venture on their own. The Mexican government repeatedly has said it "prefers" foreign capital to associate in a minority equity position with Mexican capital.

In a number of fields—advertising, mining and smelting, secondary petrochemicals, food packaging—the law requires at least 51 per cent ownership Mexican.

In other areas, the government tries, through tax exemptions and liberal import permits, to induce foreign investors to accept a minority status. Almost all new investment enters on a "Mexicanized" basis.

The process is also applied to long-established, wholly owned foreign companies. Subsidiaries of American Smelting and Refining, Pan American Sulphur, Allis-Chalmers, Eaton, Yale and Towne, Union Carbide, Kimberly-Clarke, and John Deere and Co. are now 51 per cent or more held by Mexican nationals.

The government makes exceptions when it wants a particular kind of investment badly enough and can attract it only by allowing the foreign company to retain control. This pragmatism is evident toward automobile and electronics manufacturers and toward agricultural firms willing to invest in backward rural areas.

Parent U.S. firms retaining full or majority ownership are Philco, General Electric, Admiral, Sears Roebuck, IBM, ITT, Monsanto, Anaconda, Ford, General Motors and Anderson Clayton. The last three are among the largest business operations in Mexico, each with annual sales in excess of $80 million.

SOME OPPOSITION

Some foreign investors have found themselves unable to work amicably with Mexican partners, and others complain that the government went back on earlier understandings—by failing to provide promised benefits, or by forcing "Mexicanization" against their will.

Yet, Mexico's soaring rate of industrial growth—the most active in Latin America—indicates that the program has been a success. As Octaviano Campos Salas, the secretary of industry and commerce, points out: "No matter what may be said, we continue to have more than enough suitors."

This is because Mexico offers investors a number of conditions that cannot be matched elsewhere in Latin America: a large potential market, stability, no restrictions on the remittance of profits and next-door proximity to home offices.

U.S. money is moving south of the Rio Grande at a record rate. During 1967 (the last year for which complete figures are available), U.S. firms operating in Mexico increased their total investment by $100 million, compared with an increase of only $62 million in 1966. The total now is $1.34 billion.

The implication is that the key factor is the chance to make money. In exchange for that opportunity, American firms apparently are willing to favor Mexican partners with manufacturing licenses, technical assistance and capital—all for minority share of the new enterprise.

CHILE'S ALTERNATIVE

At the opposite end of Latin America, the Chileanization program represents different ideas than "Mexicanization."

Chile's problem is that of a country that depends for its livelihood on a single natural resource—in Chile's case, copper—and that has lacked the capital or technology to exploit it alone.

By 1964, when President Eduardo Frei was elected, nationalistic resentment over the dominant role played by American mining companies made this a subject that could no longer be ignored.

To nationalize the copper industry and throw the American firms out, as extremists demanded, could have ruined the economy Instead, Frei worked out Chileanization—a form of joint venture designed to bring the Chilean government into partnership with the mining companies.

The plan, which went into effect in 1967, called for the Chilean government to become part owner of the holdings of the three firms controlling 85 per cent of Chilean copper production—Kennecott, Anaconda and the Cerro Corp. The government became majority shareholder in some operations and a junior partner in others. The companies pledged big investments to expand existing mines and to join in new explorations. The aim was to double Chile's copper production to 1.2 million tons by 1972, making it the largest copper producer.

Payment to the companies for the shares taken by the government was to be spread over 20 years. The companies were to receive a re-estimated, stable tax base and guarantees against expropriation.

Originally, the companies accepted "Chileanization" only because the alternative would have been nationalization. Now, partially because of the stability created by the agreement and partially because of high world market prices for copper, they are prospering as never before.

There is a growing feeling within the Chilean government that the agreement so far has not worked out as favorably for the state as had originally been hoped.

Many Chileans expect that in next year's presidential campaign parties on both the left and the right will pressure to abrogate the existing agreements—despite their ostensible guarantees—and either rewrite them or nationalize the industry.

Because of these unsettled issues, it is difficult to pass any judgments on Chileanization. At any rate, these are the two programs that growing numbers of Latins think should serve as the models for future foreign investment throughout the region—Mexicanization as the means of creating a modern, locally controlled industrial base and Chileanization as a way to reassert a country's control over its basic natural resources.

However, to get U.S. investors in the rest of Latin America to do what they have in Mexico and Chile is something else again.

When the potential investor looks at countries whose stability falls short of the Mexican standard, his enthusiasm for joint venture is apt to decline.

Despite the reluctance, the feeling is growing among Latin Americans that U.S. investors really have no choice—if they want to remain in the area.

PRIVATE PANACEA?

The risk can be reduced, they say, if the United States will move away from government-to-government lending and put part of its emphasis on incentives to private investment.

This is especially important, many students of the aid question say, at a time when the U.S. Congress is hostile to traditional foreign assistance methods.

While the U.S. Government decides on future aid goals, many feel that the Nixon Administration can buy time by putting forward aid proposals designed to encourage increased private investment in Latin America.

One hears increased talk of such potential legislative ideas as tax relief on repatriated earnings from U.S. investments equal to the tax reductions originally offered by Latin governments to attract these investments. There is talk also of U.S. tax incentives for firms willing to make socially productive investment in underdeveloped areas and greatly expanded guarantees against expropriation.

But, in the view of many impartial observers, these ideas will not have much lasting impact unless American business changes its thinking sufficiently to make a broad new push in the direction of joint ventures. Moreover, they say, such joint ventures should be a real transitional process leading to the Latins becoming masters of their own economies.

These observers say that the continued timidity of American investors toward joint ventures is playing into the hands of their enemies. Joint ventures, they say, offer foreign investors their only real hope of turning aside nationalistic charges that the Latin American economy is in pawn to outsiders.

If these charges are not answered convincingly, they warn, the nationalists eventually will become strong enough to impose really harsh restraints on foreign capital. If that happens, the eventual result will be not only the loss of the sizable stake that U.S. private enterprise has in Latin America but the end of the capitalist system in a region to which the United States has important geographic, strategic and business ties.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, 50 years ago a group of officers and men of the American Expeditionary Force met in Paris to form a veterans organization upon their return home.

In mid-March 1919, these men were not far in time or space from the horrors of battle on the western front. Not long out of the muddy trenches, they sought not to forget, but to remember those for whom the armistice brought only a quiet grave, a lonely hospital or an uncertain future.

For at that time no broad program of benefits awaited these veterans. There was no Veterans' Administration. There were no veterans' hospitals.

That meeting in Paris, and subsequent veterans' meetings in American cities, led to the formation of the American Legion later in 1919; and with the Legion as their champion, veterans were soon to receive assistance.

Those men, who met in Paris, would not see an end to war. Their sons and sons' sons would take up arms, fight, be wounded, and die. They do so today.

If we have failed to bring peace to the world, we have at least sought to ease the painful wounds and dislocations of those who have fought for our country.

By example and urgings, the American Legion has directed our efforts toward positive steps to assist our veterans, to ease their suffering and to assure them that the Nation, which stood behind them in battle, stays with them when the battle is over and the scars slowly heal.

During this 50th anniversary year of the American Legion, I salute those pioneering Legionnaires and all their successors for their unceasing efforts on behalf of those of whom we have asked so much and who have given us more than we can ever repay.

LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE POOR ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill designed to expand the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity and give it specific legislative endorsement. In introducing this bill, I made reference both to the innovative nature of the services being provided by the program, and to the widespread support legal services have received across the country.

An article published in the March 7 edition of Time magazine gives a good example of what I mean. Discussing the legal services project in Atlanta, Ga., the article highlights the important work of lawyers in the program in consumer education, and in legal matters. As the director of the program points out, the true need is just beginning to be met. And what is true in Atlanta is true in other parts of the country as well. I believe Director Padnos and his staff are to be congratulated, as are all the other legal services program participants. Further, I believe their pioneering efforts should be expanded as I propose in my bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Saturday's Lawyers," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Urban Law: Saturday's Lawyers

Bus passengers in Atlanta have been staring at some unusual posters in recent weeks. "They fixed my porch, but then they took my house!" one proclaims. "I'd rather walk clean across town than pay 45¢ for a bunch of greens!" advertises another.

Part of a publicity campaign by the city's Legal Aid Society, the slogans warn the poor—most of them uneducated Negroes—against some common forms of exploitation. They also serve as a warning to the exploiters. Under a Legal Aid Society program, some of the smartest young lawyers in Atlanta's top firms are taking their Saturdays and other days off to defend the poor.

Young lawyers in many cities are representing the poor in their spare time. They handle everything from criminal matters to consumer complaints and even divorces. But Atlanta has one of the most aggressive programs. The Legal Aid Society has 21 regular staffers and 56 volunteer lawyers who spend their weekends hearing complaints in ghetto offices. They are responsible for seeing each case through, even if they must work on it during the regular work week. Their employers do not seem to mind. In fact, the society's board of directors is composed mostly of senior lawyers from the volunteers' firms.

REDUCING THE BILL

The volunteers are doing pioneer work in a comparatively new field of law: the rights of the poor. In an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, the Legal Aid Society seeks to have the state's tenant-eviction statute declared unconstitutional because the law makes it all but impossible for the evicted persons to defend themselves in court. Volunteer lawyers are also challenging in a federal court state welfare laws that provide payments for a parent's first three children but none for any born thereafter.

Responding to complaints about high prices and sales of spoiled food, the Saturday lawyers persuaded the owner of a ghetto supermarket to make improvements and to meet regularly with a committee of his customers. Society Director Michael Padnos also arranged to have Grady Hospital, which treats many of the city's poor, review the financial status of certain patients—and perhaps reduce their hospital bills—before bringing lawsuits to collect the money.

The Saturday lawyers try to retaliate against those who take advantage of others' ignorance to make their own living. In a typical case, an illiterate woman came to Legal Aid because she had been tricked into putting up the deed to her home as security for $700 worth of household repairs. After the repairs were completed, a loan company claimed that with interest and other charges she actually owed $1,900. When the company threatened to take over her home, Bill Ide, one of the Legal Aid volunteers, promptly filed suit for his client. Charging contractor and loan company with a "fraudulent conspiracy," Ide asked for $25,000 in punitive damages. The claim against the woman was quickly dropped—and so was Ide's suit.

STARTING TO SCARE

Director Padnos, 33, a University of Chicago Law School graduate, is the man most responsible for turning the Atlanta Legal Aid Society into an effective and exciting organization. "We're just scratching the surface," says Padnos, who wants to double the size of his volunteer staff to 100 lawyers this year. "There are still plenty of people being victimized for every one we help." But the weekend lawyers are at least beginning to fight back against those who once took advantage of the poor without risk of either exposure or interference.

IN BEHALF OF THE REAL STUDENT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in behalf of the American college student—the real student.

He is a conscientious and law-abiding student, who attends his college or university for the purpose of acquiring an education. He is not one who would use the campus as his forum to put forth his views on overthrowing the so-called establishment or to extoll the virtues of communism or some other theory dedicated to disruption of the greatest, and most free, Nation—the United States of America. He does not try to disguise his motives behind such fictitious labels as "Students for a Democratic Society."

Yet this student, in his peaceful and diligent pursuit of knowledge, suffers from the label being placed upon the entire college community by the actions of a small minority of agitators.

We would do well to lend our support to the college administrators who have the fortitude to uphold regulations and deliver justice to those who bring violence to the campuses. One such administrator is Acting President S. I. Hayakawa, of San Francisco State College. Dr. Hayakawa is an intellectual and one of what we could choose to call the thin gray line of heroes standing between our educational institutions and total disruption.

Dr. Hayakawa has not chosen to face down the advocates of violence in any attempt to lessen the voices of dissent. Dissent is to be encouraged in the United States; no place is it better understood or appreciated than in the Congress, where those in the minority appreciate the privilege just as those in the majority value the contribution of the "loyal opposition."

We, and Dr. Hayakawa, honor the right of dissent. But we do not recognize a right to violence. The Supreme Court of the United States also has recognized in recent rulings that students forfeit their right to dissent when they resort to violence.

Dr. Hayakawa has fought to grant to the real student, who actually represents the vast majority of students, his right to pursue his quest for knowledge.

When the irresponsible few force a classroom to shut its doors, the responsible many suffer. And the responsible many now find they must suffer for the bad reputation of the irresponsible few.

We have no laws in this country, to my knowledge, that force a dissatisfied student to attend a specific college, or any college at all, for that matter. Those who seek radically to alter the college they attend, through violent means, have no manacles to keep them enrolled. They are free to leave, and at the same time the administrators should be free to expel those who do not choose to abide by the regulations which are so important to the responsible student's pursuit of education. But too often, we find that those who incite violence on campuses actually were expelled previously and have no legal business in returning to the campuses. There are even many instances where the leaders of such violence are not students at the universities concerned, nor have they ever been.

Much has been said about the problems of the generation gap. When many of those arrested in campus disorders prove to be well into their thirties, or even older, we wonder if the leadership of the agitators is even representative of a tiny minority of young America.

Our stake is high in the future of the youth of America. They must be given the best opportunity possible to acquire the vast knowledge which will be needed to keep the freedoms of America strong. Dr. Hayakawa is doing his part to give them this chance.

We in Wyoming have been fortunate that our students have not fallen prey to this element which, in the end, would seek to deprive them of education. Wyoming, of course, is not the only State which has thus far been spared. Most students have resisted those who would lead them from their goals, and turned them away.

Some of our most outstanding students in Wyoming have told me they resent being classed in the public mind with those few disrupters of the college scene. These are the real students, and they number in the millions from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

But the misdeeds of the few have become the problem of the many. The problems on various campuses no longer are remote to those States as yet untouched. It is a national problem, and it must be recognized by the Congress.

Contrary to what some feel on the subject, this does not appear a matter for Federal legislation. Investigations of the leaders and their sources of economic support are appropriate. We must be certain that educators, from the local school boards to the college administrators, understand clearly the threat that is made to our democratic institutions through these manifestations of violence.

And we can lend our moral support to their decisions.

Of all the places in America, it is on the campus where those with whom we cannot agree can most readily be heard. Professors and teachers encourage students to express varying viewpoints. Here lies the future security and progress of America. If force ever subordinates reason and denies dissent, minorities will suffer first, but we will surely all suffer eventually.

Violence and force have no place on a college campus. Education, which appeals to the mind of man and suggests reason as the alternative to force, suffers when classrooms are closed and is diminished when the free exchange of ideas is throttled by the roar of the mob.

The future of our Republic depends upon our hearing not only the loud voices, but all voices.

The Wyoming State Tribune recently published three editorials which explore this problem in depth and with accuracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, so that the seriousness of the matter may be emphasized.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 4, 1969]

COLORADO UNIVERSITY: FORCE REPLACES FREEDOM

The University of Colorado through its shameful tolerance of the Students for a Democratic Society, an intolerant, anti-freedom, anarchical organization dedicated to the destruction of higher education in this country, now has made another contribution to the New Totalitarianism.

The events of last night on the CU campus in which followers of the New Left denied President S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State College his inalienable right to be heard, is a disgrace to education in general, and a particular disgrace to the administration and regents of the University of Colorado who by their abject permissiveness have permitted such a situation to develop.

Last Nov. 12, in a speech to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, New York University professor of philosophy Sidney Hook said; "The University of Colorado can serve as a paradigm case of high-minded blunder and panicky ineptitude."

In reviewing a series of confrontations between the Students for a Democratic Society that began at Boulder commencing on Oct. 25, 1967, when a group of students forcibly blocked the entry to the placement office, and the administration's and faculty's repeated submission to demands made by this revolutionary organization, Professor Hook observed that the SDS "was not selling ideas but planning an assault on the integrity of American educational institutions including the University of Colorado."

Hook, in his speech, reported on the climactic event of last Oct. 12 when the SDS, granted permission by the university administration to hold a national convention on the campus with the stipulation the sessions should be open to the press, reversed itself on demand of the radical student leaders and permitted coverage only by the reporters not equipped with electronic devices or cameras.

"At a press conference held by President (Joseph) Smiley and Regent (Daniel) Lynch," Hook noted in his speech, "they confessed that the members of the press would have to choose between covering the SDS convention or covering a riot." After further consultation, the university officials reversed themselves again and decided not to use police either to force in cameramen or to clear the hall.

"The SDS had scored a great triumph by its threat to riot. Both the president of the institution and the regents who supported him not only revealed themselves as hopelessly confused about the nature of academic freedom, but also devoid of the courage of their confusion."

"It was a sad day for the University of Colorado and for American higher education," said Hook on that occasion, nearly four months ago, "for it can only embolden the SDS and its allies to continue their policies of confrontation and educational demoralization."

Deriding the university's administration's claim to allowing recognition of the SDS in the furtherance of the university as a "free market place of ideas," Hook said: "Even the administration of the University of Colorado must by now be aware that the SDS is selling different goods than ideas." He quoted Tom Hayden, a leader of the SDS, who, writing after the Columbia University riots of last spring, said, "Columbia University opened a new tactical stage in the resistance movement . . . From overnight occupation of buildings to permanent occupation; from mill-ins to the creation of revolutionary committees; from symbolic resistance to barricades resistance. Not only are these tactics already being duplicated on other campuses, but they are sure to be surpassed by even more militant tactics. In the future it is conceivable that students will threaten destruction of buildings as a last deterrent to police tactics."

Hayden then wrote of tactical hit-and-run operations including raids on the offices of professors doing weapons research which he said he could "win substantial support among students while making the university more blatantly repressive."

Commented Hook: "Here the armed enemy of American higher education is out in the open. Let us not build a Trojan horse of questionable dogma in which he can hide. In the stormy days ahead let us clear our minds of cant and rhetoric and not paralyze ourselves by pious and irrelevant platitudes about the free market place of ideas when students riot according to the directives just cited." And Hook concluded: "Let us firmly uphold the principles of academic freedom . . . and at the same time insist on acceptance of the responsibilities of academic freedom (both of freedom to teach and freedom to learn), and at the same time insist on acceptance of the responsibilities entailed by these academic rights. For without the sense and discipline of responsibility, of the mutuality of respect, academic freedom is indistinguishable from anarchy. And where academic anarchy prevails for long, it is followed by academic tyranny or despotism."

The ugly events of last night on the University of Colorado campus suggest that tyranny and despotism dictated by a small group of radical revolutionaries who follow the theories of Marx as preached by some of his latter-day disciples, in which the dictatorship of the proletariat is replaced by the dictatorship of a so-called intellectual elite, is destroying both academic as well as personal freedom at this educational institution.

As long as CU through the misguided concepts of its regents and administration pursues the idea that it must accord recognition to this repressive, violence-pursuing organization because to do so is to make CU a "free market-place of ideas," then for so long will it cease to be such a free market-place of ideas, and instead will become a place where rule of fear and force prevails.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 5, 1969]

EDUCATION, STUDENTS AND THE LAW

A few days ago, a justice of the United States Supreme Court, William O. Douglas, in a speech at Creighton University, said today's campus dissent is the "highest form of constitutional dignity." There are those who would vigorously disagree, however, as to the "constitutional dignity" of the violence that attends today's college and university disturbances.

There are those who believe there are entirely different circumstances connected with

XUM

the academic process than with the everyday life of ordinary citizens. Included are some members of the judiciary.

Last September, the four judges of the U.S. District Court for the western district of Missouri delivered a memorandum opinion in the cases of three students involved in disciplinary proceedings in tax-supported colleges and universities.

The opinion established judicial standards of procedure and substantive review in such cases, but outside the narrow purview of the case itself, the court's opinions as to the peculiar nature of higher education itself, and the duties of both institutions and those who attend them, provides an exceptional philosophical essay for one of the great developing social crises of our times.

In its memorandum opinion, the court, comprised of Chief Judge William H. Becker and District Judges John W. Oliver, William R. Collinson and Elmo B. Hunter, sitting en banc, expressed itself on the subject of higher education, college administrations and students. Following are pertinent portions of the opinion:

"Achieving the ideal of justice is the highest goal of humanity. Justice is not the concern solely of the courts. Education is equally concerned with the achievement of ideal justice. The administration of justice by the courts in the United States represents the people's best efforts to achieve the ideal of justice in the field of civil and criminal law . . .

"The modern courts are, and will continue to be, greatly indebted to higher education for their personnel, their innovations, their processes, their political support, and their future in the political and social order. Higher education is the primary source of study and support of improvement in the courts. For this reason, among others, the courts should exercise caution when importuned to intervene in the important processes and functions of education . . .

"Education is the living and growing source of our progressive civilization, of our open repository of increasing knowledge, culture and our salutary democratic traditions. As such, education deserves the highest respect and the fullest protection of the courts in the performance of its lawful missions. . .

"The nihilist and the anarchist, determined to destroy the existing political and social order, who directs his primary attack on the educational institutions, understands fully the mission of education in the United States.

"Federal law recognizes the powers of the tax-supported institutions to accomplish these missions and has frequently furnished economic assistance for these purposes.

"The genius of American education employing the manifold ideas and works of the great Jefferson, Mann, Dewey and many others living, has made the United States the most powerful nation in history. In so doing it has in a relatively few years expanded the area of knowledge at a revolutionary rate.

"With education the primary force, the means to provide the necessities of life and many luxuries to all our national population, and to many other peoples, has been created. This great progress has been accomplished by the provision to the educational community of general support, accompanied by diminishing interference in educational processes by political agencies outside the academic.

"If it is true, as it well may be, that man is in a race between education and catastrophe, it is imperative that educational institutions not be limited in the performance of their lawful missions by unwarranted judicial interference.

"Attendance at a tax-supported educational institution of higher learning is not compulsory. The federal constitution protects the equality of opportunity of all qualified persons to attend. Whether this protected opportunity be called a qualified 'right' or 'privilege' is unimportant. It is optional and voluntary.

"The voluntary attendance of a student in such institutions is a voluntary entrance into the academic community. By such voluntary entrance, the student voluntarily assumes obligations of performance and behavior reasonably imposed by the institution of choice relevant to its lawful missions, processes, and functions. These obligations are generally much higher than those imposed on all citizens by the civil and criminal law.

"So long as there is no invidious discrimination, no deprival of due process, no abridgement of a right protected in the circumstances, and no capricious, clearly unreasonable or unlawful action employed, the institution may discipline students to secure compliance with these higher obligations as a teaching method or to sever the student from the academic community.

"No student may, without liability to lawful discipline, intentionally act to impair or prevent the accomplishment of any lawful mission, process, or function of an educational institution.

"The discipline of students in the educational community is, in all but the case of irrevocable expulsion, a part of the teaching process. In the case of irrevocable expulsion for misconduct, the process is not punitive or deterrent in the criminal law sense, but the process is rather the determination that the student is unqualified to continue as a member of the educational community. Even then, the disciplinary process is not equivalent to the criminal law processes of federal and state criminal law. For, while the expelled student may suffer damaging effects, sometimes irreparable to his educational, social, and economic future, he or she may not be imprisoned, fined, disenfranchised, or subjected to probationary supervision. The attempted analogy of student discipline to criminal proceedings against adults and juveniles is not sound.

"In the lesser disciplinary procedures, including but not limited to guidance counseling, reprimand, suspension of social or academic privileges, probation, restriction to campus and dismissal with leave to apply for readmission, the lawful aim of discipline may be teaching in performance of a lawful mission of the institution.

"The nature and procedures of the disciplinary process in such cases should not be required to conform to federal processes of criminal law, which are far from perfect, and designed for circumstances and ends unrelated to the academic community.

"By judicial mandate to impose upon the academic community in student discipline the intricate, time consuming, sophisticated procedures, rules and safeguards of criminal law would frustrate the teaching process and render the institutional control impotent."

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 6, 1969]

THE BELL TOLLS FOR THEE

A leader of the Students for a Democratic Society in a speech at Colorado State University yesterday gave his organization "credit" for the demonstration at the University of Colorado Monday night against President S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State College. This really is an outstanding accomplishment, a lawless mob that deprived one lone man of the right to be heard.

The SDS spokesman, who had a secure audience at CSU where he spoke before 1,000 students, said Hayakawa should have been dragged off the stage at CU. The SDS leader added, "I'm proud of what we did." Hayakawa, he added, didn't have a right to speak at CU because the educator "runs a police state."

The thing that should disturb a lot of people in this country is that such acts of sheer terror and mob rule are allowed to occur. The University of Colorado administration through Dr. Joseph Smiley, president, now has apologized to Professor Hayakawa for what took place at CU. So has Governor Love of Colorado. To say one is sorry, of course, does a great deal of good.

If a band of men in tall hats and hoods over their heads had stood up in the CU auditorium while Hayakawa was attempting to speak and shouted him down or attempted to attack him, as the SDS did, there would be arrests all over the place. But because a rabble of students committed this heinous, illegal, immoral act, nobody does anything about it except wring his hands, say he's awfully sorry, and announce that the incident is being investigated and arrests will be made. All of it after the fact.

Every citizen in this country should be secure not only in his own home, but in the streets and in public or private buildings; secure in his person and secure in his constitutional guarantees including that of free speech; he should moreover be secure against the use of illegal force and violence.

But the authorities seem somehow paralyzed by these student demonstrators whose proclivities toward violence and breach of the peace, and whose actions deprive individual citizens such as Prof. Hayakawa of their inalienable rights.

It is not enough to say one is sorry. It is not enough to express regret. The time has come to secure the rights of all citizens, not just those of the criminals, the law-violators, the lawless, the student mobs, the destroyers of our society.

Until such time as colleges and universities, using the laws of the larger society, act to preserve order on their campuses and to preserve the fundamental guarantees accorded all people, students and non-students alike, then for so long will they continue to serve as incubators for such an evil brood as the Students for a Democratic Society—an organization that is not democratic, that is antisocietal and that is not really comprised of sincere students.

The unfortunate thing is that whenever such as took place at Boulder last Monday night occurs, everyone including the authorities tend to view it as a remote event, affecting someone else. But Professor Hayakawa, in this case, is the embodiment of every citizen who believes in a society that enjoys the benefits of rule of law devised by constitutional means, not rule of men, not the imposition of rule by mob violence.

John Donne's lines are as true in this instance as any other: "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

And so the bell tolls for all of us, for all law-abiding Americans, when such as occurred at the University of Colorado this week, takes place. It is a shameful blot that no expressed regret can erase.

A GENERATION IN SEARCH OF A FUTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most helpful statements I have read in many months is the text of an extemporaneous speech by Dr. George Wald, Harvard's Nobel Prize-winning biologist, who addressed a large audience at MIT on March 4, 1969. This memora-

XUM

ble speech was reproduced in the Boston Globe of March 8, 1969.

Because of its great importance, I ask unanimous consent that this address by Dr. Wald be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENERATION IN SEARCH OF A FUTURE

(By Dr. George Wald)

(NOTE.—The crowd of 1200 at M.I.T.'s Kresge Auditorium last Tuesday was shifting and restless when Harvard biologist George Wald rose to speak.

(Students and professors there as a part of the "Mar. 4 movement" protesting the misuse of science were disturbed at the lack of focus in the day's numerous panel discussions and speeches.

(The 1968 Nobel prize winner in physiology and medicine provided a focus.

(As in his popular lectures at Harvard, Wald talked extemporaneously, his head back, his eyes almost closed. His words had an electric effect.

(A hush fell over the audience, broken just once by sustained applause midway in the speech, and climaxed by a prolonged standing ovation at its conclusion.

(Two Boston Globe staffers, reporter Crocker Snow Jr. and editorial writer James G. Crowley, covered the M.I.T. meeting, returned to the office independently of each other and told an editor, "I think I've just listened to the most important speech of my lifetime.

(It may well be just that.)

(With gratitude to WGBH-Ch. 2, which furnished the tape-recording, The Boston Globe takes pleasure in printing for the first time the entire text of Dr. Wald's March 4 speech.)

All of you know that in the last couple of years there has been student unrest breaking at times into violence in many parts of the world: in England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Mexico, and needless to say, in many parts of this country. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what it all means. Perfectly clearly it means something different in Mexico from what it does in France, and something different in France from what it does in Tokyo, and something different in Tokyo from what it does in this country. Yet unless we are to assume that students have gone crazy all over the world, or that they have just decided that it's the thing to do, there must be some common meaning.

I don't need to go so far afield to look for that meaning. I am a teacher, and at Harvard, I have a class of about 350 students—men and women—most of them freshmen and sophomores. Over these past few years I have felt increasingly that something is terribly wrong—and this year ever so much more than last. Something has gone sour, in teaching and in learning. It's almost as though there were a widespread feeling that education has become irrelevant.

A lecture is much more of a dialogue than many of you probably appreciate. As you lecture, you keep watching the faces; and information keeps coming back to you all the time. I began to feel, particularly this year, that I was missing much of what was coming back. I tried asking the students, but they didn't or couldn't help me very much.

But I think I know what's the matter, even a little better than they do. I think that this whole generation of students is beset with a profound uneasiness. I don't think that they have yet quite defined its source, I think I understand the reasons for their uneasiness even better than they do. What is more, I share their uneasiness.

What's bothering those students? Some of them tell you it's the Vietnam War. I think the Vietnam War is the most shameful episode in the whole of American history. The concept of War Crimes is an American invention. We've committed many War Crimes in Vietnam; but I'll tell you something interesting about that. We were committing War Crimes in World War II, even before Nuremburg trials were held and the principle of war crimes started. The saturation bombing of German cities was a War Crime and if we had lost the war, some of our leaders might have had to answer for it.

I've gone through all of that history lately, and I find that there's a gimmick in it. It isn't written out, but I think we established it by precedent. That gimmick is that if one can allege that one is repelling or retaliating for an aggression—after that everything goes. And you see we are living in a world in which all wars are wars of defense. All War Departments are now Defense Departments. This is all part of the double talk of our time. The aggressor is always on the other side. And I suppose this is why our ex-Secretary of State, Dean Rusk—a man in whom repetition takes the place of reason, and stubbornness takes the place of character—went to such pains to insist, as he still insists, that in Vietnam we are repelling an aggression. And if that's what we are doing—so runs the doctrine—anything goes. If the concept of war crimes is ever to mean anything, they will have to be defined as categories of acts, regardless of provocation. But that isn't so now.

I think we've lost that war, as a lot of other people think, too. The Vietnamese have a secret weapon. It's their willingness to die, beyond our willingness to kill. In effect, they've been saying, you can kill us, but you'll have to kill a lot of us, you may have to kill all of us. And thank heavens, we are not yet ready to do that.

Yet we have come a long way—far enough to sicken many Americans, far enough even to sicken our fighting men. Far enough so that our national symbols have gone sour. How many of you can sing about "the rockets' red glare, bombs bursting in air" without thinking, those are our bombs and our rockets bursting over South Vietnamese villages? When those words were written, we were a people struggling for freedom against oppression. Now we are supporting real or thinly disguised military dictatorships all over the world, helping them to control and repress peoples struggling for their freedom.

But that Vietnam War, shameful and terrible as it is, seems to me only an immediate incident in a much larger and more stubborn situation.

Part of my trouble with students is that almost all the students I teach were born since World War II. Just after World War II, a series of new and abnormal procedures came into American life. We regarded them at the time as temporary aberrations. We thought we would get back to normal American life some day. But those procedures have stayed with us now for more than 20 years, and those students of mine have never known anything else. They think those things are normal. They think we've always had a Pentagon, that we have always had a big army, and that we always had a draft. But those are all new things in American life; and I think that they are incompatible with what America meant before.

How many of you realize that just before World War II the entire American army including the Air Force numbered 139,000 men? Then World War II started, but we weren't yet in it; and seeing that there was great trouble in the world, we doubled this army to 268,000 men. Then in World War II it got to be 8 million. And then World War II came to an end, and we prepared to go back to a peacetime army somewhat as the American army had always been before. And indeed in 1950—you think about 1950, our international commitments, the Cold War, the Truman Doctrine, and all the rest of it—in 1950 we got down to 600,000 men

Now we have 3.5 million men under arms: about 600,000 in Vietnam, about 300,000 more in "support areas" elsewhere in the Pacific, about 250,000 in Germany. And there are a lot at home. Some months ago we were told that 300,000 National Guardsmen and 200,000 reservists had been specially trained for riot duty in the cities.

I say the Vietnam War is just an immediate incident, because so long as we keep that big an army, it will always find things to do. If the Vietnam War stopped tomorrow, with that big a military establishment, the chances are that we would be in another such adventure abroad or at home before you knew it.

As for the draft: Don't reform the draft—get rid of it.

A peacetime draft is the most un-American thing I know. All the time I was growing up I was told about oppressive Central European countries and Russia, where young men were forced into the army; and I was told what they did about it. They chopped off a finger, or shot off a couple of toes; or better still, if they could manage it, they came to this country. And we understood that, and sympathized, and were glad to welcome them.

Now by present estimates four to six thousand Americans of draft age have left this country for Canada, another two or three thousand have gone to Europe, and it looks as though many more are preparing to emigrate.

A few months ago I received a letter from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin posing a series of questions that students might ask a professor involving what to do about the draft. I was asked to write what I would tell those students. All I had to say to those students was this: If any of them had decided to evade the draft and asked my help, I would help him in any way I could. I would feel as I suppose members of the underground railway felt in pre-Civil War days, helping runaway slaves to get to Canada. It wasn't altogether a popular position then; but what do you think of it now?

A bill to stop the draft was recently introduced in the Senate (S. 503), sponsored by a group of senators that ran the gamut from McGovern and Hatfield to Barry Goldwater. I hope it goes through; but any time I find that Barry Goldwater and I are in agreement, that makes one take another look.

And indeed, there are choices in getting rid of the draft, I think that when we get rid of the draft, we must also cut back the size of the armed forces. It seems to me that in peacetime a total of one million men is surely enough. If there is an argument for American military forces of more than one million men in peacetime, I should like to hear that argument debated.

There is another thing being said closely connected with this: that to keep an adequate volunteer army, one would have to raise the pay considerably. That's said so positively and often that people believe it. I don't think it is true.

The great bulk of our present armed forces are genuine volunteers. Among first-term enlistments, 49 percent are true volunteers. Another 30 percent are so-called "reluctant volunteers," persons who volunteer under pressure of the draft. Only 21 percent are draftees. All re-enlistments, of course, are true volunteers.

So the great majority of our present armed

XUM

forces are true volunteers. Whole services are composed entirely of volunteers: the Air Force for example, the Submarine Service, the Marines. That seems like proof to me that present pay rates are adequate. One must add that an Act of Congress in 1967 raised the base pay throughout the services in three installments, the third installment still to come, on April 1, 1969. So it is hard to understand why we are being told that to maintain adequate armed services on a volunteer basis will require large increases in pay; they will cost an extra $17 billion per year. It seems plain to me that we can get all the armed forces we need as volunteers, and at present rates of pay.

But there is something ever so much bigger and more important than the draft. The bigger thing, of course, is what ex-President Eisenhower warned us of, calling it the military-industrial complex. I am sad to say that we must begin to think of it now as the military-industrial-labor union complex. What happened under the plea of the Cold War was not alone that we built up the first big peacetime army in our history, but we institutionalized it. We built, I suppose, the biggest government building in our history to run it, and we institutionalized it.

I don't think we can live with the present military establishment and its $80-100 billion a year budget, and keep America anything like we have known it in the past. It is corrupting the life of the whole country. It is buying up everything in sight: industries, banks, investors, universities; and lately it seems also to have bought up the labor unions.

The Defense Department is always broke; but some of the things they do with that $80 billion a year would make Buck Rogers envious. For example: the Rocky Mountain Arsenal on the outskirts of Denver was manufacturing a deadly nerve poison on such a scale that there was a problem of waste disposal. Nothing daunted, they dug a tunnel two miles deep under Denver, into which they have injected so much poisoned water that beginning a couple of years ago Denver began to experience a series of earth tremors of increasing severity. Now there is a grave fear of a major earthquake. An interesting debate is in progress as to whether Denver will be safer if that lake of poisoned water is removed or left in place. (N.Y. Times, July 4, 1968; Science, Sept. 27, 1968).

Perhaps you have read also of those 6000 sheep that suddenly died in Skull Valley, Utah, killed by another nerve poison—a strange and, I believe, still unexplained accident, since the nearest testing seems to have been 30 miles away.

As for Vietnam, the expenditure of fire power has been frightening. Some of you may still remember Khe Sanh, a hamlet just south of the Demilitarized Zone, where a force of U.S. Marines was beleaguered for a time. During that period we dropped on the perimeter of Khe Sanh more explosives than fell on Japan throughout World War II, and more than fell on the whole of Europe during the years 1942 and 1943.

One of the officers there was quoted as having said afterward, "It looks like the world caught smallpox and died." (N.Y. Times, Mar. 28, 1969).

The only point of government is to safeguard and foster life. Our government has become preoccupied with death, with the business of killing and being killed. So-called Defense now absorbs 60 percent of the national budget, and about 12 percent of the Gross National Product.

A lively debate is beginning again on whether or not we should deploy antiballistic missiles, the ABM. I don't have to talk about them, everyone else here is doing that. But I should like to mention a curious circumstance. In September 1967, or about 1½ years ago, we had a meeting of M.I.T. and Harvard people, including experts on these matters, to talk about whether anything could be done to block the Sentinel system, the deployment of ABM's. Everyone present thought them undesirable; but a few of the most knowledgeable persons took what seemed to be the practical view, "Why fight about a dead issue? It has been decided, the funds have been appropriated. Let's go on from there."

Well, fortunately, it's not a dead issue.

An ABM is a nuclear weapon. It takes a nuclear weapon to stop a nuclear weapon. And our concern must be with the whole issue of nuclear weapons.

There is an entire semantics ready to deal with the sort of thing I am about to say. It involves such phrases as "those are the facts of life." No—these are the facts of death. I don't accept them, and I advise you not to accept them. We are under repeated pressures to accept things that are presented to us as settled—decisions that have been made. Always there is the thought: let's go on from there! But this time we don't see how to go on. We will have to stick with those issues.

We are told that the United States and Russia between them have by now stockpiles in nuclear weapons approximately the explosive power of 15 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. And now it is suggested that we must make more. All very regrettable, of course; but those are "the facts of life." We really would like to disarm; but our new Secretary of Defense has made the ingenious proposal that one must be practical. Now is the time to greatly increase our nuclear armaments so that we can disarm from a position of strength.

I think all of you know there is no adequate defense against massive nuclear attack. It is both easier and cheaper to circumvent any known nuclear defense system than to provide it. It's all pretty crazy. At the very moment we talk of deploying ABM's, we are also building the MIRV, the weapon to circumvent ABM's.

So far as I know, with everything working as well as can be hoped and all foreseeable precautions taken, the most conservative estimates of Americans killed in a major nuclear attack run to about 50 millions. We have become callous to gruesome statistics, and this seems at first to be only another gruesome statistic. You think, Bang!—and next morning, if you're still there, you read in the newspapers that 50 million people were killed.

But that isn't the way it happens. When we killed close to 200,000 people with those first little, old-fashioned uranium bombs that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, about the same number of persons was maimed, blinded, burned, poisoned and otherwise doomed. A lot of them took a long time to die.

That's the way it would be. Not a bang, and a certain number of corpses to bury; but a nation filled with millions of helpless, maimed, tortured and doomed survivors huddled with their families in shelters, with guns ready to fight off their neighbors, trying to get some uncontaminated food and water.

A few months ago Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia ended a speech in the Senate with the words: "If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve, I want them to be Americans; and I want them on this continent and not in Europe." That was a United States senator holding a patriotic speech. Well, here is a Nobel Laureate who thinks that those words are criminally insane. (Prolonged applause.)

How real is the threat of full scale nuclear war? I have my own very inexpert idea, but realizing how little I know and fearful that I may be a little paranoid on this subject, I take every opportunity to ask reputed experts. I asked that question of a very distinguished professor of government at Harvard about a month ago. I asked him what sort of odds he would lay on the possibility of full-scale nuclear war within the foreseeable future. "Oh," he said comfortably, "I think I can give you a pretty good answer to that question. I estimate the probability of full-scale nuclear war, provided that the situation remains about as it is now, at 2 percent per year." Anybody can do the simple calculation that shows that 2 percent per year means that the chance of having that full-scale nuclear war by 1990 is about one in three, and by 2000 it is about 50–50.

I think I know what is bothering the students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future.

I am growing old, and my future so to speak is already behind me. But there are those students of mine who are in my mind always; there are my children, two of them now 7 and 9, whose future is infinitely more precious to me than my own. So it isn't just their generation; it's mine too. We're all in it together.

Are we to have a chance to live? We don't ask for prosperity, or security; only for a reasonable chance to live, to work out our destiny in peace and decency. Not to go down in history as the apocalyptic generation.

And it isn't only nuclear war. Another overwhelming threat is in the population explosion. That has not yet even begun to come under control. There is every indication that the world population will double before the year 2000; and there is a widespread expectation of famine on an unprecedented scale in many parts of the world. The experts tend to differ only in their estimates of when those famines will begin. Some think by 1980, others think they can be staved off until 1990, very few expect that they will not occur by the year 2000.

That is the problem. Unless we can be surer than we now are that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. It's not good enough to give it tender loving care, to supply it with breakfast foods, to buy it expensive educations. Those things don't mean anything unless this generation has a future. And we're not sure that it does.

I don't think that there are problems of youth, or student problems. All the real problems I know are grown-up problems.

Perhaps you will think me altogether absurd, or "academic", or hopelessly innocent—that is, until you think of the alternatives—if I say as I do to you now: we have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war: nothing material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating. Those atom bombs represent an unusable weapon. The only use for an atom bomb is to keep somebody else from using it. It can give us no protection, but only the doubtful satisfaction of retaliation. Nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror; and a balance of terror is still terror.

We have to get rid of those atomic weapons, here and everywhere. We cannot live with them.

I think we've reached a point of great decision, not just for our nation, not only for all humanity, but for life upon the Earth. I tell my students, with a feeling of pride that I hope they will share, that the carbon, nitrogen and oxygen that make up 99 percent of our living substance, were cooked in the deep interiors of earlier generations of dying stars. Gathered up from the ends of the universe, over billions of years, eventually they came to form in part the substance of our sun, its planets and ourselves. Three billion years ago life arose upon the Earth. It seems to be the only life in the solar system. Many a star has since been born and died.

About two million years ago, man appeared. He has become the dominant species on the Earth. All other living things, animal and plant, live by his sufferance. He is the custodian of life on Earth. It's a big responsibility. The thought that we're in competition with Russians or with Chinese is all a mistake, and trivial. Only mutual destruction lies that way. We are one species, with a world to win. There's life all over this universe, but we are the only men.

Our business is with life, not death. Our challenge is to give what account we can of what becomes of life in the solar system, this corner of the universe that is our home and, most of all, what becomes of men—all men of all nations, colors and creeds. It has become one world, a world for all men. It is only such a world that now can offer us life and the chance to go on.

LAW AND ORDER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we often hear today the cry for "law and order." It seems, however, that for some people this cry is really an incantation. That is, they believe if they say "law and order" often enough and loud enough the crime problem will disappear.

What is needed more than incantations is systematic analysis. What is it we really mean when we say we want "law and order?" Do we want to double our police forces or mete out stricter sentences to lawbreakers so as to retard their activities? Do we really know that these are the most effective means to accomplish this end? Perhaps we would accomplish more by working to correct the social causes of crime rather than merely seeking to deal with crimes after they have been committed.

Mr. President, once again I invite attention to a report called "Toward a Social Report," prepared by HEW. Among other things, the report tries to analyze systematically the problem of crime as it relates to the quality of American life.

Under the Full Opportunity Act of 1969, S. 5, the President would be required to submit such a report to Congress annually. The Full Opportunity Act would also establish a Council of Social Advisers to help the President formulate the social report and a Joint Committee of the Social Report to help the Congress evaluate it. Of equal importance is the fact that S. 5 declares full opportunity for every American to be a national goal.

Let me say a few words about what the fifth chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Public Order and Safety," has to say about how crime impairs the full opportunity of many Americans. According to statistics compiled by the FBI, major crimes have increased 13 percent in 1964, 6 percent in 1965, 11 percent in 1966, and 17 percent in 1967. It is noted that the victims of crimes, as well as the perpetrators, "are more likely to be residents of the poverty area of central cities than of suburbs and rural areas."

The report notes that Negroes have higher arrest rates than whites, but that Negroes also "have higher rates of victimization than whites of any income group." Quite related to this phenomenon is the fact that it is precisely in the ghetto areas "where the prospects for legitimate and socially useful activity are the poorest." As the report states:

> It seems unlikely that harsh punishment, a strengthening of public prosecutors, or more police can, by themselves, prevent either individual crime or civil disorder.

These measures do not really speak to what I consider to be one of the major causes of crime in the ghetto: powerlessness and frustration born out of the culture of poverty. What is really needed is to bring full opportunity—in all of its ramifications—to the people whose dominant cultural milieu is poverty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Public Order and Safety," the fifth chapter of "Toward a Social Report," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chapter V. Public Order and Safety

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF CRIME ON OUR LIVES?

To assess the quality of American life, we must consider the impact of crime on our society. People neither want to be the victims of crime nor to live in fear of crime. Moreover, crime challenges the basic assumptions of civilized society. A society cannot claim to be minimally civilized if greed and aggression are regularly permitted to override respect for other people.

An increase in crime has a variety of implications for the well being of a society. It is reflected in the workload of the police, the amount of harm to victims, and the prevalence of criminal behavior and attitudes. The impact of crime needs to be appraised from each of these perspectives to determine how crime can best be prevented and controlled.

For these purposes it is best to concentrate on crimes generally considered most serious. There is a set of actions which almost every society has felt it necessary to combat. These include criminal homicide, assault, rape, and different varieties of theft. Because such actions have been prohibited at almost all times and places by a nearly universal consent, the study of these crimes answers best to the needs of social reporting for data, for meaningful comparisons, and for phenomena of clear concern to our society.[1]

INCREASES IN MAJOR CRIMES

The periodic reports of law enforcement agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation show large and persistent increases in the numbers of known crimes. The FBI statistics show increases in major crimes generally considered serious of 13 percent in 1964, 6 percent in 1965, 11 percent in 1966, and 17 percent in 1967.[2] Major crimes have been increasing faster than the population. The FBI index of major crimes per hundred thousand population increased at an average rate of 8.7 percent per year between 1958 and 1967.

Different types of crime have been increasing at very different rates. Indeed, the homicide rate was actually lower in 1967 than in 1933. From 1958 to 1967 FBI index crimes per 100,000 population increased at the following average annual rates:

	Percent
Homicide	2.9
Rape	5.6
Aggravated assault	7.8
Robbery	10.0
Burglary	8.4
Larceny	9.9
Auto theft	8.2

The problem of underreporting

It has long been known that there has been a difference between the total number of crimes and those officially reported. In fact, sample surveys undertaken for the President's Crime Commission in 1965 indicate that several times as many crimes occur as are reported in official crime statistics. One explanation is that the victims of crime often do not report incidents because of the circumstances in which a crime occurs. Assaults, for example, commonly occur among members of the same family or among neighbors and the participants involved often prefer to make their own peace with each other. If a juvenile steals something it may seem kinder to obtain restitution through his parents rather than through the police.

THE HARM DONE TO VICTIMS

In addition to information on the number of significant criminal offenses, we need to know how much harm these offenses do to their victims. If in a given year there were 90 more murders and 100 fewer burglaries, most people would surely say that victims had suffered more, though the number of criminal offenses would be less. We need a way of "weighting" each crime that occurs according to the amount of harm it does.

So that a burglary will not count as much as a murder, property crimes could be weighted by the average amount of the dollar loss which results and murders weighted by some appropriately much greater figure. A very conservative, if not callous, figure would be the projected life-time earnings of an individual, perhaps $200,000. This weighting procedure would be crude, but it would be far less misleading than counting every crime equally as one. To illustrate, there were on average 298,661 burglaries reported in the years 1938 to 1942. There were on average 7,525 murders in the same years. In a latter 5-year period, 1952 to 1956, there were an average of 491,864 burglaries and 7,000 murders. The total number of the two crimes per year was 192,678 greater on average in the second period. But if we weight the burglaries in constant dollars and the murders by $200,000, even this crude and illustrative weighting would strongly suggest that there was less harm to victims.

Vulnerability and property risks

Information on the aggregate amount of harm resulting from crime would tell us something important from the victims' point of view, but not enough. Different people—or the same people at different times—are vulnerable in different degrees. A physical injury which represents a brief period of pain and inconvenience to a young person can be catastrophic to an older one. A loss of a few dollars might hardly be missed by a rich man, but felt sorely by a poor one.

Analogously, we need to ask questions about the vulnerability of whole societies or the same society at different times. How much does crime hurt the members of a society, given their ages, activities, wealth and way of life?

If we consider only crimes of theft against property we can estimate both the amount of harm and the degree of our vulnerability. We can estimate the dollar losses from such crimes from FBI statistics going as far back as the thirties. At the same time, we can

---

[1] It should not be forgotten, however, that other sorts of crimes create an immense caseload for the police and the courts. Over half of all arrests are for public drunkenness, drunk driving, other liquor offenses, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, and gambling.

[2] The FBI Index of Crime is composed of murder and willful manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery (involving at least the threat of personal violence in an attempt to steal), aggravated assault, burglary (with or without the use of force), larceny (stealing without the use of force or fraud), and automobile theft. Arson and kidnaping are the most obviously serious crimes not included.

XUM

contrive a very crude dollar measure of our vulnerability over the same period. We can estimate the dollar value of consumer durables in each year together with the amount of currency in circulation in that year as the measure of our wealth exposed to theft. This makes it possible to say whether the rapacity of criminals is gaining on the growing wealth of the country, or lagging behind it.

Has a dollar in property values become safer or less safe from the common forms of theft? Table I shows that by the above calculation the overall risk per $1,000 has increased from $3.55 to $3.91 from 1938 through 1967. For robbery, larceny, and auto theft it was less than in 1938 as recently as 1965; but for burglary it was already considerably greater.

TABLE 1.—VALUE OF PROPERTY INVOLVED IN THEFT (WHETHER RECOVERED OR NOT) PER $1,000 OF APPROPRIABLE PROPERTY [1]

Year	Robbery	Burglary	Larceny	Auto theft	Total loss
1967	0.14	1.18	0.79	1.80	3.91
1966	.12	.99	.73	1.65	3.48
1965	.11	.94	.68	1.57	3.30
1964	.12	.89	[2] .71	1.63	[2] 3.35
1963	.11	.80	.67	1.33	2.90
1962	.09	.70	.58	1.18	2.55
1961	.11	.68	.56	1.08	2.43
1960	[2] .11	[2] .66	[2] .54	[2] 1.09	[2] 2.41
1959	.07	.54	.47	1.00	2.08
1958	.07	.55	[2] .46	.99	[2] 2.08
1957	.06	.45	.53	1.12	2.16
1956	.06	.43	.51	1.09	2.09
1955	.07	.43	.48	1.02	2.00
1954	.08	.50	.54	1.13	2.24
1953	.08	.45	.55	1.35	2.43
1952	.08	.50	.61	1.43	2.63
1951	.07	.39	.47	1.30	2.23
1950	.10	.40	.46	1.16	2.12
1949	.09	.42	.51	1.20	2.22
1948	.11	.48	.62	1.48	2.69
1947	.12	.55	.67	1.60	2.94
1946	.13	.63	.74	1.94	3.44
1945	.12	.57	.70	2.19	3.58
1944	.08	.45	.60	1.90	3.02
1943	.07	.37	.56	1.66	2.66
1942	.08	.36	.56	1.52	2.52
1941	.13	.42	.62	1.90	3.07
1940	.13	.42	.57	1.83	2.95
1939	.15	.47	.62	1.90	3.14
1938	.15	.52	.69	2.20	3.55

[1] Appropriable property represents currency in circulation plus a rough estimate of the stock of consumer durable goods.

[2] Data not strictly comparable to previous year.

TABLE 2.—VICTIMIZATION BY AGE AND SEX

[Rates per 100,000 population]

Offense	Age: 10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 plus	All ages
MALE							
Total	951	5,924	6,231	5,150	4,231	3,465	3,091
Robbery	61	257	112	210	181	98	112
Aggravated assault	399	824	337	263	181	146	287
Burglary	123	2,782	3,649	2,365	2,297	2,343	1,583
Larceny ($50 plus)	337	1,546	1,628	1,839	967	683	841
Auto theft	31	515	505	473	605	195	268
FEMALE							
Total	334	2,424	1,514	1,908	1,132	1,052	1,059
Forcible rape	91	238	104	48	0	0	83
Robbery	0	238	157	96	60	81	77
Aggravated assault	91	333	52	286	119	40	118
Burglary	30	665	574	524	298	445	314
Larceny ($50 plus)	122	570	470	620	536	405	337
Auto theft	0	380	157	334	119	81	130

Source: 1965 survey by the National Opinion Research Center for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

TABLE 3.—VICTIMIZATION BY RACE AND INCOME

[Rates per 100,000 population] [1]

Offenses	White: 0 to $2,999	White: $3,000 to $5,999	White: $6,000 to $9,999	White: Above $10,000	Nonwhite: 0 to $2,999	Nonwhite: $3,000 to $5,999	Nonwhite: $6,000+
Total	2,124	2,267	1,685	2,170	2,894	2,581	3,387
Homicide	0	0	0	0	56	0	0
Forcible rape	58	46	0	17	111	60	121
Robbery	116	91	42	34	278	240	121
Aggravated assault	146	289	147	220	389	420	121
Burglary	1,310	958	764	763	1,336	1,261	2,056
Larceny ($50 plus)	378	700	565	916	501	300	363
Auto theft	116	183	167	220	223	300	605

[1] Rate per 100,000 population of each specific race and income group.

Source: 1965 survey by the National Opinion Research Center for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

The uneven burden

There are groups in our society which bear a larger share of the harm done by crime than others. Those most likely to be victims of major crimes—poor Negroes living in the central city—appear to have a rate of victimization several times that of those least likely to be victims—middle-income whites living in a surub or rural area (see tables 2 and 3).

In general, victimization rates tend to decline as one moves outward from central cities to rural areas. This tendency is pronounced for violent crimes against the person, which seem to show a central city rate five times greater than that of small cities and rural areas. Property crimes, on the other hand, show a rate only twice as great. The rates of "white collar crimes" such as forgery, counterfeiting, and the various types of fraud do not seem to vary with the type of community.

The response to risk

How do different groups in the population respond to their different risks? Many people are seriously frightened by the risk of crime, and forgo certain activities in order to minimize this risk, such as working or seeking entertainment in certain areas of cities where they live. It would be valuable to know the extent of such dislocations, for they detract significantly from the quality of life.

Information on the character of such dislocations was obtained by the President's Crime Commission. Sixteen percent of respondents in one survey said they had recently wanted to go out but had stayed home because of fear for their own safety. One out of three Negroes had done so and one of out eight whites. Those who were worried about burglary and robbery were 50 percent more likely to take precautions (such as installing locks or bars on windows and keeping firearms) than those who were not.

The Commission also discovered, however, that there was no clear relationship between having been a victim or witness of crime and the taking of precautions. There was a similar lack of clear relationship between the relative rate of crime in a respondent's neighborhood and his perception of it.

THE DEGREE OF CRIMINALITY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

The harm criminals do to their victims is the main reason we are concerned about crime, but it is not the only reason. The crimes that are committed call in question the decency of our society and the dependability of our social institutions.

When assessing the criminality or law abidingness of a population it is necessary to consider the age distribution of the population. Since young people commit a disproportionate share of crime at all times, it would be possible for the crime rate to increase with a growing proportion of young people even if the propensities of *both* older and younger age groups remained the same.

This possibility is pointed up by the fact that for any one-year age bracket, the greatest number of people arrested for rape, aggravated assault and robbery are age 18, for burglary probably age 15, for auto theft age 16. Crime rates for all age cohorts fall off as their members get older, the rates for the lesser property crimes as early as age 16 or 17, the rates for the major crimes considerably later.

Part of the recent increase in crime rates can thus be attributed to the growing proportion of young people in the population, since there were more adolescents and young adults in the United States in the sixties, relative to the rest of the population, than there were in the fifties. But part of the increase apparently must also be attributed to greater criminality among the young. The percentage increase in juvenile arrest rates from 1960 to 1967 was nearly a third more than that for adults. Arrest rates themselves may not be a good indicator, but they point to the possibility that the propensity of youth to crime is increasing.

If we take into account the size and age composition of the population, the rate of increase in criminality over the past decade appears to have been less than the rate of increase in the absolute number of reported crimes. In 1958, there were 1,573,210 major crimes officially reported; in 1967, there were 3,802,300 such crimes, an increase of 142 percent, for a compound annual rate of increase of 10.3 percent. The rate of such crimes per 100,000 population was 903.6 in 1958 and 1,921.7 in 1967. This crime rate increased 113 percent, for an annual rate of 8.7 percent. But if the proportion of young people, ages 13 to 20, had been the same in 1967 as in 1958, there would have been fewer crimes, a 92 percent increase in the rate, for an annual rate of increase of 7.5 percent.

CRIME PREVENTION

If "crime does not pay," it is because society tries hard to see that it does not. It hires policemen and prosecutors and punishes those convicted of crime.

It is natural that any increase in crime or fear of crime should bring forth demands to apprehend more criminals and punish them more severely. Just as higher wages should attract more labor, so harsher punishments and greater probabilities of apprehension and conviction should deter more crime.

Incentives that deter crime

There is obviously much to be said for this "deterrence" or incentive-oriented approach to the crime problem. Fear of punishment undoubtedly deters some crime. Moreover, if the legal system can, in fact, succeed in inflicting harm only on the guilty, this approach appeals to the sense of justice, in a way that police harrassment of "suspicious characters" or preventive detention do not. And unlike vengeance, it has a positive social purpose.

The implications of this approach are, however, a good deal less clearcut than they seem to be. If the theory is not properly stated and qualified it can be a disastrous guide to policy. The conclusion that an increased concern about crime demands harsher punishments is in need of distinction and qualification.

One alternative to harsher punishment is greater reward for legitimate and socially useful activity. For example, there is not much doubt that the poor have higher crime rates for the major and violent crimes than those who are well off. That there is a relationship between poverty and crime is clear, although its precise nature is not.

It is most unlikely that the greater involvement of the poor in criminal activities can be explained entirely, if at all, in terms of the relative severity of potential punishment. In law the punishment is not supposed to vary with the income of the criminal. The social and economic loss resulting from a criminal record are probably greater for those who are well off, but on the other hand, it has been observed that the well-off often receive milder sentences. The rewards for legitimate activity are, on the other hand, systematically and considerably greater for the well-off than for the poor, and this makes crime a relatively less attractive alternative for them than for the poor. Thus informal penalties and incentives to lawful and productive activity seem more likely to explain the difference between the crime rates of rich and poor than the formal deterrents of the law. Adding plausibility to this view is the fact that those with a criminal record are more likely to commit further crimes and have fewer opportunities for legitimate activity because of their criminal records.

The complexity of criminal motivation

Whether a potential criminal is tempted to commit a criminal act or not depends on his perception of the alternatives open to him. There is always a risk that the criminal may be caught, and the potential criminal may perceive such a risk. But he is not likely to be deterred from committing a criminal act by the perception that there is a small chance that he will be severely punished.

The fact that the criminal is often confident he will not be caught, and may be disposed to taking chances, does not mean that harsher punishments would not deter some crime. But if punishments are already sufficiently severe that few will commit criminal acts unless they are disposed to take chances and think the odds are good that they will not be caught, then somewhat more severe punishments can often have only a minor deterrent effect.

This line of reasoning does, however, argue that additions to police forces that are large enough to make it clear to everyone that he is very likely to get caught if he commits a crime would have a significant deterrent effect. And there is clear evidence that more intensive police deployment does, in fact, have such effects. When authorities saturate a high crime area with policemen, the crime rate in the area drops dramatically.

Most crimes are committed by the young, whose experience and knowledge are limited. The alternatives a young person considers, and his evaluation of them, depend particularly on what he learns from his family and friends. Presumably most children brought up in fortunate circumstances never even consider becoming criminals. They know crime is wrong, realize it doesn't pay, and are intellectually and emotionally prepared for legitimate careers. They are, moreover, taught to look upon the police and the system of law and order as something that helps and protects them.

For some young Americans, the situation is very different. They grow up in miserable circumstances and are given no reason to think that legitimate effort will brighten their future. The law for their forbears may have been an instrument of oppression; the police a source of rudeness or even brutality, rather than of protection. In some slum areas most young men have police records, and a readiness to risk arrest may be considered a sign of manhood.

What this means is that the social context of poverty, and the poorer prospects for those who grow up in it, both tend to make socioeconomic deprivation a major cause of crime. A crime prevention strategy which focuses only on punishment, prosecution, and policing is therefore not only insufficient in terms of the theory that is used to justify it, but in addition neglects the cultural factors that must also be taken into account.

Among those who commit crimes there are not only those whose values and perceptions are the result of the influence of deviant social groups such as teenage gangs. There are also those whose deviance is a product of mental illness. There are some people in every social class who act as though they wish to be punished or as though they have determined that their values will be the opposite of those that social authorities lay down, whatever these values may be. For those who value punishment in general or deviance in general to some degree, to a like extent the punishments generally prescribed to deter crime will be ineffective. This illustrates the importance of keeping the extraordinary complexity of criminal motivation in mind.

Crime and civil disorders

The importance of group attitudes toward the law and the police, and of the objective obstacles to legitimate success in the slum environment, are illustrated by the civil disorders. These disorders tend to center in ghetto areas whose residents regularly list police behavior—lack of service and protection as well as rudeness and brutality—as primary complaints.

It seems likely that such negative attitudes toward the police and the system of law, and pessimism about the prospects of legitimate success, cannot be remedied through harsher punishment, a strengthening of public prosecutors, or more police. Such measures may help, but they are unlikely by themselves to prevent either individual crime or violent protest. The objective opportunities for the poor, and their attitudes toward the police and the law, must also change before the problems can be solved.

The policy challenge

The crime problem confronts society with a number of alternatives. Apprehension and punishment serve as deterrents to crime, as of opportunities, and measures to improve tiveness. At the same time an enlargement of opportunities, and measures to improve the social context in which crime emerges, are also necessary. Crime is, in other words, an index of the health of the entire social organism.

REVIVAL OF A FAILING COOPERATIVE SUPERMARKET

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am informed that a little over a year ago Safeway Stores, Inc., undertook a project to revive a failing cooperative supermarket known as the Hunters Point Cooperative Supermarket in San Francisco, Calif. The Hunters Point Cooperative Supermarket was on the edge of bankruptcy when Safeway stepped in with financial, managerial, and technical support. Since that time the Hunters Point Cooperative Supermarket has once again become profitable and is now an ongoing, sound business. I think this is an excellent example of the contribution that private industries can make toward the problems of business in the inner city. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that certain articles concerning this matter be printed in the RECORD in order that others might be able to acquaint themselves with this success story.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Immaculate, December 1968]

ALL FOR $1

(By Evelyn M. Raabe)

Two men entered the Neighborhood Co-op. The all-but-bare shelves underscored the plight of the business.

"Got any ideas what we might do to save it?" asked John Wilks of his companion, Cal Pond.

The story of what followed has all the facets of once upon a time.

This co-op is located in San Francisco's Negro community of Hunters Point. It had its beginning in a dream that "goes back 6 or so years," said Sam Jordan, one of its founders—owner of a bar and catering service in the area. "At that time, some other fellows and I were picketing that very store—now the Neighborhood Co-op. We had pickets at the other stores as well. We wanted them to hire more of our people, and also give the people a fair shake for their money—fair prices and better merchandise.

"A few of us got to thinking then," Jordan continued. "Maybe the answer was to have a store owned by the people. When we learned that that particular store was available, a group of us—having been working on the co-op idea for a few years and raising money—jumped at the chance in 1965 to buy it."

This Neighborhood Co-op thus had its beginning.

But the business did not flourish and, gradually, as the months mounted into more than 2 years, things went from bad to worse. The credit rating tottered—until the co-op could buy only on a cash basis.

"Maybe we rushed into it too fast, underfinanced, not realizing the complexities involved in food retailing," the directors later summed up the situation.

Another factor. "It costs $5 to own a share in the business, and many of the investors thought that they would immediately start getting rebates on their investment—rebates whether or not they bought anything in the store.

"Then, too, because this is their store, and because they have so long been made to feel inferior, they think the merchandise in their store is inferior, too. So, in spite of having a personal interest in the welfare of their store, they probably feel they are rising above their environment and circumstances by shopping elsewhere."

XUM

Then came a day in November, 1967. Two gunmen held up the store—and left with $3,000 in cash and $9,000 in checks. . . . The co-op was insured—for $2,000. Only a fraction of the amount of the checks was recovered.

The downhill trend worsened. The Board of Trade threatened. "We were doomed," said Leonard Batts, President of the Neighborhood Co-op's Board of Directors.

The Board turned to one of the Neighborhood Co-op's shareholders, John L. Wilks—nationally-known public relations and business management consultant.

In his search for a helping-hand, Wilks mentioned the store's desperate situation to a friend, Cal Pond, Corporate Public Relations Department Manager at Safeway.*

And so it was that Wilks took Pond to see the Neighborhood Co-op. The outside of the store "left much to be desired." Inside—it had "all the makings" for a modern supermarket; but many of the shelves were empty; there were "inept displays, inefficient check-out stands and numerous other deficiencies."

The two men discussed the situation at length. Pond then pursued it with Safeway's Vice President, Malcolm Grover, and, subsequently, with others at the top—including Quentin Reynolds, President, and R. A. Magowan, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board.

Some days later, W. S. Mitchell, Executive Vice President, visited the store with Pond and Wilks. And one evening brought another visitor. The manager of the co-op, Louis Valente, struck up a conversation with the stranger. Perhaps a new customer? "My name is Reynolds," the man replied. "I work for Safeway." . . . Only hours later did Valente realize he'd been speaking with Safeway's President.

The rescue operation was soon underway. The Board of Trade was "persuaded" to grant a 90-day extension. Safeway's Vice President in Charge of Corporate Development, W. Creighton Peet, Jr., became the link with the co-op management. Peet assigned Safeway's Wally Lane, Manager of Store Operations Department, to head up the task-force—that was to spend "hours, days and weeks studying every part of the problem and making recommendations."

Among the recommendations—and one of the first—was to appoint a Safeway manager to "pilot the co-op's retail operations and set up personnel training programs." Mel Thomas—in his 16th year with Safeway—was chosen for this assignment. And Thomas more than welcomed it. "It's a pleasure," he said, "to come here and try to be of some help."

Safeway's study of the co-op's situation was "an elaborate one—a computerized analysis of the store's entire operation from management down to every item on the store's shelves." Safeway's helping-hand "providing management consultant services covering all phases of food retailing: including store design, fixtures, stocking plans, personnel hiring and training, merchandising, delivery scheduling, inventory, accounting and security measures." But Safeway would not participate in determining the co-op's pricing of merchandise—it would only "advise on basics of sound business management."

And Safeway's price for all this? $1.

"We look upon this project as more than a business challenge," said Safeway's President, Quentin Reynolds. "Once the fate of that small co-op came to our attention, we couldn't stand idly by knowing it was going under and some 2,700 persons of limited circumstances suffer from the loss. Here was a chance for our company to really become involved in giving a hand to low-income people who are trying to better themselves.

"Yes," Reynolds said, in answer to a question, "we have a Safeway Super Market in the area—about ten blocks from this co-op. This had no bearing on our decision. There are many other competitors in the area, but there's enough business for all. But more importantly, we wanted to see this co-op succeed because it symbolizes the free enterprise system."

"Safeway's undertaking,' wrote one San Francisco paper, "is a significant one nationally, for it marks the first all-out effort by a corporation of tremendous know-how to help a losing ghetto business. Other big companies have established branches of their own in Ghettoes elsewhere in the nation, but have never ventured into a Ghetto to assist a failing business."

The re-opening of the Neighborhood Co-op was scheduled for early June. Prior to that time, the store was closed for a few days "while the Safeway task-force supervised alterations inside and out, re-stocked shelves and moved in new equipment to bring the store up to the operating level of Safeway stores."

THE FORMAL OPENING

June 6 brought the formal reopening of the co-op—located at Third and Paul Streets: the turnoff point for baseball fans to Candlestick Park. San Francisco's Mayor Joseph Alioto was there to cut the ribbon. Safeway's top executives were present. Like the mayor, Safeway's Quentin Reynolds also spoke to those who had come for the event—black businessmen and leaders of the community, and many of the Hunters Point residents. "Others in business and industry throughout the United States," said Reynolds, "will be encouraged to try this effort at cooperation if the result of this work is a success."

Some weeks before, Leonard Batts had said: "It leaves me almost speechless to realize that the know-how of the vast Safeway organization is working with us to analyze our problem and help us make our dream become a reality."

And now, as Batts looked around—the co-op "glistening like a typical Safeway operation"—it was still all very hard to believe. But . . . the ribbon-cutting ceremony HAD taken place. "I'm very proud of this," Batts said slowly. "It reminds me of a ship being christened for a second maiden run."

It is now several months since that second launching. And the voyage?

"Our business has increased steadily," Batts reports. "We have received over 500 new applications for membership in the Co-op, and every day brings more.

"Safeway still stands with us at the helm, and will continue to do so until we reach our objective."

And Safeway?

"That Co-op has come along in good shape," Reynolds beamed. "We're most enthused about it."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Sept. 3, 1968]

"TRIBUTE TO KENNEDY": HUNTERS POINT CO-OP ALMOST ON ITS OWN FEET

(By Steve Pelletiere)

Safeway Stores is on the brink of creating a living memorial to the late Senator Robert Kennedy.

It was June 6—the day the Senator died—that Safeway undertook to save the dying Hunters Point Co-op.

Last week, a Safeway manager announced that "We (the Safeway personnel) definitely have doubled business since taking over. The store was doing less than $7000-a-week, and now its over $14,000."

The manager, Mel Thomas, quoted from the just completed store inventory to show that "for the first time in three years, the store has made a profit. This," said Thomas, "is sort of a tribute to Senator Kennedy."

FUNCTIONS

Safeway Stores went into the Co-op under the personal direction of its president, Quentin Reynolds. Reynolds felt that the store—which had been going bust for months—could serve the ghetto community in two very valuable ways.

First, if the store could be made to pay, Hunters Point-Bayview would have a store truly its own. And second, a soundly operated Co-op could provide jobs and apprentice training for Negro youths.

Reynolds asked Leonard Batts, the president of the Co-op's board of directors, if the giant supermarket chain could assign a Safeway team full time to the project of bringing the Co-op out of debt. Since the store had just sustained a $12,000 uninsured loss through robbery, Batts was only too willing to give the approval.

CLEANUP

Thomas said, "The most difficult thing about putting this place on its feet was getting started." Thomas, formerly manager of a Safeway store at Seventh avenue and Cabrillo street, put together a "clean-up" squad of Safeway employees.

"For three days," said Thomas, we pulled display counters apart, fumigated them; killed rats; wiped out a termite infestation and threw away five huge scavenger bins of junk."

Then Thomas bought $50,000 worth of merchandise. "We received, cut (opened), priced and marked 4000 cases of food and goods—all in three days. The deadline was killing."

According to Thomas, the old Co-op management didn't have the proper savvy in the buying end. "People would come in here, looking for nine items, and be lucky if they could get four," Thomas said.

As Thomas gradually put the store on a more efficient basis, he sent the members of his original Safeway team back to their old jobs. "I hired six replacements" the manager said, "All from the community."

And just last week, Thomas hired his own replacement, Willie L. Scott, a former assistant store manager from Hayward.

"Now that the store has shown a profit," Thomas concluded, "I'll be going back to my old Safeway job." Thomas said he will stay around just long enough to break Scott in on his new duties.

PRIDE

John L. Wilks, a public relations man and Co-op member, and he thinks the new Co-op can make it. "The original Co-op was started," he said, "by some 2700 community people who bought shares."

"Negro people are developing a fierce pride in their community. The idea of owning their own store appeals to them."

"All this store needs," said Thomas, "is for people to come in and buy."

Added Scott: "If we could do $21,100-a-week business, it would be like we were 5000 feet out of the hole."

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 23, 1969]

"PROJECT PROGRESS" HELPS SAVE STORES

(By David Holmberg)

A white San Francisco grocery chain representative who helped revive a dying food store in a ghetto area there—and earned the respect of militant Black Panthers in the process—has come to Washington to try to boost similar projects here.

The new effort of Cal Pond, a Safeway stores public relations man, is part of a broad new assignment here to involve his corporation with the problem of American cities.

---

*Editor's Note: There are nearly 2,500 Safeway food stores and drug centers here and aboard—in which, according to statistics, Safeway sales totaled 3.36 billion in 1966.

Mr. Pond was instrumental in persuading his firm to provide managerial help to the Hunter's Point Co-op in San Francisco—a large store owned by some 2,700 shareholders, most of them Negro.

Last summer the store was in debt to the tune of $85,000, and a $12,000 robbery appeared to be the finishing blow.

It was at that point that Mr. Pond stepped in.

He had been meeting with other business executives and talking to city officials in an attempt to find ways to aid the inner city. Thru these contacts he met John Wilks, a Negro public relations man and a shareholder in the Co-op.

POOR MANAGEMENT

Mr. Pond checked out the store's possibilities after talking to Mr. Wilks, and a Safeway management team soon moved in to try to save the store. The Safeway study showed that the store's management simply did not have the know-how to run it profitably.

By September, the store had shown a profit for the first time.

While working on the Hunter's Point project, Mr. Pond met members of the militant Black Panthers, including Eldridge Cleaver. He spent a week-end with other Negro Panther members and some students in a seminar which he said "turned out to be a sort of a psychodrama."

Some of the Panthers were hostile at first, Mr. Pond said, but they changed their attitude "once we demonstrated we were sincere, once we showed we really wanted to narrow the gap between promise and performance."

LOCAL PROJECTS

Mr. Pond is here to study problems of the inner city, at the national level and to attempt to aid projects like the Hunter's Point Co-op rejuvenation—and Project Progress, which the Safeway office here began working on last June. Mr. Wilks and Mr. Pond recently conferred here on various projects.

Safeway has provided advice on management and design to a group of ex-convicts who opened a "Project Progress" food store at 4131 Wheeler Road SE in Congress Heights. It also has set up a training school for managers and workers at the store.

That store, like the Co-op is prospering, and its success has further encouraged Safeway in the belief that what Mr. Wilks has called "the failure psychosis" of the ghetto can be ended.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, Jan. 12, 1969]

HUNTERS POINT CO-OP MARKET PROVES MODEL PROJECT—OTHERS COME TO STUDY, ADAPT PROGRAM SET UP BY SAFEWAY

(By Harry Johanesen)

An idea began to blossom for Frank E. Clarke when he read about the unprecedented project launched by Safeway Stores in San Francisco's Bayview-Hunters Point District.

Clarke, coordinator of special events for the Los Angeles Black Congress, was delighted to read these things:

Safeway had come to the rescue of the Bayview-Hunters Point Co-op Supermarket, a black owned business tottering at the brink of bankruptcy due to a long series of bad breaks.

Safeway's voluntary undertaking had brought all the top business talents of the giant retail food chain into the dying Co-op at 6190 Third St. in an 11th hour operation to stave off almost certain disaster for its small competitor.

Before he had finished reading, Clarke's idea had reached full blossom.

WHY NOT?

If Safeway would undertake to do these things to keep a competitor from going under, why wouldn't Bank of America extend help to the Bank of Finance, a black-owned financial institution in Los Angeles?

Following through, he called on Bank of America officials, told them what Safeway was doing in San Francisco, and asked whether they could arrange similar assistance for the Bank of Finance.

HELPING POOR

Bank of America agreed and has been training personnel at Bank of Finance ever since . . .

The Los Angeles outgrowth of Safeway's project is one of many stemming elsewhere in the country and at least one in Africa since Safeway volunteered last June to help put the Co-op on a paying basis.

Mel Thomas, a Safeway store manager who took over direction of Co-op operations seven months ago, said yesterday visitors from all over the world as well as this country have visited the new sparkling supermarket during those months.

"They were all interested in the idea of helping poor people get into business for themselves," said Thomas.

Thomas left the supermarket yesterday to return to the ranks of Safeway's top managerial staff.

Thomas turned over the reins of management to Willie Scott, an experienced supermarket manager and a graduate of Lincoln University in Missouri.

But Thomas's return to Safeway did not mean that the food chain is completely satisfied with business growth at the Co-op. The company's Co-op task force, headed by corporate vice president Creighton Peet, will continue in an advisory capacity to the Co-op's board of directors.

Safeway president Quentin Reynolds said the Co-op's business has tripled in the past seven months.

"It's coming along and being operated in a fine manner," Reynolds said. "Our goal is a 15 to 20 per cent increase over present volume of business."

The store has moved ahead so well that only last week the state corporation commission authorized the sale of 10,000 additional shares of stock in the Co-op.

Leonard Batts, chairman of the Co-op board, and John L. Wilks, board member and public relations consultant, said a committee is being formed to sell the shares at $5 each to buyers all over The City.

"People don't need to buy shares to shop at the Co-op," said Batts. "Shoppers from everywhere are welcome. But we feel the more people who own shares the more shoppers we will have."

[Reprinted from Chain Store Age Supermarket Editions, August 1968]

SAFEWAY: REVIVING A DYING NEGRO SUPER—$85,000 IN DEBT, BADLY UNDERSTOCKED—SAN FRANCISCO CO-OP SUPER GOT MANAGEMENT AID FROM QUENTIN REYNOLDS-LED SAFEWAY TEAM

In San Francisco late last year, 30 business execs met to discuss a burning issue: How to help the ghetto jobless, and the Negro businessman, survive.

Included was Cal Pond, a public and government relations man for Safeway, the nation's second largest food chain (1967 sales: $3.36 billion).

The top echelon group reached three conclusions:

1.) There was a great deal of money, muscle and expertise represented at the conference table. 2.) Social and civil unrest in the country had reached alarming proportions. 3.) Something had to be done fast to relieve the problem.

Cal Pond came away from that meeting with one thought: What is that "something" . . . what can *we* at Safeway do to help the economic bottom rung of our society up the ladder?

Co-op on last legs. About the same time, in the Hunter's Point-Bayview section of San Francisco, a grocery store owned by some 2,700 co-operative shareholders, most of them Negro, was one step away from closing its doors—permanently.

Under-financed, under-patronized, poorly managed, the 15,500 sq. ft. "Neighborhood Co-op" had been waging a valiant but losing battle for survival since the day it opened, in 1965.

It had accumulated debts of $85,000, owed to some 100 creditors—most of them suppliers—and was losing money at the rate of $5,000 monthly. The store was reduced to two limited bank accounts, had a total of only six employes, and a shelf inventory that was 75% below normal.

With weekly volume down to a starvation-level of under $10,000, the Co-op had received a nearly fatal death blow last November when gunmen held it up and fled with $3,000 in cash and $9,000 worth of checks.

Cal Pond visited the store shortly after the robbery. He was told of its desperate plight by John Wilks, a Co-op shareholder, and head of a prominent San Francisco Negro executive research firm. Wilks had been working with Safeway to help ferret out causes of, and find solutions to, inner city problems.

Could Safeway help? As Pond looked at the empty shelves, he wondered aloud—"Is this the place to do 'something'?" Could the famed management skills of Safeway teamed with Co-op spirit be put to work to transform this sick store into a profitable community business—one that would strengthen the local, predominantly Negro economy, and provide employment for area jobless? To act would set a precedent unique to the business community.

After all, he reasoned, the store had potential. Agreed, it was located in a low, to low-middle, income area, and unemployment there was fairly high. But he had noticed that the houses were neat and orderly, streets pleasantly tree-lined, and there was none of the feeling of hopelessness and despair that you usually find in such ghettos as Harlem or Watts.

From a traffic-building standpoint, the store was on the corner of a busy intersection, accessible by highway, and near a turn-off point to the Giants' Candlestick Park. In short, the unit could succeed, if someone could help transform the store into the type of supermarket local people would be proud to patronize.

Could that "someone" be Safeway? Pond took the idea to vice president Malcolm Grover, and to other Safeway top management including president Quentin Reynolds, and board chairman Robert A. Magowan. They agreeed to help.

Safeway investigates. The chain immediately began a 90-day investigation to determine the root causes behind the Co-op's decline—why it had sunk to a literal hand-to-mouth existence . . . and what they could do to reverse the downward trend. What they found:

The Co-op management team, though hardworking and dedicated, simply lacked the knowledge and experience needed to turn the store into a profitable operation. Security and cash control procedures, for example, were woefully inadequate. Cash and checks were mixed together, and pilferage was excessive.

Stock rotation was neglected, prices were high and perishables had the sallow look of too many days in the case.

The Co-op's merchandise buying decisions were naive, and frequently unrelated to customer preferences and needs. A $4,000 inventory of French vermouth was gathering dust on the shelves. End displays consisted of items like $1.50 dog candy, a price out of reach for all but the most affluent consumers.

The Co-op wasn't being patronized by its shareholders. Leonard Batts, president of the store's board of directors, estimates that 70% of the Co-op members live within a one-mile radius of the store—but only 6% shopped it regularly.

Safeway steps in. Safeway felt the store could be turned around. and on April 15th, the chain and the Neighborhood Co-op drew up a contract, whereby the former agreed to supply—for the fee of $1.00—"management consultant services" covering such areas as stocking plans, personnel hiring and training, delivery scheduling, inventory management and security. The agreement stipulated that Safeway would act merely as an advisor. But competent, professional advice is what the Co-op needed most.

One day after the agreement was signed, Safeway's management team rolled up its sleeves and went to work with Co-op employes and shareholders curing the sick store.

Quentin Reynolds says of the milestone occasion: "In attempting to grapple with social and economic problems, private industry has too often given promises without performance. Good intentions are fine, but they don't put food on the table, or help a dying business."

He continues: "Here was a chance to help close the gap, to follow through. The fact that we would be competing with a Safeway just blocks away wasn't important. What was important was that we would be working together with others to help decent, respectable citizens pull themselves up by their own bootstraps."

Reynolds designated W. Creighton Peet, vice president, corporate development, to act as liaison between Safeway and the Co-op. One of Peet's—and Safeway's—first recommendations was to move in a Safeway store manager (salary paid by the Co-op) on an interim basis.

Appoint new manager. The man tapped for the job: 39-year-old Mel Thomas, a 16-year Safeway veteran, and manager of the chain's Cabrillo Street unit in San Francisco.

Quentin Reynolds says this of Mel Thomas: "He wasn't picked out of a hat. He was selected over dozens of other manager candidates for several important reasons, not the least of which is his proven track record as teacher and trainer."

No less than six assistants who had worked under Thomas are now managing their own stores. As well, Thomas has always been active in community affairs. And, as a former manager of a Safeway super in a predominantly Negro area, he is sympathetic to their problems.

Thomas' obligation to the store will continue until a permanent manager is selected and approved by the Co-op board. Safeway, meanwhile, has volunteered to train the store's front-end staff, and help recruit additional clerk personnel.

Facelift for Co-op. In addition to beefing up management and training, the chain suggested changes in store layout, equipment and inventory.

Safeway extended a line of credit for merchandise to help the Co-op restock its nearly empty shelves. The chain also advised the Co-op to put greater emphasis on national brands instead of Co-op private labels, which had only limited shopper appeal. Advisors also recommended boosting the store's non-food assortment, with special attention to H&BA and housewares.

Safeway donated five checkstands from its surplus warehouse to replace the Co-op's older, less efficient split types. Also supplied: A brace of reconditioned, repainted shopping carts. Almost all of the Co-op's carriers were missing.

Modifications in store layout included changes like these: An upfront office-conference room was reduced in size, to provide more lobby space, more room for shopping carts; several of the store's split-aisle gondolas were filled in to accommodate more shelf items, add linear footage; H&BA, which had been scattered throughout the store, was consolidated into a single, permanent section opposite produce.

TIGHTER SECURITY SOUGHT

Finally, Safeway called in Jesse Wagner, head of the chain's central security department. Wagner's recommendations: Regular register pickups, to reduce cash drawer overflows; closer policing of backdoor receiving; a two man team to open and close the store; armored car service for the deposit of receipts.

Safeway didn't want—and studiously avoided—any publicity for its efforts. But word of mouth, and a key article in the San Francisco Examiner, triggered a groundswell of outside support that exceeded Safeway's, and the Co-op's, wildest expectations.

OTHERS HELP, TOO

Media people, both press and radio, were among the first to jump on the bandwagon. The Berkeley Post and the San Francisco Sun, papers with large Negro readership, offered free ad space. A radio station volunteered spot announcement time, on an open-schedule basis. Other communications people helped revamp exterior signs and repaint a parking lot pylon. Another vote of confidence was supplied by a major business machines manufacturer who gave the Co-op five new cash registers.

Suppliers and distributors pitched in. They extended lines of credit, helped restock shelves, moved equipment even decorated.

People—store staff and ordinary citizens—also pledged willing hands and strong backs. Shareholders and non-shareholders, blacks and whites, women and children, streamed into the store to haul rubbish, scrub floors, clean shelves—with the local clerks union's blessing.

A NEW BEGINNING

On June 6th, San Francisco mayor Joseph Alioto, Safeway's Quentin Reynolds and a host of Co-op shareholders reopened the refurbished super. That day and the three days that followed brought in a total of $16,000 in sales, double the previous week.

At presstime, sales continue to trend upward.

What's the long-range outlook for the Neighborhood Co-op? Optimism runs high—from Safeway president Reynolds, to Co-op chairman Batts. But both realize the store is not out of the woods yet.

Still to be done: A permanent store manager must be selected from either the Safeway organization, or through Co-op sources. A store staff must be honed into a competent, efficient work team. Debts totaling $85,000 must be erased off the books.

Says Leonard Batts: "One of our immediate aims is to reach the breakeven point, so that we can begin paying back our creditors. The store should start showing a profit when we reach a $20,000–$25,000 per week volume. (Editor's note: That goal should have been exceeded by now.)

Batts continues: "We want more shareholders. We've already started soliciting new members and hope to have an additional 6,000–7,000 owners within two years."

"Influence others." Safeway's interest in the Co-op goes beyond dollars and cents. Says Quentin Reynolds: "We want to leave footprints. We want to influence others to take an active, demonstrable interest in pumping new life into Negro-owned businesses. No one can do the job alone . . . not the government, not the food chains, not other private sectors. But, collectively, we can make a dent."

To the question of what will happen to the Co-op once Safeway starts severing the umbilical cord, Reynolds answers: "If the Safeway management team is as good as it's supposed to be, and if the people we've helped to train are as good as we think they are—the Neighborhood Co-op will succeed."

Projections call for Safeway to begin a gradual withdrawal from the store within six months to a year from now. They will maintain contact with the Co-op as long as needed.

Gap closing. Safeway is not the only food chain to aid the Negro entrepreneur movement. NAFC says that at least six other major chains are currently providing marketing, managerial, and operational expertise to new owned and operated Negro food stores. Among those helping: Supermarkets General in N.J. Thanks to S. G. C. assistance, a Harlem, N.Y. co-operative, open since May, has begun providing supermarket service in an area where there was none; created between 60 and 85 new full- and part-time jobs for the hard-core unemployed.

Safeway has helped a store in trouble. Six other chains are helping stores before trouble starts. The gap between promise and performance has begun to close.

OVER 70 FOOD CHAINS PLAN TO HIRE JOBLESS IN NAB–JOBS PROGRAM—300,000 JOBS PROMISED HARD CORE

Like Safeway (see previous story), the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB) is closing the gap between hope and reality—by finding companies who will pledge themselves to hire and train the hard-core unemployed.

To quote Malcolm Grover, Safeway's representative to NAB: "Thus far, I'd say that business has performed nobly." Indeed it has, with a total job commitment from business that is nearing 300,000.

SEVENTY CHAINS PLEDGE

Food chains, adds Clarence Adamy, National Association of Food Chains president, have contributed to that performance. Over 70 companies have contacted him with questions about the NAB-run JOBS (Job Opportunities in the Business Sector) program. Among these: National Tea, Borman Food Stores, Hillman's, Stop & Shop, to name only a few.

As well, companies like Acme, Jewel and Supermarkets General Corp. (Cranford, N.J.) have strong programs for hiring and training the hard core. Lucky Stores (San Leandro, Calif.), a late starter, has come up with an ambitious plan to train 200 employes within the next 12 months.

In New York State, a 12-chain consortium has pledged to hire and train 200 disadvantaged, and employ from three to 60 each, depending on company size.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 12, 1968]

GOLIATH RESCUING A TOTTERING DAVID

(By Harry Johanesen)

Safeway Stores, a giant of the U.S. retail food industry, is coming to the rescue of a small competitor with its back against the wall in the Hunters Point ghetto.

Safeway's voluntary project, The Examiner learned yesterday, will be to transform the tottering Hunter Point Neighborhood Co-op Supermarket into a profitable operation for benefit of the Co-op.

The store at 6271 Third St. has been a losing proposition ever since it opened in 1965, owned lock, stock and barrel by 2700 low income investors who bought in at $5 a share.

Leonard Batts, president of the Co-op board of directors, said Safeway has entered into an agreement with the board to provide "management consulting services" to the store for the sum of $1.

Translated that means Safeway's strength in the business world and the talents of its top corporate executives are being applied to put the Co-op on a paying basis.

The Safeway undertaking is a significant one nationally because it marks the first all-out effort by a corporation with tremendous know-how to help a losing ghetto business firm.

XUM

Other big companies have established branches of their own firms in ghettos elsewhere in the Nation, but have never ventured into a ghetto to assist a going business.

Quentin Reynolds, president of Safeway, confirmed the Co-op agreement and said he has personally inspected the store.

"I'm very enthusiastic about the opportunities for success," Reynolds added. "We feel our people can be of considerable assistance in getting the Co-op back on its feet and operating profitably."

The Safeway president said he could not discuss all the things his company plans to do for the Co-op because a comprehensive study of what needs to be done has not yet been completed.

Another source told The Examiner the Safeway study is an elaborate one consisting of a computerized analysis of the store's entire operation, from management down to every item on the store's shelves.

RESTOCK SHELVES

The store, this source disclosed, will be closed for a week while Safeway task forces supervise alterations inside and outside, restock shelves, move in new equipment and bring the store up to the operating level of one of their own stores—all for $1.

Safeway itself operates a supermarket about 10 blocks away on Williams Street near Third. It is one of nearly 2500 food stores and drug centers here and abroad in which Safeway sales totaled $3.36 billion in 1966.

This contrasts with the Co-op's present dismal position in the business world: no reserve funds, no credit with suppliers and bankruptcy just around the corner.

CHIEF PERSUADER

Just last week, it was learned, the Board of Trade was persuaded to grant the Co-op a 90-day extension on demands for payment of outstanding obligations. Safeway is believed to have been the chief persuader.

John L. Wilks, San Francisco public relations consultant and member of the Co-op, was asked by the board to seek help for the store after it suffered a devastating blow one day last November.

On that ill-starred day, two black gunmen held up the store and fled with $3000 in cash and $9000 worth of checks. The bandits didn't know that they were in a store owned by poor people, the overwhelming majority of them residents of the Bayview-Hunters Point black communities. They thought they were hitting "the man."

EMPTY SHELVES

Insured for only $2000, the Co-op never recovered from the loss and to this day has regained only a fraction of the check losses.

As a consequence, the store had no cash to buy on a day to day basis and shelves throughout the Co-op took on a discouraging gap-toothed appearance as the stock on hand was sold to acquire enough money to at least partially restock.

In his search for a helping hand to keep the Co-op alive, Wilks mentioned the store's dire situation to a friend, Safeway executive Cal Pond.

REYNOLDS' VISIT

Things began to happen after that. Like Reynolds' personal visit to the store one evening several weeks ago, an event that aroused the curiosity of the manager, Louis Valenti.

Valenti struck up a conversation with Reynolds and asked whether he was a new resident of the area who would be trading at the Co-op.

"My name is Reynolds; I work for Safeway," said the visitor.

It didn't strike Valenti until hours later that Reynolds was actually the president of Safeway Stores, but even then he had no idea why Reynolds had come into the store. Now he knows.

Batts expressed the gratitude of his board for Safeway's rescue operation.

"You can't find better technical know-how than Safeway's in the entire food industry," he said. "We should not be making any wrong moves any more."

The Co-op president said his board won't put the entire burden on Safeway.

"We're going to intensify our campaign for new shareholders and work to get the general public to patronize our store," he explained. "We have a convenient location for an awful lot of people."

Batts meant baseball fans traveling to and from Candlestick Park since the store sits at the Third Street corner of Paul Avenue, a turnoff point to Candlestick.

"We're getting into the ball game," he promised.

BENDING THE GUIDELINES

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Washington Post yesterday carried a very significant and disturbing article about the school desegregation program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The article describes how the man who reportedly is in line to become the general counsel at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare believes the Department can relax the school desegregation guidelines without making a public announcement. Perhaps as disturbing as this aspect of the article is the revelation that the guidelines apparently were "bent" recently in order to accept a desegregation plan which, under normal circumstances, would not have been acceptable.

Mr. President, the article by Mr. Peter Milius in yesterday's Post should be "must" reading for Members of Congress and others interested in maintaining the integrity of the title VI school desegregation program. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and I urge Senators who may have missed the article take a few minutes to read it.

Needless to say, I hope that Secretary Finch will reject out of hand the proposal made by the man who the Post reports, will be the No. 1 lawyer at HEW.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINCH AIDE URGES EASED GUIDELINES

(By Peter Milius)

The man scheduled to become the No. 1 lawyer in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has urged Secretary Robert H. Finch to relax the Federal school desegregation guidelines without delay—and without public announcement.

In a memorandum to Finch two weeks ago, Robert C. Mardian, a conservative California Republican already serving unofficially as HEW's general counsel, suggested that a statement be issued "clarifying" the guidelines for HEW civil rights officials.

Mardian told the Secretary that the statement should be issued right away, but "probably should not be the subject of any particular public announcement."

"Should the question arise," he wrote, "we can simply respond that our policy is in accordance with our reading of the (present) guidelines."

Mardian's memorandum, which he handed out to Justice Department civil rights lawyers during a day-long review of Justice-HEW desegregation policies last week has no official standing.

It is another in the long list of conflicting desegregation suggestions that Finch has been getting ever since he took office.

Nor is Mardian's nomination as general counsel official yet. It is a presidential appointment, not yet formally announced and subject to Senate confirmation.

As general counsel Mardian would have considerable influence over HEW desegregation policies. In the past, no school district has had its funds cut off or even been taken into the complicated process that can lead to a cutoff without the general counsel's approval.

If its own lawyer says a suspect school district is complying with the law, HEW is in no position to defend a cutoff if it is taken to court. In effect, Mardian would thus have legal custoday of the guidelines.

The Californian is the first conservative Republican to have found his way into HEW's inner circle since Finch took over. Well-placed HEW sources say he was not Finch's own choice for the job.

Mardian was a special field representative for the Republican National Committee in 10 Western states during the 1964 Goldwater campaign. He was also active in President Nixon's campaign last fall.

His tentative HEW appointment has been used to reassure Southern Republicans uneasy or angry about Finch's continuing cutoffs of Federal funds to recalcitrant Southern school districts.

SOUTHERNERS PLEASED

The State, a newspaper in Columbia, S.C., reported 10 days ago, after a meeting between Southern Republican chairmen and national GOP officials at the White House, that "the Dixie leaders are also pleased with the selection of Robert Mardian of California to be HEW general counsel.

"They consider him to be 'reasonable' in the area of school desegregation."

The main point of Mardian's memo to Finch was that HEW's guidelines go beyond both the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the source of HEW's authority to cut off funds, and the most recent desegregation decisions of the Federal courts.

HEW officials have been telling Southern schoolmen they must desegregate completely by September, 1969, or in special cases, September, 1970, at the latest.

SUGGEST WAYS

The guidelines suggest several ways to achieve complete desegregation. One is "pairing" formerly white and Negro schools. Another is drawing new, geographic attendance zones.

One of the main legal bases for the 1969 and 1970 deadlines is last May's Supreme Court decision in the so-called Green case. In the Green decision, the Court threw out a freedom-of-choice plan because it wasn't working fast enough, and said "the burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now."

Mardian argued that this does not mean a school district must desegregate now. It simply means, he said, that a district must start desegregating now.

Southerners, Mardian went on, say their main objection to pairing and zoning is that both would require "the teaching of underachievers in the same classroom with overachievers."

He suggested that Finch meet this objection by accepting plans that would let Southern school districts spend a few more years raising Negro achievement levels, and then desegregate.

Mardian told the Secretary he should not rewrite the guidelines because that "would be misinterpreted as a basic retreat by the Department . . . and would damage our over-all enforcement program." He suggested instead that the guidelines quietly be bent.

A good example of how this can be done cropped up last week, in the case of Chester County, Tenn.

Finch issued an order last month, cutting off Chester County's Federal funds effective March 15, two Saturdays ago.

Chester County is just outside Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District, where there will be an election next Tuesday to fill the vacancy left by the death of Rep. Robert A. (Fats) Everett, a Democrat.

Republicans here were anxious not to cut Chester County off on the eve of the election, for fear it would destroy their candidate's chances.

Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.) intervened in Chester County's behalf, County officials showed signs of coming up with a new plan, and Finch, on the final Saturday, gave them an extension through last Thursday.

ORDER RESCINDED

Thursday night, after a long meeting here with Baker and Chester County representatives, Finch accepted the new plan and rescinded his cutoff order.

Two kinds of school districts are generally given until 1970 to desegregate, those with Negro majorities, and those that can't readily desegregate without putting up new buildings.

Only 405 of Chester County's 2131 pupils are Negroes.

HEW civil rights officials maintained that the County could desegregate without putting up a new building, by drawing new attendance zones and sending white children to its one all-Negro school next year.

The County said it had another use in mind for the all-Negro school, and couldn't desegregate without building an addition to one of its presently white schools.

PROMISE EXACTED

Finch, who was under heavy political pressure, came down on the County's side, after getting it to promise to send some white children to "regularly scheduled classes in music and chorus" at the Negro school next year.

The County, which had about $200,000 in Federal funds at stake, will desegregate completely in September, 1970.

The next day The Commercial Appeal, the Memphis newspaper that serves Chester County and most of the Eighth Congressional District, carried a story about the reinstatement.

The story quoted Senator Baker. Finch's decision, he said, was "a clear indication of the direction of the Nixon Administration. It wants to open, not close, the schools."

THE FRUITS OF INDECISION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, many Members of Congress who have followed and supported the school desegregation program carried out under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were dismayed by some of the statements attributed to then-candidate Richard Nixon and some of his supporters during last fall's campaign. After the election, however, most of us were willing to give the new administration the benefit of the doubt, believing that the school desegregation program would continue to be administered firmly and fairly as I believe it has been in the past.

Unfortunately, the new administration has not been clear in its intentions with respect to this important program. And its indecision and seemingly contradictory, sometimes confusing statements are causing a predictable reaction. Until the administration—either through the President or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—makes clear its commitment to this program, without any ifs, ands, or buts, the confusion which abounds today will continue and increase.

Mr. President, an article published recently in the New York Times provides some indication as to how the administration's actions and statements in the area of school desegregation are being interpreted. It is time to put an end to the confusion. I hope the President or Secretary Finch without further delay will issue a statement setting forth this administration's determination to continue to enforce the law consistent with the current court decisions and the existing school desegregation policies for carrying out the title VI compliance program. I ask unanimous consent the Times article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION OPPONENTS INTENSIFY PRESSURE ON PRESIDENT

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—"Dear Mr. President: The South elected you in 1968. The South will defeat you in 1972 if you don't fulfill campaign promises."

This letter to President Nixon from a man in Lakeland, Fla., is evidence of what appears to be a widespread Southern protest against school desegregation.

White citizens, school boards and members of Congress have mounted a campaign to achieve a slowdown of integration for the 1969–70 school year, which the Johnson Administration had fixed as the target date for abolishment of the dual school system in districts receiving Federal funds.

A FLOOD OF LETTERS

President Nixon and Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, have received a flood of letters similar to the following from a woman in Elysian Fields, Tex.:

"The South feels that we had a commitment from you guaranteeing true freedom of choice in attending schools. You were elected by conservatives and middle of the roaders. I, myself, was influenced by Senator Strom Thurmond (South Carolina Democrat who campaigned for Mr. Nixon)."

The amount of mail and pressures from Congress, a Government spokesman said, has picked up since U.S. News & World Report carried an interview with Mr. Finch in its issue dated March 10. The interview was widely read in the South and interpreted by many as a new, softer approach to desegregation enforcement.

In it, Mr. Finch said that the desegregation guidelines drawn by the Johnson Administration would be changed to make them "more responsive and realistic in terms of what is happening in education" and to make them "nationally applicable."

RAW PERCENTAGES

"I'm convinced that we just can't work with raw percentages and say, 'You've got to have the same percentages of blacks and whites in every school.' You can go into parts of Chicago and Harlem and Pasadena, Calif., into Washington, D.C., and you find all-black situations.

"It's totally artificial to insist on busing schoolchildren if it may be detrimental to the level of education. The greatest problem we've got in the elementary and secondary schools in the country is not to get so hung up on these other struggles as to let the quality of education in the public school system erode and erode and erode."

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has been enforcing desegregation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans racial discrimination in any federally assisted program. Enforcement has been largely in the South, where there was a dual school system by law, but recently has been extended to other reigons on a limited basis.

In the South, about 130 districts have foregone Federal funds rather than desegregate, but in the vast majority of Southern districts the department and the Federal courts achieved about 20 per cent desegregation this year, meaning that one-fifth of the Negro students are in formerly all-white schools.

Planning is under way for the 1969–70 school year. Under the Johnson Administration guidelines, department officials had hoped for a considerable increase of integration in faculties and classrooms.

In 1967, the districts were told that they would have until 1969 to complete abolishment of their dual systems.

GEARING FOR A FIGHT

Thus, Southern whites are gearing for a fight. Various statements by Republican officials, one agency aide conceded, have created a great deal of confusion from which the Southerners are drawing hope.

During the campaign, Senator Thurmond assured Southerners that Mr. Nixon would let up on school desegregation.

Mr. Nixon said that he would favor withholding funds from school districts practicing segregation but that the aim would not be to achieve what he considered arbitrary standards of racial balance. He accused the former Education Commissioner, Harold Howe 2d, of setting arbitrary standards.

Since taking office, Mr. Finch has cut off funds of several districts found not to be in compliance with the law and given others additional time to comply. He has insisted that he will enforce the law and the Supreme Court's interpretation of it. Some of his statements drew an angry response from the South.

"What kind of sellout is this to that forgotten American, the taxpayer peasants who put Mr. Nixon in office?," a man in Ellicott City, Md., wrote to Mr. Finch.

Mr. Finch's interview in U.S. News, however, was interpreted by some conservative columnists to the South. It was obvious from a sampling of a mountain of the mail received by the Administration that many people considered the desegregation issue an open one.

Joshua B. Zatman, who heads the information section of the department's office of civil rights, said that in the three years he had been here he had never seen as much mail.

"We have a backlog of 2,000 letters we have not answered," he said.

He said that a number of school boards were appealing to their Congressmen for a slowdown, and that the department was hearing from the Congressmen.

Only a small percentage of the mail requests a speedup of desegregation, Mr. Zatman said. Not all the mail is from the South.

A Kansas City, Mo., woman who worked in Mr. Nixon's campaign wrote:

"President Nixon, you owe the Negro nothing. They did not support you. You were elected on grounds of cleaning up this nation."

COMMENDATION OF WILLIAM R. McCANDLESS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, President Nixon yesterday announced the appointment of a new Federal Co-chairman to replace William R. McCandless who has been Federal Co-chairman of the Ozarks Regional Economic Development Commission for the past 2½ years. While I do not question the President's authority to appoint a replacement for Mr. McCandless, I nonetheless would like to say a few words about the Ozarks Commission, and the outstanding success of the

XUM

programs undertaken by the commission under Mr. McCandless' guidance and leadership.

I was a coauthor of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act which authorized the establishment of the Ozarks region. I held hearings as a member of the Public Works Committee on the section of the bill dealing with the establishment of the Ozarks Regional Commission, and at that time, emphasized the need for economic development in the underdeveloped areas of eastern Oklahoma, western Arkansas, southwest Missouri, and southeast Kansas. After the Ozarks Commission was established by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. McCandless was appointed Federal Cochairman and undertook the extremely difficult task of planning for the development of the Ozarks region and coordinating the efforts of local, State, and Federal Government. Under Mr. McCandless' leadership, the Ozarks Commission has embarked on a bold program for the development of this region. We now have in Oklahoma and Arkansas and Missouri initiated a vocational-technical training program second to none. Mr. McCandless felt—and still does—that vocational-technical education is absolutely necessary in order to provide the highly skilled work force demanded by today's modern industries. We now have such an educational program in Oklahoma, and its impact on the accelerated economic growth in our State is unquestioned. Mr. McCandless also recognized the need to bring about coordination of the development in connection with the Arkansas navigation project which will bring navigation to Tulsa, Okla., in 1970. Under his leadership ports and industrial sites have been planned, funded and are under construction which will stimulate industrial growth and create needed private jobs in this historically underdeveloped portion of our State.

I feel that Mr. McCandless is to be commended for his dedicated public service as Federal Cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Economic Development Commission in that he never lost sight of the goals of the Commission to meet and conquer the problems of social and economic deprivation of the Ozarks area. Mr. McCandless in dealing with the chief executives of the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas acted in a nonpartisan manner and welcomed the advice and suggestions of public officials on all levels. I feel that Mr. McCandless has performed admirably in his job, in a spirit of cooperation and has contributed admirably to the success of this program. He has paved the way for his successor, and I am hopeful that the programs initiated by the Ozarks Commission in the past 2 years, as well as those that are still on the drawing boards, will be carried forward by the new Federal Cochairman in the same nonpartisan manner so necessary for the ultimate success of the Ozarks regional economic development effort. Once again, I commend Mr. McCandless for a job well done, and I look forward to calling upon him for his advice and counsel in the months and years ahead.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, at present there are a number of bills before Congress providing for different ways to revise or replace the draft. In the course of the current national debate on this issue, I have been especially interested in hearing the views of our diverse religious communities about the draft. Recently, a statement drawn up by the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ was brought to my attention. The statement is a thoughtfully constructed document which raises a number of fundamental ethical and moral questions about the Selective Service System and concludes that the System should be discontinued. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the council's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

(NOTE.—Statement adopted by the Council for Christian Social Action and approved in principle by the Board for Homeland Ministries and the Council for Church and Ministry. The latter organizations have authorized their officers to join with other instrumentalities in a recommendation that a similar statement be adopted as a pronouncement by the General Synod.)

Recognizing that the Selective Service System raises many issues of justice and of the rights and responsibilities of all citizens, the Council for Christian Social Action adopts the following statement and recommends it for adoption by the Seventh General Synod. The reasoning in this proposal leads to three major conclusions: (1) that we return to our historic policy of voluntary armed forces; (2) that Selective Service be invoked only in times of national emergency so declared by the Congress; and (3) that the Selective Service System be revised to eliminate its many inequities.

I. THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

The Christian Church, directed by its Lord to seek both peace and justice, knows that both require costly efforts. In the present world, armies and military establishments are one method by which nations seek to protect themselves and fulfill international obligations. Christians hope and work for a world in which old methods of military coercion and threat will give way to more peaceable methods of establishing world order. But so long as nations maintain armies, their ways of doing so raise major issues of justice, which are the concern of the Church.

Any society must find ways of distributing its burdens among its people. Christian faith knows that, whether voluntarily or by necessity, men are members of one another. Scripture and experience lead us to reject any individualism that ignores the responsibility every man has to society and any collectivism that regards persons only as instruments of the society. Government is one method by which society tries to harmonize the demands upon the individual and the securing of his freedoms. A people concerned for justice seeks the best governmental devices for sharing the costs and duties of society, allowing the maximum interaction of personal freedom and social responsibility. In this process the Church has a special responsibility, coming directly from Christ, to champion the poor, victims of prejudice, and all those whom society is likely to ignore or silence. Faithfulness to God and concern for men require us to seek justice for all.

II. THE RESTRICTION OF CONSCRIPTION TO NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

Throughout their history the American people have regarded military conscription as an emergency measure for times of national crisis. Many of the citizens of this nation, emigrating from European countries where conscription was in effect, found one of the evidences of American democratic freedom to be the absence of compulsory military service.

Now the once exceptional practice has become the routine. For more than a quarter of a century (with a hiatus in 1947–1948) the United States has been drafting citizens for military service.

We challenge the use of the draft as normal public policy. We ask for a return to the American tradition which regarded conscription as an emergency device.

We do not here maintain that there should never be a military draft. Conscription has been used in our national history, with overwhelming public approval, as a method of assigning manpower during times of crisis. But we believe that the military draft is not part of a normal way of life, and we concur with those today who think there are better ways of meeting national responsibilities. The only justification for Selective Service is an emergency that requires the exceptional mobilization of the nation's resources and manpower—an emergency to be determined not by executive fiat but through a declaration by the Congress as the major representative voice of the American people.

We offer two reasons for our stand:

1. Military conscription is an infringement on personal freedom, justifiable only in times of national crisis. It is more drastic than governmental appropriation of property; it appropriates the person, not merely his property. It deprives him of the freedom to choose his place and way of earning a living. It subjects him to a system in which his behavior, for obvious reasons, is largely prescribed. It subjects him to risks, sometimes to the virtual certainty of death. It commands him to do things, including the killing of other men, that he may believe to be morally offensive.

To say this is not to pass judgment on men who thoughtfully choose to enter military service. On the contrary, we recognize that those who freely serve in the armed forces have helped to safeguard our own freedom and that of others as well. But conscription (with its implication that men are not likely to serve without compulsion) takes away from the dignity of the conscientious volunteer. It lets society avoid facing its obligation to pay fairly for the service it expects from some.

2. A selective draft is inherently unfair. It requires an immense service, perhaps including death, of some men while leaving others free to choose their own goals and ways of life. We recognize that men have social responsibilities and that society must sometimes impose the fulfillment of those responsibilities. But in the case of the draft the imposition is capricious. Therefore, any selective service system is justifiable only in an emergency democratically determined by the people's representatives.

For these reasons we urge a return to the American tradition in which the draft is the exception rather than the normal procedure.

III. REFORM OF THE PRESENT SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

When conscription is declared necessary, the Selective Service System should be organized and administered within the framework of principles which are consistent with the theological and historical considerations referred to above.

Among these principles are the following:

1. Every attempt should be made to eliminate the prolonged uncertainty every draft-

eligible young man faces between the ages of 19 and 26. A method should be devised which provides maximum opportunity for the registrant to be free to plan his education and/or career without fear of interruption by immediate induction. The proposal to reverse the present order of call from the induction of the oldest first to the youngest seems to be consistent with this principle.

2. The system of selection should eliminate the recent inequities of the present policy where the final determination varies greatly among local draft boards. We believe that the most equitable method of following the principle is a system of impartial random selection on a national basis.*

A greater degree of uniformity should be provided in the law as to procedures, regulations, and guidelines for classification of registrants. The rationale for the highly decentralized system which puts complete power of determining the draft status of registrants in the hands of local boards is based on the assumption that local boards know the registrants personally. This is wholly unrealistic in today's highly urbanized society.

3. Deferments of students should be limited to eliminate their becoming a means of complete evasion of or exemption from military responsibility.

4. Revision should be made in the present Selective Service System to eliminate from its operation all elements which have the effect of discriminating against those of a particular race or economic class. For example, membership on all local and appeal boards should reflect the economic and ethnic composition of the community and area they serve.

5. Under no circumstances should the draft be used as an instrument for discouraging dissent or protest against the political, social, economic, or military policies of the government, nor should military service be used as punishment for such activities.

6. Deferments of young men because of their occupations should be discontinued.

7. Exemptions of clergy, ministerial and pre-ministerial students should be repealed.

8. Every attempt should be made to revise the Selective Service law to eliminate the many procedural inequities which presently exist.

Specifically, the law should do the following:

(a) Provide for the publication of an informative and readable booklet detailing the legal rights as well as the responsibilities of registrants and the procedures of the system—to be distributed at government expense to all registrants;

(b) Allow the registrant's lawyers to appear with him at a fair hearing on any decision affecting his rights and on any appeal decision. It should give fair notice of the action proposed to be taken at all such hearings; permit counsel to participate fully, to call and examine witnesses and to confront all adverse evidence; and cause a record of the entire proceedings to be made for the purpose of appeal or judicial review;

(c) Provide for legal services (as by a pool of lawyers) to registrants, similar to the public defender system;

(d) Subject decisions of the Selective Service System to scrutiny in judicial review by the normal standards which require that administrative determinations be supported by some substantial evidence in the record to sustain a test of their validity and lawfulness in the courts; and

(e) Permit a registrant to seek such judicial review before being ordered to report for induction. He should not need to wait until the government has either inducted him—possibly wrongly—or charged him with a crime in order to test the validity of the Selective Service determination.

CONCLUSION

The present Selective Service System is in need of drastic revision if even minimum safeguards are to be obtained, not only to protect individual freedom but also to provide for national security. In recognition of this need, we call upon our members, churches, and Conferences to urge the United States Congress to work immediately toward reform of the present Selective Service System along the lines suggested here and to work for the return to our historic policy of voluntary armed forces and toward the abolition of conscription except in times of Congressionally declared national emergency.

THE FAMILY—THE BASIC UNIT OF STABILITY OF SOCIETY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the basic unit of stability in our society is still the family. The influence of the home, either negative or positive, can be seen in a person as he assumes his role in society. A first step, therefore, in ensuring the responsible growth of an individual is through fortifying the family unit.

In Minneapolis, an innovative program is being conducted with a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The parent and child center is designed to prepare poverty area preschoolers for school. This center, however, is operating on the premise that the family group forms the personality of the child. With this in mind, the project attempts to have programs for everyone in the family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Minneapolis Tribune which describes how this center is attempting to help the "nonvocal" poor without the discouraging presence of bureaucratic redtape.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS SOCIAL CENTER TAKES FAMILIES AT THEIR WORD: THEY GET HELP WITHOUT REDTAPE

(By Marilyn Becerra)

Fifteen north Minneapolis families are involved in a radical experiment—a social service agency is taking them at their word.

They don't have to fill out forms in triplicate to get a check.

Mrs. Margaret Douglas, director of the two-month-old Parent and Child Center, said the project, headquartered at 302 Girard Terr. N., is run not by "program directives" but by "feeling."

Home workers and other staff members—even the custodian who spends much of his time in his downstairs workshop building toys for the children—were hired because they possess what she calls "that special feeling" for people.

The project, which has a $175,000 Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) grant, is a head start for the Headstart program, designed to prepare poverty-area pre-schoolers for school.

There are 36 Parent and Child centers in the United States, each with different types of problems. One is on a South Dakota Indian reservation, one on a Hawaiian island, one in an Alaskan fishing village.

Each center had to choose a number of families who met the required guidelines: A child under 3 years of age and a poverty-level of income.

But Mrs. Douglas chose to push a step further. She decided to help only families that have been shifted from agency to agency to solve their many problems and they compose what she calls the "non-vocal poor."

They are the ones who don't complain, don't demonstrate and thus rarely get the help they need, she said.

So far, 15 families are involved in the program here. Eventually there will be 45. Mrs. Douglas has hired three homeworkers, each one responsible for five families.

She hopes to maintain that low ratio of families to workers so each worker can spend one day a week in each home and so the family members and the workers can get to know and trust one another.

In its first couple of months, the center has not set up all of the formal programs it eventually hopes to offer, but that failure, Mrs. Douglas said, stems from the fact that "we've been too busy dealing with emergencies.

"For example:

They had to get medical attention for a Mexican-American family. The entire family seemed to be afflicted with "a strange kind of worm. We couldn't find a cure at first. But finally we did." Mrs. Douglas said. Now the family members are being tutored. The wife and children spoke no English, the husband only a little.

They got food for an AFDC (Aid to Families With Dependent Children) mother and her children.

They stopped a probation officer from putting one of the fathers in jail because he was an alcoholic. "He's not. He drinks too much sometimes. That's his release. We all have one," Mrs. Douglas said.

The point of the whole program is to help the children but the only way to do that is to help the parents too, Mrs. Douglas said.

She said she doesn't believe in making value or moral judgments about people's lives. The staff accepts the families as they are and tries to help from there.

She's critical of other agencies because often their only interest is in "solving the problem quickly." Often it's not the right solution, especially when it breaks up the family.

Mrs. Douglas believes in the family as a unit—at least she believes in what she called "an old fashioned family," a family that is close-knit, whose members do things together, have trust in and love for one another.

What does that have to do with giving a child a head start for Headstart?

"The family group forms the personality of the child," she said.

That's why the program attempts to have something for everyone in the family—to try to bring them together, Mrs. Douglas said.

There's an after-school program for teenagers and children, sewing instruction for the mothers and "we've done anything to get the fathers interested—card games, things they like to do."

Camping trips and picnics and baseball games (mothers and daughters against fathers and sons) are planned for next summer.

"In most of these families the members function as individuals, not as a group," she said.

What Mrs. Douglas would like to do is show them they can do both.

Under the OEO grant, each family has $600 available for whatever it needs. Once the money is used for food, clothes, furniture, medical bills, the family members have to pay it back by working at $2 an hour at the center.

One of the fathers has proved so helpful he's been hired full-time, Mrs. Douglas said.

To help pay for the recreational activities, the families would like to find a store front on Broadway to sell some of the furniture and canned food that has been donated.

The participating families could purchase the items by work at the center. Others could buy it "cheap," Mrs. Douglas said.

---

*Such was recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service (Marshall Commission).

Mrs. Douglas said she won't judge the success of the program by whether it creates major revolutions. "If a mother who didn't ever wash her dishes starts washing them every day, then we have succeeded," she said.

She discounts the argument that the center is "holding people's hands too much."

"It's like a child going to school. At first he achieves for his parents—then, later for himself," she said.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES FOR RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, articles in Washington newspapers recently said that the railroad industry, through the Association of American Railroads, has announced that it will ask for direct Government subsidies for the operation of passenger service. The subsidies would be used only to "make up the losses on passenger trains the railroads are forced to continue running by the Interstate Commerce Commission," according to one article, and would not support operations which show a profit or break even.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse consideration of the railroads' request.

The question of Federal subsidy should be considered as a part of a study of transportation policy. If the continued operation of passenger service in certain parts of the Nation is deemed to be vital to the health of the communities served, and if it can be demonstrated that there is an actual loss to the railroad, then perhaps a subsidy is the answer.

The key is full disclosure by the railroad, not only of its claimed losses on passenger service, but of its entire financial structure, nonoperating income, ownership, investments, subsidiary operations, tax benefits, and so forth. Only full disclosure will dispel the confusion that has prevailed over what constitutes an actual loss. The railroads, in requesting Interstate Commerce Commission approval of discontinuances, have claimed losses which have been subject to question. We must reach agreement with the railroads on the assignment of costs and we cannot do that until we have all the facts.

Further, the study of whether or not to subsidize passenger train service should focus on the service itself. Is a subsidy sought by a railroad whose losses occur because the service has been inconvenient, uncomfortable and slow, or is help needed because despite excellent service there is just not enough traffic?

Mr. President, I think that consideration by the Congress of the question of rail passenger subsidies would present an opportunity to the railroads to put their cards on the table so that we can intelligently determine what our policy should be.

THE ABM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several recent articles and an editorial concerning President Nixon's recommendation for the deployment of a modified version of the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile defense system be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

CAPABILITY OF A FIRST STRIKE ADJUDGED REAL RUSSIAN AIM

The unspoken but primary reason for the President's ABM decision was chillingly simple. The review group led by Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard was driven to conclude that a nuclear "first strike capability" is the real Soviet strategic aim.

In the Pentagon jargon, a "first strike capability" is the power to wreak such complete destruction that the other side is unable to deliver an effective counterstrike. Former Secretary of Defense Robert A. McNamara always used to contend that a true first strike capability could never be achieved by either of the giant powers, because a fearful counterstrike could never be averted.

But Deputy Secretary Packard does not share the brilliant McNamara's highly questionable conviction that Soviet marshals must use computers and measure acceptable damages exactly as he does. Hence Packard judged the Soviet aim, not by theoretical calculations, but by the harder evidence of Soviet actions to date.

The troubling feature of Soviet actions to date is the very heavy, very costly emphasis that is being placed on "counter-force" weapons. These are, quite simply, weapons mainly or exclusively designed to destroy the several components of the U.S. strategic striking force. If you have enough counter-force weapons, and they work, you then have a first strike capability—for there is then no need to fear a counterstrike.

Three main counter-force weapons, each carefully tailored to one of our three types of offensive weapons, are being intensively produced by the Soviets. The first, aimed at our Polaris submarines, is the nuclear-powered and extremely speedy SSN attack submarine. These are being added to the big existing Soviet submarine fleet, numbering above 200, at the rate of at least one a month.

Our Polaris fleet numbers only 41, of which no more than 30 can be continuously at sea. In a few years, a situation can too easily arise in which each of our Polaris submarines will be continuously shadowed by one or more Soviet SSN submarines. If this happens, of course, the Polaris fleet will be largely neutralized.

Oddly enough, the second of the Soviets' counter-force weapons appears to be their equivalent of the Polaris—the submarines of the Yankee type, also nuclear-powered and carrying a nuclear ballistic missile with a range of about 1500 miles. The evidence indicates that these submarines of the Yankee type, which are also coming off the ways at a high rate, are mainly designed to frustrate the FOBS early warning system that now protects our B–52 bases.

They could do this by throwing their missiles from fairly close inshore—say 500 miles. A sudden, simultaneous attack of this sort, aimed at the B–52 bases, would knock out all B–52s not on airborne alert. Thus, FOBS would become nearly useless.

Finally, the very large and continuously growing Soviet panoply of intercontinental ballistic missiles, all nowadays in hardened silos, also has a strong and growing counter-force component. This comprises SS9 missiles. There are already 200 of these outsize ICBSs, carrying triple warheads with a total power of around 25 megatons.

The SS9s are quite clearly designed to destroy our Minutemen missiles, which they are strong enough to do. At the present rate of deployment, the Soviets will have one SS9 warhead per Minuteman in two or three years time. Overall, by 1975, they will have an array of all three of their counter-force weapons quite powerful enough to give them some exceedingly worrying ideas.

Nor is that the end of the story. No counter-force weapon can ever be 100 per cent effective. B–52s on airborn alert will always escape. A few Polarises and Minutemen will always escape, too, however, complete the surprise. But a defensive system, ineffective against a heavy and multiple attack, can be made highly effective by greatly lightening the weight of the attack.

The counter-force weapons, in short, are clearly designed to work in conjunction with the Soviet defensive weapons. These are the vast anti-air defense systems known as Talinin, plus the new ABM system that the Soviets are now deploying.

As to Soviet measurements of acceptable damage after a first strike, it is well to remember Robert Conquest's unchallenged computations. According to Conquest, in peacetime, in the purges of the 30's, Stalin directly or indirectly murdered 20 million people, or rather more than one-tenth of the population of the U.S.S.R.

It can be seen, then, why Packard finally recommended some Sentinel protection for our Minutemen, in order to neutralize at least a part of the counter-force weapons the Soviets are building.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 15, 1969]

NIXON PUTS SAFETY OF UNITED STATES FIRST

President Nixon has boldly told the world and the peace-at-any-price people in this country he puts the safety of the United States first. At the same time he insisted this is a move for peace—for without our safety there will be no peace.

His decision to go ahead with the deployment of an ABM system, known as the Sentinel, with important changes, announced at yesterday's press conference, he described as a protection of our nuclear deterrent. As such it is designed to prevent, not encourage, war. It will help preserve the peace.

He admitted frankly that the ABM deployment faces a hard fight in Congress—particularly in the Senate. But he expects to win the fight after the issue has been thoroughly debated.

And so Nixon has come to grips firmly with his first major problem in foreign policy. In addition, he showed himself determined to deal equally firmly with the Vietnam war, now being escalated by the Communists of the North and the Viet Cong, Hanoi's front in the South. He told the press that his practice is not to repeat a warning. His warning delivered a week ago was he would take "appropriate" steps. What action he will take in response to the present Communist offensive he declined to reveal at this time, and if he retaliates he will do so without announcing his move in advance. He still believes the Paris talks will be effective and produce peace in the end.

He announced he proposed to deploy the Sentinel ABM not around our cities, as provided in the Lyndon Johnson proposal enacted by Congress last year, but in country areas; that it will be a "phased" system rather than a fixed one, subject to annual review, designed particularly as a defense against a possible Chinese Communist attack during the next ten years, but having its implications for the Russian Communists, too.

In a measure, Nixon has departed from precedent, for the history of the United States since World War I and the days of Woodrow Wilson has been a series of magnificent gestures for world peace. Wilson's League of Nations, though rejected, by a group of hard-nosed members of the Senate, was the first.

In every instance real peace has been blocked by Fascists, Communists, and whatever, down to the present day. This, how-

XUM

ever, has not prevented America's search for the most elusive bird in the world—the bird of peace.

President Harding, who followed Wilson in the White House, called the Washington Arms Conference, designed to put an end to wars through the limitation of naval armaments. The strong nations of the world were urged to limit or do away with those naval vessels used for offensive war.

No one who was present at the opening of the Washington Arms Conference will ever forget the moment when Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes announced the intention of the United States to do away with and to halt building the greatest and most powerful Navy the world has ever seen, as its earnest of peaceful intentions. It was indeed, a magnificent gesture—but doomed in the end to failure. Calvin Coolidge and his Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, did their best too for peaceful international agreements.

Although the German Kaiser passed out of the picture and a National Socialist republic was set up in Germany, the war hounds came to the front again when Adolph Hitler grasped power, overthrowing the government and setting the Germans on another effort to conquer the world. The great depression hit the world, including the United States, and we had other things to think of beside world peace.

We were rudely jolted, along with the rest of the world, when Hitler finally made his move and with air power, panzer divisions and submarines overran Belgium and France and struck terribly at Great Britain.

Franklin D. Roosevelt at Yalta made his plays for peace after war, conceding much to Stalin at that conference and to the Russians when he held back and permitted them to take Berlin.

Harry S. Truman hosted the United Nations conference in San Francisco where the charter was written which was to establish world peace. He later sponsored the Marshall plan under which we poured out billions of dollars to permit the warring nations, both friend and foe to rebuild. And to prevent a third world war Truman refused to let our air forces bomb the Chinese Communists and their supplies beyond the Yalu River in the Korean war.

Gen. Eisenhower was a persistent searcher for peace—and he kept it. He held back, however, from rooting out Castro in Cuba allowing the Communists a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. John F. Kennedy followed suit. Lyndon Johnson sought peace in Vietnam always, although building up our forces there, even to the extent of withdrawing from the presidential race in 1968.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

ON HONEYMOONS AND ABM'S

Far be it from us to set ourselves up as marriage counselors to the Nixon Administration and its liberal Democratic opposition. We never had very high hopes for the match in the first place, and that has not just to do with the principals in question, but also with the nature of that strange phenomenon known as the "political honeymoon." For to the extent that political honeymoons actually do exist, they seem to be even more artificially contrived and disaster-prone than the real kind. Moreover—and more important—they aren't really honeymoons at all, being more in the way of political breathing spells, unilaterally declared and unilaterally terminated by a lot of people who have just lost an election and who never did think much of the people who won it.

To be sure, simple decency suggests that it is not cricket to engage a new President in battle while he is still hanging his pictures on the wall. But the honeymoon metaphor, suggesting as it does an arrangement based on mutual consent—not to say on actual romance—can be pushed too far. And in our view, it has been by those most disappointed in the President's decision to deploy a modified version of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system. Each day, it seems, a new voice is added to the chorus protesting that the President's gravest error was in deciding the issue in such a way as to force the end of the honeymoon he was enjoying with themselves and with the American people.

We have a lot more respect for the people who are making this argument than we do for the argument itself; it seems to us to represent at once a weakening of their case and a useless diversion from it. In the first place, there is something highly contrived in the assertion. It may well be that Mr. Nixon's political opposition can and will and even should work to keep the ABM issue before the public and to mobilize support for their position. But their decision should not be made to sound such an involuntary, more-in-sorrow response to overwhelming public discontent or to the dashing of their own hopes. It might have been more to the point for Mr. Nixon's critics to suggest that they meant to develop and direct such discontent in a cause they regard as critically important.

Nor do disappointment or disillusionment seem very fitting terms in which to explain their termination of a period of political neutrality. The grounds for both emotions are shaky indeed. Mr. Nixon, during the campaign, professed himself an ardent supporter of the Sentinel deployment and strongly suggested both that the Johnson Administration had been tardy in proposing it and that he viewed it as a judicious first step toward a much larger system. In office, he not only encouraged more open debate on the subject than there had been in the previous Administration, but he also listened to what the debaters were saying. One Democratic President and two Democratic Secretaries of Defense endorsed the Sentinel system for deployment around a number of U.S. cities. Now, a Republican President who was committed to the expansion of that system has taken steps to curtail its originally planned development and to limit its potential for provocation abroad. The critics wished him to abandon the Johnson Administration's project altogether, or to recast it in terms of research and development only. Mr. Nixon did not follow their prescription, but he did take real steps to limit the program and to create the conditions for intelligent oversight of its growth. That hardly seems grounds for divorce.

There is much that is tenuous and arguable and also ill-considered in the Administration's explanation of what its modified Sentinel program is about. As the Administration is called upon to make its case before Congress and elsewhere in the coming days and weeks, all this is likely to present itself to view. But those who have set about opposing the President's decision will never be able to do so effectively so long as they are disposed to disregard the meaning of that decision in terms of the choices available to the President, the actual import of the one he made, and the direction in which it is likely to take us.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the March 21 and March 24 Washington Daily News "Crime Clock." I again invite attention to the fact that most of these crimes involve the use of firearms.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME CLOCK

Here is The Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today, March 21, 1969.

10 a.m.: Ann Sweeney, 37, white, a cashier-clerk at Catholic University said a Negro man came to the cashier's window, and after asking whether he could cash a check, pulled a note from his pocket. The note said, "This is a holdup, give me the money and no one will get hurt," and the man escaped with $1,524 in cash.

2:35 p.m.: James Fitzpatrick, 70, white, was in the hallway of 2804 14th-st nw, when a Negro gunman placed a pistol in his back and demanded money. The bandit took $165.

2:45 p.m.: James Brewster, 19, Negro, of Northeast, a clerk in the Safeway store at 3220 Pennsylvania-av se, said a Negro man, who had several items with him in the checkout line, pulled a gun and said, "Put it all in the bag." He got an unknown amount of cash.

3:40 p.m.: Akel Feriozi, white, of McLean, owner of the Capitol Shoe Store, 1415 U-st nw, was robbed of $40 at gunpoint by two Negro holdupmen.

7:20 p.m.: Betty Settles, 30, Negro, clerk at a High's store at 80 Upshur-st nw, was held up by two armed Negro bandits, who got an unknown amount of money.

8:50 p.m.: John Torreulla, 21, Negro, attendant at the Chevron gas station, 4925 South Dakota-av ne, lost an undetermined amount of money to a lone Negro bandit, carrying an automatic pistol.

8:55 p.m.: Roy Bowling, 30, white, manager of a Safeway at 1730 Hamlin-st ne, said three Negroes, all armed with pistols took an undetermined amount of money from the store.

CRIME CLOCK

Here is The Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today.

6:45 p.m.—David Scott, 13, Negro, was at 15th and K streets ne when he was grabbed by a group of Negro youths, knocked to the ground and robbed of 25 cents.

9:45 p.m.—Allbertine Vasquez, 27, white, was at Ninth and Farragut streets nw when five Negroe teen-agers grabbed her purse containing $5.

9:45 p.m.—Ella Grayson, 42, Negro, was beaten and robbed by a Negro at the intersection of 14th and Harvard streets nw. He took her purse.

10:00 p.m.—Mrs. Lillie Peterson, 51, Negro, was robbed of $300 in the parking lot at 301 Rhode Island-av nw by two Negro men, one of whom had his hand in his pocket as if he had a gun.

10:05 p.m.—Ella Robinson, 46, Negro, was shot four times in the left side at 912 12th-st ne by an unknown Negro man.

12:00 midnight—Andrew Treadwell, 49, Negro, was near his 11th-st nw home when three Negro men beat him and took his watch and wallet containing $60.

12:15 a.m.—Carlos E. Chavez and Eric R. Rivas, both white, were walking at Georgia and Farragut avenues nw when they were stopped by three Negroes, one armed with a gun, and robbed of $15.

12:45 a.m.—LaVerne Jones, 18, a clerk at a sandwich shop at 3010 Georgia-av nw was robbed of $50 by two Negroes, one armed with a sawed-off shotgun.

1:35 a.m.—Curtis Roberts, 27, Negro, was at the Union Grill, 6th and G streets nw when he was robbed by three Negro women, one armed with a gun, of $75.

3:00 a.m.—James F. Boggs, 24, white, of Arlington, was sitting in his car in the 1600 block of 17th-st nw when four Negro men opened the door and punched him in the face and took his wallet containing personal papers and $1.

MOST YOUNG AMERICANS HAVE WHOLESOME VALUES—RALLY IN MIAMI IS LAUDED—VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER IS PRAISED—NEW MOVEMENT NEEDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was with genuine delight that I read in the Washington Post today of the rally in Miami, Fla., that attracted 30,000 young people to crusade for decency in entertainment.

Under the leadership of Mike Levesque, a 17-year-old Miami high school student, the rally was a strong protest against the obscene and the vulgar that some misguided individuals would try to make a dominant part of the teenage culture. The outpouring at Miami was strong evidence that a large number of our young people believe their lives can be meaningful and their leisure entertaining without crude obscenity.

It is far too infrequently that we hear of this kind of protest against the popular notion that today's youth consists solely of drug-taking anarchists. In fact, Mr. President, I am convinced that the opposite is the truth and the outpouring of this recent protest gives expression to what is really in the hearts of the vast majority of our young citizens.

Most of our youth accept the decent, wholesome values that are at the foundation of our American way of life and are repelled by the antics of some of their contemporaries. This wholesomeness of the majority needs to surface into full public view, and I sense on college campuses a growing mood to counterbalance the disruptive tactics of the minority by a more vigorous expression of the feelings of the majority.

I only hope that they will be given an equal opportunity to tell their story.

Such is not always the case. Only a month ago I was privileged to be one of 2,400 people attending a banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and heard a moving address by Miss Debra D. George, of Wyoming, who is this year's winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy Contest. Miss George expressed what I believe comes close to being the true feelings of most of America's young people. But the next day I could not find a single report of the words of this admirable young lady in any of the news media.

It is time that the majority had its say, and I believe that what it has to say will prove to be reassuring about our youth. The rally of 30,000 young men and young women and teenagers in the cause of decency should be just the first step in a new movement that I hope will sweep the Nation.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to an article by Mr. Stephen M. Aug in the Washington Star, Sunday, March 9, 1969. The article, "Foreign Trade Zones Spark Lively Controversy," presents an unbiased and highly informative account of the purpose and history of foreign trade zones. It is especially useful for the light it sheds on the controversy over the proposed foreign trade zone at Machiasport, Maine.

Mr. Aug's article is a fine example of balanced reporting. I commend it to any Senator who would increase his understanding of the issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES SPARK LIVELY CONTROVERSY

(By Stephen M. Aug)

This country's business map is dotted with small business enclaves which have a peculiar status in the trading world. They are known as "foreign trade zones" and a new one is currently the center of one of the liveliest controversies in years.

These little Hong Kongs—they aren't new, as a matter of fact they date back to 1937—work something like this:

In one in Toledo, Ohio, a businessman imports foreign trucks and turns them into campers for sale in the U.S. He uses American labor and parts, and the conversion from trucks to passenger vehicles allows him to import at lower duties: 5 percent for passenger cars as opposed to 25 percent for trucks. He also reduces gold outflow by doing the conversion here rather than ordering from abroad.

In New York a pharmaceutical firm imports raw materials—mostly chemicals—and makes pharmaceutical products. It then exports these with a respected "Made in USA" label. Thus, it pays no import taxes and can compete more effectively with foreign drug firms in foreign markets. At the same time it uses American labor, some domestic materials, and standard U.S. quality control.

A growing number of American businesses—more than 1,000 last year—are utilizing these zones. They are scattered over seven cities. Only when the goods move from the zone—generally a fenced-in area which includes warehouses and frequently factories—into the U.S. proper is duty charged.

THEY'RE INTERNATIONAL

Such zones offer the advantages of U.S.-based operations, and at the same time many advantages usually credited to overseas locations.

Among the advantages are:

Manufacturing here for export items which include foreign materials which otherwise would be subject to import taxes or quota restrictions.

Reducing the outflow of gold because raw materials are imported rather than finished goods, and domestic labor can produce the finished product.

Lower customs duties on goods produced in the zone. This can result from lower duties on parts rather than higher duties on finished products.

There are such zones all over the world—but in this country they were made possible under a 1934 law. The first was set up in 1937 in New York City, and still is operating. Others are at New Orleans, San Francisco, Seattle, Toledo, Honolulu and Mayaguez, P.R. Zones have been authorized also for Bay County, Michigan; Bayonne, N.J., and subzones at Taft, La., and New Orleans.

Each zone must be approved by the Commerce Department's Foreign Trade Zone Board—perhaps the government's smallest regulatory agency. The three-member board consists of the Secretary of Commerce, who is chairman, and secretaries of the Treasury and Army.

Applications are pending for new zones or subzones at Portland and Machiasport, Maine; Honolulu and Savannah, Ga. The Honolulu, Savannah and Machiasport installations would include oil processing facilities as a way of circumventing oil import quotas.

The use of these zones has increased slowly over the years—but they had not aroused much controversy until last September when Maine applied to the board for a new zone at Portland. Included would be a subzone at Machiasport, a small southeastern Maine community that achieved a moment of fame in 1775 when a British ship was captured nearby in what is considered the first naval battle of the American Revolution.

The latest war, however, is with the major oil companies. For Maine has an agreement with Occidental Petroleum Corp. to place a $145 million refinery at Machiasport capable of producing 300,000 barrels of petroleum products, gasoline and heating oil daily. It would be the first trade zone in this country to have an oil refinery—and Occidental's only U.S. refinery.

The major oil producers have mounted a sufficiently powerful campaign not only to stop immediate consideration of the zone by the board, but also to force President Nixon to announce a full White House review of oil import policies. The President last month also took from the Interior Department direct control over oil import policies until completion of the study.

The Occidental plan is a source of grief to the oil companies for principally two reasons:

The companies believe that if the zone is approved others will follow. The result, they fear, will be to wreck the present oil import quota policy. At least one estimate has it that imported oil is a source of about $500 million worth of additional profits to the oil industry annually.

The major companies serving New England feel Occidental may cut prices so low on the products it refines at Machiasport as to make their marketing problems immense. Occidental has promised a 10 percent lower price on heating oil. One oil industry source estimates the New England petroleum market at about 300,000 barrels of products a day into which Occidental would pump at least 100,000 from Machiasport. The same source estimates the market to be worth $15 million daily in gross receipts.

REAL PROBLEMS

Both problems could be very real. Most major companies remember that Hess Oil and Chemical Co. has a quota for only 15,000 barrels a day from its Virgin Islands refinery—the islands are essentially a free trade zone. Some of these products are sold here at prices much lower than those of major companies.

Further, the Steuart Petroleum Co. wants to establish a zone at Piney Point, Md., for a $40 million refinery. This would produce, among other things, low sulphur-content oil for power plants. Low sulphur oil does not pollute the air when burned as much as high sulphur oil—and federal standards now require oil to be desulphurized. The cost of this process is about 40 cents a barrel.

The Steuart facility would refine a low-grade oil into a so-called residual oil, which is used for power plants and heating large buildings. Residual oil—the finished product—may be imported on a consumption basis, virtually with no quota. But the crude from which it is made requires a quota. Since residual oil is too inexpensive to justify carrying it great distances it is generally unloaded close to where it is consumed.

Any oil that is produced domestically must be transported in U.S. flag vessels. Such transportation charges are considerably higher than for transportation in foreign vessels.

As a result, dealers like Steuart, forced to seek lower-priced desulphurized oil, are soon going to be hard put to compete with new foreign refineries being built close by. One, a 300,000-barrel-a-day facility, is being built by New England Refining Co. at Freeport in the Bahama Islands.

New England Refining has already begun soliciting business for its low-sulphur Libyan residual oil among domestic consumers along the East Coast. Those solicited include Po-

XUM

tomac Electric Power Co. which consumes about one million barrels a year.

Proponents of the foreign trade zone idea for oil refineries list two supporting reasons:

National security. If foreign oil sources were suddenly shut off—as they were briefly during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war—the nation would have added refinery capacity to process domestic crude oil.

Balance of payments. The zones would not import all of their oil into this country, but would process some of it for export using U.S. labor. Further, there would be less need to import finished petroleum products.

NEEDS REFINERY

Maine says it needs the Machiasport refinery because there are no refineries in New England. As a result fuel costs—for both electric power plants and home heating—are high. One effect is that industry has not located in New England because it doesn't want to pay high electric power costs.

The Gulf Oil Corp. which has about 8 percent of the New England market, has been one of the most vocal opponents. It contends that sending oil from Machiasport to Providence, R.I., for example, would cost as much as sending oil from existing Gulf refineries at New York and Philadelphia to Providence, and therefore Occidental could not serve New England any more economically than could Gulf.

Gulf contends also that prices dealers pay in New England for home heating oil have been lower than the U.S. average five out of the past six years—they were higher in 1968. But consumer prices have consistently been higher than the U.S. average at least since 1961. In 1968 they were about 6 percent higher.

The price of home heating oil is vital in New England where winters are cold and long. Occidental's output would include 90,000 barrels of heating oil daily and 10,000 of gasoline.

The proponents of the project also contend that having the trade zone at Machiasport could open the way for industrial development by providing a convenient source of low-sulphur fuel for new electric plants and factories.

For its part, Occidental needs a refinery in this country as well as a hefty import quota if it is to market here its big find of very low sulphur content oil in the Libyan desert.

Occidental's problem, therefore, is a product without a U.S. market—unless it sells the oil to another producer. It has two refineries in Germany and one in Belgium producing a total of 100,000 barrels a day.

Under the complicated system of oil import quotas in this country, any refinery is entitled to import 19.5 percent of the first 10,000 barrels of its refinery capacity, 11 percent of the next 20,000, 7 percent of the next 70,000 and 3 percent of everything over 100,000. On this basis Occidental's quota would be 15,050 barrels a day. That's not much to keep a 300,000 barrel-a-day plant going. Additional crude oil would have to be bought domestically.

TWO QUOTA TYPES

Under the trade zone proposal, Occidental would seek Interior Department permission to import 100,000 barrels a day from the zone into New England. Of the other 200,000 barrels, about 110,000 would be refined and exported to foreign markets and 90,000 barrels of residual oil would go to satellite power plants and other factories which could process it into chemicals.

Under present policies there are two types of quotas: one for crude oil and one for finished products such as gasoline, kerosene, jet fuel and the like. Residual oil may be imported on the basis of consumption.

Gulf, for example, imports 40,000 barrels a day of crude and unfinished products and 1,900 barrels of finished products.

East of the Rocky Mountains about 122 companies share in what amounts to a quota of about 600,000 barrels of crude a day. The Machiasport plant would consume 100,000 barrels of this which would have to come out of everybody else's quota. This assumes the Interior Department would approve the 100,000-barrel requested quota which some say is unlikely.

The loss of 100,000 barrels a day from the import quota would mean the loss of about $45.6 million a year to other companies. That's figured on $1.25 a barrel—the price differential by which domestic crude is that much more costly than foreign crude.

The reasons for the higher cost include more expensive transportation for domestic oil in U.S. ships, state restrictions on well flow, and the vast number of wells dotting U.S. oilfields. Middle eastern fields have fewer wells that flow at greater levels.

Last year, according to the Independent Petroleum Association of America, oil imports, mostly on the East Coast, totaled 463,550,000 barrels of crude. At $1.25 a barrel that's a $579,437,500 saving for the oil companies over the cost of domestic oil.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. DAVID S. BLACK

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Mr. David S. Black, former Under Secretary of Interior, recently addressed the convention of the Soap and Detergent Association on the necessary partnership between Government and industry in the control of water pollution. It is an excellent speech and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Black comments:

> Expediency and short-range economics often have the upper hand over reasoned and rational deliberation of values, alternatives, and consequences.

This is a particularly timely point in light of the consequences of the Government's decision to grant oil drilling leases in the Santa Barbara Channel.

It must be the duty of the Government to assure that a proper balance among conflicting values is maintained, but the job of Government will be easier if the industrial community exerts responsible control over itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Black's speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. DAVID S. BLACK, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF INTERIOR, AT THE SOAP AND DETERGENT ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 23, 1969

I don't know if the invitation to address this meeting (which I received prior to the election) was extended on condition that when January 23rd rolled around I would still be Under Secretary of the Interior. And I haven't inquired. I can assure you that it was my desire to appear in that capacity. But, I was deprived of my title through the conspiracy of an obscure group of individuals known as the Electoral College. I suppose I should have demonstrated the good grace to step aside and make room on the program for someone whose views might still influence the Federal water pollution control program. But for some reason my speaking invitations fell off rather sharply along about the second week in November, and I decided I'd try to hold onto this one.

As Under Secretary I have been keenly interested in Interior's vastly important water pollution control program. I have worked with Charlie Bueltman in connection with the Joint Task Force on Eutrophication. I have become increasingly aware of the responsible efforts by the Soap and Detergent Association and its member companies in the battle against pollution of our Nation's rivers and lakes. You are to be commended for the progress you have made and for the social responsibility you have acknowledged and assumed. President Johnson several months ago directed each department to prepare thorough briefing materials for use of a new administration. As a prime example of the value of Interior-Industry cooperation we pointed out in the briefing books to be used by the new Secretary the work of the Joint Task Force, with the hope that this relationship will be continued and strengthened.

Your cooperation with the Interior Department and your continued research efforts are vital if Interior is to succeed in its mission to preserve and enhance our natural environment. As you know, Interior is, essentially, the Department of Natural Resources, and during the past several years under Stewart Udall's leadership we have brought about, I think, a whole new understanding and philosophy of conservation in America. It emphasizes the *total* environment and the interrelationship of all the pieces that make it up and that are affected by it.

But success for this growing determination to preserve the quality of life available to the American public is not assured. Our personal health, security and well-being are increasingly dependent upon the decisions of the men and the institutions which are the custodians of our technology. This is a technology which even today is capable of poisoning our environment from the ionosphere to the depths of the oceans. We are faced in many cases with seemingly irreconcilable conflicts between technological and economic progress on the one hand and the interests of preserving the integrity of our habitat on the other.

These conflicts have sharp focus in Interior's relationships with the private economic interests whose responsibilities in one manner or another impinge upon and in one degree or another adversely affect the nation's resources which the Secretary is entrusted to protect. The mining industry, the power industry, the timber industry, the petroleum industry, the real estate developers, the manufacturers of soap and detergents. Members of all of these industries show responsibility, social conscience and statesmanship. And some of them do not. Expediency and short-range economies often have the upper hand over reasoned, and rational deliberation of values, alternatives and consequences.

We see the results daily: In worship of the automobile and in the name of progress we rip corridors through our cities, parks and wilderness. To increase the productivity of the land, we aimlessly proliferate the use of pesticides and chemicals without knowing the consequences. In a single generation our quest for prosperity and industrialization has left barren and dead rivers and lakes that previously served the needs of man for countless generations.

Ironically, this same technology, along with the population explosion, has changed our whole pattern of life. More leisure time and increased spending power have brought a dramatic escalation in outdoor recreation and travel. More and more people have, therefore, reached a direct confrontation with the grim realities of vanishing open space, streams without fish, forbidden beaches—all beneath the cloud of a sulfurous atmosphere.

If we are to halt man's headlong race to extinction all facets of our modern society which have an effect on the environment must undertake a continuing long-range assessment of the technology which has built that society. Some of this is taking place. There has been, in the past few years, a

XUM

marked growth in industry of an environmental conscience. The modern industrialist, whose predecessors regarded pollution as a necessary concomitant of profits and beyond their responsibility, is becoming increasingly alert to the virtues of pollution control and abatement.

Growing support in the board rooms of the Nation's great corporations for better environmental management is especially evident with respect to water pollution control. We see a greater realization in the industrial world that there is a distinct relationship between water pollution control and economic progress. The main concern has long been the simple, direct cost of controlling pollution. But now there is evidence of a new appreciation that in the end, pollution itself can cost far more than its control. As a nation so dependent upon water we are coming to realize that along with its many other and manifest drawbacks, uncontrolled pollution, from whatever source, is simply false economy.

It is a hopeful sign that business and government are moving in the same direction of solving social and environmental problems perhaps for different but equally important reasons.

Your soap and detergent industry is a very good example of the increasing environmental concern and social awareness of industry. Your manufacturers became concerned in the 1950's with foaming effects on surface waters of their products. So you launched a program to discover a substitute. You were successful, and voluntarily 100 per cent of the industry replaced that ingredient which caused the problem. You spent millions of dollars for the protection of the environment.

One of the toughest current pollution problems which we currently confront is eutrophication. Man-made nutrients—phosphates and nitrates—from municipal sewage, land runoff, fertilizers, detergents and other products, are pouring into our lakes and speeding up the process of aging so that rich water sources are prematurely lost to our use. Again, your industry is taking a progressive, responsible approach in a quest for a solution to the problem.

A task force was set up last year by the Soap and Detergent people, their suppliers and the Department of the Interior to investigate the problem and work together towards solutions. The fertilizer industry and the Department of Agriculture have joined the task force, and the Corps of Engineers is an ex officio member. Together we have worked out significant steps toward understanding and controlling eutrophication.

A eutrophication information center has been set up to store and evaluate information on this scientific phenomenon. To assist this effort a provisional procedure has been devised to measure the algae growth potential of various chemicals and water. The project is experimental at this stage, but findings are being confirmed in laboratories and in the field. It is a significant step toward identifying those effects that man's activities will have on his environment.

Perhaps one of the most important accomplishments of the Joint Task Force is improved communications between industry and government. We are sitting down, sharing information, and seeking answers together as equal partners. I think this is an important key to effective management of the quality of our environment.

Better communications and such joint action as this will be essential to solution of other pollution problems; pesticides use and disposal, salinity buildups from agriculture return flows, animal feedlot wastes disposal, thermal pollution from electric power plants, oil pollution, silt and erosion from construction sites and farming activities.

All this that we have seen on the water pollution front in the last few years—the development of water quality standards, the research, the construction of needed waste treatment works, the enforcement actions, the cleanup on federal installations and the new sense of corporate responsibility and joint action with government—all of these things I count as pollution control successes. But we've experienced failures, too. The greatest of these, I think, is the clean water legislation of last year. It was critically needed then—even more so now—and it failed of enactment by Congress, even with total floor support in the Senate and the House.

Different versions of that bill—the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968—passed both the Senate and the House but the differences were not worked out in the last hours in the 90th Congress and the legislation died. Had it been enacted it would have provided the necessary funds to meet the construction schedule for critically needed waste treatment plants and the means to control pollution from oil and other hazardous substances. It would have stopped pollution from ships, added funds for research into acid mine drainage and lake eutrophication; and made it mandatory that Federal agencies assure that installations built under their licenses be equipped so as to prevent pollution, particularly thermal pollution.

It was a tragedy when this bill failed to pass. All the features that I've mentioned are essential, but if I may single one out as being particularly critical, I would point to the provision for funding of waste treatment plant construction. Interior has required each State to guarantee that municipalities will have secondary treatment in operation within the next five years. To do this will require staggering sums of money. But many of the States have already raised their matching share, and, indeed, a number of them are prefinancing the Federal portion. And yet the Federal Government, which imposed this requirement, has not kept its side of the bargain. The new Congress *must* provide the means for the Interior Department to keep faith and meet its obligations. I would urge your help as well as that of responsible industry throughout the country in seeking Congressional action on this vital legislation as early as possible in the new session.

I have mentioned waste treatment, and I would also like to point out one additional situation that I know would be of interest to you. Many of you are aware that the Lake Michigan and Lake Erie Enforcement Conferences have adopted a requirement that all communities discharging wastes into those lakes must remove at least 80 percent of the phosphates. I am told that this is both practical and economically feasible. This requirement should be extended to most of the lakes and many of the rivers in our country during the next few years. It is a weapon eutrophication. Your investigation into pos- that we have today with which we can fight sible substitutes for phosphates can greatly assist this effort.

Earlier this year, in a message to Congress, President Johnson declared:

"Today, the crisis of conservation is no longer quiet. Relentless and insistent, it has surged into a crisis of choice.

"Man—who has lived so long in harmony with nature—is now struggling to preserve its bounty.

"Man who developed technology to serve him—is now racing to prevent wastes from endangering his very existence.

"Our environment can sustain our growth and nourish our future. Or it can overwhelm us."

This theme of concern with total environment, to an ever increasing degree, has emerged through this decade as the central necessity of a modern conservation movement. No longer can we concentrate solely on the protection of one facet of Nature's gifts—whether that single focus be on forests, or wildlife, or soil, or water. We now see all of these as interrelated in a matrix that involves many disciplines, many industries, and a wide span of our whole social and economic structure.

The pesticide that controls forest insects may also destroy other useful forms of life, a stream impoundment that checks floods and conserves water may alter downstream temperatures or estuarine salinity to the detriment of fish habitat. If we reject a dam project to preserve a scenic valley in favor of thermal power generation, the resulting air pollution may threaten an even wider area.

These are the complex issues that give meaning to the President's description: a "Crisis of Choice" is indeed with us. A conservation program for this era of technology and population concentration must address itself to the total ecological balance that nature provides—and most particularly to man's impact upon it.

Unlike the early mission of conservation pioneers, the current task is not restricted to the outdoorsman, the naturalist, the forester or the field engineer. In fact, the major part of the job is now focused elsewhere.

The big decisions will come from our legislative halls, courthouses and corporate board rooms. Answers to major problems will be found in laboratories as often as on a wooded hillside.

Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut has written a very penetrating article in the July *George Washington Law Review* entitled "Technology Assessment—A Legislative View". He pleads for a new concept of long-range advance assessment of the technology which more and more controls our destiny and this is the thought I would like to leave with you—an industry which can and does indeed have a significant environmental impact.

"The need", writes Mr. Daddario, "is to find out how, why and what we—humans—are doing to the natural rhythms of earth and to the life and environment upon it . . . What apparently is happening is that man, through his cunning and acquisitiveness, his desire for comfort and security—and through the technology he has developed to help meet these ends—has engendered the capability to telescope nature, to alter it, to foreshorten it, to accelerate its natural cycles—and very possibly to destroy many of its life supporting characteristics."

He goes on to say that "Historically, assessment [of our technology] has usually occurred well after the technology was introduced and when undesirable consequences had reached serious proportions. For example, the intensive cultivation of grasslands in the Great Plains precipitated the duststorms and erosion during the drought of the 1930's. As a result, studies showed the way to corrective action through windbreaks and other soil conservation measures—too late to prevent hardships to the farmers involved.

"Frequently, the call for assessment has come from inspired social critics and writers. This was the case with environmental and human health hazards from pesticides. Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* brought the realization of how quickly we had accepted the pest control properties of certain chemicals without questioning what the consequences of their widespread dissemination might be to valuable insects, fish and wildlife.

"Countless times a radical change was made to a locality or region prior to any assessment of all potential consequences. Invariably, some adverse condition arose which took time and effort to combat. . . .

"Many unwanted consequences have been labeled as the price of progress. But even in a nation as affluent as ours, these prices all at once seem too high. And at the same time, mature reflection suggests that the price need not have been paid at all if a thorough understanding had been gained of what was happening in the ecological system at an earlier date."

Your industry has shown itself to be progressive and forward looking in terms of the effect your products have on the Nation's lakes and streams. But as population spirals upward and as ever more new products competing in the market place find their way into our homes and industries and—inevitably—into our waters—the need for greater advance knowledge of their impact becomes critical.

So let me plead that your efforts in this direction be intensified and you as an industry will contribute importantly to the preservation of our earth.

WORK RECORD REFUTES ALLEGED INACTIVITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States often appears to be sluggish and slow moving when viewed from the outside without a knowledge of its methods. Those occasions when there are not many Senators on the floor engaged in debate and voting may give the impression that the lawmaking process has ground to a standstill and the Senators are away from their jobs.

Those familiar with the mechanics of Government know, however, that action on the floor is only the very important end product of long hours, days, and weeks of preparation. The analogy of an iceberg being only one-seventh visible above the water has been used to illustrate many situations, but it is particularly applicable to the procedures by which the Congress does its work.

There have been allegations recently that the 91st Congress has been derelict in its duties since it was convened in January. This charge is inaccurate.

A new Congress, such as we have this year, means reorganization of the Senate and frequently new assignments for its Members. In addition, we have now a new administration in the executive branch of Government, and the Senate committees have spent considerable time examining the appointees of the new President in confirmation hearings.

If, indeed, there has been little visible action by the Senate, work within the committees has been copious and has constituted the less conspicuous six-sevenths of the iceberg. The 16 standing committees of the Senate have already spent approximately 550 hours in executive session meetings and in hearings to consider both pending legislation and nominees of the President.

A variety of topics has come before the Committee on Public Works, of which I am chairman. At this still early point in the year, members have spent 60 hours in meetings on such diverse matters as presidential nominations, air pollution, equal employment opportunities, flood control and economic development as embodied in the Appalachian Regional Commission and other regional development bodies.

The Subcommittee on Labor, on which I also serve, has devoted 22¼ hours in the past 3 weeks to public hearings on proposals to strengthen Federal laws protecting the Nation's coal miners. This is legislation of life and death importance to thousands of men in my own State and will receive considerably more close attention before it is refined and sent to a final vote in the Senate.

And the Committee on Foreign Relations has conducted hearings for more than 125 hours on the vital business of American affairs abroad.

All of these formal committee meetings in which Senators have participated are in addition to countless informal discussions and conferences, including those with constituent groups, that have been held and which are an important and indispensable part of the legislative process.

So, it is inaccurate to speak of the Congress as having been inactive. The mechanics of making the laws under which we live is a complex and time-consuming process, and it is one which demands a large amount of unglamorous background work.

The efforts in the Senate in which we are now engaged, and in the House of Representatives as well, will flower in profusion in the weeks ahead but only because the Congress is hard at work now.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded, and, in accordance with the previous order, the Senator from Montana is recognized for 20 minutes.

A PACIFIC PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 20 the distinguished assistant majority leader, the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), made a speech in which he discussed a new China initiative, or a new China policy on the part of the United States.

It is my belief that the distinguished Senator made a real contribution in opening up the question of China, pulling it out of the sawdust bin, so to speak, and laying before the American public his views on what might be done in regard to that particular country.

Mr. President, China cannot be obliterated by blacking it out on the map or by trying to make believe that it does not exist; because it does exist. It is one of the great powers. It is the great power on the Asian continent.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), made some suggestions as to what our relations with China should be. On March 10, I had some suggestions of my own to make in a speech at the Alfred M. Landon Lecture Series at the Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans. My views are somewhat different from those expressed by the assistant majority leader.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that that part of my speech at the Kansas State University which discusses China—and incidentally, may I say, Japan, Indonesia, and the Philippines were also discussed—be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that following it, the speech by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), be printed in the RECORD in toto.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM LECTURE OF SENATOR MANSFIELD

IV

I have talked of several facets of the situation in an effort to place the needs of our Asian policies in clearer perspective; of the distinction between a Pacific power which we have no choice but to be and an Asian power which we can and should choose not to be; of our military relations with Japan and the heat which is rising from the issues of the bases, Okinawa, and the overall Japanese role in the security of the Western Pacific; and, finally, of economic development in the Asian countries and the possibilities of cooperative aid. There are several other related questions which need to be touched on to complete this discussion. One concerns our relations with mainland China.

Strictly speaking, China is not of the Pacific but of Asia. Yet, the very vastness of China projects its relevance not only over the Asian mainland and the Pacific but, in fact, throughout the entire world. It is not possible to talk about the future of international peace, let alone about our future in the Pacific, without reference to the great nation which lies on its farther shore.

China will not remain forever, as is now the case, in substantial isolation. Its proper role is as a leading nation in the councils of the world. Sooner or later China will assume that place. It seems to me the Japanese have long since come to recognize that prospect. And there are indications that they are seeking to bridge the gap with China. Even if we could, there is no cause for this nation to impose obstacles of any kind—either spoken or unspoken—to increasing Japanese contacts with China. On the contrary, such efforts—whether in the economic, cultural, or political fields—might well be encouraged. They can serve not only Japan's needs for trade, they can contribute to clearing up a whole range of enigmas involving China and the security of the Western Pacific. In that fashion, they can be helpful in bringing about an enlightened approach to the building of a stable peace in that region.

For our part, and for much the same reasons, I see no purpose in imposing any special restrictions on the travel of Americans to China. Nor do I see any reason not to place trade with China in non-strategic goods on the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union, Poland, and other Communist countries. For a decade and a half we have sought to maintain a rigid primary and secondary boycott of Chinese goods. The effort is unique in our history and it finds no parallel among the present practices of other nations with respect to China. In my view, we would be well advised to abandon this antiquated pursuit of China's downfall by economic warfare and treat with the Chinese in matters of trade as we treat with European Communist countries—no better and no worse.

It seems to me, the Nixon Administration's announced intention to reopen previous offers to exchange journalists, scientists, and scholars with China is well founded. The cancellation of the meeting in Warsaw on February 20, at which these offers were to be reiterated, is regrettable. One can only hope that another opportunity will soon present itself and, hopefully, that the official offers will be made and accepted.

Trade, travel, and cultural and scientific exchanges are relatively tangible issues in our relationship with China. Hence, they seem to be more readily amenable to solution; perhaps, that is why current discussion of the relationship with China tends to concentrate on them. Similarly, the present debate is intensive on the questions of Chinese admission to the United Nations and U.S. diplomatic recognition of Peking. These issues, too, seem susceptible to clear solu-

XUM

tion. They are not, however, at the root of the difficulties. To try to resolve them at this point may be a useful intellectual exercise but it also tends to put the cart of the difficulty before the horse.

The fundamental problem of U.S.-Chinese relations is the status of Taiwan. It is a problem which is as complex as it is crucial. It is not an either-or issue. It is not really soluble, in an enduring sense, in terms of two Chinas as has been suggested in recent years because there are not two Chinas and the attempt to delineate them is synthetic. The fact is that China is a part of Taiwan and Taiwan is a part of China. Both Chinese governments which are agreed on little else are agreed on that score. The question is not whether the twain shall meet but when and in what circumstances. While we are not aloof from this question, the decisions which appertain thereto involve primarily the Chinese themselves—the Chinese of the mainland and the Chinese of Taiwan. Sooner or later the decisions will have to begin to be made. Only then will the other part of the Chinese puzzle—such questions as U.S. recognition and U.N. admission—fall into a rational place in our policies.

Address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy Before the National Committee on United States-China Relations, New York City, March 20, 1969

This conference is one of the most important public sessions on China policy in recent years. That fact alone is extremely significant. The time at which this conference is being held is also significant. For if we ever hoped that the communist regime in China would disappear, our hope is in ruins today, as thousands of Chinese soldiers engage Russian border troops in the continuing struggle by two powerful nations for domination of the world communist movement.

Thousands of American soldiers are dying in Vietnam in a land war in Asia whose purpose, we are told, is the containment of Peking. Demonstrations against American bases in Japan and Okinawa—bases built in part to contain China—shake the foundation of Japan. The shadow of Peking hangs dark over the discussions in Paris and over virtually every conference we attend on arms control. The success of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, on which the ink is hardly dry, depends in large part on the participation of China.

If we ever hoped that somehow our relations with China could be stabilized at a point of rigid hostility without domestic sacrifice, our hope was dashed when we were told last week by our government that we must now spend $7 billion as a down payment to protect our missiles and our nation from nuclear attack by China.

It is for these reasons that I consider this conference, and what can come from it, so important to the foreign policy of our nation. It is imperative that the issues you have discussed for so long become part of the national agenda of the United States. For almost twenty years, the United States has pursued the same unyielding policy of military containment and diplomatic isolation toward Communist China. However valid that policy may have seemed for the Cold War of the Fifties, it is demonstrably false in the Sixties, and must not be carried into the Seventies.

Every new Administration has a new opportunity to rectify the errors of the past. Each such opportunity consists in large part of the precious gift of time—time in which the good intentions of the government are presumed; time in which the normal conflicts of politics are suspended; time in which the new government has a chance to show it is not tied to the policies of its predecessor.

If the new Administration allows this time to pass without new initiatives; if it allows inherited policies to rush unimpeded along their course, it will have wasted this opportunity. It will have compromised the promises it made to the American people, and worst of all, it will have disappointed the hopes and expectations of the world.

This is especially true in Vietnam. There is growing impatience with the continuing loss of American lives and the seeming frustration of our hopes for the reduction of violence and for the reduction of the American commitment. The advent of a new Administration affords a moment of hope for millions of Americans and Vietnamese. It is a moment that will not long be with us.

The same opportunity exists for our policies throughout Asia. That is why it is all the more important that you who have been involved in the formulation and evaluation of those policies, both in private life and public service, meet here at this time to chart your recommendations.

For twenty years, our China policy has been a war policy. For far too long, we have carried out hostile measures of political, diplomatic, and economic antagonism toward one of the world's most important nations.

Now we must turn away from our policy of war and and pursue a policy of peace. We must seek a new policy, not because of any supposed weakness in our present position or because we are soft on China, but because it is in our own national interest and the interest of all nations. By its sheer size and population, China deserves a major place in the world. As a nuclear power and a nation of 750 million citizens—likely to exceed one billion by the 1980's—China demands a voice in world efforts to deal with arms control and population control, with Asian security and international economic development, with all the great issues of our time.

Yet sixteen years after the end of the Korean War, we do not trade with China. We have no scientific or cultural exchanges. We oppose the representation of China in the United Nations. We refuse to give any sort of diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime on the mainland, and continue to recognize the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-Shek on Taiwan as the government of all China. Instead of developing ways to coexist with China in peace, we assume China will attack us as soon as she can, and we prepare to spend billions to meet that threat.

By some cruel paradox, an entire generation of young Americans and young Chinese have grown to maturity with their countries in a state of suspended war toward one another. Tragically, the world's oldest civilization and the world's most modern civilization, the world's most populous nation and the world's richest and most powerful nation, glare at each other across the abyss of nuclear war.

The division between us goes back to American support of the Chinese Nationalist regime during World War II, and to the immediate post-war struggle between the Communists and the Nationalists. In the beginning, our policy was uncertain. The Communists gained power over the mainland in 1949. Between then and the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, the United States seemed to be preparing to accept the fact of the Chinese Revolution. After the retreat of the Nationalists to Taiwan, our government refused to go to their aid and refused to place the American Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait to prevent a Communist takeover of the island. To do so, we said, would be to intervene in the domestic civil war between the Communists and the Nationalists.

This policy was fully debated by the Congress and the public. Although we deplored the Communist rise to power, we recognized we could do nothing to change it. We anticipated that we would soon adjust to the new Asian reality by establishing relations with the Communist regime.

This situation changed overnight on June 25, 1950, when North Korea attacked South Korea. Fearing that the attack foreshadowed a Communist offensive throughout Asia, the United States ordered the Seventh Fleet into the Taiwan Strait and sent large amounts of military aid to the weak Nationalist Government on the island. To the Communists, the meaning was clear. We would use force to deny Taiwan to the new mainland government, even though both the Communists and the Nationalists agreed the island was Chinese.

Shortly thereafter, in response to the attempt of our forces to bring down the North Korean Government by driving toward the Chinese border, China entered the Korean War. With hindsight, most experts agree that China's action in Korea was an essentially defensive response, launched to prevent the establishment of a hostile government on her border. At the time, however, the issue was far less clear. At the request of the United States, the United Nations formally branded China as an aggressor, a stigma that rankles Peking's leaders even today.

While we fought the Chinese in Korea, we carried out a series of political and economic actions against their country. We imposed a total embargo on all American trade with the mainland. We froze Peking's assets in the United States. We demanded that our allies limit their trade with China. We conducted espionage and sabotage operations against the mainland, and supported similar efforts by the Nationalists. We began to construct a chain of bases, encircling China with American military power, including nuclear weapons.

It is not my purpose here to question the merits of the actions we took while fighting China in Korea. We all remember the climate of those times and the great concern of our country with Chinese military actions. Today, however, sixteen years after the Korean armistice was signed, we have taken almost no significant steps to abandon our posture of war toward China and to develop relations of peace.

Let us look at our policy from the viewpoint of Peking: China's leaders see the United States supporting the Nationalists' pretense to be the government of the mainland. They see thousands of American military personnel on Taiwan. American warships guard the waters between the mainland and Taiwan. American nuclear bases and submarines ring the periphery of China. The United States supports Nationalist U-2 flights over the mainland, as well as Nationalist guerrilla raids and espionage. Hundreds of thousands of American soldiers are fighting in Vietnam to contain China. America applies constant diplomatic and political pressure to deny Peking a seat in the United Nations, to deny it diplomatic recognition by the nations of the world, and to deny it freedom of trade. We turn our nuclear warheads toward China. And now we prepare to build a vast ABM system to protect ourselves against China. In light of all these facts, what Chinese leader would dare to propose anything but the deepest hostility toward the United States?

With respect to the ABM question, I am strongly opposed for many reasons to the deployment of the Pentagon's system. For the purpose of the present discussion, however, one of its most significant drawbacks is that it is likely to be seen in Peking as a new military provocation by the United States. Our overwhelming nuclear arsenal already provides adequate deterrence against any temptation by Peking to engage in a first strike against the United States. From the Chinese perspective, the only utility of an American ABM system is to defend the United States against whatever feeble response Peking could muster after an American first strike against China. Far from deterring aggression by China, therefore, deployment of the ABM system will simply add fuel to our warlike posture toward China. It will increase Chinese fears of American attack and will encourage China's leaders to embark on new steps in the development of their nuclear capability. Apart from the technical and other policy objections that exist against the ABM system, I believe it makes no sense from the standpoint of a rational Asia policy for America.

In large part, our continuing hostility toward China after the Korean War has rested on a hope that is now obviously forlorn, a hope that under a policy of military containment and political isolation the Communist regime on the mainland would be a passing phenomenon and would eventually be repudiated by the Chinese people. Few of us today have any serious doubt that Communism is permanent for the foreseeable future on the mainland. There is no believable prospect that Chiang Kai-Shek and the Nationalists will return to power there, however regrettable we may regard that fact.

Surely, in the entire history of American foreign policy, there has been no fiction more palpably absurd than our official position that Communist China does not exist. For twenty years, the Nationalists have controlled only the two million Chinese and eleven million Taiwanese on the island of Taiwan, one hundred miles from the mainland of China. How long will we continue to insist that the rulers of Taiwan are also the rulers of the hundreds of millions of Chinese on the millions of square miles of the mainland? It is as though the island of Cuba were to claim sovereignty over the entire continent of North America.

The folly of our present policy of isolating China is matched by its futility. Almost all other nations have adjusted to the reality of China. For years, Peking has had extensive diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with a number of the nations in the world, including many of our closest allies. Outside the United Nations, our policy of quarantine toward China has failed. To the extent that the Communist regime is isolated at all, it is isolated largely at China's own choosing, and not as a consequence of any effective American policy.

Our actions toward China have rested on the premise that the People's Republic is an illegitimate, evil and expansionist regime that must be contained until it collapses or at least begins to behave in conformity with American interests. Secretary of State Dulles was the foremost exponent of this moralistic view, carrying it to the extent that he even refused to shake hands with Chou En-Lai at the Geneva Conference in 1954. That slight has not been forgotten.

The Communist regime was said to be illegitimate because, we claimed, it had been imposed on the supposedly unreceptive Chinese people by agents of the Soviet Union. Communist China, according to this view, was a mere Soviet satellite. One Assistant Secretary in the State Department called it a Soviet Manchukuo, suggesting that China's new leaders were no more independent than were the Chinese puppets whom Japan installed in Manchuria in the 1930's. This evaluation grossly exaggerated the extent to which Soviet aid was responsible for the Communist takeover of China, and the events of the past decade—amply confirmed by the intense hostility of the current border clashes—have shattered the myth of Soviet domination of China.

The Communist regime was said to be evil because of the great violence and deprivation of freedom that it inflicted on millions of people who opposed its rise to power. Obviously, we cannot condone the appalling cost, in human life and suffering, of the Chinese Revolution. Yet, in many other cases, we have recognized revolutionary regimes, especially when the period of revolutionary excess has passed. Even in the case of the Soviet Union, the United States waited only 16 years to normalize relations with the revolutionary government.

Unfortunately, we have tended to focus exclusively on the costs of the Chinese revolution. We have ignored the historical conditions that evoked it and the social and economic gains it produced. We have ignored the fact that the Nationalists also engaged in repressive measures and deprivations of freedom, not only during their tenure on the mainland, but also on Taiwan. We have created a false image of a struggle between "Free China" and "Red China," between good and evil. Given our current perspective and the greater understanding of revolutionary change that has come with time, we can now afford a more dispassionate and accurate review of the Chinese Revolution.

Finally, there is the charge that the Communist regime is an expansionist power. At bottom, it is this view that has given rise to our containment policy in Asia, with the enormous sacrifices it has entailed. The charge that the Communist regime is expansionist has meant different things at different times. On occasion, American spokesmen have conjured up the image of a "Golden Horde" or "Yellow Peril" that would swoop down over Asia. Today, most leaders in Washington employ more responsible rhetoric, and it is the Russians who perpetuate this image of China.

Virtually no experts on China expect Peking to commit aggression, in the conventional sense of forcibly occupying the territory of another country—as the Soviet Union recently occupied Czechoslovakia. Such action is in accord with neither past Chinese actions nor present Chinese capabilities. Despite their ideological bombast, the Chinese Communists have in fact been extremely cautious about risking military involvement since the Korean War. The Quemoy crises of the 1950's and the 1962 clash with India were carefully limited engagements. The struggle over Tibet is widely regarded as reassertion of traditional Chinese jurisdiction over that remote area. China has not used force to protect the overseas Chinese in the disturbances in Burma, Malaysia, or Indonesia. Her navy and air force are small. She can neither transport her troops nor supply them across the long distances and difficult terrain of a prolonged war of aggression.

Obviously, our concern today is not so much the danger of direct Chinese aggression as the danger of indirect aggression, based on Chinese efforts to subvert existing governments and replace them with governments friendly to Peking. Yet, until Vietnam led to our massive involvement in Southeast Asia, Peking enjoyed only very limited success in its attempts to foster "wars of national liberation." Although China of course will claim to play a role wherever political instability occurs in Asia, Africa and even Latin America, its record of subversion is unimpressive. On the basis of the past, it is very likely that nations whose governments work for equality and social justice for their people will be able to overcome any threat of Chinese subversion.

Furthermore, we can expect that time will moderate China's revolutionary zeal. Experience with the Soviet Union and the Eastern European Communist nations suggests that the more fully China is brought into the world community, the greater will be the pressure to behave like a nation-state, rather than a revolutionary power.

Ironically, it is Communist China's former teacher, The Soviet Union, that is now determined to prevent any moderation of Chinese-American hostility. We cannot accept at face value the current Soviet image of China, for the Soviets have far different interests in Asia than we do. Although we must persist in our efforts to achieve wider agreement with Moscow, we must not allow the Russians to make continuing hostility toward Peking the price of future Soviet-American cooperation. Rather than retard our relations with Moscow, a Washington-Peking thaw might well provide the Soviet Union with a badly needed incentive to improve relations with us.

We must not, however, regard relations with Peking and Moscow as an "either/or" proposition. We must strive to improve relations with both. We must be alert, therefore, to any opportunity offered by the escalating hostility between China and the Soviet Union to ease our own tensions with those nations.

Both of us—Chinese and American alike—are prisoners of the passions of the past. What we need now, and in the decades ahead, is liberation from those passions. Given the history of our past relations with China, it is unrealistic to expect Peking to take the initiative. It is our obligation. We are the great and powerful nation, and we should not condition our approach on any favorable action or change of attitude by Peking. For us to begin a policy of peace would be a credit to our history and our place in the world today. To continue on our present path will lead only to further hostility, and the real possibility of mutual destruction.

Of course, we must not delude ourselves. Even if the United States moves toward an enlighted China policy, the foreseeable prospects for moderating Chinese-American tensions are not bright. It is said that there is no basis for hope so long as the current generation of Communist Chinese leaders remains in power. This may well be true. Yet, Peking's invitation last November to resume the Warsaw talks, although now withdrawn, suggests the possibility that China's policy may change more rapidly than outside observers can now anticipate.

We must remember, too, that the regime in Peking is not a monolith. As the upheavals of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution have shown, China's leaders are divided by conflicting views and pressures for change. We must seek to influence such change in a favorable direction. We can do so by insuring that reasonable options for improved relations with the United States are always available to Peking's moderate or less extreme leaders.

The steps that we take should be taken soon. Even now, the deterioration of Chinese-Soviet relations in the wake of the recent border clashes may be stimulating at least some of the leaders in Peking to re-evaluate their posture toward the United States and provide us with an extraordinary opportunity to break the bonds of distrust.

What can we do to hasten the next opportunity? Many of us here tonight are already on record as favoring a more positive stand. We must actively encourage China to adopt the change in attitude for which we now simply wait. We must act now to make clear to the Chinese and to the world that the responsibility for the present impasse no longer lies with us.

First, and most important, we should proclaim our willingness to adopt a new policy toward China, a policy of peace, not war, a policy that abandons the old slogans, embraces today's reality, and encourages tomorrow's possibility. We should make clear that we regard China as a legitimate power in control of the mainland, entitled to full participation as an equal member of the world community and to a decent regard for its own security. The policy I advocate will in no way impede our ability to respond firmly and effectively to any possibility of attack by the Chinese. What it will do, however, is emphasize to China that our military posture is purely defensive, and that we stand ready at all times to work toward improvement in our relations.

Second, we should attempt to reconvene the Warsaw talks. At the time the talks were cancelled, I wrote the Secretary of State, asking the Administration to make an urgent new attempt to establish the contact that we so nearly achieved at Warsaw, and to do so before the air of expectancy that hung over the talks is completely dissipated. If the talks

XUM

are resumed, we should attempt to transform them into a more confidential and perhaps more significant dialogue. The parties might meet on an alternating basis in their respective embassies, or even in their respective countries, rather than in a palace of the Polish Government. Whether or not the talks are resumed, more informal official and semi-official conversations with China's leaders should be offered.

Third, we should unilaterally do away with restrictions on travel and non-strategic trade. We should do all we can to promote exchanges of people and ideas, through scientific and cultural programs and access by news media representatives. In trade, we should place China on the same footing as the Soviet Union and the Communist nations of Eastern Europe. We should offer to send trade delegations and even a resident trade mission to China, and to receive Chinese trade delegations and a Chinese trade mission in this country. Finally, we should welcome closer contacts between China and the rest of the world, rather than continue to exert pressure on our friends to isolate the Peking regime.

Fourth, we should announce our willingness to re-establish the consular offices we maintained in the People's Republic during the earliest period of Communist rule. and we should welcome Chinese consular officials in the United States. Consular relations facilitate trade and other contacts. They frequently exist in the absence of diplomatic relations, and often pave the way for the establishment of such relations.

Fifth, we should strive to involve the Chinese in serious arms control talks. We should actively encourage them to begin to participate in international conferences, and we should seek out new opportunities to discuss Asian security and other problems.

Sixth, we should seek, at the earliest opportunity, to discuss with China's leaders the complex question of the establishment of full diplomatic relations. For the present, we should continue our diplomatic relations with the Nationalist regime on Taiwan and guarantee the people of that island against any forcible takeover by the mainland. To Peking at this time, the question of diplomatic recognition seems to be unavoidably linked to the question of whether we will withdraw recognition from the Nationalists and the question of whether Taiwan is part of the territory of China. Both the Communists and the Nationalists claim Taiwan as part of China, but our own government regards the status of the island as undefined, even though we maintain diplomatic relations with the Nationalists.

We have failed to agree on solutions involving other divided countries and peoples—as in Germany—and we cannot be confident of greater success in the matter of Taiwan. There are critical questions that simply cannot now be answered:

Will the minority regime of the Chinese Nationalists continue to control the island's Taiwanese population?

Will the Taiwanese majority eventually transform the island's government through the exercise of self-determination?

Will an accommodation be worked out between a future Taiwan Government and the Peking regime on the mainland?

To help elicit Peking's interest in negotiations, we should withdraw our token American military presence from Taiwan. This demilitarization of Taiwan could take place at no cost to our treaty commitments, or to the security of the island. Yet, it would help to make clear to Peking our desire for the Communists, the Nationalists, and the Taiwanese to reach a negotiated solution on the status of the island.

A dramatic step like unilateral recognition of Peking would probably be an empty gesture at this time. As the experience of France implies, unilateral recognition of Peking is not likely to be effective unless it is accompanied by the withdrawal of our existing recognition of the Nationalists. And, as the case of Great Britain suggests, Peking may insist on our recognition of the mainland's claim to Taiwan before allowing us to establish full ambassadorial relations. These problems will have to be negotiated, and we should move now to start the process.

Seventh, without waiting for resolution of the complex question of Taiwan, we should withdraw our opposition to Peking's entry into the United Nations as the representative of China, not only in the General Assembly, but also in the Security Council and other organs. The Security Council seat was granted to China in 1945 in recognition of a great people who had borne a major share of the burden in World War II, thereby making the United Nations possible. It was not a reward for the particular political group that happened to be running the country at the time.

In addition, we should work within the United Nations to attempt to assure representation for the people on Taiwan that will reflect the island's governmental status. It may be that the Chinese Nationalists can continue to enjoy a seat in the General Assembly. Or, if an independent republic of Taiwan emerges, it might be admitted into the United Nations as a new state. Possibly, if a political accommodation is reached between the Communist regime on the mainland and the government on Taiwan, the people of Taiwan might be represented in the United Nations as an autonomous unit of China, by analogy to the present status of Byelorussia and the Ukraine in the United Nations as autonomous provinces of the Soviet Union.

From its inception, the United Nations has displayed remarkable flexibility in adjusting to political realities. There are many possible solutions to the China problem in the United Nations. Without insisting on any one, we should move now to free the United Nations to undertake the long-delayed process of adjusting to the reality of the People's Republic of China, and we should clearly indicate to Peking our willingness to discuss these questions.

In dealing with the problems of diplomatic recognition and United Nations representation, I have placed primary emphasis on the need to initiate discussions with Peking in these areas. Since it is impossible to predict when or how the Chinese will respond to a change in American policy, we cannot maintain a hard and fast position on these questions. We cannot afford to close any options by endorsing detailed schemes at this time. What we can do, however, is act now on the broad range of initiatives I have mentioned, and make clear to Peking that our views are not rigid on even the most difficult issues that have divided us so bitterly in recent years.

We will have to be patient. Peking's initial reaction to serious initiatives on our part will probably be a blunt refusal. But, by laying the groundwork now for an improved relationship in the Seventies and beyond, we will be offering the present and future leaders in Peking a clear and attractive alternative to the existing impasse in our relations.

Many outstanding authorities on China are here tonight. Perhaps I can sum up my central theme in terms that you may find appropriate. According to Chinese tradition, the model Confucian gentleman was taught that, whenever involved in a dispute, he should first examine his own behavior, ask himself whether he bears some responsibility for the dispute, and take the initiative to try to arrive at a harmonious settlement.

It may prove futile for us to follow this advice when dealing with Chinese who claim to reject many of China's great traditions. But we will never know unless we try. If nothing changes, we Americans will have to live with the consequences of arms and fear and war. We owe ourselves, we owe the future, a heavy obligation to try.

ABM: THE FOCUS OF THE PROPOSAL

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, as the Senate begins its evaluation of the ABM system, the features of President Nixon's new proposal for this system ought to be seen in proper focus.

May I say that I make this speech today with due respect to the difficulties which confronted the President of the United States when he thought about a drastic changeover in the configuration of the Safeguard system from what had previously been known as the Sentinel system, which he had inherited from a Democratic administration.

May I say, also, that I appreciated the frankness with which the President of the United States discussed this matter with the joint leadership on the day he also later discussed it with the people of America by means of a TV broadcast, at which time he outlined his views and gave his reasons and opened himself up to questions on the part of the communications media.

At that meeting, when the President told us of the decision, he asked for our reaction. I must admit, in all candor, that the reaction among those present was almost unanimously in support of what he had stated he was going to do. But, with equal candor, I must say that one or two of us expressed our doubts and stated that we had serious questions relative to cost, reliability, alternatives, need, and other factors. He understood perfectly that this was a matter which could be from two, if not more, sides, and he stated that he did not call the leadership down to form a cheerleaders' section to get behind him, but to tell us his views and, in return, to get our reaction.

The President had a most difficult decision to face up to. I give him great credit for being responsible—solely responsible—for the review which he requested on the Sentinel system. I give him credit—great credit—for facing up to his responsibility as President of the United States and arriving at a decision. I have no doubt in my mind that his decision was based on what he considered to be in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

I did not attend the meetings at which the Secretary of Defense and his advisers—Under Secretary Packard, General Wheeler, and Dr. Foster—appeared before the appropriate committees; but I did read the newspaper accounts with a great deal of interest, and I also happened to be lucky enough to view certain portions of their appearance before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I want to give Secretary Laird great credit, also, for the way he presented his case, for the vigor he showed in marshaling his facts and in answering the variety of questions which were directed to him from all directions.

But I do think, Mr. President, that this matter should be viewed in proper focus, and I anticipate that the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system will be the subject of thoroughgoing and extended debate in this body.

It was evident from the press conference on March 14, for example, that the President's basic decision changed the earlier concept of the ABM system. Last year the ABM was billed as affording protection primarily to the cities against a Chinese attack and only incidentally as safeguarding emplaced ICBM missile sites in rural areas. This year the President proposes to shift the emphasis of protection 180 degrees, from the cities to the rural ICBM sites. This change was explicit in the President's press conference, and it was clear in the presentation to the congressional leaders at the White House prior to the press conference.

Since then, other briefings have been provided to amplify the President's decision. These subsequent statements by the officials of the Defense Department seem to me to be confusing the emphasis which the President had set forth in his new approach.

President Nixon's proposal was to limit the actual deployment of the ABM system at this point to missile farms in Montana and North Dakota. Indeed, it was evident that he was hopeful that negotiations with the Soviet Union might make even the completion of this limited deployment unnecessary. The President specifically reserved until a later review any decision for elaboration of the proposed system beyond the initial two-site installation. The President put off, until this future review, any extension of the system—whether to provide for a "thin" coverage against Chinese attacks or to counter an accidental missile firing from abroad which might destroy one or more cities. Insofar as protection of people against a massive Soviet first strike, that was rejected outright by President Nixon, as it had been rejected by the previous administration.

Such was the emphasis given by the President in his new approach. Defense Department interpretations have tended to obfuscate, it seems to me, the restraint which characterized the President's decision. These subsequent statements leave the strong impression that the two-site installations are just the beginning of a vast program to convert the entire Nation into a missile maginot. It is as if future reviews of the international situation which the President has stressed he would make prior to any further elaboration of the system will be nothing more than some sort of charade for the benefit of those who have had grave concern about the entire enterprise from the outset.

As a courtesy to the President, I have endeavored to keep an open mind on the new approach. The Senate knows that I have opposed the original ABM proposal in the past, not only during the first few days of the Nixon administration, but also throughout the closing years of the Johnson administration. For me, there is not now and there has never been any partisanship in this issue. As I have opposed the Sentinel program during two administrations of different political leadership, it has been opposed in the same fashion by other Members on both sides of the aisle. In this connection, I would refer to the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the contributions of other Republican Senators.

To infer partisanship where none exists does a disservice to the Senate and to the country. Before judgment on this issue is taken, all Senators will insist, as I will insist, upon the most thorough discussion. We are deciding here not for a day but for years and, perhaps, decades. Who doubts that Senators will not form their conclusions on the basis of understanding and conviction rather than on the basis of party considerations? Members of the Senate would be well advised to put aside talk of partisanship. There is no partisanship and I would hope and expect that there will be no pettiness with respect to this critical issue.

It would be my hope, too, that subordinates in the administration will not read into the President's decision their own preconceptions and predilections. The President has made clear that he has not gone beyond a fixed point of decision and he will not go beyond it without subsequent review of the shifting nature of security needs. His subordinates in the Defense Department—whether political or bureaucratic—ought to be the first to hear and heed him. When he says that he will decide not now but in the future, whether the situation at that time justifies curtailment, expansion or any other modification of the initial deployment, he should be taken at his word.

It should be borne in mind, too, that we are in a most difficult period in Vietnam and at home. We are in a time of growing financial stress among the tax-squeezed, inflation-pressed people of this Nation.

It is of the utmost importance that there not be lost any opportunity to bring under control the immense and growing cost of armaments to this Nation. Negotiations with the Soviet Union, which the President has made clear he intends to pursue, might conceivably act to curb those costs.

Frankly, I do not know whether agreements can be achieved with our principal rival in this wasteful military competition. I do not believe, however, that it enhances the propects for agreement when nonelected officials of this Government play one-upmanship with limited presidential decisions. Nor does it it enhances the prospects for agreement if the rationale which is set forth in order to justify deployment of the ABM gives the appearance of a missile system in search of a mission, to quote the words of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). That has been the effect of the flailing efforts to push this system through the Congress over the past several years. The country has been saturated with a propaganda that has not only puzzled our own people but which may well have exposed the Nation to international ridicule. First, it was urged that the Sentinel system be adopted on the grounds that it would protect Americans against the Russians. Then, when it was transparent that nothing could protect the people of the Nation against massive Soviet attack, the system was labeled a defense of the inhabitants of the cities—a thin defense—against the irrational Chinese. Finally, it was termed a defense against both the Russians and the Chinese and even against accidental missile firings. Indeed, is it any wonder that there are grave doubts, now, as to whether an ABM system can protect this Nation against anyone?

That is another point, however, and I will take it up at another time. I wish to stress now that the system which President Nixon has proposed be built this year is for the protection of a segment of our deterrent power—350 Minuteman missiles in Montana and North Dakota. That is not a protection against China; it is a protection of a small part of our capacity to retaliate against an attack from the Soviet Union. By the same token, therefore, it is with Russia that disarmament agreements which might make possible the forestalling of the immensely costly placement of the ABM's might have relevance. If, instead what is proposed for this year is to cement in a plan for a mixed system—a polyglot ABM—to protect all of the ICBM deterrent power of the United States, to protect against China, to protect against third parties or to protect against accidental attacks or to protect against whatever, then what sense would it make, as it is obviously contemplated, to talk disarmament with the Russians but not with the Chinese? Do you disarm a defense system, Mr. President, against China or against accidental missiles because you have negotiated an arms agreement with the Soviet Union?

What I am suggesting, Mr. President, is that it is at least possible to find a rationale in the association of a two-site ABM installation and negotiations with the Russians on arms limitation. President Nixon linked these two considerations in shifting from the previous ABM concept. I fear, however, that subsequent interpretation by his subordinates is rapidly dismantling the connection. To be sure, there is a certain ritual deference paid to the disarmament aspect of the President's approach but any perusal of the record to date will show that the emphasis has clearly shifted so that the two-site installations appear to be coming into focus as a mere wayside stop along the road to the construction of a great nuclear wall whose costs would be incalculable.

It seems to me, therefore, that we need to know whether the presumption upon which the Defense Department now seems to be acting is valid—that is, that an open-ended deployment of an area defense system aimed in any and all directions is a foregone conclusion. I thought the President had not decided that point—that he had decided at this time only to deploy ABM's at two sites. I thought the President was trying to keep open an option which would permit him to restrain the costly spread of the system at that point or even to reverse it. The interpretations seem to me, however, to be closing off that option. How are we to explain, otherwise, the effort which may well be made by the Defense Department to obtain appropriations from the Senate, for example, to purchase land, this year, for several ABM sites beyond those in Montana and North Dakota?

It is my understanding that last year Congress appropriated $227.3 million for acquisition of land and construction; that is, brick and mortar items. It is my further understanding that about one-third of that money has been spent. It is my further understanding that the law can well be interpreted so that the remaining two-thirds, or approximately $150 million, is available and spendable with no restrictions whatsoever because when the appropriation was made it was open ended or "no ended," however one wishes to refer to it. So it may well be that there will be no request for funds this year because of the two-thirds of $227.3 million appropriated for this fiscal year being available and ready to be spent.

Incidentally, speaking of construction, I wonder what is going to happen to the sites which have been bought in the vicinity of Boston, and very likely, in other parts of the country as well, which because of the change from Sentinel to Safeguard now no longer have the purpose intended for them when the purchase was originally made. These purchases, beyond Montana and North Dakota, would have no purpose other than to set in motion an elaboration which President Nixon presumably has not yet decided. What justification can there be for appropriating or expending moneys available this year for a need which may not exist next year?

Indeed, the Department's request for this money seems to me to be presumptuous of the intent that both the President and the Congress had in mind.

The basic focus of this discussion on the ABM, then, if I may sum up, ought to be on what President Nixon has proposed to begin to do this year: that is, to provide ABM's to protect 350 Minuteman ICBM missiles in Montana and North Dakota while trying to move ahead, at the same time, with negotiations with the Russians on curbing the armaments competition. Whether even that limited ABM deployment is justified is another matter. That will have to be considered in the light of the reliability, redundance, and the relevance of any ABM deployment at this time. It will have to be discussed in the light of the immense costs, actual and potential. It will have to be decided, finally, on the basis of the need to balance the requirements of external security against the requirements for halting the disintegration of the nation's internal security in all of its ramifications.

I shall have more to say on this subject, Mr. President, at a subsequent date. But at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the President's news conference of March 14, published in the New York Times on March 15, 1969, having to do with foreign and domestic affairs, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

OPENING STATEMENT

Ladies and gentlemen, today I am announcing the decision which I believe is vital for the security and defense of the United States and also in the interests of peace throughout the world.

Last year a program, the Sentinel antiballistic missile program, was adopted and that program, as all listeners on television and radio and readers of newspapers know, has been the subject of very strong debate and controversy over the past few months. After a long study of all of the options available I have concluded that the Sentinel program previously adopted should be substantially modified.

The new program that I have recommended this morning to the leaders and that I announce today is one that perhaps best can be described as a safeguard program. It is a safeguard against any attack by the Chinese Communists that we can forsee over the next 10 years.

It is a safeguard of our deterrent system, which is increasingly vulnerable due to the advances that have been made by the Soviet Union since the year 1967, when the Sentinel program was first laid out.

It is a safeguard, also, against any irrational or accidental attack that might occur, of less than massive magnitude, which might be launched from the Soviet Union.

The program also does not do some things, which should be clearly understood. It does not provide defense for our cities and, for that reason, the sites have been moved away from our major cities.

NO WAY TO DEFEND CITIES

I have made the decision with regard to this particular point because I found that there is no way, even if we were to expand the limited Sentinel system which was planned for some of our cities, to a so-called heavy or thick system, there is no way that we can adequately defend our cities without an unacceptable loss of life.

The only way that I have concluded that we can save lives—which is the primary purpose of our defense system—is to prevent war. And that is why the emphasis of this system is on protecting our deterrent, which is the best preventive for war.

The system differs from the previous Sentinel system in another major respect. The Sentinel system called for a fixed deployment schedule. I believe that because of a number of reasons that we should have a phase system. That is why, on an annual basis, the new safeguard system will be reviewed. And the review may bring about the changes in the system based on our evaluation of three major points.

First, what our intelligence shows us with regard to the magnitude of the threat, whether from the Soviet Union or from the Chinese.

And, second, in terms of what our evaluation is of any talks that we are having by that time or may be having with regard to arms control.

And, finally, because we believe that since this is a new system, we should constantly examine what progress has been made in the development of the technique to see if changes in the system should be made.

I should admit at this point that this decision has not been an easy one. None of the grave decisions made by a President are easy. But it is one that I have made after considering all of the options and I would indicate before going to your questions two major options that I have overruled.

One is moving to a massive city defense. I've already indicated why I do not believe that is, first, feasible, and there is another reason. Moving to a massive city defense system, even starting with a thin system and then going to a heavy system, tends to be more provocative in terms of making credible a first strike capability against the Soviet Union. I want no provocation which might deter arms talks.

Doing nothing option

The other alternative at the other extreme was to do nothing or to delay for six months or 12 months, which would be the equivalent, really, of doing nothing, or for example, going the road only of research and development.

I have examined those options. I have ruled them out because I have concluded that the first deployment of this system which will not occur until 1973, that that first deployment is essential by that date if we are to meet the threat that our present intelligence indicates will exist by 1973.

In other words, we must begin now. If we delay a year, for example, it means that that first deployment will be delayed until 1975. That might be too late.

It is the responsibility of the President of the United States above all other responsibilities to think first of the security of the United States. I believe that this system is the best step that we can take to provide for that security.

There are, of course, other possibilities that have been strongly urged by some of the leaders this morning. For example, that we could increase our offensive capabilities, our submarine force, or even our Minuteman force, or our bomber force.

That I would consider to be, however, the wrong road because it would be provocative to the Soviet Union and might escalate an arms race. This system is truly a safeguard system, a defensive system only. Its safeguards are deterrent and under those circumstances, can in no way, in my opinion, delay the progress which I hope will continue to be made toward arms talks which will limit arms not only this kind of system, but particularly offensive systems.

We'll now go to your questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Enemy attacks in Vietnam

Question. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam has been intensifying recently and if there has been any notable progress in Paris it has not been detectable publicly. Is your patience growing a little thin with these continued attacks, particularly such as came out of the DMZ today?

Answer. Mr. Smith you may recall that on March 4 when I received a similar question at an earlier stage of the attacks, I issued what was interpreted widely as a warning. It will be my policy as President to issue a warning only once, and I will not repeat it now.

Anything that in the future is done will be done. There will be no additional warning. As far as the Paris talks are concerned, I have noted the speculation in the press with regard to whether we will have or should have or are, for example, approving private talks going forward. I will not discuss that subject.

I trust there will be private talks. I think that's where this war will be settled, in private, rather than in public, and this is in the best interests of both sides. But public discussion of what I think is significant progress which is being made along the lines of private talks I will not indulge in.

2. State of Union talk

Question. Will you make your State of the Union address and what will your legislative program encompass?

Answer. I do not plan a State of the Union Address in the traditional manner. I will within approximately a month, however, state a general domestic program. By that time the program will be at the point that I

XUM

think it should be completely summarized and set forth not only for the nation as to what we have done but particularly to the Congress as to what we expect for the balance. I would not like to anticipate now what will be in that program.

3. Reaction to ABM plan

Question. There's been a great deal of criticism in Congress against the deployment of any type of antiballistic missile defense system. What kind of reception do you think your proposal this morning will receive there?

Answer. It will be a very spirited debate and it will be a very close vote. Debates in the field of national defense are often spirited and the votes are often close. Many of my friends in Congress who were there before I was there remarked that the vote on extending the draft in 1941 won by only one vote. This might be that close.

I think, however, that after the members of the House and the Senate consider this program, which is a minimum program, but which—and which—particularly provides options for change in other directions, if we find the threat has changed or that the art has changed—our evaluation of the technique has changed—I think that we have a good chance of getting approval. We will, of course, express our views and we hope that we will get support in the country.

4. Effectiveness of ABM plan

Question. Mr. President, I understand that your first construction or deployment of antimissile systems would be around two Minuteman retaliatory operations. Do you think that deploying around these two provides enough deterrent that would be effective?

Answer. Let me explain the difference between deploying around two Minuteman bases and deploying around, say, 10 cities. Where you are looking toward a city defense, it needs to be a perfect or near-perfect system to be credible, because, if, as I examine the possibility of even a thick defense of cities, I found that even the most optimistic projections considering the highest development of the art, would mean that we would still lose 30 to 40 million lives.

That would be less than half of what we would otherwise lose, but we would still lose 30 to 40. Now, when you are talking about protecting your deterrent, it need not be perfect.

It is necessary only to protect enough of the deterrent that the retaliatory second strike will be of such magnitude that the enemy would think twice, before launching a first strike, and I, it has been my conclusion that by protecting two Minuteman sites we will preserve that deterrent as a credible deterrent and that that will be decisive and could be decisive in so far as the enemy considering the possibility of a first strike.

5. The face of the war

Question. Mr. President, there have been charges from Capitol Hill that you have stepped up the war in Vietnam. Have you?

Answer. I have not stepped up the war in Vietnam, I have—actually have examined not only the charges but also examined the record. And I discussed it at great length yesterday with Secretary Laird.

What has happened is this. For the past six months the forces on the other side had been planning for an offensive. And, for the past six months, they not only had planned for an offensive but they have been able, as a result of that planning, to have mounted a rather substantial offensive.

Under these circumstances we had no other choice but to try to blunt that offensive. Had General Abrams not responded in this way, we would have suffered far more casualties than we have suffered—and we have suffered more than, of course, any of us would have liked to have seen.

The answer is that any escalation of the war in Vietnam has been the responsibility of the enemy. If the enemy de-escalates its attacks, ours will go down. We are not trying to step it up, we are trying to do everything that we can in the conduct of our war in Vietnam, to see that we can go forward toward peace in Paris.

That is why my response has been measured, deliberate and—some think—too cautious. But it will continue to be that way because I am thinking of those peace talks every time I think of our military option in Vietnam.

6. Prospects on taxes

Question. Mr. President, your safeguard ABM system, I understand, would cost about $1-billion less in the coming fiscal year than the plan which President Johnson sent up. Will this give you the opportunity to reduce the surcharge, or will the continued high level of taxation be needed for the economy?

Answer. That question will be answered when we see the entire budget. Secretary Laird will testify on the defense budget on Wednesday, and incidentally, my understanding at this time and I've seen the preliminary figures is that the defense budget for, that Secretary Laird will present, will be approximately $2.5-billion less than that submitted by the previous Administration.

Now whether, after considering the defense budget and all the other budgets that have been submitted, we then can move in the direction of either reducing the surcharge or move in the direction of some of our very difficult problems, with regard to our cities, the problem of hunger and others, these are the options that I will have to consider at a later time.

7. Response to foe's attacks

Question. Last week you said that, on the matter of Vietnam, you would not tolerate heavier casualties in the continuation of the violation of the understanding without making an appropriate response of—is what we're doing in Vietnam now in a military way that response of which you were speaking?

Answer. This is a very close decision on our part, one that I not only discussed with Secretary Laird yesterday but that we will discuss more fully in the Security Council tomorrow. I took no comfort out of the stories that I saw in the papers this morning to the effect that our casualties for this, the immediate past week, went from 400 down to 300. That's still much too high.

What our response should be must be measured in terms of the effect on the negotiations in Paris. I will only respond as I did earlier to Mr. Smith's question. We have issued a warning. I will not warn again. And if we conclude that the level of casualties is higher than we should tolerate, action will take place.

8. Reaction in Moscow

Question. Do you have reason to believe that the Russians will interpret your ABM decision today as not being an escalating move in the arms race?

Answer. As a matter of fact, Mr. Kaplow, I have reason to believe, based on the past record, that they would interpret it just the other way around.

First, when they deployed their own ABM system, and as you know, they have 67 missiles—ABM sites—deployed around Moscow, they rejected the idea that it escalated the arms race on the ground that it was defensive solely in character.

And second, when the United States last year went forward on the Sentinel system four days later the Soviet Union initiated the opportunity to have arms limitation talks.

I think the Soviet Union recognizes very clearly the difference between a defensive posture and an offensive posture. I would also point this out—an interesting thing about Soviet military and diplomatic history: They have always thought in defensive terms and if you read their—not only their political leaders but their military leaders—the emphasis is on defense.

I think that since this system now—as a result of moving the city defense out of it and the possibility of that city defense growing into a thick defense—I think this makes it so clearly defensive in character that the Soviet Union cannot interpret this as escalating the arms race.

9. Summit meeting plans

Question. Mr. President, last week at your press conference you mentioned negotiations with the Russians at the highest level being in the wings. Could you tell us if since then we've moved any closer to such a summit meeting?

Answer. I should distinguish between negotiations at what you'd call the highest level, and what I said was the highest level, and talks. Talks with the Soviet Union are going on at a number of levels at this time. On a number of subjects.

However, those talks have not yet reached the point where I have concluded—or where I believe they have concluded—that a discussion at the summit level would be useful.

Whenever those talks—preliminary talks—do reach that point, I anticipate that a summit meeting would take place. I do not think one will take place in the near future, but I think encouraging progress is being made toward the time when a summit talk may take place.

10. Personnel problems

Question. Sir, there have been several reports from your staff members that Kennedy and Johnson holdover people who made policy have sewn themselves into civil service status and thus may mean some problem for your people in personnel. I wonder if this means that you are going to transfer a lot of these people or abolish the jobs?

Answer. Well I've heard a lot from some of my Republican friends on Capitol Hill on this point as well as from, of course, Republican leaders in the nation. We—it seems this is a rather common practice when one Administration goes out and the other comes in.

We will do what we think will best serve the interest of effective government and if the individual who's been frozen in can do the job we're going to keep him. However, we're moving some out but we won't do it through subterfuge. We'll try to do it quite directly.

11. Assistance from allies

Question. Mr. President, on your recent European trip did you find any willingness on the part of our allies to increase their military and financial contributions to the alliance?

Answer. Well, that matter was discussed with all of our allies. And, particularly, will be a subject for discussion when we have the 20th anniversary meeting of NATO here in April. I do not . . . I think it might be potentially embarrassing to allies to suggest that we're urging them—anyone specifically—to do one thing or another in this field.

I think it's best for me to leave it in these terms. Our allies do recognize the necessity to maintain NATO's conventional forces. They do recognize that they must carry their share or that the United States—and particularly our Congress, representing our people—will be—have much less incentive to carry our share. I believe they will do their share. But I think we're going to do it best through quiet conversation rather than public declaration.

12. ABM as bargaining issue

Question. Mr. President, in any talks with the Soviet Union, would you be willing to consider abandoning the ABM program altogether if the Soviets showed a similar willingness, or, indeed, if they showed a readiness to place limitations on offensive weapons?

Answer. Well, Mr. Scali, I am prepared in the event that we go into arms talks to consider both offensive and defensive weapons. As you know, the arms talks that have at least preliminarily been discussed do not involve limitation or reduction; they involve only freezing where we are.

Now your subject, your question goes to abandoning. And on that particular point I think it would take two, naturally, to make the agreement. Let's look at the Soviet Union's position with its defensive deployment of ABM's.

Previously, that deployment was aimed only toward the United States. Today their radars, from our intelligence, are also directed toward Communist China. I would imagine that the Soviet Union would be just as reluctant as we would be to leave their country naked against a potential Chinese Communist threat.

So the abandoning of the entire system, particularly as long as the Chinese threat is there, I think neither country would look upon with much favor.

13. Nonproliferation treaty

Question. Mr. President, would you think that the deployment of the ABM by both the Soviet Union and the United States are compatible with the N.P.T., the nonproliferation treaty?

Answer. I considered that problem and I believe that they are compatible with the N.P.T. We discussed that in the leader's meeting this morning and I pointed out that as we consider this—this kind of defensive system which enables the United States of America to make its deterrent capability credible, that that will have an enormous effect in reducing the pressure on other countries who might want to acquire nuclear weapons.

That's the key point. If a country doesn't feel that the major country that has a nuclear capability has a credible deterrent then they would move in that direction.

One other point: I wish to make an announcement with regard to N.P.T.—that I was delighted to see the Senate's confirmation or consent to the treaty and this announcement—I hope President Johnson is looking.

I haven't talked to him on the phone. I'm going to invite President Johnson, if his schedule permits, to attend the ceremony when we will have the ratification of the treaty because he started it in his Administration and I think he should participate when we ratify it.

14. Aid to college protesters

Question. Mr. President. I wonder if I can turn you to the campus disorders and unrest. They're continuing and we haven't had an opportunity to ask you your views of them. But particularly would you favor the cutting off of Federal loans to the offenders?

Answer. Mr. Lisagor, I've asked the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to examine this problem particularly in view of a Congressional report that 122 of 540 that had been arrested at San Francisco State were direct recipients of Federal funds. I will have a statement on that that I will be making either Monday of Tuesday in detail. I prefer not to go into it now.

15. Paris peace talks

Question. To follow up Mr. Day's question on Vietnam earlier, is there any evidence that your measured response to the enemy attacks in South Vietnam has produced or yielded any results in Paris or in the attitudes of the North Vietnamese leaders in Hanoi?

Answer. Our measured response has not had the effect of discouraging the progress—and it is very limited progress—toward talks in Paris. That is the negative side in answering your question.

As to whether or not a different response would either discourage those talks or might have the effect of even encouraging them is the decision that we now have to make.

16. U.S. troop reduction

Question. Again on Vietnam—in connection with Secretary Laird's visit, we've heard for some time predictions that American troop levels could be cut as the South Vietnamese capabilities improved. And again last week while he was in Vietnam, we were given similar reports from Saigon, despite the high level of the fighting that's going on now. Do you see any prospect for withdrawing American troops in any numbers soon?

Answer. Mr. Bailey, in view of the current offensive on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, there is no prospect for a reduction of American forces in the foreseeable future.

When we are able to reduce forces as the result of a combination of circumstances—the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves in areas where we now are defending them, the progress of the talks in Paris, or the level of enemy activity—when that occurs I will make an announcement. But at this time there is no foreseeable prospect in that field.

17. Shelter program

Question. Mr. President, what effect, if any, will your safeguard program have on the shelter program. Can you tell us anything about your long-range plans in this direction?

Answer. Congressman Holifield, in the meeting this morning, strongly urged that the Administration look over the shelter program and he made the point that he thought it had fallen somewhat into disarray, due to lack of attention over the past few years.

I have directed that General Lincoln, the head of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, I directed him previously to conduct such a survey—we're going to look at the shelter program to see what we can do there in order to minimize American casualties.

18. Middle East stand

Question. Mr. President, if I recall correctly at the last press conference when you were discussing the meeting with General de Gaulle and the Middle East situation, you said you were encouraged by what he told you because he was moving closer to our position. I wonder if you can tell us what our position is in the Middle East and if it has changed significantly in the last year.

Answer. We have had bilateral talks, not only with the French but also with the Soviet Union, and with the British, preparatory to the possibility of four-power talks. I would not like to leave the impression that we are completely together at this point.

We are closer together than we were but we still have a lot of yardage to cover. And until we make further progress in developing a common position, I would prefer not to lay out what our position is. I don't think that would be helpful in bringing them to the position that we think is the right position.

Thank you Mr. President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S 1634—INTRODUCTION OF TAX SHARING ACT OF 1969

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Bellmon, Cook, Cooper, Cotton, Dole, Dominick, Fannin, Goodell, Griffin, Gurney, Hansen, Javits, Jordan of Idaho, Murphy, Packwood, Pearson, Percy, Scott, Thurmond, and Tower, I introduce, for referral to the appropriate committee the Tax Sharing Act of 1969, a measure which would require the regular distribution of a specified portion of the Federal individual income tax to the States primarily on the basis of population with virtually no conditions attached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1634) to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States, introduced by Mr. Baker (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, while the history of Federal assistance to State and local governments goes back to the inception of our country, it is only for the last 20 years that Federal aid has increased at a rapidly accelerating rate. In the 10 years prior to 1956 Federal aid doubled to $3.7 billion, doubled again in the next 4 years to 1960, and between 1960 and 1969, only 9 years, it has expanded from $7 billion to $18.9 billion, an increase of almost 150 percent. Moreover, the projection for Federal aid to State and local governments for 1975 is estimated at $35 to $40 billion, and former President Johnson once set the figure at $60 billion.

This leaves open the decision as to what should be the form of future Federal aid. The problem which confronts the Congress is the establishment of the most efficient delivery system for this rapidly proliferating assistance. In my judgment, it is imperative that we create a delivery system with a greater degree of flexibility. We should move away from complete reliance on particularistic Federal grant-in-aid instruments and adopt approaches which seek to strengthen the political structure and enhance the responsiveness of American federalism. This can best be achieved, as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended, by the establishment of a combination of Federal tax sharing and general functional block grants along with Federal categorical grants-in-aid.

Under this flexible approach tax sharing would be utilized to allow States and localities to devise their own programs and set their own priorities to help solve their own unique and most crucial problems. Block grants would be used to give States and localities greater flexibility in meeting needs in broad functional areas. And categorical grants would be used to stimulate and support programs in specific areas of national interest. Under this scheme revenue sharing would supplement rather than supplant existing categorical aids.

Underlying my firm support for the concept of tax sharing is the basic conviction that strong and financially viable State and local governments are essential not only to a healthy federalism but also to the best possible performance of governmental services. Dr. Walter W. Heller, who along with Dr. Joseph A. Pechman was the first exponent of tax sharing, has stated this thesis cogently:

> In part, this simply expresses the traditional faith in pluralism and decentralization, diversity, innovation, and experimentation. For those who lack that faith—for died-in-the-wool Hamiltonians and for those who believe that the states are bound to wither away—there can be little attraction in revenue sharing or other instruments relying heavily on local discretion and decision.
>
> Yet, apart from the philosophic virtues of federalism, all of us have a direct stake in the financial health of state-local governments for the simple reason that they perform the bulk of essential civilian services in the country.

The enactment of a revenue sharing measure would thus recognize a substantial role for the States and would provide a broad scope for decentralized decisionmaking. If the benefits of American diversity are to be exploited and enhanced, then the Federal Government must aid in creating a fiscal environment that will enable States and localities to exercise wide latitude in determining their own priorities and solving their own problems.

It is particularly important that we recognize the need for viable, imaginative State and local governments. We have during the last several years witnessed an increasing concentration of effective governing authority in the Federal Government and a decreasing ability for the States, the counties, and the cities throughout the Nation to cope successfully with the seemingly limitless problems which confront them. These trends constitute a threat to the traditional system of federalism which has produced the maximum good for the maximum number with maximum responsiveness in government throughout the history of this Nation. The federal system as we know it consists of an effective partnership of governing authority between the Federal Government on the one hand, and State and local units on the other. I believe that the future of this country interrelates to a large degree with our ability to preserve this partnership system of government.

The thrust of these remarks is not an appeal to some academic concept of States rights, sovereignty or independence, nor calculated to be in derogation of the absolute requirement for a vital, effective, imaginative Federal Government. Rather, it is a plea for the reinvigoration and revitalization of the authority of State and local governments in order that they may undertake and discharge their governing responsibilities. In a word, it is a plea for refederalization.

Mr. President, apart from the virtues of federalism, the fiscal argument for tax sharing is compelling. From 1946 to 1966, State and local governmental purchases of goods and services rose 348 percent with State and local debt increasing 573 percent. During this same period States and localities made impressive efforts to meet domestic public service needs, increasing tax collections from $11 to $59 billion. In spite of this dramatic increase, as well as the substantial growth of Federal categorical aids, there has been no letup in the intense fiscal pressures on States and their local entities, and every indication is that State and local expenditure demands will continue to rise sharply.

While State and local governments are confronted with this unrelenting fiscal pressure, a somewhat different situation prevails at the national level. Because of progressive tax policies, Federal revenues tend to increase at a faster rate than the Nation's economic growth. In fact, Federal income tax revenues increase by 15 percent for every 10-percent increase in the gross national product, producing approximately an additional $8 billion in Federal revenue each year with no increase in tax rates. Looking beyond the current costs of the Vietnam war, one can visualize the $8 billion automatic annual growth in Federal revenues generating new leeway for fiscal dividends among the States.

But the fiscal dilemma of State and local governments is only the beginning. Consider the unmet needs. One has only to walk in his suburb to see the need for schools, sewers, sidewalks, street lights, and more frequent garbage collection. He has only to walk in the urban area to see streets with gaping holes and crumbling curbs, to see rundown parks and miserable housing, and even to see increasing crime and poverty. And he must not at the same time forget the rapidly expanding cost of higher education, the woefully inadequate prisons and mental hospitals, and the still-to-be-conquered problems of air and water pollution.

There is, of course, no easy answer to these problems, but the enactment of a modest tax sharing measure would be a beginning. Under the provisions of the bill which I introduce, tax sharing moneys would be placed in a trust fund from which distributions to the States would be made. The distributions would be due the States as a matter of right, free from the uncertainties of the annual appropriation process.

The bill calls for an appropriation of one-fourth of 1 percent of the Federal individual income tax base for the 1971 fiscal year. This would yield an estimated $850 million. The bill further provides for a rate increase to one-half of 1 percent in fiscal 1972 and 1 percent in fiscal 1973.

The distribution formula to determine each State's share of available moneys from the trust fund would be composed of a population factor, which expresses an approximation of the total need of a given State, and a revenue effort factor, which expresses the need and initiative of the State. The revenue effort factor would be computed as the sum of all State and local general revenue, divided by adjusted gross income in the State, divided by the national average of such a revenue-income ratio. The net result of the application of this formula to available funds would provide some premium to those States that exercise their best efforts to provide for their own requirements and also some premium to those States that have a greater fiscal need.

Of the money allocated to each State from the trust fund, a portion would be required to be distributed to local governments. The amount that must be distributed to local governments would be the proportion of locally raised revenues compared to total State and local revenues. Thus, for example, if in one State 60 percent of total State and local revenue is raised at the local level, then that State would be required to pass through to local entities 60 percent of its allocation from the trust fund. But if in another State only 40 percent of total State and local revenue is raised at the local level, then only 40 percent would have to be passed through.

The term "local government" would be defined by the statute as all general purpose local governments, including counties, municipalities, and townships, but not including school districts or special purpose districts. The money passed through would be distributed to all local governments, and the amount that each local government would receive would be determined on the basis of the local government's revenue share of total statewide locally raised revenues. This amount would then be adjusted by the local government's own revenue effort.

Under the scope of this bill the States would be given virtually complete freedom in the use of their tax shares except for the usual public auditing, accounting, and reporting requirements on public funds. A Council on Tax Sharing composed of three Governors, three local government representatives, and three representatives of the public-at-large would be established to administer the program. The Council would be charged only with the implementation of the provisions of the act and would be without authority to direct or coerce the States or local governments.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that I am not wed unyieldingly to the specific terms and provisions of this bill which I introduce and which I have just summarized. I have no pride of authorship, and I recognize that many different approaches could be taken in establishing the concept of tax sharing.

I also realize that in drafting any particular tax-sharing bill, numerous problems present themselves. For example, under almost any approach, data problems arise, and at the present time I do not believe sufficient data are available to quantify the factor in my pass-through formula of adjusted gross income for all local governments. However, it is my understanding that some effort may soon be underway within the Internal Revenue Service, and I do not believe this to be an insurmountable problem.

Mr. President, tax sharing was endorsed in 1968 by both presidential candidates and by both party platforms. Over 100 different revenue-sharing bills were introduced during the 90th Congress, and many of these have already been reintroduced during the current session. I am most hopeful, therefore, that the appropriate committees in both Houses of Congress will soon hold hear-

XUM

ings on this concept and on the various approaches that might be utilized.

The enactment of tax sharing would relieve the intense fiscal pressure on State and local governments. It would serve the tradition of federalism by instilling in State and local governments a new vitality and independence. It would reverse the regressive tendency in the Federal-State-local tax structures. And it would enable the economically poor States to upgrade the quality of their services.

For all of these reasons I urge the adoption of this measure.

The text of the bill (S. 1634), is as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1634

A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Tax Sharing Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Council" means the Council on Tax Sharing established by section 8;

(2) the term "general revenue" of State and local governments means general revenue as defined by the Bureau of the Census in its publication "Governmental Finances", including taxes and non-tax revenue other than revenue from insurance trusts or from utility and liquor store sales;

(3) the term "local government" means a municipality, county, or township as such terms are used by the Bureau of the Census in its publication *Census of Governments*, "Governmental Organization", but does not include any school district or special district;

(4) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury;

(5) the term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia; and

(6) the term "trust fund" means the Tax Sharing Trust Fund established by section 3.

TAX SHARING TRUST FUND

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Tax Sharing Trust Fund". The trust fund shall consist of the amounts appropriated to it by subsection (b) and any amounts appropriated to it under subsection (c).

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (d) for the most recent calendar year for which satisfactory data are available from the Internal Revenue Service, equal to—

(1) one fourth of one percent of the individual Federal income tax base for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970;

(2) one half of one percent of the individual Federal income tax base for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971; and

(3) one percent of the individual Federal income tax base for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and for each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) In addition to the amounts appropriated by subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund for each fiscal year such additional amounts as may be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall, during each fiscal year, determine the amount described in subsection (b), and transfer the amount so determined from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund. Such transfer may be made on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary. Proper adjustment shall be made as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year, to the extent the amount transferred was in excess of or less than the amount which should have been transferred, by the transfer of additional amounts from the general fund to the trust fund or by the transfer of amounts from the trust fund to the general fund.

(e) For purposes of subsection (b), the individual Federal income tax base for any fiscal year is the aggregate of the taxable incomes as disclosed by returns of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (other than returns of corporations) made during such fiscal year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, if during a fiscal year a taxpayer files more than one return for the same taxable year, only the last return so filed shall be taken into account.

(f) Determinations by the Secretary under this section shall be final and conclusive.

METHOD OF PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 4. (a) Each State shall be entitled to payments out of the trust fund during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and during each fiscal year thereafter, as provided in this section.

(b) The total amount of payments to each State during each fiscal year shall be the amount determined under section 5. Payments shall be made by the Secretary not less than quarterly. Payments to any State made during the first and second quarters of any fiscal year may, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary in determining the amounts under section 5. Proper adjustments shall be made in the payments to any State during the third and fourth quarters of any fiscal year to the extent that payments in the first and second quarters were in excess of or less than the amounts which should have been paid.

AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 5. (a) The total amount of payments to each State for each fiscal year is an amount (computed by the Secretary) equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(1) the total amount appropriated to the trust fund for the preceding fiscal year, by

(2) the product obtained by multiplying the population percentage of such State for the fiscal year by the revenue effort percentage of such State for the fiscal year.

(b)(1) For purposes of subsection (a), a State's population percentage for any fiscal year is the percentage which the population of such State is of the total of the population of all the States.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the population of each State is the population as certified by the Bureau of the Census for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available for all the States.

(c) For purposes of subsection (a), the revenue effort percentage of any State for any fiscal year is the percentage which the revenue effort factor of such State for such fiscal year is of the average national revenue effort factor for such fiscal year. A State's revenue effort factor for any fiscal year is the result obtained by dividing—

(1) the total of the general revenue derived by such State from its own resources (including general revenue derived by the political subdivisions of such State) during a calendar year ending within such fiscal year, by

(2) the total adjusted gross income of individuals residing in such State during such calendar year as disclosed by returns of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

If the information for a calendar year for any State is not available, the Secretary may make the computation under the preceding sentence with respect to such State on the basis of information for the latest year for which such information is available.

PAYMENTS BY STATES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Sec. 6. (a) Each State shall pay to its local governments, out of the payments received by it under this Act during each fiscal year, an aggregate amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount of such payments as the total amount of general revenues derived by its local governments from their own resources for the fiscal year bears to the total amount of general revenue derived by the State and all of its political subdivisions from their own resources for the fiscal year.

(b) Each local government of a State shall be entitled to receive payments from such State for each fiscal year in an amount (computed by the State) equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(1) the total amount which such State is required to pay to its local governments for such fiscal year under subsection (a), by

(2) the product obtained by multiplying the local revenue share percentage of such local government for the fiscal year by the local revenue effort percentage of such local government for the fiscal year.

(c) For purposes of subsection (b), the local revenue share percentage of a local government of a State for any fiscal year is the percentage which the general fund revenue of such local government for the fiscal year is of the general fund revenues of all year.

(d) For purposes of subsection (b), the local revenue effort percentage of a local government of a State for any fiscal year is the percentage which—

(1) the general fund revenue of such local government for the fiscal year divided by the adjusted gross income of individuals residing in such local government, is of

(2) the statewide average of all revenue effort percentages of all local governments of such State for the fiscal year.

(e)(1) For purposes of subsections (c) and (d), the general fund revenue of a local government is that portion of its total general revenues derived from its own resources which is not expended for school or other educational purposes.

(2) For purposes of subsection (d), the adjusted gross income of individuals residing in any local government or in any State shall be determined on the basis of the latest statistics and information available from the Internal Revenue Service.

(3) For purposes of subsection (d), the statewide average of all revenue effort percentages of all local governments of a State shall be an average weighted by general fund revenue of all such local governments.

STATE UNDERTAKINGS

Sec. 7. (a) To be eligible to receive payments under this Act, a State shall undertake—

(1) to assume the same responsibility for fiscal control of and accountability for payments received under this Act as it has with respect to revenues derived from its own resources,

(2) to make payments to its local governments as required by section 6,

(3) to furnish such information and data to the Secretary as the Council may prescribe by regulations, and

(4) to submit the reports to the Council required by subsection (b).

(b) (1) Each State shall, on or before such date prior to the beginning of each fiscal year as the Council may prescribe, report to the Council its plans for the use of the funds which it will receive under this Act during such fiscal year.

(2) Each State shall, on or before such date after the close of each fiscal year as the Council may prescribe, report to the Council on the expenditures of the funds re-

ceived by it under this Act during such fiscal year.

(3) The reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be submitted by the Governor of each State, or by such State officer as he may designate. Such reports shall be in such form and in such detail as the Council may prescribe. Neither the Council nor any other Federal agency or Federal officer shall have power to approve or disapprove the plans of any State, or the expenditures of any State, as set forth in such reports.

COUNCIL ON TAX SHARING

Sec. 8. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government a Council on Tax Sharing. The Council shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) Three members appointed by the President from persons who are Governors of a State;

(2) Three members appointed by the President from persons who are highest executive officers of a local government; and

(3) Three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from persons who do not hold any Federal, State, or local government office.

Not more than five of the members of the Council shall belong to the same political party.

(b) Members of the Council who are appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 a day for each day they are engaged in the performance of duties as members of the Council. Members of the Council who are Governors or executive officers of a local government shall serve without compensation. All members of the Council shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties as members of the Council.

(c) The Council shall, from time to time, select one of its members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman.

(d) Five members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(e) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to oversee the operation and administration of this Act,

(2) to prescribe by regulations the information and data to be furnished by the States to the Secretary under section 7(a) (3) and the manner and form in which such information and data shall be furnished, and to prescribe by regulations the form and detail of the reports required by section 7(b),

(3) to prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary with respect to the manner in which computations under sections 5 and 6 of this Act shall be made by the Secretary and the States, and

(4) to make determinations under section 9 of this Act with respect to withholding of payments from any State.

In carrying out its duties under paragraphs (2) and (3), the Council shall endeavor to reduce to a minimum the administrative burden on the States, consistent with the needs of the Secretary and the Council for information and data to carry out their duties under this Act and of the Congress to carry out periodic reviews of this Act, and shall endeavor to keep the reports and forms required under this Act at an absolute minimum and in as simplified a form as is practicable.

(f) The Council is authorized to afford to the States such technical advice and assistance as may be necessary to assist them to receive payments made available to them under this Act and such information and assistance as they may request to assist them in the utilization of such payments.

(g) The chief administrative officer of the Council shall be an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the President and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for positions in level V of the Executive Schedule. The Executive Director shall perform such functions and duties as the Council may prescribe.

(h) The Council is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as are necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this Act. The Council is authorized to procure temporary or intermittent services under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

WITHHOLDING OF PAYMENTS; JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 9. (a) Whenever the Council finds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the Governor of a State, that there is a failure by such State to comply substantially with any undertaking required by section 7, the Council shall notify such Governor that further payments under this Act will be withheld until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until the Council informs him that it is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to such State under this Act.

(b) Any State which receives notice under subsection (a) that payments to it will be withheld may, within sixty days after receiving such notice, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of the Council's action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Council. The Council thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) The findings of fact by the Council, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Council to take further evidence, and the Council may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify its previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(d) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Council or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the Court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

Sec. 10. The Council shall, on or before February 1, 1972, and on or before February 1 of each year thereafter, report to the Congress and to the President on the performance by it of its functions and duties under this Act during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall include a summary of the reports received under section 7(b) (2) from the States on their use of the funds received by them during such fiscal year and a summary of the reports received under section 7(b) (1) from the States of their plans for the use of the funds to be received by them during the current fiscal year. Each such report shall also include any recommendations for changes in the amounts appropriated to the trust fund which the Council deems advisable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Representative RICHARD McCARTHY, of New York, has provided me with a copy of the letter which he has sent to the Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird. The subject of the letter was chemical and biological warfare, addressed to him in the form of questions pertaining to public policy. The Congressman prefaced his question by noting that 19 Members of Congress, as well as staff, were present on March 4 for a briefing conducted by Gen. James A. Hebbeler, Director of chemical and biological research for the Pentagon. I attended the briefing with a member of my staff.

In his remarks and questions to Secretary Laird, Representative McCARTHY made the following comment about the briefing:

> I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the nonclassified section of the briefings. I stressed that our national policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public view, and constructive criticism as are our ICBM, Polaris fleet, F–111 bomber program, and ABM system. . . . General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public questions remained unanswered.

As a result Representative McCARTHY was prompted to send a letter to the Secretary of Defense, asking some very basic questions.

Most of us are aware that the Defense Department has been engaged in chemical and biological research and that the amount of money involved has grown in recent years, notably since our involvement in Vietnam. According to the Legislative Reference Service, we are spending in the vicinity of $300 to $350 million a year on research, development, and procurement of chemical and biological weapons.

What is perhaps more significant than the dollar sign is the cloak of secrecy which has surrounded our activity in chemical and biological warfare research and development. This was adequately demonstrated in the recent NBC documentary on the subject.

The public has a legitimate right to know why the lid has been kept so tightly on the subject. If indeed our Defense authorities believe that chemical and biological warfare is easily misunderstood and misinterpreted, then we in Congress, as well as the American public, deserve to know why this is so. What is happening to produce such misunderstanding? Where does the fault lie?

Wherever there is an air of guarded secrecy, it is reasonable to expect something as potent as knowledge of chemical and biological warfare preparations to generate a certain amount of fear and outrage. For this reason it seems to me to be in the public interest for the facts to be aired in a forthright manner rather than withheld. The real issue is not just that chemical and biological warfare has grown to a more sophisticated stage of development, but that it

XUM

has also grown increasingly more difficult to comprehend.

With the prospects of warfare being more costly and destructive with every defense dollar that is spent, ignorance only breeds contempt—contempt for the means of modern warfare as well as the persons who plan for its arrival. Consequently, when it is heard that only a few droplets of the lethal chemical V–X will produce instant death, and that this chemical is being transported over our railroads and stockpiled in Army installations, we can expect many voices to be raised in protest. The protest comes at the discovery of the production of ever more lethal agents of war being concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer persons who prefer that the intent and content of these operations not be revealed. It was not until the sheep catastrophe occurred in Utah in March 1968 that criticism was raised about the Government's chemical and biological warfare experiments. Even now there are very few facts exposed to view.

Witness the report of the episode near Salt Lake City as contained in the NBC documentary:

> The only advertisements for the U.S. test program are placed where almost nobody sees them, on lonely side roads of the great Salt Lake Desert. Dugway Proving Ground is used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force to test both chemical and biological weapons. The base is so remote that very few people knew that it existed until last March and what came to be known as the "Skull Valley Sheep Episode." A valuable herd of about five thousand sheep were buried by the United States Army. But the military consistently denied any connection between Dugway Proving Ground and the dead sheep. There were many official inquiries . . . We now know that on March 13th, at Dugway, a jet fighter released the nerve gas V–X at an abnormally high altitude. Freak winds carried it even higher, and rain dropped it onto the Skull Valley pasture.

Sander Vanocur commented on this:

> To this day the United States Army maintains there is not absolute proof that the Skull Valley sheep were killed by the nerve gas test. But it has agreed to a payment of nearly four hundred thousand dollars to the owner of the sheep. And in recent months the Army has announced more stringent safety regulations for field testing at Dugway. If the sheep episode did nothing else, it stripped away a bit more of the official secrecy surrounding CBW in this country. It also turns out that Dugway is not our only test site after all. . . .

In an article written for the New York Times magazine in August of 1968, Seymour Hersh had the following to say about other chemical and biological warfare bases and what they do. He said:

> Because of the secrecy surrounding the CBW program, it is impossible to detail completely the functions of the military bases.

Mr. Hersh went on to describe the bases as follows:

> Fort Detrick, Md.: This base, about 50 miles northwest of Washington, D.C., serves as the headquarters for the nation's biological warfare research program. Detrick controls the procurement, testing, research and development of all biological munitions and products, including all defense approaches (such as masks and vaccines). The emphasis at Detrick, however, is on the offense. The fort was set up during World War II and has been one of the world's largest users of laboratory animals since—perhaps as many as 720,000 mice, rats, guinea pigs, hamsters, rabbits, monkeys and sheep a year. Most of the nation's military work on anticrop devices and defoliants is conducted in a corner of the base where, behind high wire fences, scientists work in a cluster of greenhouses.
>
> Pine Bluff, Ark.: This arsenal usually is described in military organization charts as serving primarily as a chemical munitions base. Indeed, it was opened in 1942 as a chemical facility and still serves as an important packaging and production point for smoke bombs, incendiary munitions and riot-control agents (including CS, the potent tear gas used in Vietnam). But Pine Bluff does its most important work for the biological laboratories at Fort Detrick. It is the main center for the massive production and processing of biological agents. The germs are not only brewed in heavy concentration there but are also loaded into bombs, shells and other munitions, most of which are in cold storage depots, known as igloos.
>
> Dugway Proving Grounds: This base tests biological as well as chemical agents and is also an important research center. Studies in ecology and epidemiology have been underway for years to determine just what happens to an area after many years of testing with highly infectious biologicals. (Similar test projects are sponsored by Dugway at other locations in the nation.) The problems are incredibly complex: more than 10,000 species of life are known to exist on the huge base.
>
> Edgewood, Md. Arsenal: Edgewood is the oldest of the CBW bases; it dates back to World War I, when it served as a manufacturing site for shells containing Phosgene and other gases. It was the central plant for the production and filling of gas munitions until the end of World War II, when it was switched to research and development. Edgewood's first major job in this area was to study the nerve agents, produced by the Germans, that Allied intelligence had shipped home. A pilot plant to produce one such agent—Sarin, otherwise known as G.B.—was built and in operation on the base by the late 1940's. The arsenal is now the management and final inspection center for all chemicals and chemical weapons.
>
> Much time and money are invested in Edgewood in the quest for the perfect incapacitating agent, presumably a psychochemical or anesthetic weapon. The only such weapon known is BZ, and it has yet to see combat use. The chief problem with the incapacitating agents is the requirement for a uniform dosage level—that is, they must be capable of being spread evenly; otherwise, they might kill in areas of high concentration and have no effect at all in areas of lower concentration.
>
> Rocky Mountain Arsenal: This 17,750-acre base is 10 miles northeast of Denver and served as the main production facility for the nerve gas Sarin after initial tests at Edgewood demonstrated its feasibility as a weapon. Production of the gas was halted in 1957 after three years of furious, around-the-clock activity (insecticides are now manufactured here) but the arsenal has remained busy filling rockets and bombs with it.
>
> The Newport Chemical Plant: This installation in farm country on the western edge of Indiana, near Danville, Ill., is the Army's main production plant for VX, an improved nerve gas that did not enter the military's arsenal until the early 1960's. (VX, unlike Sarin, does not evaporate rapidly or freeze at normal temperatures. Its low volatility makes it effective for a longer period of time.) The plant was built by the Food Machinery and Chemical Corporation (F.M.C.) under a 1959 Army contract and has been operated ever since by that company. Newport produced VX nerve gas on a 24-hour schedule until late 1962, when production was slowed.

There have been speculations about the secrecy prevading the development of chemical and biological warfare. An example of an incident producing such speculation is the so-called Pacific Ocean biological survey in which both the Smithsonian Institute and the U.S. Army have been involved.

In the February 21 issue of Science magazine there is a full discussion of the evidence and activity resulting from this experiment. Says Science:

> There is absolutely no doubt that the Smithsonian is conducting a biological survey of the Central Pacific under an Army contract—that is a matter of public record. From the available evidence, it also appears quite probable—even most certain—that the Army is looking for a biological warfare test site in the Pacific and is using data turned up by the Smithsonian survey to assist in the search. The Smithsonian data is relevant because any test site would have to be located where there is no danger of germs being carried outside the test area by migratory birds or other wildlife.

As witnessed here, the Army has a stake in the Pacific Ocean Biological Survey, aside from whatever value it is to the Smithsonian. But the point is to illustrate the mystery which has covered the experiment. The terms of the agreement between the Army and the Smithsonian are sufficiently unknown to raise considerable doubt and question in the minds of those who have been kept in relative, if not complete, ignorance of what has been going on there and in other places.

If, indeed, there is extensive research and testing going on at the Dugway Proving Grounds, in the Central Pacific, and elsewhere—including a number of universities—then why has the Defense Department gone to such trouble to protect the public from knowledge of this activity? Under the cloak of national security there is reason to speculate that some of the most hideous and debasing forms of human warfare are being manufactured at the expense of the unsuspecting taxpayer. Moreover, the inevitable drive toward more sophisticated and infallible weapons systems in the arms race, coupled with the enormity of the expense, is a self-perpetrating guise under which almost any experimentation can be rationalized and carried out.

Related to the secrecy of chemical and biological warfare, there are some important questions to be asked. First, what are the safeguards with respect to the testing, stockpiling, and transportation of chemical and biological agents? The public has a right to know exactly what they are. According to a "Chemical-Biological Safety Summary" produced by the Defense Department:

> The CB program of the U.S. Army provides a safe and secure environment for CB agents and munitions, and insures that the public is properly protected from accidental exposure or injury from their effects.

The summary goes on to give broad assurances of safety due to restricted and isolated depots, minimum handling of items, security to protect from theft and sabotage, precautions pertaining to the transportation of chemical-biological

XUM

agents and munitions such as accompaniment by technical escort teams and carefully chosen routes for transit, as well as the scrutiny of a chemical safety committee at Dugway Proving Ground, plus special arrangements in the case of a mishap. The summary, however, is not as explicit as it ought to be. It assures us of safety measures but does not spell them out.

Surely many precautions have been taken by those who handle chemical and biological agents. But these matters should be subject to the full investigation and satisfaction of the Congress of the United States and not just the Defense Department. A policy of preparedness should not only include civil defense against the onslaught of enemy chemical and biological warfare, but it should include antidotes for an accidental self-imposed state of chemical or biological destruction.

With every experiment with herbicides in Vietnam and gases in the skies of Utah there will come with greater facility a day when these weapons will be relied upon as the means of warfare of the future, more subtle and less destructive to property, but just as deadly as a nuclear explosion. The public had best know how to defend against them.

This leads to a second major question. What are the official policies for the use of chemical-biological weapons in the event that they are used first by a foreign aggressor against us? Who makes the decision to deploy anthrax, the plague, or a lethal nerve gas? What are the ground rules? What have they been in the case of Vietnam? What are the deterrent factors in a program of chemical and biological preparedness? How do we militarily defend against a chemical-biological attack? If the purpose of our preparedness is to prevent surprise, what specific steps have been taken to detect a surprise?

The third question is: What commitments have we taken toward a resolution of the chemical and biological arms race? Are we diligently working for the time when we can reach a mutual agreement with other nations in a manner similar to the approach taken on nuclear testing and proliferation? What specific proposals would we be willing to offer or endorse at the United Nations or the 18-Nation Disarmament Agency in Geneva?

There is yet another point which should be considered. It hardly needs reiteration. The vast military-industrial complex has already invested billions in the armaments race while fewer and fewer dollars are being given to the alleviation of human need. The larger this military-industrial complex grows, the more difficult it is to reason with the forces and institutions of war. What next will be justified in the name of military preparedness?

There is reason to believe that last week's briefing for Members of Congress by the Defense Department was as much an occasion for displaying a need for additional funds for chemical and biological research and development as it was for answering searching questions about what already exists in this area. Is it more in the interest of the military and industrial establishment or national security that alarming odds of disparity between Russian and American CBW capacity were leaked out for public view?

Chemical and biological warfare is but another example of something, not unlike the controversial ABM system, of which Congress must be wary and which ought to be probed with some very hard investigation of the facts.

I am suggesting that the Congress should make it its business to immediately look into this matter. It should be reviewed from the historical as well as the technological standpoints. We will need to review the entire scope of chemical and biological warfare. The cloak of secrecy must be removed. It is questionable whether much that is presently hidden behind the protective shield of classified information should not be open for public debate.

In fairness to the immense threat which chemical and biological weaponry poses to the whole world, we must judge our activities in this field with a view toward initiating limitations upon the use of these terrifying agents of death. To quote a paragraph from a study done by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament, headed by Hubert Humphrey, in 1960:

> While the dominant position of the nuclear weapon in the field of mass destruction may go unchallenged indefinitely, many scientists and students of warfare believe that the potentialities of toxic chemical compounds and disease-producing micro-organisms are such that they constitute a serious future threat to our national security. Some even believe that the magnitude of this threat approaches that of the nuclear weapon.

If this conclusion is correct, the American people ought to know that it is. They ought also to know what efforts are being made to combat the dreaded effects of these heinous forms of warfare. We are nearly 10 years further down the road to a possible chemical-biological confrontation and tragedy. Clearly it is in the interest of all mankind for Congress to seek ways of prohibiting such an awful eventuality.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Congressman McCarthy's letter, two articles from Science magazine, the text of the NBC documentary, and an article from the New York Times be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of the Letter of Congressman McCarthy

Dear Mr. Secretary: Recently my lack of knowledge of United States' programs and policies in the fields of chemical and biological warfare was brought home to me. I realized that I did not know, as I did concerning our ICBM's, our B–52 bomber force, our troops deployed in Germany or Vietnam, the basic reasons for these programs. I also did not know the policies that guide our use or non-use of weapons in these areas. And I did not know what safeguards are being taken to protect the American public from any danger from activities in these areas.

With the advice of my colleagues from New York State on the Armed Services Committee of the House, I asked the United States Army to give me and any other interested colleagues in the House and Senate a briefing on the basic reasons for, the safeguards, and the public policies that applied in the fields of chemical and biological warfare.

Apparently my interest was shared by many other members of Congress for 19 Members, 3 Senators, and 16 representatives from members' offices attended the briefing which was held on March 4, 1969. The number of staff would certainly have been larger had attendence, even for the unclassified portions of the briefing, not been restricted to those with active security clearances.

In discussing the nature of the briefing with the U.S. Army, I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the nonclassified section of the briefing. I stressed that our national capabilities and policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public review, and constructive criticism as are our ICBM, Polaris fleet, F–111 bomber program, and ABM system. I deliberately refrained from raising questions which I believed would legitimately fall within the area of secrecy.

General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public policy questions remained unanswered. I am therefore sending to you for reply a list of the public policy questions, the answers to which are essential to an intelligent and rational appraisal by Members of Congress and the concerned public toward these programs. I would appreciate your considered answers to these questions:

1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fallout shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

4. We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

5. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease

from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

6. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

7. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

8. What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Are they inert? Are the chemicals moved in tanks under pressure? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

9. What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields? Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and research programs on ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

10. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nationwide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrant effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publically stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the fields of chemical and biological warfare?

11. Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

12. Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's future activities abroad?

13. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

14. Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

[From Science Magazine, Dec. 27, 1968]

NERVE GAS: DUGWAY ACCIDENT LINKED TO UTAH SHEEP KILL

(By Philip M. Baffey)

Nine months ago some 6000 sheep grazing in Skull Valley, Utah, were killed or sickened by a mysterious ailment that attacked the central nervous system. The sheep were located near the Dugway Proving Ground, the Army's chief site for field testing chemical and biological weapons, so suspicions were immediately aroused that the sheep had been felled by a lethal substance originating at Dugway. These suspicions were heightened when it was subsequently revealed that Dugway had tested highly toxic nerve agents the day before the sheep became ill.

The massive sheep kill attracted to Utah a swarm of investigators from the military, from state and federal agencies, and from various universiities. There were loud pledges from all concerned that there would be a no-holds-barred investigation into the question of what killed the sheep. For a time, while public interest in the incident remained high, status reports on the investigation were issued by the Army and by some of the civilian agencies involved. The Army generally took the line that, while Dugway was highly suspect, there was no conclusive proof as to what killed the sheep and further tests were necessary to establish the cause. At this writing, more than 9 months after the incident, there has still been no detailed report of what the investigation revealed. Brigadier General William W. Stone, Jr., of the Army Materiel Command, who headed the Army's investigation, has compiled a secret report on the incident, but the Army has not released an unclassified summary of this report and shows no inclination to do so. Nevertheless, it is possible, from the scattered statements the Army has made and from a variety of other sources, to piece together the outlines of what happened.

Virtually all the scientific and circumstantial evidence publicly available indicates that the primary cause of the sheep deaths was VX, a persistent nerve agent that was used in an aircraft spray test at Dugway the day before the sheep started dying. The scientific evidence will be discussed in more detail below, but, in brief, scientists have found traces of the nerve agent in the dead sheep and in nearby vegetation and snow water; they have established that the sheep were poisoned by an organic phosphate compound, of which the nerve agent is one; and they have shown that low doses of the nerve agent fed to healthy sheep will produce the same symptoms as those found in the sick Skull Valley Sheep. There is evidence that the sheep ingested the nerve agent primarily by eating contaminated vegetation, and that the toxic material persisted in the area for at least 3 weeks after the incident. As a result of the unfortunate incident, a high-level advisory committee, headed by Surgeon General William H. Stewart, has recommended stringent new safety procedures for Dugway, and the Army last week adopted them in toto.

ACCIDENT AT DUGWAY

How the agent escaped from Dugway may never be known beyond doubt, but investigators suggest that a combination of circumstances conspired to bring about the sheep slaughter. There was an accident during the spray test at Dugway; shortly thereafter a change in weather conditions apparently carried the agent toward the sheep and then precipitated it around them; and sheep turn out to be unusually susceptible to the agent. Had any of these factors been absent, it is conceivable—though unprovable—that there would have been no "Dugway incident."

The Army's initial reaction to news of the sheep deaths was to deny that Dugway had been doing any testing that could have caused the incident, but this posture had to be abandoned when the office of Sen. Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), revealed on 21 March that Dugway had conducted three separate nerve agent operations on 13 March, the day before shepherds first noticed the sheep were ill. The Army had supplied the information to Moss and apparently intended it to be "for official use only," but Dale O. Zabriskie, press assistant to Moss, says there was no restrictive marking on the document so he promptly released the information to Utah newsmen, much to the Army's consternation.

Surgeon General Stewart states that two of the nerve agent operations—a demonstration firing of 155-mm shells containing nerve gases, and a disposal operation involving the burning of about 160 gallons of a persistent nerve agent—have been ruled out as possible sources of the substance that killed the sheep. The third operation, in which a high-speed aircraft dispensed 320 gallons of VX in the form of liquid droplets from two pressurized spray tanks, remains highly suspect.

The purpose of the aircraft spray test, according to statements made by Army officers at an informal briefing for the Utah congressional delegation last March, was not to test the nerve agent, which had been released hundreds of times at Dugway before, but rather to test the total disseminating system, consisting of the nerve agent, the spray tanks, and the high-speed aircraft. "You test the entire configuration before you put it on the shelf," General Stone explained at the briefing.

The Army has consistently refused to say whether anything went wrong during the test, and Colonel James H. Watts, Dugway's commanding officer at the time of the incident, has even been quoted as denying rumors of a malfunction. But three sources who participated in the investigation—namely D. A. Osguthorpe, a veterinarian who acted as consultant to the Utah Department of Agriculture, G. D. Carlyle Thompson, director of the Utah State Division of Health, and Surgeon General Stewart—all confirmed to *Science* that there was, indeed, a malfunction. The malfunction resulted in the agent being released at a much higher altitude than anticipated.

The Army has publicly announced that the aircraft approached the target grid on a heading of 315 degrees true at an altitude of 150 feet (see map at right). Full details of what subsequently went wrong are not available but the following version has been pieced together from several sources.

Plans for the test called for the plane to dispense the nerve agent over the target grid, then pull up and jettison its supposedly empty tanks. But the pilot, unfortunately, has no way to shut off the tanks—they continue to discharge until they are empty. In the test on 13 March, according to investigators, one of the tanks failed to empty itself over the target grid and continued to dispense the nerve agent after the plane pulled up.

To what altitude the discharge continued is not completely clear. Colonel Watts, the former Dugway commander, has been quoted as saying the agent was released at a maximum altitude of 450 meters, or about 1500 feet. Osguthorpe, who has had access to much of the Army's data, believes the agent was carried somewhat higher. Either way, the agent was clearly within striking range of the ridge of the low-lying Cedar Mountains, which stood between the sheep and the test site. At their high point, according to the contour map distributed by Dugway, these mountains rise about 2700 feet above the Dugway flats, while at the points lying directly between the sheep and the test site, they rise only some 1200 feet above the valley. Somewhat less than 20 pounds of the VX is believed to have remained airborne after the 13 March test, according to testimony presented to a Senate appropriations subcom-

XUM

mittee last May by Lieutenant General Austin W. Betts, chief of research and development for the Army.

At the time of the test, according to the Army, the winds at altitudes below 2300 feet were generally from the south-southwest, with gusts up to 35 miles per hour. Had this wind direction continued, the agent would have been carried up the west side of the Cedar Mountains and over barren salt flats. But there was a "weak front" in the area, reported the Army, and about 2 hours later the wind shifted and blew from the west. Betts said the wind "could have carried any very small particles of VX remaining airborne over the areas in Skull Valley and Rush Valley where sheep were late affected." Betts also said scattered showers developed during the early evening after the test (which took place at 5:30 p.m.) and he added that "one of these rain showers could have washed this airborne VX out of the air and deposited it on vegetation and the ground." Snow was reported the following morning.

On March 14, the day after the test, sheep in several bands in Skull Valley just east of Dugway began showing signs of illness. One herder described the sheep as "crazy in the head." They generally acted dazed, held their heads titled down and off to the side, walked in a stilted, uncoordinated manner, urinated frequently, fell down, and were unable to get up. Dugway scientists say these are not the usual symptoms associated with the nerve agent, but it was later discovered that these symptoms can be produced by low doses of the agent.

The affected herds were located in a crescent extending generally east and northeast from the Dugway site. The nearest sheep were about 27 miles from the site of the aircraft spray test and were separated from the test by low mountains. The farther sheep were 40 to 45 miles from the test site and were located in Rush Valley, beyond a second, higher range of mountains, but near a low-lying pass through the mountains. The sheep nearest the test site were the most severely affected while the herd in Rush Valley was touched only slightly. The course of the illness in the sheep that died was as short as 24 hours and as long as several weeks.

Investigators were initially mystified that sheep seemed to be the only animals in the area affected. Horses and cattle intermingled among the sheep showed no symptoms of illness, though chemical tests did indicate a somewhat depressed level of cholinesterase in the blood, an indication the animals had been exposed to an organic phosphate compound, a class which includes the nerve agents. Dogs and humans seemed unaffected. And while a survey of the area turned up at least 15 dead rabbits, rodents, birds, and other small wildlife, there seems to be no evidence that these small animals were killed by the nerve agent. One jack rabbit was observed to show signs of incoordination and trembling, symptoms which might indicate exposure to a nerve agent. But the Army, which had the area surveyed both before and after the test, maintains that the rodent population remained essentially unchanged.

Why were sheep the only animals affected? The answer seems to lie partly in the fact that sheep are more susceptible to the agent than many animals, partly in the fact that sheep had greater access to contaminated food than most animals.

Dugway scientists stated at the time of the incident that not much was known about the effects of the nerve agent on sheep. But during the course of the investigation, according to Surgeon General Stewart, it was learned that sheep are "peculiarly responsive" to the nerve agent and succumb to "much lower doses" than would harm a human being, even a child. Moreover, sheep, it seems, die easily once they become sick. Robert H. Huffaker, a Public Health Service veterinarian who participated in the investigation, believes the first sheep that died may have been killed by the nerve agent, but those that died later succumbed to such secondary causes as starvation. "Sick sheep like to die," he says. "You won't find them crawling a mile to a waterhole on a broken leg."

The Army has stated that the sheep were apparently affected by eating contaminated vegetation, and feeding experiments conducted by the Agriculture Department's Poisonous Plant Research Laboratory in Logan, Utah, lend substance to this theory. When Logan scientists fed forage from the affected areas of Skull Valley to healthy sheep, the sheep showed a marked depression of cholinesterase activity (a sign of possible nerve agent exposure) and some of them developed symptoms identical to those observed in the sick Skull Valley sheep. In contrast, sheep placed in the affected areas but muzzled and fed only hay and water brought in from outside showed no signs of toxicity, though some investigators doubt it.

There was speculation early in the investigation that the sheep may have been sickened by licking contaminated snow, and since at least one laboratory has identified traces of the nerve agent in snow water, this may remain a possible source of the poison.

The toxic substance seems to have persisted in the area for at least 3 weeks after the incident, possibly longer. Logan scientists placed three different groups of normal sheep in the affected area on 19 March, 1 April and 4 April and all groups developed illness identical to that of the sheep in the initial outbreak. By 3 months after the incident, however, the poison had apparently dissipated. Healthy sheep fed forage collected from the affected area on 12 June, and on several occasions subsequently, showed no signs of illness.

The massive sheep kill has raised questions about the potential danger to human life. Alvin Hatch, manager of the ranch that suffered the greatest losses, told *Science* his herders often obtain their water by melting snow, though at the time of the incident they were carrying a water supply. Since the nerve agent has been identified in snow water, Hatch speculates that his herders may have had a "narrow escape."

There were also reports that one of the sheepherders and two Agriculture Department scientists who autopsied the dead sheep developed headaches, nausea, dizziness, and diarrhea, but an Agriculture Department report, dated 15 July, says "there was no confirmation that these (symptoms) were directly associated with the cause of illness in the sheep." The Public Health Service and the Army tested the vast majority of humans in the affected areas and found no evidence of nerve agent effects. Whether humans escaped harm primarily because the level of nerve agent present was too low to affect them, or because they did not wander around the range munching vegetation, is not clear from the information available to *Science*.

HAS GAS ESCAPED BEFORE?

Dugway has had no off-base chemical monitoring system, so it is impossible to tell whether any significant amounts of lethal agent have escaped in the past. The advisory committee headed by the surgeon general states that the March sheep kill "provided the first off-post event which was suspected of being connected to Dugway operations," but such a statement does not rule out the possibility that nerve agents may have escaped previously and simply failed to strike populated areas. Fay Gillette, sheriff of Tooele County, Utah, for the past 22 years, told *Science* that on several occasions some 6 or 7 years ago he received "confidential calls" from Dugway, generally in the evening, asking him to patrol U.S. Highway 40, 35 miles north of Dugway, and tell people who were stopped along the side of the road to get moving. "They never told me why and I never asked them," says Gillette. Seymour M. Hersh, author of a recent well-reviewed book on chemical and biological warfare, spent 3 weeks in Utah investigating the Dugway incident and concluded that "this is not a freak event—there have been other similar occurrences at Dugway." Hersh says he has detailed his findings in an article scheduled to appear in *Esquire* magazine.

ARMY ISN'T TALKING

The weight of circumstantial evidence—the accident at Dugway, the weather conditions, the location of the affected herds—strongly suggests Dugway was the source of the substance that killed the sheep. But even stronger evidence was turned up by scientists who participated in the investigation. Unfortunately, complete information on the scientific findings is apparently known only to the Army, and the Army isn't letting its scientists say much. *Science* requested an interview in August with Mortimer A. Rothenberg, Dugway's chief scientist, and Rothenberg agreed, subject to approval by his superiors. Such approval was denied.

The Army told *Science* it could submit questions to Dugway in writing, so four questions were mailed in on 22 August. More than 3 months passed before the answers came back. Even then, the answers were, in some respects, incomplete and ambiguous.

Fortunately, the Army is not the only source of information on the investigation. Dozens of civilian specialists from federal and state agencies and from various universities participated in aspects of the investigation, and some were actually on the scene in Skull Valley before the Army even knew any sheep had died. After considerable prodding, *Science* was able to obtain reports from two major federal agencies involved, the Public Health Service and the Agriculture Department. From these reports, and from the few public statements made by the Army, it seems clear that the preponderance of scientific evidence has implicated the nerve agent as responsible for the sheep deaths.

The most convincing evidence comes from chemical tests conducted by the National Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, a branch of the Public Health Service. Chemists at NCDC used gas chromatography, infrared spectroscopy and mass spectrometry in an effort to find traces of nerve agent in the dead sheep or in such environmental materials as snow and grass. In a report to Utah's health director, dated 29 April, NCDC said unequivocally that chemists found traces of the nerve agent. The report's "summary of chemical results" states that:

"Water and forage from Skull Valley as well as blood and liver from ill sheep showed an agent which proved to be identical in chemical composition to a sample of the test agent supplied by Dugway.

"Rumen contents from ill sheep showed the same response on instruments as the authentic test agent furnished in water by Dugway, that is, hydrolysis products of test agent.

"Infrared chromatograms of test agent, hay, and water extracts showed similar scans indicating identity of agents under study.

"Mass spectrometry of test agent hay and water isolates *prove beyond doubt* (italics added) that these responses are in fact identical and can only be attributed to the same chemical."

CONFIRMING TESTS AT DUGWAY

Confirming chemical tests seem to have been conducted in Dugway's laboratories, though the Army is much less emphatic in asserting that it definitely detected traces of the nerve agent. General Betts, the Army's R & D chief, testified last May that Dugway's chemical analysis of large samples of vegetation from the affected area had proceeded "to the point where it was considered possible that traces of VX or a similar organic compound were very likely present." More recently, in a 25 November response to the questions posed by *Science*, the Army said that "traces of agent or agent-like material were found in samples of vegetation collected at several periods of time after the March 13 incident."

The chemical tests were conducted with great difficulty, for they required instruments capable of detecting minute traces of the nerve agent and considerable sophistication in interpreting the results. Army scientists initially analyzed several hundred samples of water, soil, snow, vegetation, and wool from Skull and Rush Valleys and found no evidence of VX. Only after "very large samples of vegetation" were analyzed did the Army conclude that the agent might "possibly" be present. Meanwhile, the Agriculture Department intially thought it had detected "some similarity" between decomposition products of the nerve agent and substances in the tissues from affected sheep, but later concluded that the similarity was caused by products normally found in sheep tissue and was not significant. Agriculture officials say they also had problems with their instruments. In all, according to the Army, several thousand samples of environmental materials from a 100-square mile area were analyzed by various agencies in the effort to determine what killed the sheep.

ARMY STILL SKEPTICAL

As a result of the inherent difficulties of the analysis, some Army scientists are said to remain unconvinced that the nerve agent has been unequivocally identified. Nevertheless, NCDC Atlanta remains confident of its results, and no one has publicly challenged the seemingly conclusive findings. Surgeon General Stewart told *Science* that, at the time of the incident, NCDC had "better equipment than Dugway to detect very low levels" of the nerve agent.

In addition to tests identifying the nerve agent itself, there is considerable evidence, apparently undisputed, that the sheep were poisoned by an organic phosphate compound. These compounds are found in nerve agents, many common pesticides, and some noxious plants as well. They interfere with the action of the enzyme cholinesterase at nerve endings, and a depressed level of cholinesterase is thus considered a rather specific indication that an organic phosphate is involved. Numerous investigators have reported a severe depression of cholinesterase in the blood of the affected sheep. Moreover, the Agriculture Department has reported finding a cholinesterase depressing substance in snow collected from the area of the sheep kill. Thus it seems clear that the sheep were subjected to an organic phosphate poison, and since the investigation turned up no evidence that death was caused by poisonous plants or pesticides, the most likely culprit among the organic phosphates is the nerve agent tested at Dugway.

Further evidence implicating the nerve agent comes from feeding experiments at Dugway. When healthy sheep were fed small doses of VX, they developed essentially the same symptoms as the sick sheep in Skull Valley.

Army scientists are not convinced, however, that VX was the only cause of the sheep deaths. In its 25 November response to *Science* the Army said: "Although minute quantities of the agent were detected off-post, the results from these investigations have not provided conclusive evidence that nerve agent by itself caused sickness or death in the sheep. The answer is still unknown and may never be determined. The evidence suggests a combination of factors or effects." The Army is currently conducting experiments to determine whether the toxicity of the nerve agent is increased synergistically by the action of pesticides, noxious plants, trace elements in the soil, or the condition of sheep following the rigors of trailing and lambing. Thus far the Army has concluded that there is no synergism when sheep are fed both nerve agent and heptaclor, a pesticide which has been found in portions of Skull Valley.

Though Brigadier General John G. Appel, who has immediate command over Dugway, was quoted on 6 December as denying that the nerve agent caused the sheep deaths, the Army has accepted legal responsibility by paying $376,685 to one rancher for the loss of 6249 sheep (4372 dead, 1877 others sickened) as well as a lesser amount to some Indians who lost a small number of sheep. According to an Army letter to members of Congress, such compensation is proper, under the Military Claims Act, "where the Army's activities contributed to the loss."

NEW SAFETY RULES

The sheep kill incident has caused the Army to tighten up the safety procedures used in testing persistent lethal chemical agents at Dugway. On 5 July, Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor announced the formation of a high-level advisory committee, headed by the Surgeon General, to review the safety of chemical testing at Dugway. Last week, the committee's recommendations were released, and Resor announced that every single one had been ordered adopted.

The new regulations state that high-speed aircraft must maintain "positive control" over the dissemination of lethal agents and that no release of such agents shall be made above 300 feet. They also prohibit testing when wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour, or when thunderstorms are occurring or predicted within 100 miles of the lethal cloud.

One of the most significant new rules requires that Dugway release agents in such a way that the agent cloud remains in the barren salt flats area north and northwest of the test site and does not cross heavily traveled U.S. Highway 40, to the north, for at least 3 hours (by which time the cloud would presumably have dispersed to the point where it is harmless). Heretofore, Dugway has not worried much about the direction of travel of the cloud and has counted on dilution of the cloud to render it nonhazardous. To carry out the new rules, Dugway will have to extend its ability to predict downwind behavior of the cloud from the present range of a few miles to "several tens of miles."

Another significant regulation requires Dugway, for the first time, to establish a monitoring system to detect the entry of chemicals into the environment outside the proving grounds. The system will consist of air samplers to sound an immediate alarm (though there is some question whether such samplers can be made sensitive enough) as well as ecological surveys to detect penetration of chemicals into local animal populations, both domestic and wild.

UTAHANS NOT WORRIED

Although the sheep death incident caused concern throughout the nation, the people of Utah and their community leaders did not seem particularly worried. The incident was not treated as front-page news by the Salt Lake City papers, and the Tooele Chamber of Commerce actually passed a resolution expressing confidence in Dugway, presumably because Dugway contributes heavily to the local economy. Moreover, there was virtually no reaction from Utahans when the Army revealed that lethal nerve agents, which had aroused a storm of protest in Denver, would be transferred in part from Denver to the Tooele Army Depot.

The Army has consistently said there was no negligence on the part of anyone at Dugway, so the sheep slaughter was presumably the result of inadequate safety regulations rather than a failure to follow prescribed regulations. Surgeon General Stewart told *Science* that Dugway was operating "on a set of assumptions that had worked in practice for so long that the assumptions became truths." In retrospect, the Army can clearly be blamed for a lack of caution in handling the deadly nerve agents, as well as a lack of candor in informing the public about the cause of the incidnet.

[From Science Magazine, Feb. 21, 1969]

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE: IS THE SMITHSONIAN REALLY A "COVER"?

(By Philip M. Boffey)

Early this month a program televised nationally by NBC News charged that the Smithsonian Institution is serving as a "cover" for chemical and biological warfare (CBW) activities. Specifically, the program alleged that a Smithsonian bird-banding project has served as a "screen" for efforts to locate a site in the Pacific Ocean to conduct CBW tests; and as a "cover" for an "ultra-secret test" of an "animal delivery system for CBW." The charges—made in the course of a long program on CBW activities—attracted immediate attention in many of the nation's leading newspapers. Before the hubbub had subsided, another Smithsonian project—an ecological study in Brazil—had been implicated as well.

The barrage of adverse publicity provoked alarm and indignation inside the Smithsonian. Sidney R. Galler, the institution's assistant secretary for science, was called away from a scientific meeting to investigate the charges. On the basis of his findings, he told *Science* "unequivocally" that the Smithsonian "has never engaged in any kind of biological warfare research." He also said there is "no evidence" that the Smithsonian has served as "an unwitting dupe or cloak for some kind of biological warfare research." He said charges that the Smithsonian is helping the Army find a CBW test site, or was involved in a secret test, are "absolutely without foundation."

POSSIBLE REPERCUSSIONS

Galler said Smithsonian scientists are "all shook up and really heart-broken about this kind of dastardly accusation." He expressed particular concern that the adverse publicity would undermine the Smithsonian's delicate international activities, and its relationships with the scientific community in this country and abroad.

The Smithsonian's bird study has excited such controversy that it is worth examining the project in some detail to determine just what the Smithsonian has done. There is absolutely no doubt that the Smithsonian is conducting a biological survey of the Central Pacific under an Army contract—that is a matter of public record. From the available evidence, it also appears quite probable—even almost certain—that the Army is looking for a biological warfare test site in the Pacific and is using data turned up by the Smithsonian survey to assist in the search. The Smithsonian data is relevant because any test site would have to be located where there is no danger of germs being carried outside the test area by migratory birds or other wildlife.

But there is no good evidence that the Smithsonian has either participated in, or served as a "cover" for any CBW activities. NBC never bothered to define precisely what it meant by "cover," but in modern spy terminology the word would seemingly imply either that (i) Smithsonian scientists carried out military activities while pretending to be engaged in research, or (ii) military personnel posed as Smithsonian scientists, or (iii) the Army, in order to hide its intentions, used the Smithsonian to perform research that should normally have been performed by the Army itself. None of these seems to have been the case.

Nor is it clear whether the Smithsonian should be condemned, or praised, for undertaking the project. Indeed, the whole episode provides a striking illustration of how an institution can get caught in a

XUM

changing moral climate. What seemed "good" or "acceptable" 5 or 6 years ago is often deemed "suspect" today.

The Smithsonian project—known officially as the Pacific Ocean Biological Survey—has been conducted for about 6 years in a central Pacific area covering more than 4 million square miles of open ocean, dotted with islands and atolls. The area includes the Hawaiian, Line, Phoenix, and Tokelau island chains, as well as various individual specks of land. The goal of the project, from the Smithsonian's point of view, is to learn what plants and animals occur in the area, and, in particular, what factors determine the distribution, abundance, and migration of birds. Some 2 million birds have been banded, mostly in the central Pacific, but also on islands as far away as the Pribilofs in the Bering Sea.

INITIATED BY ARMY

According to S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian and an ornithologist himself, the survey has produced "terribly exciting" scientific data on such "mystery birds" as Newell's shearwater, whose breeding and migrating habits were previously unknown. "It's a wonderful project from the scientific point of view—the fulfillment of a dream," Ripley says.

The project was apparently instigated by the Army, but the Smithsonian jumped at the chance to carry it out. Philip S. Humphrey, director of the project and also director of the Museum of Natural History at the University of Kansas, told Science that in the summer of 1962 military officials came to the Smithsonian for help in finding a university that might be interested in conducting an ecological study in the Pacific. Instead of suggesting another institution, however, Humphrey, who was then curator of birds at the Smithsonian, put together a proposal himself, and the Army accepted it. The project started in 1963. By the time it is completed next June, it will have received an estimated $2.8 million in Army funds, a sum which Humphrey feels was simply not available from any other source. Army scientists say they had to hire an outside organization to carry out the study because the Army's ornithological capabilities are "limited, to say the least."

Humphrey insists that "the project is not Army-directed research—it's Smithsonian research supported by the Army." He says that "the military at first wanted to restrict me to a narrow geographic area, but I said, 'No. If the Smithsonian is going to do it, we'll do it my way.' And they gave in." The Army has exerted some influence on the survey by requesting additional data on certain islands, Humphrey said, but in each case the Smithsonian scientists were delighted that the Army was willing to finance additional work.

The project has clearly had some relationship to the Army's CBW program. Humphrey said it was originally administered from Fort Detrick, Md., the Army's biological warfare center, but the latest contract, effective 1 August 1968, has been administered through the Army Research Office, perhaps because the Army sensed trouble was brewing. Moreover, Smithsonian scientists have regularly sent blood samples, ticks, live birds, and other specimens collected in the field to Detrick and to the Desert Test Center in Utah, another CBW installation. Smithsonian officials say it is "relatively common" to perform such collecting services for a granting agency.

WHAT THE ARMY WANTS TO KNOW

Why is the Army, and, in particular, the CBW establishment, interested in the Smithsonian's bird survey? The official explanation put forth in statements over the past year is that the Army is studying (i) the natural distribution of diseases in the area as they may affect the health of servicemen and civilians; (ii) the impact of U.S. installations on local bird populations; and (iii) the problem of collisions between birds and aircraft at airports on small Pacific islands. An Army statement submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year said the survey had shown that U.S. activities in the Pacific had not reduced bird populations; that bird populations are much larger than previously suspected; that migratory habits of several species of birds are different than previously believed; and that several species of birds are susceptible to certain diseases, and, in fact, carry diseases. The statement said "at least one new disease of humans was found." (The Smithsonian stresses that it is not doing disease work itself; it is merely supplying blood samples and field specimens to the Army.)

Almost no one believes that the Army's explanation of why it is interested in the project is the complete truth. In fact, Humphrey, the project's director, says he learned "fairly early" in the survey "why the military is interested in this in a general sense." He says he is "sure" the Army wants to test CBW in the Pacific and is looking at the findings of the ecological survey to be certain that any potential site is "safe." But he says the Smithsonian itself is not trying to pick such a site; it is simply trying to learn more about the animal and bird populations of the area.

Some ecologists suggest that the Smithsonian project may actually prevent the Army from conducting tests in the Pacific (assuming such tests have not yet been held), for it may demonstrate that no site is sufficiently "safe." Indeed, there are unconfirmed rumors that the Army was not at all eager to finance the costly, time-consuming project, but only did so to satisfy safety objections. If this is so, it raises an interesting question for the CBW critics: Should the Smithsonian be condemned for aiding CBW activities, or praised for throwing a roadblock in the way of a potentially reckless CBW venture?

A few of the Smithsonian's critics have suggested there is another purpose behind the project. They claim information on bird migration patterns and bird diseases will enable the Army to develop a bird delivery system for germ warfare. Humphrey calls such suggestions "ridiculous" because "while birds in a statistical sense may have predictable migrations, in an individual sense you don't know what the hell they're going to do." A Defense Department fact sheet states unequivocally: "We have not been studying birds as potential carriers of biological warfare agents."

The Smithsonian project was classified for most of its existence, according to Humphrey, but it was declassified at the Smithsonian's request last August. In retrospect, Humphrey believes classification may have been a tragic mistake, for it roused suspicions and made the project seem mysterious.

At times, the secrecy fetish seemed extreme. Robert Standen, a junior college teacher and graduate student in Los Angeles, who worked as a field investigator for the project in 1964–65, says he was instructed not to mention that he was on a Defense Department contract. Similarly, Victor B. Scheffer, a biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, says he was on the Pribiloff islands in 1965 when two Smithsonian field men came through banding birds. When asked what they were doing, Scheffer says, the men replied: "You can see we're banding birds, but we can't tell you why."

REASONS FOR CLASSIFICATION

The Army, and some Smithsonian officials, claim the project was classified merely because many of the sites visited, and the military ships used for transportation, contained classified military equipment. But Humphrey believes there were additional reasons. He believes the Army wanted to hide Fort Detrick's connection with the project and suppress information that would indicate locations in which the Defense Department wanted to undertake activities.

Humphrey insists that the survey's scientific findings have "never, never, never been classified." He acknowledges that the Defense Department has prevented publication of a few of the project's reports, but he says this is for reasons unrelated to the scientific data. The project has already published some 45 scientific papers, and Humphrey says that all of the research results will ultimately be published.

The repercussions caused by the bird project secrecy have reinforced a feeling that the Smithsonian, which conducts numerous projects in sensitive foreign areas, had best avoid classified research in the future. Ripley, who joined the Smithsonian in 1964, said that when the project was undertaken in 1962–63 the Smithsonian could see "no particular harm" in agreeing to restrictive conditions that seemed "routine boiler plate." But as antipathies have developed toward secret military research in recent years, Ripley said, it has become clear that the Smithsonian must avoid any hint that it is "doing undercover things for the Army."

Ripley says he knows of no other classified research being performed by the Smithsonian. Two years ago, he says, he turned down a project related to Vietnam because "I didn't want to see the Smithsonian mixed up in something that could be assumed to be related to the war." Ripley added that the Smithsonian would hesitate to undertake any research for the Defense Department—even if it were unclassified—in areas of the world that are "pathologically sensitive."

All in all—if one can accept the testimony of the scientists involved—the Smithsonian has behaved much like hundreds of other institutions and researchers who accept Defense Department support. It is conducting a basic research project that it believes has great intrinsic merit; it is accepting Army money to finance the project; and the Army presumably is using the results for military purposes.

But NBC, and some of the newspaper reports, have implied something more: they have suggested that the Smithsonian is serving as a "cover" for military activities. The charges are worth examining in some detail, for, on close inspection, they turn out to be marred by the use of loaded words and guilt-by-association reasoning.

NBC's allegations were aired on 4 February on a program called "First Tuesday." The program, which uses a "magazine format," presented several topics that night, ranging from an examination of ornate bathrooms to a tour of the Sinai peninsula, but its major segment was a long exploration of CBW. The program hit hard at the secrecy surrounding CBW activities, and, in a somewhat doomsday atmosphere, showed animals convulsing and dying from the effects of CBW agents.

The first hint of the revelations to come concerning the Smithsonian was supplied by NBC reporter Tom Pettit, who described the extent of the CBW test programs and then added: "There has even been an ultra-secret test project in the Pacific Ocean, conducted under a cover of bird-banding study." A few minutes later, after two brief preliminary interviews, Pettit supported this charge by introducing Robert Standen, the Los Angeles teacher who had once worked for the Smithsonian project. Standen described a typical day's work, and then Pettit dropped his bombshell. He revealed that "Standen later took part in an ultra-secret military CBW project in the Pacific."

In a rather confusing question-and-answer sequence, Standen said that he had never told the Smithsonian about the military test, and that the test involved a "biological carrier." He refused to say where the test had taken place.

Reporter Pettit then filled in the blanks by announcing that NBC had learned from other sources that the 6-week test was conducted in the spring of 1965 on Baker Island, a 1-square-mile U.S. possession some 1700 miles southwest of Honolulu. Pettit said Army, Navy and Air Force personnel were "testing animal vectors, or carriers, to see how they would behave in a tropical climate. No germs were involved. In effect it was a checkout of an animal delivery system for CBW."

What was the Smithsonian's involvement in this military test? "The Smithsonian never knew what it was about," Standen told *Science*. Standen said the Army asked the Smithsonian project to send an observer along so that, if the test caused biological changes on the island, the Smithsonian scientists would understand what had happened. As it turns out, Standen said, there were no changes, so Standen left the island after 12 days, well before the end of the test.

Standen said the Army refused to tell one of the Smithsonian project's ranking scientists what the test was about. He also said that he himself was barred from a meeting aboard ship at which the objectives of the test were apparently discussed, and that he was instructed not to tell his Smithsonian colleagues about anything he had seen.

Shortly after the NBC program, the Defense Department acknowledged that "some years ago" it had conducted "classified biological warfare-related testing for purely defensive requirements at Baker Island and other Pacific islands." The Defense Department said "These tests involved no Smithsonian Institution personnel and no actual BW agents were ever used."

Thus the Smithsonian's only involvement with this test seems to be that the bird project allowed one of its field men to accompany the military team, almost as an "outcast." NBC's use of the word "cover" to describe this situation seems highly misleading. As far as Standen, NBC's star witness, is concerned, the Smithsonian bird project "is not a cover for anything."

After finishing with Standen, reporter Pettit, then moved in with his clinching evidence. He revealed that former Senator Joseph S. Clark (D–Pa.), "when he was in the U.S. Senate, learned of a direct connection between the Pacific bird project and CBW testing." Clark then stated: "Well, as I understand it, under the screen of the Smithsonian Institute in a bird-banding project, they were looking for a relatively safe place to conduct chemical and biological warfare testings. This resulted in their picking one of the islands in the Hawaiian Chain, probably a pretty small one. It is my understanding that they are now on their way to do some testing there."

And where did Clark, the clincher in NBC's case, get his evidence? "I took that largely from NBC and from Tom Pettit," Clark told *Science*. "Pettit said there was no doubt about it. It was all documented in the NBC documentary." When pressed as to whether the NBC program really did prove that the Smithsonian had been used as a "screen," Clark acknowledged: "We could be wrong. I'm not so much concerned with whether the Smithsonian is covering up for the Army as with the fact that the Army is engaging in utmost secrecy, and the American people have no opportunity to know what is going on."

The allegations about the Smithsonian were virtually the only part of the NBC program to receive extensive coverage in the press. Unfortunately, some of the nation's leading newspapers seem to have been as casual as Senator Clark in their treatment of the charges. The New York *Times* put the weight of the prestigious Senate Foreign Relations Committee behind the allegations by asserting, in the opening paragraph of a story published on 5 February, that the committee's staff "has obtained information suggesting that the Army, under the guise of a bird study by the Smithsonian Institution, is looking for a remote Pacific site to conduct experiments in chemical-biological warfare." The *Times* said that Senator Clark, a former committee member, had based his statements to NBC on information obtained from the staff.

However, the staff does not seem to have much information. The only evidence mentioned in the *Times* was a letter from E. W. Pfeiffer, professor of zoology at the University of Montana, who wrote that he had "learned from an absolutely reliable source" that the purpose of the project was to locate a test site; plus indications that CBW officials are interested in the project. Peter B. Riddleberger, the staff's CBW specialist, told *Science* the Foreign Relations Committee has no other evidence that has not investigated the Smithsonian project. Indeed, the *Times* article acknowledged, in the last paragraph, that the Army's alleged interest in the Smithsonian project for CBW experiments had not been "conclusively established."

Thus, the evidence cited to prove that the Smithsonian has been used as a "screen" or "cover" seems flimsy indeed. It consists of a confused description of a military test in which the Smithsonian does not seem to have been directly involved; a casual charge by a former senator who says he got his information from NBC and admits he could be wrong; and an uncorroborated letter to the Foreign Relations Committee which quoted an anonymous source and which, incidentally, never once mentioned the word "cover."

Some press reports linked a Smithsonian project in the Amazon delta, also directed by Humphrey, with the Pacific Bird Project. The Amazon project involves a collaborative effort, with the Brazilian government, to study the ecology of a tropical rain forest, including birds and virus diseases. No one seems to have charged that this project, too, is a "cover," but some reporters have suggested that the findings might be useful in CBW. The project, which is unclassified, is supported by the Brazilian Ministry of Agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Smithsonian, and, at Humphrey's request, the U.S. Army and Air Force.

Smithsonian officials are outraged at what they regard as "irresponsible reporting" by the mass media. Project director Humphrey, who presumably knows more about the bird study than anyone else, says he was never contacted by NBC. Galler, the Smithsonian's assistant secretary for science, says he had one brief phone conversation with Tom Pettit, in which Pettit asked several general questions but never once raised the question of CBW. However, Pettit told *Science* his notes indicated he specifically asked Galler if the Smithsonian knew of a relationship between the Pacific Ocean Biological Survey and chemical and biological warfare testing. Pettit says Galler replied: "To the very best of our knowledge there is absolutely no relationship."

Any ethical judgment as to whether the Smithsonian's bird project is "good" or "bad" depends, of course, on one's own moral code. But from a practical standpoint, one can question whether it was wise for an institution with highly sensitive international dealings to accept a classified defense contract, or to send a man along on a military expedition, however innocent his role may have been. Perhaps the real lesson of the whole episode is that, in these highly charged times, an institution that wishes to maintain an unblemished reputation can't merely follow its traditional mores—it must consider the changing values of the public as well.

NBC NEWS' PRESENTS CHEMICAL-BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Prepared by: Script Transcription Associates, Inc.)

CBW: THE SECRETS OF SECRECY

Vanocur. Tonight, you will see an industrial film about a product called Death. The product is being tested by an agency of the United States government. It is produced by the United States government which is developing a full line of the product under the brand name CBW. As in all good industrial films, the product is demonstrated . . . with emotion or without exaggeration.

Narrator. This laboratory animal is about to be exposed to a nerve gas. An Army Chemical Corps technician draws up a very small amount of the nerve gas, which is in a liquid state. Through an opening in the top of the enclosure, a droplet is released. Exposure to nerve gas now begins. A current of fresh air continuously maintained inside the enclosure draws the nerve gas vapors over the rabbit. Though the amount of nerve gas is minute, and the time of exposure to it probably no more than a few seconds, the animal is already beginning to feel the effects. It becomes increasingly difficult for the animal to stay on his feet. General weakness and lack of muscle control become more apparent. Twitching, convulsions, and gasping now set in and become progressively stronger. After approximately two and one-half minutes, the animal is in the last stages . . . generalized convulsions and unconsciousness. The rabbit stops breathing and finally, death occurs.

Pettit. The United States also has nerve gas for people. These artillery shells are filled with the nerve gas, code designation V–X. V–X is a major weapon in America's arsenal for chemical, biological warfare . . . CBW. My name is Tom Pettit. I have been studying CBW for six months. The report you are about to see was prepared without the co-operation or approval of the Department of Defense. For years, the entire subject of CBW has been shrouded in official mystery, a cult of secrecy. The U.S. Army arsenal at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, 35 miles southeast of Little Rock is one of the places the Army would not let us enter. The Army has spent more than a hundred million dollars here on biological warfare facilities. Somewhere on these fifteen thousand acres of Arkansas countryside there is a germ factory, a pilot plant to produce microbes for war. The Army does not like unauthorized reports about CBW. It prohibits all photographs beyond the gates of secret bases like Pine Bluff.

The British are much more open at their biological warfare research center. Last fall, we were allowed to photograph some of the laboratories at Porton, 80 miles southwest of London. Even laboratory work can take on the appearance of a medieval executioner's ritual. The British emphasize that the work here is purely defensive . . . designed to develop masks and vaccines. But to do this requires detailed information on how germs can be used as weapons. The knowledge of biological weaponry developed at Porton is given to the United States military for its own use. For one thing, British scientists have learned how to mass produce germs. The first step of the process is called seeding. It is very delicate work, requiring the skill of a master chef, preparing a favorite recipe.

Disease organisms are planted in a gelatin-like substance. This is where they will take root, grow, and reproduce. The British even turn out high-quality germs for export to scientists in other countries. At Porton, as in the United States, scientists have studied anthrax, brucellosis, the plague, and more exotic diseases: o-fever, encephalities, rabbit fever. They even combine them in a sort of germ cocktail, guaranteed to kill. The scientists at Porton have earned an international reputation for their expertise. They

XUM

also have done major work on immunization using chicken embryos to provide the raw material needed to produce living virus cells. This is how Porton developed new vaccines for undulant fever, anthrax, and the plague . . . all potential weapons. In 1957, they produced a rush order of three-quarters of a million doses of vaccine against the Asian flu. One English commentator interpreted this to mean they could produce three quarters of a million doses of a disease just as easily. In this sealed air chamber, scientists at Porton have demonstrated that airborne microbes can remain alive and virulent for as long as 24 hours. This laboratory finding proved the military feasability of biological warfare. Germs sprayed from enemy airplanes would still cause infection when they reached the ground. Any country with a good-sized brewery could manufacture the germs with essentially the same technology used to make beer. Britain actually tested biological weapons in 1941, when there was fear that the Axis powers might use germ warfare. In one test, the remote island of Gruinard, off the northwest coast of Scotland, was sprayed with anthrax bacteria. The targets were sheep. They died. But the anthrax bacteria were so durable that the island still is unsafe for people, 28 years later. It is expected to remain that way for at least another one hundred years.

Vanocur. Some military men believe that biological weapons would determine the balance of world power in the event of effective nuclear disarmament. Some believe that Russia is ahead of us in the development of both chemical and biological weaponry. No one knows for sure, but it is believed that the United States spends a million dollars a day on CBW. Ironically, this is about the same amount Russia spends every day to subsidize Cuba. But we do not know how much Russia spends on CBW. Everyone prefers to think of CBW as a combination of mystery and myth, even it's history.

The conventional or accepted history of chemical warfare blames Germany for first using poison gas . . . a chlorine attack against the British and French in April, 1915. But eight months earlier, the French had used tear gas against the Germans. Most people have forgotten that after the first German chlorine attack, both sides used poison gases until the end of the War in 1918. Chlorine, phosgene, and mustard gas. The United States Army organized a unit and called it The First Gas Regiment and it saw action on nearly every section of the western front. It participated in the campaigns of Chateau-Thierry, Saint Mihiel, and Meuse Argonne. The United States spent on the order of seventy million dollars, just to manufacture poison gases for combat, in World War I. In mobilizing for World War II, the United States expanded its poison gas production facilities at Edgewood Army Arsenal, Maryland, and elsewhere. President Roosevelt pledged in 1943 that we would not use such weapons unless they were first used by Germany or Japan. They were not. But in 1945, we had nearly twice the gas supplies of the enemy, though nothing as deadly as Germany's secret nerve gas.

Announcer. Uncovered in the American zone in Germany, 75,000 tons of Nazi poison gas are loaded aboard ships for destruction. One type, deadliest of all, attacks the skin, lungs, and bloodstream and can kill a man in two minutes. The obsolete S.S. Alcobanner heads out on her last journey, for the only practical way to dispose of this deadly gas cargo is to send it to the bottom of the sea.

Vanocur. Germany had not used the nerve gas, presumably from fear of retaliation, even though in fact we did not possess nerve gas. The allies destroyed much of the captured gas, but on the Eastern front, the Russians had captured an entire nerve gas factory, giving them a headstart in chemical weaponry for the Cold War.

Pettit. After the war, and in great secrecy, the United States also went into the nerve gas business. We built at least two full-scale factories to produce nerve gas. One is on the isolated plains of Western Indiana, not far from the small farming community of Newport. It cost more than thirteen million dollars to put up this plant, and for nine years it turned out a high quality nerve gas called V–X. Then last fall, it was quietly decided that American stockpiles of nerve gas are adequate, at least for now. There have been no Pentagon press releases about Newport because the Defense Department seldom publicizes chemical weapons. One rare exception was a film about military Psycho-Chemicals. It was released in the late 1950's and widely shown on national television news programs.

The so called cat and mouse experiment demonstrated a chemical, which would put an enemy soldier out of action but not kill him. In the first part of the experiment, the cat's behavior was normal. Then the chemical, an experimental drug, was administered to the cat. At the time, the name of the drug was withheld, but its effect was self-evident. A complete reversal of normal emotions. The cat became afraid of the mouse. It is now known that this was a demonstration of LSD and the cat was merely on a bad trip. LSD turned out to be impractical but we did develop a number of other chemicals designed to incapacitate. At the same time, production of chemicals that kill went on. Just after the Korean War started, a forty million dollar nerve gas factory was built at the Rocky Mountain arsenal near Denver. The Army rules on secrecy have been inconsistent, to say the least. In 1954, the Hearst Metrotone Newsreel company was permitted to take these films. But in 1963, NBC was denied permission to enter the plant, even after the Denver Post had been allowed to document the loading of shells, bombs, and rocket warheads with nerve gas in liquid form. One ton tanks of liquid nerve gas were stockpiled in quantity on the grounds of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. But with air traffic increasing at the adjacent Denver airport, and the city itself expanding, the Army became sensitive about publicizing the storage of nerve gas at the arsenal. The supposedly-secreted stockpiles were clearly visible, however, to passengers flying in and out of Denver, even though photographs on the ground were prohibited. The factory itself is no longer producing nerve gas; and then late last summer, the Army started to remove the nerve gas supplies.

Tuttle. This is Lt. Terry Tuttle at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. This information was released by the Department of the Army on August 22, 1968 concerning the movement of toxic agents at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. Most of the toxic materials now at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal will be moved. This includes toxic materials of all types. Details are classified.

Pettit. About half the nerve gas at Denver was shipped by rail to a remote Army depot, 35 miles southwest of Salt Lake City. This is the principal nerve gas storage point within the continental United States. The amount stored here is secret. In every other respect, there is more secrecy surrounding CBW in the United States than about hydrogen bombs. Canada also has a CBW establishment. The Canadian base was set up on the bleak prairie of Alberta, early in 1941, when wartime secrecy concealed its existence. Even today, a traveller on the highway southeast of Calgary is not likely to stop for a sight-seeing tour. But there is far less official mystery than in the United States. We were allowed inside on the basis of a single telephone call to the Canadian Defense Research Board. By national policy, the station at Suffield works only on defensive measures.

But the findings are shared with Britain, Australia, and the United States. Samples for some of the experiments are supplied by the United States. This technician is working with a concentrates liquid nerve gas, code letters G–B, the material which was produced at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. He is diluting it for use in an experiment. Pure G–B is colorless and odorless in liquid or vapor form. A few drops on the skin or a few deep breaths of concentrated G–B would kill in minutes. Like other nerve gases, G–B is chemically similar to a good bug killer. It attacks the human nervous system . . . just as an insecticide kills bugs. Canada does extensive animal studies with G–B. Once the liquid nerve gas is diluted, men can work without masks and usually do. It remains a liquid at room temperature. One carefully measured microgram . . . a few billionths of an ounce . . . of G–B will be dropped into one eye of the rabbit as part of an experiment to study the non-lethal effects of nerve gas. Canada has done exactly the same experiment on human volunteers. Within seconds, the pupil of the eye contracts sharply. This condition, known as miosis, reduces night vision. In combat, this could happen to a soldier before he knew what was happening. Full recovery from miosis takes up to three weeks. This test shows that a nerve gas attack could reduce the fighting effectiveness of unprotected troops, even if they were not killed outright. The Suffield laboratories also are testing new antidotes for victims of nerve gas. So far, they have found nothing better than the standard antidote, a chemical called atrophine. Ironically, nobody knows why atrophine works, but it does. You are looking at a living mouse heart, sustained by oxygen and a nutrient solution. Injection of a nerve agent causes paralysis of the nerve endings; the heart slows down and stops. The electro-cardiograph falls to zero. Injection of atrophine, if done quickly enough reverses the nerve paralysis and the heart resumes beating. The Canadian laboratory has been doing animal exepriments for many years. For the technician, killing with nerve gas is just part of the day's work. Many people working in CBW today have been in the business for twenty or twenty five years. They have a vested interest in CBW. Most are convinced that these are the weapons of future wars.

This vial contains the nerve gas G-D in dilute solution for injection into the laboratory mouse. CBW researchers are always trying to improve the product through testing. G-D is one of hundreds of nerve gases, each a slight variation of the same basic formula. G-D is more resistant to atrophine. All of them kill as G-D kills very quickly.

Exercise Vacuum was conducted last Fall at Suffield by Canadian, British, and United States troops. While Exercise Vacuum was never announced in America, it was openly reported on Canadian television.

Warren. Military and scientific authorities emphasize that the exercise was strictly a defensive one. It was a test of man, equipment and procedures against the hypothetical enemy equipped with chemical and biological weapons. That means germs and nerve gas, but they don't use the term very often around here. It was the first time Canadian troops have been tested in a full scale CW, that's Chemical Warfare exercise. The men were forced to wear respirators and protective gear for as long as fourteen straight hours while performing their military jobs. The men had simulated nerve gases shot at them, sprayed at them from aircraft and blown up around them in mines in pre-contaminated areas. The stimulant used was such that a badly equipped or careless soldier suffered irritating symptoms similar to those of a mild shot of tear gas and they discovered that sleeping, eating, and other functions could be difficult in full protective equipment. The scientists say Canada has no weapons for waging chemical and germ warfare . . . only for defense. John Warren, CBC News, at the Defense Research Establishment, Suffield, Alberta.

Vanocur. In contrast to Canada and England, the United States does have weapons for waging chemical and biological warfare. That report will be next.

Vanocur. As we said the United States does have weapons for waging chemical and biological warfare. We test them in Utah at a base which was nicely obscure until an accident last Spring, at the Dugway Proving Grounds, eighty miles Southwest of Salt Lake City. Here is Tom Pettit.

Pettit. The only advertisements for the U.S. test program are placed where almost nobody sees them, on lonely side roads of the great Salt Lake Desert. Dugway Proving Ground is used by the Army, Navy and Air Force to test both chemical and biological weapons. The base is so remote that very few people knew that it existed until last March and what came to be known as the "Skull Valley Sheep Episode". A valuable herd of about five thousand sheep were suddenly wiped out. Most had been grazing in Skull Valley, twenty miles North of Dugway. Some were forty miles away. All were buried by the United States Army. But the military consistently denied any connection between Dugway Proving Ground and the dead sheep. There were many official inquiries. The governor of Utah named a special investigator, Dr. D. A. Osguthorpe, a veterinarian, who looked first for physical damage to the sheep, or what a veterinarian would call "pathology".

Osguthorpe. The main effect is upon the nervous system. There was one thing about . . . I noticed about the sheep, that there was no pathology what so ever with these sheep. The gastro-intestinal tracts, the circulatory systems, musculature were all perfectly normal from a pathological standpoint, but the animals were dead, mainly from suffocation due to the fact that there was no connection between the muscles they used . . . that these animals used to breathe and the respiratory center, and as a result, they were not able to take in sufficient oxygen and they died of suffocation. After several days of, of um, questioning, why the Army finally admitted that they had conducted experiments in the area with nerve gas agents.

General Stone. There are too many confusing aspects. We have been working in this area for twenty-five years, in this particular part of this country. With complete safety and impunity and we have never done anything to damage the surrounding area. If we are the cause of this, we have a problem.

Lt. Col. Black. No other form of animal life has evidenced any symptoms whatsoever, although they are located in the same area where the sheep are dying. Horses, cows, dogs, birds, and rabbits.

Osguthorpe. This is a rabbit showing the effects of the poisoning. This is very typical, you can see the tribulation. Notice the trembling of the hair on the rabbit. See there . . . see the very minute tribulation.

Pettit. Did this rabbit die, do you know?

Osguthorpe. This rabbit died, yes. Here again you . . . you just saw the, the muscular incoordination that this compound produces.

Pettit. This is the same thing that happened to the sheep then, that is happening in this rabbit?

Osguthorpe. Yes.

Pettit. The U.S. Department of Agriculture studied the surviving Skull Valley sheep and some animals which the Army tested at Dugway. USDA needed Army clearance merely to report on the findings of the Dugway test.

Van Kampen. These animals were given low levels of the nerve agent. And after a short period of time they developed the same droopiness of the head and twisting in the spine as had been seen in the Skull Valley sheep. Symptoms have persisted for as long as three months in some of the animals.

Pettit. Or longer?

Van Kampen. Or longer. We have several here that have had the symptoms persist for six months.

Pettit. In your view then, there is absolutely no doubt that the cause of the sheep dying and becoming sick in Skull Valley was a nerve agent.

Van Kampen. Certainly connected with the nerve agent, yes.

Pettit. We now know that on March 13, at Dugway, a jet fighter released the nerve gas V–X at an abnormally high altitude. Freak winds carried it even higher, and rain dropped it onto the Skull Valley Pasture. Dr. Osguthorpe feels that the V–X might have been carried even farther.

Osguthorpe. This could have been, very easily washed into, into one of our reservoirs, our drinking water. Had it been rained out over one of these areas we might have had some real disastrous results. Um, one, one specifically, the Deer Creek reservoir very easily could have got that far had it not been rained out. I'm, I'm sure that had this got into a water supply why, it would have definitely killed people. You cannot conduct these, this type of experiment without endangering the life around you.

Vanocur. To this day the United States Army maintains there is no absolute proof that the Skull Valley sheep were killed by the nerve gas test. But it has agreed to a payment of nearly four hundred thousand dollars to the owner of the sheep. And in recent months the Army has announced more stringent safety regulations for field testing at Dugway. If the sheep episode did nothing else, it stripped away a bit more of the official secrecy surrounding CBW in this country. It also turns out that Dugway is not our only test site after all.

Pettit. The United States headquarters command for testing chemical and biological weapons is designated the Deseret Test Center. Its work is so secret that even its location, Fort Douglas in Salt Lake City was not known until after the sheep episode. The Deseret Test Center plans and conducts America's CBW tests, at Dugway and elsewhere. Military sources have revealed the existence of other test programs directed from here. At Fort Greely, in Alaska, Fort Clayton in the Panama Canal Zone, and at Fort Huachucha in Arizona. There has even been an ultra-secret test project in the Pacific Ocean, conducted under a cover of bird-banding study. A scientist in California had been asked to develop a bird-counting radar.

Cogswell. There was some possibility of the Department of Defense seeking a, um, test site of some sort or other, I never knew what, in the general region. And were interested therefore in the bird populations and numbers in the region. I did know, also at this time that the Smithsonian Institute or the U.S. National Museum in Washington, D.C. had a project going on at that time in the area, that the area of interest was in the Central Pacfic, Southward from the Hawaiian Islands to near the Equator. The whole, the whole Central Pacific area.

Pettit. The Pacific Ocean biological survey has cost the Defense Department more than two and a half million dollars. This amount was paid over the past six years to the Smithsonian Institution. Fred Sibley, a biologist, worked on the project for three years.

Sibley. Um, this was a program administered by the Smithsonian Institution to study distribution and migration of sea birds in the Central Pacific. My job was mainly that of a trip leader, taking four or five people out on a party, and we would land on the various islands, do biological survey on these islands and part of which was banding, a considerable number of birds.

Pettit. This story is picked up by Robert Standen, who took these home movies in true amateur fashion, waved at his own camera.

Standen. On one very dull day, we spent the whole day doing nothing but bagging birds with that long net, which is not much fun, since you can go around pick them up at night with no trouble at all. Fred felt that we should keep busy. We went about finding out how isolated that area was. In a sense that was part of what we were doing, I would say. Not specifically. Nobody ever said that to me, mind you . . . But that . . . I felt was implied. We did a very intensive biological study of a specified area.

Pettit. Standen later took part in an ultra-secret military CBW project in the Pacific, which he was not allowed to film. He said the military test involved vectors . . . the scientific term for live animals, which can carry disease organisms. Have you ever told anybody what was done?

Standen. No I haven't.

Pettit. Not even the Smithsonian?

Standen. No I didn't. I haven't told a soul. I would like to tell somebody, sometime, because it, it would be just fun to tell somebody. I thought it was extremely interesting.

Pettit. What was the point of holding this test, that far out in the Pacific?

Standen. Well, the vector, the carrier, the biological carrier, didn't live in that place normally, okay. The place was well isolated from other areas, okay. And it would be very easy to eliminate the carrier, once it was over. Therefore it wouldn't introduce a new species into the area. Also, of course, I think, this is worthy of note; since the vector that we used had to be kept alive all the way to the location, you see. This was an experiment in itself. This is where the scientific experiment comes in. There were meteorologists there who observed everything about the conditions of the atmosphere at the time and place, okay. Plus we had an extensive biological staff. We had, literally, guinea pigs on the island.

Pettit. Where was this?

Standen. I can't say.

Pettit. Roughly.

Standen. In the Pacific Ocean.

Pettit. In the Hawaiian chain?

Standen. No.

Pettit. In the Hawaiian Islands?

Standen. I can't say.

Pettit. Can't say yes or no?

Standen. I could say yes or no, but I won't.

Pettit. Why?

Standen. Because I was told not to.

Pettit. Since talking with Standen, we have learned from other sources that the test was conducted in the Spring of 1965, on an island seventeen hundred miles southwest of Honolulu, just north of the equator . . . Baker Island, a U.S. possession. There is an abandoned World War II airstrip on Baker, but the island is uninhabited. The six-week test involved Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel, commanded by the Deseret Test Center. On the one square-mile Baker Island they were testing animal vectors, or carriers, to see how they would behave in a tropical climate. No germs were involved. In effect it was a check-out of an animal delivery system for CBW. The Smithsonian says it knows nothing about a biological warfare testing programs related to its bird-study project. But Joseph Clark of Philadelphia, when he was in the U.S. Senate, learned of a direct connection between the Pacific Bird project and the CBW testing.

Clark. Well as I understand it, under the screen of the Smithsonian Institute in a bird-banding project, they were looking for a relatively safe place to conduct chemical and biological warfare testings. This resulted in their picking one of the islands in the Hawaiian Chain, probably a pretty small one . . . it is my understanding that they are now on their way to do some testing there.

Vanocur. The Army has cataloged all the diseases which could be used as weapons, either by us or against us. For example, it knows that brucellosis or undulant fever, is very disabling, with long lasting severe fever and general aching. It knows that plague produces rapid pulse, rapid breathing, high fever and death. That anthrax causes fever, sores, lesions of the lung and death. Much

XUM

of the research on disease is done in the Army's own secret laboratories or by contract at various universities and private companies. At one time more than fifty different institutions held Army contracts. One of them is the University of Utah. Again, Tom Pettit.

Pettit. The University of Utah has been doing secret biological research for the Army for sixteen years, but very few people on the campus in Salt Lake City know anything about it. The work is done by an obscure university research organization, housed in these unpretentious quarters. The E and E group, which means Ecology and Epizoological Research has been doing supposedly routine studies of diseases in Utah wildlife. The full nature of the work was not known even to the university president, until last August. At that time a series of false alarms at the main, biology building aroused the curiosity of William Hanly, an associate professor of biology. Hanly already had heard about a secret laboratory in his own building on the main campus.

Hanly. I knew that something had been going on there which was connected in some way, and I am still not sure, which way with Dugway Proving Grounds here. Um and at same time connected with the University housed in the same building.

Brown. The first two runs, we were all restricted from going into the specific area where these alarms were originating from. The University personnel advised us to stay out because of um, disease problems.

Hanly. I was told by a number of people that in order to enter that area, one had to have immunizations against certain diseases. Diseases such as tularemia, anthrax, plague and various others. One would assume then that these diseases are in that area. The organism which cause those diseases. And in order to get these immunizations, one had to go to the Dugway Proving Ground.

Pettit. The University, voluntarily showed us its contract with the Army. It reveals a clear-cut relationship with Dugway Proving Ground. Through the Deseret Test Center the E and E group is paid about five-hundred thousand dollars a year. The University insists that it is not involved in weapons testing. But the contract does specify certain diseases: Tularemia, plague, Q-fever, Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, and viruses such as encephalitis, all transmissable from animals to man, all potential weapons. Until now it has not been generally known that the University of Utah scientists do some of their Army work right at the Dugway Proving Ground. They have done so, since 1952. In 1955 they made this film to document their own activities. Besides their academic study of disease in native animals of the Dugway area, they have performed experiments to induce infections artificially. For these studies, the Utah research group developed laboratory procedures for growing large numbers of ticks. Some ticks are vectors, or carriers of several highly infectious diseases, among them, Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, Tularemia and encephalitis ticks are reared by the simple process of letting them feed on living kangaroo rats. As part of its Army work, the Utah research group raises literally thousands of animals. Some have been set out in the field to monitor the spread of biological agents being tested by the Army. The special infection studies are of obvious interest to Army experts on biological warfare. In this case, a deer mouse was prepared for exposure to germs in an aerosol-spray chamber . . . probably to the organism which cause tularemia.

Military men consider aerosol-spray the best system for spreading diseases. They feel germs distributed this way are more efficient at causing disease than germs carried by bugs or animals. The University researchers have done pioneering scientific work in charting the flow of diseases. In other words, how infection is spread from one animal to another. In this experiment, disease organisms were injected into a laboratory guinea pig. The guinea pig was then fed to a wild coyote. This work adds to the Armys knowledge of how germs can be spread, both by nature and by humans' design. But for years, the military implications of the University research were kept obscure. The secrecy syndrome in the chemical biological warfare business is most pronounced when private industry meets with the military. This is a U.S. Navy installation at Port Huenema, California, where an unpublicized CBW conference was held. Security precautions were extraordinary. Even generals were thoroughly checked. And every person attending was required to have Defense Department clearance for secret information. The conference amounted to a who's who of CBW. Brigadier General James A. Hebbeler, the Army's ranking officer in the field, is Director of all chemical, biological, and nuclear operations. Major General Lloyd E. Fellenz, who used to be head CBW, now works for a large chemical company. Colonel Clyde L. Friar, commanding officer of the arsenal at Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Dr. Jacob Minarik, civilian scientist at Fort Detrick and the foremost export on defoliation. Norman I. Shapira, chairman of this meeting, a retired Army colonel, now employed by Litton Industries. Many other large companies were represented: DuPont, Alcoa, Dow Chemical, Lockheed, McDonnell-Douglas, North American Rockwell, Aero-Jet General, the Rand Corporation, Goodyear, Honeywell, Monsanto . . . more than forty companies in all. Some who participated in the closed door meetings were willing to discuss their work. One was Roger Eyler, his consulting firm has received more than a quarter of a million dollars from the Pentagon for CBW research. Particularly an analysis of intelligence information.

Eyler. Obviously, the Chinese Communists are behind us. And as a result of their, um, um, say, student revolutions, they're getting even further behind, because, their technical base is going down. But um, other than that I don't think I can say anything else.

Pettit. The Soviet Union is not in that same position.

Eyler. No, as a matter of fact the Soviet Union is a very sophisticated enemy. Their threat would be at least on a par with ours.

Reinnagel. The hardware does exist. Quantity wise, whether one could do this to mount an engagement or not, that is a question I can't answer. But it can be manufactured.

Pettit. The Hayes Corporation, which wants to manufacture the hardware, already manufactures defoliation equipment for use in Viet Nam, and is actively developing CBW hardware. At its own expense, Hayes is working on a number of weapons systems all listed right in the company brochure. One of them is called, "The Wet-Dry Agent Biological Bomblet", the biological bomblet is not being mass produced right now. This indicates that the United States has the technology for biological warfare, but not a combat capability. At Fort Detrick, Maryland, the U.S. Army has been accumulating biological warfare know-how for nearly twenty-six years. The work started here in 1943 in secrecy equal to that of the atomic bomb project. Today, Fort Detrick, is even more secret than Oak Ridge. Using laboratory animals, the scientists at Fort Detrick have precisely measured the infectivity of nearly every known disease. Especially in the aerosol-spray form of transmission. Aerosol-spray, forces microbes deep into the most sensitive part of the lungs. Even human volunteers have been infected this way. Seventh-Day Adventists, serving as conscientious objectors in the army medical corps. One of them was Frank Miyashiro.

Miyashiro. It was somewhat, um, spooky, when the light would flash on and you know that um, there are organisms being passed into your body to make you sick. This is the time that you really wonder if you should be there. Um, some of the fellows came down with tularemia, well they started developing systoms about two days after we received the organisms. I know, um, when, . . . we were all waiting to see who would get hit first. And, um, a friend of mine, um, had violent headaches one night. And his temperature zoomed up to about 103 degrees overnight. We were given . . . our temperatures and our pulse rates were taken every six hours throughout the day and we could see when the temperature started rising that . . . after about two or three days, the fellows, most of the fellows started developing symptoms . . . violent headaches and um, muscular aches pains, most . . . fellows couldn't even get out of bed. Um, the temperatures, like I said always increased to about 104 degrees. And um, just um a lot of sweating . . . some of the fellows would get up in the middle of the night completely soaked. And it would last for a few days, well a couple of days, and as soon as the doctor knew that you had developed a disease and they were certain that you had developed a disease, they would give you medication.

Pettit. Tularemia is fatal in less than ten percent of the cases. But it is highly disabling and once was routinely suggested for use in Viet Nam. This suggestion was turned down. Instead the military in Viet Nam has turned to chemical warfare: Tear gas on the ground, defoliation of the jungle from the air. C–123 aircraft have dropped tons of chemical weed killers. The spray technique, or a modification of it, could also be used to deliver nerve gas, or even germ weapons, if they were available. In Viet Nam, the military has demonstrated its ability to wage chemical warfare, this is the "C" of CBW. The possibility that chemical or biological weapons might be used against the United States has not gone unnoticed.

Film Narrator. A mask filters out dangerous elements in the air, such as gas, germs, or radioactive dusts. Final tests on this mask used volunteers to breathe in a completely harmless test spray. The volunteer children participated with the consent of their parents. The mask will be made in six sizes, to fit all persons from the age of four upward. For children under four, there is a tent like infant shelter.

Pettit. The all-purpose mask was never produced in quantity for civilian defense. No one seriously expects nuclear attack. And nerve gas is primarily a battlefield weapon anyway. But in future wars, biological weapons could be used against civilians.

Despite all the mystery about biological warfare and all the secrecy, there is one simple fact: The United States, today does not have germ weapons ready to go at the push of a button. We know how to build them: we have tested the stuff, but so far at least there has been no order to go into mass production. And until there is an order, the U.S. biological warfare capability will remain only a paper tiger. Of course we don't know about Russia or Red China.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1969]

Pentagon Bares Cost of Germ War Study

(By John W. Finney)

Washington, March 4.—Because a Congressman's wife was upset after watching a television program, the Army disclosed today that the Pentagon was spending $350-million annually to develop and produce chemical and biological warfare weapons.

At a private briefing for a group of Senators and Representatives, the Army said that the United States effort in this field was outmatched by that of the Soviet Union. According to Army estimates, the Russians have seven to eight times the capability of the entire non-Communist world for waging chemical and biological warfare. The briefing also brought out that the Army was regularly shipping by rail to and from test centers, 300-gallon canisters of a nerve gas known as

G-B, a few drops of which are sufficient to kill a person.

The private briefing, attended by two dozen Senators and Representatives, was arranged by Representative Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat of Buffalo. It was held in a hearing room of the Rayburn House Office Building.

After watching a recent National Broadcasting Company show on chemical and biological warfare, Mr. McCarthy's wife asked him what he knew about the subject. Mr. McCarthy replied, "Nothing," and proceeded to arrange for the briefing by Brig. Gen. James A. Hebbeler, director of chemical-biological-radiological and nuclear operations of the Army.

The briefing, partly confidential, brought out information that the Army has preferred to keep secret about its chemical-biological warfare program, even from members of Congress.

For the last four years, for example, with the cooperation of senior member of the Appropriations and Armed Services committees, the Army has managed to keep secret how much the Pentagon was spending on chemical-biological warfare research and production.

The money was scattered throughout the defense budget in such a manner that it was virtually impossible for the individual member of Congress to determine how much was being spent, and references to the over-all total were customarily censored out of the testimony given the committees.

PRESSED FOR ESTIMATE

Pressed at the briefing for a budget estimate, General Hebbeler said that the military services were spending around $350-million annually on chemical-biological warfare, but he added the injunction that this information was "confidential" and could not be made public.

After the briefing, Mr. McCarthy managed to get around the injunction by refusing to disclose the general's estimate but quoting approvingly from a recent Library of Congress study concluding that the Pentagon was spending between $300-million and $350-million annually on chemical-biological warfare.

About half this amount is believed to be for research and development, the rest for production of chemical and biological warfare agents.

In secret terms, the general also discussed the size and nature of the Soviet chemical-biological warfare program. A senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat of Florida, proceeded to discuss the Soviet program with reporters as he left the briefing.

Declaring that the United States was spending a "comparatively small amount" on research, Mr. Sikes said the Soviet Union had "seven to eight times the capability of the free world" to wage chemical-biological warfare and had enough chemical or biological agents "to kill most of the people of the free world."

Mr. Sikes a member of the Military Appropriations subcommittee attended the briefing at the suggestion of General Hebbeler. The purport of Mr. Sikes' comments to reporters was that the United States capability "should be expanded."

Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, interpreted the Army presentation as "a not very thinly disguised argument for more support" of chemical-biological warfare efforts.

The reaction of some members, such as Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Brademas, to the briefing was that the United States was spending too much on chemical-biological warfare and should seek some arms control agreement with the Soviet Union to stop the production of chemical or biological agents.

Mr. McCarthy also expressed concern about the "safety precautions" being taken by the Army in shipping the G-B gas. He said that there had been an "alarming increase" recently in rail accidents and that such rail shipments "pose a most serious problem."

S. 1646—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill which would remove the Baton Rouge division of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana and create from that Baton Rouge division a new middle district of Louisiana.

At the present time, the eastern district of Louisiana is composed of the Baton Rouge division and the New Orleans division. Its administrative offices are in New Orleans.

For a number of years now, the Baton Rouge division has for most purposes operated, in effect, as a separate district. The efficient administration of justice would be far better served, however, if the division were to be given a separate district. There can be no doubt that the present caseload of the Baton Rouge division warrants this change.

I would hope that this bill will be given the fullest consideration on its merits since I am thoroughly convinced that an adequate study of the factors prompting my proposal will prove the pressing need for effecting this improvement in the district court system in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1646) to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Long, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 98 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 98. Louisiana

"Louisiana is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the eastern, middle, and western District of Louisiana.

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(a) The eastern district comprises the parishes of Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, Saint Bernard, Saint Charles, Saint James, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Tammany, Tangipahoa, Terrebonne, and Washington.

"Court for the eastern district shall be held at New Orleans.

"MIDDLE DISTRICT

"(b) The middle district comprises the parishes of Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, Saint Helena, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana.

"Court for the middle district shall be held at Baton Rouge.

"WESTERN DISTRICT

"(c) The western district comprises six divisions.

"(1) The Opelousas division comprises the parishes of Evangeline and Saint Landry.

"Court for the Opelousas division shall be held at Opelousas.

"(2) The Alexandria division comprises the parishes of Avoyelles, Catahoula, Grant, LaSalle, Rapides, and Winn.

"Court for the Alexandria division shall be held at Alexandria.

"(3) The Shreveport division comprises the parishes of Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, DeSoto, Natchitoches, Red River, Sabine, and Webster.

"Court for the Shreveport division shall be held at Shreveport.

"(4) The Monroe division comprises the parishes of Caldwell, Concordia, East Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Tensas, Union, and West Carroll.

"Court for the Monroe division shall be held at Monroe.

"(5) The Lake Charles division comprises the parishes of Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson Davis, and Vernon.

"Court for the Lake Charles division shall be held at Lake Charles.

"(6) The Lafayette division comprises the parishes of Acadia, Iberia, Lafayette, Saint Martin, Saint Mary, and Vermilion.

"Court for the Lafayette division shall be held at Lafayette."

Sec. 2. The district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana holding office on the day immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, and whose official station on such date is Baton Rouge, shall, on and after such date, be the district judge for the middle district of Louisiana. All other district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana holding office on the day immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall be district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana as constituted by this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) Nothing in this Act shall in any manner affect the tenure of office of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana who are in office on the effective date of this Act, and who shall be during the remainder of their present terms of office the United States attorney and marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana as constituted by this Act.

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney and marshal for the middle district of Louisiana.

Sec. 4. The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows with respect to the State of Louisiana:

"Districts	Judges
* * * *	*
"Louisiana:	
"Eastern	7
"Middle	1
"Western	3".

Sec. 5. Section 134(c) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by deleting the first sentence.

Sec. 6. The provisions of this Act shall become effective one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 1647—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RELEASE 100,000 SHORT TONS OF LEAD FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill authorizing the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national and supplemental stockpiles.

XUM

Representing a State whose industries are among the major users of lead in the United States, I have followed the trends in the lead market with attention and care. Lead has been in short supply since the last half of 1968. Industrial consumption of lead has increased and the overall supply of lead has failed to keep pace with demand. The continuity of two industries in Louisiana—antiknock compounds and batteries—is threatened by lack of lead supplies.

If the shortage is not relieved through a release from the national stockpile, the production of electrical storage batteries, antiknock compounds, and other industrial commodities will be curtailed. In fact, several plants have been forced to reduce promotion for lack of lead. The consequences of failure to take immediate action will be damaging to employees and employers alike.

The stockpile objective for lead was reduced to zero by the Office of Emergency Planning in June 1963. Consequently, the entire current inventory of 1,171,649 tons of lead in the national and supplemental stockpiles is in excess of defense and strategic stockpile requirements. Following the precedents set in 1964 and 1965 by Public Laws 88–373 and 89–9, my bill would authorize the release to and sale by established lead producers of 100,000 tons of that surplus lead.

In light of the present emphasis on Government economy, it is also relevant to point out that the sale of 100,000 tons of surplus lead at the present high price of $0.14 per pound will bring $28 million into the U.S. Treasury.

The principal uses of lead are in automotive batteries, antiknock compounds, paint pigments, insulation, and other products such as cable, solder, and pipes. Consumption of lead by industries producing these products has increased substantially during recent years due to favorable economic conditions and increased demand for such products.

On the average about 1,200,000 tons of lead are consumed in the United States annually, 400,000 tons being supplied by primary producers, 500,000 tons by secondary smelters, and the balance from imports. However, the latter part of 1968 saw extraordinary lead consumption, and the normal sources have been unable to meet the demand. Estimates place domestic lead consumption for 1968 at 1,300,000 tons, an all-time record for domestic consumption and an amount that might have been even greater had the inadequate supplies of late 1968 not restricted production of major lead consumers.

The consuming industries mentioned are essential to the defense posture of the United States and continuity in their production must be insured. Interruption of current levels of production in the battery and gasoline additive industries can have serious effects on our strategic commitments throughout the world.

New domestic lead production facilities were planned for 1968. Construction delays, labor-management disputes, and technological problems have prevented completion of these additional facilities and have kept primary lead production well under the expected levels. Consequently, the high demand for lead metal reduced the stocks of primary domestic producers to 15,000 tons by the end of 1968, an unacceptable low level that has drained supply lines and has minimized consumers' inventories. While lead consumers usually maintain a 1-month supply in inventories, they are currently operating with an only few days' supply or no inventory at all.

Secondary smelter production in 1968 declined due to a shortage of scrap and increased production costs. The shortage of available scrap was especially pronounced in late 1968 and early 1969 when the demand for lead was extremely high. At the same time, high demand for lead throughout the world reduced producers' inventories of refined lead to 158,156 tons in November, the last month for which data are available and the fourth consecutive month in which those inventories declined. The limited availability of foreign lead due to high world demand has aggravated the critical shortage of lead in the United States. Although 338,000 tons of lead were imported into the United States in 1968, only 136,000 tons were imported during the last half of 1968, the time during which domestic supplies of lead were becoming increasingly restricted.

Already the shortage of lead has forced curtailed production by lead users. If lead is not expeditiously released from the national and supplemental stockpiles, many lead consumers will have to close down completely. In my State, for example, there are large battery manufacturing plants at Shreveport and Baton Rouge, and a major gasoline antiknock plant at Baton Rouge. These plants employ several thousand workers and contribute substantially to the economy of Louisiana. Passage of this bill is essential to continued operation of these plants at normal production levels.

I, therefore, urge that the Senate pass this legislation at the earliest possible time in order to bring an end to the existing critical shortage of lead and insure continuity of production in many strategic industries.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1647) to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately one hundred thousand short tons of lead now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607). The disposals authorized by this section may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, provided that the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

S. 1650—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF SERVICE GROUP LIFE INSURANCE AVAILABLE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I also introduce today a bill to increase the amount of service group life insurance available to our fighting men in the Vietnamese war.

Between 1961 and 1968, more than 30,000 GI's lost their lives in Vietnam. Most of these deaths occurred within the last 2 years. No Member of Congress, regardless of his sentiments toward the war in Vietnam, has any doubts about our responsibility to the welfare of the widows and orphans of those men who have been killed in Vietnam.

Today, we have three programs offering protection to the survivors of the men killed in Vietnam. First, the servicemen's group life insurance program offers all servicemen $10,000 in life insurance at a cost based on civilian group rates. The Federal Government pays the cost of the extra risk faced by men in the military service.

Second, the dependency and indemnity compensation program provides monthly payments to widows and orphans of servicemen and veterans whose death was connected to their military service.

Third, we have extended social security protection to all men on active duty.

The value of the dependency and indemnity compensation payments and social security benefits is quite substantial. For example, the lump-sum value of these two benefits today for the widow of a sergeant with 7 years' service, who has two young children, is $165,000—compared with an $80,000 value during the Korean war and a $48,000 value during World War II.

But though the lump-sum value is substantial, the benefits are paid out over a period of many years. There is a need for a benefit which will make available a significant sum to a widow at the time of the serviceman's death. It was for this reason that the SGLI program was created.

I think that it is time for us to go further than the $10,000 face value for the men that are facing enemy fire in Vietnam. I am, therefore, introducing today a bill which will double the serviceman's SGLI protection while he is assigned to duty in a combat zone, unless he does not want the added protection. As with the present program, the serviceman will pay only for the cost of ordinary civilian group protection, and the Federal Government will pay the additional cost related to the risks of military service. In other words, a serviceman who now pays $2 a month for $10,000 protection will be provided $20,000 coverage at $4 a month while serving in a combat zone. In other words, for $48 a year, he will

XUM

have $20,000 of protection in addition to the benefits provided elsewhere, in the event he should lose his life in Vietnam.

Mr. President, this added protection is and should be a cost of our Vietnam effort. The extra hazard cost represents recognition of the extra hazard faced by these men. While the men in Vietnam may give their lives, we can only give money. The death of a man can help provide for the unusual expenses cannot be made up with dollars, but we associated with the death of the head of the family for whose country that life was given.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received and appropriately referred—in this case, I believe it would be referred to the Committee on Finance. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1650) to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide double indemnity coverage under servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services assigned to duty in a combat zone, introduced by Mr. Long, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1650

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 765 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) The term 'combat zone' means any area designated by the President of the United States by Executive order as a combat zone for the purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

Sec. 2. Section 767 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereoff a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Any policy of insurance purchased by the Administrator under section 766 of this title for any member shall provide double indemnity coverage against death resulting from an injury or disease incurred or aggravated, in line of duty, while such member is assigned to duty in a combat zone. Double indemnity coverage provided for under this subsection shall include any case in which the death of a member resulted from combat activities or the performance of extrahazardous duties while such member was assigned to duty in a combat zone; and such coverage shall continue in effect during any period a member is temporarily outside a combat zone to which he is assigned so long as such period does not exceed thirty-five consecutive days."

Sec. 3. Section 769(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No deduction may be made from the basic or other pay of a member for double indemnity coverage provided under section 767(c) of this title for any month except a month (or portion thereof) in which such member was assigned to duty in a combat zone; and none of the costs attributable to such additional coverage for members assigned to duty in a combat zone shall be paid for by members not protected by double indemnity coverage."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by the first three sections of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

SENATOR RUSSELL AND THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, a column written by the well-known and highly respected William S. White, entitled "Northerners' Prejudice Kept Senator Russell From Presidency," and published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NORTHERNERS' PREJUDICE KEPT SENATOR RUSSELL FROM PRESIDENCY

(By William S. White)

The calm, patrician disclosure of Richard Brevard Russell that he is in the cold grip of a wasting lung tumor brings a sense of elegy to the Senate and to the country the beginning of the end of an American tragedy.

For this, one of the greatest Senators of his era and the highest embodiment of a Southern tradition of aristocratic and large-minded public service, has acted for his Nation with a gallantry and a generosity which that Nation has in fact repaid with a petty discrimination against him and all his kind.

The personal disaster that has overtaken this authentic gentleman of politics, this able and devoted guardian of true national interest, is cause for general sorrow and for more than personal sorrow. If no man is an island to himself, true it is, too, that when the great ones pass from the scene all are thereby left diminished; all are thereby left impoverished.

So it is that if grief for a man must now run high among those who know his personal value, higher yet should run grief for all the implications of a political life so cramped and cribbed and confined by needless and surely outmoded sectional prejudice.

For here has not been simply a Senator from Georgia but rather, in the best and highest meaning of that old-fashioned term, a Senator of the United States of America. On every single ordinary and rational test of performance, of competence, and of private and public honor; no politician in his time has more clearly and more repeatedly earned consideration for the highest office of them all. No one who understands the Senate can doubt that for many years he has towered there. But the trouble for Richard Brevard Russell has not been that he ever lacked the ability to be an outstanding President but only that he had himself born in the wrong place at the wrong time and thus was forever denied even a chance at that elevation which otherwise could hardly have been refused to him.

In a word, the door to the White House was locked and nailed up against him because he was "a Southerner" and thus a member of a lesser breed without the law. More than any other qualified man, he has been absurdly the victim of a kind of reverse "discrimination" which we might all usefully examine. For the ugly coin of bias has two sides, though we usually talk as though it had only one, and in Richard Russell's case the coin has always fallen into heads I win and tails you lose.

The bleak, the undeniable and the foolish unfairness of the facts of his career surely presents some opportunity for national second thoughts; surely in elementary justice requires political criteria of this country.

Granting if one wishes a thousand sins by a South long dead and gone, how long should this Nation go on and on punishing its present southern men of talent for what went on, or is supposed to have gone on, in its long, long yesterdays? How many times must Fort Sumter be avenged and reavenged? How many times must "Northern liberals" in their inner awareness of their professional inferiority to such Richard Russells as still survive, reassure themselves by seeing to it that every Richard Russell is kept firmly in his place? How long can the Nation afford all this?

It used to be said, and truthfully, that it was the South which would not allow the Civil War to be forgotten. But is it not now—and has it not long since been—the other way round? When the Senate says farewell to Richard Brevard Russell, something much more than the Senate will have been deprived. So, too, will have been the United States of America.

Perhaps, just perhaps, it may be that his last service will not after all be that stout leadership for a strong American defense posture to which so long he has contributed so much. Perhaps it will instead be to recall a Nation to common sense, if not to a sense of ordinary justice, so that the Civil War may be ended in politics, too, and so that qualified men may be allowed to contend for the Presidency, whatever the section of their birth.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for having that very logical and much deserved tribute to Senator Richard Russell, of Georgia, printed in the Record. I read it, and I was much impressed by it. I agree with it, as I think the Senator does.

The article points out the tremendous contribution Senator Russell has made to his Nation, and the fact that prejudice is a two-edged sword. Senator Richard Russell has been very much the victim of prejudice, and I say that as one who availed himself of the privilege of supporting Senator Russell for nomination as President of the United States. I went to the Democratic Convention, and I refused to walk out when the delegation seemed determined to walk out of the convention because it would not support Senator Russell.

I believe the Senator from West Virginia will recall that there was a large vote at the Democratic Convention for the nomination of Richard Russell as President of the United States. Had it not been for the aspect that the Senator has in mind, Senator Russell probably would have been nominated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The column is a very appropriate, thought-provoking, and perceptive one.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following to-

XUM

day's session, until noon on Wednesday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that it be in order for such messages to be referred to appropriate committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent, further, that during this period of adjournment, all committees be authorized to file their reports, including minority, additional, supplemental, or individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that the measure extending the debt limit may be reported tomorrow, during the period of the adjournment of the Senate from today until Wednesday next, so that it can be called up and considered by the Senate on Wednesday, when the Senate next meets; and that on Thursday next, the Senate will consider the supplemental appropriation bill on the Commodity Credit Corporation, which will be managed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD).

THE HUNGER IMPERATIVE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in the past week, in response to a contention that the special committee of the Senate looking into hunger and malnutrition was making hunger a political cause, I stated that hunger knows no politics. Hunger is not and should not be made a partisan issue, and I believe every member of this committee not only holds to that view but also has conducted himself accordingly.

I see the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) in the Chamber. I am certain that he will verify that in every stage of our hearings we have made no effort to make political capital out of those hearings, but to acquaint ourselves with the tragic dimensions of the problem of hunger and then to respond, as best we could, at the appropriate time, with recommendations for dealing with the problem.

I rise today because I believe that a special burden falls on all of us in the Government to assure that adequate resources are devoted this year to the solution of our most pressing single domestic need, and that is the presence in this country of an estimated 10 or 12 million citizens who are suffering either from hunger or from acute malnutrition. I think this is a burden which falls particularly on the new President of the United States at a time when he is making judgments among competing priorities for this year's Federal budget.

It is my understanding that the President has received several alternative recommendations that are now before him for increasing our food assistance programs and that a decision will be made shortly—perhaps within a few days or a few weeks—as to whether we can afford a substantial increase this year to feed our hungry citizens.

The President is now reportedly considering a package of reforms costing roughly $1 billion, with an expenditure of $100 million the first year.

Mr. President, I was repeatedly queried about this report by members of the press last week; and, finally, at the end of the week, I responded by saying, in effect, that if these reports are correct, they fall far short—that is, they indicate a recommendation that falls far short—of what is indicated by the size of the problem with which we must deal.

It is my own view that if, in fact, serious consideration is being given to adding $1 billion to the war on hunger in this country, that is a substantial and important step forward; but instead of spreading that out over 4 years, we should invest that much and more in the coming fiscal year. It would not be difficult to program an expenditure of that kind, nor would it be an outlay beyond our means. It would return dividends to the country many times over.

We talk a great deal about the cost of programs of this kind, but perhaps a more fundamental question is this: What does it cost us to ignore the existence of 10 or 12 million malnourished citizens? What does it cost us in the form of mentally retarded children? What does it cost us in the form of chronic welfare cases that never go beyond that level because of weakened bodies and weakened minds?

Mr. President, I believe I have a special obligation before the President makes his recommendation to Congress, both as a Senator with a concern for our hungry citizens and as chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, to urge that the war on hunger be funded at an adequate level.

I do not seek to engage in a partisan battle with the administration. I think we should all be grateful that the President is considering an increase in the food assistance budget recommended last January. I am particularly grateful that the Select Committee has gone about its business in a completely non-partisan manner, with the support of all members, and without the slightest hint by the ranking minority member, the senior Senator from New York, or his Republican colleagues that we are engaged in any sort of partisan struggle.

If we are partisan it is on behalf of the hungry in our midst. I am sure that all our members will want to preserve that spirit.

Of course, some of us have differing views as to the appropriate responses to the problems of hunger and malnutrition. But any differences we may have center not along political lines any more than the differences within the present administration over what that response should be are along partisan or political lines.

The issue is whether or not as a Nation we will devote the necessary resources with the same sense of urgency to the war on hunger that we devote to the war in Vietnam, to nuclear weapons, and the race for the moon.

The issue is one of priorities—whether we will spend millions for arms and pennies for the hungry.

This is the question I shall speak to today and that I will continue to speak to until hunger and malnutrition are eliminated.

Some consider it premature to speak to the new administration only 2 months after it has taken office. Frankly I do not see the wisdom in waiting until final judgments are made before speaking out on an issue as important as this.

Mr. President, 10 days ago President Nixon announced his decision on the antiballistic missile. The American taxpayer is being asked to spend $7 billion to protect two missile sites with a highly questionable weapons system that could set off another spiraling arms race; $7 billion is about half the cost of ending the hunger and serious malnutrition which plagues 10 or more million of our citizens.

Shortly after the President's announcement, the country was told by the Deputy Secretary of Defense:

> This country can afford to do what we need to do to remain strong and also solve *some* social problems.

I think the time has come when we ought to have learned the lesson that solving our social problems and providing strength for national security are not alternatives. They are one and the same thing. So long as hunger, poverty, and racism continue to afflict us at home, it does not matter how many missiles we have. Not one of us as an individual or all of us as a nation will be secure.

Yesterday our military commanders in Saigon confirmed that since the bombing halt last November, the United States has sharply escalated our ground war offensive in Vietnam, increasing our contacts with the Vietcong by 100 percent in February. Our ground offensives continue to mount week by week. So do our casualties. Last week 351 American boys died on the battlefield. While these boys die in Vietnam, the cost of their sacrifice at home is reflected not only in the drain on our economy but in the number of lives that will be stunted in mind and in body because we have failed to meet the challenge of hunger and malnutrition at home. For less than the cost of 2 months of our Vietnam involvement, we can feed all the hungry, malnourished poor at home.

I have an uncomfortable feeling that the cost of the antiballistic missile and our intensive military effort in Southeast Asia may shortly be reflected in a number of decisions about our economy which are on the front burner at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I am fearful that we will be told that we cannot afford to feed as many hungry Americans as we know are in need.

Because of the enormous continuing cost of the war in Vietnam and additional weapons of destruction, we are faced with spiraling inflation—inflation which affects every American consumer and which must be brought under control.

But will the control of inflation rest on the weakened bodies of the poor and undernourished?

Last week the Secretary of Commerce stated in an interview in the Washington Post that the present administration has agreed that it must take time out from major new social objectives until inflation is checked. Social problems, Secretary Stans was reported to have said, will be attacked on a low-budget basis while we wait for the economy to cool off and for the war in Vietnam to end.

Ten days ago we were told by the administration's Communications Director that the problem of hunger "requires a study in depth before solutions can be offered." I sincerely hope that this does not mean that the way is being paved for a decision that we will have to do less than enough in providing food assistance to our hungry poor.

The single most important cause of hunger in America is painfully obvious, millions of our fellow citizens do not earn enough money to buy food for their families. It takes no special genius to figure out that a family whose total income is less than the amount required to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet is going to suffer from malnutrition. Nor does it require special genius to perceive at least a short-run solution to this problem. Such families must be provided with the purchasing power necessary to enable them to meet their minimum nutritional needs.

I will shortly propose amendments to the Food Stamp Act of 1964 designed to do just this—to insure that our poor enjoy the most basic necessity of a productive life, adequate nutritious food. I will propose that the poorest of the poor be given free stamps, that those who pay for stamps pay what they can afford out of their meager incomes and that all recipients receive enough stamps to meet their monthly food needs.

We can certainly do no less now—this year. We will have to do much more—we will have to provide the health care, sanitation facilities, and nutrition education which are essential to the complete elimination of malnutrition.

Mr. President, I shall support every effort of our President and his administration on behalf of our hungry citizens. But I shall not hesitate to warn against halfhearted efforts in that direction.

I urge both the President and the Congress to do right by our hungry children and adults. We can afford to do no less.

REPORT ON THE FIELD TRIP TO FLORIDA BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs last week completed its first field inspection trip. Six of our members, three from the majority and three from the minority spent 2 days in two southern Florida counties, Lee and Collier Counties.

We chose southern Florida for our first field trip not because it is different from other areas of the country; not because there are many or few hungry people in Collier or Lee Counties. We did not seek to single out these counties or their officials for criticism. But what we found was nothing short of disgraceful—a level of human misery combined with official neglect which none of us expected in a country founded and governed for 200 years on the premise that human dignity is the inalienable right of every citizen.

Our trip was not without controversy. We were charged with seeing only the bad sides of Collier and Lee Counties. Like it or not that is our job—and that is what we did see and hear.

We saw in southern Florida what others have seen before us, American citizens existing without the barest necessities of life including the most urgent need—a decent daily diet. We saw people who existed on beans and grits and fatback for so long they did not even know what it is to be free from hunger and malnutrition—people so retarded in mind and spirit they had no conception how desperately poor they were—people who could not even contemplate, much less communicate their needs and desires to have what the rest of us take for granted.

We saw families with six, eight, or 10 children living in one- or two-room shacks, not fit for animals—windowless, rat-infested, without water or plumbing or electricity—shacks for which the landlord collects $12 to $15 a week rent each.

We saw empty iceboxes and iceboxes that did not work with fatback, beans, and lard the only things stored in them.

We saw children with the blank, expressionless stare of hunger on their faces—children not yet old enough to go to school who, when asked what they had for breakfast said "grits and coffee"; for lunch, "beans and coffee"; for supper, "beans and coffee." Many could not remember when they last had milk.

We saw old people. One in particular I shall never forget. Mrs. Clauder Mae Smith, lucky enough to have a three-room shack for herself and her grandchild. She was almost blind. She wanted to work but could not afford glasses. Her income is $44 a month from social security. She pays $39 a month rent. Her apartment has no running water because when she was in debt to the water company they shut the water off. She has no electricity because she cannot afford to pay the electric bill. Rats and roaches crawl through the house at night. She receives commodities but they last only 3 weeks. The rest of the month she begs or goes hungry.

Yes, we saw the worst of Immokalee and Fort Myers.

We visited Bookers' Alley, an indescribable development of 24 shacks housing 30 families each paying $52 rent a month to a landlord who also happens to be chairman of the board of the local bank and who grosses $1,560 per month from his tenants who have no hot water or heat. It is there we saw the child whose legs were so bowed from rickets that they almost formed a circle from his hips to his feet. It is there that we talked with Mrs. Katie Dell Murphy who with her husband and eight children live in a two-room shack with no hot water, with three beds and an income of $125 each month if there is work, $65 of which is paid in rent to the chairman of the board of the bank. Her children never have fresh milk at home and seldom have meat.

We heard that migrants in Collier County often live there 8 months of the year, traveling as far north as Michigan in summer to find work. We heard that if the migrants left Immokalee at harvest-time, Collier County's $40 million farm economy would collapse.

> But these—

Said the county commissioners

> are Federal people . . . not Immokalee people. They're not Collier people, they're not Florida people.

"Federal people" they said were not theirs to feed. "We take care of our own," they said, with $7,500 for food out of their county welfare budget—enough to feed 24 people an adequate diet for a year. Their "own" does not include the 22,000 Collier migrants and their families who harvest Collier's $40,000,000 farm crops, go to its schools, buy food from its grocery stores, and live in its slumlord's wretched shacks.

When we left the reaction was quick. The chairman of the county commissioners told the press:

> We know we had three strikes on us. We had Senator McGovern, an ultra-liberal; Senator Javits, who in my thinking is a Socialist, and Senator Mondale who I understand was handpicked by Hubert Humphrey.
>
> We can expect what the results of the investigation will be. It could have been written before they came except for a few details. They were evidentally trying to justify their existence and their trip to Florida.

In view of the commissioners' testimony, I can only say that the script could not possibly have been written before we came to Collier County. I wonder if the commissioner can cite any justification for his own existence in that office when he said publicly in his own county that migrants are "Federal people" who do not deserve his help.

Collier County showed us the most backward side of local officialdom. Lee County showed us what happens when the local establishment accepts its responsibility—halfheartedly. Lee County has a commodity distribution program. It provides 21 of the 22 commodities which the Department of Agriculture makes available for a supposedly balanced diet each month. But we found few people participating in this program—450 families—2 percent of the population while 32 percent are in poverty.

They are the lucky families. Lucky enough to pass muster at the local welfare office where others are arbitrarily denied assistance and frequently demeaned by the welfare director.

But they still have to pay a taxi $4 to take them to the warehouse 4½ miles out of town to pick up their commodities. And the commodities they get last less than 3 weeks out of the month.

Thousands of other families in Fort Myers are excluded from commodity assistance.

We found families who did not know about the program. We found families who were afraid to go to the welfare office because they said they knew from their neighbors who had been there, that they would be insulted and humiliated and denied assistance, even though they were in need. And those families with

XUM

whom we talked, who were on commodities, said they were hungry the fouth week of every month because the commodities did not last.

These are some of the things we saw and heard. And because we embarrassed some local and State officials we were criticized when we left.

We have been criticized for creating publicity and for exposing through the news media the problems I have just described in Florida. We have been told by the present administration's Communications Director that we are making hunger "a political cause" by "traipsing around the country with television cameras." We have been told by the Governor of Florida to "stop talking and do something about hunger."

I for one will not stop talking. Our committee will continue its field trips and we will, through every means at our disposal, put the problems of hunger before the American people and expose the good and the bad in our food assistance programs.

And we will, as we travel, try to help the people we see and hear about.

In Collier County, where the commissioners refuse to accept Federal assistance, others are willing to administer a commodity program. The Office of Economic Opportunity will, I am glad to say, pay the administrative costs and the local community action agency will provide the personnel and space to certify poor migrants and townspeople and see that commodities are distributed. The Department of Agriculture will be asked to supply the commodities to assure that between 4,000 and 5,000 destitute people in Collier County are fed.

Mr. President, I think our committee has an obligation to report to the Senate on each of its field trips. That is why, I, as chairman, have presented my personal observations today.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of documents which will provide a more complete record of our hearings be printed in the Record. They include a statement of Mr. T. Michael Foster, our first witness in Immokalee, a memorandum relating the plight of one family evicted when contacted by the committee staff, and a series of press reports of our activities.

Finally I ask that there also be printed in the Record a number of affidavits relating to charges that were made against the welfare director of Lee County—charges that were categorically denied by the director and the chairman of the Lee County Commission.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF T. MICHAEL FOSTER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, SOUTH FLORIDA MIGRANT LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM, INC., BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS, IMMOKALEE, FLA., MARCH 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Senators: May it please the Committee, my name is T. Michael Foster, Assistant Director of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program. I am honored to appear before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs to present my views on the problems of the rural poor in Collier County. At this time I would like to read a brief statement outlining the evidence of hunger and malnutrition in Collier County, including a chronology of the efforts that have been made toward initiating a food program for the poor and the opposition to the implementation of such a program.

In order to place my remarks in their proper perspective, I would like to start with a description of the environment of the rural poor. The image of Collier County is one of a lush vacation land and retirement haven. Tourism is an important asset to this area, but is secondary to the very important and lucrative industry of agriculture. Less well known than the Gulf coast at Naples, and further inland, is Immokalee—one of the main vegetable producing areas in the United States. The major crops are tomatoes, cucumbers, peppers, and watermelons. The total land area cultivated for all crops last season was 21,270 acres as compared to 6,340 acres ten years ago. To further emphasize the importance of farming to the county, the State Department of Agriculture estimates that the vegetable volume will double in the next ten years. Last year Collier County realized a gross income of 40 million dollars from its crops.

Understandably, the main concern of the county is the maintenance of this lucrative agricultural business. Since the economy of Collier County is so dependent on the success of the farms and all the business generated by agricultural activities, it is not surprising that the official position taken by the County reflects this pervasive force. It is of paramount importance to the county, as well as to the farmers, to concentrate their efforts on maintaining a sizable work force to plant and harvest their crops.

Past history has demonstrated that there is a correlation between the productivity of farmworkers and the extent of their dependence on their employers. If the workers' entire livelihood remains dependent on the farming system, that system can exercise a great degree of control over the workers. The rural poor thus become the victims of a concert of interests. In order to keep the rural population responsive to the needs of agribusiness, they are forced to remain subservient to these interests.

The best evidence of the plight of the rural poor is a visual tour of the farming communities of south Florida. I have been an attorney in this area for over 18 months, and the sight of listless children living on a diet of beans and grits shocks me. Aside from my personal observations, various studies have demonstrated that hunger and malnutrition do exist in Collier County.

In December of 1967 a team of investigators from the Citizen's Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States visited the Immokalee area on two occasions. Included among the investigative personnel was Dr. Gilbert Ortiz from New York. The Citizen's Board of Inquiry issued a press release on December 21, 1967, in which they stated that their study of the Immokalee area had produced evidence of ". . . poverty, poor nutrition, and parasitic disease" among migrant farmworkers and their families.

On April 23, 1968, the Citizen's Board of Inquiry issued its report, entitled "Hunger, U.S.A." That study discussed conditions among farmworkers and other rural poor in Collier County, Palm Beach County, and Lee County, Florida. Collier County is cited as one of those counties having a serious hunger problem.

As a result of the publicity surrounding the Board of Inquiry's press release and other news stories regarding the survey, denials of the existence of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition were forthcoming from various state, federal, and local officials. In light of this controversy, the Florida State Board of Health conducted an evaluation of the health situation in Immokalee, probing particularly into the condition of migrant children. That report was released in February of 1968, and stated ". . . there is no evidence of severe malnutrition or serious incidence of disease in the migrant population."

However, many remarks contained in the report of the State Board of Health can only be interpreted as indicating severe conditions of poverty and deprivation among farmworkers and their families in the Immokalee area. For example, the report states that Collier County is one of the areas of the U.S. with the highest incidence of newly reported active cases of tuberculosis. The rate for the County is 50 cases per one-hundred thousand persons compared with Florida's rate of 23.3 per hundred thousand and the national rate of 27.3 per hundred thousand for the period covering 1962 to 1965. The report concludes "most of these cases occur among migrants (particularly the adult male Negro) . . ."

The study further states that Immokalee schools have 1/20th as many students in the twelfth grade as they do in the first grade, explaining that most males and many females quit school to work in the fields."

The State Board of Health also stressed the need for adequate day care for migrant children and voiced the opinion that a commodity foods program would contribute "significantly to the welfare of the migrants."

At approximately the same time the Florida State Board of Health was conducting its survey, a sample group of 23 children selected at random from farmworkers' families in Immokalee were examined at the Variety Children's Hospital in Miami. The resulting report indicates that among the 23 children examined 38 clinical diseases were found, many with a traceable connection to malnutrition, including 11 cases of iron deficiency anemia, 14 cases of upper respiratory infection, 2 cases of pneumonia. By letter of March 7, 1968, Gerard W. Frawley, Executive Director, Variety Children's Hospital, commented that "the findings in the report are most startling. It is rather incredible that out of 23 children, we found 38 clinical diseases—a most extraordinary morbidity rate for such a group."

The results of hunger and malnutrition can not be overstated, although some are difficult to detect without comprehensive testing and prolonged examination. For example, tests for parasitic infestation require laboratory analysis, and these tests were not conducted on the children either by the State Board of Health or Variety Children's Hospital. However, the report from Variety Children's Hospital concluded, "there is probably a high percentage of intestinal parasites which this test does not reflect."

All available evidence indicates that the incidence of hunger and malnutrition coincide directly with income levels. A nationwide consumption study conducted by the Department of Agriculture in 1965 states: "at each successively higher level of income, a greater percentage of households met the recommended dietary allowances." Bureau of the Census records show that 29.9% of the families in Collier County have incomes under $3000. And this figure does not include the migrant population whose average yearly income nationally is only $1737. The percentage of families in Collier County living below the poverty level would indicate a high incidence of malnutrition.

The effect of low income and poor nutrition on children is especially distressing. The correlation between malnutrition and poverty is reflected in post neo-natal mortality rates. Although nutrition is not the exclusive cause of death, it is of primary importance as a cause in the one month to one year age group. Collier County has an appalling rate of 20.3 deaths for every 1000 live births in this age group. When categorized as to whites and non-whites, the figures are even more shocking. For white persons in Collier County, the rate is 15.3 per 1000 live births,

XUM

while for non-whites the rate is an astounding 40.8 deaths per 1000 live births. This is triple the rate for non-white in Florida, over 3½ times the rate for non-white nationwide, and 6 times the rate for all persons in the United States. The comparative statistics on post neo-natal mortality rates in the United States, Florida, and Collier County, as compiled by the National Center for Health Statistics, is attached as Appendix *A*.

While a food program, whether it be a commodity distribution or a food stamp program, cannot solve all the nutritional needs of the rural poor, it can alleviate actual hunger and make inroads into the problems facing those living below the poverty level. The Florida Department of Public Welfare has participated in the distribution of commodity foods received from U.S. Department of Agriculture for many years. However, the program is administered on a county option basis and 17 of Florida's counties do not take advantage of this program. Collier is one of these counties.

While the Collier County Welfare Department has a budget in excess of $121,000, only $6,681.96 was spent for food orders for poor people in fiscal year 1968. The current budget has allocated $7,500 for such food orders.

Our efforts to implement a commodity foods distribution program in Collier County were undertaken shortly after our program began operation in this part of the state.

Public opinion became focused on the need for a commodity food program following the Citizen's Board of Inquiry report, the State Board of Health survey, and the Variety Children's Hospital study. In March of 1968 Mrs. Marion Fether, a member of the Immokalee Migrant Committee and a social worker for the Collier County Board of Education, appeared before the County Commission to report that 250 families were suffering from severe hunger because of adverse weather conditions and restrictions which prohibited local officials from granting them assistance.

Also during the month of March the Community Action Fund Migrant Program, an active anti-poverty agency serving this area, attempted to persuade the Collier County Commission to accept a commodity foods program.

Mrs. Hazel Griffin, Director of the County Welfare Department, has been quoted as saying "if we had a federal commodity distribution program, I am sure we could use it." Mrs. Marion Fether, who had previously spoken out about the conditions among farmworkers in Collier County, voiced her concern over the need for some sort of an emergency program, perhaps of a voucher type, which would help families with children to get food if they needed it. She is quoted as saying, "I sometimes feel the children are forgotten," and "I go into the homes and look into the refrigerators and cupboards and I know they were hungry."

Mrs. Eleanor DeWilde, Director of the Naples Welfare Association, has admitted the possibility that hunger exists in Collier County.

On July 1, 1968, I wrote to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture urging him to exercise his authority to establish a commodity foods program in Collier County.

A short time later, Mrs. Hazel Griffin, Director of the Collier County Welfare Department, reported that the Department's food budget had been depleted, and that 75 persons had applied for food relief during the month of July. The County Commission replied by pointing out that they were unable to fill county jobs for which they were presently recruiting, and that they felt the jobs would be filled if people became hungry enough.

On July 18, 1968, Mr. E. Lee McCubbin, State Director of the Commodity Foods Program, appeared before the Collier County Commission to map out plans for an estimated $434,000 food distribution program. By Mr. McCubbin's estimate, 4,200 persons, or 15% of the estimated 27,700 population of the County, would be qualified for a commodity foods program, while only 795 persons in the county are qualified for public assistance under the State Wefare regulations.

It is noteworthy that the disparity between the number of persons estimated to be eligible for commodity foods and those in the county who are eligible for public assistance is approximately 12%. This would seem to be the affect of the residency requirements upon migrant farmworkers. The Collier County Welfare Department has a residency requirement of 6 months, and State Welfare has residency requirements ranging from one to five years for its categorical assistance programs. Obviously, the migrant does not fit into this' scheme.

On August 6, 1968, I received a reply to my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. He pointed out that the Department of Agriculture was attempting to expand its food programs to reach all non-participating counties. The Secretary expressed his support for our efforts and voiced the hope that the local community action agency would work closely with the County Commission to initiate the operation of a food program.

Collier County rejected the food program on the basis that the expense would be greater than the good accomplished by it. The commissioners felt it would cost $3 to give away $1 worth of food, but at the same time promised to put more money into their own food budget. Their budget figures do not support this promise.

Shortly thereafter I corresponded with Whitaker, Chairman of the Collier County Commission, in an effort to get the commission to reconsider the program. In my letter I expressed the opinion that a county which grosses $40 million a year on its farm crop should show more concern for the farmworkers upon whom the harvesting of that crop depends.

On August 13th I appeared before the County Commission to urge them to reconsider their decision. The commissioners reiterated their stand, and expressed the philosophy that "Collier County takes care of its own," which has been the tradition in the county since the days of the New Deal, when county officials rejected WPA and other federal aid projects.

In October I spoke with the Department of Agriculture's Regional Director for food programs for the Southeastern United States. He advised me that he would meet with Collier County officials in the near future in an effort to persuade them to accept the food program.

In recent months Dr. Charles Bradley, Director of the Collier County Health Department has attempted to implement a supplemental food program for pregnant women and their children under six years of age. Dr. Bradley's efforts to date have not been successful.

On November 21st of last year a suit was filed to require the Department of Agriculture to institute food programs in all non-participating Florida counties. Collier County was named in that suit.

On December 11th the Collier County Technical Action Panel, which was established under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, advised the Secretary of Agriculture that it had unanimously resolved to express their feeling that there is a ". . . crucial need for a Commodity Foods Distribution Program in this county."

With this chronology in mind, I would like to summarize the reasons stated by Collier County officials for their refusal to sponsor a Commodity Foods Program and suggest recommendations to the Committee regarding possible solutions to the problem.

I have outlined the facts which we believe point to the need for a food program in Collier County. Before discussing the failure of the county to institute such a program, some mention should be made of the successful efforts in Collier County to help the rural poor. The County participates in the school lunch program, and figures for the month of January indicate that in Immokalee, 20% of those students who participated in the program received lunches either free or at a reduced price. Mrs. Eliose Lester, Director of the Collier County School Lunch program, feels that this percentage of free and reduced price lunches does not adequately reflect the total of those who need the program.

There is also a breakfast program functioning in Immokalee's elementary schools. In January an average of 533 students per day participated in it. Mrs. Lester has expressed the opinion that this program should be expanded to include students in secondary schools.

The county's Headstart Program, which operates out of this building, served a daily average of 75 free breakfasts and lunches during the month of January. The Headstart program reaches only a small portion of the children in the preschool age group, and not all of those who participate attend classes regularly.

In addition, there are two day care centers in Immokalee which receives commodity foods from the Lee County program.

I commend the Collier County Migrant Health Project for its dedication and concern for migrant families, particularly in the field of nutritional education. I am aware of their financial and manpower limitations, which cause their impact to be limited in terms of the entire migrant population, which the Health Project estimated to be 22,000 persons during fiscal year 1968. In that same period the total number of patients treated by the Collier Migrant Project was 2,075.

While these efforts are praiseworthy, it is our opinion that poverty, hunger, and malnutrition still exist in Collier County. The failure of the County Commissioners to meet these problems is perplexing.

I would like to turn now to the particular reasons stated by the county commissioners for their opposition to the commodity foods distribution program.

First, the county commission believes that the administrative costs of the program would be prohibitive. They have estimated this cost to be from $40,000 to $55,000 each year. We believe a study of Collier County's poor and the facilities needed to serve them will indicate that the commission's projected administrative costs are excessive. By contrast, the administration of a commodity foods distribution program in neighboring Lee County is budgeted at $8,265.00 for the present year.

Secondly, the commission has voiced the opinion that it will cost $3 to give away $1 worth of food. We believe this is patently erroneous and absolutely incapable of substantiation. This view is based on a purported lack of storage and refrigeration facilities and the commission's theory that it would have to build such facilities in order to distribute the commodity foods. The building we are in now is in many ways an ideal location for a commodity distribution center to serve the rural poor. In addition, this school is equipped with a refrigeration unit and has considerable unused storage space.

Third, the commissioners object to the federal guidelines for the administration of the program.

A fourth reason given is the county's fear that the poor will refuse to work if they receive free food. A suggestion made by the President of the Immokalee Migrant Committee and the Immokalee Chamber of Commerce, Capt. Harold Reece, was that the program be operated in conjunction with the Farm Labor Bureau, so that workers who refused to accept jobs offered them would be considered ineligible for the commodity foods program. We believe this fear to be baseless. Countless other rural counties in south Florida and across the nation which depend upon farmworkers to harvest their crops administer commodity food distribution programs according to federal guidelines. To my knowledge no county has been faced with the problem anticipated by the commission.

Another objection is that any program which renders sustenance to the rural poor might inadvertently lend support to efforts to unionize farmworkers. Implicit in this criticism is the attitude that the farmworker must remain dependent upon the farmer for his livelihood.

The opinion has been expressed that a commodity foods program will present a danger to the grocers in Immokalee and other areas of Collier County in which concentrations of poor people are found. This is considered a threat to these businessmen, and cannot be discounted as one of the major factors in opposition to the program. It is our belief that the commodity program would not be a threat to grocers in Collier County, as it has not been to grocers in other communities in which the program is successfully operating.

I cannot recommend too strongly to this committee the immediate need for either a commodity foods distribution program or a food stamp program (or a combination of the two) as a partial solution to the nutritional problems of Collier County. I would further recommend that the program be administered by either the federal government or by a community action agency, in view of the consistently negative attitude of the Collier County Commission. It is my firm belief that, in spite of the good faith efforts of many concerned people in Collier County, a locally sponsored program would be very begrudgingly accepted, with the result being an unwillingness to apply for assistance on the part of those persons who need it most.

In addition to the institution of a food program, I urge the committee to recommend that an expanded nutritional education program be undertaken with sufficient outreach to cover a larger segment of the migrant population.

Lastly, we cannot delude ourselves by thinking that any food program can completely solve the problems of the rural poor. We do not have the time today to fully discuss the deplorable conditions among migrant farmworkers in this country. However, I would be doing a disservice to this committee if I did not mention the other possible avenues of approach which could be taken by the Congress in an effort to help alleviate the problem confronting the migrant farmworkers. Much attention is being focused on urban problems. However, the crisis in our cities is one result of the plight of the rural poor.

I have several suggestions that I hope will be considered and which I believe would aid in the solution to the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Additional health programs and facilities are urgently needed at the federal, state, and local level.

In the area of welfare, specific obstacles facing the rural poor are the residency requirements, inadequate budgetary standards, and the fact that welfare recipients in Florida and elsewhere receive payments which do not meet minimum subsistence levels.

With regard to working conditions and the employment status of the farmworker, there is a tremendous need for additional legislation. Farmworkers are not covered by the National Labor Relations Act. The Federal minimum wage law covers only 390,000 of the 1.4 million farmworkers in the country. Agricultural laborers are not protected by workmen's compensation or unemployment compensation laws. Even the Social Security Act is ineffective in its application to farmworkers.

Lastly, the environment of the rural poor could be significantly improved by full funding of the Housing Act of 1968.

I realize that this committee is focusing its attention specifically on problems relating to hunger and malnutrition. While the food programs should be given top priority, every possible avenue that will help improve conditions among the rural poor should be exhausted. No one program will alleviate the poverty, deprivation and despair visited upon the poor of this country. What I would hope and urge is that the Congress and all concerned citizens commit themselves to forceful and positive action to rid this land of the blight of hunger and malnutrition. Every day which passes without this total commitment results in an irreparable loss in human resources.

(NOTE.—This statement has been prepared with the assistance of Valerie Kantor, Research Assistant; Gerald S. Joseph Cassidy, Staff Attorney; William F. Dow III, Staff Attorney; Michael Kantor, Staff Attorney.)

APPENDIX A

POST-NEO-NATAL MORTALITY RATE[1] PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS, 1966—COMPARATIVE STATISTICS[2]

	United States	Florida	Collier County
All persons	6.5	8.1	20.3
White	5.0	5.1	15.8
Nonwhite	14.0	15.6	40.8

[1] Deaths from 1 month to 1 year after birth.

[2] All figures taken from "Vital Statistics of the United States, 1966," vol. I (Natality), vol II, pts. A and B (Mortality), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Center for Health Statistics.

MEMORANDUM: EVICTION OF NOYOLA FAMILY SUBSEQUENT TO AN INTERVIEW CONNECTED WITH THE INVESTIGATION BY THE U.S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS IN IMMOKALEE

Mr. and Mrs. Edio Noyola arrived in Immokalee with their six children in October of 1968. This was the first year they had come to this area in pursuit of agricultural work. Their housing, until February 27, 1968, was a furnished three-room apartment which they rented from a local landlord for $25 per week.

A short while ago Mr. Noyola complained to his landlord that the overflow from the septic tank collected in puddles under and in front of the building in which his family resided. This was obviously a serious health hazard, especially to the minor children who frequently played near this water. The landlord's reaction to Mr. Noyola's request for repairs was anger and abuse. He refused to correct the situation.

Mrs. Noyola was pregnant at this time and expecting her seventh child. In order to help her mother around the house and to prepare for a proposed move to Texas, the eldest daughter, Anna Noyola, 13, was kept home from school. This was initially approved by the school social worker, but was later reported by her to the Justice of the Peace and Mr. Noyola was fined $100 for having kept Anna out of school. Unable to pay the fine, Mr. Noyola was sent to jail. He was later released to take his wife to the hospital for what resulted in a miscarriage. Upon his return to Immokalee, Mr. Noyola was once again apprehended and returned to the stockade. When Mrs. Noyola returned from the hospital she was forced to sell their car in order to pay the fine and obtain her husband's release.

On February 27, 1969, Mrs. Noyola was visited at her home by an investigator and an attorney from Migrant Legal Services along with another individual working with the staff of the Select Committee. Mrs. Noyola received a check from the Migrant Service Center Project for food through MLS. That evening the Noyolas received a visit from their landlord who demanded the rent that was due him, plus the rent for the next week in advance. He refused to accept $50 for back rent and said, because the Noyolas had complained about the septic tank and people were coming around to look at the house, they would have to move out. That night the Noyolas received a visit from the Sheriff's deputies who said they had been called by the landlord and informed Mr. Noyola that if he didn't move out that night they would have to throw him out the next day. The Noyolas moved and only with the help of friends could they find new housing, and even this was not adequate for their family.

This story well illustrates how the many problems facing the migrant workers of Immokalee combine with hunger to cause untold misery. First, the high rents in the area significantly reduce the buying power of the farmworker. Second, even though the rents are high, the quality of the homes and facilities for migrants is substandard. Third, any request for improvement in housing is useless or, as in this case, can result in the eviction of the tenants. Fourth, the school authorities often fail to understand the special needs of migrant families and at times use drastic penalties to punish truancy. This same criticism may be made of the local legal system which, as in this case, imposes nearly impossible fines on parents who cannot pay and who subsequently must serve the alternative term in jail or sell essential possessions to meet the fine. Finally, if this were not enough, when a family falls on hard times and seeks assistance because they are hungry, they suffer eviction because the landlord feels they have notified the sanitation officials that he maintains a public nuisance. The helping hand they sought to help to alleviate their problems has in fact caused one more.

This story is not unusual and when all is considered it should not be difficult to see why there are families who go without food in Immokalee.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Feb. 17, 1969]

REPORTER SAYS MIGRANTS HUNGRY IN IMMOKALEE

(By Homer Bigart)

IMMOKALEE.—Ten miles southwest of here, strung out like garbage along the edge of a cypress swamp, is Smith's Camp, a gathering place for some of the migrant farm workers who flock here in winter to pick the vegetable crops.

It consists of a dozen or more windowless plywood shacks, all without toilets or running water, all painted a dull green and all facing a dark slough choked with bottles and trash.

Some distance away there are three smaller shacks, two of them privies, the third a cold-water shower. None shows signs of recent use. Few migrants are hardy enough to take cold showers out of doors in the dead of winter, even in Florida, and the latrines are unspeakably filthy, seats and floors smeared with dried defecation. So the people use the woods.

A spigot planted in the ground provides water for the shacks. But the 20 or 30 migrants who live here say the water is foul smelling and foul tasting. The only apparent amenity is the naked electric light bulb hanging from the ceiling of each shack.

Such a place is Smith's Camp, its condition of poverty far removed from the snowy affluence of nearby gulf coast resorts and its people, during frequent periods of unemployment, vulnerable targets for hunger and disease. A senate committee investigating hunger will be in the area March 10.

XUM

On a recent Saturday, a visitor found most of the camp's adult population assembled in the canteen. The migrants had just been paid, apparently, and several men and women were finding release from the surrounding squalor by getting themselves drunk.

One woman, still sober enough to talk, said that in good times she made as much as $60 for six days work in the fields, picking beans and peppers, but now work was slack because cold weather had retarded the crops.

"We've got to pay $10 a week for these huts," she said. "Last week the water was up so high we had to wade to the door. I never would've left Carolina, but they told us the rent was free."

A man who introduced himself as "Hobo Bob" reeled out of the canteen and proudly produced an old photo that showed him with a wine bottle in one hand and a pistol in the other, a cigarette dangling from lips creased in a grin. He said he was sending the photo to a cousin in South Carolina, to show the relative what a happy life migrants could lead.

"That's Hobo Bob," he laughed, patting his photo.

Smith's Camp is one of 60 or 70 accommodations for migrants around Immokalee. Other camps seem less appalling in physical appearance but hold a greater potential for human degradation and misery because they swarm with children.

Albert Lee, an energetic young Negro who heads the local antipoverty project, the Community Civic Workers, said it was a bad season for migrants, with heavy unemployment.

Immokalee, a town of 3,000 near the northern edge of the Everglades, normally has a mid-winter population of 12,000 migrants, he said, but now there were only about 10,000. Many who normally wintered in Immokalee had gone to Texas instead.

Immokalee is in Collier County. Many well-to-do retired people live in Naples the county's biggest community, and this element, plus the big farm owners, have insured a highly conservative county government.

The county has a long history of snubbing federal aid, even during the depression era, and in recent years the county commissioners have stoutly rejected the food distribution program of the Department of Agriculture.

Today Collier County offers neither direct food distribution nor the food stamp program. Migrants who run out of money here are out of luck.

How do they keep alive, Lee was asked.

He said he had received on Christmas Eve $500 from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The instructions were that the money could be distributed only for emergency food.

"Now I've got a few dollars left," he said, "but I've been pinching and pinching and pinching."

He explained how he made the money last. He was doling out $1 a day per person to the most desperately hungry, then cutting them off after 14 days.

"That's it," he said. "After 14 days if they can't get handouts from the neighbors they don't eat."

Two young lawyers from the OEO-financed South Migrant Legal services program, T. Michael Foster and William F. Dow, said their organization had been trying for years to get federal food sent into Collier County.

Last summer Foster wrote to the then Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, telling of hunger and malnutrition in the labor camps, reporting the refusal of Collier County to participate in making food surpluses available to the poor and pleading for intervention.

Washington did nothing. Congress had authorized the OEO to take over the distribution of food in the poorest counties, which, for one reason or another, were not participating. But Collier County was not poor enough to qualify; the median annual family income, thanks to the wealthy gulf coast resorts, was $4,673 a year.

"I've seen hunger in Immokalee as bad as in Latin America," said Dow, a graduate of Yale and Columbia, "yet the Collier County commissioners always say the problem doesn't exist, that the county always looks after its own 'worthy poor'."

Observers recalled that at a hearing last August Vice Chairman A. V. Hancock warned: "There are those sitting with their hands out waiting to be fed, and that's a situation we won't go for."

Other officials expressed the fear that if migrants were given food they would not work. Others thought that free food would drive the corner grocery into bankruptcy.

Immokalee, which calls itself the "Watermelon Capital of America," is a flat, sprawling, dusty town where people of different colors, black, brown, red and white, live in strict residential segregation. Smith's Camp, out in the swamp, is all black, but there are several other Negro camps inside the town.

These are in "the quarters," an area that contains not only the Negroes but concrete-block huts occupied by Mexican-Americans. Outside "the quarters," scattered around the rest of the town, are camps for white migrants. A few score Seminole Indians live in grass huts on the eastern edge of the community.

Most of the camps are clusters of wooden shanties, concrete huts, trailers. Rents range from $10 to $20 a week, plus utilities. Flush toilets are a rarity, most camps providing a communal latrine. Regardless of the color of the occupants, the camps appear universally mean and squalid.

Mrs. Angela Spencer, 38, and two small pallid children occupied a trailer in one of the white camps.

"I was lucky enough to get three days work this week," she said.

She said she had been averaging two and one-half days of work a week, earning $25, out of which she had to pay a baby sitter $3. The rent was $15. That left $7 for food and all other expenses. She owed $19 in back rent, she said, and $100 in doctor's bills.

There was a platter of green beans and hominy on the stove. Clouds of flies wheeled about. The refrigerator was empty except for three sticks of margarine, a partly empty bottle of milk and a box of powdered milk.

She had been helped from Albert Lee's meager allotment of cash, as had Mrs. Caroline Conner, an attractive blonde who lived in another white camp and was 10 days out of the hospital after delivering a baby girl. Her husband abandoned her.

"We were real desperate," Mrs. Conner said of herself and the baby. "If it weren't for my friends, I wouldn't have been able to make it."

Mrs. Conner said she had been migrating from Florida to the great lakes and back for the last four years, following the spring strawberry crop to northern Florida, then Arkansas, Illinois and Michigan; picking Michigan's blueberries, peaches and grapes during late summer and early fall, then going back to Immokalee for winter tomatoes, peppers and "cukes," or cucumbers.

She liked Michigan best, she said, because migrants got free quarters there. In Immokalee her rent was $20 a week, and she had just about run out of the money she had received from Albert Lee.

In a black camp nearby Mrs. Pauline Milton and 10 children were crammed into a two-bedroom-and-kitchen hut.

"Me and two of the little ones sleep in this bed," said Mrs. Milton, "and there are two beds in the other room and one in the kitchen for the rest."

She had worked two days that week, earning $11.05 each day, and paying $2 a day for babysitters.

"I couldn't afford to give them breakfast," she said, surveying the hungry brood, "but we had boiled beans, rice and potatoes for lunch, and I'll give them the same for supper."

Mrs. Milton is one of a comparatively few migrants eligible for county welfare, for she has lived in Immokalee for seven years. She said she had applied, but had been told that her application would take 30 to 45 days to process.

Of all the ethnic groups, the Mexican-Americans probably suffered most during times of hunger, Dow said.

"Mexicans are proud," he explained, "and feel they are violating cultural mores if they ask for help."

Foster said that the Florida State Board of Health had denied the existence of widespread malnutrition in Collier County.

"People are hungry, no one can quibble about that," he insisted. "And there is a tremendously high incidence of parasitic infection."

Last March, the state health board issued a report saying that a team of doctors had "closely observed" some migrant children at play or in schools and clinics and that "none had gross signs of malnutrition."

The report said that pellagra, a severe dietary deficiency disease, had been noted but only in "known chronic alcoholics."

In reply, friends of the migrants released next day the results of clinical examinations of 23 migrant farm children of Immokalee by the Variety Children's Hospital of Miami.

The sampling uncovered 38 clinical diseases in the 23 children, ranging from pneumonia to worms.

The hospital's executive director, Gerald W. Frawley, described the findings as "rather incredible . . . a most extraordinary morbidity rate" and concluded: "The migrant population must be about the most underprivileged in the nation, at least in terms of medical attention."

In a few weeks Collier County will feel the spotlight of national publicity. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs is making this county its first stop on a tour of suspected hunger areas.

The committee is seeking information on the failure of the federal food programs to reach millions of poor Americans.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Feb. 19, 1969]

INADEQUACIES OF PROGRAM AIRED—SOME SCHOOL CHILDREN DENIED LUNCH

TALLAHASSEE.—Of the 1,250,936 children attending public schools in Florida one day last September, an Education Department survey shows 58,905 had nothing to eat for lunch.

Another 233,682 brought their lunch from home. Mrs. Thelma Flanagan, director of the state food service program guessed yesterday that 200,000 of these couldn't afford to buy a hot lunch.

Most people think a lot of tax money is poured into the school lunch program for children, especially the needy, Mrs. Flanagan said.

But figures in Mrs. Flanagan's office in the State Department of Education show federal aid provided slightly more than $9 million last year. County funds totaled $3.2 million. The state provides no direct funds.

The total spent on school lunches in the 67 counties was $61,044,080.

Mrs. Flanagan said most of it comes from the children. She said the total federal subsidy, including aid of up to 15 cents per lunch for needy children, averages less than a nickel per plate.

One reason boys and girls sit in school all day with nothing to eat, Mrs. Flanagan said, is because in many school boards the program has to remain solvent.

XUM

This, she said, "puts a ceiling on how many free and reduced-price lunches can be served. When they reach the limit, they just close their eyes."

Making the program self-sustaining means that the money the children pay for lunches must pay the salaries of cafeteria employes.

"The kids of this state should not have to pay the cafeteria salaries any more than they have to pay the bus driver or the custodian," she said.

If the state and county funds were used to pay the food service employes, Mrs. Flanagan predicted, the number of children eating hot lunches would jump from the present 66 per cent to 90 per cent in two years.

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 20, 1969]

Our Camp's Not Bad, Migrant Chief Says

(By Tom Morgan)

IMMOKALEE.—Perhaps it wasn't the blue bird of happiness, but it definitely was a blue bird that fluttered about Smith's Camp or Smithville. The migrant camp was one questioned in a New York Times story headed "Hunger in America: stark poverty, leaves Florida migrants vulnerable to disease."

Other than the blue bird, a few cardinals flitting through the pines nearby, several ducks, underfoot, a fluffy cat and an old dog the Smithville inhabitants were few and the outlook poor.

Collier County commissioners have said they welcome a U.S. Senate investigation of the plight of migrant farm workers living in the area.

Field hearings of the Senate's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs are scheduled to begin here on March 10.

Committee Chairman Sen. George McGovern (D., S.D.) announced the hearings after publication of the story by The Times.

The Senate committee, which only recently suffered a 40 per cent budget cut, was given new life Tuesday when the full Senate voted to restore the $100,000 previously cut from the study.

The move was the first time in memory that the Senate has reversed the powerful Rules Committee in a head-on fight over a committee budget.

At the camp, 15 green-painted plywood shacks huddle around a small lake near the Audubon Corkscrew Sanctuary. They had little to recommend them except that they had been vacant two weeks. Empty bottles, trash and broken toys littered the ground but one smouldering fire and the ashes of others showed cleanup attempts.

"Usually I have two men cleaning up my camp while the crew's in the fields," explained crew chief Sylvester (Honeybun) Hall. "We aren't staying here now, we're over on the Oil Well Grade and the cleanup men are working there. I work camps in North Carolina, Michigan and Ohio and I don't keep a nasty camp."

While The Times' story said "a spigot planted in the ground" was the only water supply and is "foul smelling and tasting," Hall pointed out spigots between each of the 15 cabins and a pressure water system he repaired just before the crew moved. He still stays at the camp in a new, large and neat three bedroom house trailer with colonial furniture. With him are his wife, mother and six children.

"This 'pitiful' drinking water was certified in December by the Board of Health," said Moise Smith, who built the camp in 1966 and owner until it was sold to Laguna Farms recently.

"It's the same water year round in Immokalee—it's sulphur water."

The water level in drainage ditches was at least two feet below the hut elevation, "and there's more water now than since we've been here," Hall said. The county had a 1.6-inch rain on Saturday.

Other than the huts, an old school bus with the wheels off and up on blocks at one side, the main vehicles were a newer bus that Hall said threw a rod and needed an engine, another new bus that carried the crew in to check with the chief before going to the fields, Hall's pickup and station wagon and Smith's white Lincoln Continental.

There were three privies and two shower rooms in fairly clean condition, but one toilet was fouled up, as The Times had said, and a water line to the shower appeared to have been recently disconnected. Power lines run to each of the eight-by-16-foot cabins and light sockets were in place outside as well.

"It was like a small city when we were here," Hall said.

He agreed few people use the cold water showers "but they all had their stoves to heat water and little foot baths in their rooms to wash in."

Neither Smith nor Hall agreed with other conditions The Times claimed, although the crew chief admitted workers "would be drunk and in the county jail in an hour if I took them into Immokalee on Saturday."

"I had nothing in that building but a piccolo (juke organ) and a soft drink machine," Hall said. "I'd like to see the kind of person who would tell lies like that."

Neither man nor any of the 20-member work crew recalled a visit to the camp by other reporters or photographers, but they did remember a "Hobo Bob" mentioned by The Times and a picture he displayed.

"It was made at the picture place in back of Fred's Barn in Immokalee," they said, and that Hobo Bob had been at the camp some time ago, though no one could say when.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 21, 1969]

Hunger Fighters Will Head for Immokalee

(By Charles Stafford)

WASHINGTON.—A little band of evangelists bent on stamping out hunger, rather than sin, will visit the migrant camps of Immokalee next month and if one or two of them claims to be a U.S. senator, don't be surprised.

They are senators, members of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. It was Sen. Spessard L. Holland, D-Fla., not entirely happy about having a section of Florida singled out for investigation by the committee, who labeled its members "evangelists in the food field."

George S. McGovern, D-S.D., is chairman. Among the 11 other members are Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., and Charles Percy, R-Ill.

McGovern certainly, and some other members, will accompany committee staff people to Immokalee March 10 for two days of inspecting migrant living conditions and holding hearings on hunger and malnutrition problems. They picked out Immokalee even before a New York Times story painted a grim picture of life in Collier County for a migratory farm worker.

The committee did so because of complaints it received about conditions there, and because the County Commission has refused to take part in federal programs which could make surplus foods available to the poor.

A committee employe said the investigation, first of a dozen field trips throughout the country to look into hunger and malnutrition problems, will be trying to:

Discover how severe are the hunger and malnutrition problems.

Survey and analyze the effectiveness of existing food assistance programs.

The food assistance programs include (1) the distribution of surplus foods, (2) the food stamp program in which the poor buy food stamps on a subsidized basis which can be redeemed at grocery stores for food supplies, (3) the school lunch and (4) school breakfast programs to provide meals to school children.

In Collier County, the spokesman said, the committee will be specially interested in finding ways of helping migrant farm workers who have difficulty in meeting residency and income qualifications for any kind of assistance.

The committee might visit other areas of Florida, he said but no schedule has been set up. Members would like to visit a county with a large migrant population where a food program has been established.

Since Collier County officials claim the surplus food distribution program would be too costly for the county to bear, the Senate group will seek testimony from county officials on the program's drawbacks, the spokesman said.

But he added that the committee will do more than that.

"Where we find a need, we are going to recommend that people be fed," he said. "We are not just going to do a survey."

Holland, second-ranking Democrat on the Senate Agriculture Committee, saw Collier County as a pawn in "a fight going on between two federal agencies as to who will be the principal handler of this (food distribution) program in the federal field."

"The Department of Agriculture has been the principal handler of legislation I have mentioned and other legislation which I can mention and I think that by and large it has done a good job," he said. "However, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has been trying to get hold of that program."

During debate this week on the resolution continuing the select committee and providing funds for its investigative work, Holland said the New York Times story on Immokalee was "probably a bit of propaganda" in the struggle for control of the food distribution programs.

Holland said he had "no disposition at all to cover up anything in my own state" and would welcome the select committee's visit.

But he said of the newspaper article: "It seems to me, from reading that article, that the reporter was concerned about two things in particular. One was that he found some poor, hungry, ill-fed and ill-housed people, whom he did not describe as migrants, but who I am sure were migrants, in a county where he said the average income per person was $4,600 and where the county commissioners had not been willing to install a food stamp program or a program in the field of general commodity distribution.

"Perhaps," the senator continued, "he was overlooking the fact that migrants do come to Florida in the winter, just like everybody else, including the evangelists, who always come to Florida in the winter; and they come to Florida sometimes before the work is available. Perhaps that might have been the case.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 28, 1969]

Kirk Accepts Hunger Look, but Says State Doing More

(By Charles Stafford)

WASHINGTON.—Gov. Claude Kirk Jr. said Thursday he has no objection to a Senate committee investigating hunger in Immokalee, but his administration is "doing more meaningful work in all this migrant worker problem than any headline will do."

The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, headed by Sen. George S. McGovern (D., S.D.) will visit Collier County March 10–11 to inspect living facilities for farm workers and hold hearings on hunger and malnutrition problems.

Kirk, in Washington for a two-day meeting of the national governors' conference,

XUM

said: "I hope they do come if they want to come in a sense of accomplishing a survey. But I don't want it to be in any way political."

Both the governor and members of his staff said many urban areas have more hunger than Immokalee. Robert Roesch said, "Frankly, I think we've got in a given square block of Miami, Liberty City, as many or more problems than the entire Immokalee area in terms of human suffering. I've been through all of these places and quite frankly my own feelings are that people in Immokalee are far better off than perhaps they are in some of the real congested slum areas."

There were reports gubernatorial aide James Bax was working to persuade county officials in several counties, including Collier, to adopt a food stamp or surplus commodity distribution program to aid the poor, or to allow the state to do so. But Bax refused to confirm this.

"My recommendations on this will not go to newspapers first," said Bax "They'll go to the governor."

Bax said a program he was seeking to work out with Avco Corp. could help migrant farm workers more than any Senate investigation. But he said he was not ready to announce any details.

Kirk said he met Wednesday morning with Avco officials to discuss an "impact training, vocational training" program that would be carried out at the old Sanford Naval Training Center.

"Our vocational training in Florida just doesn't work," said Kirk. "It's not relevant, it's not productive, and we are not turning out the people we should be turning out for the jobs that are there . . .

. . . You can't deliver a house in Palm Beach County in less than seven months, I am told, because they don't have the people."

Kirk said the state can get a federal grant to help pay for a vocational training program run by Avco. He said he envisions a pilot program for 150 trainees to begin with.

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 7, 1969]

TRUTH PROBE IS WELCOME

NAPLES.—There will be a welcome in Immokalee Monday for the Senate investigating committee—if it's there to investigate and not merely to backstop a preconceived case.

I'll tell you all about welfare and work, if you'll tell the truth. Some of these newspaper reporters won't tell the truth, said an Immokalee woman this week.

The same for the committee. If it wants to see the truth, it will be welcome. Immokalee doesn't want to prevent aid to migrants or to others in need, but it sees no need to be crucified for a television show like the Miami production this week which I am told could find nothing to picture in the Immokalee area but dozens of outhouses, "more outhouses than I'd ever seen before," as one viewer said.

The most vicious and widely circulated story of all was the one that wealthy Neapolitans were teaming up with the farmers to hold down migrant aid when, for example, it is largely the wealthy Neapolitans who provided an $8-million hospital that is the only one available to migrants and poor people in this county.

The story even reached California and brought an indignant letter from a young college student to the county commission this week.

Writing of "the tragic condition of migrant workers in your area," Miss Sidney Connell said, "one understands you aren't going to give these pathetic souls money directly from your own Christian pockets, but if the federal government offers food and money, what sort of pride is it that is allowing you to deny them to thousands of depressed individuals living on $25 a week?"

The migrants are not in a tragic condition, but it would be false to say their lot is paradise. Some have good conditions, some bad. Some have enough to eat, some don't.

The federal government is the only group which could break this stream of traveling misery, and it isn't trying. It has offered Collier County food but no money, especially no money to handle delivery and distribution of the food. In Lee County this means the county has to use a war surplus warehouse at Page Field and welfare clients have to take taxis or hitch rides to get their food.

Collier doesn't refuse federal free food. It uses that food to see that every migrant school-age child gets a warm breakfast and lunch free and that others with low income can buy meals at 20 and 25 cents. Lee County, which has been justly credited for its food program, sells its meals for 42 and 47 cents and has stricter rules than on "freebies."

The worst aspect of this national publicity is the $25-a-week pay angle, which is totally untrue. Independent reporters going to Immokalee have found workers being paid $11, $17 and even $39 a day in one case.

Labor has been in short supply all season—6,000 to 7,000 workers short at harvest time—according to Don Lander, veteran county agricultural agent.

And it is not just a farm labor shortage. A downtown drugstore has had two-thirds of its luncheon counter closed this week for lack of help. The Naples Daily News this week has been running up to 172 job openings of all types, and the 172 figure is a conservative reading of requests for "men, laborers, waitresses," counting each request as only for two people.

The committee by all means should talk to Albert Lee, who has worked so hard to improve many fields of activity at Immokalee. It should also talk to Mrs. Hazel Griffin, who directs county welfare, Mrs. Eloise Lester, who heads the county school lunch program, Dr. Charles Bradley, head of the health department, and to the Immokalee Migrant Committee which has over the years spent thousands of dollars out of its own pockets and even worked with Naples to raise emergency funds to aid migrants in need.

My own suggestion to the committee members is to act like a good reporter: Believe nobody without checking the opposite side of the story, and go over every angle, not just the beautifully worded and prepared handouts from some non-local source.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Mar. 9, 1969]

HOW MUCH HUNGER IN IMMOKALEE?

(By Howard Van Smith)

IMMOKALEE.—Start talking about whether hunger is really rampant along this farming town's main street that looks like part of the wild, wild west and you can just about get yourself into a gun battle—no matter which side you take.

Monday, amid this chipsdown atmosphere, Sen. George McGovern, the South Dakota Democrat, leads this Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs into town for two days of hearings at the Bethune Elementary School. With him will be Sen. Jacob Javits, R.-N.Y., Sen. Allen Ellender, D.-La., Sen. Marlow Cook, R.-Ky., and Sen. Robert Dole, R.-Kan. Missing will be Sen. Edward (Ted) Kennedy and six other members of the committee.

The charge, made mainly by the South Florida Migrant Legal Aid Services, is that there is malnutrition bordering on starvation brought on by lack of work—and especially among the older or otherwise incapacitated migrant and other farm workers. Free government food will be asked.

The countercharge, made mainly by the farmers, businessmen and the Immokalee Migrant Committee, is that there is plenty of work for those who want to work even though this is the "off season"—between the fall and spring harvests. No such giveaway food is needed, they say.

The gap of misunderstanding is very, very wide.

IT BEGAN

The controversy began—and brought the Senate here—on the basis of a Feb. 17 story in The New York Times which told of hunger at the starvation level and wages too low to live on because there was not enough work. The story was admittedly "fed" by the Migrant Legal Aid to writer Homer Bigart as part of a "Hunger in America" series. A key picture showed a youngster under two with a caption, "Child's distended abdomen indicates malnutrition."

Since then doctors who have seen the picture say it surely doesn't represent malnutrition. True, the child has a big stomach but where are the spindly legs and arms that with a distended stomach factually spell out malnutrition? This child, they say, is merely fat.

Some people refuse to talk. Immokalee doesn't like the front page. It's been there before. People here still smart from the memory.

The year was 1958. But actually it began on Dec. 8, 1957. It just took time to settle in.

There was the kind of frost-and-freeze the farmers call a wipe-out. There was no work from then on for the migrants.

THOUSANDS HUNGRY

By mid-January the number who were without food was in the thousands. No one could give the exact number then. Immokalee is an odd town in this way. It is still unincorporated. This meant then—more so than now—that there were no laws covering sanitation, housing, health or anything else. There were no county laws that could be substituted or active state laws.

Neither had Immokalee been a farming town then for too long, although it was boasting it would overtake big Dade County with its 50,000 acres in winter vegetable farming. (And since then with sugar cane and an increase in tomatoes it has considerably narrowed the gap.)

By early February the condition was so serious migrants were dying. The one doctor in the town—still the same Dr. Hinton and still the one doctor—was sick with hepatitis. He had always done a big business with the migrants, one he's mostly lost now to the health clinic built in that year of famine.

A common sight to see then were the migrants who had some kind of old rattletrap—there was hardly one left that did run and no gas for that—rolling bald tires into the service stations and trying to sell them for 10 cents with which to buy some bread or fuel.

Yes, it stayed cold. The elements combined in this misery. Paratyphoid broke out. So did other diseases. It was known by then that 4,500 migrants were stranded. Some took to the woods. Some died there.

CENTER OF MISERY

All this misery centered in a place called Shacktown. This term when used in Immokalee makes the residents squirm. Call it the Quarters, they urge. But if ever there was a jungle of misery and destitution it was Shacktown. It is nearly the story of Immokalee itself.

Discovering dike farming brought the migrants to Immokalee. These dikes enclose fields into which water is pumped in or out as needed. But these farms are not in Immokalee. Not even one can be seen from the edge of the town. They're spread for miles and miles over the countryside, in places with names like the Devil's Kitchen. But nearly all the migrants lived in Immokalee, in Shacktown. In fact it did then, and still does, make up a community of about 5,000 when fall or spring farming is peaking.

Once Immokalee had been a lumber town. Here a great deal of cypress was milled. The boards that were planed off, some of them of the pecky type that have big holes throughout, were ideal for making shacks. Other leftover lumber helped. The residents of the town saw a new industry. They built the shacks and rented them to the migrants.

SOME ANSWERS?

The obvious places to find the answers to such contradictory charges would be the town's only doctor and the local Collier County Health Clinic.

Dr. Forrest Hinton, the local physician, replied to the question by saying: "There are only three times to get your name in the paper: when you are born, when you get married and when you die. So far, I've had mine in twice and that's that."

At the clinic a nurse, on the condition that her name not be used, said that there had been no increase in malnutrition but some had to be expected in an area which had a population, at season peaks, of 7,000 migrant and other farm workers and their family members.

But there had to be more to it than that.

Perhaps the most useful observation came from a teacher at the Pine Crest Elementary School, which is integrated and contains farm children. He not only refused his name for "protective" reasons but ducked every time a camera was aimed at him. But he did say:

"I'm sure there is malnutrition. We serve free breakfast and free lunch, two meals a day, and give milk later in the day also, and I'm sure there wouldn't be any reason for doing that if there were no malnutrition."

Many of these shacks were so rickety they were falling sideways. Many were so small they would squeeze one man, yet families of 10 were in them. They rented for prices up to $10 a week, and at that time migrants when working were making 60 and 65 cents an hour. Before the freeze children went to the fields with their parents to try to meet the cost of rent and food.

SANITATION UNKNOWN

Sanitation was just about unknown. The only real argument was whether there should be pit-type outhouses instead of surface ones. One served a cluster of shacks. So did one well and usually it was located near the latrine.

The water also was high that winter. It flowed around the latrines and sewage floated in it and around the well nearby. The water flowed across the floors of many shacks and the cold remained. Sometimes it went down into the 20's. And yet in this huge mass of hungry, stranded humanity women still kept on having babies. One public health nurse tried to work against all this, to do what she could, and one time she kept working day and night when her own temperature was 102.

Conditions had always been so bad in Immokalee that the farm labor bureau of the Florida State Employment Service called it "the forgotten area" and refused to send migrants who used its service there.

Those who did come, with an unusually heavy amount of Mexican-Americans for a Florida farm area, were what were called "free-wheelers." They came on their own from wherever they left. Migrant labor, with some 3,000,000 workers and their families, is big business in America. So, long ago the states began cooperating in moving crews (about 50 men bossed by a crew-leader) to the farm areas of the nation as they needed them. Certainly some of those areas were bad enough, such as can still be seen in Broward County, but Immokalee was just too much even for the farm labor service.

A curious thing happened at the start of this misery. The Immokalee Migrant Committee was a body supposed to function in an emergency. But then who expected an emergency? There hadn't been anything really before. The chairmanship revolved among better known people although there was no particular need to hold meetings.

A MINISTER ARRIVES

At that time a young Methodist minister had come to town to preach at the Immokalee Methodist Church and occupy the nearby parsonage. His name was the Rev. David Newell. He was honored by giving him the chairmanship. It was entirely an honor, not because he knew anything about migrants.

Young Dave Newell suddenly found himself the rallying point of a debacle, of trying to control the swirling of what was literally a human cesspool. He began working day and night and he thought the others on the committee cared as much as he did. Perhaps some did. But others were there for the "front" the committee had become.

At one meeting Rev. Newell heard a member ask a farmer what should be done with all the destitute migrants. The farmer suggested digging a hole and dumping them all in it.

From then on, still never slowing his pace, Rev. Newell began working more with a reporter as a means of bringing in outside help. The town he knew, was trying to cover it up.

Eventually these newspaper stories brought in $150,000. At the worst time of the crisis government surplus food was sent in after a long delay because of freight cars "lost" enroute to Immokalee. But this food given out each month only amounted to enough for a week at best. The town was full of babies and little children and it contained nothing for them. Also the main item was cheese as a protein.

A remarkable fact emerged about this item. People of Mexican descent—and Immokalee had many—can't eat cheese because of their natural oily diet. It wasn't a matter of taste or anything like that. You might as well give them a block of wood. Finally a Puerto Rican dietitian was brought in, who said all this was not only true but the "blocking effects of cheese on the Mexicans could increase the amount of illness.

The newspaper stories brought the money and the money bought supplemental food and kerosene. The stories also brought many other things, including clothes and cases of baby food from the Pablum Company that arrived by the freight car-load. Rev. Newell set up his supplementary food depot at the Lions' Den, home of the local civic club. For months he labored at this.

Dr. George Kareles of Newberry, Fla., then head of the rural health committee of the American Academy of General Practice who even before that year had wanted Immokalee investigated and somehow changed, said this effort had saved the lives of dozens, perhaps hundreds.

The stories kept flashing across the country. They told a far, far different story of Florida, the land of sunshine and palms. Then Gov. LeRoy Collins became admittedly angry because he couldn't believe anything was that bad in his state.

He sent his adjutant general down with an investigating group. They landed at the local airfield, were given a careful tour by a farm group of one hour and a lunch of one hour. They then flew back to Tallahassee and announced the farmers had the Immokalee conditions under control.

The Rev. Newell spoke bitterly about the "whitewash" and the stories became more strident also. Finally Gov. Collins, "incognito" in a hunter's outfit and his wife, Mary Call, literally sneaked into town.

The meeting of the minister who had stood up against virtually an entire town as the voice of the voiceless starving 4,500 and the governor was—for a fleeting moment—one of the most dramatic of those which happen when migrants experience one of their frequent tragedies. They stood together for a moment looking down upon Shacktown. Then the governor said, "It's only fit for a bulldozer." Behind him Mary Call Collins kept repeating, "Oh my God!"

When the governor left he said he would do something. There were no laws he was told. He would find them, he said. And he did.

Sanitarians came in as soon as the migrants had gone in the spring and condemned 90 percent of the buildings. Other laws on health and sanitation were found and enforced.

But that didn't mean these buildings would all disappear. Declared "unfit for human habitation," they could not be rented. Many just collapsed. But some remain.

THE HEAT'S OFF

The story went around town, something gangster-like in tone, that in time "the heat would be off." Today some of these "unfit" buildings are back being rented. Someone is helping to overlook. Others that made it through the hammer of condemnation signs have reached a stage as bad as the others were 10 years ago.

Shacktown in all its cesspool-like horror is well on its way back. It's again a place in America that Americans wouldn't believe until they saw it. Americans, they think, do not live this way. But they do. And pay dearly in rents.

Shacktown, then, was the place to pursue the controversy that has one part of a town fuming at the other part—and which Sen. McGovern will see Monday. What do the people who live there think?

Mrs. Rosalee Brown explained she was born "century-time," which means she's 68 or 69. She can get no state welfare because she's a migrant—and of course there is not local welfare.

But she must pay $12 a week for half a house whose two "apartments" are contained in a building that, were it a garage, one car would find it a tight squeeze.

"I can't do stoop work (squatting for picking) so good anymore," she said. "An' it been cold a lot so I ain't had no work since last fall."

She said a grandson supports her.

TWENTY-FOUR DOLLARS A WEEK

But Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Mabel Allen who lives in the tiny cubicle on the other side together pay $24 a week, more than $100 a month for their tiny cubicles, and all these places are cubicles. There's no other place to go.

James Kelly is 71, diabetic and lives in a bus.

He described it succinctly, "They ain't working and they ain't eating."

It's easy to see a lot of people aren't working because they're around Shacktown during the day. But why?

Authorities and farm people say there's all the work around needed to employ everyone. The town isn't as full now as during its fall and spring harvesting peaks. That's what the farm people say. They say the migrants are down in Dade and over in Belle Glade mostly. But still no place is empty. Even one cabin that is teetering so badly it will collapse at any moment is occupied.

Agreement is hard to come by in Immokalee.

Albert Lee, who heads the Community Civic Workers of the OEO's legal aid group, says it has been a bad season for migrants with heavy unemployment. He explained when he said "migrants" he really means farm workers in general because about half are migrants and half are year-round residents. The word migrant is becoming a misnomer because so many are dropping out of the "streams" because by living year-around in a place they can become residents and eligible for welfare.

He said Immokalee, an unincorporated area which doesn't bother much with censuses—and no one has ever been able to take a census of the wandering migrants anyway—has a normal population of 3,000 and bulges to 12,000 in the winter growing season.

Stanley Wrisley, publisher of the local paper, The Immokalee Bulletin, said the local population is about 5,000 and the number of farm workers is about 7,000. But he says half of these stay here year-around and half are true migrants.

This divergency of opinion indicates how little is really known about this vast population of people who live at a subhuman level here and who will attract Sen. McGovern's inquiry Monday.

ANOTHER ODDITY

Another oddity is that Migrant Legal Aid, which set up the show, now refuses to show newspaper people the places they have cited as "extreme conditions." The obvious reason is that the members fear publicizing of this has backfired on them and owners of such places are making an effort to clean up in advance of the committee's visit.

Down in Shacktown no one seems to know about the senatorial inquiry. All they say, in case after case, is that there is very little work and that the high rents are taking what food they could get out of their mouths. They say they are hungry, very hungry.

Clarence Gaskin, who lives with his wife and one son in one of the shacks, said, "This place is a pigpen, that's all. Just look around you."

Around him is every kind of shack. One group is of corrugated sheetmetal and none larger than a small tool shed. Certainly smaller than a jail cell. In one a man, trying to keep warm, recently burned to death. His burned shoes and a few skimpy charred belongings still lie in front of the shack. The metal is held up by a few two-by-fours. There are no windows but a piece of board can be pulled down when the occupants are away. How even a small family can get into one is impossible to imagine. But the rent is only $7 a week. Eight of these on the space of about half a lot bring in $56 a week.

* * * * *

A CONSTANT THEME

That's a constant theme: migrants as destitute as they are nevertheless are good business for the townspeople.

Neither Mr. or Mrs. Gaskins had made a dime by late last week but somehow, like the others, they manage to eke out or borrow a few cents to pay sky-high prices for cheap food and rental payments—and these must be made every week to stay in a place.

Sylvester Parker, 46, who was lugging a collard he'd got out of a friend's garden along the street under his arm, said, "Work is bad and I'm hungry. You talk to me after I eat this up."

Earl Jones and his wife pay $13 a week for a tiny cubicle in a long building of tiny cubicles. The ability, in these larger places, to get so many "apartments" into so little space becomes architectural wizardry.

Mrs. Ina Delgedo, lives in what is called "Utopia Apartments." This is in the Spanish-American section of Shacktown. She has eight children and no husband and pays $17.14 a week. A 16-year-old son, Bernardo, works to support the family. She speaks very little English but what she does say is: "Not enough work among people and people very hungry."

How hungry are they? How sick are they?

* * * * *

SAME RESULTS

* * * * *

The Rev. Keith Kelly, who has replaced David Newell also subs in the schools. He's also been made a member of the Immokalee Migrant Committee but there's never been a meeting in the months he's been there. He said:

"There's work if they want to work. There was one bad freeze last fall when nearly all was harvested so it didn't slow us down too much."

County Commissioner Ewell Moore, a former Immokalee farmer himself, is a veteran of the 1958 crisis. He was in charge of government free food distribution and worked long and hard for the migrants during that period. He has been asked to testify and he isn't hesitant about what he has to say:

"They're accusing us of refusing federal commodities here and we're right. We're not going to spend $40,000 or $50,000 of the taxpayer's money, especially after what a tie-up I learned it meant after speaking to Lee McGovern (no relation to the senator but in charge of surplus food in Florida.) If you decide to give these people groceries you won't have any workers."

County Commission Vice-Chairman A. C. Hancock had this warning: "There are those sitting with their hands out waiting to be fed, and that's a situation we won't go for."

A PUT-ON SHOW

And you can even find migrants—or farm workers—who agree, though it takes a lot of looking. Mr. and Mrs. Santo Sanchez walked along a street in Shacktown. She said: "I ain't sure this is such a bad time." She said she and her husband, despite the cold weather slow-up, had made about $30 apiece last week. And some weeks they'd averaged $100. They're buying their own home. But, too, they are not field hands but work in the packing house grading lines. In migrant territory that's the aristocracy.

Publisher Wrisley, a former migrant himself who has also been asked to testify, calls it a put on show and he'll tell Sen. McGovern that.

"The OEO is trying to garner publicity to get a new lease on life," he said, in obvious reference to the Migrant Legal Aid which the state government division controlling OEO funds says will be cut off at the end of the fiscal year because it has been such an unnecessary irritant. "Gerry Cassidy, one of the attorneys of the South Florida Migrant Legal Aid Services, did it in an effort to try to stave off being put out of business."

He said he is going to ask the legal aid people to produce before the committee the cases of malnutrition they say are here, not just talk about it.

"This isn't any 1958," he added.

The conclusion? There's only one left to come to. The prediction that Shacktown is returning to a place of disease and filth is true—as lucrative as it is to some townspeople. The gouging rents always take a huge bite. But when work slows down that big bite doesn't and it's big enough then to consume a lot of families' groceries. Then there's hunger. There's malnutrition. There are all those things associated with it, such as disease.

Sen. McGovern will have to make a big decision Monday. But will he overlook the obvious—after a look at Shacktown what will happen if there's another freeze such as in 1967? Perhaps not this year but the next or thereafter. The seeds are there; for complete human degradation and destitution, for famine, for virulent epidemic disease—yes, for the cycle of death.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Mar. 11, 1969]

Javits: Slums Better Than Immokalee Shacks

Immokalee.—Sen. Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., said yesterday the poor people in the pine shacks of a southwest Florida migrant labor camp are worse off than New York's slum tenement dwellers.

"In the slums they at least have toilets," said Javits after he surveyed the dingy, smelly community outhouses and outdoor spigots in a labor camp.

Javits and other members of the Senate's Committee on Nutrition toured one of the 50 labor camps which house some 10,000 migrant workers who annually come here to harvest vegetable crops. The migrant population is nearing a peak with the approach of the early spring tomato harvest.

As the committee began its tour, T. Michael Foster, assistant director of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, reported figures showing that 20 of every 1,000 children born in Collier County die before they first birthday, primarily of hunger and malnutrition.

He said the death rate among nonwhite children in the county is "an astonishing 40.8 deaths per 1,000 births. This is triple the rate for nonwhites in Florida."

The committee, headed by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., saw migrant shacks made of pine and covered with tar paper roofing, and many of them had been spruced up with paint for the visit of the committee.

"On visits like this, you get the feel of it. I am sure it's tricked up in some cases for our benefit but it is pretty hard to sweep a whole community under the rug," Javits said.

"Hunger is uniquely appealing to the American people. This is what has really touched the conscience and what is worrying the country."

McGovern, whose committee is making the first of several field trips, expressed concern over the cost of the proposed anti-ballistic missile system President Nixon is studying and said he believes such military considerations "delay the day when we can come to grips with problems like this."

"This is sub-standard housing as we see it today. We will see conditions like these in many parts of the United States," McGovern said.

One of the committee's first stops following a 75 mile-an-hour motorcade from Fort Myers to this farm community of some 4,500, which lies in the rich growing land midway between Florida's inland Lake Okeechobee and the Gulf of Mexico, was the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Adderson. It was an unpainted three-room shack that leaned with age and was lit by a bare bulb inside.

The senators crowded inside to talk with Mrs. Adderson, a 65-year-old invalid who sat in a rocking chair and told the committee she supports her 69-year-old husband and four children on a monthly Social Security-disability income totaling $134. She said the main diet was peas and beans.

"It's obvious the woman has never known what it is to have a decent standard of life," McGovern said as he emerged from the shack, shaking his head.

"There's evidence when you look around this house, this is a poverty stricken family. They are not even aware they are poor."

He said he believes the answer to some of the migrants' problems is food stamps and commodities, "but it also is a nutritional education."

"After talking with her it was obvious she didn't know anything about an adequate diet," McGovern said.

"We're trying to find out the nature and dimension of the problem, then make recommendations for new legislation to correct the problems."

The committee also visited Rosalee Bryant, 19, an unmarried mother of four who is one of the residents of a complex of dingy white two-story block apartment buildings which house Negro families, most of them farm workers.

Miss Bryant, a thin woman dressed in slacks and blouse, told the senators she lives on $50 a week she makes working in the fields, but that she cannot always work. She pays $65 a month for her apartment and $3 a day for a babysitter when she can go to the fields.

"Do you ever go hungry?" McGovern asked the woman.

"Yes sir, it was during the summertime when there was no work. There was too much rain." She said neighbors gave her enough food for her children until she was able to work again

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 11, 1969]

Collier Officials Protest Hunger Probe

(By Sam Adams)

Immokalee.—Collier County officials attempted to thwart hunger investigations here yesterday by interjecting during a national television taping and disputing testimony of some residents during field study.

Lester Whitaker, County Commission chairman, said some of the statements about widespread hunger in the Immokalee area are not true.

Rep. Paul Rogers, D-Fla., criticized the decision of the select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs for failing to include visits to some of the better exhibits in the county such as self-help housing.

Even Gov. Claude Kirk, who surprised the committee by flying in just as the 1 p.m. hearing was to begin, chided the committee for not contacting him to learn what he and his aides had uncovered in prior investigations. The committee will continue their hearings today.

He also complained that the physician in charge of the county's health clinic was not scheduled to appear and that a nutritionist rather than his boss was to testify. "I like to hear from the chiefs not the corporals," Kirk said.

Freshman Sen. Marlow Cook, R-Ky., brought muffled rumbles from the packed hearing room while questioning Albert Lee about a side trip he took to a migrant camp called Smith's visited earlier by New York Times reporter Homer Bigart, whose stories brought national publicity. (Lee was one of the drivers in the caravan transporting the committee from Fort Myers.)

"I just shook hands with a camp boss with wet paint on his hands. Some people are concerned about retribution for what they say to this committee. I want it known that Lee didn't want to take me out there," Cook said of his visit to the camp.

Smith's Camp, which was temporarily closed after Bigart's visit and sold to another owner, is one of several camps apparently receiving quick paint jobs in preparation for the committee's widely publicized visit.

Cook's party included Lee; Robert Choate, who was staff director of the private Citizens Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition and a St. Petersburg Times reporter.

The Kentucky senator said his state has probably as much poverty and hunger as Florida and if investigators came in there they would find it. But, he said, the purpose is not to give Florida a black eye and officials are erring in taking that attitude.

When the Cook car broke away from the caravan it was followed to the camp by the county health inspector in an official automobile. The inspector took pictures of the little touring party as it inspected the camp.

At Brown's Camp, about three miles away, Cook found a large group of Mexican children playing and had three take him through their families' two 8 by 10 shacks.

He noted the occupants paid $15 week for rent plus $5 for electricity and said the owner was collecting about $250 a month for operating a small generator, which supplies electricity to the camp.

Cook called excessive $20 per month for electricity for heatless shacks with one light.

The three children included a 14-year-old boy whose growth the senator said was stunted and who was three grades behind in school. He was about 4 feet tall and hardly understood English. The children said their parents and three adult children live in one of the shacks and six younger children live in the other, some sleeping on the floor.

"It doesn't speak too well for this area and for the nation when a boy is three grades behind and brags about it," Cook said.

He rejoined the caravan at Bethune Apartments where Congressman Rogers was being questioned about license tag inscriptions on his car that stated, "I fight poverty. I work."

Rogers said the inscription is relevant because the County Commissioners told him they have been looking for 20 workers and were able to get only five out of 100 available. Questioned further about why the others were not hired, he admitted he wasn't filled in on the details.

Sen. George McGovern, D.-S.D., reacting to criticism for not scheduling some of the nicer sites, said it wasn't their purpose to look for the beautiful. The committee, he said, wants to find the extent of the existence of hunger and to structure programs to deal with it:

"In this nation of abundance if we can't solve the question of hunger and malnutrition we can't do anything," McGovern said.

Both McGovern and Sen. Jacob Javits, R.-N.Y., talked of having the federal government do the job if local governments continue to reject food programs.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 11, 1969]

There's Lots of Hunger in Immokalee, Senators Agree After Look at Migrants

(By Matt Taylor)

Immokalee.—They didn't vote on it, but five senators looking for hunger in Collier County Monday agreed that they found plenty of it.

Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota found people "living on fatback and peas" but offered county authorities who had refused federal help his understanding.

Sen. Jacob Javits of New York, outspoken and biting, found people "living in houses fit for chickens and pigs—but not people," and said if the county wasn't going to do something, the federal government must.

Sen. Marlow Cook of Kentucky, who took a private tour of his own, found that "when they came out and met me, their hands were still wet with paint." The senator was referring to a cleanup program under way in Immokalee since the committee hearings were announced.

Rep. Paul Rogers and Gov. Claude Kirk attended the sessions, Rogers because he represents the district and Kirk because he didn't like the witness list. He was angry because Dr. Wilson T. Sowder, head of the State Board of Health, was not called, but one of his nutritionists was.

"I believe we ought to hear from the general," Kirk said, "and not from a corporal."

The tour in the morning covered a number of dismal houses near the heart of Immokalee. Sen. McGovern went through refrigerators as the senators inquired about family diets.

"They don't even know what good nutrition is," McGovern said.

T. Michael Foster, assistant director of the State's Legal Service Program, was the lead witness as the committee met in the Bethune School after lunch.

He said his agency and others had investigated housing and nutrition in Collier County and found significant poverty and significant hunger. "When a little child misses a meal," Foster said, "I consider that significant hunger."

Said Sen. Javits, standing in a muddy yard and shivering from cold, "I think hunger is an issue that is uniquely appealing to the American people. I think we've got a real issue."

Javits said there was no comparison between the slums in New York City and the migrant camps around Immokalee.

"In the slums, they at least have toilets," he said after looking at the community outhouses and outside water spigots in a labor camp.

Rep. Rogers noted an old television set in one house on the tour, (the house had one room, a barn-like door, a privy, no water and got its electricity from an extension cord to the house next door) and said: "We've got to teach them how to handle their money." At a labor camp, McGovern talked to 65-year-old Mrs. George Adderson. She told him she supports a husband and four children on a monthly income of $134, most of it from Social Security.

She said their main diet is beans and peas.

McGovern walked away from Mrs. Adderson's three-room shack shaking his head and saying: "They are not even aware they are poor.

"It's obvious the woman has never known what it is to have a decent standard of life. This is a poverty-stricken family."

As the committee began its tour, Foster reported figures showing that 20 of every 1,000 children born in Collier County die before their first birthday, primarily of hunger and malnutrition.

He said the death rate among non-white children in the county is "an astounding 40.8 deaths per 1,000 births. This is triple the rate for non-whites in Florida."

McGovern's committee, which planned to move to nearby Fort Myers today, has received a cool reception from local farmers and government officials, who resent the investigation as an intrusion into their private affairs.

Kirk offered some support to two county commissioners who found themselves under a whithering examination by Sen. Javits. His support was only that "the senators have the county commissioners at a disadvantage."

Sen. McGovern told the county commissioners, "We have an urgent problem here," if they really considered migrants a federal problem and not a county problem.

Commissioner Ewell Moore said that was how he saw it.

Commission chairman Lester Whitaker agreed with him.

The Florida Field Director for the NAACP, Marvin Davies, told the five senators he once taught in the same school where the hearings were being held.

"At this very school," he said, "I really saw hunger and malnutrition at its very worse. There were white lips on black children, a sure sign of hunger.

"I have seen children whose only verbal sound was heard only at the command for lunch. Too, I have witnessed with the flow of tears, at the same command because there was no money to purchase the school lunch.

"The only continuing sounds that were assured from these children were those of agony, pain and the cry acids in the digestive tract.

"I have also seen brown paper bags opened during the lunch hour to reveal only a cold piece of corn bread or cold biscuit or a small container of molasses. Occasionally there will be a piece of cold pork or fat back or neck bones."

Sen. Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana asked if things had changed since Davies had left the school with the new free lunch program furnished by the U.S.

"Thing are better," Davies said.

(Sen. Ellender was the chief architect of the school lunch program.)

Commissioner Whitaker told the panel that about $7,500 was spent on emergency food in Collier County each year. He said there are about 22,000 workers at the peak of the season.

Sen. Ellender briefly interrogated the assistant director of South Florida Migrant Legal Services Inc. about the validity of his program.

The assistant director, P. Michael Foster, was the lead witness and it was on documentation prepared by him that much of the subquent testimony and interrogation was based.

Foster told Sen. Ellender that the program had been funded for two years at about $800,000 but was going to be running out soon.

Sen. Javits, thanking Foster for "your very dedicated work," asked him how much he made. Foster told him $11,700 and that he had taken a cut in pay to come down to Florida from the U.S. Department of Justice.

Sen. Ellender then dropped his line of questioning. The Migrant Services has been under continuing attack from some Florida officials and particularly from Rep. Rogers.

Davies of the NAACP was almost weeping with anger when he told Rogers—at the conclusion of his testimony for the senators—"I don't feel too good about being here with you today, because I've been fighting your opposition on and off for years. If you've been changed . . . if nothing but that comes out of this today, I'll be glad."

Angry, Rogers said he had worked for a number of activities for migrants "such as migrant help and the housing bill."

"That's for the farmers," Davies said.

"It's for the laborers," Rogers said. He added that if Davies' pinpoint program for relieving migrant problems was founded on information as unreliable as that, he didn't think it was worth much.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota challenged the editor of the weekly Immokalee Bulletin, Stan Wrisley, who was testifying that migrants are shiftless and that welfare or free food would lead them to sitting home all day:

"Do you know anyone who works harder than a migrant laborer? We had a witness here, a man 30 years old with seven children. He's been at it since he was five and crawls all over this country doing piece work. At 45 he'll be burned out.

"Is that four-dollar county welfare payment you offer (per person per week) that much competition to going to work?"

"No, Sir," the editor answered.

"You know," said Sen. Mondale, "There's some suggestion we're defaming this county for coming here for our hearings. But I don't know any worse way to defame the county than to say you have to starve the people to get them to work."

The committee heard that Collier County gets about $40 million annually from its farm crop but feels that migrants are "gypsies, not citizens of the county."

Asked Sen. Javits: "What would you do without them?"

Whitaker said the economy would collapse.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 11, 1969]

"HAVEN'T SEEN ANY HUNGER," COLLIER HEALTH CHIEF SAYS

IMMOKALEE.—Here are comments made during the morning tour of this area by the Senate Committee headed by Sen. George McGovern.

Dr. Charles Bradley, Collier County health department head: "If hunger is here, I don't see it. I haven't actually seen any hunger or malnutrition. I have never had anybody tell me they are hungry or are not getting food. If there are any such it would be the preschoolers. The ones in school get free hot breakfasts and lunches.

"If the inadequacy of the medical service could be said to be manifest, it would be that I wish I could practice a bit more medicine. We are short of doctors all over the county but if necessary here we can run people to the Naples Community Hospital emergency room."

Sen. George McGovern: "We are looking for the worst, not the best. I have seen housing like this in my own state. It is true in many states. We need to adjust national priorities to the greater needs, that is one reason I am concerned about the anti-ballistic missile program.

"We have people here who have never had a good diet, which is probably why they are sick a lot."

Sen. Jacob Javits: "We are trying to view the most acute areas of need in every state. We are not viewing the model programs, there are lots of pretty poor housing in New York but the slums of Immokalee are different. They have outhouses. No matter how bad the slums are in New York, they have plumbing.

"I imagine there has been some touching up for our benefit but you can't sweep a whole community under the rug, such as when you have one doctor treating 40 people a day and they have to trek to him.

"We have to touch the conscience of the people. It may take the federal presence and we may not depend on the County Commission but we must see that people don't just eat beans and peas. That's the real issue before the country. It's not an irreconcilable conflict but there is a need and it has got to be met. I hope we really have an issue that will arouse America."

Rep. Paul Rogers: "This is a problem over the nation. We will see what has to be done to improve the lot of the people."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 11, 1969]

SENATORS TOUR MIGRANT HOUSING AMID PUSH, SHOVE OF NEWSMEN

(By Tom Morgan)

IMMOKALEE.—The Select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs got a close look at at migrant labor housing and food problems here Monday on the first day of a two-day tour of Collier and Lee Counties.

The tour was planned by the South Florida Migrant Legal Services, Inc. but not all the itinerary was followed.

Eight stops were planned before lunch, but the tour was shortened after the senators had to fight their way in and out of houses and apartments and stop for frequent questioning along the way.

Nearly 100 newsmen, photographers and TV reporters hustled after the senators with lights, cameras, microphones and recorders. Tempers grew short as microphone cords were fouled or camera views disturbed in efforts to get more detail.

Two TV cameramen clashed briefly at one apartment when one poked his mike boom into the other's field of view.

At another stop, Les Whitaker, Collier County Commission chairman, said he had to argue his way inside over the objections of Sen. Jacob Javits.

"I told him 'let me in, we're the ones being attacked and I have a right to be here,'" Whitaker declared.

Whitaker said that when he pointed out to the Senator "four packages of meat and two half-gallons of milk," in the refrigerator at this house the senator paid no attention and stepped outside to tell the TV cameras "this woman has nothing but beans, potatoes and greens to eat."

Bob Moss of station WNOG, Naples, said at the home of Mrs. Mary Anderson at Cummer's Camp there was a similar incident when he showed Sen. George McGovern "a pile of pork chops in the refrigerator and what looked like chickens in the freezer, but the senator stepped out on the porch and said, 'there is hunger here—this woman has only beans, peas and potatoes to eat.'"

Early in the tour Whitaker flared up at Dan Shore of CBS who insisted he comment on conditions seen in the first two houses while Whitaker insisted he would make a statement during the afternoon hearing.

"All I ask is for you to tell the truth, no matter what you see," Whitaker said, obviously angry, "None of these damn lies that have been put out some places and in some newspapers."

"We're still waiting for your statement," Shore called as Whitaker walked off.

The television cameramen went along with the senators' statements "we're here to see the worst" and refused to picture other subjects. Children were reportedly posed by faucets getting a drink until all the cameramen were satisfied, but another shot was refused that showed a different aspect of the situation.

Rep. Paul Rogers, invited by the Senate committee but left outside at the house stops, picked up camera interest when talking to 12-year-old Tino Anzualdo Jr. who was sitting on a nearly new bicycle. The microphones and cameras quickly swung away when Anzualdo told of free hot breakfasts and lunches in school.

Another television cameraman jeered loudly when Bill Price, president of the First Bank of Immokalee, drove off as the man tried to photograph a tag on Prices car that said "I fight poverty—I work."

"How much do you think you can really learn from this three ring circus?" a Negro reporter asked Sen. Allen J. Ellender, who replied "This is really no circus. It is a very good bi-partisan committee and it is very important that we get things in perspective."

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Mar. 11, 1969]

SENATORS BRAND IMMOKALEE LABOR QUARTERS "SHOCKING"—KIRK APPEARS, SUPPORTS COLLIER COUNTY OFFICERS

(By Eddie Pertuit)

IMMOKALEE.—U.S. Senate committee investigating "nutrition" and human needs" toured squalid migrant labor quarters here Monday, held a six-hour hearing at which county officials were criticized and defended—and found no person who said he was hungry.

Chairman George McGovern, D-S.D., remarked, however, that malnutrition can occur while a person has a stomach full of the wrong foods.

He explained that the committee came "not to look at the best side of this great state but frankly to look at areas of the most acute need." He termed what he found "simply shocking" and Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., called it "distressing."

Gov. Claude Kirk sat through the hearing and defended the Collier County commissioners in connection with food stamps. They have declined to set up a program for providing free government surplus food to the needy.

SAGGING SHACKS

The tour took in sagging shacks and slum apartment housing. It did not take in the better camps. Sen. Allen Ellender, D-La., after watching camermen of the three major television networks film pictures of hovels, said he hated to see the pictures shown because they were a misrepresentation.

"What we saw was not typical of Florida," said Ellender. "I hope Tuesday we will see a little better side."

LEE COUNTY TOUR

Today the group tours some Lee County houses in the morning and holds a major hearing, similar to the Immokalee hearing, at Southward Village Recreation Center on Edison Avenue at 2 p.m.

Sen. Marlow W. Cook, R-Ky., didn't tour with the rest of the group. He talked Albert Lee, president of the Community Civic Workers of Immokalee, into showing him two camps not on the selected list. They were Brown's Camp and Smith's Camp.

"At Smith's Camp," he said during the testimony of Rodolfo Juarez. "I shook hands with a man who still had wet paint on his hands." There is no rent there, he said, but the camp charges $15 per week for food in the camp kitchen, or $450 per week to feed 30 people.

USUALLY 13

He asked Juarez if it were common to have five people, a man, wife, two teenage daughters and a son, sleeping in the same single room with two beds.

XUM

"That's very unusual, sir," Juarez said, "because there is usually sometimes 13."

Javits expressed astonishment at the attitude of the Collier County Commission. Testimony had been entered, and the two commissioners testifying supported it, that if it were not for migrant laborers the $40 million agricultural industry in Collier County would collapse.

Yet, Javits told Kirk, Commissioner Ewell F. Moore and Chairman Lester Whitaker of the commission, "said they had no responsibility for migratory labor."

Whitaker said the county cannot spend money legally on non-residents and the migrants are non-residents. Even the $7,500 budgeted for food for the poor, criticized by McGovern as comparatively picayune, can be spent only on residents, Whitaker told the committee.

FOOO STAMPS TOPIC

A food stamp program was discussed. It was on food stamps that Kirk defended the commissioners. The state has no food stamp program in any county because Congress didn't appropriate enough money to include Florida, he pointed out.

If Congress provides the money the state will implement the program, said Kirk.

"I'm pleased you favor food stamps," said Ellender.

"Don't bind me on that," reported Kirk. "I said we'd implement the program," not that it was favored.

The commissioners favored food stamps. They are issued for use to buy food at a local store. They are issued free or at a set ratio below face value, deepnding on the level of poverty of the user. The storekeeper recovers face value.

SELF-HELP BACKED

The commissioners backed Self Help Housing, Community Action Fund manpower training efforts and other such programs that are not direct "gimmes," Whitaker said.

"These are the programs that are going to correct this," he said.

Javits asked if the county couldn't spend some money on the people who are vital to the $40 million agricultural returns.

"The county," said Whitaker, "does not get any tax out of that $40 million industry."

Kirk told the senators that the migrants "are a Florida problem." The migrants are a human need "and we consider a human need to be the need of Florida," he said.

A 12-state coalition is being formed by governors along the "migrant stream" to close loopholes in the programs for the roving workers," he said. Kirk said he was organizing the "concert."

"What I have achieved here is a modified federalism," he said. "But bringing 12 states together does not mean we are going to secede."

ROGERS ASSAILED

Marvin Davies, field representative for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, charged Congressman Paul G. Rogers with blocking programs.

"We have had to fight over your opposition," Davies told Rogers, who was sitting with the senators.

Rogers cited programs he had helped urging Davies to first determine the facts. He agreed that he had opposed some ideas originating with NAACP.

Others testifying included Michael Foster, assistant director of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services; Juarez of the migrant-originated Organized Migrants in Community Action; Albert Lee of the Community Civic Workers of Immokalee; Capt. Harold M. Reece, president of Immokalee Chamber of Commerce; Stan Wrisley, editor of the Immokalee Bulletin; John Murphy, Collier County school superintendent, and the county health officer, Dr. Charles Bradley.

The meeting pointed up a number of programs lauded by both the poverty representatives and the other side. In addition to Self Help Housing and the Community Action Fund development programs, the schools have a free lunch program and a free breakfast program. Murphy said he had never seen a hungry child in the schools. The schools also have a 200-student pre-school program at Bethune School.

The houses and conditions seen on the tour were generally what was expected, Javits said. Even the testimony hadn't brought out anything not already known, he said.

McGovern said he knew somewhat of how the Immokalee residents felt. His own state, South Dakota, has a huge collection of Sioux Indians.

"At least once a year the New York Times does an expose on the Sioux Indians," he said. But it takes "these nudges" to keep progress moving, he added.

"We would hope that rather than be too resentful the people will respond by working together," he said.

Javits said the committee would not condone retribution on anyone who was a witness on the tour or at the school.

"We are not going to forget this," he said.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D.-Minn., told the commissioners to pay particular heed not to call the migrant worker a loafer.

"He literally crawls on his belly all over this country," he said, earning at best $3,000 per year with the average income half that.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1969]

HUNGER TOUR FINDS SQUALOR IN FLORIDA—SENATORS ALSO ENCOUNTER AN INDIGNANT GOVERNOR WHO WASN'T NOTIFIED

(By Marjorie Hunter)

IMMOKALEE, FLA., March 10.—A special Senate committee investigating hunger in America found migrant squalor and a coldly furious Florida Governor waiting for them here today.

Angered by the committee's failure to notify him of a hunger tour in his state, Gov. Claude Kirk flew here from the state capital about noon.

Four Senators—two Democrats and two Republicans—had just spent nearly five hours trooping through squalid labor camps, peeping into nearly empty refrigerators and ducking under clotheslines outside dilapidated shacks that in some places house families of 10 or more.

The sign at the city limits proclaimed "Welcome to Immokalee, New World of Opportunity."

"Simply shocking," Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, said later of what he had seen.

JAVITS "DISTRESSED"

And Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, termed it "distressing."

Governor Kirk left no doubt that he too was distressed and shocked—that the committee had failed to tell him it was coming to his state.

"I wish my office had been asked so I could have supplied you with information about my previous trips here," the Governor said coldly, as the committee opened afternoon hearings in a crowded school auditorium.

It was the first of a series of field trips in which the McGovern committee plans to investigate hunger and malnutrition across the continent.

By singling out Florida as a starting place, they angered not only Governor Kirk, a Republican, but Democratic county officials here in Collier County, a farming area sometimes described as the watermelon capital of the world.

For years, county officials have thwarted all attempts to bring in Federally aided food programs, such as surplus commodities and food stamps for the poor.

They have argued that such aid would be too costly, that migrant farm laborers might be tempted to settle down here instead of moving North and that the poor might refuse to pick crops if they received free food.

U.S. FOOD AID BLOCKED

"We want to get to the bottom of this," Senator McGovern said. "If the county won't cooperate, maybe we'll have to set up a wholly Federally supported food feeding program."

But there is dissension even within the ranks of his own committee.

Senator Allen J. Ellender, a peppery, 78-year-old Louisiana Democrat, protested today that the committee was touring only the worst areas.

"Why?" he asked. "That's what I want to know, why? This isn't typical of Florida. I've been here many times and I know."

While conceding that "conditions certainly aren't good here," Senator Ellender gestured toward a clump of shacks and said, "The people we talked to here today seemed to be happy. I haven't seen anyone who isn't contented"

He and others had just left a rotting shack where an elderly Negro man and his one-legged wife live with a 6-year-old granddaughter.

"All I need is a new leg," Mrs. Mary Adderson told them. She said that she had plenty to eat, "peas and beans and sometimes a piece of fatback."

The Addersons have an income of $136 a month, from Social Security and Old Age Assistance.

One 19-year-old migrant worker, an unwed mother of four tots was working a sweatshirt emblazoned with "Flower Power" as she opened the door to the touring Senators.

A few weeks earlier she had told antipoverty investigators that she had trouble feeding her family. Today, she said that they "eat well."

Refrigerators at most of the shacks visited today contained little more than fatback, sodden corn bread and plates of cold string beans.

But at one shack, Collier County Commissioner Les Whitaker took Senator McGovern in tow and said, "Come look in this refrigerator." It was jammed with milk and fruit juices and packages of meats and butter and other staples.

A staff investigator for the committee said that just two days before he had found only fatback and cold beans in that refrigerator.

"It's passing strange," Senator McGovern said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1969]

FLORIDA OFFICIALS STUNG BY HILL'S HUNGER PROBE

(By Bruce Galphin)

IMMOKALEE, FLA., March 10.—A Senate committee turned the spotlight on hunger here today, but white officialdom said it still didn't see any.

Florida Gov. Claude Kirk testily accused the committee of ignoring him and refusing to allow the State Health Department director to testify.

The chairman of the County Commission angrily interrupted a network television filming session to accuse newsmen of misrepresenting conditions in Collier County.

But other witnesses appearing before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs offered statistics showing the substantial nutritional and related health needs. And the Senators, in a 3½-hour whirlwind tour this morning, saw that housing is also a severe problem.

Kentucky's freshman Sen. Marlow Cook broke off from the main tour to make unannounced visits to migrant worker camps, and expressed shock at what he had seen.

He said he found "showers" that were no more than spigots "about two feet off the ground" and other housing conditions that couldnt pass urban code inspections.

At one camp, he said, "I shook hands with a man with wet paint on his hand." This was one of several references made during the hearings to last-minute sprucing up in Immokalee.

Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.), chairman of the Committee, told a standing-room-only audience at the Bethune School here that he was "not singling out Florida . . . I suspect that in my own State, we will see problems of hunger and housing that are worse than those here."

Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) remarked earlier in the day that he believed the Nation is on the edge of a breakthrough against hunger. "I think this is at last going to spark the conscience of America," he said.

During today's hearings, the hardest data on malnutrition came from T. Michael Foster, assistant director of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program.

He said the Florida Board of Health had investigated Immokalee a year ago and concluded ". . . there is no evidence of severe malnutrition or serious incidence in the migrant population."

But, said Foster, the Citizen's Board of Inquiry in its report "Hunger U.S.A." listed Collier County as one with a serious hunger problem.

Nearly 30 per cent of the families in Collier County have incomes under $3000, Foster reported, and that does not include the migrant workers who nearly double the County's population in certain seasons.

Foster contended that the high disease rate among migrants in Collier County was circumstantial evidence of malnutrition.

Among children one month to one year in age, he said, the death rate is three times the national average. Among nonwhites, he continued, the rate is more than six times the national average.

A survey of 23 Collier County farmworkers' children, selected at random, was made at Miami's Variety Children's Hospital. Foster reported. It found 38 clinical diseases among the 23 children, including anemia, respiratory infection and pneumonia. Hospital director Gerard W. Frawley, called it "a most extraordinary morbidity rate."

The State Board of Health's own study showed Collier County has one of Florida's highest rates of incidence of new active cases of tuberculosis.

Gov. Kirk, who stayed throughout the hearing said he "regretted" that the Committee had not checked with his office about data he said he already had on Collier County. And he said the Committee called a State Health Department nutritional officer while refusing to allow the director, Dr. Wilson Sowder, to testify. "I like to get the generals, not the corporals," the Governor said.

Kirk added later, however, "If there's any way we can help uplift them (migrant workers), we want to. We want them to grow and prosper with us. I think we too often make "good" the enemy of 'better'."

A Committee spokesman said the panel had been in contact with Kirk's office and understood Dr. Sowder was satisfied with the testimony arrangement.

The flareup between the County Commission chairman, Lester Whitaker, and a CBS-TV newsman occurred during the morning tour of poverty areas. Whitaker interrupted while newsmen were recording introductory remarks, accusing them of lying about Collier County. When he was invited to state his own side on camera, Whitaker said newsmen would only "slant" his remarks, and stalked away.

Chamber of Commerce President Harold M. Reece, who had argued that people would not work if they had free food, said that if there were any food program at all, it should be administered by the Farm Labor Bureau, so that workers refusing jobs would be ineligible for food distribution.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 12, 1969]

LASHES OUT IN RADIO TALK: WHITAKER, "COMMITTEE IDEAS PRECONCEIVED"

(By Tom Morgan)

NAPLES.—County Commission Chairman Les Whitaker said in a radio interview on Tuesday night that the Senate committee investigating hunger in Immokalee was a three-ring circus that came with preconceived ideas and views the Collier County Commission as criminals.

"We knew we had three strikes on us," Whitaker said. "We had Sen. McGovern, an ultra liberal, Sen. Javits, who in my thinking is a Socialist, and Sen. Mondale who I understand was hand picked by Hubert Humphrey.

"We can expect what the results of the investigation will be. It could have been written before they came except for a few details. They were evidently trying to justify their existence and their trip to Florida."

Whitaker admitted he himself had been distracted "and didn't act in a very adult way" in at least one television interview, but that he objected to the disagreeable treatment by news and television reporters.

"When I saw what they were doing, I couldn't contain myself," he said. "Every network had a representative, every news service. It was as many as the Coppolino trial but they were a more avid and rabid gang.

"Some of the people interviewed admitted later they had been schooled in what to say."

Whitaker said that he spoke to Dan Shore, CBS commentator, when he heard him say the County Commission had done everything in its power to keep the committee from coming to Immokalee.

"I told him," the chairman said, "I'm sick and tired of this kind of reporting. When he asked for 'my side' I replied, 'You'd cut and edit and twist it every way—you can hear me at the hearing.' "

Whitaker said the South Florida Migrant Legal Services "probably set up the whole thing because their funds are being cut off, although I understand the Robert Kennedy Foundation is try to get them reinstated."

He had one bit of praise for the OEO-financed Migrant Legal Service: "Their report was a little closer to the truth than what they have said in the past—they even had one figure right, but it still was practically all wrong."

Whitaker repeated the County Commission claim of last year "that when it offered jobs to 100 welfare seekers it could only get five takers," and said, "I made a survey on the tour and saw at least 100 apparently able bodied men standing around doing nothing."

Bob Moss, WNOG reporter who accompanied the tour, said he had shown Sen. McGovern "stacks of pork chops and five or six whole chickens in a refrigerator and the senator went out and said 'here is hunger, this woman has nothing to eat but greens and grits.' "

Witaker said he had a similar experience with Sen. Javits and a young woman with four illegitimate children. He said she pleaded poverty but under his questioning admitted she had two major operations at county expense and had received county food orders.

"The senator wouldn't listen or pay attention to the four packages of meat I showed him in the refrigerator," Whitaker concluded.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 12, 1969]

PEOPLE HERE AFRAID

FORT MYERS.—"I'm surprised at the large numbers of people here who tell you they don't have enough food, but who are not participating in the commodity program," Sen. George McGovern said Tuesday.

McGovern, chairman of the select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, went on to describe his reactions to the committee's Tuesday morning tour of Fort Myers poverty areas.

"I had thought from what I had been told that they were taking care of a considerable number of people here through the free food program.

"I find that they are not; that people don't know about it and others who do are afraid to apply in many cases because of the kind of harsh conduct of the man running the program (County Welfare Director Robert Craft) so it is not as effective a program here as I had expected to find.

"This project (the FHA rent supplement Sable Palms apartment project) is very encouraging. You can just see the pride on the part of these people when we asked them about the housing here that obviously is a great improvement over the type of thing they had been accustomed to."

McGovern said, "I think probably the worst single thing we saw was that garage over there in Immokalee where the one family was living next door to this other one. But other than that one unit, there were several that we saw today that seemed to be somewhat worse than what we saw in Immokalee."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 12, 1969]

I DON'T LIKE TO GO BEGGING, I NEED FOOD BAD AS ANYBODY

FORT MYERS.—Most of a typical interview with one of the people living in the poverty areas of Fort Myers is given below. The primary difference between this woman and others interviewed is that she gets commodity foods.

Asking questions of Mrs. Clandar Mae Smith were the senators on the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and several reporters.

The following discussion took place in Mrs. Smith's kitchen after Mrs. Smith had shown the group making the Tuesday morning poverty study a box of commodity foods she had received and discussed the taste and nutritional value of the foods with the committee.

(Q. represents various individuals and A. represents the answers of Mrs. Smith.)

Q. We talked to a couple of ladies earlier today who said they were afraid to go down there (County Welfare Director Robert Craft's office) because they turn them down.

A. Oh, they did turn me down couple times. . . . . everytime I go now I take somebody with me so I don't have no arguments."

Q. What kind of arguments did you get at first?

A. Well, he said I didn't need anything. Now, after awhile, I said I need it as bad as anybody else that don't have nobody working. My husband was dead and I needed something to eat. It was summertime and I didn't have no work.

Q. Why are you people afraid? I don't understand. Why are they afraid to go down there and at least ask for it?

A. Well sometimes you just don't get the satisfaction. If you're like me I just don't want to go down there to an argument and begging because I get mad just like they do. My patience is very short too . . . And that's the reason I carry somebody with me to see that I get it. Because I needed it but yet still, he knows you need it, but he's just that crabby.

Q. Does he want to prove that you don't have enough income, is that why they are worried?

A. Well, sometimes it makes no difference with Mr. Crab.

Q. What did you call him?

A. Crab.

Q. What's his name?

A. I don't know.

Q. How long have you been here, Mrs. Smith?

A. I been here 12 years.

Q. How much do you pay on this property?

A. This house here? Oh, $9. . . .

Q. Nine dollars a week?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you pay your own electric bill, water bill and gas bill?

A. Yes. But I don't have no gas and water now because I wouldn't give them no money and they cut my gas and water off.

Q. You don't have any water at all?

A. No . . . (A discussion followed in which she said they were cut off because she owed 25 cents more than the $20 deposit. She said her income is about $40 a month and she uses water at the homes of her neighbors.)

Q. Who do you take down there with you when you want to get the food?

A. (Mrs. Smith said she takes one of the people from the South Florida Migrant Legal Services.) . . . My doctor said it's time for me to get some food. So he said I'll have to make out an application. She say, well can't she make it out now and let her have food today. He say yah I can do that. And so he say well I know her cause she has been here before. That's what he told her. So after that, every time it's time to sign up I get somebody to go with me . . .

Q. Did you ever complain about that step out front?

A. Sure . . .

Q. How long has that been torn up like that?

A. Been torn up now a good while.

Q. Somebody's going to get hurt on that step.

A. I know . . .

Q. Who is the landlord here?

A. L. M. Dixon.

Q. Is he a white man?

A. No.

Q. Colored man?

A. Yes . . .

Q. What's your age?

A. I'll be 63 in October . . .

Q. When you work, where do you work, Mrs. Smith?

A. I worked on a farm, but I need glasses and I can't see how to work and so I need glasses and my stocking worse than I need anything in the world right now. (She explained the stocking was an elastic stocking for her bad leg.)

Q. How long ago did they promise it to you?

A. It's been more than a month now . . . They haven't said nothing about my glasses and I can't see nothing.

Q. Have you been examined for glasses?

A. Yes sir. I want glasses. But my other ones, I had em about seven years and they wore out. They broke.

Q. Who examined your glasses?

A. County clinic down on Anderson. I got some papers to fill out. I filled em out and sent em back, but I haven't heard from them . . . I wish they would hurry up and get then before I go stone blind trying to see. You see when I'm looking at anything I have to look close to tell what it is . . . Eyes, that's my trouble. If it I had my stocking and my glasses I could do a little work.

(She said she really wanted to work so she could get her water and gas back on. Mrs. Smith also said she would like to get a better house. It was pointed out by one of the senators that it would take half her month's Social Security just to get the water and gas back on. Mrs. Smith said people are afraid to go to the welfare director because he yells at them and will not give them anything unless they take somebody along with them.)

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 12, 1969]

SENATORS SEE LEE SQUALOR

(By Matt Taylor)

FORT MYERS.—Working their way through weeds, garbage and rotting houses, members of a Senate committee had a confrontation with a landlord Tuesday and finally saw "a stunning example of what federal help can do."

The stunning example was at Sabal Palms, an apartment complex with federal rent supplements.

"Why they're living like human beings here," said Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota, chairman of the Senate's Select Committee for Hunger and Human Needs.

McGovern had just come from another squalid housing settlement for Negro farm workers in Fort Myers. There he had encountered people totally ignorant of the fact that federal food was available to them when they were in need.

Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota joined McGovern in quizzing Robert Reilly, who owns about 20 houses in the area.

Reilly had been criticizing the senators and newsmen who were interviewing a number of his tenants.

"They like it like this," Reilly told Mondale. "You act like I make my living out of these people."

Mondale asked him how he did make his living. Reilly said, he used to have a warehouse and "just ask them how it burned down."

(Reilly's warehouse burned down shortly after the funeral of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. Some townspeople feel that because Reilly did not close down for the day of the funeral he "was burned down." Four persons were quizzed in connection with the fire, but the verdict was innocent.)

Walking through the houses, the senators found cold, drafty rooms, leaking roofs, broken steps and sagging floors. People told them that they were getting commodity foods and making do.

"Out of that house," Reilly told the senators, pointing to one they had just left, "I get $500 a year . . . maybe . . . if they pay the rent every week and the insurance man don't get there first."

He asked Mondale, "How much can you put in a place like that?" He was asked if he was losing money. Reilly would not give a direct answer.

Sen. Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, courted by county officials who hope the senators would go easy in their report of conditions, said he had seen what he had expected.

"These conditions exist everywhere, all over America," he said. The senator added that he had seen clear evidence in both Collier and Lee counties that more federal help was needed. He made it very clear that Collier County, which he visited Monday, "needs a food program. We've got to do something."

An old lady running a day care center almost got in trouble by the visit. Mrs. Mary Green operates the center for seven children whose mothers work during the day.

Health inspectors accompanying the senators took one look at Mrs. Green's operation and said they might have to close her down for operating a below-standard facility.

But the health director came right along behind them and ordered that they work with her to bring the center up to standard.

Sen. Jacob Javits of New York has promised his own intervention if anyone threatens or harms in any way anyone who has testified before the committee.

The committee took testimony Monday in Immokalee and found there was a great need for a food program there.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 12, 1969]

A POVERTY THAT CONFOUNDS THE NOTION OF DEMOCRACY

When the U.S. Senate investigating team currently in Immokalee ends its inspection of poverty in America, it will return to Washington to face the realities of public policy.

The truth is that American public policy has a hard time dealing with the existence of hunger, illiteracy and all the other earmarks of hopeless poverty in this rich nation.

It is embarrassingly simple to approve a $2-million federal purchase of grapefruit juice for the needy, because it satisfies a powerful agricultural lobby. Such a purchase—751,000 cases, or one tenth of an average year's pack—was announced last week, and the announcement caused not a ripple.

But let someone suggest raising the maximum income level for participation in the new federal free food program in South Carolina—raising it above the current maximum of $30 income per month for a family of four—and the processes of public policy freeze.

It's easy to buy grapefruit juice for the needy, but it's hard to increase the number who can receive it. The difference can be expressed in terms of political power—or lack of it.

That's the dynamic in Collier County too. Public policy can tolerate the exploitation of migrant labor in order to protect a $40-million truck crop economy, but it cannot abide the expenditure of $50,000 per year to participate in federal food programs that would feed hungry migrants.

County commissioners explained that the $7,500 local poverty-fighting budget was for "residents" only. (For residents substitute "voters.") Sadly, the migrants are resident only long enough to rescue the county economy each year.

The team of visiting senators was careful to point out that Immokalee, or even the state of Florida, is not unique. There is poverty in every corner of America.

But the migrant's special burden is a rootless, nomadic, purposefully exploitative kind of poverty—a perpetual flight from disaster. It is a kind of poverty that warps children and paralyzes the humanity of their parents.

The proposed solutions all suffer the same realities of public policy. The tendency is to inject into every program an "incentive for self-help"—whether such an incentive is relevant or not.

But what kind of ethic is it that places more emphasis on self help than on feeding the starving and the malnourished, than on clothing those who live in rags, than on housing those who live in shacks that have no toilets, than on stabilizing the lives of a rootless tribe of the American poor, than on ending the exploitation of humanity for the sake of harvesting vegetables?

The pitiless poverty of the migrant is one case in which incentives are not immediately relevant.

Massive expenditures must be made to raise these and other desperately poor to a level of human existence that does not confound the simplest notions of democracy.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 12, 1969]

FOOD STAMP PLAN OKAYED BY CABINET

TALLAHASSEE.—A plan to let poor people buy more than their money's worth of food was approved yesterday by the Florida Cabinet.

Without discussion, the Cabinet agreed to submit an application to the federal government to start the food stamp program.

State Welfare Director Emmet Roberts said Monday that, under the program, a family of four with an income of $80 to $100 per month could buy up to $40 worth of federal food stamps which could be exchanged for $70 worth of food.

The Florida Legislature approved the program in 1965, Roberts said, but state and federal officials have not been able to agree on wording of the plan until now.

The stamps would only be good for foods not available under the surplus commodities program, such as fresh milk, eggs or vegetables, he said, and they could not be used for luxury items like beer or cigarettes.

Roberts said the federal government would pay the difference between the cost of the stamps and the cost of the food.

Dade and Orange Counties have already requested the program and, with Cabinet approval, should get federal authorization immediately, Roberts said.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Mar. 12, 1969]

COLLIER BOARD MEMBERS IRKED AT INVESTIGATION

(By Fred Winter)

NAPLES.—Collier County Commissioner Chairman Les Whitaker told the commissioners Tuesday, "I'm still suffering from my battle wounds yesterday."

Whitaker referred to the Immokalee investigation Monday of the U.S. Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Other commissioners also had remarks about the visit.

After hearing a division of corrections report that a prisoner in the Immokalee Jail needed to have a cyst removed from his throat, Commissioner Ewell Moore said "We'll have to provide an operation."

"Whether they're hungry or not," Whitaker said, "we'll have to also see they get recreation and work programs."

The corrections report, which generally praised the new branch county jail, noted the lack of recreation and rehabilitation programs.

"I'm just repeating what one of our distinguished senators said over there," added Whitaker.

"Ellender (Louisiana Sen. Allen) was the only one willing to see both sides," said Moore.

When Health Officer Dr. Charles Bradley and social worker Mrs. Hazel Griffin brought in no welfare claims, Whitaker said, "This doesn't jibe with yesterday" and testimony migrants suffer from lack of food and from insufficient housing facilities.

Mrs. Griffin explained the usual week's cases had not been written up.

Dr. Bradley, whom commissioners praised because he fought off an attack of pneumonia long enough to appear before the Senate committee late Monday afternoon before entering Naples Hospital, was still in the hospital Tuesday.

"We should commend him," said Moore, "for sitting there all day with pneumonia while he waited to testify."

"We should pass a resolution backing him up 100 per cent in all future recommendations," added Commissioner Cliff Wenzel. "I wouldn't want to go that far," said Commissioner A. C. Hancock.

The "backing up" suggestion came after Whitaker told the board the Health Department had reported a labor camp in the Immokalee area which had failed to get a building permit before construction.

"You cannot keep employes," said Whitaker, "if you don't back them up."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1969]

SENATORS HEAR POOR IN FLORIDA—MIGRANTS TELL OF LAG IN U.S. FREE FOOD PROGRAMS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

FORT MYERS, FLA. March 11.—Many of the poor of this coastal city told United States Senators today they were afraid to seek free Government food from the man they call "Mr. Crab."

That is their name for Robert Craft, director of the Lee County Welfare Department, the man who decides who gets free "Government commodities."

The commodities—beans and flour and other staples—do not make for exotic meals, but they are nutritious. And it was obvious to five Senators as they toured the slums here today that many of the families not now getting free food needed it badly.

"Mr. Crab, he snap at us, and I snap right back," Mrs. Clander Mae Smith told members of the Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Mrs. Smith is an exception. Others said they were so afraid of the welfare director that they had not sought the commodities. Some said they had stopped asking for the free food because "Mr. Crab insults us" and "Mr. Crab makes us feel like nobodies." And still others said they were unaware there was free food available.

"There is certainly something wrong," Senator George McGovern, chairman of the committee, said as he walked away from a rotting shack where a mother of 10 children had told him she had to send her children to school hungry.

Meanwhile, Senator McGovern disclosed today that the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity had agreed to underwrite the cost of a free commodities program for neighboring Collier County.

Yesterday, the Senators toured the town of Immokalee and other parts of Collier County and found widespread squalor among the migrants who pick the beans and truck crops before heading North each year.

Contending that the migrants were "Federal people" and not their responsibility, Collier County officials have refused to set up any of the Federally supported food programs, commodities or food stamps.

Furthermore, the Collier officials argued, the cost of administering distribution of the food would be prohibitive.

Senator McGovern said the Office of Econonmic Opportunity would underwrite the cost of distribution if the Department of Agriculture would provide free commodities.

In the past, the Department of Agriculture generally has required that the distribution cost be financed locally.

But even as they learned that there now seems a good chance that the migrants and other poor of Immokalee may get free commodities, the touring Senators were discovering that a free food program did not reach all the poor.

Lee County, which describes itself as "the flour capital of the world," has had the commodities program for several years. The county officials testified today that they were happy with it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1969]

MCGOVERN EXPRESSES SHOCK AT FLORIDA POVERTY

(By Bruce Galphin)

FORT MYERS, FLA., March 11.—At the conclusion of a field trip into Southwest Florida today, Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) expressed shock at the living conditions of the poor there and said America must do better about the problem of hunger.

"We have seen diet and living conditions these past two days that one might expect to find in Asia, not in America," the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Aid said.

"Most of the cattle and hogs in America are better fed and sheltered than the families we have visited (in Collier and Lee counties)," he said.

"A country that is powerful enough to rocket men to the moon should be able to feed its own hungry people."

McGovern earlier had described as intolerable the administration of programs to help the poor in Florida.

In Immokalee, Fla., yesterday the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Need was confronted with a county government that refused to participate in free food distribution. Here in Lee County, there is a food program, but it is not reaching all the needy.

The local director of commodity food distribution, Robert Craft, was the target of a barrage of criticism from the poor, who accused him of such humiliating treatment that many needy persons were afraid to seek free food.

A $4 TAXI FARE

Repeatedly, during a 3½-hour tour of run-down shacks in the Fort Myers area, the committee heard Welfare Director Craft referred to as Mr. Crab."

The Senators were told that in this city, without a public transit system, it cost an average of $4 round trip for free food recipients to collect their allotments by taxi.

They also were surprised to discover the number of obviously under-fed people who said they didn't know about the free food program.

More than 700 families are on public assistance in Lee County and automatically are eligible for commodity food, yet only 450 are getting it.

"There is no evidence of outreach at all," Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) said.

"I was surprised to see so much hunger," Sen. Allen Ellender (D-La.) commented. He urged use of existing agencies, such as agriculture and health departments, to bring immediate relief.

Again and again the poor people's complaint centered on "Mr. Crab."

"He talks to a man just like he talks to a dog," said Clifford Stewart, an elderly man who said he had refused free food even though his income was only $65 a month. I thought he was buying it the way he was talking about it," Steward said.

(The Federal Government pays for the food commodity. The county pays for its distribution.)

"If you're like me," 62-year-old Mrs. Clander Mae Smith told the Senators when they visited her waterless, fuelless shack, "you don't like to argue and beg. I get mad like he (Craft) does.

Mrs. Smith finally is getting commodity foods after receiving help from the South Florida Migrant Legal Service Program.

A $12-A-WEEK SHACK

Mrs. Altames Jackson, her husband and eight children live in a $12-a-week rental shack. She said she hadn't tried to get the free food because of the bad experiences neighbors have had in applying for the program.

Reuben S. Mitchell, regional director of Community Action Migrant Program, Inc., said many of the poor "feared to protest or to challenge—for they fear retaliation." He said Craft was "a director who is without compassion for the poor, who is humiliating, and insulting."

Craft denied that "any client of ours has been treated with abusive language," the County Commission Chairman Julian Hudson remarked that "sometimes a 'no' is considered an insult."

Craft insisted that he simply was adhering to the rules layed down by the Florida Welfare Department.

McGovern disputed him. Reading from a Welfare Department handbook, the Senator said there were several ways of verifying an applicant's need, and Craft was using only one of them.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Mar. 12, 1969]

INVESTIGATE SENATORS

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

The investigating senator panel who investigated poverty in Immokalee travel on a big fat salary with a per diem expense voucher, enjoying the nice Florida sunshine at the taxpayers' expense.

XUM

They are not proving or disproving anything. Their sales pitch was the further distribution of government food stamps, free to the receiver, also at the taxpayers' expense.

When a family travels to several different locations each year because they have chosen that way of life and the liberal freedoms that go with it for the purpose of making an independent living without the responsibility, in many cases, of marriage, taxes, withholding and Social Security, being paid from day to day instead of by the week or month, and a group of young inexperienced lawyers who call themselves the Migrant Legal Aid Society wants to get their greedy hands into a basket of the taxpayer's money under the auspices of do-gooders at the taxpayers' expense and forgetfully pushing in where they aren't wanted or needed, and I might add, their funds are running out next month unless they can create enough stink and public opinion for another appropriation.

I appreciate the manner in which Gov. Kirk represented our state, telling one of the senators that he was down here for a hearing and not to make a speech, and I believe that all the people who are creating this rabble-rousing unnecessary atmosphere, they should be investigated as to their background and their possible loyalty to the good old U.S.A. and I quote the Bible which states, "The poor ye shall have with you always." There is no political body going to disprove one prophecy in the Bible.

JOE P. BROWN.

Immokalee.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press Mar. 13, 1969]

KIRK PROPOSES NATIONAL GROUP ASSIST MIGRANTS—SUGGESTS SENATORS STOP TALKING AND DO SOMETHING

TALLAHASSEE.—Gov. Claude Kirk, suggesting that members of a U.S. Senate committee stop talking and start doing something, proposed Wednesday formation of a far-reaching national council to solve the problems of migrant laborers.

He said mobile migrant centers should be set up to follow season workers from state to state.

PUBLICITY GIMMICKS

"We are all growing tired of seeing the poor among us used as pawns in political publicity gimmicks," Kirk said in a communication to the committee headed by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D. "There has been altogether too much talk and not enough action at all levels of government."

The proposal was made in the aftermath of hearings in Immokalee and Fort Myers by the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. Kirk attended both days and revealed part of his plan on Tuesday.

McGovern said he found conditions in Florida "that one might expect to find in Asia, not America."

HOGS BETTER FED

"Most of the cattle and hogs in America are better fed and sheltered than the families we visited in these two counties," the senator said.

Kirk said "the first order of business" to help the migrants should be coordination at the federal level.

A national coordinating council on migratory farm labor services should be created by executive order by President Nixon to coordinate the efforts of at least seven cabinet-level agencies, the governor said. He said the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should head it.

Since the migrants are always moving, Kirk said, the federal government should use trailers to "provide mobile one-stop service for migrant family needs."

He said state agencies concerned with migrants should be coordinated through the mobile centers. Federal surplus food and food stamp programs should also be handled through the traveling centers, he said.

MOBILE CENTERS

One of the mobile centers should be established for every 5,000 migrants, the Florida chief executive said. Each center should have a broadly based local advisory group.

He said the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development should set up a program to help seasonal workers purchase mobile homes through FHA-type financing.

"The committee came to Florida and it saw and it listened," Kirk said. "The committee will go to another community and another and another and will see more and listen to more—then what?

BRIGHT YOUNG AIDES

"Then some bright young aides will write up a committee report and perhaps by the end of the year there will be some legislation introduced for more direct commodity support or more food stamps and the matter will be forgotten and the same people will still be hungry."

He said shoveling more food into the migrant camps will not solve the problem of hunger. There must also be education from health officials about nutrition, health care and help in obtaining proper housing.

"We must develop a comprehensive delivery system to do the complete job," Kirk told the committee.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 13, 1969]

HUNGER AND FLORIDA'S "PRIDE"

Conditions under which the migrant workers live in the farm camps of South Florida are predictable, as we said earlier this week on the eve of the federal investigation in Collier and Lee counties.

The message of the Sermon on the Mount is also predictable, but it needs repeating to gain and keep the attention of those who would forget that they are their brother's keeper.

Sen. George McGovern's Committee on Hunger and Human Needs found both in startling quantity. The pride of local politicians has been hurt and there are complaints that the senators came to Florida looking for hungry people and paid no attention to all the good things of life not in short supply.

But county programs ignore and reject federal assistance. The Senate committee found that Lee County is using only about 10 per cent of the commodities it should be using. That means 90 per cent of the people who need help are not getting it. And Lee County is doing a better job than Collier, where a majority of the farm workers are now living.

The director of Florida's school lunch program told the senators that she estimates 58,000 children in the state go to school without breakfast. And teachers know that many children can't pay attention to their morning lessons because their minds are on the free lunch they know is coming.

As several of the senators acknowledged, the conditions found in South Florida also exist in the labor camps of Georgia, North Carolina and many Northern areas.

But South Florida is where the crops grow this time of year and this is where the migrant workers are. If the senators were to document medical testimony of hunger in America this is where they had to come at this time.

That documentation is necessary for the enactment of effective programs. There was no intention of branding Florida as a place of special cruelty. We regret that Rep. Paul Rogers, who represents the farming counties, continues to talk about minor nutrition problems.

The forthcoming Senate report doubtless will put such bland talk beyond understanding.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1969]

HUNGER: WHY DOES IT EXIST AMIDST PLENTY?

After weeks of hearings in Washington at which nutritional experts testified to the paradox of hunger in a land fat with agricultural surpluses, members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs toured migrant labor camps in Florida's Collier and Lee counties last week. They looked for hunger and found it. They also found rust, rot, the stench of abject poverty and appalling human suffering along with belligerent local officials who considered these conditions none of their business.

"They're not Collier County people," said one of the officials, referring to the migrant farm workers who spend most of their time helping that county reap $40 million annually from its farm operations. "They're Federal people."

The select committe on its first field trip discovered that Federal programs aimed at helping provide the poor with adequate diets may not reach them at all. Intervening levels of government can erect barricades.

Florida is one of seven states that does not participate in the Federal food stamp program and Collier County is one of several hundred across the nation that has not been willing to shoulder the usually modest costs of administering a surplus commodity distribution program.

The food stamp program is designed to stretch the food dollars of the very poor. The poor buy stamps for small amounts which can be redeemed at grocery stores for larger amounts. They may pay $40 for $60 worth of stamps.

The surplus commodity program offers certain commodities—mostly vegetables—free to eligible families. The foods are purchased by the Department of Agriculture from those that tend to be in surplus. The program is linked to the farm price support program.

In Collier County the Senators visited Combers Camp, a depressing collection of windowless, bare-board shacks sitting on the flat, sandy land. They met Miss Rosalee Bryant, 18 years old, unmarried, mother of four, who lives with her children in a concrete and tin apartment project, in a small, 10-by-15 room. Miss Bryant used to travel north to Virginia and Pennsylvania picking tomatoes and other crops and she still goes to the fields in Collier County when she can find someone to keep her children. It is difficult, she says. Her badly deformed retarded three-year-old son requires special attention. "We have enough food to eat now," she told visitors. "We didn't have last summer though. It was rough then.'

The touring Senators heard Rodolfo Juarez, a representative of Organized Migrants in Community Action, tell about the abuse migrants suffer, the poverty they endure and the benefits of Federal and state welfare laws they are denied. Senator Marlow W. Cook, Republican of Kentucky, toured migrant camps not on the official schedule and reported finding as many as five or six in a family living in windowless shacks as small as 8-by-10 feet.

"Is this unusual?" he asked Mr. Juarez.

"Very unusual," the migrant replied. "Usually, sometimes thirteen."

The Senators heard children report having coffee and grits for breakfast and nothing else and other children report having no breakfast at all. They saw children with cold-encrusted noses, sores on their feet from playing in lots strewn with broken glass and boards with protruding nails. They saw one little girl with legs so badly bowed that she could hardly walk.

XUM

Collier County officials flatly denied that any real hunger exists—"Maybe just a little and a little malnutrition"—and they cited a special state survey of its health departments as confirmation of their views. Outside groups have reported wholly different findings. The Citizen's Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, a group that helped spark formation of the select Senate committee, found in 1967 that there was clear evidence of "poverty, poor nutrition and parasitic disease."

Despite all this, Collier County does not operate any food program for poor families. Neighboring Lee County, where the statistics are only a little better, operates a commodity distribution program but the touring Senators discovered that it reaches only a small percentage of those eligible for it.

Senator Jacob Javits, like his touring colleagues, was struck by conditions in the two counties and by their failure to bring the benefits of Federal programs to those needing them. When Florida Gov. Claude Kirk appeared at the hearings to insist on a continuing role for the states, Mr. Javits warned: "We want to give the state every opportunity but not to allow the thing not to be done." He cautioned that the Federal government would have to do the job, as it has begun to do it in two impoverished South Carolina counties by offering free food stamps to the most needy, if the states and the localities do not do it.

The Florida state cabinet voted while the tour was in progress to permit its counties to participate in the Federal food stamp plan. The Office of Economic Opportunity announced that it would authorize one of its local agencies to administer a surplus food distribution program in Collier County, even over the protests of local officials, if the Department of Agriculture would supply the food. Senator George McGovern, chairman of the select committee, intends to pursue the offer with Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin.

JOHN A. HAMILTON.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 16, 1969]

SENATORS FIND FOOD ALONE WON'T SOLVE MISERY OF POOR

(By Bruce Galphin)

FORT MYERS, FLA.—Until now people have been calling it the "hunger committee." But after their first field trip last week in southwest Florida, members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs were paying increased attention to the second part of the title.

For they found heart-rending evidence that hunger is inseparable from a whole tangle of human problems.

The search for hunger led to a circular trail of squalid housing, lack of sanitation, bad health, poor education and limited job opportunities.

The senators found that children may receive free breakfasts and lunches and still stay sick because of home conditions.

They talked, for instance, to Eloisa Martinez, a Mexican-American who lives with her husband and eight children in a sagging frame shack. Six of the children get free meals at school, but they come home to a hovel with no plumbing and with dirty bedding on the floor.

Mrs. Martinez' 15-year-old daughter was home from school sick. She is still in the sixth grade. Grinning nervously, she said she was so far behind because she is sick a lot.

COFFEE INSTEAD OF MILK

There are health clinics for the poor, but they are frequently ill. There are classes in nutrition, but as Sen. Marlow Cook (R-Ky.) remarked, "what good would it do for them to come into your nutrition clinic if they don't have food?"

The committee had talked to children under the age of 6 who regularly drank coffee instead of milk. They heard mothers tell of not having enough food to give their children breakfast.

They learned the poor typically eat a "white diet" high on starches and low on proteins, except beans and peas.

The senators heard and saw evidence that the poor of Collier and Lee counties were far more prone to disease than the average population. Malnutrition, they were told, is a contributing factor.

Sanitation and heating obviously are problems, too. In the shacks the senators visited, portable kerosene stoves are the typical sources of heat. Housefires are frequent.

The senators rarely saw properly functioning indoor plumbing. One woman had no running water because her water bill ran 25 cents over her $20 deposit. Several of those visited used toilet facilities of neighbors. Communal outhouses were common.

And the senators learned to their dismay that Congress can enact food distribution plans, but hasn't been able to guarantee the neediest will receive the help.

None of Florida's counties distribute food stamps. However, the State Cabinet agreed on Tuesday to apply for the program.

Some counties do participate in the commodities or "surplus" food program under which the U.S. Department of Agriculture provides free packages of basic food items and the counties bear the costs of distribution.

But Collier County site of the first day's committee hearings, has no commodity program yet.

(The Office of Economic Opportunity said Wednesday that it would pay the administrative costs of a commodity food program for Collier. The program now needs the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

(Under the commodity program, a local welfare organization would be responsible for distributing the food. However, Collier County may have to help provide warehouse space to store the commodities. This cooperation may be hard to get since the county commission feels the migrants are a federal problem.)

Lee County (Fort Myers) has commodities but a stream of witnesses accused the local distribution agent of treating applicants in a humiliating manner and turning down many who were qualified. Some of the poor told senators they were afraid to apply. Others said they didn't know how.

And the county's sole distribution center is at the local airport, a $4 round-trip cab drive from the area where most recipients live. There is no public transit system.

In this area where truck farming is such an important part of the economy, the problems of the poor are magnified by the seasonal influx of migrant farm workers.

Migrants are excluded from coverage by the National Labor Relations Act, workman's compensation and unemployment compensation law. Residency requirements exclude most from welfare. A housing shortage forces them into crowded, unsanitary, often overpriced camps.

Most migrants specialize in certain crops, and when these are ready for harvest they earn good money for two, three or four weeks. Then follow long weeks of bare subsistence until it is time to move to the next part of the country.

Some of the senators were openly irritated by local officials who denied that there were any serious problems among the poor, or insisted they were someone else's concern.

Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) told Collier County commissioners that their attitude was "inconceivable" to him.

REFUSAL TO WORK BLAMED

The area's congressman, Rep. Paul Rogers, told reporters, "the health doctor here tells us he's seen no extreme cases of malnutrition."

Rogers, a Democrat from West Palm Beach, was riding in a car with a tag that read: "I fight poverty. I work." He explained that the car belonged to a friend.

Asked whether he thought refusal to work was the reason for poverty in Collier, Rogers replied that "it applies in some areas."

The editor of the local newspaper, was more sweeping. "There is but one way to fight poverty, gentlemen," he said—"by providing work to those who will work and denying access to the welfare rolls to those who refuse to work."

Despite the cold-hearted remarks of some officials and community leaders, the poor are not being totally ignored. There are free lunch and breakfast programs for some children in some schools. County health officials, within severe budgetary restrictions, are trying to improve health and nutrition conditions.

OTHER HEARINGS SCHEDULED

But the problems are far beyond the scope of local finances, even where the willingness to help exists. Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.), chairman of the committee, remarked at one point that it may be necessary to have complete federal funding of food programs.

The committee will continue exploring the dimensions of the problem with hearings in other parts of the country, starting with a front-yard trip to hunger areas in the District of Columbia. Other sites include Boston and California.

The first traveling hearing suggested, however, that food alone will not crack the cycle of human misery. It may take an assault from all directions.

[From the National Observer, Mar. 17, 1969]

THE HUNGER CRUSADE: HOW THE SENATORS SEARCHED FOR MALNUTRITION

(By Jude Wanniski)

FORT MYERS, FLA.—The caravan of 30 cars that left the Holiday Inn motel at 8:30 a.m. was embarking on a crusade. In the lead was Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota, directing a two-day search for hunger and malnutrition in the two counties at the northern edge of the Everglades. The entourage included newsmen, local officials, and four other members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, the panel formed last year to take jurisdiction over "hunger," the hottest current social-action issue in Congress.

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives are rushing to this latest "pop issue." It springs from the idea that while poverty is a long-range problem, hunger can be tackled more neatly and quickly.

DRAMA, NOT EXPERTISE, ACCENTUATED

"The game plan," says Senator McGovern, "is to take these field trips to all regions of the country, arousing the national conscience." Then, he figures, leverage will be exerted to pry an extra $1 billion for Federal food programs from the Nixon Administration, doubling the current outlay. Congressional Republicans, he believes, will not want the Democrats to exploit this issue, and therefore will push for a maximum budget increase themselves. With this kind of politics in the air, the McGovern caravan candidly had as its prime interest drama and publicity, not scientific thoroughness. There was no doctor or nutritionist aboard, for example. And at lengthy hearings, first in the farm town of Immokalee, then in Fort Myers, witnesses who complained of their plight were heard at length. Rebuttal witnesses often were required to summarize their statements as the committee seemed to run out of time.

Not that it would have done local officials much good if they had more time to defend themselves. Against the squalor witnessed by

XUM

the senators, no explanations apparently would have sufficed. The senatorial panel plainly was in no mood for debate.

In the mornings, in bright sunshine, the caravan traveled to the meanest migrant camps its advance men could find, places like Comber's Camp, Booker's Alley, Harry's Camp, squalid $10-a-week quarters occupied by Negro and Latin-American families.

The senators, crowded by the entourage of television cameramen, went from hovel to shack, sometimes stunned, sometimes sickened, often furiously outspoken.

"These shacks are fit for pigs or chickens," raged Sen. Jacob Javits, New York Republican, who wore Army boots with his business suit. "In the slums of Harlem the people at least have inside plumbing," a crack that brought hoots from the defenders of Immokalee. Mr. McGovern winced at the Javits remark.

Sen. Marlow Cook, Kentucky Republican, at first said he thought the committee was "spinning its wheels" by taking such field trips. But on the way back to Washington, he admitted he hadn't been able to sleep well the night before, troubled by conditions he had seen during the day.

THE STENCH IN DARK ROOMS

Sen. Walter Mondale, Minnesota Democrat, and Sen. Robert J. Dole, Kansas Republican, staggered from the stench they encountered in the dark, cramped rooms of Mrs. Altames Jackson, whose husband supports her and eight children on income as a field hand of about $1,500 a year. Sen. Allen Ellender, Louisiana Democrat, at first complained that the committee was misrepresenting Florida by focusing on its meanest conditions. But he softened his objections as the quarters he viewed progressed in wretchedness.

"We have seen diets and living conditions these past two days." Mr. McGovern summed up, "that one might expect to find in Asia, not in America. Most of the cattle and hogs in America are better fed and sheltered than the families we have visited in these two counties."

This was a slight exaggeration. The group did find abysmal housing and sanitation, but no genuine hunger or blatant malnutrition. When women told the senators what they ate and what they fed their children, the senators could assume, however, that their diets were unsatisfactory. Both counties appear to have adequate school breakfast and lunch programs. And Lee County, in which Fort Myers is located, participates in the Federal surplus-commodity distribution program on a limited scale.

The committee was originally drawn to Immokalee and Collier County by the report *Hunger, USA,* issued by a private group early last year. The report suggested there was widespread malnutrition in the area, especially among migrant laborers.

MIGRANTS ARE "FEDERAL PEOPLE"

The Collier County Commission, however, was not impressed with the report and continued to refuse participation in a Federal surplus-food program. The county's permanent population is 27,700, and its peak migrant population is 22,000. Ewell F. Moore, a county commissioner, insists the migrants are "Federal people," since they move across state boundaries in following the crops, and so they are not his county's responsibility.

The senators were openly incensed by Mr. Moore's distinction. The commissioners have argued that they "take care of their own," and now Mr. Moore was drawing a line between Collier's "own" and the migrants. Besides, the Federal food is free, the county need pay only for distribution. But Mr. Moore, and some others in the county, seemed to fear that if a significant welfare hand is extended to the migrants they will choose to remain year round in Immokalee instead of moving north with the migrant stream. Their labor is needed only four months of the year.

Under pressure from the senate panel, County Commission Chairman Lester Whitaker finally agreed to "take a look" at the Food Stamp program when it becomes available in Florida. The state has delayed getting into this program. Many counties have resisted surplus food after protests from grocers who fear loss of trade because of the direct giveaway.

WITHERING BLASTS FROM JAVITS

Claude Kirk, Florida's Republican governor, glumly sat through the hearings, puffing on a pipe. He risked statements a few times only to suffer blasts from Senator Javits and Senator Mondale, who believe Governor Kirk should have exerted more influence to bring Collier County into the surplus-food program.

At the conclusion of the hearing in a Fort Myers' recreation center, Mr. Kirk chided the committee for posturing as if it had the monopoly on social conscience, pulled out some freshly drawn charts, and suggested a 12-state governor's compact to serve the migrant stream in a Federal-state effort. The panel brusquely dismissed him after Mr. McGovern made a faint show of welcoming the governor's suggestion. In Tallahassee the following day, Mr. Kirk put a long-distance blast on the committee: "We are all growing tired of seeing the poor among us used as pawns in political publicity gimmicks."

The population of Lee county is 83,200 and almost a third consists of families with an annual income of less than $3,000. It has a Federal food-surplus program. Nevertheless, on their tour of Fort Myers, the senators again found miserably poor families who had either never heard of the program or had been turned down by County Welfare Director John Craft.

Mr. Craft indicated that he insists upon documentary proof of abject poverty before handing out the free Federal food. Nor will Mr. Craft or his aides make a home visit, which is enough under Florida law to qualify a family for free food if the conditions are obviously miserable.

THESE POOR DON'T COME TO CHURCH

Julian Hudson, chairman of the county commission, apparently believed Mr. Craft was serving 4,600 families a month, rather than a scant 450. The local president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), who is also pastor of the Friendship Baptist Church, brushed aside suggestions from Senator Dole that he perhaps has a responsibility to get word out to the poor that free food is available. "These poor don't come to church," the minister replied.

The hunger crusade, in a way, was baptized in these two Florida counties. It was the place, at least, where the rhetoric of hunger politics got a chance at some needed refinement. And some tentative conclusions might be drawn:

Mr. Kirk may have been laggard in bringing food stamps to Florida. Doubtless more of his energies could have been spent on ridding his state of places like Harry's Camp and Booker's Alley. But his idea of a 12-state compact to service the migrant stream is not a bad one. At least that was the only fresh approach offered at the hearings.

The caravan's goal is to build a national issue, to pull a mandate from the White House, to channel more of the nation's resources toward fighting hunger. Mr. McGovern seems to think a good move has been made in that direction, and he is probably right. There was direct benefit too. Mr. Craft may ease up on his guidelines. Immokalee will "take a look" at Federal food stamps. And Senator Mondale made sure Mrs. Altames Jackson's toilet was unplugged.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA, *County of Lee, ss:*

Before me, the undersigned authority authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments personally appeared Gerald S. Joseph Cassidy and Michael Kantor, Attorneys at Law, who after first being duly sworn depose and say:

Our names are Gerald S. Joseph Cassidy and Michael Kantor, we are employed by the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc.

On Thursday, November 14, 1968 at 2:00 P.M. we met with Julian Hudson, Chairman, Lee County Commissioners at his office in the Lee County Courthouse.

At this time we presented affidavits from Dora Robinson, Ruby McDonald, Colar Johnson, Mildred Robinson and Lynda Dolliver, all alleging abusive conduct by Robert Craft, Director, Lee County Welfare Department to Mr. Hudson.

We explained to Mr. Hudson the seriousness with which we viewed these charges and stated that we were presenting them to him privately in order to afford the county an opportunity to correct the situation themselves, and if this was not done we would have to proceed to suit.

Mr. Hudson expressed his concern and told us he would investigate the matter, and see to it that the situation was rectified, and would inform us of his efforts. We have not heard from Mr. Hudson on this matter since then.

GERALD S. JOSEPH CASSIDY.
MICHAEL KANTOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of March, A.D. 1969.

MARY E. DORMAN,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgements personally appeared Colar Johnson, who after first being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I had an operation in 1961 and after I got out of the hospital I went to Mr. Craft for some help. He said my doctor said I was able to work. I don't see what you are coming up here for. I am not going to give you no help. You better carry yourself into the fields and work.

I went back to him in 1962 for help. I had been just about everywhere for help. I went to the Social Security Board and they sent me back to Mr. Craft and he refused to give me anything and kept yelling the same things over and over. I went back to Social Security and a man there gave me a slip to take to Mr. Craft and he still refused me. About a week later, I went back with Mrs. Sylvia Preston and Mr. Craft said I don't see why you keep coming up here for. I don't feel like being bothered with you. Then he walked out and slammed the door. After I left the courthouse, I fell and broke one of my ribs. Sylvia carried me to the Hospital. They worked on me and sent me back home. After I got so I could walk around again, I went back up to Mr. Craft and he hide from me. The secretary said Mr. Craft wasn't in. I looked in the office and saw Mr. Craft and said yonder he is and she said well he hasn't got time to bother with you. She said he is not going to help you and there wasn't any need for me to keep running up there.

In 1967 I wrote Mr. Claude Kirk to tell him how Mr. Craft was treating me and he wrote back that the welfare people said I was able to work. I went to Mr. Craft the following week and he said you are still trotting up here you are able to go to the fields. In 1967 I kept going there until one day I fell out in the street coming back from Mr. Craft's. I called the welfare worker so she could see how my lip was busted. I told her I thought it was the sugar diabetes causing me to fall down.

In May of 1968 I went back up to Mr. Craft. He had started giving me commodities and when I went up to be re-certified the secretary snatched the card out of my hand. I said there is no need for you to grab anything out of my hand I am not no dog. She said when you start getting your welfare checks we will give you some groceries. They never did give me no more groceries or welfare until Mr. Foster took it over but I kept going up there for help.

COLAR JOHNSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of November, A.D. 1968.

MARY DORMAN,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments personally appeared Lynda Dolliver, who after being duly sworn, deposes and says:

My name is Lynda Dolliver, and I am an investigator with South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc., at 2106 Ford Street, Fort Myers, Florida.

I was employed by South Florida Migrant Legal Services on July 29, 1968 and since that time I have had as a part of my duties the responsibility of assisting needy families in obtaining aid i.e. commodity food, medicine, physician's care, etc. from the Lee County Welfare Department under the direction of Mr. Robert Craft.

The following is a list of clients and examples of the treatment and aid they have received from the County Welfare Office.

Julio Sanchez Rivas is a disabled veteran who applied for commodity foods at the Welfare Office. Mr. Sanchez was told by Mr. Craft that it was not right for him to come here to be a burden on Lee County's tax payers when he knew he was disabled and could have stayed in Puerto Rico and drawn welfare. Mr. Sanchez was allowed to receive commodity foods.

Dora Robinson is a 58 year old woman who has repeatedly been abused by Mr. Craft and was told that your disability is self-inflicted. Why don't you get rid of that fat and get yourself a job. He then said I'll give you your medicine this time but I won't give you any more. Get your children to buy your medicine for you. Mrs. Robinson's son-in-law is recovering from wounds received in Viet Nam and is trying to support his pregnant wife and two children.

Mildred Robinson is the mother of six children whose husband has suffered a stroke. Mrs. Robinson was told what you look for, me to take care of your children? She was told repeatedly by Mr. Craft not to come back for help. She was certified for one month for commodity foods.

Cleo Cain was suffering from an unhealed surgical wound and was told to go to work and earn enough money to see your own doctor. She finally did receive a referral to the County Health Department who told her there was nothing they could do and she had to go back to her own doctor.

Ruby McDonald was refused for commodity foods and was told to sell her children's land and to use the money to buy food. Mrs. McDonald has a serious heart condition and her husband has diabetes which has caused him to have one leg amputated. Most of their money has had to go to buy expensive medicines. They have never received any assistances through County Welfare.

Josephine Smith has been constantly refused commodities because her 18 year old son is at home. Mrs. Smith went to Mr. Craft to be refused to the Lee County Health Department for an examination of her eyes which have been causing her extreme pain. Mr. Craft told her that there was nothing wrong with her eyes and refused to refer her to a doctor. After many attempts she was finally referred to the Health Department who in turn had the Migrant Health Project refer her to be examined by Dr. Cecil Beelher. Dr. Beelher told Mrs. Smith she needed glasses very badly.

The above examples are a few of the cases I have personally witnessed.

LYNDA DOLLIVER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of November, 1968.

MARY DORMAN,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgements personally appeared Mrs. Mildred Robinson, who after first being duly sworn, deposes and says:

My name is Mildred Robinson. I reside at 3026 Franklin Court, Fort Myers, Florida. I have been in Fort Myers for seventeen years and have also been living at 3026 Franklin Court for five years.

What I want to say to you is I was in need mighty bad and was sent downtown to Mr. Robert Craft for help. He talked to me mighty bad but I took it because I had little kids to feed and didn't have nothing myself.

After the doctor sent me, he still talked like he didn't want to do anything so he asked me "what do you look for, me to take care of your children?" and I said no I don't.

When he gave the grocery order he would tell me not to come back but when I needed it again the doctor would send me back.

I was getting commodity food for my children two years ago. He stopped giving it to me because he told me my son could help me. My son is now married and have a family of his own to take care of. The lady that I pay rent to said that he should give it back to me. She told me to go see if I could get it again.

MILDRED ROBINSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of November, 1968.

MARY DORMAN,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments personally appeared Ruby McDonald, who after first being duly sworn, deposes and says:

My name is Ruby McDonald. I have lived in Fort Myers for twenty-eight years.

In 1963 I went down to Mr. Craft for help and he denied me and turned me down. I was asking for aid for my grandchildren. He said put their mothers out, he couldn't give me anything.

In 1965, I was admitted to the hospital for surgery and didn't have enough sufficient insurance. The hospital officials sent me to Mr. Craft for help. He again turned me down saying he just wouldn't help me.

In 1968 my husband had cement poison and gangrene set in. He was admitted for emergency and in that he lost a leg. The hospital sent me back to Mr. Craft again. He turned me down.

When I first went to him for aid my husband was disabled and Mrs. Shatford who was my case worker at the time tried unsuccessively to get him to give me aid. He said I would have to have a statement from the doctor which he was able to get from Dr. M. F. Johnson. He still wouldn't accept and turned me down. He talked so ruff about it.

Every time I ever went there he yelled at me and talked ruff. He don't intend to give me any kind of help which I need so bad right now.

I have had the foregoing statement read to me, and it is a true statement of the facts.

RUBY MCDONALD,

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of November, 1968.

MARY DORMAN,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments personally appeared Dora Robinson, who after first being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I Dora Robinson, am a 58 year old Negro woman. I reside at 2252 French Street, Fort Myers, Florida. I have lived in Fort Myers the last thirteen years.

I am a widow, and have done farm work all my life.

On or around June 7th, 1968, I visited the local Social Security Office to inquire about Disabled Widows Benefits, and they told me they couldn't help me. I asked if they could help me get money to get my medicine. (I suffer from hypertension and have recently been told by Dr. J. Frank Rawl that I can no longer do farm work.) They told me to go see Mr. Craft at the county Welfare Office and that he would help me.

I went to see Mr. Craft that day and told him that Social Security told me he might be able to help me. He did not let me fill out an application, nor did he ask me about my wages. He told me he couldn't afford to help me, and why didn't my children buy me my medicine. He told me to go get a job, that he wasn't going to give me the taxpayers money. I said I was sorry for bothering him, and I left. I don't like being yelled at.

I have had this statement of one page, read to me and it is a true statement of the facts.

DORA ROBINSON,

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of June, 1958.

SHULEN WALKER,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Lee, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgements personally appeared Dora Robinson, who after first being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I Dora Robinson, am a Negro woman, age 58. I reside at 2252 French Street, Fort Myers, Lee County Florida. I have resided in Lee County for the last thirteen years, including this last present year.

I have never worked at any other work than field work in my entire life. Recently, June 15th, Dr. J. Frank Rawl told me I could no longer do field work because of my hypertension.

During the last two months I have earned no more than thirty-dollars.

My daughter, her husband and their two children live with me. My son-in-law is in the army, he was recently wounded in Vietnam, and is now at home awaiting a medical discharge. He is unable to work, and will be so unable for some time to come. They will have to move to Orlando very soon, so that he will be close to a government hospital in order to receive further rehabilitation treatment Presently they receive $140 per month. I will no longer share in this income when they move out in the very near future.

Our total monthly income has been less than $170, for five of us.

I have had this statement of one page read to me and it is a true statement of the facts.

DORA ROBINSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of June, 1968.

SHIRLEY M. WALKER,
Notary Public.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar, beginning with No. 93, and that the remaining measures be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESOLATION WILDERNESS, ELDORADO NATIONAL FOREST

The bill (S. 713) to designate the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, in the State of California was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance, with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the Desolation Valley Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom as generally depicted on a map entitled "Desolation Wilderness—Proposed," dated April 26, 1967, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the Desolation Wilderness within and as a part of the Eldorado National Forest, comprising an area of approximately sixty-three thousand five hundred acres.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Desolation Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The Desolation Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. The previous classification of the Desolation Valley Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-97), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill, S. 713, designates a total of 63,469 acres in the El Dorado National Forest in California to be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act, Public Law 88-577, by the Secretary of Agriculture.

DESCRIPTION

The area lies immediately west of Lake Tahoe on both sides of the crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. It is 90 miles east of Sacramento by way of U.S. Highway 50. The area includes the headwaters of the Rubicon River, the South Fork of the American River, and the Truckee River watershed within El Dorado County.

The proposed wilderness is a popular hiking area because of its rugged mountain scenery, glaciated valley and ridges, lakes, streams, and alpine vegetation. However, 65 percent of the proposed wilderness is devoid of vegetation. Lakes make up about 3 percent of the area, and provide a special attraction for fishermen.

The area has a summer population of California black-tailed deer and California mule deer, and a few black bear. A wide variety of small mammals and birds frequent the area.

Of the total of 63,469 acres in national forest land which comprise the proposal, 40,744 acres are now within the Desolation Valley Primitive Area, and the remaining 22,725 acres in six separate units.

RESOURCES

While scattered stands of alpine-type conifers grow in the various lake basins, a small commercial volume of timber is not economic for logging. The volume has never been included in the calculations of the allowable cut of the Eldorado National Forest. Cattle graze under permit, and this will be continued. The U.S. Geological Survey says there is no record of mineral production from the area, and no mineral commodities that can be mined economically at the present. One gold potential was uncovered, but was said by the Geological Survey and the U.S. Bureau of Mines to be too low in grade and too erratically distributed for economic extraction.

WATER

The area is important as a water source because of its location, size, area of heavy precipitation, and because of its basinlike topography which forms a catchment for snow. The water is nearly 100 percent utilized for agricultural, irrigation, and domestic uses, and for power production in both California and Nevada.

RUBICON DAM PROBLEM

During hearings on S. 713, the question was raised as to whether or not the inclusion within the boundaries of two dams might dilute the wilderness concept. The committee decided that due to the particular circumstances surrounding the use, establishment, and management of the dams, they were acceptable within the boundaries suggested by the Forest Service for the wilderness area.

Lake Aloha is a shallow reservoir constructed in 1865 in the southern end of the primitive area. The small dam is made of native rock masonry, and blends so well into its surroundings as to be hardly noticeable. In recent years the water has been used for generation of power outside the proposed wilderness by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

In the northern end of the primitive area, a dam was built by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in 1963 after many years of negotiation and study of alternate sites and facilities, and after many conferences by the Forest service with conservationists and other interested parties. The Rubicon Dam is constructed of gray concrete and blends with the surrounding rocky area. A tunnel diverts water to Rock Bottom Lake. An access road used for construction of the dam has been abandoned and is now only a trail to the dam. Helicopters are used by the SMUD to land at the dam and read gages. The Forest Service testified this was an existing use which could be continued under provisions of the Wilderness Act. The committee believes that the Forest Service should also accord SMUD emergency access whenever the need arises.

It was brought out in the hearing, and re-emphasized by the committee, that establishment of the wilderness area would in no way change the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission which licensed the two dams.

All land within the boundary of the proposed desolation wilderness is national forest land.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably recommends S. 713 for early passage.

YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 742) to amend the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, at the beginning of line 5, strike out "$5,352,000 (October 1966 prices)" and insert "$6,735,000 (January 1969 prices)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Insert the words "and Kennewick division extension", after the words "Kennewick division" in section 1 and add the following items to the principal units listed in said section: "Kiona siphon" and "Relift pumping plants".

(b) Insert at the end of section 3 the following: "Costs of the Kennewick division extension allocated to irrigation which are determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the water users' ability to repay within a fifty-six-year repayment period following a ten-year development period, shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided,* That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him."

SEC. 2. No water shall be delivered to any water user on the Kennewick division extension for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this authorizing Act for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension $6,735,000 (January 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in

XUM

addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–98), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of S. 742, which was cosponsored by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, is to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of an extension to the existing Kennewick division of the Yakima reclamation project in southeastern Washington. The extension would bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation and provide wildlife conservation benefits.

BACKGROUND

Construction of the Yakima project was initiated in 1905. There are presently six operating divisions in the project. The Kennewick division is the most recently constructed, having been authorized in 1948 (Public Law 80–629).

The Secretary of the Interior's feasibility report on the Kennewick division extension was transmitted to the Congress on April 10, 1964, and has been printed as House Document No. 296, 88th Congress.

S. 742 contemplates the authorization of the Kennewick extension by amendment of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382) which authorized the Kennewick division.

Bills to authorize construction of the extension passed the Senate in the 88th Congress (S. 2630), 89th Congress (S. 794), and 90th Congress (S. 370). Final action was not taken in the House.

The Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources held hearings on S. 742 on March 4, 1968. The Department of the Interior, by letter of March 3, 1969, recommended enactment of S. 742 with an amendment. The Bureau of the Budget, by letter of March 5, 1969, expressed no objection to enactment if amended as the Department recommends. The committee has adopted the recommended amendment.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

The existing Kennewick division serves approximately 19,000 acres of land. It is the most recent of the six operating divisions of the Yakima project. Section 6 of the 1948 authorization act provided for extra capacity in the division's main canal sufficient to irrigate approximately 7,000 acres over and above the lands in the division, and recognized the cost of the construction of such extra capacity as a deferred obligation.

The extension proposed in S. 742 would fully utilize this previously provided capacity, built at a cost of $341,000. Major new facilities would be a third pump at Chandler pumping plant, the mile-long Koina siphon, six small relift pumping plants, 24 miles of canals and conduits, a lateral distribution system, and draining facilities.

The average annual diversion requirement for the extension would be 31,500 acre-feet and would consist primarily of return flows from irrigated lands upstream, supplemented by natural flows of the Yakima River. In 1931 the Bureau of Reclamation obtained a permit from the State of Washington for the Kennewick Irrigation District to divert up to 1,600 cubic feet per second for irrigation and power purposes. This permit fully covers the diversions to the extension lands.

The Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development, but benefits to wildlife resources will also be realized. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that irrigation of these lands will be beneficial to upland game birds. Opportunities to develop significant benefits to recreation, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, or other purposes are not available.

FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The estimated construction cost of the extension is $6,735,000. This cost reflects recent changes in design of the distribution system and updating of estimates to January 1969 price levels. The investment cost of the extension, which also includes assigned costs from works already completed and other assigned costs, totals $7,554,700 of which $7,421,900 is allocated to irrigation and $132,800 is allocated to fish and wildlife conservation. Annual operating costs are $51,600.

Annual project benefits are evaluated to total $889,800 of which $884,300 are irrigation benefits and $5,500 are wildlife conservation benefits. The project has a ratio of benefits to costs of 2.8 to 1 over a 100-year period of analysis.

The irrigation water users would repay all operating costs and in addition $1,688,400 of the investment costs allocated to irrigation. In addition, $259,300 of assigned power costs would be repaid from irrigation water pumping power charges. Financial assistance of $5,474,200 would be provided from Federal Columbia River power system revenues.

The project repayment analysis utilizes a formula for determining an irrigation pumping power rate which assures repayment without interest of an equitable portion of the overall power investment of the Federal Columbia River power system and associated operating costs. This is compatible with the traditional Reclamation policy that irrigation investment be returned without interest. It will not adversely affect the rates or the repayment schedule for the commercial power investment of the system.

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Almost all of the lands in the extension area are dry, supporting for the most part only sagebrush and native grasses used for livestock grazing, and other uses are impracticable under present conditions. When irrigated, the land will be especially suitable for production of general row crops, and for specialty crops and fruits, such as grapes, sweet cherries, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

The project will put to beneficial use the investment in additional capacity which was made when the Kennewick division was initially constructed. It has the strong support of the State of Washington and the local interests.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended the bill to reflect the recommendations of the Department of the Interior. The amendment will increase the authorization of appropriations for the Kennewick extension from $5,352,000 (October 1966 prices) to $6,735,000 (January 1969 prices). This increase not only reflects the updating of costs to current price levels but also includes the costs of a recent design change which would provide a pipe distribution system in place of open ditches.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that S. 742 be enacted as amended.

WALLA WALLA PROJECT, OREGON-WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 4, line 18, after the word "division," strike out "$16,630,000 (January 1965 prices)," and insert "$22,774,000 (January 1969 prices),"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for purposes of supplying irrigation water initially for approximately ten thousand acres of land, providing municipal and industrial water, flood control, the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, and the enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division of the Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the division (hereinafter referred to as the project) shall consist of the Dayton Dam and Reservoir, fish passage facilities, a diversion dam, and associated drainage facilities.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to construct the Dayton Dam and Reservoir to the physical limitations of the site and to recognize the cost of providing such additional capacity as a deferred obligation to be paid, in accordance with section 2 of this Act, at such time as the additional storage capacity is contracted for: *Provided,* That until such additional storage capacity is contracted for, operation and maintenance costs attributable to the excess capacity shall be funded and added to the construction costs allocated to deferred capacity.

(c) In order to assure a realization of the fish and wildlife enhancement benefits contemplated by this Act, the Secretary shall adopt appropriate measures to insure the maintenance of a streamflow between Dayton Dam and the mouth of the Walla Walla River that is not less than thirty cubic feet per second unless he determines that a water shortage or other emergencies exist or that lesser flows would be adequate for the maintenance of fish life.

Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years, exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation funds in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707).

Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Touchet division shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213). All costs allocated to the enhancement of anadromous fish species shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 4. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and, where appropriate, interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable obligations assumed by non-Federal entities shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption from fifteen years from date of issue, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be

XUM

delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Touchet division, $22,774,000 (January 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–99), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of S. 743, which was cosponsored by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, is to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Touchet division of the Walla Walla reclamation project in southeastern Washington. The division would develop the flows of the Touchet River for the purposes of irrigation, municipal, and industrial water supply; flood control, fish and wildlife enhancement, and recreation.

BACKGROUND

The Secretary of the Interior's feasibility report on the Touchet division was transmitted to the Congress on April 21, 1965, and has been printed as House Document No. 155, 89th Congress.

Bills to authorize construction of the division passed the Senate in the 89th Congress (S. 1088) and the 90th Congress (S. 485). Final action was not taken in the House.

The Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources held hearings on 743 on March 4, 1968. The Department of the Interior, by letter of March 4, 1969, recommended enactment of S. 743 with an amendment. The Bureau of the Budget, by letter of March 7, 1969, expressed no objection to enactment if amended as the Department recommends. The committee has adopted the recommended amendment.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

The Touchet River now is completely uncontrolled. Every year in the pattern of all tributary streams in the Pacific Northwest the river floods its valley in the spring and by late summer carried insufficient water to meet local requirements.

Although some irrigation development was started a century ago, today only 5,000 to 6,000 acres are irrigated and much of the land has less than a full water supply. Irrigation from the river has been primarily by gravity diversion but pumping has increased in recent years. Water rights on the river have been adjudicated and a system of priorities has been established.

A principal feature of the Touchet project will be the Dayton Dam on the Touchet River a few miles upstream from the valley's largest community of Dayton. The dam would be a rolled earthfill structure about 200 feet high. It would create a reservoir of 52,600 acre-feet, of which 33,200 acre-feet would be conservation storage, and 15,000 acre-feet would be joint storage to be operated on a seasonal and forecast basis for flood control and conservation.

Reservoir right-of-way required for all project purposes totals 1,470 acres, all now in private ownership. Of this total about 390 acres are now cultivated and 15 farmsteads would be inundated. A country road and power and telephone lines would be relocated.

Facilities of fish enhancement in addition to the necessary controlled flow of water consist of a trap below the dam, and a hopper and tramway to carry upstream migrants over the dam. Selective level outlets in the dam and a collector system for downstream migrants are also to be provided specifically for fish.

The large cost allocation to fish and wildlife enhancement is primarily justified by the restoration of a substantial run of anadromous fish made possible by this project. A large annual yield of mature salmon made available to the fishermen of the lower Columbia and Pacific waters, as well as local sportsmen, is contemplated.

Water from the reservoir will be released into the natural stream channel from which it will be diverted by the irrigators and the city of Dayton through their own facilities; some by gravity system and some by pumping.

Irrigation water will be served initially to some 9,960 acres of land: 3,520 acres requiring full supply, and 6,440 acres requiring only supplemental water. The quality of the land when irrigated suits it for a shift from grain production, the area's principal land use, to row crop farming of fruits and vegetables.

The reservoir capacity is adequate to serve an additional 7,000 acres, and contracts for the additional service are anticipated.

FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The estimated construction cost of the Touchet division is $22,774,000. This cost reflects recent changes in design of the dam and updating of estimates to January 1969 price levels. The costs are allocated to the project purposes as follows:

Irrigation	$9,014,000
Flood control	1,004,000
Municipal and industrial water supply	150,000
Fish and wildlife enhancement	12,261,000
Recreation	195,000
Highway improvement	150 ,000
Total	22,774,000

Annual project benefits are evaluated to total $1,545,900. The project has a ratio of benefits to costs of 1.72 to 1 over a 100-year period of analysis.

The irrigation costs will be repaid without interest. The water users in the initial development are capable of repaying $1,214,500 (28 percent) of the initial irrigation costs. Financial assistance of $3,058,500 for the initial development will be required from the surplus revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System and from net municipal and industrial revenues. The remaining irrigation costs of $4,741,000 are associated with anticipated later contracts.

Department witnesses assured the committee that many owners of land outside the boundary of organized irrigation districts had expressed interest in contracting for portions of the yield of Dayton Reservoir beyond that required for the presently organized districts. Despite the provision of section 1(b) of S. 743, the committee feels that construction of Dayton Dam and Reservoir should not be initiated until repayment contracts have been executed with water user organizations representing sufficient arable land to utilize substantially the entire firm irrigation yield. The committee further feels that under this arrangement there will be no necessity for repayment to be deferred for any part of the irrigation allocation.

Costs allocated to municipal and industrial water supply will be repaid with interest. Costs allocated to flood control and the incremental costs of higher standards for relocating highways are nonreimbursable by law. Costs allocated to recreation will be shared under the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act.

The costs associated with the enhancement of anadromous fisheries ($9,082,000) would be nonreimbursable under the provisions of section 3 of the proposed bill. The remaining costs allocated to fish and wildlife conservation would be shared under the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act.

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Dayton Dam and Reservoir which are authorized by the bill will form the only sizable lake in the Walla Walla Basin. The facility will bring 10,000 acres of rich farmland under full irrigation in its initial stages with deferred water storage for an additional 7,000 acres. Water sports, boating, swimming, fishing, and water skiing as well as camping and picnicking opportunities will be created.

Expert testimony shows that the project will reestablish the anadromous fish run on a very large scale. A potentially outstanding salmon stream, the Touchet River, is expected to contribute more salmon to the Columbia River fishery when the project is in full operation than it did in the days before Lewis and Clark.

The Touchet Valley suffers destructive floods and periods of severely reduced flow with resultant pollution of the stream. The proposed project will afford vital protection of life and property.

The regulation afforded by the reservior will permit the maintenance of flows in the river during the irrigation season of sufficient quantity to provide high quality water for sustenance of the fisheries.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended the bill to reflect the recommendations of the Department of the Interior. The amendment will increase the authorization of appropriations for the Touchet division from $16,630,000 (January 1965 prices) to $22,774,000 (January 1969 prices). This increase reflects not only the updating of costs to current price levels but also includes the costs of a recent design change on the Dayton Dam to reflect recent hydrologic data.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that S. 743 be enacted as amended.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1011) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 1, after line 2, strike out:

That section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be specified in annual appropriation authorization acts to carry out the provisions of this Act. Effective July

1, 1969, funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used to participate with public or private agencies in foreign countries in the construction or operation of desalting plants or components thereof; or to perform as an agent or to provide supervision in connection with the construction or operation of such plants or components when the primary purpose of the plants or components is the production of potable water for use by foreign countries, except that funds so appropriated shall be available to carry out any commitment made prior to said date."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

That the last sentence of section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958, et seq.) is further amended to read as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1968, except for the activities authorized by section 3 of this Act, no new commitments shall be made under authority of this Act for cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries which require the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, but funds so appropriated shall be available to carry out commitments made before said date."

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1011

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958, et seq.) is further amended to read as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1968, except for the activities authorized by section 3 of this Act, no new commitments shall be made under authority of this Act for cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries which require the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, but funds so appropriated shall be available to carry out commitments made before said date."

SEC. 2. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Saline Water Conversion Act (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.), during fiscal year 1970 the sum of $27,000,000 as follows:

(1) Research and development operating expenses, not more than $18,095,000.

(2) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than $5,355,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than $1,450,000; and

(4) Administration and coordination, not more than $2,100,000.

(b) Expenditure and obligations under any of the items in this section except item (4) may be increased by not more than 15 per centum if such increase is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other items, including item (4).

SEC. 3. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by this Act, the Secretary may utilize any funds previously appropriated for this program which are not obligated on June 30, 1969, subject to the dollar limitations applicable to the fiscal year 1969 program.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-100), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of this legislation, which was proposed by the administration, is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1970 for the saline water conversion program and to amend the Saline Water Conversion Act to clarify the authority to expend funds for foreign activities.

BACKGROUND

The Office of Saline Water was established by the Congress to conduct a research and development program aimed at the development of low-cost methods for desalting saline and brackish waters for beneficial and consumptive purposes. The program through fiscal year 1967 operated under two basic authorizations:

1. Authority to conduct research and development programs. (Saline Water Act of 1952, 66 Stat. 328, as amended.)

2. Authority to construct, operate, and maintain desalting plants in order to demonstrate the production of desalted water (72 Stat. 1706).

In 1967, the Congress enacted legislation (81 Stat. 78) to consolidate the earlier acts under the title of the Saline Water Conversion Act, and to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1968. It has since been the policy of the Congress to authorize appropriations for the program on an annual basis.

In 1968 the act authorizing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 program (82 Stat. 110) amended the Saline Water Conversion Act to delete the references to appropriations ceilings and to provide for separate appropriations acts in future years. It also added a provision to prohibit commitments to be made with agencies in foreign countries which require the expenditure of funds.

PRESENT LEGISLATION

The draft of S. 1011 was transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior by letter of January 15, 1969, and the bill was introduced by Senator Jackson by request, on February 17, 1969.

The provisions of the bill as amended by the committee are as follows:

Section 1 would further amend section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act (66 Stat. 328, as amended), to clarify the Secretary of the Interior's authority to expend funds to perform the functions involving foreign activities which he is authorized to perform by section 3 of the act.

Section 2 would authorize appropriations of $27 million for fiscal year 1970. This amount supports the request in the fiscal year 1970 budget now under consideration by the Congress. Further limitations are imposed upon the portions of this amount which may be applied to specific activities within the program. This section would also provide authority to reprogram funds among activities to the extent of a 15-percent increase in any single activity (except administration and coordination). Presently, reprograming is limited to 10 percent.

Section 3 provides for the utilization in fiscal year 1970 of any previously appropriated funds which are carried over into the fiscal year.

The Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources held an open hearing on March 11, 1969.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended the bill by deleting section 1 of the Department's bill and submitting language which will not extend the Secretary's authority to engage in foreign activities but will clarify his authority to expend funds in the performance of foreign activities which are already authorized by section 3 of the Saline Water Conversion Act.

Public Law 90-297 (82 Stat. 110), authorizing appropriations for the program for fiscal year 1969, amended section 8 of the Conversion Act to include the following language:

"Effective July 1, 1968, no new commitments shall be made under authority of this Act for cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries which require the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, but funds so appropriated shall be available to carry out commitments made before said date."

This language originated in a House amendment which was accepted by the Senate. The House committee report comments on the provision as follows:

"The authority given the Secretary in section 3 of the basic act is left unchanged. Section 3 includes authority to (1) conduct onsite inspections of promising projects, domestic and foreign; (2) foster and participate in international conferences relating to saline water conversion; and (3) cooperate fully with the Department of State. The committee considers that section 3 provides the authority necessary to inspect foreign projects and exchange technical information with foreign countries in order that the United States may be kept fully abreast of all progress in this field. Also, there is no intention of prohibiting foreign firms or individual scientists from participating in the research program authorized by section 3 of the basic act."

The Department, in its letter of January 15, 1969, transmitting the draft bill states as follows:

"The language of section 8, however, appears to bar even the activities under section 3 described in the committee report, to the extent that they require the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to the act. We believe the existing language in section 8 is not reconcilable with the legislative history in this regard. Consequently, it would be appropriate to further amend section 8 to insure that the intention of Congress, as expressed in the House report, is carried out."

The committee believes that the amendment proposed by the Department is unnecessarily broad, however, and that the more limited language of the committee amendment will serve to resolve any conflict which may exist between the statutory language and the legislative history of Public Law 90-297.

The committee amendment would not accomplish the objective of the Department's bill to eliminate the termination date of fiscal year 1972 for the saline water conversion program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends that S. 1011, as amended, be enacted.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING FINAL REPORTS UNDER THE CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION STUDY ACT OF 1965

The bill (H.R. 8438) to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969, was announced as next in order.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I support the bill H.R. 8438, reported without amendment by the House Committee on Education and Labor, which extends the time for filing final reports required by the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969. This is an extension of 4 months from the original date of completion, March 31, 1969, that was required by the act.

XUM

The study called for by the act is being conducted by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training and deals with one of the serious problems of our day: how to secure enough trained men and women to bring about the rehabilitation of offenders through our correctional systems and thus prevent further delinquency and crime.

A fire destroyed Commission office files and working materials, and the death of a key employee of the Joint Commission are the principal reasons necessitating additional time to complete the study.

No additional funds are needed to complete the study. Funds already appropriated for the use of the Joint Commission are available to complete the final report during the additional 4-month period.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CHENG-HUAI LI

The bill (S. 348) for the relief of Cheng-huai Li was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cheng-huai Li shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 7, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report No. 91–101, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Cheng-Huai Li as of July 7, 1962, thus enabling him to file petition for naturalization.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 41-year-old native and citizen of China who last entered the United States on July 7, 1962, as a student. He is a graduate of the Republic of China Naval Academy and holds an M.S. degree from MIT. He resides in Washington, D.C., where he is employed as a naval architect by the Naval Engineering Center, U.S. Navy. He was previously in the United States from October 1953 to February 1954 as a member of the Chinese Navy for the purpose of receiving training. His status was adjusted to permanent residence on August 1, 1966, on the basis of an approved third preference petition. He desires U.S. citizenship in order to obtain security clearance which will enable him to use his technical skills and knowledge in work areas restricted to U.S. citizens.

KOON CHEW HO

The bill (S. 628) for the relief of Koon Chew Ho was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ho Yee, a deceased United States citizen, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, within the meaning of section 1993 of the Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878).

Sec. 2. For the purposes of the said Act, Koon Chew Ho shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of the said Ho Yee, and shall be further held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since July 9, 1913: *Provided,* That the said Koon Chew Ho enters the United States for permanent residence within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–102), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Koon Chew Ho, the son of a deceased U.S. citizen, to assume his status as a U.S. citizen based upon his father's residence in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, the date of Koon Chew Ho's birth.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 55-year-old native of China, who claims U.S. citizenship as the son of a U.S. citizen who resided in this country prior to his birth on July 9, 1913. The beneficiary's father was allegedly born on September 15, 1891, in Honolulu, Hawaii. He departed to China in 1902 and returned to Honolulu in 1923, where he resided until 1946. He then returned to Hong Kong, where he died in 1948. The beneficiary's brother entered the United States in 1924, as the son of a U.S. citizen and in 1952, he was issued a certificate of derivative citizenship. The beneficiary is a self-employed merchant in Hong Kong and a leading businessman in that community. The beneficiary's brother is manager of an importing firm in Honolulu. The beneficiary, in assuming his U.S. citizenship, would contribute much to the American business community with his varied background and interests.

ERNESTO ALUNDAY

The bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 648

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 203(a) (1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernesto Alunday shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Teodoro A. Alunday, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–103), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to qualify for first preference status as the unmarried son of a citizen of the United States.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 27-year-old native and citizen of the Philippines, who was adopted there by his uncle on January 15, 1953. He presently resides in the Philippines with his sister. His adoptive father is a U.S. citizen who resides in Los Angeles, Calif., with his wife and daughter. Information is to the effect that he is financially able to provide for him.

VICTOR ABADI

The bill (S. 927) for the relief of Victor Abadi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 927

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Victor Abadi may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since October 1, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–104), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. RICHARD FRANCIS POWER

The bill (S. 1016) for the relief of Dr. Richard Francis Power was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Richard Francis Power shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 24, 1960, and the period of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of such Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–105), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANGEL SOLAR

The bill (S. 1049) for the relief of Dr. Angel Solar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Angel Solar shall be held to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 21, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–106), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Angel Solar as of May 21, 1963, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization.

WONG WAH SIN

The bill (S. 1120) for the relief of Wong Wah Sin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1120

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wong Wah Sin may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–107), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has sought to procure a visa by misrepresenting a material fact in behalf of the son of a U.S. citizen.

AH MEE LOCKE

The bill (S. 1123) for the relief of Ah Mee Locke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ah Mee Locke, the widow of the late Loy Hepp Locke, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to be an alien eligible for immediate relative status under the provisions of section 201 (b), and the provisions of section 204 of such Act shall not be applicable in this case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–108), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of an immediate relative to Ah Mee Locke which is the status she would be entitled to were it not for the death of her husband, a citizen of the United States.

SEIN LIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 301) for the relief of Sein Lin which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after "1960" strike out the comma and "upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available." so as to make the bill read:

S. 301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sein Lin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91–109), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

NORIKO SUSAN DUKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 537) for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano) shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 323(c) of such Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report No. 91–110, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary's adoptive parents to file a petition for naturalization in her behalf. The purpose of the amendment is to delete reference to the first section of the bill because it is no longer necessary.

CHARLES RICHARD SCOTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 672) for the relief of Charles Richard Scott which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204 (c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of adopted children, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Charles Richard Scott by Mr. and Mrs. Denny F. Scott, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall thereafter, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report No. 99–111, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of an orphan to be adopted by citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the prospective adoptive parents have previously had the maximum number of petitions approved. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

JOHN ANTHONY BACSALMASSY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 958) for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of" strike out "September 17, 1962." and insert "September 19, 1959, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act."; so as to make the bill read:

S. 958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Anthony Bacsalmassy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 19, 1959, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

XUM

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 91-112, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to reflect the proper date upon which he first entered the United States as a student.

THE CARL HAYDEN PROJECT

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Whereas Carl Hayden has served with distinction in the United States Congress for the unsurpassed period of fifty-seven years, including forty-two years of consecutive service in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas Carl Hayden has dedicated his lifework to public service, having been elected treasurer of Maricopa County, Arizona, in 1904 and sheriff of such county in 1906 and 1908, and having served as a Member of Congress from the State of Arizona since its admission into the Union, first as a Member of the House of Representatives from February 19, 1912, to March 3, 1927, and then as a Member of the Senate from March 4, 1927, to January 3, 1969; and

Whereas, as the result of his vision and ability, and his unrelenting efforts for a period of two decades in participation with the other members of Congress from Arizona, Carl Hayden was successful in bringing about the enactment in 1968 of legislation authorizing the Central Arizona Project; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that a suitable monument be dedicated in tribute to Carl Hayden and in recognition of his unique contributions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Colorado River Basin Project Act is amended by striking out "Central Arizona Project" at each place that it appears in such Act and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place the following: "Carl Hayden Project".

SEC. 2. In addition to the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution, any designation or reference to the Central Arizona Project (described by section 301 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act) in any other law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be held to designate or refer to such project as the "Carl Hayden Project".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report No. 91-113, explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF JOINT RESOLUTION

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 28 is to provide a lasting, living monument to one of the greatest of America's legislative statesmen during the middle half of the 20th century. The measure would accomplish this purpose by amending the Colorado River Basin Project Act (Public Law 90-537; 82 Stat. 885) to provide that the vast "Central Arizona Project", which is the heart of this far-reaching legislation, shall be known as the "Carl Hayden Project." As passed by the Senate on August 7, 1967, the bill that became the Colorado River Basin Project Act, S. 1004, 90th Congress, which was sponsored by Senator Hayden, was titled the "Central Arizona Project Act." This project will bring lifegiving Colorado River water to the arid central part of Arizona where water is in desperately short supply even for the domestic needs of its burgeoning population. Senator Hayden dedicated himself over long years to the project giving unstintingly of himself, his time, and his effort.

The law as finally passed is truly a monument to his career in the Congress of the United States, which spanned an unsurpassed 57-year period, including 42 years of consecutive service in the Senate.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Carl Hayden was born in what was then Hayden's Ferry, Ariz., which had been established by his frontiersman father, Judge Charles T. Hayden, a Connecticut Yankee schoolteacher who followed the famed admonition: "Go West, Young Man." At the time the son was born, the population of the United States was but a quarter of its present figure. The War Between the States was a recent memory. The Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, the cold war with its Koreas and Vietnams were still ahead. The first gasoline engine hadn't turned, the first electric streetcar hadn't moved, the first airplane hadn't flown, motion pictures, radio and television were yet to be experienced. Arizona itself was not to become a State for some 30 years plus.

The young frontiersman, who had been elected sheriff of Maricopa County in 1906, became Arizona's first Congressman upon statehood in 1912, was reelected to seven succeeding Congresses, elected to the Senate in 1926, and reelected six times. He retired at the end of the 90th Congress, at the age of 92. He had been chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and as such was one of the most powerful men in the Senate. He also was one of the most beloved, being known as "the Senators' Senator."

The Central Arizona Project was not by any means the only monumental legislation crowning his long career. The Hayden record shows that he was the sponsor in 1919 of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, extending the right of suffrage to women; that he sponsored and managed the bill establishing the Grand Canyon National Park, and that he was a pioneer in establishing the interstate highway system, among other far-sighted legislation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The members of the Senate Interior Committee, of which Carl Hayden was a member, unanimously urge prompt approval of S.J. Res. 28. No expenditure of Federal funds is in any way involved, and the name of Carl Hayden Project on the great water works for the State he served so long and so well will be a fitting, well-merited monument to a very great legislative statesman.

REPORT ON THE FIELD TRIP TO FLORIDA BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the opportunity to reply to the Senator from South Dakota who has spoken earlier on the report of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs field trip to Florida.

I want to say to my good friend from South Dakota that I appreciate his courtesy in sending me, last Friday afternoon, a copy of his proposed remarks relative to the recent hearings held in Immokalee, Fla., among other places.

I have had an opportunity to see the speech briefly this morning. I spent the weekend in Florida, too. Even Florida people like to go to Florida in the wintertime, just as my friend from South Dakota and his committee chose to go down there to enjoy a few days.

I noticed two completely inaccurate figures in his statement about his trip to Immokalee that I should like to advise my friend about.

He declares, for instance, in his statement, that Collier County people—speaking about their willingness to take care of their own—include 22,000 Collier migrants who harvest Collier's $40 million in farm produce.

Twenty-two thousand is just about 10 times too many. I hold in my hand the official report of the Florida State Employment Service, which is a cooperative service of the Federal Government and the State, showing the figures both of intrastate and interstate—which would be the migrants—on farm labor employed last year, 1968—and this year is not greatly different—and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD in full at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUMBER OF MIGRATORY WORKERS EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURAL REPORTING AREAS COVERING THE 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, 1968

Reporting date [1]	Lake Okeechobee [2]			Lower west coast [3]			Central Ridge [4]		
	Total	Intrastate	Interstate	Total	Intrastate	Interstate	Total	Intrastate	Interstate
January	4,200	1,100	3,100	4,225	1,625	2,600	8,858	1,615	7,243
February	4,400	1,100	3,300	5,135	2,585	2,550	9,027	1,475	7,552
March	4,500	1,100	3,400	5,117	2,517	2,600	6,423	1,455	4,968
April	4,000	1,200	2,800	5,355	2,205	3,150	6,693	1,416	5,277
May	1,300	400	900	8,550	4,950	3,600	7,906	1,880	6,026
June	50	50	0	1,520	1,005	515	5,072	1,530	3,542
July	0	0	0	70	50	20	1,378	285	1,093
August	0	0	0	90	65	25	300	150	150
September	0	0	0	265	95	170	200	100	100
October	1,900	500	1,400	1,640	290	1,350	280	100	180
November	3,400	900	2,500	4,440	1,340	3,100	2,320	500	1,820
December	3,800	500	3,300	4,515	915	3,600	5,428	1,400	4,028

[1] Midmonth employment.

[2] Includes Broward, Glades, and Palm Beach Counties.

[3] Includes Charlotte, Collier, De Soto, Hendry (west), Lee, Manatee, and Sarasota Counties.

[4] Includes Brevard, Hardee, Hernando, Highlands, Hillsboro, Indian River, Lake, Martin, Okeechobee, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie, Seminole, Sumter, and Volusia Counties.

Source: In-season farm labor reports, Florida State Employment Service.

XUM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this statement covers not the whole State but does cover in one of its compilations—compilation No. 2—the lower west coast— and does cover Collier County, Charlotte, De Soto, Hendry, Lee, Manatee, and Sarasota Counties.

Those figures show clearly that the number of migrant laborers in each month of the year, 1968, as computed and as shown, would not even begin to approach for that whole area of seven counties the figure mentioned by my good friend from South Dakota.

For instance, in January of 1968, the total number for those seven counties of migrant laborers was 2,600. That is an official figure compiled by the Florida State Employment Service.

Surely someone has misled the Senator from South Dakota in stating to him that there were 22,000 Collier migrants who harvested their crops.

Mr. President, the second part of his statement is obviously completely out of accord with the facts, his statement that there are 4,000—if I may have the attention of my distinguished friend, because I am trying to save him from getting into very grave error which I think he will regret later—in trying to state the situation in Collier County, he states that between 4,000 and 5,000 destitute families are in Collier County.

In the first place, there is no such number of destitute families in Collier County. That number of families would very nearly embrace the population of the county, which was 15,600 in 1960 and which is now somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000, of whom the major portion live in Naples, and are anything but destitute people.

The idea of there being 4,000 or 5,000 destitute families in Collier County is an enormity. I know my distinguished friend has been misled by somebody who told him about those figures, when those figures are completely out of accord with the possible facts.

Collier County is a progressive and prosperous county. The actual residents there could not possibly come under the classification of destitute people. I happen to have known it ever since shortly after World War I. I have visited there repeatedly. I know well of the quality of the Collier County residents. I am talking about residents there. The idea of there being 4,000 or 5,000 destitute families there, when there may have been merely 2,000 or 3,000 migrants there at one time, many of whom do not bring their families, and those who do are not all destitute, is so far from any possible facts that I wanted to call it to the attention of my distinguished friend while he was on the floor.

I hope he will be more careful in stating the result of his various hearings, both the ones he has already held and the ones in the future, and in stating as facts things that simply cannot be facts.

I am talking about something I know something about, because ever since about 1922 a group of friends in my hometown, who like to hunt and fish, have made Immokalee their headquarters. "Immokalee" means "our home." That is a Seminole Indian word. When we first used to go there, there were few there but Indians. I remember meeting there, at the Episcopal chapel, Deaconess Bedell, who gave such wonderful service to the Indians at Immokalee. I have been there from that time until now. The people who have lived there all these years are very fine people. I know many of the families there.

I am perfectly willing for any facts to appear in the RECORD which relate accurately to the situation either there or anywhere else in Florida, but I would not like my friend to be misled on the numbers involved. There have never been 22,000 migrants in Collier County or in any other similar county of Florida, unless it was Dade County. There are not 4,000 or 5,000 destitute families in Collier County, because there are no destitute families among the resident part of the population there.

I could go a great deal further into the matter, because I not only know the area; I know the families who have been there a while and others that have moved there since. I was there between Christmas and New Years and had a considerable chance to visit with some of those old families.

I am just giving this word of caution because I think someone appearing before the Senator's able committee has given figures so extravagant and completely out of line with the facts that I would want him to know that is the case.

I have gone to the trouble this morning of obtaining the latest estimates of the population of Collier County, which goes up to about 30,000 in the census, and half of the population or more lives in the Naples area. There are other towns, if I can give some of them, besides Immokalee—each of which I happen to know, because I am an avid hunter as well as fisherman, and because this is an active area for that. Collier City, Marco, Goodland, Everglades City, and others which I can mention, are in that county, in addition to Immokalee and Naples—Naples, of course, being the metropolis of the whole area.

Without questioning at all either the sincerity or the effort to state the facts of the Senator from South Dakota, I simply want the record to show that someone has misinformed him completely as to the number of migrants there in the first place and as to the possible number of destitute families who are there, because the figures are so thoroughly out of accord with the actual facts in Collier County.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to say to the Senator from Florida—and I know he understands this—that we did not go to Florida to get a general appraisal of all the virtues and weaknesses of the State, but to look at a specific problem, and that is the problem of hungry people in that State. We started our appearance there with statements to the press and to everyone we could get to listen that we were not singling out Florida on any assumption that it had the worst problem in the country. We had plans to go into every area in the country and go into hearings on hunger there.

The New York Times has an article about a survey in New York City, in which early indications are that problems of very serious malnutrition will be found. We have it in my State, particularly among the Sioux Indians, and we will be going into those areas.

But as to the statistics contained in the report I filed today, there was not a statistic that was not the result of testimony that was taken or official local or State reports. We took the statements of the local people, such as county commissioners, State officials, and others.

I would like to suggest there may be one area of confusion when the Senator speaks of the number of migrant workers. We are using figures representing families as well as workers. We found families with eight or nine or 10 children that might be included in the labor statistics the Senator has referred to as one single person—the father of that family, for example. But the figure of 22,000 for Collier County was the figure—and I think the Senator from New York will verify this, if he recalls the testimony—that was used by persons who came before the committee, indicating that, at the peak of the season, that was approximately the migrant population.

The 22,000 figure was cited by our first witness, Mr. T. Michael Foster. He said at page 26 of our transcript that the entire migrant population of Collier County is estimated by the county's migrant health project to be "22,000 persons during fiscal year 1968."

The figure he cited was taken from "Florida Migrant Health Project Report, 1967–1968," by the Florida State Board of Health in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service.

In the Immokalee area alone, the president of the chamber of commerce testified that the peak migrant population was as high as 12,000. That appears at page 152 of our transcript.

He also said that the day the committee was in Immokalee there were approximately 4,000 migrant workers there.

There may be one other area that explains the Senator's somewhat lower figure, and that is that some local officials who testified before the committee said "These people are not residents." One county commissioner, as I remember, said, "They are not Collier people. They are not even Florida people. They are Federal people." That was the statement made. He did not recognize them as residents or citizens or as their having any responsibility at all on the part of the county or his State.

The figure of 4,000 to 5,000 destitute people is the estimate of Mr. E. Lee McCubbin, the commodity distribution director from the State capital, of how many people he thought there were in Collier County, that should be fed by a commodity program in that county.

That being the case, I can only say to the Senator, if these statistics are wrong, it is not because of a lack of effort by our committee to get an accurate picture. We queried witnesses over 2 long days of intensive committee hearings, and we took the word of the local officials on these estimates. They are not guesses on our part. Every one of those statistics appears not once, but several times, in the testimony taken by our committee. Now, if they are wrong, we will certainly correct the record, but they stand, as far as I am concerned, at this point, as a result of the very careful hearings of 2 days.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already said in my remarks that I did not question either the intentions of the Senator or the fact that he must have been informed of those figures by somebody else. I am just saying that those figures are not right; that they are incorrect; and the Senator might as well start in this period of investigations—which I hope he will continue—with the understanding that the people who are most interested in these causes of discovering malnutrition, and calling it hunger, and discovering perhaps a few hundred people, and calling them many thousand, are not going to give the actual figures.

I have put in the Record already the official figures on migrant workers, not just in Collier County but in the seven counties. I think Collier County had the most of any, but all of them had some.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to question him on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall in a moment. I have put in the figures for January of 1968 and for every month thereafter. The Senator will see that the largest number in any month was 3,600 in the whole seven counties. That is the workers, now, the migrant workers. The statement that this does not include the 22,000 migrants who harvest Collier's farm crops simply cannot help but be grossly exaggerated, regardless of who gave the figures; and it is to that fact that I am calling attention.

I do not question the Senator's objectivity. I do not question his kindness nor his sense of charity. Everyone knows he is an evangelist, and I am glad that we have two or three evangelists in the Senate.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think we have more than that.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the fact of the matter is that the figures are just inaccurate, and I know something about it, because this has been one of my own stamping grounds for many years, and I know all of the old families there and many of the newer ones. The idea of there being 4,000 or 5,000 destitute families there, when, to the contrary, there could not be half that many of migrant workers all told, at that time or in any 1 month, in that particular county, is also not in accord with the facts.

I do not mean by that that the testimony was not given, because I am sure it must have been, or the Senator from South Dakota would not have so reported it. I have never known the Senator to misstate anything on the floor of the Senate, and I do not ever expect him to, and I have made that very clear. I am simply calling his attention to the fact that someone has led him down an alley here, which does not lead to a sound conclusion, because it does not give the proper facts. I hope the Senator will appreciate that, because that is the point of view from which I have made this statement.

I have not tried to give him any general answer to his hearings, although I have a great deal of material that might be brought into the matter later. But on these two figures, I know the situation well, and since the hearings—as a matter of fact, only over the weekend—I called in to obtain, not from the witnesses the Senator talked to, but from the most credible sources in Collier County and the most credible sources at the capital, the true information, and I have already placed in the Record information upon which the Senator can rely as to the number of migrant workers in the three groups of counties.

One of those groups contains Collier County, and the three groups are the counties named in the list; it does not cover the whole State.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, would not the Senator agree that there could be a difference based on the criteria that he has used?

When we talk about migrant workers, that is a different matter than talking about the migrant population, which includes the children, the mothers, the boys and girls, and the whole families. I think that may be one discrepancy that exists between the figures the Senator is using and the ones I am using.

When we talk about a hungry person, it does not make any difference whether it is an adult or a 6-month-old infant, though the latter certainly cannot be classified as a worker.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator's words, in his statement, are as follows:

> . . . does not include the 22,000 Collier migrants who harvest Collier's $40 million farm crops.

There never has been any such number of migrants who harvested Collier County's farm crops. To the contrary, the official figures show that in the seven counties of which Collier County is a part, in January of 1968, there was about a tenth that number of actual migrant workers, and that in the maximum month in 1968, the population of migrant workers in those seven counties was 3,600.

So there is a discrepancy, but it is not in what the Senator from Florida has said; it is in the wording of the statement of the Senator from South Dakota; and it is that to which I am calling his attention.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the 22,000 figure will have to stand, on the basis of our hearings, but it may be that the Senator has a point, that that ought to be worded so as to make it very clear that it includes the children of migrant workers, the wives, and the elderly who are unable to work.

In other words, it embraces the entire migrant worker population, including those who actually labor in the fields, the children, and those who are unable to work.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the office at Tallahassee has just completed the compilation for January for all counties in the vegetable growing areas of the State. It shows that in January of this year, there were 2,628 in Collier County, in February, there were 2,902, and in March there were 2,799. I believe the hearing was held in late February, was it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. It was in March.

Mr. HOLLAND. Early March?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, the number could not have changed greatly.

Mr. McGOVERN. The 22,000 is a peak figure.

Mr. HOLLAND. So when you come to compare that figure, or rather contrast it, with the 22,000 reported in the Senator's statement, you can see there is gross exaggeration in the figures given to the Senator by somebody who testified before his committee, because I am sure he used figures that were given to him.

SENATOR JAVITS REMARKS ON FLORIDA FIELD HEARING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I apologize to my colleague Senator McGovern, the chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. I was attending a luncheon for the Prime Minister of Canada and asked to be excused before his address because I was anxious to come to the floor to discuss this matter.

As the ranking minority member of the committee, and because I was in Collier County with Senator McGovern, I can certainly verify the fact that the witnesses who should have known the facts, the county officials, testified that there were 22,000 migrant workers—not families, but workers—at the peak of the season.

The officials indicated that this large migrant population was responsible for county agricultural sales amounting to $40 million last year. Mr. President, I am sure that we will be able to ascertain how the State arrived at the figures to which the Senator from Florida has referred and I am certain that the Senator from South Dakota, or I, will insert them in the Record precisely as they were derived. The same procedure will be followed for the figures reported by the committee's witnesses to whom Senator McGovern referred earlier. By so doing, I am confident that any discrepancy will be clarified. However, and because of the circumstances, I must view the committee's figures as being factual and representative of the situation until such time as there is definite evidence to the contrary.

Mr. President, I think it is most important that we do not defy the evidence as seen through our own eyes. Whatever the number—and committee witnesses stated the figure at 22,000—it is capable of being defined in terms of the production of vegetables, fruits, and other produce. This is what the witnesses were referring to—the labor force and its circumstance of being.

Our visible evidence was of malnutrition amounting to hunger, and the philosophy of the county officials supported that situation, as the Senator from South Dakota has stated. They spoke of "Federal people," and that the Federal Government is not taking care of the people—the migrants—who are responsible

XUM

in great measure for the agricultural production, sales and wealth of the county.

I challenged the officials on their attitudes and by stating that here I am not repeating anything that was not stated to them in person. But notwithstanding the migratory workers' enormous contribution to the county's economy, the officials said they were "Federal people," and that they—the officials—were really not responsible for them. They further said that if the Federal Government wanted to give the migrants free food stamps, it was someone else's job and not theirs.

They came before the committee with the philosophy that migrants were going to be paid for what they produced, and that the county had no further responsibility to them. This was not all. The county officials further testified that their philosophy was that the only way they were going to get migrants to work in the fields was by operating with a "No work, no eat philosophy." This is what it really amounted to and in those primitive terms.

Mr. President, most important for us, because it has so shocked the conscience of this country, is not how many people are involved, but the extent to which the problem exist at all? I am convinced that it does exist. I am also convinced that it exists not only in Immokalee but throughout the country, including my own State of New York. For this reason, I organized a statewide committee composed of the deans of the 12 medical schools in the State of New York to investigate the extent of malnutrition and hunger. The New York Times this morning says there are hungry people in the city of New York. I do not dispute this. I do not know. I shall be shocked and saddened if it is so, just as any Senator would.

I can understand perfectly how the Senator from Florida feels. Nevertheless, the problem exists. This is something, previously unknown, that has been uncovered by the struggle against poverty.

If anything will spring us to the kind and scale of action that ought to be, it will be this specter: that there is actually such malnutrition in our country as to amount to hunger, not in one place but in many and perhaps even in our biggest cities with the best welfare programs.

Mr. President, I value, of course, whatever any Senator may say about his own State, attempting to clarify the facts and determine the magnitude of the problem. However, I rise today in an effort to point out that whatever our experience may have been, it does not diminish our responsibility nor the impact of the problem upon us.

I have been in this very struggle for a long time as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I was involved in the matter before this phase began. There is movement, and there will have to be more.

There is nothing sacrosanct about food stamps. They may have to be given free to the poorest of the poor, because food stamps are a very effective way to get food distributed.

We must all resolve—whether it is 2,700 migrants as the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) says, or 22,000 as we and the county officials say—that something must be done about it

We actually saw women with children who had no other means of subsistence except to go out on the farms and work. One woman told us that if she did not work—and she, though unmarried, had several children—she did not know where, using her words, she "could have somebody help" her out

Even the doctor in the community who operated the local health clinic—although he was only one man and had only one helper—said that even by prescription he could not do very much. He felt that if any county should have had a case of starvation called to its attention that that county would find a way to relieve the situation. He said that Collier County had allocated $7,500 of the budget for food assistance.

If the figures are remotely correct—2,700, let alone 22,000—that is a very small and sorry figure.

I have explained the philosophy involved. Whatever the right figure may be, this situation should not exist in our country. We must undertake a solemn resolution to deal with the situation in whatever form we have to deal with it, whether by an amendment to the law dealing with food stamps and the distribution of food or money, or some other way. We will do whatever we must do.

Then the work of the committee will have been a blessing. The committee is limited. It must develop these facts all over the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course the Senator from New York is used to dealing in large numbers. When he talks about malnutrition in his own city, he could easily talk about thousands and maybe many thousands. When we get into a rural county, however, where there is a small vegetable industry and a sizable cattle industry, using the figures in the statement, it is so out of proportion that I thought it my duty to call the matter to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota.

My friends who are so dedicated to this committee work are like others who are trying to solve the problem. It is primarily a problem of malnutrition rather than of hunger.

Last November Secretary of Agriculture Freeman came to me and asked to have relief funds from section 32, which is a very dear section to me, to set up a group of 5,000 paid workers to learn something about nutrition and then to circulate in the more poverty stricken areas, both of the cities and of the country.

They are working and have been working on this subject. And I think that the real answer to the problem is going to be one of education as to what is sound nutrition.

Although I did not attend the hearings because I had hearings of my own here, I found in the papers repeated statements as to the fact that some of these migrants were eating nothing but beans and grits and fatback. There are many thousands of people that have been living on just that kind of food. It may not be a very balanced diet and, as far as I am concerned, I probably would not live very long on it alone. I have probably eaten more grits than any three other Members of the Senate. It has not done me any harm.

The fact is that the people do not know what a balanced diet is. The real job is to let them know what it is.

I make the point that last fall the Department of Agriculture began a program. The testimony is that there were 5,000 of these workers, and quite a number of them were in two counties in South Carolina, where free food stamps were available.

The present Secretary of Agriculture came to me as the chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations and asked me to help because something needed to be done to make available free food stamps to the very deprived people in those two counties. I did so. Yet I did so reluctantly, because I think that the mere ability to purchase does little good in providing a balanced food diet if the people who are doing the purchasing would rather have something that is not nutritious and is not balanced and insisted on buying that.

The real answer is, of course, in a better dissemination of the information long spread by the domestic science agents in every county in my region, and I assume by the workers in most counties of the Nation as to how family heads can best feed their families.

So far as I am concerned, to talk about malnutrition makes sense to me. But when we talk about hunger in an area where, so far as residents are concerned, there was never any hunger to exist, and I do not think there ever will be, that is quite a different thing.

The only purpose for my speaking this afternoon is that I do not want the figures placed in the RECORD by the Senator from South Dakota, to go unchallenged, of 22,000 migrant workers in Collier County, when there has never been that many there. Collier County has never had that many migrants. Someone has misinformed the Senator. I do not want to have that figure go into the RECORD unchallenged.

Neither are there 4,000 to 5,000 destitute families. That number of destitute families would make up more than half the population of the county; and, incidentally, more than half the population of the county lives in the opulent end, in and around Naples.

I felt that I should communicate these facts to the Senate. I am not ready to discuss the greater issues until I find out in which direction the committee wants to go. But I am not going to support any program that will make the food stamp program a free stamp program or a general welfare program, because that was never the purpose of it.

I agree with Representative SULLIVAN, who has been the head of the movement in the House and who believes that to put the program on that sort of basis would simply wreck it. I have not seen the Senator's bill; he introduced it only today. I hope we can work out good legislation, but I do not want it to be, and I hope and believe it will not be, by way of making food stamps free to any large seg-

XUM

ment of people, or to place the program in the control of anybody who has no knowledge of what is malnutrition and what is sound diet.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, but I cannot accept the fine words of my colleague, the Senator from Florida, about the fact that this is not a balanced diet. I saw these kids, and so did the other members of the committee, and this was not a matter of their having an unbalanced diet. It was a matter of the larder being empty. In many cases, we actually looked into the larder to find out.

I also point out, that one of the figures in this area which is fascinating is the fact that the post-neo-natal mortality rate per thousand live births—that is, deaths from 1 month to 1 year after birth—in respect to this particular area is approximately three times the national average for the United States. For nonwhites it is 14 per thousand live births. For Collier County it is 40 per thousand live births. These are Federal Government statistics and I would like to ask unanimous consent to have these statistics placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATISTICAL CHART SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAVITS

POST NEONATAL MORTALITY RATE [1] PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS'
1966

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS [2]

	United States	Florida	Collier County
All persons	6.5	8.1	20.3
White	5.0	5.1	15.8
Nonwhite	14.0	15.6	40.8

[1] Deaths from 1 month to 1 year after birth.

[2] All figures taken from "Vital Statistics of the United States—1966," vol. I (natality), vol. II pts. A and B (mortality), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Center for Health Statistics.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is my duty, as it was the duty of the chairman of the committee, to testify to what we saw and heard; and we saw and heard about conditions which are equivalent to hunger, not just an unbalanced diet, in this particular part of the country.

We have seen it before in South Carolina, where a distinguished Senator, Senator HOLLINGS, testified to it himself. We have seen it—that is, a previous subcommittee on which I served with former Senator Clark, Senator MURPHY, and the late Senator Robert Kennedy—in Mississippi, and I feel we have seen it in Florida.

I said before that we may see it in New York. If we do, I will be the first one on the floor of the Senate to inveigh against anyone who is responsible. I do not care who it is or how high an official he may be. I shall do it. I shall not do my best to defend my State in some superficial way if my State has not done what is right.

That is all anybody asks; that is all anybody has a right to ask; and I should think that the people of any State would be proud of the fact that an effort would be made to correct a situation such as that. Conditions such as those described today can only cause the consciences of the people of any State to be deeply disheartened and sickened, that such conditions could exist in our country.

SENATOR JAVITS' STATEMENT ON THE ADMINISTRATION AND HUNGER

I understand that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), said before I arrived in the Chamber that we needed a very massive effort to solve these problems and that he was not satisfied that the administration's reported expenditures in this area were sufficient to meet the needs. That is premature. We do not know what the administration will do. However, I do not mind the injunction on one proviso. I do not think any of us would be so arrogant personally as to assume that the President of the United States or any Senator is less concerned about a matter of this kind than we are.

I feel that when the President does come to a conclusion and lays it before us, he has every right to be challenged. I will join with my colleagues in such a challenge if the President's decision does not meet the needs.

We ought to give the President the benefit of the doubt until such time as he lays a program before us. We should not allow hunger, malnutrition, and their related evils to take second place to money. On that point I agree with the Senator from South Dakota.

I think these conditions exist in many places and States, places in which we never dreamed they existed.

It is deeply shocking to the Nation. It may show us what statements about poverty actually mean as they relate to the action of the administration. Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and Secretary of HEW Finch have done their utmost to move bureaucracy in a way that was never done before.

The problem of hunger and malnutrition is entitled to No. 1 priority in this country. If America can do what needs to be done in matters of defense, then it can afford to do what needs to be done in matters involving malnutrition and hunger.

Mr. President, that is all I have to lay before the Senate

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator mentioned some vital statistics about the children, their rate of mortality, and so forth.

I was distressed to note, in reading the press accounts of the hearings down there, that this able committee would not even hear the State health officer of the State of Florida.

I want the RECORD to show something about who that officer is, because I brought him to Florida when I was Governor of that State. He was a very highly regarded member of the Public Health Service in Washington. I brought him to Florida because we had as our State health officer a man who was of some age and approaching retirement. Dr. Wilson Sowder became the State health officer of Florida very shortly after that time. He has been a man of great distinction, recognized all over this Nation for what he has done here and for some periods in Latin America, as a matter of fact.

When this committee went down there and declined to hear or allow to be heard the State health officer of Florida, a man of that distinction, on questions which he could have told them the truth, I regretted it exceedingly, and I voice that regret now, because I assume that what this committee wants, and what it should get, is the facts from the best possible sources.

I do not know what their reason was for declining to hear him. The newspaper reports that they did decline to hear him.

I want to make clear that not only do I know Dr. Sowder, but also, I brought him to Florida; and the Public Health Service was very reluctant to let us have him. They let us have him first, as I recall, on a 2- or 3-year-loan basis. Finally, I had to offer to make him the head of our Public Health Service as they would not permit him to stay there longer on a leave basis; and he resigned and came there, to do a magnificent job for our State. I am sorry that my distinguished friends did not see fit to hear him on a subject on which he could have told them more nearly what the facts are in an authoritative way than any of the OEO people and others who appeared before the committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The health officer to whom the Senator has referred did submit a statement to our committee, which was incorporated in the committee hearings, and to that extent the press reports were mistaken.

We suggested to the health officer that since we were not on a general investigation of health conditions but were there to look primarily into the problems of nutrition, he send his nutritionist who is attached to the Office of Public Health. With the consent and cooperation of Dr. Sowder, his nutritionist did appear, he did testify, and he brought with him the statement from Dr. Sowder, which he read into the record; and then, for a period of well over an hour, the State nutritionist attached to Dr. Sowder's office fielded questions from all members of the committee.

I found nothing in Dr. Sowder's statement that was at variance with what his nutritionist had to tell us. As a matter of fact, we pressed the interrogation considerably beyond what could have been expected of the committee. We had only two days there, but we did give the Public Health Office a good chance to make their case on this nutritional problem by calling a man in that department who is an expert in that field.

Mr. HOLLAND. My information is that Dr. Sowder sent the committee a wire before the committee left Washington, requesting the right to be heard before the committee, and he was never given that right. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. MCGOVERN. What we suggested to him was that we had his nutritionist scheduled to testify and that he was the man who could best give the committee the information we were seeking. But we did accept the doctor's statement, and it became a part of the hearing record. He filed a full statement.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Select

Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (Mr. McGOVERN) has delivered an excellent report on the committee's field investigation in Florida on March 10 and 11, 1969. In support of the report, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I issued to the press in Minnesota on March 16, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND STATEMENT

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

There are times in the life of a public official when he is brought face to face with the shocking reality of hunger and dire poverty. I have just had such an experience in visiting depressed areas of Lee and Collier Counties in Southwest Florida as a member of the Senate's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

We saw many who lived in shacks which were unfit for human habitation. We saw children and old people who regularly missed one or two meals a day and who depended on grits and fatback to survive. And we saw people of all ages who were obviously defeated by these conditions.

In the evenings I met privately with migrant workers, who constitute a large segment of the population of Southern Florida. They told me a story of unequalled human misery and despair—of seldom having enough to eat, of seldom knowing where or when their next job would be, of seldom being eligible for community services we take for granted. They are often unable to vote, and rejected by the communities they help make prosperous. To put it very simply, they are treated as less than human beings.

The people I talked with travel the length and breadth of our land in search of jobs. They do not know what it means to have a place to call home, or to have their children enrolled in fewer than 3 or 4 different schools every school year. They are the dispossessed and the disoriented—people who are chasing the American dream, but destroying themselves and their families in the process.

What I saw during the day and what I heard at night had a profound impact on me. But it is the faces of listless and undersized young children that I cannot get out of my mind—faces which stared straight ahead, indicating no comprehension of the world around them. The condition of these children was the vivid and terrible proof of what nutritionists and pediatricians have been telling our Committee for the past several months, i.e., that children who are malnourished suffer irreversible brain damage, as well as injury to the body's tissues.

I could see the result of many years of malnutrition and sordid living conditions in the parents of these children. It is not over-dramatic to characterize their existence as a "shadow-life"—hemmed in by poverty in its most extreme form and yet too weak, too ill, and simply too worn down to press for change.

As a result of this trip, I now know to be true what I had suspected for some time.

To begin with, the effects of hunger and malnutrition are even more severe than the testimony of experts would lead one to believe. I am convinced that malnutrition and primitive living conditions have a direct causal relationship with the "shadow-life" existence of so many of the people we saw.

I am also convinced that the often heard cries that the poor are lazy and that their sole purpose in life is to obtain welfare benefits are among the great myths of our time.

Few people in this country work as hard as the migrants living in Collier County; the work is so difficult that many are physically "washed-out" at the age of 45. And in Lee County, representative of the people I talked with was a sixty-three year old woman who had only recently stopped picking tomatoes because of failing eyesight, despite the fact that she was afflicted with arthritis and varicose veins.

As to the notion that the poor are constantly in search of government handouts, how does one explain the fact that in Lee County, where there is a commodity food program, many of those eligible and in desperate need of food do not participate in the program? Their failure to participate in this program as well as their failure to obtain other welfare benefits for which they were obviously eligible, is certainly inconsistent with the myth.

And finally, I realized the grave harm which results from the Federal Government's failure or inability to provide sufficient food for people when the local government has abdicated its responsibility to do so. Collier County officials have repeatedly refused to participate in the Commodity Program, ignoring their citizens' pleas for participation and ignoring the overwhelming need for such a program. In a county where there are often as many as 22,000 migrants in residence, the attitude of these local officials was best expressed by one Commissioner's assertion that the county had no responsibility for these individuals since they were "federal people."

And even in Lee County, the harsh and restrictive administration of the Commodity Program by the county welfare director has led to a situation where less than 2% of the County's population receive commodity foods, while 32% of the population earns less than $3,000 per year. The officials in this county have repeatedly refused to hire outreach workers or to set up food distribution centers nearer to the depressed areas of the county.

But it would be a mistake to assume that extreme poverty and malnutrition exist only where there are indifferent and disdainful local officials. I am sure that equally intolerable conditions can be found anywhere in the country. I know, for example, that similar conditions exist in Minnesota on some of our Indan reservations and in the ghettos of our cities.

The truth is that we have all failed the poor and hungry in this country, and those of us who are public officials must accept a large share of the blame for this failure. What is even worse is that it is impossible to calculate the damage which has occurred as a result of this failure. For example, while we know that in Collier County 41 out of every 1000 infants die before they are one year old, there is no way to estimate the amount of irreversible brain damage in the children who survive.

As to the federal government's role in eliminating hunger in the United States, I think the following actions must be taken immediately:

1. Free food stamps must be made available to those under the poverty level, as well as to those whose income prevents them from attaining a fully adequate and nutritious diet.

2. A county should be able to participate simultaneously in the food stamp program and the direct food distribution program.

3. The Federal Government should distribute *all* commodities, whether or not in surplus, to supplement the food stamp program.

4. An applicant should be eligible for these programs after submitting an affidavit, with no onerous red tape.

These measures and others are contained in the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1969, which I re-introduced in this session of Congress. I hope that there will be sufficient public pressure as a result of the Select Committee's investigations to insure passage of this legislation.

In addition, the school lunch program must be expanded to provide every needy child with a free lunch; at the present time the school lunch program reaches less than half of the nation's school children. Even more importantly, the school breakfast program, which has only been established on a pilot basis, must be expanded to reach all children from poor families. Our committee has repeatedly been told that a child's ability to learn is greatly enhanced after he has had a decent breakfast.

And finally, we must devise a food distribution system which will enable pregnant mothers and pre-school age children to have an adequate and nutritious diet. Such a system is absolutely essential, for it is from the pre-natal period to age five that hunger and malnutrition are most devastating to the mental and physical condition of a young child.

S. 1664—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BROADEN THE PRESENT DEFINITION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), a bill to broaden the present definition of bank holding companies, reaffirming a major principle of the U.S. economy—namely, the separation of banking and commerce.

We are witnessing today a clear and present danger both to sound banking practices and to the diversity we have all come to recognize as being basic to the American enterprise system.

Sound banking practices—which have a decided effect on our economic structure—must be preserved. Reasonable, but immediate restraints must be placed on those activities which tend to erode the basic tenents which characterize our economic practices and system.

The dangers we face are the growing number of bank acquisitions by industrial conglomerates and, conversely, the potential for multi-billion-dollar banks to acquire large and diverse nonfinancial businesses.

Although this trend is just emerging, it must be stopped. If permitted to continue, it seems predictable that our economy could shift during the next few years from one where power is now widely dispersed among a vast number and variety of interests, into one dominated by a few large power centers, each comprising a major industrial-financial complex. If this trend goes unchecked, we could witness the insertion of a new word to the American business vocabulary—"zaibatsu," which means, according to one definition, "financial clique."

This bill provides an equitable—although stringent—regulation that is needed to prevent such a concentration. It draws a clear line—and that is what we need now, this year, in 1969—to prevent financially related activities from being drawn under a single roof with commercial and industrial-related activities.

While achievement of that objective would appear to be reasonably simple, it can only be brought about by a quite sophisticated statute. I believe that this bill, developed by all the relevant sections of the executive branch, will effectively separate banking from commerce. At the same time it will give full consideration to the serious questions arising in the antitrust area.

Before describing the legislation, let me briefly develop the history of this problem:

The principles of preserving the watertight door between financial power and industrial-commercial power were laid down in the Bank Act of 1933 and were bolstered in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Private enterprise benefited our banking system.

Since the public interest required that banks be regulated, it followed logically that companies which owned banks be regulated as well. Accordingly, the 1956 act provided for the appropriate regulation of all holding companies that owned 25 percent or more of the stock of two or more banks.

For a decade, this act worked well. It exempted from Federal regulation holding companies that controlled only one bank, since these relatively small one-bank holding companies were a useful device that enabled many medium-sized communities to enjoy progressive banking services.

Mr. President, that pattern is familiar to most of us, I think. In a small community, usually there are one or two families that have the financial capacity to operate a bank, and usually they are related with a local commercial enterprise such as a lumber yard, a hardware store, or a general store. We permit those combinations to exist.

But there were those, as far back as 1956, who held that this one-bank exemption might one day be abused.

President Eisenhower, when he signed the 1956 act, noted that "further attention of the Congress" would be necessary to control activities which he said could result from the "exemptions and special provisions" of the act.

Now is the time for Congress to eliminate those exemptions.

Recent figures show that the one-bank exemption is leading to excessive concentration.

In 1955 there were 117 one-bank holding companies controlling bank deposits of about $12 billion. Within 10 years the number of such companies had grown significantly, to 550. But while this growth had occurred primarily in the form of small companies, the bank deposits figure had risen a total of only $15 billion.

At the end of 1965, the average bank deposit figures for one-bank holding companies were less than $30 million. This supports the congressional view, held only 3 years ago, that the one-bank exemption in the act had not given birth to any dangerous transformation in our economic structure.

However, dramatic changes have occurred during the past year. Taking into account announcements of intention to create one-bank holding companies, the figures at the end of 1968 showed growth to almost 800 companies controlling bank deposits in excess of $100 billion.

There is no doubt that the possibility of financial pressure being brought to bear in this situation exists—and, whether actually exercised or not, the very presence of this potential is harmful to the free enterprise system.

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1969 will rebuild the wall separating diverse economic interests. Under the legislation:

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 will be amended to extend Federal regulation of bank holding companies to those companies which control one bank.

All corporations which have affiliated with banks since June 30, 1968, will be required to confine their activities to the financial, fiduciary, or insurance functions specified in the 1956 act.

Activities which are bank related will be decided by a unanimous agreement of the three appropriate bank regulatory agencies, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

This latter provision, I believe, is a key element in this legislation.

Under it, the regulatory authorities, in considering whether to approve acquisitions, must consider the factors of competitiveness and public interest. In turn, these characteristics are taken into account by an interagency group, which makes a list defining bank-related activities.

This is a stringent safety valve.

Many bankers are properly worried about the takeover of banks by industrial conglomerates. Many industrialists are equally worried about the domination of huge bank holding companies. The fact is that whoever wins in such a battle, business, as a whole, suffers—with the basic economic structure a certain loser.

The free enterprise system, source of our Nation's strength, must constantly guard against even the potential of economic oligarchy. Financial-industrial power centers should not be permitted to develop. Such domination of the economy must be prevented.

Other bills, on this same subject, have been introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

President Nixon, at an early date of his administration, said this subject was one of the most important facing our economy. He has given his strongest endorsement to this measure.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement released by the White House today when the bank holding company legislation was released.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 24, 1969.*

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The Secretary of the Treasury, with my approval, has today transmitted to the Congress proposed legislation on the further regulation of bank holding companies.

Legislation in this area is important because there has been a disturbing trend in past year toward erosion of the tranditional separation of powers between the suppliers of money—the banks—and the users of money—commerce and industry.

Left unchecked, the trend toward the combining of banking and business could lead to the formation of a relatively small number of power centers dominating the American economy. This must not be permitted to happen; it would be bad for banking, bad for business, and bad for borrowers and consumers.

The strength of our economic system is rooted in diversity and free competition; the strength of our banking system depends largely on its independence. Banking must not dominate commerce or be dominated by it.

To protect competition and the separation of economic powers, I strongly endorse the extension of Federal regulation to one-bank holding companies and urge the Congress to take prompt and appropriate action.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I believe this legislation is in the best interests of the country, its economy, and our banking system. I urge this Congress to give it speedy and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record in its entirety and that a brief analysis of the bill and a statement showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill also be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, the analysis, and the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1664) to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bennett (for himself and Mr. Sparkman), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Bank Holding Company Act of 1969."

Sec. 2. The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 is amended—

(a) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) 'Bank holding company' means any company (1) that directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of any bank or of a company that is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of this Act, (2) that controls in any manner the election of a majority of the director of any bank, or (3) that has the power directly or indirectly to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of any bank; and, for the purposes of this Act, any successor to any such company shall be deemed to be a bank holding company from the date as of which such predecessor company became a bank holding company. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (A) no bank or no company owning or controlling voting shares of a bank shall be a bank holding company by virtue of such bank's ownership or control of shares in a fiduciary of capacity except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in subsection (b) of this section, or as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (g) of this section, (B) no company shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its ownership or control of shares acquired by it in connection with its underwriting of securities if such shares are held only for such period of time as will permit the sale thereof on a reasonable basis, and (C) no company formed for the sole purpose of participating in a proxy solicitation shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its control of voting rights of shares acquired in the course of such solicitation."

(b) by amending subsection (b) by inserting "partnership," immediately after "corporation," by striking "(1)" and by striking ", or (2) any partnership".

(c) by amending subsection (d) by striking "or" immediately preceding "(2)," and by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

"or (3) any company, whose management or policies such bank holding company has the power directly or indirectly to cause the direction of or direct.

" 'Total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks' as used in subsection (h) of this section shall include assets held by the bank holding company if it is a bank."

(d) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and by inserting immediately before it a new subsection to read as follows:

"(h) 'Appropriate banking agency' means

(1) The Comptroller of the Currency with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are national banks or district banks exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System and exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System;

(2) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered non-members of the Federal Reserve System but whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System;

(3) The Board with respect to any bank holding company not included under paragraphs (1) or (2) hereof." (e) by amending subsection (i) as designated by subparagraph (d) hereof by striking the words "the banking." (a) Section 3 is amended—

(a) by striking the first word of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"A company which is not a bank holding company may, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, become a bank holding company with respect to a national bank, or, with the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, become a bank holding company with respect to a state bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation but which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System. Except as provided in the preceding sentence it".

(b) by adding in subsection (a) immediately preceding the sentence beginning with the word "Notwithstanding" the following new sentence:

"It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1971, for any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, to retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any bank or bank holding company acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of such Act, or of 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of any bank or bank holding company any part of which was acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, unless such retention is approved in the manner prescribed in the two preceding sentences."

(c) by striking from subsection (c) the words "The Board shall not approve" and inserting in lieu thereof "Neither the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, nor the Board shall approve".

(d) by striking from subsection (c) the words "the Board shall take" and inserting in lieu thereof "there shall be taken".

(3) Section 4(a) is amended—

(a) by striking "Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "appropriate banking agency".

(b) by amending subparagraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) after two years from the date as of which it becomes a bank holding company, or, in the case of any company that has been continuously affiliated since May 15, 1955, with a company which was registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, prior to May 15, 1955, in such a manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of that Act, after December 31, 1978, retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank or bank holding company or engage in any businesses or activities other than (i) those of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank with respect to which it is a bank holding company, (ii) those specified under clause (8) of subsection (c) of this section subject to all the conditions specified therein, or (iii) those in which it was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968, and in which it has been continuously engaged since that date."

(4) Section 4(c) is amended—

(a) by amending clause (5) to read as follows:

"(5) shares acquired and held in the manner, kinds and amounts specifically permissible for national banks under provisions of Federal statute law and regulations issued pursuant thereto;"

(b) by amending clause (8) to read as follows:

"(8) shares retained or acquired with the approval of the appropriate banking agency in any company (other than a company engaged principally in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution at wholesale or retail or through syndicate participation of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes or other securities) engaged exclusively in activities that have been determined by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board (1) to be financial or related to finance in nature or of a fiduciary or insurance nature, and (2) to be in the public interest when offered by a bank holding company or its subsidiaries.

"No retention nor acquisition may be approved under this clause except pursuant to and in accordance with guidelines established by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board. In establishing such guidelines consideration shall be given to any potential anti-competitive effects of a bank holding company engaging in any proposed type of activity, and limitations on permissible activities may be established on the basis of any relevant factors, including size of bank holding company or its subsidiary banks, the size of any company to be acquired or retained, and the size of communities in which such activities should be permitted.

The appropriate banking agency shall not approve—

(a) any retention or acquisition under this clause which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize any part of trade or commerce in any part of the United States, or

(b) any retention or acquisition under this clause whose effect in any line of commerce in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any other manner would be in restraint of trade.

In every case, the appropriate banking agency shall take into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served."

(c) by amending clause (9) to read as follows:

"(9) shares lawfully acquired and owned on December 31, 1968, in any company organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged principally in banking or other financial operations outside the United States;

(d) by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon and by adding the following:

"(11) shares lawfully acquired and owned on June 30, 1968, by any company (or subsidiary thereof) which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, so long as the company issuing such shares is not engaging and does not engage in any business or activities other than those in which it or the bank holding company (or its subsidiaries) was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968;

"(12) shares lawfully acquired and owned by a subsidiary of a bank holding company if both the subsidiary and the company issuing the shares are organized under the laws of a foreign country and do not operate in the United States; or

"(13) shares retained or acquired by any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, but which ceases to be a bank holding company no later than June 30, 1971, or such other date not later than June 30, 1974, as may be fixed by the appropriate banking agency in the manner prescribed in subsection (a) of this section."

(5) Section 5 is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Information received by the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be made available to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act."

(b) Subsection (b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are each authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.".

(c) Subsection (c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The authority granted herein to the Board is hereby granted also to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act."

(6) Section 8 is amended by striking the words "by the Board".

(7) Section 9 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Any party aggrieved by an order issued under this Act may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals within any circuit wherein such party has its principal place of business, or in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, by filing in the court, within thirty days after the entry of the order, a petition praying that the order be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted to the agency issuing the order by the clerk of the court, and thereupon the agency shall file in the court the record made before it, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have the jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify

XUM

the order and to require the agency issuing such order to take such action with regard to the matter under review as the court deems proper. The findings of the agency as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive."

(8) Section 11 is amended—

(a) by amending the first sentence of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"The Board shall immediately notify the Attorney General of any approval by it pursuant to this Act of a proposed acquisition, merger, consolidation or other transaction by which a bank holding company acquires a bank (hereinafter referred to as a 'bank acquisition'), and such a bank acquisition may not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day after the date of approval by the Board."

(b) by further amending subsection (b) by striking the words "acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction" at each place they appear in the second and succeeding sentences, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "bank acquisition."

(c) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) The appropriate banking agency shall notify the Attorney General of any application received by it under section 4 (c) (8) of this Act.

"(h) Each appropriate banking agency shall include in its annual report to the Congress a description and a statement of the reasons for approval of each transaction approved by it under section 4(c) (8) of this Act during the period covered by the report."

SEC. 3. (a) No bank holding company or subsidiary of a bank holding company may in any manner extend credit, lease or sell property of any kind, or furnish any service, or fix or vary the consideration for any of the foregoing, on the condition, agreement, or understanding

(A) that the customer shall obtain some other credit, property, or service from the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company; or

(B) that the customer shall not obtain credit, property, or services from a competitor of the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company.

(b) The district courts of the United States have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of subsection (a) of this section, and it is the duty of the United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. The proceedings may be by way of a petition setting forth the case and praying that the violation be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of have been duly notified of the petition; the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case. While the petition is pending, and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as it deems just in the premises. Whenever it appears to the court that the ends of justice required that other parties be brought before it, the court may cause them to be summoned whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not, and subpenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(c) In any action brought by or on behalf of the United States under subsection (a) of this section, subpoenas for witnesses may run into any district, but no writ of subpoena may issue for witnesses living out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than one hundred miles from the place of holding the same without the permission of the trial court being first had upon proper application and cause shown.

(d) Any person who is injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in subsection (a) of this section may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover three-fold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

(e) Any person, firm, corporation, or association may sue for and have injunctive relief, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, against threatened loss or damage by violation of subsection (a) of this section, under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity, under the rules governing such proceedings. Upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.

(f) Any action to enforce any cause of action under this section shall be forever barred unless commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued.

The analysis presented by Mr. BENNETT, is as follows:

ANALYSIS: BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

The first section would designate the Act as the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969.

Section 2 is divided into eight subparagraphs, all of which would amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The amendments are as follows:

Paragraph (1) would amend section 2 containing definitions. It would redefine "bank holding company" to include any company which owns or controls one bank, and to include any company which in fact has power to control the management of any bank; it would provide a definition of "appropriate banking agency"; finally, it would make clear that the Act is not intended to have extraterritorial application.

Paragraph (2) would provide that any company which wishes to become a bank holding company may do so with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency if it seeks to acquire a national bank, with the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation if it seeks to acquire a nonmember insured bank, and with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board for any other bank acquisition. It would also require retroactive approval for any acquisition of one bank by any company (other than a bank holding company) made after March 1, 1969, and before the date of enactment.

Paragraph (3) would amend the Act to permit any company which under the Act would become a one-bank holding company to continue to engage in any businesses or activities in which it was engaged on June 30, 1968.

Paragraph (4) would amend section 4(c) in several respects. It would make a technical amendment to insure that bank holding companies would have to get the same type of approval as national banks for the acquisition of corporate shares that national banks are permitted to acquire. It would require federal approval for the acquisition after December 31, 1968, of the shares of any bank organized in a foreign country and engaged in the banking business outside the United States. It would permit one-bank holding companies to keep other companies which they owned on June 30, 1968, so long as those companies did not engage in new businesses. It would provide that foreign subsidiaries of bank holding companies could retain and acquire shares in other foreign corporations which do not operate in the United States. It would permit a one-bank holding company to retain or acquire shares in any company until June 30, 1971, provided that it disposes of its banks no later than that date. This period of time could be extended by the appropriate banking agency for an additional three years, but no extension could be for more than one year at a time.

Paragraph (4) would also permit bank holding companies to retain or acquire shares in other companies engaged exclusively in activities that have been determined by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board to be financial or related to finance in nature or of a fiduciary or insurance nature, and to be in the public interest when offered by a bank holding company. (This would not include engaging in the securities business.)

The retention or acquisition of shares under this authority would have to be approved by the appropriate banking agency, which would be the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a bank holding company having primarily national banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of a bank holding company having primarily nonmember insured banks, and by the Federal Reserve in all other cases. The approval authority would have to be exercised under guidelines established by unanimous agreement of the three bank supervisory agencies. In the establishment of the guidelines consideration would have to be given to potential anticompetitive effects, and the guidelines could include limits based on size either of companies or banks involved or of communities involved. Also, in considering applications the banking agencies would have to apply anticompetitive and banking standards similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 as amended in 1966.

Paragraph (5) would make technical changes in the sections of the Bank Holding Company Act dealing with administration. All bank holding companies, including one-bank holding companies, would have to register with the Federal Reserve Board, but the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would each have access to necessary information, and each would be authorized to issue regulations and orders, to require reports under oath and to make examinations.

Paragraph (6) would extend criminal penalties contained in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, to violations of any regulation or order issued by any of the three bank supervisory agencies.

Paragraph (7) would provide for judicial review of any order issued by any of the three agencies.

Paragraph (8) would require that the Attorney General be notified of any application for the acquisition by a bank holding company of shares in any company other than a bank; and would require that each application approved be described in the agency's annual report.

Section 3 of the bill would prohibit tie-in arrangements which would condition the furnishing of any service on the obtaining of any other service. The district courts would have jurisdiction to restrain violations of this provision and suit for that purpose could be brought by the Attorney General.

The statement, presented by Mr. BENNETT, is as follows:

STATEMENT SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL—THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED (70 STAT. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841 ET SEQ.)

(NOTE.—Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets and new matter in italics.)

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) "Bank holding company" means any company (1) that directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of [each of two or more banks] *any bank* or

XUM

of a company that is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of this Act, or (2) that controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of [each of two or more banks] *any bank, or (3) that has the power directly or indirectly to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of any bank;* and, for the purposes of this Act, any successor to any such company shall be deemed to be a bank holding company from the date as of which such predecessor company became a bank holding company. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (A) no bank and no company owning or controlling voting shares of a bank shall be a bank holding company by virtue of such bank's ownership or control of shares in a fiduciary capacity[.] except *where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in subsection* (*b*) *of this section, or* as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (g) of this section, (B) no company shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its ownership or control of shares acquired by it in connection with its underwriting of securities if such shares are held only for such period of time as will permit the sale thereof on a reasonable basis, and (C) no company formed for the sole purpose of participating in a proxy solicitation shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its control of voting rights of shares acquired in the course of such solicitation.

(b) "Company" means any corporation, *partnership*, business trust, association, or similar organization, or any other trust unless by its terms it must terminate within twenty-five years or not later than twenty-one years and ten months after the death of individuals living on the effective date of the trust, but shall not include [(1)] any corporation the majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or by any State[, or (2) any partnership].

(c) "Bank" means any institution that accepts deposits that the depositor has a legal right to withdraw on demand, but shall not include any organization operating under section 25 or section 25(a) of the Federal Reserve Act, or any organization that does not do business within the United States. "District bank" means any bank organized or operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

(d) "Subsidiary", with respect to a specified bank holding company, means (1) any company 25 per centum or more of whose voting shares (excluding shares owned by the United States or by any company wholly owned by the United States) is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by such bank holding company, or is held by it with power to vote; [or] (2) any company the election of a majority of whose directors is controlled in any manner by such bank holding company; *or (3) any company, whose management or policies such bank holding company has the power directly or indirectly to cause the direction of or direct.*

"Total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks" as used in subsection (*h*) *of this section shall include assets held by the bank holding company if it is a bank.*

(e) The term "successor" shall include any company which acquires directly or indirectly from a bank holding company shares of any bank, when and if the relationship between such company and the bank holding company is such that the transaction effects no substantial change in the control of the bank or beneficial ownership of such shares of such bank. The Board may, by regulation, further define the term "successor" to the extent necessary to prevent evasion of the purposes of this Act.

(f) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(g) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) shares owned or controlled by any subsidiary of a bank holding company shall be deemed to be indirectly owned or controlled by such bank holding company;

(2) shares held or controlled directly or indirectly by trustees for the benefit of (A) a company, (B) the shareholders or members of a company, or (C) the employees (whether exclusively or not) of a company, shall be deemed to be controlled by such company; and

(3) shares transferred after January 1, 1966, by any bank holding company (or by any company which, but for such transfer, would be a bank holding company) directly or indirectly to any transferee that is indebted to the transferor, or has one or more officers, directors, trustees, or beneficiaries in common with or subject to control by the transferor, shall be deemed to be indirectly owned or controlled by the transferor unless the Board, after opportunity for hearing, determines that the transferor is not in fact capable of controlling the transferee.

(h) "Appropriate banking agency" means (1) The Comptroller of the Currency with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are national banks or district banks exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System and exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System; (2) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to any bank holding company of which the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered non-members of the Federal Reserve System but whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, exceed the total banking assets held by its subsidiary banks which are State-chartered members of the Federal Reserve System; (3) The Board with respect to any bank holding company not included under paragraphs (*1*) or (*2*) *hereof.*

[(h)] (i) The application of this Act and of section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371), as amended, shall not be affected by the fact that a transaction takes place wholly or partly outside the United States or that a company is organized or operates outside the United States: *Provided, however*, That the prohibitions of section 4 of this Act shall not apply to shares of any company organized under the laws of a foreign country that does not do any business within the United States, if such shares are held or acquired by a bank holding company that is principally engaged in [the banking] business outside the United States.

ACQUISITION OF BANK SHARES OR ASSETS

Sec. 3. (a) [It] *A company which is not a bank holding company may, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, become a bank holding company with respect to a national bank, or with the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, become a bank holding company with respect to a state bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation but which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System. Except as provided in the preceding sentence it* shall be unlawful, except with the prior approval of the Board, (1) for any action to be taken that causes any company to become a bank holding company; (2) for any action to be taken that causes a bank to become a subsidiary of a bank holding company; (3) for any bank holding company to acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any bank, if after such acquisition, such company will directly or indirectly own or control more than 5 per centum of the voting shares of such bank; (4) for any bank holding company or subsidiary thereof, other than a bank, to acquire all or substantially all of the assets of a bank; or (5) for any bank holding company to merge or consolidate with any other bank holding company. *It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1971, for any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, to retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any bank or bank holding company acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of such Act, or of 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of any bank or bank holding company any part of which was acquired after March 1, 1969, and prior to the date of enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, unless such retention is approved in the manner prescribed in the two preceding sentences.* Notwithstanding the foregoing this prohibition shall not apply to (A) shares acquired by a bank, (i) in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b) and except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(g), or (ii) in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith, but any shares required after the date of enactment of this Act in securing or collecting any such previously contracted debt shall be disposed of within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired; or (B) additional shares acquired by a bank holding company in a bank in which such bank holding company owned or controlled a majority of the voting shares prior to such acquisition.

(b) Upon receiving from a company any application for approval under this section, the Board shall give notice to the Comptroller of the Currency, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired is a national banking association or a District bank, or to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired is a State bank, and shall allow thirty days within which the views and recommendations of the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority, as the case may be, may be submitted. If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority so notified by the Board disapproves the application in writing within said thirty days, the Board shall forthwith give written notice of that fact to the applicant. Within three days after giving such notice to the applicant, the Board shall notify in writing the applicant and the disapproving authority of the date for commencement of a hearing by it on such application. Any such hearing shall be commenced not less than ten nor more than thirty days after the Board has given written notice to the applicant of the action of the disapproving authority. The length of any such hearing shall be determined by the Board, but it shall afford all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to testify at such hearing. At the conclusion thereof, the Board shall by order grant or deny the application on the basis of the record made at such hearing.

(c) [The Board shall not approve] *Neither the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, nor the Board shall approve—*

(1) any acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize or to attempt to monopolize the business of banking in any part of the United States, or

(2) any other proposed acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section whose effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any manner would be in restraint of trade, unless it finds that the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly weighed in the public interest by the prob-

XUM

able effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

In every case, [the Board shall take] *there shall be taken* into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted on the effective date of this amendment or the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication. For the purposes of this section, the State in which the operations of a bank holding company's subsidiaries are principally conducted is that State in which total deposits of all such banking subsidiaries are largest.

INTERESTS IN NONBANKING ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, no bank holding company shall—

(1) after the date of enactment of this Act acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank, or

(2) after two years from the date as of which it becomes a bank holding company, or, in the case of any company that has been continuously affiliated since May 15, 1955, with a company which was registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, prior to May 15, 1955, in such a manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of that Act, after December 31, 1978, retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank or a bank holding company or engage in any [business other than that of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank of which it owns or controls 25 per centum or more of the voting shares] *businesses or activities other than (i) those of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank with respect to which it is a bank holding company, (ii) those specified under clause (8) of subsection (c) of this section subject to all the conditions specified therein, or (iii) those in which it was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968, and in which it has been continuously engaged since that date.*

The [Board] *appropriate banking agency* is authorized, upon application by a bank holding company, to extend the period referred to in paragraph (2) above from time to time as to such bank holding company for not more than one year at a time, if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest, but no such extensions shall in the aggregate exceed three years.

(b) After two years from the date of enactment of this Act, no certificate evidencing shares of any bank holding company shall bear any statement purporting to represent shares of any other company except a bank or bank holding company, nor shall the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any bank holding company be conditioned in any manner whatsoever upon the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any other company except a bank or bank holding company.

(c) The prohibitions in this section shall not apply to any bank holding company which is a labor, agricultural, or horticultural organization and which is exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and such prohibitions shall not, with respect to any other bank holding company, apply to—

(1) shares of any company engaged or to be engaged solely in one or more of the following activities: (A) holding or operating properties used wholly or substantially by any banking subsidiary of such bank holding company in the operations of such banking subsidiary or acquired for such future use; or (B) conducting a safe deposit business; or (C) furnishing services to or performing services for such bank holding company or its banking subsidiaries; or (D) liquidating assets acquired from such bank holding company or its banking subsidiaries or acquired from any other source prior to May 9, 1956, or the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later;

(2) shares acquired by a bank in satisfaction of a debt previously contracted in good faith, but such bank shall dispose of such shares within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired, except that the Board is authorized upon application by such bank holding company to extend such period of two years from time to time as to such holding company for not more than one year at a time if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest, but no such extensions shall extend beyond a date five years after the date on which such shares were acquired;

(3) shares acquired by such bank holding company from any of its subsidiaries which subsidiary has been requested to dispose of such shares by any Federal or State authority having statutory power to examine such subsidiary, but such bank holding company shall dispose of such shares within a period of two years from the date on which they were acquired;

(4) shares held or acquired by a bank in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b) and except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(g);

[(5) shares which are of the kinds and amounts eligible for investment by national banking associations under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes;]

(5) shares acquired and held in the manner, kinds and amounts specifically permissible for national banks under provisions of Federal statute law and regulations issued pursuant thereto;

(6) shares of any company which do not include more than 5 per centum of the outstanding voting shares of such company;

(7) shares of an investment company which is not a bank holding company and which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, which securities do not include more than 5 per centum of the outstanding voting shares of any company;

[(8) shares of any company all the activities of which are or are to be of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature and which the Board after due notice and hearing, and on the basis of the record made at such hearing, by order has determined to be so closely related to the business of banking or of managing or controlling banks as to be a proper incident thereto and as to make it unnecessary for the prohibitions of this section to apply in order to carry out the purposes of this Act;]

(8) shares retained or acquired with the approval of the appropriate banking agency in any company (other than a company engaged principally in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution at wholesale or retail or through syndicate participation of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes or other securities) engaged exclusively in activities that have been determined by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board (1) to be financial or related to finance in nature or of a fiduciary or insurance nature, and (2) to be in the public interest when offered by a bank holding company or its subsidiaries.

No retention nor acquisition may be approved under this clause except pursuant to and in accordance with guidelines established by unanimous agreement of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board. In establishing such guidelines consideration shall be given to any potential anticompetitive effects of a bank holding company engaging in any proposed type of activity, and limitations on permissible activities may be established on the basis of any relevant factors, including size of bank holding company or its subsidiary banks, the size of any company to be acquired or retained, and the size of communities in which such activities should be permitted.

The appropriate banking agency shall not approve—

(a) any retention or acquisition under this clause which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize any part of trade or commerce in any part of the United States, or

(b) any retention or acquisition under this clause whose effect in any line of commerce in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any other manner would be in restraint of trade.

In every case, the appropriate banking agency shall take into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

[(9) shares of any company which is or is to be organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is or is to be engaged principally in the banking business outside the United States; or]

(9) shares lawfully acquired and owned on December 31, 1968, in any company organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged principally in banking or other financial operations outside the United States;

(10) shares lawfully acquired and owned prior to May 9, 1956, by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries[.]*;*

(11) shares lawfully acquired and owned on June 30, 1968, by any company (or subsidiary thereof) which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, so long as the company issuing such shares is not engaging and does not engage in any business or activities other than those in which it or the bank holding company (or its subsidiaries) was lawfully engaged on June 30, 1968;

(12) shares lawfully acquired and owned by a subsidiary of a bank holding company if both the subsidiary and the company issuing, the shares are organized under the laws of a foreign country and do not operate in the United States; or

(13) shares retained or acquired by any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, but which ceases to be a bank holding company no later than June 30, 1971, or such other date not later than June 30, 1974, as may be

fixed by the appropriate banking agency in the manner prescribed in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) With respect to shares which were not subject to the prohibitions of this section as originally enacted by reason of any exemption with respect thereto but which were made subject to such prohibitions by the subsequent repeal of such exemption, no bank holding company shall retain direct or indirect ownership or control of such shares after five years from the date of the repeal of such exemption, except as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (a). Any bank holding company subject to such five-year limitation on the retention of nonbanking assets shall endeavor to divest itself of such shares promptly and such bank holding company shall report its progress in such divestiture to the Board two years after repeal of the exemption applicable to it and annually thereafter.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 5. (a) Within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, or within one hundred and eighty days after becoming a bank holding company, whichever is later, each bank holding company shall register with the Board on forms prescribed by the Board, which shall include such information with respect to the financial condition and operations, management, and intercompany relationships of the bank holding company and its subsidiaries, and related matters, as the Board may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Board may, in its discretion, extend the time within which a bank holding company shall register and file the requisite information. *Information received by the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be made available to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(b) The Board is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable it to administer and carry out the purposes of this Act and prevent evasions thereof. *The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are each authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(c) The Board from time to time may require reports under oath to keep it informed as to whether the provisions of this Act and such regulations and orders issued thereunder have been complied with; and the Board may make examinations of each bank holding company and each subsidiary thereof, the cost of which shall be assessed against, and paid by, such holding company. The Board shall, as far as possible, use the reports of examinations made by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the appropriate State bank supervisory authority for the purposes of this section. *The authority granted herein to the Board is hereby granted also to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent necessary to enable them to properly perform the functions assigned to them under this Act.*

(d) Before the expiration of two years following the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter in the Board's annual report to the Congress, the Board shall report to the Congress the results of the administration of this Act, stating what, if any, substantial difficulties have been encountered in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and any recommendations as to changes in the law which in the opinion of the Board would be desirable.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS TO STATES

Sec. 7. The enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof.

PENALTIES

Sec. 8. Any company which willfully violates any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued [by the Board] pursuant thereto, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000 for each day during which the violation continues. Any individual who willfully participates in a violation of any provision of this Act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Every officer, director, agent, and employee of a bank holding company shall be subject to the same penalties for false entries in any book, report, or statement of such bank holding company as are applicable to officers, directors, agents, and employees of member banks for false entries in any books, reports, or statements of member banks under section 1005 of title 18, United States Code.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 9. Any party aggrieved by an order [of the Board] *issued* under this Act may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals within any circuit wherein such party has its principal place of business, or in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, by filing in the court, within thirty days after the entry of the [Board's] order, a petition praying that the order [of the Board] be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted to the [Board] *agency issuing the order* by the clerk of the court, and thereupon the [Board] *agency* shall file in the court the record made before [the Board] *it*, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have the jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify the order [of the Board] and to require the [Board] *agency issuing such order* to take such action with regard to the matter under review as the court deems proper. The findings of the [Board] *agency* as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

* * * * *

SAVING PROVISION

Sec. 11. (a) Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct, except as specifically provided in this section.

(b) The Board shall immediately notify the Attorney General of any approval by it pursuant to this Act of a proposed acquisition, merger, [or] consolidation *or other* transaction, *by which a bank holding company acquires a bank (hereinafter referred to as a "bank acquisition")*, and such [transaction] *a bank acquisition* may not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day after the date of approval by the Board. Any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of an [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* shall be commenced within such thirty-day period. The commencement of such an action shall stay the effectiveness of the Board's approval unless the court shall otherwise specifically order. In any such action, the court shall review de novo the issues presented. In any judicial proceeding attacking any [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* approved pursuant to this Act on the ground that such transaction alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), the standards applied by the court shall be identical with those that the Board is directed to apply under section 3 of this Act. Upon the consummation of an [acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction] *bank acquisition* in compliance with this Act and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed in this section, or upon the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein, the transaction may not thereafter be attacked in any judicial proceedings on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), but nothing in this Act shall exempt any bank holding company involved in such a transaction from complying with the antitrust laws after the consummation of such transaction.

(c) In any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of any acquisition, merger, or consolidation transaction approved by the Board pursuant to this Act, the Board and any State banking supervisory agency having jurisdiction within the State involved, may appear as a party of its own motion and as of right, and be represented by its counsel.

(d) Any acquisition, merger, or consolidation of the kind described in section 3(a) of this Act which was consummated at any time prior or subsequent to May 9, 1956, and as to which no litigation was initiated by the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this amendment, shall be conclusively presumed not to have been in violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2).

(e) Any court having pending before it on or after the date of enactment of this amendment any litigation initiated under the antitrust laws by the Attorney General with respect to any acquisition, merger, or consolidation of the kind described in section 3(a) of this Act shall apply the substantive rule of law set forth in section 3 of this Act.

(f) For the purposes of this section, the term "antitrust laws" means the Act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 1–7), the Act of October 15, 1914 (the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 12–27), and any other Acts in pari materia.

(g) The appropriate banking agency shall notify the Attorney General of any application received by it under section 4(c)(8) of this Act.

(h) Each appropriate banking agency shall include in its annual report to the Congress a description and a statement of the reasons for approval of each transaction approved by it under section 4(c)(8) of this Act during the period covered by the report.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Sec. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Sec. 1102. * * *

* * * * *

(f) Certain Other Bank Holding Companies.—This part shall apply in respect of any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, with the following modification:

(1) Subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) of section 1101 shall not apply.

(2) Subsections (a)(1) and (2) and (b)(1) and (2) of section 1101 shall apply in respect of distributions to shareholders of the distributing bank holding corporations only if all

XUM

distributions to each class of shareholders which are made—

(A) after March 1, 1969, and

(B) on or before the date on which the appropriate banking agency (as defined in section 1103(f)) makes its final certification under section 1101 (e), are pro rata. For purposes of the preceding sentence, any redemption of stock made in whole or in part with property other than money shall be treated as a distribution.

(3) In applying subsections (c) and (d) of section 1101 and subsection (b) of 1103, the date "March 1, 1969" shall be substituted for the date "May 15, 1955."

(4) In applying subsection (d)(3) of section 1101, the date of enactment of this subsection shall be treated as the date of enactment of this part.

(5) In applying this part, the references to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall be treated as referring to such Act as amended by the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969.

(6) In applying this part, the term "Board" shall be treated as referring to the appropriate banking agency (as defined in section 1103(f)).

(7) In applying subsections (b) and (c) (3) of section 1101, the term "prohibited property" shall include property which would otherwise be prohibited property (within the meaning of section 1103(c)) except for the application of section 4(c)(11) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

SEC. 1103. * * *

* * * * *

(*f*) APPROPRIATE BANKING AGENCY.—*For purposes of this part, the term "appropriate banking agency" shall have the same definition as in section 2(h) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.*

NEW LAW: BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

Sec. 3. (a) No bank holding company or subsidiary of a bank holding company may in any manner extend credit, lease or sell property of any kind, or furnish any service, or fix or vary the consideration for any of the foregoing, on the condition, agreement, or understanding

(A) that the customer shall obtain some other credit, property, or service from the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company; or

(B) that the customer shall not obtain credit, property, or services from a competitor of the bank holding company or subsidiary of the bank holding company.

(b) The district courts of the United States have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of subsection (a) of this section, and it is the duty of the United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. The proceedings may be by way of a petition setting forth the case and praying that the violation be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of have been duly notified of the petition, the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case. While the petition is pending, and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as it deems just in the premises. Whenever it appears to the court that the ends of justice require that other parties be brought before it, the court may cause them to be summoned whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not, and subpoenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(c) In any action brought by or on behalf of the United States under subsection (a) of this section, subpoenas for witnesses may run into any district, but no writ of subpoena may issue for witnesses living out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than one hundred miles from the place of holding the same without the permission of the trial court being first had upon proper application and cause shown.

(d) Any person who is injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in subsection (a) of this section may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

(e) Any person, firm, corporation, or association may sue for and have injunctive relief, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, against threatened loss or damage by violation of subsection (a) of this section, under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity, under the rules governing such proceedings. Upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injuction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.

(f) Any action to enforce any cause of action under this section shall be forever barred unless commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued.

S. 1665—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DEALING WITH TAX ASPECTS OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as I said, I am introducing two bills because if the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969 is adopted, it would create a tax problem for those bank holding companies that would be required to divest themselves either of their bank or commercial properties.

Therefore, I also introduce, for myself and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), a second bill which deals with the tax aspects of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969.

This bill would amend sections 1102 and 1103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide generally that corporations which become bank holding companies as a result of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969 may distribute on a pro rata basis to their shareholders, without tax consequences to such shareholders, either their nonbanking assets or all their banking assets acquired prior to March 1, 1969. This is very similar to the treatment afforded corporations which became bank holding companies as a result of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 or the amendments thereto enacted in 1966.

Those companies which are not required by this bill to divest, but which, nevertheless, choose to do so, are permitted to distribute their banking property tax free, if they comply with all the applicable requirements of sections 1101 to 1103, including obtaining a determination of the appropriate banking agency that such distribution is appropriate to effectuate the policies of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1665) relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE ABM—ANOTHER LOOK

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, since the Senate began to consider the question of a proper anti-ballistic-missile system, we have had an abundance of words. So far, not much in the way of clear-cut conclusions that can be grasped by the American people have resulted from this discussion. We have had voices opposing, voices supporting, voices qualifying their previous positions, and often just voices.

Mr. President, I place myself in the category of what I believe to be the majority of Americans who are laymen when it comes to missile terminology, and even more at sea when it comes to missile technology. Most of us do not know a Sprint from a Spartan, a Mirv from a Minuteman, and think a Galosh is the singular of what we are supposed to have two of when it snows.

My point is that most Americans, while vitally interested in the defense capability of our Nation, are not equipped to make technical judgments about a missile defense system. If we are not then equipped to make technical judgments, what are our options? Whom may we trust to make these judgments for us?

First of all, I suggest that the representative system in America has worked well for almost 200 years—perhaps that is the best place to which we can turn.

The President has the facts, the intelligence information gathered from around the world, and the sophistication and experience to use those facts. I think we should express the objectives we, as the people of America, would like to see accomplished, and then let him proceed.

May I say at this point that I have little patience—and it is growing smaller every day—for those in the liberal community who apparently have dedicated themselves to the proposition that they are going to make President Nixon's decision on the ABM his "Vietnam." First, I think that does little credit to them or to the men they previously backed with their political support—former President Johnson and former Vice President Humphrey.

It is implicit in such reasoning as the liberals have espoused, that getting involved in Vietnam was a decision entered into lightly, willingly, and with apparent abandonment of good sense. I think mistakes have obviously been made in the Vietnam war. One of the most obvious is the serious break with credibility on which President Johnson embarked during the 1964 campaign against my good friend and colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Careful examination of the campaign record shows that candidate Goldwater "told it like it was," while candidate Johnson gave the impression—at least to me, and I think to quite a few others—that the war was not really a war and that he would soon have it over. But that is past history, and while I may disagree with President Johnson's assessment of the war, I would certainly never intentionally imply that he entered the war willingly or with light regard for the consequences.

Now I think at least that much charity should be allowed President Nixon as he attempts to cope with the situation in which the United States presently finds itself. For a group of liberal idealists deliberately to set out to scuttle President Nixon's defense policy, simply to satisfy their picayune philosophy or petty politics, is beyond contempt.

That brings to mind still another semantic chimera often used in discussing the ABM problem. I am referring to that well-beaten dead horse known as the "military-industrial complex." The frequency and sincere conviction with which liberal journalists damn this nightmarish "monster" would convince a newcomer to our shores that the name is capitalized and engraved at a Connecticut Avenue address. No doubt the offices are inhabited by retired generals, admirals, and corporate presidents who sit around all day gleefully figuring new ways to get America involved in policing the world so that they can devise new weapons to sell to our Government. This picture is a trifle stale and very shopworn and I would implore those who feel they must knock a strawman to at least give him a new name.

If we can clear the verbal landscape, perhaps those of us who are concerned with the defense of America, its institutions and ideals rather than following a vision written by a flaming finger on inscrutable tablets revealed only to the pseudointellectual community, can get on with an intelligent examination of the problem.

Of all the arguments advanced against deployment or even development of the ABM, the most irrelevant—it seems to me—is the argument that it will cost too much.

First of all, I cannot discern the source of the iron-bound assurance which characterizes those who bandy about a cost figure of $400 billion. This figure has been quoted and requoted until those who are quoting the quoters are absolutely sure they have an inerrant source by the tail. They remaind me of the trio of tigers in "Little Black Sambo" who chased their tails around the palm tree so fast that they eventually dissolved into butter.

This buttery figure of $400 billion has been compared to the national debt and opponents hold out the prospect of doubling our debt overnight. This seems to me to be a most fortunate comparison. As most of the over-30 generation knows, the largest portion of our national debt was incurred as we fought to win World War II and rehabilitated a war-shocked world in the months and years that followed.

I ask those who make such an irresponsible comparison of cost: Would we be better off if we had lost World War II but not incurred that portion of the national debt? Would they swap a defeat for a debt? That appears to be precisely the choice they offer the American people.

I say if we need the ABM to defend the country, then we need it no matter what the cost. I shall come back later to the question of how we decide if we need it, but let us have no quibbling about the need to have a strong defense of our national security. This silly questioning of cost, without relating it to the alternative, is not only foolish but it harks back to the old "better Red than dead" idea which I took for granted had been thoroughly discredited a very long time ago. Let us have responsible speaking out on this matter and no more panic-stricken shirt waving.

One of Lewis Carroll's characters in "Alice in Wonderland" says, "A word means what I say it means." This fantastic attitude seemed to have been adopted in its totality by some learned men participating in this public discussion. It is quite within the realm of possibility for one to call a defeat a victory, but that does not make it one.

By the same process, some of my learned friends say that for the United States to decide to lay down all its nuclear weapons is not "unilateral disarmament" but simply a "lessening of tensions in the world." I suggest that this reasoning has a distinct "wonderland" character to it and believe it to be fine for children's fiction but hardly worthy of a debate in the U.S. Senate.

It was most interesting to read in the March 17 issue of the Washington Post, a short, detailed history of the debate on the development of the H-bomb by Joseph Alsop. Mr. Alsop points out that during that debate, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer used precisely the same arguments now being presented by scientists opposing the ABM system. Those points were:

First. That the H-bomb would not work.

Second. That it would be too expensive to develop.

Third. Development would destabilize the world balance of power.

At that time, Dr. Oppenheimer was regarded as an infinitely greater authority than Dr. Edward Teller, according to Mr. Alsop. Being a great authority, however, did not prevent him from being dead wrong.

We have had a lot of testimony and many speeches from scientists and nonscientists alike, telling us that the ABM simply will not work. On the other hand, I have had invitations to make a trip out to the South Pacific and see the technology work for myself—without the nuclear warhead, of course.

May I call my colleagues' attention to the words of Dr. Oppenheimer, quoted by Joseph Alsop, as to why he had been so wrong, especially about the feasibility of the H-bomb. Dr. Oppenheimer:

> I guess I concluded it wouldn't work because I wanted it so much not to work.

It strikes me that we may well be in the same situation now. Those who tell us with absolute certainty that the ABM will not work may simply be hoping that it will not work. Perhaps, like Dr. Oppenheimer, they are testifying from their desires rather than their knowledge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 17 edition of the Washington Post by Joseph Alsop, to which I have referred, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, now to return to a point I mentioned earlier. How do we decide whether we need the ABM or not? Let us, as laymen, look at some of the facts that are available to us publicly.

Take, for example, the traditional edge in rocket power which the Russians have held over the United States for years. Even with the amazing "catchup" job done by our scientists, I think there is little doubt that today Russia still possesses more powerful engines than we do. Now when we transfer that to the MIRV concept that we have heard so much about—multiple independent reentry vehicle—the experts are talking about our rockets carrying two or three warheads on every rocket, each one targeted independently. But with the Russian superiority in rocket power, it is apparent that they could probably carry 10 warheads—maybe more. This means that we cannot simply count missiles as a measure of deterrence. We must look at this matter in a more sophisticated manner.

Mr. President, in testimony developed last week before Senate committees, Secretary Laird indicated that had the Soviet ABM system which they have proceeded to deploy around some of their cities been successful, our defense posture right now would be greatly endangered.

In the face of such evidence, I fail to see how opponents of our ABM system can conscientiously continue to argue that we must maintain a defense parity with the Soviets. It is perfectly obvious, it seems to me, that Communist governments are going to continue to develop and deploy the best weapon systems they can develop, regardless of international negotiations, treaties, and the like. To talk about parity, or detente, at a time like this is simply unrealistic.

Then, we have had a very strange argument advanced in opposition to the development of a defense to counter incoming missiles. It runs something like this: "If we do not want the enemy to use a weapon against us then we should not develop a defense for it."

That argument, Mr. President, was a little hard for me to follow, until the opponents came up with an example. They pointed out that although Germany developed deadly gases for possible war use, they never used them in World War II. Following this argument, I can only conclude they did not use the poison gas against us because we never developed a gas mask. The point is obviously facetious. We had some defensive capability against those gases, and we had some offensive capability too, in the form of our own weapons. The fear of sustaining far more damage than their weapons would inflict on us was the only force that kept such terrible weapons from being unleashed. So far as I can see, that is the only thing that keeps our world as peaceful as it is today, and that

XUM

is the only course that is most likely to keep it peaceful tomorrow.

On March 13, Mr. President, before President Nixon had made plain his decision to go ahead with the modified ABM proposal, I said in the Senate:

> It is my intention to support continued research, development, and if necessary deployment of the Sentinel system if the situation is as I understand it to be. I also broaden this to include any other recommendations which the President makes in support of our national security.

That is still my position today, Mr. President. I think our national security must continue to be the issue—not whether one supports or opposes this particular proposition. If the President thinks we need to go ahead with this system, I am satisfied that he knows what he is talking about. Certainly he cannot afford to sit at the table of international negotiations while our Nation could be subjected to nuclear blackmail.

The question, it seems to me, is this: Are the opponents of this system willing to bring the United States to a nuclear Pearl Harbor? The battleship *Arizona*, named after my State, lies at the bottom of Pearl Harbor. Its rusting hulk is still silent evidence to the perfidy of mankind. The still-entombed sailors on that vessel say to us, with voices unmuted by the years, that America, as a bastion of freedom, must always be on her guard against those who would snatch that freedom from us by cowardly action. I could not stand the strain, Mr. President, of bearing partial responsibility for bringing America to the brink of a nuclear Pearl Harbor; for allowing America to become susceptible to a nuclear attack from which she might never recover. I would not dare that responsibility, Mr. President.

At this time, I think we must still the rhetoric, and stop the shrill voices berating the phantom of a military-industrial complex. We must consider the solemn alternatives before us and we must decide in favor of America.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 17, 1969]

OPPOSITION TO THE ABM SYSTEM RECALLS DISPUTE OVER H-BOMB

(By Joseph Alsop)

As everyone knows, President Nixon has decided on what may be called a timid development of anti-ballistic missiles. He had no alternative.

He would frankly have preferred to put off the whole problem for another year. Yet the scientists and other experts whom he trusts the most told him, quite plainly, that further delay might jeopardize the future defense of the United States. He was convinced, and being convinced, he did his duty as a President.

Thus we have an interesting first test (and it really has been the very first test) of the kind of President that Nixon is going to be. All those on both sides of the ABM controversy ought to be relieved that Nixon has passed the test, but this, of course, is a vain hope.

The controversy itself, meanwhile, has produced strong arguments, alas, for the strictest secrecy in all defense-scientific decisions of this character. To understand why, you need only look back in time, to the secrecy-muffled governmental debate about going forward with development of the H-bomb.

In that debate, the prime arguments against the H-bomb that were used by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer were precisely the arguments now being used by the ABM's scientist-opponents. Oppenheimer said: (A) That the H-bomb would not work; (B) that it would be inordinately expensive to develop; and (C) That development would only increase the instability of the world balance of power.

Robert Oppenheimer was then regarded as an infinitely greater authority than Dr. Edward Teller. As anyone can now see, he was nonetheless dead wrong on all three points. Later, he admitted as much.

This reporter was one of the tiny band who came whole-heartedly to Oppenheimer's defense when this republic dishonored itself by removing the greater scientist's security clearance. Later, during a visit to the Oppenheimers in Princeton, the opportunity arose to ask him why he had been so dead wrong, especially about the feasibility of the H-bomb.

"I guess I concluded it wouldn't work," said Oppenheimer wryly, "because I wanted it so much not to work."

Yet if that long-ago debate about the H-bomb had not been so secrecy-muffled, there is no doubt at all that Oppenheimer could have rallied to his cause a large majority of the scientific community, plus huge numbers of the same sorts of non-scientific people who are now aroused against the ABM. It is always easy to arouse wishful people to kick against the pricks of this dreadful new world, in which fate has condemned us all to live.

The suspicion cannot be banished that scientists' guilt and other quite extraneous considerations have again played a huge role in the present controversy, as happened with Oppenheimer and H-bomb. There is the case, for instance, of Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who is probably the leading organizer of scientific opposition to the ABM.

Senators and other scientific illiterates are heard on every side, solemnly quoting Dr. Wiesner on the utter impossibility of effective defense in the present high-technical age. Yet in the 1950s, Dr. Wiesner was a leader in the Lincoln project, which developed the theory and technology of the first U.S. air defense system.

At that time, the shoe was on just the other foot. Dr. Wiesner clamored for spending on air defense. The air staff, meanwhile, was bitterly opposed. In reality, this was because spending on a defensive system was expected to compete with spending on the Strategic Air Command; but the air staff instead said that defense was wholely impractical.

The chief of air staff, General Hoyt Vandenberg, even called this reporter to his office, to suggest that the proponents of the air defense system were "under Communist influence." And Dr. Oppenheimer's support of Dr. Wiesner, far more than his opposition to the H-bomb, was what earned him the bitter and unfairly damaging enmity of the Air Force leaders.

The evidence suggests, to put it bluntly, that Dr. Wiesner and most of the others like him are now saying one thing and really thinking, inwardly, about quite another thing, just as Oppenheimer did in the H-bomb argument. For there is a great deal of evidence in the past record to show that Dr. Wiesner is, above all, motivated by his unshakable conviction that agreement on arms limitation will be made much easier if the U.S. does not proceed with ABM deployment.

On this point, just about every experienced expert on Soviet affairs, in or out of government, quite flatly disagrees with Dr. Wiesner. Dr. Wiesner would have a right to be a mite huffy if Ambassadors Thompson or Bohlen tried to teach him physics. And it just could be that physicists are equally incompetent guides to the best way to negotiate with the Soviets.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1663—INTRODUCTION OF ADULT EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Adult Education Amendments of 1969. This bill is designed to provide an opportunity to "catch up" for the estimated 56 million adult Americans who have not had the opportunity to obtain an education as far as the 12th grade. This proposal has the support of the National Association for Public School Adult Education and the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education.

This measure would expand present law to—

Include secondary-level training so that adults might obtain the junior and senior high school training they have previously missed since present law covers only adult education through the eighth grade;

Lower the eligibility age from 18 to 16 so as to encompass school dropouts, a group estimated at up to 1 million young people annually;

Establish State adult education advisory councils to aid in the development and evaluation of programs at the local level, such as is now being done under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Vocational Education Act;

It would authorize an expenditure of $300 million for fiscal year 1970, $350 million for fiscal year 1971, and $400 million for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. At this rate of authorization, illiteracy in the United States could be wiped out in 15 years.

This bill is a step forward as the first Federal commitment toward meeting the needs of the millions of our adults who were unable to complete their education through the high school level. It would also make available further educational opportunities for many of the 1.26 million adults who have participated in the adult basic education program made possible under the terms of the Adult Education Act of 1966. Many of these Americans, having advanced as far as the eighth grade, are now deprived of more education because they are unable to continue their education. Today fewer than 10 States presently provide any funds for high school education for adults.

Under present circumstances, securing a high school education represents little more than a remote possibility for 56 million educationally disenfranchised American adults. The bill I propose would not only provide this high school training but would also give these adults an opportunity subsequently to under-

XUM

take college or post-secondary vocational or technical studies.

In today's complex society, a "basic" education for an adult is more than acquiring literacy. It should be at least the equivalent of going through high school. Yet we face the paradox that in this Nation which has prided itself on our philosophy of educational opportunity for all, some 56 million Americans are short of this goal. Achieving it is not that difficult because, in many instances, a high degree of motivation or the effective use of programed instruction and educational technology leads an adult to earn 2 or 3 years of high school credits in but 1 year.

A recent survey revealed that in 1967 all but 5.4 percent of a sample group then taking adult education courses had annual incomes of under $6,000 and more than half had annual earnings of less than $3,000. And almost half of those in adult education courses were either family heads or the principal wage earner in a family. Significantly, too, almost half the students were between 25 and 44 years of age, a crucial time of career development. The return to the economy by giving these individuals the educational opportunity they missed in their earlier years will more than repay the average annual cost of $120 for adult education at the high school level and $200 for basic adult education.

While we seek to help make available the best possible education for our young people to help them meet the responsibilities of citizenship and the challenges of a career, we have fallen short in our responsibility toward those who for some reason fell by the wayside and were unable even to obtain the minimum of a high school education. This measure seeks to correct that oversight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1663) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for adult education, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GIFTED CHILDREN—A NATIONAL RESOURCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a study conducted for the U.S. Office of Education by Dr. Joseph L. French, professor at Pennsylvania State University, it was observed:

> Each year more than 80,000 youths who are within the top 25 percent of the nation's population intellectually, who have the scholastic potential for higher education, and who have the occupational potential for a job requiring relatively high-level intellectual power leave school before graduation.

This is a measure of the waste of one of our greatest national resources, our gifted young people, whose potential is lost. As Dr. John W. Kidd, President of the Council for Exceptional Children, has pointed out:

> While we have established massive efforts to reclaim and preserve many of the great physical and natural resources of our land, little or nothing has been done to develop the resource that will provide our leadership for future generations.

On January 28, together with Senators PROUTY, ALLOTT, BELLMON, COOK, COOPER, DOMINICK, SCHWEIKER, and STEVENS, and seven members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I introduced the Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act (S. 718) designed to focus Federal resources on the improvement of educational opportunities for gifted and talented children. This measure would launch a national effort to assist local and State educational agencies in establishing programs—and training personnel to carry out these programs—to meet the unique learning needs of these youngsters.

This proposal has received the strong endorsement of the Council for Exceptional Children—the council is a department of the National Education Association—and the Association for the Gifted. I ask unanimous consent to have included as part of my remarks letters of endorsement from the presidents of these two groups, together with the article, "Characteristics of High Ability Dropouts," the study to which I referred earlier.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN,
March 12, 1969.

HON. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: On behalf of The Council for Exceptional Children and its 38,000 members concerned about the education of handicapped and gifted children, may I take this opportunity to commend you for your leadership and sponsorship of S. 718, the Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act of 1969.

The gifted and talented child represents one of the greatest resources of our nation. While we have established massive efforts to reclaim and preserve many of the great physical and natural resources of our land, little or nothing has been done to develop the resource that will provide our leadership for future generations. With numerous federal programs which the Congress has wisely established for the improvement of education, there is no program designed to meet the unique learning needs of the gifted and talented child. Your bill is an excellent step in this direction.

Again, we commend you for your interest in the problems of the gifted and talented child and please be assured of our support in seeking passage of this bill. We hope that consideration will be given to the bill during the hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. If we can be of any assistance in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. KIDD, Ed.D.,
President, CEC.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE GIFTED,
March 12, 1969.

HON. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The Association for the Gifted commends you for your sponsorship of S. 718, the Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act of 1969.

As educators of gifted children we have long been concerned about the lack of resources available to bring these children the education that they need. Recent evidence has demonstrated clearly that many of these children not only do not receive an appropriate education, but that many of them out of frustration drop out of the education system. In a recent article which I wrote for the National Association of Secondary School Principals as a result of several years of research, it was noted that "Each year more that 80,000 youth who are within the top 25% of the nation's population intellectually, who have the scholastic potential for higher education, and who have the occupational potential for a job requiring relatively high-level intellectual power leave school before graduation."

The Association for the Gifted sincerely hopes that during the hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, consideration will be given to S. 718. Please be assured that we will be glad to provide any assistance you may need in regard to supporting this bill.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH FRENCH, Ed.D.,
President.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH ABILITY DROPOUTS

(By Joseph L. French)

"Our country's freedom and security are threatened when its youth are not educated to their maximum potential."[1] The tremendous waste involved when a youth prematurely drops out of school affects all citizens. His contribution of talent (and tax money) to our way of life is reduced. The greatest loss, however, is to the indivdual who is restricted in his personal development. The restriction of self-realization that accompanies a student's withdrawal from school before he is capable of entering an appropriately high vocation activity is one of the most devastating aspects of the United States' dropout problem. Too often these dropouts are youth who are disadvantaged in other ways also.

Even though school holding power is better today than it ever has been, about 25 percent of the secondary school population in the U.S. withdraw without graduating. Of every 1,000 pupils enrolled in the fifth grade in 1924–25, 302 graduated from high school. The situation has changed dramatically in 30 years. Of every 1,000 pupils enrolled in the fifth grade in 1954–55, 642 graduated. The secondary schools more than doubled their holding power in that 30-year period. The holding power has steadily improved at the rate of two or three percent a year. Of course the holding power varies by state and within each state.

For example, only a few years ago, 27 percent of all students entering the ninth grade in Pennsylvania failed to graduate. In 1964–65 only 16 percent of all students entering the ninth grade four years earlier dropped out before graduating. Comparative data for dropout studies are difficult to obtain, but studies of Pennsylvania dropouts of all intellectual levels were conducted for the 1956–57 and the 1962–63 school years.

DROPOUTS WITH IQ'S OF 110 +

Very little information has been collected about dropouts of specified intellectual levels. For too long, dropouts have been considered a homogeneous group with IQ's of 95 or less. O. R. Warner reported, in a summary of the literature concerning dropouts, that about 11 percent have IQ's of 110 and above. Only 25 percent of the total population have IQ's

---

[1] O. R. Warner. "The Scholastic Ability of School Dropouts." *Selected Reports and Statistics on School Dropouts*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964, 11–13.

XUM

of that magnitude, so it's a surprise to many laymen to learn that some dropouts have high IQ's of 110 and more. Based on the figures just given, each year more than 80,000 youth who are within the top 25 percent of the nation's population intellectually, who have the scholastic potential for higher education, and who have the occupational potential for a job requiring relatively high-level intellectual power leave school before graduation.

This article is based on a study designed to answer some of the questions I raised in a previous paper on dropouts of high mental ability, which was published in the *Vocational Guidance Quarterly* in the winter of 1965–66. I limited this study to youth with recorded IQ's of 110 and above. Dropouts were defined as those youth who had withdrawn from school before completing grade 12 during the 1964–65 academic year for any reason other than illness, death, or transferral to another school. The study was conducted in two phases. In Phase One data were requested from each school in Pennsylvania enrolling students in grades 9 through 12. Personnel in all but seven percent of the schools returned questionnaires describing 1,721 bright dropouts, giving their reasons for withdrawing and information pertaining to their various ~~curricula,~~ classes, IQ's, employment conditions, ~~and~~ addresses.

Among the subjects identified in the statewide survey, 55 percent were females. However, the emphasis of the study (employment potential) strongly recommended that a disproportionately large number of male subjects be included in the sample. As a result, 125 male and 81 female dropouts were selected for study in Phase One. In addition, a similar number of males and females of comparable IQ, socioeconomic level, and grade who were still in school were selected for comparative study in Phase Two (the comparison group was labeled "persisters"), which will be discussed later.

PHASE 1: DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION OF HIGH ABILITY DROPOUTS

On the basis of a composite figure derived from data up to 1964, Pennsylvania could expect to find 4,000 intellectually very able high school students withdrawing without graduating from high school. This figure represents those dropouts with IQ's of 110 or more—11 percent of the total number of Pennsylvania's dropouts. However, the recent campaign to reduce dropouts seems to have been especially effective in Pennsylvania, for a definite decrease in the number of dropouts at all intellectual levels has been noted.

The data for the survey being reported here are based only on dropouts with IQ's of 110 and above. Instead of an anticipated 4,000 students, a figure based on 11 percent of all dropouts, only 1,721 dropouts meeting the criteria were identified and another 100 were assumed to have withdrawn from the schools from which data were not obtained.

The personnel in the secondary schools were asked to state the reason for each student's withdrawal. The reasons which they listed have been classified and presented in Table 1. It is the consensus of personnel working with dropouts that most of the categories used for classifying such students are misleading. For example, the males were not asked *why* they needed a job, but a reasonable assumption is that many of them needed jobs to support newly-acquired wives. The fact that 292 males "passed the required age" does not really explain why they dropped out. Obviously, more boys of their age stayed in school than withdrew. School personnel indicated that four percent of the boys were asked to leave, but interviews with the students themselves revealed that many more than four percent were asked to leave. And many others felt that they could never graduate even if they did continue to attend.

TABLE 1.—REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL BEFORE GRADUATION PROVIDED BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL (1965 SURVEY)

	Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
To get a job (employment certificate)	183	23.9	107	11.2
Needed at home (exemption permit)	6	.8	24	2.5
Passed required age	292	38.1	144	15.1
Military service	94	12.3	1	.1
Had failing grades	25	3.3	6	.6
Didn't like school	38	5.0	19	2.0
Was asked to leave	31	4.0	4	.4
Pregnancy	0	0	227	23.8
Marriage	29	3.8	380	39.8
Illness	11	1.4	12	1.3
Institutionalization	17	2.2	1	.1
Other [1]	32	4.2	24	2.5
Unknown [2]	9	1.2	5	.5
Total	767		954	

[1] Speech difficulty, religious beliefs, family fight, etc.

[2] "I wish I knew," etc.

REASONS FOR QUITTING SCHOOL

The majority of the male dropouts, in their own words, left school because: 1. they did not like school (20 percent), 2. they were asked to leave (18 percent), 3. they wanted to get a job (17 percent), or 4. they wanted to get married (11 percent). Twenty percent of the unmarried female dropouts left school because they did not like it; others left because they wanted jobs (16 percent), because they had failing grades (12 percent), or because they were needed at home (12 percent). A large majority (82 percent) of the married female dropouts left school in order to be married. Personality data which will be discussed later suggest that the married females were quite different from male, and unmarried female, dropouts.

MILITARY SERVICE

In studies five to ten years ago in Pennsylvania, three to five percent of the male dropouts of all intellectual levels withdrew to enter military service. In 1965 12 percent of the males in that state with IQ's of 110 or more entered service immediately after withdrawal. Perhaps this percentage increase in dropouts entering the armed forces is due to the conflict in Viet Nam. However the percentage of those in this study of high ability dropouts who left school for military service is higher than the percentage of generally average dropouts who left school for the same purpose. Perhaps this higher percentage is the result of the brighter students being more able to qualify for service. Although school records suggest that 12 percent of the males withdrew from school so they could enter military service, approximately 29 percent were in military service within a few months of quitting school. Later it was determined by a follow-up of additional interviewing and testing that an even larger proportion were in military service.

The next highest category for employment of males—factory work or trades—included 22 percent of the boys and five percent of the girls. Eighteen percent were unemployed. The remaining subjects were scattered among six other categories.

This survey of employment encounters several problems. Perhaps the greatest problem in determining employment status involves the time of reporting job classification. Eighty-eight men were listed as "remaining at home," but practically all of those contacted in the second phase, or testing stage, of the project were employed, with the exception of a few who were in penal institutions or were mentally ill. Perhaps the change in their rate of employment was due to a shift in the job market which made finding work somewhat easier. On the other hand, it was found among those tested that many did not remain very long on the jobs they accepted upon high school termination. They will probably experience some upward mobility and profit from training programs as they are established.

It should be noted that in the general population more males than females withdraw from school without graduating, despite this study's evidence to the contrary. This study of high ability youth indicates that considerably more *females* withdrew. This reversal was not evident in Philadelphia, but in the rest of the state nearly twice as many high ability females as males withdrew.

Interestingly, approximately 65 percent of the females withdrew because they were either pregnant and/or intending to marry or because they were already married. This percentage looks large, as does the number 607. However, only 77 percent of the girls in Pennsylvania with IQ's of 110 and above are accounted for in these two entries in Table 1. Comparing these data with some data collected by the Department of Public Instruction one year earlier for the total student body reveals that pregnancy is found half as often among high school girls with IQ's of 110 and above as among such girls with IQ's of 109 and below. These figures were computed on a proportional representation and based on the assumption that 75 percent of the population will have IQ's of 109 and below. In this context, it should be recognized that although pregnancy and/or marriage accounts for two-thirds of the female dropouts with IQ's of 110 and above, pregnancy and marriage occur proportionately more often among high school girls with IQ's of 109 and below.

Table 2 shows the last grade attended by the dropouts studied in this survey of 1964–65 and some comparative data from the statewide dropout study conducted during the 1962-63 year without and reference to IQ. Unfortunately, comparable statistics are obtained spasmodically. Of the 1,721 bright dropouts, 478 had I.Q.'s of at least 120, and 81 had recorded IQ's of at least 130. It is evident in Table 2 and in data from dropouts with IQ's of 120 and above that the brighter students stay in school longer.

TABLE 2.—PENNSYLVANIA DROPOUTS LISTED BY LAST GRADE OF ENROLLMENT

Grade	Dropouts of all intellectual levels in 1962–63		Dropouts with IQ's of 110 and above in 1964–65							
			Males				Females			
			Population		Sample		Population		Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
9	3,024	15.1	28	3.7	6	4.8	36	3.8	1	1.2
10	7,380	37.0	173	22.6	25	20.0	193	20.2	15	18.5
11	5,889	29.5	304	39.6	52	41.6	386	40.5	33	40.7
12	3,674	18.4	262	34.2	42	33.6	339	35.5	32	39.5
Total			767		125		954		81	

POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION

Approximately 46 percent of the males and 48 percent of the females who graduate from Pennsylvania secondary schools enter some kind of postgraduate educational program. It is quite possible that in a follow-up a short time from now investigators will find that a number of bright secondary school dropouts have entered some kind of postsecondary school. In fact, the limited amount of follow-up accomplished so far has revealed that several students who had dropped out of high school were already enrolled in colleges. Some dropouts entered college without graduating from high school; others entered after taking high school equivalency examinations; others finished high school by correspondence courses or night school. Many dropouts who entered the armed forces received vocational education and training that will be helpful to them after they are discharged.

Enrollment by curriculum is summarized in Table 3. This table indicates that more dropouts in Pennsylvania for the 1962–63 school year—both male and female—were enrolled in the general curriculum, the curriculum which is being criticized more and more as diluted and unfocused. Certainly this bit of data points to its inability to prevent *potential* dropouts from becoming *actual* dropouts.

TABLE 3.—CURRICULUM ENROLLMENT FOR GRADES 9-12

	All dropouts, male, 1962–63		All dropouts, female, 1962–63		Dropouts IQ's of 110 and above [1]			
					Males, 1964–65		Females, 1964–65	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
College prep	502	5.1	406	5.7	146	24.4	235	28.3
Commercial	678	6.9	2,662	37.4	44	7.4	421	50.8
Vocational	2,780	28.3	683	9.6	124	20.8	16	1.9
General	5,315	54.0	3,032	42.6	276	46.2	150	18.1
Other	550	5.6	335	4.7	7	1.2	7	0.8
Total	9,825	99.9	7,118	100.0	597	100.0	829	99.9

[1] Philadelphia dropouts were not reported by curriculum.

According to some research, frequency of transfer of schools is a means of identifying a potential dropout. In this study only 29 percent of the males and 33 percent of the females had transferred from one school to another before dropping out. These figures are not higher than those of the persisters in this study or of the seniors with IQ's of 110 and above responding to PROJECT TALENT tests in 1960. Therefore, this frequently mentioned correlate of school withdrawal was not substantiated in the findings of this study.

Another integral factor which has often been cited as indicative of a student's dropout potential is the parents' low level of education and employment. Using this assumption as a starting point, we used parental occupation and education as a basis for classifying dropouts in five socioeconomic levels. We found that nine of the males were in the top two levels. About one-third of the remaining males were in each of the lower three levels. Females who were married or anticipating marriage were more evenly distributed through all five socioeconomic levels.

Phase One of this study merely set out to describe the high ability dropout. Now Phase Two, in its comparison of dropouts and persisters, attempts to reveal striking differences in the two groups. It will treat such areas as personality, interests, attitudes towards school, educational skills, and family orientation toward school processes.

PHASE 2: COMPARISON OF DROPOUT AND PERSISTER SAMPLES

The subjects described in the remainder of this paper are 125 male dropouts, 55 *married* female dropouts, and 26 *unmarried* female dropouts. In addition, for comparative purposes there are three similar groups of persisters. The dropouts and the persisters have comparable IQ's (X 117) and neighborhood backgrounds.

In this phase of the study, all dropouts and persisters responded to the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory (MVII), the High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ), an autobiographical data form called the Student Information Blank (SIB), an attitude scale developed for the project called Attitude Inventory for Youth (AIY), and an interview. These tests and interviews were administered by 63 school counselors and psychologists located in the schools at which the dropouts had previously been enrolled.

On the HSPQ, the greatest discrepancies between male dropouts and persisters were found in dispositional traits labeled "Obedient/Assertive," and "Sober/Happy-go-lucky," and "Tough-minded/Tender-minded" on the profile. The male dropouts were significantly more assertive, independent, self-assured, rebellious, competitive ($P<.05$), cheerful, expressive, frank, happy-go-lucky, and talkative ($P<.01$) than the persisters.

From the overall profile, the male dropout of high ability could be described in the following terms. He is a happy-go-lucky fellow who is interested in people. Although he tends to be easy-going, his actions are marked with deliberateness and his speech with frankness. His profile does not suggest lack of interest in school and much that school represents, but it does indicate that the school's pressures for conformity might create a stumbling block for him. And his overall response pattern would suggest that he falls well within normal limits with regard to his mental health (neuroticism, anxiety, etc.). He is, from all indications, a fairly sound individual.

The girls dropping out of school for reasons other than marriage were very similar to the boys. The personality differences which were noted were slight and appropriate to the difference in sex. The description of the male dropouts, then, would basically apply to the unmarried female dropouts.

The girls who withdrew because of pregnancy and/or marriage were less socially oriented than the persisters; they were less prone to seek social recognition. Their scores were near the norm group on most traits.

IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL DROPOUTS

A formula for predicting dropouts from HSPQ data was developed by Satir and does not identify many false positives.[2] A scoring key to identify potential dropouts from MVII responses was constructed by Bonfield.[3] In a cross validation study the key proved effective. I have developed similar keys for the SIB.[4] Although not tested as a composite score, the scores from the HSPQ formula, MVII key and SIB key should be very helpful in predicting high ability high school dropouts. A problem in preparing a paper such as this, as with many papers about the gifted, involves trying to generalize about a heterogeneous group. The following reactions by dropouts to a question about how schools could be improved illustrate the problem.

A male who left school because he was "needed at home" but who was soon employed as a clothes sorter for a linen service said. "I am in the U.S. Army. I have just completed a high school equivalency course, and I am waiting for the results. As far as I am concerned, the schools in ---------- do not need any changes. It is not a school's fault if a pupil learns very little. He [the pupil] has to be interested and want to learn. The schools are doing their primary job. They supply books and teachers, and the pupil has to make the best of them."

From a male who left because he wanted to get a job and who was employed in a greenhouse and drove a truck, we hear. "I believe one of the main troubles in the school system is the lack of good judgment in the hiring of teachers and administrative personnel. When they bring a teacher into the system, they don't go deep enough into his personal background. Some of the most psychotic human beings I have ever met have been in a schoolroom. These teachers not only undermine the possibility of education in the classroom, but they harass and psychologically upset the children and young adults at an age when they cannot retaliate. Periodic checks—not only written, but oral—should be made to see if teachers are fit to be in such a position. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to let you know how I feel."

And from a female who left because she "did not like school" and who is now employed as a photographic technician: "I feel the two main problems in today's schools are the overcrowded classrooms and the lack of teacher dedication and interest. Classes today are so large that the students have little chance to get individual attention for their special problems. By the time attendance is taken, assignments given out, and things organized, there is little time for study of the subject itself. Children who find it difficult to study or slow learners are left behind or forgotten and soon lose interest. Consequently, the slow learners fail the subject. On the other hand, the quick learners are quickly bored and disgusted.

"If classes were smaller or divided according to learning ability, the teachers could get to know the students as people with different interests and problems and, in many cases, could find out why the children find it difficut to learn a certain subject. If the teachers would take a little more time and interest and show the students that someone cares about them and their progress, the students would try a lot harder and get better grades. Some people just don't have the ability, but many more have it and don't use it. What's the use of trying if no one notices or cares about your efforts? I know I never would have left school if my teachers and principal had listened to me and tried to understand why I found a subject so difficult. If they had helped me instead of lecturing, I would be a graduate today. I had only four weeks to go."

PARENTAL ATTITUDES

Current campaigns to keep dropouts in school are working. Both dropouts and per-

---

[2] B. W. Cardon and K. Satir, "Personality Factors as Predictors of High Ability Dropouts," *Journal of School Psychology*. In press, 1968.

[3] J. Bonfield, "Development and Validation of an Identification Scale for High Ability Dropouts," *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*. March 1968. 16, 177–180.

[4] See Cardon and French's *Employment Status and Characteristics of High School Dropouts of High Ability*. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.

XUM

sisters realize that dropouts have more difficulty getting and keeping jobs. A major difference between the dropouts and persisters in this study is in their perception of parental attitude. Persisters feel that their parents force them to stay in school, but dropouts feel that their parents wanted them to stay in but did not force them to do so. If it is really important for students to complete secondary school, attention must be directed to parental attitude and behavior.

If schools are to better meet the needs of all bright youth, some changes must be made. Some potential dropouts are being kept in school by admonishment, while others are being kept by money—$1.50 an hour to stay in school! Many of these youth (persisters) have very poor attitudes toward teachers, curriculum, and activities. If we do not modify old programs and introduce innovation to meet the needs of potential dropouts, we may have more trouble in schools than when it was easier to drop out.

The high school dropout rate of high ability students enrolled in general and commercial curricula (see Table 2) suggests a need for attention to these programs now. Too often they have been neglected by educators concerned with the gifted. Many vocational and technical but non-professional jobs are highly important in our society, and bright, efficient workers are badly needed. Trying to channel all youth with IQ's of 110 and above into traditional college programs and neglecting vocational curricula is a mistake. We need to become concerned about the bright adolescent with non-professional aspirations. What most of the dropouts wanted of the school was "practical" courses which would assist them in "living in the real world."

A GUIDED AND GRADUAL ENTRY

While there is reason to believe that the dropout's perception of the content of many courses and the sequence of courses was realistic, their perception of work and non-student days might have been unrealistic. Not only should course conent and sequence be examined with the idea of making them as meaningful and practical as possible, but part-time work for students and on-the-job training for workers prior to "senior standing" should be instituted. A guided and gradual entry into the role of wage earner seems to be very desirable. As programs develop to pay potential dropouts for work around school or for part-time employment elsewhere, attention needs to be given to the objectives of such programs. Dropouts seem to need help in planning the use of money.

The high incidence of pregnancy and early marriage in this sample suggests a need for positive attention to sex and marriage education. With an increasing proportion of young women entering the labor market, attention will need to be directed to preparing young mothers for the maximum utilization of their talent.

Many dropouts want to go back to school, but the prospect of being in classes with younger adolescents keeps most of them from returning. The "evening school" or community college program may hold considerable promise, but so far little attention has been directed toward their resources for dropouts of above-average ability.

Obviously, some attitudes are too well fixed to modify in a short period. Communicating with even "frank and independent" adolescents presents quite a problem for adults. However, many of our dropouts would like to tell of their disillusionment and problems. Perhaps some of the bright dropouts could be effectively utilized in a prevention program. Other dropouts recommend entering the labor force briefly to develop an appreciation for school. If this approach is attempted, integration of dropouts into an educational program will need considerable attention.

Activities which help develop social skills seem to be needed by potential dropouts. In many schools male and female dropouts did not participate as often as persisters in activities which develop feelings of self-respect, belonging, and acceptance. Although such activities are available for many students, the dropouts in this study sought, but were unable to obtain, as much participation in group activities as did persisters or as they wanted. Direct attention to, and perhaps subtle guidance in, social development seems highly desirable. In many schools new organizations will be necessary to provide for these students.

SERIOUS RE-EVALUATION NEEDED

Most of the recommendations given for overcoming several aspects of the dropout problem among high ability youth are in no way new to educators. In fact, most of the recommendations have already been put into practice by many schools. What is needed, therefore, is a serious re-evaluation of what is presently being done with a particular student in mind: the bright student who is a potential or actual dropout. The extent to which present programs are meeting the needs of this group will determine the degree to which change is necessary.

It was interesting to note that several dropouts who were contacted as possible subjects for the present study returned to school as a result. A concerted effort must be made to prevent the dropouts from "dropping out of sight." And there should be a systematic program of contacts, not only with the idea of bringing the dropout back to high school but to provide other forms of assistance as well. The schools, for example should be the primary source of information regarding the resources of other community agencies which might provide the kind of assistance best suited to the dropout. In turn, such follow-up studies will assist school personnel in revising current programs in keeping with student needs.

THE SPANISH CHIEF OF STATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya), I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Senator Montoya entitled "The Spanish Chief of State," together with an accompanying book review article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Spanish Chief of State

Mr. Montoya. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to draw the attention of my distinguished Colleagues and the general public to the review of a new book about the present Spanish Chief of State written by one of my friends, the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, and published in the summer issue of "World Affairs," official publication of the American Peace Society, the oldest genuine peace organization in the United States.

It is interesting to note that Father Thorning, who enjoys the friendship of many Members of the U.S. Congress, reported the facts about events in the Iberian Peninsula during the Spanish Civil War. At a time when many newspaper writers found it difficult to understand the nature of the action, Dr. Thorning correctly foretold the outcome of the struggle, almost from the beginning. Numerous articles under his name were carried around the globe by the NCWC News Service. Other pieces on this theme were featured in The Washington Star, The Washington Post and the Washington Herald-Examiner. Moreover, reports about this priest-scholar's impressions of Spain were published in The New York Times. Thanks in no small part to these presentations and to the respect which Father Thorning's judgment commanded in Washington, the Nationalist regime was recognized as the *de facto* and *de jure* government of the Spanish people early in April 1939. This marked a milestone in the history of Europe, if not of the world. Soon we will observe the thirtieth anniversary of that event.

Today, Dr. Thorning continues to serve as an associate editor of "World Affairs" in the company of other university scholars; as the United States Honorary Fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil and as an Honorary Professor of the Catholic University of Chile and the University of Santo Domingo. He is also working on a new book about the movement which succeeded in re-establishing full diplomatic relations between Spain and the United States. Many distinguished Members of the Congress remember this effort because they were active in the same cause.

A synopsis of the volume about Generalissimo Francisco Franco y Bahamonde follows.

Franco, by Brian Crozier. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968. Pp. XX–589. $10.00.)

This biography of the present Spanish Chief of State, Generalissimo Franciso Franco y Bahamonde, is presented in historical perspective. Although the author is a journalist rather than a professional historian, he has devoted more than two years to research in Spanish, British, Italian, German and Portuguese archives. Interest in his subject also led him to examine, with no little care, official Soviet and other sources that throw light upon the origin, development and dénouement, not only of the Spanish Civil War, but also upon the almost equally bitter and much more prolonged struggle of a number of nations, despite the decisions of the Potsdam conference, to re-establish full diplomatic relations with Spain. After this victory, as Brian Crozier points out, another campaign of global dimensions was required to secure the election of the present Spanish Government, by a two-thirds' vote, to membership in the United Nations and related specialized agencies.

The author, in his final chapters of a fascinating volume, adds fairly detailed reports about the negotiations that led to Spanish-American agreement about naval and air bases in the Iberian Peninsula. The provisions of this treaty, advantageous for both parties, have been in effect for fifteen years. They are now subject to re-negotiation and, in all likelihood, renewal in the light of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the activities of the reinforced Red Fleet in the Mediterranean. From the viewpoint of United States officials defense needs have to be balanced against economic realities. Spain has put a high price tag on renewal before March 1969, pointing out that the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula might be the first target of Soviet aggression in the event that the Red Army would move against Western Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Spain, although not a member of NATO, indirectly is tied in with ith communications, transport and defense supply systems. Many functions that had been assigned to President Charles de Gaulle's France are the present responsibility of the Spaniards.

Brian Crozier, it may be noted, was born in Australia and served as a correspondent of Reuters. His experience includes work on the staff of *The Economist* (London). Whenever he judges it necessary or important, he writes in a critical vein. This biography is not panegyric.

Mr. Crozier, unlike many another in his profession, is aware of, and cites with credit, an indispensable book by Burnett Bolloten (Stanford University professor), "The Grand Camouflage: The Communist Conspiracy in the Spanish Civil War." This study was published by Hollis and Carter in London (1961) and by Frederick A. Praeger in the USA.

Brian Crozier also consulted "Spain: The Vital Years," by Luis A. Bolin. The latter volume by an eyewitness of the events he relates was reviewed in the Spring 1968 issue of *World Affairs*.

Another praiseworthy feature of this biography is its collection of maps, illustrations, appendices and numerous source references. The index alone lacks a scholarly touch.

A more serious defect is that Brian Crozier, like others who write from the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, failed to examine evidence about peoples and governments in the Western Hemisphere that helped to influence the course of history in Spain during the epoch described with skill and impartiality in this highly readable report.

JOSEPH F. THORNING,
The United States Honorary Fellow of The Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 26, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 24, 1969, after adjournment of the Senate March 20, 1969, under authority of order of same date:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Thomas A. Flannery, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, for the term of 4 years vice David G. Bress.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1969:

PEACE CORPS

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294:

To be major

Madden, Joseph P., O99911.

To be captains

Geimer, William S., O96383.
Madden, Joseph P., O99911.
Montgomery, Robert E., O90972.

To be first lieutenants

Ames, Orrin K., OF109676.
Bausch, James M., OF109509.
Conderman, John D., OF108517.
Dort, Dean R., III, OF108548.
Ellis, John D., Jr., OF108559.
Finnell, James M., II, OF109382.
Friesner, Wayne L., OF109716.
Gray, Kenneth D., OF108610.
Gray, Thomas W., OF109726.
Jones, Hugh M., III, OF108690.
Kennett, Michael B., OF108704.
Kingham, Thomas B., OF108711.
Kurzweil, Robert B., OF113116.
Lewis, Robert E., OF113120.
Loveland, Daniel J., OF107231.
McNeill, Robert H., III, O98836.
Meacham, Christopher, OF108774.
Mulford, Ralph K., III, OF108804.
Parsons, William X., OF108831.
Pursley, Charles N. Jr., OF109784.
Seibold, Paul M., OF113127.
Shelton, Donald E., OF109792.
Sovie, Donald E., OF108922.
Strassburg, Thomas M., OF108944.
Szymanski, James G., OF108954.
Vaughan, Ronald B., OF108985.
Wagner, Anthony L., OF108992.
Wilson, John W., Jr., OF109026.
Wilson, Thomas W., OF109040.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be majors

Gleber, Anthony J., O2266377.
Lee, Robert E., Jr., O4010464.
Reeves, Gale T., O4042820.

To be captains

Baumann, Philipe F., O5850096.
Boyd, Reese L., O5211363.
Boyd, Richard F., O5503099.
Bradshaw, Hershal W., MN902166.
Brewer, Gerard F., O5716331.
Brown, Richard T., O5525576.
Bukowski, Edward F., O5515726.
Burns, Marlene G., N5407290.
Campbell, Dean J., O4084442.
Chard, Stanley R., O5540533.
Cohen, Marsha H., N5407214.
Coldewey, Johann F., O5265423.
Fore, Curtis W., MN2298059.
Fujitani, Donald S., O4078096.
Fulton, Charles F., O5412787.
Gillespie, Henry B., Jr., O5307336.
Giustolisi, Vincent R., O5242222.
Gray, Charles A. Q., Jr., O5214043.
Greene, Hubert D., O5315089.
Henry, James M., O5242371.
Hummel, Robert A., MM2297782.
Kraemer, Robert P., O5217047.
Lathem, Larry B., O5512711.
Lester, Rodney D., O5315234.
Orlowski, Joseph, Jr., O4031098.
Patrick, Harold L., O5502786.
Peyton, John J., O4068434.
Pinson, Robert L., O5426140.
Pope, John L., O87887.
Rand, Donald E., MN2295979.
Rhodes, Charles T., Jr., O5319920.
Ruddle, Arthur R., O5212668.
Sargeant, Francis L., MN2303931.
Scarsdale, Bobby R., O5411926.
Schloesser, Kenneth, O5304512.
Schrantz, Marshall K., O2307988.
Schulz, Charles E., Jr., O5259407.
Shaw, Robert W., O5420910.
Simone, Ronald J., O5540407.
Skelton, Samuel E., Jr., O5309473.
Tucker, Billy D., O5412825.
Walker, Neal R., O5411824.
Webb, Loren W., O4023649.
Wells, Lyndoll L., N2244413.
Wise, A. J., O5320105.

To be first lieutenants

Allanach, Bruce C., MN2326203.
Barnes, Cary M., O2325519.
Bates, Thomas J., O5707418.
Benham, Deborah K., N2331218.
Bergeron, Alfred J., O5418101.
Bond, Larry A., O5418938.
Brennan, Thomas J., O5018751.
Brinsfield, Carroll S., MN2318053.
Brown, Alan R., O5227956.
Brown, Robert W., O5419844.
Brundage, Richard W., O2319828.
Bryan, Gareth D., MN5520413.
Carlton, Darrel H., O5329321.
Carter, Willard T., O2324901.
Castellanos, Ronald D., O5252776.
Chase, James E., Jr., O5326204.
Clark, Dorothy J., N2321834.
Copenhaver, Dianne G., ON2336924.
Coppedge, Raleigh E., O5415173.
Corley, Milton D., O5328884.
Crawford, David H., O5324181.
Crummey, Peter F., O5320135.
Davila, Manuel A., O5826406.
Donowho, Everett M., O5423792.
Erkins, Moses, O5317419.
Eubanks, Lonnie H., Jr., MN2325714.
Fairfield, Louis D., O5530912.
Fiore, Leonard A., O5017435.
Foree, Betty M., N5411494.
Franklin, William A., O5326400.
Gallagher, Stephan M., O5515447.
Gilman, Robert L., O5016370.
Glassman, Arthur L., O5517324.
Goncalo, Richard, O5329649.
Griffin, James H., O2306811.
Hargo, Roderick L., O5221963.
Hartgraves, Michael B., O5421248.
Havens, John W., O5321664.
Hill, Norman J., O2306575.
Hixson, Garry P., O5531801.
Holleque, Oscar E., O5406462.
Holmes, William R., O5318919.
Holomon, Cyril P., O5326240.
Horio, Kenneth K., O5516421.
Ingalsbe, Duane G., O5517876.
Ionoff, John, Jr., O5320326.
Jones, Marsha M., N5407437.
Joyce, Joseph J., Jr., O5222419.
Kent, Charles E., O5014461.
Long, Elmer C., Jr., O5255748.
Mackey, George D., O5420479.
Madden, Charles E., O5314726.
Marcaccio, Joseph P., O5327089.
McCaffrey, John C., O5318377.
Merrill, Richard H., O5013652.
Minahan, Sue P., N2328759.
Mitchell, Ralph W., O5315528.
Mitchell, Richard R., O5800596.
Montgomery, Patrick J., O5320502.
Murphy, Patrick W., O2332036.
Nowakowski, Andrew, O3202585.
O'Donnell, Dennis J., MN5422052.
Oslin, Robert W., O5022927.
Piersall, Grady C., O5531017.
Pierson, Dean L., O2325591.
Platt, Richard A., O5241260.
Pritchard, Alan F., O3202856.
Pyle, John F., O2318421.
Raffle, Stephen M., O5541910.
Ratcliff, Owen L., Jr., O5530126.
Recker Carol R., N5417290.
Reeves, Jerry F., O5318075.
Robinson, Richard S., O5516810.
Robison, Gary A., O5218757.
Sandidge, William M., O5223321.
Sawallesh, Robert F., O2324336.
Schaefer, Dennis W., O5532505.
Schneider, William A., O5005884.
Schulz, Patricia J., N2326544.
Sneed, Bryant S., III. O5318090.
Sokness, Gary L., O5534170.
Sowder, Norman G., O2308638.
Spencer, Joanne M., N2326865.
Staiano, Ralph A., O5255823.
Steel, Virginia M., N2329982.
Steinbauer, David J., O5260170.
Sullivan, Darr F., Jr., O5406396.
Thomas, Joseph J., O2309090.
Thomas, Stanley E., O2304045.
Tisdale, David M., O5317634.
Tufano, John R., O5018027.
Turner, Charles E., O5316536.
Twombly, Richard F., O5015742.
Vander Naald, James, O5012212.
Walsh, James A., O2317515.
Walther, John R., O5707839.
Watts, Robert P., Sr., O5324133.
Weaver, Noel L., O5413506.
Wessling, Richard B., O2306518.
Whisker, Dennis W., O5536535.
Willmann, Lawrence D., O5225277.
Young, Roger A., O5239176.

To be second lieutenants

Badger, James L., Jr., O5424002.
Ball, Robert M., O2335726.

Bemis, Al H., O5244132.
Bowlyow, Ronald G., MN2328730.
Braddock, Richard R., O2318142.
Brannon, David L., O5425703.
Bristol William A., O5236685.
Brooks, Raymond R., MN422262.
Cook, Thomas E., MN5422229.
Cowan, William L., O5319172.
Darden, Thomas S., O5425191.
Dellinger, William R., O5330783.
Farineau, Paul F., MN5264800.
Gilliam Charles E., O5333419.
Griswold, Walter W., O5334868.
Hinson, Robert L., Jr., O5338449.
Hitchcook, John L., O5714184.
Hohn, Dennis E., O5537586.
Huchko, Joseph E., MN5251193.
Hunsaker, George D., O5338278.
Hunter, Addison A., III, O5421378.
Johansen, Ralph F., O5424391.
Kinman, Harry D., O5247989.
Koop, Gerald L., O5432229.
Larose, Willard G., Jr., O5424206.
Moore, William T., O5336812.
Peterson, Lawrence T., O5238566.
Pope, Richard L., MJ2332743.
Porter, Irvine C., III, O5328924.
Sale, LaFayette L., O5337459.
Schwartz, Samuel R., O5018873.
Sealfon, Michael S., O5230842.
Seremet, Joseph H., O5332943.
Sinclair, Allen L., MN5330872.
Smaggard, Arthur G., O2331639.
Stewart, James R., O2322155.
Thomason, Melvin F., Jr., O5237611.
Tibbetts, Walter P., O5240302.
Tyner, James C., Jr., O5424601.
Utley, Robert C., O5422666.
Wiener, Michael L., O2326899.
Zaccagni, Philip J., O5336107.

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288 and 3290:

Robey, Kenneth W.
Roush, Robert H.
Cox, William R., Jr.
Davis, William T., Jr.
Garrett, Robert W., Jr.
Smith, Leigh W.
Wicker, Russell A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Page, Felton
Noe, Anthony M.
Palacios, Noe

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1969, after adjournment of the Senate, under authority of order of same date:

In the Army

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, U.S. Army.

U.S. District Judge

John B. Hannum, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania vice Francis L. Van Dusen, elevated.

U.S. Attorney

John W. Stokes, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years vice Charles L. Goodson.

U.S. Marshal

Doroteo R. Baca, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years vice Emilio Naranjo.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN FALLON URGES CONTINUING CONSTRUCTION OF THE NATION

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, issued a stirring challenge in an address to the Associated General Contractors of America meeting in their 50th annual convention in Washington March 19.

With the skill and knowledge for which he is noted as a great legislator, Chairman FALLON outlined the building activities and programs which better serve the public interest.

Because he was intimately involved in the conception and realization of the legislation which gives life to the dreams of the people for a better America, Chairman FALLON's remarks should be of interest to each of us.

His timely challenge to continue building this Nation has a direct message for every Member of this House, and I place it in my remarks at this point:

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE H. FALLON, OF MARYLAND, TO ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS, MARCH 18, 1969

It is, as always, a pleasure to join you for your annual meeting. Our association spans many years, and the cooperative effort of that association has contributed substantially to the nation's progress through public works. I hope the association has been as pleasant for you as it has been for me.

As Chairman of the Public Works Committee, I am very much aware of a sometimes painful paradox in our national personality. Virtually every area of our legislative responsibility is periodically attacked, with varying degrees, as "big government, boondoggle, pork barrel, federal bulldozer"—and worse, I suppose. But it is the productive exercise of those responsibilities, beginning with a lighthouse at the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay in 1789 and expanding down through 180 years as our nation has expanded, our population has grown, and our needs have become increasingly complex, that has provided so much of the foundation upon which our national well being rests.

Public buildings house government activities, not so much to serve the individual government activities as to make it better serve the public interest.

Rivers are developed and maintained as waterways to serve economic growth. They are also held in harness to provide water supply, electric power, and playgrounds, and to prevent their wayward destruction of people and property.

Small watersheds are reclaimed and revitalized, that the erosion forces of neither nature nor man shall do cumulative damage to the rural face of the land.

Highways spread a network of unfettered mobility from ocean to ocean, border to border, state to state, village to city, and back. Without them and the flexibility they afford us, little of the abundant and prosperous life we enjoy today would have been possible for a nation that embraces such vast reaches on the continent.

With growth and abundance have come problems. Waters have been defiled and must be reclaimed and protected. In the forward stride, some areas have been left behind and the multiple public works avenues can be and are being used to bring them abreast of their sister regions.

No public works program or project is an entity in itself. Everyone of them creates an ever-widening sweep of opportunity—for employment, for further development, for greater opportunity, for a better life.

It is a fundamental of our form of government that each of us sacrifices absolute freedom that all of us may be held safe in a common freedom. The ethic applies to public works as well as to other aspects of our national life.

To provide the dam that will hold hundreds of people safe from flood, some people must give up land. Elsewhere, to provide a highway that will afford access and opportunity for hundreds, some other people must do the same.

Views in terms of the ethic, it balances—locally, regionally, and nationally. If it did not, our system would not have survived and we would not be, as we are, for all our problems, the most fortunate of men.

You have been active participants in these accomplishments. Let me briefly recite to you the relevant statistics and recount the landmark statutes through which they have been achieved.

The landmark Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the subsequent amendments thereto that have been adopted over the years set into being the greatest single public works program in the history of the world. It tied together in the final and definitive bind all sections of this great nation. It opened the door to all of our citizens to traverse freely and unimpeded over highways, and it not only led to better job opportunities and greater economic growth for our nation, but also to a greater understanding and better knowledge of our country for all of our citizens. One of the great problems we face today is the pressing need for clean water. This affects all of us—large or small—in industry and in our homes. It affects the survival, not only of our generation, but of generations still unborn. The Committee on Public Works has been in the forefront in this field. It recognized its importance at an early stage and has moved consistently in an impressive and meaningful legislative manner to preserve the pristine purity of our nation's lakes, rivers and streams to provide, not only good clean water, but that water that is so essential for our industrial growth.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959 gave a real meaning and a real purpose to federal growth by giving to our citizens, and not only those who work for the government, but the hundreds of thousands others it provided a fit and proper place to carry on their essential duties.

Lately, the Committee on Public Works has moved into a field that requires the attention of all of us, the need to bring those citizens who, through no fault of their own, have fallen behind a majority of our people who live in gainful prosperity. The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and the Economic Development Act of the

XUM

same year are clear examples of the effort—and more than an effort, I might say, to bring all of our citizens up to a standard of living we ask for every American. Economic progress has been tied in with proper public works development in the field of the Appalachian Regions and the economic development program affecting the entire nation. The committee and the Congress has endorsed programs that will give to those people who need it most an opportunity to advance with the rest of the nation.

I have just touched very briefly on a few of the major programs that are covered by the Committee on Public Works. We have, I think, met the challenges that have existed in the past, but let me say this: The challenge is to meet the demands of today and tomorrow with enough hindsight to prevent more old mistakes and enough foresight to anticipate the possible new ones. It is upon that course that we are embarked. This country cannot live without effective and flexible transportation, clean and abundant water, recreational facilities and access to them, and the economic development that waterways and harbors, and assistance to areas like Appalachia, afford, to cite but a few of our tasks.

The critics of public works are, in large part, the advocates of the narrow view. Their battleground is always yesterday or today; ours is tomorrow. Theirs is the status quo; ours is progress and change. Our critics have always been with us, and I suppose they always will be.

They are, so to speak, one of the hazards of the game. But the hazards have not yet prevented either your industry or our committee from striving—even at some risk—to meet the public resource development needs of this country.

I have every confidence you are prepared to continue on that forward course and I assure you that the Public Works Committee certainly is determined to do so. Ours is a commitment to the continuing construction of a nation, still young and still growing. Building of any kind has always been an adventure. Building the nation is the most exciting and challenging adventure of all.

REFLECTIONS ON APOLLO

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the successful Apollo missions have brought national pride to new heights. What was once considered science fiction is now a very real part of our everyday lives. But once the euphoria subsides, we find we are still faced with another very real aspect of our lives; domestic needs which are, as yet, unmet.

Tom Wicker, of the New York Times, has written a column which brings perspective to this issue. He believes that the fantastic success of our space program can stand as a symbol of America's tremendous capacity to excel in all areas of life. He believes that we may now be entering a new era; one that may see our Nation achieve the greatness that potentially is ours.

Because I believe it will be of interest to others, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's March 18, 1969, column, entitled "In the Nation: Reflections on Apollo," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1969]

IN THE NATION: REFLECTIONS ON APOLLO

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—One guest who received deferential attention at the annual Gridiron Club dinner was Frank Borman, the astronaut who captained the recent circumnavigation of the moon. Colonel Borman, despite having led one of man's greatest feats of science and exploration, by no means resembled Superman; if anything, Senators, Cabinet officers, Justices, and generals, jostling each other to shake his hand, found him as unexceptional as any other earnest young fellow trying to live and get his work done.

Since the Christmas-time triumph of Borman, Lovell and Anders has now been followed spectacularly by that of Apollo 9, manned by much the same sort of men, it may be useful to recall that even so remarkable a venture as the conquest of space is, after all, the work of human beings—and not necessarily the most extraordinary of the breed.

TECHNICIANS, NOT POETS

No spaceman, for example, has yet produced any memorable words—either in action or in retrospect—and both the men why fly the missions and those who manage them from earth appear to be first-class technicians, planners, mathematicians, artisans, administrators and the like, largely content to leave the poetry of the thing to others. They are, in short, much the kind of men who man and manage any number of other highly technological, complex, widespread, often dangerous enterprises in the late twentieth century.

This gives rise to some questions not easily answered. One of these is why is it that men who can organize themselves and their knowledge and resources to get to the moon apparently cannot do a great many other things of equal worth and greater urgency.

IF IN SPACE, WHY NOT ON EARTH?

In fact, the vision, skill, courage and intelligence that have gone into the space program ought to shame mankind—and Americans in particular. Because if men can do what the astronauts and their earthbound colleagues—human beings all—have done, why cannot we build the houses we need? Why must our cities be choked in traffic and the polluted air it produces?

Why are our lakes and rivers so fouled by mankind that, as Bob Kennedy once said, if you fall in you don't drown, you dissolve? Why is virtually every major city without clean, safe and comfortable public transportation? Why are our airways and airports overcrowded to the point of scandal? Why does every effort to remove slums and rebuild cities bog down in red tape and red ink?

When a nation can train and organize the skilled manpower needed to launch and recover Apollo, why can't it train and employ the unskilled manpower standing hopeless and embittered on the ghetto streets? Why are the transient workers on both coasts, Indians in the West, blacks in the South and unfortunates in every state going hungry in the richest nation in the world? Is it not obscene for a nation that conquered polio to permit pellagra and rickets?

To raise such questions is not necessarily to suggest that the space program should be halted and its resources diverted to other purposes. When that question was discussed in this space after the moon flight, David P. Bloch of the University of Texas wrote in response:

"This may be an appropriate occasion to take an Olympian view of ourselves. Life is one of the properties of matter. Its evolution has given rise to consciousness. Someone once said that man is the mind by which the universe contemplates itself. Now he is on the threshold of space. Some day it will matter little to what extent our individual or collective interests in space were motivated by curiosity, adventure (not vicarious), acquisitiveness, quest for security, competitiveness, or what have you . . . What will matter will be the consequences, and few of us would take seriously any guess as to what they would be even two generations from now. For all we know, a very practical result of man's colonization of space may be his survival.

MAN'S REACH

"Our reaching out into space is akin to our first clutch at a tool, or to the poor fish's straining to be an amphibian, or to the development of the first nervous system. In its portent, it is of a different order of magnitude than Columbus's discovery. Except for some immediate practical considerations, our reasons for reaching out are inconsequential."

That may be the only answer possible, not just to the question of the space program, but to the riddle of man's failures on earth. Perhaps that mind by which the universe contemplates itself does not yet truly see its own works; but perhaps, too, the consciousness that distinguishes man is entering a further evolution, a new flowering beyond the earth, perhaps.

MEMORIAL TO DR. ENRICO FERMI

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Enrico Fermi will long be remembered as one of the world's greatest atomic physicists, whose experiments resulted in the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever to take place. I can think of no recognition more appropriate than to name the giant nuclear accelerator at Weston, Ill., the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator for the late Italian scientific genius. I deem it an honor to sponsor legislation that will add to man's knowledge in his name. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Dr. Fermi:

SOME THOUGHTS OF ENRICO FERMI AND PARTICLE PHYSICS

From his early days in Italy as an experimental physicist, Enrico Fermi was fascinated with the minute particles of modern physics. Neutrons, electrons, protons and, later, the heavier particles provided him with means to ask questions of nature, and his observation of his experiments gave him many answers which he could record for posterity. Some of these particles he obtained from electrical apparatus. Some from a piece of radium that flung off speeding particles that he could use for his experiments. As an experimenter with these nuclear particles, he naturally was interested in design and use of sources for them. His interest in accelerators, then, and his success in using them to probe for the secrets of nature alone would be ample reason to dedicate the Weston accelerator to his name.

The Nation's more immediate reason to commemorate Enrico Fermi is, as many high school students now learn, his

XUM

achievement in leading the team of scientists and engineers who built and brought into operation the first nuclear reactor which demonstrated a controlled nuclear chain reaction. While the story of this remarkable achievement, which took place at the University of Chicago, has been well recorded for history, it is pertinent to recall briefly its highlights for, without proof that the chain reaction among uranium atoms could occur, there would have been no atom bomb, and no Manhattan project.

The principal fact of science which underlies use of atomic energy, whether it be for peace or for war, as a continuing source of energy or as an explosive, is the fact that under certain conditions atoms of uranium and plutonium will fission, or split apart, with the release of energy. The physical mechanism for practical release of this fission energy is the chain reaction which Fermi demonstrated. With hindsight, his demonstration may seem simple, even primitive in comparison with the sophisticated and elegant devices of this day that employ the chain reaction. But at that time the outcome was far from sure for many practical unknowns could have prevented attainment of what in theory was possible.

I would like to begin the story of Fermi's part in the conclusive demonstration of the nuclear chain reaction with the year 1939. In January 1939, the famous nuclear physicist Niels Bohr visited the United States, only a few days after Fermi had fled from Italy. Fermi already had established himself at Columbia University. The cyclotron there promised to be a powerful new tool for new experiments in nuclear physics. At the time, Fermi was without doubt the greatest expert on neutrons.

Fermi had hardly arrived in the United States when the discovery of fission of uranium took place. The famous Bohr brought the news with him. Upon arriving in New York, Bohr hurried to Columbia University to discuss the new discovery with Fermi.

Fermi saw directly that in so violent a nuclear reaction, neutrons might be released too. If the arrangement were such that the emitted neutrons could produce further fissions, the process might become multiplicative. If circumstances were favorable enough, a chain reaction might be obtained. This was shortly before Bohr and Fermi were to open the Fifth Washington Conference on Theoretical Physics. In that brief time Fermi and a graduate student quickly modified experimental apparatus to confirm Bohr's news. At the conference the next day Fermi was able to speak of the fission process with the conviction of personal experience.

By the time Fermi returned to Columbia the next day, Fermi knew what questions he wanted to answer. Were neutrons emitted in the fission of uranium? If so, in what numbers? How could these neutrons be brought to produce further fissions? What other processes might compete for these neutrons? Could a chain reaction be developed? Fermi began to answer these questions in a letter of February 19, 1939, to Physical Review on the fission of uranium. That spring he gathered together his research group including Walter H. Zinn, Leo Szilard—a Hungarian scientist who had come without benefit of a faculty appointment to work with Fermi, and Herbert L. Anderson, his gifted graduate student and future associate.

Fermi and his group continued their neutron work at Columbia until the summer of 1942 when they moved to the University of Chicago to work more closely with the new Manhattan project. In May of that year the decision was made to build one or more full scale nuclear reactors to produce the artificial element of atomic number 94 at a cost of $25 million. This decision was made in anticipation that Fermi would successfully demonstrate a chain reaction in Chicago.

During the summer of 1942 Fermi planned the construction of a small reactor capable of a chain reaction of a few hundred watts energy output. As his plans evolved, he realized that such a novel and possibly dangerous experiment should not be carried out in the heart of one of the Nation's cities. That September it was decided to move Fermi's reactor—or pile—from the squash court of the university's Stagg Field to the Argonne Forest Preserve. But this move was plagued with troubles. Labor disputes delayed the completion of a building at Argonne. Rather than lose time, Fermi thought that he could assemble his pile at Stagg Field before space would be ready in Argonne. He convinced Arthur Compton of the University of Chicago that the experiment was safe.

Not daring to seek approval from either the Army, which by then had taken over administration of the atom bomb project, or from the university administration, Compton took it upon himself to authorize Fermi to go ahead.

Time was short, General Groves had appointed a special committee to review Compton's entire project at Chicago, which included Fermi's work. The situation was critical. Unless the review committee could be convinced to share Compton and Fermi's optimism, the work of the reactor might be wasted. By recruiting all available help, Fermi and his team set about the arduous task of machining 40,000 blocks of graphite, and assembling them with blocks of uranium metal and oxide into the necessary form.

The review committee arrived on Thanksgiving, 1942. Fermi was not ready. The committee returned to Chicago on December 2. The pile was finished the night before. At 9:45 on the morning of December 2, Fermi began to withdraw the first of the control rods that governed the pile. Before noon he was able to invite Compton and a committee representative to witness the final phases of the experiment. Finally, at 3:20 p.m., Fermi's instruments indicated a self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction had been attained.

The review committee was convinced. Based on its recommendations, the Manhattan project decided to build with the utmost speed and highest priority the plutonium production reactors that were to cost $100 million.

Writing of this experiment some 20 years later, Eugene Wigner, one of the participants, said:

> Do we then exaggerate the importance of Fermi's famous experiment? I may have thought so sometime in the past, but do not believe it now. The experiment *was* the culmination of the last doubts in the information on which our further work had to depend. It had a decisive influence on our effectiveness in tackling the second problem of the Chicago project: the design and realization of a large-scale reactor to produce the nuclear explosive plutonium. This objective could now be pursued with all the energy and imagination which the project could muster.

Fermi stayed at Chicago until the next spring when his group moved out to what is now the Argonne National Laboratory. He continued on with his work. Within 2 years of the Stagg Field demonstration, the initial power run of the first plutonium production reactor began. The time was a few minutes after midnight on September 27, 1944. The place was the Manhattan District's Hanford Works in the State of Washington. Fermi was there to supervise and check the operation.

Fermi's work with the Manhattan District did not stop here. Leaving the scenes of his monumental accomplishments, he went to Los Alamos where he turned his powerful mind to the question of a thermonuclear bomb. Someday I hope the history of his contribution to that mighty item in our Nation's armory can be adequately acknowledged.

In August 1945, Japan surrendered and thus ended the Second World War. The scientists at Los Alamos, Fermi included, began thinking of peacetime research. Fermi was still on leave of absence from Columbia University, but just at that time the University of Chicago began to organize its Institute for Nuclear Studies, which later was to become the Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies. The university repeatedly offered Fermi the directorship, but he was interested in research, not administration. He resolutely refused. Fortunately Prof. S. K. Allison, a distinguished and a very able administrator and a good friend of Fermi, was appointed director of the institute and Fermi then joined as a research scientist. And at the new institute would be a large and powerful synchrocyclotron, which was being built across the street from the old squash court at Stagg Field. This machine was built with the idea that Fermi would be the principal user.

Fermi returned to Chicago on January 2, 1946. While waiting for the synchrocyclotron to be finished, he again worked with neutrons at the Argonne Laboratory, using its reactor as a source. This period at Argonne marked the end of his investigations on neutrons which traced back to his initial work in Rome.

Fermi formed a new group of young pupils, many of them returning from Los Alamos. At Chicago he was active in all seminars and in many discussions. Often, with a single remark, he sowed the seeds of further discovery. For instance, Maria Mayer in reporting an experiment inspired by Fermi generously acknowledged his assistance.

Meanwhile the stage was readying for the last period of Fermi's research. Meson physics was opening and Fermi immediately recognized its importance. Since the new Chicago synchrocyclotron

XUM

promised a powerful artificial source of mesons, Fermi's experimental talents turned in this direction.

The new machine began operations in the spring of 1951, and he and his group soon were publishing new discoveries. He did his last experiment in 1953, and his paper on "Scattering of Negative Pions by Hydrogen" of that year concluded his experimental work. Thereafter, Fermi spent more and more time helping his students by discussion and frequently lending a hand in their experiments, but never again to the extent that would allow him to admit that the work was his own.

Thus freed from the demands of experimental work, he could consider the possibility of working together with the Indian scientist Chandrasekhar on problems of astrophysical interest related to his longstanding interest in cosmic rays. His new colleague was later to write of Fermi's intuitive insight into nuclear physics:

> During all my discussions with Fermi, I never failed to marvel at the ease and clarity with which he analyzed novel situations in fields in which, one might have supposed, he was not familiar and, indeed, was often not familiar prior to the discussion. In the manner in which he reacted to a new problem, he always gave me the impression of a musician who, when presented with a new piece of music, at once plays it with a perception and a discernment which one would normally associate only with long practice and study.

Chandrasekhar also gives us this further insight into Fermi's magnificent feel for nuclear physics and the psychology of his inventive genius. Fermi had described to him how he came to make the discovery which Fermi thought was the most important one he had made, when he was working with neutrons in his early days in Italy. This is Fermi's account:

> One day, as I came to the laboratory, it occurred to me that I should examine the effect of placing a piece of lead before the incident neutrons. And instead of my usual custom, I took great pains to have the piece of lead precisely machined. I was clearly dissatisfied with something: I tried every 'excuse' to postpone putting the piece of lead in its place. When finally, with some reluctance, I was going to put it in its place, I said to myself, 'No! I do not want this piece of lead here; what I want is a piece of paraffin.' It was just like that: with no advance warning, no conscious, prior, reasoning. I immediately took some odd piece of paraffin I could put my hands on and placed it where the piece of lead was to have been.

Mr. Speaker, these few but telling insights into Fermi's work, these evidences of his genius, when coupled with the lasting and vital significance of what he accomplished for this country constitute the necessary and sufficient reasons, as our mathematical friends would say, to dedicate the Weston machine to the memory of Enrico Fermi.

THE PURPOSE OF THE 200-BEV ACCELERATORS

Consider the purpose of the new accelerator and the questions that our scientists can put to nature with its energetic particles. Dr. Robert R. Wilson, director of the project, looks at the many particles discovered through use of less energetic particles. That nature thereby revealed is more complex than first expected, he reminds us, is a challenge rather than a disappointment. In building higher energy machines to study these complexities, all kinds of exciting and fundamental discoveries have been made. Not only have various new particles been observed, but also new physical laws have been discovered while old ones have been observed to be violated. In previous studies of the nucleus—where Fermi was a masterful leader—physicists were able to understand why the stars shine and how matter is made.

Dr. Wilson eloquently reminds us that pure science, the search for understanding, is as important for its effect on the minds of men as it is for eventual contributions to his standard of living:

> Man's effort to achieve a better comprehension of the world in which he lives will continue to have a profound effect not only on his philosophy, not only on his well-being, but also on his whole social organization.

What are some of the questions that scientists can put to nature with the new machine when it is finished? These fortunate men will be in the same happy situation as was Fermi when the Chicago synchrocyclotron came on-line in 1951. Dr. Wilson lists some of these questions:

> Which, if any, of the particles that have so far been discovered, is, in fact, elementary, and is there any validity in the concept of the elementary particles?
>
> What new particles can be made at energies that have not yet been reached? Is there some set of building blocks that is still more fundamental than the neutron and the proton?
>
> Do the laws of electromagnetic radiation, which are now known to hold over an enormous range of lengths and frequencies, continue to hold in the wave length domain characteristic of subnuclear particles?

These are some of the questions that scientists in nuclear physics would explore. There is good reason to believe that they can be clarified by experiments. Although these are questions that appear to be the "right" ones to investigate, the best questions have undoubtedly not yet been asked. Only further experiment with the Batavia machine will give us the insight to ask them. Nature in the past has always surprised us. It is probable, as our scientists take the step up to the 200-Bev machine, that more surprises await.

Enrico Fermi were he with us today would be chaffing impatiently to ask these questions of nature and to interpret her answer.

Enrico Fermi was a great experimentalist. He had a deep and intuitive insight into nature. Working with the Weston machine will demand the greatest insight and ability to see in the experimental returns new relations, new facts that can escape the comprehension of the less gifted. Above all, Fermi was a great teacher. The full return on the Nation's pending investment in the Weston accelerator will be realized only as its scientists can emulate. Fermi in his ability to teach, to simplify, to lay out for their students and associates the strange beauties of the worlds of the atoms.

Mr. Speaker, I have laid out my reasons why the new 200-Bev accelerator should be dedicated to Enrico Fermi and I hope that you and our fellow Members of Congress will give it your support.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Washington Post Sunday supplement, Potomac, of March 16, 1969, contains an article entitled "The League of Women Voters—They've Come a Long Way," authored by Julius Duscha. It is well written and researched and commemorates one of our Nation's outstanding women's organizations.

The League of Women Voters has been in the forefront of social change in our country. Their careful study and consideration of vital political issues has repeatedly resulted in the passage and approval of vital legislation at all levels of our Government, from the city council to the Oval Room of the White House.

The league serves a unique function in the education of its membership. Its nonpartisan nature allows it to take positions unaffected by considerations of party loyalty or political advantage. Its services to the community, the States, and the Nation are outstandingly deserving of recognition and support.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS—THEY'VE COME A LONG, LONG WAY

(By Julius Duscha)

On a gray winter morning 15 women gathered in the comfortable family room of the Herman P. McNatt residence at 14620 Melinda Lane in Rockville to have coffee, exchange neighborhood gossip and talk about poverty in Montgomery County. Three of the women were knitting and another was turning worn-out collars on some shirts as Mrs. George McRory led a discussion complete with hand-drawn charts, on the county's poverty problems and the inadequate community efforts to help its 1600 poor families.

A male reporter felt like an interloper as he sat in the back of the room listening to Peg McRory, who is a great-great granddaughter of Julia Ward Howe, author of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." When you are the only man in a family room full of women it is of course impossible to be inconspicuous. I was there because I had been told I could never understand the League until I had seen one of its unit meetings.

I became interested in the League of Women Voters when I learned earlier in the winter that the ladies were beginning a year-long celebration to mark the 50th anniversary of their organization and of the ratification of the constitutional amendment which gave women the right to vote. "Yes, we're celebrating for a whole year," Mrs. A. P. Guyol, national public relations director for the League, said rather defensively, "but the Girl Scouts spent three years celebrating their 50th anniversary."

For 50 years now women like those who gathered in Mrs. McNatt's family room out in Rockville the other day have been meeting in small groups and earnestly discussing such problems as poverty. Not only are League

XUM

members earnest; they are purposeful, tenacious and often frighteningly well-informed. And they can be effective. No less a political realist than Sargent Shriver wrote the national president of the League last spring when he was still directing the war on poverty to praise the League for its support of the antipoverty program and to say that the organization "surely helped to make the difference between passage and outright rejection or dismantling of a highly controversial and effective poverty program."

Men of course are always tempted to kid women's organizations. There is the clubwoman image of the Helen Hokinson cartoons in the *New Yorker* which showed the befuddled lady chairmen entangled in Robert's Rules of Order. And there is the further feeling among men that despite women's demands for equality the ladies are always prepared to fall back on appeals to motherhood or on their own feminine winks and wiles even to get poverty legislation through a stubborn Congress where the pervading atmosphere all too often is still that of a men's smoker.

But what about the League of Women Voters at the decidedly matronly if not grandmotherly age of 50? To find out I went not only to a League unit meeting to sample its participatory democracy; I also spent some time at its national headquarters on the fifth floor of the American Psychological Association Building up on 17th st. and Rhode Island ave. nw. as well as on Capitol Hill. There, among other things, I found the remnants of the rival Woman's Party and its proud leader Alice Paul, who organized the woman's suffrage march down Pennsylvania Avenue 56 years ago—broken up by the police on the eve of Woodrow Wilson's first Inaugural on March 4, 1913.

The League of Women Voters is the daughter of the National American Woman Suffrage Association which along with the Woman's Party and some other organizations carried on for more than 60 years their fight for women's suffrage. The battle ended in 1920 when the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified. The amendment was adopted by the Senate and the House just 50 years ago, in 1919. Early in 1920, before the suffrage amendment had been ratified by the necessary three-fourths of the states but when it was already obvious that the amendment would become part of the Constitution, the National American Suffrage Association held its victory convention in Chicago. It was followed by the first national Congress of the League of Women Voters.

Carrie Chapman Catt, last president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association and first president of the League of Women Voters, explained the League's purpose to the founding congress in these words: "We are going to be a semi-political organization. We want to do political things. We want legislation. We are going to educate for citizenship. Be a partisan, but be an honest and independent one. Important and compelling as is the power of the party, the power of principle is even greater. Those who have struggled in a 60 years old battle for political freedom should not voluntarily surrender to political slavery—and one kind of partisanship is little more than that. It is possible, even though unusual, to be a partisan and an independent.

"To sail between the Scylla of narrow-minded partisanship on the left and the Charybdis of ultra-conservation on the right," declared Mrs. Catt in her peroration, "is the appointed task of the League of Women Voters; through that narrow and uncomfortable passage it must sail to wreck upon the rocks or to glorious victory."

In the nearly half a century since Mrs. Catt spread out her vision of the League of Women Voters, the organization has been on some shoals and has had some glorious victories. The tiny, gray-haired and persevering Miss Paul still directs the Woman's Party from the early 19th century Alva Belmont House at 144 Constitution ave. ne. across from the U.S. Supreme Court building, continuing its 46-year-old campaign for an amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing women equal rights in all matters of law. But the League of Women Voters, now under the direction of the fortyish, stylish Mrs. Bruce B. Benson of Amherst, Mass., is involved in all matter of issues ranging from foreign trade to the poverty program. The League now takes a neutral stand on the equal rights amendment, which it opposed for 30 years on the ground that it would take away from women protective labor regulations and other laws designed to help them.

"I'm not a feminist really," said Mrs. Benson, a blonde, attractive woman of 41 who favors gold jewelry, as we talked about the League of her modest, vaguely academic and New England office on 17th Street.

"A feminist," she continued, "is really someone who thinks women are better than men. I find myself very irritated with people who treat me as a woman rather than as an individual. If that young thing wants to be a jockey, let her be a jockey, not because she's a woman but if she's able to do it." (Mrs. Benson was referring to Diane Crump, the 20-year-old woman who has had such a difficult time trying to establish herself as a jockey in the face of opposition from male jockeys and from the men who control horse racing.)

Lucy Benson is fairly typical of the 150,000 members of the League of Women Voters. She is the wife of a physics professor at Amherst College. She joined the League in 1950 when the wife of the chairman of her husband's department asked her to. That's the kind of an invitation you don't turn down. But however reluctant, Mrs. Benson may have been in the beginning she soon became a highly interested member. Like most other League members, Mrs. Benson is middle-middle to upper-middle class, well-educated (bachelor's and master's degrees in political science from Smith College and a master's thesis on the decline of the British Liberal party) and intensely concerned about the world around her.

Before becoming national president of the League last year, Mrs. Benson was head of the Massachusetts League. She led such a successful drive to end the excessive powers held by the Governor's Council that an infuriated legislator once referred to her group as the "League of Women Vultures." Commenting on Mrs. Benson's work as president of the Massachusetts League, a Boston newspaper noted: "She has dared to lead the League's 12,375 members far deeper into the thicket of politics than ever before. Today, as a result, the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts is unquestionably the most powerful political action group in the state."

In recalling her experiences in Massachusetts politics, Mrs. Benson said as she sat in her Washington office smoking a cigarette and occasionally sipping coffee from a paper cup: "Probably, most politicians do not attack the League because they are afraid it will boomerang on them as an attack on motherhood. Politicians have very mixed feelings about the League. Many wish the amount of energy we put into the League could be channeled into the political parties. Others want us to be barefoot, pregnant and in the kitchen."

Over the years the League has generally been allied with liberal causes. In the 1920's Mrs. Catt, an internationalist, got the League to sponsor a conference on ways to keep the peace and prevent war. The League has long advocated the removal of most restrictions on world trade. Domestically, the League in recent years has supported civil rights legislation and electoral college reform as well as the antipoverty program. But the League's program, which is supposed to percolate up from hundreds and even thousands of unit meetings to its biennial conventions (and does for the most part), has some curious blank spots. It has never taken a stand on the war in Vietnam and it has not become involved in the current surge of concern over consumer problems, an area that would seem to be made to order for a liberal-minded women's organization.

One reason the League often does not quickly become involved in controversial issues is its tradition of study, study and more study. Its units, for example, are supposed to have been talking about Communist China for four years now. Open housing has been on the agenda while Federal legislation has been passed and gone into effect. Another problem which confronts the League is the feeling among some of its leaders and a lot of its members that they only influence themselves.

"Are we just talking to ourselves?" Mrs. Benson asked in the course of our conversation. "Sometimes I think this is true, but it is not because League members want to talk just to themselves. It's because we lack financial resources to get our information out."

Throughout the country last year, the League spent almost $2.7 million, but only $447,000 of that made up the budget of the national office in Washington. As part of its 50th anniversary the League is seeking to raise its national budget by one-third. Funds for its national office come about equally from members' dues, which are around $10 a year and which are divided among local, state and national offices, and from contributions which members seek annually from businessmen. The League doesn't even pay all of Mrs. Benson's expenses as president. She spends three days a week in Washington and travels a great deal. "We have been and still are extremely poor," Mrs. Benson said, "and that's the honest-to-God truth. We still depend on voluntary contributions and that old sort of Lady Bountiful business."

Mrs. Benson and other League leaders think that the organization is probably more effective on the local and state levels than in national affairs. Local Leagues like to submit questions on key issues to candidates for public office, and these questionnaires often succeed in getting would-be fence-sitters to take positions on issues. Leagues have also helped to organize many successful campaigns for amendments to state constitutions and for reform of city charters.

But when it comes to influencing Congress or the executive departments in Washington, the League's role is much harder to assay. On a major issue before Congress there are so many pressures on both sides that it is difficult to know who is genuinely persuasive.

"Knowledge and tenacity are what we have," said Dorothy Sortor, a wide-eyed, attractive brunette who is congressional secretary—or chief lobbyist—for the League, when I asked her about the League's clout on Capitol Hill.

"League girls," Miss Sortor added, "like to read and they like to write. They know what's happening in the community, and congressmen are responsive to that. Members of Congress appreciate the quality of the letters that come in from the girls."

Senators and Representatives also appreciate the quality of the husbands of League members. Miss Sortor acknowledged that League members whose husbands are important men in a community are not above reminding Members of Congress of such not incidental facts. Sometimes the Senators and Representatives need no reminding because they quickly recognize the name of the League member who may be the wife of the president of the biggest bank back home.

XUM

As Miss Sortor makes the rounds of congressional offices she says that she still finds "a lot of men in government with a 19th century mentality."

"They say to you," Miss Sortor continued, "'Oh, isn't it nice that you're interested in government?'

"Women," Miss Sortor added, "are still at a disadvantage intellectually, and the League is a place where a woman can shine on her own merits. There are no strictly 'woman' issues left anymore. But the League is a place for women who are committed, who have tenacity and who have ability and the time to stick with something. You can't be involved in the world and then just go home to raise babies."

The League also has served as a training ground for women who enter public life. Esther Peterson, a former Assistant Secretary of Labor, got her start by going to League unit meetings for coffee, gossip and serious discussion of issues, as did Mary Keyserling, who until recently was director of the Women's Bureau in the Labor Department. Other League members who made good in public life in the Washington area include Joy Simonson, chairman of the District of Columbia's Alcoholic Beverage Control Board; Kathryn Stone, a former member of the Virginia House of Delegates, and Margaret Schweinhaut, a Maryland State Senator.

Being serious-minded, the members of the League not only are always examining the world about them but are also always looking inward, too. Among other things, this means (in these days when it sometimes is easy to mistake a man for a woman on the street) that the League members are reexamining the need for a woman's organization a half century after women won the vote.

"The question is," League President Lucy Benson said as we talked about the League's future, "whether a women's organization *per se* continues to have any validity. Or is it anachronistic? There have been suggestions that we change our name simply to the League of Voters. Even bastions of female education like Vassar are going co-educational. There is all this student activism and interest in public affairs. Maybe we should make it possible for all young people and not just young women to get involved in the democratic process through an organization like the League."

Maybe. But it is hard to visualize men in a Rockville family room with clipboards at the ready, earnestly discussing poverty, seriously trying to understand its causes and laboriously trying to think, as one woman put it that morning in the McNatt home, "about what really we should be focussing on."

There is something about the slow, educational process of the League of Women Voters that seems to be peculiarly suited to the legendary patience of woman. Besides, man still needs a conscience, and in matters political the League of Women Voters is often as good a conscience today as the suffrage movement was 50 years ago.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

The movement in the United States to obtain equal rights for women began at a small meeting in Seneca Falls, N.Y. on July 19, 1848. The women at this meeting demanded the vote and adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved,* That such laws as conflict, in any way, with the true and substantial happiness of woman, are contrary to the great precept of nature and of no validity, for this is 'superior in obligation to any other.'

"*Resolved,* That all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature, and therefore of no force or authority.

"*Resolved,* That woman is man's equal—was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

"*Resolved,* That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position, nor their ignorance, by asserting that they have all the rights that they want.

"*Resolved,* That inasmuch as man while claiming for himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman moral superiority, it is preeminently his duty to encourage her to speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

"*Resolved,* That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behaviour that is required of women in the social state, should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

"*Resolved,* That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill-grace from those who encourage, by their attendance, her presence on the stage, in the concert, or in feats of the circus.

"*Resolved,* That woman has too long rested satisfied in the circumscribed limits which corrupt customs and a perverted application of the Scriptures have marked out for her, and that it is time she should move in the enlarged sphere which her great Creator has assigned her.

"*Resolved,* That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

"*Resolved,* That the equality of human rights results necessarily from the fact of the identity of the race in capabilities and responsibilities.

"*Resolved,* therefore, That, being invested by the Creator with the same capabilities, and the same consciousness of responsibility for their exercise, it is demonstrably the right and duty of woman, equally with man, to promote every righteous cause by every righteous means; and especially in regard to the great subjects of morals and religion, it is self-evidently her right to participate with her brother in teaching them, both in private and in public, by writing and by speaking, by any instrumentalities proper to be used, and in any assemblies proper to be held; and this being a self-evident truth growing out of the divinely implanted principles of human nature, any custom or authority adverse to it, whether modern or wearing the hoary sanction of antiquity, is to be regarded as a self-evident falsehood, and at war with mankind.

"*Resolved,* That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, for the overthrow of the monopoly of the pulpit, and for the securing to woman an equal participation with men in the various trades, professions, and commerce.

CAPT. A. T. LUTHER: ABLE PANAMA CANAL PILOT HONORED IN CANAL ZONE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the operation of the Panama Canal where there is compulsory pilotage, no professional group plays a more dramatic or vital part than canal pilots. Under Executive order and canal regulations, the pilots assigned to vessels have control of their navigation and movement within Canal Zone waters.

One of the ablest pilots in canal history was Capt. A. T. Luther of the Pacific terminal, whose service extended from the time of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens—1905–07—until his retirement in 1943.

A newsstory in the Panama Canal Spillway of February 20, 1969, gives an account of a recent visit by Captain Luther to the Canal Zone. The story records some of his early experiences, including a conversation with Chief Engineer Stevens who encouraged young Luther when he first sought canal employment. The article is illustrated by a picture showing Paul M. Runnestrand, executive secretary of the Canal Zone, greeting Captain Luther who, despite his advanced years, shows good health and vigor.

When inquiring about further details of Captain Luther's canal service, I learned that when the time came for him to retire, he called on his superior, Comdr. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, then in charge of marine operations of the Pacific sector of the canal, who persuaded him to remain for another year for special piloting assignments and to pass on in written form to those who followed some of the valuable lessons that he had learned from a vast experience as a tugmaster and pilot.

The result was a brochure by Captain Luther, in the preparation of which Commander DuVal collaborated, on "Handling of Tugs in the Panama Canal" issued in May 1942. This work proved to be the first such work in English since a booklet on towboat handling on the Mississippi River published in 1868 and it won wide acclaim for its wealth of knowledge on the act of efficient tug handling.

The indicated newsstory follows as part of my remarks:

[From the Panama Canal Spillway, Feb. 20, 1969]

EARLY CANAL PILOT RETURNS FOR VISIT

Capt. Arthur Taylor Luther, 88, known to the old family of Canal pilots as the "speed merchant" for his expediency in putting ships through the waterway, recently visited the Canal Zone where he had spent 40 years in the service of the Panama Canal organization.

Back in 1905, the young graduate of the Massachusetts Nautical Academy and crew member of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line *Allianca*, often expressed his desire to work on the Big Ditch as he watched the Stateside employees debark at the anchorage in Colon. On one such occasion, John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer for the Canal Commission, heard the young man say he had no fear of the fever, mud, and other hardships which had been enumerated to him. "That's the kind of men we want," remarked Stevens as he told him where to go to be hired.

Due to a mix-up in the paperwork and a return trip to the States, his work record dates back to 1906, when he was made master of a 16 inch French suction dredge. His first job was to dredge the French Canal from the entrance of the drydock to Gatun.

A most memorable experience in Luther's early career was recovering an old French ladder dredge which had been lying in the Chagres River for 19 years. It was full of water and jungle growth covered the dredge almost completely. Working in the torrential downpours of the rainy season, the jungle was cut away from the waterlogged dredge with machetes. Luther and his coworkers

XUM

subsisted on whatever food the jungle yielded and drank muddy Chagres water. It took them 2 weeks to free the dredge which was later repaired and put to work on the Canal. As a result of this ordeal he contracted black water fever and spent some time in the Colon Hospital.

After 9 years in the construction operations of the Canal, Luther was made a pilot but shortly after came the disastrous slides that blocked the Canal from September 1915 to April 1916. Luther went back to work for the Dredging Division. With the dredges working night and day, the Canal was again opened to commercial traffic and Luther returned to piloting. He remained a pilot for 30 years until his retirement in 1943.

As a lock pilot at Miraflores Locks before World War I, Luther joined the U.S. Navy. Because his work was vital to the Canal, he served in the dual capacity of mine field pilot and canal pilot while wearing the uniform of a Navy lieutenant. It was at this time that Luther was dubbed "speed merchant" when he handled as many as three battleships in Balboa Harbor in one afternoon.

After the Pearl Harbor attack, Luther piloted the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Yorktown* through Gaillard Cut at night and in heavy fog. Following the Dredging Division tug *Chagres*, he sneaked through on what he calls his "secret" channel in the Cut. Luther recalls this feat as the highlight of his career on the Canal.

Canal Zone residents may remember his daughters, Mary, wife of James A. Driscoll, former assistant superintendent of the Dredging Division who left in 1955, and Martha, wife of Frank H. Lerchen, who retired in 1964 as assistant Engineering and Construction Director.

Captain Luther, who is a Roosevelt Medal holder, attended the Roosevelt Memorial ceremonies here in 1955.

During this visit he was given extensive tours on both sides of the Isthmus and kept a busy schedule since the moment he arrived on the *Cristobal* January 28.

Captain Luther originally planned to return to the States on the *Cristobal* trip last week but postponed his departure for 2 days to attend a luncheon-meeting in his honor hosted by the Canal Pilots' Association.

He returned to his home in St. Petersburg, Fla., February 15.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, a great bulwark of our American way of life is seen in the dedicated service by the American Legion which this year is observing its 50th anniversary. This is a fraternity of service. The American Legion has a membership that encompasses four generations and the veterans of five wars.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Legion for its continued achievements and devotion to veterans over the years of service to God and country. And, for helping to maintain the security of this Nation.

The American Legion in the years to come, I am sure, will pursue the fine goals established 50 years ago in Paris at the cessation of hostilities in Europe. One great effort of the American Legion to especially note is the worthwhile program with America's youth as the Legion instills courage, understanding, devotion, leadership, patriotism, and good citizenship into the youth of today.

The Legion's work is found throughout the world and the accomplishments derived are surely a strengthening brace on which our American democracy and society rests safely.

HARASSING OF BUSINESSMEN BY EQUAL EMPLOYMENT PERSONNEL

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I have often referred to the confusion created by the number of agencies involved in policing equal employment rights. I have pointed out that many companies have been besieged by personnel from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, and other individual agencies, all determined to see that their own versions of equal employment programs are maintained.

So far as I have been able to determine from many sources, the personnel of these agencies are not concerned with seeing that the law is complied with; rather, they see their duty as one to belittle, embarrass, bully, and abuse American industry for failure to make up for alleged past misdeeds. As time goes on, these people are becoming increasingly arrogant and insulting. I think that it is high time that the personnel of these agencies learn that there are limitations on their power. Judging from recent reports, they might also learn simple manners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter and enclosures which I recently received illustrating only a part of what employers must put up with under the guise of equal employment. It is hard enough on employers to comply with the many regulations and to accomplish the many forms and questionnaires issued today without being subjected to fishing expeditions conducted by misguided zealots. I often wonder whether the objectives of these persons are intended to coincide with the best interests of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHWEST FOREST INDUSTRIES,
Phoenix, Ariz., March 3, 1969.

Hon. PAUL A. FANNIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FANNIN: I applaud and support your efforts to create some order and consistency out of the present confusion created by the multiplicity of agencies involved in policing the Civil Rights Legislation and Equal Employment Regulations issuing from Executive Order 11246.

In addition to being thoroughly investigated by the EEOC, Southwest Forest Industries has been investigated by compliance review teams from the Agriculture Department, Post Office Department and Small Business Administration. We have just received word that next month the Defense Department will have their turn at one of our operations.

The time taken up by the representatives of the various agencies is not inconsiderable, and each agency has a somewhat different idea as to what actions a company should take to demonstrate its affirmative action in providing equal employment opportunities. Southwest Forest Industries employs approximately 3,000 men and women. Over 35 per cent of the employees come under one or another of the Government classifications of minority races. These minority race employees are laborers, operators, clerks, salesmen, skilled craftsmen and supervisors. With the large amount of discrimination which is allegedly occurring across this nation, we are hard pressed to understand how all of these agencies are able to find time in their schedules to investigate us separately.

Your efforts to correct this situation are appreciated.

Sincerely,

D. H. BROKAW.

P.S.—Take a look at the enclosed copy of a just received Defense Department letter and request for information they want. Consider how many man hours of work will be required to collect and prepare the data requested.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY,
11099 South La Cienega Boulevard,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 26, 1969.

Mr. ROBERT SCHILLING,
Southwest Forest Industries,
Santa Fe Springs, Calif.

DEAR MR. SCHILLING: Confirming our conversation of 25 February 1969, I will visit your facility at 9:30 a.m. on 18 March 1969 for the purpose of conducting a review of your Equal Employment Opportunity program.

In preparation for the review, it is requested that certain information be made available during the visit. A check list of the information desired is enclosed along with a blank SF-100 which should reflect current employment statistics.

I look forward to our visit and wish to express my appreciation for your cooperation. If you have any questions concerning the review you can reach me at (213) 643-2246.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. GARFIELD,
Contractor Relations Specialist,
Office of Contracts Compliance.

LIST OF MATERIAL THAT SHOULD BE PREPARED IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW—ONE COPY OF EACH ITEM CHECKED WILL BE NEEDED

√ 1. One copy of your last previous Standard Form 100, EEO-1 Report.

√ 2. Current employment statistics entered on a Standard Form 100.

√ 3. List of all departments by name, indicating the total employment and total minority employment in each. For those departments having minority employees, identification of each minority person by name, race, sex, date of hire, current job classification, and rate of pay.

√ 4. A list of all recruitment sources (employment agencies, schools, colleges, Federal and civic organizations, and so forth) showing job categories for which each is used, and sample copies of job orders.

√ 5. Copies of recruitment advertising, including college recruitment brochures, if any.

√ 6. Statistics denoting the total number of applicants during the last 3 months showing, separately applicants for white collar and blue collar positions by sex, indicating the number of minority group persons by race in each category.

√ 7. List of new hires during the last 3 months, or the last 100 hires, still on the payroll, showing name, race, job into which hired, pay rate, and date of hire.

√ 8. List of all significant changes in classifications by promotions and transfers of employees involved, and showing the classifications and departments losing and gaining the employees. (3 months)

√ 9. List of company-sponsored or supported educational and training programs and activities showing current employee participation in each, with minority group participation shown for each.

√ 10. List of all terminations during past 3 months, or the last 100, by name, race, sex, job classification, and rate of pay.

√ 11. Copies of all collective bargaining agreements and the seniority lists and progression charts provided for therein.

√ 12. Evidence of notification to collective bargaining agent(s) of Federal contractor status. (Posting EEO posters suffices—60–1.42b)

√ 13. Current seniority list, identifying minority group employees. In the event a seniority list is not applicable, a list of all employees, identifying minorities by race, and showing date of hire and current job title.

√ 14. An estimate of manpower needs, by department or job category, for the next 12 months.

√ 15. Copy of the Company Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, and copies of material indicating management follow-up to monitor awareness of the policy by supervision.

√ 16. List of affirmative actions taken to implement the EEO program in the past 6 months.

√ 17. A copy of a Certificate of Nonsegregated Facilities as prescribed by ASPR Section 2–201(a)(xii).

√ 18. A copy of your written affirmative action program as directed by OFCC's Rules and Regulations 60–1.40.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD KENNEDY BEFORE THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held its 27th annual meeting at Atlantic City, N.J. On Tuesday, March 18, I had the pleasure, along with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of addressing the delegates of this convention.

Senator Kennedy's speech recognized the crucial need for this Nation to stem the tide of migration from rural to urban areas. He also spoke of the critical electric power problems facing America today.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the text of Senator Kennedy's forward-looking speech proposing an eight-point program for guaranteeing the advance of low-cost, reliable power consistent with the capabilities of our society:

Address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy Before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Atlantic City, N.J.

It is a pleasure for me to be here today, with the leaders of our nation's rural electric cooperatives. Cooperatives have a long and distinguished record—not only of supplying low-cost power, but also of advancing the public interest; not only of bettering the lives of rural Americans, but also of building a balanced economy for our country as a whole.

HISTORY OF RURAL COOPERATIVES

In the depression years of the 1930s, this nation recognized the priority of rural development. We recognized that low-cost electricity was the cornerstone of economic progress. And we recognized that cooperatives are an effective framework to achieve that goal. We moved forward with an REA program which has been an outstanding and resounding success.

When I say "we," however, I certainly do not mean that every American back in the 1930s recognized the potential of rural electric cooperatives. One utility spokesman at the time was rather confident about the subject. In 1935 he observed:

"Only in the imagination of the farmer's champion does there exist any widespread demand for electric services on the farm, or any general willingness, or ability to pay for it. With the present low average of farm income, the electrification of all farms, desirable as this may be from a social viewpoint, is clearly an economic impossibility."

In the face of opposition like that, you cooperative leaders have certainly come a long way.

And there is a lesson from your success. You have shown that when determined rural Americans get together, you can handle the most difficult tasks. You have demonstrated that with a strong REA program, the goal of rural development is anything but an economic impossibility.

Your record is an impressive one. When the REA Act was signed by President Roosevelt in 1936, only 10 per cent of America's farms were served with electric power. Today, over 98 per cent are served.

You have nearly 1000 consumer-owned cooperatives in 46 states. You supply electricity to over 20 million Americans. You bring its benefits to over 150,000 new consumers every year.

Even though I come from an urban state in the Northeast, I am well aware of the significance of this growth. Let me give you an example of what rural electric development—and the dedication of the members of the NRECA—has meant in one specific case.

A decade ago, in the Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, the economy was dying; jobs were scarce; people were moving with increasing rapidity to the cities.

Then the Blue Ridge Electric Membership Corporation, a consumer-owned electric cooperative, came into the picture, and its members went to work. They recognized the potential of rural areas. They worked closely with community leaders. They sparked a broad economic development drive. They achieved spectacular results.

Today, in the five Appalachian counties served by Blue Ridge, there are 8,000 more jobs than in 1962. Five thousand new homes have been built in the last four years. Ten new high schools have been constructed since 1960. A technical institute and a community college have been built. The tourist and recreation business is booming.

You at the NRECA, however, can accomplish this kind of progress only if the REA is responsive to your needs. And this can happen only if the Administration and the Congress of the United States respond with determination to the budget requirements of the REA.

President Kennedy recognized this only too well. In Billings, Montana, on September 22, 1960, he pledged of his Administration: ". . . we will restore REA to its former role of preeminence, bringing it from costly concern over political interference, higher rates of interest and budgetary starvation, and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

Shortly after he took office in 1961, President Kennedy asked Congress for a $50 million increase in REA 2 per cent loans. Congress approved.

The next year he sought an additional $100 million, over and above the initial $50 million. Congress again approved.

In the first two years of his Administration, the budget for REA loans to "rural electrics" was doubled. Congress supported the Administration requests.

This is the kind of action in the Executive and in Congress which is so important to the cooperative movement. And now is the time, at the start of a new Administration, when we must be alert to your concerns.

NEED FOR RURAL-URBAN BALANCE

We are constantly confronted with the unmet problems of our cities. Yet you, who live in our rural areas, know that a large part of these problems can be met by paying greater attention to developing an even stronger rural economy.

You must continue your leadership in developing job opportunities in our rural areas. Only then will there be the balance between urban and rural America which will slow the rural-urban migration. In recent years, nearly 600,000 people a year have left the countryside and journeyed to the cities in search of jobs and shelter and medical care. In the cities, they have found that their hopes are not fulfilled.

Unless we halt the tide of migration from the country to the city, a migration which puts more and more people into less and less space, we have little hope of making our cities livable. You and your organization and its work can restore promise to the countryside—the promise of jobs, of good schools, of modern medical facilities, and of all the other elements so important to raising the quality of life. This is perhaps the most critical aspect of the tasks which lie ahead for you and your friends.

EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM FOR RELIABLE POWER

In light of your responsible approach to electric power development, this NRECA annual convention is a particularly suitable forum for a broad look at the electric power problems and issues which confront us today. I think we must view them as part of a more general program to enhance our social and natural environment.

I would like to present what I think is an effective program of guaranteeing the advance of low-cost, reliable power consistent with the enhancement of the quality of our environment.

I would like to discuss this eight-point program with you today.

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

First, rural electric cooperatives. Recently, Congress has failed to appropriate enough REA loan funds to meet your needs. It has rejected legislation to provide supplemental funds.

As a result, there are at present almost $400 million in applications pending in the REA—but there is less than $100 million available to meet these needs.

I know that the NRECA is considering the idea of a self-help financing institution. I know further that you are alert to the danger of supplemental financing. You are aware that opponents might try to use it to weaken the REA loan program.

If you decide to adopt supplemental financing. I urge you to keep up the fight for REA loans as well. You will have my support and cooperation on both fronts. I will support full funding. I will support needed loans at 2 per cent interest. I will support loans to distribution co-ops. And I will support loans to necessary G and T's.

XUM

PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Second, planning and coordination, no longer can we afford the overlap and the inefficiency of building facilities on an ad hoc basis. Rather, all systems in each region of the country must work together to look 10, 20, 30 years down the road.

The benefits of coordination have been recognized by most members of the industry. Many have made attempts at regional planning. But the industry on its own has not moved far enough or fast enough.

And far too often, emerging councils have been overly restrictive. They have failed to follow a critical planning principle. I know you endorse that principle, and I stress it here today: all utility systems in a region must have equal access to participate in planning and coordination on fair and equitable terms.

In particular, all systems—large or small, public or private, cooperative or privately-owned—must be offered reasonable opportunity to share in the output of large new plants.

I supported the Kennedy-Aiken bill last year. I will continue to support similar legislation in this session of Congress.

Effective planning also requires better research and development. For both utilities and the Federal Government have neglected their responsibilities.

Manufacturers, rather than utilities, have borne most of the R. & D. expense in the field of electric power. The result, predictably, has been an over-emphasis on efficiency of equipment.

It is a distortion of priorities that an industry which received $15 billion in operating revenues last year spent only $37 million—less than ¼ of one per cent—on research and development. Surely this figure can be doubled or tripled, and I urge all utilities to make the effort.

When appropriations and power legislation are considered in the Senate, I will stress the need for a more balanced R. & D. program in the electric power field. The Federal Government has spent over $2 billion to develop the technology for nuclear generating plants. Surely a small fraction of that sum can now be spent on environmental and social protections.

SITING OF POWER PLANTS

Third, siting of power plants. With demand for electricity doubling every decade, an estimated 250 huge new generating plants must be built by 1990. Each will require a site containing several hundred acres. These plants will bring light and power to our people. But they can bring dangers as well—to the environment, to the residents of surrounding areas and to the structure of the whole electric utility industry. Only planning beforehand can ensure that these plants are safe, efficient, reliable and consistent environmental protection.

For the past several weeks I have been revising the Electric Power Plant Siting Act which I sponsored last year. I intend to introduce it shortly in the Senate. Today, for the first time, I would like to discuss some of its features.

Under my bill:

The Federal Power Commission would study all considerations affected by the decision of where to build a power plant: air and water pollution, effect on ecological balance, scenic beauty and recreation possibilities, geological feasibility, and economic efficiency.

The FPC would develop siting criteria and prepare an inventory of sites for all regions of the country.

The FPC would update the siting plan every year. Thus changing technology would be taken into account—for example, changes which may someday make it safe to locate plants in cities.

The FPC would consult with all government agencies experienced in specific aspects of the problem.

At every stage, the FPC would consult with concerned citizens, local planning agencies and the utilities.

During the initial two-year period of the study, certain restrictions would be placed on the construction of new plants. Utilities would be required to comply with existing pollution standards, and to give assurance that serious harm to the environment would not occur.

When this legislation is introduced I would appreciate the suggestions—and hopefully the support—of the NRECA.

RELIABILITY

Fourth, reliability. Blackouts are a clear and present danger, and the situation will continue to get worse unless we plan now to prepare for the future.

The northeast blackout of 1965 and the P-J-M failure of 1967—these and other disasters have dramatized for all Americans that blackouts are inconvenient, costly and dangerous to public health and safety.

We have had in my own state of Massachusetts four outages in the last three months. These have emphasized and re-emphasized the disruption and frustration which accompany any loss of electricity. And scores of blackouts throughout the country have highlighted the need for remedial action at the Federal, state and local levels.

Last month I introduced the Electric Power Reliability Act of 1969, a revision of legislation I sponsored last year. Let me summarize that bill:

The FPC would oversee the formation of effective regional planning councils throughout the country.

Full participation and influence in the council would be given to every utility or group of utilities in the region.

Each council would develop a coordination plan for its region, providing inter-ties, backup facilities, and other measures to minimize the effects of failure in one part of the system.

The FPC would establish minimum standards of reliability.

Construction of extra-high-voltage generating and transmission facilities would have to conform to the overall plan and meet the reliability standards.

The FPC would have power to compel steps necessary for reliability and efficiency.

Hearings on an identical House bill are starting next week. I hope that the Senate will give equal consideration. And I hope that the NRECA, which endorsed quite similar legislation last year, will continue its responsible interest.

Most blackouts are preventable. When they are not, their effects can be minimized. There is no good reason why the deficiencies of the past must be tolerated in the future.

EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUES FOR POWER PRODUCTION

Fifth, At this very moment, controversies over power facilities are raging from Chesapeake Bay and Long Island Sound in the East to the Columbia River in the West. Everywhere the challenge is the same: to preserve our environment while seeking reliable and low-cost power.

The problem is complex. Fossil-fueled plants cause far more air pollution than nuclear plants. But nuclear plants produce dangerous radioactive waste.

And nuclear plants threaten far more serious thermal pollution than their fossil-fueled counterparts. While overheating of our waterways can be avoided by cooling towers, these may become unsightly blights on the landscape. For the most part, however, nuclear plants can be blended more skillfully than others into surrounding areas.

Let me emphasize the positive as well as the negative. Thermal effects need not pollute; they can also enrich. Superheated water might be used for example, to cultivate fish cultures, to heat buildings, and to prevent ports from freezing over. Other benefits from power facilities should be explored.

With some variation, both the siting bill and the reliability bill which I mentioned provide for councils on the environment. These councils, composed of conservation experts, would advise and work with the FCC on environmental aspects of its decisions. The bills contain other environmental safeguards, and would go a long way toward assuring balanced growth—with full consideration of the conservation interest.

Finally, I look forward to the day when unsightly overhead wires will be gone from our scenic landscapes. The industry itself has shown commendable interest in putting transmission and distribution lines underground. What is needed now is further research to develop effective and economically feasible techniques. All must contribute. As a start, I urge funding of the Department of Interior's industry-government research program on undergrounding.

All of us must recognize the urgent demand for electric power and the necessity for new facilities. We cannot simply say "don't build here." Rather, interested parties must work together toward solutions which accommodate both the need for additional electric power and the need for environmental preservation.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Sixth, consumer protection. Consumers of electric power are a captive market. Utilities are granted exclusive privileges by the states. In return, utilities have an obligation—to inform and consult with those so vitally affected by what they do.

Cooperatives have always operated on the principle of consumer participation. It is the basis of your success. And the lesson is clear: All utilities must develop greater public contact with a priority on the public's interest.

Consumers deserve courteous and efficient service. They deserve swift repair when breakdowns occur. They deserve to be informed of what utilities are doing. Unfortunately, this attention is often lacking.

I am disturbed, for example, by complaints that during recent blackouts consumers were unable to phone their utility company to report that the power was off. It sometimes took hours to get through. And when calls were finally connected, customers received an unresponsive recorded message.

In addition to service, vigorous maintenance of the lowest possible rates is perhaps the most important form of consumer protection. As a New Englander, I am especially sensitive to the problem. For we pay nearly the highest rates in the country for our electric power.

Frequent and thorough investigation of rate structures is absolutely critical. Only with full knowledge, gathered by objective bodies, can we determine whether rates should be raised or reduced.

Far too many states have failed to protect their people in this regard. Regulatory commissions have been weak, understaffed, and dependent for information on the very utilities they were set up to regulate.

To meet some of these problems, I have cosponsored Senator Lee Metcalf's bill to promote utility consumers' counsels. The bill would create a Federal agency to act as an ombudsman on utility matters. It would provide support to similar state agencies.

Consumer councils would appear before state and Federal regulatory bodies. They would publicize relevant information about utilities. And they would firmly assert the consumer interest at all times. I join the NRECA in supporting this bill.

DICKEY-LINCOLN DAM

Seventh, the Dickey-Lincoln dam. When a utility receives a government-granted monopoly, there is no pressure of competition to ensure efficiency and consequent low rates. We have no standard by which to judge its performance.

In New England, I will continue to fight for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam project. It would serve as a source of low-cost power, and a yardstick for judging other rates in the area. And it would serve as a backup during blackouts, as well as during peak periods.

The feasibility of Dickey-Lincoln has been confirmed time after time. Congress has authorized the project. It must now vote funds to move ahead at last. I pledge to continue the fight.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Eighth, social responsibility. These are turbulent times. Unrest and dissatisfaction plague our rural communities and our crowded cities. We are the richest nation on earth. But we have failed so far to meet our most pressing domestic problem.

Electric power utilities constitute one of the largest industries in the United States. They have the opportunity and the responsibility to help improve the lot of every American.

Cooperatives have a solid record on this score. You have advanced the broad economic development of rural America. You have supported important measures for the cities. You have worked to promote the rural-urban balance so necessary for a prosperous nation.

The utility industry as a whole, however, still employs only a very low percentage of Negroes, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and other members of minorities.

Again, cooperatives have made substantial contributions—especially in setting up co-ops in areas where a majority of the benefitting members have been from minority races.

I would urge all segments of the industry to continue to make a strong effort toward equal opportunity. The industry can eliminate racial discrimination in its hiring practices. And it can actively seek out minorities in its membership, its leadership and its staffs.

The electric power industry, with over half a million employees, is uniquely capable of developing programs for the unemployed and underemployed. Some progressive utilities have already initiated on-the-job training. Many have an opportunity to provide manpower development activities for the less advantaged in our society, All can learn from the attention to jobs given by rural cooperatives.

I know that you are constantly exploring ways in which you can assist the people you serve. I sincerely hope that the whole utility industry will follow your lead, and will capture the opportunity to meet public needs.

You are important to the future of this nation—no only because you daily strengthen rural America; not only because you bring better lives to millions; and not only because you plan to be aggressive in continuing your impressive work. You are important to America because whatever work you do in the countryside makes lives in our cities better; makes economic development greater; makes our nation as a whole stronger.

This is the challenge which the NRECA has recognized since its founding, and the challenge which remains with us today.

Because of you, millions of Americans are participating in our economy and society in a meaningful way.

As we applaud the past efforts of the thousands who are gathered here today, let us rededicate ourselves to the unfinished agenda of effort that remains.

This is the spirit of the men and women you represent in rural America.

And it is in the spirit of this splendid organization which I am pleased to have addressed today.

DEATH IN VIETNAM

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, recently the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an article entitled "We Died in Vietnam." The subject of the article was the awesome responsibility carried by those who have the task of negotiating a peace in Vietnam while the death toll continues. The article, written by R. J. Henle, S.J., academic vice president of St. Louis University, was brought to my attention by William I. Bouton, of Greenville, S.C., whose son recently was killed in Vietnam while serving as a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army.

I believe that the thought expressed in the article will be of interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WE DIED IN VIETNAM"

THOSE WHO STALL NEGOTIATIONS CARRY HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONTINUED TOLL

(By R. J. Henle, S.J.)

Gulliver reported, on his return from one of the "remote nations" of the world, that the Lilliputians were in violent disagreement with their neighbors over whether eggs should be eaten by breaking the small end or the large end first.

Deep theological and political passions surged between the large-enders and the small-enders; invective and counter-invective resulted in bloody violence.

Would that some Jonathan Swift could transpose the tragic comedy of the Parisian talks to the context of a "remote nation" of the world, so as to display to all the absurdity of the round-tablers and the long-tablers of the protocol, propaganda, and face-saving of Paris.

All this would be comedy, were it not bitter tragedy in that, for every hour of delay, human beings are being burned and blasted and blown to pieces in Vietnam. Whatever one thinks of the justice, of the rightness of the Vietnam war, the spectacle of delays while men die is sickening.

In Henry V, Act IV, King Henry, incognito at the campfire, says: "Methinks I could not die anywhere so contented as in the King's company, his cause being just and his quarrel honourable." Young Williams, not knowing that he spoke to the King, replied: "That's more than we know." And Bates: "Ay, or more than we should seek after; for we know enough if we know that we are the King's subjects. If his cause be wrong, our obedience to the King wipes the crime of it out of us."

And, finally, Williams: "But if the cause be not good, the King himself hath a heavy reckoning to make when all those legs and arms and heads, chopped off in a battle, shall join together at the latter day and cry all 'We died at such a place'; some swearing, some crying for a surgeon, some upon their wives left poor behind them, some upon the debts they owe, and some upon their children rawly left. I am afeard there are few die well that die in a battle, for how can they charitably dispose of anything when blood is their argument? Now if these men do not die well, it will be a black matter for the King that led them to it . . ."

And it will be a black matter for those responsible for the continuance of the Vietnam tragedy and a black day when those shredded bodies stand before God at their resurrection crying all, "We died in Vietnam."

There should be an arrangement by which, for each established death in Vietnam, black-bordered telegrams be delivered to the head of each delegation in Paris naming the deceased, his age, the place of his death and its hour, and surviving relatives. As these telegrams pile up, they may be a memento of the hours of futility in Paris. Or a great sign, such as we use to proclaim traffic fatalities, might be erected across from the front door of each delegation in Paris and each casualty in Vietnam be registered in large numerals with the striking of a dismal death knell.

How can men pause or take their ease, when this chopping off of heads and arms continues because of their failure to negotiate sincerely for peace?

FRANK W. BOYKIN

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Mobile Register newspaper published on March 13 an excellent tribute to a remarkable man. In order that it be shared with more Americans I place it here, as follows:

FRANK W. BOYKIN

From rural obscurity as a 35 cents a day water boy to the national spotlight both in public and private life is a rare career.

So rare, indeed, that Frank W. Boykin will be remembered as one of few to experience it in the fullness of reality which he lived to do.

His achievements in influence and wealth after he left his native Bladon Springs in Choctaw County for Mobile and Washington in search of greater opportunities for ambition, and greater outlets for energy, gained prominence for Mr. Boykin.

He was indefatigable in this search. But no more indefatigable than he was enthusiastic and optimistic.

He once quoted the late Gov. Bibb Graves of Alabama, "I will just keep on keeping on," and adopted the phrase as also a motto for himself.

He had the privilege of pursuing that motto longer than most men and he remained steadfast in the pursuit until at last death intervened to end his career at the age of 84 years.

But Frank W. Boykin will live in memory and in history not first of all for achievements in business and politics, not first of all because he grew wealthy in multiple holdings in private enterprise or because he became known literally to multitudes of his fellow Americans as a colorful congressional figure of influence and distinguished appearance.

Nor will he live in memory and in history first of all for public service as a long-time member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the First Alabama District. Much as this service may be appreciated and should be appreciated, it is not the prime reason for which he will be remembered.

His exuberant, spontaneous friendliness toward his fellowmen exceeded all else in assuring that Frank W. Boykin will not soon be forgotten.

Those whom he knew long and well, those whom he knew only casually and those whom he knew not at all—all of these knew the warmth of his greeting, the cordiality of his smile, wherever he and they met.

XUM

He translated his exhilarating, unfailing friendliness into a household term—"Everything is made for love"—and wherever he went and whomever he saw he demonstrated his esteem for others, whatever their walk or station in life.

It truly may be said that Frank W. Boykin was blessed with much of which there is too little in this world: Uninhibited friendliness.

This quality of his personality lives after him as an example in need of wider and more frequent practice by men who travel this way but once.

PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED PERSONS

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as a member of the Special Committee on Aging and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual, I have long been interested in the problem retired persons face with respect to part-time employment. Too often retirees are confined, long before they are incapacitated, to lives devoid of the stimulation and enjoyment work can bring. I have been convinced that retired persons are a wasted manpower resource, but that it takes imagination and resourcefulness on the part of employers to make effective use of the skills older persons may possess.

The John Deere Co., Waterloo Tractor Works has pioneered in using retired employees in its plant, and recently has created a program that ought to be examined throughout this country. Matching the need for persons familiar with the plant to the need of retired persons for jobs, the company now is using its former employees as tour guides for the 14,000 persons who visit their plant annually.

An article published recently in the Bulletin of the Institute of Gerontology at the University of Iowa describes this imaginative program.

I ask unanimous consent that the story of this pioneering venture be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

John Deere's Use of Retirees May Set National Pattern

An idea born at the John Deere Waterloo Tractor Works may spread to other large industries throughout the United States, and even become world-wide, setting a new pattern for the effective use of retirees. Innovator of the plan is Bush Dodd of Cedar Falls, member of the Deere sales department in charge of plant visitations. Before the "idea" employees were selected daily from production and sales departments to conduct plant tours. Production suffered as men were drawn from assembly lines and machine shops. "Foremen hated to see us coming," states sales manager Lyle Cherry.

Then came the idea. The plant is visited annually by some 14,000 persons. Why not use retirees who knew the plant's layout, tractor-building processes, and the job skills involved. These former employees not only possessed great loyalty to Deere, but cared deeply about Deere's "image." Why not employ this heretofore unused highly skilled, knowledgeable labor group as tour guides? Many were still active and still very much interested in the plant where they had spent most of their working life. Also, retirement incomes would be supplemented. Thus, the program appeared to have many mutual advantages.

Dodd's idea was a welcome solution to a problem, but no sooner had it become operative when another problem appeared. Putting retirees back on the payroll would involve tremendous paper work—pension adjustments, accident and insurance coverage, income tax withholding—and might also affect their Social Security benefits. The problem seemed insurmountable until an outside agency engaged in the business of supplying part-time personnel agreed to handle the hiring, payroll, and other paper work.

After final details were worked out, the retiree-guide system was initiated in the fall of 1966 and at present has about fifty guides. "We try to have enough so the tours won't become a burden on the retirees. Nothing is compulsory. If a retiree has scheduled other activity on a day we call him to take a tour, he is not pressured. A man who is retired should be able to call his time his own."

Qualifications for the tour guides include capacity to walk four or five miles a day, knowledge of the plant, and "he must like people. It's hard work—talking and walking." Mr. Cherry states that "Enough retirees are used to handle the tours without the Social Security $1,630 limit on earnings being affected."

Mr. Dodd, in an appraisal of the program, said, "I would certainly recommend this procedure when part-time help is needed. We have found these gentlemen sharp and eager, having a deep desire to improve themselves in the knowledge of the product; and they have become skillful and tactful in the handling of our people. Their vast knowledge of our operation has been helpful, and from the standpoint of good public relations, the program has been outstanding. These people feel they still have a value and that John Deere still has an interest in them, so it has been a successful venture."

HOW CAN WE BEST GET LAW AND ORDER?

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of Nation's Business, readers were given the opportunity to sound off to the editor on the question: "How Can We Best Get Law and Order?" It is my understanding that the response to this question brought the largest number of replies any "Sound Off" question has in a long time. These responses are a good cross section of the mood of the Nation in dealing with this problem and should provide a reliable guide to legislators and law enforcement officers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Record the "Sound Off" question, the explanation of the question, and a sampling of responses to the question:

Sound Off Response: How Can We Best Get Law and Order?

The nation's soaring crime rate is one of the gravest problems that confront Americans. Latest FBI statistics show a crime increase of 19 per cent for the first nine months of 1968, with robberies up 32 per cent and murder, rape, assaults all jumping sharply.

Together with crime is a widespread disdain for authority.

Law and order was a major issue in the Presidential campaign. President Richard M. Nixon, Democratic nominee Hubert H. Humphrey and Independent George Wallace all cried out for a curb on crime.

The need for law and order is a fact with which no one can quarrel. How best to attain it is another matter.

Many contend the nation will never solve its crime problem until the "root causes" for it are cured. Crime commissions, sociologists and others say that among these are a lack of jobs for the disadvantaged, slum housing, an unrealistic welfare program, and sham rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents and convicted criminals.

Just as many brand as "hogwash" the contention that poverty alone is responsible for crime. They decry poverty, but claim that this can't excuse criminals, that what is needed to stop crime is a tougher attitude by courts toward those who rob, rape, murder and mug, along with beefed up police forces. They also call for less permissiveness and more respect for our established institutions.

Slums may well be a breeding place for crime. But FBI statistics show increases of crime in affluent suburbs and rural areas as well.

How can we best attain law and order? What do you think?

Get tough with the lawbreakers.

That's the opinion of a majority of Nation's Business readers responding to February's "Sound Off" question, "How can we best get law and order?"

An outpouring of responses shows many definite opinions.

Many feel poverty and unemployment must be eliminated. But they stress this alone is not enough. For an immediate cutback on crime, Nation's Business readers look to the judicial system and the law enforcement agencies.

The most common criticism—that courts are too lenient—was coupled with the protest that policemen are not given enough power to carry out their functions and are not backed by the courts.

"There is only one way to have and maintain law and order. Quit coddling the lawbreaker!" writes C. L. Thayre, president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank in Cherry Tree, Pa. "Let's give our police some backing. You don't hear the law-abiding citizens crying 'police brutality'."

"We seem to have come so far in protecting the rights of the individual that we are forgetting that society has a right to protect itself from lawlessness. We need speedier trial procedures and courts that will support rather than hamper law enforcement," Keith Brown, secretary and treasurer of Sealrite Manufacturing Co., Kansas City, Mo., says.

R. T. Ball, administrative supervisor of West Virginia Pulp and Paper in Charleston, S.C., advises, "Reverse the recent findings of the Supreme Court which have handcuffed law enforcement personnel in favor of the criminal."

"The problem lies with the inefficiency of the courts," James S. Jackson, president of The Boston, Inc., New Philadelphia, Ohio, says. "We will have no better conditions in this country until we have judges who have the guts to serve a penalty to lawbreakers."

"The judicial process takes too long," says W. Clarence Kimbrell, chairman and president of Kimbrell's, Inc., a chain of furniture stores in North and South Carolina. "Interminable delays and appeals must be eliminated. Appeals should be fast and decision quick. The men and facilities to apprehend and prosecute should be beefed up."

"The overcrowded conditions of the courts and the leniency of these courts have created our biggest problem," says Philip R. Hoffman, president of Hoffman-Marquard Machinery

XUM

Co., St. Louis, Mo., and, the American Machine Tool Distributors Association, Washington, D.C. "Many crimes are committed by men who are currently out on bond awaiting trial. As long as the judges extend freedom on bond, change of venue and delays offered by defense attorneys, these unemployed lawbreakers will pursue crime. The problem is not with the police."

S. Whitney Downer III, regional manager of Bell & Howell Co., in Westfield, N.J., says, "Police should have power to search 'suspicious' persons or dwellings. Where trial is required, it should be as soon as possible after the indictment. Guilt should be established on the facts, not the procedure of the arrest and jurisprudence surrounding the crime. Improper procedure should give cause for a new trial, not freedom to a heinous criminal."

"A liberal sickness permeates our judicial system," Logan Young, president of Forristal-Young Sales Co., St. Louis, Mo., says. "Recent Supreme Court decisions leave little hope for any foreseeable improvement."

"Slums may be a breeding ground for the crime germ, but the courts could be penicillin instead of just aspirin. It stands to reason that the tougher the consequences, the fewer people would take the risk of committing crimes," writes Frank Latham Jr., president of Texas Security Systems, Inc., Austin, Tex.

"Courts should hand out penalties and make them stick," says E. M. Everson, manager of J. C. Penney Co., Inc., in Beaver Dam, Wisc. "Speed up court actions by eliminating silly technicalities and eliminate retrials except in obviously necessary situations. Elevate the police to the position of respect formerly held and forget about so-called police brutality."

"Swift, sure justice to offenders is the best deterrent to crime and violence," Paul McHenry, vice president of Macmillan Ring-Free Oil Co., Inc., of El Dorado, Ark. says.

Readers were particularly firm in their views toward crime repeaters.

Vernon Miller, president of Alvern Boat Shop., Inc., Northport, N.Y., calls for "no bail and stiff prison sentences for second offenses," and "fewer criminals released on technicalities."

F. A. Bendix, president of Bendix Mouldings, Inc., Bronx, N.Y., suggests refusing bail "in all cases involving defendants with any record."

"Release on bail is one of the rights guaranteed by our Constitution, but I believe that, if a criminal has been given advantage of one release on bail, if he is re-arrested, further release on bail should not be permitted," Albert A. Beste, vice president of fuel sales with Koenig Fuel and Supply Co., Detroit, Mich., says.

Donald H. Burton Jr., supervisor of systems evaluation for Hercules, Inc., Wilmington, Del., says, "As one of the first steps, I would suggest a minimum mandatory jail sentence for repeat violators of the law."

"Make it a federal law that commission of any crime with a gun or knife, upon conviction carries a mandatory minimum jail sentence. Much crime of all kinds is committed by people who are only big and brave enough when they have the advantage of a lethal weapon," contends R. A. Niles, manager of design and engineering for American Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.

W. J. Sagstetter, sales promotion director for Gulf Publishing Co., Houston, Tex., says, "To those who use force as a weapon, the return use of force against them is the only language they understand. Let's quit tolerating the mobs who occupy public places and destroy public property."

John Clements, field products specialist with American Standard Corp., Detroit, says we will achieve order "by making clear to everyone the law and just what it means. This is the guideline for all, with no exceptions. All must know and realize that to go beyond the law for whatever reason, you must pay the penalty."

"Only by strict enforcement of the law is order possible," A. Bruce Durkee, president of Durkee-Mower, Inc., Lynn, Mass., says. "A law unenforced is worse than no law because all laws then become candidates for breaking and all authority ceases to exist."

E. K. Goodson, vice president of Belk Brothers Co., Charlotte, N.C., says, "Let's restore in the minds of the criminally inclined fear of punishment."

Howard G. Mikeleit, a Buffalo, N.Y., dentist, expresses the views of many readers when he says, "Restore the death penalty. In 1968, there were no executions in the U.S., but thousands of decent, law-abiding citizens were killed."

William H. Henneberg Jr., general agent for Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., New Orleans, calls for a "mandatory death penalty for premeditated murder and the sale of narcotics to minors."

Others attribute the breakdown of law and order to outside influences.

"Riots and defiance of authority are stated methods of the communists to gain control of this and other countries through chaos and revolution. Why not deal with the communists in this country as the criminals they are?" asks Fred A. Rose, president of Corbett-Rose Music Co., of Alcoa, Tenn.

Many readers say crime and violence in television and movies and excessive news coverage of criminals have led to the increase in crime.

O. P. Johnson, manager of Union Carbide Corp.'s Greenville, S.C., plant, feels "the vast increase in filth, obscenity and pornography in literature, movies, etc., contributes to the permissive attitudes in our lives."

R. C. Boyd, customer service manager with Westinghouse Electric Corp., suggests, "Change the national mores." He calls for a "broad-gauge, concerted effort in all areas of public communication, TV, radio, press, advertising, government at all levels—to influence society's attitudes. Simultaneously, it requires recognition of criminal tendencies early in life and treatment as a disease, with congruent research effort."

To preserve and maintain law and order with permanence, readers call for a return to morality, respect for others and their property, and respect for the nation's laws. They look to the family unit, the educational system and our land's highest leaders to instill discipline and a respect for authority.

"Moral decline, not poverty, is the main reason for the crime increase," Estel R. Borden, owner of Borden's Motel, Mexico, Mo., says. "The percentage of crimes was lowest during the depression years of the '30's."

"Law and order will never be realized until a majority of our people really want it badly enough to live better, more honest lives and insist on exemplary lives from our leaders and elected officials," Richard A. Seggel, president of Dodge-Newark Supply Co., Inc., Newark, N.J., says.

"Our youth are not disciplined any more," Rudolf Abrams, vice president of Great American Knitting Mills, Inc., Bally, Pa., says. "A disrespect for parents breeds disrespect for the authorities in education and law enforcement."

"The nurturing of respect for authority has to begin in the home during the child's earliest years and should be reinforced by his school and religious training as he matures. Until we seriously concern ourselves with the cause of home breakdowns, the downgrading of basic religious and moral principles, other efforts to attain law and order will be futile," H. E. Roethe, an assistant manager with Oxford Paper Co., New York City, says.

A. Amarillos, president of Omega Service Parts Corp., also in New York City, suggests, "Hire school teachers with strict moral principles who respect the law and are willing to instill respect for the law in their pupils."

T. E. Henderson, superintendent of United Cotton Goods Co., Inc., Griffin, Ga., says, "Permissiveness within the home, school, college and courts has destroyed character-building principles in many of our young and we are paying for this. To restore law and order, reinstate discipline, enforce the law and make criminals pay for crime."

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF JONES AMENDMENT

HON. THEODORE F. STEVENS

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners passed a resolution late last year which pertains to legislation designed to permit my State to operate a ferry-type vessel of foreign construction in U.S. coastwise service.

The resolution recognizes the problem confronting Alaska and delineates the reasons such legislation is desirable.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Relating to Proposed Legislation Submitted to Congress by the State of Alaska in 1968, Designed To Permit the State of Alaska To Operate a Ferry-Type Vessel of Foreign Construction in U.S. Coastwise Service

Whereas, The major cities of Southeast Alaska including the state capitol, City of Juneau, are isolated, in that they cannot feasibly be interconnected with each other by overland highways nor can they feasibly be interconnected with other cities of the United States or Canada by overland highways; and

Whereas, The State of Alaska, in 1963, constructed the *Alaska Marine Highway* and through its Division of Marine Transportation, owns and operates large, ferry-type vessels between Seattle, Washington, and the isolated cities of Southeast Alaska and between the City of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Canada and such cities of Southeast Alaska and between the several isolated cities of Southeast Alaska; and

Whereas, The *Alaska Marine Highway* is essential to the people of these Southeast Alaska cities as the only means of connection with continental highway systems; as a means of access and egress to this vast region of some 46,000 square miles; and as a tool for economic and industrial development particularly with relation to the tourist industry; and

Whereas, The entire cost of construction of the *Alaska Marine Highway* including the purchase of ferry vessels has been financed by the people of Alaska through the sale of State general obligation bonds; and

Whereas, The *Alaska Marine Highway* is an essential highway link to the trucking industry in intrastate, interstate and foreign commerce movement of cargo; and

Whereas, The *Alaska Marine Highway* is not a common carrier engaged in commerce within the usual sense of these terms but is in fact maintained and operated as a toll highway; nor is it operated in competition with privately owned common carriers but is only providing a means by which private

XUM

common carriers may transport cargo and passengers between points in Southeast Alaska, Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and Seattle, Washington; and

Whereas, The growth of traffic over the *Alaska Marine Highway* since its inception in 1963 has been phenomenal resulting in a critical shortage of ferry vessel capacity in August, 1967, and an annual 20 percent increase in tourist traffic was projected for 1968, 1969 and 1970, which projection is now believed to be conservative; and

Whereas, It was essential for the State of Alaska to augment its ferry fleet by the addition of at least one large ferry vessel by June, 1968; and

Whereas, No suitable ferry vessel of U.S. construction was available nor could one be constructed and available before 1970; and

Whereas, In order to remedy the emergency and adequately serve the traveling public, the State of Alaska purchased a large ferry-type vessel, the M/V Wickersham, which vessel was built in Norway, construction having been completed in December, 1967; and

Whereas, the State of Alaska cannot utilize the M/V Wichersham to the fullest of its capabilities as a ferry because of the existence of the so-called Jones Act (46 U.S.C. 289, 883) which prohibits the utilization of foreign-constructed vessels in American coastwise service, that is, picking up passengers or merchandise at one United States port and discharging the same passengers or merchandise at another United States port, but instead must limit the M/V Wickersham's operations to interconnection between Canada and the United States, which is a foreign service; and

Whereas, The restrictions of the Jones Act are causing American tourists to spend American dollars in Canada which would be spent in the United States, because tourists travel through Canada to Central Alaska, whereas, the M/V Wickersham would permit these tourists to choose to travel the *Alaska Marine Highway* for a considerable portion of this route, rather than over Canadian roads; and

Whereas, The restrictions of the Jones Act discourage tourist traffic to Southeast Alaska because tourists may not go from one Alaska community to another by means of the M/V Wickersham; and

Whereas, The Congress has from time to time passed special legislation to permit Canadian vessels to carry passengers and merchandise between United States ports, more particularly between ports in Alaska; and

Whereas, Certain of the legislation permitting Canadian vessels to engage in United States coastwise trades is still in force and effect; and

Whereas, The State of Alaska has proposed legislation, such being H.R. 17815 and H.R. 17814, 90th Congress, 2d session, the purpose of which is to enable the State to utilize the M/V Wickersham in coastwise service as a ferry, by granting special permission to the M/V Wickersham and exemption thereby or waiver from the provisions of the Jones Act.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That with respect to HR 17815 and HR 17814, 90th Congress, 2d session, and any similar legislation which will be introduced by the State of Alaska in the session of Congress which will convene in January of 1969, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners assembled in its Eighteenth Annual Convention recommends the following:

1. The Jones Act has placed an undue burden upon the *Alaska Marine Highway* demanding relief, in that, unlike other states, the State of Alaska may not freely and fully develop its highway system without restrictions, nor is the State of Alaska free to use foreign material in construction of its highway systems, as are other states, these disabilities being based upon a statute passed by Congress to remedy a condition in no way resembling the *Alaska Marine Highway* and its problems.

2. The Jones Act (46 U.S.C. 289, 883) by restricting coastwise service to vessels built in the United States has imposed an insuperable burden upon the people of the State of Alaska in developing their highway system.

3. The Jones Act was never intended to prevent one of the states of the United States from developing its highway system, and had there existed such as the *Alaska Marine Highway* in 1920, when the Jones Act was enacted, the Congress would have very likely excluded state-owned marine highway operations from its coverage.

4. The State of Alaska should be granted an exemption, exception, waiver, special permission, temporary permission, or some other special legislation should be enacted by Congress enabling the State of Alaska to utilize the M/V Wickersham for the purpose for which it was purchased, a coastwise ferry service, all of which is in the best interests of the State of Alaska, the national defense of the United States, the United States balance of payments, and in the overall long term best interests of the American shipbuilding industry, shipbuilding workers and American merchant seamen.

Adopted November 14, 1968.

A STUDENT LEADER SPEAKS OUT

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the voices of responsible student leaders are beginning to be heard across this country. An example of their thinking is the following editorial by Mr. John Heerlein in the Breeze, which is the Madison, Va., College newspaper. Mr. Heerlein's excellent article on Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, the president of San Francisco State College, is recommended to my colleagues:

EDUCATOR FIGHTS BACK

Congratulations are in order for one faithful educator in California who has taken a firm stand against the ever-increasing number of agitators attempting to disrupt campuses throughout the U.S.

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, noted educator and semanticist, and Acting President of San Francisco State College, stated before a House subcommittee meeting on February 3, that "an alliance of militant students and alienated faculty, using tactics that helped the Nazis rise to power in Germany, is dedicated to destroying society, starting with San Francisco State College."

The militant students, on strike since November 6, 1968, have demanded that the administration set up a school of ethnic studies, with absolute autonomy from the California state college system. The student demand for autonomy has certain requests, all of which are non-negotiable. They apparently want all or nothing.

Another demand of the militants is that all black students wishing admission in the fall of 1969 be accepted. However, this would do away with the present acceptance system and could be against the Civil Rights Act, resulting in a type of reverse discrimination.

The strike itself started when black students attacked the campus newspaper (6–8 Negroes were arrested during the attack for beating up the Editor). Since that time, planned violence has overtaken the campus. It was first directed toward the classrooms when students were terrorized and furniture was turned over. This was soon followed by a series of minor bombings and arson (mostly trashcan fires to disrupt classes). Finally, the violence spread to guerrilla fighting and outright student beatings.

It appears that most of the students were against mob rule and were simply seeking an education. However, those students attempting to attend classes were severely beaten by the militants.

Hayakawa has taken a firm stand, and has said he is prepared to keep the college going, even if he must continue to rely on squads of policemen every day to prevent strikers from disrupting classes. He estimated that the actual cost incurred for the use of police to be approximately $100,000 per day.

What are the students' reasons for this alleged takeover attempt? He says "the Students for Democratic Society has said it wants to destroy our society. However, they are not going to begin here."

When commenting on the news media coverage, he states: "It is very interesting to attend a noon rally and get home in time to see yourself on the six o'clock news." Although he feels that there are presently revolutionaires on campuses through the U.S. attempting to cause trouble, he says that his problems differ from those of other college campuses throughout the U.S. as each has its own unique problems.

Let us be truly thankful for such a man as Dr. Hayakawa and that we do not have the problems on our campus that he is presently facing.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS READY TO VOTE

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. In my remarks at that time, I commented that I thought most Senators had come away from high schools or colleges being impressed with the high quality and intelligence of the students they met.

On Wednesday, March 12, I held a collegiate news conference, and answered questions from editors and reporters representing newspapers and radio stations at a dozen colleges in Pennsylvania and the District, and I should like to say that my observation about the high quality of our young people today was fully supported.

In a wide-ranging discussion of foreign, domestic, and military affairs, the students showed a deep concern over the problems we are facing today, and also a good understanding of what the important issues are today.

The questions they asked were every bit as intelligent and mature as any I received from adults last fall while I was campaigning throughout Pennsylvania for the Senate.

Too often, the unruly and disruptive element on campuses gets all the publicity, and it is easy to forget that these irresponsible elements are in the minority. The majority of our students today not only have considerable intellectual and moral concern about the directions our country is moving, but they are interested in bettering, not destroying our institutions, as some of the dissidents do.

I consider it a privilege to be able to stand up and report that the responsible students have said something, such as at this collegiate news conference.

This experience is further evidence that now is the time to lower the voting age to 18, to give these responsible young people an active voice in the affairs of their country.

WATER NEEDS OUTLINED BY CONGRESSMAN JONES OF ALABAMA

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. **FALLON**. Mr. Speaker, the alarming downward trends in the rate of water resource development were outlined to members of the Associated General Contractors of America March 19 by our distinguished colleague from Alabama, the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

He is widely hailed as a great authority on water resources, and he puts his knowledge to valuable use as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control for the House Public Works Committee. In addition, he serves as chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Appalachia and has served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds.

His contributions to the direction and accomplishments of the Public Works Committee, and the contributions of the other subcommittee chairmen, have made my job as chairman easier and have advanced the improvement of this Nation for all the people.

His comments to the contractors, particularly in regard to the need for better evaluation of the total benefits of water developments, have great significance, and I include them in my remarks at this point:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE BOB JONES BEFORE THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA HEAVY AND UTILITIES DIVISION, MARCH 19, 1969

I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you today and discuss the outlook for construction of public works facilities.

Forecasting is always dangerous. The rapidly changing economic situation of the past year emphasizes the difficulty.

There is one aspect of the outlook for new public works to which I can testify without question. That is, the outlook is not nearly so good as it should be. When compared to the present and anticipated needs, our national investment in public works facilities, especially water resource development, is woefully short.

To be specific, we have authorized 450 Corps of Engineer projects on which there has been no construction. Planning is completed in 160 of these projects, but there has been no funding.

The 1970 budget submitted by the former administration called for only 11 new construction starts and 15 new planning starts—mere peanuts compared to the backlog.

Those of you engaged in construction of Corps of Engineers projects already know of the starvation funding which seems to be coming a way of life. Budgetary restrictions have meant delays and stretch-outs for about 70 per cent of the ongoing Corps projects. The very tight federal expenditures ceiling has also prevented transfer of savings from one project to another where schedules could be advanced.

The same tight-belt situation applies in other public works areas—reclamation, building construction, highways, small watersheds.

These delays and restrictions have not promoted efficiency in pursuit of public projects.

I don't have to tell you that construction costs are rising each year. Each year a water resource project is delayed adds to the ultimate cost of that project.

In addition, the later completion dates for projects have been costly in delaying the availability of project benefits, including flood control, water supply, navigation, recreation, power, and general economic advancement. The loss in benefits due to delays in funding was estimated a year ago to amount to approximately $200 million. In addition, the delay of power on line at 12 multiple-purpose projects results in a loss estimated at $52 million in power benefits.

The level of public works activity is all the more alarming when you pause and take a look at the general trends in this country. Population is increasing, trade and commerce are up, and the gross national product is rising. During the past 10 years, federal government receipts and expenditures have doubled.

But in the public works area, direct federal outlays for civil projects have remained about constant in dollars. In view of the annually increasing costs, those dollars are buying fewer dams and reservoirs, fewer miles of roads, and fewer public benefits.

As a share of the total budget outlays, our nation's investment for the future through public works has actually declined.

While the present situation is distressing enough, the years ahead have more problems.

The very limited number of new starts funded in recent years means that the construction pipeline of the Corps is rapidly drying up as the current projects are being completed.

During the past three years, the Corps completed projects with a total cost of more than twice the value expected of new projects started in the same period.

It is estimated that without a significant increase in the number of new starts in the immediate future, the construction pipeline of the Corps will require an annual level of funding of only about $500 Million by fiscal year 1974. This compares to a current annual funding requirement of about $900 Million and represents a decrease of about 45 per cent.

The pressure to hold down new starts is felt from two flanks. We have already mentioned the budgetary limitations. The second flank involves the double-barrel issue of the interest rate used for computing the benefit-cost ratio and the criteria used in evaluating a project's benefits.

It is perfectly clear that, at this moment, interest costs for government money are up. But our water resources developments are being constructed, not for the moment, but for the future, and will be delivering benefits 50 and 100 years from now. Any attempt to chart the course of interest rates over the next 100 years would be fool-hardy, but we can look to history and see that the cost of money has changed several times during such a time period.

Also changing is the value of water and the benefits of water resource projects to the people and to the economy of the nation. This change in value is more predictable.

Until about 50 years ago, water resource development accrued benefits primarily through improvement of navigation and the increased prosperity this fostered through growth of trade and commerce.

But our nation changed. Population increased. People accumulated in the cities. New products, industry, and technology were developed. Increased population and greater consumption resulted in greater accumulations of wastes.

More people meant greater emphasis on the need for economic growth and industrial expansion to broaden employment opportunities, particularly in depressed rural areas.

Increased production and prosperity made recreation and leisure possible for more people.

The requirements for industrial and residential sites increased the value of land and marginal flood plains came into use.

Likewise, the need to feed and clothe the larger population made transportation of water to arid lands economic.

These changes multiply the importance of water resource development for water supply to cities and industry, for low-flow augmentation, for economic stimulation, for recreation, for flood control and alleviation of human misery, for agriculture and for navigation.

As the population continues to increase, these benefits of water resource projects become more significant to the people, and we must give them proper credit in evaluating projects.

Experience indicates that estimates of benefits from water resource developments in the past have been far too conservative, particularly the total benefits of a project.

We place unfair restrictions on future generations in evaluating resource projects without due regard to the increasing values which will accrue from growing population and higher levels of prosperity.

Those who delay this necessary work in the belief that it can be accomplished at less cost in some future period delude themselves.

Thus, the budgetary and criteria restrictions which hamper these direct federally financed projects are doubly dangerous. They delay the appreciation of the benefits, and they increase the ultimate cost.

The one area of federal public works endeavor which has shown substantial increase during the past 10 years has been the assistance grants to States and local governments to help construct facilities such as roads, schools, hospitals, water supply systems, and waste disposal facilities.

Here, too, problems are ahead.

As borrowing costs for States and municipalities in the past six months have soared to the highest levels in a generation, more than half a billion dollars in tax-exempt bond issues have been postponed or canceled altogether.

Statutory interest-rate ceilings have cut some states and localities out of bond revenue sources. The unusually high cost of money has caused others to re-evaluate, postpone, or cancel projects where local participation is involved.

There is no indication that credit conditions will ease this year.

The difficulty in securing local matching funds for participating programs will have adverse effect on many projects—hospitals and health facilities, school and college construction, waste treatment facilities and water supply projects, streets, and highways.

Meaningful increases in Federal assistance in this area are no where in sight.

Instead, we hear today the same arguments which have been used to oppose public works projects throughout our nation's history.

You may remember the forecasts of doom concerning the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the 1950's. Listen to the opposition of Rep. Cleveland Bailey of West Virginia: "The cost of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway will be added to the United States' national debt now near the legal ceiling."

A Pennsylvania Member believed: "There is no genuine merit in this proposal. It is not justified from a navigational standpoint; it is not justified from the standpoint of national defense."

Rep. Thomas J. Lane of Massachusetts imagined other problems: "The proposed St. Lawrence Seaway would detour business away from our ports and our railroads with side effects that would compound our present difficulties. It is estimated that 30 per cent of Boston's foreign trade would be lost to the Seaway.

"Similar losses would be suffered by all other Atlantic and Gulf Ports and traffic along the Mississippi will diminish."

Similar arguments were used before that, when the Rivers and Harbors bill was amended to provide for development of the Bonneville Dam on the mighty Columbia River in the northwest. Listen to what then Rep. Frank Carlson of Kansas said: "It is a power project to put water on this arid land. There is no sale nor need for additional power in this section."

Referring to the new land which would be opened to farming in the northwest: "How can the farmers of the middle west compete with this kind of proposition?"

Earlier, do you know what they were saying in opposition to the construction of the Tennessee Valley Authority Project in 1933? Here are some quotes from the Congressional debates:

"How far can the government run into public debt without impairing its credit and bringing about a great crash? Extraordinary borrowing would be at this time a calamity.

"If you pass this bill . . . you will destroy the Commonwealth & Southern Company, which is a holding company, and make it impossible to ever pay dividends to thousands that own stock in that and allied companies.

"The existing power company in that part of the country is able to produce more power than can be consumed by any business development in the next 10 years." That was Rep. Harry Clay Ransley of Pennsylvania.

Consider the concern of Rep. Joe Martin of Massachusetts: "The trusting people of Tennessee and Alabama hope that out of this government venture in the realm of business will rise a new industrial empire. A magnificent mirage. Lost sight of is the fact that industrial expansion in the United States is over for a few years at least . . . I think I can accurately predict and no one in this generation will see materialize the industrial empire dream of the Tennessee Valley."

Rep. Carl Edgar Mapes of Michigan said: "This is no time to start expenditures of this kind when we are trying to reduce the expenses of the country, when everybody is in such distress. It is not a sound investment. It is economically unsound from the standpoint of both navigation and the development of power."

Rep. Daniel Reed of New York believed: "This is not retrenchment. It is wild, unrestrained and inexcusable extravagance."

A former House Member now in the Senate said: "I cite to you that nothing definite or conclusive has been offered to show that there is any particular need at this time . . . The development of power in that particular locality of the nation, or of fertilizer, for that matter, can be of no general good, as I see it."

If we listen to the opponents of public works, the time to start will always be in the future; whether depression or prosperity, the economic conditions will never be auspicious; the public debt will never be low enough to justify an increase; taxes will always be too high to merit investment; other needs will always be too pressing and demanding; the facilities will never be justifiable; the imaginary and false fears of local economic disaster will always lurk ahead.

I submit that our nation's entire experience with public works improvements proves these opponents wrong.

Our nation's investment in development of resources has paid dividends to the people many times over in greater general prosperity, growth, and enjoyment. This investment has been the very keystone of our unequalled level of economic achievement.

Other problems—the cities, poverty, unemployment, education, and training—cry out for immediate attention. These are real and must be serviced.

But direction of our efforts toward these problems will be marked with frustration, and the problems themselves will be compounded in the future unless adequate attention is given to the basic needs for resource development and construction of needed public facilities.

In fact, many of the problems which seem so urgent today are related to our past neglect of resource development.

I have confidence in our country, our great economic strength and our ability to move forward.

We cannot defer vital public improvements and hope to move forward at an acceptable pace for future growth, security, and well-being.

Most of these projects require years of planning before they become a reality. When some crisis makes the need apparent to all, it is generally too late.

If we don't start making plans and move forward making those plans a reality, this nation is going to be impoverished in such areas as water resources shortly after the year 2000 when our population has doubled to more than 400 million.

That's 30 years from now—a short span.

Yet at the present rate, we are not even keeping up with the backlog of public works needs. We are certainly not building for future needs.

Present plans accommodate only present requirements and that, in a most meager fashion.

This meager servicing of resource development in the sacred name of economy is going to prove very costly in the long run.

Repairs for lack of proper planning have been our most expensive endeavors in public projects. Repairs cannot be made without extraordinary expense, and inconvenience.

Repairs or rehabilitations will not give us the comprehensive and total beneficial use of our water and other resources.

As an example, the Ohio River was initially developed under the Flood Control Act of 1909 with a principal aim for the navigation potentials.

The Act ignored all other aspects of water resources development and today we are trying to rehabilitate this enormous and valuable stream. But due to the industrialization and urbanization in the flood plains of the river, no scheme can now be developed to give us all the benefits of the resources of this stream.

This primary lesson should be so impressive that we dare not continue these gross mistakes and miscalculations in our future planning.

Failure to plan and develop for all the total aspects of water use penalizes future generations and forecloses options which should remain viable.

Our nation will respond to the need for development of such resources as water.

If that response is delayed until a crisis provokes action, the solution will be expensive if it is obtainable at that late date.

As a group which has a strong interest in seeing America progress, I urge you to join in helping awaken the people to the needs for a national goal of proper, orderly, and adequate development for the future.

We must hasten to do this work.

We lose distance each day this work remains undone.

OPPOSITION TO NOMINATION OF DR. JAMES E. ALLEN

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, strong objections have been voiced in Alabama and from throughout the South to the choice of Dr. James E. Allen to fill two powerful positions in the present administration. Dr. Allen is scheduled to assume the duties of the Office of U.S. Commissioner of Education and also the Office of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The reasons for opposition by responsible leadership in the South are clearly shown in an article published recently in Human Events, and reproduced on the editorial page of the highly respected and influential Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala.

Mr. President, I believe that the facts, inferences, and conclusions expressed in the article are highly relevant to the appointment of Dr. Allen. Accordingly, I commend the article to the thoughtful consideration of Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as an extension of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Mr. Busing" Comes to Washington

Republican politicos were intensely unhappy last week with the naming of the controversial Dr. James E. Allen—a zealous school integrationist—to two powerful positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The startling selection of New York state's commissioner of education, who will assume both the jobs of assistant secretary of HEW and U.S. Commissioner of Education in the Nixon Administration, is considered a stunning setback by GOP strategists who realize the party must move southward to forge a permanent Republican majority. Yet the strange choice of Allen—made by Nixon's supposedly good friend Robert Finch—promises to wreak havoc with that plan.

"If anything can regalvanize the Wallace movement," noted one Southern Republican last week, "it is the appointment of such persons as Allen." But Allen's policies—if implemented on a national level—are bound to trigger an adverse reaction to the Nixon Administration not only in the South but in almost all other sections of the country as well.

The czar of New York's primary and secondary education system for 14 years, Allen has become the champion in inflexible and irresponsible integrationist policies, policies which Nixon repeatedly—and vigorously—opposed during the campaign. He is, in fact, "Mr. Busing" himself. Moreover, in New York's decentralization struggle, Allen allied himself with the racial militants, both black and white.

What Allen will probably choose to accomplish in his new post can be gauged from his New York performance in the past six years. On June 14, 1963, he issued a directive to every school district in New York demanding the elimination of "racially imbalanced" school as "one having 50 per cent or more Negroes enrolled." Since this incredible edict, Allen has been disrupting the state's local system by energetically trying

XUM

> to end de facto segregation, closing down perfectly good schools if they are "racially imbalanced" and instituting a massive busing program . . .
>
> Upon being formally nominated to his new position last week, Allen did nothing to suggest a softening of his previous positions. He even went so far as to stress that he was "fundamentally" in agreement with the past Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, whose plans to achieve compulsory racial and economic integration in the nation's schools included massive busing, educational parks and the virtual elimination of neighborhood schools.
>
> Allen's love for Howe was not exactly a surprise, however. Indeed, Allen's chief aide in implementing his own compulsory integrationist policies was one Theron Johnson, who became a special assistant to Howe in 1966. Also an advocate of busing and educational parks, Johnson plans to stay in his $25,000-a-year job to serve Allen once again.
>
> Yet Allen's attitude on integration is not all that is disturbing. In the late 1950s, Allen put pressure on the city board of education to help eliminate an investigation into Communist teachers headed by assistant corporation counsel Saul Moskoff. Allen, further, is considered almost as responsible as John Lindsay for permitting racial militants to take over the schools in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville area.
>
> The Allen selection, then, bodes ill for the Nixon Administration. Unless Allen can be hamstrung, HEW will be a far more activist department than Nixon—or its new secretary Robert Finch—had led many to believe.

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS' 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute to the dean of the Alabama delegation, the Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS, who has completed 25 years of service in this House.

Our distinguished colleague has the unusual honor of having been elected to the Congress with a minimum of personal effort on his part. At the time of his election, he was serving as an officer in the U.S. Navy during World War II. He was released from active duty to take his seat in Congress on March 14, 1944, and has served continuously since that time.

The relative ease of his initial election was a credit to his reputation as a hard worker. He earned this reputation while serving as circuit solicitor for the Third Judicial Circuit of Alabama from 1931 to 1943 when he entered the Navy.

He has maintained this reputation for hard work during the past 25 years as a Member of this House.

The Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS is noted for his conscientious and dedicated service to the people of his district and of this Nation. The people of every section of this land should be grateful to him for his attention to the problems of national defense as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

We, in the Congress, owe him a special debt of gratitude for his skills and adeptness in handling appropriations for the Congress as chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

As a reflection of his longtime interest in the building of this great Nation, he has recently assumed responsibilities on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. From this important assignment he will be able to continue to exercise his great interest in the public endeavors which form the very backbone of our economy.

Our colleague's reputation for close attention to the needs of the people of the district he represents is evidenced by his unusually handsome victories in those few occasions when he has had opposition.

I am confident that the people of the Third District of Alabama will return GEORGE ANDREWS to this House for many years to come.

As I join in commemorating his 25th year of service, I wish him and his lovely wife, Elizabeth, continued good health and happiness in the many years of service which lie ahead.

A PROPER MEMORIAL

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it has disturbed me to hear of the recent statements of Rev. Ralph Abernathy, mayor of the problem city set up on the Mall in Washington last year. Mr. Abernathy is reported to have said that he expects to see demonstrations and disruptions when Negroes observe the first anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King.

It appears to me that this is entirely the wrong approach. I cannot see that constructive results can be accomplished if the negative actions are followed.

The Phoenix Gazette has published an excellent editorial which sets forth a positive plan of action for those who would properly memorialize Dr. King. To my mind it is a completely appropriate and fitting tribute to a man who was a leader to so many. I quote the last two sentences from the editorial:

> The Negro has no monopoly on the dreams of Dr. Martin Luther King; all men of conscience share his hopes.
>
> But dreams soon mock a man, and hopes become hollow, if he stands and complains when he could be moving and creating.

Mr. President, the title of the editorial is: "Don't Dream on April 4—Do." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DON'T DREAM ON APRIL 4—DO
>
> Dr. Martin Luther King's dreams for his race will suffer a setback on April 4, the first anniversary of his death, if Negroes observe the day as the Rev. Ralph Abernathy thinks they should.
>
> "I expect to see boycotts, school walkouts, work stoppages, peace demonstrations, student protests, rent strikes, marches against hunger and many other forms of non-violent action," the leader of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said.
>
> And what will any of those negative actions bring other than a negative response?
>
> If you are a Negro who wants to honor the memory of Dr. King on April 4—don't dream—do.
>
> Don't stage a school walkout. Walk in. And wring every new drop of knowledge out of that day that your brain can absorb.
>
> Instead of a work stoppage, work to your limit. Show your fellowman what your mind and hands are capable of performing.
>
> Rather than holding a peace demonstration, demonstrate that you are a man of peace.
>
> Don't march against hunger—feed someone.
>
> Instead of a rent strike, strike out for that day when you can burn the mortgage on your home.
>
> The Negro has no monopoly on the dreams of Dr. Martin Luther King; all men of conscience share his hopes.
>
> But dreams soon mock a man, and hopes become hollow, if he stands and complains when he could be moving and creating.

JUST WHO RUNS THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the U.S. Supreme Court's school prayer decision, the point was made that one of several possible logical extensions of such a ruling would be banning or at the very least sharply restricting activities of Armed Forces chaplains.

The Supreme Court has not moved in this direction, but a private, nongovernmental organization has. It has come to my attention that the American Civil Liberties Union, finding fault with certain phrases in instruction manuals for the military's character guidance program, has pressured the Pentagon to make the manuals conform to what the ACLU deems fitting and proper.

The character guidance program, for all enlisted military personnel, is customarily conducted by chaplains who use material prepared by the Office of the Chief of Chaplains. Materials issued to those who conduct the course states, in part, that aim of the program is "to instill into all the members of the Army a sense of individual moral responsibility and moral principles that sustain the philisophy of American freedom. That philosophy regards man as a creature of God. As such, every soldier is responsible and accountable to his Creator for the way he performs his civic and military duty."

I cannot remotely understand what anyone finds offensive in this concept. The term "Creator" means many things to many people, and all but a very tiny minority, no matter what their faith, do acknowledge a "Creator" in some form. And, I might add, I was also under the impression that practically everyone, believer or atheist, admitted existence of individual moral responsibility in varying degrees.

XUM

I understand the ACLU's original complaint was made about a year ago, and that recently the ACLU has been assured by the Pentagon that "we are revising all the materials in question to eliminate passages with religious connotations."

It should be noted here that Postmaster General Winton M. Blount takes a somewhat different view about the worth of "passages with religious connotations." It was announced in late February that he had ordered revision of the Apollo 8 commemorative stamp to include the words "In the beginning God . . ." which were spoken by Lt. Col. William A. Anders when he read from the Book of Genesis during the historic flight orbiting the moon. The Postmaster General stated that it seemed eminently appropriate that this introductory phrase should appear on the stamp that commemorates one of the most significant and dramatic events of our time.

I imagine the ACLU will protest this, as well, but the ACLU is not the Supreme Court. Furthermore, I do not think the ACLU or any other organization, for that matter, is especially qualified to arbitrarily prescribe what goes into military troop guidance courses. It seems this incident is a prime example of outright minority dictation, and if the ACLU can do it today, another organization can do it somewhere else tomorrow.

I am making an official request for an explanation of this incident. Aside from the fact that I see no reason for the Office of the Chief of Chaplains to knuckle under to what seems is little more than unjustified meddling on the part of the ACLU, I believe it set an extremely poor precedent and I would like to know just what factors were taken into consideration in the Pentagon's eventual decision.

THE TRAGEDY COME HOME

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it was with deep sorrow that I recently read in the Blackfoot News, one of Idaho's finest newspapers, an editorial account of the death in Vietnam of a young Idahoan, Pvt. Douglas Rowe.

Written by the News' publisher, Drury R. Brown, the editorial speaks for itself. It is a striking indictment of the folly we pursue in Vietnam. Because it places the tragedy there in the perspective of one soldier and his family, this account deserves to be widely read. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PVT. DOUGLAS ROWE DIES

Word was received by his parents yesterday that on March 9, 1969, Private First Class Douglas Noel Rowe died in battle in Vietnam. The notification did not reveal the place of his death. Neither was it revealed when his body may be returned to Idaho.

Private Rowe was born Nov. 13, 1946 in Rupert, Idaho. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Noel F. Rowe, 706 South Fourth Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho. He is survived by his parents; by two brothers; Alvin Rowe, Washington, D.C., and Airman First Class Steven Rowe, now stationed in Thailand, and by a sister, Elaine, Pocatello.

Private Rowe attended school in Blackfoot, graduating from Blackfoot High School with the Class of 1965, and thereafter attended Idaho State University, Pocatello, for two years.

He was a member of The First Baptist Church of Blackfoot. Time of funeral services cannot be established until the family has been notified by the Army when his body will be returned. But it is announced by his parents that the funeral will be held in The First Baptist Church of Pocatello and burial in the Blackfoot City Cemetery.

This is the sort of simple war statistic that has appeared thousands of times in American newspapers since the beginning of our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

But Doug Rowe is much more than a war statistic. Doug is the little boy grown to man. He is the son and brother who, through his entire lifetime, was a source of extreme pride to his family. He was intelligent and fun-loving yet always unassuming. He was clean-cut and fastidious. He was the thoughtful and dependable boy that carried a newspaper route. In so doing, he won the affection and esteem of the people to whom he delivered the newspaper. He was the young man who for four years worked part time in the office of the Blackfoot News and who was mature and competent enough in his last summer of employment to act as its circulation manager.

He was the talented guitar player who with Nancy Edison, Julie Hutchings and Joe Evans, made up one of the most entertaining and delightful singing groups ever formed in Blackfoot High School.

Doug Rowe became one of the group of young American men who were unable to plan their careers because conscription to military service was hanging over their heads. Doug thought the war in Vietnam was wrong—that it was a waste of the nation's energy and resources—he believed that most of the people in the little nation of Vietnam wished that we had not come there and that we would leave—that it was immoral for us to be fighting there.

With such thoughts in mind, perhaps it was natural that Doug found it impossible to finish his college work while waiting for the draft to reach him. He dropped out of school and, while waiting, he took a job selling encyclopedias in Torrance, Calif. He reported to his family that he had met with startling success in the field of selling—that such would be the career he would pursue when his service to his country was completed.

He received his draft call in August, 1968.

In one of the last letters received by his family from Doug in Vietnam, he wrote that he had just returned from a 10-day military operation in the jungle. During that period there had been no time to bathe, shave nor change clothing.

Doug's family had every reason to be proud of him in life. They may find little solace in the assurance of military authorities that their son and brother died in Vietnam as a hero, nor in the flying of the flag over Blackfoot High School at halfmast the day that he will be buried. We can grieve with them as we remember there was every reason to think he could have made a very real contribution to his world.

There are many of us who knew Doug Rowe who believe, as he did, that the war in Vietnam is a tragic mistake into which the nation was dragged by an ill-conceived foreign policy.

Perhaps the greatest tribute such of us could pay to his memory is to demand without ceasing that the old men who make wars in which young men fight and die shall cease dragging their feet in the pursuit of the peace to which they say they are committed, and that saving the lives of both American and Asian boys has a much higher priority than saving the faces of political and military leaders.

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF TVA

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been drawn to a series of articles which appeared in the Ford Lauderdale, Fla., News and criticized many aspects of the Tennessee Valley Authority program. One of the basic complaints in the article is that TVA owns 4,800 acres of land in Florida. The article complains that this land is held for phosphate reserves although "the TVA was created in 1933 to provide electricity to the valley."

This statement, which alludes to TVA's important assignment of supplying electric power to the Tennessee Valley area, shows a complete lack of understanding by the author of the purposes for which Congress created TVA. The author's additional statements indicating that TVA somehow intruded itself into the fertilizer field clearly show the author's ignorance of the origins of TVA. It must be remembered that part of the reason for establishing TVA was to utilize an idle nitrate plant that had been started during World War I. If the author had taken time to read President Roosevelt's message to Congress asking that TVA be created he would have found:

> It is clear that the Muscle Shoals development is but a small part of the potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee River. Such use, if envisioned in its entirety, transcends mere power development: it enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry. In short, this power development of war days leads logically to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many States and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns.

If the author had taken the time to read the TVA Act he would have found that section 5, which contains 14 subsections, is mainly devoted to explaining TVA's role in fertilizer development and research. In the face of references how can anyone honestly imply that TVA's role in fertilizer development and research was not one of the primary reasons for which it was formed?

Before I go on to show what TVA has accomplished in this area, let me point out that Congress understood that the same plants that could aid American farmers in time of peace, through fertilizer research and development, could aid its soldiers in time of war by producing munitions. Thus, section 5(j) and section 20 of the TVA Act provide for the use of these facilities for war purposes when needed.

How has TVA used these powers given to it? Aside from the tremendous job done in the Tennessee Valley area, it has worked to aid American agriculture with

XUM

farmers, colleges, and fertilizer distributors and manufacturers in all parts of the United States. Its impact on the fertilizer industry is shown by the fact that 514 licenses, issued on a nonexclusive royalty-free basis, have been granted to 300 companies for use in plants in 39 States. These licenses make the technology represented by TVA patents freely available to the fertilizer industry in order to promote low fertilizer costs for the farmer.

Just as TVA's licensing takes its technology to industry, its test-demonstration program takes its research to the farmer through demonstration programs conducted in cooperation with State universities. Last year, thousands of farmers in 35 States gained knowledge and found solutions to problems through these programs.

To round out its approach to the farmer TVA reaches the fertilizer dealer by the distributor-demonstration program which was active in 41 States last year. Through this program the fertilizer dealer, often a small businessman, is given access to knowledge of new products to enable him to serve better the farmers in his area.

This, in brief, outlines the importance of the TVA fertilizer program. But, before I return to those 4,800 acres that the Fort Lauderdale News is worried about I would like to mention the role of TVA in national defense. I have seen favorable comments in the past on TVA's ability to supply munitions during World War II and the Korean war. But few realize that throughout the Vietnam war TVA has been the sole supplier of phosphorus to the Army.

Now for the 4,800 acres of land. In developing new process and fertilizer products that can be patented and licensed to industry—TVA needs phosphate. In producing fertilizers for use in fertilizer and distributor demonstration programs—TVA needs phosphate. And in producing phosphorus for the Army—TVA needs phosphate.

Because of this need TVA acquired those 4,800 acres in Florida as a phosphate reserve. The reserve will assure TVA the future supplies of the high-grade Florida phosphate it needs for the nationally important programs it conducts. Until phosphate is needed or until it appears that other arrangements should be made to assure phosphate for the TVA program, the mineral should not be mined and the land should remain in TVA's custody. In the meantime what should TVA do with the property?

The Fort Lauderdale News complains about the 3,000-acre timber management program and the forest tree fertilization program being conducted on this land. I wonder if the University of Florida, which assisted TVA in the timber management program and joined in a forest fertilization symposium with TVA and the U.S. Forest Service, would complain about these activities. I also wonder if the residents of Florida who use the 4,800 acres in TVA's custody for hunting and fishing and other recreational activities complain about TVA's management of this land.

Such uses are not a cause for complaint but for congratulations. Instead of letting this asset lie fallow until such time as it is needed, TVA chose to put it to interim uses that serve the public. This is the essence of good stewardship.

Furthermore, if changed circumstances indicate the reserves should be disposed of, these interim uses will have enhanced the value of the land for other purposes.

I could point out other areas where the Fort Lauderdale News exhibits ignorance of TVA, but I think just one more point is sufficient. The Fort Lauderdale News article states, with disapproval, that TVA's fertilizer research, development, and production plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., operates at a $10 million-a-year loss. First, it should be pointed out that Congress did not intend this program, which is heavily involved in research, to finance itself. Second, the $10 million mentioned result in benefits far exceeding costs to the taxpayer.

The processes and equipment that are being used to produce most of the granular mixed fertilizers made in the United States today were developed by this program. This program has been a leading factor in a one-third reduction since 1950 of the costs of fertilizer to the American farmer. This program also has provided capacity to produce needed defense material so that private industry can continue following peaceful pursuits.

With such results, these funds do not represent a net loss, but are of the truly foresighted investments this country has made.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as we approach the bicentennial of the American Revolution, it is important that we understand the causes of that event and the foundations of American independence. A significant contribution to that objective is being made in my home State of South Carolina.

Volume 1 of a 12-volume series of "The Papers of Henry Laurens" has just been published. This series will contain pertinent material about a crucial period in our history. Through the life of Henry Laurens—wealthy colonial merchant and planter, vice president of the State of South Carolina, Member and President of the Continental Congress—succeeding John Hancock—for 15 months prisoner of the British in the Tower of London charged with high treason, and one of the peace commissioners who negotiated the Treaty of Paris of 1783 in which Great Britain recognized the independence of the United States—we are able to gain great insight of the colonial period of American history.

Joint sponsors of this project are the South Carolina Historical Society of Charleston, and the National Historical Publications Commission with the cooperation of the University of South Carolina. Two native South Carolinians are editing the papers: Philip M. Hamer, editor, retired Executive Director of the U.S. National Historical Publications Commission and George C. Rogers, Jr., associate editor, professor of history at the University of South Carolina.

SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO HELP PREVENT THE DISTRIBUTION OF PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE AND ADVERTISEMENTS TO MINORS

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last year alone the Post Office Department received over 165,000 formal complaints from recipients of unsolicited offensive mailings to both adults and minors, and the volume seems to be growing each month. A number of my constituents have sent me samples of objectionable advertisements they have received, and people everywhere express concern that Congress must act.

Today, I am introducing two bills which, if passed by the Congress, will provide postal authorities with decisive powers to crack down on dealers in pornography—particularly those who increasingly are using the mails as a pipeline for the unconscionable flow of smut and obscenity to minors.

The first bill would prohibit mail order sales of obscene materials to school-age children, and it would also make the unsolicited mailing of "hard core" pornography—or offers to sell "hard core" pornography—to any family with children under the age of 16, a Federal crime punishable by a fine and jail sentence.

The second bill would require the written consent of each person whose name appears on a list sold or exchanged by mailing list brokers. This is aimed at those persons who gather lists of names from high school annuals and similar sources and sell them to distributors of obscene material.

The Supreme Court held just last year that the sale of pornography to minors may be much more restricted than to adults. In *Ginsberg* v. *New York* (390 U.S. 629), the Court held that a New York statute which prohibited the sale of pornographic materials to persons under 17 years of age was constitutional. In this decision, the Court recognized the special responsibility of parents in rearing their children.

I realize that Public Law 90–206 enacted by the last Congress has provided parents with some degree of protection. Under this statute any post office patron receiving material which he considers objectionable can request the post office to order his name to be taken off the sender's mailing list. This is but a small step, however, and does not really meet the problem since the material must be in the home before the recipient can object. Apart from the substantial possibility that the mailing will have found its way into children's hands, the act provides no deterrent to unsolicited mailings by smut merchants. Furthermore, it places the considerable burden of enforcement on the innocent recipients and post office authorities.

Under my bill, if a person is convicted of sending offensive material to minors he would be subject to a sentence of $5,000 fine and 5 years imprisonment for the first offense, and $10,000 fine and 10 years imprisonment for subsequent offenses. While this may seem a rather severe penalty, we need to have a clear deterrent to assure that our youth are protected from degenerate matter. The Supreme Court has very specifically set out an area in which legislation is valid, and, in my opinion, necessary. I would urge the House to move swiftly in considering this legislation.

HISTORY OF ZION EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH OF NANTICOKE, PA.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Zion Evangelical and Reformed Church in the city of Nanticoke, Pa., will observe its 80th anniversary next month. Arrangements are being made for the congregation to duly note the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies. The committee in charge of the anniversary program has brought together a detailed and informative history of the church and as part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit the aforementioned history which I am sure many people will find most interesting:

HISTORY OF ZION CHURCH

According to the minutes Zion's Reformed Church of Nanticoke was organized as a separate congregation on the 10th of April 1889. Previous to this, the people who went into this organization and the people comprising St. John's Lutheran Church worship in the church on State St. which they jointly built and owned. They were served by Dr. Levan from Wilkes-Barre under the care of Classis. This amicable relation, however, did not exist very long. A Lutheran minister came upon the scene and caused a disturbance in the congregation. As a result of this, the church was closed against Rev. Levan and his people. Litigation was entered into by the classis to secure the property but thru mistakes and misunderstanding they failed. Having thus secured permanent possession of the church property, the Lutheran faction in the congregation called a Lutheran minister and organized St. John's Lutheran Church. Those who differed and did not wish to enter into this compact withdrew and organized themselves into a separate congregation calling themselves "The Evangelical Zion Reformed Church of Nanticoke."

They sacrificed their interest in the church property and were forced to begin empty handed but this did not discourage them. They rented a hall in which they worshipped for some time until they could arrange either to build or buy a church of their own. In the course of time this was accomplished thru the indefatigable labors of Rev. Glantz who became the first pastor, and his little flock of faithful men and women. They secured the present property and church home from the Welsh Congregation which was then splitting into different and differing sections and was abandoning the old site for new ones. There seemed to be a difference of opinion in those days as to the best course to pursue: to build new in some other sections of the city or to buy the present church with all its improvements and its splendid location at a figure which would seem now ridiculously low. This question is now no longer debated but is considered settled. In convenience, in beauty of location, and the increase in the value of the property, nothing better could have been secured. The property was bought for three thousand dollars, eleven hundred of which was paid during the ministry of Mr. Glantz. This brother was permitted to labor but a short time, less than four years but during this brief period of his ministry much was done in foundation work for future success. After this short period of successful toil and patient endurance this brother was called up higher to enjoy the rest of the saints. Rev. S. C. Hechel, who had previously given a helping hand now took care of the congregation until Rev. Ruloff was called to become its pastor. Rev. Ruloff's pastorate extended over a period of about ten years. Many things were adjusted and strengthened during this period. Seven hundred (700) dollars of debt was paid and some minor repairs made to the property. In him the congregation had a strong and fearless preacher and a guide of many good qualities. His pastorate came to an end in 1903 and he was immediately succeeded by the present pastor. The congregation at this time had a mortgage against its property of $1300. The peoples energy in the good work had slackened and the church needed repairs badly. But the people revived in interest and by united effort much has been accomplished during the last six or seven years. The mortgage on the property was paid. Repairs to the church and its surrounding such as shingling, painting, sewerage connections, and paving were made costing a total of about 600 dollars and the present inside improvements costing somewhat over a thousand dollars. The grand total raised for debt and improvements alone amounts to more than 3000 dollars. This money has come out of the pockets of our own people and has been secured not by a process of begging or by a constant round of socials or by questionable means of any kind but mostly by systematic giving and receiving. While this amount might be considered small if paid by a large and wealthy congregation it means sacrifice where given by a small congregation of comparatively poor people.

If giving as some one has said is a true index of the spirituality of a people we believe there has been improvements along this line also. "A good tree" the master says, "bringeth forth good fruit" and the reverse. We doubt not but that the life of Jesus and his power and mission to save as presented by the ministers who have served this charge has come to fruition in the acts, and deeds of the people.

We hope at least that these improvements are the outcome of a genuine Christian spirit.

The painting and papering has been paid for by the congregation. The carpet was paid for by the Frau Fraun and the magnificent lights by the young people of the church. One of the hopeful signs of the future progress is the interest our young people have taken of late in the good cause.

We hope that these lights in which they have taken such an interest may be to them an emblem of the light of God's truth. We hope and pray, also that what has been accomplished in the past may be but a prelude of larger and better things to come and that wiser minds and purer hands join in chronicling the future history of this church and that still nobler things may crown its pages.

(The above is an extract from an address delivered by the Rev. W. H. Herbert at the reopening services of Zion's Church, November 27, 1910.)

After extensive repairing and improvements of both interior and exterior of Zion's Reformed Church, which cost over Three Thousand Dollars ($3000). It was rededicated to the Tribune God on Sunday, Dec. 5th, 1920 by the pastor, Rev. W, H. Warner, in the presence of an interesting audience. The repairs of the interior consisted of the seats being repainted and varnished. Memorial windows were put in, a new ceiling of metal, which was painted. Also a new door to the auditorium. The improvements to the exterior consisted of having the church painted, new spouting all around the church, plumbing, and other minor repairs. The Ladies Aid Society paid one fourth of the entire expenses of the church all of which was done cheerfully.

It is now a beautiful house of worship practically a new church, equal to any Protestant church in the town.

One of which its members should feel proud. While the improvements were being made to the auditorium of the Church, services were held in the basement.

In the spring of 1921 A.D. the church property was further beautified by a nice stone wall extending over 300 feet in front of the church along the street at a cost of over $800.

On October 15th, 1921, one of the latest improved International furnaces was placed in the basement of the church which was paid by the Ladies Aid Society, and has given much comfort and service.

Later in the season of 1921 a railing was placed on either side of the stone steps leading up to the church, to assist the old people in going up and down. And in the early spring of 1922 the Young Peoples' Society presented the church with collection plates, also an individual Communion Service, also a filler and they were dedicated on Easter Sunday. The insurance has also been paid for 3 years until April 1925.

In May 1922 the basement was thoroughly renovated: painted, papered, and repaired. These are the improvements made during the Pastorate of the Rev. W. H. Warner. Near the close of his pastorate, Wyoming Classics of the Eastern Synod met in the 35 annual session in Zion Reformed Church on Monday, May 22nd to 24 inclusive.

In a response to a unanimous call from Zion Reformed Church, the undersigned began his pastorate, Nov. 1, 1922 and terminated it June 1, 1926.

Although not all our hopes were realized, in some things we were sadly disappointed, yet it is gratifying to know that in no other period of the same length of time in the history of the congregation were so many telling things achieved and so much money raised for various purposes.

The outstanding achievement was the building and paying for a much needed parsonage. The contract price of the parsonage was seven thousand five hundred dollars.

The final payment of the parsonage was celebrated March 13, 1925, and was largely attended, the Sunday school, Young Peoples Society, and Ladies Aid Society, uniting with the congregation in making the occasion a great success.

First religious service was conducted in the main auditorium of the church. At this service the paid notes were burned.

After this service a banquet was given in the basement of the church. Representatives of the congregation and the auxiliaries of the church delivered addresses.

In the arrangement of the program for the happy occasion committees of the Young Peoples Society and the Ladies Aid Society assisted. Other improvements were putting a new roof on the church and rebuilding the chimneys, and leveling and improving the rear yard.

XUM

Following are some of the things purchased by the congregation or auxiliaries of the church: pulpit light, new church hymnals, new song books for the Sunday school, chairs for primary department of Sunday school, piano for basement of the church, english pulpit Bible, etc. Also a range, window shades, light fixtures, and linoleum for the parsonage. We regret, however, that we cannot report so favorably concerning things spiritual. During the present pastorate, a Woman's Missionary Society was organized, but due to a lack of interest, and opposition the Society ceased to exist. During the latter part of the present pastorate, weekly prayer services were conducted, which were the means of blessing and spiritual strengthening for those who attended. We believe that the great need of this congregation is the stressing of the importance of the spiritual side—real, true, christian living.

As we conclude our pastorate it is gratifying to know that we have endeavored to lead believers to the attainment of a higher standard of christian living and to point sinners into the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. Some heeded and were helped.

The writer, Rev. Robert W. Hucke, came to the Nanticoke Church, the Sunday before Thanksgiving, 1926, and served this congregation as student pastor until the following June 2, 1927, at which time he was ordained and installed as Pastor.

Upon our arrival in the parish, we found that the membership had dwindled until there were but fifty who were regarded as members. The congregation was in a most critical situation and even some of the older members of Wyoming Classis felt that the church was ready to disband, because of the few people who remained and the fact that there were so many divisions, animosities and heartaches among the people.

However, we set to work with prayerful zeal and devotion to the task before us. By the Grace of God alone, we were able to create a new environment and started the people working. We found, that with few exceptions they responded in a very fine manner, and as a result of this response and cooperation we have been able to make considerable progress.

The first task with which we were confronted was that of the basement. They were a few small dusty moldy rooms. Considerably one half of the church stood on rock. What a beautiful sight it was, and a memory I am sure, that will never be forgotten, of a large group of men working with pick and shovel by electric light to excavate the entire basement of the church. Much credit must also be given to the fine ladies of the congregation who served free lunches to the men every night. In a short time the work of excavating was finished and then we started to "build" our fine basement which we have today. It is as large as the church, very spacious and suitable to our needs, both for Church School purposes, Religious Education and social functions. In it we have a splendid and well equipped kitchen, in which gas stoves were placed. We also provided a ladies rest room completely furnished with lamps, rugs and the usual furniture.

And so we went from one task to the next accomplishing the following:

After the basement, which including labor, cost around $8000 we put in a new heating system so that we would not need to wear overcoats at the church services. This system cost us close to $2000.

An electric bulletin board was purchased by the Royal Daughters Bible Class, and it was a great aid in reaching the unchurched.

Cement walks were then placed around the church and between the church and parsonage. Previous to this there were no walks.

The church had very poor music facilities and so we purchased a new pipe organ and set of Haegen Chimes. The organ being one of the finest makes, costing about $3100.

We continued to beautify the church by papering it. The three chancel chairs were re-upholstered, as also was the pulpit, and new draperies were hung around the choir loft and choir assembly room. A cork bulletin board was placed in the vestibule and a new hymn board hung in front of the church. Several dozen of new church hymnals and Sunday School books were purchased.

Beautiful green altar hangings were purchased for the Trinity season. New collection plates were also furnished, and a much needed piano was purchased for the basement.

The street in the front of the parsonage and the church was paved, previous to this, it was covered with big cobble stones.

Copper spouting was then placed around the church. A new electric sweeper was purchased for use both in the church and the parsonage.

A gas heater for the water tank in the parsonage was purchased and a splendid gas range was placed in the parsonage.

This brings us to our last big forward act in a material way, namely, the brick veneering of our entire church. Previous to this, the church was almost like a sieve when the winter winds would blow, but now since we have it brick veneered, it is a most beautiful as well as comfortable church.

In addition to all this, we issued an inspirational church bulletin each Sunday.

Surely these various events of progress show that we have moved forward and we are glad to mention not only these works at the home base, but also our work of benevolence. We have seen the time when our benevolence to Classis was paid in full. Other times it was not, but it always was done according to the ability of the people in these latter days of economic depression.

The Pastoral and spiritual work of the congregation was greatly strengthened. Teacher Training Classes were organized and graduated for the first time. A Junior and Senior Choir was organized under the leadership of the organist, Mrs. Robert Hucke. We also introduced the greatly needed habit of having Holy Communion four times a year instead of the ordinary two times. Classes in German were also organized for the young people of the church.

A Daily Vacation Bible School was organized, the first of its kind to be held in the city. We had such a school each summer.

The pastor also was chosen in the county as the one to broadcast over the radio, which helped greatly to bring our church forward.

The pastor was also County Superintendent of Expert Endeavor causing the influence of our church to reach out way beyond the cities' ends.

Large numbers of new members were added to the church from time to time which gives us now over 225 communicant members. Our church has grown from a little obscure church to one of the cities most outstanding and influential pulpits.

We also introduced the idea of having early dawn services at Christmas and Easter.

Our order of worship was gradually improved.

The Sunday School has grown splendidly and has been graded and departmentalized.

The organizations of the church are to be commended for their faithful labors—The Ladies Aid Society and the Royal Daughters Bible Class, giving us not only most of the financial support but also that valuable but intangible support—namely the moral support.

We also tried to work with the boys, organizing them into a Cadet troop and the men into a Bible class and a Reformed Church man's league. The men however, do not have near the sense of feeling that they must be loyal and true to their responsibilities as compared with the loyalty of the women.

The relation of Pastor and people was most pleasant and we shall treasure many sacred memories of this, our first charge. We shall also treasure the set of resolutions drawn up by the Consistory when our resignation was presented. Our resignation went into effect September 30, 1931. We are grateful to our Heavenly Father for all the blessings we enjoyed, both material and spiritual, as we labored here in His vineyard and we hope and pray that greater blessings may still be in store for this whole hearted people. May the Lord grant it and bless them abundantly.

The writer came to Zion Reformed Church Dec. 31, 1931 and served this congregation as student pastor until May 26, 1932 at which time he was ordained and installed as pastor. There was always a cordial relationship existing between pastor and people. Many material things were accomplished and altogether we were quite happy as we labored here in our Master's Vineyard.

JANUARY 30, 1934—REV. HARVEY GOODLING

The next pastor of Zion Church, Rev. F. Nelson Schlegel, began his pastorate on May 1, 1934 and terminated it on May 20, 1937. During Rev. Schlegel's pastorate, a gift was made to the Zion Congregation of $1,500 by Mr. Charles Kurzawsky. The gift came without solicitation, and represented, in a very beautiful way, the affection of one of our elderly members for the blessed things for which the Church of Christ stands. In receiving this splendid gift the Consistory voted to use part of it as a payment toward the church's debt. Another part of it was used, in accord with a request made by the donor thru the pastor, for the improvement of the church's educational equipment. At the same time Mr. Kurzawsky made this gift to the congregation, he declared his interest in the wider work of the church by sending a check for $500 to the Board of Foreign Missions. On September 23, 1934, the congregation changed its name to Zion Evangelical and Reformed Church after the Reformed Church in the United States merged with the Evangelical Synod of North America. Rev. Schlegel's pastorate was a very pleasant one during which there was always a cordial and friendly relation between pastor and people.

The next pastor to come on the scene was Rev. Henry Jerome Leinbach who began his pastorate November 1, 1937 and ended it on July 23, 1961 when he died of injuries sustained in an automobile accident on July 16. Rev. Leinbach, a well learned man and active in civic as well as church affairs served the congregation for nearly a quarter of a century. Soon after Rev. Leinbach came to Nanticoke, he changed the order of worship to the one we use today. Many things were accomplished during his pastorate and many new additions to the church sanctuary were made. One of these was the presentation of the illuminated cross by Mrs. Kathryn Graboske (Ann Kate in memory of her husband). Also a steam table was purchased for the kitchen of the church. On March 22, 1940 the Three Hour Good Friday Devotional Service was held in Zion Church. In 1941, Rev. Leinbach made the following report to the congregation following the death of his wife.

This report would not be complete if I did not take this occasion to record my high and grateful appreciation of the kindness, consideration, and help, on the part of the congregation as a unit, of the various organizations and their members and officials, and of the members as individual friends which was made manifested during my pastorate. To give recognition of all the acts of kindness and courtesy is impossible. Your kindness was overwhelming to me personally and to my family. Nothing was left undone that could be done to make the burdens lighter and to show both your appreciation of me and Mr.

Leinbach. May the Good Lord abundantly bless all and everyone of you. Realizing that the years past and present have and will present vexing and difficult problems, we nevertheless cast ourselves upon the strength of our Heavenly Father and upon our Faithful Savior Jesus Christ, with the full assurance that as we place our trust in Him we shall not be confounded, and we shall be able to perform every task before us successfully.

Then after a few years, the congregation formed the Plymouth Nanticoke Charge with the First Reformed Church of Plymouth, Pa.

A youth fellowship, organized under the leadership of Mr. & Mrs. Elmer Lohman, contributed much to the advancement of the work of Christ in the Church.

In 1954, the Nanticoke-Plymouth Charge held an open house to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Rev. Leinbach's ordination into the Christian ministry. The congregation placed a new automatic stoker in the parsonage in 1956.

The church again changed its name. This time to the Zion United Church of Christ when the Evangelical and Reformed Church merged with the Christian Congregational Church in 1957.

One of the most outstanding events that took place during Rev. Leinbach's pastorate was the sending of a heifer to a deserving family in Europe thru the Board of World Ministries of United Church of Christ, by the Nanticoke-Plymouth Charge.

In October 1960, Elder Chester R. Lytle left the Zion Church in order to enter Lancaster Theological Seminary. He graduated from Seminary and was ordained into the Christian Ministry in 1964. He was able to serve His Lord but 4 short years when he was called to his eternal rest.

Following the tragic death of Rev. Leinbach, Rev. A. Ward Campbell, close friend of the deceased pastor, served the church for the next 3 years as supply pastor. Some of the things added to the church during Rev. Campbell's pastorate was the heavy oil base portrait of Rev. Leinbach which hangs in the vestibule. This portrait was done by Pawlowski and presented to the church by Earl W. Lohman Funeral Home. The candelabra were dedicated in memory of Pastor Leinbach by the Senior Choir and Congregation; new carpet was bought for the church; new drapery was placed around the choir loft and new hymnals were purchased for the church.

On October 11, 1964, Zion Church terminated its relationship with First Church of Plymouth in order to form a charge with Bethel Congregational Church.

After forming this Charge, it was decided that Zion Church would be supplied by Senior Seminary students. They supplied the church for about a year. When in 1965, Prof. Dr. Bashore (lay minister of the United Church of Christ) came and served the church as supply. During his stay the organ in the church was completely overhauled.

Finally on July 15, 1966, Rev. James W. Leamon was called to be the pastor of the Nanticoke Charge of the United Church of Christ (Zion and Bethel Churches). He accepted the call and was ordained at St. Mark's Church, Easton, Pa., in June 1966 and installed in Bethel Church in September 1966. Some of the things done so far during Rev. Leamon's pastorate are: the presentation and dedication of a communion chalice and paton; a new roof for the church. The Home Department presented the church with a new lecturn Bible in memory of Mrs. Martha Eckerd. A new oil furnace was installed in the parsonage and the latest improvement is the remodeling of the bathroom in the parsonage.

All in all the 80 years existence of Zion Church have been filled with both material and spiritual achievements which will remain in the hearts and minds of members and pastors for many years to come.

BETTER HOUSING

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Conference recently met in Washington, D.C., for their 38th annual convention. At the convention the conference adopted a series of resolutions emphasizing their commitment to the goals of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. They recognize that we must increase our production of low- and moderate-income housing if Americans are to be adequately sheltered. They recognize that we must remove the obstacles to replacement of substandard housing if we are to meet the problems of our cities. They are to be commended for their concern about these problems.

Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith, president of the National Housing Conference, delivered the keynote statement at the start of the convention. I include his remarks for the information of my colleagues:

KEYNOTE STATEMENT BY NATHANIEL S. KEITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1969

It is a great pleasure to welcome Secretary Romney and his top staff in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to this 38th annual convention of the National Housing Conference. I know that our members and friends assembled here this afternoon are eager to hear from the Secretary and his colleagues; consequently my remarks will be brief.

Over the years, the National Housing Conference has worked in close concert with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and its predecessor agencies. This is not to say that we have always seen eye to eye with the Federal housing leadership on the specifics and details of programs. But on the broad issues and goals for housing and community development, our support and cooperation have been consistent and steadfast. This certainly continues to be the policy of this Conference.

It has also been our privilege and obligation to act in closest cooperation with the legislative leaders on housing and community development in the Congress. We have communicated to them our recommendations and goals, based on the broad experience and expertise of our membership. And we have acted as a channel of information on legislative proposals for the many national organizations which look to NHC as their principal clearing house in this field.

I believe it is also a basic role of the National Housing Conference to respond to the dynamic nature of national and local housing and development needs and to identify essential objectives, even if extended periods of education are required to achieve them. For example, the NHC was the first national organization to advocate the consolidation of principal Federal housing functions in a cabinet table status, many years before the achievement of that objective in 1965 with the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Likewise, in addition to our traditional commitment to an effective and expanded public housing program for low income families, beginning in the early 1950's NHC identified the urgent need for special programs to meet the housing needs of moderate and low income families, just above the public housing level. This was reflected in legislative proposals which were partially achieved in the Housing Act of 1961 and which were greatly advanced by the interest assistance provisions of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

The NHC also advocated for many years a concerted approach by Federal, State and local programs on the problems of concentrated areas of blight and slums, based on the primary thrust of urban renewal and federally-assisted housing and community development activities. This approach was recognized by Congress in the model cities legislation of 1966 which we strongly supported and continue to support.

The resolutions adopted by the members of the National Housing Conference yesterday afternoon reflect our continuing response to the dynamics of housing and community development problems in the United States. They reflect equally our recognition of the inescapable tie between these problems and the urban crisis.

Our emphasis is on the essential importance of greatly increased production if the goals laid out by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 are to be achieved. The first step obviously is to fund fully the programs authorized by the 1968 Act, which were drastically reduced by Congressional appropriations prior to the adjournment of the 90th Congress last fall.

There also must be expedition of Federal procession of the local programs which can be financed; we are encouraged by the progress which has been made but much more needs to be done. Also, there must be imaginative but achievable approaches to enlarging the resources—private and public—which will be essential if the production goals of the 1968 Act are to be meaningful.

The NHC resolutions also reflect our deep concern with the impact of the unprecedented tight money market on expanded housing production for moderate and lower income families, as contemplated by the 1968 Act. They present positive recommendations for administrative and legislative action to relieve this problem, with limited effect on the Federal budget.

Our resolution likewise reflect our recognition of the implications of the continuing massive population growth already in process and the need for establishing a realistic national urban growth policy, with responsive provisions for necessary Federal aid.

The conviction of the National Housing Conference is that the national goals reiterated by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 must be fulfilled over the coming years and not be a stigmatized as paper promises. We pledge our support to help make these goals a reality.

WYATT SENDS QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth straight year I am sending the residents of Oregon's First Congressional District a questionnaire, seeking their views on the pressing problems facing Congress and the Nation.

The replies to this annual query have been invaluable to me in formulating my legislative judgment on the important issues in the past, and I am sure the answers to this year's questionnaire will prove likewise useful.

I would like to present my fifth annual questionnaire at this time:

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT: CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS

APRIL 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: A great variety of complex problems, both at home and abroad, face a new Congress and a new Administration this

XUM

year. The Paris peace talks, tax reform proposals, and the great upsurge in crime are but a few of the matters now demanding immediate attention and action.

For the fifth year in a row I am sending out a list of questions so you may have the opportunity of expressing to me your views on the crucial issues before Congress. Never have your opinions been of greater importance. While the final responsibility for my voting record rests with me alone, the excellent response to my previous questionnaires has been very helpful to me in formulating my legislative judgments.

A simple Yes or No answer may not fully express your feelings. In such case, your further comments are welcomed.

To return this questionnaire, simply fold it over and affix a six cent stamp. Please do not seal it with staples or tape. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL WYATT,
First District, Oregon.

1. If the Paris talks drag on with no apparent progress toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict, would you favor a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

2. Should the President be required to secure the approval of Congress before taking any action involving the commitment of American forces to hostile actions abroad?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

3. Should the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Red China?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

4. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic missile program?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

5. Foreign Aid:

a. Should the United States continue to extend *military* assistance to other nations?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

b. Should the United States continue to extend *economic* assistance to other nations?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

6. Once the Vietnam conflict has been resolved, would you favor replacement of the present draft system with an all-volunteer army?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

7. Tax Reform: Do you feel that there are substantial inequities and loopholes in the Federal Income Tax laws which require change?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

8. Do you favor the banning of cigarette advertising on television?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

9. Should Congress enact a statute to require the licensing and registration of all firearms?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

10. Should the Congress create a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

11. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal to create a National Law Enforcement Academy to up-grade the competence of state and local police?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

12. Should the National Labor Relations Act be amended to require that farmers recognize and bargain with unions representing their workers?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

13. Should Congress place a ceiling on the total amount of Federal farm subsidy payments which one person may receive in any one year?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

14. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in social security benefit payments?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

15. Should Congress propose a Constitutional Amendment to set the minimum voting age at 18 in all states?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

16. Should Congress propose a Constitutional Amendment to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools?
   - ☐ Yes.
   - ☐ No.
   - ☐ No opinion.

17. Electoral College reform is being advocated. Which of the following choices do you prefer? (Please check one only.)

☐ Abolish the Electoral College system and provide for the direct popular election of the President.

☐ Provide for the election of presidential electors by districts within each state, rather than the present "winner-take-all" system of state at-large election.

☐ Provide for the proportional division of each state's electoral votes among the various presidential candidates in accord with the share of the popular vote each receives in the state.

☐ No change in the present system.

DECENCY RALLY IN FLORIDA DRAWS 30,000

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a short editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer and a news story by the Associated Press appearing in the Chicago Tribune, both dated today, March 24, provide a marked contrast between the long established, wholesome values which have been part and parcel of our heritage and the sick, disruptive policies of those who seek to tear down our society. The Inquirer editorial follows:

HATEFUL AND DISGUSTING

District Attorney Specter and Police Commissioner Rizzo should have full community support—and, especially, the cooperation of college and university authorities—in their investigation of a crudely worded pamphlet, circulating on the campuses of educational institutions in the Philadelphia area, which details methods of conducting violent demonstrations.

The manual features phrases right out of the gutter in referring to policemen. It instructs in the manufacture of weapons. It tells how to set fire to buildings.

Participants in the preparation and distribution of this foul and filthy tract should be brought to the bar of public accountability and prosecuted to the maximum extent the law will allow.

Although these attempts to encourage violence are distressing, it is encouraging to see American youth opt for positive and constructive programs such as the Decency Rally held in Miami, Fla., yesterday. The rally, attended by approximately 30,000 youths and adults, was supported by a number of organizations including the American Legion and major religious denominations. Short talks were delivered by teenage speakers on "God, Parents, Patriotism, Sexuality, and Brotherhood," to quote the AP release. Entertainers including Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant, and the Lettermen helped make the rally a success by their appearances.

The original organizer of the rally, Mike Levesque, a 17-year-old senior at Miami Springs High School and Miss Julie James and other members of the Rally for Decency executive committee are to be commended for their efforts in organizing the rally. I certainly hope this is the forerunner of many such events throughout the land.

I include the article "Decency Rally in Florida Draws 30,000," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 24, 1969]

DECENCY RALLY IN FLORIDA DRAWS 30,000

MIAMI, March 23 (AP)—Thirty thousand hand-clapping persons, some waving signs saying "Down With Obscenity," rallied in the Orange bowl today to support a teen-agers' crusade for decency in entertainment.

Teen-agers organized the rally after Jim Morrison, lead singer of The Doors, was charged with indecent exposure during a Miami concert on March 1. Six warrants have been issued for Morrison's arrest.

"This is not a protest rally," said Julie James, 18, a member of the teen-age Rally for Decency executive committee. "We're not against something. We're for something."

THREE-MINUTE TALKS

Teen-age speakers gave three minute talks on God, parents, patriotism, sexuality, and brotherhood. There also were appearances by professional entertainers who donated their services.

"Sex is definitely being exploited and it is because society has been losing its reverence for one's sexuality," Miss James said.

The shirt-sleeved crowd basking in a warm sun cheered for entertainers such as Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant, and the Lettermen who appeared to applaud the rally.

COMMENT BY GLEASON

"I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps around the world," Gleason said.

"I think it's great; there should be more things like that," said Tony Butala of The Lettermen.

The original organizer of the rally, Mike Levesque, 17, a senior at Miami Springs High school, said the idea grew out of a Catholic youth group discussion two days after the controversial Doors concert.

RAPID GROWTH CITED

Levesque said he was impressed by the rapid growth of the decency movement and the support it gained from adults.

XUM

The crowd was about evenly split between teen-agers and adults.

Numerous organizations, including major religious denominations, contributed to the rally. American Legion members passed out 10,000 small American flags.

BUDGET REQUESTS FOR NASA PROGRAMS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my correspondence with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, newly confirmed Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—with regard to NASA's original budget requests from the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1970:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1969.

Dr. THOMAS O. PAINE,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. PAINE: Will you kindly arrange to obtain for me the presentation of NASA to the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1970 authorization of appropriation.

I would like to have the presentation in the same categories and in similar form to the presentation which NASA has made to the Committee on Science & Astronautics.

I understand that there have been two presentations made by NASA to the Bureau of the Budget: one at the level of $4.7 billion; another at the level of $4.2 billion. I am also interested in any revisions proposed by NASA since the inauguration of the Nixon Administration.

My purpose is to obtain a comparison of where the Bureau of the Budget has made reductions in line items of the NASA request. As the Subcommittees are now finishing their hearings, it becomes timely that a reply be prompt.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

P.S.—As I have stated in the hearings of the Science & Astronautics Committee as well as to various NASA officials and personnel, it is my intention to go over the budget for fiscal year 1970 carefully to see that there are no crippling reductions in the budget and to find the optimum rate of expenditures.

My opinion is that this will result in a substantial restoration of funds to NASA, during fiscal year 1970.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This is in response to your letter of March 19 concerning NASA's presentations to the Bureau of the Budget with regard to the FY 1970 budget request. The attached table indicates, for each line item, the budget request submitted by President Johnson, and the respective amounts included in NASA's earlier estimates at the $4.2 and $4.7 billion levels.

As you know, the new Administration has requested the head of each agency and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the budget requests of the previous Administration in the light of the policies of the new Administration and the overall fiscal situation of the Nation at this point in time. The reviews are now under way, and, under specific directions from the Budget Director, until such time as this process is completed and the President has made his decision, we are not at liberty to discuss the recommendations which we have made.

As we have indicated in testimony before the Committee on Science and Astronautics this year, the three areas of principal concern under President Johnson's request are the areas of continued, and extended, lunar exploration, manned orbital operations after the Apollo Applications Program, and the production of large space boosters. It is my hope that as we move forward with our considerations with President Nixon's Task Group on the space program we will be able to focus attention both on these problems and other areas of long range concern in the Nation's aeronautics and space programs.

Sincerely yours,

T. O. PAINE,
Acting Administrator.

NASA BUDGET LEVEL COMPARISONS

The budget guidelines from the previous Administration were, in effect, that NASA should submit estimates for a minimum program for continuing on-going programs, include only new starts or extensions considered absolutely essential, and wherever possible, defer new programs and leave the decisions to the new Administration. The amount we requested under these guidelines was $4.2 billion. In addition we did present to the Bureau our estimates of what we felt would be necessary to move this nation toward a position of world leadership in space and aeronautics. These estimates totalled about $4.7 billion. The table below reflects NASA's request in comparison with that allowed in President Johnson's FY 1970 Budget after his consideration of all the needs of the Federal Government and the revenues available to meet such needs.

BUDGET LEVEL COMPARISONS

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1970 budget estimates	$4.2 billion level	$4.7 billion level
Apollo [1]	$1,651.1	$1,777.5	$1,950.3
Space flight operations [2]	[3] 354.1	403.1	473.1
Advanced missions	2.5	7.5	10.0
Physics and astronomy	119.6	149.5	156.5
Lunar and planetary	146.8	138.8	202.2
Bioscience	32.4	47.1	64.4
Space applications	135.8	161.8	199.8
Launch vehicle procurement	124.2	128.0	132.0
Sustaining university program	9.0	39.0	57.0
Basic research	21.4	20.6	24.8
Space vehicle systems	30.0	30.9	37.7
Electronic systems	35.0	38.2	52.6
Human factors systems	23.6	24.2	32.3
Space power and electronic propellant systems	39.9	41.0	44.5
Nuclear rockets	36.5	36.5	50.0
Chemical propulsion	25.1	35.6	44.1
Aeronautical vehicles	78.9	100.5	100.5
Tracking and data acquisition	298.0	310.3	310.3
Technology utilization	5.0	5.0	7.2
Total, R. & D	3,168.9	[4] 3,495.1	[4] 3,949.3
Research and program management	650.9	[4] 644.1	[4] 665.0
Construction of facilities	58.2	79.2	83.2
Total, NASA	3,878.0	4,218.4	4,697.5

[1] Includes lunar exploration.

[2] Includes AAP, space station and shuttle, and operations.

[3] Includes $117,473,000 from fiscal year 1969 which has been reserved from apportionment by BOB (Revenue and Expenditure Control Act reductions).

[4] Not adjusted for conversion of certain support service contract operations at the Goddard Space Flight Center which amounts to $7,300,000.

ACID MINE DRAINAGE

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, acid mine drainage pollution is a serious problem in many areas of the country. Two engineers at Ohio State University are engaged in research that shows promise of alleviating this blight on the watersheds and streams in mining districts. A report on their progress was published in the March 22, 1969, edition of the Lancaster, Ohio, Eagle-Gazette. I include this article in the RECORD:

SOUTHEAST OHIO PILOT PLANT FIGHTS TO END DREAD DISEASE

(By Charles E. Platt)

Acid mine drainage is the number one disease of Appalachia, and efforts to make the mountains healthy again have amounted to an unequaled reclamation project.

In the past 6 months, a team of Ohio State University research engineers headed by Drs. Edwin E. Smith and Kenesaw S. Shumate has taken what they call a giant step toward the solution of acid-mine drainage.

Working in a laboratory on the Columbus main campus and a complex of small mines 70 miles south in Ohio's hilly coal country, Smith's group has decided the sulfuric acid is produced by vapor phase oxidation of iron pyrite deep in the mines.

Most experts have blamed the oxygen in water, draining from overburden through a coal seam, and subsequently out the mouth of a mine, for feeding the reaction which produces sulfuric acid and an iron ("yellow-boy") precipitate.

Smith's theory, being proved weekly when he collects samples from 8 small mines, opens up a whole new set of possibilities for ending acid mine drainage at the source.

It also punches holes in existing abatement procedures.

Smith has found that sulfuric acid is being manufactured wherever oxygen in the air is in contact with iron pyrite.

While oxygen flow was always thought to end at a mine's coal face, sometimes deep in a mine, Smith has shown that air, containing oxygen, flows easily through porous sandstone and shale above the coal seam to react with pyrite beyond the coal face.

Waterflooding of mines below drainage (below the water table) is fine, acknowledged Smith, but for the mines which have drained their overburden of a water table, thus allowing free air passage to the seam, flooding and sealing is to no avail.

The researchers, working on a $79,000 project for the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency, Department of Interior, and satisfied that vapor phase oxygen is their biggest problem, are now trying some novel methods of removing or nullifying the effect of the oxygen in a mine.

Increasing the atmospheric pressure of a mine with something other than air, an inert gas, has halted the acid-forming pyrite reaction during early research at the Ohio State mine site.

Smith's gas-flood principle would be used in conjunction with a partial seal. Co-worker Shumate is considering the use of a bladder, or rubber inflatable seal, which would reduce the size of the opening and facilitate gas pumping.

Smith says water seepage from gas-pumped mines would occur but be no problem.

Investigation of the vapor-phase oxygen has set this team's work apart from the hundreds of researchers and millions of dollars at work on acid mine drainage.

Smith, who is willing to stake his professional reputation on vapor-phase oxygen as the problem in acid drainage, says that in three to five years the acid drainage pattern could start to turn.

"Legislation has helped stop new sources of the tainted drainage," says Smith, "and with the money now being spent on schemes that won't work, we could start restoring watersheds by systematically deoxygenating individual mines."

Smith's pilot is a hollow in southeastern Ohio, about 4 miles north of Lake Hope in Vinton County and about 70 miles from Ohio State's Columbus campus, with a small drift mine on one side and an exposed coal seam on the other.

The drift mine has been "worked" by the university since 1956.

On the other side of the hollow, the hill was scraped to expose a coal seam and a mining machine brought in to drill seven 36-inch diameter auger holes in the seam.

Auger drilling, commonly used to recover coal from thin seams, provided the site with seven individual research mines.

The auger holes extend from 120 to 200 feet into the hill and are spaced about 100 feet apart.

THE HIGH COST OF KIDNEY CARE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a front-page article in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal was titled with the disturbing headline: "The Cost of Living: Some Kidney Patients Die for Lack of Funds for Machine Treatment."

Because I believe this article contains an accurate description of the prohibitive costs of comprehensive kidney treatment in America today—as well as the urgent need to find a better way to provide such lifegiving health care to aid victims of chronic kidney disease—I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the full text of the Wall Street Journal article:

THE COST OF LIVING: SOME KIDNEY PATIENTS DIE FOR LACK OF FUNDS FOR MACHINE TREATMENT—ARTIFICIAL ORGAN WORKS WELL, BUT USE IS COSTLY—FEDERAL GRANTS, DONATIONS DWINDLE—INSURANCE DOESN'T MEET BILLS

(By Jim Hyatt)

The effort to treat sufferers from chronic kidney disease by machine, which once promised to save thousands of lives a year, is floundering for lack of financial support.

High costs have plagued the so-called artificial kidney program from the outset. Hospital bills for the twice-weekly machine blood "washings" that take over the kidneys' vital function of removing blood wastes and adjusting body chemistry now run from $10,000 to $20,000 annually per patient. That's the main reason only about 1,700 Americans currently receive the treatments, while an estimated 8,000 people will die this year for lack of them.

But even this far from adequate situation is deteriorating. Federal grants have been running out at the 14 hospitals designated by the U.S. Public Health Service about three years ago as demonstration centers for the process; without Government help, some of them have had to reduce the number of cases they handle.

Some private hospitals have been forced into similar cutbacks because of difficulties in attracting donations to support patients who can't pay the cost themselves. Indeed, private support of any kind has been slow in coming.

COMING OUT SECOND BEST

"The cost per capita of the treatment is an overwhelming drawback when we approach organizations for help," says Dr. Frederic B. Westervelt, director of the kidney care demonstration center at the University of Virginia School of Medicine in Charlottesville. "They say, 'Look what we can do for $10,000 a year—we can give 20 people an artificial leg.' When they measure what they think is the greatest good for the greatest number, we come out second best."

As a result of this lack of funds, hospital committees that once spent weeks agonizing over which artificial kidney candidates would receive the life-giving treatments, called hemodialysis or simply dialysis, now find that the decision has been taken out of their hands. "Who gets the care here now is determined purely by ability to pay—we don't like it, but that's the way it is," says Dr. Daniel Leb of the Louisville (Ky.) General Hospital's kidney center, run by the University of Louisville School of Medicine.

Physicians' chagrin over the financial obstacles to the treatment is heightened by the highly advanced state of artificial kidney technology. The prototype of the present artificial kidney machine, which resembles a squat old-fashioned washing machine; was developed in 1943 in Holland by Dr. Willem J. Kolff, who now is a resident of the U.S. The patient is connected to the machine, and his blood is pumped through a series of tubes, coils and filters.

The key element of the device is a thin cellophane membrane immersed in a saline solution. Through the process of osmosis, wastes in the blood that otherwise would accumulate and cause death pass through the membrane into the solution. At the same time, vital chemicals normally added to the blood by healthy kidneys pass from the solution into the blood. The "cleansed" blood then is returned to the body.

A SURGICAL BREAKTHROUGH

For a number of years, the machine could be used only when a few treatments would suffice—such as in cases of acute infections—because the surgery required to connect the patient with the machine was difficult and dangerous. In 1960, however, a team of specialists from the University of Washington devised a system that made the artificial kidney available to individuals who had suffered irreparable kidney damage and needed frequent blood washings. In minor surgery, they permanently inserted small plastic tubes in an artery and vein in a patient's arm or leg. During dialysis, the machine is easily connected to the body through those tubes; when the treatment is finished, the tubes are plugged and covered with a small bandage.

Recently, some doctors have improved on this method. By increasing the flow of blood through an artery and a vein, they enlarge them to the point where they can be easily punctured with large needles for connection to the kidney machine. This makes the mechanics of dialysis about as simple as giving blood.

Dialysis is time consuming; the twice-weekly treatments take from six to 13 hours each, depending on the patient and model of machine used. But it is painless, and patients undergoing the life-long treatment can lead a nearly normal life. Clyde Shields of Seattle, who nine years ago received vein and artery implants from the University of Washington team and became the first person to start regular dialysis by machine, still is regularly employed as a mechanic. He is 49 years old.

THE ROLE OF TRANSPLANTS

Treatment by kidney machine isn't the only alternative open to victims of kidney failure. Kidney transplant operations have been performed since 1954 with a high and growing rate of success. Up to last year, three-fourths of the transplant patients who received a kidney from a blood relative had survived for at least one year after the operation (people have two kidneys but can live with just one). The one-year survival rate for a person who received a kidney from a cadaver was 45%.

The utility of this operation is limited, however. Many kidney patients might not survive a transplant operation because of poor general physical condition, and not nearly enough suitable organs are available for those who could benefit. Only about 2,000 kidney transplants have been made in the past 14 years, an average of less than 150 a year.

Moreover, transplant candidates often require dialysis. They usually must undergo the treatment while awaiting an organ, and they must fall back on the machine if the operation fails.

Amid the general gloom over the outlook for artificial kidney treatment, some see a hopeful sign in the recent trend for more patients to receive machine dialysis at home instead of in a hospital. The savings from such a move can be substantial. The first-year bill for home dialysis, including $3,000 to $4,000 to purchase the artificial kidney machine itself and fees for training a family member to run it, usually total about $10,000. After that, it costs $3,000 to $5,000 a year to maintain the machine and buy the various components and chemicals that must be changed after every use.

About 200 of the 1,700 Americans on machine dialysis currently are treated at home, and some kidney specialists say they have high hopes that the number will rise sharply in the next few years. In 1967, the U.S. Public Health Service moved to accelerate the trend by setting up 12 home treatment training centers around the country and promising them $4 million over a five-year period.

But many experts in the field strongly doubt that home care will assume the majority of the treatment burden in the near future. They point out that some patients don't have a relative who can assume the job of operating the complex artificial kidney, others don't have homes where the treatments can be safely carried out and still more have strong fears about entrusting themselves to the care of a family member when a mistake could prove fatal. Moreover, even patients who intend to purchase their own artificial kidney must receive hospital dialysis for several months while a relative is being trained to run the machine.

THE FINANCIAL SQUEEZE

To date, the financial squeeze has been hardest on the hospitals picked by the Federal Government in 1965 and 1966 to demonstrate the feasibility of the widespread use of artificial kidneys. The Federal grants—which totaled $2.5 million—paid the operational costs of the kidney centers and permitted them to admit patients who couldn't pay for their own treatments. Federal funds for medical projects go only for research or treatment-demonstration purposes, not for daily general patient care, so the centers knew the funds might not be renewed when

XUM

the grants expired. But many of them felt that the Government wouldn't cut them off after having made a commitment.

Since it became clear that the grants would stop in the wake of the Government economy drive caused by the war in Vietnam, the centers have moved to pare their rolls. None have summarily cut off any patients, but when a patient receives a transplant or moves to home care, he isn't replaced.

The center at Cleveland's Mt. Sinai Hospital, for instance, now has only 17 patients on dialysis, down from 30 in 1967; its Federal grant expired Dec. 31. The unit at the University of Alabama Medical Center in Birmingham now only accepts patients likely to receive transplants fairly quickly; if new funds can't be obtained, it plans to phase out its artificial kidney program as soon as other facilities can be found for its 15 present patients.

PAY IN ADVANCE

The center at Hennepin County General Hospital in Minneapolis, whose Federal grant expired Dec. 31, now requires some prospective patients to put $12,000—funds for at least one year's care—in an escrow account before they can begin dialysis. "A couple of people have felt they'd rather die than spend the amount of money involved," says one doctor at the hospital.

A bill now pending in Congress would commit new Federal money for artificial kidney programs, but its prospects for passage aren't clear now. A similar bill made little headway last year.

The outlook for developing other sources of funds is even less bright. Only a half dozen states support dialysis patients, and few others show signs of following. New York has the largest state program; according to Dr. Ira Greifer, medical director for the National Kidney Foundation, Medicaid in New York helps pay dialysis bills for more than half of the state's 400 dialysis patients and the state has set up a Kidney Disease Institute to coordinate the various public and private kidney treatment projects. But state officials say that about 900 New Yorkers a year need the treatments, and their efforts help only a fraction of those who need financial help.

Ordinary types of health insurance often pay some costs of dialysis but typically fall short of meeting the actual expenses. The average maximum major medical policy benefit of $10,000 "just about covers the preliminary steps to start a patient on dialysis," says L. A. Orsini, an official of the Health Insurance Association, a New York-based trade group.

INSURERS ARE HESITANT

A few companies now offer kidney treatment policies. Western States Life Insurance Co. in Sacramento, Calif., for instance, sells a $50,000 maximum benefit group policy for an organ transplant or dialysis. However, most private insurers have been reluctant to enter the field.

Persons covered by the Federal Medicare program for the elderly receive little aid for dialysis. Medicaid, the Federally assisted program adopted by some states to help low-income people pay medical expenses, provides more aid—$25 for each in-hospital dialysis treatment—but still leaves substantial bills.

What's left for some kidney disease suffers, then, is charity. While organized support for kidney care has been slow in coming, instances abound of local largess in individual cases. Last Christmas, for example, residents of Whitesville, Ky., a town of fewer than 1,000, raised $26,000 in four days for Roscoe French, a 33-year-old carpenter for whom machine dialysis represented the only chance at life.

Even well-off victims may end up needing charity. "If you aren't indigent when you start dialysis, you soon will be," says one physician.

REDS GROW BOLDER ON CAMPUSES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as college campus riots spread so does the Communist role in the disturbances.

British historian, Lord MacCaulay, once told an American friend:

> Your Republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th Century as the Roman empire was in the 5th, with this difference—that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country, by your own institutions.

A news article written by Robert Betts, a reporter for Copley News Service tells how the Reds work and the tools they use to disrupt and destroy. I place his article at this point in the RECORD:

ACTIONS REVEAL REDS

(By Robert Betts)

Americans do not have to look for Reds under the bed.

They can be seen almost any night on television—leading a college riot or mingling in the melee like extras in a movie crowd scene.

They are not all card-carrying members of the Communist party. They are defined not by whether they pay party dues, but by their actions, their vocabulary and the way they always manage to be where trouble is.

Those who keep close, continuing watch on the unfolding pattern of subversion in this country can pick them out easily.

The average American sees only turmoil and shakes his head over the "impetuousness of youth."

Educators tell him—between frequent fires, bombings and other acts of sabotage and terrorism—that the young people have many legitimate grievances and that they need "patience and understanding."

Others oversimplify the problem, and play into the hands of those who ridicule "'Red-baiters," by attributing all criticism and protest to "the Communist conspiracy."

A bewildering assortment of youth protest movements adds to the confusion—the Third World Liberation Front, Progressive Labor Movement, New Left Forum, W.E.B. DuBois clubs, Students for a Democratic Society, Young Socialist Alliance, Young People's Socialist League, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and dozens of others.

Communist activity inside such groups is so subtle and diversified that it is not always easy to distinguish between real enemies and well-meaning, misguided, would-be reformers.

Whatever the radicals call themselves, democratic-socialist or Marxist-Leninist, progressive-laborite or Trotskyite, Stalinist or Maoist, white Castroite and black militant, so far as the Federal Bureau of Investigation is concerned, they are all the same color underneath—Red.

Distinction between such labels is irrelevant, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation points out, "because the basic objective of both New Left and oldline Communist and their adherents in our society is to completely destroy our form of government."

The leaders of campus violence make no secret of it. They travel from campus to campus making speeches and distributing literature calling for the overthrow of "bourgeois America."

Peter Camejo, 29-year-old nonstudent leader of the Socialist Workers party, who has loomed large at every demonstration of consequence over the last four years, recently told the Third World Liberation Front in San Francisco: "Yours is but part of a world struggle against the ruling class of the United States. Your victory will be the victory of oppressed peoples around the world."

Camejo, who faces a conspiracy trial for his part in the seizure of Moses Hall, Berkeley, last October, was writing from Cuba. Police list him as a "Trotskyite-Communist professional agitator."

Another familiar face is that of Tom Hayden of the Students for a Democratic Society, whose members call themselves "professional revolutionaries" committed to the destruction of imperialism and capitalism by organized sedition and guerrilla force.

Hayden, 29, helped found the SDS in 1961 when he was a University of Michigan student. Today he is SDS tactical chieftain. He visited Hanoi in 1965 with top U.S. Red strategist Herbert Aptheker. He also has consorted with Red bigwigs in Moscow, Peking and Havana.

Last year he went to Paris to confer with North Vietnamese delegates, then came home to lead a student crusade against the draft.

He was also at Columbia last May, helping local SDS man Mark Rudd, another delegate to Cuba, to organize the assault on the university buildings.

Two months later Hayden, disguised this time with dark glasses, pulled-down hat and bandana mask, was among the 8,000 Chicago demonstrators during their confrontation with the police. Still later, he showed up for the troubles at San Francisco State College.

The task, says Hayden, is to "create more 'Chicagos' in our cities, more 'Columbias' on our campuses."

Also on the picket line recently at San Francisco State was Arthur Goldberg, one of the organizers of the Free Speech Movement which in 1964 put the blight on Berkeley.

Other FSM instigators who have been busy before and since include:

Steve Weissman, who graduated from Berkeley and went on to Stanford to be a ringleader in the troubles there.

Bettina Aptheker, Communist daughter of Herbert. Having at the tender age of 16 suffered three broken ribs during a rowdy "peace" demonstration in New York, Bettina is not such an ardent advocate of the violent method. She prefers the strategy of "going limp," a fashion she set during the Berkeley riots.

Mike Myerson, former chairman of the early Berkeley radical group SLATE, delegate to the Eighth World Communist Youth Festival in Helsinki, who went on to found, with Bettina and others, the DuBois clubs for bringing together Communist youth. On a visit to Hanoi in 1965, Myerson was proclaimed an "honorary nephew" of Communist leader Ho Chi Minh. He has participated in demonstrations in this country wearing a Viet Cong cap and a ring he claims was made from the wreckage of an American plane.

Karen Wald, or Lieberman, who reportedly went from Berkeley to Cuba, on to Moscow, back to New York in time for the Columbia uprising, then back to Berkeley for the latest disturbance there.

Jerry Rubin, now in prison for his part in the Chicago disorders. In a letter to friends asking for contributions to the "Rubin Defense Committee," Rubin wrote: "To challenge the courts is to attack American society at its roots. In campus rebellions, the most revolutionary demand, the demand that can never be granted by the administration, is the demand for amnesty . . . An offensive against the courts and jails—including direct action and direct legal and financial aid to the victims of the system—would be the most immediate link that a white movement could possibly make with blacks and poor whites . . . As a beginning let's organize massive mobilizations for the spring, nationally coordinated and very theatrical, taking place near courts, jails and military stockades."

XUM

Others who will not be appearing on television for a while are Eldridge Cleaver, 33, in hiding after a parole violation in connection with charges stemming from a gun battle with police, and Huey Newton, 26, Black Panther "minister of defense," now serving 2 to 15 years for manslaughter of an Oakland policeman.

Both men were defended by Charles Garry, a San Francisco lawyer identified as a Communist by a former fellow member in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1957.

A member of the Communist-organized National Lawyers Guild which, it is said, forms the "legal bulwark of the Communist party," Garry is one of several called on to defend Communists in court, as well as to play a leading role as public speakers and lobbyists against federal and local government security programs.

Garry is also one of the defense attorneys in the trial of the seven Oakland radicals arrested during "Stop the Draft" week in October, 1967.

Among the seven is Terry Cannon, who recently met comrades of the National Liberation Front in Budapest.

"The NLF could not understand why we did not have a single revolutionary organization like them in this country, one organization with a strategy for the liberation of America," he recently told fellow students. "We tried to explain that we were new at this business, we were experimenting, we were still trying to find the revolutionary tactic that would bring this country down."

When it does come down, Cannon thinks, it will be through "some massive combination of leaflets, sit-downs, strikes and fighting in the streets—all of them together."

Another one of the seven is Steve Hamilton, a well known Berkeley troublemaker, listed on file in the dean of students' office as chairman of Campus Progressive Labor, president of the May 2 Movement, chairman of the Medical Aid Committee (formed to give aid to wounded demonstrators).

Hamilton told the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1966: "I joined with other people who are fighting for a just and socialist society and I became a member of the Progressive Labor party and became a Marxist-Leninist."

Some Negro groups have steered clear of the Communists. Their leaders are experienced, sincere men concerned only to right the wrongs that Negroes have undeniably suffered down the years. They are conducting a responsible, worthwhile campaign for better facilities for their people and, in schools, more courses tailored to what they regard as their own needs. Above all, they want recognition for the black people as people with pride in their own heroes, history and culture.

Some black groups, however, have fallen under the Communist spell. For all the venomous anti-white invective, it is never anti-Red. The Red line is followed. The same language is used. Communists provide the causes, the propaganda and much of the funds. To calls for "Negro rights" have been added slogans like "imperialist warmongers," "capitalist scum" and others supplied by the Reds.

Nor is the campaign confined to hate words and obscenities. The threat of physical violence—beating, knifing, shooting—is also used to deter opposition.

Black Panther "minister of education" George Murray, former Oakland elementary schoolteacher, education coordinator for San Francisco State's Summer Youth Work program and lately part-time English teacher at the college has told students: "America represents slavery, America represents hell."

He calls the American flag "a piece of toilet paper" and says it should be "flushed down the toilet and burned in the sewers."

Murray claims he was victimized by suspension from the college for urging the students to "carry guns to protect themselves." His actual words at the campus rally left little doubt what he meant. "What we want to do," he said, "is use guns and force to liberate black people, as our brothers all over the world are doing against American imperialism."

Murray is an old-time Marxist. The Communist party publication in Cuba, which he also has visited, gave him 2½ pages. He was quoted as saying: "Every time a guerrilla knocks out a U.S. soldier this means one aggressor less against those who fight for freedom in the United States." The Detroit riot, he said, kept National Guardsmen busy so they could not even be considered for duty in Vietnam.

Many student demonstrators, both black and white, deride suggestions of Communist connection with their movements.

"Marx? Lenin? Those old fuddy-duddies," one young Berkeley demonstrator chuckled through his beard. "Communists are square, man. They wear collars and ties—just like you!"

Square or not, the Communists are past masters in the art of mob manipulation. They have had 60 years experience of organizing peasant and worker uprisings around the world.

II

"Fronts are things of the past—we don't need them," said Gus Hall, secretary of the Communist party, U.S.A.

He was right. No operation of subversive forces in this country has been more bold, direct or blatant than the Communist takeover of the youth protest movement.

"We've got the DuBois Clubs, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Students for a Democratic Society," Hall boasted. "We have them going for us and they are not fronts in the usual sense of the word."

He could have listed several more.

The Communists have made great headway since 1961 when they started their plan to capitalize on the energies, resourcefulness, idealism and inexperience of young American hotheads.

On Jan. 20, 1961, Hall told his national committee: "The party must give much higher priority for the work among youth in all fields of endeavor."

A national organizing committee was set up to form a national network of dissident youth groups, tying in the Marxist and socialist-oriented groups that already were springing up.

Contact was made with groups that were not, like SLATE and Advance, already Communist fronts. The idea was to give them every encouragement and help to feed them with propaganda and, where they showed promise, to supply them with more funds.

Where local leaders were not considered active or militant enough, trained leaders were dispatched to the area. Their job was to build up the group by recruitment among the rootless intellectuals and loudmouthed malcontents, to make more impact on the community and stir up more resentment.

Liberal movements, calling themselves non-Communist or even anti-Communist, were also marked for infiltration. While concealing his Communist connections, the agent was to exploit existing grievances, arouse members to protest other "wrongs," and use his own persuasive personality either to be elected or eventually to take over as spokesman for the group. Activities thereafter were to be directed along channels that served the ends of the party.

College campuses were particularly fertile soil. Fidel Castro's victory in Cuba in 1959 had shown what could be achieved by a small group of young, dedicated followers.

Castro's deeds had stirred the imagination of American students already touched with revolutionary fever. They were ripe for indoctrination by Communist, pro-Communist and liberal professors. There were plenty of these around ready to talk about the "evils" and "injustices" of imperialism, capitalism and the American system, and the plight of oppressed peoples around the world.

Back-up was provided from outside by Communist party functionaries, including Hall himself, making speaking tours of the campuses.

Other vehicles of indoctrination were open forums, rallies and teach-ins. The teach-ins were a technique developed from the earlier Communist front "study group" to reach larger audiences.

Dressed up to look like fair debate, the "teach-in" was in fact carefully planned, timed and supervised by specially picked "discussion leaders" to give the organizers the advantage over the invited opposing speakers. Planted strategically about the hall were hecklers armed with prepared questions and statements, versed in the art of stifling the opposition and swaying an audience.

It also was no longer necessary to confine activities to the old secret Communist "cells." Radical students and non-student radicals were enlisted to organize college chapters of new national organizations formed under various banners—civil rights, "fair play for Cuba," "end the war in Vietnam," "stop the draft," "academic freedom"—everything from free speech to free sex.

One of the first, and most radical, was the Progressive Labor Movement, formed in 1962 by two long-time Communists who wanted action according to the teachings of Red Chinese leader Mao Tse-tung.

This movement organized student trips to Cuba, arranged karate classes and established arms caches in the New York area. Mortimer Scheer, a former member of the New York State Committee of the Communist party, later founded Progressive Labor's West Coast chapter in San Francisco. He was active in the Free Speech Movement and the Vietnam Day Committee at the University of California campus at Berkeley and since has been busy at most of the big Berkeley demonstrations.

West Coast organizer for the Progressive Labor group today is Steve Cherkoss, who was assigned by the VDC to head the anti-draft committee. He also led anti-draft demonstrations at Berkeley High School and at Garfield Junior High in Berkeley, where he recruited 12- and 13-year-olds for a Junior Vietnam Day Committee.

The Students for a Democratic Society was the new name given to the student affiliate of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy. Although SDS originally repudiated communism as an authoritarian system and excluded Communists from its membership, Communist agents sat in on meetings and coached organizers almost from the start.

As a result, the 1965 SDS convention repealed a constitutional stipulation barring Communists from membership. Subsequently, Communist party leaders quietly told members they "could work through SDS." Today they control several chapters.

By mid-1968, SDS claimed to have 6,300 dues-paying members with another 35,000 unregistered participants in 250 chapters across the country, all under the direction of SDS headquarters in Chicago.

SDS members now openly embrace the Red cause, wave Viet Cong flags, display portraits of Marx and Mao, denounce "capitalist exploiters" and "the Al Capones who run this country" and shout slogans like, "Lenin won, Castro won, and we will win too!" They have been in the thick of the disruption and violence that has exploded on campuses from Berkeley to Columbia.

The latest SDS statement, appearing in one of the underground student papers which serve as organs of Communist propaganda, says: "The notion that we must remain simply 'an anti-imperialist student organization' is no longer viable. The nature of our struggle is such that it necessitates an organization that is made up of youth and not just students, and that these youth become class conscious. This means that our struggle must be integrated into the struggles of the working people."

SDS organizers are told that they should "direct the focus of their energies to organizing on campuses of working-class colleges, community schools, trade schools and technical schools as well as high schools and junior colleges."

Following SDS came the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, named for the founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. DuBois joined the Communist party at the age of 93. He died in Ghana.

The first club was established at the University of Wisconsin in 1964. One of the founders was Eugene Dennis Jr., son of a former national secretary of the party. Another was Bettina Aptheker, daughter of Herbert Aptheker, the party's leading theoretician.

Other chapters quickly sprang up across the country. The UC Berkeley chapter was one of the prime movers behind the 1964 Berkeley riots.

By May, 1965, the Communists were boasting openly, in their party newspaper, of other DuBois achievements. They said: "The DuBois Club of New York, a socialist youth organization, is proud to say that, along with hundreds of others on campuses and in communities throughout the country, have sponsored teach-ins, sit-ins, rallies, marches and the huge demonstration of over 25,000 Americans in Washington, D.C., last April 17 to protest the war in Vietnam."

Some party members originally had suggested that a major effort should be made to bring all student radicals together inside a single national organization. The wily, more experienced leaders knew this would not work.

"The kids are too erratic to sustain any popular front," they said. "They're unpredictable and they go from one cause to another. Better to let them choose their own labels, while we do the prompting from behind the scenes."

Local organizers—dedicated volunteers as well as paid, full-time agents—worked to build up cooperation between those students supporting different causes. They arranged for the distribution and exchange of literature appropriately sympathetic to the other's complaints, suggested they share meeting places and other facilities as well as some of the functions such as handbill distribution and fund-collecting.

Thus, students who originally were interested mainly in civil rights, or a greater say in domestic university matters, were conned into demonstrating, marching and rioting in common cause with others protesting everything from "capitalistic exploitation" to the draft.

Said Inspector Tom Fitzpatrick, director of the San Francisco Police Department's intelligence unit:

"It is no mere coincidence that most of the leaders in recent demonstrations either are or were members of the Communist party or some revolutionary organization.

"Nor is it without significance that the pattern of agitation and action neatly conforms to procedures carried out by Communists or revolutionaries elsewhere and at other times."

III

For all that has been said about the impetuousness of youth and the so-called "generation revolt," few campus riots are spontaneous. Most are the result of careful planning and organization.

Communists call it "mob manipulation." They have had long practice at it. About the only new method they have introduced is the use of the two-way radio for the ringleaders to keep in touch with each other.

The operation is carried out in six stages:

Stage 1: Infiltration of any group already protesting some grievance. Agents also are moved into strategic position where they can aggravate some real or imagined wrong and form a new protest group.

Stage 2: Meetings are arranged, on or off campus, to discuss an issue and what should be done about it. Small contributions are sought to help the cause. Attention is drawn to some article in one of the underground student newspapers that carry Red propaganda which "happens to deal with this very subject." Volunteers are enlisted to distribute leaflets and posters.

Stage 3: Bigger, public meetings are organized; rallies and forums are held to call wider attention to the grievance. Other "injustices" are aired and the charge made that they are all the result of "exploitation and oppression."

Supporting speakers are invited from outside. Their Communist connections are not advertised. The word "Communist" is generally avoided.

Allusions are made rather to such universal aspirations as "freedom," "peace," "civil liberties" or—a sure winner on campuses—"students' rights."

Neither is it made apparent, at least not in the early stages, that there is any connection or cooperation with other radical groups parading under different banners but using similar slogans.

The aim is to draw sympathy, break down trust in this society's established traditions and ways of keeping order, appeal to malcontents and restive youths eager to join in any defiance of authority.

If such agitation succeeds in recruiting more adherents to the cause and building up the hard-core membership, so much the better. The main intention, however, is to stir up as much discontent as possible and win enough sympathizers to stage an impressive demonstration.

It is also at this stage that support is enlisted from liberal faculty members. Some professors already are party members. A lucid professor who is popular with students can be of enormous help to the cause and add dignity to the proceedings.

Stage 4: Matters are forced to a head by getting members and sympathizers to agree on a list of demands to be presented to the university authorities. They may be demands for changes in campus rules, better cafeteria food, more black admissions or a stop to on-campus recruiting by industrial firms contributing to the war effort. It does not really matter, so long as it has the support of several dissident groups and discomfits the authorities.

If the authorities yield, the organizers prepare new demands. The strategy is to keep adding issues until the authorities call a demand impossible and refuse to yield.

Stage 5: The issue is dramatized by calling a mass meeting or demonstration and appealing for active support from other groups.

A ringleader climbs on the stand and makes an impassioned but well-prepared speech about "our just rights" and "the hidebound bullies who are trying to deny them."

The stand is yielded to others who back up the main speaker. They also introduce wider issues like "civil liberties" and the "unjust war in Vietnam" to convey the impression that these are all connected and all due to the same hateful cause—"capitalist exploitation."

University authorities are represented as "hired lackeys of the system," "stooges of the military-industrial complex," upholders of racism and the real enemies of truth and justice.

Anyone who tries to speak in opposition is lumped with them.

An emotional frenzy is worked up by contrasting hate words with rousing slogans like "freedom now," "we shall overcome," "let's show 'em," and "let's march."

Chanted repeatedly to the accompaniment of waving banners, these have an effect similar to the repeated suggestions at a hypnosis session.

Stage 6: This is the direct confrontation. It calls for violation of campus rules or civil laws to "force the issue" and to challenge the authorities to take disciplinary action.

Students who sympathize with the dissidents but who don't go along with violence by now have been drowned out. Anyone who has the courage to stand up and call for "further negotiations" is ridiculed and shouted down.

Faced with incidents which escalate from strikes and sit-ins to outright assault on college buildings, the authorities finally must choose between yielding to "student power" or calling in the police.

The riot organizers prefer the latter. The appearance of police on campus—even to many who have not swallowed all the incessant Communist propaganda—is seen as the ultimate crime that a university administration can commit. It stirs up a heady feeling of revulsion against these ultimate symbols of authority and of sympathy for the demonstrators.

"Police brutality" and "pigs" are terms that have been used by Communists in other riots long before police ever appeared on U.S. campuses. It is taken up by other students as policemen, goaded by obscene insults and flying bricks and challenges to use their nightsticks, try to quell what has by now become a full-scale riot.

The riot organizers also welcome television cameras, especially if one can give a close-up of a policeman standing over a student with a bloodied head. It is good propaganda and costs nothing.

The ringleaders are not necessarily the riot manipulators. These are less obtrusive. They direct operations, keeping in touch with each other by means of hand signals, runners and two-way radio.

"The ability to manipulate people through violence and the mass media has never been greater, the potential for us radicals never more exciting than now," proclaimed a speaker at a meeting of the Students for a Democratic Society, a Communist-backed organization which has been behind many college riots.

The SDS and other radical groups under Communist direction have worked up demonstrations and riots at San Francisco State College, at the Universities of California, Texas, Georgia, Chicago, Wisconsin, Princeton, Brandeis, Howard and many other colleges. They also have organized many riots off campus.

In the name of defending such issues as "free speech," "better cafeteria food," allowing girls in men's dormitories, draft deferment, no on-campus recruiting, more black studies, etc., they have launched rampages of looting, brawling and arson. Carrying the red flag of Communist revolution and the black flag of anarchy, they have stormed buildings, held people captive, beaten up opponents, erected barricades and fought pitched battles with the police, deploying radio-directed students as shock troops.

The Columbia riot was directed by an SDS "high command" which set up headquarters in one of the occupied college buildings, and coordinated activities through a network of 40 walkie-talkies, telephones and runners. The same kind of organization has been observed at Berkeley and elsewhere.

IV

"University reform can only be a means to revolution, never a revolutionary end in itself. Once you secure the campus you have just begun."

So asserts Lee Felsenstein, who calls himself "military editor" of the Berkeley Barb.

The Barb is one of nearly 50 underground newspapers circulating in the United States and sold on many campuses. They are joined

XUM

in a syndicate, which includes others in Canada, Latin America and Europe.

They freely use each other's material. Much of it is virtually indistinguishable in tone from the anti-American outpourings from Moscow, Peking and Havana.

Such publications serve not only as organs of Red propaganda; they also are used to transmit directives to party members and others working for the same cause. Detailed subversive tactics are worked out locally at secret meetings, but there is no secrecy about the over-all mission and the objectives.

Under the heading "Commune-ism Can Win" the Barb piece outlines a plan for setting up "revolutionary communes, each consisting of from 10 to 30 people who live near each other."

Such communes, Felsenstein says could form a "decentralized revolutionary organization which is so vital for sustained militancy. It would be a substantial and yet invisible organization, capable of explosive activity of dormancy as the situation demanded.

Since several groups of this nature are already known—at least by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—to be in existence, such articles can only have the purpose of building up the network.

"Some of us should move into factories and shops as well as into working class communities," the Communist-backed Students for a Democratic Society proclaims through the underground press. "We should move into the liberation struggle now being fought inside the armed forces and take an active part."

Educators used to shrug off the SDS as just an unruly bunch of impetuous youngsters until a congressional report last year charged it with having given "open support to guerrilla warfare in the United States."

The SDS makes no bones about it. "We're working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," it states. "We're actively organizing sedition," boasted national secretary Greg Calvert.

Recruiting for revolution reaches down to high schools, junior high and even lower.

One SDS pamphlet urges young school radicals to exploit tensions and potentialities existing in the American high school setup. Suggested ways for creating disorder at the junior level include starting trash can fires, setting off false fire alarms, organizing mass protests on such issues as dress regulations, attendance, even education itself.

"We have much to learn from SLATE, the Berkeley campus political movement," the SDS lectures its up-and-coming agitators. SLATE, an early Communist front organization, helped structure the Free Speech Movement which disrupted Berkeley in 1964.

At San Francisco State College, student rebels were given specific instructions on how to make bigger and better Molotov cocktails and how to make use of sodium, potassium or white phosphorus, which could be obtained from the college's chemistry department.

Another statement put out by the SDS during the San Francisco State trouble was headed, "The Need to Fight the Cops." It exhorted:

"The weapon that the rulers always fall back on when others fail is their armed might. In this case it was the police forces from San Francisco and surrounding counties. (President S. I.) Hayakawa thought if he used enough police terror we would quit and give up the strike, but instead of rolling over and playing dead we fought back. We met their clubs with Mace and rocks and bottles. Several plainclothesmen were beaten up when they were discovered. This was a big step forward for many of the white students. They overcame their awe and fear of the pigs and helped defeat every attempt to smash the strike."

How are radicals who help the Reds financed?

Said Inspector Tom Fitzpatrick, director of San Francisco Police Department's intelligence unit: "We know they take up collections, charge dues or solicit contributions from well-heeled fellow travelers, of whom there are many. But all these sources put together couldn't come up with the money it takes to run their operations.

"Some of them, for instance, have been able to commute between Havana, Hanoi and even Moscow, like well-to-do globetrotters, not to speak of frequent transcontinental trips."

Proceeds from the sales of underground publications, plus profits from the salacious commercial ads and personal "want" columns, make up only a small part of the revenue to finance the youth subversion program.

Membership dues to various radical groups are used to subsidize the propaganda campaign. For every paid, full-time worker there are dozens of volunteers—canvassing, fundraising or busy in makeshift offices near the campus, cranking out mimeographed sheets, letters and notices of forthcoming meetings.

In some cases where radicals control the student body, part of the student body fees are channeled off to leftist causes. The California Education Code specifically prohibits grants of students funds (which are compulsory college fees) to racist organizations. This may keep out Ku-Kluxers all right but not their opposite numbers.

Outraged students at San Francisco State College sent Gov. Reagan and Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch a letter showing how these fees had provided money for a number of radical groups including the Third World Liberation Front ($15,339) and the Black Students Union ($22,073). The attorney general's investigation of the San Francisco State budget revealed that one speaker had quietly returned a $400 student government speaking fee to the Black Students Union and that an officer of the Black Students Union had bought a sniper rifle with a telescopic sight with a $150 student government check.

Public money also is misdirected into Communist causes by New Left students and others who have worked their way into influential positions on various off-campus projects financed under the War on Poverty. Local office facilities have been used for printing and distributing propaganda.

An investigation by an Office of Economic Opportunity auditing team showed that over $6,000 of federal funds had been expended in promoting various rallies and demonstrations in San Francisco, events having nothing whatsoever to do with the War on Poverty.

Summer youth camps have also been occasions for Red indoctrination. A San Francisco mother complained that her son returned from one weekend outing laden with Communist propaganda literature. He told of having lectures on Marxism and Maoism.

Investigators found that chartered buses were taking 60 to 70 youngsters at a time from around that area to a camp owned and operated by Willie and Else Beltran, longtime functionaries of the Communist Party. Manager was Virginia Proctor, wife of Roscoe Proctor, righthand man of Mickie Lima, who heads the Northern California branch of the Communist Party U.S.A. Buses, lodging and other costs were paid for out of War on Poverty funds.

Other so-called "youth leaders," some carrying the title of "reverend" but identified as working for Communists, have participated in similar projects.

Other big money raisers are admission fees to private pornographic plays and movies which have lately been making the rounds of more and more campuses. The proceeds from sales of pornographic books and drugs, as well as from organized looting and robbery, are documented acording to cases on file with the FBI.

Also on file is evidence of funds supplied from Communist sources abroad. The Progressive Labor Party obtained $43,000 in Peking, money that had been changed into U.S. currency. It was picked up at the Mexican City National Bank in Mexico City by a girl University of California student, who brought it to Berkeley and, according to House Committee investigation, delivered it to PLP leaders Mortimer Scheer and Lee Coe.

Testimony was given in Washington a few months ago by breakaway members of the PLP and Trotskyite Social Workers Party.

They told how activity had been financed by money sent from Peking by way of Havana. It was brought into the United States in the diplomatic pouches of the United Nations Mission from Cuba. Agents picked up the briefcases in New York.

The nationwide network of subversion is made up of oldtime "cells"—groups meeting in private houses or "clubs"—front establishments like private schools, summer camps and hotels which are really training and indoctrinating schools—plus many groups openly calling themselves Communist, pro-Communist, leftist or New Left.

The main "knots" in the network are New York in the East, Chicago in the interior and San Francisco in the West.

One of San Francisco's earliest Communist front establishments was the California Labor School. After the U.S. Justice Department put it on the subversive list as a Communist indoctrination center and closed it down, organizers moved out into other subversive activities, where they are still busy today, some of them on college campuses.

West Coast source of much Red propaganda material is 55 Colton Street, one of a shabby, broken-down block of buildings with closed doors and shuttered windows off San Francisco's Market Street. It is headquarters for the Third World Liberation Front and the Vietnam Day Committee, and command post of Asher Harar, reportedly the No. 3 Trotskyite in the United States and No. 1 man west of the Mississippi River. It also is the hangout of the Black Panthers and other revolutionary groups.

There the office mimeograph machines run late turning out anti-police, anti-establishment, pro-revolutionary propaganda.

One of the directives that went out coast to coast said: "If you are working for a defense plant engaged in making munitions, you want to see that that munition proves to be a dud when it gets there. If you are working for a food plant making K ration, do whatever you can to contaminate that food so it will be nonedible when it gets there."

San Francisco was chosen as the launching place for subversion in the West because of its cosmopolitan population, the climate of liberalism that already existed, and, chiefly, because it was also the home of one of the greatest, most influential centers of learning in the world—the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

V

The wave of disorder and violence that has swept U.S. universities and colleges was set in motion at the Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964.

Few people are aware of the full significance of the "Battle of Berkeley." It was no spontaneous student uprising. It was planned and organized by Communists, with the help of the so-called "New Left" and others committed to the destruction of this country's system of government.

They won an historic victory. Berkeley became the beachhead from which to try to launch a revolution across the nation's campuses.

Today's Communists or pro-Communists control some of the positions of authority within the faculty and administrative offices. They dominate at least 10 important departments of the university.

XUM

The result is "a great and continuous barrage of propaganda at Berkeley denouncing this nation and its foreign policies. It has nothing to do with a youth movement. It is the effect of the subversion of youth."

The words are those of a Berkeley professor concerned enough to utter public warning of what has happened and is happening there. He is Dr. Hardin B. Jones, no wild-eyed Red-baiting fanatic.

Professor of medical physics, assistant director of the Donner Laboratory and an internationally respected scientist, he is a tall, dignified, quiet-mannered man with more than 30 years' close contact with Berkeley, beginning when he was a student.

"No one any longer speaks out effectively in the faculty or administration at Berkeley for the important concepts basic to our free society or to retain the excellences of our past social achievements, even though such identified excellences are usually regarded as the core material for an education," said Jones.

Several professors, including some who had considered themselves liberal, have left Berkeley in disgust.

Sociology Prof. William Peterson, who left to become research professor at the Institute of Human Sciences, Boston College, said:

"The University of California, still the nation's greatest public institution of higher learning, is in rapid disintegration. The university has a dark prospect; and the reason is that there has been no one with the will, intelligence and courage to administer it."

Dr. Lewis S. Feuer, who moved on to become sociology professor at the University of Toronto, said:

"Berkeley has become a symbol for the world. To many Americans, it stands for studentry in senseless rebellion; to the Communist government of North Vietnam it is a faithful ally whose demonstrations against the United States government are the most valued propaganda."

The greater political awareness of the modern generation is widely acknowledged. Its members feel critical of society, condemning poverty, racism and war as weaknesses which they are impatient to correct. Many are ready to protest and demonstrate without Communist coaxing.

A small but determined group had been working to undermine the university's academic structure and "politicize" it long before the 1964 outburst over "free speech."

In 1957, a small student coalition called SLATE sought to gain the political advantage of claiming to utter their extremist political views in the name of the 20,000 registered students.

Its platform was that the student government "should take stands on national and international issues," contrary to the principle embodied in the university's charter that the university and its subdivisions should be "free from political influences."

SLATE was defeated. After repeated defiance of authority it became an off-campus organization, continuing to press radical demands. Communists held leading positions.

In the summer of 1964, SLATE issued a manifesto calling for revolution on the campus to match and support political revolution in the world. It urged students "to begin an open, fierce and thoroughgoing rebellion on this campus . . . start a program of agitation, petitioning, rallies, etc., in which the final resort will be to civil disobedience."

It exhorted them to "organize and split this campus wide open! If such a revolt were conducted with unrelenting toughness and courage, it could spread to other campuses across the country."

The SLATE slogans became the battle cry of the Free Speech Movement, whose organizers included the Red Functionaries of SLATE.

For all the Free Speech Movement protesting, free speech was never a real issue. As a Berkeley professor, Nathan Glazer, put it:

"Berkeley was one of the few places in the country, I imagine, where in 1964 (pre-FSM) one could hear a public debate between the supporters of Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung on the Sino-Soviet dispute. There were organized student groups behind both positions."

It was not free speech, but freedom to organize political action and collect funds on campus that was the immediate issue in the dispute that broke out two weeks after the SLATE manifesto was distributed to students.

FSM victory depended upon a hard core of about 200 members of the faculty who were in sympathy with the movement from the beginning and whose leaders were in touch with FSM leaders.

Some radical professors abused their position of academic authority to help the FSM leaders. They called off classes to make the student strike more effective and spoke in support of the strikers.

"I am aware," said Jones, "that activists on the faculty at Berkeley regard the Free Speech Movement and its political offspring as the greatest event ever in American education. With no de facto restraints on speech, the major characteristic of Berkeley became that of a political war, including violence, against American and Western society."

Though most university students might try to ignore or reject indoctrination aimed at the unqualified denial of the established principles of American society, there are few who could spend four or more years on campus without being affected by the deluge of propaganda.

Gradually the smaller political cliques that had been given freedom to campaign on campus formed themselves into larger, more cohesive groups which organized and led a series of activities on and off campus—stopping troop trains, encouraging defiance of the Selective Service system, handing out pamphlets on "How to Beat the Draft," upholding "filthy speech" and "free sex."

Warnings by alarmed professors and other concerned citizens that the Berkeley situation would be the precursor of other university eruptions were soon justified.

According to Prof. John R. Searle, who supported the FSM at Berkeley, "Many college administrations in America don't yet seem to perceive that they are all in this together.

"Like buffaloes being shot, they look on with interest when another of their number goes down, without seriously thinking that they may be next."

VI

Beneath the flood of revolutionary propaganda and exhortations to violence aimed at today's youth is an undercurrent of filth which goes far deeper than most Americans realize.

For parents to be shocked at youthful pranks is nothing new.

What is sinister, however, about the present student preoccupation with sex, drugs and perversion is that, unlike "panty raids" and other student frolics, it is largely the result of planning and organization.

It is the most sinister aspect of the Red youth subversion program—one part of the East-West psychological warfare which is practically one-sided, because little is being done on this side to combat it.

The discovery of the "conditioned reflex" by the Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov had an important influence on all of Russian biological and social sciences. Few Westerners are aware of how widely Communists have used the principle to condition political behavior.

"American scientists have tended to neglect this area of study," said Dr. Hardin B. Jones, professor of medical physics and physiology and assistant director of the Donner Laboratory at the University of California at Berkeley. "American politicians have made comparatively little use of its capabilities because, until now, the politics of this country were very stable."

On the other hand, Jones said, "the leaders of world communism have relied heavily on the social methodology developed from Pavlov's principle of conditioning.

"It is a way in which satisfaction of animalistic human needs such as food, affection, discipline and sexual activities can be controlled so as to condition a person to actions and beliefs without intellectual evaluation."

Communists and radical Socialists used the principle for political purposes by seeking to subvert German youth movements in the 1930s. The animalistic mob culture they helped develop was taken over by Adolf Hitler. Through mass meetings, social activities and organized sexual contacts, the Hitler Youth was turned into a political army—unthinking, obedient, conditioned to give prompt reflex responses such as Pavlov studied. Elite members of the Nazi SS were introduced to abnormal sexual activities as part of the conditioning process to break down their attachment to traditional moral values.

Indoctrination through perversion came later to the United States as a weapon in the cold war. Young people, particularly university students, were the main targets. This came at the same time the universities were marked for political subversion and revolution.

The Vietnam Day Committee, also directed by Communists, followed by sponsoring on-campus plays which mixed politics with pornography. These and other indecent shows and activities to which students were invited helped as fund raisers for antiwar, antidraft demonstrations, civil rights marches and related projects.

Four-letter vulgarities have become the stock-in-trade of campus radicals.

So have the obscene badges and open enticements of "sex" clubs and "sexual freedom" groups. So have the lurid language in the "underground" and many student newspapers which mix anti-American propaganda with titillating articles and pictures about drug-taking, sex and sex perversion. There also are columns of personal ads which leave nobody in doubt as to the prurient interests of the advertisers. These are but surface signs of the poison to which young minds today are being exposed.

Portraits of Lenin, Mao, Castro or Che Guevara, "Pig Brutality" and other "anti-imperialist" wall posters are an important part of the "scene." So are psychedelic art containing pornographic symbols, and "way out" music with its frenzied rhythmic beat, shrieking, hysterical voices and frequently lewd lyrics.

Veteran investigators into the underworld of dope and vice have a hard time holding onto their stomachs, as well as their sanity, when they look into some of the practices to which novices of the so-called New Left are introduced.

It goes far beyond "making love, not war." The narcotics in use today make the old dope dens look like dreary joss houses.

Neither are obscenity and pornography confined to the backroom "pads" of bearded, long-haired dirty-toed boys and their radical girl and boy-girl friends.

They are introduced into the theater and made part of student courses of instruction.

Performances for which "sick" might be considered too mild a description, have made the rounds of campuses. Either they are condoned by the "liberal" section of the faculty or are not objected to for fear of infringing rights of free speech. Some professors have even helped in publicizing and promoting them.

The "heroes" of these "dramas" are usually depicted as Socialist "revolutionaries." The villains are "capitalist pigs." Actors, sometimes naked or near-naked, portray characters in lustful, sadistic, brutish attitudes.

The coupling with political propaganda of blasphemous, sacriligious and vulgar sexual terms used with regard to religious themes

XUM

and family relationships is a deadly weapon, blatantly used to demoralize and destroy.

Another part of the same weapon is "sensitivity training," now being promoted on a massive scale in the United States, including on some campuses, notably the University of California.

The training consists of creating physical awareness of other persons. It is highly related to such physical contacts as between mother and infant and sexual feelings between persons. The idea is to become aware of the other person through touch and other forms of direct contact. Classes often are conducted in the nude.

"Sensitivity training," Jones said "is a powerful form of Pavlovian conditioning by which sexual-emotional types of response can be substituted for intellectual consideration of any proposition common to the group, developing a surge of animalistic mob response."

This conditioning, he stresses, has been developed "by the Communoid forces, who apply these techniques to control of group behavior."

Many of those interested in sensitivity training and its "group dynamics" are well-intentioned. They believe these emotional responses can be applied to increase a feeling of brotherly love in the antiwar movement and to generate similar feelings of affection and admiration between whites and blacks.

Jones warns, however: "To the extent we begin to be influenced by animalistic tendencies and mob psychology, we certainly lose the structure of a society based on solving its problems rationally."

FAMILY PLANNING CLINICS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing our poor today is their inability to control the size of their families. This results in inflicting not only further financial burden but often inadequate care for the children.

There are, however, projects underway to assist mothers in family planning. An example of this was brought to my attention in an article written in the Los Angeles Times on February 7, 1969. Several family planning clinics, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, are operating in the poverty areas of Los Angeles. These clinics provide advice and free medical attention to the women in the area. They succeed in educating the residents in birth control methods and hygienic practices. Further, they aid in curing and preventing disease and abortions which are both costly and dangerous.

This is one step in the road to releasing the bondages of poverty for the poor and uneducated of this country, and I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues.

The place looks kind of old. But for the women who go there it offers a new future and just maybe a chance to step out of the poverty pocket or at least eliminate some of its rushing blows.

It is the newly opened, freshly funded Family Planning Clinic at Harbor General Hospital.

Funded by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, it is operated by the Los Angeles Regional Family Planning Council, which runs several other clinics in the Los Angeles area.

And to its doors come women of all ages, usually in their late 20s or early 30s, a cultural mix of brown, black and white. Many have as many as seven or eight children, all looking for the same thing, knowledge and help.

Many are desperate. Take the case of Rosa, a Mexican-American, mother of eight, who didn't know there was such a thing as family planning. On learning she was pregnant for the ninth time, she resorted to a $350 abortion she could ill afford under primitive medical conditions. Then she ended up in a county hospital when complications set in.

Or the case of Norma, a Negro from Compton with five children who experienced complications from a birth control pill. Not knowing where to go for help, she ended up alone and bleeding all night in an emergency room because she couldn't reach a doctor for medical care and advice.

At the Family Planning Clinic, the only prerequisite is that the service is limited to people who can't afford a private physician.

Otherwise, the most complete care of its type for any free clinic in Southern California is provided.

The clinic operates 65 hours a week, making its services available to almost any woman under any special circumstances.

Hours are 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Mondays through Fridays and 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Saturdays.

No appointment is necessary, there are no lengthy waits, no tedious financial screenings.

Instead they accept a statement of need. Then the patient is whisked into a pleasant decorated pale blue consulting room, where all methods of contraception—intra-uterine devices ("the loop"), the pill, foam, diaphragms, etc.—are explained by a doctor or nurse.

The woman and her husband are then free to make their choice. If it is for a vasectomy or tuballigation, the case is referred to the hospital, thus giving a full range of care.

In addition, women are given a gynecological examination and a complete cancer screening—breast check, pap smear and culposcopy, a visual scan with a microscope of the cervex and vaginal areas to check for cell changes. If a cell looks bad, they do an instant biopsy.

CONTINUING CARE

And the care is continuing—revisits, consultations to see how the birth control device is working, pelvic examinations a minimum of once a year by a team of doctors headed by Dr. Daniel R. Mishell, head of the hospital's Ob-Gyn department, and including Drs. Duane E. Townsend, Sidney Wechsler and Jim Gardner.

For its task, the hospital is well located, placed in the middle of some of the worst poverty areas in the Southland—parts of Harbor City, Wilmington, Lawndale, Lomita, Compton, Carson and Artesia.

Many of the residents have less than eighth-grade education.

The facts speak for themselves.

Fact: Nine out of 10 poor women in Los Angeles had no access to birth control services until very recently.

Fact: Women in poverty have between two and seven or more children.

Fact: Educated middle-class women want and bear between two and four children.

Fact: The local infant mortality rate is as low as 10 per 1,000 in wealthier sections of the city. It is as high as 38 per 1,000 in extreme poverty pockets. The highest acceptable rate determined by the World Health Organization is 17 per 1,000.

Until now, the alternatives for expectant mothers from these areas have been limited. The abortion rates are alarmingly high. One out of five pregnancies, with the poor hazarding poor health care and high costs, is aborted.

MORE CLINICS

A partial answer is the founding of family planning clinics (more will open under the auspices of the Los Angeles Regional Family Planning Council), offering efficient, hygienic and total health service to a portion of the population long neglected.

The problems underlying such an undertaking are enormous. But the clinic hopes to overcome them in part through the services of Peggy Golden, educator and social worker.

She is dedicated to her cause and believes that, next to the issue of peace, overpopulation is the most significant problem of our time.

She goes to schools, to community agencies, to welfare agencies, to poverty agencies, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Department of Public Social Service—anyone and everyone directly connected to poverty—to tell about their service.

She also works with six specially trained women—two from Compton, two from the Long Beach Pact, two from the Parent Child Center in Harbor City—who go into neighborhoods and explain birth control.

EX-PROBATION OFFICER

She comes by her interest not only as the wife of an assistant dean of the UCLA School of Medicine, Dr. Joshua Golden, but as a former probation officer for Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties.

"That's when I saw first-hand what happens to children people don't want," she said.

"People in poverty are rightly incensed because they are weak and voiceless and feel they are being singled out because other people don't control their progeny.

"This is exactly what we're trying not to do. We're trying to offer them a complete medical service they've previously had no access to. We try to do everything for these women.

"They have to have faith they won't be harmed, or embarassed or that their fertility won't be interfered with.

"Many women don't know they have certain medical problems," she adds. "You live with a great deal more disease if you live in poverty.

"But when people are in stress, it doesn't matter what their ideologies are, they want the help."

Slowly and uncertainly women began to trickle into the clinic after it opened Nov. 4. Since then, the caseloads have doubled to 40 or more patients a week. But the facilities can service 10 times that many. That is the clinic's goal.

IN THE NATION: THE OLD MERRY-GO-ROUND

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam continues with new ferocity. American deaths from this war will soon surpass the total number of U.S. servicemen killed in the Korean conflict. The hopes for an end to the killing fostered by our bombing halt and the Paris negotiations have faded. The time for bold new initiatives from a new administration has all but passed. Instead of new voices and policies, we are hearing more of the same Vietnam rhetoric. I strongly recommend for my col-

XUM

leagues' consideration the following analysis by Tom Wicker in the New York Times of the factors contributing to the present administration's failure to take any meaningful action at this time to end the war.

IN THE NATION: THE OLD MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 19—President Nixon has elaborated a sort of chicken-or-egg argument that, for a number of months past, American forces have not been conducting an offensive in Vietnam—just spoiling operations to blunt a Communist offensive they knew was coming. The Communist offensive came anyway, and now the allies have mounted a counter-offensive. This is the same old game of lethal leap-frog.

Mr. Nixon has also said that "in view of the current offensive on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong," there was no prospect of a reduction of American forces in South Vietnam. Secretary Laird, testifying before Congress, said that more money was necessary to prepare South Vietnamese to take over the fighting from Americans so that Americans could come home. This is the same old merry-go-round.

As for the Paris negotiations, the best information available here is that the kind of private talks that might produce substantive progress are not yet going on, although such talks may soon begin, and Mr. Nixon said Friday that "significant progress" was being made toward such a beginning.

This is a familiar and melancholy story; it is almost as if nothing had happened—no elections had been held last year, no change of Administrations had taken place, no profound public decision had been registered to take this country out of a dispiriting and divisive war that can neither be won nor justified—no more today than in November.

LIKE GRAVEN COMMITMENTS

So, it seems, the fighting must go on—although, to his credit, Mr. Nixon has not made the slightest move to renew the attack on North Vietnam itself. There is no prospect of withdrawing American troops; there has been on political initiative, and apparently none is being prepared; and the new Administration like the old stands by the Saigon Government and all the past American "commitments" as if they had been carved in stone and handed down from Mount Sinai.

Where are the fresh ideas and the new start—let alone any "plan" to end the war—so many Americans believed they were voting for? What has happened to the opportunities and maneuverability of new men unsullied by the conflicts and policies of the past? The answer from the high councils of this Administration is that it does not wish to give away the game. It is "locked in" to many positions. It has "commitments."

The reasons for this are not entirely ideological and geopolitical—although Mr. Nixon's fifteen-year record on Indo-China clearly shows him to be intellectually comfortable with the current stance of his Administration; nor are they all to be found in the pressures of the military-diplomatic bureaucracy which has so great a vested interest in vindicating its long, fruitless prosecution of this war.

THE PRESSURE IS OFF

In fact, these influences and whatever others are at work within the Administration are having their effect only because Mr. Nixon and his associates have decided that they are under no domestic political pressure to settle the war swiftly. They believe that President Johnson's withdrawal, the opening of the Paris talks, the suspension of the bombing of the North, the change of Administrations—that all of these pacified the great outpouring of public unrest and dissent that was the most striking phenomenon of 1968.

Mr. Nixon and other high officials are known to believe that not before the end of summer or perhaps even longer will domestic peace pressures become significant; and that in the interim they are free of any political necessity to take unilateral action to end the war, or to launch major new initiatives to that end.

So far, this estimate has no doubt been accurate. How long it will remain so is another question. Congressional doves are already restive. But whether it is next week or next autumn before the rallies and the demonstrations begin all over, before the picket lines form again wherever the President goes, before the whole angry and dangerous business of public confrontation is renewed, the Administration will wait that long only at great cost.

And that cost will include not only the lives, money and energies cruelly wasted in Vietnam; it will include also another corrosive demonstration of how dubiously if at all, the American "democratic" process works on questions of high policy. Even after voting twice in four years for Presidents who promised peace, must Americans once again go into the streets to get it?

THE EXCEEDINGLY THIRSTY COLORADO RIVER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, copies of U.S. News & World Report currently being received—dated March 31, 1969—contain an article datelined Yuma, Ariz., detailing the plight of the overworked Colorado River. It is a pity that with all the excess water in areas surrounding the Colorado River Basin, Congress was forced last year by the contumacy of the water heavy Pacific Northwest to ban for a period of 10 years any studies of importations into this water deficit basin from water surplus basins. This prohibition is both cruel and unnecessary, as even its perpetrators could admit. The article I have referred to substantiates what I have said. It follows:

AS FLOODS THREATEN IN UNITED STATES, THE COLORADO RUNS LOW

(NOTE.—Spring floods predicted for the Northern U.S. would be welcome in the Colorado River, the country's most overworked stream. Troubles are piling up along this waterway for the fast-growing Southwest, and there is little relief in sight.)

YUMA, ARIZ.—While people along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers are bracing for spring floods that may reach record proportions, people of the Southwest U.S. are pleading for more water in their river—the once-mighty Colorado.

The Colorado is the world's most overworked river. So completely does man control this stream that it leaves the U.S. here at Yuma as little more than a trickle.

Unless more water can be brought into the Southwest, this booming region that is a mainspring of the U.S. economy faces drastic change in the foreseeable future.

The heavy winter snows that now may melt to produce floods along some stretches of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers also promise more water for the Colorado River. Predicted spring runoff will be 6 per cent more than normal.

STILL NOT ENOUGH

But the Colorado could easily use double its normal flow to serve the future needs of seven Western States: California, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming and Utah.

The mouth of the Colorado River is at the Gulf of California, 110 miles downstream from Yuma. Its headwaters are 1,400 miles away in snow-covered mountains. Between these points, there are dams that enable man to turn the river off and on like a faucet.

These same dams so curb the river that it cannot flush itself of silt along lower reaches.

Use and reuse of the Colorado's waters as it flows to the sea have pushed its salt content above federal standards for drinking. Salt also is damaging crops grown on land irrigated by the Colorado in California and Arizona.

Finding water for new works authorized by Congress in 1968 will be a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

More water for Arizona through the Central Arizona Project, authorized at a cost of more than 800 million dollars, will mean less for the teeming population of southern California. It may result, too, in shortages for projects approved for the Upper Basin States of Utah, Colorado and Wyoming.

OVERCONTROL?

Just how did the Colorado River, and the Southwest economy which it sustains in a major way, get into this predicament? The answer is in the story of how man, seeking to control the river for his use, appears to have succeeded too well.

It was Hoover Dam, completed in 1935, that first gave man a measure of control over the Colorado. Water stored in Lake Mead behind this dam in flood years could then be rationed out in dry years for downstream irrigation projects.

Today, as shown on the accompanying map, there are eight major dams on the Colorado and its tributaries. From these dams flow billions of kilowatt hours of electricity to sustain the Southwest's desert boom. That boom, without water and power from the Colorado River would collapse overnight.

DEPENDENT MILLIONS

In southern California, 10 million people depend on the Colorado for 80 per cent of their water supply. Upward of 10 million more are expected in this area by the turn of the century.

The Colorado also supplies irrigation water to more than 600,000 acres in southern California and another 170,000 acres on the Arizona side near Yuma.

Projects now under construction are to carry water from Colorado Basin reservoirs to the last-growing cities of Las Vegas, Salt Lake City and Albuquerque.

Denver and a string of smaller cities on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains draw water through the continental divide from headwaters of the Colorado. In this area, 720,000 acres of land are irrigated from the same source.

Hoover Dam and those farther upstream relieve the river of a heavy load of sediment. But when it leaves Davis Dam downstream from Hoover, the river picks up silt which plugs lower reaches and creates vast marshes. Dredging, begun in the early 1960s to clear the river channel, was stopped in 1968 when conservation and wildlife groups said draining of the marshes was destroying fish and wildlife.

Farther downstream, silt is threatening to overwhelm the diversion works at Imperial Dam, where water is drawn from the Colorado to irrigate the Imperial and Coachella valley projects.

BRACKISH FLOW

These irrigated lands also suffer from the increasing concentration of salt in the Colorado's water, which is the result of overworking the river.

At its headwaters in the Rocky Mountains, the Colorado's water is clear and pure. But much of this high-quality water is diverted to the east slope of the Rockies. The rest courses on downstream, picking up salt and other minerals along the way.

Vast quantities of pure water are lost through evaporation in reservoirs. From Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, an average of 830,000 acre-feet of water is lost each year. From all reservoirs combined, according to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, evaporation loss in the years ahead will average 1.9 million acre-feet a year. That is more than 13 per cent of the river's average annual runoff of close to 14 million acre-feet.

An acre-foot of water, which is the amount that will cover one acre to a depth of 1 foot, will support five people for a year. Thus, the 1.9 million acre-feet lost to the air would supply the needs of 9.5 million people.

"WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE"

By the time the Colorado leaves Hoover Dam, its salt content is around 700 parts per million. At Lake Havasu, where water is drawn by aqueduct for the Los Angeles-San Diego areas, salt level is 800 parts per million. The limit for drinking water, set by the U.S. Public Health Service, is 500 parts per million. So the water has to be diluted with supplies from other sources.

At Imperial Dam, the salt level rises to 900 parts per million, high enough to damage some irrigated crops. Says Matt LaBrucherie, who farms 4,000 acres near El Centro, Calif:

"This salt is getting worse all the time. It's hard on vegetable crops, especially lettuce, carrots and onions. It's getting tougher to establish a stand of sugar beets. Alfalfa seems to be hurt by the salt, too."

On the Arizona side of the river, fields in the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District, northeast of Yuma, were in danger of becoming saturated with saline water. Pumps were installed to draw the water out and send it back to the Colorado River for delivery to Mexico. U.S. is committed by treaty to give Mexico 1.5 million acre-feet of water in the Colorado each year.

Then Mexican farmers became angry. They said water from diversion works at Morelos Dam was ruining their soil. Now much of the saline water pumped from Wellton-Mohawk fields has to be carried by drainage canal around Morelos Dam. This is virtually the only water that escapes man's use to trickle on down the Colorado River to the Gulf of California.

"LAY ANOTHER RIVER"

The way to rescue the overworked Colorado, says Arleigh B. West, regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, is to "lay another river the same size down on top of it."

From headquarters in Boulder City, Nev., Mr. West directs the battle to keep silt and salt under control along the river from Hoover Dam to the Mexican border. He points out that reservoirs behind the eight major dams in the Colorado Basin could hold more than four times the rivers' average annual runoff of about 14 million acre-feet.

Doubling the Colorado's flow, says Mr. West, would bring its salt content down to a manageable level, deliver good-quality water to Mexico, permit dredging for silt control and enhance wildlife habitats.

It would also assure ample water for the Central Arizona Project, which otherwise will depend heavily on water salvaged from the marshes and from other sources. Some water experts say that unless a way is found to augment the Colorado's flow, the Arizona Project may not get enough water to pay its cost.

THE COLUMBIA NEXT?

The best way to "lay another river down" in the Colorado Basin, in the view of Southwestern Congressmen, would be to divert water from the Columbia River. But Congress has ruled that such a plan cannot even be studied for the next 10 years. Experience has shown that 30 years can elapse between the start of planning and the completion of major water projects.

Plans for desalting sea water and pumping it across California to Lake Mead have been studied. But without a major technological breakthrough, cost would be prohibitive. Cloud-seeding to increase snow and rainfall over the Colorado Basin is another possibility. Some water experts say it may be the solution to the Southwest's water crisis. Substantial success in a similar area of Iran, in the Mideast, has been reported.

A recent report, "Water and Choice in the Colorado Basin," by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences suggests that one way to handle the Southwestern water problem would be to take water from irrigation for municipal and industrial use.

Southwest officials say this not only would cause severe dislocations, but would require changing Western water law based on "first in use, first in right." This is seen as taking years of legislation and testing in courts.

So, as spring floods in the Northern U.S. roll to the sea, people of the Southwest will be watching and wishing that some of the water could be used to fill Colorado River reservoirs.

THE 96TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN PUERTO RICO

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, the Puerto Ricans celebrated the 96th anniversary of the abolition of slavery in their country. It is my privilege today to congratulate them on their great achievement and to rejoice with them for throwing off the yoke of slavery and establishing a democratic government of the highest caliber—the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Of all the evil traditions in the history of man, few exceed the degradation of chattel slavery, reducing human beings to the level of beasts. And of all the evil traditions none has done so much to impede the progress of civilization.

When Christopher Columbus discovered Puerto Rico, in 1493, the way was open to great and wonderful developments for all mankind. But only two decades later, slave traders began doing business with the Spanish authorities, stealing Africans from their homes, transporting them to Puerto Rico, and selling them, like so many oxen, to be used in behalf of the Spanish economy. The practice was continued for almost three centuries, to the detriment of millions who suffered from it and millions more who witnessed their suffering and did not act to stop it.

No less villainous nor more virtuous than the Spanish, the British and the Dutch authorities established the same terrible custom in North America, and the New World of such glowing promise became, overnight, a great, giant slavepen, festering with broken hearts and broken dreams.

Meanwhile, however, abolitionist sentiment began to grow. The first abolitionist committee was formed in England in 1789, and the slave trade was suppressed by Denmark, Sweden, and Holland. Toussaint L'Overture outlawed slavery in Santo Domingo, in 1801, and when Napoleon sent an army to reverse that development, Toussaint destroyed the Army. In 1815, Portugal suppressed the slave trade in the north of Ecuador, and this action was rapidly followed by similar acts of other nations until slavery was made illegal in the British dominions in 1838. France declared against slavery in 1849, Holland in 1863, and the United States in 1865.

The common people of the world rejoiced at these developments. They recognized that slavery, by its very nature, was aristocratic, and greatly at odds with democratic institutions. They thrilled to the announcement of each new convert to the cause of human freedom. Yet they were puzzled and disturbed at the realization that in Puerto Rico the curse of human slavery lived on.

Finally succumbing to mass protests and entreaties on the part of people the world over, the Spanish authorities in 1893 abolished slavery in Puerto Rico, to the great delight and satisfaction of freedom-loving people everywhere.

I am particularly proud of the Puerto Ricans, for many of them reside in the Seventh Illinois Congressional District, which I have the privilege to represent, and consequently, I know firsthand of their many valuable contributions, both in Puerto Rico and in the United States, to the advancement of our mutual objectives.

Mr. Speaker, there are today in the free world no greater advocates of democratic traditions than the people of Puerto Rico. I take this occasion to express my best wishes for continuing prosperity to the people of that noble island community, which has risen from its chains to stand erect among the peoples of the Western World.

BRADY WILLIAM HERRING—A COURAGEOUS YOUNG MAN

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said of the Vietnam war that the only people in this country who really understand its greatest impact are those whose loved ones are stationed there. While this by no means is valid, it does seem to many that Vietnam is something to live with and, therefore, can be thrust from the mind much as a bad dream.

I know that people care about our men in Vietnam, and on numerous occasions in my State of South Carolina, it has been my privilege to witness spontaneous support for these great defenders of freedom. Often the outpouring is not in the form of parades or speeches. Tragically, it can be the grief felt by an entire community when one of its own marches to war only never to return.

This was the case several months ago in West Columbia, S.C., which is located in my congressional district. The entire community was shocked to learn that one of its most outstanding young citizens, Brady William Herring, age 21, was killed in Vietnam.

Brady, the son of Mrs. Letha W. Herring, died in the same manner that he had lived—with unrelenting courage and devotion to others. In fact, this magnificent young American soldier was awarded the Air Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Ribbon, and the Aircraft Crewman Badge before his death. Only recently, his dear mother received posthumous medals for Brady which included the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroism, Air Medal—first through 14th Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart, and Good Conduct Medal.

Because Brady represented youth at its finest and because he dedicated his life so that others might live, I would like to include as a part of my remarks, the notice of his death which contains a beautiful and moving final letter to his mother, an article on the awarding of the posthumous medals, and a poem by Archibald McLeish which I think very appropriate, as follows:

BRADY HERRING KILLED IN VIETNAM

Spec. 4 Brady William Herring, 21, son of Mrs. Letha W. Herring, 1235 Guignard Ave., West Columbia, was killed September 16 in action in Vietnam, during his last week of service. He was scheduled to be separated from the army October 1.

Young Herring went overseas January 23 of this year following training at Fort Knox and Fort Hood. At Hood he was with the First Armored Division (Old Ironside).

On September 15, the day before his death, Spec. Herring wrote the following letter to his mother:

"DEAR MAMA: How is everyone back in South Carolina? All is well over here. I was down today to try and send some of my baggage home but the air force was closed. So, I will try again tomorrow.

"The one thing to do is not to expect me home in September. I hope to be there the first part of October. There is going to be a lot of personnel leaving around the same time, so, I plan for a delay at Travis for my clearance out of the army. There is already a hold up on the guys leaving Bien Hoa Air Base.

"I told you when I first came in that I would not stay in the army and I don't plan to. I came pretty close to it this past week, though. After you see what the Viet Cong have done to these little kids, and the kids still have faith in the United States and can smile, you know there is no way of pulling out.

"Everyone back home keeps yelling to pull out and let the Vietnamese fight for themselves. Well, they don't know what it is like over here, and probably never will, after you have seen a little kid with a grenade scar on his face, a young boy with a bullet hole through his wrist, or the unlucky one with a hand missing, or maybe the little baby with a .30 caliber bullet crease on his head. Just by doing the traveling I do, I can see the Vietnamese are thankful and in return are showing their gratitude. Maybe one of these days someone will wake up and realize just how necessary our being over here is. I could go on but I guess all this means very little to you.

"I was down at Vung Tau yesterday, I tried to look up Duane Johnson, but ran out of time just as I found his company. I doubt that I will ever be that way or have a chance again.

"I just got back from operations. Do you remember the Air Medal I received some time ago? Well, I have multiplied the time by sixteen. Instead of medals, I will just receive clusters to put on the original Air Medal. I have put in better than 500 hours of flying with 416 of them credited to combat hours of operation. That sure seems like a lot of hours for the last 4½ months.

"Well, I guess I will close for now. Be sure and say hello to everyone and send good news this way.

"Love,

"BRADY."

Funeral services were conducted for Spec. Herring September 30 from the Lutheran Church of the Transfiguration by the Rev. C. P. Fisher. Burial was in the Bethlehem Lutheran Churchyard at Irmo.

Survivors include his mother, the widow of Francis A. Herring; one brother, F. A. Herring, Jr., of West Columbia; the paternal grandmother, Mrs. W. L. Herring of Columbia; the maternal grandmother, Mrs. Eva L. Weed of Irmo; and the maternal great-grandfather, J. W. Lever of Irmo.

Spec. Herring was a lifelong resident of West Columbia and was graduated from Brookland-Cayce High School in 1965. He also completed a diesel mechanic's course at the Area Trade School in West Columbia.

HERRING HONORED POSTHUMOUSLY

Mrs. Letha Weed Herring recently received posthumous awards for her son Brady who was killed in action in Viet Nam in September 1968.

The awards included the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroism, Air Medal (First through Fourteenth Oak Leaf Clusters), Purple Heart and Good Conduct Medal.

Prior to his death, Brady had been awarded the Air Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Ribbon and the Aircraft Crewman Badge.

The official reasons for his receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross are as follows: For heroism while participating in aerial flight evidenced by voluntary actions above and beyond the call of duty; Specialist Four Herring distinguished himself by exceptionally valorous actions while flying as a door gunner on a UH-1D helicopter involved in an operation near Dau Tieng.

During the day, several elements of an allied airborne brigade had been inserted and one of the units made contact resulting in an American advisor being wounded. After inserting a replacement, his aircraft received enemy fire on departure. Every crew member was wounded and the radios and intercom were inoperable.

Although seriously wounded, Specialist Four Herring defended his side of the helicopter. While on final approach to Dau Tieng, the engine failed and a forced landing was executed. Due to the crew members serious wounds and the condition of the aircraft, complete control of the aircraft could not be maintained and the ship crashed and exploded on impact with the ground.

His heroism and willingness to risk his own life for his comrades was truly above and beyond the call of duty. His actions were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

The Citation for the Air Medal (First through Fourteenth Oak Leaf Clusters) reads as follows: For distinguishing himself by meritorious achievement while participating in sustained aerial flight in support of combat ground forces of the Republic of Vietnam during the period May 8, 1968 to August 27, 1968.

During this time he actively participated in more than 25 aerial missions over hostile territory in support of counter-insurgency operations.

During all of these missions he displayed the highest order of air discipline and acted in accordance with the best traditions of the service. By his determination to accomplish his mission in spite of the hazards inherent in repeated aerial flights over hostile territory and by his outstanding degree of professionalism and devotion to duty, he has brought credit upon himself, his organization, and the military service.

Brady's father was the late Francis A. Herring.

THE YOUNG DEAD SOLDIERS

(By Archibald MacLeish)

The young dead soldiers do not speak.
Nevertheless they are heard in the still houses.
(Who has not heard them?)
They have a silence that speaks for them at night
And when the clock counts.
They say,
We were young. We have died. Remember us.
They say,
We have done what we could
But until it is finished it is not done.
They say,
We have given our lives
But until it is finished no one can know what our lives gave.
They say,
Our deaths are not ours,
They are yours,
They will mean what you make them.
They say,
Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and a new hope
Or for nothing
We cannot say.
It is you who must say this.
They say,
We leave you our deaths.
Give them their meaning.
Give them an end to the war and a true peace,
Give them a victory that ends the war and a peace afterwards,
Give them their meaning.
We were young, they say.
We have died.
Remember us.

GRANT APTHORP: EAST CLEVELAND DYNAMO

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my attention that Mr. Grant Apthorp, the city manager of the city of East Cleveland in my congressional district, has announced his retirement. Mr. Apthorp has been among the very finest public officials I have ever known. Highly competent in city management, he has demonstrated a high degree of understanding and compassion for problems of the city.

During Mr. Apthorp's long and distinguished career of service, he has become known as Mr. East Cleveland. He provided exemplary leadership during a period of dynamic change. He has endeavored to provide plans for the decades ahead.

As a culmination of his great career, the city of East Cleveland recently unveiled a $50 million program for physical, organizational, and social change. After having witnessed the great successes already to his credit, I am sure that East Cleveland can show the Nation how to get results from imaginative planning.

I wish to extend to Mr. and Mrs. Apthorp a very happy and healthy future together in whatever endeavors they plan to undertake. My pledge goes to Bill Gaskill, executive assistant to Grant Apthorp, who will become city manager. The city of East Cleveland remains in very capable and creative hands. I will continue to offer every possible assistance to assure the continued revitalization of East Cleveland.

I wish to insert at this point a very fine editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Thursday, March 20, on the retirement of Grant Apthorp. The editorial is as follows:

APTHORP AN ASSET

It is fortunate for East Cleveland that City Manager Grant T. Apthorp will remain in the community and serve as a consultant-without-pay to the administration after he retires June 1.

We hope the East Cleveland City Commission will continue to profit from Apthorp's complete knowledge of municipal affairs, his special talent for fiscal management and his long experience in dealing with the state legislature on matters of interest to his own and other cities.

Apthorp has given of his skills and know-how to East Cleveland's government for nearly 46 of his 68 years. In the county and in the state he is recognized as an authority on city problems and an effective spokesman for municipal rights.

East Cleveland is fortunate to retain the valuable resource it has so long possessed.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY: THIS DAY WE CELEBRATE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the Irish have been among us for a long time, but I wonder if we realize just how long. The Hibernian Society of Baltimore last Monday observed its 166th anniversary, an indication of the long time the Irish have been in Baltimore. Their influence has been felt throughout all levels of our city and State.

There were about 800 persons present at the banquet, including many city, State and Federal officials, high-ranking military personnel, and representatives of the St. Andrew's Society, the St. George's Society, and the German Society.

In addition to the fine entertainment always a part of these banquets, we had the privilege and pleasure of hearing an address by our colleague, the gentleman from California, JEROME R. WALDIE. Knowing that his remarks will be of interest to all of you, I include them herewith for your perusal:

THIS DAY WE CELEBRATE

(By Congressman JEROME R. WALDIE, Hibernian Society of Baltimore, March 17, 1969)

Mr. Chairman, Senator Tydings, Most Reverend Clergy, Judge Finan, Mr. Mayor, and Gentlemen: I am most pleased and honored to be wtih this noble and highly respected Society of Hibernians on this most auspicious occasion, and I am particularly pleased and honored to be in the presence of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, the entire Baltimore congressional delegation: The Honorable George Fallon, my former chairman, as I was for two years a member of his Public Works Committee; the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and the Honorable Samuel Friedel, chairman of the House Administration Committee. I don't know if many of you here are fully aware of the tremendous power that the city of Baltimore has by virtue of this triumvirate of highly respected and capable committee chairman. I know of no city in America that is as blessed in that respect as is Baltimore, and unless you are a member of the House of Representatives and thereby aware of the tremendous power of committee chairmen in that body, you perhaps would not be cognizant of the power that is yours through these three men.

And, finally, let me similarly pay my deep and sincere respects to my very good friend and personal host this evening, Senator Joe Tydings. Were he of a mind he could be elected overwhelmingly in the State of California where he made a tremendous number of friends at every appearance that he made on behalf of the late Senator Robert Kennedy.

I am among those Californians who became ardent fans of his during that campaign.

Although the Irish blood in me may be slight, being slightly thinned by that of several other nationalities, on St. Patrick's Day, I, like any politician worth his salt, whose grandmother is named Annie Sweeney, am totally Irish—and most proud of it.

The timing of this day, one of the few bright spots in the otherwise dreary month of March, is one of the finest things about it. Finley Peter Dunne's fabled Irish pub keeper, Mr. Dooley, summed it up properly when he said, "If there's wan thing that St. Patrick did for Ireland that I like better than anything else, tis the day he fixed for his birthday . . . being an ingenious man as well as holy and well read in the Calendar, he named a day that was sure to fall somewhere in the middle of Lent."

Philosopher Dooley also had words to say of March 16th—which he called "the longest day in the year." Heathen astronomers say it ain't—but I know better," he said, "An the 17th is the shortest, it's like a dream. It don't last more than a minute, but a million things can happen in it."

The Irish in the United States are much like Mr. Dooley's description—they haven't been here in great numbers for very long—but a million things have happened to them because of them in that short time.

But to me, the most obvious mark left by the Irish in America is in my own profession—politics.

To the Irish, politics was an attractive profession in those early years. Since newly naturalized voters were usually more willing to give their votes to another son of the old country than to a native born candidate, politics was one of the few professions in which it was an asset rather than a drawback to be an immigrant.

It was said that the Irish didn't enter politics—they erupted—and the many election day riots attested to that.

The Irish had a real advantage over other groups of immigrants in that they came with a live political tradition. They had learned some understanding of the use of politics and of the discipline a successful political organization required. They had a common language and shared the culture of the new land. They had gifts of charm and eloquence.

The Irish antagonism of England offended some leaders, but it did not upset most Americans since in the 19th Century twisting the lion's tail was the national sport.

It was the English, in fact, who helped align the Irish with the Jeffersonian tradition and the Democratic Party in the United States. The old Federalist Party sided with England against revolutionary France in the 1790's. This meant that the Federalists were also against Ireland which had hoped to win its independence with French aid as had the United States.

This tradition of an alliance with, and affection for the Democratic Party, was very strong among the Irish. The story has been told by John Danaher of Connecticut, who in 1938 became the first Irish Republican ever elected to the U.S. Senate.

It seems it was Danaher's father who switched allegiance to the GOP, an occasion that prompted an old Irish Catholic lady to say to her friend, "have you heard the news? John Danaher has become a Republican!"

"It can't be true," her friend replied, "I saw him at mass just last Sunday."

Teddy Roosevelt encountered some of the same feeling on one of his whistlestop campaign trips.

During one of his orations an Irishman evidently fresh from a nearby saloon kept interrupting the candidate with shouts of "I'm a Democrat, I'm a Democrat." Finally, Teddy asked the Irishman why he was a Democrat. "My grandfather was a Democrat, my father was a Democrat and I am a Democrat," the Irisher replied.

With no small amount of sarcasm Teddy added, "My friend, suppose your grandfather had been a jackass and your father had been a jackass? What would you be?"

Instantly the Irishman replied, "A Republican, sir—a Republican."

The Irish made their big move into American politics at the time when both the theory and practice of politics were at a particularly low ebb. And there are those who will tell you that the Irish entry didn't necessarily result in a marked improvement. But if any there be of such a mind. I would strongly recommend they not give voice to such traitorous sentiments on this day of days!

The Irish took over the political party at the local level and converted it into virtually a parallel system of government. When the machine became strong enough and came into power it could provide that most precious of all commodities—for an immigrant—a job. When the machine was in power it expanded construction, building courthouses and schoolhouses and paving more streets, digging more subways and erecting new bridges. When the reform governments were in office public construction work was cut back—and Irish jobs!

It was quite true that at times the morality of Irish early politics did not bear the closest of scrutinies. Thus an old-time Irish district leader was once investigated by city officials on a charge of accepting bribes for favors rendered. When the Irishman, who was on the city payroll for $7,000 per year, was asked how on his salary he was able to bank $40,000 annually, he replied innocently and simply "thrift."

This period was the time of Tammany Hall's greatest influence in New York City. During that era there was a notable ward boss by the name of "Big Tim" Sullivan. On one election, prior to granting women the vote, Big Tim carried his district with a majority of 8,571 votes to two votes for the Republican opposition, and naturally his friends thought that Big Tim would be very happy with the results. But instead, Big Tim the next day was quite glum and nasty of disposition. When asked why, Tim explained, "Last week Joe Doyle come to me and said that the fellow running on the Republican ticket was a relative of his wife's and the women in his family were at him to vote for him. So I told Joe to go ahead and vote for him."

"What I want to know *now* is—who was the other S.O.B. who voted Republican without my permission?"

It was a mark of their skill, that many Irish politicians achieved power at an early age. Alfred E. Smith and Jimmy Walker were floor leaders in the New York Legislature while still in their thirties and James Michael Curley of Boston was a Congressman at 36 and mayor of Boston at 39.

All three had charm, boldness, energy, and a quick mind. This coupled with a fluent tongue brought these young politicos to the top rapidly.

It was Walker, you may recall, who was questioned by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "Why do you Irish always answer a question with a question?"

"Do we now?" answered Walker.

Alfred Emanuel Smith, the happy warrior, was a natural actor, as were most politicans of the time. He learned his lines quickly and remembered them. He could ad lib a speech for an hour and a half or two hours and his loud voice carried in the largest hall.

He knocked around in politics in the blood and guts nineties and the turn of the century days when politics was a lusty man's trade carried on in saloons and at torch-lit parades and street corner rallies.

During his heyday Al would cite the story of the lady temperance orator who concluded her vibrant pleading with, "I would rather commit adultery than take a glass of beer." And a voice came from the back of the hall, thick with Irish accent, "Who wouldn't?"

After a brilliant record as legislator and Governor in New York Al Smith was selected as the nominee of the Democratic Party in the election of 1928.

It wasn't the best time for an Irish-Catholic Democrat. The country was in a time of prosperity and Smith was ill-prepared for the national issues and unfamiliar with the West and Midwest.

Will Rogers told him, "You can't lick this prosperity thing. Even the fellow that hasn't any is all excited over the idea."

But the final analysis of the 1928 election showed what really had happened. A man qualified by integrity, talent and achievement had been denied the Presidency in a campaign that was marred by religious hatred and snobbery towards a self-made man. It seems that the country had rejected Smith because of his family origin, and his religion and paid little or no attention to his vision of the country as he thought it ought to be.

Many an Irishman bowed his head and wept after the election of 1928 and despaired of the workings of the democracy.

It was during the time of Al Smith that another Irishman came to prominence in Boston. He was James Michael Curley, a man with more ups and downs than a mug of beer at Hooligan's.

James Michael Curley was elected four times to Congress and four times mayor of Boston and held other offices ranging from alderman to Governor in his nearly fifty years of service to the people of Massachusetts. Yet he was defeated once for the House of Representatives, once for the Senate, twice for the governorship and no less than six times for mayor of Boston.

His was a career of turbulence never completely free of an aura of aggression and violence.

At one time in his career he unloaded an uppercut at his Republican foe on the day he was sworn in as Governor and he once threatened to throw a high city official through a window to the street below if the official carried out a threat of removing Curley from his alderman's post because of a "minor" infraction of the law which sent Curley to the city jail for only 60 days.

Curley made little pretense to sincerity in his political campaigns. He said, "there are times, when, if you want to win an election, you must do unto others as they wish to do unto you, but you must do it first. It's all a part of the great game of politics, where the epithets are not to be taken too seriously."

Once when confronted with a fellow Irishman for an opponent, Curley took note of the fact that the man, although a Catholic, had moved near a Protestant church. Curley charged his opponent, a man named Murphy, had done it so as not to have so far to walk to church. And while Murphy spent several days denying it, Curley went to work on another attack saying that the counterman at Thompson's saloon had seen Murphy ordering a roast beef sandwich on a Friday. "While I," said the outraged Curley, "was at St. Mary's walking the stations of the Cross." Despite it all—or because of it—Curley won again.

Early in his career Curley had forced out of office a more conventional Boston Irishman who had served two terms as mayor. He was Honey "Fitz" Fitzgerald, the father-in-law of Joseph P. Kennedy, and grandfather of John F. Kennedy.

Joe Kennedy was among the number of men of his age who had lowered their heads at the defeat of Al Smith but were quick to respond to the challenge of a new leader in 1932, and the leader's new deal. They included Thomas G. Corcoran, the most gifted and versatile of the new deal brain trusters; John McCormack, who was one of Roosevelt's most effective and dependable lieutenants in the House of Representatives and who is now Speaker of the House, and James Farley, who became the ablest party manager of his day. Joseph P. Kennedy made real an old Irish American dream by becoming Ambassador to Great Britain. He later presided over the fulfillment of an even more splendid dream in 1960—the election of his son, John Fitzgerald Kennedy to the presidency!

For these men, and for the Irish American community as a whole, the economic breakdown that was the depression afforded the occasion for a major breakthrough from the old confines of city and State politics. None of this group became a real presidential possibility, but as a group they made possible the transition from Al Smith, (who had lost, to John Kennedy, who in 1960 did what had been the impossible for the Irish-Catholic, he became President of the United States.

Jack Kennedy knew he had more against him than being an Irish-Catholic. He also had the political liability of being rich as well. But he never tried to hide the fact from the people.

During the 1960 campaign he told the annual gridiron dinner at the National Press Club in Washington that his father had just sent him a telegram.

Opening the alleged wire he read, "Buy all the votes you can, but remember I am not paying for a landslide."

The late Senator Robert Kennedy was also of quick wit. Once noting that there were two Rockefellers running for Governor, he said, "If there is anything I hate in politics, it's someone who runs on a famous name."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's winning of the presidency in 1960 was the fitting capstone for a century of Irish-American political activity. It swept away the disappointments and bitterness of Al Smith's 1928 disaster. The Kennedy victory was an accomplishment in which all Irishmen could take rightful pride and pleasure.

John Kennedy was their man—a man of words, a scholarly reader and writer, an orator of great ability and power and a man of taste and sensitivity. He was a man from a people who have produced so many poets, singers, actors, writers and good talkers. These people deserve to have as their greatest political leader a man who loved the language and could use it.

Jack Kennedy was such a man.

But the tragedy that took him away from his people—all of us—has not ended what he started. Electing the first Irish-Catholic was like the first man in space, the first seven-foot high jumper or the four-minute mile. After a time the memory of how difficult the first task was will grow dim. It will happen again—and who knows how soon? Perhaps 4 years from now.

So on this St. Patrick's day that we celebrate with such grand company, let us toast the man in public office. From the old Irishman who congratulated himself by saying. "Half the lies told about me are not true." To the men who serve our country now—and to those who will lead it in the future—may many of them be Irish—and if they are not—may they be as grand as an Irishman.

SIECUS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the concerned parents of America are speaking out to keep their schools free for education and independent of unwanted dogma.

In recent years, far too many parents, misled by glowing promises of the effectiveness of "modern" and "progressive" education, have delegated the responsibility for moral instruction as well as the three R's to the public schools.

Now they, the parents, are demanding parental voice in school matters and the curriculum offered their children.

I think there is no better proof of this than news in the past several days which indicates that SIECUS-sponsored programs of so-called "sex education" have been rejected in two instances in Texas, banned at young ages by the House of Representatives of Oklahoma, and refused in Tangipahoa Parish, La.

So that we might have a national investigation of the operations and tax-exempt status of SIECUS, and similar organizations I have introduced House Resolution 329 for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have various news articles on SIECUS, a letter, and the text of my bill, follow my remarks for the benefit of our colleagues:

[From the Oklahoma Journal, Mar. 20, 1969]

House Votes Ban on Sex Education—58 to 23 Tally Ends Fiery Discussion

(By Paul English)

The Oklahoma House voted 58–23 Wednesday to ban sex education in all public schools.

The vote climaxed a torrid campaign by supporters of Sanity on Sex (SOS), a group opposed to sex education in schools and especially to material recommended by Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), a national organization.

The bill provides that local school boards could hold a hearing and fire any teacher accused of violating any section of the bill.

Sponsor of the measure, Rep. Lonnie Abbott, D-Ada, said the SOS group had shown him "filthy, lewd material" which allegedly was being used in some schools in the nation.

[From the Amarillo, (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 20, 1969]

SIECUS Gets Two Turndowns

SIECUS is becoming a controversial term in some communities across the Southwest, although the SIECUS-sponsored program of sex education in the schools has not been adopted in any Texas community that we know of.

Some communities are taking the initiative by acting against it before it has a chance to infiltrate the schools.

Last week the El Paso school board voted disapproval of SIECUS.

And yesterday the Borger school board unanimously rejected it.

"Now it's a closed subject in Borger," said Stewart Dunaway, board president.

SIECUS stands for Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.

Its headquarters are in New York.

It is described as a voluntary "health agency" dedicated to helping communities and schools set up sex education programs. It enjoys a certain degree of official and institutional support.

It operates largely on foundation grants.

Executive director of SIECUS is Dr. Mary Calderone.

Three of its board members are also staff or board members of a publishing company that puts out the sensational "Sexology" magazine, readily available among the more lurid publications on newsstands.

Its treasurer, Isadore Rubin, has a long history of left wing political activity, and has been involved in Un-American Activities Committee investigations.

SIECUS believes in starting sex education in the schools from the earliest grades—and apparently with little left to the imagination of the pupils.

It doesn't seem to be the sort of program Texans will take to, and we trust that communities throughout the Southwest will follow the example of Borger and El Paso and turn thumbs down before SIECUS gets a hold on any of our schools.

THE PRENTICE-HALL CORP. SYSTEM,
INC.,
Dover, Del., March 11, 1969.

Re SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States).

Mrs. ——— ———,
——— ———.

DEAR MRS. ———: Reference is made to your letter of March 8 concerning the above-named Delaware corporation, for which we act as registered agent. In the capacity just noted, we have no complete knowledge of the activities of the corporation. According to the latest annual report filed with the Secretary of State of Delaware, the nature of the corporations business is "health and education, non-profit, tax exempt agency". Its place of business outside of Delaware is listed as 1855 Broadway, New York City 10023. May I respectfully suggest that you communicate with the corporation at the above address for a more complete answer to your inquiry.

Very truly yours,
Z. A. POOL, III,
Assistant Vice-President.

H. RES. 329

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of ten Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Not more than five members of the committee shall be members of the same political party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation into the operations and tax-exempt status of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, Incorporated (S.I.E.C.U.S.), and any other organization instructing, indoctrinating, or training minor children in those subjects traditionally the responsibility of the home, including but not by way of limitation, sex, religion, and morals without express consent of their parents.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL, OF VIRGINIA, IN SUPPORT OF THREE BILLS FOR THE BENEFIT OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR SURVIVORS, MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1969

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three bills supported by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees (NARCE), an organization founded in 1921. The objectives of NARCE are to serve civil service annuitants and their survivors, and potential annuitants and their survivors under retirement laws, and to sponsor and support beneficial legislation.

I feel strongly that the legislation, represented by the three bills I will introduce, should be carefully considered and studied.

The first bill I am introducing will not bring all low-income retirees above the poverty level, but will give them a substantial increase in their annuities with the largest increases going to those with the smallest annuities. It would give an increase to all Federal retirees and their survivors as follows: $26 per month if now less than $200 per month; 13 percent if now at least $200 but less than $300 per month; 9 percent if now at least $300 but less than $400 per month; 7 percent if now at least $400 but less than $500 per month, or 5 percent if now at least $500 per month.

Of an approximate 800,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, some 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than $100, and 513,000 receive less than $200 per month. Using a poverty level income of $3,000 per year, 611,000 plus former employees and their survivors are now living in poverty. The only way we can correct this great injustice is to grant these former Federal employees a substantial increase.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill I am introducing would correct one glaring inequity which is providing a special hardship on a number of retirees. The present retirement law provides that a retiree at time of retirement may elect to take a reduced annuity to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse.

Some annuitants who retired many years ago were forced, under law, to take as much as a 25-percent reduction in their annuities to provide for a survivor's annuity. Over the years, liberalizing amendments have been adopted and those retiring today take a reduction of 2½ percent on the first $3,600 of annuity and 10 percent on the remainder. The law also states that only one election can be made, and that at time of retirement.

When a retiree is predeceased by the named spouse he must continue to pay for a survivor's annuity through his reduced annuity as long as he lives, although there never will be anyone who can receive the survivor annuity. Also, if the retiree remarries he cannot name the second spouse as beneficiary. This bill which I have introduced provides for the restoration of the full annuity, or permits the retiree to name a new spouse as survivor when the originally named spouse predeceases the retiree, and the new spouse has attained age 60.

I believe the present law is not fair or just. The retiree has reduced his own annuity to provide for his spouse. If this spouse predeceases him and he remarries, even though he still must take a reduced annuity each month, he cannot provide any security for the second spouse. One can change a beneficiary on an insurance policy, why not on a survivor annuity, which is in itself a form of insurance an employee elects by taking a reduction in his monthly annuity?

Mr. Speaker, the third bill I am introducing is to increase the credit against tax for retirement income. This bill is to correct an injustice which has come to my attention.

The credit against retirement income was intended to provide equal treatment under the law for those who receive social security payments, which are totally tax exempt, and those who receive an annuity from some other public retirement system. When increases were provided for social security recipients we did not follow through and increase the tax credit in proportion. This bill will correct that oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is not the perfect answer to the complex problem of equalizing tax treatment but it is a step in the right direction. We may possibly have to approach this problem from a different angle and consider a flat exemption of some part of the retirement income.

I need not remind my colleagues that the rising cost of living has steadily reduced the buying power of those living on fixed incomes. When we consider this factor, along with the realization that many of these retirees retired years ago, when salaries were low and produced small annuities which are now inadequate to maintain an acceptable standard of living, the great problem our retirees face becomes increasingly evident.

It would seem to me that we have a responsibility to correct such injustices and give these former Federal employees a life of dignity.

THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY O. TALLE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened last week to learn of the recent passing of the Honorable Henry O. Talle who for 20 years represented the people of Iowa's Second Congressional District. I had the pleasure of intimately knowing Henry for many of those 20 years and while we may have disagreed on some things from time to time, it was a distinct privilege to serve with him as well as to travel abroad with him. Henry Talle was a well respected and diligent Member of the House of Representatives and those of us who knew him will miss him greatly. To his dear wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy on their great loss.

MILITARY SHOULD SPEAK OUT ON SST

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recent statements by Treasury Secretary David Kennedy on the SST in which he called for a "delay" in the program appear to be very shortsighted to me. It looks as though the Secretary is concerning himself more with "outgo" than "income."

In suggesting a deferral in America's supersonic transport program, the Secretary apparently overlooked the hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits to our balance of payments as well as the tax income that will come from the many thousands of jobs this project will create.

But, aside from the economic advantages to be derived from the SST program, there is the military consideration. Defense Secretary Laird is an open champion of the multibillion-dollar Sentinel ABM system, yet he has not stated his support of this aircraft which has decided and vital military capabilities.

The Seattle Times recently editorialized on this military aspect, and for the information of my colleagues I include this editorial in the RECORD:

MILITARY SHOULD SPEAK OUT ON SST

The Times suggests the time has come for military officials at the highest uniformed level to end their silence regarding the military value of the proposed supersonic transport.

The SST is, of course, planned as a commercial product—a futuristic craft that will carry more passengers for longer distances at higher speeds than foreign-built competitors, and thus maintain Uncle Sam's international sales supremacy in commercial aviation.

Yet the SST would have indisputable military value as a means of whisking troops and equipment to trouble points anywhere on earth in a matter of hours.

In this respect, it should be kept in mind that all aircraft operated by United States commercial airlines are part of a "reserve fleet" that can be converted to military use in an emergency.

The Soviet Union already is testing its first SST, and one can be sure the high priority assigned that project, despite the strains in the Soviet economy, is due in large measure to the craft's military value.

In addition to the SST's potential as a military carrier, which is unquestioned, there is great likelihood that some of the technical knowledge gained in developing the commercial transport would be useful in building an Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft, a new Air Force bomber that Defense Secretary Laird reportedly will ask Congress to support at a high funding level.

Yet the SST apparently is being subjected to serious challenge within the 11-man commission that President Nixon has appointed to study the project.

The commission has been divided into four subcommittees, each of whose reports is said to be "weighted on the negative side."

What is most disturbing, though, are reports noting that the military has not spelled out its views.

Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe (who reportedly favors the SST) says he will forward the commission's report to the President by April 1.

Thus not many days remain in which the military can get its views on the commission record. It is time to do so.

THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY O. TALLE

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the former Congressman from Iowa, Henry O. Talle, who passed away last Friday, March 14, 1969. Henry Talle spent his entire life serving the people of Iowa and the Nation. During the First World War, he served his country as an officer in the Navy. After the war, he embarked upon a long and successful career as an educator, serving as professor of economics at Luther College in Decorah, Iowa, from 1921–38. He was also the treasurer of Luther College from 1932 to 1938. In 1938 Henry Talle was elected to Congress from the Fourth District of Iowa, and was reelected in 1940. After redistricting, he was elected from the newly formed Second District in 1942, and was returned every election until 1958.

During his 20 years in Congress, Mr. Talle served as the ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Defense Production, and the House District Committee. In 1959 he was appointed as Assistant Administrator for Program Policy with the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Although I came to the Congress from a different district of Iowa on the same day he left and therefore did not have the pleasure of serving with Mr. Talle, I know he enjoyed the reputation of a courageous and devoted public servant. He is held in the highest esteem by those who knew him, worked with him, and were so faithfully represented by him for so many years.

Mrs. Smith and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Talle and the members of his family.

CHARLES A. SPRAGUE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oregon has lost one of its most valued citizens and one of its greatest statesmen with the passing of former Gov. Charles A. Sprague.

He was an independent man, advisor to Governors, legislators and private citizens, sharing his wealth of knowledge and his keen sense of what was right in public affairs. He will be greatly missed, for he was one of a kind.

As the Portland Oregonian said in tribute:

> Oregon is much, much poorer today because of the departure of Charlie Sprague. But his example should inspire Oregon leadership for a long time to come.

His friend, and competitor in both politics and publishing, Dewey Rand, wrote in final tribute:

> You were a very nice, a very good guy, Charlie Sprague.

I place two representative editorials, expressing the sorrow of all Oregonians, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 14, 1969]

CHARLES A. SPRAGUE

Charles Arthur Sprague was Oregon's wartime governor, an office in which he served with distinction. But his eminence in the affairs of the state and the nation was by no means limited to that period (1939–1943). His influence was such that he was widely recognized for many years prior to his death Thursday as Oregon's most distinguished citizen.

Wherever he lived, Charlie Sprague built something. In Waitsburg, Wash., he built a school system as its superintendent while still in his early 20s. Later he served as assistant superintendent of instruction of Washington state. In Ritzville, Wash., and Corvallis he built newspapers. And, at 42, he moved to Salem to build the Salem Statesman, which was the base for his extensive civic endeavor for 40 years.

As the state's chief executive, Gov. Sprague was responsible for mobilizing the state's industry and manpower for World War II. He also had a hand in the introduction of enlightened forestry management policies, the benefits of which will accrue for centuries.

Well beyond the time most men have retired or are thinking of it, Gov. Sprague put his energies wholeheartedly into civic service. In 1952, he became the first Oregonian to become a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. He bore heavy responsibility in the leadership of state commissions on government reorganization and constitutional revision and as president of Colleges for Oregon's Future. He served as a trustee of Willamette University and of Albany College, later Lewis and Clark College. He was active locally and nationally in the affairs of his church (Presbyterian) and was president of the Oregon Council of Churches. His leadership roles in many other civic enterprises—the Community Chest, Salem Philharmonic, YMCA, Salvation Army were a few—are too numerous to catalogue here. At his death he was the incumbent president of the Oregon Historical Society, a demanding job he accepted in his 81st year.

But such positions and the many awards he received for accomplishment are not a full measure of Gov. Sprague's contribution to his community, state, and nation. He was the respected consultant of Oregon governors and legislators of both parties. A life-long Republican, he often crossed party lines. It could be said of him as of few politically inactive men that he put principle above politics.

Legislative leaders and committees gave him the attention due his deep knowledge of Oregon affairs. He was always on hand when he felt an important issue was at stake—often in such controversial fields as conservation and civil rights. With the late William M. Tugman, editor of the Eugene Register-Guard, he waged a successful fight against the imposition of a restrictive teachers' oath by the 1951 Oregon Legislature, just one of the many products of his ceaseless concern that public policy be enlightened.

Late in the afternoon of almost every day of the week he could be found in his cluttered office in the Statesman, writing his daily column, "It Seems to Me," which supplemented his personal civic efforts. One day it might concern a critical issue at the Statehouse, the next the anniversary of the birth of Chopin, and on another day methods of teaching in the Salem schools (he, himself, sat as a pupil to get his material for that one).

Oregon is much, much poorer today because of the departure of Charlie Sprague. But his example should inspire Oregon leadership for a long time to come.

[From the Capital Press, Mar. 21, 1969]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

The name Charles A. Sprague is surely a familiar one to most readers of this column although many may not have known Governor Sprague personally. It was my good fortune that I did know him well and that we were, in a limited way that I will describe, friends through the circumstances of our businesses and residence in Salem.

On his death last week it was both fitting and natural that Charles Sprague, for more than two decades editor and publisher of the Salem Statesman, would be eulogized by his fellow editors. He was, beyond argument, the most eminent member of his profession in Oregon, and the tribute he has received, even when it might seem extravagant, was earned and deserved. I would hope that you have read at least some of it.

But his fame, if that is the word, had become such that comments have naturally centered on his outstanding accomplishments as an editor, a politician and an actively participating citizen. What about Charles Sprague as a person rather than a public figure? For balance, and because the one side has been so well and extensively done by others, I would like to write a little about my own associations with this very unusual man.

When I came to Salem in 1946 it was only a few years after Mr. Sprague had become sole owner of the Statesman. What brought us together first was contract negotiations between local employers and members of the typographical unions. These were not easy times for any of us. The employers were facing post-war price increases of materials and labor. Union members were in a bind also trying to match incomes to increased cost of living.

It was through these many annual meetings that I learned first hand about Charles Sprague's extraordinary capacity to see the other man's problems and also his inherent fairness. In fact, at times I thought him a little too "fair." Each year the wages went up and the discussion at the meeting always seemed to be about how much more the scale would increase. Each raise meant either lower profits, if any, or increased prices for circulation and advertising.

One year, before the annual meeting, I suggested that we employers might hold the line for once. He thought about this for a minute and his reply was that this would not be fair even it were possible. He was thinking about the position of our employees when he explained that if they got the same wages the next year it would mean a "cut" in their pay because of increased living costs. Serious as were our problems at times he had consideration for others. This was his way, thoughtful, fair and—right.

Through the years I never had a pre-arranged "social" meeting with Charles Sprague although at times I would visit him at the Statesman when mutual business interests dictated. We would however, meet by chance at lunchtime occasionally as happens in a community the size of Salem. Often his greeting would be: "Well, Dewey! How are your Democrats doing?" For we both liked to talk about politics and the political people we knew.

Without exception these meetings were a pleasure for me and he, I think, enjoyed them also. This might sound rather unbelievable considering that we were members of opposing political parties and rarely, if ever, did our newspaper endorsements of major candidates agree. But Charles Sprague, consistently Republican as he was, did not believe his party was infallible or that its candidates were without imperfections. Because of this he could discuss this fascinating subject without heat or emotion. Is this not too common characteristic of "partisans" important? I think so.

An editorial in the Eugene Register-Guard had this to say last week: "Governor of Oregon from 1939 to 1943, he remained 'the governor' the rest of his life. When someone asked, 'What does the governor say?' he likely meant not call McCall, Hatfield or any of those, but THE governor. A few called him 'Mr.', almost nobody 'Charlie'." This caused me to wonder, for in all our Salem association I had never addressed him in any other way than Charlie. I don't know why this was other than it seemed natural for me. Certainly, no one respected him more. And it is another measure of Charlie that "respect" was never something he demanded. It was showered upon him. It is my thought now that he may have liked a "Charlie" mixed in with "Mr." and "Governor" now and then.

When it became permissible, I visited Charlie at the hospital. When I entered his room his eyes were closed as he lay in bed. After waiting a minute I asked, "are you asleep?" He opened his eyes and held out his hand. "Well, Dewey! No, I wasn't sleeping." Then with his wry humor he said: "I was thinking about something. I have never smoked and I got lung cancer. Maybe the cigarette people could use me to counteract the anti-cigarette drive."

Are these small things reported here material when writing about Charles A. Sprague? I believe they are as important as the many unusual accomplishments that have been noted recently. And I would express the sum of these by saying something I'm sure he would have enjoyed as much as his many other deserved compliments. "You were a very nice, a very good guy Charlie Sprague."

LET US HONOR DR. ENRICO FERMI

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining in sponsoring a measure that would name the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Ill., the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator," in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

The first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever to take place was a direct result of his work. This birth of the atomic age took place at the University of Chicago, where, under his direction, this first atomic reactor was built and uranium fission took place.

Enrico Fermi was as passionately devoted to the ideals of democracy as he was to the advancement of man's knowledge. After winning the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1938, he was a marked man. America became his refuge, to our benefit and that of all free men everywhere.

Enrico Fermi was one of the world's scientific pathfinders. He was a true explorer and groundbreaker, worthy of being ranked among the towering minds of history.

The Weston accelerator is designed to break new ground for generations of people yet unborn. It is one of those culminations of activity which bear fruit after so much effort. Were Enrico Fermi alive today, such a creation as the accelerator would undoubtedly command much attention and fascination from him. It is altogether fitting that we should honor him by naming this new scientific marvel for him.

Just as the spirit of free Italy lived with Fermi, finding expression in his scientific contributions, so the spirit of scientific inquiry will find new impetus from this machine.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION TO ACT AGAINST STUDENT VIOLENCE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, President Richard M. Nixon's announcement that he intends to enforce the provisions of the Higher Education Act, including those providing for the withdrawal of Federal assistance from students engaging in violent and disruptive protest will assist college administrators in regaining control over the college campuses. These laws were not intended to stifle dissent but rather to prevent destruction. Last year, however, President Lyndon Johnson's administration refused to enforce any of these provisions.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, has sent a letter to the presidents of the institutions of higher education calling attention to these sections of the law. This is laudable, particularly when contrasted with the foot dragging in this area by the previous

XUM

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen.

A subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, is presently holding hearings to determine the effectiveness of existing laws. It is most heartening to know that this administration has the courage to enforce the laws passed by Congress.

The Attorney General, John N. Mitchell, has also pledged to crack down on "militant activists" who conspire to create riots and disorders on the Nation's campuses.

President Nixon is to be commended for taking action to ease the current wave of campus disorders. No longer must the taxpayers of this country be forced to subsidize students who engage in disruptive behavior.

INDICTMENTS UNDER ANTIRIOT ACT FIRST STEP TOWARD RESTORING LAW AND ORDER IN AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of solid satisfaction that I note the recent action of the Justice Department in securing indictments under the 1968 Antiriot Act against eight individuals charged with instigating the riots and violence that took place at the Democratic National Convention last August.

As author of the Antiriot Act, I naturally had been concerned over the apparent recalcitrance on the part of the previous Attorney General to enforce its provisions. It is my belief that had the Justice Department, as I requested, made known its intention to prosecute individuals traveling in, or using facilities of interstate commerce, to incite riots before the August convention, at least some of the individuals under indictment today may have been discouraged from traveling to Chicago in the first place and much violence and bloodshed might have been avoided.

Indeed, it is high time the Government clamps down on those revolutionaries who are attempting to thwart the democratic process by fomenting riots in our cities and now on our campuses. The eight indictments returned on March 20 are evidence the Government under the Nixon administration will not permit our sacred institutions to be debauched and other people's property to be reduced to ashes.

Mr. Speaker, riots and civil disorders have no place in a government such as ours which provides ample and effective lawful avenues for individuals to register their complaints. To permit individuals to travel around the country for the purpose of fomenting riots is clearly not sanctioned by the Constitution or by the simplest standards of good reason and commonsense.

I am, therefore, highly gratified that the present Justice Department is enforcing the Antiriot Act and I commend the President and Attorney General Mitchell for implementing this first essential step toward restoring domestic tranquillity to the United States. It is my fervent hope that this action will have to be a deterrent to future rabble-rousing riot inciters who appear to have no respect for law and order or for other people's property or rights.

The article reporting on the Justice Department action in this matter which appeared in the March 21 edition of the Washington Post is inserted herewith for the information of my colleagues:

UNITED STATES INDICTS 16 IN DISORDERS AT 1968 CONVENTION—EIGHT POLICEMEN, EIGHT PROTESTERS FACE TRIAL

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Eight Chicago policemen and eight civilian demonstrators were indicted yesterday on charges growing out of the disorders at the Democratic National Convention last August.

The indictments charged a police lieutenant and seven officers of lower rank with individual action in beating up demonstrators. They charged the civilians, including prominent Yippies and other antiwar figures, with conspiracy to foment a riot.

Justice Department officials indicated that the bundle of criminal charges just about wound up the investigation of the convention turbulence. But they added that the Nixon Administration is far from through with investigations of youth violence, including campus disturbances.

The civilians indicted were David Dellinger, 53, chairman of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Rennie Davis, 28, a Chicago Mobilization project director and a leader in the Students for a Democratic Society; Tom Hayden, 28, an SDS founder and Mobilization steering committee member; Abbie Hoffman, 32, and Jerry Rubin, 30, top officers in the Youth International Party or Yippies; Lee Weiner, 29, a member of Northwestern University's sociology faculty; John R. Froines, 29, assistant professor of chemistry at the University of Oregon, and Black Panther leader Bobby G. Seale, 32.

They were accused of conspiring to violate the 1968 Civil Rights Act's ban on interstate travel to incite riots. It was the first criminal charge to be brought under this provision.

A separate indictment was returned against Enid Roth, a former NBC news director, charging her with trying to bug the Convention's Platform Committee. It was the first charge of illegally planting electronic listening devices to be brought under the 1968 Crime Control Act, which forbids all bugging and wiretapping except when law officers do it under court order.

Although eight persons on each side of the demonstrator-police confrontations were charged with crimes, the grand jury appeared already to have made an important judgment—that the Yippie leaders were riot conspirators, while any repression by Mayor Richard J. Daley's police force was the work of individual lawlessness by single officers.

The conspiracy charge carries a maximum penalty of five years in prison and $10,000 fine. Seven of the policemen, accused under a Reconstruction Era civil rights law, face a maximum sentence of a year in prison and $1000 fine if convicted. The eighth officer, charged with two counts of falsely denying the use of violence, faces a maximum of five years in jail and $2000 fine on each count.

Accused of perjury in yesterday's indictments was 39-year-old Lt. Carl Dobrich.

The other policemen, charged with beating up newsmen and students were Officers Arthur R. Bischoff, Thomas M. Mayer, George Jurich, Vincent J. D'Amico, Edward M. Becht, Thomas M. Flemming and Ramon C. Andersen.

The crux of the conspiracy indictment is that the demonstration leaders planned, beginning in mid-April, to go to Chicago with the specific intent of fomenting violence. The defendants, most of whom will appear voluntarily for arraignment by agreement with defense counsel, are expected to deny that they intended anything but peaceful demonstrations against the war.

Included in the indictment were 13 overt acts alleged to have furthered the conspiracy. They began with a speech by Rubin last July 23 in New York and ended with speeches and conversations and meetings at Lincoln and Grant parks in Chicago in late August.

The defendants, who have anticipated the indictment for some time, indicated in statements after the convention that they consider their utterances and meetings to be protected by the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech and association and that they acted peacefully until provoked by police.

The indictment charged that several defendants planned to publish articles and make long distance phone calls encouraging sympathizers to come to Chicago. It said the establishment of headquarters in Chicago, karate training sessions, park demonstrations with or without permits and other activities were likewise part of the plot for violence.

Also linked to the overall conspiracy was the charge that Weiner and Froines would teach other protesters how to make "an incendiary device" that was to have been used in an aborted scheme to blow up the underground parking garage at Chicago's Grant Park.

Yesterday's indictment listed 12 alleged co-conspirators who were not named defendants, including Mobilization leader Sidney M. Peck, a teacher at Western Reserve University.

Others listed were Wolfe B. Lowenthal, Sara C. Brown and Bradford Fox of New York; Stewart E. Albert of Berkeley, Calif.; Kathie Boudin and Corina F. Fales of Cleveland, Benjamin Radford of Chicago, Craig Shimabukuro of Los Angeles, and Bo Taylor and David A. Baker of Detroit.

It was not clear yesterday what decision had been made about disclosure of electronic eavesdropping by Federal agents in which Rubin was overheard. The Justice Department, which told the Supreme Court Wednesday it is reconsidering its entire disclosure policy, admitted to the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in December that Rubin's voice was heard on a listening device in a national security investigation.

THE POOR, DOWNTRODDEN, PUT-UPON NEW YORK TELEPHONE CO.

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, very recently, the New York Telephone Co. asked for a major rate increase. Their action highlights a serious situation whereby monopolies of this kind squeeze the taxpayer with ever-increasing frequency. Because of its ramifications, I not only have protested this action, but feel that a record of this protest might be illuminating to other Members of the House. As this nationwide phenomenon spreads, they may wish to act accordingly.

The text of my letter follows:

MARCH 24, 1969.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
Department of Public Service,
Albany, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: The New York Telephone Company is proposing to add $175 million to the bills of 5.6 million telephone subscribers. They request a 10.5 percent rate increase on basic monthly charges for local residence and business calls, among other requests.

By their own admission, their rate of the profit is 6.87 percent, which they claim they must raise in order to attract investment capital to keep their construction program going.

I find this excuse unsatisfactory in the extreme, and consider their proposal unfair and unworthy of serious consideration or approval. Again, we see a massive corporation making major profits seeking still more for its coffers at the expense of millions of helpless members of the taxpaying public. Surely, there can be no element of fairness in their request.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: INDUSTRY FINDS AN ANSWER

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I spoke to the House suggesting what could be done by the Federal Government to solve the log and lumber shortage which has been responsible for the present high prices of lumber and plywood.

In this speech I mentioned what some private timber owners had been able to accomplish by intensified management of their own timber resources. A good example is the Weyerhaeuser Co., in the Northwest. In the Weyerhaeuser News of July 1967, nearly 2 years ago, that company reported in detail to their official family the plans, which by then had been adopted, to increase the yield of company lands on a long-term basis. While I am not advocating this exact program for Federal forest lands, I certainly think that this is the direction in which we should be heading. Therefore, I offer this full article herewith for the information of my colleagues:

Wild as it sounds, without adding a square foot of land, Weyerhaeuser Company is going to grow 33 per cent more wood in its forests in the future than it has been growing in the past.

This modern miracle is called the High Yield Forest and was outlined to shareholders at the annual meeting in April.

Briefly, Weyerhaeuser will get this extra fiber from the woods through fertilization, thinning, use of genetically superior trees and reforesting logged lands quickly.

In one way the High Yield Forest is evolutionary in that the skills and knowledge to do these four things have been accumulated by Weyerhaeuser through many years. This knowledge is the foundation on which the High Yield Forest will be built.

The High Yield Forest is revolutionary in that for the first time this vast pool of knowledge—some of it owned only by Weyerhaeuser—has been cranked into a computer in a simulation that proves how this 33 per cent increase in wood growth can be gained.

Yet revolutionary as it sounds, it follows the pattern Weyerhaeuser has set through the years.

Back in the early part of this century, the logging method was to "cut and get out," abandoning land and moving on to new forests. Weyerhaeuser made a radical departure at that time by deciding to keep its land wherever possible. This decision was one of the key ones which has given Weyerhaeuser Company its timber wealth today. This change in policy also set the pattern for today's industrial forest management.

Concurrently, the company began to study reforestation and—contrary to nationwide practices at that time—began treating timber as a renewable resource.

At the same time, Weyerhaeuser helped pioneer fire prevention and established better forest fire prevention and control methods.

These steps led in 1941 to the beginning of the privately sponsored American Tree Farm System, again setting a pattern for both private and public forestry, which has proved to be one of the great success stories in the world of conservation.

So today, when the company says it can increase the growth of its forests by 33 per cent, it's following the pioneering spirit which made these other basic decisions in the past.

The High Yield Forest for one thing is sound business. It will also bring benefits to our nation and the world just as the earlier departures into tree farming did. The plan is bold, just as earlier Weyerhaeuser departures into reforestation, fire prevention and tree farming were bold. And just as these earlier departures became the accepted forestry methods throughout the nation, so the high yield forestry concept promises to become the nationwide pattern on both private and public lands.

THE HIGH YIELD FOREST

This will do even more than tree farming did to revolutionize the timber industry!

That was a typical comment following the statement that Weyerhaeuser is going to grow 33 per cent more fiber in its forests in the coming years.

The statement is no blue sky dream, but based on a heavily documented report made to shareholders at the company's recent annual meeting.

The report is a blueprint for what is called the High Yield Forest. It describes how Weyerhaeuser Company lands are going to be producing more than 1,000 tons of wood per hour, day in and day out, forever.

The idea behind the High Yield Forest is really quite simple. It's that a tree farmer, like any other kind of farmer, can get bigger crops from each acre of land if he uses fertilizer, spaces his crops to let them grow as fast as possible, plants genetically superior seed and fully utilizes the total growth of the forest.

For example, American Indians grew 15 to 20 bushels of corn per acre. Today, the average production of corn in the United States is over 100 bushels per acre and production up to 200 bushels has been reached.

While the concept is simple, the means of carrying it out are probably as complex as any plan ever attempted in the industry.

This conversion to the High Yield Forest will be done in four basic ways:

1. Improvement of standing timber through thinning (and in so doing recovering fiber that would have been lost otherwise)
2. Fertilization
3. Getting quick and full reforestation of logged lands
4. Using genetically improved seeds for this reforestation

Much of the knowledge that makes this change to high yield forestry possible was not easily gained, but has been compiled in the past quarter of a century through research, study and practical experience in the field by Weyerhaeuser employees.

Some of the major contributions have come from the company's research laboratory which was created at Centralia, Wash., more than 20 years ago. These include new forest measurement and silvicultural techniques and intensive studies in soils, genetics, wildlife, forest disease and insects.

At other places throughout the company, work by forest economists, cruisers, log scaling and raw material supply men, logging cost analysts, accountants, and developers of new logging equipment have all poured facts into the High Yield Forest study.

A brief look at some of these individual skills and studies will illustrate both the complexity of the plan and how it will be carried out.

One step was to classify all the company's lands according to their tree-growing potential. Weyerhaeuser has some of the best conifer lands in the world, both for the amount of wood they will grow and also their location close to transportation.

By classifying these lands it can be predicted accurately what each acre will grow under different intensities of management thus making it possible to apply to each acre the most profitable combination of management techniques such as fertilizing and thinning.

This is one of the sound principles of any business, to achieve the most profitable combination of a large number of factors. In the case of forestry, however, this is the first time that so many of the vital facts have been determined with such accuracy and brought together.

Some of these facts were compiled over the years in the yield tables at the Centralia research center. These tables are more complete than any others in existence and isolate the different factors that affect tree growth.

Another key factor is the knowledge from thinning studies made over a period of years. This includes pre-commercial thinning, much as a gardener thins carrots to let the remaining ones grow larger, and several kinds of commercial thinning. Thinning helps the remaining trees grow more fiber and also gives new income in the form of fiber which in an unthinned forest is lost to insects and decay.

It's a lot like eating your cake and having it too. It's possible to take out over a third of the total volume in an average stand during the growth cycle, gaining additional income and still ending up with more wood when the stand reaches harvest age than it would have produced without thinning.

Today, the company is beginning to buy fertilizer in railroad car quantities and helicopters are spreading it on thousands of acres. This has been proven economically sound by a 12-year research and testing program.

In the field of genetics, a combination of seed orchards where only the best trees are used for growing seed, and nurseries where these trees get a head start, will increase future yields greatly.

The company also has accumulated over many years, a broad experience in reforesting logged lands. This is vital, for idle acres are not contributing to the company's supply of fiber.

The company has adopted a measuring system in which the unit is 100 cubic feet, called a cunit. This replaces the old board foot system which was developed when logs were used mainly for lumber. This old system tended to ignore the part of the log that ends up in anything other than lumber, such as pulp chips. Hence, it was not an accurate measurement for today's integrated mills where plywood, pulp and particleboard are also produced. The smaller the logs, the less accurate the old system became, so with the increased use of small logs in the High

Yield Forest, an improved system of measurement was even more necessary.

Finally, this increased production of timber will be handled by logging equipment far more efficient than that used previously.

Some of this equipment was pioneered by Weyerhaeuser. Some is a result of the general technological revolution in the industry. Some is yet to be developed, but will be as needs arise.

An example is the new equipment designed specifically to handle small logs. Other equipment will make logging of mature trees and the planting of new trees as much more efficient compared to past methods as the chain saw is compared to yesterday's two-man hand saws.

At about this point, the company had more facts than a battalion of scientists could interpret in a lifetime. So the computer scientists took over, programming all this into a forest model that simulated inventories, growth and harvest, and values and costs of all the company's lands, a task of many months in itself.

Then came that magic moment when it was possible to compare various harvest cycles to see which would yield the most fiber, to vary such elements as how much thinning compared to various amounts of fertilizer would yield the most in various cutting cycles and to balance the financial and biological considerations.

The effect was almost like stepping into a time machine. It was possible to look at the forests 30, 60, 120 years from now. It was possible to say "this is the High Yield Forest we will have, these are the steps we have to take to get there."

It was setting a goal, then creating the road map of how to get there, something it had never been possible to do so completely or with so much certainty in the industry before.

There are other sophisticated forestry programs in the industry, both in Europe and in North America. Many of them involve some of the same techniques as does the High Yield Forest.

What is it that makes Weyerhaeuser's program unique?

For one thing, the vastness of the program—nothing on this scale, at this intensity, ever has been attempted before.

Even more important, the High Yield Forest is not just a forestry program. It is a comprehensive industrial plan. Other programs have been aimed only at the goal of increasing fiber growth. The High Yield Forest is aimed at increasing that growth within the framework of projected market demands and the projected financial requirements of the company.

This overlay of marketing and financial considerations is what makes possible the selection of specific management programs for each acre within the company's landholdings. Each portion of our timberlands has not only its individual soil quality, moisture, slope and altitude characteristics, and its own latitude and longitude. Each also has its own characteristics in regard to its location near various mills and markets. Taxes and other cost factors affecting return on investment also differ in each area.

These factors are just as important in planning for a profitable forest as are the factors which determine potential tree growth under various management programs. When they are given weight in the computer simulation of the program, not only the tree growth but also the economics of the High Yield Forest can be simulated.

And with the computer simulation, if some of the factors change—if some of the techniques exceed expectations while others aren't as effective, or new methods are developed—the adjusted factors can be cranked into the computer and the plan adjusted for even greater efficiency.

Finally, the High Yield Forest generates its own cash to operate the plan, plus profit which would have been lost, by furnishing more fiber as the plan develops.

The High Yield Forest will differ from the forests of today. Gone are the days when land was reforested and then left for 20 or more years. Men will be working in these future forests all the time, to make them work harder to serve men.

This is conservation in its truest sense.

If an individual, for instance, merely hoards the money he has earned, he has in a sense conserved it. Inflation, however, will eat away at its value. And, while it serves a certain insurance purpose, the money is essentially idle and steadily decreasing in value.

If he invests this money wisely, however, it is not merely kept intact, but its purchasing value is also conserved. And, even more important, the money so invested earns new money—the asset is actually increased, as well as conserved. As this holds true with the individual and his money, it also holds true with the forest industry and its trees.

And this, in a sense, is the value of the High Yield Forest. While under the original sustained yield program, Weyerhaeuser was able to insure that it would always be able to operate with a constant supply of timber. Now the new High Yield Forest program will permit the company to operate with a dramatically increased supply of its basic raw material.

Weyerhaeuser Company's unique combination of circumstances, including the balance of old growth to second growth timber on its lands, and the quality and location of those lands themselves, makes this specific program possible at this specific time.

The High Yield Forest plan promises to become the nationwide forestry pattern of the future for both private industry and government.

THE 1970 CENSUS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to limit categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law on the 1970 census, I was naturally pleased to note the strong radio commentary carried over WBBM, Chicago, Tuesday, March 18, dealing with this subject.

The editorial very effectively goes to the heart of the question. I am hopeful that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve, will give the matter the proper attention it deserves.

The editorial follows:

The 1970 Census

Next year's federal census is supposed to check every household in this nation. It involves asking 120 questions on 67 different subjects. And any citizen who refuses to answer those 120 questions is subject to criminal penalties of 60 days in jail, or up to $100 in fines, or both.

There is now a bill before the House to make the answering of most of these questions voluntary instead of mandatory. We think this is a good idea. Of course, we support the basic information which a census is supposed to provide. That is name, age, sex, number of persons in the household, and a few other essentials.

But the next census goes far beyond these primary questions. It requires you to disclose your income from all sources including public aid and unemployment insurance. It requires you to disclose your educational background, your military and job background; it requires you to disclose the bathroom facilities in your home and if they are shared and if so with whom. The 1970 census requires all kinds of additional information such as whether you own a second home, a dishwasher, and radio and TV sets.

To our way of thinking, this is just too much federal information gathering. There are practical reasons why this information would be helpful in both governmental and private programs. But we do not support the idea that gathering this information should be required of all citizens. If you want to disclose your income and ownership of items, so much the better. But if you don't care to do so, we think you should not be required to answer questions under threat of criminal penalties.

A TALE WORTH REPEATING

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Ben V. Flora, superintendent of Bellevue public schools, Bellevue, Ky., sent me the following article which all members of Congress should read. It is entitled "A Tale Worth Repeating":

[From the Thief River (Minn.) Times]

A Tale Worth Repeating

Once upon a time there were two men who lived on farms across the road from each other. One of these men labored from early to late to plant and tend his crops, care for his livestock, improve his buildings and repair his machinery. His wife took part-time employment in the nearby town to supplement the family income and provide for the education of their children.

The other man preferred to rise at his convenience, spend many of his days in the nearby town playing cards, talking on the street corner or relaxing in an air-conditioned bar. His crops—seeded later than his neighbor's—were infested with weeds. He had no livestock, for they were too much work, and his buildings were in too poor repair to keep them. His wife joined him in town or went on her own way, letting the housework slide and neglecting her children.

By virtue of his effort, enterprise and initiative, the first man harvested a good crop, his livestock and their products brought top prices and his farmstead had a neat orderly appearance. Because of his indolence and carelessness, the second man harvested only little crop and his buildings deteriorated.

Then along came a being called Equalizer. He looked upon the second man and said, "Your children are undernourished and underclothed. I will provide you with sustenance for yourself and for them. You are poverty-stricken because you have little income. Your house is in poor condition; I will build you a new one."

He looked upon the first man and said, "You have more income than you require to provide your family with necessities; I will take the remainder from you. Your land and buildings and machinery are of great value; I will exact payment in relation to their value. Your production has created surpluses; next year I shall restrict the acreage you may plant. I shall take much of what you have and give it to your neighbor who is less fortunate than you."

Other neighbors heard what the being called Equalizer had to say and they reasoned thus: "Why should we labor when the returns of our labor are taken from us? Why should we not do as we please, forsaking our labors, when the being called Equalizer will care for our wants and educate our children? Let us then pursue the course of leisure and pleasure."

Now the country in which this parable took place was called the United States of America and the being called Equalizer was the government. And the people grew lazy and dependent upon the Equalizer, and he lost his power to sustain them and they disappeared from the face of the earth.

AN OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting and thought-provoking article, entitled "An Ombudsman for the United States," written by Dr. Ake Sandler, Ph. D., professor of government at California State College at Los Angeles, and printed in the May 1968 volume of "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science."

The concept of a Federal ombudsman in America has been advanced as one possible means of making government more responsive and more responsible to the average citizen—as well as of providing a more effective way for an individual person to assert his rights against a seemingly ever-growing bureaucratic establishment in our increasingly complex 20th-century society.

Therefore, I believe Dr. Sandler's discussion of this important subject is especially pertinent today as a constructive contribution to the effort of citizens throughout the country to improve the quality of life in the United States—so that all Americans may one day fully enjoy the great promise of this land.

Dr. Sandler's article follows:

AN OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By Ake Sandler)

(NOTE.—Ake Sandler, Ph. D., Los Angeles, California, is Professor of Government, California State College at Los Angeles. He has taught at Stanford University, University of California at Los Angeles, and the University of Minnesota. His work abroad includes a study of the Ombudsman in Sweden (1966). He has written a textbook in American government and has authored numerous articles on Swedish government and politics, for American as well as Swedish publications. He has appeared as expert witness at hearings on the Ombudsman bill in the State of California, 1966.)

"One wonders why the Republican Party waits another moment before coming out, as a party objective, for ombudsmen at all levels, state and federal,"[1] wrote a nationally syndicated columnist in November 1966.

Many who read this whole-hearted endorsement of the Ombudsman must have been astonished when they realized that it came from William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of the *National Review* and as conservative as one can be, this side of the John Birch Society. But he meant every word, and his unconditional support is an indication of the extent of the acceptance of the idea—an idea that originated in Sweden some 160 years ago.

Just about everybody who considers himself educated knows what "Ombudsman" means—someone to whom people can take their complaints against bureaucrats, and from whom they can hope to get a complete and thorough hearing and, perhaps, redress. The Ombudsman has worked well in Sweden and in a half-dozen other countries, all of them, except England, with relatively small populations—none exceeding ten million. So the question immediately arises whether there is a population number beyond which one cannot or should not establish an Ombudsman because its size would render the office ineffective. England, with a population of over fifty million, has an Ombudsman of only very limited functions, who could not—certainly by Swedish standards—qualify as a genuine Ombudsman, and West Germany, with an equivalent population, has an Ombudsman solely for military affairs. Sweden incidentally, has Ombudsmen for both civil and military affairs, the Justitieombudsman (JO) and the Militieombudsman (MO). But some experts on the subject believe that twenty million may be the optimal population that an Ombudsman can handle effectively.

"Size," says Professor Stanley Anderson of the University of California, "is the single most important factor in considering whether to transplant the institution to another country."[2] That would rule out nations of the size of the United States—unless, of course, a federal Ombudsman were established for every state, as is the case with federal district attorneys. For some larger states, like California and New York, possibly two or three federal Ombudsmen might be necessary. We shall consider this possibility later in this discussion.

A CONSTITUTIONAL GAP

For all the intricacy of America's separation of powers and checks and balances, with numerous built-in safeguards to protect individual rights, there exists a gap—a constitutional gap—that exposes the citizen to some serious pitfalls. He can defend himself against just about everybody except the bureaucrat. The federal, state, and local bureaucracy can, if dishonest or unscrupulous, treat the "little fellow"—he who has no "connections"—with disdain, and subject him to all sorts of indignities, including loss of life, limb, and property, without having to worry for a moment about the consequences; for who will take a public agency or a public official to task? The courts? They are too busy, and when they have the time, it may take an eternity to get a decision, let alone a favorable one. And ordinarily the complaints are not of the type that call for legal action. Often, they involve administrative decisions. Sometimes several agencies are acting in co-operation. Then there is the attitude, on the part of both public and politicians, that such general complaints belong in the growing realm of "letter-to-your-congressman"—that "your congressman" properly is the person to listen to, and respond to, complaints of constituents against federal agencies or officials abusing their power or guilty of incompetence.[3]

The fact is that Americans feel that they "can't fight city hall," and so they do not; or if they do, they feel that they have little chance of getting anywhere beyond blowing off steam. Here is where the congressman enters the picture and provides a "couch" but little else. The irate citizen can "get it off his chest" and then go back to work and forget about it, because the average congressman (or any legislator, for that matter) has neither the time nor the inclination to *do* anything about a complaint other than to put in a phone call or write a letter on behalf of his complaining constituent.

SOME AVAILABLE REMEDIES

Americans are not helpless, of course—far from it; they have perhaps the most alert and active courts and tribunals in the world, which cover possibly the widest spectrum of complaints in the world. The complaints are of all sorts, and Americans, on the whole, fare well, for "American administrative adjudication and rulemaking are attended by the world's most fully elaborated procedural protections against ill-informed exercises of official judgment."[4]

Although the American people, on the whole, have confidence in their judges and in the courts, this confidence is not the same in all fifty states, and not the same from one social grouping to another. Negroes in the South obviously have little faith in the court system there, and many foreigners, such as Puerto Ricans and Mexicans—in New York and California, respectively—have found no reason to be jubilant about the way they are being treated in the courts, not to mention by the police—the latter often being immune to inquiry and examination. In California, where I commented in the *Los Angeles Times*[5] on a particularly flagrant case involving the shooting and killing of a Negro driver by a young police officer, the police not only enjoy the reputation of being "the best" in the nation, but virtually comprise a state within the state and go unpunished for countless abuses and violations of (minority) citizens' rights. At this writing (November 1967), a trial against peace supporters, who demonstrated at Century Plaza, Los Angeles, at the time that President Johnson spoke there, is attracting a good deal of attention. Several judges are handling these cases, and I spoke to one of them. He was, without doubt, prejudiced against their case, calling them "kooks" and other less printable names, and when I raised the question of constitutional rights, he seemed to think that this was almost irrelevant; yet he is a most honored and able judge in all other respects. This, I may add, is typical of the situation. And there are hundreds of similar cases pending or being tried in the United States at the moment that this is being written. So, although the remedies are there, and are frequently superior to those in most countries, they still leave much to be desired. The Ombudsman is designed to remove this deficiency in the adjudicative system.

WHO WOULD QUALIFY AS OMBUDSMAN?

A serious question often raised by those who support the idea of an Ombudsman for America is: Who would be able and willing to fill such an office? It requires a person not only with extraordinary merits and great prestige, but also with the energy and fortitude, not to mention courage, to tackle a task of this magnitude and scope.[6] Even at the state level, this is a problem. It has been carefully considered by all the states which have considered having their own Ombudsman. Proposed legislation in California, for example, provides for a commission, consisting of the state's Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Attorney General, Speaker of the House, President pro Tempore of the Senate, and the President of the University of California, to "select one or more qualified candidates for the office of Ombudsman."[7]

Other states—Illinois and New York—leave it up to the governor to appoint the Ombudsman. But, in either case, it is understood that he must have special qualifications for the job. On the national level, he may be proposed by the Supreme Court, appointed by the President, and confirmed by both houses of Congress. This might seem like going to extremes for an office that is not after all, a constitutional office, and which would rank beneath that of a Supreme Court Justice, and perhaps even that of a Senator.

The person who is chosen for this arduous task should be unafraid of abuse or criticism. The job requires one of prominent national—perhaps even international—stature, known for his high principles and noble intents—the kind of person that Sweden has been lucky in finding in Alfred Bexelius, a former judge. He was interviewed by John Bainbridge for the *New Yorker*, and said:

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

The ombudsman cannot be concerned about his popularity. It is no secret that high officials in Sweden . . . dislike the ombudsman. They say that he is interfering in things he doesn't know anything about, and that they could do their jobs better if he would stop meddling, but all their grumbling doesn't mean a thing. Everybody knows that it is necessary to have an ombudsman.[8]

That is in Sweden. What about America?

I think it goes without saying that he should be nonpartisan, as is the case in all Ombudsman countries. But the Ombudsman should be not only nonpartisan, but also independent of politics. It is not a political office, and its holder should be a professional civil servant who never ran for public office, and will not be tempted to return to politics. He should serve for life, and should be so carefully selected that there never could be a question of his honesty, integrity, ability, or motive. This is indeed to ask for perfection—or pretty close to it. But it should be aimed for. In all the 160 years that Sweden has had its Ombudsman, the *man* has never been doubted.

DOES THE NATION REALLY NEED AN OMBUDSMAN?

Many earnest political scientists, and others who have concerned themselves with the matter, doubt that a national Ombudsman would be necessary, or, if necessary, possible. On the other hand, they do not deny that there are some glaring defects in the existing constitutional structure which cannot be glossed over or ignored—or excused by the comment that Americans are "in most regards" better off than others. The fact is that there is an inordinate number of miscarriages of justice in America—*daily*. And the most serious of these are not those committed, unintentionally or otherwise, by administrative agencies; they are those committed by federal courts and federal police—federal marshals and officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)—whose abridgments of civil rights, usually in dealing with members of minority groups, is serious, even after the adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1964! As for police brutality, the numerous so-called "civilian review boards" which have been proposed in state after state (without success) bear witness to serious concern about this problem on the part of many citizens. And the vociferous opposition to such boards by police associations is not less significant. In some countries, notably Sweden, the Ombudsman is the real answer to this problem.[9]

The fact that so many of the states—from Connecticut to California—want such an office is an indication that maybe the nation, too, needs an Ombudsman, or perhaps several Ombudsmen. For the federal government reaches into every state, and its activities in the states often excel those of the state governments and are, in many cases, more vital to the pepole in those states. One need only mention Social Security and Medicare. Open a telephone directory in any major city, and you will find "United States Government" dominating the pages. Frequently, the complaining citizens' only resort may be the courts. An Ombudsman would be a direct and immediate remedy—and much cheaper!

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

Where would a federal Ombudsman fit in? And to whom would he report? In Sweden and some other Ombudsman countries, the Ombudsman is primarily a judicial officer. He has the power to survey and to report on the courts, as well as to criticize them and to recommend changes in the law. No state, to date, is prepared to give the Ombudsman this authority; he is entirely an executive official, whether the creature of the legislature or the governor. He is much like the head of the independent regulatory commissions such as the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) or the Federal Power Commission (FPC). But he is more independent. On the federal level, I would think it impossible to avoid making him a judicial official because so many of the complaints would be of a judicial nature. And it may eventually be necessary for the states to grant him judicial powers as well, so that he could deal effectively with corrupt or incompetent judges, of which each state has an ample number (usually elected ones), and so that he could ensure that police do not exceed their legal authority. In some states, the latter are often the direct cause of riots and other disturbances by their use of raw power when gentler tactics would work better. Policemen themselves admit this; they lack training in how to deal with the public.[10]

The American constitutional system is one of checks and balances, and each branch checks and balances the other so that, in the end, power is evenly distributed and no branch can arrogate to itself more power than the Constitution assigns to it. But who would check the federal Ombudsman? To whom would he report? Who would control him? Granted that independence is necessary, may he not become too independent? Can one rely entirely on the hope that he does not abuse his powers?

I think that we need not fear a too-powerful Ombudsman if the legislation establishing the office clearly delineates his powers, and does not vest in him any authority beyond that of investigation, recommendation, prosecution, and publicity. He should not be able to enforce his own decisions. He should not be able to change an administrative decision, no matter how erroneous, stupid, or wicked. His authority should be to inquire and, with the help of a subpoena, to check all pertinent records, to interview personnel involved, to make his findings public, to make recommendations, and to prosecute. Since he would be a creature of all three branches of the federal government he would be responsible to all three, and subject to removal only by the Congress on the recommendation of the President with the approval of the Supreme Court, which selected him in the first place. The federal Ombudsman would not be a fourth or fifth branch of the government, but an official of the order of, say, the Solicitor General; but he would have a number of deputies, perhaps one for each state, and a fairly substantial staff of former judges and lawyers well versed in United States law.[11]

WHAT WOULD THE OMBUDSMAN DO?

Perhaps I should have begun with this question. But I am assuming that the educated layman has a fairly accurate idea of what an Ombudsman does. He is, in a sense, the post office for all kinds of complaints by irate or injured or disturbed citizens who feel that some government agency has treated them unfairly—whether or not the complainant is mistaken. He then examines the complaint to determine whether or not it is valid. A vast number of complaints are ignored because they need not be acted on. Let me cite some illustrations from two Ombudsman countries, Sweden and New Zealand. Addressing the Assembly Interim Committee on Government Organization of the State of California, on March 1, 1966, the Swedish Ombudsman, Alfred Bexelius, engaged in the following exchange with Assemblyman Jack T. Casey of Bakersfield:

"Mr. CASEY. You mentioned . . . that about nine-tenths of the cases are thrown out with no foundation, and so about how many complaints would the other one-tenth amount to over a period of a year?

"Mr. BEXELIUS. There are 1,200 complaints every year and that means only——

"Mr. CASEY. Ninety per cent are thrown out, so 120 a year.

"Mr. BEXELIUS. But many of these complaints have been thoroughly investigated before they are thrown out.

"Mr. CASEY. And . . . there is only one Ombudsman in Sweden?

"Mr. BEXELIUS. Yes."[12]

In New Zealand, a much smaller country than Sweden, the Ombudsman there reported that of the 1,100 complaints during the first year, he "acted" on 434 "in the first six months and 760 in the following year."[13]

To be effective, the Ombudsman must be armed with power of subpoena and must have complete access to all pertinent records. If needed, he must be free to attend proceedings which bear on the case under study. He should have the authority to investigate on the spot, to ascertain what the circumstances are, and to question all personnel involved. It should be understood by those who complain as well as by those who are being investigated that the Ombudsman will make his findings public, and that whether he does so or not is not a matter of his discretion but of law; for publicity is often the strongest deterrent. As Mr. Bexilius pointed out to the author of this article: "The real value of the JO lies in the fact that his mere existence is often enough to discourage bureaucratic abuse."[14]

THE PROBLEM OF U.S. POPULATION SIZE

Is this country to big for an Ombudsman, or even several Ombudsmen? How could one man, or even a staff of men, handle the enormous amount of complaints that would descend on such an office? Americans are notorious complainers. Litigation in this country reaches staggering proportions in one year and exceeds anything that could be handled by present federal courts. So how could it be sensible—or reasonable—to establish another office that would deal not with legal, but with civil matters? Would not such an office simply be overwhelmed, even if, say, 90 per cent of the complaints were weeded out as redundant?

This is a distinct possibility during the first years. Maybe the first five or six years would have to be devoted primarily to acquainting Americans with the proper use of the office, but with the help of the mass media, it could be done. Already, millions of Americans have a fairly good idea of what an Ombudsman is. A radio station in Los Angeles is known as "your Ombudsman station," and it investigates complaints involving government bureaus. Many people complain against private companies and against other individuals, but the idea is gaining hold that complaints should be those directed against government agencies. Once people get into the habit, as they have in Sweden, it will be as natural to register a complaint against the government and hope to see results as to complain, to a particular company, against a product.

Two hundred million Americans may still prove to be too many for an office of this kind, and it may have to be modified to suit America's peculiar situation.[15] For example, I am not convinced that an American Ombudsman could or should investigate the courts. The federal court system is, to begin with, such a gigantic establishment that it is hardly subject to effective review. This must be done by other means, through a combination of public alertness, the press, and political intervention. But even when the courts are left out, what is left may still be too big for the Ombudsman alone to check; so it might be necessary to limit his function and jurisdiction, as determined by the legislature. Thus, if the office is brought under control, a federal Ombudsman might be a useful functionary to perform some duties necessary in the constitutional scope of things.[16]

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Los Angeles Times,* November 30, 1966, Part II, p. 21.

[2] *Center Diary: 14* (September-October 1966), p. 20. (A publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.)

[3] See Walter Gellhorn, *When Americans Complain* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966). Representative Henry S. Reuss, who introduced a bill for a "national Ombudsman" in Congress, has presented his views, with the aid of Everard Massey, in "The United States," a chapter in D. C. Rowat (ed.), *The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1965), pp. 194–200. See also various works on the Ombudsman by Stanley V. Anderson, who helped Representative Reuss to draft his bill.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 212.

[5] *Los Angeles Times*, June 12, 1966, p. 26.

[6] *Center Diary: 14, loc. cit.*, pp. 20–21.

[7] California, Assembly Bill No. 2956, April 22, 1965.

[8] Alfred Bexelius, *New Yorker*, February 13, 1965, p. 151.

[9] Marion K. Sanders, "Sweden's Remedy for 'Police Brutality,'" *Harper's* (November 1964), pp. 132–134.

[10] The Los Angeles Police Department is seeking to remedy this with a special, very hush-hush training program.

[11] See Walter Gellhorn, "Annotated Model Ombudsman Statute," in Rowat (ed.), *loc. cit.*, Appendix, pp. 159–173.

[12] Alfred Bexelius, Testimony before California Assembly Committee on Government Organization, Sacramento, California, March 1, 1966, p. 13.

[13] J. F. Northey, "New Zealand's Parliamentary Commissioner," in Rowat (ed.), *loc. cit.*, p. 140.

[14] Interview with Alfred Bexelius, Stockholm, Sweden, March 12, 1966.

[15] The President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs is the closest thing to a national Ombudsman—or Ombudswoman, in this case—with Betty Furness in charge.

[16] Walter Gellhorn, "The Ombudsman's Relevance to American Municipal Affairs," *American Bar Association Journal* (February 1968), pp. 134–140.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM GROWING AS MATTER OF PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the lead article of the April issue of the Reader's Digest is titled "Is Congress Destroying Itself?"

This title of the article by Eugene Methvin of the magazine's Washington, D.C., staff is harsh, but it is also provocative.

Expanding on the headline, Mr. Methvin expresses the fear that "unless Congress modernizes its procedures and organization, it will destroy itself as a crucial force in our constitutional system."

He centers his argument on what he considers five major weaknesses in existing congressional operations—inadequate staffing, failure to deal with the information explosion, poor evaluation of the programs Congress has legislated, a committee system that often works at cross-purposes, and decisionmaking behind closed doors.

Many Members of Congress would agree with the general thrust of this reasoning. In fact, nearly 100 Members of the House of Representatives already have demonstrated their determination to take steps to begin to correct some of these deficiencies by cosponsoring H.R. 6278—The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969.

H.R. 6278 would improve the staff situation by assuring adequate staff for minority members on committees, by providing for the use of outside consultants by committees, and by strengthening the operations of the Legislative Reference Service.

It would help Congressmen get on top of the information explosion by broadening the use of computer-based analytical and data handling techniques in the Legislative Reference Service and the General Accounting Office. The legislation would also charge a new permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with keeping abreast of changes in information technology.

It would strengthen the hand of Congress in evaluating governmental programs by more sharply defining the oversight function of committees and by improving the capacity for program analysis in the General Accounting Office.

It would deal with the committee jurisdiction problem by making it a specific area of study for the new joint committee.

And H.R. 6278 would rule out decisionmaking behind closed doors by providing for more open committee meetings, public disclosure of committee votes and rollcall votes on all appropriation matters.

None of the cosponsors of H.R. 6278 would argue that all weaknesses in the congressional structure would be solved by this legislation, but it would be a beginning. And the bill would provide for continuing scrutiny of congressional operations by a joint committee, which surely will arrive at further recommendations in future Congresses.

There is a growing public awareness of the need for congressional reform, and widely distributed articles like the one in Reader's Digest will increase that awareness.

Legislative reorganization is becoming a major national issue, because the people are beginning to demand that Congressmen use the best techniques and procedures available to cope with the problems of our modern society.

The Reader's Digest article follows:

IS CONGRESS DESTROYING ITSELF?

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

"Obsolete"—"inefficient"—"slitting its own throat." Every day these and harsher words descend upon one of the most important institutions in the free world, the U.S. Congress. The attacks come from worried citizens—journalists, political scientists, students of government, state and local officials, disillusioned voters. Most significantly, concern is now growing within the halls of Congress itself. Scores of Republicans and Democrats alike who cherish the historic value of our legislative branch realize that it is in serious trouble.

"Congress has bogged down in trivia and inaction," declares Sen. Hugh Scott (R.-Pa.). Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D.-N.C.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, after lengthy hearings and study is convinced that Congress "increasingly abdicates its responsibility to determine policy and to set standards." Adds Rep. Jack Marsh (D.-Va.), "Congress is in danger of becoming merely a rubber stamp for programs proposed by the executive branch."

What these and countless other thoughtful citizens fear is this: *Unless Congress modernizes its procedures and organization, it will destroy itself as a crucial force in our constitutional system.*

No one questions that Congress has passed landmark legislation, uncovered and helped remedy grievous national ills, and produced a legion of statesmen and leaders. But certain entrenched weaknesses are crippling Congress. Only by a close, frank examination of shortcomings can the public understand the need for the sensible reforms now being pressed by Congressional members of both parties.

Since 1961 Congress increased federal dollars for manpower training ninefold, spawning 15 programs administered by eight agencies pumping out $2.25 billion this year. But the situation is "little short of chaotic," says Garth Mangum of the George Washington University Center for Manpower Policy Studies. "Individual acts were written, considered and amended in rapid succession to meet current crises with little attention to their interrelation."

After 18 months of wrangling, the House approved the income-tax increase President Johnson recommended in January 1967. As a price for this tax hike, the House demanded a $6-billion budget cut. Challenged by the President to specify where the cuts should be made, Congress would not. Instead, it left the details to be decided by the President's Budget Bureau. Thus, the people's elected representatives bucked to non-elected bureaucrats their constitutional duty to set priorities for spending our tax dollars.

Not until almost two years after Congress authorized hundreds of new anti-poverty programs and "community action agencies" did the executive branch try to determine how existing government efforts were affecting the poor. I asked the systems analyst who supervised the research, "How could Congress legislate sensibly without having such facts?" "It couldn't," he told me. "Without this information it was like throwing money out the window hoping some would blow to the poor." Concludes Daniel Moynihan, President Nixon's top urban adviser and a veteran of the 1964 White House task force which designed the $7.7-billion War on Poverty: "Many men in the Executive Office and in Congress, men of whom the nation had a right to expect better, did inexcusably sloppy work. *The government did not know what it was doing.*"

Why can't Congress respond more effectively to the challenges of our day?" It is impossible for us as now organized to discharge our constitutional duties of making policy for and overseeing the executive branch," declares Rep. Bill Brock (R.-Tenn.). Here's why:

1. Inadequate Staffs. No Congressman has adequate help for his incredible array of duties. Democrat John Tunney represents 567,000 Californians. Offices in each of his two counties require full-time secretaries. In Washington he receives 200 letters daily, half of them requiring contacts with federal agencies on constituents' problems and occupying three staffers full time. Two more secretaries plus two part-time girls answer correspondence and send out a newsletter to Tunney's constituents. His "legislative assistant" must write press releases and handle other chores. Result: not one person on his staff of ten can devote full time to legislation, research and program evaluation.

Committee staffs present an even more dismal picture. The House Appropriations Committee has a catch-all Subcommittee on Independent Offices that must decide on money bills totaling $17 billion for 23 agencies ranging from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For their gargantuan job these six Democrats and four Republicans have only three staffers! "Even if we conscientiously try to decide whether a program is useful and operating within legal limits, we have to trust to dumb luck to ask the right questions," one member told me.

For all their work our legislators vote themselves $135 million out of the $184-*billion* federal budget. They appropriate three times as much annually to support an executive-branch army of 6800 publicity agents. Prof. Samuel Patterson of Iowa State University found that Congress has only 588 committee staffers. Yet the "executive lobby" wooing legislators on behalf of federal agencies numbers well over a thousand. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has more bill drafters than the entire House legislative counsel. Senate and House Armed Services committees have only 40 staffers to oversee our vast $81-billion defense operations, while the Pentagon maintains 272 "legislative liaison" officers.

2. Information Explosion. The average Congressman puts in a 60-hour week during legislative sessions, an American Political Science Association study found: 15 hours on the House floor, 11 in committee, 24 on constituent requests, postmasters, military-academy appointments and such. He has ten hours left for studying legislative issues.

Yet ponder the maelstrom he faces! Members dropped 29,133 bills into the last Congress's hoppers and voted 1002 of them into law. Their 1967 debates filled 36,420 pages of the *Congressional Record*, triple the number when Congress last renovated itself by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Government Printing Office last year alone ground out 248,152 pages of printed committee testimony, the equivalent of 287 *Gone With the Wind*-length novels, plus 27,000 pages of committee reports and recommendations, more than the 23-volume *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Finding out *anything* in this flood is ridiculously difficult. Is it any wonder that, in one survey, 78 percent of the legislators queried rated "lack of information" as the No. 1 problem preventing them from executing their duties satisfactorily?

3. Poor Evaluation. One of the great reforms supposedly attained by Congressional reorganization 23 years ago was specified provision for overseeing and evaluating programs already legislated. Indeed, the General Accounting Office (GAO) was specifically commissioned to perform expenditure analyses. But Congress never voted the money to give GAO the manpower to do the job. Worse, a survey shows that the 20 House committees do not themselves systematically evaluate programs under their jurisdiction. "We vote all these programs and money and do not follow through carefully to see what the impact of our actions is," Rep. John Brademas (D.-Ind.) complained to the Joint Committee on Organization.

4. Crazy-Quilt Committees. The 535 members of the House and Senate divide themselves into 36 committees, 376 subcommittees, plus uncounted boards, commissions and caucuses. Senators average 20 assignments each, Representatives seven. This tangled maze of jurisdictions defies rational, comprehensive policy-making. In the House 18 committees oversee one or more educational programs scattered over 42 agencies, dispensing upwards of $10 billion. One committee considers new highways to bring more cars downtown, and another works on mass transit to keep cars out. Funds are appropriated for the reclamation of Southwestern desert so that bumper cotton crops may be grown—at the same time Southeastern farmers are paid to retire their acreage to prevent surpluses. Says Rep. Fred Schwengel (R.-Iowa): "No single unit of Congress is looking across the board at the sum of the nation's goals and resources."

5. Closed Doors and Deals. Committee chairmen guard their domains like Oriental satraps, arrogating crucial decisions the House should make after thorough debate. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act requires open hearings unless a majority specifically votes otherwise, but chairmen frequently disregard it. Foreign and military affairs may require secrecy. But does the House Agriculture Committee require secrecy in 53 percent of its meetings? Protests former Rep. Tom Curtis (R.-Mo.), "Legislative hearings should be open so people can see just how badly some of these programs have been mismanaged. Congressional secrecy is a scandal."

Indeed it is. By monopolizing crucial data behind closed doors, chairmen and senior committee members are able to monopolize crucial policy decisions, leaving rank-and-file members in the dark on many complex issues. This kind of power pays off in a cozy spoils-system alliance that often soaks the taxpayer and ignores the country's real needs. Thus, it is not strange that the Departments of Housing and Urban Development should shower rural DeKalb County, Tenn. (population 12,000), with "Model City" grants to the tune of $4.7 million, ahead of 147 real cities. DeKalb's foremost native just happens to be Chairman Joe L. Evins of the House subcommittee that oversees HUD's appropriations.

What can be done? Plenty.

Save Time on Votes. Today, ringing bells in legislators' offices announce a roll-call vote. As clerks on the House floor laboriously call the 435 names, members scurry through the tunnel connecting the three House office buildings to the Capitol. Frequently they have to ask a colleague for a quickie description of the pending issue. In this antique ritual, requiring half an hour, the House cast its 478 record votes during the 90th Congress. Electronic voting, already used in 33 state legislatures, could slash this time-consuming procedure to a fraction, freeing harassed legislators of the equivalent of *two calendar months* of floor sessions!

Make Information Swiftly Available. Today's legislator cannot even get a daily list of all Capitol Hill hearings, and must wait weeks for the impossibly verbose printed transcripts, relying meanwhile on sketchy press accounts.

The 310-man Library of Congress staff now serving our legislators could, if augmented and armed with modern information technology, bring order to this Capitol Hill confusion. Every legislator could have on his desk each morning, through a remote computer terminal in his office, a complete list of all meetings scheduled for the coming day, plus summaries of the previous day's testimony and even digests of every article in the many periodicals coming into the Library that matches his computerized personal "interest profile." On any roll call, he could have via television an instant summary of the issue, the bill's sponsors and legislative history, voting positions recommended by the President and majority and minority party leaders—research requiring hours now.

Florida's legislators, computerized for four years, can have daily an "instant electronic scorecard" on the status of 5100 pending bills. A Pennsylvania legislator can tap out a question on an IBM typewriter keyboard and instantly obtain on a small television screen results of a computer search of every state law, or specified clauses in all 50 state constitutions. New York State Sen. Jeremiah Bloom asked his legislature's computer: "Give me all the laws affecting banking that are not in the banking law." The machine spewed forth 1604 laws, a task that would take trained staff lawyers weeks with paste-pot and shears.

Improve Evaluation. Impatient with Congressional failure to oversee programs already passed and with the House blockade on modernization, Sen. Winston L. Prouty (R.-Vt.) and others amended the poverty legislation in 1967 to require the GAO to make a special evaluation. (The more than 150 investigators will report this spring.) But GAO itself opposed a similar Congressional attempt on the fragmented manpower training efforts because its staff, already strained by the antipoverty study, would have to neglect regular auditing duties.

One proposal is to create a separate "Office of Legislative Evaluation," possibly in GAO, staffed by social scientists armed with the best computer systems and statistical sampling techniques to do "evaluative research" on how people are affected by government programs. "A new source of knowledge is coming into being," testified urbanologist Moynihan, "and this should not remain an executive monopoly. The executive is exposed to the temptation to release only findings that suit its purposes." Such an office might well have spotted trends in the welfare, farm and educational programs in the 1950s that foreshadowed the crime wave and urban riots of the 1960s. Congress could thus have been alerted to the need to change directions.

Press for Modernization. Congress in 1965 created a Joint Committee on Organization, co-chaired by Rep. Ray J. Madden (D.-Ind.) and Sen. Mike Monroney (D.-Okla.), who pushed through the 1946 reorganization. Six Democrats and six Republicans from the House and Senate spent more than a year examining legislative procedures and oraganization. They unanimously recommended a reform package including a modern information system, restrained powers of committee chairmen, more adequate staffing and improved legislative evaluation.

In 1967, the Senate, after six weeks of debate, approved modernization by a vote of 75 to 9. But the entrenched powers of the House, led by Speaker John McCormack, 77, last year would not even permit the bill to come to the floor for consideration. This year, dozens of Democrats and Republicans, led by Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.), are pushing modernization. Though Representative Rumsfeld's bill, H.R. 6278, would be only a modest beginning it would at least create a permanent committee to institute continuous improvements in legislative machinery and procedures.

Congressional modernization is no substitute for tough-minded legislators who do their homework, ask the hard questions and demand no-nonsense answers. But it can help them by reducing diversions and confusion, and arming them with expert help in marshaling the facts that can illuminate complex decisions. What happens to H.R. 6278 involves nothing less than the issue of whether we shall be ruled by elected representatives or a bureaucratic elite. Find out how your Congressman and Senators stand on H.R. 6278 today—and let them know how you feel about it.

WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial recently appearing in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader which, I think bears wide publication.

The bleeding hearts can well ponder the question of the one-sidedness of this war in Vietnam. Is it wrong for the civilians in South Vietnam to suffer, while we are required to protect the civilians in North Vietnam?

The article is as follows:

XUM

WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

Remember, a few months ago, the hue and cry which could be heard from various "anti-war" protesters concerning the bombing by the United States of military targets in North Vietnam?

The cry "stop the bombing" could be heard from one end of the world to the other. Even U.N. Secretary General U Thant joined the chorus.

Where are they now when the North Vietnamese and their Viet Cong allies are making concerted attacks by mortars and other large weapons on civilian areas of Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities?

Most of recent assaults on the cities have been deliberately aimed at the civilian population, apparently in an attempt to create panic and confusion.

American targets in the North, by contrast, were concentrated on military installations, to the point that some were avoided because they were too close to civilian centers.

VIOLENCE AND THE NEW LEFT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tendency of the New Left to advocate resort to violence as a political tactic is increasingly disturbing to those who believe in continued freedom for America. Violence is not the answer to anything except perhaps defense against aggression. The lot of even the less fortunate in the United States presents no just cause for violence. Even the poorest citizen of this Nation is rich in constitutionally protected freedoms that he will lose for sure if the anarchists prevail.

The country needs a law making it a Federal offense to incite—or commit—violence in support of any objective no matter how conscientiously motivating it may be to the actor. Then it needs enforcement without regard to the race, color or station in life of the offender. Bombing ROTC facilities, passing out pamphlets instructing how to prepare fire bombs, or train mines, or how to make homemade explosives; these things are truly un-American. The actors should be identified and prosecuted, for their deeds undermine the cornerstone of our Nation—liberty under law.

Even more contemptible are those who masquerade as social benefactors yet use their position to encourage criminal action, or things that will inescapably and predictably lead to crime. No longer can those who repeat this pattern be excused as crusaders for civil rights. The vast majority of Americans, white, Negro, or what have you have civil rights, too, and they are not about to sit back idly and watch them go down the drain.

In this connection I commend a thoughtful reading of a recent article in Roll Call, the magazine of Capital Hill, by their extremely capable editorialist Allan C. Brownfeld, entitled "Violence as a Political Tactic":

VIOLENCE AS A POLITICAL TACTIC

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Violence, in a short period of time, has moved from an occasional aberration and disturbance to a political tactic, endorsed by many leaders of the New Left, by leaders of the new black nationalist movement, and by others who feel disaffected and disillusioned.

During his recent news conference, President Richard Nixon said that he had asked John N. Mitchell, the Attorney General, and Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to look into the problem of disorder on the nation's campuses. He did so, the President said, "particularly in view of a Congressional report that 122 of the 540 that had been arrested at San Francisco State College were direct recipients of Federal funds."

But the question, in the long run, is far more complex than this. The political tactic of violence has resulted in many overt and covert acts, the full import of which is yet to be understood and assimilated. There are, of course, the major incidents, such as the take-over of Columbia University and the disorder which was precipitated in Chicago. These bear careful analysis. But there are many, often unreported, incidents of what their perpetrators term "sabotage."

The Institute of Science and Technology at the University of Michigan was rocked by an explosion last October 14. The bombing was the thirteenth to hit the Detroit area since August and came only two weeks after extensive damage forced the closing of a semi-secret C.I.A. recruiting office in a downtown Ann Arbor office building.

Ann Arbor Police Chief Walter Krasny has claimed the series of bombings may be the work of "anti-Establishment militants" at the University of Michigan, while Detroit officials blame "hippies" for the explosions. The far-left National Guardian reported that "Reaction to the bombings in the Ann Arbor radical community has ranged from quiet amusement to fantasy to increased discussion regarding the nature and timing of revolutionary chaos and terrorism and their possible relation to politicization of young people and/or mass repression of the radical movement. While some feel that such violence will help increase the consciousness of students, others feel that the level of awareness is now so low that the bombings will do little . . ."

The Cleveland riots of July, 1969, according to Federal investigators, were the product of a black nationalist conspiracy. Key figure in the conspiracy, the experts say, was Fred "Ahmed" Evans, a local black power leader who has been linked with the pro-Peking Revolutionary Action Movement. Evans, who was arrested during the riots, was charged with shooting to kill. "If my carbine hadn't jammed I would have killed you three," police quoted him as saying. "I had you in my sights when my rifle jammed." Evans told police that he and 17 others had organized the sniper attacks that resulted in the deaths of three policemen. Told that three of his snipers had been slain, Evans said, "They died for a worthy cause." Phil Hutchings, militant head of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, told newsmen that the Cleveland outbreaks were "the first stage of revolutionary armed violence."

Violence is often proclaimed as the only means by which society can truly be cleansed. The Rev. William Sloane Coffin, convicted this summer of conspiring to violate draft laws, delivered his first sermon of the academic year at Yale University in praise of change, even if change comes in violent ways. He told 300 persons, mostly students, that "life is change, growth, love and readiness to suffer." The Rev. Coffin warned that the current condemnation of violence by political leaders may also be a condemnation of change. He stated: "Jesus, when he threw the money changers out of the temple was no more violent than (Columbia radical student leader) Mark Rudd."

Following this advice, a new publication, Mayday, has appeared. Making light of the violence which has shaken a number of campuses it led off its fourth issue with this verse: "Sabotage, This Is Number One and The Fun Has Just Begun." Edited by Andrew Hopkind, James Ridgeway, and Robert Sherrill, its November 8, 1968 issue included the following: "The war began last winter on the Western front, in the rainy season. The guns of February were four Molotov cocktails thrown at the Naval ROTC building on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. . . . The first attack on the Berkeley ROTC building was followed by the burning of a similar center at Stanford. At about the same time, electric power cables strung over the Berkeley hills were cut. Then, three giant electric towers in Oakland were blown to the ground leaving 30,000 houses without power and stopping work at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley. A few days after the tower was destroyed, a University of Colorado drop-out student turned himself in to publicize his 'crime.' 'I had to do something to stop their machines—so maybe they would listen, so that this war would be stopped,' he said."

The majority of those who advocate violence either to change the system or to improve its shortcomings are unaware of the historical consequences of violent upheavals. George Bernard Shaw wrote that "Revolution never lightens the burden of tyranny, it simply shifts it from one shoulder to another." That violence is the solution to our current difficulties is, observing the historical record, very unlikely.

Crusades which initially seek to throw off the fetters of an old order have, in most instances simply replaced them with new fetters. The French Revolution led to the Reign of Terror, the Russian Revolution to Stalin, the Chinese revolution Mao Tse-tung. The tyrannies which follow violent revolutions have been infinitely more brutal than the autocracies they replaced.

Modern rebellion has been linked very closely with ideologies which seek to explain man on the basis of one or another theory of human behavior. But man is infinitely complex, and it is doubtful that any theory about man's behavior can adequately explain it, or can effectively predict its future course. Western thought has, for some time, been engaged in explaining man in one manner or another. Both Marx and Freud discussed man's social unconscious, and stated that man's consciousness is determined by the "logic of the historic process."

With regard to the theories of Marx and Freud, those which perhaps had the greatest impact on Western thought, Erich Fromm has made this assessment: "It is the rule rather than the exception in the historical process that ideas deteriorate into ideologies. The ideology, while still using the words of the original idea, in effect expresses the opposite meaning . . ."

Those who advocate the necessity for the use of violence to effect a particular social change are often deeply committed to one ideology or another. Such commitment lies at the root of the rise of modern totaliarianism. This judgment is presented by Hannah Arendet in her important study, Totalitarianism: "Ideologies—isms which to the satisfaction of their adherents can explain everything and every occurrence by deducing it from a single premise—are a very recent phenomenon. . . . In their claim to total explanation, ideologies have the tendency to explain not what is, but what becomes, what is born and passes away . . . in this capacity ideological thinking becomes independent of all experience from which it cannot learn anything new . . . since the ideologies have no power to transform reality, they achieve this emancipation of thought from experience through certain methods of demonstration."

Violence has resulted in less freedom and more repression, and violence imbued with ideology has pursued with a vengeance ends which have made means such as genocide, inquisitions, and slave labor camps acceptable.

XUM

One of Nazilism's sympathizers announced: "When I hear the world culture, I draw my revolver." Those who call for violence today are also drawing their revolvers. The road to tyranny is paved with idealism. We know this. We have been there before.

GOVERNOR REAGAN PLACES CAMPUS CHAOS IN CONTEXT

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, submitted a statement on March 19, 1969, before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Governor Reagan's statement is the most thorough and perceptive statement I have yet seen relating to the campus chaos which our universities, students and taxpayers are suffering today.

Governor Reagan's problems with the college campuses have been the most severe of any Governor. Governor Reagan has had the most experience with campus disorders, militant radicals, and subversive teachers, students and campus trespassers.

I believe his statement should be read by every public official and every citizen who is concerned about our educational institutions and the fulfillment of his responsibility to teach, research, and serve.

I insert Governor Reagan's testimony at this place in the RECORD, prior to the publication of hearings of this subcommittee, because his understanding of the problem is extraordinary and the urgency for general understanding of the problem is crucial to university officials and legislators:

STATEMENT OF GOV. RONALD REAGAN

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, to attempt to analyze in a brief time the significant factors which have brought about our current campus problems must do an injustice to the complexities of the situation. However, one of the main factors of our dilemma is a general lack of information and understanding of the total problem by much of the public. I wish to commend this committee on its endeavor to shed light on these problems and to assess the means for resolving them. Our educational institutions are the key to individual growth and to the progress of our society. Your efforts are particularly appropriate at this time because it is only through the cooperative efforts of public officials at all levels of government, as well as campus administrators, faculties, and students, that our educational institutions will be guaranteed the ability to carry on their responsibilities for teaching, research and service.

As I am sure you are well aware, there is a wealth of misinformation and the widest range of interpretation of the causes of coercion and violence spreading to campuses throughout the land. We are faced with circumstances which have never before confronted our society. People are groping for explanations without experience to guide them and it is too easy to make generalizations. We also have the added confusion of "Mythologies"—some developed by well-meaning apologists for the antisocial behavior of a few, and others apparently put forth by those in revolt, who seek to make their excuses acceptable through sheer repetition.

Today's situation did not come about overnight. In California it is the culmination of activities which have transpired over the past ten years. At first there were occasional episodes of mass disruption. The protests against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1960 in San Francisco were followed by months of romanticizing the role of the protestors in literature, speeches, recordings, and conferences. In 1963–64 there were mass sit-ins in hotels, automobile agencies, and banks over alleged discrimination in employment practices. In 1964–65 there were similar disturbances at newspaper offices and restaurants. During these years, the campuses were used as "launching pads" for action in the surrounding community. The Berkeley campus of the University of California was most frequently involved.

Beginning in 1964, rather than serving as the launching pad, the campus itself became the focus of attack. In September and October, 1964, a floor of the Berkeley campus administration building was "captured." The staff of the Dean of Students' Office was forced to flee over the roof of the building. A few days later, a police car was captured and held for 32 hours, one of the longest episodes of mass interference with due process of law. The police car and its occupants were finally released after negotiations and major concessions to the mob by University officials. In December, the entire administration building was occupied by more than 800 persons, and was held until police cleared the building by making mass arrests. The pretext for these major disorders was first related to the demand to use campus facilities for collecting funds for political purposes; later the slogan "free speech" was introduced.

Since 1964, the tempo of disruption has rapidly increased until there is rarely a day that a campus somewhere in California is not in difficulty. The campuses have been in constant turmoil: the Berkeley campus of the University of California, and, during the past few years, San Francisco State College.

Certain trends are evident. There has been a shift in tactics from nonviolence to planned and announced violence. There has been a shift from mass confrontation to guerrilla tactics with beatings, the disruption of classrooms, shootings, bombings, arson and general vandalism and destruction. Initially, the participants in these incidents were primarily from the campus although they represented only a small minority of students and faculty. More recently, their ranks have been swelled by large numbers of outsiders who have no legitimate connection with the campus. Mobility between campuses has increased and just recently in California even high schools have beocme heavily involved in disorders.

Following a half million dollar fire on the University of California campus in Berkeley, an editorial appeared in the San Francisco *Examiner* of January 24, 1969. I quote:

"The arsonist-set fire at Wheeler Hall Auditorium on the U.C. Berkeley campus sets a new high in the wave of criminal violence perpetrated during current strikes and attacks against bay area educational institutions and educators.

"Here is a partial catalog of recent crimes, including some involving potential murder:

"February 9, 1968: four firebombs damaged naval ROTC building at U.C. Berkeley.

"February 19, 1968: flammable liquid set fire on porch of naval ROTC building at Stanford, causing $35,000 damage.

"May 7, 1968: naval ROTC building at Stanford destroyed. Will cost $70,000 to replace.

"July 15, 1968: a $100,000 fire destroyed the office and irreplaceable effects of former Stanford president Wallace Sterling.

"August 6: two fires were set in the Stanford student activities office.

"September 14: a bomb blasted the naval ROTC building at U.C.

"December 11: a firebomb was hurled at the administration building at San Francisco State College.

"December 13: College of San Mateo students smashed windows and broke crockery in the college cafeteria.

"January 5: shots were fired into a San Mateo home in the mistaken belief it was the residence of a college trustee, endangering life.

"January 7: the home of Philip C. Carlington, Sr., former Dean of Instruction at the College of San Mateo, was severely damaged by firebombs. He and his family were lucky to escape with their lives.

"January 10: firebombs were thrown into the home of Edwin Duerr, coordinator of internal affairs at San Francisco State. One failed to go off. If it had, Duerr, his wife and three children would have been killed or gravely injured.

"January 16: a firebomb was defused in the state administration building. It would have killed anyone within 25 feet.

"January 17: a mob of strikers smashed windows and crippled the sprinkler system in a rampage at San Jose State College.

"January 20: two firebombs exploded on the U.C. campus.

"Those who see nothing but high moral purpose behind the current campus violence are invited to re-read the above."

Just as there have been trends in militancy there have also been pattern of response to destructiveness. Campus administrators have typically been slow to act and quick to concede. Often they belatedly call in the police only when real danger becomes all too apparent.

In California today, there is continuous concern at all levels of government, including the governing boards of the universities and colleges, about campus problems and violence. The concern of all is for the protection of students, for the integrity of the learning process, and for society itself. It is tragic that the campus, which has represented a forum for expressing differences of opinion, for the pursuit of truth, and for the peaceful resolution of problems, has now become the arena for oppression by revolutionaries, vandals and arsonists.

It may seem incomprehensible that a portion of our population—including some students, some faculty members, and outsiders—are attempting to overthrow our democratic way of life. It is equally incomprehensible in a democratic society—which is the pinnacle of man's dream for self-government and dignity—to find so many of its citizens standing mute and helpless while their basic values and processes are assaulted. Students of Plato and other political philosophers should today recognize a condition long anticipated: when the majority does not function, our society falls into the hands of the most cunning or the most powerful.

For some time, the climate of our society has not been conducive to the most responsive and responsible citizenship. I need only cite the letdown which followed World War II as such periods follow all wars—a sort of recess from social responsibility following a time of total commitment to a cause larger than ourselves. The prosperity which then followed led to affluence for the great middle class—that group which historically has set our basic standards of behavior and attitude. Affluence often leads to self-centered behavior and a smaller chance of experiencing maturity and good judgment. It weakens pride in meeting challenges and lessens cooperation among individuals.

Also the recent advocacy of so-called "right" and "wrong" ways for rearing children has had profound effects. Parents, who since the dawn of history found in their hearts what was right and found in their heads what made sense were undercut and lost confidence in their relationships to their

XUM

children. Who can estimate the effect on a child who finds his parents consulting a book to make decisions instead of confidently and directly stating what they believe?

The knowledge explosion which has brought us some great benefits also has a hidden cost. There is too much to know: specialization follows and people become less sure of their own opinions. Those values that human beings need—and indeed what our culture requires—have been challenged. When moral standards become doubtful values become negotiable. When even some clergy question the existence of God mere mortals become anxious.

In the past few decades, progress in agriculture, business and industry has led to the replacement of men by machines. It also has reduced the opportunities for youth to discover the gratifications of real work with real purpose. Consider the opportunities for positive work experience when, in the first decade of this century, 90 percent of our young people lived on farms. Now only six percent have these opportunities. Consider the shortage of labor supply in 1900 when it was necessary to pass child labor laws to protect our youth so they could stay home or go to school. In wisdom and compassion, we passed those laws. But today it is the fortunate seventeen-year-old who can find a job during summer vacation, let alone find full-time work.

All of these changes—and there are more—have operated to make people less sure of themselves. When unsure, it is natural to withdraw. It can be no surprise that we speak of a "silent generation," that we find a growing distaste by youth for competition, that we find individuals less willing to stand apart from the crowd.

A democratic society depends upon an active majority of "civilized" individuals, who express, each in his own way, the values of the culture. In this way, traditions of fair play, of freedom of speech, of equal opportunity to learn, even of the right of life, are protected. A democratic society develops laws largely to protect individuals from the extreme behavior of those who are not bound by the cultural values and who are not persuaded by the normal expressions of approval and disapproval by their peers.

It is obvious—but so important that it bears repeating—that as an increasing number of citizens refuse to become involved, society for its survival must depend increasingly upon law enforcement. Law enforcement becomes a substitute for the moral suasion previously exercised by the people themselves.

There is general agreement that a small percentage of our society is responsible for coercion, threats and violence on our campuses. There is agreement that the behavior of a relative few infringes daily upon the rights of the many. There is agreement, too, that quality education—the pursuit of the truth wherever it may lead, of the opportunity to hear the widest variety of viewpoints on issues—has suffered terrible damage in the past six or seven years. That disturbances have occurred more on some campuses and in some states than others provides no reassurance, because the spread is rapid not only nationally but also locally from colleges into high schools and junior high schools and out into surrounding communities.

Those who speak and write about the increasingly coercive minority reveal their own confusion, and add to the confusion of others, by the descriptive terms they use: "protestors," "demonstrators," and "activists". These terms suggest those persons are engaging in activities normal to American life. Is this normal dissent? Just listen to the words of their leaders:

Devereaux Kennedy, student body president of Washington University, said:

"I want student power to demand 'revolutionary reforms' that can't be met within the logic of the existing American system.

"I'm going to say loudly and explicitly what I mean by revolution," he continued. "What I mean by revolution is overthrowing the American government, and American imperialism, and installing some sort of decentralized power in this country.

"This," he added, "is going to come about by black rebellions in our cities being joined by some white people. People in universities can do a number of things to help it. They have access to money, and they can give these people guns, which I think they should do. They can engage in acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto. Negro people have trouble getting out because they cordon those areas off, but white activists can go outside, and they can blow things up, and I think they should.

"But," he concluded, 'that's just a minor part of it. We must start up fifty more Vietnams. The major thing student activists can do while all this is going on is to completely demoralize and castrate America."

Ewart Brown of Howard University said: "I think we agree that the revolution is necessary, and that you don't conduct a revolution by attacking the strongest enemy first. You take care of your business at home first, and then you move abroad. Thus, we must make the University the home of the revolution . . ."

Our confusion has been deliberately planned: the banners under which militancy moved were, first, "Abolish HCUA"; then, "Fair play for Cuba," then, "Free speech" at Berkeley; next, anti-US-Vietnam policy (often indistinguishable from pro-Viet Cong). Now, we have demands for autonomy in determining staffing, admittance to campuses and all matters relative to students of ethnic minorities. Yet, throughout this sequence we learn that much of the leadership is the same. After the assassination of President Kennedy, the "Fair Play for Cuba" Committee disappeared and new groups, with the same leadership, were formed.

When Mario Savio was the spokesman for "free speech" in California he was also referring, in a New York publication, to the issue of free speech as somewhat a pretext—the silver iodide you put in the clouds to make the rain fall!

The Vietnam "teach-ins"—and who is against teaching?—were, in fact, almost uniformly a series of provocative speeches presenting only one side.

We have noted that there has been a rapid shift in tactics from nonviolent coercion to the advocacy of and the use of violence. There also has been a corresponding increase in openness in word and deed—the success of violence has bred arrogance.

It is apparent that there is also a roving leadership which appears on campus after campus and in close relationship to accompanying disorder National publications of *SDS*, Black Panthers and other new groups exhort the closing of institutions, destruction of facilities, and the silencing of opposing viewpoints.

Instructions for constructing bombs and how to place them are now commonplace.

In a situation with the majority of students and faculty all too silent, and with a relentless minority of students and faculty (now with outside reinforcements) becoming increasingly effective in harassment and in distortion of the academic environment, we have prevalent college administrations who have proved themselves consistently ineffective.

Typically, we find negotiation, compromise and concession—usually without reference to, or even in the face of, the expressed desire of the majority of students or faculty.

It is argued that there is danger of "escalation" when campus authorities assume their responsibility to enforce laws and regulations. There is fear that in response to authority, other students and faculty will join the participants. To rationalize their permissiveness and appeasement, administrators themselves often promote myths which confuse those both on campus and off. They speak disparagingly of "generation gap" at a time when too many parents are in awe of, and tend to imitate, their own children. They speak of a "new breed with wisdom and conscience" at a time when research has clearly indicated a social and emotional immaturity of youth to a degree previously unknown (although linked with better scholastic preparation).

Administrators speak of "freedom" when they are describing license. And whereas a few years ago they insisted that, for the protection of institutions of higher learning, partisan political activity not be launched from within academic facilities, they now rationalize the use of these institutions by militants for highly partisan purposes as "relevant education."

A few years ago, administrators and faculty members jealously guarded the schools' entrance requirements. They now—under pressure and with good intentions—admit a number of students so underprepared that they can only fail. It should be no surprise that those facing failure react with hostility and frustration, and seek radical change in curriculum in an attempt to remove the threat posed by their inability to attain even minimum standards of performance.

One cannot fault administrators who use tact, whose responses are determined in part by a sense of timing and circumstance, and who recognize fully that irrational, forceful response without explanation and fairness can have only unfortunate results. One must fault, however, total abdication of leadership.

Failure of administrative leadership silences further a majority which is unsure and which is seeking support and guidance. On our campuses with the most turmoil the percentage voting in student body elections is so low that student publications and student government have become the possessions of the militants—the silent majority has no representation.

I might interject here, however, that there have been in recent weeks a few responsible efforts to find voice for the moderate majority. These efforts should be given every encouragement. Sadly we must also note, however, that there have been a few examples of "vigilante-type" conduct by extremists. Continued nonsolution will result in new forces on the scene, some of them dangerous.

It is true that regardless of social climate or social change, basic human nature remains the same. Unless limits are set, unless adults provide models for youth to emulate, unless there is reasonable discipline which with experience becomes internalized and leads to "self-discipline," man will become once again only an animal. A culture will revert to a jungle if there are no traditions, values and laws which are respected and defended. Without these, only might will make right.

These tragic circumstances have continued too long. On some campuses it may be too late for a sure solution even if thoughtful and courageous administrators are found. It has already become necessary in California to pass new laws and to rely on law enforcement to a degree not excepted and never desired.

In considering laws to govern campus behavior and the use of law enforcement in our campuses, it is important to recall the words of Dr. Hayakawa, who stated: "In a democratic society, the police are there for the protection of our liberties. It is in a totalitarian society that police take our liberties away."

One of the purposes of these hearings is to inquire into the effectiveness of provisions of the higher education amendments of 1968.

XUM

and in various appropriation acts directed at the elimination of federal aid to students who violently disrupt the functioning of a college or university.

I welcome such provisions if they be fair and effective. On some of our campuses we are informed that a disproportionate number of students receiving federal aid have been involved in disruption. This probably results in part because militants have been using demands for ethnic studies as the vehicle for confrontation and disruption. Withholding federal monies would surely serve as a deterrent and would hopefully redirect protest into appropriate channels. Also of importance is that public confidence in such programs will be further reduced if they are, or are believed to be, the source of disorder.

May I suggest that it would be helpful if there were greater uniformity among various programs concerning the procedures for withholding aid to those who disrupt. Also, it may be necessary that such provisions be absolutely mandatory so that they will not be thwarted because of pressures on administrators or by current administrative style. Since the withdrawal of government assistance will often be tantamount to removal from the campus, in the interest of fairness as well as of responsible administration, campus officials should be urged to be equally concerned about those who commit violence who are not receiving aid.

I stated earlier my support of these provisions if they are effective. Too often students have heard threats which are not followed through. This leads to disrespect for appropriate authority, including the authority of government. An escalation of threats with no subsequent action leads to an escalation of violence with no concern for results.

Again, my gratitude to you and to your committee. I wish to offer you the complete assistance of the State of California in your pursuit of our common goal.

It is my heartfelt wish that your action will be of help in protecting students and faculty, as well as all of our educational institutions, in their vital mission of serving our society.

THE ENZYME—LYSOZYME

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished constituent of mine, Dr. Alfred T. Sapse, has recently sent to me the text of a speech on a subject of vital importance to us all. Dr. Sapse is associated with the University of California at Los Angeles in the department of bacteriology as a special research fellow. His present 3-year project is called "Smog Eye Irritation Experimental and Clinical Studies" involving a National Institute of Health grant of some $190,000. To be investigated are the eye tissues most exposed to smog, such as the tears, cornea, conjuntive, lacrimal glands. This is the first of several articles to be released as the study progressses. Dr. Sapse's speech of March 5, 1969, follows:

THE ENZYME-LYSOZYME

The March issue of *Fortune* magazine has brought to the surface something that has been developing, steadily and quietly, almost unnoticed, in the field of medical research. It deals with the life-saving promise of enzymes, and is concerned with something which I believe, truthfully, will open a new era in medicine.

Today, I would like to acquaint you with the first enzyme discussed in this article, one which, undoubtedly in the near future, will be the most talked about—*Lysozyme.*

Lysozyme is an enzyme discovered accidentally by Sir Alexander Fleming in 1922—the same Fleming who six years later discovered penicillin, also "accidentally."

Lysozyme is the body's own antibiotic. It is considered to be in the body's first line of defense. It is present throughout the body anywhere the danger of infection or other injuries is most likely to occur. It is present in tears, skin, saliva, bronchial secretions of the lungs, and in the white cells of the blood.

Like penicillin, the discovery of Lysozyme didn't arouse too much excitment initially. Lysozyme was left dormant for many years until scientists suddenly became aware of it. I won't bother you too much with its description—how its molecule of 129 amino acids was discovered, or how Lysozyme kills bacteria. That is for the biochemists. It is important though, that in some forms of leukemias, lysozyme in the blood serum is present only in very low levels. It was, therefore, possible to detect these forms of leukemia by measuring lysozyme-in-serum. Also, when human kidneys were transplanted, scientists while checking for the presence of lysozyme-in-urine, found that they were capable of detecting the early symptoms of kidney rejection.

Cow milk differs from maternal human milk, in that it contains no lysozyme. Some eye infections are accompanied by the lowering or even total disappearance of lysozyme levels in tears. Recently, it was demonstrated by two groups of scientists that lysozyme levels in human tears were lowered when the eye was subjected to smog eye irritation; also, in experimental studies, lysozyme in lung secretions was observed to be inactivated by ozone—a smog component.

The list of uses for lysozyme as a diagnostic tool is long, ranging from measurements of Lysozyme in the serum for the detection of damage by irradiation, to the low levels of lysozyme found in the early stages of viral hepatitis.

This initial presentation demonstrates how Lysozyme may be useful in the *detection* of a variety of diseases.

In the following talks, I shall discuss how Lysozyme can be useful in many other ways to human and animal welfare.

A FORWARD MARITIME POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dangers to the national security of the United States inherent in the Soviet Union's massive naval shipbuilding program are widely recognized. Perhaps not so well known are the national security implications involved in the Soviet's accelerated programs in the merchant marine, oceanography, and fisheries.

One of the authors of a significant report on "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance: U.S.S.R. Versus U.S.A.," which was published last December, was Dr. James D. Atkinson of Georgetown University.

Based on that experience, Dr. Atkinson has now prepared a paper on the Soviet challenge in the merchant marine. He also makes some recommendations regarding U.S. response to this challenge which I believe should be important reading for Members of this body. The paper follows:

A FORWARD MARITIME POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Presented by Dr. James D. Atkinson, professor of government, Georgetown University, at a luncheon sponsored by the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, Washington, D.C., Jan. 22, 1969)

THE STRATEGIC NAVAL BALANCE

The naval balance study

In early December 1968, the House Committee on Armed Services published a study entitled "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance: USSR vs. USA." This study was prepared for House Armed Services by a special committee of the American Security Council on which I served. This carefully researched paper pointed out that the burgeoning Soviet merchant marine served to enhance Soviet attainment of strategic objectives on the oceans of the world and that this constituted one of the significant developments of our times. The study emphasized that the Soviet effort was both qualitative and quantitative and noted that "four out of five Russian merchant ships are less than 10 years old, whereas four out of five of the U.S.-flag vessels are of World War II vintage or older!"

Continued Soviet momentum

Since the publication of this report, the trend has been for continued upward movement of the Soviets on the high seas. There are many examples of this continuing Soviet thrust at sea, but these are especially interesting:

(1) On 26 December 1968 the official Soviet news agency Tass stated that "the Soviet Merchant Marine has firmly taken the world's sixth place this year" and that one more line had been added "to the score of regular services. It links the ports of the Baltic with Australia."

(2) On 6 January 1969 Tass stated that meetings had begun that day between the Soviet Union and East Germany in order to coordinate their maritime policy including that "on the international freight market." With the recent example of Soviet rate cutting on Australian cargoes, this report is highly suggestive for future Soviet and bloc policy.

(3) On 9 January 1969 Moscow Radio announced that ten ships of the Soviet merchant navy had arrived in Havana, Cuba, and that a record number of Russian ships would be plying the sea route to Cuba this month.[1]

(4) On 14 January 1969 press reports revealed an historic first for the Soviet merchant marine. It was stated that the first *regular shipping service* by the USSR to North America's Pacific Coast had begun with the over 14,000 ton *Ostrogozhsk* (built only 4 years ago), one of three Soviet ships to be in service from British Columbia to Japan. Significantly, this is a third country service, *not* a Soviet home port operation.

PROJECTIONS FROM THE NAVAL BALANCE STUDY

There are, of course, a number of projections which could be made from "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance." The following, however, appear to have special relevance to the fields of merchant marine, oceanography and fisheries:

General projections

(1) *The Maritime Psychological Gap:* Of prime importance is the closing of the mari-

---

[1] In another part of the world, the Mediterranean, the Soviet capability—greatly assisted by merchant shipping—for exploiting trouble spots was indicated by the statement in Pravda on 11 January 1969 that "the USSR has always taken a firm position of supporting Arab peoples."

XUM

time psychological gap. For too long the American people have been told—by the prophets of gloom and doom—that it is useless for the United States to make a maritime effort, because other countries can build and operate more efficiently. A logical examination of this claim leads, of course, to a *reductio ad absurdum*. For, if we accept this kind of defeatism, it follows that, very shortly, we cannot make an effort in the fields of electronics, in steel, or in textiles. All of these fields are challenged from overseas as is our maritime enterprise.

Furthermore, a recent example indicates that American labor and management in the maritime field are performing far more efficiently than the critics would have us believe. I cite the sad case of the Queen Elizabeth II, not as a criticism of the grand maritime tradition of Britain, but, rather, as, by contrast, emphasizing what America is doing and can do at sea.

The London *Daily Telegraph* stated (1 January 1969) of the Queen Elizabeth II that there were "minor defects, mainly electrical, in 900 of the 1,000 cabins." Their correspondent went on to say that "plumbing is bad in several cabins and one can wade in inches of water. Shower attachments are missing. The taps on baths are also missing. In some cases attachments in bathrooms have come away in people's hands." Far more serious were the faults in two turbines. The *Daily Telegraph* of 8 January 1969 reported these were even more serious than it was first believed and that the chairman of Upper Clyde Shipbuilders "refused to give a completion date for the ship." [2]

(2) *National Need vs. Cost-effectiveness:* Closely associated with the maritime psychological gap is the myth of maritime cost-effectiveness. A myth, because the U.S. maritime posture should, in truth, be related to national need, not to cost-effectiveness *alone*. The U.S. merchant marine has been steadily deteriorating. And the British merchant marine—upon which many of our exporters and importers have placed reliance—now appears to be headed towards a sharp decline. Can we believe that the Soviet Union will be so conscientious that, in future, it will refrain from taking advantage of what will be a geopolitical fact of life? If this should come to pass, would the American voter ask whether the policy had been cost effective?; or would he ask why was not something done?

Specific projections

(1) *Merchant Marine:* In "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance" we point out that "a vital factor in the Russian merchant marine expansion is the total of national resources devoted to this oceanic enterprise. In 1965, the Soviet government devoted more than $600 million to the construction of merchant vessels. The United States spent only $150 million in the same year. These figures make clear the different priorities that the Soviet Union and the United States assign to a vital segment of sea power."

It would appear, therefore, that a minimum program by the United States to restore the merchant marine balance would be the building of 50 ships per year for the four-year period fiscal 1970 (calendar year beginning 1 July 1969)—fiscal year 1973. This is a minimum program; indeed, in view of the growing magnitude of the Soviet effort, it may be necessary to review this number and project a total of 250 instead of 200 U.S. built merchant ships, that is, 50 in each of the first two years and 75 each in the latter two years. Based on national need, 50 per year for the four-year period would certainly appear to be a minimum number.

(2) *Oceonographic:* The arrival in Leningrad last October of the new oceanographic research ship *Akademik Vernadskiy* is in many ways symbolic of what needs to be done to redress this part of the maritime balance. This ship, built in East Germany for the USSR was reported to have made its first voyage (and where it may still be operating) not in seas adjacent to Russia, but in the Atlantic Ocean. The *Akademik Vernadskiy* becomes one of an increasingly large fleet of oceanographic ships given the task of both basic and applied research on the seas of this great globe. For the Russians realize that while outer space is, of course, very important, the liquid space of the world's oceans is in the long run of equal importance and, in the short run, may be—at various times—of even greater importance.

A modest program in oceanography, therefore, would be the tripling of the present approximately 3700 people in the field of ocean studies and the building of four oceanographic ships—exclusive of undersea research ships for here we should, perhaps, have a crash program—per year over a four-year period from fiscal 1970 onward.

(3) *Fisheries:* The magnitude of the task facing us here is too well known to require more than brief comment. A comparison with Soviet priorities is relevant. In the past fourteen years the USSR put *$4 billion* into its fishing fleet-shoreside plant complex. In the same period, a goodly part of the U.S. fishing fleet became museum pieces. It would hardly be imprudent to suggest that we either directly spend or indirectly use tax incentives to provide, over a four year period, at the very least, one-half the average yearly amount of the Soviet expenditure

SUMMARY

In short, what is at stake is not only a significant industry—and important the maritime industry certainly is—but, much more, a vast sector of the U.S. national security. This sector embraces the inter-related mix of naval, merchant marine, oceanography-marine resources, and fishing fleet-shoreside plant complexes. If the American people can be shown the overriding importance of this maritime complex, the evidence indicates that they will ask, indeed, may even demand, that their country adopt and implement a forward maritime policy.

---

[2] The British are not alone. The *Daily Telegraph* of 17 January 1969 reported that "a faulty turbine in the West German passenger ship Hamburg, 23,500 tons, has delayed its test run and speed trials for two weeks . . ."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, March 25, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

My defense is of God, who saveth the upright in heart.—Psalm 7: 10.

O God, who art a strong tower of defense to those who put their trust in Thee, have mercy upon us as we bow in prayer before Thee and gird us for the experiences of this day. Grant that in moments of low moods and in minutes of high moods we may keep our faith in Thee in whom alone true life is to be found.

Forgive the ways we have placed shackles about ourselves and others, the intolerance we have shown when others differed from us, the envy we have revealed when some have received what we thought we deserved, the prejudices we have mistaken for principles, and the ill will generated at the success of others. May we pray not only to be forgiven but to learn to be forgiving.

Amid the perplexities of this period may we always remember to be kind and generous, understanding and upright in heart, knowing that he who lives in Thy spirit and who keeps Thy commandments is walking in the way of truth and love—the best defense our Nation can ever have.

We pray in the spirit of Him who walked the way of the loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 301. An act for the relief of Sein Lin;

S. 348. An act for the relief of Cheng-huai Li;

S. 537. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano);

S. 628. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday;

S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott;

S. 713. An act to designate the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, in the State of California;

S. 742. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 743. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 927. An act for the relief of Victor Abadi;

S. 958. An act for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy;

S. 1011. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes;

S. 1016. An act for the relief of Dr. Richard Francis Power;

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Solar;

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Wong Wah Sin;

S. 1123. An act for the relief of Ah Mee Locke; and

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law

XUM

86-420, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, chairman; Mr. HARTKE, Mr. DODD, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SAXBE to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the U.S. group to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in three cities in Mexico from April 2 through April 9, 1969.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 22, United States Code, section 276, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN, chairman; Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HART, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. SCOTT to be delegates on the part of the Senate to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting to be held in Vienna, Austria, April 7 through April 13, 1969.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 87-758, reappointed Mr. PROUTY as a member of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

BILL TO ALLOW SMALL BUSINESS TO RETAIN MORE EARNINGS

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, the principle of which has been repeatedly endorsed in the past by the House Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, and its Senate counterpart.

This measure would permit a tax deduction of up to $30,000, or 20 percent of net income for the taxable year, whichever is smaller, for money plowed back into a business for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory and accounts receivable.

This would extend the principle of the 7-percent investment credit, adopted in 1962, which has worked so well in producing jobs, from the manufacturing to the retail and service fields, by the inclusion of inventories and receivables.

I first endorsed this concept more than 10 years ago after intensive hearings of the Small Business Committee conducted here and in various parts of the country.

Need for the bill was never better stated than by the Ways and Means Committee in a report at that time:

> One of the greatest problems confronting small and medium-sized businesses is the acquisition of sufficient capital to modernize and maintain a rate of expansion competitive with larger companies. Small business must rely largely on retained earnings for modernization and expansion. Thus, there is a need to allow small business to retain more earnings to provide the funds necessary for growth.

This measure is one of several I intend to sponsor in connection with the overall review of the tax structure now underway. The first was introduced last week, increasing the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,200.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 23 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPACEMEN SHOULD PLANT U.S. FLAG ON THE MOON

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with some amazement that I have read press reports that the National Aeronautics and Space Agency is debating what kind of flag U.S. astronauts will place on the surface of the moon when they land there this summer.

It is inconceivable to me that any flag other than Old Glory should even be considered. Press reports have indicated that a U.N. flag is being pressed by some. This, of course, would give the Communist nations a full share in what is essentially an all-American project.

The taxpayers of this country have put up $20 billion in what has openly been called a race to the moon. There have been three deaths of fine young men. There have been many risks, many daring and dangerous exploits leading up to this effort to make a successful lunar landing.

I feel it would be a travesty and a doublecross of the astronauts and the American public if any other flag than the U.S. flag were planted on the moon by our spacemen. I do not think NASA need debate that issue any longer.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

MARCH 21, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to submit my resignation from the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library to which I was elected pursuant to House Resolution 263 of the 91st Congress.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION RESTORATION OF CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement on yesterday, I call up House Joint Resolution 584, making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 584

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

For partial restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs heretofore incurred, $1,000,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joint resolution advancing from fiscal year 1970 into fiscal year 1969 the sum of $1 billion for the purpose of restoring impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Due to heavy unexpected production of certain of the major crops, the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand about $5 billion worth of commodities. As a result of this and other factors it is substantially out of cash to carry on its operations.

The reason why we have to be on the floor today to seek action prior to the Easter recess is that the dock strike has more or less paralyzed shipping and has prevented the export of commodities

XUM

held by the CCC. This has also brought on stagnation in the domestic market.

Under these circumstances we are required to ask that the capital stock of the CCC be increased by $1 billion. There seems to be no alternative. There are many aspects involved here. In view of the fact that this is an emergency situation, and we will have many opportunities later in the session to discuss in depth many of the agricultural problems which trouble us, I hope we can move along with the acceptance of this emergency resolution.

The RECORD of yesterday's session, which was available this morning, carries a full statement explaining the need for this action. The report is available. The hearings have been printed and are available.

I will be glad to yield for any question at this point.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the subcommittee which handled the hearings on this resolution and which handles the regular appropriations in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say to my chairman that our committee, as he well knows, did hold extensive and rather complete hearings on the financial situation.

The committee recommends the budget request contained in House Document No. 91–76 for a supplemental appropriation of $1 billion to restore capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for losses heretofore incurred. This resolution, which merely moves this amount forward from the budget for fiscal year 1970 into fiscal year 1969, will not expand the total appropriations presently requested for the Commodity Credit Corporation through fiscal year 1970.

The action recommended by the committee is made necessary by a serious financial situation currently facing the Corporation. Despite the use of every financial resource available to the department, it is apparent that the Corporation's capital funds are about to be exhausted. The most current estimates indicate that the balance available on March 18, 1969, will finance the Corporation's programs for another 10 days at the present rate of expenditure.

Since carrying out the Nation's price support programs is mandatory under the law and Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures are therefore uncontrollable, it is essential that the recommended funds be provided to assure continued operation of the price support and related programs of the Corporation. None of these funds are provided for personnel and other administrative expenses.

The increased demands on the Corporation's borrowing authority were caused by large unanticipated increases in crop production, particularly in feed grains, wheat, and soybeans, and decreases in exports. Lower market prices, along with the increased supply, have resulted in higher quantities going under loan and in lower repayments.

The nationwide dock strike, which started last December 20 and is still in progress at the gulf coast ports, also has added uncertainty to the commodity markets and has slackened the demand for agricultural commodities.

These additional demands do not represent a final cost to the Corporation. They, in effect, represent an investment in commodities held by the Corporation as security for loans or commodities to which the Corporation has title. As of March 7, 1969—the latest date available—the value of commodities on hand and under loan is estimated at $5.1 billion. Of this amount, Commodity Credit Corporation has title to $1 billion and has $4.1 billion pledged for loans.

So it is a case of having money invested in commodities, with the borrowing authority tied up in secured loans, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) stated earlier.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized under the laws of Delaware, and later organized under the laws of the United States. It has all the normal functions and powers of a corporation: to buy, to sell, to enter into contracts, and all the other practices followed by other corporations.

One of its prime purposes through the years has been to maintain a proper relationship—as was the intent of Congress—between the agricultural, industrial, and labor sectors of our economy.

The Congress has provided by law that labor can strike and organize to bargain collectively—and thereby secure a large share of the consumer dollar. Industry, too, of course, is in a position to add its profits over and above its costs, thus securing its share of the consumer dollar.

Congress, through the years, has recognized the crucial role of agriculture, as the producer of the raw material of our food and fiber, and has recognized that, unless agriculture is accorded equal treatment in law, the other two sectors of the economy would take a bigger and bigger share of the consumer's dollar, leaving less and less for the farmer.

The vehicle through which the Congress has tried to achieve this objective is the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the law, the Corporation is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the farm program. It gets its money from borrowing authority provided by the Congress, through the sale of its commodities, and in other ways. The appropriations from the Congress are made annually only to reimburse the Corporation for losses sustained in its operations during earlier time periods. The Corporation operates from day to day on its borrowing authority.

It should also be noted that the Congress has failed to restore the Corporation's capital impairment that occurred in 1961. This impairment amounts to more than $1 billion. I think it would make sense for us to restore that impairment at this time, since the Corporation is in financial difficulties. CCC has the obligation under law to purchase commodities and grant loans to farmers on their crops. If the Corporation's officers do not do this, they are violating the law, and yet if they do do it, and the Corporation does not have any money or borrowing authority left, they will also be violating the law.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), for yielding to me at this time.

We are considering today whether or not to pass House Joint Resolution 584 which would make additional appropriations available for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has explained the purpose of this resolution in yesterday's RECORD—page 7162. As Chairman MAHON pointed out, the Commodity Credit Corporation has reached the limit of authorized spending authority, namely $14.5 billion.

Last year I introduced an amendment to H.R. 17126 to limit farm subsidy payments to a maximum of $20,000 a year per farmer. The amendment was adopted by this House, then dropped in conference. It was adopted by this House because the inequities and the inappropriateness of the present farm subsidy program had been clearly demonstrated.

I believe as strongly today as I did then, that our farm program is outmoded, that it is unfair, and that it must be revised.

The question before us today is whether to authorize an additional $1 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation. This money is needed in order that contracts already entered into between the CCC and individual farmers can be fulfilled. To deny this money would be to breach existing and binding contracts and I have no intention of taking any action today which might interfere with the fulfillment of these contractual obligations.

I want to make perfectly clear, however, that I similarly have no intention of abandoning the effort which was begun last year.

At the first appropriate time I intend to again introduce my amendment placing a $20,000 maximum on farm subsidy payments. I certainly hope furthermore that all of those who supported me last year will back this limitation again.

I stated last year and let me repeat it today—there is simply no justification today for the taxpayers of this country paying hundreds of millions of dollars to large and prosperous farmers for not farming their land.

I would like to serve notice here and now that I intend to continue this battle until we have been successful—until we have eliminated the unfair subsidies which now exist and have developed new agriculture programs and policies to meet the challenges of today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation in this present situation and for holding his amendment for the future.

XUM

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. It is generally known to the membership of this House that I am usually not very enthusiastic about supplemental appropriation bills. The one before us today, however, seems to be of such importance and of such character that it warrants our immediate support and passage. Were we not to do so, many serious hardships would be created throughout rural America, and the economic effects would be such that they would adversely affect the entire Nation.

Mr. MAHON, chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. WHITTEN, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations, has, as usual very ably, eloquently, and specifically outlined for the House of Representatives the need and provisions of the legislation before us. Permit me to briefly elaborate further.

I stated at the outset that the bill was of such urgency and character that it warrants our immediate support. The committee report, which is available to every Member, sets forth the urgency in noting that this supplemental appropriation of $1 billion is to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for losses incurred during this fiscal year in order to alleviate the serious financial situation which currently faces the Corporation.

The character or provisions of this bill are such that it merely moves forward from fiscal year 1970 to fiscal 1969 $1 billion so that the total appropriations presently requested for the Commodity Credit Corporation through fiscal year 1970 will not be increased at this time. Testimony before the subcommittee indicated that the balance available on March 18, 1969, to the Corporation would finance its programs only for another 10 days at the present rates of expenditure. These are the moneys that are used for our Nation's price support programs, which are mandatory under the law, and unless additional moneys are provided at this time, the continued operation of price support and related programs could not be carried out during the remainder of this fiscal year, and so would constitute a breach of promise on the part of the Government to the many thousand participators in these programs throughout the Nation. None of these funds are used for personnel or other administrative expenses.

It would be a reasonable question to ask why has this action become necessary. Last year your subcommittee did its best to provide adequate funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis of the information and statistics that were available to us at that time. In fact, we had the assurance of the department at that time that there might be anywhere from a billion-and-a-half to $2 billion of moneys available for unforeseen circumstances. Factors beyond our control, however, which have already been identified brought demands that were far beyond any reasonable anticipation that these moneys would be needed in these amounts at this time.

Let it also be thoroughly understood that it is not the fault of the present administration, nor is it the fault of the past administration, but has rather come about because of factors that are beyond the control of any administration and are substantially unpredictable. It is most unfortunate that those who have just taken over the management of these important programs should be confronted with the inheritance of this problem.

The problem is serious because of the economic hardships that would be created for individual farmers as well as all of rural America. It is well known that the economic plight of American agriculture is severe enough as it is without further aggravation. If this bill is not passed to provide the additional moneys, it will mean that all price support and related programs will of necessity have to be discontinued because of a lack of money with which to carry them out, even though the commitments have been established by law to farmers throughout the land. This would result in an economic calamity and great injustice to farmers who in good faith have signed agreements to comply with the programs enacted by the Congress and recommended to them by their Government. Gross inequities would result because many farmers have already completed these transactions as compared to others who are presently in the process of completing their loans and preparing for the coming spring season.

The moneys involved in these programs are most essential to all farm operations around the country, and with the high cost of operation, it is most important that these moneys should be available to them or many would have real difficulty in continuing to operate their farms during this coming production season. Farmers throughout the Nation are having difficulty enough at this time in sustaining their operations for the coming year because of a lack of operating funds. It is just as unfortunate at this time that the Farmers Home Administration does not have funds available for operating or emergency loans, even though our committee and the Congress did appropriate last year more adequate funds for these purposes. However, the Budget Bureau, in spite of continuous urging by Congress, myself included, have withheld $25 million of operating loan funds, and I understand there is still $19 million more that could be provided under last year's appropriation for emergency loans. This further aggravates and increases the need for the approval by the House of this supplemental appropriation today. To not provide these moneys for the Corporation would have far-reaching economic effects in that it would force many people to move grains and agricultural commodities on the markets at accelerated rates which would only further depress the already too low prices, and so reduce farm income even below the present unacceptable levels.

Another question might be properly raised—What are the elements that have caused this emergency need for money by the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time? I have already stated that the problem has been brought about by numerous factors which were not controllable by either the Corporation or the participants in the respective programs affected. Let me identify a few of them.

Last year crop production throughout the country was at exceptionally high levels and so there were substantial increased volumes of crops and commodities that are subject to the various price support programs. This fact in itself brought a substantial increase in the number of loan requests. The demand for loans was further increased by the fact that a large grain crop depressed prices to the point where it became necessary to make further use of the loan program, all of which brought extra demands on the moneys available for these purposes as administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Adding to these adverse conditions was the national dock strike which started last December 20 and is still in progress at the gulf coast ports which prevented and held back the normal amount of shipments to foreign countries.

With the limited amount of moneys available to the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time, they testified before our committee that it had already been necessary for them to place a hold on shipments under the Public Law 480 program. These actions, of course, have already affected the markets throughout the country and if permitted to continue, will further aggravate the problems that are already so evident. Testimony before the committee indicated that we might have lost as much as $200 million worth of exports which cannot be recovered. Besides the increased production and reduced foreign shipments of feed grains, wheat, and soybeans, cotton has also presented an unexpected problem. While cotton production was down about 2.1 billion bales less than predicted, the present market prices are such that both domestic and export demands have dropped at the point where an extra 23 billion bales have been placed under Commodity Credit loans with an additional investment of $215 million.

The committee report identifies by language and by tables the results of these facts as they affect the demands for money of the Corporation, amounting to program increases totaling $1,686 million. Of this total $973 million occurred prior to submission of the 1970 budget and $713 million additional were added since that time.

I will include for the RECORD a summary of the program developments and the major influencing factors from the 1969 budget to the current estimates for fiscal year 1969.

Following is a summary of program developments and major influencing factors from 1969 budget to the current estimates for the fiscal year 1969:

XUM

Item	1969 budget	Current estimate	Change
Feed grains:			
Production (million tons)	167	168.1	+1.1
Season average price (corn) (per bushel)	$1.17	$1.05	−$.12
Loans made (million short tons)	11.2	18.6	+7.4
Loans repaid (million short tons)	10.9	8.2	−2.7
Advance payments, 1969 crop (millions)	$435	$336	−$99
Net outlays (millions)	$1,361	$1,842	+$481
Wheat:			
Production (million bushels)	1,510	1,570	+60
Exports (million bushels)	790	600	−190
Domestic use (million bushels)	686	750	+64
Season average price (per bushel)	$1.40	$1.22	−$.18
Loans made (million bushels)	250	440	+190
Loans repaid (million bushels)	170	160	−10
Sales (million bushels)	75.5	32.3	−43.2
Net outlays (millions)	$470	$857	+$387
Cotton:			
Domestic use and exports (million bales)	13.3	11.4	−1.9
Production (million bales)	13	10.9	−2.1
Loans made (million bales)	2	4.3	+2.3
Net outlays (millions)	$760	$975	+$215
Soybeans:			
Production (million bushels)	1,050	1,080	+30
Domestic use and exports (million bushels)	990	931	−59
Season average price (per bushel)	$2.45	$2.42	−$0.03
Loans made (million bushels)	250	340	+90
Loans repaid (million bushels)	190	130	−60
Net outlays (millions)	$167	$542	+$375
Dairy products:			
Production (milk equivalent) (billion pounds)	120.0	116.9	−3.1
Domestic use (billion pounds)	119.6	119.2	−0.4
Purchases (million)	$305	$290	−$15
Sales proceeds (millions)	$76	[1] $224	+$148
Net outlays (millions)	$245	$78	−$167
Storage facility loans:			
Loans made:			
Bushel capacity (million bushels)	41.2	300	+258.8
Value (millions)	$16	$120	+$104
Loans repaid (millions)	$16	$22	+$6
Net outlays (millions)		$98	+$98

[1] Includes sales of $111,000,000 of dairy products to sec. 32 funds.

It will be noted that in feed grains there was a production increase of 1.1 million tons, requiring an additional cost of $481 million. In wheat there was an additional 60 million bushels resulting in an additional outlay by the Corporation of $387 million. In soybeans, increased production was 30 million bushels with a net effect of $375 million of additional cost. Experience was similar with cotton, as well as other commodities, all of which brought on an additional demand for storage facility loans, costing an added $98 million.

During the course of the committee hearings, it was also called to our attention that there were other related factors that contributed to these additional outlays of money that accrued to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Statements were made to the effect that the dock strike might well have been settled much earlier had it not been for the fact that many of the strikers were participants in the food stamp program, thereby affecting the entire negotiations. It is somewhat ironic that the food supplies furnished in this manner should become a substantial factor in the costs involved to produce the food supplies to sustain the program. While it is not a subject for consideration today, it would seem that proper notation ought to be made of the effects that accrue to consumers and taxpayers alike that I am sure was not the original intention in the adoption of the food stamp program.

I am sure it is evident to everyone who has had their attention directed to these factors that I have identified for you and discussed with you briefly that in the aggregate, they amount to an added economic burden that affects the entire Nation. If we do not provide the necessary moneys today to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to function in its normal and assigned pattern, then even further economic demands will be placed on Government, as well as all of its citizens.

It, therefore, in my judgment is of the greatest urgency that we approve the requested appropriation. This should be done without delay so that moneys will be on hand before the Commodity Credit Corporation finds it necessary to curtail any of their operations. I, therefore, urge the House to look with favor on this appropriation bill today.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Texas to yield to me at this time for a question.

I believe the gentleman just stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time has $5 or $6 billion in commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. A total of $5.1 billion to be exact.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to make this observation about this very alarming figure. I would like to make it for this reason: I have in my file at the present time two letters from the Commodity Credit Corporation in which I asked them to tell me the facts regarding sales on two lots of peanuts. I would like to point out the cost involved in those sales. Within the last 3 weeks the Commodity Credit Corporation lost a cool $3 million on the two that were sold.

If we are going to sell $5 or $6 billion in the same manner and under like conditions, they are going to have to come here for many additional supplementary appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Of the total, about $4 billion is invested in commodities under loan with the Commodity Credit Corporation and about $1 billion represents commodity stocks owned by the Government.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the hearings on this supplemental appropriation is a table showing the borrowing authority in use by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the balance available or deficit. I draw the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) to the item which shows the balance available on June 30, 1968, as being $1.5 billion.

I will ask the gentleman if the appropriation before the House today can reasonably be expected to restore approximately the same balance on June 30 of this year?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman well knows, we are dealing in an area where it is virtually impossible to say what will happen. It has been pointed out that about $4 billion of capital of the Corporation is tied up in commodity loans. If those commodities are redeemed the Corporation would have $4 billion with which to operate.

Unfortunately, due to the backup of commodities in the country, largely as a result of the dock strike, and very large production of certain crops in the feed grain and wheat areas, the domestic market has been very, very bad. So, being unable to sell, the producers have turned to the Corporation, and put their crops under loan with the Corporation.

So it comes back to the fact that if the market strengthens domestically—and I believe the department is giving some thought to strengthening the domestic market—it can be hoped that many of these commodities would be withdrawn, the loans to the Government repaid, and this would leave the Corporation a larger balance as of June 30 next. But I do not know how anybody can foresee at this time what is going to happen in the next few months.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the bottom figure of that same column which shows the figure of minus $381 million estimated for June 30, 1969. If we accept this hearing data as being substantially correct, this means that the appropriation of $1 billion will leave the available balance at only $619 million on June 30. This, as the gentleman knows, is substantially less than the balance of the year previous—almost a billion less.

The reason I mention this is because I question whether this type of procedure actually conveys fairly the budget situation for the fiscal year just ended which, of course, in a sense is the last fiscal year of the Johnson administration, as well as the fair estimate, or presentation of the budget situation which will prevail in the next fiscal year, which will be the first full fiscal year of the Nixon administration.

Had the amount requested here been $1.9 billion instead of $1 billion, then if we accept these figures as reasonably accurate the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation impaired during fiscal 1969 would have been fully restored, so that the available money for corporation use July 1 of this year would be about the same as July 1 of last year. As it is, figures on total budget for the fiscal years will inevitably be distorted to the disadvantage of the Nixon administration, and to the advantage of the Johnson administration.

Would the gentleman agree with me in that statement?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe that it can be so claimed, because the $1 billion has been moved forward from the pending budget for 1970, which could be called the Johnson budget. We are just moving it forward from then until now because in this period we have had the very heavy use of Corporation funds for loans to producers of these commodities.

Also we are going to be into our Easter recess, and the situation is a serious one, so we had no alternative whatsoever.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. But when it comes to the prospective situation, it is difficult to answer. In 1961, as the gentleman will recall, they took inventory of the true value of the commodities, and certified the losses they had incurred. Those losses which total about $1,050,000,000 have never been restored.

So this appropriation merely restores that amount of impaired capital. But to anticipate what the situation will be the 1st of June or July, I just do not know how to go about it.

Even the figures you have made reference to on page 4 of the hearings have probably changed somewhat since they were provided.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure that the gentleman would have inserted a reservation in the printed hearings or the report if he had reason to question the accuracy of this minus $381 million figure.

My point is that the difference between Federal receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year that will end July 1 presents an unfair and distorted picture to the extent of nearly $1 billion, and I think it is unfortunate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is another item that I would like to call to the attention of the House. That is the adverse impact on Commodity Credit Corporation resources caused by the unwise action of Secretary Freeman in maintaining the loan rate of soybeans at $2.50 per bushel long after it was evident to him that this was leading soybeans into disaster.

As a result, at the end of this marketing year, the CCC is going to have over 300 million bushels in storage representing a heavy dollar investment. Had we had prudent management of the loan rate for soybeans under Secretary Freeman, this costly problem never would have developed. Now Secretary Hardin has taken what I think is a courageous and statesmanlike approach to the problem of soybeans by dropping the loan rate.

He has also announced that he will not sell the Government soybean stockpiles on the market during the next year in order to give the market an opportunity to make the adjustment which is wrecking market prices—action necessitated by the folly that Secretary Freeman put across. This will cost money, the CCC will have to tie up funds amounting to at least a billion dollars in inventory and loans, a use of Government funds which would have been totally unnecessary except for Freeman's soybean folly.

As we evaluate the circumstances which today lead us to the necessity of appropriating an extra billion dollars for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in all fairness, we ought to allocate a great measure of the blame for this unfortunate event at the doorstep of the former Secretary of Agriculture. At the same time we should salute the new Secretary who has taken this courageous step to try to right the wrong of yesterday.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I would like to comment on the gentleman's earlier observation with respect to the balance at the beginning of the next fiscal year that will be on hand by the Commodity Credit Corporation even with this supplemental appropriation of $1 billion.

Actually, to have a cushion of just $600 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation is not very much. As a matter of fact, on some days transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation can total $200 million in 1 day's activity.

I should like to point out to the gentleman that when the current fiscal year's regular appropriation bill was on the floor of the House, we were given to understand that there would be a $2 billion cushion, and I am speaking of the kind of figures and estimates as they were presented to us. But it shows how quickly outdated they become, particularly in view of the dock strike and the accumulation of commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the point now where a $2 billion cushion has shrunk down practically to a minus figure and with this billion dollars, it will be down further for the new fiscal year.

If I may make one further point. We were talking of net realized losses on these commodities from prior years.

At the rate these figures are carried forward—$1,057,000,000 from 1961.

Mr. FINDLEY. And that was never restored.

Mr. MICHEL. It has never been reimbursed. And then there is $2,211,000,000 unreimbursed from 1967. Also, $2,948,000,000 in 1968. You have a total there of $6,215,000,000 of net realized losses through June 30, 1968. You see, we are a long, long way from really getting caught up.

Mr. FINDLEY. On July 1, 1967, the funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation exceeded $3 billion. Then a year later, they were tightened down to $1½ billion. Now they are tightened down to a little over a billion dollars.

The whole purpose here, in my opinion, was to try to make the Johnson budgets look better than they really deserved to look, and trying to shift an unfair burden to the first Nixon fiscal year.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and it is a very valid one. When the regular bill for fiscal year 1970 appropriations is considered we will develop this point further, for it needs to be aired fully.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture is currently facing a serious economic crisis. The price and income problems with which U.S. farmers have had to contend in recent years have grown even more acute in the past few months. And, on top of that, adverse weather conditions in many parts of our country have compounded the difficulty, resulting in crop losses and severe hardship to farmers who, even under more "normal" circumstances, have found it increasingly difficult to make ends meet in the face of steadily rising costs and low farm prices.

Many of us are deeply concerned over this situation and its implications for the future of American agriculture and our Nation. It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that every possible effort be made by this Congress, the administration, U.S. farmers, and the American public to find ways in which this highly damaging trend of falling farm prices and rising costs can be reversed. Our Nation's strength is directly linked to an economically healthy agriculture, and it is most important that we never lose sight of this fact.

Nearly all segments of U.S. agriculture have been hard hit this season for one reason or another. Wheat producers, for example, are faced with price and market problems resulting from a variety of adverse factors. Wheat prices are far below last year's levels, and wheat futures are currently about the lowest of the season. The U.S. Department of Agriculture tells us that the season average price originally estimated at $1.40 per bushel now is expected to be 18 cents less—about $1.22 per bushel.

The wheat export situation presents cause for serious concern at this time, also. Wheat exports are now expected to fall around 190 million bushels below earlier USDA expectations of 790 million bushels. The dock strikes and the recent problem involving shipment of sprout-damaged wheat to Japan have reduced our exports and now the Canadian offers to sell wheat at prices below the International Grains Arrangement have cast an even deeper shadow over the entire U.S. wheat export picture. This latest action has raised a number of questions as to the future of the IGA and the effects to be expected on U.S. exports and domestic prices. A meeting of world wheat exporters has been scheduled for next week here in Washington, D.C., to discuss the problem of price cutting under the IGA, and I sincerely hope for the sake of U.S. wheat producers that the meeting will be a productive one.

With this background, Mr. Speaker, the need for congressional appropriation of additional funds needed by the Commodity Credit Corporation becomes more obvious. We are all only too well aware of the serious fiscal situation which our Nation faces today. With the budgetary belt tightening which has been required, it is necessary to thoroughly examine every further Federal expenditure from the standpoints of need and priority.

XUM

Using this yardstick to evaluate the request for additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, it becomes clear that approval of this request could be the only responsible action under the circumstances. Without the needed funds, CCC would shortly cease to operate. This would mean halting the Public Law 480 program, with subsequent loss of export markets and lower domestic market prices. Price support loans could not be made to farmers, causing further market depression. The effects would be widespread and an extremely serious blow to our entire agricultural economy—an economy that has already suffered so much damage this season it would probably not be able to withstand the shock.

In summary, the need for additional Commodity Credit Corporation funds at this time serves to very effectively point up the critical economic situation faced by U.S. agriculture today. I do not believe the seriousness of this situation can be overemphasized, and I would urge all my colleagues in the House to keep this well in mind as the request before us is considered and in the days ahead as we attempt to come to grips with these problems.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this resolution for supplemental appropriations to restore over $1 billion in capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation should draw attention to the importance of world trade in agricultural commodities. The amount of commodities exported not only affects our domestic budget by affecting the quantity of basic commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation acquires in a particular year but it also affects our balance of payments and budgeting problems. A dock strike in the United States practically cut off these exports for several weeks. In addition to that, we have several trade and cargo preference restrictions which limit very considerably the competitive role of U.S. agricultural products.

Congress must bear its share of the blame because politically inspired amendments and gimmicks have been added to all kinds of bills as they go through Congress in an effort to prove that the author of the amendments and certain groups are Communist haters, Arab haters, anti-British, or friends of shipping interests. All of these things working together in the past few months have restricted agricultural exports, given part of our export market to other countries, required an appropriation of additional funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation, put additional pressure on the budget at a time when we have budget problems, will require borrowing money to invest in these commodities which will be stored at a time when competition for money is already too great and interest rates too high, and in the end it will require farmers to cut back on production if they are to keep supply in balance with demand well enough to avoid reduction in prices.

With exports being so important to farmers and at a time when the European Economic Community is considering a tax on our soybean meal and oil imports we certainly need the most vigorous informed and enlightened special trade representative, but this position formerly held by William Roth has not been refilled in this new administration. We need one man speaking for USDA, the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the President instead of letting negotiations get bogged down with each Department working in its own way, and pushing its own separate point of view on world trade matters. Sixty precious days have passed and American agriculture cannot help but suffer from the time that has already been lost since Roth's job was vacated. I strongly urge this new administration to install their replacement for William Roth immediately and I also urge both Congress and the administration to review the various restrictions on trade that in the end cost the American farmer, the American taxpayer and adversely affects our balance of payments. There should be no less than a complete review of all aspects of agricultural trade.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in connection with the consideration of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT INSURANCE AND HEALTH BENEFITS, COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, TO MEET AT 2:30 P.M. TODAY

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Retirement Insurance and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee may be permitted to meet at 2:30 this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ABM SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

(**Mr. CELLER** asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the deployment of a limited ABM system has resulted in a flood of words, pro and con. In discussing the deployment of the ABM Safeguard system, as I view it, the question is not "What if the opponents are right," but rather "what if they are wrong?" If the opponents are right, we have spent $800 million; but if they are wrong, we, in our turn, have wronged untold millions of lives. Certainly, there are unprovable assumptions on both sides; estimates that cancel out each other, demonstrable facts upholding each end of the argument. But, the disparity in possible consequences leads me inexorably to conclude in favor of the Safeguard system, the modified anti-ballistic-missile program. The gamble is too great, the awesome risk too much to bear.

I have reached this conclusion painfully, fully aware that there is a respectable body of opinion against the deployment, in any form, of the ABM. There are those who believe earnestly that it will accelerate the arms race, inhibit disarmament talks, that we already have sufficient deterrent power to absorb an attack and still effectively retaliate, that our Poseidon force eliminates the need for the Safeguard system. But such arguments, I believe, must fall before the estimate that by the mid-seventies the Soviet Union could have a "first strike" capability. Nor do we assume that if she has, she will use it. What underlines my thinking is we just do not know now any more than we knew then that a "Pearl Harbor" could happen.

What the Safeguard system spells out is a double lock on a door. In that sense, it is a guard against a tempted aggressor, be it the Soviet Union or Red China. The ABM is not a weapon of offense. It does not thrust outward, but stands mute witness to one of the paramount interests of government to protect the lives of its people. With the knowledge that the Soviet Union is perfecting highly sophisticated undersea detective devices, total reliance on the Polaris and Poseidon force will not do.

Moreover, the project of the ABM system has not halted the willingness of the Soviet Union to enter more fully into disarmament talks.

The decision to limit the ABM to selective missile sites is an additional signal to the Soviet Union that we seek and welcome disarmament agreements. It is a precaution we take so limited in scope that I, for one, cannot view it as provocative or as indicative of an arms escalation.

Nor do I view the cost of the Safeguard system as cutting into our determination to meet our domestic needs. We can do both. Our gross national product is approaching $300,000,000,000, and we need not embrace the counsel of despair. We have the resources to heal the ravages of want and poverty if we have the national will to do so. It is up to the administration to accent this national will by stating publicly now that the savings secured by moving from a Sentinel system to the Safeguard system—from 1.8 billion to 800 million—will be allocated to wage battle against the domestic ills that beset us.

Those who oppose the ABM system, I repeat, could be right, but what—dreadful to contemplate—if they are wrong? And because I cannot know and am no prophet, I support and will vote for the ABM.

PUBLIC WORKS MORATORIUM WOULD PENALIZE FUTURE GENERATIONS

(**Mr. JONES** of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe my eyes this morning when I read that the administration is seriously considering a moratorium on public works.

This startling and tragic disclosure was made by Budget Director Robert P. Mayo in testimony on the proposal to increase the debt limit. His aim in this drastic move would be an attempt to reduce inflationary pressures.

It is highly questionable that such a remedy will improve the situation, much less effect a recovery.

Coming at a time when our Nation's proportional investment in public works endeavors is every year diminishing, it is doubly confounding that such a policy would even be considered.

Aside from the adverse effect on the employment and the economy of every State in this Union, we must think of our obligation to those who come after us.

A moratorium on public works will prove to be costly to the American people in terms of the delay in benefits which accrue from these endeavors. A moratorium will prove disastrous for future generations which would be saddled with the task of trying to make repairs, if such repairs are even possible, for the mistakes and problems which we pass on by our failure to plan and act for undeniable future needs.

Our Nation's unexcelled levels of prosperity and accomplishment were not the products of an adding machine approach to problems. The greatness of America is the result of people who dared to dream boldly and to forthrightly plan and execute private and public endeavors which fostered industry, trade, and commerce.

In recent years we have not maintained a level of public investment in facilities which are the very keystone to growth and development for the people of this Nation.

This is evidenced by the pollution of many of our streams, the traffic congestion resulting in delays for travelers and goods, the overcrowding of hospitals and health facilities, the crisis in education, the bogging down of the mails, the floods which recently damaged California and which now threaten vast areas across the northern and western sections of our land, the dearth of recreational areas, and the many, many other costly and frustrating problems we see at every turn.

We have a backlog of public works needs now.

We can easily read the charts about the increases in population which are expected in the years ahead. This compounds our immediate problem and makes the need for planning and action all the more urgent.

Any moratorium adds to the problems we pass to future generations. The need is for greater investment in public works. Our failure to adequately service these needs is a selfish expedient which penalizes unborn generations. We can do better. We must.

MORATORIUM ON PUBLIC WORKS

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carries the news that Budget Director Robert F. Mayo, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, stated that very serious consideration was being given to a total moratorium on public works.

To me this is one of the most alarming reports I have heard since the new administration took over. I hope that the Budget Director was merely speaking for himself and not for the administration, because it seems to me that we have some public works programs underway in this country that so vitally affect the well-being of the entire Nation that it would be disastrous to reembark upon a no-new-starts policy.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I read the same news story the gentleman from Oklahoma read this morning. This morning I was privileged to be at a meeting where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was present. I asked him a question whether or not this would be the Bureau of the Budget recommendation, and the categorical answer was given: There will be no freeze on new starts. There will be high selectivity. Those projects that have a good benefit-to-cost ratio will qualify for initiation, as will also those projects where there is an emergency situation, such as we might be facing up in the North or the Northwest, with heavy rains, snow, et cetera; and there will undoubtedly be favorable consideration given—unquestionably, I should say—where those projects are underway where it would be uneconomical and unwise for the project to be stopped when it is halfway through. So I can only say to the gentleman that there is no truth to the statement that the administration is going to put an arbitrary freeze on such projects, as was indicated perhaps by the headlines this morning.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I hope we can rely on the statement the minority leader has made as being fairly to the point, because I recall last week he gave a statement to the press about the Democrats not having done anything about stopping the riots in our colleges and had not used the laws that were available to them. Then the next day the White House said, Well, the reason they had not used them was that no college had asked them to, and you cannot do it unless you ask them. So the gentleman sort of marched up the hill and got sort of pushed down. I hope in marching up the hill today he won't get pushed back down again.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The statement made by the White House was at least an affirmative statement to the effect that college presidents and university presidents ought to use the power which the Congress gave them to withhold the funds from those students who violate the law or other regulation. This was at least a White House backing up of any action that might be taken by authorities on the campuses where there is a violation of their rules and regulations. We never had that before under the previous administration.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. That is about the best "Alice in Wonderland" explanation that I have heard. Everybody who read that newspaper knows that the White House has been throwing this football back and forth. If you want to call what the President has stated an affirmative action, that is all right with me, but it is clear that it is the sort of statement designed to get him off the hook.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I hope that the selectivity on starts to which the minority leader referred will be a selectivity that recognizes the quality of a project, and the urgency of need for it, regardless of the congressional district involved.

TAX REFORM OVERDUE—TOTAL ABOLITION OF THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been an enormous amount of verbiage in recent weeks over tax reform. We hear sound. We observe fury. Great noises are heard. Huge clouds of verbal dust arise to the heavens. When all is said and done, we stand still in the same place. A time has come for plain talk.

Our tax system makes a slice of Swiss cheese look like solid concrete. It has ceased to be an equitable system of taxation. Further, a growing number of Americans are acutely aware of what is wrong and what must be done to rectify the situation. Many of these observant people reside in the 13th District of New York, and I have been hearing from them daily. They know all about millionaires and near-millionaires who pay no taxes whatsoever. They are aware of all the loopholes. From foundations, conglomerates and tax loss farming to capital gains, gifts and charitable deductions. From municipal industrial development bonds to real estate depreciation deductions. Yet none of these loopholes elicits more intelligent indignation than the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance.

Recent reports indicate that no significant attempt at closing this loophole is contemplated by the administration this year. Substantial tax relief for lower- and middle-income taxpayers is to be delayed, while the depletion loophole gushes streams of wealth for a few at the expense of the many. Yet it seems that the oil barons are untouchable. Why is this so? Why is their preserve sacred? Why should the oil barons be treated favorably at the expense of the entire Nation?

XUM

Why should scores of millions pay for the free ride they are taking? Particularly in light of their recent activities in areas of price hikes and pollution? Why, indeed?

Oil companies charge themselves higher prices for crude oil they control and produce. They then proceed to take a higher depletion allowance and raise gas and oil prices to every American citizen. Consumers are skinned from the ankles up and from the neck down.

The Congress of the United States gave the oil depletion allowance to the oil barons. What Congress gave, Congress may take back. This is exactly what it should do and can do—if it wishes. These oil barons constitute a fourth level of government, polluting our environment, maintaining artificially high prices, preventing cheaper oil from entering the Nation and generally doing everything with the Treasury but placing it on wheels and taking it away to their board rooms. I believe we can and should act to abolish the oil depletion allowance—all of it, totally, irrevocably, swiftly.

TEXAS RUBY RED GRAPEFRUIT

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding as though I am bragging, I must admit that the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas grows the finest grapefruit in the country. And without any fear of successful contradiction, I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the valley's Ruby Red grapefruit are without peer in the world.

So that everyone will know whereof I speak, I have arranged that these grapefruit be served all who eat lunch tomorrow in the House Restaurant in the Capitol. The grapefruit is being served through the courtesy of the Texas delegation in the Congress with the compliments of the TexaSweet Advisory Committee, Inc., of Pharr, Tex. This is the committee handling advertising under the citrus marketing order and represents all the citrus growers in the valley.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with a poem and "A Magic Menu" I sent the Members advising about tomorrow's treat:

TEXAS RUBY RED GRAPEFRUIT

On March 26 when your lunch you eat
The House Restaurants will serve a treat
Of grapefruit from Texas' Rio Grande Valley—
Around its zesty flavor rally.

The grapefruit diet's one sure slimmer,
It makes you trim, then a little trimmer,
So take note, joggers, calory misers—
It's Ruby Reds for appetizers.

This fruit, the finest in the nation,
Comes through the Texas delegation
From TexaSweet Citrus Advertising
Who knows you'll find it appetizing.

So gather around with a right good will
For a Texas treat without a bill!

TEXASWEET CITRUS ADVERTISING, INC., MAGIC MENU

I. Breakfast: ½ TexaSweet grapefruit or unsweetened grapefruit juice, 2 eggs, any style, 2 slices bacon, minimum (you may eat 12 eggs and 12 slices of bacon if you want to). Coffee or tea, no cream or sugar.

II. Lunch: ½ TexaSweet grapefruit, Meat, any style, any amount, Salad, as much as you can eat with any dressing that contains no sugar. Coffee or tea.

III. Dinner: ½ TexaSweet grapefruit, Meat, any style, any amount, with gravy provided it is not thickened with flour. Of course, you may substitute fish for meat. Any green, yellow or red vegetables; as much as you can eat, and salad above.

IV. Bedtime snack: Tomato juice or skimmed milk.

1. At each meal you must eat until you are full, until you cannot possibly eat more.
2. Don't eliminate anything; for example, don't skip bacon at breakfast or omit the salad at dinner. It is this combination of foods that burns up accumulated fat.
3. The TexaSweet grapefruit is important because it acts as a catalyst that starts the fat burning process.
4. Cut down on coffee. It is thought to affect the insulin balance that hinders the burning process. Try to limit yourself to one cup at each meal.
5. No eating between meals! If you can eat the combination of foods suggested until you are stuffed you won't be hungry between meals.
6. Note that this list completely eliminates sugars and starches which form lipoids and lipoids are what form fat. Fat does not form fat; it helps burn it up. You can fry your eggs in butter and use butter generously on your vegetables.
7. Note that with this "magic menu" you can eat what your family eats with the exception of desserts, breads, and white vegetables. While your family eats these, you may have a double or triple helping of meat, salad, or vegetables. Eat until you are stuffed and then force yourself to eat some more . . . the more you can eat of the proper combination the more you lose.
8. You can lose 10 pounds in 10 days. There will be no weight loss the first four days, but you will suddenly drop 5 pounds on the 5th day. Thereafter, you lose 1 pound a day until the 10th day. Then you will lose 1½ pounds every 2 days until you get down to the proper weight.
9. Check with your family doctor.

THE MIAMI TEENAGE RALLY FOR DECENCY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon in Miami my wife and I attended an event which I think is of national, if not worldwide, significance. There, 30,000 teenagers gathered in our Orange Bowl to proclaim to the country and to the world their belief in God and in their country and their support of the cause of decency in this country.

This is the program which they announced on that occasion; the Miami Teenage Rally for Decency.

This is what we stand for:

1. Belief in God and that He loves us.
2. Love of our planet and country—Patriotism.
3. Love of family.
4. Reverence for one's sexuality.
5. Equality of all men.

It was an inspiration to have been privileged to be present and observe this great thoroughly peaceful but exciting outpouring of our young people. I hope this gigantic rally of youth will be followed throughout the country, and I hope, the world, to restore the faith of people everywhere that the youth of this generation is basically wholesome and sound and truly dedicated to the love of God, love of country and the principles of human rights and decency.

The greatest credit should go to a fine young man who is a senior at Miami Springs High School and lives at Hialeah in my district, Mike Levesque, 17 years old, for being the one to conceive and principally to organize this momentous rally. Another having much to do with the success of the rally was Father Sullivan, a dynamic young Irish priest. Others who had a great part were Father Briggs, Rabbi Lehrman, Bishop Duncan and many other spiritual leaders of the Greater Miami area who gave most meaningful support to the movement. Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant and Ted Mack and many name bands and entertainers thrilled the thousands of eager young people present with their participation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following newspaper articles which tell of the rally.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1969]

TEEN-AGE DECENCY RALLY DRAWS 30,000 IN MIAMI

MIAMI, March 23.—Some 30,000 hand-clapping persons, some waving signs saying "Down With Obscenity," rallied in the Orange Bowl today to support a teen-age crusade for decency in entertainment.

Teen-agers organized the rally after Jim Morrison, 24 years old, the lead singer of The Doors, a rock group, was charged with indecent exposure during a concert in Miami on March 1. Six warrants have been issued for Mr. Morrison's arrest.

Mike Levesque, 17, the originator of the rally, a senior at Miami Springs High School, said the idea had grown out of a Roman Catholic youth group discussion two days after the concert by The Doors.

"This is not a protest rally," said Julie James, 18, a member of the teen-age Rally for Decency. "We're not against something. We're for something."

TALKS ON GOD AND SEX

Teen-age speakers gave three-minute talks on God, parents, patriotism, sexuality and brotherhood. There were appearances by professional entertainers, who donated their time.

"Five virtues," selected as the keynote of the rally, were "belief in God and that He loves us; love of our planet and country; love of our family; reverence of one's sexuality, and equality of all men."

"Sex is definitely being exploited and it is because society has been losing its reverence for one's sexuality," Miss James said.

The shirt-sleeved crowd basking in a warm sun cheered for Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant and The Lettermen, popular music singers, who appeared in order to applaud the teenage rally.

"I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps around the world," Mr. Gleason said.

"I think it's great, there should be more things like that," said Tony Butala of The Lettermen.

Young Levesque said he was thrilled by the rapid growth of the decency movement and the support it had gained from adults.

The crowd was about evenly split between teen-agers and adults.

Another member of the executive committee, Alan Rosenthal, 16, said telephone calls and letters had come in from around the country from teenage groups interested in the movement.

He said: "We're going to try to come up with some kind of international youth or-

XUM

ganization. It could really tie the world together.

"The youths start out with something like this, and 10 years from now when they get a little older, who knows what could happen."

Numerous organizations, including major religious denominations, contributed to the rally. Members of the American Legion passed out 10,000 small American flags.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1969]

ABOUT 30,000 RALLY FOR DECENCY

(By John Van Gieson)

MIAMI, March 23.—About 30,000 handclapping people, some waving signs saying "Down With Obscenity," rallied in the Orange Bowl today to support a teenagers' crusade for decency in entertainment.

Teen-agers organized the rally after Jim Morrison, lead singer of The Doors, was charged with indecent exposure during a Miami concert on March 1. Six warrants have been issued for Morrison's arrest.

"This is not a protest rally," said Julie James, 18, a member of the Rally for Decency executive committee. "We're not against something. We're for something."

Teen-age speakers gave three-minute talks on God, parents, patriotism, sexuality and brotherhood, sandwiched between appearances by professional entertainers who donated their services.

"Five virtues" selected as the keynote of the rally were: "Belief in God and that He loves us; love of our planet and country; love of our family; reverence of one's sexuality, and equality of all men."

The shirt-sleeved crowd basking in a warm sun cheered for entertainers such as Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant and The Lettermen, who appeared in order to applaud the teens' rally.

"I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps around the world," Gleason said.

"I think it's great; there should be more things like that," said Tony Butala of The Lettermen.

The originator of the rally, Mike Levesque, 17, a senior at Miami Springs High School, said the idea grew out of a Catholic youth group discussion two days after the controversial Doors concert.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1969]

SOME 30,000 LAUNCH TEEN-AGER CRUSADE FOR DECENCY

MIAMI.—Some 30,000 handclapping people, some waving signs saying "Down With Obscenity," rallied in the Orange Bowl yesterday to support a teen-agers' cruade for decency in entertainment.

Teen-agers organized the rally after Jim Morrison, lead singer of The Doors, was charged with indecent exposure during a Miami concert on March 1. Six warrants have been issued for Morrison's arrest.

"This is not a protest rally," said Julie James, 18, a member of the teen-age Rally for Decency executive committee. "We're not against something. We're for something."

Teen-age speakers gave three-minute talks on God, parents, patriotism, sexuality and brotherhood, sandwiched between appearances by professional entertainers who donated their services.

"Five virtues" selected as the keynote of the rally were: "belief in God and that He loves us; love of our planet and country; love of our family; reverence of one's sexuality, and equality of all men."

"Sex is definitely being exploited and it is because society has been losing its reverence for one's sexuality," Miss James said.

The shirt-sleeved crowd basking in a warm sun cheered for entertainers such as Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant and The Lettermen who appeared in order to applaud the teens' rally.

The originator of the rally, Mike Levesque, 17, a senior at Miami Springs High School, said the idea grew out of a Catholic youth group discussion two days after the controversial Doors concert.

The crowd was about evenly split between teen-agers and adults.

Another member of the executive committee, Alan Rosenthal, 16, said telephone calls and letters poured in from around the country from teen-age groups interested in the movement.

DECENCY RALLY RATTLES ORANGE BOWL TO RAFTERS

(By Jean Wardlow)

Roaring "rock" and cheering teenagers shook Miami's Orange Bowl stadium to its cantilevered roof and rattled it down to its locker room doors Sunday as a crowd of 30,000 "stood up to be counted" at the Miami Teenage Rally for Decency.

"I want to tell you," said The Great One, Jackie Gleason, to the cheering teens rallying for "decency" in all areas of life, "that up to now I've told people I'm happy to be a Floridian.

"But now, after what you kids are doing, I want to say I'm proud to be a Floridian."

Most of the crowd, which began arriving about 1 p.m. for the pre-show was teens. They came in groups or on their own, some displaying hand-lettered signs, "Down With Obscenity," "Mater Center Backs You" and "St. John Bosco Youth Movement Supports You."

There were kids in jeans, kids in sneakers. Kids in minis and Sunday best. Kids in sports shirts and flare pants and kids in tie and jacket. Negro kids, white kids, a few with beards, a few with beads; short kids, tall kids—all clapping in time to the music of some top stars whom they'd seen on TV, heard on records and who were appearing at their rally for free because they believed "in our cause."

Sleepy-eyed Ronnie Smith of The Lettermen was clutching his breakfast-lunch—part of a hot dog and a coke—because the pop singing group had driven all night without sleep after a Saturday night concert in Jacksonville to take part here.

"We wanted to take part to bring back the good will entertainment groups should have and which was lost to some extent by what happened (with The Doors' performance here)," Smith said. Jewish groups, civic and community leaders from all faiths and political areas of Dade.

"It won't stop here," one of the rally's teens said. "This shows we are in the majority. The kids are with us."

(It is estimated that the countywide total of Dade's teenagers is 70,000.)

Father Briggs said the rally "will probably evolve into a countywide group. Gleason, who had been driven in in a 1911 touring car (all celebrities arrived by these special cars) had said, "I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps even around the world."

Miami Dolphin football star Bob Griese, standing on the sidelines after his appearance, said, looking out at the cheering stadium, "You hear so much on TV programs about the bad teenagers. They're not in the majority at all, and this shows what the fine teenagers are really like, I think it's been a privilege to take part in this."

From the time the youngsters first entered the stadium, the boom of electrified sound shook their eardrums. At first, sitting in seats higher up, many later moved down to sit on the wall in front of box seats to be closer to the action—performers playing from the huge stage at the east end of the field.

The youngsters clapped, waved small U.S. flags given out by the American Legion, or kicked their heels in time to the music.

It was an enthusiastic crowd—"we've had to give out a couple of dozen aspirin—too much excitement," said a nurse at one of the stadium's four emergency nursing stations. But it was an orderly crowd throughout the long program.

At first scheduled for two hours—two and a half with the pre-show—it went to nearly four hours long, with more crowd remaining at the end than at major football games in the stadium.

"This is great. Just great," said a happy Mike Levesque, one of the originators of the rally and who, one friend said, "is so tired he can hardly stand up by now. He says it will be relaxing to just go back to school now."

Mike was presented with a special book from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge during the program. Singer Anita Bryant made the presentation.

The singer, obviously moved by the event, told the audience, "I had a speech prepared, but now that I see the reaction of what can happen when our young people stand up for what they believe in God and our country, it makes me at a loss for words."

Ted Mack told them, "These young people are out to show the world it isn't about to fall apart."

From the first electrified twang of The Shufflin' Kind, the CYO groups and The Rainbeaux in the pre-show, the crowd was "with" the entertainers, and the five teenage speakers who alternated between acts of the regular rally program.

And the acts showed the kids can be modern without being square or obscene.

First, to wild cheers, came the red-jacketed The Letterman ("Up, Up and Away") and then, to more wild cheers, The Village Stompers in modern Dixieland fashion whose "Washington Square" was a top hit.

There were the lavender mini-ed and rose-colored Edward-jacketed The Faculty, which brought cheering like somebody had just made a touchdown, and The Rhodes Brothers—"the Rhodes," the kids called them—whose nationwide recording of "Never My Love" was a best seller, had a whole stadium singing along ("don't be bashful, chillun, 'cause that's not where it's at.").

The acts were hip, hep and high-powered. "It's to show what we like is modern, but modern doesn't have to be obscene," said a rally teen.

By the time the big-act Impact of Brass and Sing Out America had finished their "thing" the teens had surrounded them with requests for autographs and had enough musical memories to fill a recorded scrapbook.

In between, the basic ideals of what the rally stood for on topics of God, patriotism, family, sex, and equality of man, were expressed by Joe Burke, Columbus High; Alan Rosenthal, Miami High; Pat Idlette, Miami High; Juliet James, Westminster Christian; and Mike Levesque.

"The power of Love is found in all people and makes us all brothers," said Joe Burke. "It's up to us to use our power of democracy," said Alan Rosenthal. "We do not seek to overcome; we seek to unify."

"Sex is being exploited," said Julie James. "We can be both modern and modest. Sex is not a plaything," she said. "It is not giving up the body without giving up a commitment of the total self."

And Mike said that each man "must realize for himself that he cannot just sit back and let the world go by him. He must be a part of the world."

And as the last amplified guitar string faded out over the goalpost, the Rev. Ted Place—the offstage emcee and executive director of the Greater Miami Youth for Christ—lauded the teens "who had the courage and concern to stand here and be counted."

"SHOULD DO THIS EVERY 6 MONTHS"

(By Larry Mahoney)

Plain old-fashioned Americanism, tinged with a touch of rock, reigned in the Orange

Bowl on a euphoric Sunday afternoon dedicated to decency.

This is the way it was:

Legionnaires, whose own wars ended long ago, pass out 20,000 pocket-sized versions of the Stars and Stripes. The Rhodes Brothers give booming renditions of "The Green Berets" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." The Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge presents an award for "moral courage."

Jackie Gleason in an antique 1911 White touring car. Anita Bryant in a 1931 Model T. Ted Mack quoting Patrick Henry. Congressman Claude Pepper, newest member of the old House Un-American Activities Committee, standing at attention for The Star Spangled Banner, a Legion flag over his heart. Near him is Father Sean O'Sullivan, the young priest from County Cork who inspired the rally.

Mayor Chuck Hall, a flag in his breast pocket, likes the scene. "I think we should do it every six months," his honor said. "This is magnificent; isn't it?"

Watching the crowd are 60 off-duty Miami policemen, double the number who staffed the famous exhibition of The Doors at Dinner Key March 1. After the rally was done, Sgt. Ronnie Reeder goes before national network TV cameras to say: "This is the best Orange Bowl crowd I've ever seen; absolutely no hoodlums around. We weren't needed. The officers have decided to donate their day's pay to the rally." That comes to about $20 from each patrolman, $25 for the sergeants.

A sign: "Stay Clean—Swim! the Coral Park High Swim Team."

A Salvation Army banner flutters in the breeze on the other side of the stadium. Some 200 children, largely subteens, are recruited from the stands to march afield with The Miami Herald's giant American flags.

Moral rearmament is represented by Miami's "Up With People" singers, who sang all the old ones such as "Which Way America?" and "The Nicest People I Know Are People."

Hank Meyer, the publicist, beams as Jackie Gleason puts in a plug for Florida before the national TV cameras. Anita Bryant draws an ovation when she mentions her twins: "And they're heavyweights, by the way . . . six pounds, 10½ ounces, and six pounds, three ounces."

Mrs. Annie King James—"just say I'm past 80"—is wearing a feathered hat and a handknit sweater with the U.S. flag on one side and "G.O.P." on the other. She was carried into the stadium aboard her special chair.

"Wouldn't have missed it," she said. "I'm interested in better government and what these kids are doing."

Outside, a few pickets parade with signs bearing messages like this: "Jesus Is Coming. This Is The Last Generation." Ken Russell, 17, of Fort Lauderdale, explains: "We're a group of former hippies and drug addicts who're going all the way for Christ." Ken's hair is still long enough to draw unfriendly looks from a squad of policemen.

Inside, Father O'Sullivan, the cherubic Irish priest, is smiling. "The teenagers," he said, "now realize that solidarity is their strength. They will strike when the iron is hot . . ."

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **PEPPER**. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this meeting in Miami to the attention of the House. I concur with the approach of these youngsters to this matter of demonstrating their faith in God and respect for the law as they have expressed it.

It is unfortunate indeed that the headlines and the TV film always seem to go to the relatively small clique bent on destroying our country. It is a pleasure, for once, to see these young men and women making headlines. More attention should be given to them and I am glad my colleague from Florida has brought this material to our attention.

WELCOME TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **PICKLE**. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Broadcasters are in town again. We welcome them, for they are a great group of editors, advertisers, salesmen, programers, and newscasters. As a former broadcaster myself, I think I know something about their dedication to the public service, and their pursuit of the American dollar, both admirable aims.

We are all agreed, I take it, that freedom of speech should be zealously protected. Every Member of this body is equally dedicated to that most fundamental right given to us in the first amendment.

But freedom of speech does not give the network broadcasters immunity from all kinds of broadcasting, whether that be newscasts, programing, or even advertising. The network broadcaster has a public duty to be fair and accurate, to be objective, and to present a balanced program in the public interest.

Freedom of speech does not mean that broadcasters are above the law or that they cannot be touched by any rule or regulation in the public interest.

There is considerable discussion going on these days about the matter of violence on television and radio, about prescreening of programs, and whether some rules and regulations over networks should be passed by the Congress. I do not subscribe to the prescreening or preprograming or censorship of programs or news, although at times we do wonder if complete freedom is always responsibly performed.

If the prescreening is done voluntarily by the industry's association, perhaps that is well and good. I am willing to let the facts of the program stand on their own merits.

Yet we should remember that our Government grants these public licenses to individual stations and the Government has the right to be sure that programs and newscasts and advertisements of networks are fair and balanced and objective. The networks are now the sole judge and jury—outside of public reaction—of their own newscast; or of programs, which they generally own as their private property. They do not have to obtain a license, and they are under no direct rule or regulation. While it must be proudly admitted that they perform a marvelous service, still we should caution the networks that they too could be required to operate within rules prescribed by their government.

Let us all join in and wave the flag of free speech, but while we are at it, let us remind the networks that someone in our free government has the right to determine if networks abide by reasonable rules, even as their affiliate stations are held accountable to the fairness doctrine.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT IN MICRONESIA

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Speaker, in these times our Nation is so beset by controversy—the Vietnam war, the ABM debate, the Middle East crisis—that crises-in-the-making do not get the attention they deserve.

Today I wish to pinpoint one problem area which tomorrow may flare to emergency proportions. It is the status of the U.S. Trust Territories of the Pacific, more commonly known as Micronesia.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out for the United States in Micronesia.

How many Americans realize that the Congress of Micronesia has passed a resolution and sent it to the United Nations condemning U.S. stewardship in the islands and asking that the international body reconsider its legal and political status?

How many Americans know that the Marianas Islands District Legislature has called on the Soviet Union to aid the people of the Trust Territories?

How many Americans are concerned over a resolution that has been introduced into the Congress of Micronesia asking the Soviet Union to present its form of government to the people of the region, since the form they know—American democracy—has semed to fail them?

Certainly, all these resolutions were intended to shock the United States into taking definite action on the status of the Pacific islands, as our Nation promised when we took over their administration after World War II.

But just as surely, in the absence of U.S. action, the people of this strategically vital area will grow more disillusioned with the United States and our system.

We have seen the problems which the actions of Anguilla have caused the United Kingdom.

Yet the very same difficulties may be in store for our Nation unless speedy action is taken to fulfill the pledges we have made to the people of Micronesia.

Last Congress I introduced a bill to establish a Commission To Study the Future of the Trust Territories. Today events appear to have outrun that kind of solution.

Very soon our Government must make a concrete proposal for allowing the people of Micronesia to exercise a right sacred to Americans—the right of self-determination.

We have educated these people. We have helped to give them a sense of identity as Micronesians. We have aided them in establishing democratic institutions patterned after our own.

Now the people of that area are demanding to be heard. They wish to be released from the political limbo in which

XUM

they now find themselves. If given a choice, I have no doubt that the great majority of Micronesians will choose close association with the United States.

The people of the Marianas—who now ask for Soviet aid—again and again have petitioned for American citizenship.

But will they still wish such association on some distant—or not-so-distant—tomorrow? Because of the great importance of these islands to America's strategic position in the Pacific, it is a question of great moment.

Action is required now, Mr. Speaker. I urge the Administration to heal this breach between the Micronesian and American peoples now by taking the necessary steps to find a political accommodation acceptable to both parties.

Mr. Speaker, in order to further acquaint my colleagues with the situation, I am including at this point in the RECORD the text of the resolution passed by the Congress of Micronesia asking the United Nations to reconsider Micronesia's political and legal status. Also included is an article from the Honolulu Advertiser of March 12 on the call for Russian help by the Marianas District Legislature and an article from the March 10 Honolulu Star-Bulletin on other recent developments in the Trust Territories.

The resolution and articles follow:

S. RES. 18

A Senate resolution requesting the United Nations to reconsider the legal and political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Whereas, on April 2, 1947, the United Nations Security Council by unanimous vote, and on July 18, 1947, the United States Senate did approve a Trusteeship Agreement between the United States and the United Nations regarding the administration of the islands, exclusive of Guam, known collectively as Micronesia; and

Whereas, by the acceptance of this Agreement, the United States bound itself to act in accordance with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, the International Trusteeship System, and the Trusteeship Agreement itself; and

Whereas, the said Charter, System, and Agreement demanded of the United States, and of all other signees, certain obligations, which the United States did freely and of its own accord, take upon itself in regard to the islands of Micronesia, hereinafter referred to as the Trust Territory; and

Whereas, under the Trusteeship Agreement the United States undertook to "foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory" and to "promote the development of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government or independence," according to the "freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," and, to these ends, to give the inhabitants a progressively increasing share in the administrative services of the Trust Territory, to develop their participation in government, and to give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants; and

Whereas, under the said Agreement, the United States undertook to "promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants," and, to this end, to regulate the use of natural resources, to encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industry, to improve transportation and communication facilities, and to protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and

Whereas, under the said Agreement, the United States undertook to "promote the social advancement of the inhabitants," and to this end, to protect the rights and fundamental freedoms of the inhabitants without discrimination, to protect the health of the inhabitants, to control the traffic in arms and ammunition, dangerous drugs, and alcoholic beverages, and to protect the inhabitants against other social abuses; and

Whereas, under the said Agreement, the United States undertook to "promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants," and, to this end, to establish a general system of elementary education, to facilitate the vocational and cultural advancement of the population; and to encourage qualified students to pursue higher education, including professional education; and

Whereas, the International Trusteeship System (Article 73 of the United Nations Charter) requires the United States to "promote to the utmost" the well-being of the inhabitants; and

Whereas, the Trusteeship System (Article 76a of the Charter) requires the administration of the Trust Territory in such a way as to further international peace and security; and

Whereas, the Trusteeship System (Article 76c) requires administration in such a way as to "encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the inter-dependence of the peoples of the world; and

Whereas, the Trusteeship System (Article 76d) requires the administering authority (the United States, in this case) to "ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals;" and

Whereas, the United States has attempted to transplant in the Trust Territory a system of government far too closely resembling its own to be relevant to the actual political conditions of Micronesia; and

Whereas, the United States, in considering political alternatives for the Trust Territory, has consistently refused to discuss seriously the possibilities of independence or alliance with a country other than the United States, apparently taking for granted a continued association with itself, whether the Micronesian peoples desire this or not; and

Whereas, the United States has, for over twenty years, deferred any program of political education for the inhabitants; and

Whereas, the number of Micronesians in policy-making positions in the administration is, after twenty-one years, distressingly small; and

Whereas, regardless of the "practical necessity" of such action, so many Congress of Micronesia bills are vetoed annually as to constitute a major thwarting of the will of the inhabitants, bringing to naught their already limited participation in government; and

Whereas, the Micronesian people have no voice in the selection of members of the judiciary branch, of the High Commissioner or even of district administrators; and

Whereas, the district and territorial administrative systems impose upon the Micronesian peoples a system of government totally alien to their respective cultures; and

Whereas, to date there has been no significant development of either fisheries or industries in the Trust Territory; and

Whereas, the people of Kwajalein were forced to surrender on ninety-nine year lease approximately seven hundred fifty acres of land in return for seven hundred fifty thousand dollars, or about ten dollar per acre per year in an area where land is scarce and therefore precious beyond the comprehension of outsiders; and

Whereas, the islands of Roi-Namur in Kwajalein Atoll were expropriated without compensation; and

Whereas, the people of Eniwetok and Bikini, surrendered their land for a nominal cash fee plus a larger amount held in trust, from which the people in question are permitted to receive only the interest of a few dollars per person per year; and

Whereas, this trust fund was granted with the provision that it could be invested only in United States Government securities, meaning that, with inflation, the United States Government got the use of Eniwetok and Bikini for almost no cost to itself, and at the cost of great hardship and suffering to the former residents of those atolls; and

Whereas, the atolls of Eniwetok and Bikini were used for the detonation of several series of nuclear and thermonuclear test explosions, all with disastrous results to the atolls themselves and to the animal and plant life, both land and marine; and

Whereas, the Micronesian people do not believe that such explosions are consistent with the maintenance of international peace and security; and

Whereas, communication remains, for the most part, slow and inadequate; and

Whereas, firearms and ammunition are freely available in most areas to those who can afford them; and

Whereas, liquor control laws are inadequately enforced; and

Whereas, Micronesians suffer from discriminatory wage scales which permit an indigenous District Administrator to earn less than an American contract high school teacher, strictly on the basis of his national origin; and

Whereas, most Micronesians still live in inadequate housing, and, even in the district centers, without electricity, running water, or adequate sanitation; and

Whereas, on the islands of Kwajalein Atoll, the most rigid form of segregation is practiced, in which Micronesians are not permitted to live on the same islands as Americans, to shop in Global Associates' stores, or even to take home with them anything of any value which Americans might freely give them; and

Whereas, some district hospitals remain inadequately and/or incompetently staffed; and

Whereas, provisions for the health of Micronesians generally are so bad as to render the population sighly susceptible to periodic epidemics of hepatitis, measles, and other diseases; and

Whereas, while there is a general system of elementary education within the meaning of the Agreement, it is, in many areas, inadequately or incompetently staffed, and poorly supplied; and

Whereas, the system of secondary education, such as it is, is a very recent innovation in the Trust Territory, and in many areas still lacks even basic curriculum planning; and

Whereas, excepting a handful of Micronesian doctors, the vocational advancement of the populace has not been advanced at all; and

Whereas, far from promoting cultural advancement of Micronesians, the administering authority has managed to downgrade and even virtually destroy the native culture in certain areas, replacing it with low-grade American mass culture; and

Whereas, it is difficult to see how the pursuit of higher education has been greatly encouraged by the veto of a two hundred thousand dollar scholarship bill; and

Whereas, there is no professional or college-level training institution in the Trust Territory after twenty-one years of United States administration; and

Whereas, the equal treatment which all other members of the United Nations and their nationals receive has been the systematic prohibition of entry into the Trust Territory; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Third Congress of Micronesia, First Regular Session, 1969, that the manifestly unequal treatment which the Micronesian peoples receive even in their own homelands is positively destructive of the respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms which the United States under Article 76c of the United Nations Charter, is required to promote; and

Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the Senate, Congress of Micronesia, that no reasonable man could maintain that the United States has acted to "promote to the utmost" the well-being of the inhabitants, as it is required to do under Article 73 of the United Nations Charter; and

Be it further resolved that the Senate, Congress of Micronesia, hereby respectfully petitions the United Nations Trusteeship Council to commission a thorough investigation into the performance or non-performance of the United States Government in the fulfillment of its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement; and

Be it further resolved that the Senate, Congress of Micronesia, hereby respectfully petitions the United Nations Security Council, under Article 83 of the Charter, to review the entire basis for continuation of the United States' presence in Micronesia, with a view to revision or abolition of the Trusteeship Agreement, as may be necessary to promote to the utmost the well-being of Micronesians; and

Be it further resolved that, failing action by the Security Council, the United Nations General Assembly, under Articles 10, 12, 13, 14 and 16 of the United Nations Charter, is hereby petitioned to review the performance of the United States, as above; and

Be it further resolved that, upon the passage by the Senate, Congress of Micronesia, copies of this Resolution shall be sent to all interested persons and agencies including but not limited to the Secretary General of the United Nations, all member delegations of the Security Council of the United Nations, all Chairmen of all delegations to the United Nations, the President of the United States, all members of the United States Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, members of the United States Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, the Secretary of the Interior and the High Commissioner.

Adopted January 27, 1969.

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Congress of Micronesia, Third Congress, First Regular Session in January, 1969.

AMATA KABUA,
President of the Senate.
VICTORIO UHERBELAU,
Clerk of the Senate.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Mar. 12, 1969]

MARIANAS PASS SHOCK RESOLUTION

AGANA, GUAM.—The Mariana Islands District Legislature has called on the Soviet Union to aid the people of the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific, according to the Micronesian News Agency.

The shock resolution was passed on Saipan in the last week of February in an effort to stimulate more U.S. interest in the Trust Territory.

The resolution said the Marianas people have been "disappointed again and again" when seeking help from the United States for political and economic development.

The legislature appropriated $6,000 to send a three-man delegation to the United Nations Trusteeship Council's meeting in May.

The resolution said the Soviet representative to the U.N. Security Council should be asked to approach his government with a request for aid for the Marianas.

The Mariana Islands are part of a U.N. trust administered by the United States.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Star-Bulletin, Mar. 10, 1969]

UNITED STATES PUT MICRONESIA ON PATH OF DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science at the University of Hawaii, takes exception with detractors of the United States Administration of the Pacific Trust Territories.

"We are facing today what we ourselves developed," said Meller, Friday, closing a day and a half seminar on Doing Business in Micronesia, held at the Ilikai Hotel by the Hawaii International Services Agency.

To the more than 50 Hawaiian businessmen Meller said, "The U.S. has favored one pattern consistently in the poltical development of Micronesia."

Starting on the municipal level, the American administrators have put the Micronesians on a "path of development" that led to the establishment of the Congress of Micronesia in 1965.

To those who felt the Trust Government moved too slowly, Meller said, it was understandable because "the High Commissioner is accountable to the White House, the Department of Interior, chairmen of the Senate and House Finance and Subject Committees, and to the United Nations . . . seven authorities."

Meller feels there are three alternatives in the political future of Micronesia.

The commonwealth status, he said, is improbable because "not one of 11 trusteeships has become an entity of the administering state."

"Many detractors say Micronesia cannot become independent because it is not economically viable," said Meller, countering, "Micronesians have the advantage of land which the U.S. will need someday for bases."

Meller said another anti-independence argument is "Micronesia is an artificial grouping of six different cultures and an historical happenstance."

However, Meller said, "When people believe it exists, it does. They are developing that historical myth."

The third possibility is the maintenance of Micronesia by another state other than the United States, and possibly by the United Nations, Meller said.

Answering a question posed by a member of the audience, Meller said, "There is a possibility of a political or economic relationship of Micronesia and Japan, and it would be a good tie."

Hampering such a relationship, Meller felt, would be the differences in the political and monetary systems.

"And, Japanese has not been taught in the schools for 25 years," he said, adding, "The chances are they will be associated rather than interrelated."

A member of the audience asked of the possibility of a Hawaii-Micronesia tie.

Meller answered, "This is an absurdity, but despite the absurdity expanding Hawaii's state borders seems to be a most agreeable approach.

"But whether the Guamanians, Americans, Samoans or Micronesians would agree is another thing."

Seminar planners had scheduled a military representative to speak.

Moderator Donald Wolbrink, however, read a letter from Adm. John McCain, Jr., Pacific Commander-in-Chief, who said the military could not provide any "assessments" or participate in "speculative or theoretical discussions" regarding the military's presence in the vast Pacific area.

A member of the audience asked how the Micronesians viewed the American military posture and presence to which Rep. Polycarp Basilius, member of the Congress of Micronesia answered.

He said, "The question is very touchy. It doesn't matter whether you like it, it's there."

Speaking of his home district, Basilius said, "In Palau where we are frustrated with the TT (Trust Territory) government, we accept the military because we think they can help us build roads.

"On Saipan, the legislature has asked that the military operation of Okinawa be moved to Saipan.

"In the Marshalls, they complain that the Army and Coast Guard are taking land and they are unhappy. At Ponape, they welcome the military."

George Ngirarsaol, president of his own firm at Koror and a member of the panel, said, "We prefer the military to help develop our economy, but I'm afraid the military might change the identity of the Micronesians because the military has its own way of running business."

Ngirarsaol conceded, "But whether we like it or not, if they come, they come."

Another panelist Joseph Kramer, who is associated with Acme Importers at Majuro, said, "The military has affected the Marshalls the most in Micronesia, and the feeling there is one of fear of the military."

The appropriation of land "without equitable payment" is the major objection of the Marshallese to the American military, Kramer said.

Francisco Uludong, a journalism and political science major at the University of Hawaii, spoke of "Micronesia for the Micronesians."

Uludong dispensed with his assigned topic "Asia's Role in Micronesia" with "We know the Japanese exist and they are good competition for you (Americans).

"I am just waiting until such time that the competition can be played off!"

Uludong said, "December 7, 1941 was an end and a beginning. It was the end of Micronesia for the outsiders, and the beginning of Micronesia for the Micronesians."

"I don't think the Americans intended the changes we are witnessing there, but the emergence of nationalism which runs counter to the American presence is sometimes subject to the whims of the American government."

"America has succeeded in fostering an outspoken generation. My generation is dissatisfied with the American maintenance of the (Trusteeship) agreement."

Uludong added this final plea to the Hawaiian businessmen, "I hope you are morally responsible to help us gain independence and respect Micronesia for ourselves."

Moderator Donald Wolbrink ended the seminar with a talk on long range planning for Micronesia, stressing the importance of involving the people in planning physical facilities they will be using.

SAFEGUARD—THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the ABM controversy, we should remember that ABM are initials for anti-ballistic missiles. Ballistic missiles are nuclear bombs which can be launched from China or Russia to any place in the United States. A single missile can obliterate New York or San Francisco. The Russians have at least several hundred aimed at the United States. China is trying to develop nuclear missiles. We have missiles, but we are committed not to launch until after an enemy attacks us with nuclear missiles. Our defense policy is "nuclear deterrent," a system of missiles—the Minuteman, now—which can achieve a "second strike" with sufficient

XUM

power to inflict certain unacceptable damage upon any would-be attacker. An attack could kill and devastate most of our country and possibly knock out our Minutemen. In such event, we "have had it."

I wish there were no international marauders. Maybe that great and wonderful day will come—but it is not here yet. The Communists are committed to overrun us.

The first responsibility of the Federal Government is our common defense. The sole purpose of our anti-ballistic-missile system is to protect our lives, facilities, and our defenses. The more sophisticated and numerous the ballistic missile system of our enemies, the more sophisticated and effective our defenses must be. Any defense is costly; but the alternative of destruction and submission to communism is unthinkable.

Cost is the major factor, right after security. Our best technocracy has been applied.

Antiballistic missiles opponents include some who prefer that we have no defenses—some of these want the Communists to take us over, preferring their society; some believe the Communists would not subdue us even if we declined to resist and had no defenses. Some believe the present ABM system will not function—we can land on the moon, but we cannot intercept a missile or a bunch of them. Some think our effective system would be provocative—cause the Communists to accelerate the missile race. Some think it will cost too much—and we cannot afford to defend ourselves if it costs too much. Some oppose for a combination of these reasons.

I believe President Nixon's Safeguard ABM proposal is the best course now. It provides some defense for our basic second strike missile system; at minimal cost; with a chance to continue research and development; room for bargaining for arms controls; flexibility to cope with developing international threats; but very little protection for our people. A simple defense against nuclear missiles aimed at us cannot be as provocative as building offensive weapons. We can only pray that we will not be attacked before we are better defended.

Few will deny that our earlier perfection of the atomic bomb permitted us to survive World War II. Until world order and justice is achieved by the rule of law, we have a duty to provide for the common defense by the most advanced means known. As present, the Safeguard ABM is an integral part of our national defense.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 51st anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. It is very fitting that the Congress of the United States devote time to commend the Byelorussian people and to remind the world that Byelorussia and its people will continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government.

The Byelorussians, who had lived under the czars for several centuries, had their own sovereign and independent state before the birth of the Russian Empire. During the period of foreign rule over their country they carefully guarded many of their national traditions, and had been looking forward to the opportunity to assert their freedom. They therefore seized upon the welcome chance provided by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Then they formed their own democratic government in their capital city Minsk and began to rebuild their war-torn country. A National Constitution was put in force guaranteeing freedom of speech and assembly, liberty of conscience, inviolability of person and home, and equality of all citizens under law. The new Government made significant advances in education, culture, and social welfare. It obtained recognition from a number of countries.

Unfortunately the Byelorussians were not to enjoy their richly deserved freedom for very long. In December 1918 the Red army overran Byelorussia and annexed it to the Soviet Union. Today, let us therefore express our fervent hope that the day may not be too far in the future when the March 25 anniversary of Byelorussian independence may again be celebrated in a Byelorussian nation enjoying the blessings of freedom and liberty.

PROPOSAL TO EXCLUDE POW'S FROM TAXATION

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the moment there are 333 known American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and almost a thousand other Americans listed as missing in action. Although these figures seem small compared with the staggering casualties of the war, we must not overlook the hardships these Americans are forced to endure in Communist captivity. Also, we must not forget the mental anguish suffered by their wives and families as they anxiously await the safe return of loved ones.

Last fall, I had the opportunity to meet with a group of POW wives who reside in my district of San Diego, Calif. Although our Government is doing everythink possible within the bounds of existing laws to assist these families, certain inadequacies in these laws do exist and should be corrected. I am today introducing a package of three bills aimed at correcting these inadequacies.

In 1967, Congress approved a measure allowing prisoners of war and servicemen in a missing status to participate in the uniformed services savings deposit program which provides 10 percent interest on savings up to $10,000. What Congress failed to recognize, in approving this bill, however, is that the American prisoner in Southeast Asia has no control whatsoever over his return from overseas. Thus, an American who is held captive for several years would accumulate deposits considerably more than $10,000—even after the necessary allotments for his dependents were deducted from his pay. One of the bills I am introducing would remove the $10,000 limit on deposits for any member of the uniformed services who is a prisoner of war, missing in action or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict.

Another inequitable situation exists with respect to prisoners of war. A good number of these men are enlisted servicemen with relatively low pay, and it is their dependents who suffer the most financially during their absence. Part of the economic hardship results from the fact that there is no man around the house to perform routine maintenance chores. The armed services have recognized this problem to some extent by providing a $30-a-month family separation allowance to servicemen, E–4 and above, whenever the servicemen's duties require him to be away from the home for more than 30 days—provided that his family does not live in military housing.

A second bill I am introducing would remove these restrictions. In other words, all prisoners of war and servicemen in a missing status—regardless of whether their families live in military housing or whether they are E–4 or above—would be entitled to the family separation allowance.

Much has been said about current legislation to forgive Federal income taxes for the *Pueblo* crew while it was held captive by the North Koreans. Our distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee has introduced a bill to carry out this proposal. Why should we not grant the same forgiveness of Federal taxes in the full incomes of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia? This would be little recompense, indeed, for the tremendous sacrifices they are making for their country.

At present enlisted men are given a full tax deduction for basic pay received in the combat area. The exemption for officers is limited to $500 per month. While this situation may be equitable for those assigned a 1-year tour of duty, I feel this is not so for those held captive against their will for extended periods of time. Since many of the known American prisoners of war are pilots, whose monthly incomes exceed $500, I feel that such tax relief is more than justified in their cases. Therefore, the third bill that I am introducing would exclude from taxes the full pay of all members of the Armed Forces who are POW's missing in action or in a detained status.

I feel very strongly about the need for these three bills and hope that rapid and favorable action will be scheduled in the near future.

YEAR 1969 MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY, ILL.

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

XUM

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman who represents the Seventh Illinois Congressional District, where the headquarters of Goodwill Industries of Chicago and Cook County, Ill., are located, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to the American people the observance of this outstanding organization's golden anniversary which is taking place during 1969.

Goodwill Industries has served for 50 years—without regard to race, creed, or national origin—thousands of physically handicapped, mentally and emotionally disturbed, and socially and culturally deprived people. A national movement begun in Boston in 1902 by Dr. Edgar J. Helms, a Methodist minister, Goodwill Industries laid down its roots in Chicago in 1919 simply, humbly and without fanfare. It was the development of the Methodist Mutual Aid Union, an organization representing the combined efforts of Chicago Methodism, existing for the purpose of gathering cast-off material and selling it to poor people at a nominal cost.

Chicago Goodwill Industries opened shop with just five workers in the basement of an old church on the city's West Side, aptly described half a century ago as a building which in its old age served its intended purpose so well it is now doing its dying best to serve its present task. The aim of this nonprofit agency was to undertake the challenge of giving to handicapped people a chance to earn a livelihood and enjoy the social, moral, and spiritual blessings of society.

The number of times it moved to keep pace with its increasing and expanding services to the vocationally handicapped has dimmed with the passage of time. Today its five-story modern rehabilitation facility stands tall on the skyline of the same west side—a shining beacon of hope to nearly 2,000 disadvantaged people who come to its doors yearly seeking not charity but a chance.

Vocational rehabilitation was a relatively unknown concept when Chicago Goodwill Industries first opened its doors. But today it is a unique, self-help process encompassing in-depth interviewing, scientific evaluations, group and individual counseling, work adjustment programs, formal on-the-job training, and selective job placement.

The value to the Chicago community of these vocational rehabilitation services resulted in Chicago Goodwill Industries helping to place in the local labor market in the past 5 years, 1,330 men and women who otherwise might have been burdens on the State or family.

The vocationally handicapped whom Chicago Goodwill Industries serves earn while they learn. They want the dignity a paycheck provides rather than the stigma of accepting welfare money because they could not find employment in the competitive labor market or they had to depend on family or friends for support. In 1968, the agency's workers and trainees received wages totaling more than $1,450,000. Their productive efforts resulted in their paying approximately $318,000 in Federal income and social security taxes, notwithstanding thousands of dollars they paid in local and State taxes.

Chicago Goodwill Industries' enviable record in rehabilitation was attained in the face of cruelly rising costs. But the agency has accepted today the challenges of tomorrow to give the less fortunate fuller, more rewarding lives. At considerable expense it has developed a new and unique scientific testing program aimed at making employable increasing numbers of disadvantaged people who earnestly desire a bright future of steady jobs with steady wages.

Through this scientific program, known as MOVE an individual's vocational aptitudes and interests are measured by means of a series of job sample tests, job tryouts, and actual work experience within the agency. Thus is created a multidimensional job profile from which is developed the vocational program planning that renders a person employable in private industry.

Chicago Goodwill Industries' first 50 years have been recorded on the pages of time with the notation "Well done." Now it looks confidently to the future when it can implement even more the charge given by Dr. Helms, founder of the National movement, back in 1902 that:

> Let us be dissatisfied with our work until every handicapped and unfortunate person in our community has an opportunity to develop his fullest usefulness and enjoy a maximum of abundant living.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation, and indeed, the gratitude of all Cook County residents for the great record of accomplishment compiled by Goodwill Industries, and to commend the officers of this fine organization for their contribution to its success. They are: M. Glen Miller, president; Elmer W. Lenz, vice president; R. C. Wieboldt, Jr., vice president; Carl M. Blumenschein, vice president; Richard P. Miller, vice president; S. N. Tideman, Jr., secretary; Lynn G. Sahlin, treasurer and assistant secretary; George P. Thermos, assistant treasurer; Edward W. Lyman, Jr., assistant treasurer; Executive Director William Rogolio; Public Relations Director Paul Hoffman; Directors Laurance H. Armour, Jr., Kenneth E. Campbell, Philip V. Carter, Paul M. Corbett, John M. Coulter, John David, George H. Dovenmuehle, Robert G. Gibson, Benjamin J. Gingiss, Gerald A. Gitles, Robert M. Hoffer, Edward C. Holmblad, M.D., William Ingram, Henry S. Kahn, N. Hall Layman, Samuel N. Lebold, Fred G. Litsinger, Mrs. B. J. Maiworm, R. P. Merridew, Lester R. Minion, D.D., Richard S. Oldberg, William G. Olson, Luther I. Replogle, Alfred Slicer, Lee D. Smith, Leonard Spacek, Stanley W. Tate, Percy J. Trevethan, L.H.D., Oliver W. Tuthill, Maynard P. Venema, Vern E. Whaley; and Honorary Directors John L. Dole, Nathaniel Leverone, Bert R. Prall, Thomas M. Pryor, Bishop, Henry F. Tenney.

I know that in the years ahead, Goodwill Industries of Chicago and Cook County will remain in the forefront of leadership for the physically and mentally handicapped. To the handicapped Goodwill Industries is not a charity—it is a chance. Mr. Speaker, to this great organization I extend my congratulations on its golden anniversary and my best wishes for continuing success in its worthy endeavors.

MILITARY BASES IN SPAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the questions presented by the expiration tomorrow of the agreement providing for American air and naval bases in Spain. Questions raised by these bases seem especially significant at a time when so many decisions must be made about America's role in the world and about the relationship of military expenditures to the national tax burden and priorities.

Could this money be better spent to meet domestic needs?

At what cost would these bases exceed any possible military value?

Could the continued existence of these bases "commit" the United States to protecting a government that lacks popular support in its own country and which must resort to extreme repression to remain in power?

Have the negotiations for these bases been conducted without civilian participation or have they led to the sort of alliance which should constitutionally require the advice and consent of the Senate?

I hope we shall open what will become a general discussion of these and other pressing questions so the American people can consider the impact of this decision—a decision that will have considerable effect on policies of consequence at home and abroad.

I yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) for remarks on this question.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is patently obvious that Europe's agile and durable Fascist, Francisco Franco, dear friend and comrade of Adolf Hitler, has been attempting to blackmail America over renewal of the 15-year-old bases agreement. Four hundred million dollars worth of facilities are at stake, as Spain seeks to extort from our country a prohibitive price, including a broad promise of defense for Spain and major quantities of military hardware. Although the price seems to have been lowered recently, it is sad to see us come to this.

Must the United States lie down and grovel at the boots of the dictator who "pacified" the Basques. Must our country jump through a hoop held by the man who provided Adolf Hitler with the "Blue Division," which gave its all for the Nazis in combat. Must America beg for favorable treatment from he who sheltered innumerable Nazi murderers fleeing the hangman's noose—protector of Otto Skorzeny and Juan Peron. It leaves a bitter taste in any honest man's mouth to see us cater to whims of this dictator,

XUM

who managed to evade the justice meted out after World War II to others of his ilk.

This is the man who employed the Condor Legion of Nazi flyers to pulverize cities full of his own people. The man who unleashed his Foreign Legion and Moorish soldiery on his brethren. They remember the Moors at Oviedo. It was he who allowed a Falangist service for Hitler to take place in Madrid on May 10, 1968, where participants sang the Horst Wessel Lied as they came onto the street.

Here is the man who ordered executions by the thousands, legitimized sentences by military tribunals and brought terror to every corner of Spain. This is the freedom-loving gentleman who only recently suspended freedom of speech, assembly and association as well as all guarantees against unwarranted search and detention.

Now he masquerades as El Caudillo, the man who brought peace to suffering Spain. He brought peace, all right—peace of graveyards and prison cells—peace that comes after echoes of a firing squad have ended. Peace that came when all his oponents were dead, in prison or driven into exile.

How sad it is to see our country convincing itself that to remain free or fulfill its obligations we must deal with this dictator and his minons. By no stretch of any wildest imagination can we say that Franco and his bully boys are lovers or defenders of any freedom, except that to do ill unto those who oppose them.

Mr. Speaker, I question the real worth of these Spanish bases. Technological advances have eliminated much of the need for them. We are losing valuable foreign exchange by our major presence there. This ignoble chapter in our American story is long overdue for closing. Let us tell Franco what he can do with his bases, ideology and promises. Let us then forthwith pack up and depart from his sunny national prison. The facts speak for themselves.

I am totally out of patience with America's policy of lying down with dictators of the world. If it is not a Perez Jimenez, Peron or Stroessner, then it is a Franco. As our technology advances, surely we are not going to remain dependent upon such people and the regimes they have created.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his most helpful contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk now about the cost of these bases relative to the cost of other items on the national agenda. Americans generally will be concerned to know at a time of enoromous tax burdens and delayed domestic programs whether the money needed to continue these particular installations would be wisely spent.

We have contributed over the years more than $2 billion in economic and military aid to the upkeep of the Spanish Government in return for the bases.

That $2 billion, could have produced 35,500 classrooms in the United States, or new facilities for 1,065,000 students. $2 billion could have supported Headstart programs for 1 year for 1,904,000 children.

The Spanish Government is reported now to be asking $300 million for the renewal of the bases. This same money would buy enough food stamps to feed 1,875,000 people, which is a substantial part of the population of the United States that still suffers from chronic malnutrition.

And it pays to remember in this connection that as far back as 1959, Congressman PASSMAN of Louisiana, remarked:

> Every year that we have earmarked a certain amount of money for Spain, the Administration has spent much more money out of support funds for Spain than the amount earmarked.

It is now suggested that the U.S. Government is prepared to pay what is usually described as "only" $140 million; $140 million would provide food stamps for only 875,000 people.

These sums may not seem worth quibbling about in a total annual defense budget of $80 billion, but one must start somewhere. Mr. Speaker, why not here? Why not now? $140 million or $300 million beyond $2 billion already—is this expenditure really necessary?

Furthermore, every penny spent on these bases aggravates the balance-of-payments problem. We ask American businessmen to curtail overseas investment, we put unpleasant restraints on the American people, to save much less than is spent in this one peculiar enterprise.

Congressman REUSS, of Wisconsin, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury on March 22, about this aspect of the economics of this whole affair:

> I write to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, and your capacity as guardian of the United States balance of payments, to express my concern about the impact on our payments position of another renewal of the 1953 bases agreement between Spain and the United States.
>
> After a period in which renewal appeared in doubt, negotiations between Spanish and U.S. representatives now seem to be going forward, and may continue beyond the March 26 deadline originally set for agreement. As is well known, the recurrent United States balance of payments crisis is almost entirely caused by our overseas military operations. Yet neither the Pentagon nor the Department of State has seemed overly concerned by the payments damage wrought by these operations.
>
> The Spanish bases question offers an opportunity to the Department of the Treasury to bring to bear a business-like cost-benefit analysis on military operations affecting our balance of payments. Of the three major air bases involved, one is already on a "caretaker" basis. All three have greatly diminished in strategic value as U.S. military capabilities have advanced. The submarine base at Rota appears to be useful but not absolutely vital to U.S. security. Moreover, given political uncertainties in Spain, the availability of these bases at some future time seems open to doubt. Certainly, the present number of American military personnel and dependents in Spain—some 25,000—seems excessive to need.
>
> In sum, the time is obviously ripe to let balance of payments considerations weight heavily in determining the future level of the U.S. military presence in Spain.
>
> Since the original bases agreement of 1953, the Spanish reserve position has greatly improved, and the U.S. reserve position has greatly worsened. Between 1953 and 1968, U.S. reserve position has greatly worsened. Between 1953 and 1968, U.S. reserves (gold and convertible currencies) decreased from $22.09 billion to $14.42 billion. In the same period, Spain's reserves increased from $150 million to $1.09 billion.
>
> Furthermore, between 1960 and 1965, Spain was a net purchaser of U.S. gold in the amount of some $758 million, and at a time of great embarrassment to the United States. The gold component of Spanish reserves at the end of 1968 was some 72 percent of reserves, or $785 million.
>
> Just as the U.S. gold loss in recent years may be largely traced to our military involvement abroad, so Spain's improved reserve position may be attributed in large measure to the U.S. military presence in Spain. The direct foreign exchange cost to the United States, and the gain to Spain has averaged close to $50 million a year in recent years, in terms of outlays by the U.S. military and their dependents, and salaries for Spanish employees. As maintenance costs rise, this figure will inevitably increase.
>
> I respectfully urge you to present these considerations at the highest level of the U.S. negotiating team. It is high time we stopped endangering the world position of the dollar and restricting American trade and investment abroad by letting foreign military operations that yield marginal military benefits at great cost to our balance of payments go unchallenged. I wish you every success.

In short, the question goes far beyond how much it will cost to renew and operate the bases. We are entitled to ask—we are not entitled not to ask—how much do these bases add, if anything, to American security, and what would it cost to do the job in other ways? The B–47's for which the airbases were originally built are no longer even part of U.S. defense forces. Our submarines can be based in the United States and elsewhere—and almost as conveniently—as at Rota.

President Truman, years ago, was unconvinced of the military necessity for bases in Spain. Then in 1963, we were assured that that extension was the last that would be needed, that in fact the airbases would be phased out because weaponry advances would make them unnecessary. There are, it seems, constant assurances from the military that bases will later on be unnecessary. But later on seems always to be yet later on. One scours the mind for an occasion when the military have acknowledged that "later on" has finally arrived.

So once again—much "later on" since the last renewal—we hear that "later on" is still to come. When, Mr. Speaker, when is it later on?

Senator SYMINGTON, one of the great authorities on military affairs in the Congress and former Secretary of the Air Force, thinks when is, in fact, now; that it is in fact at last "later on." He said in the Senate yesterday:

> This country does not have the financial resources necessary to continue leasing military installations which were constructed originally under defense policies that now appear obsolescent to the point of being obsolete.

And Business Week magazine, in its issue of September 1968, said:

> With changes in weaponry, equipment and mobility: U.S.-based and submarine-based missiles have, for example, lessened the need

> for air bases abroad. Satellites are diminishing requirements for foreign communications and electronic spy stations. The giant C–5A transport plane will enable troops and their equipment to reach trouble spots quickly from U.S. bases.

Thus, one wonders if anyone can make a case that would justify the existence of the Spanish bases in terms of defense needs, of responsible fiscal programing, of national priorities or of wise global policy.

With regard to this last point, Mr. Speaker, this House should be reminded of President Nixon's comment during the campaign:

> Other nations must recognize that the role of the United States as world policeman is likely to be limited in the future.

The President has since expanded on this idea. On March 4, he was asked at a press conference:

> Mr. President, there has been some concern in Congress about reports that a general in the Pentagon took the initiative in arranging for the U.S. to recognize a threat to Spain from North Africa. In your opinion, is this concern merited, and what is the policy of your administration about carving out new commitments to other countries by the United States?

The President's reply was:

> Well, I think as far as commitments are concerned, the U.S. has a full plate. I first do not believe that we should make new commitments around the world unless our national interests are very vitally involved. Secondly, I do not believe we should become involved in the quarrels of nations in other parts of the world unless we are asked to become involved and unless also we are vitally involved. I referred earlier to even the quarrels and divisions in Western Europe. I stayed out of most of those up to this point, and I intend to in the future.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman, my colleague from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) for taking this time on the eve of the day when the leases for the four military bases in Spain expire in order to bring before the House the very important question of whether or not the United States should continue to maintain the bases in Spain.

Negotiations for the extension of the leases are now in progress. This is being done at a time when the extent and character of U.S. commitments abroad is being called into serious question, and moreover, when the imbalance in our present budgetary priorities is clear. It is important that we understand these priorities and that we thoroughly examine the propriety of extending the leases with an eye toward determining both the military need for these bases and the political implications of channeling additional financial support to the Franco regime, a regime which has shown repeatedly over the years its unwillingness to grant basic civil liberties to its citizens.

Not only that, but there is another important question involved. Articles which have appeared recently, one in the New York Times of February 26 and one in the Washington Post of February 25, reported that the military had attempted to pressure the State Department into signing an agreement which contains a U.S. pledge to defend Spain as if it were a NATO country and also to defend Spain against attack from North Africa in exchange for Spain's extension of the leases.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious matter because it again indicates that the State Department is not exercising primary responsibility but that the Pentagon is playing a key role in developing foreign policy.

Insofar as the military need for these bases is concerned, it appears that they are now obsolete. Senator SYMINGTON yesterday on the floor of the other body made that point very clear. The Air Force admits that of the three airbases, only one is being used at this time, and that only for the maintenance of fighter interceptors. The bases were built to service and maintain the B–47, which has long since been retired, and they are not adequate to handle our advanced aircraft of today. By the same token, the naval base is not really a necessary item for the servicing and maintenance of our Polaris submarines.

It seems to me clear from a political and military point of view that the leases for the bases should not be extended.

The benefit which Franco has gained from these bases should not be underestimated. The Spanish economy was extremely shaky in 1950, 3 years before the ratification of the bases and related agreements. Many economic observers at the time believed that Spain was on the verge of bankruptcy and that, in the absence of outside aid, the Franco regime would be unable to withstand the pressures from within Spain to liberalize and modify the totalitarian institutions which Franco had instituted after the end of the Spanish Civil War of 1936–1939. Britain and France declined to provide Franco with economic or military assistance. However, the United States viewed Spain as a potentially valuable ally in the construction of the defense system which was being built to ring the Soviet Union. Negotiations on the acquisition of the four bases were begun in 1951 and were concluded on September 26, 1953. The argeements which were signed at that time consisted of three parts:

First. A defense agreement authorized the development, maintenance, and joint utilization on Spanish territory of "such areas and facilities as may be agreed upon," the sovereignty therein to remain Spanish. The agreement was to continue in force "for a period of 10 years, automatically extended for two successive periods of 5 years each" unless terminated by notice given in September 1963 or September 1968 and effective 18 months later.

Second. A military defense assistance agreement obligated the United States to provide military equipment and supplies, and funds for military expenditures by Spain. The agreement has no terminal date but is subject to cancellation on notice.

Third. An economic assistance agreement, to remain in effect until June 30, 1956, but subject to cancellation on notice. This agreement was renewed periodically but expired in 1963. Deliveries of aid materials continued until 1964.

The agreements comprised the original "Pact of Madrid Mutual Defense Treaty".

The base agreement was renewed in 1963 for 5 additional years and formally expired on September 26, 1968. After that, the two governments had a 6-month period in which to negotiate a new agreement. If the two governments could not agree, the United States would be obliged to withdraw the 25,000 American servicemen and dependents now stationed in Spain within 1 year to close down the bases. The 6-month period expires tomorrow.

Military assistance to Spain in exchange for the right to operate these bases has amounted to about $1.7 billion since 1953. In addition, the bases now bring Spain about $40 million a year in local American spending.

Last summer Spain specified an additional $1 billion in military aid as the price of renewing the leases on these four American bases. That sum was subsequently scaled down to $700 million. Even the lesser sum, however, represents a sevenfold increase in the amount of aid provided by the 1963 renegotiation, $100 million.

According to press reports, there were other demands as well, including a commitment to come to the aid of the Franco regime in the event of a Soviet-inspired attack against Spain from North Africa, a commitment from the United States to assist Spain in her efforts to regain Gibraltar from the British, and the obligation to defend Spain under the NATO agreement as "an integral part of Western Europe." All of these demands would have a far-reaching impact on future American commitments if the United States agreed to them.

The manner in which the U.S. Government has carried out negotiations for these bases during the past year also raises some fundamental questions about the way in which far-reaching commitments can be made. According to published reports in both the Washington Post and the New York Times, the negotiations were first carried on by a military man, Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, Deputy Commander of the U.S. forces in Europe. General Burchinal, acting without consultation with the Department of State, accepted at least two of the Franco government's demands—assistance in the event of attack from North Africa, and Spain to be defended in the same manner as a member NATO country.

The status of General Burchinal's "commitments" on behalf of the United States is in doubt at this point. Although, the Department of Defense has denied that the general has made any "irretrievable" commitments, it has not yet said whether or not the signed minutes represent "agreed views" which constitute the basis for further talks between Madrid and Washington, as General Burchinal insisted they did.

The dangers posed by this kind of "negotiation" are extremely serious. It is disturbing to contemplate what kind of "commitments" might result if the military is allowed to carry on negotiations on issues which are essentially diplomatic and political in nature. Congress must insist that any such commitment—particularly which would oblige us to come to the defense of a totalitarian and repressive regime—not be made by the Pentagon and that Congress be consulted before any such far-reaching agreement is ratified by the administration.

The facilities which the United States has constructed under past agreements with Spain include a 12-mile long naval and air station at Rota on the Bay of Cadiz; three airbases—near Zaragoza in the northeast, at Torrejon near Madrid in the center of the country, and at Moron near Seville in the south. In addition, the agreement provides for two additional naval facilities at El Ferrol and Cartagena—which are used to store supplies—and two minor airbases at San Pablo and Reus. There are also six radar sites on the mainland and one on the island of Mallorca, and a pipeline, 485 miles long, from Rota to Zaragoza, which is used to pump oil between the two bases at those locations.

The military value of these bases is, if not completely negligible, at the least dubious. According to the Washington Post of March 17, the strongest language one can extract from the Pentagon with respect to the value of these bases is that they are "desirable." The utility of the airbases is particularly questionable, especially in light of the development of intercontinental missiles and missile-carrying submarines which can be deployed from almost anywhere in the world. The Polaris submarine facility at Rota provides a convenient location to service the submarines at a marginally lower cost than if they were serviced at the eastern coast of the United States. But the savings afforded by this base is minimal and hardly essential to our overall Mediterranean force.

Beyond strategic considerations is the more fundamental question of whether or not the United States should be providing any aid whatsoever to Franco Spain. As I have indicated earlier, military and economic aid from the United States has helped to maintain Franco ever since the early 1950's. The effect of the infusion of additional U.S. military aid into Spain on the development of democratic Spanish institutions must be considered. The effect will be to place the weight of the United States behind the Franco regime and against those who seek to substitute democratic rule for the one-man authoritarianism which has characterized Franco's rule from the beginning. No amount of explanatory denials or private briefings from the White House will negate the effect of supplying more military hardware to Franco.

In the past week there have been reports that the Spanish Government is now lifting press censorship and relaxing restrictions on civil liberties. The coincidence of the new "liberalization" with the approaching deadline in the negotiations period for the bases should not be lost by the administration. In 1962 Franco used a similar ploy to try to pave the way for future Spanish association with the European Common Market. The occasion for that brief liberalization of the political climate coincided with Great Britain's efforts to enter the Common Market. Great Britain was at the time Spain's best customer abroad and, if Britain had joined the Common Market, economic consideration seemed to dictate some kind of Spanish connection with the European economic entity—perhaps as an associate member. In order to win admittance to the Common Market, it was necessary to create a "new image" of Spain in the eyes of the Western European social democrats, from whom Franco had deliberately sealed off Spain for two decades.

Just at the moment when Spain seemed on the road to social and political democratization, General de Gaulle vetoed Britain's application for the Common Market. With the economic pressures to join the Market gone, Franco almost immediately returned to the policies of press censorship and tight regulation of civil liberties which he had only a few months before relaxed.

We should not be too surprised if the newest version of Franco's "liberalization" also turns out to be founded on public relations concerns. We should additionally keep in mind the fact that the additional military aid which Franco would receive from any agreement would almost surely be used to squash incipient opposition to him in Spain. After nearly two decades of propping up the Franco regime, it is time to withdraw support from Franco in the interests of furthering the democratic evolution of Spain. To pour more money into Spain would only result in a strengthening of the totalitarian system of rule that has prevailed in that country since the end of the Spanish Civil War.

One more issue needs to be touched upon. That is the question of the effect of the ratification of a new agreement on these bases on the way in which the United States regards events in Spain. So long as we continue to maintain military bases in Spain, the fact of those bases will always be a factor in determining our response to who rules in Spain. The military will want to know what anti-Franco elements will do with the bases and whether or not they will remain amenable to future military operation in Spain. The presence of the bases means that military considerations will come ahead of political considerations. And the result will be the formulation of foreign policy based on preestablished military commitments, rather than military strategy following political aims, as should be the case.

As the Washington Post of March 17 stated:

> This agreement appears to have very little to recommend it. It does not appear to be favorable to American interests on any grounds, military, political or economic, and in fact would tend to bring this country into disrepute with exactly those elements, in Spain and out of it, who should be our allies.

At a time when funds are desperately needed for the solution of urgent housing, education, and employment needs in our country, the money which the Pentagon contemplates providing to Franco Spain—whether it be $700 million or $100 million—could be far better spent on the solution of our own domestic needs. I urge the Congress to make clear to the administration that the leases should not be extended and to insist that the money be redirected instead towards the solution of the problems of our own society.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I thank my distinguished colleague for the insights he has added here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague from New York, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for his leadership in organizing today's discussion of our relationship with Spain. As you have already heard, his timing is particularly apt. Tomorrow, March 26, will, if we are wise, mark the beginning of the end of our 15-year-old defense agreement with Spain. I fear that we shall not be that fortunate, but I do want to add my voice to those who are urging just such a parting of the ways as very much in the best interests of the United States.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, or will hear from others here this afternoon, the variety of good reasons for permitting our 1953 defense agreement with Spain to lapse. I should like to review these arguments, and the background to this accord, only briefly and then focus on the issue which strikes me as central to the entire question—the extent to which we permit our national policies, foreign and domestic, to be dictated by military considerations.

My colleagues will recall that the United States signed a trio of agreements with Spain on September 26, 1953, after 2 years of negotiations which spanned both Democratic and Republican administrations. Our action was motivated largely by the concerns which grew out of the Korean war. We were trying to build a worldwide base network as part of our "containment" effort, and Spain was seen as a choice location. For the Spanish Government of Generalissimo Franco, the pacts offered a heaven-sent opportunity to break out of the diplomatic isolation which their policies during World War II had led the wartime allies to impose on them.

So the deed was done. The three agreements signed on that September day in Madrid covered economic aid, defense, and mutual defense assistance. They provided the framework for the United States to build and operate bases in Spain, and for the Spaniards to start profiting from the growing American programs of aid for the less-developed countries of the world. Three air bases, a naval base, and supporting facilities were hurriedly built during the 1950's at a total cost of over $395 million. The Spanish role as a so-called bulwark against communism has been bolstered with over $625 million in American military aid through fiscal 1968. And the Spanish economy has been stimulated by

XUM

the infusion of over $1.5 billion in economic aid from the United States.

The agreements were entered into, in essence, for military purposes. They comprised a package which we felt in 1953 was necessary to our national security. We needed the bases; we needed a strong Spain as a potential partner in resisting Soviet expansion. The economic price, and the political price of becoming a virtual ally of a dictatorship ostracized for a decade and a half by most of the world, became a secondary consideration. One sop to democracy was inserted in the preamble of the economic aid agreement, in the form of a sentence by which the two signatories recognized "that individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in all countries, as well as defense against aggression, rest largely on the establishment of a sound economy." But none of this language crept into the operative paragraphs of any of the agreements, so the Spanish Government was spared any potentially embarrassing obligation to move toward a more open society as part of the price for its friendly relationship with the United States.

Initially, the chief American strategic interest lay in our three airbases in Spain. From Zaragoza in northeastern Spain, from Torrejon on the outskirts of Madrid, and from Moron in the south, the B-47 bombers of the Strategic Air Command maintained regular patrols along the periphery of the Soviet Union as part of the nuclear force which constituted our deterrent to war. Over the years, B-52's replaced B-47's, and ballistic missiles have since pretty much put even the B-52's out of the strategic deterrent business. The focus of our strategic interest shifted then to the naval base which we had built at Rota, on Spain's Atlantic coast. For Rota became, and still is, one of just three oversea bases equipped for servicing and repairing our nuclear submarines. The airbases, meanwhile, changed character. Zaragoza was put into "caretaker" status; Torrejon became home base for tactical fighter units rotating from areas with poorer weather and for transport aircraft; and Moron came to house air-sea rescue units.

Thus, one factor to be weighed in the balance as we consider the future of our defense agreement with Spain is the current value of the installations it permits us to maintain there. In pure dollar value, the replacement cost of the bases in Spain has been estimated at slightly over $1 billion. But what about their military value? For it was our sense of urgent military need that led us to pay the initial price for their construction, and presumably this same consideration should also weigh in the decision on their retention.

Where opinion in 1953 was heavily in favor of the bases, however, opinion in 1969 is decidedly mixed. Let me give a few examples from the past 6 months. Warren Unna, writing in the Washington Post of September 17, 1968, said:

> U.S. officials reportedly consider that the air bases now have been phased out by long-range missiles, but that the Rota naval base still is very important.

The Washington Daily News on the same day reported:

> The new agreement will reduce the number of air bases from three to two. The U.S. wants to close its base at Zaragoza, in northeast Spain, because tactical advances have ruled out the need for it.

On September 26, the Spanish Government suggested closing of the base at Torrejon. In their statement, the Spaniards noted:

> The base is situated near Madrid, Spain's capital of more than three million inhabitants and now the center of an important industrial area . . . The Spanish Government would welcome its removal.

The Washington Post added on September 27:

> While U.S. authorities concede that the loss of the Rota base in particular would pose a problem for the Pentagon, it would be a loss the military could live with.

The most detailed single exposition of current views, based on the opinions of unnamed "analysts," appear under Benjamin Welles' byline in the New York Times of September 28, 1968. Mr. Welles reported as follows:

> The bases are "important, but not vital" . . . The base at Rota, one of three overseas Polaris bases, was useful but could be dispensed with.
>
> Of the three air bases, Zaragoza is already on a "caretaker" basis. Torrejon, built near Madrid at Spanish insistence, can be closed, as the Spanish are now suggesting, to avoid making Madrid a nuclear "target."
>
> The third big base, at Moron de la Frontera, near Seville, serves as a take-off point for the tankers that refuel B-52 bombers on patrol . . . Its loss would be inconvenient but not grave, experts say.

These varied accounts differ in some detail, but are consistent in suggesting that our bases in Spain are of only marginal value for the 1970's. As the Washington Post noted only last week, " 'Desirable' is about the strongest word one can in good conscience extract," while former U.S. Ambassador to Spain Angier Biddle Duke once referred to the bases as "just a convenience to the United States." And the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Foreign Affairs Committee (Mr. FARBSTEIN) said on March 4:

> These facilities are no doubt convenient, but not so essential to national or Western security as to justify an unreasonable commitment of scarce military or economic resources.

Under these circumstances of marginal military value, how shall we evaluate the political costs of a defense agreement with Spain? This is, after all, not merely a run-of-the-mill dictatorship such as we have so cavalierly supported elsewhere in the world. This is the last surviving dictatorship based on the political concepts we fought against in World War II—the last surviving dictatorship whose sympathies in that conflict lay with our enemies. And the Franco government has changed its coloration only slightly in the ensuing years, despite the vast changes which have swept across the rest of the globe. A brief period of "liberalization" undertaken in 1966 never bore full fruit, and was abruptly—and brutally—reversed in January of this year with the proclamation of a "state of exception." Once more, the Spanish press was subjected to full censorship; key articles of the Organic Law were suspended; and police power to arrest, interrogate, banish or imprison opponents of the regime was virtually unchecked. The "state of exception," interestingly enough, is ending today, 1 month ahead of schedule—a piece of timing which coincides a little too neatly with the resumption of base negotiations to be accepted as pure coincidence.

Should this, then, be our choice for a partner in a defense agreement? It must also be remembered that Spain is not merely a right-wing dictatorship internally, but it is a country whose Government is willing to flirt with the Soviets and threaten "neutrality" as a means of pressuring us to comply with its demands. Spain, in 1953, may have looked like the most solid and enduring of allies. But Spain, in 1969, is a would-be ally which has made tentative offers to the Soviet Union for limited base rights and which has proposed the removal of the U.S. 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean. It is also Fidel Castro's best friend in Europe, and one of Cuba's most helpful trading partners outside the Communist world. Its national flag airline is the only non-Communist carrier providing regular service to Havana.

We have long accepted, in this amoral world, that allies are all too often bought. But "bought" allies like Spain are usually a bad bargain, and this is nowhere so clearly demonstrated as in cases like this where they show a reluctance to stay "bought" unless the price is constantly increased.

Yet it can be said, with some reason, that the political cost to us elsewhere has been relatively limited even though we have borne the Spanish incubus for 15 years. How, then, can we argue for a shift in policy on political grounds? The argument here rests, I think, on the currents of change which are moving backward in Spain and forward elsewhere in the world. When we made our initial decision in 1953, security considerations were judged to be paramount. In 1963, at the time the agreement was given its first 5-year extension at a supplementary price of $100 million, it was argued with some plausibility that the American presence was helping open Spain to the winds of progress. The Spanish economy was blossoming under the stimulus of American dollars; the Spanish political structure was seemingly loosening somewhat. But in 1969, we are negotiating with a Government which has recently taken a giant step backward. Further extension of the defense agreement, involving substantial additional military assistance to the Franco regime, would constitute an American seal of approval for political retrogression and a severe blow to those who still hope to sway the Government in Madrid from its renewed enthusiasm for dictatorial rule.

We have, then, a proposal to renew a defense agreement which gives us bases of marginal military value and bears a heavy political cost. What about the economic cost? The direct price for the past 5 years was $100 million in military assistance. Spain refused a similar offer when it called for new negotiations last year, and asked instead for an initial $1 billion and a subsequent "rock bottom" $700 million in military aid. The 5-year American counter offer, according to press reports, came to $240 million. To this, of course, must be added the operating and maintenance costs of the bases themselves, with their 25,000 American servicemen and dependents.

It is, of course, clear that we can afford the cost of our Spanish bases if they are really necessary to our national security. But with the military and political value so questionable, the cost seems badly out of proportion to the anticipated return.

This brings us, Mr. Speaker, to the key question which I believe underlies our entire discussion today. Are we dealing here with a carefully defined national security policy, and deciding whether this particular defense agreement complements or detracts from that policy? Or are we seeking to define national security policy so that it can encompass this defense agreement because our military planners want to keep this pact alive?

Incidentally, the role of the military in this particular case is a strange one. My colleagues will recall the story, first reported in Newsday by Flora Lewis late in February, of the free-wheeling negotiations conducted in Madrid last December by Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal. The general, evidently acting well beyond his instructions, came up with new justifications for the Spanish bases—but only by accepting a major potential extension of American commitments abroad. He agreed with his Spanish opposite numbers, for example, Spain was an "integral part" of Western Europe and therefore within the U.S. defense umbrella. He also accepted their view that we might face a joint threat with Spain as a result of developments in North Africa. As the distinguished majority leader of the Senate (Mr. MANSFIELD) pointedly remarked at the time, the report of General Burchinal's activities "raises serious questions as to who shall conduct the foreign policy of the United States, be it the Pentagon or, as the Constitution states, the State Department under the direction of the President."

This bizarre episode, however, is only a parenthetical note to the overall problem. For this kind of blatant military intrusion into the negotiating process will, almost inevitably, be found out and overcome. Of far greater concern to me, and with far greater impact on the future course of this Nation, is the basic question we must consider: are we to have a rational process for deciding our national priorities, in which the military case receives appropriate but not prequestion we must consider: Are we to be swept irresistibly along on a tide of "national security" expenditures while other urgent needs remain unmet?

This broader debate is swirling all around us. It is evident in the argument now raging over deployment of an ABM system. It is a major factor in consideration of the bill introduced recently in both Houses to undertake planning for post-Vietnam economic conversion. It is manifest in the widespread popular outcry against our continuing inattention to a host of pressing national problems, all too often excused on the ground that national security demands leave insufficient resources for these other purposes.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe we must look at this challenge to the Spanish defense agreement in the context of the debate now underway all across the country on the critical question of establishing national priorities and allocating national resources. The ABM has been called a defense in search of a mission. So the Spanish bases might be called installations in search of a justification. Just because the Defense Department, as the Washington Post said, "never voluntarily gives up its turf" is no reason for a major element of American policy to be seriously distorted to fit the Pentagon's preconceived pattern.

We must break the bad habit we have fallen into since World War II of accepting without serious question the claims advanced by the military for a share in national resources. They have for too long come to accept their 10 percent of the gross national product as their due. They have for too long gotten bases, with or without accompanying security commitments, wherever their fancies turned. I believe the proposed renewal of the defense agreement with Spain is a perfect place to draw the line. The return accruing to the United States from this pact is marginal at best in the military sphere and strongly negative in the political sphere, and the costs are out of all proportion to any benefits. Adding these solid specific arguments to our broad interest in seeing national priorities more rationally defined, there is little remaining case for renewal of the agreement.

I therefore join with my able colleague from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), and with other Members who are speaking here this afternoon, in urging the administration to let this defense agreement die the quiet death it so richly deserves.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague. In this light, Mr. Speaker, one must agree with him that the nature of the negotiations and the new rationale given for the continuation of the bases, has done little to increase the national confidence in the wisdom of American oversea commitments being negotiated primarily by military officials.

I include at this point the remarkable February 25 column by Miss Flora Lewis, of Newsday, Inc. Her accuracy and insights were so sustained that to date there has been no persuasive rebuttal to her rather disquieting revelations.

STATE, PENTAGON SPLIT ON COMMITMENTS TO SPAIN

(By Flora Lewis)

A secret dispute has developed between the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff over American commitments to Franco Spain. At one point, the military almost made a U.S. pledge to fight for Spain as though it were a NATO country.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is starting to study how the U.S. gets into military obligation abroad, got wind of the blow-up between the State Department and the Pentagon at its peak. A committee staff member inquired and was told by both sides that there was no disagreement, no trouble. The executive departments are not inviting the Senators into their quarrel.

But the trouble has been brewing for months. The issue is now on its way to the National Security Council and will have to be decided by President Nixon. The story is a new case history of how the U.S. can stumble into a foreign war.

The immediate issue is the two air bases and the submarine base which the U.S. has in Spain. Although American officials disagree on their precise value, there is general agreement that none is essential to national security though all are useful.

The base agreement runs out this year. It provides that unless Madrid and Washington agree on renewal terms by March 26, the U.S. must evacuate within one year.

Talks on renewal went on during much of 1968. But last September, the Spaniards broke off negotiations, saying the gap between their price of $700 million in new weapons for another five years' use of the bases and the U.S. offer of $140 million in weapons and services was too big. If it was a bluff, it didn't work.

So in October, Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella called on then Secretary of State Dean Rusk to launch a new approach. In place of the diplomatic talks, an American military mission was assigned to a three-stage discussion with the Spanish military, who dominate Spain. They were to assess the actual threat facing Spain, the "tasks and missions" the Spaniards must undertake to face it, and then the equipment needed to do the job.

Rusk's idea was that by tackling the subject in terms of needs rather than supplies, Madrid could be brought way down from its exorbitant demands for its three armed services.

Rusk also asked twice for a six-month extension of the March 26 deadline to give the new Administration time for this important policy decision. The Spaniards flatly refused

On Nov. 18–20, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, visited Madrid and opened the talks. He made a general speech about Western strategy and mentioned in passing "the potential problem of political instability in North Africa." And to head the mission he named Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, a tall dapper man who as deputy to NATO supreme commander Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer has the dual role of second in command over all NATO forces in Europe and over all American forces in Europe.

Burchinal started work on Dec. 7. Two days later he signed a joint minute with the Spaniards on the threat they face. It included as a seirous element the threat of limited war in North Africa, mentioning such possibilities as Algerian aggression, a "proxy" war in the Spanish colonies backed by the Russians, and other highly unlikely developments. His signature to this vast expansion of Wheeler's remark implied that Spain was justified in seeking far more weapons than the U.S. wants to give.

While he worked, he kept his papers locked in a safe at the U.S. air base at Torrejon, which is under his command. Neither the U.S. Embassy in Madrid nor the regular U.S. military mission there was given any word on conduct of the talks, nor could they possibly get access to the papers that were taken each night from Madrid to Torrejon.

Burchinal sent his copy of the signed minute back to Wheeler. It was not shown to the State Department nor to Pentagon civilians. After two weeks, with the intervention of top Pentagon civilians, the paper was finally produced.

The civilians, at the Pentagon and especially at State, were distressed with it. The

XUM

extended reference to a threat from North Africa could be used to involve the U.S. in a Spanish colonial war. They wanted the text changed. Burchinal refused on the grounds that it was already signed and that trying to get a redraft would ruin his negotiations.

So State and the Pentagon compromised. They agreed on the text of a "prefatory note" which was sent to Burchinal to be inserted in the next joint minute on "tasks and missions." The note said the talks were a useful exchange of views but that nothing in the first or future minutes could be considered a binding Spanish-American understanding or commitment.

They also agreed on a proposed minute for the second stage and sent it to Burchinal to negotiate. It eliminated the whole passage about North Africa. There was no report from Burchinal for over a month. Then, in early February, he returned the jointly signed minute with a deadline of 48 hours for approval. The Joint Chiefs demanded State's endorsement.

The State Department people exploded. Burchinal had made three crucial changes:

1. The "threat from North Africa" idea was reinserted.

2. A statement was inserted saying the U.S. was obligated to defend Western Europe "of which Spain is an integral part." State Department lawyers pointed out that this could extend the NATO guarantee to include Spain, a vast and probably illegal commitment without Senate ratification.

3. The "prefatory note" was changed. It said that the minutes were "agreed views" of the two military sides and "must constitute" the basis for further talks on arms for Spain, though it still contained the phrase that this was not a commitment.

Furthermore, State was incensed at the impertinence of the 48-hour deadline and refused approval. Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird intervened on the request of Pentagon staff. He got Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who was in Florida, to insist on speedy clearance of the paper.

An inter-departmental meeting was called. It was stormy. Reluctantly, State agreed to endorse Burchinal's minute provided two changes were made. The fateful "integral part of Europe" phrase was removed and a sentence was added to the "prefatory note" saying the talks "do not necessarily reflect the views of the two governments."

The whole issue was then sent, as case No. 1, to the new Inter-Departmental Group for Europe set up under the Nixon Administration's machinery for funneling policy decisions to the National Security Council. Assistant Secretary of State John Leddy is chairman of the group. Its report went into the broad dangers of any security commitment to troubled Spain, whether the U.S. really needs the bases and how high a price it should pay for them in terms of both money and future policy risks.

The Spaniards have repeatedly made vague threats that they might turn neutral if there is no new base agreement. Some American officers argue that Madrid might settle for fewer weapons if it could get a mutual security treaty with the U.S. American diplomats are convinced this would be an outrageously false economy.

At the least it would open the U.S. to serious charges from anti-Franco Spaniards that it deliberately supported his dictatorship, as Cuban moderates who initially supported Castro charged about Batista. At the worst, it could impel the U.S. into an unwanted war.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States is indeed to follow the prescription of President Nixon during and after the campaign, to decrease our policing commitments around the world, would not Spain be a salutary place to begin?

Is it really in the interest of the United States to go on propping up forever so dubious a government against so dubious a possibility as a hypothetical invasion by Algerians or from Ifni and the South Sahara?

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, with the deadline near for renewal of the agreement covering American military bases in Spain, I wish to join my colleagues, and particularly commend the able gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) in focusing attention on a number of significant issues involved in this agreement.

The American public deserves to have its Government examine with a much more discriminating eye this relationship which reveals so many questionable aspects of our foreign policy:

Is there a significant military necessity for American bases in Spain when even the Defense Department agrees their security value appears minimal?

Is American diplomacy to be carried out by American generals with a restricted view of the political consequences of their actions?

Is the tremendous financial commitment to Spain over the past years justified by the minimal value of these bases?

Should we allow ourselves to become involved in the internal politics of another country by giving aid to an undemocratic, a totalitarian regime?

Should the executive be allowed to make such consequential commitments by executive agreement without benefit of congressional review?

However, I would like today to briefly elaborate on one particularly important question in addition to those I have stated, which is raised by our support of the Franco dictatorship which only recently again reverted to the repressive policies of a police state.

The issue is not a new one, but it never suffers from reiteration because it is so important in disclosing a chronic flow in our foreign policy. How often must we earn the enmity of the large majority of the peoples of foreign lands by materially supporting the oppressive governments that they abhor? Why must we lose sight of the idealism we cherish so dearly?

That Franco's government has nothing in common with American ideals of democratic government hardly bears explanation, but recent facts make the conclusion even more apparent. Although a new era of moderation was supposed to have been effected over the past 5 or 6 years, on January 24 of this year Franco established a "state of exception," suspending numerous civil liberties, in response to student unrest and some simple declarations by intellectuals of desires for more freedom.

The emergency action established nothing less than a severe police state.

Hundreds of arrests were made—Spain admits to 260—and thousands of detentions were imposed without warrants.

Police were given authority to make searches at any place or time.

At least 17 intellectuals and university professors were forced into exile.

The Spanish press was severly censored. Even as the "state of exception" is being lifted, Franco's government has made it clear that it will retain power to suspend publications or fine editors who are too politically outspoken.

Indeed, the recent announcement of the lifting of emergency measures would seem to be deliberately aimed at softening criticism at this delicate point in negotiations. But the meaning of this gesture is certainly little more than illusory. When the need to cultivate American opinion is passed, the experience of this dictator has shown he will have no hesitancy in restoring his repressive measures at his whim so let us not be fooled by this superficial act of the so-called lifting of restrictions. The period of moderation that existed earlier was dispensed with as soon as the "strong man" felt the slightest threat to his omnipotent power.

In addition to the serious moral reservations the American Government should feel in dealing with this regime, due consideration should be given to the effect our support produces on the minds of the dissatisfied Spaniards. More and more America is being equated in the thoughts of millions of Spaniards with the hated regime.

The people of Spain want a change from the old ways of the "caudillo." Numerous widespread elements of the Spanish public have shown their impatience with the strong-arm tactics. Before the emergency, state students had called for academic reform; lawyers from Madrid College asked the government to shelve proposed repressive legislation; 1,300 prominent Spaniards called on the government to investigate alleged police torture practices; even the younger Catholic clergy had made some outspoken protests.

That American money and military aid should be going to Franco at precisely the time when so many of his own people have launched their heaviest criticism upon him is a course that is at once ironic and unwise. Despite explanatory speeches and the like, few Spaniards would fail to regard the concluding agreement as placing the weight of Washington behind the generals of Madrid.

In short, there is little to recommend this compact. It is not favorable to any American economic or political interests and where the needs of American security are so questionable, should the United States be aiding a foreign regime which controverts the ideals of democratic government and is opposed by its very own people. It is both the right and the responsibility of the American Government to take an objective look, unclouded by the limited views of its military advisers, at the whole question.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York. And, finally, Mr. Speaker, I must ask what hidden benefits there are for the United States in expensive alliances with repressive governments in their declining periods. Do we really need to finance rotten little dictatorships resented by their own people and rejected

XUM

by the decent opinion of mankind? Do we need a Greek junta so badly that we must finance and equip one?

I have spent a good deal of time in Spain over the years. There will, thank God, be a Spain when there is no longer a Francisco Franco. And one day the Spanish people, who—like many other peoples but more heroically than most—fought for their freedom against Hitler and Mussolini, will live in freedom again.

But meanwhile, what are we doing to America in the eyes of Spain. And what are we doing to Spain in the name of America.

The guns and planes with which we pay rent for our bases in Spain have been used and will be used not to fight Russians or Chinese, but to frighten Spaniards. Where do the armored personnel carriers, the machineguns, the ammunition, the helicopters—paid for by Americans and given to the Spanish Army—where do they go? What do they do? What are they for?

About these matters, Mr. Speaker, I am especially grateful for the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN).

And I want to call to the attention of the House the comments of the Abbot of Montserrat, one of the great figures of the Roman Catholic Church, who said in 1963:

> We have behind us not twenty-five years of peace, but twenty-five years of victory. The victors . . . have done nothing to put an end to this division between victors and vanquished. Therein lies one of the most lamentable failures of a regime which calls itself Christian, but whose state does not obey the basic principle of Christianity.
>
> The people should be able to choose their own form of government and should be able to alter it.
>
> The government has no right to abuse its power. It should be an administrator in the name of God and a servant of the people.
>
> I have been very much interested, and continue to be interested, in the political prisoners, whose existence constitutes one of the most painful aspects of the regime. Their presence in the prisons is in direct relation to the peace which the state has not succeeded in restoring.

I have been in Spain again recently, Mr. Speaker, and whatever the Spanish Government now says to ease the resentment against it here and elsewhere on the eve of these negotiations, the unhappy fact remains that the finest democrats of that sad land are once again in hiding, in jail, in terror, in remote villages for undisclosed crimes, for undefined periods of time.

There must be a better use for the money extracted from the people of this Nation than to add to the burdens of a friendly people who have done us no harm and who crave only freedom and justice for themselves.

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Before the gentleman concludes I want to compliment the gentleman on his remarks here today. I did not hear everything the gentleman had to say, but certainly it is my own view that there is some need to maintain some military capability in the Mediterranean.

I believe that the Rota Base, which our Navy uses out there, is perhaps critical for some of our deployments there. I believe there are, however, a considerable number of other surplus military installations which we still currently have on lease with the Spanish Government, and with respect to those surplus capabilities I would certainly point out they are pertinent to the nature of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Mr. LOWENSTEIN on his fine presentation of the facts and major problems at issue in the negotiations on U.S. military aid and installations in Spain.

It is becoming increasingly clear that events such as the Spanish negotiations are symptomatic of a far deeper problem confronting U.S. foreign policy. This problem is the military determination of U.S. foreign policy. The problem takes on two dimensions. The first is that many of our advanced and extremely costly weapons systems are so far reaching in their capabilities and missions that the systems are in effect determining the foreign policy. This would seem to be the ultimate in the often feared technological takeover of our society. In the past we have always assumed that our policy would be determined by men—hopefully, the President with consultation from the Department of State. Now however, it seems that we are reaching the era where the weapons systems promoted by the military are rushed through Congress, and a foreign policy is then structured around the capabilities of the system. Not only does this directly threaten the long held concept of civilian control of the military, but goes a step further, and threatens to have the computers and systems analysts control the civilians.

The second symptom is present in the Spanish incident. In this case the military—Major General Burchinal to be exact—has negotiated far-reaching commitments with the Spanish authorities. These negotiations go far beyond technical military aid requirements and reach directly into the province of our overall commitments to the Spanish Government, including discussions on possible U.S. involvement in Vietnam-type actions which the Spanish fear may erupt in their spheres of influence in Africa. I would think we had learned a lesson by now from our Vietnam experience. It seems we have not. The military is still determined to involve the United States in a perennial position of police force to the world. These discussions were carried on by the Army without the consultation of the Department of State and from all indications against the judgment of the Department of State.

We must put a stop to the Pentagon bulldozer. Just yesterday Senator MANSFIELD charged that the officials of the Department of Defense in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Armed Services Committee hearings had gone beyond the outline of the safeguard ABM system presented by President Nixon. The DOD is determined to have its way with these systems, and I predict that by the time they are through, the ABM system that is deployed will be far heavier than the one originally proposed. This has happened time and time again. The systems get bigger and more expensive and no effective controls are placed on their development.

This blatant example of diplomatic negotiation by the military in Spain is symptomatic of the dangerous problem facing us.

We must once and for all decide who is in charge here. Is the military the arm of the civilian authority, or are the civilians merely the conduit for funds to the military?

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I heard one statement the gentleman made to which I should like to take exception. The gentleman has said that no evidence has been offered as to need for these bases.

I would concede that the character of the need has changed. The technology of defense, if we want to call it that, has changed, and to some degree we have passed from the bombers which were used when the bases were originally instituted to the use of submarines and also of missiles.

But I believe it is very important to look back at the history of the use of these bases and to realize they have proved to be of vital importance in many respects and I cite their use in relation to the Congo and in relation to the recent war in the Middle East.

As a Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have heard no one—in the military, or in Defense, or State—say that they are not important. To the contrary, they have said they are very important.

While the importance has changed in quality and perhaps to some degree otherwise, nevertheless they still have a very vital importance for us in the Mediterranean and in relation to these other areas of which I have already spoken.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I was wondering whether that importance would be in connection with the accessibility of these areas to Spain? I believe it is important, if that would be the inference, to consider some of the mileages involved.

Mr. MONAGAN. It is not to the areas of Spain, but it is our use of these bases in relation to other areas in the world, such as the Middle East. I mentioned the Congo. Biafra might be a conceivable area. Although it is not big enough to require any great mercy airlift, which is what I am thinking of. With the base of Wheelus in Libya being of questionable availability, with the bases in Turkey being in some doubt, with the increased activity of the U.S.S.R. as to its fleet in the eastern Mediterranean, and its activities in the Red Sea area, its penetration of the United Arab Republic, I believe that this is practically the only remaining base available to us outside of the Azores which is on a de facto basis, means it assumes a greater significance.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. The mileage from Madrid to the Suez Canal is 2,100 miles and the distance from Wiesbaden to the same place is 1,800 miles. In terms of critical areas the mileage from Madrid to the Bosporus is 1,650; from Wiesbaden it is 1,150; submit that, while it may be convenient to have additional bases, these bases are neither more accessible nor more convenient than the bases we already have.

Mr. MONAGAN. Of course, Wiesbaden is not a base of this character. I have visited all of these bases. It is not the same type of base at all in size or capacity or anything else. We are not increasing the number of bases. Actually the fact is that we are decreasing them. I mentioned Wheelus and the Turkish bases, as examples. So it is not a question of increasing their number, but we are actually decreasing them.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I find it difficult to understand what purpose it serves to involve ourselves in this considerable additional expenditure, or to commit ourselves to the particular government that runs Spain, simply for the decreasing convenience that you suggest.

Mr. MONAGAN. We do not know what the expenditure will be. Actually, talks are in process at the present time and no agreement has been reached. In the past in similar bargaining we have seen the figures go down from something like $1 billion to a matter of several hundred million. I am sure that will happen in this case. However, I do not agree and would not want my own support of the military necessity to be read as any support of the Franco regime. Nor do the people who are negotiating on our part consider a military agreement to constitute political approval. On the other hand, we should not sacrifice our security interests because a cooperative regime does not conform in all ways to our prescription. So I think that is clearly not a point as far as this matter is concerned.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I wonder if the gentleman would suggest what reasonable limit we should pay, in view of the cost to the taxpayer, for the use of these additional bases which, you suggest, may have been essential years ago but now may be a matter of convenience.

Mr. MONAGAN. No. I do not say they are merely a matter of convenience. I say they are a matter of great importance. What the amount of the rental should be involves a great many things. I do not have those figures at hand. But it seems to me that there was a time when it was a matter of $100 million or something like that. However, I would not want to be held down to amounts. On the other hand, I point out that purchases have been made in this country by Spain that have exceeded the amounts we have paid for the rental rights.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. The trouble is that when they purchase $50 million in military equipment, we give them a like amount of $50 million, which in effect means that we are giving the Spanish Government a sort of matching grant, a grant-in-aid which means they get American military equipment at half the price we pay to supply our own troops in Vietnam. I confess that I am troubled by a concept of U.S. military security that involves making available to Spain military equipment at half the price that we have to pay for it ourselves.

Mr. MONAGAN. As far as I know, it is paid for at regular prices and the purchase has been in excess of the amounts that we have paid in for the bases.

It has been used as I understand it for the modernization of the equipment of the Spanish Armed Forces.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. If I may pursue the point a bit further, the official figures are that to date we have expended almost $700 million in military assistance to Spain, exclusive of these military matching grants and of economic aid. I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut that we would be wasting our time to argue the history of the matter at this point. But I would hope we could agree that in view of our immense national debt and tax burdens, of our other defense needs, of our varied commitments around the world, and of our innumerable other obligations, we should set up a scale of priorities. I believe it is incumbent upon the Members of the House of Representatives to consider this question of priorities, and to consider in that context whether we really ought to continue this operation in Spain. In my opinion it would be unwise to consider just the immediate price tag when there is so much involved here.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I fully agree with the gentleman. I myself have filed a bill to set up a commission to determine priorities in the allocation of our national assets. I think the gentleman from New York and I might differ as to the importance of this particular project in relation to our overall defense. When we get down to that point, I think that is basically what we are arguing about here.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. In that connection, might it not be a useful pursuit to determine whether, in view of the limited resources of the United States, its pressing other needs, its overwhelming tax burden, and its rising national debt, it makes sense to continue this program in Spain. Is it desirable to further extend these leases without a full national discussion of the facts and of all the questions that you and I are discussing now?

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am in favor of public discussion. One of the reasons I rose to raise these points is because I think it should be discussed and we are discussing it. I do think that the gentleman from New York has done a service in bringing his point of view before the House. Mine differs somewhat and, therefore, I want to bring out the points that I think are important in this matter. Certainly, this matter of military spending does involve the consideration of an allocation of priorities. I would be the first one to admit that there are many areas where I think we could cut back. Even the Secretary of Defense has recommended a reduction in military spending. So it then becomes a matter of one's judgment as to what is best for the welfare of the country.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman for taking part in this discussion. I hope, however, we have only begun the discussion today. I think it would be unfortunate for the United States, in view of the significance of this decision and the many other things involved, to act on the question of whether to extend the bases in Spain as if there were no further implications and costs.

I think on the matter of the national security that the viewpoint of Senator SYMINGTON and others who have been intimately involved with security problems for years, and who are deeply concerned about the effect of our overseas base policies and commitments on our national situation that that testimony might wisely be considered along with yours and mine.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just one more point, I read the views of Senator SYMINGTON and I think that one must consider statements that are made at the present time in connection with negotiations that are going on. Sometimes a lawyer in a case where a settlement is about to be made might puff his case or belittle the opponent's case. I think that, perhaps, is the case here.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from New York is to be very much commended for bringing this matter to the floor for discussion. I would like to say further that I find myself somewhat in disagreement with the views expressed by the gentleman from New York, and more in conformity with the views of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) as to at least the reservations that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) has just expressed.

Be that as it may, however, the reason for asking the gentleman to yield is because, along with the gentleman from Connecticut, I serve on the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There have been some initial hearings on this subject in that subcommittee. However, I feel that I should call to the attention of the House that I believe that to the desk of every Member of the House, certainly to mine, there came a statement from the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee.

In that statement there is certain language which is subject to the interpretation, and I am sure that it is not intended to be subject to that interpretation, but nevertheless is subject to the interpretation that the Subcommittee on Europe has acted upon this matter, and that the chairman has been authorized to speak for such committee. I want to make it clear that that is not the case. The subcommittee has not, as far as I know, taken any action in connection with this issue. I believe it is useful to explore the issue. I believe, however, as the gentleman from Connecticut has already explained, that when one attempts to assess the economic and military problems, as well as the effect on our foreign affairs of these decisions, one is looking at a pretty broad scope, and to try to isolate one particular area and examine it without reference to the entire problem of defense is extremely difficult.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contributions to this discussion made by the gentleman from Ohio. I quite share his concern that we consider the Spanish bases in a larger context—that, in fact, has been a major thrust of my remarks today. Unless we have the capacity in the United States to question whether or not it is in the interest of our country to continue this involvement and this expenditure, we have lost a very important part of our best traditions. Almost anything can be done in a cloak of secrecy if we assume that the incantation of the words "national security" precludes weighing military requests—and rejecting military requests that do not withstand careful scrutiny successfully. There would not be much left of the America we love if the people were denied the right of investigation and decision.

Thus it seems to me there is a very special responsibility for us to examine this matter with great diligence and great awareness of our overall national purposes and needs.

It does not serve simply to say that we need some military program or other because some general says so. Our generals may be highly motivated, but they have been known to be wrong nonetheless. This country is not dependent exclusively upon the views of generals in the determination of these matters. I suspect if it were we would not have done as well as we have. We would certainly not be what we are.

I hope therefore that others will want to proceed with this discussion after today, will want to urge upon the President and the Congress the importance of the continuation of such a discussion.

I hope today will help sound a tocsin for the necessity of such a discussion.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues today in raising serious questions as to the propriety of our renewal of our base agreement with the Franco regime. It seems to me that the Spaniards, whose foreign minister is now in Washington to consummate another 5-year executive agreement between our two Governments, have indeed struck a fine bargain—for Spain.

But has the national interest of the United States been well served? I think not. I believe it is important to view the agreements in a very basic sense. Is the U.S. Government which will have to furnish some $300 million additional in war material for the Spanish armed forces getting a good return for its money? The most ardent supporters of our continued commitment to Spain do not, and can not, claim that these bases are vital in any sense to our own security.

On the other hand, the pitfalls that could result from our continued intimate association with the dictatorial Spanish Government are too readily apparent. Should much needed social and political change finally come to Spain, on whose side shall we stand? How shall the United States as guardian and benefactor of the Ancien regime be judged by the new leadership and the Spanish people? If serious civil disturbances occur as they did on a milder scale 2 months ago, will not the pressures to intervene to protect the lives of our 15,000 servicemen and their dependents override other considerations? What of our costly installations there? Could we ever allow them to be taken over precipitously?

Mr. Speaker, the unmistakable fact that emerges is that our bases and our lavish military assistance are tying our own hands in identifying with the winds of change that must some day sweep over the Iberian Peninsula. What is surely not more than a matter of convenience today for our own military, could very well become a matter of urgency, or at the least, acute political embarrassment tomorrow.

The Defense Department's dubious role in the negotiations has fortunately already been brought to light. The arrogant unconcern for opposing viewpoints, the Byzantine secrecy, and the eagerness to commit our Government to the defense of Spain—under a set of highly unlikely circumstances, I must add—these all raise serious questions as to the proper role of our generals in making foreign policy for the United States. The Defense Department's undercutting of the authority and the responsibility of the Department of State in the base negotiations is but a single example of the increasingly preeminent role of our military in the formulation of vital political decisions affecting our country's future.

In the background of this sorry episode, we must not overlook the most severe suppression of dissent in Spain—the past 2 months under their "state of exception"—a form of rigid martial law. It is apparent to me that these draconian measures which have been conveniently lifted only yesterday, too conveniently coincide with the visit here of Foreign Minister Castiella. If anything, this cynical gesture shows a fine appreciation for public relations—particularly when the American public is involved, rather than the Spanish public.

Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves whether the renewal of the base agreement with Franco-Spain will encourage the liberalization that we have read about with grateful anticipation. I think not. Besides strengthening the hands of the Spanish military, the agreement gives substance to the menace of the Communist bogeyman supposedly threatening Spain, and against which the harshest measures are justified.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, a renewal of our base agreement with Spain offers aid and encouragement to the two parties whose narrow interests in this matter have unfortunately prevailed—the Franco regime, and our own Department of Defense.

April 1, 1969, will mark the thirtieth anniversary of the complete domination of Spanish life by Generalissimo Franco and his cohorts, and of the subjugation of a proud people whose culture has enriched our own hemisphere particularly. Mr. Speaker, is not the time ripe to rid ourselves of the tie to a most dismal period of Spanish history, and to commit ourselves to Spain's future?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the United States is being asked to pay $700 million in military aid to retain three Air Force and one submarine base in Spain for 5 years, a high price even in these days of inflated rents.

The Spanish people, and press, when allowed have made clear their unhappiness with the American military presence in Spain. The United States unfortunate experience in losing a hydrogen bomb off Paomares, Spain, in 1966 made even the Franco government unhappy. The bases have become an open sore to the Spanish workers and students, prohibiting good relations with them.

Further, the Spanish Government recently suspended many of the limited freedoms enjoyed by the Spanish people. For the United States to renew the leases, and pay $700 million in military aid for them, would be de facto endorsement of those limitations on basic freedoms.

The Christian Science Monitor has called the proposed payment "a bribe." Whether it is rent, or a bribe, the question arises whether these bases are needed, or whether they are now unnecessary real estate. The original agreement with Spain in 1953 came at a time when bases for relatively short range Air Force strategic bombers were needed. Today the United States is armed with intercontinental missiles, B–52 bombers and the Polaris submarine fleet—a fleet which can operate from the shores of the United States. What then is the need for the Spanish bases?

The security of the United States is not a question. The payment of a rent, or "bribe," for unnecessary bases is.

The present administration, which often has called for economy, can accomplish a $700 million economy at the stroke of a pen. As per our present agreements with the Spanish Government, the United States should notify Spain the bases are no longer required and will be evacuated within the specified year. The $700 million can be put to far better use.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleagues—Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Adams, Mr. Halpern, Mr. McCloskey, and Mr. Ryan—for arranging this opportunity for the Members of the House to discuss the critical issues involved in the negotiations for the renewal of American base rights in Spain.

It seems to me altogether fitting on the eve of the expiration of our present agreements for these bases in Spain for the House of Representatives to address itself to the question whether it is wise to continue to operate those bases, and if so whether it is wise to expend hundreds of millions of dollars and new defense commitments to preserve that continued operation.

I would only hope that the administration would heed the concerns which motivate several of us to today question the wisdom of our continued military

XUM

presence in Spain at these high dollar and commitment costs.

It seems to me that the situation in Spain is not unique, but rather that it reflects circumstances in the making and operation of American foreign policy which can be, and indeed have been, duplicated in other parts of the world.

First. There is the tendency to hold on to foreign bases even after the facts justifying their original acquisition have ceased to exist.

Our bases in Spain were acquired at a time when they were thought essential to the maintenance of our nuclear deterrent. No one today claims these bases are still essential for this purpose. And so it is that one is led to question whether the continued use of these bases is worth the price we are being asked to pay—in money, in support of an unattractive regime, in the extension of further military commitments to defend still more nations in more circumstances.

I expect that the arguments we are now hearing with regard to bases in Spain, we will be hearing in the coming months with regard to bases in Japan, and in Korea, and in Turkey, and in other parts of the world. I suggest that we pay close attention to these arguments to retain these bases. In a good many cases I think we will find that the original justifications have expired, and that only jury-built reasons remain to support the request.

Second. I think we can discern in the Spanish situation a possible example of how it is that our military presence tends to expand into still further commitments and presence. Press accounts indicate that an American general negotiating on behalf of the U.S. Government may have offered to commit the United States to defend Spain in the same degree to which we are now obligated to defend NATO allies. This is, if true, a most ominous development.

Where afterall is the great threat to Spain at this moment? It would appear on casual analysis to be a threat from the people of Spain in opposition to the repressive regime of the present rulers of the country. Are the French or the Italians or the Russians or Chinese apt to attack Spain? And if they did, is it clear that the United States should in every case be obligated to come to Spain's defense?

I do not think the answers to these questions are so clear as to indicate that the United States should enter into such a defense commitment—and moreover, I do not believe there can be any justification for undertaking such a commitment so lightly and in such cavalier fashion.

Again, I think it may be that this extension of commitments by military authorities in the countries in question could be duplicated in Latin America or Southeast Asia. Again, too, I suggest to my colleagues that we listen closely to how this offer of new military undertakings came about—it may be very instructive in preventing a recurrence.

Third. I am concerned with the apparent fact that the Department of Defense and not the State Department or the President has been independently carrying on negotiations which vitally affect our foreign policy. Is it true that uniformed officers have taken great pains to conceal their activities from civilian scrutiny in the Department of State? If it is, I think it is a matter which should be of interest to us.

Is it true that after review in Washington by diplomats and defense experts our negotiators in the field agree to arrangements in opposition to the instructions from Washington? If so we should be interested.

Could it be that this behavior too could be duplicated elsewhere in American relations overseas?

Fourth. I wonder whether we are giving adequate attention to the impact of continued American military assistance to the Franco regime on the attitudes of the Spanish people and of our friends and enemies throughout the world. I think it is fair to say that the present Spanish regime is antithetical to most American values and ideals. This Government has in recent months moved to an even more repressive posture than that which has marked its past reign. Military assistance provides the funds to operate, equip and maintain an army to enforce this repression should it be challenged by force. This overwhelming military strength in turn allows the present regime to refuse to accede to the desires of its people for increased liberty. Is this the sort of policy for which precious American resources should be spent?

Fifth. I come finally to the large monetary costs of our continued operation of these Spanish bases.

The American civilians and servicemen assigned to these bases consume millions of dollars in foreign exchange each year—years in which balance-of-payments difficulties have caused us to restrict American investments abroad, and to maintain artificially high interest rates. Are these Spanish bases and the convenience they provide worth the foreign exchange costs? Would American businessmen rather see American foreign exchange spent to maintain these facilities in Spain, or would they prefer to increase their freedom to invest overseas?

Would American consumers rather pay lower prices due to the elimination of "voluntary" limits on imports caused by foreign exchange shortages, or would they prefer to maintain these bases in Spain?

In terms of foreign assistance the costs are high, too. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee charged with oversight of the foreign assistance program I can testify to the scarcity of resources available for expenditure in support of foreign countries. Would the American people rather spend their limited foreign aid resources on payoffs to the Spanish for these bases, or would they rather meet the problems of starvation in Nigeria/Biafra, or the problems of overpopulation in India, or the general problems of economic development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America?

And then, too, would those who live in America and need food, and housing, and job training, would they rather spend American resources for the convenience of these Spanish bases, or would they rather save the money for expenditure at home?

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I believe that very grave questions are raised by our continued operation of these Spanish bases.

Are the reasons for the maintenance of these bases outdated?

Is the military expanding our commitments to defend still more countries in still more circumstances?

Is the Defense Department and not the State Department and the President making our foreign policy?

Is the United States wise in continuing to support a regime antithetical to the American way of life?

Are the costs of these bases so vital that Americans should be willing to restrict their foreign investments and foreign assistance to preserve their operation?

These I submit, Mr. Speaker, are questions which should and must be answered before we proceed to pledge away the future lives and resources of this country. Until they are answered to my satisfaction I have strong reservations about renewal of our Spanish operations.

For the sake of informing those who read the RECORD, I would like to include at this point an editorial from the Washington Post and an article by Flora Lewis which deal with the questions I have raised today:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1969]

THE SPANISH BASES

This week Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Castiello Maiz arrives in Washington to conduct the final round of negotiations for the continued American occupancy of four bases in Spain, whose lease expires March 26. These bases—three Air Force, one Navy—have quite a history. They were established in 1953, in the most frigid years of the Cold War as part of the defense system that ringed the Soviet Union, from Spain and Morocco to Turkey. In return for the leased land, the United States pumped $1.2 billion in economic and military assistance into Spain over the next ten years. In 1963 the lease was renewed for five years in return for $100 million in military aid. Last summer the Spanish came back with a demand for $1 billion for the next five years, a sum that was later scaled down to $700 million in military aid. There were other Spanish demands as well, among them a commitment that the United States come to Spain's defense in case of attack—presumably, and incredibly, from North Africa. The American Government's position on all this has been far from clear, in part because the Johnson Administration apparently authorized a major general to do its diplomatic business in Spain, and it is not at all certain that his views coincide with the Government's. The notion now is that the United States will settle for a five-year extension at $100 million.

It is an astonishing business. No one, not even the Air Force, contends that the three air bases in Spain—in this, the age of the ICBM—are essential to American defense. "Desirable" is about the strongest word one can in good conscience extract, and that largely on the basis that the Department of Defense, the bureaucratic proof of the validity of the territorial imperative, never voluntarily gives up its turf, in this case three air bases. The naval base, useful for the servicing

XUM

of Polaris submarines, is not essential either; it is marginally less expensive to service the subs in Rota, rather than the Eastern United States, and that is about all. So there is little in the way of persuasive military argument for retention of the bases and the 10,000 men who man them, particularly at a $700 million price tag.

The objections to extension of the lease however, go way beyond $100 million or $1 billion and four obsolete and obsolescent bases. It is that the money in military aid will go to the Franco regime at precisely the time when it is under heaviest fire from its critics—left, right and center, from anarchist to monarchist—for reinstating the repression so characteristic of "the system" in the years immediately following the civil war. To conclude this agreement now would be to place the weight of Washington behind the generals in Madrid, no matter how many explanatory speeches, statements and backgrounders came from the White House. Beyond that, and not very far beyond it, is the inadvertent stake we acquire in a country once we establish bases and staff them with American soldiers. Diplomacy follows the flag. Who rules in Madrid becomes important not for political reasons but for military ones: What will they do to the bases? It would be interesting to know how the Administration is sorting out these questions. Which comes first: politics or military security, in this case—by most of the evidence—a dubious military security.

In short, this agreement appears to have very little to recommend it. It does not appear to be favorable to American interests on any grounds, military, political or economic, and in fact would tend to bring this countrv into disrepute with exactly those elements, in Spain and out of it, who should be our allies. A persuasive case for renewal of the leases has yet to be made.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 27, 1969]

Pentagon's Spanish Bases "Diplomacy" Triggers Feud

(By Flora Lewis)

A secret dispute has developed between the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff over American commitments to Franco Spain. At one point, the military almost made a U.S. pledge to fight for Spain as though it were a NATO country.

The Senate Foreign Relations committee, which is starting to study how the U.S. gets into military obligations abroad, got wind of the blow-up between the State Department and the Pentagon at its peak. A committee staff member inquired and was told by both sides that there was no disagreement, no trouble. The executive departments are not inviting the senators into their quarrel.

But the trouble has been brewing for months. The issue is now on its way to the National Security Council and will have to be decided by President Nixon. The story is a new case history of how the United States can stumble into a foreign war.

The immediate issue is the two air bases and the submarine base which the United States has in Spain. Although American officials disagree on their precise value, there is general agreement that none is essential to national security though all are useful.

The base agreement runs out this year. It provides that unless Madrid and Washington agree on renewal terms by March 26, the United States must evacuate within one year.

Talks on renewal went on during much of 1968. But last September, the Spaniards broke off negotiations saying the gap between their price of $700 million in new weapons for another five years' use of the bases and the U.S. offer of $140 million in weapons and services was too big. If it was a bluff, it didn't work.

So in October, Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella called on then Secretary of State Dean Rusk to launch a new approach. In place of the diplomatic talks, an American military mission was assigned to a three-stage discussion with the Spanish military, who dominate Spain. They were to assess the actual threat facing Spain, the "tasks and missions" the Spaniards must undertake to face it, and then the equipment needed to do the job.

Rusk's idea was that by tackling the subject in terms of needs rather than supplies, Madrid could be brought way down from its exorbitant demands for its three armed services.

Rusk also asked, twice, for a six-month extension of the March 26 deadline to give the new Administration time for this important policy decision. The Spaniards flatly refused.

On Nov. 18–20, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, visited Madrid and opened the talks. He made a general speech about western strategy and mentioned in passing "the potential problem of political instability in North Africa." And to head the mission he named Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, a tall, dapper man who as deputy to NATO chief Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer has the dual role of second in command over all NATO forces in Europe and over all American forces in Europe.

Burchinal started work on Dec. 7. Two days later he signed a joint minute with the Spaniards on the threat they face. It included as a serious element the threat of limited war in North Africa, mentioning such possibilities as Algerian aggression, a "proxy" war in the Spanish colonies backed by the Russians, and other highly unlikely developments. His signature to this vast expansion of Wheeler's remark implied that Spain was justified in seeking far more weapons than the United States wants to give.

While he worked, he kept his papers locked in a safe at the U.S. air base at Torrejon, which is under his command. Neither the U.S. Embassy in Madrid nor the regular U.S. military mission there was given any word on conduct of the talks, nor could they possibly get access to the papers, which were taken each night from Madrid to Torrejon.

Burchinal sent his copy of the signed minute back to Wheeler. It was not shown to the State Department nor to Pentagon civilians. After two weeks, with the intervention of top Pentagon civilians, the paper was finally produced.

The civilians, at the Pentagon and especially at State, were distressed with it. The extended reference to a threat from North Africa could be used to involve the United States in a Spanish colonial war. They wanted the text changed. Burchinal refused on the grounds that it was already signed and that trying to get a redraft would ruin his negotiations.

So State and the Pentagon compromised. They agreed on the text of a "prefatory note" which was sent to Burchinal to be inserted in the next joint minute on "tasks and missions." The note said the talks were a useful exchange of views but that nothing in the first or future minutes could be considered a binding Spanish-American understanding or commitment.

They also agreed on a proposed minute for the second stage and sent it to Burchinal to negotiate. It eliminated the whole passage about North Africa. There was no report from Burchinal for over a month. Then, in early February, he returned the jointly signed second minute with a deadline of 48 hours for approval. The Joint Chiefs demanded State's endorsement.

The State Department people exploded. Burchinal had made three crucial changes:

1—The "threat from North Africa" idea was reinserted.

2—A statement was inserted saying the United States was obligated to defend western Europe "of which Spain is an integral part." State Department lawyers pointed out this could extend the NATO guarantee to include Spain, a vast and probably illegal commitment without Senate ratification. It could be used to drag the United States into a second Spanish civil war if Madrid held that possible rebels were acting for Moscow.

3—The "prefatory note" was changed. It said that the minutes were "agreed views" of the two military sides and "must constitute" the basis for further talks on arms for Spain, though it still contained the phrase that this was not a commitment.

Furthermore, State was incensed at the impertinence of the 48-hour deadline and refused approval. Secretary of Defense Mel Laird intervened on the request of Pentagon staff. He got Secretary of State Bill Rogers, who was in Florida, to insist on speedy clearance of the paper.

An interdepartmental meeting was called. It was stormy. Reluctantly, State agreed to endorse Burchinal's minute providing two changes were made. The fateful "integral part of Europe" phrase was removed and a sentence was added to the "prefatory note" saying the talks "do not necessarily reflect the views of the two governments."

The whole issue was then sent, as case number one, to the new intergovernmental committee for Europe set up under the Nixon Administration's machinery for funneling policy decisions to the National Security Council. Assistant Secretary of State John Leddy is chairman of the committee. Its report went into the broad dangers of any security commitment to troubled Spain, whether the United States really needs the bases and how high a price it should pay for them in terms of both money and future policy risks.

The Spaniards have repeatedly made vague threats that they might turn neutral if there is no new base agreement. Some American officers argue that Madrid might settle for less weapons if it could get a mutual security treaty with the United States. American diplomats are convinced this would be an outrageously false economy.

At the least it would open the United States to serious charges from anti-Franco Spaniards that it deliberately supported his dictatorship, as Cuban moderates who initially supported Castro charged about Batista. At the worst, it could impel the United States into an unwanted war.

State is opposed to asking the Spaniards again to extend the March 26 deadline because that would stiffen Madrid's intransigence. Time is running out. Soon, probably before the Senate committee gets down to work on finding out how the United States gets pushed into pledges which lead to national disasters, President Nixon will have to decide how badly the United States wants its Air Force and Navy bases in Spain.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of my colleague from New York (Mr. Lowenstein) in his perceptive analysis and recommendations regarding lease renewals for American military bases in Spain. As does Mr. Lowenstein, I argue that we should let the leases lapse, but I think this decision should be part of a much larger move toward a positive U.S. foreign policy.

Ideally, foreign policy ought to be determined by Congress and relevant executive agencies. But, as far as I can discern, during recent years most foreign policy has emanated from the Defense Department, with both Congress and executive agencies serving as virtual rubberstamps.

In all too many instances, "national security" has turned into "international hegemony." The United States plays the part of benevolent patron for many regimes; no matter if they are authoritarian, repressive, racist—ruling cliques are favored as long as they retain vestiges of anticommunism. Humanitarian values get brushed aside, only adherence to anticommunism counts.

Given such distortions within foreign policy precepts, it is not surprising that two decades of dictators—the Diems, Kys, Trujillos, Chiangs, Francos—arise and remain smug and secure for so long in countries where needs for massive social, political, and economic change are so evident. Nor is it surprising that eventually we become terribly entangled within these countries' political affairs, with the United States often finding its support with the forces of status quo and oppression. And the results are equally unsurprising: Taiwan, Korea, Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Vietnam, just to name major catastrophes.

The antidote for this inept system of foreign policymaking is not hard to swallow. In simple terms, Congress—at least—must fully reassert itself in foreign policy matters, and a proper balance be established between military and diplomatic.

Congress already has the means to accomplish such a redirection in its use of the legislative appropriations process. Now, a determination to use those means must be undertaken.

A good place to start is in policy regarding our foreign military bases, and congressional disapproval of extending the Spanish leases should be the first step.

Certainly, tactical importance of most—if not all—American military bases outside this country has declined with the rise of our vaunted ICBM force. On strategic grounds, foreign bases tend more to exaggerate tensions than provide protection. Indeed, the Soviet deployment of an ABM system closely followed the mid-1950's decision to ring Russia with a series of nuclear-equipped military bases.

On humanitarian grounds, the vast sums given as lease payments reinforce oppressive governments and thus halt any evolving internal pressures for equitable development.

In economic terms, balance of payments outflows to support bases are considerable, and each dollar expended for such bases means one less dollar for vital social programs both at home and abroad.

The current negotiations with Spain are typical of the situations into which the United States has been forced by maintaining these foreign bases. The Franco government is classic in its application of terror and repression; his recent vacillations are near-farcical as a display of a totalitarian who turns on and off periods of "liberalization" to suit his own whim or to improve a "public image" for foreign eyes. No, the case against the Franco government is not hard to make.

But we are fooling ourselves if we terminate our lease agreement with Spain purely on grounds of the "unattractiveness" of that government. Much as I oppose the tenets of the Franco government, I feel stronger that we could just as easily scratch out the name "Spain" and fill in its place any one of a dozen other countries or leaders. And even in those cases I do not advocate pulling our bases out because we are backing a bad regime. That, of course, is a factor, but it is not my major objection.

As long as the militarists hold reign in foreign policymaking, the proclivity for planting "American enclaves" all over the world will persist. And as long as these enclaves remain, I can foresee no end to the spate of flare-ups which trouble us year in and year out. An American "presence" is virtually imperialistic in its significance; and it is this imperialism of power, this aura of political and military greatness which above all must be halted.

We know America is not attempting to conquer the world. No rational person can argue that we should try to make the rest of the world into carbon-copy American strongholds. Yet, to foreigners who see our far-flung military bases stacked with their awe-inspiring arsenels of destruction, the thought of America as world policeman must occur often.

And it is this image of America, this view so pleasing to the militarists, that must be changed. My view of America is different; it is one of a nation still confronted with an unfinished revolution, a revolution so impressive that all the strength of the military-industrial-political-educational complex cannot stave it off, a revolution based on providing freedom, equity, and justice for all citizens of all lands.

I oppose any and all American military bases abroad because they impede rather than enhance our national security. I favor any measures which can be taken to reduce our foreign military commitments. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against any further funds for such bases.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject matter of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is at a crucial point in Vietnam policy. This week the aggregate number of our men killed by hostile action will surpass Korea. If the toll continues at the present level for another 11 months, it will surpass our losses in World War I. Stalemate is evident on the field of battle, where the best that can be said is that allied forces have kept Hanoi from winning. Stalemate is equally evident at Paris, where only the shape of the conference table has been settled.

These grim facts converge at the White House where the new administration faces the necessity of deciding what to do with the legacy it assumed on inauguration day.

The voluminous transition papers prepared by President Johnson's staff with the aim of providing the new administration with a balanced appraisal of current problems should have included a series of three documents prepared by the Directorate for Statistical Service, Office, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller.

These documents, captioned "List of Casualties Incurred by U.S. Military Personnel in Connection With the Conflict in Vietnam," list by name and hometown each American killed.

In my view, these names should be called to the attention of the administration and the American people because they establish, as no other arrangement of words can possibly do, the true dimensions of the Vietnam war in total overall terms, as well as the most intimate.

For that reason, I have placed the entire listing in my remarks today, totaling in all 31,379 names.

The publication is thoroughly justified, of course, for another reason. While our combat participation in the war may have been a grievous error from the very beginning—as I firmly believe it was—the men who have died in this mistaken conflict nevertheless deserve every recognition and honor. The fact that misguided national leadership, in which I freely acknowledge my own share of the blame, erred in sending them to war diminished in no way whatever their heroism, made no easier their sacrifice, and lessened not at all the anguish of their relatives.

The names listed are all of those killed by hostile action from the very beginning of the war through the end of January 1969, a few days after President Nixon took the oath of office. The listing therefore constitutes a description of

XUM

the dilemma which immediately confronted Mr. Nixon and his staff.

The listing is especially appropriate this week because, making adjustment for the Department of Defense's 1-week lag in reporting those killed in action, it is clear that Vietnam deaths have now surpassed Korea. Nearly one-third occurred since the "peace offensive" began last March 31.

This fact raises sobering questions:

What advantage to our national interest has been secured by the death of the men listed on the following pages?

Were sacrifices of this magnitude justified by events and issues in Vietnam?

In Korea, by contrast, a like amount of sacrifice left that country with both military and political stability—conditions which exist to this day. In Vietnam, despite our heavy investment, the military situation is so grim that the enemy is able to mount heavy attack across a broad front, even close to Saigon.

Last week I urged President Nixon to make the fundamental decision to withdraw our combat forces, arguing that present circumstances are the best conceivable for the decision and warning that the decision will become increasingly difficult as time goes on.

In my view our involvement was a mistake from the beginning, and the rational corrective action is to withdraw—not to compound the original error by staying there.

Questions that inevitably will be asked are: Would withdrawal dishonor those who have died? Would it be a camouflaged surrender unworthy of our Nation?

Perhaps the best answer is another question: Will additional casualties alone rectify mistaken war policy?

If the premise is accepted—as I believe it must—that our military policies have been based on false assumptions all along, then the best way to honor the war dead is to take steps to assure that the casualty lists stop growing.

To waste additional lives simply because of previous deaths is rationalization so warped as to dishonor every noble sentiment attached to the name America.

To justify more casualties primarily through appeals to national vanity is to distort our greatest tradition, under which the interests of the state are always considered subordinate to those of the individual citizen.

Every parent of a war casualty with whom I have talked has expressed the fervent hope that the loss of American lives will quickly stop.

I am glad to yield to my good colleague and friend, TIM LEE CARTER, and before doing so, to take note of his wisdom, so often expressed over the past 2 or 3 years, in which he has been in the forefront of those who have, I believe, courageously questioned the wisdom of our war policies. I came to his view at a relatively late date, and I am glad to salute my "leader."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think that the years our men have spent in Vietnam, the lives we have lost there, the thousands of wounded, and the billions of dollars we have blown away are mute testimony to the fact that we have made the greatest military mistake in the history of the United States. I regret this is true. I have always supported the men who are in Vietnam, and certainly I shall continue to support them, as has the distinguished gentleman in the well. I have supported the GI bill of rights. I was the first Member to introduce the GI insurance bill. I have supported everything which would be helpful to the men. However, I feel that in their conception, the ideas for having our men in Vietnam were wrong. And, remember, we must recall when this was started. It was not in 1963 or 1964. This was was first escalated in 1961 when 17,000 men were first placed over there. Later, in 1964, about the time of the Tonkin Bay resolution, we were told that our vessels, the destroyers, *Maddox* and the *C. Turner Joy* were under attack by North Vietnamese vessels. Hearings in the Senate have shown beyond doubt the commanders of those vessels today know not whether they were attacked or not, and will not state whether they were attacked at that time.

Mr. Speaker, it would be as if we were attacked by a fleet of ships from Mexico, if we were at war with Mexico. Suppose that was the case, and two Argentine vessels happened to be among the group attacking us with vessels at war. Actually, if they attacked our coasts, they would be fair game. If we had two destroyers with the South Vietnamese vessels that were attacking North Vietnam in 1964, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that shots at them would have been justified. North Vietnam had as much right to fire at them as we would have to fire at vessels accompanying the people at war with us. I was not a Member at that time, but the House took the distorted information it had, and committed thousands and thousands of troops to South Vietnam, with the effect which we have had today. And still we are in this ceaseless, tireless war where our men are mangled and mutilated, and in which 33,000 have now been killed, over 200,000 have been wounded, and $100 billion has been blown away.

To what effect? To what avail? We are still entangled in this "green hell" of Vietnam, in this morass. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that this is true. Certainly for 2 years, in 1965 and 1966, I tried to go along with what we call the loyal opposition. At that time it seemed that they were making quite an effort to do something in the war.

But after two visits to South Vietnam, one in 1965 and one in 1966, it became evident we were not winning. On the second visit, I saw villages which supposedly had been pacified which had fallen back into the hands of the enemy.

After seeing these things, it became apparent that actually during those 2 years of 1965 and 1966, we had not made the valiant effort to win which we should have. Up until that time I had said we should get in with all we have got and win it and get it over with and get out. But we did not do that. It was sort of a tit for tat, in which we would retaliate only with light counterattacks. The result has been the continued loss of life and our continued desperate involvement in Vietnam.

Certainly I do not want to be critical of anyone or of the present administration. I would hope and pray our President will continue in his efforts to get peace for this country and to bring the finest young men of the United States back home where they can live peacefully and pursue their lives as they did previous to this terrible engagement.

This war, Mr. Speaker, has not been fair at all to the manhood of America. The underprivileged youngsters, the ones who have not gone to college, are the ones who have borne the brunt of the war. They are the ones who have been subject to the draft. I regret this is true. Those who were affluent, those who were able to go to college, those who were able to get into the National Guard and the Reserve have been spared.

I feel certainly, if I may digress a moment, that our draft laws should be improved so our youngsters would be held liable for draft for a shorter period of time than they are now and if possible a volunteer army should be instituted.

Again, I certainly thank the gentleman in the well for yielding to me. Without doubt, he is one of the great thinkers in this House and one who has the courage of his convictions. I fondly hope and fervently pray that our present administration will be able to get us out of the morass in Vietnam which threatens to get us into other wars in Laos and Thailand and perhaps Burma and Malaysia and Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the fine contribution of the gentleman from Kentucky.

I am sure I speak for my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), as well as for myself in stating that we have nothing but compassion for the President and his staff as they wrestle with this very vexing problem. It is not easy to admit a mistake, whether the entity involved is a person or a nation. It is a mark of greatness when the grievous error does come to light to face it squarely and correct the error.

That is precisely the problem which lies at hand. It is not easy for the President of the United States, even though the problem he confronts is one that was inherited, for him to take a step to correct this error. But it is also fair to say, I believe, that the longer this fundamental decision is put off, the more difficult it becomes. That is why, in a spirit of compassion and good will and a desire to be helpful in the appraisal of various forces and various elements that must necessarily go into a decisionmaking process at the White House, that I hope this will be a worthwhile contribution.

Mr. Speaker, here is the roll of honor, consisting almost entirely of men between 19 and 24 years of age. It presents the precise width, breadth, and depth of the war Mr. Nixon has inherited:

XUM

Deaths Resulting From Hostile Action in Vietnam Through December 31, 1967

ALABAMA

Army

Abston, James Estus, Jr., Cottondale.
Acton, Marion Franklin, Huntsville.
Adams, Walter Lee, McIntosh.
Addison, O. Neal, West Ensley.
Andrews, Coley L., Mobile.
Ard, Henry, Robertsdale.
Arrington, Samuel W., Jr., Montgomery.
Ball, Jimmy Rex, Rogersville.
Bason, William Alfred, II, Huntsville.
Battle, Harold James, Birmingham.
Bearden, Lee V., Stanton.
Bearden, Richard Dewayne, Gadsden.
Beaton, Robert Louis, Mobile.
Bell, David Tomie, Phenix City.
Bennett, Melvin Leslie, Cordova.
Binion, Thomas, Reform.
Black, Larry Paul, Cordova.
Bradley, Rubin Fletcher, Jackson.
Bright, Billie Wayne, Gaylesville.
Broadhead, Jack Phillip, McCalla.
Brown, Colburn, Birmingham.
Brown, Paul O. Neal, Florence.
Bullard, Kenny Wayne, Fairfield.
Burch, Kenneth Edward Ray, Samson.
Butts, Lonnie R., Oneonta.
Byrd, Guy Albert, Enterprise.
Cameron, Bobby Waits, Hayden.
Canada, George, Jr., Montgomery.
Carmichael, Alfred, Jr., Prichard.
Carson, Charles N., Jr., Ensley.
Carter, Harry Gibson, Montgomery.
Carter, Nathaniel Earl, III, Mobile.
Cauley, Aubrey, River Falls.
Chambers, Oscar Edward, Moundville.
Clark, Francis Everette, Mobile.
Clark, Robert Lee, Birmingham.
Clemmons, Jack Elliott, Atmore.
Cleveland, Albert Franklin, Alexander City.
Coats, Douglas, Red Bay.
Cochran, Aaron Washington, Birmingham.
Colston, Louis, Jr., Bessemer.
Cook, Marlin Curtis, Vernon.
Cooper, Herman Lee, Town Creek.
Cotney, Elmer Eugene, Lineville.
Cousette, Joseph, Aliceville.
Cox, Charles Edward, Lexington.
Crain, Robert Victor, Tuscaloosa.
Crenshaw, William Anderson, Mobile.
Crofford, Clinton E., Russellville.
Crowell, Samuel Gerald, Prattville.
Culver Alfonzie, Elba.
Daniel, Elijah, Jr., Bessemer.
Daniels, Walter Eugene, Mobile.
Darby, Jimmy Earl, Opp.
Davenport, James Donald, Pell City.
Davenport, James Huey, Wedowee.
Davis, Charles William, Tallassee.
Davis, Willie Louis, Luverne.
Dedman, Leslie Paul, Birmingham.
Dickets, David Rudolph, Mobile.
Dillard, Thomas Manuel, Sheffield.
Dixon, Leo Chester, Phenix City.
Doran, Thomas E., Montgomery.
Dorfman, William David, Birmingham.
Duncan, Thomas David, Attalla.
Eidson, Samuel Arlen, North Birmingham.
Elenburg, James Walter, Sumiton.
Elmore, Claude Eugene, Anniston.
Elrod, Jimmy Charles, Pinson.
Estes, Donald Carthel, Auburn.
Evans, Andrew C., Sylacauga.
Evans, James Larry, Florence.
Evans, Johnnie Lee, Birmingham.
Finch, Lamont Wilkerson, Birmingham.
Ford, Charles Walker, Dothan.
Fox, Carl James, Minter.
Freeman, Garry Don, Fort Payne.
Gamble, James Henry, Bessemer.
Gardner, Fred Michael, Mobile.
Gardner, Roy Edward, Brookside.
Gardner, William Hugh, Jr., Montgomery.
Garrison, Carl Franklin, Clanton.
Garth, Raymond, Tanner.
Gaston, Ross Allen, Fairfield.
Gautney, Earl, Coffee Springs.

ALABAMA—continued

Army

Glover, Freddie Bee, Gadsden.
Gordon, Thomas Leslie, Sylacauga.
Gray, Delacy, Elba.
Grove, Richard Craig, Birmingham.
Gunn, Terry Sidney, Mobile.
Gunter, Melvin Wister, Vincent.
Gurley, Thomas, Somerville.
Hammac, Joseph Earl, Brewton.
Hamner, John Albert, Northport.
Hargrove, James Mabron, Limestone.
Harper, Richard Earl, Birmingham.
Harris, Nathaniel, Bessemer.
Harrison, Cleophis, Prichard.
Hatfield, Billy T., Eufaula.
Hayes, Johnny Vance, Birmingham.
Heath, Charles Edward, Talladega.
Hegler, Mose, Jr., Magazine Point.
Hervas, Aaron Kamala, Mobile.
Heyer, Edward E., Prichard.
Higgins, Jerry Wayne, Cordova.
Hill, Eddie Lee, Jr., Mobile.
Hood, Charles Earnest, Opelika.
Howard, James J., Birmingham.
Hudgens, John Wayne, Oxford.
Hudson, Johnny, Birmingham.
Hurd, Lawrence Adams, Margaret.
Ingram, Charlie Bernard, Jr., Phenix City.
Johnson, Harry J., Tarrant City.
Johnson, Jerome, Birmingham.
Johnson, Joe Edward, Tuscumbia.
Johnson, Sanford Steven, Tuskegee Institute.
Johnson, Thomas Allen, Athens.
Jones, John Henry, Enterprise.
Kelly, James Mathew, Atmore.
Kendrick, James Calvin, Robertsdale.
King, Felix Deloach, Jr., Florence.
Kinney, Randle, Dothan.
Kistler, Russel Wilford, Dothan.
Knight, Mack Arthur, Lowndes.
Knight, Ralph Max, Attalla.
Lagrand, Robert Henry, Bessemer.
Leatherwood, James, Mobile.
Lee, George Blue, Bay Minette.
Leonard, Matthew, Birmingham.
Likely, James Thomas, Georgiana.
Little, John Edgar, Holt.
Lockett, Cleo, Birmingham.
Long, Charles Edward, Clanton.
Lott, Junior Edward, Athens.
Love, J. C., Black.
Lueallen, Edgar Bowie, Jacksonville.
Madden, James Floyd, Brewton.
Malec, Paul William, Summerdale.
Maness, James Emory, Talladega Springs.
Marsh, Bobby Joe, Oneonta.
Marvin, Joseph, Prattville.
Matthews, Robert L., Huntsville.
McBride, Herman Alvin, Jacksonville.
McCaig, Robert Lee, Florence.
McCary Charles Wayman, Leighton.
McDuffie, Larry Ray, Phenix City.
McHaney, Carl Jamerson, Uniontown.
McLemore, Taylor Henry, Boligee.
McManus, Charles Verne, Woodland.
McMurray, Johnnie Ray, Dixiana.
Menefee, Gene Allen, Birmingham.
Michael, Don Leslie, Lexington.
Mickens, Eddie James, Parrish.
Milam, Lewis Edward, Gadsden.
Miller, Claude Paul, Saraland.
Mills, Robbie Ray, Phenix City.
Minor, Randy Mickel, Clanton.
Mitchell, Eugene Emmett, Scottsboro.
Mooney, James, Selma.
Moore, Joseph M., Elba.
Moore, Robert Louis, Montgomery.
Morrison, Billy Joe, Heflin.
Mosier, Robert Keal, Grady.
Murphree, Ira Jerome, Birmingham.
Nailen, James Patrick, Talladega.
Nicholas, Tommy L., Decatur.
Nichols, Larry J., Blue Mountain.
Oakes, Christopher Columbus, Bessemer.
Odom, John Thomas, Alexander City.
O'Neal, Victor Hubert, Birmingham.
Otis, Sherman Eldridge, Mobile.
Parker, Udon, Phenix City.

ALABAMA—continued

Army

Patty, Dudley Randolph, Montgomery.
Penland, Marvin Kenny, Piedmont.
Perry, George Edward, Birmingham.
Perry, Robert Lewis, Union Springs.
Phillips, Howard Edward, Scottsboro.
Phillips, Orman Dorr, Bremen.
Phillips, William Russel, Enterprise.
Pierce, Edward Davis, Homewood.
Pool, Harold Laverol, Town Creek.
Rand, Earlie, Prichard.
Reed, Willie, Prichard.
Rhodes, Ray Anthony, Moulton.
Robinson, Willie James, Seale.
Rugers, Clayton George, Jr., Bridgeport.
Russell, Floyd H., Jr., Birmingham.
Scarbrough, Ennis Ralph, Birmingham.
Scott, Jimmie L., Montgomery.
Scott, Patterson, Jr., Prichard.
Seawright, William J., Jr., Montgomery.
Shedd, Alton, Joppa.
Sheffield, Anthony D., Huntsville.
Simmons, Obie Clyde, Brewton.
Smith, Charles Warren, Mobile.
Smith, Jack A., Bay Minette.
Smith, James Buford, Phil Campbell.
Smith, James David, Altoona.
Smith, Jeffery W., Hillsboro.
Smith, Jim L., Birmingham.
Smith, Loughton, Talladega.
Smith, William Cary, Bessemer.
Spencer, Cordell, Bessemer.
Stamey, Jimmy Edward, Saraland.
Stephens, James Rowe, Enterprise.
Stone, Roger Allen, Parish.
Storey, Charles William, Birmingham.
Stoves, Merritt, III, North Birmingham.
Studdard, Finis Roney, Steele.
Suggs, James David, Eufaula.
Taylor, Elmer Jack, Atmore.
Taylor, Jimmie B., Northport.
Thackerson, Walter Anthony, Talladega.
Thomas, Roy Edward, Lafayette.
Townes, Morton Elmer, Jr., Mobile.
Traylor, Wayne McKennely, Heflin.
Troupe, Herman Lee, Tanner.
Turner, Anderson, Bessemer.
Turner, George Allen, Mulga.
Turner, Louis G., Mount Vernon.
Upner, Edward Charles, Anniston.
Uptain, Davis, Fayette.
Vinson, Henry Mitchell, Birmingham.
Walker, Charlie Lewis, Munford.
Wallace, Frankie Lee, Cherokee.
Wallace, Gary Frank, Killen.
Ware, Mack Arthur, Bessemer.
Ware, Matthew, Bessemer.
Watts, Roy Delano, Lanett.
Waxton, Wilbert Eugene, Grand Bay.
Wells, Benjamin G., Madison.
Williams, Gene William, Birmingham.
Williams, Jimmy Laverne, Wetumpka.
Williams, Johnny, Jr., Montgomery.
Williams, Larry Douglas, Birmingham.
Williams, Tommie Lee, Birmingham.
Wilson, Gerald W., Empire.
Winston, James Clennon, St. Elmo.
Woods, Abraham, Marion.
Wright, James Earl, Arab.
Zeigler, Eugene, Montgomery.

Air Force

Brooks, James Foster, Kellyton.
Coughlin, Arthur Raymond, Mobile.
Cunningham, Carey Allen, Collinsville.
Fields, James Lewis, Mobile.
Holbrook, Horace Alvie, Jacksonville.
Middlebrooks, Robert Neal, Ariton.
Mitchell, Andrew C., III, Mobile.
Moon, Jerry Rudolph, Lanett.
Rainwater, James Alvin, Jr., Billingsley.
Wilkinson, Joseph E., III, Selma.

Marine Corps

Alexander, Bobby Ray, Decatur.
Allen, Robert Warren, Birmingham.
Arnold, Harold, Prichard.
Barnard, Lewis Cecil, Gadsden.
Bexley, Robert Edward, Mobile.

ALABAMA—continued

Marine Corps

Brock, James Walter, III, Cullman.
Brown, James Homer, Birmingham.
Brown, James Phillip, Harvest.
Bryant, Roger Jerrel, Florence.
Buckley, Robert Earl, Theodore.
Canidate, James Ellis, Montgomery.
Cantrell, Lewis Edward, Centre.
Carver, Jerry Leon, Bridgeport.
Chaffin, Allan Ray, Anniston.
Chambers, Paul Richard, Scottsboro.
Clanton, Charles Benjamin, Mobile.
Clark, J. C., Jr., Fairfield.
Colley, Michael Ira, Birmingham.
Collier, Willie Lester, Birmingham.
Cupp, Ernest Bryan, Hanceville.
Dailey, Francis Edwin, Birmingham.
Davies, Timothy Scott, Mobile.
Day, Charles Tyrone, Montgomery.
Denney, Jimmie Bryson, Gadsden.
Dennis, James Walter, Jr., Montgomery.
Dixon, Lee Artice, Saraland.
Dixon, Leland Francis, Whistler.
Duffy, Patrick Edward, Mobile.
Giles, Leonard Earl, Summerdale.
Gonzalez, Larry Eugene, Atmore.
Hadley, Verlon, Bay Minette.
Hall, Lavie Jimmy, Huntsville.
Hardy, Warren, Jr., Montgomery.
Hasty, William Donald, Birmingham.
Hendrix, Paul George, Hartselle.
Himes, Michael Bruce, Birmingham.
Hollaway, Philip Stephen, Birmingham.
Hose, John Wallace, Jr., Decatur.
Howard, Clarence William, Birmingham.
Hudson, Jimmy Dale, Tallassee.
Huff, James Edmond, Huntsville.
Hunt, William Dickson, Birmingham.
Jackson, Thomas Clayton, Autaugavile.
Jenkins, Frank Paul, Jr., Anniston.
Johnson, Jimmy Earl, Cullman.
Johnson, Richard S., Jr., Tuscumbia.
Kelley, William Robert, Citronelle.
Kiger, James Anthony, Huntsville.
Lafferty, David Nelson, Grand Bay.
Leslie, Roger Lamar, Birmingham.
Lilley, Joseph Emmett, Mobile.
Little, Henry Leon, Tuscaloosa.
Lockhart, Clarence, Seale.
Lowery, Dalton Buster, Brewton.
Lyle, Larry Vann, Birmingham.
Mangrum, George Thomas, Rogersville.
Mann, Carl William, Birmingham.
McCall, Clifford, Birmingham.
McCamble, Robert Lee, Mobile.
McGeever, Thomas Joseph, Mobile.
McGinty, Calvin A., Jr., Tallassee.
McVay, John Earl, Decatur.
Mitchell, Joseph Robert, Jr., Alexander City.
Mosley, Rayford Junior, Stapleton.
Murff, William Edward, Prattville.
Murry, Eugene, Montgomery.
Newcomb, James Dwight, Mobile.
Payne, Lawrence Edward, Tuscaloosa.
Peoples, Eddie Donald, Phenix City.
Perry, James Earl, Huntsville.
Pope, Charles Dean, Anniston.
Presnall, Carl Hamby, Bay Minette.
Price, Marlin Ladon, Mulga.
Randall, James Arthur, Somerville.
Rich, Ronald Dudley, Decatur.
Robinson, Herman Ray, Birmingham.
Robinson, John Leo, Prichard.
Runnels, Glyn Linal, Jr., Birmingham.
Rushing, Michael Gean, Tuscaloosa.
Salter, Charles Lowell, Birmingham.
Sanders, Glenn Edward, Attalla.
Scarbrough, Arthur Benjami, Mobile.
Shaw, William Marshall, Jr., Talladega.
Smith, Clifton Bradley, Midland.
Smith, Malcolm Carlis, Montgomery.
Smith, Rickey Gene, Gadsden.
Smith, Roy, Birmingham.
Spivey, Harley Edwin, Samson.
Stephenson, Waymond Nelson, Anniston.
Tisdale, Henry Carlos, Tuscaloosa.
Toyer, Lee Arthur, Birmingham.
Vinson, Walter Wayne, Birmingham.
Wadsworth, Harry Marshall, Millbrook.

ALABAMA—continued

Marine Corps

Waldrep, Jimmy Ray, Logan.
Watkins, Harold Eugene, Birmingham.
White, Robert Eugene, Birmingham.
Wood, David Mitchell, Gordon.
Youngblood, Jimmy Dean, Birmingham.

Navy

Boston, Donald Earl, Sheffield.
King, Doyle Gaylon, Vinemont.
Sims, Michael Eugene, Mobile.
Weimorts, Robert Franklin, Eight Mile.

ALASKA

Army

Elisovsky, David Henry, Cordova.
Harmon, Daniel Lee, Kodiak.
Horn, Jerry Verne, Soldotna.
Kilbuck, George Gregory, Bethel.
Lape, David Alen, Cordova.
Lee, Robert Edward, Fairbanks.
Sanders, Donald Ray, Elmendorf AFB.
Whitney, Arthur Joseph, Jr., Ketchikan.

Marine Corps

Hoke, Michael Thomas, Elmendorf AFB.
Kito, Donald Harry, Petersburg.
Labelle Kermit Harold, Jr., Fairbanks.
Prentice, David Shelton, Anchorage.

ARIZONA

Army

Aguayo, Oscar, Jr., Phoenix.
Allred, Orin Larry, Casa Grande.
Anderson, Lee E., Phoenix.
Aragon, Joseph Manuel, Phoenix.
Arlentino, Dudney Nelson, Coolidge.
Arnn, John Oliver, Kingman.
Arrington, Joseph Phillip, Phoenix.
Bateman, Mark Andrew, Oracle.
Benton, Robert Daniel, Tempe.
Boried, Richard David, Phoenix.
Boyce, John Franklin, Scottsdale.
Campbell, Steve Daniel, Phoenix.
Canales, David Joseph, Sierra Vista.
Carrasco, Ralph, Phoenix.
Chaira, Francisco Peraza, Tempe.
Clark, Jesse Lewis, II, Phoenix.
Clark, Richard Garland, Phoenix.
Conley, Green, Phoenix.
Cook, Jimmy Lee, Phoenix.
Cribb, Edward Bernard, Cactus.
Cronin, Jarmes Russell, Tucson.
Davis, Leonard Douglas, Bisbee.
Daw, Jerry Lorenzo, Tonalea.
Denney, Alan Wayne, Phoenix.
Dianda, Casimiro, Yuma.
Ends, Leonard Arvin, Scottsdale.
Flores, Manuel Solares, Phoenix.
Flores, Robert Lee, Parker.
Furch, Joe Henry, Phoenix.
Garcia, Juan Manuel, Mammoth.
Gomez, Jesse Yutze, Tempe.
Gosney, Durward Dean, Phoenix.
Gossett, William O., Phoenix.
Green, Kenneth Leon, Roosevelt.
Hamblin, Ronald B., Phoenix.
Hamilton, William Eugene, Scottsdale.
Haskins, John Merle, Ehrenberg.
Hawkins, Thomas G., Phoenix.
Hayne, John Ona, Tucson.
Higgins, Edwin Ray, Glendale.
Hill, John Walter, III, Valentine.
Himes, Jack Landen, Phoenix.
Hoagland, George Appleton, Phoenix.
Hobbs, Larry L., Prescott.
Holck, Paul Alan, Avondale.
Hopkins, Leroy, Jr., Florence.
Huff, Jackie Eugene, Peoria.
Hunt, Bob Clarence, Jr., Tuscon.
Kelley, Victor Bruce, Tucson.
Kinsey, Joe Edward, Glendale.
Kiser, William Brooks, Phoenix.
Knepper, Warren Orison, Jr., Tucson.
Knight, Billy Melton, Ganado.
Lauffer, Billy Lane, Tucson.
Legleu, Samuel, Nogales.
Litherland, Thomas Edward, Phoenix.
Lopez, Eddie Cesario, Clifton.
Lumpkins, Larry Richard, Phoenix.
Makin, Allen Theodore, II, Buckeye.

ARIZONA—continued

Army

Marrietta, Harold Joseph, Sacaton.
Martin, Edwin Woods, Jr., Polacca.
McCullough, Ronald James, Phoenix.
Mendenhall, Thomas Deal, Phoenix.
Molina, Simon Rosalino, Queen Creek.
Montgomery, William John, Leupp.
Murrietta, Frank A., Phoenix.
Nead, Elwood Franklin, Jr., Pima.
Norvelle, Clyde L., Jr., Tucson.
Pennington, Fred Melvin, Tucson.
Perkins, David Drake, Coolidge.
Ramriez, Roberto Mandoza, Peoria.
Schrader, Ronald Bruce, Tucson.
Sershon, Laurence G., Phoenix.
Sexton, Jeffrey Ross, Maricopa.
Slocum, William Scott, Phoenix.
Soto, Bravie, Somerton.
Southard, Charles A., III, Pierce.
Stands, Daniel Gilbert, Jr., Phoenix.
Tarkington, Curtis Ray, Scottsdale.
Toth, William Charles, Scottsdale.
Tuohy, Jackie Allen, Phoenix.
Valle, Manuel Burrola, Tucson.
Varner, Harry Kay, Phoenix.
Walker, Bradley A., Flagstaff.
Willett, Franklin David, Hereford.
Wilson, Robert Laurence, Tucson.
Yescas, Antonio Gilberto, Prescott.

Air Force

Godfrey, Johnny Howard, Phoenix.
Lehman, Millard Wesley, Naco.
Newville, Van Harold, Phoenix.
Oxley, James Edward, Winslow.
Webster, David O'Neil, Phoenix.
Wheeler, James Atlee, Tucson.

Marine Corps

Alvarez, Esteban Morales, Tucson.
Andreyka, Theodore E., Jr., Phoenix.
Arkie, Vallance Galen, Parker.
Armstrong, Walter Lee, Tucson.
Baker, Vincent B., Flagstaff.
Bell, Oscar Charlie, Jr., Tucson.
Billie, Larry Rogers, Chinle.
Bohannon, Edward Jean, Phoenix.
Braxton, James Harold, Phoenix.
Bryant, William J., Jr., Phoenix.
Burns, John Patrick, Tucson.
Chaves, Allen Fred, Winslow.
Davis, Harry K., Tucson.
Delozier, John Adrian, Tucson.
Denipah, Daniel Dee, Tuba City.
Deschamps, Ramon, Tempe.
Draper, Robert Dale, Morenci.
Elmore, Donald Robert, Buckeye.
Engelman, Richard George, Nogales.
Felkins, Wilburn Daniel, Phoenix.
Francisco, Patrick Phillip, Stanfield.
Fritz, Leonard Eugene, Superior.
Gray, James, Chandler.
Henling, Richard Ray, Holbrook.
Hepner, Stephen Thomas, Glendale.
Higgins, Roy John, Jr., Phoenix.
Hiller, Michael James, Phoenix.
Howell, James Riley, Tucson.
Hunt, Leigh Wallace, Tempe.
Johnson, Darrell Lee, Phoenix.
Johnston, David William, Tucson.
Jordan, Lawrence William, Tucson.
Kersey, J. D. William, Phoenix.
King, Bradford Stanley, Clifton.
Leyva, Frank Montano, El Mirage.
Long, Robert Orrie, Mesa.
Martin, William Everett, Prescott.
Mesquita, Fernando Olivas, Phoenix.
Monroe, Charles Caleb, Tucson.
Montano, Francisco Andrew, Tucson,
O'Brien, Arthur Alen, Tolleson.
Parker, Michael Lee, Phoenix.
Parks, Calvin Alan, Tucson.
Patterson, William Weslay, Casa Grande.
Razo, Frank Ambrose, Cottonwood.
Reyes, Gilbert, Ashfork.
Rich, John Allan, Mesa.
Rodiguez, Paul M., Jr., Tucson.
Rosenstock, Mark Lamon, Phoenix.
Salinas, Antonio Montano, Douglas.
Strahl, Richard William, Glendale.

XUM

ARIZONA—continued

Marine Corps

Vasquez, Jose Maria, Coolidge.
White, Donald Merle, Jr., Phoenix.
Wilson, John Thomas, Phoenix.
Wilson, William Neil, Duncan.
Ybarra, Manuel Gutierrez, Superior.

Navy

Aguirre Filberto, Jr., Tucson.
Bois, Claire Ronald Alan, Tucson.
Cassell, Robin Bern, Fort Huachuca.
Coons, Clifford Kent, Pomerene.
Ellis, Donald Ray, Florence.
Rendon, Guadalupe, Casa Grande.
Rhine, Richard Allen, Holbrook.
Suter, Jerry Timothy, Mesa.
Ycoco, George Rojas, Douglas.

ARKANSAS

Army

Baker, Aquila, North Little Rock.
Barnwell, Ray Max, Newport.
Bennett, Harold George, Perryville.
Bobo, Edward Lee, Elaine.
Boston, Charles Edward, Crossett.
Bradshaw, Theodore Jackson, England.
Brown, Charles Edward, Thorne Bay.
Carpenter, Douglas Joe, Bauxite.
Cartwright, Jimmy, Mountainburg.
Charlton, Jerry Dean, Marvell.
Clark, Timothy Eugene, Paragould.
Coldren, Thomas L., Hughes.
Crain, Ronald Edward, Jonesboro.
Crockett, Delmer Lee, Jr., Benton.
Cumbie, Harold Ervin, Hope.
Daniels Johnie Nathaniel, Redfield.
Denson, Floyd, Cornelius, Arkadelphia.
Dodge, Jewell Fletcher, Mammoth Spring.
Eason, Joshua Way, Marianna.
Edwards, Charles M., Clarendon.
Ellison, Willie, Jr., Shoffner.
Everett, Jerry Don, Tillar.
Flagg, James Edward, Luxora.
Freeland, Guy Thomas, Russellville.
Freeman, Chester Leon, Little Rock.
Freeman, Flemmon Paul, McCrory.
Friar, Freddie Lynn, Blytheville.
Fuller, Carlo, Benton.
Futrell, Gary Thomas, Wynne.
Gensemer, David Daniel, III, Little Rock.
Godwin, Harry M., El Dorado.
Goree, Willie Vann, Crossett.
Green, Willie, Jr., Little Rock.
Harding, John H., Benton.
Harmon, Jerry Wilson, Malvern.
Harris, Robert Taylor, Earle.
Harrison, Sammy Ray, Star City.
Hastings, Bobby Gene, Trumann.
Helton, James Edward, Fulton.
Hendrix, Earnest L., Texarkana.
Hooper, Julian R., El Dorado.
Hoover, Thomas Lee, Benton.
Houston, John Wesley, Little Rock.
Hubbard, Roger Lee, Wynne.
Hutchins, Toler Lee, Jr., Colt.
Hutson, Carl Rickie, Clarksville.
Jermany, Riley, Camden.
Johnson, David Harold, Jonesboro.
Jones, Otis Cecil, Jr., North Little Rock.
Jones, Roy Mitchell, Widener.
Keifer, Joe Harold, Walnut Ridge.
Kennedy, Charles F., Blytheville.
Langston, Everett Eugene, Leachville.
Lanier, Jerry Don, Siloam Springs.
Lee, Chester Lloyd, Poyen.
Lee, Hubert Leon, Jr., Perry.
Lemon, Joe Lee, Guy.
Lewis, William Ewing, Wiseman.
Maroon, James Willmer, Prescott.
May, Ernest, Moro.
Mayhue, Don N., Stuttgart.
Mays, McElree, Jr., Altheimer.
McElhaney, Bobby Gene, Huntsville.
McElroy, Grady Edward, Little Rock.
McFalls, Billy Cesar, Lockesburg.
Metcalf, Charles Eugene, Fort Smith.
Miller, Arnez Franklin, Jr., Carlisle.
Mize, Clifford N., Malvern.
Modesitt, Samuel Lee, Manila.
Moody, Larry Gene, Dell.

ARKANSAS—continued

Army

Moon, Walter Hugh, Rudy.
Morden, Bobby Leon, Little Rock.
Morgan, James Edward, Garfield.
Myers, John Earl, Brinkley.
Noe, Frank Ray, Hot Springs.
Nothern, James William, Jr., Clarendon.
Owen, Robert Danel, Jr., Pine Bluff.
Parker, Lonnie Edward, Success.
Pendergist, Ronald Lynn, Augusta.
Pendergrass, Willie Cleber, Gravelly.
Peters, Stephen Frederick, Malvern.
Pippins, Willie, Sr., Little Rock.
Purifoy, Hubert J., Little Rock.
Reed, Floyd Lardino, Jr., Heth.
Roberts, Noel Wayne, Texarkana.
Robinson, Winston Terry, Rector.
Rogers, Guinn Junell, Arkinda.
Rose, Jesse Bea, Tillar.
Ross, Jerry Wayne, Ingalls.
Russell, Arthur James, Delight.
Shores, Malton Gene, Clarksville.
Siler, Gary Hubert, Hinosville.
Sims, Ponder Ray, Princeton.
Solomon, Douglas Edward, West Point.
Stout, John Henry, Luxora.
Stribling, Jesse B., Pine Bluff.
Talley, Billy J., McCrory.
Talley, Teddy Gene, Marked Tree.
Taylor, David F., III, Osceola.
Teas, Clarence A., Mayflower.
Tefteller, Gordon Ray, Elm Springs.
Turnage, Thomas Alfred, Texarkana.
Varnado, Clarence, Marion.
Waters, Troy Lee, Limedale.
White, Charles, Star City.
Whitton, Teddy Gene, Paragould.
Wickliffe, John Norman, Benton.
Williams, Plummer, Forrest City.
Young, Leroy, Jr., Wabash.

Air Force

Boatwright, Jacklin Meggs, Nashville.
Cotner, Morrison Auther, Booneville.
Goodman, James Donald, Little Rock.
Humble, Charles Ray, Devalls Bluff.
Smith, William Ward, Searcy.
Thrower, Frederick Lamar, Pine Bluff.
Worst, Karl Edward, Fort Smith.

Marine Corps

Aylor, Gerald Leon, Ashdown.
Biles, Calvin Webb, Little Rock.
Cecil, Roger Dale, Alma.
Cole, Marvin Ray, Fort Smith.
Conrad, Carlos Wade, Corning.
Craddock, Fred Burkett, Jr., Monticello.
Crockett, Joel, Osceola.
Cunningham, Billy, Wrightsville.
Cupples, Gary Curtis, Marion.
De Vasier, Billy Kieth, Horatio.
Eakin, Shelton Lee, Texarkana.
Evans, Sammy Gray, Hampton.
Fort, Raymond, Jr., Carlisle.
Gould, Edward Dean, Batesville.
Halstead, Michael Clay, Hoxie.
Hamilton, Donald Paul, Alicia.
Hill, James Edward, Pine Bluff.
Hix, Richard Lawson, Judsonia.
Homsley, Victor Jory, Jacksonville.
Hutchins, Marion Ray, Fayetteville.
Kemp, Robert Victor, Earle.
King, Eli J. B., Magnolia.
Knippers, Willard Russell, Jacksonville.
Lyons, Walter John, Biscoe.
McMillan, Donnell Dean, Mena.
Norman, Jay Roy, Bluff City.
Pattison, Ronald Alan, North Little Rock.
Perry, Richard William, Marion.
Poole, Perry Lee, Helena.
Ramsey, Virgus Fredrick, Jr., Little Rock.
Roberts, Eddie Leroy, Hope.
Seavers, Stanley Joseph, Little Rock.
Smith, George Freeth, Berryville.
Stevenson, George Mark, Little Rock.
Stone, James Lawrence, Conway.
Taylor, Charles Minor, III, Little Rock.
Walker, Charles Edward, Magnolia.
Williams, Joel, Jr., Little Rock.
Withey, Howard Hugh, Fayetteville.

ARKANSAS—continued

Navy

Baker, Curtis Richard, El Dorado.
Barr, John Frederick, Hope.
Coker, Douglas Carroll, Little Rock.
Fincher, Cecil Franklin, Jr., Washington.
Hollingsworth, John Andrew, Little Rock.
Langford, Richard Henry, Dover.
Taylor, Edd David, Kensett.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Ables, Elmer Robert Lee, Jr., Newhall.
Achica, Eddie, San Francisco.
Adams, James Edward, Pacoima.
Adams, Kenneth Stanley, Santa Barbara.
Aguilar, Rudolph Rene, Los Angeles.
Albertini, Joseph Alfred, La Puente.
Allen, Terry James, Indio.
Almanza, John Jerald, Santa Ana.
Altieri, Allan Joseph, Glendale.
Alvarado, Alfred Frederick, Long Beach.
Alvarez, George Calderon, Monterey Park.
Amato, Richard C., Hayward.
Anderson, Clinton Russell, Healdsburg.
Anderson, Robert Douglas, Carmichael.
Andrews, Ronald L., Pico Rivera.
Andrews, Vaun, San Frenando.
Annos, George Richard, Calexico.
Anthony, Lionel S., Los Angeles.
Apodaca, Peter Michael, San Bruno.
Applegate, Kenneth Charles, Ventura.
Arent, Kenneth Jacob, Sacramento.
Armendarez, Mike, Huntington Beach.
Arraiz, James Paul, North Hollywood.
Arrey, Frank, Jr., Norwalk.
Aubert, Thomas Clifford, Los Angeles.
Austin, Robert, Modesto.
Aylor, Charles Vincent, San Bernardino.
Azbill, Roy Gordon, Weaverville.
Baglio, Richard Anthony, Lomita.
Baird, Robert Stanley, Orinda.
Baker, Alton Eugene, Salinas.
Baker, Barry Jay, Oakland.
Baker, Stanley Wellington, Los Angeles.
Balbirnie, James Frederick, Stockton.
Barber, Melvin, Compton.
Barber, Roger Lee, Sun Valley.
Barker, Gary Lee, Garden Grove.
Barkfelt, David William, North Hollywood.
Barleen, Thomas Lyle, Vallejo.
Barrera, Manuel, Hanford.
Barreras, Frank, III, Pico Rivera.
Barrett, Charles Wesley, San Francisco.
Bartalotti, Alfonso Paul, Vallejo.
Barton, Harold Bruce, Campbell.
Batty, Denny Albert, Campbell.
Bauer, James Neil, San Diego.
Baum, Douglas Bruce, La Mesa.
Baum, Michael Lee, Riverside.
Bayles, Gerald William, Indio.
Bays, Lee R., Olivehurst.
Bazell, Frank David, Los Angeles.
Bellrichard, Leslie Allen, San Jose.
Belveal, James Allen, Sacramento.
Benadum, Richard Dennis, Los Angeles.
Bennett, Clifton E., El Monte.
Benson, Keith Lloyd, Santa Clara.
Bentley, Boris Roman Benja, San Francisco.
Berard, James Eugene, Saratoga.
Bermudez, Jesus Rojas, Mendota.
Bernal, Raymond, Jr., San Jose.
Betancourt, Gabriel, Hollister.
Betchel, David Brooks, Los Angeles.
Billhimer, Gary Arthur, Santa Fe Springs.
Bishop Daniel Edward, Newcastle.
Bishop, Richard Lavern, Covina.
Blackburn, Elbert Frank, Norwalk.
Blessman, William David, Sebastopol.
Boelzner, Robert Craig, Hawthorne.
Boettcher, Walter R., Jr., Concord.
Bohler, Robert Ronald, Downey.
Borja, Domingo R. S., San Francisco.
Bowman, Paul, Jr., Kensington.
Boyer, Donald William, Riverside.
Bozarth, Alvin Ray, Lamont.
Brady, Thomas Gerald, Fremont.
Brady, Thomas Paul, Bakersfield.
Brancato, Michael George, Los Angeles.
Breda, Dennis John, Oxnard.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Breshears, Kenneth Lester, Riverbank.
Breshears, Ronald Chris, Martinez.
Britten, Lawrence Alan, Fair Oaks.
Broadbeck, John Gilbert, Sacramento.
Brockington, Curtis, Harbor City.
Brotzman, Michael Ray, Richmond.
Brown, George Michael, Los Angeles.
Brown, Michael Gregory, El Segundo.
Brown, Michael R., Fresno.
Brown, Richard Tyrone, Hayward.
Bruce, Dennis Ray, San Luis Obispo.
Brumley, Bob Gene, Chowchilla.
Brunat, Michael F., Los Angeles.
Bullington, James Allen, Santa Rosa.
Bumgarner, Bruce Howard, Vallejo.
Burkey, Kermit Edward, San Jose.
Burlingame, Stephen Frank, Glendale.
Burnett, Joseph Darryl, Trona.
Bushay, Byron Haley, Fullerton.
Butts, Jerry Eugene, Long Beach.
Byam, Michael Leroy, El Centro.
Byers, Kenneth Edward, San Leandro.
Cagnacci, Joseph Mario, Pleasanton.
Caguimbal, Pepito, Castroville.
Callen, Richard James, Los Angeles.
Calph, Gene Elwood, Eureka.
Calvillo, Robert Jess, Bakersfield.
Camero, Santos, Malaga.
Campbell, Carlin Martin, Jr., San Diego.
Campbell, Thomas Edwards, Arcadia.
Campo, Robert E., San Francisco.
Campos, Richard Frederick, San Francisco.
Caramella, Paul Doane, Long Beach.
Card, Wayne Norman, Whittier.
Carey, John, Jr., Santa Barbara.
Carley, Raymond Montell, Los Angeles.
Carnevale, David James, Woodside.
Carrola, Edward, Sacramento.
Carter, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Carver, Richard Alan, Escondido.
Casselman, Rodney Willard, Arcadia.
Castaneda, Benjamin Beltra, El Monte.
Castro, Jesse Romero, Fremont.
Caudillo, Joseph, Kerman.
Cavarzan, Duane Earl, Weed.
Cecil, Jack Wilson, National City.
Centeno, Charles Manuel, Gilroy.
Chabot, Don William, Oakland.
Chacon, Rigoberto Coto, El Monte.
Chase, Mark Richardson, Santa Monica.
Chavez, Eduardo, Santa Paula.
Chavez, Ruddlfo, Santa Ana.
Cheroff, Michael, Downey.
Cherrstrom, Ronald Paul, Belmont.
Cherry, William Temen, Jr., Anaheim.
Chislock, Leonard James, Lakewood.
Cisneros, Mario Alvarez, Riverbank.
Claeys, Edward Oran, Fremont.
Clark, Gary Richard, San Francisco.
Clark, Paul Leslie, Lynwood.
Clark, Thorne M., III, Lompoc.
Clausen, Harland Gene, Jr., Venice.
Clendenen, Charles Curtis, Cypress.
Cleveland, James, Los Angeles.
Close, Donald Edward, Burbank.
Cloud, Joseph, Jr., Pleasanton.
Cochran, Michael Dale, Lancaster.
Coffey, Richard Arthur, Los Anegeles.
Coleman, Gary Terrence, Alameda.
Cullins, Richard Glen, Altadena.
Combs. Alfred Henry, Jr., Seaside.
Combs, Allan Eugene, Los Angeles.
Conley, Terry Lewis, Sacramento.
Conrad, Roy Eugene, Goshen.
Constantini, Frank J., Jr., Sepulveda.
Cook, Austin Bruce, Alameda.
Cook, George Kenneth, Fortuna.
Cook, William Donald, Jr., San Jose.
Cornejo, Alfred Joseph, San Mateo.
Cornell, Edward Michael, North Hollywood.
Corona, Rudolph Ralph, III, Pacific Grove.
Curyell, Michael Noble, Santa Barbara.
Cossa, William Edward, Jr., Inglewood.
Coulson, Thomas Eugene, Orosi.
Crain, Charles Ernest, Redwood City.
Crawford, Claude Lee, Los Angeles.
Cripe, Merl L., Orland.
Cross, Hugh W., North Hollywood.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Cross, Monroe, Ward, Colusa.
Cryar, Michael George, El Monte.
Cullen, Dennis John, Anaheim.
Cummings, Donald Louis, Jr., Glendora.
Cummings, James Barton, Jr., Long Beach.
Cuned, Andrea, Jr., Sunnydale.
Cunnigham, David Carson, Fall River Mills.
Curtis Richard, Walnut Creek.
D'Aiello, Michael Dennis, Pasadena.
Dailey, Kevin Melbourne, San Diego.
Daily, Thomas Blake, Hawthorne.
Daniels, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Danna, Samuel Don, Temple City.
Danser, Gary Richard, Fontana.
Daugherty, Donald D., San Diego.
Davis, Alfred Lee, Long Beach.
Day, Peter Evan, Modesto.
De Amaral, Charles Francis, Carmel.
De La Torre Luis, Los Angeles.
Deaver, Jack, San Diego.
Deherrera, Raymundo F., Los Angeles.
Dekker, George William, San Mateo.
Dellamandola, Gregory John, Stockton.
Denman, Willam Luther, Maxwell.
Dennis, Blair Edward, Sacramento.
Dickson, William Douglas, Oxnard.
Dietz, Lawrence Alfred, II, Palos Verdes.
Dillon, David Andrew, Spring Valley.
Doane, George Alfred, San Rafael.
Dodd, Lawrence Rudin, Aromas.
Dodson, David Lee, Oakland.
Dominguez, Ernesto, Bakersfield.
Dorsey, Carlito Ladores, Seaside.
Douglas, Charles Mac, Bloomington.
Drake, Earle Avon, Mill Valley.
Duck, Curtis Lamar, National City.
Dueman, Merle L., Inglewood.
Duffy, Francis Joseph, Los Angeles.
Duncan, James Robert, Fremont.
Dungey, Rim Michael, San Diego.
Dunn, Creighton Robert, Ventura.
Dunn, Gregory Lynn, Santa Rosa.
Durbin, Thomas Frederick, Escondido.
Durham, Samuel Ray, Lomita.
Dye, Danny David, Visalia.
Edwards, John Leonard, San Diego.
Elias, Porfirio Elias, Colton.
Ellis, Michael Le Roy, Valinda.
Enari, Mark Niggol, Pasadena.
Enderiz, Victor Anthony, Vallejo.
Engherson, Robert Lewis, San Leandro.
Enriquez, Terry Michael, Burbank.
Epley, Roger Lee, Lancaster.
Erickson, Donald Theodore, Fresno.
Erschoen, Arthur Raymond, Los Angeles.
Ervin, James Wilbur, Gilroy.
Escobar, Edward Angiano, Coachella.
Estes, Dennis Rex, Garden Grove.
Evans, Chris Steven, Paramount.
Evans, Donald Ward, Jr., Covina.
Ewing, Timothy David, Exeter.
Eynon, John Patrick, Yuba City.
Fackrell, Clinton Blair, Willits.
Fannin, Clayton Allen, Bakersfield.
Farley, Marshall Colin, Folsom.
Faulks, Daniel Clyde, Jr., Eureka.
Ferguson, Blaine M., Los Angeles.
Ferguson, Edward Kenneth, San Lorenzo.
Ferguson, Merl Wayne, Yuba City.
Ferguson, Ronald Dennis, San Francisco.
Fergusson, Robert Charles, Monterey.
Fernandez, Earl William, Westminster.
Fernandez, Xavier, Los Angeles.
Ferro, Philip Anthony, Northridge.
Ferrulla, Robert Samuel, Lynwood.
Fidel, Honorio Moran, Jr., Stockton.
Files, Albert Clifton, Jr., Sacramento.
Fischer, Gregory James, San Bernadino.
Fisher, Jimmy Lee, Calistoga.
Fitzgerald, Terence Patric, San Francisco.
Flannery, Michael Edward, Willows.
Flansaas, Daniel Robert, Loomis.
Flickinger, James Herbert, Burbank.
Florez, Reynaldo B., Visalia.
Flower, Carl David, Rio Linda.
Force, David Lee, San Bernardino.
Foster, Robert Lee, Sacramento.
Fowler, Daniel Charles, Citrus Heights.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Fowler, William Holt, III, San Jose.
Frakes, Kenneth Dean, Lancaster.
Francis, Steven David, Burbank.
Frankel, John Paul, Santa Clara.
Franklin, George Steve, San Pablo.
Franklin, Jammie Van, Merced.
Freiling, John Richard, Jr., Sunnyvale.
Frenzell, Herbert Ernest, Sacramento.
Frick, John Alan, Anaheim.
Frits, Orville Bill, Concord.
Fry, Billy G., Bakersfield.
Frye, Terrance Donald, San Bernardino.
Gabbert, Dennis Erwin, Eureka.
Gaines, Melvin Clyde, Los Angeles.
Garcia, Gregorio M., Los Angeles.
Garcia, Melesso, Watsonville.
Garcia, Raymond, Jr., San Diego.
Garcia, Richard, Ft. Ord.
Garcia, William, Pacoima.
Gardner, Jack Elroy, Vacaville.
Garibay, Guadalupe, B. L., San Diego.
Gorton, Tommy Ray, Vallejo.
Gasser, Donald Leroy, Berkeley.
Gatti, Gary Francis, Lynwood.
Gault, Bill Edger, Newberry Springs.
Gaymon, Stephen H., Corcoran.
Gellerman, Kenneth Gilbert, San Jose.
George, Richard Eugene, San Diego.
Gerhardt, Ernest Kay, Modesto.
Gershen, Howard Dexter, Pacoima.
Giannelli, Giuseppe, Oakland.
Gibson, Walter Lewis, Oakland.
Gilbert, Thomas Orval, Stockton.
Gilbertson, Verland Ansel, Banning.
Gilliam, Robert Wendell, Lompoc.
Giovanacci, Richard Allen, Santa Maria.
Goar, Larry L., Snelling.
Goias, Everett William, San Francisco.
Gomez, Henry, Riverside.
Gomez, Robert. Los Angeles.
Gomez, Robert Razo, Los Angeles.
Gonzales, Merced Herman, Woodlake.
Good, Kenneth Newlon, San Marino.
Goodman, Greg Fredric, San Clemente.
Goodwin, Robbin Adair, Riverside.
Gosse, Jose C., San Francisco.
Graham, Albert, Jr., Bakersfield.
Graham, John Harry, San Mateo.
Graney, Donald Caryl, Santa Barbara.
Gray, Leonard Clarence, Jr., Los Angeles.
Green, Bernard Alan, Los Angeles
Green, Billy Monroe, Los Angeles.
Green, Roy Colyn, Long Beach.
Greene, Edward Leonard, Marysville.
Gregory, Mack Edward, Gardena.
Grey, James William, Los Angeles.
Grothe, Lewis Daniel, Lakeport.
Grove, Norman Doyal, Fall River Mills.
Grundy, Dallas George, San Jose.
Guerra, Jerry Eugene, Pasadena.
Guglielmoni, Timothy P., Hermosa Beach.
Guillory, James Clifton, Los Angeles.
Gupton, Richard Charles, Compton.
Hadley, Jerome Cecil, Brooks.
Hagen, Craig Louis, Sacramento.
Hahn, Gary Gordon, San Gabriel.
Hambrick, Harold Michael, Los Angeles.
Hamilton, Earlie C. Jr., Long Beach.
Hammar, James Leroy, La Mirada.
Hammond, Kenneth Joe, San Diego.
Hampton, Henry Garfield, Van Nuys.
Hanger, Jack Dennis, Cypress.
Hannigan, John Edward, III, Antioch.
Hanson, Kenneth Gregory, Los Angeles.
Haraldson, David Alan, Long Beach.
Harding, Terry Alan, Vallejo.
Harnden, Jim Lawrence, Long Beach.
Harper, Monte Ray, Palmdale.
Harris, Jack M., El Cajon.
Harris, Jack Marston, Roseville.
Harrison, Paul James, Lakewood.
Hartman, John William, Long Beach.
Hartman, Nicholas Mark, Sun Valley.
Hartnell, Richard Miguel, Whittier.
Harvey, Michael Gail, Redwood City.
Hasuike, Skyler Lance, Los Angeles.
Hauser, Vincent Vanalstyne, San Diego.
Hawk, Jeffrey Allen, Capistrano Beach.

XUM

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Hawkins, Arthur Loren, Jr., Reseda.
Hawkins, Don Albert, San Diego.
Hayden, John Loren, Los Angeles.
Hayes, David Anthony, Bell Gardens.
Heal, Michael Joseph, Hayward.
Heaston, Donald Leroy, Santa Ana.
Hendricks, Terry Alan, San Bernardino.
Henry, William Richard, Sunnyvale.
Herderick, Christopher Erv, Buena Park.
Hernandez, Clemente Daniel. San Bernardino.
Hernandez, Demetrio Lomell, Patterson.
Hernandez, Reynaldo Castil, Tulare.
Herrell, Daniel Bruce, Anaheim.
Herrick, Henry Toro, Laguna Beach.
Hill, John Robert, Van Nuys.
Hill, Maurice Richard, Los Angeles.
Hill, Rodney Dean, Tahoe City.
Hitson, Frederick Alton, Exeter.
Hoffman, Frederick Jean, Sacramento.
Holcomb, Daniel Jennings, Buena Park.
Holguin, Frank John, Los Angeles.
Hollis, James Shelton, Sacramento.
Holmes, Jerry Leonard, Modesto.
Holovits, Laszlo, Seaside.
Holstein, John L., San Bruno.
Honrath, Jon Roy, Garden Grove.
Horton, Albert Hugh, Oakland.
Hotchkiss, Michael Jennings, Anaheim.
Houghton, James Curtis, Downey.
Houser, Jerry Lee, Sacramento.
Howell, Michael Wayne, Rodeo.
Hubbard, Gregory George, Sherman Oaks.
Hughes, Edward Cowart, III, Garden Grove.
Huicochea-Reyna Ignacio, Compton.
Hume, Carl Michael, Fresno.
Hunt, Martin Mosher, Menlo Park.
Iannicelli, Richard Lee, Castro Valley.
Ingalls, George Alan, Norco.
Irving, John William, Jr., San Jose.
Irwin, Richard Ray Jr., Arcadia.
Ives, David Allen, Fairfield.
Jackson, Arthur James, Los Angeles.
Jackson, James Albert, Seaside.
Jackson, Otis E., Los Angeles.
Jacobs, Joseph Lewis, Northridge.
Jacobsen, Wallace Ray, Oakland.
Jagield, Allen Dale, San Gabriel.
James, Joe Neal, Oakland.
Jamison, Rockwell Grant, Los Angeles.
Jaramillo, Jorge M., Loe Angeles.
Jeter, Danny Wayne, Riverside.
Jett, William Howard, Los Angeles.
Johnson, David Joseph, Los Angeles.
Johnson, Dougles Ray, Burbank.
Johnson, Leonard Richard, Oakland.
Johnson, Philip Harry, Redondo Beach.
Johnson, Ray Eldriege, Oakland.
Johnson, Robert Allen, Novato.
Johnson, Ronald Joe, Santa Cruz.
Johnson, Timothy Alan, Lancaster.
Johnson, William F., Los Angeles.
Johnston, Jerry Bernis, Wilmington.
Johnston, Richard J., Sacramento.
Jones, George Wallace, Los Angeles.
Jones, Jerry Don, Susanville.
Jones, Tommy, Bakersfield.
Joujon-Roche, Edward, Bakersfield.
Juarez, John, Colton.
Kajiwara, James Toshi, San Francisco.
Kaneko, Julio, Lemon Grove.
Karger, Richard Tildon, Los Angeles.
Katz, Allan Harvey, Santa Monica.
Kazikowski, Jeffrey G., San Diego.
Kead, John K., III, Los Angeles.
Keckler, Robert L., Los Angeles.
Kell, James Stewart, Montebello.
Kelly, Charles Patrick, Fullerton.
Kennedy, William Edward, Los Angeles,
Kenney, Elmer Frederick, Canoga Park.
Keppler, John M., Gardena.
Kiehl, Michael Raymond, El Cajon.
Kiley, Michael James, Long Beach.
King, Charles Michael, Jr., Sylmar.
Kistner, Guy Dale, Burlinga
Kitner, Richard Granville, Los Angeles.
Klausing, Ronald Lavern, San Diego.
Klug, Richard Duane, Glendale.
Koeppe, Walter, Jr., San Jose.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Kofler, Siegfried, Ventura.
Kovacs, Zoltan Alajos, Berkeley.
Kozel, Patrick Charles, Los Angeles.
Krotzer, Donald Morgan, Wilmington.
La Barber, James J., Lodi.
Lake, Larry Vernon, Inglewood.
Lamarr, Phillips, Compton.
Lanelli, Jack Daniel, Napa.
Lapp, Melvin Charles, Sacramento.
Lara, Chevo Garcia, North Sacramento.
Larson, Peter Swinnerton, San Francisco.
Lau Cornelius, Afai Laul, II, Los Angeles.
Lawson, Donald Victor, Jr., Bakersfield.
Lawson, William E., Merced.
Leal, Frank Daniel, Corona.
Leal, John Borges, San Bernardino.
Ledesma, Joseph, Jr., San Jose.
Lee, James George, Paso Robles.
Lee, John Patrick, La Crescenta.
Legler, Steven Edward, Woodland Hills.
Lewis, Rodger Dale, Los Angeles.
Leyva-Parra-Frias, Fernand, Norwalk.
Lider, Fred Rodriguez, Oakland.
Linn, David William, Anaheim.
Locatelli, Vincent, Santa Cruz.
Lockhart, Roy, Vallejo.
Logan, Halford, Los Angeles.
Lohman, Robert Thomas, Woodland Hills.
Loisel, Patrick Michael, Chatsworth.
Lona, Gabriel, Los Angeles.
Looney, Jerry Wayne, Hanford.
Lopez, Lupe Paul, Sacramento.
Lopez, Max Andy, Anaheim.
Lopez, Raymond, Los Angeles.
Lopez, Steve, Fremont.
Lovato, Lauriano Lawrence, Oakland.
Lowe, Clayton Bentley, Jr., Palmdale.
Lowery, Michael Ayre, San Francisco.
Lucas, Myron Donald, Bakersfield.
Ludiwg, Leonard R., Oxnard.
Luhnow, Glenn Eugene, El Cajon.
Luna, Henry Thomas, Fresno.
Lusk, Donnie Ray, Kettleman City.
Lussier, Larry Paul, Gustine.
Lyle, Terrance, Richard, Lapuente.
Machado, Gary Allaen, Oakland.
Mack, Robert Lee, San Francisco.
Macklin, Ronald Wayne, Glendale.
Maguire, Robert Stanley, Atascadero.
Marek, Joseph Penn, Fontana.
Marin, Julian, Corcoran.
Marion, Harry Lewis, Los Gatos.
Marshall, Richard Allan, Glen Avon.
Marshall, Roger Robert, Lakewood.
Martin, David Lee, Jr., Gustine.
Martin, Jimmie Carter, Gardena.
Martin, Joseph Thomas, San Luis Obispo.
Martin, Larry Joe, Arvin.
Matayoshi, Wallace Kenji, Torrance.
Matthews, James Newton, Milpitas.
Mauldin, Michael B., Fresno.
Maxwell, Robert James, Fresno.
Maynard, Thomas Harry, El Monte.
McAlister, Donald Lynn, Inglewood.
McBride, Fitz-Randolph Bu, Portugees Bend.
McBroom, Loyd Lindal, Costa Mesa.
McClelland, Myron, Downieville.
McClure, Jack Dale, Modesto.
McCommons, Michael Ray, Anaheim.
McCoy, John Lowery, Los Angeles.
McCollough, Michael Eugen, Concord.
McDaniel, Craig Allan, Lake Arrowhead.
McDonald, James Howard, Carpinteria.
McDowell, William Joseph, El Monte.
McElyea, James Frank, Escondido.
McGriff, Danny Jay, Fresno.
McKenzie, James Allen, Hayward.
McKinney, Ronald Eugene, Los Angeles.
McLaughlin, James Paul, Sacramento.
McLaughlin, William Lawre, San Bernardino.
McLeod, Robert Lee, Inglewood.
McMahon, John Thomas, Long Beach.
McMaster, John William, IV, Merced.
McMasters, Charles Anthon, Los Angeles.
McMinn, Danny Lee, Hermosa Beach.
McNally, Harry Merle, Hayward.
McNeilly, Ronald William, Alhambra.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

McRoberts, Clifford Wayne, Whittier.
Mears, Charles Robert, Patterson.
Meek, Joe Lanell, Exeter.
Melendez, Rudolph, San Jose.
Melendres, Joseph Thomas, Concord.
Menane, Jerry Bruce, Santa Barbara.
Messer, Jon Laird, Downey.
Meyer, Gary Paul, Pleasanton.
Meyer, Otto Paul, III, Palm Desert.
Michael, Lloyd Donald, Round Mountain.
Middlekauff, David, El Cerrito.
Miller, Gary Dean, South Gate.
Miller, Jerry Robert, Baldwin Park.
Miller, Jimmy Allen, Los Angeles.
Miller, Louis Charles, Watsonville.
Miller, Michael Clifton, Norwalk.
Miller, Oren Kenneth, Oxnard.
Milovich, Robin Patrick, Yreka.
Miramontes, Arthur Fred, Woodland.
Mitchell, Michael Sidney, Richmond.
Mitchell, Roger C., Delano.
Moldenhauer, Russell, Oxnard.
Molina, George Geronimo, Los Angeles.
Molina, Michael Joseph, Los Angeles.
Monahan, Michael James, San Francisco.
Monterroso, Alfonso Alfred, Los Angeles.
Montes, Raul, Los Angeles.
Moore, Charles Sargeant, Sacramento.
Moore, Dennis Eugene, Riverside.
Moore, Galen Leroy, Newport Beach.
Morales, Tommy, Los Angeles.
Moran, Alberto Hector, Los Angeles.
Moran, Ray Edward, Jr., Big Bear Lake.
Moreno, Martin Walter, Newark.
Moreno, Robert, Los Angeles.
Morgan, Glendell, Los Angeles.
Morgan, Stephen Edward, Saratoga.
Moritz, Michael Perry, Ventura.
Mummert, Robert Sterling, Rialto.
Munden, Donald Martin, Quail Valley.
Munoz, Jesus Arthur, Port Hueneme.
Murphy, Timothy Xavier, Sacramento.
Murphy, Walter Edward, Jr., Covina.
Murray, Douglas Earl, Pomona.
Myers, Charles Lee, Chula Vista.
Myers, Edward George, Los Angeles.
Nadal, Baldomero Arturo, Delano.
Nagengast, Carl Delane, Long Beach.
Nance, David Eugene, Marysville.
Nasser, Robert Benjamin, Los Angeles.
Nathan, John Arthur, San Francisco.
Nelson, Allan Joseph, Jr., Novato.
New, George, Jr., Frenso.
Newberry, Jasper Newton, Jr., Lewiston.
Noe, Tim A., Redlands.
Noelke, Richard Allen, Fontana.
Nootz, Gaylord Eugene, Rialto.
Norman, Clae Terry, San Leandro.
Northern, James Robert All, Fullerton.
Norwood, Richard Dale, Orange Grove.
Noyola, Richard, Los Angeles.
Nuesse, Chester Keith, Fremont.
Nunez, Fred Contreras, Tulare.
Nunez, Rudolph Algar, Wilmington.
O'Connor, Denis, San Francisco.
Ochoa, Louis, Hanford.
Oglethorpe, Thomas Jay, Petaluma.
Oland, David Michael, Whittier.
Olmos, Luis, Pacoima.
Onana, Ralph Wheeler, Los Angeles.
Ontiveros, Thomas J., Santa Maria.
Orosco, Larry J., Corona.
Osborne, Richard Gene, Hanford.
Oshiro, Warren Shigeo, Los Angeles.
Ostroff, Steven Larry, Sun Valley.
Osuna, Antonio Richard, San Diego.
Otsen, David Bryan, San Bernardino.
Owens, Billy Ray, Moss Beach.
Padilla, Robert Louis, Ventura.
Paiz, Jerry, Norwalk.
Palacios, Casimiro, Los Angeles.
Palenske, William Allen, San Jose.
Palmer, Ronny Leroy, Azusa.
Papalas, Anthony Steven, Hermosa Beach.
Parham, Richard Lynn, Modesto.
Paris, Crawford Brain, Los Angeles.
Parkel, Gerald Phillip, North Hollywood.
Parker, Bennie Frank, Bakersfield.
Parks, Stephen Earl, Los Angeles.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Parnella, John, San Francisco.
Patrick, Richard Michael, San Jose.
Patterson, Dwayne Maxifiel, Calipatria.
Patterson, Ronald Oren, Northridge.
Patton, John Perry, Oakland.
Pelham, Lester Leon, Westminster.
Penman, Ronald Stirling, Los Angeles.
Penn, Ronald W., Cucamonga.
Perez, Guadalupe, San Joaquin.
Petersen, Raymond Allan, San Jose.
Petersen, William Robert, Garden Grove.
Peterson, Donald Martin, Santa Maria.
Peterson, Michael Eugene, Monrovia.
Peterson, Richard W., West Covina.
Pettit, Denzil Dele, Bloomington.
Petty, Eugene, Farmersville.
Phelps, Ronnie Louis, Porterville.
Philbin, Richard Griffith, Sacramento.
Phillips, Anthony Bruce, Los Angeles.
Phillips, Pat Ellis, Sylmar.
Pierce, Larry Stanley, Taft.
Pinchot, Craig D., Lakewood.
Pink, Joseph Patrick, San Jacinto.
Piper, James Dennis, San Lorenzo.
Pipkin, Frank Meadows, Blythe.
Pitt, Robert Louis, Culver City.
Pitt, Roy Sharp, Menlo Park.
Pleasant, Stephen Donald, Burbank.
Plumb, Cary Anthoney, Alameda.
Podgorney, Dennis Richard, Livermore.
Pope, Derek Boyd, Alameda.
Portello, Roderick Charles, Pacoima.
Portugal, Ignacio, Jr., Norwalk.
Powers, Bradley Leland, Kettleman.
Prange, Joseph Wilder, Los Angeles.
Pratt, Richard Chester, San Francisco.
Preddy, Robert Lee, San Bernardino.
Prediger, Franz Gerhard, Long Beach.
Prentice, Dennis Albert, San Pablo.
Prys, Robert William, San Diego.
Pulsifer, Nelson F., Jr., Lakeside.
Purser, James Leavell, Anaheim.
Quintero, Jose Hernandez, Santa Fe Springs.
Raine, David Shelton, San Bernardino.
Ramirez, David Thomas, Sanger.
Ramirez, Juan, Lynwood.
Ramsey, Michael Wayne, Port Chicago.
Randall, Michael Paul, Los Angeles.
Rangel, Richard, San Bernardino.
Rarig, Robin Arthur, North Hollywood.
Raschke, Dean Nelson, Dos Palos.
Rasmussen, Neal Arthur, Modesto.
Reeder, David Lee, Saugus.
Reid, Edward Rowan, Jr., North Hollywood.
Reid, William Albert, North Hollywood.
Reilly, Allan Vincent, Los Angeles.
Renfro, Norman, Oakland.
Reynoso, Rene, Los Angeles.
Rhoads, Danny David, Lemoore.
Rice, Cameron A., Petaluma.
Rice, Ronald Fred, Los Angeles.
Richardson, David Allen, Long Beach.
Ridgway, Clyde Moses, Rosamond.
Rigg, William Cecil, Los Angeles.
Riggins, Gary Ronald, Yreka.
Rivera, Jose A., San Francisco.
Rix, Douglas Alfred, Grass Valley.
Robbins, Charles Lester, Los Angeles.
Roberts, Michael Allen, Los Angeles.
Robin, David Alan, Richmond.
Robinson, Floyd Irwin, San Jose.
Robison, Jim Bruce, Borrego Springs.
Robustellini, David W., Montague.
Rocha, George Xavier, Garden Grove.
Rodarte, Alexander D., Compton.
Rodreick, Ronald Nelson, Fresno.
Rodrigues, Eugenio, Santa Fe Springs.
Rodriguez, Manuel Joe, Oxnard.
Rodriguez, Roger Espinoza, Heber.
Rodriguez, Romiro C., Stockton.
Rodriguez, Rudolph, Lindsay.
Rogoff, James Bill, Kerman.
Romo, Frank Gonzales, Azusa.
Rorick, Kenneth Roy, Wilmington.
Rose, Barnes, Warland, Jr., Wilmington.
Rose, David Jon, San Diego.
Rose, Frank James, Jr., Watsonville.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Ruberg, Christopher Eugene, Pacific Palisades.
Rugge, Lloyd Taylor, North Hollywood.
Russ, Lee Henderson, Oakland.
Ryan, Daniel Joseph, Modesto.
Ryse, Roy Louis, Jr., Inglewood.
Rytter, Paul E., Bakersfield.
Sabel, Joel Michael, West Covina.
Sain, Don Rue, Saratoga.
Salzman, Lavern Leo, Montclair.
Sanchez, Jesse, Union City.
Sanchez, Thomas Joseph, Pasadena.
Sander, Michael Dennis, Oakland.
Sanders, Richard Lee, Los Angeles.
Sanderson, Sander Chris, Kings Beach.
Sandoval, Thomas Fredrick, Alhambra.
Sandstrom, Robert Richard, San Francisco.
Sapp, Clark Edward, Littlerock.
Sarsfield, Harry Carl, Oxnard.
Schaeffer, Frederick Willi, San Diego.
Scheidt, William H., Concord.
Schlottman, James Edward, Carmichael.
Schmidt, Rickford Ray, Lawndale.
Schmitz, Richard Albert, Lynwood.
Schoel, Renny Dean, Marysville.
Schrobilgen, Warren H., Jr., Pacoina.
Schubert, Joel Luther, San Francisco.
Schultz, David Alan, Santa Maria.
Schwellenbach, Gary Ralph, Chico.
Scoggins, John Paul, Hollywood.
Scott, O. D., Seaside.
Scott, Thomas Lee, Anaheim.
Self, Irving Albert, Sacramento.
Semler, Stanley Kenton, Stockton.
Semmer, Peter Anthony, Long Beach.
Semore, Bobby Allen, McKinleyville.
Senger, Michael Melvin, Riverside.
Serna, Leopoldo Perea, Baldwyn Park.
Setzer, Paul Ray, Colma.
Seu, Milton J. S., Alameda.
Shannon, Randell Frank, Redding.
Sharp, Larry Douglas, San Lorenzo.
Shelley, Michael Owen, Pico Divera.
Shelton, Arthur Alexander, Loyalton.
Sherlock, Joseph V., III, Concord.
Shomaker, Jerome Charles, Newport Beach.
Sievers, Dale Glenn, Jr., Oroville.
Sipes, Richard Earl, Chula Vista.
Skarphol, Robert Wayne, Hayward.
Skipper, Hugh G., Paramount.
Sloan, Leslie Ray, Redlands.
Smead, Carl Roy, Thermal.
Smith, Donald Eugene, El Monte.
Smith, Donald Ray, Inglewood.
Smith, Gary Kenneth, Santa Ana.
Smith, Gilbert Nolan, Durham.
Smith, Marshall R., Lakewood.
Smith, Vennie Lee, Alameda.
Snyder, Preston John, San Carlos.
Soth, Michael Joseph, Ontario.
Soto, Ricardo Hinjosa, Los Angeles.
Soule, Ronald Glen, Los Gatos.
Speak, Eric B., Costa Mesa.
Spinali, David John, San Mateo.
Spittler, Ira James, III, Santa Maria.
Spitzer, Kenneth Lyle, San Jose.
Stacey Ralph McGuin, Jr., Pinole.
Stalter, John R., Pico Rivera.
Standridge, Jerry Wayne, Tracy.
Starkey, Henry Morgan, Auburn.
Sterns, Michael Forrester, San Francisco.
Stemac, Stephan Joseph, Sacramento.
Stephan, Larry Roy, Glendale.
Sterud, Martin Frederick, Oakley.
Stevens, Edrick Kenneth, Simi.
Stewart, William Wesley, Livermore.
Stirling, John F., Los Angeles.
Stone, Richard Arland, Palo Alto.
Sturdivant, Jasper Dean, Lake View Terrace.
Sturdy, Alan MacDonald, Redwood City.
Sullivan, Richard Arthur, San Mateo.
Sutherland, Herbert Lee, Los Angeles.
Tactay, Eugene Ricardo, Jr., San Diego.
Tafad Fa Asaviliga, V., San Diego.
Tauaese, Valentino, El Monte.
Taylor, Paul Clive, San Francisco.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Taylor, Robert Dwight, Santa Monica.
Tesillo, Armando, Los Angeles.
Thomas, James Edward, Jr., Fresno.
Thomas, Jerry T., Los Angeles.
Thomas, Monte Vernon, Altoe.
Thomas, Rufus Alfonzo, Jr., San Bernardino.
Thompson, Robert, Jr., Sepulveda.
Thorpe, David Louis, San Andreas.
Tighe, Charles Joseph, Los Angeles.
Tighe, John Roy, Lomita.
Tillinghast, Bradley Olen, Woodland.
Timmons, Edward Hugh, Central Valley.
Tingle, Kenneth Wayne, Mira Loma.
Tiscornia, John Joseph, San Carlos.
Tomasini, Richard E., Jr., San Francisco.
Totty, Delbert Chan, Wasco.
Toy, Gerald Oscar, Los Angeles.
Tramell, Daniel, Bakersfield.
Troelstrup, Thomas Lee, Hemet.
Tschumi, William John, Manhattan Beach.
Tuller, Dennis J., Martinez.
Turner, Eddie D., Porterville.
Valdez, Daniel Viramontes, Antioch.
Valencia, Francisco Macedo, San Diego.
Van Campen, Thomas Charles, Oroville.
Van Duyne, Robert Schuyler, Beverly Hills.
Van Gieson, Robert Lester, Van Nuys.
Van Patten, Robert Andrew, San Carlos.
Vasques, David, San Juan.
Vasques, Selvester Joe, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Jimmy, Pico Rivera.
Vasquez, Max V., III, Santa Paula.
Vaughan, Donald Charles, Modesto.
Vaughn, John Patrick, Sunnyvale.
Vaught, Craig Stephen, Redlands.
Verlinden, Craig Alden, El Sobrante.
Vernes, Robert Frank, Anaheim.
Vierra, Joseph, Oakland.
Villa, Armando, Brentwood.
Villalobos, Juan Jesus, Greenfield.
Vinal, Richard Alden, San Carlos.
Vinassa, Michael, Culver City.
Vincent, George, Los Angeles.
Vurlumis, Chris C., Oakland.
Waldron, George Allen, San Jose.
Waldrop, Ronald Terry, Santee.
Walker, Thomas Ray, Los Angeles.
Wallace, Michael D., Huntington Beach.
Walters, Donald Wesley, South Gate.
Walters, William, San Diego.
Wanamaker, Danny Wayne, Los Angeles.
Warrelmann, Klaus, Carmel.
Washburn, Johnny Lee, Azusa.
Watanabe, James Ryoichiro, Oxnard.
Watkins, Martin Lee, San Diego.
Watkins, Sherdin Jay, Cottonwood.
Watson, Alfonza, Los Angeles.
Watson, James Edward, Porterville.
Watson, Wilmer, Seaside.
Weatherly, Jackie Don, Sacramento.
Webber, Scott Stillman, Los Angeles.
Weborg, John Charles, Modesto.
Weeder, Richard D., Chula Vista.
Wehr, James Le Roy, Colton.
Welch, Michael Allen, Crockett.
Weller, Robert Allen, II, Mira Loma.
Wells, Richard Kenneth, Canoga Park.
Werner, Odell Jack, Los Angeles.
Westbay, Gaylord Lee, Hanford.
Whaley, James Goodwin, Sacramento.
Whiting, Richard Edward, Pico Rivera.
Whitley, Emmanuel David, Stockton.
Whitten, David Elga, Los Angeles.
Widener, John Edward, Ventura.
Wilder, Arlos Clayton, El Monte.
Willett, Richard James, Citrus Heights.
Williams, Charles James, Oakland.
Williams, Christian Lars, Redondo Beach.
Williams, David George, Sacramento.
Williams, Dennis Craig, Lodi.
Williams, Frederick Joseph, Rescue.
Williams, Johnny, Los Angeles.
Williams, Larry Keith, Torrance.
Williams, Vincent Richard, Alameda.
Willingham, Eldon Wayne, Santa Maria.
Willis, Donald Clyde, Hayward.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Willis, Joel Thomas, Lodi.
Wilson, Daniel L., Lennox.
Wilson, William Jeffrey, Sanger.
Wiltse, James B., Jr., Monrovia.
Winkempleck, George Harold, Porterville.
Wolfe, Kenneth Wayne, Calipatria.
Wonnacott, Walter L., Downey.
Wood, William Milton, Jr., Happy Camp.
Woodall, George Wally, Los Angeles.
Woodruff, Edward Warren, Napa.
Woods, Alonzo Dale, Visalia.
Woods, Charles Gordon, Corona.
Woodson, Johnny, Los Angeles.
Woolley, Mack Lee, Jr., Placentia.
Wright, James L., Novato.
Wright, Jay L., Long Beach.
Wright, Tyrone, Compton.
Wyatt, Alvie Clinton, Walnut Grove.
Yates, Bruce Edgar, Alameda.
Ybanez, Jose, Richmond.
Yeakley, James D., Los Angeles.
Young, Michael Robert, Newport Beach.
Zimmerman, Raymond L., Compton.
Zoeller, Lee Benjamin, Lakewood.
Zoller, Eric Ward, Rambla Vista.
Zuniga, Efrain, Jr., San Francisco.
Zuniga, Vicente, Fresno.

Air Force

Adams, Lee Aaron, Willits.
Anderson, Warren Lester, San Jose.
Bedal, Arthur Eugene, Tarzana.
Buckley, Francis Richard, Los Angeles.
Butterfield, Douglas Holma, Vista.
Callanan, Richard Joseph, Concord.
Campaigne, Jerry Alan, Central Valley.
Cruz, Raphael, Stockton.
Dixon, Lee Chris, Orland.
Eason, Edwin Raymond, Blythe.
Elkins, Jerome, Los Angeles.
Ellis, James Alvin, Campbell.
Goss, Richard Dean, Los Angeles.
Greco, Lee Attilio, Gilroy.
Green, Donald George, Baldwin Park.
Guerin, John Peter, Los Angeles.
Halvorson, Ernest Joseph, Montclair.
Hendrickson, Alan Eugene, Arcata.
Hudson, Leonard Paul, Sacramento.
Jewitt, Bob, Bell Gardens.
Kelley, Dana Richard, San Carlos.
Knudsen, Harold Eugene, Jr., Paradise.
Krouse, James Charles, North Highlands.
Le Tourneau, Jack Date, Hughson.
Lindberg, David Carl, Lakeport.
Mattis, William Carroll, Acampo.
McAllister, William Walte, Hawthorne.
McPherson, Fred Lamar, Oakland.
Phillips, Theodore Bert, Riverside.
Ruonavaara, Robert Edwin, Healdsburg.
Secanti, Richard Michael, Santa Monica.
Simon, Paul Joseph, Anderson.
Thornell, Edmund Francis, Redondo Beach.
Weger, John, Jr., San Fernando.
Whitesides, Richard Lebrou, Stockton.
Winters, Darryl Gordon, San Francisco.

Marine Corps

Abina, Robert Thomas, San Leandro.
Abner, Carl Edward, Campbell.
Acevedo, Richard Joseph, Los Angeles.
Ackley, Gerald Levie, Dunnigan.
Acosta, Daniel, Stockton.
Aguirre, George, Fountain Valley.
Allen, Gary Charles, Pleasant Hill.
Allen, Richard Graham, Long Beach.
Anderson, Clinton H., Jr., El Segundo.
Anderson, Donald Leroy, Jr., Hawthorne.
Anderson, James, Jr., Compton.
Anglim, Patrick Emmett, Long Beach.
Armenta, Heriberto, Los Angeles.
Armenta, Ruben Maximo, Pico Rivera.
Armstrong, John Henry, San Diego.
Arredondo, Thomas Alfred, Fresno.
Arreguin, Joe, La Puente.
Aschenbrener, Ervin G., Jr., Fresno.
Austin, Eddie Paul, Coachella.
Avila, John Manuel, Los Angeles.
Bailey, Robert Benton, Yreka.
Baker, Donald Lee, Huntington Park.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Ballin, Joe Magdaleno, Jr., Fresno.
Balters, Stephen A., Jr., San Jose.
Barnard, Gary Michael, Highland.
Bartels, Stephen Donald, Pleasant Hill.
Barth, Wayne Robert, Lodi.
Bartlow, Gary William, Modesto.
Barton, Virgil Wayne, San Diego.
Bauchiero, Harold, Inglewood.
Baumgardner, David Leon, El Cajon.
Bazulto, Salvador, Los Angeles.
Beckermann, Fred Benjamine, Tujunga.
Beeche, Rafael Eduardo, San Diego.
Belknap, Ronald Lee, Daly City.
Benegas, Vincent Joseph, Riverside.
Bennett, Donald Lucian, Fairfield.
Benton, Thomas Howard, Sonora.
Berry, William Aaron, Yreka.
Bianchini, Michael Linn, San Francisco.
Bierman, Carroll Monroe, Jr., Garden Grove.
Billingsley, Richard Wayne, Glendale.
Biscailuz, Robert Lynn, Midway City.
Bishop, Russell Laverne, Santa Ana.
Blinder, Richard Bart, Los Angeles.
Bloom, Richard McAuliffe, San Francisco.
Bocanegra, Hugo Arthur, Whittier.
Boda, James Albert, Pico Rivera.
Boetcher, Harold Edward, Milpitas.
Boets, Peter Quirinus, Jr., Cypress.
Bohner, Leonard Allen, San Bernardino.
Booth, Emmett Lee, Encinitas.
Bosh, Anthony Robert, Long Beach.
Boyd, Robert Carl, Newark.
Boyer, Barney Evans, Pleasant Hill.
Boyer, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Brackins, Vernon Edward, Pasadena.
Bridges, Berry Joe, Bellflower.
Brink, James Richard, Sacramento.
Brookens, Willard, Jr., Los Angeles.
Brooks, Benjiman, Stockton.
Brooks, Lawrence Arthur, Fountain Valley.
Brothers, Gerald John, San Diego.
Brown, Marc Alan, Long Beach.
Browne, Edward Raymond, San Diego.
Browning, Michael Louis, Fullerton.
Buckholdt, Leo Buddy, Santa Cruz.
Burciaga, Robert, Los Angeles.
Burke, John Patrick, Contra Costa.
Burkhart, Eugene Wayne, Palmdale.
Burri, Miguel Ramon, La Mirada.
Burris, Leonard Charles, San Francisco.
Butler, Edward Wayne, Sacramento.
Callan, Philip Michael, Berkeley.
Callis, David George, Redwood City.
Campbell, Robert Dean, South Pasadena.
Candler, Gregory James, Los Angeles.
Cantrell, Phillip Gene, Delano.
Carriere, Oscar Roland, Santa Monica.
Carter, Michael Boyd, Torrance.
Casey, Liam Soueph, Paradise.
Castillo, Charles Mike, Lakewood.
Castillo, Jose, Fresno.
Castillo, Manuel Grijalva, Placentia.
Castro, Juan Jose, Norwalk.
Centeno, Edward Louis, Los Angeles.
Cervantes, George Andrew, Redlands.
Chapp, Robert Anthony, Santa Ana.
Chatfield, Wendell Oliver, Red Bluff.
Childers, James Stanley Be, Pacifica.
Christie, Dennis Ray, Imperial Beach.
Christy, Donald Ray, Yuba City.
Chrysler, Medford Adarine, Pacifica.
Church, Levan Arlin, Hayward.
Churchill, Lawrence Jeffre, Tustin.
Cintron, Jimmie Duayne, Acampo.
Clark, Raymond Charles, Los Angeles.
Cobos, Alfred, Los Angeles.
Compton, William Edgar, III, Long Beach.
Conn, David Bruce, Oakland.
Contreras, Miguel Zaragoza, Corona.
Cook, Michael Dean, Rubidoux.
Cooke, Harold Thomas, San Diego.
Cooley, Ocie Daniel, Baldwin Park.
Cooney, James Henry, Camarillo.
Coons, Peter Michael, San Diego.
Corona, Dominic Anthony, Fontana.
Cortez, Richard, Los Angeles.
Courteu, Edward Gerard, Los Angeles.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Coutrakis, George, Ripon.
Cox, Larry James, Weedpatch.
Craig, Thomas Edward, Los Angeles.
Crapo, Ronald Carl, Buena Park.
Crowe, Richard Eyre, Long Beach.
Cruz, Oscar, Escondido.
Cummings, Ronald Eugene, Stockton.
Cuozzo, Frank Xavier, Los Angeles.
Curry, Jimmy Douglas, San Jose.
Curry, Robert Erven, Pacifica.
Dalrymple, Roger Earl, Bakersfield.
Darcy, Michael Chavez, Colton.
De Abre, James Michael, Morgan Hill.
De Lacy, Michael Charles, Los Altos.
Dennis, Hayvard, Jr., Los Angeles.
Deocampo, Gregorio Manese, San Francisco.
Dewey, Eric Melvin, Bishop.
Dominguez, Michael Charles, Santa Barbara.
Doran, Patrick Michael, Burlingame.
Dukehart, Stephen Ernest, Gardena.
Dulay, Salvador Redilla, Fairfield.
Duncan, Richard Winerfred, Livermore.
Edwards, Jerrald Leroy, Costa Mesa.
Edwards, Robert Theodore, Lancaster.
Eggleston, Robert Richard, Los Angeles.
Eliason, Wendell Theo, Escalon.
Elliott, Brock Dennis, Manteca.
Elmore, Allan Ladd, Hollywood.
Endsley, Kenneth Richard, Sacramento.
England, Ronald Lee, Lynwood.
Enriquez, Nicholas Ben, Los Angeles.
Ephriam, David Burnell, Los Angeles.
Ernst, Edward Joseph, Torrance.
Ervin, Gregory Allen, Santa Susana.
Escobar, Joseph Sanchez, Fresno.
Esquivel, Jaime, San Jose.
Ewart, John Andrew, Sepulveda.
Felt, David Levant, Sacramento.
Felton, Ruby Edward, III, Los Angeles.
Ferguson, Mark Andrew, Lancaster.
Ferguson, Richard Eugene, Covina.
Fernandez, Robert Sanchez, Stockton.
Fierro, Alejandro Francisco, Los Angeles.
Fiorentin, John Velco, Anaheim.
Fish, William Aaron, Oakdale.
Fisher, Dennis Franklin, Alta Loma.
Fisher, Lamarr, Los Angeles.
Fisher, Rickie Davis, Santa Rosa.
Fitzsimmons, James Patrick, Garden Grove.
Flannery, Robert Edward, Jr., St. Helena.
Flickinger, James Edward, Concord.
Flores, Jose DeJesus, Los Angeles.
Folsom, Robert Elmer, San Bruno.
Forbes, Paul Glenn, Jr., San Diego.
Forrest, Stephen Caleb, Westminster.
Foster, Lawrence Eugene, Pacifica.
Foster, Paul Hellstrom, San Francisco.
Foust, Michael Thornton, Victorville.
Franklin, John Henry, Hughson.
Fredsti, Steffan Michael, Simi.
Fromme, Frederick W., Jr., Vallejo.
Frontella, Melvin Lawrence, Mountain View.
Frye, Richard Alan, Venice.
Gabaldon, Tony Eiddie, Reedley.
Galan, David Luis, Huntington Park.
Gale, David Lee, Long Beach.
Galiana, Rudolph Steven, Los Angeles.
Gallegos, Gabriel, San Bernardino.
Gamble, Harry Paul, San Francisco.
Garcia, Edilberto, Orange Cove.
Garcia, Frank Joseph, Redlands.
Garcia, John, Selma.
Garcia, Manuel Mendez, Jr., Los Angeles.
Gazdagh, James Alex, Hawthorne.
Gebhart, Carl Merlin, Jr., Rialto.
Gemas, Terry Dale, Saugus.
Georges, Jerry Harold, Santa Barbara.
Gerard, Lawson Douglas, Santa Monica.
Gilson, Michael Anthony, Sacramento.
Godinez, Alejandro Ray, Los Angeles.
Gonzales, Jimmy, Madera.
Gonzalez, Bernardino, Jr., Gardena.
Gooden, Michael Anthony, Bellflower.
Gordon, Johnny Lee, Los Angeles.
Gore, Donald Earl, Ventura.
Gotti, Gale Edward, Westminster.

XUM

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Granillo, Henry, El Monte.
Grannon, Michael Stephen, Canoga Park.
Grant, Stephen Lee, Torrance.
Grant, Warren Harvey, Jr., Oakland.
Griffiths, Raymond Carson, San Francisco.
Griffiths, Robert Brynley, Long Beach.
Grimes, Michael Bryan, North Hollywood.
Guevara, Ervell Madrid, Gardena.
Gummere, David Dee, La Habra.
Gutierrez, Ernest Lemas, San Jose.
Hahn, Paul Edward, Hawthorne.
Halstead, Wayne Edwin, Burbank.
Hanks, Ernest Beauel, III, Willows.
Hann, David Michel, Santa Monica.
Hardy, Fred Douglas, Pasadena.
Hare, Michael James, Berkeley.
Harmon, Wayne Clark, Downey.
Harrison, Edward Terry, Jr., Los Angeles.
Hartland, Charles Lee, Weaverville.
Hawking, Thomas Howard, Fullerton.
Hayes, Wayne Norman, Oceanside.
Heekin, Terry Gene, Covina.
Henderson, Hughlen, Los Angeles.
Henderson, John Michael, Oakland.
Henneberg, Robert Joseph, San Francisco.
Henry, Gerald Russell, Hayward.
Henshaw, Thomas Stow, Pacific Palisades.
Herchkorn, Richard Ronald, Walnut Grove.
Herms, Klaus Jurgen, San Dimas.
Hernandez, Alexander Vera, Compton.
Hernandez, Louis Peter, San Bernardino.
Herrera, Phillip Arnold, Jr., Selma.
Herrmann, Walter Edwin, III, Buena Park.
Hickman, David Alan, El Cajon.
Hirschmann, Frederick, III, El Toro.
Holcomb, Melvin Douglas, San Jose.
Holley, Bobby Roy, Bakersfield.
Holsclaw, Gary Arthur, Loomis.
Holstius, Michael John, Anaheim.
Holte, Brent Arthur, Bakersfield.
Hoppe, Patrick Bert, San Lorenzo.
Hottinger, Fred Lee, San Jose.
Houser, Dorian Jan, Los Angeles.
Howell, Gatlin Jerryl, Colma.
Hulse, Robert Mark, Los Angeles.
Hummingbird, Ferrell, Oakland.
Hurtado, Albert Steven, National City.
Inscore, Roger Vernon, Huntington Beach.
Insprucker, Glenn Edward, Glendale.
Jackson, Colin Frank, Thousand Oaks.
James, Claude Ray, Oakland.
Johnson, Dennis Charles, Twain Harte.
Johnson, Gerald, Long Beach.
Johnson, Kenneth Michael, San Diego.
Johnson, Stanley Garwood, Applegate.
Jones, Clifford Alan, Porterville.
Jones, James Robert, Long Beach.
Jones, Jimmie Wayne, Merced.
Jones, John Wallace, Fremont.
Jones, Robert Emmett, Corona.
Jordan, Jimmy Dale, Riverbank.
Joys, John William, San Francisco.
Judge, Mark Warren, Torrance.
Kalfas, Allan George, Garden Grove.
Kearney, Charles Daryl, Oakland.
Keith, Danny Joe, Salinas.
Kelley, Roger Virgil, La Mesa.
Kelly, Gregory Paul, La Crescenta.
Kelly, James Raymond, III, Sacramento.
Kennedy, Bruce Leonard, Santa Monica.
Kimmel, Lewis Albert, Jr., Camarillo.
King, Ronald Reed, Burbank.
Kirby, Donald Robert, III, Mountain View.
Kitzmiller, John Lester, Westminster.
Kloese, Wayne Richard, Long Beach.
Knapp, Kenton Don, Los Angeles.
Kolas, Robert Allen, San Diego.
Kolemainen, Michael Walter, Orange.
Kornovich, Frank Dennis, San Rafael.
Kramer, Dennis Dale, Placerville.
Lake, Ronald Lee, Lynwood.
Lara, Arturo Mendoza, Los Angeles.
Larson, Larry Joseph, Carmel.
Lauer, Charles Russell, Downey.
Lazar, George Feodro, San Francisco.
Lewis, Richard Eugene, Los Angeles.
Liggett, Durand Garfield, Downey.
Linder, Garry Harold, Los Angeles.
Linder, George Richard, Gardena.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Long, Floyd Lester, Pasadena.
Lopez, Jose Antonio, Los Angeles.
Lopez, Richard Henry, Los Angeles.
Losoya, Ernest Felipe, Salinas.
Lotta, Phillip Anthony, Sacramento.
Lovell, Ervin, Ontario.
Lowe, Edward Leonard, Pico Rivera.
Lozenski, Richard Ordell, San Mateo.
Lucido, Josept Bert, El Granada.
Lyman, Gerald Clyde, San Diego.
Lytle, Clifford James, Los Angeles.
Mallon, Thomas Winston, Millbrae.
Malone, Sidney Jack, Jr., San Diego.
Manning, Jerry Wayne, Lamont.
Margolis, Robert Lynn, Van Nuys.
Martin, Gregory Lawrence, Simi.
Martin, Raymond Charles, Pomona.
Martin, Stephen James, Los Angeles.
Matthews, Alan Lee, Palos Verdes.
Mayo, Gerald Frank, Oakland.
McCall, Douglas Hudson, Hayward.
McCarty, John Leich, Stockton.
McClain, Gary Thomas, Glendale.
McConahay, Michael Paul, Long Beach.
McDonald, Clyde D. II, Santa Ana.
McEntee, Neil Charles, Oakland.
McFarland, Kenneth Earl, Sacramento.
McKee, Thomas Eugene, Palm Springs.
McKenzie, James Calvin, Yorba Linda.
McKinnon, Larry Dee, Sacramento.
McLaughlin, Kirk Alvis, Cottonwood.
McMurdo, James Alfred, Sepulveda.
McNees, Ronald Harvey, Sunland.
McNulty, Milton Keith, Palmdale.
McPhee, Randy Neal, Long Beach.
Meister, George Frederick, Rancho Cordova.
Mendoza, Antonio, Biola.
Mendoza, Jose Medel, Compton.
Merrill, Dennis Lee, Grove City.
Metzger, Russell Edward, North Highland.
Miguel, Michael Joseph, Lemoore.
Millard, Kenneth Arthur, Long Beach.
Miller, Gary Ames, Grass Valley.
Miner, Michael Robert, San Luis Obispo.
Mitchell, Ernest Darrell, Garden Grove.
Mitchell, James McNally, Jr., Encinitas.
Moffett, Melvin Glen, Covina.
Monfils, Dennis Eugene, Riverside.
Mooney, John Howard, Jr., Lakewood.
Moore, Ronald Allan, Manhattan Beach.
Moore, Walter Zampier, Jr., Los Angeles.
Moore, William Robert, Richmond.
Morand, Brad William, Riverside.
Morgan, Mark Lake, San Bruno.
Morrill, David Whittier, San Carlos.
Mos, Ronald Bruce, Lamont.
Moses, Willie Lee, Los Angeles.
Moshier, Jim Edwin, Bakersfield.
Mulick, Michael William, Poway.
Murphy, Robert Emmett, Jr., Compton.
Myers, Charles Dean, Jr., Duarte.
Neal, Stephen Browning, Santa Barbara.
Negranza, Mariando, R., Jr., Roseville.
Nelson, Gary Nels, Glendale.
Nevarez, Alexandro, Stockton.
Neves, Manuel Catano, Tracy.
Nichols, Douglas Ellsworth, San Pedro.
Nicholson, James Arthur, Anaheim.
Noble, Morris Allan, San Pablo.
Norris, John Alexander, III, Los Banos.
O'Brien, Chester Lavern, Jr., Taft.
O'Connor, Dennis Alfred, Anaheim.
Oberle, David Allan, Walnut Creek.
Okamoto, Donald Ray, National City.
Ortiz, Reinaldo Salvador, San Francisco.
Owens, Jack Coleman, San Jose.
Owens, Reo, Santa Monica.
Pacheco, Jose Anthony, Los Angeles.
Padilla, Antonio Duarte, Wilmington.
Page, Steve Wilson, Oxnard.
Paine, Victor Llewellyn, South Fork.
Painter, John Ralph, Jr., Palmdale.
Painter, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Palczewski, Edmund Lawrence, Sacramento.
Palma, Raymond Barela, Pacoima.
Pappas, Ralph Byron, Presidio.
Parrish, Frank Brennan, Riverside.
Parrish, Michael Lawrence, Perris.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Parker, Larry Thomas, Fresno.
Parker, Maxim Charles, Rolling Hills.
Partridge, Douglas Elwood, Martell.
Patterson, Bruce Dixon, Glendale.
Patterson, Daniel Arthur, Eureka.
Patterson, Steven Craig, Huntington Park.
Patton, Dorris Edward, San Francisco.
Pedersen, Fred Lewis, Azusa.
Pehrson, Dale Christopher, Redding.
Pene, Ronald Edward, Hacienda Heights.
Perdue, Don Melvin, Oceanside.
Perez, Ernest Eustace, Lone Pine.
Perich, John Whilden, Bakersfield.
Perkins, Ronald James, Pacoima.
Perkins, William Thomas, Jr., Sepulveda.
Peterson, Dennie Donald, Los Angeles.
Petrick, Ronald Paul, Montclair.
Phillips, John Michael, Orange.
Piatt, Richard Weaver, Los Angeles.
Pittenger, Donald Alan, Los Angeles.
Plake, James Ronald, Camarillo.
Poirier, Roger Milton, Redondo Beach.
Porter, Ronald William, Antioch.
Presby, Thomas Frank, Sunland.
Prescott, Willard Sherwin, Rolling Hills.
Quigley, James Michael, Hollywood.
Quinn, Douglas Frank, Eureka.
Quinn, Terry Lee, Huntington Beach.
Randazzo, Joseph Anthony, Modesto.
Ratliff, Paul Wayne, Torrance.
Rauch, Edward Harold, San Francisco.
Reagan, John Walter, Los Angeles.
Reaves, Homer Lee, Pomona.
Reed, Robert William, San Francisco.
Reeves, Gordon Michael, San Mateo.
Reilly, Robert John, Jr., Walnut Creek.
Reyes, Ronald David, Edison.
Reynolds, Joseph Ray, Compton.
Riate, Alfonso Ray, Bell Gardens.
Riley, James Calvin, Pleasant Hill.
Roberts, Clifford Alton, San Bruno.
Robertson, Clifton Boyd, Jr., Los Angeles.
Robinson, Mark Edward, Manhattan Beach.
Roe, Phillip Willard, Riverside.
Roland, George Ray, Casitas Springs.
Rose, Dana Gale, Santa Rosa.
Rose, David Lee, Santa Clara.
Ross, Larry Edward, Novato.
Ross, Raymond Jefferson, Jr., Norwalk.
Ross, Robert Garry, El Monte.
Ruiz, Raymond, Los Angeles.
Rundle, Danny Ray, Whittier.
Runnels, Lloyd Chisolm, Jr., San Diego.
Salazar, Gilbert Solano, Pico Rivera.
Samson, Francisco Leo, Jr., San Francisco.
Samson, Michael Roman, Antioch.
San Marcos, Edmond, Long Beach.
Sanchez, Jimmy Pineda, Los Angeles.
Sanchez, Santos, Selma.
Sanders, Harvey Richard, Garden Grove.
Sands, Thomas Michael, Monrovia.
Satcher, Charles Sherlee, Vallejo.
Sauer, Philip Howard, Coronado.
Shaina, Conrad William, Santa Susana.
Shalhoob, Terry Wayne, Santa Barbara.
Shamel, John Clarence, Thousand Oaks.
Sharp, Samuel Arthur, Jr., San Jose.
Sherrell, David Frank, Woodland Hills.
Shields, Alan Harry, Los Angeles.
Shoemaker, David Howard, San Jose.
Shook, George Leonard, Jr., Hermosa Beach.
Short, Mitchell Conrad, Canoga Park.
Shults, Walter Glenn, Oakland.
Silas, Theodore Buchanan, Los Angeles.
Silva, Federico, San Bernardino.
Simpson, Alfred Franklin, Gardena.
Sitler, Barry James, Compton.
Smith, John Calvin, Sacramento.
Smith, Michael Bruce, Fairfield.
Smith, Michael Rex, Red Bluff.
Smith, Philip Jeremiah, Redwood.
Smith, Timothy N. Jr., Santa Ana.
Soliz, Thomas, Bakersfield.
Solley, John Joseph, San Diego.
Sorenson, Donald Robert, Lakewood.
Sorrow, Charles Finney, Jr., Santa Barbara.
Sousa, Robert Patrick, Alameda.
Speer, Byron Morrow, San Marine.
Srsen, Steve Albert, San Lorenzo.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

St. Louis, Bruce Wayne, Newhall.
Staab, Kurt Clarence, El Centro.
Stansell, Richard Norris, Los Angeles.
Stelle, Gerald Cain, Temple City.
Stevens, Tamadge Cecil, Jr., Sacramento.
Stevens, Walter Bruce, San Diego.
Stewart, Richard James, El Monte.
Stirling, Elgin Leroy, San Bernardino.
Stoker, Kenneth Grant, Alameda.
Stokes, Charles Eugene, Santa Ana.
Stutes, William Byron, Oceanside.
Sunisa, Michael Edward, Ojai.
Suzuki, Kenny Ryosuke, Santa Monica.
Swayze, Richard David, Santa Maria.
Taboada, Adolfo Antonio, Jr., Los Angeles.
Tagata, Laavale Fuatau, San Francisco.
Tague, Nicholas Allen, Fillmore.
Talley, Harold Lee, Glendora.
Talmon, Peter George, III, Los Angeles.
Tamayo, Francisco Mario, Jr., Sacramento.
Tandy, Michael Gordon, Novato.
Tarango, Ernesto, Los Angeles.
Tate, Fennell, Los Angeles.
Tate, Fred Eugene, Hollywood.
Tedds, Mervyn Donald, Mountain View.
Tela, Molimau Asomaliu, San Pedro.
Thompson, Edgar Wayne, San Francisco.
Titsworth, Kenneth Carl, San Jose.
Toleson, Thomas Norman, Willow Creek.
Trevino, Juan Ramon, Calwa.
Tunstill, Frank, Jr., Los Angeles.
Turcotte, Ralph Jean, Santa Ana.
Tyron, Fred Albert, Jr., Downey.
Ucker, David John, Palo Alto.
Ueli, Peni, Wilmington.
Ullmer, William Arthur, Jr., Escondido.
Upchurch, Rodney Cleveland, Palo Alto.
Vagnone, Richard Bernard, Norwalk.
Valencia, Ralph Mario, Monterey Park.
Vallerand, Larkin Oscar, Tracy.
Valtierra, Juan Borja, Merced.
Vanover, Paul Phillip, Castro Valley.
Varner, Jerry Daniel, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Mark Anthony, City of Commerce.
Vasquez, Patrick John, San Jose.
Vaughn, Richard William, San Luis Obispo.
Velasquez, Antonio, Santa Maria.
Verdugo, Daniel Alexander, Whittier.
Vergano, Robert Thomas, Merced.
Vigil, Arthur Vernon, San Francisco.
Villegas, Ralph Paul, San Pedro.
Wagner, Richard Allen, Stockton.
Wagner, Russell Mark, Vallejo.
Wagner, Walter Adolph, Redwood City.
Wagner, Wayne Douglas, Porterville.
Walker, Thomas James, San Jose.
Walkinshaw, George Myron, Long Beach.
Ward, Robert David, Yucaipa.
Warner, Charles William F., Santa Monica.
Warner, Herbert Alvin, Jr., Long Beach.
Watson, Arthur, Jr., Los Angeles.
Wheatley, William George, San Francisco.
Whipple, Clifford Leroy, Downey.
Whisenhunt, James Henry, Crescent City.
Whitehead, Charles Franklin, Mill Valley.
Willard, Frederick R., Jr., Glendora.
Williams, Barry Hennett, Saratoga.
Williams, John David, Claremont.
Wittman, Narvin Otto, Jr., Coronado.
Wright, Steven James, Norco.
Xavier, Augusto Maria, San Jose.
Yager, John Corwin, Granada Hills.
Yarnell, Daniel David, Highland.
Zimberlin, Robert E., Jr., San Diego.
Ziss, Emil Roger, Concord.
Zoboblish, Donald, Inglewood.
Zuniga, Leon Jr., Imperial Beach.

Navy

Allred, Frank Leroy, Jr., Fresno.
Amspacher, William H., Jr., Canoga Park.
Antone, Frank George, Carmel.
Avila, Manuel Jr., Fresno.
Balch, James Iverson, Fresno.
Ballauf, Charles Alan, Oxnard.
Bennett, Daniel Joseph, Beverly Hills.
Birch, Daniel Patrick, Los Angeles.
Bird, Harold Alvin, Boulder Creek.
Boyd, Billy Ray, San Bernardino.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Navy

Boyle, David Joseph, Woodland.
Brown, Donald Hubert, Jr., Berkeley.
Burns, William Carl, Jr., San Mateo.
Carey, Michael William, Rescue.
Carver, Bobby Don, Richmond.
Center, Robert Lee, Inglewood.
Chambers, Steven Doyle, Fresno.
Cooper, Edwin Earl, Chula Vista.
Croxen, Richard Lynn, Westminster.
Di Napoli, Michaeal Joseph, La Mesa.
Dibble, Gordon John, Los Angeles.
Duggan, William Joseph, Lynwood.
Edie, Kurt Charles, Sunnyvale.
Esqueda, Arthur Diaz, Chino.
Estok, Michael David, San Bernardino.
Farrell, Bruce Charles, San Francisco.
Flowers, Wilson Nathenial, East Palo Alto.
Frye, Donald Patrick, Los Angeles.
Fuentes, Hector, Riverside.
Gelien, Walter John, Oakland.
Gingerich, Gregory Ray, Redondo Beach.
Godwin, Joseph Samuel, Saugus.
Graham, Gilbert James, Anaheim.
Hessom, Robert Charles, Alameda.
Higgins, John Ignatius, Jr., Chula Vista.
Hill, Arthur Sinclair, Jr., Rancho, Santa Fe.
Hill, Paul Wayne, Upper Lake.
Holderman, Bruce Edward, Santa Barbara.
Hom, Charles David, Huntington Park.
Hoover, William Clifton, San Diego.
Kardell, David Allen, Sonoma.
Kelley, Joel Franklin, Applegate.
Kirstein, Daniel Lynn, Pasadena.
Laws, Richard Lee, Sacramento.
Maguire, Christoper J. III, San Diego.
Mape, John Clement, Dublin.
Markillie, John Roy, Modesto.
Mc Ham, Richard Hugh, Sunland.
Miller, Calvin Leroy, Wishon.
Miller, Robert Lester, Salinas.
Mullan, Charles Richard, Jr., Berkeley.
Najarian, Michael Anthony, La Crescenta.
Northup, David Wayne, Campbell.
Paine, Edward Arthur, Redondo Beach.
Perez, Arthur Carlyle, San Diego.
Perry, Antone, Jr., Union City.
Peterson, Dennis William, Huntington Park.
Pogre, Bob Ella, San Francisco.
Potter, William Vernon, Maywood.
Quiroga, Alex Leon, San Jose.
Rawsthorne, Edgar Arthur, Miramar.
Rudolph, Robert David, Encino.
Sather, Richard Christian, Pomona.
Shea, James Patrick, Burlingame.
Smith, Michael Frank, Fairfax.
Smith, Wiselee, San Francisco.
Stiles, Charles Walter, Agnew.
Taylor, Jesse Junior, Los Alamitos.
Thirkettle, Michael John, Whittier.
Thomas, Darwin Joel, Santa Clara.
Thomas, Harry Eugene, Taft.
Thompson, William Dewey, Jr., Healdsburg.
Thornton, Gary Lynn, Porterville.
Vaughan, Robert Reddington, Los Angeles
Vedros, Randolph Paul, Mountain View.
Walters, John Brady, Long Beach.
Wilson, Claude David, Jr., Stockton.

COLORADO

Army

Alaniz, Benito, Colorado Springs.
Anderson, Everett Robert, Fort Collins.
Archuletta, Ray Adam, Florence.
Beasley, James Otis, Denver.
Beeson, Robert Henry, Jr., Denver.
Borgens, Jerry Lee, Westminster.
Burnell, Sam, Junior, Grand Junction.
Carroll, Gerald Ford, La Salle.
Condreay, Ervin Lee, Greeley.
Cook, Donald Estel, Colorado Springs.
Crossman, Melvin Eugene, Monte Vista.
Cunningham, Bruce Wayne, Denver.
Davis, John Allen, Denver.
Day, Stephen Wayne, Hygiene.
Delgado, Leroy Fred, Jr., Grand Junction.
Dickinson, David Thomas, Denver.
Donovan, Leroy Melvin, Cedaredge.

COLORADO—continued

Army

Dunn, Ralph Allen, Colorado Springs.
Duran, Eloy, Denver.
Duran, Ernest Louis, Pueblo.
Elder, James Bryan, Jr., Wheatridge.
Ficklin, George Ray, Delta.
Fields, Daniel Lee, Wheat Ridge.
Foster, Donald Ray, Denver.
Garcia, David Benedicto, Pueblo.
George, Gerald Lee, Jr., Colorado Springs.
Goddard, Rockford Wayne, Fort Collins.
Gordon, Hubert Elton, Hudson.
Grant, Dennis Howard, Denver.
Griego, Eloy Santiago, Jr., Denver.
Harrington, George M., Lamar.
Heller, David, Junior, South Boone.
Herritz, Everett August, Pueblo.
Hoffman, Rodney Louis, Denver.
Huffstutler, Keith Vincent, Denver.
Hyde, Robert Lee, Denver.
Jones, William Archie, Jr., Colorado Springs.
Kelley, Jerry Conrad, Englewood.
Kelly, Ernest Calvin, Denver.
Lamb, Michael Hugh, Denver.
Lucero, Alberto A., Salida.
Maciel, Peter, Jr., Fort Collins.
Manzanares, Charles Edward, Lafayette.
Markle, William Carl, Jr., Commerce City.
Marquez, Valentine, Wiley.
Martinez, Robert Lee, Denver.
McWethy, Edgar Lee, Jr., Leadville.
Mendenhall, William G., Commerce City.
Midcap, David Michael, Fort Morgan.
Miller, Joseph Lloyd, Denver.
Miller, Manfred Bertold, Boulder.
Miller, Stanley Gene, Commerce City.
Montoya, Alexander, Pueblo.
Moreno, Ricardo Leon, Greeley.
Myrick, Alva Norten, II, Littleton.
Naylor, Edward Reynolds, Jr., Denver.
Ortiz, Jacob, Denver.
Otto, Michael L., Aurora.
Pizer, Wesley Irwin, Denver.
Platt, Gary W., Boulder.
Potter, Jerry Lee, Englewood.
Rodriguez, Paul David, Longmont.
Romero, Bennie, Starkville.
Rooney, Terrence Mann, Denver.
Roybal, Anthony Wilfred, Trinidad.
Saiz, Ronald James, Denver.
Saleh, Christopher Ruben, Denver.
Sanders, William LeRoy, Denver.
Schmitt, Gary Walter, Denver.
Schrenk, Donald George, Buena Vista.
Scott, James Howard, Pueblo.
Scriber, Leon R., Canon City.
Shapard, Michael Robert, Boulder.
Showalter, Waldemar D., Salida.
Skinner, Brian Kay, Denver.
Smith, James Richard, Rifle.
Stice, Larry Douglas, Lakewood.
Stone, William J. B., Denver.
Terwilliger, Rodger Edson, Littleton.
Valasquez, Pete Anthony, Loveland.
Van Beber, Eldon Christ, Evergreen.
Vargas, Frankie Leyba, Denver.
Velasquez, Jose Hilario, Alamosa.
Walker, La Verne, Greeley.
Wilson, William Bruce, Denver.
Winslow, Jerry G., Commerce City.

Air Force

Freeman, Ivel Doan, Englewood.
Hyde, Michael Lewis, Boulder City.
Land, Charles Dwayne, Denver.
Martin, Duane Whitney, Denver.

Marine Corps

Ballard, Adam David, Olathe.
Blessing, William Stanton, Denver.
Bobian, Ralph Daniel, Denver.
Carstens, Gary Amos, Denver.
Clark, Francis William, Denver.
Conn, Donald Warren, Jr., Loveland.
Cordova, Rutilio Profiro, Fruita.
Dewitt, James Phillip, Denver.
Donathan, Richard Pete, Grand Junction.
Eckvall, Richard Allen, Englewood.
Emmons, Thomas Kenneth, Denver.
Gibson, Walter Carl, Denver.

COLORADO—continued

Marine Corps

Gilbert, Jack Dean, Limon.
Gomez, Felidelphio Benjimi, Trinchera.
Gregory, Alfred Raymond, Denver.
Hakes, James Daniel, Jr., Aurora.
Hannon, Patrick Joseph, Littleton.
Hanratty, Thomas Michael, Beulah.
Hernandez, Joe, Jr., Pueblo.
Herrera, Manuel, Pueblo.
Hocker, Norman Roger, Denver.
Horton, Fred Howard, Denver.
Iles, Bruce Adrion, Denver.
Ives, Timothy James, Colorado Springs.
Kastrinos, Jerold Lloyd, Leadville.
Kibel, Charley Chester, Penrose.
Lemon, James Richard, Aurora.
MacKenna, James Jesse, Denver.
Manning, David Lawrence, Arvada.
Martin, Charles Frederick, Littleton.
Martinez, Pete Michael, Pueblo.
Matthews, Michael Franklin, Aurora.
Mince, Lynn Eldon, Adams City.
Musick, Morris Olen, Denver.
Naranjo, Miguel Ernest Jr., Pueblo.
Navarro, Nicholas Leon, Denver.
Pacheco, Eugene Carl, Pueblo.
Patrick, Jerry Kent, Denver.
Peters, Emmett Jack, Green Mountain Fal.
Pilon, Alan Everett, Dove Creek.
Purvis, Philip Alan, Denver.
Renteria, Louis Jesus, Eaton.
Reyes, Harold, Denver.
Ringenberg, Jerome Joseph, Littleton.
Robbins, John William, Pueblo.
Shimoda, Wesley, Commerce City.
Smith, Duane Charles, Windsor.
Spinuzzi, James Carl, Pueblo.
Stephens, Nathaniel H., Jr., Denver.
Taylor, Larry Robert, Pueblo.
Thomas, Barry Don, Barthoud.
Thompson, Karl Ludwig, Security.
Thouvenell, Armand Rene, Wheatridge.
Toth, Ronald C., Westminster.
Vaden, Robert Lee, Denver.
Vigil, Louis David, Denver.
Whalen, Rodrick Pius, Denver.
Whips, Fletcher Danny, Denver.
White, Donald Lee, Rockvale.
Wiley, Phillip Tony, Pueblo.

Navy

Harman, Charles David, Fleming.
Krist, Matthew John, Pueblo.
Miller, James Olen, Colorado Springs.
Spaulding, Richard Lee, Englewood.
Strunk, William Locke, Denver.
Toothaker, James Allan, Greeley.
Youngman, Edwin Lloyd, Fraser.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Anderson, Everett Lee, New Haven.
Baczalski, Joseph, Wauregan.
Beaver, Hearne W., Beacon Falls.
Bedworth, Griffith Bronson, Woodbridge.
Berry, Malcolm Crayton, Hartford.
Bieber, Edward L., Bloomfield.
Biehl, Oscar, Jr., Hamden.
Bourdeau, Gerald Lee, Trumbull.
Boyd, Gerald David, Willimantic.
Braman, Donald Leon, Mystic.
Brund, Paul Joseph, Canaan.
Cables, Gordon Leonard, Litchfield.
Cancel, Pedro O., New Britain.
Carlson, David Lawrence, Georgetown.
Carson, William D., Bridgeport.
Cassin, Richard Albert, Torrington.
Connors, Fergus Francis, Jr., Stamford.
Costanzo, Ralph Paul, New Haven.
Curtin, John Gerald, Manchester.
Cushen, Kenneth, New Haven.
Debarber, John Thomas, Seymour.
Doyle, John Francis, Prospect.
Dunn, Merl Thomas, Jr., Wilson.
Dwyer, Robert Keefe, Stamford.
Fabrizio, James, Norwalk.
Facondini, Richard Michael, Waterbury.
Fleming, Duncan Hartwell, Stamford.
Foster, Daniel William, Ansonia.
Francolini, Joseph David, Ansonia.
Frazier, Leroy, Middletown.

CONNECTICUT—continued

Army

Geisen, John Bennett, Jr., Darien.
Gianelli, Anthony, New Haven.
Grasso, John M., Jr., New Britain.
Guarino, Raymond Blaise, West Haven.
Haburey, Edward James, Winsted.
Harris, George William, Stratford.
Hight, David Keith, Hartford.
Horton, Floyd Monroe, New Britain.
Kaske, Richard Alan, East Norwalk.
Kelly, Barney Joe, Danbury.
King, Patrick Willmer, Meriden.
Kociper, Antonine George, Bridgeport.
Kosovich, George C., Jr., Bloomfield.
Langston, Jimmy Lee, Hartford.
Levy, Gerald, Meriden.
Lind, Fred Andrew, New Canaan.
McNeely, James William, Norwich.
Melnick, Stephen John, Southport.
Miller, William Edward, East Hartford.
Mlynarski, Robert Lucian, New Britain.
Muller, Eric P., Greenwich.
Mulwee, Isaiah, Jr., Bridgeport.
Myers, Walter Harvey, Jr., Unionville.
Nelson, Henry J., New Haven.
Nyman, Michael Stuart, Granby.
O'Brien, Clyde Harold, Portland.
Paquin, Michael Bradley, Westport.
Patience, William Ronald, Noroton.
Peck, Stephen Grady, Trumbull.
Pecora, Joseph Anthony, Jr., New Haven.
Pelletier, Lawrence Joseph, New Britain.
Platosz, Walter, Hartford.
Preira, Dominic J., Jr., Burlington.
Pugh, Kenneth Lee, Hartford.
Purdy, Louis James, Greenwich.
Quey, David Michael, Manchester.
Richards, Gary Charles, New Haven.
Roberts, Gerald Jason, Jr., Torrington.
Robinson, Howard Clinton, Mystic.
Romaniello, Anthony Joseph, Torrington.
Roy, Richard W., New Britain.
Saegaert, Donald Russell, Berlin.
Sampt, John Francis, Waterbury.
Schmecker, John Leonard, Shelton.
Schultz, John Robert, Naugatuck.
Sedgwick, Robert Charles, Hartford.
Sferrazza, Angelo Joseph, Thompsonville.
Shay, Thomas William, Middletown.
Sheehy, David Lawrence, Shelton.
Sheehy, Ronald J., Derby.
Smith, Clinton Arnold, Oakville.
Stevens, Robert Francis, Norwalk.
Stewart, Gerald Hiland, East Hartford.
Tarsi, William James, East Norwalk.
Terlecki, Walter Alexander, Hartford.
Thorne, Larry Alan, Norwalk.
Tillquist, Robert Arnold, New Haven.
Van Cedarfield, James Ray, East Haddam.
Visconti, Lawrence Guy, Danbury.
Voegtli, John Sargeant, Madison.
Wilkerson, Junior, Waterbury.
Wisniewski, Charles Joseph, Uncasville.
Woods, Lawrence Dane, Hartford.

Air Force

Andersen, Martin Weigner, Wallingford.
Bankowski, Alfons Aloyze, Stamford.
Brown, Joseph Orville, Norwalk.
Machowski, Joseph Anthony, Winsted.
Silver, Lawrence Jay, Hartford.

Marine Corps

Ainsworth, John Mathew, Jr., Stonington.
Atherden, Lester Robert, Bridgeport.
Baker, Vernon Howard, II, Danbury.
Barber, Sidney Emery, Woodstock.
Barnes, Eric Marvin, Windsor.
Batson, James Charles, Hebron.
Bauchmann, Earl John, Meriden.
Belton, Calvin, New Haven.
Bernard, Henry Wilfred, Jr., Willimantic.
Berry, Robert Erva, New Milford.
Blanchette, Raymond, Tolland.
Blount, Johnie Lee, Jr., Groton.
Branson, James Allan, Stamford.
Braun, Paul Joseph, Milford.
Broadhurst, Richard Edward, Stamford
Burke, Roger Vincent Paul, Georgetown.
Carley, Michael John, Sharon.
Cauthern, Roger Robert, Stamford.

CONNECTICUT—continued

Marine Corps

Chabot, Richard Earl, New Britain.
Christensen, Edward John, Bristol.
Clarke, John Kearnan, Danbury.
Corr, John Geyer, Wilton.
Cronkhite, Christopher, Southington.
Dawson, Norman Edward, Jr., Derby.
Diaz, Angel Luis, Hartford.
Diedricksen, Alan Lee, Darien.
Donohue, Francis Charles, Norwich.
Dumin, Paul Michael, Southington.
Eddy, Edmund Francis, Hartford.
Fitzgerald, George Richard, Bridgeport.
Gilly, Ronald Alan, Easton.
Gravil, John Allen, Cheshire.
Griswold, Gary Clifford, Bethel.
Guthrie, Archie Lee, New Haven.
Hensley, Richard David, Meriden.
Kerr, Charles David, Stamford.
Labrecque, William Francis, Pawcatuck.
Lavigne, Joseph Everett, New Britain.
Leonard, James Steven, Hartford.
Lilly, William Joseph, Rowayton.
Lonsdale, George Edward, Hartford.
Lukasiewski, Stephen James, Ellington.
Maloney, Jeffery Raymond, Milford.
Marinelli, Elmo, Ansonia.
McGlothin, Alexander Jame, New Haven.
McKenzie, Wayne Robert, Meriden.
Meglio, William Michael, Jr., New Haven.
Miller, Keith Allan, Manchester.
Mitchell, Robert Walter, Terryville.
Mitchell, William Bruce, Bethel.
Nelson, Robert Charles, Milford.
Nielsen, Harold Richard, Norwich.
Ouellette, Donald Roland, Wapping.
Parker, Ralph John, Jr., Waterford.
Phillips, Paul Henry, Torrington.
Prevost, Albert Michael, Norwalk.
Raber, John Harold, New Haven.
Regan, Richard James, New Haven.
Renshaw, Franklin Mason, Occum.
Richards, Thomas Stephen, New Britain.
Roy Allen Jayson, East Hartford.
Sarmento, Henry Michael, Milford.
Scanlon, Michael John, Norwalk.
Sherman, John Brooks, Darien.
Smith, Alan Ivan, Hamden.
Smith, Michael David, New Britain.
Spenard, Norman Joseph Geo., Springdale.
Strycharz, Stephen Stanley, Hartford.
Taylor, Dennis Gilbert, Fairfield.
Tino, John Francis, Jr., Torrington.
Towne, Peter Clark, Morris.
Vautour, David, Norwich.
Vought, Warren Demarest, Jr., Georgetown.
Warner, Bruce Byerly, Farmington.
Welch, John Henry, III, West Hartford.
White, Robert James, Manchester.
Wilcheski, Richard John, East Haven.

Navy

Firmneck, Allan Paul, Hartford.
Gilbreath, Richard Arthur, New Britain.
Kasper, Robert Edward, Newington.
Katona, John James, Jr., Bridgeport.
McKinley, Gerald Wayne, Danbury.
Nickerson, William Brewster, Stamford.

DELAWARE

Army

Alexander, Robert David, Claymont.
Alley, Douglas Dwight, Newark.
Amoroso, Francis Bradford, Newark.
Bischof, Wolfram Walther, Wilmington.
Bowman, Robert Michael, Wilmington.
Branyan, Paul F., Jr., New Castle.
Butler, Wilbert Rudolph, Wilmington.
Chason, Theodore Joseph, Wilmington.
Cripps, George Warren, Dover.
Donnelly, James Voelkel, Wilmington.
Flaherty, Kevin Gregory, Wilmington.
Glover, James Albert, Wilmington.
Holden, James Edward, Millsboro.
Johnson, James Harold, Jr., Milford.
Johnson, Robert Ernest, Greenville.
Lowdon, Graham Norris, Jr., Wilmington.
Lowman, William Louis, Smyrna.
Miller, James Lee, Seaford.
Morris, Arthur Cyrus, Jr., Newark.
Morris, James Thurman, Jr., Wilmington.

XUM

DELAWARE—continued

Army

Perry, George Francis, III, New Castle.
Porter, Charles Edward, Wilmington.
Press, Victor Eugene, Wilmington.
Smith, Frederick E., Wilmington.
Sornson, Edwin Harold, Dover.
Sudler, Edmund Lawrence, Wilmington.
Tams, Robert Nielsen, Wilmington.
Webb, Howard Lee, Rehoboth.
Williams, George Harvey, Wilmington.

Marine Corps

Hamilton, Donald Philip, Ellendale.
Hill, Richard Kenneth, Seaford.
Lasalle, Lawrence Lee, Newark.
Leatherbury, Louis Anthony, Wilmington.
Ludwig, Raymond James, Wilmington.
Paoletti, Samuel, Stanton.
Pollard, William Alfred, New Castle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Army

Adams, Russell Lee, Washington.
Atkins, Joshua Abraham, III, Washington.
Bouknight, Calvin, Washington.
Brooks, Raymond Augusta, Washington.
Brown, Jack Montgomery, Jr., Washington.
Chaney, Elwood David, Jr., Washington.
Charity, Edward, Jr., Washington.
Clegg, Lester Howard, Washington.
Cooper, John Olin, III, Washington.
Dougans, Emmett Arthur, Washington.
Duckett, Joseph L., Jr., Washington.
Formey, Jerry Bernard, Washington.
Fuller, Johnnie Chester, Washington.
Graves, Frank, Washington.
Hare, Dayton Leo, Jr., Washington.
Hargraves, Mance Kenneth, Washington.
Henderson, Ralph Lee, Washington.
Hill, Leroy, Washington.
Hopkins, John Edward, Washington.
Hoskinson, Harry Ronald, Washington.
Hurdle, Paul Edward, Washington.
Jackson, Alexander, Washington.
Jackson, Frederick Leroy, Washington.
Jones, Philip Alfonso, Washington.
Kuri, Jack, Washington.
Laskin, Frank Howard, Washington.
Lofton, Charles Edward, Washington.
Mahoney, Harry Curtis, Jr., Washington.
McClain, Harry, Washington.
Murphy, Bobby Louis, Washington.
Morcia, James Joseph, Washington.
Onley, Claude Aloysius, Washington.
Proctor, William Ambrose, Washington.
Reed, Harold B., Washington.
Reese, James Harrison, Washington.
Reynolds, Kenneth Alderson, Washington.
Sherrod, Louis, Washington.
Smith, Fred Douglas, Jr., Washington.
Stallings, Franklin Delano, Washington.
Stanley, Earl, Washington.
Taylor, Randy Lee, Washington.
Teglas, Geza, Washington.
Thompson, Jerome, Washington.
Toogood, Mansfield Morris, Washington.
Watkins, Gerald Edward, Washington.
Wright, Andrew Samuel, Washington.

Air Force

McIntyre, Homer Cleo, Jr., Washington.
Mitchell, Willie, Jr., Washington.

Marine Corps

Brown, Nicholson, Washington.
Bunn, Benjamin, Jr., Washington.
Carter, Reginald F., Jr., Washington.
Chambers, Ernest L., Jr., Washington.
Fields, Anthony Thomas, Washington.
Fraley, Lander Ray, Washington.
Kemp, Samual Lee, Washington.
Kurtz, Lloyd Nelson, Washington.
McCormick, Richard Alan, Washington.
Mills, Kynard, Washington.
Mitchell, Kenneth, Washington.
O'Donnell, Douglas William, Washington.
Porter, Larry Michael, Washington.
Powell, James William, Jr., Washington.
Prince, Raymond Louis, Washington.
Williams, Coleridge, Jr., Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Abernethy, William Forman, Winter Haven.
Adamitz, Ian William, Opa Locka.
Albright, Peter Henry, Pompano Beach.
Allen, William Orlando, Chiefland.
Alston, Ruben Cleveland, Jacksonville.
Amodias, Osvaldo, Miami.
Anderson, Howard D., Marathon Shores.
Anderson, Ivy Thomas, West Palm Beach.
Annable, Jeffrey Dale, Clearwater.
Arnold, David L., Jacksonville.
Ballance, Norman L., III, Jacksonville.
Ballard, John Richard, Tallahassee.
Barker, Howard Cleveland, Madison.
Barksdale, James William, St. Petersburg.
Barnes, Rodger Glynn, Orlando.
Bass, Duncan Edward, Jr., Live Oak.
Bell, James B., Jr., Tampa.
Benton, Henry, Fort Lauderdale.
Benzing, Bruce Martin, Miami Springs.
Blackburn, David Ray, Cocoa Beach.
Blackwell, Kenneth Horace, Cantonment.
Boatwright, Raymond Lavoy, Wauchula.
Boger, Rhine Hart, Weirsdale.
Bonanno, Frederick M., Fort Lauderdale.
Bracker, David Eugene, Miami.
Branch, David Wesley, Daytona Beach.
Brass, Basil Plane, Dunnellon.
Brock, Marvin Zion, Jr., Tallahassee.
Brodt, James Henry, Cocoa.
Brooks, Jimmie Lynn, Cottage Hill.
Brothers, Benjamin M., III, Jacksonville.
Brown, Aubrey Shawn, Cocoa.
Brown, Donald Ray, Pensacola.
Brown, William B., Immokalee.
Broxton, Arthur, Jr., Starke.
Bryant, Caesar, Deland.
Bunting, Dennis Lamar, Neptune Beach.
Burney, David Frank, Palatka.
Burns, Leonard Wesley, Jacksonville.
Butler, Earlie James, Jr., Jacksonville.
Byrd, Nathaniel, Jacksonville.
Campbell, Michael, Sarasota.
Cannon, Henry Tucker, Jacksonville.
Cantrell, Robert Owen, Panama City.
Carricarte, Louis Anthony, Miami.
Carroll, Walter Jackson, Cedar Key.
Cassube, Richard Hugh, Homestead.
Castleman, Rickey Don, Hastings.
Chamberlain, Allen B., Palm Beach.
Chambers, Cornelius James, Kissimmee.
Chase, Leo Curtis, Jr., St. Augustine.
Cherry, Charles Edward, Daytona Beach.
Christmas, Loye Thomas, Jacksonville.
Clark, Charles Edward, Blountstown.
Clausen, Lawrence C., St. Petersburg.
Colangelo, George Peyton, Fort Lauderdale.
Coleman, Ralph, Cantonment.
Collins, Horace Cleveland, Jacksonville.
Cordell, Terry Denver, Sanford.
Cortes-Rosa, Ramon, Hialeah.
Cox, George Tollovar, Tampa.
Cox, Mack Cecil, Tampa.
Crawford, Billy Max, New Smyrna Beach.
Crews, Charles Richard, Starke.
Cromwell, Earl Lee, Fort Lauderdale.
Crutcher, Joe Albert, Winter Park.
Gulbreath, Johnnie King, St. Petersburg.
Cullen, Kenneth Arthur, Panama City.
Cummings, William Larry, Jacksonville.
Dalton, David James, Tampa.
Danford, James Isah E., Chipley.
Dean, Christopher J., Jr., Fort Myers.
Deen, David Keith, Nokomis.
Demaline, John Thomas, St. Petersburg.
Dempsey, Theron Spencer, Riviera Beach.
Derosier, Michael Douglas, Fort Walton Beach.
Deuerling, William Joseph, New Smyrna Beach.
Deutsch, Henry Albert, Palatka.
Dickey, Charles C., Jr., Wauchula.
Dixon, Terrence Glade, St. Petersburg.
Donker, Leo Michael, Miami.
Drake, Micheal John, Sanford.
Drummond, Emanuel Frank, Jr., Fernandina Beach.
Duncan, James Henry, Pensacola.

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Dundas, Michael C., Tarpon Springs.
Duschek, Rudi Hermann, Daytona Beach.
Dyer, Willie Gene, Lakeland.
Edenfield, Ronald David, Grand Ridge.
Elder, Willard Francis, St. Petersburg.
Ellis, Walter Gene Mervin, Palatka.
Engram, Randal Clyde, Miami.
Farto, Carlos Angel, Miami.
Ferra-Flores, Pedro, Miami.
Ferrell, Tennis Crispian, Orlando.
Fillingim, Thurman Elby, Pensacola.
Flemister, Hugh Robert, Jupiter.
Ford, Leonard David, Olustee.
Ford, Russell Thomas, Dunedin.
Fowler, Joel Carol, Miami.
Frederick, James Carl, Margate.
Friddle, Glenn Mark, Longwood.
Fulford, John Thomas, Fernandina Beach.
Fulford, Varl Eston, Bowling Green.
Gaffney, Ronald Sefton, Groveland.
Gaines, Charles A., Sanford.
Gainous, John Charles, Port Saint Joe.
Galan, Richard, Tampa.
Gallant, Henry Joseph, Tampa.
Gamble, Henry Hwey, West Palm Beach.
Gandy, Clauddell, Ft. Pierce.
Gaylor, Gerald H., Melbourne.
Geoghagen, George Eddie, Pensacola.
Godboldt, Willie Frank, Jacksonville.
Golden, Kenneth D., Jr., Sarasota.
Goldman, Harold, Ocala.
Goodman, Jack Lance, Bonifay.
Goswick, Wesley Ira, Gainesville.
Gould, Johnny Wayne, Crestview.
Grant, Johnnie, Tampa.
Haas, Charles George, Miami.
Hall, Michael Robert, Tampa.
Hamilton, Edward, Tampa.
Harris, Harlin, Jr., Ft. Meade.
Harris, Rodney Carswell, Jacksonville.
Hayes, Albert Judson, Hialeah.
Helveston, Robert Fulton, Fort Myers.
Henderson, James D., Defuniak Springs.
Hensley, John Thomas, Sumterville.
Hester, Vanester Lamar, Fort Pierce.
Hickey, John Patrick, Miami.
Hill, Alvin Gene, Bartow.
Hinson, James Harvey, Bonifay.
Hoffmann, Charles J., III, Opa Locka.
Hollingsworth, Vernice, Boynton Beach.
Holloway, Charles Edward, Deleon Springs.
Holmes, Sammy Lee, Miami.
Hood, Richard E., Jr., Winter Haven.
Horne, Kenneth Ray, Palatka.
Houston, John Lucius, Winter Park.
Huggins, Frazier Daniel, Seffner.
Hughes, Jerry Nelson, Miami.
Hunt, Marshall Wimberly, Tampa.
Hurd, Ernest Leon, Homestead.
Hutting, Roy Donald, Fort Myers.
Huyler, Cecil, Miami.
Ingram, Jerry Grant, Tallahassee.
Ivey, Dorris Albert, Orlando.
Jackson, Thornton Isham, Jacksonville.
Johnson, Eric Wayne, Jacksonville.
Jones, Clarence Lloyd, Greenacres City.
Jones, Edwin, Jacksonville.
Jones, Jimmie Lee, Zellwood.
Jones, Milford, St. Petersburg.
Jones, Sherman Lawrence, Jacksonville.
Jones, Willie Donald, Homestead.
Joyner, Carl Henry, Crystal River.
Juckett, Elmer L., III, West Palm Beach.
King, James Henry, Jacksonville.
Kirby, Michael Charles, Miami.
Kleckley, Freddie Lee, Gainesville.
Knight, Peter Stanley, Key West.
Kockritz, Jeffry Letson, Miami.
Lamb, Billy Wayne, Milton.
Lamb, Theodore, Dundee.
Lamn, James Franklin, Pompano Beach.
Lantz, Peter J., Orlando.
Laurie, Michael J., St. Petersburg.
Ledbetter, Thomas Isaac, Tampa.
Lee, Donald Lamar, Orlando.
Leer, John Edward, Miami.
Leffler, Russell Alan, New Smyrna Beach.
Legate, Richard Edward, Jacksonville.

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Lewis, Johnny Elmer, Zephyrhills.
Lindsey, Daniel Hinson, Orlando.
Linthicum, Don William, Sarasota.
Loftheim, Dennis Dean, Largo.
Loudermilk, James Ellis, Vero Beach.
Lowry, Jimmy Clint, Nocatee.
Luke, Ronald Harold, Miami.
Magruder, Douglas Graham, Coral Gables.
Manigo, Eugene, Sarasota.
Marshall, Freddie, Jr., Jacksonville.
Martinez, Thomas Michael, Pensacola.
Mason, Bobby G., Crestview.
Maulden, Lorenzo Columbus, Gainesville.
Mayhair, William Herbert, Milton.
McAlum, Ernest E., Jacksonville.
McBride, Ellis A., Jr., Lithia.
McCarey, Guy Hector, Tampa.
McCarty, John Davis, Tampa.
McCloskey, Scott Simons, Hollywood.
McConnico, Donald, Pensacola.
McCoy, Booker Tee, Jr., Orlando.
McCrae, James Henry, Miami.
McCray, Frank, Jr., Miami.
McGrath, Edward Charles, Crestview.
McKinnie, Charles W., Jr., Immokalee.
Meek, James Brannon, Maitland.
Merrihew, Glen Frederick, Pompano Beach.
Mesa, Manuel E., Jr., Coral Gables.
Messer, Earley Joseph, Seffner.
Mihalek, Adelbert Francis, Hialeah.
Miller, Michael Merlin, Mt. Pleasant.
Miller, Robert Earl, St. Augustine.
Mincey, John H., Fort Lauderdale.
Mitchell, Thomas Peter, Sarasota.
Mize, James Wesley, Jr., Palm Beach.
Monsewicz, Lloyd Joel, Jacksonville.
Montana, Harold Lloyd, Tampa.
Moody, Arthur R., III, St. Petersburg.
Moore, Arthur James, Ft. Myers.
Morales, Harold Wayne, Tampa.
Morgan, Dennis Laco, Auburndale.
Morgan, Shelton, Sanford.
Morningstar, George Aaron, Ocala.
Moutardier, Odes Herman, Marathon.
Murphy, Michael Thomas, St. Petersburg.
Musa, Henry Alfred, Jr., Port Tampa City.
Nicholas, Denis, Venice.
Norris, Jerry A., Coral Gables.
Norris, Joseph Robert, Hillsborough.
O'Rourke, Ronald Patrick, Miami Springs.
Osborn, Richard D., Tampa.
Osborne, Ronald Charles, North Palm Beach.
Owens, Kenneth Grant, Orlando.
Patterson, James Robert, Orlando.
Peacock, Nathan Eddlow, Jr., Winter Garden.
Pearson, James Roy, Lakeland.
Peek, Russell James, Pensacola.
Pendleton, George, Jr., Miami.
Perez, Celso A., Miami.
Phillips, Thomas Frank, Pompano Beach.
Pickett, Willie Clarence, Pensacola.
Pitts, Charles R., Lakeland.
Poncurak, Raymond Joseph, Miami.
President, Ernest, Fort Pierce.
Pugh, Robert Earl, Port Salerno.
Purcell, Charles Kent, II, Valparaiso.
Ragin, William David Howsa, Palatka.
Ratliff, Oscar E., Jacksonville.
Reagan, Robert William, Miami.
Recupero, Richard Anthony, Key West.
Register, Billy Elwood, White Springs.
Rhodes, Clifford G., Apalachicola.
Rhodes, Willie Michael, Sanibel Island.
Rice, George Warren, Pensacola.
Rice, Michael Ray, Fernandina Beach.
Riggs, Dorse, Lakeland.
Roberts, Lester Lee, Jacksonville.
Robinson, Sheppard, Jr., Miami.
Rogerson, Charles Roland, St. Petersburg.
Rohn, Hershel Hillary, Jr., Fort Pierce.
Roland, Charles Edward, Newberry.
Rollings, Jimmy, Perry.
Roque, Florentino R., Key West.
Rosenwasser, Lee Edward, North Miami Beach.
Rowland, John William, Jr., Ocala.
Sapp, Ronald Allen, Orlando.

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Schollard, John Andrew, Lakeland.
Schultz, Ernest M., III, Fort Myers.
Scott, James Raymond, Fort Lauderdale.
Scott, William Norman, Casselberry.
Scriven, Samuel T., Ocala.
Segers, Roger, Dale, Atha.
Sexton, Jimmy Clyde, Blountstown.
Shaw, Robert Floyd, Clearwater.
Shiver, Henry Arnold, Oviedo.
Shubert, Edwin Lenard, Jr., Milton.
Shubert, Jackie Echols, Jacksonville.
Simkaitis, Erich, Tampa.
Simmon, Rosevelt Jr., Quincy.
Smith, Donald P., Pensacola.
Smith, James Henry, Milton.
Smith, Larry Eldon, Tampa.
Smith, Luther Augustus, Miami.
Smith, Ottis Thomas, Jacksonville.
Smith, Richard Jr., Stuart.
Smith, Robert Joe, Jacksonville.
Solomon, Eckwood Harold, Jr., Key West.
Spainhower, Clayton, Marqui, Fort Myers.
Sparks, Clifford Edward, Fort Lauderdale.
Spradlin, Roger Wayne, Orange Lake.
Spray, Victor Gene, Pinellas Park.
Stahl, Phillip Thomas, Pompano Beach.
Stephens, David Allen, Largo.
Stovall, Carl Rogers, Fort Pierce.
Swain, Walter Lee, Miami.
Taylor, Gerald K., Cocoa.
Taylor, James Robert, Fort Lauderdale.
Taylor, William Edward, Miami.
Terry, Robert Louis, Homestead.
Thomas, Freddie Lee, Jr., Jacksonville.
Thomas, Oscar Lee, Tallahassee.
Thompson, Herbert Leon, Winter Garden.
Tiller, Walter Leon, Riverview.
Tindell, James Franklin, Port St. Joe.
Titus, Charles M., Jacksonville.
Tomlinson, James Howard, Sr., East Palatka.
Townsend, Bruce, Miami.
Tucker, Jerry James, Apopka.
Turner, Raymond Rivers, Miami.
Type, Walter John, Jr., Jacksonville.
Veltman, Timonthy Andrew, Winter Park.
Vernon, Donald Gene, Ocala.
Walker, Isum Merrill, Lakeland.
Walker, Robert Lee, Lake Placid.
Walker, Thomas, Tampa.
Waterbury, Richard Mead, Melbourne.
Weinman, Donald Frederick, Lakeland.
Weiss, Douglas John, Homestead.
Welch, Joshua, Jr., Alachua.
Welch, Terry, Auburndale.
Wenderoth, Gerald Frederic, Lantana.
Wernet, David Paul, Sarasota.
White, Laris, Jr., Bonifay.
White, Ulysses, Miami.
Wiggins, Joseph, St. Petersburg.
Williams, Alexander, Jacksonville.
Williams, Allan James, Clewiston.
Williams, Curtis F., Jr., Stuart.
Williams, Genrett, Jupiter.
Williams, James Gordon, Inverness.
Williams, Ray Francis, Lake City.
Williams, Robert Curtis, Orlando.
Worrell, James R., Ft. Lauderdale.
Young, Charlie M., Riviera Beach.
Young, David, St. Petersburg.
Young, William, Palatka.

Air Force

Arnold, Louis Broward, Jacksonville.
Baggett, Joseph Bradshaw, Fort Pierce.
Bailey, Fred Earl, Pensacola.
Booth, Herbert W., Jr., Sarasota.
Brungard, Guy Joseph, Haines City.
Carter, Clyde Walter, Miami.
Clayton, Billy Jack, Williston.
Cook, Harold Clarence, Palm Beach.
Delphin, Barry Ronal, Clearwater.
Duck, William Whitby, Quincy.
Gordon, Otis, Jr., Jacksonville.
Hartson, Stanley Gerald, Marianna.
Henry, Lindy Edward, Gainesville.
Jerkins, William Edgar, Plant City.
Lewis, Don Robert, Holly Hill.
Neura, Ted Peter, Jr., Hialeah.

FLORIDA—continued

Air Force

Packard, Dan Bruen, Miami.
Peeler, Glover Austin, III, Jacksonville.
Phillips, David Joseph, Jr., Miami Beach.
Pullara, Angelo, Tampa.
Reynolds, Donald J., Seffner.
Richardson, William L., Jr., Cocoa.
Sandner, Robert Louis, Clearwater.
Sellers, Jerry Alan, Altha.
Taylor, Robert Lyman, Hialeah.
Williams Derex, Jr., Plant City.

Marine Corps

Albury, Leland W., Jr., Key West.
Arnold, Reid Carlton, Largo.
Barnes, Cephas, Jr., Belle Glade.
Barrow, Eric B., Jr., Orlando.
Basco, Joseph F., Jr., Walton Beach.
Beasley, James Terry, Cantonment.
Beggs, Larkin McDonald, Jr., Miami.
Bell, John, Jr., Tampa.
Bell, Lester, Miami.
Bell, Oliver, Jr., Pompano Beach.
Bennett, Daniel Morris, Boynton Beach.
Berrios, John Richard, Hialeah.
Biehl, Gary Ladd, Oneco.
Boyett, Gary Rodney, Pensacola.
Bremerman, Dale Vincent, Jr., Naples.
Brown, Steven Alan, Pensacola.
Burke, John Roland, Clearwater.
Bush, Otis Lee, Orlando.
Byrd, George Benjamin, Jr., Orlando.
Cadeau, Robert Kenneth, Fort Lauderdale.
Cannon, Edward Eugene, Avon Park.
Canter, William Lindley, Sarasota.
Carroll, James Joseph, Miami Beach.
Carter, Paul Lamar, Maxville.
Carter, Thomas Anthony, Fort Lauderdale.
Carter, Vernon Thomas, Jr., Gainesville.
Chamberlin, George E., Jr., Coral Gables.
Chase, Victor Edward, Pensacola.
Cheaney, Pruitt Henry, Sarasota.
Clayton, Jesse Nathaniel, Jacksonville.
Clemmons, Douglas Frank, Westville.
Clemons, Joseph, Orlando.
Coleman, James, Jr., Jacksonville.
Collins, Michael Howard, Tampa.
Cornell, Robert Leslie, Miami Springs.
Corms, Ronald Freeman, Jacksonville.
Culberth, Robert Lee, Jr., Fort Pierce.
Cullins, Alvin, Jacksonville.
Currier, Richard James, Jr., Fort Lauderdale.
De Jesus, Joaquin, Miami.
Deeson, Michael Daniel, Miami.
Detmer, Donald Gary, Fort Lauderdale.
Dixon, Morris Franklin, Jr., Clearwater.
Drawdy, Ryland Whitney, Orlando.
Dubose, Douglas Scott, Tampa.
Duvall, Gary Lee, Mount Dora.
Edwards, Thomas Clifford, Tampa.
Emmons, Judson Wayne, Pensacola.
Esters, Charles, Jr., Orlando.
Exum, Ezekeil Theodore, Tampa.
Fike, Arthur Harry, Fort Lauderdale.
Forehand, Jerry, Orlando.
Foster, Isiah, Tampa.
Foster, Tompkins Griffin, Lithia.
Freeman, Ardenia, Panama City.
Fryer, Willie James, Jacksonville.
Gaines, Bryon Adams, Jr., Jacksonville.
Geddis, Henry Leo, Jr., Jacksonville.
Godwin, Stanley Maurice, Fort Meade.
Goodwin, Alvin Maynard, Tampa.
Greene, Arthur Willie, Fort Pierce.
Griffin, James Roger, Plymouth.
Groover, Richard Anthony, Warrington.
Gunter, William Clayton, Arcadia.
Hall, Jerry Ray, Pensacola.
Hall, Milton Lee, Jacksonville.
Hare, Angus Lafayette, Sneads.
Hewitt, Brian Charles, Mayo.
Hill, Edwin Charles, Sebring.
Hill, William Ernest, Leesburg.
Holder, Randolph Chester, Miami.
Holloway, Paul David, Orlando.
Hopewell, Donald Clement, Lakeland.
Hopper, Daniel Eugene, Ocala.
Howard, Billy, Hialeah.
Hughart, Harold Granville, Miami.

FLORIDA—continued

Marine Corps

Hughes, Jeffrey Rex, Pensacola.
Hurlock, Curtis Woodrow, Arcadia.
Hutchinson, Chester K., Fort Lauderdale.
Hutchinson, Wayne Allen, Miami.
Jackson, Eddie Lee, Jacksonville.
Jenkins, James Lucky, Jacksonville.
Jennings, Jasper Lewis, Jacksonville.
Johnson, George Dennis, Naples.
Johnson, William Theodore, Freeport.
Jones, Julius Frazier, Lake City.
Jones, Marcus Claude, Gainesville.
Kelsey, Straughan D., Jr., Indialantic.
Kern, Bruce Alan, Orlando.
Key, Lester, Opa Locka.
King, Laurence Michael, Tampa.
Kittle, Stephen Randall, Hollywood.
Knuth, Lawrence Douglas, Boynton Beach.
Kraft, Noah Morris, Gainesville.
Land, David Alfred, Panama City.
Landers, Kenneth Jefferson, Westville.
Lawrence, Francis M., Jr., Tampa.
Lee, Joe Lewis, Jacksonville.
Lewis, Joe, Jacksonville.
Main, William Terry, Jacksonville.
Mason, Robert Ernest, Milton.
Matejeck, Walter Lawrence, Cocoa.
Matthews, Aitken L., Jr., Miami.
Mazariegos, Francisco Albe, Tampa.
McGee, Thomas Lee, Fort Myers.
McKinnon, Titus, Jr., Jacksonville.
McKnight, Matthew Owen, Opa Locka.
Means, Johnny, Wauchula.
Miller, James Bernard, Fernandina Beach.
Millican, Malcolm Edward, Orlando.
Mitchell, Curtis, Jacksonville.
Moody, Jerry Marcus, Jacksonville.
Moorman, Cecil Roy, Winter Garden.
Morris, Kenneth Bryan, New Smyrna Beach.
Myers, Homer Julius, Oneco.
Myers, William Lathen, Jr., Tampa.
Nail, Robert Melvin, Starke.
Nelson, Toney, Jr., Jacksonville.
Nereck, Lawrence Thomas, Sarasota.
Nickerson, William Walter, Sarasota.
Norman, W. H., Macclenny.
O'Brien, Gary Malcolm, Orlando.
Osteen, Richard Arnold, Jr., St. Augustine.
Owens, Bennett Howell, Jr., Jacksonville.
Page, Jimmy Edward, Day.
Penny, William Victor, Jacksonville.
Pitts, Freddie Richard, Fort Walton Beach.
Pitts, Wayne Monroe, Pensacola.
Proctor, James Patrick, Tampa.
Radtke, Leroy Carl, Jr., Lutz.
Rhodes, John Owen, Thonotosassa.
Richardson, Arphalia L., Jr., Melbourne.
Richardson, Scott Douglas, Melbourne.
Robertson, John Chester, New Smyrna Beach.
Rogers, Gary Henderson, Tampa.
Roker, Jonathan Cecil, Hallandale.
Rolle, Melvin, Miami.
Samuels, Elzie Eugene, Tallahassee.
Sargent, Kenneth Page, Warrington.
Schmidt, Karl Albert, Jr., Orlando.
Schmitt, Richie Mumes, Tampa.
Scott, Roosevelt, Gifford.
Sharar, Ronald Lee, Orlando.
Shepherd, Harry Joseph, Jr., Largo.
Simpson, Bruce Larmar, Sebring.
Sisk, Robert Donald, Miami.
Smedley, Larry Eugene, Orlando.
Smith, Brian Frederick, Miami.
Smith, Charles Marcelleus, Jacksonville.
Springfield, Thomas Earl, Haines City.
Steele, Robert Hugh, Naples.
Stokes, Bartley Thomas, III, Pensacola.
Surber, Herbert Donald, Floral City.
Sutherland, John Alvin, Tampa.
Temples, Kenneth Ray, Lakeland.
Theisen, George Daniel, Fort Myers Beach.
Thomas, Frank Herbert, Jr., Pompano Beach.
Thomas, Jimmie Lee, Ocala.
Tipton, Lynwood Austin, Panama City.
Trushaw, James Edward, St. Petersburg.
Tucker, Carl Wesley, Jacksonville.
Turnage, Earnest Lee, Pensacola.
Twomey, Raymond Lee, Miami.

FLORIDA—continued

Marine Corps

Van Norman, John R., III, Bradenton.
Vanderzicht, John Robert, Pompano Beach.
Waller, James Harrell, Lakeland.
Waller, Robert Willie, Marianna.
Wardrobe, Richard Alfred, Fort Lauderdale.
Washington, Booker Thomas, Jacksonville.
Williams, Joseph Pierce, Fort Lauderdale.
Wilson, Raymond Wesley, Jacksonville.
Wright, Jerry Gordon, Lutz.
Wyatt, Robert Paul, St. Petersburg.
Wynn, Leonard Andrea, St. Petersburg.
Zane, Tilden Bruce, Miami Beach.

Navy

Askin, James Frederick, Port Charlotte.
Bouton, Jeffrey Dale, Largo.
Carter, Terrel Elbert, Wauchula.
Cosson, Wilbur Lynn, Defuniak Springs.
Crosby, Frederick Peter, Orlando.
Davis, Blakely Irving, Jr., Bradenton.
Forshey, John Daniel, Jacksonville.
Hopps, Gary Douglas, Coral Gables.
Jones, Walter Holt, II, Orlando.
McComb, Auburn Dale, Gainesville.
McEnany, Keith Allen, Dunedin.
Miller, Malcolm Thomas, Tampa.
Shappee, James Monfre, Miami.
Van Vleck, John Joseph, Clearwater.

GEORGIA

Army

Allen, Raymond, Rossville.
Altman, David Brantley, Blackshear.
Amerson, Carlton, Darien.
Anderson, Artis Wesley, Atlanta.
Anthony, David Marshall, Geneva.
Arline, Soloman David, Jr., Columbus.
Arnold, Willard David, Oglethorpe.
Bagley, Jerry, Millwood.
Bailey, Larry William, St. Marys.
Ballanger, Enoch Andrew, Walker County.
Barker, Oscar, Jr., Matter.
Barlow, Jessie Lee, Columbus.
Barnes, Robert Lee, Albany.
Barrett, Michael Owen, Atlanta.
Beckworth, Harley Daniel, Baxley.
Bellew, Guy Lester, Atlanta.
Bembry, Snyder Pattishall, Unadilla.
Bonner, Roger Lee, Jr., Glenwood.
Boswell, Johnnie Lee, Eatonton.
Bowen, Harvey Lewis, Jr., Atlanta.
Boynton, Frank, Columbus.
Brackins, Allen, Blakely.
Brown, Douglas, Columbus.
Brown, Eddie, Jr., Macon.
Brown, James Tharpe, Jr., Atlanta.
Brown, Willmatt, Savannah.
Bryan, David Gradey, Murrayville.
Bryant, George Edward, Folkston.
Buffington, Sammy, Barnesville.
Bulloch, Samuel Viel, Jr., Ochlocknee.
Burroughs, James Michael, Comer.
Bussey, Jimmy Lee, Thomaston.
Cagle, Allen James, Chatsworth.
Call, John Edward, Jr., Savannah.
Calhoun, Patrick Palmer, Columbus.
Callahan, Welborn A., Jr., Columbus.
Cameron, Thomas Stewart, Hogansville.
Campbell, Thomas David, Thomasville.
Cawthorne, William Bayles, Marietta.
Chambliss, Luther, Altanta.
Champion, Joseph, Decatur.
Charles, Billy, Cummings.
Chatmon, Charles Louis, Ailey.
Clark, Harlow Gary, Jr., Savannah.
Clark, Ronald Cleveland, Gainesville.
Clements, Lonnie Edward, Atlanta.
Cleveland, Clark Edward, Elberton.
Cofield, Jessie Clifford, Newman.
Collier, Noah Chandler, Jr., Wiley.
Collins, Albert, Atlanta.
Collins, Floyd Eugene, Jr., Lithonia.
Colon-Motas, Esteban, Benning Park.
Conner, Jessie Wendell, Statesboro.
Cook, Jerry Robert, Alpharetta.
Cooper, Ulysses Cornelius, Eastman.
Cooper, Willie A., Cuthbert.
Couch, Julian Wayne, Cedartown.
Cox, Allan Lamar, Atlanta.
Croom, Rufus Ray, Donalsonville.

GEORGIA—continued

Army

Davis, John Gaylealon, Jefferson.
Davis, William Dewitt, Columbus.
Devine, John Willie, Waynesboro.
Dorsey, Robert Lee, Albany.
Dorsey, Roger, Augusta.
Dotson, Michael Lee, Ringgold.
Douberly, James Oden, Patterson.
Dowdell, Marvin, Cordele.
Downs, Arthur Mitchell, Brunswick.
Dumas, Oliver Dewitt, Atlanta.
Durham, Harold Bascom, Jr., Tifton.
Echols, Robert Edwin, Bowman.
Elder, Grady Lee, Grantville.
Ellis, James Lee, Jr., Jesup.
Embrey, Grady Keith, La Grange.
English, William Welton, Jr., Rome.
Evitt, Wayne Lee, Fitzgerald.
Faircloth, Johnnie William, Cordele.
Fetherolf, Larry Steven, Lilburn.
Flowers, William Edward Columbus.
Forbes, Thomas Leroy, Rockmart.
Frank, Harry Bernard, Jr., Alpharetta.
Freeman, Rube Alfred, Columbus.
Furney, Willis Lee, Macon.
Gaddis, Fred Ausbun, Atlanta.
Gambrell, John Lawrence, Powder Springs.
Garrett, Robert Eugene, Atlanta.
Garth, Robert Wilton, Jr., Madison.
Gay, John Ben, Dearing.
Gentry, Jerry Wayne, Cartersville.
Gibbs, Kenneth Samuel, Atlanta.
Gipson, Robert Paul, Athens.
Glenn, Livingston, Boston.
Godfrey, Billy Lamar, Calhoun.
Grant, Ed Nathan Louis, Savannah.
Grant, Houston, Jr., Dahlonega.
Gray, Herbert Hoover, Gray.
Guttillia, Charles Richard, Decatur.
Hadley, William Yancey, Thomasville.
Harden, Robert Wesley, Jr., Waycross.
Harris, Marvin, La Grange.
Harrison, Joseph, Thomasville.
Hart, Fred D., Thomson.
Hatcher, Carlos Randall, Norcross.
Hatten, George Edward, Hazelhurst.
Hawkins, Ralls, Atlanta.
Hayslip, Bobby Vernon, Cordele.
Herendon, David Mack, Cherrylog.
Hester, Martin David, Hogansville.
Hewitt, Aubrey Laurence, Decatur.
Hipp, Joseph Earnest, Albany.
Holbrook, Carl Eugene, Louisville.
Holt, Jack English, Columbus.
Holton, Leon G., Douglas.
Horne, Lamar, McRae.
Howard, Haze, III, Macon.
Howard, Jimmie, Columbus.
Huddleston, Thomas Pate, Newnan.
Hudson, Calvin Clifford, Abbeville.
Hufstetler, James Thomas, Acworth.
Hughes, Jesse Howard, Hazlehurst.
Hunter, Kenneth Ronald, Hapeville.
Hutto, Curtis Woodrow, Savannah.
Hyatt, Joseph Lamar, Fayetteville.
Hyman, Wallace, Columbia.
Ireland, Leroy, Athens.
Isbell, Marshall Howard, Eastanollee.
Janes, Nicklos Byron, Gainesville.
Jenkins, Barnette Gartrell, Savannah.
Jivens, Jerry, Savannah.
Johnson, Charles Buford, Jr., Oglethorpe.
Johnson, Cliffford Thomas, Atlanta.
Johnson, Jimmy Alvin, Macon.
Johnson, Marion Edward, Milledgeville.
Johnson, Milo Preston, Augusta.
Johnson, Willie C., Jr., Savannah.
Jones, Allen Winfred, Elberton.
Jones, Leroy Elton, Thomasville.
Jones, Luther M., Statesboro.
Jones, Thomas Steven, Rome.
Jones, William, Jr., Savannah.
Jordan, Jerry Kenneth, Resaca.
Joslyn, James Eugene, Elberton.
Kelly, Charles L., Warm Springs.
Kelly, Paul Edward, Jr., Smyrna.
Kelly, Stephen Allen, Atlanta.
Kelsall, Billy Allen, Savannah.
Kesler, Lawrence David, La Grange.
Kitchens, Harry Moss, Warner Robbins.

GEORGIA—continued

Army

Knight, Troy Lee, Scottdale.
Knowles, Nathaniel, Menlo.
Koster, Kenneth Leroy, Atlanta.
Lamb, Bricey Elrod, Macon.
Latini, Gerald Leopold, Columbus.
Lay, Gene Wendell, Winder.
Leach, Douglas Horace, Atlanta.
Leach, Roy Hamilton, Decatur.
Leboff, Johnny Hans, Augusta.
Lee, Moses Calvin, Atlanta.
Lester, James Thomas, Atlanta.
Lindsey, William Jefferson, Augusta.
Lipscomb, Melvin, College Park.
Lowery, Donald Steven, Newnan.
Mack, Joseph Bingham, Jr., Atlanta.
Mackey, Vertis L., Manassas.
Mann, Eddie Morris, Barnesville.
Mann, John Harold, Mt. View.
Manning, Ralph E., Thomasville.
Mathis, Ronnie Thomas, Atlanta.
Maxwell, Charles D., Bowden.
Mayer, Juergen, August, Millwood.
Mays, Emmitt, Jr., Columbus.
McDaniel, Jerry Jackson, Winder.
McGruder, Edward, Cusseta.
McHellon, George S., Atlanta.
McWilliams, Roy M., Mableton.
Means, Vernon, Cordele.
Melton, Clifford Dean, Columbus.
Miles, Palmer Beach, Columbus.
Mimbs, Billie, Lollie.
Minnitee, Johnson, Jr., Ellenwood.
Mitchell, Fred W., Jr., Grovetown.
Moldavan, Edward A., Austell.
Moog, Phillip Jacob, Augusta.
Moore, Clyde Vernon, Irwinville.
Moore, Edward Lamar, Jr., McDonough.
Morris, James Logan, Ellijay.
Mullis, Charles Edward, Waycross.
Nations, Michael Clay, Dalton.
Nelson, Miles Henry, Ft. Benning.
Nesmith, Newman Ray, Sylvania.
Odum, Joseph Britton, Augusta.
Ogles, Kenneth Wayne, Dalton.
Owenby, Clyde, Hiawassee.
Owenby, Eugene Oliver, Thomaston.
Padgett, Robert Jerry, College Park.
Palmer, Carl Lee, Pelham.
Parker, Waymon M., Rising Fawn.
Patrick, Jimmie Lee, Columbus.
Patterson, Maxie, Valdosta.
Patterson, Thomas, Savannah.
Payne, Lloyd Adrian, Sandersville.
Payne, Ronald Harry, Bloomingdale.
Peacock, Leonard Earl, Folkston.
Pearson, John Rudolph, Thomasville.
Plumley, Jimmie Lee, Ellijay.
Poole, Oris Lamar, Screven.
Pope, Emmett Felton, Jr., Danville.
Pough, Eddie Lee, Columbus.
Powell, Morris James, Pelham.
Pressley, James Edward, Lagrange.
Preston, Johnny Calvin, Fort Valley.
Price, Ronald Bruce, Swainsboro.
Proctor, Samuel, Jr., St. Simons Island.
Putnam, Charles Richard, Columbus.
Ray, Durward Frank, Columbus.
Ray, James Floyd, Milledgeville.
Reach, William Thomas, Waycross.
Reece, Ronney Dean, Atlanta.
Reid, Robert Woodson, Eatonton.
Richards, Don June, Ringgold.
Richards, Ronald, Cartersville.
Rickerson, James Edward, Danville.
Rogers, Clarence W., Jr., Gilmer County.
Roper, Joel Clyde, Marietta.
Ross, William Allen, Columbus.
Rudolph, Robert George, Atlanta.
Rush, Ronald Edward, Kensington.
Sands, William D., III, Daisy.
Scott, Eddie James, Keysville.
Scott, Leonard Stanley, Jr., Lincolnton.
Sexton, Wesley Robert, Cornelia.
Shannon, Jessie Edwin, Columbus.
Shaw, John Andy, Rising Fawn.
Shelton, Charles Murry, Washington.
Sheriff, James Charles, Jr., Columbus.
Sills, Tommie Lee, Waycross.
Simmons, Burnell, Leary.

GEORGIA—continued

Army

Simmons, Edward Lamar, Lafayette.
Sizemore, William D., Augusta.
Sloan, Lewis Leonard, East Point.
Smallwood, Erral Dale, Putnam City.
Smiley, Jimmie Tavy, Ludowici.
Smith, Donald Eugene, Columbus.
Smith, Herbert, Jr., Boston.
Smith, Jessee E., Augusta.
Smith, Tommy Lee, Preston.
Sognier, John Woodward, Jr., Savannah.
Spears, Benjamin George, Albany.
Sperry, William Forsyth, Augusta.
Stalnaker, Lawrence Arnold, Watkinsville.
Stanley, Virgil, Jr., Decatur.
Starley, James Arthur, Dublin.
Stegall, Allan, Jr., Atlanta.
Stewart, James Jr., Americus.
Stokes, Wayne Joseph, Stockbridge.
Sullivan, Eddie Lee, Atlanta.
Sutera, Louis, Jr., Atlanta.
Tabb, Phil, Colquitt.
Talley, James Lane, Fort Benning.
Tatum, Dorsey L., Gabbettville.
Taylor, Calvin Leroy, Macon.
Taylor, Jimmie Ellis, Carrolton.
Taylor, Roynald Edward, Metter.
Templeton, Billy, Pelham.
Tenon, Johnnie Merritt, Columbus.
Thomas, Fred L., Athens.
Thompson, Robert Acquinn, Lincolnton.
Thompson, Roger Darriel, Fairburn.
Thornton, Frank, Jr., Thomasville.
Train, William Frew, III, Savannah.
Tucker, Ollie, Atlanta.
Tucker, Richard Eugene, Lafayette.
Walker, Charlie C., Ashburn.
Ward, Gary Edwin, Rossville.
Weaver, Jack, Millen.
Webb, Leroy Boyd, Rome.
Wells, Bobby Gene, Flowery Branch.
Weston, Thomas, Jr., Dawson.
Wheeler, Johnny Cecil, St. Marys.
Whitehead, Clarence Albert, Atlanta.
Whitfield, James Lemar, Augusta.
Willbanks, Charles Edwards, Mountain View.
Williams, Charles Clinton, Trion.
Williams, Moses, Columbus.
Williams, Willis White, Savannah.
Williamson, Milliard Leroy, Perry.
Wilson, George A., Cartersville.
Woodall, Ralph Traylor, Jr., Jesup.
Woody, John Henry, Suches.
Wright, James, Columbus.
Wynn, Harvey Eugene, Donolsonville.
Yawn, Terry Lynn, Hawkinsville.

Air Force

Hinson, Ralph Leon, Macon.
Hunter, Robert Gerald, Douglasville.
Wilbanks, Hilliard Almond, Cornelia.
Wise, James Carl, Jr., Atlanta.

Marine Corps

Alfred, Bruce Crocklin, Moultrie.
Amos, Floyd Lehman, Blakely.
Amos, Willie Frank, Atlanta.
Barrow, Thomas Melvin, Jr., Atlanta.
Beavers, Charles Evan, Dalton.
Benfield, Don Curtis, Macon.
Boren, Tom Edwin, Fayetteville.
Brannen, James Robert, Statesboro.
Brigham, Albert, Savannah.
Bush, James Howard, Jr., Guyton.
Bynum, Franklin Delano, Columbus.
Call, John Granville, Columbus.
Campbell, Stephen Manton, Forest Park.
Clark, Clyde, Jr., Macon.
Cokley, Troy, Wesley, Savannah.
Collins, Franklin Thomas, Tifton.
Cox, Jackson Elliott, Waynesboro.
Crook, Jimmy Ray, Austell.
Daniels, Earl, Jr., Thomasville.
Daniels, James Dennis, Savannah.
Davis, Jerry Vanoid, Tucker.
Davis, Rodney, Maxwell, Maron.
Dwight, William Lamar, Dalton.
Foy, Thomas Lamar, Coolidge.
Frazier, Ulysses Van, Savannah.
Friddle, Kenneth Clayton, Atlanta.

GEORGIA—continued

Marine Corps

Fuller, John Luther, Jr., Atlanta.
Garrett, Tommie, Augusta.
Gayman, John Duff, East Point.
Goings, Joseph Hubert, Jr., Albany.
Green, Donald Albie, Columbus.
Greene, Willie, Macon.
Griffin, Calton, Putney.
Hall, Arvel Hugh, Columbus.
Hammond, Carey, Jr., Newington.
Harmon, James Edward, Griffin.
Harris, James Thomas, Williamson.
Harris, Perry Lee, Thomaston.
Helton, John Kenneth, Griffin.
Holtzclaw, Thomas J., III, Atlanta.
Inglett, Gerald Wayne, Augusta.
Jackson, Clarence, Leary.
Johnson, Emory Franklin, Toccoa.
Johnson, Freddie Lee, Sandersville.
Johnson, Robert Milton, Forest Park.
Johnson, William C., Jr., Augusta.
Jones, Boyd Eugene, Atlanta.
Jones, Daniel Cleveland, Savannah.
Jones, Sterling M., Jr., Columbus.
Kines, Edward Wray, Cairo.
Lawrence, Larry Eugene, Brunswick.
Marbutt, Gary Thomas, Summerville.
Martin, Henry Olin III, Savannah.
Martin, John Warren, Forsyth.
Mathis, Roger, Edward, Jesup.
McCaskill, William, Boston.
McClure, Thurlo, Merida, Thomaston.
McCook, Gregory, Madison, Atlanta.
McCuaig, Glenn Richard, Americus.
McGee, Danny Dean, Conyers.
Melvin, Stanley Tracy, Atlanta.
Millirons, James Eugene, East Point.
Murphy, Roy Lynwood, Moultrie.
Nasworthy, Malvin Lowe, Jr., Baxley.
Navarra, James Lee, Nashville.
Patrick, Marion Elijah, Rossville.
Payne, Troy David, Jr., Smyrna.
Perry, Dennis Mitchell, Perry.
Pierce, Phillip Malcolm, Jr., Augusta.
Rainwater, Wilbur Dean, East Point.
Ramsey, Rocke Darrell, College Park.
Reid, Danny Elie, Macon.
Rhodes, James Robert, Brunswick.
Richardson, Robert, Augusta.
Ritchie, Earnest Dee, Tiger.
Roberts, Ben, Savannah.
Robinson, Willie Clyde, Jr., Camilla.
Rotton, Johnny Steve, La Grange.
Scott, Clarence Walter, Atlanta.
Silver, Lonnie Lee, Zebulon.
Sims, Charles Wayne, Clarkesville.
Sims, James Larry, Savannah.
Skrine, Willie B., Jr., Mayfield.
Sloan, Max Eugene, Moultrie.
Smith, Leonard Howard, La Grange.
Spires, Robert Lee, Fitzgerald.
Sprouse, Lonnie David, Mableton.
Strickland, Wayne Thad, Macon.
Sutter, Richard Furlong, Atlanta.
Tatum, Harold Dean, Sandy Springs.
Taylor, David Adolphus, Thomaston.
Taylor, Robert Allen, Atlanta.
Tebow, William, Jennings, McBean.
Thomas, Allison Lewis, Jr., Atlanta.
Thomas, Othel, Ochlochnee.
Toombs, William Hayward, Atlanta.
Wade, James Lee, Jr., Vidalia.
Waller, Jerry Gordon, College Park.
Watkins, Bruce Lamar, Atlanta.
West, Eugene Edward, Savannah.
White. Nathan Monroe, Savannah.
Williams, Donald, Eastman.
Williams, Ira Winard, Baxley.
Williams, James Thomas, Fairburn.
Williams, Milligan Rudolph, Atlanta.
Williams, Terry Douglas, Donaldsonville.
Winston, William Overton, Atlanta.
Wood, Donald Roy, Buford.
Wood, Willis Leroy, Brunswick.
Woods, Willard Paul, Jesup.
Worthen, Larry Eugene, Union Point.
Wynn, Joseph Ray, Jr., Chula.

Navy

Brown, Robert Lewis, East Point.
Castleberry, Roy Lee, Marietta.

GEORGIA—continued

Navy

Elrod, James Thomas, Moultrie.
Fowler, William Ray, Rome.
McGee, Samuel Russell, III, Atlanta.
McWhorter, Henry Sterling, Savannah.
Morris, John Nathan, Meldrim.
Rice, Claude, Marshallville.
Riddle, Larry Ray, Atlanta.
Rivers, John Wilson, Camilla.
Rogers, Robert Russell, Cairo.
Smith, Dean, Jr., Savannah.
Wood, Robert Wayne, Smyrna.

HAWAII

Army

Amisone, Fuifutaua, Kahuku.
Andrade, Robert Soares, Waimanalo.
Anduha, Howard J., Wahiawa.
Aragon, Henry T., Waipahu.
Arakaki, Wayne Allen, Keneohe.
Arriaga, Tony R., Waipahu.
Barcena, Bobby John, Hakalau.
Bayron, Benedicto Piosalan, Waianae.
Bilonta, Larry Kilito, Honolulu.
Blevins, Thomas A. K., Honolulu.
Bode, Robert Russell, Ewa.
Buell, Norman Joseph, Honolulu.
Cabrera, John Waikane, Kohala.
Caires, Clyde Joseph, Kalaheo.
Caliboso, Robert Maluenda, Honolulu.
Campos, Magno, Lahaina.
Chock, Linus Gerard K., Honolulu.
Concepcion, Francisco, Jr., Kilauea.
Costello, George Simonds, Fort Shafter.
Crane, Charles Henry, Molokai.
Dickens, Elmer William, Wahiawa.
Doike, John Toshio, Honolulu.
Ellis, Richard Leialona Ke, Aiea.
Flores, Douglas, Kaunakakai.
Funn, Gary Francis, Honolulu.
Gabriel, James, Jr., Honolulu.
Greenwood, George Randolph, Oahu.
Hao, Joseph N., Honolulu.
Hoopii, Bernard Palenpa, Jr., Kaneohe.
Horn, John Elia, Honolulu.
Howard, James Edward, Jr., Honolulu.
Hugo, Felicisimo A., Honolulu.
Imae, Hachiro, Kahului.
Ishihara, James Hiroshi, Honolulu.
Jacobs, Richard Chester, Kahului.
Kaaihue, Kenneth R., Honolulu.
Kama, Fred Kaimi Naauao, Honolulu.
Kane, Momi Nuhi, Kailua W Kona.
Kaneshiro, Edward Noboru, Honolulu.
Kauhane, Elias Maulili, Kaneohe.
Kawamura, Gary Noboru, Lihue.
Keo, Edward Kikau. Oahu.
Kobayashi, Roy Shigeru, Honolulu.
Leanio, Hilario B., Jr., Honolulu.
Lima, Kenneth Kawika, Honolulu.
Lindsey, James Kahililauin, Naalehu.
Luis, George Gregorio, Pahoa.
Machado, Roberts, Honolulu.
Matsuura, Alan Yukio, Honolulu.
McKillip, Merrill Andrew, Kaneohe.
Nerveza, Delmore Byron, Hilo.
Nishiyama, Melvin Tetsuo, Honolulu.
Noguchi, Rockne Masayoshi, Honolulu.
Olivar, Gilbert, Kurtistown.
Paele, Peter James, Kahului.
Paialii, Pasia, Laie.
Panganoran, Abraham, Waipahu.
Paresa, Edward Kenneth, Honolulu.
Pascual, Florendo B., Honolulu.
Perpetua, Roque, Jr., Kauai.
Pimentel, Teofilo Castillo, Wahaiawa.
Puhi, Daniel Kimokeo, Honolulu.
Ramos, Roland Rolando, Haleiwa.
Rego, John H., Hoolehua.
Remular, Rudolph, Honolulu.
Rickard, Walter L., Lahaina.
Sagon, Rudy Mantiad, Aiea.
Sagon, Stanley Incillo, Aiea.
Salema, George Stanley, Kurtistown.
Smith, Elmelindo Rodrigues, Wahiawa.
Solomon, Samuel Kanehailus, Hawi.
Storch, William Frank, Jr., Kaunakakai.
Tadios, Leonard Masayon, Lanai.
Tanaka, Minoru, Waiakoa.

HAWAII—continued

Army

Tatsuno, Albert Hiroshi, Aiea.
Wells, Orville D., Paia.
Yamashiro, Edward Satoru, Kaneohe.
Yamashiro, Naoto, Honolulu.

Air Force

Miyazaki, Ronald Kazuo, Waialua.
Sumida, Jerald Katsuji, Kahului.

Marine Corps

Arquero, Elpidio Allen, Honolulu.
Cabanayan, Albert, Kahului.
Castaneda, Eugene, Honokaa.
Chow, Calvin Kealohaokalan, Honolulu.
Gier, David Julian, Honolulu.
Igarta, Benito, Jr., Honolulu.
Meno, Roy Flores, Honolulu.
Nueko, Robert Lani, Nanakuli.
Padilla, Ronald Matthew, Honolulu.
Richardson, Ricky Wayne, Kailua.
Saleaumua, Uinifareti, Honolulu.
Suapaia, David Kealoha, Honolulu.
Toma, Richard Hisao, Honolulu.
Webb, George Grant King, Jr., Honolulu.
White, Robert Henry, Honolulu.

Navy

Capodanno, Vincent Robert, Honolulu.

IDAHO

Army

Akkerman, Duane Charles, Lewiston.
Anderson, Victor Edward, Stone.
Anderson, William Edward, St. Maries.
Baumert, Brent John, Twin Falls.
Bee, Ross Michael, Georgetown.
Carlson, Richard Buck, Twin Falls.
Chambers, Robert Stanley, Potlatch.
Coburn, Clyde Ralph, Preston.
De Ford, Elmo Lee, Hansen.
Fairchild, David Acel, Buhl.
Herbert, David Edwin, Rupert.
Huston, Terry Floyd, Caldwell.
Larison, Robert Wilbur, Pocatello.
Larson, John Gilbert, Blackfoot.
Lockwood, James Alton, Sandpoint.
Martin, Clayton Arthur, Idaho Falls.
Massine, Richard Peter, Kellogg.
Mottishaw, Ronald Grant, Pocatello.
Nakayama, Jimmy D., Rigby.
Petersen, William Donn, Boise.
Peterson, Bobby Gene, Idaho Falls.
Phillips, Samuel C., III, Homedale.
Priest, Michael Lloyd, Idaho Falls.
Sandoval, Vicente Diaz, American Falls.
Savell, Floyd Gwen, Boise.
Smith, Billy Gene, Twin Falls.
Stapelman, Ronald Lee, Paul.
Steele, Gary Lyn, Bliss.
Tanner, David Arlington, Boise.
Turner, Kenneth Eugene, Bruneau.
Wade, Douglas John, Idaho Falls.
Walker, James Lloyd, Blackfoot.
Wilson, Jerry Barber, Mackay.

Air Force

Bitton, Gary W., Blackfoot.
Brumet, Robert Newton, New Plymouth.

Marine Corps

Bennett, Bruce Rolla, Boise.
Bohlscheid, Curtis Richard, Pocatello.
Clark, Grant Leroy, Pocatello.
Crouson, Michael Lee, Pocatello.
Defilippis, Larry Dale, Idaho Falls.
Endicott, Franklin David, Boise.
Estes, Jerry Duane, Boise.
Finley, Raymond Patrick, St. Maries.
Flint, Winfield Scott, Payette.
Flores, Francisco John, Parma.
Foster, Gary Jack, Boise.
Gabriel, Garry Lee, Boise.
Hepburn, William Barton, Lewiston.
McLain, Jay Darwin, Bancroft.
Powell, Robert Allan, Boise.
Reasoner, Frank Stanley, Kellogg.
Ward, Jimmy Lee, Nampa.
Yagues, Robert Gene, Mountain Home.

Navy

Chatterton, David Roger, Twin Falls.

ILLINOIS

Army

Adams, Michael Edward, Granite City.
Aguado, Robert Charles, Chicago.
Alberts, John Charles, South Beloit.
Allen, Howard Lloyd, Pearl.
Allman, Henry Hayden, Chicago.
Anderson, Lewis Carl, Chicago.
Andres, Keith John, Carpentersville.
Andrews, Robert P., Chicago.
Arms, James Walter, Cahokia.
Asbridge, Larry Gene, Pekin.
Bailey, Joseph, Jr., Chicago.
Bailey, Raymond, Chicago.
Ballard, Melvin, Rockford.
Barlett, Ralph Harry, Jr., Mt Carmel.
Barnard, Gary Adrian, Chicago Heights.
Barnhart, Carl Ray, East Peoria.
Bartram, Gerald Edward, Chicago.
Bean, George Tyrus, De Soto.
Beavers, Christopher Wayne, Naperville.
Beck, Edward Charles, Carpentersville.
Becker, Lester Erwin, Harvard.
Bednarz, William Walter, Chicago.
Bell, Jerry W., Pekin.
Benner, Fred Alfred, East St Louis.
Berek, Michael Stanley, Chicago.
Berthoux, Dale Porter, Jerseyville.
Bertolino, Fred Gordon, Bushnell.
Besze, Gyorgy Janos, Old Shawneetown.
Beuke, Dennis Arthur, Chicago.
Bigley, George Carl, Cicero.
Bishop, Dale Alan, Dolton.
Bishop, William Wayne, Montgomery.
Black, Charles Duffy, Peoria.
Boaz, Kenneth Wayne, Ottawa.
Boicourt, Robert C., Park Ridge.
Bonert, Ronald Joseph, Chicago.
Boone, James Arthur, Elgin.
Borowski, John C., Chicago.
Borst, Leroy J. Jr., Chicago.
Brackett, Frank, Decatur.
Bradshaw, James Thomas, Decatur.
Brantley, John Arthur, Chicago.
Bried, Robert Allan, Waukegan.
Britt, Ronald Jerome, Oaklawn.
Brooks, Allen, Chicago.
Brown, Charles C., Chicago.
Brown, Dennis William, Moline.
Brown, Robert Edward, Chicago.
Brown, Walter William, Waukegan.
Bryant, Francis Leon, Decatur.
Brynelsen, Thomas Allen, Chicago.
Buckley, Carl Dwyne, Cahokia.
Burchett, George Elmer, Bloomington.
Burger, Dieter Hans, Lombard.
Bylon, John Louis, Chicago.
Campa, John Joseph, Chicago.
Campbell, Allie William, St. Louis.
Campbell, Jack, Carterville.
Cardenas, Arnoldo J., Chicago.
Carlone, John Joseph, II, Chicago.
Carls, Terry Alan, Virginia.
Carmichael, Samuel Lee, Chicago.
Carrell, Larry Dale, Lawrenceville.
Carson, Mervyn Maurice, Chicago.
Carter, Leonard James, Winthrop.
Cassata, Orrin Joseph, Chicago.
Castillo, Louis, Chicago.
Cavanaugh, John Charles, Chicago.
Chepely, Gene E., Granite City.
Childers, Stephen Andrew, Alton.
Chronister, James Virgil, Chicago.
Chunges, Jerry, Michael, Alvin.
Churchill, Steve John, Elmhurst.
Cicero, Fedele Anthony, Chicago.
Clark, Richard Crosby, Kankakee.
Clements, Marshall Edward, Chicago.
Coleman, Richard, Chicago.
Collins, Ray, Chicago.
Corrigan, Danny Joseph, Lansing.
Cowan, Aaron Davis, East St. Louis.
Cragg, Gerald, Chicago.
Crandall, John Paul, Auora.
Cross, Bennie Lee, Carlo.
Cubit, Billy Ray, Chicago.
Dabon, Nathaniel, Harvey.
Dalton, John Michael, Chicago.
Davis, John William, Danville.
De Carlo, Gennaro Joseph, Kankakee.

XUM

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Dedman, Tony, Legrange.
Demon, Donald Clay, Chicago.
Delgado, Ruben, Chicago.
Dermont, Donald Eugene, Jr., Woodstock.
Derosa, Joseph William, Deerfield.
Deuel, William Townsley, Springfield.
Devereaux, Reese, Chicago.
Dexter, Herbert J., Decatur.
Dillard, Bernard, Chicago.
Dillon, William Jerry, East St. Louis.
Dode, Fred Richard, Chicago.
Donahue, James T., Jr., Des Plaines.
Dooley, Dennis Lynn, Alton.
Dossett, James Edwin, Geneva.
Dowdy, James Ray, Granite City.
Doyle, Michael Charles, Evanston.
Drydel, Donald L., Rock Island.
Duckett, Curtis Lee, Rockford.
Dudley, Forest Edd, Chicago.
Duffy, Thomas Benedict, Jr., Glen Ellyn.
Dunbar, John Michael, Villa Park.
Dunn, Laurence John, Chicago.
Dvoratchek, Thomas Anthony, Chicago.
Eakins, Marion Troy, Edelstein.
Eastham, Martin Phillip, Fox Lake.
Egan, Timothy James, Chicago.
Eisenhour, Glenn R., Belleville.
El Hondah, Dove, Chicago.
Elizondo, Frederick H., Alton.
Elswick, Lex, Elgin.
Elyea, Sidney John, Woodstock.
Elza, Ronald Lee, Downers Grove.
Espinosa, Ellis Casiano, Chicago.
Evans, Charles Michael, Watseka.
Eversgerd, Marlin Chris, Germantown.
Fanis, George Nicholas, Jr., Rockford.
Ference, Michael William, Chicago.
Fisher, David Luther, Mitchell.
Fisher, David Wayne, Chicago.
Flatley, Thomas Michael, Chicago.
Flourony, Jeffrey Donald, Chicago.
Foad, Melvin Eugene, Chicago.
Foley, James Richard, Chicago.
Ford, Stephen Romo, Lisle.
Franke, Bernard Lee, Mt. Olive.
Fromm, Ronald Albert, Omaha.
Fuller, James E., Evanston.
Fullilove, Willie Ketchery, Chicago.
Gagliano, Frank F., Mount Prospect.
Galbavy, George Richard, Chicago.
Galloway, Clarence, Chicago.
Ganion, Thomas Francis, Peoria.
Garcia, Antonio, Chicago.
Garner, Larry Arthur, Mulkeytown.
Garrigan, John L., Chicago.
Gavaria, George Louis, Harwood Heights.
Geier, William Michael, Maywood.
Geis, William Charles, Evergreen Park.
Gelonek, Robert Eugene, Jr., Taylorville.
Gibson, Dale Henry, Chicago.
Gillean, Gary Lewis, Alton.
Godwin, Raymond Willard, Pomona.
Goeckner, Eugene Franklin, Dieterich.
Goelz, Edward Charles, Antioch.
Gorman, Kevin Terrence, Chicago.
Graham, George Richard, Port Byron.
Grass, Lawrence George, Belleville.
Gray, David Arthur, Sterling.
Gray, Edwin Michael, Chicago.
Green Charles, Jr., Chicago.
Green, Ernest, Chicago.
Griffey, James Ray, Harvey.
Griffin, Levester, Chicago.
Gros, Ronnie Lee, East St. Louis.
Gross, Rodger Thomas, Godfrey.
Hale, Paul Edward, Nason.
Haley, Patrick Lawrence, La Salle.
Halford, Charles E., Latham.
Hammett, David A., Chicago.
Hansen, Donald Charles, Jr., Chicago.
Harbin, Gary Lee, Oswego.
Harden, John Merrill, Island Lake.
Harris, Patrick James, Waukegan.
Hartung, Thomas Edward, New Lenox.
Harvey, Carmel Bernon, Jr., Chicago.
Harvey, Charles Edward, East St. Louis.
Heft, Norman Anthony, Chicago.
Hellyer, William Edward, Springfield.
Hensley, Medford S., Jr., Steger.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Heriaud, Frederick Charles, Oswego.
Hilgart, Richard Peter, Chicago.
Hill, Robert Wilson, Chicago.
Hines, James Roosevelt, Chicago.
Hinkle, William Cecil, Granite City.
Hirsch, Marshall Raymond, Chicago.
Hitchins, Lloyd Lynn, Champaign.
Hlavacek, Glenn John, Chicago.
Hoban, Charles John, III, Chicago.
Hoeniges, Thomas Leo, Bloomington.
Hooks, Dennis Raye, New Douglas.
Hoots, Douglas James, Winchester.
Howland, John Charles, Bradley.
Hughes, James Kenneth, Lawrenceville.
Humes, Maynard Jewel, Urbana.
Hutchison, Stanley Robert, Charlston.
Hutton, James Edward, Bluffs.
Irving, Earl Elester, Jr., East St. Louis.
Ivy, Jesse W., Jr., Chicago.
Jackson, Wilbur Desmar, East St. Louis.
Jacob, Randall Gordon, Chicago.
Jarrett, Lemoyndue, Alton.
Jarvis, Roger, Ellis, Moline.
Johnson, Arnold Edward, Rochelle.
Johnson, Charles Edward, Chicago.
Johnson, Clayton Winslow, Evanston.
Johnson, Jerry Jack, Peoria.
Johnson, Robert Charles, Kankakee.
Johnson, Rodney Dean, Knoxville.
Jones, Donald Eugene, Kewanee.
Jones, Gary Lee, Maywood.
Jones, Richard William, Cairo.
Jones, Ronnie Lee, Pulaski.
Joseph, Thomas Edward, St. Charles.
Justice, Ralph Roger, Granite City.
Kearney, Timothy William, Rock Island.
Keeling, Arthur R., Chicago.
Keller, Charles Lee, Lansing.
Kelley, Michael Patrick, Decatur.
Kenter, Michael William, Effingham.
Kersten, Lester Joseph, Chicago.
Kimball, Richard Nelson, Jr., Granite City.
Klaus, George Peter, Posen.
Knighton, Hirman J., Jr., Chicago.
Kolar, Jerry Joseph, Jr., Chicago.
Kollmann, Richard Leon, Stonington.
Kotulla, Michael Jerrard, Chicago.
Kovar, James Russell, Oneida.
Kroger, Neil A., Oak Park.
Krovanda, John Martin, Chicago.
Kubiak, Leonard, Chicago.
Lange, Hans Dietrick, Downers Grove.
Latimer, William Royce, Chicago.
Lawler, John E., Jr., McNabb.
Lawlor, James V., Chicago.
Lee, Garrett Floris, Chicago.
Lekovish, Donald F., Lyons.
Leston, Thomas Jerome, Elmhurst.
Long, Clyde Edward, Jr., Bridgeport.
Long, Dennis Lane, Chicago.
Lopez, Henry Robert, Joliet.
Luberda, Andrew Patrick, Chicago.
Luttrell, Gary Allen, Sterling.
Lyles, J. L., Rockford.
Lynn, John Joseph, Jr., Chicago.
Machalica, Joseph Paul, Addison.
Maddox, Harold Wayne, Steger.
Madsen, William Joseph, Chicago.
Malczynski, Matthew Paul, Northlake.
Malone, Richard Clair, Kempton.
Manderfeld, Kenneth Jay, Evergreen Park.
Manrique, Ramiro, Jr., Blue Island.
Mara, Joseph P., Bellwood.
Marroquin, Pedro, Jr., Chicago.
Martin, James C., Jr., Chicago.
Martin, Larry, Chicago.
Mathiesen, Erhardt William, Waukegan.
Mathison, Michael K., East St. Louis.
Matson, Robert Edwin, Desplaines.
May, John Albert, Chicago.
McCord, Michael Raye, Carmi.
McCormick, James Milton, Chicago.
McCue, William James, Hometown.
McCullough, Prezel, Chicago.
McDaniel, William T., Springfield.
McDaniels, William Lawren, Dewey.
McDonial, Wesley, Chicago.
McElroy, Glenn David, Sidney.
McGowan, Paul Joseph, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Meloy, Larry John, Joliet.
Messick, James Avery, Chicago.
Metros, Carl Deane, Chicago.
Michael, James Richard, Newman.
Mikrut, John Thomas, Cicero.
Miller, Clarence Alvie, Jr., Steger.
Miller, Gerald Craig, Tinley Park.
Miller, John Edward, West Point.
Misheikis, Theodore Nicodi, Chicago.
Monroe, James Howard, Chicago.
Moore, Dale William, Princeton.
Moore, Nelson Roger, Elgin.
Morales, Ramon J., Alton.
Morgan, George Allen, Chicago.
Morgan, Kenneth Dwight, Chicago.
Morris, Winston, Chicago.
Moseley, Stephen C., Moline.
Muhr, Warren Francis, Chicago.
Neal, Johnny Leonard, East St. Louis.
Nelson, Leroy A., Decatur.
Nelson, Robert Allen, Alton.
Nicola, Dennis Grant, Champaign.
Nicolini, Peter Joseph, Chicago.
Niespodziany, Casimir, Chicago.
Novak, Gerald Francis, Villa Park.
Novotny, James Robert, Morton Grove.
Null, Harold Edward, Peoria.
Nutt, Richard E., Champaign.
Oguinn, Michael Eugene, Murphysboro.
Olive, Milton Lee, III, Chicago.
Olmstead, John Paul, Warren.
Ortiz, John Manuel, Chicago.
Otto, William Fredrick, Chicago.
Page, David Ronald, Normal.
Pannell, Joseph, East St. Louis.
Paterson, Ross James, Palatine.
Patterson, Cleveland, Chicago.
Patterson, Stanley F., Loves Park
Patterson, Terry Allen, Waukegan
Peach, Robert Alan, Skokie.
Pearson, Robert Verner, Rockford
Pendola, Anthony Eugene, Peoria
Peters, Michael, Brookfield.
Peterson, Donald Carl, Chicago.
Phillips, Ernest, Chicago.
Phillips, John Robert, Bowen.
Phillips, Lloyd Freeman, Ashkum.
Piantkowski, Edward Joseph, Chicago.
Pierce, John Robert, Bonnie.
Poeling, Eugene Frederick, Worden.
Pohlman, Charles Paul, Greenfield.
Poteet, Thomas James, Hillside.
Price, Gary Wayne, Dorchester.
Provenzano, Robert Lee, Chicago.
Qualls, David Wayne, Murphysboro.
Quiroz, Joseph Albert, Chicago.
Racine, Franklin Douglas, Midlothian.
Rea, Phillip Kenneth, Chicago.
Reilly, Michael Patrick, La Grange.
Reynolds, Frank Everett, Murphysboro.
Rice, Jesse, Chicago.
Richards, Leonard Jeffrey, Mount Vernon.
Richtmyre, Charles Lawrenc, Winnetka.
Roach, Charles Michael, Harvey.
Robinson, Clifford Leroy, Litchfield.
Robinson, James William, Jr., Lyons.
Robinson, Robert Edward, Chicago.
Rochkes, Francis Albert, Pana.
Rodenbeck, Roderick James, Rockford.
Roesler, Arthur Cleon, Robinson.
Romano, William Ross, Lombard.
Rome, Roosevelt Snow, Chicago.
Rose, Larry Emmett, Warsaw.
Rossi, Aldo, Jr., Pekin.
Rost, Leroy Alphus, Moline.
Roush, Robert Rogers, Chicago.
Rowell, Richard A., Cary.
Ruhloff, Gary Carl, Chicago.
Salazar, Roy, Rolling Meadows.
Sanders, Charles William, Jacksonville.
Sanders, William Raymond, Chicago.
Schaddelee, William D., Chicago.
Schatzley, Michael Donn, Winthrop Harbor.
Schmeltz, Jerry E., Chicago.
Schroeder, Donald Lee, Springfield.
Schukar, Ronald Keith, Vandalia.
Schulman, Sheldon Boris, Skokie.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Schultz, Kenneth Eugene, Peoria.
Schutz, Richard James, Calumet City.
Schwartz, Martin Peter, Chicago.
Schwebel, Michael Philip, Murphysboro.
Schwick, Martin Frank, Jr., Chicago.
Schyska, Leroy Floyd, Moline.
Scott, John Walter, Mount Sterling.
Scull, John Fellows, Jr., Glen Ellyn.
Seput, Frederick William, Chicago.
Settlemire, William David, Mount Vernon.
Shelby, Jay Clayton, Nebo.
Shelton, Earl S., Geff.
Shelton, Ronald Thomas, Decatur.
Shipman, Marvin Leroy, Sullivan.
Showmaker, Ronald Eugene, Mound City.
Sieben, Edward Michael, Chicago.
Simmermon, Robert John, Chicago.
Smith, Carl Gene, Decatur.
Smith, Harvie G., St. Anne.
Smith, Philip Cory, Belleville.
Smith, Samuel Jerome, Chicago.
Smith, Stephen Jay, Mount Vernon.
Snyder, Terry Lee, Chicago.
Sobota, Daniel James, Peoria.
Solczyk, Richard John, Chicago.
Solton, Norman William, Chicago.
Sorim, Rolleen C., Moline.
Souhrada, Terrence Lee, Oak Lawn.
Spain, Ervin, Chicago.
Spencer, Johnnie, Jr., Chicago.
Spencer, Wendell, Chicago.
Sprouse, Jerry Wayne, Chicago.
St. Peter, Robert Eugene, Gilman.
St. Peters, John Donald, Brighton.
Stark, Gordon William, Chicago.
Steelman, Teddy Wayne, Roodhouse.
Stone, Harmon S., Jr., Oregon.
Strom, Larry A., Chicago.
Subert, George Thomas, Berwyn.
Suedmeyer, Merill Lawrence, Nashville.
Sullivan, Thomas Emerson, Chicago.
Swanson, Nels William, Chicago.
Sykes, Hamp Jurome, Jr., Chicago.
Tabor, Everett Leroy, Pekin.
Taft, Robert Edmund, Highland Park.
Tate, Kenneth Wayne, Benton.
Tate, Todd, III, Chicago.
Taylor,, Daniel Morris, Chicago.
Thomas, James Oliver, Fieldon.
Thomas, Reginald Michael, Chicago.
Thomas, Walter Reed, Chicago.
Thompson, Thelbert Kenneth, Chicago.
Thompson, William Howard, Belleville.
Thorne-Thomsen, Carl Spaul, Lake Forest.
Tieman, Edward Lewis, Carlinville.
Toennies Norman George, Albers.
Torres, Angelo, Chicago.
Treest, Norman Eugene, Marseilles.
Tremayne, James Ronald, Chicago.
Turk, Jon Peter, Melrose Park.
Turskey, Harold Sean, Oak Park.
Twing, Robert Anthony, Hillsdale.
Urbaniak, Edward, Chicago.
Utter, Thomas Duane, Hinsdale.
Vadbunker, James Patrick, Gilman.
Vaickus, Anthoney J., Jr., Chicago.
Van Hoosier, James D., Palatine.
Vasilopulos, John William, Chicago.
Viehweg, Michael, Chicago.
Vogler, Gale Kurk, East Moline.
Wagman, Jeffrey Burton, Chicago.
Walker, Richard, Jr., Chicago.
Walsh, Casper Marvin, III, Chicago.
Walters, Donald Edward, Jr., Des Plaines.
Warzecha, Gerald Walter, Chicago.
Washington, James Ervin, Chicago.
Washington, Leonard B., Jr., Chicago.
Waters, Melvin Lester, Chicago.
Welch, Jack Allen, Chicago.
Wendolowski, James Francis, Chicago.
Wente, Daniel Lewis, Neoga.
Wheeler, James, Chicago.
White, James Darrell, Jr., Decatur.
White, Lee Owens, Jr., Evinston.
Whitington, Larry E., Fairmount
Williams, John Dewey, Butler.
Williams, Richard Allen, East St. Louis.
Williams, Theodore, Jr., Robbins.
Willis, Larry Joe, White Heath.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Witt, Jerry Paul, Mt. Vernon.
Wojcik, Lawrence Adam, Chicago.
Woolridge, Paul Millard, Jr., Metropolis.
Workman, Joseph Myron, Peoria.
Wormdahl, Richard Gene, Sugar Grove.
Wright, Kenneth Michael, Alton.
Wright, Willie Alfred, Chicago.
Young, Horace Earle, Aledo.
Zelinko, George Allen, Chicago.
Zinn, Ronald Lloyd, Orland Park.
Zionts, Charles A., Cicero.
Zum, Mallen Philip Otto, Jr., Homewood.

Air Force

Carlock, Ralph Laurence, Des Plaines.
Carlson, John Werner, Chicago.
Causey, John Bernard, Granite City.
Chambers, Samuel P., III, Crystal Lake.
Collins, Willard Marion, Quincy.
Graff, James Howard, Morengo.
Hauschildt, John Charles, Chicago.
Hawkins, Jerry Pavey, Iuka.
Hays, George Burns, Robinson.
Hergert, Thomas Malcolm, Savanna.
Lankford, Charles Bernard, Collinsville.
Marshall, Richard Carlton, Chicago.
Moore, William John, Monmouth.
Price, James Henry, Winchester.
Pritchard, William Henry, Lagrange Park.
Rogiers, Charles Joseph, Rock Island.
Roth, Billie Leroy, Lacon.
Sala, James Donald, Chicago.
Williams, Robert Cyril, McLeansboro.
Woodson, Richard Eugene, Winchester.
Yates, Glendell Eugene, Harrisburg.

Marine Corps

Ahinzow, Tony, Chicago.
Aldridge, Neil Wayne, Grant Park.
Allen, Melvin Lee, Chicago.
Almanza, Pablo, Chicago.
Alvis, Roy Gene, Kell.
Anderson, Stephen Arthur, Evanston.
Armstrong, Herman Robert, Alton.
Arnold, John Craig, Quincy.
Arnold, Robin Lee, Streamwood.
Avington, Larasett Earl, Jr., Chicago.
Badsing, Michael Terrance, Chicago.
Bangert, Stephen Ray, Decatur.
Bates, Robert Anthony, Lake Forest.
Behrns, Richard John, Spring Grove.
Bell, John Henry, Peoria.
Bell, Larry Dean, Rockford.
Bell, Leo, Jr., East St. Louis.
Bennett, Dwight Farwell, Jr., Melrose Park.
Bennett, Richard Charles, Wood River.
Beran, Nicholas Michael, Jr., Chicago.
Berry, Larry Michael, East St. Louis.
Bertolozzi, Paul Charles, Elmwood Park.
Black, Ronald Lee, Jacksonville.
Bland, Gary Paul, Peoria.
Blasen, Richard Lee, Wheaton.
Blumer, Edward Eugene, Chicago.
Bocanegra, Rojelio, Northbrook.
Bollman, Donald Warren, Norridge.
Borczyk, Stephen Zbigniew, Chicago.
Boyd, Wilburn Hugh, Carbondale.
Bradley, Loren Eugene, Granite City.
Brewer, Dale Connard, De Kalb.
Bricker, Charles William, Rushville.
Broderick, Patrick Emmet, Chicago.
Bromley, Thomas Edward, Chicago.
Brouquist, Steven Andre, Champaign.
Brunner, Donald Ralph, Chicago.
Bryant, Michael Steven, Des Plaines.
Bryar, John Joseph, Chicago.
Boff, William Reinhart, Bloomington.
Butler, Benny Lee, Humboldt.
Butler, George Richard, Durand.
Cabrera, Louis Xavier, Jr., Blue Island.
Caby, Billy Ray, Cutler.
Cacciottolo, Neil Joseph, Norridge.
Canelakes, Peter Joseph, Waukegan.
Capel, John Bruce, Glen Ellyn.
Carnell, Talmadge Wayne, Moro.
Carter, Ralph Winfield, Chicago.
Cassidy, Patrick Christian, Chicago.
Catlin, Norman Richard, Chicago.
Chapman, Sidney David, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Marine Corps

Chavez, Antonio Gonzalez, Chicago.
Chlewa, John, Chicago.
Claybrook, Larry Dean, Hillsboro.
Congiardo, Thomas Dean, Murphysboro.
Conner, Patrick, Caseyville.
Cooper, Avery Lee, St. Louis.
Corley, Robert Hal, Stone Park.
Costantino, Ronald Joseph, Bellwood.
Cox, Daniel Ronen, Litchfield.
Crawford, Richard Allen, Godfrey.
Cronin, John Earl, Chicago.
Crouch, Jack Emanuel, Jr., Mt. Vernon.
Crutchfield, Charles Ellis, Kinmundy.
Dailey, William Grant, Jr., Oak Park.
Daniels, Lawrence Edward, Oak Forest.
Davis, Garry Don, Elizabethtown.
Davis, Robert Nelson, Alton.
Davis, Willie, Jr., Chicago.
Dawson, Wayne Eugene, Champaign.
Dean, Alan James, West Chicago.
Delgado, Michael Julian, Jr., Chicago.
Denny, Lawrence Edward, Belleville.
Dorsey, Cecil Everett, Duquion.
Dunlap, Lawrence David, Jr., Chicago.
Eaton, Emmanuel Lloyd, Tower Hill.
Edwards, James Walter, Normal.
Ellis, Bennel, Phoenix.
Emery, Robert Edward, Granite City.
Enderby, Robert Francis, Danville.
Erling, William Nels, Jr., Chicago.
Esch, Frank Ryan, Normal.
Evilsizer, David Nathaniel, Richview.
Fabris, Chris Frank, Chicago.
Fairfield, Dennis Howard, Modesto.
Falloon, Edwin Joseph, Evergreen Park.
Filpi, John Taylor, Glenview.
Finley, Michael Paul, Big Rock.
Fitzpatrick, Curtis L., Jr., Chicago.
Flaningam, David Eugene, Rockford.
Fleming, John James, Chicago.
Flores, Jose, Anibal, Chicago.
Foran, William Patrick, Decatur.
Freed, Robert Thomas, Aledo.
French, Allen George, Park Ridge.
Fries, Dennis Jerome, Chicago.
Frizzell, Donald Eugene, Chicago.
Frye, James Kenneth, Aledo.
Fulk, Michael Raymond, Oakley.
Gaffney, Michael Francis, Chicago.
Galarza, Rudolph Joseph, Chicago.
Gattis, Charles Manley, Jr., Crete.
Getlin, Michael Peter, La Grange.
Gibson, Donald Frederick, Wheaton.
Giebe, Richard John, Granite City.
Gilgenberg, John Daniel, Oak Lawn.
Ginter, Dennis Harry, Chicago.
Glawe, Thomas Duane, Rockford.
Gonce, Ray Lonnie, Lovers Park.
Goossens, Matthew Raymond, Chicago.
Grant, Jackya Kederis, Chicago.
Green, Arthur William, Chicago.
Green, Kenneth Leslie, Chicago.
Guerin, Walter Thomas, Cairo.
Hackett, William Ralph, Jr., Chicago.
Hahner, George Lawrence, Jr., Chicago.
Halpin, William Francis, Chicago.
Hanrahan, Jerome M., Jr., Chicago.
Harris, Glenn Alvin, Chicago.
Harrison, Celister, Jr., Chicago.
Hartzell, Sammy Lowell, Arlington Heights.
Harvey, Raymond, Chicago.
Healey, James Jay, Northbrock.
Hecimovich, Robert Allen, Chicago.
Heffernan, Daniel Joseph, Chicago.
Hengels, Raymond George, Downers Grove.
Henricks, Donald Merle, Jr., Mount Morris.
Herman, Allan Joseph, Evanston.
Hissong, Harry Leavern, Beecher City.
Hogan, Gordon Lee, Alton.
Hollwedel, Charles William, Tinley Park.
Horn, Raymond Leon, Chicago.
Houston, Bennie Lee, Chicago.
Jalloway, Stephen Frank, Oak Lawn.
Jarvis, Lee Brian, Berwyn.
Jennings, Thomas Alvin, Palestine.
Johnson, Charles, Batavia.
Johnson, Jesse Lewis, Morris.
Johnson, Kenneth Carl, Bradley.
Johnson, Oliver, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Marine Corps

Jones, David Lee, Lincoln.
Jones, James Andrew, Seneca.
Joyce, Thomas Michael, Springfield.
Kasper, Gregory Joseph, Chicago.
Keane, Patrick Brendan, Chicago.
Kedroski, Albert Arthur, Jr., Chicago.
Kellermann, Allan Howard, Chicago.
Keneipp, Warren Owings, Jr., Oak Lawn.
King, John Terrence. Park Forest.
Kinney, Merle Allan, Chicago.
Kisala, Walter, Chicago.
Klopmeyer, James Martin, Millstadt.
Knudsen, John Henry, Chicago.
Koelper, Donald Edward, Northbrook.
Kolbeck, Franz, Joseph, Deerfield.
Kopec, Edward, Chicago.
Kosky, Richard Allen, Cicero.
Kretsinger, Donald Maurice, Leaf River.
Krisan, David Anthony, Chicago.
Krystoszek, Gerald Michael, Chicago.
Kyser, John Thomas, Chicago.
Ladd, Leamon Ray, Chicago.
Landers, Ronnie Ray, Mundelein.
Landon, William Gregory, Deerfield.
Lange, Conrad Thomas, Wood Dale.
Lara, Humberto, Chicago.
Lavish, John Larry, West Frankfort.
Lee, Stephan Michael, Chicago.
Lenover, William Joseph, Dolton.
Lester, Thomas Lynn, Springfield.
Leutenegger, Joe Carl, Granite City.
Liberati, Peter Joseph, Chicago.
Liberty, Ronald Edward, Chicago.
Linder, Herbert, III, Chicago.
Lis, Richard John, Chicago.
Little, William Walter, III, Bloomington.
Lloyd, Lowell Ray, Woodlawn.
Lohrey, James William, Chicago.
Machacek, William Allen, Skokie.
Maggio, Joseph Anthony, Jr., Melrose Park.
Manheim, Vernon Arthur, Jr., Franklin Park.
Martin, Robert Elmer, Hickory.
Martin, William Deon, Springfield.
Masny, Bernard Joseph, Chicago.
Matthews, Joseph, Chicago.
Maul, Richard Allen, Chicago.
May, Alan Richard, Cicero.
McCarthy, Edward Joseph, Chicago.
McGee, Charles Adam, Alton.
McGuire, Andy, Jr., Chicago.
McKeon, Joseph Thomas, Jr., Chicago.
McKinson, Michael James, Pecatonica.
McNeil, Sylvester, Chicago.
Meltzer, Edward Alan, Round Lake.
Metcalf, Jerry Eugene, Delavan.
Meyer, Edward K. Normal.
Miller, Daniel Harold, Chicago.
Miller, Robert Michael, Chicago.
Miller, William Franklin, Jerseyville,
Miranda, Paul Andrew, Jr., Chicago.
Monroe, Gregory James, Chicago.
Moody, Richard Finisa, Cottage Hills.
Moody, Robert Wilcox, Collinsville.
Mooney, Robert Ray, St. Libory.
Morgan, Junior Ray, West Frankfort.
Morgan, Robert Francis, Glenn Ellyn.
Mullin, Richard Rocco, Roselle.
Neal, Nelson Denfield, Chicago.
Nienczuk, Peter Richard, Chicago.
Norbut. George Edward, Chicago.
Norton, Roger Kay, Auburn.
Nosek, William Allen, Chicago.
Nowakowski, Walter John, Chicago.
O'Connor, John Francis, Chicago.
O'Malley, Fred Gillespie, Farmer City.
Overmyer, Robert Joe, Mattoon.
Overturf, Philip Gene, West Frankfort.
Page, James Robert, Genoa.
Palmer, Larry Ray, Elhurst.
Pastorvich, Eugene Arthur, Walshville.
Pelikan, Roger, Chicago.
Perris, Feliz, Loves Park.
Petersen, Donald Roger, Jr., Chicago.
Peterson, Ted Barnett, Bartonville.
Petrossi, William, Jr., Palos Park.
Phillips, Tommie, Chicago.
Pike, Dennis Eugene, Petersburg.
Plote, Dale Edwin, South Elgin.

ILLINOIS—continued

Marine Corps

Praire, Leroy Paul, Momence.
Pruett, Darrel Eugene, New Salem.
Pusyrewski, Leslie, Chicago.
Radar, Charles Wayne, Chester.
Rapp, Joseph Louis, Freeburg.
Rash, Harry Don, Herrin.
Rathe, Philip Henry, Mattoon.
Rawson, William Allen, Lake Forest.
Redfearn, Don Allan, Decatur.
Reel, William Edward, Carlock.
Renz, James Thomas, Des Plaines.
Richardson, Arthur Gene, Rochelle.
Riley, Charles John, Tinley Park.
Riley, Kirk Irwin, Peoria.
Roberts, Joseph Ray, Chicago.
Rogowski, Ronald Chester, Norridge.
Rollins, Arbal, Jr., East St. Louis.
Roth, Bruce Jonathan, Park Ridge.
Rozanski, Edward Charles, Chicago.
Russell, Carl Eric, Chicago.
Sansone, Donald Frank, Chicago.
Santana, Florentino John, Elgin.
Saunders, Darryl Eldridge, Chicago.
Schmidt, Gerald Bernard, Albers,
Schneider, Jack Arthur, Elmhurst.
Schultz, William John, Stone Park.
Schumacher, Ronald Kenneth, Wauconda.
Schurch, Ronald Lee, Orangeville.
Scroggin, Michael Thomas, Mount Pulaski.
Seisser, Kenneth Anthony, Gilberts.
Shafer, Robert Laurence, Windsor.
Shaffer, Jack Leon, Arcola.
Shaner, Michael Ira, Joliet.
Sharp, Keith Francis, Sumner.
Shepard, Raymond Andrew, Chicago.
Shepler, Anthony George, Jr., Chicago.
Shumbarger, Dale Earl, Mattoon.
Sieger, Raymond Martin, Chicago.
Sircher, Paul Charles, Ingleside.
Skinner, Phillip Craig, Chicago.
Slagel, James Allan, Joliet.
Slager, Charles Albert, Berwyn.
Slane, William Llewellyn, Chicago.
Smith, John Russell, Decatur.
Snyder, Robert Lee, Chicago.
Stassi, James Stephen, Wood River.
Stateczny, Harry John, Jr., Chicago.
Staton, Paul Ray, Lyons,
Stevens, Marvin Owens, Chicago.
Strehle, Ernest William, Mundelein.
Stubstab, Gerald Edward, Chicago.
Sutton, Jack Richard, Harvey.
Tammen, William Dwight, Chicago.
Taylor, Larry Dean, Monmouth.
Terry, John Francis, Jr., Cairo.
Tinker, John Gregg, New Boston.
Toepritz, Richard, Chicago.
Totora, Chris Anthony, Wood River.
Tripplett, A. W., Rockford.
Turner, Kenneth Leon, Chicago.
Van Gundy, Nelson Earl, Mattoon.
Vanderkloot, Harry Cornell, Antioch.
Verhelst, James Layman, Kewanee.
Vicich, Albert Lee, Joliet.
Vlasak, William James, Jr., Chicago.
Wagstaff, Steven Ray, Murrayville.
Waljeski, Charles, Chicago.
Walton, Joseph Herbert, Chicago.
Waltrich, Robert John, Chicago.
Ward, Walter Leonard, Harvey.
Waters, Michael, Chicago.
Webb, Bruce Douglas, Wheaton.
Weekfall, Eddie Lee, East St. Louis.
Werderman, James Edward, Kewanee.
Werle, Harold Francis, Roscoe.
White, James Leo, Chicago.
Williams, Ralph Maurice, Chicago.
Williams, Robert Earl, Rockford.
Wilson, Michael, Chicago.
Wilson, Ronald Lee, Alton.
Wiskur, James Clyde, Winthrop Harbor.
Witcher, Leonard, III, Alton.
Woodall, John Braxton, East Alton.
Wylie, Joseph Dunn, II, Belleville.
Wynne, Larry B., Chicago.
Yarber, Michael Jerome, Chicago.
Youmans, Frederich John, Gilman.
Young, Dallas Clyde, Jr., Salem.
Yurgaitis, Stanley George, Harvey.

ILLINOIS—continued

Navy

Bardach, Robert Erle, Arlington Heights.
Bernard, Charles Louis, Jr., East St. Louis,
Bristow, Glenn Truman, Chicago.
Brown, Thomas Edward, Danville.
Bute, Donald Leroy, Streator.
Cain, Forrest Earl, Williamsfield,
Cheek, Richard Allan, Oregon.
Crose, Ronald Alan, Keithsburg.
Diamond, William T., Jr., Ottawa.
Eunice, Ronald Lee, Galesburg.
Fuhrman, William Ralph, Chicago.
Goers, Louis Lloyd, Steger.
Grasso, Anthony John, Chicago.
Gray, Robert Lyndon, Marengo.
Jackson, Walter Philip, Danville.
Kinney, Richard Lee, West Frankfort.
Knight, Larry Williams, Rockford.
Mann, Daniel McCarthy, Waukegan.
McGrath, James Patrick, Chicago.
Moran, Daniel Hagen, Jr., Chicago.
Nelson, John Thomas, Washington.
Rion, Donald Joseph, Northbrook.
Schroeder, Richard Glen, Lansing.
Stewart, David Sherman, Peoria.
Sweeney, Patrick John, Chicago.
Wilson, Gary Robert, Chicago Heights.

INDIANA

Army

Ackerman, John Robert, Gary.
Alexander, Laurie Leon, Shelbyville.
Allen, Eddie James, Richmond.
Allen, Jack Lee, Indianapolis.
Allen, James Otis, Indianapolis.
Allison, William Edwin, Decatur.
Armstrong, William L., Evansville.
Arrington, John Robert, Columbus.
Banks, Larry Clayton, Nashville.
Barksdale, Cullen, Jr., Gary.
Basey, Dwight Leroy, Anderson.
Batchelor, Max Wayne, Brazil.
Beasley, Percy, Jr., Gary.
Bell, Thomas Lynn, Indianapolis.
Biddle, Daniel Ellis, Arcadia.
Black, Dennis Walter, Laotto.
Blackerby, Ralph W., Muncie.
Blackwell, James, Lisman, Jr., Evansville.
Blevins, James Robert, Crown Point.
Bonnell, Larry Gene, Winamac.
Bonnie, Lewis Eli, Evansville.
Branaman, Kenneth Marle, Seymour.
Braswell, Dannie Glenn, Crane.
Brouhard, Malcolm Keith, Wheatfield.
Brown, Marion C., Indianapolis.
Brubaker, Max L., Laketon.
Burch, James Edward, Freedom.
Burns, Junior R., Hobart.
Burton, Dennis Lee, West Lafayette.
Cable, Richard Allen, Shelby.
Cadenhead, Randall James Elizabeth.
Campbell, Tommie Joe, Anderson.
Carle, Gary Lee, Anderson.
Carpenter, Fred W., Hobart.
Carter, William Allen, Indianapolis.
Chambers, Raymond Earl, Mishawaka.
Clanton, Howard, Indianapolis.
Coffey, Robert William, Coatesville.
Coldeberg, Donald Ray, Walkerton.
Coleman, Clarence Leroy, Indianapolis.
Cooper, David Arthur, Ragesdale.
Coy, Benjamin D., Jr., Noblesville.
Craven, Leonard Isler, Jeffersonville.
Crawford, Johnny Ray, Alexandria.
Creason, Richard Earl, Markleville.
Croy, William Mark, Auburn.
Davis, Robert Allen, Fort Wayne.
Deal, Larry Keith, Owensville.
Deaton, Jack Joe, Indianapolis.
Deitmeyer, Thomas Paul, Richmond.
Dent, Michael Earl, Evansville.
Dickerson, Harold, Poland.
Dickerson, John Green, III, Gary.
Dickerson, Riccardo Burton, Fort Wayne.
Downing, David Allen, Richmond.
Downs, Jerry Wayne, Columbus.
Draves, Larry Daniel, Hobart.
Drazer, Thomas, Stephen, Kouts.
Duckett, Ronald Warren, Trafalgar.
Edwards, Gary Stephens, Hammond.

INDIANA—continued

Army

Emmart, James Lee, Gary.
Ernhart, Stuart James, Indianapolis.
Euler, Michael Dan, North Vernon.
Fennimore, Gregory Scott, Elwood.
Ferguson, William Glen, Bluffton.
Fewell, John Phillip, Jr., Kokomo.
Fisher, David R., Lebanon.
Flory, Robert Lester, Jr., Bloomfield.
Fogle, Lary Dale, Lawrenceburg.
Foreman, James Lee, Warsaw.
Foster, Benny Edward, Hammond.
Fowler, Eugene Russell, Terre Haute.
Freeman, Donald Vern, Boonville.
Freeman, Roy Eldon, Jr., Anderson.
Funkhouser, Carl T., Anderson.
Gallagher, Frank R., Logansport.
Gibson, Rowland Edward, Indianapolis.
Gill, David Eugene, Evansville.
Gipson, Billy Edwin, Indianapolis.
Glasper, John James, New Haven.
Godfrey, John Larimore, Ligonier.
Goffredo, Michael Anthony, Griffith.
Goheen, Richard H., Evansville.
Gore, Freddy Ray, Chesterton.
Gray, Robert Allen, Avilla.
Greenwood, Francis David, Oxford.
Gribble, Ray Neal, Muncie.
Grube, Terry Lee, Ft. Wayne.
Guerrero, Joseph Donald, Marion.
Hackett, Robert E., Gary.
Handlon, Jerry Lee, Indianapolis.
Henshew, Fred Newton, Jr., Camby.
Hardesty, Robert Joe, Lafayette.
Harper, Billy Neal, Gary.
Harris, Lynn Arden, Columbia City.
Harrison, Donald Lewis, Rockport.
Haste, Rodger Dale, Greenfield.
Hatchett, Eurey Lee, Indianapolis.
Hattabaugh, Paul Russell, Rensselaer.
Hayes, Timothy Lee, Indianapolis.
Haynes, James Edward, Vincennes.
Hembree, James Vernon, Loogootee.
Heppen, George Henry, Jr., Anderson.
Higginbothan, Allen L., South Bend.
Hollopeter, Raymond Richar, Gary.
Holmes, Lonnie Michael, South Bend.
Hoos, William Arthur, Jr., East Chicago.
Howard, David Leroy, Lafayette.
Howe, Harvey Grant, Jr., Muncie.
Hubbard, Dennis Leroy, Gary.
Huebner, Burrel Dale, Monroeville.
Husk, Clarence Ray, Evansville.
Hutchings, David George, Anderson.
Huth, Ralph Charles, Indianapolis.
Jackson, Allen Lee, Anderson.
James, Arthur Leroy, Logansport.
Jenkins, Gerald Thomas, Evansville.
Jolley, David Marvin, Jr., Jeffersonville.
Jones, Gary Blaine, Evansville.
Jones, Jackie Dallas, Indianapolis.
Jones, Stephen Perry, Terre Haute.
Jordan, Daniel Walter, Griffith.
Joseph, Ronald Ray, Gary.
Kail, Robert Morton, Monroe City.
Katrenics, James Noel, Gary.
Katzenberger, Raymond L., Indianapolis.
Kellems, Raymond Earl, Cannelton.
King, John Edward, Fort Wayne.
Koch, Thomas Michael, Evansville.
Kraft, Michael Eugene, Evansville.
Kros, Roger Allen, Lake Village.
Kurtz, Robert Warner, Culver.
Laier, Stephen Eugene, Fort Wayne.
Lane, Leonard Francis, Rensselaer.
Law, James Douglas, Indianapolis.
Lawson, Roger W., Kimmell.
Locke, Jack Elsworth, Gary.
Logan, Ronnie Lee, Indianapolis.
Lynch, Richard E., Crawfordsville.
Mallory, William Earl, Jr., Indianapolis.
Maloy, Terry Lee, Royal Center.
Martz, Daniel Morris, Jr., Michigan City.
McDaniel, Wayne Ivan, Boswell.
McDaniels, Charles Albert, Evansville.
McFetridge, Gary Clayton, Wheatland.
McGee, Richard Wayne, Gary.
Meneely, Herman Richard, Terre Haute.
Metsker, Thomas Curtis, Indianapolis.
Meyers, David Lee, Milan.

INDIANA—continued

Army

Middleton, James Edward, Grandview.
Miller, Daryl L., Muncie.
Miller, Edward Clinton, Indianapolis.
Miller, Everett Gene, Wabash.
Miller, George Daniel, Indianapolis.
Miller, Ivan Dean, Jr., Ft. Wayne.
Miller, Michael J., Peru.
Mills, Dale Edward, Columbia City.
Mincks, Jimmie Lee, New Castle.
Minton, Bobby, Elizabeth.
Mitchell, Horace Gibbs, Jr., Indianapolis.
Moore, Fred, Jr., Sharpsville.
Moore, Ralph Edward, Indianapolis.
Morford, Loren Lee, North Manchester.
Morrell, Dennis Richard, Fort Wayne.
Mundy, Harold Eugene, Indianapolis.
Musselman, Robert Eugene, Richmond.
Nash, John M., Tipton.
Neeley, Dennis Paul, Indianapolis.
Nevin, Patrick Christopher, East Chicago.
Nichols, Joseph David, Jr., Gary.
Noe, Floyd Russell, Huntington.
Nunley, James E., Gary.
Odler, Steven Kent, Fort Wayne.
Oglesby, Charles Doyle, Evansville.
Orcutt, Larry Lee, Indianapolis.
Osborn, William Chester, Tipton.
Osborne, George, Gary.
Owens, Benn, Indianapolis.
Panula, Reino Arne, Columbia City.
Parrett, James Ray, Columbia City.
Phillips, Carl Wayne, Indianapolis.
Pierce, Richard A., Monroeville.
Pinkerton, Lloyd D., Huntington.
Priesthoff, Thomas Eugene, Logansport.
Pugh, Michael Lee, Indianapolis.
Ragle, James William, Velpen.
Reed, Phillip Eugene, Yorktown.
Reynolds, Jay Willard, Indianapolis.
Richardson, William H., Jr., Terre Haute.
Roark, Roy Rogers, Indianapolis.
Robbins, Hugh Miller, Denver.
Robertson, Andrew James, Gary.
Robinson, Charles Harvey, Elkhart.
Roseberry, Roger Duane, Hebron.
Rothenbuhler, Lynn Harley, Fort Wayne.
Rothring, Howard Earl, Jr., Crothersville.
Sabens, Jerry Dean, Salem.
Saylor, Charles Duane, Muncie.
Scheiber, Richard Alan, Huntington.
Scolley, Benjamin Elmer, Sheridan.
Scott, David Amos, Marion.
Sechrest, James Ronald, Hammond.
Sherman, Harley Edward, Bloomfield.
Skaggs, Lonnie G., Gary.
Slater, Kenneth Eugene, Evansville.
Slavens, Wendell Lee, Oxford.
Sloan, George Michael, New Castle.
Smith, Clifford, Indianapolis.
Smith, Leslie R., Indianapolis.
Snead, Walter Murrell, Indianapolis.
South, Oswald Clayton, Jr., Muncie.
Spicer, Jerry Louis, Kokomo.
Stamper, Frank Raymond, New Albany.
Stebbins, Hardy Wesley, Jr., Mishawaka.
Stevens, Gary Lynn, East Gary.
Stofko, Steven Michael, Highland.
Stotler, Larry Paul, Evansville.
Strange, Paul Robert Mack, Ogden Dunes.
Sutt, George Steven, Indianapolis.
Taylor, James Edward, Indianapolis.
Taylor, Robert Eugene, Warsaw.
Terhune, Charles Patrick, Indianapolis.
Thompson, Harry Stewart, Indianapolis.
Tolbert, Paul Edward, Williams.
Tuholski, Gregory Allen, Rolling Prairie.
Tungate, David Jessee, Indianapolis.
Uncapher, Valentine Daniel, Hartford City.
Utter, James Robert, Rochester.
Van Alstine, Merle O., Fort Wayne.
Van Driessche, John, Mishawaka.
Van Sessen, Ronald A., Crown Point Lake.
Vega, Antonio, Gary.
Venekamp, Phillip Robert, Valparaiso.
Wages, Jesse Floyd, Richmond.
Wallace, William Robert, Fort Wayne.
Walters, Kenneth Lee, Bloomington.
Warren, James Robert, Jr., Indianapolis.
Weber, Terry Lee, Albion.

INDIANA—continued

Army

Weiss, Stephen Lee, Fort Wayne.
Wenzel, James Edward, East Chicago.
White, Marvin Ray, Rochester.
Wilkerson, Charles Robert, Anderson.
Wilson, Bobby Joe, Indianapolis.
Wilson, Donald Maurice, Evansville.
Winters, Gene Talbert, Osgood.
Woods, Alvin, Richard, Jr., Washington.
Woodsmall, Max Marvin, Elnora.
Workman, James Arnold, Bloomington.
Wright, Terry Tim, Fort Wayne.

Air Force

Barnett, Clifford C., Jr., Hobart.
Cogdell, William Keith, Greentown.
Hills, John Russell, South Bend.
Hitchcock, Lee Charl, South Bend.
Hosea, William Hadley, Acton.
Jacobs, John Charles, Milhousen.
Klute, Karl Edwin, Richmond.
Long, Robert Lynne, Plymouth.
Mann, Robert Lee, Lafayette.
McKinney, Neil Bernard, Muncie.
Rogers, Charles Edward, Gary.
Shank, Edwin Gerald, Jr., Winamac.
Skoro, John Peter, Jr., Gary.

Marine Corps

Barker, John Wayne, Coal City.
Basham, James Darryl, Lafayette.
Black, Mark Ryan, Sweetser.
Bloom, Steven Gary, Elkhart.
Blystone, Thomas Michael, Gary.
Boice, Larry Lee, Bryant.
Bolton, Dennis Opal, Bedford.
Bonds, Byron Dean, Evansville.
Brandenburg, Verlin Richard, Laurel.
Brix, Robert Carl, Crown Point.
Brown, David Grant, Whitting.
Brown, Tom Willie, Gary.
Bryan, John Allen, Portland.
Brown, David Grant, Whiting.
Burns, Morris Eugene, Monticello.
Butler, Robert Herman, Jr., Indianapolis.
Carey, Thomas Joseph, Muncie.
Carmichael, Dale Eugene, Freetown.
Carroll, Manuel Leroy, Fort Wayne.
Chaffin, Donald Alan, Fort Wayne.
Chapel, Hosy, Indianapolis.
Chomel, Charles Dennis, Columbus.
Clark, Robert Nelson, Jr., Indianapolis.
Clester, Douglas Arthur, Kokomo.
Colvin, David, Indianapolis.
Cook, John Dale, Paoli.
Cooley, Ronald Marvin, Goodland.
Crane, Donald Leonard, Indianapolis.
Cripe, Tommie Max, Russiaville.
Cross, Larry Edward, Indianapolis.
Czarny, William Eugene, Hammond.
Daugherty, William Stanley, Evansville.
Denning, Thomas George, Laurenceburg.
Denny, David Lester, Indianapolis.
Depp, Charles William, Indianapolis.
Dixon, David Lee, Marion.
Doades, Floyd Eugene, Decatur.
Ducat, Phillip Allen, Fort Wayne.
Egly, Shelly, Fort Wayne.
Egolf, Rodger Lee, Columbia City.
Ellenberger, Carey Wayne, Bluffton.
Ellis, Herman, Jr., Indianapolis.
Fears, Thomas Jefferson, Marion.
Forney, Alvin Carver, Indianapolis.
Fraley, Gary Thomas, Fremont
Free, Lawrence Cameron, Michigan City.
Garrett, David Frank, Evansville.
Gettings, Guy Clifton, Jeffersonville.
Gil, Cornel, East Chicago.
Glassburn, Marvin Edward, Marion.
Godsey, Danny Ray, Indianapolis.
Goff, Charles Mitchell, Indianapolis.
Gomez, Harold, East Chicago.
Hall, David Emerson, Evansville.
Hall, Ronnie Elmon, Fort Wayne.
Hamilton, Michael George, Indianapolis.
Hap, Edward Frank, East Chicago.
Harper, Donald Eugene, Jr., Michigan City
Harrell, James Elmore, Courtland.
Hastreiter, Richard James, Rome City.
Hearn, Kenneth Lee, Indianapolis.
Henninger, Johnie Michael, Rome City.

INDIANA—continued

Marine Corps

Henry, Donald Ray, Dillsboro.
Hicks, Carman Keeton, Anderson.
Hill, Dennis Eugene, Frankfort.
Himes, Stephen Carl, Fort Wayne.
Hines, Terri Liegh, Richmond.
Hornby, David Eugene, Oakland City.
Huffer, Kenneth Kipling, Kempton.
Hunt, William Larrie, Indianapolis.
Ingalls, Benjamin Harrison, Austin.
Jankowski, Larry Floyd, South Bend.
Jones, Clarence Edward, Jr., Indianapolis.
Justis, Ronald Henry, Selma.
Kalil, James Noble, Oscedla.
Kappmeyer, Paul Joseph, Indianapolis.
Keeler, James Edmund, Hammond.
Kerney, John Oscar, Evansville.
Kindt, Thomas Patrick, Indianapolis.
Kistler, James Leroy, Logansport.
Kitts, Mario Clayton, Fort Wayne.
Kraus, Ronald Calvin, Grand View.
Kurdelski, James Howard, Indianapolis.
Laraway, William Dean, Seymour.
Leach, Terry Virgil, Marion.
Lirot, Charles Patrick, Bloomington.
Lopez, Robert, Gary.
Lusk, Bernard Merle, Hamming.
Lutgen, Chester Arthur, Lowell.
Mallon, James Joseph, Jr., Indianapolis.
Markowski, Henry Joseph, Jr., Hammond.
Marquardt, Merlin Eugene, Fort Wayne.
McCray, Gregory, Indianapolis.
Mielke, Bruce Edward, Evansville.
Miller, Burrnon, Elihue, Indianapolis.
Miller, Earl David, Garrett.
Miller, Russell Perry, South Bend.
Minix, Clyde, North Judson.
Mock, Joel William, East Gary.
Moore, Leonard Irvin, Hanover.
Morales, Victor, Gary.
Morris, Larry Lee, Gas City.
Muller, Stephen Peter, Indianapolis.
Mullet, Steven James, Hobart.
Myers, Pearl Wayne, Terre Haute.
Myers, William Henry, Salem.
Nash, George Alfred, Jr., Valparaiso.
Overpeck, James Harley, Rockville.
Paul, James Richard, Huntington.
Pavey, Chester Raymond, Anderson.
Polich, David William, East Chicago.
Porteous, Robert Richard, Indianapolis.
Priest, Terrence Lee, Fort Wayne.
Ramberger, Jerry Ray, Rockport.
Read, Alan Thomas, Bloomington.
Reasoner, David Lee, Yorktown.
Redic, Terry Pete, Anderson.
Reynolds, Jackie Dean, Seymour.
Reynolds, James Derek, Muncie.
Reynolds, Robert Lee, Jr., Lebanon.
Riggle, Mark Anthony, Mishawaka.
Riggs, Donald Stephen, Owensville.
Roseman, Michael Dennis, Indianapolis.
Ross, Robert James, Vincennes.
Runyon, Steven Thomas, Kokomo.
Salyer, Billy Ray, Silver Lake.
Saunders, Ralf Irvin, Hobart.
Scisney, Michael Lynn, Indianapolis.
Scofield, Robert Lee, Bedford.
Scott, Kenneth Leroy, Michigan City.
Shekell, Steven Edward, Daleville.
Sherels, Curley Jr., Indianapolis.
Sigsbee, Michael James, Elkhart.
Sink, Melvin Francis, Indianapolis.
Sipple, Conrad Alan, Salem.
Skinner, David Lee, Walkerton.
Smith, Ivan Ray, Indianapolis.
Smith, Larry Michael, Martinsville.
Smith, Lynn Leroy, Walkerton.
Southern, Rickey Dale, Ellettsville.
Spencer, Jerry Lee, Gary.
Stath, Allen, Wayne, Rensselaer.
Steffus, Gary Paul, Gary.
Stults, Eveans Jerry, South Bend.
Tosh, Michael Clay, Muncie.
Traughber, Stephen Lee, New Albany.
Travis, Edmund Burke, Sweetser.
Vannatta, Jon David, Richmond.
Wardrop, Thomas, III, Huntington.
Wayman, Bobby Ray, Huntingburg.
Wessel, Richard, Indianapolis.

INDIANA—continued

Marine Corps

Wiles, Terry Lee, Richmond.
Wilfong, Robert Wesley, South Whitley.
Williams, Leroy Walter, Indianapolis.
Wilsford, Michael Stephen, Muncie.
Wolfington, Richard, Jr., Indianapolis.
Wright, Fred Youel, Jr., Muncie.
Yoder, Bruce Allen, Kokomo.
Zimmerman, Edward C., Jr., Muncie.

Navy

Acton, David August, Bedford.
Chapman, John Roy, Washington.
Drohosky, Edward Daniel, Gary.
Heath, Lloyd Lavern, Bicknell.
Kauffman, Michael M., II, Goshen.
Knochel, Charles Allen, Lafayette.
Lambton, Bennie Richard, Indianapolis.
Miller, Tommy Roger, Laketon.
Parker, Thomas Aquinas, Oxford.
Townsend, James Lee, Indianapolis.

IOWA

Army

Anderson, Larry Michael, Spencer.
Antill, Michael Evan, Huxley.
Astley, John Michael, Des Moines.
Bass, Charles William, Winterset.
Benson, Dale Earl, Tama.
Blackman, Larry Paul, Denison.
Blewett, Roy Roger, Dubuque.
Boeshart, Richard Joseph, Sioux City.
Brendel, Larry William, Muscatine.
Brown, Dennis Edward, Sioux City.
Bruce, Denny Lowell, Aurelia.
Cason, William Arnold, Ira Grove.
Chandler, Connie Leroy, Des Moines.
Collins, Jack Larell, Melbourne.
Cunningham, James Leon, Des Moines.
Deyo, Robert Wilbur, Jr., Waterloo.
Driskell, Larry Ray, Riverton.
English, Mark Leo, Cedar Rapids.
Ferris, Delmer Lee, Mapleton.
Fettkether, Gerald Thomas, Jesup.
Fleetwood, Donald Louis, Davenport.
Fogarty, George Allen, Marion.
Foster, Jimmie Lee, Bettendorf.
Fuller, Michael David, Des Moines.
Gerken, Ralph Bernard, Winthrop.
Gilbert, Harvey Woodford, Marshall Town.
Grethen, Galen Dean, Emmetsburg.
Halley, Russell Louis, Waterloo.
Hamilton, Paul George, Jr., Des Moines.
Harrell, Don Clair, Winterset.
Hasper, Charles Martin, Keokuk.
Hass, Stephen Craig, Gladbrook.
Hibbs, Robert John, Cedar Falls.
Hieber, Jack Jean, Battle Creek.
Holland, Douglas C., Anita.
Holm, Donald Henry, Fort Dodge.
Houg, Douglas Duane, McGregor.
Houston, J. H., Shenandoah.
Hurley, Ailey Berdean, Montezuma.
Jackson, Dean Alfred, Morning Sun.
James, Jack Llewellyn, Mason City.
Jensen, Dennis Ray, Council Bluffs.
Johnson, Ben, Jr., Pacific Junction.
Jurgens, Kenneth William, Hopkinton.
Kadous, Daryl Lee, Sibley.
Kaiser, Ronald Harry, Sioux City.
Karr, Robert Eugene, Wellman.
Keenan, Lawrence John, Ryan.
Kern, William Francis, Algona.
Knight, Raymond Henry, Council Bluffs.
Lakey, Donald Kay, Fort Dodge.
Lasche, James Alan, Ames.
Lennon, Frederick William, Sioux City.
Leonardi, Jerry Lee, Des Moines.
Limbacher, Durward Allan, Farragut.
Lockwood, John Larry, Garden Grove.
Lowe, John Christopher, Des Moines.
Mallonee, Kenneth A., Ottumwa.
Manternach, Marvin George, Manchester.
Mattheis, Denis Duane, Cresco.
McCoy, Eugene Taylor, Moulton.
Michael, David William, Oelwein.
Miles, Lynn Leroy, Des Moines.
Morris, Marshall Kenneth, Des Moines.
Murphy, Thomas Joseph, Dunkerton.
Nelson, Duane Michael, Sioux City.

IOWA—continued

Army

O'Connor, Michael Donald, Mt. Pleasant.
Palmer, Arnold Ralph, Independence.
Parish, David Leroy, Ottumwa.
Pearson, David L., Maxwell.
Phillips, Warren Everett, Oskaloosa.
Powers, James Conrad, Dubuque.
Quam, John Ellsworth, Mason City.
Raffensperger, James E., Jr., Des Moines.
Reed, Terry Joe, Spirit Lake.
Reeves, Loren Steven, Des Moines.
Rogers, George Patrick, Bettendorf.
Rohlfsen, Lyle Ervin, Eldora.
Schultz, Michael Douglas, Sanborn.
Schwerdtfeger, Joseph Alle, Davenport.
Scott, Larry Robert, Hawarden.
Sells, Robert Dee, Jr., Central City.
Sissel, Charles Edward, Kellerton.
Siverly, David Lee, Oakville.
Smith, Charles Wendle, Tabor.
Stubblefield, Kenneth, Jr., Clinton.
Teatsworth, Garrel Lee, Keokuk.
Thompson, Donald Wayne, Montezuma.
Utter, Michael Joseph, Davenport.
Van Ballegooyen, Robert Jr., Ireton.
Voss, Robert J., Davenport.
Ward, Eugene Ambrose, Oelwein.
Waterman, Dennis Walter, Logan.
Wehrhein, Richard Joseph, Des Moines.
West, Grayson Jerald, Webster City.
Widtfeldt, Paul Frank, Jr., Council Bluffs.
Wohlford, Lloyd Cyrus, Jr., Des Moines.
Youngbear, Richard Clive, Tama.

Air Force

Brown, Gene Wesley, Boone.
Griffey, Terrence Hastings, Fort Dodge.
Holt, Marshall Myron, Jr., Des Moines.
Horsky, Robert Milvoy, Cedar Rapids.
Jacobsen, Donald Leroy, Ida Grove.
Moneysmith, Harold Dean, Knoxville.
Smith, Jerome Joseph, Riceville.

Marine Corps

Alsted, Stephen Paul, Des Moines.
Avery, Allen James, Sumner.
Balfour, William Jay, Toledo.
Barta, Robert Charles, Norway.
Bilden, Harlan Tilpher, Elgin.
Bleeker, Larry Dean, Ames.
Borschel, Larry Dean, Iowa Falls.
Carlson, Dennis Allen, Charles City.
Cesar, Richard Allen, Corydon.
Cook, Peter Everett, Dubuque.
Cooley, Louis Newton, Jr., Council Bluffs.
Cousins, Merritt Thomas, Clinton.
Deaver, Frederick Kenneth, Boone.
Dewitt, David Charles, Clinton.
Dines, Jeffrey Thomas, Waterloo.
Fagerlind, Merle Keith, Jr., Waterloo.
Fisch, David Alan, Remsen.
Foell, Gerald Lloyd, Plymouth.
Freestone, William Fredric, Des Moines.
Friese, Willard John, Washington.
Gertsen, Roger Lee, Coulter.
Glenn, Dennis Ray, Estherville.
Gradoville, Charles Edward, Cedar Rapids.
Gray, Paul Houston, Sergeant Bluff.
Green, James Edward, Waterloo.
Grego, Phillip Harry, Council Bluffs.
Hagedorn, Lawrence Raymond, Carroll.
Hall, Ricky Gene, Burlington.
Harris, Robert Ernest, Sioux City.
Hatcher, Jerry Dean, Humboldt.
Hipkins, Colin Keith, Van Horne.
Jameson, Larry Duane, Cantril.
Johnson, Ronald Eugene, Vinton.
Johnston, Charles W., Jr., Des Moines.
Joosten, Curtis Charles, Pella.
Juergens, William Owen, Dubuque.
Kaster, Jerry Lee, Des Moines.
Keehner, Carrol Gene, Volga.
Killen, John Dewey, III, Des Moines.
Kirchoff, Wilbur Glen, Marcus.
Klootwyk, Robert Ivan, Knoxville.
Koehler, Nicholas Ray, Mason City.
Laird, James Bryon, Davenport.
McBeth, Robert Steven, Des Moines.
McNamara, Donald Woodward, Northwood.
McQuinn, Leonard Lloyd, Jr., Council Bluffs.

IOWA—continued

Marine Corps

Meyer, Ronald William, Dubuque.
Moore, Gary Lee, Lineville.
Morse, Charles Allen, Davenport.
Musch, David Ira, Waterloo.
Nehring, Larry Joseph, Des Moines.
O'Dell, Dennis Lynn, Fairfield.
Olsen, Carl John, Davenport.
Olsen, Dennis Gale, Yale.
Paulsen, David Henry, Waterloo.
Payne, Richard Joseph, Quasqueton.
Perez, Ernesto, Rake.
Petersen, Mark Carson, Pierson.
Rath, Gary Keith, Davenport.
Reece, Howard Wayne, Shannon City.
Reed, Wayne Francis, Crescent.
Rees, William Edward, Anamosa.
Revland, Rickey Don, Garner.
Roberts, Terry, Ottumwa.
Schumacher, Donald Eugene, Lacona.
Scott, Kennetth Keith, Sioux City.
Setka, Stanton James, Riceville.
Simmons, Norbert Gene, Davenport.
Small, Vernard Jay, Akron.
Stein, Ronald Marvin, Waterloo.
Stoltenberg, Reid William, Bettendorf.
Stoltenburg, Mark Ernest, Clinton.
Straudovskis, John, Lost Nation.
Vanatta, Randall Allen, Thurman.
Wall, John Walter, Cedar Rapids.
Weber, Dennis Lee, Mechanicsville.
White, Allen Joseph, Delhi.
Williams, Gary Lynn, Glenwood.
Zahn, Leland Dale, Harris.
Zinnel, Herbert Owen, Jr., Dakota City.

Navy

Christiansen, John E., Jr., Durant.
Clemens, Michael Joseph, Dubuque.
Egbert, Dale Edward, Des Moines.
Feltner, Gerald Lee, Carroll.
Haskins, Donald Dean, Audubon.
Leazer, Terry Franklin, Seymour.
McGrane, Donald Paul, Waverly.
McKeen, Gerald Claude, Sac City.
Peddicord, Donald Glenn, Des Moines.
Sears, Steven Dwight, High View.
Sutherland, Richard Eugene, Dubuque.
Westly, Cyril Jeffrey, Manly.
Williams, Dennis Neil, Gilman.

KANSAS

Army

Acheson, Charles Ralph, Palco.
Amerine, Kent L., Great Bend.
Arb, Francis Loren, Melvern.
Arbuthnot, James Malcolm, Prairie Village.
Balentine, Roland, Jr., Kansas City.
Ball, Merlin Eugene, Garden City.
Bannon, Gary Clifford, Leon.
Bryant, Bobby Ray, Wichita.
Buckridge, Marvin Douglas, Emporia.
Butts, Darrell Wayne, Wichita.
Clark, Timothy Richard, Kansas City.
Coe, Kenneth Eugene, Anthony.
Corcoran, Bruce Anthony, Oberlin.
Costello, Lawrence R., Kansas City.
Courtney, James Ira, Kansas City.
Darty, Omer Gene, Fort Riley.
Dickinson, Daniel Albert, Wichita.
Eldridge, James Wilbur, Nicherson.
Evans, Gerald Bruce, Junction City.
Everhart, William Joseph, Canton.
Finch, John Webster, Arkansas City.
Fisher, Henry Lee, Haven.
Founds, Gerald Dean, Frankfort.
Gentry, Henry, Jr., Wichita.
Gibson, David Parker, Lawrence.
Godsey, James Frederick, Humboldt.
Goodwin, Bob Jack, Wichita.
Gordon, John Swain, North Wichita.
Greer, Charles Robert, Thayer.
Gretencord, Dean Lee, Richmond.
Griffith, Keith D., Hutchinson.
Guyer, Albert Marshall, Kansas City.
Hawthorne, William Allen, Eureka.
Hayes, George E., Williamstown.
Hays, Clifton Walter, Waldo.
Hemmingway, Charles Lynn, Dodge City.
Hoeme, Forrest Dean, Preston.
Holcomb, Rebel Lee, Wichita.

KANSAS—continued

Army

Holroyd, James Lawrence, Roeland Park.
Holt, Allen Lee, Topeka.
Hutton, Earl Dewitt, La Harpe.
Johnson, Charles Franklin, Hutchinson.
Jones, Merle Eldon, Lincoln.
Keck, Warren Edward, Kansas City.
Kenaga, Gary Lyle, Wichita.
Kier, Charles Richard, Mound Valley.
Kimmel, Robert Gene, Topeka.
Little, Gary Dean, Leavenworth.
Long, Eldon Dale, Liberal.
Lukert, Edward Roy, Fairview.
MacDonald, Allan Herbert, Overland Park.
McGovern, Jerome George, Topeka.
Morgan, Leland Ray, Wichita.
Mott, John Arthur, Iola.
Murray, Carl Eugene, Topeka.
Northrop, James Leeroy, Newton.
O'Neil, Riley Charles, Jr., Kansas City.
Pacheco, Felix, Kansas City.
Parker, Harvey R., Fulton.
Perryman, Ronald Glen, Wichita.
Petty, John Cable, II, Larned.
Pointing, John L., Emporia.
Ponting, Wayne Douglas, Garden City.
Rager, William Earl, Abilene.
Redmond, Ralph George, Topeka.
Reissig, Larry Leroy, Assaria.
Reukauf, Lee Edward, Kansas City.
Rigby, Olis Ray, Hays.
Ryan, Delbert Leroy, Lawrence.
Sanchez, Frankie, Dodge City.
Schalipp, Murvin, Jr., Leavenworth.
Sherman, Daniel L., Overland Park.
Singerhouse, Robert Allen, Junction City.
Sorensen, Kenneth Lee, Kansas City.
Stahl, Edward Arnold, Westphalia.
Straub, Conrad Francis, Claflin.
Sullivan, Michael James, Weir.
Szijjarto, Stephen Joseph, Wamego.
Thompson, Richard W., Atchison.
Viegra, Luz, Larned.
Watts, Larry Dean, Coffeyville.
Webb, Gary Alan, Wakeeney.
Weis, Kenneth D., Salina.
West, John Michael, Medicine Lodge.
Winningham, Clifton, Junction City.
Wiswell, Sammy Ray, Ottawa.

Air Force

Davis, James Thomas, Hugoton.
Fearno, Joseph Barnett, Coolidge.
Goudy, Richard Lee, Sharon Springs.
Halbower, Harlow Kenneth, Anthony.
Leftwich, Raymond Francis, Fort Scott.
Schultz, William Lee, Chanute.
Thompson, Cecil Truman, Sebatha.
Windle, Paul Ralph, Mullinville.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Alfred Earl, Sunflower.
Beller, William Russell, Jr., Salina.
Bennefeld, Steven Henry, Girard.
Buchanan, Jack Lynn, Wichita.
Cooper, James Raymond, Lawrence.
Copeland, William E., II, Eskridge.
Craig, Jimmy Leon, Mulvane.
Craig, Rex Lee, Kansas City.
Daniels, James Michael, Wichita.
Davis, Emmett Ray, Kansas City.
Delaughder, David Lee, Augusta.
Derritt, Eddie Ray, Leavenworth.
Dillon, Donald Eugene, Lawrence.
Eckhart, Russ Eugene, Norcatur.
Elgaard, Robert James, Wichita.
Fonseca, Michael Jemore, Gardner.
Glaze, Kenneth Lee, Hutchinson.
Graber, John Allen, Jr., Wichita.
Gurtler, Charles Ronald, Wichita.
Hendrickson, Gary Arland, Ottawa.
Hines, Philip Blaine, Galena.
Johnson, Jimmie Le Roy, Ottawa.
Karlin, Donald Dean, Wichita.
Lake, Lloyd Dean, Salina.
Larrabee, Floyd Michael, Olathe.
Lewis, Donald Allen, Eureka.
Malone, Robert Gary, Wichita.
Martinez, Peter, Arkansas City.
McKinnell, Richard Lee, Wichita.
Moore, Billy Ray, Kansas City.

KANSAS—continued

Marine Corps

Mortiboy, William Shelton, Overland Park.
Munday, Phillip Dean, Wichita.
Nail, Gary Dean, Salina.
O'Brien, Patrick Edward, Liberal.
Ortega, Ernest, Wichita.
Parsons, Gary Reed, Topeka.
Payne, Richard Norman, Topeka.
Payne, Robert Elgin, Gueda Springs.
Phillips, Jack Warren, Mission.
Pulliam, Dale Allan, Wichita.
Reid, James Edward, Wichita.
Riedel, Robert Eugene, Hoisington.
Rosales, Martin Angel, Bethel.
Royston, Louis Don, Jr., Wichita.
Samuels, George Leroy, Eureka.
Sasek, Richard John, Topeka.
Shambaugh, Dale K., Topeka.
Swender, Jack Shivly, Kansas City.
Thoennes, Michael Walter, Leawood.
Trube, Delbert Leroy, Jr., Burdick.
Velasquez, David Robert, Gardner.
Welch, Jodie Varner, Jr., Kansas City.
Welchel, Russell Desmond, Liberal.
Westphal, Jereld Eugene, Bethel.
Wheeler, Morris Craig, Muncie.
White, Glenn Earl, Wichita.
Williams, Billie Joe, Kansas City.
Wright, Richard Hugh, Halstead.
Wyrick, Michael Allen, Edwardsville.

Navy

Alderman, Andrew Albert, Coffeyville.
Christian, David Marion, Lane.
Dennis, William R., III, Lawrence.
Hines, Phillip Mason, Dodge City.
Krig, David Lee, Lindsborg.
Newman, Jerry Lee, Agenda.
Patterson, Jerome Dean, Pleasanton.
Rudisill, Dayton Luther, Greensburg.
Tiderman, John Mark, Kansas City.
Whinery, Roger Lee, Fredonia.

KENTUCKY

Army

Abel, Charles Seaborn, Hopkinsville.
Adams, Emmitt Colon, Isom.
Allen, Kenneth, Berea.
Alvey, Ronald Louis, Louisville.
Anderson, Ronnie Coleman, Russell Springs.
Atcher, Harold Allen, Radcliff.
Babbage, Ewing Cottrell, Hopkinsville.
Baggarly, Jimmy Ray, Stanley.
Bailey, Joseph Daniel, Fort Campbell.
Barker, Floyd, Jr., Winchester.
Barrett, William Kathman, Lexington.
Barrick, Benjamin Luther, Shelbyville.
Beasley, Donnie Ray, Versailles.
Bellamy, Wesley Earl, Catlettsburg.
Boren, Jimmy Floyd, Cadiz.
Bradford, Charles Marshall, Newport.
Bray, Ervil Thomas, Somerset.
Brightman, Harry Phillip, Louisville.
Brock, Arnold Lee, Kettle Island.
Brown, Darius E., Beattyville.
Brown, Theodore, Lejunior.
Burkhead, Danny Dale, Taylorsville.
Burns, Ervin L., Providence.
Campbell, Andrew J., Langley.
Campbell, Leonard Wayne, Jeffersonville.
Carr, Benny Gillis, Corbin.
Caudill, Orville, London.
Caudill, Roger Dale, Whitesburg.
Centers, William P., Jr., Lexington.
Chambers, Harvey Robert, Jr., Leitchfield.
Coleman, Phillip Rodney, Wayland.
Collins, Elzie J., Jr., Williamsport.
Combs, Charles, Hazard.
Conley, Billy Gene, Flemingsburg.
Conner, Roger Leroy, Dunnville.
Coon, James Thomas, Owensboro.
Cooper, Roger Dale, Fordsville.
Cotten, James L., Jr., Oak Grove.
Cox, Chester Garvis, Lawrenceburg.
Dailey, James Albert, Moorefield.
Davis, Robert Lewis, Providence.
Dickerson, George Everett, Grayson.
Dishman, William Andrew, Jefferson.
Doss, Raymond, Totz.
Duncan, Donald Robert, Morning View.

XUM

KENTUCKY—continued

Army

Duncan, Kenneth Eugene, Henderson.
Duncan, William M. Louisville.
Dunford, Frank Bellew, III, Covington.
Dusch, Paris Dale, Carrollton.
Eden, Chester Wade, Carter County.
Emerson, Robert Loyd, Mayfield.
Evans, Waddel, Hopkinsville.
Fain, James Leonard, Ashland.
Fee, Philyaw, Roark.
Fitzgerald, John W., Jr., Louisville.
Flammer, Timothy Matthew, Elsmere.
Fleming, William Gordon, Jr., Mayfield.
Flynn, Jimmy Edwin, Somerset.
Ford, Raymond Lee, Owensboro.
Ford, Raymond Sylvester, Bardstown.
Foreman, Bobby Lee, Lexington.
Fraley, William Clifford, Ashland.
Gibson, Stevie Ray, Roxana.
Gillespie, Roy Painter, Paintsville.
Gray, Walter Ray, Big Clifty.
Hall, Brownie, Deane.
Hall, Clarence, Newport.
Hamm, John William, Lexington.
Hampton, John Edison, Whitesburg.
Harmon, Ray Melvin, Fleminsburg.
Harris, Jimmy, Beattyville.
Harris, Michael R., Jr., Hopkinsville.
Hawkins, Gary Wayne, Louisville.
Hayes, Bobby Lee, Bowling Green.
Hicks, Charles Lee, Hazard.
Hogan, William Francis, Jr., Lexington.
Hogge, Michael Lee, Load.
Holland, Willie J., Carlisle.
Hoosier, Roger Keith, Campbellsville.
Horn, Jacob Andrew, Inez.
Hughes, Francis Allen, Paris.
Humphrey, Carl A., Jeffersontown.
Ison, Arnold E., Viper.
Jackson, James Charles, Oil Springs.
Jamrozy, Stanley Michael, Louisville.
Jennings, Bobby John, Sturgis.
Jewell, David Preston, Owensboro.
Johnson, Paul Edward, Lookout.
Jones, Dwight Dale, Morehead.
Jones, Freddie David, Sr., Louisville.
Juett, William Lee, Owenton.
Kemp, Mitchell Lynn, Hickman.
Kirn, James Edward, Glasgow.
Lane, Ernest Edward, Jr., Kyrock.
Lawrence, Bobby Joe., Mayfield.
Lawson, Freddie Don, Siler.
Lee, Ewell, Jr., Liberty.
Lewis, Charles Rates, Owensboro.
Loper, Miles Hilton, Jr., Fort Knox.
Lopez, Rene Cerda, Fort Campbell.
Lyon, Frank Elliot, Louisville.
Malapelli, John Wayne, Burlington.
Masterson, Robert Allen, Jefferson.
McCormick, Carl Philip, Ashland.
McGaughey, Paul, Jr., Louisville.
McGuire, Jeffrey Duron, Louisville.
McKee, Milford Gerald, Sloans Valley.
McKee, Robert Earl, Eminence.
McMillan, Donald Franklin, Hopkinsville.
McNay, Guy Eckman, Jr., Erlanger.
McNew, Ralph Dennis, Lily.
Meece, Mac Hughlen, Drum.
Mesarosh, Donald Earl, Louisville.
Mikesell, Ronald Lee, Louisville.
Miles, David Lee, Corbin.
Millay, Charles Francis, Philpot.
Miller, Donald Wayne, Alexandria.
Miller, Joseph Loran, Hopkinsville.
Miller, Michael Lee, Henderson.
Milligan, James Eldrie, Pleasure Ridge Park.
Mollette, James Ronnie, Whitehouse.
Montgomery, Owen Raymond, Lost Creek.
Mosier, Robert Sherman, Louisville.
Mueller, Carl William, Covington.
Naylor, Eugene, Lancaster.
Naylor, Raymond Luke, Lancaster.
Neace, Dennie, Bonnyman.
Nunn, Charles Robert, Henderson.
Patrick, Billy Ray, Hazard.
Patrick, Bobby Gene, Quicksand.
Paul, Clyde Evertte, Jr., Tilford.
Pendygraft, George R., Lebanon.
Pickett, Kenneth Walter, Glasgow.
Poland, Harry Turner, Tompkinsville.

KENTUCKY—continued

Army

Polson, Edward Lee, Eubank.
Prater, Harvey William, Louisville.
Presson, Billie Taylor, Paducah.
Price, Bobby Wayne, Mount Vernon.
Price, William Joseph, Louisville.
Pruitt, James Elmer, Kenvir.
Pryor, Ernest Paul, Louisville.
Radcliff, Donald Gordon, Louisville.
Rankin, Donald Irvin, New Carlisle.
Rankin, Edward Lee, La Grange.
Reed, Larry, Hopkinsville.
Reed, Ottis, Meta.
Rice, Johnnie Edward, Jr., Freeburn.
Robb, Richard Albert, Louisville.
Roberts, Jerry Ardell, Cerulean.
Robertson, Roy Allen, Jr., Danville.
Roden, George Columbus, Jr., Hebron.
Rogers, Charles Lee, Louisville.
Rowland, George, Jr., Hustonville.
Rush, Kenneth, Louisville.
Sams, Richard Barry, Southgate.
Sanders, Elzie, Jr., Smiths Grove.
Sawyer, Frank W., Jr., Louisville.
Sayers, Larry Vencil, Lick Creek.
Scherle, William Joseph, Jr., Louisville.
Sears, Earnest G., Alcalde.
Senters, Bobby, Ashland.
Senters, Carles Donald, Ashland.
Sester, Eugene, Fall Rock.
Shellman, Vernon Lindly, Stephensport.
Shufflitt, Kenneth Len, Pleasure Ridge.
Sickles, Robert T., Richmond.
Silbersack, Ronald Vincent, Cold Spring.
Skaggs, Frederick Brian, Clearfield.
Slack, Denton Ray, Fordsville.
Smith, Avery Gene, Russell Springs.
Smith, Edward Arthur, Newport.
Spencer, James Price, War Creek.
Spencer, Norman, Frenchburg.
Stallings, Ronald Clark, Louisville.
Staton, Robert Gary, Salt Lick.
Stewart, David Wayne, Fountain Run.
Stewart, Manford Dalvis, Owensboro.
Strader, Charles Edward, Lexington.
Straughn, William Herschel, Westport.
Swann, Ellsworth, Louisa.
Tackett, Clarence E., Hartley.
Tharp, Claude William, Bedford.
Thayer, Thomas Edward, Jr., Louisville.
Thomas, Murrel D., Glasgow.
Thomas, Stephen Evans, Glasgow.
Tichenor, Quinn William, Louisville.
Travis, James Leonard, Jr., Shelbyville.
Trosper, Jackie Edward, Corbin.
Turner, William Coy, Chance.
Tuttle, Arlen Clifton, Fort Campbell.
Underwood, Jerry Dwayne, Louisville.
Van Hoose, Paul Edwin, Stambaugh.
Vest, David Wayne, Lexington.
Wadlington, Louis Wayne, Salem.
Wagner, Dan, Jr., Pineville.
Walker, Cecil, Manchester.
Ward, Danny Russell, Beauty.
Watkins, Billy Joe, Paducah.
Watkins, Marion, War Creek.
Watts, Aster, Laporte.
Wetmore, Douglas McArthur, Williamsburg.
White, Marcus Delmar, Berea.
Williams, Curtis John, Evarts.
Wilson, James Murl, Utica.
Wilson, Wendell Lewis, Scottsville.
Woods, Ronald Lee, Bryantsville.
Wright, Randy Blake, Elkhorn City.
Wright, William Andrew, Hopkinsville.
Wynn, Floyd, Siler.
Young, Bobby, Viper.

Air Force

Allen, Charles Franklin, II, Georgetown.
Groves, Fergus Coleman, II, Louisville.
Kelley Virgil Kinnaird, Jr., Junction City.
Lewis, Lawrence Edward, Ashland.
McNees, George William, Frankfort.
Mitchell, Carl Berg, Mount Sterling.
Morris, Walter Kenneth, Paris.
Olds, Jerry Dean, Elizabethtown.
Sayer, Albert Francis, Jr., Fort Thomas.
Swope, Charles Frederick, Newport.
Toon, Jerry Wayne, Anchorage.
Tully, William Boyd, Maysville.

KENTUCKY—continued

Marine Corps

Adamson, Frank Leslie, Dayton.
Akers, Arvel Dewit, Grethel.
Appleton, John Burdette, Louisville.
Basham, Edward Ray, Hawesville.
Birch, Larry Wayne, Stanton.
Brumagen, Arthur, Richmond.
Caller, Michael Jay, Louisville.
Clark, Lawrence Edward, Amba.
Coomes, William Michael, Madisonville.
Corey, George Edward, Mt. Sterling.
Cox, Mitchell Edward, Louisville.
Crain, Travis Glen, Louisville.
Crump, Buckner, Jr., Cadiz.
Crump, Jessie Lee, Bonnieville.
Dean, Howard Hadden, Harrodsburg.
Dobson, James Carline, Shively.
Dowell, Gary Louis, Louisville.
Dunigan, Jerry Wayne, Benton.
Duvall, Randolph, Jr., Louisville.
Eakins, Charles Adrain, Clay.
Gallagher, William Joseph, Covington.
Gayles, Lorenza, Middlesboro.
Geilen, Donatus Joseph, Covington.
Guillaume, Norman E., Jr., Louisville.
Hardin, Richard Allen, Louisville.
Harp, Thomas Alexander, Frankfort.
Harris, Kenneth Ward, Grays Knob.
Hart, William Joseph, Jr., Louisville.
Hightower, James Larry, Brownsville.
Holland, Vernon Edward, Lexington.
Howard, Leon Gaye, Lytten.
Huckleberry, James Robert, Jeffersontown.
Hughes, Mitchell, Jr., Louisville.
James, Lee Roy, Louisville.
Jordan, Gary Stephen, Newport.
King, Billy Brown, Elizabethtown.
Lovelace, Robert Kenneth, Taylor.
Lyons, Montague, Walton.
Mefford, Bobby Ray, Russellville.
Miller, John William, Bowling Green.
Muss, Glenn David, Louisville.
Onan, Jerry Lang, Lexington.
Osborne, Charles Edward, Myra.
Pike, Donald Cleaver, Danville.
Prather, Martin William, Louisville.
Price, James Erwin, Russellville.
Price, Paul Lee, Owensboro.
Richmond, Thomas Glen, Middlesboro.
Rosser, Ernie Wayne, Maysville.
Rowlett, Jimmie Henry, Middlesboro.
Rutherford, Danny Lewis, Louisville.
Schaefer, Marvin Albert, Butler.
Scruggs, Joseph Allen, Hopkinsville.
Shoopman, Phillip Ray, Louisville.
Simpson, Danny Roy, Cardinal.
Smith, James Albert, Warsaw.
Stevenson, William Luther, Leitchfield.
Stoll, William Keen, Jr., Lexington.
Stratton, Everett, Jr., Ludlow.
Sumpter, Joseph Boyd, McRoberts.
Taylor, Lee Roy, Coalgood.
Taylor, William Russell, Bardstown.
Teague, Alonzo Allen, Middlesboro.
Tipton, Jay C., Newport.
Towater, Jerald Riley, Louisville.
Trail, Randell Gene, Owensboro.
Vanvactor, Victor Harold, Louisville.
Wagman, Nicholas Owen, Ludlow.
Weiss, Roderick Lee, Erlanger.
Wicker, Henry Ray, Lebanon.
Williams, Larry Lee, Louisville.
Young, Gary Edward, Waynesburg.

Navy

Burden, John Curtis, Madisonville.
Coomes, Joseph Anthony, Owensboro.

LOUISIANA

Army

Adam, Hosea Dennis, Monroe.
Albritton, Johnny Boyd, Farmville.
Allen, Freddie Lee, Ferriday.
Allen, Robert Clyde, Pineville.
Anthony, Carl Thomas, Springfield.
Arceneaux, Herbert John, Jr., New Orleans.
Aull, Earl Dubois, New Orleans.
Banks, Lavine John, New Orleans.
Barreto, Luis, Jr., New Orleans.
Barrett, Thomas Jefferson, Many.
Batiste, John Millian, New Orleans.

LOUISIANA—continued

Army

Bedgood, James Douglas, Goldonna.
Benjamin, Freddie James, Natchitoches.
Benjamin, Robert Lee, New Orleans.
Besson, Lawrence Eugene, Alexandria.
Bird, Kim Sovereen, Ft. Polk.
Blount, Robert Larry, Livingston.
Boudreaux, Kenneth Charles, Houma.
Boudreaux, Lee Joseph, Jr., New Orleans.
Breaux, Shelton L., Lake Charles.
Broussard, Andrew Richard, Lake Charles.
Brown, Earnest Caesar, Amite.
Brunet, Eldridge Michael, Houma.
Bryant, Emmett, Joseph, Greensburg.
Calp, Albert Franklin, De Ridder.
Carmack, John Edward, Monroe.
Carter, Milford Donavin, Haughton.
Chappell, Kenney Dean, Shreveport.
Circuti, James David, Slidell.
Cooper, Willie James, Cullen.
Cordova, James Thomas, Allt, Zwolle.
Cornett, Donald C., Lake Charles.
Crocker, Donald Jack, Monroe.
Crow, David Lynn, Coushatta.
Cutrer, Marvin Eugene, New Orleans.
Daigle, Bradley Timothy, Morgan City.
Daigle, Joseph Dewey, Marrero.
Daniels, Carl Stephen, New Orleans.
Davis, Harris Vonzell, Monroe.
De Jean, Charles Oden, III, Port Barre.
Delrie, James Edward, Homer.
Desselle, Richard Jude, Moreauville.
Dix, Stanley Wesley, New Orleans.
Doty, Charles, Natchitoches.
Dunn, Lessell, Jr., Monroe.
Duplessis, George Lloyd, New Orleans.
Duthu, Roy Anthony, Houma.
Easterling, Earl K., Winnsboro.
Eaton, Jack, Slidell.
Edwards, Billy Marcus, Shreveport.
Ellender, Terry Lee, Sulphur.
English, Carver Joseph, Jr., Kenner.
Erwin, Hubert Aaron, Jonesville.
Farrell, Michael James, New Orleans.
Flynn, Raymond Patrick, Houma.
Foret, Kenneth John, Raceland.
Foster, Billy Ray, Minden.
Francis, Willie, Jr., Franklin.
Garcia, James Ronald, Minden.
Grant, Jerry, Norwood.
Grant, Willie, Jr., Baton Rouge.
Guillory, Bud Augustine, West Monroe.
Gunter, William Anthony, Jr., Natchez.
Haggard, Thomas Edward, Covington.
Hamilton, James V., De Ridder.
Hammontree, Billy Leon, Rosepine.
Harkless, James Anthony, Mathews.
Harrison, Joseph Wayne, Crowley.
Hawsey, Kenneth, New Orleans.
Holmes, Phillip Hease, Jr., Baton Rouge.
Honley, Jimmie Carrol, Shreveport.
Hymes, John Lamuel, Plaquemine.
Jefferson, Herman Louis, Jr., New Orleans.
Johnson, Andrew, Bogalusa.
Johnson, Bobby Gene, Hammond.
Johnson, Jesse, Benton.
Johnson, Wellington M., New Orleans.
Jones, James Harvey, Lake Providence.
Kling, Leroy John Oliver, Baton Rouge.
Lacy, Edward Gene, New Orleans.
Landry, Joseph Ronald, Saint Martinville.
Le Bouef, Elton, Jr., Vinton.
Lebouf, Wilton Paul, Houma.
Lee, Alan James, New Orleans.
Lewis, Otis, Natchitoches.
Lines, Richard Michael, New Orleans.
Lockard, Leonard Wayne, Pioneer.
MacFetters, Duncan Alexan, Chalmette.
Martin, Anthony Tony, Columbia.
Mathis, Harry, Jr., Extension.
Mayes, Dave, Jr., Jonesville.
McCarroll Ivy M., Jr., Covington.
McWilliams, Freddie, Winnfield.
Metoyer, Bryford Glenn, Oakdale.
Miller, Leon Peter, New Orleans.
Moses, Abell, Natchitoches.
Mullen, Frank, New Orleans.
Myles, Phillip Murry, Minden.
Nelson, George Washington, Winnfield.
Ogea, Wallace Lee, Bossier City.

LOUISIANA—continued

Army

Palm, Josh, Jr., Alexandria.
Perez, Ricardo James, New Orleans.
Pharris, William Valrie, Lake Charles.
Powell, Lionell, Patterson.
Randolph, George, Cottonport.
Randolph, Lionel, New Orleans.
Reed, Leroy, Lake Charles.
Remedies, Richard Jarrell, Zwolle.
Rhodus, Ray Wesley, Lafayette.
Rivere, Alvin Pierie, Napoleonville.
Robbins, William D., Hapeville.
Rod, Ronald Francis, New Orleans.
Rodgers, Carrol L., Natchitoches.
Rollen, Clarence Edward, Winnsboro.
Ross, Robert Lee, Waterproof.
Rowley, Harry Emilus, New Orleans.
Simmons, Nathaniel, New Orleans.
Simon, Curley John, Youngsville.
Smith, Larry F., New Orleans.
Smith, Robert, Sr., Alexandria.
Stein, Claude Joseph, Vacherie.
Stigall, Arthur Donald, Chase.
Thompson, John H., Homer.
Thompson, John Roy, Saline.
Thompson, Robert Eugene, Leesville.
Volentine, Philip Alvin, Shreveport.
Waguespack, Gary Louis, New Orleans.
Walker, Willie, Clayton.
Wallace, Ephron, Jr., New Orleans.
Warren, Benjamin Irvin, St. Derrider.
Warren, Rodis, John, Covington.
Webb, Earl Kennon, New Orleans.
White, Kurney Joseph, Jr., Berwick.
Williams, Floyd, Charles, Hornbeck.
Willingham, Wilmer, Jay, Shreveport.
Willis, Ledell, Winnsboro.
Zerangue Alton, Joseph, Jr., Arnaudville.

Air Force

Armstrong, Frank Alton, III, Shreveport.
Flynn, George Edward, III, New Orleans.
Jackson, Carl Edwin, Natchitoches.
Magee, Ralph Wayne, Port Sulphur.
McKnight, George Parker, Lafayette.

Marine Corps

August, Frank John, New Orleans.
Baker, Isiah, III, New Orleans.
Bartholomew, Dave Martin, Marrero.
Batiste, Cleveland, Jr., New Orleans.
Bennett, Ronald Ravid, Pollock.
Billiot, Rudolph John, Houma.
Blount, Gary George, Robert.
Booty, Larry Oveid Julien, Greenwell Springs.
Borenstein, Boris, Franz, M., New Orleans.
Boullion, Ellias, Evangeline.
Bourg, Miller John, Houma.
Broomfield, Ted Dewaine, Dodson.
Brown, Robert, Plaquemine.
Brown, William Wesley, Shreveport.
Burns, Victor Lee, Shreveport.
Carnline, Troy Monroe, Many.
Cormier, Melvin Glenn, Duson.
Davidson, Donald Frederick, Shreveport.
Davis Bruce, Gilbert.
Dickson, Grover Lee, New Orleans.
Diez, Isaac Andrew, Jr., Gonzales.
Doss, Harold Conway, Jr., Gretna.
Duncan, Mitchell Jerome, New Orleans.
Edwards, R. V., Pineville.
Elie, Leonard Wayne, Alexandria.
Ferbos, Stanley, New Orleans.
Fontenot, Gary Paul, Villa Platte.
Francis, Willie, Jr., Harvey.
Gauthier, Brian James, Mansura.
George, D. C., Mansfield.
Gilmore, William Alan, Alexandria.
Girod, John Alton, Jr., Denham Springs.
Giroir, Paul Gerard, New Orleans.
Golmon, Jimmy Darwin, Alexandria.
Goodwin, Raymond Ray, Shreveport.
Guillory, William Allen, Westlake.
Hebert, Carroll, James, Lafayette.
Hellbach, Harold James, New Orleans.
Henry, Clarence Ivory, Franklin.
Hollenshead, Winston Georg, Haynesville.
Holsomback, Frank Nolan, Lecompte.
Houghtion, Robert Charles, New Orleans.
Jackson, Charles, Hammond.

LOUISIANA—continued

Marine Corps

Jackson, John Wendell, Shreveport.
Johnson, Freddie, Frogmore.
Kopfler, Joseph Starns, III, Kenner.
Landry, Eddie Lee, Gonzales.
Legaux, Merlin Philip, New Orleans.
Little, Peter, Monroe.
Long, Jerry Roy, Sicily Island.
Malbrough, Charles Ray, Sunset.
Marcombe, Steve Gary, Westwego.
McCarter, James W., Jr., New Orleans.
McKinney, James Odas, Monroe.
McMillan, Gerald Wayne, Pioneer.
Moffett, Billy Ray, Shreveport.
Monte, Salvador Louis, Jr., Harahan.
Mougier, John Edgar, Jr., Rayne.
Naquin, Simon Adolph, Montegut.
Ogburn, Glenn Roy, Shreveport.
Page, Russell Edward, Sulphur.
Paul, Danney Lee, Morgan City.
Penn, Herman, New Orleans.
Peoples, Perry Lee, Dodson.
Pichon, Louis Alphonse, Jr., Slidell.
Prewitt, William Roland, Florien.
Richard, Roy James, Lafayette.
Riviere, Frank Ira, New Orleans.
Roberson, Donald Radford, Walker.
Roberts, Charles Waddell, Alexandria.
Schnitger, Gerald George, New Orleans.
Sensat, Morris Joseph, Egan.
Sercovich, Joseph George, Buras.
Shaw, Claiborne Lavelle, Monroe.
Simmons, Chester, John, New Orleans.
Solorzano, Robert Angelo, New Orleans.
Stanford, Bobby Gayle, Monroe.
Stevens, Donney Ray, Lake Charles.
Stutes, Kenneth John, Lafayette.
Terrell, David Willis, Shreveport.
Turner, Bernard Emerson, Greenwood.
Viola, Carl Daniel, West Monroe.
Walls, Robert Lee, New Orleans.
Washington, Dan Thomas, New Orleans.
Westcott, Rodney Wayne, Arcadia.
Williams, John William, Choudrant.
Wilson, Vomer Ovid, Jr., West Monroe.
Womack, Robert Lee, Shreveport.
Worley, Stephen Ray, West Monroe.

Navy

Daw, Cecil Ernest, Anacoco.
Drinkhouse, John Watts, New Orleans.
Freitag, Kenneth D., New Iberia.
Goodfellow, Carl Raymond, Waterproof.
Hamilton, James William, Jr., West Monroe.
Hart, Teddy Myrle, Greenwell Springs.
Hornbrook, Ronald Ray, Venice.

MAINE

Army

Batchelder, William Robert, Springvale.
Belanger, George, Waterville.
Belanger, Joseph Kenneth L., Bingham.
Blair, Joseph R. L., Quimby.
Boivin, Edward J., Mexico.
Boyd, Robert White, Yarmouth.
Brown, Charles Norman, Sebago Lake.
Bubar, Richard Perley, Caribou.
Chase, Clarence Lawrence, Camden.
Cyr, Paul Leo, Sanford.
D'Entremont, Larry Aime, Kittery Point.
Dechene, Robert Normand, Biddeford.
Deland, Merwin A., Jr., Bath.
Derosier, Laurier Don, Lewiston.
Dew, Henry Louis, Jackman Station.
Dube, Peter Lee, Rumford.
Dufault, James Richard, Berwick.
Elliott, Edwin Ellis, Canaan.
Elwell, Donovan Keith, Buxton.
Farley, David Littlehale, Brunswick.
Foster, Robert Enoch, Jr., South Paris.
Freeman, Martin Lee, Bangor.
Gagnon, Morris Dominique, North Leeds.
Gallant, Roger Paul, Mexico.
Garrison, Earl Stanley, Brunswick.
Gauvin, Roger Edward, Caribou.
Gerald, Dana Leon, Fairfield.
Godfrey, James Walter, Jefferson.
Gray, Thomas Edward M., Jr., Madawaska.
Gustin, Anthony John, Rockland.
Hall, Edward Senior, Lee.

MAINE—continued

Army

Hall, Sayward Newton, Jr., Thomaston.
Hall, Walter Louis, Old Town.
Hardy, Herbert Francis, Jr., Great Pond.
Jordan, William E., III., Bangor.
La Bonte, Roger Edward, Biddeford.
Langley, Weston Joseph, Houlton.
Libbey, Malcolm Pierce, Rockland.
Mac Donald, Lester Earl, Portland.
McDonough, James Michael, Portland.
McGonagle, Michael, John, Lewiston.
McGuire, Harry John, III, Houlton.
Mills, Charles Homer, Waterville.
Mogan, John Edward, Clifton.
Morgan, Vaughan Shaw, Hollis Center.
Nadeau, Larry Joseph, Orono.
Nile, Maurice J., North New Portland.
Parsons, Ronald Allen, York.
Perkins, Ira Hilton, Jr., Calais.
Peters, Lawrence Vincent, Waterville.
Quinn, Gregory Cornelius, Augusta.
Reynolds, George R., Jr., Paris.
Reynolds, Harold W., Gardner.
Russell, Lynn Jordan, Rockland.
Soule, William D., Waldoboro.
Southard, Harold Ellsworth, Portland.
Spencer, Hayward Carl, Veazie.
Sterry, Raymond Edward, Starks.
Stevens, Francis George, Ellsworth.
Sullivan, Thomas Michael, Bangor.
Tewksbury, Robert W., South Portland.
Thomas, Ronald Medford, II, Lewiston.
Thurston, Clair Hall, Jr., Thorndike.
Vester, Fredrick Hazer, Rockpart.
Watts, Wayne Alan, Machias.
Whipple, Stephen John, Portland.
Whitten, Milan Elmer, Hollis Center.
Williamson, Robert Gregory, Portland.
Withee, Clyde William, Skowhegan.

Air Force

Carter, Zane Aubry, West Pembroke.
Meade, Johnson Ashley, Dover Foxcroft.
Smith, Robert John, Scarboro.

Marine Corps

Brown, Donald Leroy, Lincoln.
Clifford, Jon Irving, Hallowell.
Dube, Andre Louis, Livermore Falls.
Duranceau, David Marius, Saco.
Glaude, Richard Paul, Sanford.
Goderre, John Roger, Union.
Guerette, Roland Philippe, Lewiston.
Haskell, Lloyd Burton, Jr., North Waterboro.
Hopkins, Chester Lee, West Paris.
Kahkonen, Edwin Matti, Jr., Augusta.
Knowlton, Burns Winship, Jr., Pittsfield.
Lane, David Alan, Jay.
Leighton, Raymond Elton, Westbrook.
Lepage, Reynald Gerard, Biddeford.
McEwen, Roy Clifford, Bucksport.
Nicholas, Reginald, Auburn.
Nickerson, Bradford Scott, Stockton Springs.
Poitras, Norman Gerald Jos., Biddeford.
Poland, Leon Lovell, Jr., West Paris.
Pomerleau, James Gerard, Waterville.
Roberts, John Wayne, South Portland.
Roy, Robert Richard, Winslow.
Shay, Lawrence William, Jr., Portland.
Sudsbury, Paul Earl, Corinna.
Sullivan, Charles E., Jr., Bangor.
Tuell, Daniel Paul, South Portland.
Vlahakos, Peter George, Auburn.
Wardwell, Eric Michael, Bucksport.

Navy

Flaherty, Roger Ellis, Marshfield.
Musetti, Joseph Tony, Jr., Hall Quarry.
Sawyer, Jonathan Ansel, Boothbay Harbor.
St. John, Ronald George, Harrison.
Taylor, Neil Brooks, Rangeley.
Turner, Robert Allan, Portland.

MARYLAND

Army

Adams, Ronald M., Cascade.
Aiken, David Ross, Baltimore.
Armstead, Gregory Van, Baltimore.
Aronhalt, Charles E., Jr., Cumberland.
Baker, James Howard, Jr., Baltimore.
Baker, Vernon R., Baltimore.
Barnes, Barrie Vane, Salisbury.
Barnhill, Larry M., Baltimore.
Baylor, Arthur Jerome, Baltimore.
Beauchamp, John Henry, Jr., Princess Anne.
Benke, Ronald John, III, White Hall.
Beyerling, James Leroy, Baltimore.
Binko, George, Baltimore.
Biondi, John Michael, Mount Rainier.
Blake, Roger Lee,. Baltimore.
Boehm, William Joseph, Silver Spring.
Brandenburg, Charles Frank, Frederick.
Brown, James Truly, Baltimore.
Burch, Clifford Garland, Langley Park.
Byers, James Norman, Westminster.
Campbell, William Ladd, Silver Hill.
Chesley, Eugene Nathaniel, Baltimore.
Clayton, David Nelson, Perryville.
Concannon, Francis Bryant, Forestville.
Cook, Wilson Lee, Frederick.
Cooper, Oscar Edmond, Bel Air.
Graig, Dean John, Pasadena.
Crissey, Harry Elias, Jr., Baltimore.
Crosby, Gerald Lee, Rockville.
Crozier, David Paul, Baltimore.
Cumberpatch, James Richard, Bethesda.
Curtis, Bernard Eugene, Upper Marlboro.
Dale, Charles Richard, Gaithersburg.
Davis, Elmer Neal, Salisbury.
Davis, Robert Julian, Jr., Galena.
Dickens, Russell W., Piney Point.
Dixon, Linden Brook, Berwyn Heights.
Donaldson, Everette Leroy, Baltimore.
Donaldson, Robert D., Dickerson.
Dorman, Donald Ralph, West Hyattsville.
Duffett, James Henry, Jr., Baltimore.
Dydynski, Stephen Michael, Hyattsville.
Epps, Lamont George, Baltimore.
Fannin, Bryant D., Baltimore.
Farmer, Charles Edward, Baltimore.
Flonory, Orlando, Baltimore.
Furlong, William Robert, Jr., Baltimore.
Garris, Michael Anthony, Baltimore.
Gentry, Charles Edward, Cumberland.
Glenn, Edward Ralph, Jr., Hagerstown.
Gosnell, Jack Martin, Baltimore.
Grandea, Ambrosio Salazar, Baltimore.
Graves, William D., Fort Holabird.
Green, Eddie, Baltimore.
Groom, Robert Roxburgh, Rockville.
Grove, Kenneth Edward, Parkton.
Harding, Charles Clifford, Baltimore.
Harman, Curtis Joseph, Baltimore.
Harris, Steve Westlel, Rockville.
Hayes, Leroy Anthony, Baltimore.
Hayes, Richard Edward, Bryans Road.
Hook, Charles Wayne, Friendsville.
Hopkins, Aaron Milton, Mardela Springs.
House, William Handsome, Ridgeley.
Ireland, Phillip Earl, Trappe.
Jackson, Angus N., Baltimore.
Jenkins, Philip Paul, Baltimore.
Johnson, Michael Neal, Brentwood.
Johnson, Robert Lee, Baltimore.
Jones, Thomas Weldon, District Heights.
Kane, Charles William, Baltimore.
Kennedy, James Jr., Seat Pleasant.
Kenny, Ronald Michael, Mount Airy.
King, Harold Junior, Jr., Derwood.
Klippen, Arthur G., Bethesda.
Knadle, Robert Edward, Camp Springs.
Koon, George Kenneth, Baltimore.
Kralick, Kenneth Donald, Baltimore.
Kramer, Howard Morris, Baltimore.
Krug, Linwood Brooks, Baltimore.
Leonard, Paul Austin, Annapolis.
Lerner, Robert Henry, Ijamsville.
Lloyd, Freddie Gean, Baltimore.
Long, James McKinley, Baltimore.
Lowery, Richard Homer, Ellerslie.
Lumsden, William Wayne, Compton.
Lundell, Wayne Thomas, Silver Spring.
MacIver, Neil Kirk, Takoma Park.
Mannion, August Gordian, Jr., Baltimore.
Mattingly, George Michael, Oxon Hill.
McCarthy, Philip James, Baltimore.
McCarthy, Thomas Weller, Chevy Chase.
McCorkle, Charles Thomas, Bradshaw.

MARYLAND—continued

Army

Melton, Earl, Jr., Baltimore.
Moore, James, Jr., Baltimore.
Morse, Harry Madison, Baltimore.
Mosgrove, James Maurice, Jr., Baltimore.
Moultrie, Oxley Carrington, Baltimore.
Mustain, Jerry Wayne, Annapolis.
Newman, George Kennard, Baltimore.
Norton, Gregory Bernard, Baltimore.
Novello, Francis F., Rockville.
Osborne, Donald Gwyn, Street.
Ott, Richard Deane, Baltimore.
Patzwall, James George, Baltimore.
Pennington, Paul Patrick, Baltimore.
Phoebus, Frederick Allen, Baltimore.
Prather, James W., Gaithersburg.
Price, Russell Lee, Baltimore.
Purkey, James Paul, Germantown.
Quesenberry, John Quincy, Hyattsville.
Ratcliffe, Carl, Jr., Pittsville.
Ringgold, Lawrence L., Jr., Havre de Grace.
Rose, Charles William, Wye Mills.
Ruhl, Robert Wayne, Lansdowne.
Savage, Morgan Elbert, Baltimore.
Schaaf, Richard Allan, Baltimore.
Scharon, Robert E., III, Baltimore.
Schindler, Thomas James, Baltimore.
Setzer, Jerry Philip, Baltimore.
Simon, Ralph, Silver Spring.
Slaughter, William Auslee, Oxford.
Smay, Atlas Jasper Morene, Baltimore.
Smith, Jack Howard, Salisbury.
Smith, Joseph Raymond, Hyattsville.
Smith, Samuel Wallace, Baltimore.
Snyder, Rodger Clayborn, Baltimore.
Spates, William Richard, Jr., Kensington.
Stacy, William Arthur, Jr., Silver Spring.
Steiner, Charles Thomas, Cardiff.
Stewart, Wilbert, Jr., Baltimore.
Sutton, Edmond Ceasar, Baltimore.
Szabo, Istvan, Baltimore.
Taylor, Theodore Frederick, Chance.
Thomas, Robert John, Baltimore.
Vaughan, James O'Dell, Baltimore.
Von Kleist, Austin Richard, Rockville.
Walinski, Bernard Gordon, Baltimore.
Waters, Robert Mitchell, Phoenix.
Watson, James Anthony, Baltimore.
Webster, Franklin, Baltimore.
Wehner, Brian Charles, Baltimore.
Welch, David Elmer, Beltsville.
Whitefield, Charles Elmer, Frostburg.
Whitley, Arsell, Baltimore.
Wigfall, Neopolis, Fruitland.
Wilfong, Roger Dale, Cumberland.
Williams, Charles, Baltimore.
Williams, Walter Douglas, Glyndon.
Wills, Francis Desales, La Plata.
Wilson, Irving McKinley, Jr., Baltimore.
Wilson, James Edward, Baltimore.
Wilson, Joseph, Baltimore.
Winston, Alvester Lee, Baltimore.
Wintermoyer, Terry, Silver Spring.
Wise, Edward Joseph, Street.
Wisniewski, David, Baltimore.
Wright, Howard Oliver, Jr., Centreville.
Yorker, Robert D., Baltimore.
Ziegler, David Bartels, Baltimore.

Air Force

Cosgrave, Gary Wayne, Frederick.
Hilton, Robert Larie, Baltimore.
Scobel, Uwe-Thorsten, Hyattsville.

Marine Corps

Avelleyra, John William, Mount Rainier.
Bivens, Frederick Wood, Jr., Pocomoke.
Blanchfield, Richard Allen, Perry Hall.
Blanton, John James, Baltimore.
Bobbitt, Garland Claude, Beltsville.
Bowers, John Michael, Silver Spring.
Branock, William Michael, Bladensburg.
Brent, Edmund David, Jr., Baltimore.
Brittain, Daniel Spenser, Frederick.
Brown, Joseph Clinton, Pasadena.
Brown, William Joseph, Baltimore.
Budka, David John, Baltimore.
Burley, Clarence John, Baltimore.
Butler, Charles Gilman, Jr., Silver Spring.
Cannington, James B., Jr., Baltimore.
Carlozzi, Robert Matthew, Wheaton.

MARYLAND—continued

Marine Corps

Carter, Anderson, Jr., Baltimore.
Chapman, Maurice P., Jr., Harwood.
Chase, John Joseph, Laurel.
Chmiel, Larry Vincent, Baltimore.
Corbin, William Jennings, Joppa.
Cronkrite, Woodrow Charles, Suitland.
Crump, Victor Lincoln, Baltimore.
Crutchely, Donald Clair, Baltimore.
Davidson, Robert Griffin, Glen Burnie.
Davis, Melvin Gilmore, Baltimore.
Dayton, William Clarence, Ross Neck.
Deasel, James Jerome, Jr., Baltimore.
Deavers, Kenneth Lamar, Jr., Williamsport.
Devincent, Edward J., Jr., Baltimore.
Dickerson, Tommy Eugene, Rockville.
Donahue, Wellington Martin, Cumberland.
Donnell, Lawrence Henry, Annapolis.
Duff, Barry William, Baltimore.
Ecker, Terry Lee, Baltimore.
Faison, Earl, Jr., Catonville.
Fields, Clinton Angelo, Baltimore.
Fike, Ross Francis, Friendsville.
Flint, Ralph Preston, Jr., Hagerstown.
Fowler, William Edward, Baltimore.
France, Phillip Stanley, Baltimore.
Graham, James Albert, Frostburg.
Green, Thomas Owen, Jessup.
Gregory, Thomas Jr., Baltimore.
Hall, John Sterling, Baltimore City.
Hamet, Dennis Joseph, Baltimore.
Hammond, Lawrence Theodore, Baltimore.
Harmon, Alphonso Lee, Berlin.
Harris, John Lee, Jr., Baltimore.
Harrison, Paul Leroy, Hyattsville.
Hart, David Meldrum, Wheaton.
Hitzelberger, George, Baltimore.
Holdway, David Keith, Hyattsville.
Holmes, Ronald Eugene, Baltimore.
Holton, Louis Alexander, Jr. Baltimore.
Hulings, Walter Vincent, Baltimore.
Hullihen, Ira Henry, Baltimore.
James, Perry Dean, Baltimore.
Jefferson, Roland Ira, Baltimore.
Jenkins, Cecil Raymond, Taylors Island.
Johnson, John Henry, Jr., Baltimore.
Jones, Michael Edward, Baltimore.
Joyce, John Mullen, Bethesda.
Kesling, Ronald Lee, Baltimore.
Korpisz, Anthony Joseph, Jr., Baltimore.
Lipinski, Vernon Raymond, Baltimore.
Love, James Edward, Silver Spring.
Macklin, Raymond Louis, Baltimore.
March, Frederick Luther, Baltimore.
Mason, Charles Gilbert, Cheverly.
Mazza, Robert William, Baltimore.
McArthur, Jerome Dannie, Baltimore.
McGovern, James Gerald, Riverdale.
McMahon, Thomas John, Cumberland.
Mignini, William Douglas, Baltimore.
Missar, Joseph Cyril, Jr., Towson.
Nicklow, Danny Eugene, Friendsville.
O'Shell, Don Thomas, Baltimore.
Parker, William Thomas, III, Salisbury.
Pegg, David Burton, Ellicott City.
Posey, Robert Lee, Jr., Savage.
Rodenberg, John Frederick, Baltimore.
Rohleder, Donald William, Baltimore.
Rudd, Charles Niven, Aberdeen.
Ruff, Thomas Valentine, Jr., Elkton.
Sanders, Stanley, Baltimore.
Saxon, Frank Robert, Baltimore.
Scarpulla, Frank Mark, Jr., Baltimore.
Schafer, Gary Ray, Bel Air.
Schlott, Dennis Guy, Baltimore.
Scott, Charles Louis, Jr., Baltimore.
Sewell, John Francis, Jr., Severn.
Shelton, Harold David, Baltimore.
Sherman, Steven Ross, Laurel.
Skinner, Richard Aaron, Greenbelt.
Smallwood, James Francis, Lanham.
Smith, Ralph James, Baltimore.
Smith, Richard Clifton, Silver Spring.
Smith, Thomas Alexander, Baltimore.
Stevens, Joseph Nelson, Camp Springs.
Streeks, Frank Morris, Jr., Silver Spring.
Tasker, Kenneth Earl, Deer Park.
Tracy, Douglas Lee, Hagerstown.
Tucker, William Eugene, Jr., Annapolis.
Vaught, Harold Timothy, Baltimore.
Walker, Richard Lee, Pikesville.
Ward, Donald Roland, Silver Spring.
Wertman, John Thomas, Cumberland.
Wharton, Henry Marvin, Jr., Baltimore.
White, Theodore, G., Jr., Baltimore.
Whoolery, Tracy Lee, Baltimore.
Wilk, William Anthony, Silver Spring.
Wilson, Monty Norris, Bel Air.
Wright, Albert Floyd, Jr., Annapolis.
Yeager, John William, Baltimore.
Young, Donald Earl, Baltimore.
Younger, Howard James, Jr., Baltimore.
Youngkin, Andrew Winter, Jr., Capitol Heights.
Zimmerman, Sandy, Jr., Baltimore.

Navy

Ayd, Jacque Joseph, Baltimore.
Camden, Francis Edward, Jr., Wheaton.
Cook, Wilmer Paul, Annapolis.
Hodges, David Lawton, Chevy Chase.
MacLaughlin, Donald C., Jr., Baltimore.
Pender, John Francis, District Heights.

MASSACHUSETTS

Army

Aboltin, Richard D., Jamaica Plain.
Almeida, Edward Joseph, New Bedford.
Arcand, Donald Leonard, Lowell.
Ashton, Normand Joseph, Jr., Essex.
Atkinson, Frederick George, Lynn.
Barnes, John Andrew, III, Dedham.
Baxter, Bruce Raymond, Lowell.
Beaubien, William Alexis, Turners Fall.
Benjamin, Kenneth Roger, Spencer.
Berrisford, Ronald E., Brockton.
Berthiaume, Paul David, Spencer.
Bettencourt, John Francis, Chelmsford.
Bonnell, William Lawrence, Haverhill.
Borden, Lawrence Thomas, Charlestown.
Boss, Robert Leon, Brockton.
Bowman, David Wilslow, Gloucester.
Bullaert, Francois Josephi, Wolleston.
Bulger, John David, North Wilbraham.
Bumpus, Ronald Lee, Buzzard Bay.
Burgess, John B., Falmouth.
Burke, Thomas James, Gloucester.
Callery, William Thomas, Lowell.
Candeas, Joseph Edward, Beverly.
Candiano, Joseph Paul, Andover.
Carter, Kenneth Robert, Lynn.
Cartwright, Robert Michael, Randolph.
Carville, John Joseph, Lowell.
Casale, James Ernest, Sharon.
Chace, George Henry, Pepperell.
Chadwick, Frank W., Jr., Ashfield.
Chapin, Joel Henry, Springfield.
Chase, Curtis Edward, Hingham.
Cocchiara, James Stephen, Springfield.
Coggeshall, William Ayer, Marshfield.
Cogill, Peter, Cohasset.
Cohen, Sheldon Robert, Chelsea.
Collopy, John Patrick, Dorchester.
Condon, James Gregory, III, Whitman.
Cooley, William, Woburn.
Creed, Bernard James, Medford.
Cronk, Paul Marvin, Jr., Ashley Fall.
Cummings, Harold Warren, Jr., Dorchester.
Curran, Paul William, East Milton.
Currier, Gerald Francis, Lawrence.
D'Amico, Frank Anthony, Gloucester.
Daley, Paul Michael, Boston.
Daley, Walter Ralph, East Brewster.
Dalton, Edward Joseph, Jr., Concord.
Darrigan, Raymond Maurice, Brighton.
Davis, Stephen Winfield, Turners Falls.
Deschenes, Thomas Alfred, Fitchburg.
Devoe, David Francis, Lawrence.
DiReda, Robert J., Worcester.
Drown, David Alan, Fairhaven.
Duffy, Donald Raymond, Jr., Ayer.
Duffy, Lawrence Richard, Waltham.
Dunton, James G., Melrose.
Ellsworth, Neil Robert, Northboro.
English, James Patrick, North Andover.
Farris, Norman Carl, Springfield.
Ference, Edward Paul, Ayer.
Finney, Bobby Lee, Boston.
Fitzpatrick, Michael Thomas, Chelsea.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Army

Fitzpatrick, Walter Joseph, Springfield.
Flood, John Patrick, Jr., Newton.
Floyd, Paul Edward, Jr., Clinton.
Fontaine, John Albert, Methuen.
Ford, Thomas Vincent, Jr., Lowell.
Gagne, Louis Phillip, Jr., Fall River.
Gagne, Robert Omar, Chicopee.
Giroux, Ronald, Deerfield.
Grant, Joseph Xavier, Arlington.
Greene, Kenneth Lawrence, Somerville.
Guimond, Paul Daniel, Lawrence.
Hagerty, William Thomas, Vineyard Haven.
Hallett, Robert J., Erving.
Hansen, Peter Mykal, Canton.
Hargett, John, Jr., Shirley.
Harper, Richard K., Burlington.
Hartnett, Michael Gerald, Conway.
Hennessey, Arthur Francis, West Falmouth.
Hine, Glen Douglas, Leyden.
Hingston, William E., Jr., Braintree.
Holden, David Charles, Jamaica Plain.
Holden, William David, Sommerville.
Holster, Timothy, Brockton.
Horan, Leo Joseph, Maynard.
Hubicsak, Frank Charles, South Boston.
Hurst, Ronald Charles, Springfield.
Jack, Michael Francis, Monson.
Jarras, Stephen Theordore, Worchester.
Jarvis, Edward Carl, Pittsfield.
Johnson, John Robert, Watertown.
Johnson, Richard Charles, Worchester.
Jones, Isaac, Roxbury.
Joyce, John H., Boston.
Joyce, William Edward, Jr., Boston.
Kierzek, Stanley P., Holyoke.
Killilea, Martin Francis, Roxbury.
Kusy, David Paul, Auburn.
Lachance, Clifford Damon, Holliston.
Landry, Paul Joseph, New Bedford.
Lee, Paul Richard, Bristol.
Legere, Emile Joseph, Gardner.
Letourneau, Edward Randolph, Greenfield.
Litwin, Robert Richard, Williamsett.
Madigan, John Edward, Jr., Chelsea.
Main, Robert James, Dorchester.
Mantouvales, Anthony Ralph, Boston.
McAndrewson, Richard T., Jr., Braintree.
McBride, Morris Ralph, South Braintree.
McCarthy, John Edward, Peabody.
McGovern, Kevin Michael, West Brookfield.
Messer, James Allen, Springfield.
Metcalf, Gerald Ernest, Foxboro.
Miller, Clark Alan, Sommerville.
Mitchell, Lawrence Howard, Norwood.
Moreau, Eugene Raymond, Andover.
Morris, Harold Herbert, Salem.
Murphy, Charles John, Jr., Sherwsbury.
Murphy, Edward Joseph, Jr., Everett.
Murphy, William Campbell, Taunton.
Nickerson, Thomas Carroll, Chatham.
O'Neill, Dennis Michael, Bedford.
O'Brien, Alan Joseph, Revere.
O'Neill, George Edward, Leominster.
Perrault, Alan James, Needham.
Pinto, Ceasar Augustus, New Bedford.
Plaza, Bernard Stanley, Montague.
Porcela, Stephen Richard, Worcester.
Porrazzo, Louis Edward, Boston.
Porter, Kevin Anthony, Dorchester.
Potter, Richard Edward, Methuen.
Power, Richard William, Southwick.
Provencal, Roland Andre, Ware.
Rabideau, John, Easthampton.
Raisis, Leonidas, Westboro.
Rand, Richard Paul, Upton.
Rando, Joseph Paul, Waltham.
Ray, Walter Donald, Belmont.
Raymond, John James, Taunton.
Richard, William W., Auburndale.
Richards, Donald Lawrence, Athol.
Robinson, Eugene Francis, Falmouth.
Ryan, Willard R., Groveland.
Scahill, Edward John, Randolph.
Schmautz, Francis Phillip, Worcester.
Seklecki, Thomas Martin, Holyoke.
Shallah, John Herbert, Somerville.
Sherman, Ronald Earl, Greenfield.
Shuffelt, George Jerry, Pittsfield.

XUM

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Army

Sickel, John Aulde, III, Longmeadow.
Simmons, Wayne Carl, Springfield.
Skapinsky, George Joseph, Jamaica Plain.
Snyder, Guy Ford, Clinton.
Sokolowski, Frank Michael, Chelsea.
Sousa, Laurence Nelson, East Boston.
Steriti, Stephen Joseph, Boston.
Stewart, Paul Leo, Lowell.
Stochaj, Paul John, Webster.
Stovall, Gus, Jr., Springfield.
Surette, Paul Joseph, Holbrook.
Taillon, John Phillips, Jamaica Plain.
Tetreault, Robert Nazaire, Springfield.
Thibault, Kenneth M., Hudson.
Thibeault, John Lornie, Dracut.
Tolzmann, Ted Norman, Wilbraham.
Tsirovasiles, Peter, Lowell.
Tyree, Earl Edward, Fitchburg.
Underwood, George Warren, Quincy.
Upton, Carleton Webster, Lynn.
Vancellette, David Michael, Oxford.
Waden, John F., Malden.
Walker, Orien Judson, Jr., Boston.
Walsh, Robert Stephen, Cambridge.
Waterman, Michael J., Westminster.
Watts, Ralph O., Ayer.
White, Albert Ronald, Suffolk.
Williams, David Edward, Arlington.
Wilson, Calvin Ray, East Longmeacow.
Wissman, Ronald Edward, Shelburne.
Wright, Arthur Emerson, III, Gloucester.
Wright, Willie Joseph, New Bedford.
Young, Donald Raymond, Millbury.

Air Force

Bassaillon, Francis Henry, Williamstown.
Bourque, Valmore William, South Hadley Falls.
Brewer, Gardner, Melrose.
Diorsay, Douglas, Harold, Ashland.
Forbes, Walter Henry, III, Swampscott.
Garside, Frederick, Plymouth.
Henneberry, James Calvin, Pittsfield.
Marks, Antone Patrick, Nantuckut.
Robertson, Charles William, Malden.
Tofferi, Charles Ehnstrom, Fitchburg.
Wax, David J., Brookline.

Marine Corps

Albert, Peter, Danvers.
Almeida, Richard Henry, Fall River.
Almeida, Russell Viveiros, South Dartmouth.
Basiliere, Ralph, Haverhill.
Beaulieu, Normand Louis, New Bedford.
Beauregard, Kenneth Edward, New Bedford.
Berube, Kenneth Allen, Monson.
Bettincourt, Daniel Stephe, Edgartown.
Betty, Claude Charles, Webster.
Bigelow, Robert Francis, Lowell.
Blades, William Ceacon, III, Pinehurst.
Blough, David Anthony, Spencer.
Bond, Richard William, Winchester.
Borey, David Christopher, Pittsfield.
Bousquet, Robert George, Holyoke.
Brandt, Richard Carl, Berlin.
Bresnahan, William John, Jr., Ashburnham.
Brine, Christopher Dareing, Arlington.
Buchanan, Waverie Hugh, Dorchester.
Burt, Michael David, Dorchester.
Cahill, Kevin Arthur, Lynn.
Capuano, Paul Richard, Worcester.
Carota, John Thomas, Milton.
Carson, Richard James, Webster.
Carven, Rupert Sadler, III, Newton.
Caspole, Ralph Warren, Braintree.
Cavicchi, James Henry, Jr., Weymouth.
Christian Russell Thomas, Oxford.
Cloutier David William, Seekonk.
Constande, Donald, Springfield.
Conway, John James, New Bedford.
Cornier, Eugene Francis, Milford.
Cote, Robert Francis, Lawrence.
Croce, Robert James, Reading.
Curry, Robert Louis, Mansfield.
David, Richard Robert, Nahant.
Davis, William Walter, Jr., Boston.
Demaris, Richard Orin, Haverhill.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Marine Corps

Demers, Richard Wilfred, Marlboro.
Deprofio, Michael Allen, Melrose.
Dobbins, Louis David, II, Brighton.
Doig, Douglas William, Westwood.
Dorr, Gerald Brian, Middleboro.
Downey, Michael Wakefield, Needham.
Doyon, Paul Francis, Ipswich.
Drew, Joseph Lawrence, Woburn.
Duffett, Edward Stephen, Cambridge.
Duffy, Daniel Benjamin, Jr., Somerville.
Dunn, Joseph Wesley, Roxbury.
Egan, Edward Thomas Jr., Roslindale.
Erdely, Ralph Gabriel, Springfield.
Ferro, James, Acushnet.
Fitzgibbon, Richard Bernar, Weymouth.
Flood, Thomas Bernard, Wellesley.
Flynn, Gary Francis, Attleboro.
Francis, David Anthony, Taunton.
Friel, Joseph Augustus, West Roxbury.
Frost, Dana Stanley, Wellesley.
Gallant, Frank James, Beverly.
Gardella, William Kirby, Somerset.
Gaspar, Alfred John, Fall River.
Gemborys, John Chester, Gardner.
Gilbert, Harold Jeffrey, Chicopee Falls.
Gilbert, Richard Joseph, Lawrence.
Gile, Joseph Thomas, Jr., Lawrence.
Glasser, John Michael, Beverly.
Gonneville, Robert Roland, New Bedford.
Goodwin, Danny Eric, Brockton.
Gormley, Paul Leo, Jr., Dracut.
Granahan, John William, Quincy.
Hamlin, Ralph Gerald, Jr., Abington.
Hanscom, John William, Reading.
Hardiman, Kevin Barry, New Bedford.
Hassey, Paul Elias, New Bedford.
Hazzard, Franklin George, Leominster.
Henderson, Roy John, Somerville.
Henry, James Edward, Taunton.
Henry, Stephen Michael, Hyde Park.
Higgins, Dennis Michael, Nattick.
Hines, Ralph Earle, Springfield.
Houlihan, John Richard, Brockton.
Hubisz, James Francis, Salem.
Huntoon, Richard Warren, Leicester.
Hurd, Roger Michael, Cambridge.
Jackson, Thomas Francis, Waltham.
Jason, Bruce Ellsworth, Boston.
Johnson, Edward Lee, Charlestown.
Jordan, Dudley Norman, Roxbury.
Joyce, William Francis, Hyde Park.
Kane, Thomas Joseph, Dorchester.
Kelly, Patrick Joseph, Jr., Dorchester.
Krawczyk, Jan, Southbridge.
Laidlaw, William Clive, Cohasset.
Lake, Ronald Francis, Fall River.
Lane, Sidney Daniel, Jr., Roxbury.
Lapointe, Raymond Roland, Taunton.
Latessa, Andre Roland, North Westport.
Lazarovich, John F., Jr., Scituate.
Lefebvre, Rudolph H., Jr., Lowell.
Letendre, Gerald Arthur, East Longmeadow.
Loane, Allen Robert, Farmingham.
Looney, Paul Thomas, Shelburne Falls.
Mahler, James William, Marshfield.
Malloy, John Joseph, Great Barrington.
Mannion, Dennis John, Lawrence.
Manzaro, Daniel Victor, Worcester.
Matern, Robert Schrack, Worcester.
McCarthy, Edward Charles, Medford.
McCarthy, William Francis, Medford.
McDonald, Gerald Francis, Dorchester.
McEachron, Paul, Stoughton.
McLaughlin, Mark Michael, Dorchester.
McMahon, Frederick Alfred, Dorchester.
McNulty, Joseph Dennis, Roxbury.
Medeiros, Michael John, Fall River.
Melvin, James Leonard, East Boxford.
Menowsky, Glenn Alfred, Bridgewater.
Meuse, John Richard, Malden.
Monahan, Michael James, Dracut.
Mooney, Walter Stephen, Worcester.
Moore, Robert Everett, Essex.
Morgan, Walter William, Roxbury.
Moskos, Peter, East Bridgewater.
Muraco, Francis John, Winchester.
Murray, James Francis, Boston.
Murray, Thomas Edward, Somerville.
Myers, Jeffery Philip, Mattapan.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Marine Corps

Napierata, Norman Joseph, Dudley.
Nashawaty, Richard John, East Boston.
Nealon, John Michael, Sherborn.
Nelson, Harold Barnett, Medford.
Nimiroski, Joseph Elwin, Attleboro.
Norton, Richard L., Melrose.
O'Brien, Christopher Ford, Worcester.
O'Brien, Phillip Anthony, Worcester.
O'Brien, William Joseph, Lynn.
O'Connor, Brian Richard, Andover.
O'Leary, James Kevin, New Bedford.
O'Leary, Richard Laughlin, Boston.
Offley, James Clifton, New Bedford.
Pagnano, Enrico Henry, Jr., Newton.
Parmelee, Bruce Carlton, Reading.
Peel, John Charles, Bradford.
Picanso, Leonard, Jr., Acushnet.
Rabinovitz, Jack, Dorchester.
Rabiotti, Andrew Charles, East Boston.
Reid, Paul Francis, West Roxbury.
Reis, Tiago, New Bedford.
Renauld, Ralph Victor, Jr., Worcester.
Rhoades, Clinton Morell, Jr., South Hadley.
Richey, Neal Olin, Holyoke.
Robertson, Bristol, Jr., Roxbury.
Rose, Albert James, Berkley.
Roulier, Russell Rene, Adams.
Roy, Peter William, Fairhaven.
Russell, Gordon Warren, Denvers.
Sadberry, Seymour Patrick, Boston.
Sagerian, Bruce Elliott, Worcester.
Samaras, Peter Nicholas, Lowell.
Santos, Albert Willard, Fall River.
Savageau, John Henry, Peabody.
Scholes, William Hadley, Springfield.
Schramm, Peter Frye, Wakefield.
Seveney, William Francis, Ware.
Smith, Edward Francis, Easton.
St. Cyr, James Augustine, Lawrence.
St. Jean, Bernard Edward, Falmouth.
Staniszewki, Wladyslaw, Brockton.
Steinsieck, Robert T., Jr., Newton.
Sullivan, John Miller, Waltham.
Sullivan, Leo Joseph, Jr., Boston.
Sullivan, Peter Michael, Malden.
Sylvia, Wayne John, North Dartmouth.
Tadevich, Emil Jerome, Waltham.
Taurisano, James Vincent, Everett.
Tavares, Balmiro, Jr., Hanson.
Thalin, Neal Robert, Dedham.
Todd, Robert Jacy, North Easton.
Vallee, Joseph Leo, Lowell.
Vasconcellos, Richard John, Quincy.
Velardo, Anthony Guy, Wakefield.
Vicalvi, Timothy Lawrence, Worcester.
Wallace, Harry William, Burlington.
Wallen, Joseph Robert, Dorchester.
Waterman, Craig Houston, Rehoboth.
Williams, Arthur Paul, Haverhill.
Williams, Ronald, Worcester.

Navy

Archer, Richard Charles, Hyannis.
Batchelder, William Kimbal, Shelburne Falls.
Brown, Kenneth Raymond, Holyoke.
Burns, Robert Edward, South Attleboro.
Coakley, William Francis, Lenox.
Donovan, Thomas Stephen, Natick.
Fay, Robert Joseph, Wollaston.
Gillespie, Martin L., Jr., East Boston.
Graves, Richard Campbell, Sunderland.
Little, William Harris, Weymouth.
O'Brien, Edward Stephen, Woburn.
O'Reilly, James C., Jr., Brighton.
Ouellet, David George, Wellesley.
Tillson, Gardner, Jr., Salem.
Tyne, Jeffrey Gordon, Gloucester.

MICHIGAN

Army

Abranoski, Leo Bert, Detroit.
Adams, Clarence Mattue, Detroit.
Adams, David Lee, Adrian.
Adamson, Donald Bruce, Grand Rapids.
Alandt, Charles Byron, Royal Oak.
Albertson, Robert Allen, Ypsilanti.
Alderson, Michael Edward, Bay City.
Anglin, Adrian James, Gladstone.

XUM

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Arnold, Louis George Washington, Detroit.
Arvin, Carl Robert, Ypsilanti.
Ashford, Dave Edward, Detroit.
Atkins, Matthew David, III, Grand Rapids.
Austin, Edward Paul, Alpena.
Avery, Ralph Lee, Flint.
Aylworth, Randal Ray, Jenison.
Bailey, David Orin, Grand Rapids.
Bailey, John J., Port Huron.
Baker, William Emanuel, Detroit.
Baldoni, Lindsay David, Detroit.
Bankowski, John Francis, Dearborn Heights.
Bannister, Russell Reid, Lennon.
Barnaby, David W., Charlotte.
Barrett, George Patrick, Port Huron.
Bawal, Robert Joseph, Marine City.
Benedetti, Dennis Eugene, Detroit.
Bennett, Donald Lee, Hillsdale.
Berkholz, David Dennis, Berrien Springs.
Berry, James Craig, Royal Oak.
Best, Carey Edwin, Carleton.
Bihlmeyer, James Roy, Manchester.
Bird, Charles Weslay, Ypsilanti.
Bodzick, William Joseph, Petoskey.
Bojarski, George Joseph, Detroit.
Borowski, Raymond John, Dearborn.
Bost, Michael James, Grand Rapids.
Bowers, Bruce Elliot, Dearborn Heights.
Bowman, David Frank, Pontiac.
Boyless, Jose Julio, Taylor.
Bradley, Robert Neal, Gaylord.
Breeden, Clifford Lynn, Jr., Hillsdale.
Breeding, Eugene, Jr., Detroit.
Brooks, David T., Tecumseh.
Brown, Albert Lee, Alba.
Brown, David Peter, Flat Rock.
Brown, William Arthur, Detroit.
Bukala, Daniel Scott, Grand Rapids.
Burick, Wilfried, Utica.
Burnett, Douglas McArthur, Detroit.
Burroughs, Ted William, Jr., Detroit.
Butgereit, Larry Duane, Benton Harbor.
Cain, Robert Daniel, Union Lake.
Calhoun, Joseph, Detroit.
Campbell, George Lee, Lansing.
Campbell, George Samuel, Utica.
Cann, Horace, Grand Rapids.
Carter, Clifford Russell, Detroit.
Cast, Thomas Edward, Detroit.
Chamberlain, Roy Warner, Jr., Wayland.
Chapman, Charles Dane, Onaway.
Charboneau, Le Roy Harland, Cheboygan.
Chatmon, Nathan Eugene, Detroit.
Clark, Walter Levon, Roseville.
Clawson, Rodger Dean, Allegan.
Cleland, Thomas Leonard, Ypsilanti.
Cline, Rodney Barrette, Garden City.
Cobley, Warren W., Traverse City.
Cochrane, John Floyd, Dearborn.
Cole, William Winston, Detroit.
Collier, Gerald James, Essexville.
Colston, Edward Jerome, Detroit.
Conrad, Andrew Charles, Jr., Millington.
Cooper, Miles Dennis, Saginaw.
Cox, William Joseph, Saginaw.
Crabbe, Robert John, Ann Arbor.
Cragar, James Leroy, Flint.
Crawford, Lawrence Bernard, Detroit.
Cripe, Jack Lester, Onondaga.
Crisman, William Harold, Detroit.
Crossman, William Harry, Kalamazoo.
Cruz, Frank Bryan, Detroit.
Cunningham, Walter Wayne, Trenton.
Curley, Roosevelt C., Jr., Detroit.
Currethers, Jeff, Detroit.
Curry, Glenn Vernard, Detroit.
Cushman, John Robert, Saginaw.
Daniels, Charleis E., Detroit.
Danneels, Robert Harold, Marine City.
Davis, Arnel J., Jr., Owosso.
Davis, Billy Sylvester, Pinconning.
De Tamble, Thomas Glenn, Detroit.
De Young, Abe Richard, Ada.
Demorest, David Keith, Grand Rapids.
Desco, Dennis A., Flint.
Di Rita, Gene, Roseville.
Dicks, Marvin Merle, Livonia.
Dillinder, Randy Eugene, Dearborn.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Dinger, James Robert, Thompsonville.
Dlugokinski, Edmund Valent, Detroit.
Domke, Paul Louis, Detroit.
Dorsey, George Harry, Jr., Detroit.
Doty, Clair Duane, Hillsdale.
Doyle, Howard L., Davison.
Draby, Leroy Junior, Free Soil.
Dusseau, Albert Eugene, Dundee.
Dusseau, Jerry James, Palmyra.
Dykema, Ross Allen, Grand Rapids.
Earlenbaugh, Daniel Lee, Muskegon.
Edwards, George Ray Fayfie, Pontiac.
Edwards, Kenneth Miles, Royal Oak.
Edwards, Robert Wayne, Livonia.
Edwards, Rodney Clinton, Columbiaville.
Ehlers, Lonney Lewis, Rhodes.
Elenbaas, Jack, Holland.
Elmore, Gary Lewis, Garden City.
Escareno, Armando Leo, Muskegon Heights.
Farhat, Alan James, Lansing.
Fenech, Emmanuel Salvatore, Detroit.
Ferzacca Michael, Munising.
Fielder, Donald Reed, II, Rochester.
Fletcher, Charles Eugene, Buchanan.
Forsberg, Jay Edward, Williamston.
Foster, Byron James, Detroit.
Francis, Michael James, Southfield.
Fredrickson, Alan Douglas, Houghton.
Friesner, Roger Hunter, Morley.
Fugett, Henry J., Dearborn.
Funk, Dale Lee, Comstock.
Gallagher, Michael Patrick, Dearborn Heights.
Gallis, Steve Samuel, Jr., Hazel Park.
Gandolfo, Philip Nick, Dearborn.
Gardner, James Edwards, Kalamazoo.
Garside, Thomas Edward, Flint.
Gerald, Bozy, Fennville.
Gereau, Richard Norman, Muskegon.
Getty, Dennis Alan, Lapeer.
Gilbreath, Grant Madison, Monroe.
Gipson, Clarence Freddie, Decatur.
Gooch, Jerry Dale, Detroit.
Good, Larry Dean, Chesaning.
Goodall, Earl Wayne, Detroit.
Gordon, Wayne Victor, Detroit.
Goss, Hezekiah, Jr., Saginaw.
Gould, Carlyle, Leroy, Climax.
Graham, Gordon J., Yale.
Greene, Jessie Floyd, Jr., Highland Park.
Greenwald, Dennis, Southfield.
Groover, John William O., Farmington.
Gruezke, James A., Newberry.
Hanselman, Robert Alan, Mt. Clemens.
Harms, Lowell Eugene, Detroit.
Hart, Raymond Leonard, Detroit.
Hayes, Nelson Lloyd, Highland Park.
Hazen, Paul Gordon, Center Line.
Heck, Norman Walter, Jr., Monroe.
Hensley, Gary Lee, Cassopolis.
Herrando, Roger Daniel, Detroit.
Herrera, Jimmie Andrew, Melvindale.
Hintz, James Raymond, Detroit.
Hobbs, Ronald Wayne, Kalamazoo.
Hodge, Edward L., Detroit.
Hoffman, Melvin Elmer, Holland.
Holden, Lowell Dean, Davidson.
Hollingsworth, Richard Lee, Warren.
Holtzlander, Doyle Edward, Newaygo.
Hood, Raymond, Detroit.
Hoover, Gerald Donald, Chesaning.
Hopson, James H., Muskegon.
Howard, Charles Vincent, Brimley.
Howard, James Ray, Detroit.
Hoyt, Victor Ronald, Pontiac.
Hubbard, Meredith Gerald, Detroit.
Huey, Herman Leroy, Grand Rapids.
Hultquist, Edward Charles, Norway.
Hyder, Floyd Allan, Adrain.
Hyett, Kenneth Monroe, Allegan.
Illi, Daniel John, Ann Arbor.
Jackemeyer, Robert Raymond, Detroit.
Jackson, Douglas, Detroit.
Jacobs, Richard Allen, Warren.
Johnson, Dannie Lewis, Ypsilanti.
Johnson, Joe D., Jr., Ecorse.
Johnson, Richard Arnold, Escanaba.
Jones, Horatio Lee, Detroit.
Jones, Tracy Lee, Roseville.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Kaminski, Richard Dennis, Lincoln Park.
Keirns, Thomas Lee, Jackson.
Keller, Peter Joseph, Jr., Detroit.
Kelley, Thomas R., East Le Roy.
Kelsey, Clifford Earl, Newaygo.
Kemp, Jerald Wayne, Charlotte.
Kennell, Danny Owen, Portland.
Kepsel, Elmer Fred, Mount Clemens.
Killian, Gary Martin, Hazel Park.
King, Ivan Claus, Kincheloe.
King, Steven Ross, Roseville.
Kirby, Lewis Roy, Detroit.
Kish, Cary Michael, Detroit.
Knox, Irville J., Sturgis.
Kohut, Roger Scott, Detroit.
Koone, Jack Russell, Lansing.
Kosakowski, Gerald Anthony, Lincoln Park.
Kovalcsik, Richard, Linden.
Koziol, John Thomas, Detroit.
Krolikowski, Richard, Hamtramck.
Kunna, Frederick Carmen, Mount Clemens.
La Lone, James Clifton, Hazel Park.
Lajko, Robert Dennis, New Boston.
Lamb, Elwin Jay, Colon.
Lamont, Peter Alan, Detroit.
Lane, Alan, Warren.
Lause, Dale Michael, Roseville.
Lawrence, Richard Alfred, Detroit.
Lawson, William Edward, Jr., Royal Oak.
Ledford, Jeffery Lee, Detroit.
Lesky, Christopher Allan, Detroit.
Lewis, William David, Detroit.
Lichota, Dennis, Detroit.
Liminga, Frederick Hugo, Pontiac.
Linn, Robert Lewis, Jr., Niles.
Livingston, Norman James, Detroit.
Loiselle, Richard J., Saginaw.
Loso, James Michael, Pinckney.
Loucks, Herbert Allen, Lyons.
Lowe, Robert Kinloch, St. Clair.
Lubavs, Konstantins Adolfs, Kalamazoo.
Lundberg, William Raymond, Ontonagon.
Lyden, Dennis M., Myola.
Lynch, John Charles, Detroit.
Major, La Marre Arthur, Benton Harbor.
Marcotte, Dennis Wilfred, Hancock.
Marosites, Bruce Louis, Benton Harbor.
Martine, Jay Barklow, Jr., Buchanan.
Martinez, Tomas Vasquez, Munger.
Massey, Ralph Lawrence, Detroit.
Masterson, Edmund Maceo, Detroit.
Mays, Thomas Curtis, Hamtramck.
McCann, Cecil Darrell, Melvindale.
McClain, James Harry, Lansing.
McClurg, Charles D., Bangor.
McComb, Terry Russell, Lapeer.
McCurry, Andreas, Pontiac.
McGinnis, William E., II, Grand Haven.
McIlvoy, James Lee, South Lyon.
McIntire, Walter Edwin, Jr., Ann Arbor.
McKee, Kenneth Dale, Detroit.
McKellard, Dennis Alvin, Rose City.
McLean, Terry R., Saginaw.
McLennan, Gary Alfred, Flint.
McMann, Alvin Charles, Jr., Eaton Rapids.
McPhail, Morris Gene, Detroit.
McKeague, Gregory Dean, Detroit.
Medley, Michael Milton, Jackson.
Meek, Thomas Wesley, Grand Rapids.
MeGiveron, Emil George, Pontiac.
Meirndorf, Bernard James, Williamston.
Merrill, Hugh Wallace, Bear Lake.
Merritt, Vernon Allen, Detroit.
Middleton, Kenneth Dale, Port Huron.
Miedema, Matthew George, Grand Rapids.
Miller, Ernest Lee, Detroit.
Miller, James Edward, Detroit.
Minus, Raymond Benjamin, Detroit.
Misronald, Henry, East Upton.
Mize, William David, Saginaw.
Montross, Burton Charles, Clarkston.
Moore, David Allen, New Baltimore.
Morey, Darrell H., Ravenna.
Morgan, Calvin Carl, Wayne.
Morgan, Leonard Anthony, Detroit.
Morley, James Richard, Rochester.
Morrow, James Francis, Dearborn.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Moses, Donald Sylvester, Ann Arbor.
Mosier, Clive Vere, Ann Arbor.
Mounce, Barry Mitchell, Detroit.
Munn, William Arthur, Detroit.
Murphy, Vincent Francis, Grosse Pointe.
Muscynski, Frank, Utica.
Myers, Larry Dale, Camden.
Myers, Michael Lee, Detroit.
Negro, Daniel Lee, Wakefield.
Nelson, Donald Lee, Port Huron.
Newton, Donald William, Detroit.
Nitz, Robert Franklin, Wyoming.
Nolff, Daniel Benson, South Boardman.
Novotny, Richard Dennis, Brethren.
O'Donnell, Daniel Martin, Detroit.
Odenweller, Peter Edward, Grosse Pointe Farm.
Oleksa, Christopher James, Port Huron.
Olofson, Philip John, Detroit.
Onkalo, Philip Gordon, Baltic.
Orris, Steve III, Wayne.
Ortwine. Dennis Royal. Detroit.
Overweg, George Allen, Zeeland
Owens, John William, Detroit.
Parks, Joseph L., Saginaw.
Partee, Wardlow Wesley, Flint.
Patterson, James Barnett, Dearborn.
Pawlak, James William, Detroit.
Payne, Roy Charles, Jr., Saginaw.
Pearce, William Calvin IV, Detroit.
Peasley, Gary Wayne, Hudsonville.
Pennell, Wilbert Gene, Dearborn.
Perry, Randall Lawrence, Flint.
Petersen, Paul Joseph, Taylor.
Petrimoulx, Robert Gordon, Belleville.
Phair, James W., Detroit.
Phenney, George S., Petoskey.
Phillips, James Clifford, Detroit.
Phillips, James, Jr., Detroit.
Poblock, Bernard Francis, Detroit.
Polkinghorne, Robert Elish, Ishpeming.
Ponce, Antonio Ramon, Muskegon.
Posius, Robert, Detroit.
Powers, James William, Lincoln Park.
Prinz, Randall Boyd, Roseville.
Przybylowicz, Walter, Jr., Detroit.
Purgiel, Robert Charles, Posen.
Ramirez, Honorio, Jr., Pontiac.
Ramirez, Mario, Oakland.
Rasnick, Sidney McArthur, Clawson.
Rawls, Robert Edwards, Royal Oak.
Ray, Charles, Detroit.
Reed, Ronald Lee, Oscada.
Reese, Abraham B., Detroit.
Reichard, Garry Lee, Newaygo.
Remondini, Leo Angelo, Jr., Caspian.
Reynolds, Ossie, Detroit.
Ricci, Gerald, Warren.
Rice, Larry Allen, Montrose.
Rice, Robert Charles, Dearborn Heights.
Rightler, Gordon Ray, Detroit.
Rivers, Clarence, Detroit.
Robinson, Raymond Carl, Flint.
Roche, John Donald, Bay City.
Roddy, Donald Barrett, Ann Arbor.
Rogers, Roy Rumsey, Jackson.
Root, Roger Dale, Jenison.
Root, Russell Lee, Plainwell.
Ross, Larry David, Royal Oak.
Roth, John Howard, River Rouge.
Roth, Ronald Arthur Bert, Detroit.
Rowland, Harvey Lyn, Grand Rapids.
Ruiter, Jerry Lee, Nunica.
Ruszlewicz, Paul Frank, Hamtramck.
Sagan, Sylvester Stanley, Whitehall.
Salazar, Jose, Lansing.
Sanders, Francis Eugene, Augusta.
Scarborough, Elmer Wayne, Romulus.
Schell, Edward Earl, Saginaw.
Schmidt, Donald Frank, Mt. Pleasant.
Schneider, Terrance H., Montrose.
Schouwburg, Gerrit John, Kalamazoo.
Schrank, Karl F., Clare.
Schutz, Peter John, Utica.
Scott, David Lee, Edwardsburg.
Scott, Hugh Don, Adrian.
Seadorf, Michael J., Wyoming.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Shelton, Charles H., Detroit.
Sherwood, Richard Guy, Jackson.
Shetron, William Macks, Detroit.
Shields, Melvin Leroy, Detroit.
Short, J. C. Leslie, Munith.
Sickles, John Andrew, Laingsburg.
Simmons, Willie James, Detroit.
Simms, Leon, Detroit.
Simon, Terence Edward, Muir.
Simrau, Roger Allen, Gladwin.
Skinner, Ernest Mack, Ontonagon.
Slack, Lloyd, Grand Rapids.
Smith, Earl, Dearborn.
Smith, Gary Martin, Detroit.
Smith, Pedro Andre, Sturgis.
Smith, Richard Edward, Pontiac.
Smith, Ronald C., Dearborn.
Smith, Willie James, Jr., Detroit.
Somero, Kenneth Edwin, Greenland.
Sparks, Rickie D., Tecumseh
Starry, Douglas C., Roseville.
Steffens, Walter Frederick, Arcadia.
Stephens, Jasper, Jr., Detroit.
Stetten, G. Lyle, Adrian.
Stevens, Robert Louis, Jr., Kalamazoo.
Stoken, Charles Albert, Grand Rapids.
Strange, Robert Allen, Northville.
Sullivan, Charles A., Jr., Detroit.
Tate, Bernie Lee, Pontiac.
Taylor, William John, III, East Jordan.
Tazelaar, James Allen, Muskegon.
Teevens, Richard Paul, Detroit.
Terry, Tommy J., Chesaning.
Terwilliger, David William, Dearborn.
Th-uot, Hubert Owen, Detroit.
Thompson, Barry Allan, Lake.
Thompson, Samuel Dwight, Mountain Clemens.
Thompson, Stanley James, Ann Arbor.
Timberlake, Dwight Elmer, Livonia.
Toins, Fred, Flint.
Townsend, Robert Franklin, Royal Oak.
Trapani, Andrew, Grand Rapids.
Trueluck, George Guthrie, Detroit.
Vaczi, Alex E., Detroit.
Van Raemdonck, Ronald Fran, Detroit.
Vander, Weg, Phillip John, Wayland.
Vaughn, Wendell Glen, Benton Harbor.
Villarreal, Ernesto, Detroit.
Vincent, Donald, Wayne.
Vogel, Lawrence Smith, Grand Rapids.
Wagner, Bruce Allen, Lansing.
Walker, Artie Dell, Detroit.
Walker, Clark L., Bronson.
Wallace, James Clarence, Detroit.
Warren, Coleman Litchfield, Detroit.
Watson, Ernest, Benton Harbor.
Wawersik, Kenneth William, Weidman.
Wetzel, John Thomas, Buchanan.
Whitcome Larry William, Detroit.
White, Charles Boyd, Trenton.
White, Roger Duwaine, Battle Creek.
Whitlock, Thomas Daniel, Pontiac.
Wilkie, Robert George, Coleman.
Williams, Edwin Jerome, Detroit.
Williams, Frank A., Kawkawlin.
Willoughby, Julian B., Flint.
Winslow, Larry A., Plainwell.
Wolfe, Richard Lawrence, Hazel Park.
Woodworth, Clark Newell, Jr., Ann Arbor.
Wright, Leslie Edward, Livingston.
Yacks, Ronald G., Flint.
Young, Donnie Winfield, Detroit.
Zelinski, Joseph Vincent, Troy.
Zomberg, George Alan, Grand Rapids.
Zsigo, Alexander C., Jr., Durand.
Zywica, Gary Roman, Detroit.

Air Force

Boss, Charles Frederic, Ann Arbor.
Feneley, Francis James, Curtis.
Kanaar, Louis Kenneth, Muskegon.
Moroney, Robert Jerome, Grand Rapids.
Richter, Karl Wendell, Holly.
Robinson, Lewis Merritt, Saginaw.
Scoville, William Ward, Clark Lake.
Wagener, David Raymond, Ann Arbor.
Walker, Kenneth Earl, Lansing.

MICHIGAN—continued

Marine Corps

Anderson, John Perry, Iron River.
Axford, Joseph William, Livonia.
Baker, Thomas Harry, Stanton.
Barcalow, Ronald Richard, Reese.
Barnes, Jimmy Oneal, Lansing.
Barrett, Stanley Foster, Saginaw.
Barth, Bruce George, Detroit.
Beckett, Ronald Lee, Lincoln Park.
Bell, Elias, Jr., Detroit.
Benney, Kendal Lee, Jr., Ypsilanti.
Birdsall, Thomas Eddy, Royal Oak.
Blackmon, Johnny, Flint.
Blissett, Robert Allen, Lapeer.
Boudreau, John Henry, Birmingham.
Bowens, James Terry, Detroit.
Boyd, Don Gaynor, Southfield.
Bradshaw, David Allen. Manistee.
Bromley, Edward Lewis. Marysville.
Bronsnan, Randy Dale. Detroit.
Brotz, Danny Ray, Detroit.
Bruske, Gary Lee. Carrollton.
Buckler, Terry Wayne, Fenton.
Bulifant, Roger Dean. Belleville.
Burnett. William Robert, Highland Park.
Buschleiter, Walter Dennis, Detroit.
Callahan, Patrick Richard. Wyandotte.
Cantlon, John Edward, Jr.. East Lansing.
Castillo, Daniel Sandual, Lansing.
Castillo, John James, Saginaw.
Chaffin, Thomas William, Clark Lake.
Chmiel, Andrew, Utica.
Clark, James Thomas, Detroit.
Clark, Lugene Jackie, Lansing.
Clarke, Kevin Michael, Muskegon Heights.
Cody, Peter Girard, Detroit.
Coin, Gregory Cleveland, Detroit.
Colby, Brian Lynn, Lansing.
Connors, Patrick Joseph, Livonia.
Conway, Edward John, Fenton.
Cools, James Harvey, Detroit.
Copeland, Arthur Perry, Livonia.
Cotten, Ollie Ray, Sand Lake.
Cotter, John Redmond, Charlotte.
Davidson, William Galan, Filion.
Davis, Leroy, Jr., Detroit.
Dawson, John Robert, Adrian.
Day, Wesley David, Grand Rapids.
De Hommel, Hank John Conra, Grand Rapids.
Dellvon, William Grant, Utica.
Didaskalou, George Arthur, Grand Rapids.
Dozier, James Edward, Flint.
Eadie, Gordon Patterson, Detroit.
Eckerdt, Christian John, Jr., Williamsburg.
Edinger, James Gard, Sodus.
Edwards, Roger Wayne, Muskegon Heights.
Ellison, Robert Loomis, Charlotte.
Emerson, Philip Blaine, Alpena.
Engel, Gerald William, Detroit.
Everett, Lucious Lionel, Detroit.
Farrell, Michael Charles, Riverside.
Faught, David Lawrence, Grand Rapids.
Fitch, Ronald James, St. Johns.
Fitzpatrick, Peter Thomas, Garden City.
Francis, John Paul, Reese.
Fritz, Jerald Duane, Bay City.
Fuller, Hermon Eugene, Jr., Ypsilanti.
Gagnon, Patrick John, Detroit.
Gause, Charlie, Detroit.
Gautz, Wayne Jacob, Adrain.
Graboskey, Edward Elliott, Paris.
Gronau, David James, Detroit.
Gronowski, Theodore, Jr., Taylor.
Gulash, David John, Flint.
Hamilton, Paul, Jr., Saginaw.
Haney, William David, Keego Harbor.
Harmon, Dennis Leroy, Richmond.
Harris, Doyle Lee, Coloma.
Hatton, Russell Odell, Detroit.
Hearns, Roger Charles, Paw Paw.
Heether, James Joseph, II, Ada.
Hendershott, Thomas Edward, Lapeer.
Hendrickson, Gerald Ray, Muskegon.
Henrich, Bruce James, Detroit.
Herrington, Raymond Neil, Carsonville.
Higgs, Danny Trent, Battle Creek.
Highland, Byron Grant, Detroit.
Holman, Marshall Daniel, Detroit.

MICHIGAN—continued

Marine Corps

Hoover, Roger Joseph, Warren.
Hopkins, Jack Maynard, Ypsilanti.
Hoyt, Norman Lee Roy, Mt. Morris.
Hubbell, Thomas Simcock, Milford.
Hunter, Barry Alan, Hazel Park.
Jako, James Louis, Portage.
Jarrell, Joseph Daniel, Willow.
Jenks, Joseph William, Mainstique.
Johnson, Christopher Paul, Wyandotte.
Johnson, Clarence Edward, Allen Park.
Johnson, William Henry, Ann Arbor.
Jones, Danny Lee, Greenville.
Jones, Terry Agusta, Detroit.
Jozwiak, Roger Edward, Detroit.
Kelley, Johnnie Woodrow, Galien.
Kline, Gary Wayne, Lincoln Park.
Knarian, Daniel, Melvindale.
Koenig, David Bruce, Romeo.
Kooi, James Willard, Fruitport.
Koos, Norman Lavern, Olivet.
Kowalski, Robert Allen, Saginaw.
Kreh, Gary Harold, Flint.
Kropp, Gordon Gene, Lapeer.
La Nore, Dennis Arnold, Muskegon Heights
Laclear, James Phillip, East Lansing.
Lander, Mark Robert, Battle Creek.
Lanteigne, Arthur, Detroit.
Lantry, Merrill Lagene, Detroit.
Large, Bruce Edward, Sturgis.
Laudicina, James Ray, Union Lake.
Lehmann, Peter Bodo, Wayne.
Leija, Mariano, Jr., Mt. Clemens.
Lockhart, Dover Leon, Detroit.
Lopez, Frank, Jr., Detroit.
Lord, Stephen Geoffrey, Fair Haven.
Lozano, Carlos Felipe Mend, Detroit.
Lugar, Dennis Wayne, Detroit.
Lyvere, Ronald Lee, Midland.
MacBeth, Kenneth Neil, Riga.
MacDonald, Larry Edward, Detroit.
Maharg, Evert Ralph, Flint.
Makarewicz, Daniel, Grand Rapids.
Maki, Glen Arvid, Iron River.
Manning, Dennis Carrol, St. Clair Shores.
Martin, Bruno Leo, Wayne.
McGee, Kenneth Wesley, Detroit.
McGee, Robert Lee, Clifford.
McGrath, John August, Washington.
McKenzie, David Dale, Ann Arbor.
McLean, James McMurray, Inkster.
McManus, Michael George, Bridgeport.
Meek, Charles Edward, St. Clair Shores.
Millan, Robert Dennis, Jr., Southfield.
Miller, David Raymond, Erie.
Miller, Douglas J., East Lansing.
Moore, Stanley Leroy, Troy
Morse, Howard Edward, Detroit.
Moser, Keith Milton II, Lowell.
Mueller, Robert Stephan, South Haven.
Nahan, John Benedict, III, Allegan.
Nelson, David Bruce, Comstock.
Nichols, Eli Wayne, Lincoln Park.
Niemi, Roger Lyle, Detroit.
Nimox, Benny Frank, Highland Park.
Norton, Benjamin Paul, Battle Creek.
O'Neil, Vaughn Thomas, Lincoln Park.
Olenzuk, Kenneth Francis, Detriot.
Otte, Richard Lee, Traverse City.
Pace, George Alexander, Detroit.
Parks, Jerry Emmet, Grand Rapids.
Perry, William Edward, Port Huron.
Phelps, Ronald Joseph, Menominee.
Piotrowski, Daniel Joseph, Jackson.
Pitcock, Elzia Ray, Farmington.
Plum, Billie Neal, Flint.
Popp, James Arthur, Hemlock.
Powers, Steven James, Lansing.
Price, Humphrey James, Boyne City.
Raglin, Ronda Lee, St. Clair.
Ray, Edward Gean, Detroit.
Reich, Donald George, East Jordan.
Richardson, Benjamin, Detroit.
Riesberg, Danny Paul, Fruitport.
Riley, David Clark, Detroit.
Roberts, Jerry Lee, Mt. Clemens.
Roe, Jeffrey Terry, Detroit.
Roe, Kenneth Allen, River Rouge.
Roussos, William Robert, Niles.

MICHIGAN—continued

Marine Corps

Rusnell, Daniel Joseph, Vestaburg.
Sanders, Ronald Walter, Wayne.
Schafer, Donald Fred, Allen Park.
Schultz, John Joseph, Jr., Harper Woods.
Scott, John Melville, Jr., Grand Rapids.
Scovill, Gary Alan, Detroit.
Setter, James Adrian, Brown City.
Sexton, Edward Cicero, New Buffalo.
Shauver, Terry Dean, Perry.
Sinkler, Marvin John, Lake City.
Skalba, John Joseph, Detroit.
Skoviak, Ronald Frank, Warren.
Skutt, Dennis Dwayne, Midland.
Smith, Alton, Hamtramck.
Smith, David Leon, Dearborn.
Smith, J. T., Detroit.
Snyder, Richard Andrews, Rochester.
Snyder, Rocky Rand, St. Johns.
Sorovetz, Michael, Southgate.
Sotzen, Harold James, Clawson.
Stancroff, Dennis Charles, Dearborn.
Stanton, Edward Ryland, II, Detroit.
Stevens, Dennis Michael, Hazel Park.
Stewart, Rick James, Garden City.
Stockholm, Dwight Ross, Gladstone.
Stokes, Roy E., Flint.
Studards, Robert Larry, Detroit.
Stupar, Mitchell Nick, Detroit.
Sylwanowicz, Casimir Sylwa, Flint.
Taglione, Robert, Detroit.
Tangen, Terence Ronald, Mount Clemens.
Telling, Jack Edwin, Port Huron.
Tewksbury, James Lee, Midland.
Thatcher, Thomas Milton, Birmingham.
Thimm, Joseph Michael, Armada.
Thomas, Joseph Michael, Detroit.
Thompson, Everette Arthur, Grand Rapids.
Thornell, Richard Lloyd, Portage.
Tomakoski, James Roman, Detroit.
Totten, Randy Gene, Reed City.
Travis, William Harry, Mikado.
Treadway, Kenneth Earl, Riverview.
Trombley, Michael Lawrence, Garden City.
Vancil, Michael, Detroit.
Vandercook, David Franklin, Royal Oak.
Vedro Edmund Ronald, Detroit.
Vigh, Alexander Joseph, Grand Rapids.
Villamor, Roman Rozel, Jr., Warren.
Wargo, David Roy, St. Charles.
Weaver, Gary Lee, Clio.
Wenger, Robert Lee, Dowagiac.
Westbrook, Theodore Elba, Pierson.
Wiginton, Larry Michael, East Detroit.
Williams, Ted, Detroit.
Wilson, Richard Edwin, Inkster.
Winckler, Donald Lewis, Marine City.
Wright, Garry, Rockwood.
Yagle, Thomas Neil, Traverse City.

Navy

Ames, Ronald Edward, Detroit.
Bellant, Frank Leroy, Flint.
Brand, Thomas Richard, Allen Park.
Brown, William Lennington, Ypsilanti.
Chilvere, Robin Lee, Wyoming.
Damrow, Oliver Pierce, Kinde.
Dotson, Michael Robert, Lansing.
Fox, Phillip Carrol, Flint.
Grachtrup, John Norbert, Grand Rapids.
Hallowell, Albert George, Highland Park.
Klett, John Earle, Birmingham.
Lane, Thomas Allen, Fraser.
Laning, John Edward, Muskegon.
Laporte, Bruce Stephen, Fruitport.
Marvin, Robert Clarence, Dexter.
McCormick, John Vern, Burt.
Moras, Robert John, Escanaba.
Myers, John Maurice, Crosse Pointe Wood.
Nelson, Richard Allen, Lincoln Park.
Omilian, Dennis Allen, Detroit.
Orlando, Samuel Gizzi, Birmingham.
Palmer, David Scott, Ypsilanti.
Radabaugh, Harold W., II, Royal Oak.
Rush, George Henry, Jr., Detroit.
Sovey, Elwood Charles, Jr., Rockwood.
Tiglas, Thomas Lee, Manistique.
Trescott, Charles Robert, Dearborn.
Wager, Richard James, Millington.

MINNESOTA

Army

Alldridge, Gale Arthur, Minneapolis.
Anderson, Mark Anthony, Pennington.
Anderson, Robert Gary, Minneapolis.
Arrigoni, Ronald Louis, St. Paul.
Arvidson, Kenneth Arvid, Minneapolis.
Auwarter, Earl Dean, Clearwater.
Baker, Don Carter, Ogema.
Beebe, Jerry Ray, Brainerd.
Bembenek, Marlin Edwin, Gaylord.
Bixby, Jack Denton, Graceton.
Brede, Robert William, Alexandria.
Brown, Dennis Richard, Minneapolis.
Brown, Richard Gordon, Clearwater.
Buan, Lee Bjarne, Duluth.
Callivas, Gust, Virginia.
Cardenas, Manuel, II, St. Paul.
Compton, Michael Joseph, Lake Crystal.
Cran, James A., Hayfield.
Davis, Richard John, Minneapolis.
Dawsgard, Charles De Wayne, St. Paul.
Deedrick, Charles Orvis, Jr., Winona.
Derby, Earl Lee, Pequot Lakes.
Doring, Larry Allen, Mankato.
Dorman, Darrel Gene, Hackensack.
Eastman, Thomas Dell, Faribault.
Ehlers, Robert Frederick, St. Paul.
Erickson, Thomas Gustav, St. Paul.
Ertl, Richard Louis, St. Paul.
Essler, Ronald Henry, Brooten.
Feddema, Charles John, Bagley.
Fenney, Douglas James, Minneapolis.
Frye, Clifford Kenneth, St. Paul.
Gagne, Dale Francis, Duluth.
Garner, Boyd Grayson, St. Paul.
Gilbert, Stanley Donald, Dexter.
Graves, Edward Stephen, Minneapolis.
Green, Donald Carl, Park Rapids.
Grove, Earl Russell, Little Falls.
Grundman, Robert Francis, Faribault.
Haider, James Michael, St. Paul.
Halbauer, David Michael, St. Paul.
Hammerstrom, Ronald Roy, Harris.
Haney, Thomas William, St. Paul.
Harris, Lawrence Hubert, Wilmar.
Hauschildt, Charles Lee, Red Wing.
Helland, Jerry Irven, Austin.
Holcomb, Robert Earl, Minneapolis.
Holte, Mark Delane, Grugla.
Huberty, William M., St. Paul.
Jacobsen, Donald James, Montevideo.
Jamros, Richard Kenneth, Minneapolis.
Jarvi, Raymond Lee, Embarrass.
Jensen, Arlin Roger, St. Paul.
Johnson, Allen Isaac, Cloquet.
Johnson, Bruce Mark, Duluth.
Johnson, Russell Carl, St. Paul.
Johnson, Warren Dean, Minneapolis.
Jones, Robert Edward, Redwood Falls.
Keim, Larry Robert, Owatonna.
Keller, Dodd Clifton, Duluth.
Kern, David Joseph, St. Paul.
Kervin, Joel Charles, St. Paul.
Knowlton, Don Glenn, Minneapolis.
Knutson, Larry Lee, Radium.
Kooler, Michael Joseph, Stillwater.
Kuehn, Lloyd Martin, Stillwater.
Kurtz, Alvin Edward, Hillman.
Kurz, John Peter, Argyle.
Kusilek, Lawrence Robert, St. Paul.
Larson, Robert John, Minneapolis.
Le Vasseur, Jerome F., Jr., White Bear Lake.
Lehmann, Derlyn Reynold, Boyd.
Leino, Vernon Leroy, Hibbing.
Lewis, Roger Charles, Caledonia.
Lindgren, Robert William, Minneapolis.
Lossing, Clarence Ernest, Blackduck.
Lueck, Douglas Roy, Glencoe.
Madland, Robert Louis, Minneapolis.
Mannie, Roger Michael, Minneapolis.
Markus, Larry Frank, Duluth.
Martin, Terry Lee, Minneapolis.
Maxie, Charles Lee, Hibbing.
Mayer, Dwight Bennie, Pine River.
Mees, Wayne Edward, Dexter.
Mercier, Patrick Timothy, St. Paul.
Milde, David W., Rochester.
Miller, Steven Richard, Preston.

XUM

MINNESOTA—continued

Army

Mondyke, Charles Anthony, Minneapolis.
Nelson, Daniel Ivan, Rutledge.
Nelson, Dennis Leroy, Clearbrook.
Nelson, Roger Theodore, Barrett.
Nelson, Thomas Leon, Minneapolis.
Newbrough, Gerald Raymond, Alden.
Noogle, Stephen M., Minneapolis.
Nolan, David Allen, Minneapolis.
Northrup, Maurice Frederick, Minneapolis.
Nye, Wallace Gregory, Minneapolis.
O'Keefe, Ronald Thomas, Blue Earth.
O'Toole, George Patrick, Jr., Mankato.
Oak, Glen Everett, Duluth.
Oestriech, Jim Edward, Cromwell.
Olin, Thomas M., Minneapolis.
Oothoudt, Gary Eldon, Cushing.
Papesh, David C., Saint Cloud.
Peterson, Bradley Eugene, Anoka.
Peterson, Gary Wayne, St. Paul Park.
Peterson, Jack Walter, Duluth.
Peterson, Leroy Emanuel, Coon Rapids.
Peterson, Michael Gerald, Stanchfield.
Peterson, Renold William, Minneapolis.
Peterson, Terrill Gene, New Brighton.
Proszek, Anton, Jr., International Falls.
Ramaker, Lawrence Frederick, Minneapolis.
Rathbun, Gary Allen, Cosmos.
Reigstad, Danny Ray, Atwater.
Rice, Thomas Everett, Howard Lake.
Rick, Eugene Merlyn, Coon Rapids.
Riley, Thomas Jay, Columbia Heights.
Ritter, Allen Jerome, Moorhead.
Rucktaeschel, Gary Arden, Wabasso.
Rudlong, Thelmer Arthur, Spring Valley.
Sandmann, Ronald Lee, Sleepy Eye.
Schmitz, Loren Michael, Springfield.
Schramel, Kenneth Michael, St. Cloud.
Schrom, Kenneth R., Rosemount.
Schumacher, Wayne Thomas, Buffalo.
Schumann, John Robert, Cokato.
Schummer, Dale Clarence, Bena.
Selenka, Rudolph Carl, Jr., Minneapolis.
Serrano, Thomas Robert, Kelly Lake.
Shannon, Thomas Eric, St. Paul.
Silver, John Clyde, Wadena.
Sloan, Monte Thomas, St. Cloud.
Solberg, Kale Arlan, St. Paul.
Steiro, Robert Edward, Minneapolis.
Stockdale, Melvin James, Moorhead.
Strandberg, Ervind Carl, Strathcona.
Sulander, Daniel Arthur, Minneapolis.
Sullivan, Douglas J., Hamel.
Sundquist, John Olaf, Gonvick.
Svobodny, Lawrence Marvin, Mahnomen.
Tennison, Alvin Gene, St. Cloud.
Thomas, Bernard Monroe, Minneapolis.
Thompson, Stanley Wendell, Madison.
Tronnes, Alvin Phillip, Minneapolis.
Tschumper, Robert G., La Crescent.
Ugland, David Leonard, Minneapolis.
Verwers, Roger Lee, Coon Rapids.
Vincent, Norman Wayne, Duluth.
Waldvogel, Robert E., St. Paul.
Wallin, Douglas Dewey, Rochester.
Wayrynen, Dale Eugene, McGregor.
Wehrs, David Wilbert, Elgin.
Weise, Richard Raymond, St. Peter.
Welk, Lawrence Norman, Paynesville.
Wickenberg, Erik Bernard, Bertha.
Wilde, Raymond Charles, St. Paul.
Wilson, Larry Eugene, Chaska.
Wilson, Marvin James, Crosby.
Witt, Kenneth Lee, Brainerd.
Wronski, John C., Minneapolis.
Younk, David Alan, Royalton.

Air Force

Fasnacht, David Anthony, Janesville.
Jensen, Terance Kay, Detroit Lakes.
Larson, Robert Darrel, Moorhead.
Nelson, Charles Carter, Minneapolis.
Sloan, Thomas Newton, Minneapolis.
Spinler, Darrell John, Browns Valley.

Marine Corps

Allen, Ronald Paul, Winona.
Baer, Herman John, Hopkins.
Bagaason, Gerald Bennett, Clearbrook.
Beaulieu, Leo Vernon, Lengby.
Boldt, Charles David, Zumbro Falls.
Braasch, Gary William, Minneapolis.
Brenke, Fredrick Joseph, St. Paul.
Brown, Walter Stoneman, Richfield.
Bunnis, Richard Thomas, International Falls.
Bursaw, Clarence Herbert, Minneapolis.
Carey, Roger Garylee, Windom.
Carlton, David James, St. Paul.
Casserly, Joseph Michael, St. Paul.
Dieryck, James Leo, Duluth.
Dusbabek, John Robert, Waterville.
Egge, Eric Craig, Hopkins.
Elledge, Keith O'Neil, St. Paul.
Elzy, John Calvin, III, St. Paul.
Evans, Thomas James, Minneapolis.
Foss, Duane John, Hastings.
Freeberg, Randall Roger, Minneapolis.
Fuller, Eugene Edward, Minneapolis.
Gehling, Donald Anton, Grand Meadow.
Glynn, Michael Joseph, Lake City.
Hammer, Richard Joseph, Minneapolis.
Hanson, Alan Morris, Nielsville.
Hanson, James Richard, Barnesville.
Hart, Melvin Ellsworth, Minneapolis.
Healy, Thomas Micheal, Hutchinson.
Herrron, Joseph Samuel, St. Paul.
Hoglund, Gary William, Duluth.
Jansen, Miles Edward, St. Paul.
Johnson, Richard Allen, St. Paul.
Kelsey, Milton George, Madelia.
Koehler, Ronald Lee, Vernon Center.
Krage, Bruce Herbert, Minnesota City.
Krispin, Thomas Albert, Roseville.
Krumm, Richard Henry, Blue Earth.
Larson, Edward David, St. Louis Park.
Lavallee, Michael Eugene, Hennepin.
Le Noue, Bruce Vernon, Anoka.
Lewellin, Lawrence Frank, Brook Park.
Lillis, Richard Ned, Richville.
Loegering, Dean Charles, Minneapolis.
McCluskey, Benjamin Charl, Minneapolis.
McCue, Gary Francis, Bloomington.
McDaniel, John Thomas, St. Louis Park.
Morningstar, Duane Lee, Maple Lake.
Mott, Barry Lee, Savage.
Munden, Steven Douglas, Minneapolis.
Nelson, Ronald Elwood, Braham.
Nelson, Stephan Joseph, Princeton.
Nelson, Steven Howard, Minneapolis.
O'Laughlin, Daniel Thomas, Eveleth.
Otto, Dale Lester, Ellendale.
Pawlowicz, Dennis Wayne, Duluth.
Pederson, Arthur Clifford, Minneapolis.
Pepper, James Thomas, Elk River.
Pitts, Dana Allen, Minneapolis.
Power, Richard Dean, Shevlin.
Prekker, Gary Lee, Sauk Centre.
Reed, Samuel Lee, Mankato.
Rehn, Gary Lee, Park Rapids.
Reilly, John Francis, White Bear Lake.
Ritzschke, David Aaron, Minneapolis.
Ryberg, Charles Edward, Jackson.
Sangster, Gary Lavern, Minneapolis.
Savoren, William Martin, Minneapolis.
Schaefer, Sylvester Antony, Richmond.
Schouviller, Thomas John, St. Paul.
Seller, Joseph John, Winsted.
Spicer, Eugene Douglas, Maplewood.
Stoltzman, George Leo, Lehillier.
Tenhoff, Tracy Stephen, Austin.
Teske, Bernard Albert, III, Excelsior.
Theisen, James Elmer, Freeport.
Toenyan, Francis Henry, Long Prairie.
Turner, Arthur Joseph, Brainerd.
Ungerecht, Richard Alfred, Brainerd.
Vedder, Richard Jerome, Duluth.
Weaver, Robert Duane, St. Paul.
Weber, David Frank, Cold Spring.
Wellmann, Dennis Weldon, Hanska.
White, Charles Henry, Renville.
Wilber, William Frederick, Champlin.
Wilson, John Walter, Jr., St. Paul.
Yeager, Gregory Lee, St. Paul.
Zimmerman, Dean Roger, Hopkins.

Navy

Ashby, James Wesley, Park Rapids.
Benoit, Francis Arthur, Red Lake Falls.
Menshek, Stephen Albert, Minneapolis.
Nelson, Dennis Orville, Hendricks.
Nelson, Noel Steven, St. Paul.
Nelson, Theodore Russell, Austin.
Ness, Patrick Lawrence, Minneapolis.
Riehl, Harlan Cyrus, Spring Valley.
Schmitz, William David, Duluth.
Schultz, Steven Owen, International Falls.
Sparks, Peter Allan, Minneapolis.
Stommes, Kenneth Clarence, Cold Springs.
Swanson, William Edward, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Baker, Willie James, Scott.
Ball, Michael Henry, North Carrollton.
Beasley, Edgar Hunter, Hazelhurst.
Bizzell, Raymond Albert, Ripley.
Blanks, Clarence, Tupelo.
Blythe, Terry Lee, Ripley.
Boston, Johnny B., Rolling Fork.
Breland, Cecil Douglas, Hattiesburg.
Brewer, Jessie Seymore, Boyle.
Carter, Joe Eddie, Hernando.
Clark, James Genius, De Kalb.
Cole, Mozie Lee, Canton.
Coleman, Louis Wilson, Jr., McComb.
Cook, Peter Brown, Jr., Yazoo City.
Cotton, Moses M., Porterville.
Crain, Joseph Dewey, Jr., Terry.
Davis, Randolph, Greenville.
Davis, William R., Meridian.
Dedeaux, Aldon James, De Lisle.
Dixon, James C., Vicksburg.
Dozier, Debrow, Meridian.
Drakes, Clarence Earl, Gulfport.
Earnest, Willie Lee, Sunflower.
Finch, Michael Thomas, Jackson.
Flanagan, Tom, Learned.
Fortenberry, Edward Eugene, Foxworth.
Fox, Leon Vincent, Houston.
Fuller, Joel, Bogue Chitto.
Garrett, Howard, Vicksburg.
Giles, Barney McKinley, Jr., Biloxi.
Gordon, Arthur Melvin, Vicksburg.
Gregory, David Clark, Noxapater.
Groom, Hubert, Winona.
Haddox, George Henry, Columbia.
Halford, Calvin Douglas, Natchez.
Hampton, Dell Gene, Indianola.
Harper, Edward Benjamin, Jackson.
Hendrix, Kenneth Levon, Picayune.
Henry, Andrew L., Jackson.
Hill, James Edward, Okolona.
Hill, Robert Morris, Starkville.
Hines, Louis Clark, Tiplersville.
Holmes, John Harris, Tylertown.
Howell, Roland Hayes, New Albany.
Hudson, Bobby, Corinth.
Humphrey, Jerry Dale, Columbus.
Isbell, Jimmie Ray, Marietta.
Jackson, Robert Buford, Laurel.
Johnson, David E., Natchez.
Jones, David Lee, Lorman.
Kennedy, Glenn Alexander, Mendenhall.
Langham, Henry, Jr., Moss Point.
Lee, Johnnie Gene, Mashulaville.
Liddell, Benjamin Franklin, Columbus.
Majure, Eugene Jehlen, Pascagoula.
McClellan, M. L., Meridian.
McCloud Lawrence Beverly, Greenville.
McCray, Melvin, Columbia.
McDonald, Larry James, Laurel.
McGehee, Noble Douglas, Meadville.
McInnis, Henry David, Meridian.
McKinney, Hollis Ray, Jr., New Augusta.
McNair, Willie Charles, Ellisville.
McWhorter, James Daniel, Blue Springs.
Milton, Charles, Greenville.
Mooney, Tommie Lee, Jackson.
Myers, Oliver Wendell, Hattiesburg.
Netter, Daniel, Jr., Biloxi.
Nicholson, German Lee, Crystal Springs.
O'Brien, Terrence Dale, Vicksburg.
Perkins, Clyde J., Rolling Fork.
Phillips, Wiley Lavell, Polkville.
Pinion, Dock Jefferson, Indianola.
Pope, James Russell, Collins.
Reed, Charlie. Jr., Woodville.

MISSISSIPPI—continued

Army

Richardson, Louis Douglas, Biloxi.
Roeckl, John Daniel, Jackson.
Rushing, Edward Franklin, Brandon.
Sanderson, John Daniel, Petal.
Savell, Myles Clayton, Meridian.
Sharber, John, Jr., Jackson.
Sharp, Derrell Keith, Philadelphia.
Shaw, John Dillinger, Summit.
Short, Andrew Jonah, III, Union Church.
Simmons, Bennie Lee, Moss Point.
Smith, Cleo, Edwards.
Smith, Hugh Edwin, West Point.
Spann, Lynn, Sardis.
Spikes, A. V., Hazlehurst.
Steverson, Sim Smeddley, Ellisville.
Sutton, Garrett Garland, Jr., Satartia.
Swinford, Sylvester, Jr., Potts Camp.
Thomas, Anthony, Greenville.
Thornell, Lester Jefferson, Cleveland.
Tingle, Tom Kermit, Philadelphia.
Trantham, Van Vernon, III, McComb.
Traxler, Tommy, Jr., Crystal Springs.
Trim, Jack Riley, Southaven.
Tucker, Thomas Edwin, Richton.
Tumminia, Giovannino, Pascagoula.
Turner, Hayzell Calvin, Batesville.
Tyler, Willie, Leland.
Tyner, James Daniel, Indianola.
Walker, James Edward, Roundlake.
Wallace, Jimmie Carl, Tupelo.
Waltman, Richard A., Jackson.
Ward, George Howard, Starkville.
Watt, Sammie Lee, Grenada.
Wilk, Charles Lee, Meridian.
Williams, Bobby Ray, Stonewall.
Williams, Carter Lee, Jr., Winona.
Williams, Leroy, Greenville.
Wilson, Billy Joe, Bogue Chitto.
Winfield, Lucius, Itta Bena.
Woods, Samuel Lee, Ocean Springs.
Worthey, Owen Wayne, Nettleton.
Wyley, Nathaniel, Olive Branch.

Air Force

Cody, Howard Rudolph, Gulfport.
Crotwell, Byron Hugh, Jackson.
Farr, Jack Graham, Harrison.
Simmons, William Prestwood, Meridian.

Marine Corps

Allen, Billie Alvin, Prentiss.
Ard, Bobby Joe, Tupelo.
Bourrage, I. V., De Kalb.
Bryant, Nelton Raymond, Tylertown.
Clopton, Kenneth Ray, Columbus.
Cochran, Robert Fishel, Jr., Poplarville.
Davis, Ellsworth I., Jr., Vicksburg.
Dilworth, Hensley McFadden, Rienzi.
Foster, Frank, Meridian.
Frye, Alfred Allen, Hickman Mills.
Gaines, Charles Jerry, Newton.
Gillispie, Lucion, Jr., Egypt.
Goodwin, Forrest, Tylertown.
Harrington, Paul Vincent, Bassfield.
Helm, Herschel Pittman, Jr., Coffeeville.
Holloway, Johnny Ray, Okolona.
Idom, Max Ralph, Forest Scott.
Jaggers, Thomas Murl, Greenville.
Matthews, David Earl, Jackson.
McKenney, Patrick Mickael, McComb.
Menees, Richard Allen, Blue Mountain.
Nard, James Peter, III, Jackson.
Page, Larry Lee, New Albany.
Presley, Donnie Dwight, Canton.
Reed, Shellie Jean, Jackson.
Robinson, Johnny Lee, Batesville.
Roland, Hulan Duane, Canton.
Ross, Jimmie Calvin, Wilkinson.
Sigalas, George Curtis, Pascagoula.
Smith, Johnnie Earl, Pope.
Wallace, Charles Franklin, Ellisville.
Washington, Clarence Edwar, Natchez.
Wheat, Roy Mitchell, Moselle.
Wood, James Albert, Jackson.

Navy

Howell, Adrian Ealon, Lucedale.

MISSOURI

Army

Allen, Raymond Eugene, Independence.
Allen, Terry Lee Odis, Kansas City.
Amstutz, William Joseph, Jr., St. Louis.
Anspach, Robert Allen, Macon.
Ayers, Jarel Wayne, Lamar.
Baker, Willie Cecil, St. Louis.
Bamvakais, John Robert, Jr., Jefferson City.
Barker, Larry Lee, Independence.
Barnes, John Henry, St. Louis.
Barnett, Billie Joe, Jr., Overland.
Barton, James Paul, Bates City.
Bates, Robert, Independence.
Beesley, Gary Evans, St. Louis.
Beile, Fred, St. Louis.
Beltz, John David, St. Louis.
Berry, Elmer Eugene, St. Joseph.
Blanton, Kenneth Gene, Florissant.
Boyer, James Roger, St. Louis.
Bradley, Sylvan Keith, Irondale.
Breeding, Wayne Peter Earl, Eureka.
Brockman, Verndean Arthur, Sedalia.
Brooks, Franklin Eugene, Napton.
Brown, Daniel L., St. Louis.
Brown, Harvey Lee, III, St. Louis.
Brown, James Richard, Sedalia.
Buckner, Anthony Eugene, Sedalia.
Burford, John Shelby, Cape Girardeau.
Burrow, Leonard, Ferguson.
Byrd, Gary Dean, Houstonia.
Cagley, James Nelson, Independence.
Cahall, James Warren, Mexico.
Cain, Jerry Maurice, St. Louis.
Campbell, Robert Crawford, Independence.
Carnoske, Robert Thomas, St. Louis.
Chandler, Joe Wayne, St. Louis.
Childress, George, W., Holcomb.
Christofferson, Scott Andr, St. Louis.
Clemmon, Edward L., St. Louis.
Coleman, James Edward, Kansas City.
Cook, Scott Howard, Pacific.
Cooper, Gary Robert, Bosworth.
Cox, Martin, Warrensburg.
Craighead, Terry Dean, Fulton.
Crawford, Robert Dean, Springfield.
Cunningham, Wells Eldon, St. Joseph.
Curry, Marvin Ellis, St. Louis.
Dailey, Billy Jackson, Moberly.
Davis, Gail Lee, Nottinghill.
Davis, Raymond Carl, Lemay.
Davis, Wilbert Claude, Springfield.
Deathrage, Don Le Roy, Jr., Ozark.
Dickerson, Omer Paul, Elsberry.
Dickey, Forrest Pittman, Orrick.
Dougherty, Kenneth Eugene, Aurora.
Ernst, Gary Joseph, Perryville.
Ernst, Ralph Herman, St. Louis.
Eskew, Curtis Dean, Dexter.
Essary, James, Niangua.
Feldman, Barry Edward, St. Louis.
Follett, Allan Eugene, Independence.
Fordyce, Ray, St. Louis.
Frazier, Albert William, St. Louis.
Frey, Donald, St. Louis.
Gaines, Phillip Ray, East St. Louis.
Galloway, Denis Wayne, St. Louis.
Gibson, John A., Grandin.
Gooden, Gerald Lynn, Memphis.
Gorrell, David Eugene, Malta Bend.
Grayson, Jerell Lee, Duke.
Griffin, Donald Orthel, Kinloch.
Grimes, Michael, St. Louis.
Grissom, Gary L., Kirksville.
Grizzle, Charles Wendle, Eureka.
Guittar, Donald Harvey, St. Louis.
Hadden, Robert Bruce, Kansas City.
Hailey, Joseph Carlton, Conran.
Happel, Jerry Lee, St. Louis.
Hardie, Anthony Roy, St. Louis.
Harper, Jimmy Chester, St. Louis.
Harper, Marvin, St. Louis.
Harper, William Michael, Kirksville.
Hart, Green Lee, St. Louis.
Hatfield, Jimmy Dale, Joplin.
Hendrix, Elwood Randall, Fulton.
Henson, Roger Lee, Kansas City.
Hickman, Arthur Edward, Hannibal.
Higgerson, Tommy Doyle, East Prairie.
Highfill, Rex Wheeler, Marshfield.
Hix, Keith Eugene, Kansas City.
Holloway, Lyle D., Summersville.
Holsworth, James Michael, Independence.
Hood, William Willis, O'Fallon.

MISSOURI—continued

Army

Howard, Mark Thomas, St. Louis.
Hubbard, Roger Leroy, Cameron.
Hudson, Dale Francis, Poplar Bluff.
Hughes, Jesse Ray, Jr., Bloomfield.
Jackson, Lamond Joseph, St. Louis.
Jackson, Lewis James, St. Louis.
Jasmine, Charles, St. Louis.
Jenner, Richard Lee, St. Louis.
Johnson, Emmet Lee, Lexington.
Johnson, Gregory Bert, Ballwin.
Johnson, Xavier, St. Louis.
Johnston, George Eldon, Sullivan.
Jones, Douglas Wayne, Lowry City.
Jones, John Ora, Jr., Skidmore.
Joslen, Phillip Dale, Carthage.
June, William Albert, St. Louis.
Kaster, Robert Lee, Kirksvile.
Keeven, Louis Ferdinand, Florissant.
Keith, Clyde Lee, Vanduser.
Kelley, Owen C., St. Louis.
Kelly, William Patrick, Windsor.
Killabrew, Robert Leroy, Kimmswick.
Kinkeade, Ronald Jay, St. Louis.
Knight, David Marshall, Springfield.
Kolz, John Jordan, Thayer.
Landers, Blaine Wilson, Kansas City.
Lane, Famous Lee, Poplar Bluff.
Lawhon, Charles R., Kansas City.
Lawrence, James Larry, West Plains.
Laws, Delmer Lee, Mineral Point.
Lawson, Gerry Wayne, Lamar.
Ledford, Virgil Madison, Joplin.
Leech, Robert Voyd, Unionville.
Leek, Thomas, Jr., Kansas City.
Leuthold, Donald Frederick, Bolckow.
Liese, Timothy Francis, Ferguson.
Livingston, John Joseph, Cedar Hill.
Logan, Douglas Alfred, Crane.
Long, Donald Eugene, Dunnegan.
Lucas, Wilbur Ray, Clinton.
Mahurin, Elmer Wain, Goodman.
Manley, Richard Joseph, St. Joseph.
Maple, Archie James, Jr., Canton.
Marcum, Gilbert George, Oregon.
Mattingly, Timmy G., Exeter.
McCown, Robert Dewayne, Chillicothe.
McDermott, Lewis E., Fulton.
Meador, Billy Jay, Farmington.
Meadows, Millard Franklin, Boonville.
Merkle, Elliott Lynn, St. Clair.
Michael, William Arthur, Blue Springs.
Miller, Bertmann Earl, Pacific.
Mills, Terry Wayne, St. Louis.
Moore, Jesse Louis, Kansas City.
Moore, Robert Wayne, Boonville.
Morrison, Joseph Walter, Festus.
Moyers, Richard Michael, Hannibal.
Muller, Edward Jerry, Poplar Bluff.
Nore, Kenneth Harold, Kansas City.
O'Neal, Leroy, St. Charles.
Ojile, Michael Raymond, St. Louis.
Orton, Matthew Theodore, Gideon.
Overkamp, Norbert Alvin, Jr., New Florence.
Paige, Robert Edward, Fayette.
Parent, Joseph W., Glendale.
Peck, Robert William, Kansas City.
Phillips Charles Edward, Springfield.
Phillips, Stephen Hiett, Springfield.
Pipkin, Thomas Dewey, Jr., Farmington.
Powell, Robert Allen, Webb City.
Powers, Charles Ray, Thayer.
Powers, Harry Lee, El Dorado Springs.
Prather, Gary W., Festus.
Priest, Frankie Leon, Kennett.
Register, Dorsie Eugene, Henrietta.
Reifschneider, Elmer Josep, St. Louis.
Rice, Ira Albert, Cardwell.
Richardson, Raymond Lee, St. Louis.
Riley, Charles Franklin, St. Joseph.
Robinson, O. Dell, St. Louis.
Rogers, David Clyde, Kirbyville.
Rogers, Lester A., Kansas City.
Royal, Francis Patrick, Clinton.
Sanders, Arthur Edwin, Centralia.
Scherrer, Lawrence Francis, St. Louis.
Scott, Eugene C., St. Louis.
Sharp, Daniel Franklin, Greenfield.
Shegog, Willie Lee, St. Louis.
Shockley, Bobby Joe, St. Louis.
Simmons, Donald Lee, Branson.

MISSOURI—continued

Army

Sisler, George Kenton, Dexter.
Smith, Eddie Louis, St. Louis.
Smith, Robert William, Wentzville.
Smith, Walker, Jr., St. Louis.
Smythe, James Edward, Reeds Spring.
Southwich, Harold Kenneth, Lawson.
Stevens, Edward Howard, Annapolis.
Stewart, Jerry Dean, Lanagan.
Summers, Phillip Paul, Marble Hill.
Taylor, Danny Gene, St. Louis.
Taylor, John Vernon, Jr., Berkly.
Thompson, Nathaniel, St. Louis.
Thompson, Odis, West Plains.
Thompson, Sammy Lee, St. Louis.
Tims, Frederick Howard, St. Louis.
Todd, Vernon Bernard, Cedar City.
Tooloose, Dale Leroy, St. Louis.
Turnham, Clay Samuel, Independence.
Van Buskirk, Harold Dennis, Overland.
Van Horn, Donald Thomas, Kansas City.
Walden, Travis Gary, Kansas City.
Walls, Jerry Franklin, Kansas City.
Ward, David Eugene, Ozark.
Ward, Ivory Jr., St. Louis.
Watkins, Glenn Allen, St. Louis.
Welch, John Harold, Knob Noster.
Westfall, Robert Louis Jr., Higbee.
White, Donald Eugene, Lamar.
Wideman, Elvin Joseph, St. Louis.
Wiggins, Jerry Lee, Carrollton.
Williams, George Anthony, St. Louis.
Williams, Lemuel Taylor, St. Louis.
Willis, Willie Clifton, Hollywood.
Wilson, William D., Kansas City.
Winters, Ronad Paul, St. Louis.
Withers, Steven Richard, Kansas City.
Wooden, David Wayne, Higginsville.
Woods, David Alexander, Kansas City.
Woodson, James Lionel, Jr., St. Louis.
Wright, Lanny Gayle, Brookfield.
Zuniga, Martin Harry, St. Louis.

Air Force

Abernathy, Robert Lloyd, St. Louis.
Bennett, James Harrell, Jr., St. Louis.
Busch, Elwin Harry, Cape Girardeau.
Chappell, John Monroe, St. Louis.
Cherry, Allen Sheldon, University City.
Gower, William Ray, Marshfield.
Hemmel, Clarence Joseph, Jefferson City.
Offutt, Gary Phelps, Stewartsville.
Seabourn, Benny Ellis, Leadwood.
Turley, Morvan Darrell, Kansas City.
Turner, Merle Deane, Macon.
Wheeler, Raymond Lee, Kansas City.
Wolfe, Thomas Hubert, Monett.

Marine Corps

Allen, Charles Richard, St. Louis.
Austermann, Raymond A., Jr., St. Louis.
Basnett, Jerry Dale, Columbia.
Bauer, James Phillip, St. Louis.
Boardman, Michael Kenneth, Sikeston.
Boatman, Elmer Lee, Wayland.
Bockewitz, Carl Edward, Bourbon.
Bohon, Ronald Eugene, St. Joseph.
Bono, Ben Dominic, O Fallon.
Borawski, James David, North Kansas City.
Bowman, Ronald Leon, Warrensburg.
Branson, Jerry Leon, Owensville.
Brown, Harve Edward, Kansas City.
Burnett, Charles C., Jr., St. Joseph.
Campbell, John Allen, Russellville.
Campbell, Larry Gene, St. Joseph.
Carter, Jerry Ray, Imperial.
Carver, Harold Leroy, Joplin.
Casebolt, Henry Clayton, St. Joseph.
Champion, Gerald Alan, St. Louis.
Chasteen, Roger Wilson, Crestwood.
Childers, Estill Lee, Slater.
Clark, Dale Lee, Jefferson City.
Copeland, Robert, Berkeley.
Crabtree, James Otis, Bethany.
Cullers, Ronald Kenneth, Shelbina.
Davis, Charles Cecil, Bethany.
Dingus, Michael Joe, Overland.
Duff, Jack Cecil, Jr., Kansas City.
Eads, John Patrick, St. Louis.
Endicott, Michael Lee, Poplar Bluff.

MISSOURI—continued

Marine Corps

Filkins, Ronald Marion, De Soto.
Gibbs, Clifford Warren, St. Louis.
Goetz, James Gormon, De Soto.
Goss, Jack Eugene, II, Springfield.
Hailey, Jerry Lee, Conran.
Hamilton, Douglas Blake, Springfield.
Harris, Michael Stevens, Kansas City.
Hartwick, Floyd Wayne, Jr., St. Charles.
Hastings, Andrew Lalone, Lemay.
Heibel, Daniel Joseph, Columbia.
Honnold, Stephen Jeffry, Kansas City.
Horton, Charles Brent, Joplin.
Housh, Richard Henry, Kansas City.
Humphrey, Galen Francis, St. Joseph.
Hunter, John Louis, Rolla.
Hyde, Wayne, Sikeston.
Ihrig, Garry Lynn, Parkville.
Imperiale, Ronald Joseph, St. Louis.
Irvin, Stephen Lee, Columbia.
Jackson, Bobby Gene, Marshall.
Jackson, Hugh Mar, St. Louis.
James, Lee Christopher, Jr., St. Clair.
Jones, Isaac, Lilbourn.
Jones, Wayne Ira, St. Louis.
Jordan, Lawrence Wicks, Rolla.
Kindred, Lawrence Joseph, Overland.
Klages, Robert John, St. Louis.
Land, Richard Leon, Hazelwood.
Langston, Michael Gary, Spanish Lake.
Laws, Billy Wayne, Kansas City.
Leon, Pedro, Jr., Kansas City.
Long, Ray Stephen, Marshall.
Magel, James Edward, Lemay.
Maize, Wilson Junior, St. Louis.
Malin, Louis Nathanil, Fenton.
Maraczi, Anthony, Jennings.
McCoin, Kenneth Dale, Clarkton.
McCoy, James William, St. Louis.
McDaniel, Johnnie Lee, Agency.
McGuirk, Charles Anthony, St. Louis.
McKee, Julian Allan, Webb City.
McMahon, Thomas W., Jr., Kansas City.
Meier, Carl Fredric, Frontenac.
Montrey, Reavis, A., Jr., Ferguson.
Moody, Jimmy Dale, Kennett.
Mort, Daniel Leon, Kansas City.
Murray, Bernard Phillip, Riverview.
Myers, George Arthur, St. Louis.
Nelson, Larry Thomas, St. Louis.
Nixon, Jerome, Kansas City.
Norfleet, Brian Ross, St. Louis.
O'Brien, John Michael, St. Louis.
O'Neal, Marshal Junior, Essex.
Offield, Rex Kaye, Jamesport.
Parker, Kenneth Wayne, Dexter.
Patterson, Charles Edward, New Madrid.
Pilcher, William George, Golden City.
Podmaniczky, Christopher, St. Louis.
Powell, Raymond Lee, Kansas City.
Price, Garry Owen, Gordonville.
Prince, Ronald Pershing, St. Louis.
Rayski, Larry Allan Henry, St. Louis.
Reilly, Donald Joseph, St. Louis.
Reiter, Dean Wesley, Manchester.
Richardson, Richard Elvin, Maryland Hgts.
Richardson, Robert Daniel, Poplar Bluff.
Riley, Melvin Joseph, Jr., Hazelwood.
Roepke, Phillip Wray, St. Louis.
Russell, Randall Kerwin, Springfield.
Sarakas, Richard Thomas, St. Louis.
Schloemer, Carl Wayne, Bellefontaine.
Schlottman, Alvern Warren, Overland.
Schrader, Peter Anthony, University City.
Sewell, Monty Rae, Joplin.
Shortt, Walter Ruben, Augusta.
Shuh, Frederick John, St. Genevieve.
Smith, Gary Edward, Rockhill.
Sooter, Gary Ercil, Independence.
Stephens, Bing Forest, St. Louis.
Stokes, James Doyle, Springfield.
Strait, Laffey Franklin, Doniphan.
Summers, Robert Randolph, St. Louis.
Sutherlin, William Reginal, St. Louis.
Swafford, Robert Wayne, O'Fallon.
Swaim, Charles Michael, Ballwin.
Swann, Howard Ernest, Kansas City.
Trammell, Rodger Leon, Independence.
Utley, David Wayne, Chillicothe.

MISSOURI—continued

Marine Corps

Waite, Carold Rex, Shelbyville.
Walker, Randall Edward, St. Louis.
Wallace, Jimmie Lewis, Jr., St. Louis.
Watson, Curtis Lee, Jr., Richmond Heights.
White, Tommy Ryan, Kenneth.
Wilkins, Robert John, St. Charles.
Williams, Larry Joe, New Madrid.
Wright, John William, St. Louis.
Young, John Delbert, Monroe City.
Ziy, Gerald Wayne, St. Ann.

Navy

Braden, Terry Lee, Liberty.
Gamet, Randolph Merl, Canton.
Godley, Raleigh Lee, Lawson.
Meyerkord, Harold Dale, St. Louis.
Morse, Richard Dean, Morehouse.
Murray, Joseph Vaughn, Chillicothe.

MONTANA

Army

Beary, Dan Warren, Hardin.
Birkland, Wiley Cole, Hardin.
Byford, Gary D., Roundup.
Chopper, Franklin Delano, Brockton.
Clark, Richard Dewyatt, Bozeman.
Cyr, William Louis, Missoula.
Derheim, Kenneth Lee, Billings.
Eckstein, Rodger Dean, Kalispell.
Frank, Edward Roy, Sr., Helena.
Haakensen, David Arnold, Big Sandy.
Hinkle, Mark Gordon, Havre.
Hoerner, Raymond Dale, Butte.
Kern, Douglas Duane, Billings.
Kleiv, Manford Lloyd, Whitefish.
Knudson, Kenneth Max, Saco.
Locher, Walter Norvel, Lame Deer.
Miller Bernhardt William, Shelby.
Mooer, Gary Owen, Rosebud.
Murrey, Tracy Henry, Miles City.
Naasz, Larry Duane, Roundup.
Nelson, Ray La Grande, Stevensville.
Parker, Joseph E., Jr., Butte.
Pokerjim, Joseph Louis, St. Ignatius.
Polk, Preston Wayne, Whitlash.
Reece, Weston Henry, Butte.
Salyer, Stanley William, Havre.
Swensgard, William Elling, Fort Benton.
Urban, John Robert, Helena.
Vandenacre, Howard Daniel, Conrad.
Wandler, Louis John, Stevensville.
Whetham, Vernon E., Glasgow.

Air Force

Dudley, Charles Glendon, Bozeman.
Richardson, Roger Paul, Great Falls.
Sampson, Leslie Verne, Richey.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Jack Herbert, Livingston Park.
Babich, Ronald Gregory, Butte.
Backeberg, Bruce Burton, Helena.
Casey, Dennis Lee, Lewistown.
Fleming, Patrick Jay, Anaconda.
Fried, Douglas Lawrence, Missoula.
Garcia, Frank, Jr., Billings.
Havranek, Michael William, Missoula.
Johnson, Lyle Albert, Great Falls.
Jordet, Ronald George, Reedpoint.
Juel, Darryl Richard, Scobey.
Klemencic, Joseph Gordon, Great Falls.
Lehuta, Donald Alexander, Missoula.
Mayes, Richard Le Otis, Sidney.
Nelson, Stephen Carl, Great Falls.
Schultz, Danny Carl, Hinsdale.
Stephens, James Williams, Thomas Falls.
Street, Douglas Gerald, Whitefish.

Navy

Green, Robert William, Harlem.

NEBRASKA

Army

Allen, Jerry L., Norfolk.
Anderson, Lee David, Lincoln.
Bahnsen, Kent Eugene, Grant.
Barron, Florentino Ciprian, Lexington.
Beeson, Robert Bruce, Elgin.
Biber, Gerald Mack, Benkelman.
Bierma, Lynn Seaton, Cozad.

NEBRASKA—continued

Army

Bruhn, James William, Alma.
Clark, Charles Chapman, Howe.
Covey, Lawrence Lavern, Benedict.
Edmond Coil, Jr., Scottsbluff.
Gevara Ray, Jr., Scottsbluff.
Gubbels, Stanley Donald, Randolph.
Hatfield, Gary Clark, Lexington.
Holland, Johnny Robert, Hebron.
Holtz, Larry William, Fremont.
Hurt, William C., Craig.
Jessen, Robert Duane, Bloomfield.
Johnson, Floyd Dean, Marsland.
Johnson, John Ernest, Lincoln.
Jones, Theodore Roosevelt, Auburn.
Liles, Larry Joe, Hershey.
Loeckler, Marlow Martin, Crofton.
Maddox, Philip Neil, Lincoln.
Malone, Wallace James, Oxford.
Marchand, Wayne Ellsworth, Omaha.
Marsh, Alan Richard, Omaha.
Mickna, John Ronald, Omaha.
Morrison, James Anton, Omaha.
Needham, Russell Dean, North Platte.
Otte, Kenneth Michael, Valley.
Philson, Willard Arlin, Gering.
Pina, Louie Pete, Mitchell.
Roberts, William, Lincoln.
Rooth, Charles William, Oakland.
Sanders, Mack Royal, Omaha.
Sandstedt, Daniel Joseph, Omaha.
Sawicki, Richard P., Grand Island.
Schmidt, Gary Russell, Omaha.
Schmidt, Kenneth Wayne, Cairo.
Schroder, Jack Wayne, Clay Center.
Shrader, Harold William, Omaha.
Smith, Paul Richard, Omaha.
Steel, Kenneth Lee, Fremont.
Stubbe, William Leroy, Central City.
Widick, Maurice Gene, Moorefield.
Wilson, Galen Lloyd, Scottsbluff.

Air Force

Haegele, Wolfgang Albrecht, Cambridge.

Marine Corps

Anderson, John Louis, Alliance.
Bailey, Allen Charles, Omaha.
Fielder, Paul Wesley, Harvard.
Fontaine, Larry Lee, Lincoln.
Fryc, David Charles, Garland.
Grueber, Randall Roman, Nelson.
Hovenden, Darrel Leroy, North Bend.
Hultquist, Leonard Ashby, Ogallala.
James, Daniel Raymond, Loup City.
Kavulak, John Henry, Omaha.
Kempkes, Robert Louis, Palmyra.
Kildare, William James, Ogallala.
Klabunde, John Paul, Omaha.
Koch, Dale Roy, Johnstown.
Krous, Kenneth Wayne, Hastings.
Kuhlman, Melvin Ernest, Falls City.
Langman, Larry Milton, Columbus.
Marrs, Carl Robert, Falls City.
Mueller, Steven Wayne, Omaha.
Nelson, Billy Dean, Loomis.
Nelson, Robert Warren, Randolph.
Ogden, Howard, Jr., Omaha.
Petty, Ernest Floyd, Uehling.
Salyards, Patrick John, Omaha.
Shelton, Craig Stephen, Omaha.
Zichek, Richard Lansing, Lincoln.

Navy

Branstrom, David Joseph, Lincoln.
Confer, Michael Steele, McCook.
Moore, Daniel Eugene, Jr., Omaha.
Ohnesorge, Thomas Herman, Strang.
Peters, Charles Henry, West Point.
Roark, William Marshall, Bellevue.
Twehous, Gene Leander, Fremont.

NEVADA

Army

Campbell, Donald R., Reno.
Clark, Kerry Edward, Reno.
Cossins, Jack Edward, Henderson.
Cue, Carl James, Ely.
Davies, Arthur Jr., Reno.
Henry, Robert John, Las Vegas.
Hogan, Walter DeWayne, Mason.

NEVADA—continued

Army

Hopkins, Wallace W., Jr., Henderson.
Kramer, James Lee, Las Vegas.
McAndrew, James Delmas, Reno.
Newman, Clyde Edward, Tonopah.
Stone, Raymond Edward, Jr., Reno.
Tharp, Alexander, Las Vegas.
Thompson, Gregory Malcolm, Las Vegas.
Wilkins, Terry Kenneth, Las Vegas.
Yelland, Richard Max, Ely.

Air Force

Bower, Joseph Edward, Ely.
Wright, Walter Clarence, Las Vegas.

Marine Corps

Burt, Glen George, Reno.
Bylinowski, Michael David, Zypher Cove.
Carruthers, Edward Anthony, Sparks.
Garey, Robert Earle, Las Vegas.
Green, Robert James, Las Vegas.
Heater, Paul Leo, Las Vegas.
Jamison, David, Las Vegas.
Lakey, Larry Lee, Sparks.
Mayberry, Ronald James, Las Vegas.
McGee, Steven Wesley, Hawthorne.
Montgomery, George Wesley, Las Vegas.
Morrison, Howard Glenn, Elko.
Quilici, Peter, Jr., Yerington.
Rhodehamel, John Ray, II, Reno.
Shea, Michael Francis, Sparks.
Stone, Larry George, Yerington.
Wessel, Michael Daniel, Reno.

Navy

Bodamer, Michael Anthony, Carson City.
Perry, Richard Clark, Carlin.
Stierwalt, Laddie C., Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army

Badolati, Frank Neil, Goffstown.
Barnett, Glendon Roman, Jaffrey.
Bartlett, James B., Portsmouth.
Beaupre, Gilbert Thomas, Manchester.
Bennett, Michael E., Brentwood.
Broome, Cecil Angus, Jr., Lancaster.
Brown, James Warren, Campton.
Bunker, David Elvin, Kingston.
Coronis, Martin James, Nashua.
Descoteaux, Maurice Claude, Berlin.
Emro, Robert Bennett, Strafford.
Falcone, John Paul, Jr., Hampton.
Feaster, William Newcomer, Portsmouth.
Finn, James Norman, Salem.
Gardner, Robert Louis, Nashua.
Haines, Robert Frederick, Loudon.
Harriman, Eugene Howard, West Franklin.
Hebert, Yvon Andre, Stratford.
Hurd, Jay Allen, Laconia.
Jewett, Stephen Dyer, East Andover.
Johnston, Richard Bruce, Candia.
Joyce, George Edward, Portsmouth.
Kowalczyk, Czeslaw, Nashua.
Lee, John F., Newport.
Lozeau, Norman Gerard, Manchester.
Mann, Robert Bernard, Salem.
McAllister, Robert J., Jr., Milford.
Mourtgis, Arthur C., Jr., Manchester.
Nute, Leonard King, Hudson.
Robillard, Wilfred Roland, Manchester.
Roentsch, Robert Quentin, Walpole.
Saunders, Michael Jorn, Penacook.
Steer, John Clifton, Kingston.
Sullivan, Robert Joseph, East Alstead.
Sullivan, Terrence Colin, Berlin.
Sweeney, Michael Bernard, Keene.
Taggart, Winston Adams, Manchester.
Theriault, Samuel Silver, Rochester.
Trudeau, Raymond L., Durham.
Villiard, Joseph George, Manchester.
Wilkoswky, William, Jr., Nashua.
Willey, Alden Bertram, Campton.

Air Force

Cabana, John Bishop, Jr., New Castle.
Kaiser, Howard Walker, Chesterfield.
Morrison, Peter Whitcomb, Laconia.

Marine Corps

Cahill, George Eugene, Rochester.
Camire, Paul Joseph, Exeter.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—continued

Marine Corps

Cate, William Earl, Hillsboro.
Chamberlin, Howard Arthur, Brookfield.
Cormier, Ronald Raymond, Portsmouth.
Demers, Arthur Emile, Jr., Penacook.
Doucet, Leon Normand, Manchester.
Durling, Joseph A. III, Rockingham.
Fraser, William George, Manchester.
Greeley, Verne Milton, Derry.
Hall, Kenneth Robert, Keene.
Harvell, Richard Kenefick, Bedford.
Indyk, Frank Alan, Raymond.
Jordan, Kenneth Bradley, Twin Mountain.
Kenison, Benjamin Albert, Jefferson.
Loomis, William Nicholas, Salem.
Marcotte, Andre Edward, Rye.
Margaritis, Sotorios Milto, Raymond.
Marshall, Dennis Hardie, Lisbon.
Martel, Normand Richard, Manchester.
Murzin, Walter Aleck, Concord.
Paul, Ernest George, Concord.
Pillsbury, Jerry Dean, Grantham.
Robinson, Joseph Robert, Dover.
Wainio, Alexander George, Troy.
Weller, David Howard, Nashua.
White, Robert Frederick, Newmarket.
Whittaker, Terry James, Newport.
Whitticom, Jonathan Charle, Laconia.

Navy

Dionne, Robert Paul, Manchester.

NEW JERSEY

Army

Alamo, Gabriel Ralph, Lyndhurst.
Alberts, Francis John, Villas.
Albietz, Raymond Peter, Kendall Park.
Ali, Arfien Clifford, Atlantic City.
Allaway, Donald, Matawan.
Andreasen, Robert Wayne, Maplewood.
Atkins, John, Elmer.
Barker, Jeffrey Lawrence, Ridgefield.
Barrios, Bernard, West New York.
Barsch, John Paul, Garfield.
Baumann, Otto William, Jr., Spotswood.
Beeres, George Kevin, Union City.
Belicose, Richard J., Belford.
Berenwick, William Michael, Hillside.
Betancourt-Mojica, Carlos, Jacksonville.
Betz, Robert Joseph, Cliffside Park.
Binger, Gerald A., Neptune City.
Boland, James Robert, West Orange.
Boltz, Richard Leonard, Ridgefield Park.
Borrego, Anthony J., Paterson.
Bosko, Michael John, Brunswick.
Brague, Edwin Steven, Jr., Ridgewood.
Brannon, Harry G., Gloucester.
Breen, Gerald James, West New York.
Brems, Patrick John, Mahwah.
Bretschneider, Hans Karl, Hoboken.
Bridges, Lester, Newark.
Britten, Roger George, Montville.
Brockmann, Robert James, Hoboken.
Brophy, Dennis James, Trenton.
Brown, Charles Paul, South Amboy.
Brydun, Bohdan Peter, Jersey City.
Buck, Paul John, Thorofare.
Buczynski, Gregory Thomas, Flemington.
Burgans, Richard, Newark.
Burroughs, Robert James, Trenton.
Burton, William Russell, Jr., Orange.
Busch, John Edward, Somerset.
Butler, Gregory William, East Keansburg.
Carden, Charlie Alfred, Plainfield.
Carovillano, Robert, Rutherford.
Cartwright, John Stanborou, Pine Hill.
Catling, Robert Philip, Woodbury.
Cemelli, Salvatore Peter, Weehawken.
Chapman, Sherman, Jr., Trenton.
Clayton, George Donald, Belmar.
Coffaro, Anthony Charles, New Brunswick.
Cohen, Sidney, Camden.
Colantuono, Wayne Albert, Gloucester City.
Coles, George Eugene, Jr., Atlantic City.
Cone, Reginald Louis, Newark.
Conrad, Harry Floyd, Hackettstown.
Corbin, Donald Lee, Swedesboro.
Coyle, Garry, Clayton.
Coyle, James Michael, Camp Kilmer.
Coyle, John, Hackensack.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Critchfield, William Robert, Maple Shade.
Cummings, Daniel Terry, Jersey City.
Curry, George Dever, New Market.
Da Silva Helder, Arthur C., Belleville.
Dabonka, John Anthony, West New York.
Dando, Thomas J., Clifton.
Davern, Matthew John, Willingboro.
Deal, William Leander, Mays Landing.
Delasandro, Dennis Francis, Atlantic City.
Demboski, Stanley T., Jersey City.
Deriggi, Anthony, Orange.
Di Antonio, Martin M., Jr., Rahway.
Dixon, Cecil F., Trenton.
Dougherty, Robert Joseph, Hammonton.
Dowling, Willie, Jr., Trenton.
Eberhardt, William Henry, Belmar.
Elfenbein, Ernie Jon, Hillsdale.
Elman, David Herbert, Middlesex.
Engle, Russell Warren, Madison.
Eppinger, George, South River.
Estergren, James Howard, Cardiff.
Falato, Joseph Anthony, West New York.
Feistner, Stephen Ely, Cedar Grove.
Felder, Jesse Clarance, Jersey City.
Fesken, William, Hoboken.
Font, Manual Louis, Summit.
Fore, Alexander, Trenton.
Forsman, James Eskel, Mantua.
Foster, Carl, Belmar.
Franbes, John Malhon, Vineland.
Francis, Joseph William, Jr., Camden.
Francis, Thomas Earl, Trenton.
Fritz, Raymond Wilbert, Jr., Bloomfield.
Gaburo, George W., Landisville.
Garrison, Russell G., Elmer.
Genovese, Carmine Vincent, Rahway.
Gilch, James Xavier, Camden.
Girtanner, Jules T., Neshanic.
Glover, Manzie, Jr., Elizabeth.
Goble, Norman Robert, Midland Park.
Goines, Robert, Newark.
Goldberg, Howard Stanley, Saddle Brook.
Goldberg, Joseph A., Linwood.
Goodman, Barry Jason, Paterson.
Grabowski, Jan Joseph, Jr., Jamesburg.
Grant, Wayne Augustus, Morgan.
Greene, John Preston, Newark.
Greene, Lloyd Vincent, Paterson.
Gregory, David, Newark.
Grix, Thomas E., New Milford.
Gross, Victor Mahlon, Camden.
Haarwaldt, Erwin John, Trenton.
Haber, Charles Harry, Jr., Butler.
Hahn, Jeffrey Charles, Linden.
Harris, Walter, Newark.
Hauser, Robert Charles, Fair Lawn.
Hernandez-Pena, Audeliz, Perth Amboy.
Herron, Rockwell Selden, Haworth.
Hicks, Leroy, Newport.
Higdon, David Darrin, Jr., Glen Rock.
Himmelreich, Harry Edward, Union Beach.
Hoar, John Michael, Belleville.
Holland, Charles James, Elizabeth.
Hooper, Vins Ronald, Somerset.
Horvath, Andrew, Manville.
Hosking, Charles Ernest, Jr., Ramsey.
Huster, Robert Richard, Newark.
Huyler, William D., Jr., Short Hills.
Ihnat, Michael John, Perth Amboy.
James, Dutley, Newark.
Johnson, Donald Lee, Orange.
Johnson, Howard Warner, Jr., Trenton.
Johnson, Robert Irvin, Keyport.
Jones, John Lewis, Jersey City.
Judge, Charles Mark Jr., Short Hills.
Kapeluck, John Michael, Cresskill.
Keenan, Robert James, Jersey City.
Kennard, James Horace, Burlington.
Kenney, Edward, Cliffside Park.
Kilroy, Michael Winston, Packanack Lake.
Kline, Dennis, Phillipsburg.
Klossek Gerald, Newark.
Koonce, Jeffrey Wayne, Union.
Korona, Albert, III, Trenton.
Kowal, Bohdan, Clifton.
Kramer, Leon Joseph, Trenton.
La Faso, Joseph Stephen, Garfield.
Latourette, Paul E., Roselle.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Lawless, Thomas Aloysius, Newark.
Lazaro, Robert James, Glendora.
Leeds, Clyde A., Oceanville.
Legette, Oneal, Jersey City.
Lehew, Donald Lee, Salem.
Levering, Edwin Harry, Rancocas.
Light, Jerry Clifton, Hillside.
Lindaberry, John Lance, Long Valley.
Lindsley, Donald Peter, Watchung.
Littlehales, Roy Charles, Stanhope.
Loatman, Rodney Ellis, Newark.
Lofgren, James Eskel, Saddle River.
Lowden, Thomas Allen, Burlington.
Lumpkin, Gary, New Brunswick.
Lyons, Frank Ellis, Jersey City.
MacManus, Colin David, Newark.
Macarell, Michael Joseph, Hasbrouck Heights.
Magnuson, Eric C. Jr., Ramsey.
Manners, Van Dyke William, Ringoes
Manuel, Roland Will, Asbury Park.
Martineau, Michael William, Manville.
Masten, James Arthur, Columbia.
Matuscsak, George Edward, Kearny.
McBride, Claude William, Salem.
McCauley, Dennis James, Keansburg.
McDermott, Thomas Anthony, West New York.*
McFadden, Gregory Walter, Jersey City.
McGuire, Francis Michael, Bayonne.
McKennan, Clifford Abdul, Point Pleasant.
McKim, William Ritchie, Cresskill.
McWilliams, George Linwood, Palmyra.
Mikula, Emery George, Jersey City.
Milan, George Leonard, Atlantic City.
Miles, Weldon John, Cinnaminson.
Miller, George William, Camden.
Minnock, Joseph Patrick, Cranford.
Molnar, Frankie Zoly, New Brunswick.
Morgan, John D., Hackensack.
Morgan, Robert West, Jersey City.
Morseley, William Francis, Moorestown.*
Mouritzen, Donald Andrew, Middletown.
Murphy, Robert L., Madison.
Murphy, Timothy John, Avenel.
Nichols, William Ward, Jr., Ridgewood.
Nickerson, Ronald William, Camden.
Niedermeier, Arthur Alan, Newark.
O'Shaughnessy, John Franci, Jersey City.
Obermeier, George Richard, Cherry Hill.
Ogburn, Frank Jr., Burlington.
Ohlinger, James, Succasunna.
Owen, David B., Juliustown.
Paredes, Ismael Juson, Jersey City.
Patterson, James Gordon, Milton.
Patterson, Richard, Pennsauken.
Perrone, James Paul Jr., Wanaque.
Pfrommer, Stanley Dennis, Budd Lake.
Pinnell, Robert Merritt Jr., Sussex.
Pizzi, Charles Daniel, West Orange.
Pleasant, William Andrew, Jersey City.
Plotts, Richard, Mount Holly.
Pollard, William Isaac, Swedesboro.
Polonko, Joseph John Jr., Pluckemin.
Ponto, Augustus J. III, Blackwood Terrace.
Poor, George Albert Jr., Hillsdale.
Potter, Albert Raymond, Browns Mills.
Powell, Elmer Franklin, Wenonah.
Price, Frank Apperson III, Denville.
Quatrone, Ferdinand Joseph, Orange.
Reilly, Joseph John, Mount Holly.
Renz, Raymond Allan, Hawthorne.
Retzlaff, Arthur Clifton, Westfield.
Reynolds, Robert George, Neptune.
Ricks, James Luther, Montclair.
Roell, Michael Conrad, Hillsdale.
Roman-Aguilar Carmelo, Perth Amboy.
Runyon, Barry Lee, Lebanon.
Ruth, Denis, Elizabeth.
Ruzila, Peter Jr., Paramus.
Santiago, Luis Santiago, Camden.
Santiago-Cruz, Rafael, Paterson.
Schaeffer, Guy Lawrence, Deptford.
Schmidt, Walter James, Laurence Harbor.
Schoelier, Tjeerd, Sussex.
Scivolino, Anthony Christo, Union City.
Scott, William Alexander, Magnolia.
Sevenski Alfred, Willingboro.
Shaw, John James, Jersey City.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Simchock, Thomas Peter, Middlesex.
Sipe, Robert Ernest, Dover.
Sisco, Arthur Clarence Jr., Newton.
Skiles, James Arthur, New Brunswick.
Skinner, Donald Alvah, Lavallette.
Slater, Jerald Albert, East Paterson.
Slomiany, Kazimierz Henryk, Willington.
Smith, Alfred James, Dunellen.
Smith, Fortune, Newark.
Smith, Robert Barry, Plainsboro.
Snodgrass, George Edward, Pompton Lakes.
Steidler, Johnson Augustus, Gibbstown.
Stephens, George Joseph, Camden.
Stephenson, William James, Bound Brook.
Stout, Clifford Russell, Trenton.
Swangin, Michael Dewitt, Newark.
Swaykos, William Ernest, Bloomfield.
Talmadge, Thomas Robert, Sparta.
Tassey, Malcolm Fairchild, Rutherford.
Tate, Scip, Newark.
Taylor, James R., Teaneck.
Tencza, Anthony John, Wallington.
Thompson, Gerald Ronald, Penns Grove
Thompson, Otis Franklin, Camden.
Tiefenthaler, Joseph Thoma, Brooklawn.
Vanderski, Norman James, Egg Harbor.
Vause, James Edward, Wenonah.
Viggiano, Robert Edward, Waldwick.
Volpone, Dante, Newark.
Watters, Charles Joseph, Berkeley Heights.
Weedo, Vincent James, Jr., Hackensack.
Welsh, Thomas H., Kearney.
Wheeler, Frederick George, Elizabeth.
William, Glen Raymond, Cherry Hill.
Williams, Robert Alton, Ashland.
Wilson, Sylvester William, Jersey City.
Wood, Richard Alan, Dumont.
Woodrow, Robert A., Ocean City.
Woodson, Arnold, Newark.
Wyatt, Ronald, South River.
Wynn, Gerald Michael, Arlington.
Yohn, Thomas Leeonas, Brick Town.
Yohnnson, George Salvatore, Moorestown.
Zimmerman, Alan Harry, Midland Park.
Zubar, Wladmir William, Paterson.

Air Force

Abramoff, Arthur John, Margate.
Adrian, Joseph Daniel, River Edge.
Bennett, Robert Elwood, III, Springfield.
Berg, John Stephen, Trenton.
Bruch, Donald William, Jr., Montclair.
Davis, William Sheldon, III, Demarest.
Heathcote, Clifford Sheldo, Union.
Johnson, Anthony Kent, Cranford.
Kissam, Edward Knell, Jr., Plainfield.
Mathews, Claude Wesley, Franklinville.
Maysey, Larry Wayne, Chester.
Mongillo, Paul John, Riverside.
Negron, Victor Manuel, Bayonne.
White, Lowell Franklin, East Orange.

Marine Corps

Alfonso, John, New Brunswick.
Ambrose, Louis Allen, Sewaren.
Anasiewicz, Richard Joseph, New Brunswick.
Andrisano, Frank, Jr., Bayonne.
Aponte, Edwin, Newark.
Babbitt, Walter Lee, Jr., Boonton.
Badavas, Thomas Edward, Garwood.
Balmer, Robert Oliver, Oceanport.
Barker, Jedh Colby, Park Ridge.
Barnes, Lawrence Merridith, Jersey City.
Bates, Glen Douglas, Hazlet.
Bates, Richard Stanley, Nutley.
Battista, Francis Duane, Sayreville.
Baxter, Dennis Warren, Summit.
Beattie, David Rowland, Neptune.
Bell, Leon Earl, Newark.
Beschen, James, Wildwood.
Bigham, Charles Frederick, Park Ridge.
Brady, Robert James, Elizabeth.
Brower, Donald Harry, Neptune.
Brown, Richard James, Pine Beach.
Bryant, David Theodore, Trenton.
Buttenbaum, Gary Richard, Spotswood.
Campbell, Patrick Francis, Fairlawn.
Carlson, Richard Lee, Montclair.
Cheeks, John Herbert, Penns Grove.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Marine Corps

Coiner, Charles Frederick, Salem.
Conlan, Brian Daly, South Orange.
Connor, Peter Spencer, Orange.
Correa, Angel Meresi, Perth Amboy.
Cruden, Donald Joseph, Bayonne.
Daley, Michael James, Union.
De Jessa, Joseph Carmine, Lyndhurst.
De Luca, George Abraham, Hammonton.
Dicesare, Anthony, Jr., Trenton.
Dickerson, Douglas R., Jr., Trenton.
Dillard, Harold Jerome, Hackensack.
Doherty, John William, Red Bank.
Donatiello, Jerry Richard, Belleville.
Dorn, Philip Kenneth, Shrewsbury.
Drake, Donald William, Newton.
Dutches, William George, Hawthorne.
Edley, George Steven, Keasbey.
Ellis, Charles Paul, Oradell.
Ettz, Michael Charles, Lodi.
Eucker, Franklin Charles, Orange.
Fedor, Andrew, Flemington.
Ferguson, Kevin Lee, Bridgeton.
Fiducioso, Stephano James, Swedesboro.
Firth, Thomas Elwood, Little Silver.
Flack, Reginald, Fort Lee.
Foley, John Joseph, III, Plainfield.
Gabriel, Vincent James, Jr., Paterson.
Gallagher, John Michael, Elizabeth.
Gandil, Robert Patrick, Hackensack.
Gebhart, Donald Willis, Bridgeton.
Geoghegan, Gerald Daly, Verona.
Glynn, Aaron George, South River.
Goldsboro, Steven Michael, Camden.
Golembski, Paul Joseph, Camden.
Guarino, Salvatore, Newark.
Haley, John Matthew, Jr., Runnemede.
Halvorsen, Donald Kelcey, Eatontown.
Hayes, Joseph Fred, Vineland.
Haynes, Barton Edward, Freehold.
Hayward, Phillip Bruce, Newark.
Heffron, James Brooks, Spotswood.
Hess, Phillip Howard, Pequannock.
Hicks, Joseph Lonnie, Yardville.
Hocknell, Henry Robert, Jr., Carneys Point.
Holden, Thomas James, Hasbrouck.
Hopkins, Marion Marshall, New Brunswick.
Hornby, Thomas Frank, Kearny.
Horner, Walter Dennis, Waretown.
Hughes, Robert, South Amboy.
Hughes, Tony Howard, Woodstown.
Iannuzzi, Charles Earnest, Elizabeth.
Ike, Thomas Robert, Millington.
Inferrera, Louis Joseph, Vineland.
Jacobs, Del Ray, Long Branch.
James, Rodney Alvin, Plainfield.
Jenkins, Lance Norman, Vineland.
Johnson, Charles Edward, Newark.
Johnson, Edward Bruce, Union.
Jones, Roy Morgan, Jr., Penns Grove.
Jordan, Kent Douglas, Plainfield.
Keller, Joseph John, Jr., Newark.
Keri, Robert Charles, Somerset.
Knosky, Ronald Wayne, Linden.
Kopcinski, Stanley John, Bayonne.
Kruger, Robert Henry, Jr., Clifton.
Kyle, Thomas Robert, Jr., Park Ridge.
LaDuke, John Henry, Paterson.
Lamon, William Charles, Jr., North Cape May.
Land, Sylvester, Roselle.
Lawson, Albert C., Passaic.
Lopinto, Frank Thomas, Lyndhurst.
Madden, Paul Bernard, Franklin.
Magliaro, Charles Louis, Somerville.
Maiuro, Joseph, Elizabeth.
Mallon, Thomas John, Park Ridge.
Marshall, Donald Richard, Bricktown.
Mason, Benjamin Harrison, Jr., Piscataway.
Mazzillo, Peter, Jr., Avenel.
McBride, Patrick Eugene, Neptune.
McKay, Gilman William, West Keansburg.
McLaughlin, Thomas Michael, Bloomfield.
Michels, Lester George, New Milford.
Millar, Peter Edmund, Paramus.
Mines, James, Jr., New Brunswick.
Monahon, Robert Edward, Swedesboro.
Morris, Daniel Eugene, North Arlington.
Mullins, William F., Jr., Short Hills.
Myers, James Edward, Bloomfield.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Marine Corps

Nash, James Robert, Brick Township.
Nemchik, John Joseph, Jr., Trenton.
Nugent, Richard Francis, Westwood.
O'Callaghan, Maurice Josep, Iselin.
Ortiz-Corredor, Luis, Hoboken.
Ossmen, John Donald, Trenton.
Outwater, Albert Aleya, Jr., Phillipsburg.
Paarz, Gary Frederick, Absecon.
Perrelli, Keith Francis, Oak Ridge.
Perry, Louis Edward, Asbury Park.
Petrick, Frank Edward, Perth Amboy.
Pino, Alfred, Clifton.
Queen, Walter Louis, Newark.
Raitt, Albert Harold, Neptune City.
Rebelo, Joaquim Vaz, Newark.
Reed, Robert Bruce, Trenton.
Rego, Arthur, Nutley.
Reid, John Michael, Magnolia.
Rhodes, Willie Joe, Newark.
Riggins, Sim Henry, Jr., Newark.
Rilk, Harlan Carl, Dover.
Roberts, Gary Lee, Newark.
Rodgers, John Joseph, Gloucester.
Salerno, Anthony John, Cinnaminson.
Scavuzzo, Peter Gary, Toms River.
Scharibone, David John, Trenton.
Schmidt, Dennis Richard, North Plainfield.
Schmutz, Anthony Michael, Camden.
Schultz, Charles Joseph, Metuchen.
Schultz, William Arthur, Red Bank.
Schweyher, John William, Jr., Irvington.
Shields, David, Rutherford.
Shortt, William, Edison.
Slattery, Robert John, Whippany.
Smith, John David, Camden.
Smyrychynski, George Micha, Montvale.
Snaith, Thoma Rankin, Oradell.
Stewart, Richard Cortlandt, Manasquan.
Szymanski, John Stephen, Trenton.
Thompson, James Edward, Trenton.
Tolbert, Delancy DuBarry, Newark.
Tooke, John Karl, Willingboro.
Tremblay, Richard, New Brunswick.
Turner, Preston Harry, Jr., Trenton.
Vallecillo, Edgar Henry, West New York.
Valt, Ralph Wesley, Wayne.
Virgilio, Lawrence Joseph, Camden.
Wade, Robert John, Stratford.
Wagner, Harry Edward, Trenton.
Weiss, Walter, Middlesex.
Wetzel, Charles Robert, Penns Grove.
Whiting, Justin Rice IV, Short Hills.

Navy

Coles, Alexander, Jr., Salem.
Felver, Gale Herbert, Rahway.
Glanville, John Turner, Jr., Mandham.
Haines, John Charles, Jr., Bordentown.
Mack, Francis William, Jersey City.
McDowell, Donald Francis, Woodbury.
Mead, Peter Francis, Paterson.
Mongilardi, Peter, Jr., Haledon.
Morvay, Jon Richard, Ocean City.
Self, Eugene Lawrence, Carteret.
Simon, Joseph Louis John, Wharton.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Adams, George Dayton, Albuquerque.
Adams, John K., Roswell.
Alexander, George William, Las Vegas.
Archuleta Joseph, Las Vegas.
Baca, Gabriel, Santa Cruz.
Bunyea, Walter Clifford Jr., Las Cruces.
Cabrera, Edward A., Gallup.
Campos, Larry Paul, Roswell.
Chamberlain, Robert F., Las Cruces.
Cipriani, Alan Bradley, Albuquerque.
Cruz, Sam, Raton.
Cummins, John Rudolph, Jr., Roswell.
Dozier, Jobie Clayton, Albuquerque.
Dyer, Harry Gordon, Portales.
Esqueda, Antonio Alvarado, Santa Rita.
Fernandez, Daniel, Los Lunas.
Fletcher, Lon M., Albuquerque.
Gooding, Lloyd Lee, Albuquerque.
Griffith, Thurston A. Jr., Los Alamos.
Gutierruez, Juan Federico, Alamogordo.
Harvey, Octaviano Martinez, Santa Rita.
Hohstadt, Jimmy Ross, Clovis.

NEW MEXICO—continued

Army

Hubbard, Gerald Monroe, Mora.
Jones, Michael Thomas, Albuquerque.
Jones, William Coy, Roswell.
Krug, Michael Joe, Farmington.
Magby, Lloyd Burney, Carlsbad.
Martinez, Billy Richard, Albuquerque.
Martinez, Daniel Tiofilio, Clovis.
McPherson, Stanley W., Hobbs.
Montoya, Jose Albino, Grants.
Montoya, Robert Gonzales, Ruidoso.
Noseff, Ronnie Lee, Hobbs.
Pearson, Kurt Byron, Deming.
Ransdell, Curtis H., Farmington.
Riberea, Antonio, Raton.
Rice, Howard Jacob, Hobbs.
Romero, Trine Jr., Roswell.
Saenz, Hector Mario, Roswell.
Saiz, Fred Roman, Bernalillo.
Sawyers, Roger Thurston, Carlsbad.
Simbola, Jose Scotty, Penasco.
Sisneros, Roman, Anton Chico.
Smith, Danny, Le Moyne, Alamogordo.
Smith, Lloyd Edgar, Portales.
Stages, Kenneth L., Clearwater.
Stoll, David Louis, Clovis.
Summers, Donald L., Mayhill.
Tafoya, Frank, Jemez Pueblo.
Tenorio, Sam, Encino.
Thornton, Leo Keith, Farmington.
Thornton, Stephen H., Albuquerque.
Torrez, Manuel Antonio, Ranches of Taos.
Valdez, Frank, Albuquerque.
Walton, William Leroy, Albuquerque.
Wilson, Lavon Stephen, Roswell.
Zamora, Carlos, Jr., Carrizozo.

Air Force

Patch, Donald Charles, Albuquerque.

Marine Corps

Antonio, Johnnie, Jr., Crown Point.
Baca, Isidro, Socorro.
Barela, Ignacio, Alamogordo.
Begaye, Eddie Charles, Ramah.
Branch, Freddie Isidore, Espanola.
Bryant, Jerry Harold, Portales.
Carnahan, Stephen Michael, Albuquerque.
Cass, Anthony Mac, Artesia.
Curley, Albert Allen, Cubero.
Davies, Edward Earl, Lovington.
Davis, Edward Daniel, Albuquerque.
Dempsey, Warren Leigh, Church Rock.
Fowner, Jacob Henry, Albuquerque.
Garcia, Joe Cecilio, Cedar Crest.
Garrapy, David Earl, Albuquerque.
Gass, Charles Lee, Hobbs.
Gibson, Roy Allen, Albuquerque.
Gonzales, Jose Bernardino, Los Lunas.
Griego, John Frank Ray, Santa Fe.
Grijalva, David Centeno, Santa Rita.
Grubb, Earl Gilbert, Silver City.
Guzman, Reynaldo, Lovington.
Hernandez, Salome, Anthony.
Herrera, Narciso Francis, Alcalde.
Hodgkins, Guy Merrill, Los Alamos.
Hurta, Joseph Daniel, Gallup.
Jennings, Stephen Kenneth, Albuquerque.
Jory, Edward Lewis, Jr., Albuquerque.
Kaufman, Donaciano Francis, Albuquerque.
Kemp, Joe Mac, Las Cruces.
Leonard, Kent Alan, Mesilla Park.
Malins, David Reay, Las Cruces.
Marchbanks, R. B., Jr., Moriarty.
Mascarenas, Alcadio Norber, Sapello.
Montonya, Victor H., Jr., Los Cordovas.
Moore, James Michael, Albuquerque.
Nava, Francis Xavier, Sante Fe.
Oldham, John Sanders, Tinnie.
Padilla, Pedro, Albuquerque.
Ramirez, Samuel Medina, Artesia.
Risner, John Milton, Las Cruces.
Rogers, John David, Albuquerque.
Sanchez, Cresencio Paul, Roswell.
Sanchez, Juan Diego, Albuquerque.
Sanchez, Uvaldo, Albuquerque.
Sanders, Julius Mitchell, Roswell.
Sena, Benny, Albuquerque.
Tagoya, Florentino, Jr., Albuquerque.
Tarango, Magdaleno, Lordsburg.

NEW MEXICO—continued

Marine Corps

West, Bennie Lee, Roswell.
Zamora, Juan Manuel Alba, Las Cruces.

Navy

Barbour, John Ramage, Las Cruces.
Duran, Steve Gonzales, Deming.
Mathis, Jimmy Clifton, Jal.
Valdez, Phil Isadore, Dixon.

NEW YORK

Army

Acevedo, Hector Santos, New York.
Ackwood, Walter James, New York.
Adams Philip Francis, Croton Falls.
Agugliaro, Matthew John, West Hempstead
Alferoff, Ivan, New York.
Alicea, Israel, Jamaica.
Alicea, Manuel Jr., New York.
Allen, Channing Jr., Albertson.
Alston, Franklin Jr., New York.
Alterwisher, Arthur Carl, Yonkers.
Alvarez-Delgado, Luis F., New York.
Amato, Edward Mathew, Commack.
Anders, Herman E. Jr., Greens.
Anderson, Boyd Wellington, Manhattan.
Anderson, Peter Newell, Uniondale.
Anderson, Richard Andrew, New York.
Andrews, Alan Wayne, Goshen.
Argenzio, Nestor Lorenzo, New York.
Arimento, Joseph A., Yonkers.
Armlin, Loren Aaron, Central Bridge.
Augustinas, Walter Peter, New York.
Bain, Thomas Arthur, Putnam Station.
Baker, Gary Bruce, Montgomery.
Baldwin, William McKinley, St. Albans.
Barbara, Peter, Laurel Hollow.
Barnes, Richard Frank, Elmira.
Barnes, Robert Sewell, Port Byron.
Baron, Frantz Mario, New York.
Barry, John Franklin, Jamestown.
Barry, Thomas R., Flushing.
Bartolf, Noel Michael, Rochester.
Bateman, Neil Ellis, Cheektowaga.
Bates, Robert Michael, Suffern.
Bauer, Gregory Charles, Central Bridge.
Beach, Myron Stanley Jr., Elmira.
Beagle, Howard Eugene, Glen Falls.
Beek, Erwin, Maspeth.
Beglinger, Thomas Edwin, Attica.
Bellach, Louis William Jr., Staten Island.
Belt, Marvin Mark, Syracuse.
Bergin, Thomas James, Albany.
Berlanga, Rafael Angel, New York.
Bernardo-Robles, Antonio Ra, New York.
Bernstein, Leslie Paul, Mastic.
Berntsen, Robert, Sloatsburg.
Berrics, Michael, New York.
Berthel, John Joseph, New York.
Bickel, Robert John, Rochester.
Bielicki, Gregory Chester, Utica.
Birenbaum, Bernard, New York.
Bivetto, Charles Fred, Elmont.
Blodgett, David Wilmer, Poland.
Boatwright, Tommy Lee, New York.
Bostock, James Edward, Endicott.
Bourne, Richard E., Wilson.
Bowen, Howard Lewis, Albion.
Bowen, Raymond Lewis Jr., Hannibal.
Bowers, Steven Wayne, New York.
Boyd, David Stewart, Mount Vernon.
Boyle, Francis Michael, Yonkers.
Bradley, Richard Burton, Wampsville.
Bradley, William Martin, Syracuse.
Braye, Lloyd Herbert, New York.
Brennan, William Robert, Patchogue.
Brickhouse, Emanuel Kris, New York.
Brown, Edward Lee, New York.
Brown, George Allen, New York.
Brown, James Azalou Jr., New York.
Brown, Joel Andrew, Hamburg.
Brucher, Andrew Carl, Smallwood
Bryan, Lionel John, New York.
Bryant, Pellum Jr., New York.
Burch, Henry, Henderson.
Burgos, Juan R., New York.
Burkhardt, William James, New York.
Burns, James Phillip, Poughkeepsie.
Burns, James T., New York.
Burrell, Robert George, Albany.
Burrough, Judge Jr., Buffalo.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Bushey, Peter B., Yonkers.
Buskey, Orrie Julius, Champlain.
Butcher, Reuben, Jamaica.
Butler, Robert Edward, Utica.
Butler, Thomas J., Jr., New York.
Cacioppo, John Richard, Medford.
Cadille, Frederick Frank, Lewiston.
Cambrelen, Jaime, New York.
Cammarata, Salvatore, Buffalo.
Canady, Roy Billy, New York.
Canan, Harold Jeffrey, Oceanside.
Cannata, George Anthony Jr., Woodside.
Cannizzaro, Vincent Junior, New York.
Capriglione, Anthony, Ozone Park.
Cardot, John Andrew, Rochester.
Carew, Farrell Richard, New York.
Carmody, Robert J., New York.
Carr, Len E., New York.
Carraturo, Frederick James, New Rochelle.
Carson, Bradley James, Rosedale.
Cartonia, Carmen Paul, Buffalo.
Casey, Paul William, Merrick.
Casiano, Juan, New York.
Cassidy, Donald Thomas, Bellerose.
Cassidy, Raymond Senter, Patchogue.
Castillo-Lima, Benjamin, New York.
Catanzariti, Ronnie S., New York.
Cather, Terrence Jay, Port Chester.
Cavanagh, Arthur, Queens Village.
Cayey, Edward Cecil Jr., South Colton.
Celeste, Raymond, Woodside.
Cervellino, Carmine Anthon, Patchogue.
Chambley, Theodore Rooseve, Buffalo.
Chiasera, August Jr., North Tonawanda.
Chisholm, Howard, New York.
Cifelli, Dominic Joseph, New York.
Claire, Bernard Erroyl, New York.
Clark, Jerry Furman, Chateaugay.
Clarke, Irvin Jr., New York.
Clune, Brian J., Scarsdale.
Coachman, James Lee Jr., New York.
Colbert, Douglas Robert, Norwood.
Collier, Wilford Paul, West Carthage.
Collier, James William, Fort Edward.
Collins, Nathaniel, Syracuse.
Collins, Thomas Edward, Long Island.
Collins, Walter Monroe, Elmira Heights.
Colvin, Gene Francis, Fort Edward.
Conrad, Martin James, New York.
Cook, Randall Vincent, New York.
Cooper, Joseph Henry, Jr., New York.
Corbett, Linwood Calvin, Hollis.
Core, James Albert, New York.
Corson, Richard P., Buffalo.
Coveny, David Paul, Wyoming.
Cowan, John R., Elmira.
Cowdrick, Horace W., Jr., College Point.
Cramer, Parker Dresser, Wantagh.
Crocker, Denton Winslow, Jr., Saratoga Springs.
Cubero, Hector, New York.
Cullen, Mark James, Niagara Falls.
Cunningham, Prince Charles, New York.
Curry, Wilbur, Jr., Buffalo.
D'Amico, Robert Joseph, New York.
Dagostino, John, New York.
Dailey, Gerald Lee, Scottsville.
Devenport, Richard, New York.
Davis, John Henry, New York.
Davis, William Louis, New York.
DeAngelis, Dominic A., Cambria Heights.
DeDominic, Robert Mario, Ridgewood.
DeLooze, Jerald Frederick, Phelps.
DeMarchi, Frank Jr., Woodside.
DeMichael, Dennis John, Rockaway.
DeRue, David John, Marion.
Dearden Allen Kenneth, Hamburg.
Degennaro, Joseph, Sound Beach.
Delano, Peter Frank, New York.
Delgaro, Reinaldo, New York.
Demarsico, Michael James, White Plains.
DeTomaso, Charles Philip, Corona.
DiGuardia, Alexander, Nich, Holbrook.
DiLandro, Joseph John, Lindenhurst.
DiPace, Ralph Joseph, Albany.
Dibble, Morris Frederick, Corning.
Dimoulas, Christy Ted, New York.
Dixon, David Allen, Weedsport.
Donlon, Michael Patrick, Lynbrook.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Donovan, Arthur Edmund, South Ozone Park.
Donovan, Robert John, Syracuse.
Doran, William Joseph, Far Rockaway.
Dougher, Thomas Edward, Buffalo.
Douglas, Robert Edward, Jr., Waverly.
Dragoti, James Robert, New York.
Drew, Thomas Francis, Central Islif.
Dreyer, Theodore Henry, New York.
Dumond, David Edward, Middletown.
Dunkenberger, David George, Flushing.
Easley, Timothy, New York.
Eddy, Richard Nelson, Buffalo.
Emerling, John Patrick, New York.
Esposito, Frank Carl, Bellrose.
Esposito, William, Malverne.
Esposito, William, Jr., New York.
Ewing, Arthur Richard, Roosevelt.
Farr, David Leroy, Allegany.
Farrell, Gerald Martin, Black River.
Farrell, William Peter, Buffalo.
Faucett, Gary Lee, Apalachin.
Favroth, Charles, New York.
Febus, Octavio, New York.
Fennessey, David Lee, Buffalo.
Fernandez, Jorge L., Mount Vernon.
Fernandez, Manual Fortunat, New York.
Fernandez, Rene, New York.
Fero, Ronald Miller, Scotia.
Fetner, Harold Everett, East Meadow.
Fieller, Richard Burdick, New York.
Figueroa, Adan, New York.
Filiberti, Russell Louis, Astoria.
Fink, Hubert Joseph, Glendale.
Finlay, Edward Arthur, Albany.
Finnegan, John Joseph, New Hyde Park.
Fitzgibbon, Thomas George, New York.
Flavin, Patrick James, East Syracuse.
Flores-Jimenez, Angel Ramo, New York.
Foran, Patrick Joseph, Westbury.
Foster, George, New York.
Fox, Gerald Lawrence, New York.
Fox, Thomas Joseph, North Tonawanda
French, Albert Leroy, Rochester.
Fullam, John Joseph, Jr., New York.
Gagliardi, Gregory, New York.
Gaiser, Lewis Bernard, Sayville.
Gajan, Alton Louis, Brookfield.
Galbraith, Michael Joseph, Liberty.
Galeno, Anthony Michael, New York.
Gallagher, Michael Joseph, New Hyde Park.
Gannon, Gerald William, Poughkeepsie.
Garcia, Edward, New York.
Gardner, Alen Louis, Elmira.
Gariepy, Craig Barry, Islip Terrace.
Garrett, Allen Morgan, Holland Patent.
Garrison, William Lawrence, Congers.
Gascon, Gary Lynn, Watkins Glen.
Gazar, Guillermo, New York.
Geiger, Walter Thomas, Glendale.
Geoghegan, John L., New York.
Gerspach, Peter Joseph, III, Eggertsville.
Gerstel, Howard Martin, Hewlett.
Gibbons, Brian Francis, New York.
Gilbert, Patrick Joseph, Mineola.
Gill, William Daniel, New York.
Gill-Bey, Mehmet Ali, New York.
Giordano, Joseph Charles, New York.
Gleason, Arthur A., Syracuse.
Glidden, Arthur, Baldwin.
Glynne, Michael Thomas, New York.
Goodin, Sidney Uel, New York.
Goodsell, Owen David, Fort Edward.
Gordian, Larry Bernard, New York.
Gore, Gregory, Flushing.
Gorton, Gary Bruce, New York.
Gould, Carlton Edgar, New York.
Gould, William Irving, New York.
Graham, Armand Roy, Long Beach.
Graham, James, Staten Island.
Grande, Joseph John, Jr., New York.
Grande, Robert Joseph, Roslyn.
Granoff, Robert Howard, New York.
Gray, Ralph, Medford.
Gray, Thomas Alan, Massapequa.
Gray, William Earl, Corona.
Graziano, Andrew Albert, New York.
Green, Moses, Jamaica.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Greene, Charles Richard, Lake Ronkonkoma.
Grier, Laifelt, New York.
Griffin, Leander, New York.
Griffith, John Howard, Mount Vernon.
Grisci, Larry Anthony, Astoria.
Gunn, George Bruce, Schenectady.
Hamilton, Andrew Leroy, Flushing.
Hamilton, Charles Gary, Slaterville.
Hampton, Otis James, New York.
Hanley, Thomas Joseph, Woodside.
Hanno, Martin Larry, Lowville.
Hardiman, La Francis, Wyandanch.
Harley, Michael Nathan, Buffalo.
Harrigan, Lawrence Colburn, New York.
Harris, John Oliver, New York.
Harris, Roy Green, Jr., New York.
Harrison, Charles Francis, New York.
Harrison, Donald, New York.
Harrison, Johnny, Hempstead.
Hartwell, Robert Allen, Smithtown.
Hawkins, Henry B., Jr., Jamaica.
Hawkins, Norman Levern, New York.
Healy, Joseph, Long Island.
Heerdt, Randy Leigh, Pound Ridge.
Heika, John Allen, Staten Island.
Heiser, Duane Kenneth, Buffalo.
Henderson, Frederick Howard, West Point.
Henson, Thomas George, Buffalo.
Herbert, Robert W., Watervliet.
Hering, Mark Richard, North Tonawanda.
Herlihy, John Henry, Jr., New York.
Hernandez, Felix, New York.
Hickey, James W., New York.
Higgins, Dennis Edward, Fort Edwards.
Higgins, Edward C., III, New York.
Hilburger, Michael J., Cheektowaga.
Hill, Richard Alfred, Rochester.
Hill, Victor C., New York.
Hilts, Damion Randolph, Canisteo.
Hines, William Joseph, New York.
Hinton, Richard, New York.
Holleder, Donald Walter, Webster.
Hollenbach, Donald Walter, Levittown.
House, Richard Allan, Whitesboro.
Hubbard, Thomas, New York.
Hubschmitt, Elbert Richard, Far Rockaway.
Hull, Arnold Melvin, Oak Hill.
Impelithere, Alan John, Liverpool.
Irrizarry, Jose Angel, New York.
Jackson, Edward, Jr., New York.
Jackson, Sanford Levon, Jr., Buffalo.
James, John Henry, Jr., New York.
James, Lee Allen, Jr., New York.
James, Thomas, Jamaica.
Jessie, Marshall, New York.
Johanson, Wayne, Armonk.
Johnson, Charles William, Kingston.
Johnson, Donel Ray, New York.
Johnson, Jack, New York.
Johnson, Kenneth, Middle Village.
Johnson, Matthew, Jr., New York.
Johnson, Robert Edward, Highland.
Jones, Orville Nelson, Newfane.
Jones, Ronald Russell, New York.
Judd, Donald R., Alexander.
Kadetz, Gary Steven, South Ozone Park.
Kane, Coleman John, Jr., Syracuse.
Karopczyc, Stephen Edward, Bethpage.
Kasai, Thomas Taro, New York.
Kaufman, Harold James, Spring Valley.
Keaveney, Thomas Robert, New York.
Keenan, Dennis Joseph, Rochester.
Kelley, Bernard James, Roslyn.
Kelly, William Martin, Peekskill.
Kendrick, James Michael, Bellmore.
Kerndl, Bruce Edgar, Miller Place.
Keyes, Arnell, New York.
Kircher, Alfred George, Ozone Park.
Klos, Daniel Edmund, Jr., Cheektowaga.
Knaus, Richard A., Cheektowaga.
Knopf, John Francis, New York.
Knott, Keith Robert, Albany.
Kraft, Michael Albert, Mount Vernon.
Krasnoff, Arnold Ross, New York.
Kresse, Wolfgang Edward, Ridgewood.
Kreuscher, Donald Edward, Merrick.
Krische, John Daniel, West Hempstead.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Krukowski, Edward Eugene, Syracuse.
Kubinciak, Robert Joseph, Massapequa.
Kuhne, William, New York.
La Barbera, Richard F., Freeport.
Laird, Richard Francis, Alexander.
Lambert, Gary Ramond, Lockport.
Lampman, Kenneth Wayne, Rochester.
Lapardo, Anthony N., New York.
Latour, Carl Joseph, Plattsburgh.
Leake, Johnny H., Wyoming.
Lebitz, Stephen, Jr., Forest Hills.
Leszczynski, Witold John, New York.
Levine, Robert, Jamaica.
Lewis, Moses John, Mt. Vernon.
Lifrieri, Paul J., Highland Mills.
Liszcz, Robert Stanley, Hempstead.
Livermore, Keith Warren F., Garrison.
Long, Patrick Jerome, Poughkeepsie.
Looney, Edward Michael, New York.
Lopez, Hector, Astoria.
Loscuito, Ned Natale, New York.
Lozada, Carlos James, New York.
Luciw, Henry, New York.
Luna, Angel Rafael, New York.
Lupo, Joseph Charles, Massapequa.
Mack, William James, Buffalo.
Maguire, Daniel John, New York.
Malewicz, Edward A., Jr., Scotia.
Mancuso, Joseph Anthony, North Bellmore.
Manning, Bruce K., Ovid.
Manns, Edward Emil, Buffalo.
Mansfield, John Montague, New York.
Mansfield, William Granvil, Massapequa Park.
Marable, Walter A., Jr., New York.
Marsden, Tyrone Cecil, New York.
Marshall, Eddie Lester, New York.
Martinez, Joseph Raymond, New York.
Matarazzo, Steven, Montgomery.
Mavroudis, Antonio Michael, New York.
Mayer, Norman Robert, Youngstown.
McBroom, William Stanley, Russell.
McCabe, Hugh Robert, New York.
McCabe, John Francis, Highland Falls.
McCarthy, James Joseph, New York.
McCarthy, Peter Rovert, New York.
McCarthy, Timothy John, Ossining.
McCarthy, Walter Rochefor, New York.
McCarty, William Joseph, Fort Edward.
McClennahan, Charles Henry, New York.
McConnell, Gerard Robert, Buffalo.
McCormack, Hugh John, New York.
McDonald, Michael William, Carmel.
McDonnell, Martin Gerard, New York.
McEachin, John, Jr., New York.
McFarland, Tommie Louis, New York.
McGee, Henry Herbert, Hollis.
McGoey, James Francis, Westchester.
McGraw, Thomas Edward, North Syracuse.
McGregor, Richard, Woodside.
McInerney, Richard Nash, Garden City.
McIntosh, James Crabb, Woodside.
McLoud, Douglas, Lyle, Prattsburg.
McLoughlin, Miles Joseph, New York.
McMullan, Edward Michael, New York.
McNamara, John Francis, New York.
Meehan, Raymond Patrick, Rockville Centre.
Melahn, Peter T., Woodmere.
Meleca, Frank, Albany.
Menchise, Michael J., Jr., Cambria Heights.
Mendez, David, New York.
Meola, Anthony Paul, New York.
Mercado, Diego, New York.
Mercado-Santos, Wilfredo, New York.
Mercurio, John A., Syracuse.
Metcalf, Larry Duane, Savannah.
Middleton, Wayne Lee, North Babylon.
Milan-Anavitarte, Luis Enr, New York.
Milk, Allan Arlyn, Long Eddy.
Mille, Walter, New York.
Miller, Robert Herbert, Clarence Center.
Mills, Denzell Ray, Newfane.
Mills, Donald, Queens Village.
Minogue, Thomas Francis, New York.
Minutoli, John Robert, Bayville.
Mitchell, Charles Leroy, Jr., New York.
Mitchell, Richard A., Glen Head.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Mitchell, Thomas William, Buffalo.
Moeller, Vincent Gerald, St., New York.
Molano, Charles Edward, Wantagh.
Molese, Dennis Patrick, Freeport.
Monahan, William Brian, West Islip.
Money, William Wallace, Millbrook
Monk, Thomas, New York.
Moore, Charles L., New York.
Moore, Gilliam, New York.
Morgan, William S., II, Farmingdale.
Morrow, Michael Joseph, New York.
Mosbach, Michael P., New York.
Mosley, Richard John, Albany.
Moyer, Charles Albert, New York.
Muller, James Van Ness, Bloomingburg.
Murray, Wayne Paul, Potsdam.
Musto, Richard Frank, New York.
Nadeau, Harold Bradley, East Bethany.
Nederik, Michael Alexander, Rochester.
Nelson, Wayne Herman, West Hampton Beach.
Newkirk, Thomas Clifton, Saugerties.
Newman, Daniel James, Jr., Niagara Falls.
Newton, Kenneth Purcell, New York.
Nicklas, Gilbert, Michael, Niagara Falls.
Nuebel, William George, Jr., East Williston.
Nutley, Daniel Thomas, New York.
O'Shea, Stephen John, New York.
O'Sullivan, Christopher Jo, Astoria.
Oakden, Terry Lee, New York Mills.
Odierno, John William, Farmingdale.
Olson, Timothy Arthur, Jamestown.
Olt, John Paul Harris, New York.
Orosz, Andrew John, New York.
Orphanos, Theophilos, New York.
Owens, Percie Edward, New York.
Owens, Walter Albert, Uniondale.
Pacetta, Cosmo Francis, Far Rockaway.
Pagan-Lozada, Wilfredo, New York.
Page, Willie Lee, Buffalo.
Palmieri, Ernest, New York.
Pappas, Eleftherios Pantel, New York.
Parker, Mark Edward, New York.
Patenaude, Harold Michael, Mechanicville.
Patton, George, New York.
Paulley, Larry, New York.
Perez, Wilfred M., New York.
Peterkin, Thomas Douglas, Newburgh.
Petramalo, Thomas, Rochester.
Pezzulo, John Francis, Glen Falls.
Phelps, Walter William, New York.
Piambino, Joseph Robert, Bellmore.
Pickett, Stephen William, Jackson Heights.
Pierre, Carrier, New York.
Pinder, John Joseph, Bellerose.
Pinn, Arnold, Jamaica.
Pirez-Berges, Carlos, New York.
Pittman, James Sherwin, Beacon.
Pizzuto, Louis Edward, Lynbrook.
Plotkin, Martin Louis, Lynbrook.
Pohl, Floyd William, Stillwater.
Polizzi, Salvatore Frank, Wantagh.
Prentice, Edwin Paul, Binghampton.
Pretter, Thomas, New York.
Priest, Donald James, Rochester.
Proscia, Richard Michael, New Hyde Park.
Pugh, Roger Leslie, New York.
Quarles, Floyd Elmer, New York.
Quealy, Michael Joseph, New York.
Quinn, Daniel, Jamaica.
Quinn, John Michzel, New York.
Raetz, Robert Willis, Burt.
Rakentine, Kenneth Carl, Lowland Hills.
Rand, Michael, New York.
Randazzo, Edward D., New York.
Rappleyea, Tunis E., Jr., Westkill.
Raptis, Angelo Cesare, Jr., New York.
Raz, Frank Vincent, Newburgh.
Reese, William Philip, Waterville.
Reginald, Robert Jameison, Lindenhurst.
Reichelt, James Louis, Syracuse.
Reid, Joseph H., New York.
Reilly, Robert Jude, Dobbs Ferry.
Reinhardt, Arthur Welker, Staten Island.
Ribitsch, Eric, Ridgewood.
Riccione, Steven Blaine, Geneva.
Riley, Paul William, Schenevus.
Rivera, Miguel Angel, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Rivera-Reyes, Jose Alberto, New York.
Rivera-Trinidad, Nestor Ju, New York.
Rizzi, Ralph Joseph, Canandaigua.
Roberts, Julius, Jr., New York.
Robinson, Leroy, New York.
Robinson, Stanley A., Jr., New York.
Rodriguez, Carlos Mario, New York.
Rodriguez, Edward, New York.
Rodriguez, Jose Estaban, New York.
Roese, Alan John, Lancaster.
Ron, Grijalba Humberto, Astoria.
Roraback, Kenneth M., Baldwin.
Ross, George Bacon, Jr., Amherst.
Rouse, Gordon Arthur, Jr., Clyde.
Rubins, John Charles, Snyder.
Ruggero, Victor Joseph, Jr., Freeport.
Ruggiero, Robert John, New York.
Ruiz, Carlos Heriberto, New York.
Russo, Michael Phillip, New York.
Rutigliano, Anthony, New York.
Salmieri, John Dominick, New York.
Saltmarsh, James John, Ausable Forks.
Salvo, Joseph Michael, New York.
Sanchez, Angel Manuel, New York.
Sanchez, David, New York.
Sandstrom, Hugh Thomas, New York.
Sanger, Stephen Carroll, Mount Kisco.
Santana, Jose, Jr., New York.
Santoroski, Michael Paul, Kingston.
Sanzone, Robert Benjamin, Levittown.
Scherlag, Robert, New York.
Schlecht, John, III, New York.
Schmid, Robert Anthony, Hartsdale.
Schmidt, Mark Vedder, Leeds.
Schneider, Gerard Joseph, New York.
Schuler, Gary Frederick, Syracuse.
Schwartz, Calvin Elliot, New York.
Scicutella, Joseph, New York.
Scotellaro, Michael Bertra, Clinton.
Scott, Harold, New York.
Scott, Thomas Lasanda, Syracuse.
Scully, Edward Anthony, West Point.
Seefeldt, Charles L., Jr., Knowlesville.
Seravalli, John Anthony, New York.
Sessa, Michael, Jr., New York.
Seymour, James Thomas, Commack.
Shaffer, William Paul, Batavia.
Sherrill, Herbert, St. Albans.
Shorts, William Vincent, Rensselaer.
Sickler, Harry Joseph, Lanesville.
Silbert, Leo Vincent, New Hyde Park.
Simmons, James Benjamin, New York.
Simon, Paul Richard, New York.
Slavin, Richard Neal, Eastchester.
Smith, Bruce Martin, Jamaica.
Smith, George Eugene, Pine Valley.
Smith, Joseph Frank, Long Island.
Smith, Larry Earl, Forestville.
Smith, Lewis Benjamin, Camden.
Smith, Michael Francis, New York.
Smith, Michael Thomas, New York.
Smith, Richard Albert, Spencerport.
Smith, Richard Floyd, Rochester.
Smith, Robert Jeremiah, Buffalo.
Smith, Sidney Courtney Mic, Manhasset.
Smith, Stephen Scott, Yorktown Heights.
Snow, Milton, Jr., East Aurora.
Snow, Ronald M., New York.
Sommerer, Robert John, New York.
Soper, John Camden, Staten Island.
Sorrell, Sherman Amos, Morrisonville.
Sosinski, Joseph, New York.
Spicer, Donald Faye, Candor.
Spitzfaden, Alfred Louis, New York.
Sroka, Richard Marion, Buffalo.
Starkes, John Milton, Jr., New York.
Starr, Edward Irwin, Patterson.
Steed, Gerald, New York.
Steier, William Edward, Binghampton.
Steiger, William Frederick, Saugerties.
Stein, Andrew Paul, Jr., Syracuse.
Stokes, Frank Edward, Monticello.
Stone Dee Wayne, Jr., Forest Hill.
Stonehouse, Alfred Lee, New York.
Storelli, John, Watervliet.
Strack, Lawrence, Richmond Hill.
Stridiron, George Thomas, Richmond Hill.
Stryker, Robert Francis, Auburn.
Stuckey, Henry James, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Stymus, Gary Lee, Holley.
Summers, Charles G. H., Schenectady.
Tappe, Kenneth William, Jr., Floral Park.
Tarbell, William M., Syracuse.
Tart, Clifton Lee, New York.
Taylor, Harry Edward, Hempstead.
Terry, Ronald Terrance, Niagara Falls.
Testa, Richard, New York.
Thomas, Leonard Alan, New York.
Thompson, Francis James, West Point.
Thornton, William D., Jr., Tarrytown.
Tierno, James, Jackson Heights.
Tissier, Richard Henry, New York.
Tizzio, Pasquale Joseph, New York.
Todd, Franklin, Godfrey, New York.
Todi, John Anthony, Ithaca.
Togneri, Daniel Ernest, New York.
Tomasovic, Stanley Robert, Hicksville.
Tomaszewski, Stanley Jr., Batavia.
Torello, Carl Harvey, Baldwinsville.
Torres, Fernando Luis, Jr., Woodside.
Torres, Jesus M., New York.
Torres, Victor Luis, New York.
Torrey, Raymond D., New York.
Towe, Edward Scott, New York.
Travis, Jon Paul, Corning.
Tucker, David Bruce, Elmhurst.
Tumino, John Joseph, New York.
Turner, Charles Wondrews, New York.
Tyler, Lester. New York.
Ugarte, Carlos, Elmhurst.
Ulrich, George Henry, Merrick.
Valentin, Rafael, New York.
Valentino, Anthony Robert, Mount Vernon.
Van Clief, Larry, New York.
Varney, Kenneth Arthur, Tonawanda.
Vazquez, Jose Angel, Long Island.
Velilla, William, New York.
Vicich, Charles Edward, Woodside.
Victoria, Frederick Pearce, New York.
Vitacco, Michael, New York.
Wait, Bernard Joseph, Troy.
Waklee, Duane A., Franklinville.
Wallace, Brian Francis, Staten Island.
Wallner, Franz Xavier, Yonkers.
Way, Thomas Urban, Rochester.
Weems, Richard Quentin, New York.
Weisman, Alan N., Roslyn Heights.
Wells, William, Brentwood.
Wetzel, Walter Joseph, Howard Beach.
White, Joseph, New York.
White, William Sampson, New York.
Whitman, Thomas Michael, New York.
Wickham, Ralph Arthur, Durhamville.
Wilcox, Charles Chester, Buffalo.
Wilcox, Gary Lee, Brainardsville.
Wilkie, Charles David, Bellerose.
Willett, Louis Edward, Richmond Hill.
Williams, George Joseph, New York.
Williams, Nathan C., New York.
Williams, Neil Stephen, Jackson Heights.
Williams, Van, New York.
Wilson, Herbert, Jr., New York.
Wilson, Nathaniel, New York.
Windham, James Eugene, Jr., New York.
Winters, Robert J., Albany.
Witherspoon, Thomas, Jr., New York.
Wittman, Gordon Richard, Herkimer.
Wood, Edward Charles, Victor.
Wood, Robert Victor, Ogdensburg.
Wratten, Gary Patterson, Alden.
Wright, William Clay, Jr., Flushing.
Wulffert, John Lawrence, Newburgh.
Yancy, Joseph Stanley, New York.
Yates, Donald Francis, Round Lake.
Young, Weldon Horace, Buffalo.
Zeldes, Mark Hillary, New York.
Zupan, John, Hempstead.

Air Force

Abbott, Robert William, Delmar.
Armstrong, Robert George, New York.
Budka, Richard Walter, Amsterdam.
Cameron, John Irwin, Coxsackie.
Cavalli, Anthony Frank, New York.
Chase, Oliver C., Jr., Peekskill.
Fodard, Thomas Anthony, Syracuse.
Foster, Everett Edward, Beacon.
Foster, Robert Eugene, Lockport.

NEW YORK—continued

Air Force

Franco, Charles Stephen, New York.
Hickman, Vincent Joseph, New York.
Hoffman, Irwin Lewis, Elmhurst.
Jones, James Bruce, Alexandria Bay.
Kindel, James Carl, East Aurora.
Krukowski, Edward Stephen, Beechhurst.
Landringham, Robert George, Madison.
Low, George, New York.
Madison, Frank Anthony, New York.
McClean, John Howard, New York.
McCutchen, Marl W., Jr., Green Island.
Niski, Leonard Edward, Amsterdam.
Norton, George Harold, Oneida.
O'Neill, James Raymond, Levittown.
Rice, Francis David, Syracuse.
Rice, Herbert Charles, Hamburg.
Richardson, Eugene, Rochester.
Shubbuck, Rolland Bernard, Medina.
Sipos, William George, West Point.
Stephens, Michael Jeff, New York.
Thorpe, David Albert, Seneca Falls.
Waxman, Saul, New York.

Marine Corps

Ahlmeyer, Heinz, Jr., Pearl River.
Albano, Paul Edward, Hannacroix.
Albert, Sepgio Edith, New York.
Allen, Bruce Joseph, Morrisonville.
Amato, Michael John, Peekskill.
Amendola, Willet Rankin, Deposit.
Anderson, Ronald David, New York.
Angelides, James Joseph, Menands.
Araujo, Robert Joseph, Staten Island.
Asip, Edward Vincent, Amityville.
Aspinall, William Albert, Plattsburgh.
Atkinson, John F., Jr., Syracuse.
Aviles, Anibal Felipe, Jr., New York.
Aviles, Peter, New York.
Ayres, Albert Boyd, Glens Falls.
Bacon, William Ivor Tenney, Rye.
Balazy, George Stephen, Rochester.
Bansavage, John George, Amsterdam.
Barillo, Joseph William, Hornell.
Barisic, Lawrence William, New York.
Barnes, James William, Jr., New York.
Barry, Robert Owen, Glens Falls.
Baies, James John, Glens Falls.
Baxter, Peter Walter, Staten Island.
Beale, Robert Boughton, Orchard Park.
Bienkowski, Walter Joseph, Bayside.
Bigtree, James Victor, Syracuse.
Bilotta, Richard Gale, New York.
Blanchard, William George, Syracuse.
Bobo, John Paul, Niagara Falls.
Booras, Peter William, Watertown.
Boston, Ronald, New York.
Bradley, James Jerome, New York.
Brady, Edward Mark, Utica.
Brancato, Peter Joseph, Jr., North Lindenhurst.
Braswell, James Porter, Jr., New York.
Breault, Roderick Wayne, Hudson Falls.
Britton, Thomas Wesley, Jr., Great Neck.
Brogdon, Margie, New York.
Brooks, Walter Harm, Jr., Attica.
Brophy, James John, Jackson Heights.
Brown, Richard, Rockville.
Brown, Thomas, New York.
Brownfeld, Philip, New York.
Brule, Gordon Joseph, Jr., Rochester.
Bryson, Robert Eugene, Rochester.
Buckley, Michael Frank, Islip.
Burchell, Edgar Brower, III, Mamaroneck.
Burgess, David Roy, Kew Gardens.
Burns, James Edward, Buffalo.
Caputo, James William, New York.
Carlisi, Ignatius, New York.
Carpenter, George Whitney, Cederhurst.
Carroll, Michael, Dewitt.
Cartwright, Thomas Clark, Honeoye Falls.
Carvallo, Cesar Eduardo, Rego Park.
Case, David Duane, Holley.
Case, Orson Howard, Johnstown.
Case, Thomas Joseph, Port Jervis.
Casey, Francis Joseph, New York.
Cass, William David, Syracuse.
Celmer, Lawrence Joseph, Amsterdam.
Cerrano, Louis Francis, Jr., New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Cherrick, James Weston, Staten Island.
Chipchase, Philip Grant, Katonah.
Chisholm, Alexander, Lindenhurst.
Ciborowski, Thomas Paul, Maspeth.
Clark, James McKenzie, New York.
Clarke, Ritson Lewis Y, New York.
Clearwater, Norman Wilbur, Catskill.
Conley, Michael Francis, Plattsburgh.
Cook, Roger John, Medina.
Cornell, Steven Thomas, New York.
Correa, Luis Felipe, New York.
Covella, Joseph Francis, New York.
Covey, Elwood D., Jr., Newark.
Crawford, Curtis Eugene, Dunkirk.
Crawford, Richard Wayne, Wallkill.
Crissell, Earl Leon, Jr., Binghamton.
Crosley, Charles Raymond, New York.
Crossley, Orman Lee, Jr., Jamestown.
Cullen, Thomas Joseph, New York.
Cunnion, Michael Alfred, Mount Vernon.
Darling, Albert James, III, Craryville.
Dash, Samuel Lee, Jr., St. Albans.
Davila, Frank, New York.
De Wald, John Francis, Buffalo.
Dell, Thomas Carl, Buffalo.
Demunda, Gerald Anthony, Niagara Falls.
Devers, Paul Anthony, Jackson Heights.
Dewane, Richard Allen, Buffalo.
Di Roberto, Robert, Mamaroneck.
Di Sapio, Donald Anthony, Pelham Manor.
Didomizio, John, New Hyde Park.
Diker, George, Jr., Staten Island.
Ditoro, William Fenton, Albany.
Doctor, Gary Dean, Basom.
Dodd, Joseph James, Astoria.
Domiano, Peter Paul, Industry.
Doddy, Albert Charles, Franklin Square.
Dorner, Robert Andrew, Lindenhurst.
Dorsey, William Banfield, Yonkers.
Doster, Henry James, Buffalo.
Dowd, Thomas Brown, Manhasset.
Dray, Donald Barry, Buffalo.
Duffy, Daniel Walter, New York.
Dugan, John Frederick, Merrick.
Dugness, Peter, New York.
Dunham, Richard Francis, Rochester.
Dunn, Gerald, Jamaica.
Durham, Willard Duane, Jr., Greenfield.
Dutcher, Jimie Dale, Sidney.
Dwyer, Robert Martin, Troy.
Dymerski, Alfred John, New York.
Eastman, Jesse George, Fulton.
Edwards, John Jay, Lock Haven.
Edwards, Thomas William, Binghamton.
Egan, Donald Jason, Jr., Troy.
Eisner, James William, New Rochelle.
Ekwell, Thomas Janes, Rochester.
Eldridge, Thomas Farrell, Rouses Point.
Elflein, Michael Frederick, Far Rockaway.
Ellsworth, Elmer Edward, Spencerport.
Evans, Eric William, Rexford.
Feliciano, Noel Jesus, New York.
Fellinger, William G., Jr., Dunkirk.
Felter, Robert Charles, Troy.
Ferril, John Henry, II, Rockville Centre.
Figueredo, Carlos, New York.
Finkel, Charles, New York.
Fishenden, Arthur Eric, Hollis.
Fisher, Frank Clark, Patchogue.
Florio, Frank, Edgemere.
Foote, Fernando Vicente, New York.
Frasier, Dennis Willard, St. Johnsville.
Freyne, Bernard Anthony, Woodside.
Furlong, Edward Francis, Jr., New York.
Gagliardo, Frank Andrew, Deer Park.
Gall, Robert Joseph, New York.
Gallagher, Patrick, Lynbrook.
Gallagher, Patrick Joseph, New York.
Galutz, James Anthony, Cortland.
Geary, John Michael, New York.
Geary, John Wesley, Batavia.
Geary, Robert Francis, Jr., Yonkers.
Gillette, William James, Binghamton.
Gillingham, Richard Kirk, Valatie.
Giordano, Andrew Mix, Smithtown.
Glover, Larry, New York.
Goddeau, Thomas Arthur, Morrisonville.
Goodrich, Thomas Wendell, Cortland.
Grabow, Otto Charles, Bethpage.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Graham, Samuel, Henry, II, Watertown.
Granato, Frank, New York.
Graves, Donald Laverne, Rochester.
Green, John, Jr., Jamaica.
Greiling, John Fredrick, New York.
Gresens, John Carl, Pittsford.
Griffin, Bradford Thomas, Rome.
Guichaud, Frank John, Peekskill.
Gulliver, John Joseph, Schenectady.
Gutloff, Edwardo Leopold, New York.
Hairston, Clifton Odell, New York.
Hallock, Douglas Paul, Schenectady.
Hanshaw, Edward Paul, Corning.
Hartman, Gary Richard, Newport.
Hauss, James Robert, Hammondsport.
Havers, Larry Ronald, Allegany.
Helstrom, Kenneth James, Geneva.
Helt, Harry Philip, Jr., Staten Island.
Hempel, Charles Robert, Jr., Broad Channel.
Henderson, Gary Lloyd, Niagara Falls.
Henrich, Richard Frederick, Westchester.
Hens, John Michael, East Amherst.
Hentschel, Robert Edward, Rochester.
Hernandez, Manuel, New York.
Hernandez, Pedro, Jr., New York.
Hill, Herman Linwood, New York.
Hirst, Kenneth Lewis, Jr., Briarcliff.
Hock, Ronald Francis, New Baltimore.
Homeyer, Frederick, White Plains.
Hoots, Richard Maxwell, New York.
Hornyak, John Joseph, Kendell.
Hourigan, William Joseph, New York.
House, John Alexander, II, Pelham.
Howe, Leroy Charles, Holland Patent.
Hyson, Raymond Lee, Schenectady.
Iglesias, Julio A., III, New York.
Imerese, James David, Buffalo.
Jackowiak, Henry Patrick, Angola.
Jackson, Noble, New York.
Jaconetti, Kenneth Richard, South Salem.
Jambro, Robert James, Scottia.
Jerro, William George, New York.
Johns, Micky James, Levittown.
Johnson, Richard Herman, Wolcott.
Jones, Lester, Jamaica.
Jones, Thomas George, Utica.
Jordan, Henry Crawley, New York.
Jordan, Patrick Michael, Buffalo.
Jordan, Robert Patrick, New York.
Joseph, Austin Raymond, New York.
Joy, Chester Joseph, Kingston.
Joyce, Daniel Thomas, North Tarrytown.
Juers, Roy James, East Norwich.
Kaler, Richard David, Patchogue.
Karn, Wayne Douglas, West Seneca.
Katavolos, Robert, New York.
Kaus, Harry Leonard, Jr., Dunkirk.
Kehoe, Michael Joseph, New York.
Keith, Kenneth Archibald, Bainbridge.
Keller, Leroy Henry, Medina.
Kenny, John Henry, Staten Island.
Kessler, Julius Allen, III, New York.
Kilkenny, Frank Joseph, New York.
King, Thomas George, Penfield.
Kisch, Robert Anthony, Garden City.
Kissinger, Ronald Clayton, Broadalbin.
Klestinec, Albert Frederic, Massapequa.
Kmetyk, Jonathan Peter, Niagara Falls.
Knight, Albert S., III, Rochester.
Kohland, Richard Glen, Oneonta.
Kopacska, John Carl, Beechhurst.
Kopik, Edward Stanley, Amsterdam.
Kranz, William Francis, Jr., Solvay.
Krauss, Walter Joseph, Jr., Huntington.
La Flair, Richard Leon, Brownville.
La Rose, Joseph Rhuben, Hadlock Pond.
Laguer, Jose Enrique, New York.
Lane, James Thomas, Niagara Falls.
Laport, Leonard Oscar, Northville.
Larock, Rexford Adelbert, Parish.
Lawendowski, John Jacob, Utica.
Lecastre, Kenneth John, Buffalo.
Leone, John Frank, Rochester.
Lerch, John Christian, Jr., Taberg.
Leslie, Phillip Willard, Oneida.
Levy, Walter Neville, New York.
Lo Mauro, Robert Bruce, New York.
Ludwig, Larry George, Fairport.
Lynch, Charles Aaron, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Lysaght, Robert John, New Rochelle.
Mac Lean, Weston David, Westbury.
Mac Leod, Robin Douglas, Binghamton.
Mackay, Paul Alfred, New York.
Macomb, Orrie E. Jr., Great Valley.
Maher, Paul Ivan, Hauppauge.
Maldonado, Jorge Joseph, New York.
Manzi, John Peter, Millbrook.
Marks, Richard Edward, New York.
Marsh, Richard Charles, Central Valley.
Martin, Lawrence, New York.
Mason, Johnnie, New York.
McBride, Kenneth Gerard, New York.
McCormack, James Joseph, New York.
McCoy James Glendale, Buffalo.
McCracken, Ronald, Elmsford.
McCune, Edward James, New York.
McDonald, Henry, Flushing.
McElynn, Thomas Joseph, Laurelton.
McGarry, John Thomas, New York.
McGuire, Patrick John, Verplanck.
McHale, John Bunce, New York.
McKenna, Nelson William, Poughkeepsie.
McMahon, Lawrence Vincent, New York.
Mead, Norman Arthur, Granville.
Mendez, Angel, New York.
Menzies, Alexander John Ne, Walworth.
Mercado, George, New York.
Merino, Louis Phillip, Selden.
Metott, Gerald Patrick, Springwater.
Michael, Vinford Franklyn, New York.
Michalski, John Steven, Syracuse.
Miller, Donald John, Farmingdale.
Miller, Robert Arthur, Mastic Beach.
Millett, Steven Lawrence, Massapequa.
Mills, David Michael, Mohawk.
Milos, Joseph Louis, Troy.
Miranda, Oswaldo Luis, New York.
Mohamed, Mack Paul, New York.
Mollica, Benjamin George, Flushing.
Monin, Francis George, Buffalo.
Monks, John, Binghamton.
Montone, Kenneth Michael, Great Neck.
Morgan, Michael Roy, Bethpage.
Morris, William, Arverne.
Morse, Richard Lucian, Coeymans Hollow.
Moses, James, Jr., New York
Moss, William Vance, Chappaqua.
Mowbray, Douglas Ronald, Peekskill.
Muniz, Carlos Noberto, New York.
Murphy, Edward Theodore, Levittown.
Neal, Cary, Buffalo.
Neuss, William Henry, Yaphank.
Niedermeier, Thomas David, Rochester.
Novotny, John Raymond, East Northport.
O'Connell, Kevin Gerald, Williamsville.
Odiot, Edgar Wilfredo, New York.
Ohanesian, Victor, New York.
Olsen, John Louis, New Rochelle.
Orlando, Anthony Mario, Seldon.
Orton, Kenneth William, Jr., Kenmore.
Owens, James Joseph, Woodside.
Oxford, Harry Edward, Jr., New York.
Packard, Robert Frank, Ridgewood.
Pannell, Tyrone Sidney, Amityville.
Parada-Barrera, Antonio, New York.
Pastrana, Victor Raphael, New York.
Pellizzari, Louis Joseph, Solvay.
Penfold, Peter Allan, Oceanside.
Penna, John Anthony, New York.
Perea, Edward, New York.
Perez, Daniel Torres, Staten Island.
Peters, Lawrence David, Binghamton.
Pfeiffer, John Clifford, Hillsdale.
Pietras, Frank Martin, Springfield.
Plumadore, Kenneth Leo, Syracuse.
Plumey, Raymond, New York.
Preziosi, James Lawrence, Commack.
Price, Barry Francis, Jamaica.
Prothero, William Henry, Schenectady.
Purdy, Randall Breward, Briarcliff.
Ranellucci, Raymond Anthony, Rensselaer.
Reed, Louis Joseph, White Plains.
Reilly, James Richmond, Esopus.
Reilly, William Raymond, New York.
Rhodes, Clifford M., Jr., Poughkeepsie.
Richards, Donald Juan, Medford Station.
Reigel, Arthur William, Jr., Woodside.
Ries, William Stuart, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Roberts, John Henry, South Ozone Park.
Rockenstyre, Richard, Albany.
Rodriguez, Colon Ricardo, New York.
Rohring, Kevin Michael, Buffalo.
Romero-De-Jesus, Benjamin, New York.
Rosebrugh, Francis Paul, Geneseo.
Roseto, John, New York.
Ruane, Michael Patrick, New York.
Ruch, Francis William, II, Utica.
Rust, James Henry, Malone.
Ryan, Donald James, Auburn.
Ryan, John Aloysius, Jr., New York.
Sage, Robert David, Rochester.
Sanders, Thomas, East Elmhurst.
Sanseverino, Anthony, New York.
Santana, Jose Manuel, New York.
Santiago, Alan Angel, New York.
Santiago, Vazquez Bernardi, New York.
Sayer, John Stephen, Watertown.
Schapanick, Chester, New York.
Scharlach, Steven Edward, New York.
Scheib, Ralph Eugene, Rochester.
Schock, Harold Henry, Mamaroneck.
Scott, Dennis Lee, Buffalo.
Scritchfield, David Allen, Buffalo.
Searight, James Arnold, Baldwinsville.
Seda, Fernando, Jr., New York.
Segarra, Luis Ernesto, Jr., New York.
Serwinowski, Richard Earl, Buffalo.
Sheppard, Glenn Andre, White Plains.
Shoemaker, Donald Elton, Buffalo.
Sibilly, John Richard, Richmond Hill.
Simmons, Elliott, Jr., Buffalo.
Singleton, Clifford Richard, New York.
Sisson, Ronald Paul, Hulberton.
Sivatta, Marc Anthony, New York.
Skebeck, Edward John, Jr., Rochester.
Smaso, Jack, New York.
Smith, Reginald Edward, New York.
Smith, Richard Robert, Hopewell Junction.
Smith, Robert Charles, Rochester.
Snyder, Harold, Jr., New York.
Sochacki, Nicholes, Rochester.
Soto, Felix F., Woodside.
Southworth, Ronald Hubert, Massena.
Stachowski, Arthur Thomas, Batavia.
Stankiewicz, Kenneth David, Buffalo.
Starbuck, Robert French, Montgomery.
Steffans, Marshall George, Buffalo.
Stewart, Lawrence, Buffalo.
Stokes; Ronald T., Central Islif.
Sullivan, Daniel John, New York.
Sussmeier, James Joseph, Long Island City.
Tamilio, Thomas, Hartsdale.
Taylor, Robert, Niagara Falls.
Telfer, Robert Ray, Fonda.
Tette, John Bernard, Rochester.
Thompson, Lawrence Curtis, Staten Island.
Thorsteinson, Vernon Josep, Buffalo.
Threet, Pierre Anatole, Buffalo.
Thrush, Olin Richard, Lockport.
Tice, Paul Douglas, Buffalo.
Tomasek, Michael Joseph, New York.
Tori, Thomas Joseph, Staten Island.
Turner, John Richard, Yonkers.
Tuthill, Charles Preston, Uniondale.
Uhl, Thomas Francis, New York.
Upright, Edwin Francis, Avon.
Valliere, Stephen Charles, Tupper Lake.
Van Antwerp, William M., Jr., Albany.
Van Deusen, Phillip Andrew, Tully.
Van Reypen, Robert Julius, Rochester.
Vargas, Julio Cesar, New York.
Vasquez, Eddie, New York.
Velez, Bert, New York.
Vercouteren, Edward Arnold, East Meadow.
Vergallito, John Anthony, Elmira.
Villanueva, Hilario Pizarr, New York.
Vohs, William Francis, New York.
Vollmar, George Thomas, Huntington.
Wade, Melvin Alexander, Lewis.
Wainz, Robert Michael, Freeport.
Wallace, Robert Charles, Plattsburgh.
Walsh, Jerome William, New York.
Walsh, Thomas Roy, Baldwinsville.
Walton, Roger Edwin, East Springfield.
Warren, Richard John, Elnora.
Warshawsky, Joel Barry, Floral Park.
Washington, Albert Alleyne, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Washington, Erick Lee, New York.
Watington, Ralph H., Jr., New York.
Watson, John Elmo, Manulis.
Wauchope, Douglas, Lloyd Harbor.
Wearing, Marion Bernard, Jamaica.
Weaver, Jerald Bruce, Flushing.
Wenzel, Carl Richard, Allegany.
Wesighan, Lester Arthur, New York.
Wheaton, James, New York.
Widener, James Edward, Churchville.
Widmann, Raymond, Lindenhurst.
Williams, Wallace, New York.
Williamson, Joel Stephen, East Meadow.
Wilson, Reginald Eugene, Syracuse.
Wolpe, Jack, Newburgh.
Wyszomirski, John Donald, Catskill.

Navy

Agazzi, David Michael, Astoria.
Baker, Charles Alfred, Staten Island.
Baker, Larry James, Fairport.
Bossman, Peter Robert, West Seneca.
Burke, James Francis, Jr., Yonkers.
Carr, Michael Peter, Hudson Falls.
Clark, Thomas Osborn, Yonkers.
Fegan, Ronald James, Brockport.
Frantz, Maxwell Stowell, East Aurora.
Gierak, George Gregory, Jr., Springfield.
Gray, Harold Edwin, Jr., New York.
Hodge, Claude Arthur, Auburn.
Huestis, Roger Edward, North Merrick.
James, Marc Steven, New York.
Johnson, Lawrence Everett, Binghamton.
Klein, Henry Irving, Jr., Delmar.
Knapp, Fredric Woodrow, Huntington.
Mattracion, Philip Reginal, Beacon.
Murphy, Terence Meredith, New York.
Newell, Michael Thomas, Ellenville.
Phelps, David Clayton, Williamstown.
Porterfield, David Edward, Mamaroneck.
Rodriguez, Jack Charles, Jackson Heights.
Romano, Gerald Michael, New York.
Sitek, Thomas Walter, Niagara Falls.
Smith, Richard Vroman, Dundee.
Wilkinson, Jack William, East Islip.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Adams, Steadman, Jr., Cerro Gordo.
Alderman, Winfred, Burgaw.
Alford, Ulysses, Asheville.
Alston, Adell Arie, Pittsboro.
Alston, Ernest, Jr., Nashville.
Alston, Mack Arthur, Whitakers.
Anthony, Asher Aubrey, Greensboro.
Ashecraft, James Arthur, Hamlet.
Auton, Bobbie Maxsen, Taylorsville.
Baker, Everdene, Jr., Zebulon.
Ballard, Edward Harding, Charlotte.
Ballree, Emmett Eugene, Mount Olive.
Banks, Richard Roosevelt, Lexington.
Barber, Bobby Lee, Kinston.
Barber, Lonnie, Fayetteville.
Bass, David Harum, Durham.
Beddingfield, George Clyde, Zirconia.
Belton, Ray, Whitsett.
Bennett, Bentford, Lilesville.
Bennett, Charles Herman, Fayetteville.
Benton, Joseph Tatem, Hertford.
Bess, Samuel, Sanford.
Blevins, Howard Calvin, Burnsville.
Borowsky, Charles George, Fayetteville.
Brame, Clarence Ray, Henderson.
Brandon, Jesse L., Oxford.
Bray, William Robert, Burlington.
Brewington, Dannie James, Broadway.
Brewington, Harvey, Jr., Fayetteville.
Brigman, Billy Dean, Barnardsville.
Brittain, James Harold, Shelby.
Bronson, Thomas Carl, Fayetteville.
Brooks, Christopher Eugene, Kings Mountain.
Brown, Hansel, Council.
Brown, John Marshall, III, Durham.
Bullock, Nathaniel, Warrenton.
Bunch, Ivor Ecarol, Hobbsville.
Burke, John Walter, Moncure.
Burnett, Kenneth Maurice, Winston-Salem.
Burnette, Freddie Lee, Durham.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Butler, William Sanford, Jr., Morganton.
Campbell, Jerry Wayne, Statesville.
Campbell, Warren Dane, Cherryville.
Carlyle, Archie Monroe, Charlotte.
Carroll, Baxter Colidge, Triplett.
Carter, Jerry Donald, Shelby.
Carter, Jimmy Earl, Smithfield.
Chavis, Bradley, Pembroke.
Chriscoe, Charles Richard, Randolph.
Cochran, Vernon Terry, Topton.
Collier, James Allen, Carthage.
Collins, Charles Allen, Holly Springs.
Collins, William Anderson, Pembroke.
Congleton, Roy Elsworth, Chadbourn.
Connor, John, Jr., Winston-Salem.
Conway, Jasper Ray, Ayden.
Cooper, Napolen Kelly, Rocky Mount.
Couch, Harold Eugene, Durham.
Cox, Charles Claybourn, High Point.
Cranford, Larry Edward, Charlotte.
Cunningham, Jacob H. III, Lexington.
Curlee, Robert Lee, Jr., Monroe.
Dancy, Arthur Lee, Pinetops.
Daniels, Donald Edward, Goldsboro.
Dantzler, Kenneth James, Durham.
Davis, Charles Owen, Louisburg.
Davis, John B., III, Raleigh.
Davis, William Edward, Jr., Raleigh.
Dial, Robert Lewis, Charlotte.
Dickens, Phil Jackson, Fayetteville,
Dixon, Jesse James, Rocky Mount.
Donald, Robert Cyrill, Fayetteville.
Duncan, Ronnie Marshall, Wake Forest.
Dunn, Wayland, Jr., Raleigh.
Edge, James Hampton, Greensboro.
Edgerton, William T., Jr., Asheville.
Eller, Charles Leroy, Warrensville.
Elliott, James Lee, Fayetteville.
Ellis, Baxter Harrison, Ca-vel.
Ellis, Maurice Stephen, Asheville.
Farmer, William Hoke, Jr., Fayetteville.
Farmer, Willie, Jr., Pinetops.
Farrar, James Edward, Jr., Durham.
Fields, Abraham Lincoln, Spring Lake.
Fipps, Eugene, Whiteville.
Fleming, Charles Roger, Charlotte.
Floyd, James Walter, Winston-Salem.
Flynn, Billy Wayne, Greensboro.
Flynt, James William, III, Pittsboro.
Ford, William, Lexington.
Foxe, George, Rocky Mount.
Frank, Johnson Francis, Charlotte.
French, Willie, Jr., Pittsboro.
Fryar, Glasco Junior, Sampson.
Gadie, Bobby Glynn, Hope Mills.
Galyan, Troy Alexander, Concord.
Gardner, Bobby Ray, Ahoskie.
Gaskins, Darrell Frederick, Vanceboro.
Gerald, Wilson Truman, Orrum.
Golding, Jerry Boggie, Walkertown.
Gore, Kenneth Alric, Shallotte.
Gorham, Rudolph, Garysburg.
Graham, Gentry, Greensboro.
Graves, James Leroy, Burlington.
Gray, Carl Avery, Morganton.
Gray, Charlie, Fayetteville.
Gray, James Junius, Concord.
Green, Caney, Lenoir.
Green, Freddie Wallace, Charlotte.
Greene, Calvin Arthur, Fayetteville.
Greene, Edward Eugene, Lenoir.
Grissette, Prelow, Shallotte.
Grogan, Bryan Eugene, Sanford.
Guthrie, Harold Lee, Burlington.
Haddock, Louis Edward, Jr., Pollocksville.
Hall, Dennis Lee, Burlington.
Ham, Woodrow Wilson, Jr., Kinston.
Harding, Everette Eugene, Asheville.
Harmon, Floyd Steve, Valdese.
Harrington, Clifton Willia, Aberdeen.
Harrington, John Milton, Durham.
Harris, Harold Lee, Durham.
Harris, Jerry Bruce, Black Mountain.
Hayward, Ernest, Fayetteville.
Hickman, Randall Sherwood, Cumberland.
Hicks, Charles Wayne, Butner.
Hicks, John Mitchell, Rutherfordton.
Hill, Alvester, Halifa.

5

XUM

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Hocker, William Eddie, Statesville.
Holifield, Floyd, Jr., Asheville.
Holliman, Ted Delane, Jr., Greensboro.
Holmes, Linwood McCoy, Ernul.
Honeycutt, Burlon Talmage, Clayton.
Hosler, Franklin Eugene, Lumberton.
Houser, Charles Milton, Vale.
Houston, Alex Ray, Pink Hill.
Howie, Norman Perry, Jr., Concord.
Huggins, Richard Van, Monroe.
Hussey, Billy Ray, Seagrove.
Hyleman, Mausby Edward, Gastonia.
Jackson, Clinnis Harrell, Southern Pines.
Jackson, Paul Gray, Fayetteville.
Jackson, Wallace Michael, Mebane.
James, Samuel Adams, Jr., Raleigh.
Jenkins, James Earl, High Point.
Jenkins, Roger Wardell, Greensboro.
Johnson, Jack Daniel, Dover.
Johnson, James Walter, Jr., Roaring River.
Johnson, Marvin Ray, Burgaw.
Johnson, McArthur, Wilmington.
Johnson, William Charles, Leaksville.
Jones, Joshua Thomas, Moyock.
Jones, Tommy Roy, Nash County.
Keener, Robert Steven, Gastonia.
Kelly, Ernest, Jr., Bladenboro.
Kelly, Harry Allen, Huntersville.
Kerley, Royd Steve, Jr., Charlotte.
Kerns, Glenn Dirk, Lumberton.
Kidd, Dennis Curtis, Graham.
King, Joseph Deward, Carrboro.
Lambert, William David, Albemarle.
Lawler, Daniel H., Kingston.
Lee, Roy Ronald, Dunn.
Leggett, Albert Gray, Ayden.
Legrand, Milton Harris, Badin.
Leonard, Henry Thomas, Henderson.
Lewis, Charlie Gray, Fayetteville.
Lewis, Harvey Ledrew, Ahoskie.
Lively, Bobby Dean, East Flat Rock.
Lloyd, Douglas, Cornelius.
Locklear, Glen, Pembroke.
Lowe, Frederick Molee, Jr., Wilmington.
Lyerly, Ronald Wayne, Salisbury.
Lynch, Justin Marshall, Ft. Bragg.
Mashburn, Raymond T., Andrews.
Mason, Richard Floyd, Erwin.
Matthews, Henry Robert, Cameron.
Maultsby, Thomas Henry, Jr., Rocky Mount.
Mayo, John, Charlotte.
Mayo, Johnnie Murray, Beaufort.
McBynum, Jimmie Lloyd, Kinston.
McCarn, Harold Daniel, Lexington.
McCorkle, Craig Eric, Mt. Holly.
McCormick, Jerome Lomac, Raeford.
McKeel, Billy W., Wayne.
McKoy, William Othello, Wilmington.
McLain, Johnie Wayne, Statesville.
McLawhorn, Curtis Ray, Kinston.
McMahan, John Edward, Marion.
McCaslin, Gary Eugene, Vale.
Mercer, Carl Sinatra, Belcross.
Mitchell, David Henry, Concord.
Mitchell, Ralph, Blanch.
Moore, Douglas Eugene, Raleigh.
Moore, Lee Arthur, Jr., Raleigh.
Moore, William Charles, Jr., Fayetteville.
Morgan, James Pierpont, Saluda.
Morris, Clarence Luther, Spencer.
Morrison, Jimmy Keith, Shelby.
Moseley, Murray Sims, Statesville.
Motte, George D., Wilmington.
Mounce, Gerold Lee, State Road.
Mummel, Michael Jerry, Reidsville.
Mundy, Reginald Allan, Conover.
Munn, Alton Bernard, Fayetteville.
Myers, George Laxley, Statesville.
Nelson, Hugh Reavis, Jr., Rocky Mount.
Newkirk, Michael A., Watha.
Nichols, McArthur, Durham.
Oglesby, Loomis, III, Charlotte.
Oocumma, John Edward, Cherokee.
Parker, James Lester, Durham.
Parnell, William Brice, Coats.
Pate, Robert Lee, III, Burlington.
Patrick, Donald Ray, Wilmington.
Payne, Herman Howard, Marshall.
Payton, James E., Asheville.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Pearsall, Herbert, Jr., Mt. Olive.
Pearson, James Clifford, Shelby.
Pennell, Michael H., Lenoir.
Peppers, Willie Jerome, Jr., Fairmont.
Perry, Robert Lee, Henderson.
Phipps, Jimmy Doyle, Crumpler.
Pittman, Charles Terrell, Fairmont.
Pretty, Robert Alton, Raleigh.
Price, Alton Durham, Zebulon.
Price, Jack Ray, Fayetteville.
Price, James Whiteford, Jr., Monroe.
Prince, Joseph David, Jr., Roanoke Rapids.
Ray, James Leonard, Spruce Pine.
Respass, Harmon Thurston, Columbia.
Rhodes, Jimmy Linwood, Orrum.
Richardson, James Augusta, Durham.
Rogers, Horace Pope, Jr., Wilson.
Ross, Ernest Edward, Southern Pines.
Roundtree, Willie Junius, Fayetteville.
Rushing, Gary Grant, Winston Salem.
Russ, Richard Arnold, Wilmington.
Russ, Thomas Edison, White Lake.
Russ, William R., Elizabethtown.
Satterfield, Harry Truman, Madison.
Sessoms, Howard Arnold, Tarboro.
Shearin, Dan Rogers, Norlina.
Shearin, Joseph Earl, Nashville.
Sheffield, Larry Gene, Sanford.
Shepherd, Edward, Raleigh.
Shepherd, Franklin Steve, Wilkesboro.
Sherrill, Vann Dwain, Thomasville.
Simmons, Mack Daniel III., Rocky Mount.
Slade, Billy Ray, Hope Mills.
Sligh, Alvin C., Greensboro.
Smith, Bennie Allen, Raleigh.
Smith, Henry Fonzo, Albermarle.
Smith, Hubert Ray, West End.
Smith, Ralph Nathaniel, Morganton.
Smith, Ralph R., Lincolnton.
Smith, Robert Lindo, Sanford.
Smith, Robert Louis, Angier.
Speller, James Ronald, Windsor.
Spruill, James Polk, Plymouth.
Stanley, Vickey Earl, High Point.
Stewart, Robert Cole, Carthage.
Strickland, Hiram Dillard, Graham.
Sullivan, Donald Sherril, Princeton.
Sullivan, Emery Capers, III, Charlotte.
Sullivan, William Anderson, Fayetteville.
Tabron, Bobby Ray, Spring Hope.
Taste, Wade, Cerro Gordo.
Taylor, Lee Roy, Sanford.
Taylor, Phillip Earl, Henderson.
Thackerson, McClure, Hickory.
Thomas, Stephen Neil, Raleigh.
Thompson, Alfred L., Durham.
Thompson, David, Lumberton.
Thompson, William Nathaniel, Mebane.
Thornton, Leon, Oxford.
Towery, Herman, Fort Bragg.
Trivette, John Thomas, Winston-Salem.
Trogdon, Ronald Gale, Asheboro.
Tucker, Alvin Bernard, Nashville.
Turner, Larry Burns, Oakboro.
Tyndall, John Harvey, Jr., New Bern.
Underwood, Kenneth Frank, Burlington.
Vessels, Charles Robert, Livingston.
Vick, Roscoe L., Rocky Mount.
Wade, Bickett Orlando, Jr., Charlotte.
Wagner, Jerry Louis, Mebane.
Walker, Howard Leslie, Boomer.
Walton, George Samuel, Roxobel.
Ward, Donnie Lee, Pollocksville.
Waters, Elijah, Snow Hill.
Watkins, Reginald Alvin, Charlotte.
Watson, Amos Carlton, Wilson.
Watson, William B., Jr., Durham.
Welborne, Scott Terry, Salisbury.
West, Howard Cecil, Clinton.
Whaley, Carson Leo, Jr., Richlands.
Whitaker, Rudolph, Wilson.
Whitfield, Charles Curtis, Kinston.
Wilkie, Arthur Wayne, Hendersonville.
Wilkins, Harold Eugene, Vale.
Williams, Elbert Thomas, Clinton.
Williams, Goler Junior, Durham.
Williams, Remer Garth, Raleigh.
Williamson, Paul Douglas, Greensboro.
Wilson, James Robert, Sanford.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Wilson, Kenneth Pete, Clinton.
Wingate, Richard Edward, Belmont.
Woods, James Baker, III, Davidson.
Worley, Rom, Walnut.
York, Don Joseph, Buncombe.
Young, Richard T., Hildebraun.
Young, William Winifred, Jr., Asheville.

Air Force

Broom, Phillip Ward, Monroe.
Dryer, Glenn Charles, Greensboro.
Frazier, Floyd Milton, Wanesville.
Stewart, Donald David, Coats.
Wiley, John Dudley, Charlotte.

Marine Corps

Adcox, Ronnie Darnell, Henderson.
Alston, Bennie, Charlotte.
Armstrong, Richard Ted, Vale.
Bray, Ronnie Lee, Wilson.
Breeden, Robert Portner, Raleigh.
Broadnax, Willie Lee, Jackson.
Byrd, James Thomas, Wadesboro.
Byrd, Vinson, Orrum.
Camby, Steve Lewis, Spindale.
Cartrette, Harry Kenneth, Clarendon.
Chadwick, Leon Gordon, III, Raleigh.
Chrisco, Eugene, Laurel Hill.
Clay, William Clifton, III, Henderson.
Cooper, Archie Lee, Wilson.
Cox, John Dennis, II, Roanoke Rapids.
Crisp, John David, III, Pinetops.
Crooks, Ronald Lee, Hickory.
Currin, Jerry Wayne, Sanford.
Daniels, Robert Blaine, Taylorsville.
Denning, Neal Albert, Willow Springs.
Ebron, Linwood Earl, Raleigh.
Ferguson, John Edward, Lenoir.
Fewell, Chester Decatur, Greensboro.
Ford, Henry Harrison, Jr., Rutherfordton.
Fowler, Larry Eugene, Hickory.
Furr, James Henry, Concord.
Glenn, Randy Jack, Durham.
Godfrey, Gaston David, Forest City.
Goss, James Spurgeon, Mocksville.
Grantham, Joseph M., III, Goldsboro.
Gregory, James Otto, Jr., Catawba.
Griffin, Harold Dexter, Canton.
Guin, Edgar James, Fayetteville.
Gunnell, Dale Alan, Winston-Salem.
Harrill, Randy Alton, Charlotte.
Heavner, Larry Keith, Cherryville.
Hooper, Henry James Reidsville.
Howe, Francis Edward, Salisbury.
Howell, Casco Devaughn, Goldsboro.
James, John Mathas, Spring Lake.
Jarrett, Phillip Ronald, Jacksonville.
Jones, Aaron Burr, Jr., Wilmington.
Jordan, Mack Arthur, Tyner.
Lakey, James Ervin, Bryson City.
Lambert, Eldon Eugene, Mount Pleasant.
Lambert, Larry Raymond, Winston-Salem.
Lamm, Cecil Dwight, Lucama.
Lee, Douglas Wayne, Winston-Salem.
Lee, Ronald Wayne, Benson.
Lovett, Ronald Craig, Greensboro.
Matthews, Robert Jr., Carthage.
McCarthy, Whilton Anthony, Charlotte.
McCoy, Mildra, Jr., Wilmington.
McKinney, Jerry Layne, Leaksville.
Mitchell, Clyde Uland, Winston-Salem.
Monroe, Sammy Franklin, Mount Gilead.
Moore, William Roosevelt, Scotland.
Morgan, Henry Loranze, Benson.
Mullinax, Ronald Ernest, Shelby.
Munns, Walter Earl, Winston-Salem.
Niles, Ronald Edward, Charlotte.
Oates, Henry Eathen, Winston-Salem.
Orr, Raymond Samuel, Matthews.
Parrish, Philip Owen, High Point.
Patrick, Stanley Kay, Grifton.
Pettit, Robert Harold, Charlotte.
Phipps, Gene Ray, Greensboro.
Powell, Bryant Russell, Lake Waccamaw.
Reynolds, Garry Lee, Maiden.
Rhodes, Donald Frank, Raleigh.
Ross, James Lee, Hickory.
Sadler, Robert Lee, Elizabeth City.
Simmons, Herolin Thadus, Ahoskie.
Smith, Michael Ray, Spindale.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Marine Corps

Spainhour, Walter J., Jr., Lenoir.
Stackhouse, Hubert, Fayetteville.
Stansell, Gerrald Aundre, Charlotte.
Strickland, Lessie Keith, Zebulon.
Summerlin, Steve Monroe, Hickory.
Sutton, Ronald Martin, Charlotte.
Tallent, Garry Glenn, Morganton.
Thorpe, Franklin Roosevelt, Tarboro.
Upchurch, William Hardy, Jr., Durham.
Warlick, Sam Dixon, Raeford.
Watson, Percy Earl, Selma.
White, Tony Lee Van, Gastonia.
Williams, Dempsey H., III, Fayetteville.
Williams, Jimmy Darrell, Williamston.
Williams, Terry Charles, Granite Falls.
Wilson, James Milton, Murfreesboro.
Wilson, Robert Bruce, IV, Winston-Salem.
Wisham, Charles Richard, Fayetteville.
Wright, Herbert Coleman, Jr., Black Mountain.

Navy

Brown, Edward Dean, Jr., Charlotte.
Davis, Donald Vance, Salisbury.
Doughtie, Carl Louis, Tarboro.
Dudley, Carl Douglas, Jr., Winston-Salem.
Gales, James Lenard, Bynum.
Grant, Gollie Leo, Old Fort.
Jenkins, Gregory Dale, Graham.
Martin, Charles Michael, Charlotte.
Stafford, Forrest Montgome, Sneads Ferry.
Wood, Walter Sutton, Fort Bragg.

NORTH DAKOTA

Army

Bean, Kenyon Elroy, Williston.
Berg, Harold Edward, Jr., Rhame.
Brownotter, Lawrence Dean, Bullhead.
Bujalski, David Allan, Carrington.
Copeland, Ralph A., Minot AFB.
Dowling, Francis Ellsworth, Coopertown.
Fakin Zlatko M., Cogswell.
Freidt, James Christian, Grand Forks.
Gable, Arlan Dean, Rolette.
Gill, Richard Denzil, Jr., Williston.
Greany, Virgil Raymond, Rugby.
Groth, Stephen James, Enderlin.
Gunderson, Gunder Peter, Walhalla.
Iverson, Gerald Allen, Oakes.
Johnson, Fred Leroy, Leeds.
Kent, Ronald Leroy, Page.
Kline, David Bruce, Hurdsfield.
Knippelberg, Irvin Dale, Turtle Lake.
Lapp, Herbert, Hebron.
Narum, Thomas Leroy, Amidon.
Sime, Robert Joy, Tolna.
Soby, Donald Jean, Rugby.
Stoltenow, Ronald Gilbert, Hankinson.
Wagner, Roy Carl, Bismarck.
Weber, Willis William, Valley City.
Welker, Thomas A., Minot.
Williams, Norman Paul, Maddock.
Zietlow, Laurence Cris, New Salem.

Air Force

Geiger, Francis Edward, Dickinson.
Greenley, Jon Alfred, Fargo.

Marine Corps

Brenno, Wesley Craig, Larson.
Eichelberger, Stephen John, Fargo.
Johner, Kenneth Leo, Noonan.
Kessel, Michael Henry, Dickinson.
Klein, Garry Dean, Mott.
Lavoy, Eugene Louis, Jr., Grand Forks.
Lindsay, Gary Wayne, Grand Forks.
Lochthowe, Leon Leroy, Minot.
Swanson, Robert Edwin, Grand Forks.
Vidler, Murray Dean, Fargo.
Wolf, Michael Ferdinand, Beulah.
Wolos, Paul Harvey, Fargo.

Navy

Himmerick, Michael Duane, Valley City.
Woods, Carl Julius, Bottineau.

OHIO

Army

Acree, Roger Lee, Cincinnati.
Adams, Richard Lee, Cincinnati.
Adams, Steven Jack, Springfield.
Adams, Wayne Roger, Dayton.
Alexander, James Blair, Dover.
Allen, Lueco, Jr., Columbus.
Allen, Samuel R., Hamilton.
Amador, Raynald Jimenz, Putnam.
Anderson, Steven Ray, Springfield.
Arnold, George Dale, Waynesville.
Arthur, James Raymond, Cincinnati.
Asher, Samuel Quenton, Milford.
Auer, Eduard Adolph, Mansfield.
Avery, Lewis Eugene, Columbus.
Aydlett, James Quinel, Akron.
Badon, John Wayne, Columbus.
Bago, John Steven, Cleveland.
Baker, Wallace Edwin, Windham.
Barb, Manville Lawrence, Dayton.
Barga, Sammy A., Fort Recovery.
Barkley, Lawrence William, Columbus.
Barton, Larry Dean, Millerburg.
Baruzzi, Marco Joseph, Maple Heights.
Beagle, Francis Wayne, New Matamoras.
Beam, Jack Evan, Union City.
Bechtel, Herbert Stephen, Bellefontaine.
Belcher, Tommy Joe, Columbus.
Bennett, Darl D., Lowell.
Bentfeld, John Joseph, Youngstown.
Bertsch, Kenneth Ray, Hamilton.
Bethune, Robert Edwin, Massillon.
Biondillo, John Carl, Youngstown.
Bishop, Ronnie Harold, Deshler.
Blankenship, Ovie Earcil, Cincinnati.
Blanton, Russell Lee, Vinton.
Blough, Robert Dean, Sterling.
Bly, Robert Tildon, Toledo.
Bocook, Ronald Edward, Columbus.
Boggs, Ira C., Jr., Columbus.
Boling, Charles L., Barberton.
Bonko, Donald Raymond, Lorain.
Border, William Edward, Stonecreek.
Bowers, Larry Hutton, Columbus.
Bowersmith, Charles George, Marysville.
Bowman, Rudy Gordon, Morrow.
Bowman, William Thomas, Ironton.
Bragg, Fred Garland, Jr., Etna.
Brainerd, Fleming B., III, Amherst.
Brewer, James Dale, Long Bottom.
Brock, Dillard, Hamilton.
Brooks, Charles Edward, Cincinnati.
Brown, Charles William, Jr., Youngstown.
Brown, Gregory Lynn, Germantown.
Bruce, Ronald Dwight, West Alexandria.
Bruno, Vito Vincent, Toledo.
Burlile, Thomas Edward, London.
Burroughs, Walter L., North Lewisburg.
Burton, Johnny Edward, Oregonia.
Bussey, Marvin William, Jacksontown.
Byrum, Donald Edward, Wooster.
Calloway, Larry James, Cincinnati.
Caniff, John R., Steubenville.
Cantu, Esiquio Airnaldo, Bono.
Carder, Denzil Mason, Jr., Cleveland.
Carlton, Lavalle Ernest, Cleveland.
Carpenter, Clifford Lee, Akron.
Carpenter, Howard B., Youngstown.
Carpenter, Kenneth Harold, Cleveland.
Carpenter, Samuel David, Cleveland.
Carpenter, Terry Wayne, Germantown.
Carter, Hubert Clayton, Greenville.
Carter, Robert Lester, Columbus.
Casey, Maurice Aloysius, Cleveland.
Castle, Larry Floyd, Ironton.
Casto, Clarence Leroy, Jefferson.
Cavinee, Ronald C., Crooksville.
Choppa, Richard Anthony, Hubbard.
Christy, James Arthur, Bellaire.
Clark, Donald Robert, Cleveland.
Clark, Lorinzer Paul, Jr., Columbus.
Clark, Thomas Edward, North Olmstead.
Coln, Ray Eugene, North Canton.
Colopy, Stephen Lynn, Danville.
Combs, Tyrone, Dayton.
Compa, Joseph James, Jr., East Liverpool.
Corfman, Daryl Raymond, Sycamore.
Cox, Raymond Prater, Cincinnati.
Crites, Richard Lee, Cleveland.
Crossley, Joseph, Springfield.
Crytzer, Ralph Woodward, Jr., North Jackson.
Culp, Thomas Dale, Canal Fulton.
Dadante, Leonard John, Cleveland.
Dailey, Ronald Charles, Marietta.
Daley, Terrence Joseph, Cleveland.
Dalton, Gordon Thomas, Hamilton.
Davis, Charles R., Jr., Cincinnati.
Davis, Elwood William, Jr., Salineville.
Davis, Gene Thomas, Barberton.
De Camp, Michael David, Cincinnati.
Dean, Kenneth Lee, Jr., Cleveland.
Dieckmann, John E., Cincinnati.
Doak, Tommy Allen, Cincinnati.
Dodson, John Larry, Cincinnati.
Downey, Clay Edward, Jackson.
Drugger, Alfred, Warren.
Duncan, Walter Earl, Jr., Beaver.
Durham, George Ray, Cleveland.
Dye, Edward Phillip, Wellston.
Eaton, David Lee, Cincinnati.
Eggleston, Rodney Lee, Cincinnati.
Eichert, James Melvin, Toledo.
Ellerbrock, Marvin Charles, Ottawa.
Emery, Owen Ray, Cuyahoga Falls.
Ensell, John Robert, Steubenville.
Erdos, Dennis Keith, Athens.
Ervin, Baxter French, Albany.
Evans, James William, Columbus.
Evans, Ronald D., Cincinnati.
Fails, Edward Lee, Jr., Cincinnati.
Farley, Gary Lee, Ravenna.
Faulkner, Michael Lee, Cincinnati.
Feemster, Colinna, Toledo.
Fekete, James Charles, Huron.
Fenko, Steve Brian, Cleveland.
Ferguson, Lynn Michael, Russells Point.
Ferry, Daniel Samuel, Leetonia.
Filippi, John Charles, La Seven Hills.
Filliator, Richard Anthony, McCutchenville.
Fincher, Julian A., Jr., Fairborn.
Finnicum, John Otis, Kanauga.
Fisher, Danny Jay, Mayfield Village.
Florez, Frank Ochoa, Jr., Sylvania.
Fowble, Robert L., Jr., Greenville.
Frasure, Hurshel, Bainbridge.
Frederick, Charles Emmett, Bellevue.
Frederick, Lamar Donald, Toledo.
Freund, William Carl, Bridgeport.
Fugate, Garland G., Dayton.
Fuller, Larry Lee, Proctorville.
Fuqua, Robert Lee, Jr., Mansfield.
Gaskins, Larry Lee, Marion.
Gassman, Gerald Lynn, Fostoria.
Gerber, Leroy Lynn, Dalton.
Gibson, Burrell, Dayton.
Gibson, Eddie Carl, Cleves.
Gifford, David Randolph, Akron.
Gilger, William Grant, III, Cleveland.
Gillum, Rickey Learoy, Franklin.
Glowacki, Eugene Thomas, Cleveland.
Gold, Robert Joseph, Sidney.
Gonzalez, Amalio, Youngstown.
Gordon, James Edward, Cincinnati.
Gossard, David Eugene, Lima.
Graham, Kenneth Errol, Defiance.
Grant, Thomas Richard, Conneaut.
Gray, Clarence Henry, Cincinnati.
Gray, James H., Cleveland.
Greene, Paul Harrison, Cincinnati.
Greenlee, James Edward, Columbus.
Gregg, Joseph Gene, London.
Gregovich, Paul Michael, Cleveland.
Griffy, Virgil D., Creola.
Guerin, Robert Louis, Parma.
Gundolf, Steven Dean, New Carlisle.
Gutierrez, Louis Sam, Struthers.
Guyer, William Harris, St. Marys.
Hall, James Albert, Lakewood.
Hamilton, Ronald Lloyd, Richwood.
Hamilton, Russell Lee, Rodney.
Hammond, Lawrence Clair, Columbus.
Hancock, Edward Dean, Defiance.
Haniotes, Steven Michael, East Liverpool.
Harbin, Carl Ross, Jr., Cambridge.
Haroulakis, Andre, Warren.
Harris, Samuel Gary, Cutler.
Hartley, David William, Garfield Heights.
Hatton, Robert Willis, Hamilton.
Hauf, Jerry Wayne, New Carlisle.
Helton, Donald Leonard, Hamilton.

OHIO—continued

Army

Heltsley, Paul R., III, Akron.
Hendricks, Harry Lann, Akron.
Hickman, Dallas Edwin, Warren.
Hickman, Wandle Lewis, Columbus.
Hido, Richard Lee, Painesville.
Hildenbrand, Charles John, Chardon.
Hill, Jerry L., Ray.
Hill, Robert Allen, Lebanon.
Hilton, David Lynn, Cleveland.
Hinterlong, Leo Edward, Cincinnati.
Hisey, Tyrone Wade, Mansfield.
Hodge, Dennis Ray, Cincinnati.
Hoeweler, James Edward, Cincinnati.
Hogarth, Richard Douglas, Akron.
Hogston, Roger Lee, Dayton.
Holbrook, William R., Columbus.
Hood, Budd Edward, Painesville.
Hoover, James, Kingston.
Horn, David Michael, Dayton.
Hoskins, Alvin, Cincinnati.
Howell, Edward Michael, Cleveland.
Hudak, Frank Paul, Canton.
Huff, Frank C., Canton.
Hughes, Marvin Thomas, Cleveland.
Hughey, Lloyd Ray, Circleville.
Huston, Harry D., Jr., Painesville.
Hutchinson, Richard, Jr., Cincinnati.
Ingles, Danny Lee, New Lebanon.
Jackson, Charles William, Millfield.
Jackson, David Lee, Jr., Warren.
Jackson, John William, Deshler.
Jateff, William Albert, Akron.
Jelinek, Allen Leo, Cleveland.
Jelks, Carlos Dennis, Toledo.
Jenkins, Morris E., Columbus.
Jilek, Louis Henry, Chagrin Falls.
Jindra, Robert James, Wickliffe.
Johnson, Alfred Lewis, Columbus.
Johnson, Everett Eugene, Jr., Paulding.
Johnson, Ray Ellsworth, Alexandria.
Johnson, Samuel Arlon, Peebles.
Jones, Ronald Weaver, Cincinnati.
Julian, Michael Henry, Mansfield.
Julian, Percy, Warren.
Keeran, Willard David, Newark.
Kerner, Ronald Brian, Parma.
Kerns, John Edward, North Bend.
Killens, Richard, Cleveland.
King, Michael Lee, Belle Center.
Klink, James Marion, New Paris.
Knott, Douglas Hugh, Dayton.
Koschal, Gregory Andrew, Mayfield Heights.
Kranshan, Timothy Michael, Tallmadge.
Kudro, Terrence Joseph, Bellevue.
La Telle, Ronald Lon, Columbus.
Laird, Ervin Leonard, North Canton.
Langlois, James Thomas, Toledo.
Lanter, Kenneth Wayne, Cincinnati.
Lattin, John H., Jr., Columbus.
Layaou, Ernest E., Jr., Cleveland.
Lease, Richard Franklyn, Kenton.
Lechak, Frederick James, Independence.
Lee, Gene Francis, Green Springs.
Lenner, Jack Ronald, Brook Park.
Lewis, Delbert O., Shelby.
Lincoln, Gary Gene, Eaton.
Lockhart, Harlan Nathaniel, Fredericktown.
Long, Donald Russell, Columbus.
Looney, Phillip R., Athens.
Love, Gary Lee, Defiance.
Lovell, Edward Api, Fairborne.
Lowder, Jarvis Crawford, Hartville.
Lucas, Alan Frank, Cleveland.
Ludwig, Byron Nelson, Toledo.
Lupas, Gerald Allen, Willoughby.
Lynn, Jack Dale, Hilliard.
Mack, Robert Lewis, Cleveland.
Madden, Richard, Jr., Cincinnati.
Maddox, Paul Ray, Massillon.
Mahoney, Ralph George, Cleveland.
Main, William Gene, Jr., Alliance.
Malewski, Dennis W., Toledo.
Mangan, Michael L., Xenia.
Manley, Ronald Lee, Middleport.
Marley, Kenneth Charles, Wellington.
Martin, Davie Joe, Minford.
Masters, William Richard, Canton.

OHIO—continued

Army

Mattern, Charles Duane, Canton.
Mazitis, Victor Allen, Jr., Cleveland.
McCammon, Glenn Eugene, Woodsfield.
McComas, Hobart Wilson, Jr., Columbus.
McConnaughey, David Lynn, Lebanon.
McConnell, John Steven, Orrville.
McDaniel, George William, Lorain.
McGarvey, Charles Edward, Lancaster.
McGrew, William Wallace, Sugar Grove.
McKillop, William Dion, Columbus.
McKinney, Forrest Adrian, Plymouth.
McSwain, Harvey Joseph, Cincinnati.
Medley, Clarence, Cleveland.
Mehl, Richard Earl, Mansfield.
Mendoza, David Louis, Cleveland.
Middleton, Clayton, Cincinnati.
Mika, Stephen Adam, Willowick.
Miller, Charles Eugene, Piketon.
Minnix, Leroy Franklin, Luckey.
Minor, Michael James, Columbus.
Mobley, Daniel M., Toledo.
Mooney, Clarance Allen, Medina.
Mooney, Patrick Thomas, Brunswick.
Moore, Charles Thomas, Jr., Columbus.
Moore, Ronald James, Columbus.
Morgan, Theodore, Jr., Toledo.
Morris, Robert L., Columbus.
Mucha, Howard Allen, Willoughby.
Mugavin, Martin M., Cincinnati.
Muldrow, Robert Lee, Dayton.
Murphy, Thomas Ralph, Canton.
Myers, Albert C., Warren.
Myrick, Willie J., Cleveland.
Nagy, Robert Joseph, Lorain.
Neutzling, William P., Pomeroy.
Nicewander, Oscar Franklin, Dundee.
Norris, William Theodore, Mansfield.
Nottage, Michael Lewis, Toledo.
Nulph, William Lee, Jr., Massillon.
O'Nail, Robert Paul, Nelsonville.
O'Neal, Dennis Ray, Springboro.
Oliver, Carl W., Lake Milton.
Oliver, Walter B., Newark.
Ortiz, Jose Hector, Lorain.
Osborn, Jerry Wayne, Columbus Grove.
Paciorek, Robert Edward, Ravenna.
Paliskis, Eugene Michael, Struthers.
Parks, Raymond Francis, Dennison.
Parsons, Paul Gene, Van Wert.
Patrick, Mariner, Lima.
Payne, Hubert Jackson, Vermillion.
Peters, Tommy Ralph, Perrysburg.
Peterson, Jesse Earl, Barberton.
Phillips, Dennis L., Marietta.
Phillips, William Grigaby, Xenia.
Pickworth, Jerry Lee, Shiloh.
Pittman, Jack, Beallsville.
Pizzino, Thomas Carmen, Hopedale.
Plummer, Ralph William, III, Oxford.
Polley, Gary Pat, Bellaire.
Pollock, Lawrence Edward, Cincinnati.
Poss, Travis O'Neil, Brook Park.
Pottkotter, James Vincent, New Weston.
Price, Elbert Ford, Jr., Grafton.
Prince, Danny Dean, Oxford.
Pruitt, William Henry, Pedro.
Puduls, Juris, Canton.
Pultz, Robert Lewis, Toledo.
Rathbun, Robert Frank, Mansfield.
Ream, Paul Eugene, Ohio City.
Reed, Robert Thomas, Mechanicsburg.
Reid, Darrell Lee, Wadsworth.
Reynolds, George Thomas, Cincinnati.
Rickards, Clarence Howard, Piketon.
Rieck, John James, Jr., Cleveland.
Righter, Robert Le Roy, Jr., Reynoldsburg.
Rinehart, Timothy Howard, Arlington.
Ritchey, Gary Wayne, Newark.
Robey, Richard Neal, Spencerville.
Robinson, Luther, Beaver.
Rogers, Jerry Lee, Struthers.
Rolf, Gerald R., Cincinnati.
Rose, Joseph Shepard, Jr. Dayton.
Roydes, Krag Barry, Norwalk.
Ruehle, Medard A. J., Upper Sandusky.
Ruoff, Roger Dale, Wauseon.
Rupcic, Raymond Ellsworth, Lorain.
Russell, Bobby, Cleveland.
Ryan, Frederick Lee, Steubenville.

OHIO—continued

Army

Sanders, George Austin, Bloomingdale.
Sargent, Gary Lee, Lucasville.
Sas, Robert Louis, Parma.
Schmees, William F. Jr., Cincinnati.
Schnee, Donald Lawrence, Cincinnati.
Schnegg, Charles Glenn, Beallsville.
Schulz, Allan Henry, Marion.
Scott, Terrence Duane, Cleveland.
Sellers, Lloyd Andrew, III, Euclid.
Shafer, James Dudley, Lima.
Shank, Ralph, Cincinnati.
Shehl, Michael John, North Canton.
Shelton, Edward Arnold, Columbus.
Shelton, Matthews, Cincinnati.
Shepherd, Larry Eugene, South Lebanon.
Shover, William, Dayton.
Skovran, William Michael, Warren.
Smiddy, Kyle, Lebanon.
Smith, David Arlie, Cleveland.
Smith, Elijah Henry, Bucyrus.
Smith, Franklin Wayne, Columbus.
Smith, John William, Celina.
Smith, Robert George, Cleveland.
Snyder, Robert Duane, Cleveland.
Spencer, Harry Herbert, Cleveland.
Spitler, Jerry Robert, Shreve.
Stamper, Richard G. Jr., Cincinnati.
Stanley, Jackie G., Middletown.
Stapleton, Lawrence George, Euclid.
Stebner, Robert Lyle, Jr., Streetsboro.
Stein, Donald Vearl, Fresno.
Stepanov, Robert Duane, Akron.
Stewart, Jimmy G., Middleport.
Stoll, George Gerald, Clyde.
Stone, James Emmett, Cleveland.
Stoneburner, John Fredrick, Columbus.
Strait, Bennie Howard, Bryan.
Strizzi, Phillip Arthur, Cleveland.
Strong, Harold E. Jr., Cleveland.
Sukara, Michael Theodore, Parma.
Sullivan, Robert Joseph, Kansas.
Sunday, James Michael, Garfield Heights.
Swartz, Charles Delano, Middletown.
Takacs, Theodore Nelson, Jr., Mayfield Heights.
Tallion, John Michael, East Orwell.
Taylor, Ernest Ray, Jr., Loveland.
Taylor, Gary Lee, Columbus.
Taylor, Harold, Cincinnati.
Taylor, Richard Lee, Clinton.
Taylor, Ronald Lee, Mount Gilead.
Tedesco, Leonard Vito, Akron.
Terrell, John Wesly, Akron.
Thiel, John Edward, London.
Thomas, Algernon Paul, Springdale.
Thomas, Dale Daniel, Sandusky.
Thomas, Richard George, Cleveland Heights.
Thomas, Robert Virgil, Warren.
Thompson, James Escol, Cincinnati.
Thompson, Jennings Milroy, Wooster.
Thompson, Tommy Ray, Akron.
Todd, Charles Michael, Mansfield.
Toth, David McBride, Chesterland.
Trittschuh, Gerald F., Bradford.
Truesdale, Larry Lee, Lima.
Tucker, Willie James, Toledo.
Turner, Larry Eugene, Columbus.
Tuthill, Carroll Laverne, Stockport.
Tweed, James Lee, Findlay.
Ulrich, James Craig, Brecksville.
Unger, Lester Eugene, Jr., Centerville.
Vargo, Robert, Cadiz.
Waddell, Larry Jonathan, Richmond.
Waddell, Robert Douglas, Batavia.
Wahl, Dennis James, Alliance.
Wainscott, David Henry, Morrow.
Wallace, Willard Boston, Peebles.
Walls, Terry Lee, Springfield.
Ward, Tom, Cincinnati.
Warne, Dennis Eugene, Marion.
Wayt, Charles M., Cambridge.
Webster, Richard, Akron.
Wentz, Frederick Anthony, Barberton.
West, Richard Andresen, Kettering.
Whetzel, Harry Thomas, Columbus.
Whitmore, James Calvin, Elyria.
Wilbur, Jack Leroy, Dayton.
Williams, Clarence, Germantown.

OHIO—continued

Army

Williams, J. C., Cleveland.
Willliams, Walter, Jr., Cincinnati.
Willis, Watson, Cincinnati.
Wilson, Clarence Cornelius, Cleveland.
Wilson, Gerold Thomas, Kitts Hill.
Wilson, William Earl, Euclid.
Wing, Robert Charles, Washington Court.
Wise, Wilbur Mearl, Stow.
Wood, Dennis Paul, Cleveland.
Woodall, Jerry, Cleveland.
Woodruff, Wayne Thomas, Malvern.
Woods, Charles M., Cleveland.
Wright, Charles Keith, Coshocton.
Wright, Robert G., Youngstown.
Wymer, James Nelson, Canton.
Young, Steve Grant, Franklin.
Zehnder, John Mark, Lakewood.
Zgrabik, Russell Michael, Cleveland.
Zitiello, Ronald Jerome, Cleveland.

Air Force

Barden, Howard Leroy, Cuyahoga Falls.
Barthelmas, William J., Jr., Circleville.
Bartley, John Peter, Findlay.
Bennett, Robert David, Cincinnati.
Bonnell, George H., III, Worthington.
Bordner, William Harold, Canton.
Brower, Ralph Wayne, Stow.
Conley, Eugene Ogden, Akron.
Davison, Norman Ray, Farmersville.
Fuller, Gary Leroy, The Plains.
Gorton, Thomas Frederick, Toledo.
Katterhenry, Terry Fisher, Sidney.
Lute, James Robert, Montgomery.
Mahone, William Benjamin, Youngstown.
Pitsenbarger, William Hart, Piqua.
Pleiman, James Edward, Russia.
Reed, Clyde, Jr., Cincinnati.
Robbins, Richard Joseph, Cleveland.
Rosato, Joseph Frank, Hudson.
Troyer, John Michael, Beach City.

Marine Corps

Adams, Roger Dean, Ashland.
Adkins, Lloyd Marvin, Jr., Cleveland.
Allen Dale Charles, Deshler.
Allen, James Warren, Jr., Steubenville.
Allen, Jesse Wayen, Hamilton.
Allen, Thomas, Delta.
Apple, Glenn Wilson, Akron.
Applegate, Donald Lee, Loveland.
Ash, Ronald Keith, Laurelville.
Austin, Tom Lew, West Carrollton.
Azara, Charles F., Jr., Youngstown.
Baird, Jackie Randle, Cincinnati.
Ball, Charles Homer, Steubenville.
Banar, Marvin Dale, Canton.
Bargy, Morris Lee, Columbus.
Bartlett, David Allan, Lancaster.
Basalla, Donald Albert, Parma.
Basinger, Richard Louis, Kenton.
Bator, William Henry, Akron.
Bean, Richard Raymond, Springfield.
Beley, Jerry, Akron.
Bergenstein, Dennis Paul, Avon Lake.
Berry, William Anthony, North Jackson.
Billingslea, Damon Earl, Cleveland.
Bingman, Peter Ruben, Akron.
Black, Dewayne Rodney, Toledo.
Blevins, James Everett, Empire.
Boley, Ronald Martin, New Lexington.
Bolin, Danny Arnold, Roseville.
Bolman, Dennis Louis, Cleveland.
Borger, Robert Lee, Canton.
Boromissza, Casba Ferenc, Cleveland.
Bowman, Larry Earl, Cincinnati.
Brackett, Everett Lee, Cincinnati.
Brock, James Patrick, Cleveland.
Brooks, Jerry Edward, Deerfield.
Brown, Jackie Ray, Newark.
Burgess, John Peter, Stow.
Burnette, Gary Wayne, Toledo.
Burns, John Francis, Youngstown.
Byers, Clayton Henry, Jr., Canton.
Byrne, James Patrick, Sheffield.
Cahalane, Michael Joseph, Hamilton.
Caldwell, Gary Leslie, Logan.
Calkins, David Earl, Akron.
Carpenter, William, Jr., Hamilton.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Carter, Ralph Dwain, Cleveland.
Cartwright, Michael Glenn, Dayton.
Casarez, Raul, Malinta.
Chadwick, James Edward, Upper Sandusky.
Charles, Ronald, Struthers.
Chasser, Raymond Michael, Euclid.
Clark, Brian Dale, Cleveland Heights.
Clem, Edward, Hamilton.
Clinton, Larry Elza Van, Columbus.
Coates, Ronald Perry, Lebanon.
Cole, Nathan John, Jr., Youngstown.
Coleman, Richard Freeman, Columbus.
Collene, Charles Edward, Bucyrus.
Combs, Thomas Eugene, Dayton.
Conrad, Paul Lewin, Hamilton.
Corsi, Bobby Glynn, Columbus.
Couk, Karl Henry, Cleveland.
Cox, Timothy Robert, Canton.
Crumbaker, Larry Homer, Salem.
Cruz, Jesus Rosas, Bowling Green.
Curran, Philip Robert, Columbus.
Dickey, Douglas Eugene, Rossburg.
Douglas, William Lowell, Jr., Canal Fulton.
Duchnowski, John Paul, Cleveland.
Dumas, William Richard, Bellevue.
Dye, David Alan, Xenia.
Early, William Dail, Akron.
Echols, David Allen, Cincinnati.
Ellwood, Eugene Lee, Hamilton.
Eppley, Gerald Vernon, Newark.
Farlow, Gary Allan, North Olmsted.
Faulkner, Larry Allen, Wilmington.
Feliciano, Gilbert, Cleveland.
Fields, Larry Edward, Lorain.
Finkel, William Arthur, Columbus.
Fisher, David Francois, Eastlake.
Fisher, Richard Otis, Lodi.
Fitch, Philip, Cincinnati.
Flanigan, John David, Warren.
Flora, Larry Vinson, Hilliard.
Fraley, David Forrest, Cincinnati.
France, William Richard, Garfield Heights.
Frederick, David Addison, Columbus.
Frye, Danny Lee, Dayton.
Fuson, Jack Anthony, Dayton.
Fuss, Theodore Frank, Brookpark.
Gamble, David Leslie, Rome.
Gatwood, Michael Owen, Toledo.
Gerhardt, Keith Edward, Cincinnati.
Goins, Hugh Craig, Columbus.
Gopp, Thomas Alan, New London.
Gorney, Jerry Edward, Hudson.
Graff, Thomas George, North Olmsted.
Gray, Ronald K., Canton.
Greene, Charles William, Sandusky.
Greenlee, Duane Theodore, Beallsville.
Griffin, Bruce Franklin, Goshen.
Groth, William George, Monroe.
Grow, Gary Lee, Lyndhurst.
Guerra, Bert, III, Miamisburg.
Guist, John Joseph, Cleveland.
Haddix, Douglas Boyd, Springfield.
Hahn, Raymond George, Jr., Youngstown.
Haines, Paul Allen, Canton.
Hallas, Joseph Michael, Youngstown.
Hamblin, Richard Alan, Madison.
Hamilton, David Allen, Springfield.
Harp, Donald Eugene, Miamisburg.
Harris, Paul Winiford, Chillicothe.
Harshman, Stephen Ward, North Lima.
Haskins, Harry Donald, Dayton.
Hawkins, John Lewis, Jr., Cleveland.
Haynes, William Thomas, Lancaster.
Hedgpath, William Thomas, Dayton.
Hill, Lamont Douglas, Massillon.
Hinderman, Andrew Jacob, Columbus.
Hinerman, William Russell, Martins Ferry.
Hodorowski, Raymond, Lorain.
Holeman, Ray Walter, North Jackson.
Holycross, Richard Lake, Grove City.
Hood, Jerry Wayne, Cincinnati.
Horner, Albert Leroy, Kenton.
Houston, Richard Paul, Eastlake.
Houx, Lester, Jr., Ada.
Howard, Claude, New London.
Hrinko, William John, Worthington.
Hudak, Andrew Michael, Warren.
Huddleson, Rodney Leroy, Milford.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Huddy, Danny Joe, Nelsonville.
Huffer, Albert Eugene, Germantown.
Huffman, Samuel Lewis, Hamilton.
Hume, Joseph Sylvester, Jr., Hamilton.
Hunley, James William, Dayton.
Hurlebaus, Leslie Vernard, Chagrin Falls.
Hutchinson, Randolph Scott, Lakewood.
Huwel, Michael Francis, Cincinnati.
Ingels, Charles William, Cincinnati.
Irving, Lee, Heath.
Ivey, Sherman Lee, Cleveland.
Jackson, Jerry Lee, Mingo Junction.
Jacob, Phillip, Toledo.
Jaqua, Michael Douglas, Piqua.
John, Roland Ralph, Painesville.
Johnson, Thomas Alan, New Philadelphia.
Jones, Arthur Elliott, Steubenville.
Jones, Davis Allen, Wellington.
Jonozzo, Thomas Charles, Bedford.
Judkins, Terry William, Willoughby.
Keefer, Kenneth Ray, Streetsboro.
Kilbane, Terence Joseph, Parma.
King, James Edward, Dayton.
King, Richard Lee, Lancaster.
Klump, John Theodore, Marshallville.
Knight, Rick Lee, Columbus.
Kohr, Paul Theodore, Columbus.
Krick, Donald William, Jr., Cleveland.
Labbe, Robert Berg, Salem.
Lampley, Leon Parnell, Hamilton.
Lavelle, Terrence Michael, Cleveland.
Le Beau, David Allen, Canton.
Libbee, Larry Lee, Norwalk.
Lind, Ralph Richard, Jr., Columbus.
Linde, Richard Victor, Miamitown.
Livesay, Ralph Howard, Wilmington.
Livingston, Bruce Bernard, Lorain.
Logan, Jack William, Jr., Willoughby.
Logue, Robert Donald, Warren.
Lombardo, Richard Myron, Warren.
Loudin, Dale Russell, Atwater.
Love, John Wayne, Dayton.
Lowman, Jonathan Faye, Franklin.
Luker, Russell Burr, Lancaster.
Lykins, Daniel Clyde, Willard.
Lyons, Gary Dean, Cardington.
Madden, Ernest Gary, Wellsville.
Malecke, James Allen, Warrensville.
Mandler, James Thomas, Toledo.
Marcum, Walter, Hamilton.
Martell, Gary William, Olmsted Falls.
Mastroianni, Thomas Francis, Steubenville.
Mathewson, Roger Michael, Dayton.
McCandless, Michael David, Columbus.
McCauley, Dale Martin, Uhrichsville.
McCord, John Richard, Columbus.
McCorkle, Stephen Alan, Columbus.
McCorvey, Robert Kenneth, Toledo.
McIntosh, Charles Glenn, Dayton.
McJunkin, Ronald Lee, Sciotoville.
McKee, Charlie Mearl, Cincinnati.
Menart, James Joseph, Mentor Lake.
Merriman, Michael Gene, Millfield.
Meyer, Robert Jerome, Sidney.
Middleton, Donald Arthur, Akron.
Miles, Thomas Edward, Hamilton.
Miller, Foster Bishop, Springfield.
Miller Frederick Wayne, Berlin.
Miller, James Russell, Cleveland.
Miller, Mills Craft, Toledo.
Miller, Ronald Darrell, Pedro.
Mitchell, John Albert, Columbus.
Mitchell, Paul Holland, Jr., Mentor.
Moore, Phillip Alexander, Marengo.
Moreland, John Lee, Youngstown.
Morrow, Terry Patrick, Hamilton.
Mowery, Carl Francis, Springfield.
Mylant, Steve Victor, Cleveland.
Neal, Charles Marion, Jr., Gallipolis.
Nerad, Walter Joseph, Jr., Maple Heights.
Newell, Calvin Eugene, Plain City.
Newlin, Melvin Earl, Wellsville.
Nissenbaum, Michael David, Toledo.
O'Connor, David Lee, Dayton.
O'Donnell, John Patrick, Youngstown.
O'Neal, Roy David, Gahana.
Pairan, Walter Allan, Cincinnati.
Palumbo, Nickolas R., Jr., Maple Heights.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Parker, Roger Louis, Bellefontaine.
Parker, Samuel Lee, Columbus.
Pastva, Michael James, Lakewood.
Paul, Joe Calvin, Dayton.
Pavlakovich, Nicholas Alle, Geneva.
Pendergraft, Ray Daniel, Middletown.
Perkins, Michael David, Columbus.
Perko, Terry John, Maple Heights.
Pettaway, Larry Charles, Dayton.
Piatt, Charles William, New Matamoras.
Pierson, Leroy, Hamilton.
Poole, Hartwig Ralph, Dayton.
Poppaw, Michael Robert, Dayton.
Potter, Raymond George, Campbell.
Priebe, James Edward, Cleveland.
Pritchard, Donald Ray, Cincinnati.
Prommersberger, James Edwi, Youngstown.
Ralich, Donald, Lorain
Ralston, Thomas Joseph, Columbus.
Rauschenberg, Douglas Edwa, Sterling.
Ray, Timothy, Dayton.
Reeves, William Douglas, Jr., Mansfield.
Reynolds, Robert Clarence, Sandusky.
Rhoades, David, Bergholz.
Riffle, Stanley, Columbus.
Ritchey, Luther Edmond, Jr., Mansfield.
Roark, Edward Lee, Lancaster.
Rodzen, Bernard James, Warren.
Ronald, Thomas Alan, Tuscarawas.
Rosser, Gary Edward, Crooksville.
Sabec, David Louis, Vandalia.
Sauer, Walter, Jr., Hinckley.
Schmitz, Richard Travis, Cleveland.
Schneider, Gare Gene, Fort Jennings.
Schriner, Junior Lee, Lancaster.
Scott, Warren Taylor, Oberlin.
Seall, George Melvin, Columbus.
Sens, Philip Marion, Newark.
Shafer, Donald Maily, II, Dayton.
Sharp, Richard Dennis, Dayton.
Shepherd, Clifford, Dayton.
Shepherd, Gordon, Cridersville.
Sherman, Andrew Marco.
Shoup, Roy Neal, Cincinnati.
Siciliano, Joseph A., Jr., Girard.
Sills, Frank Richard, Canton.
Simons, Leroy Eugene, Springfield.
Smith, Allen Dewayne, Bryan.
Smith, Dennis, Columbus.
Smith, James Alvin, Columbus.
Smith, Michael Edward, Hamilton.
Smith, Thomas Eugene, Akron.
Snitch, John Herbert, Sheffield Lake.
Spak, George Stephen, Jr., Akron.
Speir, Dale Lloyd, North Baltimore.
Spencer, James Herbert, Poland.
Staneart, Ronald Keith, Piqua.
Starr, Ronald Dean, Martins Ferry.
Stein, Alan Albert, Sandusky.
Steward, James Herbert, Jr., Columbus.
Stickel, Gary Stephen, Dayton.
Strahm, Robert Euguene, Kenton.
Swafford, Kenneth Wayne, Cincinnati.
Sweesy, John Earl, Parma.
Taylor, Grant Carl, Tiffin.
Taylor, James Timothy, Grafton.
Terwilliger, Virgil Byron, McClure.
Theis, Freddie Edward, Ashtabula.
Thompson, Dallas Eugene, Barberton.
Thompson, Jerrald Rich, Columbus.
Thornton, Kenneth Eugene, Shelby.
Tomalka, Vincent Milo, Youngstown.
Toops, Francis Ivan, Logan.
Troxell, Donald Richard, Shelby.
Van Clake, John William, Cincinnati.
Vaughn, Jeffrey Paul, Canal Fulton.
Wade, William Glenn, Berea.
Waller, Charles Robert, Chillicothe.
Wassenich, Stephen George, Dayton.
Webster, Thomas Montrose, Lake Milton.
Weidner, Richard Dale, Columbus.
West, Frederick Thomas, Cleveland.
West, James Dennis, West Milton.
White, Gene Arcaro, Oberlin.
Wildman, Richard Lynn, Cleveland.
Williams, Leroy, Cincinnati.
Williams, Noah, Columbus.
Wilson, Nelson Eddie, Hamilton.
Wohlgamuth, Billy Robert, Sylvania.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Wooden, Joe Pete, Jr., Columbus.
Wuertz, Robert Damian, Columbus.
Wynne, Jerry Peter, Barberton.
Young, William Russell, Jr., Barnesville.
Zegarac, Daniel Gregory, Kirtland.

Navy

Agee, John Charles, Lindsey.
Barschow, William Marcus, Bay Village.
Butsko, Albert Michael, Westerville.
Conklin, Thomas Arthur, South Euclid.
Cottrill, George W. Jr., Chillicothe.
Crawford, Charles Hugh, Batavia.
Davis, Terry Lee, Parma.
Dennis, Mark V., Miamisburg.
Edris, Richard John, Newark.
Gilliam, Thomas Edward, Rocky River.
Gollahon, Gene Raymond, Cincinnati.
Hume, Kenneth Edward, Cincinnati.
Judd, Michael Barry, Cleveland.
Keyer, Dennis Lee, Xenia.
Lozano, Edward Robert, Youngstown.
Manton, Bruce Arthur, Youngstown.
Monat, Donald Henry, Jr., Galion.
Oquendo, John Onofre, Jr., Campbell.
Plants, Thomas Lee, Medina.
Prudhomme, John Douglas, Tipp City.
Rhodes, Joseph John, Youngstown.
Roach, Richard Franklin, East Liverpool.
Starkey, Blair William, Canton.
Vogt, Leonard Frederick, Jr., Cincinnati.
Zavocky, James John, Parma.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Adair, Thurman, Ardmore.
Allen, Robert Eugene, Oklahoma City.
Allen, Ronald Stewart, III, Muskogee.
Anderson, Kenneth Ray, Mounds.
Aranda, Eugene Leonard, Anadarko.
Arnold, Kenneth Harold, Oklahoma City.
Bailey, James Edwin, Bartlesville.
Barbee, Thomas Joseph, Chelsea.
Beckham, Jerry Lee, Tulsa.
Beeler, Clifford Doil, Muldrow.
Bennett, Dwight Lloyd, Tecumseh.
Bemannon, John Calvin, Sayre.
Brock, William Tony, Wilburton.
Buford, Alpha Lee, El Reno.
Bullard, Curtis Herman, Wister.
Burgess, Donald Ray, Tulsa.
Burkett, Joseph William, Muskogee.
Byrd, Elmer Don, Oklahoma City.
Campbell, Edgar Allen, Ponca City.
Carter, Ernest Lee, Tulsa.
Carver, Billy Kay, Coweta.
Christie, Edward Eugene, Stillwell.
Christy, Gilmore Wilson, Tulsa.
Churchill, Wendell Eugene, Woodward.
Coe, Benny Bob, Owasso.
Cole, Willie, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Craythorne, Robert Earl, Duncan.
Daily, Sam Webster, Stringtown.
Davis, Buren Ray, Muskogee.
Dempsey, Jack Taylor, Coalgate.
Doiron, Wilfred Alcide, Lawton.
Dore, James Allen, Tulsa.
Dresher, Harry Everett, Jr., Vinita.
Edwards, Charles David, Tulsa.
Eisenberger, George Joe Bu, Pawhuska.
Elliott, Billy Ronald, Heavener.
Emmett, Gary William, Lawton.
Evans, John Troy, Ardmore.
Farbro, Millard Wade, Vinita.
Fields, James Benjamin, Tulsa.
Forman, Clarence Gene, Ponca City.
Forrester, Jorden Duwayne, Tulsa.
Franklin, Marvin Lyle, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Gaines, William Franklin, Sand Springs.
Gardner, Daniel Eli, Oklahoma City.
Gilmore, William Allen, Oklahoma City.
Green, Wesley, Park Hill.
Gresham, Wilbert James, Hoffman.
Grosslin, Gallen Cheek, Midwest City.
Guild, Leroy J., Jr., Prague.
Hall, Billie Allen, Sand Springs.
Hampton, David Conrad, Oklahoma City.
Harvey, Robert Leon, Moore.
Henderson, Marion F., Oklahoma City.

OKLAHOMA—continued

Army

Henslee, James Eugene, Oklahoma City.
Hilderbrand, Ronald Lee, Laverne.
Hill, Douglas Wayne, Lawton.
Holbrook, James Newton, Washington.
Hopkins, Alvin, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Hudspeth, James L., Oklahoma City.
Humphries, Wayne Warren, Shawnee.
Hunter, Michael J., Mcalesley.
Hutson, Ronald Wayne, Sapulpa.
Isaacs, Royal George, Jr., Allen.
Johnson, Clifford Curtis, Fairfax.
Johnson, James Earl, Spiro.
Johnson, Paul William, Tulsa.
Johnson, Robert Lee, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Johnson, Vernon Joe, Del City.
Jones, Billy Charles, Okmulgee.
Jones, Howard Lee, Tupelo.
Jones, Jerry Robert, Norman.
Jones, Sammy, Jr., Tulsa.
Jordan, Joe Ritchard, Madill.
Kelley, Joe C., Stilwell.
Kennedy, Marcus Truman, Skiatook.
Kingsbury, Dave Royce, Sunset Lake.
Knight, Michael Perry, Sapulpa.
Krieger, Eldon Eugene, Wayne.
Lasiter, Lawrence Ray, Lawton.
Laskey, John Bennie, Bristow.
Le Clair, Prentice Dale, Tulsa.
Leathers, Clifford W., Jr., Wright City.
Leemhuis, Donald J., Clinton.
Lewis, Jerry D., Oklahoma City.
Madden, Rory Antonio, Kingstown.
Marlow, John P., Glencoe.
Martie, Ernest Raymond, Chandler.
Mayer, Alexander Leo, Choctaw.
McBurnett, Larry Turner, Tulsa.
McClure, James M., Apache.
McWhorter, Jerry Monroe, Cushing.
McWilliams, Richard Eugen, Norman.
Mikulecky, Donald Henry, Fairview.
Mitchell, Arthur G., Oklahoma City.
Mosburg, Henry Lee, Putnam.
Moses, Leslie Don, Wetumka.
Mullins, William Donald, Ada.
Neely, Donald Lee, Mounds.
Noah, Josh Cain, Hugo.
Ogle, Lewis Milton, Amber.
Oliver, Charles Edward, Seminole.
Owens, Fred Monroe, Picher.
Parker, Richard Howard, Bartlesville.
Patton, Ronald Wade, Del City.
Pearl, Raymond, Jr., Muskogee.
Peters, Josh, Salina.
Pierce, Oscar Wayne, Pauls Valley.
Pitts, Riley Leroy, Oklahoma City.
Poolaw, Pascual Cleatus, Sr., Apache.
Powell, David Bruce, Jr., Beggs.
Pray, Vern Lee, Ponca City.
Ray, John Mack, Broken Bow.
Reyman, Lawrence Francis, Oklahoma City.
Rhamy, Raymond Dale, Cushing.
Riddle, Walter Ray, Anadarko.
Rieger, Rodney L., Enid.
Roberts, Albert C., Lawton.
Robinson, Thomas Dale, Miami.
Rodgers, Billy Gene, Alex.
Sanders, Kenneth Eugene, Porum.
Saunders, Basil Lee, Oklahoma City.
Shaw, Clarence Lee, Ardmore.
Shaw, Roland Junior, Tulsa.
Shipley, Drew Douglas, Miami.
Shuyler, James Earnest, Buffalo.
Simmons, Ronald Wayne, Blackwell.
Singleton, J. D., Bokchito.
Smith, Jack Milton, Bartlesville.
Snook, James Arthur, Tulsa.
Sodowsky, Melvin Dewayne, Fairview.
Stephenson, David Richard, Sand Springs.
Stinson, George William, Jr., Adair.
Stivers, George Edward, Tulsa.
Sullens, George Buster, Jr., Pryor.
Taber, Jerry Dean, Enid.
Tagman, Johnny Ray, Owasso.
Tarkington, Richard, Jr., Okmulgee.
Tarver, Lloyd Robert, Oklahoma City.
Taylor, Clyde David, Lawton.
Thomas, Joe Minor, Tulsa.
Thompson, George Ray, Oklahoma City.

XUM

OKLAHOMA—continued

Army

Thompson, Nathaniel Anthon, Tulsa.
Thompson, Turner L., Jr., Talihina.
Trizza, Sam Richard, Jr., Tulsa.
Turner, Eugene, Wister.
Wade, Thomas Joe, Antlers.
Watson, Ronald Lee, El Reno.
Webster, Henry Wayne, Vinita.
Whited, James Lafayette, Oklahoma City.
Whitfield, Richard K., Oklahoma City.
Wiegert, Larry Robert, Mc Loud.
Wilson, John Charles, Edmond.
Winget, Harold William, Bartlesville.
Wolfe, Hulsa D., Lawton.
Wood, Ross W., Jr., Carnegie.
Wright, Roscoe, Jr., Wynnewood.
Young, Ronald Wayne, Tulsa.

Air Force

Brown, Gordon Richard, Oklahoma City.
Campbell, Dwight Stanley, Fairland.
Cox, Stanley Gilbert, Tulsa.
Crisp, William Henry, Fitzhugh.
Cumiskey, James Lee, Claremore.
Davie, Thomas Earl, Jr., Tulsa.
Davis, Robert Wendell, Oklahoma City.
Egger, John Culbertson, Jr., Tulsa.
Gauley, James Paul, Ringwood.
George, S. W., Canadian.
Goucher, Edward Louis, Oklahoma City.
Nabors, J. C., Tulsa.
Ritchie, Herman Hiram, Okmulgee.
Smith, Myron Francis, Mc Alester.
Woodworth, Samuel Alexande, Mingo.

Marine Corps

Abmeyer, Kenneth Ronald, Tulsa.
Adams, John Terry, Covington.
Armstrong, Dean Edward, Atoka.
Bennett, Anthony Hercules, Tulsa.
Bennett, Jerry Claud, Frederick.
Bernard, Donald Lee, Midwest City.
Boatman, Larry Neal, Caddo.
Bruns, Robert Harris, Cushing.
Burns, Gerald Ray, Enid.
Cardwell, Johnnie Wayne, Blackwell.
Chapman, David Lee, Tulsa.
Clay, Raymond, Oklahoma City.
Close, Floyd Eugene, Dewey.
Daniels, Charles Wesley, Jr., Lawton.
Davis, Ray Elbert, Glenpool.
Davoult, Gaylon Daryl, Oklahoma City.
Dirickson, Marion Lee, Tonkawa.
Downing, William Kelly, Fort Gibson.
Duncan, Galvin Lee, Oklahoma City.
Edmonds, William Orville, Tulsa.
Evans, Clive Leroy, Lawton.
Everett, Tony, Oklahoma City.
Fowler, James Harrell, Ponca City.
Freeman, John Oliver, Hinton.
Goddard, Robert Gordon, Jenks.
Grammar, William Michael, Oklahoma City.
Guinn, Allan, Bokoshe.
Gustafson, Donald Lee, El Reno.
Haley, Tommy Wayne, Enid.
Hamilton, Floyd Wayne, Tulsa.
Harvey, Larry Drew, Oklahoma City.
Hewitt, William Frank, Drumright.
Hisaw, Teddy Lee, Jr., Cattoosa.
Jennings, Earl Wayne, Colcord.
Johnson, Daryl Linn, Oklahoma City.
Johnson, James, Jr., Ponca City.
Johnson, Jerry Dean, Wheatland.
Johnson, John Kirby, Midwest City.
Johnson, Lee Grant, Tulsa.
Keck, Garth Wayne, Jr., Woodward.
Keck, Russell Forrest, Okmulgee.
Kinkle, Bobby Gene, Oklahoma City.
Manners, David Paul, Durant.
Marr, Noel Don, Ada.
Matlock, Nelson Allen, Depew Creek.
McBride, James Larry, Anadarko.
McElhannon, James Phillip, Okmulgee.
Miller, Allen Perda, Midwest City.
Miller, Phillip, Oklahoma City.
Moyer, Robert Wade, Tulsa.
Mullins, Jimmy Meryl, Del City.
Noah, Marvin Tidwell, Broken Bow.
Odom, Henry Duane, Eldorado.
Pesewonit, Russell Eugene, Lawton.

OKLAHOMA—continued

Marine Corps

Rembert, Harvey Lee, Enid.
Reynolds, William Donald, Ponca City.
Robbins, Lawrence Stephen, Midwest City.
Royal, Jerry Charles, Oklahoma City.
Russell, Kenneth Truman, Perry.
Sanders, Frederick Wright, Oklahoma City.
Schalf, James Ray, Headrick.
Schoumeiler, David Lee, Tulsa.
Shackelford, Ivan J., Jr., Mudrow.
Shelton, James Harvey, Hominy.
Sillaway, Charles Eugene, Oklahoma City.
Smith, James Robert, Adair.
Thomas, Charles Elbert, Oklahoma City.
Thompson, Frank Albert, Yukon.
Treat, Floyd Gene, Kaw City.
Tull, Martin Nelson, Pryor.
Williams, James, Oklahoma City.
Williams, James Edward, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Williams, Larry Glen, Broken Bow.
Wilson, Isaiah Herman, Tulsa.
Wilson, James Clair, Choctaw.
Young, William Glenn, Sapulpa.

Navy

Boon, Murlin Eugene, Watonga.
Broad, William Ray, Tulsa.
Carter, Merle Keith, Sapulpa.
Cazares, James Steven, Oklahoma City.
Deaton, Carl Woodrow, Howe.
Fryer, Charles Wigger, Oklahoma City.
Hubbard, Charles Austin, Oklahoma City.
McKee, Wesley Raymond, Porum.
Olmstead, Stanley Edward, Marshall.

OREGON

Army

Ames, Gary Dennis, Portland.
Barnett, Alan Lynn, Astoria.
Bauman, Charles W., Maupin.
Benson, Stanley J., Kinzua.
Blackman, David Rawson III, Toledo.
Bolden, Rollie Lee, Albany.
Brannfors, Erie Arthur, Portland.
Brooks, Clearence Herbert, Portland.
Cartwright, James Warren, Eugene.
Cartwright, Ronald Joseph, Eugene.
Chandler, Larry Tom, Milton Freewater.
Chatburn, Thomas Wellingto, Merrill.
Clark, David Lloyd, La Grande.
Collins, Francis Leo, Klamath Falls.
Cook, Melvin Bruce, Salem.
Crabtree, Mitchael Andrew, Portland.
Cramer, Henry Lee, Prineville.
Crocker, David Stephen, Medford.
De Butts, Daniel Frenchy, Lebanon.
Dietz, Lewis Ray, Portland.
Duncan, Lloyd Alvan, Albany.
Ellis, Aldwin Ardean, Jr., Portland.
Erwin, Arthur Albert, Eugene.
Fellows, Robert Dawyne, Ontario.
Fillman, Walter Charles, Sr., Cave Junction.
Fleming, John F., Grants Pass.
Foster, Jamess Wilbur, Scappoose.
Foster, Larry Ray, Salem.
Garner, Lydes Jay, Jr., Mapleton.
George, Edward Lee, Myrtle Creek.
Gessel, Greg Low, Hermiston.
Hamill, Wright Bartwyn, Albany.
Hardenbrook, Robert Homer, Eugene.
Hill, Joe Lawrence, Coquille.
Holladay, George Alfred, Coos Bay.
Huffman, Gerald Don, Newport.
Hurse, Kenneth Charles, Sweet Home.
Irwin, William Edward, Portland.
Johnson, Gary Ray, Silverton.
Hamph, Michael Clyde, Newberg.
Klindt, Dan Thomas, Astoria.
Klinefelter, Gaylord Natha, Harbor.
La Flemme, Delbert Charles, Salem.
Ladd, Gary Melvin, Cottage Grove.
Lagrand, William John, Portland.
Lawson, Michael Lester, Medford.
Lewis, Arthur Eugene, Portland.
Louvring, Carl Fredrick, Lowell.
Lovett, Donald Walter, Portland.
MacDonald, John Alan, Estacada.
Mangat, Fredrick Charles, Veronia.
Marcum, Leonard Gerald, Jefferson.
Matson, Harold Eugene, Independence.

OREGON—continued

Army

McDonald, Jerry Duane, Salem.
McMullen, Lyman Allister, Newport.
McNinch, Philip Aaron, Portland.
Michaelis, John David, Portland.
Miller, Donald Gene, Myrtle Point.
Morgan, David Allen, Salem.
Muir, William Guy, Eugene.
Mundhenke, Douglas O., Portland.
Newport, Gary Lee, Roseburg.
O Brien, John Henry, Buttle Falls.
Olson, Grover Konard, Grants pass.
Ortis, Joseph Raye, Oakland.
Patterson, Donald Lee, Florence.
Perkins, Dale Allen, Oregon City.
Phillips, Robert James, Milwaukie.
Phillips, Walter Mack, Salem.
Pyle, Jesse Andrew, Springfield.
Rippy, Terry Allen, Hammond.
Roberts, David William, Portland.
Rohde, Lloyd Hans, Madras.
Roland, Larus Wayne, Portland.
Sandefur Billie E., Cottage Grove.
Sergent Walter A., Portland.
Seelig, Gerd Franz, Beaverton.
Shipp, Keith Leroy, Medford.
Shriver, Robert S. Jr., Eugene.
Sieben, Thomas Richard, Corvallis.
Sills, Darel Lee, Salem.
Snow, Charles Harry, Medford.
Soderstrom, William E., Albany.
Speare, Walter Richard III, Bedford.
Sprinkle, Vernon Patrick, Portland.
Steele, Daniel Scott, Redmond.
Stephenson, William Willar, Mitchell.
Stinnett, Richard Doil, Roseburg.
Sudborough, Michael G., Ashland.
Thompson, Leland Herbert, Portland.
Tolbert, Dale William, West Linn.
Ullberg, Victor Vance, Portland.
Van Poll, Hubert Clarence, Cottage Grove.
Vance, Theodore Roosevelt, Yoncalla.
West, Robert Lee, Grants Pass.
Wells, Allen Glaine, Tigard.
Wilson, Lawrence Humes Jr., Lorane.
Wisdom, Selwin Deroy, Eugene.
Yabes, Maximo, Oakridge.

Air Force

McClellan, Paul Truman Jr., West Stayton.
Moore, Charles Larry, Huntington.
Musgrove, John David, Eugene.
Shorack, Theodore James Jr., Salem.
Swift, Derald Dean, Vale.
Walker, Lloyd Francis, Mt. Angel.
Walker, Thomas Taylor, Toledo.
Walsh, Thomas Charles, Portland.

Marine Corps

Aday, Richard Donald, Portland.
Barber, Ronald Lee, Umatilla.
Barker, James Harold, Portland.
Bauer, William Lyle, Creswell.
Beam, Ernest Lee, Yoncalla.
Bentley, Duane Russell, Portland.
Bern, Harold Stanley, Powers.
Blanton, Michael Merle, Portland.
Brandon, David Bruce Jr., Lake Oswego.
Briles, James Walter, Portland.
Brown, Dennis Earl, The Dalles.
Brown, Raymond, Earl, Portland.
Button, Monty, Duwayne, Coos Bay.
Bystedt David John, Portland.
Carey, John Douglas, Salem.
Clifton, Layne Farell, Lakeview.
Coates, Donald Leroy, Tigard.
Coffman, Douglas Davis, Bend.
Collins, Robert Knapp, Eugene.
Crary, Morrell Joseph, Salem.
Crawn, Ronald Marcel, Portland.
Daffron, Jimmy Sherman, Portland.
Darnall, Don Edward, Bend.
Dooley, Richard Lee, Coos Bay.
Duncan, Edward Francis, Portland.
Elford, Gary Eugene, Newport.
Evenhus, Gerald Wallace, Salem.
Floren, Jimmy Erik, Klamath Falls.
Fuller, Robert Gene, Portland.
Gardner, James Lee, Portland.
Greeley, Michael Jefferson, Milwaukie.
Harris, Dennis Day, Mulino.

OREGON—continued

Marine Corps

Haslinger, Paul Michael, Portland.
Henderson, Roger Leo, Portland.
Iyndellin, Edward Allen, Portland.
Janigian, Richard Allen, Beaverton.
Johnson, Jay Dean, Medford.
Jones, Thomas Jake, Portland.
Kelley, Patrick Gene, Gold Beach.
Kelly, Joe Dustin, Portland.
Koho William Harmon, Bend.
Lee, John Raymond, Creswell.
Lindsey, Larry Alan, Portland.
Longanecker, Ronald Lee, Portland.
Machau, Johnie Boyd, Redmond.
Martini, Gary Wayne, Portland.
Mathews, Grover C., Jr., Roseburg.
McStravick, Richard P. Jr., Portland.
Meeker, Timothy James, Redmond.
Meier, Terrance Leo, Portland.
Nelson, Bradley Albert, Portland.
Okamoto, Roger Thomas, Portland.
Osborne, Amos Roy, Winston.
Perkins, Keith Charles, Hood River.
Phares, Kenneth Duane, Astoria.
Pierce, Merrick Robert, Portland.
Rowden, James Herbert, Medford.
Russell, David Gordon, Salem.
Shadburne, Brooke McKay, Ashland.
Smith, Earl Frederick, Albany.
Smith, Marvin R., Powers.
Smith, Steven Adrian, West Linn.
Spohn, Kenneth Raymond, Portland.
Stuart, James Henry, Turner.
Sumerlin, Terry Lee, Bandon.
Tate, Lyle Scott, Portland.
Watrous, Robert Roland, Coos Bay.
Webb, Michael Ray, Springfield.
West, Garfield, Jr., Portland.
Williams, Fred Joseph Jr., Sweet Home.
Willams, Ralph Gene, Hines.
Wright, George Nathan, Boring.
Young, John Edward, Tigard.

Navy

Austin, Carl Benjamin, Woodburn.
Burke, William Ervin, III, Roseburg.
Cook, Lewis Collin, Portland.
Cooper, David Lawrence, Milwaukie.
Cummings, David Newton Rouge River.
Goeden, Gene William, Cornelius.
Hann, Garold Arthur, Aumsville.
Heintz, Ronald Arthur, Eugene.
Horner, Michael Mervin, Joseph.
Nelsen, Dean Richard, Portland.
Pierce, Allen Linn, North Bend.
Schon, John Edward, Portland.
Webb, Frederic Peers, Redmond.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Abbott, Denis Eugene, McConnellsburg.
Adam, Barry L., Reading.
Adams, Robert Lee, Jr., Carlisle.
Adams, Robert Leland, Tarentum.
Aikey, Timothy Wayne, Warrensville.
Allen, Richard C., Philadelphia.
Allum, Daniel E., Dilliner.
Althoff, Rodney Eugene, York.
Amantea, Samuel Donald, West Mifflin.
Amos, Joe, Philadelphia.
Anderson, William Edgar, Jr., Acme.
Andre, Douglas Vernon, Chicora.
Aufiere, Armand James, Lansdale.
Bagenstose, Tom Jay, Reading.
Bagshaw, James Malcolm, Belleville.
Baker, Jack Amos, Sipesville.
Baker, Joseph Wright, Pittsburgh.
Balmer, Wayne Ashley, Beaver Springs.
Balukonis, Richard Charles, West Hazleton.
Barner, Larry Kenneth, Loganton.
Barnett, John Daniel, Jr., Reading.
Barrott, William Chauncey, Philadelphia.
Baun, David Elroy, Mercer.
Beck, Joseph Robert, Jr., Greencastle.
Bell, Charles Arthur, Philadelphia.
Benning, William Donavan, Pittsburgh.
Bense, John Frederick, Jr., Philadelphia.
Benson, Arnold, Jr., Chester.
Berg, Gerald Leroy, Reading.
Beyrand, John Michael, Wyano.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Bingham, Michael Francis, Philadelphia.
Bish, Leonard Thomas, Plymouth.
Blanchett, Stephen Paul, Philadelphia.
Blanco, Charles Joseph, Philadelphia.
Blotzer, Edward Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Bolich, Kenneth Charles, Auburn.
Bonney, Alan Wayne, Easton.
Boorman, James Edward, Hulmeville.
Booth, John Robert, Bainbridge.
Borick, Joseph James, Wilkes-Barre.
Bowman, John David, III, Secane.
Boyd, Richard Klemm, Jr., Carlisle.
Boyer, Steven Hess, Lancastle.
Brayboy, Bryant, Jr., Philadelphia.
Brennan, Gary O., Pittsburgh.
Brennan, John Francis, Braddock.
Brillo, Albert, Jr., Canonsburg.
Brisoda, Stephen Charles, Frackville.
Brizzoli, Louis Emidio, Coraopolis.
Bronakoski, James Dennis, Erie.
Brooks, James Francis, Jr., McKeesport.
Brooks, Richard W., III, Philadelphia.
Brophy, Patrick Joseph, Erie.
Brown, Michael Paul, Hazleton.
Brown, Ralph Wayne, Benton.
Brown, Sherrill Vance, Pittsburgh.
Brown, Walter, Philadelphia.
Bryan, Hector Warren, Philadelphia.
Buckley, William Robert, Scranton.
Burd, Harmon Charles, Derry.
Burke, Marshall, Jr., Philadelphia.
Burnite, Barry Tyson, Springfield.
Buza, Frederick Andrew, Barnesboro.
Camarote, Manfred Francis, Philadelphia.
Camino, John Edward, Brownsville.
Cara, Robert Joseph, Philadelphia.
Carey, John Patrick Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Carnell, Patrick J., Philadelphia.
Carney, Thomas Earl, Stroudsburg.
Carr, Robert Hardy, Philadelphia.
Carr, Robert Howard, Jr., Beaver Falls.
Casp, Michael Allen, Beaver.
Cassel, Ronald Roy, Harrisburg.
Cavarocchi, Joseph, Phialdelphia.
Cerene, Ambrose Joseph, Olyphant.
Chase, Raymond Howard, Jr., Meadville.
Chatman, Nathaniel, Pittsburgh.
Christy, Albert Krisunas, Mercer.
Chulchatschinow, Walerija, Philadelphia.
Clark, Reuben L., Jr., Philadelphia.
Clinger, Guy Wesley, Jr., Lewistown.
Cobarrubio, Louis Antonio, Philadelphia.
Coffey, Edward Aubrey, Pittsburgh.
Coffield, John David, Philadelphia.
Cole, William Noel, Clairton.
Coleman, Joel Daniel, Pittsburgh.
Collins, John James, Vandergrift.
Collins, Michael Timothy, Philadelphia.
Cooper, Alexander, Philadelphia.
Correll, Joseph Clair, Hamburg.
Covington, Hopson, Bristol.
Cox, David Lee, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Cox, Edward Jan, Jeannette.
Crafton, James J., Philadelphia.
Craig, David, III, Pitcairn.
Crane, Donald Ellis, Stillwater.
Cross, Joseph Alexander, Philadelphia.
Crowder, Raymond D., Jr., Chadds Ford.
Cryster, James Perry, III, Pittsburgh.
Cummings, Richard Michael, Wilkes Barre.
Dahr, John Wesley, Dillsburg.
Dalola, John Francis, III, Penndel.
Danowski, David Lee, Philadelphia.
Darling, Robert Harry, Pittsburgh.
Davis, Charles Augustus, Johnstown.
Davis, Gerald Edward, Bethlehem.
Davis, Robert Arnold, Oxford.
Davis, Theodore H., Neshaminy.
Davison, William A., Jr., Montrose.
De Hart, Solomon William, Lebanon.
De Voe, Robert Lee, Fawn Grove.
Decker, David John, Yardley.
Deisher, Lawrence James, Reading.
Detrixhe, James Burkhardt, Bethlehem.
Dewey, James Elliott, Glencoe.
Di Stefano, Ronald Michael, Philadelphia.
Dixon, John T., Plains.
Dodson, Wesley Ellsworth, Robinson.
Domian, Edward Thomas, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Dougherty, Theodore Aloyis, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Douglas, Frank Frederick, Columbia.
Downey, Charles Robert, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Drake, Glenn Franklin, Roaring Spring.
Dressler, Emmett L., Carlisle.
Driza, Stanley William, Philadelphia.
Dufford, Paul Edward, West Middlesex.
Dungee, Rudolph Francis, Phoenixville.
Dunlap, Wilbur Turby, Torrance.
Dwyer, Patrick Peter, Philadelphia.
Dyer, Joseph Francis, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Dyson, Charles E., Jr., Philadelphia.
Eakin, Howard Maxwell, Jr., Rochester.
Earnesty, John William, Everson.
Ebald, Michael Leo, Philadelphia.
Ecker, Robert Raymond, Springdale.
Eckert, Ronald Lee, Manatawny.
Eckhart, Leon Delbert, Lehighton.
Edwards, Joseph, Erie.
Elmore, Hugh William, Philadelphia.
Evans, Donald Jerry, Philadelphia.
Evans, John R., Columbia.
Evans, Walter C., Pittsburgh.
Faller, Joel Edward, Reading.
Familiare, Anthony John, Philadelphia.
Farrington, Herbert L., III, Philadelphia.
Feehery, Richard Joseph, Yeadon.
Fell, Carl Eugene, Bristol.
Felton, Walter, Philadelphia.
Ferguson, Robert Francis, Philadelphia.
Ferraro, David Allen, Pittsburgh.
Fink, Richard Elwood, Harrisburg.
Fisher, Duaine Karl, York.
Fladry, Leroy Edward, Union City.
Flizanes, Vaughn Paul, Lincoln.
Flores, David, Philadelphia.
Folks, Edward Leroy, Coatesville.
Ford, Harold Andrew, Pittsburgh.
Forrester, Carl James, Mercer.
Fox, Gary Wayne, Pittsburgh.
Franks, William J., Philadelphia.
Freeland, George Edward, Pittsburgh.
Fuellhart, Robert Howard, Warren.
Fulmer, Nicholas Joseph, Norristown.
Galbraith, Raymond Clarenc, North Braddock.
Gamble, William H., New Kensington.
Garis, Gary William, Allentown.
Garland, Dennis, Philadelphia.
Garnett, Reuben Louis, Steelton.
Garvey, Vincent Francis, Philadelphia.
Gebhard, Roy Allen, Schwenksville.
Geyer, Jay Franklin, Harrisburg.
Giacobello, Frank A., Jr., Coatesville.
Giannini, Michael Anthony, Philadelphia.
Ginter, Edward John, Greensburg.
Glowiak, Frank Anthony, Plymouth.
Good, Paul Eugene, Sharpsville.
Goshorn, Walter L., Mifflintown.
Graeser, Calvin Kyrle, Jr., Wayne.
Griffin, Sammie, Philadelphia.
Groff, Ronald Howard, Christiana.
Haefner, David Raymond, Williamsport.
Hairston, Melvin Lee, Philadelphia.
Ham, Geoffrey Lawrence, Ivyland.
Hamilton, Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.
Hammond, Russell Earl, Pittsburgh.
Hanna, Robert, Philadelphia.
Hannigan, Thomas M., Jr., Philadelphia.
Hans, Neil Ronald, Muncy.
Hargrave, John King, Glenside.
Haring, Walter Walton, Easton.
Harmon, Dennis Guy, Belleville.
Harper, Thomas O., Jr., Philadelphia.
Haworth, William Harry, Bristol.
Haylett, Larry Clarence, Franklin.
Haynes, Robert Emmett, Pittsburgh.
Heaps, Charles Willis, Mount Joy.
Heath, Russell M., Philadelphia.
Henderson, Charles Edward, Philadelphia.
Hennessy, Daniel A., Newtown.
Henry, Leonard Ira, Erie.
Henry, Scott Orville, Commodore.
Hensinger, Arthur James, Emmaus.
Herrin, Larry Franklin, Glen Mills.
Hershman, Kenneth, Philadelphia.
Hess, Larry Leroy, Gettysburg.
Hess, Paul J., Jr., Sharon.
Hetzer, Joseph Edward, Jr., Irwin.
Heuston, Gerald Wilford, Roaring Spring.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Hewlett, Dennis Henry, Philadelphia.
Heydt, Richard Brown, Reading.
Hicks, James Robert, Philadelphia.
Higgins, Matthew, Philadelphia.
Hill, David William, Erie.
Hirst, Robert Lee, Allentown.
Hockenberry, Joseph Lester, Yeagertown.
Hoffman, Dennis Eugene, Orwin.
Hollar, Courtney Prile, Jr., Shippensburg.
Hollenbach, Merlin Charles, Andreas.
Holliday, James Willis, Souderton.
Holloway, Edwin Newlin, III, Flourtown.
Hommel, David Elson, Mt. Pleasant Mills.
Hopkins, Irvin James, Philadelphia.
Horvath, William Francis, Pittsburgh.
Horwitz, Stanley Louis, Harrisburg.
Houser, Clyde Richard, Jr., Trexlertown.
Howard, Lawrence Paige, Jr., Philadelphia.
Hunter, Paul Carling, Allentown.
Hymers, Charles Sutherland, Erie.
Hynek, Carl Frederick, III, Willow Grove.
Igoe, William John, Warrington.
Ishman, Michael Raymond, Punxsutawney.
Jackson, John Glen, Philadelphia.
Jamison, Frank, Philadelphia.
Jandershovitz, Paul Willia, Allentown.
Jarzenski, James Henry, Cochranton.
Jedrzejewski, Harry Franci, Pittsburgh.
Jenkins, Charles Owen, Jr., Utahville.
Jenkins, Julius Edgar, Aliquippa.
Jermany, Emmett, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Johnson, Clifford Alvin, Pittsburgh.
Johnson, Joe Thomas, Philadelphia.
Johnson, Norman Wallace, McKeesport.
Jones, Leonard Alexander, Allegheny.
Jones, Michael Leon, Harrisburg.
Jones, William, Philadelphia.
Jones, Willie Lee, Jr., Norristown.
Kachline, James Lee, Tatamy.
Kaelin, Charles Wray, Pittsburgh.
Kahler, Charles Edward, Meadville.
Kane, Charles Franklin, Jr., Collingdale.
Karpiak, Michael, Jr., Richeyville.
Keglovits, Ronald Edward, Northampton.
Kelly, James Patrick, Hatboro.
King, Ronald Richard, Coatesville.
Kirby, Steven, Philadelphia.
Kisner, Thomas R., Wexford.
Kistler, Bernard Francis, Franklin.
Klein, Szolton Sigmond, Arnold.
Klingensmith, Clyde Walter, Kaylor.
Kohr, Wilbur Linwood, Fredericksburg.
Koller, Harold Junior, Chester.
Koprivnikar, James Joseph, Cheswick.
Kraus, Robert Lee, Pittsburgh.
Kreidler, John Robert, Trucksville.
Kuhns, David Paul, Schnecksville.
Kuktelionis, John Leon, Philadelphia.
Kusick, Joseph George, Bruin.
Kuzer, Dennis, Philadelphia.
Lampley, James, Jr., Philadelphia.
Lane, Allan George, Butler.
Lane, Robert Carl, Coatesville.
Langer, Frederick Peter, Carnegie.
Lebrun, Lawrence P., Philadelphia.
Lehman, Dennis Ray, Newville.
Lesnik, William Elgie, Butler.
Lewis, Gary Franklin, Uledi.
Lewis, John Wesley, Jr., Philadelphia.
Lindecamp, Howard S., Jr., Kennett Square.
Lininger, Gary Lee, Shippensburg.
Liptock, Michael, Centralia.
Litz, Terry Richard, Olanta.
Long, Earl Wayne, Ruffsdale.
Lund, William Edward, Philadelphia.
Lynch, Richard Thomas, Malvern.
Lyons, James E., Williamsport.
Maguire, Gerald Joseph, Philadelphia.
Malloy, Thomas William, Dunmore.
Malone, Charles Kenneth, Montour.
Marcavage, Robert John, Shamokin.
Marroquin, Eladio R., Jr., Dauphin.
Marsh, Edward K., Bethlehem.
Marshall, Harold B., Philadelphia.
Martin, Leonard, Jr., Philadelphia.
Martin, Michael Peter, Jr., Monaca.
Martin, Ronald Robert, Erie.
Master, William Stanley, Pittsburgh.
Mayes, James William, Mill Hall.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Mays, Picardo Ramonlzy, Pittsburgh.
McCammon, Donald Willis, West Alexander.
McCann, Owen Fred, Utica.
McCarrick, William W., Pittsburgh.
McCarthy, Howard Christia, Glenolden.
McClellan, Brent A., Clarksville.
McClelland, Ronald Edward, Aliquippa.
McDonald, Samuel Lee, Harrisburg.
McGarvey, Raymond Lee, Transfer.
McGarvey, William Bernard, Loysville.
McKinney, Gerald Lee, Lancaster.
McMorris, Jimmie Lue, Norristown.
McIlvain, Edward M., III, Wynnewood.
Meckley, Ronald Eugene, Denver.
Meisburger, Joseph Steven, Philadelphia.
Merritte, Edward Jerome, Philadelphia.
Michelli, Angelo Francis, Philadelphia.
Miley, Frederick James, Jr., Philadelphia.
Miller, Harry J., Philadelphia.
Miller, Jesse J., Philadelphia.
Miner, Michael David, Brownfield.
Minick, Stephen Michael, Salisbury.
Mitchell, William Brooks, Chester.
Monahan, Daniel Francis, Norwood.
Montalvo, Manuel Gualverto, Philadelphia.
Moore, Frank Harris, Pittsburgh.
Moore, James Buckson, Ridley Park.
Moore, Peter Charles, Lebanon.
Morris, Robert Joseph, Oakford.
Morris, Walter F., Feasterville.
Moser, Harry Julius IV, Birdsboro.
Mosher, Maurice William, Glen Lyon.
Moyer, Douglas Isaac, Trappe.
Moyer, Merrhage Michael, Egypt.
Mullen, Frederick William, Beaver.
Mullen, Gilbert Gregory, Pittsburgh.
Murphy, James John, Scranton.
Muscara, Carmen, Philadelphia.
Myers, David Ross, Washington.
Myers, Richard Vaughn, Glenmoore.
Nadolski, Robert, New Florence.
Natoli, Joseph R., Clearfield.
Neff, Phillip Ernest, Mill Hall.
Nemchick, Michael Joseph, McKeesport.
Nichols, Colin Keith, Spartanburg.
Nickerson, Lewis Raymond, Pittsburgh.
Nicklow, Robert James, Garrett.
Niemann, David Lee, Conneautville.
Norman, Gary Leslie, Erie.
Nostadt, Frank John Jr., Philadelphia.
O'Brien, William Joseph, Connellsville.
O'Neil, Robert Andrew, Allentown.
Ockey, Bruce Gordon, Pittsburgh.
Olds, John Henry, Philadelphia.
Olearnick, Thomas, Mt. Carmel.
Olzak, Raymond Dennis, Pittsburgh.
Oplinger, David Paul, Allentown.
Paluscio, John Joseph, Harrisburg.
Panella, Nick Jr., Aliquippa.
Paolantonio, Bennie Joe, Ambridge.
Patrillo, Albert John, Susquehanna.
Patterson, Earl Allen, Tionesta.
Paull, Chester Donald, Wilkes Barre.
Pearson, George B. III, Towanda.
Pellergrino, Joseph D., Philadelphia.
Pelullo, Leonard Salvatore, Philadelphia.
Perry, Timothy Eugene, Martinsburg.
Pierce, Larry Wendell, Baden.
Pliska, Michael Dennis, McKeesport.
Poslesnik, Wayne A., Clairton.
Post, Daniel Gibson, Philadelphia.
Potempa, Louis William, Philadelphia.
Powell, Richard Edwin, Royersford.
Powers, William Maxwell, Erie.
Prazinko, Robert James, Revloc.
Pye, Safford Smith, Bucks.
Pysher, Gerald John, Ackermanville.
Quinn, Raymond Francis, Imperial.
Rafferty, Edward John, Havertown.
Raiford, Charles Leroy Jr., Pittsburgh.
Ralph, David Edward, Philadelphia.
Ralston, James Vincent, Bradford.
Ramallo, Charles Edward Jr., Allison Park.
Redmond, Carter, Philadelphia.
Reese, William Richard, Norristown.
Reichert, Lawrence John, Philadelphia.
Reilly, Edward William, Upper Darby.
Reilly, James Joseph, Jr., Washington.
Richards, Charles H., Jr., Canonsburg.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Rieger, Charles A., III, Philadelphia.
Riffey, Tracy Harley, Downingtown.
Riggle, Joseph Dale, Coraopolis.
Riley, Howard George, Philadelphia.
Ritz, Marshall Leroy, Delta.
Roberts, Charles G., Brownsville.
Robertson, Robert Glenn, Pittsburgh.
Roller, Benjamin C., Jr., Philadelphia.
Romanko, Daniel Robert, Avoca.
Rouba, Edward S., Philadelphia.
Rudinec, John Joseph, Donora.
Rummel, Francis Clair, Butler.
Runey, Lawrence F., Bristol.
Rusnak, George Bernard, Philipsburg.
Russo, Augustine Daniel, New Castle.
Rutberg, Franklin Steven, Philadelphia.
Rynkiewicz, Richard Robert, Luzerne.
Sadowsky, Lloyd J., Boswell.
Salley, Walter Junior, Philadelphia.
Sanders, Robert James, Philadelphia.
Sanford, John Francis, Coopersburg.
Santilli, Raymo, Aliquippa.
Sas, Louis, Philadelphia.
Sauble, Thomas Eugene, York.
Scheetz, John Elwood, Norristown.
Schmidt, Richard Herman, Scranton.
Schoenig, Edmond David, Philadelphia.
Schreffler, Cleon Larry, Millersburg.
Schubert, Willis Junior, East Stroudsburg.
Scott, Robert L., Pittsburgh.
Seasholtz, Ronald J., Pottstown.
Sedgwick, Richard Bruce, Philadelphia.
Shaffer, Charles, Philadelphia.
Sharpnack, Matthew F., Williamsport.
Shipley, Walter Westerman, Bristol.
Shoop, Jack Henry, Jr., Rural Ridge.
Short, Paul Theodore, Jr., Ardmore.
Showalter, James Edward, Chester.
Showers, John Ellsworth, Jr., Benezett.
Shubiak, Joseph Edward, Philadelphia.
Siengo, Ronald James, Cornwells Heights.
Sigel, Lewis William, Lykens.
Sigg, John Charles, Johnstown.
Sikon, Robert Archibald, Washington.
Singletary, Neeley James, Philadelphia.
Sippey, Wayne Keith, Pittsburgh.
Sivits, Charles E., Robertsdale.
Slack, Charles Leroy, Jr., New Castle.
Smith, Charles Edward, Glenolden.
Smith, Robert Harold, Warminster.
Smith, Robert, Jr., Philadelphia.
Snavely, Robert Ammon, Lebanon.
Snyder, James Ralph, New Cumberland.
Sokalsky, Stephen W., Jr., Philadelphia.
Solis, Antonio Abel, Philadelphia.
Solomon, Milton, Glenshaw.
Spahn, Dennis M., Altoona.
Spina, Elmer Frank, Philadelphia.
Sral, Leonard Walter, Hastings.
Stafford, Frederick, Philadelphia.
Stalnecker, William John, Philadelphia.
Stanchek, Edward Milton, Philadelphia.
Stanley, David Carl, West Chester.
Steele, Thomas Donald, Kingston.
Steighner, James Thomas, Saxonburg.
Steigleman, Derwood D., Jr., Carlisle.
Stephens, Gary Bennett, Williamsport.
Stephens, James Calvin, Bellwood.
Straley, John Leroy, Beaver Falls.
Straub, Terry Gordon, Lykens.
Stuhl, Aloysius John, Philadelphia.
Sullivan, Jeremiah Joseph, Ardmore.
Sullivan, Willis M., Jr., Youngsville.
Taliana, John Barry, Natrona Heights.
Tarantowicz, John Edward, Dickson City.
Taylor, Donald Richard, Harrisburg.
Teasley, Henry Ezra, Harrisburg.
Thomas, Aaron Leon, Philadelphia.
Thomas, John Joseph, Philadelphia.
Thomas, John William, Levittown.
Thompson, Billy Albert, Harrisburg.
Threats, George Edward, New Castle.
Tiffany, Clarence James, Lenoxville.
Tomko, Joseph Andrew, Aliquippa.
Torzok, Joseph, Punxsutawney.
Toth, Donald Bonney, Pen Argyl.
Trypus, Frank Donald, Meadville.
Turchi, Louis, Philadelphia.
Tweedy, Stuart King, Pittsburgh.

XUM

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Twigg, Michael William, Meyersdale.
Umbenhauer, Dale E., Pine Grove.
Urmann, Joseph Herman, Pittsburgh.
Valkos, Francis J., Port Griffin.
Van Dyke, Deane S., Jr., Delmont.
Vanlew, Kenneth Leslie, Downingtown.
Vinas, Gary Lionel, Sharpsville.
Vokish, Jerald Anthony, Natrona.
Vontor, Thomas Joseph, Phoenixville.
Vroman, Merlin Howard, Titusville.
Wade, Larry, Pottstown.
Wahlen, Gerald John, Philadelphia.
Warren, David Braniard, Pittsburgh.
Weaver, Franklin Floyd, Bethelehem.
Weaver, Henry Lue, Home.
Weiand, Raymond D., Mifflintown.
Weitkamp, Edgar Wilken, Jr., York.
Weller, Terry Lee, Ligonier.
Welsh, John O. Neil, Jr., Harrisburg.
Wentzel, Ralph Michael, Reading.
Wheeler, Morris Eugene, Philadelphia.
Whipple, Gary Eugene, Pittsburgh.
White, General, Philadelphia.
White, John Willie, Aliquippa.
Wilhelm, John Lester, Berlin.
Wilhelmi, Henry Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Will, William Anthony, Glassport.
Williams, Franklin Bruce, Philadelphia.
Williams, Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.
Williams, Lonnie Clifford, Philadelphia.
Willis, John Henry, Philadelphia.
Wilson, Harry Conrad, II, Richboro.
Wilson, Lloyd Calveria, Philadelphia.
Winkelvoss, Thomas John, McKeesport.
Winowitch, Theodore Alan, Pittsburgh.
Wise, James David, Pittsburgh.
Woods, Gregory Wayne, Pittsburgh.
Worman, Kenneth Glen, Perkasie.
Wyles, Donald Clair, Saxton.
Wylie, Glenn Robert, Saxonburg.
Yasenosky, Andrew Richard, Leckrone.
Yatsko, Joseph Paul, Jr., Levittown.
Yeast, John, Edinboro.
Young, Ronald Edward, Harrisburg.
Zackowski, Edward Francis, Philadelphia.
Zavislan, Barry Alan, Uniontown.
Zelenick, John Malcom, Pittsburgh.
Zerfass, Jerome Vincent, Bethlehem.

Air Force

Albrecht, George Henry, Terrace.
Bevich, George Michael, Jr., Summit Hill.
Bottesch, John Richard, Munhall.
Cestaric, Joseph Anthony, Midland.
Cole, John Matthew, Philadelphia.
Downey, Earl Garland, Williamsport.
Hetrick, Raymond Harry, Brookville.
Hincewicz, Edward Joseph, Scranton.
Korpics, Anthony Francis, Bethlehem.
Lielmanis, Atis Karlis, Quakertown.
Lukasik, Bernard Francis, Dickson City.
McEwen, James Arthur, Washington.
Mitzel, Lonny Leroy, Red Lion.
Nuschke, Edgar Erwin, Austin.
O'Brien, John Lawrence, Pittsburgh.
Preaux, Thomas Alfred, Cecil.
Purcell, Howard Philip, Lansdowne.
Riddle, Oliver John, Coraopolis.
Ronca, Robert Francis, Norristown.
Sholl, Robert Lee, Kimberton.
Stearns, Allan Julius, Girard.
Westfall, Robert Lee, Meadville.
Weyandt, Irvin Grant, Claysburg.
Widener, Michael Edward, Connellsville.
Yeingst, Peter Joel, Elverson.

Marine Corps

Abbott, Raymond Lawrence, Sugar Grove.
Adamoli, Rowland Joseph, Philadelphia.
Addison, John Edward, Philadelphia.
Aigeldinger, Eldridge Char, Havertown.
Allen, John Baxter, Philadelphia.
Almoney, John Stanley, York.
Anderson, James, Philadelphia.
Andrew, Dennis Richard, Easton.
Baer, Glenn Charles, Reading.
Bailey, Thomas Earl, Columbia.
Baker, David, Philadelphia.
Baronowski, Michael Alexan, Norristown.
Barrett, James Allen, Pittsburgh.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Bartock, David, Connellsville.
Battista, Anthoney Joseph, Dunmore.
Bauer, Karol Raymond, Philadelphia.
Baugh, Fred Otis, Jr., Philadelphia.
Beasley, Michael Lawrence, Philadelphia.
Bell, William, Philadelphia.
Bernstein, Joel, Philadelphia.
Berry, Floyd Joseph, Jr., Monroeton.
Billings, David Vern, Lake City.
Bird, Thomas Arnold, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Bireley, Kenneth Paul, Marcus Hook.
Black, Robert Jacob, Clarion.
Blank, Frank Hufford, Pittsburgh.
Bolger, Lawrence Joseph, Philadelphia.
Books, Jay Karl, Cleona.
Bowers, James Dale, Edinboro.
Bowersox, Charles W., Jr., Harrisburg.
Boyer, David Eugene, Hellam.
Brady, Daniel William, Norristown.
Brennan, Charles Eugene, Waynesboro.
Brice, Robert Kenneth, Plains.
Bridge, Joseph Leonard, Latrobe.
Briskin, Roger Steven, Wynnewood.
Brought, Dale Edward, Fallentimber.
Brown, Alfred Lee, Philadelphia.
Brown, James Frederick, Indiana.
Brown, Robert Guy, Finleyville.
Brown, William Joseph, Philadelphia.
Burkhardt, Thomas Alan, Elizabeth.
Burton, Donald Russell, Coatesville.
Butler, Allen Leroy, Pittsburgh.
Byrne, Joseph Leon, Jr., Roscoe.
Callahan, Michael John, Drexel Hill.
Callen, James Grant, Tarentum.
Cannon, William Eugene, Homer City.
Cappello, Daniel Peter, Kane.
Cardiff, Thomas N., Jr., Johnstown.
Carey, James Edward, Altoona.
Carpenter, William H., Jr., Philadelphia.
Carter, Richard Albert, Philadelphia.
Chamberlain, Leslie Allen, Windgap.
Chavous, Alvin Richardson, Philadelphia.
Cheek, Kenneth Norris, Philadelphia.
Chutis, John Vincent, Elizabeth.
Cleveland, David Luhver, Tioga.
Coates, Sterling Kitchener, Plymouth.
Coll, William Patrick, Philadelphia.
Conway, Joseph Quinton, Philadelphia.
Cooper, David H., II, Abington.
Cope, Stanley Smith, Jr., Sellersville.
Corcoran, Edward Joseph, North Hills.
Cornwell, Leon Lawrence, Jr., Philadelphia.
Couch, Leslie Craig, East Bangor.
Cowart, David Lawrence, Aliquippa.
Craft, Tommy Lewis, Rossiter.
Czzowitz, Thomas Eugene, Butler.
Dambeck, Robert Carl, Altoona.
Danielles, Deighton Alonzo, Philadelphia.
Daniels, John Francis, Jr., Monroeville.
Daut, Charles William, Philadelphia.
David, Jeffrey Jay, Camp Hill.
Davis, John Larry, Conemaugh.
Day, Wendell Lewis, York.
De Board, Blaine A., Jr., West Chester.
Dean, Thomas Joseph, III, Philadelphia.
Debold, Regis Peter, Pittsburgh.
Dexter, Vaughn Leroy, New Castle.
Dick, Timothy Morgan, Greensburg.
Dineen, Thomas Gerard, Jr., Lansdowne.
Dissinger, Gary Frank, Lebanon.
Dixon, Stephen Douglas, Philadelphia.
Donald, Howard Arthur, Tamaqua.
Duckett, Thomas Alfred, Philadelphia.
Dudley, John Mitchell, Glen Rock.
Dumond, Roland Dennis, Starlight.
Dyke, Charles Earl, Drums.
Eaker, Dennis Keith, Duboistown.
Edwards, Ted Lavern, Nottingham.
Elliott, Leroy, Philadelphia.
English, Ruben, Philadelphia.
Esbensen, Charles Joseph, Philadelphia.
Evans, Joseph George, Jr., Uniontown.
Fahey, William Paul, Scranton.
Fischer, John Richard, Pittsburgh.
Fischer, Theodore Lauer, Philadelphia.
Fisher, Thomas William, Allentown.
Flowers, Floyd Tyrone, South Coatesville.
Ford, Victor James, Upper Darby.
Fry, Joseph Patton, Bethlehem.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Funelli, Richard Arthur, Jr., Farrell.
Gabel Robert Lee, Kylertown.
Gallman, Samuel, III, Philadelphia.
Gardner, Larry Wayne, Ridgway.
Garrity, James Jeffrey, Pittsburgh.
Gendebien, William Raymond, Barto.
Gerwig, Ronald Eugene, Harmony.
Gilbert, Paul Arthur, Jenner Township.
Gillis, Harold Thomas, Philadelphia.
Giorgianni, Jon Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Gipe, J. Randall, Harrisburg.
Glenn, Charles Joseph, III, Philadelphia.
Glenn, George Earl, Jr., Marianna.
Glickman, Donald Eric, Philadelphia.
Goedeker, William Howard, Beaver Falls.
Gozdan, Michael Stephen, Easton.
Gradel, Joseph, Philadelphia.
Graham, James Everett, Jr., Rochester.
Graham, Richard Scott, Latrobe.
Griner, Thomas Eugene, Williamsport.
Grumbling, Ronald Gary, Glenolden.
Guest, Edward Robert, Verona.
Guseman, William E., III, Finleyville.
Hackett, David Spencer, Ligonier.
Haines, Robert Lee, Stoystown.
Hall, Lindy Roland, Tunkhannock.
Harris, Benjamin Harry, Marcus Hook.
Harris, Edward Louis, Philadelphia.
Hart, Larry Eugene, Quarryville.
Hartsoe, David Earl, Coatesville.
Hawk, Charles Edward, Steelton.
Heath, James Robert, Bala Cynwyd.
Heniss, Frank Amos, Philadelphia.
Herbstritt, Ronald Lee, Bradford.
Herr, Jay Donald, Lancaster.
Herron, Patrick, Sugar Notch.
Hibbard, Gary Edward, Dimock.
Hice, Robert Kenneth, Rea.
Higbee, Robert Daniel, Drexel Hill.
Hildenbrand, Leslie Ian, Circleville.
Holland, David Herman, Springtown.
Holland, Frank Rodney, Bethlehem.
Hollenbach, Kenneth Ralph, Allentown.
Holoka, John Charles, Gettysburg.
Horvath, Charles William, Bethlehem.
Hovancik, Andrew M., Jr., New Brighton.
Hoyer, Michael Gerard, Reading.
Isley, Charles Lester, III, Philadelphia.
Jackson, Alvin Edward, Philadelphia.
Jackson, Joseph Eugene, Lancaster.
Jackson, Lehron, Jr., Philadelphia.
Jackson, Richard Bernard, Philadelphia.
Jankowski, Walter Joseph, Chester Springs.
Jemison, John L., Pittsburgh.
Jeremicz, Gregory, Philadelphia.
Johnson, Arthur Anthony, Philadelphia.
Johnson, George Harry, Croydon.
Johnson, Theodore, Homestead.
Johnston, Clement B., Jr., Pittsburgh.
Johnston, Randy Lee, Reinholds.
Johnston, Thomas Patrick, Philadelphia.
Jolley, John William, Jr., Philadelphia.
Jones, Perry Kinard, Philadelphia.
Jones, Reese Alvin, Quakake.
Jordan, Reginald Archie, Philadelphia.
Kaiser, Dennis Dale, Latrobe.
Kaspaul, Alfred August, Fairview.
Keenan, Donald Wayne, Claysville.
Keglovits, Edward Joseph, Northampton.
Kelly, Leo John, III, Pittsburgh.
Kemerer, Thomas Blair, Mt. Pleasant.
Kennedy, Thomas Joseph, Jr., Erie.
Kessel, Robert Lester, Gettysburg.
Kibler, Alfred James, Altoona.
Kinard, Larry Vergess, Philadelphia.
Kinnear, Lawrence Frank, Elkins Park.
Klaric, Terrance Edwin, Sharon.
Knepp, Glenn Donald, Jr., Bigler.
Kooser, Kenneth Brian, Connellsville.
Kotik, Robert John, McKees Rocks.
Kreisher, Sidney George, Lewistown.
Kuprevich, William Alan, Philadelphia.
Langerio, Michael Luke, Hershey.
Lanski, Joseph Walter, Philadelphia.
Lauer, Michael Dennis, Allentown.
Laws, Dwight Willie, Philadelphia.
Lefever, David Brauch, Norristown.
Lenartowicz, Charles, Philadelphia.
Lessig, Daniel Kepner, West Reading.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Light, Joseph Marion, Pittsburgh.
Lightman, Samuel, Ambridge.
Linderman, Mark Thomas, Lansdale.
Link, Raymond Patrick, Butler.
Listorti, Joseph Anthony, Ellwood City.
Louthan, David Carl, Beaver Falls.
Love, Burgess Allen, Philadelphia.
Loweranitis, John Leon, Dubois.
Ludwig, Francis Joseph, Philadelphia.
Luff, Edward Richard, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Lutz, William, Philadelphia.
Lynch, Frederick George, Jr., Philadelphia.
Lynch, James Martin, Cheltenham.
Magruder, Darrell Zane, New Enterprise.
Malaspina, Richard Thomas, Hibbs.
Mark, Thomas Richard, Beaver Falls.
Matty, Thomas Richard, Denbo.
May, Reed McKinley, Jr., Johnstown.
McConahy, Thomas Arthur, Martinsburg.
McCreight, Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.
McCuen, William David, Jr., Philadelphia.
McEntee, Thomas, Philadelphia.
McGill, James Barry, Johnstown.
McGinnis, Harry F., Jr., Pittsburgh.
McMaster, Glenn Leon, Bolivar.
McMonegal, John Joseph, Jr., Girardville.
McMullen, Gene Smedley, West Chester.
MoNeish, Richard Lee, Mercer.
MoNichols, Richard Franci, Philadelphia.
McVay, Richard Wayne, Pittsburgh.
McWilliams, Robert H., Jr., Canton.
Meiss, Robert Warren, Jr., Yardley.
Mieczkowski, Joseph, Philadelphia.
Miller, Gary Leonard, Rochester.
Miller, Stephen Peter, Philadelphia.
Minor, Robert Patrick, Philadelphia.
Mohn, Richard Samuel, Lebanon.
Moll, Wayne Tyrone, Bethlehem.
Monteith, Robert F., II, Jerome.
Montgomery, Clarence Willi, Pittsburgh.
Moore, William June, Philadelphia.
Morales, Julio Victor, Philadelphia.
Morgan, George, Philadelphia.
Morningstar, Robert Lee, Warfordsburg.
Morris, Jeffrey Lynn, Harrisburg.
Morrow, Harold Eugene, Valencia.
Moyle, Wesley Allen, Duquesne.
Murphy, John James, Philadelphia.
Myers, David Gephart, State College.
Neal, Reuben James, Wheatland.
Neidrick, Jack Lee, Erie.
Neumyer, Owen Francis, Harrisburg.
Newby, Frederick Albert, Jr., Philadelphia.
Nye, Jerry Warren, Hummelstown.
Oates, Samuel Arthur, Jr., Philadelphia.
Orendorff, Ernest E., Jr., West Chester.
Orley, Walter Frank, Emmaus.
Orsino, John George, Philadelphia.
Ottey, Carlton Mattes, Chester.
Palma, Francis Michael, Philadelphia.
Palmer, James Lamont, Philadelphia.
Parker, Vernon Howard, Jr., Secane.
Paropacic, John Paul, St. Marys.
Paul, Jay, Philadelphia.
Pettiford, James Lloyd, Clairton.
Pettus, Kenneth, Philadelphia.
Plesakov, Luciano Paul, Hilliards.
Potts, Jerry, Harrisburg.
Price, Barry Carlton, Chester.
Proudfoot, Lewis H., III, Elverson.
Railing, Charles David, Chambersburg.
Ramey, Vernon Lemar, Pittsburgh.
Ream, Gary Lee, Carlisle.
Reddington, James Thomas, Scranton.
Reed, Michael Charles, St. Clair.
Reid, James Murry, Philadelphia.
Reiter, Gerald Andrew, Karthaus.
Reynolds, Arthur, Jr., Philadelphia.
Rickman, William Joe, Altoona.
Riegel, John Franklin, Gettysburg.
Riley, Neil Edward, Gibsonia.
Ringler, Robert Lewis, Jr., Brackenridge.
Ritter, Richard Frank, Watsontown.
Robinson, Martin Robert, Verona.
Rodkey, William Eugene, Northumberland.
Roldan, William Junior, Philadelphia.
Romanchuk, Michael George, Hellertown.
Roth, Frank Theodore, Philadelphia.
Rothhaar, Bruce Lee, Pittsburgh.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Rowe, Chester Earl, Jr., Lancaster.
Royster, Douglas, Philadelphia.
Ruch, Robert Stephen, Bethlehem.
Russ, Joseph Blais, Pittsburgh.
Ryder, Carl Edward, Trafford.
Rykoskey, Edward Jay, Carlisle.
Salerno, Ralph Dennis, Pittsburgh.
Santone, Joseph Anthony, Erie.
Sawicki, Anthony Peter, Philadelphia.
Schlee, Harry Lee, Williamsport.
Schoff, Leo Richard, West Homestead.
Schultz, Alan Robert, Levittown.
Schwesinger, Raymond Paul, Seelyville.
Scott, Gregory John, Philadelphia.
Setzenfand, Charles Freder, Butler.
Shanks, Thomas Frank, Coraopolis.
Sheffey, Ronald David, Reading.
Sheibley, Clarence David, Elliottsburg.
Sherwood, Robert James, Jr., Cresson.
Shields, Robert Earl, Erie.
Shogan, Paul Francis, Irwin.
Shovlin, Frank Joseph, Wilkes-Barre.
Shubert, Darnay, Philadelphia.
Siemon, David Alan, Springdale.
Simmons, Clarence Jimmie, Philadelphia.
Simmons, Harry Jennings, Jr., Langhorne.
Sinchak, William Andrew, Natrona.
Slesh, John Daniel, Jr., Washington.
Smith, Booker, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Smith, Claude Allen, Chadds Ford.
Smith, Harry Charles, York.
Smith, Henry Edward, Harrisburg.
Smith, Paul Richard, Jr., Pen Mar.
Smith, Ralph Edward, Conyngham.
Smith, Ralph Wentz, New Britain.
Smith, Stanley Richard, Pittsburgh.
Snyder, Stephen Francis, Sunbury.
Spadaro, Victor Anthony, Philadelphia.
Springfield, Alfred C., Jr., Cannonsburg.
Stahl, Donald Eugene, Southwest.
Stephen, Philippe Bruce, Philadelphia.
Stern, Gary Wayne, Indiana.
Stevens, David, Jr., Philadelphia.
Stoudt, Gordon Edward, Allentown.
Stoudt, Joseph George, Douglassville.
Strauss, Howard David, Monaca.
Sullivan, Hugh John, Jr., Allentown.
Suvara, Frank Carl, Jr., Erie.
Swenson, Pedro Arnado, Willow Grove.
Swigart, Robert Williams, State College.
Swindell, Wilbur Eugene, Connellsville.
Taylor, Richard Henry, Pittsburgh.
Temple, Thomas Richard, Devon.
Thomas, Donald Leroy, Shippensburg.
Thomas, Michael Clair, Arendtsville.
Tice, Edward Joseph, III, Williamsport.
Tigue, Paul Edward, Jr., Stroudsburg.
Towner, John Garth, Towanda.
Townsend, George Harry, Philadelphia.
Trievel, Clyde Edward, Jr., Boyertown.
Valentine, James Russell, Johnstown.
Valint, Julius Joseph, Jr., Uniontown.
Van Keuren, Depuy Raymond, Emmaus.
Verbilla, David, Tamaqua.
Verdinek, George Thomas, Bridgeville.
Vernon, Paul Lawrence, Homestead.
Vogel, Timothy Peterson, Williamsport.
Wagner, William John, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Walker, James Richard, Pittsburgh.
Walls, William Henry, Horsham.
Walter, Clifton Martin, Erie.
Wargo, Dennis Michael, Clairton.
Warren, Robert Marion, Pen Argyl.
Weatherby, John Goeffrey, Rockledge.
Weber, Jerome Paul, Pittsburgh.
Weest, James Joseph, Colwyn.
Welker, Abram Joseph, Wyncote.
Wellings, Edward Alfred, Warrington.
Welsh, Lewis Neal, Philadelphia.
West, James Edward, McKeesport.
White, Eugene, Philadelphia.
White, William Ivan, North Vandergrift.
Wickel, Kenneth William, West Lawn.
Williams, Kerry Lee, Philadelphia.
Williams, Ronald Aaron, Philadelphia.
Williams, Stephen, Philadelphia.
Williams, Woodrow, Philadelphia.
Willow, Robert Glenn, Johnsonburg.
Woodward, Wayne Howard, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Worman, Chester Eugene, Jr., Easton.
Yartymyk, Michael Harry, Freemansburg.
Yeutter, Daniel John, Philadelphia.
Zoog, Charles Louis, Mt. Pleasant.

Navy

Asherman, Aldon Mackay, Jr., Towanda.
Barnes, Donald Joseph, Philadelphia.
Burkett, Harold Elmer, Lewistown.
Byrne, Conal Joseph, III, Drexel Hill.
Chamaj, Andrew Peter, Scenery Hill.
Clifford, Michael James, Avoca.
Clydesdale, Charles Fredri, Pittsburgh.
Dickson, Edward Andrew, Wyoming.
Ellis, Raymond, Gettysburg.
Gilbert, David Arthur, Montoursville.
Hale, Ralph David, II, New Cumberland.
Holder, Kenneth Leroy, Mt. Wolf.
Kearney, David George, Pittsburgh.
Lynn, Doyle Wilmer, Aliquippa.
McBride, Earl Paul, Volant.
McCormick, John W., Jr., Villanova.
Mossman, Joe Russel, Springfield.
Oxley, James Keith, Bradford.
Salisberry, Larry Gordon, Washington.
Schroeffel, Thomas Anthony, Pittsburgh.
Shade, George Everett, Lansdale.
Stein, Leon Charles, Reading.
Weaver, George Robert, Jr., Lancaster.
Williams, John Kirby, Philadelphia.
Woolheater, John Steven, McKees Rocks.
Yoder, Larry Eugene, Latrobe.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Andrade, John Dutra, East Providence.
Blake, Ronald Earl, Johnston.
Blanchard, James A., Pascoag.
Brissette, Ronald Joseph, Woonsocket.
Bulpitt, John A., Centredale.
Burton, Stephen E., Bradford.
Carter, Frederick Thomas, Smithfield.
Cazanas-Diaz, Edwardo Enri, Providence.
Chesebrough, Frederic Read, Providence.
Cochrane, Blanchard Ward, Newport.
De Riso, Lester Michael, Warren.
Dupere, Joseph Rene, Newport.
Edwards, James Herbert, Cranston.
Guadagno, Guy Paul, Providence.
Hornstein, Edmund Henry, Providence.
Jurcak, Richard Alan, Warwick.
Knowlton, George Frank, Providence.
Kramer, Joseph P., Cranston.
La Vallee, Robert C., Jr., Middletown.
Labrecque, Paul E., Jr., Smithfield.
Littlejohn, McGeary, Providence.
Martin, Robert William, Providence.
McCutcheon, Allan Bruce, Harrisville.
Michalopoulos, Raymond Wil, Pawtuckett.
Noel, Joseph Donat, Providence.
Norberg, William Gunther, North Providence.
Panzarella, James Francis, Providence.
Parmentier, Gerald Victor, Providence.
Plante, Normand Aurele, Pawtucket.
Silva, William Gregory, East Providence.
Silvia, Clifford William, Esmond.
Stanley, William Charles, Warwick.
Sterling, Robert James, Warwick.
Walling, Lewis Metcalfe, Jr., Woonsocket.
Zarbo, Michael, Kingston.

Air Force

Bennett, Frank Everett, Warwick.
La Pierre, Edward Arthur, Nasonville.
Mansfield, Bruce Elwin, East Providence.

Marine Corps

Andreozzi, Victor Patrick, Barrington.
Andrews, Wilbert Ison, Providence.
Anter, Albert Gabriel, Central Falls.
Caruolo, Richard Anthony, Providence.
Cottenier, Robert William, Warwick.
Coutu, Rene Raymond, Woonsocket.
Decota, Walter Joseph, Pascoag.
Drummond, Paul Robert, Providence.
Durand, Paul Lionel, Woonsocket.
Greene, Richard Edward, Jr., Newport.
Lewis, James Earl, Tiverton.
Maciminio, Antonio Paul, Pawtucket.

RHODE ISLAND—continued

Marine Corps

Mack, George Jacob, Cranston.
Miller, Robert Thomas, Westerly.
Pierce, Ronald Gerard, Pawtucket.
Smith, James Edward, Providence.
Szydlo, Thomas Joseph, West Warwick.
Thibeault, Francis John, Central Falls.
Yaghoobian, Charles, Jr., Pawtucket.

Navy

Dion, Laurent Norbert, Providence.
Shaw, Edward Brendan, Cranston.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Anton, Terry Lynn, Sumter.
Ardis, John Coleman, Manning.
Arnold, James, Greenville.
Bair, Donald Ray, Harleyville.
Barnhart, John Louis, Greenville.
Bellamy, Simmie, Jr., Conway.
Belton, James, State Park.
Best, Neal Ira, Myrtle Beach.
Bethea, Jimmy Carlton, Charleston.
Bickley, Wilson Charles, Lexington.
Bischoff, John Malcolm, Mountain Rest.
Blackwell, Roy James, Jr., Clinton.
Blanding, Aaron, Manning.
Blanton, Burton Alexander, Charleston.
Boan, Jimmy E., Chesterfield.
Bradley, James, Charleston.
Branham, Johnny Thomas, Winnsboro.
Brewer, Thomas Coleman, Pageland.
Bridges, Richard Hamilton, Easley.
Brown, James Lee, Taylors.
Brown, Samuel Junious, Timmonsville.
Browning, Robert Eugene, Liberty.
Burns, Walter, Due West.
Burroughs, Ulysses G., Bucksport.
Burton, William, Jr., Hopkins.
Butler, Johnnie Elmer, Fair Play.
Byrd, Ralph Eugene, Greenville.
Cain, Robert, Jr., Sumter.
Caldwell, William James, St. Matthews.
Causey, William Harvey, Gresham.
Chastain, Gerald Edward, Walhalla.
Clardy, James Donald, Easley.
Clary, John Willard, Gaffney.
Collins, Claude Laverne, Conway.
Collins, Julius, Jr., Blackville.
Cook, James Edward, Hardeeville.
Cook, John I., Georgetown.
Craig, Robert Mitchell, Branchville.
Cribb, Floyd Allen, Hemingway.
Culvey, Kenneth Leroy, Columbia.
Davenport, David D., Jr., Taylors.
Daves, Donald Charles, Greenville.
Davis, John K., Fort Jackson.
Dingle, Earl, Mt. Pleasant.
Dixon, Cordie Lee, Hartsville.
Douse, James Louis, Aiken.
Drummond, Austin Leon, Greer.
Dunmore, Oneal, Columbia.
Edmondson, Harold T., Jr., Charleston.
Elliott, Tharold Washington, Columbia.
Estella, Anthony John, Columbia.
Federline, Audley M., Jr., Startex.
Ferrell, Charles Reginald, Fort Mill.
Finch, Fordham E., Jr., Columbia.
Flanders, Leon D., Fairfield.
Ford, Charles Evans, Charleston.
Fore, William C., Marion.
Gambrell, Franklin Douglas, Hodges.
Garrett, Lloyd Earl, Pelham.
Gell, Jack Earl, Montmorenci.
Gentry, Robert Levett, Greenville.
Gilstrap, Dwight Oneal, Pickens.
Gore, Horace Roscoe, Ocean Drive Beach.
Goude, Charles Melvin, Fort Mill.
Graham, Earl Clayton, Charleston.
Grant, Phillip, Georgetown.
Grant, Thomas, Orangeburg.
Haines, Adherene Louis, Sumter.
Hames, Bobby Joe, Blacksburg.
Hamilton, Winston Clinton, Charleston.
Harrill, Ronald William, Mauldin.
Harris, Abraham, York.
Harris, Carl E., Rock Hill.
Henderson, Robert Lee, Fairfax.
Henry, William James, Lynchburg.
Hensley, Garey Lee, Spartanburg.

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Hill, Vertis, James, Jr., Ridgeville.
Hollifield, Vernon Gilbert, Inman.
Horlback, Francis D., Mount Pleasant.
Hough, Matthew, Bethune.
Howard, David Lafate, Fountain Inn.
Huggins, Gordon Samual, Bennettsville.
Jackson, Sylvester, Jr., Florence.
Jeffers, John Larry, Camden.
Jefferson, Leroy, Darlington.
Jenkins, Fred Harvey, Frogmore.
Jeter, Curtis Lee, Union.
Johnson, Charles, Jr., Pickens.
Johnstone, James Montgomery, Fort Mill.
Keene, Gerald Brice, Columbia.
Kelley, Dewey William, Lancaster.
Kelly, Benjamin Edward, Jr., Cayce.
Kennedy, Matthew DeVanughan, Timmonsville.
Key, Anderson Harold, Orangeburg.
Knight, Richard, McColl.
Lance, John Henry, Conway.
Lankford, Henry Dean, Union.
Lawless, William Ralph, Jr., Pelzer.
Leaphart, Harold Paul, Aiken.
Lee, Billy, Walhalla.
Lewis, Jimmie, Spartanburg.
Lewis, Lee, Pickens.
Lopez, Luis Belt Ran, Columbia.
Lucas, John Willie, Orangeburg.
Lucas, Patrick Donovan, Lancaster.
Luster, Milton Bernard, Gray Court.
Lyles, Belton, Jr., Carlisle.
Mack, Daniel James, Marion.
Mack, Harold, Jr., Charleston.
Mauldin, Thomas Jasper, Columbia.
McCoy, Elec, Oswego.
McCrary, Douglas MacArth, Greenville.
McCullough, John Earnest, Chester.
McFadden, Harry Bernard, Charleston.
McKay, John Roland, Jr., Ruby.
McMahan, Thomas Edward, Jr., Greenville.
McPherson, Alfred, Charleston.
Merck, Roger Eugene, Salem.
Mickle, Moses, Columbia.
Moore, Norman James, Kline.
Moorer, Clarence Larry, Charleston.
Moultrie, Joe Davis, St. Stephen.
Nedd, Heyward Windell, Bishopville.
Norris, Ronnie Eugene, Greer.
Owens, James Eugene, Dillon.
Parker, Wesley, Charleston.
Payne, Willie James, Cross Hill.
Pearson, Jesse James, Davis Station.
Pendarvis, Robert, Orangeburg.
Penn, Franklin Hamilton, Aiken.
Phillips, Wylie Oria, Kershaw.
Pigatt, Harmon Julious, Effingham.
Poe, Jimmie Clyde, Charleston.
Poston, James, Hartsville.
Puckett, Troy Murl, Union.
Pusser, Thomas Wilson, Chesterfield.
Rabon, Joseph Levern, Charleston Heights.
Reeder, Melvin, Newberry County.
Rhodes, Kenneth, Greenville.
Richardson, Theodore, Charleston.
Roberson, Wilburn, Anderson.
Robinson, Freddie Lee, Orangeburg.
Sanford, James Walter, Orangeburg.
Scott, Randolph Clinton, Charleston.
Shumpert, Joe Thomas, West Columbia.
Smith, Harold McRae, Sumter.
Smith, Terry Lee, Piedmont.
Starks, James Edward, Cameron.
Still, Fred Harold, Spartanburg.
Stone, David Ronald, Pamplico.
Tate, Walter Reaves, Jr., Greenville.
Teague, John Walter, Clinton.
Thomas, Jack Jr., Fort Jackson.
Thompson, Carroll U., Columbia.
Townsend, Chester Davis, Saluda.
Triplett, Johnny Ray, North Charleston.
Tucker, David, Rock Hill.
Turner, Arthur, Jr., Mt. Pleasant.
Turner, Marcus Sharpe, Jr., Columbia.
Tyler, Earthell, Columbia.
Tyner, James Philemon, Hartsville.
Walker, Evans S., Blacksburg.
Ward, Herschel Rudolph, Manning.
Watson, Charles Bryant, Jr., Seneca.

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Way, Clarence L., Ridgeville.
Wellons, Hugh William, Florence.
Westpoint, Thomas Lee, Charleston.
White, Ben, Sumter.
White, Willie, Yemassee.
Wigfall, Herbert, Jr., Charleston Heights.
Willard, Hugh Grey, Orangeburg.
Williams, Billy, Charleston.
Williams, Eddie Kenneth, Columbia.
Williams, Jerry Hiott, Pickens.
Wilson, Lawrence W., Charleston Heights.
Worthy, Jerry Dean, Spartanburg.

Air Force

Foxx, Richard L., Gaffney.
Hynds, Wallace Gourley, Jr., Sumter.
Smyly, Duncan Padgett, Puffin.

Marine Corps

Arnold, Larry Franklin, Greenville.
Ayers, James Westley, Moncks Corner.
Baker, Jesse Rutledge, Whitmire.
Barbee, Frank Leroy, Lockhart.
Barnes, Joe Wilson, Brunson.
Bergess, Frederick Wilson, Nichols.
Beverly, Willard Franklin, Conway.
Bishop, James Matthew, Society Hill.
Blackburn, Hugh Frank, Columbia.
Brooks, James Roy, Jr., Anderson.
Camp, James Steven, Clover.
Cape, Jerry, Woodruff.
Darnell, Dana Cornell, Greenville.
Driggers, Arthur M., Jr., North Charleston.
Evans, Alonza, Charleston.
Fleming, Larry, Jr., Piedmont.
Franks, Anthony L., Florence.
Gailliard, Herman Bernard, Charleston.
Garner, William Donald, Easley.
Graves, Michael Leroy, Heath Springs.
Hall, Jimmy William, Greenville.
Hammond, Leland Emanuel, Sumter.
Hearon, Terry Shavon, Lugoff.
Humphries, Hazel H., III, Florence.
Humphries, Ronald Edward, Charleston.
James, Eddie Louis, Jr., Chester.
Keefe, Douglas Oniel, Columbia.
Kinsey, Harvey, Junior, Ruffin.
Lama, Ivars, Bamberg.
Lawton, Billy James, Allendale.
Lewis, Walter Wayne, Darlington.
Llewellyn, Johnny William, Florence.
Long, Raymond Ervin, Fort Mill.
Lyons, James Jr., Abbeville.
Matthews, Earl Jr., Florence.
McClary, Samuel Donald, Kingstree.
McLendon, Michael Ryan, Bishopville.
Miller, Jerry Lee, Midway Park.
Milton, Charles Rudolph, Jr., Columbia.
Mitchell, Willie James, Jr., Chester.
Morrow, Merle Bruce, West Columbia.
Mumford, Jimmy Earl, Bennettsville.
Nelson, Sanford Lewis, Laurens.
Nettles, Victor Lee, Jr., Varnville.
Norris, Charles Benjamin, Spartanburg.
Painter, Curtis Wayne, Charleston.
Pelzer, Benjamin F., II, Columbia.
Phifer, Freddie Joe, Fort Mill.
Poore, Thomas Wyatt, Summerville.
Pope, Donald Burris, Bennettsville.
Potter, Larry Emerson, Taylors.
Quigley, Terry Lynn, Columbia.
Reaves, James Louis, Myrtle Beach.
Rikard, Charles David, Batesburg.
Roberts, Lloyd Vernon, Hemingway.
Samuels, Isaiah, Wagener.
Shepherd, Thomas Glenn, Clio.
Singletary, Hilbert, M., Jr., Summerville.
Stegall, Lindell Ray, Fort Mill.
Stroud, Dennis Carroll, Joanna.
Sullivan, Joseph Harry, Dillon.
Villeponteaux, J., Jr., Cordesville.
Walters, Richard Floyd, Columbia.
Williams, Johnny Edward, Charleston.
Williams, Ronald Anthony, Greenville.
Wood, James Edwin, Spartanburg.

Navy

Garner, John Henry, Charleston Heights.
Jackson, Curtis Darrell, Redding.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Adam, Raymond Alvin, Leola.
Aschenbrenner, Dennis Dale, Lead.
Barton, Jimmie Woodrow, Onaka.
Biever, William Dennis, Bancroft.
Cunningham, Louis James, Sioux Falls.
Fjerstad, David Orson, Aurora.
Gatton, David Ray, Harrold.
Gehler, Ronald Charles, Sioux Falls.
Glaesman, Richard E., Leola.
Holm, Dennis Lee, Rapid City.
Hysell, Howard Robert, Burke.
Jackson, Michael Meredith, Waubay.
Lippman, Gordon Joseph, Lemmon.
McIlravy, Ronald Dean, Wessington Springs.
McInnis, Dale Richard, Pierre.
McPherson, Dennis Craig, Gregory.
Milbrandt, Charles J., Aberdeen.
Noteboom, Ivan, Todd.
Robeson, Evart Eugene, Rapid City.
Sandve, Donald Raymond, Langford.
Sasse, Patrick T., Mobridge.
Spider, Alvin Richard, Fort Thompson.
Steineke, James Lee, Sioux Falls.
Stockwell, Dennis Bernard, Parker.
Sundet, Gary Lee, Lake Preston.
Surma, Steven John, Waubay.
Therne, Joseph Lloyd, Brookings.
Venenga, Darrell Dean, Sioux Falls.
Voigt, Theodore Harold, Wolsey.
Walter, Ward Gunard, Minot.
Wright, James Paige, Custer.

Air Force

Frahman, Lawrence John, Wilmot.
Sprague, Stanley George, Rapid City.

Marine Corps

Aukland, Leo Curtis, Bisson.
Benter, Ronald Clifford, Milbank.
Evans, Paul Olynn, Sioux Falls.
Fenenga, Terry Howard, Iona.
Hawkins, William Henry, Greenville.
Hevle, David Eugene, Yankton.
Jamerson, Kenneth Robert, Little Eagle.
Krage, Lanny Ray, Columbia.
Ommen, Peter Richard, Central City.
Peterson, John Arthur, Brookings.
Voss, Curtis Malroy, Roshold.

TENNESSEE

Army

Abbott, Carroll David, Sevierville.
Alexander, J. H., Cedar Grove.
Allen, Dan S., III, Memphis.
Archer, Dan Willie, Jr., Memphis.
Armes, Rexie Leo, Wartburg
Arwood, Larry Randall, Sweetwater.
Ayers, Harold Gene, Jonesboro.
Bailey, James Ray, Memphis
Baker, Gerald D., Memphis.
Barnes, Clarence Edward, Harriman.
Bolding, Lanny Ross, Bells.
Bolton, Jesse James, Memphis.
Boyd, Robert Ray, Murfreesboro.
Brown, Karl Anthony, Kingsport.
Broyles, Alvin Klason, Jr., Johnson City.
Buford, Leroy, Atoka.
Burdette, Larry Wayne, Summertown.
Burkheart, George William, Murfreesboro.
Bush, James Edward, Lebanon.
Byrd, Ralph, Helenwood.
Campbell, Thomas Darthan, Millington.
Cantrell, Leslie Howard, Copperhill.
Carlton, Danny E. Greenfield.
Carothers, Richard Lee, Franklin.
Carter, Ronald Lee, Medina.
Chambers, James Wayne, Union City.
Chambers, Thomas Beeb, Memphis.
Chamblee, Dickey, Memphis.
Chandler, Thomas Jefferson, Memphis.
Clardy, Jasper Duel, Bristol
Clark, George Edward, Jr., Knoxville.
Clark, Lorenzo, Memphis.
Coffey, Jesse J., Knoxville.
Cogdill, Randy Ralph, Sevierville.
Coleman, Willie Jr., Brownsville.
Collier, William Floyd, Memphis.
Conner, Jerome, Memphis.
Conway, James Bennett, Franklin.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

Cook, Garry Kendell, Sharps Chapel.
Cooperwood, Jack J., III, Memphis.
Cornett, James Mitchell, Elizabethton.
Cothran, Robert Carlies, Mt Pleasant.
Coulter, Donald Clay, Maryville.
Crabtree, David Allen, Jamestown.
Crawford, Gale Vernon, Rogersville.
Crawford, James Edward, Memphis.
Cunningham, James Andrew, College Grove.
Cunningham, James Earl, Rockwood.
Curtis, Gary Allen, Johnson City.
Darling, Thomas Duane, Martin.
Davidson, Gerald Wayne, Oak Ridge.
Davis, James Thomas, Livingston.
Davis, John Edward, Cottage Grove.
Day, Billy Brown, Chattanooga.
Dickinson, Thomas Morton, Memphis.
Dodson, Sean Paul, Sparta.
Dorris, Curtis Eugene, Mercer.
Dotson, Donald Luther, Alcoa.
Dowdy, William, Memphis.
Duncan, Robert Lee, Dyersburg.
Earls, Larry Don, Murfreesboro.
Ensley, Ronald John Jr., Murfreesboro.
Erwin, Danny Max, Johnson City.
Eubanks, Raymond, Carl, Jr., Altamont.
Evans, William Larry, Millington.
Farley, James Cabell, Cookeville.
Ferrell, William Alford, Stanton.
Fields, Jerry L., Memphis.
Fisher, Harry, Memphis.
Floyd, Lonnie Allen, Chattanooga.
Ford, George B., Paris.
Fort, Melvin Frank, Memphis.
Fowler, Will Lee Dennis, Chattanooga.
Fox, Gary Regan, Gatlinburg.
France, Mack Lemul, Jr., Dandridge.
Franklin, Eugene Delano, Johnson City.
Fulghum, Joe Raymond, Jr., Murfreesboro.
Fuqua, John Edward, Nashville.
Gardner, James Alton, Dyersburg.
Gay, Wayne Oliver, Maryville.
Gibson, Ernest, Pioneer.
Gilreath, Luther Vermont, Surgoinsville.
Glover, Arthur Wayne, Morristown.
Gobble, Charles Hartsell, Johnson City.
Grady, James William, New Providence.
Grantham, Roy Eugene, Nashville.
Gray, Freddy Lynn, Sweetwater.
Gray, Jesse Alexander, Memphis.
Gray, Jimmie Dell, Memphis.
Green, Dallas Eugene, Oliver Springs.
Hall, William Gary, Mansfield.
Harden, Daniel David, Memphis.
Hargrove, William Eugene, Columbia.
Harlan, John Alvin, Johnson City.
Harper, William Clyde, Memphis.
Harris, John Carlos, Memphis.
Harrison, Richard Earl, Memphis.
Hayes, Lynn Carol, Crossville.
Hayworth, Dennis Truman, Lenoir City.
Heatherly, Darrell W., Springfield.
Helton, James Carlos, West Hills.
Henry, Nelson Page, Crossville.
Hensley, A. G., Limestone.
Hesson, Jimmy Dale, Lafayette.
Hesson, Larry Dean, Gallatin.
Hickey, Johnny, Cleveland.
Hicks, Elvis Gormen, Memphis.
Hiemer, Jerry Allan, Memphis.
Hill, Lonnie O. Neal, Atoka.
Hill, Raymond Lee, Knoxville.
Hillman, Coleman Gee, Whiteville.
Hitchcock, Tillmon Powell, Bone Cave.
Hixson, Randall Lee, Chattanooga.
Holcomb, Doyle, Johnson City.
Holland, Charles Ralph, Pleasant Shade.
Holmes, David William, Crossville.
Holt, Dennis Edward, Nashville.
Hoskins, Gomer Davis, Jr., Clinton.
Hubbard, James Ray, Memphis.
Hughlett, John Albert, Brighton.
Hunt, Bobby Earnest, Chuckey.
Hunt, Isaac E., Jr., Jackson.
Jarrell, Roger Dale, Nashville.
Jenkins, Len McKinley, Cosby.
Jenkins, Robert Donald, Clarksville.
Johnson, William Leroy, Cleveland.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

Jones, Cecil Ben, Jr., Johnson City.
Jones, John Ivory, Jr., Memphis.
Jones, Michael Allen, Madison.
Jones, Ray Morgan Keith, Jonesboro.
Keeton, Tommie, Huntsville.
Keith, James Kelly, III, Chattanooga.
Kelley, Glenn Howell, Chattanooga.
King, Danny Eugene, Loudon.
King, Harold B., Jonesboro.
Kirkland, Virgil, Jr., Chattanooga.
Knox, Eddie L., Memphis.
Lancaster, Jerry David, Lebanon.
Lawson, Dallas, Nashville.
Lawson, Thomas Andrew, Persia.
Lay, John Earl, Jellico.
Layne, Thomas Elsworth, Jr., Chattanooga.
Lee, Benjamin, IV, Oak Ridge.
Lee, Harold Eugene, Madisonville.
Lee, Johnny Andrew, Crab Orchard.
Lewis, Thomas, Memphis.
London, William Thomas, Humboldt.
Long, Wayne Thomas, Knoxville.
Love, Hugh Allen, Knoxville.
Madden, Donald Eugene, New River.
Madison, William Curtis, Memphis.
Manns, Roy Nance, Lewisburg.
Marcum, Jimmy Allen, Concord.
Martin, George Willis, Chattanooga.
Matthews, Willis Alanzo, Nashville.
Mays, James, Jr., Memphis.
McCarter, Robert Leonard, Knoxville.
McBroom, Eddie Odonald, Jr., Memphis.
Meroney, Raphnell J., Chattanooga.
Merrell, Robert Dell, Tiptonville.
Merriman, Charles Edward, Knoxville.
Milender, John Emerson, Counce.
Miller, Carl Socrates, Jr., Ridgely.
Mitchell, Clarence, Nashville.
Mitchell, Rochester, Memphis.
Mizelle, John Marshall, Chattanooga.
Mooneyham, Billy Franklin, Pikeville.
Morgan, John Henry, Knoxville.
Murray, Gary, Elizabethton.
Neal, Charles Ottis, Greeneville.
Noe, Jerry Lynn, Knoxville.
Nunnery, Travis Edward, Ridgely.
O'Donnell, George Maurice, Memphis.
O'Neal, James Elton, Millington.
Parker, Alvin G., Nashville.
Patterson, Billy J., Nashville.
Patterson, Johnnie Hugh, Oliver Springs.
Pease, Homer Lefterage, Johnson City.
Perkins, Gary Eldon, Whitwell.
Phillips, Marvin Foster, Gruetli.
Pipkin, Ernest Gerald, Memphis.
Pitchford, L. C., Memphis.
Poole, William Claude, Memphis.
Priddy, William F., Memphis.
Prince, John R., Chattanooga.
Profitt, Harvey Junior, Chuckey.
Pugh, Michael Laverne, Memphis.
Putnam, Ronald Virgil, Huntland.
Quinn, Bobby Joe, Morristown.
Randolph, William Lewis, Ardmore.
Reed, Charles Oscar, Powell.
Richardson, Fred Lewis, Bristol.
Richardson, Raymond Wilke, Ripley.
Robbins, Lonnie Junior, Caryville.
Robinson, Donald Richard, Turtletown.
Rogers, Allen Tebbs, Jr., Johnson City.
Rowlett, Gary Steven, Church Hill.
Royster, Joseph Edward, Martin.
Rushton, Brian Wayne, Memphis.
Russell, Fred Calvin, Maryville.
Savage, Varis, Jr., Nashville.
Scallions, Carl Wayne, Ripley.
Sexton, Larry Lee, Sneedville.
Sheffield, John Noble, Chapel Hill.
Shelton, Bobby James, Flag Pond.
Shelton, Frank Timothy, Mosheim.
Shenep, Karl Edmond, Memphis.
Sherrod, Donald Ancker, Knoxville.
Shetters, John Henry, Cowan.
Shockley, Thurman B., Jr., Sparta.
Shrum, Kenneth Edward, Chattanooga.
Skyles, Gordon Ray, Chattanooga.
Smith, Gary D., Knoxville.
Smith, Robert L., Millington.
Smith, Ronald Gordon, Covington.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

Smith, William Martin, Jr., Eads.
Southerland, Roy Edward, Morristown.
Spain, Hugh Fred, Joelton
Spangler, Carl C., Bristol.
Spears, David Paul, Rogersville.
Springer, Charles A., Memphis.
Springs, Ralph Ronald, Jr., Rockwood.
Stallings, James D., Carthage.
Stevenson, Billy Edward, Lebanon.
Stewart, Harry Ray, Johnson City.
Stigall, Charles Bennett, Memphis.
Talbert, Claude, Jr., Memphis.
Tanksley, Clifton, Chattanooga.
Tate, James E., Memphis.
Taylor, George David, Memphis.
Taylor, Joe Kenneth, Nashville.
Taylor, Ray, Tazewell.
Thomas, Jackson, Collierville.
Tucker, Charles Gilbert, Shelbyville.
Udell, Mark Foster, Millington.
Vinson, Bobby C., Jackson.
Volner, John Delane, Lexington.
Walden, Daniel Edgar, Jellico.
Ward, Clyde Anderson, Lebanon.
Watkins, John William, Jefferson City.
Whitaker, Kelly Eugene, Memphis.
Whittington, Paul Timothy, Bells.
Wilson, Tommy Robert, Sweetwater.
Wolfe, Jimmy Ray, Cleveland.
Wood, Arthur Murry Moscow.
Wood, Larry T., Mount Pleasant.
Woods, John Willie, Jr., Franklin.
Woods, Lawrence, Clarksville.
Wright, Robert Lee, Moscow.
Yoder, James Strong, Knoxville.

Air Force

Burns, John Robert, Memphis.
Childs, Vandiver, L., Paris.
Glandon, Gary Alven, Powell.
Johnson, Dale Alonzo, Elizabethton.
Lankford, Billy Eugene, Dickson.
Manis, Eddie, Gatlinburg.

Marine Corps

Akins, James Franklin, Smartt.
Alexander, Charles Phillip, South Fulton.
Allen, Dan Steven, Knoxville.
Allen, William Cordell, Jr., Sparta.
Alley, Don Earl, Church Hill.
Avery, John Paul, Elizabethton.
Bannister, Richard Wayne, Erwin.
Barber, Bobby Joe, Rutherford.
Bedwell, Sammie Lee, Friendship.
Bell, Jerry Lee, Chattanooga.
Bennett, Billy Joe, Chattanooga.
Biggs, James Edward, Joelton.
Blakley, James Aubrey, Ripley.
Bradford, Kirby Wayne, Limestone.
Bradley, Joseph, Keith, Oak Ridge.
Bradley, Richard Allen, Manchester.
Brinkley, Robert Thomas, Nashville.
Brooks, Roy Maurice, Rogersville.
Brown, David Harold, Saltillo.
Buford, Larry Graham, Franklin.
Burns, Charles Calvin, Ripley.
Cash, Jerry Michael, Memphis.
Clark, Charles Edward, Jackson.
Collier, Lawrence Henry, Memphis.
Craven, Floyd Carl, McMinnville.
Currie, Andrew, Brownsville.
Dail, Willie Fred, Jr., Knoxville.
Dison, Edward Dean, Clinton.
Dobbs, Gerald Thomas, Etowah.
Duty, Charles Howard, Bluff City.
Dye, Ralph Victor, Jr., Memphis.
Dykes, William Frank, Kingsport.
Edwards, Charles Lee, Memphis.
Edwards, Gilbert, Memphis.
Ferrell, John Wesley, Jackson.
Franklin, William E., Jr., Nashville.
Garant, Robert Oliver, Murfreesboro.
Gill, William Ralph, Jr., Memphis.
Hall, Acie David, Lake City.
Hall, Worley Wayne, Shouns.
Hamm, Eddie Dean, Nashville.
Harrison, Billy Joe, Knoxville.
Hartley, William Lee, Memphis.
Henderson, Donnell, Memphis.
Holt, Herschel Cyle, Nashville.

TENNESSEE—continued

Marine Corps

Hughes, Chester Stacy, Bristol.
Huskey, Estel, Sevierville.
Hutcherson, Jimmie Clay, Springfield.
Hutchings, Alvin Dale, Sparta.
Jacobs, Dannie Dick, Luray.
Jones, John Hubert, Nashville.
Jones, Sam Raymond, Knoxville.
Keen, Jasper Lee, Nashville.
Kennedy, William Henry, Memphis.
King, Lonnie Ralph, Memphis.
Land, Larry Adrian, Brownsville.
Lea, Fred Stanley, Chattanooga.
Lightford, Willie Junior, Nashville.
Linson, Robert Wylie, Memphis.
Lumley, Donald Richard, Knoxville.
Lunsford, James Robert, Ridgley.
Mason, Robert, Greeneville.
McCullough, Jerry Wendell, Covington.
McKinney, Charles Michael, Bristol.
McLemore, James Robert, Knoxville.
McRee, John Henry, Memphis.
Merrell, Lowell Howard, Faxon.
Midcalf, Thomas Edward, Jackson.
Miles, Stephen Lee, Bon Aqua.
Miller, Wayne Terry, Memphis.
Morgan, James Raymond, Memphis.
Murphey, Douglas Wayne, Springfield.
Murphy, B. L., Jr., Smithville.
Naylor, George Edward, Chattanooga.
Nicastro, Charles Edward, Memphis.
Nowlin, Charles Douglas, Memphis.
Orr, Jimmie Ray, Miston.
Pace, James Ralph, Memphis.
Parrott, Oscar Robert, Maryville.
Petty, John Robert, Jr., Gallatin.
Reed, Jackie Kenneth, Dayton.
Reed, Roger Dale, Rossville.
Reeder, Ronnie Ellis, Smithville.
Reyes, Douglas Cooper, Memphis.
Reynolds, John David, Daisy.
Richardson, Eugene P., Jr., Memphis.
Rivers, Jettie, Jr., Nashville.
Roberts, Charles Camille, Newport.
Rollins, Edwin Charles, Memphis.
Ross, William Sidney, Jr., Memphis.
Simpson, John Harrison, Loudon.
Singleton, Walter Keith, Memphis.
Sluder, Donald Ted, Mountain City.
Smith, Walter Lewis, Memphis.
Sprinkles, Wilford Leslie, Nashville.
Strausser, Paul Joseph, Millington.
Sullivan, Stanley Houston, Fayetteville.
Sutton, Jack Lenn, Crossville.
Taylor, Tyrone, Nashville.
Tipsy, Haywood Wade, Jr., Chattanooga.
Tucker, Thomas Cecil, Chattanooga.
Warner, Thomas Allison, Jr., Knoxville.
Voiles, Gasper Allen, Armathwaite.
Walker, John Henry, Jr., Chattanooga.
Washington, Larry Edward, Arlington.
Watkins, Charles Emanuel, Memphis.
Williams, Dorsey Burwin, Johnson City.
Williams, Reuben Charles, Altamont.
Williams, Robert D., Jr., Fayetteville.
Williams, William Jack, Elizabethton.
Wilson, Harold Wendell, Johnson City.
Wiseman, Malcolm Richard, Arlington.
Wooliver, Charles William, Knoxville.
Wright, Melvin Roy, Knoxville.

Navy

Gibbs, Michael Gerald, Del Rio.
Hill, Tommy Edward, Knoxville.
McCarter, Thomas Luther, Knoxville.
Sims, Frederick Augustas, Memphis.
Tuck, Hubert, Jr., Lenoir, City.

TEXAS

Army

Able, David Floyd, Fort Worth.
Adams, Ted Wane, Houston.
Aguilan, Armando, El Paso.
Aguilar, Robert, San Antonio.
Aguirre, Arthur Cecilio, Killeen.
Allen, James Louis, Beaumont.
Allen, John Willis, Houston.
Allen, Keith Wesley, Athens.
Allen, Terry De La Mesa, Jr., El Paso.
Almendariz, Samuel, Mc Allen.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Alvarez, Julian Martinez, Mc Allen.
Andrews, William Larry, Center.
Bailey, Roy Dee, Fort Worth.
Banks, James R., Dallas.
Barchak, Johnnie F. Jr., San Antonio.
Barr, Wilma J., Dallas.
Bartley, Howard Lynn, Cahoma.
Bass, Joe Harrell, Houston.
Bateman, Willard Thurman, Bullard.
Batson, Michael Olan, Lamarque.
Bean, James Francis, Garland.
Bell, Lewis Douglas, Fort Worth.
Beltran, Anastacio Hernand, Elgin.
Benson, Guye Raymond, Kemp.
Bermea, Victor D., Dhanis.
Berry, David Loyall, Houston.
Best, Hugh Victor, Waco.
Bevels, Leonard Leroy, Sherman.
Bills, Rufus Wilson, Sweetwater.
Bird, Michael De Verne, Llano.
Blackburn, Jerry Edward, Bonham.
Blackmon, Edward Gee, Austin.
Blair, Donald Ray, Canyon.
Blake, L. C., Hemphill.
Blalock, Walter Rogers, Big Springs.
Boggs, David Leonard, Odessa.
Bonin, Bobby Joe, Pasadena.
Booth, Roy Robert, Killeen.
Boyd, James P., London.
Boyle, Richard Eugene, San Antonio.
Bradshaw, Faybert Ray, Corpus Christi.
Bramlet, Willie Joe, Brownfield.
Braswell, Bobby Joe, Paris.
Bridges, Cecil Benny, Carthage.
Briscoe, Louie Don, Jr., Aransas Pass.
Brooks, Maurice, Mexia.
Broumley, Terry Hugh, Dallas.
Brown, Fred Jr., Fort Worth.
Brown, Gerald Austin, Fort Worth.
Brown, James Ronald, Tennessee Colony.
Brown, Robert Ray, Plano.
Bruce, Sammy Bryan, San Antonio.
Brumley, Johnny Edward, Wichita Falls.
Buckner, Robert Olen Jr., Irving.
Burks, Leroy, Jr., San Angelo.
Burns, John D. Jr., Broaddus.
Busenlehner, Richard Thoma, Rowena.
Butler, Albert, Tyler.
Butler, Henry, Dallas.
Byford, Larry Stephen, Center.
Caldwell, Merlin Francis, Pasadena.
Canada, Sam Jr., Coupland.
Cantu, Ernesto Soliz, Encino.
Caraway, Thomas Glenn, Farmersville.
Castillo, Erasmo Camargo, San Antonio.
Caston, James Calvin, Weslaco.
Caver, John Wayne, Longview.
Cervantez, Juan Jose, Carrizo Springs.
Chadwick, Kenneth Ray, Fort Worth.
Chappell, Daniel L., Pittsburg.
Chavez, Ruben G., Robstown.
Cherry, James L., Angleton.
Chitwood, Roy Duke, Houston.
Clark, Earl Glenn, Denton.
Clement, Gregory C., Galveston.
Clifcorn, James Richard, Dallas.
Cockrell, Wilbert R., Houston.
Coleman, Bobby Walter, Houston.
Collier, Charley Holton, Mount Pleasant.
Collins, William Elice, Jr., Houston.
Condon, Russell William, Humble.
Conn, Ronald Ray, Tyler.
Contreras, Pablo Guereca, San Antonio.
Cooks, Melvin Eugene, Waco.
Cooper, Robert Wesley, Colorado City.
Cormier, Francis Joseph, Houston.
Corzine, Bobby Wayne, Bonham.
Cottin, Leland Richard, Dallas.
Coy, Ben, Houston.
Cribbs, James Wesley, Dallas.
Croley, James Robert, Amarillo.
Crossland, Richard Guinn, Elsa.
Crum, Robert H., Jr., Houston.
Cruz, Richard Perez, Freer.
Culver, Dick Davis, Austin.
Davila, Teodoro, Edinburg.
Davis, Marvin Homer, Dallas.
Davis, Robert Orliff, Colorado City.
Davis, Willie Edward. Houston.

TEXAS—continued

Army

De Bault, Joe Robert, Pharr.
De La Paz, Hilario, Jr., Houston.
De Leon, Mario Ontivero, San Antonio.
De Loach, Lloyd Dwain, Dallas.
Deere, Donald Thorpe, Snyder.
Dehart, Donnie Ray, Houston.
Deland, Henry Harrison, Abilene.
Demory, Raymond Frank, Vernon.
Dennis, Paul Jones, Bronson.
Devoe, Michael Eugene, Houston.
Dodson, Freddy Dean, Marshall.
Doose, Gary Lee, Houston.
Dozier, Jerald Leon, Phillips.
Drewry, Nolan Franklin, San Antonio.
Drynan, Arthur W., Baytown.
Ducote, Lonnie Joseph, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Dunn, Teddy Rex, Wichita Falls.
Dupre, Norman Lee, Orange.
Dworaczyk, Wallace Stanley, Yorktown.
Dyer, Irby, III, Midland.
Eaden, William Henry, Houston.
Easley, Leonard Eugene, Brady.
Edwards, Kinneth Glenn, Wheeler.
Eiber, Robert Allan, El Paso.
Elledge, Don Thomas, Mabank.
Elliott, Thomas McClure, Dallas.
Emerton, Willis Wayne, Dallas.
Enmon, David J., La Marque.
Escamilla, Jose, San Antonio.
Esparza, Felix, Jr., San Antonio.
Faggett, Charles Earl, Odessa.
Farley, Robert Jerry, Sr., Houston.
Fendley, Joel David, Richmond.
Ferguson, Dewey Lindon, Marble Falls.
Fielden, Wayne Samuel, Sherman.
Fike, Ronald Edward, Burnet.
Findley, Robert Dennis, Houston.
Fisher, James Louis, Dallas.
Fitts, Charles Milton, San Angelo.
Flores, Antonio, Jr., Needville.
Floyd, Melvin Franklin, Amarillo.
Forsbach, Ronald Carl, Waco.
Foster, Marvin Ray, Aubrey.
Fox, Edward Harold, Plainview.
Fritts, Frederic William, Beaumont.
Frost, Woody Joe, Maud.
Furphy, Kent Palmer, Amarillo.
Gabriel, Herbert James, Port Arthur.
Garcia, Alejandro, Jr., Laredo.
Garcia, Andres, Spur.
Garcia, Arturo, Mercedes.
Garcia, George Arriaga, New Braunfels.
Garcia, Henry R., Rockport.
Garcia, Heriberto Arnaldo, Laredo.
Garcia, Juan, San Antonio.
Garcia, Oscar, Falfurrias.
Garcia, Pedro Incarnacion, Corpus Christi.
Garcia, Robert, San Antonio.
Garrett, Eugene, Jr., Houston.
Garrett, Norman Ray, Longview.
Garzia, Antonio Guerra, Jr., Jourdanton.
Garza, Eliazar Efrien, San Antonio.
Garza, Francisco, Corpus Christi.
Graza, Henry Allen, San Antonio.
Garza, Jose, Jr., San Antonio.
Gentry, David Anthony, Knox City.
George, Michael Dean, Dallas.
Gibbs, Raymond Andrew, Houston.
Gilmore, Kenneth Dee, Austin.
Gipson, Gaylon, Bivins.
Gladden, Michael Jay, Odessa.
Glasscock, Carl Lee, Lindale.
Glasscock, David Lewis, Rockwall.
Gober, Charles Wesley, Jr., Waco.
Goldhagen, Bobby Gene, Waco.
Gomez, Raymundo, Uvalde.
Gonzales, Manuel Martinez, Pecos.
Gonzales, Santiago Rodrigu, San Antonio.
Gonzalez, Amador L., San Diego.
Gonzalez, Benito Reyna, Bishop.
Gonzalez, Jesus, Robstown.
Gonzalez, Juan Antonio, Uvalde.
Gonzalez, Juan Jose, Laredo.
Gonzalez, Rodolfo Guadalup, Laredo.
Goodwin, Charles Ray, Galena Park.
Greathouse, Julius, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Green, Autry, Corsicana.
Greensage, Roy Lee, Marlin.
Grisby, Don Lee, Houston.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Guentzel, Larry Ray, Georgetown.
Guerrero, Jesse, San Antonio.
Guerrero, Wiley, Austin.
Gutierrez, George, Jr., Harlingen.
Gutierez, Jose Antonio, San Antonio.
Gutierrez, Raul Campos, San Antonio.
Hackworth, Dwight Lee, San Antonio.
Hailey, Oddie C., Texarkana.
Hale, Robert Lawrence, Baytown.
Halford, Michael Dean, Breckenridge.
Hall, Bruce,, Midland.
Hall, Jackie Burl, Abilene.
Hallam, Durwood Michael, San Antonio.
Hamlin, William Lloyd, Palacios.
Hammond, Earl Newsom, Kilgore.
Hardy, Abraham Lincoln, Houston.
Hargrave, Kenneth Lee, Dayton.
Hargrove, James Weldon, Rotan.
Harkins, Robert Charles, New Boston.
Harlow, Clarence Louis, Irving.
Harris, Elton Odis, Eldorado.
Harson, Edward Earl, Jr., Victoria.
Havemann, James Edward, Houston.
Haynes, Martis Leon, Vanderbilt.
Heflin, John Darracott, Arlington.
Heinen, Edgar Paul, Pipe Creek.
Helems, Kenneth Eugene, Harlingen.
Henry, David Franklin, Hurst.
Hernandez, Rudolph Villalp, San Antonio.
Herrera, Jesse Emil, Cuero.
Herrera, Ramiro, Jr., Eagle Pass.
Herrington, Charles Edward, Texas City.
Herst, William Donald, Jr., El Paso.
Hess, Zan, Wichita Falls.
Hicklen, Graham Ray, Tyler.
Hidalgo, James Ybarra, Uvalde.
Hilliard, Joseph Rollins, Bay City.
Hinch, James Gary, Wichita Falls.
Hines, Ronald Dickerson, Amarillo.
Hinojosa, Fernando Amyo, Yorktown.
Hobbs, Gary Lynn, Corpus Christi.
Hockaday, Jimmy Leon, Mount Pleasant.
Hodges, Lee Roy, Memphis.
Holland, Robert Low, Golden.
Hollandsworth, Eddie Dean, Big Spring.
Holloway, Richard Alton, Longview.
Holly, Charlie Delno, Tennessee Colony.
Hopkins, Robert Louis, Beaumont.
Horace, Albert C., Jr., Groveton.
Horn, Emmett Harvey, Vidor.
Horton, Harry Wade, Jr., La Marque.
Houston, Thomas Eugene, Terrell.
Howard, Walter Lee, College Station.
Howell, A. T., Justin.
Hubbard, W. D., Houston.
Hudson, Jerry Douglas, Bridgeport.
Hudson, Raymond Hoyt, San Antonio.
Hughes, James Oliver, Overton.
Hughes, Jerry Lynn, Center.
Ibrom, Adrian Joseph, Cuero.
Jackson, Alpha Ray, Houston.
James, Bobby Joe, Houston.
James, Gary Lynn, Santa Anna.
James, Kenneth Earl, Dallas.
Jenkins, Vernell, Powderly.
Johnson, Carl Thomas, Houston.
Johnson, Claude L., Houston.
Johnson, Donald Ray, Waco.
Johnson, James Louis, Gilmer.
Johnson, Robert Alan, Houston.
Johnson, Taylor Douglas, Joaquin.
Johnson, W. C., Tyler.
Johnston, Charles Kenneth, Clarendon.
Jolivette, Mathew L., Houston.
Jones, Harvey Wayne, Fort Worth.
Jones, Lemen Earl, Tatum.
Jordan, Chester Gale, Arlington.
Jordan, Teddy Roosevelt, Columbus.
Jumper, Stephen Franklin, Dallas.
Jurek, Dalmer Dolan, Caldwell.
Justus, Roger Gale, Memphis.
Kasprzyk, Gerald Benedict, Falls City.
Keel, David Lattimore, Houston.
Kennedy, Judd Wayne, Jasper.
Kilgore, Charles Howard, Baytown.
Kindleberger, Harold Paul, El Paso.
King, Bobby, San Antonio.
Kunz, Anthony Edmond, Kerrville.
Lane, James Everett, Odessa.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Langley, Jody Mac, Waxahachie.
Lasher, Richard Allen, Arlington.
Lawrence, Earl Dawson, Palestine.
Lawson, Johnnie Carl, Jr., Willis.
Leal, Fernando, Alvarado.
Lee, Henry C., Kingsville.
Letbetter, Bobby Weldon, Goldthwaite.
Levingston, James Arthur, Mexia.
Lewis, Frederick Harry, San Antonio.
Lightfoot, Belvin, La Marque.
Lile, Joe Charles, II, Galveston.
Lindsey, Jack Wayne, Houston.
Lofton, Glen Dorse, Lyford.
Lofton, Ronald Harry, Fort Worth.
Lopez, Jose, Houston.
Lopez, Paulino Gutirrez, Midland.
Lovato, Joe, Jr., Lubbock.
Lozano, Jose Reymundo, Roma.
Lozano, Richard Bill, Kerrville.
Luna, Francisco, Victoria.
Lute, Harry Gene, San Antonio.
Lynn, Adrian Louis, Jr., Eagle Pass.
Lyons, Joe L., Terrell.
Maberry, Calvin Dwight, Sylvester.
Mable, Washington Carver, Brenham.
Mack, Douglas Dulane, Amarillo.
Magallan, Noe, Mission.
Mahana, Vanny Chris, Vidor.
Mangold, Carl Joseph, Castroville.
Mansfield, Clayton John, Jr., Fort Bliss.
Maples, Francis Leroy, La Feria.
Marby, Donald Henry, Rusk.
Markos, George, Fort Worth.
Martinez, Evaristo, III, Abilene.
Martinez, Gilivaldo Armand, Lamesa.
Martinez, Guadalupe, Laredo.
Martinez, Isidro, Mercedes.
Martinez, Robert R., Houston.
Maxwell, Everett Lee, Garland.
May, Alfred Byron, Dallas.
Mayer, Thomas J., Dallas.
Mayer, Walter Christian, San Antonio.
Mayfield, Jimmy Gene, Fort Worth.
McBeth, Ronald Gene, Abilene.
McCain, Johnny Wayne, Ore City.
McCarter, Jimmy Carl, Waco.
McClatchy Percy W., Houston.
McCord, Burton Kyle, Brady.
McDavis, Calvin Lee, Oakwood.
McGee, Pat Weldon, Arlington.
McGhee, George William, Lockney.
McKinley, Paul Blount, Copperas Cove.
McLemore, David Eugene, Fort Worth.
McNeil, Harold Loyd, Mount Pleasant.
Means, John A., San Antonio.
Medina, Carlos, San Antonio.
Mendez, Erineo Mendez, Poteet.
Mendez, Julian, Wharton.
Mican, Allen Stanley, El Campo.
Michulka, Frank George, East Bernard.
Middleton, Homer Ray, Houston.
Miller, Ronald Alan, Wichita Falls.
Milligan, Gene Charles, Dallas.
Mindach, William R., Corpus Christi.
Miranda, Filiberto Guiller, El Paso.
Mitchell, John Edwin, Tyler.
Modisette, Thomas Glenn, Irving.
Montemayor, Frank De Leon, Houston.
Moore, Dean, Big Spring.
Morado, Antonio, San Benito.
Morris, Hoover, Lufkin.
Morton, Billy Wayne, Wichita Falls.
Morton, Jerry Wayne, Deweyville.
Mosher, Harvey Milford Jr., Austin.
Moudry, Charles Ray, Houston.
Moya, Hernando Sanchez, Woodsboro.
Munoz, Domingo, Odessa.
Munoz, Guillermo, El Paso.
Munoz, Juan, San Antonio.
Murphy, Alfred Walker, San Antonio.
Murphy, Frank Monroe, Dallas.
Murray, Thomas E., Fort Worth.
Newman, Erman Milford Jr., El Paso.
Nickerson, Curtis Carl, Mineral Wells.
Norwood, Hugh, Orange.
Noviski, Bernis J., Waverly.
Nuckles, C. Gregory, Rockport.
Ochoa, Robert, Corpus Christi.
Ornelas, Benjamin, San Antonio.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Overshine, George Edward, Lufkin.
Oviedo, Higinio Ovalle, Raymondville.
Pack, Junior B., Canadian.
Padilla, Michael Raymond, Richardson.
Page, John Willie, Houston.
Pantoja, Cipriano J. Jr., Houston.
Paredez, Augustin Chavez, Big Springs.
Parker, Carl Sylvester, Hutchinson.
Parks, Joe, Cedar Lane.
Patrick, J. V., Buna.
Peeples, Hardy Winston, Alice.
Pena, Joe Jr., Plainview.
Pennell, Arvin Douglas, Nederland.
Perez, Benito, Corpus Christi.
Perez, Daniel Flores Jr., Mathis.
Perez, Frederico, San Diego.
Perez, Homero, Laredo.
Perez, Raymond, Fort Worth.
Perry, Carroll Wayne, Belton.
Perry, R. C., Jr., Dallas.
Person, David Eugene, Kirbyville.
Peteet, Charles Leonard, Kaufman.
Peterson, Kenneth Aubrey, Roanoke.
Pettway, Patrick Henry II, Tyler.
Phillips, Donnell, Smithville.
Pierce, William Wesley, Belton.
Platt, Billy Wayne, La Porte.
Plummer, Herbert, Jr., Oakwood.
Polendo, Raynaldo, San Antonio.
Pomeroy, Deane Alva, Texarkana.
Poore, Leonard Burton, Beaumont.
Poston, Raymond Roger, Kilgore.
Poston, William Thomas, Dallas.
Powell, Waylen Lee, Lubbock.
Price, Elvin, San Antonio.
Queen, Gary Paul, Corpus Christi.
Ragsdale, Robert Louis, San Antonio.
Ramirez, Diego, Jr., El Paso.
Ramos, Jose, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Randall, Garland Jerone, Houston.
Ray, Roland Wooldriedge, Houston.
Ray, Rufus, Odessa.
Reagan, Norman Rex, Wingate.
Reeves, Alvis Oren, White Oak.
Reeves, Dennis Lee, Beaumont.
Rhodes, Timothy V., Forney.
Richard, Donald Wayne, Houston.
Richardson, Donald Loye, Corsicana.
Richardson, Harry Tracy, Jr., Daingerfield.
Rios, Teofilo Carmone, Brownsville.
Robbins, Henry Earl, Houston.
Roberson, Jimmy Don, Plainview.
Roberts, Charles Alan, El Paso.
Roberts, John Allen, Dallas.
Robinson, Gordon Lee, Old Glory.
Robledo, Efrain Julio, Fort Worth.
Rocha, Ruben Lopez, Agua Dulce.
Rodriguez, Arturo, McAllen.
Rodriguez, Elias Rangel, Austin.
Rodriguez, Jesse Nicklus, Houston.
Rodriguez, Vicente Quintan, Pharr.
Rogers, Jimmie Dale, Mesquite.
Ruiz, Richard Peter, Victoria.
Rush, Claude Benjamin, Jr., Beaumont.
Russell, James Leroy, Anson.
Ryza, Wayne David, Houston.
Saenz, Alfredo Jose, Corpus Christi.
Saenz, Rodolfo Andres, Mercedes.
Saldana, Fermin, Jr., San Antonio.
Salinas, Robert Longoria, Pettus.
Samaniego, Roberto, El Paso.
Samaripa, Jesse, Manor.
Sanchez, Wilberto Cabrera, Harlingen.
Sandoval, Evaristo, Brownfield.
Sapp, Freddy Lee, Silsbee.
Sapp, Stanley L., Amarillo.
Sauceda, Joe A., Raymondville.
Schmidt, Dale W., Jr., Houston.
Schoppaul, Robert Earnest, Roanoke.
Scott, Michael Frederick, San Antonio.
Secrest, Jack McCombs, Jr., San Antonio.
Seilheimer, Howard Allen, Brenham.
Sharp, Michael Anthony, Houston.
Sharp, Thomas Boyd, Belton.
Sharp, Valdez, McLean.
Siegert, William Fry, Duncanville.
Simmons, Jake A., Baytown.
Siner, Wallace Kingsley, El Paso.
Skelton, Paul Darrell, II, Waco.
Slade, James L., Jr., De Witt County.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Slusser, Harlan Ray, Burkburnett.
Smith, Lonnie Leo, Terrell.
Snowden, Ben David, Georgetown.
Soliz, Rolando Luis, San Antonio.
Sonnier, Albert Wilbur, Baytown.
Sosa, Secundino Garcia, Jr., Dallas.
Sosa, Victoriano Perez, Jr., New Braunfels.
Sowell, Coties R., San Angustine.
Spangler, Richard Allen, Big Spring.
Sparks, Charles Pierce, Killean.
Spier, Harry Diwain, Tyler.
Springer, Louis Daniel, Dallas.
Starnes, Milburn Hines, Littlefield.
Starns, Dan Clifton, Jr., Ft. Worth.
Steed, Jerry Lyne, Gainesville.
Stegall, Douglas Wayne, Graham.
Stephens, Andrew Lewis, Livingston.
Stephens, Clyde Wayne, Wichita Falls.
Steptoe, Raymond, Navasota.
Stilley, John Wayne, Houston.
Stoll, George Ludwig, Pasadena.
Stone, Byron Clark, Houston.
Stroud, Sanders Key, II, Corpus Christi.
Swancy, James Andrew, Mesquite.
Swindell, Bobby Dale, Dallas.
Tamayo, Joel, Houston.
Tarin, Eliseo Espinoza, San Antonio.
Tarkenton, James C., III, Fort Hood.
Terrazas, Nicholas E., San Antonio.
Terrell, Louis Wayne, Victoria.
Thomas, L. V., Jr., Amarillo.
Thomas, Lewis McCoy, Big Spring.
Thomas, Theodore Dave, Jr., Houston.
Thompson, Charlie Earl, Dallas.
Thompson, Wayland Kent, Monahans.
Threadgill, David Ellis, Perryton.
Thurman, Larry Preston, Dumas.
Tijerina, Jose Benigno, McAllen.
Till, Ralph Gary, Corpus Christi.
Tobias, Billy Lee, Houston.
Torres, Ignacio, Jr., Laredo.
Torres, Louis Ferndez, Houston.
Torres, Ramon Hernandez, Aransas Pass.
Torres, Reynaldo Sandoval, Uvalde.
Trevino, Manuel Vaillido, San Antonio.
Trevino, Rodolfo, Alice.
Tritico, Michael Joseph, Houston.
Tuch, Jimmie, Gonzales.
Tucker, Otto Dale, Fort Worth.
Twinn, Louis Bell, Sr., Victoria.
Urbanovsky, Robert Eugene, Houston.
Ursery, Michael Terry, Dallas.
Valenzuela, Juan, McAllen.
Vega, Angel, Woodsboro.
Vilano, Evaristo, Corpus Christi.
Villa, Raul, Laredo.
Villarreal, Johnny, Victoria.
Vineyard, George Mickel, San Antonio.
Vrba, Raymond Joe, Jr., Waco.
Walker, Hollis Allen, Woodville.
Walker, J. C., Jr., Hemphill.
Walker, Ralph Bamford, II, Nacogooches.
Walker, Robert Donald, Dallas.
Wallace, James Earl, Tyler.
Wallace, Jerald D., Cisco.
Warren, Willie Craig, Crockett.
Washington, James Bell, Houston.
Watson, Billy Frank, Sherman.
Watson, Carnell Earl, Houston.
Weeks, George Dale, Cross Plains.
Wellman, Kenyon Gary, Richardson.
Whitlock, Alan D., Houston.
Whitlock, Halley Don, Gladewater.
Wilkerson, Larry Wayne, Beaumont.
Williams, Eddie Earl, Houston.
Williams, Hillard Evans, Fort Worth.
Williams, Larry Lee, Austin.
Williams, Vance George, Dallas.
Williamson, Thomas Darrell, Palestine.
Wilson, Rodney Joseph, Texarkana.
Winfrey, Johnnie Paul, Bay City.
Winters, John Lane, Galveston.
Witchet, Fred Douglas, Houston.
Witzkoski, Billy Joe, Houston.
Wood, Johnny Mack, Houston.
Woodmansee, Ronny Louis, Austin.
Wright, Arthur P., Sherman.
Wright, Kenneth Harold, Crane.
Yates, Charles Michael, Dallas.
Zuniga, Guadalupe Natal, San Antonio.

TEXAS—continued

Air Force

Barnett, Robert Russell, Gladewater.
Blakeley, Roy James, Rotan.
Clay, Eugene Lunsford, Arlington.
Cooper, George Grady, Wichita Falls.
Cox, Ommie Truman, Jr., Weatherford.
England, Tonie Lee, Jr., Palestine.
Fahey, Joseph Michael, Jr., Houston.
Hawley, Donald Rey, Forth Worth.
Hill, Richard Dale, Houston.
James, Rufus La Dell, Forth Worth.
Marlowe, Daniel Paul, San Antonio.
Martin, Sammy Arthur, Bryan.
Matteson, Glenn, Dallas.
Medina, Raymond, San Antonio.
Mower, John Wayne, Wichita Falls.
Neal, Burnett, Jr., Dallas.
Paradise, Charles Alonzo, Irving.
Poole, Ronald Felton, San Antonio.
Salinas, Mercedes Perez, Mission.
Shaughnessy, John F., Jr., Houston.
Smith, Donald Clayton, McCamey.
Terry, Condon Hunter, Dallas.
Thompson, Victor Hugo, III, Houston.
Vasquez, Ephraim, San Antonio.
Wadsworth, Dean Amick, Clarendon.
Wall, Arlon Daniel, Jr., Irving.
Wall, Jerry Mack, Nacogdoches.
Ward, Charles Dwight, Portland.
Weatherby, Jack Wilton, Fort Worth.
Wiley, Frank David, Dallas.
Wranosky, Robert Wayne, San Antonio.

Marine Corps

Adams, Terrance Dean, Waco.
Aguilar, Pedro Ramirez, Odessa.
Aguilar, Reimundo, San Antonio.
Alewine, Lemuel Lenoel, Thornton.
Almanza, Juan, San Antonio.
Almonzar, Ignacio, Jr., San Elizario.
Alonzo, Julian, San Antonio.
Alvarez, Guadalupe Masias, Donna.
Alvarez, Robert, Clint.
Amador, Ernest Baldonado, San Antonio.
Angermiller, James Allen, Corpus Christi.
Angerstein, Michael Edward, Carrollton.
Anzaldua, Oscar, Raymondville.
Avalos, Alberto Angel, Brownsville.
Ayala, Eduardo, El Paso.
Baker, Wayne Roland, Ovalo.
Barrera, Gilberto, Alice.
Batson, Robert Filmore, Houston.
Becerra, Javier, Weslaco.
Bell, Doyle Lynn, Hull.
Beltram, Augustine, Jr., Austin.
Bennett, Marvin Dale, Dallas.
Beran, Frank Henry, III, Galveston.
Berry, Jack Albert, Lubbock.
Bice, Quinton Morgan, Texas City.
Bolden, Carl Eugene, Gonzales.
Booth, John Bingham, Galveston.
Botello, Juan Jose, O'donnell.
Brannon, Phillip Arthur, Odessa.
Brown, Clarence Arthur, Bloomington.
Brown, Clinton Ray, Huntsville.
Brown, Dewey Hearrell, Jr., Houston.
Brown, Donald Gene, Alvin.
Brown, James Garland, Gatesville.
Bunte, Willie Earl, Austin.
Byars, Earnest Ray, Houston.
Byler, Stephen Hawley, Fort Worth.
Byrd, Arthur Malcolm, Houston.
Caballero, Gilberto, Jr., San Antonio.
Caballero, Jose Luis, Harlingen.
Cadell, Ernest Woody, Jr., Azle.
Cain, William Michael, Irving.
Calabria, David Michael, Dallas.
Callison, Donald Joseph, Houston.
Cantu, Refugio Jose, San Antonio.
Carter, James Douglas, Jr., Baytown.
Castanon, Alfredo, Corpus Christi.
Cavazos, Martin, Sebastian.
Cerna, Marciso Reza, Jr., San Antonio.
Cheek, James William, Fort Worth.
Cochran, Patrick Sheldon, Del Rio.
Comeaux, Joseph Bernille, Winnie.
Connacher, Ronnie Edward, Houston.
Cordova, John Barelas, Houston.
Corkill, Robert Arnold, San Benito.
Courson, Charles Truitt, Tyler.
Crouch, Jimmy Leeland, Houston.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Crump, Charles Alvin, Greenville.
Cuellar, Julian Castillo, San Antonio.
Curiel, Sam Trinidad, Abilene.
Cutbirth, Kendell Dwayne, Midland.
Dalgliesh, Mark Anthony, Amarillo.
Darrett, Tyrone, Houston.
Davis, Clifford Gordon, Amarillo.
Davis, Edgar Sylvester, Odessa.
Davis, John Sevier, San Antonio.
Debusk, Ray B., Jr., Odessa.
Dennis, Dan Michael, Houston.
Dixon, William Alfred, Jr., Alvin.
Driscoll, Victor Michael, Bellaire.
Eaglin, John Henry, Beaumont.
Eaton, Bobby Lynn, Odessa.
Edington, Paul Richard, Dallas.
Evans, Robert David, Grand Prairie.
Fernandez, Reynaldo Saline, Odessa.
Fleming, Sidney Wade, Lamarque.
Flores, Jose Maria, Harlingen.
Flores, Raul, Corpus Christi.
Flores, Rayes Cisneros, Abilene.
Flores, Victor, Jr., Austin.
Flynn, Michael Frank, Leander.
French, Douglas Robert, South Houston.
Gallardo, Armando, Galveston.
Garcia, Abel D., Jr., San Antonio.
Garcia, Francisco, Brownsville.
Garcia, Miguel, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Garcia, Richard, Galveston.
Garner, Rickey Dean, Dallas.
Garza, Margarito, Bishop.
Gatlin, Ivan Webster, Houston.
Gaytan, Edward Ray, San Marcos.
Gibbs, Samuel David, Wichita Falls.
Gilbert, Franklin Delano R., Orange.
Gillespie, Joe, San Antonio.
Gipson, F. G., Jr., Tyler.
Gober, Ronald Bernard, Dallas.
Goggan, Herbert Gary, Houston.
Gomez, Jose Manuel, Edinburg.
Gonzales, Edwardo Jose, Sinton.
Gonzales, Roy, Jr., San Antonio.
Gonzales, Jose Jesus, El Paso.
Gonzales, Pablo Rene, Eagle Pass.
Gonzales, Rodolfo Marciano, Harlingen.
Griggs, Brent Ike, Beaumont.
Grimes, Gary Dempsy, Houston.
Grizzle, Wendell Ray, Ralls.
Guerrero, Richard, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Guillen, Gilberto Luis, Jr., El Paso.
Gullett, Gordon Eldon, Brownsville.
Gunn, Charley Edward, Dallas.
Guthrie, Frank Lynn, Azle.
Hack, Benny Glen, Waco.
Hadnot, Richard Lee, Newton.
Hadnott, Gary Anderson, Houston.
Hardwick, William Hixson, Dallas.
Harris, William Thomas, Mesquite.
Hartman, Timothy James, Lockney.
Hatfield, Larry Dean, San Antonio.
Hawkins, Willie George, Jr., Waco.
Hawthorne, Marvin Dale, Stinnett.
Heavin, Willis Ray, Fort Worth.
Hernandez, Marcos, El Paso.
Hernandez, Richard, San Antonio.
Hernandez, Robert Reyes, San Antonio.
Herrera, Francisco, Abilene.
Hilliard, William Earl, Houston.
Hinsley, Earnest Richard, Blossom.
Hochmuth, Bruno Arthur, Houston.
Hoelscher, John Michael, Houston.
Holdbrooks, Thomas Bernard, McKinney.
Holguin, Jose, Jr., El Paso.
Hollingsworth, Don Ray, Fort Worth.
Holt, Billy Joe, Cameron.
Hotchkiss, Leroy Case, III, Pasadena.
Howell, Robert Malichi, Jr., Mesquite.
Huckabee, James Edward, Lewisville.
Humphrey, Charles Everett, Anahuac.
Ibarra, Mike Gomez, Houston.
Ituarte, Roberto, El Paso.
Jacobs, Bobby Joe, Henderson.
Jarrell, Randall David, Odessa.
Jennings, Timothy Paul, Houston.
Jennings, William A., III, Corpus Christi.
Jimenez, Antonio, Waco.
Jimenez, Joseph Arthur, Houston.
Jinks, William Donald, Bay City.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Johnson, Denny Lee, Weinert.
Johnson, William, Dallas.
Joy, Raymond Stanley, Jr., Abernathy.
Keal, Cleveland, Jr., Port Arthur.
Kelley, Daniel Thomas, Fort Worth.
Kempner, Marion Lee, Galveston.
Kerr, J. L., Jr., Houston.
Keyes, Scotty Lee, Arlington.
King, Thomas Keith, Commerce.
Knapp, Richard, Port Lavaca.
Knight, Thomas Wilford, Dallas.
Lancaster, Eddie Lynn, Silsbee.
Lankford, Walter Merle, Jr., Mission.
Laurel, Desiderio C., Jr., Corpus Christi.
Lawrence, Johnnie Lee, Kleberg.
Lee, Jerry Dwain, Grand Prairie.
Lee, Marion Leonard, Jr., Houston.
Lee, Nathanael, Austin.
Leos, Leonardo, Corpus Christi.
Lewis, Converse Rising, III, College Station.
Lewis, Earl Leroy, Odessa.
Limon, Andres, Vernon.
Limones, Jesus Mario, Del Rio.
Lira, Alfred George, San Antonio.
Liserio, Joe Frank, Houston.
Little, Garland Paul, Longview.
Lockhart, Harry James, Kilgore.
Lopez, Augustine, Jr., El Paso.
Lopez, Manual, San Antonio.
Lopez, Richard, San Antonio.
Louis, Robert Yougete, Jr., San Antonio.
Lummus, Franklin Jack, Atlanta.
Mahan, Darrel Uldric, McKinney.
Majors, James Ray, Clute.
Mansir, Paul Wayne, Fort Worth.
Mantooth, Jimmie Hugh, San Antonio.
Martinez, Pedro, Mercedes.
Mathews, Clyde, Jr., Whiteface.
McElhanon, Warren Shelby, Beaumont.
McShan, Doyle Allen, Houston.
McWright, Edward Arthur, Dallas.
McIntyre, Robert Lewis, Houston.
Medlin, John William, Houston.
Miller, Robert Warren, Jr., San Antonio.
Minton, Don Wayne, Vidor.
Mitchell, Michael Dennis, Houston.
Mixson, Joseph Gary, Buna.
Moneachi, David Keith, Garland.
Montez, Joe, Austin.
Morales, Benito, New Braunfels.
Moreno, Francisco Hernande, Harlingen.
Moreno, Joe, Austin.
Moreno, Jose Louis, Lubbock.
Morin, Silbano, Kenedy.
Moya, Joe, Bloomington.
Muller, Walter, Jr., Galveston.
Najar, Miguel Fernando, Houston.
Nelson, Harlan Claude, Dalhart.
New City, Theodore C., Jr., Corpus Christi.
New, Morris Dwaine, Austin.
Newman, Gary Ken, Fort Worth.
Nicholas, Paul Russell, Jr., Pasadena.
Niedecken, Raymond Alvis, Midland.
Noland, Jerry Lynn, Houston.
Northcutt, William Buckele, Longview.
Oldfield, James Stanley, Jr., Dallas.
Olvera, Adam Monsivais, Alice.
Ortiz, Melecio, Crystal City.
Osbon, Tommy Eugene, Amarillo.
Owen, Thurman Wayne, Wichita Falls.
Palacios, Oscar H., Jr., Dallas.
Perez, Anthony, Brownsville.
Perez, James Sanders, Dallas.
Perez, Raul Bautista, El Paso.
Perkins, Wallace Sam, Dallas.
Perry, Jackie Ray, Dallas.
Pesek, Thomas John, Jourdanton.
Peterson, Edgar Lewis, Jr., Abilene.
Pfeuffer, Ronald Howard, Kerrville.
Phelps, Herman Roy, Houston.
Pinson, Cloyde Cyris, Jr., Dallas.
Pool, Thomas John, Henderson.
Post, Daniel Zachary, Jr., Brownsville.
Powell, Robert Clyde, Dallas.
Predmore, David Martin, Dallas.
Price, Jhue Frank, Granger.
Qualls, Ted Wayne, Dallas.
Ramirez, Juan Jose, Houston.
Ramon, Eugene Dominguez, San Antonio.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Ramos, Edward, Clyde.
Ramos, Fidel, Jr., San Antonio.
Ratcliff, Roy, San Antonio.
Reed, Delma Lee, Trent.
Relf, William Charles, Dallas.
Remmers, Kenneth Lee, Kenedy.
Resendez, Augustine, San Antonio.
Reyes, Alfredo Vicente, El Paso.
Reyes, Peter C., Austin.
Reyner, David Elliot, Houston.
Riddle, Robert Thomas, El Paso.
Robbins, James Walter, Dallas.
Robinson, Leonard, Jr., Columbus.
Robinson, Walter R., Jr., La Pryor.
Rodriguez, Joel, Rio Grande.
Rodriguez, Juan Armando, Corpus Christi.
Rodriguez, Matias T., Jr., Eagle Pass.
Rogers, Daniel Gordon, Garland.
Ronje, Joe Luis, Corpus Christi.
Roper, Robert Clarence, Rule.
Rosas, Jose Antonio, Weslaco.
Rowell, David Lou, Amarillo.
Rudd, Robert Charles, Dallas.
Ruiz, Martin, Jr., San Antonio.
Samaniego, Joe Henry, Marfa.
Sanchez, Ernesto, Jr., Olton.
Sanchez, Javier Arturo E., Laredo.
Satterwhite, Dwight King, Corpus Christi.
Schoppe, Sherwin Crescent, San Antonio.
Schroeder, Joe Lawrence, Houston.
Scoggins, Royce Glenn, McKinney.
Serna, Philip Joseph, Houston.
Shiver, Charles, Jr., Wichita Falls.
Silva, Manuel, El Paso.
Silvee, Herman William, Galveston.
Simpson, Adam Ernest, Jr., Port Arthur.
Smith, Alfred John, Houston.
Smith, Mickel Melvin, Tulia.
Smith, Varde Weston, III, Irving.
Sosa, Jorge, Laredo.
Sparks, James Henry, Pasadena.
Spiller, Leroy, III, Galena Park.
Spratley, Glenn Eugene, Houston.
St. Clair, Leonard Ray, Beaumont.
Stephen, Virgil Lynn, Garland.
Stiles, Thomas Nelson, San Marcos.
Stoker, Huelyn Bernard, Dallas.
Strait, David Leon, Dallas.
Swinford, Frank Levi, III, Sweeny.
Talkington, Dennis Lee, Haltom City.
Tanner, Donald Jay, Fort Worth.
Tate, Anthony Gary, George.
Taylor, Jesse Allen, Austin.
Tharp, Jerry Donald, Kemp.
Thomas, David John, Dallas.
Thomas, Douglas McArthur, Hamilton.
Thomas, James Edward, Fort Worth.
Thomas, Jerry Lee, Sherman.
Thompson, Don Carthal, Jr., Beeville.
Thrasher, Larry Glen, Terrell.
Tienda, Daniel, Austin.
Tijerina, Homero Eluid, Edinburg.
Tinajero, Jose Antonio, El Paso.
Todd, Frederick Welton, Dallas.
Tolleson, Lyndol Earl, Houston.
Torres, Jose, Sinton.
Townsend, Charles Dwyne, Fort Worth.
Trejo, Miguel, Granger.
Tucker, Wesley Griffin, San Antonio.
Turn, Henry Lon, Jacksonville.
Tyrone, Willie Donald, Carbon.
Valdez, Gregorio, Jr., San Antonio.
Vale, Tony, Houston.
Vandewalle, Gregory Jerome, San Antonio.
Vanzandt, Ray Louis, Austin.
Vaughn, Gene, Big Springs.
Vieregge, Walter, III, Dallas.
Villa, Feliberto, Ingleside.
Vollmar, Sammie J., Fredericksburg.
Waites, Sherman Ray, Marlin Falls.
Waters, Glendon Lee, Dallas.
Watkins, James Lee, Longview
Weaver, Greg, Abilene.
West, David Richard, Hillsboro.
Westerfield, Frank Brown, Pasadena.
Wheat, Wendell Ray, El Paso.
White, Tommie Vaughn, Garland.
Whitten, Tommie Joe, Fort Worth.
Williams, Rufus Timonthy, Houston.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Wilson, Phillip Mark, Wolfforth.
Wilt, John William, Jr., La Marque.
Wimberly, Benny Earl, Marble Falls.
Withrow, Michael Dennis, Mesquite.
Yanez, Jesus, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Ybarra, Mario, Weslaco.

Navy

Converse, Philip Howell, Dallas.
Creed, Edward Gaffney, Dallas.
Denton, Manuel Reyes, Kerrville.
Egan, William Patrick, Fort Worth.
Fee, Edward Francis, Jr., El Campo.
Gunn, Daniel McNeil, Fredericksburg.
Howard, Bruce Lee, Pasadena.
Hunter, Herbert Perry, El Paso.
Jackson, William Braxton, Stockdale.
Johnson, August David, Houston.
Johnson, Phillip Dale, Abilene.
Key, Anthony Wayne, Houston.
Leal, Armando Garza, Jr., San Antonio.
Leyva, Richard, El Paso.
Machen, Billy Wayne, Dallas.
Mills, Robert Perry, Jr., Arlington.
Munoz, Pedro, El Paso.
Quinn, Michael Courtney, San Angelo.
Roberts, Gerald Ray, San Marcos.
Robinson, Frank Eugene, Houston.
Simmons, Travis A., Jr., Midland.
Steiner, Lawrence Terrell, Houston.
Stoddard, Clarence W., Jr., Corpus Christi.
Witt, Charles Don, Lubbock.

UTAH

Army

Anderson, Robert Ralph, Bountiful.
Archuleta, Jesus Magin, Salt Lake City.
Bodell, Kenneth A., Sandy.
Bowcutt, Scott Cannon, Tremonton.
Broadhead, David J., Salt Lake City.
Brown, Thomas Tad, Plain City.
Carlquist, Brian Fiztgeral, Draper.
Cederstrom, David Orin, Salt Lake City.
Chesnut, Gerry George, Escalante.
Clark, Roger William, Pittsfield.
Colbert, George H., Salt Lake City.
Couch, Steven William, Salt Lake City.
Davis, Wendle Clyde, Wales.
De Waal, Howard Jacob, Salt Lake City.
Draper, Marion Leon, American Fork.
Eichbauer, Earl Kent, Salt Lake City.
Fonger, Lyndsey Frank, Tooele.
Fox, Dean Franklin, American Fork.
Gonzales, Tom, Jr., Midvale.
Henderson, William Glade, Clearfield.
Hunter, Lynn Elmo, Ogden.
Jensen, Reed George, Salt Lake City.
Jorgensen, Emory Lee, Salt Lake City.
Kangas, Clifford Franklin, Sandy.
Killian, Marvin Clyde, Murray.
Layne, Bob Raymond, Lewiston.
Lindley, Marvin Leroy, Spanish Fork.
Maddy, Kenneth Lynn, Magna.
Magyarosi, John Joseph, Salt Lake City.
McBroon, Jimmy, Emery.
McGregor, Donald Vernon, Salt Lake City.
Newbrand, Jerry Lester, Hyrum.
Oakey, John Russell, Grantsville.
Parker, Richard Dennis, Salt Lake City.
Pope, Morell Joe, Monroe.
Price, Darrel L., Ogden.
Reeve, David Leo, Hurricane.
Riggs, Niel Burns, Provo.
Ryan, Gerald Scott, Richmond.
Smith, Patrick Jackson, Roy.
Snow, Crawford, Saint George.
Stokes, Robert Lee, Salt Lake City.
Tafoya, Frank Leroy, Salt Lake City.
Ward, Randolph Buck, Ogden.
Whitney, William Arthur, Centerville.
Wood, Richard Steven, Salt Lake City.
Yarrington, Donald P., Jr., Salt Lake City.
Young, Byrant Henry, Jr., Salt Lake City.

Air Force

Goodman, Russell Clemensen, Salt Lake City.
Hood, Don Richard, Salt Lake City.
Meiners, Paul Albert, Kaysville.

Marine Corps

Andresen, Haakon Willy, Salt Lake City.

UTAH—continued

Marine Corps

Bacca, Robert Victor, Magna.
Bohn, David J., North Delta.
Christensen, Warren Lee, Hooper.
Craft, Robert Lee, Salt Lake City.
Delmark, Francis John Dunc, Salt Lake City.
Dyrahl, Raymond Ernest, Salt Lake City.
Foster, Glenn Wilcox, Jr., Salt Lake City.
Galley, Allen Dale, Jr., Murray.
Huntington, Bruce, Salt Lake City.
Jackman, Roger Dahl, Salt Lake City.
Jarvis, Dee Randall, Pleasant Grove.
Johnson, Verne De Witt, III, Ogden.
Martinez, John James, Midvale.
Mathias, Steven Franklin, Bountiful.
Mortensen, Gene Al, Salt Lake City.
Orr, Byron Davis, Salt Lake City.
Pinkerton, Michael David, Salt Lake City.
Renshaw, Robert Francis, Salt Lake City.
Sawaya, Robert Mitchell, Orem.
Smith, Kent Andrew, Salt Lake City.
Telford, John William, Salt Lake City.
Thornton, Rodney Gardner, Salt Lake City.
Trujillo, Richard Toby, Kearns.
Vigil, Henry Orlando, Clinton.
Wilson, Edwin Eugene, Salt Lake City.

Navy

Bruderer, Steven Lee, Brigham City.
Walster, Thomas Gavin, Salt Lake City.

VERMONT

Army

Archer, Allen H., Rutland.
Ashline, Paul Stuart, St. Albans.
Baker, Stanley Martin, Brattleboro.
Birmingham, Edward Arnold, Rutland.
Brileya, David Alan, Vergennes.
Dickinson, Eugene Harold, Northfield.
Doner, Patrick Ralph, St. Albans.
Gillespie, Daniel Craig, Northfield Falls.
Howard, Harvey Rickert, Danby.
Maxham, Ralph Arden, Jr., Roxbury.
Paquette, Bruce Armand, St. Johnsbury.
Rock, Allen Clarence, Williston.
Wilber, Dennis, Killington.

Air Force

Vandeventer, John Wilton, Burlington.

Marine Corps

Baker, Bruce Allan, Essex Junction.
Fielder, Robert Fletcher, Moretown.
Holland, John Henry, Windsor.
O'Connor, Edwin Thomas, Jr., Ludlow.
Rivers, Nelson Keith, Ferrisburgh.
St. George, Fred David, Hinesburg.

Navy

Fitzgerald, William Charle, Worcester.
Gallagher, George Francis, Barre.

VIRGINIA

Army

Adams, Donald Ben, Jr., Hampton.
Adkins, Donald Wayne, Gretna.
Akers, Edward Darrell, Wytheville.
Allen, Hervey Harris, Richmond.
Alsup, Terry Dane, Cleveland.
Amburgey, Alfred June, Dorchester.
Ammons, Walter Norris, Chester.
Ange, Ronald Edward, Virginia Beach.
Angell, Marshall Joseph, Roanoke.
Ashley, Upton Finley, Winchester.
Atkinson, Roger Dale, Salem.
Austin, Virgil Lee, St. Paul.
Babb, Kenneth Alvin, Suffolk.
Bailey, Jesse Thomas, Jr., Portsmouth.
Balfour, Dennis R., Virginia Beach.
Balzer, Michael Arlin, Fairfax City.
Banks, Irvin Sylvester, Cumberland.
Bass, Ronald Wayne, Southampton.
Bergman, Clifton Ballantyn, Spotsylvania.
Bonnet, Charles Christophe, Falls Church.
Booker, Joseph Otis, Richmond.
Bowers, James E., Bristol.
Bowling, John Raymond, Sr., Tazewell.
Bradner, Jack Ray, Pocahontas.
Brandon, James Miles, Jr., Newport News.
Branham, Harry Walter, Monroe.
Brewer, Elza Morton, Jr., Harrisonburg.
Broda, Richard Dale, Portsmouth.
Broughman, Ralph Wayne, Covington.

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Brown, Herman, Richlands.
Bryant, Roger Smith, Exeter.
Bryant, Tinsley, Schuyler.
Bullington, Frederick Curt, Spencer.
Bullock, Richard William, Richmond.
Burnett, William A., Virginia Beach.
Burnley, Dillard Reed, Shipman.
Callis, James Harold, Deltaville.
Campbell, Keith Allen, Arlington.
Carkin, Harvey McKee, Vienna.
Cartwright, Ralph Windall, Virginia Beach.
Castelda, Andrew Thomas, Arlington.
Castle, Russell Leonard, Woodbridge.
Chatten, Maryland, Richmond.
Cheives, Calvin L., Petersburg.
Cherry, William Louis, Norfolk.
Chittum, Ronald Henry, Vinton.
Claud, Pernell Russell, Newport News.
Clem, Thomas Samuel, Middletown.
Coburn, William H., Chesapeake.
Cooke, Robert Morris, Abingdon.
Corbett, Thomas Louis, Hampton.
Corns, Bobby Larry, Stuart.
Cutchins, Roland A., Franklin.
Davis, Holbert Eugene, Norfolk.
DeWitt, Spotswood, Richmond.
Dowdy, Rufus John, Suffolk.
East, Leon Nelson, Ironto.
Ellington, Herbert L., Danville.
Emory, Charles Robert, Roanoke.
Evans, Thomas J., Jr., Hampton.
Faidley, John Charles, Norfolk.
Feagan, Michael John, Fairfax.
Field, Michael Finaly, Arlington.
Fields, Lloyd, Jr., Blackstone.
Finley, Guy Marvin, Norfolk.
Finney, Stephen, Lynchburg.
Floyd, Roger Lee, Monroe.
Foley, Douglas Lee, Ridgeway.
Franklin, Douglas M., Lexington.
Garland, Conley R., Fredericksburg.
Garrett, Roger Lee, Lexington.
Gilbert, James Silas, Bee.
Gilmer, Charlie Mack, Christiansburg.
Goff, Roger Earl, Big Island.
Griffith, Willie Roger, Bishop.
Hackley, Lawrence Earl, Roanoke.
Hairston, Johnny Michael, Martinsville.
Harris, Larry Cornelious, Willis.
Harvey, Eugene David, Lynchburg.
Hassler, Charles Edward, Jr., Mount Jackson.
Hensel, Ernest Victor, Jr., Hampton.
Herman, Clyde Russel, Roanoke.
Herring, Thomas Leandra, Richmond.
Hines, John Lester, Virginia Beach.
Hood, James Gary, Arlington.
Hopson, William Douglas, Hampton.
Hoskins, Robert Lee, Jr., Norfolk.
Howell, Philip, Parrot.
Hughes, James Edward, Lynchburg.
Hunter, James Doherty, Arlington.
Hutton, John Kendrick, Jr., Suffolk.
Jefferson, Louis Allen, Martinsville.
Jenkins, Jerry Malone, Winchester.
Jenkins, Lewis Franklin, Berryville.
Johnson, Arthur Louis, Brodnax.
Johnson, Calvert James, Lynchburg.
Johnson, Harvey, III, Madison Heights.
Johnson, Henry Alston, Richmond.
Johnson, James Robert, Norfolk.
Johnson, Jessie Lee, Suffolk.
Johnson, John Alvin, Jarratt.
Johnson, Nathan, Jr., Lancaster.
Johnson, Richard Sherwin, Richmond.
Jones, Carroll Henry, Richmond.
Jones, Grandville R., Jr., Charlottesville.
Karas, Paul Richard, Alexandria.
Keaton, Danny Garth, Danville.
Keen, Albert Mason, Jr., Chilhowie.
Kelley, Fred Allan, Portsmouth.
Kennedy, Alton Ray, Norfolk.
Kesterson, Charles Robert, Raphine.
King, Harold Wayne, Floyd.
King, Lyell Francis, Falls Church.
Kinton, John Leonard, Richmond.
Krimont, Nicholas, Arlington.
Lambdin, Daniel Alvey, Norfolk.
Lattimore, Charles, Jr., Arlington.
Lawson, Boyce Eugene, Wise.

XUM

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Lee, Alfred, Rosehill.
Lewis, James Harold, Mendota.
Lewis, Robert Lee, Hopewell.
Lingle, Joseph M., Jr., Montpelier.
Logan, John Tyler, Roanoke.
Lundy, Richard Colen, Galax.
Mabe, Roger Dale, Haymarket.
Martin, Erie A., Jr., Danville.
Martinez, Donald Lynwood, Tazewell.
Mayes, Robert Gresham, Hopewell.
McCann, Donald Wayne, Danville.
McClary, Gordon Stuart, Mineral.
McGee, Curtis, J., Richmond.
McIlwee, James R., Roanoke.
Meador, Daniel R., Vinton.
Miller, Delaney Ernest, Jr., Front Royal.
Miller, Lloyd Ashton, Spottswood.
Miller, Norman Norwood, Dayton.
Mills, Ward Warren, Jr., Shawsville.
Morrison, John Franklin, Jr., Winchester.
Mullins, Daniel Lee, Pound.
Nicely, Nelson Talmadge, Clifton Forge.
O'Keefe, Michael Joseph, Richmond.
Paterson, Fred Henry, Appomattox.
Perdue, Robert Decker, Newport News.
Perry, George Everett, III, Falls Church.
Phillips, James Edward, Richmond.
Phipps, Herbert Charles, Clintwood.
Pickett, Rodney Douglas, Coeburn.
Piper, Donald Chandler, Portsmouth.
Pittsenbarger, Dennis Stove, Doe Hill.
Poindexter, Moses Leon, Danville.
Porter, Joseph Samuel, Jr., Portsmouth.
Powell, Steven Reed, Danville.
Price, Johnny Paul, Norfolk.
Pruhs, Robert L., Norfolk.
Rankin, Edward Garry, Waynesboro.
Rasnic, Olen Wesley, Duffield.
Rhodes, Thomas Henry, Portsmouth.
Riddle, John Robert, Dryden.
Risinger, Paul William, Arlington.
Robinson, Alfred William, Bedford.
Robinson, Joseph Luther, Newport News.
Rose, Onsby Ray, Clinchco.
Rouse, Phillip Leonard, Hampton.
Runion, Marion Gilmer, Radford.
Samans, Walter A., Jr., Richmond.
Sargent, Ruppert Leon, Hampton.
Seamans, Otto Andreae, Jr., Virginia Beach.
Seekford, Joseph Levi, Front Royal.
Shannon, Kenneth Arthur, Lynchburg.
Sheldon, Charles Mills, Williamsburg.
Shelton, Clyde Douglas, Jr., Gretna.
Sherrell, Melvin Leon, Portsmouth.
Siegrist, William Leroy, Norfolk.
Simon, Robert Lee, Jr., Richmond.
Sink, Otis Beverley, Elliston.
Smith, Gene Darrell, Midlothian.
Smith Marvin Bonney, Jr., Virginia Beach.
Smith, Walter Lee, Woodford.
Stainback, Mack Donald, Jr., Dolphin.
Stallard, Don Gene, Norton.
Stephens, Harry Edward, Richmond.
Stevens, Gerald, Big Stone.
Sticher, John Thomas, Arlington.
Stone, Lewis Lynn, Alexandria.
Strong, Calvin Morris, Mineral.
Sturgill, Harold J., Jr., Damascus.
Summers, Harry Lee, Fries.
Supinger, Claude Carroll, Centreville.
Tate, Bradley Haynes, Pearisburg.
Taylor, Fred, Castlewood.
Thompson, John Kirkland, Hampton.
Thompson, Joseph Wayne, Danville.
Thompson, Raymond Massie, Monroe.
Thruston, Robert Reade, III, Fairfax.
Tolley, Calvin Coolidge, Jr., Pamplin.
Tolliver, Samuel Stanley, Richmond.
Turley, Charles Van, Norfolk.
Turner, James Eddy, Franklin.
Tynes, Wilbert A., Jr., Hampton.
Vaughan, Milton Lee, Portsmouth.
Versace, Humbert Roque, Norfolk.
Victory, William Thomas, Weirwood.
Vrabel, John Robin, Culpeper.
Walker, Joe Franklin, Hampton.
Wallace, George David, Dry Fork.
Ward, Ronald Wayne, Alexandria.
Ward, Rudolph Nathinal, Portsmouth.

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Watkins, Franklin Roosevelt, Meherrin.
Webb, William Winton, Salem.
Wessells, William David, Accomac.
Wheaton, Allen Thomas, Virginia Beach.
White, Daniel Wesley, Herndon.
White, Robert Alexander, Newport News.
Whitmore, Garland D., II, Harrisonburg.
Wilde, Erskine Buford, Charlottesville.
Williams, James, Bloxom.
Williams, Walter, Jr., Portsmouth.
Witcher, Albert, Pittsylvania.
Witcher, Samuel Earnest, Martinsville.
Worley, Robert Keith, Saltville.
Wright, Johnny Wayne, Roanoke.
Yost, Harry James, Whitacre.
Young, Gordon Preston, Drakes Branch.
Young, Harold Earl, Virginia Beach.

Air Force

Barnette, Fred Edward, Clifton Forge.
Bohrer, Leroy Preston, Arlington.
Brim, John Larue, Princess Anne.
Clark, Donald E., Jr., Lynchburg.
Coghill, Milo Bruce, Clarksville.
Farrow, David Ashby, Richmond.
Fitzgerald, Woodrow Melvin, Staunton.
Jones, Robert Henry Osborn, Arlington.
Martin, William Reynolds, Callands.
Mayo, James Russell, Norfolk.
Mulhauser, Harvey, Charlottesville.
Reese, Daniel Cortez, Bluefield.
Weston, Oscar Branch, Jr., Norfolk.

Marine Corps

Angus, Clarence Ray, Glen Allen.
Ashley, Willie Frank, Crittenden.
Ball, James Edward, III, Newport News.
Barton, Lance Bryan, Richmond.
Bettis, John Calvin, Richmond.
Blankenship, Godfred, Vicey.
Blanks, Toney Page, Richmond.
Bowles, Frank Joseph, Bassett.
Boykin, Robert Thomas, Virginia Beach.
Brickey, Barry Wayne, Roanoke.
Broegeler, Herman C., III, Virginia Beach.
Brown, Joseph Welton, III, Roanoke.
Brown, Willie Lee, Newport News.
Buchanan, Robert David, Bristol.
Burks, Gary Allen, Covington.
Carey, Franklin Lee, Amelia.
Chappell, Kenneth Lee, Richmond.
Collins, Eugene, Norfolk.
Cooper, Andrew Jones, Madison Heights.
Crabtree, Robert Andrew, Portsmouth.
Crowder, Joseph Berkley, Norfolk.
Davis, Charles William, Front Royal.
Delph, Jerry, Norfolk.
Estrada, David, Coeburn.
Falwell, Donald Wayne, Fisherville.
Firth, Allen Edward, Mission Home.
Ford, Charles Lewis, Richmond.
Freudenthal, Richard Holt, Alexandria.
Fulcher, John Henry, Arlington.
Graham, William Richard, Lorton.
Gray, Samuel, Richmond.
Grinnell, Thomas D., III, Richmond.
Hardin, John Edger, North Tazewell.
Hardy, Frank Earle, Portsmouth.
Harris, Jackie Louis, Richmond.
Hartman, Vernon Lynn, Jr., Norfolk.
Hawkins, Felix Boyd, Hampton.
Heizer, Jerry Hogue, Staunton.
Herring, William Earl, Hampton.
Hogge, Douglas Warren, Yorktown.
Honse, George Emile, Falls Church.
Hopkins, Michael Edward, Norfolk.
Howard, Gregory Marshall, Greenway.
Hubbard, Samuel Burnell, Red House.
James, General Fird, Jr., Newport News.
Jones, Richard, Jr., Lynchburg.
Jones, William Oliver, Richmond.
Jordan, Wayne Lamont, Alexandria.
Keesee, Joseph Timothy, Vinton.
King, James Israel, Richmond.
Knutson, Robert Bruce, Norfolk.
Lacks, Cornelius Clayton, Richmond.
Lee, Fred Vincent, Chesapeake.
Lester, James Leroy, Jr., Norfolk.
Mann, Glenn Dill, Williamsburg.
Manns, Charles Edward, Ridgeway.
Martin, Buddy Ray, Newport News.

VIRGINIA—continued

Marine Corps

Matt, Joseph Walter, Norfolk.
Mattson, Robert Kent, Mount Jackson.
Meek, William Chester, Marion.
Murray, Charles Edward, Newport News.
Murray, Michael Gary, Richmond.
Neblett, Lynell, Blackstone.
Neisz, Charles Warren, Jr., Richmond.
Obie, Clarence Willis, III, Staunton.
Phillips, Leroy Jackson, Luray.
Preston, Luther Elmer, Grundy.
Price, David Edgar, Jr., Norfolk.
Rader, James Doll, Yorktown.
Ray, Kermit Anthony, Chesapeake.
Reed, Paul Martin, Roanoke.
Riportella, Frank J., Jr., Norfolk.
Rogers, Howard Leonard, Jr., Portsmouth.
Siddall, Jimmie, Richmond.
Smith, Joseph Preston, West Point.
Smith, Marvin, Suffolk.
Smith, Robert Lee, Jr., Newport, News.
Spearman, David Glenn, Danville.
Spires, John Milton, Hampton.
Stewart, Michael Edward, Culpeper.
Stinson, Rodney Leroy, Lancaster.
Strange, Richard Lee, Richmond.
Sutton, William Joseph, Falls Church.
Tate, Alenn Merritt, Dare.
Thomas, Arthur Isiah, Smithfield.
Thompson, Thomas Michael, Norfolk.
Touart, Foster Jewell G., Jr., Alexandria.
Urick, John William, Richard.
Vammatter, Lloyd Allen, Ettrick.
Vines, Cleveland, Newport News.
Wallace, Douglas Delano, Charlottesville.
Ware, Robert Dennis, Roanoke.
Watkins, Lawrence D., Jr., Meadowview.
Westfall, Bronson Lee, Hampton.
Whitlock, Harry Owens, Jr., Richmond.
Wilkins, Alton, III, Norfolk.
Williams, Leonard Taylor, Fort Defiance.
Williamson, Richard Wesley, Fife
Womble, William Thomas, Jr., Norfolk.
Woods, Sterling Saddler, Virginia Beach.
Wright, Garland Flendolph, Norfolk.

Navy

Carper, Loring William, Jr., Winchester.
Compton, Frank Ray, Chatham.
Evans, Lonnie Bernard, Pennington Gap.
Fee, Donald Fred, Big Stone Gap.

WASHINGTON

Army

Albanese, Lewis, Seattle.
Alexander, Terry Lee, Seattle.
Alfstad, Kenneth Orville, Seattle.
Anderson, Charles C., Jr., Bremerton.
Anderson, Charles T., Jr., Seattle.
Arens, David Le Roy, Kirkland.
Arndt, Robert Darrell, Issaquah.
Barnes, Danny Cleon, Seattle.
Barton, Will Page, II, Spokane.
Benkert, Paul Anthony, Fairchild AFB.
Bornstein, Anton Thomas, Bellingham.
Bozzello, Frank Mario, Seattle.
Brand, William Edward, Quincy.
Brock, Edward Leroy, Mount Vernon.
Bryant, Sidney Lee, Jr., Seattle.
Cain, Rodger Kenneth, Colfax.
Cannon, Steven Lee, Olalla.
Cavazos, Reynaldo Roy, Quincy.
Chambers Johnny A., Aberdeen.
Clowe, Robert Earl, Mossyrock.
Coker, Horton Sisler, Jr., Seattle.
Cole, Dennis Wayne, Sedro Woolley.
Combs, Jackie Randall, Okanogan.
Cote, Donald Richard, Mountlake Terrace.
Crane, Robert Brenden, Addy.
Crout, Kenneth Miles, Olympia.
Curtis, Gregory Paul, Longview.
Davies, David Marshall, Seattle.
Dawson, Lawrence Michael, Everett.
Degen, Robert Paul, Vancouver.
Dibbert, Bernard Wayne, Seattle.
Dieu, Gary Allen, Centralia.
Donnellan, Daniel Paul, Ferndale.
Dowling, Robert Moffett, Centralia.
Dubb, Dewain V., Bellingham.
East, Melvin Douglas, Colfax.
Eklund, Paul Herbert, Everett.

WASHINGTON—continued

Army

Ellman, Joseph Raymond, Spokane.
Emerson, James Wayne, South Bend.
Engman, Darwin Harold, Anacortes.
Everett, Mark Ross, Bellingham.
Falck, Carl Leonard, Jr., Alder.
Fanning, Thomas Garret, Seattle.
Fife, James Herbert, Jr., Seattle.
Franklin, Lawrence Andre, Wenatchee.
Frenier, Frederick Irving, Seattle.
Frodsham, Edward Thomas, Seattle.
Grandstaff, Bruce Alan, Spokane.
Guilmet, Daniel J., Seattle.
Hamlin, William Robert, Seattle.
Hancock, Jesse Leroy, Seattle.
Harbison, Roy F., Vancouver.
Harner, David Ira, Montesano.
Harris, Harvey C., Orchards.
Harris, Jesse Lee, Centralia.
Hart, Ronald David, Everett.
Hemmes, Robert Bernard, Ferndale.
Henshaw, Patrick Lee, Spokane.
Hightower, George Malcolm, Seattle.
Higman, John Everett, Bellingham.
Hobert, William Joseph, Orting.
Holien, Richard Paul, Spokane.
Holke, Donald Steven, Burton.
Holt, Gary Richard, Tacoma.
Jackson, Darrell Asa, Clarkston.
Jacobson, Kenneth James, Winslow.
Janes, William Carey, Wauna.
Johnston, Wilfred C., Jr., Olympia.
Karlstrom, Sigfrid R., Seattle.
Kauffman, Keith Walter, Clarkston.
Kelby, Wesley Robert, Federal Way.
Kerr, Stanley Jesse, Olympia.
King, Ronald Dean, Vaughn.
Kinghammer, Steve William, Renton.
Knighton, Paul Gordon, Seattle.
Krause, Kenneth J., Camas.
Landers, Billie Dwaine, Everett.
Lang, Timothy Michael, Spokane.
Larkin, Samuel James, Spokane.
Larsen, Joe Paul, Everett.
Leach, Walter Daryle, Yakima.
Letterman, Lawrence Allen, Seattle.
Lindberg, Dale Raymond, Brush Prairie.
Lund, Harry D., Chehalis.
Lunn, Tommie Richard, Fort Lewis.
Malarz, Rene Lee, Winlock.
Marinsic, Allen Henry, Chehalis.
McClanahan, Larry Byron, Yakima.
McNeal, Michael E., Geiger Heights.
Merrill, Larry Arthur, Seattle.
Messersmith, Dean Harold, Port Angeles.
Montgomery, Robert Allen, Fall City.
Morris, Archie W., Seattle.
Moss, Larry Allen, Spokane.
Murr, Clyde Edward, Richland.
Neisess, James A., Walla Walla.
Nelson, Donald Carl, Renton.
Neth, Danny A., Richland.
Newbern, Michael R., Kennewick.
Nixon, Ray, Tacoma.
Nokes, John Darrell, Seattle.
Ozuna, Juan Sanchez, Wapato.
Parker, Ronald Wayne, Mountlake Terrace.
Parkhurst, Greig Robert, Bremerton.
Pender, Donald L., Tacoma.
Perdue, John Harry, Tacoma.
Petchnick, Charles Russell, Renton.
Petersen, Robert Bruce, Payallup.
Peterson, Charles C., Snohomish.
Peterson, Warren Gary, Stanwood.
Pettersen, Wayne Adolphus, Seattle.
Piper, Walter, Jr., Spokane.
Pitts, Robert Patrick, Seattle.
Pruett, Donovan Jess, Deer Park.
Ramos, Forrest Lee, Wapato.
Randles, John Peters, Seattle.
Reynolds, Joseph Lee, Bellevue.
Rhodes, Frank Moss, Suquamish.
Roundtree, Richard Ralph, Shelton.
Rud, Kenneth Hans, Centralia.
Sabine, John Shaw, IV, Tacoma.
Sargent, Kenneth Eugene, Auburn.
Schook, George Washington, Richland.
Schultz, Lowell Eugene, Walla Walla.
Sedies, Richard Samuel, Seattle.
Sexton, Troy Laverne, Seattle.

WASHINGTON—continued

Army

Sigurdson, Johnny Allen, Seattle.
Smith, Albert Heugh, Kelso.
Smith, Frank Lee, Stanwood.
Smith, Phillip Robert, Bothell.
Smith, Steven Marty, Puyallup.
Spiker, Patrick, Jr., Yakima.
Springsteen, Dennis Eugene, Seattle.
Starr, Benny Arnold, Seattle.
Steadman, Sterling Dwight, Lake Stevens.
Stearns, Lloyd Palmer, Yakima.
Stewart, James Bartie, Kennewick.
Taylor, George Michael, Kent.
Taylor, William A., Spokane.
Thompson, Dennis Michael, Aberdeen.
Thompson, Everett Barl, Maple Valley.
Thompson, Robert Michael, Tacoma.
Thomsen, Gail Ward, Kirkland.
Thulin, Ronald Fredrick, Vancouver.
Torres, Manuel Vega, Wenatchee.
Trimble, Dennis Arthur, Seattle.
Varney, Robin Lee, Seattle.
Wagner, Edward John, Jr., Everett.
Wagner, William Peter, III, Longview.
Walling, Harry Allen, Seattle.
Watson, Richard Dale, Clarkston.
Weed, Rodney Richard, Yakima.
Weiderman, Claude Fredrick, Longview.
West, Noel Thomas, Tacoma.
Whittington, Merrel P., Toppenish.
Wilkins, Richard Edward, Mountlake Terrace.
Wilson, Darrell Wayne, Kennewick.
Wilson, Norman Raymond, Seattle.
Wingert, Douglas Gene, Auburn.
Wise, Donald A., Edmonds.
Wise, Robert Evans, Bellevue.
Wolf, John Roby, Renton.
Workman, Timothy E., Puyallup.
Wright, Robert Frank, Bremerton.
Zambano, Quentin Dennis, Bellevue.

Air Force

Baker, Duane Scott, Renton.
Brenton, Prentice Fay, Spokane.
Ellis, Melvin Rupert, Seattle.
Roper, John Morton, Bellingham.
Sebers, Frederick Theodore, Tacoma.
Steinbrunner, Donald Thoma, Bellingham.
Wilson, Albert Richard, Seattle.

Marine Corps

Aarde, James Raymond, Kent.
Aasen, David Kim, Longview.
Alm, Richard Andrew, Puyallup.
Anderson, Charles Eugene, Spokane.
Anderson, Charles Leon, Seattle.
Andreassi, Ciro John, Seattle.
Armitage, Robert Laymon, Everett.
Avery, Kenneth Varsall, Seattle.
Ball, Thomas Leslie Snider, Seattle.
Beargeon, Dan William, Seattle.
Beatty, Dewey Lloyd, Seattle.
Bergerson, John Francis, Mercer Island.
Betts, David Paul, Seattle.
Black, Mark Stephen, Richland.
Bradley, David Michael, Pullman.
Bradley, Dennis Dale, Marysville.
Brais, Jimmy Gene, Tacoma.
Briggs, Gordon Michael, Seattle.
Brown, William Floyd, Seattle.
Broz, George Michael, Stanwood.
Bryant, James Wesley, Okanogan.
Burney, Niles, Seattle.
Butler, Larry Wayne, Seattle.
Caceres, Edgardo, Tacoma.
Caldwell, Timothy Bruce, Graham.
Carmichael, Gerald Lane, Kennewick.
Church, Steven Anthony, Renton.
Cook, Delmar Frederick, Tacoma.
Cope, Robert Joe, Kennewick.
Courchane, Dale Louis, Wenatchee.
Creveling, Zed Connor, Seattle.
Dalrymple, William Ray, Hoquiam.
Davenport, Donald Gene, Snoqualmie.
Denhoff, William Michael, Seattle.
Depew, Vernon Eugene, Forks.
Derksema, William Arthur, Seattle.
Devore, William Robert, Bremerton.
Doyle, Patrick Michael, Everett
Drake, Clancy George, Kirkland.

WASHINGTON—continued

Marine Corps

Erickson, Alan Clifford, Seattle.
Faulconer, David Ross, Yakima.
Fritts, Louie Gene, Tacoma.
Garber, Edwin Sidney, Seattle.
Gardella, Mark Jeffrey, Spokane.
Goddard, Ronald William, Seattle.
Godsey, James Marvin, Seattle.
Goodsell, William Joseph, Seattle.
Gordon, Guy Lee, Morton.
Hake, David Terrance, Burton.
Hammond, Jack Michael, Marysville.
Harmon, Daniel William, Bremerton.
Harris, William Lee, Seattle.
Hayes, Ronald Morris, Marysville.
Hedblum, David Arthur, Seattle.
Henrickson, Keith Richard, Tacoma.
Hoel, Ronald Edwin, Seattle.
Jensen, John Ace, Espanola.
Jones, Michael Clay, Seattle.
Jorgensen, Rolf Wallace, Seattle.
Kessinger, Kenneth Martin, Govan.
Kielley, Byron Alick, Seattle.
Kroshus, Leonard Joseph, Seattle.
Landis, Bruce Randolph, Jr., Seattle.
Larson, Rogner Andre, Seattle.
Leach, Anthony Michael, Lynwood.
Leroy, Howard Lloyd, Jr., Vancouver.
McMurry, Roderick Dane, Mossyrock.
Mettert, Robert Arnold, Vancouver.
Mina, Juan Velasco, Jr., Seattle.
Miramontez, Leonard, Wapato.
Mock, Maurice Karl, Vancouver.
Moen, Joseph Allen, Summer.
Moser, Gregory Phillip, Edmonds.
Mulford, Alan Craig, Seattle.
Mullan, John Turner, Seattle.
Nichols, Richard Allen, Dayton.
Norris, Charles Steven, Veradale
Paddock, John Everett, Port Townsend.
Padilla, George Isaac, Toppenish.
Paulson, Marvin, Jr., Seattle.
Pearson, Ronald Russell, Port Angeles.
Pelton, William Frank, Everett.
Pollard, James Frederick, Seattle.
Pollard, Wayne Richard, Darrington.
Powell, Carroll Wayne, Seattle.
Ray, Darrell Thomas, Olympia.
Rice, John Climath, Seattle.
Riebli, Joseph Robert, Port Orchard.
Roberson, Leonard Wade, Redmond.
Roth, Fred Stewart, Tacoma.
Rowland, Thomas Patrick, Cowiche.
Schweikl, Jeffrey Allan, Enumclaw.
Scranton, Allen Frank, Jr., Kent.
Shands, Michael Anthony, Issaquah.
Sherman, John Harold, Seattle.
Stallings, Robert Elvis, Spokane.
Tanguay, Alan Michael, Bellingham.
Thomas, John Charles, Seattle.
Thompson, Richard Lee, Seattle.
Tjernberg, Roger Blake, Aberdeen.
Toschi, Richard William, Renton.
Triplett, Gordon Marshal, Seattle.
Turnbough, Charles Dannie, Spokane.
Vaughan, Robert Lester, Ridgefield.
Vigil, Anthony, Seattle.
Vivette, Leon Louis, Wapato.
Weed, James Allan, Tacoma.
West, William Richard, Spokane.
Whitby, Joe Alan, Pasco.
White, Miles Eugene, Edmonds.
Wilkening, Arnold G., III, Spokane.
Wise, Elwin Claude, Valleyford.
Wulff, Robert Wayne, Seattle.

Navy

Barber, Robert Franklin, Seattle.
Jacobs, Edward James, Jr., Mount Vernon.
Knowles, David Du Wayne, Eatonville.
Logan, Jacob Drummond, Seattle.
McMahon, Timothy James, Port Townsend.
McMican, M. D., Toppenish.
Miller, Thomas Paul, Burlington.
Moore, Thomas Michael, Tacoma.
Moultine, Charles Ray, Tacoma.
Nally, Robert Gerald, Walla Walla.
Paddock, Gary Cliffton, Marysville.
Phillips, Glenn Ross, Jr., Seattle.
Selden, Frank William, Seattle.
Shields, Marvin Glen, Port Townsend.

WASHINGTON—continued

Navy

Tate, John Cullen, Seattle.
Vercruysse, Gregory Paul, Spokane.
Warren, Galen Eugene, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Alkire, Theodore A., Jr., Ridgeley.
Amick, Freddy L., Leivasy.
Amos, William Lee, Culloden.
Anders, Charlie, Leckie.
Arbogast, Randall, Valley Head.
Ball, John Robert, Charleston.
Barrett, Charles Arthur, II, Glenville.
Bays, Paul Eugene, Rosemont.
Belcher, Ted, Lynco.
Berry, James Grayson, Barboursville.
Bethel, James Walter, McDowell.
Binion, Curtis Estill, Charleston.
Bise, Roger Allen, Morgantown.
Blackwell, William Allen, Bluefield.
Blake, Timothy Morgan, Charleston.
Bolen, Jackie Everett, Jr., Ury.
Brady, Joseph Martin, Weston.
Brown, Earl Frederick, Weston.
Brown, Edward Wallace, Jr., Charleston.
Bruno, Roger Lee, Beckley.
Bryant, Richard Wayne, Sophia.
Burdette, Robert Lee, Poca.
Burgess, Garry Lee, Pickens.
Butcher, Larry R., Pecks Mill.
Cain, Porter Ray, Parkersburg.
Chattin, Al Junious, Hemphill.
Cobb, Earl Russell, Quincy.
Collins, Clayton, Pecks Mill.
Conn, Franklin L., Amherstdale.
Cox, Earnest Lee, Montgomery.
Cronin, William Bernard, Fairmont.
Crosier, Carl Roger, Waiteville.
Curd, Richard Lowell, Rainelle.
Davey, Glen Vincent, Junction.
Dawson, Eugene, Bentree.
Dupont, Ernest Thomas, Masontown.
Durbin, Robert Vernon, Wellsburg.
Eddy, Jerry Wayne, Paden City.
Edmonds, Lawrence Nathaniel, McAlpine.
Ellyson, Archie Merlin, Richwood.
Emmert, James Richard, Huntington.
Eubanks, George F., Barboursville.
Eyster, George Senseny, Jr., Charles Town.
Ferrebee, Russell Edwin, West Union.
Fleck, Robert Lee, Costa.
Froe, George Washington, Bluefield.
Funk, Joe Albert, II, Wellsburg.
Greenfield, Kenneth Eugene, Martinsburg.
Griffith, Richard Wayne, Fairmont.
Hagey, Clarence E., Premier.
Hall, Clyde, Marion.
Hancock, William Edgar, Fayette.
Harper, Dennis, Jr., Amigo.
Harrison, Richard Darrell, Liberty.
Harsanyi, Jimmy Rogers, Allen Junction.
Hayes, Danny Martin, Edgarton.
Heaster, Roy Dwight, Crawley.
Hesson, Ronald Eugene, Glenwood.
Holcomb, James Lee, Lookout.
Hostuttler, Hermon R., Terra Alta.
Hughart, Romey Earl, Jr., Ravenswood.
Jackson, Lawrence Edward, Stotesbury.
Johnson, Wilbert Hershell, Morgantown.
Jones, Bernard Francis, Coalton.
Jones, Howard William, Bluefield.
Kauffer, William Thomas, Milton.
Keaton, David Roger, Yolyn.
Kesling, Raymon Dale, Buckhannon.
Kidd, Wayne Huffman, Clarksburg.
King, Robert Leon, Madison.
Kiser, David Butler, North Matewan.
Kittle, Cecil Wilbert, Jr., Huttonsville.
Knapp, Martin C., Wheeling.
Knight, Walter Grant, Clarksburg.
Lantz, Charles Wesley, Bayard.
Law, James Newton, Martinsburg.
Lazear, Robert Leroy, Wellsburg.
Lilly, Robert C., Nimitz.
Locke, George W., Jr., New Cumberland.
Lucas, Larry Francis, Marmet.
Marcum, Ernest Delbert, Crum.
McCarthy, David Paul, Wheeling.
McDaniel, Roger Paul, Quinwood.

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

Army

McGhee, Richard Dale, Yawkey.
McLaughlin, Russell Frank, Wheeling.
McMellon, Arthur Nello, Barboursville.
McMicken, Harry Carlyle, Barboursville.
McMillon, Jackie, Cyclone.
McPherson, William Richard, Parkersburg.
Milam, Dale E., Prosperity.
Miller, Jerry Ray, Coal City.
Miracle, Daniel L., Williamstown.
Mollohan, Steven P., Pickens.
Moore, Thomas Wayne, Jr., Webster Springs.
Moorehead, Ronald John, Arnett.
Morris, Charles H., Jr., Algoma.
Munsey, Carl L., Bluefield.
Nelson, Homer Douglas, Lake.
Newhouse, Garland Andrew, Upperglade.
Noss, James Theodore, Bruceton Mills.
O'Boyle, Shirley Wayne, Beckley.
Parkulo, Danny Richard, Beckley.
Peters, Lynn Waitman, Linn.
Phillips, Earl Gene, War.
Pilson, Wallace Edward, Eckman.
Porter, Archie Andrew, Cameron.
Porter, Franklin Delano, Cameron.
Prater, Lawrence Buford, Williamson.
Ray, Landon Clair, Kenna.
Reed, Lesley Wayne, Buckhannon.
Riley, James Lewis, Vienna.
Romine, Roger Dale, Fraziers Bottom.
Rose, Gerald Bruce, Huntington.
Ross, Samual, Tams.
Samples, Herbert Cleveland, Flemington.
Sanders, Darrell W., Wayne.
Sanford, Jackie Willard, East Rainelle.
Saunders, George Thomas, Jr., Cedar Grove.
Sawyers, Charles Douglas, Yukon.
Scates, Charlie Kenneth, Martinsburg.
Scragg, Bruce Hassell, Marmet.
Shaffer, Randall Dale, Aurora.
Shamblin, Theodore, Fayetteville.
Shupe, Herbert Carson, Caretta.
Simpson, Gerry Glen, Buffalo.
Smith, Johnny William, Monongah.
Smith, Robert Lee, Welch.
Staton, Rodney Dale, Guyan.
Steward, Edward Larry, Bluefield.
Stillwagoner, Ralph Lloyd, Paden City.
Stotler, Ray W., Paw Paw.
Stowers, Joe D., Chapmanville.
Tallman, Daniel Ferrel, Rosedale.
Taylor, Emory Le Roy, Huntington.
Taylor, Grover R., Allen Junction.
Taylor, James Lawrence, Nitro.
Thomas, William Archable, Bramwell.
Thompson, Robert Dewey, Wymer.
Tomblin, Troy Franklin, Harts.
Townsend, Delmas Sherwood, Core.
Van Meter, Jack Harold, Jr., Slatyfork.
Wadsworth, Charles David, Alvy.
Ware, Cecil Y., French Creek.
Ware, Oliver Argyle, Sutton.
Waymire, Jackie L., Huntington.
Wears, James Craig, Nitro.
White, Coley Phillip, Wiley Ford.
Williams, Troy Byron, Mount Hope.
Williamson, Charles Alton, Greenwood.
Winchell, Chester A., Jr., Fort Gay.
Wooten, John Wesley, Garten.
Wooton, Gary Lee, Kenova.
Yoho, Kermit Harold, Moundsville.

Air Force

Campbell, William Henry, Piedmont.
Gould, Warren Lee, Weston.
Karickhoff, Willis Arnold, Elkview.

Marine Corps

Agar, Robert Lee, New Martinsville.
Anderson, Charles E., Jr., Wheeling.
Boggs, Charles Edward, Charleston.
Breedlove, Rodney Allen, Alkol.
Burdette, James Ronald, Elkview.
Castle, Roger Allen, Longacre.
Christian, Ted Howard, Gauley Bridge.
Cooper, Roger Edward, Beckley.
Cox, James Blaine, Washington.
Craft, Joseph Rodney, Beech Bottom.
Custer, George Paul, Wheeling.

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

Marine Corps

Dely, William, Selbyville.
Dolin, Danny Joseph, Lake.
Drown, Samuel Robert, Prichard.
Emerson, Ervin Junior, Clarksburg.
Esters, Freddie, Bluefield.
Fenstermacher, Ronald Lee, Buckhannon.
Greene, Danny Marvin, Mount Gay.
Hamrick, Benjamin Neal, Kingmont.
Hatison, Jeffrey Stephen, Martinsburg.
Henry, George Ward, Jr., Weston.
Hickman, Robert Dave, Wheeling.
Hoover, Melvin Sylvester, McDowell.
Hundley, James Freeman, Bluefield.
Hurd, Charles Everette, Sandyville.
Jackson, Howard Wade, Westover.
Johnson, Johnny Malcolm, Huntington.
Joy, William Charles, Monongan.
Keener, James Lee, Ivydale.
Kincaid, Paul Eddie, Lenark.
Klug, Joseph Ronald, Wheeling.
Kovac, David Allan, Morgantown.
Leach, Larry Keith, Grafton.
McCrobie, George Edward, Wheeling.
McDonald, William Frederick, Farmington.
Menendez, Leo, Jr., Spelter.
Messenger, James Edward, Morgantown.
Muir, Joseph Eugene, Meadow Bridge.
Patrick, Tex Delano, Reynoldsville.
Perry, Gerald Leslie, Bald Knob.
Ratliff, Bobbie Joe, Gary.
Ratliff, Dallas, Webster Springs.
Rhinehart, Joseph Lee, St. Marys.
Rollins, Lewis Charles, Beckley.
Sawyer, James Howard, Morgantown.
Scarberry, Larry Dale, Barboursville.
Schubert, Gary Edward, Wheeling.
Simmons, James Robert, Charleston.
Simons, Edward, Jr., Bluefield.
Smith, John Darrell, Hundred.
Starcher, Eddie Dean, Leatherbark.
Stephenson, Robert Clayton, Chapmanville.
Stout, Eugene Edward, Webster Springs.
Strickland, John Lee, Charleston.
Stutler, Daniel Wayne, Fairmont.
Tarasuk, Victor, Rachel.
Thomas, James Carl, Morgantown.
Thompson, James, Roderfield.
Vilone, Philip, Jr., Fairmont.
White, Danny Carl, Matoaka.

Navy

Bannister, Howard William, Delbarton.
Childers, Roger Dale, Barboursville.
Hays, Gale Jackson, Falling Rock.
Lane, Glenn McArthur, Huntington.
Neal, Ronald Keith, Huntington.
Robertson, Charles Edward, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

Army

Abbott, Paul Dennis, Siren.
Adamski, Dennis James, Appleton.
Anderson, Erling Alton, Eau Claire.
Bair, Robert Volnie, Rochester.
Balthazor, Richard John, Eland.
Bearwald, Orland Orrin, Oshkosh.
Beaty, Jeffrey Landis, Blair.
Behlke, Gerald Dennis, Strum.
Benway, James Dwight, Milwaukee.
Beranek, Dean Mitchell, Rice Lake.
Bertschinger, Dennis Lee, Milwaukee.
Bierowski, Reiner Walter, Milwaukee.
Blaese, Ronald Paul, Combined Locks.
Bohmer, Robert James, Milwaukee.
Brandes, Thomas Glenn, Silver Lake.
Brenwall, Kenneth Wayne, Milwaukee.
Brines, Gerald Raymond, Shullsburg.
Brixen, Gary Maurice, Osseo.
Broome, Thomas Edward, Sun Prairie.
Brux, Gary H., Greenwood.
Buss, Roger Lee, Cottage Grove.
Capelle, Gerald Carl, Fond du Lac.
Carlson, Peter John, La Crosse.
Carter, Richard Kenneth, Milwaukee.
Caspersen, Robert P., II, Madison.
Chmiel, Mark Anthony, Milwaukee.
Christ, Donald Alfred, Milwaukee.
Churchill, Raymond John, Lyndon Station.
Clark, Phillip Henry, Wisconsin Rapids.
Crane, Dean Dennis, Neshkoro.

XUM

WISCONSIN—continued

Army

Cwikla, Leroy Walter, Lublin.
Dailey, George Frederick, Fort Atkinson.
Dann, David Brian, Milwaukee.
Davidson, Charles Leon, La Crosse.
Donahoe, David John, Darlington.
Dopp, Gary Russell, Almond.
Engel, Allen Norbert, Mount Calvary.
Erickson, Robert Dale, Superior.
Ertel, Loren Leslie, Plymouth.
Feierabend, Peter Matthew, Milwaukee.
Ferdig, Richard Charles, Frederic.
Fischer, James Robert, Oshkosh.
Fitzpatrick, John Dougal, Franklin.
Foran, Joseph Paul, Milwaukee.
Geary, Harry Eugene, Beloit.
Goldsmith, Roger Dwight, Black River Falls.
Goslin, Gregg Michael, Spooner.
Greetan, Roger William, Oconto Falls.
Grimes, Carl Wayne, Fond du Lac.
Gruber, Miachael Alfred, Milwaukee.
Gunderson, Melvin Willard, Cable.
Hagen, James Robert, Stanley.
Hague, Gerald Charles, Maiden Rock.
Hallberg, Carl Raymond, Delevan.
Henke, Vernon Lee, La Valle.
Hewitt, Raleigh, L. II, Kenosha.
Hill, William Ray, Kenosha.
Hipke, Hary Allan, Gleason.
Imrie, John Charles, Johnson Creek.
Isaacson, Gary Allen, Amery.
Jaeck, Richard Elmer, Cudahy.
Janka, William Robert, New Berlin.
Janke, Charles Julius, Grantsburg.
Java, Daniel M., Frederic.
Jensen, Larry Scott, Milwaukee.
Johnson, Charles Allen, Racine.
Johnson, Charles Leo, Marshfield.
Johnson. Timothy Holton, Milwaukee.
Kasten, Daniel Mark, Ripon.
Kennedy, Timothy Joel, Burlington.
Kessinger, John McFarland, Janesville.
Koch, Darryl Jay, Hartland.
Kohlbeck, Victor Joseph, Manitowoc.
Kokalis, Nick, Milwaukee.
Kostroski, Marvin David, Schofield.
Kreuziger, Robert Alan, Juneau.
Krueger, Charles William, Menash.
Krueger, Duncan Frederick, West Allis.
Krumbine, Leo Frederick, Milwaukee.
Kuhnly, Gerald Loren, Siren.
La Duke, Rex Alfred, Kimberly.
Larson, James Edward, Mauston.
Last, Donald Roy, Oshkosh.
Ledebur, Michael T., Milwaukee.
Lederhaus, Donald Herman, Milwaukee.
Ledin, James Lars, Mellen.
Leising, Bruce Charles, Wauwatosa.
Lorenz, Terry Wayne, Lacrosse.
Luther, Clayton J., Baraboo.
Lutzke, Michael Jon, Milwaukee.
Lynn, James E., Kenosha.
Lyons, Patrick Nicholas, Manitowoc.
Mahoney, Ronald J., Chili.
Mann, Robert James, Brookfield.
Manske, Dennis Rudolph, Pine River.
Manske, Paul Edward, Oshkosh.
Martin, William Paul, Beliot.
Matusew, Joel Alotis, Kenosha.
Matush, Thomas Erwin, Madison.
McCalvy, James A., Milwaukee.
McCann, William George, Grantsburg.
McCartney, Robert Allen, Janesville.
McGilvary, Daniel J. Jr., Milwaukee.
McKee, Richard Charles, Jr., Green Bay.
Mehne, Richard Allen, Oshkosh.
Meinen, Bernard Phillip, Jr., Chippewa Falls.
Merrill, David B., Beaver Dam.
Merriweather, Nathaniel, Milwaukee.
Michaud, Ronald Albert, Niagara.
Mietus, John Andrew, Eagle River.
Miladin, Raymond Edward, Kenosha.
Miller, Andrew J., Sheboygan.
Mitchell, Thomas C., Milwaukee.
Moody, Andrew Leslie, Jr., Germantown.
Moran, Michael Peter, Milwaukee.
Mueller, Robert Gilbert, Hartford.
Myers, Chester Arthur, Jr., Eagle River.

WISCONSIN—continued

Army

Neubauer, James R., Columbia.
Neumann, Mark Willard, Madison.
Oestreicher, Paul Anthony, La Crosse.
Olson, Duane Virgil, Arena.
Olson, Rodney, James, Eau Claire.
Page, James Henry, Eagle River.
Paskowicz, Donald, Greendale.
Paulson, John Paul, Jr., Neenah.
Peters, David E., Milwaukee.
Plier, Eugene John, Sheboygan.
Pundsack, Terry Lynn, Milwaukee.
Quast, Willy Vascille, Madison.
Reinke, Robert Harvey, Appleton.
Reuter, Neil George, Milwaukee.
Rixmann, Edward Harold, Star Prairie.
Roberts, Kenneth David, Wausau.
Rutowski, Dennis David, Waterford.
Sandel, Ronald S., Thorp.
Sanderson, Johnny D., Burlington.
Schaefer, Kenneth Lee, Beaver Dam.
Schliesman, Jerrod Joseph, Rio.
Schneider, William Joseph, Janesville.
Scott, Bruce Richard, Lacrosse.
Shaw, Thomas, Milwaukee.
Shepherd, Ronald Dean, Watertown.
Short, Barry Jan, Milwaukee.
Sikorski, Daniel, Milwaukee.
Smeester, Daniel Raymond, Green Bay.
Smith, Donald Laverne, Fennimore.
Smith, Lloyd Steven, Portage.
Spencer, Gene B., Walworth.
Spoehr, Winfield August, Jr., New London.
Stein, Richard William, Brookfield.
Steinberg, George Charles, Milwaukee.
Stelpflug, Merlin Clarence, Dickeyville.
Stoflet, Michael Howard, Elkhorn.
Styer, Frederic Clarence, Menomonie.
Sund, Terrence Lee, Menomonee Falls.
Sutton, Larry Ivan, Danbury.
Szymanski, Robert Thomas, Milwaukee.
Tauschek, Leonard John, Beloit.
Thiry, Scott Louis, Milwaukee.
Thoma, Charles John, Madison.
Thompson, Leonard Dean, Madison.
Van Keuren, Allen L., Elkhorn.
Wangerin, Leon Arthur, Milwaukee.
Ward, James Calvin, Milwaukee.
Weinberg, Dennis Edward, Milwaukee.
Widder, David John Wick, Sheboygan.
Wiegel, Lloyd George, Shullsburg.
Williamson, Larry Allen, Racine.
Woznicky, David James, Hatley.
Young, Glen Harry, Brodhead.
Young, John E., Oconto.
Zajac, Thaddeus, Milwaukee.

Air Force

Baldwin, Robert Lanoue, Tomah.
Bush, Robert Ira, Racine.
Dawson, Clyde Duane, Fond du Lac.
Draeger, Walter Frank, Jr., Deerfield.
Jajtner, Raymond Charles, Menomonee Falls.
Kubley, Roy Robert, Glidden.
Watson, Donald David, Tripoli.

Marine Corps

Agius, Vincent James, Janesville.
Allen, Merlin Raye, Bayfield.
Ammerman, Roscoe, Madison.
Anderson, Jack William, Jr., Milwaukee.
Antoine, Dennis Lloyd, Franklin.
Arnold, Robert Dwain, Galesville.
Arries, James Michael, Elk Mound.
Banovez, Michael Joseph, Jr., Madison.
Baranczyk, Albin Anton, Menasha.
Bartelme, Michael Paul, Watertown.
Beck, Terrence Daniel, Ft. Atkinson.
Beilfuss, Edward Alan, Jr., Milwaukee.
Bendorf, David Glen, Livingston.
Berweger, Allan Frederick, Ashland.
Boehler, James Leonard, Racine.
Boettger, Terri Martin, Milwaukee.
Brodhagen, Frederick Harol, Greendale.
Burns, Thomas Raymond, Fremont.
Calverley, Anthony George, Racine.
Carstens, Thomas James, Hartland.
Chitko, Benjamin Albin, Pembine.
Cloutier, Robert Louis, Somerset.
Davidson, Michael John, Cassville.

WISCONSIN—continued

Marine Corps

De Gray, Jerry Frederick, Milwaukee.
Dean, Albert, Milwaukee.
Demoe, Raymond Roger, Elk Mound.
Dibb, Stephen Keith, Milwaukee.
Dobish, James Thomas, Oshkosh.
Dowling, Jean Pierre, Madison.
Felch, Arleigh Francis, Sheboygan.
Folkers, Lavoughn Herman, Racine.
Frischmann, David Joseph, Waukesha.
Fuchs, William, Jr., Milwaukee.
Gannon, John Patrick, Plymouth.
Geiger, Larry Frederick, Milwaukee.
Gerg, Thomas Arthur, Brookfield.
Gilbertson, Ricky Mark, Milwaukee.
Grudzinski, William Thomas, Edgerton.
Guden, Thomas Charles, Berlin.
Haas, Kenneth Daniel, Stanley.
Hamlet, James Lewis, New Richmond.
Harteau, James Peter, Waukesha.
Hawley, Kenneth Bruce, Oshkosh.
Hayes, Wayne Michael, Menomonie.
Heiden, Carl William, Milwaukee.
Heiser, Robert Allen, Rib Lake.
Hill, Charles Herman, Fond du Lac.
Johnke, Ronald Edward, Menasha.
Jensen, Alan Theodore, Hales Corner.
Johnson, Donald Peter, Gilman.
Johnstone, Kent Leroy, Amery.
Kakuk, Allen John, Two Rivers.
Kitzke, Ronald Frederick, Wauwatosa.
Kramer, Dougles Lee, Milwaukee.
Kritz, Eugene Richard, Milwaukee.
Kropidlowski, Gerald, Stevens Point.
Laux, Michael Deane, Appleton.
Litke, Jerome Walter, Milwaukee.
Madison, Thomas Vernon, Delavan.
Martin, Vernal Glen, Marshfield.
Matson, Howard V., Jr., Brookfield.
Mercier, John Charles, Racine.
Moe, Harold John, Eau Claire.
Mulcahy, Michael Lee, Stoughton.
Natzke, Nicholas Lee, Merrill.
Neumeir, Terry James, Kewaunee.
Nickerson, Gilbert Ronald, Racine.
Olson, Gary Wayne, Milwaukee.
Patrick, Daniel Garry, Salem.
Pearson, Bradley Alan, Clear Lake.
Perlewitz, Steven Owen, Algoma.
Peterson, Timm Conrad, Clayton.
Pierson, William Edwin, Brookfield.
Plecity, James Donn, Madison.
Pokey, Frank Micheal, Jr., Milwaukee.
Rische, Karl Balthasar, Jr., Milwaukee.
Robinson, Gerald Arden, Kenauee.
Romanshek, John Charles, Milwaukee.
Ruminski, Robert Paul, Two Rivers.
Rush, Jack Raymond, Algoma.
Schaefer, Roy Anthony, Jr., Fond du Lac.
Schaeffer, Gerold, West Bend.
Schley, Robert James, Oregon.
Schmid, John Stephen, Salem.
Schmid, Ronald Kenneth, Juda.
Schwendler, Richard Willia, Milwaukee.
Senz, Dennis Leon, Tomah.
Shepard, James Merrill, Jr., Marshall.
Siemanowski, David Albert, Milwaukee.
Stecker, John Charles, Milwaukee.
Stoflet, Gordon Wayne, Madison.
Streckert, Ronald John, Chilton.
Thresher, Kenneth Eugene, Milwaukee.
Tremaine, Curtis Llewellyn, Oconomowoc.
Tycz, James Neil, Milwaukee.
Vogel, Duane Arlen, Sheboygan.
Walsh, Robert Thomas, La Crosse.
Watson, Albert Clay, Jr., Mauston.
Will, Gordon Waldemar, Waupaca.
Wixson, Ralph Michael, Janesville.
Woods, Theodore R., Jr., Milwaukee.
Wucinski, Richard Thomas, Milwaukee.
Zeichert, Henry James, Cochrane.
Zywicke, David Lee, Manitowoc.

Navy

Allard, Michael John, Schofield.
Beyer, William Arthur, Platteville.
Cork, Raymond Lee, Jr., Racine.
Decker, Robert Hugh, Marshfield.
Freund, Terrence Jay, Sheboygan.
Geise, Dell Conley, Burlington.

WISCONSIN—continued

Navy

Glueckstein, William Robert, Brookfield.
Jensen, Richard, Brillion.
Joosten, Robert Walter, Little Chute.
Judkins, Larry Duane, Appleton.
Kearns, James Thomas, Port Washington.
La Haye, James David, Green Bay.
Murphy, William Henry, III, Madison.
Pinneker, Jerald Lee, Milwaukee.
Radtke, Eric Rudolph, Menomonee Falls.
Reinke, Ronald Richard, Middleton.
Rickli, Rodney Howard, Fond du Lac.
Rohan, William James, Racine.
Walz, Nicholas George, Steuben.

WYOMING

Army

Bartz, Gary Eugene, Cody Park.
Brown, Kenneth Lloyd, Sheridan.
Bush, Gilbert Bryon, Laramie.
Byers, Jerry Duane, Casper.
Clayburn, Merrell, J., Jackson.
Dellos, Samuel Lee, Worland.
Gibson, Harold Lee, Greybull.
Harrison, George Robert, Clearmont.
Holland, Carlton, Casper.
May, Leonard Don, Medicine Bow.
Montanez, Pedro Rodriquez, Lovell.
Patino, Pablo, Powell.
Saunders, Timothy Judd, Jackson.
Shuck, Robert Le Roy, Newcastle.
Smith, Dennis Wayne, Basin.
Taylor, Ernest Edward, Kaycee.
Warnock, Larry Lyman, Buffalo.

Air Force

Blackner, Craig Slade, Lyman.
Hart, Joseph Leslie, Afton.
Krogman, Alva Ray, Worland.

Marine Corps

Beck, Michael Ray, Cheyenne.
Esslinger, William Bertus, Cheyenne.
Grove, Robert Woodrow, Casper.
Hansen, Barry Andre, Evanston.
Moore, Norman Lee, Riverton.
Moss, Weldon Dale, Ethete.
Orlikowski, Daniel John, Athens.
Rogers, Robert Richard, Gillette.
Stumpp, Alma Jack, Afton.
Torrez, Lawrence Daniel, Cheyenne.
Washut, Walter, Jr., Sheridan.

Navy

Guthrie, Robert Fred, Cheyenne.
Robinson, Philip Owen, Sheridan.

GUAM

Army

Cabrera, Joaquin Palacios, Piqua Merizo.
Cepeda, Juan Duenas, Dededo.
Cruz, Joseph William, Agana Heights.
Cruz, Pedro Aflague, Agana.
Doyle, Albert Barcinas, Merizo.
Duenas, Jose Bamba, Toto.
Flores, Benny San Nicloas, Merigo.
Gurrero, Pedro Rosario, Barrigada.
Mariano, Jesus Rosa, Mangilao.
Pereda, Henry Pangelinan, Agana.
Quenga, Johnny Cruz, Agat.
Reyes, Tomas Garcia, Agana.
Rivera, Thomas Salas, Agat.
Sablan, Thomas Quichocho, Yigo Village.
Santos, Ernest Pablo, Talofofo.
Santos, James, Edward Ander, Dededo.
Torres, Prischardo, J. T., Agana.

Marine Corps

Benavente, David Guerrero, Dededo Village.
Blaz, James Lujan, Dededo.
Cruz, Joseph Aguigui, Merico.
Damian, Allan James, Toto.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Alcocer-Martinez, Hector M., Caguas.
Algarin-Rivera, Rafael A., Juncos.
Alvarado-Rivera, Jeronimo, Barrio Asomante.
Alvarez-Buzo, Elias, Ponce.
Aviles-Aviles, Juan Pascua, Lajas.
Barbosa, Antonio Villafane, Rio Piedras.

PUERTO RICO—continued

Army

Bermejo, Richard Ismael, Quebradillas.
Bermudez-Pacheco, Enrique, Bayamon.
Bermudez-Quenones, Ludin Rio Piedras.
Bernard, Ramon, Mayaguez.
Bonilla-Viera, Felipe, Aguadilla.
Cabrera-Rodriguez, Marceli, Ponce.
Caraballo-Garcia, Megdelio, Yauco.
Carmona-Medina, Rafael C., Toa Baja.
Castro-Carrasquillo, Miguel, Cienaga Oaja.
Chaparro-Villanueya, Germa, Rincon.
De Jesus-Sanchez, Anibal, Guayama.
De-Jesus, Carreras, Efrain, Caguas.
Estrada-Costas, Herman, Penuelas.
Figueroa, Caballero, Fernando, Caguas.
Fontanez-Velez, Jose Luis, Rio Piedras.
Fragosa-Garcia, Angel Luis, Juncos.
Garcia-Maldonado, Jose I., Naguabo.
Garcia-Soto, Jeronimo, Caguas.
Gonzalez-Droz, Eduardo, Santurce.
Gonzalez-Maldonada, Manuel, Carolina.
Gonzalez-Perez, Aramis, San German.
Guzman-Lugo, Eduardo, Barranquitas.
Irizarry-Hernandez, Angello, Hato Rey.
Irizarry-Perez, Jaime, Mayaguez.
Isales-Benitez, Jorge Luis, Rio Piedras.
Jimenez, Luis Rafael, Rio Piedras.
Jordan-Molero, Adrien Manuel, Utuado.
Jurado, Ambrosios Santiago, Caguas.
Kuilan-Oliveras, Ramon, Bayamon.
Lamourt-Tosado, Pedro Luis, Camuy.
Lebron-Domenech, Omar, San Sebastian.
Lebron-Lopez, Ismael, Guayama.
Leon, De Jesus, Efrain, Salinas.
Liciaga-Concepcion, Luis A., Aguadilla.
Lopez-Agosto, Felix Manuel, Humacao.
Lopez-Colon, Juan Antonio, Loiza.
Marcano-Diaz, Gamaliel, Bayamon.
Marquez-Lopez, Luis Manuel Guayama.
Marrero-Baez, Flor, Dorado.
Martinez-Feliciano, Jose L., Guayanilla.
Martir-Torres, Julio Ignac, Isabela.
Masso-Perez, Julio, Guayama.
Melendez, Cristobal, Rio Piedras.
Miranda-Cuevas, Luis Anton, Lares.
Miranda-Perez, Noe, Juana Diaz.
Morales-Gonzalez Julio Er, Aguada.
Morales-Lucas, Leslie I., Ponce.
Moreu-Leon, Mario, Ponce.
Negron-Rodriguez, Jose, Morovis.
Ortiz-Colon, Ulises, Rio Piedras.
Ortiz-Lopez, Alfonso, Bayamon.
Ortiz-Ortiz, Ceferino, A., Orocovis.
Ortiz-Rodriguez, Angel.
Ostolazo-Maldonado, Alfred, Santurce.
Oyola-Rabago, Anibal, Hato Rey.
Pagan Pagan, Amalio, Rio Piedras.
Pagan-Cartagena, Jose Ramo, Ciales.
Parilla-Calderon, Jaime, Bo Carola.
Pellot-Rodriguez, Ramon A., Arecibo.
Perez-Cruz, Antonio, Arecibo.
Perez-Vergara, Alberto, Aguas Buenas.
Pinto-Pinto, Sigfredo, Sabana Grande.
Pumarejo-Colon, Wilfredo, Aguadilla.
Rivera, Thomas Antonio, Santurce.
Rivera-Barreto, Jose Fermi, Catano.
Rivera-Martes, Confesor, Utuado.
Rivera-Melendez, Juses D., Bayamon.
Rodriguez-Estremera, Angel, Adjuntas.
Romero-Oyola, Heriberto, Trujillo Alto.
Rosa-Sein, Rosario, Moca.
Rosado-Rodriguez, Eugenio, Ponce.
Rubio, Euripides, Jr., Ponce.
Saez-Ramirez, Angel Perfir, Orocovis.
Sanchez-Berrios, Carmelo, Barranquitas.
Santiago, Maldonado Juan A., Isabela.
Santos-Pinedo, Pedro, Ponce.
Santos-Trujillo, Daniel, Loiza.
Soto-Garcia, Gilberto, San Juan.
Soto-Rodriguez, Angel Migu, Santurce.
Torres-Acevedo, Juvencio, Ponce.
Torres-Rivera, Rafael, Hato Rey.
Torres-Rodriguez, Julio A., Coamo.
Valpais-Morales, Rafael A., Ponce.
Vargas-Vargas Israel, Ponce.
Vazquez-Gonzalez, Pedro, Cavey.
Vega-Maysonet, Rafael, Barceloneta.
Vera-Duran, Miguel de Jesus, San Sebastian.
Vigo-Negrin, Luis, Santurce.

PUERTO RICO—continued

Marine Corps

Castro-Ramos, Justino E., Ponce.
Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Ramon, Villa Palmeras.
Hernandez-Soto, Antonio, Rio Piedras.
John, Noel Alexander, Monte Flores.
Martinez-Soto Jose, Bo Juncal.
Rivera-Cruz, Marcelino, Juncos.
Serrano-Giral, Candido, Bo Palmas Altas.

Deaths Resulting From Hostile Action in Vietnam Through December 31, 1968

ALABAMA

Army

Adams, Spencer, Mobile.
Alexander, David J., Jr., Anniston.
Allen, William Terry, Enterprise.
Allums, Frederick Larry, Empire.
Ausborn, Donald Eugene, Huntsville.
Avery, Ronnie G., Hamilton.
Baker, Jerry Scruggs, Altoona.
Baker, Melvin, Gadsden.
Baker, Raymond Delmar, Birmingham.
Bell, Jerome, Foster.
Bellomy, Willard Gordon, Woodville.
Benjamin, Richard, Atmore.
Bennett, Jacob, Phenix City.
Bird, Lonie, Semmes.
Blalock, James Terrell, Salem.
Blankenship, Larry J., Midfield.
Booker, Thomas Arthur, Bessemer.
Boyd, Ananias, Shorter.
Brewster, Ollis, Wellington.
Brock, Edward Lee, Florence.
Brown, Bobby James, Bessemer.
Brown, Hugh Bernard, III, Talladega.
Burt, James Howard, Fort Payne.
Busby, Monte Rex, Birmingham.
Cannion, William, Hayneville.
Cannon, Larry George, Oneonta.
Carpenter, Thomas, Jr., Tuscaloosa.
Carter, Hamp, Jr., Bessemer.
Cash, Benny Dale, Ashville.
Causey, Ben Elmore, Jr., Choctaw.
Chambers, Robert O., Camp Hill.
Childers, Virgil Eugene, Sumiton.
Christian, Lytell B., Enterprise.
Clark, Doris Wayne, Tuscumbia.
Coleman, George, Birmingham.
Compton, Johnnie Ray, Sylacauga.
Cook, Larry Davidson, Wetumpka.
Cooper, William Morris, Georgiana.
Cottrell, Willie James, Wetumpka.
Crews, Thomas Franklin, Marion.
Davis, Cecil Leroy, Birmingham.
Davis, Michael Edward, Gadsden.
Dorough, Jerry Eugene, Springville.
Dubose, Fred Clinton, III, Birmingham.
Eatman, Earnest, Jr., Birmingham.
Elliott, Ernest Lee, Dothan.
Erwin, Earl, Jr., Mobile.
Evans, Jerry Thomas, Birmingham.
Ferguson, William Edwin, Gadsden.
Fowler, Robert Allen, Geneva.
Frye, Bobby Sam, Hamilton.
Gardner, Robert Eugene, Sylacauga.
Garner, Jackie Wayne, Gadsden.
Garner, Willie Frank, Town Creek.
Giddens, Horace Gilbert, Jr., Andalusia.
Giles, Willie, Jr., Montgomery.
Glenn, Richard J., Florence.
Godwin, Johnie Reese, Jr., Montgomery.
Goree, Carlton Travis, Mobile.
Guy, Benny Ross, Tuscaloosa.
Hamilton, Ulys Ford, Spruce Pine.
Hamm, Donald Curtis, Mobile.
Hamner, Charles, Birmingham.
Handley, Howard Brown, Sheffield.
Harrell, Ronnie, Bessemer.
Harris, Edward Leon, North Birmingham.
Harris, Gary Bluitt, Hartselle.
Harris, Jerry Lee, Mobile.
Head, Marvin, Jr., Columbiana.
Heard, Robert Louis, Jackson Gap.
Hill, Jerry Dwain, Lexington.
Hilley, Robert Lee, Attalla.
Hillman, Joseph, III., Piedmont.
Hilyer, Broadus Dale, Opelika.

ALABAMA—continued

Army

Hodges, James Dale, Florence.
Hollis, James Augustus, Birmingham.
Holmes, Earnest Paul, Jr., Talladega.
Howell, Preston Lee, Sheffield.
Hughes, Macklin Otis, Pisgah.
Hughey, Edward Wendell, Sprott.
Huie, Robert Andrew, Oneonta.
Hurst, Roosevelt, Jr., Saraland.
Jackson, Crawford, Jr., Mobile.
James, Gerald, Mobile.
Jenkins, William Clarence, Gadsden.
Johnson, Armstead, Castleberry.
Johnson, Curtis, Montgomery.
Johnson, Obbie, Birmingham.
Jones, Jack Marion, Childersburg.
Jones, Joe Louis, Phenix City.
Kelley, Larry Dean, Fultondale.
Kennedy, James, Seale.
King, Robert Henry, Tuscumbia.
Lais, Robert Wallace, Birmingham.
Larry, John Davis, Jr., Birmingham.
Lawrence, Garry Frank, Woodstock.
Lay, Willie Ray, Fairhope.
Ledbetter, David Wayne, Piedmont.
Lee, Charlie Frank, Elba.
Leonard, Sidney Lamar, Gadsden.
Lewter, Stanley Reed, Hunstville.
Lisenby, Donald Eugene, Ozark.
Little, Wallace Sylvester, Riverview.
Lockridge, Jack Ray, Piedmont.
Lundy, Lonnie Eugene, Detroit.
Manning, William Terry, Mobile.
Martin, Hubert William, Oakman.
Martin, Rufus Michael, Birmingham.
Marzenell, Edward, Jr., Birmingham.
Mason, Earnest Lee, Jr., Emelle.
McCain, Michael Clinton, Birmingham.
McDonald, David Letcher, Jasper.
McGee, Robert Lewis, Jr., Russellville.
McKelvey, James Dániel, Florence.
McMurtrey, William Newton, Killen.
Miles, Elijah, Jr., Phenix City.
Minor, Matthew, Jr., Tuscaloosa.
Molton, Kenneth Wayne, Birmingham.
Moncrief, James Ray, Cordova.
Moncus, Bennie Ray, Fort Payne.
Montgomery, Donald Lee, Cloverdale.
Moore, Leonard David, Bessemer.
Moser, Merrill Andrew, Baldwin.
Mundy, Robert Hal, Anniston.
Murray, Darnell Patrick, Anniston.
Naramore, David A., Jr., Jasper.
Neely, Dan Lee, Birmingham.
Norris, Van Allen, Union Springs.
Ogletree, Young David, Salem.
Oliver, Henry McCarty, Montgomery.
Owens, David Ray, Athens.
Owens, Dewey Ray, Andalusia.
Page, Roy Ronald, Eva.
Palmer, William Herschell, Abbeville.
Parr, Ronald Eugene, Birmingham.
Perkins, Wardell, Gordo.
Peters, Wilbert, Mobile.
Pierce, Jimmy Ray, Prichard.
Pike, Edward Morris, Hanceville.
Poole, Thomas Dewitt, West Blocton.
Presley, Melton Howard, Childersburg.
Pressley, Cornelius, Birmingham.
Prince, Garry Garnett, Birmingham.
Puckett, Jean Wayne, Piedmont.
Purcell, Larry Joe, Empire.
Rawlins, James Patrick, Montgomery.
Richard, Jerry Gordon, Anniston.
Richards, Robert, Birmingham.
Richardson, Donald William, Semmes.
Rodgers, Bobby Ray, Hollywood.
Ross, Luther Julian, Jr., Birmingham.
Salter, Robert Wayne, Parrish.
Samples, Larry Junior, Henager.
Sawyer, Paul Lewis, Jr., New Brockton.
Schmale, William Otto, Cullman.
Sewell, Johnnie Bruce, Hartselle.
Sewell, Lorenzo, Sayreton.
Simpkins, Wilmer Franklin, Fairfax.
Sisk, Harry Duncan, Huntsville.
Smiley, George Robert, Montgomery.
Smith, Joe Wilkins, Prattville.
Speaks, Mac Wayne, Alexander City.
Stabler, John Leslie, Summerdale.
Standridge, Paul Richard, Anniston.
Stanley, Joe Harry, Altoona.
Stewart, Charlie Aces, Jr., Birmingham.
Stewart, Sam William, Huntsville.
Story, J. C., Bessemer.
Stovall, Charles Allen, Gadsden.
Sullivan, Arnold Hosea, Northport.
Swain, Lee Wesley, Jr., Alpine.
Taylor, Clifton Thomas, Mobile.
Terry, Arie, Decatur.
Thomas, Jimmy Ray, Brewton.
Thomas, Tennyson Aaron, Bessemer.
Townsend, Roosevelt, Mathews.
Turner, David Lee, Lacey Springs.
Underwood, Daniel Ledare, Pisgah.
Voyles, Floyd, Somerville.
Walker, Clifford C., Sheffield.
Ward, Carl Gene, Salem.
Washington, William F., Jr., Birmingham.
Wells, Billy, Northport.
Whan, Vorin Edwin, Jr., Irondale.
White, James David, Prichard.
White, John Oliver, Saraland.
White, Leamuel Artis, Silverhill.
Wiginton, Gary Ray, Sheffield.
Williams, Donald Winslow, Sipsey.
Williams, Melvin Joe., Birmingham.
Williams, Paul Edward, Huntsville.
Wilson, Fred., Birmingham.
Woods, James Arlie, Jasper.
Wooley, Donald, Siluria.
Woolsey, Hilton Edward, Mobile.
Worrell, Hurston Edward, Pittsview.
Young, William Frank, Oxford.

Air Force

Lawrence, Gregory Paul, Phenix.
Moore, Dallas Henry, Headland.
Yeend, Richard C., Jr., Mobile.

Marine Corps

Angerman, Donald Edward, Birmingham.
Avery, John Mark, Cottondale.
Ayers, Lesley Steven, Huntsville
Ballew, Arthur Clay, Gadsden.
Beck, John Theron, Gordo.
Calhoun, Franchot Tone, Anniston.
Shastant, Rodney Rene, Mobile.
Clark, Larry Gene, Huntsville.
Craft, James David, Anniston.
Cruitt, Michael Douglas, Cullman.
Dalhouse, John Dudley, Montgomery.
Davis, Curry Barry, Roanoke.
Downs, Vernon Leroy, Jr., Huntsville.
Edwards, Joseph William, Mobile.
Faulks, Willie James, Montgomery.
Ford, Clifford Eugene, Jr., Jacksonville.
Ford, Glenn Edward, Gadsden.
Gaines, Allan Joseph, Tuscaloosa.
Gaines, Wordell, Tuscaloosa.
Gentry, Oscar, Jr., Birmingham.
Hammonds, James Robert, Evergreen.
Harris, Frank Cay, Mobile.
Holland, James Larry, Boaz.
Hollimon, Billy Michael, Mount Hope.
Hubbard, Robert Walker, Auburn.
Jackson, Billy Lee, Saraland.
Johns, Carey Lee, Oneonta.
Johns, Michael Wayne, Andalusia.
Johnson, Lile Lamar, Jr., Mobile.
Jones, Jimmie Lee, Cordova.
Jones, John Henry, Jr., Phenix City.
Joshua, James Edward, Jr., Gadsden.
King, Argestlar, Jr., Birmingham.
Kuhse, Michael Darrell, Huntsville.
Leland, Leroy, Jr., Theodore.
Littlefield, Robert Henry, Birmingham.
Lloyd, Rodney Dale, Birmingham.
Lloyd, Ronald Edward, Mobile.
Long, Michael David, Oneonta.
Lovelady, Ronald David, Cullman.
Lowe, Louis Cardell, Tuscaloosa.
Magnusson, Fred Wayne, Ardmore.
Marshall, James Conrad, Monroeville.
McCarty, Billy Joe, Wilmer.
McCorkel, James Edward, Whistler.
McGee, Danny Albert, Florence.
McLester, Sherman Douglas, Anniston.
Meads, Herbert Lynn, Huntsville.
Merritt, Allen Twiggs, IV, Atmore.
Miller, Ormond, Mitchell, Gadsden.
Mitchell, Homer, Jr., Montgomery.

ALABAMA—continued

Marine Corps

Monroe, Wilber Dean, Langdale.
Moore, Roy Lee, Madison.
Mullins, Arthur Brent, Mobile.
Nelson, Roger Tilton, Gadsden.
Norsworthy, Jimmy Layne, Brantley.
Pate, William Lawrence, Robertsdale.
Pearson, Carl Oscar, Jr., Silverhill.
Pendergrass, Vernon Frankl, Birmingham.
Randall, Simon, Birmingham.
Raynor, James Daniel, Empire.
Reynolds, John Henry, Bessemer.
Rice, Robert Ivan, Huntsville.
Ritch, John Gwin, Parrish.
Rogers, William T., IV, Montgomery.
Salter, Dwayne Lamont, Evergreen.
Scott, James Frank, Mobile.
Scott, Johnny Major, Jr., Mobile.
Scroggins, Douglas Sidney, Wing.
Senn, Thomas Larry, Lanett.
Shaw, James Douglas, Birmingham.
Smith, Author C., Glen Allen.
Smith, Hurley Alvin, Dothan.
Smith, Ronnie Wayne, Huntsville.
Smith, Samuel Thomas, Jr., Huntsville.
Sterns, Randolph Joel, Tuscaloosa.
Taylor, Robert Hildreth, Birmingham.
Thrift, Fred Lewis, Mobile.
Tulbert, Reginald Gay, Wagarville.
Turner, William Oliver, Phenix City.
Walbridge, George Wilcox, Huntsville.
Waldrop, Raymond Clarence, Albertville.
Ward, Wayne Levoyer, Mobile.
Wesley, Marvin, Jr., Guin.
Westbrook, Dennis Franklin, Prichard.
Wilder, Steve Clifton, Birmingham.
Winston, William Curtis, Roanoke.
Winter, John Wesley, Brewton.
Wyrosdic, William Everett, Mobile.
Yerion, Jeffery Allen, Dothan.

Navy

Allen, Granville Joel, Jr., Birmingham.
Collier, Jerry Lamayne, Boaz.
Dennis, William Earl, Birmingham.
Morris, William T., III, Mobile.
Pettis, Thomas Edwin, Mobile.

ALASKA

Army

Duncan, William Bradley, Anchorage.
Elliott, Robert Thomas, III, Anchorage.
Ferry, David Lynn, Fairbanks.
Gulliksen, Howard Wayne, Seward.
Millhouse, Kenneth Bruce, Sperard.
Plaskowski, William Francis, Anchorage.
Robison, Donald Robert, College.
Sperl, Donald Walter, Juneau.
Thompson, William Arthur, Ketchikan.

Marine Corps

Brown, David Dee, Jr., Wrangell.
Griffin, Dale Anthony, Anchorage.
Vanderpool, Joe Wayne, Anchorage.

ARIZONA

Army

Adair, Dallas Tyler, Jr., Mesa.
Alday, Frank Tisnero, Phoenix.
Alvarez, Jose Richardo L., Tucson.
Alyea, Walter John, Phoenix.
Andrews, Robert Lee, Jr., Phoenix.
Asplund, Marcus Ray, Phoenix.
Barnes, Allen Roy, Aguila.
Bates, Brian William, Phoenix.
Bautista, Jesus Estrada, Tucson.
Begody, Harold L., Tuba City.
Bennett, Anthony Lee, Cottonwood.
Bia, Michael Howard, Window Rock.
Bilducia, Conrado Francisc, Winkelman.
Boehm, Bradley Wainwright, Phoenix.
Bojorquez, Sisto Bojorquez, Eloy.
Brinkcotter, James Albert, Phoenix.
Brown, James Scott, Prescott.
Cardenas, Jos Candelaria R., Phoenix.
Carillo, Joe, Jr., Tucson.
Casey, Tom Gayle, Phoenix.
Cates, William Lloyd, Stanfield.
Chiago, Gregory Burkhart, Phoenix.
Classen, Earl Thomas, Phoenix.
Claw, Peter Yazzie, Kayenta.
Cobb, Theron Wallace, Tucson.

ARIZONA—continued

Army

Coker, James Lee, Phoenix.
Collins, Billy G., Phoenix.
Contreras, Richard Aguirre, Hayden.
Cox, John Davies, Jr., Tucson.
Dale, Bennie, Wide Ruins.
Delaney, James Perry, Willow.
Dent, Bruce James, Williams.
Dominguez, Frank L., Mesa.
Downing, John Leslie, Phoenix.
Elias, Juan Angel, Tucson.
Frazer, Fredrick Harry, Wickenburg.
Galvez, Tom, Casa Grande.
Geraghty, Merrill Thomas, Mesa.
Grijalyva, Geronimo Lopez, Douglas.
Hanna, Donald Ray, Scottsdale.
Harbottle, James Levern, Flagstaff.
Hardy, Charles McRae, Tempe.
Harmon, Carey Dean, Lake Havasu City.
Hernandez, Alex James, Tucson.
Herrera, Frank G., Mesa.
Hicks, Donald, Tonalea.
Hills, Clarence S., Gilbert.
Hollmen, William Harry, Prescott.
Holton, Stanley Gene, Phoenix.
Hurd, Jerry Alan, Casa Grande.
Johnson, David Alvin, Prescott.
Johnson, David Arthur, Yuma.
Jones, Michael Bruce, Mohave.
Konigsfeld, Philip Lorne, Tucson.
Kovik, Gene Lawrence, Maricopa.
Lackey, Vernon Harvic, Phoenix.
Lambert, Steve Nathaniel, Phoenix.
Laszlo, Joseph, Phoenix.
Lee, Ned, Flagstaff.
Lentz, Edward Martin, Tucson.
Lerma, Geronimo, Buckeye.
Lucas, Michael Richard, Glendale.
Machado, Francisco, Jr., Phoenix.
Madrid, Ernest, McNary.
Mansfield, Patrick Leroy, Tucson.
McChesney, John T., III, Phoenix.
Mendez, Salvador Joe, Casa Grande.
Merrett, James Allen, Phoenix.
Meyer, Arthur William, Tucson.
Moncavage, David John, Scottsdale.
Newton, Melvin Dew, Flagstaff.
O'Connor, Mortimer Lelane, Tucson.
Ogilvie, Gordon Wilson, Bakersfield.
Olea, Francisco Herrera, Ajo.
Pashano, Jack Poola, Polacca.
Patten, Jimmie, San Carlos.
Patterson, Daniel Charles, Phoenix.
Pete, Franklin Danny, Jr., Sacaton.
Powell, Larry Dean, Hillside.
Quesney, Jose Manuel, Tucson.
Quintero, Fernando Mendoza, Globe.
Ramirez, Richard, Jr., McNeal.
Robinette, Charles Edward, Tucson.
Rodriguez, Joe Stelo, Tucson.
Romero, Robert Anthony, Douglas.
Roush, Samuel Emmerson, Tucson.
Rowland, Richard Lee, Jr., Phoenix.
Sanchez, Rudolpho, Phoenix.
Shrum, William Lawrence, Phoenix.
Silvas, Jorge Alvarado, Douglas.
Sowers, Charles Henry, II, Phoenix.
Stewart, Gregory William, Tucson.
Sutton, Frank, Phoenix.
Tedrick, Warren Bambiel, Jr., Tempe.
Ten, Huskie Yazzie B., Pinon.
Todd, George Albert, Tucson.
Urias, David Soqui, Phoenix.
Valenzuela, Pedro, Guadalupe.
Valenzuela, Rodolfo, Chandler.
Van Loon, Frank C., Jr., Phoenix.
Wallace, Dixie De, Phoenix.
Walters, Craig Collins, Tucson.
Wilkes, Eulis Neil, Jr., Yuma.
Wise, Joseph Robert, Nogales.
Woolridge, Thomas Alphonse, Tucson.
Young, Robert Earnest, Silverbell.
Zeleski, Philip Edward, Phoenix.

Air Force

Beach, Sam Festis, Jr., Glendale.
Cornelius, Johnnie Clayton, Maricopa.
Ochoa, Jesus, Tucson.

Marine Corps

Atwell, William Albert, Ajo.
Banks, Henry Duane, Prescott.

ARIZONA—continued

Marine Corps

Barnett, Benjamin Franklin, Phoenix.
Bisjak, Howard Robert, Chino Valley.
Carabeo, Leonard, Bisbee.
Christman, Jerry Nolan, Williams.
Crider, Russel Duane, Parker.
Czechowski, John Louis, Jr., Mesa.
Embrey, Richard Lynn, Warren.
Fourmentin, Gregg R., Scottsdale.
Fults, Lawrence Arthur, Jr., Tucson.
Gault, Clinton Monroe, Jr., Eloy.
Gifford, William Gary, Phoenix.
Gonzales, Gerardo Holquin, Tucson.
Hathaway, Stephen Worth, Tucson.
Hogan, Cary Lee, Phoenix.
Huelskamp, Ronald James, Mesa.
Ingram, Allen Wade, San Manuel.
Koester, Joel Frederick, Phoenix.
Krisell, James Lee, Glendale.
Lamprecht, Mark August, Douglas.
Laurence, Joe Robert, Willcox.
Litzler, James William, Flagstaff.
Lopez, Perfecto Nunez, Peoria.
Lopez, Robert Francisco, Phoenix.
Lyons, Joseph Walter, Phoenix.
Moncayo, Jose Roberto, Norenci.
Muir, James, Tucson.
Munoz, Rojelio Olivan II, Mesa.
Orozco, Tony Salazar, Jr., Winslow.
Rhoades, Frederick Paul, Phoenix.
Ridenour, Edwin Michael, Yuma.
Rizo, Albert Martinez, Glendale.
Roybal, Thomas Michael, Jr., Phoenix.
Ruiz, Peter George, Ajo.
Salcido, George Arthur, Benson.
Sanchez, Paul Frank, Globe.
Schibi, James Lee, Winslow.
Sedillo, Juan Natividad, McNary.
Simmons, James Charles Dan, Eloy.
Smith, Terrence Glen, Phoenix.
Tompkins, Phillip Warren, Globe.
Weitzel, George Martin, Phoenix.
West, Larry Joe, Morenci.
Whitmer, Alfred Van, Morenci.
Yazzie, Leonard Lee, Pinon.

Navy

Brown, Anthony Bartow, Tucson.
Cook, Ronald John, Phoenix.
Graves, Gary Everett, San Manuel.
Jamison, Jan Dwain, Phoenix.
Martin, Clifford B., Jr., Tucson.
Morton, Douglas George, Phoenix.
Raper, Alvin Louis, Sierra Vista.
Reinhold, Michael J., Page.
Rice, Dennis Kelly, Phoenix.
Siqueiros, Manuel Mendoza, Nogales.

ARKANSAS

Army

Acosta, John Wayne, North Little Rock.
Ballard, Ronnie Edsel, Warm Springs.
Anthony, Carey C., Marianna.
Bailey, Thomas Harold, Stephens.
Birmingham, Terry Wayne, Trumann.
Bonner, Don W., Hoxie.
Boyce, Alton, Turner.
Bozeman, Charles Lee, Little Rock.
Bradford, Willie B., Blytheville.
Brooks, William Roger, Morrilton.
Brown, James Lee, Jr., Marianna.
Clayborn, Billy Joe, Lamar.
Cochran, James Clifford, Hardy.
Couch, Freddie Lee, Lonoke.
Cover, Bobby Cecil, Pine Bluff.
Cummings, Nathaniel, Arkadelphia.
Elledge, Michael Stewart, North Little Rock.
Ellis, Coney, Rosston.
English, Robert Preston, Malvern.
Fitts, Gerald Lampley, Little Rock.
Frird, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hot Springs.
Glenn, Charles Phillip, Patrick.
Gordon, Hubert Haskel, Jr., Little Rock.
Graham, Charles Herbert, West Memphis.
Gray, Danny Micheal, Fordyce.
Gray, Gregory Vaughan, Batesville.
Harrington, Hugh Lee, Gentry.
Harris, James Ronald, Clarksville.
Hines, Wilburt Nathan, Little Rock.
Hinton, Overtis, Jr., Wynne.
Holt, James Richard, Jacksonville.

ARKANSAS—continued

Army

Howe, Sidney A., De Queen.
Huff, James A., Viola.
Hutchison, Charles Randel, Camden.
Isbell, Otis Edward, West Memphis.
Jacks, Mark Douglas, Little Rock.
Johnson, Alexander, Jr., Van Buren.
Kertis, Henry Lee, Jr., Wabbaseka.
Kever, Dwayne Elbert, Heber Springs.
King, Johnny Ray, Cash.
Mann, Charles Clifton, Jr., Malvern.
Marcussen, Glennon, Monticello.
Mask, Joe Junior, Monette.
McDaniel, Chester, Wynne.
McDonald, Jerry Vernon, Belleville.
McFadden, Floyd, Ashdown.
McGee, Bolen Pondexder, Osceola.
Michles, Earl R., Pocahontas.
Moseley, Harold Eugene, Cabot.
Nixon, Samuel Ray, Mulberry.
Nixon, William Dale, Mulberry.
Payne, James Carl, Marked Tree.
Pillow, Ronald Edward, Hughes.
Porchia, Bobby Ray, Pine Bluff.
Purtell, Robert Buck, Lockesburg.
Rainwater, Jewel Lee, Van Buren.
Rasberry, Mike Raymond, El Dorado.
Remmel, Harmon L., III, Fayetteville.
Riley, Eugene Lee, Tontitown.
Roar, William Arthur, Newport.
Robbins, Leroy Brian, Clarksville.
Robinson, Clarence, Helena.
Robinson, Horace Valley, Jr., Blytheville.
Robison, Edward Keith, Newport.
Schaffer, John Ferdinand, Altus.
Scrivner, Brooks Michael, Little Rock.
Scucchi, John Glenn, Lake Village.
Sharpe, Jaye Arthur, Dermott.
Simmons, Edgar Lee, Pine Bluff.
Sisco, Billy Joe, Okean.
Stroble, Coy Edward, North Little Rock.
Stroud, Edward Eugene, Jonesboro.
Sublett, Michel Kent, Searcy.
Sumpter, Eddy Gale, Judsonia.
Swartzlander, Elie Edward, Hoxie.
Torrence, Willie Charles, Pine Bluff.
Vories, John Lloyd, Booneville.
Walker, Clarence, Little Rock.
Wall, Jimmie Paul, Monticello.
Wells, Richard Foy, Little Rock.
West, Danny Ray, Ft. Smith.
Wildman, Melvin Alvin, Rose Bud.
Williams, Burnell, Jr., Blytheville.
Wilson, David, Magnolia.
Wolfe, William Edward, Jr., El Dorado.
Wooley, Henry Eugene, Banks.
Young, Jimmy Randle, Oil Trough.

Air Force

Harrell, Donald Augustus, Little Rock.
Hazelwood, Thomas Gerald, Magnolia.

Marine Corps

Andrews, Fred Eugene, Urbana.
Boling, Lesley, Jr., Decatur.
Bratton, Darrell Dwane, Russellville.
Brown, Vernon, Jr., Nashville.
Cunningham, Jesse J., Jr., Searcy.
Dansby, Emmit Charles, Texarkana.
Davis, Don Edward, Cabot.
Dillion, Richard Hall, Jr., Little Rock.
Downs, Carl Lester, Little Rock.
Earnest, Junior Barnett, Prattsville.
Gentry, Jimmie Ferrel, Little Rock.
Golden, Jimmy Lee, Urbana.
Greene, John Wayne, Corssell.
Halsell, John Edmond, Hot Springs.
Handley, Anthony William, Hot Springs.
Harrison, Paul Alvin, Crossett.
Honeycutt, James Earl, Haynes.
Houston, Marvin Lynn, Little Rock.
Johnson, Ledell, Jr., Fort Smith.
Keim, James Robert, Russellville.
Livingston, Billy Dale, Alma.
Mayer, Paul Evans, North Little Rock.
McHenry, James Carthell, Camden.
Mitchell, Larry Levern, Bald Knob.
Owens, Jerry Lynn, Danville.
Pamplin, John Mac, Dermott.
Phillips, Otis Lamont, Searcy.
Reather, Wallace Lee, Jr., Conway.
Reeves, Gregory Keith, Benton.

ARKANSAS—continued

Marine Corps

Rice, John Edward, Fort Smith.
Richards, Micheal Edward, Perryville.
Riles, James Calvin, Fordyce.
Rubbins, Dennis Truman, Benton.
Robertson, Gerald William, North Little Rock.
Sanders, Edward Leon, Texarkana.
Shireman, Paul, Jr., Jacksonville.
Smith, James Christopher, Lake Village.
Smock, William Haskell, Van Buren.
Stanton, Emmett Charles, Little Rock.
Sullivan, Neil Brian, Winslow.
Turner, Arthur Travis, Texarkana.
Washington, John, Earle.
Williams, Nathaniel Mearlo, Genevia.
Young, Thomas Franklin, Hot Springs.

Navy

Armstrong, Billy Stanley, West Helena.
Boyce, Samuel Minor, Dardanelle.
Crimson, Lonnie Joe, Pocahontas.
Hamm, Gerald Eugene Booth, Camden.
Miller, Carl Jerome, Manila.
Mosley, Bernie Jack, Hot Springs.
Williams, Arthur C., Jr., Van Buren.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Abbie, Donald Paul, Sacramento.
Abbott. Edward Donald, Yuba City.
Abraham, Paul Leonard, Santa Ana.
Achor, Terrence William, Whittier.
Acosta, John Michael, Sacramento.
Adair, Harvey Gene, Kingsburg.
Adams, Gilles David, Alta Loma.
Adams, James Lindell, Pittsburg.
Adams, Paul Edwin, Garden Grove.
Aguiar, Juan Daniel, Oakland.
Ahern, John Bernard, Delhi
Akamu, Albert Kaiwi, San Francisco.
Akins, Samuel Leroy, Los Angeles.
Albert, Raymond Howard, Jr., Imperial Beach.
Aleshire, Ronald Lee, San Jose.
Alexander, Robert Emmet, Los Angeles.
Alford, Michael Lynn, Redlands.
Alfred, Thomas Samuel, Oceanside.
Allen, Larry Hugh, San Diego.
Allen, Wayne Anderson, Oceanside.
Alvarez, Charles Allen, Santee.
Alvarez, Jimmie Marron, San Jose.
Alvarez, Michael Byron, Madera.
Andersen, Michael Nile, Downey.
Andersen, William T., Jr., Techachapi.
Anderson, James Boyd, Sunland.
Anderson, James Howard, Anaheim.
Antognini, Joseph, III, San Jose.
Aragon, Alonso, Jr., San Jose.
Arambula, Paul Tejeda, Oakland.
Arellano, Leroy Fred, Santa Cruz.
Artavia, Joseph Gregory, San Francisco.
Avila, Jesus V., Dinuba.
Bachelor, Don Ray, Caruthers.
Baggett, Frank Allen, Williams.
Bailey, Alfred Leon, Jr., Los Angeles.
Baird, Ronald Eugene, Pittsburg.
Baker, Robert Nelson, Santa Ana.
Bakkie, Donald Keith, Sacramento.
Ballard, Mel Roy, Redding.
Banaga, Salvador, M. L., Jr., Holtville.
Banglos, Gary Alan, San Francisco.
Banuelos, Albert A., Jr., San Diego.
Barger, Ferdinand Ora, Jr., Bakersfield.
Barker, Robert Lee, Jr., Esparto.
Barnes, Francis Archer, San Bernardino.
Barnhouse, Darrel Emerson, Richmond.
Barovetto, John Lawrence, Davis.
Barton, Val E., Redwood Estates.
Bates, Wayne Sherwood, San Pablo.
Battiest, Andrew, Calipatria
Baumann, Rene Georges, Walnut Creek.
Beals, Ronnie Herbert, Sacramento.
Beardsley, Ronald Allen, Napa.
Beck, Steven Lee, Atherton.
Bedolla, Joseph Lopez, Gilroy.
Behm, Stanley William, Escondido.
Bell, Edward Allen, Burbank
Bell, Howard Clayton, Long Beach.
Bell, John Martin, Morro Bay.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Bellomo, Terrence John, Santa Clara.
Beltran Robert Leon, Fremont.
Benes, Wayne Joseph, Upland.
Benson, Robert William, Bakersfield.
Berg, Ray William, Jr., San Lorenzo.
Bergren, Thomas Howard, San Jose.
Berry, David Joe, Bellflower
Bertsch, Brent John, Lodi.
Bettencourt, Daniel F. Jr., San Diego.
Biernacki, James Richard, Chula Vista.
Bieser, Karl Roy, San Diego.
Birden, Lee Roy, Oakland.
Birdwell, Michael Del, Modesto.
Bishop, Michael Richard, Napa.
Blakely, William, Castro Valley.
Blankenship, James Arlia, Gardena.
Blasingame, Norman Lee, Los Angeles.
Blume, Dale L., Rosemead.
Bobbitt, Arthur, Chula Vista.
Bolster, Christopher Oran, Pomona.
Bolton, David Joseph, Marysville.
Boots, James Allen, Oroville
Borgen, Carl Lee, Manteca.
Bottan, Daniel Jacques, Santa Paula.
Boudreaux, Allen John, Riverside.
Bowen, Larry William, Cupertino.
Bowman, Stephen Wesley, Alta Loma.
Box, Houston Clifford, Jr., Sacramento.
Boyd, John Lee, Los Angeles.
Boyle, Harry Lewis, San Leandro.
Bradshaw, Henry Lee, Long Beach.
Brady, James Gregory, Sacramento.
Breitenbach, Bernard Paul, El Cerrito.
Bretches, Raymond Dean, Santa Barbara.
Brewer, John Newton, Sonoma.
Bric, William Henry, III, Burbank.
Bricmont, Francis Peter, Jr., Los Gatos.
Brierly, James Kenneth, Carlsbad.
Brocker, Thomas George, San Jose.
Brophy, Daniel Ralph, Oceanside.
Brown, Alvin Ray, Tulare.
Brown, Donald Lynn, Stockton.
Brown, Gary Wayne, Los Angeles.
Brown, Gerald Ray, Los Angeles.
Brown, Marshall Jason, Hyampow.
Brown, Richard Albert, Santa Clara.
Brown Robert Alva, II, Needles.
Buehler, Robert Henry, Napa.
Bundage, Cecil Odell, Seaside.
Burbage, Raymond Douglas, Norwalk.
Burns, Dean Harry, Sonoma
Burrola, Sammy, Jr., Buena Park.
Burson, David Richard, Los Angeles.
Butler, Kenneth Allan, Jr., Willits.
Butorovic, Steve, San Pedro
Butts, John Michael, Covina.
Buys, Kenneth Allen, Anaheim.
Buzzard, Larry B., Sacramento.
Byrd, Bobby John, San Bruno.
Byrnes, Robert Scott, Carmichael.
Calderon, Julio Alfredo, Los Angeles.
Call, Richard Joseph, San Bernardino.
Callaham, John Marshall, Jr., San Diego.
Calle-Zuluaga, Fernando, Los Angeles.
Cardin, Willis Glen, San Lorenzo.
Carl, Arthur Jack, Upland.
Carlson, James Clark, Salinas.
Carlson, Richard Allan, San Francisco.
Carmona, Efrev, El Monte.
Carr, Gregory Vernon, Santa Barbara.
Carrano, Jackie Andrew, Cypress.
Carter, Thurl Guy, III, Hayward.
Carvajal, Joseph Carlos, Norwalk.
Casey, Richard William, Los Altos.
Cash, David Manfred, Pasadena.
Casper, Ronald Jerome Dent, Santa Ana.
Castaneda, Benjamin Frank, Oakland.
Castaneda, Hugo Carlos, Compton.
Castillo, Manuel Angel, San Jose.
Castro, Jorge Arturo, Los Angeles.
Catt, Joseph Francis, Jr., Huntington Beach.
Cervantes, Gerald, San Jose.
Chaney, Donald Lee, Riverbank.
Chaney, Douglas Dale, Redondo Beach.
Charles, Ronnie Joe, South Gate.
Chase, Charles Joseph, San Mateo.
Chavez, Jesus Ernest, Jr., Pico Rivera.
Chervony, Eddie Edwin, Los Angeles.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Chilcott, Ronald Harry, Pico Rivera.
Chisum, David, Salinas.
Cho, Herbert Pok Dong, Lynwood.
Choi, William David, Watsonville.
Christer, Eugene Merl, Salinas.
Christy, Richard Thomas, Boulder Creek.
Church, John Leonard, Norwalk.
Cigar, Freddie Joe, San Pedro.
Clark, Donald Eugene, Fremont.
Clark, Doyle Wayne, Santa Clara.
Clark, James Lee, Richmond.
Clarke, Walter Kirt, El Cajon.
Cleem, Larry Lloyd, Midway City.
Clifford, Harold John, Daly City.
Cobarrubias, Roberto, San Jose.
Cobb, Tyler William, Jr., La Puente.
Cohen, Robert Bruce, Los Angeles.
Coleman, Donald Huston, Healdsburg.
Collier, Timothy Lynn, Madera.
Collins, Bruce Wayne, Ontario.
Collins, Clint, Long Beach.
Combs, Kenneth Dale, Camarillo.
Contreras, Benito, Jr., Whittier.
Cook, Charles Joseph, West Covina.
Cook, Charles, Jr., San Francisco.
Cook, John W., Long Beach.
Coonrod, Robert Lee, Napa.
Cooper, Robert Gean, Azusa.
Cornell, Ricky Lynn, Salinas.
Corrigan, Michael Joseph, Burbank.
Cotterell, Jack Patrick, Bellflower.
Courtney, Joe Ray, Jr., Reseda.
Cox, Freddie James, Jr., Oakland.
Cox, Greogry Ellis, Pleasant Hill.
Crabb, Winford R., Shafter.
Craig, Michael Dennis, Rosemead.
Crane, Robert Irving, Montgomery Creek.
Cranford, Thomas William, Redding.
Criswell, Robert Reed, San Francisco.
Cook, James Peyton, La Mesa.
Crosby, James Allen, San Diego.
Crum, Daryl Wayne, Garden Grove.
Cryan, Kenneth Michael, San Mateo.
Cuellar, Pilar Joseph, Tulare.
Culbertson, Samuel Kent, Huntington Beach.
Curley, Raymond Nelson, Orange.
Daffer, Joseph John, Modesto.
Dahlin, David Courtney, Reseda.
Daniel, Johnnie Lloyd, Montclair.
Darrah, Gary Koyle, Los Angeles.
Daughton, Joseph D. Jr., San Leandro.
David, Michael Dennis, Baldwin Park.
Davidove, Ernest Frederic, China Lake.
Davis, Charles Edward, Galt.
Davis, Dale Leroy, Santa Rosa.
Davis, James Allen, Whittier.
Davis, John Edwin, San Pablo.
Davis, Walter Scott, Pasadena.
De Graw, Charles Ivan, Thousands Oaks.
De La Pena Gilbert, Pinedale.
De La Rosa, Larry A. Jr., Baldwin Park.
De Lapp, William C. III, Pacific Palisades.
De Mello, Clyde Lawrence, El Cerrito.
De Nardo, Frank Michael Jr., Covina.
De Vore, Edward Allen Jr., Harbor City.
Del Castillo, Marco Oscar, Los Angeles.
Delgado, Ray, Richmond.
Delgado, Richard Falcon, Fresno.
Delp, Kenneth Harvey, Los Angeles.
Demara, Juan Joseph, Santa Paula.
Denton, David Andrew, Upland.
Derig, Patrick Martin, Santa Maria.
Desilets, William J., Anaheim.
Detrick, Robert Lloyd, Montara.
Diaz, Gary Michael, Redondo Beach.
Dietz, Wolf-Dieter, San Jose.
Dillon, George Alfred Ched, San Anselmo.
Dineen, Timothy John, Vallejo.
Dismaya, Eddie Jr., King City.
Dolim, Steven Francis Jr., Long Beach.
Dooley, Michael Banion, Los Angeles.
Dorman, Charles Dudley, Santa Rosa.
Douglas, Johnnie Lee, San Francisco.
Douglass, Gerald Tyler Jr., San Francisco.
Downs, Jack Dennis, Tujunga.
Drake, Richard Guy, Stockton.
Duarte, Gerald Michael, Campbell.
Duce, Roger L., Granada Hills.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Duffield, John David Lockw, Ventura.
Duke, Alan Ray, Bakersfield.
Duncan, Roy William, Brawley.
Dunsing, Dennis Paul, Ukiah.
Duran, Juan Chaires Jr., Los Angeles.
Duran, Pablo, Downey.
Dutra, Robert Leonard, San Diego.
Dyer, Dennis Earl, Taft.
Easton, John William, Anaheim.
Edgerton, Arthur Donald Jr., Hayward.
Egolf, Klaus Dieter, Westminster.
Eisenbraun, William Forbes, Santa Ana.
Elgin, Robert Gerald, San Francisco.
Elia, Reese Currenti Jr., Burbank.
Elkinton, Michael, Calistoga.
Ellsworth, James Oliver, Sacramento.
Ellsworth, Lawrence, Los Angeles.
Enbody, Michael William, Canoga Park.
England, Robert Blair II, Whittier.
Engstrom, Loren Eugene, La Canada.
Erickson, Leonard Daniel, Livemore.
Ervin, Glen Otis, Placerville.
Escott, Kenneth Robert, Oakland.
Eskew, Ronnie Joe, Yuba City.
Esparza, Malcolm Marcellin, San Fernando.
Estrada, Mario Pereda, Inglewood.
Estrada, Randolph Phillip, Los Angeles.
Estrada, Roy Lee, Lakeside.
Evans, Garfield, San Diego.
Everts, Dennis Lee, San Diego.
Farden, Kenneth Roy, Los Angeles.
Faulkner, Michael Anthony, Los Angeles.
Fay, Michael Andrew, Saugus.
Fay, Patrick Dennis, Cypress.
Federoff, Alexander, San Francisco.
Feigenbutz, Terrence R., Rialto.
Ferralez, Richard, Los Angeles.
Fielding, David Andrew, Santa Barbara.
Filippelli, John Mario, Hayward.
Finley, Leland Patrick, Huntington Beach.
Fleer, Robert Dean, Fullerton.
Fletcher, Kim William, Hollywood.
Flohr, George, Jr., Huntington Park.
Flores, Richard Javier, Hanford.
Fogg, Albert Randolph, III, Santa Maria.
Foster, Eddie Dale, Santa Maria.
Freedle, Frank Louie, Fort Ord.
Frick, Edsall A., Petaluma.
Friend, Richard Allen, San Diego.
Fritsche, Robert, Jr., Stockton.
Fry, James Ray, Jr., Los Alamitos.
Fryer, Robert Risley, Paso Robles.
Fujimoto, Donald Shuichi, Stockton.
Fuller, Carroll Bruce, Sunnyvale.
Fuller, Dennis Earl, Santa Fe Springs.
Fuller, Stanley Carl, Fullerton.
Gabriel, Meredith Alton, San Diego.
Gaftunik, Steven John, Sacramento.
Gallo, Peter Joseph, Livingston.
Galvez, Joe Angel, Oakland.
Garcia, Isaac Ramirez, Jr., San Fernando.
Garnica, Andy, Richmond.
Garver, Phillip Eugene, Calimesa.
Gatewood, Gerald Peter, Fresno.
Gau. Louis Ellie, Los Altos Hills.
Gerome, Michael Anthony, Reseda.
Geyer, Leroy Clyde, Hayward.
Gibbins, Robert Wayne, Merced.
Glaspie, William Harold, Fresno.
Godwin, James R., Sacramento.
Golden, John Michael, Westminster.
Goldsmith, Daniel Eric, Farmersville.
Gomez, Andres Armando R., Anaheim.
Gonzales, Paul Alfred, Richmond.
Gonzalez, Albert, Hollister.
Gonzalez, Carlos, Hamilton City.
Gonzalez, Joaquin Christop, Redondo Beach.
Gonzalez, Richard, Bakersfield.
Gorsich, James Tony, Yobra Linda.
Gotcher, Larrie Jack, Citrus Heights.
Goudelock, William Roger, Meridian.
Granados, Richard, Merced.
Grant, Willie, Jr., Los Angeles.
Gravel, Bobby Joe, Lawndale.
Gray, Warren, Inglewood.
Green, Donald Edward, Compton.
Griffith, William Chapin, Seaside.
Grigsby, Barry N., Redding.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Guard, Martin William, Santa Ana.
Guardado, Daniel, Santa Ana.
Guarienti, Ralph, Sacramento.
Guerra-Hernandez, Rene, Los Angeles.
Guerrero, Richard Joseph, Los Angeles.
Guest, Raymond Calvin, Redding.
Guillen, Phillip O., San Jose.
Gulie, James Patrick, San Diego.
Guzman, Juan Araujo, Artesia.
Gwinn, Michael James, Redding.
Haas, Frederick William, Santa Rosa.
Hadley, Joseph Austin, Santa Rosa.
Hadzega, George Stephen, Santa Ana.
Hammer, Robert Ralph, San Jose.
Hammett, Richard Lee, San Leandro.
Harano, Allen Hideo, Berkeley.
Harbour, Thomas James, Auburn.
Hardesty, Robert Warren, Santa Clara.
Harding, Warren Guthrie, Jr., Westminster.
Hardman, James Allen, San Leandro.
Hare, Michael Kenneth, Covina.
Harris, Robert Earl, San Jose.
Haugen, Alan Robert, Grass Valley.
Havel, Richard Thomas, Atwater.
Hayes, Dan David, San Jose.
Hederman, Patrick Shawn, Chino.
Heeren, Darrel Wayne, Maywood.
Hefner, Francis Joe, Vallejo.
Heil, Richard Edward, Lodi.
Heintz, Wayne Douglas, Elk Grove.
Heller, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Hellman, Kenneth Raymond, San Mateo.
Henry, Robert Gregory, San Diego.
Henry, Scott D., Anaheim.
Herd, Thomas Leon, Modesto.
Hermanson, Stephen Mark, Carmel Valley.
Hernandez, Ramon S., Jr., Calexico.
Hernandez, Rene Zarogoza, San Gabriel.
Hernandez, Victor Reyes, Fullerton.
Hess, Robert Jay, Sacramento.
Hewitson, Paul Crawford, Yucca Valley.
Hicks, Eugene Stanley, Arcadia.
Hicks, Steven Gary, Napa.
Higgins, Patrick Albert, Porterville.
Hill, Dale Evan, Paradise.
Hill, Peter Alan, Eureka.
Hill, Randall Steven, Lynwood.
Hinkston, Robert Francis, San Jose.
Hoadley, Gary Ellis, Fontana.
Hofer, Russell Gene, Camarillo.
Hogan, Kraig Sewell, Sunnyvale.
Holcombe, Thomas Marvin, San Diego.
Holland, Luey Vernon, Riverside.
Holton, Gary Dennis, Chico.
Hood, Ernest Ervin, Compton.
Horner, Carl Nicholas M., San Bernardino.
Horsley, Richard Wayne, Westminster.
Hourigan, Michael Patrick, Santa Rosa.
Huff, Robert Randel, Baldwin Park.
Hughes, Brian Gregory, Whittier.
Hughes, Samuel Rueben, Los Angeles.
Hughes, Thomas Gilbert, Oakland.
Hulse, Gary Wayne, Paramount.
Humphrey, Jarold Edward, Greenville.
Humphrey, Weden Gary, Camarillo.
Hunt, Hood Hal, Encino.
Hupe, Russell Edward, Los Angeles.
Hurtado, John Bernard, Sanger.
Hustead, Terence Michael, Moraga.
Hutchinson, Robert S., II, Hacienda Heights.
Ide, Ben Hervey, Marina.
Illman, William Steve, Oreville.
Imbach, John, III, Carpinteria.
Iniguez, Dennis Glenn, San Diego.
Irwin, Van Allen, Northridge.
Ishman, Albert, Jr., Los Angeles.
Jackson, David Andrew, Tulare.
Jackson, Denny Milburn, Santa Paula.
Jackson, Little Jay, San Pablo.
Jackson, Paul Edward, Richmond.
Jacobs, Dennis Wayne, San Diego.
Jacobs, William John, Lancaster.
Jacobson, Warner Craig, Fresno.
Janowicz, Joseph Anthony, Huntington Park.
Jans, Robert Allen, San Jose.
Jansen, Jerome Eddie Wally, Vista.
Jarick, Russell William, Los Angeles.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Jeantet, Francis Leon, Fremont.
Jensen, Douglas Gary, North Hollywood.
Jernberg, Robert Stevens, San Jose.
Jessiman, Thad Bazily, Castro Valley.
Jimenez, Isidro Briceno, San Gabriel.
Johnson, Anthony Eric, San Francisco.
Johnson, Larry Lee, Anaheim.
Johnson, Larry Ray, Buttonwillow.
Johnson, Robert William, Jr., Sacramento.
Johnston, Robert Earl, Jr., Alameda.
Johnston, Tommy Wayne, Bellflower.
Jones, James Lester, Lancaster.
Jones, Randolph Robert, Bakersfield.
Jordan, Stephen Alan, Monrovia.
Joseph, Michael Arnold, Sacramento.
Kamrath, Jack Harlan, Sacramento.
Kandler, Terrence Arthur, Torrence
Kaski, Donald Albert, Fortuna.
Kaye, Mark Samuel, Studio City.
Keller, James Louis, Visalia.
Kelley, David Bruce, Los Angeles.
Kelly, Dennis Leroy, Redondo Beach.
Kelly, Larry Lee, Hayward.
Keyes, Daniel Duane, San Jose.
Kim, Harry, San Diego.
Kincannon, Raymond Omer, Chula Vista.
Kindred, Michael George, San Jose.
King, Gilbert, Los Angeles.
King, Norton Zigmund, San Diego.
Kingman, Barry Dean, Palo Alto.
Kinnard, William Lloyd, Hesperia.
Kirk, Melvin Lynn, Clovis.
Klein, Michael Kenneth, Sacramento.
Klenske, Howard Lee, Burbank.
Kline, Harvey Edward, II, San Diego.
Kline, Robert Francis, Jr., Los Altos.
Klotz, John Robert, Crescent City.
Kotyluk, Kenneth Eugene, Sacramento.
Krause, Manfred Walter, San Diego.
Krech, Steven Dennis, Riverside.
Krill, Russell Walter, San Jose.
Kuchcinski, Ralph Warren, Sacramento.
Kuntz, Gene Ray, Murphys.
LaGrou, Raymond Louis, Jr., Santa Monica.
LaRoche, Joel Mitchell, Huntington Beach.
LaRochelle, Marcel Adelar, Buena Park.
Lackey, Robert Edgar, Mount Laguna.
Laframboise, Phillip Dougl, La Mesa.
Laika, Fagal, II, Azusa.
Laine, Wayne Kevin, Walnut Creek.
Laird, Patrick Steven, Castro Valley.
Lalich, David Hugh, West Covina.
Lamb, Thomas Robert, Los Angeles.
Landers, Edmond John, Vacaville.
Landers, Richard Ray, Orcutt.
Landon, Gary Joseph, Yreka.
Lane, Dennis Eugene, Wilton.
Lane, Richard Arthur, Fontana.
Lara, Apimenio, Upland.
Lara, Larry Caluistus, Santa Barbara.
Laster, Alvin Mack, Jr., Compton.
Lau, Hoi Tin, Pasadena.
Lavigne, Gerard Andre, Woodland Hills.
Lawson, William Charles, Happy Camp.
Le Blanc, Eloy Felipe Este, San Francisco.
Le Desma, Lour, Visalia.
Leach, Dickie Lynn, Alameda.
Lee, Donald Gerald, Morro Bay.
Lehr, David Richard, San Rafael.
Leon, Guerrero Kinny San N., Hayward.
Licea, Francisco Xavier, Los Angeles.
Liebespeck, James Warren, La Puente.
Lilly, David Rose, Dinuba.
Lindel, John Richard, Garden Grove.
Lipsius, Michael Glenn, Santa Clara.
Long, Hal Randolph, North Hollywood.
Loomis, Billie Cifford, Palermo.
Lopez, Edward, San Bernardino.
Lopez, Frederick George, Manteca.
Lopez, Jose De Jesus, Soledad.
Lopez-Ramos, Luis Alfonso, Calexico.
Lorenzo, Robert J., Colusa.
Losel, Fred George, Jr., La Puente.
Loveland, Ronald Ray, Sunnyvale.
Lozano, Donald James, Fresno.
Luallin, Lee Andres, Oakland.
Lucas, Herbert George, Brawley.
Lucas, Karl, Redondo Beach.
Lucas, Phillip Warren, Los Angeles.

XUM

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Luna, Robert, Alameda.
Lutge, Thomas Albert, San Francisco.
Mabrey, Gary Michiel, Berkeley.
MacIntosh, Donald Gordon, El Sobrante.
MacManus, James Francis, Anaheim.
Madeuga, Manuel Dominic, Modesto.
Madrigal-Cordero, R. A., Jr., Los Angeles.
Maestas, Gilbert Merill, San Diego.
Mailloux, Earl Adelbert, Oakland.
Makuh, Frank Joseph, Placentia.
Malone, James Edgar, Inglewood.
Mangan, Michael Robert, Costa Mesa
Manowski, Edward, Rowland Heights.
Marcello, John Bernard, Los Angeles.
Markusen, Tobias Earl, Long Barn.
Markwell, Eugene Lynn, Torrance.
Marland, Innes Lee, Long Beach.
Marlowe, Jack William, Gilroy.
Marrufo, Rodney Elmer, Jr., Stewarts Point.
Martin, Ernest Tyrone, Compton.
Martin, Freddie Kay, Hollywood.
Martin, Gerald, Chula Vista.
Martin, John Major, Fresno.
Martin, Kenneth Leroy, Los Angeles.
Martin, Michael Emmett, Los Angeles.
Martin, Richard Jody, Carlotta.
Martin, Thomas Charles, Torrance.
Martinsen, Loren Daune, Red Bluff.
Martz, Melvin Lee, Paramount.
Masteller, Allan Dean, Chico.
Matinez, Steven Catarino, Venice.
Mattson, Kenneth Eugene, Lafayette.
Mauldin, Eddie Lee, Los Angeles.
May, James, Jr., Oakland.
May, Roy Edward, Sacramento.
Mazza, Stephen Darrell, Carmichael.
McAfee, Clyde Richard, San Diego.
McCloyn, Joseph, Los Angeles.
McCoig, Donald B., Ventura.
McCollum, David Vernon, Huntington Park.
McConnell, William Walker, Sonora.
McDaniel, Richard Byers, San Mateo.
McDavid, William Earl, Ontario.
McDougal, Billy Dean, Winton.
McEuen, Ronald Curtis, Garden Grove.
McFall, Gary Richard, Northridge.
McFarland, Louis Henry, Santa Barbara.
McGehee, John Albert, San Jose.
McInnis, Theodore Valenti, Oakland.
McIntyre, Duncan B., Greenville.
McJamsey, William Robert, Oakland.
McKechnie, Daniel Lee, Concord.
McKee, Jack Roger, Needles.
McKinnon, Jack Wiley, Jr., Santa Cruz.
McKinsey, Gerald Leroy, Jr., Modesto.
McMahon, Douglas Duane, Sherman Oaks.
McMurphy, Jay Darrell, Vallejo.
McNearney, Patrick Victor, Oakland.
Mebust, Owen Edward, Manhattan Beach.
Meek, Thomas Otis, Los Angeles.
Mena, Joseph Angel, City of Commerce.
Mendibles, Raymond G., Norwalk.
Mendoza, John Dee, South Gate.
Mendoza, Martin Elby, Los Angeles.
Mendoza, Peter Acosta, Union City.
Mercke, Terrance Lee, Long Beach.
Mericantante, Thomas Lee, Solana Beach.
Mesa, James Gregory, Jamul.
Messerli, Steven Louis, Norwalk.
Miller, Glenn Edwin, Oakland.
Miller, Michael, Jr., La Mesa.
Miller, Robert Gail, San Jose.
Mills, John Paul, Sebastopol.
Minko, Michael Anthony, Culver City.
Miranda, Joe Aleman, Bakersfield.
Mitchell, Michael Jeffrey, San Esteban.
Montague, Stephen Griffith, Redwood City.
Montgomery, George Wesley, Sacramento.
Montgomery, Michael Mallor, Visalia.
Moore, Charles Edward, Jr., Moorpark.
Moore, Glenn Douglas, Castro Valley.
Moore, Jimmy Ray, San Francisco.
Moore, Larry Jay, Exeter.
Moore, Lester Lewis, La Mirada.
Moore, Robert Ned, Anaheim.
Mora, Ernest Lopez, Fresno.
Mora, Ramiro, Michael, South San Gabriel.
Moreno, Adolfo Valenzuela, Artesia.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Mori, Bruce Jun, Los Angeles.
Morris, Lyle Wayne, Ferndale.
Morris, Thomas W., Hayward.
Morrison, Glen Mark, Dale City.
Morrow, Dale Arthur, Paramount.
Mosseau, Lloyd Francis, Cudahy.
Muller, Harold Bradley, McKinleyville.
Multhaupt, James Wayne, Los Angeles.
Munatones, Jose, Jr., San Francisco.
Munoz, Carlos Garcia, San Jose.
Munoz, Larry, Torrance.
Murray, Bruce Anderson, Manhattan Beach.
Musselman, Donald L., Tulelake.
Myers, Ricky Alan, Napa.
Nash, James Robert, Davis.
Nastor, Tony Valdez, San Jose.
Naylor, Dennis Eugene, Orange.
Neal, Kenneth Lawrence, San Jose.
Neiswender, Daniel Lynn, South Laguna.
Nelson, Boyd Jeffery, Oxnard.
Nelson, Daniel Eugene, Jr., Barstow.
Nelson, John Edward, Sacramento.
Nelson, William De Witt, Long Beach.
Neubacher, Brandt Steele, Berkeley.
Newson, Leroy, Jr., Stockton.
Nickel, Warren F., Jr., Watsonville.
Nishizawa, Glenn Nobuyki, Los Angeles.
Noble, John Rodney, Van Nuys.
Nordquist, Gary Leigh, Paramount.
Nordstrom, Victor Carl, Encino.
Novakovich, Jerry A., Concord.
Numez, David Guerrero, Jr., Brawley.
Nussbaumer, Steve Owen, Hayward.
Nystrom, Thomas Allen, Anaheim.
O'Bannon, Albert F., Jr., Redlands.
O'Brien, Richard Conaway, Santa Barabara.
O'Connor, Dennis Kenneth, San Francisco.
Ogami, Terry Y., Reedley.
Oglesby, John R., Tustin.
O'Hara, Steve Masao, San Jose.
Ohlson, Galen Erick, Modesto.
Oliver, Paul Harold, Alameda.
Oliveras, Rudy Michael, Colton.
Olivares-Martinez, Arturo, Ventura.
Olson, Robert Gary, Englewood.
Omstead, David King, Costa Mesa.
Ornelas-Arellano, Victor M., Escondido.
Ortega, Frank Dennis, Saugus.
Oster, Frank Allen, Taft.
Owen, Robert Gary, Gasquet.
Ozanne, Jordan Jay, Pacoima.
Pagcaliuagan, Ceizhar Vale, San Francisco.
Page, Luther, Jr., San Francisco.
Palacio, Raymond Jesus, Seaside.
Panamaroff, Walter John, Lompoc.
Parmeter, Gerald Thomas, Cazadero.
Partida, Charlie Lopez, Chino.
Pasillas, Henry, Riverside.
Patterson, Larry Hart, Gridley.
Paul, Robert Milton, Vallejo.
Pearce, Marvin Robert, Capitola.
Pedrick, Charles C., II, Alameda.
Peguero, Richard, Los Angeles.
Pellicano, Jean Pierre V., Alameda.
Pendergraft, Ronnie Dean, Clovis.
Perez, Joseph Espino, San Francisco.
Perez, Juan J., Selma.
Perez, Raymond Luna, San Joaquin.
Perez, Richard, Morgan Hill.
Perry, Donald Lee, Taft.
Perry, Steve Joseph Leone, LaHonda.
Peterman, Thomas Howard, San Bernadino.
Peters, John Denis, Palo Alto.
Peters, Walter John, Indio.
Pettitt, Donald Ace, Bellflower.
Pickett, Wilton Ray, Santa Cruz.
Pimentel, Ronnie Cardoza, Clayton.
Pina, Frank David, Montclair.
Pittman, Robert Louis, Willowbreak.
Pogue, Michael Alan, Colusa.
Pohl, William Anthony, Los Angeles.
Pope, Thomas Robert, LaMirada.
Port, Gary Craig, San Rafael.
Poso, John Richard, San Jose.
Potts, Wilmer, Oakland.
Poulson, Bruce William, Corona Del Mar.
Powell, Daniel Lee, Artesia.
Powell, Reginald Foster, Empire.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Powell, Russell J., Redding.
Powers, Steven Charles, Compton.
Prescott, Dennis Louis, Sunnyvale.
Preston, Ross McCllelan, La Habra.
Prien, Don, Palo Alto.
Priesthoff, John Howard, II, Woodland Hills.
Prosky, Leveret Roscoe, Palm Springs.
Puffenbarger, William T., Oakland.
Pumphrey, Cornealus, Jr., Corcoran.
Purcell, Dennis Edward, Tulare.
Quezada, Arthur, Trona.
Rainford, Edward George, Santa Rosa.
Ramirez, Jesus P., Los Angeles.
Ramirez, Lorenzo, Jr., Los Angeles.
Randolph, Richard Alan, Sutter Creek.
Rasori, Carl Raymond, Los Angeles.
Rathmann, Eugene LeRoy, San Diego.
Ray, Darwin Esker, East Highlands.
Ray, Robert Breckenridge, Bakersfield.
Ray, William David, El Centro.
Reed, Dennis Dale, Palm Springs.
Reich, William Goodro, San Fernando.
Remillard, Garry Edward, Hayward.
Renteria, Rudolph Sotelo, San Jose.
Reyes, Robert Antonio, Richmond.
Reynolds, Michael Monroe, Anaheim.
Rezende, Daniel Dias, Concord.
Rich, Danny Kaye, Roseville.
Richardson, Gary Lyle, Red Bluff.
Richter, Jay Dee, Pasadena.
Rivera-Bermudez, Jose Anto, San Jose.
Rizzardini, Timothy Joseph, Ridgecrest.
Roark, Anund C., San Diego.
Roberts, Archie James, Jr., Corona.
Roberts, Clifford Joseph, Hacienda Heights.
Roberts, Kenneth Ray, Cupetino.
Roberts, Louis Wade, Los Angeles.
Robinson, Bruce Allen, Calimesa.
Rodgers, Gary Gene, San Francisco.
Rodgers, John Arlington, Fontana.
Rodrigues, Joseph Michael, Santa Rosa.
Rodriguez, Benito Bobo, Freedom.
Rodriguez, Jesse Emiterio, Cutler.
Rogers, Wayne Johnathen, Hanford.
Romo, Robert Allen, Rialto.
Rosar, Robert John, San Bernadino.
Rose, Michael Allen, San Pablo.
Rose, Nathaniel Robert, Los Angeles.
Rosenberger, David Arthur, Orange.
Ross, Gene K., Boron.
Rowe, James Gray, Jr., Davis.
Rowland, William Michael, Garden Grove.
Roy, James Willie, III, Oroville.
Ruiz, Manuel, La Puente.
Ruiz, Ramon Rodriguez, Santa Clara.
Russell, Gregory Allen, Rio Linda.
Russell, Richard Shannon, Santa Ana.
Ryan, Bernard Steven, Hollywood.
Rye, Dillard Gale, Dos Palos.
Rygg, Charles Allen, Oakland.
Sabo, Larry Michael, Turlock.
Sanchez, Ralph, Jr., Los Angeles.
Sandoval, Daniel Flore, Compton.
Sandoval, Louis Joe, Oakland.
Sandvig, Vernon Dale, Los Banos.
Sanford, Henry Charles, Jr., Parma.
Santos, Joseph, Sacramento.
Santos, Michael Eugene, Monterey Park.
Sapinosa, Alfred Robert, Santa Maria.
Scales, Astor, Jr., Los Angeles.
Scalise, Edward Joseph, Palo Alto.
Scharosch, Patrick Francis, Garden Grove.
Schasre, David M., Santa Ana.
Schmidt, Steven Warren, Anaheim.
Schroeder, Nicholas Lee, Eagle Mountain.
Schroeder, Stanley A., Los Angeles.
Schultz, Edward August, San Luis Obispo.
Schuyler, Ronald Lee, Hermosa Beach.
Schwartz, Kenneth Dale, Paso Robles.
Seavey, Douglas Rex, Highland.
Sebens, Gaylord James, Riverside.
Sehl, George Stephen, Lynwood.
Serrano, Gilbert, San Jose.
Serrano, Rodolfo Carrillo, Soledad.
Serrem, Mark MacDonald, Carmel.
Shannon, Kenneth Michael, Santa Clara.
Sharp, David Jackson, Sacramento.
Sharpless, Robert Leon, Santa Rosa.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Sheahan, Michael David, Tujunga.
Shelton, Edward Minot, Jr., Pasadena.
Sherman, Roosevelt, Jr., Long Beach.
Shields, David Thomas, Sacramento.
Showers, Dennis Karl, Fair Oaks.
Shreve, Joseph Lynwood, Jr., Newark.
Shumate, Berlin Robert, Hayward.
Silveira, Jose A. C., Turlock.
Simmonds, Jerry Lee, Sacramento.
Sims, Jerry G., Navato.
Sisco, Jerry Donald, Jr., Ballico.
Skakel, George Walter, Santa Cruz.
Smart, Lester Edward, Jr., King City.
Smevold, Emil Harold, Daly City.
Smiley, William Thomas, Fresno.
Smith, Benny James, Brawley.
Smith, Charles Lenet, San Jose.
Smith, Donald James, San Francisco.
Smith, James Douglas, San Jose.
Smith, Jesse Lee, Los Angeles.
Smith, Larry Michael, Glendora.
Smith, Paul Leslie, Stockton.
Smith, Paul Wesley, Ordville.
Smith, Philip, Jr., Bell.
Smith, Thomas Lloyd, Durham.
Smith, Tullie Roscoe, Jr., Los Angeles.
Snell, Esmond Emerson, Jr., Berkley.
Snyder, Bobby Clyde, Sacramento.
Solis, Eusebio, San Jose.
Soliz, Enrique Lorenzo, Stockton.
Sommers, Larry Eugene, Aptos.
Sommers, Steven Allen, Buena Park.
Sonstein, Paul Phillip, Pleasant Hill.
Sorenson, Eugene A., Los Angeles.
Sorick, Steven Paul, Cypress.
Soto, Arthur Ologue, Selma.
Soutar, Walter Jack, Compton.
Spafford, Galon Gene, Hawthorne.
Sparks, James Edward, Los Angeles.
Spotwood, Frank, Jr., San Francisco.
Stack, Joseph Vincent, Baldwin Park.
Stading, Gary Alan, Orange.
Stampfli, Theodore Arthur, Susanville.
Stapleton, Ollie Ray, Concord.
Stark, Coy Foster, Hughson.
Starkey, James Wayne, Campbell.
Steele, Walter Charles, San Diego.
Stephens, Roger Dean, Manhattan Beach.
Stevenson, Gary George, La Mirada.
Stevenson, John Raymond, Garden Grove.
Stewart, Leland, Monrovia.
Stewart, Lonny Lawrence, Norwalk.
Stewart, Robert Lee, Woodland.
Stewart, Samuel Kay, San Diego.
Stickler, Clark D., Orland.
Stidham, Ernest James, Carmichael.
Stone, William Earl, Fellows.
Stover, Tommy Gene, Wilmington.
Stratt, Jacob F., III, Santa Maria.
Strock, Charles Frederick, Santee.
Stuckey, Walter, Los Angeles.
Stutz, Brad John, Loma Linda.
Suiaunoa, Tuioalele T., Oceanside.
Sundell, Lars Peder, Belmont.
Sutton, Dennis Lee, Vallejo.
Swaim, Allan Gregory, Tustin.
Swanson, Keith Lyle, San Leandro.
Swanson, Todd Earle, Los Angeles.
Tabet, Henry Marsial, Compton.
Tafoya, Joseph Ernest, Lathrop.
Tappan, Frederick Howard, Mountain View.
Taylor, Herman L., San Diego.
Taylor, Richard Kenneth, Los Gatos.
Taylor, William Douglas, Compton.
Tebbetts, Terry Lee, Huntington Beach.
Theurkauf, Harry Lee, Grass Valley.
Thomas, Andrew Jackson, Oakland.
Thomas, John Raymond, Pacific Grove.
Thomas, Tim, Hawthorne.
Thomas, William Dewayne, Fremont.
Thompson, Bernard David, Jr., Los Angeles.
Thompson, Charles Clair, Bellflower.
Thompson, Dennis Eugene, Pittsburg.
Thompson, Kendall William, Piedmont.
Thompson, Robert R., Hanford.
Thompson, Walter Lee, Fresno.
Thonues, Guenter Robert, Burbank.
Thornton, David Leslie, National City.
Thorpe, Dennis Ray, Fullerton.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Timboe, Arthur Richard, San Francisco.
Timothy, Wayne Elliott, Tranquillity.
Tolette, Richard Ross, Pomona.
Tolparoff, Alex Robert, Los Angeles.
Tomkins, John Michael, Panorama City.
Torliatt, Charles Peter, Jr., Petaluma.
Torres, Arcadio, Jr., Hollister.
Tortorici, Bruce, Van Nuys.
Townsend, Stephen Lance, Calistoga.
Townsend, William Paul, Jr., Reseda.
Trisler, Richard Lee, San Jose.
Trivelpiece, Steve Maurice, Stockton.
Trombetta, Tony, Sacramento.
Turner, Eugene, Los Angeles.
Turner, Jeffrey Arthur, Mill Valley.
Twitty, Daniel Ray, Sacramento.
Twyford, Thomas Lionel, Grover City.
Tyes, Robert Lee, San Francisco.
Underwood, William Henry J., Monterey.
Uyesaka, Robert Joseph, Santa Barbara.
Valdez, Alfred, Gilroy.
Valenzuela, Henry, Jr., San Gabriel.
Valenzuela, Oscar, Jr., Oakland.
Van Fleet, Donald William, Inglewood.
Van Hook, James Douglas, Richmond.
Van Horn, Barry William, Los Alamitos.
Vantol, Gary Leon, Ripon.
Varni, Howard Steven, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Charles V., Jr., Los Angeles.
Vaughn, Donald Wilbanks, Ventura.
Vazquez, William, Huntington Beach.
Velasco, Mike Ralph, Los Angeles.
Veloz, Eduardo, Pacoima.
Vieras, Jose Louis, San Jose.
Villalpando, Raymond, Jr., Sacramento.
Villarosa, Paul Herman, Lake Tahoe.
Villegas, Daniel John, Pacoima.
Vines, Richard Larry, Bakersfield.
Vinge, Terry Lee, Ventura.
Vinter, Steven Charles, Sacramento.
Volke, Clifford James, II, Culver City.
Vossen, Stanley Joseph, Inglewood.
Wagner, David Frederick, Adelanto.
Walber, Ronald James, Nevada City.
Walker, Clifford Wayne, Mountain View.
Walker, George Thomas Lloy, Los Angeles.
Walker, James Edward, Jr., Pacifica.
Walker, Michael Frederick, Chico.
Walker, Thomas Michael, Richmond.
Wanbaugh, Ronald Nelson, Torrance.
Ward, Danny Edward, Downey.
Ware, Keith Lincoln, Los Angeles.
Watkins, David Eugene, Los Alamitos.
Watson, Ronald R., Santa Ana.
Watson, Stanley Eugene, Anderson.
Watts, Thomas Roger, Los Angeles.
Waysack, William John, Orange.
Weathersbee, Ernest Murral, Sacramento.
Weaver, Richard Allen, Woodland Hills.
Webb, Donald Ray, Grass Valley.
Weber, Raymond N., Livermore.
Weddendorf, Robert George, Inglewood.
Weiss, Raymond Douglas, Garden Grove.
Wenban, Bruce R., Redondo Beach.
Werner, Stuart Arthur, Sacramento.
Werner, Wallace Bruce, Sacramento.
Weske, Richard Alwine, Camarillo.
Wesolowski, Alvin John, Jr., Cupertino.
West, Bobby, Orange.
West, Robert Wilks, Huntington Beach.
Whaley, Loy Neal, Sacramento.
Wheeler, Darrell Eugene, Live Oak.
Whelan, Michael Patrick, San Francisco.
White, John Herbert, Jr., Anaheim.
White, Leonard Ray, Watsonville.
White, Ralph Eric, Compton.
Whorton, Dwayne Jefferson, McKinleyville.
Will, Frederick Reed, Whittier.
Williams, David Charles, San Francisco.
Williams, Gerald Patrick, Oakland.
Williams, Richard D., San Bernardino.
Williams, Thomas Howard, Torrance.
Wilson, Jack Pyeatt, Jr., Burbank.
Wilson, James David, Richvale.
Wilson, Kenneth Richard, Los Angeles.
Wilson, Ronald Alton, Oakland.
Wilton, Stanley Frank, Sacramento.
Wiltse, Ronald Ellis, Fontana.
Wisham, George Merritt, Jr., Bakersfield.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Witherell, Gary Lee, Compton.
Wittler, Larry Eldon, Petaluma.
Wood, Peter Lorenz, South Pasadena.
Wright, Jerry Dean, Garden Grove.
Yamane, Benji, Oakland.
Yamashita, Kenji Jerry, Sanger.
Ybarra, Kenneth Francis, Gardena.
Young, Daryel Joe, Ontario.
Young, Ernest Harold, III, Downey.
Young, Gary Lee, Los Angeles.
Young, James Paul, Walnut Creek.
Young, Jon Michael, San Luis Obispo.
Youngblood, William Ronald, Bakersfield.
Zager, Edward Arthur, Arcadia.
Zamora, Edward, Selma.
Zenick, Robert James, Glendale.
Zimmerman, Edward Anthony, Long Beach.
Zuniga, Joseph Anthony, Los Angeles.

Air Force

Berry, Ralph Thomas, Escondido.
Ciarfeo, Glenn Thomas, Los Angeles.
Clanton, Larry Jack, Cupertino.
Conlin, Jeffrey Francis, San Diego.
Cunningham, George Michael, Santa Monica.
Forshey, Robert Ernest, Canoga Park.
Kawamura, Robert Kiyoshi, Santa Clara.
Kopfer, John Jerome, Redwood City.
Lede, Roy Leo, San Francisco.
Maisey, Reginald Victor, Jr., Sonoma.
McKinstry, James J., Jr., Oakland.
Moreland, Stephen Craig, Los Angeles.
Quill, Edward Beeding, Jr., San Francisco.
Ramsey, Richard Charles, Sun Valley.
Russell, Richard Lee, San Diego.
Stevens, John Bradford, Long Beach.
Wensinger, Ralph Robert, San Mateo.
Worley, Robert Franklin, Riverside.

Marine Corps

Adame, Gilbert Jimmie, Colton.
Adams, Ricky Fay, Baldwin Park.
Adams, William Ernest, Whispering Pines.
Alencastre, Anthony Albert, Concord.
Allen, Joseph Harold, Coalinga.
Amescua, Steven Epefanio, Turlock.
Anderson, Robert Eugene, Hayward.
Appleby, Rickey Eugene, Gardena.
Asuncion, Henry France, Delano.
Atkinson, Jerry Doyle, Lawndale.
Austin, Stephen Edward, Denair.
Ayala, Gilbert, Jr., Fresno.
Baker, Steven Dewitt, Santa Ana.
Baker, Tony Anderson, San Francisco.
Balades, David Zavala, Oxnard.
Banner, Steve Arthur, Los Angeles.
Barber, David Edwin, Hayward.
Barnes, Walter Frasier, San Bernardino
Bates, James Edward, Redding.
Bath, Eldridge Jack, Richmond.
Berry, Michael George, Sunnyvale.
Berry, Roy Vernon, Jr., San Joaquin.
Biber, Joseph Frank, Lompoc.
Bickle, Jimbob, Helendale.
Binns, David Richard, Reseda.
Blagdon, Edwin Ellis, Auburn.
Blair, Rocky Lee, Long Beach.
Blevins, Anthony James, Turlock.
Bocanegra, Felix Ramon, Venice.
Boggs, Clifford Allen, Casitas Springs.
Boomsma, Roger Allen, Arcadia.
Boyd, Bradley Monroe, La Puente.
Breck, Gary Anthony, Santa Barbara.
Brewer, George Henry, Sacramento.
Briggs, Thomas Harold C., Santa Barbara.
Britton, Sherrick Camden, Daly City.
Brodrick, Steven Parker, Selma.
Brown, Ronald Howard, Sun Valley.
Bruckner, Patrick Louis, Reseda.
Brunner, O. D., San Diego.
Bunch, Raymond Lee, Jr., Ojai.
Buss, Ronald Frank, Los Angeles.
Bustamante, Arthur, San Fernando.
Bustamante, Stanley R., Jr, Los Angeles.
Butler, Larry Don, Buena Park.
Byrd, Charles, San Jose.
Cabano, George Angelo, Jr., Pacifica.
Calabiz, John Rosalez, Valinda.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Camp, William Gordon, Fresno.
Candelas, John Frank, Reedley.
Carbajal, Carlos Guzman, Chula Vista.
Cardenas, Daniel Jr., Fullerton.
Carney, Tyrone Edward, Oakland.
Carpenter, Gary Ralph, Watsonville.
Carrillo, Richard, Los Angeles.
Carter, Thomas Lee, Reseda.
Casares, Manuel, Tehachapi.
Catron, Garry Wayne, Chester.
Chaney, Norman J., Lynwood.
Choate, Randall Bingham, Concord.
Chrisman, Rex Gordon, San Diego.
Chute, Stephen Forrest, Carmichael.
Claire, Kenneth William, Redwood City.
Clark, Lonnie Warren, Vallejo.
Clark, Stephen William, Plymouth.
Clark, Willie C., Los Angeles.
Coats. Charles Alex, Broderick.
Cole, Sam, Jr., San Francisco.
Comacho, Peter Frank, Jr., Santa Ana.
Conley, Robert Frank, Santa Ana.
Contreras, John Jenaro, Carpinteria.
Coomer, Richard Ross, Placentia.
Cooper, Donald Nathaniel, Big Bear Lake.
Cottrell, Thomas Lee, Los Gatos.
Courtemanche, Callen James, La Crescenta.
Crandall, Timothy Allen, Santa Barbara.
Crawford, James Patrick, Fullerton.
Croke, Robert Stanley, Walnut Creek.
Crow, Charles Curtis, Bakersfield.
Cruz, Pete Frank, Chualar.
Cummins, Lanny Dee, Oroville.
Davis, Carlos Ray, Tustin.
Dearing, Jerry Wayne, Lakewood.
Delgado, John Pedro, Sanger.
Devers, Leslie Allen Jr., Riverside.
Diefenderfer, Thomas Edwar, Santa Clara.
Diggs, John Francis, Atherton.
Dryer, Richard Eugene, Norwalk.
Duffey, Gerald Thomas, Castro Valley.
Duhe, Byrun Randall, Fountain Valley.
Dyer, David Wayne, Arroyo Grande
Dyer, Frederick Lee, Upland.
Edgar, Terrece Eugene, Oildale.
Eisenacher, Charles John, Torrance.
Enedy, Robert John, San Diego.
Escobar, Jesus Gutierrez, Wilmington.
Escobedo, Daniel, Fremont.
Esponoza, Mike Patricio, Fresno.
Eversull, Anthony Patrick, Torrance.
Ewing, Lon Barry, Chula Vista.
Fanua, Fiapai, Jr., Wilmington.
Ferguson, William Boyd, Sanger.
Ferrari, Arnold Jay, Napa.
Figueroa, Javier Puentes, Wilmington.
Filipiak, Peter Jan, La Puente.
Fix, William Leroy, San Diego.
Fleming, Bernard John, Riverside.
Flores, Felix Frank, Los Angeles.
Flores, Monico Jr., Hacienda Heights.
Frisbee, Dennis Wayne, Oakland.
Garcia, Angel Antonio, Canoga Park.
Garcia, Christopher, Oceanside.
Garcia, Jerome, Sacramento.
Garcia, Marcial Bondoc, San Francisco.
Garcia, Raymond Ignacio, Hayward.
Garrett, Michael Sherdian, Santa Susana.
Garringer, David Frank, San Francisco.
Gay, Lonnie James, Bakersfield.
Gaynor, James Thomas, Fallbrook.
Gero, John Anthony, Burbank.
Gillaspy, Edward Andrew, La Habra.
Gipson, Ricky Duane, Pacoima.
Goetsch, Wayne August, Brentwood.
Gomez, Lambert Anselmo, Los Angeles.
Gomez, Manuel Joseph, Vallejo.
Gonzales, Joe Julian, La Puente.
Gonzales, Richard Castillo, Los Angeles.
Gonzalez, Robert Espinoza, Fresno.
Gore, David Edward, Manteca.
Gorton, David Burt, Culver City.
Gosch, Thomas Charles, Oceanside.
Grady, Jerry Edward, Alameda.
Green, Robert Earl, Los Angeles.
Gregorius, George, Stockton.
Gross, James David, Pittsburg.
Gurwitz, Leonard Zachary, Costa Mesa.
Hagel, Richard William, Hayward.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Haley, Harrison Leroy, Martinez.
Hall, Richard David, Whittier.
Hamby, Clyde Randall, Hayward.
Hansen, William James, Atascadero.
Hardy, Jerry Ray, Long Beach.
Harty, David Lewis, Sacramento.
Haskell, Charles Wesley, Sacramento.
Hatch, Richard Lee, Bakersfield.
Hausrath, Donald Arthur, Jr., Villa Park.
Hawes, Robert Caribean, Los Angeles.
Hayes, Fred Joe, Walnut Creek.
Headley, Frank Eberly IV, Eureka.
Heflin, Glenn Elden, San Jose.
Hempel, Barry Lee, Garden Grove.
Henrickson, Combly Hannibal, San Diego.
Henry, Francis Gilbert, Rolling Hills.
Hernandez, Julio Alfonso, Los Angeles.
Hernandez, Pedro Alexandro, Los Nietos.
Hernandez, Reyes C., Jr., Colton.
Himmer, Lawrence, Chula Vista.
Holzman, Michael William, Sepulveda.
Hopper, Larry Charles, Ontario.
Horridge, Frederick Raymon, Lomita.
Houston, John Davis, Jr., Los Angeles.
Huggans, Kenneth Richard, San Mateo.
Hunt, James Anthony, La Puente.
Hunter, Delon, Los Angeles.
Hutson, Michael Gale, Sepulveda.
Incrocci, Richard Lafayett, Madera.
Ingram, Ronald Ernest, Redwood City.
Inman, Phillip Lee, Hickman.
Ironside, Steven Paul, Vallejo.
Issenmann, Michael William, Santa Clara.
Jackson, Donald Gene, Lakeside.
Jackson, G. B., Jr., Santa Rosa.
Jackson, Nathaniel Harvey, Los Angeles.
Jackson, Robert Elee, Paramount.
Janeway, Jerry Lee, Delhi.
Jennings, Rudolph, San Francisco.
Johnson, George Stephen, West Covina.
Johnson, Gerald Lynn, Mojave.
Johnson, James Edward, San Diego.
Johnson, Kim Williams, Fresno.
Jones, David Russell, Spring Valley.
Jones, Donald Byron, Lynwood.
Jones, James Walter, Hawthorne
Jones, Larry Allan, Thousand Oaks.
Jordan, Litael, Jr., Los Angeles.
Joyner, Stephen Douglass, La Habra.
Juarez, George Albert, Pico Rivera.
Kalb, Michael Dale, Campbell.
Kane, Michael, Canoga Park.
Kemski, Gary Douglas, North Hollywood.
Killgore, Gene Douglas, Blythe.
Kinsworthy, Loyd Eugene, San Jose.
Knevelbaard, Andy, Lakewood.
Komers, John George, El Monte.
Kralik, William John, Culver City.
Krueger, Lorne Coleman, El Monte.
Kurilick, Robert Vaso, Pasadena.
Kurtz, Christopher Landis, Long Beach.
Kuykendall, Henry Joseph, Los Angeles.
Lambert, Jeffrey Earl, Redding.
Langh, Thomas Earl, Los Angeles.
Langrock, Dennis Ray, Sacramento.
Lavelle, Patrick James, Pasadena.
Lawrence, Ernest Frederick, Walnut Creek.
Lee, Michael Duryes, Palo Alto.
Leeman, Robert Allan, Fullerton.
Leonard, Arnold Lee, Jr., Morgan Hill.
Lewis, Allen Wayne, Fremont.
Lewis, Ronald Keith, Monterey.
Lopez, Adrian Salome, San Martin.
Lopez, Armando, Los Angeles.
Lyons, Carl, Los Angeles.
Maddox, Richard Greene, Cupertino.
Maddox, Roy Raymond, Jr., Independence.
Mahoney, Ralph Martin, Port Chicago.
Mahoney, Thomas P., III, Oakland.
Maldonado, Anthony Gilbert, Los Angeles.
Malone, John Edward, San Diego.
Mamon, Cesar Jabonillo, San Jose.
Marken, John Paul, Jr., Escondido.
Marquez, Martin, Jr., Los Angeles.
Marshall, Charles Ray, Oakland.
Marshall, Willard Dale, La Jolla.
Martin, Jeffrey Lea, Santa Ana.
Martinez, Ernesto, San Jose.
Martinez, George Vincent, San Francisco.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Masadas, Ben Obseniares, Pittsburg.
Maxam, Larry Leonard, Glendale.
McCabe, Marc Wayne, Menlo Park.
McCall, Allan Lee, San Bernardino.
McCants, Alfred Frazier, Fallbrook.
McCosar, Winford, Bell.
McDonald, D. Lance, Van Nuys.
McGinley, Gerald Greydon, Concord.
McKenzie, Douglas N., II, Oceanside.
McKenzie, Richard Wayne, Oxnard.
McLelland, Marvin Edward, Arcata.
Medeiros, Dennis Joseph, San Lorenzo.
Medina, Daniel Michael, San Diego.
Melville, Timothy James, Manhattan Beach.
Mendell, Allan, San Francisco.
Mendoza, Gilbert, El Monte.
Michael, Dennis Steven, Vacaville.
Miles, Dale Arthur, San Diego.
Misa, Viane Sofeni, Oceanside.
Moise, Herve Jean, Los Angeles.
Molossi, Robert John, Daly City.
Montano, Anthony, Los Angeles.
Moore, Elliott Wayne, Long Beach.
Morelos, Catarino Jr., Sanger.
Moreno, John Bobby, Vallejo.
Mulgrew, Kevin Spear, Los Angeles.
Mullen, Joseph William, Jr., Torrance.
Muncy, Gilbert Howard, Long Beach.
Musick, Raymond Earl, Jr., Compton.
Najar, Adam Serna, Palm Springs.
Nash, David Eugene, National City.
Nelson, Donald Lawrence, Santa Susana.
Nelson, Willard Edward, Contra.
Newton, Leonard Lee, Stockton.
Nora, Raymond Vernon, Albany.
Nott, Byron Lee, Jr., Lawndale.
O'Bannon, Robert, III, San Bernardino.
O'Connor, John Vinson, Jr., Roseville.
Obregon, Raul Albert, Los Angeles.
Olsen, Steven Wayne, Sunset Beach.
Oropeza, Manuel Garcia, Los Angeles.
Orr, Raymond Franklin, Jr., Santa Cruz.
Ortiz, Arturo Marquez, Los Angeles.
Pacheco, Robert Lee, Los Olivos.
Padilla, Ralph Henry, Merced.
Page, John Arthur, San Diego.
Page, Michael Ransom, Sacramento.
Palacios, Luis Fernando, Los Angeles.
Palmquist, Steven Leonard, Kerman.
Paopao, Keila, San Francisco.
Parker, William Thomas, Stockton.
Patterson, Edward Leon, Garden Grove.
Payne, Andrew James, Jr., Glendale.
Pearson, Thomas Rickard, Jr., San Diego.
Phipps, James Alvin, Compton
Pinales, Lawrence, San Pedro.
Pinatelli, Thomas Michael, Hawthorne.
Pinole, Babe, Santa Rosa.
Pitts, Terry Dennis, Bakersfield.
Planchon, Randall T., II, Long Beach.
Poffenbarger, William Osca, San Diego.
Poppa, Gerald Leland, Salinas.
Powers, Ronald Lee, Fresno.
Prock, Daniel Lee, Gridley.
Purcell, Gary William, Torrance.
Purdie, Robert David, Sherman Oaks.
Rabey, Kenneth Tilden, Orange.
Railla, Jean Anthony, North Hollywood.
Ralph, Gary Ray, Campbell.
Ramos, George Michael, San Francisco.
Rasco, Kenneth Edward, Los Angeles.
Ratliff, Terry Dixon, Atascadero.
Reed, Roger Lee, Los Angeles.
Reyes, Ronald, La Puente.
Richee, James Burnus, Compton.
Riggs, Walter Roderick, Moorpark.
Riley, Ricky Vaughn, Compton.
Rinehart, James Dale, Jackson.
Ritchie, Douglas Reid, Whittier.
Robertson, Merle Eldon, Campbell.
Rogone, John Pio, Upland.
Roley, Herbert Wallace, Lakeside.
Romero, Joseph Michael, Lakewood.
Romero, Pedro, Jr., La Mirada.
Romero, Robert William, San Diego.
Rountree, Ronald Corbin, Sherman Oaks.
Ruchti, Heinz, Fairfield.
Ruiz, Andrew Andy, Clovis.

XUM

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Rush, Ervin Lee, Sacramento.
Rusher, Robert Charles, Tracy.
Ryan, Ronald Royce, Sacramento.
Sanchez, Edward, Jr., Los Angeles.
Sandoval, George, Los Angeles.
Sapp, Wayne Leroy, Fallbrook.
Saunders, William O., Jr., Tulare.
Saxton, Gary Lee, Cathedral City.
Scarpinato, John Andrew, La Puente.
Scharff, Lennie Harold, Ben Lomond.
Schlamp, Gary Olin, Long Beach.
Schneller, Steven Owen, Marysville.
Schramm, Brock Rowland, San Carlos.
Schwartz, David Earl, Sacramento.
Scofield, John Charles, Anselmo.
Seaman, John Charles, Jr., Spring Valley.
Searles, Charles Peter, Burbank.
Shannon, Stephen Craig, Santa Monica.
Shelton, Henry Earl, North Hollywood.
Shelton, Robert Scott, Vascaville.
Shewman, Ronald James, Los Angeles.
Shields, Jimmy Lee, San Martin.
Siller, Peter Lenhart, Sacramento.
Silvers, Mitchell Frank, Norwalk.
Skaggs, Richard Allan, Cupertino.
Skinner, Herbert Kirk, Woodland Hills.
Skinner, Walter Francis, Soledad.
Smith, Frank John, Pico Rivera.
Smith, Marlin, Los Angeles.
Smith, Robert Carroll, Bell Gardens.
Sorchini, Andres, Los Angeles.
Soto, Martin Jesus, Compton.
Spaw, James Odis, Costa Mesa.
Stanley, Eural, Jr., Venice.
Stith, Daryl La Don, Hayward.
Stonesifer, Donald Lee, San Bernardino.
Storz, George William, San Anselmo.
Strobbe, Daniel Edwin, San Jose.
Strong, Gridley Barstow, Ontario.
Strong, Stanley Grant, Covina.
Sugiura, Tom Dennis, Monterey Park.
Sullivan, Richard D., Jr., Redondo Beach.
Talley, Gary Lee, Campbell.
Taylor, Albert Russell, Springville.
Taylor, Geoffrey Raymond, Canoga Park.
Teague, Bruce Edward, Canoga Park.
Tharaldson, Jeffry Ray, Sacramento.
Thomas, Charles Blake, Cucamonga.
Thomas, Michael Edward, Canoga Park.
Thompson, Louis Kenneth, Fremont.
Thornton, William A., Jr., Lawndale.
Tice, Gary Dale, Santa Clara.
Tisdall, Gary Dean, Modesto.
Toia, Matau, Jr., San Francisco.
Tolentino, Clarence, San Luis Rey.
Tomlinson, David Marlow, Cypress.
Torres, Manuel Prieto, Piru.
Toyias, Charles Leslie, Long Beach.
Trantham, Donald Ray, Santa Clara.
Trimble, James Mitchell, Eureka.
Turk, John Geoffrey, Lomita.
Turner, David Robert, Walnut Creek.
Tyler, Larry Josh, Los Angeles.
Valdez, Ismael Jose, Jr., Pico Rivera.
Valdstad, Clyde Julius, San Diego.
Vater, Dieter Rudolf, La Mesa.
Villarreal, Ricardo, Fallbrook.
Wafer, David Earl, Richmond.
Walker, Gary Layne, Cudahy.
Walker, William John, Riverside.
Walton, Craig Leslie, San Jose.
Warren, Donald Albert, San Diego.
Washburn, Robert Glen, California City.
Waugh, Randall Michael, Paramount.
Weed, Donald Edmond, Port Hueneme.
Weidemier, Peter Joseph, Alameda.
Wentzell, Jeffrey Raymond, San Francisco.
West, Russell Udell, Orange.
Westberry, Vincent Douglas, Los Angeles.
Weymouth, Theodore Gay, Torrance.
Whittier, Mark Crosby, Whittier.
Williams, Charles Robert, Oakland.
Williams, Frederick H., Jr., Sutter Creek.
Williams, James Alec, Bishop.
Williams, Larry Ellis, San Jose.
Williams, Michael Walter, Artesia.
Williamson, Donald Ray, San Jose.
Wilson, David Lewis, Hornbrook.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Marine Corps

Wilson, Royce Harold, Jr., Montague.
Wolfe, Joseph Kent, Los Angeles.
Worley, Kenneth Lee, Modesto.
Wright, Charles Fred, Vallejo.
Wright, Edward Taylor, Los Angeles.
Wright, Henry Arthur, Oakland.
Wright, James William II, San Diego.
Wright, Robert Edward, Sacramento.
Wyatt, John Wesley, Jr., East Palo Alto.
Yamanaka, Roger Kimo, Costa Mesa.
Yohn, William Leon, Fresno.
Young, Lewis John, La Puente.
Zimmerman, David Paul, Pasadena.
Zucroff, Steven Dale, Panorama City.
Zuniga, Charles Edward, Los Angeles.

Navy

Barrett, Michael Barry, Los Angeles.
Benson, Lee David, San Mateo.
Borders, John William, Jr., Saugas.
Brunton, Stephen Cornell, Ukiah.
Calzia, Frank Vincent, El Segundo.
Cardinale, James Anthony, Danville.
Carli, David Arthur, Vallejo.
Carter, Jackie Charles, San Jose
Chester, Dennis Edward, Fair Oaks.
Clasen, Michael Roy, Napa.
Dawson, Frank Arthur, Fairfield.
Dunning, Timothy Charles, Santa Ana
Ford, Patrick Osborne, San Francisco.
Haskins, Michael Wayne, Ventura.
Hayden, Glenn Miller, Long Beach.
Hodel, Mark Edward, Lodi.
Homuth Richard Wendal, Spring Valley.
Hooper, Barry Wayne, Redondo Beach.
Howard, James Bryon, Bakersfield.
Hyland, John Peter, Santa Barbara.
Karger, Barry Edwin, Prather.
Kasch, Frederick Morrison, San Diego.
Kravitz, James Stephen, Riverside.
Lerch Earl Roger, San Francisco.
Lewis, James C. Ralph, San Diego.
Long Leonard, Tulare.
Lopez, Jose Angel, Jr., Sanger.
Macagba, Edilberto Dula, Albany.
Madrid, Michael Phillip, Stockton.
Mc Glochlin David Earl, Carmel Valley.
Mercer, William Ivan, Los Angeles.
Meredith, Gary Lee, Fremont.
Moriarity, Patrick Dale, Napa.
Myrick, George Franklin, Los Angeles.
Parkinson, Gary Convers, Turlock.
Pettit, Craig Steven, Martinez.
Pritchett, Gregory Gene, Walnut.
Rambur, Michael James, Chula Vista.
Retzloff, James Robert, Jr., Redding.
Royall, Leslie William, III, Roseville.
Schlote, Louis Chris, Ft. Bragg.
Scott, Dayne York, Hawthorne.
Slow, Gale Robert, Huntington Park.
Smith Vernon Parr, Los Angeles.
Staten, Robert Joseph, Ontario.
Volz, Stephen Thomas, Lakewood.
Wagner, Robert Kay, Barstow.
Wentz, Mitchell Allen, Lompoc.
White, Charles Mott, Sr., Lathrop.
Zillgitt, Donald Henry, Inglewood.

COLORADO

Army

Adkins, Charles Leland, Glenwood Springs.
Arndt, Craig Alan, Denver.
Bahl, Walter Timothy, Denver.
Bandy, Curtis Elbert, Denver.
Beall, William Ernest, Jr., Denver.
Belarde, Benjamin Joseph, Colorado Springs.
Blea, Robert Daniel, Denver.
Branaugh, Larry James, Denver.
Brancio, David Mike, Denver.
Brigham, Robert Gene, Denver.
Briscoe, Larry, Denver.
Casias, Henry Eloy, Trinidad.
Catterson, Ronald Gene, Fort Collins.
De Herrera, Benjamin David, Colorado Springs.
Dickson, Robert Lee, Ridgway.
Downey Stephen Wood, Colorado Springs.
Ellsworth, Robert Wayne, Pueblo.

COLORADO—continued

Army

Fahrenbruch, Richard L., Ft. Collins.
Fregia, Robert Randy, Denver.
Fuller, Timothy, Denver.
Garcia, Willie, Jr., Pueblo.
Gomez, Ernest Lawrence, Denver.
Green, Garry George, Colorado Springs.
Griffith, Perry Witt, Colorado Springs.
Hamilton, Gilbert Lee, Denver.
Heck, David William, Littleton.
Heggen, Gregory Lynn, Denver.
Herrera, Manuelito Leopold, Manassa.
Hinton, Dennis Edward, Englewood.
Hinston Dennis Edward, Englewood.
Hirschler, Ralph Dean, Jr., Lamar.
Hyland, Dennis Michael, Denver.
Jackson, Lloyd William, Jr., Pueblo.
Jackson, Robert Eugene, Pueblo.
Jenkins, Eric Doran, Nederland.
Jensen, James Maynard, Denver.
Johnson, Gregory Randolph, Pueblo.
Jones, Lawrence Edward, Denver.
Kennann, Larry Russell, Glenwood Springs.
Kinton, Donald Ray, Denver.
La Pointe, Larry W., Denver.
Lambert Timothy, Denver.
Landes, Drek Allen, Denver.
Larson, Jeffry Arthur, Denver.
Lucero, Patrick Arnold, Pueblo.
Manly, Frederick Lee, Lamar.
Manzanares, Jose Adoro, Pagosa Springs.
Marquez, Ronald O., Denver.
Martin, Richard Le Roy, Aurora.
Martinez, Juan Patricio, Pueblo.
Martinez, Manuel Floyd, Denver.
Mascarenas, Robert Ray, Denver.
Mc Gowen, Charles Frank, Boulder.
Miller, David Harvey, Pueblo.
Minton, Christopher Alan H., Denver.
Mondragon, Benjamin Allen, Denver.
Mora, James J., Denver.
Mussman, Denis Ervin, Denver.
Nelson, Donald Eugene, Colorado Springs.
Ontis, Billie Joe, Denver.
Penn, Edwin Allan, Denver.
Petersdorf, Charles H. Jr., Colorado Springs.
Peterson, Russell George, Denver.
Pettie, Floyd William, III, Colorado Springs.
Phillips, Jerry Len, Golden.
Reeves, Robert Linton, Colorado Springs.
Rocha, Daniel Albert, Denver.
Rynning, Kenneth Dean, Aurora.
Sandersen, William Leonard, Aspen.
Schmidt, Paul Edward, Denver.
Schultz, Ronnie Dean, Grand Junction.
Sena, Fred, Jr., Pueblo.
Solano, Porfirio Sam, Avondale.
Spellman, Joseph Victor, Denver.
Stolpa, Raymond Vincent, Golden.
Stotler, Michael Dean, Denver.
Tabor, Bruce Wayne, Aurora.
Taggart, Larry Joel, Denver.
Tessadri, Jimmy Joe, Salida.
Thompson, Donald R., Alamosa.
Trevarton, Larry George, Longmont.
Tripp, Dennis Robert, Sterling.
Valdez, Juan Pedro, Avondale.
Vanwey, William Earl, Pueblo.
Vialpando, John A., Steamboat Springs.
Walker, Michael Clyde, Denver.
Wallace, Russell Lewis, Littleton.
Whitney, Philip Leonard, Fort Collins.
Williams, Floyd Lee, Jr., Northglenn.
Williams, Lawrence Dean, Denver.
Williams, Vere Loyd, Jr., Commerce City.
Williams, Virgil Lawrence, Snyder.
Winget, Kenneth Wayne, Pueblo.
Wright, Lee Roy, La Veta.

Air Force

Cox, Larry Charles, Denver.

Marine Corps

Adams, Ronald Wyatt, Arvada.
Anderson, William, Jr., Denver.
Baker, Stanley Loyd, Westminster.
Beck, Michael James, Greeley.
Blatnick, Rodger Alan, Trinidad.
Blunn, David Lee, Pueblo.
Byars, Richard Scott, Rye.

COLORADO—continued

Marine Corps

Cain, Michael Joseph, Denver.
Capraro, Claud William, Penrose.
Clark, Billy Floyd, Basalt.
Clevenger, Daniel John, Pueblo.
Cunningham, Stephen Rae, Denver.
Denava, John Joseph, Denver.
Dickson, Eric Voughn, Woodland Park.
Duran, Amie Jacob, Delta.
Fiebelkorn, Marcus Guy, Pagosa Springs.
Garcia, Jesus Maris, Conejos.
Gutierrez, Joe Maria, Pueblo.
Halcomb, Carlton Barry, Longmont.
Herrera, Louis Anthony, Denver.
Hollingworth, David McLean, Ouray.
Horgan, Duane Frank, Lakewood.
Horvath, Robert John, Rockvale.
Hunter, Troy Hazard, Colorado Springs.
Hurlbert, Roy Douglas, Wheatridge.
La Voo, John Allen, Pueblo.
Lopez, Joseph Paul, Denver.
Lucero, Robert Floriencio, Eaton.
Martinez, Adolph Alfred, Denver.
Martinez, Mauro, Hudson.
Medina, Johnny, Denver.
Miller, Philip Denis, Grand Junction.
Mueller, Kurt, Jr., Wheatridge.
Neel, Charles Herbert, Jr., Wheatridge.
Orsland, Gary Varner, Branson.
Prideaux, James Earl, Brighton.
Ratliff, Fred Alexander, Denver.
Reichert, Steven Edward, Colorado Springs.
Roesler, John Onderdonk, Denver.
Romero, Arthur Wilfred, Colorado Springs.
Ross, Robert Lee, Colorado Springs.
Rouse, Gregory Michael, Evergreen.
Santistevan, Benny M., Jr., Denver.
Schaeffer, Arlon Glenn, Loveland.
Steele, Thomas William, Colorado Springs.
Stetson, Kenneth Earl, Longmont.
Thomson, Robert Brian, Colorado Springs.
Trujillo, Gary Leon, Grand Junction.
Turner, James Louis, Pueblo.
Waller, James Leonard, Pueblo.
Warren, Michael Walter, Golden.
Watson, Kenneth Gary, Colorado Springs.
Weimer, Jerry Alan, Fort Morgan.
Williams, Thomas Hansford, Golden.
Worrell, Robert Lee, Littleton.

Navy

Adams, Arthur Lloyd, Jr., Loveland.
Barber, Thomas David, Aurora.
Dexter, Richard Augustine, Colorado Springs.
Parsons, Douglas Blanchard, Arvada.
Wells, Larry Dean, Wray.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Azzarito, Frank Anthony, Jr., Brookfield.
Baghleda, Bernd, East Hampton.
Barker, Frank Akeley, Jr., New Haven.
Bath, John Michael, Niantic.
Brown, Richard Craig, Uncasville.
Canfield, Matthew M., Jr., Bristol.
Caputo, Richard P., Rocky Hill.
Carnegie, Thomas Edward, Ridgefield.
Cassidy, David Alexander, Waterbury.
Cohn, William Paul, Jr., Old Mystic.
Collier, Steven Edward, Branford.
Davis, Edwin Phillip, Rockville.
De Angelis, Richard Nichol, Wallingford.
De Orio, William Joseph, Jr., Hartford.
Doneski, Henry John, Derby.
Donovan, Thomas Edward, Norwich.
Duel, Edward Kenneth, Hamden.
Edmond, Thomas Allen, Canterbury.
Elia, Robert A., Shelton.
English, Daryl Lee, Hartford.
Esten, John Ernest, Pequabuck.
Farnham, Allen Stearns, Brookfield.
Ferguson, Donald Porter, Hamden.
Ferguson, Peter Clarence, Portland.
Fiedler, Drew, New London.
Fletcher, Randall Scott, Vernon.
Forgue, Gerald Henry, Shelton.
German, Bromley Howard, Waterbury.
Harrell, Lenwood Thomas, Waterbury.
Holland, Joseph Phillip, Naugatuck.
Hopkins, Robert E., Willimantic.

CONNECTICUT—continued

Army

Jackson, Charles Arthur, Waterford.
Jobst, Kurt Karl, Jr., Stamford.
Johnson, Peter Wyeth, Wilton.
Jurek, Edward Joseph, II, Meriden.
Keller, Timothy Wayne, Wallingford.
Le Blanc, Francis Joseph, Waterbury.
Le May, Richard Driggs, Jr., New Britain.
Lescarbeau, George Gerald, Hartford.
Leska, Robert John, Trumbull.
Levesque, Roland Phillip, Bristol.
Lubesky, George A., Jr., Waterbury.
Mann, James Edward, New Britain.
Manselle, Eugene L., III, Hartford.
Matis, Walter Francis E., Jr., Stratford.
McDonald, Walter Raymond, Meriden.
McGilton, Calvin Eugene, New Haven.
Miglierina, Robert Leo, Wallingford.
Navarro, Frank Gea, New Haven.
Neger, Roger Lee, Fairfield.
Nestico, Philip Frank, Bristol.
Nolan, Robert Frank, Madison.
Palmieri, John Joseph, Riverside.
Palowski, Richard Edwin, East Hartford.
Pellegrino, John Peter, Stamford.
Prindle, Ashton Haywood, Greenwich.
Provost, David Armand, Thompson.
Raymond, Theodore Paul, Jewett City.
Rivera-Ruiz, Andres, Hartford.
Ryan, Michael John, Groton.
Sanders, Melvin Hilton, Bridgeport.
Sebastian, Alton Browning, Norwich.
Shavies, George Arthur, New Haven.
Smith, Howard Bruce, New Canaan.
Speath, David Paul, Hartford.
Strano, James Clinton, Winsted.
Tierney, Brian Edward, Roxbury.
Tigner, Jeffrey Sanders, Riverside.
Ursin, William Normand, Bolton.
West, William Edward, East Granby.
Willey, Donald Morris, East Hartford.
Young, John F., Sandy Hook.
Zale, Joseph Paul, Vernon.

Air Force

Kuhlmann, Charles Frederic, New Britain.

Marine Corps

Bagnall, Robert Salmon, Bloomfield.
Banning, James Henry, Jr., East Hampton.
Barmmer, Timothy Michael, Westport.
Barreiros, Silvino Fernand, Hartford.
Baynes, Ernest John, Jewett City.
Bingham, David Richard, Quaker Hill.
Blanchard, Thomas Joseph, Briston.
Bryant, Creed Lorenzio, New Haven.
Burgess, Raymond Arthur, Southington.
Cavanaugh, Thomas James, Waterbury.
Clark, George William, Lakeville.
Conklin, Richard Douglas, Milford.
Cullinan, John Patrick, Waterbury.
Currie, George Crawford, Quaker Hill.
Curry, Jack Henry, Killingworth.
Dolan, William John, Hartford.
Doria, Aldo Anthony, Derby.
Falcon, Anibal, Bridgeport.
Falk, Frederick John, Jr., Torrington.
Farmer, Michael Melvin, Danbury.
Fialko, David Andrew, Jr., Bridgeport.
Foy, Michael Joseph, Ansonia.
Fritsch, Thomas William, Cromwell.
Graveline, Richard Paul, Killingly.
Greene, James Leonard, Jr., Taftville.
Grillo, Joseph John, Jr., Norwich.
Jacob, Robert Michael, Bristol.
Lafond, Roland Robert, East Hartford.
Links, Richard Frederick, Noank.
Loughran, Joseph M., Jr., Greenwich.
Machie, Michael Allen, Coventry.
Mansfield, John Michael, Preston.
Marino, Carl John, Thompsonville.
Markarian, William Aram, Simsbury.
Marx, Robert Garry, Meriden.
McLellan, Arthur Charles, Terryville.
McManus, Truman Joseph, Mansfield.
Meisel, William W., Jr., Riverside.
Norton, Robert Lyon, West Hartford.
Post, James Harvey, Jr., Bridgeport.
Price, Dwight Anthony, New London.
Randall, Ronald Mitchell, Seymour.
Remer, Charles Bradley, Jr., Southington.

CONNECTICUT—continued

Marine Corps

Richards, Charles Edward, Stamford.
Robbins, Wayne Dustin, Southington.
Rotko, Russell Joseph, Jr., Danbury.
Rowson, Geoffrey Thomas, North Grosvenordal.
Ryder, Aldo Eugene, Bristol.
Saunders, Earnest Rollin, Waterbury.
Sincere, James Walter, East Hartford.
Slack, Steven George, Rockville.
Smith, James Gordon, Shelton.
Spirito, Anthony Joseph, Jr., Hartford.
Stull, Jay Webster, Riverside.
Tchakirides, Irving Burr, Waterbury.
Thibeault, Gilbert, Bristol.
Thomas, Bruce Maynard, Fairfield.
Thorik, Paul, Jr., New Britain.
Urban, Richard Edward, Stratford.
Williams, James Joseph, Ansonia.
Wright, Herman W. O., Jr., Pawcatuck.

DELAWARE

Army

Adams, Thomas B., Selbyville.
Arnold, David Morgan, Hockessin.
Baker, William S., Middletown.
Bonham, Theodore R. Jr., Wilmington.
Brown, Werner Curt, II, Wilmington.
Collins, Toby Ernest, Dover.
Coppage, George Herman, III, Wyoming.
Cubbage, Clifton, Bowers Beach.
Dawson, Donald Edward, Jr., Wilmington.
Dieffenbach, Robert W., Jr., Newark.
Dubrzynski, Raymond Paul, Wilmington.
Dolbow, Bruce Edward, Felton.
Faulkner, Richard J., Wilmington.
Fones, Paul Mark, Bear.
Gibson, Donald Lee, Milford.
Henrickson, Jan Victor, Hartly.
Jester, Wayne Clifford, Milford.
Kenton, Donald E., Dover.
McFalls, Harry Preston, Lewes.
Momcilovich, Michael, Jr., Wilmington.
Ray, Nolan Reed, Dover.
Weldin, Jacob Robinson, Wilmington.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Robert Carl, Middletown.
Bird, Leonard Adrian, Wilmington.
Bleacher, Ronald Thomas, Marshallton.
Brittingham, Linden Wayne, Milton.
Chamberlain, Richard Morri, Wilmington.
Clough, Bruce Edward, Magnolia.
Cuff, Donald Merritt, Wilmington.
Doyle, Robert Walter, Wilmington.
Faulkner, Elmer Lee, Jr., Greenwood.
Grant, Gene Tyndall, Bridgeville.
Howard, Sylvester Joseph, Wilmington.
Kaminski, Joseph M., Jr., Wilmington.
Thompson, Ralph Layton, Jr., Wilmington.

Navy

Gott, John Joseph, Jr., Wilmington.
Tracy, Robert Louis, Greenville.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Army

Alexander, Robert, Washington.
Brown, Robert Maurice, Washington.
Burge, Frederick, Washington.
Dargan, Jeffrey Lynn, Washington.
Dickinson, Robert Charles, Washington.
Gaston, John Rufus, Jr., Washington.
Gooden, Johnnie, Washington.
Graham, Henry Herndon, Washington.
Hairston, Jimmy Lee, Washington.
Hamilton, Leon Gonza, Jr., Washington.
Henry, Bismark Washington, Washington.
Hill, Sid, Washington.
Johnson, Sterling Henry, Washington.
Kowalewski, Zygmunt, Washington.
Mason, Charles Joseph L., Washington.
Mazak, Stefan, Washington.
McGonigal, Aloysius Paul, Washington.
Moore, James Russell, Washington.
Phillips, Michael Leon, Washington.
Ponder, Willie Le Earl, Washington.
Price, Jay Anthony, Washington.
Price, William Sidway, Washington.
Richardson, Bernard McKinl, Washington.
Rinehart, Joseph Lester, Washington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—continued

Army

Scott, Grady, Washington.
Simons, Ainsley Cudie, Washington.
Smith, George John, Jr., Washington.
Smith, John Robert, Jr., Washington.
Warner, Henry Luke, III, Washington.
Whittington, Perry Lee, Washington.
Williams, Robert Lee, Washington.
Winder, Walter Ridgeway, Jr., Washington.
Zeigler, William Henry, Washington.

Air Force

Risher, David Horace, Washington.

Marine Corps

Allen, Douglas Melvin, Washington.
Battle, William Alfred, Washington.
Cabness, Derrick Clifford, Washington.
Darden, Claude, Jr., Washington.
Dean, Thomas Nelson, Washington.
Downs, Edward Joseph, Washington.
Durham, James William, Jr., Washington.
Findley, Robert Gaylord, Washington.
Foster, Gerald Anthony, Washington.
Gordon, Gerald Elliott, Washington.
Gordon, William Samuel, Washington.
Hobbs, Ronald Robert, Washington.
Jackson, Andrew, Washington.
Langley, David Francis, Washington.
Lewis, Ronald William, Washington.
Mason, Alvin Pernell, Washington.
McQueen, Claude Edward, Washington.
Melton, David Lawrence, Washington.
Plunkett, Raymond Louis, Washington.
Preston, Alvin Lewis, Washington.
Russell, David Adams, Washington.
Smith, Edward Spencer, Washington.
Stewart, Tommy Lane, Washington.
Turner, Richard, Washington.
Tyler, Sylvester George, Washington.
Watkins, Kenneth Maurice, Washington.
Williams, Lawrence, Washington.

Navy

Brett, Robert Raymond, Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Adams, James Robert, Bartow.
Akel, Richard Louis, Miami.
Allen, Gary Lee, Lynn Haven.
Anderson, Alto, Jr., Quincy.
Anderson, Lucius, Jr., Ocala.
Anslow, Walter Harold, Jacksonville.
Arnold, Gary Wayne, Orlando.
Artman, Timothy Harold, Hialeah.
Aue, Otto Wayne, Live Oak.
Avella, John Joseph, Clearwater.
Babuljak, Stephen, Miami.
Baldwin, Norman Earl, Fort Lauderdale.
Bartlett, Bruce Eugene, Fort Lauderdale.
Baxter, James Colon, Dover.
Baxter, Terry Lee, Marathon.
Bayonet, Thomas Wylie, St. Petersburg.
Beall, Charles Richard, De Bary.
Beaver, James Harold, Bradenton.
Beck, Winfield Wesley, Pensacola.
Bellamy, Larry Ronald, Jacksonville.
Bellamy, Robert Lee, Tampa.
Bennett, Howard Duncan, Hollywood.
Blackshear, James Guy, Starke.
Bolyard, Larry Charles, Bradenton.
Borders, Wardell, Bronson.
Boutwell, Amos Hayes, Marianna.
Bradee, Gary Leroy, Miami.
Branch, Louis William, Davenport.
Bray, Richard Loyd, III, Milton.
Breitnitz, Lawrence W., Ocala.
Bridges, Willie Gene, Ruskin.
Bristow, Norman Kenneth, Hawthorne.
Brockman, Robert David, Hialeah.
Brogdon, Donald Ray, Ocala.
Brommann, Henry Richard, Miami.
Brooks, Gregory Paul, Miami.
Brown, Gerald Keith, Maitland.
Brown, Jonathan, Miami.
Brown, Larry Wayne, Stuart.
Bullard, Karl Lee, Miami.
Bullock, Leon Daniel, West Palm Beach.
Bunn, James Albert, Miami.
Burrows, Marvin Eugene, Fort Lauderdale.
Burton, Thomas John, Pompano Beach.

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Butler, Randolph Todd, St. Petersburg.
Caldwell, Richard Bruce, Jr., Orlando.
Calfee, Jack Wayne, Miami.
Campbell, Ronald Gates, Pompano Beach.
Cannon, John Henry, Jay.
Carlisle, Larry Dexter, Miami.
Carroll, Larry Martin, Baldwin.
Carter, Johnnie, Jr., Watertown.
Carter, Mark Jerald, Thonotosassa.
Cato, Robert O'Neal, Apalachicola.
Clark, Brian James, Orlando.
Clark, Charles II, Winter Park.
Cleveland, Richard Grover, Venice.
Clifton, Terry W., Jacksonville.
Cline, Paul Harold, West Palm Beach.
Cohan, Stephen, Miami.
Cone, Leroy, Jacksonville.
Conner, Paul Allan, Fort Lauderdale.
Connolly, Kevin Thomas, St. Petersburg.
Cooper, Gary Ray, Keystone Heights.
Corbin, Thomas Berry, Cross City.
Cox, Lester Wayne, Cocoa.
Coy, Jessie Eddie Lee, Ocala.
Crews, Robert Louis, North Naples.
Cutinha, Nicholas Joseph, Alva.
Damron, William Thomas, Pensacola.
Daniels, Gary Leonard, West Palm Beach.
Davenport, Charles E., II, Hollywood.
Davis, Ernest Pettway, Miami.
Davis, James Albert, Orlando.
Davis, Tom, Jr., St. Augustine.
Davis, William Terrell, Haines.
Davis, William W., Jr., Jacksonville.
Delara, Franklin Victory, Hialeah.
Diers, Richard Walter, Pinellas Park.
Digsby, Leroy, Panama City.
Dillon, James Dale, Jacksonville.
Dixon, Charles Alvin, Palm Harbor.
Doelger-Landivar, Hermann, Miami.
Douglas, Johnnie Lamar, Pensacola.
Doxey, Jan Dean, Big Pine Key.
Dukes, Arthur Roger, Jr., Coral Gables.
Ealum, Carrel Gorum, Ft. Walton Beach.
Edwards, Dennette A., III, Hollywood.
Edwards, Richard, Jr., Leesburg.
Fennell, William Ervin, Ft. Lauderdale.
Fernandez-Leston, Enrique, Miami.
Flint, William Neil, Naples.
Flournoy, Paul Douglas, Quincy.
Fox, Reinis, Merritt Island.
Franklin, Charles Robert, Miami.
Franklin, Eugene, Ft. Lauderdale.
Fuqua, James F., Bartow.
Gaines, Douglas, Jr., Perry.
Garnet, Owen Niel, Miami.
Gates, Robert Alfred, North Palm Beach.
Geiger, Isadore Samuel, Jr., Anthony.
Gerdon, Roy Clinton, Tampa.
Geronimo, Charles Anthony, Hialeah.
Giles, Clem Calvin, Sarasota.
Gillman, Donald Standley, Milton.
Glover, Fred Richard, Fartow.
Goldberg, William Jacob, Miami.
Gomez, Steve, Miami.
Gonzalez, Hector, Miami.
Gordon, Charles A., Hawthorne.
Grant, James Wood, Sanford.
Green, Jeremiah, Auburndale.
Greeson, John Egbert, Melbourne.
Gregory, Eulas Fay, Fort Meade.
Griffis, James Larrian, Jacksonville.
Grooms, Ronald Keith, Plant City.
Gunther, John Jacob, Melbourne.
Hadley, Sherry Joe, Bradenton.
Hall, Charles Edward, Sanford.
Hall, James Hayes, Crestview
Hall, John Dean, West Palm Beach.
Hall, Patrick Lindsey, Sanford.
Hankinson, Tommy Lee, Gainesville.
Harris, Grady Hershall, Caryville.
Harris, Thomas Wyatt, Brandon.
Harvin, Jimmie Lee, Jacksonville.
Hayden, Ralph Parker, Boca Raton.
Hayes, Quentin, Pensacola.
Hays, John Hulsey, Winter Haven.
Hendson, Edward E., Jr., Miami.
Henderson, Leon, Jacksonville.
Henesy, Harold Thomas, St. Petersburg.
Herald, Robert, Tampa.

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Herring, Harold Joerenzo, Jacksonville.
Hession, Patrick B., Tampa.
Higginbotham, Harold S., Coral Gables.
Higgins, Edward Hubert, Tarpon Springs.
Hines, Joe Raymond, Key West.
Holton, John Thomas, Jr., Jacksonville.
Hoops, Franklin Werner, Jr., Fort Lauderdale.
Howard, Gary Edward, Quincy.
Huber, Leon Fairden, St. Augustine.
Hudson, Joseph, Jr., Deerfield Beach.
Hughes, Sam Zeb, Miami.
Hulslander, Ross Thomas, Gainesville.
Hunt, Arthur Walton, III, Jacksonville.
Hunter, Willie Hayward, Fort Lauderdale.
Huston, Dale Martin, Lakeland.
Hutchins, Lucious, Jacksonville.
Ilgenfritz, Herbert E., Jr., Orlando.
Jackson, Herman, Miami.
Jackson, Richard Curtis, West Palm Beach.
Jansenius, Raymond Lee, Panama City.
Jenkins, Larry, Live Oak.
Jenkins, Larry Barney, Middleburg.
Jewett, Guy Leonard, Belleview.
Johns, Donald Cecil, McIntosh.
Johns, Ronald Elmer, Daytona Beach.
Johnson, Buford Gerald, Winter Garden.
Johnson, John Wayne, Leesburg.
Johnson, Norris Felton, Tampa.
Jones, Aldon Cecil, Tampa.
Jones, James Randall, Tampa.
Jones, Willie Gerald, Fort Lauderdale.
Joyce, Derrell Walter, Miami.
Keene, Grat Albert, Palatka.
Kelley, Kendrick King, III, Jacksonville.
Kelly, Seeber J., Lake Wales.
Kennedy, Michael Joseph, Fort Lauderdale.
Kepczyk, Tadeuz Marian, Port Charlotte.
Kett, Randolph Charles, Tampa.
Kickliter, James Thomas, Redington Beach.
Kidd, Kenneth Edward, Orlando.
King, Lewis, Ocala.
Knight, Carlos Larue, Plant City.
Krupski, Walter Benjamin, Umatilla.
Ladson, Lafon Winston, Jacksonville.
Lambert, Lee Mathews, Jacksonville.
Lambert, William Glenn, Pensacola.
Land, Fred Emery, Wewahitchka.
Lang, Ernest Alphonso, Jacksonville.
Ledgerwood, David Gail, Deltona.
Lee, George, Jr., Jacksonville.
Lisenby, James Arlond, Plant City.
Livengood, Steve Allen, North Miami Beach.
Loiselle, Bruce Wayne, St. Petersburg.
Long, Billie Monroe, Fort Lauderdale.
Lowes, Richard Smith, Inverness.
Lutes, Mark Stanton, Miami.
Mackey, Robert Eugene, Cocoa.
Maleszewski, Paul Edward, Pensacola.
Maloy, Gary Lee, St. Cloud.
Manos, Arthur, Jacksonville.
March, Frank, Jr., Cocoa.
Martin, Larry Eugene, Niceville.
Martin, William George, Titusville.
Maslyn, Edward James, Lakeland.
Matheny, Russell Lee, Sarasota.
McClendon, Willie James, Miami.
McCorvey, Edward, Jr., Pensacola.
McLemore, Tilghman Richard, Cedar Key.
McPheters, Chet Eugene, Clearwater.
McWaters, Dalton Hubert, Mulberry.
Meisheid, Alan James, South Daytona.
Miller, Ernest Lee, Jacksonville.
Moss, Richard Lee, Tampa.
Mullins, James Edward, Hillsborough.
Naley, Richard Herbert, Pompano Beach.
Nelson, Archie Lee, Jr., Delray Beach.
Niedermeyer, John Gary, Eau Gallie.
Norris, Billy Rayvon, Defuniak Springs.
Osteen, Michael Steven, Gulf Hammock.
Pace, James Alvin, Clewiston.
Parker, Dale Warren, Bradenton.
Parounagian, George, Jr., Miami.
Pate, William, Lake City.
Patrick, Jerry Lee, Eustis.
Paulk, Elias Johnson, Ocala.
Peacock, Jack Allan, Quincy.
Pendley, Robert Glenn, Wauchula.

XUM

FLORIDA—continued

Army

Petrie, Richard Jeffrey, Jacksonville.
Pharis, Ronald Washington, Lake City.
Pina, Gerald Martin, Tampa.
Plata, Marvin James, Miami.
Plummer, Richard Eugene, San Mateo.
Pollard, Sidney Gerald, Lake Placid.
Powell, Johnnie Earl, Jacksonville.
Powell, Richard Warren, Jr., Hollywood.
Rainey, Charlie, Winter Garden.
Ramberg, Michael John, Palm Beach.
Reali, Guido Silvestro, Jr., Orlando.
Rein, Charles Frederick, Tampa.
Rhodes, David Frederick, Popamo Beach.
Rhodes, Ronald James, Opa Locka.
Rhynes, Glouster, Ft. Pierce.
Riley, Bobby Lee, Bradenton.
Roberson, John Tarry, Greenville.
Roberts, Claude, Delray Beach.
Roberts, Wayne Leroy, Jacksonville.
Russell, Joe Travis, Tampa.
Salmela, Robert Earl, Eau Gallie.
Sampson, Randolph, Jacksonville.
Sansing, Jerry Russell, Ojus.
Sauls, George Harold, Jr., Orlando.
Saunders, Geoffrey Douglas, Miami.
Saunders, Michael Joseph, Clearwater.
Schmitt, Francis Baron, Tampa.
Schneider, John Millard, Tarpon Springs.
Schrader, Rudolf August, Lantana.
Scott, Herbert William, III, St. Petersburg.
Seay, William Wayne, Pensacola.
Sexton, Luther Manley, Jr., Jacksonville.
Shamp, Paul David, Jr., Jacksonville.
Sheffield, Earnest Earl, Chipley.
Sheffield, James Timothy, Tallahassee.
Shepard, Morris Raymone, Jr., Tampa.
Shirley, Harold Gene, Cottondale.
Shiver, Richard Wayne, Fort Pierce.
Sikes, Thomas Gary, Jacksonville.
Sims, Clifford Chester, Port St. Joe.
Singletary, Alton Lamer, Madison.
Singletary, James Samual, Ojus.
Siorois, Maurice Leo, Winter Haven.
Small, Eugene, Palatka.
Smalls, Bernard Augustus, Jacksonville.
Smith, Lloyd Henry, Jacksonville.
Snitchler, Howard William, Largo.
Sosa-Camejo, Felix, Miami.
Steimbach, Joseph John, Jacksonville.
Stewart, Edward Samuel, Pensacola.
Stewart, Samuel R., III, Miami.
Stokes, Donnie Monroe, Dade City.
Stone, James Marvin, Miami.
Stone, Jerry Michael, Lockhart.
Stovall, William Dale, Sanford.
Strickland, James S., Jr., Jacksonville.
Sullivan, Glenn, Pensacola.
Summersill, Earl Phillip, Apopka.
Szidor, Joseph Daniel, Miami.
Terrell, Robert Earl, Starke.
Thiele, John Arthur, Jr., St. Johns.
Thomas, Arthur Wayne, Lake City.
Thomas, Jess, Mascotte.
True, Malcolm Roscoe, Jr., Cocoa.
Turnbull, Joseph Parkhill, Tampa.
Turner, Lawrence Frank, Stuart.
Turner, Stephen Fredrick, Largo.
Ungaro, Dominic, Jr., Ocoee.
Walden, James Robert, Miami.
Walden, Marion Frank, Jr., Miami.
Waldron, Jerry Monroe, Jacksonville.
Walters, Frederick F., Eau Gallie.
Watson, Donnie Edward, Plant City.
White, James E., Pensacola.
White, William Edmond, III, Coral Gables.
Whitten, Robert Eugene, Fort Myers.
Wiggins, Stephan Max, Vero Beach.
Wilkerson, David Lee, West Palm Beach.
Williams, Alfronzia, Tampa.
Williams, Ben Harold, St. Petersburg.
Williams, Maurice Theron, Ocala.
Williams, Robert Earl, Cantonment.
Williams, Robert L., Tampa.
Wilson, John Robert, St. Petersburg.
Winston, Ernest Gregory, Miami.
Worlds, James Allen, Tampa.
Wright, Larry, Jacksonville.
Young, James Howard, Fort Lauderdale.
Zamora, Wilfredo Pantaleon, Miami.

FLORIDA—continued

Air Force

Collins, Guy Fletcher, Miami.
Hampton, Frederick Jordan, Gainesville.
Kehrli, Herbert Albert, Ormond Beach.
Merry, Donald Lewis, Pass A Grille Beach.
Reed, Marion Eugene, Winter Garden.
Tosh, Brent John, Cocoa.

Marine Corps

Alexander, Kerry, Fort Pierce.
Allen, Herbert Marshall, Winter Haven.
Anderson, David Michael, Miami.
Anderson, Phillip Russell, Jacksonville.
Anderson, Ralph Tommy, St. Petersburg.
Anderson, Robert James, Dunedin.
Anderson, William Mark, Opa Locka.
Arnold, Robert, Tampa.
Bacote, Moses June, St. Petersburg.
Ballard, Norman Casey, Felda.
Ballou, David Allan, St. Petersburg.
Baptiste, Michael Bradford, Tampa.
Bartle, Barry George, Longwood.
Beasley, Johnnie Harold, Lakeland.
Beauchamp, Kevin Patrick, Fort Lauderdale.
Bell, Gary Joseph, Winter Park.
Bell, Ruben, Jr., St. Petersburg.
Benedict, Joseph Wayne, Jacksonville.
Bloomfield, Harry Gene, Jacksonville.
Brady, Terry Philip, Tallahassee.
Brittle, Adrian Coogie, Jr., Tampa.
Brooks, David Leroy, Limona.
Brown, Byron Lea, Titusville.
Brown, Davis Freeman, Winter Park.
Brown, Joseph L., Jr., Casselberry.
Brown, William Leo, Deland.
Bruce, Samuel, Jr., Jacksonville.
Buckles, William Thomas, Hollywood.
Burris, Franklin Ivan, Jr., Largo.
Chessher, Charles Michael, Crestview.
Clark, Isaac Nathaniel, Jacksonville.
Clark, John Howard, Jr., Tampa.
Clarkson, Gerald Joseph, Jacksonville.
Clemons, Larry Raymond, Kissimmee.
Colburn, Denver Dewey, Jr., Brooksville.
Coleman, Ronald Dean, Tarpon Springs.
Conner, Idus James, Lake Alfred.
Conway, Raymond Terrence, Miami.
Corbitt, DeWayne, Jacksonville Beach.
Corcoran, William Richard, Hollywood.
Crawford, Richard, Ocalla.
Cromwell, Robert Walter, Hollywood.
Curtis, Thomas Guy, Jr., Lakeland.
Darden, Larry Euel, Orlando.
Decker, Allan George, Westwood Orlando.
Denham, Gail, Jr., Pensacola.
Denhoff, Thomas Edward, Tampa.
Dick, Alan Jay, Jacksonville.
Dixon, David Ernest, Miami.
Dodd, James William, Tampa.
Eberle, Ronald Earl, Fort Lauderdale.
Fischer, Kenneth Edward, Eustis.
Fischer, Roy Scott, Lakeland.
Foard, Wallace Billany, Jr., Miami.
Frederick, Douglas Lloyd, Jacksonville.
Freeman, Eugene Larry, Jr., Lake City.
Frost, Richard Hammond, Holmes Beach.
Gaskin, David William, Deerfield Beach.
Gast, William Raymond, Jacksonville Beach.
General, Carl Lewis, Jacksonville.
Gipson, George Wesley, Miami.
Glazar, Aaron, Zane Howard, Tampa.
Glenn, Michael O. Roy, Indialantic.
Goi, Louis Charles, San Antonio.
Goodson, Thomas Henry, Miami.
Grant, Stephen Mitchell, Miami.
Greer, Matthew Ernest, East Palatka.
Gregory, Herbert Lee, III, Tampa.
Grundy, Anthony Warren, Clearview.
Hadsock, William Alfred, Tarpon Springs.
Hair, Robert Lee, Monticello.
Hardwick, Tommy, Miami.
Harless, Carl Clarence, Jacksonville.
Harrell, Stanley Moore, Miami.
Harrington, Patrick James, Hollywood.
Hetrick, Carl Post, Gainesville.
Hicks, Benny Joe, Pensacola.
Hitchcock, Ralph John, Jacksonville,
Holmes Cleveland, St. Petersburg.
Houdashelt, Francis Gerald, Pensacola.

FLORIDA—continued

Marine Corps

Hubbard, Thomas Lee, Fort White.
Hubbard, Tony Gene, Orlando.
Huber, Stephen Lee, Carol City.
Irwin, Robert Joseph, Hollywood.
Johnson, James Alvin, Miami.
Jones, Joseph Richard, Sanford.
Jones, William Stanley, Orlando.
Knight, Hubert Charles, Cantonment.
Kurlin, Wayne Carlton, Orange Park.
Kyle, Donald Charles, Miami.
Lentz, Douglas Alan, Orange Park.
Lewis, James Robbins, Jr., Pinellas.
Lewis, Steven, Orlando.
Mangrum, Richard Gale, Lynn Haven.
Masters Edward Ulyses, Winter Haven.
Mathias, Robert, Fort Lauderdale.
McCall, Billie Ray, Winter Haven.
McKee, Walter Roy, Panama City.
McKinney, Wesly Junior, Tampa.
McNac, Donald Charles, Cantonment.
Medlin, Jackie Monroe, Sanford.
Melton, Jackie Lee, Winter Haven.
Memory, Al Dewitt, Eatonville.
Misiuta, Edward Michael, Hialeah.
Moore, Hercules Lee, Brookville.
Muckleroy, James Richard, Miami.
Naimo, Joseph Peter, Jr., Fort Lauderdale.
Neilsen, Magnus Carl, West Palm Beach.
Noble, Lewis Raulerson, Jacksonville.
Noles, Gary Edwin, East Wahneta.
Norman, Michael Warren, Orlando.
O'Connor, Michael Barry, Winter Haven.
Oliver, Romnie, Orlando.
Owens, Harold Eugene, Mayport.
Patrick, Albert Earl, Graceville.
Peeks, Lee Roy Eldred, Daytona Beach.
Proctor, Johnny Lee, Melrose.
Rainey, Thomas Ballard, Pensacola.
Ralya, Warren Henry, Jr., Shalimar.
Reilly, Raymond Patrick, Lake Worth.
Roberts, David John, Miami.
Roberts, Frank James, Elkton.
Rushing, James Monroe, Pensacola.
Schryver, Peter Edward, Fort Lauderdale.
Scott, Jeremiah, Miami.
Scott, Preston Roosevelt, Century.
Sellers, Floyd Eugene, Caryville.
Sexton, Phillip Edward, Orlando.
Shafer, Gary Christopher, Jacksonville.
Sheffield, Roy Henry, Frostproof.
Shelley, Stephen Andrew, St. Augustine.
Shorter, Robert Lee, Gainesville.
Smiley, Frankie Lee, Miami.
Smith, Jack Stephen, Perry.
Smith, James Pratt, Tampa.
Smith, John Archer, Tampa.
Spicer, Jonathan Nathaniel, Miami.
Stedman, Paul Francis, Lakeland.
Stewart, Donny Ray, Homestead.
Stewart, Ralph Carson, Jacksonville.
Stoddard, Jan Martine, Jacksonville.
Strickland, Billie Granvil, Sarasota.
Taylor, David Stuart, Jr., Hilliard.
Taylor, James, Miami.
Valrie, Dwight Theodore, Ocala.
Vickery, Frederick M., III, Gainesville.
Wallace, Jackie Elmore, Apopka.
Wallace, Lemon, Jr., Tampa.
Warner, Douglas Leroy, Orlando.
Watts, Frank Taylor, Pensacola.
Whisenant, Perry Shelton, Cocoa.
Whitman, Jerry Ronald, Boca Raton.
Wildy, Shirley, Jr., Panama City.
Wilhoit, Robert Steve, Jacksonville.
Williams, Samuel, Tampa.
Winslow, William David, Orlando.
Woodall, Jerry Russ, Mount Dora.
Wyatt, Phillip Edgar, St. Petersburg.
Wyrick, David Keith, North Port Charlot.
Yarber, Vernon Lee, Jacksonville.
Youmans, Dan Randel, Jacksonville.

Navy

Alday, Danny Wade, Tallahassee.
Atwood, Charles Aaron, Jr., Miami.
Chavous, Samuel Calhoun, Jr., Cross City.
Darville, Edward R., III, Hialeah.
Hollingsworth, Michael Den, Lake Park.
Johnson, Wallace B., III, Pensacola.
Lockwood, Kenneth Charles, Hollywood.

FLORIDA—continued

Navy

Mole, Malcolm Geoffrey, Deland.
Peterson, Thomas Wayne, Lake Wells.
Scarborough, Russell Willi, Dunnellon.
Tarrance, James Curtis, Jacksonville.
Webb, Daniel David, Sarasota.

GEORGIA

Army

Allen, Terry, Jr., Newman.
Armstrong, Atwell Asbell, Brunswick.
Bailey, Gene Thomas, Villa Rica.
Bailey, James Alvin, Rydal.
Barnaby, Roland Nathaniel, Fort Benning.
Beam, Raymond, Chatsworth.
Beauford, Samuel P., Atlanta.
Bedgood, Jimmy, Milledgeville.
Bennett, Charles Duane, Calhoun.
Bennett, George Rogers, Fitzgerald.
Bernard, William Edwin, Columbus.
Berry, Charlie E., Atlanta.
Berry, Joe Cleveland, Sylvania.
Betleyoun, Gola Calvin, Macon.
Biddulph, Thomas Arthur, Atlanta.
Black, Harvey, Hawkinsville.
Blair, Kenneth Ray, Mableton.
Blount, James Curtis, Columbus.
Bogart, Charles Robert, McDonough.
Bowen, Roland Michael, Iron City.
Bowman, Daniel Raymond, Elberton.
Bozeman, Dwight Ervyn, Cochran.
Brantley, David Watson, Brunswick.
Bricker, William Edward, Decatur.
Britt, Kenneth John, Norcross.
Brock, Randy Hoffman, Austell.
Brooks, Leon Ray, McDonough.
Brown, Donald William, Fort Benning.
Brown, Joe David, Augusta.
Bryant, Freddie James, Vienna.
Bryson, Johnny Ray, College Park.
Burgamy, Ernie Lee, Wrightsville.
Burroughs, Emanuel Fero, McBean.
Byrd, Walter Frank, Jr., Vidalia.
Camacho, Gregoria Meno, Toccoa.
Campbell, George Allen, Columbus.
Campbell, Gordon Allan, Atlanta.
Campfield, Melvin, Savannah.
Carpenter, William Johnny, Butler.
Casey, Johnny Dale, Moultrie.
Chapman, Billy, Jeffersonville.
Clark, Billy Earl, Columbus.
Cline, Charles William, Dalton.
Clovis, Franklin, Cedartown.
Cloggins, James Terry, Griffin.
Cole, Timothy, Jr., Newnan.
Collier, Alonzo Carlton, Riverdale.
Condon, Frank Alloysius. Augusta.
Condrey, George Thomas, III, Atlanta.
Cook, John William, Jr., Atlanta.
Cook, Patrick Henry, Jr., Marietta.
Cooper, James Ennis, Dublin.
Cooper, John Randolph, Jr., Lawrenceville.
Corn, Jack Alvin, Ranger.
Corry, Charles Michael, Washington.
Couch, Robert Edward, Senoia.
Cousin, Robert Lee, Hogansville.
Crow, Edward David, Columbus.
Cruse, Gary Robert, Dalton.
Davis, Herbert Carson, Blairsville.
Davis, Jerry Lloyd, Resaca.
Delaigle, Theus Everette, Waynesboro.
Dickerson, Thomas Gerald, Thomaston.
Dismuke, Albert Royce, Swainsboro.
Dixon, Donald Wayne, Rome.
Dykes, Robert Lee, Jr., Tifton.
Earles, Arthur James, Columbus.
Eaves, Frank George, Atlanta.
Elliott, Anthony Edwin, Gainsville.
Eukel, David Dean, Columbus.
Evans, Freemon, Gordon.
Evans, Michael Eugene, Greensboro.
Faircloth, Ellis Lovine, Brainbridge.
Fields, Willie Stephen, Macon.
Folmar, Harris Alan, Pelham.
Fox, Richard Herbert, Atlanta.
Franklin, John Alvin, Rossville.
Fuller, George Ronald, Thomaston.
Fuller, Johnny Thomas, Dallas.
Gaddis, Jonathan Royal, Quitman.
Gaddy, Willie Gene, Griffin.
Gaines, Gregory Randall, Atlanta.

GEORGIA—continued

Army

Galloway, Sam Harris, Vidalia.
Gantt, Johnny Edward, Rome.
Garrett, Ernest William, Hiawassee,
Gates, James Walter, Atlanta.
Glover, Donald Lawrence, Pelham.
Glover, Willie Edward, Marietta.
Gober, Billy Willie, Monroe.
Goswick, Larry Eugene, Adairsville.
Goudelock, Forrest, Gainsville.
Green, Eugene, Swainsboro.
Green, Ronald Frank, Chamblee.
Green, Stanley Norris, Macon.
Griffin, Garland Alex, Jr., Coolidge.
Griffis, William Arland, Waycross.
Grooms, Richard James, Atlanta.
Gross, Billy Monroe, Columbus.
Hale, Hollis Ray, Dallas.
Hall, Charles Wayne, Griffin.
Hall, Jackie Wayne, Norman Park.
Halstead, Stephen Lloyd, Bainbridge.
Hamilton, James Edward, Adairsville.
Hammond, Herbert Lee, Atlanta.
Hancock, William Tyler, Brunswick.
Harding, Steve Aldman, Augusta.
Hardison, Allen Carson, Macon.
Harmon, Lewis Andrew, Atlanta.
Harper, John David, Jr., Coolidge.
Harrell, William Franklin, Adel.
Henry, Willie Lee, Lakeland.
Herren, Ronald Wayne, Marietta.
Hill, Larry Edwin, West Point.
Hines, Arthur, Grantville.
Hodges, Joseph, Midville.
Holcomb, Daniel, Columbus.
Holland, Eddie Herman, Lafayette.
Holt, Richard Ancil, Atlanta.
Honaker, Raymond Kermit, Jr., Brunswick.
Hounshell, Jeffrey David, Decatur.
Howell, Ben Willis, Tennile.
Hudson, Samuel Bernard, Glennville,
Hulsey, Larry Bryson, Gainesville.
Hulsey, Roger, Powder Springs.
Humphrey, Johnny William, Vidalia.
Humphries, Bennie Frank, Dawson.
Hunter, Washington, Atlanta.
Jackson, Allen Verone, Moultrie.
Jackson, Willie, Albany.
James, Bobby, Bowersville.
James, Dan Ninkey, Riceboro.
James, Samuel Reese, II, Carrollton.
Jarrard, Jerry Edwin, Buford.
Jarvis, William Thomas, Savannah.
Jefferson, Nelson, Jr., Columbus.
Joiner, William Franklin, Fairburn.
Jones, Gary C., East Point.
Jones, Joseph Barry, Lyons.
Jones, Joseph Melvin, Eastman.
Kelley, Nathaniel, Stockbridge.
Kenerly, Warren Eugene, Griffin.
Kerr, James Clayton, Palmetto.
Kimble, Eddie Claude, McDonough.
Kinasz, Monte Clifford, Griffin.
King, Johnny, Columbus.
Knight, Billy, Climax.
Lang, Mainor David, Jr., Savannah.
Langford, Robert Candler, Atlanta.
Lassiter, David Steven, Atlanta.
League, Roy Barry, Tallapoosa.
Leavell, Melvin Randolph, Atlanta.
Lee, Anthony Irvin, Rossville.
Lindsey, Edward Byron, Dublin.
Linse, Kenneth David, Atlanta.
Long, Herlihy Townsend, Macon.
Mallard, Morris A., Jr., Chamblee.
Martin, Bennie Louis, La Grange.
Massey, Michael Jay, Columbus.
Mattox, Wilbur Florence, Gainesville.
Mayo, Marvin Lacy, College Park.
McBurrows, Wendell D., Abbeville.
McCan Claude, Jr., Alpharetta.
McCollum, Robert Henry, Marietta.
McKenzie, Willie James, Byronville.
McKibben, Ray, Cedartown.
McKinnie, Herman, Augusta.
Melton, Dennis Carol, Rossville.
Miller, Charles Russell, Augusta.
Mitchell, Larry Leon, Valdosta.
Monfort, Bennie Frank, Albany.
Moore, Kenneth Dee, Vidalia.
Morgan, Jackie Marcell, Homerville.

GEORGIA—continued

Army

Morris, Robert Davis, Savannah.
Morris, Thomas Hall, Stockbridge.
Mosley, Robert Lee, Atlanta.
Nesbitt, Johnny B., Danville.
Norrid, Hollis Ronney, La Grange.
Overstreet, Roger Wayne, Columbus.
Palmer, Leon Alton, Mableton.
Palmer, Millard Lamar, Clarksville.
Pannell, Walter Thaxton, Atlanta.
Parker, Richard Anthony, Buford.
Pelham, Earl Anthony, Jr., Augusta.
Pickett, Morris Calvin, Boston.
Pittman, William T., Bogart.
Poe, Jerry Lynn, Dalton.
Powell, Raymond Alan, Forest Park.
Powell, William, Columbus.
Pratt, Fred Omar, Columbus.
Queen, Donald Wayne, Epworth.
Rampley, Charles Howard, Chamblee.
Randall, James Gary, Atlanta.
Register, Roy Carroll, Valdosta.
Reich, Merrill Dale, Jr., Atlanta.
Reid, David Donald, Austell.
Reid, Johnnie Gene, Augusta.
Richardson, Danny Joe, Covington.
Richardson, Willie Lee, Valdosta.
Richey, Thomas Earl, Atlanta.
Rickerson, Albert Leonard, Swainsboro.
Robinson, Herman David, La Grange.
Roper, Claude Tillman, Gainesville.
Rowland, Thomas W., Macon.
Rudolph, Richard Joseph, Atlanta.
Sapp, William Edward, Ludowici.
Savacool, Paul Ross, Jr., Augusta.
Scales, Douglas, Lithonia.
Schoepflin, Charles Duaine, Atlanta.
Shaffer, Earl Thomas, Sr., Covington.
Shannon, Leroy, Jr., Dawson.
Simpson, Johnny Cleveland, Elberton.
Simpson, Otis Raymond, Fayetteville.
Sirmans, Albert Wilson, Jr., Waycross.
Smith Charles Lee, Atlanta.
Smith, Donald Lamar, Bartow.
Smith, Edgar Larue, Wadley.
Smith, Emory Morel, Sylvania.
Smith, Jerry Lynn, Newnan.
Smith, Kenneth Douglas, College Park.
Spurlin, Daniel Raymond, Atlanta.
Suit, Grover Lynn, Rockmart.
Sutherland, Bobby Collins, Meddleton.
Swancey, Randall Fillmore, Clarkston.
Sykes, Don Carlos, Savannah.
Taylor, James Alton, Atlanta.
Taylor, Robert L., Columbus.
Terry, Eddie Thomas, Manchester.
Thacker, Grady, Norcross.
Thompson, Onnie, Jr., Twin City.
Tigner, John Henry, Columbus.
Tillmon, Willie Sandford, Ambrose.
Turner, Philip Gerald, Jackson.
Valle, Francisco Louis, Columbus.
Vaughan, Egbert R., Alpharetta.
Vaughan, Harry Kenneth, Alpharetta.
Vaughan, Claude Franklin, McRae.
Wade, Nathaniel, Augusta.
Walker, Clifton, Butler.
Walthall, Charles Edward, Palmetto.
Weaver, Joseph Robert, Jr., Sylvester.
Weaver, Philip Warren, College Park.
Wells, Connie Vergel, Tarrytown.
Wenrick, Philip Bruce, Columbus.
Wesson, Lanny Lamar, Cedar Town.
West, James Larry, Smyrna.
Wester, Wilburn Edward, Cedartown.
White, Albert, Dewell, Atlanta.
White, Harold Lee, Columbus.
White, Robert Randolph, Jr., Thomson.
Wilcox, John Arthur, Jr., Moultrie.
Williams, Arthur, Jr., Savannah.
Williams, Cal Willis, Augusta.
Williams, Howard, Columbus.
Williams, Kenneth Jerry, Dalton.
Williams, Roosevelt, Jakin.
Wolf, Dewitt Joseph, Columbus.
Woods, Ray Houston, Cedartown.
Yarbrough, Lester Garnell, Kingsland.
Young, George Lamar, Gainesville.
Youngblood, Boyd James, Dillard.

GEORGIA—continued

Air Force

Berry, William Arthur, Savannah.
Hertlein, George B., III, Decatur.
Todd, Larry Richard, Chamblee.

Marine Corps

Addington, Zack Taylor, Clermont.
Anderson, Ronald Carlis, Columbus.
Arnold, Moses Anthony, Union City.
Bennett, James Stephen, Augusta.
Biggers, Lewis Lamar, Metter.
Bird, George Allison, III, Savannah.
Bridges, R. B., Jr., Americus.
Britt, Billy Winford, Atlanta.
Britt, Ted Dennis, Decatur.
Brunt, Arthur Lee, Valdosta.
Buffington, Fred, Smyrna.
Burnett, Richard James, Atlanta.
Busby, William Russell, Sylvester.
Chisholm, James, Savannah.
Christie, James Miller, Augusta.
Coleman, Lenard, Portal.
Craig, Thomas Richard, Jr., Atlanta.
Curry, Jimmy Lee, Macon.
Deese, Jack Dempsey, Columbus.
Dodson, David Paul, Atlanta.
Ellis, John Patrick, Cochran.
Evans, Albert, Macon.
Evans, Paul Raymond, Iron City.
Floyd, Alan Gregory, Atlanta.
Fordham, Kenneth Charles, Macon.
Foster, Willie James, West Point.
Freeman, Willie Lee, Milledgeville.
Gaines, Thomas Gale, Ludowici.
Gibson, John, Riceboro.
Goen, Richard Dean, Augusta.
Grant, Philo Derrick, III, Lizella.
Grovner, Allen Jerome, St. Simons Island.
Haigler, Cecil Morris, Albany.
Hambrick, James, Jr., Atlanta.
Harrison, Ricky Gene, Thomaston.
Henderson, Billy Hugh, Moultrie.
Hesterlee, Ray Wesley, Forest Park.
Holmes, Nathan, Columbus.
Hood, Carlton Harvey, Barnesville.
Hudson, Roy, Perry.
Inman, James Wesley, Valdosta.
Jackson, Calvin Otis, Columbus.
James, Mark Everett, Bremen.
Jenkins, Robert Wiley, Gray.
Johnson, David Lee, Columbus.
Johnson, George Milton, Clarkston.
Johnson, Horace, Jr., Macon.
Jones, George Edward, Jr., Atlanta.
Jones, Ronnie Joe, Macon.
Jordan, Joseph Lamar, Thomaston.
Junkins, Johnny Juergen, Marietta.
Justice, Richard Lee, Rome.
King, De Wayne, Douglas.
King, Larry Eugene, Macon.
Lamberton, George Magee, II, Doraville.
Lanier, James Arthur, Guyton.
Laslie, Joseph Taylor, Jr., Attapulgus.
Leary, Solomon, Macon.
Little, Donnie Hugh, Atlanta.
Long, Douglas Leonard, Jr., Savannah.
Martin, Charles Thomas, Oakwood.
Maybury, Thomas Vincent, Chamblee.
McElrath, Winston, Jr., Atlanta.
McLendon, Ralph Werner, Columbus.
Meadows, Artis Wilbur, Jr., Atlanta.
Morris, Robert Wesley, Macon.
Mulkey, Terry Lee, Smyrna.
Mullis, Marvin Burnett, Jr., Valdosta.
Murphy, David, Griffin.
Murray, Michael Van, Macon.
Nash, Thomas Steven, Atlanta.
Nelson, Rayford, Albany.
O'Keefe, Timothy John, Kennesaw.
Odom, Steven Craig, Atlanta.
Owens, Thomas Rudolph, Tifton.
Painter, Gary William, Smyrna.
Parker, Donald Fredrick, Dalton.
Perry, Earnest, Columbus.
Poole, Melvin, Glenwood.
Porter, Oscar Kilpatric, Jr., Albany.
Powell, Charles Thomas, Columbus.
Presley, James Henry, Ashburn.
Purser, David Arthur, Columbus.
Range, Thomas Ronnie, Jr., Conyers.

GEORGIA—continued

Marine Corps

Reese, James Robert, Griffin.
Reid, Benjamin Herschell, Atlanta.
Richardson, Eugene, III, Marietta.
Robinson, John Calvin, II, Savannah.
Rumsey, Melvin Darryl, Marietta.
Scott, Willie Charles, Thomasville.
Sepulveda, Lawrence Kennet, Valdosta.
Seward, William Henry, Atlanta.
Sharp, Lufkin Scott, Gainesville.
Sherfield, Bruce, Jr., Cedartown.
Simmons, Frank Rudolph, Decatur.
Sitten, Johnny Wayne, Rome.
Smith, Charles Daniel, Smyrna.
Smith, Charles Eugene, Hapeville.
Smith, Michael Anthony, Tignall.
Smith, Robert Joseph, Columbus.
Smith, Russell Lamar, Brunswick.
Spotanski, Serge Walter, Pineridge.
Terrell, William Lee, Chickamauga.
Thaxton, Johnny R., Jr., Atlanta.
Thomas, Nathan, Appling.
Thurmond, Edward Scott, Augusta.
Turner, Michael Barry, Decatur.
Turner, Milan Elliot, Atlanta.
Vessell, Wayne Jackson, Senoia.
Vickers, Robert Lee, Atlanta.
Wallin, Dennis Ray, Lafayette.
Walton, Harold Lee, Hapeville.
Watkins, Earl Weldon, Jr., Decatur.
Wells, James Randall, Garden City.
Wesley, Ernest Lamar, Stockbridge.
White, Thomas Mitchell, La Grange.
Williams, Freddy Roosevelt, Plains.
Williams, Ray, Atlanta.
Wood, Robert Helm, Fort Benning.
Wyatt, Charles Rembert, East Point.
Youmans, James Nelson, Savannah.

Navy

Anderson, Franklin Emmett, Waverly Hall.
Chandler, Anthony Gordon, Warner Robins.
Hallman, Paul Truville, Atlanta.
Risher, Clarence T., III., Savannah.
Stringer, Anthony Odell, Rockmart.

HAWAII

Army

Ahuna, Abraham Kaalele, Honolulu.
Alameda, William Kapena, Waimanalo.
Andrade, Kenneth Soares, Honolulu.
Balai, Andres, Waipahu.
Benjamin, Robert William, Honolulu.
Cantohos, Rodney Salvador, Waiphau.
Carlos, Stephen G., Honolulu.
Cash, Morris Elton, Honolulu.
Chun, Reginald Wung Yett, Honolulu.
Factora, Douglas George, Honolulu.
Hatada, Fred Kawailani Mas, Hilo.
Jarrett, Frederick, Kaneohe.
Jeremia, Aleki Homes, Pearl City.
Johnson, Gideon Picha, Honolulu.
Kaakimaka, Algernon P., Jr., Honolulu.
Kahana, Samuel Kauluhaimai, Honolulu.
Kalua, Solomon, Jr., Honolulu.
Keahi, Gene Luther, Ewa Beach.
Kovaloff, Joseph Thomas, Honolulu.
Levinthol, John, Jr., Honolulu.
Lindberg, Robert Raymond, Honolulu.
Marshall, Donald Fisher, II, Honolulu.
Mohl, Wolfgang Tony Otto, Papaikou.
Okumura, Earl Akio, Honolulu.
Pascal, Ivan Kimokeo, Honolulu.
Ribucan, Van V., Hamakuapokok.
Rodriguez, Arturo Serna, Honolulu.
Rodriguez, Frank Louis, Honolulu.
Sakai, Ernest Seichi, Hawi.
Salazar, John, Honolulu.
Sarocam, Joseph, Waipahu.
Soriano, James Gabriel, Haliimaile.
Takemoto, Kenneth James, Wahiawa.
Tomlinson, Jones Eugene, Waianae.
Valdez, Fernando Marcelo, Pepeekeo.
Victor, George M., Honolulu.
Villon, Casimiro, Paia.
Wark, Daniel Edward, Honolulu.

Marine Corps

Faleafine, Sisifo, Honolulu.
Johnson, Michael Elliott, Hickam AFB.

HAWAII—continued

Marine Corps

Kapalu, George Kuamoo, Wailuku.
Kekahuna, William Antone, Honolulu.
Kiaha, Rodney Siu, Pearl City,
Littler, James L. M., III., Honolulu.
Llanes, Harold Leroy, Nanakuli.
Shimabukuro, Kenyu, Hilo.
Tauanuu, Pelesasa Solomona, Honolulu.
Wire, Eugene Charles, Waipahu.
Woodward, Stanley Kamaki, Hanalei.

Navy

English, Philip Dominic K., Honolulu.
Newman, Clifford Auhuna, Wahiawa.
Soderstrom, Michael Dennis, Honolulu.
Taylor, William Robert, Honolulu.
Wolter, Steven Ross, Hilo.

IDAHO

Army

Anderson, James Barton, American Falls.
Bellamy, Anthony Rodney, Boise.
Benton, Johnny William, Jerome.
Boggess, Edward James, Lewiston.
Damiano, Leroy Edward, Harrison.
Evans, Gary Gene, Heyburn.
Frazier, Gary Virgil, Pocatello.
Haile, Donald Jack, Caldwell.
Lamb, Colin Edward, Caldwell.
Lish, Gilbert Ray, Boise.
McArthur, Steven Michael, Coeur D'Alene.
Millspaugh, Cecil Ray, Declo.
Rios, Arturo Recio, Idaho Falls.
Rotter, Ralph Lee, Lewiston.
Smith, Gary Clarence, Pingree.
Smith, James Andersen, Blackfoot.
Snyder, Michael Allan, Lewiston.
Tews, Henry James William, Shoshone.
Thomas, Terrence Pierce, Hammett.
Wheeler, Michael T., Emmett.

Marine Corps

Boicourt, Jess Burton, Jr., Nampa.
Gorton, Ralph Shoup, III, Boise.
Hoskins, Sheldon Dale, Blackfoot.
Jones, Howard Lemuel Jr., Post Falls.
Lohman, Herman Augusta Jr., Twin Falls.
Mitchell, Lonnie Ray, King Hill.
O'Brien, Mark James, Tetonia.
Oliver, Troy Robert, Jr., Boise.
Poletti, Michael Lee, Pocatello.
Schaffner, Marshall Gust, Cataldo.
Skidmore, Verle Jennings, Terreton.
Tedron, Daniel Cline, Mullan.
Waldron, Howard Bert, Coeur D'Alene.
Wasserman, Michael Leon, Boise.

Navy

Beasley, Philip Arthur, Boise.
Curtis, James Marvin, Hagerman.
Funke, Thomas George, Coeur D'Alene.
McNamar, Jim Carl, Mountain Home.
Rodriguez, Samuel Henri, Wendell.

ILLINIOS

Army

Ajster, Joseph Robert, Peru.
Alexander, Roy M., Mt. Carmel.
Allen, Bobby Kenneth, Jonesboro.
Alles, James Kenneth, Chicago.
Alongi, Michael Peter, Jr., Elmwood Park.
Ambrosini, John Steven, Lockport.
Anderson, Francis Alan, Sandwich.
Anderson, Justin Kenneth, Chicago.
Anderson, Randall Bruce, Oak Park.
Anderson, Richard Gunnar, Wauconda.
Archibald, Dennis, Chicago.
Arnold, Donald Edward, East St. Louis.
Arnold, Kenneth W., Chicago.
Artman, James Boyd, Metropolis.
Babiarz, Edward Martin, Round Lake.
Bailey, Floyd Clark, Chicago.
Baker, Eugene, Jr., Chicago.
Baker, Reginald, Chicago.
Baldwin, William Clarence, Chicago.
Ballew, Roland Lee, Chicago, Wilmington.
Bandy, Larry Gene, Kincaid.
Barber, Ernest Lee, Peoria.
Bartels, Norman William, Berwyn.
Bates, Larry Lee, Litchfield.
Batt, Roger Lee, Rochelle,
Battaglia, August Thomas, Chicago.

XUM

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Battles, Troy Cleveland, Peoria.
Beatty, Leonard, Jr., Chicago.
Beck, Richard James Jr., Chicago.
Belchak, Paul Jr., Chicago.
Bell, Donnell, Venice.
Bezency, John William, Riverside.
Biegel, Robert Charles, Chicago.
Bloomer, Terry Lee, Pekin.
Bodine, Robert Lee, Chicago.
Boetje, William Wayne, Rock Island.
Bugguess, Maurice, Chicago.
Bornman, Donald Wayne, Edwardsville.
Boyle, James Patrick, Chicago.
Brandon, James Byrd, Chicago.
Brent, Gerald Robert, Chicago.
Brimm, John M., Jonesboro.
Brockmeyer, Delbert Ray, Ava.
Broeffle, Ivan Clifford, Downers Grove.
Brown, Billy James, Chicago.
Brown, Bruce Gilbert, Chicago.
Brown, Joseph Raymond, Chicago.
Brunner, Hans Wolfgang, Oswego.
Bryan, Dan E., Kewanee.
Buehler, Leon Christ, Red Bud.
Bugajsky, Kerry Michael, Christopher.
Bullis, Stanley Allen, Savanna.
Burgett, Joseph Scott, Cahokia.
Burkes, David Ronald, Jr., Elmhurst.
Burkhart, Michael James, Chicago.
Burzawa, John Andrew, Joliet.
Butkus, Alan Paul, Chicago.
Butler, Robert Lee, Peoria.
Campbell, James Henry, Jr., Chicago.
Cannada, Brian Jeffrey, Des Plaines.
Caravetta, Larry Anthony, Cicero.
Carpenter, Ralph R., Jr., Palatine.
Carroll, William Eugene, Lockport.
Cederlund, Ronald Michael, Chicago.
Celletti, Jerry, Sterling.
Cerione, James Stanley, III, Dallas City.
Cervantez, Edward Eddy, Chicago.
Chambers, James Dougles, Markham.
Ciupinski, James Michael, Chicago.
Clair, James Thomas, Chicago.
Clay, Karol, Chicago.
Claypool, Rhondal Gene, Martinsville.
Cofran, William Earl, Homewood.
Coldren, Eldon, Dean, Jr., Rockford.
Coney, Lawrence Nelson, Chicago.
Connolly, Thomas Charles, Chicago.
Cook, Bernard James, Bloomington.
Cook, Billy Lee, Beardstown.
Cooney, Thomas Joseph, Decatur.
Covey, Gene Tracy, Cottage Hills.
Cowell, James Edward, Chester.
Cravens, Robert Milton, Jr., Olney.
Crawford, Bobby Dean, Buncombe.
Crichton, Charles Frederic, Shannon.
Cronin, David Michael, Carbondale.
Crum, Edward Waldren, Champaign.
Cruthird, George W., Chicago.
Culleton, Carson Gregory, Lincoln.
Cummings, James Thomas, Jr., Elmhurst.
Curtin, James Christopher, Chicago.
Curtin, John Henry, Elmhurst.
Czerwonka, August Emil, Mattoon.
Dahl, Albert Eugene, Aurora.
Dale, Donald Milton, Champaign.
Daugherty, Richard Lawrence, Waterloo.
Davino, Thomas Alphonse, Chicago.
Davis, Eugene Fester, Chicago.
Davis Joe Mason, Chicago.
Davis, Robert Joseph, Abingdon.
Davis, Terry Lee, Granite City.
Dawson, Andrew Lee, Chicago.
Dayton, James Leslie, Granite City.
De Coste, David Anthony, Minooka.
De Leon, Rodolfo, Chicago.
Delaney, Herald Lee, Streator.
Dematteis, David Kell, Collinsville.
Dency, Karl Peter, Chicago.
Dixon, Alonzo Lenord, Pekin.
Donnelly, David, De Kalb.
Donovan, Michael John, Berwyn.
Downey, Patrick H., Chicago.
Dudek, Joseph Walter, Chicago.
Duncan, William Jay, Fox Lake.
Ealy, William Daniel, Assumption.
Elben, Michael William, Decatur.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Elliott, Frank William, Streamwood.
Elliott, Gerald Lee, Granite City.
Engs, Russell Larned, III, Taylorville.
Erickson, Russell Martin, Franklin Park.
Essig, Phillip John, Bensonville.
Evans, Joe, Chicago.
Fessender, Roger Allen, Hanover Park.
Fischer, George Arthur, Chicago.
Fitch, Gary Ray, Bushnell.
Fleming, Jerry, Chicago.
Ford, Michael Eugéne, Quincy.
Fox, Bernard Lyle, Decatur.
Frazer, Kenneth Charles, Chester.
Frisby, Charles Lee, East St. Louis.
Fuller, James Larry, Granite City.
Funston, Joseph Ernest, Galena.
Garapolo, Frank William, Chicago.
Gassen, Steven Carl, Evanston.
Gavin, Ezra, Chicago.
Gee, Raymond Leon, Jr., Mount Pulaski.
Gemmati, Oronzo, Chicago.
Gerlach, Steven Henry, Marengo.
Girsch, Robert Edward, Skokie.
Githens, Richard Earl, Centralia.
Gordon, Darwin Dale, Rock Island.
Gosnell, Odis Leon, Harvey.
Grange, Arthur Charles, Roxana.
Grant, Robert William, Park Forest.
Green, Richard Al, Chicago.
Grindol, Philip Wayne, Decatur.
Groene, David, Dana.
Gross, Larry Michael, Chicago.
Grove, Walter Brenneman, Jr., Cary.
Gubbins, Eugene, Albion.
Gulbrantson, David Arlan, Rockford.
Gurvitz, Jeffery, Chicago.
Guy, Allen Edward, Rock Island.
Guyett, George Ervin, Springfield.
Hann, Douglas John, Jr., Morrison.
Haberman, Nolan Donald, Willisville.
Hacek, James David, Crystal Lake.
Hadley, James Stanton, Jr., Chicago.
Hahn, Dennis Francis, Olney.
Haines, Michael Scott, Yorkville.
Hamilton, Timothy McKee, Streator.
Hampton, David Lee, Wood River.
Hanik, Raymond Conrad, Chicago.
Hansen, Lyle Wayne, Steger.
Haring, Karl Richard, Aurora.
Harris, Harvey, Jr., Chicago.
Harris, Jessie Earl, Peoria.
Harrison, Jimmie Hay, De Kalb.
Harrison, Thomas Edward, Granite City.
Hawk, Jesse Virginius, III, Roodhouse.
Hazlip, Charles Edward, Polo.
Heiman, Sherlin Andrew, Edwardsville.
Henderson, Jonathan, Chicago.
Henderson, Monte Eugene, Toulon.
Hendrix, John Russell, Huntsville.
Henson, Charles Kenneth, Champaign.
Hockett, James Raymond, Blue Island.
Hodge, Charles Edward, Chicago.
Hodge, Thomas Wayne, Springfield.
Holbrook, Charles Allen, Chicago.
Holden, Robert Franklin, Columbia.
Holeman, Morris Eliot, Chicago.
Hollie, Robert Lee, Jr., Chicago.
Hollingsworth, Nicholas Le, Onarga.
Hon, Johnny Joe, Chicago.
Hoop, Robert Gene, Mattoon.
Houle, Kirk Edward, Peoria.
Howerter, Bruce G., Canton.
Hudson, Richard Grey, Springfield.
Huff, Bruce Norman, Chicago.
Hughes, Robert Wayne, Alton.
Hurley, Noel, Godfrey.
Inboden, James Ray, Robinson.
Irby, Charles, William, Hillsboro.
Jacobs, Thomas Carlyle, Bloomington.
James, Willie Lee, Chicago.
Jansen, Larry Wayne, Galesburg.
Janssen, Robert Dean, Minonk.
Jefferson, Jimmie Lee, Chicago.
Johnson, Aaron Gilbert, Deer Grove.
Johnson, Daniel Gene, Rockford.
Johnson, Henry L., Rockford.
Johnson, John Andres, Chicago.
Johnson, John Peter, Berwyn.
Johnson, Lawrence, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Johnson, Marshall D., Cairo.
Jones, Dennis Keith, Quincy.
Jones, Larry Wayne, Bridgeport.
Jones, Lowen Leon, East St. Louis.
Jones, Omar David, Bloomington.
Jones, William Thomas, Decatur.
Jonsson, Ronald Bryniel, Chicago.
Jordan, Robert Leroy, Jr., Paris.
Jowers, Ben, Jr., Peoria.
Kale, Michael Robert, Milan.
Keats, Robert George, Evanston.
Keene, Robert Michael, Steger.
Keep, Donald Wayne, Freeport.
Kellett, John Edward, Galva.
Kelnhofer, Joseph Allen, Hoopeston.
Kenney, Terry Joe, Crystal Lake.
Kiesling, Gerald Dennis, Rockford.
Kitchen, Eddie, Jr., Chicago.
Klausing, Thomas Patrick, Des Plaines.
Korando, Oliver Kasper, Murphysboro.
Kosar, Richard Dennis, Park Ridge.
Kowski, Edward John, Jr., Chicago.
LaBundy, John Arthur, Park Forest.
LaFleur, Gerald John, Aurora.
Lake, James Lee, Aurora.
Lang, David Robert, Chicago.
Lang, Walter Robin, Niles.
Lankford, John Wayne, Belleville.
Latoria, David Joseph, Chicago.
Lazzarotto, Albert Louis, River Grove.
LeFevre, Brian Francis, Chicago.
Ledbetter, Roger Dale, Brownstown.
Lee, Steve Donald, Rockford.
Letto, Roger William, Mundelein.
Lewis, Leslie Ross, Chicago.
Lindner, John Michael, Caseyville.
Lopp, James Leonard, Scales Mound.
Luebke, John Charles, Jr., Naperville.
Mack, Larry Wesley, Freeport.
Madson, Robert Warren, Alton.
Maksymiw, Walter B., Chicago.
Manuel, Larry George, Effingham.
Martinez, Rogelio Manuel, Chicago.
Mate, Donald Richard, Chicago.
Matheny, Bobby Daniel, Oak Lawn.
Mathews, James Leonard, Worth.
Mattson, Bernard Charles, East Peoria.
Mattson, Paul Edward, Lake Bluff.
Mayberry, Larry Eugene, East St. Louis.
Maymon, David Mark, Fairfield.
McGeath, Richard Allen, Murphysboro.
McGee, Herman, Chicago.
McHenry, Edward Curtis, Oak Lawn.
McIntire, Herman Leroy, Rantoul.
McLellan, Emmett Deneen, Waukegan.
McMasters, James Thomas, Rosiclare.
Merrell, David Richard, Marion.
Mershon, Steven Victor, Harvey.
Miller, Glenn Ray, Summit.
Miller, Paul Lynn, Glendale Heights.
Mitchell, Albert Jean, Evanston.
Mitchel, Stephen Philip, Carpentersville.
Moody, Charles Wilburn, Wood River.
Moomey, Charles Ray, Taylorville.
Moore, Maurice, Chicago.
Morgan, Roger Wayne, West Frankfort.
Mourgelas, Dennis W., Chicago.
Mucha, Louis Stephan, Stickney.
Mummert, Allen Lawrence, Lanark.
Myers, Billy Eugene, Pekin.
Nagy, John Paul, East St. Louis.
Nance, Charles Thomas, Chicago.
Neal, Jonathan, Chicago.
Neill, Joe Melvin, Mounds.
Nemeth, Anthony John, Chicago.
Nicholoson, Glenn Edward, Red Bud.
Noddin, William David, Morton Grove.
Norfleet, Henry, Jr., Chicago.
Norris, Otis Leslie, Jr., Champaign.
O'Connor, John Thomas, Forest Park.
Oehler, George Herman, Staunton.
Oliver, Fred, Jr., Chicago.
Olsen, Donald Wayne, Jr., Downs.
Olson, Charles Andrew, Lanark.
Omeara, Lawrence W., Chicago.
Ordonez, Raymond, Chicago.
Ortiz, John, Chicago.
Ortiz, Manuel Galvan, Chicago.
Pahr, William John, Jr., Markham.
Painter, Dennis Earl, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Palenik, James Andres, Jr., Chicago.
Parkhurst, Vincent Bertram, Chicago.
Passavanti, Joseph J., III, Park Forest.
Patrizi, Anthony, Chicago.
Pedicone, Jerome John, Chicago.
Peeler, William Gerald, Arcola.
Peggs, Albert Lee, Chicago.
Pekny, Charles Dennis, Lombard.
Pelzmann, Gerald F., Skokie.
Pennamon, Richard Steve, Chicago.
Pennington, James E., Jr., Atwood.
Penson, Harold Eugene, Chicago.
Peppers, Harold Douglas, Chicago.
Perkins, Charlie, Jr., Chicago.
Perry, Andrew, Jr., East St. Louis.
Peters, Robert Charles, Round Lake.
Petrauskas, Kestutis A., Chicago.
Petty, Willie, Jr., Chicago.
Pheiffer, Michael Laverne, Oneida.
Phillips, Aquilla Anthony, Chicago.
Phillips, Roy Lee, Chicago.
Pigg, Edward Wayne, Mt. Vernon.
Pinkston, Robert Gene, Bloomington.
Pippin, David Wayne, Stanford.
Pitts, Benjamin Frederick, Chicago.
Plucinski, Jack Albert, Harvey.
Plummer, Newton Ray, Bement.
Pue, Jessie Gerald, Kingston.
Pointer, Darryl Warren Ant, Shipman.
Pooler, John Shelby, Wheaton.
Powell, Morris, Chicago.
Powers, Ronald Eugene, Plainview.
Pratt, William Terry, Carlinville.
Press, Robert M., Jr., Skokie.
Pridemore, James Leslie, Chicago.
Protz, Claude Douglas, Chicago.
Pyle, John William, Chicago.
Querry, Howard Emerson, Downers Grove.
Quin, Collen Wood, Chicago.
Ramirez, Louis Joseph, East St. Louis.
Rapczak, Martin Joseph, Kewanee.
Rassano, William, Berwyn.
Rekau, Harold Edward, Calumet City.
Render, Cecil Lavon, Danville.
Rhodes, Richard James, Eureka.
Roberts, Ronald Eugene, Belleville.
Robinson, Walter, Chicago.
Rohan, Frederick Leo, Chicago.
Rohrkaste, Ronald Edward, Edwardsville.
Ronzani, Charles Kenneth, Chicago.
Rose, Lawrence Carroll, Elmhurst.
Ross, Charles Gregory, Taylorville.
Roy, James Dean, Norris City.
Royalty, Amel Douglas, Gifford.
Russell, Ronnie Len, Stone Park.
Ryan, John Roger, Jr., Bellwood.
Sandidge, Theodore William, Pawnee.
Sands, Richard Eugene, Springfield.
Santucci, Vinicio Fredek, Chicago.
Schertz, John Edward, Princeton.
Schlosser, Steven Michael, Lacon.
Schroeder, Alfred M., Jr., Chicago.
Schueren, Daniel Richard, Arlington Heights.
Schultz, James Chester, Chicago.
Schwarz, Francis Anthony, Chicago.
Scott, David Lee, Carlock.
Scott, Dorty Hinchman, Jr., Chicago.
Scott, Michael Jon, Smithboro.
Scott, Thomas William, Canton.
Seidel, Kenneth Wayne, Wayne City.
Sek, Mitchell Francis, Chicago.
Severson, Paul Roy, Glenwood.
Shehorn, Tommy Loren, Decatur.
Shenson, Gwyn Thaxton, Chicago.
Shoot, Terry William, Charleston.
Sibley, Ralph, Chicago.
Siekierka, Donald Bernard, Peru.
Simpson, Edward Monroe, Collinsville.
Simpson, Michael Paul, Mattoon.
Simpson, William James, Forest Park.
Sims, Larry Roy, Rolling Meadows.
Sintic, Gregory John, Chicago.
Sipp, Roger William, Hanna City.
Slabinger, Peter Walter, Chicago.
Slifka, John Joseph, Livingston.
Smith, Bernard Edward, East St. Louis.
Smith, Luke Andrew, Jr., Chicago.
Smoczynski, Thomas Joseph, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Smrtnik, Donald Eugene, Waukegan.
Solomon, James Verdell, Fairfield.
Southey, James Russell, Peoria.
Spicer, Jerry Eugene, Decatur.
Spragg, Harold Dean, Dolton.
Spurlock, John, Pekin.
Stanton, Harold E., Jonesboro.
Staudchar, Terrence Edward, Chicago.
Stec, Frank Louis, Chicago.
Stein, Paul Henry, Jr., Lockport.
Stender, Paul Alan, Skokie.
Stites, James John, East St. Louis.
Stone, Harold Alvin, Champaign.
Stromback, Glenn Charles, Chicago.
Sturtevant, Theodore James, Villa Park.
Superczynski, John Paul, Jr., Chicago.
Swatsley, Mickey Lynn, Mount Carmel.
Szczupaj, James Walter, Chicago.
Taggart, Isaac, Chicago.
Tarjany, Randolph Michael, East St. Louis.
Taylor, Ronald Burton, Addison.
Tebbe, Ronald Joe, Breese.
Tegtmeier, Leslie Jon, Chicago.
Tellis, Andrew Jesenek, Winnetka.
Thomas, James Lawrence, Chicago.
Tompkins, Harvey Joseph, Chicago.
Totcoff, Dennis Steven, Chicago.
Trucano, Alan Dale, Steeleville.
Trusty, William Robert, Jr., Eldorado.
Tucker, Arthur L., Jerseyville.
Tucker, Valentine, Chicago.
Tunison, George Robert, White Hall.
Turbitt, Richard John, Jr., Waukegan.
Turkstra, Arthur John, Chicago.
Turone, Norman Michael, Chicago.
Tuttle, Cletus Dale, Galatia.
Urdiales, Alfred, Jr., Chicago.
Urdiales, Charles A., Jr., Chicago.
Van Duyn, Jon Francis, Wheaton.
Van Gorder, William Joseph, Markham.
Van Horn, John Richmond, Lyons.
Varick, Robert Kittridge, Deerfield.
Vitale, William Miller, Taylorville.
Vogel, Donald Francis, Chicago.
Walker, Julius Lemuel, Jr., Chicago.
Walker, M. B., Jr., Chicago.
Wallace, James Leroy, Martinsville.
Washington, Anthony Felix, Chicago.
Watts, Robert Lee, Jacksonville.
Weitz, Donald Edward, Chicago.
Welch, Larry Eugene, Jacksonville.
Wells, Barry Scott, Moline.
White, Lucky Gaylen, Collinsville.
White, Stephen O. Meara, Chicago.
White, William Henry, Chicago.
Whitfield, Thomas Michael, Quincy.
Whittington, Russel Joseph, Macon.
Wickam, Jerry Wayne, Rockford.
Wieneke, Carl Joshua, Hardin.
Williams, Eugene Vernon, East St. Louis.
Williams, Joseph Michael, Nebo.
Williams, Lonnie, Rockford.
Williams, Louis, Chicago.
Williams, Raymond Charles, Chicago.
Willoughby, Jesse Lavern, St. Charles.
Wissell, Lawrence James, Hebron.
Wittevrongel, Michael Cami, Shannon.
Witzig, Raymond George, Gridley.
Wolfe, Joel David, Chicago.
Wonderlich, Michael Kaye, Moline.
Woods, Earl, Chicago.
Woods, Gary Dorvin, Madison.
Woods, Stephen Forrest, Godfrey.
Wopinski, Barry Milton, Chicago.
Worthey, David Allen, Flora.
Wright, Robert Leroy, Gardner.
Wyant, William Douglas, Colona.
Young, Mark Douglas, Sidell.
Zach, Ronald Lee, Oak Lawn.
Zaehler, Earl Henry, Chicago.
Zawisza, Theodore Leo, Harvey.
Zimmerman, Roger, Deerfield.

Air Force

Brown, Barry Lynn, Dowell.
Bucher, Bernard Ludwig, Eureka.
Byrne, Joseph Henry, Evanston.
Des Rochers, James Brian, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Air Force

Kerr, Charles Franklin, Golconda.
Riggins, Robert Paul, Champaign.
Scott, Robert Miller, Evanston.
Thomas, Norman, Eugene, Collinsville.
Zucker, Louis Claude, Ottawa.

Marine Corps

Abbate, Richard Clark, Elmwood Park.
Almanza, Ricky Jerome, Moline.
Anderson, Michael Francis, Evanston.
Ariaz, Edward Joseph, Chicago.
Arnold, Joe Eddy, Chicago.
Baker, Curtis, Everett, Oakley.
Baker, Raftkeith Eros, Chicago.
Ballew, Henry Herschel, South Roxana.
Barkley, Jesse Louis, Chicago.
Barnes, Robert Crozier, Jr., Carmi.
Barnes, Willie James, Chicago.
Beierle, Thomas Lawrence, Zion.
Belles, John David, Chicago.
Benford, Jonas, Chicago.
Bieneman, John Charles, Wheeling.
Blumer, Wilford Lee, East St. Louis.
Boland, William Joseph Jr., Cicero.
Boochko, Victor, Chicago.
Botes, George, Lagrange.
Bouchez, Danny Phillip, Decatur.
Boyce, Terry Lawrence, East St. Louis.
Boyd, Ernest, Jr., Chicago.
Boyd, Roger William, Decatur.
Bradford, Rodney, Chicago.
Brancato, John Harrison, Jr., Lagrange.
Braun, Harry Walker, Jr., Hebron.
Brent, David Allison, Roseville.
Burke, Robert Charles, Monticello.
Butterfield, Calvin Frankl, Pekin.
Byrnes, Robert Howard, Chicago.
Campbell, Kenneth, Chicago.
Cardenas, Ramiro, Aurora.
Cates, Norman Gene, Rochelle.
Caulton, Willie Richard, Chicago.
Chapman, Jerry Junior, Albion.
Chrystynycz, Theodore, Chicago.
Cistaro, Rudolph V., Jr., Chicago.
Clay, Doyle Gregory, Chicago.
Coffman, Charles Eugene, Peoria.
Cole, Thomas Stephen, Oak Lawn.
Colegate, William Karl, Red Bud.
Coleman, Michael John, Bensenville.
Collins, James Alfred, Broadwell.
Colvins, Ronald Earl, Chicago.
Cornelius, Merlin G., Jr., Chicago.
Craig, Harry Lee, Arlington Heights.
Davis, Glenn Edward, Cahokia.
Davis, Glenn Phillip, McHenry.
Davis, Ronnie Dean, Pleasant Plains.
Decesaro, Jack, Jr., Decatur.
Derrig, Michael James, Chicago.
Dicken, Perry, Jr., Danville.
Divens, Melvin, Chicago.
Dodson, Jerry Lee, Collinsville.
Dorsey, Dennis, Chicago.
Doye, Ricky Lee, Prophetstown.
Droszcz, Daniel Patrick, Chicago.
Druschel, William Lenord, Joliet.
Dunn, Larry, Chicago.
Eaves, Carroll Wayne, Makanda.
Embry, William Robert, Jr., Godfrey.
Evans, Jeffery William, Chicago.
Eversgerd, Norman Lee, Germantown.
Federowski, Robert Allan, Lansing.
Feezel, Harold Eugene, Loogootee.
Fernandez, Dennis, Chicago.
Fitzmaurice, Timothy Georg, Chicago.
Fonseca, John, Chicago.
Friese, Michael Keith, Mattoon.
Garcia, Juan Refugio, Chicago Heights.
Garlick, Richard Lee, Aurora.
Gaska, Lawrence Leonard, Chicago.
Gee, Leroy, East St. Louis.
Geller, Charles Gregory, East St. Louis.
Gibbs, William Harley, Jr., Oak Lawn.
Gibson, John Arthur, IV, Chicago.
Gischer, Gerald Marion, East St. Louis.
Golden, Calvin, Jr., Chicago.
Gomez, Armando Abel, Chicago.
Gonzalez, Victor, Jr., Chicago.
Gordon, Henry Joe, Chatham.
Greene, Ben John, Chicago.

XUM

ILLINOIS—continued

Marine Corps

Grunewald, Bruce Walter, Springfield.
Gustafson, Edward Lee, Wheaton.
Hacker, Kurt Eric, Palos Hills.
Hanson, Michael Leroy, Evanston.
Harrison, Dana Alan, Canton.
Hayes, William Allen, Chicago.
Heaver, Brian Tracy, Peoria.
Henderson, Jack, Jr., Chicago.
Hill, Joseph Arnold, Taylorville.
Hoffman, Richard Alfonce, Highland.
Hollis, Thomas William, Gillespie.
Huff, Charles Frank, Chicago.
Jackson, Billy Dale, Centralia.
Jackson, David Eric, Springfield.
Jackson, Leonard, Jr., Chicago.
Jackson, Tyrone, Chicago.
Johnson, Gary Steven, Lockport.
Johnson, Larry Allen, Varna.
Johnson, Terry Melvin, Springfield.
Jones, Jack Pahl, Mundelein.
Jones, Jimmy Jay, Chicago.
Jones, Larry, Gary.
Joselane, Howard Leo, Chicago.
Judy, David Lynn, Potomac.
Keag, Robert Thomas, Chicago.
Kehoe, Robert Anthony, Chicago.
Kettmann, Daniel Ray, Red Bud.
Kick, Daniel Lee, Riverton.
Kisucky, Anthony Edward, Chicago.
Kmiec, John Stanley, Chicago.
Knox, David, Dolton.
Krauhs, Curtis John, Springfield.
Kupperschmidt, Jerome Dean, Sandwich.
Laye, Edgar Cartha, Jr., Chicago.
Lewis, John Frederick, Joliet.
Lopez-Vazquez, Leonardo, Chicago.
Lowe, Ronald Bruce, Chicago.
Luster, Dale Alan, Chicago.
Machut, Richard Ray, Chicago.
Madsen, Mark Eugene, Bloomington.
Magyar, Blaze, III, Granite City.
Major, Steven Robert, Elmhurst.
Malnar, John Marion, Sawyerville.
McAllister, Kenneth Ralph, Danville.
McAllister, Robert Allen, Tinley Park.
McCall, Dimitrious Cortez, Chicago.
McCann, James Kevin, Chicago.
McElwee, Jackie Ray, Sidney.
McFarland, William Lloyd, Granite City.
McGuire, Timothy Patrick, Deerfield.
McNabb, Alfred Lee, Chicago.
McNamara, Edward Michael, Chicago.
Meads, Kim Elmer, Chicago.
Meeker, Ramon Arthur, Pekin.
Michalowicz, Stanley Jului, Chicago.
Michalowski, Raymond John, Chicago.
Miles, Blaine Stanley, Jr., Springfield.
Miles, John Emory, East Peoria.
Miller, Thomas Leonard, Chicago.
Monkman, Donald Eugene, Bloomington.
Moody, Paul James, East St. Louis.
Moon, William Charles, Joliet.
Moore, Denver, Jr., Lovejoy.
Moore, Harry Truman, Chicago.
Morey, Alden Frank, Jr., Decatur.
Murdock, Stanley, Chicago.
Myers, Lawrence Thomas, Cary.
Nawrocki, Robert Dennis, Chicago.
Neal, Robert Junior, Sandwich.
Neeley, William Merritt, Olmsted.
Newsome, Dean Oliver, Chicago.
O'Connor, William James, Jr., Chicago.
Olson, Randall Alan, Moline.
Orszulak, Kenneth Benedict, Chicago.
Osborne, Joseph, Jr., Chicago.
Oskilanec, William Joseph, Homewood.
Page, Lewis Wayne, Carmi.
Palmer, Leroy, Jr., Chicago.
Pampel, Loren Lee, Chicago.
Payne, Robert Paul, Hampshire.
Pensoneau, Terry, Belleville.
Perez, Victor, Jr., Chicago.
Perkins, Donald Dean, Jr., Winnetka.
Peters, Edward Kent, Zion.
Pickett, Joseph Charles, Jr., Chicago.
Pierce, Calvin Bob, Chicago.
Pierce, Joseph Robert Clin, Mattoon.
Pondoff, John Christopher, East St. Louis.
Pounds, Alvin Lee, Chicago.

ILLINOIS—continued

Marine Corps

Pratt, Donald William, Riverside.
Presser, Paul Michael, Chicago.
Prieto, Anthony Raymond, East Chicago.
Prip, Soren, Grayslake.
Redenius, David Gary, Plymouth.
Redmond, Donald Merle, Chicago.
Richard, Andrew Gus, Elkhart.
Riepe, Everett Dale, Metropolis.
Riley, James Thomas, Zeigler.
Riordan, Patrick Carlisle, Des Plaines.
Robertson, Jimmy Karon, Chicago.
Robinson, Harold Jack, Jr., Harvey.
Rodriguez, Pedro Angel, Gary.
Russell, Cecil Lee, Coal City.
Russell, Larry Gene, Chicago.
Salonies, Edward, Jr., Chicago.
Schneller, Anthony John, Jr., Dolton.
Schweig, Victor John, Chicago.
Scully, Patrick R., Jr., Chicago.
Sefrhans, James, Chicago.
Shelley, Delmar, Chicago.
Shiner, John Robert, Joliet.
Sietsema, Dennis Raymond, Calument Park.
Smith, James Alfred, Dixmoor.
Smith, Jeffrey Earl, Belvidere.
Sobacki, Pete Williams, Chicago.
Spilker, Kenneth Alfred, Quincy.
Spino, Anthony Lawrance, Chicago.
Stein, Paul Andrew, Villa Park.
Stephenson, Frederick Dale, Calumet City.
Stiehler, George Dennis, Orlando Park.
Strand, Frank Jay, Lockport.
Strande, Thomas Alvin, Chicago.
Strategos, Peter Stephen, Chicago.
Templeton, John Ashley, Lake Bluff.
Timson, David Oliver, East St. Louis.
Toadvine, Dennis Arron, Aurora.
Trent, William Derrill, East Peoria.
Trezex, Jerry Allen, Chicago.
Triplett, Mark Leon, St. Charles.
Trolia, Michael Patrick, Oak Lawn.
Turner, Thomas George, Chicago.
Tyrka, Peter Steven, Berwyn.
Vance, Sherman Dale, West Point.
Vaughn, Howard Gregory, Chicago.
Wajda, Philip John, Chicago.
Ware, Joe L., East St. Louis.
Washburn, Wayne Arthur, Peoria Heights.
White, Larry Frederick, Peoria.
White, Owen, Jr., Chicago.
Wierzba, Edwin Rudolph, Bridgeview.
Wiggins, Tommy Austin, Mount Carmel.
Williams, Nathaniel, Jr., Chicago.
Wilson, Roger Lee, Elgin.
Witek, William Frank, Chicago.
Wood, Robert Delun, East St. Louis.
Woodard, Jon Robert, Waukegan.
Woods, Cordell Emanuel, Chicago.
Woods, John Kevin, Western Springs.
Woolbright, John Wayne, Rockford.
Wright, Scott Alan, Downers Grove.
Yarber, David Wayne, Justice.
Ziemann, Ronald John, Chicago.
Zimmerman, Kurt Fredrick, Durand.

Navy

Beckmeyer, Fredrick Hall, Mt. Vernon.
Brown, Gordon Curtiss, Alado.
Campbell, Brian Eugene, Byron.
Dodsworth, Robert Lee, Franklin.
Engelsen, Robert Allen, Blue Island.
Heller, Ivan Louis, Geneseo.
Janssen, Arnold, Chicago.
Kares, John Michael, Neponset.
Keith, Roy Benjamin, Joliet.
Mathison, Brian John, Park Ridge.
Miller, Leo Juan, Lockport.
Morrison, Charles Lloyd, Romeoville.
Myers, George Lester, Jr., Chicago.
Nightingale, Randall John, Onarga.
Perysian, Joseph Salvatore, Oak Lawn.
Redtke, Duane Francis, Chicago.
Sheldon, William Charles, Chicago.
Sinks, Larry Eugene, Chatsworth.
Starcks, Jerome Steven, Chicago.
Tomaszewski, Zbigniew John, Chicago.
Wobbe, Dennis Michael, Breese.
Wurtz, Emil John, Chicago.

INDIANA

Army

Abel, Arnold Gordon, French Lick.
Acree, Billie Ray, Cedar Lake.
Adams, Jerry Dean, Franklin.
All, Carl Kelly, Midland.
Allstott, Mark Joseph, French Lick.
Alsman, William Franklin, Indianapolis.
Alvis, Donald Dean, Hope.
Archibald, Gary Michael, Huntington.
Arnold, James Edward, Indianapolis.
Ash, Paul Michael, Terre Haute.
Atwood, Dawson Jesse, Martinsville.
Baker, Eldon Allen, Frankfort.
Baker, Robert Lee, Evansville.
Barrett, Larry Wayne, Redkey.
Beeson, William Dale, Gary.
Bennett, Edward Dale, Indianapolis.
Bigger, Calvin Hart, La Porte.
Bishop, Thomas Wayne, Bluffton.
Bloyer, Sheldon Eugene, Portage.
Booker, Jerry Laborn, Bloomington.
Booth, Stephen Floyd, Orland.
Borman, Jerald Allen, Hammond.
Bowman, Clarence, Jr., Austin.
Bowman, Leslie Von, Wallace.
Broady, Terry Lee, Cannelton.
Brown, Joel Kenton, Valparaiso.
Brown, John Stephen, Orleans.
Brown, Raymond, Kokomo.
Bryant, David Alton, Griffith.
Buchanan, Gilbert Edward, Danville.
Burton, Steven Dale, Columbus.
Campfield, Albert L., Columbus.
Carnine, Stephen Michael, Indianapolis.
Carpenter, Tommy Lee, Anderson.
Carver, Harry Franklin, New Albany.
Cawley, William Brace, Jr., Hobart.
Chapman, Gary Wayne, Gary.
Chapman, Larry Lee, Henryville.
Charles Dan Eugene, Hammond.
Chifos, William Lewis, Indianapolis.
Clark, Jerry Douglas, New Albany.
Clark, Steven Eugene, Noblesville.
Clark, Vincent Allen, Indianapolis.
Clay, Edward Roger, Valparaiso.
Clewlow, Robert Lee, Evansville.
Clifford, Gary Alan, Michigan City.
Cole, Robert Leroy, Eaton.
Collins, Elton Bradley, Fort Wayne.
Colone, Ronald James, Fort Wayne.
Conley, Robert L., South Bend.
Connelly, Samuel Gerald, Hammond.
Cooper, Maurice Alan, Fort Wayne.
Cox, Everett, Frederick, Indianapolis.
Cupp, John Charles, Noblesville.
Darling, Larry Wayne, New Castle.
Darnell, William Eugene, Goshen.
Davidson, James Richard, Anderson.
Davis, Jeffrey Alan, Indianapolis.
Davis, Robert Eugene, Elkhart.
Davis, Ronald, New Castle.
De Busk, Michael Eugene, Shelbyville.
Decker, Wayne Austin, Elkhart.
Delp, Ronald Marvin, Delaware.
Devore, Richard E., Charlestown.
Dingus, Carl, Marion.
Dixon, Gale William, Madison.
Dluzak, David Martin, Crown Point.
Dorsett, Harry Clinton, Mitchell.
Dorshak, Robert Joseph, Michigan City.
Dougherty, John Christian, Terre Haute.
Douglas, James Dale, Veedersburg.
Downing, Michael William, Elwood.
Eaton, Tommy Ray, New Castle.
Ebert, Michael Leroy, Greenfield.
Eichenauer, Thomas Lynn, Fort Wayne.
Eiler, Linden Dale, Jr., Peru.
Ellis, Robert Wayne, Syracuse.
Estrada, Guillermo, Gary.
Faulkner, Earl Eugene, Attica.
Flores, Manuel Soto, Red Key.
Folck, Benjamin Thomas, Frankfort.
Foust, Donald Charles, Kokomo.
Frazer, Ronald Lloyd, Cambridge City.
Freund, Ernest Elwood, Jr., South Bend.
Fryman, James Omer, Indianapolis.
Geise, Michael David, Carthage.
Gibson, Lawrence Edward, Portage.
Gilbert, Gerald Frederick, Logansport.
Gilsinger, Frederick M., Jr., Highland.

XUM

INDIANA—continued

Army

Gordon, Wyatt Cecil, Lawrence.
Grubbs, George Edward, Hammond.
Guthrie, Thomas Leon, Medora.
Hagan, Robert Albert, Jr., Anderson.
Hall, George Michael, Glen Park.
Halley, Wilson Fitzgerald, Chesterton.
Hampton, Steven Aaron, Gary.
Hantz, Herman Eugene, Angola.
Harter, William Aaron, Knightstown.
Hartwell, William Raymond, Indianapolis.
Haugh, James Curtis, Terre Haute.
Hawkins, Jonathon Jeffrey, South Bend.
Haws, Homer Howard, Seymour.
Hedden, Roger Dale, Hartford City.
Hefty, John Ellsworth, Waterloo.
Henze, Randall Allen, Evansville.
Heyen, John Eugene, Terre Haute.
Hicks, Donald Gene, Indianapolis.
Hueckelberg, Thomas Joe, Crown Point.
Holbrook, Jeffrey Lynn, Indianapolis.
Hoover, Rex Michael, Logansport.
Horton, Charles Ronald, Muncie.
House, George Jonathan, Indianapolis.
Hovis, Ronald Lee, Mooresville.
Huffman, David Keith, Speedway.
Jarboe, William Lee, Indianapolis.
Jasper, David Claud, New Castle.
Jilcott, Charles B., Jr., Logansport.
Johannes, Urban Harold, Jr., Gary.
Johnson, Gerald Lee, Sheridan.
Johnson, Terry Alan, Monrovia.
Jones, Guy Thomas, Sheridan.
Jones, James Edward, Evansville.
Kelly, Jerome Richard, Cutler.
Kennedy, Raymond O., Indianapolis.
Kessler, Timothy Robert, Hammond.
King, Frederick Ben, Hammond.
Kirkendall, Joseph Keith, Vevay.
Klarik, Steve, East Chicago.
Kleint, William Stanley, Fort Wayne.
Kolvek, Mark Andrew, Gary.
Kryske, Leo Neal, Mishawaka.
Ksiazek, Bennie, Gary.
Kuhn, Clifford Martin, Fort Wayne.
Kupferer, Jack Joseph, Terre Haute.
Kurella, Michael J., Whiting.
Labuda, Robert Alan, Gary.
Lackey, Phillip Lans, Warsaw.
Lanier, James Perry, Brownsburg.
Lawson, Karl Wade, Terre Haute.
Lee, Dom E., Brazil.
Lewicki, Steve William, Hammond.
Lomax, Malcolm Eugene, Jeffersonville.
Long, Lorin Elwood, Chesterton.
Loy, Randell Hood, Lafayette.
Maher, Louis Joseph, Jr., Walkerton.
Marvin, Robert Gerald, Gary.
Matchett, Leslie David, Kokomo.
Mathews, William Jerome, Gary.
McClain, Michael Dee, Jerseyville.
McCelland, Chester Ray, Brazil.
McDonald, Genie Lee, Gosport.
Merkel, Michal Alvin, Indianapolis.
Metcalf, Harold, Metamora.
Miller, Jack Wayne, Fountain City.
Miller, Marvin Leo, Madison.
Miller, Richard L., Angola.
Mills, Richard Thomas, Anderson.
Monroe, Marvin Eugene, Columbus.
Montgomery, Larry, Fort Wayne.
Moore, James Lynn, Pendleton.
Moore, Randy Cois, Trafalgar.
Moore, Roger Dean, Muncie
Morgan, Samuel Floyd, Muncie.
Morman, William Eugene, Jr., Jeffersonville.
Neal, Ronald Wayne, Rockport.
Nerini, Thomas Harold, Lafayette.
Newberry, Larry Gene, Kokomo.
North, Claude Eugene, Muncie.
Oldham, Kenneth Lindle, Indianapolis.
Packard, George Richard, Fort Wayne.
Pahl, Ronald G., Michigan City.
Patterson, Larry Gene, Muncie.
Penry, Marvin Eugene, Indianapolis.
Perry, Robert Lee, Muncie.
Pranger, Glenn Airen, Plymouth.
Pry, Jerry Earl, Vincennes.
Quick, Robert Eugene, Elkhart.

INDIANA—continued

Army

Randall, Michael Allen, Sr., Warsaw.
Randall, Michael Eugene, Sr., Noblesville.
Reedy, Gary Martin, Indianapolis.
Richards, Ricky Lee, Jasonville.
Riegel, Terry Lee, Indianapolis.
Roach, Ralph Edward, Michigan City.
Roberts, David Owen, Indianapolis.
Roberts, John Leslie, Fort Wayne.
Ross, Conrad E., Richmond.
Runkle, Daniel C., Fort Wayne.
Ruth, Terry Austin, Anderson.
Safrit, William Julius, South Bend.
Sallee, Doyle Eugene, Lafayette.
Saltz, Marion Nelson, Marengo.
Sanders, Charles, Indianapolis.
Sappingfield, Franklin A., Terre Haute.
Scheck, Clifford Henry, Kokomo.
Schneider, Thomas Herschal, Richmond.
See, Ward Eugene, Peru.
Sevier, David Howard, Indianapolis.
Sferruzzi, William Lee, Indianapolis.
Shaw, Stephen William, Indianapolis.
Sherman, Larry Dee, Marion.
Shutters, Patrick Alan, Greensburg.
Siders, Marvin Isaac, Macy.
Sizelove, Edward Leroy, Alexandria.
Skaggs, Willard, Jr., Sellersburg.
Sklodoski, Lawrence, South Bend.
Small, Robert Raymond, Indianapolis.
Smith, Fredrick Joe, New Castle.
Smith, Michael Eugene, Loogootee.
Smith, Ronald Lee, Beech Grove.
Smith, Wardell, Gary.
Soden, Robert Harry, South Bend.
Speer, Louis Leon, Dupont.
St. Clair, Bradley Andrew, Indianapolis.
Stalnaker, Leonard Allen, Crawfordsville.
Stegall, Lorenzo, Hammond.
Stevens, Richard Craig, Lebanon.
Stevens, Thomas Arthur, Jr., Seymour.
Stokes, Harold Dean, Gary.
Stuckey, John Steiner, Jr., Cloverdale.
Swaim, Bruce Alan, Lynn.
Sweatt, Theodore Alfred, Terre Haute.
Thomas, David Carl, Muncie.
Thompson, Johnny Wayne, Michigan City.
Tribbett, Lloyd Eugene, Crawfordsville.
Trout, Bradford Lee, New Castle.
Trujillo, William Owen, North Vernon.
Tuttle, Lawrence Kay, Fort Wayne.
Urbelis, John Edward, East Chicago.
Vance, Darrell Vernon, Indianapolis.
Vernon, Murray Lee, Borden.
Walters, John Edward, Kokomo.
Warthan, Albert William, Gosport.
Washington, Clarence H., Jr., Newburgh.
Washington, Robert James, Indianapolis.
Weaver, Terry Lee, Marion.
Weber, Danny A., Albion.
Weisner, Gregory Charles, Columbus.
Wells, James Edward, Albion.
Westlake, William Arnold, Lynn.
Westphal, Glenn A., Michigan City.
Wiedemann, Robert Joseph, Gary.
Wieskus, William Clemens, Indianapolis.
Willard, Kenneth Eugene, Jr., Indianapolis.
Williams, J. C., Jr., Muncie.
Williamson, Robert Joe, Lawrenceburg.
Wilson, Bobby, Bloomington.
Wilson, Donald Charles, Portage.
Wilson, Earl Clifford, Michigan City.
Wolfe, Richard Edward, Princeton.
Wood, Richard Dale, Goldsmith.
Woods, Matthew, Gary.
Workman, Larry E., Pierceton.
Worth, Roy Edward, Indianapolis.
Wright, Stephen Louis, Centerville.
York, Ivol Michael, Peru.

Air Force

Canup, William David, Indianapolis.
Galey, James Norbert, Elkhart.

Marine Corps

Abbott, Harold Wayne, Darlington.
Allen, Edward James, Gary.
Applegate, Joseph Charles, Monticello.
Armstrong, Douglas Wayne, Elkhart.
Ballinger, James Arthur, Rochester.
Bapp, Ronald Dale, Clinton.

INDIANA—continued

Marine Corps

Bartley, Richard Louis, Jeffersonville.
Berry, William McKinley, Marion.
Blacksten, Ronald Lee, Muncie.
Borowski, Tadeusz Jan, South Bend.
Bowling, James Wisdom, Evansville.
Bowman, Jack Allen, Evansville.
Bradley, Kenneth Robert, Cedar Lake.
Brewer, James Eugene, Edinburg.
Bridges, Ernest Larry, Gary.
Briscoe, Chester, Jr., Evansville.
Brown, Vaughn Lee, New Palestine.
Buchanan, Jeffrey Lynn, Evansville.
Buffin, Nicholas Jay, Muncie.
Bustos, Gregorio C., Warren.
Cancel, Ramon Pena, East Gary.
Caranasios, Evangelos K., Elkhart.
Carpenter, Howard R., Jr., Indianapolis.
Cheek, Robert Michael, Wolcottville.
Cook, Dennis Lynn, Yoder.
Cooper, Howard Kenneth, Valparaiso.
Cottrell, Darrell Wayne, Rockville.
Cuevas, Frank Oscar, Gary.
Dale, Terrence Michael, Jamestown.
Davis, Everett, Butler.
Davis, Randall Mark, New Albany.
Dempsey, Ronald Lee, Evansville.
Ellinger, Franklin Max, Terre Haute.
Ellis, Ronald Lee, Evansville.
Flegle, Gerald William, Crown Point.
Flaskamp, John Eugene, Indianapolis.
Fogleman, Johnny, Indianapolis.
Foy, Steven Joseph, Schererville.
Fuhrman, Terry Lee, Fort Wayne.
George, Claude Marvin, Hammond.
Glegg, James Edward, Hammond.
Gordon, Richard Dale, Indianapolis.
Gose, Elvin Wayne, Cumberland.
Hadley, Stephen Wayne, Princeton.
Hale, Michael David, Lebanon.
Hale, William Earl, Columbus.
Harp, Douglas Ray, Evansville.
Harper, Ralph Lewis, Indianapolis.
Harris, Bruce Randall, Columbus.
Hawley, John Harrison, Indianapolis.
Hazlett, Robert Dale, Indianapolis.
Heitger, Michael Lynn, Mishawaka.
Henderson, Derrick, Gary.
Hoffman, Terry Alan, Danville.
Hook, William Wren, Indianapolis.
Humphrey, Cecil Howard, Jr., Madison.
James, Richard Dale, Shelbyville.
Jaronik, Robert Walter, South Bend.
Johnson, William D., Jr., Kokomo.
Jones, Edward Charles, East Chicago.
Kellams, Glennis Ray, New Albany.
Keppen, Thomas Roger, Evansville.
Latham, Michael Terry, Ft. Wayne.
Lee, Billie Lewis, Gary.
Lenz, Gerald Francis, Whiting.
Manger, James Allen, Anderson.
Marcum, Jerry Lee, Muncie.
Marks, Frank William, Fortville.
Martin, Charles Jeffery, Connersville.
Martin, Donald Edward, Indianapolis.
Martin, Robert Alan, Logansport.
McBride, Thomas Leo, Evansville.
McDuffie, Ronald Lee, Gary.
McGee, Stephen Dwayne, Mishawaka.
McKinley, Allen, Gary.
McKinney, Larry Robert, Richmond.
Mead, Dennis Michael, South Bend.
Miller, Jerry Eugene, Boonville.
Miller, John Michael, Peru.
Mills, Roger Dale, Linton.
Moore, William Junior, Jr., Evansville.
Morgan, Dennis Everett, Mishawaka.
Mundell, Gregory Stan, Frankfort.
Muvich, Dennis Robert, Whiting.
Ort, Ivan Allen, Jr., Fort Wayne.
Owens, Robert Franklin, Wheatland.
Parcel, John William, Winamac.
Perdue, William Carman, Gary.
Persons, Henry Harvey, Fort Wayne.
Pierson, Larry James, Beech Grove.
Rains, Michael Edward, Kokomo.
Reff, Charles Richard, Muncie.
Reno, Dennis Keith, Indianapolis.
Rigsby, Barry Lane, Madison.
Roberts, Paul Michael, South Bend.

XUM

INDIANA—continued

Marine Corps

Roy, Leonard Allan, Alexandria.
Schroeder, Donald Ray, New Albany.
Schuck, Donald Philip, Brookville.
Scott, Walter Michael, Bloomington.
Slack, Donald Francis, Jr., Munster.
Smith, Bobby Dale, Manilla.
Smith, Michael Stephen, Bedford.
Smith, Steven Lee, Fort Wayne.
Smith, William Gary, Sellersburg.
Smock, Terry Dane, Indianapolis.
Staley, Robert Lee, Jr., Princeton.
Stoops, Jonathan Lynn, Union City.
Straszewski, George Stephe, Gary.
Strate, Bruce Edgar, Vincennes.
Stuck, Ransom Lee, Farmersburg.
Thomas, James Leon, Jr., Beech Grove.
Toth, Robert Gene, Elkhart.
Travis, Dallas Ray, Gary.
Travis, Michael Warren, Sweetser.
Tyson, Dennis Lee, Elkhart.
Veach, Robert Eugene, Lebanon.
Waldon, Tommy Andrew, Hobart.
Ward, Terry Michael, Bicknell.
Williams, Jimmie Keith, Franklin.
Windbigler, Richard Edward, Gary.
Wozniak, Richard Louis, Hobart.

Navy

Ankrum, Glenn Eugene, Alexandria.
Bandelier, Howard Wayne, New Haven.
Brees, William Marion, Jr., Greenfield.
Burns, Howard Frank, Shelburn.
Crandall, Charles Everett, New Castle.
Cummings, Dallas Dewey, Bedford.
Delaplane, James Charles, Camden.
Delph, Scott Claymon, Sheridan.
Goss, Larry Jo, Marion.
Hemphill, David Wayne, Moores Hill.
Markham, Raymond Paul, Anderson.
Merrill, David Louis, South Bend.
Miller, Gerald Leon, Spencer.
Myers, James Alexander, Jr., New Harmony.
Smith, John Byron, Butler.
Soucy, Ronald Philip, Whiting Lake.

IOWA

Army

Ahrendsen, Dennis Lynn, Olin.
Alexander, Nicholas Richar, Wesley.
Ballheim, Richard Alan, La Porte City.
Barber, Harry Adelbert, Moulton.
Beeck, Ronald Marvin, Miles.
Behrens, Thomas Martin, What Cheer.
Bissen, Howard Matthew, Stacyville.
Borchard, Leonard E., Jr., Langdon.
Brandts, Harlan Ray, Sheldon.
Bunting, Ronald Dell, Corning.
Burke, Kevin Gail, Anita.
Cain, Douglas Michael, Sioux City.
Chatfield, Daniel H., Dubuque.
Clark, Ronald Blair, Runnells.
Clark, Ronald Emery, Des Moines.
Claussen, Henry Robert, Palmer.
Cobb, Robert Jan, Webster.
Collister, Jerry Lee, Maquoketa.
Comstock, Robert James, Lovilia.
Conner, Eugene Joseph, Cumberland.
Cornwell, Harry Jay, Des Moines.
Crouse, Leslie Dewayne, Fort Dodge.
Cuff, Dick E., Maxwell.
Cullen, Richard Lee, Mason City.
Dautremont, Dennis Dale, Riverside.
Ditch, David Kenneth, Davenport.
Drew, Edward Joseph, II, Des Moines.
Duneman, Allen Eugene, Magnolia.
Farlow, Randall Lee, Booneville.
Fedler, Bruce Jerome, Donnelson.
Flattery, Richard T., Jr., Fort Dodge.
Foster, Carl Richard, Davenport.
Friedhoff, Dennis Patrick, Elma.
Gaulocher, Francis Leroy, Iowa City.
Gray, Newton Morgan, Jr., Leon.
Gronewold, Larry Marshall, Donahue.
Gunder, Dennis Anthony, Cedar Rapids.
Hanson, Howard Emerson, Jr., Cedar Rapids.
Heiselman, John Gerald, New Hampton.
Hensley, Raymond Albert, Des Moines.
Hinman, Dwight Earl, Belmond.
Hoffner, Wayne Henry, Clarence.

IOWA—continued

Army

Ivener, Terry Lee, Sioux City.
Johnson, George, Mason City.
Johnson, Ronald John, Quimby.
Jones, Robert Taylor, Jr., Des Moines.
Keeler, Bert Austin, Weldon.
Klaahsen, Lawrence Jon, Sibley.
Knapp, Tommy Duane, Des Moines.
Knapper, Edward William, Eldridge.
Kouhns, Dennis Ben, Ogden.
Kruse, Kendal Robert, Glenwood.
Kuehn, Duane Joseph, Ionia.
Lewis, Gary Lee, Fort Madison.
Liewer, Richard George, Des Moines.
Link, John Francis, Ottumwa.
Lundby, Lorence Marion, Waterloo.
Maag, Joseph Anthony, Jr., Le Claire.
Madison, John B., Des Moines.
Manson, John Edward, Des Moines.
Mathers, Steven Allen, Rockwell.
McCord, Roger Clair, Dunlap.
McGuire, Wayne Thomas, Des Moines.
Means, Ronald Leroy, Cherokee.
Meier, Carroll Rodney, Logan.
Meighan, Richard James, Sumner.
Meloy, John Patrick, Dubuque.
Mihalakis, Elias Louis, Dubuque.
Myers, Charles Louis, Jr., Dubuque.
Oakes, Paul Laverne, Jr., Atlantic.
Oltman, Dean William, Hampton.
Osborn, Earl Douglas, Council Bluffs.
Passig, Duane Rinehardt, Delmar.
Peterson, Kermit C., Jr., Des Moines.
Pickering, Donald William, Hastings.
Pollard, Thomas Leroy, Red Oak.
Raney, Steven Leon, Swan.
Reistroffer, Daniel Philli, Clinton.
Rich, Craig Arthur, Brighton.
Roche, Kenneth Wayne, Nemaha.
Rosenbaum, Gerald George, Waucoma.
Rule, Ted James, Waterloo.
Schmidt, Allan Lee, Tipton.
Schmidt, Dale Howard, Harrison.
Schmitt, John Kenneth, Jr., Dubuque.
Schultz, Robert William, Clinton.
Schutt, Randall Karl, Sioux Center.
Schwebke, Larry Charles, Ackley.
Shank, John B., Des Moines.
Smidstra, Charles Richard, Rock Rapids.
Smith, Harold Lee, Des Moines.
Stephenson, Kurt Patrick, Cedar Rapids.
Stickels, Mark Galen, Afton.
Striepe, Paul Raymond, Holstein.
Thompson, Donald Arthur, West Union.
Thompson, Melvin Eugene, Fonda.
Ulfers, John Burdette, Sibley.
Van Dalsem, Marc Gregory, Des Moines.
Van Riesen, Alvin Chris, Sheldon.
Villarreal, Michael, Sioux City.
Wagner, Grey H., Hampton.
Walker, Lester Timothy, Des Moines.
Warth, Woodroe Warren, New London.
Wearmouth, Ronald Vernon, Newton.
Weber, William Eugene, Dolliver.
Weidner, Frederick William, Des Moines.
Westberg, Richard Charles, Marshalltown.
Wetjen, Gordon John, Homestead.
Weyker, Donald Dennis, Marshalltown.
Wilcox, Thomas Dewey, Marion.
Wilson, Bryan Lee, Richland.
Wilson, Keith Leslie, Marathon.
Winger, Jon Richard, Cedar Rapids.
Wisely, Daniel Lee, Davenport.
Woodard, Stephen Lee, Waterloo.
Wrisberg, John Holger, III, Mason City.
Yetmar, Dennis James, Clare.
Zimmerman, Terry Ray, Des Moines.

Air Force

Bennett, Martin Lee, Hamburg.
Brown, Warren Keith, Sioux City.
Carra, Anthony, Des Moines.
Hutton, Kenneth Keith, Deep River.
Shain, E. Rox, Iowa City.
Smits, Herman, Jr., Scranton.

Marine Corps

Aldridge, Herbert Ray, Cedar Rapids.
Anderson, David Bruce, Avoca.
Antrim, Tommy Edward, Oneida.
Baldwin, Kenneth Maynard, Grafton.
Barr, Michael McKee, Fort Madison.

IOWA—continued

Marine Corps

Bartlow, Richard Lee, Oskaloosa.
Baxter, Kenneth Carl, Council Bluffs.
Bender, Ivyl Ray, Pleasantville.
Bills, Lyle Preston, Council Bluffs.
Buttz, Harold Warren, Council Bluffs.
Cain, Dennis Reed, Council Bluffs.
Campbell, David Lavern, Clarinda.
Cox, Howard Max, Bedford.
Dehner, George Edward, Alton.
Dickerson, Bernard W., Jr., Clarinda.
Dowling, John Robert, Akron.
Downs, William George, Jr., Sioux City.
Ewing, Michael Lee, Independence.
Ewoldt, Robert Edwin, Whittemore.
Ford, Manzelle Alan, Mount Pleasant.
Garrison, Larry Allen, Council Bluffs.
Grant, Dale Eugene, Des Moines.
Gross, Wayne William, Carroll.
Hahn, Michael Duane, Davenport.
Harms, Lloyd, Mason City.
Harvey, Robert George, Washington.
Hilton, Daniel Jerome, Cedar Falls.
Holland, Douglas Dean, Inwood.
Ives, William Allen, Council Bluffs.
Johnson, Dennis Ogden, Eagle Grove.
Kaplan, Daniel James, Cedar Rapids.
Kinny, Gerald Carl, Toledo.
Kremer, Donald Paul, Aurora.
Lammers, Donald Gary, Forest City.
Lamphier, Larry Gene, Waterloo.
Leamon, William Eugene, Davenport.
Letsch, Robert Donald, Jr., Cedar Falls.
Matthews, Gordon Bruce, Bloomfield.
McCarl, Robert James, Des Moines.
McClain, Kenneth Allen, Exira.
McClain, Richard Aaron, Des Moines.
Meier, Roy Alan, Marion.
Miller, Charles Claude, Mount Pleasant.
Myers, David Wendell, Ames.
Norris, George Clyde, Des Moines.
Powels, Donald Eugene, Red Oak.
Randall, Terrell Lynn, Swisher.
Randolph, Vernon Chester, Bettendorf.
Rendon, Raphael Johnny, Washburn.
Rindone, Michael Gustave, Council Bluffs.
Robins, James Milton, Rose Hill.
Rudd, Richard John, Jr., Keokuk.
Ruden, Matthew Albert, Holy Cross.
Schwarz, Roger Lee, Le Mars.
Slater, John Edward, Marshalltown.
Smith, Craig Lewis, Cedar Rapids.
Smith, Stanley Richard, Marshalltown.
Snitker, Curtis Dean, Cedar Rapids.
Stokes, David Alan, Council Bluffs.
Stroschein, Ronald Robert, Elkader.
Tafolla, Nabor Richard, Oelwein.
Tedesco, James Joseph, Des Moines.
Tracy, John Leo, Swaledale.

Navy

Buckley, Jimmy Lee, Sac City.
Ekart, Paul David, Ottumwa.
Fitzgerald, Michael Thomas, Dubuque.
Fleskes, David Allen, Fort Dodge.
Lake, Ronald Roy, Sioux City.
Olson, Roger Lewis, Fort Dodge.
Poppema, Leroy Warren, Hospers.
Reid, John Lee, Dewitt.
Swaim, Ronald Gail, Des Moines.

KANSAS

Army

Anderson, James Richmond, Scranton.
Arnett, James Douglas, Wichita.
Bailey, Charles Clifford, Eureka.
Barber, Johnnie Ray, Kansas City.
Barrett, George Dwayne, Reading.
Bland, Isaac, Wichita.
Borders, Dareld Norval, Mission.
Bowling, Joseph Perry, Wichita.
Bowman, Donald Robert, Lawrence.
Bradford, Allen Royal, Liberal.
Brenner, David Alden, Parsons.
Brooks, Barton W., Clayton.
Browning, Gary Lee, Hutchinson.
Burnam, Steven Wayne, Wichita.
Canfield, Boyd, Topeka.
Carey, Barton Wainwright, Manhattan.
Christeson, Leonard Wayne, Durham.
Clark, Ronnie Lee, Hugoton.

KANSAS—continued

Army

Cowan, Samuel Paige, Jr., Kansas City.
Cruse, George Larry, Liberal.
Diederich, John Leo, Jennings.
Eckell, John W., Isabel.
Eisenhour, James Doyle, La Crosse.
Ellsworth, Mark Allen, Waterloo.
Evans, Donald Allen, Augusta.
Few, Samuel Arthur, Kansas City.
Fuqua, Harry Ivan, Jr., Leavenworth.
Gandy, Michael L., Dexter.
Gardner, Samuel Ray, Wichita.
Gfeller, John Herbert, Abilene.
Girdner, Robert Oral, Shawnee Mission.
Gooch, Wesley Lee, Leavenworth.
Goode, Jack Dee, Topeka.
Grothaus, Robert John, II, Prairie Village.
Hadley, Leo Larry, Manhattan.
Haywood, Jazreal Levite, Junction City.
Heffner, Steven Clinton, Winfield.
Hendrickson, Gaylord Blain, Mission.
Heskett, James Earl, Hays.
Hilmes, Steven Lee, Ransom.
Horinex, Donald Edward, Wichita.
Humphrey, James Gilbert, Shawnee Mission.
Jarvis, Ronald Alan, Ness City.
Jenkins, Robert Earl, Wichita.
Jimenez, Eduardo, Humboldt.
Johnson, Gary Dale, Baldwin City.
Johnson, Robert Fred, Jr., Kansas City.
Jones, Richard Lee, Wichita.
Jordan, Francis Eugene, Russell Springs.
Kirkendoll, Clee Andrew, Kansas City.
Knowles, Kenneth Joseph, Atchison.
La France, Jon Patrick, Overland Park.
Lamon, Roy Allen, Liberal.
Laskowski, Anthony James, Kansas City.
Le Bombarb, Lonnie Guy, Lawrence.
Lindholm, Dan Victor, Lindsborg.
Love, Darrell Steve, Clearwater.
McDonald, Michael Jay, Wichita.
McGinnis, Lester Cleo, II, Kansas City.
McKain, Bobby Lyn, Garden City.
Meis, Donald David, Wichita.
Merys, Robert Keith, Overland Park.
Miller, Kenneth Walter, Phillipsburg.
Mitchell, Craig Wesley, El Dorado.
Moore, Donald Eugene, Pratt.
Muehlberg, Ronald Lee, Salina.
Neuburger, Daniel Leo, Ellis.
Nufer, James Leo, Dodge City.
Ogle, David Robert, Lyndon.
Osenbaugh, James Dale, Hutchinson.
Pappan, Bobby Jack, Derby.
Partridge, Norman Wayne, Towando.
Petett, Larry Wynn, Shawnee Mission.
Pike, Raymond Horace, Jr., Leavenworth.
Planck, Everett Allen, Winchester.
Prieto, Ruben, Kansas City.
Romine, Albert W., Burlingame.
Runkle, Robert Leslie, Ft. Scott.
Sage, Terence Fairchild, Leavenworth.
Scanlan, Lawrence Walker, Shawnee Mission.
Scott, Dave Russell, Junction City.
Sevick, John Francis, Kansas City.
Sherrill, Amos Chester, II, Stafford.
Simmons, John Stephen, Hoisington.
Small, Norman Eugene, Alden.
Springer, Gerald Wayne, Prescott.
Standeford, James Michael, Chetopa.
Stewart, Leonard Keith, Salina.
Stewart, Michael Henry, Wichita.
Stone, George Davidson, Shawnee Mission.
Swazick, Danny George, Kansas City.
Tinkum, Ether Arnold, Wichita.
Todd, Jimmie Lester, Herington.
Toomes, Willis Albert, Shawnee Mission.
Treas, Richard Lee, Muncie.
Turner, James Earl, El Dorado.
Urban, Robert Lee, Hays.
Warren, Larry Dean, Liberal.
Webb, Johnny Robert, Chanute.
West, Paul Edward, Shawnee
Whitehead, Thomas Leroy, Wichita.
Williams, Thomas Vernon, Jr., Lakin.
Wilson, Michael Lund, Hutchinson.
Zeller, Michael Charles, Wamego.

KANSAS—continued

Air Force

Brenner, David George, Manhattan.
Davis, Yale Rezin, Jr., Salina.
Long, George Wendell, Medicine.

Marine Corps

Avila, Thomas Robert, Wichita.
Barksdale, Jerry Dean, Berryton.
Berger, Gerald David, Topeka.
Berwert, Patrick Michael, Topeka.
Camden, Johnnie Roger, Wichita.
Chapman, Kurtis Nolan, Overland Park.
Coon, Kieth David Ed Will, Topeka.
Davis, Charles Eugene, Wichita.
Davis, John Lawrence, Pleasanton.
Doornbos, Don Michael, Wichita.
Gadson, Eddie Dean, Salina.
Glynn, Dennis Wayne, Shawnee Mission.
Gorman, Edward T., III, Manhattan.
Gosselin, Philip Lyn, Topeka.
Grace, Martin Joseph, Jr., Topeka.
Hale, Victor, Topeka.
Harris, John James, Iola.
Hazelwood, John Edward, Gypsum.
Hoffman, William David, Russell.
Janke, Theodore, Jr., Salina.
Lacey, Franklin D., Meriden.
LaPlant, Kurt Elton, Lenexa.
Long, Jerome Albert, Beloit.
Long, Melvin Ray, Topeka.
Loyd, Lonny Lee, Kansas City.
McGonigle, William Dee, Wichita.
McTeer, Jeffery Clark, Overland Park.
Miller, Timmy Larry, Stockton.
Moore, James Ezra, Kansas City.
Mora, Raymond Castillo, Kansas City.
Mounts, Jerry Duane, Wichita.
Nelson, David Reid, Hutchinson.
Ornelas, Carl John, Wichita.
Owens, Timothy Eugene, Kansas City.
Phillips, Marlen LeRoy, Bucklin.
Porras, Juan, Kansas City.
Roberts, Richard Stephen, Kansas City.
Salinas, Phillip Louie, Leoti.
Scates, Charles Edward, Jr., Newton.
Smith, Kenneth, Wayne, Bethel.
Travis, Michael Richard, Wichita.
Whiters, Donald Emery, Wichita.
Zutterman, Joseph A., Jr., Marysville.

Navy

Anderson, Denis Leon, Hope.
Comer, William Marvin, Jr., Larned.
Griffin, Patrick Joseph, Topeka.
Hinton, Rodney Gene, Topeka.
Ingrum, Joseph Henry, Abilene.
McDermott, John Patrick, Pittsburg.
Nevins, Eldon Eugene, Osborne.
Wards, Dan Thomas, Paola.

KENTUCKY

Army

Akers, Dennis Owen, Louisville.
Aldridge, Willie Gene, Winchester.
Allen, James William, Ashland.
Anderson, Walter Evan, Jr., Lexington.
Aton, Paul Douglas, Franklin.
Baney, William Gerald, Jr., Hardin County.
Bates, Norman William, Louisville.
Bauerle, Fredrick E., III, Dayton.
Belcher, Jordan, Dorton.
Berryman, Luther Clark, Paris.
Bishop, Roger Earl, Louisville.
Blackburn, Freddie Andray, Lexington.
Bolt, August Ferrel, Louisville.
Boone, Danny Lee, Ludlow.
Bradley, Given West, Paducah.
Braghini, Roberto, Jr., Radcliff.
Branson, Daniel Alexander, Hopkinsville.
Bratcher, Charlie Aruce, Caneyville.
Bridgeman, Billy Wayne, Virgie.
Brown, Eddie Wayne, Jamestown.
Bryant, Kenneth Mark, Cold Spring.
Buckley, James Andrew, Coal Run.
Burton, Ernest, Ewing.
Busby, William Leon, Henderson.
Bush, Pearl, Little.
Butler, Donald Ray, Morehead.
Butler, Thomas Lynn, Monroe.
Campbell, Robert Lewis, Lancaster.

KENTUCKY—continued

Army

Cauley, Roger Dale, Owensboro.
Cayson, Alvin Lloyd, Lexington.
Chaffins, Ernest, Jr., Hitchins.
Cole, Billy Joe, Guthrie.
Colegrove, Robert Howard, Grayson.
Coleman, Richard Clyde, Henderson.
Collins, Clyde Cecil, Jackson.
Cornett, Carlos Wayne, Flatwoods.
Cossey, Ricky Fay, Cadiz.
Cox, Rube Arthur, Jr., Strunk.
Denham, James Virl, Richmond.
Dennison, Cortland Ellis, Cave City.
Dick, Boyce Ray, Monticello.
Downard, Clyde David, Jr., Foster.
Eldridge, William Franklin, Covington.
Elliott, Lavaughn, Russellville.
Fields, Julian Thomas, Pikeville.
Fields, Kelly, Pikeville.
Fletcher, Robert Melvin, Lynn.
Foster, Billy Rex, Monticello.
Galloway, Robert Glenn, Berea.
Gibson, James Thurman, Amburgey.
Glisson, James Edwin, Benton.
Goff, Aubrey, Jr., Louisville.
Goodall, Herman Glendaee, Beaver Dam.
Graham, Charles Wayne, Richardsville.
Graves, James Eddie, Drake.
Gray, Robert Edward, Corbin.
Green, Jeffrey Wallace, Bowling Green.
Greene, Lawrence Douglass, Fort Knox.
Grismer, Edgar Joseph, Louisville.
Hannah, Freddie Jarrel, Van Lear.
Hardin, Kenneth Allen, Morehead.
Hardwick, Jimmy Wayne, Louisa.
Harris, Jimmy Leo, Louisville.
Hathorne, James Coleman, Jr., Louisville.
Hayes, Christopher Lynn, Louisville.
Hayes, George Franklin, Busy.
Helm, Carl Benjamin, Louisville.
Henson, Clifton, Liberty.
Hereau, Danny Edward, Louisville.
Hettich, Alan Joseph, Louisville.
Highlander, Micky Ray, Dayton.
Hinkle, Kenneth Daniel, Manchester.
Hodge, Russell Addison, Crab Orchard.
Hokenson, Wayne Allen, Louisville.
Hopkins, William Robert, Pikeville.
Hornbuckle, Clarence E., Jr., Ashland.
Hubble, William Baker, Waynesburg.
Hurry, Samuel Green, Covington.
Isom, David, Cottongim.
Jackson, Larry Richard, Bettle.
Jameson, David Allen, Providence.
Jefferson, Jerry Wayne, Paris.
Johnson, Dohn William, Louisville.
Johnson, Lowell, Melvin.
Jones, John Lee, Madisonville.
Jones, Larry Hugh, Owensboro.
Kidd, Donald Eugene, Louisville.
Kihnley, George Matthew, Louisville.
Kirchner, Henry Joseph, Jr., Louisville.
Knight, Johnnie David, Williamstown.
Kramer, Arthur Theodore, Jr., Burlington.
Law, William Larry, Greenup.
Lawson, Thomas Junior, Beverly.
Lee, James Richard, Louisville.
Lindsey, Johnny Warner, Fredonia.
Littleton, David Ernest, Olive Hill.
Lively, Paul Johnson, Cynthiana.
Lockard, David Lee, Louisville.
Lynch, Michael Henry, Louisville.
Maggard, Larry Dwight, Isom.
Martin, Samuel Calvin, Greensburg.
Mason, Larry Joe, Sr., Louisville.
Matlock, John Phillip, Louisville.
Matlock, McKenley Odis, Barbourville.
Maynard, Darrell Wayne, Scottsville.
McCollum, Ronald Lee, Covington.
McCubbins, Larry James, Fairdale.
McFaddin, Larry Ronald, Paintsville.
Metcalf, Carl Joseph, Jr., Louisville.
Midkiff, O. L., Dunbee.
Miller, Donald Robert, Henderson.
Miller, Hubert Wayne, Elizabethtown.
Million, Ronald Lee, Danville.
Miracle, James, Jr., Pineville.
Molnar, Istvan, Hopkinsville.
Morton, George Winston, Lexington.

XUM

KENTUCKY—continued

Army

Mueller, Michael David, Louisville.
Mulkey, Jeff, Banner.
Mullins, Earnest Randall, Elkhorn City.
Nash, David Paul, Whitesville.
Nester, Roger, Mount Sterling.
Niewahner, Ronald Leo, Ludlow.
Norris, James Raphael, New Haven.
Overton, Wince Issac, Jr., Pineville.
Perdue, Donald M., Beattyville.
Perkins, Johnnie Kay, Louisville.
Perry, Claude, Pathfork.
Petters, Ralph Edward, Bonneville.
Pfeister, Robert, Louisville.
Philbeck, Donald Dewayne, Richmond.
Poole, Charles Burton, Maceo.
Price, William David, Samuels.
Puckett, Roger Dale, Bowling Green.
Ramey, Thomas Randell, Tomahawk.
Randolph, Richard Wayne, Greenville.
Ray, David L., Louisville.
Redmon, Larry Ray, Salvisa.
Robinson, Joseph Bruce, Ashland.
Robinson, Nathan Lyen, Harrodsburg.
Rowland, George Clayton, Jr., Owensboro.
Russell, Charles Glenn, Louisville.
Scheiber, William Henry, Jr., Louisville.
Scott, Sammy Lee, Peytonsburg.
Seaton, David Thomas, Fordsville.
Seaton, Robert Wayne, Kevil.
Secress, Harlan, Hebron.
Shain, Jerry Wayne, Cromwell.
Sherrill, Jimmy L., Morgantown.
Shirley, Carl Eugene, Louisville.
Shrum, Leon Jerry, Bowling Green.
Smith, Albert Douglas, Glasgow.
Smith, Billy, Edmonton.
Smith, Robert Lewis, Smithland.
Spencer, Eugene, Bellevue.
Squires, David Ray, Louisville.
Tackett, Ruben Noah, McRoberts.
Terry, Philip Allen, Lexington.
Thompson, Myron, Manchester.
Tomlinson, Edgar Lee, Williamstown.
Torres, Estevan, Hopkinsville.
Vanderpool, Edward Lee, Beattyville.
Vibbert, Carlos Dyral, Louisville.
Waford, Hubert Earl, Shelbyville.
Walker, George Nelson, Adolphus.
Walls, Walter Lee, Louisville.
Watson, William L., Louisville.
Weddington, Phillip Murry, Valley Station.
Weill, John Bruce, Owensboro.
Welch, Randall Edward, Covington.
Wester, Donald Lee, Cleaton.
White, Sylvain Larry, Vine Grove.
Whitehead, Alfred Evarts, Harlan.
Wilkinson, Gary, Murray.
Williams, James A., Paducah.

Air Force

Bennett, James Harvey, Cynthiana.
Dixon, Warren Mitchell, Catlettsburg.
Martin, Harreld Pirtle, Cromwell.
Rose, Johnny, Jr., Williamsport.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Delmer, Bellevue.
Andrew, Joseph Carlisle, Auburn.
Armstrong, Wardell Lester, Glasgow.
Becker, John Bertram, Cold Springs-Highland Heights.
Bertram, David Michael, Campbellsville.
Binkley, Steven Ray, Louisville.
Blair, Kenneth Neal, Louisville.
Bowling, Bradley, Demossville.
Burrows, Roger Thomas, Georgetown.
Caldwell, Charles Warren E., Rush.
Cambron, Joseph Terry, Louisville.
Coldeman, Charles Loyd, Louisville.
Dorris, Claude Hesson, Louisville.
Durham, David Terrell, Corbin.
Fiechter, Johnny Patton, London.
Fields, Jerry, Lexington.
Fitts, Richard Lee, Jr., Louisville.
Floyd, Edwin Zeke, Lexington.
Frye, Earl Wayne, Franklin.
Green, Robert Carl, Jr., Louisville.
Hamilton, Willie Charles L., Louisville.
Harris, Robert Eugene, Russell.
Hendrix, Charles Rodney, Louisville.

KENTUCKY—continued

Marine Corps

Hilbert, Jerry Lee, Louisville.
Hughes, William Burdick, Vanceburg.
Jones, David Allen, Fort Thomas.
Knight, Alvin Coy, Elizabethtown.
Lancaster, John Manning, Louisville.
Lawson, Stanley Garfield, Shelbyville.
Litton, Gary Wayne, Fort Mitchell.
Loschiavo, Thomas Lee, Covington.
Lowery, Carl Cecil, Lexington.
Luttrell, James Lee, Owensboro.
Mallory, Connard Darrell, Lewisburg.
Marshall, James Edwards, Lexington.
Marshall, Samuel Thomas, Jr., Covington.
Mayberry, Gerald Wayne, Franklin.
McKinney, Raymond Bruce, Covington.
McMackins, Reuben Carl, Jr., Valley Station.
Melczek, Joe Roger, Insko.
Mitchell, Donald Wayne, Princeton.
Moore, Larry Gene, Owensboro.
Murray, Cecil Scott, Louisville.
Newsome, Kenneth Ray, Ashland.
Pannell, Harry Clayburn, Canmer.
Parsons, John Robert, Combs.
Payne, Herman Garfield, Whitesville.
Pembleton, Ronald Lee, Nicholasville.
Ratliff, Larry Gene, Louisa.
Renfro, Franklin, Jr., Richmond.
Retschulte, Thomas Howard, Covington.
Rutherford, Ernest Wayne, Smiths Grove.
Sanford, Albert Russell, Russellville.
Schaefer, William Hays, Louisville.
Schaffner, Jack Dohn, Louisville.
Scholl, Clifford Leo, Louisville.
Simon, Michael Wayne, Owensboro.
Singleton, Arthur Dwight, Valley Station.
Smith, Charles Allan, Louisville.
Smith, Gary Holden, Pleasure Ridge Park.
Sowards, David Michael, West Liberty.
Sumpter, Bobby Rece, California.
Sweatt, George Edward, Bowling Green.
Terrell, Calvin Lee, Louisville.
Tolliver, Jimmy Ellison, Cromona.
Vick, William Leon, Paducah.
Webb, Paul Henley, Elsmere.
Whalen, Charles Arthur, Berry.
Wilhoit, Howard Ray, Jr., Ludlow.

Navy

Aker, Jeffrey Scott, Covington.
Ash, Robert Everett, Pleasure Ridge Park.
Ashby, Clayborn Willis, Jr., Louisville.
Bechtel, Stephan Leroy, Harrodsburg.
Bobb, John Franklin, Erlanger.
Cruse, James Dale, Paducah.
Moore, Thomas Philip, Louisville.
Salyer, Fred Lamarr, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Army

Ackerman, Dennis Carlton, Gretna.
Adams, Joseph, New Orleans.
Ainsworth, Kenneth John, Harahan.
Alford, Thomas Earl, III., Mer Rouge.
Andry, Hilaire Albert, Jr., Metairie.
Austin, Michael Francis, Crowley.
Babin, Thomas Dalton, Jr., Baton Rouge.
Ballard, Robert Irving, West Monroe.
Bandy, Michael J., Bridge.
Bass, Budrow, Jr., Jonesville.
Baugh, Charles Lee, Grand Isle.
Beckwith, Edward Coe, Trout.
Bennett, Robert Vernon, New Orleans.
Berry, Jackie Wayne, Olla.
Billeaud, Willis J., Jr., Broussard.
Blocker, Murrie Lee, New Orleans.
Bob, Chester, Grand Coteau.
Booker, Harvey Watkins, New Orleans.
Bradley, Louis Lloyd, Jr., Metairie.
Bratton, John Leslie, West Monroe.
Bridges, William Lee, Sulphur.
Bryant, Russell David, Jr., Fort Polk.
Burke, Charles Morris, Mandeville.
Burns, Robert George, Lake Charles.
Butler, Gordon, New Orleans.
Calhoon, Donald Eugene, New Orleans.
Clark, Thomas, Jr., Shreveport.
Cobb, Raymond, New Orleans.
Cole, Emile, Baton Rouge.
Colson, Donald Reginald, Monroe.

LOUISIANA—continued

Army

Cooper, Ira Daunette, Bogalusa.
Cotton, Michael, Alexandria.
Croxdale, Jack Lee, II, Lake Charles.
Daigrepont, Robert Lynn, Bunkie.
Daniels, Raymond Louis, Starks.
Darby, James Michael, Harvey.
Davis, Clifton Anthony, Farmerville.
Davis, Steven Frederick, Shreveport.
Davis, Thomas J., III, Shreveport.
Evans, Johnny Lee, Baton Rouge.
Feller, David Kent, Maplewood.
Firmin, Mitchell Lawrence, Cottonport.
Fournet, Douglas Bernard, Lake Charles.
Garrett, Alfred Douglas, Alexandria.
Gerdes, Albert Bruno, Jr., New Orleans.
Glenn, Robert Lee, Jr., Marrero.
Graham, Joseph Harold, Jena.
Guillory, Hubia Jude, New Orleans.
Gullung, Joseph Frank, III, New Orleans.
Haley, Jerry Rankin, Bastrop.
Hampton, Isaac de Vand, Shreveport.
Heath, Douglas Randolph, Kenner.
Henderson, Anthony Joseph, Morganza.
Hetzler, Larry Glen, Westlake.
Hill, James Marshall, Oak Grove.
Hoskins, John Thomas, Sulphur.
Hubbard, Marvin Peter, New Orleans.
Jackson, Abraham, Opelousas.
Jackson, Ray Lee, Jonesboro.
Jackson, Willie, Clinton.
Jerson, James Ray, New Orleans.
Johnson, Victor, Jr., Donaldsonville.
Johnston, Paul Kinard, Sterlington.
Jones, Charles Wayne, Baskin.
Jones, Henry, Jr., Bains.
Jones, Reuben, Jr., De Quincy.
Juneau, Michael Joseph, Hessmer.
Kellogg, Alton Delany, Bossier City.
Kemp, Charlie Edward, Baton Rouge.
Kirkwood, Deryl Ramon, Baton Rouge.
Kujawa, Larry Frank, St. Martinville.
Lachney, Floyd Camille, Alexandria.
Le Blanc, Gerald Thomas, Port Allen.
Lemoine, William Francis, Kenner.
Lewis, Freddie, Alexandria.
Lockett, Lloyd, Centerville.
London, Earl, New Orleans.
Lyons, Quillard Frank, De Ridder.
McClendon William W., Jr., New Orleans.
McDuffy, Robert Louis, Coushatta.
McKinney, Charles Anthony, Donaldsonville.
McManus, Jerry Doyne, Atlanta.
Miller, Anthony, Edgard.
Moak, Clifton Pearce, Baton Rouge.
Moore, Anthony Louis, Pride.
Moppert, Eugene Meyers, New Orleans.
Narcisse, Paul, Point a la Hache.
Ortego, Gerald M., Simmesport.
Payne, Ernest, Baton Rouge.
Pea, Edward Earl, Grand Cane.
Peters, Albert James, Bogalusa.
Pool, Charles Leo, Tangipahoa.
Potier, Milton Phillip, Gueydan.
Pounds, Ronnie Louis, Kenner.
Price, Michael Glen, Trout.
Quebodeaux, William C., Jr., Crowley.
Reid, Winfield Walter, Ponchatoula.
Robinson, Francis Joseph, New Orleans.
Robledo, Raul, Shreveport.
Sanders, James Edgar, Jr., Kentwood.
Sanders, Robert Herndon, Marthaville.
Sharpley, Leonard Cosby, New Orleans.
Sikes, Bobbie Earl, Extension.
Singleton, George James, Baton Rouge.
Smith, David Leon, Marrero.
Smith, Robert, Converse.
Spence, Edgar Clay, Baton Rouge.
Stein, Armond Joseph, Donaldsonville.
Stephens, Danny Lynn, Logansport.
Stewart, Edward, Monroe.
Stewart, Ulysses, New Orleans.
Talton, Bobby Ray, West Monroe.
Tate, Tony Larue, Thibodaux.
Taylor, Duncan, Jr., Alexandria.
Thomas, Charlie Bernard, Ethel.
Thomas, Isiah, Washington.
Thompson, Perry Eddison, New Iberia.
Tweedy, Vernno Ruben, New Orleans.

LOUISIANA—continued

Army

Valentine, Joseph Ronald, Prairieville.
Venable, Joseph Alvin, Clinton.
Verrett, Durwood Wayne, Monroe.
Vidrine, Terrel James, Ville Platte.
Washington, Douglas Mac, Waterproof.
Washington, King David, Abbeville.
Williams, Ernest C., Jr., Thibodaux.
Wilson, James William, Shreveport.
Wolfe, Abra Joseph, Jr., Houma.
Wood, Bobby Clyde, Monroe.
Yelverton, Don Junior, Houma.
Young, Leroy Joseph, Thibodaux.
Youngblood, Charles Eugene, Shreveport.

Air Force

Cradeur, Douglas Joseph, Sulphur.
Mercer, Pollard Hugh, Jr., Winnfield.
Ratliff, James Lee, Ferriday.

Marine Corps

Abshire, Richard Franklin, Abbeville.
Acosta, James Arthur, Jr., New Orleans.
Barrows, Irving Donald, De Ridder.
Branch, George Allen, Minden.
Breaux, Leonard, Reserve.
Brignac, Joseph Paul, Gonzales.
Burgess, Ruben Anthony, New Orleans.
Chabert, Gary August, Metairie.
Cross, Herbert Terrell, Oakdale.
Dair, Albert Joseph, Lake Charles.
De La Houssaye, Arthur, Jr., Lafayette.
Derryberry, Abraham R., III, Shreveport.
Doherty, Guy Woods, New Orleans.
Ezell, William Benjamin, West Monroe.
Faulk, Theodore Alphonse, Baton Rouge.
Feucht, James Donald, Eunice.
Fletcher, John Earl, Ft. Polk.
Gauthier, Gerald Paul, St. Martinville.
Glasper, William Lawrence, Baton Rouge.
Gloer, David Lawrence, Sibley.
Guillory, Wendell, Church Point.
Hampton, Charles Vernon, Jr., Livingston.
Hampton, Edmond, New Orleans.
Hayes, Phillips, III, New Orleans.
Hays, William Brian, Baton Rouge.
Heaps, John Wayne, Shreveport.
Hill, James Louis, Ponchatoula.
Howard, Roy William, Baton Rouge.
Impson, Douglas Gerald, Denham Springs.
Jack, Wilson, Jr., Ville Platte.
Johnson, Clayton Henry, New Orleans.
Jones, Melvin Lewis, Shreveport.
Lassiter, John Alfred, Slidell.
Le Blanc, Alfred Leroy, Ponchatoula.
Lee, Robert Charles, Shreveport.
Lejeune, Horrace Joseph, Jr., Crowley.
Lewis, Clarence Henry, Plaquemine.
Menard, Louis Uisville, Jr., Houma.
Miller, Arthur, Jr., Dalcour.
Miller, Charlie Reuben, Jr., Bossier City.
Molaison, Gordon Thomas, Thibodaux.
Monday, Alvin, Eunice.
Moore, Kenneth Charles, New Orleans.
Morgan, Charles Richard, Rayville.
O'Neal, Harold, Jr., Shreveport.
Orso, Prinis Wilson, New Orleans.
Peralta, Raphael Alexander, New Orleans.
Pousson, Michael Wayne, Iota.
Prather, Henry Lee, III, Shreveport.
Reid, Joseph Clark, Baton Rouge.
Richardson, James Douglas, New Orleans.
Romero, Ronald James, Youngsville.
Scott, Robert Lee, Houma.
Seamster, Willie Purfoy, Minden.
Seebode, John Conrad, Morgan City.
Semon, Kenneth Ronald, Shreveport.
Skinner, Claiborne John, De Quincy.
Terhune, Daryl Bert, Jr., Harvey.
Thibodeaux, Edward Joseph, Greenwell Springs.
Thomas, Kenneth Lee, Doyline.
Trainham, Thomas Neil, Metairie.
Tuyes, Donald Glenn, Metairie.
Walker, James Edward, New Orleans.
Wallace, Vernon Martin, Winnfield.
Weekley, Russell Joseph, Sulphur.
Welch, Thomas Edward, Springhill.
Williams, Howard Clayton, Gueydan.
Williams, Jimmy, Eunice.
Williber, Gerald Paul, New Orleans.

LOUISIANA—continued

Navy

Eldridge, Thomas Charles, New Iberia.
Fontenot, Chester Joseph C., Luling.
Kempff, Ronald Warren, New Orleans.
Ledford, Steve Dennis, Ruston.
Passafume, Michael Jay, Chalmette.
Songne, Darnell Joseph, Abbeville.
Warren, Jeider Jackson, Castor.
Wheat, Gene Joseph, Pineville.

MAINE

Army

Alexander, David Harold, Sanford.
Bailey, George Leroy, New Sharon.
Barker, Paul Leroy, South Paris.
Bell, Gilbert Stevens, Jr., Augusta.
Bernard, Theodore Daniel, Mexico.
Blain, Dennis Knut, Portland.
Brooks, Lyle Gibson, Ogunquit.
Buck, Hollis Winfield, West Paris.
Cayford, Phillip J., Jr., Brewer.
Colosanti, Norman Edward, Portland.
Cyr, Wayne Clifton, Bath.
Deschenes, James George, Bangor.
Dulac, Malcolm Cyril, Dexter.
Ferguson, William Glen, Jr., South Portland.
Fitch, Dellwyn Allen, Perham.
Fitch, Ronald Russell, Brunswick.
Gagnon, John Edgar, Caribou.
Gregoire, Miles Robert, Wells.
Harrington, William Freder, South Paris.
Heal, Henry Albert, Jr., Milo.
Heath, Joseph Emerson, Brewer.
Hoyt, Arthur James, Mars Hill.
Knight, John Wallace, Berwick.
Libby, John H., Portland.
Manchester, John Smythe, Lisbon Falls.
McHugh, Frederick William, Bangor.
Michaud, Benton, Fort Kent.
Michaud, Leo Edward, Hallowell.
Milledge, Frederick Raymon, Mexico.
Morrill, Fred William, Limerick.
Plourde, Victor M., Oakland.
Quirion, Joseph G. L., Jr., Skowhegan.
Shuman, William Conrad, Waldoboro.
Smith, James Allen, Portland.
Walker, Harold Everett, Jr., Auburn.

Marine Corps

Almon, William Russell, Auburn.
Bean, Stephen Louis, Saco.
Borduas, Raymond Arthur, Biddeford.
Cash, John Harold, Jr., Sanford.
Chase, James Francis, Howland.
Corson, Terry Charles, Skowhegan.
Cox, David Auston, Fort Fairfield.
Crowell, Arthur Albert, Unity.
Deschaine, Normand Camille, Lewiston.
Deschenes, Michael Hubert, Auburn.
Dickinson, Leslie A., Jr., Patton.
Ferguson, Thomas Bernard, Rumford.
Frost, Carlton Andrew, Winslow.
Googins, Douglas E., Jr., Yarmouth.
Guay, Herve Joseph, Biddeford.
Lofstrom, Leland Eddy, Oakland.
Mann, Edward Leonard, Jr., Bangor.
Mansfield, Donald Lewis, Rockland.
Matthews, Richard Lee, Portland.
Moody, Thomas John, Guilford.
Nicholson, James Paton, Eliot.
Salinas, David Gregory, Bangor.
Sangillo, Wayne, Milo.
Smith, Eldon Wayne, Waterville.
Stewart, Richard John, East Lebanon.
Thibodeau, David Paul, Rumford.
Toppi, Christopher John, South Portland.
Ward, Allen, Lea, Skowhegan.
West, James Russell, Gray.

Navy

Bryant, Philip Sherwood, Turner.
Elliot, Arthur James, II, Thomaston.
McKenney, Norman Laforest, Thorndike.

MARYLAND

Army

Abernathy, Robert William, Rockville.
Allport, James Sherwood, Marlow Heights.
Amoss, Russell Monroe, Mount Airy.
Ansell, John Arthur, Jr., Bladensburg.
Anzelone, Paul Robert, College Park.

MARYLAND—continued

Army

Barclay, Frederick Allen, Silver Spring.
Barnes, John Howard, Baltimore.
Bates, James Leon, Bowie.
Bazemore, Earl Sherman, Baltimore.
Beard, Jack Allen, Boonsboro.
Bedsole, Charles Arthur, Severna Park.
Begosh, Martin John, Rockville.
Betts, Albert Leon, Baltimore.
Bifareti, John Anthony, Jr., Rockville.
Blades, Thomas Nelson, Easton.
Blake, Danny Lee, Baltimore.
Boardman, Edward Allen, Pasadena.
Bounds, Gary Lee, Salisbury.
Bowman, Reginald Alonzo, Baltimore.
Boyce, McDonald E., Baltimore.
Brewer, Michael Leon, Frederick.
Bryant, Roscoe Edward, Baltimore.
Buggs, Nathaniel, Jr., Baltimore.
Bullen, Lawrence Randolph, Oxford.
Burdette, Lanny Joe, Baltimore.
Byrd, Nolan Daryl, Hagerstown.
Caldwell, Donald Patrick, Berwyn Heights.
Canapp, Gary Edward, Baltimore.
Cantler, Dennis Richard, Baltimore.
Carter, Harvey William, Glen Burnie.
Cassidy, William Edward, Baltimore.
Castro, Joaquin, Mount Ranier.
Clark, Larry Monroe, Olney.
Clover, Lionel Timothy, College Park.
Coleman, Ronald Allen, Baltimore.
Cook, Audrey Julius, Baltimore.
Cox, George Marion, II, Baltimore.
Czajkowski, Joseph Verbert, Baltimore.
Davis, James Norris, Riverdale.
Davis, Lawrence Arnold, Lothian.
De Marr, John Charles, Jr., White Plains.
Dize, George Harland, Crisfield.
Dyson, Leslie Milton, Jr., Takoma Park.
Ecton, Harry Leon, Boonsboro.
Eder, William John, Baltimore.
Edwards, John Paul, Baltimore.
Evans, Cecil Vaughn, Salisbury.
Evans, Jeffrey Alan, Baltimore.
Feezer, John Harvey, Marriottsville.
Fitez, Harry Samuel, Jr., Ellicott City.
Fossett, Norman Archie, Baltimore.
Foy, Thomas Walter, Baltimore.
Fulton, Clarence, Baltimore.
Gaffney, Edward Albert, Baltimore.
Gibis, Michael E., Gambrills.
Gilliam, George Harvey, Baltimore.
Gilliam, Ronald Stuart, Hyattsville.
Goldberg, Benjamin Niles, Baltimore.
Golder, Edward Enoch, III, Baltimore.
Gorschboth, Roland Allen, Baltimore.
Graser, John William, Frederick.
Gray, Francis Garfield, Laurel.
Greenfield, John Arthur, Hughesville.
Gutrick, Donald Maurice, Nanjemoy.
Hackney, Tate Talmage, III, Hillside.
Hall, James Bucker, Rockville.
Hammersla, James Russell, Reisterstown.
Hanna, Gary W., Ellicott City.
Harbert, Charles Walter, Brunswick.
Hardesty, Michael Owen, Galesville.
Harris, James Louis, Baltimore.
Havas, Stephen Lawrence, Camp Springs.
Henson, Alvah Worrell, Jr., Laurel.
Himes, Clyde Steven, Myersville.
Holcomb, John Palmore, Baltimore.
Hughes, Marion Bennett, Jr., Salisbury.
Itzoe, Robert Anthony, Baltimore.
Jennings, James Lewis, Baltimore.
Johns, Frank Howard, Baltimore.
Jones, Everett Sorrell, Baltimore.
Julia, Jon Albert, Bethesda.
Keller, Wayne Arnold, Silver Spring.
Kline, Harold Franklin, Frederick.
Koehne, Rodney Howard, Baltimore.
Krom, Kenneth Lionel, Walkersville.
Letmate, George Caroll, Baltimore.
Lockard, Alan Carroll, Baltimore.
Lucas, Allen Lee, Pasadena.
Lytton, Balfour Oliver, Jr., Rockville.
Mack, Earl, Cambridge.
Manello, Frank Ronald, Baltimore.
Martin, Harold Douglas, Silver Spring.
Mason, Raymond Leroy, Baltimore.
Mattaro, Donald James, Jr., Langley Park.

XUM

MARYLAND—continued

Army

Mello, Anthony Joseph, Baltimore.
Milberry, Russell E., Union Bridge.
Miller, Joseph John, Jr., Baltimore.
Miller, Vernon Joseph, Jr., Baltimore.
Moore, Thomas Woodrow, Ellicott City.
Moore, Wesley Rice, Jr., College Park.
Moulden, John, Harwood.
Mulcahy, John Edwin Charle, Baltimore.
Muse, Mario Fowler, Jr., Baltimore.
Myers, George Lee, Baltimore.
Nielson, John Leif, Takoma Park.
Nitsche, Richard Edmund, Jr., Severna Park.
O'Keefe, Roy Tulane, Chevy Chase.
Oliver, Tony Sylvester, Baltimore.
Owen, Dean Gilman, Camp Springs.
Owens, George Adam, Baltimore.
Parks, Donald Jerald, Baltimore.
Penson, Daniel L., Baltimore.
Perkins, Calvin Moore, Baltimore.
Plunkard, John Francis, Frederick.
Powell, Raymond, Jr., Baltimore.
Powers, Vernie Homer, Baltimore.
Pryor, Thomas William, Fort Holabird.
Purwin, Antoni Boguslaw, Baltimore.
Rehberger, Charles George, Baltimore.
Reynolds, Sherwood, Prince Frederick.
Rhodes, Curtis Allen, Swanton.
Riffle, Joseph Henry, White Marsh.
Robinson, William D., Jr., Reisterstown.
Ross, Willie James, Baltimore.
Roy, Clifton Douglas, Woodlawn.
Saunders, Ronald, Baltimore.
Scheap, Frank Joseph, Baltimore.
Schroeder, George H., Jr., Baltimore.
Selby, Robert B., Baltimore.
Sigler, Adrian Edward, Fort George Meade.
Simmeth, Maximilian Heinri, Bel Air.
Singleton, Edward, Jr., Baltimore.
Sirbaugh, Thomas Edward, Oakland.
Smith, Alfred Douglas, Jr., Rockville.
Smith, Allen Thomas, Baltimore.
Smith, Charles Daniel, Suitland.
Snodgrass, William Leonard, Gambrills.
Squarrell, Samuel Luvene, Baltimore.
Stafford, Harold Richard, Baltimore.
States, John Wayne, Baltimore.
Stevenson, Lawrence Edward, Baltimore.
Stockman, David Lynn, Baltimore.
Stoneking, Danny Mire, Baltimore.
Summers, John Thomas, III, Baltimore.
Szekely, Akos Dezso, Silver Spring.
Thomas, John Charles, Baltimore.
Thompson, John Patrick, Baltimore.
Thompson, John Walter, Brinklaw.
Tibbs, Eugene Costella, Sellman.
Titus, Donald Robert, Highland.
Tolliver, Larry Lee, Churchville.
Traylor, Marthell, Jr., Camp Springs.
Tremblay, James Allan, Glen Burnie.
Turner, Charles Herbert, Jr., Baltimore.
Twigg, Joseph Richard, Jr., Cumberland.
Vaden, Robert William, Camp Springs.
Varney, Willie Ross, Aberdeen.
Watkins, Alton Lamotte, Jr., Hyattsville.
Watkins, Harry Lee, Jr., Hagerstown.
Watson, Paul Edward, Baltimore.
Wernsdorfer, Gerald Francis, Baltimore.
West, Dallas Arnold, Edgewater.
Williams, Rayner Edward, Baltimore.
Willingham, John Davis, Salisbury.
Wilson, Virgil Henry, Jr., Golts.
Wingfield, Albert Green, Jr., Owings Mills.
Winston, Thurman William, Trappe.
Wojcicky, John Leo, Baltimore.
Woodland, Thomas S., Jr., Indian Head.
Youngham, James Dominio, Glen Burnie.
Zimmerman, William E., Jr., Frederick.

Air Force

Flanagan, Sherman E., Jr., Westminster.
Hartman, Eugene Winfield, Silver Springs.
Mills, Roger Bertha, Havre De Grace.

Marine Corps

Adams, Stephen Hamilton, Clarksville.
Anastasio, Vincent John, Baltimore.
Arrowood, James Oscar, Cumberland.
Bissell, William Ronald, Cabin John.
Brashears, Larry Franklin, Walkersville.

MARYLAND—continued

Marine Corps

Brazier, John Kenneth, Baltimore.
Briscoe, John Arnold, Baltimore.
Brown, Robert Wilson, Jr., Centreville.
Buchanan, Robert Butler, Baltimore.
Campanello, Darrell Edward, Silver Spring.
Carbaugh, Woodrow Franklin, Thurmont.
Carter, George Albert, Baltimore.
Chase, John Lenwood. Lexington Park.
Chin, Alexander Scheleph, Baltimore.
Christopher, Wayne Edward, Lansdowne.
Cole, Ernest Wesley, Silver Spring.
Cox, Jehu Junis, Jr., Baltimore.
Coyne, Kevin Mark, Silver Spring.
Craft, Ezra Delano, Baltimore.
Daffin, Gary Robert, Baltimore.
Decker, Steven William, Woodlawn.
Derrill, Carroll Edward, Baltimore.
Dickerson, James Egbert, College Park.
Dieudonne, Carroll Stephen, Silver Spring.
Drosd, Walter Lloyd, Kensington.
Fickus, John Zang, Baltimore.
Foster, William Henry, Severn.
Griggs, Michael Allen, Bowie.
Groomes, Muriel Stanley, Hampstead.
Hicks, Norman Edward, Jr., Baltimore.
Hitchcock, Raymond, R., Jr., Harve De Grace.
Hopkins, William Kennis, Wheaton.
Horton, Robert Bernard, Timonium.
Hussman, Kurt Christopher, Hyattsville.
Hutzell, John Franklin, Williamsport.
Johnson, David Rudolph, Brooklyn Park.
Johnson, Eugene Melvin, Jr., Baltimore.
Jones, Donald Ernest, Pasadena.
Jones, Dubois Robert, Baltimore.
Jones, James Howard, Beltsville.
Justice, Everett Eugene, Jr., Mount Airy.
Kidd, Michael Lou, Millers.
Kirk, Arnold David, Baltimore.
Lamorte, Arthur William, Baltimore.
Leach, James Kenneth, Baltimore.
Lee, Charles Thomas, Oxon Hill.
Liverman, John Clarence, Silver Spring.
McAllister, Donald C., Jr., Elkton.
McClanahan, Donald Lee, Point Pleasant.
Mentzer, Robert Edwin, Jr., Rockville.
Metzker, Franklin, H., Hillside.
Middlebrooks, Carl Mason, Baltimore.
Morrison, Richard Keith, Silver Spring.
Nichols, Larry Donald, Oxon Hill.
Orash, Michael William, Baltimore.
Perkins, William Arthur, Jr., Baltimore.
Postorino, Ernest, Rockville.
Propst, William Earl, Cumberland.
Rash, William George, Baltimore.
Reid, James Alfred, Derwood.
Reilly, William F., III, Cheverly.
Robinson, Samuel Percell, Baltimore.
Rolfe, Michael Duane, Rising Sun.
Ruby, Blane Markwood, Baltimore.
Shorter, John Joseph, Glen Burnie.
Smithson, Paul Winthrop, Bethesda.
Snead, Bernard James, Jr., Baltimore.
Spare, Wayne John, Baltimore.
Steiner, Larry Allen, Baltimore.
Swab, Richard Eugene, Takoma Park.
Tesauro, John Apollo, Baltimore.
Tilghman, Benjamin, Deal Island.
Tinson, Paul Drake, Baltimore.
Torrington, Thomas Jacob, Cumberland.
Ward, Alexander Kearney, Annapolis.
Wiley, Michael Ray, Baltimore.
Wilson, Jan Franklin, Brandywine.
Wright, David Leo, Suitland.

Navy

Boynton, Charles B., Jr., Baltimore.
Brooke, Earl Thomas, Capitol Heights.
Durbin, Ronald Wayne, Cumberland.
Kirk, David Grant, Baltimore.
Pendergast, Arthur Oneill, Baltimore.
Swift, Eugene Edward, Hyattsville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Army

Agri, Calvatore, Jr., Chelsea.
Albertini, James Christoph, Attleboro.
Alfano, Rodney Arthur, Malden.
Allard, Val Gene, Worcester.
Anderson, Edward, Lynn.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Army

Anderson, Harry William, Jr., Southbridge.
Angell, Alan Francis, Uxbridge.
Argy, Edward William, Medford.
Baldwin, Terry Lyman, Foxboro.
Bartlett, Charles Dennis, Rockland.
Bastarache, Fidele Joseph, Gardner.
Beals, Lawrence Frederick, Bridgewater.
Bergeron, Robert James, Tyngsboro.
Bonnettee, Paul Eugene, Springfield.
Burke, Patrick Kevin, Norwood.
Burham, Neil Robert, Petersham.
Byron, Michael Joseph, North Andover.
Callahan, Daniel David, North Reading.
Cann, Douglas Allen, Carlisle.
Carpenter, Clinton R., Jr., Dorchester.
Carvalho, Gilbert, Fall River.
Charland, Roger Ovide, Boston.
Chase, Robert Kendrick, Duxbury.
Chassion, Philip Ronald, Fitchburg.
Cloney, William Thomas, III, Milton.
Conaxis, Nicholas S., Franklin.
Connolly, Richard, Nabnasset.
Constantine, Michael Eugene, Fall River.
Contestabile, Daniel J., Jamaica Plain.
Cordeau, Edward Richard, Winthrop.
Crowe, Douglas D., Dedham.
Crowley, James Allen, II, Springfield.
Daigneault, Joseph Richard, Worcester.
Daley, William Michael, Everett.
Daly, Eugene Thomas, Jr., Wellesley Hills.
Dana, Roger Joseph, Somerville.
Dashner, Gilford Frank, Burlington.
Davis, Richard Shirley, Jr., Quincy.
De Lorenzo, Philip T., Jr., Randolph.
Deane, Michael Lindsey, Westfield.
Derocher, Frederick George, Haverhill.
Devine, Richard Daniel, Jr., Saugus.
Di Berardino, Perry, East Boston.
Dull, Edward James, Taunton.
Falardeau, Joseph Ernest, Attleboro.
Farelli, Lawrence John, Lawrence.
Farrell, Charles Douglas, Boston.
Fassitt, Eric Richard, Dorchester.
Fera, John Anthony, Danvers.
Fitzgerald, John Francis, Norwood.
Fitzgibbons, John Francis, Wakefield.
Fitzgibbons, Paul Edward, Walpole.
Flint, William John, Lynn.
Fontaine, Normand Edward, Westport.
Foote, Peter Wellesley, North Adams.
Fordi, Michael Joseph, Everett.
Forget, Ronald Edmond, Lowell.
Forte, Richard Joseph, Newton.
Fullerton, John Joseph, Jr., Wilmington.
Gariepy, Robert David, Fitchburg.
Gaudreau, Charles Arthur, New Bedford.
Ghais, Taher Fathi, Belmont.
Ghelli, Thomas Alfred, Holliston.
Gillespie, Robert James, Jr., Attleboro Falls.
Given, Martin Gehring, Northfield.
Gonsalves, August, Jr., Dorchester.
Gottwald, George Joseph, Jr., Roslindale.
Granville, Ronald Lester, Rochdale.
Gray, Robert Roger, Athol.
Greene, Donald Joseph, Dorchester.
Grenham, Lawrence Alphonse, Boston.
Hamilton, David Kenneth, Malden.
Harrington, Frederick E., Jr., Watertown.
Harris, Robert George, Roxbury.
Harrison, Robert Louis, Lowell.
Hartley, Robert Joesph, West Roxbury.
Hosnander, Carl E., Holden.
Hubbard, Glen David, Lunenburg.
Jablonski, John Andrew, Webster.
Jablonski, Zygmunt Paul, Jr., Chicopee Falls.
Jenczyk, Frank Paul, Jr., Cambridge.
Jenks, James Joseph, Jr., North Quincy.
Johnson, Byron Steven, Leominster.
Johnson, Hugh Richard, Jr., Brockton.
Johnson, Rodney W., Roxbury.
Johnson, Theodore Fred, Brockton.
Johnston, Bruce E., III, Raynham.
Jones, Clifford Raymond, Jr., Westwood.
Joyce, Walter Edward, Jr., Somerville.
Kapetanopoulos, Kosmas Pet, Marlboro.
Kelley, Daniel Martin, Dorchester.
King, Paul Chester, Jr., Waltham.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Army

Kozach, John Albert, Springfield
Lee, Edward Gilbert, Belmont.
Long, James Thomas, Billerica.
Ludwig, James Michael, Burlington.
MacDonald, Jerome James, East Weymouth.
MacKay, Calvin Ronald, Jamaica Plain
Magee, John Joseph, Jamaica Plain.
Maney, Ralph Warren, Peabody.
Marron, Bruce Allen, Peabody.
Matte, Alan Louis, West Springfield.
McCafferty, Michael Leste, Lynn.
McCormick, Thomas A., Jr., Mattapan.
McGinness, Paul Edward, Burlington.
McNutt, Charles Thomas, Hingham.
Mears, Peter Joseph, Jr., Braintree.
Mello, Edward Thomas, Jr., Falmouth.
Mercer, Robert John, Brookline.
Mitchell, Cyril, Jr., Chelsea.
Moran, John Francis, Dorchester.
Morris, David Michael, Tewksbury.
Newberry, Lewis Jewett, East Longmeadow.
O'Connor, Frederick J., Jr., Somerville.
O'Toole, James Edward, Jr., Boston.
Ordway, William Dwight, Baldwinville.
Parent, Robert Warren, Wilmington.
Paulette, Joseph Ronald, New Bedford.
Pelletter, Paul John, Wilbraham.
Philipson, Joseph Bion, Jr., Boston.
Pinheiro, Jeffrey Antone, South Dartmouth.
Piscitello, Salvatore John, Gloucester.
Pizzano, James Robert, Everett.
Poirier, Paul Eugene, Southbridge.
Popkin, Steven Jay, Springfield.
Preston, Robert Edward, Roxbury.
Przelcmski, Paul Anthony, Webster.
Quintal, John Vincent, Somerville.
Ramsey, John Louis, Lynn.
Rattee, Carl Allan, Monson.
Rich, Peter Bernard, Wakefield.
Rodrigues, Daniel Everette, Somerset.
Rogers, Richard Leo, Sudbury.
Rosenbusch, Charles Richard, Worcester.
Ross, Robert Leslie, Peabody.
Rumrill, Paul William, Cambridge.
Rumson, Samuel James, Jr., Malden.
Rust, Gary Alfred, Southbridge.
Sanchez, Ignacio, Humarock.
Schofield, Alfred Vincent, Quincy.
Scott, Richard Allen, South Deerfield.
Seaborne, Frederick Vernon, Merrimac.
Servent, Henry Joseph, Jr., Brighton.
Severino, Wayne Thomas, Taunton.
Shortsleeves, William Jose, Malden.
Shotwell, James Hunter, Beverly Farms.
Shuman, Michael Bernard, Stoughton.
Simoes, Anthony, Hyde Park.
Simon, David Lowell, Brookline.
Sintoni, Joseph Eugene, Sagamore.
Skinner, Gordon Armstrong, Framingham.
Small, Alfred John, Beverly.
Sowinski, Robert Joseph, South Hadley Falls.
Spillane, Paul Donald, Leicester.
St. Amand, Richard Carl, Lowell.
Sullivan, Francis C., Jr., Framingham.
Sullivan, John Joseph, Watertown.
Sullivan, Paul Joseph, Watertown.
Tanasso, Ambrose P., Jr., Randolph.
Thompson, Theodore A., Jr., Boston.
Tobey, Michael James, Greenfield.
Valentine, Pervis B., Jr., Roxbury.
Walker, Douglas Alexander, Indian Orchard.
Walsh, James Michael, Quincy.
Washburn, Fred Zimri, Middleboro.
Welch, Richard William, Wilmington.
West, Raymond John, Quincy.
Wheeler, James Kenneth, Boston.
Wight, Ralph Chester, Jr., Newtonville.
Willard, Ralph John, Quincy.
Williams, Wilbur Leo, Jr., Fitchburg.
Witanek, Chester L., Jr., Cheshire.
Wolk. Barry Lee, Hingham.
Yeomans, Charles Augustus, Medford.

Air Force

Beresik, Eugene Paul, Webster.
Cyr, William Joseph, Webster.
Driscoll, Francis Murtaugh, Attleboro.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Air Force

Milan, Edward Walter, Boston.
Sleeper, David Frederick, Framingham.
Turbert, Francis Xavier, Newton.
Willard, Alan Wayne, Franklin.

Marine Corps

Adams, George Francis, Worcester.
Ahern, Brian Paul, Quincy.
Arruda, Richard Hathaway, Wareham.
Baker, Kenneth Alvin, New Bedford.
Beauford, Willis, Jr., Dorchester.
Belanger, George Henry, Andover.
Berg, Ralph Russell, Paxton.
Bergin, Gerald Francis, Cambridge.
Bernard, Vincent, Dorchester.
Bingham, David Andrew, Melrose.
Blake, William H., Jr., Hanover.
Brooks, Richard William, Lunenburg.
Burrell, Philip Edward, Boston.
Burwell, Langdon Gates, Woods Hole.
Bush, Thomas Edward, Billerica.
Cadorette, Michael John, Brockton.
Calhoun, John Caldwell, South Boston.
Campbell, Joseph Timothy, Stoneham.
Carter, Paul C., Jr., Barnstable.
Casey, Michael James, Dalton.
Cerrone, Joseph Carmen, Jr., Stoneham.
Chisholm, David Andrew, Lynn.
Cole, John Henry, South Boston.
Connelly, Edward Walter, Jr., Agawam.
Cook, Joseph Francis, Foxboro.
Coughlin, John Peter, Quincy.
Countaway, John Alden, Jr., Winthrop.
Couto, Jimmie Michael, North Reading.
Czerwonka, Paul Steven, Stoughton.
Dabreu, Daniel John, Sharon.
Degnis, James Edward, Worcester.
Delverde, Ronald Leon, Boston.
Desmond, Joseph Francis, South Boston.
Downey, Edward Joseph, Jr., Williamsett.
Drake, Richard Kenneth, Jr., Walpole.
Dutton, Bernard F., Jr., Dedham.
Edmonds, Joseph, Worcester.
Emerson, William, Concord.
Evans, John Douglas, Lynn.
Fanning, Michael Francis, West Boylston.
Feeley, Eugene Joseph, Jr., Boston.
Flumere, Keith Michael, Natick.
Foley, Robert Paul, Dorchester.
Furtado, Edward, Jr., Fall River.
Garron, Lawrence E., Jr., Franklin.
Gautreau, Reginald Joseph, Waltham.
Gorman, Paul James, Watertown.
Grant, Norman William, Jr., Lynn.
Green, Robert Paul, Springfield.
Gregoire, David Edward, Malden.
Griffin, Robert, Dorchester.
Griffin, Theodore Steven, Springfield.
Gunset, William Francis, Somerville.
Hamel, Wayne Douglas, Milford.
Hellard, Richard W., Jr., Beverly.
Hinkley, Stephen, Medfield.
Holt, Robert Alan, Reading.
Howlett, Norman Locke, Jr., Brimfield.
Hunt, Joseph Thomas, Scituate.
Jacobs, John Paul, South Boston.
Jasnocha, Alfred L., Jr., Ware.
Johnson, Daniel Joseph, Westfield.
Johnson, Kenneth Richard, Florence.
Jones, Bruce Edwin, Rockland.
Jordan, Allan Harold, Lynnfield.
Joyner, Kenneth Russell, Dorchester.
Kelley, Richard Joseph, Lowell.
Kennedy, Bruce James, Chelsea.
Kent, Daniel Wilder, Auburndale.
Kent, Gregory Patrick, Lawrence.
Kolenda, Paul Michael, Brockton.
Kuzma, Marc John, South Hadley Falls.
Kyricos, George Arthur, Tewksbury.
Laderoute, Michael John, Boston.
Leigh, Lawrence Graham, Jr., West Medway.
Lowe, Barry, Framingham.
Luscier, Howard Henry, Cheshire.
MacMillan, Thomas, Leominster.
Malato, James Costa, Jr., New Bedford.
Mailloux, John Joseph, Lynn.
McAfee, David Alfred, Northboro.
McCarthy, John Henry, Allston.
McCarthy, Robert John, Dorchester.
McCue, James Edward, Rockland.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Marine Corps

McIntosh, John Arthur, East Boston.
Medeiros, William Correia, New Bedford.
Merrill, Joseph Adelbert, Dennis Port.
Minehan, Michael Paul, Marlboro.
Mohrmann, Douglas Robert, Buzzards Bay.
Monska, Bruce William, Easthampton.
Moore, Wayne Paul, Plymouth.
Moores, Kenneth Frederick, Waltham.
Moreno, John Herbert, Watertown.
Morrison, William John, Middleboro.
Mottola, Vincent Antonio, Medford.
Moxley, Richard Stephen, Watertown.
Murphy, Arthur Patrick, Jr., Brookline.
Murphy, Michael, Waltham.
Murphy, Richard Brian, Norwood.
Murray, John Butler, Newton.
Nash, Peter Gary, Monsoon.
Nelson, Robert Joseph, Lynn.
Newcomb, Wayne Paul, Scituate.
Noyes, Russell Willis, Woburn.
O'Neill, Charles Leo, Jr., Woburn.
Parsons, Charles Edward, Springfield.
Pasquantonio, John Emidio, Westwood.
Perkins, Frederick Joseph, Somerville.
Perry, Daniel, Fall River.
Peterson, Burton W., Jr., South Boston.
Peterson, Gerald Roy, Quincy.
Pignato, Joseph Michael, Winthrop.
Pitts, David Allen, Quincy.
Plunkett, Robert Stephen, North Randolph.
Pointer, Ronald Joseph, Somerville.
Quill, Paul Francis, Weymouth.
Rago, Stephen Joseph, Fall River.
Rainaud, Jeffrey William, South Hadley Falls.
Rice, James Joseph, Newtonville.
Robitaille, Paul Edward, North Attleboro.
Roderick, Ronald, Taunton.
Rogers, Edward Francis, Roslindale.
Shaller, Ronald William, Mattapan.
Sheehan, Charles J., III, West Concord.
Sirois, Lawrence Everett, Quincy.
Skelton, Ronald Albert, Lowell.
Sleigh, Duncan Balfour, Marblehead.
Soares, Manuel Aguiar, Fall River.
Speyer, Alfred William, Hyannis.
St. John, David Michael, Milford.
Stewart, James Joseph, South Boston.
Stewart, Paul John, Dorchester.
Stone, Edward Thomas, Jr., Dorchester.
Strafello, Charles Frankli, Avon.
Sullivan, Edward Michael, Boston
Sullivan, Michael Xavier, Dorchester.
Sullivan, Stephen Thomas, Melrose.
Swain, Craig Francis, Medford.
Swan, Leo Edward, Jr., Brighton.
Sweeney, Thomas Paul, Ashburnham.
Theriault, Paul Raymond, Cambridge.
Thomas, Joseph Eugene, Boston.
Tolpa, Robert Richard, Chicopee.
Trainor, Paul William, Malden.
Turcotte, Peter Rudolph, Rowley.
Turner, Don Eldridge, Dorchester.
Wakefield, Carl Daniel, Framingham.
White, John Edward, Allston.
Woodson, Laurence Oliver, Attleboro.
Young, Douglas Allen, Dorchester.
Young, Gerald Francis, Boston.

Navy

Albrecht, Joseph Alfred, Falmouth.
Allerby, Milton Richard, Jr., Brockton.
Aucoin, Robert Joseph, Worcester.
Bouchet, Robert Louis, Needham.
Chesley, Leonard George, Jr., North Uxbridge.
Cousineau, Henry Conrad, Swansea.
Donahue, John Joseph, Taunton.
Donato, Paul Nicholas, Boston.
Edge, Paul Joseph, Boston.
Foley, Robert Raymond, Jr., Southboro.
Gerrish, Alan Robert, Woburn.
Hartlage, John Peter, III, Savoy.
Kulacz, Donald Edward, Chicopee Falls.
Labonte, Donald Arthur, Holyoke.
McGinn, Walter William, Mattapan.
Pinsonnault, Richard Norman, North Attleboro.

XUM

MICHIGAN

Army

Ackerman, Maxie Edward, Saginaw.
Adams, David Lee, Mount Morris.
Adams, Larry, Detroit.
Airey, George Vernon, Jr., Ann Arbor.
Albertson, Ronald Dale, Dimondale.
Allen, Lyle Ernest, Jr., Allegan.
Allen, Terrance W., Bay City.
Anderson, Richard Meridith, Dearborn.
Ankney, Samuel Frederick, Flint.
Arenas, Reynaldo, Holland.
Austin, Victor Leroy, Kalamazoo.
Avery, Gerald Lawrence, Mio.
Bachert, Richard Charles, Davisburg.
Baker, Jerry, Highland Park.
Baker, Philip Kenneth, Detroit.
Balog, Louis Robert, Monroe.
Banks, Richard Steven, Galesburg.
Batozynski, Charles Henry, Detroit.
Baxtor, John Stanley, Plainwell.
Beardslee, Terry Hugh, Dimondale.
Beaver, John Douglas, Detroit.
Becannen, Barry J., Clayton.
Beck, Glen Ray, Ontonagon.
Belcher, Frank Edward, Osseo.
Belinski, James Gerald, Stalwart.
Bell, Dexter, Kalamazoo.
Bell, Wayne Morris, Cassopolis.
Benson, Robert John, Bay City.
Berkfield, Thomas Dudley, Detroit.
Betts, Terry Wade, Tuscola.
Bies, Edward Alan, Belleville.
Bigelow, Paul Lee, Grand Rapids.
Binder, Quentin Wayne, Bruce Crossing.
Blaauw, James Evart, Grayling.
Black, Ralph Roland, Crystal Falls.
Blackmer, William Edward, Barryton.
Blauwkamp, Arlyn Jay, Zeeland.
Blossom, Steven Carl, Detroit.
Blume, Gerard James, Jr., Mount Morris.
Bolak, Theodore Nicholas, Detroit.
Bolding, Edgar Lee, Detroit.
Bonner, Joseph, Inkster.
Bonney, John Clair, Vandercook Lake.
Boughner, Gary William, Johannesburg.
Bousley, Donald George, Ann Arbor.
Bova, Edward James, Wayne.
Bowman, James Lavern, Dundee.
Bowman, Tommy Ray, Detroit.
Braatz, Curtiss Edward, Charlotte.
Bradford, Thomas Johnson, Lincoln Park.
Brandon, Tommie, Detroit.
Brant, Dave William, Mattawan.
Brock, James Barrett, Dearborn.
Brown, Charles Patrick, Ann Arbor.
Brown, Joseph M., Detroit.
Brown, Warren Gene, Detroit.
Brum, Peter, Lansing.
Bruning, David Kenneth, Rogers City.
Bryant, Ronald William, Detroit.
Bugni, Florian Anthony, Jr., Farmington.
Bump, Thomas Edward, Marshall.
Burdick, Douglas John, Detroit.
Burke, Joseph, Detroit.
Burkell, Gene Michael, Pontiac.
Burney, James Larry, Bay City.
Bush, Lee Randall, Lansing.
Butler, Harry William, Detroit.
Byers, Melvin John, Tustin.
Cameron, William Burr, Detroit.
Campbell, Donald A., Detroit.
Capanda, Robert John, Detroit.
Carclay, Jack Craig, Detroit.
Carmona, Jesse, Jr., Bay City.
Carr, Alvin, Detroit.
Carroll, Thomas J., Grand Rapids.
Carter, James Devrin, Clarkston.
Caswell, Robert Lynn, Pontiac.
Cavis, David Jude, Hubbell.
Chambers, Richard Alan, Grand Rapids.
Charles, Nicholes William, Muskegon.
Chase, Russell David, Warren.
Christoffer, Vernon H., Jr., Saugatuck.
Ciecura, Thomas Paul, Detroit.
Clancy, Dennis Patrick, Royal Oak.
Clark, Jerry Wayne, Dearborn.
Clarke, William Victor, Lincoln Park.
Clavier, David Michael, Monroe.
Clay, Christopher Elliott, Alto.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Cline, Robert Louis, Warren.
Coates, Kenneth William, West Branch.
Cole, Gordon Eugene, Grand Rapids.
Coleman, Bonnie Lee, Detroit.
Collis, Gerald Alan, Muskegon.
Colwell, Ronald Lee, Samaria.
Connors, David Thomas, Cheboygan.
Consavage, Ralph Edward, Williamston.
Cook, Delfin Hilario, Gibraltar.
Cook, Donald Michael, Kinde.
Cook, Milton, Detroit.
Coppo, Patrick Brian, Calumet.
Coughlin, Patrick Charles, Mount Pleasant.
Cousin, Moses James, Detroit.
Cox, Fredie Ray, Saginaw.
Cox, Michael John, Detroit.
Crandall, Rodney Allen, Detroit.
Crane, John LaVerne, Flint.
Cribelar, Michael Dean, Ypsilanti.
Cromie, Michael John, Harper Woods.
Crossley, Eugene, Benton Harbor.
Cutler, James Irving, Muskegon.
Dains, Roger Allan, Ludington.
Darling, Rolland Eugene, Jr., Saginaw.
Davies, Alfred John, Jr., Detroit.
Davis, Dale L. E., Adrian.
Davis, Douglas Oneill, Melvindale.
Day, Edward, Flint.
Dean, Kenneth Bernard, Battle Creek.
Dean, Woodie Junior, Battle Creek.
Deering, Gale Edward. Grand Rapids.
Desormeaux, Harry Henry, Sault St. Marie.
Devins, Richard Charles, Allen Park.
Dickson, Mark Lane, St. Clair Shores.
Diekema, Arnold Raymond, Grand Rapids.
Doezema, Frank, Jr., Kalamazoo.
Drob, David Michael, Mount Clemens.
Dugger, Douglas Alan, Detroit.
Dulyea, Barry H., Muskegon.
Dundas, Jerry Richard, Oak Park.
Durham, John Melvin, Grand Ledge.
Dyer, Jay Cee, Dearborn.
Ebel, William Michael, West Olive.
Edwards, Leon George, Detroit.
Egyed, Gerald Leonard, Detroit.
Elzinga, Larry La Vern, Charlevoix.
Evans, Donald Patrick, Lake Orion.
Evans, Gregory James, Union Lake.
Fairbotham, Robert Lawrence, Grayling.
Farmer, William Nial, Leslie.
Faro, James Ellis, Detroit.
Faull, Clifford Leonard, Norway.
Favor, John Robert, Flint.
Fisher, James Elton, Taylor.
Fosburg, Rick Harold, Grand Rapids.
Foxworth, Roger Christopher, Dearborn.
Franks, Joseph Ronald, Roseville
Frechette, Terry Allen, Cedar Springs.
Freestone, Spencer Scott, Holland.
Fritzgerald, Larry John, Grand Rapids.
Fulton, Kenneth Lige, Belleville.
Galpin, Ronald Davis, Detroit.
Gambotto, Larry Louis, Dearborn.
Gerstheimer, Heinrich, Detroit.
Giddings, John Patrick, Cass City.
Gilbert, Richard Lee, Monroe.
Gilin, Gary Joseph, Detroit.
Gillespie, James Roy, Battle Creek.
Giesenkamp, John Carr, Flint.
Glime, Donald Eugene, Berkley.
Goff, Larry Allen, Grand Haven.
Golembiewski, Walter Edward, Detroit.
Goulet, Ronald David, Garden City.
Graham, David Del, Cass City.
Grandahl, Jack William, Ironwood.
Green, Kenneth Gerald, Warren.
Green, Larry Vernard, Detroit.
Grennay, William Efren, Jackson.
Gressel, John Vincent, Dowagiac.
Grieve, Michael A., Hazel Park.
Groat, Richard James, Port Huron.
Guenther, William Richard, Warren.
Gulich, Dennis Fransic, Detroit.
Gutierrez, Oscar G., Sandusky.
Guzzo, Alfred, Wayne.
Haines, John Loda, Vandalia.
Hall, Jeffrey H., Dowagiac.
Hamilton, James Richard, Flat Rock.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Hammond, Charles Weldon, Fennville.
Hanna, Elgie George, Eaton.
Hanselman, Charles Leon, Dearborn.
Harbison, Sherron Everett, Flint.
Hardy, Willie Charles, Detroit.
Harper, Gregory Alexander, Detroit.
Harris, Carl Allen, Flint.
Hartman, Howard John, St. Clair Shores.
Hartry, Otis Lamont, Detroit.
Hasford, John Lawrence, Jr., Williamston.
Hath, James Stuart, Dearborn.
Heath, Ned Arthur, Alpena.
Heliker, Russell James, Walled Lake.
Henley, Charles Ray, Union Lake.
Hering, James Alfred, Detroit.
Hernandez, Ramon Sanchez, Grand Junction.
Hicks, Hiawatha, Grand Rapids.
Higbee, Gary Lee, Montgomery.
Hill, Sterling Harold, Rochester.
Hilyard, James Harold, Mendon.
Hinkle, John Warren, Saginaw.
Hobbs, Cecil R., Jr., Wyandotte.
Holderbaum, John Arthur, Kalamazoo.
Holiday, Michael Leonard, Detroit.
Holston, Paul, Detroit.
Honeycutt, Donald Eugene, Cadillac.
Hodgterp, Stephen Joseph, Wyoming.
Hoopengarner, B. L., Jr., Fraser.
Hoskins, Harold Orion, Bronson.
Hough, Michael Peter, Remus.
Hower, Thomas Allen, Muskegon.
Huczek, Gerald Albert, Roseville.
Humphreys, Gilmer Earl, Royal Oak.
Huscher, John Randolph, Dowagiac.
Jackson, Garland Duane, Jackson.
Jacobson, John W., Sr., Crystal Falls.
Jasura, Robert William, Pinconning.
Jaworowicz, Lawrence Frank, Detroit.
Jenks Harley John, Barryton.
Jenks, Robert James, Concord.
Johnson, Bruce Michael, Wetmore.
Johnson, Carl Irving, Wakefield.
Johnson, Michael James, Owosso.
Johnson, Wayne David, Menominee.
Jones, Byron Norris, Detroit.
Jones, Jon Carl, Grand Rapids.
Jones, Larry Allen, St. Louis.
Jones, Lee Francis, Fenton.
Jones, Marvin Harold, Jr., Mount Clemens.
Jones, Robert Ernest, Harrison.
Jose, Paull David, Garden City.
Judd David Terrence, Birmingham.
Kasnow, Edward, Elwell.
Kay, Byran Thomas, Garden City.
Keating, Ralph Ainsworth, Caledonia.
Keyes, William George, Midland.
Kinney, Charles William, Ecorse.
Klinger, Gary Lynn, Morenci.
Klippel, David John, Daggett.
Klos, Ronald Frank, Detroit.
Knight, Martin Roy, Belding.
Knobloch, Craig Geoffrey, East Lansing.
Knoll, Robert Edwin, Holland.
Koch, Ronald Lee, Chelsea.
Koebke, John Lee, Port Huron.
Koivupalo, Robert W., Jr., Detroit.
Kolka, Edward Louis, Hancock.
Koseba, Dennis William, Southgate.
Kottyan, George Edward, Garden City.
Koyl, Harry Glenn, Detroit.
Kralowski, James Edward, Detroit.
Kronberg, Charles, August, East Detroit.
Kuchek, Richard Michael, Midland.
Kucway, Robert John, Hamtramck.
Kunst, Gene Arthur, Blanchard.
Kupiec, Thomas Mark, Warren.
Kutchey, Lawrence David, Madison Heights.
La Cosse, Jimmy John, Rock.
La Rouche, James Michael, Garden City.
Lahti, James Walter, Walled Lake.
Landon, Vincent P., Detroit.
Lane, Warren Clifford, Grand Rapids.
Larrick, Richard Allen, Plymouth.
Larsen, Michael Conrad, Cedar River.
Lawfield, Glenn Robert, Detroit.
Less, Randall Patrick, Detroit.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Lewis, Alfred John, Detroit.
Link, David John, Grand Rapids.
Link, Gary William, Tawas City.
Linna, Steven Paul, South Range.
Liparoto, Leonard Joseph, Monroe.
Liskow, Larry Lee, Battle Creek.
Long, Douglas Eugene, Keego Harbor.
Lord, Robert Randal, Flint.
Lozier, William Earl, Cassopolis.
Lukes, Thomas Burton, Pontiac.
Lulofs, Dennis Jay, Clarksville.
Luna, Adolfo, Flint.
Lutze, John Edwin, Flint.
Lyon, Christopher Edwin, Coldwater.
Mack, Dennis Lee, Detroit.
Maddox, Julius, Detroit.
Maisano, Joseph Anthony, Detroit.
Mallett, Douglas Mackarthu, Muskegon.
Maria, Charles Anthony, Ferndale.
Martin, Elmer, Detroit.
Martin, James Louis, Shelby.
Mawdsley, Danny Joseph, Flint.
McArthur, Melvin Lloyd, Waterford.
McClain, Willie James, Jr., Detroit.
McDonald, George E., Jr., Harbor Springs.
McIlroy, Douglas Steven, Dearborn.
McIlroy, Patrick C., Pontiac.
McNabb, Douglas Meredith, Traverse City.
Meadows, Merl Russell, Lincoln Park.
Meringa, Gary Paul, Grand Rapids.
Meyer, Terry Robert, Holland.
Michalke, Russell Arthur, Saline.
Michalski, John Mitchell, Hazel Park.
Miculs, Janis, Grosse Point Park.
Milks, Richard Allen, Fenton.
Miller, Charles Irvin, Ann Arbor.
Miller, John Robert, Clawson.
Miller, Robert J., Bad Axe.
Miller, Ronald Jay, Grand Rapids.
Miszewski, David Martin, Muskegon.
Moline, Kevin Eugene, Allen Park.
Moll, Roger Ralph, Bay City.
Morgan, James Mark, Concord.
Morrison, Jack Allen, Detroit.
Morrow, Kenneth Porter, Kalamazoo.
Mrazik, James Patrick, Mio.
Mulholland, Arnold Lee Roy, Fenton.
Munson, Edward Louis, LaSalle.
Murray, Michiel David, Clare.
Nagelkirk, Dennis Dale, West Olive.
Neil, Samuel Thomas, Jr., Detroit.
Nelson, Larry Douglas, Royal Oak.
Newton, Vernon Lee, Detroit.
Niezgoda, Michael Allen, Dearborn.
Nimphie, Max Edward, Jr., Fenton.
Northouse, Rollie Melvin, Saginaw.
Novak, Michael Joseph, Grand Blanc.
O'Connor. Garrett Timothy. Warren.
Obney, Ronnie Lee, East Detroit.
Olenzuk, Paul Gregory, Detroit.
Orr, Michael Walter, Grand Rapids.
Osterberg, Bernard J., Jr., Jackson.
Ott, Alan Robert, Augres.
Ouillette, Thomas Robert, Pinconning.
Overton, Danny, Jr., Detroit.
Painter, Howard Leroy, Rothbury.
Palmer, Bruce Cameron, Wyoming.
Patterson, Walter Marcellu, Grand Rapids.
Pelch, Michael J. D., Flint.
Permaloff, Charles Wassel, Detroit.
Perry, Robert Conroy, Petersburg.
Pietrzyk, Mark Harold, Dearborn.
Pingel, Wayne Edward, Flint.
Pirkola, Paul Henry, Calumet.
Pizzuti, John, St. Clair Shores.
Pohjola, Jeffrey Willis, Southfield.
Polisky, Thomas Richard, Filer City.
Porden, Lee Victor, Jr., Detroit.
Powell, David Michael, Bellevue.
Pratt, Walter Raymond, Detroit.
Precour, Richard Frank, Port Huron.
Price, Richard John, Detroit.
Proehl, Paul Allen, Rapid River.
Pruett, James Randall, Buchanan.
Pyne, Roger Dale, Detroit.
Quan, Kenneth Raymond, Lawton.
Radics, Donald M., Detroit.
Randall, Donald David, Jr., Detroit.
Raub, Franklin Harrison, Flat Rock.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Raubolt, Thomas Edward, Wyandotte.
Ray, Thomas Frederick, Jr., Big Rapids.
Reichert, Robert D., Alma.
Reiter, Clyde Alvin, Pontiac.
Rheault, Willis Clifford, Lake Linden.
Riley, Thomas Eugene, Springport.
Rindy, Gregory Arnold, Roseville.
Roat, Rodney Allen, Flint.
Roberts, Alan Richard, Detroit.
Robinson, Joseph Earl, Sanford.
Rock, Gerald Francis, Grand Rapids.
Roerink, Gary Doyle, Pontiac.
Rogers, William Henry, Battle Creek.
Rondo, Ronald Lee, Hemlock.
Rosales, Bernie, Jr., Ithaca.
Rose, Albert Eugene, South Lyon.
Rosekrans, Leslie Donald, Auburn.
Rugar, Steven Dale, Midland.
Ruiz, John Franco, De Witt.
Ruple, Homer Alfred, Jr., Three Rivers.
Rusha, Gary Edward, North Escanaba.
Ryden, Gary Ardean, Pontiac.
Sales, Nathan Ray, Milford.
Salisbury, Gary Eugene, Ceresco.
Samolej, Gerald, Richmond.
Sanborn, Jack Richard, Detroit.
Sanford, David Amon, Shadyside.
Sanford, Gary Bernerd, Jackson.
Santellan, Teodoro, Grant.
Sarna, Arnold Paul, Livonia.
Sauls, Ollie Leslie, Jr., Detroit.
Sawyer, William A., Madison Heights.
Schieve. Paul Everett, Lansing.
Schmude, John Robert, Pontiac.
Schultz, David Charles, Port Huron.
Scott, Marvin, Hamtramck.
Seablom, Earl Francis, Ishpeming.
Seabrooks, Arthur, Detroit.
Settlemyre, Jeffrey Colin, Big Rapids.
Shafer, Roger Dale, Baroda.
Shambaugh, Gregory Randall, Ann Arbor.
Shapland, Kenneth Wayne, Saginaw.
Shellie, Darrel Andre, Detroit.
Sherrod, Walter, Jr., Saginaw.
Sherwood, James Robert, Newaygo.
Sieting, Stanley Lawton, Detroit.
Slater, Donald Eugene, Paw Paw.
Smarsh, Joseph, II, Orchard Lake.
Smith, Steven Robert, Edwardsburg.
Smith, Warren Allen, North Park.
Smyk, Frank Barth, Detroit.
Soper, Richard Orrin, Flint.
Spaulding, Dean Francis, Jr., Manchester.
Speck, Dennis Jerome, Livonia.
Spitzer, Howard Ray, Paris.
Stamps, George Harrell, Madison Heights.
Stauff, Eric Louis William, Jackson.
Steele, Patrick Matthew, Roseville.
Stehle, Herbert Neil, Ann Arbor.
Stiglitz, Dennis Lawrence, Stephenson.
Stogsdill, Delbrt Ray, Detroit.
Stover, James Edward, Detroit.
Strecha, James, Jr., Kalamazoo.
Stremler, David Allen, Charlotte.
Stucky, Ronald, Detroit.
Suarez, Eugene Ravn, Ann Arbor.
Swoveland, William Alan, Detroit.
Taffe, Thomas Leo, Union Lake.
Tamm, Richard David, Royal Oak.
Tank, Philip Leonard, Ecorse.
Taylor, David Bernard, Detroit.
Tellis, William James, Detroit.
Templeton, Gary Dale, Detroit.
Thomas, David George, Port Huron.
Thomas Johnie B., Detroit.
Thompson, Neil Stewart, Warren.
Tilley, James A., Livonia.
Townsend, Franklin Arthur, Port Huron.
Tucker, Gerald Alexander, Dearborn Heights.
Turner, James Paul, Detroit.
Turpin, Richard Floyd, III, Roseville.
Uebler, Roy Nicholas, Jr., Berrien Center.
Ulbrich, John Harold, Rochester.
Ulman, Edward Delbert, Flint.
Uren, Fred Thompson, Detroit.
Van Gilder, Robert Randall, Grand Rapids.
Vanden, Bosch Dwaine Wilme, Grand Rapids.

MICHIGAN—continued

Army

Veihl, John, Tower.
Vellance, Richard Paul, Saginaw.
Ventline, Lukas John, Detroit.
Villalobos, Jaime, Ecorse.
Vincent, Ivan L., Jr., Detroit.
Visser, John Joseph, Grandville.
Vruggink, Joel, Hudsonville.
Walker, Robert Lee, Detroit.
Wallace, Richard Dean, Flint.
Walsh, Allan Ray, Detroit.
Walsh, Robert Paul, Jackson.
Wangeshik, Melvin Udelson, Traverse City.
Ward, Roger Elgin, Spring Lake.
Warner, Robert Allen, Grand Rapids.
Weaver, George Anthony, Fife Lake.
Wedhorn, David Earl, Union Lake.
Weeks, Walter Darryl, Detroit.
Wells, John Curtis, Dearborn.
Westrate, Robert Jay, Holland.
Whelpley, Raymond Lawrence, Lake Orion.
Whinnery, David Vernon, Ravenna.
White, Alger Lawrence, Jr., Bay City.
Whitelaw, George David, East Detroit.
Wilder, Bruce Jeffrey, Dearborn Heights.
Wilderspin, Vernon Charles, East Lansing.
Williams, Frank Edward, Benton Harbor.
Willis, Archie Vaughn, Detroit.
Wilson, David Reynolds, Kalamazoo.
Wimberly, Arnold Bruce, Highland Park.
Winner, Brian Carl, Detroit.
Winter, Carl J., Hemlock.
Winters, Allen Lane, Adrian.
Wolfe, Patrick Robert, Jr., Waterford.
Wolosonowich, Larry James, Flint.
Woldpert, Larry Michael, Saginaw.
Wood, Arthur Windell, Ecorse.
Wood, John Allen, Lake Orion.
Wright, Roderick Michael, Detroit.
Wyman, Jerry Alan, Livonia.
Yntema, Gordon Douglas, Holland.
Yokes, Frank Joseph, Detroit.
Zamiara, Joseph C., Grand Rapids.
Zurek, Michael Robert, Ubly.

Air Force

Fyan, Russell Rickland, Muskegon.
Griffin, Charles Farrell, Grand Rapids.
Lapham, Robert Granthan, Marshall.
Stuifbergen, Gene Paul, Augusta.

Marine Corps

Achterhoff, James Patrick, Muskegon.
Aerts, David Lee, Pentwater.
Allen, Richard James, Grand Rapids.
Andrews, Dale Charles, Pontiac.
Aputen, Leslie George, Pontiac.
Arizmendez, Daniel Michael, Holland.
Baker, Ruston Lee, Mendon.
Bard, Michael, Detroit.
Barnes, George Lee, Lakesville.
Barnes, William Carel, Jr., Battle Creek.
Bauer, Robert Louis, Port Huron.
Bernard, Rodney Royce, Garden City.
Bernheisel, David Arnold, Albion.
Blomfelt, Daniel John, River Rouge.
Bolter, Kent Robert, Manistee.
Bonacci, Lawrence Louis, Detroit.
Brady, Joseph James, Three Rivers.
Brown-Bey, Lancaster, Detroit.
Bumstead, Donald Royce, Brimley.
Buchong, Donald Richard, Troy.
Buursma, David, Holland.
Canales, Victor Joel, Fennville.
Carnes, Donald Lloyd, Lansing.
Carr, George Lee, Adrian.
Cavazos, Ronald Thomas, Detroit.
Chran, Rickey Lee, Port Huron.
Clapp, Gary Lyn, Grand Ledge.
Clark, Richard Thomas, Highland Park.
Copeland, Melvin, Detroit.
Craig, Bruce Keith, Escanaba.
Crandell, James Lee, Grant.
Cudnik, Edmund Victor, Detroit.
Curtis, Terry Melvin, Flint.
Cussins, Louis Wade, Trenton.
Deeds, Rick Duane, Carleton.
Dobbs, Ronald Stephen, Detroit.
Donohue, John Martin, Gregory.
Drake, Michael Leon. Flint.
Dudek, Richard Alan, Inkster.

MICHIGAN—continued

Marine Corps

Dunn, Charles Clifford, Saginaw.
Durham, James Claude, Jr., Lincoln Park.
Edmonds, Monzie Durrel, Detroit.
Etter, Paul Quammen, Ann Arbor.
Evans, Thomas John, Riverview.
Fante, Robert Gerald, Roseville.
Ferguson, Marion Franklin, Romulus.
Foldvary, John, Jr., Lincoln Park.
Fracker, Douglas Monroe, Jackson.
Frederickson, Paul Lowell, Battle Creek.
Giddens, La Von, Detroit.
Ginal, Richard, Detroit.
Gonzales, Nicholas Valeria, Pontiac.
Grekela, William Eino, Flint.
Gross, Richard Alban, Royal Oak.
Hage, Mark Kellogg, Wyoming.
Hall, William Gardiner, Rochester.
Halstead, Lee Michael, Lansing.
Hames, Lawrence Everett, Kalamazoo.
Harrington, John Charles, Traverse City.
Harris, William Lawrence, Detroit.
Hartness, Donald Harry, Royal Oak.
Hatfield, Bobby Ray, Detroit.
Hawyer, Donald Robert, Detroit.
Hayden, Michael Pym, Detroit.
Hedger, James Robert, Pontiac.
Helka, Glenn Owen, Dearborn Heights.
Henderson, Ricky Donald, Detroit.
Henry, Thomas Carmen, Flint.
Herrada, Gabriel, Muskegon.
Hetrick, Gerald Everett, Newberry.
Higgins, John Francis, Lincoln Park.
Hill, Phillip Andrew, Pontiac.
Himebaugh, Lee Edward, Alto.
Hoadley, Larry Francis C., Watervliet.
Hodal, Robert John, Grand Haven
Holbrook, Gary Wayne, Trenton.
Horsley, Lamonte Van, Lennon.
Hughes, Fernando James, Detroit.
Husted, Gary Arza, Flint.
Indrecc, Gregory Thomas, Detroit.
Jaskiewicz, Daniel Joseph, Grand Rapids.
Jeffries, Gerrie George, Boyne Falls.
Johnson, Charles Timothy, Cadillac.
Johnson, Gerald Lee, Royal Oak.
Johnson, Lawrence Eugene, Jackson.
Jones, Richard Alfred, Morenci.
Kaminski, Kenneth, Detroit.
Keene, Walter Martin, Millington.
Kemp, Thomas William, Rockford.
Kline, Robert James, Bay City.
Klinski, Michael Roman, Auburn.
Klusendorf, Harold John, Troy.
Kohler, Paul Jerome, North Branch.
Kolakowski, Henry, Jr., Farmington.
Kurson, Gerald Edward, Greenville.
Kovacevich, Thomas James, Detroit.
Kruger, Frederick Lyle, Wyoming.
Lautner, Francis Anthony, Minden City.
Lavigne, Steven Bruce, Cheboygan.
Little, Randell Blake, River Rouge.
Lubbezoo, Dennis Lee, Grand Rapids.
Long, James Robert, Hancock.
Loughren, Michael Evan, Marysville.
Lower, Larry Le Mar, Union City.
Lyons, James Andrew, Wayland.
Malec, Dennis Stanley, Roseville.
Mallory, Jerry Douglas, Linden.
Markel, Runald Joe, Waldron.
Marshall, Brian Alexander, Bloomfield Hills.
McHugh, Fred C., Jr., Hadley.
McKinley, Patrick James, Trenton.
Meagher, Robert John, Kalamazoo.
Micunek, Michael Mark, Detroit.
Miles, Patrick Charles, Saginaw.
Miller, Kenneth, Brooklyn.
Minch, Roger Carl, Grand Rapids.
Moore, David Charles, Pontiac.
Moore, Harold, Detroit.
Mullin, Gerald Carl, Mt. Clemens.
Murdock, Carl Thomas, Galien.
Murphy, Patrick Michael, Merrill.
Murphy, Patrick William, Southfield.
Mutz, Dennis Howard, Detroit.
Nelson, Daniel Alan, Detroit.
Newstead, Thomas Eugene, Buckley.
Niemi, Martin Roy, Sundel.
Noble, Ronald Glen, Royal Oak.
North, Donald Richard, Jr., Southgate.

MICHIGAN—continued

Marine Corps

Novak, Bernard John, Muskegon.
Nowry, Richard Loren, Plymouth.
Nuber, Richard Anthony, Detroit.
Olney, Steven Ira, Lansing.
Olsen, Donald Bryan, Warren.
Parker, Charles John, Royal Oak.
Parker, William Gene, Detroit.
Peckham, George Robert, Wyoming.
Personette, Michael Darwin, Cassapolis.
Picciano, Terrance Alan, Baraga.
Piercy, Robert Conover, Milan.
Pruiett, Thomas Pierre, Jr., Coloma.
Quattlebaum, John Franklin, Detroit.
Reichle, Dwight Gerald, Marine City.
Reyes, William, Warren.
Rich, Michael Robert, Bloomfield Hills.
Rimson, Martin Luther, Detroit.
Roach, Terence Raymond, Jr., Birmingham.
Sachen, William George, Jr., Detroit.
Scott, Steven Joseph, New Baltimore.
Scribner, Gary David, Memphis.
Sharpe, Thomas Edward, Emmett.
Simmons, David Leroy, Grand Rapids.
Smith, Elliott Robert, Luna Pier.
Smith, Larry Curtis, Flint.
Smith, Robert Lee, Monroe.
Spear, Fred Harold, Roseville.
Spens, William Edward, III, Southgate.
Staples, Thomas Harold, Petersburg.
Sutton, James Thomas, Ortonville.
Synod, Michael John, East Detroit.
Tangeman, James Leroy, Flat Rock.
Tate, Robert Gerald, Livonia.
Taylor, Billy Joe, Wyandotte.
Thomas, Gary Joseph, Davison.
Thompson, Michael Guy, Swartz Creek.
Thorson, Wallace R., Jr., Newberry.
Tidwell, Voyd Eugene, Pontiac.
Tyler, Mark Dennis, Detroit.
Van Donkelaar Gerald Wayn, Fruitport.
Vance, William Charles, Allen Park.
Voorhees, Richard Allen, Montague.
Wiar, Joseph Clerman, Jr., Harper Woods.
Wilkerson, William Mhoon, Royal Oak.
Williams, Clifford Dan, Newberry.
Williams, Dewayne Thomas, St. Clair.
Williams, Gerald Stuart, Greenville.
Wilson, William Henry, Jr., Kalamazoo.
Wirt, Dennis Harold, Detroit.
Wood, James Anthony, Detroit.
Worley, Thomas James, Jr., Detroit.
Wydra, Milan Chauncey, Sault Ste Marie.
Zayas, Saul, Detroit.

Navy

Fletcher, James Ferrell, Garden City.
Green, Ralph La Verne, Coldwater.
Marsh, Larry Lee, Battle Creek.
Miller, Charles Wayne, Lansing.
Newhouse, Bernard Joseph, St. Johns.
Peek, John Forman, Pontiac.
Shepperdson, Gary Robert, Ann Arbor.
Steffen, Frederick George, New Baltimore.
Stevens, Philip Paul, Twin Lake.
Thoresen, Donald Nellis, Detroit.
Wendel, Richard Louis, Flint.
Widon, Kenneth Harry, Detroit.
Wood, Donald Frank, Coloma.

MINNESOTA

Army

Abbott, Steven Glenn, Minneapolis.
Anders, Joel Gary, Worthington.
Anderson, Dennis Keith, Crookston.
Anderson, Herbert R., Virginia.
Antonovich, Richard Robert, Calumet.
Arvidson, James Warren, Aitken.
Asp, Frank Walter, Goodridge.
Backlund, James Victor, Britt.
Bang, James Curtis, Minneapolis.
Barduson, David Julien, Danvers.
Blanksma, Gerrit Lynn, Pequot Lakes.
Bodin, Daniel Roger, Waverly.
Botts, David Martin, Minneapolis.
Branch, Charles Arthur, Glenwood.
Bronczyk, Lawrence Joseph, Gilbert.
Bronson, Richard Terry, Breckenridge.
Campion, Eugene Michael, Minneapolis.
Cardinal, Garryl David, Montrose.
Carlson, Carl Leonard, Swatara.

MINNESOTA—continued

Army

Carlson, Donald Le Roy, Minneapolis.
Carlson, William Eugene, Pelican Rapids.
Carson, Edwin Everett, Fairmont.
Champion, Wayne William, St Paul.
Clark, Douglas Mark, St. Paul.
Clark, Norman Harvey, Hawick.
Clitty, Charles Gust, Springs Lake Park.
Cloud, Ronald Myron, Ponemah.
Cowden, Leslie Lawrence, Cedar.
Culshaw, Donald Ignatius, Minneota.
Cunningham, Ronald Charles, Byron.
Cysewski, Gary Francis, Winona.
Deboer, William Sylvester, Ray.
Denny, Richard Emerson, Jr., St. Paul.
Doyle, Larry R., Minneapolis.
Dressel, Kenneth Harold, Watertown.
Dumdei, Charles Marion, Pemberton.
Elwell, Michael Reid, Gaylord.
Esparza, John Paul, Jr., Inver Grove Height.
Ewald, Richard Clayton, Minnetonka.
Fast, Roger Theodore, Butterfield.
Fish, Fred Keith, Warroad.
Fix, Michael David, Minneapolis.
Fransen, Ronald Clifford, Eagle Bend.
Fraser, Ronald Monte, Grand Rapids.
Freese, Elmer Eugene, Austin.
Fritz, David Urban, Cologne.
Gagnier, William Joseph, Mankato.
Garvick, Deryl Ray, Kiester.
Gens, Jonathon Lee, Eden Prairie.
Gibbs, William Arnold, Lakeville.
Glidden, Robert Wayne, Bemidji.
Graham, Patrick John, Minneapolis.
Guenther, Carlyle, Garfield.
Hass, Harry James, St. Paul.
Haefner, David Allen, North Mankato.
Haerle, Jeffrey William, Minneapolis.
Hamsmith, Allan Fredrick, Fairmont.
Hansen, Bernard Timothy, St. Paul.
Hansen, Peter Raymond, Jr., Ortonville.
Hanson, Dennis Gordon, St. Paul.
Hanson, Terrance Randall, Stewartville.
Hanssen, William Dennis, Duluth.
Haupert, William John, Duluth.
Hayashida, Herbert Reiji, Minneapolis.
Hedin, Gary Orville, Long Prairie.
Helmke, Darrel Bruce, Cokato.
Hemphill, Fredrick H., Red Wing.
Hiebert, Lynn Gregory, Thief River Falls.
Hill, Henry, Jr., Anoka.
Hinkle, Norman Lee, Austin.
Hoff, Dennis Wayne, Minneapolis.
Holte, Roger Allen, Grygla.
Housker, Harold Dean, Mabel.
Huerd, Lauren Dale, Bovey.
Hulwi, William George, Jr., Richfield.
Ilstrup, John Alvin, Jr., St. Louis Park.
Johnson, Barton Wendell, Scandia.
Johnson, Francis David Leo, Minneapolis.
Johnson, Terry Jay, Mora.
Kashiemer, Carl Frederick, Rockford.
Kelman, Wayne H., Richfield.
Klemmer, Sydney William, Owatonna.
Klinkenberg, Richard Carl, St. Paul.
Knake, Lloyd E., St. James.
Koch, James Anthony, Wadena.
Koebernick, Allan Fred, Blackduck.
Kokosh, George Gerald, Minneapolis.
Kolinski, Thomas George, Minneapolis.
Konecny, James Frank, Minneapolis.
Kortesmaki, Patrick Leo, Silver Bay.
Kosel, Gene Marlow, Graceton.
Koski, Richard Arne, Pengilly.
Koskovich, Michael L., Hayfield.
Kyar, Larry Clarence, Hanska.
La Plante, William Roy, III, St. Paul.
Lanning, Ronald Barry, Bloomington.
Lantz, Gary Lee, Barnesville.
Larcher, Roger William, Eveleth.
Lattman, Donald Wayne, St. Paul.
Lawrenz, Darol Edward, St. Charles.
Le Duc, Thomas Glen, Minneapolis.
Lee, Clyde Marvin, Claremont.
Leyde, Theodore Edward, St. Paul.
Lieberman, Jay Leslie, Duluth.
Lilienthal, William Edward, Glencoe.
Litzinger, Duane Edward, Waite Park.
Lobsinger, John Forman, St. Louis Park.

MINNESOTA—continued

Army

Loehlein, Robert John, Jr., New Hope.
Lohse, Richard Lee, Elbow Lake.
Longtin, Mark Warren, Red Lake Falls.
Lucas, William Harvey, Wykoff.
Martinson, Leroy Clayton, Thief River Falls.
McGovern, Richard Dale, Hallock.
McLaughlin, Daniel P., Jr., St. Paul.
Mega, James Frank, St. Paul.
Meier, Gary Michael, Lake Crystal.
Meldahl, Allen Robert, White Bear Lake.
Menz, Clyde Ronald, Minneapolis.
Milbrodt, Gerald Lee, Sleepy Eye.
Moore, Roland Edroy, Marshall.
Muhich, Craig Stanley, Aurora.
Nehring, Dennis Dean, Wells.
Nelson, Melvin Douglas, St. Paul.
Nichols, James William, Jr., International Falls.
Normandin, Duane Michael, Gentilly.
Oglesby, Gerald Phillip, North Mankato.
Ohm, David James, Alend.
Olson, Alfred Richard, St. Paul.
Olson, Kenneth Lee, Paynesville.
Ott, Douglas Ralph, Mahtomedi.
Panzer, Ronald Lee, Rosemount.
Parker, David Lloyd, Alden.
Pedersen, Dennis Irwin, Duluth.
Persons, Daniel Bruce, Minneapolis.
Peterson, Donald Lee, Fridley.
Piper, Thomas Leigh, Storden.
Quitmeyer, Tony John, Parkers Prairie.
Rabel, Laszio, Minneapolis.
Randall, Robert Bruce, Edina.
Ranthum, Dale Harold, Duluth.
Rassel, Robert Herman, Waubun.
Reeves, Raymond Stanley, Jr., St. Paul.
Reinhardt, Barry Thomas, Minneapolis.
Reinke, Jack Raymond, St. Paul.
Riedlberger, Gerald Frank, St. Paul.
Robinson, Timothy George, Hoyt Lakes.
Robinson, Warren James, Brownton.
Rood, Craig Allen, Minneapolis.
Rubin, Herman Francis, Pine Island.
Russek, John Joseph, Delano.
Sack, Gerald Duane, Mankato.
Salveson, Selmer Ernest, St. Paul.
Sarvela, Merrel Gerald, Moose Lake.
Schaaf, John Raymond, St. Paul.
Scheuble, Melvin John, Montrose.
Schindler, Eugene Donald, Barnesville.
Schmidt, Donald Harold, St. Paul.
Severson, John Edgar, Winnebago.
Seykora, William Joseph, Owatonna.
Sharpe, Richard Allan, St. Paul.
Smoger, Michael Arthur, Two Harbors.
Sommerhauser, Joseph Allyn, St. Paul.
Sorensen, Robert William, Minneapolis.
Spinler, Raymond Paul, Medford.
Stahl, Robert Henry, St. Paul.
Steffes, William Joseph, St. Cloud.
Stricklin, Thomas Grady, Minneapolis.
Stroub, Steven John, Austin.
Tracy, Gerald Francis, Dennison.
Truhler, Bruce Lee, St. Paul.
Tscherter, Vernon S., Windom.
Uecker, David Arnold, Howard Lake.
Van Vleet, Jeffery Harold, Kimball.
Vick, Richard Dewey, Bemidji.
Vogel, Garrity, Chaska.
Wagner, James Edward, Elgin.
Wallace, Ronald Ray, Ivanhoe.
Weber, John Knute, St. Paul.
Weber, William James, St. Paul.
Welch, Leland Douglas, Belview.
Wencl, David Allan, Claremont.
Willard, Lloyd Loren, Solway.
Williams, David Leigh, Lake Crystal.
Williams, Larry Dale, Minneapolis.
Wittkop, Joe Allen, Duluth.
Woehnker, Harrison E., Jr., Minneapolis.
Wright, Bradford Dwain, Duluth.
Zaitz, Jack Michael, Hibbing.

Air Force

Couillard, Bruce Alvin, Duluth.
O'Connor, Daniel Jerome, St. Paul.
Wackerfuss, Richard Willia, St. Paul.
Waldron, Karl Merritt, Jr., Minneapolis.

Marine Corps

Ades, Arnold Alvin, St. Paul.

MINNESOTA—continued

Marine Corps

Anderson, Marlyn Ronald, St. Paul.
Auge, David Charles, St. Paul.
Baron, Francis Vincent, Foley.
Beckwith, William Henry, Minneapolis.
Bellanger, John George, Minneapolis.
Bina, Thomas Melvin, Pine City.
Brenden, Norris Lee, Deer River.
Brindley, Thomas Drew, St. Paul.
Corley, Jerry Wayne, Rosemount.
Fogard, Ronald Dean, Battle Lake.
Gaertner, Byrl William, Rochester.
Gardner, Michael John, Minneapolis.
Geerdes, Donnie Adelbert, Rochester.
Gerdesmeier, John Alois, Lakeville.
Goodman, Kenneth Virgil, Stewart.
Gunderson, Gerald James, Willmar.
Hedlund, Peter Burr, Cedar.
Hendrickson, Patrick Raymo, Minneapolis.
Hill, Jerry James, Minneapolis.
Hinds, Stephen John, Osseo.
Johnson, Eugene Charles, St. Paul.
Johnson, Paul, Conrad, Crystal.
Joly, Mitchell Lewis, Minneapolis.
Jones, Loyd Ellis, Minneapolis.
Kettner, Alan Arthur, Springfield.
Kingston, Thomas Lloyd, St. Paul.
Kinney, Lee Charles, Welch.
Kopp, Patrick Daniel, Burnsville.
Krinke, Stephen Matthews, Minneapolis.
Kunshier Gary Lee, Wyoming.
Lewer, Thomas Charles, Bemidji.
Lindberg, Brian Victor, Dunnell.
Longtine, Jerry Allen, International Fall.
Mariz, Robert J., South St. Paul.
McKeever, Michael Edward, Duluth.
Midthun, Roger Wayne, Frost.
Miller, James Walter, Fridley.
Nelson, Bruce Jeffrey, Wayzata.
Nelson, Max Alvin, Walker.
Nystul, Michael Dean, Minneapolis.
O'Neill, Michael James, Minneapolis.
Onslow, Robert Cranley, Minneapolis.
Peterson, Stephen Edwin, Willow River.
Popp, David Joseph, Minneapolis.
Raiolo, James John, St. Paul.
Remer, Kevin Ralph, Minneapolis.
Romanko Michael James, Minneapolis.
Rostamo, Thomas David, Robbinsdale.
Rowland, Roger Lee, Monticello.
Satter, Donald Stephen, Minneapolis.
Schanck, Henry Edward, Fairmont.
Schrom, John Francis, Owatonna.
Skanson, Louis James, Rochester.
Skuza, Arvid Burdeen, Ada.
Smith, Dennis Carol, Deer River.
Spiczka, Aloysius F., Jr., Minneapolis.
Spierowski, Russell Dean, Sauk Rapids.
Stevens, Raymond John, Duluth.
Strausser, Darry Richard, Jackson.
Sturtz, Darwin Clifford, Paynesville.
Swanson, Lawrence Harry, Hastings.
Thotland, John Alfred, Minneapolis.
Thuet, Stephen Paul, St. Paul.
Tracy, John William, Minneapolis.
Uutela, Derris Lee, Duluth.
Vasquez, Dean, Robbinsdale.
Vonasek, Richard James, East Grand Forks.
Walensky, Gordon David, St. Louis Park.
Watson, Larry William, Rochester.
White, Charles Clinton, St. Paul.
Wielinski, Donald James, Inver Grove.
Willey, Peter Ray, Bloomington.
Williams, Richard Earl, Richfield.
Yates, John Charles, Fergus Falls.

Navy

Abrams, John Leon, Minneapolis.
Burnside, Donald Wayne, Hawley.
Duncan, Kurt William, Princeton.
Gustofson, James Ernest, Minneapolis.
Kollmeyer, Carl, Hopkins.
Murphy, Daniel Joseph, Brainerd.
O'Brien, Terrence Patrick, St. Paul.
Odaffer Richard Duane, Albert.
Olson, Charles Emmette, Naytahwaush.
Paine, Paul Warren, Rochester.
Schnurrer, Reinhard J., Jr., St. Paul.
Spillman, Charles Otto, New Brighton.
Swedeen, Richard Allen, St. Paul.
Young, Randall Lee, Worthington.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Adams, Davey Marlin, Greenville.
Anderson, Leon, Jr., Senatobia.
Barfield, John R., Bude.
Bateman, James Ronald, Gloster.
Beacham, Edward Earl, Hazlehurst.
Blair, Ivy Louis, West Point.
Blalock, John Hilton, Liberty.
Bolen, Freeman, Columbus.
Boozer, Don Allen, Plantersville.
Brady, Sherman C., Vicksburg.
Brown, Joe Henry, Jackson.
Burnside, Donald Ray, Vicksburg.
Burton, Johnny Ray, Hattiesburg.
Carpenter, Kenneth Braxton, Booneville.
Cherry, James Edward, Scooba.
Clark, Robert Samuel, Jr., Columbus.
Coleman, Arthur, Jr., Marks.
Craft, Grayson, Magee.
Creel, David De Witt, Long Beach.
Cunningham, Larry La Mont, Louisville.
Curry, M. L., Holly Springs.
Daniels, Paul Freeman, Jr., Jackson.
Danner, Jessie James, Meridian.
Davis, Samuel M., Gulfport.
Davis, William Jewel, Jr., Como.
Depriest, Darrell James, Abbeville.
Douglas, Paul Melvyn, Hattiesburg.
Everett, Rockford Grey, Columbus.
Ficklin, Eric, Morton.
Ficklin, Excell, Morton.
Gardner, Eddie Augustus, Jackson.
Garth, Clyde, Jr., Aberdeen.
Gibson, William Arthur, Tylertown.
Griffin, Allen Avery, Houston.
Grubbs, Jerry Roe, Mendenhall.
Hamby, Jimmy Wayne, Leland.
Hammer, Leon, Porterville.
Harmon, Arthur, Laurel.
Harper, John Curtis, Meridian.
Harris, Richard Flamond, Canton.
Hill, Elmer Dean, Laurel.
Holmes, James Michael, Tylertown.
Holt, James, Hollandale.
Hosey, Tommy Bryan, Stringer.
Houston, Lathan, De Kalb.
Izard, Phillips H., Jr., Fulton.
Jeffries, Mack Simpson, Holly Springs.
Jenkins, Jerry Wayne, Meridian.
Johnson, James, Jr., Natchez.
Johnson, John Foster, Carthage.
Johnson, William Newton, Starkville.
Jones, Clarence, Batesville.
Jordan, Jack Joseph, Jr., Columbia.
Kennebrew, John G., Jackson.
Kent, Lloyd Henry, Grenada.
Kerns, Donald Ray, Lowndes.
King, James Roy, Collinsville.
Lamar, Nelvin Stettinius, Hattiesburg.
Lannom, Gary Kenneth, Corinth.
Laws, Isaiah, Jr., Greenville.
Lofton, Joe Eddie, Mantee.
Marlar, Donnie Joe, Burnsville.
McGee, Charles Edward, Marks.
McGee, William Royal, Meridian.
Moore, George Washington, Columbus.
Morrow, Hershel Eugene, Corinth.
Newcomb, Larry Franklin, Corinth.
Phillips, Clyde Raymond, Corinth.
Portis, Anthony Jerome, Laurel.
Powell, Walter Merrill, Bolton.
Powers, Spencer Byrd, Jr., Cary.
Quick, Robert Glynn, Terry.
Randall, Richard Dennis, Natchez.
Randle, George, Jr., West Point.
Reese, Daniel, Jr., Bassfield.
Robinson, Paul William, Tupelo.
Rush, James Edward, Jr., Preston.
Scott, Robert Lee, Redwood.
Seals, Walter, Beulah.
Smith, Audron L., Poplarville.
Smith, George W., Jr., Terry.
Smith, Larry Hays, Jackson.
Smith, Willis Wilson, Jr., Decatur.
Stribling, Victor Michael, Starkville.
Stutts, Thomas Richard, Rienzi.
Tall, Warren Lee, Moorhead.
Taylor, Bernell, Magnolia.
Thomas, Henry Earl, Lexington.
Walden, Larry Huston, Columbus.
Ward, Earnest Shelby, Florence.

XUM

MISSISSIPPI—continued

Army

Ware, Ricnard Alexandra, Bay Springs.
Washington, Sylvester, Vaughan.
West, Melford Wayne, Fulton.
White, Roosevelt, Jackson.
Whitfield, Willie, Jr., Columbus.
Williams, Henry Braxton, Jr., Jackson.
Williams, James Earl, Columbus.
Williams, Robert Lee, Clarksdale.
Williams, William Charles, Horton.
Willis, Howard Daniel, Stonewall.
Wright, Booker T., Greenwood.
Young, Calvin Edward, Biloxi.
Young, Eugene, Wiggins.

Air Force

McBride, Edward Ernest, Hattiesburg.
Muse, Edward Grady, Tutwiler.

Marine Corps

Adams, Larry Earl, New Albany.
Allen, Joe Ebert, Bay St. Louis.
Beasley, Luzon, Clarksdale.
Boland, Melvin Lynn, Shaw.
Chapman, Clinton, Newton.
Cockrell, James Warren, Jr., Macon.
Coleman, Lynn Bailey, Ashland.
Crowder, Hylan Lynn, Winona.
Cummings, James Lonel, Silver City.
Dandridge, Albert, Coldwater.
Dilworth, Arthur William, Iuka.
Dooley, Robert Ellis, Jackson.
Erby, Lester, Clarksdale.
Gant, Eddie Dean, Grenada.
Gore, Harold Douglas, Houston.
Hamburg, McArthur, Enterprise.
Hampton, Fred Lee, Houlka.
Hardy, Thomas Douglas, Pascagoula.
Hill, John Kenny, Tunica.
Hodges, Dwight, Kosciusko.
Hoffman, James Michael, Rolling Fork.
Johnson, Prince Arthur, Jr., Corinth.
Luri, Robert Michael, Carthage.
Mack, Joseph Dean, Prairie Point.
Magee, Herman Paul, Pascagoula.
Mangum, William Thomas, Jr., Jackson.
McKinnon, Bobby Ray, Kosciusko.
O'Dell, Timothy Lee, Biloxi.
Peterson, Robert Vernon, Canton.
Shows, James Jerry, Pass Christian.
Smith, Robert Eugene, Jackson.
Stokes, Colben Benjamin, Jr., Laurel.
Ulmer, David Joseph, Meridian.
Wallace, George F. Jr., Rolling Fork.
Walters, Thomas Jerry, Laurel.
Ward, Thomas Leslie, Starkville.
Wilson, Eugene, Water Valley.
Young, John Curtis, Baldwyn.

Navy

Burnley, Earl Rosemond, Jr., Jackson.
Lint, Darrell Clifford, Ocean Springs.
Roberts, Michael Land, Purvis.
Wickliffe, Robert Logan, Natchez.

MISSOURI

Army

Abbott, Robert Esten, Jr., Pine Lawn.
Allen, Elvin L., Kansas City.
Alley, Michael Morris, Bridgeton.
Ames, James David, Florissant.
Anderson, George Rogers, St. Loius.
Andreotta, Glenn Urban, St. Louis.
Armor, Loyde Dean, Broseley.
Ayer, Herley, Jr., Kahoka.
Backy, Thomas Alan, Festus.
Badger, Thomas Albert, Arnold.
Baker, Michael Ray, St. Louis.
Baker, Thomas Michael, Fulton.
Barham, Larry Gene, Portageville.
Bartell, Larry Michael, Hazelwood.
Belinge, Richard Lewis, Springfield.
Bell, Dean Allan, Kansas City.
Betebenner, David Lee, Alba.
Biondo, Martin, Kirkwood.
Blacksten, Billy Joe, Versailles.
Blankenship, James Oris, Independence.
Blattel, David Lee, Scott City.
Boever, David Richard, St. Louis.
Bonderer, Thomas Edward, Chillicothe.
Bowdern, Robert James, Jr., Pagedale.
Boyles, Jerry Lee, Foster.

MISSOURI—continued

Army

Bradley, Martee Jr., Olean.
Brown, Dierother, St. Loius.
Bumiller, Robert Oscar, La Due.
Burnett, Gary Ray, Union.
Bush, Steven Clarence, Grubville.
Caplan, Laurence Curtis, Kansas City.
Chambers, Udell, Kirkwood.
Chitwood, Fred Allen, Jr., Bridgeton.
Claspill, Larry Vernal, Kansas City.
Claveria, Richard Lee, Maplewood.
Colbert, John Wayne, Kinder.
Coleman, James Francis, Festus.
Collins, Arlin Darrell, Elsberry.
Cook, Jay Alan, High Ridge.
Cook, Robert Edward, Overland.
Cooper, Richard Lee, Richmond Heights.
Cope, Charles Alfred, St. Louis.
Cordia, Michael James, Richwoods.
Currier, Gordon Leroy, Jr., Independence.
Dalman, Leonard James, St. Louis.
Daugherty, Everett L. Jr., Galena.
Delassus, Charles Edward, Florissant.
Dian, Don Faurot, Hannibal.
Dillard, John Edward, Kansas City.
Ditzfeld, Bobbie Lee, Sedalia.
Doggett, Ronald Thomas, St. Louis.
Drake, Steven Cole, Kirkwood.
Duncan, Gary Beryl, Williamsville.
Ellerman, Garry Ronald, Salem.
Elliott, Larry Wilbert, Sherman.
Elmore, Larry Eugene, Kansas City.
Fahrenhorst, Thomas Kennet, Ferguson.
Faircloth, Julius Clyde, Sedalia.
Fennewald, Daniel Frank, Spanish Lake.
Ferguson, James Donahue, West Plains.
Ferguson, Latney Dean, Bois D Arc.
Flaherty, William F., III, Kansas City.
Floyd, Bogard Lafayette, Kennett.
Frisk, Johnny Earl, Purdy.
Genzler, August Henry, St. Louis.
Glover, James Lear, Jr., Hannibal.
Goins, Michael Ray, Broseley.
Gonzalez, Douglas David, St. Louis.
Goodale, Thomas Lee, Kansas City.
Gossage, Douglas Eugene, St. Louis.
Grant, Bill Wayne, Everton.
Graves, Jerry Lee, Mexico.
Gray, Harold Leroy, St. Louis.
Greb, James J., Kansas City.
Greene, Lloyd Rolland, St. Louis.
Gregory, Philip Lee, Kansas City.
Grigsby, Joe Walter, Kansas City.
Grosshart, Robert Steven, Kansas City.
Grutsch, John Wilbur, Jr., Brentwood.
Hackleman, Larry L., Kansas City.
Hadley, Gary Patrick, Arnold.
Hall, Chauncey Ike, Walnut Grove.
Hanlin, Gary Leon, Kansas City.
Hansen, John Mark, Marshfield.
Harlamert, Michael Ray, Dixon.
Head, Noble Thomas, Macon.
Headrick, William David, Smithville.
Henderson, Rufus Q., Charleston.
Herrick, Bennett James, Kansas City.
Hicks, Jeffrey Lynn, Jefferson City.
Higgins, Hershel, Herculaneum.
Hill, Eugene Donald, Kansas City.
Hill, Gary, St. Louis.
Hirni, Troy Edward, II, Warrensburg.
Holt, Clarence Ray, Liberty.
Holt, Clay; Jr., Marshall.
Houtz, Joseph Merle, Springfield.
Hudson, Thomas Gordon, Kansas City.
Huff, Terry Kenneth, Success.
Hunt, Philip Wade, Wright City.
Igert, John William, Independence.
Jackson, Richard Albert, Kansas City.
Johnson, Roger Lee, Jr., Flat River.
Jones, Robert Lewis, Dawn.
Karr, David Ray, Quitman.
Kester, Thomas Dufaux, St. Louis.
Kimbley, Robert Glenn, Joplin.
Kimbrell, Louis Cleveland, Sibley.
Kindle, William Doyle, Concordia.
King, Guy Richard, Springfield.
Kinkead, Maurice Harrison, Centralia.
Klipfel, Joe Paul, Portageville.
Kram, Harold Andrew, Jr., St. Louis.
Kratzberg, Jimmie Lynn, Columbia.

MISSOURI—continued

Army

Lintner, Darryl Charles, Perryville.
Lollar, Byron Clifton, Kansas City.
Longo, Dennis Michael, St. Louis.
Loos, Thomas Walter, Perryville.
Marrion, Jimmie Charles, Springfield.
Marshall, John Grady, Kansas City.
Martinez, Richard Paul, Kansas City.
McClafferty, James Edward, Kansas City.
McClellan, Edward Eugene, St. Joseph.
McLeary, Orval Wade, Sturdivant.
Mensch, Charles R., Kansas City.
Miller, Michael Wesley, Kansas City.
Miller, Paul James, Poplar Bluff.
Moller, Glenn Loren, Jr., Glendale.
Montgomery, Jackie Gene, Cabool.
Moore, Charles James, Kansas City.
Moore, Louis Charles, St. Louis.
Moore, Terry Lee, Richmond Heights.
Mosley, Glen Herbert, Jr., Independence.
Murphy, John William, III, Florissant.
Nelms, Patrick Irvin, Oakville.
Nelson, Bruce Anthony, Malden.
Niemeyer, Louis Andrew, Jr., Bowling Green.
North, Dale Eugene, Wright City.
Noto, Robert Joseph, St. Louis.
Null, Arthur Elliott, Jr., Nevada.
O'Toole, Michael Joseph, St. Louis.
Parker, Herman, Jr., Gray Summit.
Parker, Marvin Russell, Hartsburg.
Patten, Jearl Ray, Lebanon.
Pennel, Lawrence Paul, Springfield.
Petty, Jerry Leon, Marshfield.
Pleasant, Eddie Lee, Campbell.
Poff, Bill Dean, Auxvasse.
Pomeroy, David Keith, Lutesville.
Poscover; Gary Stuart, University City.
Powell, Michael Allan, Olivette.
Pragman, Donald Eugene, Higginsville.
Price, John Chad, Richmond.
Pumphrey, Donald Lee, Springfield.
Rawlings, Jerome, Kirkwood.
Reece, Stacey Dana, Pevely.
Reese, Delbert Leon, Esther.
Reiff, Michael Dean, Independence.
Renfro, Richard Alvin, Kansas City.
Rhode, Edward Anthony, St. Louis.
Richardson, James Evert, Houston.
Richardson, Melvin Nelson, Independence.
Rickert, Roger Allen, Bowler.
Rippee, Jon Alan, Columbia.
Ruhl, Robert Jack, Jr., Joplin.
Rupert, Leo Franklin, Newburg.
Sanzaro, Ernest, Jr., St. Louis.
Schmidt, John George, St. Louis.
Scott, Daniel R., New Haven.
Scowden, Curtis Dean, St. Louis.
Seaton, Charles Everett, Lamar.
Shannon, George David, Raytown.
Sheets, Orville Allan, Fulton.
Silvey, Harold Ray, St. Louis.
Simmons, Harold Joseph, St. Louis.
Slankard, Wayne Albert, Jennings.
Smith, David William, Kansas City.
Smith, Donald C., Lawson.
Smith, Larry Dean, Jefferson City.
Snyder, Michael Bryant, Ferguson.
Srader, Charles Wesley, Jr., Independence.
Stafford, Lee Roy, Dudley.
Stephens, Arthur Allyn, Walker.
Stephenson, Kenneth Ray, Marceline.
Stewart, Stephen James, Clinton.
Stockwell, Paul Marion, Corder.
Suggs, John Fenton, Jr., Farmington.
Swanguarim, Lawrence Alfre, St. Louis.
Taylor, Robert Lee, Jr., Cape Girardeau.
Thoman, Floyd Nickolas, Mountain Grove.
Thompson, Dennis Hugh, Kansas City.
Thompson, James Edward, Benton.
Threet, Howard Andrew, Monett.
Tinsley, James E., St. Louis.
Titsworth, Carrel Jean, Reeds Spring.
Truitt, Jerry Bob, Novinger.
Tullis, James Cleveland, Windsor.
Underwood, Harry William, St. Louis.
Underwood, Robert Stephen, O'Fallon.
Vanskike, Monte Eugene, St. Louis.
Venable, Billy Ray, Liberal.
Wallace, John Clayton, Neosho.

MISSOURI—continued

Army

Ward, Albert, Sheldon.
Wells, John Charles, Mayview.
Westbrooks, Allison A., Jr., New Madrid.
White, Ronald Gene, Marshfield.
Whitley, Freddie Lee, St. Louis.
Wilcox, Charles Kirby, Springfield.
Williams, John Dillard, St. Louis.
Williams, Joseph Jerome, St. Louis.
Wilson, Jerry Lee, Doniphan.
Wilson, Michael Richard, St. James.
Winkler, Bobby Joe, Marshall.
Winter, Roy Alan, Aurora.
Wood, James Lewis, Eldon.
Wood, James Schenler, La Due.
Wright, John Wesley, Kansas City.
Wyatt, James Edward, Sikeston.
Young, Jimmy Ray, Fredericktown.

Air Force

Dickens, Freddie Dale, Poplar Bluff.
Hardy, John Charles, Troy.
Lang, James Franklin, Tipton.
McKinney, Eugene Phillip, Jefferson City.
Richards, Lon Davis, North Columbia.
Schmidt, Herbert Ellis, Kansas City.

Marine Corps

Allen, Otis Lee, Steele.
Austin, Tyrone Wagner, St. Louis.
Bateman, Raymond, St. Louis.
Bean, Donald Wayne, Holt.
Bell, Ronald Eugene, St. Joseph.
Biggs, Jimmy Dean, Kansas City.
Brennan, James Aloyisus, Creve Coeur.
Burns, John Robert, Jr., St. Louis.
Callahan, Thomas Francis, St. Louis.
Callihan, Lyndal Ray, Kansas City.
Carson, Lawrence Howard, Springfield.
Cason, George Gilbert, Jr., St. Joseph.
Child, Ronald William, St. Louis.
Clark, Larry Gene, Kansas City.
Cobb, Ronald David, Poplar Bluff.
Cook, Charles Herman, New Haven.
Copeland, Norman Ottis, De Soto.
Cramer, Robert Michael, Stoutland.
Crockran, James, St. Louis.
Crook, Thomas Hiram, Kansas City.
Cureton, Ronnie Charles, Kansas City.
Cutbirth, Richard Eugene, Marionville.
Dains, Paul Leland, Maryland Heights.
Dalton, Michael Francis, Kansas City.
Darnell, Jimmy Allen, Dover.
Darrow, Donnie Len, Lebanon.
Davis, Carl Raymond, Manchester.
Deeds, Leland Samuel, Newton.
Dennis, John Allen, St. Louis.
Dobbs, Ronald Gene, Chaffee.
Donaldson, James Allen, St. Louis.
Dykes, Frank Fayete, St. Joseph.
Evans, Richard Allen, Jr., Independence.
Ferren, Jerry Wayne, St. Louis.
Fishbach, William Edward, Springfield.
Frazier, Ronald Leon, Weatherby.
Fussner, Allen George, St. Louis.
Green, Allen Russel, Hanley Hills.
Hamilton, Michael Eugene, Independence.
Haymes, Richard Scott, Warrenton.
Henson, Clark Lee, Jr., Joplin.
Hoppers, Michael Eugene, Kansas City.
Hudson, Gary Lee, Kansas City.
Hutter, Robert Nelson, Jr., Bellefontaine.
Isgrig, Dennis Edward, Bonne Terre.
Jennings, Larry Jo, Keytesville.
King, Garry Eugene, Fairfax.
Kirkland, Charles S., Jr., Kennett.
Knoll, Anthony, Pacific.
Lakey, George Leo, Springfield.
Layton, Patrick Arthur, Kansas City.
Lee, Walter Clarence, Caruthersville.
Luebbers, Ralph Joseph, Jr., Webster Groves
McBride, Donald Wayne, Kansas City.
McCallister, Robert Lynn, Oak Ridge.
McDaniel, Roy Dean, Kansas City.
McMullin, Charles Ernest, Willard.
Oliver, Charles, Raytown.
Olson, Steve Ricky, St. Clair.
Parsons, James Lloyd, Warsaw.
Parsons, Warren Cecil, Jr., Crystal City.
Paschal, Leslie Calvin, Jr., Kansas City.

MISSOURI—continued

Marine Corps

Pennington, Thomas Jack, Scott City.
Phelps, Larry Lee, Aurora.
Pierce, Danny Ralph, St. Louis.
Pliler, Larry Dean, Joplin.
Ponder, John David, High Ridge.
Raulston, Riley David, Poplar Bluff.
Rayfield, Gregory Russell, St. Louis.
Reeves, Lonnie Michael, Clayton.
Reichardt, Steven John, St. Charles.
Robinson, Alan Joseph, St. Ann.
Seymour, Gary Carl, Hazel Park.
Simpson, Bobby Gene, Kansas City.
Siron, James Lloyd, Sedalia.
Slaughter, Phillip Edward, Kansas City.
Smith, Cary Carson, Kansas City.
Smith, Scott Gary, Berkeley.
Snyder, John Marshall, Jr., Webster Groves.
Spindler, John Gates, St. Louis.
Straker, Gary Ennis, Cowgill.
Sutherland, Charles Edward, St. Ann.
Taylor, James Otis, St. Louis.
Travers, Wallace Oldham, Jr., St. Louis.
Voss, William Arthur, Kansas City.
Watson, Sammie Lee, Jr., St. Louis.
Whitaker, Donald Eugene, Durham.
Whitted, Joe Ray, Joplin.
Williams, Curtis Lee, Catron.
Williams, Willard Loyd, Lilbourn.
Willis, Paul Mitchell, Berkeley.
Wiseman, John Samuel, St. Louis.
Woods, Gregory, St. Louis.
Wyatt, Billy Joe, Columbia.

Navy

Cawley, Richard Ernest, St. Joseph.
Farris, Michael J., Lincoln.
Ledbetter, James Riley, Lebanon.
Proffer, George Floyd, Patterson.
Smith, Theodore, St. Louis.
Stanton, Richard Eugene, Kansas City.
Thurman, Curtis Frank, St. James.
Williams, Lester Lee, Kirksville.

MONTANA

Army

Anderson, David Anthony, Anaconda.
Barber, David Lynn, Denton.
Barnum, Wayne Alan, Ronan.
Burkhardt, Larry James, Billings.
Burns, James Lynn, Billings.
Byington, Steven L., Libby.
Carroll, Robert Hugh, Missoula.
Deitchler, Russell Floyd, Rosebud.
Derenburger, Ronald Hal, Miles City.
Doan, Lester Allan, Butte.
Dorris, David Walter, Kalispell.
Edden, George Edward, Avon.
Fish, Glenn Charles, Great Falls.
Fuhrman, James Francis, Larslan.
Gallagher, Raymond Leroy, Bozeman.
Grayson, Reid Ernest, Jr., Scobey.
Han, Charles William, Inverness.
Hinther, Gary Rodger, Jordan.
Johnson, Lester Wesley, Jr., Libby.
Kriskovich, Raymond George, Butte.
Lockwood, Harold Spencer, Troy.
Martin, Ronald Steven, McLeod.
Moe, Ronald John, Anaconda.
Murphy, Jon Michael, Thompson Falls.
Murphy, Steven Patrick, Butte.
Nathe, Michael Leo, Redstone.
Osterloth, James Allan, Wibaux.
Peters, George Edward, Jr., St. Xavier.
Picard, Michael W., Bainville.
Pickle, Jimmy Dee, Logan.
Rollins, Dale Franklin, St. Ignatius.
Rowland, Zack Oscar, Busby.
Sullivan, David Patrick, Missoula.
Tillotson, Robert Virtus, Helena.
Uhren, Bernard Jeffrey, Billings.
Wear, Dennis William, Billings.
Welch, Robert Edward, Libby.
Wiest, John Robin, Billings.
Williams, Ralph Leroy, Billings.
Woods, Albert Clarence, Jr., Hathaway.
Zahn, Florian J., Butte.

Marine Corps.

Allen, Robert Christian, Reno.
Anderson, David George, Billings.

MONTANA—continued

Marine Corps

Archer, Sanford Kim, Melrose.
Boyer, Charles Goodhue, Billings.
Chavez, Paul Edward, Sanders.
Crase, Lionell Russell, Missoula.
Doane, Michael Leo, Browning.
Healy, Louis Glenn, Dodson.
Hendrickson, Michael Franc, Great Falls.
Howard, Walter John, Jr., Forsyth.
Johnson, William Michael, Great Falls.
Kendall, George Percy, Jr., Missoula.
Light, Glee Roy, Lewistown.
Loyd, Harold Ivan, Orrick.
Nelson, Louis Howard, Harlowton.
Padilla, Michael David, Billings.
Schwarz, Larry Edward, Malta.
Sonsteng, Dennis Wayne, Butte.
Stockburger, Arthur Lee, Livingston.
Wood, Alvy Eugene, Livingston.
Zerbst, Gilbert Leroy, St. Ignatius.

Navy

Cawley, Robert William, Butte.
Gifford, Gregory Allen, Billings.
Hagl, Edward Allen, McAllister.
Heisley, Gregory Phillip, Butte.
Lawrence, Delmar Leon, Thompson Falls.

NEBRASKA

Army

Adler, Henry, Lincoln.
Auman, Ervin Lewis, Firth.
Ballinger, William Joseph, Bingham.
Caldwell, Larry Gail, Omaha.
Campbell, James Robert, Trenton.
Carr, Daniel Lee, North Platte.
Chandler, Jerome Dee, Norfolk.
Clark, Kendall Hanson, Elwood.
Culbertson, Gary Morten, Lincoln.
Draper, Clifford Arvin, Hastings.
Dunn, Gary Wayne, Falls City.
Enquist, Arthur John, Columbus.
Estrada, Richard Allen, Bridgeport.
Foley, James Williams, Omaha.
Fous, James William, Omaha.
Garamillo, Eldon, Overton.
Gillham, Jan Royce, Grand Island.
Golden, Jack Duane, Ponca.
Green, Norman Duane, Albion.
Heesacker, Victor Roman, Humphrey.
Henk, James Lynn, Swanton.
Hiley, Thomas Charles, Omaha.
Hudson, Danny Charles, Chadron.
Jackson, Eddie Lee, Jr., Omaha.
Korinek, John Charles, Friend.
Lane, Roger Leroy, Fremont.
Lentz, Jerry Francis, Hartington.
Lewis, Donald Gene, Stanton.
Martin, Marvin Henry, Scottsbluff.
McQuay, Roger Dillon, Ogallala.
Moore, James Eldon, Weeping Water.
Moore, Ronnie Guns, Nebraska City.
Moser, James Myron, Randolph.
Murphy, John Patrick, Omaha.
Murphy, Robert Dennis, Falls City.
Novak, Larry Dean, Platte Center.
Nowak, Robert Virgil, Ogallala.
Plahn, Jack Charles, Fremont.
Raubach, William Pierce, Valentine.
Robertson, John Craig, Fremont.
Sanders, Robert Neil, Orleans.
Schneider, Roger Lloyd, Louisville.
Schultz, James Ronald, Lincoln.
Schwartz, Allan Edward, Lushton.
Skavaril, Thomas Joseph, Omaha.
Smith, Larry Eugene, Lincoln.
Smith, Michael Francis, Omaha.
Solomon, Wilfred L., Sr., Omaha.
Sperling, Wesley William, Arlington.
Stoehr, David Loren, Lincoln.
Stolinski, James Francis, Omaha.
Straus, Allen Arthur, Omaha.
Thiem, William Raymond, Loretto.
Wagner, Robert Alfred, Winside.
Waite, Donald Steven, Omaha.
Walker, Elbert Berton, North Platte.
Walters, Gerald Leroy, Culbertson.
Welding, Clifford Kay, Roca.
Williams, Robert Floyd, West Point.
Wojtkiewicz, Ronald Joseph, Omaha.

NEBRASKA—continued

Army

Wolf, Jack Morse, Omaha.
Wolfe, Mathew, Macy.

Air Force

Johnson, Kenneth Lee, West Point.
Moorberg, Monte Larue, Grand Island.

Marine Corps

Adkins, Ronald Eugene, Plattsmouth.
Adolf, Larry Eugene, Omaha.
Ballantine, Richard Reed, Millard.
Becker, Michael Paul, Omaha.
Boyle, Robert Ray, Ogallala.
Flanagan, David Dale, Lincoln.
Fuss, Robert Edward, Lincoln.
Garcia, Jerry Frank, Omaha.
Graham, Harlan Lee, Lincoln.
Hall, Richard Le Roy, Hastings.
Hancock, William Howard, II, Yutan.
Iler, Kenneth Marvin, Omaha.
Klabunde, Arthur John, Jr., Omaha.
Konwinski, Ronald Eugene, Omaha.
Kot, Myron, Lincoln.
Langston, Melvin Doyle, Valentine.
McAdams, Gerold Jerome, Lincoln.
McKnight, Thomas Edwin, Lincoln.
Polt, Erwin Andrew, Pierce.
Schmidt, Richard Leroy, Fort Collins.
Ward, Carl Ray, Kearney.
Wigton, Philip Gregory, Omaha.
Wilkerson, Steven Douglas, Wakefield.

Navy

Condon, Robert Eugene, Lexington.
Hobson, John King, Lincoln.
Niebur, Edward Leroy, Bellevue.
Sutton, Terry James, Red Cloud.

NEVADA

Army

Ackerman, Daniel Leverne, Carson City.
Barger, Larry Earl, Las Vegas.
Bell, Jim Glenn, Jr., Las Vegas.
Bidart, David Louis, Reno.
Cates, Robert Matthew, Jr., Las Vegas.
Dubois, Greg Alan, Las Vegas.
Farnow, Jere Douglas, Las Vegas.
Fox, Charles Burton, Jr., Sparks.
Garcia, Joseph Andrew, Ely.
Holly, George Joseph, III, Las Vegas.
Johnson, Willard Vernon, Fallon.
Knittle, Harold Joseph, Las Vegas.
Lunzmann, Lowell Eugene, Henderson.
Ortega, Jesus F., Jr., Las Vegas.
Parnelle, Samuel W., III, Las Vegas.
Pierini, John Robert, East Ely.
Reid, Daniel Francis, Las Vegas.
Sanders, Robert Bruce, Hawthorne.
Schworer, Ronald Paul, Las Vegas.
Smothers, Danny Lee, Carson City.
Thomas, Morris E., Las Vegas.
Ward, David James, Las Vegas.
West, Daniel Floyd, Las Vegas.
Worley, Robert Lee, Las Vegas.

Air Force

Le Beau, Andrew Ernest, Jr., Sparks.

Marine Corps

Collins, David Leroy, Carson City.
Griffith, Richard Owen, Ely.
Johnson, Sterling Price, Carlin.
Mayhall, Alonzo Earl, Las Vegas.
Meginn, Michael Meridith, Las Vegas.
Minetto, Robert Neil, Reno.
Rice, Maxie Ross, Reno.
Rogers, David Robert, Las Vegas.
Smith, James Herbert, Jr., Las Vegas.
Taylor, Keith Degero, Carson City.
Whitlock, Theodore Jay, North Las Vegas.
Willis, James Ronald, Carson City.

Navy

Barber, Barry Morris, Las Vegas.
Hastings, Michael Kenneth, Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army

Ackerman, David Alan, Derry.
Albert, Daniel John, Berlin.
Bloom, Lawrence Clifford, Exeter.
Brown, Bruce Wadleigh, Hampton.
Brown, Warren Richard, Nashua.
Dale, George Louis, Gorham.
Delano, Darwin James, Hinsdale.
Dickey, Charles Joseph, Lancaster.
Dyer, Orrin Leonard, Jr., Rumney.
Ford, Marshall H., Marlborough.
Frost, Gerald James, Dover.
Gamelin, Ernest Ulric, Jr., Suncook.
Gardner, David Ernest, Walpole.
Godbout, Richard Gerald, Manchester.
Hillsgrove, Barry Malcolm, Dover.
Letendre, Richard Edward, Nashua.
McGuire, John Winchester, Derry.
Miller, William Michael, Keene.
Plourde, Robert James, Laconia.
Provencher, Wayne Thomas, Concord.
Rivard, Richard Norman, Merrimack.
Roach, Ronald D., Concord.
Sawyer, Robert William, Manchester.
Sweet, Eugene Frederick, Jr., Portsmouth.
Viel, Alfred, Dover.
Whipple, Gary Norman, Claremont.

Marine Corps

Abbott, Terry Michael, Lancaster.
Castelot, Robert Sheehan, Hillsboro.
Daley, Raymond Coyle, Dover.
Davis, William Thomas, Holderness.
Desmarais, George Philip, Concord.
Fecteau, Ralph Barnard, Jr., Cornish.
Flanagan, George Francis, Nashua.
Martin, Steven Wayne, Wolfeboro.
Milot, Larry Joseph, Manchester.
Morrissey, Thomas J., Jr., Dover.
Raymond, Lawrence Robert, Manchester.
Russ, Alfred Bayard, Peterborough.
Santy, Steven Craig, Belmont.
Stanley, Raymond Ernest, Manchester.

Navy

Cutting, William Stanley, Lebanon.
Guild, Eliot Franklin, Winchester.
Joy, William Arthur, Manchester.
Keller, Ronald Norman, Exeter.
Riordan, George William, Dover.
Sanville, Ernest Eugene, N. Hinsdale.

NEW JERSEY

Army

Abernathy, Daniel Owen, Burlington.
Ackerman, Thomas Alan, North Haledon.
Allen, Gary John, Hanover.
Allen, Robert Samuel, North Bergen.
Anderson, Marcus Peter, Cranford.
Applegate, Ross, Bergenfield.
Armento, Franklin Charles, Irvington.
Arntz, Willard Lee, Bernardsville.
Ashford, Howard Herrell, Newark.
Asselta, Charles Carl, Vineland.
Backes, Bruce Richard, Titusville.
Baldwin, Michael Richard, Flemington.
Belcher, Fred Arthur, Lafayette.
Benn, Philip Craig, Short Hills.
Biesiada, Richard Edward, Sayreville.
Boche, Gary Allen, Delanco.
Bonner, Frederick Neil, East Brunswick.
Boross, Laszlo, Jr., Nixon.
Boyd, Samuel, Jr., Newark.
Branin, Michael Francis, Jr., Kearny.
Brice, William Francis, Jr., Dover.
Brooks, David William, Montvale.
Brown, Gerald Francis, Newark.
Bulmer, Robert Arthur, Ogdensburg.
Bursis, Joseph Thomas, Jr., Jersey City.
Byrne, Jeffrey R., Piscataway.
Carney, George Austin, Pleasantville.
Carter, Robert Nel, Camden.
Castaldi, James, Camden.
Cervera, Michael Bernard, Bloomfield.
Chambers, Hillman Glen, Pemberton.
Clarken, Thomas Henry, III, East Orange.
Clayton, Brian Douglas, Milltown.
Cofrancesco, Louis J., Jr., Paterson.
Corbin, Andrew Phillip, Fort Dix.
Cornish, Russell Hubard, Maplewood.
Cowen, Christopher, Woodlynne.
Craig, Edward Joseph, Willingboro.
Crawford, Charles J., Jr., Jersey City.
Crews, John Divine, Jr., Morristown.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Critelli, Alfred Joseph, Nutley.
Cromwell, Roger Brian, Belleville.
Curtin, John, III, Hopatcong.
Da Ponte, Anthony, Freehold.
Daley, Daniel William, Elizabeth.
Dalton, James Albert, Jersey City.
Dalton, John, Riverdale.
Daniels, Christopher Micha, Gloucester.
Danowski, Thomas George, Linden.
Dawson, Steven James, Newark.
DeGarmo, Gordon Earl, Mount Holly.
DeHaas, Peter, Asbury.
DeJesus-Colon, Jose Celso, Freehold.
DeVore, Craig Jesse, Garfield.
Degenaars, Bradley Richard, Franklin Lakes.
DiCavallucci, Victor, Blackwood.
DiNapoli, John, Jr., Carlstadt.
Donovan, John Dennis, Trenton.
Doran, James Donald, Ridgefield Park.
Dorio, John William Allen, Avenel.
Duffy, John, Bayonne.
Eister, William, Mount Holly.
Ellis, Harry Joseph, III, Atco.
Evans, Samuel James, Newark.
Faith, Walter Daniel, Sayreville.
Fallon, Michael James, Jersey City.
Farmer, Michael Lee, Atlantic City.
Fett, Dennis James, Pompton Plains.
Field, Leon Roy, Glassboro.
Frolich, Leslie James, Roselle.
Gaspard, Claude Joseph, Jr., Short Hills.
Geib, Allen, Fair Lawn.
Gerwatowski, Joseph, Jersey City.
Giacobbe, Angelo, Blackwood.
Giles, Franklin N., Jr., Bridgeton.
Gilray, Robert Bruce, Jr., Chatham.
Gleason, Dennis Stephen, Teaneck.
Golon, Wayne Leonard, Bergenfield.
Gotthardt, Robert William, Jersey City.
Granger, Willie Earl, Princeton.
Green, Douglas Barton, III, Elizabeth
Greene, Kenneth John, Jersey City.
Grove, Louis Cancian, Clifton.
Guerra, Dario David, Elizabeth.
Halpin, Michael Patrick, Nutley.
Hannigan, Udo, Beverly.
Hayes, Francis Joseph, Jr., Runnemede.
Heggan, Donald Ernest, Hammonton.
Hein, Anthony, Verona.
Hanasey, Harold, Burlington.
Hilderbrandt, Daniel Alan, Iselin.
Hill, Eugene John, Jr., Blackwood.
Hill, John Charles, Irvington.
Holjes, Frederick Y., Lebanon.
Holmes, Harold, Jersey City.
Hutchinson, George Robert, New Providence.
Iandoli, Donald, Paterson.
Jackson, Joseph Louis, Edison.
Jacobs, Jerome Edward, Bayonne.
Janowitz, Robert Lawrence, Glen Rock.
Jervis, John Leroy, III, Pitman.
Johnson, Richard, Glassboro.
Jones, Clifford, Jr., Hackettstown.
Jones, Stephen Crawford, Watchung.
Jones, Thomas Hubert, Salem.
Jordan, Arthur, Paterson.
Jursza, William, Jr., Newark.
Kaminski, Edward J., Rahway.
Keeler, William Gilbert, Pennsville.
Kernahan, Gregory P., Jr., Avon by the Sea.
Kimball, William B., Jr., Parlin.
Klein, Dennis W., Keansburg.
Kocher, Lawrence Henry, West Milford.
Kovach, Peter Frank, West Orange.
Kowaleski, Gregory Stanley, Riverside.
Kravchak, Michael Steven, Roselle.
Krupinski, Frederick Joseph, Jersey City.
Kukinski, Edward, Paterson.
Lance, Alfred Frank, Glen Gardner.
Langford, Alvin Hugh, Paterson.
LeDonne, Lawrence Joseph, Ridgefield Park.
Lee, Bobby Eugene, Newark.
Leonardis, Stephen William, Newark.
Leta, Donald, Irvington.
Lewis, Richard Gary, Westfield.
Lilley, Thomas Edward, Toms River.
Lollis, Charles W., Oakhurst.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Long, George Francis, Tuckahoe.
Long, Richard Lytle, Glen Rock.
Love, Frederick Eugene, Andover.
Lubonski, Lawrence Frank, Collingswood.
Maher, Edward Michael, Jr., Hillsdale.
Manthey, Barry Arthur, Columbus.
Marason, John Edgar, Phillipsburg.
Marchut, Thomas Andrew, Sayreville.
Martin, John C., Ocean City.
Maxey, Eason Jasper, Newark.
Mayer, Howard Hercher, Moorestown.
McClain, Richard Larry, Toms River.
McConnell, James T., III, Pitman.
McManus, Robert Francis, Wayne.
Meara, William Daniels, Jr., Mount Holly.
Melnick, Stewart Arthur, Bradley Beach.
Mena, Samuel, Paterson.
Merschrod, Lawrence Richard, New Milford.
Mika, Victor George, Fords.
Miller, Donald, Pompton Lakes.
Moore, Manuel, Hackensack.
Moore, Robert Joseph, Morristown.
Moorer, Bobby, Vineland.
Morgan, Rainer K., McGuire AFB.
Morley, John Joseph, Jr., Bayonne.
Nawrosky, Michael Robert, Dumont.
Nemeth, Michael, South Amboy.
O'Connell, Eugene George, Edgewater.
Ochs, Timothy Carl, Dayton.
Oleson, Joseph, Jr., Bloomfield.
Ortiz-Burgos, Jose Alberto, West New York.
Ovaitt, Richard Arthur, Ramsey.
Pall, John Joseph, Montvale.
Pape, John David, Navesink.
Paul, Fred John, Boundbrook.
Pavlocak, Michael Peter, Edison.
Petracco, Robert, Summit.
Picarelli, Joseph Henry, Paterson.
Pierce, Irving Clarence, Jr., Bridgeton.
Pine, Frederick Andrew, Trenton.
Ponty, Stephen Chester, Jr., Monmouth Junction.
Potter, Paul D., Allentown.
Premock, Dennis, Franklin.
Ptak, Thomas John, Highlands.
Ramirez, Nelson R., West New York.
Ramos, Angel Luis, Jersey City.
Ramsey, Steven George, Teaneck.
Rand, Dwight Francis, Somerville.
Ranges, Robert Henry, Jr., Rivervale.
Reamer, Donald Page, Barrington.
Reck, John, Union City.
Reeves, Michael Davis, Absecon.
Robertson, David William, Kearny.
Robinson, James P., Newark.
Roman, Eulalio Arturo, Paterson.
Salemi, Vincent Ralph, North Bergen.
Santori, Joseph, Keyport.
Schlinger, James Irwin, New Bedford.
Schmalz, Carl Fredrick, Jr., Old Bridge.
Schmid, Jay Julius, Ridgewood.
Schopmann, Raymond Frank, Secaucus.
Schorndorf, Kenneth Francis, Garfield.
Scuitier, James, Summit.
Secor, Gilbert Arthur, Cranford.
Seibert, Richard J., Far Hills.
Sexton, Leonard Earl, Cookstown.
Shauger, Harrison Benjamin, Vernon.
Simpson, Walter Stephen, Trenton.
Sinibaldi, Michael William, Kearny.
Smith, Ernest William, Belvidere.
Smith, Terrance Edward, Phillipsburg.
Smith, Thomas F., Jr., Atlantic City.
Solari, Steven, Newark.
Sosnowski, James Francis, Bayonne.
Spikes, Stanley, Plainfield.
Stalevicz, Gregory Henry, Rahway.
Stefaniak, Stephen Robert, Clifton.
Sternin, Edward Marvin, Hillside.
Strangeway, James J., Jr., Clifton.
Strupp, David Alan, Sparta.
Swenson, Swante August, Denville.
Szawaluk, Nickolas, Hackettstown.
Szczepanczyk, George V., Paterson.
Tangarie, Joseph Thomas, Hillside.
Terry, James Willie, Atlantic City.
Thompson, Daniel Francis, Wayne.
Thompson, Dennis Wayne, Paterson.
Thorn, Joseph Merel, Bordentown.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Army

Tieman, William Edward, Delanco.
Tomeny, John Harold, Hackensack.
Torres, Anthony Wilfred, Mount Holly.
Tozour, Marvin George, Mayville.
Turnbull, Robert Chester, Andover.
Vanderhoff, George A., Jr., Oak Ridge.
Vanderhoof, Allen Walter, Dover.
Vogel, Edward Barry, Interlaken.
Von Bischoffshausen Robert, Elizabeth.
Weber, William Paul, Denville.
Whitaker, Freddie, Union.
Wilkins, Randolph Recardo, Camden.
Williams, C. W. Richard, Newark.
Williams, Lester, Jr., Bridgeton.
Wolfe, John Thomas, Paterson.
Wolff, Richard Glen, Newark.
Woods, Robert Walter, West Orange.
Wright, Leroy Norris, Newark.
York, Robert Leo, Maple Shade.
Zibura, Michael Edward, Jr., Boonton.

Air Force

Abara, Jose Gene, Long Branch.
Garrido, Robert Jacob, Newark.
Gunster, David James, Ridgewood.
Matyas, Andrew, Camden.
Reilly, John Norman, Jr., Spring Lake.
Richardson, Charles Henry, Bergenfield.
Scott, Peter Wilson, Linden.
Worshinski, Robert Matthew, Roselle Park.

Marine Corps

Abene, Charles Frederick, Bloomfield.
Amejka, Joseph Edward, Jersey City.
Bach, Colin James, Neptune.
Baker, Jon Allen, Elberon.
Ball, Robert Lee, Trenton.
Baranoski, John Frank, North Plainfield.
Bardet, Raymond Frederic, Union City.
Barnhart, Jack Adrian, Rahway.
Berkery, Michael Wayne, Alpine.
Bibbs, Warren Larry, Dividing Creed.
Bierlein, Patrick Michael, Passaic.
Bilenski, John Charles, Clifton.
Billingham, Frederick A., Jr., Trenton.
Birch, Thomas Harper, Keansburg.
Boyd, David Leroy, Newark.
Boye, Henry Joseph, Jr., Pine Hills.
Brellenthin, Michael John, North Bergen.
Brereton, Raymond James, Hoboken.
Brown, Tyrone, Newark.
Brunnow, Richard Albert, East Paterson.
Bucior, Andrew Zbigniew, Perth Amboy.
Bukowski, Ronald, Jersey City.
Burnham, Joseph Francis, Bloomfield.
Caporale, Michael Joseph, South Hackensack.
Capparelli, George Guy, Riverside.
Christmas, Paul, Newark.
Church, Robert Edward, Lakehurst.
Coleman, George William, Wildwood.
Coles, Vincent Samson, Newark.
Collins, Theothis, Asbury Park.
Conner, Gerald William, Colts Neck.
Corcoran, Kevin, Garwood.
Corcoran, Richard Francis, Clifton.
Cosgrove, Chester, Bloomfield.
Costa, Mario, Lafayette.
Covington, Lawrence Cornel, Jersey City.
Cuccinelli, Robert Alvandr, Ridgefield Park.
Dadamo, John, Jr., North Arlington.
Danberry, Charles Labaw, Lambertville.
Demattio, Mario Frank, Kenvil.
Dodson, Robert Gerald, Bloomfield.
Dwyer, Matthew Murice, Jr., Nutley.
Ellison, Jasper, Jr., Jersey City.
Esposito, James Michael, Pennsauken.
Espy, Johnnie Bee, Montclair.
Evans, Haydn, Roselle.
Featherstone, Richard Alli, Hillside.
Ferrelli, Robert Thomas, Salem.
Finnerty, Francis M., Jr., Washington.
Fischer, Robert Philip, North McGuire.
Foster, Steven Joel, Midland Park.
Freed, David Bruce, Montclair.
Gordon, James Thomas, Englewood.
Gray, Edward James, Newark.
Greenspan, Richard, Nutley.
Grimstad, Sigard Richard, Teaneck.
Grohman, John Joseph, Atlantic City.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Marine Corps

Haddock, Edward, Matawan.
Hamacher, William Bernard, Gloucester.
Hanson, Robert, Sewaren.
Harris, Lantie Lawrence, Jr., Shrewsbury.
Healey, Robert Charles, Jr., Trenton.
Hill, Tyrone, Garfield.
Hippie, Bradford John F., Jersey City.
Holland, William L., Jr., Orange.
Holloway, James Owens, Jr., Newark.
Hunter, Donald Lee, Salem.
Jackson, Robert Leonard, Newark.
Johnson, Havart Earl, Newark.
Jones, Garland, Newark.
Juranic, Francis Joseph, Jr., Trenton.
Klein, Joseph, Highland Park.
Lauer, Joseph Edward, Gibbsboro.
Law, Eugene, Linden.
Maczulski, Waclaw Jozef, Bayonne.
Majeski, Michael Thomas, Jersey City.
Manganello, Anthony, Jr., Garfield.
Marcantoni, Robert John, Phillipsburg.
Martorella, Gary Mario, Bayonne.
Mathews, Harold Joseph, Jr., Butler.
Mathews, James Michael, Butler.
Mayer, Francis John, Jr., West Long Beach.
McCall, Gerald Anthony, Atlantic City.
McClelland, George, Passaic.
McCloskey, Robert Allen, Verona.
McDonald, James, Newark.
Meade, Thomas Allerton, Orange.
Miller, Edward Kenneth, Richland.
Morris, James Robert, Phillipsburg.
Morse, Charles Francis, Jr., Keyport.
Mount, John Edward, Vineland.
Neal, John Hall, Jr., Jersey City.
Novembre, Carmine, Passaic.
Patterson, Jeffery Scott, Sparta.
Petrone, Louis Gene, Jr., Morristown.
Phipps, Lanny William, Rutherford.
Post, Vernon, Jr., Wenonah.
Preziosi, John Patrick, East Paterson.
Priset, John Frederick, Jersey City.
Prizgintas, Antanas Arvida, Bound Brook.
Reeves, Wayne Paul, Mount Holly.
Rhoades, Francis Steven, Elmer.
Rogers, Douglas Manuel, Newark.
Ross, Myron Rudolph, II, Rahway.
Rowe, Arthur Mortimer, Phillipsburg.
Russo, William, Elizabeth.
Rutter, Thomas Clayton, West Creek.
Ruvolis, Edward Joseph, Washington.
Santoro, Ronald Peter, North Plainfield.
Saunders, Donald Baron, Belleville.
Savoth, Terry Lee, Metuchen.
Schauble, Kenneth William, Closter.
Schavelin, Hugh Ernest, Norma.
Schuster, Frank, Willingboro.
Scott, Donald Blue, Harrison.
Selig, Ronald John, Westfield.
Sevell, Robert Lee, Clark.
Sharp, Bruce David, Pitman.
Shellem, Robert Patrick, Atlantic City.
Shelley, Gregory Allen, Palisades Park.
Sheppard, Lonnie, Jr., Newark.
Sickler, Charles Steven, Ewan.
Simmons, William, Newark.
Smith, Dennis, Bayonne.
Smoyer, William Stanley, Princeton.
Soroka, Douglas Martin, Blackwood.
Spina, Fred Concetto, Woodbury.
Sykes, Jonathan Edward, Trenton.
Taylor, Anthony, Newark.
Taylor, Louis Anthony, Atlantic City.
Thibault, Jeffery Allen, Pitman.
Thomas, Alton, Jr., Penns Grove.
Walker, Irvin, Elizabeth.
Wedlake, Brian Francis, Midland Park.
West, Edward Tyrone, Linden.
White, Herbert, Franklin, Camden.
White, Wesley William, Carteret.
Wienckoski, David Raymond, Linden.
Witt, James, Bayonne.
Woodard, Paul Leroy, Camden.

Navy

Bowman, Harry Thomas, II, Wood Ridge.
Casey, Robert Michael, Gutteberg.
Doty, Wesley George, Sussex.
Hubbs, Donald Richard, Palmyra.

NEW JERSEY—continued

Navy

Raab, James Donald, Beachwood.
Rossell, Francis L., Jr., Haddonfield.
Tamagnini, Joseph Edward, Edison.
Wynder, Edward Orlando, Bridgetown.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Abeyta, Jerry Delbert, Gallup.
Arellano, Anthony William, Albuquerque.
Austin, Rollin Randolph, Estancia.
Beckett, John Wesley, Albuquerque.
Carrillo, Melvin, Roswell.
Chino, Gerald Gregory, Cubero.
Conant, Gregory C., White Sands.
Crespin, Arthur, Santo Domingo Pueb.
Crow, Ennis Eugene, Lovington.
Cruce, Leonard Erwin, Hobbs.
David, Robert, Albuquerque.
Denney, Donald Gene, Albuquerque.
Dennis, Douglass J., Artesia.
Direen, Keven Thomas, Albuquerque.
Etsitty, Van, Gallup.
Faircloth, Richard Dwayne, Farmington.
Flores, Charle Cordova, Las Cruces.
Foster, George Arthur, III, Carlsbad.
Gadziala, Gary Lee, Albuquerque.
Garcia, Louis Magin, Albuquerque.
Garcia, Ramon, Albuquerque.
Ghahate, Luther Anderson, Zuni.
Graham, Robert Lee, Roswell.
Hayes, Thomas, Shiprock.
Herrera, Jose Benjamin, Las Vegas.
Horn, Ronald David, Eunice.
Jackson, Frederick G., Jr., Las Cruces.
James Billie, Farmington.
Largo, Calvin David, Shiprock.
Leisure, Jackie Glen, Jal.
Lott, Charles Allison, Albuquerque.
Markland, Gerald David, Albuquerque.
Martin, Guy Wayne, Albuquerque.
Martinez, Bobby Joe, Ft. Wingate.
Martinez, Jim Daniel, Chamisal.
Martinez, Juan Henry, Albuquerque.
McCraw, Ronald Gene, Lovington.
Mechem, Jesse, Las Cruces.
Montanez, Miguel F., Carlsbad.
Morales, Samuel, Serafina.
Munson, Alvin James, Albuquerque.
Nunez, George Henry, Picacho.
Pacheco, Andrew Jose, Tucumcari.
Peina, Ernest Delbert, Zuni.
Perea, Juanito, Albuquerque.
Phelps, Larry Delton, Albuquerque.
Phillips, Gregory Lee, Albuquerque.
Porter, Frank Solis, Deming.
Rickels, John A., Lovington.
Roberts, Freddie Joe, Melrose.
Rodgers Luia, Alamogorda.
Romero, Sammy Chacon, Rosewell.
Sanders, James Garland, Farmington.
Segura, Manuel Tiodoro, Sante Fe.
Skeet, Patrick, Gallup.
Tafoya, George Eloy, La Joya.
Tharp, Harold Allen, Jr., Alamogordo.
Tice, Wayne Artamus, Gallup.
Trainor, Terry Leo, Lovington.
Valdez, Leroy Frank, Mora.
Waide, Donald Giles, Clayton.
Walter, Albert Marion, Organ.

Air Force

Obenland, Roland, Nevis.

Marine Corps

Aguirre, Carlos Cruz, Silver City.
Auten, Frank Leroy, Albuquerque.
Baca, Johnny Lawrence, Jr., Taos.
Bustamante, Paul, Albuquerque.
Cabe, Johnny Dwain, Carlsbad.
Cabrera, Andy Anastacio, Las Cruces.
Coca, Andrew, Taos.
Foster, James Lester, Roswell.
Garcia, Luperto, Belen.
Griego, Jesus, Ribera.
Hager, Harold Eugene, Lovington.
Le Compte, John Ault, Albuquerque.
Lee, Willie B., Socorro.
Lopez, Robert Charles, Albuquerque.
Lovato, Michael Leon, Belen.
Madrid, Frank Jesse Lee, Vaughn.

NEW MEXICO—continued

Marine Corps

Montoya, Eusebio, Bernalillo.
Moreno, Hilario, Belen.
Morris, Michael John, Albuquerque.
Nunn, Samuel John, Deming.
Rea, Billy McCall, Tijeras.
Rowe, Sharber Mayfield, Las Cruces.
Salazar, Patrick, Grants.
Spurgeon, Roy Stephen, Albuquerque.
Stanley, Don Scott, Albuquerque.
Taylor, Bobby Allen, Silver City.
Tejada, Henry Leroy, Las Vegas.
Webber, Brian Lee, Albuquerque.
Westphall, Victor D., III, Albuquerque.
Yazzie, Jones Lee, Tohatchi.

Navy

Dale, Chester Donald, Capitan.
Deshurley, George Robert, Roswell.
Isler, Reid Allen, Estancia.
Leyba, Ramon, Albuquerque.
Whitlow, Ronald David, Albuquerque.
Winkles, Harvie Perry, III, Texico.

NEW YORK

Army

Abdullah, Ghalib Ahmed, New York.
Abreu-Batista, Miguel A., Jr., New York.
Abruzzesa, Michael John, Jr., Valley Stream.
Alicea, David, New York.
Alicea, Robert, New York.
Allen, Gerald William, Sidney.
Allen, Terry Ernest, Canastota.
Alling, John Stephen, Jr., Auburn.
Allsopp, Stephen Allison, New York.
Alston, Willie Edward, New York.
Ambrose, Gregory Francis, Glendale.
Andersen, Andrew Carl, Ridgewood.
Anderson, Eric Arnold, New York.
Anderson, John Austin, Williamsville.
Anderson, Larry, New York.
Anderson, Michael Patrick, Flushing.
Anderson, Steven Richard, Levittown.
Andrews, James Edward, Buffalo.
Andrysiak, Francis Howard, Glen Head.
Angrisani, Charles Joseph, New York.
Armwood, Jesse James, New York.
Arnett, Francis Ignatius, Seacliff.
Atwell, Robert Wagner, Cooperstown.
Baldwin, Peter Nelson, North Babylon.
Bales, Richard Lee, Fairport.
Barbery, Robert Nelson, Chittenango.
Baretti, Alan George, New York.
Barlow, Clark Eugene, South Glens Falls.
Barnard, Richard George, Rochester.
Barnes, Mark Albert, Wyandanch.
Barnhill, James Eugene, New York.
Barrimond, Errol Michael, New York.
Batista-Rodriguez, Jorge L., New York.
Bauer, Charles James, Jr., Long Island.
Beane, Harold George, Jr., Richville.
Beatty, Donald Edward, Rochester.
Bechard, John Cowie, Stillwater.
Bechtold, Francis Scott, Churchville.
Beckwith, Richard Earl, Buffalo.
Bedwell, Wayne Joseph, New York.
Bell, Leonard Jonathen, Buffalo.
Bellinger, Ronald Lee, Jamaica.
Benz, Robert Joseph, Syracuse.
Bernreuther, Walter John, Macedon.
Billings, James Arthur, Jr., Flushing.
Bitel, Ben Stanley, Flushing.
Blair, Alan Lee, Staten Island.
Blanding, Henry Arthur, Jamaica.
Bloemhard, Anton D., Great Neck.
Boardman, Davis James, Port Washington.
Bobowski, Jan Edward, Jr., Buffalo.
Bolson, James Joseph, Plainview.
Bomberry, Gregory Lee, Niagara Falls.
Boney, Bernard, New York.
Boone, Robert Edward, Rosedale.
Borczynski, Frederick Earl, Buffalo.
Bornheimer, Richard Irving. Newark.
Boyer, Charles Dennis, Trumansburg.
Brabant, William Andrew, Clayton.
Bravin, Joseph Simon, New York.
Brennan, James John, New York.
Briggs, David Ivan, North Collins.
Brooks, Andre Maurice, Nyack.
Brophy, Martin Earl, Buffalo.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Brown, Donald Calvin, St. Albans.
Brown, John Thomas, Staten Island.
Brown, Raymond Lee, Bath.
Brown, Richard Charles, Stony Point.
Brown, Robert Irwin, New York.
Brown, Ronald Lewis, New York.
Browne, Gordon Francis, New York.
Brust, Glenn Roy, Troy.
Buchner, James Irving, Hamburg.
Buckley, Thomas Edward, New York.
Buono, Matthew Joseph, Staten Island.
Burdick, Daniel Joseph, Richland.
Burke, Robert Allen, Orange.
Burris, Bernes Edward, St. Albans.
Buscemi, Anthony Peter, Belleross.
Butler, Peter Mark, Glens Falls.
Butler, Terrence Edwin, Ozone Park.
Button, Howard Earl, Buffalo.
Byrnes, Ralph William Cincinnatus.
Byrnes, Robert John, Southold.
Cacciuttolo, Michael, Brentwood.
Caceres, Adalberto, New York.
Cady, Brian Thomas, Edmeston.
Callihan, Blaine Edward, New York.
Callwood, Gladston, New York.
Capers, Lee Marvin, New York.
Capozzi, Anthony Louis, South Ozone Park.
Caravello, Vincent James, Staten Island.
Cardinal, David Charles, Hyde Park.
Cardona, Gabriel, Jr., New York.
Carlisle, Thomas G., II, Sanborn.
Carlson, Frederick Joseph, New York.
Carmody, Jan Arthur, Staten Isand.
Carr, Lon Gale, North Tonawanda.
Casilla-Vazquez, Manuel, Jr., New York.
Cassano, Richard Anthony, New York.
Castagna, Joseph Philip, New York.
Castellanos, Juan Carlos, New York.
Cavalaratos, George Anasta, New York.
Chambers, Richard Thomas, Islip.
Chubbuck, Michael Francis, Lancaster.
Cirillo, Philip M., Herkimer.
Clavio, Peter Anthony, Jr., Newburgh.
Clayton, Alfred Patrick, New York.
Clokes, Robert, New York.
Coates, Robert Edmund, New York.
Codrington, Stephan, New York.
Coffey, Edward Vincent, Richmond Hill.
Coffin, Donald A., Little Falls.
Cohen, Gerald, Levittown.
Coleman, Wilbert Evane, New York.
Coles, Howard Franklin, Jr., Vestal.
Colicchio, Peter, Brentwood.
Colon, Luis Angel, New York.
Colon-Perez, Abraham Linco, New York.
Colonna, Philip George, Howard Beach.
Colter, Kenny Lawrence, New York.
Conklin, Joseph Peter, Haverstraw.
Conklin, Ronald Raymond, Collins.
Conlin, Peter Edward, Upper Nyack.
Connolly, Michael Dennis, Woodside.
Conroy, Patrick J., New York.
Contreros, Albert D., Jr., New York.
Cook, John Patrick, LaGrange.
Cook, Raymond Lee, Gouverneur.
Cook, Thomas Stanley, Hamilton.
Cooper, James Ralph, West Islip.
Corley, John Thomas, Jr., New York.
Coulon, John Gerard, Jr., Hempstead.
Covington, Claude Henry, New York.
Cox, Frank William, Jr., Elmira.
Cox, James Alan, Hollis.
Cragin, Robert Stuart, Jr., Schenectady.
Crandall, Wayne Stephens, Farmingdale.
Crawford, Andy Paul, Hinsdale.
Cudworth, Albert Wayne, Plattsburgh.
Curless, Eugene Jerome, Jr., Medusa.
Cusick, Michael Peter, New York.
Czajak, Daniel Joseph, Jr., Syracuse.
D'Agostino, Norman Thomas, Buffalo.
D'Ambra, Joseph Nick, Franklin Square.
D'Angelo, Raymond Anthony, Flushing.
Daiello, Vincent Thomas, New York.
Dammer, Wilhelm Karl, New York.
Daniel, Andrew James, Nyack.
Darling, Lloyd Thomas, Kill Buck.
Dashnaw, John Myron, Syracuse.
Dauber, Jerry Martin, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Davis, James, New York.
Davis, Stanley Roy, Howells.
DeWitt, Lawrence, New York
Dean, Thomas Jolley, Scarsdale.
Dedrick, Dwight A., Delevan
Del Terzo, Colombo Phil, New York.
Dengler, John Leo, Rochester.
Denisco, Thomas Joseph, Mount Vernon.
Denisowski, Stanley George Utica.
Denslow, George Robert, Boonville.
Deusebio, Frank Cesare, Briarcliff Manor.
Di Caprio, Paul Joseph, New York.
Di Fate, Ralph Douglas, Bayside.
Diaz, Pedro, New York.
Dickinson, John Albert, New York.
Dillon, Raymond Lawrence, Clay.
Doiley, Arthur Leroy, Jr., New York.
Donovan, Michael, G., III, Central Islip.
Downey, John Francis, Jr., Flushing.
Draper, William Michael, Rochester.
Duelk, Joseph David, Jr., Monroe.
Dugan, Kevin Howard, Blue Point.
Dugan, Kevin John, New York.
Dunlop, Johnston, Auburn.
Dunn, Michael John, Barker.
Dunne, Gerard Joseph, New York.
Durr, Brian Francis, Whitesboro.
Duryea, Arnold Max, Nunda
Dusart, Kenneth Walter, Camillus.
Dutton, Charles Mathew, Wellsville.
Dziencilowski, James, New York.
Edwards, Randolph A., Corona.
Elbert, George Steven, New York.
Elia, Gary Lawrence, Willseyville.
Eliot, Bruce, Jr., Manhasset.
Elmandorf, Arthur Dewey, Oneonta.
Engle, Richard Eugene, Albion.
Engstrom, Bruce Einar, White Plains.
Enners, Raymond James, Farmingdale.
Evans, Jerry Dewain, Holland Patent.
Faccio, Robert Daniel, Uniondale.
Farrell, Kenneth James, Little Neck.
Febo-Betancourt, Ivan Robe, New York.
Felshaw, John Arthur, Utica
Fernandez, Gary Dennis, Levittown.
Fetter, Kenneth Lloyd, Schenectady.
Fettuccia, Frank, Endicott.
Filippelli, Alfred Andrew, Woodside.
Finnegan, Robert Michael, Garden City.
Fischer, George Warren, Jr., Holley.
Fisk, Barry Kevin, Long Island City.
Fitzgerald, Patrick Vincen, Attica.
Fleming, Morris Lafond, New York.
Flynn, Daniel Joseph, Kings Park.
Flynn, Frederick, Harold, Warrensburg.
Flynn, William Patrick, East Hampton.
Foden, John Joseph, Brookhaven.
Fonda, Peter Francis, Saratoga Springs.
Forkl, Robert Wayne, Holland.
Foster, James Clair, Patterson.
Fournier, Nelson Edward, Schenectady.
Fox, Larry Ross, Westfield.
Frasca, Richard Patrick, Bellport.
Freeman, Lester, New York.
Frese, Steven Robert, Wantagh.
Fritz, Nicholas Hefer, Brentwood.
Fulkerson, Roger Alan, Troy.
Fusco, Paul Richard, Avon.
Galante, Ronald Alfred, Ridgewood.
Gallagher, Gerald Thomas, West Hempstead.
Gallagher, Larry Herbert, Pulaski.
Gallery, Richard Mulroy, Amherst.
Gantt, Grady, Jr., Staten Island.
Garcia, Leandro, Corona.
Garrahan, Ernest Edward, Flushing.
Geddes, Kerry Richard Fost, Levittown.
Gentile, Harold Francis, New York.
Gershnow, Steven Andrew, Woodmere.
Gherardini, Sergio John, New York.
Giacone, John Albert, Jr., New York.
Giannelli, Alan Robert, Massapequa.
Gideon, Richard Edward, Valley Stream.
Gifford, Robert Allen, Bainbridge.
Gilley, Richard Alan, Maspeth.
Gladding, Daniel George, Seaford.
Glazier, Herbert Jay, White Plains.
Golda, Edward, New York.
Goldsmith, David Peter, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Goldstein, Steven Victor, Far Rockaway.
Golwitzer, Ronald Anthony, Buffalo.
Gomez, Jesus Ephraim, Jr., New York.
Gomez-Mesa, Luis G., New York.
Gonzalez, Conrad Nicholas, New York.
Gonzalez, Ramon Hernandez, Newburgh.
Goodheart, William, New York.
Gormley, James, New York.
Graebner, Siegfried Louis, New York.
Graham, Floyd, Jr., New York.
Graniela, Jose Antonio, Jr., Brentwood.
Grant, Kellum Warren, Levittown.
Grassi, Ernest Joseph, Rochester.
Grasso, Paul David, Hudson.
Green, Carl Fred, Shady.
Green, Richard, Jr., Rochester.
Greene, Joseph, New York.
Greenwood, Paul John, Ithaca.
Greiner, Donald Henry, Buffalo.
Guasp, Gary Arnaldo, Brentwood.
Guenette, Peter Mathew, Troy.
Guley, David Anthony, Binghamton.
Gunning, Leo Brent, Potsdam.
Gustafson, Randall John, Lakewood.
Hack, Ronald, Gordon, Beaver Falls.
Hall, Willie Lee, Jr., New York.
Hamm, Adolph Brinkman, Jr., North Clymer.
Hammond, Gerald Edmund, Jr., Glens Falls.
Hammond, Richard Mark, Buffalo.
Hannigan, Timothy Charles, Lockport.
Hargrave, Tracy Wallace, Addison.
Harned, Richard Douglas, College Point.
Harper, Richard Walker, Baldwin.
Harrell, Lovett Lee, New York.
Harrington, James A., Jr., Locust Valley.
Hartley, John Thomas, New York.
Hartz, Jesoph Edward, New York.
Haselbauer, John Irvine, New York.
Hassell, Norman Winston, New York.
Hay, James Stewart, New York.
Hefner, James Joseph, Goshen.
Heissenbuttel, Peter Herma, Baldwin.
Henning, Douglas Allen, Orchard Park.
Hernandez-Carrion Gilbert, New York.
Herod, Arthur Weinmann, Gorham.
Hesse, George Bernard, Deer Park.
Heusel, Albert Francis, Jr., New York.
Higgins, John Lawrence, New York.
Hill, Dale Arthur, West Fort Ann.
Hill, James Wallace, Jr., Buffalo.
Hoag, Paul Richard, Jr, Poughkeepsie.
Hodges, Ernest Maehue, South Ozone Park.
Holl, George William, Buffalo.
Holt, Edward Eugene, Long Island.
Hominick, Howard Hugh, Carle Place.
Hommell, Daniel John, Brentwood.
Hopkins, Thomas, New York.
Horne, Wayne Morris, Yonkers.
Horton, John Martin, Jr., Suffern.
Horton, John Richard, Liverpool.
Howcott, Henry Grant, New York.
Howden, Robert Wilson, Belfast.
Howe, Charles Lee, Granville.
Hucks, Walter Herman, Rochester.
Hudson, George Alex, Jr., New York.
Hufschmid, Robert George, Hewlett.
Intihar, John Thomas, Jamestown.
Iorio, Lewis Patrick, Highland.
Jackson, Abraham, Long Island.
Jackson, Alfred, New York.
Jackson Johnnie, New York.
Jackson, Lamont, New York.
Jamrock, Stanley M., Rochester.
Jednat, Eric John, Wales.
Jennings, Lawrence Martin, Utica.
Jernigan, Charlie Mizzelle, New York.
Jirsa, Peter Joseph, Long Island.
Johannsen, Gustav Alfred, East Islip.
Johnsen, William Arthur, New York.
Johnson, Henry Louis, Jr., New York.
Johnson, Herbert Burton, Poughkeepsie.
Johnson, Larry Wayne, Corning.
Johnson, Leroy, New York.
Johnson, Robert Leonard, Jr., Rosedale.
Johnson, Webster Bereal, New York.
Jones, Charles, Jr., New York.
Judge, William Charles, Lackawanna.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Justiniano, Victor A., Jr., New York.
Kane, William Gerald, Jr., New York.
Kardash, Kenneth Michael, Yonkers.
Kearney, Donald Brian, Schenectady.
Kedenburg, John James, Central Islip.
Keels, Marlowe Eugene, Cambria Heights.
Keller, Norman Lawrence, North Tonawanda.
King, Joseph Cephus, Jr., New York.
Kirkland, Eugene H., Chester.
Kletinger, Hans, New York.
Kloster, Thomas Henry, Croghan.
Knapp, David Bruce, Rochester.
Knecht, Adam Dyckman, Oceanside.
Knight, James Roy, New York.
Knoblock, Joseph M., Jr., New York.
Koch, Lawrence George, Merrick.
Koenig, Roy Robert, Rosedale.
Kohlmeir, George John, III, Binghamton.
Krobetzky, Raymond George, Armonk.
Kuiper, John Frederick, New York.
Kyzer, Raymond Bert, Central Islip.
La Fleur, James George, Middletown.
La Rocco, Anthony, New York.
Lafferty, John Arthur, New York.
Landers, Donald Francis, Munnsville.
Lane, Dennis William, New York.
Lathan, George, Yonkers.
Lennon, Jerry, New York.
Leo, Theodore Thomas, New York.
Lesando, Nicholas Peter, Jr., Greenwood.
Lesure, Ernest Estell, Rochester.
Levy, Bruce, Elmhurst.
Lewis, Michael Louis, Jr., New York.
Lightbourne, Richard Grego, New York.
Link, John Joseph, Chittanango.
Lo Grasso, Ralph Anthony, New York.
Loback, Thomas John, Queens.
Lofaro, Marcello James, New York.
Longabardi, Michael Joseph, New York.
Lopez-Garcia, Geovel, New York.
Lovett, Peter Louis, New York.
Lucisano, Rocco Rosario, New York.
Ludwig, Charles, Queens Village.
Lumm, Charles Lavern, New Berlin.
Lupien, David G., Rochester.
Lupoli, Albert Francis, Jr., Valley Stream.
Lynch, Michael Joseph, New York.
Madel, Robert Thomas, Mt. Vernon.
Maguire, Kevin James, Staten Island.
Majer, Charles Anthony, Troy.
Major, Kenneth Carroll, Jr., New York.
Malava-Rios, Abelardo, New York.
Maloney, Thomas Robert, New York.
Mancino, Salvatore John, New York.
Mancuso, Anthony John, New York.
Mandarino, Joseph, North Bellmore.
Mannina, Michael Carmelo, Bellmore.
Manno, Michael Ralph, New York.
Marasco, Philip, New York.
Marcano, Winston Elvette, New York.
Marcin, William Keith, Frankfort.
Marek, Paul Steven, Johnson City.
Marino, Ariel, New York.
Marlow, James Edward, Malone.
Marrone, Joseph Vieto, New York.
Martin, Charles Robert, Hogansburg.
Martin, John Francis, Watertown.
Martinez-Mercado, Edwin J., New York.
Mashlykin, Kenneth Henry, New York.
Mason, Harold, Jr., Hempstead.
Mathis, James Rufus, Buffalo.
Matias-Santana, Federico, New York.
Mattera, Gerald, Central Islip.
Matteson, Thomas William, Rochester.
May, Robert Walter, Buffalo.
Mazyck, Raymond John, Jr., New York.
Mazzone, Joseph Mark, Hicksville.
McCaffrey, Charles Patric, Northport.
McCaffrey, William James, Farmingdale.
McCaskey, Robert Walter, Woodhaven.
McClain, Roy Howard, New York.
McCormick, Patrick John, Richmond Hill.
McDaniel, Mural, New York.
McDonald, Gerard Morris, Ellenburg Depot.
McGonigal, John P., Jr., Belle Harbor.
McKinney, Richard Henry, Poughkeepsie.
McKnight, William, Jr., New York.
McManus, Frank Joseph, Jackson Heights.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Meade, Daniel, New York.
Medina, Carlos Juan, New York.
Meerholz, Charles J., Jr., Bellmore.
Melish, Arnold Edward, New York.
Mercado-Collado, Luis Rola, North Babylon.
Merchant, Carl Lee, Corinth.
Messenger, Kenneth Edward, Wantagh.
Middleton, Ronald, New York.
Milich, James Henry, Cornwall on the Hudson.
Miller, Peter Thomas, Stanfordville.
Milliner, Robert, New York.
Minard, Earl Chester, Hyde Park.
Mino, Robert E., Queens.
Miskimmon, Jonathan, Jr., New York.
Mitchell, Peter, Yonkers.
Mocker, William Francis, Corning.
Mohr, Victor Allen, Salamanca.
Moore, Dennis Francis, New York.
Moore, John Joseph, New York.
Moore, Ronald Kelvin, Herkimer.
Moore, Thomas Jon, Williamsville.
Mork, Thomas Lee, Newburgh.
Morris, Gary Keve, Rockaway Beach.
Morse, James Earl, South Kortright.
Morse, William Joseph, Glen Cove.
Mosby, Jerry, New York.
Mosher, Harry Van Arnam, Northville.
Moss, Charles Lewis, Jr., Jamaica.
Mota, Pedro Juan Tomas, New York.
Mott, Terry Ward, Horseheads.
Mularz, John Bruce, Rochester.
Mullervy, Michael, New York.
Munoz, Luis R., New York.
Murphy, Cornelius F., Jr., Northport.
Murphy, Robert Dennis, New York.
Murray, Marvin Winston, New York.
Murray, Merritt Lewis, Genoa.
Murray, Thomas J., New York.
Muszynski, Michael John, Depew.
Myers, Wayne Chester, Saugerties.
Myskyweiz, Richard John, Forest Hills.
Natale, Nicholas Anthony, Medina.
Neidlinger, James Joseph, New York.
Neto, Jose Torres, New York.
Newsome, William Lester, New Rochelle.
Nicolini, Richard Domenic, Elmont.
Nilsen, Eric Bjarne, Staten Island.
Noel, Maurice Thomas, Woodside.
Nolte, William Henry, E. Northport.
Norton, Thomas, New York.
Norton, Thomas Francis, New York.
Nunziato, Aniello Carlo, Woodside.
O'Conner, Richard Edward, Staten Island.
O'Conner, Edmund Anthony, Lindenhurst.
O'Grady, Martin Edward, Jackson Heights.
O'Leary, Paul Francis, New York.
O'Neil, Terrence Edward, Beacon.
Oakley, James Ronald, Grand Gorge.
Ohler, Frederick Richard, Garden City.
Ojeda, Nestor, New York.
Orlando, Gasper, Ozone Park.
Ortega, Anibal, Jr., New York.
Ortiz, Domingo, New York.
Ortiz-Rivera, Anibal, Jr., New York.
Ortiz-Rodriguez, Jaime, New York.
Osborne, Lawrence Elston, Peekskill.
Owczarczak, Melvin Joseph, Buffalo.
Owens, Vernell, Corona.
Paddock, David Allen, Cortland.
Paduchowski, Paul Richard, Rochester.
Pagliaroni, Alan Paul, Brentwood.
Palazzola, Stephen Frank, Levittown.
Palcic, Ernest Patrick, Staten Island.
Palenscar, Robert Joseph, New Hyde Park.
Palumbo, Anthony Paul, Buffalo.
Paniccia, Ronald James, Rochester.
Papke, Theodore Arthur, Rochester.
Paramatto, Paul Angelo, New York.
Parker, James Leonard, Jr., New York.
Pasco, Allen, New York.
Paskins, Wayman E., Greenwood.
Pastore, Robert Joseph, Watkins Glen.
Patrizio, Charles Joseph, New York.
Peck, Jeffrey Lloyd, New York.
Peda, Robert Charles, Kingston.
Pedersen, Russell Alford, New York.
Pellegrino, Bernard Michae, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Penney, Donald Thomas, Willseyville.
Peralez, Louis Fabian, New York.
Perez, Jeffrey, Elmhurst.
Perkins, Bobby James, New York.
Perry Karl Frederick, Baldwinsville.
Pershing, Richard Warren, New York.
Peterson, Thomas Payne, Seaford.
Petraglia, Angelo Andrew, Valley Stream.
Petrillo, John James, Farmingdale.
Pickard, Dennis Lee, Phoenix.
Plattner, Ernest Melvin, Marathon.
Pontuck, Howard Samuel, New York.
Post, Thomas, Frank, West Islip.
Powell, Alfred Lee, New York.
Powers, Robert Lawrence, Staten Island.
Prescott, Steven James, Brightwaters.
Pringle, James Edward, Dansville.
Prior, Anthony George, Pelham.
Procida, Richard Nicholas, New York.
Prunka, Alexander E., Jr., New York.
Pugliese, Frank, Central Valley.
Pullen, Thomas Richard, Oyster Bay.
Puma, Wayne Paul, New York.
Pumilio, Michael, New York.
Puryear, Joseph A., Auburn.
Quick, Adrian Allen, Jr., Bolivar.
Quick, Isham Ike, New York.
Quinones, David, New York.
Quinones, Juan Manuel, New York.
Raines, Warren Henry, Wood Haven.
Randolph, Van La Salle, Jr., Utica.
Ransom, Robert Crawford, Jr., Bronxville.
Rehder, Robert Edward, Richmond Hill.
Reichlin, Joseph Albert, Jr., Buffalo.
Reilly, John Thomas, Middle Village.
Reiner, Charles Edward, Rye.
Reithmann, Timothy Charles, Valley Stream.
Rera, Robert, Washingtonville.
Revak, Anthony Neal, Apalachin.
Reyes, Angel Luis, Jr., New York.
Reynolds, David Richard, Buffalo.
Reynold, Thomas York, Auburn.
Rial, Richard Fred, Rathbone.
Ribeiro, Joseph Francis, Mineville.
Richardson, Johnnie Bryant, Mount Vernon.
Rickmers, Rolf Ernst, New York.
Riggs, Steven James, Potsdam.
Ripel, John Kenneth, Sparrow Bush.
Richie, Damon Ligouri, Selden.
Rivera, Carlos Manuel, New York.
Rivera, Fernando A., Jr., New York.
Rivera, James, New York.
Rivera, Jesus, New York.
Rivera-Galarza, Benigno, New York.
Robena, Charles Edward, Rochester.
Robinson, Terry Alan, New York.
Rodney, Carlisle Anthony, New York.
Rodriguez, Ralph O., New York.
Rodriguez, Ramond Saul, New York.
Roemer, Donald Peter, East Amherst.
Rogers, Phillip, North Babylon.
Roman, Jeremias, New York.
Romano, Michael Stephen, Yorktown Heights.
Rosado, Ernest, Sr., Middleton.
Rose, Lawrence Oliver, New York.
Ross, Kevin Henry, New York.
Rossotto, Vincent, Joseph, Dunkirk.
Rotger, Gustavo, Jr., New York.
Rotonnelli, John, New York.
Roussell, Clarence A., Jr., Hollis.
Roy, Gerald Raymond, Massena.
Ruderson, Anderson Linwood, New York.
Ruiz, Angel O., New York.
Ruminski, Philip Edward, Jr., Highland Mills.
Rummel, Donald Eugene, Candor.
Rupert, John Michael, New Hyde Park.
Russell, Gary Lee, New Berlin.
Russo, Dennis Joseph, New York.
Russo, Michael Candido, Central Islip.
Russo, Ronald Salvatore, New York.
Rybak, Francis Paul, Syracuse.
Sacco, James Dominick, Syracuse.
Sadler, Ronald Francis, Tonawanda.
Salvania, Ronald Landon, New York.
Samoray, Richard Martin, Queen Village.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Samples, Stephen Henry, New York.
Samuelson, Robert L., Dunkirk.
Sanabia, Oscar Enrique, New York.
Sanderson, Jack Johnsontone, Warsaw.
Sanfilippo, Frank, New York.
Santana, Anthony John, New York.
Santangelo, Samuel John, Springfield Gardens.
Santiago, Jose Juan, New York.
Santiago-Colon, Hector, New York.
Sanzoverino, William Eugen, Bayville.
Saporito, Michael Charles, Valley Stream.
Sardina, Frank, East Islip.
Scala, Richard Michael, New York.
Scamaroni, Luis Guillermo, New York.
Scavella, Jesse Ellison, Jr., New York.
Scherer, Christopher, J., Long Island.
Schneider, Kenneth Eugene, Staten Island.
Schramm, William George, New York.
Schultz, Robert Charles, Lancaster.
Scognamillio, Patrick John, New York.
Scott, Gary Arnold, Rochester.
Scott, James Guinan, Rochester.
Scruton, Kenneth Charles, Mineola.
Sebast, William Michael, Albany.
Segal, Jeffrey Bernard, New York.
Seidensticker, James, Brentwood.
Serio, Robert Frank, New York.
Serrano, Rene, New York.
Serrano-Echevarria, Raul, Manhattan.
Setter, Richard Allen, Victor.
Shattuck, Ronald Lawrence, Hamburg.
Shaw, Richard Earl, Delhi.
Shea, Gary John, Ripley.
Sheares, Johnnie N., Jr., New York.
Sheredos, Roland Mike, Long Island City.
Sherman, Victor P., Jr., New York.
Shramko, Michael Angelo, New York.
Shutt, Carl, Alvin, Jr., Cortland.
Signa, Anthony Robert, West Babylon.
Simiele, Donato Joseph, Amsterdam.
Sinclair, Robert Henry, Jr., Watertown.
Sito, Richard Anthony, Sr., New York.
Skoch, Eugene Richard, East Meadow.
Skolits, Wayne E., Lake Ronkonkoma.
Skumurski, David Leonard, Schenectady.
Small, Donald Bruce, Mount Vernon.
Smeal, Robert, Tonawanda.
Smith, Allen Lloyd, Yonkers.
Smith, Daniel J., Chaumont.
Smith, John Thomas, West Babylon.
Smith, Robert James, Albany.
Smith, William Henry, Jr., New York.
Smith, William Paul, Wayland.
Sokal, Irwin Norman, Flushing.
Sonner, Eugene Vincent, Elmira.
Soranno, Vincent Michael, Manhattan.
Sorrentino, Gerald David, Rockville Center.
Sosa, Aristides, New York.
Soto, Charles, New York.
Soto, Efrain, Sr., New York.
Squires, Sidney Chester, New York.
Stasio, Richard Peter, Staten Island.
Steiner, Joseph R., III, Buffalo.
Stetter, Ronald Thomas, Buffalo.
Stevens, Richard Durand, Elizabethtown.
Stiger, Greg Patterson, Waverly.
Stimson, John Thompson, Jr., East Islip.
Stirpe, John, Rochester.
Strassner, Cornelius W., Rochester.
Strate, John Delbert, Alden.
Strippoli, Joseph Pat, Jr., Woodside.
Strouse, Gary Lee, Vestal.
Supino, Louis Vincent, Yorktown Heights.
Supple, John Philip, New York.
Swieczkowski, Michael John, Hamburg.
Szor, Henry, New York.
Taranto, Robert Joseph, New York.
Tate, Alexander, Jr., New York.
Tavarez, Jose Rafael, New York.
Tawil, Aaron, New York.
Teasley, Robert, New York.
Terejko, Benjamin John, Jr., Solvay.
Testa, Donald Anthony, Lindenhurst.
Thompson, John Bryan, Eden.
Thompson, William Bernard, Syracuse.
Thompson, William Matt, Jamaica.
Thornhill, William Joseph, New York.
Thurston, Wesley George, Rochester.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Tinsley, Franklin Denis, Suffolk.
Tirico, Richard Louis, New York.
Todarello, Francis Vincent, Oakdale.
Toonkel, Benjamin Richard, New York.
Toporcek, Andrew James, Jr., Ozone Park.
Torres, Jose Enrique, Newburgh.
Torres, Santiago, Jr., New York.
Townes, Leroy, New York.
Travieso, Jose Antonio, New York.
Tremblay, Alain Joseph, Hempstead.
Tremblay, Patrick Joseph, Conesus.
Trier, Kenneth Robert, Westbury.
Trotter, Richard Barry, Grand Island.
Turnbull, Justin Glaston, New York.
Turner, William Richard, Jr., Garnerville.
Valentin, Martiniano, Jr., Cambria Heights.
Van Alst, Harry L., Jr., Le Roy.
Van Duynhoven, Patrick Fra, Blooming Grove.
Van Tassel, William D., Jr., Scarsdale.
Vazquez, Felix, Jr., Long Island.
Velez, Luis Felipe, New York.
Ver Pault, Kevin Edward, Wyandanch.
Vergara-Arbil, Augustine, New York.
Vickery, Garry Francis, Queens.
Vicks, Edward James, Jr., Binghampton.
Vinscotski, Robert Valenti, Putnam Valley.
Virgona, John Angelo, New York.
Vojir, James Paul, Jackson Heights.
Vonderchek, Walter Earl, Horseheads.
Voorheis, Harold Robert, Trumansburg.
Wagner, William Walter, New York.
Ward, Forrest Edward, Troy.
Waters, Leon Eldred, Jr., Oneonta.
Watkins, Gregory H., New York.
Waugh, John Louis, Rochester.
Webber, Frederick Carl, Williamson.
Weidner, Richard John, Bellmore.
Weinper, Arthur J., Roslyn.
Welch, Richard Dennis, Niagara Falls.
Western, Richard Alan, Larchmont.
Whitaker, Thomas Earl, New York.
White, Stephen Robert, Waterloo.
White, Whitney Lee, New York.
Wilcox, William Eidman, Jr., Kenmore.
Wilder, Avery, New York.
Wilkens, John Herman, New York.
Williams, Frederick Thomas, New York.
Williams, Reginald, Jr., New York.
Wisher, Herbert James, Goshen.
Wisnier, Gary, Buffalo.
Wittman, William, Binghamton.
Witzel, Robert Charles, Spring Valley.
Wood, Melvin, New York.
Woods, Edward John, New York.
Wozniak, Robert Andrew, Bellerose.
Wuertenberger, Charles Edg, Geneva.
Wunderlich, Henry, New York.
Wysocki, Wojciech, New York.
Young, Andrew King, New York.
Zerilli, Robert Joseph, Corona.
Zewert, Edward Joseph, Jr., Arverne.
Zielinski, John Peter, Bayside.
Zimmer, James Leon, Owego.
Zimmerman, Terry, New York.
Zimulis, John Jautris, New York.
Zydel, Robert Walter, Buffalo.

Air Force

Bull, Bobert George, II, Marlboro.
Carey, Bruce Leo, Troy.
Chomyk, William, Hicksville.
Craig, Benjamin, Jr., New York.
Fischer, Louis Harold, Wood Haven.
Krumm, Robert Charles, New York.
L Huillier, Joseph Andre, Grand Island.
La Grange, Lance, Maspeth.
Lund, Ralph James, Johnston.
Manners, Ralph William, New Hyde Park.
McElroy, John Lee, Schenectady.
Selanikio, Leonard, West Islip.
Shanks, James Lee, Oyster Point.
Siegwalt, Marlin Lynn, Schenectady.
Whitehill, David Hugh, Newburgh.

Marine Corps

Adams, William, Jr., St. Albans.
Addison, Richard Edward, Jr., New York.
Alaimo, Howard James, Katonah.
Alberici, Michael, Floral Park.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Armstead, James Douglas, Jr., Jamaica.
Arthur, Lawrence Kenneth, Lowville.
Bagshaw, Wiliam Michael, Catskill.
Bailey, Joseph Thomas, Gainesville.
Baldwin, Clarence Jay, Cherry Valley.
Baldwin, Gerald Lee, West Winfield.
Banna, William Thomas, Jr., New York.
Barash, Louis Abbey, Islip.
Barber, Christopher James, Farmingdale.
Barbour, James Wesley, New Rochelle.
Basso, Michele, North White Plains.
Bayes, Thomas Joseph, Bayside.
Beck, John Robert, Goshen.
Belasco, Charles Theodore, New York.
Bennett, Clifford Raymond, Westbury.
Bernhardt, Wayne William, Cambria Heights.
Bisonett, Lawrence Edward, Clayton.
Bixby, Thomas Eugene, Millport.
Borowicz, Kenneth, Buffalo.
Bowen, Donald, Middle Village.
Bowman, Arthur Bailey, Jr., Mount Vernon.
Brandes, Kenneth Neil, Flushing.
Brant, Donald Gene, Norwich.
Brewer, Edward Joseph, Elmira.
Brown, Andrew Thomas, Buffalo.
Bukovinsky, Andrew Thomas, Manhasset.
Burdick, Brian Harry, Herkimer.
Burdick, Howard Earl, Norwich.
Burgess, Alex Leroy, New York.
Burke, John Joseph, New Hyde Park.
Burke, Walter Laverte, New York.
Burton, Christopher Leonard, New York.
Butler, James Clifford, Jr., New York.
Butler, Steven Andrew, Bay Shore.
Campbell, Thomas Francis, New York.
Campestre, Albert John, New York.
Carlo, Gilbert, New York.
Carmondy, Timothy Lee, Ogdensburg.
Casillo, Carmine, Buffalo.
Cestare, Joseph Angelo, New York.
Chadee, Nyroon, New York.
Chapman, Warren Nelson, Franklinville.
Chimeri, Louis, Island Park.
Cicio, Robert Daniel, Farmingdale.
Colon, Alberto, Bayside.
Colson, Bruce Norman, Corinth.
Cotton, Modesto, Jr., New York.
Cox, Francis Patrick, Flushing.
Crane, David Chauncey, Rochester.
Crise, Perry Rocco, Fredonia.
Cruz, Luis, New York.
Cunningham, Clarence Beno, Buffalo.
Cunningham, Edward, New York.
Cutri, Michael John, Syracuse.
D'Eustachid, Thomas Gerard, New York.
Daigle, Louis Vinnie, Waterford.
Davila, Alfredo, New York.
Davis, Richard, Jr., Mount Vernon.
De la Hoz, Carlos Morales, Yonkers.
Deso, Bertram Anthony, Albany.
Devos, William Marinus, Rochester.
Diaz, Alejandro, New York.
Diaz, Francisco, New York.
Diaz, Gilbert, Astoria.
Distefano, Ferdinando, New York.
Donnelly, Alan Charles, Gloversville.
Donohue, William Edmond, Buffalo.
Donovan, Peter Michael, Kingston.
Dumas, David Donald, Syracuse.
Duprey, Arthur Raymond, Peru.
Dyke, Stanton Richard, Lewiston.
Dziarcak, William Walter, Waterford.
Eaton, Clifford Lyman, Cortland.
Elkins, Jan Avery, East Brunswick.
Enzinna, John Joseph, Niagara Falls.
Evans, Jerry Brian, Wurtsboro.
Falk, Thomas Edward, Troy.
Farinaro, Guido, Bethpage.
Fauser, Russell Jay, Jr., Long Beach.
Fedasch, Peter, Amsterdam.
Ferrara, Michael John, Massapequa.
Ferrazzano, John Raymond, New Hyde Park.
Fiffe, John Charles, Albany.
Flahive, William Joseph, Jr., New York.
Forbes, Kevin, Lynn, Boissvale.
Frazier, Timothy J., Jr., Cohoes.
Frink, Richard W., Norwich.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Fuentes, Francisco, New York.
Galindez, Manuel Antonio, New York.
Galloway, Emmitt, New York.
Garcia, Ludin, New York.
Gelb, Alan Stuart, Forest Hills.
General, Leslie Neil, Niagara Falls.
Gibbs, Charles Edward, Buffalo.
Glessing, Ferdinand W., Jr., Auburn.
Gonzales, Carlos Luis, New York.
Gonzalez, Robert, New York.
Goodman, Bruce Ted, New York.
Gordon, John Patrick, Jr., New York.
Graves, Terrence Collison, Groton.
Greenidge, Michael Rodney, New York.
Grier, Ronald Eugene, Van Etten.
Grzegorek, James Andrew, Buffalo.
Gucwa, Joseph John, Buffalo.
Handley, Craig William, Cape Vincent.
Harster, Raymond James, Rochester.
Hayes, Bruce Robert, Richmond.
Henderson, Henry F., III, Rome.
Henderson, Robert Caufield, Geneseo.
Henry, Eugene Earl, Marathon.
Hershan, William, Buffalo.
Hinson, Don, New York.
Hoare, Thomas Joseph, Jr., Bellerose.
Hoover, Gordon Wood, Millport.
Hoyt, Larry Leonard, Cobleskill.
Hudson, John Barden, Peekskill.
Hueffner, Richard Alan, Oceanside.
Hughes, Edward John, Jr., White Plains.
Hughes, John James, New York.
Hutchins, Frank John, Mechanicville.
Ioanni, Lorenzo Joseph, Memphis.
Jacobs, Edward Daniel, Jr., New York.
Jacques, Donald, Rochester.
James, Thelbert Allyson, New Rochelle.
Jenkins, Barry Douglas, New York.
Johnson, Herbert Nicholas, New York.
Jones, Marvin Carl, Interlaken.
Jones, Walter Chapman, III, Garden City.
Jordan, Terence Patrick, Wantagh.
Kassatkin, Paul, New York.
Kaulback, Peter John, Webster.
Keating, Daniel James, Jr., Larchmont.
Keepnews, John Arthur, Manhasset.
Kelly, James Kevin, Rosedale.
Kelly, Robert Francis, New York.
Kelly, Roger Edward, Kenmore.
Kemp, Frederick Donald, Arkport.
Kidd, Phillip Meridith, Frewsburg.
Kimmel, Robert Charles, East Islip.
Kleinhans, Lawrence Charles, Honeoye Falls.
Knickerbocker, Irwin Lee, Scottsville.
Krec, Frank, Williamson.
Krol, John Lewis, New York.
La Fountain, Robert Alan, Rouses Point.
Labounty, Gene Alfred, Plattsburgh.
Laboy, Neftale John, New York.
Lacoste, Michael Thomas, New York.
Lamitie, Tyrone Francis, Brushton.
Lane, Louis Michael, Rochester.
Larkin, John Patrick, Port Chester.
Larson, Bruce Stanley, Bedford.
Lavery, Gregg Eugene, Syosset.
Leahy, Robert Michael, Roosevelt.
Leigh, Thomas Anthony, Jr., Flushing.
Lewis, Paul, Saugerties.
Lia, Nicholas Anthony, Staten Island.
Ljung, Carl Louis, New York.
Long, Joseph Leroy, Kingston.
Lovan, Peter John, Elmont.
Loya, Paul Nelson, Fultonville.
Lucas, Glenn Allen, Jackson Heights.
Lucas, James Francis, New York.
Lucchesi, Giancarlo, Buffalo.
Malone, Leo Fredrick, Huntington.
Maloney, John Edward, Jr., Ridgewood.
Marasco, William Frederick, Rochester.
Marcano, Carlos Alberto, New York.
Markum, Robert Bailey, Norfolk.
Marsh, David, Joseph, New York.
Marsh, John Robert, Newark.
Marshall, Jackie Everett, Jamaica.
Martin, Albert, Lake Ronkonkoma.
Martin, Robert Willie, Long Island.
Martinez, Frank, New York.
Marturano, Joseph A., Jr., Rome.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Matarazzo, Peter David, Rochester.
Matthew, Harry Eric, New York.
Maynard, Gregory Valentine, New York.
McAlister, James David, Binghamton.
McArdle, Kevin Joseph, Albany.
McBride, Albert, New York.
McGrath, Edward Albert, Astoria.
McGrath, Paul Martin, Rye.
McKellip, Robert, Jr., Bronxville.
McQueen, Freddie, Jamaica.
McRae, Adelbert Earl, Oswego.
Medina, Orlando, New York.
Michel, Daniel Victor, Astoria.
Miley, Reuben, Jr., Hollis.
Mitchell, Henry Albert, Keeseville.
Mitchell, Philip Daniel, Pleasant Valley.
Montoya, Anthony John, Jr., Rome.
Montz, Roger Ellis, Town of Tonawanda.
Moore, Carter Lee, Ilion.
Moore, John Bigelow, Geneva.
Moran, Terrence, New York.
Moshier, Chester John, Jr., Peekskill.
Muldovan, William Jeffrey, Watertown.
Murphy, John Robert, Yorktown Heights.
Murphy, Patrick James, Levittown.
Murphy, Walter Michael, Staten Island.
Murray, Steven, New York.
Murrin, Thomas, Jr., Staten Island.
Natale, Patrick Henry, Stony Point.
Navarro, Carmelo, New York.
Nesbitt, Calvin Ian, Buffalo.
Nevidomsky, Frank Theodore, Auburn.
Nielsen, Charles Joseph, New York.
Nielsen, Robert, Rome.
Nightengale, Timothy James, Buffalo.
November, Dwight Myles, New York.
O'Brien, Theodore, New York.
O'Halloran, William Brian, New York.
Obey, Donald Alton, Central Square.
Ocasio, Felix, New York.
Pagan, Miguel, New York.
Paige, Douglas Alan, Baldwinsville.
Parasiliti, Nicholas, Binghampton.
Parker, William Hill, Rockville Centre.
Pascascio, Rodney Gustavus, New York.
Paulino, Carl Arthur, Clarence.
Perkins, Charles Harold, New York.
Perretta, John Rocco, Lowville.
Peterson, Albert Eugene, Milford.
Phelps, David Harlow, Buffalo.
Piazza, Robert Gary, Merrick.
Pino, Anthony Carlos, Elmsford.
Pixley, Richard Gordon, Franklinville.
Pizarro, Vic Manuel, New York.
Polchow, William Alfred, Washington.
Pollastro, Dominick, Syracuse.
Powell, William, New York.
Pruden, Rene Thomas, New York.
Quillen, John Edward, Jr., Islip.
Rachon, Charles Joseph, White Plains.
Randolph, James Timothy, Schenectady.
Raver, Charles David, Phoenix.
Reeder, Brent Alexander, Buffalo.
Reyes, Humberto, New York.
Reynolds, Richard Peter, Jr., New York.
Rice, Robert, Flushing.
Rijos, Tony, New York.
Rittlinger, Donald Andrew, Oneonta.
Roberts, Harley Richard, Richville.
Robilotto, George Francis, New York.
Rodriguez, Raymond, Staten Island.
Rodriquez, Joaquin, New York.
Romano, August, Staten Island.
Rosa, Juan Antonio, New York.
Rosario, Agustin, New York.
Rosolie, Walter William, Rosedale.
Rubado, Charles Francis, Brasher Fall.
Rudon, Jose Antonio, New York.
Ruiz, Jose, New York.
Ruiz, Jose, Jr., New York.
Ruiz, Thomas, New York.
Ruscito, John Andrew, Centereach.
Saavedra, Luis Forero, Forest Hills.
Salas, Orlando Alberto, New York.
Sanchez, Jose Ramon, New York.
Sand, James Edward, Flushing.
Santaniello, Vincent Benor, Jamaica.
Schampier, Robert Bruce, Alcove.
Schiller, Joseph Frederick, New York.

NEW YORK—continued

Marine Corps

Schwendy, Randall James, Copenhagen.
Scott, Gary James, Gloversville.
Semidey, Hector Luis, New York.
Serrano, John Reyito, New York.
Sheehan, Allen Paul, Muttontown.
Sheridan, Philip Francis, Garden City.
Shorten, Timothy John, Garden City.
Sickles, Robert Paul, Avon.
Simon, Victor, New York.
Sirianni, Daniel Edward, Buffalo.
Smith, Douglas Mark, North Tonawanda.
Smith, Edgar Armstrong, Mount Vernon.
Smith, Joseph Bernard, Jr., Ballston Lake.
Smith, Joseph Earnest, Port Chester.
Smith, Robert Charles, Fonda.
Sobel, Irwin Ross, New York.
Soler, Rafael, New York.
Spadaro, Thomas, Staten Island.
Steele, Raymond Thomas, Flushing.
Stern, Larry, New York.
Stone, Daniel Melvin, Ilion.
Stow, John Lewis, Ashville.
Strong, Jack Merriel, Horseheads.
Stuart, Miles Boyd, New York.
Swanker, Nelson Christian, Fort Johnson.
Swed, Roy Francis, Shrub Oak.
Sweeney, Bruce Robert J. N., Freeport.
Sweet, James Newton, South Lima.
Sweet, Jerry Alan, Lebanan Springs.
Tanney, John Michael, Rome.
Tate, Charles Thomas, Jr., Port Chester.
Taylor, Dwight Joseph, New York.
Taylor, Louis Gaines, New York.
Tines, Franz, Cherry Valley.
Torres, Roberto, New York.
Torres, Santiago, Jr., New York.
Totten, Kenneth Romaine, Jr., Brewster.
Townsend, Gary Ray, Orchard Park.
Trojahn, Darrell Carl, Nanuet.
Tuttle, Herbert Leroy, Jr., Schenectady.
Tymeson, Raymond W., Jr., Troy.
Tyrcz, Walter Frederick, Jr., Buffalo.
Valente, Anthony Nicholas, Albany.
Vallone, Frank, New York.
Van Tassell, James Warren, Glens Falls.
Vanderheid, Mark Edward, Tonawanda.
Vasquez, Carmelo, New York.
Velez, Paul, New York.
Vennard, John Joseph, Albany.
Vera, Pedro Angel, New York.
Viruet, Jose Galeno, New York.
Vollmer, David Stephen, Scotia.
Wagstaff, James Donald, Harpursville.
Walsh, Michael Patrick, Laurelton.
Wells, Robert James, Jr., Schenectady.
Wheeler, Joseph Keith, West Utica.
Whitehead, Esau, Jr., New York.
Whiteley, Wayne Anthony, Wappingers Falls.
Whitley, Robert Lee, New York.
Wiedeman, Robert Arthur, Oneonta.
Wiley, Gilbert, New York.
Wray, William Clayton, Plattsburgh.
Wright, O. Neal, New Rochelle.
Wright, Robert, New York.
Wuest, Louis Arthur, Jr., Utica.
Yatteau, Richard Franklin, Rochester.
York, Henry, North Babylon.
Zenkewich, George Walter, New York.
Zornow, Robert Lawrence, Henrietta.

Navy

Adamo, Richard Charles, Woodhaven.
Barrett, Stephen Clark, Troy.
Bermingham, Daniel Joseph, Batavia.
Boswell, David Henry, Buffalo.
Duffy, Keith William, Yonkers.
Gregory, Thomas Eston, Endwell.
Henry, Daniel Benedict, Olean.
Hogan, John Bernard, Fort Plain.
Houghtaling, Floyd W., III, Canajoharie.
Jarvis, David Leonard, Jamesville.
Kemelmacher, Robert, New York.
Kordasiewicz, Harry Jay, Kenmore.
Mancini, Richard Michael, Amsterdam.
Marks, George Alfred, Jr., Brockport.
Moinester, Robert William, Lynbrook.
Parsons, Gary Lee, Endicott.
Pearson, David Allen, Town Tonawanda.
Pellegrino, Michael Philip, Maspeth.

NEW YORK—continued

Navy

Ramos, Roberto, New York.
Rockefeller, Ronald Edward, Tivoli.
Saporito, Ronald, Mt. Vernon.
Schoener, Roger Harry, New York.
Trani, Frederick Eugene, Jr., Hyde Park.
Van Der Schans, Donald Edw., New York.
Van Dusen, John Phillip, Johnson City.
Welker, Thomas Edward, Darien.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Adams, John Louis, Selma.
Addis, Jerry Leroy, Dallas.
Albritton, Kenneth Hosea, Fayetteville.
Allen, Sanford Thomas, Smithfield.
Anderson, William Theodore, Statesville.
Ashley, Eugene, Jr., Wilmington.
Averill, Craig Philip, Fayetteville.
Bailey, Carroll James, Morganton.
Bailey, Douglas Grant, Rutherfordton.
Ballance, Elbert Andrew, Lowland.
Barbee, Wilbert Ray, Kenly.
Barnes, Aaron Andre, Jr., Charlotte.
Barr, James David, Carthage.
Basden, Dennis Earl, Beulaville.
Bell, Christopher Hiawatha, Clinton.
Bell, Reginald Conrad, Fayetteville.
Bell, Roger Dale, Clover.
Benton, Henry Edwin, Jr., Wilson.
Berrier, Kenneth Clay, Winston Salem.
Blue, James Earl, Fayetteville.
Bonds, Charles Edward, Winston Salem.
Boone, Dennis Clayton, Burlington.
Boone, Randolph Ernell, Roduco.
Boston, Harry James, Conover.
Bowden, James Lee, Louisberg.
Bowden, John Westley, Charlotte.
Bowden, Lee Andrew, Lumberton.
Bowers, Edgar Lee, Cooleemee.
Brewer, William Glenn, Charlotte.
Brown, Derris, Bladenboro.
Bryant, James Clinton, Andrews.
Bryant, Samuel Edward, Clinton.
Burch, David Carroll, Faison.
Byrd, Billie, Fayetteville.
Callahan, Marshall Eugene, Charlotte.
Campbell, Coyte David, Hickory.
Chapman, Robert L., Colerain.
Cheek, Donald Kirby, Robbins.
Christenbury, Gary Steven, Concord.
Clark, Rhonnie Lee, Maxton.
Coates, James Russell, Dudley.
Cochran, Roy Benjamin, Grover.
Collins, John Calvin, Morehead City.
Connell, John Alexander, Southport.
Copeland, Larry Odell, Swepsonville.
Costin, Charles Grey, Warsaw.
Cox, Charles Stanley, Winston-Salem.
Crawford, Rembert, Jr., High Point.
Crawford, William Don, Pikeville.
Crosby, Roland Clemon, Shelby.
Culp, David, Jr., Pineville.
Daniels, Larry Dean, Ash.
Daniels, Lunas Jonas, Taylorsville.
Darden, Paul L., Jr., Snow Hill.
Davis, Arthur Leroy, Beaufort.
Davis, Johnnie, Cameron.
Davis, Samuel Luther, Thomasville.
Dawes, Daniel Lee, Sr., Sharpsburg.
Dawkins, Benjamin Tally, Rockingham.
Deese, James Edward, Jr., Hickory.
Dellinger, Charles Avery, Conover.
Dellinger, Robert Larry, Kings Mountain.
Dew, Edward Earl, Hallsboro.
Dew, James Junior, Wilson.
Dillard, James Bryan, Cashiers.
Dobbins, Freddie Junior, North Wilkesboro.
Doby, Carl Lee, Mocksville.
Downing, Joseph Henry, Jr., Washington.
Eller, Lawrence William, Ferguson.
Ephland, Guy Bernard, Jr., Burlington.
Evans, Loney, Jr., Oxford.
Evans, Michael Thomas, Wadesboro.
Fennell, Walter Henry, Durham.
Flowers, Milton Eugene, High Point.
Floyd, Kenneth Wayne, Raeford.
Fox, Robert Lynn, Jr., Asheboro.
Freeman, Charles Lloyd, Stedman.
Frye, Gary Nelson, Southern Pines.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Furr, Donald Michael, Charlotte.
Gaines, Marvin Jerome, Statesville.
Gaskins, Wilbur Cornell, Wilson.
Gilliand, Jerry William, Marion.
Glover, Harold Lee, Siler City.
Grace, William Edward, Winston Salem.
Green, Jimmy Carroll, Gastonia.
Griffin, Ronald Devone, Charlotte.
Grimmett, Jon Leslie, Fayetteville.
Hall, James Eugene, Dillsboro.
Hankerson, Jimmie, Battleboro.
Harris, Johnnie Darriel, Raleigh.
Haugen, Warren George, Jr., Charlotte.
Hawkins, Den Junior, Gastonia.
Hawkins, Robert Carroll, Clyde.
Hester, Elvester, Jr., Greensboro.
Hicks, Gary Dale, Mt. Airy.
Hicks, Kenneth Wayne, Greensboro.
Hightower Alfred, Jr., Waynesville.
Hill, Carl Lee, Jr., Kinston.
Hill, Samuel Tony, Gastonia.
Hinson, William Ronald, Midland.
Hodges, Gary Stephen, Greenville.
Hodges, Terry Alan, Charlotte.
Holland, Wayne Bizzle, Salemburg.
Holt, David Rodney, Greensboro.
Hopkins, James Earl, Lucama.
Howell, Kenneth Ralph, Draper.
Hults, Jeffrey Andrew, Fayetteville.
Hunter, Billy Charles, Charlotte.
Hurst, Ronald Lynn, Swannanoa.
Hussey, Sherman Junior, Carthage.
Irby, William Samuel, Charlotte.
Jackson, Johnny Franklin, Fayetteville.
Jacobs, John Edwin, Leland.
Jenkins, Roy Lee, Aulander.
Jenkins, Wayne Daniel, Bryson City.
Johnson, Danny West, Four Oaks.
Johnson, Furman Lee, Willard.
Johnson, Haywood, Jr., Monroe.
Johnson, Jimmy Leroy, Jr., Rutherford.
Jolly, Robert Gerald, Taylorsville.
Jones, Donald Albert, High Point.
Jones, Doward Leroy, Jr., Greensboro.
Jones, Larry William, Greensboro.
Jones, Robert Lewis, Raleigh.
Joyner, Paul Louis, Louisburg.
Keeter, Donald Larry, Charlotte.
Kennedy, Curtis Lee, Rocky Mount.
Kennington, Billy Don, Charlotte.
King, Charles Lee, Hendersonville.
Knox, David Allen, Charlotte.
Lambert, Fred Donald, Ayden.
Lanier, Dayton Wayne, Wilmington.
Lanier, Lee Roy, Morganton.
Lawrence, James Loyd, Jr., Sylva.
Laws, Lonnie Charles, Statesville.
Leary Gary Hoyt, Washington.
Leggett, Franklin Oneil, Fayetteville.
Leigh, Joel Miller, Chapel Hill.
Linville, Samuel Swann, Greensboro.
Locklear, Jimmy, Maxton.
Lowry, William Allison, Asheville.
Lunsford, Lemmie Dee, Timberlake.
Lutz, Donald Thomas, Southern Pines.
Lyman, Charles Lee, Mt. Holly.
Mabe, Ronald Lee, High Point.
Mabe, Tommy Darrel, Winston-Salem.
Mabery David Michael, Asheville.
Macon, Joseph, Raleigh.
Martin, Frederick L., New Bern.
Martin, James Michael, Tuckasegee.
Matthews, George Dennis, Currituck.
Maxwell, Elbert Henry, Statesville.
McAlister, John Ulmer, High Point.
McClamb, Herman Lee, Four Oaks.
McCoy, Ronald Jay, Statesville.
McCray, Thomas, Kenly.
McDonald, Phill Gene, Greensboro.
McGee, Robert Junior, Whitnell.
McGuire, Mitchell Lee, Fayetteville.
McKenzie, Donald Frank, Lumberton.
McLaughlin, Larry Holmes, Raleigh.
McMillian, Robert David, Dunn.
McNeil, Freddie Lee, Fayetteville.
McNeill, Willie B., Fairmont.
McPherson, James Edward, Rockingham.
Melton, James Arthur, Jr., Hamilton.
Melton, Robert Lee, Jr., Rocky Mount.

CXV——473—Part 6

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Melvin, Benjamin, Roseboro.
Merrill, Weldon Bernard, Penrose.
Miles, Robert Wake, Hays.
Miller, Johnny, Kinston.
Miller, Vernell Henry, Jr., Kinston.
Mobley, Jenies Isaac, Grimesland.
Mobley, Sutton, Jr., Wilmington.
Mooney, Dwight Edgar, Marion.
Moore, Huriel Lee, Plymouth.
Moore, James Minick, Durham.
Motsinger, Jerry William, Kernersville.
Moye, Robert Douglas, Greenville.
Mrdjenovich, Charles, Ft. Bragg.
Mulkey, Ralph Buddy, Jr., Gastonia.
Nance, Lewis, Charlotte.
Nance, Paul Marion, Jr., Washington.
Neal, James Richard, Topton.
Nixon, Mason, Jr., Hertford.
Osborne, Thomas York, Harrisburg.
Owens, Charles Edward, Gastonia.
Paige, Ezekiel, Siler City.
Parker, Charles Thomas, Asheboro.
Parker, James Earl, Oak City.
Parker, James Ronald, Ashville.
Parrott, Dempsey Woodrow, Kinston.
Paysour, Donald Blair, Dallas.
Perry, Harmon Wayne, Durham.
Perry, Steven Dale, Ahoskie.
Phillips, Charles Edward, Lansing.
Phillips, Lionel Nesbit, Jr., Concord.
Pigford, Phillip Wayne, Mount Olive.
Pope, George Richard, Turkey.
Poteat, Dennis Michael, Marion.
Powell, Stephen Rolley, Valdese.
Prince, Gary Davis, Gibsonville.
Pyrant, Donald Ray, Sanford.
Ramsey, Thomas Earle, Asheville.
Reaves, Fred, Jr., Burlington.
Reid, Gene Calvin, Lenoir.
Richards, Stephen Ryan, Burlington.
Riddick, Sterling, G. W., Elizabeth City.
Riggins, Billy G., Greensboro.
Riggs, Richard Vernon, Goldsboro.
Roberson, Larry Michael, Burlington.
Rogers, Michael Dean, Asheville.
Rogers, William Francis, Asheville.
Rose, Norman Earl, III, Oxford.
Ross, Phillip K., Greensboro.
Ross, Robert James, Charlotte.
Royster, Hubert, Jr., Oxford.
Rummage, James Felix, Albemarle.
Russ, Billie Grover, East Rockingham.
Russell, Charles E., III, Graham.
Sain, Larry Dean, Cherryville.
Sands, Eddie Bernard, Fayetteville.
Scott, Kenneth David, Bear Creek.
Sexton, Wayne Edward, Waynesville.
Sheppard Garry Daymon, Skyland.
Shipman, Willie Frazer, Bladenboro.
Smith, David, II, Elizabethtown.
Smith, Donald Gray, Walnut Cove.
Smith, Douglas Bane, Durham.
Smith, Noah, Leland, Hamlet.
Spach, Jimmy Russell, Rural Hall.
Speight, Franklin Elliott, Currituck.
Spencer, Floyd Tyrone, Highpoint.
Staton, Robert Milton, Jr., Jamesville.
Stephens, Donald Henry, Lilesville.
Stephens, Sonnie, White Oak.
Stockard, Robert Ferrell, Greensboro.
Stokes, Odell, Jr., Newton.
Strickland, Billy Lewis, Hendersonville.
Strickland, Charlie R., Jr., Rocky Mount.
Stroud, Able Croom, III, La Grange.
Stroud, Allen Sheffield, Garner.
Sutton, Douglas Rolland, Bryson City.
Sutton, Eugene Morgan, Jr., Statesville.
Sutton, Terry Wayne, Greenville.
Swann, Thomas Fredrick, Jr., Elizabethtown.
Tate, Robert Lee, Gastonia.
Taylor, Richard Berry, Midway Park.
Thomas, James Ernest, Greensboro.
Thomas, Pearly Junior, Tabor City.
Thompson, Charlie Vance, Stantonsburg.
Thompson, Douglas Gerald, Fayetteville.
Throckmorton, Gary Gray, Winston-Salem.
Tippett, Albert Allen, Whitakers.
Toler, Edmond Ray, Goldboro.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Turner, William Irvin, Jr., Bowden.
Turney, James Fred, Pinnacle.
Vernon, Broadus Wayne, Alexis.
Walker, Stephen Archie, Charlotte.
Walker, Thomas James, Gastonia.
Walker, Willie C., Trenton.
Wall, Donald Lee, Garner.
Walston, Ruby Kenneth, Ayden.
Watson, Arthur, Smithfield.
Watson, Lee Arthur, Smithfield.
Webster, John Thomas, Burlington.
Welch, Harold Hugh, Shelby.
Wells, Ralph Norwood, Elm City.
West, Roy Rogers, Ahoskie.
Whelihan, Thomas Meakin, Winterville.
Wilder, Luther Tommy, Spring Hope.
Williams, Charles Edward, Smithfield.
Williams, Johnny, Durham.
Williams, Kermit Louis, Clinton.
Williams, Walter Alexander, Mocksville.
Williams, William Smyly, Jr., Fayetteville.
Williamson, Albertis, Abbottsburg.
Williford, Elsworth, Fayetteville.
Woods, David Edward, Winston-Salem.
Young, Fred, Greensboro.

Air Force

Boyd, James, Winston-Salem.
Brown, David Chappell, Waynesville.
McDaniel, John Lewis, Gibsonville.
Pittard, David Hunter, Raleigh.
Scarborough, Griffin Eli, Greenville.
Smith, Lowell Vetter, Banner Elk.
Vail, Walter Wilber, Plymouth.

Marine Corps

Adger, Willie Howard, Greensboro.
Andrews, Michael Wayne, Timberlake.
Baggett, Curtis Franklin, Raleigh.
Barringer, Andrey W., Jr., Statesville.
Batton, Curtis Lee, Belmont.
Berg, John Vernon, Kinston.
Blalock, Harry Lamar, Albemarle.
Braswell, James Earl, Wilson.
Brown, Donnie Wayne, Robbins.
Brown, James Leroy, Washington.
Brown, Robert Maxwell, Jr., Salisbury.
Brown, Thomas Edward, Murphy.
Bullock, Marvin A. J., Elm City.
Burr, Robert Glenn, Wadesboro.
Burris, Roy Neil, Dallas.
Byers, James Robert, Jr., Gastonia.
Caldwell, Robert Edward, Charlotte.
Campbell, Donny Rae, Coats
Carter, Clyde Ray, Jr., Raleigh.
Cauthen, Frank Reginald, Lincolnton.
Chamblin, Donald Ray, Jr., Charlotte.
Cheek, Roger Dale, Greensboro.
Coleman, John Lee, Charlotte.
Collier, John Stanford, Fuquay Varina.
Conley, Theodore R., Jr., Lenoir.
Connell, Edwin Douglas, Hickory.
Copeland, James Alan, Raleigh.
Couick, Roger Lynn, Gastonia.
Davis, Arthur Lavelle, Charlotte.
Davis, Kinsey Arthur, Dover.
Denning, Dwight Thomas, Raleigh.
Draemer, Charles Edward, Burlington.
Draughon, Isaac Roy, Dunn.
Dubose, Larry Douglas, Rocky Mount.
Edwards, Ted Willis, Charlotte.
Fields, Sherman Robert, Jr., Dallas.
Forte, Ollie, Raleigh.
Foy, John Carl, Greensboro.
Freeman, Robert Glenn, Fayetteville.
Gilliam, David Lee, Greensboro.
Godette, Michael Spencer, Beaufort.
Griffin, Roy Lee, Jr., Greensboro.
Hadley, Thomas Joseph, Pittsboro.
Hall, Richard James, Hays.
Hansard, John William, III, Swannanoa.
Harding, John Charles, Jr., Mocksville.
Harris, Eugene, Hickory.
Hayes, Billy Charles, Winston-Salem.
Hayes, Hilton, Jr., Fayetteville.
Helmstetler, Michael David, High Point.
Herring, John Howard, Maxton.
Hodges, Carl Frederick, Jr., Washington.
Hollifield, Samuel, F., Jr., Lexington.
Hoover, Edward Lee, Huntersville.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

Marine Corps

House, Alton, Walstonburg.
Ing, Herbert Edgar, III, Camp Lejeune.
Inman, James Mackenzie, Asheville.
Jackson, Roy Lee, Candor.
Jennette, Leo Miller, Buxton.
Jensen, Paul Andrew, Asheville.
Johnson, Harrell Wayne, Roseboro.
Jones, Joseph John, Scotland Neck.
Keefe, Dennis Michael, Greensboro.
Keeter, Michael Yates, Gastonia.
Kelly, Edmund Joseph, Wilson.
Lane, Bobby Ray, Goldsboro.
Ledford, Danny, Belmont.
Link, Frederick, Beard, Newton.
Love, Anthony Ray, Gastonia.
McCrimmon, Ernest C., Jr., Raleigh.
McGill, Joe Louis Lockhar, Shelby.
McInnis, John Terry, Kannapolis.
McLaurin, Charles Lonnell, Clinton.
McNeill, Lonnie Earl, Dunn.
Meeks, Johnny Lee, Dallas.
Menton, Charles Russell J., Charlotte.
Miller, Gurney Len, Wilkesboro.
Miller, William, Jr., Durham.
Mobley, Clarence Vernon, Winnabow.
Mobley, Lawrence, Clinton.
Morden, Robert Nelson, Greensboro.
Moses, William Joshua, Charlotte.
Nesbitt, Hasker Lee, Jr., High Point.
Norman, William Wilson, Charlotte.
Norton, Kenneth Bradley, Laurel.
Owens, Elwood, Windsor.
Oxendine, Willie F., III, Fairmont.
Parker, Lewis Jeffery, Gates.
Parrish, Leonard Monroe, Lillington.
Parton, Floyd Eugene, Asheville.
Payne, James Terry, Columbia.
Power, George Patrick, Mount Olive.
Price, George Michael, Charlotte.
Ramey, Glenn William, Gastonia.
Ray, Franklin Daniel, Smithfield.
Reece, Walter James, Marshall.
Richards, James Michael, Pelham.
Ritch, Michael Eugene, Gastonia.
Roberts, William Claude, Boone.
Robinson, James Delano, Kannapolis.
Sanders, Robert Earl, Raleigh.
Siler, Jimmy Louis, Siler City.
Slade, William, Greensboro.
Smith, Terry Cleveland, Trinity.
Snipes, Jerry Arthur, Albemarle.
Sprinkle, Roger Dale, Statesville.
Stewart, Billy Gray, Swannanoa.
Taylor, Herbert Gordan, Ahoskie.
Tharrington, Rossevelt, Jr., Durham.
Thomas, Gregory Wayne, Kings Mountain.
Tillman, John, III, Lilesville.
Trantham, Raymond Farley, Murphy.
Tucker, Willie, Jr., Greenville.
Walker, Larry Wayne, Greensboro.
Weaver, James Onley, Swannanoa.
West, Seth Lee, Jr., Kinston.
Williams, Eddie, Whitakers.
Wright, Willard Gerald, Leaksville.
York, William Prather, Liberty.

Navy

Blasko, Peter Paul, Jr., Southern Pines.
Brice, Eric Parker, Rocky Mount.
Bullin, Vernon Terry, Walnut Cove.
Guest, Daniel, Salisbury.
Hembree, Ronald Gene, Andrews.
Leonard, Jerry Smith, Greensboro.
Moore, Lloyd Whitfield, Wilmington.
Wiglesworth, Ernest W., Jr., Greensboro.
Woodard, John Douglas, Clyde.

NORTH DAKOTA

Army

Alberts, Roger Duane, Fort Totten.
Beier, Elroy Eugene, Langdon.
Boots, Curtis Eugene, Watford City.
Borgman, Richard Lee, Minot.
Brinkmeyer, John William, New England.
Charnetzki, Paul Frederick, Valley City.
De Priest, David Reed, Rugby.
Ellenson, Jerome William, Walcott.
Froehlich, Norbert Louis, Belfield.
Frost, Rapheal John, Hunter.
Hertel, Rodger Ray, Portal.

NORTH DAKOTA—continued

Army

Hillyer, Louis, Monango.
Honcharoff, Gene Edward, Max.
Hovland, Richard Dale, Williston.
Jansonius, Fred Walter, Jamestown.
Klein, Gerald Dean, Raleigh.
Klose, Douglas Clemens, Jamestown.
Kramer, Raymond Eugene, New Salem.
Kuss, Florian Henry, Strasburg.
Latraille, David John, Grafton.
Lembke, Melvin Dennis, Grand Forks.
Lokken, Gary Dan, Bowman.
McCowan, Ralph Charles, Trenton.
Meyhoff, Michael Frederick, Center.
Nesset, David Jon, Fargo.
Olson, Larry Rex, McHenry.
Orsund, Richard Wayne, Grafton.
Senne, Thomas Alfred, Valley City.
Storey, Robert Lee, Grand Forks AFB.
Tingley, John Charles, Kathryn.
Tongen, George Elwood, Walhalla.
Valker, George Ernest, III, Minot.
Warbis, Larry Lyle, Haynes.

Air Force

Bond, Ronald Dale, Fargo.

Marine Corps

Backer, William Paul, Mandan.
Gaffaney, Richard James, Jr., Fargo.
Goodiron, Ronald Christy, Shields.
Himler, Robert John, Williston.
Kelly, Douglas Milton, Dickinson.
Kirkeby, David Lynn, Drayton.
Lunde, Gregory Howard, Westhope.
Myers, Gary Fredrick, Fort Yates.
Neuenschwander, Dan Lee, Fessenden.
Olson, Richard James, Grand Forks.
Selby, Dewayne Michael, Bismarck
Triske, Richard Frank, Grand Forks.

Navy

Carter, Leslie Louis, Jamestown.
Coons, Chester Leroy, Bismarck.
Olson, Delbert Austin, Casselton.

OHIO

Army

Achoe, Leeverne Richard, Cincinnati.
Ackerman, James Carroll, Jr., Mansfield.
Adams, William J., Canton.
Adkins, John, Bartlett.
Algire, Roger Dean, Mount Vernon.
Ambrosio, Joseph George, Elyria.
Anders, Richard Alan, Nelsonville.
Anderson, Charles E.. Cleveland.
Anderson, George Donald, Troy.
Anderson, William Edward, Lancaster.
Ange, Carmello, Jr., Parma.
Armentrout, Stanley Willia, Rittman.
Atwood, Richard, Cleveland.
Aurady, Michael Victor, Cleveland.
Babyak, Andrew John, Jr., Youngstown.
Bach, Michael Robert, Cincinnati.
Bachman, Paul John, Wadsworth.
Badgley, Dale Ernest, Covington.
Bagen, Ronald S., Cleveland Heights.
Baker, Edgar, Jr., Franklin.
Banks, Dingus, Jr., Columbus.
Banks, Richard Anthony, Cleveland.
Bargar, Richard M., Novelty.
Barry, Robert James, Lorain.
Beard, Jeffrey Lee, Fremont.
Began, John Lester, Elyria.
Behm, Charles Joel, Jr., Marion.
Belcher, Roland, Columbus.
Bell, David Thomas, Willoughby.
Bernhart, Carl Hans, Richmond.
Berzinec, William Edward, Akron.
Best, Ronald Lee, Dayton.
Bevier, Melvin Edward, Willard.
Bixel, Kenneth Bruce, Willoughby.
Black, Paul, Jr., Cincinnati.
Blair, Ronnie, St. Marys.
Blair, William Earl, Akron.
Blakeslee, Thomas Wayne, Medina.
Blankenship, Edgar William, Lewisburg.
Bockbrader, Jerry Allan, Perrysburg.
Bodnar, George Joseph, South Euclid.
Bodnar, Joseph A., Athens.
Bonifant, Samuel Harold, Dennison.
Bonner, Ike Othel, Columbus.

OHIO—continued

Army

Bosworth, Richard Lee, Marengo.
Botts, Robert Eugene, Columbus.
Boulware, Sherman James, Columbus.
Bowling, Gary Dean, Seven Mile.
Bowman, Robert Eugene, Wadsworth.
Bozarth, Terance M., Kettering.
Brown, David Allen, West Manchester.
Brown, Frank Lester, Youngstown.
Brown, James Michael, Toledo.
Brown, Ronald Douglas, Jefferson.
Brown, William Ernest, Hillsboro.
Brown, William Franklin, Cleveland.
Bruce, Richard Peter, Cleveland.
Brucker, Leslie L., Jr., Circleville.
Bruckner, Donald Richard, Garfield Heights.
Bryan, Clifford Edward, Toledo.
Busby, Ronald Dean, Columbus.
Calentine, Ronald Lee, Toledo.
Callaway, McArthur, Cincinnati.
Carey, David Lee, Danville.
Carroll, James Nathan, III, Cincinnati.
Carter, Gregory, Columbus.
Chahoc, David Keith, Lakewood.
Chapman, Thomas Todd, Hicksville.
Chavez, Filiberto, Burgoon.
Chilcote, Bryan Michael, Cincinnati.
Chilton, Richard Kenneth, Lebanon.
Chinn, James Russell, Columbus.
Christian, Vernon Webb, Jr., Stewartsville.
Clark, Ralph E., Toledo.
Clingerman, Joseph Allan, Youngstown.
Collins, Ralph Raymond, Jr., Barberton.
Combs, James Stephen, Dayton.
Combs, John Asher, Akron.
Conkel, Thomas Eugene, Circleville.
Conrady, Michael Joseph, Sheffield.
Cook, Charles Robert, Lakewood.
Cooley, Shelby Emerson, Mineral City.
Coonrod, Arnold Lee, Orient.
Cooper, Terry Lee, Thornville.
Cottrell, Timothy James, Wellington.
Cramer, Jeffrey Thompson, Cleveland.
Crawford, Stephen Earl, Portsmouth.
Crouse, John Raymond, Hillsboro.
Crum, Curtis Ray, Ironton.
Culotta, Anthony Thomas, Shaker Heights.
Darnell, George W., Jr., Warren.
Dauch, Gary Leonard, Clyde
David, Charles Edward, Jr., Wellsville.
Davis, John Clayton, Jr., Columbus.
Davis, Paul Patrick, Cincinnati.
Davis, Philip George, Cincinnati.
Davis, Robert Henry, Warrensville.
De Jarnett, George Wesley, Elyria.
Dean, William Edward, London.
Dearing, Larry Gene, Jackson.
Debo, William Louis, Portsmouth.
Decker, William Bernard, Prospect.
Deeter, David Kim, Celina.
Deike, Robert James, Willoughby.
Dickman, David Michael. Ottawa.
Dimagard, William Charles, Euclid.
Dimmerling, Rome Edward, Louisville.
Dobbins, Gary Lee, Akron.
Doody, Douglas William, Cleveland.
Doolittle, Gary Wayne, Cincinnati.
Drake, Roger Kenneth, Fostoria.
Drown, Larry Gene, Green Springs.
Dulebohn, Dennis Lee, Wapakoneta.
Dybvig, Ned Turner, Akron.
Eckle, Stephen John, Columbus.
Edwards, Thomas Ray, Middletown.
Eggert, Russell William, Cleveland.
Elston, Roy David, Jr., Toledo.
Elswick, Robert Wayne, Newark.
Enczi, Raymond Michael, Elyria.
Englert, James Raymond, Cincinnati.
Erbland, Norman Joseph, Fostoria.
Erford, Dennis Charles, Miller City.
Evans, Joe Franklin, Fayetteville.
Ewalt, Donald Thomas, Parma.
Faul, Kenneth Wayne, Clarksville.
Faverty, Alvis Ray, Jr., Alliance.
Fazzino, James Douglas, Cuyahoga Falls.
Fields, Ronald Clark, Dayton.
Fisher, David Herbert, Milford Center.
Fisher, Marshall Wayne, East Fultonham.
Fleming, Kenneth Clair, Jr., Zanesville.

OHIO—continued

Army

Flesher, Russell Ray, Wooster.
Flood, Charles Dale, Ridgeville.
Floyd, Robert Eugene, Bradford.
Frankhauser, Chris Walter, Sylvania.
Fravel, David Ward, Columbus.
Friley, Arthur Timothy, New Philadelphia.
Fullum, Darryl Blake, Ravenna.
Fusile, Mark Louis, Cleveland.
Gabel, Gary Lee, Fremont.
Gallaugher, Darryl Alan, Chillicothe.
Garcia, Raymond Charles, Cleveland.
Gawel, Walter L., Cleveland.
Gill, Joseph George, Toledo.
Goins, Gordon L., Eaton.
Golden, Kenneth Edward, Youngstown.
Gonzalez, Andres Avalos, Sandusky.
Goudy, Gary Roy, Powhatan Point.
Green, Melvin Rickey, New Paris.
Greendyke, Gerald Bruce, Greenville.
Gregory, Henry, Cleveland.
Grier, Richard Eugene, Burbank.
Griffin, Ronald Lewis, Lancaster.
Griffis, Robert Dale, Cincinnati.
Griffith, Michael Lynn, Lancaster.
Grooms, William David, Xenia.
Gross, Gary Wayne, Jackson Center.
Gruber, Martin Steve, Jr., Mason.
Guenther, Joseph Ellis, Akron.
Hamilton, Jeffrey Giles, Mansfield.
Hamilton, Robert Richard, Cleveland.
Hamner, Michael Keith, Chillicothe.
Hampshire, Robert Cloyce, Fostoria.
Handy, Todd Arthur, Xenia.
Hanlan, Allen Dewey, Cleveland.
Hannaman, Robert Allen, Stockport.
Harris, Edward James, Jr., Lowellville.
Harris, Ervin Ellis, Oregon.
Harrison, Paul Raymond, Medway.
Hartpence, Dennis Ray, Edison.
Hayes, Danny Carlton, Scottown.
Hayman, Archie Andrew, Gallipolis.
Heightland, Orville W., Jr., Columbus.
Heil, Louis George, Springfield.
Heiser, Edward Michael, Brookpark.
Helfenstine, Samuel James, Cincinnati.
Helton, Dwayne, Dayton.
Hendle, David Wallace, Massillon.
Herbert, Larry Eugene, Glouster.
Heringhausen, Arthur J., Jr., Oregon.
Herkins, Thomas Franklin, Brookville.
Herron, Dennis, Sylvania.
Hewitt, Burl Denton, Newport.
Heydinger, Lauren Joseph, Norwalk.
Heydorn, Charles George, Cleveland.
Hill, Paul Jewell, Circleville.
Hilton, Eugene, Jr., Cleveland.
Hinkle, Terry Lee, Franklin.
Hoffert, David Edgar, Uniontown.
Hoffman, Donald Robert, Akron.
Hoge, Frank Lee, Bellefontaine.
Holler, Carl Wayne, Utica.
Holmes, James Cecil, Sabina.
Holsinger, Gary Olson, New Boston.
Hook, Mark Loren, Hillsboro.
Hoskins, Danny, Trenton.
Howard, David Ray, Dayton.
Hughes, Gordon Kay, Upper Sandusky.
Hughes, Robert Laurens, Westerville.
Hughes, William Joseph, Salem.
Hull, Ricky Lee, Zanesville.
Hummel, Harry Lynne, Fremont.
Huzicko, Charles James, Struthers.
Iding, Gregory Thomas, Cincinnati.
Inboden, Roger Lee, Creola.
Ingram, Israel Lonzo, Columbus.
Inlow, Ricky Gene, Wilmington.
Intihar, Josef Paul, Wickliffe.
Jackson, John Herston, Kent.
Jamison, Ted Ray, Portsmouth.
Jatich, Gary Lee, Akron.
Johnson, Gus Winslow, Jr., Blacklick.
Johnson, Harry Wilbur, Dayton.
Johnson, Larry Dean, Risingsun.
Johnson, Raymond Junior, Hamilton.
Johnson, Ronald Gene, Uhrichsville.
Johnson, Stanley, Cincinnati.
Jones, Gregory Thomas, Columbus.
Jones, Norman, Jr., Elyria.
Jordan, James Eldon, Jr., Vandalia.

OHIO—continued

Army

Katterhenry, Leroy W., Jr., Columbus.
Keister, David Earl, Reynoldsburg.
Kemer, Robert Patrick, Cleveland.
Kemper, John Richard, Carroll.
Kennedy, John Franklin, Lima.
Kerns, Roger Ray, West Mansfield.
Kinnard, Daniel Lee, Newark.
Kinnard, Dennis Ray, Mount Vernon.
Kirkpatrick, Eldon John, Jr., Ashland.
Klann, Martin Douglas, New Philadelphia.
Kocak, John Anthony, Lorain.
Kolarov, Michael Carey, Akron.
Korecki, Eugene M., Toledo.
La Chapelle, Gary George, Toledo.
Lamar, Willie James, Cleveland.
Lanter, Raymond Edward, Cincinnati.
Lasure, Danny Lewis, Albany.
Lea, Robert Edward, Cleveland.
Leak, Jerry Day, Lebanon.
Lee, Guy Eugene, Lancaster.
Levier, David James, Sandusky.
Lewis, Barry Wayne, Batavia.
Lewis, David Harry, New Straitsville.
Licate, David Louis, Ashtabula.
Lindsey, Elmer R., Jr., Columbus.
Loftus, Raymond Sharp, III, Toledo.
Loitz, Michael Nelson, Rootstown.
Lomax, Richard Eugene, Mansfield.
Long, Robert Davis, Cincinnati.
Lothman, James Edward, Euclid.
Lovedahl, Charles Robert, Lynchburg.
Luecke, Robert Wayne, Parma.
Lulla, Robert Allen, Steubenville.
Lutz, Larry Eugene, Parma.
Mack, Alvin Anthony, Jr., Cleveland.
Mahoney, Ernest, Cleveland.
Maroscher, Albert George, Columbus.
Marsh, Richard Albert, Blanchester.
Martich, Thomas Mark, Cleveland.
Martin, Leonard Ray, Fairborn.
Massa, David Lynn, Mansfield.
Mathew, Cecil Leroy, Jr., Columbus.
Matuska, John James, Garfield Heights.
Maurer, James Robert, Columbus.
Maxwell, William Earl, Barberton.
Mays, James Edward, Hamilton.
McAfee, Cary Francis, Hillsboro.
McCarroll, Oren B., Columbus.
McGuire, Mitchell, Hanoverton.
Meadows, Chad David, Dayton.
Melott, Charles Edward, Rodgers.
Messer, Bobby Gene, Dayton.
Millard, Larry David, Columbus.
Miller, James Garrett, Akron.
Miller, Victor Raymond, Beach City.
Mink, Boyd Carl, Lockland.
Mitchell, Thomas Allan, Canton.
Molzon, Ernest Alvin, Chardon.
Moore, James Cecil, Cincinnati.
Moree, Barry Russell, Akron.
Morris, Neil Jay, Greenfield.
Mortus, Patrick Clinton, Twinsburg.
Mossford, Gregory Fredrick, Ashtabula.
Mueller, Stephen Michael, Huntsville.
Mullins, Richard Allen, Lebanon.
Murphy, Robert Edward, Jr., Euclid.
Murray, Brian Thomas, Lorain.
Murray, James Edward, Cleveland.
Napier, Zack William, Miamisburg.
Nau, James Christian, Madison.
Nervie, Kenneth John, Youngstown.
Nestich, Frank Joseph, Akron.
New, Zachary Phillip, Cincinnati.
Newell, Edwin Grant, Xenia.
Newland, Michael Dwaine, Lima.
Niehaus, James Edward, Cincinnati.
O Laughlin, James Francis, Dayton.
O Reilly, Anthony Paul, Kettering.
Oates, Robert James, Cincinnati.
Obenour, Ronald Michael, Fairborn.
Orwig, David Thomas, III, Niles.
Osinski, Ronald Anthony, Toledo.
Painter, Wayne Allen, Fort Recovery.
Palm, Dale Arden, Toledo.
Paonessa, Michael Dominic, Akron.
Parks, James Kermit, London.
Patton, James Alan, Akron.
Penland, Fred Daniel, Sparta.
Penney, Charles Otis, Cleveland.

OHIO—continued

Army

Peretiatko, Jerald Paul, Lindale.
Perkins, Gary William, Wellington.
Perry, Edward Lee, Fairborn.
Perry, John Everette, McArthur.
Pierce, David Wayne, Marion.
Pierce, Homer Earl, Jr., Chillicothe.
Plavcan, Kenneth Michael, Parma.
Poling, Jackie Ray, Scott.
Polito, Gene Albert, Cleveland.
Pozmann, Alexander, Jr., Cleveland.
Price, Dennis Alton, Minerva.
Price, William Edward, Plain City.
Prieser, Robert Sherman, Toledo.
Quinn, Roger Allan, Scioto.
Rains, Christopher Lee, Columbus.
Ramon, Dennis Michael, Sandusky.
Rees, Joseph Maurice, Columbus.
Reno, Lawrence Gerald, Cincinnati.
Rice, Walter Garland, Jr., Bristolville.
Richardson, Farris Lee, Cincinnati.
Rickard, Ronald Lee, Ashtabula.
Riley, Curtis Ray, Stouts.
Ringel, James Robert, Toledo.
Roberts, Thomas Warren, Belpre.
Robertson, Alvin Warner, Twinsburg.
Robinson, Roy Ray, McArthur.
Ross, Ronald Carl, Girard.
Ross, Thomsa Michael, Akron.
Ross, William Keith, Cincinnati.
Rucker, Richard Lee, Beallsville.
Rugh, Fred Plymouth, Youngstown.
Rusek, Ronald Lee, Toledo.
Russin, Donald John, Jr., Youngstown.
Rutledge, James Benson, Columbus.
Sablotny, Richard Alan, Bedford Heights.
Sanchez, Angel Luis, Lorain.
Sanders, Richard Wayne, Goshen.
Sanford, James Russell, Jr., Xenia.
Sapp, Benny James, Rockford.
Sarjeant, Dwight Cutler, Perrysburg.
Sayre, Leslie Berkeley, Fairborn.
Schaub, Terry Lee, Haynesville.
Schmidt, Joseph, Newark.
Schultz, Jerry Lee, Zanesville.
Schwab, Thomas Paul, Cincinnati.
Schwan, Daniel George, Columbus.
Scully, John Michael, University Heights.
Seifert, Thomas Leonard, Willoughby.
Seiferth, Stephen Eric, East Liverpool.
Shaffer, William Emerson, Cable.
Sharp, Curtis Henry, Jr., Mogadore.
Sharrock, Edward Alva, Bucyrus.
Shaw, Gary Francis, Toledo.
Sheline, Allen Curtis, Jackson.
Shellito, Walter Charles, Youngstown.
Shy, Gary Nolan, Portsmouth.
Siebenaller, Robert Charle, Tiffin.
Sims, Erwin Bruce, Uniontown.
Sines, Timothy David, New Lexington.
Sinnock, John Robert, Massillon.
Skaggs, Floyd Peter, Springfield.
Skyles, Nyles Bernard, Chillicothe.
Smith, Andrew Richard, Jr., Middletown.
Smith, David Ronald, Columbus.
Smith, Frank Norman, Seneca.
Smith, Patrick, Edward, Jr., Avon.
Smith, Robert Lee, Chillicothe.
Smith, Roger Lee, South Point.
Smith, Steven Dean, Bellville.
Smith, Thomas David, Columbus.
Snakovsky, Louis Allan, Jr., Maple Heights.
Snyder, Duane Harold, Fremont.
Sobczak, Joseph S., II, Peninsula.
Sollars, Franklin Ellwood, Williamsport.
Sonnichsen, Edwin Charles, Cleveland.
Sonnkalb, Charles David, Jr., Columbus.
Spear, Howard Joseph, Columbus.
Speck, George Edgar, Ravenna.
Spring, Timothy Lanzer, Cleveland.
Stainer, William Edward, Columbus.
Stapleton, Clifford, Newark.
Stecker, Richard E., Newcomerstown.
Stepp, Eugene Henry, Cleveland.
Stevens, Forestal Alonzo, Doylestown.
Stiles, James Leo, Bedford Heights.
Strawbridge, Joseph Edward, Findlay.
Strayer, Patrick Joseph, Cleveland.
Strohmaier, John Richard, Toledo.
Stroisch, Loyd Edward, Mentor.

OHIO—continued

Army

Sullinger, James Edward, Windham.
Swaney, Larry Dean, Wellston.
Szahlender, Juluis Nichola, Bratenahl.
Tarpley, Norman Wesley, Columbus.
Tasker, James Bruce, Troy.
Taylor, Frederick Wayne, Marietta.
Taylor, Theodore, Jr., Dayton.
Terry, Arlie, Fairborn.
Thomas, Freddie Lee, Hamilton.
Thomas, Tom Michael, New Philadelphia.
Thompson, Kenneth David, Marion.
Thompson, Randall Alan, Columbus.
Timms, Terry Lynn, Columbus.
Tongret, Thomas Edward, Canton.
Townsley, Steven Douglas, New Carlisle.
Truett, William Randal, Miamisburg.
Tsiros, Alexander, Lakewood.
Tutor, Rex Franklin, Cleveland.
Tuttle, Kenneth Allen, Martins Ferry.
Tyrrell, John Franklin, Berea.
Urban, David Lee, Chardon.
Vadakin, Donald Keith, Marietta.
Van Meter, Larry Eugene, Columbus.
Vandermuelen, Robert Lynn, Canton.
Vasko, Richard Martin, Swanton.
Viktoryn, John William, Jr., Cleveland.
Wagner, Richard Edward, Moscow.
Walsh, James Edward, Dayton.
Ward, Kurt Eugen, Dayton.
Weaks, Timothy Howard, Findlay.
Webb, Terry Emerson, Grove City.
Webb, Virgil Junior, Marysville.
Weber, Rober Dale, Dover.
Wedgeworth, William Thomas, Cleveland.
Weidinger, William Joseph, Bellevue.
Weister, Ronald Keith, Canton.
Wells, Lucion Perry, Oregonia.
Welty, Terry Chip, Massillon.
Wertz, Steve Edward, Springfield.
White, Eddie Joe, Barberton.
White, Michael Dale, Columbus.
Widener, Larry Allen, Youngstown.
Wigfield, Ronald Lee, Mineral City.
Wilcox, Armour David, III, Hudson.
Willeke, Gary Robert, Ada.
Williams, Clifford Leroy, Akron.
Williams, Eugene Melvin, Youngstown.
Wilson, Earnest, Bethel.
Wilson, John Ray, Barberton.
Wilson, Marion Earl, Zanesville.
Wilson, Ronald Eugene, Columbus.
Wilt, Richard James, Holland.
Winch, Gerald James, Lakewood.
Wiskow, Ingo Julius Robert, Columbus.
Wolfe, Daniel Edward, Sidney.
Wolford, Billara, Sheffield.
Wolford, Marshall David, Youngstown.
Woodford, Wesley Lee, Tallmadge.
Worthey, Ed, Akron.
Wright, Arkie Junior, Williamsburg.
Wright, Chester Anton, Coshocton.
Wymer, William Clifford Jr., Scio.
Yost, Paul Leonard, Bidwell.
Young, Charles Earl, Columbus.
Young, James Michael, Cincinnati.
Zimmerman, Steven Arthur, Wapakoneta.

Coast Guard

Rittichier, Jack Columbus, Barberton.

Air Force

Ball, Robert, Toledo.
Edwards, Richard Lyon, Coal Grove.
Helgeson, Ellis Eugene, Jr., Cincinnati.
Klinzing, Thomas Lee, Hamilton.
Locker, James Douglas, Sidney.
McMahon, William Lawrence, Fredericktown.
Oferdier, Lyn Douglas, Toledo.
Shroyer, Perry Vernando, Marion.
Strahm, Paul Douglas, Sheffield Lake.
Wichman, Roger Edward, Dayton.

Marine Corps

Akins, Ronald Paul, Akron.
Aldrich, David Alan, Gibsonburg.
Allen, Kenneth Jeffery, Cincinnati.
Ammon, William Resor, Cincinnati.
Andrews, David Lynn, Wilmington.
Andrews, Michael Allen, Mogadore.
Anthony, Ward Leroy, Canton.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Armstrong, Michael David, Cridersville.
Armstrong, Raymond, Cleveland.
Ausmus, Robert Arthur, Cambridge.
Bargaheiser, Lawrence Gilb, Tiffin,
Barnhart, Earl Edward, Jr., Lorain.
Bass, Harry Wayne, Jr., Columbus.
Baylor, Harold Booker T., Columbus.
Beale, George Eugene, Cincinnatti.
Berger, John Edward, Cincinnati.
Berkheimer, Denver Joseph, Streetsboro.
Bevilacqua, Renato Martin, Cleveland.
Bezeau, Rick William, Toledo.
Bobkovich, Stephen Joseph, Akron.
Bogard, Jack Crosby, Sycamore.
Bond, George Alan, Newark.
Bond, Theodore Charles, Columbus.
Bonnett, Sherl Kent, Windham.
Boyer, Charles Thomas, Toledo.
Briscoe, Charles, Cleveland.
Britton, William Ned, Dayton.
Broderman, Barry Bernard, Cincinnati.
Brown, Eddie Stephen, Columbus.
Brown, Richard Allen, Columbus.
Brown, Richard Samuel, Ashville.
Brunner, Michael Carl, Toledo.
Bryan, Lawrence George, Columbus.
Burgoon, William Paul, Columbus.
Burke, James Robert, Fremont.
Burkes, Bruce Wayne, Kettering.
Caley, Michael Shane, Coshocton.
Campbell, Donald Allen, Gloucester.
Cannon, Robert Byrel, Bellbrook.
Carney, Robert Arthur, Akron.
Carter, Edward Eugene, Dayton.
Caudill, James, Marion.
Cegielski, Richard Joseph, Cleveland.
Chambers, James Larry, Cincinnati.
Cheadle, Harold Lee, Jr., Cleveland.
Chearnley, Joseph Michael, Shelby.
Chmel, Denis Michael, North Olmsted.
Christian, Daniel Kieth, Wadsworth.
Claypool, George Robert, Toledo.
Clementz, Richard Joseph, McGuffey.
Clemson, Gerald Richard, Geneva.
Coe, Ronald Ray, Norwalk.
Cole, Marvin Eugene, Shiloh.
Coleman, William Frank, Cleveland.
Coon, Calvin Kermit, Elyria.
Corley, Thomas Eugene, Cleveland.
Corwin, Edwin Hugh, Bryan.
Critchfield, Reece A. Jr., Upper Sandusky.
Crysel, Kenneth Lee, Warren.
Cue, William Charles, Akron.
Dagger, Carl Richard, Urbana.
Daisher, David Charles, Akron.
Daniels, Joseph Ray, Jr., Toledo.
Daniels, Richard Gale, Columbus.
Daniels, William Marcus, Akron.
Davidson, Ronald Lee, Hudson.
Davis, Gary Ray, Warren.
Davis, Robert Dennis, Swanton.
Deeter, Michael Alan, Coolville.
Defosse, Thomas Glenn, Ripley.
Discepolo, Anthony Albert, Cleveland.
Doran, Timothy Patrick, Cincinnati.
Drewicz, Robert Charles, Toledo.
Dulen, Rendle, Piqua.
Dulik, Thomas William, Cleveland.
Ebright, William Raymond O.; Miamisburg.
Ector, Jerry, Cincinnati.
Edmonds, Arthur Lee, Jr., Cleveland.
Egger, Walter Jacob, Columbus.
Eldridge, Wetzel Lonnie, Urbana.
Enix, Jack Gene, Lorain.
Ens.Walter Lyman, Jr., Gambier.
Favourite, Ronald Lee, Bryan.
Ferguson, Ralph, Jackson.
Fischer, Gregory William, Parma.
Fischio, John Anthony, Youngstown.
Fish, George William, Jr., Mount Carmel.
Fleming, Dennis K., Orrville.
Foster, Douglas Eugene, Bellbrook.
Frankenstein, Jackie, Cincinnati.
Garrett, Robert Lee, Zanesville.
Gearheart, Ralph Allan, Crestline.
Gibson, John Eddie, Cleveland.
Gillespie, Albert Aloysius, Streetsboro.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Greene, Joe William, Canton.
Grover, Gene Delano, Orange Springs.
Haberman, David, Cleveland.
Halman, John Henry, Jr., Ashtabula.
Hannah, Samuel James, Reily.
Hardin, Dennis Ivan, Columbus.
Harmon, Paul Oliver, Jr., Medina.
Hauck, James Michael, Akron.
Hawkins, Albert William, Columbus.
Hawkins, Arthur Lee, Jr., Cleveland.
Hays, Wayne Allen, Cleveland.
Hazzard, Louis Timothy, Lima.
Healey, Richard John, Toledo.
Heifner, Edward William, Parma.
Hess, Dale Joseph, Dayton.
Hesselschwardt, Herman Alo, Defiance.
Hinkle, Jack Lee, Lyons.
Hobbs, Glen Thomas, Portsmouth.
Hodge, James Edward, Macksburg.
Hudson, George Howard, Cleveland.
Huffman, Glen Michael, Columbus.
Hunt, Ralph Edward, Jr., Alliance.
Idle, Thomas George, Bellevue.
Iser, Kenneth Eugene, Canton.
Jacobs, Rickie Jerome, Mansfield.
Jewell, James Clarence, Jr., Columbus.
Johnson, John Martin, Holland.
Johnson, Johnny L., Cleveland.
Johnston, Evaristo Packeco, Columbus.
Jones, Howard William, Chillicothe.
Jorgensen, David Wayne, Hilliard.
Kandel, James Edward, Marysville.
Kane, Larry Wayne, Ashland.
Kean, Billie Orr, Alexandria.
Kearsley, Ronald Charles, Sandusky.
Keefer, David Charles, Cincinnati.
Kegg, Donnie Stanley, Elyria.
Keller, David Richard, Bellefontaine.
Kelly, Michael John, Findlay.
Ketch, Michael Hayward, Dayton.
Lackey, Billy Jay, Dayton.
Lauer, Charles Arthur, St. Marys.
Lawson, Amos David, Cincinnati.
Lay, Roger Minett, Milford.
Leasure, Delbert Louis, Columbus.
Lengyel, David George, Akron.
Lewis, James Frederick, Columbus.
Lind, Thomas Reino, Pomeroy.
Linville, Dennis Wayne, Dayton.
Livingston, William Michael, Columbus.
Lloyd, Kenneth Edwin, Toledo.
Long, Edward Eugene, Mansfield.
Long, Richard Paul, Ashland.
Lord, Barry David, Findley.
Luca, Patrick Charles, Lyndhurst.
Lyons, Roger Gene, Amelia.
Mahan, David Allan, Troy.
Marshall, Doc Henry,Youngstown.
Martin, Napoleon, Cincinnati.
Martin, Wiley Louis, Cleveland.
Masterson, John Patrick, Rocky River.
Matthews, William L., Jr., Port Clinton.
Mayberry, Squire, N., Jr., Dayton.
McConnell, Robert Mueller, Mansfield.
McGill, Robert Warren, Dayton.
McGlew, John Joseph, Willowick.
McInturf, Samuel Duane, McConnelsville.
McIntyre, Raymond Neal, Fostoria.
McNaughton, Michael Dean, Dayton.
McPherson, David Lee, Martins Ferry.
Mikitis, Michael Allen, Lakewood.
Milburn, Michael Drennen, Elyria.
Miller, Burt Everett, Akron.
Miller, Harold Dwight, Toledo.
Miller, James Howard, Pandora.
Miller, Robert Jacob, Jr., Galion.
Mills, Thomas Wayne, Cincinnati.
Minniear, Harold Norman, Columbus.
Mitchell, Clarence E., Jr., Cincinnati.
Mizner, Darrell Condie, Akron.
Moon, Thomas Henry, Toledo.
Morton, David Eugene, Cedarville.
Moss, Thomas John, Jr., Shelby.
Mullins, James Ray, Franklin Furnace.
Murphy, John Lyle, Lorain.
Myers, Paul Junior, Lorain.
Nalley, Charles Thomas, Steubenville.
Newman, Maurice Glenn, Jr., Akron.
Nicholas, Dean Edward, Mentor.

XUM

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Nichols, Jerry Russell, Windham.
Nigh, Frederick Ellis, North Baltimore.
Novak, Thomas Eugene, Swanton.
Oliver, Kenneth Roy, Columbus.
Ort, Steven Michael, Columbus.
Ortiz, Zeneido, Jr., Lorain.
Ostapchuk, Walter Michael, Columbia.
Palmore, Donald Steven, Cincinnati.
Parker, Eric, Cleveland.
Parks, Sydney, Columbus.
Parsons, Terry Lee, Columbus.
Pepper William Franklin, Oxford.
Phillips, Marshall W., Jr., Cincinnati.
Pietraszak, David Aloysius, Toledo.
Pigott, James Harold, East Liverpool.
Polley, Richard Alan, Nelsonville.
Poole, Ronald Dean, Delaware.
Porter, Jack Eugene, Dayton.
Porter, Lawrence Beugen, Dalton.
Pryor, Jerome, Toledo.
Puskarcik, Ronald Joseph, Campbell.
Quimby, Daniel Lee, Beverly.
Ramos, Frank, Jr., Youngstown.
Ranc, William Edward, Columbus.
Ranke, Allen James, Columbus.
Rappold, Albert Joseph, Jr., Dayton.
Reiter, William Francis, Cincinnati.
Ripley, Larry Dean, London.
Rizzo, James Patrick, Bratenahl.
Roach, John Harold, Warren.
Roberts, Arthur James, Jr., Dayton.
Roseberry, Michele, McCord, Marysville.
Russell, James Lowell, Akron.
Russell, William John, Jr., Lima.
Saneda, John, Bryan.
Santora, Raymond Paul, Cleveland.
Sarossy, Steve Sandor, Fairview Park.
Scarbrough, David Clifton, Marietta.
Schaich, Donald Bruce, Cincinnati.
Schneider, David Francis, Avon.
Scott, Billy Joe, Cincinnati.
Scullen, Thomas James, Berea.
Shagovac, Peter William, Jr., Lorain.
Shanower, Timothy Edward, Perrysburg.
Shepherd, Roger Eugene, Bellefontaine.
Sheppard, Johnnie Arnold, Lorain.
Sikorski, Elmer Gerald, Cleveland.
Skaggs, Raymond Gene, New Boston.
Smith, Alan Ray, Sunbury.
Smith, Arthur Wayne, Liverpool.
Smith, Gary Lee, Cleveland.
Smith, Johnnie Cecil, Jr., Columbus.
Smith, Kenneth Sheldon, Jr., Cincinnati.
Smith, Richard Eugene, Cincinnati.
Smith, Robert Lee, Cincinnati.
Smith, Steven Eugene, Middletown.
Spangler, Larry Kieth, Breman.
Sparks, Steven Lee, Columbus.
Sparrow, Carl William, South Charleston.
Spicer, Michael Bruce, Marion.
Spiller, Clifton, Dayton.
Sprowl, James Edward, Norwalk.
Ssinger, Michael Ernest, Canton.
Stahl, John Welfred, Dayton.
Stanton, Edgar Douglas, Jr., Cincinnati.
Staples, Alton Leon, III, Cincinnati.
Starks, George Larry, Cincinnati.
Stemen, Frederick Milton, Perrysburg.
Stickle, Timothy David, Mentor.
Stolz, Robert Larry, Akron.
Strausbaugh, Howard Albert, Tiffin.
Subler, Gerald Francis, Versailles.
Szymanski, Frank Adam IV, Cleveland.
Tallentire, Gary Lee, Cincinnati.
Thedfore, Luther James, Cleveland.
Thomas, David Roy, Conneaut.
Thomas, Earl, Cleveland.
Thomas, George, Jr., Cincinnati.
Thomas, Robert Wayne, Cincinnati.
Thompson, Howard Michael, Toledo.
Threet, Troy Tony, Elyria.
Thurmond. James, Cleveland.
Timmons, James Michael, Groveport.
Toth, John Paul, Toledo.
Towslee, Edward Lawrence, Akron.
Turner, Fredrick Ray, Columbus.
Turner, Michael Dennis, Gahanna.
Turner, Richard Eugene, Columbus.
Tuttle, McCrea Benedict, Cincinnati.

OHIO—continued

Marine Corps

Utz, Gary Douglas, Englewood.
Vance, Danny Ray, Cleveland.
Vance, Reggie Lee, Dayton.
Vaughan, John David, Cincinnati.
Vierheller, Harold, J., Jr., East Canton.
Vinson, Albert Gamaliel, Toledo.
Voorhies, Emory David, Cambridge.
Voytko, David Lee, Columbus.
Wagner, Cecil Boyd, Jr., Maple Heights.
Walters, J. D., Dayton.
Walton, Lawrence Richard, New London.
Watkins, Jeryl Linn, Loveland.
Watson, Kenneth Michael, Toledo.
Weathers, Nathaniel, Cleveland.
Weathers, William B., III, Akron.
Weaver, Richard Michael, Camp Dennison.
Webb, Donald Franklin, Youngstown.
Weese, Ralph Junior, Mansfield.
West, Stephen Alan, Dayton.
White, John Clyde, III, Dayton.
Wilcox, Russell Lee, Waynesfield.
Williams, Hollis, Jr., Columbus.
Williams, Robert Enoch, Chagrin Falls.
Williams, Timothy Ronald, Columbus.
Williams, Tommie Dorsey, Columbus.
Wilson, Michael Donvian, Lima.
Wilson, Thomas Leslie, Hamilton.
Wirick, William Charles, Toledo.
Witt, Michael Robert, Cincinnati.
Wolf, Roy Edwin, Cleveland.
Woodward, James, Cincinnati.
Wymer, William Wayne, Ravenna.
Yanchar, Ronald Albert, Cleveland.
Young, Lonnie Ray, Cincinnati.
Zinimon, Oliver, Jr., Columbus.
Zug, Harold Lecurne, Jr., Fairborn.

Navy

Bacorn, Keith Ray, Warren.
Buck, Arthur Charles, Sandusky.
Cartwright, Richard Cortez, Jamestown.
Crampton, Gary Lee, Dayton.
Crist, Kenneth Lee, Cincinnati.
Devine, David Eugene, Fostoria.
Eisenbraun, David Lawrence, Youngstown.
Fell, David Gleason, Van Wert.
Golling, Charles Ronald, Navada.
Hartkemeyer, John Raymond, Hamilton.
Holley, Paul Richard, Columbus.
Johnston, Dennis Neil, McDonald.
Kenney, Harry John, Cincinnati.
Kneece, Charlyes Leroy, Chillicothe.
McLellan, Stuart Murray, Cleveland.
Parker, Winston Glen, Columbus.
Patrick, Donnie Lee, Galloway.
Powell, Richard Lee, Youngstown.
Shaver, Ronald Lee, Bellevue.
Stull, Larry Warren, Fostoria.
Vinton, Robert Alfred, Jr., Shaker Heights.
Wethington, David L., Jr., Cincinnati.
Wyrick, David Hugh, Alliance.
Yoxsimer, Alvin George, Dola.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Allison, George Brian, Chelsea.
Amspacher, Robert Alan, Norman.
Anderson, Roy L., Oklahoma City.
Armstrong, Edwin Lawrence, Union City.
Ashby, Jedd Edward, Muskogee.
Ausbern, John Raymond, Sand Springs.
Baker, Edward Glen, Midwest City.
Barnum, Gary Lane, Choctaw.
Bartling, Terry Noble, Oklahoma City.
Beam, Ernest Eugene, Guthrie.
Bear, Donald Earl, Mountain View.
Beaver, Max Russell, Waurika.
Bell, Edgar Dewayne, Perkins.
Bennett, Larry Darrall, Oklahoma City.
Berry, Kenneth Beryl, Nowata.
Bess, Benny Dale, McAlester.
Black, John Enoch, Idabel.
Black, Walter Curtis, Jr., Broken Arrow.
Blankenship, James Thomas, Ada.
Boggs, Jimmie Wayne, Marlow.
Bolin, Forrest Lee, Wellston.
Bollman, Robert Vinson, Ninnekah.
Boston, Grover Wesley, Coweta.
Bowers, Bradley D., Oklahoma City.

OKLAHOMA—continued

Army

Bowman, Harold E., Weleetka.
Boyett, Paul Dewayne, Oklahoma City.
Bradshaw, David Alford, Chelsea.
Brown, Rex Lee, Muskogee.
Brown, Thal Anthony, Oklahoma City.
Bryant, Larry Kenneth, Hockerville.
Burleson, John Allan, Tulsa.
Burnsed, Randell Heathe, Midwest City.
Butler, Elmo Larry, Skiatook.
Chambers, Jackie Dean, Tulsa.
Chapman, Garry Raymond, Muskogee.
Chitwood, Jerry Michael, Washington.
Clayton, Gary Everet, Oklahoma City.
Clements, Richard Bart, Lindsay.
Clemmer, Derrell W., Willow.
Collins, Albert Eugene, Durant.
Courtney, Ronnie, Tahlequah.
Cullum, Dennis Owen, Cushing.
Cutter, William Scott, Stillwater.
Dart, Danny Joe, Oklahoma City.
Deere, Charles Kenneth, Okemah.
Derrick, Randy Wayne, Lehigh.
Dowling, Jesse Willard, Lawton.
Dryden, Michael Theodore, Oklahoma City.
Duke, Douglas Ovyle, Rush Springs.
Duncan, Roger Evans, Tulsa.
Elston, Jackie Lindell, Cordell.
Eulitt, Leonard Elzy, Miami.
Ezell, Burley Dean, Noble.
Faires, Robert Don, Cushing.
Faught, Frank Edwin, Coweta.
Fields, John Curtis, Oklahoma City.
Finerty, Michael Roy, Midwest City.
Freeman, Rex Bradford, Oklahoma City.
Gaines, Philip Falcona, Ardmore.
Galindo, Edwin Gene, Yukon.
Gamble, Dexter Nunton, Jr., Broken Bow.
Gibson, Austin Dale, Keota.
Gibson, Otha Douglas, Blanchard.
Gleghorn, Jerry Wayne, Tulsa.
Goins, Billy Lee, Vinita.
Goins, Gerald, Jay.
Green, Jimmie Ray, Keota.
Greer, Edmond Junior, Jay.
Gregory, Bob Leroy, Oklahoma City.
Gritts, William Archie, Hulbert.
Guffey, James Dale, Midwest City.
Guthrie, Edward F., Idabel.
Haley, Jack Wayne, Ada.
Hall, Gary Neal, Vinita.
Hammer, Robert Wayne, Pauls Valley.
Harger, Charles F., Jr., Headrick.
Herschbach, Paul Dell, Grove.
Hinckle, James Nelson, Tulsa.
Holderby, Verlin Don, McCurtain.
Holland, Gary R., Muskogee.
Hood, John Edward, Ryan.
Horseman, George Leslie, II, Sulphur.
Howard, A. W., Jr., Oklahoma City.
Hubbard, Theodore, Jr., Chouteau.
Hudson, Robert Benjamin, Enid.
Jent, Billy Gene, Vinita.
Jones, Gary Claud, Graham.
Jones, Robert Lee, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Kiely, Billy Ray Walter, Enid.
King, Larry Douglas, Talihina.
Kinney, John Wade, Aline.
Kiser, Jerry Allen, Midwest City.
Kummell, Robert Michael, Enid.
La Fevre, Darrel Eugene, Buffalo.
Landkamer, Michael George, Muskogee.
Langston, John Alan, Laverne.
Lansden, Thomas Jack, Lawton.
Lauderdale, Arthur Leon, Bennington.
Lawrence, John Robert, Shawnee.
Lemley, Jimmy Davis, Checotah.
Lewis, Benny Joe, Atoka.
Lloyd, Donald Lee, Oklahoma City.
Luman, Ronnie Dean, Oklahoma City.
Mabry, Ralph Edgar, Jr., Duncan.
Mackey, Talton Lee, Red Oak.
Maness, Martin Rowland, Pauls Valley.
Massie, Larry Glen, Tonkawa.
McKinzie, Thomas Leon, Hulbert.
McVay, Thomas Martin, Bethany.
McVey, John Wesley, Bartlesville.
Mendenhall, Michael Joseph, Tulsa.
Michalik, Willy Robert, Tulsa.
Miller, Jerry Lavon, Oklahoma City.

OKLAHOMA—continued

Army

Moore, Franklin Edward, Sallisaw.
Moran, Lozo Joseph, Jr., Lawton.
Muncy, Robert William, Hydro.
Murphy, Jesse Allen, Fairmount.
Nabors, Paul Howard, Binger.
Okemah, John, Harrah.
Parsons, Gerald Loyd, Del City.
Perdue, Richard W., Velma.
Peters, David Arthur, Lawton.
Phillips, Oscar C., Jr., Oklahoma City.
Pickett, Morrison Louis, Utica.
Plato, Robert Dean, El Reno.
Poole, Franklin Willie, Luther.
Porter, Bobby L., Bethany.
Powell, Peter Earl, Shawnee.
Price, Hubert, Jr., Stigler.
Rangel, Florentino, Tulsa.
Rankins, Donald Lee, Miami.
Reid, Carl J., Covington.
Reynolds, David Mack, Wayne.
Rhodes, Wayne A., Guymon.
Richards, Wayne, Tulsa.
Riley, Joe Ed., Jr., El Reno.
Rouse, Frederick Eugene, Ponca City.
Rycroft, Larry Wayne, Oklahoma City.
Sandefur, Tommy Gerald, Tulsa.
Saunders, William Michael, Oklahoma City.
Shackelford, Ricky Lee, Del City.
Sherrill, John Otis, Oklahoma City.
Shirley, Dale Edward, Stilwell.
Skinner, Kenneth W., III, Del City.
Sloan, Michael Lee, Big Cabin.
Smith, Ervin Dale, Yukon.
Smith, Sammy Ray, El Reno.
Smith, William Gene, Oklahoma City.
Sockey, Ronald, Red Oak.
Sonaggera, Freddie Leon, Heavener.
Sparks, Stephen Duane, Sr., Tulsa.
Stayton, Coy G., Altus.
Stockdale, John Robert, Tulsa.
Strome, John Clarence, Tonkawa.
Sutton, Lowhman Solon, Claremore.
Taylor, Ernest Ray, Sentinel.
Thompson, Rudy Michael, Tulsa.
Tipton, Martinis Gene, Oklahoma City.
Tomlinson, James Richard, Perkins.
Troyer, Rodney Phillip, Blackwell.
Tyler, Edward, Oklahoma City.
Vaughan, Thomas Cecil, Ardmore.
Vetter, Ernest, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Vincent, Keith Dan, Bokoshe.
Wages, James Lewis, Medford.
Wagner, Farl Duane, Tulsa.
Walker, Jackie Dale, Okemah.
Washington, Donald Leroy, Oklahoma City.
Watkins, Anthony Ronald, Ardmore.
Whiles, Fred Lamar, Jr., Tulsa.
Whitlock, Jimmie Dale, Holdenville.
Wilbanks, Donald Melven, Oklahoma City.
Wilburn, John Edward, Luther.
Williams, Danny, Kellyville.
Williams, Mack Wilbert, Apache.
Williams, Noel Dean, Nicoma Park.
Wilson, Roger Glenn, Oklahoma City.
Wilson, William Dean, Tulsa.
Winer, Roy Lee, Broken Bow.
Winters, Steven Andrew, Tulsa.
Yearout, Donald Eugene, Okeene.
Zornes, Hamp Edwin, Adair.

Air Force

Holden, Elmer Larry, Oklahoma City.
Lee, Roger Gail, Hinton.
Midkiff, Gary Bruce, Miami.
Perryman, Dallis, Coweta.
Stow, Lilburn Ray, Vici.

Marine Corps

Armstrong, Billy Carl, Tulsa.
Arthur, Gregory Kenneth, Tulsa.
Ashford, James Anthony, Blanchard.
Baker, Garry Wayne, Oklahoma City.
Bettis, James William, Tulsa.
Blair, William Webb, Jr., Norman.
Boyd, Samuel Lee, Jr., Oklahoma City.
Bradford, Edward Lewis, Westville.
Bryant, Christopher, Mangum.
Buck, James Marion, Chandler.
Calvin, Glenn Henry, Grant.

OKLAHOMA—continued

Marine Corps

Carter, Clyde Elmer, Jr., Wilburton.
Castillo, George Ralph, Midwest City.
Copeland, Jerry Don, Oklahoma City.
Corbo, Al Douglas, Harrah.
Cornett, Charles Randell, Stroud.
Dacy, James Wesley, Tulsa.
Davey, Loren Keith, Oklahoma City.
Dewberry, Jerry Don, Ardmore.
Donohue, Stephen Scott, Midwest City.
Durant, Forbis Pipkin, Jr., Atoka.
Ferguson, Willie C., Jr., Oklahoma City.
Foiles, Francis Ivan, Woodward.
Foley, William Loyd, Fort Towson.
Frazier, John Dudley, Oklahoma City.
Fuller, Michael Bruce, Stillwater.
Hammons, Herbert Don, Pocasset.
Henderson, Timothy, Tulsa.
Hicks, Glen Ray, Oklahoma City.
Hicks, Paul Everett, Oklahoma City.
High, Ronald Clyde, Midwest City.
Hill, Foster Eugene, Pittsburg.
Holley, Robert Gordon, Camargo.
Humphreys, Larry Don, Bixby.
Ingram, John Lee, Weleetka.
Johnson, Michael Lee, Tulsa.
Johnson, Steven Edward, Yukon.
Latimer, Richard Eli, Jr., Tinker AFB.
Lewis, Donnie Gordon, Stigler.
Little, Sun Thomas Lee, Pawnee.
Lynch, Bruce Anthony, Bartlesville.
Mason, Dennis Ray, Cushing.
McElreath, Randall Lee, Midwest City.
McGee, George William, Oklahoma City.
Meixner, Edwin George, Alva.
Miller, Carl Robert, Elk City.
Miller, Charles Daniel, Wewoka.
Mock, Donald Ray, Tonkawa.
Moffett, James Delton, Midwest City.
Moore, Terry Englebert, Canton.
Morris, Michael Eugene, Lawton.
Mount, Charley Le Mear, Norman.
Newfield, Jimmy Charles, Wynnewood.
Pahcheka, Robert Carlos, Indiahomo.
Patterson, Jerry Leroy, Checotah.
Pritchard, John Lee, Oklahoma City.
Ranstead, James Terry, Miami.
Raymond, Robert Kenneth, Oklahoma City.
Reynolds, Earnest Lane, Hartshorne.
Riley, Larry Lloyd, Midwest City.
Rolen, Samuel Floyd, Idabel.
Shafer, Francis Loe, Jr., Newkirk.
Shearer, Don Tyrone, Oklahoma City.
Shields, Ronald Wayne, Enid.
Shoopman, Kenneth Doyle, Oklahoma City.
Smith, Ricky Dovie, Tulsa.
Snodgrass, Jack Lee, Perry.
Street, Lenard, Jr., Holdenville.
Taylor, Larry, Broken Bow.
Thomas, Michael Howard, Pawnee.
Thompson, Ronald Eugene, Oklahoma City.
Tiffany, John Michael, Norman.
Tifft, Danny William, Sapulpa.
Umdenstock, Michael Lane, Ames.
Ware, Orten Lee, Jenks.
Webb, Bill Alan, Ripley.
Wilson, Billy Leo, Calumet.
Woolsey, Jack Lee, Oklahoma City.

Navy

Belt, Cecil Delbert, Jr., Duncan.
Blevins, Richard Lewis, Tulsa.
Cross, Sammy Joe, Hominy.
Going, Wallace, Watson.
Roy, Billy Duane, Oklahoma City.
Willeford, Franklin Patric, Lawton.
Williams, Jerry Leonard, Picher.

OREGON

Army

Akin, Richard Arthur, Jr., Albany.
Allen, Melvin Arleigh, Lakeside.
Anderson, Franklin Vance, Portland.
Ball, Leslie Arnold, Pendleton.
Barrett, David Morris, Sheridan.
Bartell, Michael Richard, Portland.
Bartholomew, Roger Jay, Portland.
Berge, James Maynard, Portland.
Block, William John, Milwaukie.
Bowdish, Keven Wayne, Reedsport.
Brehm, Tommy Joe, Ukiah.

OREGON—continued

Army

Brockman, John Nelson, Monroe.
Brown, John Patrick, Bend.
Burkhart, Ronald Wayne, Albany.
Butler, Kenneth Doran, Portland.
Cantu, Felipe, Jr., Gervais.
Carlson, James Blain, Lakeview.
Cavanaugh, Richard Fred, Portland.
Chloupek, Melvin Eugene, Salem.
Clark, David Leroy, Portland.
Cochran, Paul Jefferey, Philomath.
Cole, Jerry Jerome, Oakland.
Collins, Michael Stephen, Medford.
Colquhoun, Ted D., Portland.
Cox, James William, Prineville.
Dimmitt, Frank Robert, Portland.
Eagleson, Robert William, Eddyville.
Edge, Dennis, Eugene, Rainier.
Elliott, Arthur Floyd, Salem.
Evans, Curtis Neil, Gladstone.
Evans, David Lynn, Klamath Falls.
Finch, Terry Dean, Portland.
Fray, Earl Richard, Portland.
Gifford, Larry Howard, Portland.
Gonsalves, George Greart, Corvallis.
Gorham, Marc Charles, Portland.
Gray, Richard Paul, Roseburg.
Greenfield, Guy Emery, Portland.
Gullixson, Richard Owen, Milton-Freewater.
Harden, Donald Lewis, Gresham.
Hatcher, Charles Laverne, Portland.
Hebert, Melvin Derward, Jr., Seaside.
Hess, James Donald, Gaston.
Hills, Earl H., Troutsdale.
Holcomb, John Noble, Richland.
Hughes, Thomas Steven, Baker.
Iannetta, Larry Albert, Milwaukie.
Johnson, David Allen, Eugene.
Kempke, Santford Bernard, Roseburg.
Korsmyer, Gary Robert, Beaverton.
Layton, Jon Walter, III, McMinnville.
Lesseg, James Alfred, Portland.
Lowery, James Allen, Port Orford.
Martin, James Emmett, Portland.
Mathews, Frank James, Ontario.
McClellan, Bruce Mayo, Blodgett.
McClure, Dwayne Charles, Portland.
Miner, Steven Jay, Portland.
Moore, Paul Martin, Sandy.
Neher, Robert William, Portland.
Nelson, Grady Ray, Coos Bay.
Partsafas, Terryl Glenn, Medford.
Plaep, Alfred Edgar, Jr., Myrtle Point.
Post, Karl Walter, Portland.
Rhodes, Gary Arthur, Aloha.
Richter, Dale Ray, Sweet Home.
Ritzau, August Karl, Clackamas.
Roesner, Dana Hyland, Portland.
Rogers, Scott Cameron, Portland.
Shipley, Roger William, McMinnville.
Slane, Ronald Allen, Lincoln City.
Smith, Everett Harold, Jr., Portland.
Sollers, Francis Craig, Portland.
Stratton, Milo Hersey, Culp Creek.
Strohm, Timothy Lawrence, Enterprise.
Stuart, Edward Harold, Eugene.
Taylor, Jack Clinton, Springfield.
Terrell, Gordon Lee, Gervais.
Traser, Richard Eugene, McMinnville.
Van Avery, Ronald Francis, Portland.
Vaughn, Herbert Lee, Portland.
Viestenz, Kreg Arthur, Eugene.
Webb, Michael William, Monmouth.
Wheeler, John Clark, Eugene.
White, Loren Douglas, Salem.
Williams, Thomas Henry, Klamath Falls.
Wood, Joe Irvin, Prineville.
Woods, Patrick Leonard, Oregon City.

Air Force

Badley, James Lindsay, Hermistion.
Ferguson, Wayne Ardell, Milton Freewater.

Marine Corps

Allen, Terry Lee, North Bend.
Baughman, Wesley Gene, Dallas.
Beckwith, William Arnold, Eugene.
Beddoe, Paul Melvin, Jr., Medford.
Bellamy, Paul Robert, Portland.
Bergeron, Douglas Hugh, Tillamook.

XUM

OREGON—continued

Marine Corps

Blanchard, David Melvin, Glendale.
Boyce, John Merton, Central Point.
Brown, Lester Eugene, Portland.
Burgard, Paul Edward, Portland.
Caldwell, James Bruce, Portland.
Carter, Bruce Landon, Milton Freewater.
Chambers, Christopher Lee, Molalla.
Clarke, Robert Wayne, West Linn.
Coats, Charles Thomas, Klamath Falls.
Couch, Michael Alfred, Pacific City.
Cram, Roy Robert, Idanha.
Craun, Gale Eugene, Portland.
Dedmore, Gerald Glen, Jr., Portland.
Deland, Jimmy Lynn, Albany.
Drew, Kenneth Lee, Portland.
Dyreson, Donald Lee, Portland.
Emery, Donald Carlton, Portland.
Findlay, Robert Bruce, Portland.
Fletcher, Bruce James, Eugene.
Freeman, Walter David, Gladstone.
Golz, James Roland, Eugene.
Gray, Terry Adam, Portland.
Haddock, Arthur, Irving.
Hames, Henry McNeal T., Jr., Portland.
Heckman, Lawrence Eugene, Cottage Grove.
Hiukka, Gerald Allen, Albany.
Hoage, Gerald Curtis, Portland.
Hoyez, James Kenneth, Albany.
Imlah, Jack Selwyn, Corvallis.
Jeremiah, Randall Craig, Portland.
Jones, Cecil Lee, Grants Pass.
Kestler, Gary Lyle, Oregon City.
Kilgore, Danny Ray, Myrtle Point.
King, George Louis, Jr., Clatskanie.
Klawitter, William Richard, Bend.
Lloyd, Daniel Edward, Astoria.
Luker, Rickie, Portland.
Mickelson, Dennis Erwin, Eugene.
Moore, Ronald Stanley, Salem.
Morris, Robert J., Scotts Mills.
Oliver, Michael Dee, Corvallis.
Pearson, William Delbert, Portland.
Peterson, Robert Lee, Portland.
Pitner, Monte Gale, Sutherlin.
Prather, Ronald Robert, Jr., Cave Junction.
Ross, David Lyle, Springfield.
Rowden, John Wayne, Jacksonville.
Salisbury, James Russell, Lebanon.
Schauermann, Arthur Garry, Forest Grove.
Schriver, Thomas Clyde, Salem.
Shepherd, Peter Merrill, Portland.
Shively, Dennis Carl, Coos Bay.
Staples, Gregory Joe, Grants Pass.
Steele, Robert Charles, Sutherlin.
Stenberg, Jerry Oscar, Klamath Falls.
Taylor, Steven Earl, Portland.
Teetor, John Harold, Medford.
Thompson, Robert Bruce, Grants Pass.
Trout, Michael Richard, Portland.
Turner, Michael Glenn, McMinnville.
Whisnan, James Carl, Medford.
Williams, Terry Allen, Bandon.
Willoughby, Jimmy Stewart, Portland.
Wilson, Michael Lance, Eugene.
Wilson, William Larry, Coquille.
Youngman, Paul Arnold, Siletz.

Navy

Johnson, Charles Eugene, Toledo.
Kinyon, Rodney Edwin, Roseburg.
Kurtti, Stephen William, Salem.
Peters, Rodney Walter, Grants Pass.
Pochel, Gerald Dever, Otis.
Romanski, James Henry, Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Abraham, James Joseph, Duquesne.
Adams, Lee Scott, Pottstown.
Ahern, Raymond Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Aleshire, Kenneth Edward, Philadelphia.
Allen, Roy, Philadelphia.
Allessie, Joseph, North East.
Althouse, Earl Irvin, Myerstown.
Anderson, George John, Philadelphia.
Anderson, James Albert, Chester.
Anderson, John H., Jr., Wellsville.
Anderton, Samuel Lee, Seneca.
Anello, Bruce Francis, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Arey, William Novak, Allentown.
Ault, Daniel Lee, Mountville.
Ayers, Dennis Michael, East Conemaugh.
Ayers, George Bernard, Wilkes Barre.
Bahl, Robert Francis, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Baker, Jerald Lavern, Laceyville.
Bakewell, Ronald Charles, East Millsboro.
Barnes, David Thomas, Allentown.
Barrick, Harold Eugene, Newville.
Barron, John Eldrew, Homestead.
Bartholomew, David Russell, Kresgeville.
Bartholomew, Harry Robert, Pittsburgh.
Beam, Roger Leroy, Fair Oaks.
Beatty, Jerry Allen, Shirleysburg.
Beaumont, Warren Martin, Langhorne.
Beck, Richard James, Pittsburgh.
Behan, William Gerald, Philadelphia.
Belletti, Anthony John, Bethlehem.
Belsar, Kenneth Ray, McClellandtown.
Bennett, Joseph Richard, Titusville.
Bitting, Jack, Philadelphia.
Bixler, Martin Edward, Glen Rock.
Blevins, Lural Lee, III, Philadelphia.
Bollinger, Neal George, Palmerton.
Bondrowski, Darrel Anthony, Boothwyn.
Bongartz, Charles Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Boothe, Bay Benton, Monaca.
Bowers, William James, Koppel.
Bowman, Lester Elwood, Jr., Lykens.
Boyle, James Robert, Philadelphia.
Bradford, Leonard Edward, Tyrone.
Breece, William Warren, Jr., Morrisville.
Breeden, William Raymond, Meadville.
Breightmyer, William Denni, Ford City.
Brenker, Eckhardt Gerhard, York.
Bridgeford, William Michae, Philadelphia.
Brinzo, Andrew J., III, Chester.
Bromley, Albert Leroy, Chester.
Brooks, John Richard, Pittsburgh.
Brown, Lawrence James, Turtle Creek.
Brown, William Leroy, Philadelphia.
Brulte, Robert Francis, Jr., Philadelphia.
Brunn, William Edward, Wilkes-Barre.
Burke, Earl Frederick, Uniontown.
Burns, Bernard John, Jr., York.
Butler, Doyle Leroy, Jr., Rimersburg.
Campbell, Ronald Jacob, Philadelphia.
Campos, Michael William, Burgettstown.
Cannon, Kevin George, Pittsburgh.
Cannon, Robert Earl, Media.
Carr, Dennis Robert, Pittsburgh.
Carroll, James Richard, Middletown.
Cartney, Patrick Cyril, Titusville.
Casey, David Warrington, Carlisle.
Cashley, John Edward, Philadelphia.
Cashman, Harold Edward, Jr., Hatboro.
Cassidy, Joseph J., Jr., Philadelphia.
Chambers, Robert John, Philadelphia.
Charles, Francis, Scranton.
Childress, Robert Morris, Norristown.
Ciesielka, Michael J., Jr., Eddington.
Cimorelli, John Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Clampffer, Robert Lee, Cornwells Heights.
Coleman, Peter Michael, Edensburg.
Cullins, Edward W., III, Verona.
Collins, James Gilbert, Pittsburgh.
Concannon, James P., Jr., Morton.
Conley, William Thomas, Philadelphia.
Conlin, Richard Joseph, Philadelphia.
Conti, Anthony Noah, Pittsburgh.
Cook, Thomas Ray, Jr., Greencastle.
Coon, Jesse James, Sharon.
Cosgriff, Paul Leonard, West Chester.
Covington, Rory Arn, Philadelphia.
Coyle, Gerald, Scranton.
Cramer, James Wallace, Camp Hill.
Creep, Guy Bare, Jr., York.
Crescenz, Michael Joseph, Philadelphia.
Criswell, James Joseph, Red Lion.
Criswell, Richard K, III, Hummelstown.
Crone, Gary Lee, York.
Cropper, Ray D., Philadelphia.
Cullen, Richard Ivory, Greensburg.
Cushman, Kenneth George, Finleyville.
Daniels, Francis Anthony M., Philadelphia.
Davidson, William James, Jr., Coatesville.
Davis, Martin Joseph, Patton.
Dayhoff, Ralph Paul, Harrisburg.
Deeny, Michael Francis, III, Levittown.
Degerolamo, Anthony, Jr., Wheatland.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Dell, Kenneth John, East Vandergrift.
Derrico, Jack Edward, Bethlehem.
Devor, Kenneth Lee, Walnut Bottom.
DeWitt, David Eugene, Lancaster.
Dick, Wililam Edward, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Diehl, Dana Edward, Shippensburg.
Diffenderfer, Terry Eugene, York.
Dillman, Wayne Thomas, Philadelphia.
Doddy, Victor Louis, Bethlehem.
Donohue, Francis David, New Castle.
Dorchak, George Robert, Johnstown.
Doyle, Joseph Clarence, Butler.
Drake, Donald Joseph, Mount Union.
Dubbs, Raymond, Arthur Bellefonte.
Dunlap, John Turner, III, Feasterville.
Durant, Willie, Philadelphia.
Easton, David Stearns, Pittsburgh.
Ebert, Charles Dandridge, Pittsburgh.
Eisenhart, Guy Lee, Lake Ariel.
Eisenhower, William Jack, Trout Run.
Ellis, Adolphus, Aliquippa.
Eltringham, William David, Branchdale.
Falk, Richard William, Walnutport.
Fawks, Ernest Eugene, Altoona.
Fedor, Terrence Eugene, Allentown.
Feeman, James Oscar, Roaring Spring.
Fey, Glenn Thomas, Ashley.
Fine, Norman Ellsworth, Jr., Milton.
Fisher, James Roy, Star Junction.
Foley, Robert John Joseph, Norristown.
Fox, John William, Conshohocken.
Frantz, Larry Edward, Punxsutawney.
Frey, William Austin, York.
Frey, William Joseph, Monroeville.
Fritz, Martin Charles, Macungie.
Fullerton, Fred Samuel, Jr., York.
Fyock, Terry Louis, Indiana.
Galata, John Michael, Greensburg.
Gallagher, Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.
Gamber, Robert Allen, York.
Gault, Alan Robert, McKees Rocks.
Gay, Curtis Taylor, McKeesport.
Gearhart, Donald Lee, Pittsburgh.
Giambrone, Richard Lawrence, Norristown.
Gibble, Alvin Ralph, Lancaster.
Gigliotti, Michael, Johnsonburg.
Gingery, John Bernard, Carlisle.
Gies, Donald Richard, Spring Grove.
Gleason, Larry Fred, Harleysville.
Gleixner, William Allen, Mechanicsburg.
Glorioso, John Anthony, Lansdale.
Golebiewski, Ronald Frank, Pittsburgh.
Gorman, Henry William, Philadelphia.
Gough, Linwood, Philadelphia.
Grasser, Harold Phillip, Manns Choice.
Grassi, Lawrence Gary, Bradford.
Gray, George Albert, Philadelphia.
Gray, Harold Paul, Coraopolis.
Grine, Paul Ray, Stoystown.
Guest, Douglas Willard Jr., Pottstown.
Guy Leonard Allen, Darby.
Haas, Ray Ira, Pennsburg.
Hamilton, Foster, Philadelphia.
Hamilton, George W., Jr., Philadelphia.
Harah, Frank A., Pittsburgh.
Harbaugh, Roy Arben, Jr., Dauphin.
Hargrove, Lane Kornegay, Wyndmoor.
Harner, Richard Edward, Jr., Chester.
Hawkins, Wayne, R., Pittsburgh.
Haynes, Albert Randell, Philadelphia.
Henderson, Robert Michael, Folcroft.
Hershey, Charles Thomas, Philadelphia.
Hertrick, Donald Joseph, Philadelphia.
Hewlett, James Joseph, Bellview.
Hill, Ronald Lee, Palmyra.
Hilte, Frank Elton, Danboro.
Himes, Lloyd Allen, Rimersburg.
Hinkle, Terry Richard, Bloomsburg.
Hinnant, Benjamin Lowell, Philadelphia.
Holland, Gary David, Quakertown.
Holzapfel, Norbert Paul, Pittsburgh.
Homer, Ernest Craig, Oil City.
Hornbaker, Kenneth Eugene, Mercersburg.
Houston, William Joseph, Bethlehem.
Hudson, Joseph Robert, Jr., Norristown.
Jester, Thomas Story, Carnegie.
Johnson, James, Jr., Eddystone.
Johnson, Gary Francis, Wexford.
Johnston, Robert Patrick, Lock Haven.
Jones, Gregory, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Jones, Richard Joseph, Jr., Allport.
Jones, Robert Nelson, Delta.
Jones, Roosevelt, Philadelphia.
Julius, William F., III, Erie.
Kairaitis, Francis, Folcroft.
Kaleikini, Theodore K., Jr., Levittown.
Kaplafka, Michael John, Mahanoy City.
Karras, James Michael, Pittsburgh.
Keisling, Dervin John, Ephrata.
Keller, Raymond E., Jr., Petersburg.
Kelly, Gregory Richard, North East.
Kendra, George John, West Hazelton.
Kephart, Russell Edward, Lewistown.
Kerchner, Robert Bard, Pittsburgh.
Kidd, Victor Elden, Bedford.
Kinard, Lester Stephen, Seven Valleys.
Kirchner, John Henry, Jr., Lancaster.
Kissinger, Harold James, Pottsville.
Kite, Harry Turner, Jr., Philadelphia.
Kitzer, Carl Sanford, Scranton.
Klein, George Paul, Pittsburgh.
Kline, James Joseph, Philadelphia.
Kowalski, Robert Joseph, Chester.
Kraynak, James Clyde, Connellsville.
Krill, Brian Stuart, Towanda.
Kubica, Thomas Michael, Smock.
Kull, Joseph John, Jr., Philadelphia.
Kuntz, Richard Lorraine, Punxsutawney.
Large, George Wayne, Elizabeth.
Lashinsky, Stephen M., Jr., Newton Square.
Latsch, David Rudolph, Philadelphia.
Lederer, Anthony Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Lennard, Benjamin Edwin, Jr., Hillsborough.
Lhota, Robert Allan, Monessen.
Littlejohn, Gregory Lawren, Norristown.
Lodise, Joseph Francis, Jr., Philadelphia.
Lordi, Louis Robert, North Wales.
Lynn, Richard Robert, Bethlehem.
Lyons, John Michael, Philadelphia.
Lyons, Thomas Kevin, Philadelphia.
Magrie, Dennis Louis, Havertown.
Mahoney, Michael Thomas, Towanda.
Mangiolardo, Michael Antho, Reading.
Martin, George Roland, Philadelphia.
Martin, John, Jr., Philadelphia.
Mason, William Paul, Horsham.
Matarazzi, John Joseph, Jr., Lebanon.
Matthews, Robert William, Upper Darby.
Matylewicz, Leo John, Scranton.
McAleer, James K., II, Bridgeville.
McCahan, Walter Lee, Harrisburg.
McClary, Benjamin Frankli, Philadelphia.
McCormick, Robert Patrick, Westgrove.
McCullough, Alfred, Cambra.
McDonough, James Robert, Uniontown.
McGinnis, Leonard David, Chester.
McGinty, Lawrence Michael, Philadelphia.
McHugh, John J., Lansdowne.
McLaughlin, William Lee, Hookstown.
Melnick, Pete, Yatesboro.
Melnyk, Joseph James, Jr., Burgettstown.
Merschel, Lawrence James, Wayne.
Mihordin, Donald Stephen, Sharon.
Miller, Dennis J., Pottstown.
Millikan, John Russell, Quakertown.
Mitchell, Byron Joseph, New Paris.
Monismith, Wayne Eugene, Carlisle.
Moore, Michael Keith, Philadelphia.
Moore, Robert Irvin, Hatfield.
Moran, Bruce James, Duquesne.
Moran, John William, Pittsburgh.
Morrison, James Albert, Irwin.
Morrissey, James Joseph, Philadelphia.
Mowery, Robert Allen, Lancaster.
Moyer, Barry Lee, Reinholds.
Mullins, Edward Patrick, Bethlehem.
Murphy, John Paul, Conshohocken.
Mutter, Alvin George, Boyertown.
Nafe, Timothy Mark, Strausstown.
Nahodil, Donald A., Jr., Shamokin.
Nicholson, George James, Reynoldsville.
Nitka, Joseph Stanley, Philadelphia.
Nixon, Robert John, Paoli.
Noden, Timothy Joseph, Linwood.
Nolan, Charles Albert, Jr., Philadelphia.
Noland, Kenneth Eugene, Chester.
Null, Ricky Lee, Lemoyne.
O'Donnell, John Thomas, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

O'Toole, Peter Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Oakes, Jack Wayne, Kennerdell.
Ochs, Valentine Ambrose, Sandy Lake.
Olszewski, John Michael, Philadelphia.
Onderko, John Patrick, Monessen.
Orison, Louis James, Burgettstown.
Oscelus, John Albert, Pittsburgh.
Ostifin, Joseph Lynn, Pittsburgh.
Palm, Allen Neil, Greenville.
Park, Joseph Conrad, Jr., Horsham.
Parola, Jay Wayne, Charleroi.
Pass, John, III, McKees Rocks.
Passanante, William James, Pittsburgh.
Patricca, Anthony Pasquale, Irwin.
Patterson, Robert Dewayne, Leechburg.
Pentland, James Douglas, Pittsburgh.
People, James Dale, Altoona.
Perrins, Robert Richard, Wilkes Barre.
Piatowski, Robert J., Philadelphia.
Piconi, Pietro, Hannastown.
Policastro, Mark Edward, Renovo.
Porter, James Frank, Warrington.
Porter, Timothy Michael, Pittsburgh.
Powers, James Willard, Jr., Loyalhanna.
Pretnar, Allen John, Euclid.
Price, Arnold W., Philadelphia.
Price, Rodney Allen, New Enterprise.
Probst, Delmar Wayne, Erie.
Rauber, William, Wheatland.
Reale, John Battiste, III, Philadelphia.
Reed, Gary Dewayne, Lyndora.
Reed, John Bruce, Milford.
Reed, Scott Douglas, Reading.
Reeder, Edward James, Boothwyn.
Rees, William Allen, Drexel Hill.
Reeves, M. Raymond, Bristol.
Reigle, Aaron Henry, Hershey.
Remper, Gerald Neal, Terentum.
Reynolds, Robert Michael, Imperial.
Rice, Jack Walter, New Enterprise.
Richardson, James, Philadelphia.
Risner, Wayne Eric, Philadelphia.
Ritchey, Clair F., Jr., Everett.
Ritsick, Edward, Austin.
Rodman, David, B., Hanover.
Rodriguez, Louis, Ambridge.
Rogers, Kenneth Lee, Pittsburgh.
Romig, Leroy Henry, McClure.
Rosenwald, Robert John, McKees Rocks.
Roush, Ronnie Ray, Port Trevorton.
Rowe, Ernest Leroy, Waynesboro.
Runk, Gary Wesley, Gettysburg.
Russo, Thomas Peter, New Castle.
Rylee, James Sidney, Glenmoore.
Saldana, Richard E., Saltsburg.
Sandberg, Charles H., Philadelphia.
Santiago, Angelo Carmelo, Philadelphia.
Satterwhite, Ruffin J., Jr., Pittsburgh.
Sauble, Martin G., Jr., Manheim.
Schaffer, Blaine Clarence, Slatedale.
Schall, Charles Nelson, Jr., Templeton.
Schell, Randy Stephen, Mt. Wolfe.
Schermann, Herman William, Pittsburgh.
Schramm, Christopher Josep, Fairless Hills.
Schroeder, Timothy Richard, Bethlehem.
Schultz, George Joseph, Pottsville.
Schweighofer, Reed Jay, Honesdale.
Scott, James Bernard, Philadelphia.
Secrest, Edward William, Philadelphia.
Seibert, William Robert, Pittsburgh.
Sell, Clifford Lloyd, Palmerton.
Seltzer, Jackie Ralph, Hamburg.
Sentman, Donald Warren, Forty Fort.
Seth, Charles William, Ambridge.
Sheroke, John Richard, Jr., Morrisdale.
Shiller, Albert, Easton.
Silfee, James Everett, Uniondale.
Simmons, Richard Stanley, Ephrata.
Simons, David Richard, Huntingdon Valley.
Skunda, Ermund, Pittston.
Slussear, Alexander Martin, Moosic.
Smith, Albert Edwin, Clairton.
Smith, Charles Frank, Elizabeth.
Smith, Harold, New Paris.
Smith, Raymond Julius, Philadelphia.
Smith, Ronald Carlton, Hatboro.
Smith William Robert, Pittsburgh.
Snell, Herbert Donald, New Milford.
Snell, Marc Edward, Erie.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Sopko, Robert Michael, Bethlehem.
Sovizal, Robert James, Pottstown.
Spangler, Stanley, E., Jr., York.
Spear, Edward Bruce, Philadelphia.
Sprinkle, Thomas Thoma, Mechanicsburg.
Sproule, William C., Jr., Folcroft.
Stancell, James, Jr., Philadelphia.
Stancil, Reginald Alfonso, Bristol.
Stanley, Michael John, Philadelphia.
Stell, James Arthur, Point Marion.
Stepsie, Ronald Stevens, Boyertown.
Stiles, Donald Laveren, Coudersport.
Stilley, Ronald Joseph, Library.
Stitely, Carl Michael, Milton.
Stockton, Clifford Geoffre, Chester.
Strothers, Thomas F., Jr., Philadelphia.
Stys, Stanley Albert, Johnstown.
Sudlesky, Thomas Francis, Susquehanna.
Sugden, William James, Verona.
Sullivan, Pierre Leroy, Chambersburg.
Szoszorek, Gerald James, Erie.
Taylor, Oris Camillus, Philadelphia.
Thiroway, Patrick James, Jr., Philadelphia
Thomas William Arthur, Jr., Havertown.
Thompson, Charles Michael, New Freedom.
Thornton, James Vincent, Philadelphia.
Tinker, Norman Lee, Dubois.
Toal, Alonzo Jr., Havertown.
Torres, Robert, Philadelphia.
Tredinnick, Charles Nichol, Dallas.
Truance, Francis Patton, Mahaffey.
Urbanski, Ronald Michael, Pittston.
Van Artsdalen Clifford, DA., Plumsteadville.
Van Blarcom, Richard Willi, Columbia Cross Roads.
Vannoy, Dan Page, Landenberg.
Waller, James, Philadelphia.
Walls, Ronald Ray, Lewistown.
Ward, Patrick Edward, Philadelphia.
Warren, Thomas Allen, Albion.
Warsing, Charles Grafflous, Saxton.
Weaver, Ronald Lee, Quakertown.
Welch, Donald Walter, Tyrone.
Weleski, Martin W., III, Cabot.
Weltz, Herbert F., Jr., Gibsonia.
Wentz, Donald Ray, Drexel Hill.
Wenzler, Joseph R., Lebanon.
Wescott, Frederick Devilla, Nelson.
Whitmore, Gregory Brian, Camp Hill.
Wildman, Miles Gregory, Conshohocken.
Wilson, David Ralph, Oreland.
Wilson, Robert Allyn, Pittsburgh.
Wise, James Leroy, Jr., Big Run.
Witko, Daniel Andrew, Plymouth.
Witkowski, Dennis Edward, Shenandoah.
Wolfe, Frank Jesse, Wescosville.
Wood, Donald Charles, Philadelphia.
Woods, Robert M., Philadelphia.
Worley, William Paul, Altoona.
Wright, Paul Thomas, Willow Grove.
Wright, Robert Richard Jr., Hatboro.
Yarbinitz, Bernard Francis, Johnstown.
York, Larry Lee, Trumbauersville.
Zboyovski, James Robert, Erie.
Zeigler, Roger David, Yeagertown.
Ziegler, Steven William, Zelienople.

Air Force

Ballou, Charles Davison, Lancaster.
Greene, Bruce Briant, Wynnewood.
Hepler, Frank Monroe, Glenside.
Hoffman, Lynn Arthur, Sewickley.
Hopper, Richard Whan, New Castle.
Kittle, Frederick Martin, Williamsport.
Margle, Thomas Joseph, New Philadelphia.
Platt, Robert Lloyd, Leraysville.
Whitteker, Richard Lee, Easton.

Marine Corps

Allen, James Joseph, Philadelphia.
Alwine, Ray Ernest, Natrona.
Andrews, Dennis Dee, Pittsburgh.
Antonace, John, Jr., Lower Burrell.
Atherton, Frank William, Templeton.
Auen, David Oliver, Blairsville.
Baker, Bernard Gerald, Coraopolis.
Baker, Donald, Philadelphia
Balkit, Donald, Bethlehem.
Bancroft, Philip Sean, Pittsburgh.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Beadle, Harry Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Beanner, Robert Randolph, New Alexandria.
Beck, James Robert, Cresson.
Beers, Edward Nelson, Fairless Hills.
Belancin, George John, Philadelphia.
Benigni, Alfredo, Folsom.
Bennett, Donald Charles, Jr., Sunset Valley.
Bielek, Rudolph John, Jr., North Braddock.
Bilbo, William John, Jr., New Brighton.
Black, Robert James, Jr., Monroeville.
Blackwell, Kenneth, Pittsburgh.
Blewitt, William A., Jr., Wayne.
Bloom, Ronald Norman, Clearfield.
Borrell, Clifford Glenn, Reading.
Bradley, John Allan, Lilly.
Branigan, Lawrence Anthony, Philadelphia.
Brockman, Phillip Lloyd, Philadelphia.
Brookins, Freddie, Philadelphia.
Brown, David Lynn, Ellwood City.
Brown, Roger Allen, Farrell
Brown, Roger Thomas, Kittanning.
Brown, Theodore, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Bruder, James Robert, Allentown.
Buckley, Charles Joseph, Philadelphia.
Buckwalter, Jay Q., III, Manheim.
Burian, Dennis Wayne, Allentown.
Burkhart, Charles Kenton, Jr., Greensburg.
Burentte, Gary Ray, Souderton.
Bush, Paul William, Greenville.
Butler, William Grant, Jr., Peach Bottom.
Campbell, Donald Bruce, Richboro.
Campbell, William Roger, Butler.
Carey, John Leroy, Carlisle.
Carroll, Fergus, Joseph, Philadelphia.
Carter, Glenn, Philadelphia
Cauthen, Caldwell M., Jr., Philadelphia.
Cawley, James Patrick, Scranton.
Christman, Ronald Steward, Lehighton.
Clay, James Henry, Philadelphia.
Clayborne, Milton, Gay, Philadelphia.
Cobb, Bruce Alan, Bradford.
Cohen, Louis George, Philadelphia.
Comfort, Ray Thomas, Northumberland.
Conley, Gerald Donald, Pittsburgh.
Connor, Francis Joseph, Clifford.
Convery, Joseph Francis, Jr., Chester.
Cook, Leslie, Philadelphia.
Coonon, Daniel James, Lebanon.
Cron, Jody Allen, Nicholson.
Cummings, Thomas Francis, Chester.
Cunnane, Dennis Thomas, Levittown.
Cunningham, Bruce Edward, Bausman.
D'Amico, Philip Anthony, Jr., Philadelphia.
Dalton, Theodore Hubert, Sharpsville.
Dasilva, Raymond M., Jr., Swoyersville.
Daubert, Edward Lynn, Pottsville.
Daugherty, James Alexander, York.
Davis, Joseph Edward, Jr., Philadelphia.
Day, Edward, Philadelphia.
Defazio, Phillip Frank, Reading.
Demko, Leonard Richard, Pottsville.
Dennis, Paul Leslie, Cornwells Heights.
Devine, Francis Stanley, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Dickie, Guy Douglas, Pittsburgh.
Dillon, Dennis Earl, Johnstown.
Dolby, Melvin Lester, Osceola Mills.
Dorsch, Richard Stephen, Pittsburgh.
Drivere, Richard Joseph, New Wilmington.
Eans, Lawrence George, Dunbar.
Eckenrode, David John, Bellefonte.
Edsall, James, Honesdale.
Eicher, Merle Clayton, Jr., Smithfield.
Fair, Ronald, New Castle.
Figueroa, Michael Angel, East Springfield.
Fike, Daniel Eugene, Uniontown.
Flanders, Danny George, Waterford.
Flyte, Forrest Jay, Pen Argyl.
Fraker, Roger Lee, Hellam.
Franklin, Philip Gilbert, Seneca.
Frantz, William David, Schuylkill Haven.
Frazier, Barry Lynn, Jersey Shore.
Gaines, Bernard Laverne, Jersey Shore.
Gallagher, Richard, Philadelphia.
Gamble, Ronald Richard, Harrisburg.
Garland, Marcellus, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Gartland, Thomas, Philadelphia.
Gaughan, Austin Michael, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

George, Michael Theodore, Erie.
Gertzen, Fred, Ziegierville.
Gibson, William Terry, Easton.
Gilkey, Timothy William, Irwin.
Graham, Barry Lee, Washington Boro.
Grassi, Clement John, Philadelphia.
Greer, Wayne Stevenson, Trafford.
Gregory, Charles Lester, Ormsby.
Gregory, Frank Edwin, Sugargrove.
Grist, William Anthony, Bessemer.
Grove, Stanley Colville, Pittsburgh.
Guardino, Stephen Anthony, Norristown.
Gula, Paul Richard, Sykesville.
Hagara, Leslie Paul, Saltsburg.
Haller, Leroy Clayton, Birdsboro.
Hamilton, Wayne David, Pittsburgh.
Hammel, Ralph Lewis, Duncansville.
Hankins, Thomas Fred, Pittsburgh.
Hanks, Joseph Henry, III, Croydon.
Hanley, Richard Willis, Philadelphia.
Hannings, William Elwood, Lansdale.
Hannon, Patrick Keith, West Mifflin.
Harkanson, James Phillip, Philadelphia.
Harman, Robert Henry, Erie
Hart, William Darryl, Philadelphia.
Hawk, Ray Glenwood, Nazareth.
Heagy, James William, Pittsburgh.
Heard, James Cornel, Philadelphia.
Heilman, William Emory, York.
Hester, William Walter, Philadelphia.
Himes, Bernard Malcolm, Anita.
Hixson, Carl Edward, Philadelphia.
Holland, Clayton Monroe, Jr., Altoona.
Hopkins, David Lee, Pittsburgh.
Houck, Allen Paul, Reading.
Howard, Horace, Philadelphia.
Huber, Randy S., Reading.
Huff, Louis Howard, II, McKeesport.
Huff, William Edward, Nazareth.
Huffman, Richard Allen, Troutville.
Hunter, Donald Eugene, South Fork.
Hutchinson, Paul Lee, Philadelphia.
Ianieri, Richard Joseph, Bryn Mawr.
Isaac, Rocco Renell, Philadelphia.
Jefferson, Randolph Thomas, Philadelphia.
Jennings, Thomas Edward, Lancaster.
Jensen, Robert Arthur, Stroudsburg.
Johnson, Charles William, Philadelphia.
Johnson, Dwight Dawson, West Chester.
Johnson, Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Johnston, Richard William, Lock Haven.
Kane, Francis Xavier, Philadelphia.
Kanonczyk, Richard Walter, Erie.
Kaplan, Albert, Philadelphia.
Kardos, Joseph Francis, Vandergrift.
Kause, William Raymond, Pittston.
Kelley, Ronald James, Philadelphia.
Kennedy, Arlan Joseph, Jr., Reading.
Kerr, Richard Allen, Pittsburgh.
Kilderry, Michael Joseph, Philadelphia.
Killion, Thomas Joseph, Jr., Philadelphia.
Kloran, Thomas Walter, Luzerne.
Koman, Lawrence Ryland, Aliquippa.
Kustaborder, Ronald Lee, Altoona.
Lair, Ellis Edward, Dalton.
Lamon, Francis William, Jr., Philadelphia.
Lannon, Joseph, Jr., Hatboro.
Larimore, John Richard, Aliquippa.
Latshaw, Harry Kenneth, Rea.
Laughlin, Thomas William, Blairsville.
Lee, Nate Francis, Hazleton.
Leed, Carl Robert, West Fairview.
Lindsay, Philip Trieste, Philadelphia.
Link, George Arthur, New Kensington.
Lowry, Ronald Raymond, Lemont Furnace.
Lydon, Ralph Joseph, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Mack, Allen Glenn, Allentown.
Malmquist, Pierce, Dingmans Ferry.
Malseed, Frank James, Jr., Roslyn.
Marino, Nicholas, III, Philadelphia.
Markel, James Calvin, Jr., Coatesville.
Markoski, Gerald Michael, West Conshohocken.
Mastromatteo, Frank James, Upper Darby.
McClelland, James Richard, Irwin.
McClintock, Gerald, Chester.
McDonald, Henry, III, Philadelphia.
McElroy, John James, Karns City.
McGrath, Charles Francis, Springfield.

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

McHenry, Paul Vincent, Camp Hill.
McHugh, Timothy David, Springfield.
McNamara, William James, Philadelphia.
McRae, Lawrence Joseph, Wilkes Barre.
McPherson, Robert Alan, Canonsburg.
Mealy, David Howard, Pittsburgh.
Mellinger, Carl B., Jr., Lancaster.
Melton, Rodney Wayne, Wyomissing.
Metzler, John Edward, McKees Rocks.
Michaels, John Jay, Gouldsboro.
Milek, Martin Heinrich, Philadelphia.
Miller, Daniel August, Pittsburgh.
Miller, Edward Charles, Hollidaysburg.
Miller, Phillip Daniel, Quakertown.
Molettiere, Joseph Anthony, North Wales.
Monaghan, Joseph Thomas, Philadelphia.
Morris, Carl Michael, Harrisburg.
Morrison, Christian Herman, Philadelphia.
Mosso, Robert Bruce, Wellsboro.
Moyer, Warren, Jr., Birdsboro.
Murphy, Ronald James, Lansdale.
Naugle, Russell Wayne, Republic.
Neff, Larry Lee, Danielsville.
Ness, Lester Milton, York.
Nutter, Gregory Leroy, Philadelphia.
O'Farrell, William Patrick, Nanty Glo.
Oesterreich, Tilo Rudolf, Philadelphia.
Olesnanik, John Francis, Indiana.
Ortiz, Eliezer, Bethlehem.
Owens, Gary Lee, Wilkes-Barre.
Painter, Robert Glen, Williamsport.
Peden, Clark Edmund, Pittsburgh.
Pennetti, Francis, Philadelphia.
Perinotto, Ernest David, Allentown.
Peterson, Dillard Eric, Philadelphia.
Petrey, James Jim, Modena.
Phillis, Donald R., Jr., Titusville.
Piotrowicz, David, Philadelphia.
Piscar Vincent, Jr., Greensburg.
Pitts, Joseph Wade, Jr., Philadelphia.
Poniktera, Stanley F., Jr., Bethlehem.
Popowitz, Gregory Francis, McKeesport.
Pugh, Stephen Brian, Waynesboro.
Quick, Robert Lee, Wallaceton.
Radgowski, Chester J., Jr., Bethlehem.
Ralls, Raymond Bernard, Philadelphia.
Rampulla, Terry James, Easton.
Ray, Frederick Franklin, Jr., Philadelphia.
Reed, Larry Bruce, New Castle.
Reich, Thomas Alan, Cleona.
Resnick, Robert Albert, Upper Darby.
Reynolds, Jack Edward, Wesleyville.
Reynolds, John Eugene, Linesville.
Rimel, Melvin Lewis, Dawson.
Rivers, Harry Eugene, Philadelphia.
Robinson, Willard Michael, Philadelphia.
Roble, Joseph Edward, Latrobe.
Rodgers, Gregory Wayne, Philadelphia.
Rokaski, Mark Charles, Philadelphia.
Root, Clarence Robert, Philadelphia.
Ross, Reid Rex, Jr., Flinton.
Rouse, John William, Pittsburgh.
Rowlett, Gary Paul, Feasterville.
Rozelle, David Thomas, Scranton.
Rubbo, Kenneth, William, Turtle Creek.
Rudd, James Earl, Meadville.
Rusnak, Robert Joseph, Johnstown.
Sanders, Gerard Jede, Gettysburg.
Sandnes, Larry Gordon, New Cumberland.
Sands, Kenneth Earl, West Lawn.
Satchell, Ronald Edward, Philadelphia.
Scalise, Thomas Randal, Carnegie.
Schatzman, Robert James, Woodlyn.
Scheckler, Paul, Huntington Valley.
Schreckengost, Harold Lee, Rural Valley.
Scott, Billy Edward, Philadelphia.
Scott, Edward Drake, Media.
Seawright, Walter Lee, Philadelphia.
Selgrade, Stephen Frank, Philadelphia.
Seng, Richard Michael, Allentown.
Shane, Wallace William, Baden.
Shemory, Kenneth Charles, Mifflinburg.
Simons, Ray Otis, Jr., Avella.
Singer, Samuel Arnold, Philadelphia.
Sinkewicz, Joseph Michael, Plymouth.
Skocich, Frank Albert, Ambridge.
Skoniecki, Leonard F., Jr., Gardenville.
Slichter, Donald James, Sanatoga.
Snyder, Lawrence James, Rochester

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Marine Corps

Stamato, Vincent James, Jr., Philadelphia.
Stanciu, Kenneth Allen, Verona.
Stasko, Paul, Jr., Butler.
Stovall, Wilbert, Harrisburg.
Surgalski, John Anthony, Tidioute.
Sutton, Matthew Earl, Jr., Philadelphia.
Sweeney, Thomas James, McKeesport.
Synkowski, Valentine John, Glassport.
Szyszputowski, Gerald Adam, Reading.
Taylor, Karl Gorman, Avella.
Tillery Jerry Thomas, Philadelphia.
Tomon, F. Ronald, Philadelphia.
Toomey, Joseph Patrick, Pittsburgh.
Turner, Edward Phillip, Jr., Ardsley.
Vanover, Edward Charles, Oxford.
Vaughn, John Myron, Erie.
Vrankovich, Nicholas Samuel, Beaver Falls.
Walsh, Charles Sumner, Philadelphia.
Walsh, Jeffrey Michael, Bethel Park.
Walters, Sherman Lee, Philadelphia.
Waltz, James Robert, Washington.
Wargo, Vincent Joseph, Jr., Ardsley.
Wark, William Edward, III, Gladwyne.
Washington, Willie J. Jr., Philadelphia.
Watts, Theartis, Jr., Philadelphia.
Weaver, Dale Larry, Honey Brook.
Weintraub, Neil William, Cornwells Heights.
Weiss, Frank Enzer, Clymer.
Weiss, Thomas Joseph, Havertown.
Welsh, Earl Raymond, Jr., Darlington.
Wenger, David Allen, West Lawn.
Whalen, Edward Eugene, Arnold.
White, Michael Matthew, Philadelphia.
Wilbur, William, Jr., Lake Ariel.
Wilkins, William George, Mount Pleasant.
Willingham, Nathaniel, Philadelphia.
Wills, Robert John, New Castle.
Woehlcke, Bernard Richard, Philadelphia.
Worthington, Robert Lee, Williamsport.
Wyant, Alfred Leroy, Titusville.
Yantis, Kenneth Richard, Philadelphia.
Young, Robert William, Pittsburgh.
Young, William Lloyd, Jr., York.
Ziegler, Lawrence Goric, Lancaster.

Navy

Baker, Joseph William, West Middlesex.
Berkebile, Jack, Johnstown.
Caron, Wayne Maurice, Middleboro
Carothers, Cecil Wayne, Altoona.
Cicchiani, Walter Anthony, Butler.
Day, Dennis Patrick, Monongahela.
Dellinger, Charles Hilton, Gibsonia.
Feit, Christian Franz, III, Smethport.
Galati, James Francis, Philadelphia.
Gosselin, James Edward, Pleasantville.
Hogenmiller, Frank, Kittanning.
Lewis, Stanley, Philadelphia.
Mariskanish, Charles Edward, Barnesboro.
Michels, John Jay, Sawickley.
Miller, Joseph Anthony, Jr., Lebanon.
Moscrip, Arthur David, Jr., Philadelphia.
Peterson, Albert Allen, Emporium.
Purcell, Michael Joseph, Shavertown.
Rackow, Andrew Charles, University Park.
Rahn, Donald Keith, Erie.
Rundle, Cary Frank, Aldan.
Slocum, Quenton Edward, Jr., Warren.
Spielman, John Mark, Irwin.
Sprout, Richard Michael, Duncannon.
Toner, Louis Joseph, Pittsburgh.
Torcivia, Anthony Richard, Easton.
Waltz, Larry Thomas, Harrisburg.
Wheeler, Ralph D., III, Trafford.
Wonn, James Charles, Pittsburgh.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Allen, Robert John, Providence.
Atteridge, Leon Joseph, Jr., Slatersville.
Baglini, Thomas Edward, North Providence.
Banek, Lawrence Benjamin, Cumberland.
Braga, John Paul, Jr., Newport.
Burke, Dennis Edward, Woonsocket.
Callahan, Charles L., III, East Greenwich.
Carpentier, Lucien Gerard, Woonsocket.
Donovan, Robert Martin, Barrington.
Dunsmore, Leo Paul, Warwick.
Dye, Daniel Robert, East Providence.

RHODE ISLAND—continued

Army

Frisk, Robert John, Woonsocket.
Hicks, Gene Daniel, Providence.
Jerome, Paul Andrew, Jr., Tiverton.
Kelley, John Patrick, Middletown.
Koster, John Knowles, West Warwick.
Lauzon, Robert William, Woonsocket.
Lopes, Lawrence Renaldo, Providence.
McQuade, Arthur F., Jr., Barrington.
Mellor, Mark Eldredge, East Greenwich.
Menconi, William Lee, Central Falls.
Misiaszek, Joseph Peter, Central Falls.
Moore, William Howard, III, Pawtucket.
Morgera, Domenico, Jr., Providence.
Palmer, Kenneth Oscar, Coventry.
Phillips, Henry Richardson, Foster.
Pigeon, Joseph Thomas, Jr., Warwick.
Rounseville, Joseph Wilfre, Hope Valley.
Saulnier, Jeremiah John, Newport.
Scurfield, Danny Vinson, Cranston.
Sivo, Anthony John, Cranston.
Sullivan, John Francis, Franklin.
Vandevender, Joseph Tommy, Newport.
Warner, James Leo, Warwick.

Air Force

Krawczyk, Edward Chester, Warren.

Marine Corps

Appolonia, John Joseph, Coventry.
Bosse, Laurier Gerard, Providence.
Campbell, Joseph, Providence.
Exum, Neil Harris, Providence.
Farley, Patrick Michael, Central Falls.
Hanley, Kevin Carroll, Cranston.
Holt, Craig Barker, Woonsocket.
Jackson, Robert Andrew, Providence.
Jalbert, David Michael, Wakefield.
Kanaczet, John Francis, Jr., Providence.
Lavoie, Gerald Henry, Woonsocket.
Myllymaki, Carl W., III, Westerly.
Quillette, Donald Henry, Providence.
Tripp, Alfred Leonard, Warwick.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Adams, Jesse Lewis, Rock Hill.
Anderson, Archie, Eastover.
Bacot, Douglas Monroe, Orangeburg
Barbare, James Michael, Greenville.
Barnes, Allan George, Greer.
Belton, Theodore, Ridgeway.
Bodison, James Calvin, Round O.
Boyce, Eugene Russell, Spartanburg.
Boyd, Sam Henry, Fort Mill.
Boyd, Wayne, Aiken.
Brannon, Walter Lee, Lockhart.
Brasington, Jack Williams, Charleston.
Brock, Thomas Dean, Greenville.
Brown, Irvin, Mt. Pleasant.
Brown, Wilson Boyd, Myrtle Beach.
Burdett, Clarence Henry, Marietta.
Byers, Jerry Walter, Greenville.
Campbell, Richard Michael, Piedmont.
Carpenter, Roger Lee, Columbia.
Cato, Herbert Hugo, III, Mayesville.
Childs, Bobby Ray, Greenwood.
Clayton, Benny Dean, Johnston.
Coaxum, Theodore, Charleston.
Cobb, George Lee, Clover.
Coleman, Wyman Byrd, Lynchburg.
Cooler, Sidney Homer, Burton.
Cosom, Levern, Society Hill.
Croft, Jimmy O'Neal, Columbia.
Culp, John Paul, Lancaster.
Currie, James, Jr., Sellers.
Daniels, Danny Earl, Spartanburg.
Davis, Roland K., Florence.
Davis, Woodrow, Jr., Holly Hill.
Dietz, Wallace James, Charleston.
Dill, James Arthur, Central.
Ducker, Ronald Dwight, Spartanburg.
Dudley, Bruce Wesley, Jr., Cayce.
Dukes, George Bennie, Branchville.
Dyches, Charles Henry, Norway.
Eddleman, Royce Edsel, Simpsonville.
Edwards, Fredfor, Effingham.
Edwards, William Edgar, Glendale.
Evans, Ernest, Lane.
Ferguson, Leroy, Spartanburg.
Foster, Samuel Edward, Gaffney.
Foster, Willie Frank, Anderson.

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Frederick, Arthur Donald, Chester.
Fyall, Vernon Robert, Port Royal.
Garrett, Jacky Leroy, Liberty.
Gibbs, William, Jr., Moncks Corner.
Gibson, David, Pomaria.
Gibson, Silas Eugene, Greenville.
Goldsmith, Donald Lawrence, Travelers Rest.
Graham, Robert Lee, Pamplico.
Graves, Jehovah, Columbia.
Green, David Harry, Jr., Awendaw.
Griffin, Francis Lekirklas, Charleston.
Griggs, Harley Franklin, Darlington.
Gruber, Clement Bradley, St. George.
Hall, Boyce Lee, Spartanburg.
Herring, Brady William, West Columbia.
Hingleton, Eugene, Jr., Columbia.
Hinson, Ronald Douglas, Conway.
Hodges, Harkles Leroy, Smoaks.
Hooker, John Arthur, Greenville.
Hooks, Dayton Joseph, Mullins.
Hutcherson, Gary Carol, Spartanburg.
Jacobs, Ernest Linwood, Jr., Spartanburg.
Jenkins, Kenneth Bruce, Orangeburg.
Jenkins, William, St. George.
Johnson, Charles French, Jr., Columbia.
Johnson, Lemuel, Moore.
Johnson, Leroy, Carlisle.
Jordon, Atrhur L., Greenville.
Kohn, Alan Spence, Columbia.
Lakaszus, Helmut Gustav, Shaw Air Force Base.
Lamkin, Freddie Lee, Greenville.
Lawson, Lamar Alvis, Pauline.
Lewis, Robert Russell, Pierre.
Long, Thomas Ira, Kinards.
Makin, James Brian Lawrenc, Charleston.
Martin, Hoyle, Spartanburg.
Mattison, Benjamin Frankli, Anderson.
Mauldin, Melvin Calvin, Jr., Williamston.
Mayes, Joseph, Chesnee.
McCoy, James Raymond, Travelers Rest.
McDaniels, Billy Clayton, Dillon.
McDowell, Samuel T., Jr., Clemson.
McGaha, Harold F., Columbia.
Middleton, Steven Alfred, St. Stephen.
Miller, James, Barnwell.
Mitchell, Isaiah, Jr., Charleston.
Moody, Herbert Wayne, Barnwell.
Moore, Leonard Lee, Greenville.
Morgan, Clyde Edward, Greenville.
Nelson, Dickie Owens, Simpsonville.
Oliver, Clifton, Cayce.
Owen, Ray William, Columbia.
Owens, Robert Lee, Beaufort.
Oxner, Marion Luther, Leesville.
Pairis, Arnold, Columbia.
Parker, Edgar Eugene, Anderson.
Pasch, William Ernest, Groton.
Potts, Johnnie Wylie, Fort Mill.
Price, Maxis Lane, Greenville.
Proctor, Wayne Shelton, Saluda.
Pruitt, David Monroe, Wellford.
Ramey, Jordan Eugene, Coumbia.
Renwick, Harold McGill, Jr., Winnsboro.
Rhinehart, Clyde A., Charleston Heights.
Rich, Joseph Walter, West Columbia.
Richardson, Jimmie Jenkins, Florence.
Robinson, John William, Jr., Charleston.
Robinson, Lucien, Johns Island.
Sartor, Leonda, Whitmire.
Segar, Charles, Jr., St. Stephens.
Simmons, Isiah, Johns Island.
Simmons, Richard, Charleston.
Simmons, Robert Louis, Ridgeway.
Singleton, Raymond, Alcolu.
Sizemore, Donald Ray, Langley.
Smith, Cary Joseph, Laurens.
Smith, David Wesley, Fort Mill.
Smith, John Clifford, III, Pacolet.
Smith, Wilbur Eugene, Jr., Spartanburg.
Sneed, Sammie Ray, Jr., Spartanburg.
Sowell, Harry Lee, Jr., Kershaw.
Speights, Roosevelt, Lake City.
Sprouse, Ronald Edward, Greenwood.
Still, Floyd Laverne, Barnwell.
Stone, James Edward, Johnsonville.
Sullivan, Gerald Dewayne, Richland.
Swofford, Danny Ray, Cowpens.

XUM

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Army

Tate, Willie James, Cheraw.
Taylor, Tommy Lee, Lydia.
Thompson, Danny Stewart, Laurens.
Thompson, Thermall, Orangeburg.
Trapp, Bobby Ray. Blair.
Tuten, Michael Hamilton, North Augusta.
Waiters, Lawrence, Hartsville.
Walker, Edward, Charleston.
Walters, Eugene, Patrick.
Warner, Arthur Lee, Charleston Heights.
Wasilow, John Stephen, Myrtle Beach.
White, Isaiah, Lane.
Whitt, Broadus Alfred, Honea Path.
Williams, Doyle, Anderson.
Williams, Willie Amos, Fairfax.
Wilson, William Earl, Laurens.
Wright, Curtis Ronald, Columbia.
Wuestenberg, Lewis Curtis, Greenville.
Zeigler, Glen Allen, Manning.

Marine Corps

Adams, William Othilo, Jr., Greenwood.
Allaire, John Kevin, Columbia.
Allison, John Robert, Gaffney.
Bethea, Luther, Jr., Dillon.
Bingley, John Lee, Jr., Charleston.
Bradley, Kenneth Ray, Chesnee.
Bryant, James Roy, Conway.
Burns, Luther, Mt. Pleasant.
Carter, John Lewis, Charleston.
Cassell, Kenneth Wayne, Spartanburg.
Caulder, Durwood, Florence.
Chaplin, Lawrence, Frogmore.
Chisolm, Alexander, Charleston.
Crapse, Wayne Franklin, Brunson.
Crotts, Donald Coleman, Blacksburg.
Dawkins, Clarence, Jr., Columbia.
Edwards, Edwin Ray, Inman.
Edwards, James Merton, Pawleys Island.
Etheridge, Colie, Jr., Columbia.
Gibbs, Isreal, Charleston.
Gourdine, Larry Ronald, Goose Creek.
Grooms, Jimmie Lee, Hopkins.
Harvin, Jimmie Lee, Sumter.
Henderson, Montie H.,Jr., Charleston.
Hilton, Stephen Randolph, Winnsboro.
Hoffman, Shuler Adolf, Springfield.
Hollingsworth, Jerry G., Jr., Columbia.
Holmon, Alphonzo, Jr., Columbia.
Jackson, Nathaniel Earnest, Georgetown.
Jenkins, Reginald Rockefeller, Clinton.
Johnson, Jacob, Moncks Corner.
Johnson, Ralph Henry, Charleston.
Jones, Clifton Randal, Pickens.
Joseph, James, Darlington.
Kapp, Richard Worrell, Jr., Orangeburg.
Ledford, Don Kenneth, Marietta.
Makin, Woodrow, Jr., Dondals.
McDowell, Harold Guinn, Anderson.
McRae, Jimmie Lefon, Blenheim.
Moore, Jimmy Lee, Greenville.
Moore, William Lewis, Charleston.
Morgan, Charles Lewis, Rock Hill.
O'Connor, Thomas Duckett, Allendale.
O'Connor, William Eugene, Hilton Head.
Owens, Martin Lee, Hanahan.
Parker, Robert, Frogmore.
Patterson, Patrick Chasie, Columbia.
Pettit, Stanley, Russell, Liberty.
Rambert, Franklin, Charleston.
Riley, Eddie Lee, Columbia.
Roberts, Gary Kenneth, Summerville.
Ruff, Willie Jerome, Columbia.
Simmons, Fay Clyde, III, Cayce.
Sloan, Vernar, Bennettsville.
Smalls, Joseph, Oakley.
Sparkman Isaac, Charleston.
Spivey, Willie Dalphus, Myrtle Beach.
Springs, Andrew, Rock Hill.
Sweeney, Michael Murphy, Columbia.
Turner, Robert Lawrence, Greenville.
Walker, Thomas Edward, Charleston.
Wall, James Allen, Columbia.
Wallington, George Heyward, Columbia.
Weatherford, Roy Julian, Jr., Warrenville.
Whitaker, Jerry, Camden.
White, Nathan, Jr., Charleston.
Williams, James U., III, Charleston.

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Navy

Adams, Joseph Boyce, Aiken.
Bowman, Frank, Walterboro.
Cathey, J. B., Greenville.
Cone, Lloyd Alford, Greenville.
Glenn, Donald Nelson, Chesnee.
Larsen, Gary Alvin, Irene.
Minor, Carrol William, Greenville.
Nelson, Eugene, Lugoff.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Aadland, Gerald L., Sisseton.
Andersen, Curtis Lee, Lake Preston.
Berrigan, Brendon Jay, Rapid City.
Boyer, Stephen Gregory, Rapid City.
Busse, Daniel Dean, Highmore.
Cameron, Roger Sletten, Pierpont.
Chistensen, Alvin Peter, Viborg.
Dougherty, Kirby Jon, Sioux Falls.
Ferdig, Russell Norman, Elk Point.
Harris, Vern Allen, Glad Valley.
Heimes, Richard Theodore, Yankton.
Hill, William Leo, Garretson.
Jacobs, Robert Milton, Sioux Falls.
Kaupp, Curtis James, Gregory.
Kenyon, Dale Dean, Sioux Falls.
Kidd, Donny Ramon, Sioux Falls.
Kloos, Richard Nicholas, Gary.
Korb, Donald Duane, Aberdeen.
Lawver, Dennis D., Miller.
Marks, Michael David, Sioux Falls.
McDowell, John Clark, Corsica.
Meyer, Verlyn Gwen, Lennox.
Morehouse, David Lloyd, Canistota.
Noldner, Ronald Lee, Stickney.
Norgaard, Larry Wayne, Iroquois.
Reil, Ronald Le Roy, Wilmot.
Renville, Arden Keith, Sisseton.
Sturdevant, William Dean, Brookings.
Two Crow, Blair William, Kyle.
Volk, Dennis Richard, Aberdeen.
Williams, Randal Lee, Sioux Falls.
Yellow Elk, Carlos Nichola, Milesville.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Daniel Leone, Rapid City.
Bibby, John Francis, Brookings.
Callies, Marlin Joseph, Howard.
Cutshall, David Warren, Rapid City.
Fried, Vern Jacob, Aberdeen.
Fuchs, James Lee, Vermillion.
Hutchison, John William, Presho.
Kimmel, Eugene William, Sioux Falls.
Mills, Arthur Lee, Rapid City.
Simonson, Donald Wayne, Sioux Falls.
Watson, Lester Arthur, Sturgis.
Winterton, Larry Dean, Sioux Falls.

Navy

Langenfeld, Charles Thomas, Watertown.
Lien, James Lawrence, Lead.
Nelson, Roger Miller, Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Army

Adcock, Billy Anthony, Smithville.
Ake, Homer Lee, Jr., Nashville.
Angus, Willie James, Columbia.
Bacon, Nilon Kay, Fall Branch.
Baker, Micheal Roger, Oak Ridge.
Barbee, Jerry Paul, Dyersburg.
Barnard, Larry Wayne, Knoxville.
Barrett, Thomas A., Harrogate.
Basham, Harold Lawton, Mc Minnville.
Bass, James Henry, Jr., Chattanooga.
Beard, Charles C., Santa Fe.
Beauregard, Silvester, Bolivar.
Bell, Homer, B., Jr., Tullahoma.
Bentley, James, E., Jr., Memphis.
Bernard, Thomas D., Rogersville.
Blalack, Jimmy Dale, Brighton.
Blevins, Danny Eugene, Alcoa.
Bonner, Charles Larry, Memphis.
Bradshaw, Conley Arlen, Church Hill.
Brady, James Alfred, Sr., Knoxville.
Branam, Ronnie Franklin, Athens.
Brewer, Sammy L., Hohenwald.
Broome, Wade Lamar, Chattanooga.
Brown, Ned Rayburn, Columbia.
Burns, Benny Charles, Lenoir City.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

Butler, Robert Earl, Memphis.
Byrd, James Edward, Jr., Oliver Springs.
Campbell, Jerry Albert, Jamestown.
Casey, John Michael, Sparta.
Cates, Gary Ray, Bradford.
Childress, Ivy Gale, Dyersburg.
Clark, Jimmy Ray, Estill Springs.
Clark, Raymond Gordon, Chattanooga.
Clay, Ambrose, Wilkie J., Jr., Nashville.
Collier, Junius Columbus, Memphis.
Coone, George W., Jr., Dickson.
Cooper, Willie Gene, Jickson.
Creighton, Paul Baren, Memphis.
Crews, Philip Marvin, Gallatin.
Crutchfield, Terry Wayne, Memphis.
Cummings, Dave, Jr., Memphis.
Cunningham, John Edd, Jr., Memphis.
Damewood, Donnie Lee, Tuttrell.
Daugherty, Ronnie Joe, Newcomb.
Davis, James Thomas, Decatur.
Davis, Lester Ray, Decaturville.
Derry, David Wayne, Memphis.
Dial, James William, Knoxville.
Dillard, Terry Lee, Lebanon.
Dingus, John William, Jr., Kingsport.
Dockery, Steve Julius, Tellico Plains.
Dunlap, Richard Lance, Friendsville.
Dyer, Willford Leon, Cleveland.
Edney, David Lee, Erwin.
Engle, Phillip Henry, Woodlawn.
Estes, Douglas Dale, Memphis.
Farmer, Joseph Lyle, Clarksville.
Ferguson, Jerry Roger, Harriman.
Fink, Philip Rush, Mosheim.
Fletcher, Herman Ray, Manchester.
Fletcher, Jerry, Memphis.
Ford, Freddie Darrel, Hawkins County.
Forkum, Garry Michael, Inglewood.
Garrison, George Albert, Nashville.
Goins, William Harrison, Franklin.
Goodman, Thomas Hill, Jr., Knoxville.
Gossett, Hershel Lee Walto, Athens.
Greene, Freddy, Athens.
Greenwell, William Leonard, Johnson City.
Griffith, Joe Edd, Robbins.
Grisham, Charles Cole, Memphis.
Hamilton, Robert E. Lee, Chattanooga.
Hammock, Jerry Wendell, Westmoreland.
Hardison, Charles Herbert, Franklin.
Harrington, Charles J., Memphis.
Harris, William Lee, Dyersburg.
Hawkins, Gordon Abner, Knoxville.
Headley, Charles Paul, Madison.
Headrick, Vernon Leon, Knoxville.
Hodges, Robert Gentry, Jonesboro.
Holeyfield, Robert Erie, Memphis.
Hopper, William Carl, Maryville.
House, Douglas Arthur, Cedar Grove.
Hover, John Michael, Nashville.
Howard, James Van, Madison.
Hutcherson, Ronald David, Jackson.
Jacobs, Aubrey Eugene, Jr., Nashville.
Jacobs, George Edgar, Nashville.
Johnson, Everett, Wilson, Jr., Harriman.
Jordan, Raymond Robert, Nashville.
Kemmerling, Joe Thomas, Dyersburg.
Kent, William Wayne, Memphis.
Kilgore, Gary Brewster, Whitwell.
Layne, Dillard Ray, Whitwell.
Leonard, Charlie Murphy, Harrogate.
Lewis, Bobby Dwight, Pikeville.
Littlejohn, Troy A., Newbern.
Logan, Jimmy Morris, Cumberland Furnace.
Lowe, Earnest Lon, Caryville.
Lyons, Larry Jerome, Johnson City.
Malone, Clifton, Millington.
Marlin, William Lunn, Jr., Burns.
Marple, Reece Leslie, Jellico.
Martin, James Henry, Memphis.
Mattock, John Lee, Blaine.
McCorkle, Bennie Eugene, Johnson City.
McCormick, Donnie Ray, Morrison.
McCoullough, Ben, Jr., Wartrace.
Mc Coy, Carl Thomas, Jr., Memphis.
Mc Coy, James Larry, Dyer.
McDaniel, Andrew Leroy, Memphis.
McElhaney Lee Roy, Ten Mile.
McElroy, Thomas Lee, Pulaski.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

McReynolds, George Wayne, Bristol.
Medley, Homer Landus, Chattanooga.
Meredith, Hubert Arthur, Turtletown.
Miller, Glenn Stanford, Gallatin.
Mitchell, Fred Evans, III, Smyrna.
Morgan, James Henry, Nashville.
Morrow, William Danny, Farner,
Neal, Roy William, Blountville.
Nipper, Donald Edward, Knoxville.
Novel, Charles Edward, Dyersburg.
O'Neal, Nelson Montague, Gallatin.
Oliver, Gary Lee, Ashland City.
Oliver, Michael Pierce, Butler.
Osborne, George D., Murfreesboro.
Owens, Howard, Memphis.
Owens, Larry Thomas, Jamestown.
Pate, John H., Jr., Knoxville.
Payne, Jeppie Joseph, Copperhill.
Peay, James Edmund, Franklin.
Peeples, Harry Frank Edwar, Nashville.
Pegram, Richard Epps, Jr., Memphis.
Pettitt, James Allen, Louisville.
Petty, Howard Palma, Pulaski.
Plunkett, Gerald W., Memphis.
Poe, Robert Edwin, Chattanooga.
Price, Robert Glen, Kingsport.
Proctor, Ervin, Townsend.
Quillen, Roger Dell, St. Joseph.
Randolph, William, Jr., Nashville.
Ray, William Lee, Nashville.
Reed, James Eddie, Kingsport.
Reed, Joe Allen, Niota.
Rhodes, Hi Blakemore, Shelbyville.
Rogers, John Avery, Chattanooga.
Rollins, Hobert Truman, Washington College.
Ross, Carlton, Chattanooga.
Roulett, James Houston, Maryville.
Self, James Edward, Madisonville.
Shaw, Wade Thomas, Henning.
Shelton, Willie, Chattanooga.
Sherrill, James J., Dover.
Short, Joseph William, Hixson.
Silberberger, Paul John, Nashville.
Smith, Anthony, Memphis.
Smith, Charles Wallace, Dickson.
Smith, Jackie Glenn, Hornbeak.
Smith, Yancey, Jr., Nashville.
South, John Hershel, Memphis.
Spakes, Estel Denny, Harriman.
Stafford, Robert Beryl, Kingsport.
Stephenson, Donald Ray, Shelbyville.
Stringfellow, John D., Jr., Memphis.
Stroye, Ferdinand, Memphis.
Tarte, James Lafon, Kingsport.
Taylor, Dennis Wayne, Montezuma.
Taylor, George Dennis, Chattanooga.
Taylor, Wendell Gene, Paris.
Terry, Hoyle, Jr., Oak Ridge.
Thomason, James Calvin, Niota.
Thompson, Russell Lee, Memphis.
Treadway, Thomas Charles, Elizabeth.
Underhill, Benjamin S., Burns.
Underwood, Jackie Shirl, Pleasant Shade.
Vaughn, Dennis Wayne, Wartburg.
Wade, Douglas Burem, Kingsport.
Walton, Eugene, Memphis.
Wanamaker, Johnny Wayne, Nashville.
Ward, John Douglas, Jr., Lancing.
Ward, Randy Neal, Tullahoma.
Warrick, Clarence Ray, Nashville.
Watson, Clarence Edward, Madisonville.
Watson, James Franklin, Chattanooga.
Watts, Bradley Keith, Harriman.
West, Carl Lynn, Nashville.
Westbrook, James Barringto, Memphis.
White, Carroll Wayne, Memphis.
White, Donnie Raymond, Nashville.
Whiteaker, Johnny Laverne, McMinnville.
Wiles, Alvin Eugene, Knoxville.
Wilkinson, John Terrell, Manchester.
William, Perry Wayne, Lynnville.
Williams, David Clark, Bluff City.
Williams, Wayne Charles, Maryville.
Wilson, Chester Wayne, Whitesburg.
Wilson, Lewis Bracy, Manchester.
Wilson, Roy Haskel, Elizabethton.
Worth, Timothy Lane, Tullahoma.
Wright, Billy Lee, Stanton.

TENNESSEE—continued

Army

Wright, Raymond Earl, Portland.
Young, Danny Stephen, Hendersonville.

Air Force

Blaylock, Beryl Stanley, Crossville.
Bowman, James Edgar, Jonesboro.
Brinkman, James Martin, III, Memphis.
Harris, Leslie Earl, Jr., Chattanooga.

Marine Corps

Adams, Dwight Lee, Nashville.
Barbee, John Wesley, Nashville.
Bennett, Prentice J., Hohenwald.
Blunkall, Earl Jerome, Nashville.
Bowen, Clifton Lee, Bell Buckle.
Bowers, James David, Johnson City.
Bradley, Kenneth, Eugene, Nashville.
Burks, Harmon Wayne, Henning.
Burton, Jack Edwin, Whites Creek.
Burton, John Thomas, Mt. Juliet.
Campbell, Robert Wayne, Nashville.
Carroll, Dwight Wayne, Springfield.
Carter, Gary Michael, Church Hill.
Chamberlain, Carl Eugene, Nashville.
Clark, Bobby Joe, Memphis.
Cleave, Lonnie Leonard, Memphis.
Corbin, Russell Bigbee, Jr., Adams.
Denson, Jerry Edward, Old Hickory.
Doss, Larry Donnell, Nashville.
Essary, George Arthur, Chattanooga.
Fernandez, Eugenio E., Jr., Knoxville.
Foster, Larry Edward, Lenoir City.
Garcia, Augusto Jose, Chattanooga.
Gregg, Daniel Lee, Kingsport.
Harris, Earl Wayne, Buchanan.
Hayes, Ray Allen, Knoxville.
Henry, Edward Earl, Memphis.
Hibbard, Ronald Edward, Oak Ridge.
Hinnant, Kenneth Lee, Johnson City.
Howard, Donnell, Memphis.
Howard, Ernest, Memphis.
Howland, Howard P., Jr., Nashville.
Ivory, Michael Thomas, Memphis.
Jackson, Charles Sid, Mason.
James, Ray Don, Tiptonville.
Jaynes, James Oakley, Chuckey.
Johnson, Alex Lee, Memphis.
Johnson, Howard Leon, Memphis.
Jones, Bennie Ray, Jackson.
Jones, Joseph Wester, III., Dyersburg.
Kelley, James Daniel, Greeneville.
Kelly, Eddie, Jr., Antioch.
King, Gerald Eugene, Knoxville.
Kirkes, Kenneth Lee, Tullahoma.
Lane, Norman Edward, Jr., Brownsville.
Larson, Andrew Martin, Johnson City.
Ledford, James Harvey, Johnson City.
Lewis, Al Rickey, Memphis.
Marlin, Leonard Thomas, Donelson.
McJunkin, Robert Taylor, Chattanooga.
McLoughlin, Robert A., Jr., Knoxville.
Miller, Richard Dennis, Memphis.
McLoughlin, Robert A., Jr., Knoxville.
Morelock, Willard Franklin, Kingsport.
Moses, Clifton, Whitwell.
Patterson, Mark, Memphis.
Paul, Brinson Ira, Memphis.
Pemberton, William Larry, Chattanooga.
Phelps, Ray Williard, Jr., Yuma.
Pitt, William Lynn, Springfield.
Presley, Ronnie Calvin, Lebanon.
Ratliff, Franklin Delano, Chattanooga.
Rich, Roy Wayne, Wartrace.
Roberts, William Jackson, Kingsport.
Robinson, James Edward, Winchester.
Rogers, Robert Lee, Maryville.
Ross, Frank Milan, Jr., Memphis.
Ross, William Gray, Big Rock.
Ruggles, John Richard, III, Knoxville.
Rush, Marvin Gene, Memphis.
Russell, James A., III, New Market.
Russell, Samuel, Nashville.
Ryland, William Patrick, Memphis.
Segine, Ronald Eugene, Nashville.
Shaffer, Robert Lee, Elizabethton.
Shasteen, Kenneth Parker, Estill Springs.
Shull, Sandy Lee, Nashville.
Smith, Gary Ray, Memphis.
Smith, Ricky Edward, Memphis.
Smith, Terry Lee, Nashville.

TENNESSEE—continued

Marine Corps

Stanek, Robert Lee, Milan.
Stewart, David Glenn, Memphis.
Stringfield, Charles Dean, Harriman.
Tate, Charles Edward, Memphis.
Taylor, Homer, Jr., Memphis.
Taylor, Tommy Lee, Chattanooga.
Templeton, Donald Lee, Gallatin.
Tolley, Michael, Unicio.
Trevathan, Robert Lewis, Union City.
Tuttle, Robert Ervin, Memphis.
Uzzell, Frank Nelson, Columbia.
Vaught, Johnnie L., Jr., Chattanooga.
Walker, Manley Glen, Memphis.
Washam, Denny Lee, Norma.
Weaver, Jerry Lee, Knoxville.
Weber, Gregory John, Oak Ridge.
Wells, Harry Leon, Memphis.
White, Allen Eugene, Erwin.
Whiting, J. C., Jr., Memphis.
Whitthorne, Paul Lucius, Jr., Memphis.
Williams, Maxie R., Jr., Waverly.
Williams, Robert Eugene, Memphis.
Worley, James Ronald, Hartsville.
Wright, Ronald Lee, Chattanooga.
Yarbrough, George Allen, Jackson.
Yeary, Randall Douglas, Kingsport.

Navy

Hodges, Harry Gaines, Sevierville.

TEXAS

Army

Adams, George Gayral, Houston.
Adams, Ronnie Lee, Iowa Park.
Aguilar, Adolfo, San Antonio.
Akin, John Vincent, Rockport.
Alaniz, Benito V., Brownsville.
Alaniz, Raymond, Wichita Falls.
Alba, Jessie Charles, Port Lavaca.
Albarez, Seferino, Jr., Lockhart.
Alderson, Terry Howard, Fort Worth.
Aldrich, Lawrence Lee, Fort Worth.
Allen, Andrew Augustus, III, Galveston.
Allison, James Samuel, Lubbock.
Allison, Sam Stephen, Abilene.
Alvarado, Ramiro, San Antonio.
Alvarez, Francisco, Rio Grande City.
Alvarez, Ignacio, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Antu, Juan, Uvalde.
Arenas, Manuel V., Jr., Amarillo.
Armstrong, William Preston, Jacksonville.
Arnold, Robert Milton, Jr., San Antonio.
Aronce, Joseph Charles, El Paso.
Asher, Robert Franklin, Smiley.
Ashton, James Odell, Buras.
Audilet, Franklin Delano, Yorktown.
Austin, William Olen, El Paso.
Ayres, Jesse Stephen, Silsbee.
Azore, David, Beaumont.
Baer, William Clay, Dallas.
Baker, John Houston, Beeville.
Baldwin, Robert Earl, Cleburne.
Ballard, Gerald Roy, Whitewright.
Balsley, Robert F., Jr., Bay City.
Banks, Ray Carrol, Scroggins.
Barber, George L., III, Jacksonville.
Barbolla, Richard Anthony, Fort Worth.
Barlow, Ross Owen, San Benito.
Barnes, Charles Peter, El Paso.
Barnett, Jimmy Dalton, Houston.
Beals, Stephen Carl, Dallas.
Beaty, Arthur Lee, Hillister.
Bennett, Charles Edwin, Terrell.
Bernardy, Thomas G., Killeen.
Berry, Vance Alyn, Amarillo.
Blackmon, Kenneth Leon, Plainview.
Blake, Jack Patrick, Beaumont.
Blanco, Heriberto, Friona.
Blissett, Jimmie Ray, Houston.
Boaz, Donald Joe, Gainesville.
Bone, Robert Lynn, Irving.
Braddock, Stephen Lee, Abilene.
Bradley, Franklin S., Jr., Fort Worth.
Brager, Roy Lee, Dallas.
Brazzeal Ted Oland, Yoakum.
Brossman, Edgar James, Weimer.
Brown, Billy Ray, Belton.
Brown, Earnest Wayne, Richland.
Brown, James Douglas, Hillsboro.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Brown, Jimmy Ray, Cleburne.
Brown, Larry Paul, Fort Worth.
Brownlee, Robert Leon, El Paso.
Buckley, Mac Curtis, Center.
Buentello, Leonel, Gregroy.
Bullock, Hershel Joe, Sr., Fort Worth.
Burchwell, Ashland Frederick, Garland.
Burciaga, Albert, Houston.
Burrough, Jesse Clarence, Dallas.
Caballero, David Joe, Corpus Christi.
Cain, James Douglas, Hull.
Calhoun, William Steve, Coolidge.
Callaway, Michael Rogers, Bellaire.
Camarillo, Felipe Duran, Seguin.
Campos, Ricardo, San Antonio.
Canales, Refugio, Kemah.
Candelaria, Raul, El Paso.
Cantu, Florentino, Jr., Laredo.
Cantwell, Kenneth James, Arlington.
Caraway, Earnest Wesley, New Braunfels.
Carrillo, Arnoldo Leonel, Benavides.
Carroll, Michael David, Houston.
Carter, Fred Douglas, Jr., Dallas.
Castleberry, James Andrew, Jarrell.
Caswell, Raymond M., Dallas.
Chaffin, Clarence Ray, Grapeland.
Chambers, David Wayne, Dallas.
Chambers, James Thomas, Georgetown.
Chambers, John Luther, Hondo.
Chambers, Tommie Allen, Forth Worth.
Champion, Charles Don, Irving.
Childress, Billy W., Forth Worth.
Cobb, Hubbard Don, Odessa.
Cochran, Isom Carter, Jr., Houston.
Cochran, Robert Edmund, Rosser.
Coggins, Terry Lee, Wilmer.
Cole, Robert Earl, Carthage.
Collett, Paul Raymond, Jr., Fort Worth.
Collins, Harris Lester, San Angelo.
Collins, Noble, Jr., San Antonio.
Combest, Jerry Wayne, Wylie.
Cooley, Harvey Lynn, Houston.
Cooley, Monte Ray, Kermit.
Cooper, James William, Houston.
Copp, Barry Alan, Houston.
Cortez, Jose G., Corpus Christi.
Cotton, Charles Michael, Angleton.
Creecy, Larry Raymond, Hurst.
Crim, Charles Ray, San Angelo.
Crocker, Evans Blane, Jr., Orange.
Crockett, Travis Richard, Mission.
Crosby, Robert Michael, Wichita Falls.
Culver, Daryl Chester, Limestone.
Cumbry, John Evert, Kemp.
Cunningham, Dennis Lane, El Paso.
Curtis, Herbert Ray, Tomball.
Daniels, Harold Dwaine, Temple.
Davis, John Wesley, Joshua.
Davis, Leroy, Jr., Seagoville.
Davis, Robert Charles, Houston.
De La Cerda, Antonio H., Jr., El Paso.
De Leon, Guillermo, Jr., Uvalde.
Delgado, Gilbert Trevinio, Houston.
Dennis, Charles, Dallas.
Dent, Billy Ray, Kilgore.
Dunbar, Allen Sevarn, Houston.
Dunlap, Raymond Earl, Amarillo.
Dupree, Douglas, Mineola.
Duran, Ignacio, El Paso.
Edwards, Anthony John, San Antonio.
Edwards, Roy William, Henderson.
Elledge, Wayne Clarence, Kingsville.
Elliott, Julius R., Brownfield.
Ellison, Wilbert Allen, Austin.
Ephraim, Eddie Lee, Brownwood.
Espinosa, Mike, Amarillo.
Estein, Dalton Main, Waco.
Estrada, Esteban Pena, Poteet.
Evans, Clarence Lovice, Paris.
Evans, Lloyd William, Jr., San Angelo.
Everett, Gary Wayne, Athens.
Fedro, James Ray, Sr., Fort Worth.
Ferguson, James P., Nederland.
Ferguson, Thomas Alton, Damon.
Figueroa, Albert Martinez, San Antonio.
Fitzsimmons, Harry Lee, Houston.
Flores, Arthur Merino, Austin.
Flores, Daniel Porras, Valentine.
Flores, Jimmy, San Antonio.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Flores, Ramon Aguilar, San Antonio.
Floyd, Larvon, Houston.
Forsythe, David Allen, San Antonio.
Fortner, Gary Duane, Corpus Christi.
Foster, James Earnest, Aubrey.
Foster, Robert L., Amarillo.
Frazier, Edward Lee, Aubrey.
Freeman, James Paul, Masterson.
Freeman, Ollie Curtis, Groveton.
Freeman, Steven Forrest, Houston.
Fulkersin, Robert Douglas, Texline.
Gage, James Robert, Bowie.
Gallardo, Ernesto R., San Antonio.
Gallegos, Oscar Conando, Alice.
Garcia, Antonio, Laredo.
Garcia, Antonio Vargas, Kingsville.
Garcia, Crecencio Casarez, Converse.
Garcia, David Adame, Houston.
Garcia, Emilio Gamboa, Barstow.
Garcia, Jose, Los Ebanos.
Garrett, Thomas Steven, Houston.
Garza, Jose Salustino, Laredo.
Garza, Marcello C., Jr., Corpus Christi.
Getter, Waydell, Lufkin.
Gideon, Wilburn Chastain, Dilley.
Gilbert, Don Ray, Fort Worth.
Gillespie, Lloyd Dean, Houston.
Gillock, Raymond Richard, Longview.
Gilstrap, Danny Lynn, Sherman.
Gipson, R. W., Naples.
Gomez, Atanacio, Jr., Brownsville.
Gonzales, Agapito, Jr., Dallas.
Gonzales, Eligio Rice, Jr., Marfa.
Gonzales, Frank Cavosos, Marble Falls.
Gonzales, Luis Garcia, Jr., Lamesa.
Gonzalez, Vincente Ramirez, San Marcos.
Gooch, Calvin Lionel, Burkeville.
Goodman, Charles Edward, Fort Worth.
Goodman, James A., Highlands.
Goodrich, John Matthew, Dallas.
Gore, Thomas, Silsbee.
Grant, Benjamin Davis, Eureka.
Graven, Donald Ray, Terrell.
Graves, Stanley Edwin, Jr., Dallas.
Gregg, Johnny Glen, Houston.
Griffin, Cephus, Jr., Dallas.
Griffin, James T., Jr., Cameron.
Guerra, George, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Gutierrez, Albert R., Jr., San Antonio.
Gutierrez, Eristeo, Jr., Mathis.
Gutierrez, Fernando, Fabens.
Gutierrez, Raul Grimaldo, Brownfield.
Hale, Henry Maurice Staffo, Houston.
Hale, Lanny Earl, Plano.
Haley, Garland Gene, Amarillo.
Hamil, Louis William, Houston.
Hancock, John David, Dallas.
Hansard, James Burl, Plainview.
Hardy, Davis Edwin, Fort Worth.
Harland, Wayne Lynn, Texarkana.
Harness, James William, Dallas.
Harris, Billy Dean, Houston.
Hartman, Henry Wilburn, San Angelo.
Hartness, Aaron, Fluvanne.
Hatton, Franklin Delano R., Fort Worth.
Hawthorn, John Edmond, Dallas.
Hernandez, Raymond Rodrigu, San Antonio.
Herndon, Harry H., Terrell.
Herrera, Aurelio Garza, San Antonio.
Herrera, Ben Lopez, Odessa.
Hill, James Leroy, Amarillo.
Hill, Thomas, Grand Prairie.
Hillman, Ronald Arwed, Texas City.
Hinojosa, Jose Antonio, Rio Grande City.
Hinojosa, Marcos, Hebbronville.
Hobbs, Kimmey Dean, San Antonio.
Hoffman, Charles Edwin, McKinney.
Hoffman, Ronnie Joe, Del Rio.
Holguin, Ismael, Big Spring.
Hollis, Theodore Robert, Silsbee.
Holman, Bobby Foster, Dallas.
Homsley, Ivan D., Aledo.
Hood, Rufus, Texas City.
Hosey, Sandra, Telferner.
Hotchkiss, Kenneth Eugene, San Antonio.
House, John K., San Antonio.
Hughes, Billy Eugene, II, Wichita Falls.
Humphrey, Victor James, Baytown.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Hunt, Richard, Arlington.
Hunter, Gerald N., Austin.
Hurst, Jake Edward, Houston.
Insall, Billy Glen, Lampasas.
Irby, Donald Reece, Houston.
Isbell, David Gene, Huntsville.
Izard, B. C., El Paso.
Jablonsky, Edmond A., Jr., Pasadena.
Jackson, Lawrence, Houston.
Jaime, Antonio Barrera, Alice.
Janak, Joe John, Columbus.
Jerdet, Dennis Clarence, Austin.
Jimenez, Juan Macias, San Antonio.
Jobe, Bobby W., El Paso.
Johnson, Cal Duain, White Deer.
Johnson, Donald Ray, Palestine.
Johnson, Duane Aaron, Kerrville.
Johnson, James Grady, Marshall.
Johnson, Joe Alan, Westminster.
Johnson, Larry Travis, Nacogdoches.
Johnson, Roy L., Galena Park.
Jones, Alan Peter, San Antonio.
Jones, Freddie Lee, Houston.
Jones, Jimmie Douglas, Houston.
Jones, Seaborn Dan, Red Oak.
Jones, William Arthur, Borger.
Jordan, Thomas Lee, Jacksonville.
Juarez, Joe Manuel, Pecos.
Jurado, Elias Castro, Jr., Austin.
Jurado, Fred V., El Paso.
Juercko, Daniel Edward, Corpus Christi.
Keefe, Richard Carlysle, Houston.
Keesee, Arthur Earl, Brownwood.
Kelly, John Franklin, Houston.
Kendricks, Doy Ray, Fort Worth.
Kiefer, Stuart Otis, Austin.
Kiker, Douglas Hugh, Hamshire.
Kirby, Gerald, Houston.
Kohanke, Lance Jack, Houston.
Koliba, Herbert, Copperas Cove.
Krussow, Donald John, Corpus Christi.
Ladell, Joe Earl, Paris.
Laird, James Eugene, Texarkana.
Lamas, Raul Ruben, Corpus Christi.
Langford, James Minter, Carthage.
Langham, Holland Irwin, Tyler.
Layne, Victor Lee, Albany.
Leal, Guadalupe Mendoza, Quitaque.
Lee, Calvin Ray, Dallas.
Lee, Homer Hardy, Fort Worth.
Lee, Milton Arthur, San Antonio.
Lewis, Darrel Gene, Greenville.
Lewis, Leslie A., Waco.
Link, Roger Mark, Dallas.
Litterio, Robert Dale, San Antonio.
Lofton, Booker T., Jr., Austin.
Lopez, Alfredo, Jr., Kyle.
Lopez, Antonio, Jr., Mission.
Lopez, Pete, San Antonio.
Lopez, Rudy, Austin.
Lozano, Paul Rodriguez, Bay City.
Maas, Clarence F., III, Victoria.
Macias, Tristal, San Antonio.
Maddux, David Allen, Houston.
Magnon, Myron William, San Antonio.
Maldonado, Patricio, Jr., Falfurrias.
Malone, Robert Earl, Seymour.
Manzanares, William, Jr., El Paso.
Martin, Lonnie Gene, Tomball.
Martinez, Angel, Bandera.
Martinez, Florentino, Jr., Edinburg.
Martinez, Jesus, Mission.
Martinez, John Andrew, San Antonio.
Martinez, Juan Jose, Fort Worth.
Martinez, Louis Alvarado, Leming.
Martinez, Margarito, Batesville.
Martinez, Rafael, Edinburg.
Maughan, George Lee, Sr., San Antonio.
Maurice, Robert Charles, Fort Worth.
McCaskill, Fredric Cecil, Lubbock.
McClatchy, Jeffery, Jr., El Campo.
McCullough, Gary Michael, Fort Worth.
McKenzie, Jerald Thomas, Orange.
McKibben, Larry Sims, Houston.
McKinney, Cecil Curtis, Midland.
McSwain, Baynes Ballew, Jr., San Marcos.
McVea, Robert Minor, Converse.
McVea, Willie Dee, Austin.
Medina, Alfredo, Jr., Rockport.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Medley, John R., Texas City.
Medrano, Jose, Jr., El Paso.
Mejia, Jesus, Brownsville.
Michel, William Leigh, San Antonio.
Miller, Larry T., Wichita Falls.
Milstead, Antonio, Harlingen.
Milton, Gary Andrew, Hartley.
Milus, Edward Lee, Fort Worth.
Mitchell, Michael Lang, Houston.
Molina, Gilberto Mendez, Harlingen.
Molpus, James Davis, Longview.
Montalvo, Sigifredo, Jr., San Benito.
Montemayor, Jose Sanchez, Cotton Center.
Moore, John Terry, Jr., Beaumont.
Moore, Walter Lee, Jr., Austin.
Moran, Joe Michael, West Columbia.
Moreno, David J., Austin.
Morris, Julius William, Jr., Houston.
Morton, William Howard, Houston.
Moser, Cecil Joe, Higgins.
Moslye, Irvin William, Madisonville.
Mouton, William Wayne, Groves.
Murphy, Michael Thomas, El Paso.
Najar, Alfred Saturn, Jr., Galveston.
Navarro, Armando Sanchez, San Antonio.
Neary, John Runyon, II, Odessa.
Neasbitt, Larry Douglas, Garland.
Neely, James Elgin, Abilene.
Nelson, Marshall Dayle, Austin.
Nevels, John Alton, Brazoria.
Nicolaisen, James Ellswort, Dallas.
Nix, Robert Michael, Daingerfield.
Northcutt, Danny Ray, Port Arthur.
Norton, Gerald Wayne, Dallas.
O'Hara, John Patrick, Galveston.
O'Toole, Gerald Arnold, San Antonio.
Ochoa, Lupe P., San Antonio.
Olivo, Ramiro Frolian, Eagle Pass.
Orem, Allen Wayne, Arcadia.
Orozco, Reynaldo Nava, Sinton.
Ortega, Helberto, San Antonio.
Ortiz, Lawrence, Jr., Houston.
Ortiz, Pedro Moreno, Stafford.
Osborn, Jack William, Plainview.
Pack, Willard Orval, Alice.
Pagan, Gary Don, Ozona.
Page, Edgar De Witt, Pasadena.
Palmer, Jesse James, Houston.
Parham, James Wayne, El Paso.
Parker, David Allen, San Angelo.
Parr, Michael Grambling, Fort Worth.
Paterson, Gordon Lee, Odessa.
Pena, Daniel, Jr., Baytown.
Perdue, George Edward, Victoria.
Perea, Ernesto Salvador, Pecos.
Perez, Adolfo Moreno, Corpus Christi.
Perez, Alberto L., San Benito.
Perry, Willard Alton, Jr., Brownwood.
Pfeuffer, Michael Lawrence, San Antonio.
Phears, Ronald Gene, Liberty.
Philibert, Brian Hardman, Fort Worth.
Platt, Wayne B., Borger.
Poling, John Earl, El Paso.
Pope, Robert Dale, Coleman.
Powers, Edward Doyle, Houston.
Proctor, George Richard, Hondo.
Pryor, Melvin, Sr., Dallas.
Pullen, Robert Dale, Pampa.
Pyle, Charles Richard, Collieville.
Rainer, Curtis Hall, Fort Worth.
Ramirez, Jose Heriberto, El Paso.
Ramirez, Ramiro Rios, San Antonio.
Ramon, Aurelio R., Jr., Edroy.
Reeder, Philip Dallam, Beaumont.
Reeves, Harold Ray, Mercedes.
Reeves, Harold Ray, Odessa.
Reyes, Jose Angel, Cotton Center.
Rice, Virgil Ray, Austin.
Rickels, David Lee, Breckenridge.
Rios, Roberto Pena, San Angelo.
Rivers, Michael Ross, Kennedale.
Roberson, Robert Sidney, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Roberts, John Clyde, Lampasas.
Robinson, Robert Douglas, Houston.
Rocha, Raymond Gonzalez, Houston.
Rocha, Rudolfo Leonard, Jr., Dallas.
Rodriguez, Casimiro, Jr., Bloomington.
Roe, Donald Jay, Sherman.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Rogers, William Louis, San Antonio.
Rolf, Tommie Allen, El Campo.
Rollins, William Paul, Snyder.
Romero, Ronald M., Yoakum.
Ross, Gene Autry, Dallas.
Roush, William Wakefield, Houston.
Rowell, Keith William, Amarillo.
Rucker, Kenneth Ray, Denver City.
Ruiz, Felix Alvardo, San Antonio.
Rushing, William Lendell, Austin.
Russell, John Ernest, Corpus Christi.
Ruvalcaba-Lopez, Miguel An, Brownsville.
Sadler, Howard, Jr., Valley Mills.
Saffell, Ronald Cory, Odessa.
Saldivar, Jose Angel, El Paso.
Salinas, Ramiro Lopez, Houston.
Sanchez, Pablo Demeo, Taft.
Sanchez, Reynaldo Ayala, Big Spring.
Sanchez, Robert Huerta, San Antonio.
Santiago, Timoteo Munoz, Jr., San Benito.
Scherer, James Lee, Victoria.
Schilling, George Don, Houston.
Seymoe, Joseph Phillip, Waco.
Shelton, Darwin Hugh, Houston.
Shelton, Sherrell Vance, Keene.
Shepard, Ronald Wayne, Amarillo.
Simpson, Loyde Harold, Corpus Christi.
Sims, William A., Fort Worth.
Singleton, Thomas Arnold, Tyler.
Slay, Ronnie Glynn, Houston.
Sloan, Larry Eugene, Houston.
Smith, Curtis Oran, Jr., Gilmer.
Smith, James Warren, Houston.
Smith, Jerry Walton, Orange.
Smith, Joseph Ewing, Corsicana.
Smith, Thomas King, Fort Worth.
Smith, William Edward, Rusk.
Snitko, Joe Anthony, Austin.
Solis, Extrumberto, Elsa.
Soliz, George, Kenedy.
Soliz, Julian, Victoria.
Sosa, George Ramiro, McAllen.
Spangler, George Owen, Baytown.
Spangler, Max Ray, Dallas.
Spearmon, J. B., Conroe.
Spencer, Floyd Brown, Jr., Killeen.
Springer, Robert L., Waco.
Stafford, Fred Patrick, Beaumont.
Standefer, James Glenn, Colorado City.
Stanley, Bobby Dwayne, Dalhart.
Stephens, Ben Wesley, Fort Worth.
Stewart, Morgan Eugene, De Leon.
Stocker, Daniel Leo, Canyon.
Strain, James Paul, Moran.
Strauss, Klaus Josef, Fort Worth.
Stride, James Daniel, Jr., Denison.
Sullinger, Wilton James, Jr., Aransas Pass.
Summers, Ronald Lee, Lytle.
Swinnea, Thomas Henry, Beeville.
Symank, Tommie Lee, Gatesville.
Taboada, Frank Olivares, San Antonio.
Tajchman, Adolph William, Fort Bend.
Tameyoza, Noe, Baytown.
Tanner, Raymond Marshall, Lubbock.
Tarin, Edward James, Elmendorf.
Terronez, Domingo Mendoza, Rio Vista.
Thackrey, Wade E., Jr., Lubbock.
Thomas, Earl William, Jr., Houston.
Thomas, Elmer Wayne, Odessa.
Thomas, Julius, Bastrop.
Thompson, John Michael, Grand Prairie.
Thompson, Peter Garland, Orange.
Thompson, Willie Ray, San Antonio.
Thorn, Clifton Cardell, Houston.
Tidwell, Donny Gay, Diana.
Tijerina, Arthur Castillo, Hereford.
Titus, Toussaint Leo, Fairfield.
Toney, Willie Lee, Dallas.
Torres, Reynaldo Lerma, Jr., Laredo.
Trevino, Carlos V., McAllen.
Trevino, Faustino, Corpus Christi.
Triggs, Waymon Leon, Houston.
Trollinger, Jimmy Michael, Port Lavaca.
Tucker, Bobby Dan, Fort Worth.
Turk, Joseph Michael, Tyler.
Turner, Johnny Charles, Arlington.
Turner, Otis, Mt. Pleasant.
Tyler, Larry Jerome, Galveston.
Tyler, Mitchel Ray, Silsbee.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Tyson, Larry Preston, Houston.
Valandingham, Everett Jose, Dallas.
Vandevender, Jerry Wayne, Fort Worth.
Vasquez, Rodolfo Arturo, El Paso.
Veara, John Vincent, El Paso.
Vela, Vitalio, Jr., Falfurrias.
Vera, Abelardo, Brownsville.
Villafranco, Rodolfo, San Benito.
Voss, Ralph, Dallas.
Vrba, James Mathew, Jr., Houston.
Walker, Robert Harvey, Spur.
Walker, Tommy Dale, Swenson.
Walley, Terry Clinton, El Paso.
Warr, James Milton, Pleasanton.
Washington, James B., Houston.
Watkins, Gary Winston, Blooming Grove.
Watson, Gary Eugene, Midland.
Watt, William Roy, Sweetwater.
Watts, Afton M., Austin.
Watts, William E., Ft. Worth.
Waugh, Marion Edward, Marshall.
Weatherford, John Michael, Mesquite.
Webster, James Robert, Jr., Vernon.
Webster, Michael Warren, Beaumont.
Wells, David Claud, Carthage.
Wells, Russell Lee, Jr., El Paso.
Wesley, Robert Earl, Borger.
Wesolick, Harold James, Jr., Richards.
Wheless, Jimmy Ray, San Angelo.
Whetsel, Jack Allen, Jr., McAllen.
White, Barney Joe, Ft. Worth.
White, Jerry Morgan, Bonham.
Whitehouse, Gregory Kent, Abilene.
Whittlesey, Roy Lee, Houston.
Wickersham, Harry W., Jr., Kingsville.
Wilkinson, Billie Weldon, Comanche.
Williams, Augustus Louis, George West.
Williams, Bobby Ray, Spearman.
Williams, Gerald Dan, Corpus Christi.
Williams, Herbert, Marshall.
Williams, Howard C., Jr., Corpus Christi.
Williams, Rayfield, Dallas.
Willis, Hiney, Houston.
Willson, Loyd Meredith, Dallas.
Winfield, George Edward, Terrell.
Wood, James Wilburn, Lavernia.
Wood, Lester Lee, Dallas.
Wood, Ronald William, El Paso.
Wooten, Philip Milton, Bogata.
Worthington, Edward Llewel, El Paso.
Wright, Robert Joseph, Lubbock.
Wyatt, Everett Albert, Jr., Temple.
Yarbrough, Billy Edward, Plainview.
York, Emmett Lee, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Young, Marvin Rex, Odessa.
Zamora, Arturo S., Mathis.
Zanca, Peter Allen, San Antonio.

Air Force

Baker, Kenneth Earl, Jr., La Porte.
Garcia, Eduardo, Jr., San Antonio.
Hasdorff, Denton Joseph, San Antonio.
Hebron, Charles Edward, Bryan.
Rucker, Emmett, Jr., Wichita Falls.
Santos, Jose Carlos, Brownsville.
Tomchesson, Teddy James, Marlin.
Wester, Albert Dwayne, Terrell.

Marine Corps

Aaron, Michael Peter, Irving.
Acton, Tom Perry, Bedford.
Adames, Santiago D., Jr., Victoria.
Adams, Roscoe David, Longview.
Aguilar, Arnold, Austin.
Alaniz, Paul Gilbert, Jr., Corpus Christi.
Alford, George Allen, Jr., Alvin.
Allen, Donald Ray, San Benito.
Allen, Eddie Hugh, Waxahachie.
Amador, Severiano, Corpus Christi.
Anderson, Johnny Mac, Amarillo.
Ashmore, Laurence Ray, Houston.
Austin, Riley Clayton, Houston.
Averitte, William Clayton, Dallas.
Avila, Rafiel, Victoria.
Awalt, Jimmy Ardell, Plainview.
Ayala, Tony John, Port Arthur.
Baker, Allen James, Houston.
Bankston, Arnold Neil, Kaufman.
Barger, Phillip Dennis, Dallas.
Barton, James Wesley, Liberty.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Battle, Joseph Chriss, Houston.
Bejarano, Adolfo Martinez, Port Isabel.
Bell, Michael Dean, Beaumont.
Benge, Larry Wayne, Houston.
Bergen, James Thomas, III, Austin.
Berger, Dixie Carl, Arcola.
Bernal, Enrique Munoz, San Antonio.
Bialock, Gherald Edward, Houston.
Bolton, Billy Carroll, Victoria.
Boney, William, Dallas.
Bowen, Billy Roy, Bonham.
Branning, Wilbur Ralph, Jr., Denison.
Brewer, Thomas Neal, Gainesville.
Brown, Curtis Charles, Dallas.
Brown, John Charles, Dallas.
Bryan, Charles William, McKinney.
Burge, Ben Carlos, Houston.
Burgess, Russell David, Fort Worth.
Burleson, Michael Finnie, Waxahachie.
Camarillo, Fernando, Jr., San Antonio.
Cardenas, Rudy, San Antonio.
Carranza, Horacio, San Antonio.
Carson, Alan Dale, Richardson.
Carson, John Harvey, San Antonio.
Cassell, Kevin Ray, Dallas.
Caudillo, Pedro Jaime, Laredo.
Chambers, Lester Eugene, Dallas.
Chenault, Robert Glen, Austin.
Cisneros, Roy, San Antonio.
Clarke, James Phillip, Premont.
Cleveland, Walter K., Dallas.
Cole, Claude, Jr., Galveston.
Colgan, Daniel Paul, El Paso.
Combs, Lowell Thomas, San Ontonio.
Cooper, Otis, Jr., Kirbyville.
Copeland, Joe Mikel, Conroe.
Cores, Thomas Richard, II, Del Rio.
Corrales, Richard Mendoza, Richmond.
Courtney, Allen Wesley, Jr., Houston.
Coy, Dwight Clifford, Jr., San Antonio.
Crary, David Wayne, Hooks.
Craven, James Everett, III, Austin.
Crockett, Charles D., Jr., New Braunfels.
Dailey, Harold Carl, II, Austin.
Davila, Jose, Chapman Ranch.
Deluna, Manuel, Jr., Needville.
Desselle, Thomas William, San Antonio.
Dewlen, Michael Lee, Amarillo.
Dodd, Lawrence Addinson, El Paso.
Dominguez, Carlos, El Paso.
Dominguez, Joe Reini, Sanger.
Dorries, Carl Wayne, Irving.
Dunes, Alberto, Jr., Brownsville.
Dunn, Joe Daniel, Weslaco.
Dusbabek, Glenn Henry, Waco.
Dwyer, Alfred Thomas, El Paso.
Espinoza, Martin, San Antonio.
Espinoza, Victoriano, Jr., Edinburg.
Estes, Edward Stanley, Dallas.
Fain, Gary Lee, Houston.
Ferguson, Thomas Wayne, Wills Point.
France, Richard Wayne, Fort Worth.
Frausto, Nolberto, Jr., Del Rio.
Fraze, Jerry Wayne, Dallas.
Galbreath, Bobby Frank, Amarillo.
Gallow, Ryan Jude, Beaumont.
Garcia, Jesse Eulojio, Martindale.
Garcia, Jose Gilberto, San Antonio.
Garcia, Pedro Gallardo, Harlingen.
Garcia, Richard, San Antonio.
Garcia, Salvador Borrego, El Paso.
Gard, Danny D., Ballinger.
Garza, Carl Edward, Refugio.
Gibbs, Jerry Don, Gainesville.
Gibson, Roy Lee, Dallas.
Glaze, Jerry Wayne, Dallas.
Goble, Patrick Michael, Burnet.
Gomez, Basilio, San Antonio.
Gonzales, Tomas, Beeville.
Gonzalez, Alfredo; Edinburg.
Gonzalez, Hector Manuel, Premont.
Gray, Michael Douglas, Temple.
Gray, Ruzell, Crockett.
Greene, Billy Ray, Fort Worth.
Griffin, Douglas Holtz, Coleman.
Hale Terrell William, Abilene.
Hale, William Thomas, Big Spring.
Hall, Charles William, Jr., Fort Worth.
Halt, Ardon, Houston.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Hammons, James Luther, Corpus Christi.
Haney, Perry Eugene, Galveston.
Harrell, James Randolph, Houston.
Harris, Eddie Clayton, Lufkin.
Harrott, Richard Leonard, Dallas.
Hawkins, Philip, III, Houston.
Hebert, Rodger Dale, Port Arthur.
Henderson, David B., Jr., Italy.
Hernandez, Antonio, San Benito.
Hernandez, Antonio Benavid, Abilene.
Hernandez, Robert, Round Rock.
Hernandez, Rolando, Corpus Christi.
Herrera, Felipe, San Antonio.
Hillin, Douglas Wayne, Houston.
Hinz, David Lee, Fort Worth.
Hodges, Homer Lee, Jr., Mineral Wells.
Hodges, Wesley Eugene, Lufkin.
Hopkins, Gary Wayne, South Houston.
Howell, Dwight Sanford, Seymour.
Hudson, Kenneth Wayne, Houston.
Hurst, John Clark, Lufkin.
Hutchings, Steven Wylie, Dallas.
Hyland, Paul Edward, Dallas.
Jackson, James Herman, San Antonio.
Jackson, Johnnie Bruce, Fort Worth.
Jasso, Martin, Houston.
Jimenez, Thomas Ortega, Jr., San Antonio.
Johnson, Donald Vern, Dallas.
Jones, Kenneth Ray, Waco.
Jones, Sam, Marshall.
Juarez, Oscar Reina, San Angelo.
Jurado, Ramon, El Paso.
Kalka, Charles Clinton, Bandera.
Kaplon, Phillip Felix, Jr., Houston.
Kimling, Miles Wayne, Galveston.
King, Carson Milo, Alvin.
Kinsey, Michael Christophe, Star.
Kissling, Benjamin Kaon, Dallas.
Kittrell, Larry Don, Highlands.
La Bonte, Gary Lee, Mesquite.
Lee, Charles Edwin, Dallas.
Lee, Ronald Paul, Dallas.
Lee, William Allen, Austin.
Leos, Narcisco, Jr., San Antonio.
Lewis, Stephen Herman, Houston.
Lindsey, William Royal, Channelview.
Lopez, Richard, San Marcos.
Love, Clarance Lee, Tyler.
Lusk, Sammy Ray, Houston.
Lyman, Alan Richard, Georgetown.
Manning, John Edward, Channelview.
Marquez, Eduardo, Jr., El Paso.
Marsh, William Clifton, Amarillo.
Marson, Rickey Joe, Pampa.
Martinez, Jorge, San Antonio.
Matocha, Donald John, Smithville.
May, Chester Howard, Fort Worth.
McClain, William David, Waco.
McClelland, Aubrey David, Dallas.
McCumber, Raymond, San Antonio.
McElroy, Ronald Lenear, Duncanville.
McKim, Edward Alton, Dallas.
McWright, Dale Stephen, Dallas.
Medley, Tommy Ray, Newton.
Mendez, Roberto, Corpus Christi.
Metcalf, Jimmy Allen, Dallas.
Mills, James Dale, Commerce.
Mills, Leonard Mark, Houston.
Minter, Wilbur Loving, Jr., Garland.
Monsebais, Lupe, Mathis.
Morris, Clenzell, Lufkin.
Mullins, James Michael, Dallas.
Murphy, Robert D., Jr., San Antonio.
Musick, Thomas Wayne, Orange.
Navarro, Daniel Leon, El Paso.
Neal, William Richard, Amarillo.
Nino, Amelio, Dimmitt.
Norman, Marion Henry, Houston.
O'Brien, Michael Mackie, Big Spring.
Orozco, Antonio, Muleshoe.
Ortiz, Marcelo, Jr., San Antonio.
Padilla, David Esequiel, Borger.
Palmo, Jimmie Charles, Dallas.
Palos, Erasmo, Eagle Pass.
Pegross, Leroy, Port Arthur.
Penland, Ray Lee, Jr., Seadrift.
Perez, Israel, Brownsville.
Perez, Jesus Ramon, Kingsville.

TEXAS—continued

Marine Corps

Perez, Rodolfo, Corpus Christi.
Perry, Elmer Joseph, Jr., Odessa.
Pierce, Joe, Jr., San Antonio.
Polk, Robert Louis, Sherman.
Powell, John Dee, Jr., Port Arthur.
Powell, Larry Keith, Fort Worth.
Powers, William James, Fort Worth.
Ralph, Thomas Henry, Jr., Clifton.
Ramos, Leonardo, Jr., San Antonio.
Ramsey, Bill Edward, Jr., Fort Worth.
Rector, Roy Jack, Whiteface.
Redford, James Robert, Fort Worth.
Reese, William Robert, Abilene.
Reyna, Samuel, Corpus Christi.
Richardson, Larry Eugene, Houston.
Ridgeway, Ronald Lewis, Houston.
Rivas, Arturo Brown, Dallas.
Rivera, Arnold Javier, El Paso.
Robledo, Jesus, Jr., San Antonio.
Rodgers, Larry Joe, Ranger.
Rodriguez, Domingo, Jr., Falfurrias.
Rodriguez, Pedro Juan, San Angelo.
Rodriguez, Pedro S., Jr., Waco.
Roe, John Elmer, Dallas.
Romero, Manuel Villareal, San Antonio.
Russaw, Preston Ivory, Diboll.
Ryan, Lionel Alvarez, Houston.
Ryan, Robert Dale, Houston.
Salazar, Elias, Jr., Harlingen.
Salazar, Rene Javier, Del Rio Val.
Salazar, Rudy Jessie, Fort Worth.
Sanchez, Alberto Vasquez, Uvalde.
Sanchez, Jose Guadalupe, Jr., San Antonio.
Sanchez, Juan Oscar, Harlingen.
Sanchez, Pedro, Jr., Dallas.
Scott, Paul, Port Arthur.
Scroggins, Carrey Eugene, Amarillo.
Shawn, Raymond Ben, Bryson.
Shelton, James Dallas, Wichita Falls.
Silva, Rito, Alice.
Simmons, Nolan Lester, Edinburg.
Simmons, Tom Willis, Jr., Trinity.
Simpson, Melvin Richard, Houston.
Sinegal, Larry James, Houston.
Sisson, Bennie Joe, Lufkin.
Smith, Douglas Wayne, Fort Worth.
Smith, Jerry Wayne, Fort Worth.
Sparks, Thomas James, Groves.
Spring, Homer Doyle, Buda.
Stall, William Robb, Midland.
Stavinoha, Robert James, La Grange.
Steinbach, Thomas Raymond, Texas City.
Stevenson, Charles Robert, Fate.
Stovall, James Tucker, Palestine.
Stratton, Sidney Taylor, Dallas.
Stroud, Roger Lee, Corpus Christi.
Stroud, Steven Arnold, Houston.
Swonke, Edward Antone, Jr., Houston.
Taylor, Ernest Vernon, Dallas.
Tellez, Daniel, Kingsville.
Terry, Allen Lee, Fort Worth.
Terry, Ronnie Lee, Tatum.
Thompson, Roger Allen, Palestine.
Trevino, Gregorio, Jr., Port Arthur.
Trumble, Darrell Lynn, Vidor.
Vansant, John Willard, Houston.
Vara, Paul Martinez, Houston.
Vasquez, Enrique, El Paso.
Vasquez, Jesus Roberto, El Paso.
Votaw, Marvin Lynn, Houston.
Wardlow, James Dillon, Belton.
Webb, William Matthew, Odessa.
West, Robert Lewis, Waco.
White, Charles Theron, Dallas.
Williams, Joe Buck, Dallas.
Willman, Gary Lynn, Dallas.
Wilson, Billy Wayne, Trenton.
Wood, Calvin Knight, Jr., Houston.
Wood, Leroy, Woodville.
Woodward, Richard Henry, El Paso.
Woolf, Alton Kenneth, Jr., Abilene.
Wright, Michael Vincent, Houston.
Ybarra, Ricardo, El Paso.

Navy

Ball, Arthur Wyman, DeKalb.
Barron, Robert Bruce, Fort Worth.
Burns, Michael Allen, Amarillo.
Carman, Robert Leon. Monahans.
Claiborne, Dell Ross, Seminole.

TEXAS—continued

Navy

Cook, Kenneth Lynn, Paradise.
Crone, Carl Richard, Orange.
Delgado, Christopher Georg, San Antonio.
Durham, Oliver Earl, Honey Grove.
Everett, Everett White, Olden.
Hand, Frank Edward, III, Fort Worth.
Lehman, David Johan, III, Dallas.
Miller, Herman A., II, Irving.
Moore, Amon Franklin, Jr., Palestine.
Mueting, Michael Joseph, Amarillo.
Plemmons, Robert Colquitt, Huntsville.
Samford, Jesse Leroy, Purto Connor.
Schmittou, Eureka Lavern, Ringgold.
Teague, Michael Autrey, Brownwood.
Tinnin, Eugene Sanford, Austin.
Tyszkiewicz, Arthur Kasimi, Amarillo.
Williams, James Wesley, Dallas.
Wilson, Wilmer Dwayne, Sweetwater.
Windham, Melvin George, El Paso.
Winingham, Jerry Lynn, Bowie.

UTAH

Army

Aldous, Lilo Elmer, Ogden.
Angell, Vaughn Marvin, Salt Lake City.
Archuleta, Rodolfo Jose, Clinton.
Barbury, John, Salt Lake City.
Belew, Greg Blaine, Brigham City.
Bigham, Theodore Lewis, Salt Lake City.
Bond, Lawrence Frederick, Ogden.
Burr, George Wallace, Koosharem.
Christensen, Dick Hooten, Moab.
Cox, Gerald Wayne, Jr., Salt Lake City.
Crowley, Robert Edward, Ogden.
Dockstader, Randell L., Kanarraville.
Dudley, Donald Kieth, Joseph.
Eckman, Kenneth Wayne, Layton.
Economous, George J., Jr., Logan.
Ferguson, Aaron Floyd, Provo.
Fowlke, Earnest Wesley, Pleasant Grove.
Glines, Allen Bruce, Layton.
Hall, Gary Dodds, Vernal.
Hill, Richard Allen, Springville.
Jenkins, Ray G., Logan.
Jenne, Robert Earl, Salt Lake City.
Johnson, William Wayne, Bicknell.
Jones, Ronald, Salt Lake City.
Keown, Blair Logan, Murray.
Krek, Philip James, Jr., Bountiful.
Lacey, Frank Jay, Coalville.
McNeil, Allen W., Kamas.
Munson, Chris Delano, Tropic.
Nicholes, Harold James, Salt Lake City.
Nick, Otis Lee, Myton.
Noble, Richard Edwin, Smithfield.
Parker, Paul Elmer, Salt Lake City.
Peck, Joe Russell, Salt Lake City.
Perry, Steven J., Salt Lake City.
Pinsonault, Fred John, Roy.
Pool, Gary Glen, Provo.
Rasmussen, David Nilsson, Pleasant Grove.
Rogan, James Paul, Salt Lake City.
Rose, Danny Lee, Sandy.
Saunders, Randall Leroy, Logan.
Schofield, Thomas Harvey, Layton.
Searle, Joseph Kent, Park City.
Shepherd, Blaine Joseph, Thistle.
Snow, Kellynn Val, Salt Lake City.
Sorensen, Richard Lee, Eureka.
Steiner, Mark Steven, Ogden.
Sundquist, Jack Donald, Salt Lake City.
Sutphen, Jack B., Salt Lake City.
Vogrinec, Joseph Gary, Ogden.
Volz, Roger Wayne, Salt Lake City.
Ward, Terry J., Salt Lake City.
Watkins, Samuel Eugene, Tooele.
Webster, Francis Marion, Salt Lake City.
Widdison, Imlay Scott, Woods Cross.
Williams, Douglas Candit, Salt Lake City.
Wolterman, Gerard Theodore, Salt Lake City.
Yardley, Rodney Birdell, Clearfield.

Air Force

Woods, Robert Francis, Salt Lake City.

Marine Corps

Andrus, Daniel Francis, Riverton.
Bugger, Curtis Burke, Kearns.
Clayton, Michael Marshall, Kearns.

UTAH—continued

Marine Corps

Cobbley, Earl William, Jr., Salt Lake City.
Coles, Kyle J., Salt Lake City,
Cuch, Wilbert Wayne, Springville.
Dalton, Bill Norman, Kearns.
Day, Terry Buckles, Bountiful.
Dunyon, David Pherral, Ogden.
Foster, Gary Neil, Orem.
Goss, Jeffery Alan, Orem.
Green, Laurence Burton, St. George.
Horspool, Robert Kent, Ogden.
Lawrence, Michael D., Granger.
Mathias, Randy Lee, Bountiful.
McCoy, Dennis Ray, Moab.
McFarlane, John William, Salt Lake City.
Oveson, James Raymond, Elmo.
Pennington, John Charles, Roy.
Rogerson, Garry Earl, Eden.
Salter, Scott Bruce, Magna.
Spensko, Louis Paul, Helper.
Thornton, Larry Lee, Spanish Fork.
Thorpe, Gary Wilford, Bear River City.
Tueller, James Albert, Midvale.
Vanstaveren, Theodore Dan, Salt Lake City.
Ward, Brent F., Ogden.
Welch, Blaine Alfred, Heber.
Williams, Gregory J., Kaysville.
Williamson, Don Claude, Salt Lake City.

Navy

Luke, Steve Ralph, Provo.
Mair, Allan Leon, Park City.
Martin, James Edward, Salt Lake City.
Miller, Jerry Lee, Eden.
Roland, Thomas Milton, Salt Lake City.
Thornton, John Bruce, Salt Lake City.
Wallace, Michael Walter, Salt Lake City.

VERMONT

Army

Badger, Bruce Lyle, Danville.
Dartt, Paul Richard, Brattleboro.
Frappiea, Fred Charles, Jr., Saxtons River.
Gaboriault, Sanford Rene, Franklin.
Germain, Philip Michael, Winooski.
Gomez, Gelasio Nicanor, Jr., Lower Graniteville.
Greene, Philip F., Poultney.
Jordan, Roger Francis, Milton.
Larocque, Leslie Howard, Brookfield.
McKenzie, Edward Austin, Burlington.
Morse, Durward Glennie, Newport.
Orvis, Douglas Gordon, Bristol.
Sheldon, Edward Clarence, Milton.
Shompany, Ernest Von, Newport.
Smith, Harold Roger, Winooski.
Stone, Robert Douglas, Salisbury.
Treadwell, Eugene Durwood, Essex Center.
Ulmer, Jan Alan, Brattleboro.

Marine Corps

Fish, Joseph Kenneth, Rutland.
Hall, Gary Albert, Cuttingsville.
Henry, Edward Douglas, North Clarendon.
Hill, Gary Paul, Vergennes.
Morrison, Bruce Austin, Proctor.
Russell, John Malcolm, Jr., South Burlington.
Sweeney, John Edward, East Poultney.
Washington, Louis Weldon, Burlington.

VIRGINIA

Army

Alley, Lonnie Douglas, Martinsville.
Alphin, Talmadge Horton, Jr., Williamsburg.
Angle, Peter Jason, Arlington.
Ash, Edward Garland, Jr., Portsmouth.
Bahr, Richard Duncan, Newport News.
Bandy, Raymond Douglas, Bandy.
Banks, Sterling Clark, Newport News.
Barbour, James C., Jr., Richmond.
Biggerstaff, Henry Charles, Norfolk.
Bitner, Danny Lee, Richmond.
Blatz, Russell Keith, Lynchburg.
Bobbitt, William Eskridge, Norfolk.
Bowman, Joseph B., Roanoke.
Bowman, Roger Dale, Ararat.
Brooks, James Lloyd, Chatham.
Brooks, Lonnie Allan, Bassett.

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Brooks, Terry Hudgins, Mathews.
Brown, Charles William, Jr., Hampton.
Brown, David Carlton, Fort Monroe.
Brown, Elmer William, Norfolk.
Brown, Ronald Lee, Portsmouth.
Brubaker, Norman Curtis, Luray.
Bunting, Bertram Arnold, Norfolk.
Cain, Lewis Rodney, Kilmarnock.
Campbell, Frank Willis, Jr., Chilhowie.
Carr, James William, Nathalie.
Chaney, Arthur Fletcher, Vienna.
Chaney, David Lee, Hopewell.
Clarke, William Mosby, Jr., Norfolk.
Clayton, George Milton, Jr., Hampton.
Conley, Alex Boyd, Hampton.
Conway, Raymond Lester, Alexandria.
Cooke, Charles Thomas, Covington.
Cooke, Douglas Rudolph, Newport News.
Cooke, Ernest Frissell, Jr., Hampton.
Cosby, David Franklin, Richmond.
Cox, George Jose, Abingdon.
Creech, Robert, Jr., Norfolk.
Cressel, Terry Walker, Arlington.
Critzer, Ronal Edward, Schuyler.
Crockett, Freddie Isiash, Hopewell.
Cupp, Robert William, Alexandria.
Curtis, Henry Thomas, II, Culpeper.
Dameron, Robert Woodrow, Buena Vista.
Daniel, Charles Lincoln, Nelson.
Davidson, John Clark, Penhook.
Davis, Clifton Henry, Danville.
Davis, George Nathan, Bedford.
Davis, Hugh Mozell, Portamith.
De Luca, Raymond Paul, Williamsburg.
De Priest, David Wayne, Lynchburg.
Deverall, George Noble, Arlington.
Dillman, Roger L., Marion.
Dixon, John Henry, Chesapeake.
Doering, Lloyd Douglas, Roanoke.
Donnell, Peter Francis, Falls Church.
Dunn, Morris Gordon, Mecklenburg County.
Easley, Samuel Harrison, II, Bassett.
Eighmie, Ronald William, Norfolk.
Elliot, Charles Henry, Jr., Alexandria.
Embrey, David Norman, Rockfish.
Epps, Cecil Wayne, Halifax.
Farrow, Frankie Lee, Danville.
Fields, Willie, Jr., Richmond.
Fox, Thomas Amiss, Richmond.
Fulcher, Douglas Edward, Tacoma.
Furrow, Sherman Alvin Jr., Rocky Mount.
Gay, Albert Lummis, Jr., Hampton.
Gee, MacArthur G., Charlotte Court House.
Gerald, George Aden, Portsmouth.
Goodman, Edward Lee, Virginia Beach.
Goodman, Rayman Lee, Lynchburg.
Goss, Warren Judge, Norfolk.
Hale, Charles Chaplin, Jr., Williamsburg.
Hareford, Basil Lee, Elkton.
Harrison, Douglas Lee, Roanoke.
Hatcher, Larry Davis, Martinsville.
Hawthorne, James Lynwood, Fredericksburg.
Hayden, Harold Richard, Glade Spring.
Hayden, Troy Ray, Saltville.
Hayes, Thomas Jay, IV, Arlington.
Herndon, Donald Lee, Danville.
Herring, Boyd Lemuel, Hampton.
Hershberger, David Harper, Virginia Beach.
Hicks, Dan Sellman, Williamsburg.
Holdaway, Guy, Herdon.
Houston, Elwood Layton, Lynchburg.
Howard, Harley Michael, Arlington.
Huff, Paul Lloyd, Pilot.
Huggett, Richard Thomas, Poquoson.
Isler, Charles C. Jr., Norfolk.
Jarrett, Steven Andrew, Newport News.
Jenkins, John Allen, III, McLean.
Johnson, Alvin Samuel, Hampton.
Johnson, David Curtis, Tannersville.
Johnson, Jerry Hampton, Hampton.
Johnson, Samuel, Jr., Pennington Gap.
Kellas, Robert Louis, Arlington.
Kidwell, Wayne Minor, Herndon.
King, James Edward, Alexandria.
Knack, Richard Carl, Virginia Beach.
Lamb, William Lloyd, Hampton.
Lamkin, Lewis Dean, Collinsville.

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Langford, Lewis Nelson, Crouch.
Lawhorne, Donnie Jackson, Amherst.
Lee, Daniel L., Norfolk.
Lee, William Robert, Virginia Beach.
Lenchner, David Allen, Newport News.
Levendis, William McNamara, Vienna.
Lewis, Fletcher Leon, Danville.
Long, Norman Lacy, Jr., Roanoke.
Lovell, Lewis Randolph, Jr., Martinsville.
Lowe, Roy Dallas, Jr., Charlotte Court House.
Lowery, Clem Spencer, Jr., Chesapeake City.
Ludwig, Michael Eugene, Alexandria.
Manuel, Francis Everett, Bluemount.
Martin, Alphonso, Martinsville.
Martin, Floyd Newton, Fairfield.
Martin, Linwood Dwight, Bassett.
Martin, Paul Rivers, Pearisburg.
McKibbin, Hugh R., Jr., Arlington.
McKinney, David Lee, Richmond.
Meiggs, Richard Ray, Hampton.
Meisinger, Jerold Werner, Norfolk.
Mickles, Charles Edward, Norton.
Miller, Curtis O'Neil, Monroe.
Miller, John Edward, Arlington.
Mills, Graham Lonnie, Portsmouth.
Mitchem, Charles Clifford, Quantico.
Monaghan, John Joseph, Jr., Mechanicsville.
Moore, Larry Richard, Hampton.
Moore, William Clarence, Independence.
Mull, Gerald Crawford, Vienna.
Mundy, George Linwood, Jr., Richmond.
Nance, Elmer Mason, Moneta.
O'Kusky, Henry Joseph, Jr., Craddockville.
Oliver, Thomas Tucker, Bedford.
Oscar, Cecil Thomas, Grottoes.
Painter, David Oliver, Norfolk.
Parker, Earl Ephraim, Portsmouth.
Parker, Lonnie Thomas, Thaxton.
Patton, Curtis Ray, Eastville.
Peele, Lloyd William, Jr., Portsmouth.
Pennington, Philip Eugene, Front Royal.
Pipes, James Lee, Jr., Richmond.
Pledger, Donald Allen, Norfolk.
Quinn, Stephen Wayne, Virginia Beach.
Reid, Ralph Henry, Belle Haven.
Richardson, Harry F., Jr., Alexandria.
Rudd, James Wallace, Halifax.
Scarborough, Edmund Bagwel, Belle Haven.
Sexton, Carl Howard, Jr., Damascus.
Shaw, Charles E., Abingdon.
Signett, James Guerdon, Chesapeake.
Singleton, James Perry, Abingdon.
Smith, Arthur Burman, Riner.
Snead, Leonard Harrison, Jr., Abington.
Sparks, Ronald David, Rich Creek.
Spencer, Edward Odell, Culpeper.
Stallard, Giles Warren, Saltville.
Stanley, Dennis Ralph, Clintwood.
Stanley, Thomas Lee, Culpeper.
Starkey, Lloyd Martain, Hardy.
Strauss, Robert Stephan, Portsmouth.
Strickler, David Francis, Falls Church.
Stuller, John Charles, Falls Church.
Sutton, George Stanley, West Chesapeake.
Sweet, Donn Lafayette, Roanoke.
Tarpley, William Junior, Callands.
Taylor, Joseph Gordon, Shumansville.
Thornhill, John R., III, Roanoke.
Tisdale, Donald Wayne, Nathalie.
Tolley, Lee G., Arlington.
Tynes, Reginald Bernard, Norfolk.
Umholtz, Darrell Raymond, Falls Church.
Van Deusen, Frederick Fren, Blacksburg.
Velvet, Walter C., Jr., Waverly.
Wade, Thomas Lee, New River.
Washington, Thomas Melvin, Newport News.
Webb, Frank Wright, Kenbridge.
Whitbeck, Robert Earl, Alexandria.
White, David Lee, Danville.
Whitehead, Morris Alfred, Martinsville.
Whitlow, Leroy Allen, Charlotte Court House.
Willard, Leon David, Christiansburg.
Williams, Walter Joseph, Jr., Appalachia.
Wilson, George L., Portsmouth.

VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Wood, James C., Lynchburg.
Wright, Grover C., Jr., Doran.
Wright, James Ambler, Manassas.

Air Force

Buchanan, Joseph William, Broadford.
Hayes, Willard Fayette, Bandy.
Swann, James Cecil, Newport News.

Marine Corps

Allen, Charles Ervin, Newport News.
Blevins, Ronald Wayne, Damascus.
Bordeaux, James Preston, Jr., Norfolk.
Burkhead, Jerry Clark, Lee Mont.
Charles, Michael Lane, Bristol.
Clarke, Lee Tilson, Richmond.
Cobb, Paul Frederick, Roanoke.
Connor, Glenn Marshall, Danville.
Cooper, James William, Nansemond.
Cox, Elbert Elisah, Jr., Chesapeake.
Crickenberger, Richard Way, Lynchburg.
Crigger, Henry Gleaves, Abingdon.
Daniels, Edward Earl, Bedford.
Davidson, John Wayne, Lynchburg.
Diggs, Michael Ronell, Newport News.
Dishman, Douglas Edward, Dante.
Draper, William Lloyd, Hopewell.
Eller, John Arthur, Norfolk.
Elliott, George L., III, Norfolk.
Farmer, James Bryon, Bristol.
Farris, Blake Wiley, Jr., Saltville.
Fleming, Thomas Ryan, Arlington.
Fort, Jerome, Norfolk.
Fox, Richard W. B., Jr., Richmond.
Garber, Charles William, Jr., New Hope.
Gibson, Carl Reed, Radford.
Gibson, Cornell Harrison, Portsmouth.
Gills, Lewis Clarence, Hampton.
Goff, Henry Larry, Chesapeake.
Grajewski, Jerry Francis, Richmond.
Hall, Blucher Ray, Arlington.
Hall, Robert Edward, Lynchburg.
Harrell, John Rehill, Richmond.
Harris, Charles Edward, Norfolk.
Higgs, Ralph Edward, Portsmouth.
Hittinger, Francis R., Jr., Ocean View.
Holland, Robert Vernon, Martinsville.
Hollar, Howard Eslie, Charlottesville.
Hunt, William Spraggins, Danville.
Jenkins, Vincent Earl, Portsmouth.
Jeter, Benton Arthur, Newport News.
Johnson, Charles Eugene, Richmond.
Johnson, John Victor, Jr., Norfolk.
Jones, Roger Kenneth, Hampton.
Keegan, Richard Michael, Norfolk.
Kidd, Melton Lavone, Chesapeake.
Kizzie, Leon Edward, Richmond.
Koehler, William Edwin, Newport News.
Lawson, Raymond Christophe, Virgilina.
Lipscomb, David Lee, Richmond.
Lodford, Henry Alverson, Alexandria.
Lucas, Robert Eugene, Oak Grove.
Lunsford, Glen Thomas, Danville.
Mabe, Carl Marion, Pembroke.
MacLeod, Sidney B., Jr., McLean.
Madison, Richard Carl, Richmond.
Mahone, Haywood, Jr., Richmond.
Marshall, Roland Trent, Richmond.
Martin, Gary Alan, Roanoke.
Martin, Harry Pemberton, Martinsville.
Massengill, Larry Dale, Chesapeake.
McDorman, Darl Kenneth, Lyndhurst.
Miles, James Edward, Richmond.
Millner, Charles Hewett, Roanoke.
Moore, David Ned, Woodbridge.
Morris, Ronald Edwards, Sandston.
Murchison, James Emanuel, Newport News.
Owen, Larry James, Danville.
Owens, Larrington, Palmyra.
Pangle, William Medford, Harrisonburg.
Pepper, Anthony John, Richmond.
Phipps, Norman Ira, Haysi.
Pinter, William James, Bellamy.
Powell, Donald Keith, Winchester.
Powell, Joseph Lewis, Jr., Alexandria.
Prostell, Richard Louis, Chesapeake.
Randolph, Howard Edward, Richmond.
Rash, Donald Ray, Pocahontas.
Richards, Thomas Joseph, Jr., Staunton.
Robinson, Donald Rayford, Chesapeake.

VIRGINIA—continued

Marine Corps

Rumble, Jon MacGillivray, Fairfax.
Shields, Martin Dean, Chesapeake.
Smith, Donald Lee, Ino.
Smith, Thurman Horace, Chesapeake.
Smith, William Prosper, Jr., Norfolk.
Staples, Louis Franklin, Chesapeake.
Taft, Philip Jeffrey, Fairfax.
Tully, Robert Edward, Arlington.
Valentine, William Martin, Quinton.
Warren, Thomas Wayne, Petersburg.
Washington, Ralph Levon, Portsmouth.
Waters, William Walter, Jr., Norfolk.
Wells, Kenneth Ray, Portsmouth.
Wells, Thomas Ralph, Petersburg.
West, James Edward, Jr., Norfolk.
White, Carroll, Eugene, Richmond.
Williams, Donald D., Jr., Richmond.
Williams, Roger Dale, Roanoke.
Wilson, Robert Lee, Jr., Norfolk.
Young, James Ray, Roanoke.

Navy

Craghead, Thomas James, Jr., Covington.
Dickerson, James Carol, Randolph.
Groshong, Allen Eberly, Newport News.
Wallace, Richard Courtney, Norfolk.
Wright, Russell L., III, Richmond.
Wyatt, Richard Coleman, Hampton.

WASHINGTON

Army

Aiton, Gerald David, Centralia.
Alakulppi, Vesa Juhani, Seattle.
Albanese, Luigi Frank, Seattle.
Arney, Randall Nave, Klickitat.
Atchley, Keith Noel, Woodland.
Barnhill, Glen Robert, Wilson Creek.
Bowden, James Edward, Spokane.
Boykin, Prentis Barney, Jr., Vancouver.
Brady, John James, Tacoma.
Brix, John Elmer, Seattle.
Brooks, Guy Franklin, Pasco.
Brutscher, Ronald Wayne, Walla Walla.
Burgeson, Vernon Walter, Tacoma.
Burke, Howard D., Seattle.
Burnette, Archie, Jr. Aberdeen.
Butler, Lionel, Sr., Tacoma.
Butler, Russel E., Yakima.
Campen, Gary Lynn, Washougal.
Carpenter, Raymond Earl, Amboy.
Carter, Alan Glen, Tacoma.
Charette, Mark Owen, Puyallup.
Christenson, Daniel Brian, Oroville.
Christian, Bruce Calvin, Snohomish.
Cleveland, James Arthur, Kirkland.
Coffroth, Alfred Patrick L., Seattle.
Cole, Phelon Herman, Tacoma.
Colfack, Lloyd Arthur, Sedro Woolley.
Collins, James Bruce, Walla Walla.
Combs, Paul Rex, Bellingham.
Cyr, Ransom Craig, Mercer Island.
Daily, David Christopher, Tacoma.
Damschen, Richard A., Jr., Bremerton.
Davison, Guy Allen, Everett.
De Graaf, Dick, Seattle.
Durham, Van Leslie, Seattle.
Dutro, Richard Thomas, Spokane.
Dyer, Bruce Herbert, Federal Way.
Elbert, Joe A., Lakebay.
Engebretson, Gary Lynn, Shelton.
Ferguson, James Allen, Seattle.
Fowler, Virgil James, Arlington.
Franck, Ralph Henry, Jr., Spokane.
Frank, Rodney Gale, Bellevue.
Franklin, Amos Lee, Seattle.
Fredricksen, Allan Marcus, Seattle.
Frink, Steven Arthur, Vancouver.
Frost, Michael Dennis, Mercer Island.
Fullaway, Lawrence Lee, Seattle.
Gillmer, Steven Martin, Tacoma.
Glasford, Michael Richard, Omak.
Glore, Stephen Leslie, Yakima.
Graves, Leonard Olsen, Seattle.
Greenwald, Ronald Albert, Mount Vernon.
Grunstad, Stanley Lloyd, Everett.
Hanneman, Michael Irvin, Spokane.
Hansen, Gerald Steven, Enumclaw.
Hansen, Stephen Michael, Seattle.
Haug, Earl Warren, Everett.
Hayden, Robert Allen, Bridgeport.

WASHINGTON—continued

Army

Heinecke, Ronald Mathias, Theresa.
Hence, William Washington, Tacoma.
Hensley, Wayne George, Prosser.
Hickox, Robert Davis, Seattle.
Hines, Leslie Edmund III, Spokane.
Hoggatt, John Andrew, Seattle.
Hogue, John Michael, Chehalis.
Holes, Jason Aireal, Moses Lake.
Holmes, Norman Ward, Cosmopolis.
Hoover, Alvin R., III, Redmond.
Huban, Michael Noel, Edmonds.
Huttula, Carl Richard, Elma.
Jackson, Robert Alan, Port Orchard.
James, Morris Keith, Lynnwood.
Johnson, Bradley James, Tacoma.
Johnson, Roy Marvin, Spokane.
Kearney, Robert Curt, Seattle.
Kimball, Pierce Mallory, Seattle.
Koitzsch, Ronald Norman, Camas.
Laipple, John Elden, Spokane.
Lambert, Dale Lee, Elmer City.
Lane, John Timothy, Brewster.
Lang, Dean Laverne, Everett.
Langworthy, James Scott, Clinton.
Larsen, Fredrick Ellis, Seattle.
Larson, Paul Noble, Everett.
Leuning, Vernon Lee, Yakima.
Likkel, Duane Allen, Everson.
Lochridge, Robert Eric, Olympia.
Lodheim, Norman Elliott, Forks.
Lopez, Robert, Seattle.
Lowe, Donald Everett, Tacoma.
Lynn, John Thomas, Kennewick.
MacCallum, Stephen Morley, Cashmere.
Mack, Gary Leigh, Olympia.
Malone, Lawrence Michael, Seattle.
Mannery, Richard Charles, Seattle.
Mansel, James David, Kirkland.
Mason, Charles Buckley, Spokane.
Mattson, Timothy George, Brush Prairie.
McClintock, James Richard, Port Orchard.
McConnel, Gerald Wayne, Jr., Moses Lake.
McLaughlin, Michael Paul, Seattle.
McNeil, Donald K., Seattle.
Moseley, David Wesley, Seattle.
Mukai, Bryan Thomas, Spokane.
Murden, Stephen Brooks, Mt. Vernon.
Murphy, William Patrick, Seattle.
Nelson, Lewis Charles, Seattle.
O'Brien, John Joseph, Seattle.
Odegard, Dell Coleman, Vancouver.
Ollom, Robert Lee, Seattle.
Owen, Stephen Boyd, Yakima.
Parrish, Billy Joe, Tacoma.
Patterson, Gary Lee, Seattle.
Perry, Robert Kent, Cashmere.
Petersen, Harry Allen, Buckley.
Phipps, Leonard Morris, Renton.
Puishis, Dale Scott, Rochester.
Pursel, Thomas Ronald, Yakima.
Rash, Lynley Lee, Longview.
Ray Michael George, Longview.
Ray, Ronald Edwin, Spokane.
Reaume, Wade Russell, Bremerton.
Reid, Kenneth Wayne, Blaine.
Reid, Leon, Everett.
Reyna, Thomas O., Lynden.
Rider, James Austin, Jr., Seattle.
Sargent, Stevan Roy, Kalama.
Saux, Roger Douglas, Taholah.
Schultz, David Joel, Kent.
Shrewsberry, Roger Lynn, Sunnyside.
Sills, Kenneth Howard, Spokane.
Slusser, Charles Rodney, Seattle.
Smith, Harry Ernest, Kirkland.
Smith, Terry Hugh, Bingen.
Sonner, Kaley Alfred, Spokane.
Sparks, Roger Howard, Bellingham.
Spears, Milton Earl, Longview.
Stewart, John Leonard, Seattle.
Strong, Richard William, Jr., Greenacres.
Stroomer, Ronald Lee, Auburn.
Sullivan, John Anthony, Seattle.
Swalley, Robert Eugene, Puyallup.
Swan, Jerald David, Mountlake Terrace.
Swantak, Dennis Ray, Shelton.
Taylor, Glenn Dean, Redmond.
Teague, Thomas Nickell, Mountlake Terrace.

WASHINGTON—continued

Army

Tejano, Ricardo Robert, Spokand.
Theodore, J. Athan, Vashon.
Traw, Jim Silas, Lake Stevens.
Turner, Donald Eugene, Port Orchard.
Tyson, Clifford Earl, Tacoma.
Van Allen, Charles Cliffor, Bellingham.
Van Horn, Edward Lindley, Tacoma.
Vanhulle, Anthony F., II, Monroe.
Vernor, James Edwin, Maple Valley.
Visker, Thomas Peter, Warden.
Walker, Richard Harold, Spokane.
Walterman, Larry John, Chehalis.
Weamer, Allen Ray, Tacoma.
West, Stanley Eugene, Seattle.
Whitlock, Patrick A., Poulsbo.
Whitney, Robert Arnold, Kennewick.
Wight, Charles Edwin, Tacoma.
Wilhelm, David Kenneth, Spokane.
Wilson, Walter Gene, Seattle.
Wright, Darrel Zane, Port Orchard.
Wright, Darryl Whitney, Mercer Island.
Zeller, Douglas Lee, Seattle.
Zyph, James Louis, Yakima.

Air Force

Greenhalgh, Terry Lynn, Sunnyside.
McHugo, Donald Lyle, Spokane.

Marine Corps

Akehurst, Howard David, Vancouver.
Anderson, Doyle Travis, Arlington.
Anderson, Larry Edward, Spokane.
Armstrong, Peder Walter, Seattle.
Barker, Stephen Peter, Bremerton.
Bernard, Guy North, Port Orchard.
Blaine, James Graham, Spokane.
Boyle, Michael Peter, Spokane.
Brown, Robert Jay, Kettle Falls.
Cady, Michael Morris, Seattle.
Carlson, Gary Lee, Seattle.
Cottingham, Duane Roger, Pasco.
De Water, Patrick Lee, Kent.
Devik, David Ralf, Bellevue.
Dolen, Jimmie Alan, Bremerton.
Ellis, James Francis, Seattle.
Evans, Cliffred Melvin, Shelton.
Feiro, Richard Dale, Seattle.
Feser, Jeffery Evan, Seattle.
Fincher, Larry Leonard, Algona.
Foster, Douglas Gene, Beaver.
Francavilla, John Francis, Renton.
Galbraith, Marvin Earl, Brewster.
Garcia, Enrique Lorenzo, Jr., Seattle.
Gardner, Stephen Mark, Wenatchee.
Ginder, Richard Samuel, Yakima.
Haralson, William Scott, Everett.
Hartman, Marvin Leo, Camas.
Hawley, Oril William, Spokane.
Hellwig, Steven Louis, Seattle.
Henry, Walter Maurice, Seattle.
Herndon, W. Cole, Seattle.
Hoskins, Robert Edward, Renton.
Inay, Christopher Henry, Wapato.
Jamerson, Larry Allen, Spokane.
Johnsen, Larry Vernon, Seattle.
Keller, Gary Dale, Yakima.
Keo, Daniel William, Bothell.
King, Robert D. Orr, Seattle.
Knollmeyer, Mark Alan, Seattle.
Kohn, Wayne Edward, Seattle.
Krogh, Richard Otis, Mercer Island.
Larsen, Chris John, III, Seattle.
Linderman, Michael Edwin, Auburn.
Lindsay, Michael Claude, Tacoma.
Lindstrom, Patrick Eugene, Spokane.
Marco, Robert Donald, Yakima.
Markwith, Gerald William, Federal Way.
Massie, George Edgar, Clear Spring.
McGarvey, Patrick George, Spokane.
McRae, David Le Roy, Walla Walla.
Murdock, Michael George, Rockford.
Myers, Robert Leslie, Seattle.
Neas, Stephen Edward, Vancouver.
Noble, Gary Paul, Bremerton.
Odell, John Michael, Bellingham.
Peters, Elliott Lee, Moxee City.
Peterson, Thomas Lawrence, Vancouver.
Savare, Howard Leroy, West Richland.
Soule, William Fred, Auburn.
Stephens, Tommy Lee, Kennewick.

WASHINGTON—continued

Marine Corps

Till, John Jeremiah, Pasco.
Vinge, Richard Lonnie, Seattle.
Warner, David Howard, Mercer Island.
Webb, Robert James, Brownstown.
Wedrick, Lonnie Mark, White Salmon.
White, Jack Lee, Tacoma.
Whyte, Charles, James, Olympia.
Wilkins, Gary Lee, Longview.
Williams, Kenneth R., Jr., Olympia.
Wood, Stuart John, Granite Falls.
Young, Stephen Rogers, Kennewick.

Navy

Caywood, Gary Steven, Spokane.
Cowan, Harley Richard, Kennewick.
Grimshaw, Danny Lee, Seattle.
Hanley, John Joseph, Wenatchee.
Johnson, Frankie Ray, Toppenish.
Kruse, Dale Lynn, Kelso.
Murray, Leslie Eugene, Chehalis.
Newby, Kenneth Leroy, Jr., Sumner.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Adams, Darrius Wayne, Ivydale.
Adams, James Clarence, Martinsburg.
Antolini, James Vincent, Norton.
Auxier, Jerry Edward, Dixie.
Barker, Kenneth Monroe, Charleston.
Beavers, Frank Arvis, Newhall.
Bias, Clifford, Huntington.
Bleigh, Alfred Harlen, Jr., Sutton.
Bowyer, Rex Allan, Richwood.
Boyer, Wayne Douglas, Shepherdstown.
Brown, Ronald Lee, Booth.
Cabell, Darrell Lee, Foster.
Carson, David Rickey, Lesage.
Carwithen, Albert Morgan, Charleston.
Cashdollar, Glenn Francis, Reynoldsville.
Chess, Lloyd Allen, Cowen.
Clark, Robert Arthur, Mannington.
Compton, Lorn David, Squire.
Crabtree, Varise Helton, Jr., War.
Crothers, Howard Robert, New Martinsville.
Crow, Jessie Franklin, Alvon.
Dillow, Jerry Wayne, Charles Town.
Dunithan, Thomas Lawrence, Elk Garden.
Durst, John Bernard, Romney.
Ford, Billy Keith, Mount Carbon.
Griffith, Roger Dale, Elkins.
Grubb, Gary Howard, Fairmont.
Hairston, Charles McKinley, Jenkinjones.
Halpenny, Jerry Lee, Enterprise.
Hanna, Marvin Jim, Canvas.
Harrison, Randolph Monroe, Nitro.
Haynes, Garry Dwight, Romance.
Hively, Guy Richard, Elkview.
Hoback, Douglas Edward, Skygusty.
Holmes, Billy Ray, Arnett.
Howell, Danny Ray, Leewood.
Huffman, Eddie Gray, Lewisburg.
Hutchinson, Robert Lee, Mount Hope.
James, Washington L., Shady Spring.
Johnson, Everette R., Greenville.
Johnson, Thomas Alan, Albert.
Jones, Benjamin Allen, Parkersburg.
Jones, Delmer R., Ripley.
King, Lewis Milton, Jr., Morgantown.
Lester, William Wayne, Williamson.
Martin, Darrell G., McComas.
Maynard, Lester Eugene, Holden.
McCarty, Douglas Wayne, Frost.
McClanahan, Cleatus Wayne, Charleston.
McClung, John Ambrose, Parkersburg.
McDonald, Dennis Elwood, Romney.
McKinney, Joseph Stanley, Basin.
McNear, Terry Lee, Kingwood.
Miller, James Ray, Kenna.
Miller, Terry Lynn, Scott Depot.
Mitchell, Danny Joe, Marmet.
Morgan, Gary Wayne, White Sulphur Springs.
Nichols, Phillip Larry, Clay.
Norris, Charles Raymond, Artie.
Norris, Thomas Andrew, Jonben.
Pemberton, James Alexander, Beckley.
Poff, Elbert Darrell, Mullens.
Powell, George Ralph, Jr., Grafton.
Ransbottom, Michael Lee, Huntington.
Rider, Samuel Dewey, Jr., Marlinton.

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

Army

Robison, David Lee, Ireland.
Ross, William Robert, Jr. Morgantown.
Scarborough, Jack Wade, Jr. Morgantown.
See, Otto William, Summersville.
Shelton, Arthur David, Rock Creek.
Shumate, Nile Dean, Ashford.
Sisler, William Douglas, Morgantown.
Spencer, Dean Calvin, III, Morgantown.
Spencer, Kenneth Clinton, New Cumberland.
Sprouse, Lee Roy David, Dunmore.
Squires, Roy Benjamin, Flemington.
Stepp, John Paul, Kermit.
Stewart, Arnold Lee, Baker.
Straface, Jeffrey Dennis, Star City.
Styers, Reid Tyrone, Berkeley Springs.
Summerfield, Samuel Reed, Elkins.
Tichnell, Kenneth Eugene, Newburg.
Umstot, Samuel Gilmore, Jr., Keyser.
Underwood, Watson, Jr., Huntersville.
Urban Paul Richard, Jr., Huntington.
Valentine, John Wesley Brandonville.
Vincent, Richard Elsworth, Danville.
Walls, Thurman Tracy, Avondale.
Weissman, Victor Barry, Wheeling.
Wheeler, Bobby Lee, Hamlin.
White, Terry Roger, Van.
Williams, John Ray, Marlinton.
Wines, Thomas Lowell, Elkview.
Wolfe, Alfred Melvin, Masontown.
Worley, Stephen Michael, Charleston.

Air Force

Fabian, William Hilric, Pullman.
Ford, Wallace Addison, Huntington.
Pearson, Anthony Joseph, Olympia.
Pick, Donald William, Richland.

Marine Corps

Abraham, Arley George, Madison.
Carr, William Lee, Jr., Flemington.
Chacalos, George Manual, Wheeling.
Christian, Thomas Barry, Bluefield.
Coleman, Thomas Keith, Big Chimney.
Cook, David Samuel, Oceana.
Cool, Mark Douglas, Colliers.
Cooper, Michael Linn, Chesapeake.
Corder, James Russell, Wolf Summit.
Craft, Clayton Andrew, Elkview.
Davis, William Thomas, Crab Orchard.
Dean Ronald Philip, Buckhannon.
Dunlap Darrell Edward, Madison.
Dye, Ronald Harvey, Clarksburg.
Edwards, Daniel Lynn, Ceredo.
Emrick, Steven Eric, Parkersburg.
Foster, Julius Cartwright, Welch.
Goggin, Paul Stephen, Morgantown.
Gorbey, Jack Eugene, Fairmont.
Graham, Harold Edward, Wilkinson.
Hannah, Charles Mitchell, Whitesville.
Harville, Lawrence, Princewick.
Heater, Larry Steven, Weston.
Heeter, James Ralph, Spencer.
Highley, Raymond Howard, Williamson.
Horn, Michael Lee, Ridgeley.
Hoskins, Robert Sullivan, Morgantown.
Howell, Hal Kent, Van.
Hutchinson, Kenneth P., Jr., Huntington.
Johnson, George Franklin, Summersville.
Kennedy, Larry Scott, Charleston.
Knisely, Robert Lee, Jr., Grafton.
Lawrence, William Aubrey, Man.
McCord, David Paul, Pentress.
McKinney, Bernard B., Jr., Helen.
Mikels, James Herbert, Jr. Wheeling.
Mills, Johnny Ray, Matoaka.
Moore, Lewis Wayne, Charleston.
Moore, William James, Minden.
Morris, Wayman Dewey, War.
Moyers, Richard Lee, Moorefield.
O'Brien, Frank Anthony, III, Wheeling.
Patton, Barry Michael, Fairmont.
Pesimer, Daniel, Salt Rock.
Phelps, Randall Carl, Barrett.
Powell, David Lee, Lost Creek.
Richmond, James Ross, Fairmont.
Sargent, James Ray, Anawalt.
Singleton, Theodore, Jr., Nutter.
Tucker, Danny Eugene, Waverly.
Vickers, Billy Joe, Milton.

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

Marine Corps

Wilson, William Wayne, St. Marys.
Yates, Charles Leonard, Fairmont.
Zelaski, Leonard Joe, Jr., Moundsville.

Navy

Adams, Edward Cody, Pennsboro.
Smith, William Eugene, Bradley.
Stephens, Michael Eugene, Huntington.

WISCONSIN

Army

Ackerman, Roger Carl Henry, Lowell.
Agard, Timothy Charles, Janesville.
Allen, Donald William, Jr., Waterford.
Anderson, Dale Edward, New Lisbon.
Anderson, Gerald Robert, Kenosha.
Anderson, William Joseph, Superior.
Arens, Timothy George, Appleton.
Atkinson, Roger Carl, Pardeeville.
Banaszynski, Richard Micha, Pulaski.
Barnes, David Gregory, Marinette.
Bartkowski, Gregory Joseph, Milwaukee.
Baumgart, Robert Lee, Mishicot.
Becker, Thomas Lewis, Janesville.
Begotka, Joseph Lloyd, Green Bay.
Behrens, William Charles, Two Rivers.
Benson, Gerald Allen, Darlington.
Beranek, Charles Sylvester, Mosinee.
Blank, Robert Gerdes, Neenah.
Blohm, Ronald Roy, Eau Claire.
Braun, Michael William, Milwaukee.
Brefczynski, Edward Joseph, Two Rivers.
Breuer, Anthony Joseph, La Crosse.
Brown, Edwin Fay, Beloit.
Brunner, Michael James, Marshfield.
Bulkley, David Justus, Chilton.
Burbach, Richard, West Allis.
Burlingame, Wynne Leonard, Milwaukee.
Burr, Daniel Lee, Milwaukee.
Carroll, Patrick John, Maiden Rock.
Casper, Frederick Raymond, Fond du Lac
Crawley, Robert Leo, Baraboo.
Dahm, Ralph Albert, Iron Ridge.
Dalberg, Dean Laverne, Viola.
Danielson, Lee Roger, Cadott.
Dazey, Thomas Francis, Jr., Neenah.
De Cora, Elliott Leo, Wyeville.
Dean, Glenn Frederick, West Bend.
Del Camp, Adrian Leroy, Milwaukee.
Dobrinska, Thomas Earl, Antigo.
Drought, David Lee, Janesville.
Du Long, Franklin Roosevelt, Waukesha.
Dunifer, Delferd Benjamin, West Allis.
Dutcher, Leonard Earl, Melrose.
Eberhardt, Phillip John, Pewaukee.
Edelstein, Roy L., Superior.
Ferguson, Ted Scott, Milwaukee.
Fortney, Kendall Thomas, Stoughton.
Frazier, Paul Reid, Milwaukee.
Fredenberg, Ralph, Shawano.
Gercz, Francis Gary, Jr., Milwaukee.
Gerlach, Paul Edgar, Madison.
Gerou, James Allan, Milwaukee.
Gibney, Allen Richard, Kenosh.
Giesen, Wallace Lee, La Crosse.
Gilbertson, Terry Alan, Boscobel.
Golden, Ronald Duane, Superior.
Gomez, Frank, Milwaukee.
Gonzalez, Wilfredo Louis, Milwaukee.
Grassl, Kenneth Joseph, Appleton.
Greenwood, Bruce John, Maribel.
Greshamer, Leon G., New London.
Grunewald, Jerome E., Sheboygan.
Haas, Maurice John, Cassville.
Haas, Russell Carl, La Crosse.
Halverson, Gary Joseph, New Richmond.
Hambleton, Harry B., III, Elm Grove.
Hanson, William Henry, Park Falls.
Harff, William Henry, Jr., Kenosha.
Hasko, Ronald Jon, Wausau.
Heider, Andrew L., Neenah.
Hellenbrand, David Peter, Janesville.
Henning, Arthur Robert, Lake Tomahawk.
Hering, Robert Henry, Burlington.
Hernandez, Joseph J., Jr., Milwaukee.
Herrera, Frank Vincent, Green Bay.
Heuer, Jerry Wayne, Sparta.
Hierlmeier, Donald Alvin, Milwaukee.
Hildebrandt, James George, Middleton.
Hodge, Michael Allard, Sparta.

WISCONSIN—continued

Army

Hoffman, Leroy David, Athens.
Holtz, Alfred Joseph, Jr., Milwaukee.
Hondel, William James, West Allis.
Horton, Ruben Lee, Milwaukee.
Howard, Gene Jay, Neenah.
Hulbert, John Roy, Menomonie.
Hurkmans, Wilhelm S., Jr., Rhinelander.
Jackson, Richard Thomas, Green Bay.
Jackson, Todd R., Manitowoc.
Jordan, Jeffrey Robert, Pewaukee.
Junk, Richard Henry, Cassville.
Kelley, Michael James, Menomonee Falls.
Kesselhon, James Edward, Sun Prairie.
Kissinger, Norman Charles, Milwaukee.
Klimpke, Dennis Lee, Colby.
Kmetz, David William, Washburn.
Knorr, John Roy, Manitowoc.
Knouse, David Walter, Gratiot.
Knox, Bruce Neal, Madison.
Kohlbeck, Terrence Eugene, Stratford.
Kresic, Joseph, Jr., Neshkoro.
Kromrey, Dennis John, Osceola.
Krueger, Wayne Dale, Wausau.
Kube, Joseph Bernard, Warrens.
Kuczewski, William Robert, Milwaukee.
Lalan, Larry Ralph, Weyerhauser.
Lang, William Otto, New Holstein.
Langer, Michael Walter, Milwaukee.
Lawson, Rodney John, Augusta.
Leahy, James Alexander, Madison.
Lefeber, Wayne Robert, Milwaukee.
Lepak, Donald Chester, Amherst.
Lind, James Jerome, Oshkosh.
Loduha, Gary, Milwaukee.
Lopez, Manuel Torres, Oshkosh.
Mager, Vincent Leo, Hales Corners.
Mason, Dennis Rae, Argyle.
Mazursky, Bernard Richard, Madison.
McConnell, James Paul, Beloit.
McCormick, Dennis Lee, Waukesha.
McGurty, Timothy Arthur, Milwaukee.
Meinecke, William Frederic, Milwaukee.
Mengel, Kenneth Raymond, St. Cloud.
Meyer, Leo Roland, Fond Du Lac.
Meyers, Victor Bert, Superior.
Milanowski, John Edward, Milwaukee.
Morack, Gene Charles, New London.
Morrison, Edward Arnold, Kenosha.
Mulvey, Francis Trainor, Fennimore.
Murphy, Timothy James, Green Bay.
Nettesheim, Bruce Paul, Sussex.
Netzow, Earl Jeffrey, Lake Mills.
Novakovic, George D., Kenosha.
Osuski, Robert Eugene, Milwaukee.
Otte, Thomas William, Kaukauna.
Pache, Harlan T., Arlington.
Pamanet, Paul Joseph, Wausaukee.
Perlewitz, Brian Scott, Milwaukee.
Peterson, Lowell Todd, Eau Claire.
Pfister, Dan Leon, Sturgeon Bay.
Phillips, Leon Milton, De Pere.
Pitzer, Richard Lyle, Boscobel.
Pochron, Ronald Edward, Pulaski.
Podebradsky, Anthony John, Lena.
Ponath, Kurt Francis, Cudahy.
Price, David Merrill, Oconomowoc.
Price, James Allan, Peshtigo.
Propson, Marvin Norbert, Hilbert.
Prothero, Michael Eugene, Reedsburg.
Przybelski, Thomas F., Green Bay.
Quirk, Jeffery Michael, Manitowoc.
Rades, Robert Raymond, Hawkins.
Radley, Leland Eugene, Boscobel.
Raih, Roger William, Manitowoc.
Rance, Steven Paul, Green Bay.
Rausch, John Alex, Big Bend.
Reed, Dennis Wayne, Milwaukee.
Rhoades, Louis George, De Pere.
Ryan, Edward Kenneth, Milwaukee.
Schuh, David Michael, Elcho.
Schultz, David Charles, Milwaukee.
Schuster, Daniel Carl, Milwaukee.
Seibert, Joseph Dean, Green Bay.
Siegel, Dennis Lee, Marion.
Smith, Lynn Hudson, Cudahy.
Sonnenberg, Arden Gene, Kenosha.
Springer, James Robert, Kenosha.
Stoltz, Donald Robert, Milwaukee.
Stozek, Gerald Stanley, Fond du Lac.

XUM

WISCONSIN—continued

Army

Sturgal, Thomas John, Ashland.
Sukowatey, Stanley Joseph, Waunakee.
Swiggum, Larry William, Genoa.
Thomson, Stuart Harold, Milwaukee.
Tomczak, Thomas James, New Berlin.
Tomczyk, Victor David, Dorchester.
Tousey, Gearwin Phillip, Green Bay.
Turner, Michael Bruce, La Crosse.
Van Lone, Murray Wayne, Sr., Kenosha.
Van Mater, William Wayne, Friendship.
Vander Hyden, Charles Gary, Oshkosh.
Vandersterren, Cornelis A., Waukesha.
Vielbaum, James Michael, Hartford.
Vollmer, Valentine Bernard, Clintonville.
Wagner, Randall William, Egg Harbor.
Waldorf, Gary Alan, Green Bay.
Walker, Tomas David, Elkhorn.
Waschick, Walter Raymond, Merrill.
Weiher, Douglas Richard, Milwaukee.
Welsh, Larry Michael, Muscoda.
Williams, Terry Joe, Oconomowoc.
Wood, Aaron Lee, Waukesha.
Wood, Dennis Melvin, Beloit.
Woolcott, Randall Alan, Milwaukee.
Woolridge, Larry Roger, Dousman.
Wusterbarth, Clinton Carl, Manitowoc.
Zeimet, James George, Brookfield.
Zeske, Robert Edward, Milwaukee.
Zink, Robert George, Stevens Point.

Air Force

Morris, John David, Waukesha.
Skaar, Wilbur Arnold, Jr., Chippewa Falls.

Marine Corps

Adams, Lee Chester, Milwaukee.
Babich, Nikola, Milwaukee.
Beck, Robert James, Oshkosh.
Bender, Larry Warren, Stoughton.
Blackman, Thomas Joseph, Racine.
Blaha, Thomas John, Madison.
Bungartz, Frederick William, Chippewa Falls.
Capezio, Francis John, Pell Lake.
Cerra, Richard Ralph, Bruce.
Chicantek, Andrew James, Greenfield.
Chitwood, Wayne Ceciel, Necedah.
Connelly, Patrick Allen, Green Bay.
Crabb, Bruce Wayne, Milwaukee.
Cramer, David Arthur, Burlington.
Cunningham, William Ledfor, Antigo.
Derby, Paul David, Menomonie.
Deuel, Charles Frank, Palmyra.
Diedrich, Robert James, Random Lake.
Dziedzic, Mark Robert, Oak Creek.
Fuller, Eugene Otto, Wyocena.
Gray, John Patrick, Brillion.
Grenier, Ronald Louis, Brill.
Haakenson, Kenneth Wayne, Racine.
Halfman, Blake Henry, Fond du Lac.
Heinz, Paul Walter, Brown Deer.
Herfel, Laurence John, Madison.
Heyne, Raymond Thomas, Mason.
Hren, Timothy Louis, Milwaukee.
Keefe, Dennis Wright, Wauwatosa.
Kelpine, Randall Wayne, Milwaukee.
Langenfeld, Christian Alan, Oshkosh.
Lewis, Raymond Roy, Milwaukee.
Lupe, Eugene, Kenneth, Green Bay.
Lutz, Robert Steven, Oconomowoc.
Marshall, John Keith, Green Bay.
Mead, Jeffery Evans, Janesville.
Mellon, Michael Owen, New Berlin.
Meyer, James Frederick, Jr., Oak Creek.
Meysembourg, Daniel Lloyd, Madison.
Mihalovich, John Michael, Milwaukee.
Moore, Kevin Walker, Milwaukee.
Moriarty, James Michael, Appleton.
Mueller, Marco Francisco, Port Washington.
Nowak, Leonard Michael, Luxembourg.
O'Hare, Richard James, Racine.
Patterson, William Anthony, Superior.
Peterlich, Joseph James, Antigo.
Peterson, Carl Elving, Keewaunee.
Radonski, Kenneth Wayne, Milwaukee.
Sanchez, Roberto, Racine.
Schettl, David Leroy, Manitowoc.
Schneider, Harry Warren, Janesville.
Schuett, Jerome Alan, Reedsburg.
Schurrer, John Rodney, Milwaukee.

WISCONSIN—continued

Marine Corps

Sears, Michael, Milwaukee.
Smith, Timothy John, Lake Geneva.
Sullivan, Mikal James, West de Pere.
Theyerl, Clayton Joseph, Racine.
Treweek, Charles John, St. Francis.
Ward, Allan Curt, Deerfield.
Weber, Karl Edwin, Two Rivers.
Weeden, Robert Lee, Waukesha.
Wehrs, Dennis Duane, La Crosse.
Westphal, Stepehn John, Ixonia.
Wilcox, David John, Portage.
Willis, Benjamin Galu, Leone.
Wilson, Michael Jay, Sussex.
Wolf, Robert Clarence, Milwaukee.
Zwirchitz, Dennis James, Abbotsford.

Navy

Bennett, Dan Michael, Madison.
Cunningham, Kent Alan, Appleton.
Davis, Richard Lloyd, New London.
Fina, Richarl Carl, Hudson.
Giejc, Alexander, Milwaukee.
Gray, Harvey Duncan, Plainfield.
Harries, Jimmy Ried, Spencer.
Hartzheim, John Francis, Appleton.
Kirkham, Donald Alan, Brookfield.
Layton, Steven James, Racine.
Leindecker, Larry James, Antigo
Loy, James Richard, Green Bay.
Meenan, Thomas James, Menomonee Falls.
Millard, Loren Ray, Marshfield.
Robinson, Raymond Douglas, Kenosha.
Roesler, Richard Alfred, Rhinelander.
Simon, Richard Charles, Ellsworth.
Smith, Thomas Herbert, Markesan.
Stangel, Lawrence Norbart, Green Bay.
Swatek, Steven Paul, Peshtigo.

WYOMING

Army

Barnes, Robert Eugene, Casper.
Braun, Edward Raymond, Cheyenne.
Brown, Richard Steven, Laramie.
Cazin, Richard Paul, Evanston.
Endicott, Richard Leroy, Casper.
Evans, Bennett Edward, Green River.
Faler, Allen Lee, Riverton.
Fetzer, Terry Lee, Cody.
Ford, Donald Lee, Sheridan.
Fox, Gary Duane, Sheridan.
Handy, Walter Elmer, Casper.
Johnson, Dale William, Auburn.
King, Kenneth Walter, Sheridan.
Lantos, Leslie John, Ten Sleep.
Lawton, Edward Lester, Thermopolis.
Martin, Richard M., Encampment.
Maul, Henry Eugene, Worland.
McAtee, William Joseph, Hanna.
McNally, Edward, Cheyenne.
Nix, Vernon Walter, III, Casper.
Padilla, Joseph Anthony, Cheyenne.
Reberg, Charles Wayne, Casper.

Marine Corps

Anderson, Elton Gene, Lovell.
King, Dennis Dwain, Green River.
Pantier, James Edward, Laramie.
Selders, William Dean, Cody.

Navy

Stark, Stephen William, Rock Springs.

GUAM

Army

Aguon, Jose Quinata, Umatac.
Camacho, David Bitanga, Tamuning.
Deleon, Herman Borja, Agana.
Eay, Rudy Edejer, Tamuning.
Herrera, Jose Babauta, Agat.
Mendiola, Robert L. G., Agana.
Meno, Jesus Quinene, Inarajan Village.
Perez, Vicente Duenas, Mongmong Village.
Quidachay, Jesus Aquiningo, Umatac.
Rodriguez, Lucas Herrera, Agat Village.
Taitague, Johnny Salas, Talofofo.

Marine Corps

Violett, James Edward.

Navy

Cruz, Edward Cruz, Inarajan.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Alvarez-Tapia, Jose Luis, Rio Piedras.
Aranda-Santos, Eduardo, Santurce.
Brenes-Escobar, Jose, Salinas.
Burgos-Cruzado, Angel Luis, Vega Baja.
Cabrera-Rodriguez, Candido, Bo Toita.
Camacho-Rodriguez Pedro J., Corozal.
Carrasquillo-Denton Alber, Santurce.
Cintron-Mendez, Wilfredo, Utuado.
Colon-Rivera, Jose Ramon, Cayey.
De Jesus-Munoz, Alejandro, Ponce.
De Lisa, William Joseph, Ponce.
Diana-Diaz, Jose Ramon, Guyama.
Diaz-Collazo, Miguel Angel, Corozal.
Estrada Adolfo Medardo, Rio Piedras.
Felix-Torres, Juan Ramon, Cayey.
Gabana Roberto Lay, Cadiz.
Gomez-Rivera Juan, Cabo Rojo.
Gonzalez-Martinez Angel, Hormigueros.
Gonzalez-Morales, Roberto, Santurce.
Gonzalez-Velez, Joel Humbe, San Sebastian
Gutierrez-Oliveras, E. P., Yauco.
Gutierrez-Velazquez, J. D., Arecibo.
Hernandez-Velez Alberto, Boqueron.
Infanzon-Colon, Ramiro, Puerto Nuevo.
Lebron-Maldonado, Rogelio, Rio Piedras.
Leon Felix, Jr., Rio Piedras.
Lopez-Del, Toro Saul, Guanica.
Lugo Mojica Hector, Toa Baja.
Marin-Ramos, Hector Ramon, Fajardo.
Marrero-Rios, Jose Antonio, Santurce.
Martinez-Santiago Rafael, Ponce.
Matos-Correa, Jose Antonio, Mayaguez.
Maymi-Martinez, Pedro Anto, Guanica.
Medina-Gonzalez, Ruperto, Rio Piedras.
Melendez-Gonzalez, Jose D., Naguabo.
Menendez-Ocasio, Ismael, Bayamon.
Mercado-Gutierrez Ruben D., Santurce.
Montes Anthony, John, Yabucoa.
Montes, Jose L., Rio Piedras.
Morales-Mercado, Juan Baut, Bayamon.
Narvaez-Marrero, Andres Lu, Morovis.
Nazario, Juan Jose, Aguas.
Negron-Rodriguez, Miguel A., Cayey.
Neris-Aponte, Joaquin, San Lorenzo.
Nieves-Colon, Marcelino, Jr., Country Club.
Oquendo-Gutierrez, Ramon, Jayuya.
Ortiz-Negron, Jose Juan, Rio Piedras.
Ortiz-Perez, Luis Antonio, Ponce.
Pena, Jose Manuel, Boqueron.
Pereira, Socorro, San Juan.
Ramos-Himenez, Raul, Bayamon.
Rios-Rosario, Teodorito, Aibonito.
Rivera-Colon, Hector, Juana Diaz.
Rivera-Fernandez, Samuel, Gaguas.
Rivera-Lopez, Jaime Albert, Arecibo.
Rivera-Velazquez, Angel A., Las Piedras.
Rodriguez-Acevedo, Jose, Aguadilla.
Rodriguez-Lebron, Santiago, Fajardo.
Rosario-Cruz, Miguel, Jr., Las Piedras.
Ruiz, Jose Manuel, Vega Baja.
Ruiz-Bernard, Guillermo, A., Bayamon.
Ruiz-Del, Pilar Rafael Ang, Quebradillas.
Sanchez-Ortiz, Dionisio, Santurce.
Sanchez-Saliva, Rafael, Aguadilla.
Santiago-Aponte, Nelson, Dorado.
Serrano-Rivera, Julio, Mayaguez.
Sosa-Hiraldo, Carmelo, Carolina.
Thiesfeldt-Collazo, William, Rio Piedras.
Torres-Lopez, Rigoberto, San Sebastian.
Trujillo-Trujillo, Abraham, Rio Grande.
Vazquez, Juan Francisco, Utuado.
Vega-Lopez, Carlos, Ponce.
Velazquez-Feliciano, R., Jr., Penuelas.
Velazquez-Ortiz, Carlos A., Ponce.
Velez Rivera, Luis Alfonso, Jauna Diaz.

Marine Corps

Figueroa-Perez, Cristobal, Bayamon.
Garcia-Figueroa, Juan F., Yabucoa.
Santiago, German Antonio, Hato.
Sola-Maldonado, Yldefonso, Villa Blanca.

Navy

Esquilin-Ortiz, Errol W., Bayamon.

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Army

Berry, Louis Edward, St. Thomas.
Lang, Andrew Alphonso, St. Croix.
Peterson, Francois Achille, Christiansted.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Marine Corps

Lokeni, Fagatoele, Mapusaga.

Deaths Resulting From Hostile Action in Vietnam During January 1969

ALABAMA

Army

Barber, Chadwick McFall, Florence.
Belt, Arthur Lavine, Prichard.
Clark, Richard, Tallassee.
Crody, Ronald Isaac, Enterprise.
Dilbeck, Lonnie Acken, Fairhope.
Ford, Edward, Birmingham.
Grayson, Ronnie Paul, Ensley.
Thomas, Larry Benjamin, Atmore.
Woodall, Charles Minor, Town Creek.

Marine Corps

Drysdale, Charles Douglas, Birmingham.

Navy

Hunt, Larry Frank, Gadsden.

ARIZONA

Army

Brownlee, Kenneth Duane, Yuma.
Lee, Dennis Varis, Mesa.
Oviedo, Michael Leslie, Phoenix.
Scarborough, James Arthur, Mesa.
Simmons, Billy Joe, Phoenix.

Marine Corps

Terrell, Alva Ray, Elfrida.
Tersteege, Paul Francis, Tuscon.

Navy

Laser, James Dale, Arlington.

ARKANSAS

Army

Blisard, Rex Wayne, Siloam Springs.
Crowder, Michael, Carthage.
Dickason, Clyde Leroy, Booneville.
Dunham, Bobby Joe, Fayetteville.
Ford, Alvin Wallace, Camden.
Palmer, Jerry Allen, Junction City.

Marine Corps

Bailey, Michael Wilson, Star City.
Burgett, Boyce Dale, Dyer.
Cook, Marvin, Jr., North Little Rock.

Navy

Russell, Kenneth Murel, Judsonia.

CALIFORNIA

Army

Aguirre, Joseph Anthony, Orange.
Barrios, James Patrick, Lemoore.
Bartlett, John Rex, Vallejo.
Bartman, Steven Douglas, San Diego.
Berry, James Edward, San Fernando.
Blakey, Michael Archie, North Highlands.
Bradford, Sherman Duane, Arleta.
Brown, Roger Louis, Costa Mesa.
Case, Robert Don, Weaverville.
Catelli, Charles John, Santa Rosa.
Chacon, Robert Reinhard, San Bernardino.
Currence, William Allen, Santa Clara.
Devore, Kenneth Roy, Fullerton.
Dotson, Eugene Lewis, Stockton.
Edwards, Bobby Brance, Torrance.
Eisman, James Fredrick, Whittier.
Erickson, Philip Charles, Garden Grove.
Escamilla, Joseph, San Jose.
Gilles, Alan Clark, Pacoima.
Griswold, Scott Craig, San Jose.
Hicks, Frank Edward, Pomona.
Hill, Allan Bruce, Torrance.
Humphries, Gary Dean, San Pablo.
Jenkins, Steven Lee, Santa Ana.
Johnson, Charles Aaron, Compton.
Johnson, Kenneth Paul, Bakersfield.
Jordan, Paul Robert, Sacramento.
Keister, Lawrence Lee, Sacramento.
King, Donald Gene, Lakewood.
Laguna, Mario Montes, Marysville.
Leake, Ronald James, Jr., Glendora.
Lema, Anthony Leroy, Hughson.

CALIFORNIA—continued

Army

Lewis, Calvin, Fontana.
Lopez, Victor, Solana Beach.
Lozano, Fernando Leonard, Los Angeles.
Martin, Larry Allen, Bellflower.
McAdoo Glenn Paul, Bell.
Mitchell, Mark David, La Puente.
Montanez, Paris William, Fontana.
Morrell, William Alexander, Hayward.
Narcisse, Alvin Ray, San Francisco.
Nicholson, James Alexander, Highland.
Oens, La Vern Oren, Placerville.
Offerdahl, William Bruce, Hawaiian Gardens.
Ozbun, James D., Fairfield.
Puentes, Miguel Angel, San Jose.
Queener, Ulysses Grant, Jr., Los Angeles.
Quintana, Juan Carlos, Daly City.
Ramirez, Hildefonso M., Watsonville.
Reed, Melvin L. Jr., Los Angeles.
Rice, Gregory Lloyd, Granada Hills.
Rideout, David James, San Bernardino.
Rowles, Steven Robert, Glendora.
Rush, David Clyde, Los Angeles.
See, Richard Charles, Sunnyvale.
Sloppye, Robert Royce, Sacramento.
Stephens, Larry Allan, Travis AFB.
Street, Toby Windfield, Rialto.
Suarez, Encarnacion Alegre, Escondido.
Sullivan, Raymond Walter, San Francisco.
Taylor, Rudy Ronnie, Hacienda Heights.
Thompson, Richard Vickers, Auburn.
Trejo, John Michael, Pomona.
Tritsch, Philip Alon, Nevada City.
Tucker, Gregory Charles, Santa Clara.
Wikle, Ricky Lynn, Concord.
Wood, Todd Louis, Chico.
Worthington, Laurence D., Fullerton.
Yabiku, Takeshi, Los Angeles.

Air Force

Asada, Ronald Kazuo, Mountain View.
Davis, Albert Jackson, Fallbrook.
Fink, Robert Alton, San Diego.

Marine Corps

Atkins, Doyle, Modesto.
Borquez, Lawrence Gabe, Los Angeles.
Bullard, Victor Walker, Jr., Northridge.
Carroll, Peter Richard, Winters.
Dolan, David Patrick, San Pedro.
Duggan, Thomas Patrick, Berkeley.
Guevara, Irineo, Los Angeles.
Hannibal, James Edward, Mountain View.
Heredia, Miguel, Bakersfield.
Icke, Ralph Edward, II, El Centro.
Jordan, Steve Eugene, Venice.
Kunkel, John Robert, Santa Clara.
Martin, Joseph Craig, La Mirada.
Mooers, William Mathias, Los Angeles.
Pagaling, Michael, Santa Maria.
Peddy, Charles Lee, Fresno.
Ramirez, Joseph Ybarra, Jr., Huntington Park.
Rose, Daniel Patrick, Los Angeles.
Rose, Leonard Dale, Herlong.
Russell, James Robert, Arcata.
Telles, Paul George, Newark.
Venuti, Vincent, Jr., Bellflower.
Warmbrodt, Jon Frederick, Santa Monica.
Holdredge, David Lee, Los Angeles.
Horrell, Gerald Robert, North Hollywood.
Langslow, Robert Malcolm, La Puente.
McKinley, Stephen William, Hilmar.
O'Neil, Robert William, Sunnyvale.
Wilson, David Allen, South Gate.

COLORADO

Army

Baker, Gerald Otis, Kersey.
Chenoweth, Austin Ray, Dove Creek.
Dabney, Harold Thomas, Pueblo.
Hershiser, David Owen, Colorado Springs.
Hurley, Kevin Michael, Denver.
Schukar, Gene Leroy, Hugo.

Marine Corps

Havens, Alan Dale, Denver.
Jones, Harold Lee, Fruita.
Whalen, Garland Guy, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Army

Grandpre, Edward Frederick, Middlebury.
Micloskey, Ken E., Plymouth.
Riggs, Robert Charles, East Hartford.
Shelton, Jerold Jerome, Stamford.
Tyszka, Edward Michael, Ansonia.

Air Force

Kurtyka, George Albert, Derby.

Marine Corps

Equi, Russell Lloyd, Easton.
Ramos, Roberto, Hartford.
St. John, William Luke, Oakdale.

DELAWARE

Deaths resulting from hostile action: None.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Marine Corps

Williams, Timothy Leroy, Washington.

FLORIDA

Army

Brigham, James Woodrow, Jr., Ocala.
Brown, Larry, Baldwin.
Bullard, Thomas C., Jacksonville.
Cloud, Harry James, Gretna.
Darby, John Frederick, III, Titusville.
Davidson, Ronald Larry, Miami.
Frederick, Brian Randall, Homestead.
Jackson, Arelinn Lewis, Greenville.
Langford, Roger Leo, Valrico.
Luckey, James Alfred, Ft. Myers.
Moore, David T., Plant City.
Rolle, John Berkley, Ft. Myers.
Sherman, Kenneth Larmar, Ft. Lauderdale.
Tiffany, Raymond Ellis, Daytona Beach.

Air Force

Sprott, Arthur Roy, Jr., Delray Beach.

Marine Corps

Carey, James Douglas, Jr., Pensacola.
Close, Sanford, Jr., Orlando.
Gay, Eddie Gilbert, Clearwater.
Newman, Stanley Harold, Jacksonville.
Phillips, Roy Franklin, Sarasota.
Schickel, Michael Joseph, St. Petersburg.
Spivey, James William, Ft. Meade.
Thompson, William Eugene, Pensacola.
Truett, Quincy Hightower, Leesburg.

GEORGIA

Army

Callaway, Lewis Andres, III, West Point.
Graham, Thomas, Jr., College Park.
Hogan, David Cleveland, Columbus.
Jennings, Elton Lee, Jr., Macon.
King, Alexander, Woodbine.
Payne, Gary Lee, Tucker.
Smith, Billy Eugene, Columbus.
Solomon, Leavy Carlton, Palmetto.
Taylor, Deane Arthur, Jr., Atlanta.
Thomas, Charles Franklin, Macon.
Williams, David, Jr., Thomasville.

Marine Corps

Copeland, James Randall, Rockmart.
Wiley, James Joseph, Chickamauga.

Navy

Worrell, Milton Jerry, Conalsonville.

HAWAII

Army

Chung, Douglas Kamkee, Honolulu.
Yano, Rodney James Takashi, Kealakekua.

Marine Corps

Kaawa, John Richard, Waianae.
Ribillia, Mariano, Jr., Puunene.

IDAHO

Army

Bowles, Bruce Gregory, Boise.
Boyle, John Alex, Idaho Falls.
Foreman, Thomas Allen, Caldwell.

ILLINOIS

Army

Ambrose, James William, III, Crystal Lake.
Ascher, James Allan, Aurora.
Beam, Raymond Glenn, Butler.
Blauvelt, Ralph Leigh, Deerfield.

ILLINOIS—continued

Army

Bower, Jimmy Charles, Antioch.
Bowlin, Robert Joe, Sparta.
Campbell, John Russell, Carbondale.
Cassano, Daniel, Chicago.
Christensen, William Ray, Elgin.
De Merjian, Stephen Haig, Glenview.
Dixon, Richard Lee, Reddick.
Gallegos, Steven, North Chicago.
Gniadek, Robert Joseph, Chicago.
Goralski, Leo Stanley, Chicago.
Hardig, Terry Neil, Urbana.
Johnson, Martin Raymond, Batavia.
Kelly, Stephen Gere, Waukegan.
McCraney, Clarence, Chicago.
Miller, Robert Edwin, III, Ingleside.
Moore, Lee Elmer, Jr., Chicago.
Neville, William Roy, Evergreen Park.
Page, John Mac Artur, Rochelle.
Riddle, William Miller, Ipava.
Rives, John Arthur, Jr., Chicago.
Tessaro, Michael John, Edwardsville.
Welge, Bruce Richard, Chester.
Zeller, Lawrence Joseph, Wadesville.

Air Force

Fleming, Richard Alan, Johnson City.

Marine Corps

Amador, Diego, Chicago.
Burton, James Arthur, Chicago.
Daley, William, Mt. Prospect.
Kagebein, Dale Leonard, Midlothian.
Swisher, William Henry, Hammond.
Van Wambeke, Ronald Arthur, Rockford.
Vowles, John Wesley, Cherry Valley.
Wilberton, Harold, Jr., Chicago.
Zimmerman, Richard Elmer, Quincy.

INDIANA

Army

Alexander, Carl Theodore, Colfax.
Brookins, David Everett, Leesburg.
Cody, Robert Dean, Columbus.
Dance, Jack Ray, Greensburg.
Diedron, Michael Peter, Cedar Lake.
Fairchild, Dennis Melvin, Akron.
Francis, Terrance Dean J., Chesterton.
Gest, Dennis Eugene, North Webster.
Merrell, James Keith, Milroy.
Richardson, Charles Wayne, St. Paul.
Smith, Donald Joseph, Marion.
Warbritton, Jerry Lee, Attica.

Air Force

Buhr, Thomas Frederick, Fort Wayne.

Marine Corps

Hammack, Cal Thomas, Sellersburg.
Steinbacher, Steven Michael, Fort Wayne.
Suchka, Bradley Eugene, East Gary.

IOWA

Army

Beall, Roger Cloyce, Moorhead.
Bettis, Norman Radean, Oceola.
Miller, James Leroy, Fairfield.
Mohrhauser, William Richard, Danbury.
Wehr, Marvin Francis, Sigourney.
Wilson, Paul Josiah, Pella.

Marine Corps

Abolins, Janis, Des Moines.
Farrell, William Douglas, Le Claire.
Fogarty, John Joseph, III, Bluffs.
Jones, Philip Boyd, Slater.
Squiers, Gary Ladd, Toledo.
Krukow, Arden Lee, Spencer.

KANSAS

Army

Bird, Dannie Leon, Webber.
Dukelow, Cornelious P., II, Kansas City.
Kaeberle, Dana James, Osage City.
Montemayor, James Michael, Kansas City.

Air Force

Martin, Walter Wesley, Opolis.

Marine Corps

Dudley, Gary William, Topeka.
Porter, James Holland, Enterprise.

Navy

Green, Dennis Blaine, Hutchinson.
Land, David Alden, Wichita.

KENTUCKY

Army

Banta, Lanny Wilson, Pleasureville.
Beattys, Lawrence Vick, Louisville.
Brawner, Frank Edward, Frankfort.
Greenwell, Joseph Edward, Vine Grove.
Hall, James Michael, Benton.
Johnson, David Lee, Flemingsburg.
Rountree, Glen Everett, Williamsburg.
Stone, Orman, Barlow.
Terry, Ralph Paul, Cannel City.

Marine Corps

Newberry, Clifford Lee, Crescent Springs.
Whisman, Ermil Lee, Lexington.

Navy

Luttrell, Lloyd Irvin, Lexington.

LOUISIANA

Army

Arnaud, Gary Wayne, Lake Charles.
Barnes, Darryl Verdue, Monroe.
Brackens, Joe Jefferson, Castor.
Brooks, Lee Murray, Shreveport.
Draughn, Thomas Edward, Baton Rouge.
Fontaine, Michael Arthur, New Orleans.
Francewar, John Edward, Hammond.
Strickland, Robert Cecil, Greensburg.

Marine Corps

Ballew, Patrick Dewey, Baton Rouge.
Broadtman, Henry Robert, Jr., Waggaman.
Moreland, Larry Wayne, Arcadia.
Romero, Glenn Wayne, Lafayette.
Schmolke, Joseph Michael, Pearl River.
Sinegal, Hubert, Jr., Lafayette.

Navy

Stockwell, Edward E., Jr., Metairie.

MAINE

Army

Anderson, Curtis Stewart, Hampden.
Belanger, Paul Edward, Saco.
Ellingson, James Earl, Milo.
Foster, David Dan, Gray.

Air Force

Zenga, Ronald Paul, Winchester.

Marine Corps

Dean, Donald Bing, Portland.

Navy

Douglas, Harvey James, East Sebago.

MARYLAND

Army

Albi, Louis Victor, Jr., Baltimore.
Benjamin, Phillip Ernest, Baltimore.
Briddell, Charles Lilleton, Baltimore.
Bruce, Lee Raymond, Jr., Pasadena.
Campbell, Jack Edwin, Oella.
Lamb, Edward Alan, Dundalk.
Macy, James Robert, Baltimore.
Pearson, Rudolph, Baltimore.
Stoker, Ronald Edward, Forestville.
Tomikel, David Harold, Seabrook.

Marine Corps

Davis, Thomas Raymond, Frostburg.
Minahan, Daniel Joseph, Dorchester.
Rogers, Bobby Dale, Pasadena.

Navy

Mattingly, Harry Albert, Jr., Essex.

MASSACHUSETTS

Army

Bartlett, Arthur Francis, Tyngsboro.
Bellerive, David Leslie, Middleboro.
Corwin, Francis Henry, Jr., Somerville.
Gresch, Frederick William, Ipswich.
Guertin, Donald Alan, Springfield.
Langer, Alan Karl, Lawrence.
LeClair, William George, Athol.
Murray, William Donald, Jr., North Weymouth.
Quinn, Richard James, Cambridge.
Robinson, Charles John, Easthampton.
Silverberg, Arvid Oscar, Jr., West Brookfield.

Marine Corps

Bradley, Gerald Gregory, Braintree.
Cabral, Anibal Sylvia, Jr., New Bedford.
Gale, Alvin Richard, Hyde Park.
Turner, Donald John, South Boston.

MASSACHUSETTS—continued

Navy

Blais, Robert Lawrence, Revere.
Morrison, Wendell Albert, Springfield.

MICHIGAN

Army

Adams, David Vernon, Pontiac.
Andrus, Carl Joseph, Detroit.
Cady, Douglas Michael, Flint.
Cottrell, John Nelson, Vanderbilt.
Crouck, Nathan Eugene, Farmington.
Davis, Harold Michael, Jr., Hazel Park.
Defer, William Charles, Mount Clemens.
Dieckman, James Henry, Saginaw.
Freda, Norman Alan, East Lansing.
Goodman, Norman Elan, Portland.
Greer, Frank Michael, Detroit.
Hays, Kenneth Douglas, Big Rapids.
Isaacs, Gary Neal, Detroit.
Kiel, Steven Tracy, Muskegon.
Measell, Kenneth William, Gaylord.
Michels, Donald Mathew, Jr., Mount Clemens.
O'Neal, Jerry Lee, Flint.
Potter, Wesley Roy, Alma.
Smitherman, Frank Donald, Detroit.
Tellefsen, Timothy Martin, Livonia.
Wallace, Eddie, Ypsilanti.
Washington, Carl, Detroit.
Weatherhead, Gary Robert, Swartz Creek.
Winningham, Richard Daniel, Battle Creek.

Marine Corps

Cole, Jerry Richard, Muskegon.
Kansik, Frederick Daniel, Livonia.

MINNESOTA

Army

Apland, Richard Bruce, Herman.
Bangert, Roger Carl, Albert Lea.
Carlson, Richard Arnold, Wabasha.
Christensen, Jan Paul, Austin.
Harra, Lee Hamilton, Owatonno.
Klein, Don Robert, St. Paul.
Kuffel, Conrad Joseph, Gilman.
Loftus, Craig John, Minneapolis.
Malloy, James Francis, North St. Paul.
Oker, David Paul, Isanti.
Schroeder, Lyle William, Pipestone.
White, Michael James, St. Paul.
Wicklace, Randall James, Aitkin.
Wolter, James Lester, Granada.

Air Force

Bolton, Wayne Franklin, Gordonsville.
Maahs, Milo George, Nashua.

Marine Corps

Meyer, John Franklin, Le Sueur.

Navy

Krekelberg, Raymond Joseph, St. Paul.

MISSISSIPPI

Army

Cowart, John Wayne, Myrtle.
Miller, Alvin Edward, Jackson.
Poore, Robert Earl, Ellisville.
Smith, Robert Walter, Lake Cormorant.
Studway, DeWitt, Jr., Durant.
Talley, Jerry Wayne, Corinth.

MISSOURI

Army

Carlyle, Donald Richard, East Prairie.
Firebaugh, Robert Anthony, Annapolis.
Harris, Lee Russell, St. Louis.
Hunter, Harold Henry, Warrensburg.
Jones, Kenneth Loren, Marshall.
Lederle, Michael Alan, Mexico.
Mann, Edward Harold, St. Louis.
Mason, Roman Gale, Arnold.
McClatchey, Jewel Edward, New Madrid.
McCullough, Marvin L., Jr., Excelsior Springs.
Moore, Joseph Lee, Carthage.
Slayton, Ronald Dennis, Sikeston.
Smith, Edward, Jr., Steele.
Walker, LaValle, St. Louis.
Weiche, Lawrence Michael, Florissant.

Air Force

Lomas, Johnie, Kansas City.

MISSOURI—continued

Marine Corps

Beers, Carl William, Jr., St. Louis.
Boswell, Joe Roscoe, Steele.
May, Gary Wayne, Neosho.
Weaver, John Forrest, Kansas City.

MONTANA

Army

Slusher, Steven, Missoula.

Marine Corps

Hevern, Russell James E., Butte.
Ulstad, Dennis Elmer, Billings.

NEBRASKA

Army

Gillham, Richard Gerald, Grand Island.
Reiser, Steve Ronald, Thedford.
Tippery, Terry Lee, Lincoln.

Navy

Holtz, Paul August, Falls City.
Kurz, Dennis Lee, Palmer.
Leighton, Earl La Roy, Omaha.

NEVADA

Army

Berger, Loran Leon, Reno.

Marine Corps.

Shock, Jack Dean, Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Marine Corps

Douillette, William R., Jr., Concord.

NEW JERSEY

Army

Baker, George Arthur, Little Ferry.
Bastian, Michael Francis, Sewell.
Boyce, James Franklin, Plainfield.
Carlough, George Gerald, Pompton Lakes.
Davis, Charles Henry, Camden.
Flaherty, Paul James, Gloucester City.
Francisco, William, Jr., Summit.
Laird, Jerry Proctor, Allentown.
Lopez, Jose Lius, Passaic.
Marshall, Willie Junior, Newark.
Miller, Robert Theodore, Westfield.
Moore, Leon David, Summit.
Morris, Robert John, Collingswood.
Rivera, Euclides, Irvington.
Ross, Roger Alan, Morrestown.

Air Force

McCollum, James Patrick, Pleasantville.

Marine Corps

Davis, Richard Wayne, Vineland.
Mokuau, Kenneth William, Jr., Wenonah.
Sincavage, Richard, Elizabeth.

Navy

Bauer, Alfred, Keansburg.
McFadyen, Bruce Searight, Montclair.
Melady, Richard Raphael, Dumont.
Pearce, Henry Ellwood, II, Stamhope.

NEW MEXICO

Army

Clough, Kenneth Richard, Albuquerque.
Ortega, Ramon Felix, Jr., Tucumcari.
Roberts, Virgil Jessie, Aztec.
Tafoya, John Olivio, Albuquerque.

Marine Corps

Thomas, William Michael, Carlsbad.

NEW YORK

Army

Adiutori, Richard, New York.
Bellemare, Andri Remi, New York.
Bellwood, Richard Roy, New York.
Burnett, James Sandford, Jr., Water Mill.
Carlin, Stephen Bernard, Oceanside.
Couture, John Victor, Hampton Bays.
Davis, James Gregory, New York.
De Bono, Anthony Jay, College Point.
Doty, Vaughn Ormon, Rainbow Lake.
Ellison, Greg Benson, Bellmore.
Evans, George Augusta, New York.
Freeman, Ronald William, Dunkirk.
Funk, Joseph John, Bay Shore.
Grayson, Joe Edward, Roosevelt.

NEW YORK—continued

Army

Groh, Charles Dieter, New York.
Grompone, James John, Greenvale.
Hendrix, Robert Edward, Rome.
Hitro, Bernard George, Jr., Buffalo.
Jamieson, Gary Lee, Binghampton.
Langhorn, Garfield M., Riverhead.
Levinson, Jay Barry, New York.
Magri, Giuseppe, New York.
Marconi, Frank Joseph, Carmel.
Nogiewich, William Peter, Huntington Station.
Petersen, Carl Robert Watertown.
Prosser, Irvin Willis, Jr., Sauquoit.
Reiter, Bruce Martin, New York.
Roche, Jon Patrick, Canisteo.
Rumsey, Jay Dee, Elmira.
Scavella, Allan Napoleon, New York.
Sims, Harry, New York.
Smith, James Lee, New York.
Soltan, Lawrence William, Bay Shore.
Stec, Robert Michael, Schenectady.
Swidonovich, Nicholas John, New York.
Tripodo, Benedict John, New York.
Warren, John Earl, Jr., New York.
Watson, Arthur, New York.

Air Force

Albanese, John Ernest, Jr., Medina.
Coon, John Lemoine, Phelps.
Gerstenlauer, Peter F., N. Merrick.

Marine Corps

Brezinski, Charles Anthony, Oyster Bay.
Evans, Paul Michael, Buffalo.
Galea, Michael, New York.
Green, Larry, Niagara Falls.
Johnson, Robert Lee, Falconer.
Jourdanails, Thomas F., Jr., Waterford.
Macfarlane, William Joseph, South Ozone Park.
Purvis, Bernard George, Wheeler Lane.
Slingerland, Harold J., Jr., Ravena.
Spark, Michael Melvin, New York.
Thornton, Curtis Francis, North Syracuse.
Gray, William Russell, Jr., Fulton.
Nolan, Michael Francis, Jr., Schuylerville.
Thomas, James Weldon, Buffalo.

NORTH CAROLINA

Army

Anthony, Bobby Dean, Cherryville.
Benton, Benjamin Perry, South Mills.
Best, Hugh Elroy, III, Tarboro.
Gies, Marvin Arthur, Lillington.
Gold, Eric Stuart, Charlotte.
Hayes, Robert Gary, Hiddenite.
Haynes, Dennis Harold, Wilson.
Keel, John David, Robersonville.
Keener, Lawton Arvil, Highlands.
Laney, Jerry Wayne, Monroe.
Love, Robert, Thomasville.
Midgette, Willis Leandrew, Alliance.
Shuler, Roger Dale, Gastonia.
Westmoreland, Bruce Wayne, High Point.
Williams, Bill Fred, Jr., Marion.
Williams, Edgar, W., Jr., Durham.

Air Force

Taylor, William Henry, Wilson.

Marine Corps

Campbell, Robert Merrill, Charlotte.
Holt, Johnny Samuel, Charlotte.
Hoyle, Wayne Roger, Shelby.
Jenkins, Dan Laverne, Goldsboro.
Prestwood, Benny Ray, Hudson.
Rankins, Joseph Mc Kinley, Colerain.

Navy

Morgan, David Elmer, Candler.

OHIO

Army

Allan, Donald Eugene, Jr., Dover.
Ballard, Paul Allen, Columbus.
Beauchamp, Raymond Frederick, Eastlake.
Collins, Gary Edward, Dayton.
Davis, Sylvester, Akron.
Day, Charles Keith, Franklin.
De Ville, Francis Xavier, Columbus.
Ellis, Jesse Leonard, Elyria.
Eutsler, John Wesley, Spencerville.

OHIO—continued

Army

Evans, Willard James, Toledo.
Falk, Gary David, Fairport Harbor.
Gaarder, David Eidnes, Shaker Heights.
Gant, Herman Eugene, Castalia.
George, Leo Allen, Lorain.
Godfrey, Parker Keith, Fletcher.
Hewit, Russel Howard, Jr., Seville.
Long, James Allen, Nevada.
McFarland, Terrence W., Columbus.
Miller, Darrell, Edwin, Columbus.
Pipher, Carl Dale, Canton.
Rupp, Jeffrey David, Bay Village.
Rush, James Theodore, Piqua.
Spangler, Michael Robert, Tarlton.
Stocklin, Curtis Robert, Delphos.
Stone, Paul Aaron, Williamsport.
Vickers, Roger Lee, Springfield.
Von Ahrens, Norman Lee, Toledo.
Warner, Michael Lee, Toledo.
Zimmerman, Richard King, Saint Clairsville.
Zoldi, Gabriel, Parma Heights.

Marine Corps

Baker, Richard Allan, Mansfield.
Culp, Richard Thomas, Akron.
Davis, Abron Earl, Youngstown.
Gauch, David Alan, Euclid.
Henderson, John Leslie, Tallmadge.
Jones, John Howard, Columbus.
Moore, Richard Allen, Madison.
Napoli, Daniel Luke, Cleveland.
Parker, William E., III, Warren.
Riemer, David Walter, Mentor.
Sadick, Richard John, Independence.
Wade, Charles Frederick, Canton.

OKLAHOMA

Army

Blakely, Melford Keith, Shawnee.
Deerinwater, Bruce Edward, McAlester.
Guthrie, Dennis Harold, Quinton.
Hildebrand, Alfred Dean, Cordell.
Messer, Ferrell Edward, Luther.
Pack, Robert Van, Duncan.
Thurman, Raymond Dale, Ada.

Marine Corps

Beck, Larry Monroe, Paoli.
Holding, Darrell Eugene, Woodward.
Kester, Fred Duane, Oklahoma City.
Morrison, Jackie Lee, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

Army

Liddyccat, William Rowland, Portland.
McKibban, Michael James, Klamath Falls.
Neal, Ronald Forrest, Pilot Rock.
Smith, Charles Ernest, Portland.
Thompson, Terry Lee, Beaverton.
Weeks, Michael Douglas, Lake Oswego.

Marine Corps

Mitchell, Tommie Lee, Albany.

Navy

Campbell, Francis Duncan, Geahart.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Balzarini, David Raymond, Jeannette.
Barnes, Walter Edward, Evans City.
De Marco, Patrick Thomas, Carby.
Eshleman, Dennis Charles, Conestoga.
Gaston, Stanley Stephen, Pittsburgh.
Glover, Ralph Lewis, Pittsburgh.
Habecker, Gerald Lloyd, Rothsville.
Harris, Ronald Lee, West Mifflin.
Heine, Charles Edward, Chester.
Hippo, Dennis William, Norristown.
Kapp, John Francis, Scranton.
Klingenmith, Theodore R., New Castle.
Koslosky, Walter Norman, Pittsburgh.
Kunf, John Thomas, Jr., Philadelphia.
Mann, Thomas Charles, Folcroft.
McDonnell, William Herber, Newtown.
Minkus, Dennis James, Port Vue.
Nuhfer, William Daniel, Warren.
O'Farrell, John Michael, Philadelphia.
Olson, William Craig, Russell.
Peters, Kenneth Walter, Philadelphia.
Petteys, James Birch, Shippensburg.

XUM

PENNSYLVANIA—continued

Army

Porter, William Robert, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Reagle, John Louis, Centerville.
Rouscher, John Martin, Manchester.
Rykaczewski, Stanley K., Natrona.
Seely, Richard Clair, Berwick.
Siegrist, Wilbur Jerry, Johnstown.
Tomasko, Damian Thomas, Portage.
Tubbs, Edwin Franklin, Coudersport.
Wright, Tyrone Melvin, Philadelphia.

Air Force

Birchak, Francis Joseph, Latrobe.

Marine Corps

Breen, David Thomas, Easton.
Challener, Robert Joseph, West Mifflin.
Dorn, Michael Lewis, Philadelphia.
Gallagher, Daniel Patrick, Philadelphia.
Heeman, Gary Lee, Sayre.
Lucas, Donald Ray, Centre Hall.
McLay, John Jacob, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Rhoads, Thomas Vernon, Chester.
Rodriquez, Samuel, Philadelphia.

Navy

Hall, David Charles, New Milford.
Rudziak, Erik Niles, Carlisle.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Mullen, Leo Robert, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Adams, Dwane Lonnie, Aiken.
Bouton, William Innes, Jr., Greenville.
Dorsey, Harry James, Nesmith.
Higbee, Charles E., Jr., North Charleston.
Hines, John Thomas, Campobello.
Jones, Horace, Iva.
Jones, William Junior, Westminster.
Mason, Kenneth Allen, Spartanburg.
Nash, Anthony Preston, Fountain Inn.
Robinson, Calvin, Johnston.
Stevenson, Bobby Gene, Greenwood.
Witherspoon, Marion, Charleston.
Yates, Charles Russell, Turbeville.

Marine Corps

Barnette, Roy Grant, Sharon.
Blandin, Raymond Wellington, North Charleston.
Lesaine, Jimmy Wilson, Kingstree.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Apperson, Gerald Franklin, Hot Springs.
Hurney, Joseph Emanual, Sioux Falls.
Sip, Raymond Lee, Bonesteel.

Marine Corps

Janssen, Douglas Duane, Yankton.

TENNESSEE

Army

Ayres, Charles Haskell, Midway.
Bearfield, Cluster Lee, Etowah.
Bradley, Larry Grant, Knoxville.
Chandler, Robert Larry, Bethel Springs.
Cox, Sterling Edward, Knoxville.
Davis, John Paul, Frankewing.
Ford, William Wallace, Knoxville.
Hayes, Jesse Boyd, Grandview.
Livermore, Ross Whittier, Germantown.
Martin, Irvin Eugene, Clarksville.
McFalls, Jerry Arnold, Kingston.
Melton, Ronald David, Whitwell.
Oakes, Arnold Glen, Spencer.
Rollins, Glenn Haskell, Monteagle.
Wilburn, William Levy, Jr., Memphis.

Marine Corps

Armstrong, Robert Dale, Fayetteville.
Blakley, Edwin, Jr., Memphis.
Harris, Larry Ray, Englewood.
Meade, Joseph Lynn, Kingsport.
Mott, William Larry, Jefferson City.
Pless, William Hudsol, Chattanooga.

TEXAS

Army

Bolton, Anderson Don, San Antonio.
Bonetti, Freddie Allen, Brady.

TEXAS—continued

Army

Browne, Frank Harold, II, Fort Worth.
Bullard, Charles Dorian, Arlington.
Cano, Jose Ramon, Austin.
Cantrell, Keith Noland, Amarillo.
Cortez, Juan Esquivel, San Marcos.
Culwell, Jimmy Lee, Lubbock.
Davis, Benny Earl, Dallas.
Dewveall, Jerald Glenn, Fort Worth.
Dominguez, Roberto, El Paso.
Fullerton, Ronnie Joe, Slocum.
Gonzales, Arturo Perez, Cotulla.
Green, Jimmy Leon, Dumas.
Hernandez, Ramon N., El Paso.
Hernandez, William Anthony, Houston.
Holder, Henry Emil, Jr., San Antonio.
Kozik, Raymond Jim, East Bernard.
Macias, Joe, Greenville.
Mitchell, Ronald Earl, Jr., Fort Worth.
Ogden, Edward Paul, Dallas.
Padgett, Dallas Landon, Bacliff.
Reyes, Antonio, O'Donnell.
Riggins, James Patrick, Los Fresnos.
Scott, Danny Ray, Fort Worth.
Smith, L. C., Jr., Dallas.
Soza, Reynaldo, Alice.
Taylor, David Earl, Big Spring.
Torres, Gilbert Garcia, Munday.
Verastique, Johnny Ralph, Houston.
Wacker, Joseph Henry, Houston.

Marine Corps

Armbruster, Anthony Clark, Orange.
Estrada, Juan Vargas, Eagle Pass.
Gilmore, Harlon Joe, Waco.
Hill, Irvin Hugh, Seagraves.
Jackson, Amil, Jr., San Antonio.
Morgan, Aubra Erie, Jr., Arlington.
Oakes, Bruce Donald, Fort Worth.
Olsowski, Gary Neal, Dallas.
Pearce, Jerry Doyle, Celeste.
Reeves, Samuel David, Jr., Austin.
Roberson, William Thomas, Abilene.

Navy

Campos, Jose Ballentine, Seguin.

UTAH

Army

Bailey, Scott Jay, Salt Lake City.
Feinauer, Wayne Owen, Salt Lake City.
Lafon, Val Lyndon, Ogden.
Maurin, Charles Dennis, Santaquin.
Moore, Lyle Thomas, Grantsville.
Nance, Shirl Brad, Salt Lake City.
Percival, Alton D., Roosevelt.

VERMONT

Marine Corps

Currier, Philip Buchanan, Newport.

VIRGINIA

Army

Cates, Norman Louis, Hampton.
Clark, Danny Taylor, South Hill.
Dixon, Roger Allen, Richmond.
Eskridge, Warren Reed, Tangier.
Gravley, James Thomes, Pulaski.
Hodson, Charles Herbert, Jr., Winchester.
Roberts, James Richard, Hampton.
Rush, Joseph Bradley, Dunn Loring.
Thompson, Grover Willis, Marion.
Thornton, Matthew Winston, Alexandria.
Watkins, Charles Henry, Jr., Buffalo Junction.
Williams, David Michael, Arlington.

Marine Corps

Gimbert, Martin Joseph, Virginia Beach.
Gorbitt, Wallace Thomas, Richmond.
Jones, Raymond Parker, Arlington.
Stancil, Gregory Hale, Arlington.

Navy

Wilk, Joseph Anthony, Jr., Newport News.

WASHINGTON

Army

Brower, Patrick Earl, Auburn.
Cheney, Daniel Bernard, Bellingham.
Holt, Daniel James, Renton.
Holzheimer, Dennis Allen, Toppenish.
Martin, Merle James, Omak.

WASHINGTON—continued

Marine Corps

Hanna, Rocky Wade, Addy.
Heider, Donald George, Renton.
McClintock, Ted Ernest, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Ayers, Johnnie Marvin, Elkview.
Fitzwater, John Curtis, Charleston.
Moreland, Thomas Lee, Charleston.
Mullins, Stephen Ralph, Shady Spring.
Rollins, William Blaine, Jr., Saint Marys.

Marine Corps

Koerner, Frank Michael, Wheeling.

Navy

Thomas, Michael Dale, Huntington.

WISCONSIN

Army

Bulin, Jerrald Joseph, Beloit.
Erickson, Marvin Le Roy, Ashland.
Feder, Lloyd Arthur, Green Lake.
Gahagan, James Milan, Cleveland.
Gehrke, Gary Bernard, Woodruff.
Hartman, Bruce Bradley, Prescott.
Horn, Alec Henry, New Berlin.
Jacobson, Mark Nels, La Crosse.
Kellenbenz, Barry Charles, Manitowoc.
Knox, James Richard, Newton.
Martin, Terry Lynn, Milwaukee.
Olson, Craig Seimon, Osseo.
Pederson, Marvin Clifford, Monroe.
Rawling, Bruce H., Prescott.
Roum, Steven Jerome, Cambridge.
Vogeli, Ralph Lee, Cambria.
Wieckowicz, Anthony Joseph, Conrath.
Wojtkiewicz, Jeremy Robert, Weyerhauser.

Marine Corps

Cleereman, David Frank, Green Bay.
Quezada, Jesus, Milwaukee.
Vanerem, Dan Allen, Green Bay.

WYOMING

Army

Farris, Dennis Barry, Cheyenne.

GUAM

Army

Carter, Donald Suminguit, Dedeco.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Bauza-Perez, Juan, Rio Piedras.
Gonzales-Madera, Angel L., Albonito.
Guzman-Pagan, Jorge Luis, Aguas Buenas.
Jimenez-Gonzalez, Isabelio, Santurce.
Ruiz-Perez, Roberto, Aguaga.
Santos-Izagas, Diosdado, Rio Piedras.
Velez-Rodriguez, Elliott, Vega Baja.

Air Force

Maldonado, Juan Arturo, Santurce.

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Army

Aubain, Roy Antonio, St. Thomas.

FCC'S PROPOSED BAN ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING IS DISCRIMINATORY AND USURPS CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1969, the Federal Communications Commission—FCC—issued a notice of proposed rulemaking, amending part 72 of the FCC rules, to the effect that the FCC was banning all cigarette advertising on radio and television unless the Congress vetoed the order before June 30, 1969.

I object.

I object not because I come from a tobacco producing or processing district, because I do not.

I object not because I own any interest in any radio, television, advertising agency, or tobacco-related business, because I do not.

I object not because I believe cigarette smoking is in any way beneficial to one's health, ego, or well-being, because I do not.

I object for two reasons which are basic and fundamental to our system of government—the proposed ban is discriminatory and usurps congressional authority.

My credentials for objecting will measure up to any other Member. For years I have worked in many ways to dissuade youngsters from starting to smoke before they know the consequences. I opposed the cigarette package labeling law because it was weak. I have urged the networks to voluntarily restrict cigarette advertising during daytime youth programs and sporting events, and am disappointed with their response. I have worked with the American Cancer Society to obtain more antismoking advertising on the electronic media. I believe that cigarette smoking is dangerous to one's health—it can and does cause death and agony.

I believe young people become hooked by smoking even though tobacco may not be technically addictive, and that radio and television advertising induces some teenagers and preteenagers to start smoking before they are able to make a responsible judgment. I believe cigarette smoking shortens more lives, causes more misery and suffering, wastes more money, and is responsible for more property damage than all nonmilitary guns, which have been the object of considerable recent congressional attention. Cigarette smoking also contributes significantly to the air pollution of public transportation and accommodations, and to the litter of our public places.

In brief, I oppose cigarette smoking for a myriad of sound reasons.

It is the responsibility and the prerogative of the Congress to initiate and enact any legislation which regulates interstate advertising. The Congress did not and should not delegate this power to any independent agency of the Federal Government. The Congress has given the FCC the authority to regulate "interstate and foreign commerce in communications." This power includes authority to issue radio and television licenses and to regulate those licensees—but it does not include the authority to set moral or social standards and then restrict truthful, balanced advertising of a perfectly legal product. By this order the FCC has spent considerable time and effort to arrogate to itself a constitutional function of the Congress.

The FCC notice of proposed rulemaking is discriminatory. It will prohibit cigarette advertising on radio and television, but this is only a part of total cigarette advertising. Interstate cigarette advertising will still be permitted in newspapers, magazines, and by direct mail.

This discriminatory factor emphasizes the basic error of the FCC order. No single independent agency should be permitted to enact a law which proscribes for only a portion of a particular industry. If cigarette advertising is deemed to be illegal, it should be banned in all media.

I oppose the FCC order because the law-making responsibility of the Congress should not be usurped by an independent agency. Congress should not mutely stand by while an independent agency arrogates to itself a legislative function.

The FCC order is discriminatory, and Congress should intervene to obviate this unfair discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress consider the whole subject of cigarette advertising, vitiate the FCC order, and enact whatever legislation is deemed necessary.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST-PACIFIC SOUTHWEST INTERDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, despite some opinion differences which might exist between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest States over water matters, we have always taken it for granted that the two regions had some very basic, and important, common interests.

Now we no longer have to depend on mere assumptions. A new, comprehensive study, entitled "Economic Inter-Dependence of the Western States," has been made public and it clearly, forcefully portrays what we have long thought: that the economic ties between the four great States of the Northwest—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana—and the seven States of the Colorado River Basin—Arizona, California, Nevada, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah—are so close and so extensive that it is not only economically smart, but almost necessary, that the 11 States consider themselves as a single economic unit.

Whether or not the two regions ever decide upon any transbasin transfer of surplus water, this study will serve as a meaningful basis for future interregional relationships. It should be read and digested not only by the Members from the 11 States involved but by all Members with problems similar to ours and those interested in the strong economic dependence between specific regions vis-a-vis neighboring areas and the U.S. economy as a whole.

This report was prepared by an outstanding Los Angeles economist, Wilbur McCann, for the Colorado River Association, a citizens organization concerned with the water supply of the Colorado River and how it affects the six major agencies in southern California which rely on the river for about 80 percent of their total water needs. The report was unveiled March 24 at a meeting of the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce by Philip F. Walsh, vice president for economic development for the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce.

I request permission to have the whole of Mr. Walsh's fine speech inserted with my remarks, but I would also like to quote some pertinent passages from it.

Quoting some of the report's conclusions, Mr. Walsh points out that "the West has long played an important part in the economic development of the United States and its role in the future will become even more vital. The long-range growth and economic health of this Nation will be increasingly affected by what happens in the West."

The report proves, he noted, that "virtually every part of the West has an economic interest in every other major geographic segment of the country. This community of interest stems from the flow of goods and services between points within the West in both directions, with the receiving areas benefiting from this interchange as well as the shipping or originating areas."

These are just a few examples of the North-to-South commerce:

> The four States of the Northwest—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana—sell the 25 million people in the Southwest everything from apples to insurance—and in vast quantities. About one-third of the tonnage of all commodities shipped by rail out of this region goes to the Southwest. More than one-fourth of the Northwest's total lumber production—most of it in Oregon—is shipped to the Southwest. Manufacturers in Seattle and vicinity ship more than one million tons of goods yearly to the Southwest.
>
> The Los Angeles area alone buys more Washington apples than Chicago, New York and Detroit combined; more than a half million bushels of Oregon apples go to just California each year by truck. The Northwest, principally Idaho, supplies around 30 per cent of all the butter shipped into the Los Angeles market. Idaho and Oregon ship more than 300 million pounds of potatoes a year to four city markets—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver and Salt Lake City. The shipments of Oregon potatoes to these four cities constitute more than half of the total shipments to 41 cities throughout the nation. Los Angeles is also the most important market for dry onions from Oregon.
>
> Considering air travel, nearly 50 per cent of the passengers at Seattle-Tacoma airport are either going to or coming from points in the Southwest. The pattern is similar at the Portland airport and others up here.
>
> To turn to another area, the 12 insurance companies headquartered in the state of Washington do more than 30 per cent of their business in California alone.

The findings which I have just cited, a mere fraction of the eye-opening data contained in the McCann report, certainly give substance to the conclusion that "in problems affecting the economic development of major portions of the West, it is logical to consider the West as a whole because of the extensive and real interdependence involved. The West also justifies a regional approach to its problems on the basis of its size and importance. If the West were a separate country, it would rank fifth in area and 16th in production among the 140 nations of the world."

Here is the text of Mr. Walsh's speech:

NORTHWEST AND SOUTHWEST—ECONOMIC PARTNERS

> It is a pleasure to be with you here today on behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. I am also here in a very real sense on behalf of the entire Pacific Southwest which in the context of my talk means the seven states of the Colorado River Basin,

XUM

namely, Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming.

I might begin by saying how greatly impressed I was by the sight of the mighty Columbia River as our plane came in to your airport late yesterday afternoon. The thought flashed suddenly into my mind why no one in California or elsewhere in the arid Southwest has ever considered investigating whether some of that majestic flow of water might be surplus to your needs up here.

Seriously, the Southwest believes as strongly as ever that this question should be studied fairly and carefully. The subject of my talk today is not water but, as a former chairman of the water and power committee of the L.A. chamber, I must say that water shortages will inevitably occur in the Southwest unless more water is brought into the Colorado River Basin. Desalting of ocean water, whether modification, reclamation of waste water, more efficient use of existing supplies—all these will play an increasingly important part in meeting future needs.

However, we in the Southwest are convinced that large-scale importation of water from some other basin will also be necessary and that it is shortsighted not to include a study of the Columbia in any overall assessment of how best to solve this far-reaching problem. And when I say shortsighted I mean from the standpoint of the Northwest as well because of the innumerable and strong economic links between the two regions. If an impartial, objective study proves there are really surplus waters in the Columbia, the exportation of some of that surplus to the Southwest might prove to be the wisest economic investment the people of the Pacific Northwest ever make.

Now, the study of another sort which I will discuss today—it is entitled "The Economic Inter-dependence of the Western States"—may turn out to be only a historical footnote for, as you may have heard up here, an interesting assortment of telepaths, astrologers, cultists and kooks are predicting doom for much of California very shortly. A devastating earthquake will split off the coastal areas of the state and Los Angeles and San Francisco will plop neatly into the ocean. San Francisco and Los Angeles will finally have something in common. This is all going to happen at noon on April 4 which also happens to be Good Friday—but apparently not for California. The spirit of free enterprise never flags in Los Angeles and there is already a radio commercial on the air selling residential lots far, far out on the bleak sands of the Colorado Desert. "The beaches are already in," the huckster says, "and the Pacific Ocean will be arriving soon."

However, undaunted by the approach of doomsday, let me go ahead anyway. First, a word of explanation about the origin of this study. It was made for the Colorado River Association, a citizens organization concerned over the water supply of the Colorado River Basin. The study was conducted by Wilbur McCann, an economic consultant of the highest standing. It is being made public today throughout the West simultaneouly with my talk here. There will be copies available for you as you leave this meeting. I hope you will take one with you and read it carefully.

Now, we didn't need this report to tell us or you that a lot of food stuffs and manufactured goods come from the Northwest to the Southwest. But the enormous volume and the striking diversity of all this is brought out with sharp impact by the information Mr. McCann assembled from a multitude of authoritative sources and organized into understandable shape. I am a businessman myself and I did not expect to learn too much of value when I opened this booklet. In contrast, I learned a very great deal for I came to realize as I never had before that this great Western part of the United States is so closely interlinked economically that there is no Northwest or Southwest economy—there is just a single, thriving, constantly growing economic unit. And it is time that we all recognize this and work even more closely with one another in seeking answers to common problems and, where we can, helping one another.

Since I first read this study a month or so ago, I've been clipping stories from the newspapers that point up the existence of the closest kind of economic partnership in the West. For example, just a few days ago a 19-million-dollar contract for construction of a tunnel in the Los Angeles area was awarded to Lockheed Shipbuilding and Construction Company of Seattle. Proving you are not against all our water planning the tunnel will be part of the distribution system for the water that the State of California is bringing 450 miles down from Northern California. And your Governor Tom McCall held a press conference in Los Angeles to invite California business and industry to expand their activities into Oregon. And I read where some of the charming specimens of young America from the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco were flocking north to establish a a hippy colony north of Seatttle—not far enough north, you'll say. And I read an editorial about how the Pacific Northwest Power Intertie with the Southwest has lessened the chances of either of the areas suffering from a blackout as well as providing direct economic benefits to each region.

As a matter of fact, the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie deserves some special comment here today. It is an excellent working example of how these two great regions can cooperate to mutual advantage. You have vast power resources and we have vast power needs. A group of public and private electric utilities in the Southwest have agreed to buy from the Bonneville Power Administration surplus peaking capacity and surplus energy. The intertie system is a two-way street which also gives the Northwest the right to buy excess Southwest energy. The ability to transmit power in both directions increases the flexibility and reliability of operation of electric power systems throughout the West.

This was dramatically demonstrated last December when a construction crane working at the Grand Coulee power plant of the Bonneville system accidentally contacted power lines carrying one million kilowatts of electrical energy. The interconnected utilities in California were able to absorb this "bump" without incident, avoiding what might have been a major power blackout. A week later the California utilities again were of major assistance to the Northwest. Severe winter storms and the temporary loss of generation at the Bonneville Hanford nuclear power plant made it necessary for the Northwest to call on California utilities for assistance through the intertie network.

The capability of existing 500,000-volt intertie transmission lines to handle emergency deliveries of power under extreme conditions, as I have described, will be beefed up substantially when the 750,000-volt direct current line being built by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to provide another major power link with the Bonneville area is completed late this year. While this 105-million-dollar project was conceived primarily to bring an important new power resource to the Los Angeles area, it may prove of critical importance to the Northwest again if emergency conditions should require.

These operational considerations, important as they are, are fringe benefits to the basic financial fact that the purchase of surplus power through the intertie network is expected to increase net income of the Bonneville Power Authority by as much as 20 million dollars annually on a long-term basis. This proves how mutually beneficial regional cooperation can be.

But now let me tick off a few statistical highlights of this economic study of the **inter-dependence of the Western States. . . .**

The four states of the Northwest—Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana—sell the 25 million people in the Southwest everything from apples to insurance—and in vast quantities. About one-third of the tonnage of all commodities shipped by rail out of this region goes to the Southwest. More than one-fourth of the Northwest's total lumber production—most of it in Oregon—is shipped to the Southwest. Manufacturers in Seattle and vicinity ship more than one million tons of goods yearly to the Southwest.

The Los Angeles area alone buys more Washington apples than Chicago, New York and Detroit combined; more than a half million bushels of Oregon apples go to just California each year by truck. The Northwest, principally Idaho, supplies around 30 per cent of all the butter shipped into the Los Angeles market. Idaho and Oregon ship more than 300 million pounds of potatoes a year to four city markets—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver and Salt Lake City. The shipments of Oregon potatoes to these four cities constitute more than half of the total shipments to 41 cities throughout the nation. Los Angeles is also the most important market for dry onions from Oregon.

Considering air travel, nearly 50 per cent of the passengers at Seattle-Tacoma airport are either going to or coming from points in the Southwest. The pattern is similar at the Portland airport and others up here.

To turn to another area, the 12 insurance companies headquartered in the state of Washington do more than 30 per cent of their business in California alone.

And then there's beer. . . . The Los Angeles-Orange County area with some eight million people is by far the largest beer market in the West and major breweries throughout the country compete intensively in this market. A survey conducted by the marketing research department of the Los Angeles Times showed that one of the two most popular brands in the area is Olympia, a product of the Olympia Brewing Company near Tacoma. And as the Olympia ads in the magazines say, "All beers are over 90 per cent water . . . that's why we brew ours at Tumwater." What better proof do you need that you really aren't basically against letting us have some of your water?

A few more examples of Oregon's exports for the latest year records were available—and these cover shipments only to California. . . . 223,000 beef cattle and calves . . . 162,000 sheep and lambs . . . 23,000 tons of barley, oats, wheat and other grains.

I could go on at great length with more examples that abound in the report demonstrating how much business and industry and agriculture up here look to the Southwest for their markets, but they are there in the report for you to read yourself. Let me instead give you some of the general conclusions reached by Mr. McCann on the basis of the statistics he collected.

First, the West has long played an important part in the economic development of the United States and its role in the future will become even more vital. The long-range growth and economic health of this nation will be increasingly affected by what happens in the West. Based on Census Bureau projections, the 11 Western states will account for 25 per cent of the net population growth in the United States as a whole between now and 1985. In other words, a fourth of the nation's total growth will be concentrated in the West in the immediate years ahead. The West will also be responsible for

XUM

a fourth or more of many other aspects of national growth.

Second, virtually every part of the West has an economic interest in every other major geographic segment of this part of the country. This community of interest stems from the flow of goods and services between points within the West in both directions, with the receiving areas benefiting from this interchange as well as the shipping or originating areas. In problems affecting the economic development of major portions of the West, it is logical to consider the West as a whole because of the extensive and real inter-dependences involved. The West also justifies a regional approach to its problems on the basis of its size and importance. If the West were a separate country, it would rank 5th in area and 16th in production among the 140 nations of the world.

And the last of the conclusions of this study. . . . As transportation and communication methods continue to improve, the degree of economic inter-dependence in the West will increase. Modern means of transport brought the West closer to distant markets (world and national) at the same time telescoping the West into a more compact viable economic unit. Forces are at work which will continue this trend and bring the West even closer together. The West will become more diversified and specialized, depending to an ever greater extent on the exchange of goods and services between its various geographic areas. It is obvious to even the casual observer that this trend is under way in countless ways.

And in concluding let me add a few more words of my own. I believe this economic study—which as far as we know is the first one to bring together a wealth of material of this kind—should be an invaluable tool in unifying the leaders in all the Western states on countless important programs. Perhaps it will help those of us in the Southwest to solve our long-range water problems by suggesting to you that their solution may be just as much in your fundamental interest as in ours. I can tell you that the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce looks forward to an even friendlier and more productive relationship with the Portland chamber than we have enjoyed in the past. If the West is in truth a single economic unit—and can there be any doubt remaining that this is the fact—it is urgently necessary that we help each other in all ways that we can find.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Gerald R. Ford) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the day when the Byelorussian people proudly proclaimed their independence only to be overwhelmed by Bolshevik invaders. Today, lovers of freedom among the Byelorussians just as proudly proclaim that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic established in place of independent Byelorussia is simply an administrative arm of the Soviet Union and does not truly represent the Byelorussian people. I firmly and fervently believe in the right of national self-determination, Mr. Speaker. The only government worthy of the name is that which governs by consent of the governed. Let it be noted here and now that there has never been a free election in Byelorussia during the 51 years since it first was absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In their dedication to truth and freedom, Americans salute freedom-loving Byelorussians here and throughout the world on this the 51st anniversary of their independence day. We share with them the hope that one day they will realize their national aspirations and retrieve the rights which are properly theirs.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore granted to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly) for March 26, 1969, be transferred to Thursday, March 27, 1969.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS' 1972 CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the continuing deterioration of our environment has reached crisis proportions. If this many-faceted worldwide problem is not attacked quickly and effectively, the results will surely be catastrophic.

An important step toward the restoration of a healthy environment was taken on December 3, 1968, when the United Nations General Assembly unanimously agreed to hold a U.N. Conference on the Human Environment in 1972.

Many of us have become increasingly alarmed by the steady growth of environmental contamination. I have seen it in my home State and in other Great Lakes States. I have seen it in many other parts of our country. And I have seen it abroad. Man's activities are largely responsible for the deterioration of our air, water, and land, and the degradation of the living things on our planet. It is man's responsibility to find the cure.

For this reason I am heartened by the U.N.'s action. I am sure that millions of persons throughout the world who have become increasingly concerned with both the urgency and the magnitude of this problem share my hope that this conference will help to protect and improve man's environment.

The 1972 conference will study the accelerating impairment of the quality of the human environment caused by air and water pollution, erosion and other forms of soil deterioration, waste, noise, and secondary effects of biocides, which are hastened by rapidly increasing population and urbanization.

Although the conference agenda has not yet been established, it is likely to emphasize such questions as what man, by himself and through the U.N. and other international organizations, can do about air and water pollution; the adverse effects of pesticides, fertilizers and other chemicals entering the environment; radioactive wastes; oil spills from tankers; the rising carbon dioxide content of the earth's atmosphere; noise pollution; the continuing crowding of people into urban areas; and the physical and psychological effects of uncontrolled urban growth.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees will also consider the question of how to deal most effectively with the world's disappearing plant and animal species. In the 88th Congress, I introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 107, which I reintroduced in the 89th Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 1032, calling on the United States to "take all necessary steps to convene an international governmental conference on the conservation of wildlife, after consultation with, and if possible, under the sponsorship of, the United Nations or its specialized agencies."

On October 7, 1966, I testified in support of House Concurrent Resolution 1032 before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which thereafter reported it favorably.

In my testimony I underscored the need for a coordinated international effort "to conserve the earth's resources of wildlife." We must have, I stated, "joint action by all of the developed and developing countries, which can only come out of an international conference in order to bring an end to the disastrous poaching of wildlife." I also pointed out that voluntary international conservation organizations—such as the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—the IUCN—had taken the lead to save endangered species of wildlife from extinction.

The world's conservation needs far exceed the resources of private organizations. The participation of the governments of the world—their expertise, technical help, information, experience, and financial assistance—is required to keep the great benefits of conservation and to avert the loss of world assets that are literally priceless.

The IUCN recently reported—almost 2½ years after the hearings on House Congressional Resolution 1032—that "mammals alone are disappearing at a rate of one species per year," and that "the ranks of 250 mammals are dwindling so fast that they may become extinct at any moment—in a year or in a decade."

The conference participants will face both an enormous task and an enormous challenge. To the assembled member governments, natural and social scientists, educators, businessmen, engineers, and other leaders, will fall not only the job of discussing the problems and making the decisions, but also the task of recommending the action that is needed to attain and preserve a healthy environment for all mankind and living things.

In the meantime, we in America must intensify our efforts to control, and eventually to prevent, the pervasive contamination of the environment. For no one is immune from the ravages of this man-made destruction.

MIAMI, FLA., YOUTH HOLD SUCCESSFUL RALLY FOR DECENCY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, national attention was focused on Miami, Fla., this past Sunday as some 30,000 teenage citizens, celebrities, and others gathered in the Orange Bowl for the Miami Teenage Rally for Decency.

This outstanding demonstration of the basic goodness of the overwhelming majority of our youngsters came about in spontaneous reaction to the recent appearance of a music group whose lead singer was subsequently charged with indecent exposure. That "performance" outraged most Miamians, but it was the teenagers themselves who took the lead in arranging the "down with obscenity" rally to counteract the adverse picture which that event created.

Miami's teenagers wanted the world to know that they were not sitting idly by while such a group smeared the reputation of the entire youthful community. And the world turned its eyes to their message as 30,000 "stood up to be counted" on the side of decency in all aspects of life.

I heartily applaud the Teenage Rally for Decency. It is a stirring and patriotic reminder of the basic creed of all Americans—and of the spiritual and moral values that have made this country great. I devoutly hope that it will help lead to a revitalization of the wholesome national spirit of our heritage, as millions of other proud Americans also "stand up" for decency.

With the fine example set by the teenagers of Miami, I hope and believe that other youngsters throughout this fine land will realize the need for each of us to contribute his part to the goal. By uniting in purpose and spirit, our citizens can restore the high standards of decency and righteousness that have served us so well during our history.

Among the many news media covering the rally was the Miami Herald. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am happy to include its accounts of the event in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

DECENCY RALLY RATTLES ORANGE BOWL TO RAFTERS

(By Jean Wardlow)

Roaring "rock" and cheering teenagers shook Miami's Orange Bowl stadium to its cantilevered roof and rattled it down to its locker room doors Sunday as a crowd of 30,000 "stood up to be counted" at the Miami Teenage Rally for Decency.

"I want to tell you," said The Great One, Jackie Gleason, to the cheering teens rallying for 'decency' in all areas of life, "that up to now I've told people I'm happy to be a Floridian."

"But now, after what you kids are doing, I want to say I'm proud to be a Floridian." Most of the crowd, which began arriving about 1 p.m. for the pre-show, was teens. They came, in groups or on their own, some displaying hand-lettered signs, "Down With Obscenity," "Mater Center Backs You" and "St. John Bosco Youth Movement Supports You."

There were kids in jeans, kids in sneakers, Kids in minis and Sunday best. Kids in sports shirts and flare pants and kids in tie and jacket. Negro kids, white kids, a few with beards, a few with beads; short kids, tall kids—all clapping in time to the music of some top stars whom they'd seen on TV, heard on records and who were appearing at their rally for free because they believed "in our cause."

Sleepy-eyed Ronnie Smith of The Lettermen was clutching his breakfast-lunch—part of a hot dog and a coke—because the pop singing group had driven all night without sleep after a Saturday night concert in Jacksonville to take part here.

"We wanted to take part to bring back the good will entertainment groups should have and which was lost to some extent by what happened (with The Doors' performance here)," Smith said.

"Man, that's a great audience," said singer Barry Smith, who had had to shed his dapper jacket and mop his brow Sachmo-style because of the hot sun. "I'd like to find out who's their agent," he joked.

"It's tremendous," said a smiling and sunburned priest, Father James Briggs of St. Mary's Cathedral. He was coordinator of the rally which was supported jointly by Protestant, Catholic and Jewish groups, civil and community leaders from all faiths and political areas of Dade.

"It won't stop here," one of the rally's teens said. "This shows we are in the majority. The kids are with us."

(It is estimated that the countywide total of Dade's teenagers is 70,000.)

Father Briggs said the rally "will probably evolve into a countywide group. Gleason, who had been driven in in a 1911 touring car (all celebrities arrived by these special cars) had said, "I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps even around the world."

Miami Dolphin football star Bob Griese, standing on the sidelines after his appearance, said, looking out at the cheering stadium, "You hear so much on TV programs about the bad teenagers. They're not in the majority at all, and this shows what the fine teenagers are really like. I think it's been a privilege to take part in this."

From the time the youngsters first entered the stadium, the boom of electrified sound shook their eardrums. At first, sitting in seats higher up, many later moved down to sit on the wall in front of box seats to be closer to the action—performers playing from the huge stage at the east end of the field.

The youngsters clapped, waved small U.S. flags given out by the American Legion, or kicked their heels in time to the music.

It was an enthusiastic crowd—"we've had to give out a couple of dozen aspirin—too much excitement," said a nurse at one of the stadium's four emergency nursing stations. But it was an orderly crowd throughout the long program.

At first scheduled for two hours—two and a half with the pre-show—it went to nearly four hours long, with more crowd remaining at the end than at major football games in the stadium.

"This is great. Just great," said a happy Mike Levesque, one of the originators of the rally and who, one friend said, "is so tired he can hardly stand up by now. He says it will be relaxing to just go back to school now."

Mike was presented with a special book from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge during the program. Singer Anita Bryant made the presentation.

The singer, obviously moved by the event, told the audience, "I had a speech prepared, but now that I see the reaction of what can happen when our young people stand up for what they believe in God and our country, it makes me at a loss for words."

Ted Mack told them, "These young people are out to show the world it isn't about to fall apart."

From the first electrified twang of The Shufflin' Kind, the CYO groups and The Rainbeaux in the pre-show, the crowd was "with" the entertainers, and the five teenage speakers who alternated between acts of the regular rally program.

And the acts showed the kids can be modern without being square or obscene.

First, to wild cheers, came the red-jacketed The Letterman ("Up, Up and Away") and then, to more wild cheers, The Village Stompers in modern Dixieland fashion whose "Washington Square" was a top hit.

There were the lavender minied and rose-colored Edward-jacketed The Faculty, which brought cheering like somebody had just made a touchdown, and The Rhodes Brothers—"the Rhodes," the kids called them—whose nationwide recording of "Never My Love" was a best seller, had a whole stadium singing along ("don't be bashful, chillun, 'cause that's not where it's at").

The acts were hip, hep and high-powered. "It's to show what we like is modern, but modern doesn't have to be obscene," said a rally teen.

By the time the big-act Impact of Brass and Sing Out America had finished their "thing" the teens had surrounded them with requests for autographs and had enough musical memories to fill a recorded scrapbook.

In between, the basic ideals of what the rally stood for on topics of God, patriotism, family, sex, and equality of man, were expressed by Joe Burke, Columbus High; Alan Rosenthal, Miami High; Pat Idlette, Miami High; Juliet James, Westminster Christian; and Mike Levesque.

"The power of Love is found in all people and makes us all brothers," said Joe Burke. "It's up to us to use our powers of democracy," said Alan Rosenthal. "We do not seek to overcome; we seek to unify."

"Sex is being exploited," said Julie James. "We can be both modern and modest. Sex is not a plaything," she said. "It is not giving up the body without giving up a commitment of the total self."

And Mike said that each man "must realize for himself that he cannot just sit back and let the world go by him. He must be a part of the world."

And as the last amplified guitar string faded out over the goalpost, the Rev. Ted Place—the offstage emcee and executive director of the Greater Miami Youth for Christ—lauded the teens "who had the courage and concern to stand here and be counted."

SHOULD DO THIS EVERY 6 MONTHS

(By Larry Mahoney)

Plain old-fashioned Americanism, tinged with a touch of rock, reigned in the Orange Bowl on a euphoric Sunday afternoon dedicated to decency.

This is the way it was:

Legionnaires, whose own wars ended long ago, pass out 20,000 pocket-sized versions of the Stars and Stripes. The Rhodes Brothers give booming renditions of "The Green Berets" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." The Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge presents an award for "moral courage."

Jackie Gleason in an antique 1911 white touring car. Anita Bryant in a 1931 Model T. Ted Mack quoting Patrick Henry. Congressman Claude Pepper, newest member of the old House Un-American Activities Committee, standing at attention for The Star Spangled Banner, a Legion flag over his heart. Near him is Father Sean O'Sullivan, the young priest from County Cork who inspired the rally.

Mayor Chuck Hall, a flag in his breast pocket, likes the scene. "I think we should do it every six months," his honor said. "This is magnificent, isn't it?"

XUM

Watching the crowd are 60 off-duty Miami policemen, double the number who staffed the famous exhibition of The Doors at Dinner Key March 1. After the rally was done, Sgt. Ronnie Reeder goes before national network TV cameras to say: "This is the best Orange Bowl crowd I've ever seen; absolutely no hoodlums around. We weren't needed. The officers have decided to donate their day's pay to the rally." That comes to about $20 from each patrolman, $25 for the sergeants.

A sign: "Stay Clean—Swim! the Coral Park High Swim Team."

A Salvation Army banner flutters in the breeze on the other side of the stadium. Some 200 children, largely subteens, are recruited from the stands to march afield with The Miami Herald's giant American flags.

Moral rearmament is represented by Miami's "Up With People" singers, who sang all the old ones such as "Which Way America?" and "The Nicest People I Know Are People."

Hank Meyer, the publicist, beams as Jackie Gleason puts in a plug for Florida before the national TV cameras. Anita Bryant draws an ovation when she mentions her twins: "And they're heavyweights, by the way . . . six pounds, 10½ ounces, and six pounds, three ounces."

Mrs. Annie King James—"just say I'm past 80"—is wearing a feathered hat and a hand-knit sweater with the U.S. flag on one side and "G.O.P." on the other. She was carried into the stadium aboard her special chair.

"Wouldn't have missed it," she said. "I'm interested in better government and what these kids are doing."

Outside, a few pickets parade with signs bearing messages like this: "Jesus Is Coming. This Is The Last Generation." Ken Russell, 17, of Fort Lauderdale, explains: "We're a group of former hippies and drug addicts who're going all the way for Christ." Ken's hair is still long enough to draw unfriendly looks from a squad of policemen.

Inside, Father O'Sullivan, the cherubic Irish priest, is smiling. "The teenagers," he said, "now realize that solidarity is their strength. They will strike when the iron is hot . . ."

BILL TO HALT FLOW OF OBSCENITY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for years, Members of Congress and other concerned public officials have tried to do something about the multimillion-dollar pornography industry which is flooding the Nation with all forms of smut and filth. My own efforts as a Congressman to halt this flow of obscenity go back to my first term, in the 84th Congress, when I was a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. After our committee made an extensive study of distribution of obscene and fraudulent materials through the U.S. postal system, Congress passed legislation authorizing the Postmaster General to impound mail directed to a person or firm known to be distributing such literature. I also backed legislation in the 85th Congress authorizing the detention of such mail, both at point of origin and point of destination. In the next Congress, we strengthened the Post Office's powers to detain these indecent and salacious materials by giving authorities adequate time to prepare criminal charges. Still another strong effort to combat smut was made, the "antipandering" bill, which was passed by the 90th Congress. This allows any postal patron receiving material which he considers objectionable to request the Post Office to order his name expunged from the mailing list.

I wholeheartedly and vigorously supported all of these, and other, attacks on the pornography racket. Yet our mail in congressional offices tells us that still more needs to be done. The people are complaining that unsought smut continues to fill their mailboxes. In 1968 alone, the Post Office Department received more than 165,000 formal complaints from recipients of unsolicited offensive mailings. Citizens also complain about the lurid books, photographs, and magazines sold at newscounters everywhere.

One reason that our past efforts have proved inadequate is the difficulty in winning court approval of antipornography measures. For example, our statute providing criminal penalties for anyone sending obscene materials through the mail has proved difficult or impossible to enforce because the courts have construed the term "obscene" in accordance with the definition formulated by the landmark Supreme Court decision in the 1957 Roth against United States case. That decision said the test of obscenity was "whether, to the average person applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material takes as a whole appeals to the prurient interest" in a manner so as to be patently offensive. The practical effect of this test has been to open the mails and newsstands to practically any material, including that which many persons would describe as pure hard-core pornography.

The Supreme Court's purpose has been made clear in other cases reviewing and reversing lower court findings of obscenity—it believes that the Constitution's "free speech" clause gives the widest protection to the freedom of adult speech and communication. While seeking to accomplish this goal, however, the Court has, in effect, allowed pornographers to deal injury to a group who are not "average persons"—our children. And it is precisely this group that has been the prime object of the smut peddler's interest.

Investigation of the staggering number of complaints made by citizens against unsolicited obscenity received in the mails has disclosed that most come from parents of school-age children. Indeed, the pattern of unscrupulous publishers and dealers has been known for years: they attempt to "hook" young people on smut at as early an age as possible, then continue to pander to their newly aroused interest as they grow to adulthood. The unconscionable effect of this filthy material on the emotional development of our youngsters is ignored by the smut merchants, who often develop mailing lists of children from responses to innocent advertisements for stamps, model airplane kits, and toys.

Clearly, we cannot allow these callous pornographers-for-profit to continue polluting the minds of our youth. I offer today legislation to provide postal authorities with expanded power to protect school-age children from this traffic in filth.

My bill is similar to legislation, H.R. 2522, which has already been introduced by Mr. Cahill of New Jersey and other colleagues. It is based on a new approach, one which circumvents the constitutional arguments involving adult freedom of speech by applying safeguards only to children.

My bill would prohibit mail-order sales of obscene materials to persons under 16 years of age. It also would make the unsolicited mailing of hard-core pornography, or offers to sell such material, to a family with children under 16, a Federal crime punishable by fine and jail sentence.

To avoid difficulties in the definition of "obscenity," my bill incorporates specific categories of depictions banned under the legislation. Since the bill does not affect mailings to adults, it also averts this area of judicial conflict; in the past, the Supreme Court has recognized the right of parents to direct the rearing of children in the structure of our society.

In sum, this legislation is centered solely on the protection of our children from the prurient wares of smut peddlers who now flood the mails with their filth in apparent immunity from our best efforts to stop them. I believe that Congress and the courts can accept this as an effective and constitutional approach to the problem which does not limit freedom of speech or expression in the adult world.

HISTORY OF NEGROES IN CONGRESS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in a time when all of us are trying to eliminate the remaining vestiges of racial discrimination in our Nation, it is instructive to look back into history from time to time, to get a better perspective of the present. In that connection, I am pleased to note that the first Negro claimed membership in the Congress a century ago this year.

An interesting and informative article on the subject of Negro membership in the Congress of the United States was published in a recent edition of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, published in Washington, D.C. As the article points out, it was 100 years ago on February 27, 1869, that John Willis Menard, a Negro from Louisiana, stood up on the floor of the House of Representatives and stated his case for being seated. Another candidate and he both claimed victory in a special election, and although neither was seated, Menard addressed the House in a plea for his seat. The historic event marked the first noteworthy effort to gain Negro representation in Congress—a goal that was achieved 1 year later, in 1870, by Senator Hiram Revels, of Mississippi.

A table accompanying the article lists States which have sent Negroes to Congress, and the number of Negroes who served. For the Senate it lists two from Mississippi and one from Massachusetts. In the House it lists: California, one; Missouri, one; Illinois, three; Michigan, two; Ohio, one; Pennsylvania, one; New

York, two; Louisiana, one; Mississippi, one; Alabama, three; Georgia, one; Florida, one; South Carolina, eight; North Carolina, four; and Virginia, one.

The Representative from Florida, Josiah Thomas Walls, served in this body from March 4, 1873, to April 19, 1876, in the 42d and 43d Congresses. Born of very poor parents in Winchester, Frederick County, Va., on December 30, 1842, Mr. Walls had limited opportunity for schooling but because of his determination managed to receive the fundamentals of an education in the common schools of the area.

Moving to Florida at the close of the Civil War, Mr. Walls developed a truck-farming business, and, in addition, joined the various Republican groups operating in the State, to learn as much about politics as he could. In 1868, he was a delegate to the State constitutional convention and, later in the same year, he was elected to the State house of representatives. After 1 year in this body he ran for the State senate and was elected for a 4-year term.

In the election of 1872, he was elected to the 42d Congress. His election to the 43d Congress was contested by Jesse J. Finley, and for nearly a year Mr. Walls fought unsuccessfully for his right to be seated. On being succeeded by Mr. Finley, Mr. Walls resumed his occupation as a truck farmer. He continued to participate in his party organization by playing an important role in determining party nominations. Mr. Walls died in 1905.

The article follows:

A Century Ago the First Negro Came To Hill

(By L. Robert Davids)

It was 100 years ago on February 27, 1869 that John Willis Menard, a Negro from Louisiana, stood up on the floor of the House of Representatives and stated his case for being seated. He had run for election to fill an unexpired term in the 40th Congress. Victory was claimed by Menard and by another candidate. Neither was ever seated, although Menard addressed the House in a plea for his seat.

This historic event marked the first noteworthy effort to gain representation in the National Congress. It also launched the first of two sharply contrasting periods of service in Congress for the Negro. The first period ran from 1870 to 1901 and consisted of rather indefinite tenure for 20 Representatives and two Senators. All were Republicans from the Southern States of the old Confederacy.

No member of the colored race served in Congress 1901-28, but service was resumed in 1929 and has grown with gradually increasing numbers to the present time. Representation in this period was from non-Southern States, was primarily Democratic, and resulted in stable and continuing membership.

The groundwork for entry of Negroes into Congress was laid quickly after the Civil War by the adoption of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. The 13th Amendment, adopted in late 1865, formally abolished slavery; the 14th, adopted in 1868, gave Negroes citizenship in the U.S. and in the States where they resided; and the 15th, adopted in 1870, gave Negroes the right to vote.

By the late 1860's, some Negroes had gained seats in the legislatures of various Southern States. It was there that they obtained the little legislative experience they could before competing in elections to the National Congress.

Willis Menard had served only briefly in the Louisiana legislature. Born in Illinois in 1838, he had won an appointment in the Bureau of Emigration in Washington in 1862. This marked the first time that a Negro had held a clerkship in the Federal Government. After the Civil War he went to New Orleans where he served as Inspector of Customs. In 1868, the Representative of the Second Congressional District died, and Menard, 30 years old, decided to run in the special election. The election was held November 3 for the term ending on March 3, 1869. Menard apparently won over Caleb Hunt and was declared elected by the authorities of the reconstructed state.

When Congress assembled in Washington in December 1868, Hunt challenged Menard's claim to the vacant seat. The issue was turned over to the Committee on Elections which wrestled with the matter until it came to the House floor on February 27, 1869. There was lengthy debate over the matter and it was finally decided that both candidates would be given permission to address the House for 15 minutes. Menard, in this historic appearance, made an eloquent but moderate statement of his qualifications, starting off with "I wish it to be well understood before I go any further that in the disposition of this case, I do not expect nor do I ask that there shall be any favor shown me on account of my race or the former condition of that race."

Hunt declined the offer to speak. Eventually the matter was put to a vote. The Representatives voted 137 to 41 not to seat Hunt and 130 to 57 not to seat Menard. There was less than a week left of the 40th Congress, so it was agreed that the two would split the $5,000 salary for time and expenses contesting the seat.

Less than one year later, the Senate was confronted with its first challenge from a Negro candidate. This was Hiram Revels of Mississippi. He was a graduate of Knox College, a gospel preacher in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and a State Senator. In January 1870, "the nation stood with its mouth wide open" when he was elected to the Senate seat last occupied by Jefferson Davis.

As the first member of his race to enter Congress, he had numerous social hurdles to overcome as well as one legal obstacle. That was the charge that he had not been a citizen the required nine years—dating from 1868 when citizenship was granted Negroes. However, he had the public endorsement of President Grant and, more importantly, he had the strong support of Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, the dominating figure in the Senate at that time. After a long and sometimes bitter debate, he was seated on February 25, 1870, almost a year to the day that Menard was refused his seat.

The next Negro elected to the Senate was Pinckney B. S. Pinchback, of Louisiana. He was Lieutenant Governor and served for a time as Acting Governor in the chaotic days of reconstruction in that State. Pinchback was elected to the Senate for the term beginning March 4, 1873, but there was another claimant and the seat was left vacant for more than three years. During this hiatus, Pinchback, also contested for a House seat, but was turned down. Eventually, his Senate bid was also defeated, although he did receive part of the Senate salary during the long contest.

In 1874, Blanche Bruce of Mississippi had the unusual distinction of being elected, being seated without a contest, and then serving a full six-year term in the Senate. Senate elections then were determined by the State legislatures, and Southern legislatures were never really under Negro control in the Reconstruction period. This was the primary reason that only three Senators were elected and two served during this period.

Only in South Carolina was there a semblance of Negro political dominance, brief as it was. That State sent eight Negroes to Congress, four at one time in 1873–75. Joseph Rainey was the first to serve in the House, taking his seat December 12, 1870; and he served the longest—to 1879.

The only House member from Mississippi was John R. Lynch. He was only 25 and the youngest member when he entered Congress in 1873. He served three terms. In 1884, long before Edward Brooke had a similar distinction, he presided as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention in Chicago. He died in 1937 at the age of 92, the last survivor of the 43rd Congress and the oldest of all the former Negro members of Congress. He is buried in Arlington National Cemetery, based on his service in the Spanish-American War and 12 years thereafter.

Another Representative who had earlier military experience was Robert Smalls of South Carolina. He served as a riverboat pilot for the Confederates during the first part of the Civil War. However, he ran a blockade and escaped with the vessel to the North. He served with the Union Navy until the end of the conflict, attaining the rank of captain.

The background and capabilities of the first period members of Congress varied greatly. A number of them had been slaves or were from slave families. Some had mixed blood including two who were sons of slave owners. On the other hand, Senator Revels was a freeman of a white mother and a father who was Indian and Negro. When he broke the color line in Congress in 1870, he did it for more than one minority.

John Langston, of Virginia, was that State's only Negro in Congress. His mother was Indian and Negro and his father Caucasian. Graduated from Oberlin College in 1849, he practiced law in Ohio for 13 years. He then became professor of law and later Vice President of Howard University in Washington. In addition to one term in the House, he served 8 years as Minister Resident and Consul General to Haiti.

While there were some Negro legislators who had little education and lacked essential qualifications for their duties, there were others like Langston, who were well educated as freemen in the North. Two early period legislators were born in the North and became in a sense "carpetbaggers."

One of the latter was Robert Brown Elliott, born in Boston in 1842. His parents were from the West Indies and he was educated in Boston, Jamaica, and England, graduating from Eton College. Law was his chosen profession, but after the Civil War, he got into the newspaper business in Charleston, South Carolina. From there he went into Congress 1871–74. A brilliant orator, he frequently tangled in debate with Southern Representatives including Alexander Stephens of Georgia, Vice President of the old Confederacy.

James O'Hara was born in New York City but went South after the war. He represented North Carolina for two terms in the House. He proposed a bill to give Negroes equal rights with whites in Washington restaurants, but the bill was not acted upon. Nevertheless he was rated a good legislator.

He was defeated in 1886 by Furnifold Simmons and for the 1887–89 session of Congress there were no Negroes in Congress. Three came back in the next session, but the times were changing and the Whites were coming back in full control in the South. Finally there was only one left, Rep. George White of North Carolina, who frequently referred to the fact that he represented not just a district in North Carolina but nine million Negroes across the nation. A graduate of Howard University, he was a race-conscious, militant politician and he could see what was happening. He was defeated in the 1900 election and as he neared the completion of his term on January 29, 1901, he spoke with some bitterness but with great feeling and perceptive prophecy:

"This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negroes' temporary farewell to the American Congress; but let me say, Phoenix-like he will rise up some day and come again. These parting words are in behalf of an outraged, heart-broken, bruised, and bleeding, but God-fearing people, faithful, industrious, loyal people—rising people, full of potential force. . . . The only apology that I have to make for the earnestness with which I have spoken is that I am pleading for the life, the liberty, the future happiness, and manhood suffrage for one-eighth of the entire population of the United States."

The absence lasted somewhat longer than Rep. White anticipated and he passed away in 1918, a full decade before a member of his race was returned to Congress.

With the conservatives once again reigning supreme in the South, there was not a single Negro in the state legislatures by 1902. Laws were legislated and other devices were used which essentially disenfranchised the Negro. These political measures were followed by the resignation of those institutions which had been desegregated during Reconstruction, including state universities and public facilities. The result was mass migration to the Northern states in the period a few years before World War I and some time thereafter.

One example of this migration was Oscar DePriest. He was born in Alabama but moved to Kansas and then to Illinois where he established a painting and decorating business. He was the first Negro elected to the city Council of Chicago and he served as a City Commissioner 1912–22. In 1928 he was elected as a Republican from a predominantly Negro district to the House of Representatives.

Mr. DePriest was the first Negro in Congress in 28 years and as far as social barriers were concerned, it was like starting all over again. Southern Congressmen objected even when Mrs. Hoover invited Mrs. DePriest to the White House for tea. But the new Representative did not shrink from what he considered his primary task to improve the lot of his people. He invaded the South to speak for the anti-lynch law and was taunted by the KKK. In his six years of office, the tall, white-haired legislator appointed several Negroes to the U.S. Military Academy and took numerous other steps to integrate members of his race into American society.

In 1933 Franklin Roosevelt swept into office on the wings of a voter coalition that included numerous minority groups. In 1934 a Negro Democrat challenged DePriest in Illinois First District and defeated him. This was Arthur Mitchell, who also had migrated north from Alabama. Once the office boy for Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee Institute, he received his education at Columbia and Harvard. From his law practice in Chicago he went to Washington as the first Negro Democrat in Congress.

A great supporter of FDR, Mitchell said he wanted "to help this grand President of ours feed the hungry and clothe the naked and provide work for the idle of every race and creed." He declared "the Negro is in this country to stay. We have to live side by side and learn to dwell together in peace."

Mitchell, who died less than a year ago, served until his retirement in 1943. He was succeeded by William Dawson in what was becoming a Negro Democratic stronghold in Chicago. But for 16 years it was the only district in the nation sending a Negro to Congress. Finally, in 1945 a second was added in Adam Clayton Powell of New York City. Then, as Negroes continued to flood the urban centers of the North and California, Representatives were sent to Washington from Detroit, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and a second one from Detroit. All were Democrats.

But then in 1966, there was a happening in Massachusetts that didn't fit the political pattern in any respect. Edward Brooke, a Republican, was elected by popular vote to the Senate from a State that had a minimal Negro population. In 1968 the pattern resumed with Democratic Representatives elected from St. Louis, Cleveland, and a second from New York City. There was a new dimension in the New York situation, however, as Shirley Chisholm became the first female Negro elected to Congress.

The second-period Negro Congressmen experienced unusual political stability in their districts. Over the last quarter century, none lost an election. One, Rep. Powell, was elected (twice) but not seated during the 90th Congress. When he was seated earlier this year, the total number of Negroes in Congress reached ten. Many references have been made that this is the greatest number since Reconstruction days; actually, it is two more than were seated in 1875–77, the high point of the earlier period.

Negroes also are gaining seniority. Rep. Dawson is serving his 27th consecutive year in the House. Nearly 83, he also is the oldest of all members of the present Congress. As Negro voter registration is increased and as urban organization is improved, it is expected that Negro representation in Congress will grow. Fulfillment will not come, however, until there is once again representation from heavily Negro populated areas of the old Confederacy. Then the dream of Willis Menard to enter Congress 100 years ago will be fully realized.

States which have sent Negroes to Congress

House:	
California	1
Missouri	1
Illinois	3
Michigan	2
Ohio	1
Pennsylvania	1
New York	2
Louisiana	1
Mississippi	1
Alabama	3
Georgia	1
Florida	1
South Carolina	8
North Carolina	4
Virginia	1
Senate:	
Massachusetts	1
Mississippi	2

CONSUMER PROTECTION REQUIRES ACTION BY OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the the past few years, we in the Congress have enacted a number of landmark measures aimed at insuring fair dealing in the American marketplace. The American consumer is now entitled to greater protection against flammable fabrics, to more uniformity in the packaging of foodstuffs, and to increased automobile safety. Soon he will be entitled to full disclosure of the cost of his credit transactions. These examples only highlight recent congressional activities in the interest of consumer protection. In the 91st Congress, additional measures will be taken to strengthen the consumer protection machinery of the Federal Government.

In the executive branch of our Government, there is an office already established, although little known, which holds great promise for what can be done to protect the consumer under existing laws. That is the Office of Consumer Counsel, within the Department of Justice.

First established in 1968 by President Johnson, the Office of Consumer Counsel has the potential of becoming an important coordinating force in the overall Federal consumer protection program. Currently, more than 30 different Federal agencies are engaged in activities which, in one way or another, affect consumer interest. The need for an active coordinating office to concern itself with this mass of activities is readily apparent, and I believe that the objectives of the Office of Consumer Counsel can well fill that role.

I have therefore written to the Attorney General, requesting his advice on the staffing and functions which he plans to assign to that office.

The text of my letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The 90th Congress, as you know, probably surpassed all previous Congresses in its concern for consumer protection. The 91st Congress promises to challenge that record. In keeping with this concern, President Johnson, early in 1968, announced that he had established within the Department of Justice the Office of Consumer Counsel "to work directly under the Attorney General . . . and to serve the consumers of this land."

The potential capabilities of that office to effectuate a more coordinated and effective Federal consumer protection program are great. In a statement to the Federal Trade Commission Hearings on National Consumer Protection on December 4, 1968, former Consumer Counsel Paul G. Bower enunciated some of the goals and functions which that office may serve. These include:

1. Coordinating the consumer protection activities within the Department of Justice including prosecution under the Mail and Wire fraud statutes and security frauds.
2. Coordinating consumer related activities of the Federal agencies and assisting in developing policies for the Executive branch relating to consumer affairs.
3. Representing consumer interests before the Federal regulatory agencies and, when appropriate, in the courts.
4. Developing closer liaison with State and local consumer protection agencies.

I was encouraged by your remarks to the Fordham Law Alumni Association on March 8 wherein you stated that consumer protection is one of the principal priorities of your Department.

As Chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I am interested in the operations of your Department. I request that you submit to this Subcommittee your comments for the staffing and functions of that office, including plans that you may have for filling the vacancy that now exists in the Office of Consumer Counsel.

Sincerely yours,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN—NOW—ADOPTS LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR 1969

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

XUM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at the national conference in Atlanta, Ga., December 7 and 8, 1968, the National Organization for Women—NOW—adopted a comprehensive legislative program for 1969 intended to advance the status of women and enable them to more fully contribute their talent, skills and ideas to the Nation.

NOW is a national civil rights movement, consisting of dedicated men and women who are working to bring women into equal partnership with men in the mainstream of American society.

NOW has described its purpose as follows:

> The organization is devoted to the realization of the full human potential of women—who comprise over 51% of our population, but are almost 'invisible' in our industrial leadership, our political life, our national leadership and in the decision-making levels of government where the destiny of our nation is determined.

NOW has members in every State—and also in the Virgin Islands. The officers are: chairman of the board: Dr. Kathryn Clarenbach, University of Wisconsin professor; president: Betty Friedan, New York author—"The Feminine Mystique"—vice presidents: Muriel Fox, New York public relations executive, and Aileen Hernandez, of San Francisco, formerly an EEOC commissioner; secretary: Eliza Paschall, Atlanta civil rights leader; and treasurer: Inka O'Hanrahan, San Francisco biologist.

The proposals were recommended by Jean Faust, coordinator of the national legislative task force. After a discussion meeting with members of the task force from all over the United States, during which the final proposals were drafted, the program was presented to a session of the national conference at which further proposals were added and the final program was adopted.

Cochairmen of the National Legislative Committee for 1969 are Jean Faust—former first president of the New York chapter, currently chairman of the board—and Barbara Ireton, former president of the Washington chapter. Both were also elected members of the national board of directors at the Atlanta conference.

NOW officers and directors will be in Washington on March 29 and 30 for a national board meeting. On Monday, March 31, a legislative conference will be held, to which all Members of Congress have been invited. NOW members are also planning visits to their own legislators and to the chairmen of committees which are considering legislation pertinent to our program.

NOW's eight-point legislative program for 1969 follows:

NOW Legislative Program

I. Equal rights amendment:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." NOW supports this amendment *without change*.

II. Equal opportunity in education:

(a) There should be no discrimination on the basis of sex in schools that receive federal funds.

(b) Award of scholarship, fellowship and other benefits should be made without regard to sex.

III. Equal opportunity in employment:

(a) Enforcement of Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(b) Enforcement of federal contract compliance.

(c) Equal treatment for women in federal training and job opportunity programs, such as OEO, MDTA, and the Vocational Education Act.

(d) Extension of Fair Labor Standards Act and Equal Pay Act to cover all workers.

(e) Child Care Facilities for Working Parents.

(f) Protection of Employment Rights during Maternity. Women should receive maternity leave as a form of social security and/or employee benefit (similar to sick leave or job security because of the draft for men). Women must be ensured the right to return to their jobs within a reasonable time after childbirth, without loss of seniority or other accrued benefits.

IV. Repeal of abortion laws.

V. Review of income tax laws, social security laws, and retirement plans:

(a) Eliminate tax provisions that discriminate against single persons.

(b) Allow deductions for child care, whether or not child may be listed as dependent.

(c) Social security laws should be revised to eliminate discrimination against working wives.

(d) Social security laws should be revised to eliminate discrimination against divorced women.

(e) Retirement and Pension Plans should be revised to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sex.

VI. Identifying and reporting on sex discrimination:

Agencies should be established on all governmental levels to investigate, study and report on sex discrimination in all areas of life. NOW supports the Griffiths bill (HR 837) to broaden the Civil Rights Commission mandate of studying and reporting on discrimination based on race, color, religion or national origin to include sex.

VII. Including women in appointive positions in Government:

There should be legislation to include women on all commissions, boards and other appointive bodies at all governmental levels.

VIII. Nondiscrimination in public accommodations:

"Sex" should be added to Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

SABMIS, THE SOVIETS, AND MARITIME STRENGTH—ADDRESS BY CHARLES F. DUCHEIN, PRESIDENT, NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BLANTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1969, Gen. Charles F. Duchein, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, and president of the Navy League of the United States, delivered an address to the Military Order of World Wars and the Memphis Council of the Navy League in Memphis, Tenn. I would like to submit the text of this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the primary purpose of giving recognition to my friend and colleague, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, former commander of the *Nautilus* on its historic cruise under the North Pole. The text of this speech gives due tribute to Congressman ANDERSON and his accomplishments to Tennessee, the Nation, and the world. While the entire text may not reflect my complete philosophy, I deem it a great honor to endorse the comments concerning my esteemed colleague.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of General Duchein's remarks in the RECORD at this point and commend it to our colleagues for their information:

Sabmis, the Soviets and Maritime Strength

(Address by Charles F. Duchein, president, Navy League of the United States, before the Military Order of World Wars and the Memphis Council of the Navy League, Memphis, Tenn., March 13, 1969)

For my money, Tennessee is a great maritime state, just as America is a great maritime nation and that is why I am particularly pleased to address this joint meeting of the Military Order of World Wars and the Navy League in Memphis tonight.

Almost equidistant from the two great oceans, many of the citizens of your great state may consider the seas to be distant from your daily lives. Not on your life—the Polaris revolution changed all of this—Tennessee, just as California, Florida and Minnesota, now borders on the great ocean of the world. Tennessee has become a center of the world strategic struggle for mastery of the oceans.

All of the great land mass of planet Earth can now be dominated from the sea. The long-range, nuclear-tipped, submarine-based ballistic missile, both American and soon those of the Soviets, has brought us all into the realm of the oceans in a security sense. From an economic standpoint, our direct dependence on the oceans has been the case ever since our early history.

Living as you do on one of the great rivers of the world, the Mississippi, your Memphis friends know precisely what I mean. Hopefully, I can spark your interest in this beautiful "Volunteer State" to the wonders of the world of water in an intellectual sense, that will add depth to the national oceanic educational effort.

We are living in a turbulent world. The turmoil, tension and swift changes that characterize our lives are gradually leading us to the world ocean to seek solutions for our perplexing problems. Unfortunately, we are not moving swiftly enough. Most of our citizens are land bound in their thinking; we tend to be a country of land-conscious citizens. Consequently, there is a critical need for education, particularly oceanic education. An oceanic doctrine, a maritime concept, is the crux of capitalizing on the oceans of the world. But the concept, the doctrine, the policy and the strategy of the seas do not come naturally to most Americans.

Since the Navy League is an educational organization, understandably, I place considerable faith in the knowledge of the oceans. In reorienting our thinking to seaward—to gain the understanding of the importance of an oceanic guide for our policy and program formulation—the defense dialogues must pit the view of the oceans against that of the land. This is the only way to gain balance in the planning process.

I cite *Polaris* as an example, rather deliberately, not to foster fear in highlighting that Memphis has already become a prime target for nuclear destruction from the sea, but rather to bring geography into the reality of today's modern world. As free world leaders, we had best be realistic about the threats to our future. Seven-tenths of the world is water and more and more this world of water will come into play in international affairs. To capitalize on the oceans, the United States must place priority on the prosperity producing activities of the ocean.

XUM

Today there is a great debate in the Congress on the antiballistic missile system Sentinel. The implications of the dialogue are ominous. There are far reaching consequences in the decisions that our Commander-in-Chief, President Nixon, must make. The citizens of Tennessee have a stake in this and I am happy to realize that a Tennessee Congressman has assumed the leadership and is in the forefront—spearheading a seabased solution.

The strategic importance of the North Pole quite probably was dramatically driven home to many of you friends from Tennessee by this courageous naval pioneer from the "Volunteer State." His dramatic under-the-ice cruise to the North Pole in command of *Nautilus* provides a heroic page in American history. It paved the way for an achievement of unprecedented strategic strength for the preservation of the Republic. Captain Anderson's historic cruise in a very true sense led to what we now know as the Polaris revolution, giving America a greater sense of security than was attainable when the nation relied preclusively on fixed land-based strategic arms.

Today, Captain Anderson is providing the same kind of enlightenment and determined action in the Congress. He is determined to give even greater defensive strength to the arms of the nation. I speak of Congressman Anderson's stand on Sabmis, the seabased antiballastic missile intercept system. Through his understanding of the oceans to build our strategic strength, he is providing perspective in the ABM debate that has reached a white heat in recent weeks. His congressional leadership on the key issue has provided the Navy League with reinforced resolve in the conduct of its oceanic educational effort. It seems fitting that I pay appropriate tribute to Bill Anderson in his home state of Tennessee during my pleasant Memphis visit, as we discuss the vast opportunities unfolding for the nation through oceanic progress.

For Sabmis is more than a defensive strategic system. It, together with Polaris-Poseidon offensive systems, can provide the operational cornerstone for the new grand strategy of the oceans needed by this nation to protect and preserve the Republic and to prosper economically through increased exploitation of the world ocean. But were it not for his articulate efforts in Congress, the seabased ABM never would have been interjected into this defense dialogue and Sabmis is of singular significance to the nation. I urge that each of you study the Sabmis concept as a means of moving nuclear wars to sea, away from our population centers of America.

Both Polaris-Poseidon and Sabmis are but a start toward reorienting our defenses to seaward. There are many other ways of utilizing the oceans of the world in our interest. The crux is to gain an understanding by the citizens and their representatives in Congress who, unfortunately, are generally land-conscious in their thinking. This is the role of the Navy League.

For example, as the peace talks in Paris move along with no apparent substantive results, and American casualties mount in Viet Nam, we begin to realize the importance of strength in solving our complex military problems in our worldwide confrontation with the Communist world. As I have said on many occasions in my talks around the country, we have never won anything when we dealt with the Communist world from a position of weakness. They are tough and determined realists and they respect only strength.

In Cuba where our strength showed, we won. We backed them down and without firing a shot! We talked with strength. Our will and our determination showed in the naval strength that provided presence and enabled President Kennedy to impose a maritime blockade. This lesson was impressive.

That is why I am encouraged that our President and his new Administration give every evidence of a returning to the harder line to insure that our battlefield victories in Viet Nam will not be lost at the conference table.

This again brings us back to the importance of water in our worldwide actions. We have led with our infantry too long. The sterility of our strategy shows when we bog down in our efforts to defeat half a nation with half a million American men in distant Southeast Asia.

The "Achilles Heel" of this Communist effort is their sea lines of communication. We should know this. Over 98% of the supplies that keep the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese fighting arrive in ships and are unloaded in the Haiphong Harbor complex. Closure of this port complex would bring the Hanoi delegation to the conference table to talk on our terms in very quick order. The Joint Chiefs of Staff understand this. They recommended the closure of Haiphong but they were overridden by those who do not understand the significance of sea lines of communications in supporting any war effort. I pray that unless an acceptable solution in Viet Nam is brought about quickly, the President will place high priority on the closure of Haiphong Harbor to bring this seemingly never-ending war to a successful conclusion promptly.

This oceanic action would be the most positive the United States can take to restore the peace. Had our nation understood the maritime concept better, I am confident that the war would have long since been terminated.

This makes me wonder whether we as a nation realize how dependent we are on the American Merchant Marine from the standpoint of security and also for long-term prosperity.

Over 98% of the beans, bullets and jet fuel is carried to our military forces in Southeast Asia; and the Merchant Marine deserves great credit. But another "hot spot" somewhere else would stretch our ship elastic limit beyond the breaking point. For this reason, watching the Middle East tinder box starting to flare up again is not only a nightmare for our strategic planners, it is a warning to remind us of our global responsibilities and requirements.

Our fast moving 20th Century industry depends increasingly on strategic materials carried from overseas in ships. The burgeoning trade along the sea lanes of the world affords the most inviting possibility for economic growth in our history.

As I see it, the problem boiled down to basics is an educational one. Yes, education—and the aggressive merchandising of the American maritime product. We must take a page out of the bold aerospace industry's promotional book to gain a number one world maritime position.

Speaking of modern methods of merchandising, Jack Gilbride, president of Todd, and a good friend of mine, and I must say one of the most progressive American shipbuilders, is telling the nation through a fine program of educational communications—"you can't walk on ¾ of the Earth's surface." How strange that the American people and their government, at this late hour, need such elementary oceanic education; but, unfortunately, they do. No, you can't walk on the water, but there is gold in the oceans of the world—and strength and security. Bold imaginative plans are needed now to tap the oceanic resources.

I watched the Apollo 8 launch at Cape Kennedy; what a marvelous experience! While catching my breath as I stared at the rocket soaring into space, to myself I humbly thanked Stalin, Khruschev, Brezhnev and Mikoyan. Who launched Apollo 8? I would say, unquestionably, "Sputnik". The Soviets touched a sensitive American nerve—we can't stand a second place position—and that is good. The psychological shock of Sputnik's first spin in space awakened this nation. And Apollo 8, if it did nothing else, showed the tremendous American potential to produce, to create, to think—it showed the strength of our will and our determination and it came at a time when the world was beginning to wonder.

What we need now is some sort of shock treatment; Americans will then demand that we build our national maritime prowess to the strong, modern, competitive position world conditions dictate. Actually, the Russian revolution at sea provides the same competitive challenge. Though hardly as dramatic, the exploding Soviet maritime strength has far more ominous political, economic and military implications.

Focusing on the Red revolution at sea, the central significance of the competitive Merchant Marine stands out. How do we stack up? Four out of five of our merchant ships are of World War II vintage. But not Soviet ships—four out of five of their ships are less than 10 years old. While the Soviet Union builds better than 1,000,000 tons of merchant ships each year, 448 ships this year, for example, we build 48. In point of relative priorities, in 1965 the Soviet government spent more than $600 million on merchant ship construction, in the same year we spent a mere $150 million. Her vigorous ship construction program already has given her 10.4 million tons of merchant shipping and 1400 ships, with a projection of 27 million tons by 1980. Having already passed us by the end of this year, unless the trend is reversed, the Soviets in ship count will knock us out of our fifth place position as a merchant power.

For the past 18 months, I have toured the greater part of this nation and have talked largely about my reaction to the way we have conducted the Viet Nam War in context of global strategy. And I might add, I have been somewhat critical. Had the maritime concept been understood and accepted, Haiphong Harbor many months ago would have been blocked to the Communist ships that have carried the preponderance of arms used against our men in combat. As a consequence, the war would have long since been won or at least we would have talked on our terms, rather than from a pusillanimous position at the peace table confrontation.

What has impressed me most has not been the handling of the war by our political leadership, but the spirit of our American fighting men—the youth of our nation—in the fox holes of this distant battlefield.

From the youthful American viewpoint of our forces at sea, there is room for much optimism in the prospect for the oceanic future. Make no mistake, America's destiny is oceanic.

To you friends in Memphis, I propose for your consideration the following five maritime measures to give our oceanic power a preeminent world position.

First, and foremost, the formulation of national maritime policy providing positive incentive to gain a competitive maritime position on the oceans of the world. The new Administration, with a minimum of delay, must provide national policy, undergirded by an oceanic doctrine, to guide our government in the military and Merchant Marine and oceanic programs of a scientific, technological and educational nature. A platform plank provides for such.

Second is strategy. Our nation must orient its national strategy to the oceans of the world, just as the Kremlin has done in recent years. To do so will require the construction of many more naval and merchant ships than we are producing at present.

My third point is, therefore, ship construction. America must go after the merchant marine market by building a minimum

XUM

of 100 ships a year for at least the next decade.

Fourth, Oceanic Education must be fostered in our school systems to give our youth as good a subject grounding in the seas as they now receive on the land environment. The Sea Grant College program on the college and university level must be pursued with the utmost vigor to mobilize the best minds of this nation—the scientists, the scholars, the student—in the pursuit of oceanic solutions to the pressing problems of state. I know I don't have to remind you that in recent history when great powers lost control of the seas, they lost their greatness. Consider Spain after the defeat of the Armada, France after Trafalgar, Japan after Midway, England after the exhaustion of two wars.

My fifth point is a proposal I have previously made for the establishment of a Maritime Manhattan Project that gives the magnitude impetus to the maritime research programs largely neglected of late. My concept follows along the same lines as the Maritime Manhattan Project that produced the atomic bomb. Its purpose would be to give a sea based profile to the revolutionary technological advances this nation is capable of achieving in our 20th Century. Obviously, I am thinking in terms of the swiftest, most modern, streamlined merchant and naval ships, the kind that can compete and maintain a strategic mastery of the environment of the oceans.

A single sentence sums up my proposal, "The security and prosperity of the United States and its allies depend increasingly on the military, economic and political exploitation of the world oceans." If we pursue this program that I propose with vigor, vision and determination, I am confident that our flag will fly with pride worldwide in recognition of American supremacy of the high seas and our mastery of the world ocean.

The voice of a soft spoken, but articulate, Representative from Tennessee is leading the way for this transformation and we of the Navy League are behind him 100%. I hope you are also, for this nation desperately needs his kind of maritime leadership.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. continues to beat its drums of prejudice and hate against our friend, South Africa by passing some Security Council resolution which "does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanction." Possibly the U.N. is only interested in the world community opinion.

Most observers acquainted with the U.N.O.'s propaganda techniques wonder where the sanctions are against Russians being in Czechoslovakia and the British being in Anguilla.

At most, the action by the United Nations can be interpreted as a mop-bucketful of officious intermeddling in a civilized country at peace. And who can disagree with the reply by the South African Government that it would pay no more attention to this resolution than it did to previous mutterings against the peace and security of its people and protectorate?

The United Nations has proved again that it is nothing but an assembly of loud mouths who know they cannot back up their threats unless they have U.S. boys and equipment and U.S. taxpayers money.

Mr. Speaker, I place two news clippings concerning South-West Africa and Art Buchwald's column at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

SOUTHWEST AFRICA RESOLUTION PASSES U.N.

UNITED NATIONS, March 20.—With U.S. support, the U.N. Security Council, called on South Africa today to withdraw immediately from the neighboring territory of South-West Africa.

The 15-nation Council adopted a resolution to that effect 13–0, with two abstentions. Britain and France abstained because they believed the United Nations cannot insure its implementation and it would only encourage false hopes.

It was the first Council action to put into effect the General Assembly's 2½-year-old declaration that South Africa's League of Nations mandate to govern South-West Africa, a former German colony, was terminated.

Before the vote, U.S. Ambassador Charles W. Yost said the United States was able to support the resolution "because it wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions."

Many black African nations have been demanding at least economic sanctions against South Africa for defying the U.N. declaration. Zambian Ambassador Vernon Johnson Mwaanga, who introduced the resolution, contended it was broad enough to encompass mandatory sanctions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 22, 1969]

SOUTHWEST AFRICA

UNITED NATIONS.—South Africa indicated it would pay no more attention to a U.N. Security Council Resolution Calling for it to withdraw from South-West Africa than it has to a similar demand from the General Assembly.

South Africa holds that the General Assembly acted illegally Oct. 27, 1966, when it declared that South Africa's League of Nations mandate over the big territory had been terminated.

ALL HAIL PLUCKY LITTLE BRITAIN FOR HUMBLING MIGHTY ANGUILLA

(By Art Buchwald)

The only bright spot in the news these days is what has happened in Anguilla. In one of the most amazing reversals in modern military history, tiny, helpless, and, up to now, ineffectual Great Britain defeated the powerful forces of Anguilla and conquered this impregnable island fortress.

Little Britain, playing the role of David, smote the Anguillan Goliath, to the surprise of the experts and the delight of those who are constantly rooting for the underdog.

"No one thought the British could do it," said a London correspondent at the National Press Club bar, where everyone was buying him drinks. "But I believe this proves once and for all Her Majesty's Government can no longer be considered a paper tiger."

The bar rang with cheers. "The Anguillans bit off more than they could chew," someone shouted.

What everyone wanted to know was how the lightly armed British paratroopers and Marines managed to break through the heavy Anguillan defenses, which consisted of one Napoleonic cannon, 12 shotguns, three Ford trucks and 2000 sheep.

"The Anguillans were overconfident," the British correspondent told us. "They thought our troops were afraid of their sheep. But we used their overconfidence to our advantage. We pulled our frigates up, and when the sheep saw them, they scattered. The sheepherders tried to rally the herds, but by this time the sheep were so disorganized they couldn't possibly put up any defense.

"It proves again that a small, tight-knit, well-trained force of paratroopers and Marines can overwhelm a much larger force of sheep if they are determined to do the job."

This was the first military defeat for Anguilla in its history, and there is great soul searching going on now amongst the Anguillan armed forces, which consist of three constables, six deputies and three Red Cross nurses. There will probably be a shake-up in the Anguilla military within the next month.

Anguilla watchers in Washington felt that the consequences of the British invasion would be felt throughout the world.

"Anguilla can no longer be considered a major power," a State Department man at the bar said.

"We have to readjust our thinking vis-a-vis their military potential. If a little country like Great Britain can defeat them, with all the hardware the Anguillans had at their disposal, then we'll have to figure out some other way of defending the Caribbean."

The London correspondent said, "We have always insisted that we could take Anguilla any time we wanted to, but everyone laughed at us. I don't imagine they're laughing anymore. The world must know by now that we just won't allow anyone to trifle with our Empire."

He went on to say that the doves in Britain had argued against the invasion, not because it was immoral but because they didn't think the British military could do the job. But the hawks argued that with a surprise attack they could overwhelm the Anguillans before they could get their pitchforks out of their barns. The hawks, it turned out, were right.

"Now that you've brought Anguilla to her knees," an American correspondent said, "what do you plan to do next?"

"We are a peace loving people," the London correspondent replied. "We intervened in Anguilla only when our interests were threatened. But I think this will serve as a warning that aggression will not go unpunished in any part of the globe."

A member of the English Speaking Union raised his glass. "Today Anguilla—tomorrow the world."

WORLD PEACE: WHO THREATENS IN AFRICA?

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in Africa who threatens world peace? An established civilized Christian government or a band of Communist guerrillas who seek to impose a puppet Red dictatorship by terrorism?

The situation in South Africa has been trumped up to indicate some pretended threat to world peace—should the civilized leadership not surrender the safety of their people for the benefits of a proven culture to the raw savagery of the Red dictatorship. The facts of life are that the civilized nations in Africa have proven they can protect their people very well and are the most advanced progressive governments on the continent.

The record is clear that any threat to peace in Africa comes from the Communist terrorists—armed, trained, and commanded in the Communist world and supported, strangely enough, by some misguided Americans, including even religious groups.

Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues will be interested in reviewing the activities in South Africa with reports from both sides of the question, and I

XUM

place an interview with Dr. Eduardo Mondlane from the War and Peace publication, a chapter from "Blueprint for Conflict," by the American-Africa Affairs Association, and several reports on Africa from American Opinion magazine follow:

[From War and Peace Report, January 1966]

ANOTHER "VIETNAM" IN AFRICA?

(NOTE.—The American press has almost totally overlooked the "war of national liberation" in Mozambique—despite the fact that the Frelimo rebels claim control of a fifth of the territory of this big Portuguese African colony. Here is presented an interview with Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, leader of the revolution, followed by comments from the Portuguese government.)

A guerrilla operation, smaller and younger than that of the Viet Cong but operating on the same general principles, has established a firm base in the Portuguese East African colony of Mozambique. It is being led by a Mozambican professor on leave from New York's Syracuse University. Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, who is president of the Mozambique Liberation Front.

The U.S. press appears almost totally unaware of the extent of the rebel activities in Mozambique. It may be that editors are more attuned to the denials of rebel activity coming from Lisbon than from firsthand reports out of Africa.

The most complete recent report on the war came in a series of articles published in late September and early October in Rhodesian newspapers by Lord Kilbracken, of the conservative Evening Standard (London). After traveling with Portuguese patrols, he wrote:

"By military airplane, army lorry and gunboat I have traversed in 10 hard days the whole active battle zone along Lake Malawi, where Portuguese troops are locked in combat with Frelimo (nationalist) guerrillas. . . .

"The scale of fighting in this bitter, unsung war has steadily increased since the first minor incidents just a year ago—especially in recent weeks when there has been a strong Frelimo build-up. Today the battle zone stretches some 20 to 40 miles inland along almost all Mozambique's lake shore from the Tanzanian to the Malawi border. In 3,000 terrorized square miles the Portuguese, both civil and military, are now confined to five small isolated garrisons.

"The Frelimo, a Viet Cong in miniature, are a tough and elusive enemy. They generally operate in very small units, often only half a dozen men. I could obtain no estimate of their total strength in Mozambique. They are at home in the jungle and bush, where they live off the country, striking silently by night, withdrawing swiftly into the dense cover if the Portuguese reply in strength. . . .

"I saw much captured equipment—mortars, grenades, machine-guns, high explosives and mines—certainly identified as Chinese- and Russian-made. . . ."

The Frelimo (the name is an acronym from Frente de Liberçao de Mozambique) are undertaking their insurrection in a territory somewhat larger than Texas lying east of Rhodesia on the Indian Ocean. On the other side of Africa, in another Portuguese colony, Angola, a separate revolution is older and has been much more widely reported on. However, the Angolan revolt seems to be making less headway now than it was a year or so ago, partly because of the factionalism of its leadership and partly because of the political instability in the Congo, which has been providing sanctuary to the rebels. Frelimo so far has avoided both these problems: Its leadership is more united and Tanzania has offered a stable sanctuary.

Frelimo's leader, Dr. Mondlane, who was born in 1920 in southern Mozambique, took his Ph. D. in sociology at Northwestern University and taught at Syracuse before returning to his country. His headquarters is in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. His white wife, Janet, who is from Minnesota, now runs the Mozambique Institute in Dar es Salaan, which educates exiles and refugees from Mozambique.

About a year ago, Dr. Mondlane spent a month in the U.S. seeking backing and publicity for his cause, but he encountered principally apathy. A few weeks later, he made a trip to Peking to seek aid from the Chinese—and it was only then that the American press took note of him.

Last month Dr. Mondlane finished another stay in the U.S. His main business was at the United Nations, where he testified before the Fourth Committee (Trusteeship) of the General Assembly. He again sought American backing and notice in the press for his cause—and again he failed.

War/Peace Report arranged a discussion with Dr. Mondlane on Dec. 7, just before his return to Dar es Salaam. In addition to WPR Editor Richard Hudson, participants were Immanuel Wallerstein, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University and author of the book, *Africa: the Politics of Independence;* Marvin Harris, chairman of the department of anthropology at Columbia University, who lived in Mozambique for a year as a Ford Foundation fellow, and Collin Gonze, publications director of the American Committee on Africa.

The interview, which begins on the next page, is followed by comments on it from the Portuguese Embassy in Washington, D.C.

THE INTERVIEW WITH DR. MONDLANE

HUDSON: Dr. Mondlane, what is going on in Mozambique?

MONDALE: In Mozambique there is a military action that started in September, 1964, led by the Mozambique Liberation Front to force the Portuguese either to negotiate with us for independence, or to get out of Mozambique. We are fighting the Portuguese government, which uses both the police and an army to maintain its colonial control over our country.

HUDSON: What are conditions like in Mozambique?

MONDLANE: There are about seven million Mozambicans and a hundred thousand Europeans in the country. Economically, the Europeans dominate the commercial, administrative and other structures that exploit the majority of the people, who are predominantly farmers. In addition, several hundred thousand Mozambican migratory laborers work in Mozambique, Rhodesia and South Africa. They work mostly for foreign companies and are controlled by the Portuguese government.

Clearly, the white people enjoy a position of economic and social privilege at the expense of the African people in Mozambique.

GONZE: This new booklet, "Mozambique," published by the Portuguese government, says, "The franchise is the same as in Portugal, i. e., universal adult suffrage, based on being either literate, or a taxpayer or a householder." Is this true?

MONDLANE: The first qualification, literacy, would cut out 95 percent of the African adult population.

GONZE: How about the taxpayer qualification?

MONDLANE: The tax system in the country depends on a certain level of income, which your source conveniently did not indicate. Ninety-eight percent of the African population would be eliminated by this qualification.

GONZE: Take the third one, a householder.

MONDLANE: The Portuguese define *family* in a strictly European manner, which excludes most Africans from being classified as householders. It is the European, the mulatto and a few assimilados who would be honored with this kind of name.

We discovered, in statistics taken from the March, 1964, elections, that less than two per cent of the population of Mozambique voted, a percentage which exactly equals the percentage of adult Europeans in Mozambique.

From a practical point of view, then, this has no meaning.

HUDSON: How would you compare conditions in Mozambique with those in South Africa?

MONDLANE: The policy of the government of South Africa is quite different from that of the Portuguese in Mozambique. Although we personally disagree with the policy of South Africa, the policy of apartheid is nevertheless an open and honestly-stated policy of separation and discrimination. In Mozambique, the Portuguese government says that there is no discrimination, but practices discrimination anyway.

HUDSON: Is the objective of Frelimo to take over the government?

MONDLANE: Yes. We want the same chance that other African states have had to take over their own governments. We want a democratic government based on majority rule, not a government that controls by fear, as does the present one.

HUDSON: Does this mean independence from Portugal?

MONDLANE: Yes.

HUDSON: And what would happen, in your opinion, to the Portuguese there in the event of majority rule?

MONDLANE: The same thing that happened to the English whites who are settled in Kenya, Tanzania, of many African countries after independence came. They will have the option to be citizens if they wish to be citizens.

Whether or not a person is a natural citizen of Mozambique will depend not on his race, but on whether or not he was born in Mozambique. Portuguese whites who wish to be Mozambicans should participate in our struggle for liberation. After liberation even those who did not participate in our struggle may become citizens providing they did not commit crime against the African people.

HARRIS: To go back to the comparison between Mozambique and South Africa, I do not think that it is widely known that much of the South African labor force consists of migrants from Mozambique, and that this is also true of a considerable portion of the labor force in Rhodesia. Would you comment, Dr. Mondlane, on the reason to this situation, and its prospects for the future?

MONDLANE: There is a historical reason for this situation. There is more than a hundred thousand Mozambican laborers in South Africa. When South Africa was first established a state, even before the Union of South Africa was established, there were no laws to force black men to work for Europeans. But there were never enough Africans who wanted to work in the mines of South Africa. They tried bringing in Chinese, first, and then Indians to work, but both attempts were unsuccessful.

Finally they noticed that there were a large number of Mozambicans who seemed interested in working in South Africa. When the Portuguese also became aware of this, they saw an opportunity to make some money, so they negotiated an agreement with South Africa. South Africa was provided with cheap labor and the Portuguese government could profit from regulating and controlling the labor. For example, the Portuguese would limit the period of time a Mozambican could spend working in South Africa, but it would not limit the number of times he could go back. Since the Portuguese government got a certain amount of money every time a Mozambician laborer went into South Africa, the Portuguese profited. The Portuguese also decided that the worker's family could not travel with him to South Africa, thus always ensuring his return to Mozambique.

Part of the South African commitment in this agreement was to ship goods from the mining-industrial area of the Witwatersrand through Mozambique. As a matter of fact, it stipulated that 50 per cent of the industrial production of that area must go through the port of Lourenco Marques.

Harris: How much do the Portuguese get per worker each time he enters?

Mondlane: It now amounts to six dollars per person. Then, for the first four months, the Portuguese government gets 50 per cent of the man's wages, which is deducted from his salary. During the remainder of the two years he is allowed to spend in South Africa, 50 per cent of his wages go to the Portuguese government, which hands this back to him, without interest, in Portuguese escudos when he returns. This helps to keep the Portuguese coffers well supplied with South African sterling. The whole system is worth millions per year to the Portuguese.

Harris: Dr. Mondlane, how can the Portuguese pretend that they wish to avoid establishing a system of apartheid, while Mozambique labor is contributing to the maintenance of the South African economy?

Mondlane: They only try to tell foreigners that they do not wish to establsh apartheid. They know better than to try to tell us that, since they know that we know that apartheid exists.

What they have said to many of us is that the South African racial problem is really due to giving the African population too much education, thus making control over them more difficult. They do not hesitate to tell some of us that they do not intend to educate too many Mozambicans, since the African position must always be that of an inferior.

My wife, Janet, and I spoke with the governor of Mozambique in 1960. He said that it was Portuguese policy not to discriminate and that Africans were to be treated as brothers. He admitted, though, that discrimination existed and that my people were treated very badly. He considered himself to be in the wing of the Portuguese government favoring a change in the policy, but he said, "Realtistically, we can't change this; it will be here for years." Now I say that he was dreaming. The Portuguese government can't be there for years, because the Africa of today is not the Africa of his time.

Wallerstein: Under what circumstances do you conceive it possible that the Portuguese will negotiate?

Mondlane: Possibly after a change of government in Lisbon—meaning the death of Salazar. We might have a new government which would not carry out all these policies, but we do not expect it.

Wallerstein: Would this new government come about without an internal revolution in Portugal? Within the framework of the present regime, might some other man be willing to negotiate?

Mondlane: No. I think that the death of Salazar would mean an internal revolution in Portugal.

Wallerstein: Could the revolution gain power?

Mondlane: They might.

Wallerstein: Under what circumstances would they negotiate?

Mondlane: By seeing realistically that they can't win.

Wallerstein: Would they then have to concede independence?

Mondlane: Yes, they would have to or we would not talk.

Wallerstein: Would there be discussion about some sort of Portuguese Commonwealth in Africa?

Mondlane: No. There is no basis for it.

Wallerstein: What argument could they use back home to justify granting independence?

Mondlane: They would be under pressure back home to let us go, since young Portuguese men are dying in the African colonies.

Wallerstein. Would this, then, be a military victory, or the result of public opinion back home, as well as world opinion?

Mondlane: Both. Algeria is a good example. There it was a complex of internal opinion, and pressures within France, and the inability of the French army to defeat the liberation movement, which forced de Gaulle to negotiate.

Wallerstein: Why isn't that combination of pressures working in Rhodesia?

Mondlane: Because the main eye of resistance is not in Britain, but is within Rhodesia. The only point of comparison would be if you asked "Do you expect a white settler government to develop in Mozambique?"

Wallerstein: Do you?

Mondlane: No. First, the population proportion is extremely in our favor. Second, there is not a white settler government in Mozambique as there is in Rhodesia.

Wallerstein: What is the impact of the present Rhodesian crisis on the Portuguese in Mozambique?

Mondlane: I'm sure that they are pleased with the success of Ian Smith. He supports the position Portugal maintains.

Wallerstein: Will the Rhodesian crisis be a setback to your struggle in Mozambique?

Mondlane: Yes, unless the nationalists take direct action.

Wallerstein: What are the prospects, as far as you can see, of the Organization of African Unity getting involved?

Mondlane: It is possible, but I do not know whether it will. I can say, though, that the Rhodesian nationalists can get support from us if they want it.

Hudson: How would you describe the ideology of Frelimo?

Mondlane: Our ideology is independence. We are fighting for freedom, democracy, and majority government in Mozambique. In this ideology, we have been supported by the majority of the members of the United Nations.

To achieve independence, we first approached the Portuguese to negotiate and they refused. We then appealed to world opinion to push Portugal into negotiation, and world opinion has not been successful. This left us with the third alternative, military action, in which we are now engaged.

We need support, and we get most of it from Africa. However, since African states do not produce many weapons, we must seek this material support outside of Africa. If the West won't give it to us, the communists will.

Wallerstein: Do you get any significant aid from the West in any form?

Mondlane: None, in terms of equipment, although we do get some medical and educational aid, particularly from Scandinavian countries.

We prefer to get our aid, however, from everybody, everywhere. We have no special choice.

Hudson: Aren't you afraid that if you get help from the communist countries, the U.S. will call your insurgency communist and, therefore, will not support you?

Mondlane: We don't really care what the Americans think of us. No American has given us any equipment we need for our struggle. It would be ridiculous if we shivered in fear that the United States would call us communist when the only countries willing to give us military assistance are the communist countries.

Harris: I would like to make the point here that the mere fact that you have an insurgent movement appears these days to be sufficient for the United States to claim that it is communist-inspired and supported by Peking and Moscow, even when no arms have been supplied. If I were running a revolutionary movement and faced the prospect of being called a communist regardless of whether or not I took arms from Moscow or Peking, I would take the arms, since I would be called communist anyway. We (the U.S.) are suppressing every liberal, revolutionary movement throughout the world as a matter of policy.

Mondlane: Beyond this, we in Mozambique feel no special obligation to be any more sensitive to the feeling of United States citizens concerning our struggle than we are toward the Chinese, the Russians, or anybody.

Hudson: Are you asking for help in the United States, and what reaction are you getting?

Mondlane: We are getting a negative response in the United States, even for educational help. Our educational program in Dar es Salaam was started with a grant from the Ford Foundation, but after the Portuguese yelled "foul," the Ford Foundation withdrew. It is still impossible to get help from foundations or private groups.

Harris: You might add that the Portuguese threatened the Ford Company and that the Ford Company then reacted on the Ford Foundation.

Mondlane: And the Ford Foundation promised the Portuguese that it will never consider giving any aid to educational programs in their colonies without their approval.

Hudson: Do you have proof of this?

Mondlane: Yes, it was in the *New York Times* last year. Many letters of protest were written both to the Ford Foundation and to newspapers by myself and many private citizens in the United States, including the American Committee on Africa, but the Foundation never said "boo."

I have many friends in the United States, individual friends, but they are not people who can afford to finance and equip an army like ours.

Wallerstein: Do you see this war in Mozambique as a short war or a long war?

Mondlane: It will be a long war because we must force the Portuguese into talking or getting out.

Hudson: Are you looking for advisers?

Mondlane: No. We train our people now, ourselves. Originally Algeria helped. The president of Algeria, Houari Boumediene, directed the training of our officers, who now train our soldiers in Mozambique. We train in Mozambique, not in Tanzania, as some think.

Wallerstein: What percentage of the territory is under your control?

Mondlane: About one-fifth.

Wallerstein: What does it mean when you say it is under your control? Do you mean there are no Portuguese troops there?

Mondlane: No, it means that the Portuguese army is confined to specific points and the roads are not usable by them. Supplies have to be brought in by air.

Wallerstein: This is near the northern border?

Mondlane: About 500 miles deep, and we are pushing steadily south. There is political action throughout the country, but the military action has to be more confined at first because of the difficulty of transporting the equipment. Militarily, we must proceed point by point until the war is won.

Wallerstein: Would you care to comment on the support you get from neighboring African countries.

Mondlane: No, I cannot.

Hudson: Is your war following the guerrilla war patterns advocated by such guerrilla experts as Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung and General Vo Nyugen Giap?

Mondlane: Yes, to the extent that they attempted to develop universal principles of action and, in a sense, made guerrilla war scientific. However, every such war has to be adapted to its particular environment, and so we are adding our own techniques to these principles based on our own experience in Mozambique.

Gonze: Do you have a military commander for Frelimo?

Mondlane: No, we have a secretary of defense. You see, we work as a team. We have a secretary of defense just as we have a secretary for education and a secretary for social welfare. Each of these secretaries re-

XUM

ports to me, and I, in turn, report to the central committee.

Hudson: What should be American policy toward Frelimo? I would like to hear what you Americans think on this.

Gonze: I don't think there has been a specific American policy toward Mozambique. What seems to be at stake is U.S. policy toward Portugal.

It is a curious phenomenon that one can talk to desk officers at the State Department and find enlightenment, understanding, and abundant information, and then go to another bureau and find the most abysmal ignorance and medieval kind of thinking. For example, one finds that U.S. policy is dominated by concern about Portugal's strategic role on the Iberian Peninsula. But it gets even more petty than that.

About five years ago, American policy was generally sympathetic toward the movement for liberation in southern Africa. But about two years ago the American lease for an air base in the Azores expired and a new one was to be negotiated. It became evident that in exchange for the continued use of the base, the U.S. agreed not to push its policy for liberation in Angola. As a result, the State Department has put on continual pressure to prevent as many student exiles from Portuguese territories coming to the United States, and has tried to prevent them from making too much of a show or making too many speeches, so as not to anger the Portuguese.

So, I do not think that the U.S. has any real policy toward these countries.

Harris: I believe that American policy is a national disgrace which exists by virtue of the colossal ignorance of the American people concerning affairs in Portugal and southern Africa. The U.S. is supporting in Portugal a dictatorial regime which maintains the Portuguese in perhaps the most backward condition of any people in Europe, and yet the U.S. continues to support Portugal in its attempt to provide so-called civilization to the African territory.

Hudson: It's really not an either-or proposition, is it? The United States is not giving weapons to the Mozambique Liberation front, nor is it giving weapons to Portugal through NATO.

Mondlane: Well, that is precisely it. It *is* an either-or proposition, and the U.S. is supporting Portugal.

Harris: Dr. Mondlane's men are now fighting Portuguese who have been equipped either directly or indirectly through American NATO support, and the American people don't know this.

Mondlane: And there are leaders and military commanders who are trained in NATO counter-insurgency techniques in the United States.

Hudson: But they are not actually getting much equipment, are they?

Mondlane: They used American planes in Angola and Guinea, but this caused quite a stir and NATO insisted that Portugal withdraw these planes. Other equipment from the U.S. is used, I'm sure.

Gonze: We have in our office fragments of napalm shells and casings of napalm bombs which were made in the U.S. and used in Angola by the Portuguese.

Wallerstein: Regardless of whether or not the arms we give Portugal reach the colonies directly, the arms we give will make it possible to release other arms, made by somebody else, which can reach the Portuguese colonies. So this detective game, though it may be fun, is not to the point. If we give arms to Portugal we are, by definition, aiding its fight in Mozambique.

Mondlane: The position of the U.S. in the Security Council a few weeks ago was anything but encouraging. A resolution sponsored by the African states was watered down as much as possible by the U.S. and when the vote came, the U.S. abstained. Later, I was told by reliable sources that Ambassador Goldberg had been told either to water it down or veto it. So even African leaders friendly to the United States have no choice but to conclude that the United States is pro-Portuguese.

U.S. diplomats help to convince the Mozambicans that Americans are pro-Portuguese. For instance, the U.S. ambassador to Portugal, Admiral Anderson, makes public statements every chance he gets supporting Portuguese power in Africa.

Hudson: Do you have any idea how long the war will take—one year, five years, ten years?

Mondlane: We cannot predict. It depends on so many complex factors. We might venture a guess, were we fighting Portugal alone, but with the support she is getting from the U.S. and other countries, it is impossible to predict. We wouldn't be surprised eventually to see European and American "advisers" coming to work with the Portuguese. I wouldn't even rule out another Vietnam situation in Mozambique. But our people are ready for any eventuality. Since we have waited 450 years, another 10 or 20 years does not seem too long to get what is our right.

Harris: Although I'm not a political scientist by profession, I nevertheless feel entitled, as an American citizen who has lived in Mozambique and knows Dr. Mondlane and what he stands for, to point out that the American State Department has missed a great opportunity to provide the basis for a genuinely multiracial and democratic form of government in southern Africa. There is every moral reason and every practical possibility for the United States to lend its assistance, not to Portugal and to the dictatorship which controls the Portuguese people, but to this movement in southern Africa which promises to put an end to the vicious apartheid system and the tyranny which we theoretically condemn. Instead of lending our support to this movement to build up the forces of democracy, we are doing our best to repress it.

As is well known, Dr. Mondlane, who holds a Ph. D. degree from Northwestern University, who is on leave from an American university (Syracuse) and who is married to an American woman, was, in the beginning, extremely friendly toward the stated goals of American democracy. I do not know to what extent there is any remnant left in his heart of the friendship which he once felt for the American people. He would be a remarkable person if he maintained the admiration that he once had concerning the potentiality of the American system.

Hudson: Is that right?

Mondlane: His point was well made. In view of the attitude of the American government toward my people who are now dying, if I were to continue to admire the United States for its democratic ideals the way I used to, I would have to be mentally deranged. We judge a government by its actions. The actions of the U.S. government concerning the Portuguese question are, at best, dubious.

Hudson: Given our traditions you expected more . . .

Mondlane: More understanding, more support and more outright opposition to Portuguese colonialism.

I do not know what the U.S. wants to save in Portugal. I go to Europe quite often and the question I hear is, "Why don't the Americans save *themselves?*" Europeans don't need your protection in this sense. Why should you allow Portugal, a fascist government, to sit on us in Mozambique when the Portuguese don't have any special affection for your system of government? Portugal is a fascist state that is against the ideals in which Americans say they believe.

A Portuguese Comment on Dr. Mondlane's Interview

(*The Portuguese Embassy to the United States, in response to an invitation by* War/Peace Report, *made the following comments on the interview with Dr. Mondlane:*)

The population of Mozambique is near 6,500,000, not 7,000,000, and the number of inhabitants of European descent is well over 150,000, not 100,000. It is untrue to allege that literacy is a necessary qualification for voting. The legal requirements are: a) if, being of age, the person can read and write Portuguese, *or,* b) *if unable to read and write,* he contributes to the state a sum of no less than 100 escudos ($3.50), yearly, in payment of property tax, industrial tax, professional tax or tax on use of capital.

Although Mozambique still suffers from a high percentage of illiteracy, as do all other African territories south of the Sahara, the percentage is much lower than the 95 per cent Dr. Mondlane indicated. As of December, 1964, 988,949 children and many adults were attending the state, private and missionary primary schools of Mozambique, 446,299 in mission schools)—which means 16 per cent of the whole population (excluding the ones attending the schools on the secondary, technical and university levels). This percentage is *higher* than in most African states.

Dr. Mondlane states that "the Portuguese government says there is no discrimination but practices discrimination, anyway." This is utterly false and all the visitors to Mozambique (thousands of them every year) know this. An example: Nampula, a district capital, and Mozambique's most modern city, has a black mayor, although the majority of the urban population is white. A British Labor M.P., Mr. Ron Ledger, after a visit to Mozambique, wrote in the London *Evening Standard* (Sept. 21, 1964): "There was no race discrimination. I was surprised and pleased with what I saw and I am glad I captured it on film—anyone who is interested can see it."

About the migratory labor from Mozambique to the South African mines, which is strictly voluntary, Dr. Mondlane again makes untrue statements, to wit: a) it is untrue that the Portuguese government receives "six dollars per head" for every migrant worker. The worker merely pays a small tax for assistance, unemployment compensation and social services which are rendered to him by Portuguese supported agencies in his zone of work, b) it is untrue that the Portuguese government collects for itself the first four months' pay of the laborer, or any fraction thereof. It is true that 50 per cent of the worker's wages are withheld and paid in escudos; this insures, first, the support of the worker's family, secondly, savings for the worker when he returns home. The correctness and desirability of this practice have never been questioned, least of all by the workers' families. Even so, some of the workers return to Mozambique loaded with useless and expensive articles sold to them by merchants and unscrupulous pushers always to be found around mining camps. The Report of the International Labor Organization (a specialized agency of the United Nations), after an exclusive survey *in loco* has this to say:

Par. 745—"The Commission finds that the recruitment of labor in Mozambique for South Africa is based on the economic attraction of employment in South Africa and the element of social status which having been so employed confers, and that there is no element of compulsion under Portuguese jurisdiction and no element of fraud in such recruitment; it also finds the operations of the Witwatersrand Native Labor Association which it inspected to be both efficient and humane."

The I.L.O. report is available at the U.N. The new agreement of 1964 between the Portuguese and South African governments improved still more the working conditions and assistance to the Mozambique migrant workers.

Dr. Mondlane claims that for many years he has been carrying on his fight against "Portuguese colonialism." It is curious to note that on his last visit to Lourenço Marques, in 1961, just before he decided to lead an anti-Portuguese group, he spoke over Mozambique Radio, *voluntarily,* of course, and warmly praised the Portuguese administration, the progress, and multiracial society of his native land.

Speaking of material support, Dr. Mondlane says, "If the West won't give it to us, the communists will." Clarification, please: the communists *have* supported Frelimo from the very beginning. Money, instructors on terrorist warfare, and weapons to Frelimo have always come and are still coming from such states. Since November, 1964, the Portuguese security forces in northern Mozambique have captured enough war matérial, prisoners and other evidence to prove this. In a statement to the journalist, Malcolm Payne, published in the *Daily Colonist,* of Victoria, B.C., Canada (Oct. 22, 1965), Dr. Mondlane revealed that the Frelimo weapons came mostly from "China, Russia, Czechoslovakia and Indonesia."

He also claims that his terroist training camps are inside Mozambique. This again is untrue. Such camps are in Tanzania: the main base at Bagamoye, two more at Moshi and Kizizu; another camp at Mgawina; and still two more at Tanga and Kongwa. He also claims that "one-fifth" of Mozambique is under Frelimo control. This is a ridiculous claim and Dr. Mondlane knows it. Please name a single town of any importance, port, airfield, means of communication, or area, under Frelimo control. If his terrorist organization controls one-fifth of Mozambique (*which would mean 60,540 square miles,* nearly the area of the large state of Washington), why is Dr. Mondlane residing at Dar es Salaam? He claims further that his "forces" have penetrated "five hundred miles" inside Mozambique territory. This again is plainly preposterous. But, as the hit-and-run actions by Frelimo terrorists have occurred and still are occurring in points bordering Tanzania, it is conceivable that Dr. Mondlane is counting the five hundred miles from his palatial home at Dares Salaam (Tanzania) to the Mozambique border, across Tanzanian territory.

Unfortunately, the limitations of space for our comments will not permit us to take, point by point, the extensive pronouncements of the interview. Inasmuch as Dr. Mondlane was touring this country on a propaganda trip, trying to raise funds and rally support for his terrorist organization. Frelimo, one cannot be too surprised at his distortion of the facts, with the heavy anti-Portuguese slant, and his exaggerations. In the last few years either at the U.N. forum or on propaganda junkets throughout the world extremist leaders of all sorts have indulged in that kind of talk against anything or anyone who stands for law and order.

What is much more shocking than Dr. Mondlane's pronouncements is the utterances of some of the "interviewers," particularly Prof. Marva Harris, for many years a fancy champion of any anti-Portuguese cause that might have come along, regardless of whether or not he knew what he was talking about. In regard to the present situation in the Portuguese Overseas Provinces, he does *not* know what he is talking about; as for the communist-oriented nature of subversive movements, such as Frelimo, he undoubtedly does know. His statement beginning—"I would like to make the point here . . ." and ending, "We (the U.S.) are suppressing every liberal revolutionary movement throughout the world as a matter of policy."—clearly defines where he stands.

Excerpt From "Blueprint for Conflict" on the Mozambique Front

One cannot infer from this diversification, however, that the Communists are experimenting to determine the best way to conquer the fastest. From personal observation I am inclined to believe it much more likely that they were forced to adapt to situations created when hot-headed terrorists launched the fighting prematurely.

Consider, for instance, the evolution of battle in those 4,000-odd square miles of northeastern Mozambique now claimed as "secured" by the *Frente Liberadazao Mocambique* (Frelimo) forces from the Tanzanian frontier to the Lurio River in the south, Their use of the word "secure" is more than a little dubious. Rebel troops, captained by Algerian, Cuban and occasional American Black Nationalist officers, and encadred by a few elite regular troops from Ethiopia, Kenya, and Tanzania, conquered and held, no matter how briefly, some of the more strategic heights, by Portugal's own admission. Certainly there are still rebels in the area—in strong positions, too. But the nonchalance of Portuguese paratroopers and their black Mozambique Rifles circulating in the area—even with me, a foreign visitor, to protect—totally belies the insurgents' claim to hold a solid front.

Not that the Portuguese soldiers and their tribal allies are careless. Quite the contrary. They know that their real strength lies in the elasticity of their superb defenses, now virtually a reflex, which to date has resulted in the capture of several thousands of prisoners, including the man generally credited with firing the first shot that triggered the Frelimo fighting—prematurely. He is Lucas Fernandez, currently one of more than 2,000 terrorist prisoners in a detention camp in southern Mozambique.

Fernandez, a leader and self-appointed secretary of the Mozambecano African National Union (MANU), was credited early in the resistance planning with the recruitment of more than 1,000 volunteers. At the time—1963—this was considered to be an excellent showing, even if the recruits had virtually no weapons. The showing, in fact, was enough for Fernandez to believe he was entitled to membership in the Frelimo's Party Council or steering committee, then headed by Adelino Gwambe and Uria Simango and located in Tanzania. The rivalry between these two men, however, was so bitter that their Red Chinese sponsors relieved both and called in a compromise candidate for the presidency of the movement. He was Eduardo Mondlane, a native of Mozambique, who was taken directly from his post as Professor of African Studies at Syracuse University. (Mondlane was killed by a time bomb in Dar es Salaam on February 3, 1969.)

Not only did this move leave Fernandez out in the cold, but it angered him sufficiently to goad him into planning and executing a coup of his own, one he hoped and believed would compel the Chinese Communists to recognize his worth to the movement. Picking up a truckload of weapons, which he told his Chinese sponsors were to be used in a weapons familiarization course, and ammunition from Soviet recruiters who were interested in gaining influence in the activist MANU, he went to Mueda where he organized a team of terrorists. With them he worked his way across-country, the Portuguese say, warning the Meconda and Angonia tribesmen to keep their ears open because "the black man will rise."

The authorities reacted quickly, but not fast enough to prevent Fernandez from reaching Vila Cabral near the Malawi border. There, on September 25, 1964, he picked for his target one of the most popular men in the district, Father Daniel, a Jesuit priest and medical missionary, whose real last name is lost in the dusty archives of the Catholic Church. All that is known about him, just a little more than four years later, is that he was Dutch and "rather old." Characteristically, the methodical Fernandez organized a mammoth demonstration, knowing full well that as soon as the priest heard of it, he would also appear—if only to debate.

Fernandez reportedly toyed with the debate until the priest turned to the assembled tribesmen and told them all to go home. Witnesses say Fernandez' four shots hit the priest in the neck, the back, the chest and the abdomen. He then leaped from the podium he had set up for himself and stabbed the dying priest a total of 33 times.

The audience was thunderstruck—too frightened to flee, too confused to react, and too shocked to do anything but stand and stare. Fernandez had made his mark. Stooping to pick up the frail priest's body, he held it out: "See," he shouted to the crowd, "I have killed a white man! I am not afraid! I shall lead you on to other victories like this until all of Mozambique belongs to the black man!" He and his fellow terrorists, a mere handful of men, walked away in the stunned silence that followed. Portuguese secret police soon traced them to Dar-es-Salaam—inviolate sanctuary, from which they could be neither extradited nor abducted.

This first shot triggered an increasingly vicious war. The Portuguese reacted swiftly, deploying defensive troops. So too did the Red Chinese and their Soviet collaborators. Apparently, however, the Communists determined to dump Fernandez, and they duped him into leading another expedition into Mozambique. Insiders today say he believed he was opening an African counterpart of the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Fernandez' "Ho Trail" was to lead from the Tanzanian frontier southward some 750 miles to the Republic of South Africa—right across the heart of Mozambique. Inevitably Fernandez was captured, some say on information received. The date was April 12, 1965.

One learns with no little surprise that even in a war as vicious as this one, the Portuguese, who abolished the death penalty in 1810, have not reinvoked it for guerrillas. Even though the matter has received considerable thought, executions are still banned. Fernandez therefore wound up in a detention camp near Lourenço Marques, the capital. I interviewed him there in a room of his choosing. He demonstrated all the symptoms of acute schizophrenia, talking on the one hand quite freely of his day-long prayers for the priest, and on the other of a mysterious companion who "really committed the murder," and whose identity he can readily assume. Breaking off, he will invite the visitor to inspect a crucifix he carved out of waste lumber and erected in the prison yard as a monument to his victim.

He is a ready talker and speaks more than passable English. But ask him any details of the crime: "I didn't kill the priest," he will shout, "Carlos did!" Carlos, a prison doctor explains, is his *alter ego*. Pressing him only precipitates anger, and since he is a very strong, wiry man, despite his imprisonment, one doesn't press too far. But a proposed compromise worked out well. I asked him what Carlos did, and down to the last detail I got the full story, embellished perhaps a little by pride when the listener expressed any horror.

Only once during the interview did Fernandez drop the mask of Carlos to assume a first person role in the murder, and that was when he said, "I stopped soon after the death to wash the blood from my clothes . . . it was drawing flies." Aside from that one slip, Fernandez firmly indicated that he now believes himself to have been merely one of the 236 eyewitnesses whose identical

XUM

stories of the murder were written in the record. The man will remain in prison until the day his body dies. His mind is already gone.

The consequences of that cold-blooded murder, too, will linger. Despite the premature triggering of the fighting, the Frelimo forces did at one time push as far south as the Lurio, but their claim to holding some 4,000 square miles today does not hold up. My own more conservative estimate, based on a personal survey and the freedom of movement enjoyed during the look-see, might concede some 1,800 miles under spotty control of the guerrillas. That is somewhat more than the 1,100 square miles admitted by the Portuguese as of mid-September, 1968. And the rebels appear to be using only some 8,000 to 10,000 spottily trained forces.

One thing does appear certain: from the frequency of their attacks, in bands of 15 or 20 sallying out of their strongholds, the Frelimo is still far from defeated. "But we feel that time is on our side," explained one official, a knowledgeable subinspector of Portugal's security forces—the *Policia Internacionale de Defese do Estado* (PIDE) at Lourenço Marques. "The Frelimo's slow progress and heavy casualties seem to be cooling the enthusiasm of their backers on the other side of the Tanzanian frontier [i.e., the Chinese Communists], and the loyal blacks on our side of the frontier are getting better organized."

This subinspector conceded that the Mozambecano tribesmen had been forced to react because "they were in trouble. If they helped the terrorists, they risked getting shot by our [black] Rifles. If they didn't, they risked getting shot by the terrorists. But now the balance appears to have swung to our side. We arm the blacks when we believe it will do some good. To date, it has."

The frequency of the rebels' probing forays across the front can be accurately charted. PIDE and other sources each admit an average of about 15 to 20 incidents a month. Keeping tabs and neutralizing these thrusts, however, hasn't yet strained what at first glimpse seems to be a rather skimpy frontier guard. That guard, though, is made up of elite troops, all men well versed in jungle warfare and guerrilla tactics, familiar to the point of contempt with their immediate action theaters.

Now while attacks can be and are fairly freely discussed with an outside observer, casualty figures for the enemy, and particularly the number of prisoners, are not. True, prisoner totals of 2,000 or so in any camp can be accurately estimated, but it is not quite so simple to determine *how many* camps there really are. One neutral intelligence source said his non-African headquarters believed that the Portuguese alone were holding more than 20,000 prisoners. And a recently captured Iron Curtain agent (European, not Asian), interviewed while under house arrest, was even gloomier in his estimates. He frankly admitted that *total losses* on all fronts since August, 1964, amounted to "at least 42,000, many of whom, of course, were deserters."

Prisoners only recently taken into custody claimed that in the 15-day period immediately preceding their capture, they knew of nine operations involving a total of perhaps slightly more than 200 insurgents. Four of these engagements were to set booby traps, simple but dreadfully effective Chinese land mines, on the main patrol routes. These highly portable TNT charges are designed to explode under four pounds of pressure. Simple they may be, but the terrorist in his nervousness is sometimes betrayed by them. One occasionally hears them exploding, both night and day. Subsequent investigation invariably shows that some of the terrorists fail to learn Rule One of the household handyman: "Don't paint yourself into a corner." Quite often they set so many mines they step on them themselves.

A favorite trick of the rebels, however, initially inflicted some damage on the defending forces. Portuguese military men engaged in neutralizing these attacks admitted losing three men in the earliest days through sheer carelessness. The terrorists had deliberately allowed themselves to be detected, and fled at the approach of the counter-insurgents. Lying in plain sight were 12 or 15 unplanted mines. The stack of black, hatbox-shaped mines was tempting and, it transpired, triggered to explode on contact. A trooper walked over and picked one up . . . Three men died, one of them a black Rifleman who had guessed the trap and sought to prevent it.

Surrounded by a pile of mines still stacked in his office, another PIDE inspector, waiting for an ordnance man to come in and disarm them, cursed the "outside interference" disrupting Mozambique.

"If they'd leave our blacks alone," he said, "we could improve their lot fifty times faster than we are doing. We've been working at that since the end of World War II, just as all other progressive, white governments in Africa have been doing. Don't for a minute believe our concern was motivated by or *because* of the guerrillas. It is in spite of them. If the outside assistance now reaching the Frelimo from Tanzania were to be cut off tomorrow, fighting would collapse in a matter of days—if not hours. Then all we'd have to contend with would be the Meconda tribesmen. They are fierce, proud and, up to the past few years, completely autonomous by their own wish. In this world, however, the state of Mozambique can only survive united.

"The outsiders don't want that. It prevents them from moving in and imposing a dictatorship of their own on our people. Don't you for a minute believe they have any intention of permitting any of this 'one-man, one-vote' opposition once they take over, either.

"Look at Cuba! Did Fidel Castro ever in the past almost ten years come closer than talking about it to giving the *guajiro* [peasant] a vote? Okay! So where's the world's opprobrium against Castro? Where are the British frigates lying off the coast? They cut *us* [the Portuguese] off from free trade with the world because of *suspected* oppression in Rhodesia? Is Cuba blockaded?

"Admit it, Mr. Brigham, the 'idealists' in your country, in Britain, in the United Nations, have deprived you of your reason. They have seized control to right an imagined wrong without so much as an *unbiased* look at the target states of their hatred. They have permitted themselves, and forced all thinking men, to abandon logic for emotion."

GUARDING CABORA BASSA

Perhaps because of the slow inroads the Portuguese, playing a waiting game, are making on the northeast frontier against the Frelimo, the Communists have recently reactivated operations on what might be called the West Mozambecano front in the province of Tete, where the Portuguese line all but completely surrounds Malawi, making it an enclave of Mozambique.

Terrorist forces in this area are largely Zambian-based, somewhat better trained and equipped, but still too newly engaged to permit of any accurate assessment. Tactically, their operations are generally the lethal hit-run variety, with no quarter given or asked. Casualties are, therefore, consistently high. These rebels are members of the Committee for Revolution in Mozambique (COREMO) and their effectives appear to specialize in sabotage of a highly skilled type.

Currently one of their principal targets appears to be the Mozambecano hydro-electric plant on the Zambesi River at Cabora Bassa. When completed that installation, larger than Egypt's Aswan Dam, will deliver some 2 million kilowatts to an 800-mile powerline net, construction of which is well under way. One can readily appreciate the virtually impossible task of protecting such a powerline; intermittent sabotage, particularly in the more deserted zones, is almost a daily occurrence. The Portuguese are meeting this problem in a most interesting way.

Drawing from the ranks of war prisoners in various detention camps, they have "rehabilitated" hundreds willing to accept the responsibility of protecting the pylons, armed them, and sent them into the region with their families. The PIDE with great satisfaction reports the system is paying off.

"You have the tale of your farmer in America," said Anthony Vaz, Sub-Director of PIDE in Mozambique (there is only one PIDE Director, and he is in Lisbon). "Well, this farmer trapped a raccoon, I believe, that was stealing grain from his barn. He was irked because the grain was for his horses. When he killed the animal, he skinned it and made a whip from its hide. When a neighbor asked him why he hadn't just thrown the pelt away, he replied: 'I'm going to get horsepower out of that grain, one way or the other.'

"We Portuguese, too, have to get 'horsepower' one way or another out of the swelling ranks of the prisoners, particularly with the threat hanging over us all the time of a mass attack by all of the black states in the north. And if we just rounded up the prisoners and let them rot mentally and physically right where they are . . . well, we can neither afford this, nor is the idea tolerable.

"Some day, the men we're now meeting on battlegrounds of their choosing will return to their homes. Peace will come—it always has in the history of war. So we got the idea it might be a good thing to start training our enemies for peace. It hasn't failed us yet."

Director Vaz, of course, has a number of things going for his idea. First, by returning the prisoner to his home or tribal area, he is sending back a man under suspicion. Had he talked? Was that why he was released? Should the local tribesmen believe this story of rehabilitation, or should they kill him? Did he return as a spy?

It speaks well for the PIDE that to date not a single attacker of one of the rehabilitees has escaped. Nor, with the exception of a single ex-prisoner who was surprised working with a sabotage team, has any of the released prisoners failed to repulse an attack on the pylons. The one exception was killed when he tried to shoot his way out of the trap.

On the other hand, by early October of 1968, eleven of the ex-prisoner guards had paid in blood for their loyalty to their new responsibilities. Four of them were killed. Two of the wounded, questioned through interpreters, grinned through their pain: "What?" one of them asked. "Do you for a minute believe an outsider could come into *my* valley undetected and attack property I am defending? I've got a family, you know. And neighbors who are watching me all the time, waiting for me to slack my responsibilities. I've been given a second chance. I'm going to fight for it!"

Fight for it, he had. He killed three of his five attackers, captured another, though grievously wounded himself, and was trying to stop the villagers from beating the fifth to death when outside help arrived.

The other, who lost a foot to an attacker's hand grenade, managed to kill all three of the saboteurs. A high-school graduate before he joined the terrorists, he'll receive a pension from the state—$25 a month, not bad by African standards. But he was much happier about the "proof of his rehabilitation" that his act had given the government. "Now they'll have to believe me when I say I'm Portuguese!"

XUM

TRIPARTITE DEFENSE

Prior to this experiment with rehabilitation troops (historically, first used by the British in Germany toward the end of World War II) the sabotage activity on the Coremo front had pinned down so many Portuguese and Mozambecano Riflemen that the Communists had enjoyed an almost completely free hand building up supply routes across the Chirundu plateau from Tanzania to Rhodesia. And under the same diversionary umbrella, the Communists had also made considerable progress in developing their African "Ho Chi Minh Trail," some 400 miles long and skirting Mozambique's western frontier with Rhodesia, to bring rebels and equipment into South Africa.

Well marked on the ground but fairly well hidden from air reconnaissance, even during the recent intensive drought, that trail was to be the main route also used by the troops of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU) sent to strike into eastern Rhodesia. Portuguese forces, however, are now freed to mop up both trails and are doing it.

These mopping-up operations, moreover, appear to be demonstrating the effectiveness of another unobtrusive evolution in the "White South's" counter-insurgency. With the quiet development of an informal central command for all three countries, an international and (again) informal radio net has been created for instantaneous communications that earlier were often bogged down for days in "channels." The tripartite arrangement has also permitted the free interchange of manpower, information and equipment, to forestall invasions, build reinforcements and step up pressure on the rebels' lines.

As noted previously, with the exception of a single bombing run on a rebel formation fleeing into Tanzania from Mozambique, there has been to date no counter invasion of the north. Not that the police and military directly concerned haven't wanted to counterattack, since both Zambia and Tanzania serve the rebels as ready sanctuary to which they can flee, regroup and re-equip, and shift the axis for their next attack, always secure in the knowledge that no one will follow.

One diplomat, from a neutral non-African (and non-European) nation, recalled what he termed "the ultimate affront" the White South had suffered, when ideologues associated with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace compiled a 170-page staff study, including estimates of probable casualties presumably American troops would suffer in a not-so-hypothetical plan to invade South Africa to end apartheid.

"Where are the outcries from the idealists against that plan?" he asked. "The point I wish to make," he added, "is that even at its *stylized worst*, which it definitely is nowhere near approaching, the relationship between the black man and his alleged white overlords is no excuse for the current programs of sanctions, implicit and explicit, against these powers in the south—as anybody could plainly determine if he would take the trouble of making one unbiased survey trip with no preconceived notions as to what to expect."

Rhodesia's BSAP has been reinforced with units of the Rhodesian African Rifles (white officers, black troops). Portugal's totally unsegregated Mozambecanos have been reinforced with some 45,000 elite troops from the Metropole (Lisbon), and the Republic of South Africa has loaned some 300 of its highly skilled State Police to the joint effort. Pretoria's simple explanation for its contribution: it wants to hold the terrorist operation as far from South African soil as it can. "The day we have to fight them on our soil," explained General van den Bergh, "it will be an entirely different kind of war: one where we will have to drop the defensive and strike hard on the offensive. It will be a total war."

Prime Minister Vorster recently warned: "If we ever have to strike back at President Kaunda and the Zambians, we will hit them so hard where it hurts that they will never forget it. We may be a small state, but we have a compact defensive force." His reference to "where it hurts" was presumably to an all-out counterattack *into* Zambia.

Invasion rumbles on both sides of the terrorist front continue to echo, with sometimes amazing side-effects. President Kaunda blasted British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and his "cowardly government that resorts to dirty tricks" for its refusal to release to Zambia (on credit, naturally) some $20 million worth of British-manufactured "Rapier" missiles. Wilson told a House of Commons questioner it would take two years to deliver the missiles, that British defense experts doubted Zambian soldiery "possessed the technical know-how to use them," but that the missiles could still be purchased—if Zambia wanted to pay cash. Wilson satisfied his questioner further with assurance that it "appears highly unlikely that the [white African] states will attack Zambia." At last report, Kaunda was attempting to induce the Chinese to move some of their missilery now protecting the southern approaches to Dar-es-Salaam (from Mozambique) to the area around his capital, Lusaka. Infiltrators indicate he has not yet been successful.

Paradoxically, President Kaunda recently served notice on the guerrillas now stationed on his soil to "Fight or quit!" Infiltrators slipping back across the lines after Zambian penetrations reported Kaunda, as late as mid-October, had ordered the closing of a chain of "Freedom Houses" from which the OAU's Committee of Liberation had been directing the insurgency effort. Key personnel from those local headquarters have apparently been evacuated to Dar-es-Salaam to new offices near the Sino-Soviet headquarters.

Kaunda also cracked down on press gangs operating throughout the mining areas in Zambia, looking for "recruits" for the terrorist movement. His public statement was that "while it was deplorable that many [Zambians] had been inadvertently [sic] impressed into service, many others who did not want such service were so severely beaten that many died."

Invasion rumors brought an invitation from the Zambian government for an on-site inspection by neutral newspapermen. Curiously enough, only Iron Curtain newsmen appeared to have succeeded in obtaining visas from Kaunda's Vice President, Simon Kapwepwe. Nevertheless, a ringer managed to sneak in and brought back a report:

1. There is a network of training and transit camps within walking distance of the Rhodesian frontier.

2. The camps were set up by ZANU and ZAPU organizers. Both resistance groups have now been outlawed by decree from Kaunda, though they have a stay of dissolution through late January—presumably to permit them to conform to Kaunda's order to fight or quit.

3. To date, camps have been moved constantly, apparently to spare Zambia international embarrassment.

4. Activities of troops in these camps were directed by a Sino-Soviet staff operating in Lusaka with the full knowledge of the Zambian Foreign Office.

5. By Kapwepwe's own admission, Zambia's attitude to date toward these camps had been one of blind permissiveness. He is reported to have commented on the Kaunda "fight or quit" order that the black resistance movement can't delay much longer because the White South's defensive measures are "becoming perfected."

Kapwepwe himself, however, is a bit of an opportunist. Infiltrators repeatedly tell of the Vice President's pep talks at terrorist training camps. Making no bones about it, he was quoted many times as telling the recruits, "The day is coming . . . when you shall follow *my* leadership to complete victory over the white man." A rabid pro-Peking Communist, Kapwepwe has somehow managed to keep his political skirts clean by avoiding a direct confrontation with Zambian *regular* troops. These are encadred by British-trained and hence presumably anti-Communist officers—a by-product of Zambia's recent independence.

Prisoners captured on the Rhodesian front often spoke with awe of those Zambian regulars and specifically of their ruthlessness in those rare confrontations with the rebels "in training." From the tenor and context of such interviews, however, it might justifiably be inferred that since January 1968 Kapwepwe's advisors have misled the Vice President into believing that the time is near to begin testing the regulars' loyalty to the President. If so, it may produce some interesting results. Kapwepwe at this juncture, even with all his determination to "kill off the whites," could scarcely survive without the help of the Chinese Communists. Few outside Kapwepwe's immediate circle believe the Communists would be foolish enough to commit their forces in an internecine struggle.

The same may be said of Tanzania where, whatever his other sympathies, President Nyerere sees to it that his regular army forces are hand-picked and get the cream of the Communist weapons entering his country. He carefully nurtures a two-faced intimacy with both the Soviets and the Red Chinese. Does he hope he can play them off, one against the other? Many small-nation strong-men have entertained that hope, even though history to date suggests it is illusory. In Nyerere's case the hope would seem futile, given the unity of purpose the two Communist giants have maintained in the African theater.

The Free World would do well to note that unity of purpose in Africa. And the mere fact that the Communist pressure is maintained, in spite of continuing reverses, may be read as an augury of the Sino-Soviet joint determination.

The so-called White South, most directly and immediately concerned because of proximity, of course, recognizes this continuing pressure. Nonetheless it has been able, thanks to successes to date, to relax many of the onetime oppressively restrictive measures it was forced to apply. Clifford W. Dupont, Officer Administering the Government of Rhodesia—an office roughly equivalent to that of Governor-General under the British—deplored the necessity for such laws, however temporary.

"When the controversial Section 48–A (1) (a) of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act was legislated in 1963, black men, women and children were innocent victims of an increasing terror. The casualties mostly resulted from fire bombs callously tossed into highly flammable grass-thatched huts. The resulting conflagrations often wiped out entire black villages, not only near the present front lines but far into the interior." (Guerrillas and their leaders captured after such attacks freely admitted that their sole intent was to sow terrorism to forestall future resistance.) "The only offense of the victims was that, being black, they did *not* espouse the terrorists' cause.

"Enactment of Section 48 made it a mandatory hanging offense for a man to enter Rhodesia bearing weapons of war. Enforcement of that law so dramatically stopped those firebombings that this October the law's mandatory capital punishment provisions were repealed. A Justice will now mete out the death penalty only on the evidence. It is only fair to add, however, that not a single terrorist among the several hanged, after apprehension under Section 48, was

XUM

executed for being a terrorist. *Every one of them went to the scaffold for common law murder."*

The same can be said of South Africa, where the death penalty has only been invoked where acts of terriorism have cost human lives.

Talking to prisoners at all stages of detention, from immediate capture to those already jailed for a long time, one encounters emotions ranging from conviction that the tide has turned to fear that it hasn't and won't until the Communists are cornered and evicted from Africa. Then white and black can get on with the job of building started immediately after World War II when the world awoke to the concept of the developing nation.

Portuguese Africa

Portugal is taking sensible precautions to protect her multi-racial citizenry in both her east and west overseas provinces. In Mozambique, on the east coast, desperadoes began fighting in the jungles; by coincidence very close to the Tanganyikan border. But the Portuguese have put fifty thousand troops into the area to demonstrate a sense of responsibility. They would like to get their hands on Eduardo C. Mondlane, who reportedly has left his hideout at the State Department in Washington to lead the jungle games in person. He studied his trade at a number of prominent American vocational institutes, ranging from Oberlin to Harvard, and took his apprenticeship in Ralph Bunche's office at the UN Trusteeship Council. Mondlane, who recently taught at Syracuse University, is a Peace Corps instructor when not leading Communist terrorists.

[From American Opinion, June 1968]

From Africa

(By George S. Schuyler)

Students of World War III with their attention riveted on Vietnam and the *Pueblo* incident might well be equally concerned with the African sector of the conflict where significant gains have been made by the Communist enemy.

There is first the continuing and devastating civil war in Nigeria where the successes of the Federals over the Biafran rebels have been largely made possible by massive aid from Moscow in the form of arms and aircraft. Of course, since the Lagos government has no pilots capable of flying the Soviet planes, the Kremlin has graciously sent an ample supply of those too. With the death toll already at thirty thousand, or more than the total U.S. deaths in Vietnam, it continues to mount daily as Soviet bombers destroy cities, churches, and hospitals, in the absence of any worthwhile military targets. The British military aid to Lagos has also been substantial, but nothing approaching the Russian help which came from the beginning after urgent appeals.

Thanks to this foreign military aid, the Federal forces have demolished Biafra's great trading city of Onitsha—where a $1.4 million market is now a scorched skeleton of twisted girders, the $17 million bridge across the mighty Niger has been destroyed, and the population of 160,000 has been reduced to less than 1,000, without water, electricity or food, except that supplied by the victorious Federal forces of General Yakubu Gowon.

Both the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches have appealed for peace in Nigeria in a joint statement saying they "unite in one voice in most urgent appeal to both contesting parties for an immediate cessation of armed hostilities in this sad conflict and for the establishment of a lasting peace by honorable negotiations in the highest African tradition." Neither of these august bodies, of course, has ever appealed to the Algerian dictatorship for the release of the kidnaped and imprisoned Moise Tshombe; nor to anyone in behalf of the half million Christians and pagans chased out of southern Sudan by the Khartoum politicians beefed up by Soviet arms (nothing can be done about the half million already slaughtered there in the civil war which has been going on since 1956); nor have they appealed on behalf of the thousands of hapless Jehovah's Witnesses who have been raped, robbed, tortured, and killed by the brave forces of Dr. Hastings Banda, dictator of Malawi.

Only the much-maligned Portuguese and the French have helped supply arms to the Biafrans, though the Dutch (with their usual eye to commerce) have run several freighters through the blockade. The United States has aided neither side but has recognized all sorts of virtue in the case of Lagos. In return it has been daily denounced by the Moscow-leaning Nigerians.

President Tubman, of one-Party Liberia, and Emperor Haile Selassie, the daddy of all African dictators—who co-chaired the Nigerian peace mission of the Organization of African Unity—have been distressingly ineffective as the genocide against the talented and progressive Ibo people of Biafra has progressed. But, as a sort of farcical note, it was announced in mid-March that a month hence the big brass of the Negro Leadership Conference on Africa would emplane for Lagos to offer their good offices in bringing about Nigerian peace (something they can't maintain in their "ghettos" at home!). The delegates were to be Roy Wilkins of the N.A.A.C.P.; Whitney Young of the Urban League; A. Philip Randolph, President of the Sleeping Car Porters; and, Dr. Martin Luther King, the nonviolent agitator. With King now gathered to his fathers, the trip may be postponed with no loss to anybody except the airplane companies.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is zealously prosecuting its plans for conquering Africa, thereby enriching its sources of mineral wealth and denying same to the capitalist world. The Rhodesian war is being stepped up with increasing attacks across the Zambezian border by guerrillas trained by Chinese Communist military experts and equipped with the latest arms. It is estimated that there are two thousand of these guerrillas in Tanzania and Zambia, although the veracious President Kenneth Kaunda denies they are being trained in his country. This is affirmed by James R. D. Chikerema, Lusaka-based Vice President of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union, and the Dar es Salaam-based Oliver Tambo, who heads the African National Congress forces in Tanzania. But, only the incredibly naive believe them. Both operate up-to-date headquarters from which they direct the movement of their Communist guerrillas across the Rhodesian and Mozambique borders.

The multi-racial Rhodesian army has repulsed the several murder teams sent across the Zambezi, but its officers admit that the guerrillas are highly trained and well equipped. That figures, since their leaders were instructed in Russia and China, with the rank-and-file being drilled in Tanzania and Zambia—and the whole tribe carrying Russian- and Chinese-made rockets and rocket-launchers. Since each guerrilla gets a $70.50 handout when he starts out on a mission, it is evident that Messrs. Chikerema and Tambo are handling a lot of money from the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity (which gets its from the Soviet Union).

Parked over in Kinshasa and also backed by the O.A.U. is Communist Holden Roberto, author of the March 15, 1961 atrocities in Angola, with his forces of the Revolutionary Government of Angola; across the Congo River in Brazzaville, capital of the old French Congo, is quartered the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola, headed by the Communist Angolan intellectual, Dr. Neto. Roberto has the nod and cash from the O.A.U., but Neto's funds come directly from the Red bosses.

The other prong of the Red pincers on Southern Africa is directed by Eduardo Mondlane, President of the Mozambique liberationist group called FRELIMO, which is quartered in Dar es Salaam. A Mozambique mulatto, married to an American girl from the Midwest, and formerly Professor at Syracuse University, Dr. Mondlane was originally bankrolled by the Ford Foundation which supported his "school" on the outskirts of Dar es Salaam. His outfit is now financed by the O.A.U.'s Liberation Committee and is credited with having eight thousand guerrillas training inside Mozambique and an equal number in Tanzania. The 65,000-man Portuguese Army is holding its own and the rebels are making no advance.

The strategy is to invade Rhodesia, Angola, Botswana, and Mozambique, and to encircle South Africa, the real goal. With South Africa's wealth in capital and natural resources, and South West Africa's diamond bonanza, the Communists figure they would have it made. The only obstacle to world conquest would then be the United States.

[From American Opinion, April 1969]

Portugal: Enjoying the Last Laugh in Africa

(By George Schuyler)

Fifty years before their erstwhile protege, Chirstopher Columbus, "discovered" America, the Portuguese established their presence in West Africa; and, at the turn of the Sixteenth Century, they were a terror to the Asiatic bosses along the East African littoral who had for half a millenium been exploiting and selling the natives.

Today, after weathering five centuries of competition, envy, warfare, and derision of Africa's poverty, ignorance, weakness, and ineptitude, the much-maligned Portuguese are rapidly approaching Easy Street there. In the early centuries (like everybody else) they eked out a living and maintained their African presence by selling the most readily available product: slaves. Now they are the first coffee exporter in Africa (the third largest in the world), and a major marketer of diamonds. They have some of the largest hydroelectric schemes in Africa, tremendous mineral resources, gushing oil wells, and an African territory a third the size of the United States.

The Third World since its emergence has evil-wished the Portuguese empire, denigrated it, maligned it, conspired against it in the United Nations, invaded it with guerrilla mercenaries bankrolled indirectly by the Russian and Chinese Communists, and mobilized the vast propaganda machine of the "Liberal" West against it. The Portuguese have endured the psychological and military attacks, tolerated the defection and treason of their N.A.T.O. partners, rolled with the juridical punches of the black conspirators in the U.N., and are today living higher on the hog than all of their Third World detractors.

The politico-military lineup against Portuguese Africa has been formidable. Communist Holden Roberto's People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola launched the initial attack from the new Congo Republic eight years ago, hitting northern Angola on March fifteenth. The initial slaughter was terrific, an orgy of butchery and mutilation unprecedented this side of the Iron Curtain, and using the innovation of sawmills in disposing of victims. The latter were not only white but colored farmers. A month later when your correspondent was in Luanda and toured the affected area, I saw hundreds of the impoverished refugees. They were of all colors, rich and poor.

XUM

As soon as Guinea's Sekou Toure celebrated his independence by giving Khrushchev his first foothold in Africa, and the brilliant Communists supplied quantities of tanks, anti-aircraft guns, and snow shovels, the African Independence Party of Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde was born. Portuguese Guinea, sandwiched between Senegal and Guinea, seemed particularly vulnerable. The initial surprise attack swept a large area of country, and the Communists were jubilant, predicting early ousting and/or slaughter of the Portuguese. It didn't happen.

Three years later the Mozambique Liberation Front was formed by the ex-Syracuse University professor, Eduardo Mondlane—well-oiled with contributions from the elite of the American Left. Eduardo set up headquarters in Dar-es-Salaam at a "school"—for "Mozambique refugees" financed by the Ford Foundation—where the curriculum consisted of courses in revolution and guerrilla warfare. The warriors are generally under the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization (A.A.P.S.O.) headquartered in Cairo and dominated by the minions of Mao. Arms for the guerrillas are delivered through Zanzibar, and training and leadership are supplied by Chinese officers. No doubt their help will be needed as Mondlane opened a package containing a bomb early this year and disappeared. I do not know who was the world benefactor, but Eduardo Mondlane has been gathered to his fathers—via a vacuum cleaner.

The Red terrorists maintain two staging areas in Zambia, where Kenneth Kaunda, the "pacifist," is President. Several heavy infiltrations have been made through the Zambezi valley of Rhodesia and the Caprivi Strip of South-West Africa. These have been regularly attended by disaster. It will be noted that occupancy of the Caprivi Strip would threaten southern Angola as well as Botswana. and hence Rhodesia.

But the Portuguese were not born yesterday, and they have known Africa and the Africans intimately, for five hundred years. Where younger and more cruel imperialists imposed white racism on the conquered blacks and insulted them with discriminatory practices which particularly offended people of position and education, the Portuguese pronounced and practiced interracialism from the Fifteenth Century. So after Roberto's and Mondlane's failure to penetrate Angola and Mozambique, the Portuguese redoubled their social work in border areas, put up model villages to replace those bombed during the warfare, bought off venal rebel leaders, and soon had things back to normal. All can vote, schools have been greatly increased, and universities have been established.

So, while racism soars everywhere else in the continent, it declines toward nadir in Portuguese Africa. This reporter has traveled five thousand miles in the two big departments, and if there had been any manifestations of racism, he would have detected it.

Today, those who evil-wished Portugal are grinding their molars to the quick over her new African prosperity. Offshore discoveries, spouting wells, and a busy refinery in Angola's Cabinda area are now producing 20,000 to 25,000 barrels daily. This sulphur-free oil will be increasingly in great demand as delivery of oil from the Middle East grows more uncertain because of politics. Production will be 150,000 barrels daily by 1970. As Robert F. Ward of Cabinda Gulf says: "This represents one of the major growth areas in the corporation." No wonder Texaco is trying to get in on the action.

Diamonds totaling 1,268,140.45 carats showed an annual increase of 9.7 percent. Geologists report that the Cassinga district in southern Angola is so rich in top grade iron ore (with reserves of 123 million tons) that it bids fair to becoming one of the world's major producing areas. The Benguela fishing industry is one of the world's biggest.

At Cabora-Bassa on the Zambezi in Mozambique a huge dam is being built which will establish a hydrographic basin covering an area of 1,200,000 kilometers—a bigger project than Aswan. The Cunena River project along Angola's South-West African border is almost equally promising with possibilities of settling 500,000 inhabitants, thanks to irrigation and giant power. Labor is sharing in this new prosperity, with improved housing and plentiful food. *Volkswagens* (dubbed "Hitler's Revenge" in Portuguese Africa) scamper all over the place, and all major U.S. automobile companies have agencies.

With prosperity busting out all over, and the highest African wage rates outside South Africa and the copper districts, long-aligned Portugal is having the last laugh.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the second decade of the 19th century, Western Europe began to take notice of the agonies of the Greek people who were striving to throw off the yoke of four centuries of Turkish oppression.

The possibility of the resurrection of a people fraught with such historical meaning thrilled like the sound of a trumpet through the heart of Europe. And a young English poet was moved to write:

> The mountains look on Marathon,
> And Marathon looks on the sea;
> And musing there an hour alone,
> I dreamed that Greece might still be free.
>
> Lord Byron.

The Greeks are an ancient people, makers of myths and philosophies, tenacious in their individualism, devoted in their love of freedom.

Today is Greek Independence Day. It celebrates the 148th year since the Greek War of Independence broke out on March 25, 1821. On that date, Bishop Germanos hoisted the flag of rebellion in the village of Kalavryta. And this is the official beginning of the revolt, although numerous other revolts had erupted in Greek settlements throughout the Balkans.

The 19th-century British historian, Archibald Alison, wrote movingly of the condition of the Greeks at the time the rebellion began:

> Although the Greeks had for four centuries groaned under the dominion of the Ottomans, and the heel of conquest had perhaps crushed them with more severity than any other nation in Europe, yet they had preserved the elements of nationality, and kept alive the seeds of resurrection more entirely than any other people.
>
> Amidst all the severities of Turkish rule they had retained the great distinctive features of nationality, their country, their language, their religion. As long as a nation preserves these, no matter how long the chains of servitude may have hung about it, the means of ultimate salvation are not lost, the elements of future independence exist.
>
> The very severity of the Ottoman rule, the arrogance of their Turkish masters, the difference of language, religion, manners, laws, between the victors and the vanquished, had tended to perpetuate the feelings of the subjugated people, and prevent that amalgamation with their oppressors which, though it often softens the severity of conquest, does so only by preventing its chains from being ever thrown off. They had lost all—all but the sense of oppression and the desire of vengeance.

This passage has relevance for us today. It should be read and re-read by those who wish to understand the psychology of rebellion in Czechoslovakia currently, in Hungary in 1956, and in subject states everywhere.

The Greeks of 1821 numbered but two million in their mountain strongholds of southern Greece. They dared to face an Ottoman Empire of 30 million people. The five million Greeks scattered in the Balkans and along the Black Sea were of some help but more often they were victimized by their vulnerability and slaughtered by the thousands.

At last, the Greeks prevailed, despite quarrels among themselves. With help from the great powers, England, France, and Russia, peace was achieved in 1828. And there was a Greece again.

Alison wrote:

> The newly-instructed Greeks found to their astonishment that they were the descendants of a people, inhabited a country, and spoke a language celebrated beyond any other in the literature of western Europe, and from the genius of which nearly the whole illumination of the world had sprung.
>
> The image of the ancient freedom, the triumphs of ancient art, the glories of ancient warfare, which had come down to them in their own country only through the dark and uncertain streams of tradition, now stood clearly revealed in the works of their own ancestors, written in their own tongue, and preserved with pious care by the Christians of the West.

Thus modern Greece was born in the revolution of 1821. Its result was a fraction of what are today's boundaries. At the beginning in 1828, there was only Peloponnesos, a small corridor of the mainland around Athens, and a few of the Aegean islands.

For more than a century, Greece pursued her dream and her destiny, redeeming her lost children. In 1864, she acquired the Seven Islands of the Ieanian Sea; in 1881, Thessaly; in 1912, Crete; in 1913, portions of Macedonia and Epius, the islands of Samos, Chios, Lesbos, and others in the north Aegean. At last, in 1948, she redeemed the final islands of the Aegean, the group lying between Crete and Turkey, known as the Dodecanese.

Only Cyprus remains, and this helps explain the emotions behind the cry for Enosis which agitated Greece and Cyprus in the 1950's. One other dream, the retaking of the ancient center of the Greek empire of Byzantium, Constantinople, was shattered in the Greek-Turkish War of 1921–22.

Greece, now a nation of 8 million people, was a faithful ally in World War II. Indeed, its undermanned forces gave the Allies their first victory in 1940 by throwing back the Italian invasion.

Following the German defeat, a wounded Greece endured a bitter civil war which ended with the defeat of a new totalitarianism.

The United States, with its Truman doctrine aid, played a vital role in the success of pro-West democratic Greece.

We have been intimately involved in Greece ever since. American action or inaction has a critical impact on Greek political affairs.

In this context, it must be with some sadness that we observe Greek independence day today, for Greek freedom has been smothered by a military dictatorship.

We should ask ourselves what we would like to see in Greece. This is particularly pertinent now that a new administration is in office in Washington and, presumably, a review of past policies is being made.

I believe a fair answer, acceptable to American liberals and conservatives, and to Greek liberals and conservatives, is that we would like to see a Greece that is free, pro-West, prosperous, with an independent parliament, basic constitutional freedoms, a viable political system with two non-Communist political parties—one liberal and one conservative and an annual economic growth rate of 6 to 8 percent. Does this seem too much to ask? Well, it's almost exactly what existed in 1965 prior to the blundering dismissal of Prime Minister George Papandreou by King Constantine.

This blunder precipitated a long political crisis which culminated in a coup by a group of obscure colonels in April 1967. Unfortunately, the American Embassy was a party to the political blunders which created the atmosphere of the coup, though not a party to the coup itself.

I think the United States should now express with greater emphasis its support for a "national government," made up of leaders of liberal and conservative political parties. This could, if established, serve as a transitional government until genuine elections were held.

The Papadopoulos junta government is a dead-end government, unable to solve Greece's problems, uninspiring to a sullen Greek people, and uncommitted to genuine elections which would topple it from power. Accordingly, a U.S. policy which supports the junta is a dead-end policy. We ignore at our peril the long-term dangers of such support and its crippling effect on those very elements in Greece who engineered Greece's postwar economic and political recovery.

I believe we must not discount the importance of America's moral leadership and moral responsibility. We must believe in our own democratic principles and their almost universal appeal abroad. If we assert these principles, then with Byron we, too, can say:

The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.

RELEASE OF FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent storms and flooding in California have made clear the necessity of flood control and drainage projects. Further, huge sections of the United States face one of the most serious flood threats in history this spring.

My county, Santa Clara, escaped by but a narrow margin disastrous flooding earlier this year. Even so, the southern end of the county had many acres of rich farmland flooded by waters from the Upper and Lower Llagas Creeks.

Flood control projects have been pending on these creeks for many years. But funding for these projects under Public Law 566 has been held up since 1966. The two projects in my county are but among 96 nationwide delayed by a dispute between the President and the Congress. For 12 years prior to 1966, the funding was approved by the Congress, but President Johnson in that year decided the authority to fund small watershed projects belonged to the President, not the Congress.

I am strongly urging President Nixon to end this dispute and promptly release the funds for these needed projects.

A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Saturday last to address the graduating class of the School of Social Work of Florida State University in Tallahassee. This occasion called to my mind a proposal which I have been considering for some time and which I am introducing in the House of Representatives today.

The proposal is that we create a Council of Social Advisers which would advise the President on broad matters of social policy, as the Council of Economic Advisers now advises on economic policy, and prepare for the President, the Congress and the country an annual social report to complement the economic report which has been prepared now for more than 20 years.

The preparation of an annual economic report is one of the results of the Full Employment Act of 1946, which I was privileged to help enact when I was a Member of the Senate. This report is prepared by the Council and, when it is submitted by the President to the Congress, is give very close study by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report. Both the Joint Committee and the Council were created by the Employment Act to give the President and the Congress greater capacity in dealing with the economic problems faced by any modern industrial economy.

Today, many of the economic problems which prompted the adoption of the Full Employment Act following World War II and the bitter depression years of the 1930's loom less ominously than they did in former years. The terrifying possibility of a plunge into another great depression no longer haunts us. We have enjoyed an 8-year period without ever an economic recession. There is, of course, the problem of now reducing the inflationary forces in our economy without producing a significant increase in unemployment. But, as a result, in a large measure of the Full Employment Act of 1946 and the creation of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, we are confident that we can make the public and private economic decisions necessary to prevent a return to the periodic economic crises which were for so long characteristic of our economic life. The instrumentalities created by the Employment Act have developed national measures of economic activity, such as the gross national product, national income, and other economic accounts, as a basis for enlightened decisionmaking by Government and industry.

I believe we can begin to do the same thing in the field of social policy. We can develop more objective criteria for measuring the extent of our social problems and for gaging our progress in dealing with these problems.

Our most urgent domestic problems today are social crises rather than economic upheavals. We are witnessing an appalling rise in crime and a corresponding decline in the sense of security of our people. We are being shocked by student revolts into a reconsideration of our comfortable past assumptions that the quality of life automatically improves with an increase in the quantity of economic means available to our citizens—that rises in our gross national product can be correlated directly with increases in human happiness. We are being forced to face the ugly facts of discrimination; the development of poverty cycle and perhaps a permanent poverty class amid great abundance, the breakdown of family life and marriages, widespread mental illness, alcoholism and drug abuse, the deterioration of our inner cities, the continuing slaughter on our highways, the denial of dignity and meaningful life to so many of our senior citizens, and many other broad indications of deep and insistent social problems affecting the lives and happiness of millions of Americans.

In the face of these problems we should bring our social scientists into the forefront of our national decisionmaking, into the highest councils of our Government, and into the active public consciousness of our democratic society—just as we have made economic expertise an essential factor in the decisionmaking of a modern society.

We should seek to place alongside our annual economic report a comprehensive social report on how we are doing in our efforts to build a society which offers expanding opportunities for meaningful living for our people. We should enable the President, the Congress and the people to judge in the most concrete terms possible how we are doing as a human and humane society.

To this end I am today introducing in the House a proposal which has been introduced in the other body by Senator MONDALE and others to provide a "Full Opportunity Act" to complement the Full Employment Act of two decades ago. This bill provides for the creation in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Social Advisers who would assist the President in the preparation of an annual social report. It would also create a Joint Committee on the Social Report to review this annual report in the Congress and make recommendations to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the social report.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 5

A bill to promote the public welfare

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Full Opportunity Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to promote the general welfare, the Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, consistent with the primary responsibilities of State and local governments and the private sector, to promote and encourage such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and to provide a clear and precise picture of whether such conditions are promoted and encouraged in such areas as health, education, and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal, and by measuring progress in meeting such needs.

SOCIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than March 20 of each year a report to be known as the social report, setting forth (1) the overall progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 with particular emphasis upon the manner in which such efforts serve to meet national social needs in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal; (2) a review of State, local, and private efforts designed to create the conditions specified in section 2; (3) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by such efforts and the progress of development of plans to meet such needs; and (4) programs and policies for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports and supplementary to the social report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 2.

(c) The social report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b) of this section, shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 5.

COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Social Advisers (hereinafter called the Council). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend programs to carry out such policy. Each member of the Council, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule by section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of such Scehdule.

(b) The Chairman of the Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and is authorized, subject to such provisions, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of such chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the social report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information and statistical data concerning developments and programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2, both current and prospective, and to develop a series of social indicators to analyze and interpret such information and data in the light of the policy declared in section 2 and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and programs;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 of this Act for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities contribute to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop priorities for programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 and recommend to the President the most efficient way to allocate Federal resources and the level of government—Federal, State, or local—best suited to carry out such programs;

(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to programs, activities, and legislation to carry out the policy declared in section 2 as the President may request.

(6) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to programs, activities and legislation as the President may request in appraising long-range aspects of social policy and programing consistent with the policy declared in section 2.

(d) Recognizing the predominance of State and local governments in the social area, the President shall, when appropriate, provide for the dissemination to such States and localities information or data developed by the Council pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

(e) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in February of each year.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, organizations, and individuals as it deems advisable to insure the direct participation in the Council's planning of such interested parties;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, use the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided;

(3) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, insure that the individual's right to privacy is not infringed by its activities; and

(4) the Council may enter into essential contractual relationships with educational institutions, private research organizations and others as needed to fulfill its duties and functions enumerated in section 4(c).

(g) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $900,000 in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL REPORT

SEC. 5. (a) There is established a Joint Committee on the Social Report, to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five members and the minority party shall be represented by three members.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of all matters relating to the social report; and

(2) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the social report, not later than June 1 of each year to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the social report, and from time to time make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government and private research agencies.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $425,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

A DEPARTMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHIC SERVICES

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we have come a long, long way in a very short

XUM

time since this country embarked on a crash program of space exploration.

The fruits of this effort will be reached with a manned landing on the moon before the end of the year and the long-range benefits are as unbounded as man's imagination.

The space exploration program, on the whole, is a laudable and worthy enterprise. But I rise today to voice attention to another vast, equally mysterious, largely unexplored and potentially rich environ.

I refer, of course, to the depth, the breadth, and the width of the seas.

In the forward of "Our Nation and the Sea," from the recently released report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, is the opening statement:

> From the days of discovery and colonization, America has looked to the sea. In times of stress the sea has been our ally, and in times of peace, a source of our prosperity. Sometimes hostile and sometimes generous in its moods, the ocean always has offered its abundant resources in countless ways. But only recently have we begun to perceive its true potential.

The report points out that it is now nearly 10 years since the National Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Navy focused attention upon the vital import of our underdeveloped marine resources.

Packed within the 300-pages of this expertly detailed report are facts and forecasts of efforts to explore and control the sea for the service of man. I highly commend this publication to my colleagues.

It is, then, my distinct pleasure today to have the opportunity to introduce a bill to create a Department of Oceanographic Services within the cabinet of the President.

To those who might question the advisability of yet another "bureaucratic department," I would reply that this bill is designed to accomplish just the opposite.

Under the present Federal setup relating to maritime and marine interests, there is a total of 11 separate agencies engaged in the marine sciences.

Not one of these agencies functions in any substantial part for the total interest of a national marine science policy.

This legislation envisions the coordination and consolidation of the major civilian marine functions of the Federal Government to accomplish, among its goals: the expansion of exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources; development of port, harbor and estuarine areas; enunciation of a national policy pertinent to the maritime and marine interest of the United States, and the revitalization of the American-flag merchant marine.

Under this plan, the Secretary of the Department of Oceanographic Services would work with a general counsel and four Assistant Secretaries, one each designated as the Assistant Secretary for Merchant Marine, Assistant Secretary for Exploration and Resource Development, Assistant Secretary for Marine Fisheries, and Assistant Secretary for Port and Harbor Development.

Transferred to the new Department would be the U.S. Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Oceanographic Data Center of the Office of the U.S. Navy Oceanographer, the Sea-Air Interaction Laboratory, the sea-grant college program of the National Science Foundation.

Also, the Coastal Engineering Research Center of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and whatever other agencies as the President deems advisable.

There would additionally be created an Office of Marine Geology and Mineral Resources to develop mineral, fossile-fuel exploration and related affairs pertinent to the exploitation of the wealth and reserves of the Continental Shelf, Great Lakes, and world oceans for the enhancement of the national and international economy.

Studies have shown that resources from the oceans will help to diminish the world's protein deficiency. The United States is now recognizing the value of fish protein concentrate—FPC—as the means to end world hunger, and has undertaken steps for large-scale processing FPC for export.

The Government estimates that within two decades 30 to 40 percent of the domestic and world production of petroleum and mineral gas will come from offshore sources.

And we are only beginning to realize the amazing potential of the seas to produce what in time may prove to be the major source of the world's food supply.

In the matter of ocean-borne trade, it has been distressing for me to see the foreign ocean-borne commercial tonnage carried by U.S.-flag ships drop from almost 60 percent in 1947 to less than 6 percent today. Government projections see a further decline to less than 3 percent by 1980.

The policy to move our international commerce aboard cheaper foreign carriers not only reduces the freight revenues accruing to the U.S. merchant marine and aggravates the balance-of-payments deficit, but also erodes our status as a world maritime power.

We must focus prompt attention to the plight of our country's maritime fleet.

We must have an awakened attitude to the potentials that can be obtained from the exploration and cultivation of the seas. Our past and present greatness grew in large measure from dependency on the seas. Our future greatness could very well depend on it.

About three-fourths of our population is concentrated in 30 States which border the oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes. Nearly one-half of our industrial might is concentrated in coastal counties.

We are only recently becoming aware of the active and effective work that the Soviet Union is pursuing in our last frontier on earth—the oceans.

For these and other reasons, I offer for consideration a cabinet Department of Oceanographic Services.

Mr. Speaker, I request that at this point the full text of the legislation proposed be printed in the RECORD:

H.R. 9482

A bill to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Oceanographic Services to enunciate national policies pertinent to the maritime and marine interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources, to revitalize the American-flag merchant marine, to develop port, harbor and estuarine areas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Oceanographic Services Act of 1969."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES AND POLICIES

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares:

(1) That the lessons of our history in unlocking the frontiers and resources of the North American Continent for the benefit of mankind offers an historic parallel with the situation confronting the Nation today in the virtually unexplored and underdeveloped resources of the marine environments of the oceans, the Great Lakes, and the Continental Shelf. That the historic role of Federal Government in these United States with regard to little-known environs and the discovery of potential resources of benefit to its people is primarily one of exploration and survey, of leading the way through geographic exploration for scientific investigation, research, and conceptual development by the academic community, private industry and government alike, and by private industrial and capital investment and development to follow. That the expansion and enhancement of governmental exploration efforts for the greater ascertainment and delineation of marine environment and resources is clearly in the national interest.

(2) That the United States acquired under international law on June 10, 1964, sovereign rights to the exploration and development of resources of the Continental Shelf under the Convention of the Continental Shelf adopted at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Pursuant to the internationally recognized and exclusive rights so secured, the United States assumes the responsibility of executing an accelerated program of exploration and development of the physical, chemical, geological, and biological resources of the Continental Shelf.

(3) That the expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in and related to the oceans, the marine environment, the Great Lakes, their boundaries and contents, and to the interaction of sea, earth, and atmosphere is of paramount importance to the peoples of the world and particularly of importance to the general welfare and security of the United States and therefore worthy of vigorous pursuit.

(4) That the United States must encourage private investment in the economic utilization of the marine resources on the Continental Shelf and in the Great Lakes and oceanic environs and determine the benefits from the use of these marine resources for increased investment and economic growth.

(5) That the development and improvement of the capabilities, performance, and efficiency of vehicles, equipment, and instruments for use in exploration, research, surveys, the recovery of resources, and the transmission of energy in the marine environments is an integral and prerequisite part of the national effort and is worthy of maximum encouragement.

(6) That the effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States, requires close cooperation and coordination among all interested Federal

XUM

and State agencies and the private industrial sectors of the United States, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities and equipment, or waste, and further that such cooperation and coordination is only possible when the various agencies and private industries concerned with marine endeavor foster the collection, storing, and distribution of significant data and knowledge acquired as a result of scientific and engineering marine and atmospheric research developments, surveys, and technological advances when such are in the national interest.

(7) That the establishment of long-range studies of the potential benefits to the United States economy, security, health, and welfare to be gained from the opportunities for, and the problems involved in the utilization of scientific marine, Great Lakes and oceanic research, investigations, and surveys is paramount to the continued enhancement of the national interest.

(8) That it is of paramount importance for the United States to cooperate with other nations and groups of nations, including organizations of the United Nations, in oceanographic, marine, and related development, research and surveys when such cooperation is in the national interest.

(9) That the preservation and enhancement of the role of the United States as a leader in oceanographic and marine science, technology, and development is clearly a national goal and that to this end the advance of education and training in marine science and technology is of basic importance.

(10) That the execution of the purposes and policies heretofore enumerated and the recognition of the vital role of marine resources and oceanographic and atmospheric considerations in the affairs of our national life and the enhancement of our international stature in the conduct of such affairs requires the establishment of an executive department to achieve the best administration of the principal civilian programs of the Federal Government concerned with marine affairs.

(11) That the American-flag merchant marine is and has been since the founding of the Republic, vital to the defense of the Nation. And that its revitalization is necessary to both the economy and the national defense. That, because of major differentials, equipment and labor costs between the United States and foreign maritime nations, the Federal Government is required to play a major role in cooperation with industry to support the merchant marine. That this role should be expanded and supported in concert with the nation's economic and defense needs.

(12) That the fisheries of the high seas, the inter-continental shelf and such major inland fresh water bodies as the Great Lakes contain enough food on an annual yield basis to feed several times the present population of the world. That, because of the exploding world population and increasing world hunger both in the United States and other countries the world's fisheries resources have taken on new importance, particularly since agricultural production in the United States and abroad is approaching its outer limits. That this resource has been scarcely tapped by the United States fishing industry. That a more dynamic United States policy toward fisheries is required to stimulate the further harvesting of these invaluable replenishable resources. That, through such a policy, advantage can be taken of the technological and scientific developments that lead to a greatly expanded and more efficient harvest of these resources. That such government policy is in the best interest of the Nation through the founding of human nutritional improvement both domestically and internationally.

(13) That the port harbor and estuarine areas of the nation constitute increasingly valuable resources, particularly as the nation's population surges from inland toward these coastal areas. That a defined government policy toward port harbor and estuarine areas can help stimulate and develop conservation. That federal guidelines in the usage of the latest technological and scientific developments can lead to the orderly and most efficient development of these areas. That such policy is clearly in the national interest.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Oceanographic Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Oceanographic Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments.

(b) The Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to marine environments of the oceans and the Great Lakes; provide leadership and recommend to the President policies and programs for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's maritime and marine affairs, including the revitalization of the American-flag merchant marine, the development of the nation's port, harbor and estuarine facilities, exploration and delineation, traffic and trade, the natural resources of the Continental Shelf, the Great Lakes and the oceans, science and technology, and the safety and protection of the users of marine resources and environs; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities relating to marine resources, their exploration, exploitation, and development; provide technical assistance and information including a clearinghouse service to State governments and industries concerned with the exploration, development, utilization, and management of marine resources and allied technologies; encourage comprehensive planning by the State governments and private sectors of the economy with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and private industrial development activities; and conduct continuing comprehensive studies, and make available findings, with respect to the progress and problems of marine exploration, research, development, and technology.

(c) The Secretary shall further, among his responsibilities, pursue the execution of programs which shall provide significant emphasis to the exploration and development of the marine resources of the Continental Shelf and waters above the Continental Shelf.

(d) The Secretary may, under the foreign policy guidance of the President, engage in a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to this Act, pursuant to agreements made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 102. (a) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, one each designated as the Assistant Secretary for Merchant Marine, Assistant Secretary for Exploration and Resource Development, Assistant Secretary for Marine Fisheries, Assistant Secretary for Port and Harbor Development, and a General Counsel, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of executive departments, and who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Administrative Assistant Secretary, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary under the classified civil service, who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time, and whose annual rate of compensation shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by or pursuant to law for administrative assistant secretaries of executive departments.

COMPONENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 103. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d) of this section, there are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all of the functions, powers, and duties of the United States Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, United States Coast Guard, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, the National Oceanographic Data Center of the Office of the United States Navy Oceanographer, the Sea-Air Interaction Laboratory, the Sea Grant College program of National Science Foundation, the Coastal Engineering Research Center of the United States Corps of Engineers.

(b) There are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all those functions, powers, and duties of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and its component Bureaus, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which pertain to the administration, utilization, development, and management of the fisheries resources of the oceans, Continental Shelf, marine estuaries and Great Lakes including all those fisheries resources of anadromous habit of nature. Such functions, powers, and duties are to be vested in the Department within a Bureau of Marine Fisheries and administered by a Director of Marine Fisheries under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary for Marine Fisheries.

(c) There is hereby established as a function of the Department an Office of Marine Geology and Mineral Resources which shall direct, and coordinate with the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Oil and Gas, Office of Mineral Exploration, Office of Minerals and Solid Fuels, and other functions of the Department of the Interior, other Federal agencies and departments, the academic community, and private industry, the conduct and development of mineral and fossil fuel exploration, technology, and related affairs pertinent to the useful exploitation of the mineral and fossil fuel resources of the Continental Shelf, Great Lakes, and world oceans for the enhancement of the national and international economy and general welfare.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be transferred to the Department and vested in the Secretary any additional functions, powers, and duties as may be now or hereafter vested in any agency or department of the Federal Government when such is deemed by the President to be in the National interest and is in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

EFFECTS UPON THE EXECUTIVE ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 104. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to orient and consolidate the responsibilities pertinent to the marine and related affairs of the Nation into three categories: (1) the Department of the Navy representing the marine and related military interest and security of the United States, (2) the National Science Foundation and Smithsonian Institution representing the marine, and related academic interests, and (3) the Department of Oceanographic Services representing the civilian marine interests and industry.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) hereof the Congress recognizes that numerous

XUM

additional agencies and bureaus within the Federal establishment possess and should continue to possess functions, powers, and duties relating to marine and atmospheric environments which because of their nature and scope are legitimate functions of their vested agency or department.

(c) The transfer of the marine related functions, powers, and duties of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and its component Bureaus, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife within the Department of the Interior to the Bureau of Marine Fisheries within the Department of Maritime and Marine Development and the retention of inland fisheries affairs within the Department of the Interior is predicated upon the consideration and intention that the fisheries affairs of the Nation are best administered pursuant to the dictates of environment. Pursuant to this intent of the Congress:

(1) The United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are hereby abolished.

(2) The following positions in the Department of the Interior are hereby abolished:

(a) Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks;

(b) Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife.

(c) Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; and

(d) Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

(3) There is established within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and Parks. Such Assistant Secretary shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments, and who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe from time to time. There is also established within the Department of the Interior two separate agencies for the administration of inland fisheries and wildlife resources, each of which shall have the status of a Federal bureau. One of the Bureaus shall be known as the Bureau of Inland Fisheries and the other bureau shall be known as the National Wildlife Service. There shall be a Director of each of said Bureaus appointed by the Secretary.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 105. (a) The personnel employed in connection with, and the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by section 103 of this Act are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties respectively.

(b) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties.

(c) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate, may authorize such successive redelegations of such functions, powers, and duties as he may deem desirable, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations therefor as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to arrange with the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of such security or other personnel investigation of the Department's officers, employees, and consultants, as he deems appropriate, and if any such investigation develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject thereof is of questionable loyalty there shall be a full field of investigation of the matter, the results of which shall be furnished to the Secretary.

(f) The Secretary is authorized to request and the Atomic Energy Commission may authorize any of its employees, or employees of any contractor, prospective contractor, licensee, or prospective licensee of the Atomic Energy Commission under subsection 145(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2165(b)), to permit any member, officer, or employee of the Department to have access to restricted data relating to oceanography and the marine sciences which is required in the performance of his duties and so certified by the Secretary but only if (1) the Secretary or designee thereof has determined, in accordance with the established personnel security procedures and standards of the Department, that permitting such individual to have access to such restricted data will not endanger the common defense and security, and (2) the Secretary or designee thereof finds that the established personnel and other security procedures and standards of the Department are adequate and in reasonable conformity to the standards established by the Atomic Energy Commission under section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2165). Any individual granted access to such restricted data pursuant to this subsection may exchange such data with any individual who (A) is an officer or employee of the Department of Defense, or any department or agency thereof, or a member of the Armed Forces, or a contractor or subcontractor of any such department, agency, or armed force, or an officer or employee of any such contractor or subcontractor and (B) has been authorized to have access to restricted data under the provisions of section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2163).

(g) The Secretary is authorized to establish a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of such common administrative services as he shall find to be desirable in the interest of economy and efficiency in the Department, including such services as a central supply service for stationery and other supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department and its agencies; central messenger, mail, telephone, and other communications services; procurement and management of office space; central service for document reproduction and for graphics and visual aids; and a central library service. In addition to amounts appropriated to provide capital for said fund, which appropriations are hereby authorized, the fund shall be capitalized by transfer to it of such stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order as the Secretary shall direct. Such fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and for depreciation of equipment.

(h) The Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) acquire, in any lawful manner, including purchase, transfer, lease, donation, gift, or devise, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized by this Act; and

(5) prescribe and issue such rules, regulations, or orders, pursuant to law, as he may deem necessary and commission employees of the Department for the enforcement of those laws, rules, and regulations vested within his authority and for the carrying of firearms in the execution of such duties.

(i) The Secretary is authorized to sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Secretary or his property. Nothing herein shall be construed to except the activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28, United States Code, and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316).

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 106. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or any other officer whose functions are transferred by the provisions of this Act, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, or by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary or such other officer or office of the Department as may be appropriate.

(b) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions powers and duties transferred by this Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer or office of the Department as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

Sec. 108. (a) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days following the date on which this Act is approved by the President, or on such earlier date as the President shall specify by Executive order published in the Federal Register, except that the President may nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate may appoint, any of the officers provided for in sections 101(a), 102(a), 102(b), and 104 (c)(3) of this Act at any time after the date this Act is approved by the President.

(b) In the event that one or more officers required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act, the President may designate any person who was an officer of any agency or bureau transferred to the Department pursuant to section 103 of this Act immediately prior to said effective date to act in such office until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following said effective date, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such persons shall receive compensation at the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act.

APPLICATION OF ACT

Sec. 109. As used in this Act, the terms "State", "States", and "United States" include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa and the terms "marine affairs" or "marine sciences" shall be deemed to apply also to endeavors in and with relation to the Great Lakes.

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 110. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act and the related operations of all agencies and departments of the United States in the field of oceanography and marine affairs and science for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Such report shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report to contain an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of the attainment of, or the failure to attain, the objectives developed pursuant to this Act and further shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Secretary may consider necessary or desirable for the attainment of the objectives developed pursuant to this Act. No information which has been classified for reasons of national security shall be included in any report made under this section, unless such information has been declassified by, or pursuant to authorization given by, the President.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Sec. 111. Information obtained or developed by the Secretary in the performance of his functions under this Act shall be made available for public inspection except (a) information authorized or required by Federal statute to be withheld, and (b) information classified to protect the national security: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize the withholding of information by the Secretary from the duly authorized committees of Congress.

APPROPRIATION

Sec. 112. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended unless otherwise provided by appropriations acts.

TITLE II—MARINE EXPLORATION FUND

Sec. 201. (a) There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury a marine exploration fund which shall be available to the Secretary for the acceleration and expansion of programs currently extant or hereafter promulgated for purposes of—

(1) the intensive exploration, survey, and delineation of the topography, physical, geological, geomorphological, chemical, and biological properties and resources of the Continental Shelf, Great Lakes, and superjacent waters; and

(2) the extensive exploration, survey, and delineation of the topography, physical, geological, geomorphological, chemical, and biological properties and resources of the world oceans.

(b) The fund shall consist of amounts appropriated thereto pursuant to section 203 together with amounts received as repayments of principal and payments of interest on such loans.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to expend appropriated marine exploration funds in support of direct Federal operating, construction and experimental programs, either within the Department or by transfer to other Federal agencies, or pursuant to cooperative or cost-sharing arrangements, leases, or contractual considerations with Federal or State agencies, public or private universities, institutions or foundations, business enterprises, corporations, or individuals concerned with same, similar or related programs, undertaken in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

LOANS AND GRANTS

Sec. 202. (a) The Secretary shall make loans, grants, or cost-sharing arrangements from the marine exploration fund for purposes of (1) developing, improving, and testing the instrumentation, vessels, vehicles, equipment, or facilities required to execute the program purposes of the Government, its assigns, cooperators, and contractors, designated in section 201(a), 201(b), and 201(c), of this title, and (2) the conduct, administration, and execution of such programs.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to establish terms for loans, grants, or other cost-sharing arrangements from such fund providing he gives due weight to the benefits inuring to the Government from the activities carried out with the proceeds of such loans, grants, or cost-sharing arrangements, and providing further—

(1) That interest rates for loans so established shall not be in excess of 5 per centum per annum;

(2) That the borrower of loans so established shall pay such fees and charges as the Secretary may require;

(3) That the period for repayment of loans so established shall not exceed forty years;

(4) That security for loans so established shall be such that in the judgment of the Secretary the equity of the United States is prudently protected;

(5) That no single loan so established shall exceed $5,000,000;

(6) That grants so established shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the project for which the grant is given; and

(7) That no single grant so established shall exceed $2,000,000.

FINANCING

Sec. 203. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary annually for the purposes of this title.

TITLE III—MARINE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Sec. 301. (a) There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury a marine research and development fund which shall be available to the Secretary for the acceleration of basic research in and the development of programs currently extant or hereafter promulgated for purposes of—

(1) the advance of oceanographic engineering including the development and improvement of the capabilities, performance, and efficiency of vessels, vehicles, equipment, instruments, and facilities required for exploration and discovery, the recovery of resources, the transmission of energy and communication, and the enhancement of basic knowledge pertinent to marine environments, air-sea interaction, climatological influences, and weather modification;

(2) the advancement of knowledge pertinent to the geomorphology and geology of the Continental Shelf and deep ocean floors;

(3) the advancement of knowledge pertinent to biological life of the Continental Shelf and deep ocean environs;

(4) the advancement of knowledge pertinent to the hydrological and physical characteristics and movements of the waters of the Continental Shelf and oceans and the climatological and meteorological phenomena of oceanic and continental areas including the modification of such phenomena for the benefit of man;

(5) the advancement of knowledge pertinent to the chemical qualities and characteristics of the marine environment including the waters and submerged bottoms of the Continental Shelf and oceanic areas; and

(6) the advancement of knowledge pertinent to the transmission of electrical energy for the generation of power and the transmission and reception of communications within marine environs.

(b) The fund shall consist of amounts appropriated thereto pursuant to section 303.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to expend appropriated marine research and development funds in support of direct Federal operating construction and experimental programs either within the Department or by transfer to other Federal agencies or pursuant to grants, cooperative or cost-sharing arrangements or contractual considerations with qualified Federal or States agencies, public or private scientific institutions, universities, foundations, corporations, or individuals concerned with the advance of marine, oceanic, atmospheric or related science, technology, and understanding.

GRANTS

Sec. 302. Basic research and development grants or cost-sharing arrangements entered into by the Secretary pursuant to the criteria of section 301 shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and restrictions which the Secretary may determine to be in the national interest for the maximum benefit of the Government in seeking to achieve an optimum understanding of the phenomena of marine, oceanic, atmospheric, and related environs.

Sec. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary annually for the purposes of this title.

LAST HOME OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to join my distinguished colleague and neighbor, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Findley), in sponsoring a

XUM

bill which, if it becomes law, will make the last home of Abraham Lincoln a national historic site.

Although the great emancipator was born in Kentucky and grew to manhood in Indiana, it was as a citizen of Illinois that he achieved national and worldwide fame. He was a resident of Springfield from 1844 until 1861, when he became President of the United States. He and Mrs. Lincoln had looked forward to a return to their home in Illinois' capital at the conclusion of his service as Chief Executive. Unfortunately, he was not able to enjoy a few years among his old friends and neighbors as an elder statesman, for an assassin's bullet decreed otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, even though Abraham Lincoln was not permitted to return to Springfield, his spirit has pervaded it in the century that has elapsed since he saved the Union, freed the bondsmen, and gave a new birth of freedom. While Lincoln belongs to Illinois, he also belongs to the Nation. While his home is a State memorial, let us pass this legislation and make it a national shrine.

HAWAII'S 10 YEARS OF STATEHOOD

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, on March 12, 1959, when the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to make Hawaii one of the United States, I was one of the Members of this body who voted "aye." As the other body had, on the previous day, passed the act providing for admission, the measure needed only the signature of President Dwight D. Eisenhower to become effective.

On the following July 4, the 49 stars of the flag of the United States became 50, as the new State joined the galaxy. Although it did not achieve statehood until six decades after its annexation by the United States, Hawaii had long been one with our spirit.

Many of the inhabitants of Hawaii had come from the United States. Hawaii had borne the brunt of the Japanese attack that plunged our Nation into what was to become World War II. The sons of Hawaii fought courageously, not only against Japan, but against National Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy. When I voted for statehood for Hawaii, I was only confirming a fact, because, as far as I am concerned, it was already a part of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, the first 10 years of statehood have been years of progress and prosperity for our youngest State. May the people of the State of Hawaii write even brighter chapters in the decades that lie ahead.

STUDENT VIOLENCE AND THE LAW

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am most encouraged by the actions of Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and President Nixon, over the past week in announcing the intent of the administration to enforce the laws relating to denial of Federal funds to students who substantially disrupt the operations of our colleges and universities.

That it was necessary in the first instance to say the law will be enforced is evidence not only of the growing seriousness of unrestrained student violence, but of the failure of the past administration to faithfully execute the laws as Congress directed it to do. For those who have probed the depths of the appendix of "The Budget of the U.S. Government," fiscal year 1970, it is to be noted that on page 486, the former administration proposed to delete section 411 of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, 1969. You will recall that that section prohibits the use of funds under the act to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, or a grant to any applicant that, through his actions, prevents the officials or students at an institution of higher education from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies.

Only last month, in my remarks to the House, I suggested that "every ounce of public support must be marshalled through the elected and appointed public officials of Government to enhance and encourage the exercise of the existing prerogatives of educational administrators to deal firmly with those whose conduct interferes with the lawful functioning of the institution in a manner that paralyzes its educational responsibilities." There should be no doubt, now, in the minds of our college and university administrations that the Government is reflecting the attitude of the public in its appeals to put down this student violence so that reason might once again prevail.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the administrators of our institutions of higher education will heed the words of our President and will forthrightly comply with the intent and purposes of the law.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the 148th anniversary of Greek independence. It is, therefore, a fitting occasion to review the heritage of this noble nation whose people have given, and continue to give, much to human achievement.

I am sure that most Americans recognize and are deeply impressed with the fact that so much of the world's basic knowledge, in so many varied fields, is of Greek derivation. For example, Grecian art, philosophy, literature, and science have profoundly affected each of our daily lives.

Americans recognize the concept of freedom of the individual. Historically, this concept is Greek and our concern today for man's freedom was no less important to the ancient Greeks. Indeed, it was the genesis of much of their civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian, quotes a Greek conversing with a Persian:

> You do not know what freedom is . . . if you did, you would fight for it with bare hands—if you had no weapons.

One cannot find a more appropriate comment on today's many problems particularly those confronting this Nation now in Southeast Asia.

But paramount among the reasons for Greek freedom was their willingness to obey the law, whether written or not. Their respect for law is also a cornerstone upon which our cherished freedoms rest. In addition, their ideals of self-control, moderation and devotion to reason served to substantiate their commitment to freedom.

While Grecian culture flourished under the city-states, the inability of Greece to unite politically led to the annexation of her territories. The death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., the shattering of his empire, and the lack of national unity laid the groundwork for defeat by Rome near the end of the Macedonian wars in 146 B.C. and Greece became a Roman province; but Athens remained a center of learning, and the Greek language and culture were widely influential in Rome as well as other places. In A.D. 395, the Roman Empire crumbled, and Greece became the center of the Byzantine Empire for more than a thousand years—a genuine recognition of Greek knowledge and influence.

The Ottoman Turks who conquered Constantinople in 1453 gave the Greeks a large measure of political autonomy. Greek merchants became engaged in worldwide trade, and the Greek Orthodox Church gained ascendency in communal affairs. But the age-old flame for individual freedom and liberty was still smoldering in the hearts of the Greek people and the spark was united unsuccessfully in the brief uprising of 1770. That revolt led to severe retaliation by the Turks, and in 1821, under the leadership of Archbishop Patras, the Greeks on March 25 launched their war of independence against Turkish suzerainty. Their cause was assisted by Britain, France, and Russia who recognized Greece's independence in the London Protocol of 1830.

Mr. Speaker, a strong sense of patriotism is characteristic of both modern and ancient Greeks—as an example, in 1912–13, an estimated 50,000 Greek immigrants returned home from the United States, at their own expense of passage, to help their motherland capture northern Greece during the Balkan wars. The magnitude of this undertaking becomes clear when it is realized that free Greece's population at that time was 3 million. The volunteers from America were decisive.

In summation, the Greeks of yesterday left such an imprint on their world that those of us in the modern world literally live in their shadow. One might reflect for a moment that the State of Virginia has been the site of so many battles during the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, and has been the birthplace of so many of our great men, that it can fairly be said every acre has a story to tell. In the

XUM

case of Greece, with its longer history of struggle and glory, virtually every rock has its own story.

The most esteemed modern Greek writer, Nikos Kazantzakis, has written:

> Greek soil has been so saturated with blood, sweat and tears, the Greek mountains have witnessed so much human struggle, that you shudder in contemplating the fact that here on these mountains and shores, the destiny . . . of all mankind was at stake.

Ancient Greece picked man up and set him on his feet as an individual with individual worth. After many centuries of decline and foreign occupation, the revolution of 1821 began the liberation of modern Greece. This land which has given us so much has much to give to the world once again and I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute Greece and its sons and daughters on this Greek Independence Day 1969.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE KIND OF FUNDING AUTHORITY ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESSFUL U.S. EFFORT WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL BIOLOGICAL PROGRAM

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with Chairman Miller of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the introduction of a new resolution designed to provide the kind of funding authority which is essential to a successful U.S. effort within the international biological program—IBP.

The resolution provides no new authorization or specific appropriation. It simply assures that appropriate Federal agencies will be able to support the IBP as the Office of Science and Technology has requested without any question as to legality or congressional intent.

Hence the provision in the resolution which states:

> The Congress authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the International Biological Program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions or objectives and provide such other support as may be appropriate.

This provision appears to be necessary in view of the uncertainty of some of the departments and agencies concerning their present authority to aid the IBP through the Interagency Coordinating Committee for the IBP even though the amounts involved are relatively nominal.

Mr. Speaker, the IBP is not just another Government venture and it is not some abstract international dream. It is a very real, planned, and coordinated effort to establish an ecological base for the management of our environment and for the prevention of the deterioration which is threatening our entire planet. It may be one of the most crucial programs, in spite of its mild-sounding title, to evolve in our time.

Let me provide a bit of background. The international biological program is the scientific core of many of the problems with which the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and indeed the entire Congress, has been concerned over the past several years. As Mr. Miller reminded a convention of American biologists at Ohio State University last September, this program is centrally ecological and as such it is indispensible to the development of the intellectual disciplines at stake in pollution abatement and in the appraisal and control of the quality of our environment. He emphasized then, as have witnesses before my subcommittee, that the needed increase in numbers of theoretical and field scientists competent to deal with environmental problems can come only from an action program like the IBP which involves fieldwork and at the same time strives for a more complete fundamental base.

Since last summer when the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development completed its hearings and review on the status of the IBP a great deal has transpired to justify our original enthusiasm and to eliminate those reservations we had concerning the organization and management of such a complex program.

The U.S. IBP leadership has responded well to our several suggestions. The scope of the program has been focused on the most pressing problems, the national committee has evolved into a decision-making body, and agreements on points of responsibility have been worked out with the National Science Foundation as the lead agency. The program's grasslands ecosystem project, even on a minimum budget, appears to have become a model project in systems ecology; its 700-page progress report and proposal of January 1969 is a complete document which justifies past and planned expenditures for that biome. This program helps provide the confidence we need for funding and supporting recommendations to the Federal agencies for real efforts on other biomes such as the deciduous and coniferous forests, the arctic tundra, as well as those projects which deal with our "urban ecosystem."

Mr. Speaker, since World War II we have left ecology—the only scientific discipline which specializes in the total environment—to its own devices in a market in which it could not possibly compete. As a result, a science which might have matured to meet our problem solving needs in environmental matters has fallen behind the bold advances in many other areas of American science.

It is the problem solving—the utilitarian and practical aspects of conservation and its management—which is the motivation for the IBP, rather than the usual emphasis on sentiment and esthetics. This pragmatic approach has led ecological practitioners in the United States and in some 70 other nations to undertake the complex task of planning and designing a research program which will produce the manpower, skills and theory essential to the management of our environmental resources.

We have no responsible policy choice other than to respond favorably to the needs of the ecological sciences. Our immediate opportunity is the international biological program which we have requested American biologists to design and promulgate. Thus we intend and expect, by means of this resolution, that Federal agencies which conduct relevant scientific work will support the IBP to the extent that meets the needs of the U.S. projects under that program.

BLACKBURN INTRODUCES RETIRED OFFICERS PAY EQUALIZATION BILL

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to reintroduce a bill to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

The purpose of this bill is to repeal that provision of the law which provides for the adjustment of retirement or retainer pay when the Consumer Price Index goes up 3 percent. Substitute for this provision would be my bill which would have the pay of personnel recomputed to reflect increases in the basic pay of persons on active duty. Thus, when the basic pay of active military personnel is increased, the retired or retainer pay of retired members would be recomputed on the basis of the new pay rate for the grade in which he was serving at the time of his retirement, rather than at the rate in effect at the time he retired, which is currently the case.

Under present law members of the armed services who retired with equal rank and equal length of service, but not at the same time, can be receiving greatly varying rates of retirement pay. The rate differential between some our our older retirees and the younger comrades has slipped to as much as 30 percent.

President Nixon issued a statement during his campaign which I am sure his administration will follow:

> Our retired military personnel have been unjustly treated because of the failure of the Congress to remedy the growing disparity between active and retired pay. This unfair discrimination is wholly contrary to the long established principles of equalizing retired pay with existing active duty pay for the same grade or rank.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this proposal in order to correct a glaring inequity.

NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE CALLS FOR NEW HOUSING EFFORTS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Conference recently held its 38th annual convention in Washington. Along with other Members of Congress, it was my privilege to address the conference as I have done for many years during its conventions. I was pleased to note that Secretary Romney and his principal staff appeared on a panel at one of the sessions at the conference.

For many years, the National Housing Conference has been recognized as the conscience of the public interest in programs for housing, urban renewal and community development. Its members include representatives of public interest organizations, local officials, labor officials, church, business and professional groups—all of whom share the goal of providing adequate housing for people of all incomes. NHC has functioned as a clearinghouse for information and support of these programs over the years. It has played a leading role in securing the enactment of many measures for Federal assistance to these programs which have passed the Congress over the past 3½ decades, including the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

During the annual convention, the membership of the National Housing Conference adopted a comprehensive set of resolutions relating to all segments of the housing and urban development programs. These resolutions were the result of many meetings during the past year attended by representatives of public interest organizations from all parts of the country. There was a continuing legislative policy committee which functioned under the chairmanship of Mr. David L. Krooth. As president of the National Housing Conference, Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith then presented the recommendations of this committee to several meetings of the board of directors of NHC which adopted resolutions to be presented at the annual meeting. At the convention, Mr. William J. Guste, Jr., served as chairman of the resolutions committee which adopted the resolutions that were later approved by the full membership. I recite this process because it indicates the careful study and wide participation involved in the formulation and adoption of the resolutions.

I believe it would be helpful for Members of Congress and others to read these resolutions in order to have a better understanding of the critical problems in our cities and the solutions recommended by this group of outstanding professional and civic leaders. These resolutions are really an encyclopedia which we can use for reference purposes. On each program, they contain a statement of: first, its objectives and the actions taken in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; second, the actions taken in appropriation acts; and third, the recommendations for necessary additional appropriations, legislation, and administrative actions. The resolutions not only cover the programs enacted into law, but they also recommend additional and supplemental programs. There is a table of contents at the beginning to help you locate the subjects in which you are interested.

In speaking to the National Housing Conference, I pointed out that the housing field is pockmarked by goals that have never been met. All of us here can recall the string of high-sounding goals that have come forward from the National Housing Conference, from Presidents of the United States, and from various committees of the Congress. Wonderful words, excellent goals, but little performance.

This is shameful in a great and powerful nation. We pride ourselves on our ability to produce. In the production of material goods, we look on ourselves as second to none in the world. We are able to build sophisticated space vehicles that reach to the moon. We are able to glut the market with millions of shiny high-powered automobiles, and we are able to devise and construct the most complex computer and communications systems. Yet somehow—and for some reason—we cannot put together the financing, the bricks, the lumber, and the glass to house our population in decent, reasonably priced homes.

This kind of failure demands attention from the highest levels of the Federal Government. This is an emergency which cannot be dealt with by another round of high-sounding Presidential messages and reports from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Nation must have action—real action—on housing and not another reshuffling of existing machinery. We need officials all down the line who really believe in these programs and who believe that the Nation's domestic priorities can and should be met.

In the 1968 Housing Act, Congress established a housing goal of 26 million units in the next 10 years and declared that "the highest priority and emphasis should be given to meeting the housing needs of those families for which the national goal has not become a reality." We do not accomplish anything by passing great authorizing laws like the 1968 Housing Act unless there is a proper followup with adequate appropriations and effective administration.

There is no doubt about America's capacity to meet this housing goal if we all work together toward achieving this goal and remove the obstacles that impede the housing program. We must find answers and take action in the critical areas of financing and credit, both as to its availability and its price. We must get full funding of the 1968 act by the Congress. We must get action by housing officials, labor, the building industry, and suppliers to meet our housing needs and goals and produce housing in the volume and at prices which the American people need and can afford.

The resolutions follow:

Resolutions Recommended by the Legislative Policy Committee and Approved by the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference

CHAPTER A. GENERAL STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. America's cities are in a crisis resulting from the decay of decades and from failure to improve the quality of American life. Many of the people in the cities are ill-housed and live in despair and disillusionment. The need for decent housing is at the heart of the crisis. We must take vigorous and immediate action toward achieving our goal of providing good homes and good neighborhoods for all who are ill-housed. It is not enough to build new housing or rehabilitate existing housing. At the same time there must be an expansion of social programs and services for the people.

2. We must respond to the hopes and aspirations of the ill-housed and eliminate their human suffering and disillusionment which is contributing to demonstrations and violence in our cities. In these Resolutions, NHC presents measures which are essential to help solve these problems and alleviate the crisis in our cities. No single program can embrace the solutions to all of the cities' problems. These Resolutions recommend programs designed especially to:

(a) Provide good homes for people of all incomes in wholesome living environments which are in keeping with our Nation's standards and aspirations;

(b) To take action to revitalize our cities and save them from blight and obsolescence; and

(c) To expand social programs, services and job opportunities to improve the quality of American life.

3. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 was enacted by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. It is a comprehensive and historic law to help meet these critical housing and urban problems. On behalf of NHC and other public interest organizations who cooperate with us, we express our appreciation for the acceptance in the 1968 Housing Act of many of the recommendations which NHC made last year. However, much more remains to be done. In these Resolutions, we are recommending additional measures which are needed to accomplish our goals—both (a) through new or amendatory legislation, and (b) through changes in policy and improvements in administration of existing legislation.

CHAPTER B. CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF HIGHEST PRIORITY FOR HOUSING LOWER INCOME FAMILIES

1. The 1968 Housing Act reaffirms the national housing goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" which was first proclaimed in a housing law enacted 20 years ago. In the Declaration of Policy of the 1968 Housing Act, the Congress "finds that this goal has not been fully realized for many of the Nation's lower income families; that this is a matter of grave national concern; and that there exist in the public and private sectors of the economy the resources and capabilities necessary to the full realization of this goal." NHC applauds the action of the Congress in so clearly restating our national goal and affirming that it is a manner of grave national concern that this goal has not been realized for many of the lower income families.

2. In these times when there are so many competing demands for the use of federal funds and national resources, it is most significant that Congress further declared that these programs should have the highest priority. This Congressional determination is so important that we quote it in full as a necessary introduction to these Resolutions:

"The Congress declares that in the administration of those housing programs authorized by this Act which are designed to assist families with incomes so low that they could not otherwise decently house themselves, and of other Government programs designed to assist in the provision of housing for such families, *the highest priority and emphasis should be given to meeting the housing needs of those families for which the national goal has not become a reality;* and in the carrying out of such programs there should be the fullest practicable utilization of the resources and capabilities of private enterprise and of individual self-help techniques." (Emphasis added.)

3. This declaration by the Congress recognizes the need for a drastic realignment of past priorities in our federal budget and expenditures, since these housing programs were given a lower priority than other less urgent programs. Now the Congress had declared that these programs should be given the highest priority and there is a federal

commitment to take all action necessary to achieve the goal of providing decent housing for families with incomes so low that they could not otherwise decently house themselves. To translate this highest priority into reality takes firm and courageous action. We must assure that action is taken to carry out this mandate. Specifically this highest priority means that:

(a) All of the legislative authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act should be provided with full funds and full contract authority in Appropriation Acts.

(b) Such funds and contract authority should not be subject to recapture by the Budget Bureau; instead, these programs should be exempted from the further restraints and recaptures pursuant to across-the-board reductions in the national budget, such as the $6 billion cut in the current fiscal year.

(c) When funds or contract authority are made available, they should be promptly committed so that the planning and work in initiating projects can proceed promptly in order to step up the rate of production as contemplated by the Congressional goals.

(d) Adequate legislative authorizations should be included in future housing acts to provide sufficient funds and contract authority to achieve the Congressional goals.

(e) Adequate administrative staffs should be made available to carry out the new programs and achieve the Congressional goals.

(f) Administrative actions should be geared to accomplishment rather than caution and all necessary measures should be taken to simplify and expedite housing programs at all levels to speed them up.

(g) Adequate authorizations and appropriations of federal grants required for public facilities and services in housing and urban development programs, including those relating to health, education, and welfare and other purposes.

CHAPTER C. GOALS TO ACHIEVE HOUSING WE NEED

1. In the 1968 Housing Act there is a very important determination made by the Congress, which we quote:

"The Congress finds that the supply of the Nation's housing is not increasing rapidly enough to meet the national housing goal, established in the Housing Act of 1949, of the 'realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.' *The Congress reaffirms this national housing goal and determines that it can be substantially achieved within the next decade by the construction or rehabilitation of twenty-six million housing units, six million of these for low and moderate income families.*" (Sec. 1601) (Emphasis added.)

During the next decade Congress has fixed the goal to produce 26 million dwelling units, 6 million of which are to be for low and moderate income families. Moreover, it has determined that this goal can be substantially achieved. This includes both new housing units and rehabilitated housing.

2. (a) The Congress also required that the President make a report to it by January 15, 1969, setting forth a plan to be carried out during the next decade for the elimination of all substandard housing and the realization of the foregoing housing goals. A further report is to be made on January 15 of each succeeding year comparing the results achieved during the preceding fiscal year with the objectives for (a) the completion of new or rehabilitated housing units and (b) the reduction in occupied substandard housing. In this manner, Congress will be informed each year as to the deficit in housing production and the recommendations of the President concerning the measures necessary to eliminate this deficit and to meet the goal during the coming year. NHC recommends that the report should identify gaps or areas of unmet needs in our housing program.

(b) NHC further recommends that there be Congressional hearings each year on the Report received from the President concerning the progress toward meeting the goals and the additional legislation and other actions necessary to achieve the goals in the coming year.

3. In keeping with these Congressional goals there should be no gaps or areas of unmet needs in our housing programs. Effective means must be developed so that housing will be available to families of all incomes. Each family whose income is too low to obtain decent housing should receive the amount of assistance it needs to get such housing. We must reach the unserved income group below the level now served by public housing or rent supplements as more fully discussed below. Likewise, we must avoid a gap or area of unmet need in programs serving moderate and lower income families through private enterprise with federal aid consisting of (a) below market interest rates under Section 221(d)(3); and (b) assistance under Sections 235 and 236.

4. While the law approves an average national goal of 2,600,000 units annually during the next ten years, NHC urges that the average national goal should be 3,000,000 units a year. NHC agrees that 2,000,000 units should be built annually for those above the low and moderate income groups who do not need federal assistance. However, instead of 600,000 units annually for low and moderate income housing, NHC recommends a goal of at least 1,000,000 units annually for these income groups—of which half would be for the low income group. The recommendations contained in these Resolutions are intended to provide the measures necessary to achieve this goal and bring construction up to a level commensurate with it

CHAPTER D. OBSTACLES WHICH PREVENT NEW PROGRAMS FROM STARTING

1. We are facing a critical emergency which will prevent the building of housing to serve lower income families through the new interest assistance programs and the rent supplement program. Under these programs, the capital financing has been shifted to the private market where mortgage loans must be obtained at market interest rates which are currently 7½ %.

2. Unfortunately, there is no assurance that it will be possible to sell these FHA-insured mortgages at par, and no federal funds have been made available to buy them. If sponsors of projects cannot obtain this financing at par in the private market they will have to pay a discount which is not covered by mortgage proceeds. Nonprofit organizations do not have this money to pay this discount. Cooperatives will not be able to increase the downpayments by the amount needed for the discount above the amount which is already required. Other sponsors will not increase their investment by this amount.

3. The current 7½ % interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages was declared to be a "temporary" solution. On housing to serve those of moderate or lower incomes, we should find a way to achieve a more reasonable interest rate without charging the consumer for discounts. NHC strongly recommends an approach whereby GNMA purchases mortgages for such housing at par under its special assistance programs and then resells the mortgages to FNMA at the market price.

4. The Federal National Mortgage Association ("FNMA") is no longer regarded as a government agency or a part of the Budget as a result of action taken in the 1968 Housing Act to establish it as a private institution with a gradual retirement of the federal investment. As a private institution, FNMA will not provide subsidies. Accordingly, it will not purchase mortgages at a price or interest rate which results in a yield below the current market yield. FNMA recently took action to issue advance commitments to buy mortgages under the Section 236 and rent supplement programs at a price based upon the market as established through weekly auctions in the sale of single-family home mortgages. When the interest rate was 6¾%, FNMA was requiring a discount on a mortgage under the programs of interest assistance and rent supplements which ranged from 1½% to 5%, depending upon the auction prices on single-family mortgages and yield-related prices on multifamily mortgages. This discount on purchase commitments varied from week to week, based upon the auction prices on single-family mortgages and the special yield-related price for mortgages on rent supplement and interest subsidy (236) projects. Now with 7½% rate FNMA's current discount on these mortgages is 1½%.

5. On a program which Congress declared was entitled to the highest priority, we must find a way to achieve two objectives:

(a) to make mortgage financing available at reasonable interest rates for housing to serve those of moderate or lower incomes; and

(b) to obtain capital financing for such projects without requiring the sponsors to pay a discount which they are unable to do.

6. Fortunately, we have two institutions available to help in providing this mortgage financing—the Federal National Mortgage Association ("FNMA") which has now become a private operation and the Government National Mortgage Association ("GNMA") which is authorized to provide special assistance. These two institutions should work together in a "tandem" program. NHC urges that GNMA purchase these market-interest-rate mortgages at par under its special assistance program. It is imperative that this be done to enable the development of housing under the interest-assistance and rent supplement programs. In the Reports of the House and Senate Committees, there was a clear statement of intention by the Congress that they intended special assistance funds to be used to purchase these mortgages when necessary. In fact, Congress made an additional $500 million of special assistance funds available on July 1, 1969, to supplement the $525 million of such funds which became available on July 1, 1968, under the existing law. As to these funds, the committee reports stated the Congressional intention as follows: "It is understood, of course, that the President could use these funds as needed, along with the present special assistance funds to support the new sections 235, 236 and 237 programs of housing for lower income families."

7. Accordingly, we strongly recommend that the President authorize the use of special assistance funds for the GNMA purchase of mortgages *at par* under the interest assistance and rent supplement programs. After it has purchased the mortgages at par, GNMA would sell them at the current market price and reuse the sales proceeds to buy additional mortgages. There should be only one commitment and marketing fee charged—the one to be paid to FNMA which will provide a take-out commitment to buy the mortgages from GNMA. Unless this action is taken now, these housing programs will be stopped and lower income families will be denied the fulfillment of legislation to meet their housing needs. Obviously, with higher interest rates, there will be a lower volume of housing produced with the contract authority available under the 1968 Housing Act.

8. It is necessary that additional measures be taken to meet the needs for mortgage financing for the programs involving interest assistance and rent supplements. While the authorized amount of special assistance funds will help to start and continue these programs, it will not be sufficient to meet their increasing needs for capital funds as the programs accelerate. Under the 3-year programs authorized by the 1968 Housing Act for interest assistance and rent supplements, a total of $18 billion of mortgage

financing will be required or an average of $6 billion a year. We must assure the availability of a steady flow of mortgage financing without requiring sponsors either (a) to pay discounts on mortgages for which they lack funds; or (b) to pay unreasonable interest rates in order to avoid discounts. NHC recommends a new program to meet this problem. Since GNMA does not have special assistance funds to buy or hold the billions of dollars of mortgages which will be involved as the new programs accelerate, we recommend that GNMA sell the mortgages after it has purchase them. GNMA would sell them at the current market price. GNMA would then reuse the sales proceeds to buy additional mortgages through the operation of its revolving fund. Under such a program the amount that would appear in the federal budget would represent only the discount instead of 100% of any mortgage held by GNMA.

9. In the foregoing discussions, we have referred to sales to FNMA at a discount if the mortgage bears an interest rate below the special related yield for multifamily mortgages. However, there may be times when the interest fixed in the mortgage would justify a sale of the mortgage to FNMA at a premium. If such conditions arise, it should be recognized that FNMA would pay a premium to GNMA for the mortgage based upon its yield as compared with the prevailing yields in the market.

10. The proposed program would represent a proper use of GNMA as a governmental agency to provide the limited subsidy assistance required to meet the discounts which nonprofit, cooperative or other sponsors are unable to pay. At the same time, by reselling the mortgage in the private market, GNMA would accomplish the Congressional purpose of obtaining private financing for the projects. Such mortgages could be sold by GNMA to FNMA (as a private mortgagee), insurance companies and other investors. They should be prepared to buy the mortgages at the prices which reflect the current market prices.

The proposed program would enable GNMA to utilize its limited special assistance funds as a revolving fund to provide a steady flow of capital financing at reasonable interest rates for the interest assistance and rent supplement programs and other special assistance programs. This would help enable the fulfillment of the Congressional goals to provide housing which is urgently needed for moderate and lower income families.

11. Besides its use to provide capital financing for projects receiving interest assistance and rent supplements, the proposed program should also be used for the GNMA purchase at par and resale at market prices of other mortgages now covered by special assistance authorizations. This includes programs which Congress has previously determined had a sufficient public interest to merit such special assistance, such as market-rate mortgages under Sections 213, 221 (d)(3) and 220. Moreover, as to these and other multifamily mortgages, FNMA should buy them at the same special yield-related price as it now pays for mortgages aided by interest assistance and rent supplements, instead of charging higher discounts on these mortgages. These multifamily mortgages have the same lower servicing costs as multifamily mortgages aided by interest assistance on rent supplements.

12. There is an alternative solution to this problem of mortgage discounts. FHA could include the discount as part of the cost of the project, just as other financing costs and building costs are now included. If this were done, mortgage proceeds would be available to pay the discounts, so this would meet the problem of sponsors who are unable to pay discounts.

13. Besides assuring a market for mortgages on the completed projects, it is necessary to assure interim financing during the period when the projects are under construction. In past tight-money periods, there were times when it was not possible to obtain construction financing at a reasonable price. To avoid a recurrence of this problem in the present tight-money period, NHC recommends that FNMA issue a commitment which would cover *both* the construction financing and the permanent financing on a project. FNMA could take a 90% participation in the construction financing and another mortgage institution could take a 10% participation and handle the processing involved in construction advances. Under such a program, the construction financing should be provided for a total fee which is not more than the amount allowed in the mortgage.

14. NHC urges the repeal of the requirement that nonprofit sponsors make a 5% investment in rent supplement projects as a condition to the use of special assistance funds for the GNMA purchase of mortgages on a nonprofit project. Nonprofit sponsors cannot meet this requirement and should not be denied the use of special assistance funds for the purchase of their mortgages at par.

15. In addition to its present authority to make purchases on the open market, the Federal Reserve Board should be authorized to purchase directly from FNMA, GNMA and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the obligations issued by these agencies. This would assure that the funds would be channeled directly into the mortgage market when needed during periods of monetary stringency and rising interest rates. These obligations would include participation certificates or other securities issued against a pool of mortgages or consolidated debentures or other obligations.

16. NHC recommends a 2-year extension of the legislation lifting the 6% interest ceiling on mortgages which are FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed.

CHAPTER DD. NEED FOR ASSURING AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF MORTGAGE FUNDS AT REASONABLE INTEREST RATES FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME FAMILIES

1. It is important to reduce interest rates and increase the supply of mortgage funds for low and moderate income housing. Low and moderate income housing is least able to compete for mortgage funds. In this statement we recommend that programs be developed to assure an adequate flow of capital into housing, particularly for low and moderate income families.

(a) There will not be an adequate supply of mortgage funds for the program and the achievement of the housing goals set forth in the Housing Act of 1968 unless Congress and the Administration take measures to assure the availability of adequate mortgage funds for housing. Housing cannot compete with others seeking money for financing and offering higher interest rates, such as those who are building industrial plants and commercial and office buildings. Without the action described below to implement the highest priority for housing prescribed in the 1968 Act, the private sector will not meet the housing goals in the 1968 Act.

(b) Unless additional steps are taken as described below, the mortgage money will not be available for housing at reasonable rates.

2. Need for fiscal restraint and monetary ease: NHC favors a combination of sufficient fiscal restraint and monetary ease to assure that the needed real and financial resources are available to support this volume of homebuilding while maintaining reasonable price stability. The Federal Reserve Board currently has the power to make additional resources available for mortgage financing of housing but has failed to do so.

As stated earlier in these resolutions, one of the measures we recommend is that in addition to its present authority to make purchases on the open market, the Federal Reserve Board should be authorized to purchase directly from FNMA, GNMA, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the obligations issued by these agencies. This would assure that the funds would be channeled directly into the mortgage market when needed during periods of monetary stringency and rising interest rates. These obligations would include participation certificates or other securities issued against a pool of mortgages or consolidated debentures or other obligations.

3. Suggestions for institutional reforms: (a) NHC suggests a change in the lending policies of the Federal Home Loan Banks so that savings and loan associations can borrow with greater certainty at lower costs and for a longer time than at present. In addition, we recommend that the Federal Home Loan Banks should earmark a substantial part of the funds it advances to savings and loan associations for exclusive use in purchasing mortgages to finance housing for low and moderate income groups. Other measures should be taken to assure that an appropriate percent of the loans of associations from other funds will also be for the low and moderate income housing market.

(b) NHC suggests that financial institutions be required to direct a certain percentage of their new loanable funds into mortgages. Other countries have been successful in requiring various financial institutions to use a certain percentage of their new loanable funds for mortgages to finance housing, particularly for those in the moderate and lower income group. The institutions listed below should be directed to invest a certain percentage of their funds in housing for moderate and lower income persons and families. The investments could be in bonds guaranteed by GNMA under the 1968 Housing Act which bonds would be secured by a pool of insured housing mortgages. This would relieve the investors of the burdens or costs of servicing the mortgages. It would also assure a full recovery of the funds invested.

(1) Social Security Trust Funds. An appropriate percentage of these funds should be earmarked for investment in mortgages to produce such housing. This requirement will not work a hardship on the Trust funds because the mortgages would provide a reasonable return.

(2) Pension Funds. An appropriate percentage of pension funds should be invested in housing for those of low and moderate incomes. Like the Social Security Trust Fund, this requirement would work no hardship on these funds.

(3) Insurance Companies. While the insurance companies pledged $1 billion for the purchase of housing mortgages to meet the needs of those of lower incomes in our cities, they should be urged by the Commission to make additional pledges for such mortgage purchase each year.

(4) Veterans Administration Funds. With respect to certain Veterans Administration funds which are available for investment, NHC supports the pending legislation authorizing the use of such funds for investments in VA-guaranteed mortgages.

NHC applauds the recent effort by the AFL–CIO to help the adverse effects of the unprecedented high interest rates and tight mortgage money. The AFL–CIO has recently embarked upon an expansion of its Mortgage Investment Trust. A national campaign has begun to attract general treasury and pension and welfare funds of AFL–CIO affiliates and qualified labor-management funds into a mortgage investment program designed to do three principal things: (1) to help provide adequate housing for America's families; (2) to provide a safe, reasonable yield on the investment of union funds; (3) and to create jobs. NHC joins with the AFL–CIO in urging

XUM

the participation of all AFL–CIO affiliates and the allocation of regular percentages of union investments in the AFL–CIO Mortgage Investment Trust.

(c) As stated earlier, NHC is in favor of requiring the Federal Reserve System to purchase securities guaranteed by the Federal Home Loan Bank, FNMA, or GNMA in times of tightness in the mortgage market thereby providing these institutions with funds to funnel to the mortgage market. NHC believes the Federal Reserve Board should be authorized to purchase directly from FNMA, GNMA, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the obligations issued by these agencies. This would assure that the funds would be channeled directly into the mortgage market when needed during periods of monetary stringency and rising interest rates. These obligations would include participation certificates or other securities issued against a pool of mortgages or consolidated debentures or other obligations. In the past, the Federal Reserve has objected to open market purchases because it stated that there was no guarantee that if Federal Reserve did make purchases the money would find its way back into the mortgage market. However, this objection would be met since purchases of securities from the Federal Home Loan Bank, FNMA or GNMA will automatically feed back into the mortgage market because the operation of these institutions are limited to the financing of housing.

(d) NHC recommends that savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and other mortgage lenders be permitted to issue long-term securities to raise funds for mortgages. This would be an additional means of channeling funds into mortgages in housing.

(e) NHC recommends legislation to permit thrift institutions to accept deposits of cities and other public agencies for investment in housing; such deposits should be fully guaranteed and exempt from the $15,000 limit on guaranties.

(f) As stated above, NHC strongly recommends bringing into early operation the new authority provided to the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) to insure mortgage-backed bonds issued by institutions seeking to raise new funds for mortgages. It will tap additional sources for investment in housing. Many institutions and investors would buy such bonds since they would be relieved of the burdens or costs of servicing the mortgages. They would also be assured of necessary protection on their investment through the GNMA guaranty.

4. Dealing with Discounts: (a) In the private financial markets when there are changes in the expected yields through interest, it is not feasible to forbid discounts or premiums on mortgages with fixed interest rates. Whenever there is a fixed interest rate on mortgages, the price paid for the mortgage will reflect the current market yield available on comparable investments. Accordingly, there will be a discount or a premium on a mortgage bearing a fixed interest rate, as this is the method by which there is an adjustment in the yield to reflect the market conditions.

(b) While there may be discounts on mortgages which bear a fixed interest rate, this does not necessarily mean that the consumer should pay the discounts. On housing for families of moderate or lower incomes, it is necessary to achieve reasonable interest rates without discounts in order to serve the families at monthly charges which they can afford. There are many families in the moderate income group who will not be eligible for interest assistance under the programs of Sections 235 and 236, because their incomes are above the lower income limits that have now been established for these programs. The recent increases in interest rates have excluded people from the housing market who need homes but can no longer afford them at the higher interest rates. Accordingly, as stated above, we have recommended a tandem program for the combined use of GNMA and FNMA which would make it possible to achieve reasonable interest rates for those of moderate incomes without charging the discount to the consumer. Instead, any discounts that are necessary—even with an increased flow of funds into the housing mortgage market—would be absorbed by GNMA as part of a sound public policy to assure the availability of housing financing at a reasonable price for those of moderate incomes who need housing.

CHAPTER E. RENTAL AND COOPERATIVE HOUSING UNDER SECTION 221(d) (3)

1. Objectives: Since 1961, there has been a program under Section 221(d) (3) to provide housing for moderate and lower income families who could not obtain decent housing in the private market without Federal assistance. This is accomplished through FHA-insured financing at a below-market-interest rate of 3%. This program has been a most successful one. There is a long accumulated backlog of unfilled applications for additional projects under Section 221(d) (3).

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: In the 1968 Housing Act, there was an increase of $500 million in the special assistance authority to become available on July 1, 1969. This was in addition to the present revolving authority which was increased by $525 million on July 1, 1968 under existing law. In their reports, the House and Senate Committees stated that they had approved these additional funds primarily for the use by GNMA in the purchase of Section 221(d) (3) below-market-interest rate mortgages. The Senate and House Committees recognized the necessity for continuing the 221(d) (3) program without a lapse of authority which could do damage to the Congressional goal for stepped-up activity in the field of new construction for housing for lower income families The Committee reports further stated:

"The committee is mindful of the practical difficulties of getting a new program rolling; that is, the long lead time it takes to prepare regulations, allocate the funds, educate the local sponsors and builders and finally produce specific projects to receive the benefits of the new subsidy program. The Section 221(d) (3) BMIR has hurdled all of these obstacles and it is now a going program. The committee wants to assure that it will continue to be a going and effective program until the new Section 236 program has reached some degree of efficiency. The additional special assistance funds of $500 million would be used to provide the backup support for the program necessary to carry out this objective."

3. Recommendations: (a) As explained elsewhere in these Resolutions, the 236 program has not become fully operational nor has it hurdled the obstacles in getting the new program started. One of the major obstacles is the lack of private financing without a discount of at least 1½ points in the current market. Nonprofit, cooperative and other sponsors are generally unable to provide funds to meet this discount which is not covered by mortgage proceeds. There was a clear Congressional intent and mandate to continue the 221(d) (3) program as indicated above. Yet the Bureau of the Budget is recapturing all funds not previously allocated under the 221(d) (3) program for the GNMA purchase of below-market-interest-rate mortgages. As a result of this action, no further allocations will be made under Section 221(d) (3). We strongly urge that this action by the Bureau of the Budget be rescinded that the balance of 221(d) (3) funds be allocated for housing projects which require financing.

(b) NHC opposes the request of former President Johnson to defer from July 1, 1969 to July 1, 1970 the $500 million increase in GNMA's special assistance funds which the 1968 Housing Act made available. These funds should be committed primarily for mortgages under Section 221(d) (3).

(c) While GNMA would make allocations and commitments to purchase mortgages with these special assistance funds, the actual expenditures and purchases of the mortgages would not occur until the housing is completed. This will not happen on any new construction during fiscal year 1969. Likewise, most of the housing construction will not be completed in fiscal 1970, so there will be a relatively small impact on the Budget through GNMA expenditures during fiscal 1970.

(d) The advance commitments by GNMA to purchase these mortgages is necessary now to enable the 221(d) (3) projects to proceed. Otherwise, it will not be possible to continue the 221(d) (3) program while action is being taken to get full and efficient operations under Section 236. Unless the 221(d) (3) projects receive the foregoing special assistance funds, there will be a serious interruption in the program to provide housing for lower income families, contrary to the goals and mandates of the 1968 Housing Act.

(e) The 221(d) (3) program was continued under the 1968 Housing Act, with $500 million of additional special assistance primarily for this program commencing July 1, 1969. However, it had been contemplated that this program would be phased out in later years after the new interest assistance program under Section 236 became equally efficient and acceptable in its operations. NHC recommends against phasing out the 221(d) (3) program of below-market-interest rates, because such action would create a new gap and area of unmet need in our housing program. The new interest assistance programs have lower income limits for eligibility than Section 221(d) (3). Moreover, due to the requirement that occupants spend certain percentages of their income for housing, these programs will result in little or no interest assistance for many moderate income families who had been eligible under 221(d) (3); such families will be excluded from interest assistance they need to achieve monthly payments which they can afford. Accordingly, it is necessary to continue the 221(d) (3) program as a permanent program to serve those of moderate income who will not be eligible under the interest assistance programs, but who need help to obtain decent housing. A similar situation occurred several years ago when the rent supplement program was proposed; it had then been contemplated that the 221(d) (3) program would be phased out. However, the rent supplement program was finally enacted to serve the low income group instead of the same group which had been served by 221(d) (3); consequently, Congress determined that the 221(d) (3) program should be continued. Similar action is required now on the 221(d) (3) program to avoid creating a new gap and area of unmet need.

CHAPTER F. HOMEOWNERSHIP UNDER SECTION 235

1. Objectives: The new program under Section 235 provides financial assistance to enable lower income families to acquire individual or cooperative homeownership. This law responds to the urgent desire for homeownership among such families. They want the pride of owning their own home and the greater sense of security and dignity which it affords. Individual and cooperative ownership provides benefits not only to the owner, but to the community as well. Such owners take responsibility for maintaining and improving their homes. They acquire a stake in the community and participate in its affairs. The result is a more stable and wholesome living environment in which to raise children.

2. Authorizations in the Housing Act of 1968: (a) HUD is authorized to enter into

contracts to make periodic payments to lenders who make FHA-insured home mortgage loans to lower income families. The payments will be in an amount necessary to make up the difference between 20 percent of the family's monthly income and the required monthly payment under the mortgage for principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and mortgage insurance premium. In no case, however, can payment under the mortgage exceed the difference between (i) the required payment under the mortgage for principal, interest, and mortgage insurance premium and (ii) the payment that would be required for principal and interest if the mortgage bore an interest rate of 1 percent. The amount of the payment on each mortgage will vary according to the income of the homeowner. The family's income is required to be recertified at least every 2 years and appropriate adjustments made in the assistance payment to reflect any change.

(b) The assistance payment is available for a purchaser having an income at the time of his initial occupancy not in excess of 135% of the maximum income limits that can be established in the area for initial occupancy in public housing. However, up to 20 percent of the funds authorized in appropriation acts for the program can be used to assist families with incomes above these limits but which are not in excess of 90 percent of the income limits for occupancy in a section 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate housing project.

(c) In calculating the income of the homeowner for the purpose of determining eligibility as well as the amount on which the 20 percent computation will be made, there will be deducted $300 for each minor child who is a member of the homeowner's immediate family and living with him. Also, income of minors will not be included in the homeowner's income for this computation. By administrative action pursuant to recommendations in the Senate Committee Report, there is a deduction of 5% of gross income to cover payroll deductions for social security taxes and compulsory pension funds.

(d) The amount of a home mortgage cannot exceed $15,000 ($17,500 in high cost areas). These limits are increased to $17,500 except that it may be $20,000 in high cost areas for families with five or more members. The same limits apply as an average to the blanket mortgage of a cooperative.

(e) On individual ownership of single family homes, the minimum downpayment is $200 for families with incomes up to 135 percent of the maximum income limits that can be established in the area for initial occupancy in public housing and 3 percent in other cases.

(f) HUD is authorized to provide budget, debt management, and related counseling services to homeowners who purchase homes under the program.

(g) The housing, with a few limited exceptions, must be new or substantially rehabilitated housing, except that up to 25 percent of the amount of contracts authorized to be made before July 1, 1969 can apply to existing housing, with this percentage decreasing to 15 percent the following year, and 10 percent the third year.

(h) The aggregate amount of contracts to make payments cannot exceed amount approved in appropriation Acts. The payments pursuant to the contracts cannot exceed $75 million per annum prior to July 1, 1969. This amount is increased by $100 million on July 1, 1969, and by $125 million on July 1, 1970.

(i) The 221(h) program—with a new limit of $50 million—is charged to allow the Secretary to reduce the interest rate on a home purchaser's mortgage under the program to as low as 1 percent where the purchaser's income justifies, with periodic adjustments between 1 and 3 percent to reflect changes in the homeowner's income. Under this program nonprofit mortgagors purchase and rehabilitate housing with FHA insured mortgages and resell it to low-income families.

3. Authorization in Appropriation Acts: Of the $75 million authorized under Section 235 for interest-assistance contracts prior to July 1, 1969, $25 million of the contract authority has been embodied in appropriation acts.

4. Recommendations: (a) *Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts*. NHC recommends that appropriation actions include the additional interest-assistance contract authority under Section 235 as follows:

(1) The $50 million in interest-assistance contract authority which has not been included in appropriation acts and is authorized by the 1968 Housing Act for use prior to July 1, 1969; and

(2) The $100 million in interest-assistance contract authority for fiscal year 1970 and $125 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1971.

In making these recommendations, we emphasize the need for advance authorizations for each succeeding fiscal year, besides the current one, to allow more lead time for the planning and initiation of homeownership programs for lower income families.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: NHC recommends increasing the legislative authorizations for interest assistance contracts under Section 235 to achieve an average annual rate of 300,000 units for a 5-year period. Initially, the annual rate should be 225,000 units, but it should be accelerated each year until it reaches 375,000 units in the fourth and fifth years.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: NHC makes the following recommendations for other legislative amendments:

(1) NHC recommends the removal of the limitation that interest assistance payments shall be limited to the initial owner of a house or the initial and second member-occupant of a cooperative dwelling unit—and the person to whom the initial member transfers his membership. This present limitation will prevent the program from meeting the continuing need for housing low and moderate income families because it prevents the particular house or dwelling unit involved from being available to subsequent families with such incomes. We recommend that this provision be amended so that when the owner or cooperative member sells his dwelling to a purchaser meeting the income limits applicable to this program, and the purchaser will also be eligible to obtain an interest subsidy on the dwelling involved. This amendment should apply to all subsequent eligible purchasers.

(2) NHC recommends an amendment to the provision requiring families to spend 25% of their income for mortgage payments for total housing expenses. NHC recommends that including utilities and maintenance, a family should pay 20% instead of 25% under Section 235. The proposed interest subsidy would pay only the excess of the mortgage payment above the amount which represents 20% of the family income. Statistics show that a median of 15.5% of income was spent for such mortgage payments, as distinguished from total housing expense, under the FHA 203 program. NHC recommends a requirement that 1/6th of income be spent for mortgage payments under Section 235. This is necessary to assure that families will have enough income remaining to pay for food, clothing and other requirements for a decent standard of living. As to the present requirement that the owner spend 20% of his income for mortgage payments, it results in reducing or eliminating the amount of interest assistance available for many lower income families. This excludes them from assistance they need to achieve monthly payments which they can afford; thus it excludes them from the market for this housing and creates an unfilled gap in our housing program, as explained below in the discussion of Section 236.

(3) NHC recommends an amendment which will establish a realistic cost limit for high-cost areas comparable to other provisions in existing law. In high-cost areas, the Secretary should be authorized to increase by 45% the mortgage amounts of $15,000, or, in the case of families with five or more members, $17,500.

(4) With respect to the contract authority for interest assistance, NHC recommends that the same 25% thereof should be made available for use on existing dwellings in fiscal 1970 and 1971 as the Act now authorizes for fiscal 1969. This would represent an increase above the 15% and 10% of such contract authority now authorized for such use in fiscal 1970 and 1971. Besides enabling the homeownership program to have a greater immediate impact, this amendment would afford a greater opportunity for freedom of choice among lower income families in selecting the areas in which they desire to live.

(d) Administrative Actions: NHC makes the following recommendations for administrative actions:

(1) In computing family income under Section 235, FHA should allow deductions of the type which have been long recognized in public housing, particularly since the income limits in the interest assistance program are now computed as a percentage of the local public housing limits. Moreover, this action would respond to the Senate Committee's report that fair standards and rules should be followed within HUD for determining such income.

(2) FHA should repeal the asset limitations which penalize lower income families who have been thrifty. The 1968 Housing Act does not require that lower income families be declared ineligible if they have accumulated savings. NHC does not believe that such a limitation should be imposed administratively.

CHAPTER G. RENTAL AND COOPERATIVE PROGRAM UNDER SECTION 236

1. *Objectives*. The new program under Section 236 provides financial assistance to enable lower income families to acquire rental housing or cooperative homeownership. This program is urgently needed to provide housing for families with incomes too high to qualify for public housing but too low to afford decent housing that could be produced in the private market. A tremendous unmet need exists for housing to serve moderate income families who cannot afford standard private housing without federal assistance. There is a long accumulated backlog of unfilled requests and applications for additional projects to serve this income group. Unlike Section 221(d)(3), the capital financing under Section 236—as well as Section 235—is shifted to the private market where the mortgage loans must be obtained at market interest rates. Federal Assistance payments would make up the difference between the market rate of interest and 1%.

2. Authorizations in the Housing Act of 1968: (a) Section 236 authorizes a new program of Federal assistance to rental and cooperative housing for lower income families. The assistance is in the form of periodic payments to the mortgagee financing the housing to reduce the mortgagor's interest costs on a market rate FHA-insured project mortgage.

(b) The interest assistance payments will reduce payments on the project mortgage from that required for principal, interest, and mortgage insurance premium on a market rate mortgage to that required for principal and interest on a mortgage bearing an interest rate of 1 percent.

(c) The interest assistance payments will reduce rental or occupancy charges to a basic charge. A tenant or cooperative member will either pay (a) the basic charge or (b) such greater amount as represents 25 percent

XUM

of his income, but not in excess of the charges which would be necessary without any interest assistance payments. Incomes of tenants or cooperative members will be re-examined at least every 2 years for the purpose of adjusting charges. Rental or occupancy charges collected in excess of the basic charges are to be returned to HUD for deposit in a revolving fund for the purpose of making other interest assistance payments.

(d) Tenants or cooperative members of these projects who pay less than the fair market rental charge for their units will generally have to have incomes, at the time of their initial occupancy, not in excess of 135 percent of the maximum income limits that can be established in the area for initial occupancy in public housing dwellings. However, up to 20 percent of the contract funds authorized in appropriation acts may be made available for projects in which some or all of the units will be occupied, at the time of the initial occupancy, by tenants or cooperative members whose incomes exceed the above limit but do not exceed 90 percent of the income limits for occupancy of section 221(d)(3) below-market-interest-rate housing.

(e) In determining income for the purpose of eligibility as well as the amount of rent or occupancy charges to be paid a $300 deduction is permitted for each minor person in the family and any income of such minor is not counted. By administrative action pursuant to recommendations in the Senate Committee Report, there is a deduction of 5% of gross income to cover payroll deductions for social security taxes and compulsory pension funds.

(f) To qualify for mortgage insurance under the new program, a mortgagor must be a nonprofit organization, a cooperative, or a limited dividend entity of the types permitted under the section 221(d)(3) housing program. The mortgage limitations with respect to maximum mortgage amount are the same as for mortgages insured under the 221(d)(3) program. Interest assistance payments can also be made with respect to State-aided housing projects approved for receiving the benefits of the program prior to completion of construction or rehabilitation of the projects.

(g) Contracts for assistance payments are authorized, subject to approval in appropriation acts, in the amount of $75 million annually prior to July 1, 1969. This amount is increased by $100 million on July 1, 1969, and by $125 million on July 1, 1970.

(h) A project financed under the new program can include such nondwelling facilities as HUD deems adequate and appropriate to serve the occupants of the project and the surrounding neighborhood, as long as the project is predominantly residential and any nondwelling facilities contribute to the economic feasibility of the project. Where a project is designed primarily for occupancy by the elderly or handicapped it can include related facilities for their use, such as dining, work, recreation, and health facilities.

(i) A cooperative or private nonprofit corporation or association can purchase a project from a limited dividend mortgagor and finance the purchase with a mortgage insured under the program.

(j) Rent supplement payments may be provided for tenants in projects financed under Section 236, but no more than 20 percent of the units in any one project can receive rent supplement assistance.

3. Authorization in Appropriation Acts: Of the $75 million authorized under Section 236 for interest-assistance contracts prior to July 1, 1969, $25 million of the contract authority has been embodied in appropriation acts.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends that appropriation acts include the additional interest-assistance contract authority under Section 236 as follows:

(1) The $50 million in interest-assistance contract authority which has not been included in appropriation acts and is authorized by the 1968 Housing Act for use prior to July 1, 1969; and

(2) The $100 million in interest-assistance contract authority for fiscal year 1970 and $125 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1971.

In making these recommendations, we emphasize the need for advance authorizations for each succeeding fiscal year, besides the current one, to allow more lead time for the planning and initiation of housing programs for lower income families.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: NHC recommends increasing the legislative authorizations for interest assistance contracts under Section 236 to achieve an average annual rate of 300,000 units for a 5-year period. Initially the annual rate should be 225,000 units, but it should be accelerated each year until it reaches 375,000 units in the fourth and fifth years.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: NHC makes the following recommendations for other legislative amendments:

(1) NHC recommends an amendment to the provision requiring that 25% of family income be paid for total housing expenses—including mortgage payments, real estate taxes, utilities, heat, and the estimated cost of maintenance and repair. The proposed interest assistance would pay only the excess of total housing expense above the amount which represents 25% of family income. Statistics show that a median of 19.6% of income was spent for total housing expense under the FHA 203 program. NHC recommends that 1/5th of the income be spent for total housing expense under Section 236 so that families will not be required to spend a disproportionate amount of their earnings for housing. This is necessary to assure that families will have enough income remaining to pay for food, clothing and other requirements for a decent standard of living. As to the present requirement that the owner spend 25% of his income for total housing expense, it results in reducing or eliminating the amount of interest assistance available for many lower income families. This excludes them from assistance they need to achieve monthly payments which they can afford; thus, it excludes them from the market for this housing and creates an unfilled gap in our housing program as shown by the following examples:

These examples relate to a $15,000 mortgage on a 2-bedroom unit where the fair market charge would be $167 per month:

(i) If the income of a family of four, after allowable deductions, were $8,000, it would be required to pay the $167 a month which would represent 25% of its income—so this family would receive no subsidy.

(ii) If the income of this family, after allowable deductions, were $7,000, it would pay $146 a month and receive a $21 subsidy. This would be about a third of the authorized subsidy on this unit, which would be $58 monthly at the 1% interest rate.

Families with incomes cited in the foregoing examples cannot afford to pay these monthly charges. Unless the 221(d)(3) program is continued to serve these families, the 236 program would create a new gap in meeting housing needs by excluding moderate income families who previously received adequate subsidies under Section 221(d)(3) and who will receive little or no subsidy under Section 236.

(2) NHC recommends that Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) should be amended to remove the 10% limit on the number of units in a project which may be occupied by moderate-income individuals as distinguished from families. All moderate-income individuals would then be treated in the same manner as those who are elderly or handicapped.

(d) Administrative Actions: NHC makes the following recommendations for administrative actions:

(1) In computing family income under Section 236, FHA should allow additional deductions of the type which have been long recognized in public housing, particularly since the income limits in the interest assistance program are now computed as a percentage of the local public housing limits. Moreover, this action would respond to the Senate Committee's report that fair standards and rules should be followed within HUD for determining such income, after deductions.

(2) To help effectuate the Congressional purpose to encourage ownership, FHA should include cooperative ownership as one of the major criteria in selecting projects for the allocation of funds under Section 236.

(3) FHA should establish cost limits which will be realistic and workable in high cost areas, including both high and low rise buildings. This is necessary to assure that housing under 236 can be constructed within the cities where employment and public transportation are available.

(4) FHA should repeal its administrative limitation that no more than 20% of the units in any one project can receive assistance under the rent supplement or leasing programs. The statute merely establishes this 20% limitation as to those receiving rent supplements. NHC recommends against the extension of this limitation to include occupants who receive assistance under the leasing program. In appropriate cases, it will be desirable to have more than 20% of the units in a project occupied by low income families, in which case the additional families could receive assistance under the leasing program.

CHAPTER GG. SPECIAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 237

1. Objectives: In the new section 237, the 1968 Housing Act provides help to assure adequate housing for families of low and moderate incomes who—because of poor credit records, irregular income or seasonal employment—are unable to meet the credit requirements of purchasing single-family homes financed by a mortgage insured under Sections 203, 220, 221, 234, or 235(j)(4). This help is to be extended to those who appear able to achieve homeownership through the counseling assistance.

2. Authorizations in the Housing Act of 1968. (a) HUD is authorized to insure mortgages under the above-mentioned programs in an amount not to exceed $15,000 with increases not to exceed $17,500 in high-cost areas.

(b) Monthly payments, in combination with local real estate taxes on the property, must total 25% of the applicant's monthly income during the year prior to his application or the average monthly income during the three years prior to his application, whichever is higher.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide, or contract with public or private organizations to provide such budget, debt management and related counseling services to those obtaining housing under Section 237.

(d) The aggregate principal balance of all mortgages insured under Section 237 and outstanding at one time may not exceed $200 million.

(e) Authorizations are made in such sums as necessary to carry out the provisions in Section 237.

3. Recommendations: (a) NHC recommends an amendment which would require families to spend 20% instead of 25% of their income for mortgages, including insurance and real estate taxes.

(b) NHC recommends an amendment which will establish a realistic cost limit for high-cost areas comparable to other provi-

XUM

sions in existing law. In high-cost areas, the Secretary should be authorized to increase by 45% the mortgage amounts of $15,000, or, in the case of families with five or more members, $17,500.

(c) NHC recommends necessary appropriation of funds to enable FHA to provide budget, debt management, and related counseling services to those obtaining housing under Section 237.

CHAPTER H. LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

1. Need: There is a tremendous unmet need for additional housing to serve the low-income group who cannot be decently housed without the aid of Federal subsidies. Many of the ill-housed in this income group are living in the slum and ghetto areas of our cities. Their unmet need for adequate housing has contributed to the crisis in our cities. Cities throughout the country have recognized the urgency of building additional public housing. Applications for additional public housing units are now being submitted to HUD at an annual rate of about 140,000 units.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: (a) The Act provided an increase in the contract authorization for annual contributions of $100 million upon its passage and an additional $150 million on July 1, 1969 and July 1, 1970. These increased authorizations would provide about 375,000 low-rent dwelling units over the 3-year period for the public housing program.

(b) The Act authorizes HUD to make grants to local housing authorities to assist in financing tenant services for tenants of public housing. Appropriations for the grants are authorized up to $15 million for fiscal year 1969, and $30 million for fiscal 1970. The tenant services include: counseling on household management, housekeeping, budgeting, money management, child care, and similar matters; advice as to resources for job training and placement, education, welfare, health, and other community services; services which are directly related to meeting tenant needs and providing a wholesome living environment; and referral to appropriate agencies when necessary for the provision of such services.

(c) High-rise public housing projects for families with children are prohibited except where HUD determines that there is no practical alternative.

(d) HUD is prohibited from prescribing limitations on the types or categories of structures or dwelling units (other than those provided in the law) which can be leased under the public housing, section 23 leasing program.

(e) An additional annual subsidy of $120 is authorized for public housing units occupied by large families or families with very low incomes. In the past a like subsidy has been limited to the elderly and displaced families.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: No appropriation has been made of the $15 million authorized for fiscal 1969 to assist in financing tenant services in public housing. No further authorizations are required in appropriation acts on the authority for annual contribution contracts.

(4) Recommendations: (a) Necessary Appropriation: NHC recommends the appropriation for the fiscal year 1969 of the $15 million authorized for grants to local housing authorities to assist in financing tenant services in public housing. We also recommend the advance appropriation of the $30 million authorized for such grants for fiscal 1970, since such an advance appropriation will allow necessary lead time for the initiation and planning of programs to provide tenant services.

(b) Increases in Legislative Authorizations: There is a need to increase the authorizations for public housing to an average annual rate of 200,000 units for a 5-year period. Initially, the annual rate should be 150,000 units, but it should be accelerated each year until it reaches 250,000 units in the fourth and fifth years. This should include public housing of the conventional type, along with turnkey housing and leasing programs.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: We should perfect the existing public housing programs in light of our experience. In the conventional public housing program, this requires the following new federal aids to meet conditions that have been too long neglected.

(1) Additional annual contributions should be provided to meet all costs except those which low income families can afford as rentals. This should include not only the debt service, but also adequate maintenance, conservation and operation of public housing, and additional services. It should also cover the cost of work required to comply with Federal anti-air-pollution legislation. The present needs and costs are higher than those which prevailed when the original annual contribution contracts were signed. If the annual contributions are not raised, local housing authorities will be forced to increase rents and income limits. This would jeopardize the continued achievement of the purpose of this program to serve low-income families. Also, it will cause the deferment of necessary maintenance and repairs, thereby jeopardizing the physical condition and long-term life of the property. The present annual contributions were computed to assure their adequacy to meet debt service, but without provision for the increased later costs of maintenance and operation; or the need for additional services. There has been criticism of conventional public housing because of its failure to provide necessary services and because of its lack of conservation through renovation. Correction of these conditions should remove the cause of this criticism and produce a better living environment in public housing.

(2) There should be an amendment authorizing the leasing of available private housing outside central cities for low-rent housing purposes. Parenthetically, state laws should likewise be amended to enable local authorities to lease such housing outside central cities.

(3) Authorization to HUD to make federal capital grants to cover the full amount of land and site development costs in excess of the reuse value of the improved land for new low-rent public housing projects which are not located in urban renewal areas. Also to make such federal grants for a write down on buildings acquired for rehabilitation.

(4) The annual subsidy formula should be revised to permit annual Contributions equal to full debt service on permanent financing (plus such additional amounts as may be necessary for the purposes described in paragraph (c)(1) hereof) with residual receipts being used either for project rehabilitation and improvement or accelerated amortization. At any time after completion of a public housing project, provision should be made for reopening development cost, if necessary (i) to make additional loans for needed rehabilitation or improvements, with annual contributions correspondingly increased; or (ii) to make grants for such other purposes as may be necessary.

(5) The present law provides for disposition of public housing to residents, when the housing is sufficiently separable for ownership by the residents. We recommend an amendment to authorize sale of an entire project to a cooperative with a membership limited to those who will reside in the project. In broadening the authorization for disposition of public housing, the amendment should require a finding that such disposition would not adversely affect the low-rent program of the public housing agency involved. The proposed NHC amendment would make it possible for residents of public housing to achieve cooperative home ownership and to produce better and more stable communities. Further, instead of requiring over-income families to move out, they should be allowed to acquire cooperative homeownership by paying a higher monthly charge which they can afford, based upon a percentage of their increased earnings. This amendment will give public housing tenants an incentive to better themselves. As to public housing tenants whose incomes have not increased, they can either be: (i) relocated in other public housing projects, with their moving expenses paid; or (ii) permitted to remain in the project as public housing tenants receiving the benefit of annual contributions so long as they qualify as low-income families. When vacancies occur, they would be filled with over-income tenants from other public housing projects who desire to become cooperative homeowners.

(6) Increase the present statutory limits on construction costs per rental room from $2,500 to $3,000 and increase the additional allowance for high-cost areas from $250 to $500; and provide that the only monetary limitation to be applied in project development shall be the statutory room cost. In other words, administrative limitations should not be imposed as is now the case. This would enable local authorities to meet the great need for large housing units to serve large families.

(7) Repeal the provision in the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which requires a 20% gap between the lowest private and the upper public housing income limits for admission. Also, permit low-income individuals—in addition to low-income families—to be eligible for occupancy in low rent public housing.

(8) Make the necessary changes to permit construction in a municipality of low-rent public housing for those of low income who will later migrate to the municipality for employment in industries located there or in service activities. This would include new towns or municipalities outside of central cities. It would facilitate dispersal of population and reduction of the concentration of low-income families in central cities.

(9) In new and existing low-rent housing projects, there is a great opportunity to provide social impetus and vitality not only to those living in the development, but also the neighborhood. The need is both for physical community facilities on a large scale and for skilled and dedicated personnel to operate them imaginatively. A program was authorized by the 1965 Act for ⅔ federal grants to assist communities in developing neighborhood facilities of all types, with preference to those in neighborhoods involving the anti-poverty program. While this affords a new opportunity to obtain needed physical facilities, the law should be amended to provide for necessary social and counseling services in such neighborhood facilities. Where funds or services cannot otherwise be obtained, local authorities should be permitted to use project funds for this purpose. Adequate funds for social and counseling services should be included in the project budget.

(10) Neither the program to lease privately-owned housing for public housing purposes, nor the rent-supplement program for those of public-housing incomes, require a local financial contribution in the form of exemption from local real estate taxes. Conventional public housing projects are therefore at a disadvantage in gaining acceptance by local governments, since these projects require tax exemption and 10% of shelter rents in lieu of taxes. To eliminate this disadvantage, NHC recommends that local housing authorities be permitted to make payments in lieu of taxes equal to full taxes. Federal annual contributions should be increased to cover the payment of a full tax equivalent.

XUM

(11) The 1965 Act repealed as to future projects the requirement of Section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 that annual contributions to a public housing agency be reduced by any amounts by which the receipts of the agency exceed its expenditures. As a matter of fairness and to meet the needs of public housing agencies, NHC recommends that this repeal should also apply to public housing projects existing at the time of the 1965 Act, as well as future projects.

(12) The Section 23 leasing program should be amended to permit longer term leases as this will encourage more private owners to participate in the program. The leasing program should be available for use in connection with any FHA-insured housing so as to help achieve economic integration. It should also be available for use in connection with FHA-insured nursing homes.

(13) NHC recommends the removal of the 10% limit on the number of units in a project which may be occupied by low income individuals as distinguished from low income families.

(d) Administrative Actions: NHC recommends and approves the following administrative actions by HUD:

(1) While we believe the proposal for private management of turnkey housing is of dubious merit, we favor trying this new approach to determine whether it will produce benefits or improve techniques in the management of public housing and the achievement of the program's social objectives. The proposal should be recognized as a pilot and experimental program to be determined by local housing authorities. Meanwhile, NHC reaffirms the wisdom of continuing the present tested management operations through local authorities. They have long experience in handling the operations and problems and social aspects of public housing management. Moreover, they are clearly motivated by the public interest in managing public housing to serve low-income families.

(2) NHC is impressed by the early evidence of widespread community acceptance of the provision in the 1965 Act authorizing the use of suitable private housing for low-income families through lease or other arrangements between local authorities and the owners and operators of private housing.

(3) We again commend HUD for its flexibility in using existing legislative tools to develop a program which will enable low-income families to live in the same projects as families of moderate incomes instead of isolating families of each income group. Under this program, the low-income family can continue in occupancy when its income increases, but would no longer receive public housing subsidies; instead, it would get the benefit of a below-market interest rate. When the family becomes self-supporting, it would pay the full market rate of interest.

(4) The special subsidy for housing elderly and displaced persons is now available only in the event of a deficit operation. NHC recommends that this subsidy be made available generally in an amount equal to the difference between the rent paid per month and the average cost of operation.

(5) NHC recommends that the documentation required to qualify initially for the leasing program eliminate the unnecessary requirement for development of detailed hypothetical data as to the extent of the potential supply of units.

(6) The 1958 Housing Act emphasizes the importance of good public housing design to the low-income family and to the local community. The Nation is concerned not only with the quantity of new public housing, but also with its quality. We urge HUD to take all actions necessary to achieve higher design standards for public housing developments.

(7) NHC recommends necessary adjustments in public housing income limits in those localities which have failed to keep pace with the increases in costs and incomes; also, there should be a recognition of the larger income which larger families require. Thus, there is no justification for a public housing limit for a larger family which would make a welfare recipient ineligible for occupancy.

(8) NHC recommends administrative action by HUD to pay the maximum amount of annual contributions allowed by statute in order to help toward meeting the costs and expenses on a public housing project which are not defrayed from rentals paid by low income families in amounts which they can afford. While this administrative action will alleviate the critical needs of local housing authorities it is not adequate; so, we have recommended an increase in the present statutory ceilings on annual contributions.

(9) NHC recommends a revision in the letters of intent used by the Housing Assistance Administration in its turnkey housing program which would make it mandatory for housing authorities to purchase the land and plans from the developer if—for any reason—the local housing authority and the developer fail to execute a contract to purchase.

CHAPTER I. THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

1. Objectives: The Rent Supplement Program is an innovative approach to low income housing. It utilizes the free enterprise system and has been strongly endorsed by the home-building, real estate, and insurance industries. It provides incentives for people to escape from poverty and for the building of modest but decent housing for those who need it most.

2. Authorization in the Housing Act of 1968: The Act makes all previous authorizations for rent supplement contracts aggregating $150 million available for contract prior to July 1, 1969, but only to the extent that these contract authorizations are contained in appropriation acts. The Act provides for an additional $40 million in contract authority for rent supplements in fiscal year 1970 and an additional $100 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1971. The 1968 Housing Act provides that state aided projects are eligible for rent supplements if the projects are approved for such assistance prior to completion of construction or rehabilitation.

3. Authorization in Appropriation Acts: Of the $150 million authorized for rent supplement contracts prior to July 1, 1969, only $72 million of the contract authority has been embodied in appropriation acts. As yet, there are no appropriation authorizations covering the increased rent supplement contracts authorized for fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorization in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends that appropriation acts include the additional rent-supplement contract authorizations in the 1968 Act as follows:

(1) The $78 million in rent-supplement contract authority which has not been included in appropriation acts and are authorized by the 1968 law for use prior to July 1, 1969.

(2) The $40 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1970, and the $100 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1971.

In making these recommendations we again urge the need for advance appropriations for each succeeding fiscal year, besides the current one, to allow more lead time for the planning and initiation of rent supplement programs. Accordingly, besides the authorization of rent-supplement contracts for fiscal year 1970, the next appropriation act should include rent-supplement contract authority for fiscal year 1971.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations. NHC recommends increasing the legislative authorizations for rent-supplement contracts to achieve an average annual rate of 100,000 dwelling units for a five year period. Initially the annual rate should be 75,000 dwelling units but it should be accelerated each year until it reaches 125,000 units in the fourth and fifth years.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments. NHC makes the following recommendations for other legislative amendments:

(1) The rent supplement legislation imposes too great a burden on low income families by requiring them to pay rents equal to 25% of their annual incomes since rent supplements will pay only the difference between such a rental payment and the fair market rental. To eliminate this hardship, NHC recommends that this rent paying requirement be reduced to 20% of family income. A similar recommendation has been made elsewhere in these resolutions relating to the requirement that too high a percentage of family income be spent for housing under the interest supplement programs of Sections 235 and 236.

(2) Counseling and social services should be made available to residents of housing aided by rent supplements. Such services should be allowable housing costs in computing rent supplement payments.

(3) Instead of being allowed to use only 10% of rent supplement funds in the program involving a below-market-interest rate, NHC recommends that half of the rent supplement funds be authorized for use in such projects. This would make it possible to combine in one project (a) rent supplements for low income families and (b) below-market interest financing for moderate income families. In the interest supplement program under Section 236 where mortgages will bear a market rate of interest, it will be possible to combine occupancy by low income families receiving rent supplements with moderate income families receiving interest supplements. These programs should be encouraged and expanded to help achieve the objective of economic integration.

(4) The present law limits rent supplements to lower income families who are living in substandard housing. NHC recommends that the law be amended to include overcrowded conditions as a substandard housing condition; and to permit any low-income family to be eligible for housing aided by rent supplements so long as the family qualifies as to low income, even though the family does not live in physically substandard housing. This would meet the needs of newly-formed families and those who are spending too much of their low income for housing.

(5) There should be a repeal of the requirement for a workable program or local government approval before rent supplements can be used in a locality.

(6) Local housing authorities should be eligible as sponsors under the rent supplement program; also, we make the same recommendation concerning the Section 221(d)(3)-below-market-interest-rate program and the Section 236-interest-assistance program.

(7) NHC urges the establishment of an additional rent supplement program for non-profit mortgagors who own buildings which are not financed under Section 221(d)(3). When the buildings meet code standards—or are rehabilitated to meet such standards—rent supplements should be available so that the housing can serve low-income families. Present rent supplement requirements for rehabilitation are often unworkable because they cost too much. Rehabilitation to meet code requirements should be acceptable. This will stimulate rehabilitation and provide standard housing quickly and reasonable for many low and moderate income families.

(8) The standards under the rent supplement program should be ungraded to produce better-designed housing which will more adequately meet the needs of families, with attention to their comfort and convenience. The limit of one-bathroom-per-dwelling unit should be removed, as this denies

XUM

adequate sanitary facilities for larger families.

5. Recommendations for Administrative Actions: (a) Construction cost limitations were initially established in the rent supplement program which were unworkable in many high cost cities that faced the greatest need for this program. Last year NHC recommended that there be sufficient increases in these cost limitations to make it possible to build rent supplement projects within these cities. FHA has approved some increases in these cost limits. If these increases prove insufficient, NHC recommends further increases in the cost limitations to keep pace with the increases in construction costs. Only through adequate construction cost allowances can the rent supplement program fulfill its purpose of serving low-income families in these cities, near the places of employment and public transportation.

(b) FHA has established lower limits as to the amount of rent supplements available for families in a project than the amount permitted by the statute. NHC recommends the repeal of these lower administrative limits. FHA should be prepared in appropriate cases to contract to pay the full amount of rent supplements on a project up to the statutory ceiling. Only in this way can the needs of many low income families be met, particularly in high cost areas.

CHAPTER J. HOUSING FOR FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND OTHERS WITH VERY LOW INCOMES; ALSO, CODE ENFORCEMENT

1. Four million American families are receiving all or part of their income from public assistance programs. Many of these families are ill-housed, primarily because welfare grants in most cities are inadequate to pay the cost of standard housing. NHC urges the enactment of legislation which would establish and enforce minimum standards for housing occupied by recipients of public assistance. In addition, such legislation should require that public-assistance shelter allowances cover the full charge for decent housing and that the Federal Government bear the entire additional cost above the present inadequate allowances for shelter. Such shelter allowances should be made in a manner which will encourage rather than discourage home ownership and the security which it should afford.

2. NHC recommends Federal grants to housing authorities or other public agencies—as described elsewhere in these Resolutions—to bring housing up to minimum code standards and to make it available for families of low income, including those who are receiving public assistance.

3. NHC urges an acceleration of concentrated code enforcement in deteriorating areas, together with necessary public improvements to halt their decline. The costs of code enforcement programs—both for determining Federal grants and local grant-in-aid credits—should include all costs incurred for repair or installation of streets, sidewalks, streetlighting, trees, parks, open areas, recreational facilities, and other necessary improvements.

CHAPTER K. REHABILITATION OF HOUSING

1. Need: NHC again reaffirms the importance of saving existing neighborhoods through rehabilitation and other conservation measures. It is sound policy to improve our present housing supply and conserve neighborhoods, rather than allow them to deteriorate until they require greater costs in demolition and reconstruction.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: (a) *Dwellings Eligible for Rehabilitation Grants and Loans*. The Act broadened the program of rehabilitation loans under Section 312 for repairs and improvements of dwellings. Instead of limiting the program to dwellings located in urban renewal and code enforcement areas, owners and tenants of dwellings are eligible for loans if the dwelling is located in an area certified by the local governing body as containing a substantial number of structures in need of rehabilitation and:

(1) If the locality has a workable program; and

(2) If the area is definitely planned for rehabilitation or code enforcement within a reasonable time, and the repairs to be assisted are consistent with the plan for rehabilitation or code enforcement.

The Act authorizes rehabilitation grants under Section 115 to low income homeowners whose properties are located in an area of the character described above, instead of limiting such grants to dwellings in urban renewal and code enforcement areas. The Act also authorizes the Secretary of HUD to make rehabilitation grants and loans to low income homeowners whose property has been determined to be uninsurable because of physical hazards. Such grants or loans may be made only to rehabilitate the property to the extent necessary to make it insurable under a statewide plan.

(b) Increase in Rehabilitation Loan Authorizations: The new Act increases the amount authorized to be appropriated for rehabilitation loans. The increase for each fiscal year is from $100 million to $150 million; also, the program is extended to June 30, 1973. The Act limits eligibility for residential rehabilitation loans to persons whose annual income meets the locally applicable income limits for the Section 221(d)(3) below-market-interest-rate program.

(c) Increase in Rehabilitation Grants: The Housing Act of 1968 increases the limit on the amount of rehabilitation grant to a low income homeowner from $1,500 to $3,000.

(d) Repeal of Urban Renewal Limit on Acquisition and Rehabilitation: The Act removes the previous limits on the acquisition and rehabilitation of residential properties by local renewal agencies. Under prior law, such agencies could acquire and rehabilitate for demonstration purposes no more than 100 units or 5% of the total residential units suitable for rehabilitation in an urban renewal area, whichever was the lesser. This limit has been repealed.

3. Recommendations: To provide additional tools that are needed to achieve substantial progress through rehabilitation, NHC recommends the following:

(a) Section 312 should be amended to increase to $500 million the annual appropriations in each fiscal year to carry out the program. Section 312 should broaden the category of eligible borrowers to include public bodies, cooperatives, nonprofit corporations and limited dividend companies in addition to owners or tenants who are now eligible.

(b) With respect to residential rehabilitation loans under Section 312, NHC recommends that the 221(d)(3) income limits should not be applicable to persons who will occupy the rehabilitated housing who have previously been residents of the neighborhood where the dwellings are located.

(c) While the 1968 Housing Act increased to $3,000 the federal rehabilitation grants to eligible occupants who own their own homes in the rehabilitation neighborhood, NHC recommends an increase to $5,000.

(d) Where state or local governments allow tax abatement to encourage rehabilitation, there should be an annual Federal grant to reimburse them for the tax losses.

(e) Relocation assistance and payments should be available to anyone displaced as a result of a rehabilitation program.

(f) More realistic financing should be made available under FHA programs, particularly to serve those people by low and moderate incomes. This requires more practical and workable financing terms and allowances as follows:

(1) The formulas for determining mortgage amounts must recognize the actual cost of acquiring and rehabilitating properties that are structurally sound.

(2) There should be a contingency allowance built into the mortgage financing, which has been recently done by FHA. In rehabilitation, the contractor is often not aware of potential problems until he opens the walls and ascertains actual conditions.

(3) The FHA requirements for rehabilitation should not require a specified percentage of mortgage proceeds to be used for rehabilitation, so long as property is brought up to code standards.

(4) In projects where the property is owned or controlled by the proposed mortgagor, cost savings may be achieved by stripping down the building and tearing out the interior walls before making estimates or getting bids, for the rehabilitation work. In such cases, FHA should recognize the cost of gutting the building since this increases the value of the property for rehabilitation because conditions are known and unforeseen contingencies are minimized.

(5) To reduce the monthly charges to the level which moderate-income families can afford, it is necessary to eliminate present requirements for short amortization periods on rehabilitation projects. Where the rehabilitation project property is in a central city, there is likely to be an increment in land value from which to repay the loan, even though demolition occurs well in advance of the remaining estimated life of the improvements. Thus, the property may later become part of a model city neighborhood or urban redevelopment area. At present, the statute limits the mortgages to a maturity not exceeding three-quarters of the remaining economic life of the building improvements. This limitation should be repealed. FHA should be authorized to permit up to 40-year maturities where appropriate.

(g) There should be Federal grants to a local agency for a total coordinated plan for rehabilitation of the neighborhood and for carrying out the rehabilitation program contemplated by the plan. The local agency should enlist the participation of cooperative and nonprofit organizations and local housing authorities. The local agency would also act on behalf of eligible homeowners in the area in obtaining:

(1) Rehabilitation grants, interest supplements or rent supplements for them;

(2) Below-market-interest-rate loans or market-interest-rate loans for their rehabilitation work; and

(3) Contracts to perform the rehabilitation work, subject to supervision by the local agency.

CHAPTER L. HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

1. Authorization in 1968 Housing Act: The 1968 Housing Act does not provide for any increase in the authorization in the 202 program of direct loans at 3% interest to provide housing for the elderly. Instead, the new 236 program of interest assistance is intended to make FHA-insured financing available for this program. There will be interest assistance to reduce monthly housing payments to the level achievable with an interest rate of 1% and without any FHA mortgage insurance premium. Under 236, projects can now be undertaken which will provide housing exclusively for the elderly. Such projects may include related facilities, such as dining, work, recreation and health facilities. The Act authorizes the refinancing of certain 202 projects in order to achieve the lower monthly charges resulting from refinancing with interest assistance.

2. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: The contract authority in appropriation acts for 236 will now be utilized to finance housing for the elderly. For a description of the 236 authorizations in appropriation acts, see the section hereof which covers that program.

3. Recommendations: (a) NHC urges that an average of 30,000 housing units for the elderly be provided each year for the next 5 years. Our recommendations relating to the 236 program include the amounts needed for this program.

(b) NHC recommends against phasing out the 202 program because it has not been demonstrated that the 236 program will fully and adequately meet the housing needs of the elderly. We anticipate a continuing need for the 202 program to avoid creating another gap and area of unmet need due to the lower income limits in the 236 program and its other restrictions.

(c) NHC also recommends that the authorizations under 202 and 236 should be available to acquire existing housing for the elderly, including projects developed with FHA insurance under Section 231.

4. Other Legislative Amendments: There is a need for special programs to provide ferderal grants for the following purposes in housing for the elderly:

(a) to assist in training professional personnel to manage elderly housing projects; and

(b) to provide working capital and seed capital to states and localities and to national nonprofit organizations such as church groups, labor unions, fraternal and cooperative-servicing organizations.

5. Recommendations for Administrative Action: (a) The 202 and 236 cost limits should permit housing to be built within the cities where they are needed to serve the elderly. In view of high land costs, this should include high-rise buildings. The programs should include rehabilitation as well as new construction. Tax abatement should not be required since it is often unavailable because of restrictions in state and local laws. Moreover, many cities are facing problems of inadequate tax revenues and are reluctant to grant tax abatements. Section 202 and 236 housing for the elderly should be permitted to pay full taxes, as is permitted in leasing privately-owned housing for public housing purposes and in the rent supplement program. Nursing facilities should be eligible for financing in housing for the elderly.

(b) NHC urges that housing for the elderly be included in all planning under the model cities program.

(c) In accordance with the statutory authority for loans equal to the total development costs, HUD should not require in the 202 or 236 programs that an approved sponsor must make an investment to cover the cost of preliminary expenses, facilities, furnishings, equipment and working capital. Such costs should be included in the loan. It should not be necessary for a nonprofit sponsor to make a monetary contribution. Its contribution consists of its devotion of time, ingenuity, and energy in initiating, and developing projects—all without compensation and motivated by public service.

CHAPTER M. FINANCING NURSING HOMES AND FACILITIES FOR GROUP MEDICAL PRACTICE

1. Objectives: NHC again recognizes that a continuing desperate need exists for hundreds of thousands of nursing home beds, especially among the low-income elderly. This need has increased by demands generated through Medicare. Since local housing authorities have long experience in building low-rent housing for the elderly, they are well qualified to develop nursing homes for low-income persons. They should be authorized to coordinate programs of housing and nursing homes facilities for the low-income group. This can be done effectively by amending the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, to authorize annual contribution contracts with local housing authorities for nursing home facilities.

2. Authorization in 1968 Housing Act: The 1968 Housing Act amends Section 232 of the National Housing Act to permit the cost of major items of equipment used in the operating of a nursing home to be included in the FHA-insured mortgage; also, to permit supplementary loans for the installation of such equipment in nursing homes previously constructed.

3. Recommendations: (a) NHC recommends that Section 202 and the new Section 236 be amended to permit the inclusion of nursing facilities in housing projects for the elderly. In this way, elderly persons who need nursing facilities would not have to leave the community in which they are living. NHC further recommends that financing be available to nonprofit sponsors under Sections 202 and 236 which will cover the full cost of nursing homes; also that such projects should get the benefit of below market interest rates or subsidies which would reduce the interest rate to 1%.

(b) The 1966 Act included a program of FHA insurance for facilities used for group medical practice. NHC reaffirms its support of this program and urges its use to encourage the development of nonprofit cooperatives whose members will obtain the benefits of bonafide group medical practice at a reasonable cost. The program should operate in both urban and rural areas.

(c) NHC continues to recommend that mortgage amortization be permitted to commence after completion of construction of group practice facilities rather than at the time the mortgage is executed.

(d) NHC continues to support the basic concept of the prior Patman Bill, H.R. 10188, which would remove obstacles that impede the broader development of group health plans and which would make financing available for group health programs providing hospitalization, out-patient and preventive care.

CHAPTER N. COLLEGE HOUSING

1. Objective: Need for College Housing: Our Nation has increasingly recognized its dependence upon higher education for its security, welfare, and continued prosperity. To meet the demands made by the expanding number of students and by required increases in faculties, additional housing must be provided for students and faculty. Congress recognized the appropriateness of meeting these needs for college housing nearly twenty years ago. In the Housing Act of 1950, it initiated low-interest loans for housing and educational facilities for students and faculties. Since 1961 there have been authorizations for loan increases at the rate of $300 million each year. Such increases are wholly inadequate to meet current needs. The study conducted under the auspices of the American Council on Education has indicated that approximately $1.5 billion per year will be needed for college housing for the next ten years. Recognizing that a portion of this amount may be derived from non-federal sources, the Council recommended that Congress authorize a minimum of $1 billion a year for the next ten years in the form of long-term, low interest loans for the construction of housing facilities.

2. Authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act: Instead of expanding the direct loan program for college housing, the Act contemplates financing in the private market, but it authorizes financial assistance to colleges by means of annual debt service grants. The new grant program is to be used to reduce the borrower's annual debt service payments on private market loans to the average annual debt service that would have been required if the loan were based on the rate charged on loans under the direct loan program. Annual grants can be made over a fixed period up to 40 years. The total amount of annual grant contracts is subject to approval in the appropriation acts. The total amount cannot exceed $10 million, with this limit increased by $10 million on July 1, 1969. The new grant program is made available for loans involving the purchase of existing properties which are in need of little or no rehabilitation.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: There was an authorization of $3 million of annual grant contracts for college housing instead of the $10 million authorized in the 1968 Housing Act.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends that the authorized balance of $7 million of annual grant contracts be included in the next appropriation act, together with an advance authorization of $10 million in annual grant contracts for fiscal 1970 to give colleges more lead time for their planning and development of college housing programs.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: NHC recommends a 5-year authorization of contracts for annual debt service grants which would be sufficient for $1 billion of private financing annually for college housing.

CHAPTER O. COOPERATIVE HOUSING

1. In urban areas where multifamily housing predominates, cooperatives provide an important means of achieving howeownership. This produces better communities where the control and responsibility rests with the people who have a stake and pride in their own housing development.

2. NHC approves the use of the 221(d)(3) interest assistance and rent supplement programs in cooperatives. They will make it possible to reach lower income groups because of the economic savings and advantages of cooperatives. These are illustrated by the following savings:

(a) Lower closing costs with one closing on an entire project of many dwellings, rather than one for each dwelling.

(b) Lower transfer costs since it is unnecessary on a cooperative sale to incur the costs of title examinations and transfers, brokers' fees, refinancing and other charges.

(c) Lower construction costs which cooperatives have achieved through the economies of large scale building when many housing units are presold before construction starts.

The cooperative programs has been successful for low and moderate income families assisted under Section 221(d)(3) where financing is provided at a 3% interest rate. Even though these projects serve lower income families, there have been no failures or defaults among the consumer cooperatives in this program. NHC fully concurs in the Congressional mandates to encourage such cooperative ownership.

3. The need and demand for cooperative housing at a below-market interest rate greatly exceeds the amount of funds available. The below-market program of 221(d)(3) has demonstrated its success in meeting the housing needs of lower income families who cannot be served by private enterprise without Federal assistance. Cooperative housing represents over one-fourth of the accumulated backlog of projects awaiting funds under the 221(d)(3) program of below-market interest rates. This backlog of need should be met by the release of funds already available and increased authorizations recommended for the 221(d)(3), 235 and 236 programs.

4. We recommend that FHA recognize the presently uncompensated costs to Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate cooperative projects resulting from the requirement of recertifying incomes. The cooperative should be reimbursed by retaining the costs of recertifications from "over-income" surcharges that are ultimately returned to HUD. In addition, FHA should allow portions of the "over-income" surcharges to be used by the cooperative for improvements that FHA may consider advisable and justifiable during the life of the project.

5. Eleven years ago Congress established a revolving fund of $225 million—which is now administered by GNMA—for the purchase of cooperative mortgages insured by FHA under Section 213. This financing has made it possible for middle-income consumers to join together to help themselves get good housing through their cooperatives.

While there have been extensive mortgage purchases from the cooperative revolving fund, much of the money has been returned, so it now has an uncommitted balance of about $100 million. The Administration has impounded this fund and no further GNMA commitments can now be issued. NHC strongly recommends that the balance in the cooperative revolving fund be made immediately available for the purchase of mortgages on cooperative projects. The 213 program meets an important need among those middle-income families and individuals who can only afford the lower monthly charges achievable through cooperative economies and financing.

6. NHC supports the proposition that FHA should carry out the Congressional intent that Section 213 cooperatives be allowed appropriate reduction in mortgage insurance premiums in recognition of the lower loss rates of these cooperatives.

7. As recommended elsewhere in these Resolutions and subject to the conditions stated therein, NHC urges the disposition of public housing and Federally-owned housing to cooperatives whose members will reside in such housing and enjoy the benefits of mutual ownership.

8. We urge HUD and its contituent agencies to use fully all available legislative tools under existing programs to achieve the values and objectives of cooperative homeownership by people with low or moderate incomes. This should include the following:

(a) Encouragement of cooperative housing projects in all parts of the country under all available programs. NHC commends FHA for the issuance of a circular to impress upon all Insuring Offices that it is the policy of HUD to encourage homeownership through the cooperative approach and to offer all possible assistance in the development of cooperative housing projects. However, there is a need for FHA to assure that its Insuring Offices observe this policy in recognition of the importance of cooperative homeownership.

(b) In the disposition of housing acquired by HUD and its constituent agencies, a priority should be afforded to the residents so they will have the opportunity to acquire the properties through their cooperative. An FHA circular advised Insuring Offices that many acquired multifamily housing projects are particularly suitable for cooperatives and that negotiated sales would be made. This was successfully done in a pilot case.

(c) In the disposition of property by urban renewal agencies, there should be a recognition in the disposition plan that it is important to achieve cooperative ownership of multifamily housing in urban renewal areas. Accordingly, part of these areas should be considered for the development of housing to be so owned by the people. In making a disposition for this purpose, there should be a disposition condition that those who acquire the property agree to develop it for housing that will involve cooperative ownership.

(d) The Special Assistant for Cooperative Housing at FHA should be provided with adequate staff and funds to undertake a broad program for the encouragement and development of cooperative housing including necessary training of cooperative leaders and managers.

CHAPTER P. RURAL HOUSING, RENEWAL AND PLANNING FOR MULTI-COUNTY AREAS

1. Objectives: There is increasing national concern to make rural America more attractive and livable for all. To achieve this goal, programs must be initiated to encourage the young and better educated to continue living in rural America. Programs which provide the same kinds of financial assistance as are provided for urban housing and urban renewal should be available to rural areas for rural housing and rural renewal. We endorse those provisions of the 1968 Housing Act which make certain housing assistance equally available to rural areas, but other legislation is required as described below.

2. Authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act: Under new Sections 235 and 236, the Secretary was authorized to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture a reasonable portion of the total authority to contract to make periodic interest reduction payments for use in rural areas and small towns. By agreement, the Secretary of Agriculture was delegated $2 million in contract authority under Section 235(k). However, projects under Section 236 will be processed by FHA.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: Elsewhere we have described the authorizations of interest assistance contracts under Sections 235 and 236 which are now available for housing in rural areas. In addition, the rural housing program of the Department of Agriculture was authorized to maintain a $5 million program of 3%, 50-year loans.

4. Recommendations: (a) Legislative Amendments Relating to Rural Housing: NHC recommends the following legislation relating to rural housing programs:

(1) The 3%, 50-year loan program to supplement the new authority granted under the 1968 Housing Act should not only be continued but increased and the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to contract to maintain the interest rate throughout the duration of the loan. Also, the Secretary should be granted the power to reduce the interest rates to as low as 1% under this program.

(2) Repeal of the provision, in Section 515(b) and termination of the administrative practice under Section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, limiting mortgage size to $300,000 on multifamily rental or cooperative projects; and enactment of provisions permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to contract at the outset to finance all stages of a multifamily housing project.

(3) An increase of the mortgage term to 50 years for rural housing loans under Section 515(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

(4) Enactment of legislation creating the position of Special Assistant for Cooperative Housing in the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture (a similar position to that created in the Housing Amendments of 1955 for urban cooperative housing) with similar powers, duties and adequate staff and budget; and the additional responsibility of mobilizing the support of rural area cooperatives of all types for the creation and continued successful operation of rural cooperative housing projects.

(5) Amendments to make applicable to all rural areas provisions similar to those of Title VI of the 1968 Housing Act which would: (i) authorize HUD to make planning grants to assist district planning agencies for rural and other non-metropolitan areas; (ii) authorize grants of $20 million for fiscal 1969; and (iii) give the Secretary of Agriculture certain functions as to planning grants for districts, including a requirement that he be consulted before any such grant is made.

(6) Give the Secretary of HUD authority to waive rules and regulations of HUD programs so small cities and towns can get an equitable share of HUD programs.

(7) An amendment to provide that only the new farm home and the immediate lot—not exceeding one acre—need be encumbered in home mortgages under the Farmers Home Administration ("FmHA").

(8) Expand the low-interest loan program under the Aiken-Poage Water and Sewer Act to include predominantly rural areas and to cover community facilities such as police and fire facilities, street lighting and community centers.

(9) Provide Farmers Home Administration the $25-million requested in the Budget for fiscal 1970 to employ an additional 2,000 employees so that it can carry out its greatly expanded responsibilities for housing, sewer and water, and economic development in rural areas.

(10) Eliminate ceiling of $100-million in Section 517(c) of Housing Act of 1949 on amount of loans Secretary of Agriculture can hold at any one time in Rural Housing Insurance Fund, which, at present, has the effect of limiting Farmers Home Administration insured housing loans to $500-million a year since the fund as a practical matter can only be revolved about five times a year. This provides for only about 50,000 new and rehabilitated housing units a year—far below the need in rural areas where there are more than four million substandard housing units.

(11) Delete the restriction in Section 517(h) of the Housing Act of 1949, which prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from borrowing from the Secretary of the Treasury for additional capital for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund. This would enable Farmers Home Administration realistically to meet the tremendous needs of low and moderate income people for housing credit, which generally is not being met by any other source—government or private—in communities under 5,500 population.

(12) Add a provision to Title X of the Housing Act of 1968 to permit Farmers Home Administration to make loans to public and private non-profit community corporations for the acquisition and development of land as building sites to be subdivided and sold to low and moderate income families or cooperatives who are eligible under Section 235 or 236 of the National Housing Act or Title V, Sections 501 and 521 of the Housing Act of 1949. This provision would supply two important ingredients now missing in the FmHA housing program; namely, involvement of local leadership, and development of housing on a larger scale.

(b) Recommendations for Administrative Actions:

(1) Besides Congressional actions, there is a need for more effective executive actions and better coordination of Agriculture and HUD, and for consultation with industry and public interest groups. Such actions should be taken to assure that federal housing, community facility and planning aids for rural areas are equivalent to those available in cities and metropolitan areas.

(2) NHC recommends and urges the Secretary of Agriculture to stimulate and encourage programs under new and existing cooperative housing provisions to alleviate the housing ills in rural areas.

(3) NHC urges the Federal Housing Administration and the Farmers Home Administration to work out a plan for making housing credit available in small towns that are too large for FmHA to service (over 5,500), but not practical for FHA to service because of remoteness or other reasons. A serious credit shortage exists in many of these areas.

CHAPTER Q. NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP FOUNDATION; NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING; NATIONAL HOUSING PARTNERSHIP; AND ASSISTANCE TO NON-PROFIT SPONSORS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING

I. National Homeownership Foundation

1. Objectives: The 1968 Housing Act creates the National Homeownership Foundation to carry out a continuing program of encouraging private and public organizations to provide increased homeownership and housing opportunities in urban and rural areas for lower income families.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: The Act authorizes the Foundation to make grants and loans (not otherwise available from Federal sources) to such organizations to help defray organizational and administrative expenses, necessary preconstruction costs, and the cost of counseling or similar services to lower income families for whom

XUM

housing is being provided The Foundation can also provide technical assistance to the organizations. The Foundation is to be administered by an 18-member Board of Directors. Fifteen members are to be appointed by the President. The Secretary of HUD, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of OEO are the other three members. The board will appoint an executive director as its executive officer.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: Appropriations up to $10 million are authorized. The Foundation can also use donated funds. $250,000 was requested in Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 1969. Nothing was appropriated.

4. Recommendations: NHC urges that the Foundation be fully funded so that the Foundation can begin its vital assignment.

II. National Advisory Commission on Low-Income Housing

1. Objectives: The 1968 Housing Act establishes a National Advisory Commission on Low-Income Housing to undertake a comprehensive study and investigate the resources and capabilities in the public and private sectors of the economy which may be used to fulfill more completely the objectives of the national goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family".

2. Assignments: The Act directs the Commission to submit to the President and the Congress an interim report with respect to its findings and recommedations not later than July 1, 1969, and a final report not later than July 1, 1970.

III. National housing partnerships

1. Objectives: The 1968 Housing Act creates a national housing partnership for the purpose of securing the participation of private investors in programs and projects to provide housing for low and moderate income families. Initially, a federally chartered, privately funded corporation will be organized under the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. The corporation in turn will organize the National partnership under the D.C. Uniform Limited Partnership Act. The corporation in turn will organize the National partnership under the D.C. Uniform Limited Partnership Act. The corporation will serve as the general partner and managing agent of the National partnership and each of its stockholders can be a limited partner. It will provide the staff and expertise for the Partnership in organizing and planning project undertakings in which the partnership has an interest, and receive a fee for such services.

2. Authority: Both the corporation and the National partnership are authorized to engage in a broad range of activities appropriate to the provision of housing and related facilities primarily for low or moderate income families, with or without the use of Federal programs, and may enter into and participate in all forms of partnerships and associations. The National partnership is expected to form partnership ventures with local investors for the purpose of building low and moderate income housing projects throughout the nation. Normally, it will be a limited partner in such undertakings, with an interest of not more than 25% of the aggregate initial equity investment for the project. The President has appointed the incorporators of the corporation and will appoint 3 of the 15 members of the board of directors. The incorporators will serve as the initial board of directors and arrange for the initial offering of shares of stock in the corporation and interests in the National partnership. The President is authorized to create additional partnerships when he determines it to be in the national interest. National banks are authorized to invest in a corporation and other entities formed under this title.

3. Recommendations: NHC recommends that the following actions be taken:

(a) FHA should issue necessary directives and procedures to implement the provisions of Section 236(j)(3) of the 1968 Housing Act relating to the sale of housing projects by limited distribution mortgagors to cooperatives or other non-profit corporations. It is important that this be done promptly in order to encourage participation by private investors in the National Housing Partnership.

(b) Actions should be taken to encourage widespread participation and private investment in the National Housing Partnership. This includes appropriate measures to provide contemplated tax incentives for undertaking housing developments to serve low and moderate income persons.

IV. Assistance to nonprofit sponsors of low- and moderate-income housing

1. Objectives: The 1968 Housing Act has provisions to assist nonprofit sponsors of low and moderate income housing.

2. Authorization in the 1968 Housing Act: (a) The Secretary of HUD is authorized to provide technical assistance with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, and operation of low and moderate income housing to nonprofit organizations.

(b) The Secretary can also make 80-percent, interest-free loans to non-profit sponsors of such housing to cover certain preconstruction costs under Federally-assisted programs.

(c) The Low and Moderate Income Sponsor Fund is established for the purpose of making the loans with an authorization of appropriations of $7.5 million for fiscal year 1969 and $10 million for fiscal year 1970. The fund will be a revolving fund and repayments of loans will be deposited in the Fund.

3. Authorization in Appropriation Acts: $500,000 was appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal 1969.

4. Recommendations. NHC urges that the full authorization of $7.5 million be appropriated for fiscal 1969 and at the same time the full authorization of $10 million be appropriated for fiscal 1970.

CHAPTER R. MODEL CITIES

1. Objectives: NHC reaffirms its endorsement of the model cities program to launch local programs for the upgrading of entire neighborhoods. This is done through the concentrated and coordinated use of all available Federal aids and local private and governmental resources, including the supplementary Federal grants for such model cities. We urge acceleration in the disbursement and release of funds under the present program.

2. Authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act: The Housing Act of 1968 provides for (a) an increased authorization of $1 billion for the fiscal year 1970 for supplemental grants and (b) $12 million for fiscal year 1969 for grants to plan model cities programs. Any amounts authorized, but not appropriated, may be used for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1971.

3. Authorizations in Appropriations Acts: (a) Of the $400 million authorized for supplemental grants to model cities for fiscal year 1968, $200 million was appropriated. For fiscal year 1969, there was an authorization of $500 million for supplemental grants but the amount appropriated was $312.5 million. No appropriation has been made of the additional $1 billion for fiscal year 1970 for supplemental grants.

(b) Of the $12 million authorized for fiscal year 1967 for grants to plan model cities programs, there was an appropriation of $11 million. For fiscal year 1968, there was an appropriation of the $12 million which was authorized for such planning grants. No appropriation has been made of the $12 million of planning grants for fiscal year 1969.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Appropriations: NHC urges that the authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act be fully funded, including: (1) the $1 billion of additional funds for supplemental grants during fiscal year 1970, together with the $387.5 million authorized for previous fiscal years but not appropriated; and (2) the $12 million of model cities planning funds for fiscal year 1969, together with the $1 million previously authorized but not appropriated.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: NHC recommends a legislative increase in the appropriations for the model cities program for a 5-year period as follows: (1) additional supplemental grants at the rate of $1 billion a year; and (2) additional model cities planning funds at the rate of $50 million a year. We further recommend that there be advance appropriations for each fiscal year, besides the current one, to give cities more lead time for their planning and development of model city programs. While we are pleased to note the significant increase in cities now participating in the model cities program, we urge that the foregoing recommendation be adopted to enable participation by all qualified cites and counties which apply; also, to enable participating cities and counties to obtain the additional funds which they require.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: The model cities program cannot achieve its goals and provide necessary housing unless there are increased authorizations and programs—as recommended elsewhere in these Resolutions—as follows:

(1) To expand urban renewal activities.

(2) To increase the supply of adequate low- and moderate income housing in the model cities. Such housing should not be limited to what will be developed in the model neighborhood area or the city itself. New housing and relating community facilities should be developed extensively on vacant land or other sites not involving substantial residential displacement.

(3) To increase Federal grant funds for water, sewer, and neighborhood facilities, and for open-space and urban beautification.

(4) To increase Federal grant funds for all other programs involved in model city areas, including those relating to health, education, training, welfare, mass transportation, training and other purposes relating to urban affairs; also, to specifically designate such categorical funds for these purposes which would be available for model cities.

(d) *Other Recommendations*. To achieve the objectives of this program, full coordination is required between HUD—and all of its participating constituents—and all of the other Departments of the Federal Government who participate in the model cities program; also between the Federal Government and local governments. Each must effectively use all of its powers and available funds in doing its share of the total job. NHC recommends Presidential action and direction to assure that all participating Departments of the Federal Government fulfill their responsibilities under the programs for model cities and urban affairs, including (i) effective coordination and cooperation between them and (ii) the priority handling of applications for assistance filed with the various Federal Departments by model cities.

NHC recommends the removal of the present limitation that a model cities program cannot cover more than 10% of the area of the city. NHC also recommends the appropriation of the additional funds required for this enlarged program.

CHAPTER S. URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

1. Objectives: Urban renewal is a major instrument of reform which deals primarily with the physical side of removing blight. Its objective is to eliminate slum, blighted or deteriorating areas and provide for the use and disposition of land in accordance

XUM

with comprehensive urban renewal plans that meet community needs. Nearly 900 cities are reclaiming such blighted areas for redevelopment or rehabilitation under urban renewal programs. The blacklog of urban-renewal-grant applications was in excess of $1.75 billion at the end of the last fiscal year, despite HUD actions to discourage applications by the imposition of more stringent requirements concerning program objectives and priority criteria. Each year about 60 additional communities are joining in the participation of the urban renewal program, after adopting workable programs for community improvement. There is a tremendous need for increased urban renewal authorizations to meet the requests of cities who are seeking to stop the insidious blight which is overwhelming their older neighborhoods.

2. Authorizations and Limitations in the 1968 Housing Act: (a) An additional $1.4 billion of urban renewal grants was authorized by the Act for fiscal year 1970. In addition, there was an authorization of $350 million for urban renewal grants for projects in model city areas, which supplements the previous authorization of $250 million for this purpose.

(b) The Act provides for a new approach to urban renewal which is intended to facilitate more rapid rehabilitation and redevelopment of blighted areas on an effective scale. Financial assistance would be provided for a neighborhood development program which consists of urban renewal undertakings and activities in one or more areas that are planned and carried out on the basis of annual increments. Financing is based on the amount of funds needed to carry out the activities planned during a 12-month period in each of the urban renewal areas in the community's program. As to subsequent annual increments of the program, the community would receive financial assistance to the extent that funds are then available and the community's program is acceptable to HUD. This will permit the undertaking of urban-renewal-execution activities, land acquisitions and public improvements simultaneously with planning.

(c) The Act requires that a majority of the total number of housing units in a community's residential urban renewal projects which receive Federal recognition after August 1, 1968, must be for low and moderate income families or individuals. As to housing units in urban renewal areas, at least 20% of the total must house low-income families or individuals, but HUD may waive this 20% requirement to the extent that these units are not needed in the community.

3. Authorization in Appropriation Acts: For fiscal 1969, $750 million was authorized and appropriated for urban renewal grants. In addition, an advance appropriation was made of $750 million of the $1.4 billion authorized for fiscal 1970 in order to give communities more lead time for planning their urban renewal program. For urban renewal projects in model city areas, $312.5 million was appropriated for fiscal 1969, as compared with the $350 million authorized. Of the $250 million authorized for grants on urban renewal projects in model city areas for the preceding fiscal year, $150 million was appropriated.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorization in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends appropriations in the full amount previously authorized by law but not yet appropriated, including: (1) $650 million for urban renewal grants of the $1.4 billion authorized for fiscal 1970; and (2) $137.5 million for urban renewal grants in model city areas.

(b) When there are additional legislative authorizations as recommended below, there should be additional appropriations for each fiscal year and an advance appropriation for the succeeding fiscal year. This will follow the precedent established by the last Congress to give communities more lead time for planning their urban renewal programs.

(c) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: NHC recommends an increase in the authorizations for appropriations for a 5-year period at an annual rate of $3 billion for urban renewal grants. Such an appropriation will make realistic the national objective of overtaking the decay in our cities and making urban renewal more immediately responsive to urban needs.

(d) Other Legislative Amendments: NHC recommends the following amendments to urban renewal laws:

(1) On capital grants for urban renewal, code enforcement and other comparable programs, there should be an increase in the federal grant to ¾ from the present ⅔ which is paid to larger cities. The ¾ grants are now made only to smaller cities, but they are equally needed by larger cities. Further, where the community elects to finance survey and planning costs at its own expense, the project capital grants should be increased to ⅚ from ¾. Pooling all of such grants should be permitted for all urban renewal projects in the city. Where the urban renewal is located in a distressed area, existing law already provides for a larger urban renewal grant.

(2) Loan and grant contracts should be authorized for the purpose of assisting the rehabilitation of scattered properties in residential neighborhoods designated for conservation, rehabilitation, or intensive code enforcement by an approved community renewal program. The cost of any new public improvements serving the rehabilitation properties should be recognized for appropriate grant-in-aid credits.

(3) Local public agencies should be authorized to make sales of industrial and commercial land for later development by nonprofit industrial development corporations or properly constituted public bodies on the same basis as is now authorized under economic development laws.

(4) There should be a broadening of the existing statutory provisions for recognition of real property tax losses—on the land as improved before the demolition occurred—by the locality in an urban renewal area as a local grant-in-aid credit. Such losses should be computed from the date of acquisition of the property to the completion of the redevelopment in accordance with the urban renewal plan for the project.

(5) Where a project is in execution, tax abatement should count as a non-cash local grant-in-aid to the project when such tax abatement is granted to federally-assisted housing for the purpose of achieving lower rents and facilitating relocation unless there is a Federal grant to reimburse the state and local taxing authorities for their tax losses.

(6) NHC supports special urban renewal provisions for central business districts which would:

(i) permit a waiver of residential requirements in renewing such districts;

(ii) recognize that employment, commercial, industrial and cultural functions of central business districts are of vital importance to community growth and revitalization; and

(iii) require HUD to accept 100% of site improvements and supporting facilities as part of the gross project cost and as a local grant-in-aid.

(7) There should be an amendment to the urban renewal law allowing any public facility to be eligible for non-cash grant-in-aid credit covering the full cost of the facility; (i) if its development was occasioned by the urban renewal program as certified by the urban renewal agency; (ii) if it is located in a community having more than one urban renewal project; and (iii) if the community has a workable program and a community renewal program.

(8) There should be no limit in the amount of grants to a particular urban renewal demonstration project, under Section 314, so the Federal Government in special cases could pay up to 100% of the cost of the demonstration program.

(9) Non-cash grant-in-aid credits should be extended to cover air rights involved in the development costs for 221(d)(3) or 236 projects for low and moderate income families.

(10) Urban renewal grants of 75% should be available for the reclamation of otherwise unbuildable land which is located within metropolitan areas. Often there are large available areas of land which are not suitable for building because of problems which can be corrected by appropriate expenditures of public funds, and the use of appropriate reclamation and conservation techniques.

This will provide convenient sites for housing and other community facilities needed by those now living within the overcrowded areas of central cities.

(11) Where state or local law requires abutting property owners to pay a portion of the cost of street repairs, federal urban renewal grants should be made to cover the owner's share when there is a showing of need.

(12) Under the Neighborhood Development Program (N.D.P.), non-cash grants-in-aid—otherwise meeting time requirements—should become eligible as soon as an area is recognized by HUD for overall study purposes, to the full extent which said facilities serve the study area, without any prerequisite for an approved urban renewal plan covering such study area.

(e) Recommendations for Administrative Action: NHC recommends the following administrative actions in the Neighborhood Development Program:

(1) It should be flexibly administered, particularly as regards the requirements for actions on plans for areas larger than those proposed for the action year.

(2) HUD should make every effort to develop administrative guidelines which will permit the program to function smoothly under existing state renewal enabling legislation.

(3) Costs of development of the initial application should be an allowable project cost.

CHAPTER T. INTERIM ASSISTANCE AND INTERIM REHABILITATION PROGRAMS IN SLUM AND BLIGHTED AREAS

1. Interim Assistance for Blighted Areas as Provided for in the 1968 Housing Act: The 1968 Housing Act authorizes the Secretary of HUD to contract to make grants aggregating up to $15 million in any fiscal year to cities or countries to assist them in taking interim steps to alleviate harmful conditions in slum or blighted areas of communities. To qualify, these areas must be planned for substantial clearance, rehabilitation, or federally assisted code enforcement in the near future, and must need some immediate public action until permanent action can be taken. Grants may not exceed two-thirds of the cost of planning and carrying out an interim assistance program, except that three-fourths grants can be made to any community with a population of 50,000 or less. A community has to have an approved workable program to qualify for assistance.

2. Need for Interim Rehabilitation Program: In slum and blighted areas, there should be a fast program of interim rehabilitation to correct those housing conditions which directly affect health and safety. The people now living in substandard housing should not be expected to wait until permanent neighborhood improvement programs are developed. We need a program which will provide grants and loans which can be rapidly disbursed to eliminate health and safety hazards, without regard to the useful life of the buildings. The objective is to provide whatever assistance is needed to achieve

XUM

monthly charges, after interim rehabilitation, which will be within the financial reach of the low income and moderate income residents. The emergency upgrading of structures should not involve increases in rents beyond the reach of the present tenants.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts for Interim Assistance: There have been no appropriation authorizations to implement the 1968 Act providing interim assistance to alleviate harmful conditions in slum or blighted areas.

4. Recommendations: (a) Authorizations in Appropriation Act: NHC recommends necessary appropriation authorizations to carry out the 1968 Act relating to the interim assistance program in slum areas. However, the Secretary should be authorized to enter into contracts for grants in such amounts as are commensurate with the need. This should include an advance appropriation for fiscal year 1971 to give cities and counties more lead time in planning interim steps to alleviate harmful conditions in slum or blighted areas. NHC further recommends that the amount of the appropriations—and legislative authorizations therefor—should be increased in response to the increasing needs evidenced by the applications which will be filed for interim assistance.

(b) Legislative Amendments on Interim Assistance: All cities should be eligible for a three-quarters grant for the cost of planning and carrying out the interim program. Instead of limiting the larger grants to the smaller cities, the large cities should get such a grant and not be limited to a two-thirds grant.

(c) Legislation for Interim Rehabilitation Program. NHC recommends legislation to provide for the above-described program of interim rehabilitation to correct housing conditions which directly affect health and safety, without regard to the useful life of the buildings. The legislation should include the following:

(1) Amendments to the interim assistance law, so that it is broadened to include such interim rehabilitation of housing as is necessary to protect the health and safety of residents. This would make grants available to cities and counties which are undertaking such a program.

(2) With respect to interim rehabilitation to correct conditions which directly affect health and safety in homes located in slum and blighted areas, the following financial assistance should be extended to owners of homes who have low and moderate incomes: (i) rehabilitation grants under Section 115 in an amount not to exceed $3,000; and (ii) rehabilitation loans under Section 312.

(3) Federal code enforcement grants for interim rehabilitation of housing.

(4) Federal grants to urban renewal agencies to acquire slum buildings which are in violation of housing codes, and for interim rehabilitation to eliminate hazards. Public acquisition of properties for interim rehabilitation may be an early acquisition of part of the property that would later be involved in a permanent renewal program for the neighborhood.

(5) Section 312 should be further amended to provide loans to public bodies or agencies which take possession or control of any property—through receivership or otherwise—which violates code requirements or local laws concerning health or safety. This would cover property where the owner has failed to correct such violations within a period prescribed by local law. The loan should be made on the condition that it will be repaid from the income derived from the rehabilitated property, with appropriate liens or other rights that will be enforceable against the property.

Pursuant to the foregoing legislation, the assistance should be sufficient to achieve monthly charges, after interim rehabilitation, which will be within the financial reach of the present occupants or of others of low or moderate incomes.

CHAPTER U. NEW TOWNS AND NEW COMMUNITIES

1. Need: Since 40,000,000 additional people will be living in cities during the next decade, we need new towns and new communities to help take care of this increased urban population; and to provide for an orderly dispersal of population and relieve further city congestion. These new towns would be carefully planned as balanced communities. They would be largely self-contained with homes, apartments, schools, jobs, hospitals, recreational facilities and open spaces. They should be planned to minimize transportation needs by assuring employment for residents within or near the new community. They should provide housing for all income groups, including those of low and moderate incomes. These new communities can provide a new kind of urban living which can offer an alternative to the sprawling growth that threatens to overwhelm our metropolitan regions with costly and inefficient development.

There is an urgent need for Federal guaranties to overcome major obstacles which have prevented greater efforts in this field, namely: (1) the large capital investments to acquire large land areas and install the basic facilities needed to prepare the land for development; and (2) the extended period for the planning and installation of site improvements, during which large expenditures must be made for debt service, taxes and overhead.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: The Act authorizes HUD to guaranty obligations issued by new community developers to help finance approved new community developments. These guaranties should overcome the major obstacles which have prevented greater accomplishments in this field. With the security of Federal guaranties, investors should be willing to provide financing geared to the realities of internal cash flow in new community development projects. To encourage localities to use Federal aid programs in support of new communities, the Act includes a program of incentive grants. When Federally-assisted facilities are being constructed to serve a new community, the public agency will be eligible—in addition to the basic Federal grants—for a supplementary grant covering an additional 20% of construction costs. However, the total Federal contribution to the cost of community facilities cannot exceed 80% of the cost of the facility. This would include facilities such as water, sewer and the open-space land. Appropriations for supplemental grants were authorized in the amount of $5 million for fiscal year 1969 and $25 million for fiscal year 1970.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: The appropriation acts have not appropriated the funds authorized for supplement grants to public agencies which install Federally-assisted facilities to serve new communities.

4. Recommendations: (a) Appropriations: We recommend that the full amount of $5 million be appropriated for supplemental grants for fiscal year 1969. We also recommend an advance appropriation of the $25 million authorized for supplemental grants for fiscal year 1970 in order to give more lead time for initiating and planning new communities.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorizations: We recommend that the aggregate limit on outstanding guaranties be increased by $1 billion above the present limit of $250 million. We further recommend an additional authorization of appropriations for supplemental grants of $30 million a year over a 5-year period.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: (1) The 1968 Act should be amended to include public agencies or authorities instead of limiting the HUD guaranties to private developers. NHC believes that a public authority is an effective instrumentality to undertake necessary land acquisition and to carry out the development of a new town.

(2) The Bureau of Public Roads should be authorized to purchase excess land beyond the amount needed for the roads themselves This would include land suitable for residential development which the Bureau should make available to rehouse displaced families. At large road interchanges, the Bureau should be authorized to acquire additional land for the development of new communities which can meet the needs of our growing population, including displaced families. Such land can generally be acquired by the Bureau at low cost at the time that land is being acquired for new road systems.

(3) The 1968 Act requires low and moderate-income housing to be included in new towns as a prerequisite for supplemental grants. There should be a similar requirement as a condition to a HUD guaranty of obligations issued by a new community developer.

(d) NHC joins with the National Committee for Urban Growth Policy in recommending the additional measures which should be taken to facilitate New Communities and urban growth.

CHAPTER V. PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES INCLUDING WATER, SEWER, NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES AND OPEN-SPACE LAND PROGRAMS

1. Need: There is a great and continuing need for Federal public facilities grants to assist in overcoming serious backlogs in replacing substandard or obsolete facilities—especially in the central cities—and eliminating water pollution and meeting the unprecedented demands for additional facilities and services generated by population expansion. These needs cut across whole metropolitan areas and involve central cities, new suburbs and the new communities still to come. This essential expansion in Federal aid could be a potent influence in resolving the present chaotic conditions created by the multiplicity of local governmental jurisdictions in most metropolitan areas. This multiplicity has led to suburban sprawl, land misuse, land speculation, and frequent failure to metropolitan area and regional planning as an effective tool for the control of new developments. Such a program could provide important leverage to establish coordinated local governmental approaches to control programs of area and region-wide significance. At the same time, it could foster decentralization of local governmental functions of strictly local application.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: The Act only authorized funds to be appropriated for water and sewer facilities and the open-space land program. For water and sewer facilities an additional $150 million was authorized for fiscal year 1969 and $115 million for fiscal 1970. For the open-space land program, the 1968 Act authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants, an additional $150 million (for a total ceiling of $460 million) prior to July 1, 1970. The limit on the amount of funds the Secretary of HUD is authorized to use for grants for technical assistance on open space was raised by $75,000. The Act provided that any appropriations made for water and sewer facilities, neighborhood facilities, and advance acquisitions of land programs not already appropriated may be appropriated for fiscal 1970. The Act extends the interim planning requirements under the basic water and sewer facilities grant program to October 1, 1969.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: For fiscal year 1969 there was an appropriation of $165 million for water and sewer grants, an appropriation of $75 million for open-space land grants, and an appropriation of $35 million for neighborhood facilities grants.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: Based upon past Congressional legislative authorizations and actions, we anticipate that at least $165 million would be appropriated for each fiscal year for water and sewer grants.

However, there should be advance appropriations for each succeeding fiscal year, besides the current one, to give public agencies more lead time for their planning and development of these programs. When the additional legislative authorization recommended below is made, we recommend an increase in the rate of appropriations to $2 billion annually for water and sewer grants, and for other public and community facilities as described below.

(b) Increase in Legislative Authorization: NHC recommends a 5-year authorization of $2 billion annually for grants to local governments for basic water and sewer facilities and other types of public improvements and community facilities. Of the $2 billion, $250 million should be made available annually for the open space land program. The public improvements and community facilities should include those authorized by the 1965 Act such as neighborhood and public facilities, particularly in slum and ghetto areas. It should also include the acquisition of land to provide parks and recreational facilities in urban areas, so that they are closely accessible to the people who need them most.

(c) Other Legislative Amendments: (1) As recommended in these Resolutions on other comparable programs, Federal grants to larger cities for public and community facilities should be increased to ¾ from the present ⅔'s, since their need is as grave as that of small cities. For neighborhood centers, parks and recreational facilities in slum and ghetto areas, the Federal grant should be 100%. Moreover, there should be annual Federal grants to provide for the staff and operating expenses of such facilities. The neighborhood facilities centers in such areas should be permitted to include swimming pools—either indoor or outdoor—and gymnasiums.

(2) We believe that the foregoing grants should be generally restricted to communities that are simultaneously providing adequate housing for low and moderate income families, where the need for such housing exists.

CHAPTER W. URBAN PLANNING AND FACILITIES—COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND PLANNED AREA-WIDE DEVELOPMENT

1. *Need.* The increased concentration of population in and around metropolitan areas has created an urgent need for a coordinated development of resources and services for urban and rural areas and a need to facilitate comprehensive planning for these areas. Because of the problem of multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved with this planning, and because of the inadequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them, NHC believes that Federal programs are badly needed to achieve the additional participation and cooperation from the states and localities. The 1968 Housing Act contains the following provisions to meet this need:

(a) The Section 701 planning assistance grant program is extensively revised. The Secretary of HUD is now authorized to make comprehensive planning grants to State planning agencies for assistance to "district" planning agencies for rural and other nonmetropolitan areas. Consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture is required prior to approval of any district planning grants. The Secretary of Agriculture and, when appropriate, the Secretary of Commerce, may provide technical assistance in connection with the establishment of districts and the carrying out of planning by them.

(b) Other new provisions authorize direct planning grants to Indian tribal planning councils or other bodies for planning on Indian reservations; to regional and district councils of government as well as those organized on a metropolitan basis; to regional commissions and economic development districts established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to cities, without regard to population, within metropolitan areas for planning which is part of metropolitan planning; and to official Government planning agencies for areas where rapid urbanization is expected as a result of a new community development assisted under Title IV of the act. The Secretary is required to consult with the Secretary of Commerce before making any planning grant which includes any part of an economic development district.

(c) The definition of comprehensive planning is broadened to include planning for the provision of governmental services and for the development and utilization of human and natural resources. The inclusion of a housing element is required as part of the preparation of comprehensive land use plans. The use of private consultants, where their professional services are deemed appropriate by the assisted governments, is added to the stated purposes of the program.

2. Authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act: (a) Comprehensive Planning: The Act increased the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of comprehensive planning by $35 million making a total not to exceed $265 million prior to July 1, 1969 and authorized to be appropriated an additional $125 million for a total not to exceed $390 million prior to July 1, 1970. Of the amount available prior to July 1, 1969, $20 million may be used only for district planning grants and that amount shall be increased by $10 million on July 1, 1969. All amounts appropriated must remain available until expended except that any funds so appropriated, not to exceed an aggregate of $10 million plus 5 percentum of the funds so appropriated, may be used by the Secretary for studies and research in comprehensive planning.

(b) Planned Area-Wide Development: Supplementary grants (designed to encourage areawide planning) are authorized for Federally-assisted projects in all multijurisdictional areas (not just metropolitan areas as previously provided) such as the rural planning districts proposed to be assisted with comprehensive planning grants under the comprehensive planning provisions of the law. Unused authorizations for appropriations for supplementary grants for fiscal year 1967 and 1968 are made available through fiscal year 1970.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: For fiscal year 1969, $43,338,000 was appropriated for urban planning grants. Out of $10 million requested for area-wide development grants for fiscal year 1969, none was appropriated.

4. Recommendation—Additional Authorization in Appropriation Acts: NHC urges that $55 million be appropriated for fiscal 1969 as supplemental grants for the orderly growth of our urban areas. These are needed to achieve more effective coordinated metropolitan area planning and program development. In addition, NHC urges that the $10 million requested for a program of areawide incentive grants in fiscal 1969 be appropriated.

CHAPTER X. URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

1. Objective: There is an urgent need to modernize, expand and reorganize the urban transportation systems. Adequate Federal grants are necessary to achieve this objective.

2. Authorizations in the 1968 Housing Act: The Act increased authorized appropriations for grants and other assistance to urban mass transportation by $190 million for fiscal year 1970. The amount of funds which can be used for research, development, and demonstration projects was increased by $6 million, commencing July 1, 1968; also the statutory limit on the funds available for this purpose is removed, commencing July 1, 1969. The definition of "mass transportation" was broadened to allow greater flexibility and opportunity for application of new concepts and systems.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: For the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 there were appropriations of $175 million each year. Of the total amount in legislative authorizations for mass transit grants, $70 million has not been appropriated.

4. Recommendations: (a) Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends an appropriation of the $70 million authorized by law, but not yet appropriated. When the additional legislative authorization recommended below is made, we urge an increase in the rate of appropriations to $750 million annually for mass transportation grants.

(b) Increase in Legislative Amendments: NHC recommends that the authorization of appropriations for mass transit grants be increased to $750 million per year for the next 5 years. The expansion of the program is necessary to achieve the housing and urban development goals recommended in these Resolutions. We also urge an advance appropriation for each succeeding fiscal year, besides the current one, in order to give cities more lead time for planning their mass transit programs.

CHAPTER Y. RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY, TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1. Need for Basic Research and Training: (a) The housing industry has neither the organization nor the resources to support substantial research in the area of housing technology and research. Existing research is almost exclusively in the hands of material and large equipment suppliers and reflects the particular interests of these groups. It is necessary that Federal financial support be given towards the development of new systems and overall construction techniques. The technological advances necessary to reduce housing costs must be accompanied by more uniform building codes in all areas of the nation. This will make it more feasible for developers and manufacturers to produce housing and materials for a national market.

(b) There is a shortage of trained professional and sub-professional personnel in the broad field of community development. This presents a serious problem in achieving effective action programs.

2. Authorizations in 1968 Housing Act: The Act recognizes the need for urban technical assistance, research, and training and provides assistance in the following areas:

(a) Advances in Technology in Housing and Urban Development; The Act authorizes such sums as may be necessary to be appropriated, commencing with fiscal year 1969, for studies of new and improved techniques and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction and rehabilitation, and to urban development. Four-year contracts are authorized for such studies rather than two-year contracts as heretofore authorized.

(b) Housing for Lower Income Families Through New Technologies: The Act directs the Secretary of HUD to institute a program under which qualified public and private organizations will submit plans for the development of housing for lower income families, using new and advanced technologies, on Federal land which has been made available for that purpose or on other suitable land. The Secretary is to approve five plans, each of which shall have a technology and organization with a potential to produce at least 1,000 dwelling units a year. The Secretary is to seek the construction of that number of dwelling units a year over a five-year period for each of the various types of technologies proposed in approved plans. Mortgages financing the projects are authorized to be insured under the FHA experimental housing program.

(c) Authorization for Urban Information and Technical Assistance Service Program: The Act increases the authorization for

XUM

grants to states to assist in the provision of urban information and technical assistance by $5 million for fiscal year 1969, and by $15 million for fiscal year 1970. Amounts authorized for these grants, but not appropriated, are authorized to be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1970.

(d) Federal-State Training Programs: The Act broadens the Federal-State training program to permit grants to states for the training of subprofessional—in addition to professional—persons who will be employed in the field of housing or community development. The trainees may be trained for employment by private nonprofit organizations or public organizations which have responsibility for housing and community development programs.

3. Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: Instead of the $20 million which the President requested for urban research and technology, there was an appropriation of $11 million. Instead of about $4.5 million requested for the low income demonstrations program, there was an appropriation of $2 million for this purpose. There was an appropriation of $500,000 for urban fellowships. There was an appropriation for the urban information and technical assistance service programs.

4. Recommendations: Additional Authorizations in Appropriation Acts: NHC recommends necessary appropriation authorizations to carry out all of the authorizations in the 1968 Act. Where the appropriations were less than the amounts requested by the President, we recommend appropriations in the full amounts so required as necessary for each of these programs. In addition, NHC recommends that $1 million a year be appropriated for training under a 5-year program; and that the fellowships be increased to $2 million a year under a 5-year program.

CHAPTER Z. PROGRAMS AND POLICIES FOR GENERAL APPLICATION TO HOUSING

1. Equal Opportunity for Housing: (a) Throughout its entire life NHC has been committed to equal opportunity for all American families to secure good housing in good neighborhoods. It again reaffirms this position. While recognizing the slow but significant progress that has been achieved in recent years, it deplores the fact that this opportunity is still denied to millions of American families throughout every section of the land because of their race, color, creed or national origin, or because of the myth which exists as to their desire, or ability to pay for and maintain good homes. To overcome this denial of opportunity and to dissipate these myths, a great challenge is facing the nation.

(b) NHC has long supported the principle of a competitive housing market open to free bargaining by all American families without regard to racial or ethnic background. Many localities have been limited in achieving this objective, however, because of inadequate supplies of low and moderate cost living accommodations and by the congestion of many minority group families in limited sections of the community. To provide an adequate supply of housing, it is necessary to raise production to a minimum of 3,000,000 dwelling units per year.

(c) We urge the President and the Congress of the U.S. to take all steps toward providing an equal opportunity for housing. This includes full and adequate appropriations for the administration of the fair housing program under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1968. Of the $8 million requested by the President, Congress only appropriated $2 million for such expenses of administration. We strongly urge the larger appropriations required for sufficient staff to effectuate fully the foregoing open-housing objectives of achieving equal opportunity for all American families to secure good housing in good neighborhoods. Finally, we urge the Admintsration to take all necessary additional actions to achieve this equal opportunity objective. Strong affirmative measures should be taken to enforce the fair housing rights in Title IV.

(d) We should provide an opportunity for freedom of choice in our housing program. The choice of individual or cooperative homeownership or rental housing and the choice of city, suburban, new town or country living must not be limited by race, color, or religion.

2. Relocation: (a) NHC has long recognized the need for coordinated relocation payments and practices within the various programs of the Federal Government. We therefore give strong support to S. 1, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Bill of 1969 pending before Congress. However, this bill makes no provision for assistance to persons displaced by rehabilitation outside of urban renewal, code enforcement, and model city areas. NHC suggests that the bill be amended to provide for assistance to all families displaced by any governmental activities.

(b) When homeowners or tenants are being displaced for urban renewal or other governmental action, there should be a Federal grant to provide adequate payments as equitable compensation to pay not only their moving expenses, but also to help them obtain decent homes elsewhere. In the case of a displaced home owner the amount of the payment should be sufficient to enable him to obtain adequate housing, without limiting such payment to $5,000 as is now provided in the Housing Act of 1968.

(c) When a small business is being displaced through urban renewal or other governmental action, affirmative action should be taken to assist its relocation either within the urban renewal area or elsewhere. If it is to be relocated within the urban renewal area, there should be a policy to establish a rental for the small business which it can afford. In order to achieve this, an appropriate write-down should be made in the disposition of property under the urban renewal program. While it is recognized that there are allowances under the present legislation to cover the cost of relocation by a business which is displaced through urban renewal, we recommend this additional action to better assure the continuance of a small business that is being displaced. NBC also recommends the full implementation and use of the 1965 amendments to the Small Business Act for businesses which are being displaced by urban renewal or other governmental actions.

3. Uniform System for Computation of Incomes by HUD: (a) HUD should have a uniform system for computing incomes which could be used by all constituent agencies administering housing programs which involve income limits. To be equitable, income limits should allow appropriate deductions and exemptions like those long recognized and utilized in the public housing program. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency recognized the appropriateness of such unuiformity in its Report on the 1968 Housing Act:

"Although the statute is silent on defining income, the committee is aware of the necessity for the Secretary to establish procedures to assure that fair standards and rules are followed within HUD for determining income (after allowable deductions) for eligibility of low or moderate income families or mortgagors under HUD's various programs. These procedures would apply to those who receive the benefit of subsidies or below-market interest rates to enable them to obtain occupancy, homeownership, or cooperative housing membership."

(b) At the present time, the methods of computing income differ in HUD, although the constituent agencies are administering comparable housing programs involving income limits. For years, public housing has allowed appropriate deductions or exemptions in computing the family income such as:

(1) Deduction of $600 from the income of a secondary wage earner thereby recognizing that there are at least this amount of additional expenses in earning such wages, so they do not represent a full increment to family income:

(2) Deductions for expenses for the care of children or sick or incapacitated family members when these expenses are necessary to permit the wage earner to be employed;

(3) Deductions for social security taxes and compulsory pension funds; and

(4) Deductions for minors or dependent adults.

(c) Although these deductions or exemptions are allowed in the public housing program, they are not recognized uniformily in the FHA program involving rent supplements or below-market interest rates under Section 221(d)(3). Thus, in interest supplement programs the 1968 Housing Act provides for the deduction from family income of $300 for each minor child and the elimination of the earnings of all minor children. Pursuant to the Congressional intent as evidenced by the foregoing quotation from the Senate Committee Report, FHA has allowed a further deduction of 5% of gross income to cover payroll deductions for social security and compulsory pension funds. However, FHA has not allowed other deductions of the type which have been long recognized in public housing, particularly since the income limits in the interest supplement program are now computed as a percentage of the local public housing limits.

4. Rehabilitation in Slum Areas not Intended as Containment Program: Rehabilitation programs for slum areas are not intended to be containment programs which would restrict present residents so that they must continue to live there. They should have an opportunity to move into other areas. The NHC goals contemplate development of new and rehabilitated housing in other areas which would be available for the low and moderate income families now living in slum and ghetto areas. To help assure achievement of this objective, we recommend enactment of legislation providing that no program of subsidy, aid, or assistance by any agency of HUD—including sewer and water facility grants, open space grants, community facilities grants, urban renewal programs, model cities programs, mass transit grants, and FHA insurance—may be carried on within any jurisdiction if a reasonable share of housing will not be available for low and moderate income families. Such legislation would help assure the development of balanced programs of housing in new areas into which the residents of slum and ghetto areas could move.

5. Adequacy of Housing to be Provided for Low and Moderate Income Families: Federally-assisted housing programs are intended to provide adequate space and facilities and otherwise meet proper standards for low and moderate income families. To meet the needs of larger families, more housing units must be built of larger size and with more bedrooms. In housing communities for low and moderate income families, provision should be made for recreational facilities—including swimming pools when appropriate—day care and pre-school centers, and other facilities for community activities. This will provide children and other residents with opportunities to engage in wholesome and constructive activities which will help create better communities. These measures to improve the quality of life in Federally-assisted projects will accomplish the objectives prescribed in the 1968 Housing Act, including the requirement for better design standards in such housing. These housing communities should be pleasant

places to live and respond to the needs of the residents, with attention to their comfort, convenience and recreation. As such, they will be attractive for residence by families of both moderate and low incomes.

6. Uniform System of Tax Exemption and Tax Abatement: (a) In some HUD programs there is no requirement for real estate tax exemption or tax abatement. This is true in the new leasing program for the use of privately-owned housing for public housing purposes. It is also true in the rent supplement program for those of public housing incomes. Yet, conventional public housing projects are required to have tax exemptions and they pay only 10% of shelter rent in lieu of taxes. We previously recommended that conventional public housing projects conform with those other publicly-assisted programs which serve low-income families. This would be accomplished by permitting the payment in lieu of taxes to be equivalent to full taxes.

(b) There should be a more practical and consistent policy concerning the requirement for tax abatement on privately-owned projects which are Federally-assisted either with (i) below-market-interest rates, (ii) interest assistance, (iii) rent supplements, or (iv) leasing programs under public housing. Tax abatement should not be required on these projects, even as a means of offsetting the higher costs that prevail in some cities. Such tax abatement is often unavailable because of restrictions in state and local laws; moreover, the cities often face serious problems of inadequate tax revenues and are unwilling to grant tax abatement. Cost limits should be made realistic so that these private housing programs can function in high cost areas without requiring tax abatement.

(c) Where state and local governments grant tax abatements on housing projects which are Federally-assisted in the manner described above, there should be an annual Federal grant to reimburse them for their tax losses.

7. Disposition of Federally-Owned Housing Projects: (a) FHA has acquired ownership of rental housing projects upon which defaults have occurred. When requested, FHA should either lease these projects to local housing authorities for public housing or make negotiated sales of these projects for cooperative ownership by low income or moderate income families. Also, sales may be made to public agencies or nonprofit or other properly motivated organizations which will use them to provide housing for low or moderate income groups. The housing should be sold at a price and with a mortgage term and interest rate—on the purchase money mortgage accepted by FHA—which would enable the property to serve these income groups at monthly charges which they can afford. When necessary, financing should be made available to rehabilitate these properties. Such properties should be eligible for rent supplements and interest subsidies. These recommendations also apply to other federally-owned housing.

(b) FHA has also acquired ownership of single-family homes on which defaults have occurred. In the disposition of this housing, FHA should meet the needs of those of low and moderate incomes. The housing should be sold to them at a price and with a mortgage term and interest rate—on the purchase-money mortgage accepted by FHA—which would be within the financial reach of the low and moderate income purchasers. Priorities should be established for sales which would accomplish this purpose, rather than granting priority to cash sales or sales involving conventional loans, as these generally involve purchasers with incomes above those at the low and moderate level. Legislation should be enacted if it is necessary to establish disposition policies in accordance with the foregoing principles.

8. Support for Increased Grants to Meet Cities' Needs. (a) NHC favors increased Federal grant authorizations to meet the needs of cities, many of which are facing financial crises. These Federal grants should include all of the following:

(1) Necessary increases in supplemental untied grants under the Model Cities Program which give cities an incentive to develop programs for the improvement of entire neighborhoods.

(2) Necessary funding of the authorization for supplemental untied grants under the New Communities Program of Title IV of the Housing Act of 1968 where a balance has been achieved economically and racially; such grants give public agencies an incentive to provide necessary facilities for such New Communities.

(3) Federal grants to reimburse state and local taxing authorities for their tax losses when they grant tax abatement on housing projects which are federally assisted.

(4) Necessary increases in the authorizations of Federal grants: (i) for urban renewal; (ii) for water, sewer and neighborhood facilities; (iii) for open-space and urban beautification; and (iv) to meet other vital needs including those relating to health, education, training, welfare, mass transportation and other purposes.

(b) We recommend development of a three-year demonstration program of untied Federal supplemental grants-in-aid to be used by cities, counties and other local public agencies. This will help relieve their financial plight. This should be done in a manner which would provide incentives to them to promote national policies relating to housing and urban development.

(c) All supplemental untied grants—including those under this new proposed demonstration program and those under the Model Cities and New Communities programs—should be made available for use by cities, counties and other local public agencies for purposes determined by them, without Federal accountability or program supervision.

9. Acceptance and Accumulation of Applications for Programs: HUD has discouraged the submission of new applications in programs where a backlog of unsatisfied applications exists. NHC is strongly opposed to this discouragement of applications for HUD assistance. Even when there is an unsatisfied backlog of applications, HUD should continue to accept applications. There is no better way by which HUD can learn the needs and demands for programs which it administers, so that it can document and support requests for necessary Congressional authorizations and appropriations.

10. Construction Work and Employment in Ghetto Areas: Increased construction volume will require substantial increases in the work force. The large pool of untrained unemployed or under-employed within the ghetto is a large source of additional manpower. There should, therefore, be an effective program to accelerate the training of unskilled groups and to broaden their opportunities for employment in the construction industry. NHC recommends an adequate expansion of the training program of the Manpower and Training Administration of the Department of Labor, together with the full amounts needed as appropriations. NHC endorses the provisions in the 1968 Housing Act which direct the Secretary of HUD to require:

(a) That opportunities for training and employment arising in connection with the planning, construction, rehabilitation, and operation of housing be given to lower income persons residing in the area of the housing; and

(b) That to the greatest extent feasible contracts for work pursuant to the housing programs shall, where appropriate, be awarded to business concerns located in or owned in substantial part by persons residing in the area of the housing. If bonding is not available to such contractors or subcontractors, HUD should take necessary actions to enable them to obtain adequate bonds.

In the foregoing programs, we recommend that bids be invited from local contractors which have the participation of minority groups either in an ownership, executive management or direction capacity.

11. Support for International Programs for Housing: (a) NHC is aware of the critical housing problems elsewhere in the world, particularly in the developing countries. We urge continuation and expansion of our Government's foreign aid programs for housing in the developing countries, particularly cooperative housing to provide ownership by moderate income families as contemplated by the Foreign Assistance Act.

(b) Further, we urge our Government to support efforts: (i) to elevate the importance of housing in the economic development process by supporting efforts to establish, within the framework of the United Nations, a specialized international agency dedicated to solving the housing problems of the developing countries; (ii) to increase U.S. financial support to U.S. universities and other institutions for research and training programs to help solve these housing problems and supply the trained personnel so badly needed.

(c) NHC applauds the leadership provided by the United States in the adoption of a resolution by the United Nations giving emphasis to a pilot demonstration program for the improvement of squatter areas; also for support of the United Nations resolution concerned with the campaign to focus world attention on housing including consideration of an International Housing Year.

(d) NHC recommends enlargement of the investment guaranty program for housing by increasing the available guaranty authority and by extending the 100% guaranties to other appropriate areas besides Latin America. We recommend legislation providing for the encouragement of cooperative and other homeownership by low and moderate income families in the cooperating countries and for the utilization of financing assistance of the types which have been proven effective in our domestic programs.

(e) NHC supports the proposal for the creation of an International Housing Finance Corporation, which would be associated with the World Bank or the United Nations Development Program, to facilitate the mobilization of capital and the development of housing programs, particularly in the newly developing countries.

12. Appropriation Authorization: (a) NHC strongly recommends Congressional appropriations of adequate amounts for the administration of all HUD programs, including the additional funds which are required for additional staff to administer the many new programs contained in the 1968 Housing Act. These funds are urgently needed to meet the critical problems of our urban areas and the shortage of adequate housing for persons of low and moderate incomes. We further recommend all of the additional appropriations described elsewhere in these Resolutions.

(b) Advance appropriations to provide lead time for initiating and planning programs in all authorizations in appropriation bills providing contract authority or funds. The authorizations should cover the succeeding fiscal year in addition to the fiscal year involved in the appropriation act. Appropriation acts have recently adopted this practice for the urban renewal and mass transit programs. It is equally necessary that this be done in all other programs involving private enterprise as well as public agencies. This will give more lead time for the planning and initiation of programs. Such a practice in the housing program will help avoid the past difficulties experienced as a result of uncertainties and delays in providing funds and commitments. Through advance authorizations for two fiscal years, there will be an uninterrupted flow of funds and commitments at an early enough time to permit advance planning and work in the initiation of housing programs.

13. Workable Program: In order to remove impediments to construction of low and moderate income housing, NHC recommends repeal of the requirement for a workable program or local government approval of projects receiving Federal assistance. However, in localities without a workable program, the Secretary of HUD must first be satisfied that: (i) there is a need for the project; and (ii) its location will provide a satisfactory residential enviroment.

14. Preparation for Post-Viet Nam Period: In preparation for the termination of hostilities in Viet Nam, NHC recommends that we be ready to provide for the necessary expansion of peacetime development in order to assure steady employment for those formerly in jobs supporting our forces in Viet Nam. This should include the long-delayed construction of housing and urban development, together with the production of all materials and equipment required therein. It should also include plans for the use of abandoned defense housing or other installations. In the post Viet Nam period, we should fulfill the housing needs of those families for which the national goal has not become a reality. This would implement the highest priority and emphasis established for this program in the Housing Act of 1968.

15. Recommended Change in Budget Concepts Concerning Mortgage Purchases: (a) NHC does not believe in new concept of the Federal Budget which initially reflects expenditures for mortgage purchases in the same way as it reflects expenditures for grants, even though collections on mortgages are later credited as offsetting income. If several billion dollars of mortgages are purchased and retained by a government agency, all of this initially appears as an expenditure in the Budget during the fiscal year when the mortgages are purchased. This has an adverse effect on many public interest and social programs which are dependent upon the steady flow of mortgage financing at reasonable interest rates. The Budget should reflect only the actual cost to the Government of purchasing and holding these mortgages—this would be the differential in interest between the rate of the mortgages held by the Government and the rate on Government borrowings.

(b) *If* the present Budget concepts are retained which initially treat mortgage purchases as an expenditure in its entirety, NHC believes that there should be active encouragement of the sale to private investors of participations in mortgages held by GNMA or other Government agencies. Upon such sales, the funds realized can and should be offset against the expenditures for the purchase of the mortgages.

16. Availability of Land: NHC recommends such measures as are necessary to help assure the availability of enough land, at reasonable cost, to achieve our housing goals. These should include the establishment of appropriate reserves of land for future use to provide the housing, public facilities and recreational areas required to meet these goals.

17. Increases in Housing Costs: We deplore the inflationary rise in housing costs, particularly the spiralling increases in interest rates and prices of building materials such as lumber. It is urgent that action be taken to achieve a reasonable and stable level of interest rates and housing costs. When interest rates and housing costs increase, many people who need homes can no longer afford them—even though they could have afforded them previously when the interest rates and housing costs were at more reasonable levels. NHC strongly recommends that necessary measures be taken to stop these inflationary increases in interest rates and housing costs which adversely affect the consumer and jeopardize achievement of the housing goals established by Congress and the higher goals recommended in these Resolutions.

18. Insurance for Ghetto Areas: NHC recommends that when a home is purchased in a ghetto area and the mortgage is FHA-insured, necessary federal action should be taken to assure that the home owner obtains all hazard insurance required for his protection.

19. Private Investment in Lower Income Housing: NHC urges the participation of private investors in programs to provide housing for low and moderate income families. NHC recognizes that the tax savings which result from current rules of accelerated depreciation on improved real property are essential to insure the continued flow of such equity funds into investment in low and moderate income housing. NHC opposes any change in such rules which would reduce the already too-low return from investments in housing for families of low and moderate income.

20. Reduction of Monthly Mortgage Payments: With the recent increases in interest rates, people have been excluded from the housing market who need dwellings but can no longer afford them at the higher interest rates. Elsewhere in this report, NHC recommends measures to increase the flow of funds into the housing mortgage market and to make mortgage financing available at more reasonable interest rates. In addition, FHA should take administrative actions which would help to reduce the monthly debt service on mortgages by providing for level amortization payments instead of the higher amortization payments presently applicable to certain mortgage insurance programs—e.g. those under Sec. 220, 221(d)(4) & 207—which involve higher initial curtailments of principal. By reducing the debt service payments, the level amortization plan would reduce the monthly charges to the consumer and help offset the current high interest rates.

CHAPTER AA. NEED FOR EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONS, ADMINISTRATION AND FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

1. In itself, the enactment of adequate legislation will not achieve the goals set forth in these Resolutions; nor will it meet the needs of the American people or the crises in our cities. Laws are *not* self-executing. It is necessary to assure the establishment of effective institutions, administration, and federal-local relations. NHC recommends that HUD take the following actions to assure the effective execution of laws relating to the programs under HUD's jurisdiction.

2. HUD should redefine its role to concentrate on major policies and on constructive leadership in executing federal laws and to grant greater local autonomy to local governments and agencies in undertaking and operating projects involving HUD aid. NHC believes this HUD role would constitute creative federalism. The expenditure of federal monies should be subject to broad federal guidelines. Through the years, there has been a continuing increase in the burden and detail of HUD controls over local operations in the conduct of HUD-aided programs. All HUD controls should be eliminated which are not required by federal law. We will never achieve the volume and expedition required in programs authorized by the Congress unless there is a decentralization of responsibility to the local agencies involved. The local agencies can properly be held to account for their responsibilities under programs. There is no reason to assume that there is any less integrity and competence in local officials than in federal officials.

3. HUD should accelerate processing, production and decision-making by federal and local officials and by participants in *all* HUD programs, including the establishment of time schedules for all actions required. There should be a time limit for submission of applications by local agencies and a time limit for HUD action in approving or rejecting applications. However, qualified applications should not be rejected because of technical or insubstantial reasons, lack of money or lack of a priority status according to a schedule established by HUD; likewise, applications should not be rejected in order to remove them from the pending work load.

4. After applications have been approved and allocations made, there shall be a time limit for contracting and execution. With respect to requirements for HUD approval after a contract or commitment is issued, there should be a recognition that HUD has a certain period within which to act; and, failing such action on matters requiring HUD's approval, the proposal to HUD shall thereby be accepted and considered approved.

5. HUD should act promptly in making allocations and commitments of all authorizations and funds made available by Congress. Such allocations and commitments should be based upon:

(a) The requests that are received within a designated time which meet the applicable statutory requirements; and

(b) The respective needs for the communities involved. There should be no impounding or holdback of funds. The money should be allocated and committed as quickly as possible. All monies should be made available based upon the qualified requests that are received within a prescribed time limit. The guideline should be the need for the program in the community involved.

6. HUD should simplify its regulations and conditions attached to HUD aid and eliminate the detailed controls over project development and operations. Such controls are overly burdensome, costly, and time-consuming. They discourage initiative and innovation. They are inconsistent with the achievement of the goals recommended in this report.

7. HUD should eliminate conflicting policies and requirements among its different units, as applied to comparable programs. For example, the methods of determining incomes under the public housing program are different from those under the rent supplement, interest supplement and below-market-interest-rate programs.

8. HUD should consult with representative groups of local public agencies and private participants in each of its programs to identify problems which impede their progress and to develop workable solutions. For this purpose HUD should establish:

(a) A federal-local committee on public housing and urban renewal; such a committee functioned effectively for years until it was discontinued.

(b) A federal-city committee on the model cities program.

(c) Like committees of representatives from the participants in each program; thus, there should be a restoration of the committee of representatives of cooperatives participating in FHA programs.

Each such committee would meet periodically to give HUD first-hand experience concerning the operations of the HUD-aided program involved. Such consultation should result in quick and realistic action in eliminating obstacles and solving problems. Otherwise, such obstacles and problems are long neglected, often because they are not known or because HUD does not get proposals for solutions from those directly engaged in the program.

9. (a) In Section 5, the 1968 Housing Act directs the Secretary of HUD to make a report to the Banking and Currency Committees early in calendar years 1969 and 1970

XUM

identifying specific areas of program administration and management which require improvement. The report will describe actions taken and proposed for the purpose of making such improvements, and recommended such legislation as may be necessary to accomplish such improvements.

(b) Many of our recommendations in these Resolutions cover areas of administration on which HUD is required to report to the Committees, pursuant to the following provision in the 1968 Housing Act:

"Each such report shall include, but not be limited to, the following areas of program administration and management: uniformity and standardization in program requirements, simplification of program procedures, ways and means of expediting consideration of proposed projects and applications for assistance, the provision of more useful and specific assistance to communities, organizations, and individuals seeking to utilize the Department's programs, and ways and means of combining or otherwise adapting the Department's programs to increase their usefulness in meeting the individual needs of applicants."

(c) We urge HUD to take the actions recommended in these Resolutions relating to areas of program administration and management which require improvement and to report thereon to the Banking and Currency Committees.

HIGH INTEREST RATES HIT THE LOW-INCOME GROUPS HARDEST

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when prime interest rates are raised as they were last week, it is not the big businesses that suffer, but it is the low-income and moderate-income families and the small business concerns that take it on the nose.

On the financial pages, we hear much of the "prime rate" which goes only to the triple A big corporations with perfect credit ratings. We hear very little about the rates that are paid by the average citizen and by the small businessman. Invariably these rates are substantially above the quoted prime rate and I regret that the Nation's news media says so little about the real rates which hit the great mass of the population.

For this reason, I was happy to see a column by Harold B. Dorsey in the Washington Post of Monday, March 24, outlining this very fact—that high interest rates hit the little man in this economy the hardest.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record a copy of this column, entitled "Impact of High Interest Rates Falls on Low-Income Group."

Impact of High Interest Rates Falls on Low-Income Group

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

Last week's increase in the interest rate which commercial banks charge for loans of prime quality is more significant than suggested by the relatively strong behavior of the stock market.

The 7½ per cent rate is available only to commercial customers of the highest credit rating. Others must pay more. And since the borrower is normally permitted to draw out only about 80 per cent of his money—while the remaining 20 per cent is kept by the bank as a "compensating balance"—actual interest cost for the top quality borrowers is about 9⅜ per cent on the money which can be used.

The main impact of soaring interest rates falls on consumers, small businessmen, municipalities and home builders. Larger corporations are more likely than the others to obtain the available credit, because they have firm credit lines with the banks and a ready access to money in the capital markets. And they can charge off the interest cost as a tax-deductible expense at the 52.8 per cent marginal corporate income tax rate.

But, insofar as these corporations can attract the available credit supply that might otherwise go to consumers, home owners and small businesses, they ultimately hurt themselves. The other groups—and particularly the consumer whose spending accounts for 62 per cent of Gross National Product—cannot maintain their rate of buying if they are unable to get credit. As a result, the corporations find that they cannot meet their sales targets; inventories pile up; and they are then forced to cut back production and, ultimately, trim their capital spending programs.

None of these economic consequences are yet visible, although they are likely to become more apparent within the next two or three months. Meanwhile the catch-up payments for individual income taxes due April 15 may also have a negative effect on consumer spending; particularly for durable goods.

And with tax payments rising sharply, and with Federal spending recently—and belatedly—showing signs of flattening out, the budget swing from deficit to surplus in the period immediately ahead should have a slow-down effect on the economy, especially since the Federal Reserve is simultaneously restraining the growth of money supply.

Despite these signals of things to come, a great many people are not "buying" the disinflation idea. In this space last week, supporting evidence for this observation was presented in capital spending intentions, rising employment and relatively good retail sales.

I encountered an additional illustration last week at a meeting with about two dozen managers of very substantial investment capital. The majority view was the effect that continuing inflation was inevitable. The worst that could be seen was a brief period of modest hesitation and then we would be off on another inflationary boom.

It was argued that minority groups would continue to press for more government spending in the welfare area—especially so if there was even a modest increase in the unemployment rate. It was contended that policy-makers in Washington would not have the courage to continue with restraining pressures long enough to break the deeply imbedded inflation psychosis. As a result, it was the consensus of this group that their investment policies must continue to favor common stocks and that commitments in bonds should be avoided.

So what's wrong with inflation? In the first place, the low income groups are hurt the worst by inflation. Next in line for suffering are the millions of savers and pensioners who lose—via inflation—many billions of dollars of purchasing power of their incomes, savings and insurance. The Nation as a whole will suffer because continuing inflation will probably lead to another international currency crisis, which would have an adverse effect on the economies of the industrial world.

Nevertheless, there is plenty of evidence—up to this point at least—that many business executives, consumers and investment managers believe that inflation has gone on too long to stop. Even the highest interest rates in modern history have failed to reduce the pressures in that direction. So far!

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. Albert) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of independence days has its particular significance; it rekindles and revives the spirit which once united a people for the glorious fight that culminated in their freedom. And the celebration of Greek Independence Day is of great significance for a number of reasons. In the first place, the ancient Greeks were the first citizens of the West and the free world. They showed the world that they preferred to fight for the attainment and preservation of their freedom rather than willingly submit to their conquering oppressors. In the second place, when eventually they were forced to submit to alien tyrants, they proudly maintained their spiritual independence throughout the many centuries. And finally, in 1821 when they saw a chance of regaining their freedom and national independence, they staged a revolt which in the course of many years of bloody warfare, led to the birth of modern Greece.

From the day the stouthearted Archbishop Germanos, of Patras, raised the standard of the cross over his monastic establishment in 1821 to this present day, the American people have followed the course of events in Greece with keen interest and heartfelt sympathy. There never was, and let me hope that there may never be, any doubt of our wholehearted and united sympathy for the Greek people whenever they have been pitted against foreign oppressors and totalitarian tyrants. We have always held them in exceptionally high esteem. Long before the beginning of their war of independence we were fully conscious of our debt to Greece, the real nursery of many human values associated with our civilization. When we attained our independence the Greek people were suffering under alien oppressors in their homeland. And when the news of their revolt against the Turks reached us, it was natural for us to hope and pray for Greek success. Many years later when they succeeded in attaining their goal we on this side of the Atlantic were as much overjoyed by their success as were those closer to them in Europe.

Nor have we wavered in our sympathy for the Greeks since then. During and after the last two World Wars we have done our very best to save Greece from the ravages of war and from the clutches of Communist totalitarianism, and have striven consistently to help them maintain their hard-won independence. In doing this we have gained a loyal ally in our struggle against Communist tyranny.

During the last war the Greeks fought bravely and brilliantly in their homeland and on their islands on the side of democracies, and suffered much at the hands of the Nazi oppressors. Toward the end of that war, when their liberation was in sight, the country was plagued by Communist partisans and Soviet agents, who came very close to dragging it into the Stalin totalitarian camp. But the

timely and resolute British aid, backed up and then effectively supplanted by our own assistance under the Truman doctrine, saved the Greeks from Communist totalitarianism and safeguarded their national independence. It is no exaggeration to state that, soon after the last war, when Greek independence was in peril, our material aid to Greece and our moral support were of decisive importance. Even though it cost us more than a billion dollars to do this, I am indeed glad to say that we were in position to render such aid for a great cause, and in return gain a valuable ally, a true bastion against communism in the Balkans.

The Greek people have shown their appreciation of our help in many ways, particularly by their participation in the Korean war, and by their very firm and unwavering stand against totalitarian tyrants. The courage, the tenacity and the willingness to sacrifice their all for the attainment of their independence, are Greek national characteristics and these characteristics serve them well in defending their national independence.

I am indeed glad to join all loyal and patriotic Greek-Americans on the observance fo Greek Independence Day.

SERMON DELIVERED BY REV. FATHER JOHN F. DONOGHUE AT ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH ON MARCH 17

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. Albert) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the following sermon, most appropriate and informative, which I am pleased to include in my remarks, was delivered by Rev. Father John F. Donoghue, secretary to His Eminence, Cardinal O'Boyle and vice chancellor of the archdiocese of Washington, at a concelebrated mass in St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D.C., on Ireland's patronal feast, March 17. The principal celebrant of the mass was His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington.

Sermon Delivered by Rev. Father John F. Donoghue at St. Patrick's Church, March 17

Every nation has endeavored to preserve and perpetuate the memory of its heroes, so that future generations might be inspired by their feats and accomplishments and encouraged by their example to emulate them. Monuments of stone and marble give evidence of a peoples' love for their heroes. Today, Irishmen, wherever they may be, celebrate the feastday of their greatest hero, a man who has been elevated by the Church and numbered among the ranks of the saints—a man who bears the proud title, "Apostle of Ireland." Neither monuments of stone nor marble can fittingly attest to the devotion and love of the Irish people for St. Patrick. Continents are his monuments because those who enjoy his faith, who have never swerved from his allegiance, are found everywhere. His memory, however, is preserved in a special way in the hearts of everyone of Irish ancestry.

It might be well for us to review briefly the highlights of Patrick's life, because it is from his life that Irishmen in every generation have drawn the inspiration and courage to resist the temptations that could destroy their faith.

Although the date and place of his birth are not known with certainty, historians generally believe he was a Briton, a citizen of a Roman province who was born about the year 385. He was a descendant of those Roman conquerors of the world who made the Roman Empire—an empire which ruled over all the civilized peoples of their time. He lived at a time when a large portion of the then known world had become Christian. He was likewise a contemporary of such men as St. Augustine, St. Jerome and St. Ambrose.

Very little is recorded of the early life of the saint, except that when he was sixteen years of age he was carried off by Irish raiders and taken to Ireland as a slave. During this period of captivity, which was a blessing in disguise, he underwent a religious conversion and, as he himself describes it, he spent his days and nights in prayer while tending the herds of his master in the forests and mountains of Ulster. He likewise acquired a knowledge of the language and customs of his captors, and came to admire deeply and to love the character of the Irish people. Separate from his family and friends he learned to put his trust in God and to learn from Him the lessons of wisdom and love, which he would one day preach to the Irish people.

After six years of captivity, Patrick managed to escape. From the time he obtained his freedom until his return to Ireland many years later, he devoted himself assiduously to his studies at the Seminary of Tours in preparation for his life's work. When at last he was ordained to the priesthood, he travelled to Rome as Apostles in all ages have done, as St. Paul went to Peter, as St. Augustine did before he set out for England, as St. Boniface and St. Francis Xavier did to receive the blessing and commission of Christ's Vicar. Pope Celestine, impressed by Patrick's zeal and desire for the missions, consecrated him a bishop and commissioned him to carry the gospel of Christ to the pagan people of Ireland.

When St. Patrick returned to Ireland he found there a very remarkable people, a people it is true who were sunk in superstition, and with a fixed pagan religion, with an established priesthood proud of its traditions and jealous of the power it exercised. These people were not only isolated from the rest of the continent, but despite the fact that they were pagans worshipping false gods they were, nevertheless, preserved from the coarseness and orgies often associated with paganism. They believed in a supreme being on whom they depended for their life, for their success in this world, and for the happiness that they craved in the world to come.

When St. Patrick began to preach the doctrine of christianity he found the soil very receptive. In other countries the apostles were received with open opposition, and in many cases—in fact it was almost always the rule—the apostle of a country paid the penalty with his life. In the conversion of Ireland, however, it is a very singular fact that not one drop of blood was shed. It was a peaceful conquest, but not only so, it was accomplished in the lifetime of the apostle himself—so that St. Patrick lived to see the length and breadth of the island devoted to christianity and devoted to it with an enthusiasm that was unparalleled. It looked, in fact, at one time as if the whole island was going to become one great monastery.

His *Confession*, which was written towards the end of his life, is singularly lacking in information about the details of his later career. He speaks in general terms of "the success of his preaching, of the many thousands he converted of the sons of the Scots and the daughters of the chieftains" who became monks and virgins of Christ, of the persecutions he endured and his continual travels "amid many perils to remote places where there was no one beyond and where no one else had ever penetrated to baptize or ordain clergy or to confirm the people." It is sufficient to say that success following him wherever he went. Kings as well as peasants embraced christianity as a result of his preaching. After thirty-three years as an apostle, he died, leaving Ireland almost entirely converted.

The work which St. Patrick began continued to flourish after his death. The seed of the gospel planted by St. Patrick bore abundant fruit, not only on the island, but throughout Europe. Not long after their conversion, converts who became priests went out as missionaries, spread the doctrine of Christianity and diffused the light of scholarship as well, all over the west of Europe. They realized, as must we, that one of the features of religious zeal is not merely personal sanctification, but it is the desire to share the blessings of religion with our less fortunate neighbors. Religion is a light, and it shines not merely to illuminate the faith of him who walks in it, but it is to give an example to those who are not blessed with the same knowledge, the same devotion. It is for this reason that Irish missionaries went to the ends of the earth, carrying with them the message that they received from St. Patrick, and that wherever they went they taught those same remarkable lessons that had made converts of the Irish nation. And there was supreme need of their work. The Romans were in utter decadence. The barbarous invaders of Roman territory from the north had come down to take first the vices and only afterwards the virtues of the civilization they threatened to destroy. This decivilizing effect was felt not only in Italy, but practically everywhere in Roman territory. But Ireland stood as the missionary of civilization, of learning, and of sanctity, lifting men up from the mire of barbarism, opposing the spirit of the world of war and bringing men together by the ties of human brotherhood, learning and religion.

When persecution came to Ireland, as it has many times, it was a persecution of their religion; it was not merely a war of conquest, nor a war of retribution; it was an endeavor to uproot the faith that had been planted in the hearts of their fathers and that had grown and developed in the hearts of their children. Exile was one of the penalties that they paid for their faith. That exile sent them not merely into England and the continent, but it sent them across the stormy Atlantic; it sent them to distant Australia; and it gave to this country an untold number of heroic men and devoted women, who brought with them, not merely the faith that they had received, but brought with them the sturdy devotion, the tireless energy and industry, the genial humor, that has done so much to make the Irish people honored and loved. Macaulay, the English Protestant historian has fittingly remarked: "We have used the sword for centuries against the Catholic Irish. We have tried famine, we have tried extermination, we have had recourse to all the severity of the law. What have we done? Have we succeeded? We have neither been able to exterminate nor enfeeble them. I confess my incapacity to solve the problem. If I could find myself beneath the dome of St. Peter's and read with the faith of a Catholic, the inscription around it, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it', then I could solve the problem of Ireland's story."

That same indomitable spirit which moved St. Patrick, St. Columkille, St. Columba and an army of missionaries after them to leave the shores of Ireland and to spend themselves for christianity in countries far from home, is still alive in Irishmen wherever they may have settled. When Irish emigrants, compelled by the condition of their own land

XUM

to seek a better life, left their country, Irish priests followed them. Today, there are literally millions of Irish in all parts of the world united by a common bond of faith and belief, who have preserved in tact the tenets of christianity which fifteen hundred years ago St. Patrick preached.

Perhaps the greatest glory possessed by the Irish race and a glory which any people can desire, is the solid permanent uncompromising christian character. A character of singular interest in the knowledge and desire of the supernatural, which made the conversion of Ireland to christianity so bloodless, so immediate and so universal; a character of a love of truth and deep religious instinct, and a character of christian zeal with which Ireland was inflamed to make known the truths she possessed. A character of exalted christian charity by which she mainfested the truths of God even in the midst of her suffering.

As Christ prayed for St. Peter, so St. Patrick prayed for Ireland. It is said that when about to die, St. Patrick went to the top of a neighboring mountain and asked for fidelity to the faith for the Irish people. It is nearly fifteen hundred years since St. Patrick passed from earth to heaven and Ireland's faith has not failed yet. Fifteen centuries of fidelity to Christ and His Church; fifteen hundred years of strong spiritual life, a life of vigorous faith and love, which neither prosperity nor persecution could interrupt. From the moment that Ireland had seen the sun of faith rise upon her, she had vowed herself to it with an ardor and tender devotion which became her very life.

This same determination and strong faith, this same filial love and devotion to the Holy See which nothing can shake, the same reverence and respect for bishops and priests are the strong characteristics of the faith of the Irish today.

We believe that the heritage of truth that Christ gave to His Apostles by the Sea of Galilee with the direction to teach all nations, and that Patrick received in direct line from Peter's successor, is ours today, and that mandate was not given to a class, but to all, and each of us is a treasure bearer of that faith and each of us should be a disseminator of its knowledge.

Those of us of Irish ancestry possess the heritage of the faith and the mission of St. Patrick. We continue his missionary effort and preach the religion of Christ by the example of our lives. It was the virtue of the Irish people that kept their faith strong. And may the memory of their heroic virtues, the memory of their long fidelities, of their honor and suffering sustain us and may St. Patrick pray for us as he did for his converts, that our own faith may not fail us, and we by our lives may continue his missionary activity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Stafford (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for March 26 through the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Rumsfeld, for March 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1969, on account of his attendance at an international conference in Ditchley, England.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hanna, for 1 hour, Thursday, March 27, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Talcott, for 5 minutes, on March 25, 1969.

Mr. Pelly, for 20 minutes, on March 26, 1969.

Mr. Hosmer, for 20 minutes, on March 25, 1969.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford, for 3 minutes, on March 25, 1969.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Burlison of Missouri), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Diggs (at the request of Mr. Burlison of Missouri), for 60 minutes, on March 26; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Fascell.

Mr. Michel and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rumsfeld in five instances.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. Springer.

Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Wydler in three instances.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Cleveland in two instances.

Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Landgrebe in two instances.

Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Wyman in three instances.

Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Miller of Ohio.

Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. Skubitz in five instances.

Mr. Scherle in two instances.

Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Cunningham in three instances.

Mr. Button.

Mr. Derwinski in two instances.

Mr. Meskill in two instances.

Mr. Conte in three instances.

Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Taft.

Mr. Gude in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burlison of Missouri) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Matsunaga in two instances.

Mr. Daddario in two instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.

Mr. Bingham in five instances.

Mr. Friedel in two instances.

Mr. Patman.

Mr. Podell in three instances.

Mr. Minish.

Mr. Teague of Texas in six instances.

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. St. Onge in two instances.

Mr. Pucinski in 12 instances.

Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Rooney of New York in two instances.

Mrs. Sullivan in three instances.

Mr. Rarick in three instances.

Mr. Conyers in three instances.

Mr. Howard.

Mr. Mikva in two instances.

Mr. Wolff in three instances.

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey.

Mr. Flowers in three instances.

Mr. Alexander in three instances.

Mr. Dulski in two instances.

Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Patten.

Mr. Kyros in two instances.

Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Ottinger in two instances.

Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Galifianakis.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois.

Mr. Chappell.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 301. An act for the relief of Sein Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 348. An act for the relief of Cheng-huai Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 537. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 628. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 713. An act to designate the Desolution Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 742. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension. Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 743. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 927. An act for the relief of Victor Abadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 958. An act for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1011. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other puposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1016. An act for the relief of Dr. Richard Francis Power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Solar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Wong Wah Sin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1123. An act for the relief of Ah Mee Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint Resolution providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

618. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committe on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

619. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

620. A communication from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

621. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

622. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 4148. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 336. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7757, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–128). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 337. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 337, a bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–129). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2218. A bill for the relief of William John Moher; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Adela Durda; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2552. A bill for the relief of John Vincent Amirault; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Lee, In Sook; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5067. A bill for the relief of Yuka Awamura (Rept. No. 91–121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5133. A bill for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5134. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Schofield (Rept. No. 91–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5136. A bill for the relief of George Tilson Weed (Rept. No. 91–124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6607. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss (Rept. No. 91–125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Charles Richard Scott; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 9404. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9405. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. Dent, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Vanik, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Podell, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Rostenkowski, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Findley, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Michel, Mr. Minish, Mr. Giaimo, and Mr. Conte):

H.R. 9406. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9407. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 9408. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 9409. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 9410. A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9411. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9412. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9413. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9414. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9415. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9416. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9417. A bill to provide protection for the fish resources of the United States including the freshwater and marine fish cultural industries against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of fish and shellfish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

XUM

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9418. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9419. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9420. A bill to prohibit the leasing of submerged lands under the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif., for exploration, development, and removal of minerals, and to rescind all such existing mineral leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9421. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9422. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 9424. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the pueblo of Laguna; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 9425. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9426. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9427. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the determination of average pay for retirement purposes and the computation of retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Wold, Mr. Camp, Mr. Weicker, and Mr. Hastings):

H.R. 9428. A bill to establish the Capitol Guide Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H.R. 9429. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply by intergovernmental cooperation and strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the preservation and enhancement of the environment and conservation of scenic, historic, recreational, and other natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9430. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9431. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9432. A bill to provide for the election of a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9433. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of guaranteed loans for the modernization of hospitals and other health facilities and otherwise to facilitate the modernization and improvement of hospitals and other health facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9434. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for certain motor vehicle maintenance employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 9435. A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 9436. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9437. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9439. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9440. A bill to increase to 6 percent per annum the maximum interest rate payable on U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 9441. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal reclamation laws relating to the furnishing of water service to excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 9442. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 9443. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize reduced fares for persons who are at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9444. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons committing a third or subsequent violent crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9445. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate certain permittees where permits for summer or recreation-type residences on national forest lands are terminated and not renewed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9446. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 52 in the State of West Virginia as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9447. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9448. A bill to prohibit the manufacture or importation of coin replicas unless such replicas are manufactured in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9449. A bill to prohibit the alteration of coins in use and circulation for any purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9450. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9451. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 9452. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr O'HARA:

H.R. 9453. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to secure to physically handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops the right to organize and bargain collectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9454. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 9455. A bill to modify the reporting requirement and establish additional income exclusions relating to pension for veterans and their widows, to liberalize the bar to payment of benefits to remarried widows of veterans, to liberalize the oath requirement for hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9456. A bill to increase the effectiveness of certain student loan programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 9458. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9459. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 9460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt organizations which voluntarily engage in litigation for the benefit of third

XUM

parties, or commit other prohibited acts shall lose their exemption from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 9461. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9462. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Fort Washington, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9463. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9464. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 9465. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing by air, at no cost to the sender, under a regulated mailing coupon system, of certain parcels to members of the U.S. Armed Forces in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9466. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which benefits may be paid thereunder to an individual on account of posthospital extended care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9467. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9468. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9469. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9470. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 9471. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9472. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 9473. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9474. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 9475. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal reclamation laws relating to the furnishing of water service to excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9476. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9477. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 9478. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9480. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize additional mileage to permit needed adjustments in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 9481. A bill clarifying the intent of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, as pertains to operations vital to Vietnam support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9482. A bill to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Oceanographic Services to enunciate national policies pertinent to the maritime and marine interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources, to revitalize the American-flag merchant marine, to develop port, harbor, and estuarine areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9483. A bill to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9484. A bill to provide the same preference for veterans of the Vietnam era as for other veterans for certain Farmers Home Administration financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 9485. A bill to remove the $10,000 limit on deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9486. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 588. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. DADDARIO):

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 592. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 593. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Contitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 21 through April 26, 1969, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a fitting memorial in the Nation's Capital to the American space program and to the brave and dedicated individuals who carry it forward; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of school prayer hearings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Res. 338. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAFFORD (for himself and Mr. POLLOCK):

H. Res. 339. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of at least one standard metropolitan statistical area in each State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

XUM

86. By Mr. LANDGREBE: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to commending Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, for his outstanding record of achievement in the field of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

87. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, realtive to enactment of necessary legislation to appropriate full authorization for financing cooperative fire control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

88. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the citizenship of members of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

89. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Indiana, relative to changing the method of judicial review of convictions under State laws concerning obscenity and pornography; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River; to the Committee on Public Works.

91. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to locating a new national cemetery in Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

92. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to amending the Social Security Act to provide for Federal payment of the cost of welfare benefits paid to persons who do not meet State-imposed residency requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 9488. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9489. A bill for the relief of Ann Marie Parada and Oscar Nelson Parada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9490. A bill for the relief of Dapen Liang, his wife, Alice Tsai-hunk Y. Liang, and their children, Gladstone C. K. Liang, Nancy C. C. Liang, Dora C. F. Liang, Mary C. M. Liang, and John C. P. Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9491. A bill for the relief of Harold George Pereira, his wife, Winifred Caroline Pereira, and their children, Joseph Maurice, Anthony Francis, Bevery Ann Maria, Nathaniel Francis, Joachim Boniface, and Thomas James Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 9492. A bill for the relief of Dr. Helena V. Strandstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9493. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9494. A bill for the relief of Gloria Blackwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Bowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9498. A bill for the relief of Enrique G. Balart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9499. A bill for the relief of Juanita Cecile Sawyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9500. A bill for the relief of Michael Waithe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 9501. A bill for the relief of Miguel Arrastio Esponda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 9502. A bill for the relief of Digna Espartero Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9503. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Susca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 9504. A bill for the relief of William J. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to a Federal tax-sharing program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the little-known Slavic peoples whose homeland in the northwest of Russia and east of Poland has been part of the Russian empire for centuries. These sturdy people, never numerous or strong enough to cope with their more powerful foes, had been overwhelmed by the Russians. For many centuries they endured all sorts of hardships under the czarist regime, and when that regime was no more, in 1918 they attained their goal of freedom and independence.

On March 25 of that year, Byelorussian leaders proclaimed their national independence and founded the Byelorussian Republic. They formed their own democratic government, began rebuilding their war-torn country and were doing their best to reconstruct the shattered fabric of their social, economic, and political life. Unhappily, however, they were faced from the beginning by numerous insurmountable difficulties, and the defenses of the country were totally inadequate. Soon the country became an easy prey for the Red Army of Communist Russia. Late in 1918, the Byelorussion people were robbed of their richly deserved, but short-lived, freedom.

Since then, the Byelorussian people have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. But the idea of freedom and independence has never deserted them, and they still cling to the hope that someday they will once again—and this time permanently—attain their national goal. On the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day we all pray that their just cause will prevail against the forces of tyranny, and that they will attain that freedom.

Correspondence recognizing Byelorussian Independence Day follows:

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Jamaica, N.Y., February 18, 1969.

Hon. W. T. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. In spite of all the sacrifices, the young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic which was created in its place is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

This is why March 25th is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the Free World as a symbol of their national aspirations. Americans of Byelorussian descent will also celebrate the twenty-fifth of March this year, which marks the fifty-first anniversary of the struggle of Byelorussian people for freedom and independence.

We deeply appreciate your moral support of the nations enslaved by Russian Communism, among them the Byelorussian nation. This is why we ask you, as a United States Congressman, to make this year a statement from the House floor in defense of the national and political rights of the Byelorussian people.

Speeches in the halls of Congress give strength and hope to the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and encourage them in their spiritual resistance against Communist slavery.

Respectfully yours,
VLAD KURYLLO,
National President.

UNITED BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE,
Kew Gardens, N.Y., March 7, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The day of March 25, 1969 will mark the anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian origin. On this day Byelorussians everywhere in the countries of the free world will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

In Byelorussia, however, this national celebration is not permitted. This year, instead, marks the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian SSR.

The Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state. Soviet Russia turned Byelorussia into its own colony by military conquest. At the time of the First World War, the Tsarist Russian Empire was disintegrating. All the non-Russian nations liberated and restored themselves as free, independent and sovereign countries. The Byelorussian constituent body—the First All-Byelorussian Congress—assembled on December 17, 1917 in Miensk, the capital of Byelorussia. It was composed of 1,872 freely elected delegates from all areas

XUM

of Byelorussia. Their first task was to take the necessary steps for establishing an independent Byelorussian Republic. Since participating communist delegates were of a small minority, they were unable to change this trend. Therefore, an armed force, dispatched by the Bolshevik-Russian government, overran and dispersed the Congress. Immediately following this action, however, Congress met and chose the Executive Council which, on March 23, 1918, proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The elected Byelorussian government acted vigorously on the diplomatic arena and organized armed forces which fought for national independence.

The Soviet Russian government, in opposition to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, decided to create fictitious statehood for Byelorussian people. In Moscow in November 1918 the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) passed a resolution establishing the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The candidates for the government of BSSR were selected in Moscow and dispatched to Byelorussia. In Connection with the departure of those candidates from Moscow on December 29, 1918 Stalin sent a telegram to Myasnikoff, a Russian ruler in Byelorussia, which read as follows: "The Byelorussian are departing for Smalensk today. They are carrying a manifesto. The Central Committee of the Party and Lenin is asking to have them accepted as younger brothers, who as yet may be without experience, but who are ready to give their lives for the Party and Soviet work".

In the city of Smalensk on December 30, and 31, 1918, the sixth north-western provincial conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) took place. This conference, consisting of Russians and internationalists, named itself after the first meeting of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia. There were participating 162 delegates with voting rights and 25 delegates with consulting right. This meeting sent a greeting to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Moscow, which also contained this statement: "By proclaiming the establishment of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia, the conference confirms its uninterrupted ideological, tactical and organizational connection with the Russian Communist Party, which was created during many years of common activity. The conference further confirms that in the future the communists of Byelorussia will follow the leadership of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and consider it as the higher authority of the Party".

On December 31, 1918 the conference approved "the provisional revolutionary workers' and peasants' government for Byelorussia", which had been previously appointed in Moscow and which consisted of communists only. As a matter of ethnic formality two Byelorussians: Zhylunovich and Charviakou, were added to this government. The leading part of this government, however, was composed of non-Byelorussians. On January 1, 1919 this government announced a manifesto which had been prepared earlier in Moscow. This date and this act are considered the foundation for the Byelorussian SSR.

On February 2, 1919 the first assembly of Soviets of BSSR convened in Miensk. It was composed of 230 delegates, of which number 213 were communists and 17 sympathizers. The representative of the Soviet Russian government, Sverdloff, had announced the decision of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee which recognized the Byelorussian SSR. Answering this recognition, the assembly decided to maintain close federal connection between the BSSR and RSFSR.

On February 3, 1919 this assembly accepted a constitution, a national emblem and a flag for BSSR, modeled after the Russian SFSR. Created by Soviet Russian government in this way, the BSSR is camouflaging the actual colonial status of Byelorussia. For the entire 50 years of this Soviet Russian domination, Byelorussians, have been subjected to a systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level.

This rule has been marked by economic exploitation, social oppression, mass terror, political deportations, imprisonments and murders. Denial of religious freedom to all faiths openly continuous. A low standard of living, malnutrition and substandard housing are permanent features of the Soviet rule. The end result is that during this period Byelorussian nation has lost over six million of her population.

At this time Byelorussians in the BSSR do not have any possibility to defend their own national interests. Therefore, we take the liberty to ask you for support of the aims of the Byelorussian nation for liberation from the horrors experienced during these past 50 years of Soviet Russian occupation, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian State.

Very respectfully yours,
MICHAEL BACHAR,
Chairman.

INCREASED "E" BOND RATE SEEN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 7015, providing for an increase to 5 percent in the interest rate for U.S. savings bonds and now that we have 3 consecutive months in which there were more bonds cashed in than were purchased, I feel that something should be done immediately to increase the incentives for savers to purchase these bonds.

An article by Mr. Joseph R. Slevin appearing in the Washington Post edition of Sunday, March 23, 1969, discusses this matter and I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

INCREASED "E" BOND RATE SEEN: MEAGER YIELD ANGERS SAVERS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Savings bond buyers want a more generous interest rate return and the Administration intends to give it to them.

Dissatisfied investors are sending a stream of bitter complaints to the White House, Congress, and the Treasury Department. They are making it clear that they think the 4¼ per cent "E" bond return is stingy and should be increased.

"Being a good citizen, I put my life saving in Government 'E' bonds," an older woman recently wrote Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy. "However, now that I am retired I feel that I have done myself a great injustice by doing so. I do think some consideration should be given to older folks, who invested their savings with the Government. We retired people cannot keep up with the purchasing power with inflation on the rampage."

A retired cripple advised Kennedy the other day that he had sold his savings bonds and put his money in savings and loan associations that pay 5 per cent. Another man complained that inflation has halved the value of his bonds and warned that he will cash them in unless the Treasury increases the rate. "I am at the edge of the cliff, ready to leap," he declared.

President Nixon will ask Congress to authorize a higher rate as soon as the lawmakers complete action on a controversial debt limit bill that passed the House on Wednesday. Administration plans call for urging Congress to repeal the statutory 4¼ per cent ceiling both on savings bonds and on marketable bonds.

The best reason for increasing the savings bond rate is that small savers are not being treated fairly by their Government. The 4¼ per cent rate not only is below the 5 per cent return that an investor can get from many thrift institutions but it is even further below the return of more than 6 per cent that the Treasury pays to sell billions of dollars of notes and other securities to professional investors. Most savings bond buyers are financially unsophisticated people. They trust the Government to give them a fair shake and their confidence is being abused.

The savings bond program will start to come apart at the seams if the interest rate is not increased. The Treasury will find it harder to sell new bonds and cash-ins of outstanding bonds will rise rapidly.

Millions of Americans now hold $52 billion of savings bonds. While sales and redemptions are slightly less satisfactory than they were, officials believe the erosion can be halted if the 4¼ per cent rate is increased soon.

The Government has boosted the rate five times since the savings bond program was started in 1941. An "E" bond originally paid 2.9 per cent. The most recent change came last year when the rate was lifted from 4.15 per cent to 4.25 per cent. All savings bond owners get the benefit of a rate increase for it applies to outstanding bonds as well as to new purchases.

Thrift institutions, such as savings and loan associations, look on savings bonds as competitors and can be expected to try to limit the size of the coming increase. Savings bond holders should get at least 5 per cent but that is a higher return than the heads of many thrift institutions would like to see the Government pay.

Nixon and Kennedy may find that they can give savings bond holders a fair return only at the price of a bitter row with the well organized thrift institutions.

INCREASING THE NATIONAL DEBT CEILING

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on H.R. 8508, the President's request for an increase in the permanent and temporary debt ceilings to $365 billion and $377 billion respectively.

This bill passed the House by an overwhelming majority—313–93, because the Congress really had no other choice. Not to have approved it would have been denying the Government the funds to pay its obligations. Obligations, incidentally, which had previously been approved by this very body.

I voted for this bill because it would have been irresponsible not to have done so. When this Congress approves programs and expenditures and appropriates funds therefor, if it then refuses to honor these commitments by not voting for the necessary increase in the debt limit, such action cannot be described as other than irresponsible.

Such a situation would be analogous to giving the Government a credit card and then refusing to pay the bills resulting from the charge account.

I do not mean to imply that I approve of the debt ceiling device. Quite the contrary. I rather resent being forced into a position of voting for a procedure which I think is basically wrong in order to be voting responsibly. But when a nation incurs debts it is obligated to pay them. What we should do instead is to cut down on the debts.

Attempting to control expenditure of public funds by manipulating the debt ceiling is deceptive, fictional, and extremely misleading to the public. The only true and effective means of fiscal control is to control the congressional approval of programs, expenditures and, most importantly, of appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this is the last time Congress will ever be asked to approve this inappropriate means of fiscal control.

ELECTRONIC GADGETRY A BARGAIN—EVEN AT $1,000 A POUND

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, an article appeared in the Washington Post casting serious reflections on the capability, efficiency, and perhaps even the probity of the American areospace industry. This article was commented on in the January 29 issue of the authoritative Aerospace Daily which seriously questioned the validity of the Richard A. Stubbing study on which the Washington Post article was based. I inserted the Aerospace Daily article in the Record on February 18 noting at that time that I did not intend to become an apologist for the areospace industry, or indeed for any other segment of our industrial structure, but indicating that I felt that both accuracy and fairplay dictated that any illumination of the true facts with respect to our aerospace industry should be presented as a matter of open record.

In continuance of my original intentions in this respect, I wish to draw the attention of Members of the House and the public to another article on this subject, this one appearing in the March 18, 1969, issue of the Washington Star. It is written by Mr. Orr Kelly who, in referring to the Stubbing report, states that:

> A new myth is in the process of being created.
>
> The myth, in its simplest form, is that most of the newest, most complicated gadgetry being turned out by this country's laboratories and factories is a lot of junk.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record at this point Mr. Kelly's article which does much to dispel the myth referred to and, further, explains and describes some of the true achievements of the aerospace industry:

"Junk" Myth on Electronic Gadgetry

(By Orr Kelly)

A new myth is in the process of being created.

The myth, in its simplest form, is that most of the newest, most complicated gadgetry being turned out by this country's laboratories and factories is a lot of junk.

The myth got its start with publication, earlier this year, of a report on a study done by Richard A. Stubbing, a budget analyst for the Bureau of the Budget—and, according to those who worked with him, one of the best.

While on leave from his government post last year for studies at Princeton University, Stubbing wrote a paper for a class in systems analysis in which he tried to determine how good some new electronic equipment was by comparing the time and work before breaking down—known as the mean time between failures—with the standards set in the original specifications.

He found that, in many cases, it measured up rather poorly to the original goal.

The conclusion drawn by some of those who read the report—or read about it—was that Stubbing had proved that the newer electronic equipment doesn't work very well and that it is getting worse and worse.

But Stubbing's study really proved no such thing because, for the limited purposes of his class report, he used only one measure of reliability and compared it with the original specifications.

Another, perhaps better, measure would be to check how well a piece of equipment compared to what it was designed to replace.

By this measure, there is no doubt that much of the newer electronic gadgetry does far more and operates more reliably than what it has replaced. The dramatic advance in capability and reliability from the early Gemini Space Craft to the Apollo Moon Craft is a clear indication of the kind of improvement that has been made.

(The main question raised by Stubbing is whether the government is getting its money's worth for some of the new equipment it is buying and there are many in the Pentagon who would agree with him that it isn't. But this is a different question from whether the equipment itself is junk.)

The myth has been greatly nourished in recent days by scientists opposed to the Sentinel missile defense system.

Dr. Herbert F. York, former director of defense research and engineering, for example, told a Senate hearing the other day that the system could prove to be a "catastrophic failure" and other scientists have testified that it can't be made to work.

But this neglects the fact that it is something close to a scientific miracle that antimissile technology has advanced to the point that it is worth a serious debate.

The basic problem is to hit a missile coming in at four miles a second with a defensive missile that can only get up to a speed of about 1 mile a second—hitting a fast bullet with a slow bullet. This seemingly impossible problem was solved nearly seven years ago.

Next was the problem of a radar set so fast and accurate it could sort out a real warhead from a cloud of decoys and debris. With the phased array radar, developed a few years later, that problem began to come under control.

The technology, which is pretty remarkable, does work.

But the debate is over whether this technology can be put together into a system that works, and that is a different problem.

A missile defense system, once deployed, may remain in place for years. And then, perhaps without warning, it must work both instantly and perfectly.

The difficulty is illustrated by comparison with a conventional air defense system. No one has ever developed such a system that even approached 20 percent effectiveness. If the North Vietnamese had come close to that figure for even a short time, they could quickly have broken the back of the American bombing effort. But a missile defense system that dropped as low as 90 percent effectiveness would indeed, in York's phrase, be a "catastrophic failure."

The myth that most of our modern gadgetry is junk may well be obscuring a much more important truth.

Man progressed over a period of many centuries from simple, highly reliable implements of limited usefulness like the chipping stones and the club to complex, highly useful devices of limited reliability like the vacuum tube radio. Now, he is beginning to come within sight of the day, when he can build complex, highly useful devices that will also be very close to being perfectly reliable.

The remaining degree of unreliability can be very frustrating, as anyone knows who has found his battery dead on a cold morning.

But it would be unfortunate if the myth that we are busy building junk were allowed to flourish and draw attention away from such real and pressing problems as how to build these new gadgets most economically and, even more important, what to build and how to use it most effectively for the benefit of mankind.

A MODEST PROPOSAL

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion over the question of whether or not we should proceed with the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. The President has requested congressional approval of a "safeguard" system. I support him in this request. As our Commander in Chief, it is the President's constitutional function to insure the national security. He has decided that that security requires the "safeguard."

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial in the Record from the March 16, New Haven Register. This editorial was forwarded on to me by former Congressman Ellsworth B. Foote, of the Third Congressional District, 80th Congress. I commend it to your thoughtful consideration:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Mar. 16, 1969]

The ABM Decision: Nixon Makes His Move With Skill

So it is to be "safeguard" instead of "Sentinel." It is to protect the American deterrent to war and not America's centers of population. And it's to cost $6 billion or $7 billion and not $10 billion as the most conservative estimators guessed.

In announcing his awesomely difficult decision on the anti-ballistic missile program the other day, President Nixon cleared away a lot of underbrush. He revealed convincingly that the art of political compromise is finely developed in the new Administration, and that this art can be employed without violating national security—at least for now—and without limiting the avenues open for the future. We think he should have solid national support in this effort.

The President came neatly down the middle between those who advised him to approach Moscow naked with an olive branch in his hand, and those who urged him to arm to the teeth—without regard for the possibility that the Soviets then would do the same.

XUM

By his plan to equip the Minuteman missile sites with ABM systems that presumably will protect them from enemy missile assaults, the President warns both China and Russia that there can be no "first strike" against the United States without sure and devastating retaliation against the aggressor, America is not being left exposed.

Yet "peace" is the Nixon Administration's watchword. The President is taking pains not to provoke hostile response abroad with anything that appears to be an offensive build-up.

There is, of course, immense risk involved. At stake is the conclusion—or, more accurately, the conjecture—that the Kremlin, with a Chinese tiger glowering menacingly on the East and a domestic population yearning for a plumper consumer economy within, is anxious to minimize its expenses and frictions with respect to the West.

It is this combination of circumstances that has built up intense pressure on the White House to accept the view that history is offering a rare "opportunity" for international rapport that should not be lost, for it may not recur for a generation.

Nixon himself noted this possibility in his Inaugural. But he has huge responsibility to discharge as well as circumstances to act upon—circumstances and widely conflicting shreds of advice. Scientists offer political advice, politicians offer scientific advice. Even those who stick to their specialized fields aren't in agreement with each other.

We can't be sure that our ABM will work when its installed in 1973—or that the Russian missiles won't. Even if our Minutemen are protected successfully by our ABM's, will these Minutemen be able to penetrate Russia's defenses and serve as a convincing deterrent?

Again the President has been frank. There is no final answer to the deterrent problem at this time, and there is no sure way to protect America's cities—except by preventing war. All Nixon promises is an annual review of his "modified" ABM program, weighing up-to-date intelligence on the nature of the international threat, the status of arms-control talks if any, and new technological developments—all elements on which to base changes or new decisions as warranted.

Congress now must decide whether this is a reasonable solution, adequate at this time for national security and also for the prospects of securing a tapering-off of the cold war.

There are times, even in a democracy where the individual voter is sovereign, when the public has to let its President choose, and to place its confidence in his judgment. This is such a time—and Congress, we hope, will see it just that way.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO LOCATE A VETERANS HOSPITAL IN SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Legislature which was approved by the senate on March 10, 1969, and by the general assembly on March 17.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the resolution and again urge action on proposals to build a veterans hospital in the southern part of my State. While I represent a district which is along the Hudson River I am well aware that the need of veterans in our State justifies a third veterans hospital to supplement the two overcrowded facilities at East Orange and Lyons.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45; STATE OF NEW JERSEY

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to locate a veterans hospital in southern New Jersey

Whereas there is only one Federal Veterans Hospital located in New Jersey; and

Whereas the general population as well as the disabled veteran population of southern New Jersey has expanded greatly and continues to expand; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to give appropriate consideration of the location of a new veterans hospital in southern New Jersey.

2. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives elected from New Jersey and to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

D. D. DUGGAN: A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1969, Donald D. Duggan retired as Deputy Chief Postal Inspector after serving in the Post Office Department for nearly 45 years.

Mr. Duggan, a native of the Seventh District of Iowa, rose from the position of substitute mail clerk to the second highest post in the Postal Inspection Service.

During World War II he served as the U.S. Army's Chief Postal Inspector and was awarded the Legion of Merit citation for his meritorious service contributing to the "improvement of mail service for our troops abroad."

After the war he served as a member of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff and helped to supervise the rehabilitation of the Japanese postal service. For his outstanding contribution, he was awarded the second highest award Japan can bestow, the Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.

D. D. Duggan's record of dedication to his job is well known throughout the entire U.S. Government service. Upon his retirement he returned more than 2,916 hours of unused accumulated sick leave.

I wish to join the citizens of western Iowa in saying how proud we are of this native of Honey Creek, Iowa, who graduated from Missouri Valley High School, and rose to this important post in the service of our Government.

Donald Duggan's dedication and excellent performance will long be missed in the Post Office Department. At this point in the RECORD I insert the following article concerning this outstanding civil servant, "Missouri Valley High School Alumnus Retires as Deputy Chief Post Office Inspector":

MISSOURI VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL ALUMNUS RETIRES AS DEPUTY CHIEF POST OFFICE INSPECTOR

Donald D. Duggan, the Post Office Department's Deputy Chief Inspector, retires February 28, after nearly 45 years of continuous service in the nation's civilian and military postal systems.

Mr. Duggan was born and reared at Honey Creek, Ia. He is an alumnus of Missouri Valley High School.

Rising through the ranks to the second highest position in the Department's Inspection Service, Duggan began his post office career in 1924 as a substitute mail clerk in Chicago. He entered the department's inspection service in 1934 as an inspector for the Philadelphia post office. He also has served as an inspector in the Washington, D.C., and St. Louis post offices. He was appointed deputy chief inspector by the Postmaster General in 1961.

WAS CHIEF FOR ARMY

During World War II, Duggan served as the U.S. Army's chief postal inspector. He was awarded the Legion of Merit Citation for his recognized contributions to the "improvement of mail service for our troops abroad."

Later, as a member of General Douglas MacArthur's staff, Duggan helped to supervise the post-war rehabilitation of the Japanese postal service. His successful efforts. including the establishment of an inspection system patterned after our own, earned him Japan's second highest decoration, The Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.

As deputy chief postal inspector, Duggan has assisted the chief postal inspector in the implementation of policies designed to insure the safe and prompt delivery of the mails and to guard the public against the use of the postal service for illegal purposes.

HIGH PRAISE

Commenting on Duggan's retirement plans, Chief Inspector Henry Montague expressed his "deep gratitude and high praise for Don Duggan's record of accomplishment.

Duggan, who will return 2,916 hours of unused accumulated sick leave to the Post Office Department when he retires, said he has no special plans after he leaves his post. "First, I am going to catch up on some long overdue rest and relaxation," he said. "I do know one thing, however," Duggan added. "Whatever I do, whenever I send or receive a letter I will think of the Post Office Department and especially my good friends and associates in the Postal Inspection Service."

Duggan resides with his family in Arlington, Va.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this day, March 25, marks the 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The importance of commemorating this event here in Congress should not be underestimated. I am certain that it will serve as an inspiration to the millions of Byelorussian people now subjugated by the Soviet Union.

Recent press accounts of new liberal reforms in Hungary demonstrate that the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet bloc troops has only temporarily slowed down the progress of democratic reforms within the Soviet bloc.

The rulers of Soviet Russia are finding out that oppression can never eradicate the yearnings for political and social freedoms that motivate mankind.

The reaction of the Czech people to the invasion is itself a demonstration that the love of freedom still flames within their hearts and cannot be put out by force.

Indeed, the courageous sacrifices for liberty that we can recognize in the Byelorussian people and elsewhere in Communist-dominated lands serve as an inspiration and example for all of us.

As we view renewed popular unrest and pressures against autocratic Communist rule, we must reaffirm our own sympathy and support for the Byelorussian people's search for freedom and justice.

Let us extend our prayerful wishes to the people of Byelorussia that they may soon be free of the yoke of Communist slavery within the Soviet Union.

May they once against exercise meaningful political and social determination.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE MACHIASPORT PROJECT

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD joint resolution 11 of the Vermont General Assembly, a resolution relating to expressing support of the Machiasport project in Maine.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE MACHIASPORT PROJECT

Whereas, Vermonters and their fellow citizens of New England do not have ready access to low cost sources of energy now available to virtually every other area of the country, *and*

Whereas, our region is sorely dependent on fuel oil, particularly for home heating, *and*

Whereas, this commodity is generally more expensive in New England than anywhere else in the United States and, in recent winters, its supply has often been threatened by quotas and other factors over which we have no control, *and*

Whereas, the State of Maine has applied to the Free Trade Zone Board for permission to site an oil refinery in the town of Machiasport for the purpose of producing large quantities of this desperately needed commodity, *and*

Whereas, the presence of this refinery in our region will assure a lowered price for fuel oil and ready availability of this product, particularly in the winter months, *now therefore be it*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the members of the Vermont General Assembly express their support for our sister state's application for this refinery and urge our Congressional Delegation to continue its vigorous advocacy of Maine's request that the communities of Machiasport and Portland be declared free ports for the purpose of receiving crude oil and processing it for eventual distribution in our region, *and be it further*

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation and to the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Interior in Washington, D.C.

Approved: March 14, 1969.

DEANE C. DAVIS,
Governor.
THOMAS L. HAYES,
President of the Senate.
JOHN S. BURGESS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I personally very strongly support not only the statements of fact but the resolving portion of Joint Resolution 11 of the Vermont General Assembly.

EDUCATION OR CHAOS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William O. Walker, outstanding publisher and Negro leader in Ohio, in an article of March 8, 1969, in the Call and Post, comments on disruption in our schools. As he aptly points out, while depriving many students of an education, the unrest in our schools hits hardest at the Negro, who, more than any one thing, suffers from the lack of a good education.

I associate myself with the views of Mr. Walker and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

EDUCATION OR CHAOS

(By William Walker)

It seems that the gauntlet is down. Our school officials will either have to run it or stand up to the challenge.

The whole question revolves around who will run our public schools: the elected Boards of Education, or dissident students and their advisors—a renegade bunch of subsidized troublemakers.

This is the challenge facing schools in most of the big cities of Ohio, and to a large extent, the nation.

These public schools were created and exist for the sole purpose of furnishing an education, at the taxpayers' expense, for all students as provided by law.

The authority of elected and hired schools officials to provide this education is being challenged. School buildings are being invaded by outsiders. Classes are being interrupted. Teachers are threatened and, as in John Hay High School in Cleveland, every kind of harassment imaginable used to prevent those students who want to study from doing so. The result was utter chaos and the closing of the school.

Despite the fact that trouble has been brewing at John Hay for several months, school officials acted as if they were caught unawares. They were indecisive, vague as to what to do and reluctant to take a firm stand.

This weakness on the part of the school officials encouraged the troublemakers to become more bold and demanding. Some encouragement was given them by a board member who tried to act on his own without first knowing all the facts. This is inexcusable.

John Hay is the starting point. Either the school officials win the battle there, or else they will lose control of all the other schools. At some point, Supt. Paul Briggs must decide that thus far he will retreat and no further. It must be determined now who runs the schools—the teachers and the officials or a motley group of troublemaking students and their incitors.

In no case where trouble has erupted in a public school, has a majority of the enrolled students participated. This majority has its rights too. It is the lawful obligation of the school officials to protect them and keep the schools opened for them no matter what it cost.

At John Hay, the rebelling students were permitted to bypass the duly-elected and representative Student Council. This was certainly a big mistake. It weakened the whole democratic process of orderly procedure for presenting student grievances to the appropriate school officials. This in itself was an invitation to trouble.

If the Student Council isn't the proper agency for students action and redress, then the schools should set up such an agency and respect its jurisdiction.

All schools, colleges and public schools, should know by now that they face a revolt; a revolt that is organized, directed and financed. Demands are being made that students know cannot be granted. Demands that if granted, would wreck our whole system of education.

It seems that knowing this, our shcool officials would be better prepared and informed as to what to do.

Since a large number of Negro students are participants and or instigators in these troubles, the Negro community must therefore become involved. No matter what happens, the Negro student and the Negro community have the most to lose.

Black nationalism is all right in its proper place. But when a few self-appointed, selfish individuals arrogate unto themselves the right to dictate as to what majority of Negroes want, then it is time to call a halt.

The one thing the Negro is suffering most from today, is the lack of a good education. Anything that interferes with our improving our posture in this field, must be dealt with promptly and decisively.

We want the opportunity to get an education. The next generation of Negroes must have a good education or else their lot will be with those on relief or the outcast.

We therefore, must support education and fight chaos. With an education, we can have everything. With chaos, the gains we've made will be lost, as well as the future. We then have but one choice—education.

BLOOD AND TREASURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the income tax deadline on April 15, more Americans who still pay taxes are shuddering to learn that in addition to having had the highest taxes in the history of America, they are having to pay additional sums to finance a runaway bureaucracy. As our colleagues receive the taxpayers' embittered cries from home, I think they will find of interest the report on the World Bank from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly on March 10.

The only logical conclusion could be that instead of making matters better, we are financing them worse.

The Barron's article follows:

BLOOD AND TREASURE: A NOTE ON THE NEW HEAD OF THE WORLD BANK

From the hundreds of press releases which daily cross our desk, two last week struck us

XUM

as out of the ordinary. According to one, which arrived on Wednesday from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: "The World Bank has announced the successful placement of a $192,650,000 issue of U.S. dollar bonds in markets outside the U.S. . . . The bonds were purchased by central banks and other governmental institutions for 57 different countries and by international organizations. The new World Bank bonds, known as 'Two Year Bonds of 1969, due March 15, 1971,' bear interest at 6¾, payable semi-annually." The other, from the International Development Association (a World Bank subsidiary), ran as follows: "Expansion of telecommunications services, one of the most urgent needs in Pakistan, will be assisted by a credit of $16 million from the International Development Association (I.D.A.). The credit to the Government of Pakistan is for a term of 50 years, including 10 years of grace. The credit will be free of interest but a service charge of ¾ of 1% will be made to cover I.D.A.'s administrative costs."

In issuing the two statements, World Bank flacks—to whose professional skill we will personally attest—doubtless meant only to inform the public of the institution's latest financial moves. Willy-nilly, however, they succeeded in disclosing a good deal more. For one thing, Pakistan, the government of which, in the wake of recent bloody riots, may change for the worse, hardly rates as a preferred credit risk. Again, "telecommunications services" (which, so the press release indicates, includes "direct dialing facilities between 13 towns in East and 21 towns in West Pakistan"—who said never the twain shall meet?—as well as "the construction of two ground stations to work via the Intelsat 3 satellite" should pay their own way or command a relatively low priority in an underdeveloped land. Finally, the terms of the transactions must strike even the most openhanded observer, to say nothing of a Scrooge, as a less-than-fruitful use of scarce and costly capital.

"If I wanted to be a banker," so Robert S. McNamara, who now guides the destinies of both lending institutions, reportedly once remarked, "I would have joined a mere bank." He's in the right place. Under his management—like that of his predecessor, George D. Woods—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has grown progressively less businesslike. Key personnel, such as the highly respected former treasurer who had been with the bank since it opened its doors, have resigned or otherwise yielded to officials of scant stature or expertise in money matters. Bank and I.D.A. loans have poured out not only to applicants of doubtful credit standing but also to nations—Yugoslavia and Tanzania, for example—that are hostile to capitalism and all its works. In transactions with more respectable and better-heeled customers, the World Bank, far from seeking to operate at a profit, as investors who hold its obligations have a right to expect, lately has been lending at interest rates which fail even to cover the cost of its own newly borrowed funds. To damage or destroy the usefulness of a giant institution, and to dissipate its resources of money and talent, is no easy task. However, the man who gave us both the Edsel and the TFX may yet bring it off.

If he fails, it won't be for lack of trying. "In the past 90 days," the new president proudly told the board of governors last September, "the World Bank has raised more funds by borrowing than in the whole of any single calendar year in its history." That apparently was just for openers. Mr. McNamara went on to say: "I believe that globally the Bank Group during the next five years should lend twice as much as during the past five." Special emphasis, he added, should go to Latin America and, notably, to Africa, "where the greatest expansion of our activities should take place. There, over the next five years, with effective collaboration from the African countries, we should increase our rate of investment three-fold." The man has been as good as his word. Since fall, the bank, frequently in combination with its I.D.A. affiliate, has lent sizable sums to Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Tunisia and Zambia, on terms far and away the easiest in the world.

In consequence, neither the bank's income account—the latest quarterly statement, unlike that of most money-lenders these days, disclosed flat earnings—nor its balance sheet, which shows current liabilities exceeding current assets by one billion dollars, is much to brag about. Liquidity, indeed, is so low that despite a heavy flow of repayments, the bank must make repeated trips to the well. True, as the president noted, the funds to date have been forthcoming. (I.D.A., which draws all its giveaway wherewithal from governments, last week won a fresh vote of confidence from the Nixon Administration and the House Banking and Currency Committee, which cleared a long-delayed $480 million, authorization). What Mr. McNamara failed to stress, however, are signs of mounting lender resistance. Two bond issues publicly offered in Switzerland since 1967 have been hard to sell. Moreover, in recent financings the bank has appealed not to private sources of credit but to various government agencies—municipally owned German savings banks, for example—the resources of which are limited.

Whether the World Bank, during a global shortage of capital, will be able to pursue its course remains to be seen. It is painfully apparent that by any sensible view of the U.S. national interest—this country, after all, contributed the biggest chunk of capital and remains in effective control—such plans are not worth pursuing. Thus, by lending $16 million to Zambia, the World Bank supports an increasingly oppressive and racist regime, which, like the rest of East Africa, has robbed thousands of East Indian traders of their means of livelihood. By advancing Nigeria $6 million "to cover anticipated foreign-exchange requirements . . ." the World Bank doubtless has helped finance a war of extermination against Biafra. The $30 million earmarked for Tanzania, which has swung about as far left as anyone can go, will help to further Red Chinese designs on the Dark Continent.

Geopolitics aside, free-and-easy credit makes no economic sense. Projects which fail to offer an adequate return on investment at going interest rates probably shouldn't be launched. Borrowers who persist in such perverse ways—and lenders who provide the wherewithal—merely wind up wasting a nation's substance. In the best of times—to judge by the perennial plight of India, which has dissipated literally billions of dollars worth of World Bank, I.D.A. and other forms of foreign aid—grants and low-interest loans (which, in an age of inflation, come to virtually the same thing) are gifts of doubtful value. Today, when the free world stands on the brink of a new, and possibly fatal, financial crisis, they are a folly which no one can afford.

The last to grasp this simple truth will probably be Robert Strange McNamara, whose current views, in the light of those he recently espoused, seem curious indeed. As Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara—at the expense, to be sure, of the national security—placed computerized "cost effectiveness" and other shibboleths of the accountant's trade above all. Contrariwise, in his new post, where such yardsticks might apply, money evidently is no object. Blood and treasure come high. The head of the World Bank already has cost this country far too much.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia.

After the Byelorussian people declared their independence, they were able, for a few brief months, to live according to their ideals and beliefs.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

As thousands of American citizens who are of Byelorussian ancestry know, their families and friends still in Byelorussia have no freedom to express their deeply felt aspirations for self-determination and individual liberty. Today all Americans join with our fellow citizens of Byelorussian ancestry in renewing our own devotion to the principles of freedom and in our deeply felt hope that the day is not far off when the people of Byelorussia as well as people everywhere, can join us in our enjoyment of the blessings of freedom.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the love of freedom is strong in all Americans but it is especially so in those who have experienced, or whose loved ones have experienced, tyranny. Many of my constituents were born in other lands; many more have parents, brothers, children, and friends still residing in these native lands.

I speak today of the oppressed of Lithuania, the small Baltic nation whose independence was restored 51 years ago and then tragically snuffed out almost 30 years ago when it was invaded by the Soviet Union. Now a satellite state behind the Iron Curtain, Lithuania's memory of freedom is distant but not dim.

The Lithuanian American Councils of my district in Wisconsin include some of the most outstanding citizens of our State. These fine groups keep us aware of the value of freedom and the tragedy of its loss.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include, at this point in the RECORD, the resolutions memorializing Lithuanian independence which were adopted recently by the Lithuanian American Councils of Racine and Kenosha, Wis.:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY, FEBRUARY 9, 1969

We, Lithuanian Americans of Kenosha, citizens of and permanent residents in the United States, gathered on February 9, 1969, at Kenosha, Wis. to commemorate the 51st anniversary of the restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania,

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration of Lithuania to a free exercise of the right to self-determination and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; do hereby Resolve

(1) To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to firmly restate and vigorously promote in all diplomatic dealings with the Soviet union, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania;

(2) To assure the Lithuanian people presently suffering under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—total freedom and independence;

(3) To support the policy of *any* United States Government, aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and enduring peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government.

Dr. VITOLDAS BALCIUNAS, M.D.,
Chairman, Lithuanian American Council, Kenosha Branch.
VLADAS SKIRMUNTAS,
Secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Kenosha Branch.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, RACINE, WIS., BRANCH, FEBRUARY 2, 1969

Whereas, on June 15th, 1940, Soviet Russia forcibly occupied the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, the people of this country since then are living under severe oppression and colonial rule; and

Whereas, Communism in its relentless drive for world domination is keeping millions of people in bondage and the world in the stage of turmoil; therefore be it

Resolved, that this mass meeting condemn Soviet Russia for its aggression and colonial policies against an enslaved people, especially as it is now in progress in Czechoslovakia; and therefore be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting urge Soviet Russia start gradual withdrawal of the occupational forces from the enslaved countries and stop discriminating against the minorities within their original territories; and be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting humbly ask President Richard M. Nixon, members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that they exert necessary efforts to bring the case of Lithuania and all other enslaved countries before the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting will always support the efforts of any Administration which will seek an honorable and just peace to end the war in Southeast Asia where Communist aggression must be stopped to fulfill the American promise; and be it finally

Resolved, that this mass meeting express gratitude to the Government of the United States for the non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into Soviet Russia.

MARTIN KASPARAITIS,
President.
STANLEY P. BUDRYS,
Secretary.

A BILL TO MODIFY AND ABOLISH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to modify the reporting requirement and establish additional income exclusion relating to pensions for veterans and their widows. In addition, this legislation would liberalize the restrictions on benefits to remarried widows of veterans, and simplify procedures for hospitalization of veterans.

One of the most important provisions of this legislation concerns the abolition of the requirement that a veteran file an income questionnaire after the age of 72. This requirement particularly affects veterans of World War I. At this age, it becomes almost impossible for the veteran to, in any way, increase his income. His income at this point in time does in fact, decrease along with added expenditures for medicines for he and his wife.

This legislation is sorely needed to correct the substantial inequities which burden veterans and widows of veterans. Under the existing law, a widow permanently forfeits her right to pension benefits if she remarries. This legislation would provide for the reestablishment of such benefits if the second marriage is terminated by death or valid divorce.

APOLLO: HOW THE UNITED STATES DECIDED TO GO TO THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people Leonard Mandelbaum's excellent article on how the United States adopted the Apollo program, from a recent issue of Science magazine. The background of this historic decision is of interest to all of us.

Mr. Mandelbaum's suggestions with regard to integrating the many programs of science, research, and development funded by the Federal Government are also especially timely.

I am glad to include this article by an outstanding attorney in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

APOLLO: HOW THE UNITED STATES DECIDED TO GO TO THE MOON

(By Leonard Mandelbaum)

The United States program to send a manned expedition to the moon and back has involved more scientists, engineers, and public attention than any other civilian research and development project. Certainly none has matched the $20- to $40-billion estimate of Apollo.[1] An examination of the history of the approval of the Apollo decision should contribute to a better understanding of our national decision-making processes in the field of research and development.

HISTORY OF THE APOLLO: DECISION 1958–61

Through July 1960. Sputnik's flight in 1957 was the spacemark of this generation.[2] With this act, the Russians undermined worldwide belief in the technical supremacy of the United States. Our confidence in the strength of our international diplomatic-military position was replaced by deep anxiety which made itself felt in our educational system and our national leadership. Pressure was on the Eisenhower Administration to produce in space. Priority was given to the Vanguard program, and the Army and Air Force were authorized to use military rockets for the launching of their satellite systems (2, p. 56). Shortly thereafter, the President appointed the chairman of his Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) as his Special Assistant for Science and Technology.

Probably the first considered statement of space policy was submitted by the PSAC in 1958. Accompanied by a Presidential statement declaring belief in the "peaceful use of space," this document outlined a rough timetable ("early," "later," "still later") for projects such as orbiting solar observatories and unmanned exploration of near planets. Manned lunar exploration was placed well down on the timescale. The aim was to place space exploration in the perspective of a total national scientific effort. The names of those who signed will reappear frequently in any history of science and government: James R. Killian, Lloyd V. Berkner, James H. Doolittle, George B. Kistiakowsky, Edwin H. Land, Jerome B. Wiesner, and Herbert F. York.[3]

A few months later, Congress passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act. A civilian space agency (NASA) was established with broad powers to pursue these objectives in cooperation with the Defense Department, industry, and the educational community. Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, chairman of the Senate's Select Committee on Space, was very influential in the formulation and passage of the act.

A number of significant steps to exploration of the moon were taken even before NASA was organized. Mercury was the most popular program. As early as December 1957, an Army rocket technology team headed by Wernher von Braun submitted a "Proposal for a National Integrated Missile and Space Vehicle Development Program." It called for a booster of 1.5 million pounds thrust. This would provide a payload capability of 20,000 to 40,000 pounds for orbital missions.[4] In August 1958, the Army officially authorized work on the booster which was to become the Saturn project.

In October 1959, the "von Braun team" at Huntsville, Alabama was transferred from the jurisdiction of the Army and became the George C. Marshall Space Center under NASA. This ended 2 years of interservice rivalry between the Air Force and Army for control of this phase of space research. The transfer was made possible by a decision of the Department of Defense that the Saturn project did not offer sufficiently near-term military benefits to justify its cost.

In January 1960, the Eisenhower Administration submitted a $50 million supplemental request to Congress for a large liquid hydrogen engine for the Saturn program. Although no missions were assigned, it was clear to those who cared enough to follow these developments that the United States was beginning to provide the capability for manned flights beyond Mercury.

In unmanned flights, the United States began to deliver more immediate results, successfully launching meteorological navigational communication and sun exploration satellites. Meanwhile, the Russians continued to demonstrate their lead in booster

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

thrust by taking pictures of the back of the moon with Lunik III (October 1959).

NASA disclosed a 10-year plan which envisaged a manned permanent space station, orbiting between 300 and 1000 miles from the earth, manned circumlunar flights in 1966–68, and manned lunar landing and return in the early '70's.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics took a more aggressive position.[5] It adopted, with unnamed dissenters, a staff report which concluded that "NASA's 10-year program in space is a good program as far as it goes but it doesn't go far enough." Among other specific recommendations, the report called for a "manned expedition to the moon this decade." The major cause for concern was the Russian lead in booster propulsion.

THE 1960 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Candidate Kennedy attacked the Republicans for "letting us fall behind" in the space program and vowed that this was another field where he would "get this country moving again." Nixon conceded that we lagged in booster power but attributed the blame to the Truman Administration. He insisted that American achievement was impressive and promised to build upon it, and energetically pursue the NASA 10-year program, including the plan for manned lunar landing by 1971.[6]

The difference in the campaign promises occurred in matters regarding scheduling and the role of the military. While Kennedy urged a speedup, he nonetheless emphasized "elastic" target dates for goals such as the manned space platform, manned lunar landings, and nuclear power in space. But he called for these accomplishments as swiftly as possible. While standing for "preeminence" and "security," Kennedy did not call for military domination, and asserted that "freedom of space must be assured, preferably by mandate of the United Nations." Nixon was more explicit about giving the military the "mission" and the "necessary strength to defend freedom of space."

NASA, alert to the possibilities of change, added to the framework for future missions. Late in July, NASA representatives announced to an Industry Conference that the successor to Project Mercury would be "Apollo," a concept which then meant placing three men in sustained orbital flight and circumlunar flight.

On 17 October 1960, NASA's George Low, then program chief of Manned Space Flight Center, advised his superior, Abe Silverstein, that he had formed a study group to look into the question of manned lunar landing. No funds were needed and Silverstein approved. Later that year, NASA made a presentation on "NASA Long-Range Goals Using Saturn and Larger Vehicles" to the PSAC ad hoc Man-in-Space panel. In December 1960, the PSAC Man-in-Space panel reported an estimate of $20 to $40 billion for a manned lunar landing.[7]

EISENHOWER'S LAST BUDGET AND THE WIESNER REPORT

In preparing his final budget, President Eisenhower was apparently more impressed with the more cautious approach of his scientific adviser and the pressures of his Bureau of the Budget than with the arguments for an accelerated space program. The report of the President's Commission on National Goals warned against being "driven by nationalistic competition into extravagant programs which would divert funds and talents from programs of equal or greater importance."[8] It is also likely that Eisenhower's warning about the "military-industrial" complex was being prepared at this time.

The Budget Bureau called for a "bargain basement" figure for space. Only last minute protest from T. Keith Glennan (the first NASA administrator) and Hugh Dryden (deputy administrator) prevented a statement in the budget message barring manned space flight beyond Mercury.[9] The $1.1 billion dollar figure in the proposed fiscal year 1962 budget was accompanied by the following statement in Eisenhower's budget message:

Further test and experimentation will be necessary to establish if there are any valid scientific reasons for extending manned space flight beyond the Mercury program.

Even before the Inauguration, the new Administration was presented with a fundamental critique of space leadership and priorities. After an admittedly hasty review of the national space program, the Wiesner ad hoc committee (including Donald F. Hornig, Land, and two members of the staff of the Senate Space Committee concluded that:

(1) The Nation's ballistic missile program was lagging.

(2) More effective management and coordination of the space effort was needed and particularly in the top echelons of NASA.

(3) A national booster program was encouraged "particularly for military projects." No distinction between civilian and military requirements was acknowledged.

(4) Mercury should be downgraded since it "exaggerates" one phase of space activity.

(5) Overall space program priorities should be reviewed.

(6) The Space Council should be used for managing the space program.[10]

Glennan prepared a briefing for the new Administration, but was not called upon. The inference of ineffectiveness in the Wiesner report contributed widespread doubt as to whether NASA would continue as an independent agency (9, p. 3). The downgrading of Mercury and military emphasis in the Wiesner report fueled this type of speculation.

Between the Inauguration and 30 January 1961, NASA did not have an administrator. The job of finding one was assigned to Vice President Johnson. James Webb, a former colleague of Senator Kerr, was appointed and confirmed by the Senate. Despite the negative comments about space management in the Wiesner report, the two top technical personnel, Dryden and Robert C. Seamans, remained.

THE FIRST KENNEDY REVIEW

President Kennedy called upon NASA to recommend significant changes in the Eisenhower space budget. Administrator Webb proposed an increase of $308 million, including $173 million for vehicles and propulsion, $48 million for Apollo (presumably spacecraft design) and $25 million for interplanetary exploration. The agenda for the meetings on this subject, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, focused on the "rate" the Administration wished to pursue in closing in "on the USSR's lead in weight lifting ability; and advancing manned exploration of space beyond Mercury."[11]

There is broad agreement on what transpired at the key meetings of 22 and 23 March. The Bureau of the Budget was prepared to recommend an increase of only $50 million. At 5:15 p.m., 22 March, the President entered the meeting. Present were David Bell (Bureau of the Budget), Glenn T. Seaborg (Atomic Energy Commission), Johnson, Webb, Dryden, Seamans (associate administrator of NASA), and Edward C. Welsh, who had just been designated executive secretary of the Space Council.

Dryden addressed himself to the advantages of space exploration: science, military "insurance," avoidance of technological obsolescence, and the economic return. Seamans explained that an early version of the Saturn vehicle would make possible Apollo flights in 1964, circumlunar effort in 1967–68, and lunar landing in 1970. Seaborg spoke up for a nuclear role in any accelerated space program. The President expressed disappointment over our second place in big space programs.[11] Some idea of the President's attitude and of the pace of decision-making in this period was indicated when, half an hour after the meeting. The Bureau of the Budget called Seamans and asked whether the Saturn upper stage cost was estimated at $67 or $77 million (9, p. 6).

The final decision was to go ahead on the booster program. Important emphasis was given to the early Saturn stage and nuclear rocketry. This action was consistent with the Wiesner report. An additional $125 million was requested of Congress. Apollo was deferred for a more comprehensive review.

SPACE SCIENCE BOARD REPORT

One week later, the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences presented the government with a report entitled "Man's Role in the National Space Program." Lloyd Berkner, chairman of the group, communicated his views personally to Webb on 27 February. The Academy was performing a traditional role in providing advice to the government (upon request) on scientific and technological matters. The board adopted its position on this topic at its 10 and 11 February meeting (submitted in writing to the government on 31 March), but the paper was not made public until 7 August 1961, 2 months after President Kennedy announced the Apollo decision and one month after congressional approval.

The report recommended that "scientific exploration of the Moon and planets should be clearly stated as the ultimate objective of the U.S. space program." The board found that it was not then possible to "decide whether man will be able to accompany early expeditions to the Moon and planets." Planning should include provision for manned flight on the basis that his participation "will be essential." This planning should be "consummated only as fast as possible consistent with the development of all relevant information." Crash programs were rejected.[12]

GAGARIN AND THE BAY OF PIGS

But history preempted planning. Gagarin's 108-minute ride (12 April 1961) set off another space crisis, and in responding to newsmen on the same day, the President reiterated his impatience about being "second to Russia in the space field." Two days later, the House Space Committee pressed Seamans on the subject of the schedule of the lunar program. They stressed that 1967 was the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, a logical time for Russian astronauts to plant a red flag on the moon, and expressed impatience over the apparent lack of a sense of urgency in the Administration.[13]

One week later, the American-supported Bay of Pigs fiasco took place. In a footnote to his detailed account of the Apollo decision, the NASA historian states that the "Bay of Pigs does not emerge as relevant" (7, footnote 109). This might seem to be an overstatement, considering the fact that Cold War events of such significance as Gagarin's flight and Bay of Pigs are not dealt with in separate compartments. At the least, the Bay of Pigs entered into discussion of the prospective Shepard Mercury flight. According to one source, in a meeting attended by Welsh, McGeorge Bundy, and Wiesner, someone asked, "Could we stand another defeat?" Welsh's response was, "Could we stand a success?" (9, p. 9).

In a memorandum of 20 April, the President directed the Vice President to find out which activity would give the United States a real chance to get ahead, how much it would cost, the competitive possibilities of outer space programs, and whether we were making a maximum effort (2, p. 199). The President reported this activity to the press on the next day.

> We have to consider whether there is any program now, regardless of its cost, which offers us hope of being pioneers in a space project. . . . If we can get to the moon before the Russians, we should.

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

Meanwhile, the Vice President was consulting with key advisers. Early meetings included officers of BOB, DOD, NASA, AEC, and PSAC. The first significant recorded meeting was held 22 April. NASA advised the Vice President that the Russians would beat us to a manned circumlunar flight. A manned lunar landing and return required a new generation of boosters, so that chance of success was believed good.[11]

On 23 April, the Vice President and other government officials briefed Frank Stanton, president of CBS, George R. Brown, president of a large Texas construction firm, and Donald Cook, then executive vice president for the American Electric Power Service Corporation, as a test of "public reaction." Wiesner was reportedly meeting with scientific panels and coordinating with Welsh. Johnson also touched base with Senator Kerr, Congressman Brooks, and the ranking minority members Senator Bridges and Congressman Fulton (2, p. 199).

The businessmen were assertive in their call for a vigorous program. The military people agreed on the technical feasibility. By 3 May, the Vice President felt it was about time for NASA to come forth with a specific recommendation. Until that time, NASA was assuming the role of an adviser on the technical questions, ready to work within the framework of a policy decision.[11] Given the Vice Presidential directive, Seamans, Webb, and Secretary McNamara spent the weekend on 6–7 May working on a program. Just before the weekend started, the reaction to the successful completion of Alan Shepard's flight finally eliminated any doubts there might have been about the direction of America's space program.

The Shepard flight, unlike Gagarin's, was not one of the proximate causes of the Apollo decision. It is quite possible that had it been less successful or less tumultuously received, the decision may have been delayed for more comprehensive review and it may have been presented differently. Welsh felt that the event now served to convince the doubtful few.[14]

During the weekend, DOD and NASA representatives first agreed that "national security or national prestige" in a broad sense was involved, and that we had to do something that appeared to be significant on a worldwide basis. Secretary McNamara wondered if the lunar landing was a big enough jump. He suggested the possibility of manned planetary exploration. It was rejected as the central objective, but the overall supplemental $750 million appropriation which they recommended included support for a nuclear rocket and a communication satellite program (9, p. 10).

A major cost item stemmed from the parallel development of two large boosters. One, fueled by a solid propellant, was to be developed by the Air Force. The other, liquid-fueled, would be developed by NASA. The $750 million package also included substantial amounts for a nuclear rocket (Project Rover) and for weather and communication satellite programs. Of this total amount, $549 million was to be allocated to NASA, and the rest divided among DOD (solid fuel propulsion), AEC (nuclear rocket), and the Weather Bureau.

The report was completed at 2:00 a.m. on Monday and presented to the Vice President later that morning. It was the day of the hero welcome for Shepard in Washington. There are different recollections as to when the President approved the package for submission to Congress as a supplemental request for FY 62. One source reported the next day. In any event, there was no change of any significance (9, p. 10).

In his address to Congress, President Kennedy presented this decision that before the end of the decade, Americans would be landed on the moon and returned. He also covered a broad range of subjects including Communist activities in the uncommitted nations, defense alliances, civil defense, and disarmament. Later, Kennedy described the Apollo decision as his "most significant."

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Before Kennedy announced the Apollo decision, the House Science and Astronautics Committee completed its review of the earlier request for the $1235.3 million supplemental budget allocation. The committee recommended an increase of $1417.8 million or $130 million more than the Administration request.[15] Most of the additional funds were earmarked for Apollo ($42.6 million).

Congressman George Miller (D-Calif.), now chairman, filed a separate report with Congressman Bass (R-N.H.). This minority of two "deplored the manner in which the increased funds were authorized by the Committee. . . ." They concluded that "none of the increases have been adequately or cogently explained in detail or justified by a sufficiently itemized explanation. . . ."[15] Review by the Space Council was suggested as an alternative.

Congressman Fulton (R-Pa.), however, summarized the prevailing view prior to the President's May decision:

> My feeling is that you, NASA, are like the ballplayer who is hitting a lot of long flies and doing a pretty good job, but you aren't in the same ballpark with the Russians. You are not in competition—seems to us we are in a race. . . . I feel we are, and I feel it has a tremendous effect on the world (15, p. 828).

When President Kennedy accelerated the lunar program, he was essentially confirming the position of the committee. Accordingly, there was no problem in securing House committee approval of the supplemental appropriation.

Senate hearings were brief. Approximately the same witnesses were heard—NASA and DOD key officials. Both the Senate and House hearings were more noteworthy for who was not there and what was left unexamined. The Space Science Board report was not discussed. The record does not show any representatives of the PSAC or the scientific community, business, or labor communities. Until the Office of Science and Technology was created (in 1962), the Executive Branch was reluctant to allow the chariman of PSAC to testify on the grounds that his relationship to the President was confidential.

The Senate hearings were held 7, 8, and 12 June. No record of any testimony on 12 June is included. There were 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans on the committee at that time. Three Democrats and two Republicans were present the first day. Among the Senators who did not attend were: Russell (second ranking Democrat, and cited on the floor of the Senate as an authority and vigorous proponent), Magnuson, Dodd, and Holland. On the Republican side, the truants were: Bridges (ranking Republican), Wiley, Smith (now ranking Republican), and Case. The committee report indicates that the only pointed interrogation was on the relatively small request ($50 million) for communications satellites.

On the floor there was a fairly active debate between Senators Allott and Kerr. The former noted the "stress and strain on the President" and wondered if this "precluded serious consideration of the implications."[16] Predictably, his main concern was cost.

Senator Kerr would not risk selling the program short: "I contemplate this program as one which will enable the American people to meet their destiny . . ." He rejected the propaganda theme and stated that the basic motivations were in addition to the inspiration, the "practical aspects of space including—military spinoff." According to Kerr, the most exciting space spinoff was longevity:

> I say to the 183 million Americans of today—that in my judgment, one of the benefits that will come from the program will be an increased average life span of at least 10 years for each one under 50 years of age today. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 9, page 11628.

CONCLUSIONS

Gagarin's flight, possibly accentuated by the Bay of Pigs, reversed the policy of two administrations. The Apollo decision of 1961 was ignited by an event interpreted as a loss of international prestige. It was a commitment to recapture national honor in space. It was made possible by the preparations of men and organizations whose growth was linked with this gigantic R&D program.

Eisenhower's Administration would not commit itself to an ambitious manned space flight program until Mercury, and possibly other projects, demonstrated feasibility. The Wiesner Committee report to President-elect Kennedy favored a less prominent role for manned space flight. As late as 23 March 1961, the Kennedy review of the Eisenhower space budget resulted in greater funding for boosters, but no commitment to an accelerated manned space flight program. This cautious approach drew support from the NSF report of March 1961, which warned against "crash" priorities and called for an orderly space program.

But all the consideration gave way under the impact of the Russian spectacular of 12 April. Soon after the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy gave instructions, not for a review, but for a method to dramatically outperform the Russians in space as soon as possible.

Congress acted without hearing testimony of compelling military need.[17] The Apollo decision was made without reference to any comprehensive and integrated national policy designed to maximize the use of scientific and technological resources for social objectives. Indeed, the record does not indicate whether the available National Academy of Sciences report was introduced. It was a typical Cold War reaction.

If the views of informed and concerned citizens were solicited, the record does not provide evidence of it; if efforts by the scientific community and other groups to record opposition or reservation were made, they were not afforded much weight. Proposals of comparable magnitude, though of lesser cost, required volumes of committee testimony and days of floor debate and a flood of amendments (Peace Corps, Manpower Training, Appalachia, Reciprocal Trade). A subsequent Congress would give greater attention to rat control and rent supplement measures which did not nearly approach the $1 billion mark.

There were other grounds to justify the action. One of the more interesting reasons, outlined by Dryden, was the need to advance science and technology through a focus on specific goals. But why Apollo? Crisis usually results in a narrowing of options[18] and the cold war emergency created by the Gagarin flight preempted any opportunity for comprehensive review to choose an optimal program or programs for this purpose.

For example, the national and international need for cheap protein sources and the rich potential of underseas development might have indicated that accelerated oceanographic research would have been a wiser investment of technological resources.

With regard to the economic justification, it is important to recall that the United States was still suffering from an economic slump in 1961. But the unemployed and underemployed were mostly the coal workers and displaced farm workers of Appalachia and elsewhere, and the untrained minority groups of the ghettos—not the engineers and technicians that a research and development program demands. If public works were agreed upon as the primary approach to unemployment, most economists would have

---

Footnotes at end of article.

preferred activity that provided opportunity for the unskilled and semi-skilled.

This article has not delved very deeply into the scientific arguments for Apollo. To begin with, the advocates never raised it as a critical justification. If they had, then perhaps the report of the National Academy of Sciences, which gave priority to other pace projects and required a more orderly progression for manned space, would have been sufficient to deter the acceleration of Apollo.

A far more important question of principle is involved. Modern science is often inextricably linked with modern technological development. Both call for huge investments of men and money. This necessarily involves questions of priority: Which other proposals for R & D must be refused, and which other social objectives must be deferred? These are primarily political questions to be decided upon by political and administrative representatives with the full and knowledgeable participation of the entire concerned community—natural scientists, social scientists, and citizens' groups.

Too often, it is impossible for concerned citizens to appraise and comment upon an incipient program. This is sometimes attributed to the esoteric knowledge required to understand what is proposed. But tax and trade bills are complicated too. The more serious obstacles to mature consideration are the crisis atmosphere (often artificial), the fragmented machinery (discussed below), and the momentum of technological impulse.

The April 1961 response to the Russians was the spark that set off Apollo—but it probably would have been launched anyway. With the approval of the concept of Saturn, it was plain that the men, desire, and organization were welded together behind the idea of manned space exploration of the moon. These factors add up to a considerable social force that I have termed "technological impulse."

Only an alert and vigorous set of sociopolitical mechanisms, equipped with a well-designed policy, could confine this promotional force to its proper place in a democratic society. The American of the late 19th-century economy was substantially the manifestation of the planning and activity of the great industrial captains. This economy is now permeated by a network of social controls. It is no less vital; many argue that its growth is due in large part to the regulatory system.

Perhaps it was too much to expect both a rationalized science policy and a sophisticated system of R & D decision-making less than 4 years after Sputnik and before any experience with the Russians in limiting the technological terrors of the Cold War. But now it is 12 years since Sputnik. We know more about poverty, and other social problems both here and abroad. There is increased awareness of the potential of technological approaches to social questions of inadequate housing, food production, environmental pollution, and crime prevention and control.[19]

Nevertheless, recent decisions such as approval of the supersonic transport program, and the Air Force manned orbiting laboratory provide substantial evidence that without an integrated federal R & D policy and decision-making system, technological impulse, supported by vague claims of international prestige and increased security, will prevail.

Any well-integrated policy would recognize that scientific and engineering manpower, including systems analysis capability, are required for basic social objectives before surplus resources may be allocated to prestigious or otherwise marginal projects. The latter would be entitled to more serious consideration if the most were minimized by international cooperation, minimal duplication, and adequate research experience prior to heavy development outlays.

Such a policy is impossible within the fragmented framework of federal R & D decision-making which has not substantially changed since 1961. Executive and congressional committees and panels are certainly more informed than they were 7 years ago. But both systems are designed for specialization. The PSAC uses panels of experts to judge the validity of increasingly esoteric proposals. Nuclear, space, and military problems are assigned to separate and powerful congressional committees. It is a system ideally suited for the effective lobbyist, whether he represents industry, government agencies, or institutional education.

A generation has passed since the nuclear age was introduced and the space age heralded. Within this period, imposing numbers of articles and books by respected authorities have debunked reform ideas such as instituting a Department of Science. Now that the federal budget for research and development items is being given most critical review, it is time for well-informed people in the social and natural sciences to step forward with meaningful ideas on policy formation and machinery, so that these limited resources will be employed at maximum advantage.

FOOTNOTES

---

[1] At different stages different estimates were given. Originally, the Administration talked of the $20- to $40-billion range. More recently, NASA tried to establish that only a few billion will be used for items designed solely for Apollo. Other outlays, however (launch facilities, booster technology, Gemini, and others), are deemed necessary for an overall space program. Recently T. Wicker (New York *Times*, 29 Dec. 1968, p. 12E) cited a $24-billion estimate.

[2] For a summary of pioneering in this field, see J. Holmes, *America on the Moon: The Enterprise of the Sixties* (Lippencott, Philadelphia, 1962), sec II.

[3] President's Science Advisory Committee, *Introduction to Outer Space*, The White House (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 26 Mar. 1958).

[4] *Saturn Illustrated Chronology* (George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., 10 Aug. 1964), p. 1.

[5] Democrats enjoyed a 15 to 9 majority of this committee at that time.

[6] J. Doherty, "Space in the 1960 Campaign," NASA Historical Archives, Washington, D.C. (unpublished).

[7] E. Emme, "Historical Perspective on Apollo," NASA Historical Note No. 75, Washington, D.C., 24 Oct. 1967, p. 26.

[8] U.S. President's Commission on National Goals, *Goals for Americans* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960), p. 114.

[9] My interview with Robert C. Seamans, Jr., NASA Associate Administrator, 27 May 1964 (John F. Kennedy Library, Cambridge, Mass.), p. 1.

[10] Report to the President-elect of the ad hoc Committee on Space, released 12 Jan. 1961, particularly p. 14.

[11] My interview with Dryden in Washington, D.C., 23 Mar. 1963.

[12] *Man's Role in the National Space Program* (National Academy of Sciences, Space Sciences Board, Washington, D.C., 31 Mar. 1961).

[13] *Hearings before the U.S. House Committee on Sciences and Astronautics*, 87th Congress, 1st Session, regarding H.R. 6874, p. 375.

[14] My interview with Welsh in Washington, D.C., 14 Apr. 1964.

[15] *Report of Committee on Science and Astronautics*, No. 391 to accompany H.R. 6874, 87th Congress, 1st Session (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.), p. 89.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 9, p. 11626.

[17] While military experts saw some potential benefit from manned space flight capability (for inspection and repair of satellites, and so forth), most saw no military application for extended space flight to the moon and planets.

[18] R. C. Snyder, in *Approaches to the Study of Politics*, R. Young, Ed. (Northwestern Univ. Press, Evanston, Ill., 1958).

[19] A. Weinberg, "Scientific choice, basic science and applied missions" in *Basic Research and National Goals, 1967, A Report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives by the National Academy of Sciences* (Washington, D.C., March 1965), p. 279.

CUTTING CRIME

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Indianapolis News on March 7, 1969 concerning reducing juvenile crime in White County, Ind. It shows that greater firmness and imaginativeness on the part of our courts and judges can significantly reduce criminal offenses, particularly among the young. If this approach has been successful in reducing crime in White County, Ind., why not initiate similar methods in other areas of the country?

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 7, 1969]

CUTTING CRIME

White County has a three-man team which has reduced juvenile crime by 80 per cent in a single year.

Youngsters who get in trouble there face Judge Maurice J. Zerface. Under his "get tough" policy, juvenile offenders often find themselves confronting a jail term as well. Zerface and Monticello City Court Judge Edwin W. Malmquist agree that "once a youngster has lived inside a jail cell, he never wants to go back." Neither judge has had a youth appear a second time since the policy was initiated in July 1967.

Judge Zerface says parents are responsible for the conduct of their offspring and orders them to appear in court when their youngsters get in trouble. He makes the parents assume the burden of disciplining their children by holding them in contempt if they do not. "When we place the onus on the parents," he says, "we find they're usually tickled to death to find they can control their children after all."

The third member of the team is Charles E. Smithburn county probation officer, who aligns himself with the general views of the two judges. Smithburn works with the schools and various civic organizations to head off potential youthful crime, but he also believes offenders should be adequately punished.

In the common-sense opinion of the two judges, a person capable of stealing a car is no longer a juvenile and should be tried in adult courts. This is in sharp contrast to the attitude of Marion County juvenile court which seldom waives jurisdiction on youthful cases, regardless of the severity of the offense. Judge Harold N. Fields says he used the waiver in 80 cases in 1968 out of a total of over 3,000 cases.

The soft approach hasn't worked. Juvenile crime in Indianapolis increased from 6,573 in 1967 to 7,080 in 1968—a 7.7 per cent hike. In 1967 youthful crime rose 17 percent over the previous year.

Judge Zerface takes the view that the first job of any court is to protect the public from the offenders and that rehabilitation is an outgrowth of proper punishment. Zerface believes that the names of juvenile delinquents should be published because the public has a right to know who the lawbreakers are.

The difference in results in the two counties is graphic. While White Coutny has reduced its juvenile offenses, Marion County experiences a steady rise in youthful crime. It would seem that a dose of common sense also might work in juvenile crime prevention in Marion County.

GOOD PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the good people of Florida I have the honor to represent are deeply concerned over the substantial trend of the Congress to delegate to the executive department more and more powers properly belonging to the Congress.

I share this deep concern and it was for that reason I voted in opposition to S. 1058.

This legislation, acted upon by this body on March 18, is yet another step in eroding the people's power constitutionally expected to be exercised by the branch of Government closest to the people, namely, the Congress. S. 1058 extends until April 1, 1971, the time within which the President might reorganize the executive branch of Government. While I keenly favor substantial revamping and reorganizing of our multitude of Federal agencies with the consequent economies, I do not perceive it proper for the executive branch to reorganize short of active congressional approval.

In simple terms, the reorganization authority allows the President to substantially redesign the U.S. Government and unless the Congress rejects the plan within 60 days after the President has submitted it to the Congress, it will take effect without legislative action.

Thus, it is possible that the President could juggle the Government of more than 200 million people to his own will, and, with the help of only a few, jam the legislative process so as to make impossible any public debate on the proposal until past the 60-day deadline.

In this approach, there is great danger to our representative form of government. Once such reorganization becomes law by inaction, it will be difficult to undo it with congressional action.

In summary, it is good and proper for the President to recommend, but the decisions of policy belong to the Congress.

I shall continue to fight for governmental reorganization. It is needed. But I shall fight with equal vigor for the public's right to have their representatives constitutionally charged to do so make the final determination.

Thus, I voted in opposition to the extension of Executive power.

For similar reasons, I voted in opposition to S. 2171, the bill which, if passed, would have placed in the hands of a commission the power to set national observances and holidays. To some, this bill was insignificant. To some, the matter of presidential proclamations declaring national holidays and observances is of no import.

But, to the people of the Fourth District of Florida, it is a matter of import. To my constituents, every item of business which commits this Nation to any course of action, be it governmental reorganization or national holidays, is a matter to be decided by the elected representatives of the people.

I am committed to a course of action which will halt this pattern of lawmaking.

I shall continue to press for government by the people and I will oppose government by commission and agency.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the drive for freedom and self-government is one which is instilled in the minds of people who have been oppressed, but who find hope in the examples of other free nations that human dignity will ultimately prevail over slavery. So it is with Byelorussia, first born as a concept manifested by distinctive cultural bonds.

The outbreak of World War I gave the Byelorussian people and other non-Russians the opportunity to exert their national independence, and under German occupation, Byelorussian national cultural revival was given impetus by the order of German Field Marshal von Hindenburg to establish the Byelorussian language as the official language in the nation's public life. In October 1917, subsequent to the Russian March revolution, 1917, the Great Byelorussian Rada, representing all Byelorussian organizations and parties, declared itself the national representative of the Byelorussian people. Then by resolution of the first All-Byelorussian Congress in December 1917, the right of nations to self-determination was enthusiastically endorsed and the groundwork was laid for the establishment of a democratic government to be designated as the Byelorussian National Republic.

Although the Bolshevik revolution had intervened in November 1917, causing the Byelorussians to become the first victims of Communist aggression, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on February 19, 1918, between the Germans and Bolsheviks once again placed Byelorussia under German occupation. With the suppressive interference in Byelorussia's national and political life thus abated, the initial declaration of independence came about on March 9, 1918, pursuant to the actions of the first All-Byelorussian Congress more than a year earlier, and on March 25, the official proclamation of all independence was declared:

> A year ago, the peoples of Belorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today, we, the Rada of the Belorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Belorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The people of Belorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Belorussia with other states.

With the advent of the armistice in November 1918, the dissolution of the German armed forces was the beginning of the demise of Byelorussia as an independent nation. Submission at the hands of the Soviet power was swift, and still another nation, which tasted freedom but briefly, was snuffed out.

Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 51st anniversary of Byelorussia's independence. While the physical boundaries of this once-free nation were erased, the spirit and faith of her people still live, and in this fact alone lies the seeds of revival of national independence.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of independence for the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, but it will not be celebrated in the streets of that republic as one would see the Fourth of July in this country. Behind this lack of festivity in Byelorussia lies 50 years of occupation by the Communist forces of the Soviet Union.

We in a free nation often take for granted the liberties that were an inheritance from our forefathers. Byelorussians had only 1 year to taste freedom. After a history of being carved up among other nations and ruled by outside forces, independence was a welcome treasure to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. These people fought hard to maintain their long-sought freedom, but the overwhelming number of the enemy forced them once again into a state of conquered people.

In a recent letter to me, Michael Bachar, chairman of the United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee, described what conditions have been like for the Byelorussians under this latest occupation. He wrote:

> This rule has been marked by economic exploitation, social oppression, mass terror, political deportations, imprisonments and murders. Denial of religious freedom to all faiths (is) openly continuous. A low standard of living, malnutrition and substandard housing are permanent features of this Soviet rule. The end result is that during this period (the) Byelorussian nation has lost over six million of her population.

Such conditions should not be tolerated anywhere in this world by any free and independent nation. Therefore, I would like today to join those among our citizens who are of Byelorussian descent in calling for the liberation of their native land from the arm of the Soviet Union. Let us hope that once again we may see

XUM

the will of the Byelorussian people guiding the destiny of their nation. May I assure my Byelorussian friends that their efforts in this regard will continue to have my enthusiastic support.

THE COUNTERFEIT BALLOT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in this age when it is so important that the people of the United States be well informed as to the workings of their Government, the news media has played a commendable role in education. I should like particularly to enter into the RECORD a series of nine well written and authoritative articles published by the McClatchy newspapers: the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee, all of California. These nine articles explain and outline the problems of the electoral process which are facing the 91st Congress and the Nation. Martin Smith and Leo Rennert have written superb articles informing the people of the history and dangers of and the alternatives to the present electoral system.

Martin Smith is a gifted and powerful writer who has the talent of reporting the facts while editorializing at the same time. This combination provides an intellectual work which is an education as well as a pleasure to read. In the "Counterfeit Ballot," Mr. Smith has reported the advantages and inequities in the electoral college system along with proposed changes. With these articles, the people are able to formulate their own conclusions and take enlightened positions.

I have received numerous letters from my constituents which voice their opinions and views on this subject. I am not surprised at how well informed they are in this area after reading the works of Martin Smith. There is no doubt in my mind that the "Counterfeit Ballot" and Martin Smith are responsible for many of these reactions. We are owing to the McClatchy newspapers and Mr. Smith for their service to the American people. It seems right that we should now place the "Counterfeit Ballot" series into the RECORD as recognition and thanks for this well-done service.

The articles follow:

[From McClatchy newspaper, Jan. 20, 1969]

THE YEAR 1787 BROUGHT LONG, HOT SUMMER OF UNREST, STRIFE

(By Martin Smith)

Philadelphia and the rest of the United States had a long hot summer to endure in 1787.

There was grave social unrest and governmental instability throughout the new nation.

Still fresh in Americans' minds was Shay's Rebellion which, fed by discontent among small farmers and debtors, broke out the year before and required troops to restore law and order.

The government established under the Articles of Confederation could not bind together the 11-year-old nation.

From late May until mid-September, delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia wrestled with the problem of establishing a new framework for American government.

WORKING AGAINST TIME

They were working against time. Anarchy threatened the new nation. What was giving them the most difficulty was the question of how the nation's presidents should be chosen.

Pennsylvania delegate James Wilson noted:

"This subject has greatly divided the house and will also divide the people . . . It is in truth the most difficult on which we have to decide."

Wilson favored a direct popular vote for president. Among the delegates on his side were some of the most prominent individuals who participated in the convention, including Gouverneur Morris and James Madison.

Madison, whose role at the convention was so important that he became known as "the father of the Constitution," admitted that conducting a nationwide popular vote would not be easy. Even so, it seemed to him to be the best way of selecting a president.

"The president is to act for the people, not the states," he said.

A RADICAL IDEA

But this was radical thought in 1787.

As Neal R. Peirce, whose book "The People's President" describes the events, says:

"Only a few delegates to the Constitutional Convention felt that American democracy had matured sufficiently for the choice of the president to be entrusted directly to the people. On the two occasions that the convention voted on direct vote, the proposal was resoundingly defeated."

Elbridge Gerry called the idea "radically vicious" and warned:

"The people are uninformed and would be misled by a few designing men."

The proposal for a direct popular vote was one of the major ideas advanced at the convention for a method of choosing presidents. Another was to have Congress choose the president.

The deadlock continued through the summer until a compromise finally was reached in September.

MADISON LOOKS BACK

Thirty-six years later, Madison looked back on the convention and indicated that the compromise had been thrown together in some haste by weary men:

"The difficulty of finding an unexceptionable process for appointing the executive organ of a government such as that of the United States was deeply felt by the convention; and as the final arrangement took place in the latter stages of the session, it was not exempt from a degree of the hurrying influence produced by fatigue and impatience in all such bodies."

The compromise left it to the individual states how presidential electors would be selected. In the nation's early elections, electors assigned to the states simply were named, in most cases by the state legislatures.

ONE BIG CATCH

The compromise of 1787 gave the final say in the choice of a president to the House of Representatives if no candidate won a majority of the presidential electors. But there was a catch—a big one.

As a sop to the small states, each state's delegation of congressmen in the House would be given only one vote so that the large states would have no more powerful voice in naming a president than the small ones.

The compromise permitted the Constitutional Convention to complete its job and sell its product to the individual states. The crisis of the summer of 1787 had been met, but the compromise reached on how presidents would be elected would mean great troubles in the future of the young republic.

The troubles arrived in just a few years.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 19, 1969]

ACTING PRESIDENT WAS CHANCE UNDER ARCHAIC VOTING SYSTEM

(By Martin Smith)

It all sounded so strange that election night. The voting trend was indecisive, and the choice of the president might be left to the House of Representatives under the archaic constitutional procedures established nearly two centuries ago.

A deadlock in the House appeared to be a real possibility. The television pundits were talking of the chance an acting president might be necessary to take over the reins of government if the House could not reach a decision by Jan. 20.

An acting president? It sounded as if they were talking about a Central American banana republic, not about the United States.

But they were.

VOTERS DECIDED

It did not turn out that way, of course. Hubert H. Humphrey ran more strongly than expected, but George Wallace ran weaker and Richard M. Nixon won a majority of the Electoral College votes.

Once more, in the view of those who for decades have been warning that the nation's presidential election system is in need of basic revisions, the United States had teetered briefly on the brink of disastrous governmental instability, then veered back safely for another four years.

It is a drama occurring in one form or another every four years because—and this needs repeating—American voters do not elect their presidents. The voters only choose members of the Electoral College, who, in turn, choose the presidents and vice presidents.

TROUBLE ARISES

It is a system which only worked, more or less, the way it was supposed to in the first two elections in which it was employed. The third time around, in 1796, the system began to cause trouble.

Individual electors are expected to vote for the candidate on whose slate they ran, but they do not have to do so. Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of North Carolina proved that again last month.

He was one of the 538 individuals—members of the Electoral College—who decided who should be the president of the United States for the term starting tomorrow. Bailey is a John Bircher, which is his privilege, and although he supposedly was elected by North Carolinians to vote for Richard M. Nixon for president, he instead cast his vote in the Electoral College for George Wallace. As events turned out, that was Bailey's privilege, too.

SECOND, THIRD CHOICE

The system, coupled with an undemocratic, boss-controlled method of selecting party candidates, makes possible the election of a president who actually may be the second—or third—choice of most American voters.

United States Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, called this year's election another "brush with catastrophe."

The potential horrors of the present system long have been known. Sometimes the horrors have come to pass.

Three times in the 19th century—in 1824, in 1876 and in 1888—a candidate has captured fewer popular votes than an opponent but still has gone on to become president.

CLOSE CALLS

So far this has not occurred in the present century, but there have been three close calls—in 1948, in 1960 and again last year.

If, regardless of how many popular votes a candidate might have, neither he nor any opponent has an Electoral College majority, the choice of a president is left up to the House of Representatives, where the politicking for support would be intense.

A deadlock in the House always would be a possibility. Congressmen, when called on to elect a president, do not vote as individuals. Instead, each state is accorded one vote—no matter what its population is.

ONE VERSUS 38

Nevada's single congressman would decide how his state's one vote for president would be cast, while California's 38 congressmen would decide whom their state's one vote would support.

In the opinion of many political scientists and also many hardheaded practical politicians, the worst possibility is that a cloud would hang over the head of some future president who won the office under what were regarded as dubious circumstances.

Stanford University political science Prof. Ray Wolfinger has warned that, under these circumstances, considerable numbers of the population "might feel freer to disobey the law."

OMINOUS TALK

It is ominous talk. But it is based upon real dangers.

An acting president? A president regarded by most Americans as a usurper?

It could happen because of the Electoral College.

U.S. Electoral System Has Always Created Problems

(By Martin Smith)

After just two presidential elections the new nation's Electoral College system for selecting presidents broke down and required patchwork repairs.

George Washington managed to get elected president in 1788 and was re-elected in 1792, along with his vice president, John Adams, without trouble with the election machinery.

After that, however, the system failed to work the way it was intended.

Adams, a Federalist, won the presidency in 1796. But his running mate, Thomas Pinckney, failed to be elected vice president. Thomas Jefferson, the presidential candidate of the Republicans, later to be renamed the Democratic party, became the vice president because of the way in which Electoral College votes were counted.

MORE SERIOUS BREAKDOWN

The breakdown in the system became much more serious four years later. Jefferson ran again for president. His Republican party running mate was Aaron Burr, the candidate for vice president.

But under the confusing system of counting votes, Jefferson and Burr were tied in the Electoral College balloting for president.

It was just as if the Electoral College recently had been unable to choose between Richard M. Nixon or Spiro T. Agnew for president.

In 1801 the House of Representatives had to make the choice between Jefferson and Burr. It elected Jefferson as president and Burr as vice president, but not until after a week of turmoil and 36 ballots.

PATCHWORK REPAIR

The system obviously had to be changed, and Congress passed and the states ratified the 12th amendment to the Constitution. It was patchwork repair. The Electoral College was retained, but the tricky double ballot system by which a candidate for vice president could wind up as a contender for president, even opposing his own running mate, was eliminated.

The changes became law in 1804 and still govern today's presidential elections, although they have resulted in other constitutional crises in the ensuing 164 years and appear to be an increasing danger to the American political system.

In 1824 the election again was thrown into the House of Representatives after the four-way race ended without any single candidate capturing a majority of electoral votes. What happened then is what many observers fear might happen today. The man finally selected as president trailed one of the other candidates in the number of popular votes cast.

ADAMS TAKES OFFICE

As a result, John Quincy Adams took office under a cloud. Enough Americans thought political manipulators had cheated Andrew Jackson out of the presidency to render the Adams administration incapable of exercising effective leadership.

Candidates who trailed in the popular vote again were elected president in 1876 and 1888. Democrat Samuel Tilden won 4,287,670 popular votes in 1876, while Republican Rutherford B. Hayes had only 4,035,924 votes. But, aided by highly dubious election procedures, he won the presidency with a majority in the Electoral College.

Democratic President Grover Cleveland sought re-election in 1888 and received 5,540,365 popular votes. His Republican rival, Benjamin Harrison, trailed in the popular vote count with 5,445,269. Harrison, however, became president, winning 233 electoral votes to only 168 for Cleveland.

There have been three close calls during the 20th century.

TRUMAN VERSUS DEWEY

In 1948, Democrat Harry S. Truman won more than 24 million popular votes, while Republican Thomas Dewey was given fewer than 22 million. But if Dewey had won as little as 12,487 more votes in California, Illinois and Ohio, he would have won the presidency with an Electoral College majority.

In 1960 Democrat John F. Kennedy received 34,220,984 votes and Republican Richard M. Nixon 34,108,157. It would have required a shift of only 11,414 votes in Illinois, Missouri, New Mexico, Hawaii and Nevada to have made Nixon president eight years before his time although he would have trailed Kennedy in the popular vote.

Last year Nixon enjoyed a popular vote margin of 500,000 over Democrat Hubert H. Humphrey. But if a few thousand strategic votes had shifted in a few key states, Nixon would have failed to gain an Electoral College majority, and the election would have been thrown into the House of Representatives.

Such a result was the goal, of course, of George Wallace, the third party candidate for president. Election chaos would give the third party leaders their best chance to manipulate the selection of a president to their liking.

[From the McClatchy newspapers]

Electoral College System Faltered in Third Election

(By Martin Smith)

The founding fathers offered an attractive rationale for the Electoral College system of selecting presidents.

Although the system simply was the result of a political compromise, the framers of the Constitution argued it offered a positive good. The system, as they saw it, would permit the very best men in the nation to sit down every four years and calmly, without rancor and partisan considerations, decide who would make the best president.

This vision quickly proved to be a mirage.

The founding fathers themselves promoted the development of political partisanship. The presidential electors were regarded as faceless individuals. They were unnecessary and sometimes troublesome middlemen in the process by which presidents were selected.

UNEXPECTED VOTE

In 1796 one of the Pennsylvania electors voted for Thomas Jefferson for president when everyone thought he had been committed to vote for John Adams. An angry Federalist politician wrote:

"What, do I chuse Samuel Miles to determine for me whether John Adams or Thomas Jefferson shall be president? No! I chuse him to act, not to think."

Other individual electors occasionally have broken their faith by thinking.

The most recent was Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of Rocky Mount, N.C., who, although he was elected as part of Richard M. Nixon's slate of electors, chose instead to cast his vote for George Wallace for president.

One elector broke loose from Harry S Truman's Tennessee slate of electors in 1948. Adlai Stevenson lost one of his Alabama electors in 1956.

AMBITIOUS SCHEME

The most ambitious renegade was an Oklahoman who had been elected in 1960 to cast his Electoral College ballot for Nixon. Instead, the elector promoted an unsuccessful project to persuade other electors to desert Nixon and John F. Kennedy and support instead, a strong conservative for the presidency.

His scheme simply was a variation of attempts by Southern conservatives since World War II to force the election into the House of Representatives where Alabama's voice would count every bit as much as New York's.

Strom Thurmond ran for president in 1948 in the hope the election would go to the house where a major party candidate then might have to bow to dictates from Dixie on race questions.

Thurmond failed, as did George Wallace who ran last year with more or less the same idea.

But Wallace's movement remains as a threat to the two-party system which most political scientists think has been a mainstay of political stability in an increasingly troubled nation.

Soon after Wallace announced his presidential candidacy last year, a Democratic congressman called for modifications of the Electoral College system to provide for a runoff election if no one candidate received a majority of the electors.

But it was a Republican, U.S. Rep. Clark MacGregor of Minnesota who called for abolishing the Electoral College and replacing it with a popular vote.

"The Wallace candidacy is a cynical attempt to capitalize upon the vagaries of our presidential election system to get a stranglehold on national policy," warned MacGregor.

"The American people would not wish us to stand by idly while a minority presidential candidate attempts to blackjack either major party candidate into such an unholy alliance."

WALLACE ASSESSMENT

Robert H. Finch, the incoming Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who was until recently California's lieutenant governor, assessed the Wallace candidacy in 1972 and observed that the former Alabama governor has "a pretty good piece of political machinery going for himself."

Finch acknowledges the process by which the United States Constitution is amended is an exceedingly slow-moving one, but he sees the Wallace threat as providing "a greater catalyst for change now than ever before."

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 23, 1969]

Campaigning Nixon Moved Closer to Popular Vote Idea

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. James O. Eastland, the conservative Mississippi Democrat who, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, will have a lot to say about any changes in the system of electing presidents, has predicted the system will be revised—if the new president wants revision.

XUM

"If the next president pushes electoral reform, we'll get it," said Eastland. "If he doesn't, I don't assume so."

The new president is Richard M. Nixon who indicated during the campaign he favors changes in the system. He said once he was not proposing abolition of the Electoral College, but he also said he thinks the man with the most popular votes should become president.

NO DETAILS OFFERED

Nixon has not offered any detailed recommendations for revising the system but in his most extensive statement on the issue, he said on Sept. 3 in Cleveland, Ohio:

"I am not suggesting we go so far as the direct election of the president. But I do believe that in a particular state the fact that one man may win the state by a few thousand votes and then get all the electoral votes of that state—I think that, in effect, disfranchises a lot of other people who may have voted on the other side. I would rather have proportional representation in the Electoral College."

MOVES CLOSER

But later in the campaign, Nixon seemed to be moving closer to the idea of deciding the presidential election by popular vote.

On Oct. 15: "I think that if the man who wins the popular vote is denied the presidency, the man who gets the presidency would have very great difficulty in governing."

On Oct. 21: "Whoever wins the popular vote should be the next president of the United States."

On Oct. 30, while challenging Democratic rival Hubert Humphrey to accept the decision of the popular vote: "I say again, the candidate who gets the most votes should be the next president. I stand ready to accept the decision of the electorate."

FINCH PREDICTIONS

Former California Lt. Gov. Robert H. Finch, a close friend and adviser of Nixon's and chosen by the President to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, predicted in a Sacramento interview that Nixon will offer specific proposals for changing the presidential election system.

Finch said he does not know yet what forms these proposals will take. Speaking just for himself, however, Finch said he likes the idea of retaining the Electoral College but having most of the electors chosen by individual congressional districts. This would result in the electoral votes of most states being split among leading candidates.

Finch said this proposal "has great appeal to me because it would tend to develop a viable two-party system in the South. There would be an enormous incentive to try to develop strong congressional candidates in those Southern states."

FOUR PLANS

The congressional district plan is only one of four basic proposals expected to go before Congress at the 1969 session for changing the method by which American presidents are selected.

The other three basic plans:

Retaining the Electoral College but simply apportioning each state's electoral votes on a percentage basis to reflect the popular vote in the state. The present winner-take-all system would be eliminated.

Retaining the Electoral College system and also its winner-take-all provision so that a state's entire slate of electors still would go to the winner of the popular vote, but eliminating the office of elector. An automatic state unit electoral vote system would be substituted for the individual electors.

Simply abolishing the Electoral College and deciding the presidential elections by a nationwide popular vote.

This last proposal has been given new support as the result of a special study by an American Bar Association commission which strongly recommended that a popular vote decide presidential elections.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 24, 1969]

INDIANA SENATOR SEES ONLY ONE WAY: JUNK ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, has been calling for reforms in the Electoral College system since he first was elected to the Senate in 1962.

But for a long time he opposed any plan to eliminate the college entirely and substitute in its place a direct popular vote for president.

Bayh changed his mind in 1967.

He called for going all the way and eliminating the Electoral College entirely in favor of a popular vote.

NEW ENGINE NEEDED

"Mere procedural changes in the present system would be like shifting around the parts of a creaky and dangerous automobile engine, making it no less creaky and no less dangerous," he warned.

"What we may need is a new engine, because we are in a new age."

What caused Bayh to shift his view in a report issued by a special American Bar Association commission which after a detailed study concluded:

"The Electoral College method of electing a president of the United States is archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect and dangerous. . . .

"While there may be no perfect method of electing a president, we believe that direct nationwide popular method is the best of all possible methods."

The commission, headed by Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation and dean emeritus of the Southern Methodist University Law School in Dallas, offered detailed recommendations on how presidential elections might be decided by popular vote.

It recommended that a party's presidential and vice presidential candidates continue to run as a team. The presidential candidate and his running mate who captured the most popular votes would win—provided they had at least 40 per cent of the popular vote.

If no ticket won 40 per cent of the popular vote, then a runoff election would be held between the two tickets with the highest number of votes.

DATE SETTING PROCEDURE

Congress would have the power to set the dates for regular and runoff elections, but individual state legislatures would have the power to provide for places and manner of the elections. Congress, however, would retain reserve powers to overrule the state legislatures.

Persons qualified under state law to vote for members of Congress would vote in presidential elections except that a state would be empowered to make even fewer restrictive requirements for presidential voters.

Congress also would be given a reserve power to provide for uniform age and residence requirements.

Among those on the 15-member commission were leading legal scholars and attorneys, including Paul Freund, a constitutional law professor at Harvard Law School; four former ABA presidents; two state governors, and Herman Phleger, a San Francisco attorney and former adviser to the U.S. State Department.

They returned an eight-count indictment against the Electoral College system, charging it:

"Allows a person to become president with fewer popular votes than his major opponent.

"Grants all of a state's electoral votes to the winner of the most popular votes in the state, thereby cancelling all minority votes cast in the state.

"Makes it possible for presidential electors to vote against the national candidates of the party.

"Awards all of a state's electoral votes to the popular winner in the state, regardless of the turnout in the state.

"Assigns to each state at least three electoral votes regardless of its size.

"Fails to take into account population changes in a state between censuses.

"Employs an unrepresentative system of voting for president in the House of Representatives.

"Allows for the possibility of a president and vice president from differing political parties."

THE 12TH AMENDMENT CITED

The 12th amendment to the Constitution in 1804 was intended to eliminate this last possibility but the amendment did not shut the door completely on such a turn of events.

For example, if the 1968 presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives Republican Richard M. Nixon might well have been the ultimate choice. But the choice of the vice president would have been left to the United States Senate. Many observers think it likely that the Senators would have chosen one of their colleagues, U.S. Sen. Edmund Muskie, the Democratic vice presidential nominee, for vice president instead of Spiro T. Agnew, the Republican nominee.

The ABA report has been made at a possible turning point in history—when the defects in the present system for electing presidents are becoming increasingly apparent to the public.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 25, 1969]

SENATOR SMITH PROPOSES END OF CONVENTIONS, ELECTORS

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, the independent Republican from Maine who now is the only woman serving in the upper house, proposes the most far-reaching changes in the system by which the United States elects its presidents and vice presidents.

Not only would she eliminate the Electoral College, replacing it with a direct popular vote, but also she would eliminate the convention system of selecting nominees.

Her plan is simply to hold national direct primaries. They would be held in early August. If no one candidate in a party received a majority of the vote cast within his party's primary, a runoff primary would be held four weeks later.

FIVE PERCENT TO QUALIFY

For a party to qualify for the national ballot, it would have to have membership of more than 5 per cent of the total registered voters in the nation. A candidate would have his name placed on the primary ballot if he had nominating petitions signed by 1 per cent of the total vote in the preceding presidential general election. This would have amounted to about 700,000 signatures in 1968.

Mrs. Smith favors direct primaries in the selection of presidential nominees for the same reasons she favors direct elections in choosing presidents.

"What is good enough for electing presidents should be good enough for nominating party candidates for president," she has testified. "It is the only logical end of putting the power in the hands of the people—for they should be able to choose among all possible candidates and not just in the final round at the general election."

She has some support among her colleagues. U.S. Sen. William Proxmire, D.-Wis., has asked:

"Is it not a far better thing to choose our presidential nominees in a national primary,

XUM

where the candidates and their ideas are on display and are contending openly, than it is to choose them in the narrow, emotional, cynical, rumor-filled, bandwagon-rolling, shouting, no-one-listening climate of a party convention?"

Some who argue in favor of direct election of presidents argue, however, against direct national primaries. Aaron B. Wildavsky, chairman of the political science department at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, is one.

MAKE VOTES COUNT

He warns that experience with state primaries shows that when one party remains in office a long time, which is not unusual, interested voters tend to join the dominant party to make their votes count more in the primary elections.

Those who remain in the out-of-power party are the diehards who nominate candidates who please them "but who could not win the election because they are unrepresentative of the majority," says Wildavsky.

"A national primary is also likely to lead to the appearance of extremist candidates and demagogues, who, unrestrained by allegiance to any permanent party organization, have little to lose by stirring up mass hatreds or making absurd promises."

UNFAVORABLE LOOK

Neal R. Pierce, author of "The People's President," a book calling for direct presidential elections, is another who looks with disfavor on proposals to abandon the convention system and institute direct primaries.

He agrees with the contention that conventions provide the opportunity for various factions within a party to reach compromises on platforms and nominees and to have party leaders keep in mind the necessity of appealing to a broad base of independent voters.

Pierce adds:

"Also, there are years when none of the candidates who have advanced themselves and run in the various state primaries have been able to build a really broad base of national support. Under such circumstances, the convention can 'draft' a candidate like (Republican) Charles Evans Hughes in 1916 . . . or (Democratic) Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson . . . in 1952"

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 26, 1969]

Political Parties Press To Bring Electoral Reforms

(By Leo Rennert)

Washington.—One of the first lessons a neophyte learns on Capitol Hill is that it takes support from a potent, well-organized constituency somewhere in the country to insure success for any legislative drive.

Medicare would have been impossible without the rising strength of the old folks' lobby. Farm subsidies will go on as long as King Cotton reigns in the south and the west. And the military-industrial complex can be relied on to keep defense spending at record levels.

So in any discussion about prospects of Electoral College reform, the crucial question becomes: Where is the equivalent special interest group to prod the 91st Congress to approve basic changes in the nation's method of electing its presidents?

The answer this year—and it is at the heart of the suddenly much brighter outlook for some kind of constitutional change—is simply that the Republican and Democratic parties have become the chief active lobbyists for reform.

Their motivation—despite a lot of rhetoric about an "aroused public"—springs largely from selfish considerations.

Republican and Democratic leaders are rushing action on a constitutional amendment because nothing less than the preservation of the two-party system is at stake.

They still bear the traumatic scars of the threat posed last fall by George Wallace. They know this specter easily can come back to haunt them in 1972 if the Constitution is not changed in the meantime.

If there is one thing worse than losing a presidential contest, it is ending up with a standoff and having to bargain with Wallace for the key to the White House.

There is no question that the present system is ideally suited for a third-party candidate intent on bringing the two major parties to heel.

Wallace knew he could not win. But he was counting on an inconclusive result in the Electoral College which would have permitted him to use his electors to make a deal with one or the other of the leading contenders.

CAME CLOSE

He came close. Had California gone to Hubert Humphrey, for example, Richard Nixon would have failed to get the required absolute majority of 270 electoral votes.

Wallace then could have instructed his electors to supply that necessary majority in return for assurances on U.S. Supreme Court appointments, a veto over certain cabinet selections, a pledge to go easy on desegregation or any other number of concessions.

So it is not surprising that after such a close call, Democrats and Republicans are falling all over themselves in Congress to throw all kinds of Electoral College reform measures into the hopper.

House Speaker John W. McCormack has called for prompt action. Minority Leader Gerald Ford similarly terms the problem urgent and wants committees on both sides of Capitol Hill to get on with the job.

REFORM VIRTUALLY ASSURED

In the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who is rarely given to haste, thinks the nation already has waited too long. And Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, a master at sniffing political winds, predicts Electoral College reform is virtually assured this year.

If further evidence of unprecedented congressional interest is needed, one has only to look at the quick start of committee hearings.

The Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, headed by Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., has started taking testimony. In the House, Chairman Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., of the Judiciary Committee has scheduled extensive hearings.

All this activity, however, tends to mask major problems which lie ahead.

If—as now appears quite likely—Congress acts to protect the two-party system against "poachers" in presidential contests, there are several ways of accomplishing this without necessarily switching to direct, popular elections.

Or put another way, the survival of the two-party system is not contingent on "one man, one vote."

To remove the Wallace threat in 1972, it would be sufficient to adopt a constitutional amendment which would eliminate presidential electors—but not the Electoral College system of counting votes. If no candidate obtained a respectable plurality, say 40 per cent of the electoral total, a runoff election could be provided to keep the contest from being thrown into the House of Representatives.

BOGGS PROPOSAL

House Majority Whip Hale Boggs of Louisiana has introduced just such a proposal. It will bear close watching because it has attracted considerable interest and support. It could well be the forerunner of a compromise solution.

As far as the reformers are concerned, the Boggs plan has the advantage of eliminating the problem of "faithless electors" who change their mind after election day in total disregard of popular will.

It also would bar any further serious bid by Wallace since electors no longer would be around to be traded for political concessions. A Republican or a Democrat would have to win—either by capturing at least 40 per cent of the electoral vote or by winning in a runoff.

By retaining the electoral vote count, however, the Boggs plan would perpetuate problems and inequities created by the present system of adding state-by-state totals.

First, each state still would have as many electoral votes as it has representatives and senators in Congress. And all electoral votes of a state would continue to go to the winner in that state.

This would mean a candidate—though ahead in popular votes nationwide—still might lose if his opponent led in electoral votes.

Bayh, who favors an all-out switch to direct popular elections, believes such a situation would be intolerable.

"Grave dangers could divide this nation at a critical hour if the president-elect lacked a popular mandate," he remarked. "In these perilous times, we simply cannot afford the luxury of an electoral system that fails to guarantee the election of the popular choice."

Bayh has 40 Senate cosponsors for his direct-election proposal. But it takes a two-thirds vote in both houses and ratification by the legislatures of three fourths of the states to accomplish any change.

SOUTHERN OPPOSITION

Under these rules, opposition by southern and small states to all-out reform could become a formidable factor.

Southerners want some semblance of the Electoral College retained to preserve the notions of "federalism" and "states' rights" as key elements in the political fabric of the nation.

Small states also have grown attached to the extra influence they derive from the two-vote bonus under the present system.

For example, Nevada has only one representative. But it gets three electoral votes in recognition of its two senators. The two extra votes have the net effect of tripling the state's impact in the Electoral College. For Nevada, they represent a 200 per cent increase above its entitlement on a strict population basis.

In California's case, the extra two votes represent a comparatively insignificant addition—from 38 to 40 electoral votes, or an increase of only about 5 per cent above its entitlement under a fair population apportionment.

Since it takes only 13 states—and they all can be small ones—to block a constitutional amendment, it is quite apparent that the drive to abolish the Electoral College and substitute direct elections remains an uphill fight.

Celler, who has served in the House longer than any other present member, significantly is pushing both types of reform.

"The direct-vote approach is theoretically the most sound," he said in an interview. "But that which is wisest is not always most acceptable.

"I think we will have to adopt something short of a direct vote."

Celler predicts small states would "rebel" if Congress attempted to gain ratification of an amendment to wipe out the Electoral College altogether.

"I can understand their point," he said. "After all, we are a federal union, a union of states."

MORE OPTIMISTIC

Bayh is more optimistic. He still thinks the direct-election plan has a chance.

Small states, he argues, labor under a "misconception" when they worry about losing their two-vote bonus in the Electoral College.

What they overlook, he points out, is that the big states also would give up an important advantage—their present make-or-break role in deciding presidential contests.

Because all electoral votes of a state now go to the winner in that state, he notes, presidential candidates increasingly are basing their strategy on capturing the big states—California, New York, Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

Under a direct-election system, Bayh believes candidates would look for votes where they have the best chance of getting them—in big as well as small states—since every person's vote would count in the final total.

Thus, he reasons, what the small states would lose by giving up their two-vote bonus in the Electoral College would be offset by reducing the big punch a handful of voters now can wield in swinging one or more big states behind a particular candidate.

The argument apparently is working with some small-state representatives. Among the co-sponsors of Bayh's measure for direct elections are Sens. Alan Bible, D-Nev., Mike Gravel, D-Alaska and Daniel Inouye, D-Hawaii.

The American Bar Association and several other prestigious groups throughout the country also are supporting it.

Still, there is wide agreement that the concept of "one man, one vote" as a controlling yardstick for presidential elections so far has not developed anything resembling the devoted and dedicated constituency feverishly working on the bipartisan—but less sweeping—objective of keeping third-party intruders away from the approaches to the White House.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 27, 1969]

Electoral College Draws Governors' Dissatisfaction

(By Martin Smith)

The Electoral College has existed for more than 180 years, although Americans have been dissatisfied with it for much of that time.

Few persons think it will be easy to replace it with a direct popular vote in the selection of presidents and vice presidents. But public unhappiness with the antiquated Electoral College is greater than ever, and many political leaders agree now is the time to eliminate it.

In 1948 and again in 1960 national polls indicated the public, by a 2–1 margin, wanted the Electoral College eliminated. The percentage of those opposed to it has climbed dramatically. Last November a Harris Survey showed that an overwhelming 79 per cent of those polled favored direct election of presidents and vice presidents. Only 11 per cent opposed elimination of the Electoral College.

Dissatisfaction with the system is widespread and increasing, but there is dissent, too.

While some Southern white conservatives are reluctant to eliminate the Electoral College completely, preferring instead to tinker with and retain the present system, an important minority group also shows a cautious, if different, attitude on the issue.

Clarence Mitchell, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has told a U.S. Senate subcommittee his organization flatly opposes any move to divide a state's electors according to popular vote percentages within that state. This is one of the reform-but-retain proposals being heard in the debate over the Electoral College.

MINORITY FACTORS

Minority groups see an advantage for themselves in the winner-take-all system by which a candidate captures a state's entire slate of electors by winning that state's popular vote, no matter by how small a margin. Nominees now regard major groups of minority voters as possibly the deciding factors in swinging some states. Minorities justify this possible advantage as necessary to offset the bloc of Southern white segregationist states.

Mitchell, however, also has told U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, the American Bar Association proposal to eliminate the Electoral College completely in favor of a direct popular vote is an excellent one.

But Mitchell added the NAACP would support the recommendations for a direct popular vote "only if there are absolute and foolproof safeguards against discrimination in registering and voting."

If there can be guarantees that minority groups will not be prevented from participating in a direct popular vote for president, the NAACP will support the ABA recommendations. But if the present system is to be retained, the proposal to divide a state's electors will only make existing inequities even worse, in the NAACP view.

REWRITING IS SLOW

Rewriting the Constitution is a slow-moving process. The usual way is for an amendment to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each house of Congress, and then be ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the 50 states.

The McClatchy newspapers sent inquiries to governors of all 50 states, seeking their views on the present system of electing presidents and vice presidents. Not all replied. Some of those who did said they had not reached a decision yet on proposed changes. Some thought the Electoral College might be retained if basically overhauled.

But not one of the governors said he likes the system the way it is. There were significant voices from both major parties calling for its outright abolition in favor of direct popular votes.

One of the most outspoken was Pennsylvania Republican Gov. Raymond P. Shafer. He noted that one of his state's delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention, James Wilson, thought even then that American presidents should be chosen by direct election.

"It is time that we add our strength to the lone voice of that great Pennsylvania," said Shafer. "I will recommend that our General Assembly, when it next convenes, lead the nation in a call to Congress for a constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College."

REPLIES FROM OTHERS

Other governors who replied or otherwise expressed themselves in favor of outright abolition of the Electoral College included Democrats Warren E. Hearnes of Missouri and William L. Guy of North Dakota and Republicans Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois, John A. Love of Colorado, Russell W. Peterson of Delaware and Tom McCall of Oregon.

One who replied when he still was a governor of Maryland but since has assumed another office is Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

"There is no question in my mind that basic reform of this outdated process is necessary," said Agnew. "Maryland is one of the few states with a statute binding electors to cast their votes for the winner of the state's presidential election but even the constitutionality of this law is dubious."

UNRUH TAKES STAND

The strongest voice in California in favor of eliminating the Electoral College is Assemblyman Jess Unruh. He is asking the state legislature to urge Congress to begin the process by which the Constitution can be amended to provide for a direct popular vote for president and vice president.

"Today it is clear, as it has been for more than a century, that the Electoral College envisioned by the framers (of the Constitution) bears no relation to their intent, if indeed it ever did," Unruh has commented.

ELECTORATE IS COMPETENT

". . . No modern politician who values his profession dares to argue that the American electorate is incompetent to elect the president of the United Sates. If this is so, all rational argument against popular presidential elections disappears. The Electoral College is a useless and occasionally dangerous appendage to our body politic. It must be removed."

No matter how low the Electoral College ranks in the public esteem, the surgery proposed by Unruh and other prominent Democratic and Republican leaders will not be easy to accomplish.

Nearly everyone agrees that some surgery is necessary. So far, there is insufficient agreement as to its extent, and this could renew the Electoral College's lease on life.

DISASTER COULD OCCUR

Then, the disaster that most observes fear may occur: The Electoral College once again could award the presidency to a man who was the only runner-up in the popular vote.

The Counterfeit Ballot could result in the selection of a Brand X president.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the 51st anniversary of declaration of Byelorussian national sovereignty.

During the 20th century, the Byelorussians have endured much. They have suffered the oppression of the Russians and the injustices of German occupation during World War I. And yet, in the face of these awesome adversities, the Byelorussian people have steadfastly clung to the hope that once again they might enjoy the freedom they briefly tasted.

The making of the Byelorussian State, culminating in the declaration of independence on March 25, 1918, was the consequence of a national reawakening that occurred during the 19th and early 20th centuries. It began as a cultural revival and gradually was transformed into a political movement.

This cultural revival found its origin in a growing interest in ethnology and the Byelorussian language. It was from this that a unique conception of Byelorussian nationality developed. The formation of a Byelorussian national political party spurred on the development of national political objectives.

With the outbreak of World War I, the Byelorussians took advantage of Russia's weakened condition by declaring their independence.

The German Army continued its march eastward and Byelorussia succumbed to the German occupation. While the Germans imposed certain restrictions on them, the Byelorussians were allowed to continue their political and cultural development.

Sensing that the Byelorussian national identity posed a threat to the new regime in Russia, the Bolsheviks determined to crush this new state. The Byelorussian national state fell as one of the first victims of brutal Communist aggression.

It is with a sense of great respect and

XUM

admiration that I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to a courageous people who struggled long and hard to protect their national identity and culture. Let these freedom fighters and their descendants be an inspiration to all mankind. On the observance of Byelorussian Independence Day, let us seek to restore the faith and hope of a brave people that one day they will again be free.

VA GUARANTEED HOME-LOAN FINANCING—INCREASING INCOME OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE FUND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home-loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund.

We have extended the home-loan program to veterans with service after January 31, 1955, and this has created eligibility for about 6 million veterans. In addition, there are substantial numbers of veterans from the Korean conflict still eligible for home loans.

Last year the Veterans' Administration concurred with action of the Secretary of the Housing and Urban Development Department in raising interest rates on Veterans' Administration guaranteed and direct loans to 7½ percent. At the time this action was taken, I had hoped that increased funds for veterans' home loans would become available, and that the excessive discounts being charged by lenders would disappear. The situation did improve briefly, but since the first of the year it has become progressively worse and now with the most recent action of the administration to raise the prime lending rate, discounts have risen sharply again and mortgage financing is not readily available even at the high interest rate of 7½ percent.

It is apparent that, if the home-loan benefit is to be of any value to veterans, additional sources of mortgage financing must be found. During the past few years, while veterans have been in service, building costs, including interest charges, have risen sharply. During the 2 or 3 years that a veteran may have served, housing costs have advanced as much as 25 percent. The young veterans returning from service cannot compete with wealthy corporations which enjoy a special investment tax credit, and as a result mortgage financing is not available; and if obtained, requires an unconscionable discount.

The national service life insurance trust fund is in excess of $8 billion. In my bill, I propose that $5 billion be made available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the purchase of guaranteed and direct loans made to veterans. Under this plan, the lender-mortgagee will continue to originate loans, but may sell these loans to the Veterans' Administration. One percent is charged by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to defray administrative costs. All principial and interest over and above this charge, or 6½ percent, will be returned to the national service life insurance trust fund. At present the fund is invested in the public debt and is yielding less than 4 percent return. Under this plan, funds will be made available for veterans' loans and the return to the national service life insurance trust fund will be increased.

The veterans' home-loan program has been one of the Nation's most successful housing programs for the past 20 years. More than $72 billion has been loaned to approximately 7 million veterans. Loss rates have been lower than in conventional lending programs. This plan of using the national service life insurance trust fund is preferable to direct loans, but if this plan does not provide equity of opportunity for the returning war veterans, we will be fully justified in resorting to direct loans to insure that the veteran will have a fair opportunity to compete for mortgage financing.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9476

A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1828. Investment of funds of the national service life insurance fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter

"(a) When issuing a commitment to guarantee a proposed home mortgage loan under section 1810 of this chapter, the Administrator is authorized and is hereby directed to issue, if such is requested by the lender-mortgagee, a nonassignable commitment to purchase the completed loan from such lender-mortgagee. For each such commitment the lender-mortgagee shall pay a non-refundable fee of not in excess of one-half per centum of the amount of the commitment. Such commitment shall provide for the purchase of the loan from the lender-mortgagee for the price specified in the commitment (which price shall be specified as a percentage of par) if the lender-mortgagee certifies to the Administrator, not earlier than sixty days subsequent to the disbursement of the loan proceeds but not later than twelve months from the date of the Administrator's issuance of the loan guaranty evidence, that:

"(1) It has not been successful in effecting a sale of the loan to a private investor at a price equal to or in excess of that specified in the Administrator's commitment;

"(2) It has not charged or collected from and will not charge or collect from the seller or builder of the property, or from any third person or entity, directly or indirectly, any discount (points) in excess of the difference between the face amount of the loan and the price specified in the Administrator's purchase commitment plus the origination fee charged by the lender-mortgagee and the commitment fee specified in this subsection (a); and

"(3) The loan is not in default.

"The purchase price specified in any purchase commitment issued under this subsection shall not be less than the average price for which 180 day purchase commitments were auctioned by the Federal National Mortgage Association at the last Association auction preceding the issuance of the Administrator's purchase commitment, but in no instance shall the Administrator agree to pay more than par (unpaid principal balance plus accrued interest) nor less than 96 percentum of par for any loan purchased under this subsection. Insofar as practicable the Administrator shall utilize the purchase authorization in this subsection in those localities where the discount levels are determined by him to be substantially in excess of the discounts entailed in the Federal National Mortgage Association average auction prices for its 180 day purchase commitments.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the National Service Life Insurance Investment Fund (hereinafter called the Investment Fund). The Investment Fund shall be available to the Administrator for all operations under this section, including the payment of expenses and losses, except administrative expenses. From time to time, the Administrator shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of funds necessary to purchase loans as the consequence of commitments issued or to be issued, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and to purchase direct loans, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and the Secretary shall, as authorized by section 720(c) of this title, transfer such funds from the Insurance Fund to the Investment Fund, except that the aggregate of transfers pursuant to this subsection shall not, in the period between the enactment of this section and June 30, 1974, exceed $5,000,000,000.

"(c) The Administrator shall utilize the funds transferred to the Investment Fund as provided in subsection (b) of this section to purchase loans pursuant to commitments issued as provided by subsection (a) of this section. In addition, the Administrator may utilize available funds of such Investment Fund to purchase (at par plus accrued interest) direct loan assets of the Direct Loan Revolving Fund and the entire proceeds of any such sale of direct loan assets shall be deposited in the Direct Loan Revolving Fund and be available thereafter for the purposes of that Fund. The Insurance Fund shall be paid interest on all funds transferred to the Investment Fund at the same rate as the average interest rate on loans purchased by the Administrator less one percent but in no event less than the average return on the other invested portion of the National Service Life Insurance Fund. All monies received by the Administrator in the repayment of such loans shall be deposited in the Investment Fund and shall also be available, until June 30, 1975, for the purchase of loans pursuant to commitments issued as provided in subsection (a) of this section, and for the purchase of direct loans as provided for in the second sentence of this subsection, except that if the Administrator at any time determines that the balance in the Investment Fund is in excess of anticipated needs for the purchase of loans, he may so notify the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then transfer such excess to the Insurance Fund. All collections of interest on loans purchased and all non-refundable commitment fees received pursuant to the authority in subsection (a) of this section shall be deposited in the Investment Fund by the Administrator, who shall, after determining the amount to be retained in the Investment Fund as a reserve for expenses and losses, periodically notify the Secretary as to the amount of such interest collections available for transfer to the Insurance Fund and the Secretary thereupon shall effect such transfers. Such transfers shall constitute the payment of interest to the Insurance Fund. After June 30, 1974, all monies received in the repayment of loans purchased pursuant to [subsection (a) of] this section and all interest collections on such loans, except for such sums which the Administrator determines to be necessary for retention in the

Investment Fund as a reserve for losses, shall be deposited in the Insurance Fund. Interest collections so deposited shall constitute the payment of interest to the Insurance Fund.

"(d) In the event of a deficiency in the Investment Fund reserves for expenses and losses, the Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Investment Fund from available funds of the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund or the Direct Loan Revolving Fund such sum or sums as may be necessary to defray such deficiency. For the purposes of this subsection the Administrator shall accord priority to the utilization of available funds of the Direct Loan Revolving Fund to the elimination of such deficiency notwithstanding the obligations of that Fund in respect to advances theretofore made by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 1823 of this chapter.

"(e) The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, any loan purchased under the authority of this section at a price determined by the Administrator, but not less than the price paid by the Administrator to purchase the loan (i.e., the percentage of the unpaid balance of the loan), plus accrued interest. The Administrator may, in respect to loans [originated under section 1810 and subsequently purchased by him, guarantee any loan] thus sold, guarantee any such loans subject to the same conditions, terms and limitations as would be applicable were the loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter.

"(f) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section, the Administrator, when authorized by appropriation acts so to do, may set aside first mortgage loan assets of the Investment Fund as the basis for the sale of participation certificates pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–429), and until June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sale of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the Investment Fund and be available for the purposes of that Fund. After June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sales of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the Insurance Fund.

"(g) In the administration and management of the Investment Fund the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, invest the funds thereof in loans which will represent a broad spectrum of the veteran homebuying population in respect to age, income, and location of the properties which will constitute the loan securities. In order to facilitate a more adequate supply of mortgage financing for veterans in the lower and middle income brackets the Administrator shall purchase only loans not in excess of $30,000 which are secured by single family dwellings only. The Administrator is authorized to adopt such standards, policies, and procedures and to promulgate such regulations as he considers necessary or appropriate for carrying out his functions and responsibilities under this section. In carrying out such functions and responsibilities the Administrator may contract with private entities for the servicing of any loans purchased by him for the Investment Fund provided that the servicing fee payable pursuant to any such contract shall not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the cost of the direct servicing of such loans by agency employees."

(b) The analysis of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1828. Investment of funds of the National Service Life Insurance Fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 1811(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) he is unable to obtain from a private lender in such housing credit shortage area, at a discount charge for the purchase of existing housing to the home sellers or builders not in excess of the discount involved in the latest average auction price of the Federal National Mortgage Association's 90-day purchase commitments, and for the purchase of a newly constructed or to be constructed home, at a discount charge to the home sellers or builders not in excess of the discount involved in the latest average auction price of the Federal National Mortgage Association's purchase commitments for the period of twelve to eighteen months."

SEC. 3. Section 720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer from such fund to the Investment Fund established under section 1828 of this title such amounts as the Administrator may from time to time request pursuant to such section, and shall transfer from the Investment Fund to the National Service Life Insurance Fund, upon notification by the Administrator, such amounts as the Administrator determines are available for such transfer pursuant to the provisions of such section."

THE TROUBLED MIDDLE EAST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a very lucid and compelling article on the troubled Middle East. The article appeared in the Lawndale Press in Hawthorne, Calif., on February 27, 1969, and was written by Myron Roberts. Mr. Roberts is a professor of literature, an assistant editor of Los Angeles magazine, and the author of the column, "Observations," in the Lawndale Press.

The article follows:

OBSERVATIONS

(By Myron Roberts)

Coming as it does on the heels of our unhappy involvement in Viet Nam, the continuing crisis between the Arabs and Israel is being greeted by the great majority of Americans with studied indifference and by the American government with supercaution. America does not want and cannot afford involvement in another war at a time when domestic problems threaten the very fabric of our society. And yet it should be pointed out that significant differences exist between Israel and South Viet Nam and these differences must be kept in mind in determining this country's course.

First of all no one is asking us to send hundreds of thousands of troops to Israel to fight a war which the Israelis are unwilling or unable to fight themselves. On the contrary Israel has demonstrated its ability to defend itself; what they do seek from the United States is that we use our influence and if necessary our power to prevent Russia from attacking Israel on behalf of its Arab allies. And that we agree to sell to Israel, and I repeat sell, not give, to Israel the weapons she needs to match the weapons which Russia is providing free to the Arabs.

In short Israel is asking nothing that the U.S. would not do, as a matter of course, for any friendly government, from Mexico to Tito's Yugoslavia, which finds itself threatened. The strategy of the Arabs at this point seems clear, they hope through a series of guerrilla acts of terrorism to provoke a crisis which will seem to lead the world to the brink of a confrontation between America and Russia with all that this implies.

The Arabs apparently believe that in such a showdown the U.S. would in effect wash its hands of the affair, leaving the Israelis no choice but to submit.

But what is it that the Arabs demand of Israel? Only that this tiny nation commit suicide, since the Arabs have never budged an inch from their belief that Israel has no right to exist. In other words the Arab position is, Israel, kill yourself decently or we will do it for you—with the help of our gallant Russian and French friends. What is it that Israel asks of the Arabs? Only that she be accorded the right to exist that her ships and planes be permitted to travel through the sea and across the sky in the normal manner. That her ports remain free from blockade and her industries free of embargo. That she be permitted to buy and sell in the marketplaces of the world. The Arabs doubtless have their grievances, all of which are subject to negotiation and compromise agreement. But what is not negotiable is an insistence by one party that the other party cease to exist. That is genocide.

I have no doubt that Israel will find a suitable answer to the current wave of terrorist attacks. And when Israel hits back, I dare say she will do so, not by trying to murder innocent people, as the Arabs have done, but by damaging Arab property. Arab excesses whether they take the form of public hangings or shooting up aircraft in neutral countries may provoke worldwide consternation, but they will not be greeted with the cries of outrage and horror that would follow if the shoe were on the other foot. This is the familiar double standard by which all rational and democratic states are judged as compared to their totalitarian neighbors. For the North Koreans, for example, to have acted the part of barbarians and savages with respect to captured men of the U.S.S. Pueblo provokes no worldwide indignation. But if the U.S. had treated North Korean prisoners in a similar manner, the anti-U.S. demonstrations would have been instantaneous and global.

I have been one of those who have fervently believed in the cause and the ideals of the United Nations. But it must be admitted that with respect to the Arab-Israel conflict, the U.N. has never seemed more blind, more inept and more biased against the principles of its own charter. Remember the last war between Israel and the Arabs states was precipitated by the decision of U Thant to withdraw U.N. troops which were supposedly preventing Nasser's magnificent Arab legions from sweeping Israel into the sea. More recently the U.N. muttered a polite, "naughty, naughty" when Arab commandoes tried to kill passengers aboard an Israel airliner. But when Israel responded by destroying Lebanese property taking pains to see that no one was killed or even injured, the U.N. went into a fit of righteous indignation. The blatant unfairness of this has not been lost on the world.

In the long run, of course, Israel cannot survive indefinitely as an island of 20th century enlightenment in a sea of Arab darkness. Somehow the Arab peoples must be helped to a better life so that they will be less willing to feed their empty Stomachs with anti-Israel propaganda. The real irony of Israel and its miracle of the desert should be the hope and inspiration of the Arab world. For what Israel has managed to do the Arabs can do—provided only that they give up dreams of military glory and concentrate on building a decent life for themselves and their children. That is the real interest of the Arab peoples and to persuade the rulers of the Arab world of this fact should be the object of both U.N. and U.S. policy. It is also the interest of the Russian people and the American, none of which have anything to gain by continuing the power

XUM

struggle in the Middle East. Until the Russians and the French and the United Nations come to recognize this fact, the U.S. must persevere in its policy of insisting that Israel shall not be sacrificed on the altar of expediency.

FHA EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM NEEDS IMMEDIATE FUNDING

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most distressing situation facing many of the farmers of my district. After three almost disastrous crop years, many of the farmers in my district now face virtually a "do-or-die" situation. But without even having an opportunity to take their chances on the natural elements this year, the futures of many of these farmers are about to be foreclosed because of a lack of emergency loan funds by the Department of Agriculture.

According to the latest information I have available to me, there are almost 500 farmers in my district alone who have made application for FHA emergency loan funds and who have been approved, but who have been turned down now because of a lack of funds. Let me emphasize that the rules have not been bent concerning these people. They applied for funds, they were fully qualified to receive the loans, and they were led to believe that the loans would be forthcoming.

On the basis that the loans would be forthcoming, most of these farmers have already begun preparing their land for the 1969 crops, they have begun to buy seed and other necessities—on credit, of course—and they have even carried a number of employees on their personal word that pay would be forthcoming to them. For these farmers, their total lives and investment are dependent on receiving the FHA emergency loan funds.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these people are not asking for a gift or a grant. They are merely asking for loans that will be repaid to the Government. And I would contend that this is a fiscally sound investment to protect the livelihoods of these farmers. Most of them have devoted their entire lives to farming. They lack the training or the skills to move easily into other vocational fields. Therefore, if they lose their farms, their equipment and their homes through our inability to provide the necessary and needed FHA loans, these farmers face unemployment, underemployment or the prospect of becoming another anonymous face in our already overcrowded urban ghettos.

This is an emergency situation that deserves emergency action. I have already sent telegrams to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget urging them to find the necessary funds to fulfill these commitments to our farmers. In the case of my district, this amounts to about $2 million.

At this point, I include the texts of telegrams that I have sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO THE HONORABLE CLIFFORD HARDIN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Hon. CLIFFORD HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to bring to your attention as forcefully as possible a situation in Eastern Arkansas, as well as my whole state, that borders on disaster for many of our citizens. According to the best estimates that I have been able to assemble, almost 500 farmers in my district, and more than 650 in Arkansas as a whole, are now being turned down for FHA Loans because of lack of funds. Just yesterday, another of our farmers said he would lose his land and his equipment if he cannot get FHA help. He had been informed that his application was being denied for lack of funds. "I know the Farmers are almost forgotten objects," he told me. "This would be a small thing in comparison to other things we are spending on."

As you know, the applications that are now being turned down do not involve persons who are not qualified for the loans. The Loan Applications have already been carefully screened. The people affected are farmers who have had applications in for several weeks and who have already begun preparing their 1969 crops, acting under the assumption that the loan would be forthcoming. Since we have allowed them to go into March beginning the preparation of their crops and getting further in debt, I sincerely and strongly believe that we have an obligation to help these people. These farmers are not asking for a gift. They just want a loan that will be repaid to the Federal Government. They need your help in order that they can help themselves.

Let me point out that the problem has far-reaching circumstances, closely tied to the critical problems we are facing in our cities. These farmers now facing extinction have devoted their whole lives to the farms. All of their investment is tied up in their farms, and they lack adequate training in any other areas. In other words, they face either unproductive and underemployed work, they face addition to the too-crowded welfare rolls, or they face becoming another anonymous face in our urban ghettos. None of these alternatives is nearly as efficient or effective as the relatively low cost of keeping them on the farms.

It is imperative that we get additional funds to cover the FHA Emergency Loan Applications that have been received and are qualified. It was with this in mind that I voted Wednesday to increase the national debt ceiling, in order that we could possibly find the necessary funds somewhere to help these farmers who face ruin.

According to the unofficial statistics I have been able to accumulate, there are 488 applicants in my district with requests totaling $2,047,048 who have been denied funds. This is one-third of those in my district who applied for the FHA emergency loans. In Arkansas as a whole, there are 657 applicants who requested $2,786,861, who were turned down for a lack of funds.

I would like to request an appointment to meet wtih you at the earliest possible date to discuss this emergency. I stand willing to help in any way possible in getting the necessary money to fund these most deserving applications. I look forward to hearing from you.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
BILL ALEXANDER,
Congressman from Arkansas, First District.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT P. MAYO, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Hon. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYO: I would like to urge as strongly as possible that the Bureau of the Budget approve an additional two million dollars for Farmers Home Administration emergency loans. These funds are needed without delay. According to the latest information I have available, this would take care of about 500 farmers in my district who made application for FHA emergency loans and who were approved, but who have now been turned down for lack of funds. These farmers, who have just been through three tremendously bad crop years, had been led to believe that since their loans were approved, the funds would be forthcoming. Consequently, they have already invested in their 1969 crops, beginning to prepare the lands and purchasing seed and other necessary items—on credit, of course. Most of these farmers in my district stand to lose their land, their equipment, their homes—in short, their total investment—if FHA funds are not approved to cover their loan requests. The alternative for most of these farmers is unemployment, underemployment, or addition to the growing problems in our urban ghettos.

I realize that our financial condition is not good, but I would like to point out a few pertinent points. First, the FHA funds are a loan, not a gift. These funds will be repaid, so there is very little investment made by the Federal Government. Second, the investment we might have to make in these farmers could turn out to be much greater if FHA funds are not forthcoming and these people become part of our massive urban problems. Third, I voted to increase the debt ceiling just so we could have access to funds to meet pressing and necessary needs such as this.

Again, let me urge in the strongest possible terms that the Bureau of the Budget approve the funds requested by the Department of Agriculture to fund the FHA loan programs.

BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress.

SAVE THE DUNES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times of March 16, 1969, brought to mind again the heroic fight waged by my neighbor and constituent, former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, to preserve for all Americans one of nature's greatest wonders—the Indiana Dunes.

The editorial also reminds us, however, that although that battle was won, the war is not yet over. Those who wish to protect our Nation's natural wonders from gross commercial exploitation or from total destruction must maintain their vigilance. Luckily for those of us who wish to see the dunes preserved in their natural state, there exists a hardy group of conservationists known as the Save the Dunes Council. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to com-

XUM

mend that group and to encourage it to continue its valiant work to save the dunes.

The New York Times editorial reminds us, finally, that there are some intriguing questions about the status of the Indiana Dunes which at this point remain unanswered. In the first place, what is the nature and what are the terms of the agreement to be reached between the National Park Service and the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad? I have made attempts to get an answer to this question, and so far have had limited success. Second, why were no additional funds for land acquisition during fiscal 1970 requested by the Park Service? Those of us who wish to see the dunes park project move forward as quickly as possible have been sadly disappointed by the Service's refusal to ask Congress for funds, which have already been authorized, to acquire additional land in the dunes area.

This situation has brought to mind, Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite comments by that fount of political wisdom, Mr. Dooley:

> Th' crusade is over an' vice is rampant again. . . . Th' good man, th' crusader, on'y wurruks at th' crusade wanst in five years, an' on'y whin he has time to spare fr'm his other jooties. 'Tis a pastime f'r him. But th' definse iv vice is a business with th' other la-ad an' he nails away at it, week days an' Sundays, holy days an' fish days, mornin', noon an' night.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the crusade for the dunes is not yet over; and let us remember that it is a full-time job.

The editorial referred to is attached:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1969]

OF MEN AND DUNES

Natural sand dunes, the unending masterwork of wind and water, are among nature's more fascinating and useful creations. To the human eye, their clean lines and fantastic and changing shapes are a delight. To shore birds and migratory birds, they nurture and protect life itself. Birds nest in the beachgrasses and depend for food on the salt ponds and fresh-water pools behind the dunes. To the sea and the lakes, dunes are nature's own barrier to the devastation effects of violent storms.

But something there is in many men that does not love a dune. The only wild, clear call that they hear at the edge of the sea is the screech of profit and the bulldozer's mournful crunch. The land speculator and the summer cottage builder, the highway contractor and the jetport planner, all these see only a beach to be leveled and subdivided into lots and paved with blacktop and sold for dollars.

In recent years, the struggle to save surviving sections of the nation's seashores and lakeshores has made progress. From Cape Cod and Fire Island to Texas's Padre Island and California's Point Reyes, some dunes have been saved by Federal law. But more remains to be done, and old battles have sometimes to be won a second and a third time.

The dunes created by Lake Michigan provided two such battlegrounds. The Indiana Dunes, just east of Chicago at the southern end of the lake, were rescued after a long fight between conservationists led by former Senator Paul H. Douglas and steel companies which wanted to build a deep water port. But the Chicago, South Shore and South Bend Railroad is now pressing the National Park Service for permission to construct a marshalling yard within the boundaries of the lakeshore.

Before this railroad issue is even settled, there is already talk in Indiana that a new jetport may be built immediately south of the national lakeshore. If the so-called Chesterton site is selected, jets would spew oil and fumes as well as roaring noise over the dunes.

Far to the north at the western edge of the State of Michigan, the lake has created the beautiful Sleeping Bear Dunes, so named because their profile from a distance resembles a great bear curled in sleep. Ten years ago the National Park Service identified these dunes as one of the dozen shoreline areas in the nation most worth saving. Michigan's Senators introduced a bill to protect them as a national lakeshore in 1959. The years have passed but the bill has not.

Intensive private development now menaces the viability of Sleeping Bear as a national lakeshore. Meanwhile, the cost to the Government of acquiring the land has risen by one-third. The bill has been reintroduced in both houses of Congress, but hearings have been delayed until the Nixon Administration makes its position known. It is imperative that legislative action be completed this year. Congress waits, but the grasping hands of the land speculators are busy. Soon the Sleeping Bear may not be sleeping but dead.

THE MEN WHO MET THE OIL SLICK CHALLENGE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the March 1969, issue of Drilling magazine carried an editorial which contains a message I think should have wide distribution. The editorial follows:

THE WART ON OUR NOSE

There have been accusations and recriminations in the wake of the Santa Barbara blowout. Probably, there will be more during the weeks and months ahead. But few will come, we devoutly hope and believe, from within the petroleum industry. For who in the business can say with assurance, "It could never have happened to me"?

It happened off Santa Barbara as the whole world watched. The world saw the boiling waters in the shadow of Platform A, the inexorable spread of the oil slick, the contamination of white boat hulls, slime on the beaches and the agony of the birds.

Did it also see, we wonder, the magnificence of men in the face of disaster? Could it see the taut faces of those hundreds of men in the vicinity of Platform A, on the clean-up crews, at the bird care center? Could it identify the executives, the scientists, the field men and the clerks? Did it know that those fleeting figures on the TV screens were flesh and blood people—not corporations, not job classifications, but people pitting all they had against the awesome power of a blowout?

We doubt that the world at large has any conception of what it took in money, courage, intelligence and human endurance to contain the Santa Barbara blowout. From personal experience or close association, most of us in the industry have a pretty good idea of what it took. And we're proud of the people who, seeing what had to be done, simply did it.

Because they did it, the gray whale swims today through the Santa Barbara channel and seals cavort about Platform A as a thousand men complete the clean-up of the beaches and oil company marine biologists monitor the health of the creatures of the sea.

A solid 3500-foot column of cement now seals forever the well that goes into the record books as a wart on the industry's nose. It's a wart, that is, to the world at large. To those of us in the industry, it is also an unseen monument to the magnificence of our people.

Wells are planned and drilled by ordinary men who put on their pants one leg at a time and sometimes fail to zip the fly. They aren't automatons, they aren't perfect, they're people. Because they're people, they sometimes do things which—could they have a second chance—they'd do differently. When they make a mistake, they do all in their power to put it right.

We can't say, of personal knowledge, why there was a blowout in the Santa Barbara channel. We know only that there was a blowout and that some very fine men gave everything they had to minimize the havoc and bring the well under control.

We can't ask the world to forget the blowout, discount the damage, or hold the industry blameless. We ask only that the world also remember the little gray blobs that flickered briefly on its TV screens—the unknown and unsung men who faced a blowout and did their damndest to put it right. They're a credit to the human race.

NIXON ABM POLICY SOUND, REASONABLE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress debates the pros and cons of the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., of March 16, 1969, and fluently expresses the reaction of that publication to the President's recommendations for the modification of the ABM system:

NIXON ABM POLICY SOUND, REASONABLE

President Nixon's decision to go ahead with a modified anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system is a sound and reasonable approach to a complex and emotional issue in which this nation's security is at stake.

The President's decision to deploy a limited ABM system designed to protect American mainland military bases serves notice on both the Chinese Communists and Russia that this nation will remain fully prepared for retaliatory action in event of any attack on the United States.

American leaders absolutely cannot permit a lapse into the pre-World War II isolation blindness which left this nation totally unprepared to defend itself while Nazi Germany and Japan forged giant war machines and ridiculed cur unwillingness to face up to that threat.

It would be joyous and comforting if we could be assured that Russia and China, both nuclear bomb powers, have only peaceful intentions toward the United States. There is virtually nothing at this point, however, to show that either nation is cutting back missile striking forces.

Nor has either Communist power shown any interest in reasonable bargaining on arms controls. The recent history of both nations demonstrates adequately that they rely on the steel fist as their major bargaining weapon.

History books record clearly that every country that has attempted to bargain with either of the Communist powers from a position of military weakness, has met with disaster.

We believe President Nixon has taken a logical course on the ABM issue which should neither set off a new round in an arms race nor discourage hopes for future negotiations on arms controls.

At the same time, the President has cut back on the more costly program proposed by former President Lyndon Johnson and eased some urban fears by moving the missile sites away from major cities.

In particular, President Nixon has served notice to the leaders of the Soviet Union that the ABM system will be a defensive one but that the American ability to fight back will not be weakened.

He has also indicated that the ABM system will be subject to review each year, depending upon what the Russians have done with their programs in the meantime. The President repeated that he is willing to talk with Kremlin leaders about arms controls. This could be extended to China if the leaders at Peking ever decide to come out from behind their curtain of secrecy and negotiate.

One thing is certain.

No nation in this age of turmoil can relax its defensive capabilities and simply rely on the good will of other powers to assure peace.

We would also hope that those who yell for massive cutbacks in defensive programs will consider that the year 1969 is not 1939.

When the storm of war broke on western Europe in 1939, the Nazis, who had been preparing for a decade, rolled easily over their neighbors who somehow had talked themselves into believing such a thing could never happen.

No more tragic examples in modern history need be cited than Holland, Belgium and France in 1940 and the sleeping posture of the United States on Dec. 7, 1941.

Thirty years ago, the United States was fortunate enough to get a breather during which time it recovered and built a military machine to win the war.

In an age of ballistic missiles which can span continents and oceans, there will be no time to start preparing after the first act of aggression.

IMPROPER STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, William C. Sennett, has given appropriate reply to an improper statement by the National League of Cities concerning the use of Federal funds by Pennsylvania under the Federal Streets Act. The attorney general's statement follows:

IMPROPER STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Attorney General William C. Sennett took issue today with statements made in Washington Wednesday by the National League of Cities regarding the Federal Safe Streets Act.

"The League's statements indicate a lack of familiarity with the Federal Act," Sennett said.

The League had charged that millions of dollars in federal crime-fighting funds are being wasted on rural areas and the creation of a new level of bureaucracy.

The Attorney General said that the charges are without foundation, especially as far as Pennsylvania's participation is concerned. Sennett is chairman of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission which was designated by Governor Raymond P. Shafer to implement the Safe Streets Act in Pennsylvania.

Here is Sennett's statement in rebuttal to the allegations made by the National League of Cities:

"The record must be set straight immediately, especially concerning Pennsylvania's plan under the Federal Crime Control Act.

"The assertion that in Pennsylvania funds are being diverted away from cities and into criminal investigation and regional planning councils is totally without foundation.

"To date, of the $240,524 in Federal aid received and dispersed for riot prevention, 75 percent, or nearly $190,000, went to 30 cities, boroughs and townships throughout Pennsylvania. As for money for regional planning, the Federal Act, itself, absolutely requires planning money to be spent . . . *only for planning*.

"Approximately $360,000 has been earmarked by the Act and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for use in Pennsylvania for local government law enforcement. To date, no money has, in fact, been spent for regional planning.

"Second, not one dime of the Federal planning money under the Act is to be spent, or is being spent, in Pennsylvania for criminal investigations of any kind.

"The Federal Act mandates two phases of development: first, the planning phase; second, the action phase. Provisions in the Federal Act require a partnership in state and local planning to improve the criminal justice systems in the state. At the present time, we are just entering the planning phase.

"The assertion that mayors are not being represented is also untrue. Pennsylvania Crime Commission staff members have met several times with local government officials and will continue to meet with them in order to develop how many elected local government officials should be on each regional planning council. I absolutely guarantee that local government officials throughout Pennsylvania will have full proportionate representation, not only on the regional planning councils, but also on the Crime Commission Advisory Council.

"Governor Shafer, through the Pennsylvania Department of Justice and the Pennsylvania Crime Commission, is honestly and openly attempting to create an effective State-and-local partnership to prevent and control crime throughout Pennsylvania.

"Street crime, professional crime and organized crime will all be dealt with in a balanced State-and-local program. This program—a counterattack on all crime in Pennsylvania—will be the product of both State and local planning.

"I urge all responsible local government officials and all citizens throughout Pennsylvania to rally together to *separate fact from fiction* so that we can get these Federal programs moving. We can use these Federal programs to strengthen our criminal justice system."

SALUTE TO NAB'S MOST DISTINGUISHED MEMBER

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week the National Association of Broadcasters presented its 1969 Distinguished Service Award at the opening general assembly of its 47th annual convention here in Washington. There is probably no greater distinction than for a man to be honored by his peers who have deemed him an individual worthy of recognition.

This award is the broadcasting industry's highest honor. Previous recipients include: David Sarnoff, William S. Paley, Herbert Hoover, Dr. Frank Stanton, Edward R. Murrow, Bob Hope, Sol Taishoff, Chet Huntley and David Brinkley, and Lowell Thomas.

Yesterday, March 24, a new name was added—that of John E. Fetzer of Kalamazoo, Mich., a man highly qualified and deserving to take his place in this renowned company.

The broadcasting industry knows John Fetzer as one of the industry's great pioneers, innovators, and leaders.

The sports world knows John Fetzer as owner of the world champion Detroit Tigers. The residents of the Third District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent, know John Fetzer as a man who has contributed, and continues to contribute in countless ways, to his community and his country. He is a man of many dimensions—a leader in the business world, the academic world, chairman and member of numerous civic committees, councils, and boards.

This recognition of his meritorious service as a broadcaster and outstanding citizen is the crowning achievement of over a half century of service in the development and growth of a dynamic industry.

As Members of that august body which makes a bit of history every day, it is with great pride and deep respect that we salute this man who contributes to the first draft of history every day.

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS ATTRACT ENGINEERS

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the professional engineer is often thought of as a man buried over his drawing board, blind to the problems of society all around him. Until recently, in too many instances, this has been true. Now, however, we can begin to see encouraging signs of a change in outlook, an awakening by engineers to their social responsibilities. The National Society of Professional Engineers is playing a key role in this most important development.

With the deliberate intent of stimulating engineers to greater community involvement, the NSPE has selected six of its 500 chapters to launch pilot projects focusing on problems of their own choice. The Hartford County Chapter of the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers is, I am proud to say, one of the six.

Their activity, I think, is one of unusual interest that could well serve as a pattern for adoption in many other cities. In brief, they have undertaken, in cooperation with mechanical engineering students at the University of Hartford, to provide the children of Hartford with a unique "teaching playground." Donating their skills and time, they are working toward a target date of June 1 for completion of this playground at a site selected by the Women's League Day-Care Center.

Not only will this playground meet a need which exists in so many of our cities for more places of wholesome recreation, it will serve the additional important purpose of allowing the playground directors to set up learning situations involving mechanical principles. Who knows, perhaps this playground will inspire some youngsters to enter the study of engineering, and help meet our Nation's needs in this field.

To provide more detail on this program, I insert in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in the Hartford Times:

PILOT PROJECT HERE: COMMUNITY AFFAIRS ATTRACT ENGINEERS

(By Robert W. Bounds, P.E., president, Hartford chapter, the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers, Inc.)

The Hartford County Chapter of the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers has been selected by the National Society of Professional Engineers as one of Six chapters throughout the country for their Community Involvement Pilot Project program.

The intent of the program is to involve professional engineers in community affairs. Other chapters selected are located in: Philadelphia; Miami; Madison, Wis.; Carson City, Nev., and Newark, N.J.

As envisioned, each of these chapters were to choose some local problem or situation on which they would focus their attention and talents. The knowledge of professional engineers must be utilized to aid in solving the problems that face society.

This attitude is being emphasized during Engineers Week, Feb. 16–22, with the national theme—"Engineering—Partner in Rebuilding Urban America."

The Hartford Chapter has set up a special committee to handle the Pilot Project which is headed by Professor Conrad Hemond Jr., P.E. of East Granby, Conn.

Last year the committee met regularly and studied a list of local situations which were selected due to their technical or pseudotechnical nature.

In October, 1968, the committee decided to concentrate the attention of the Chapter on a University of Hartford student design project called, "A Teaching Playground." The chapter efforts in the Pilot Project program will be to see through to completion, this spring, the construction of this unique instructional playground to be located in the north portion of Hartford.

The playground scheme is the result of several theses prepared by senior students of the University of Hartford, Mechanical Engineering Department.

The theses describe numerous playground contrivances which are designed to instruct children about physical principles and natural laws while they play. The theses were prepared by: Robert Gilbert of Middletown; Thomas Berg of Gales Ferry, Leo Frechette of West Hartford; Edward Markowski of Suffield; Theodore McCormack of East Hartford; Archi Roberts of Moosup; and Robert Cote of West Hartford.

The subject of the theses studies was the result of suggestions to the university concerning the need for play equipment which could illustrate fundamental physical principals. The suggestions were made by Mr. William Van der Does, director at the Women's League Day Care Center which is located in north Hartford.

Cooperation and support in connection with the playground project has been very encouraging. Representatives of various neighborhood groups have attended committee meetings. Mayor Uccello has been informed of the undertaking and indicated her approval.

The Park Department and the Department of Licenses and Inspections of the City of Hartford know of the plans and have made suggestions for their implementation. Various local engineering firms are cooperating on construction problems.

The local chapter of Associated General Contractors Inc., has indicated interest in discussing the construction phase of the project. The tentative completion date is May 15, 1969.

Other organizations have expressed interest in the playground installation. The Connecticut Valley Hospital has requested information for the construction of a playground for a group of 20 disturbed children.

The NSPE Community Involvement Pilot Project will not terminate when the six selected chapters have completed their particular projects. As planned, each chapter will prepare a report for NSPE consisting of a complete history, analysis and summary of the project.

These reports will be compiled into a handbook on Community Involvement which will be distributed to the over 400 NSPE chapters in the country.

These handbooks, it is hoped, will provide the chapters with a precise outline of six case histories which can be used as guides for the same types of programs in many other communities.

We in the Hartford Chapter realize that the engineering profession is guilty of remaining aloof to many of the ills of society. We hope the undertaking of this project, as limited as it is in scope, may be the turning point and the engineering profession will in fact become genuinely involved.

THE ABM DECISION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, based on the information which I have reviewed to date, I am inclined to oppose the appropriation of $7 billion for the construction of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system that has been proposed by President Nixon. First, I believe these funds would be better spent in increasing assistance for elementary and secondary schools, for higher education loans and improved facilities, to fight crime, abate pollution, halt urban decay, and feed hungry Americans. Secondly, I do not believe this system is needed to protect us against any attack which the Communist Chinese could mount in the next 6 to 8 years. Third, I am not convinced that the Safeguard system will really improve the creditability of our deterrent vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Lastly, I believe the decision to deploy this system will escalate the arms race at a time when it appears we can make some real progress toward curtailing this spiral.

As a Congressman, I know it is my duty to lead my constituents and not follow the opinion of a bare 51 percent. However, I do feel that each and every citizen has a substantial interest in whether the Safeguard system is deployed. This morning I read that some 63 percent of those surveyed recently support the President's action. While I personally am opposed to the system at this time, I feel that this issue is far too important to be decided on my own personal preferences. Therefore, I plan to survey my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania on this matter shortly before I make my final decision. I also plan to continue to seek out as many experts on both sides of my question as I can find. I urge all my colleagues to do the same. If our constituents overwhelmingly believe that the Safeguard system will improve the national security, certainly we cannot ignore their views when this matter is considered by the House.

THE 148TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 148 years ago, the brave people of Greece rose to wage a struggle for independence against the Ottoman Empire and their valiant efforts produced for them a Greece resurrected as an independent nation. The dedication of the people of Greece to their independence should properly be commemorated on the anniversary of their uprising against the Ottoman Turks.

The people of Greece today steadfastly maintain their independence and are being served by a government they overwhelmingly endorsed in a referendum last fall. In turn, the Greek Government is dedicated to improving the living standards to its own people and it continues to provide steadfast support to the NATO Alliance. It can be said without fear of contradiction that no nation surpasses Greece in its cooperation with NATO.

Historically, the people of the United States and Greece have maintained a truly great friendship. The Greeks remember the support that American citizens gave to them in their battles for independence. This historic association is augmented by the close association that Americans of Greek origin maintain with the land of their forebearers.

Therefore, cooperation between Greece and the United States is consistent with the close historic association of the two nations.

As we note the growing pressure being exerted in the Middle East by the Soviet Union and recognize that Communist belligerence on many fronts, we should remember that Greece is bordered by three Communist-ruled countries. Therefore, people of Greece stand in the forefront of the free world struggle against Red tyranny just as they have persevered against oppressors of their nationalism in other historic eras.

Mr. Speaker, we commemorate this occasion and take the opportunity to express friendship, respect, and continued interest in the historic alliance between the people of Greece and of the United States and their respective governments.

THE TAKEN-FOR-GRANTED AIR CONTROLLERS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Department of Transportation Appropriations, I am always mindful of the millions of air travelers who rely on the alertness, skill, and fitness of the air controller who quite literally holds their lives in his hands.

As a private pilot, I am well aware of the magnificent job our air controllers are doing, often under the most adverse conditions. Yet it comes as a surprise to me that the general public, even those who make frequent use of commercial airlines, is so uninformed and unaware of the tremendous importance of the air controller, to their safe flights.

The following article from Business & Commercial Aviation magazine does not exaggerate the righteous discontent of our taken-for-granted air controllers and the conditions under which they currently are working:

THE ANGRY MEN OF ATC

(By James Holahan)

To most pilots, the air traffic controller is a detached voice, reassuring, authoritative, helpful, essential—the voice that makes our massive inertia-laden air traffic control system play as intended.

There are times we goof a bit and we can detect a tinge of sarcasm in the voice of air traffic control. Like when we stray a couple of miles off the center of the airway. There may be a time when we goof royally and we hope that beyond that voice is a forgiving heart and no violation will be filed. And there are times when we can detect a note of sincere friendliness—particularly at night when things aren't so busy and we are about the only plane up there in that great big sky. We exchange simple amenities as we are handed over to the next sector. We'd really like to say more but the rigid code of radio discipline forbids it. "Thanks a lot for the help." "How do you like your job?" "Married?" "Got any kids?" "How did you get into this crazy business anyway.

Though we seldom stop to realize it, at times there is a certain amount of humanism mixed in with the modulations that travel from the guys in the cockpit to the guys behind the scope and mikes. Hot cathodes or P-N junctions can't detect it, nor would it show up on an oscilloscope, but it's there.

But what do we know about the source of that voice on the other end of the radio wave? What type of guy is he? What's his background? What does he have to know to do his job?

Few of us, even if the questions had occurred, have ever bothered to find the answers. This guy is part of the system. A faceless entity. Despite the traces of humanism that the electronics couldn't filter out, we took him for granted. That is we used to, until one day last summer. He stood up tall and said "Damn, it I'm tired of glueing this creaky old system together with psyche, sweat and blood—now I'm going to play this game exactly according to the words written in the rule book.

He did. And traffic slowed down from Los Angeles to New York just as if someone had filled the Olympic pool with Karo syrup during the 200-meter butterfly. Suddenly this air traffic controller stepped into the spotlight. He had a face, and it was scowling.

He was telling us and the public at large that he had been neglected for too long. He felt he was overworked, underpaid, underappreciated and misunderstood. Besides, he told anyone who would listen, he had lousy equipment to work with. If air traffic kept burgeoning and he didn't get more help in the form of more men and women, reliable equipment, the summer of 1968 was going to last all year—every year.

The public and the pilots got to know the man of air traffic control—quickly. The public became aware that pilots did not fly airplanes all alone. Pilots knew this but they sometimes forgot, and this sudden self-identification jogged their memories.

Well then, who is the air traffic controller? Why is he angry?

To begin with there's 9341 of him—that is, non-supervisory-level men behind mikes and/or radar. He works in control towers, IFR rooms (which are at major airports) and air traffic control centers.

If he works in the center, his average age is 37. If he works in a control tower or IFR room, his average age is 34. Ninety percent of all controllers are between 28 and 40.

Very likely he came from the military, where he learned air traffic control or was a pilot, navigator or flying radar officer.

He's a civil service employee but doesn't like it because he's lumped in with a lot of job types requiring less skill, and the Byzantine civil service regs are forced to cover all with little differentiation. If he's a journeyman controller on the scopes, he's a GS–12 (civil service rating) and could make from $12,174 to $15,828 for a 40-hr. work-week year depending upon which one of the ten salary levels he is at within that grade. With extra pay for nightwork, Sundays and holidays, he might make about $1700 more per year. If he worked a six-day week or ten hours per day for five, his yearly salary could top $20,000.

Now if our journeyman radar controller is in one of those locations handling more than a million traffic movements annually, his grade jumps a step to GS–13 which encompasses a $14,409 to $18,729 per year spread. With night, etc., extras and overtime he could hit in the $25,000 neighborhood.

Not a bad neighborhood to be in, would say many a business pilot who has been mooging around in a twin-tailed Beech for a stipend much below twenty grand without the niceties of 26 paid vacation days and the retirement benefits afforded by Uncle Sam.

The controller starts between $5000 and $7000 per year. He attains journeyman status (GS–10 to 12 if in a control tower, GS–12, 13 if on radar in a center or IFR room—in about 3½ to 5 years. It takes him several years to go from the first pay step in a grade to the top (tenth).

While many controllers are content, particularly if they are in light-to-medium traffic locations, a good deal of them are not. Most of the dissatisfied ones are in the major terminals in the N.Y., Chicago, Washington golden triangle section of the country where the traffic is the heaviest. Their dissatisfaction seems to stem from their steady diet of long, unrelieved hours "at the boards," shift work, mounting workloads without a commensurate expansion of the work force, obsolete equipment, necessity to train men on the job, dissatisfaction with remuneration and, in some cases, difficulty with supervisors and lack of communications through the labyrinthian FAA chain of command. The voice of the air traffic controller which is listened to and obeyed over the airways and airports of the land is, they say, muffled and largely ignored on intra-FAA channels.

To strengthen and amplify that voice, many of them have joined the new Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association, PATCO, formed in the New York area in February, 1968. The organization was the idea of two GS–12 controllers in the New York Center, Mike Rock and John Maher, ages 31 and 35 respectively. Rock is the association's full-time chairman and Maher its national coordinator. They conceived the plan for the group in the fall of 1967. Both had been chapter presidents of the National Government Employees Association, NAGE, which is a union of all types of government employees. They were entirely dissatisfied with what NAGE was doing for air traffic controllers and decided another organization—composed only of active controllers—was needed.

Originally, the thought was to have such an organization for New York only. The two founders searched for a "name" lawyer to help them and ultimately contacted noted criminal lawyer F. Lee Bailey after reading about his flying activities. Bailey not only gave them valuable preliminary advice but he also went so far as to put his Learjet at their disposal, loaned them money and took, at no remuneration, the post of executive director. They decided to make it a national association.

With the drive supplied by Rock, Maher and a nucleus of some 200 controllers in the N.Y. Center and JFK, supplemented by the push of Lee Bailey, PATCO grew to its present strength of some 6250 non-supervisory active controllers who are dues-paying ($150 per year) members. "We're still getting in twenty to thirty new members a week," says Mike Rock who adds "We're the only association that speaks for the rank and file controller. Supervisors are permitted to join but only as associate members and these do not have a vote."

According to Rock, NAGE numbers only 2475 controllers and the only other controller group (The Air Traffic Controllers Association, ATCA) has 2350 members on its rolls. (A check with ATCA finds that the association claims over 4000 members, many of whom are supervisory people and a few hundred are military controllers. It says the 2350 figure cited by PATCO is the number of members who pay dues by the FAA dues checkoff plan.)

Rock and Maher told B/CA that air traffic control is decidedly a young man's game. "A controller in a busy center or terminal reaches his prime in his early thirties and starts going downhill fast when he passes 40. In his mid-fifties he's burned out as a controller in a high density location," says Maher. He claims that there are many "burned out" controllers now behind busy scopes and they may take 20 seconds to do what they used to do in five. He says that the shortcomings of these men are covered up by some of the younger controllers and that during critical periods supervisors relieve the over-the-hill types from the scopes and put them on less demanding positions. PATCO strongly favors early retirement for controllers and a six-month recheck (right now there are no rechecks unless a man is found deficient by a supervisor). PATCO, however, doesn't seek mandatory retirement; it feels that when a man starts losing his speed and confidence (another thing he loses in the forties, Rock and Maher maintain) he should be switched to a light-to-medium traffic location.

Rock relates that it is not unusual during peak periods in the New York area to have men at the boards continuously for eight to ten hours without a break. Lunch, he says, even has to be eaten at the position. Some men will have only soup and coffee since chewing food will not be conducive to intelligible communications.

"Sure," admit a number of FAA supervisors who were formerly controllers, "we put in stretches as long as twelve hours in control positions (now the maximum is ten) too. But this was not a steady thing. We had plenty of days when the workload was light. It isn't a regular thing today, either."

"They're forgetting that airlines file IFR now regardless of the weather," the working controllers will counter. "The man behind the scope sees targets. They are the same in fair or foul weather and in New York, Chicago, Washington, Los Angeles, they're always crowded in peak hours."

However, with a little probing, you will find that bad weather days are the worst because everyone flying has to be on an IFR plan and the pipelines are saturated, so there are more airplanes that must be handled in a given period.

There was a freeze put on training new controllers in 1963. Only recently has FAA, thanks to the heat generated by controller groups that was felt by Congress, was there a thaw, Congress has now provided funds for the training of 2400 new controllers and the FAA has re-opened its controller school at its Oklahoma City Center.

During the freeze, air traffic just about doubled; controllers had to handle almost twice the traffic with the same work force.

"We did it by cutting lots of corners," says Rock, "and staying on this ragged edge of minimums." He seems to imply that controllers stuck out their necks to expedite traffic by such practices as using less than the mandatory three-mile separation demanded "by the book" [i.e. FAA ATC regs] when within 40 miles of a terminal, by clearing planes to land before a plane on the runway has actually turned off, by handling too many airplanes at one time.

Shortly after PATCO was formed came the now historic "safety program" which many claim, but cannot prove, was a euphemism for an intentional slowdown to put PATCO in the public eye and lend strength to its demands. As told by PATCO, "Our policy is simply this: Follow FAA regs to the letter; give every airplane the separation its pilot has the right to expect, and stop cutting corners."

Whether, as some say, minimum separations were stretched beyond that needed for safety and other delays were deliberately introduced into the system, or the controllers just stopped sticking their necks out and making up for the lack of manpower, equipment, airfield capacity, etc., no one but the men at the boards may ever know for sure, but during May to September, 1968, air traffic operated in low gear. Delays in New York were felt in Los Angeles. Some flights suffered delays of two and three hours. Others were diverted to fields a couple of hundred miles away. Passengers lost time, airlines lost millions of dollars.

FAA officially never admitted that it found any rule infractions during the "safety program," though it sent inspection teams to critical locations. In a few instances controllers were removed from their positions by supervisors for allowing too much separation, and in one case, one was reported for not maintaining sufficient separation. In no case was punitive action taken.

In November, 1968, the Acting Administrator sent a telegram to all regional directors in the field which was a masterpiece of indecision. It started out by referring to recent newspaper articles saying that PATCO was advocating a slowdown. After emphasizing FAA would not tolerate a slowdown or compromise of safety, it quoted PATCO's executive director Herman Meyer (Bailey relinquished this job and remained as legal counsel) as saying just what he would be expected to say, i.e.; "We would not condone our members engaging in a deliberate slowdown," etc. Thomas concluded with how inquiries from the public should be answered.

If indeed there was a slowdown, the controllers had boxed FAA into a trap where it could never admit publicly that it knew (as many claim) corners were being cut and infractions to the letters of the rules had been going on for some time to make the system play. To do so would have opened it up to all sorts of libel suits and some heads in the executive suites of 800 Independence Avenue might have rolled. It would have taken a much stronger and better—politically—entrenched man to deal sternly with the situation. Dave Thomas, a career FAA man and only acting administrator didn't have the strength and, apparently wasn't inclined to take forceful action—assuming such was warranted. It was his Bay of Pigs and he suffered through until the normal traffic drop in winter.

During the rise of PATCO, ATCA began to become more vociferous. Formed in 1956 and long regarded as a very ethical and professional association more concerned with making better and more knowledgeable controllers than higher remunerated ones, ATCA lost members in droves to PATCO. The latter accused ATCA of being management dominated (many of its members are supervisors; how many, it claims it doesn't know) and of always having as its executive director a retired chief from FAA's air traffic service. It said this association was too much a part of management to fight for the journeymen controllers. While strongly denied by ATCA, many people in FAA headquarters confidentially agreed that this is true.

But ATCA is out to change this belief. A year ago it hired the public relations firm of Ruder & Finn (the same one recently hired by the State of Israel to bolster its image in the U.S.) to publicize that it is a viable spokesman for the controller. It recently has made battle with FAA on the matter of overtime pay. Top graded controllers only recently were awarded time-and-a-half for overtime. However, in many locations funds ran out and men could be paid only in compensatory time on a one-for-one basis—one hour off for each hour worked overtime. ATCA is out to insure that in all instances there will be sufficient funds to pay overtime and in no case substitute comp time.

B/CA talked to Jerry Biron, newly appointed head of the manpower section of FAA's air traffic service. Biron admits that during prolonged periods of bad weather controllers are overworked but, he says, "the only way to eliminate this is to staff for peak periods. This would result in overstaffing most of the time. With the present scarcity of controllers, we don't see how this would be feasible, or even possible."

Biron blames the situation on everyone's underestimation of the growth of aviation. "Admittedly we don't have as many controllers as we need, nor do we have enough airports," Biron told B/CA. He thinks flow control will help, although he points out we always have had flow control. "Now we're refining it, trying to predict delays so that those that occur, occur to people while on the ground."

The ATS manpower chief thinks one reason for frustration of some controllers is that there are not many management slots open to them. Also, he points out, top salaried GS–12 and –13 controllers would have to take a cut in pay to step into management and few want to do that.

Biron disagrees that controllers are burned out at 40. "Look at the lunar astronauts," he argues. "Borman is 41. These men are performing far more demanding tasks than any air traffic controller."

B/CA discussed the situation with a number of airline and corporate pilots. The general feeling is one of sympathy and empathy with the controllers. However, many feel that PATCO has instigated them, convinced them that they should be unhappy. Many think it ridiculous, even demeaning to include such entertainment-world figures as Arthur Godfrey, Arnie Palmer, Johnny Carson, and Susan Oliver among PATCO's trustees.

To this replies Mike Rock, "Who would come five miles to hear Mike Rock or Joe Schmo? Big names attract people. Controllers are individuals. They're not easily persuaded to go listen to other controllers."

Few outsiders, however, deny that F. Lee Bailey's liaison with PATCO is fortuitous for its growth. Says NBAA's ATC coordinator John Woods, "Bailey's so brilliant that he frightens everyone. He's spectacular. He keeps pushing and doing things."

Said one corporate pilot, "The guy has already moved mountains. He's done things that never could have been done without such a strong personality."

Others are suspicious. They wonder about the role of this man who saved the Boston Strangler from death row, who freed Sam Sheppard and who, because of pre-trial actions, was barred from representing another accused murderer in New Jersey. Some respect him, fear him and believe (even hope) he'll fall on his face.

However, there's no doubt that Bailey is strong, spectacular and gifted with almost relentless drive. Articulate and one of the most eloquent speakers in general aviation since Jeeb Halaby left for the Pan Am presidency, Bailey has Halaby's gift for impressing his listeners more for his form than substance. A short (about five-foot-six), well-built man with a modish touch of slightly long sideburns and a seeming preference for deep-colored shirts, ex-Marine pilot Bailey is slightly slow to smile and supposed to have an I.Q. of 170. The almost permanent furrows in his forehead and greying hair make him look older than his 35 years.

You don't have to talk to him long to realize that he is immersed in every phase of PATCO and, though a pilot and not a controller, he impresses with his understanding of air traffic control and controller problems. Frank and a realist, he will tell you that there are a lot of controllers who are content and apparently have no gripes, that the most angry spots are New York and Chicago, that some supervisors tend to push the controllers around, that the courts has established that a controller must exercise judgment in excess of the written regulations, that ATCA is not the type of organization that could represent controllers since "it just doesn't want to rock the boat," that his Learjet is great but "costs like Hell."

Bailey has his hopes set on a bill drawn up by Senators Hartke, McIntyre and others, that was introduced this month in Congress. The bill would take the controller out of civil service and form a separate career field established by federal law with certain requirements, training, progression, voluntary early retirement, and normal salaries between $17,000 and $25,000. Eventually, he would like to close the salary gap between airline pilot and controller.

Bailey also talks of unifying all the heterogeneous groups of civil aviation. Despite all the well-known obstacles and conflicting goals of many factions with the G.A. fold, Bailey, either out of naivete or Napoleonic confidence, thinks it can be done. Although he did not say it, it would be difficult to imagine him thinking of himself in a secondary role to say Tipton, Hartranft, Ruby or Ward in such a unification. He has already developed an excellent rapport with the Airline Pilots Association and currently is working out joint safe separation standards with that group. He is looking for similar rapport with AOPA and NBAA.

While he is fighting for recognition and betterment of the lot of his controllers and probing into general aviation, one wonders how he is able to keep up with his practice of criminal law which evidently pays the bills for his activities, including a Learjet (and pilot), flight school outside of Boston and, recently, part interest in the Brantly helicopter redesign and remanufacturing. One might ask "What is he looking for in aviation?" He probably couldn't afford to take a government post, nor could the industry pay him for fulltime services.

The somewhat enigmatic Lee Bailey notwithstanding, the important thing is that the collective voice of thousands of air traffic controllers has spoken. It speaks harshly and carries a big stick. While we all might not agree with all that it is saying, none of us can help listening.

ANNUAL INCOME OF JOURNEYMEN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS IN CENTERS AND IFR ROOMS ON RADARSCOPES

	Civil service grade [1]			
	GS-12		GS-13	
	Bottom of grade	Top of grade	Bottom of grade	Top of grade
Normal 40 hr. week	$12,174	$15,828	$14,409	$18,729
With premiums for nights, Sundays and holidays[2]	13,502	17,557	15,981	20,774
6-day (48 hr.) week with premiums	17,150	22,304	20,303	25,711

[1] Journeymen controllers are GS-13's in 13 designated busiest locations.

[2] Air Traffic Service estimates that a man would reasonably work 40 Sundays and 8 holidays in a year and that 40 percent of his work would be at night. (Reason is that controller's workweek begins on different day each week and he rotates among 1st, 2d, and 3d shifts.)

CHARLES D. ROCHE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Charles D. Roche, adviser on congressional relations to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has recently returned to the ranks of private enterprise. Chuck, a newsman and editor from Boston, joined the staff of the late President Kennedy in time for the 1960 campaign. Following the election that year he came to Washington as a vice president of the Democratic National Committee and soon after joined the White House staff. While serving as congressional relations adviser, Chuck played a vital part in some of the most important and progressive legislation this Nation has ever seen. His competence and guidance were always welcome just as his loyalty and integrity were always appreciated. Chuck Roche was a good friend to many of us and while we will miss him we wish him, his lovely wife and children the best of luck in the days to come.

I AM GIVEN TO USE AND BE USED FOR YOUR MINISTRY

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Congressional District of Michigan is proud to welcome a distinguished leader of the Catholic Church, Bishop Francis F. Reh, to govern the Diocese of Saginaw of which it is a part. Congressman JAMES HARVEY of Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, which also includes a substantial portion of the diocese, joins me in this welcome and in wishing the new bishop of Saginaw every success in his ministry.

At his installation, Bishop Reh witnessed to the dedication which he brings to the diocese and its people, and to the faith and hope which are so necessary in these difficult times. Congressman HARVEY and I commend Bishop Reh's remarks to the attention of our colleagues as worthy of their most serious consideration as they face the problems of our Nation here in the Congress:

I AM GIVEN TO USE AND BE USED FOR YOUR MINISTRY

(Text of Bishop Francis F. Reh's homily at his Mass of Installation as third Bishop of Saginaw)

Through the Liturgy of this Ember Wednesday in Lent, my esteemed and beloved fellow-bishops and priests, state and city officials, religious, fellow-ministers of religion, and laity, through the Liturgy of this Ember Wednesday, the Christian community throughout the world professes its faith and expresses its hope in a particular way.

In the Entrance Hymn we raise to the Lord a trusting prayer of hope, founded on faith, as the author of Psalm 24 (25) did raise his prayer when in danger.

"To you I lift up my soul, O Lord. My God, in you I trust; let me not be put to shame, let not my enemies exult over me." (Psalm 24 (25) : 1–2)

In our times of problems and tribulations, of perplexities and troubles, of uncertainties and distress, of insecurity and also danger, this liturgy begins in the same spirit of faith and hope of the psalmist,

"Look toward me and have pity on me, for I am alone and afflicted. Relieve the troubles of my heart, and bring me out of my distress." (Psalm 24 (25) : 16–17)

"Redeem Israel, O God, from all its distress." (Psalm 24 (25) :22)

Then in the readings the Church sets before us examples of these virtues of faith and hope and also of the providence of God.

The first reading (Exodus 24: 12–18) relates that after trials in Egypt and during the hazardous journey in the desert, Israel's faith and hope in Yahweh—a faith and a hope weak indeed, but bolstered by Moses—are rewarded.

The covenant is ratified on Sinai. The House of Jacob, the sons of Israel, are given the sublime destiny of becoming God's own people, a kingdom of priests, a consecrated nation. (Exodus, 19: 5–6)

The first Book of Kings (19:3–8) provides us with our second reading. It is an obvious example of God's providence as reason for faith and hope. At the point of despair for his life, Elijah is fed and strengthened by an angel of the Lord.

He escapes the hand of the wicked Jezabel, who sought to destroy him. And in the first portion of the Gospel reading, St. Matthew recounts Jesus' rebuff to those who looked for an on-the-spot miracle as proof of His authority.

He promised the one sign upon which hinge all Christian faith and hope, the sign of Jonah-His resurrection from the dead.

For, as St. Paul teaches, ... "If Christ has not been raised then our preaching is useless and your believing is useless; . . . ." (1 Cor. 15:14) "But," writes Paul, "Christ has in fact been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of all who have fallen asleep." (Ibid., 20) "just as all men die in Adam, so all men will be brought to life in Christ. . . ." (Ibid., 22).

The foundation stone of all Christian faith and hope, the ultimate proof of our own resurrection in Christ, the reason for our **hope!**

Last year my brother bishops of the United States issued a collective pastoral letter on the mystery of the Church, on her nature and function in the light of certain problems of the hour.

It was my edification, my benefit, to adopt as my own such words with which that pastoral was introduced to our Church in America:

"As the years of the Council progressed, we became more aware of the magnitude of the agony and the loftiness of the aspirations which identify this mighty century.

"We experienced anew our need to carry the cross of the human condition, to trust more deeply in the never-failing presence of the Spirit, to affirm hope even when many would counsel despair, and to wait, in all our distress, the fulfillment of Christ's Easter promise. . .

"We pray that God, our Father, who keeps alive in us a sense of inadequacy, may give us the courage to bring to fruition the work of the Council which begins and ends with confidence in one another and with faith in Him."

Do not such words echo, among the problems of our days, the humble faith and hope of today's liturgy and of the psalmist's prayer in time of danger?

In the community of the Church, St. Paul teaches us that not only are we members to form one body and even as parts of it to belong to each other, but also—marvel of mysteries—that we form one body in union with Christ (Romans, 12:5). We are more than ourselves. Together we are Christ's body. (1 Cor. 12:27)

The Church is Christ's body, and we are its living parts. (Eph., 5:30) That Christ in His members, the Church, suffer crucifixion—now from without, now from within—is ordained as the course of salvation. But it is never crucifixion without the certain faith and the firm hope of resurrection in Him.

It is in this faith and in this hope that I come to you, the community which is the Church, the Diocese of Saginaw. The local church, a diocese as is this of Saginaw, is fashioned after the model of the universal Church, as we are taught by Vatican Council II.

The universal Church comes from, and is in, the local churches. Without the local church, there is no universal, no catholic church. (Constitution on the Church, 23) Yet no local church can isolate itself from the world-wide mission of Christ and His Church, whose limits are none.

The college of bishops with the Holy Father are the gifts of the Spirit to the universal Church for her unity in faith, in hope and in love. By ordination in episcopal orders and by mission of His Holiness, I am now given to you, the people of God in Saginaw Diocese as your bishop.

I do not, of course, mean that, in a colloquial sense, I am God's gift to Saginaw. Rather am I given to you as yours to use and to be used for your ministry for your service.

I am given to you as your shepherd and leader, but as shepherd who must be willing to give his life for his sheep, as leader who will not ask his followers to go where he will not go himself.

I am given to you, may I say, by the Spirit, so that in the Spirit I may be the sign and the assembly point of your unity in faith and hope and love in Christ.

Credam Firmius!—that I may believe more strongly! It is the motto of my coat of arms. This may seem to some to be outdated heraldry, more regal than sacerdotal for a bishop.

I would find it of little interest to argue the case, for or against. But for me those words have been more prayer than motto. They are part of a prayer of Pope Clement XI.

"Lord, I believe; may I believe more strongly!

"Lord, I hope; may I hope more confidently!

"Lord, I love; may I love more ardently!"

It is my prayer today as I come in joy to have you as my lot, my portion, my life in Christ! It is my prayer in the spirit of this Lenten Ember Liturgy, of the faith and hope of Moses and the children of Israel, of trust in the Providence who renewed the covenant and saved Elijah, of faith and hope in the sign of Jonah.

It is my prayer in the spirit of my brother bishops of the American Hierarchy, of their expressed faith and trust in the never-failing presence of the Spirit and in the fulfillment of Christ's Easter promise.

Will it not also be our prayer, your prayer and my prayer in Christ, and so the prayer of the Church of Saginaw?

Since that great Council Vatican II, the spirit of evil has been busy with his minions. He saw and feared and hated that Council's thrust to renewal of Christian witness to the world. And so he has sown his weeds of confusion to overshadow clarity, his cockle of division and suspicion to dwarf unity and understanding; his evil seed of anger to stunt true zeal; his thorns of doubt and skepticism to stifle faith and hope.

If there can be degrees of ease or of difficulty in believing, it seems more easy to believe in the devil today. One can almost see his tactics, sense his presence, detect his stench.

These are times of trial for our country and for the world of men. Fear, insecurity, distrust and violence are more bed-fellows than strangers to us.

It will be the strength of our faith and the solidity of our hope which, in such times, will give true service to God and to our Church, to our country and to all our fellow-children of God in Saginaw, in America and throughout the world.

This witness of strong faith and solid hope will be our service of love to mankind in its present time of trial.

A long time ago we were exhorted by St. Paul never to surrender our precious heritage of faith and hope. In drawing to a close his first letter to the Church he had established at Corinth, he wrote at length on the fact of Christ's Resurrection, witnessed by the apostles, as the foundation of our faith and the decisive proof of our future resurrection in Him.

Paul was writing, it is true, with the particular problems and troubles of his Corinthians in mind. But can we say that the inspired words of Holy Scripture were intended by the Holy Spirit for but one time or one people? And so, cannot the conclusion of the fifteenth chapter of Paul's letter serve us also today as both a beautiful and powerful exhortation to faith, hope and perseverance?

"Never give in, then, my dear brothers, never admit defeat; keep on working at the Lord's work always, knowing that, in the Lord, you cannot be laboring in vain." (1 Cor. 15:58)

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, one of the successful and prominent lumbermen in my home State of Oregon is Mr. Grover B. Kelsay, of Jasper, Oreg.

Mr. Kelsay has had a truly remarkable Horatio Alger career. He knows why we have such high lumber and plywood prices, and he knows what the solution is and is not afraid to announce it. He recently wrote a letter to President Nixon, and has consented to having a copy of it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am certain it will be of great interest to my friends in Congress who are concerned about the high price of lumber and plywood:

HILLS CREEK LUMBER CO.,
Jasper, Oreg., March 4, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For many years, I have had a dim view of politicians! One of my oft-repeated statements is "what this country needs are more statesmen . . . and less politicians!"

I have been a most ardent supporter of you for many years. I was appalled when you were defeated in the 1960 election, and have been dismayed by the two presidents' administrations in the interim period.

Despite the sniping and the carping of your critics, I have felt you have achieved your office with the best training and most qualifications for the presidency than any man of this century. So—you would have to say I'm an admirer of yours, and I feel our nation is in the most capable hands available at this very moment.

Your acceptance speech for the nomination to the presidency was outstanding in many respects, but particularly impressed me with your "dreams" for this nation, and brought home to me the realization we all are brothers under the skin; that we all have dreams and aspirations, and that we all can achieve most of those desires if we want them strongly enough.

During your years of public life, you have impressed me with your apparent sincerity of purpose; that you do so want to do the *right* things for this nation; and I do believe in you, so foolish as it may seem, I'm writing to you, personally, on the thought that you are the common denominator we seek in our nation; that you are a man of the people; that you will, indeed, read my letter, even though it has not come through "channels" . . .

You see, Mr. President, I have tried many times in the past few years to go through political channels with plans of importance for my industry and region . . . and great reams of gobbledygook and no results has been my reward. I can't reach someone with the power of decisions.

I'm a lumberman—a success story not dissimilar to your "dream". My old boss and later partner ran a kid baseball team on which I played when 15 years old, took a liking to me, steered me through college, and hired me when I was graduated. I came to work for him as his bookkeeper in May, 1938; and here I am almost 31 years later, same company, same office . . . except now I'm a partner and general manager of the firm! My old boss has long since retired, though he lives nearby and is one of my dearest friends, and I have his job . . . all worked out and my ownership paid for out of earnings at this company.

All I needed was the opportunity; and that was given me by a man who believed in me; as I *believe* in you.

So—to the crux of this letter—I'm a lumberman, and a pretty good one, at least by reputation and accomplishment.

I *know* what this government should do in our timbered region, and I know that it will be done eventually; but I'm afraid your administration will be too long in finding out to avoid many pit-falls and countless *billions* of dollars wasted needlessly. The timing of this necessary decision is NOW!

Grandiose statement, you say? Well no, sir, it's absolutely true. The government owns 70% of the timber and timber growing regions in our western states, and has managed them decently up to recent years.

Now, however, great advances have been made in forest genetics—better seeds, better, faster growing trees, fertilization techniques, and many other things that will improve and enhance the tree growing productivity of the region.

Our federal forests are managed—and properly—on a sustained yield basis, but improvements of the past decade dictate a sharply upward curve in the potential allowable annual cut or harvest of our forest resource, and our agencies are not yet with it. The timing is now!

You, sir, cannot be unaware of the sharp prices upward this past year in plywood and lumber. Homebuilders are being shot down in their plans, for prices have skyrocketed on materials they use. The National Ass'n of Home Builders are perturbed, and indeed incensed.

Your administration has within it the power to right this situation, without expense to our taxpayers, and those odds I like.

Ed Cliff is head of our national forest service. He made a major speech two months ago in which he clearly stated the allowable cut on the national forests could be increased by up to 66% annually, if he had the necessary money appropriations through Congress to do the work necessary in the field.

"Ah ha!", you say, "money it takes". No, Mr. President, for every dollar it will take to expand the cut, 2, 3, or 4 dollars will almost immediately return to the national treasury, and those odds I like!

Certainly, if we can budget 500 million more dollars a year, with positive assurance that it will return 1 billion or more each year, there is some way to do it quickly. I'd dearly love to be in Congress with such a voting opportunity. If you will put your influence behind such a concept, I'm sure success will follow.

Plywood prices are up 140% this past year; lumber prices are up 60% or so; and the home buyer and other users of our products are the ultimate victims. Many markets historic to wood will be lost forever to steel, concrete, plastics, etc.

It has been carefully estimated by home builders that, for every 10% increase in lumber and plywood prices, 1% is added to the price of a home. If this figure be accepted and I believe it to be accurate, then as of today as against prices prevailing one year ago, homes will cost 10% more because of lumber-plywood price increases just in this last year alone.

Projecting further, 1,600,000 homes @ $22,000.00 each today as against $20,000.00 each one year ago . . . represents $3,200,000,000.00 the home buyer must pungle up extra in one year to pay for double the price of plywood and lumber in his home.

Frankly, Mr. President, the price last year was too low—the price this year is too high—surely we can manage our economy to whatever extent be necessary to avoid 100% price increase in one year.

The *only* possible, practical, substantial step that can be taken now to reduce the chaos in our industry, I do most sincerely believe, is the one I have suggested. Please, Mr. President, will you give your most earnest supporting consideration to follow through on my suggestion? To outline at once some bill for the consideration of the Congress to appropriate the extra funds so necessary to implement the full potentially allowable cut of our National Forests per Ed Cliff's up to 66% overage of that cut now officially in existence today. That would be statesmanship of the highest order . . .

Thanking you for your patience to have read this letter to its conclusion; and hoping you are, indeed, a man of and for the people, as I believe you to be, I am

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. KELSAY,
Partner, Hills Creek Lumber Co.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, until World War II, Byelorussians were among the less known of the many peoples living under the yoke of Soviet communism. We had heard of the Ukrainians, of the Baltic peoples, of peoples in the Caucasus, and even of those in distant Asiatic areas, but one seldom heard of the Byelorussians, and this despite the fact that as an ethnic group they are more numerous than any of the groups named above. As a matter of fact, the 10 million Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union. These people with their long history had lived in the area southeast of the Baltic countries, between Poland and Moscow, through the Middle Ages. Early in modern times their country was annexed to Russia and so it remained until, briefly, they regained their freedom in 1918.

Throughout their subjection to Russia's czars, Byelorussians managed to retain their national traits and traditions, and succeeded in keeping alive their national sentiments. After the czarist regime was overthrown late in 1917, it was a natural thing for the Byelorussians to proclaim their independence. They did so on March 25, 1918. They set up their own government and—for a tragically short time—were masters of their own destiny. Within less than a year, the Red Army overran the country, and independent Byelorussians ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than 50 years, these people have suffered under Communist domination. They have found it impossible to reconcile themselves to the Communist regime imposed upon them. Neither they in their hearts, nor in any sense, the Byelorussians living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. On the 51st anniversary observance of Byelorussians Independence Day let us hope that they will attain their freedom once more and live in peace in their homeland.

A QUICK LOOK AT THE WORLD AS IF THROUGH IRISH EYES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, our new colleague from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, not only put on a green tie and made a St. Patrick's Day speech, as we all did, but took a quick look at the world as if through Irish eyes. Although he does not claim to have Irish blood, the former Ambassador and Chief of Protocol has a gift of wit that is very Irish indeed. His remarks provide a devastating commentary on some all too prevalent American attitudes.

It is with a sense of privilege that I insert herewith a St. Patrick's Day address delivered at St. Louis University by Congressman JAMES W. SYMINGTON:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES W. SYMINGTON DELIVERED AT ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, MARCH 17, 1969

What does it mean to be Irish? Since we are all Irish today we have the right, even the duty, to ask. And we have a choice. To be Irish means to be passionate or thoughtful, fierce or gentle, sober or . . . refreshed. Yet, never anything but proud—with unbridled imaginations and undaunted dreams. The Irish believe, among other things, in life after birth.

Over the rest of the world "things are in the saddle and ride mankind." This was never so in Ireland. The Irish soul has slipped the halter of history for 2000 years. It is the leprechaun that can't be caught; the lilting laughter that moves with the mist and moonlight quietly over the land, soothing the hurt places and softening the soil for renewal.

Wear the green she tells us. The great thing about green is it goes with brown and black as well as white.

The great thing about Ireland is its emerald message to the world that all things can grow green again, if we would let them; that men's minds can sprout green thoughts, nations green hopes, and the world the green promise of peace.

It has been a bare two months since a new American administration took office, and a new President voiced in his inaugural address the determination to "open doors," and "keep no nation large or small in angry isolation." What large nation—in addition to our own—I thought, is "kept" in angry isolation. And what small one? If any of you read the words differently, tell me so. But important words they were—little green shoots putting forth from the frosty soil of a frozen foreign policy, testing the January winds of public opinion. Will they bud? Will the groundhog be affrighted by his shadow? Let's give him a tot of Irish whiskey and see, or maybe some cabbage.

We need the perspective to see beyond our shadow or through it.

Irish perspective is a wonderful thing. I had an Irish friend who had stayed up late carousing. "Your eyes are very red this morning," I told him. "You should see them from my side," he replied.

They sum up things.

"Marriage," said George Bernard Shaw, "is popular because it combines the maximum of temptation with the maximum of opportunity."

They are understanding.

"A fanatic," said Dooley, "is a man that does what he thinks the Lord would do if He knew the facts of the case."

What are the facts of the Irish case that distinguish it from ours?

"We have a certain freedom you haven't got," said Eamon de Valera to America five years ago. "A big power," he said, "is not free from suspicion like a small power." We do labor, do we not, under suspicions others have of us and we have of other? It's not a burden to dance under.

Yeats has told us—

"If there's no hatred in a mind
Assault and battery of the wind
Can never tear the linnet from the leaf."

Abroad, our linnet trust in the ultimate purposes of men rests on the leaves of their daily deeds; we forget their linnets rest on ours. The same is true, of course, at home. If Yeats could see our cities, he might think again—

"But I being poor have only my dreams;
I have spread my dreams under your feet;
Tread softly because you tread on my dreams."

However, being Irish for the day, in a world of nations, I thought I would confine my inquiries to my Irish foreign policy. I didn't want to bother the Irish Ambassador who would probably be gathering shamrocks to deliver to our President, if I remember correctly. So I called our State Department where I formerly worked. It's a big Department. Not everyone in it could be expected to know the Irish foreign policy. That is why we have the Irish Desk which thinks of little else but Ireland, Irish problems, and Irish viewpoints. I rang the number and a secretary answered.

"To whom do you wish to speak," she said. "To the Desk Officer," said I. "What is it you wish to know," she said. "Ireland's foreign policy," said I. "Oh," said she, "that gentleman has just stepped out." "Fine," said I, marveling at the specialties these men have, "but I'll speak with any one of his assistants." One came on. "Hello," he said. "Hello," I said, "does Ireland have diplomatic relations with either China, or with the USSR or the bloc countries, or Cuba?" "Gosh," he said, "I don't know . . . hey, Charlie, does Ireland recognize Russia, or China, or East Europe countries?" I'm holding the line. It's your money, by the way. Charlie gets on. "Let's see," he thinks, ". . . hey, Ernie . . ." By then the boss specialist had returned, and knew not, or at least not quite. They would call back. As the quarter hours ticked by, I knew their difficulty. Must they call the Irish Embassy and reveal a woeful lack of prior consultations on matters of "mutual interest?" The only other recourse, besides a call to the UN, hopeless on St. Patrick's Day, would be a call to Ireland. They called the Irish Embassy, and so did I. We learned, the Irish Desk and I, that the Irish recognize de jure the USSR, all East Europe countries, and Cuba. They trade with the Soviet bloc. They recognize one State of China, but two autonomous de facto governments, one on the mainland, the other on Formosa. Their sensitivity to their American cousins does not prohibit them from keeping the door open to what might be called a two-China policy, guaranteeing support for the continuance of a sovereign Formosa, but acknowledging Peking as the seat of the "State" of China.

The subtle Irish distinction between State and Nation leaves open the opportunity to consider that the Chinese people as a Nation may some day opt to come together in peace. The policy is like Irish lace—intricate but flexibly strong. Ours is as simple and durable as Kleenex.

What about the Irish policy? Is it born of fear? Who would say the land of Robert Emmet, and which gave us John Kennedy and his brothers, deals from fear? Was it courage then? If so, are we Americans less courageous than we Irish? Is it wise? That's the question, but one we can only begin to answer if we know what the policy is we are asking about. We suffer at times, not so much from the arrogance of power as the vagueness of bigness. And it is over the vague land that the demagogue roams at will. G. B. Shaw once said, "A 100% American is 99% an idiot." As Irishmen today, we can laugh. As Americans tomorrow, we might ponder the point. We might wonder, too, whether Irish logic would permit her to appease any threatening power by foreswearing increased contacts with that power's enemies. Even Russia doesn't do that, as Taiwan will attest.

But here in the land of the free there are those who argue we should cudgel our friends to conform their trade and diplomatic policies to our own. Well, let's start with little ones. They "conform" more easily, don't they? Will my bullyboy friends tell Ireland it's all over between us until they view the world as we do, and act accordingly? Registration will be kept open all day. Passports will be produced in 24 hours; a primer on Gaelic and a slice of cold beefsteak for your eye after you make your demands.

For Ireland is the land not only of broken hearts, but of broken heads. No, I don't think the Irish can be persuaded by threats. There's a good glass of stout for every friendly stranger, and a shillelagh for the other kind.

It's up to you here in the coming months and years to decide whether we should be Irish for a day only or whether more of what we say, and think, and love, and pursue should not be Irish forever, and Ireland—our Shamrock of Gibraltar in the defense of sanity seen through the mist.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a footnote to Congressman SYMINGTON's delightful and pungent St. Patrick's Day speech:

During my 3 years at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, it was my profound pleasure to work frequently with members of the Irish delegation. Free from the rigid ideological attitudes of great powers and devoted to the goal of world peace through law and international organization, the Irish delegation consistently played one of the sanest and most useful roles of any delegation. In the person of the Honorable Frederick Boland, the Irish provided a President of the General Assembly who was wise, humorous, respected and beloved by all.

DALLAS MORNING NEWS SUPPORTS COLLINS BILL

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, all Congressmen are extremely interested in providing the best legislation for our country and, of course, each Member takes particular interest in legislation he feels vital.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and as one dedicated to insuring quality education for every American, I am pleased that the Dallas Morning News supports H.R. 8371 and submit their editorial of March 20.

When we consider how very much our future depends on the educational breakthroughs we can enhance today, education is not merely expensive—it is priceless.

The Dallas Morning News story follows:

LEARNING DEDUCTIONS

Rep. Jim Collins proposes to let parents handle their children's college expenses, up to $1,000 a year, as a deduction on federal income tax returns. There are many other proposed deductions now before Congress with a lot less precedent going for them.

The rationale for this deduction would be much like that for job-related training. It is supposed to enhance, somebody's earning power so that, farther down the line, Internal Revenue will get the deduction back and more.

Government at the state and federal levels seems sold on the wisdom of investing in students' quests for higher learning. State and federal loans and grants have mushroomed.

The Collins proposal could make college a little less burdensome on family finances. The deduction would mean an actual difference in income taxes of only $100 or so for most families but for the family struggling to get Jane or Junior through the halls of ivy, $100 is an item.

While Congress is at it, special deductions for students working their way through school might also be fertile ground for exploration. There is no better indicator of need and dedication than a student's willingness to work for higher learning.

If Congress takes the administration's cue on tax credits for businesses that go in for employment-related training, deductions for college expenses will merit equal consideration.

The better the education, the more the earning power and the higher the tax contributions. Tax law recognizes this, so proposals like Collins' hinge on degree rather than principle, which already is on their side.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia is the vast land extending from the eastern borders of Poland to the western approaches of Moscow. It is a cold and frigid land, and its inhabitants are rugged rural workers. These people, numbering some 10 million in all, have been living in that land from time immemorial. There they led a simple life and were content with their lot, until several centuries ago their homeland was overrun by the Muscovites. They were then brought under the rule of autocratic Russian czars, much against their will. They were neither free nor happy. The czarist regime did its worst to obliterate all traits of nationalism and national feeling among them. But the Byelorussians persisted in their opposition. They struggled against that regime with all the means and might they possessed, and successfully maintained their national identity. And, in 1918, when the czarist government was gone, they had the chance to regain their freedom.

Byelorussian leaders seized upon this opportunity and on March 25 of that year proclaimed their independence, then establishing the Byelorussian Republic. For nearly a year they fought their foes for the preservation of their freedom. But their powerful foes proved formidable, and nothing could save the helpless Byelorussian Republic from the invading Red army. Soon the country was overrun and made part of the Soviet Union.

Today these hard-working Byelorussians are struggling against their totalitarian oppressors. They have not given up their hope for freedom and national independence. They feel that if, under present circumstances, they cannot count upon their friends and sympathizers abroad for direct and effective aid, they have at least some claim upon their sympathies. Today, on the observance of the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day I offer my own, and the fervent hope that one day before long these people can attain the freedom and independence they deserve.

THE MANSFIELD WEATHER STATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to note that the Department of Commerce and specifically the Environmental Science Services Administration has reviewed and reversed the decision to close the Mansfield weather station.

This facility was one of 13 which ESSA planned to close by June 30, 1969. It employs only three persons—certainly a small number—but it provides vital and greatly appreciated service to the Mansfield-Ashland, Ohio, area. Since the employees were to be transferred, the savings involved were relatively small, about $10,000. However, the people of the area, businessmen, farmers, private and commercial pilots, responded in unprecedented numbers to protest this false economy move. Working as a team, we were able to convince the Federal Government to reverse this decision.

Located at Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport, this office fills a monitoring and information gap in the heart of Ohio since it is between the major stations in Cleveland and Columbus. It is located at the highest altitude of any station in Ohio and provides local information to residents faced not infrequently with odd weather conditions which do not apply and are not as important to the major facilities.

In an attempt to reverse the decision to eliminate the facilities, and following an exchange of letters and phone calls, a meeting was arranged with administration officials responsible for the action. Although sound arguments for continuing the operation were presented, it did not appear, at first, that they made much impact. As a letter to me from ESSA had stated: "We realize the valuable service the office provides, but—" Much to the credit of the Department and especially ESSA, they did acknowledge the merit of these arguments by reversing their decision and announcing that the Mansfield Weather Bureau Office would remain in operation.

The letters, phone calls, telegrams, and personal statements I received indicated that the people of the area were genuinely concerned about losing this facility. They realized the valuable service the unit provides to the area; they probably realize it better than the parent agency.

From this station information on local weather conditions is distributed not only in Ashland and Richland Counties, but in surrounding areas including Knox, Wayne, Morrow and Crawford Counties. Officials of local radio stations noted that no less than six radio stations regularly broadcast weather reports to more than 150,000 listeners.

As a growing industrial area which is relying more and more on air travel, these reports are becoming increasingly vital.

As a major agricultural area of the State the information's value to the farmer is obvious, as it is to builders and contractors.

Also obvious is the need for a local facility and the information developed by it for use by both private and commercial pilots, a need which is increasing as the municipal airport is upgraded.

The expansion of recreational facilities in the area—ranging from boating, fishing and other water sports in the summer to extensive skiing in the winter—are also aided by accurate local weather reports.

It was more than evident to those locally involved that the weather station was of substantial service to the Metropolitan Mansfield and Ashland communities, and that these people believed the facility's services more than justified its small cost.

Another interesting fact developed during attempts to save the station. We are all familiar with the jokes and humorous barbs directed at the weatherman and his percentage of accurate forecasts. No doubt these are not altogether funny to the meteorologist. They will be pleased to learn, however, that when the chips are down the people sincerely appreciate their work and are willing to fight to keep them on the job locally. Many of the letters I received expressed this appreciation and also commented on the highly accurate forecasts and the professional and dependable service rendered.

The impersonal nature of big government at times stresses the wrong things and fails to fully appreciate problems and alternatives available. I believe this was the case with the Mansfield Weather Bureau, but it is a credit to the Department of Commerce and the ESSA that they could and did reverse their decision before it was too late.

Without the expressions of concern by the people in this area your legislators certainly could not have presented as strong a case. I was very pleased to present the views of my constituents and work for the results we accomplished together.

HALEAKALA NATIONAL PARK IN DANGER OF LOSING ITS MEAGER FACILITIES

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, each year visitors in ever-increasing numbers are viewing the many scenic wonders of our 50th State. Because natural beauty is not confined to Oahu, the principal island of the 50th State, many visitors travel to the so-called "Neighbor Islands." It is on these neighbor islands that many visitors find the Hawaii of their dreams. Especially popular on the island of Maui, both with visitors and residents alike, is the extinct volcanic crater known in legend as "The House of the Sun," or "Haleakala."

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned, along with State and county officials and citizens of Maui, because the facilities presently available to visitors to Haleakala National Park are not adequate. Specifically, the park has no visitor center for the display of educational materials, and improvements are required to make the roads and trails in the park safe. There is also no park water system, and no park communications system or restaurant facilities.

Even though Haleakala National Park today lacks the facilities which are considered necessities and not mere conveniences, an admission fee has recently been levied for the mere privilege of looking into the crater. I have written to National Park officials informing them of these desperately-needed improvements. I have also written to the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, this past week bringing to his attention a resolution adopted by the members of the Hawaii State Senate requesting the Department of the Interior to reconsider a decision to stop supplying firewood for stoves in the crater cabins at Haleakala National Park.

The National Park Service has announced that beginning April 1, 1969, it will no longer supply firewood for the cabins on the crater floor, and shortly thereafter it will remove all the stoves from the cabins. More than 1,796 campers, hikers, and other visitors utilized these meager facilities last year. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the National Park System will make Haleakala inaccessible to those who like to experience the thrill from a trip to the floor of the crater. It would leave much of this natural splendor, after the first of next month, to only the wealthy who could afford to rent pack animals to carry firewood and other camping gear into the crater.

Today, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the resolution requesting the Department of the Interior to reconsider its decision to cease the supply of firewood and stoves for the basin crater cabins at Haleakala National Park, which was adopted by the Hawaii State Senate on March 19, 1969:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, TO RECONSIDER THE DECISION TO CEASE THE SUPPLYING OF FIREWOOD AND STOVES FOR THE CRATER CABINS AT HALEAKALA PARK

Whereas, the National Park Service announced that, beginning April 1, 1969, it will no longer supply firewood for the cabins on the creater floor of Haleakala National Park, and plans to remove, shortly thereafter, all stoves from the cabins; and

Whereas, the objective of the National Park Service by law is to ". . . promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks . . . to provide for the enjoyment of the same. . . ."; and

Whereas, 1769 campers, hikers, and other persons utilized these facilities of our national park last year; and

Whereas, many of these persons are members of youth groups, and can neither physically carry the firewood and stoves to the cabins on the crater floor, nor materially afford such necessities; and

Whereas, Haleakala's natural beauty is for all persons to enjoy, including this large number of people who utilize the firewood and stove facilities; and

Whereas, the present decision of the National Park Service will deprive those who can get the most out of a trip through the crater from its full enjoyment and will leave much of this only to the wealthy who can afford pack animals, etc.; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, that the National Park Service is respectfully urged and requested to reconsider the pending plan to stop the supplying of firewood and stoves for the crater cabins at Haleakala National Park and instead to maintain these facilities for the people of Hawaii and our visitors from overseas; and

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, Director of the National Park Service, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, Representative Patsy T. Mink, Governor Burns and the Conservation Council.

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969.

DAVID C. MCCLUNG,
President of the Senate.
SECIHI HERAI,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE 51st ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the gallant Byelorussian people who in 1918 experienced briefly freedom as we know it in our own country. With a progressive constitution the Byelorussian National Republic declared its freedom and independence after centuries of czarist oppression. The freedom so greatly enjoyed by the Byelorussians was short-lived and soon the country was overrun by the Red army. With occupation came annexation by

XUM

Soviet Russia and for the past five decades the Byelorussians have lived under tyranny. Even living under oppression these freedom-loving people still hold alive the hope that someday they will once again know true independence.

On this day, Byelorussians in every part of the world wish to remind us all that freedom is priceless. In the United States we tend to take freedom for granted but it is one of the most cherished gifts that anyone can have. It does not come easily and involves much sacrifice. The people of Byelorussia who are not free make that sacrifice every day and continue to be a living example to us all.

It is the hope of all Byelorussians that the date of March 25, will again be a day of real celebration in their own land rather than a day of remembrance in other countries. Let us all who live in freedom hope that that day will be in the not too distant future.

A DEPLORABLE FAILURE OF PLANNING JUDGMENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area have suffered for years from a lack of implementation of our regional transportation plans. As my colleagues know, Congress felt so keenly about these failures that they provided legislative direction to complete the District of Columbia freeway system in the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act.

However, the response of the local District of Columbia City Council and the National Capital Planning Commission to this was to adopt a highway plan which not only failed to meet the requirements of the legislation, but which failed to meet the requirements of established transportation planning procedures. There was no consultation on the adopted highway plan with the planners of adjacent Maryland and Virginia jurisdictions. This failure has now been noted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in a letter to the Washington Area Council of Governments asking that this situation be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 23, 1969:

NONREGIONAL PLANNING

One of a number of bad things about the District's severely curtailed freeway plan is the fact that it was pieced together and approved by the City Council and the National Capital Planning Commission without the slightest consultation with the transportation planners of suburban Maryland and Virginia.

This was, by any standard, a deplorable failure of planning judgment. For the District is not an island, nor can its transportation needs be viewed realistically apart from those of the metropolitan area as a whole.

Beyond that, moreover, as the Department of Housing and Urban Development has now made clear, it violates a concept of regional planning which has become a basic requisite for participation in a broad variety of federal aid programs in urban areas. And the agency has warned that the failure must be corrected.

The assertions by HUD, which had not previously entered the District's highway fight, came in response to complaints against the District plan from a unit of the area's Council of Governments, which is supposed to have a voice in establishing this region's transportation policy. As a first step, HUD has asked the Council of Governments' board for some positive suggestions for getting back on the regional track. The council, of course, should comply.

The trouble is, however, that there is really nothing at all that the Council of Governments can do to change the situation unless the city government agrees. And the dilemma in that respect remains just as it has been for months: There is no indication that the District government will budge unless it is required to do so by Congress and by the administration.

HUD has added one more compelling reason for resolving this absurd stalemate through the negotiation of a highway plan which truly relates to the needs of the entire region. We hope that its entrance to the controvery advances that result.

RAY LIVESAY: CRUSADER FOR THE DAYTIMER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, anything that I would add to the article written by Broadcasting magazine on February 10 about Ray Livesay would be redundant. I have known Ray Livesay for more years than I would like to admit and all of the good things written about him in this article I can testify to being no exaggeration. He has been one of the prime leaders in early broadcasting and has achieved success in the industry not just through hard work, but because of his sincere and dedicated interest in promoting good broadcasting. It is with pride in a friend and constituent that I call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

RAY LIVESAY: CRUSADER FOR THE DAYTIMER

(NOTE.—James Ray Livesay—president, 25% owner, WTWO(TV) Terre Haute, Ind.; chief owner, WLBH–AM–FM Mattoon, Ill., and sole owner, WHOW Clinton, Ill.; b. Oct. 1, 1916, Grand Tower, Ill., where he graduated from high school in 1934; owner, radio-set sales and service store, Villa Grove, Ill., 1935; salesman, WDZ Tuscola, Ill. (now in Decatur, Ill.), 1936–44; radio-electronics instructor, U.S. Navy, 1944–46; founded WLBH 1946, WLBH–FM 1949 and acquired WHOW 1950; headed merger resulting in WTWO 1965; director-at-large for small-market radio stations, National Association of Broadcasters; board chairman, Daytime Broadcasters Association; past president, Illinois Broadcasters Association; long active in Rotary, Elks, Masons and Central Community Church of Mattoon; m. Leffel Elmore of Hartsville, Tenn., Dec. 10, 1937; children—married daughter Shirley and son Jim, 21; hobbies—big-game hunting, golf and flying his own plane.)

There are many stories of poor boy makes good in broadcasting.

That of J. R. Livesay, however, is somewhat unusual. It is the story of the grass-roots broadcaster who crusaded diligently for years for what long seemed a lost cause—uniform time for daytime AM radio stations—and who eventually won, at least as far as sign-on time is concerned, thereby benefiting three-fouths of the more than 2,000 daytime outlets in the U.S. but neither one of his own two daytimers.

Ray Livesay has won in other ways, however. For one, he is no longer poor.

For another, his station interests, ranging from part ownership of WTWO (TV) Terre Haute, Ind., to chief ownership of WLBH–AM–FM Mattoon, Ill., to full ownership of WHOW Clinton, Ill., are a source of pride of worthwhile public contribution, considering the social and economic achievements these stations have scored in their respective communities.

Not last nor least is the recognition and friendship of his fellow broadcasters, evident when Mr. Livesay flies his Beech Bonanza to some industry gathering and renewed each time he is elected to be director-at-large of the National Association of Broadcasters by the small-market radio-station operators throughout the 50 states. When he ends his present NAB term next year, Mr. Livesay will have served a total of eight years on the association's board.

Among the founders of the Daytime Broadcasters Association at a meeting in St. Louis in 1955, Mr. Livesay has been at the head of the group since that time and presently is board chairman. He has testified often on the issues of the DBA before congressional committees and worked for the cause constantly at the FCC. As an industry adviser to the FCC and the State Department, he helped support the official delegation in its recent negotiations with Mexico to win a new broadcast treaty that awaits the ratification of the senates of the U.S. and Mexico.

Although the full details of the treaty have not yet been disclosed, one gain will be the uniform 6 a.m. local sign-on time for about 270 U.S. daytime stations now on the seven Mexican clear channels. The treaty's chances of ratification are good, Mr. Livesay feels, especially since it is understood the Clear Channel Broadcasters Association "reluctantly" will not oppose the treaty because of national interest.

The Mexican treaty provision puts the cap on the earlier major gains won by the persistence of Mr. Livesay and the DBA before Congress and the FCC. These culminated last August when the commission on its own motion provided a uniform 6 a.m. local sign-on time for some 1,400 daytime stations. The case had been under consideration since 1961 and the ruling last summer was a refinement of the 1967 uniform time ruling after further negotiations with Canada on mutual interference standards and related issues.

"You cannot lace the public interest in an engineering straitjacket," was the theme Mr. Livesay repeated to all who would listen in his crusade. He argued the public will put up with some interference just to get its own local service and felt the FCC should serve people, not engineering curves.

Neither Mr. Livesay's WLBH or WHOW benefit from the changes because they are on U.S. class I–B clear channels. But he fought the DBA battle simply because he thought it was right.

"Principle to me has always meant more than dollars." Mr. Livesay says. However, he advises his son, also interested in broadcasting: "Don't become a crusader like your dad. You'll spin your wheels all your life and waste a lot of time."

Mr. Livesay also admits: "If I'd known it was going to be such a long fight back there

XUM

in 1955, I don't think I would have had the courage to start. It was one of those situations where you cross each bridge when you come to it and don't give up."

It is the way he doesn't give up on vital issues in his editorials on WLBH and WHOW, a policy begun in 1950 just months after the FCC rescinded its Mayflower decision banning editorials. WLBH is credited with sparkplugging a new junior college in the area, for example, and now is spearheading a drive for a new hospital.

WLBH has a heavy talk format plus middle-road music while WHOW has been country-and-western since its start. WLBH-FM, started in 1949, went to separate programing and sales in 1963 with an easy-music format. The Livesay team called half of all telephones in Mattoon homes as part of its market research in reaching the separation decision. They found wide FM awareness and acceptance.

"I very firmly believe in the future of FM radio," he says, predicting the small class A outlet will spread over the towns of the country and bring such wide use of the medium that in maybe another decade "our FM facilities will be worth more than our AM." He notes with automation "mom and pop" outlets will be feasible in towns of but 2,000 population.

Mr. Livesay skipped college because he could not find a good radio course at the time. "All they were teaching was warmed-over newspaper journalism," he recalls. During World War II he was a Navy radio instructor. He holds an FCC first class license.

Like others of his generation born on the farm and who grew up winding radio coils on Mother's Oats boxes, Mr. Livesay has broadcasting in his blood. He recalls selling main-street merchants on WDZ Tuscola, Ill. (now in Decatur, Ill.) in the late 1930's as his best education and the source of his enthusiasm for radio-TV in the free-enterprise tradition.

Typically Livesay: "Competition makes us all more healthy—if we are able to survive."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK ON NAMING THE 200 BEV PARTICLE ACCELERATOR AT WESTON, ILL., THE "ENRICO FERMI NUCLEAR ACCELERATOR

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring Dr. Enrico Fermi by adding my name in sponsorship to H.R. 391, a bill to name the 200 billion electron volt particle accelerator to be built at Weston, Ill., the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator."

It is fitting that we honor this courageous and tireless pioneer in the field of particle physics, whose theory on the chain reaction of slow neutrons in uranium and whose now-famous experiment in the squash court of the University of Chicago propelled this country into the nuclear age.

In thus honoring Enrico Fermi, we should remember that he came to this country seeking freedom from the oppression of Mussolini's police state. We must remember also that on his genius, and the genius of other European men of science who chose America as their home, rests our national security and our whole way of life.

As we reap the benefits of Enrico Fermi's contributions to this country, let us always be reminded of this great man of physics, and of the image and atmosphere of freedom and opportunity which brought him to this country.

CONGRESSMAN EARL CABELL POINTS OUT NASA CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having received permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include the news release dated March 13, 1969, from the office of the Honorable Earl Cabell, Fifth District of Texas.

I believe Mr. Cabell's remarks dramatically point out that all of the money which has been expended on our space program has not been "blown to the moon" as many disbelievers of the programs have stated.

The release follows:

Press Release of Representative Earl Cabell

As we applaud those involved in the flight of Apollo 9 for another space mission successfully completed, it is a good time to pay tribute to the dramatic revolution achieved by our space program in this nation's educational system, and to the hope it brings for solutions to more down-to-earth problems.

In the decade between 1958 and 1967, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration allocated some $572 million to almost 1,400 projects in our universities and colleges. Some of the grants covered assistance to students or to faculty members, others helped build new space science laboratory facilities, and still more financed research projects of an independent nature.

The effects of this financial assistance extend far beyond the college level, resulting in broad improvements down to primary grades where youngsters stimulated by television are showing a new awareness of and a taste for all phases of science and technology.

It is also interesting to note that during this space decade, while our population has grown by only 16 per cent, we now have 30 per cent more pupils in our elementary and secondary schools, and 120 per cent more in college.

The inception of space age education found no specific course of study into which space knowledge might be assigned and, in the rush for learning, many older sciences were impelled into new studies, diverse sciences merged into a broader community of interest, and often physical sciences found themselves side-by-side with the social sciences in joint endeavors.

There is not enough space in this brief essay to explore all the changes that have been wrought since the flight of the first Russian Sputnik, but our educators and our students know that the schools of today are nothing like those we attended as children.

Now we can see an end to this NASA-induced research. Already economies have cut pre-doctoral grants for 1968 to 75 as compared with 3,132 just four years ago, and under the Sustaining University Program, (SUP), there is no money earmarked for construction of facilities for Fiscal 1969.

However, though our educators are disappointed, they value the climate which NASA research projects have fostered.

Deprived of new projects that could reach beyond the Moon, they visualize a new and more down-to-earth approach, an application of the same principles of mental exploration as applied to subjects closer home in the fields of pollution, of poverty, and of social science.

The end result may well be that those who complained man could reach the Moon but could not live with his neighbor on earth may find that the mind-stretching search for knowledge that space exploration required may be just what is needed to find the answers to the problems that plague us here on earth.

ORGANIZED CRIME FATTENS ON STOLEN SECURITIES

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in Albany, N.Y., earlier this week, Manhattan Assistant District Attorney Murray Gross told the Joint Legislative Committee on Crime that underworld wolves have infiltrated among the bears and bulls of Wall Street. Wall Street officials also urged legislation to require fingerprinting of all personnel in securities markets to curb thefts pegged at $50 million a year. I have introduced such needed legislation in the face of growing evidence that organized crime has invaded the securities industry. The need for such legislation is urgent. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Patrick Young, of the National Observer, a hard-digging reporter from a hard-hitting newspaper, as proof of that urgency:

The Under-the-Counter Market: Organized Crime Fattens on Stolen Securities

(By Patrick Young)

New York City.—The word is out along Wall Street and down Broad, through the narrow confines of Exchange Place and on the crowded sidewalks of Trinity Place. The bookies and loan sharks have passed it on to the clerks and secretaries who labor in the back offices of the brokerage houses here in the nation's financial center.

The message: Organized crime wants securities for its under-the-counter market in stolen stocks and bonds.

Organized crime's interest in Wall Street isn't a new phenomenon. "We have found evidence of their involvement there for at least eight years," says Frank Rogers, an assistant to District Attorney Frank Hogan. What is recent is the sharp increase in thefts of negotiable securities from brokerage houses here and elsewhere.

A precise figure is impossible to obtain. But Robert W. Haack, president of the New York Stock Exchange, estimates the loss of "lost or stolen" certificates at more than $83,000,000 since 1966.

FOUR TIMES THE 1966 LOSS

In a letter to the House Commerce and Finance subcommittee Mr. Haack said lost or stolen securities reported by New York and American stock-exchange members totaled $37,000,000 in 1967, more than four times the $9,100,000 reported in 1966. Figures are not available yet for 1968, but Mr. Haack said indications are that they will total about $37,000,000 again.

The thefts, whether organized or not, have wrought problems and changes in the securities industry. Among them:

XUM

Insurance. Both the New York and American exchanges require their member firms be fully bonded. Thus a theft costs the investing public nothing. But now some brokerage houses are finding it difficult to obtain bonds. Industry spokesmen say a number of insurance companies are refusing to write bonds or are tightening their requirements and hiking the cost.

"This type of insurance is getting less attractive to insurance companies because losses are mounting," reports James Ording, secretary of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, a trade group for members of the New York Stock Exchange. "The point hasn't been reached where anyone has been unable to get insurance, but conceivably it could happen."

Insurance industry officials were bothered by Mr. Haack's estimate of recent losses. "That scared us when we saw it," says a staff member of the Surety Association of America. "He has later information than we have."

Security. "The main brokerage houses are becoming acutely aware of the situation," says an investigator here. "They're tightening up considerably." Several firms have hired former police detectives and FBI men to direct their security efforts.

Francis I. du Pont & Co., for example, has installed closed-circuit television and added extra guards. Employees working in the securities area must sign in, receive special badges to wear, shed their outer jackets, and don a company blazer before starting work. Other companies have instituted similar precautions.

The stock exchanges organized an industry committee last January. The group is to determine how many securities are actually stolen and how. Then it will devise methods to counter the back-office thefts. "The only answer to the insurance problem is that the securities industry make its back offices a lot more secure," says Mr. Ording.

Legislation. The securities industry employs about 152,000 people in various capacities. Rep. John Murphy, New York Democrat, has introduced a bill that would allow the FBI to check the fingerprints of brokerage-house and stock-exchange employes. Insurance companies and national banks now are allowed this check against dishonest employes, but not the securities industry. A similar bill is pending in the New York Legislature to amend a state law that prohibits fingerprinting as a condition of employment, except for state, local-government, and hospital jobs.

THE PUBLIC-CONFIDENCE ISSUE

Securities industry spokesmen are leery of mentioning organized crime, a wariness that stems from concern that public confidence might suffer if a link between the mob and the industry is found. Said Mr. Haack of the thefts, "This could be viewed as evidence of organized crime, but cannot be presumed as conclusive."

Few investigators here, however, have doubts about organized crime's involvement in the thefts. "They've always been the only effective source of dispersement because of their far-flung contacts," says Mr. Rogers. "You'll find stocks stolen here on Monday being offered in Detroit, Miami, Chicago, or Philadelphia on Wednesday."

But serious as the problem is, the thefts represent a tiny fraction of the $145 billion in securities traded on the New York Stock Exchange last year. "I don't think any one should run a headline saying organized crime is taking over the stock market, or even threatening its normal operations," cautions Ralph Salerno, an organized-crime consultant for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "But they are behind the recent problem of thefts."

The root of the problem is the surge of securities trading that has engulfed the stock exchanges and over-the-counter market in the last several years. Paper work has piled up and many brokerage-house books are confused. Securities are stacked on desks, on chairs, on tables, and on floors. Many back offices, says a partner in a small firm, are "amazingly sloppy. Many of the big firms and some of the small ones can't keep track of their securities." In this sort of confusion, a theft may go unnoticed for weeks or even months.

To fight the blizzard of back-office paper, brokerage houses have hired additional employes, some 25,000 last year. Added to this is the rapid turnover in low-paying jobs. Firms simply don't know the background of their employes.

Take Richard Locicero, nephew of an important mob member. He worked for three Wall Street firms within one month. On his third job, as a messenger, he reported to police that he was robbed of $386,000 in securities. Locicero, two uncles, and three other men were later accused of the theft. On April 5, 1967, two days after Locicero appeared before a grand jury, he was murdered, stabbed more than 100 times.

Conversations with state and Federal investigators and crime authorities here and in Albany, Boston, and Washington, D.C., provide an outline of how securities are stolen and disposed of. Rule 1, says a Federal attorney: "They have got to have a man on the inside where these things are handled."

Organized criminals use two methods of obtaining stocks and bonds. First, their loan sharks and bookies encourage, some times with physical force, debtors who can't meet payments to lift securities. "They've got loan sharks hovering over Wall Street like vultures," says a state investigator. The word also is passed that a market exists. This appeals to light-fingered clerks who aren't above picking up some fast money.

CRIMINALS LIKE BLUE-CHIPS TOO

Sometimes, an inside man will be ordered to lift a particular stock or bond. Blue chips are favored by organized crime as they are by many investors. Sometimes the theft is a simple grab at anything. In 1962, someone stole more than $200,000 worth of securities from a file drawer at Loeb, Rhoades & Co. All the securities started with "F." Detectives recovered the stock and arrested a close associate of a suspected mob leader when the man tried to sell the securities to an undercover agent.

An inside man may hit again and again. One brokerage house has reported three securities thefts since Jan. 1, totaling about $300,000. "They're sure it's one employe, but they don't know absolutely who," says an official of the brokerage firm's insurance company.

A co-ordinated effort among New York, Massachusetts, and Canadian officials to gather information on organized crime has produced evidence that stolen securities are funneled back and forth between New York City and Boston, with many going to Toronto. "Intelligence reports are that organized crime is finding this an extremely lucrative field and they are becoming more involved," says Dennis Crowley, Jr., chief of Massachusetts Attorney General Robert H. Quinn's organized-crime section.

This two-nation investigation shows how little detail is really known about organized crime's stock disposal. The number of people involved and the exact methods used remain unknown at this time. But some insights are being gained.

WHAT THE ORIGINAL THEFT GETS

Most of the stolen stocks and bonds pass through three levels. The original thief receives about 3 per cent of the securities' value, though this may be considerably less in a large theft. The buyer or an associate moves the securities on to a third level, usually out of the state or country, and receives roughly 5 cents on the $1. The third level arranges for the securities use or disposal, receiving 10 per cent and up.

The disposal of stolen securities demonstrates the diverse contacts and methods of organized crime. First, the securities may be sold on the open market through legitimate brokerage houses. Fake identities and papers are arranged and an account is opened in a city far from the theft. A few legitimate trades may be made and then the stolen securities are offered for sale. Once the seller gets his cash, he disappears.

Sometimes a broker may be bribed. Organized mobsters got temporary control of several small over-the-counter trading firms in 1962. When the stock market took a mighty dip that year, they supplied loan-shark money to the firms to keep them solvent. Later, they called in the debts in cash and favors, using the firms to sell stolen securities.

Securities may also be sold or "rented" to businessmen. A Los Angeles man told Congressman Murphy last week that he was offered $1,000,000 in securities for $50,000. "He said they told him, 'We'll name the bank you can go to,'" Mr. Murphy says.

District Attorney Hogan's office arrested a Manhattan manufacturer named Bernard Kessel two weeks ago in a case that involved the use of $1,250,000 in stolen securities as collateral on a bank loan. The complaint said Kessel paid $70,000 to "rent" the stolen securities. Mr. Hogan's investigators say they haven't determined who got the rental fee.

Businessmen in debt to organized crime bookies or loan sharks may be forced to obtain loans and turn the money over to mob members. Sometimes this money goes out on the street for loan sharking, at rates of 20 per cent a week and more. The loan is paid off and renewed, giving the mob a source of funds for usury operations.

Stolen securities used as collateral are usually uncovered only when the loan payments are defaulted, as happened with Bernard Kessel. Few banks check securities put up as collateral to see if they are stolen. "A bank relies on the integrity of its borrower," explains an official of the American Bankers Association.

The theft of 5,000 shares of IBM stock from Hayden, Stone Inc., in New York City in 1966 illustrates how widely organized crime operates. Montreal police recovered 600 shares in October of that year with the arrest of two men who tried to sell the certificates to a bank. In November, Toronto police arrested a Boston man and his wife when they attempted to sell 100 shares of the stolen stock.

STOCK SHOWS UP IN PENNSYLVANIA

In February 1967, FBI agents, working on a tip from the Securities and Exchange Commission, recovered 2,600 shares of the IBM stock. The stock had been used as collateral to obtain a loan from a Pennsylvania insurance company. Two hundred more shares were recovered in Los Angeles last May, again after being used as collateral.

Fifteen hundred shares remain missing. Where are they? "Probably serving as collateral for some other loans," says one investigator.

Attempts to directly link high organized-crime leaders to stolen securities usually fail. The mob long ago established a system of "buffers," where orders come down from the top through a series of levels. Intelligence reports indicate that a high organized-crime leader in New England directs much of the traffic in stolen securities between Boston and New York and Toronto.

But law-enforcement people despair of ever proving this. "He uses other people," says one investigator. "He never talks about it on the telephone. He never touches the stuff. He just directs."

XUM

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY, MASSAPEQUA CHAPTER, THE ORDER OF THE SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a special tribute and my personal congratulations to the Massapequa chapter of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, celebrating its fifth anniversary in a noble and prestigious fraternal organization, and aspiring to bring to the American way of life the best of an ancient and honorable cultural heritage.

The Order of the Sons of Italy in America had its genesis in New York in 1905 and now, some 64 years later, has satisfactorily fulfilled the vision and ultimate ambition of its principal architects—the formation of what is today one on the biggest and most effective fraternal organizations in the Nation. It has proven that the forces of culture, knowledge, and brotherly love can, indeed, be organized so as to contribute materially to the building of a better people, a better nation, and a better world.

The Massapequa chapter, one of the newest affiliates of the highly respected order, is the largest in the United States. This in itself is a signal accomplishment, taking into consideration its 5 short years of existence. It has, by its deeds, not just words, clearly demonstrated the great good to society which can be derived from an organization working in unity and utilizing the best attributes of its heritage. The strongest testimonial to the success of this effort is the steady expansion of the chapter and its parent organization.

Its membership incorporates all segments of society. It is composed, in part, of those in government, as the Italian-American is fully aware of his civic and patriotic responsibility, a representative number currently serving in the U.S. Congress.

It is composed of individuals from the arts, an area in which the Italian-American is truly gifted, the great works of the talented Fresco artist, Constantino Brumidi, enhancing our beautiful and impressive Capitol Building in Washington.

It is composed of members of the clergy, outstanding citizens from the professional fields, and embraces individuals from every walk of life—men of wisdom and integrity, people who have worked, loved, fought, and died to build a tradition of liberty, justice, and freedom in our beloved country.

The judge or high official is brother to the laborer, because the relations of the members toward each other are governed by the three principles of the order—liberty, equality, and brotherly love.

The United States has been appropriately identified as "a nation of immigrants," and the Italian-American, always in the vanguard to improve and perfect our great American heritage will, in his pursuit of excellence, also preserve his Italian heritage.

The purposes of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, as stated in the preamble of its constitution, merit commendation and support.

The preamble follows:

We, the members of the Order Sons of Italy in America, a fraternal organization, being a part of the United States of America, which we serve at all times with undivided devotion, and to whose progress we dedicate ourselves; united in the belief in God; conscious of being a representative element of an old civilization which has contributed to the enlightenment of the human spirit, and which through our activities, institutions and customs may enrich and broaden the pattern of the American way of life; realizing that through an intelligent and constant exercise of civic duties and rights, and obedience to the Constitution of the United States, we uphold and strengthen this Republic, in order to make known our objectives and insure their attainment through the harmonious functioning of all parts of our organization, the said Order Sons of Italy in America do hereby ordain and establish the following as our constitution:

ARTICLE I. PURPOSES

The Purposes of the Order are:

(a) To enroll in its membership all persons of Italian birth or descent, regardless of religious faith or political affiliation, who believe in the fundamental concept that society is based upon principles of law and order, and who adhere to a form of government founded upon the belief in God and based upon the Constitution of the United States of America which government rests upon the proposition that all men are created equal and functions through the consent of the government.

(b) To promote civic education among its members.

(c) To uphold the concept of Americanism.

(d) To encourage the dissemination of Italian culture in the United States.

(e) To keep alive the spiritual attachment to the traditions of the land of our ancestors.

(f) To promote the moral, intellectual and material well being of our membership.

(g) To defend and uphold the prestige of the people of Italian birth or descent in America.

(h) To encourage the active participation of our membership in the political, social and civic life of our communities.

(i) To organize and establish benevolent and social welfare institutions for the protection and assistance of our members, their dependents, and the needy in general, with such material aid as we are able to give.

(j) To initiate and organize movements for patriotic and humanitarian purposes, and to join in meritorious movements for such purposes which have been initiated by other organizations or groups.

I applaud the cause and determination of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America and offer my full support in its objectives.

THE COLLINS AMENDMENT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, after a thorough study of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—ESEA—I have decided that we need to clarify the whole issue of schoolbussing. Accordingly, my view has been printed as a portion of the Report of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, H.R. 514. I submit it to you now:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF JAMES M. COLLINS

I believe that an amendment to this act is needed to clarify the whole issue of schoolbussing, which is completely confused by amendments adopted in prior years which have little, if any, meaning. I think it is time that we all face the fact that schoolbussing to achieve "desegregation," "integration," "racial balance," "enrichment," or whatever term is applied in differing circumstances, has become a bitter local issue in virtually all sections of the Nation. It is an issue that ought to be settled locally without reference to the Federal programs funded under the acts amended by H.R. 514. Those programs have other purposes.

Throughout our committee hearings—and I attended them for a majority of the 22 days of hearings—it was constantly emphasized that the funds for ESEA are inadequate to do the job, particularly those allocated for disadvantaged pupils. I agree with that assessment from what I know of educational needs in my own area. Disadvantaged students desperately need additional, better qualified teachers; they desperately need better classroom space, fewer pupils per classroom, and better equipment and materials for instruction. To the extent that any of these funds are used for transportation, the disadvantaged pupil is being deprived of the essentials of education for a seat on the bus.

Accordingly, we should not permit the diversion of Federal funds to peripheral items like transportation. If local school officials feel that they must transport pupils for the purposes of any of these programs, then they should do so with local and State funds. Since nobody has suggested that the Federal funds pay the total costs of education, or even more than a small fraction of the costs, they should be reserved for essential expenditures.

The other point to be made—and a sound reason for adopting such an amendment—is that such a course would remove the Federal programs from the risk of becoming embroiled in extremely bitter local controversies, and to that extent would strengthen the programs and improve their acceptability in every section of the country.

I therefore reserve the right to offer such an amendment at the appropriate time.

JAMES M. COLLINS.

BYELORUSSIAN PEOPLE OBSERVE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On this date 51 years ago, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born.

In spite of all of its sacrifices, the young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was created in its place, is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not

XUM

represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

This is the reason why March 25 is celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations.

Americans of Byelorussian descent join in this celebration with the fervent hope that freedom eventually will be restored for their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Byelorussia have been deprived of the right of self-determination by the Soviet Union, yet they have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit this spirit and determination to be in vain.

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made clear the intent of his administration to preserve the integrity of our university system. His forthright stand opposing morally arrogant individuals who would destroy the university is coupled with an understanding of the basic principles of higher education: that universities and colleges are places in which men are judged by achievement and merit, and that violence or the threat of violence should never be permitted to influence actions, ideas, or judgments in the academic community.

The intent of the administration to enforce congressional prohibitions against grants and loans to students who would destroy a university is appropriate; but no more so than the calm and reasoned understanding of the need for change on our campuses and the responsibility of the universities to implement legitimate reforms.

There are hopeful signs on a number of campuses that faculty and students are reaffirming basic principles of academic freedom, defending the universities from dangers posed by advocates of violence. Fred Hechinger has written an excellent article describing these developments.

I include the Hechinger article from the New York Times of Sunday, March 23, and the statements of President Nixon and Secretary Finch at this point as part of a continuing effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues materials relating to campus disturbances:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

EDUCATION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"Though I am but a freshman, I hope I have enough voice to make you listen; assuredly I have anger enough." So wrote a Columbia College student in a letter to The Spectator, the school's undergraduate daily.

The student's anger was not aimed at an autocratic, repressive university administration; rather, it was aimed at what he regarded as the university's failure to prevent or punish the disruptive actions of the Students for a Democratic Society. The student charged that "a climate of timorous inaction on the one side and such emboldened anarchy on the other" have made the campus "unfit for living, let alone study."

The letter is, of course, couched in the rhetoric of youthful exaggeration that matches the style of the New-Left radicals. But it is symptomatic of a new trend that seemed to be growing last week—a trend in which liberal and moderate students and faculty members are demanding an end to violence and disruption.

This trend is different from the backlash by right-wing groups, conservative alumni and reactionary legislators who stand ready to subdue campuses with punitive laws and fiscal sanctions. It is different, too, from such "get tough" court actions as the 15-day jail sentences meted out last week to 21 students at the State University at Stony Brook for an all-night sit-in in the library. Such conservative counteraction was to be expected.

Indeed, President Nixon's long-awaited message yesterday confirmed the growing feeling that, rather than unleash the punitive powers of the Federal Government, the politically wiser and certainly educationally preferable course is to put the major burden on the universities to put their house in order and deal with the rebellion in their own way. It is unlikely that, in view of much popular anger at student excesses, the White House would have been so conciliatory if there were not a growing sense that moderation within the campuses may be gaining the upper hand.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, a publication supported by the Carnegie Corporation, reports that since mid-February and the beginning of March protest actions of varying intensity took place on at least 54 campuses; it also noted the rising tide of opposition and cited growing liberal concern that the reaction to radical activisim is beginning to smother attempts at educational reforms.

Both at Harvard and at Columbia, influential senior faculty members have recently denounced disruptive protests. The Columbia manifesto was signed by more than 100 professors, among them the institution's most distinguished names. Warning that "attempts to disrupt or prevent the holding of classes are a matter of urgent concern," they demanded that the committee on discipline (a newly established body composed of faculty, students and administration) take effective action to protect the freedom to teach and learn.

At Brandeis University, after several incidents of arson, President Morris B. Abram warned that unless universities "find the way to protect the rights of the lawful against the lawless," they will become garrison communities and "cease to be places of freedom and learning." He added that any member of the campus found to have been involved in acts of sabotage will be expelled and prosecuted in criminal court.

At Cornell—where three students were violently assaulted in an apparent confrontation between blacks and whites and the university's president, Dr. James Perkins, was pushed off the podium by a student—the undergraduate newspaper is beginning to ask for effective enforcement of safety on campus.

Harris Wofford, Jr., the liberal president of the New York State University College at Old Westbury and former Peace Corps aide to President Kennedy, in commenting on the Cornell incident, said: "When necessary we must be prepared to enforce the rule of reason by university action, by court injunction, and even by criminal prosecution of those who turn to force. That is unfortunate but not frightening . . . We should know—as we hope the destructive minority will learn—that the old law of an eye-for-an-eye-for-an-eye leaves everybody blind."

At Michigan State University, more than 10,000 students signed petitions condemning "intimidation, violence, and disruption."

A growing opposition by liberals and moderates could create a totally new balance of power; for it is that liberal and moderate sector—undoubtedly the majority at most major institutions—that alone can render the radical left influential by joining it in the fight for specific, liberal issues, such as the opposition to the Vietnam war, equality for the races, and so on.

Ironically, it was David B. Truman, the former vice president of Columbia University, who expressed his fear—months before last year's student uprising there—that the radical students' tactics would eventually pit students against students. He considered such a confrontation a much more serious threat to the future of higher education than the skirmishes between students and administration.

That this danger persists at Columbia was underscored last week by an extraordinary, full-page editorial in the Daily Spectator, headlined "The University Politicized." (One editorial board member registered his dissent.)

The editorial took what appears to be the current hard line of student radicalism that Columbia is a hostile force exactly because it is a liberal institution.

"Liberalism, which once appeared to satisfy this nation's needs and desires, is now bankrupt," the editorial said. It concluded that since "the liberal politics of the university have cast it in the role of supporting a sick society, we must commit ourselves to transforming the politics of the university by resorting to whatever means prove necessary."

If this represents the radical view (as seems to be the case on many troubled campuses), then it appears virtually inevitable that the battle between students and students will soon enter a critical new phase, paralleled by a similar battle between the radical faculty (especially the younger, nontenured ranks) and the majority of liberals.

This introduces an entirely new factor in the universities' internal line-up. It had clearly been the intent of the New Left, by selecting issues on which the university administrations were vulnerable—such as war-related research and inadequate response to the needs of the racial minorities—to radicalize the liberals.

But it now appears that the radicals miscalculated the liberals' commitment to nonviolence, rational dialogue and legality. While to radicals these elements are expendable luxuries, they are indispensable to the liberal philosophy.

When it appeared that violent or disruptive tactics were not (as originally claimed) merely the reluctant, last-resort response to police busts but part of the movement's ideology itself, the liberals began to plan their own strategies to stop the radicals. In other words, the radicals may indeed have managed to radicalize the liberal campus majority, but as a force *against* rather than for violent revolution.

NIXON TEXT: INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM IS IN DANGER

This week the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has sent a letter to the presidents of the institutions of higher education in the nation calling attention to the provisions enacted by law by the 90th Congress which provide for the withdrawal of various forms of federal support to students found guilty of violation of criminal statutes in connection with campus disorders.

He did this in the exercise of his responsibility as the Cabinet officer chiefly charged with the routine enforcement of federal laws pertaining to education, however, the state of our campuses have for some time been anything but routine.

I should like to take this occasion to make some more general comments which I hope may be of some assistance in moderating the present turmoil.

REGULATIONS MODERATE

First, a measure of perspective is in order with regard to the action of the previous Congress. The new regulations are moderate, and they are justified. It is one of the oldest of the practices of universities and colleges that privileges of various kinds are withdrawn from students judged to have violated the rules and regulations of their institution. Congress has done no more than to withdraw federal assistance from those students judged, not by university regulations, but by courts of law, to have violated criminal statutes.

Almost by definition, given the present tactics of disruption, anyone so convicted may fairly be assumed to have been assaulting the process of free inquiry which are the very life of learning. Any society that will not protect itself against such assault exhibits precious little respect for intellect, compared to which the issue of public order is very near to de minimis.

For there is a second issue, of far greater concern to me, and, as I believe, to the Congress, to the American people generally, and the faculties and students of American colleges and universities especially. That is the preservation of the integrity, the independence, and the creativity of our institutions of higher learning.

VIOLENCE NORMAL

Freedom—intellectual freedom—is in danger in America. The nature and content of that danger is as clear as any one thing could be. Violence—physical violence, physical intimidation—is seemingly on its way to becoming an accepted, or at all events a normal and not to be avoided element in the clash of opinion within university confines.

Increasingly it is clear that this violence is directed to a clearly perceived and altogether too conceivable objective: Not only to politicize the student bodies of our educational institutions, but to politicize the institutions as well. Anyone with the least understanding of the history of freedom will know that this has invariably meant not only political disaster to those nations that have submitted to such forces of obfuscation and repression, but cultural calamity as well. It is not too strong a statement to declare that this is the way civilizations begin to die.

The process is altogether too familiar to those who would survey the wreckage of history. Assault and counter assault, one extreme leading to the opposite extreme; the voices of reason and calm discredited. As Yeats foresaw: "Things fall apart; the center cannot hold . . ." none of us has the right to suppose it cannot happen here.

The first thing to do at such moments is to reassert first principles. The federal government cannot, should not—must not—enforce such principles. That is fundamentally the task and the responsibility of the university community. But any may state what these principles are, for they are as widely understood as they are cherished.

First, that universities and colleges are places of excellence in which men are judged by achievement and merit in defined areas. The independence and competence of the faculty, the commitment, and equally the competence of the student body, are matters not to be compromised.

The singular fact of American society—the fact which very likely distinguishes us most markedly from any other nation on earth, is that in the untroubled pursuit of an application of this principle we have created the largest, most democratic, most open system of higher learning in history. None need fear the continued application of those principles; but all must dread their erosion.

The second principle—and I would argue, the only other—is that violence or the threat of violence may never be permitted to influence the actions or judgements of the university community. Once it does the community, almost by definition, ceases to be a university.

PRIMARY INSTRUMENT

It is for this reason that from time immemorial expulsion has been the primary instrument of university discipline. Those who would not abide the rules of the community of learning have simply been required to leave it, for any other form of coercion would cause that community to change its fundamental nature.

The difficulty of this moment, as of most times when fundamental principles are challenged, is that many of those posing the challenges, and even more of those supporting them, are responding to very basic problems. To reassert, in the fact of student protest, the first principles of academic freedom, while ignoring the issues that are foremost in the minds of those students, is less than inglorious: it is slothful, and dishonest, an affront to those principles and in the end futile.

MANY WRONGS

Students today point to many wrongs which must be made right:

We have seen a depersonalization of the educational experience. Our institutions must reshape themselves lest this turns to total alienation.

Student unrest does not exist in a vacuum but reflects a deep and growing social unrest affecting much of our world today. Self-righteous indignation by society will solve none of this. We must resolve the internal contradictions of our communities.

There must be university reform including new experimentation in curricula such as ethnic studies, student involvement in the decision making process and a new emphasis in faculty teaching.

I have directed the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to launch new initiatives toward easing tensions in our educational community.

This administration will always be receptive to suggestions for constructive reform. But the forces of separation and non-reason must be replaced by vigorous, persuasive and lawful efforts for constructive change.

SECRETARY FINCH'S LETTER

Here is the text of the letter Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch sent to the presidents of universities, colleges, junior colleges and community colleges:

"It is my responsibility as the official chiefly charged with enforcement of federal laws pertaining to education, to bring to your attention the recently enacted federal laws relating to violations by students of criminal statutes.

"The provisions enacted are included under Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (p.l. 90–575) and Section 411 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, 1969 (p.l. 90–557). For your information, I am enclosing copies of these provisions as enclosures to this letter.

"In view of the continued public debate over student unrest and the legitimate bounds of dissent, I ask that you bring to the attention of your students the applicable provisions of these laws and advise them of the procedures you intend to follow in complying with them.

"CONGRESS HAS SPOKEN

"It is important for all concerned to understand that Congress has spoken on this issue and that the law must be enforced. I hope at the same time that you will take the opportunity to review university policy and regulations with regard to student participation in campus affairs in order to guarantee that in maintaining order on the campus the right of legitimate and responsible dissent is fully protected.

"I would suggest that these provisions be fully discussed by all parties at your institution—trustees, administrators, faculty members, students, and where possible, parents.

"I hope that a thorough understanding of these provisions would enable you to better determine the ways and means by which your institution will deal with this legislation.

"I am well aware that the implementation of the enforcement procedures established by Congress will require a reasonable amount of time, and that we are involved in areas fraught with tension and emotion.

"Under the legislation, the burden of administration falls upon the institutions. We in HEW will do our best to work with you in this difficult area."

THE FOUNDATIONS BRING A BONANZA TO CANTON AREA

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the questionable operations of a few of the very large tax-free foundations has been the subject of considerable comment in Congress, press, and radio of late. I am indebted to the Canton, Ohio, Repository for an excellent article that helps to set the record straight by reporting the outstanding accomplishments of foundations in our locality.

This article may serve as a caution signal to those who wish to take restrictive action against all foundations because of the activities of a few.

The Timken Foundation, the Hoover Foundation, and the Stark County Foundation have contributed tremendously to the well-being of Stark County, Ohio, as the Repository article points out. I am certain this story can be repeated in other localities where public-spirited citizens have used the foundation system to improve their communities.

The article follows:

THE FOUNDATIONS BRING A BONANZA TO CANTON AREA

(NOTE.—Congress is taking a look at the activities of the nation's 20,000 charitable foundations. It has found what look like some "bad apples" in the barrel. Not so in the Canton community, reporter William V. Merriman finds in this study of the foundations which have contributed millions to Canton area community projects.)

(By William V. Merriman)

A west window in The Timken Foundation's offices, eight floors up in the Cleve-Tusc Building, frames the setting:

In the foreground, an American flag whipping in the wind over Timken Vocational High School in downtown Canton.

Behind it, a mile or so to the northwest, the sun reflecting from a 10-story wing under construction at Timken Mercy Hospital.

It's an appropriate view, looking through that window. Timken Foundation money put some of it there—the $2.2 million high school, a job-training showplace since 1939, and the 13-year-old hospital, built on Tim-

XUM

ken Estate land and much of it with foundation funds.

Then there's Central Plaza, for which the foundation gave $432,000. Malone College, to which Timken has given $1 million. The $10 million Cultural Center for the Arts now rising on the old Harter Estate between 9th and 12th sts. NW.

The contributions—$24 million since the late H. H. Timken Sr. and his sisters, Amelia C. Bridges and Cora Timken Burnett, established the foundation in 1934—also include:

Aultman Hospital ($3.7 million), Canton Art Institute ($223,000), Canton Public Library Association ($271,000), Canton Jewish Community Center ($100,000), Canton Park Department ($110,000).

Establishment of Canton Housing Commission ($100,000), Riverside Park in northeast Canton ($193,000), Jackson Park swimming pool ($127,000), Mount Union College ($846,000), National Professional Football Hall of Fame ($50,000), Stark Wilderness Center ($67,500), Joint Walsh-Malone College Campaign ($250,000).

Is this the type of charitable trust under attack on Capitol Hill for abusing its tax-free status?

Richard C. Baker, treasurer of Timken Foundation, doesn't believe so.

Nor do officials of Stark County's two other major foundations—the Hoover Foundation and Stark County Foundation.

They concede a few of the nation's 20,000 foundations might be "rotten apples"—those which contribute to a study of the "origin and significance of the decorative types of medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina" or educational purposes like paying college tuition of the founder's children or to "gay living and partying of twin sisters" the founder befriended.

"There's no question a foundation in competition with other private business or one set up as a tax dodge should be taxed," says W. D. Hunter, executive secretary of Stark County Foundation.

Mr. Baker agrees, but warns: "Let's not use a shotgun to shoot down a few bad foundations."

He sees this approach developing in Washington, with proposals to tax foundations' income a straight 20 per cent, require them to disburse all income annually, disclose all activities and own no more than 3 per cent of a corporation.

Would Stark County's major foundations be affected by these rules, among tax reforms being considered by the U.S. House Ways and Means Committee?

Very much, if some of the limitations are adopted, say local foundation officials.

Disclosing activities would cause no problems for their foundations, they agree. This is done right now.

But they object to a tax on foundation income and a requirement that all income be given away each year.

A tax merely would dilute the ability of the foundations to continue helping the Stark County community, they are convinced.

Expenditure of all income each year, they predict, would lead to donating money just for the sake of donating money. It would prevent them from holding funds for major projects—like the cultural center.

Foundations are like individuals and corporations under the federal income tax laws. If they donate to charitable or nonprofit enterprises for community benefit, their donations are tax-deductible.

Since foundations presumably contribute all their income for such purposes, they pay no income taxes.

What is causing Congress to take a new look at foundations are such activities as providing a baked potato at every meal for Bryn Mawr College girls, or an annual "Christmas meal" of a bushel of oats for hungry Kansas City horses, or supporting a Negro voter registration drive in Cleveland that helped elect Carl Stokes as mayor.

Some Washington eyebrows went up when the Ford Foundation, one of the nation's most respected giants in the field, issued $131,000 worth of study-travel grants to eight former aides of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

The big ones in the Canton community, however, have been donating all their money to projects whose purposes seem to fall well within the guidelines set up by Congress in the first place—guidelines aimed at encouraging generosity for the good of a community.

"We know a few foundations are involved in questionable activities but ours and most others are following the letter of the law and are contributing to worthwhile, nonprofit organizations," said J. S. Hoover, secretary and assistant chairman of The Hoover Co.

Timken Foundation, with assets of $39 million, is Stark County's largest.

Hoover Foundation, established in 1945, has assets of $13.7 million.

Stark County Foundation, set up in 1963 with half of the initial $4.5 million provided from a trust created by Edward A. Langenbach, late Canton industrialist, and the other half from the Timken Foundation, has assets of $5 million.

Other charitable trusts topping $1 million here are Timken International Foundation ($4.2 million) and Timken Roller Bearing Co. Charitable Trust ($4 million).

In all, 38 Stark County charitable trusts are listed by the most recent U.S. Internal Revenue Service records.

Their assets: $69 million.

Average annual income, as reported to IRS since 1964: $6.8 million.

Tax paid on the income: Zero.

Donations made by the foundations in latest annual reports: $2 million.

Among Hoover Foundation donations in the past two years were $262,000 to educational activities and institutions, $220,000 to Aultman and Timken Mercy hospitals, $419,000 for the new North Canton Community Building YMCA, $75,000 to North Canton Library, $340,000 for land for a North Canton City Hall, $100,000 to the United Fund, $10,000 for a lake at Stark Wilderness Center and $12,000 for conservation programs.

Stark County Foundation gifts have included $250,000 to the Aultman-Timken Mercy hospitals' building fund, $50,000 to Malone College, $30,000 to Stark Wilderness Center, $25,000 to Walsh College, $24,000 to Stark County Department of Education for a hearing van, $10,000 each to the Massillon City Hospital building fund and Massillon Museum, $6,000 to Massillon Boys Club, $17,000 to Canton Park Commission, $17,400 to Planned Parenthood of Stark County and $6,000 to Stark County Historical Society.

It is contributing $200,000 to the joint Walsh-Malone fund drive.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Byelorussian origin will mark on March 25 the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of that Republic, swallowed up all too soon by the Bolshevik-Russian Government. A Soviet Socialist Republic was created in its stead, to camouflage the efforts which the people had made to seek freedom and independence.

The history of these peoples in an area today occupied by about eight million people in some 81,000 square miles is proof of the steadfast desire for liberty which burns brightly despite the rigid controls both of czarist Russia and now the Communists.

The marking of the anniversary of short-lived democratic statehood serves to recall the growth of that country in the days prior to World War I, building and generating Byelorussian interest in their national culture, setting the clear aim which Americans must support, of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, free from the tyranny imposed upon them.

VICA'S "REPORT TO THE NATION"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America are a fine example of how the energies of youth can be channeled for the betterment of our society. Consequently, it gives me great pleasure to insert into the RECORD VICA's "Report to the Nation" which was prepared by Mr. Ronald Wright, VICA Region II vice president. I would urge my colleagues to read this report to learn of the great work being performed by many of our youths. The report follows:

REPORT TO THE NATION

(By Ronald Wright)

VICA—the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America—is about to begin its fifth year as the National organization for youth in industrial education. Our founding date is less than three months away—it was in May 1965 that VICA was founded by youth eager to work together and build an organization of opportunity.

Today, we can look back over four exciting years—years of work and planning and, yes, fun. We can look back at the successful National Conferences and past Officers Conferences where so much dreaming and planning took place. We can look back and remember the high hopes of those youth who first proudly began VICA and we can say, without hesitation, I think, that they can still be proud—as VICA moves ahead.

VICA is about to begin its fifth year as the National Organization for youth in industrial education. We can look around us today and be glad for the warm friends who are here sharing today with us. You represent education . . . business and industry . . . labor . . . government. The past three years would not have been possible without you as friends, as supporters and . . . sometimes . . . as helpful critics.

It has become a tradition for us—the state and national officers of VICA—to invite our friends here in order that we can keep you informed and up-to-date on what we are doing. Because we know that you share our interest in the advancement of industrial youth and that you *do care* about the future of VICA.

The past year has been a busy one. Our membership has grown to over 75,000. Four new state associations—Delaware, Florida, Vermont and Utah—were presented with their charter at our last national meeting. Two other states—Alabama and Kentucky—have joined and will be officially chartered this June. This brings us to a total of 37 state associations. We're happy to report that students from Massachusetts have taken advantage of the opportunity for direct affiliation with National VICA.

Perhaps most important is the fact that over 1,000 of our members this year are post-secondary students in area vocational schools, junior and community colleges. Their admission to what was originally an all-high school organization was approved earlier this year and the post-secondary division will be officially chartered in June at the Fifth National Leadership Conference. We expect it to really *take off* after that!

VICA has gathered support from many new organizations, through our Foundation this year. New to the growing ranks of contributors were Brodhead-Garrett Company; Clairol, Incorporated; the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the National Restaurant Association. Others of our earlier supporters are here and we extend warm thanks to all of you.

A great deal of planning and dreaming and work has gone into our conception of a National Leadership Center for Industrial Youth Development, which VICA hopes to construct in the future in the Washington area. It is our hope to better serve industrial youth with facilities for leadership sessions, and to provide an educational center for research and development of leadership training materials, publications and techniques, and to provide housing for the National staff and services. The National Advisory Council on Trade and Industrial Education has endorsed the Center proposal and will offer support in its development.

We have made what we know to be a firm friend this year in the National Association of Manufacturers. The NAM has wholeheartedly endorsed VICA. NAM Education Committee Chairman Roland Bixler has stated that the committee would cooperate with VICA in attaining its goals and "every effort should be made by the business community to support education for those who wish to pursue industrial education."

Another project very close to our hearts is the desire to share the opportunity of VICA with the youth of the inner-city areas who need vocational direction and motivation . . . just as we do. Initial thought and planning began during this past year on establishing a demonstration project in the heart of one of our nation's large metropolitan areas. The possibilities of VICA are boundless in this area and we hope that those interested and involved will share the chance to make the possibilities realities.

Yes . . . VICA is about to begin its fifth year as the National organization for youth in industrial education. It is good to look back and to share pleasurable memories of what has gone before but, even more, VICA likes to look ahead. With hard work and dedication, it will be a good future. Will you share the future with us?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S TOP LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER RETIRES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to a most dedicated public servant. Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague is retiring as the Post Office Department's top law enforcement officer. During his years with the Department, Mr. Montague diligently tackled the problems of postal law violations. We all know how the number of crimes committed has risen dramatically over the past decade. Postal crimes are no exception. The task of the Chief Postal Inspector has indeed been formidable. Mr. Montague has performed it exceedingly well.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Montague at the House Appropriations Committee and in my continuous contacts with the Post Office Department. He has always been most helpful and cooperative.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Evening Star on March 11, 1969. It is a fitting comment to a fine individual and a dedicated servant.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 11, 1969]

TOP BATTLER OF POSTAL CRIME RETIRING, LEAVES SKILLED CORPS

Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague, who has fought record postal crime with record arrests and convictions of postal law violators, is retiring as the Post Office Department's top law enforcement officer.

Although his retirement actually became effective February 28, he is staying on the job to assist in the transition of the law enforcement responsibility to the new administration.

The 57-year-old chief took office at the start of the Kennedy administration. During his years in the top top spot, he has seen post office burglaries and holdups reach an all-time high, mail fraud drain a conservatively estimated $500 million a year from the public, organized crime got deeply involved in credit card frauds and merchandise swindles, and apartment letter boxes being rifled by the tens of thousands—usually to get at checks arriving on a predictable schedule.

To cope with a postal crime rise which clearly reflects the spiraling nationwide crime rate, Montague developed a corps of specialists and adapted automatic data processing to show him where his specialists were needed most.

QUICK TAB ON OPEN CASES

In mail fraud, for example, his data processing equipment gave him a print-out at month's end showing how many cases were open in each area of mail fraud—how many new medical frauds, chain referral schemes, land frauds, debt consolidation, home improvement rackets, and other schemes affecting young married couples and fixed-income older people. As each new scheme surfaced, Montague deployed the specialists to meet it.

He increased the number of men assigned to mail fraud because he was particularly aware of the social effects of gimmick selling and pie-in-the-sky schemes on ghetto residents. He represented the Post Office Department on the President's Consumer Commission.

To deal with steadily climbing armed robberies of post offices and postal trucks, Montague provided better firearms, more radio equipment and the first radio cars in the Postal Inspection Service. Currently, post office holdups are running at the highest rate in U.S. history.

Postal inspectors now have base radio stations in most big cities, which direct the radio cars not only in postal robberies and burglaries but also in dealing with one of the commonest of postal crimes—letter box thefts in big cities.

FAST ACTION REQUIRED

To get the thieves, inspectors have to move fast and they're on the street ready to move in response to radio calls. Postal inspectors' investigations of mail box thefts resulted in 6,104 arrests last year.

Montague has emphasized more training all along the lines—more firearms training, more training in specialized areas, even university-administered correspondence courses.

The training paid off with the arrest of 14,339 individuals on postal violations last year, an all-time high. The 11,474 convictions last year also were a record.

A veteran of 32 years with the Post Office Department, more than 26 of them as a postal inspector, Montague last December was awarded the highest career honor the Post Office Department can give—the Distinguished Service Award.

Postmaster General Winton M. Blount yesterday hailed Montague as representing the "finest product of the postal career service tradition of advancement of dedicated careerists through the ranks."

FRANK M. CRUGER, OF INDIANAPOLIS, WRITES "POINTERS ON PREPARING AN EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK" FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the smartest moves ever made by Federal Government agencies and departments was to tap the vast reservoir of knowledge, skill, and experience found among private businessmen. This is especially so when the department or agency is charged with helping others set up, operate, and maintain their own businesses.

Mr. Frank M. Cruger, of Indianapolis, is chairman of the National Affairs Committee, National Industrial Distributors Association, of Philadelphia, and president of the Indiana Manufacturers Supply Co. He was asked by the Small Business Administration to use his own skills and talents to write, for SBA use and distribution, a document in their management aids series for small manufacturers.

Mr. Cruger's product, entitled "Pointers on Preparing an Employee Handbook," has now been published by SBA as Management Aid No. 197. To date, more than 50,000 copies have been requested, which certainly proves its worth and value to the small business community.

It is a pleasure to insert the text of the handbook in tribute to Mr. Cruger and all his fellow businessmen who so generously give of their time and talents, so they may be shared with others who are just beginning. This is in the finest American tradition and something the value of which cannot be calculated.

The above-mentioned follows:

POINTERS ON PREPARING AN EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK

(By Frank M. Cruger)

SUMMARY

Time was when employee handbooks were considered a frill which only large companies could afford. But no longer. Owner-managers of many small businesses now use handbooks to give employees information on policies, wages, and employee benefits.

This *Aid* points out that a successful handbook should include what employees need to know as well as what the owner-manager wants them to know. Suggestions are given on subjects to include, on presentation, and on format.

Nothing takes the place of face-to-face conversation with employees, both old and new. But the owner-manager often finds that he does less and less of it as a growing business increases the demands on his time.

Although an employee handbook will not replace personal contacts, it can help an owner-manager in getting vital information to employees. You should think about issuing one if you want your employees, old and new, to understand:

What you expect of them and what they can expect of you.

What your policies on wages, working conditions, and benefits are.

How much time, thought, and money go into making their jobs secure.

What your company's service to customers is.

What place your company has in the community and the industry.

What makes a job in your company good and permanent employment.

CONTENTS OF A HANDBOOK

An employee handbook can cover many subjects. See the sample table of contents of this *Aid*. A new employee's interest is apt to center around three sections of the handbook—sections number 5, 6, and 7. He wants to know what information he needs to get along on the job, what his benefits are, and what, if any, services the company offers him.

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK: SAMPLE TABLE OF CONTENTS

1—Welcome Message.
2—History of the Company.
3—This Is Our Business.
4—You and Your Future.
5—What You Will Need To Know.
    Working Hours
    Reporting To Work
    "Time Clock"
    Rest Periods
    Absence From Work
    Reporting Absences
    Employment Record
    Pay Period
    Shift Premiums
    Safety and Accidents Prevention
    Use of Telephones
    How To Air Complaints
6—These Are Your Benefits.
    Vacations
    Holidays
    Group Insurance
    Hospitalization & Surgical Benefits
    Free Parking
    Training Program
    Christmas Bonus
    Savings Plan
    Profit-Sharing Plan
    Suggestion Awards
    Jury Duty
    Military Leave
    U.S. Old Age Benefits
    Unemployment Compensation
    Service Awards
7—These Special Services Are For You.
    Credit Union
    Education Plans
    Medical Dispensary
    Employee Purchases
    Company Cafeteria
    Monthly Magazine
    Annual Outing
    Bowling League
    Baseball Team
8—Index or Table of Contents.

Spelling out this information in a handbook gives the new employee a reference source. Even if your initial interview with him is long, few individuals can absorb many details about several subjects at one sitting. Moreover, when an owner-manager talks at great length, some new employees may write him off as "an old windbag."

WHAT EMPLOYEES NEED TO KNOW. To fit in with old employees, a new man needs to know the working hours, lunch and other breaks, time clock regulations, and reporting of absence.

He also needs to know about his wages and payday. In discussing wages and other figures that may change from time to time, it is a good idea to keep figures to a minimum. If your handbook makes a general statement, for example, about wages, you can issue a mimeographed sheet on the detailed figures. In this way, you can keep your handbook from becoming out-of-date when you grant the next wage increase.

Your employee handbook also should tell the new employee whom to see when he has questions or problems connected with his work.

BENEFITS AND SERVICES. The newcomer is interested in the benefits and services your company offers. This discussion in your handbook should be factual so that employees can refer to it when they have questions.

Even though many people don't care what a thing costs someone else, it does not hurt to remind employees of the cost of their benefits—such as vacations and health and life insurance. Making them aware that benefits and services are part of your overhead may help them to realize the need for their cooperation in your cost reduction campaigns.

One company ends its section on special services by saying: "These facts mean that we can afford to maintain these plans only as long as the company operates successfully. That depends on the cooperation and efforts of every one here. We hope you make possible this extra security for you and your family. That's the way things work at (name of company): The better the job each of us does, the brighter the future will be."

Examples of services which you will want to mention are the opportunity to buy company products at a discount, the first-aid station, the low-cost cafeteria lunch, and sports activities.

SKETCHING "THE BIG PICTURE"

A welcome message and sections on the history of the company, and "our business," and the employee's future provide an opportunity for the owner-manager to sketch "the big picture" for new employees. Sincerity and simplicity are the keys to presenting these sections. The temptation to editorialize or "preach a sermon" should be avoided because some employees are apt to regard "the big picture" as propaganda.

WELCOME MESSAGE. The welcome message should convey a feeling of friendly interest to the new employee. There are as many ways of expressing a welcome as there are presidents of small companies. Here are two examples.

"I am pleased that you have decided to join us at—(company name). I hope our association will be a long and beneficial one. Our company has a history of more than 20 years of service to our customers. It has grown because of the efforts of each employee. Our future looks bright. But it will present challenges. I am counting on your help in meeting those challenges.

"We know that in return for your support the company is obligated to make your employment as satisfying as possible. Our wage policies and benefit programs are designed to make the company a good place to work. We also emphasize intelligent human relations in our day-to-day contacts.

"You will find out that our company tries to be a good citizen in this community. I hope that you will, if you are not already doing so, participate in worthwhile civic projects.

"Please call on any of us to help you become established in your new job. And again, thank you for joining us."

The second example emphasizes the importance of the employee's job as follows:

"This company is in the service business. Efficient service depends on each employee doing his or her job correctly and promptly. Each job in this company is important. If it wasn't, it would be eliminated quickly.

"I urge you never to lose sight of the importance of your job to the overall effectiveness of our company. Whether customers continue to give us their business depends on the manner in which you and your fellow employees do your work."

It is a good idea to include the owner-manager's picture in the welcoming message. The message should end with a facsimile signature rather than his printed name.

HISTORY. Whether you include a section on the history of your company depends on its age and the significance of past events. When past events are impressive, information about them can help to instill pride in the company and its importance to the community, customers, and employees.

Emphasize the growth of the company through past service to customers and the role employees played in that progress. Tie the past to the present by pointing out that satisfied customers are the company's only assurance of continued sales and jobs.

This section should be brief. It should not be a biographical sketch of the founders and their successors. It can follow the "Welcome" section or it can be the last page of the book. There, it re-emphasizes the sense of participation for the new employee.

THIS IS "OUR BUSINESS". Some owner-managers assume that employees are familiar with the company's products, services, and sales. Often the fact is that employees are ignorant of, or misinformed about, such pertinent facts. This section provides the opportunity to correct this condition. It should be brief and give employees the facts they need to feel that it is "our" business rather "your" business. If the owner-manager does not convince employees that they play an important role in the company's success, who will?

YOU AND YOUR FUTURE. In this section, the owner-manager talks to the employee's pocketbook. His future pocketbook, you might say.

The discussion should cover policies and procedures on wage reviews and promotion. It should spell out who is responsible for making performance and wage reviews and when they are scheduled.

If you have a profit sharing plan for employees, explain it in this section. Emphasize the features that make it worthwhile to remain with your company.

Also if you have a payroll savings plan for buying U.S. Savings Bonds and/or a stock participation plan, tell employees about them. Urge them to use the plan to help make their future secure.

Information about service awards might also be included.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT PROFIT

After "the big picture" has been discussed, it is a good idea to remind employees of the basis of their security with the company. They should be aware that a business must make a profit in order to grow and provide jobs and employee benefits.

Your handbook might say, for example:

"And Just A Few Words About Profit.

"Your job and mine are dependent on the success of this company. It takes money to make jobs and it takes profits to keep the company growing. If we are to expand, a profitable history will enable us to obtain necessary funds. You wouldn't invest your money in a losing company.

"To afford the benefits you've just read about we must make a profit. Our future depends on doing our jobs to the best of our ability. Our efficiency will produce the necessary profits to assure our continued expansion and our maintaining our position to the field.

"You and I have seen many businesses lose sight of the need for profit and go broke. Let's all work together for our successful future."

THE WRITING

An employee handbook should speak to the point. Employees are not interested in unnecessary details. Nor are they taken in by long phrases that say little or nothing.

The writing should also be consistent. Here, the approach determines the style. Will it be a formal approach? An informal one? A "folksy" one?

Not every owner-manager can write clearly or has assistants who can. Local writers—such as newspaper reporters—or high school teachers of English or journalism may be available on a fee basis. They might edit the owner-manager's draft to improve its readability. Or they might write the handbook, using facts which he supplies.

THE FORMAT

The booklet should be attractive. The objective is to invite the reader's attention and hold it throughout. Effective use of color and layout helps to make the booklet inviting and easy-to-read.

The type face plays an important part in the overall effectiveness, as well as design of the cover and layout of pages. Instead of small pen and ink cartoon drawings, the illustrations may be small photographs interspersed with the text. Graphs can be used to illustrate company growth.

The booklet should be small enough to be carried in a pocket but not so small as to be easily misplaced. Typical handbooks range from 5½" x 8½" to 6" x 9".

EXTRA MILEAGE

Although the primary purpose of a handbook is to inform and orient employees, the owner-manager can get extra mileage from it.

A foreman can, and should, use it as a tool for making a new employee "feel at home." For example, at the end of the new man's first week, his foreman can give him a chance to ask questions about the handbook. Sometimes this informal interview gives the foreman the opportunity to clear up information which the new man may have misinterpreted or misinformation which he may have picked up from old employees.

The handbook can also be used as a public relations tool. But keep in mind that image building begins at home. When employees have a good image of your company, they will spread the word. Such word-of-mouth advertising provides a solid basis for building good community relations.

Print enough copies so your employees can have extra to show to friends and relatives. Copies can also be given to leaders of civic and business organizations which work for community growth.

LIVING WITH YOUR HANDBOOK

Once an owner-manager issues a handbook, he has to live with it. Employees will expect to find conditions, benefits, and services as described in the handbook. This fact should present no problem.

However, there is a grey area which can cause trouble. It is connected with the owner-manager's attempt to convince employees that his company is a good place to work. A little care can prevent his leaving the handbook open to employee criticism.

For example, be sure that the booklet does not say anything you can't back up. Suppose, for instance, that your most efficient foreman is overbearing by nature. Then you had better not write in your handbook a statement such as "we strive for a friendly atmosphere in which problems can be settled amicably."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Readers interested in exploring further the subject of employee handbooks may wish to consult the following references. The list is necessarily brief and selective. However, no slight is intended toward authors whose works are not mentioned.

Getting Across to Employees by John S. Morgan. 1964. $6.95. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 330 W. 42d St., New York, N.Y. 10036

Effective Communication on the Job. 2d ed. 1963. $7.50. American Management Association, 135 W. 50th St., New York, N.Y. 10020

Industrial Editing by Bernard Smith. 1961. $6.75. Pitman Publishing Corp., 20 E. 46th St., New York, N.Y. 10017

Personal Management Guidelines for Small Business. *SBMS* No. 26. 1961. Small Business Administration. Available for 25 cents from Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402

An Employee Suggestion System for Small Companies. *SBMS* No. 1. 1964. Small Business Administration. Available for 15 cents from Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402

"Matching the Applicant to the Job," Management Aids for Small Manufacturers No. 185. Free from SBA, Washington, D.C. 20416 (or nearest SBA Office)

"Checklist for Developing a Training Program," Management Aids for Small Manufacturers No. 186. Free from SBA, Washington, D.C. 20416 (or nearest SBA Office)

BYELORUSSIANS FIGHT FOR THEIR FREEDOM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today Byelorussians throughout the free world will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in 1918.

In spite of the great sacrifices made by the Byelorussian people in gaining their independence, their young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces. And the Russians, after crushing their nation, and bestowing one-third of their territory to the Russian Republic, created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in its place, as a colony to Soviet Russia.

As a tribute to the continuing effort of the Byelorussian people who hope to see their nation again free of Communist domination, I am pleased to include at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by the Byelorussian-American Association for this occasion, and I commend it to my colleagues for sympathetic consideration:

Byelorussians fight for their freedom on the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

"We, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off the last fetters of political servitude which has been imposed by the Russian Czars on our free and independent land.

"From this day, the Byelorussian National Republic is declared a free and independent state. The peoples of Byelorussia, through their elected Constituent Assembly, will henceforth decide the future relations of Byelorussia with other states"—March 25th, 1918, Minsk, "The Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic."

This document climaxed almost 130 years of continuous struggle by the Byelorussian people against Russian imperialism when, for the first time since 1795, the Byelorussian nation was once again able to re-emerge as an independent state and renounce its enforced incorporation into the Russian empire.

The principles and objectives laid down by the new state—The Byelorussian Democratic Republic (BNR)—were enunciated to be:

The inclusion into a Byelorussian state of all former areas where the Byelorussian population constitutes a majority;

The creation by direct and closed ballot of a Byelorussian Legislative Assembly based on the proportional vote of all citizens who are to be enfranchised regardless of origin or religion;

The extended guarantee of all freedoms of speech, press, assemblage and association as well as the protected legal right to strike;

The insurance of full national and cultural autonomy for all peoples of the Republic;

The institution of an eight-hour working day, and the acknowledgment of public ownership of the woods, lakes, and natural resources.

The independence of the Byelorussian National Republic was recognized *de jure* by Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Finland, Poland, Turkey, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, and Georgia. It was recognized *de facto* by most other countries of the world.

Unfortunately, the young Byelorussian state was unable, for very long, to enjoy the freedom and sovereignty to which it aspired. In a few short years, the entire territory was turned into a battlefield when the Republic was crushed by the invading forces of the Red Army and the people found themselves once again in captivity.

To subvert the aspirations of the Byelorussian people, the Russian Bolsheviks created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic while simultaneously bestowing one-third of the original Byelorussian ethnic territory to the Russian Republic. The creation of the BSSR was to serve as naught else but a camouflage for the colonial exploitation of Byelorussia.

The Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state and her political, economic, and social position today is as a colony to Soviet Russia.

Russians occupy almost all key positions in the Byelorussian Republic and as a consequence drain the Byelorussian economy of its wealth and resources. The industrial development of the BSSR serves primarily to foster the goals of Russian imperial expansion and is accompanied by the steady channeling of Byelorussian man-power for the express purpose of building a Russian empire in Siberia and Soviet Central Asia. Coupled with the additional practices of genocide and deportation by the Soviet Russian regime in Byelorussia, the staggering loss of nine million Byelorussian lives has resulted. Moreover, the Soviet regime has been conducting an intensive and systematic "russification" of its captives. The net result has been that the Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated, not only from official use in administrative circles, but also in the higher educational institutions, in the secondary schools, and in a large number of elementary schools. By implementing policies of religious suppression, the Soviet Government has almost completely eradicated all public religious worship in Byelorussia.

One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, Byelorussia has continuously maintained its struggle against the imperial forces. There were armed uprisings in the Slucak region in 1920 and similar uprisings during 1922–26 in Vializ, Homiel, Cervien, and the Barysau districts. Despite the purges of 1929–30, 1933, and 1937 and the mass deportations during 1939 and the 1950's, and despite the mass murders and the starvation programs of 1946–48, the Communists have failed to suppress, let alone exterminate, the spiritual and moral resolve for establishing freedom in Byelorussia; on the contrary, the will of all Byelorussians has been strengthened in their desire for achieving independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25th, 1918, is commemorated by all Byelorussians wherever they live—by the Byelorussian-American community, by the emigrants throughout the free world, and by the members of the Byelorussian underground in the BSSR. To these and to all other freedom-loving people, March 25th, 1918 symbolizes the unquenched spirit of the Byelorussian people. Thus, the fight for Byelorussian independence is also the fight for the emergence of all other captive national states everywhere and is a necessary step toward the ultimate establishment of world freedom and world peace.

DR. V. D. MATTIA—CORPORATE HEAD WITH A CONSCIENCE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. RODINO. A welcome breath of candor and conscience in the drug industry is being provided today by Dr. V. D. Mattia, president of Hoffmann-La Roche of Nutley, N.J. Testimony of the unique position which Dr. Mattia occupies within the industry is given in two recent articles in Life magazine and the American Druggist, which eloquently express his deep-seated sense of social responsibility and action.

Having known Dr. Mattia for many years, I hold him in the very highest esteem, and find it especially gratifying that so truly genuine a humanitarian is given such well-deserved recognition. I am pleased to bring these articles to the attention of my colleagues, for they represent the convictions of a man whom we would all do well to emulate.

The articles follow:

[From Life magazine, Mar. 7, 1967]

A PILL-GIVING MAVERICK

Except that it is affluent to the point of embarrassment, nothing seems to be quite right for the drug industry these days. What with congressional investigation, charges of profiteering and tacit admissions of price-fixing (five major manufacturers recently agreed to refund $120 million to municipalities and other purchasers who felt they had been overcharged), the industry could certainly use a bit of good publicity, and Dr. V. D. Mattia may be just the man to provide it.

Ironically, however, the 45-year-old president of Hoffman-La Roche is distinctly at odds with the normally clubby members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. He has refused to help pay for a huge advertising campaign aimed at improving the industry's image. Instead, his company—the nation's fourth-largest producer of pharmaceuticals—each year simply gives away some 37 million pills worth about $1.4 million. The drugs are distributed by doctors to needy cases, lists of which have been solicited from the doctors.

"Barney" Mattia is himself an M.D., a churchgoer and the possessor of a strong social conscience. While he now pulls down a salary ($150,000 a year) that permits him to indulge his love of pre-Columbian art, he had to depend on the GI Bill for his medical education, and work as a researcher for years before taking over Hoffmann-La Roche. "I can't honestly say that drug prices are cheap," he admits. "I think they're reasonable only for those who can afford to pay the price." In helping those who cannot afford them, he feels, his giveaway program is also sound business. It is fully tax-deductible, and although other manufacturers may call it grandstanding, at least two of them may follow suit.

In an interview with Life Reporter Judy Gurovitz, Barney Mattia spoke about the drug industry and his own position in it:

"If there are generic drugs alike in activity and safety with trademark drugs, then I think it's folly to force physicians, patients or government agencies to pay more. Ultimately I think we're going to find that generic producers are going to be able to duplicate the therapeutic value of many drugs, though it may cost them a bit more. But it's not as simple as it may seem. Even with products that we're manufacturing we have problems such as sterility and quality control.

"I think everyone is entitled to purchase drugs at the lowest cost possible.

"I have violently objected to the advertising program of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. We should not be investing in such a program, but should be investing in research in drug metabolism to learn how to better control side effects.

"The most satisfying aspect of the job of president is the ability to exert leverage for good—to take the massive resources of this company and assign them to projects which offer promise and hope therapeutically, to mobilize its talent and resources to help in the community.

"You live in the fear that you may make a decision or not recognize when a decision should be made and that someone may be penalized for this. One could market a drug after it had been thoroughly tested and had been approved by the government. Then after several months, untoward effects may develop which place the health of patients in jeopardy. Nobody did anything wrong, but somehow or other people were hurt. You just hope it never happens to you.

"I came to the conclusion a long time ago that a man can reap the benefits of this great society for only so long before he's in debt to it. And I've been a very fortunate man. So many good things have happened to me that at some point I must dedicate myself and whatever talents and energies I possess toward helping others on a full-time basis. At some point in my life I'm going to do just that. I don't know where or how.

"One of the things we're doing now, in collaboration with one of the local rehabilitation centers, is to train our people who are about to be retired, to permit them to go to work in one of these centers. This I think will achieve two goals: to help staff these activities properly, enabling them to raise substantial sums of money and institute more efficient business methods and public relations, and to permit the individual who feels he's being put out to pasture an opportunity to maintain his place in the sun.

"If American industry were doing enough we wouldn't have need for such programs as the Job Corps. This is an excellent program, but American industry could solve the job problem quickly. After all, the government would be a partner in such ventures because of the tax benefits. When you allocate part of your profits for such programs, you're in effect making Uncle Sam a half-partner.

"Two days after I took over as executive vice president of the company, when the then chairman of the board and the president were abroad, representatives of CORE visited the plant. They called to my attention the low percentage of non-whites in our employ, and then picketed my home since I was the highest-ranking officer present. I decided that we had to do more. I felt then that the only way you could remain conscious of this responsibility day after day, week after week and month after month was if you got reports and you did an accounting just as you do in your fiscal programs. So each month personnel sends me a social balance sheet which tells exactly the number of people who were interviewed for jobs and the reasons why individuals were not hired. This has helped us hire far more socially and economically disadvantaged people and also the physically handicapped."

[From American Druggist, Mar. 10, 1969]

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Stanley Siegelman, editor-in-chief American Druggist)

Like the medicinals he deals with, Dr. V. D. Mattia, president of Hoffman-La Roche, is a complex compound:

To some in the drug industry, the 45-year old executive is a visionary whose concepts of social obligation often seem incompatible with the harsh demands of the profit-oriented business world.

To his staff and associates, he is a tough minded perfectionist—and, by his own admission, a "restless and impatient man."

To intimates, he is an accomplished story-teller, who never forgets a joke or anecdote.

To researchers, he is generosity incarnate—a man who unfailingly opens both purse and mind to new ideas.

To members of the press, he is an enigma—a corporate chieftain who shuns personal publicity with the same assiduousness with which most other executives seek it.

To fellow board members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, he is a non-conformist—more apt than not to vote against the majority.

I interviewed Dr. Mattia at his firm's Nutley, N.J. headquarters. He aired his views on a variety of subjects in the carefully enunciated, soft-spoken style which is his hallmark. He held me transfixed with the ardor of his convictions. The subject perhaps closest to his heart is that of the civic and social responsibility of business in general, and the drug industry in particular.

In today's climate, there is certainly nothing original about the topic. Indeed, it is practically mandatory for every speech-making executive to pay verbal homage to that abstraction. But this is precisely the point: Dr. Mattia was among the first to put theory into practice.

FREE DRUGS

He initiated, for example, the "Indigent Patient Plan." It supplies free Roche drugs to any patient who cannot afford them—without limit as to quantity or duration. The drugs are furnished directly to the physician, who is simply asked to confirm the patient's indigency, and his therapeutic need. Only patients of MDs in private practice are eligible.

When Dr. Mattia first proposed the plan a number of years ago, many viewed it as a quixotic idea which would inevitably result in red ink. Skeptics predicted it would be abused by doctors and opposed by pharmacists.

Initially, there were indeed some complaints by drug store owners who felt they were being unfairly bypassed—but they have now ceased.

NO ABUSES

As far as physicians are concerned: "I know of no single instance of abuse by any doctor in the nation," Dr. Mattia said. "In fact, physicians are not making use of the plan to the extent they should." The firm has a computer feed-back system which enables it to pinpoint abuses if they should occur.

At its outset, a few doctors regarded the plan as a manifestation of "socialized medicine"—but their remonstrances, like those of the druggists, have now stopped, Dr. Mattia indicated.

Another reflection of his social orientation is Roche's medicare reimbursement plan. The firm refunds to hospitals 25 per cent of the cost of Roche drugs dispensed to patients under medicare.

AID-TO-NEEDY

Dr. Mattia, who came up the hard way (he earned his MD degree at New York Medical College while studying under the G.I.. Bill and supporting a growing family) displays extraordinary sensitivity to the needs of the under-privileged. For over three years now, Roche has supplied free classroom instruction in basic office skills to ghetto residents of Newark, N.J. The firm has also been training Negroes to be pharmaceutical lab technicians.

"I am far from satisfied with what we have been doing," he asserted. "Yes, we have trained hard-core unemployed. Many of them now have jobs here at Roche. But we hope to do more.

"We are appointing an executive whose sole function will be to expand aid to the disadvantaged.

"I have the strong conviction that no area of our company is beyond the realistic aspirations of these people, if we provide them with the proper training.

"But even this is not enough. We hope to achieve total involvement on the part of the entire Roche family. Everyone is sympathetic, in a general sort of way. But each person needs a more definite role."

"ATTRITION"

Dr. Mattia, who just became regional chairman of the National Alliance of Businessmen's Division in Newark, the city of his birth, noted that well-intentioned managements often make sincere pledges about giving jobs to the hard core unemployed—but attrition occurs.

"It is not sufficiently understood that these persons are not qualified to hold any job, and that a total commitment to training is required.

"But I will say that most corporate leaders seem to recognize the changing role of business in society. The isolation in which we once functioned is no longer feasible.

"Economics are no longer the sole province business. Business must have a sense of social responsibility. Without it, corporations are doomed."

Nor is Dr. Mattia among those who believe the primary difficulty is lack of communication:

"All you have to do is state your goals clearly and simply. The problem of communication has been exaggerated."

He acknowledged, however, that the drug industry has failed, on occasion, to articulate its position well. He cited PMA's continuing ad campaign in the Reader's Digest:

"I voted against the campaign. I have nothing against the Reader's Digest. I just think there are other ways to demonstrate our sense of responsibility. PMA has a Foundation which supports research in such areas as metabolism and toxicology. Why not expand its scope and enlarge its scale? This would be a vivid demonstration to the public of the industry's concern for its welfare.

"It is sheer folly to resort to expensive advertising campaigns to convince people drugs are cheap. Drugs are reasonable, but not cheap.

"When legislative proposals involving the general area of health care come up, the industry is nowhere to be seen—either in support or opposition. At Roche, we have determined to take public positions on all such proposals."

A FEDERAL COMPENDIUM?

Dr. Mattia disagrees with PMA about another important matter: the proposed federal drug compendium, which would list all available drugs and their side effects. PMA fears such a compendium might tend to stress generics unduly—and has proposed, an an alternative, that the privately published Physicians Desk Reference (PDR) be improved.

"To oppose the compendium idea is virtually indefensible," Dr. Mattia asserted. "There is need for such a publication to keep physicians and pharmacists fully informed—especially as more potent therapeutic agents are introduced.

"The problem is how the compendium should be structured, who should exercise control over it, the calibre of people who would operate it." He was careful to point out he was talking about a compendium—which would list drugs in terms of their pharmacological properties, with no reference to prices—and not a formulary.

THE PRICE PROBLEM

And what about the perennially troublesome question of drug prices? Should a conscientious physician weigh the cost of the drug he is prescribing—or is this factor irrelevant?

"We cannot duck this question. The doctor must consider cost. He must treat the total patient—and this includes his economic status, as well as his heart, lungs, and kidneys. The doctor's first obligation is to select the best therapeutic agent available. But there is no point in prescribing a drug which the patient can't afford. He will end up not taking the drug—and the whole object of therapy will be defeated."

But isn't this an argument in favor of generics?

His reply: "If a generic product is equally effective and equally safe, there is little or no argument to justify spending more money for the brand name product."

Looking into the future, he envisions the pharmacist as playing an increasingly important role in complementing the function of the physician. He sees nothing unrealistic about the concept of the pharmacist as a drug consultant to the clinician. Moreover, he believes the pharmacist can make a real contribution in transmitting drug-taking instructions to the patient in greater detail when the doctor has been cursory.

CURRENT RESEARCH

What, I asked, are the most promising areas of Roche's current drug research?

"We have several compounds in the works. We hope, within the next year or two, to market a new, safe hypnotic. Also on the horizon is a topical preparation for malignancies of the skin. NDA's on both these products have been submitted to the Food & Drug Administration.

"In addition, encouraging tests of a new broad spectrum antibiotic have been underway.

"By April, we should be producing meaningful quantities of L-Dopa, the experimental drug for Parkinson's disease."

"Experimental" is a key word at Roche, dedicated as it is to basic research. By 1970, a $10 million structure—the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology—will rise on the firm's Nutley, N.J. grounds. Using its highly automated, computer controlled facilities, some 200 scientists from all over the world will probe the shadowy frontiers of knowledge about the life process itself.

The Institute will embody, in concrete form, Dr. Mattia's conviction that drug manufacturers have a duty to conduct basic research, and not merely develop new pharmaceuticals. He regards the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake as an obligation to society.

All the major posts in the Institute have already been filled, and requests for fellowships have been received from 20 countries. In addition, post-doctoral graduates of two local universities will conduct research at the Institute.

ARTIFICIAL HEART?

Roche's medical electronics division—recently acquired from RCA—has already looked into the feasiblity of developing an artificial heart. This is an area of considerable interest to Dr. Mattia, who concentrated on the cardiovascular field as a practicing physician.

He believes the flurry of activity in heart transplantation has had a salutary effect.

"Heart transplants have presented a host of interesting problems to the various disciplines. To dismiss this approach summarily is to negate the very basis on which science makes its advances."

ART COLLECTOR

In his spacious, deep-carpeted executive office, Dr. Mattia is surrounded by choice specimens of pre-Colombian sculpture. They project timeless emanations—a certain quality of brooding-in-perpetuity.

"I started collecting these pieces back in the days when they were all I could afford. Their value has increased considerably since then. I own something like 700 or 800 items. But my family still thinks they are pretty spooky."

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, freedom of thought, expression of ideas and the ability to live in peace as an independent nation has been the cherished dream and determined aspiration of the Byelorussian people, an objective they energetically pursued during the decade before World War I.

One year following the Russian revolution and the overthrow of the hated czar, after centuries of foreign domination, the Byelorussians proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, throwing off the yoke of Russian tsarism and forming their own democratic government in the capital city of Minsk. The constitution which they adopted embodied the basic fundamentals of self-government which free men cherish, and the small country of approximately 8 million people made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare.

However, following 3 years of tyranny and terrorism, fighting on several fronts in the defense of their country, they were robbed of their independent status by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

Despite the devastation of two world wars, some of the most savage fighting taking place on its soil, and systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level, the Byelorussians never lost faith.

These indomitable people have not given up their national ideals, their right to feedom and national independence. Nearly 50 years of continuous subservience to foreign tyrants has not subdued their free spirit, and they still pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The sympathy and compassion of the entire free world embraces the good people of Byelorussia on the observance of the anniversary of their independence day, March 25, 1918. We fondly hope that they will attain their national goal, their freedom.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a day of commemoration of some outstanding occasion is usually one of rejoicing and celebration. But this March 25, the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia is not one which the Byelorussian people can celebrate as a fulfillment of their dreams, the independence of a nation and freedom from an alien government.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian National Republic was born.

Unfortunately, the young Byelorussian National Republic was unable, for very long, to enjoy the freedom and sovereignty to which it aspired. In a few short years, the entire territory was turned into a battlefield when the Republic was crushed by the invading forces of the Red Army and the people found themselves once again in captivity.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is not a sovereign state and her political, economic, and social position today is as a colony to Soviet Russia.

Russians occupy almost all key positions in the Byelorussian Republic and as a consequence drain the Byleorussian economy of its wealth and resources. The industrial development of the Republic serves primarily to foster the goals of Russian imperial expansion and is accompanied by the steady channeling of Byelorussian manpower for the express purpose of building a Russian empire in Siberia and Soviet Central Asia.

The Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated, not only from official use in administrative circles, but also in higher educational institutions, in secondary schools, and in a large number of elementary schools. By implementing policies of religious suppression, the Soviet Government has almost completely eradicated all public religious worship in Byelorussia.

Despite the purges of 1929–30, 1933, and 1937 and the mass deportations during 1939 and the 1950's, and despite the mass murders and starvation programs of 1946–48, the Communists have failed to suppress, let alone exterminate, the spiritual and moral resolve for establishing freedom in Byelorussia. On the contrary, the will of all Byelorussians has been strengthened in their desire for achieving independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25, 1918, is commemorated by all Byelorussians wherever they live—by the Byelorussian-American community by the emigrants throughout the free world, and by the members of the Byelorussian underground in BSSR. To these and to all other freedom-loving people, March 25, 1918, symbolizes the unquenched spirit of the Byelorussian people. Thus, the fight for Byelorussian independence is also a fight for emergence of all other captive national states everywhere and is a necessary step toward the ultimate establishment of world freedom and world peace.

At this time the Byelorussians in the BSSR do not have any possibility to defend their own national interests. It is for us to take up their aims for liberation from the horrors experienced during these past 50 years of Soviet Russian occupation, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian state. We hope and pray that next March 25, we shall all rejoice in the attainment of the Byelorussian objective for independence.

IF ISRAEL LOST THE WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Richard Z. Chesnoff, of Bayville, N.Y., is one of three coauthors of a new and important novel entitled "If Israel Lost the War." The other authors of the book, published by Coward-McCann, are Edward Klein and Robert Littell.

The plot of the book is simple—what would have happened if the 6-day war of June 1967 had been reversed and Israel were the conquered and not the conqueror.

This hypothetical situation is, of course, a warning about what could happen in the future. The situation in the Middle East is more tense now than at any time since the 6-day war and the possibility of still another war is all too real.

There are those that question the wisdom of American support for Israel. I, for one, have long felt that the future of Israel, as the only democracy in the Middle East, is crucial to the future of the Mediterranean and in that sense crucial to the future of all the world.

If Israel lost the war the country would have ceased to exist and the world would have been put to shame. This did not happen in 1967 and it must not happen in the future.

Mr. Chesnoff and his coauthors have written a highly relevant book that I commend to my colleagues' attention as the United States debates its policy in the Middle East. "If Israel Lost the War" is not only an important novel with a frightening warning to the world, it is also a well-written, exciting book that makes its "what if" plot believable.

The new Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, has said of the book:

> Believe me, what Mr. Chesnoff and his colleagues have written could have happened here despite the courage of our people who would have fought to the end with sticks and stones. I really hope that "If Israel Lost the War" will help people understand what the war was all about and why we are determined not to let it happen again.

Mr. Speaker, "If Israel Lost the War" is a book that should be on all the Members' reading lists just as it should be read by all people interested in seeing Israel survive as the free, independent nation it is.

I am proud that Mr. Chesnoff, a constituent, is a coauthor of this important book.

RED CHINA—NOTHING HAS CHANGED

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest frustrations felt by the American liberal is his inability to wield enough national consensus to force an administration into recognizing Red China or supporting U.N. membership for this regime.

Each year the liberals gather their weapons for another onslaught on the Chinese question, and with perennial regularity they go down to defeat. But the liberal is not a gracious loser, and his demands of late have become so vociferous as to be shocking even for a liberal. The latest pronouncement was among the cruelest blows of all, namely that of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). As most of us know by now, the Senator made some rather astounding observations about Red China before a group of Chinese experts meeting in New York recently.

Of course, he failed to mention a few points which are of minor concern to the liberals, such as our treaty obligations with the Republic of China, the blatant defiance of the U.N. and its principles by Red China, the open aggression against the U.N. in Korea by Red China, the active role played by Red China in Vietnam, and so forth. As we all know, the list is practically endless.

It is just incredible how some well-meaning—and I give them the benefit of the doubt—Americans can actually suggest that we abandon our allies and good friends on Taiwan in favor of recognition and support of Red China.

Mr. Speaker, down my way in South Carolina, we have a rule of thumb when we are stocking a pond or lake with good game fish. We never dump a load of mature catfish in with bass, trout, etc. The reason is obvious. Catfish are scavengers and they thrive on the eggs of other fish. Certainly, no offense is intended toward the catfish. As a matter of fact, I will compare South Carolina catfish stew and hushpuppies with that found anywhere. Nevertheless, it is difficult to keep catfish out of a well-stocked pond, but it can be done. Now, Mr. Speaker, Red China is a great deal like that catfish. However, like the catfish, it can be contained.

Now, if the liberals have their way, Red China will gain world respectability while actively working for territorial conquests at the expense of its neighbors. For Mao and his gang of international gangsters the entire world is a giant lake and they are the scavenger fish. By thrusting this regime of dedicated revolutionaries on the world community, all of our efforts in the last 20 years to hold it in check will go for naught.

Really, I am shocked and dismayed that the Senator from Massachusetts would even dare suggest that this Nation sanction the Peking government. In what possible way has Red China changed? Has it mellowed? Has it shown any inclination toward accepting the peaceful charter of the U.N., or for that matter any interest in even joining the U.N.? Why, of course, the answer to these questions is negative.

Mr. Speaker, beginning with the illegal takeover of the Chinese mainland by Mao and his Communist cronies, every President of the United States, including the brother of the gentleman in question, has unalterably opposed seating Red China in the U.N. and according diplomatic recognition to it.

American men are dying this very minute from weapons manufactured in Red China. Just over 15 years ago, American men were dying as a result of weapons fired by the Red Chinese. Recognition of Peking now or in the future would be a horrible and sad testament to every one of these brave Americans.

If admitted to the U.N., the Red Chinese would only use this organization as a forum from which to spew further venom on this country and other freedom loving nations. If the United States accepted this government as a diplomatic equal, the free nations of Asia and the Pacific would justifiably lose confidence in our pronouncements to oppose the spread of communism in that part of the world.

TESTIMONY OF GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the strong statement by Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, in support of extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, presented in testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Senate Committee on Public Works on Wednesday, March 5, 1969:

STATEMENT BY HON. RAYMOND SHAFER, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. SENATE, CONCERNING EXTENSION OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Senators, I am here today at the request of Governor Rhodes of Ohio who is currently State Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission to present testimony on behalf of all 13 Governors of the Appalachian States concerning S. 1072 which extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

As Governor of Pennsylvania, I also appear as a Member of the Commission and, with your permission, will also present a statement concerning the impact of this program upon my own Commonwealth.

Mr. Chairman, the 13 Governors like this program. We like it for many reasons.

It enjoys a direct line of communication with the President on matters affecting the welfare of 17 million Americans.

It is the kind of partnership between the Federal and State Governments which most Governors have advocated for a long time.

It provides a new kind of flexibility in Federal assistance that helps assure that public dollars are being spent on the right problems.

It is helping the states to bring many local jurisdictions together to solve their problems.

It provides a new way for states, localities, and the Federal Government to share talent, experience, and expertise in order to find the best answers to difficult problems.

Mr. Chairman, we Governors feel so strongly about the Appalachian Program that I felt compelled to discuss the program personally with President Nixon. In those conversations, I told him that the Appalachian experiment represents the kind of reform we need to make the American Federal system operate more efficiently. He agreed. He assured me that he was committed to this program and that it was his intention to keep the program answerable to the Office of the President in carrying out its mission.

Most of the Governors feel that the Appalachian Regional Development Program can serve as a model for the rest of the country—a model whose application to the rest of the United States is worth serious study by this Committee, the Executive Branch, the National Governors Conference, and other groups.

At my suggestion last June, the 13 Appalachian Governors subscribed to just such a recommendation and forwarded it to the Platform Committees of both political Parties. Since that time, many other Governors around the country have joined us. Last week, a special committee of the National Governors Conference, on which I serve, was directed to study the question of the nationwide application of regional commissions.

THE APPALACHIAN PROGRAM WORKS

Over 175 vocational-technical schools have been built with Appalachian assistance. They are capable of training 110,000 additional students in commerce, trades, and industry.

Since you approved creation of the Appalachian Housing Fund, the Appalachian Regional Commission has approved six times as many housing units for construction in the six months of the program's operation as were approved for construction under Federal housing programs in the preceeding six years.

When we started in 1965, Appalachia, with over 9 percent of the American population, was receiving only 7.2 percent of Federal grants-in-aid because many of its communities were too poor to participate in regular programs. With the new supplemental grant program which you approved under the Appalachian Act, Appalachia is now receiving 9.7 percent of Federal grants-in-aid.

Over $425 million in Federal, state, and local funds have been committed under this program for improving health and education in Appalachia.

New highways are being constructed, though not as quickly as we would like, and their impact is already detectable. In my own State, we can cite industries which are expanding or locating because of new locational advantages. And the same is true in many other states.

Many of the serious physical problems of Appalachia are being solved with help under this Act. By the end of this calendar year, every major mine fire in anthracite Pennsylvania will be under attack with Appalachian assistance. Land reclamation programs under the Appalachian Act have given a whole new sense of direction to Federal programs in this field.

THE IMPACT OF THIS PROGRESS IS NOW MEASURABLE

Employment is now increasing faster in Appalachia than in the rest of the U.S. and rate of unemployment is falling faster.

Per capita incomes in Appalachia are now rising more quickly than in the rest of the U.S.

And out-migration from Appalachia is only one-half of what it was in the previous decade.

All these are healthier signs than those of the 1950's—signs that progress has begun in Appalachia and that conditions are better.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Governors would be the first to admit that the task is barely begun. We have a long way to go. Unemployment in Appalachia as a whole is still higher than the U.S. and incomes in many areas are barely half those in the rest of the country.

That is why the extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act is so critical. We cannot stop a job barely started. We cannot disappoint the millions of people who are banking on this program to help solve the problems which have afflicted our mountain areas for generations.

In your consideration of the bill, I urge you to review the current authorizations for the Appalachian Development Highway System. When Congress first authorized the Appalachian Development Highway System, that authorization was based on engineering estimates developed in 1963, or earlier.

As you well know, because of the international situation, it has not been possible for Congress to provide the level of appropriations necessary to provide that authorized amount within the six-year period in which the Highway System was originally scheduled to be constructed.

As a result, inflation has taken its toll. The original estimates of the costs of construction are now seriously out of date because of rising costs. And the longer it takes to construct the System, the more these costs will increase.

The Governors have recognized that Congress could not provide the annual appropriations originally anticipated and in June of 1968 they prepared a resolution recommending that the period for funding the Appalachian Development Highway System be extended by two years so that Congress might be able to appropriate the full amount of the authorization.

In doing so, however, they recognized that the longer it takes to construct the System, the more expensive the System becomes because of inflation.

To build the most effective System with the limited funds available, the states and the Commission determined the adequacy of existing highways within the designated Appalachian Development Highway System. We have concentrated construction on the least adequate sections of these highways. Because of the limited funds available, we estimate that we will be able to construct only 1,263 miles of the 2,600 miles of the Development Highway System. Construction of slightly over 1,000 miles of the presently approved System has been deferred out of sheer necessity.

It is obviously in the national, as well as Appalachia's, interest to build the entire Appalachian Development Highway System if the highways are to achieve the objectives Congress and the states have established.

It is our hope that this Committee will consider the situation and make it possible for us to assure that the entire System, as originally envisioned by Congress, is built.

We cannot overstress the importance of the Appalachian Development Highway Sys-

XUM

tem to the ultimate success of our whole undertaking. Not only will the Development Highway System make it possible for us to link the key economic centers of the Region to national markets so that they can support development of new employment, it will also make it possible for people in the Region to commute to jobs and services and for our children to reach better schools.

We frequently describe the Appalachian Development Highway System, together with the Interstate System, as a giant framework upon which we intend to concentrate the location of most of the new facilities and services being developed under the Appalachian Program. We are doing this because we believe it is the most effective way to assure that as many people as possible will have convenient access to these new services and facilities.

To date, 82 percent of Appalachian investments have been concentrated along the Interstate and Appalachian Highway Systems.

We are well aware that highway improvements alone are not the answer to Appalachia's problems. But without a good transport system which provides access to new educational, health, and other services—and, most importantly, to jobs—we cannot solve the problem at all. In the first four years of this program, we have invested more in Federal, state, and local funds in health and education—investments in the people themselves—than we have in the Appalachian Development Highway System. But the System is one of the important keys to our success.

Mr. Chairman, we have been extremely pleased with the administration and effectiveness of this program. But the Governors have recognized that a number of improvements could be made to the Act which would reinforce the program's effectiveness and accelerate our efforts to solve the Appalachian problem.

Our amendments deal, in the main, with increased efforts to provide manpower retraining and to assist smaller communities in dealing with their problems.

On behalf of the Governors, I respectfully submit to the Subcommittee for its consideration a number of amendments which would improve the operations of the Appalachian Program. We believe their incorporation into the Act would speed attainment of the goals you have set for us in Appalachia.

We owe this Committee a great vote of thanks for making it possible for us to begin to solve our problems in Appalachia.

Appalachia Pennsylvania exemplifies that which the program can accomplish for economic development, and better conditions of health, education and housing for the citizens of a State. It is bringing new life and hope where before lethargy and stagnation all too widely were accepted conditions of everyday life.

On the attached exhibit are shown the more than 180 projects that have been funded in Pennsylvania with Appalachia aid. The exhibit map that you see locates these projects. A total of $101,525,028* in Appalachia dollars has been channeled into these much-needed undertakings to add to the human and material wealth of our Commonwealth. There is no doubt that without the Appalachia program most, if not all, of these projects would still be little more than wished-for dreams: 26 access roads to reach industrial, recreational or school sites previously inaccessible; 32 mine fires being combatted; 7 mine subsidence projects undertaken; 4 strip mine areas being restored or corrected, to turn blighted lands into "promise lands"; 19 vocational technical schools to make realities out of promising new employment opportunities for our young people; 4 airports being expanded and improved to place communities in the main stream of transportation; 15 higher education facilities, to enhance the learning advantages of our college-age sons and daughters; 20 hospitals, 4 nurses' training facilities, and 13 mental health facilities to upgrade the health care of our citizens, and more, as you will note.

Pennsylvania has discovered in the Appalachia program a new vehicle for uniting Federal, State, and local financing for the solution of pressing problems. More than that—but less easy to measure—it has found in the Appalachia program a new means for uniting the will, the determination, and the spirit of men and women of diverse backgrounds and experiences into a cohesive force for the common good.

The experience I have related could be matched in most particulars by the other Appalachian states, each of whom I am confident views the Appalachia program as a successful experiment in creative federalism.

You have also made it possible for us to demonstrate that the three levels of government in the Federal system can work more effectively together than they have in the past.

The Governors believe that more effective ways for the states, the Federal Government, and the localities to work in partnership have become essential.

Federal assistance now covers the entire spectrum of our domestic concerns. The responsibilities of state government cover that same range of problems. So do those of a county commissioner or a mayor.

We cannot continue to work as if we were isolated entities within the Federal political system.

As far as the people are concerned we should all be working toward the same ends and should be finding better ways to discharge our responsibilities working together.

We believe the Appalachian experience will ultimately prove of greater value than any of us originally anticipated. Through this new venture in government, we may not only be able to find answers to Appalachia's problems; we have also come upon a new model with implications for the Nation as a whole.

It is for this reason that the Governors enthusiastically recommend extension of this Act.

THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC WHICH IS NO MORE SHOULD NOT BE EQUATED WITH THE BYELORUSSIAN S.S.R.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in order to eliminate possible confusion regarding an important part of the world, I deem it advisable to invite the attention of my colleagues in Congress to the fact that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which unfortunately exists no longer, is not the same as Byelorussian S.S.R. This distinction becomes all the more important because this year is the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian S.S.R.

Byelorussia is a country located at the crossroads of Europe where Western culture and freedom met Eastern barbarian despotism.

At the time of World War I, the czarist Russian empire was disintegrating, the non-Russian nations liberated themselves as independent sovereign countries and on March 23, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed.

In connection with the marking of this day, one should also take cognizance that Byelorussians are often mistaken for Russians, yet they have, since the beginning of history, developed quite independently of Russia. To preserve their independence the Byelorussians had to endure severe trials for over five centuries, from the beginning of the 13th to the end of the 18th, and it was not until nearly the start of the 19th century that their destinies were linked with the czarist empire.

The Red Soviet Russian Government, in opposition to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, created a fictitious statehood for the Byelorussian people, thus camouflaging their actual colonial status. For the past half century, this unhappy land has been subjected to a systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level on orders from Moscow. During a very short period in 1937, over 13,000 innocent Byelorussians were shot in cold blood by the Soviets. The Byelorussian Orthodox Church was completely liquidated that year and all its 2,000 clergymen were killed or deported into concentration camps and all religious life was ruthlessly suppressed by the atheistic Reds.

Former President Eisenhower said:

> To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the World, we must increase our joint efforts to make peoples around the World more aware that only in freedom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness, and fulfillment.

By the United States marking the anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, though it no longer exists, and by unmasking the true nature of the puppet regime in Byelorussia, we follow our former President's wise words. Not only that, but by noting this day, the United States shows the world that it gives the people of Byelorussia moral support in their hard struggle against the evil forces of oppression and darkness and demonstrates that the free world does indeed care for suffering and oppressed humanity.

At this holy season, we all have faith that in the end a new day of freedom, justice, and liberation will most surely dawn and that Byelorussia will again be a "democratic republic" in every sense of the word.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY DENOUNCED IN ZAMBIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the threat of Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda against Jehovah's Witnesses constitutes a religious threat to international peace.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news release from Lusaka, Zambia:

---

*This figure includes all approved Appalachia projects under Sections 201A, 201B, 203, 205, 207, 211, 212, 214 and 302.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 22, 1969]

Jehovah's Witnesses

Lusaka.—President Kenneth Kaunda declared the days of Jehovah's Witnesses in Zambia are numbered.

He told the national council of his ruling United National Independence party the sect's policy amounted to anarchy and chaos.

The sect has been the victim of a violent campaign by the party since last December's general election, when it refused to vote for religious reasons.

THE FCC REACHES OUT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of editorial comment all over the country on the recent FCC proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television. The following, from the Indianapolis Star of February 9, 1969, correctly terms this as "glaring evidence of the evils of unbridled regulatory power":

The FCC Reaches Out

The proposal of the Federal Communications Commission for a ban on radio and television advertising of cigarettes is glaring evidence of the evils of unbridled regulatory power.

As things now stand the FCC is prohibited from issuing such an order. The 1965 law requiring a health warning on cigarette labels forbids the FCC to impose changes in cigarette advertising. This law will expire in June, unless extended.

Thus the FCC proposal amounts to fair warning of the sort of thing the commission will do if it has a free hand.

The power of the FCC to make such a ban—if the present prohibition should expire—was immediately challenged by the National Association of Broadcasters. We hope the NAB is right.

The power to ban—by decree—the advertising of a legal product would be an awesome power for the FCC or any other regulatory agency to have. This is power to strike a severely damaging blow to whole industries, on the basis of nothing more substantive than the opinions of the commission members.

Even more than that is involved. If the FCC has power to ban the advertising of a particular product, what is to prevent the extension of that power to complete control over all advertising and programming on radio and television?

The FCC has in fact been moving toward assertion of such power. Last June the FCC issued an order that broadcasters who carry cigarette advertising must also broadcast "a reasonable amount" of anti-cigarette announcements. It claimed authority to do this under its "fairness doctrine."

That was a precedent-setting action. It was the first time the fairness doctrine had been applied to advertising. If the precedent stands, who knows what other demands the FCC may make on broadcasters to give time for answers to their advertising?

Even more significantly, this order of the FCC imposed on broadcasters the obligation to give time to a specified kind of propaganda. If this precedent stands, what other kinds of propaganda may the FCC decree to be imposed on the ears and eyes of American radio and television audiences?

The power to do that is terrifying in its potential.

As to the specific controversy about cigarettes and health, decisions on action to be taken should be made by Congress. They should not be made by a regulatory body, and especially not by one whose competence and jurisdiction lie far outside the field of health.

In the absence of an authoritative, documented finding that cigarettes are so injurious that their manufacture ought to be prohibited, Congress has already gone about as far as it ought to go in attempting to discourage their use.

More urgently, Congress should review the authority of the FCC and the ways in which it is using its authority to control what Americans hear and see. On its present course, the FCC has the makings of a powerful manipulator of the feeding of propaganda to the public.

That's not what it was intended to be, nor what it should be. Congress should trim it back to proper size.

LETTER FROM A CONNECTICUT TEENAGE LEADER

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress I had introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to extend the right to vote to persons over the age of 18. Unfortunately, the previous Congress took no action on the resolution.

I am now reintroducing my resolution. I believe that events during the past year or two have clearly demonstrated the need for such modification of our Constitution to provide greater participation by younger people in public affairs.

In the light of these developments, I wish to bring to public attention the text of a letter which I have received a few days ago from the president of a teenage group in my home town of Putnam, Conn. Robert L. La Rochelle, president of the Teenage Democrats Club, informs me that his club is presently circulating a petition in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 and that the petition will soon be forwarded to the Connecticut State Legislature.

I think the approach of these young people is commendable and deserves to be encouraged. They are using the democratic way and process, rather than force and violence. They speak well of American youth and its role in a free society. I am therefore pleased to insert in the Record the text of their letter, as well as a brief news item from a recent issue of the Norwich Bulletin:

Teenage Democrats Club,
Putnam, Conn.

Dear Mr. St. Onge: As you may probably know, the Teenage Democrats Club of Putnam is circulating a petition in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 in the State of Connecticut. The people's response to this drive has been overwhelming and we are soon planning to visit the Connecticut State Legislature and forward the petition to the legislators.

We hope the State of Connecticut will set a precedent for the rest of the Nation to follow. We bring this information of the petition to you because we feel you can help forward our greatest cause: the participation of youth in a free society.

Our fight for 18-year-old voting isn't limited just to that subject. We ask for greater youth participation in all the affairs of government, because we feel we have something to offer.

We ask you to mention our work in the Halls of Congress as an example of progressive youth political action.

In this time of campus turmoil, we feel that we are doing something peaceful and constructive to reach our ends.

We have succeeded in sending teenage representatives to the Democratic Town Committee, being the first area political group to succeed in this attempt.

With an election in 1968 behind us and a new 1969 slate of officers ready to keep us moving for justice and peace, we wait the coming events concerning our projects with anticipation and a desire to succeed.

We feel our attempts at constructive action deserve recognition, because we believe we represent the majority of American teenagers.

Enclosed are copies of our latest activities. We would appreciate a mention of our petition drive in the Congressional Record, which would help us in our efforts.

Sincerely yours,
Robert R. La Rochelle,
President.

Teenage Demos Get Invitation

Putnam.—The Putnam Democratic Town Committee, recognizing that youth is interested in politics invites Teenage Democrats to send representatives to Democratic Town Committee meetings.

The committee felt the Teenage Democrats had earned the opportunity to express the viewpoint of youth because of its help in the last election.

At the January meeting, the town committee voted to invite teenage Democrats to choose from its membership of youths between the ages of 16 and 20 those to attend the meetings of the Democratic Town Committee.

These representatives will have the opportunity to express the views of the youth, but, not being committee members, will have no voting power.

President of the Teenage Democrats is Robert R. LaRochelle, son of Alderman Roland V. LaRochelle of Putnam. Other youth group officers are Peter Johnston, vice president; James Morey, secretary; Patricia Tetreault, treasurer; and James Dion, public relations director.

January 29, 1969.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I am pleased to pay tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians whose brief period of freedom was cut short by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly

XUM

does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

May I take this opportunity to commend the many Americans of Byelorussian origin who continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom for their homeland.

This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and that the desire for independence and self-government continues to be the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

It is my hope that the new Director of the Voice of America will work to improve the broadcasts to the non-Russian people. It is also apparent that Radio Free Europe is not providing as an effective program as it could. Theoretically, Radio Free Europe as a private organization would be in order.

At this point in history we should emphasize the right of the people of Byelorussia to enjoy the self-determination of which they have been deprived by Communist dictators of the Soviet Union. The heroic people of Byelorussia have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit their spirit and determination to be in vain.

HAWAII EDUCATOR KIYOTO TSUBAKI URGES ISLAND TEACHERS TO DEVELOP WARM HEARTS AS WELL AS KEEN MINDS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, more and more, it is becoming evident that we are living in a decade of dissent, an age of ferment and an era of social revolution. There lies beneath the restless searchings and the dissent, which rocks the templed walls of colleges and universities throughout the country, a warning. Unless we rise to meet this spiraling feeling of discontentment voiced by our young people, our future looks bleak.

On February 24, 1969, Mr. Kiyoto Tsubaki, a distinguished member of Hawaii's State Board of Education, voiced this very warning to two gatherings of Maui Island schoolteachers. Speaking at the Hawaii Federation of Teachers annual institute and at a meeting of teacher members of the Hawaii Government Employees Association, Mr. Tsubaki told the teachers that they should try to develop not only keen minds, but also warm hearts—"skills and knowledge are not enough."

Mr. Tsubaki's frank warning and advice makes good sense, for as he stated in his speech:

> Attitudes beget attitudes. What we are hearing and what we are watching in circumstance are something of our own creation. We need to develop what the Greeks call a "good man"—a man with humanistic considerations, or a man possessing humanistic attitudes.

Mr. Tsubaki's speech is an excellent one, and one which I know my colleagues will find enlightening; therefore, it is with pleasure that I submit his speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF KIYOTO TSUBAKI

Ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed my pleasure to once again bring you greetings and aloha from the Chairman of the State Board of Education, Dr. Richard Ando.

I was invited here this morning to extend greetings. I have said it and thus ends my official function. Aloha!

But inasmuch as I still have a few minutes left, may I be permitted to make another entry right here and be allowed to share with you my anxiety and some of my personal thoughts relative to the kind of society in which we live today.

Please understand that I am reading my remarks this morning because I have another meeting to go to and I want to be sure that I say the same things here as I would be at the other meeting. I certainly do not wish to be accused of exercising some kind of expediency just because I am speaking to this group separately or to the other group separately.

If I can say any one thing about the present decade in our history, I think I can safely say that we are now living in a decade of dissent, an age of ferment, and an era of social revolution, if you will. We find many manifestations of this social enigma amongst the blacks, the economically and culturally deprived, our employed and unemployed, our youth in the colleges and high schools, our parents, our teachers throughout the country, and even in some of our churches. In fact it appears that all of us are in one way or another involved in some kind of turmoil from the home on up to international level. Indeed, our future looks mighty dim, rather frustrating and gloomy at times, and apparently every thinking individual is asking the question, where do we go from here?

But before asking ourselves that question, perhaps we should first try to analyze the causes—not so much the apparent, superficial causes; but rather the deeper, more fundamental causes behind the causes.

As I try to observe the way dissenters act and react, it appears to me that this whole bit revolves around two basic considerations—reason and attitudes.

It seems that in our schools we are trying our level best to give our youngsters the skills and knowledge, the so-called tools with which to reason; but are we teaching them enough about the true scientific reasoning process? To me, just giving our youngsters the skills and knowledge alone is not enough. I say this because I judge that skills and knowledge in the hands of the wrong people can be a very dangerous thing. It scares me no end every time I look at the five-year projections of achievement objectives of a PPB or Program Planning and Budgeting format now being used by the Department of Education. I find that these are always expressed in terms of achievement scores of skills and knowledge. And immediately I find myself asking the question, what is being done about developing what the Greeks called a "good man"—a man with human concerns, a man with humanistic considerations, or a man possessed of humanistic attitudes?

As we look around us, I suspect that some of us are saying, "Oh my, what's wrong with our people today? Just look at the way they are behaving. Their attitude is just terrible."

If life can be said to be a two-way street, I submit it is high time we realize that attitudes beget attitudes. Just listen to what people are saying. If we listen carefully, it won't take us long to realize that perhaps what we are hearing and what we are watching in circumstance are something of our very own creation. An educational philosopher back in the 30's once said that the success of an educational system can be measured only in terms of what kinds of parents our youngsters become. And not so long ago when an elderly gentleman was asked to define education, he pondered for a while and said, "Well, education to me is that which remains after I have forgotten everything else I learned in school."

I suspect what these two people were alluding to was that skills and knowledge alone are not enough—that perhaps in our curriculum we should try to develop not only a keen mind; but also a warm heart.

At the moment I am trying to get some of our curriculum revisors and developers to think about establishing humanistic values as the core of our state curriculum around which every program shall revolve—all pointing toward developing a "good man".

In the meantime, right amongst us in the Department of Education, in all our dealings with all our people, it may be well for all of us to begin practicing some humanistic considerations, re-orienting our own individual attitudes perhaps, to see if we can't work out our mutual problems on a mutual basis. This attitude of mutuality is mighty important to me as we relate ourselves day by day from the bottom up. This same attitude of mutuality becomes even more important when we relate ourselves especially from the top down because, in my estimation, the higher one goes the broader his base becomes and much, much greater the concerns and responsibilities as his attitudes and decisions begin to affect the welfare and happiness of more and more people like you and me.

And so, as a group, may I say let's begin to talk about it at least and let's see if we can't begin to mutually create a happy, warm society—a society of humanistic human beings.

I think it's worth trying.

Thank you.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 occupies a very special place in the annals of man's struggle for freedom. On that day, in 1821, the people of Greece rose up to proclaim their independence after centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire. Invoking the memory of past battles and past heroes, the Greek nation set forth to regain the liberty established during the Athenian golden age.

Several days previously there had been brief skirmishes between Ottoman troops and Greek irregulars. March 25, however, marks the feast of the annunciation, which to the Greek people means "the day of the good message." Independence was proclaimed. On March 25, 1821, the good message was that the struggle for freedom had begun anew.

Leaders and common citizens alike of the Western World, steeped in the traditions of classical antiquity, rallied to the cause of Greek independence. The

XUM

spirit of philhellenism swept through Europe and across the Atlantic, a far vaster divide in those days than now. Many persons from our own proud and young Republic joined in common struggle with the Greek people. Our own young men fought side by side with the Greek patriots. Other Americans contributed their savings, their intellectual talents, and their artistic work to the cause that was Greece's.

Bound together by a common loyalty to Hellenic ideals and a common passion for freedom, enduring bonds were forged between our Nation and the Greek people. These ties have not diminished during the ensuing years. During two World Wars and in struggles against Communist troops in the mountains of Greece and again in the mountains of Korea, our nations have stood together as one. Many citizens of Greece have come to this country, joining in the writing of our own Nation's historic saga.

I am proud to speak again of March 25, 1821, when the flame of liberty was lit again in Greece, when strangers fought together as brothers. May we ever remember this date, and may our common ideals ever endure.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ABM PLAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Washington Post contained a remarkable collection of letters expressing opposition to the President's proposal for deployment of a thin antiballistic-missile system.

Irony and ridicule are sometimes powerful weapons, as these letters illustrate. They are as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ABM PLAN

This is to register as strongly as possible an undoubtedly futile but heartfelt protest against Mr. Nixon's tragically unwise decision to go ahead with an ABM system. Is it possible he does not know that it will accelerate the arms race further (unless the Chinese and Soviet governments should have the improbable good sense we apparently lack, to use their resources for better things); will divert desperately needed money from domestic programs; will increase the stranglehold of the military on our already military-dominated economy; and will not defend or protect anyone in case of actual attack? We can only hope now that Congress will at least stand up and resist.

I can't think of a clearer case in recent times of "Emperor's new clothes." Certainly Mr. Nixon didn't think that *Mr. Laird* would tell him?

ANN MORRISETT DAVIDON.

HAVERFORD, PA.

I want President Nixon to know I heartily concur with his ABM decision. It is such a comfort knowing *American* missiles will be left on earth after we are all dead.

SANDRA WEISS.

SILVER SPRING.

Do the President and Senator Jackson seriously believe that deployment of even a limited ABM system is not an escalation of the arms race? Senator Jackson himself mentioned Russian development of a "third-generation" missile. It seems clear to me that the inevitable result of deployment of an ABM system by either country will be the development in the other country of a more sophisticated offensive system. This has been the pattern of the arms race in the past, and I can see no reason why things will be any different in the future just because the initial step is "defensive" rather than "offensive." The American people are getting another snow job and Mr. Nixon has taken a giant step down the road taken by Lyndon Johnson.

FRANK SIMONS, Jr.

WASHINGTON.

For those still confused as to why various students and Blacks are so willing to use violence, the Nixon ABM proposal offers a lucid explanation. After a barrage of scientific evidence against employment, the ABM is still accepted because the military-industrial alliance has the power to move such systems regardless of the opposition. Reasoned argument buttressed by factual evidence is irrelevant. And this is what the protesters so clearly see and adopt as a tactic. The hypocrisy of the Nation's leadership must end before social tensions destroy the country.

GERARD GIOVANELLI.

ARLINGTON.

Your editorial of March 15, dealing with the President's ABM decision, indicates that you have been taken in by his smooth public relations performance and have lost sight of the realities of his decision. His rhetoric cannot hide the fact that he has presented merely a warmed-over version of the earlier Sentinel system, packaged to deflate the intense public resistance which had built up in recent months. Although he chose not to emphasize it, his prepared statement makes clear that the system will still attempt to provide a "thin" defense of cities against a presumed Chinese attack, with all of the dangerous consequences which many people have pointed out—the rapidly escalating costs, the danger of an over-response from the Soviet Union, the added difficulties in attempting to negotiate an end to the arms race, and so on.

All of this is packaged to make it least vulnerable to attack by ABM opponents (in ABM jargon, the decision was surrounded by "penetration aids"), but this is no excuse for your having neglected to analyze its specific consequences. Construction of the system is to start with what appears to be a defense of our missile bases. But at the same time the sites will be selected and purchased to begin construction of the broader Sentinel system—just as the Army was doing when the Nixon Administration began its "re-examination." And how can this minimal system protect our missile bases (each having 150 Minuteman missiles)? If the Soviet Union were to attempt to build an offensive force that could attack our missiles, it would have to utilize thousands of warheads. Against such an attack the proposed system would be totally useless. So even from this point of view, the plan is either fakery or, more likely, the down payment on a very much larger and more costly system.

Mr. Nixon gives clear evidence that he has, in his now familiar style, refused to make a clear decision that might offend the military, while remaining unwilling to move directly into missile talks with the Russians. These, not ABM deployment, are the top priority in dealing with strategic weaponry. If these talks do not begin soon, developments in weapons technology, especially in multiple warheads, may well eliminate the chance we now have to move toward agreements that preserve the present stable balance.

LEONARD S. RODBERG.

SILVER SPRING.

It seems that the U.S. Government is busily trying to destroy itself and all else. The arms race has come to the point of total insanity: the ABM system is an example. With so many experts denying its validity, so many people protesting, ashamed to be part of this plot for total destruction, how can this Administration find a way around it to approve this deplorable monster? How can the military industrialists just think of their own huge profits? Great use they will make of it when, by accident, the whole thing explodes, taking them in the holocaust. Have these people lost all their sense? Can't they see the urgent things that must be done in our disturbed, riot-stricken cities? No security is assured once the "monster" is installed. Only more danger is assured, more wars. By God, we must stop this insane way of "protecting" us. Is the Administration totally blind to the truth?

Mrs. C. N. DOCKHORN.

WASHINGTON.

As an amateur chess enthusiast, I was thrilled by the conceptual purity and inner logical construction of Mr. Nixon's now revealed ABM deployment policy. Having recognized that this policy implies a set of national priorities which probably leads relentlessly to the ruin of our cities (Kt-Q6), the President has correctly abandoned the fatuous notion of trying to protect from hostile missiles that which increasingly can be expected to become less and less worth saving (Kt-K4!). (Having chosen this line of play, it is unthinkable that so astute a player as Mr. Nixon is contemplating the now discredited "guns and butter" continuation.) No doubt in the brave new world to come, in which computers deploy missiles to guard other missiles from missiles launched by other computers (Kt-B3), cities and the hapless creatures who once inhabited them will have long since come to exist only in memory bank (Kt-Kt5, resigns).

MICHAEL P. STERN, M.D.

ALEXANDRIA.

The same day President Nixon disclosed his decision to establish the ABM system, it was announced that District Head Start funds would be cut by one-third. Result: More games for generals, fewer for kids. I wonder what other good ideas Mr. Nixon has to help this country move forward together.

VICTOR R. HIRSH.

BETHESDA.

Now we are going to have the Sentinel ABM "safeguard" to go with nuclear "sufficiency." Mr. Nixon has picked from his options, but since the phrase is "keeping all the options open" there is another, one recently chosen, that he must have overlooked. Simply follow the precedent of the XB–70, produce not more than two Sentinel ABMs, stop, and put one in the air museum in Ohio where the XB–70 now rests.

This scheme has its advantages. It would be a carefully planned waste of defense funds, as opposed to the more or less hap-hazard methods in effect to date. The museum might be specialized to include only flying anomalies, and others from previous eras might be displayed: the Flying Wing, the B–36, Howard Hughes' flying boat whose maximum altitude was about 10 feet and the Navy's jet-powered seaplane that did little better, the Vanguard (watch it blow up on the pad) and Skybolt missiles, the Air Force's aptly named Dyna-Soar, and all those that have been overlooked. Room would be saved, of course, for the F–111 and the SST, as well as Spartan and Sprint of the Sentinel.

One problem remains. Projecting from past

XUM

experiences and future expectations, should the museum system be "thick" or "thin"? Let's remember to keep those options open.

DAVID JEFFREY.

ARLINGTON.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. But, as the United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee so poignantly expressed it:

> In Byelorussia this national celebration is not permitted. This year, instead, marks the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian SSR.

In 1919, after less than a year of independence, the people of Byelorussia were forced to accept the rule of the U.S.S.R.

And although the freedom of Byelorussia was so brief, it serves as a constant reminder of the desire of the people of Byelorussia for the basic right of self-determination. Thus it is that we join in commemorating the 51st anniversary of Byelorussia's independence.

On this auspicious day we renew our pledge to the ultimate freedom of all the captive peoples of the world, including the people of Byelorussia. The inalienable right of self-determination will someday be served.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 51 years ago the people of Byelorussia formed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and set down their beliefs in an amazing historical document. Meeting in Miensk, the National Convention proclaimed a constitution which provided equality for all under the law, freedom of speech and assembly, the right to form labor unions and strike, freedom of conscience, the right of minorities to autonomy and the inviolability of person and home. Recognition of the new Republic was granted by more than a dozen states and diplomats were sent abroad. But Soviet Russia could not tolerate the existence of such a free and democratic Republic so nearby and within 2 short years crushed the new government and murdered its leaders. Resistance continued for a few years more but the Bolsheviks had triumphed. Their reign of terror was nothing new to this tiny country bounded by Russia, Poland, and the Baltic States. For almost 1,000 years that unfortunate land had seen the scene of war, pillage, revolution, and counterrevolution. Through the twenties and thirties the Russian bloodbath was continued to be halted only by the start of World War II. The land was fought over several times by Russian and German armies and more than 2 million persons are believed to have died. At the war's end Russia once again renewed her persecution, charging this time that the Byelorussians had collaborated with the German enemy. What a tragic history for a people whose only crime seems to have been having the rapacious Soviet Bear for a neighbor. As we salute these people today, then, let us be a little mindful of our own good fortune and let us hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia, along with all captive peoples, will soon be free once again.

FOR LOVE OF CHILDREN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the importance of a childhood full of attention and warmth in the development of a healthy and well-adjusted individual. Here in the District of Columbia there are children who, for no fault of their own, may not receive proper care in these crucial years of their lives. These are the 550 dependent, homeless youngsters at Junior Village, over half of whom are under 6 years of age.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Washington Daily News of March 3, 1969, which describes the now limited implementation of a broader program recommended by Fred Taylor, executive director of FLOC—For Love of Children. FLOC is a nonprofit, volunteer, interfaith organization here in Washington dedicated to promoting the welfare of all of the District of Columbia's children, those who will, or could be the active, contributing citizens of the future. According to the proposal designed by FLOC, Junior Village would be utilized as a temporary home for school-age children. Pre-school-age children would be automatically placed in a network of group homes all over Washington, such as the one described in the article below. In these homes, young children can receive the attention and care which they deserve and need while they develop as individuals.

I join with Mr. Taylor and FLOC in urging the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare to take the lead in implementing this meritorious change in procedures for caring for homeless children. FLOC's is a 5-year plan to expand the number of group homes to 80, thus cutting costs of Junior Village and this current type of child care by one-half. With the appropriate efforts and emphasis now, this goal can be achieved much sooner than that. Not only that of each child, but the welfare of the entire community may be at stake.

The article follows:

FOR LOVE OF CHILDREN

(By Sarah Booth Conroy)

Mrs. Olive Robb is 75 years old. She has four babies, all under seven months.

At 7 in the morning, Mrs. Robb picks up the first baby to greet the day—or the loudest of the four. She changes his diapers. Tickles his toes. Warms his bottle.

Then she starts all over again with the next baby, and the next baby and the next baby.

DOUBLE MOTHERS

At 8 a.m. Mrs. Martha Walker joins Mrs. Robb.

A year ago, neither woman knew the other. Then they became involved with For Love of Children (FLOC). FLOC recruits foster parents to take care of children from the D.C. Welfare Department and contributes 20 per cent of the costs of running the home, buying the house if necessary.

FLOC played matchmaker to bring Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb together to make a home for babies who would otherwise be in an institution. The two women moved in together on Nov. 21 and the babies arrived within 10 days.

"We can see such a change in the children when they are petted and snuggled," Mrs. Robb said as she buttoned up the boy in the pink suit.

As she talked the five-month-old boy practiced the high jump in a swing hanging in front of a mirror between the living room and dining room. The other five-month-old boy sat in a baby holder on the kitchen table. The seven-month-old girl was in the play pen, thoughtfully looking at a brightly colored book. The baby sat in her carriage.

Mrs. Robb has already raised two sons of her own who live in this area. She has eight grandchildren, all now out of the baby category. A widow, she has a master's degree in German and taught at Roosevelt and Coolidge High Schools and the District's Americanization School before she retired.

"I'm taking care of these babies because I like the instant rewards," Mrs. Robb said. "What better job than to be grandmother in residence?"

Mrs. Walker, a divorcee, without children of her own, has a master's degree in child development. Until November, she was head of the pre-school nursery at Foundry Methodist Church. "But I wanted to work with babies," she said.

The two women agree they both like liver, Russian tea, music, books and babies. Nowadays all they have time for are the babies. "I haven't sent out my Christmas cards yet," said Mrs. Walker.

Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb do have some help tho. One of FLOC's eight mission groups, serve as Friends of the Family. At least one friend stops five times a week, including an evening, to relieve Mrs. Walker or Mrs. Robb. If there should come an emergency in the middle of the night, one of the friends would willingly answer the call.

Hopefully, the babies will be adopted, or placed in a more permanent foster home by the time they are a year old, leaving their bassinets for new babies for Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb to cuddle.

OUR GOOD TRUCKDRIVERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these days it is a pleasure to compliment our truckdrivers on their good driving and responsible citizenship on our highways.

It is a pleasure to note the wonderful cooperation and assistance which so many of our truckdrivers give to our citizens in distress on the highways.

Having been helped myself several times by the willingness and voluntary assistance of truckdrivers, I want to add my compliments to our good truckdrivers, and particularly I want to compliment Major Gray, of Mid-South Co., from Memphis, Tenn.

I am inserting in the RECORD the following article by Virginia Payette from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Friday, February 28, 1969:

COMMENTS

(By Virginia Payette)

It's every driver's bad dream. There you are, 50 miles from nowhere, it's pitchblack outside, bitter cold, and your engine has just started gargling nuts and bolts.

You know darned well there are cutthroats and robbers lurking out there in the frosty dark, just waiting to pounce when the motor gasps its last.

And while you sit there, dead by the road, a stream of luckier humans, snug and warm and motor purring, zips endlessly by.

But when someone does stop at night, legend has it, it's almost sure to be a truck driver. And as of last week, 30 miles up the hill from Nashville, that legend came true.

There we sat, old Betsy hissing with high fever and harboring an alarming clank somewhere in her gizzard.

Then, before old Dad could even start to look for his tools (which Sonny had probably sneaked off to college, anyway), there was a whoosh of air brakes and a trailer truck pulled in and parked 50 feet ahead.

From the comparative safety of what seems like a 10-story cab, as you stand there alone in the cheerless dark, the driver decides you look honest and climbs down—a combination of helpful mechanic, highway counselor and emergency chauffeur, to say nothing of angel-from-heaven.

Our truck driver turned out to be Major Gray, a handsome prototype from Memphis, who's been hauling trailers for 36 years. He makes the 10-hour Memphis-to-Nashville round trip daily, five days a week—100,000 miles a year.

He stuck a flashlight down Betsy's throat, diagnosed her garglings as a messed-up water pump, advised us to lock her up and leave her there, ride into Nashville with him, check into a motel, and call a wrecker in the morning.

How many people get a chance to bounce over the mountains in a heated cab, watch an expert handle a 10-speed shift, and be delivered to the front door of your motel in a 22-ton taxi?

And for all his service and advice Mr. Gray would take absolutely nothing.

"Wouldn't think of it," he said with a grin. "But if you ever have to ship anything ship Mid-South."

Turned out he was a good mechanic, too. It was the water pump.

So the next time your jalopy collapses on one of those super highways carefully engineered to avoid civilization, don't panic. Pray a little, look respectable, and I guarantee some angel in a noisy monster will happen along and help you out.

And may yours be as nice as our Major Gray.

SENATE—*Wednesday, March 26, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our life, judge of men and nations, our times are in Thy hands and we commit all our ways to Thee. We ask Thee not to lift us out of life, but to prove Thy power within it; we ask not for tasks more suited to our strength, but for strength more suited to our tasks; not to take our burdens from us, but to give us grace to carry them; not to banish our problems, but to give us higher wisdom to solve them. Give us the vision that inspires, and the grace of Jesus Christ who wore our flesh and walked the earth like a conqueror and abides with us now.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 24, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 25, 1969, received the following message from the President of the United States, which (with the accompanying report) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the report for fiscal year 1968 on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256). During fiscal year 1968, 6,777 teachers, scholars, and distinguished leaders were involved in this program in the United States and in 126 other nations and territories. This was a reduction of 10 percent from the preceding year. Since 1949, a total of 125,777 persons have participated in the exchanges.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1969.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 25, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For nomination received on March 25, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, March 26, 1969.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the following executive reports of committees were submitted, on March 25, 1969:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Jerome M. Rosow, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably, without amendment, on March 25, 1969, the bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and submitted a report (No. 91-116) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-92)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

Clearly this Nation must come to grips with the problem of an inflation that has been allowed to run into its fourth year. This is far too long, and it has already caused substantial distortions in our economy.

Inflation is a form of economic aggression against the very young and the very old, the poor and the thrifty. It is these Americans who are largely defenseless against the kind of price increases for food, clothing, medicine, housing and education that have swept over the Nation in the last few years.

Government has two major instruments for dealing with this problem. One is monetary policy, which should continue its program of restraint. The other is fiscal policy—the management of the Federal budget—which must turn away from budgets which have propelled the inflation, and turn instead to one with a strong surplus that will help to curb it.

The prospect of a thin budget surplus or a return to deficits would again nudge monetary policy off course. The result, as always, would be further increases in interest rates, a dangerously overheated economic engine, and the threat of accelerating the advance of the price level.

Because the problem of inflation was neglected far too long, we cannot risk even a neutral budget policy of narrow balance.

Only a combined policy of a strong budget surplus and monetary restraint can now be effective in cooling inflation, and in ultimately reducing the restrictive interest rates forced on us by past policies. This is fundamental economics, and we intend to deal with fundamentals.

We are determined to keep faith with America's wage earners, farmers and businessmen. We are committed to take every necessary action to protect every American's savings and real income from further loss to inflation.

The budget for the year beginning July 1, 1969, submitted in January, estimates the surplus at $3.4 billion. However, current examination of this budget reveals that some of its estimates of expenditures were low. For example, interest on the Federal debt will be far more than was estimated. This, along with such items as an underestimate of farm price support payments and a substantial overestimate of offshore oil lease receipts, means that a current analysis of the budget submitted in January shows a reduction in the surplus of $1.3 billion for this fiscal year and $1.7 billion for the fiscal year 1970.

Thus, half of the projected 1970 surplus has disappeared before the year begins. Similarly, more than half of this year's projected surplus of $2.4 billion will not be realized—and for the same reasons.

On the matter of cutting expenditures:

To produce a budget that will stop inflation, we must cut expenditures while maintaining revenues. This will not be easy. Dealing with fundamentals never is.

I intend to submit budget revisions which will reduce Federal spending in fiscal 1970 significantly below the amount recommended in January, even before those previous figures have been adjusted to reflect current conditions.

On the matter of maintaining revenues:

I am convinced that the path of responsibility requires that the income tax surcharge, which is expected to yield $9½ billion, be extended for another year. As I have said before, the surcharge is a temporary tax that must be ended as soon as our commitments in Southeast Asia and economic conditions permit. Because of budget and economic conditions, I reaffirm my support of the recommendation President Johnson made last January that the surcharge be extended, and I am transmitting to the Congress a request that this be done.

In addition, the scheduled reductions in the telephone and passenger car excise taxes must be postponed, and user charges equal in revenue yield to those now in the budget should be enacted. Together, these will produce close to $1 billion in revenue next year.

On the question of tax reform, this Administration remains committed to a more equitable and more efficient tax structure. In the coming month, the first specific proposals of that reform will be coming up to the Congress from the Treasury Department.

Taken together, these actions to reduce spending and maintain revenues will produce the strong budget surplus urgently needed to meet the inflationary threat.

Moreover, by proving Government's serious intent to counter the upward spiral of prices and wages, we will create conditions which will encourage the private sector to stop assuming a high rate of inflation in long-range planning.

Courageous Government action will modify the inflationary psychology which now afflicts business, labor and consumers generally. It is particularly hard on small business, and those of modest means in the management of their incomes and savings.

This ordering of our economic house—distasteful as it is in many respects—will do much to slow down the rise in the cost of living, help our seriously weakened position in international trade, and restore the sound basis for our on-going prosperity.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1969.*

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President of the United States on inflation be jointly referred to the Committees on Appropriations and Finance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, effective March 21, 1969, Representative CORBETT had resigned from the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 8438) to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AGREEMENTS WITH THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES ON RADIO BROADCASTING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 91st Congress, first session, two agreements with the United Mexican States on radio broadcasting, transmitted to the Senate yesterday by the President of the United States, and that the agreements, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the request, without objection, is granted.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith two separate but related agreements between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Mexico City on December 11, 1968, namely:

(1) an agreement concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcasting band (535–1605 kHz), and

(2) an agreement concerning the operation of broadcasting stations in the standard band (535–1605 kHz), during a limited period prior to sunrise ("presunrise") and after sunset ("post-sunset").

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the two agreements.

Since the end of 1967, when the broadcasting agreement of January 29, 1957, ceased to be in force, there has been no agreement governing the relations between the United States and Mexico in the use of the standard broadcasting band. Relations of the United States with other major countries in the North American Region in the broadcasting field continue to be governed by the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement of November 15, 1950, to which Mexico is not a party.

The two agreements with Mexico have been concluded after negotiations extending over a period of more than two years between United States and Mexican delegations, with representatives of the United States broadcasting industry participating as advisers to the United States delegation. The Federal Communications Commission and the Department of State express the opinion that the best interests of the United States would be served by ratification and entry into force of both agreements, the substance of which is understood to be generally satisfactory to broadcasting interests in the United States.

The first-mentioned agreement, referred to as the broadcasting agreement, contains detailed provisions designed to resolve many engineering and allocation problems between the United States and Mexico, as explained more fully in the report of the Secretary of State.

The other agreement, referred to as the pre-sunrise/post-sunset agreement, is tied to the broadcasting agreement in the sense that it can be effective only so long as the broadcasting agreement remains in effect. The regulations therein for station operation with daytime facilities for limited periods of time before the sunrise-to-sunset period heretofore prescribed will enable the Federal Communications Commission to implement plans for pre-sunrise operation of United States daytime stations, so that, for the first time, it will be possible for a large number of such stations, now operating on seven clear (I-A) channels accorded to Mexico in the broadcasting agreement, to have uniform starting times throughout the year. Whereas the United States would gain from the provisions for pre-sunrise operation, Mexico would gain from the post-sunset provisions.

The two agreements would be brought into force by the exchange of instruments of ratification and would remain in effect for a term of five years and indefinitely thereafter unless replaced by a new agreement or unless terminated by a one-year written notice from either party to the other party.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the two agreements with Mexico.

Richard Nixon.

The White House, *March 25, 1969.*

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The bill clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Rogovin, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jerome M. Rosow, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DESIGNATING THE VENTANA WILDERNESS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 112, S. 714.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 714) to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "dated" strike out "August 15, 1967," and insert "March 14, 1969," so as to make the bill read:

S. 714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of Septembr 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the Ventana Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Ventana Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 14, 1969, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the Ventana Wilderness within and as a part of Los Padres National Forest, comprising an area of approximately ninety-five thousand acres.

Sec. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Ventana Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

Sec. 3. The Ventana Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Sec. 4. The previous classification of the Ventana Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91-115), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The bill, S. 714, would designate a total of 94,728 acres in the Los Padres National Forest in California as the Ventana Wilderness to be administered in accordance with provisions of Public Law 88-577, the Wilderness Act of 1964, by the Secretary of Agriculture. The area includes most of the Ventana Primitive Area and some contiguous lands which are predominantly valuable as wilderness resource.

DESCRIPTION

The proposed Ventana Wilderness lies on both sides of the Santa Lucia Range of mountains and the east side of the crest of the Coast Range, Los Padres National Forest. It is entirely within Monterey County, Calif., and is approximately 120 miles south of San Francisco, and is approximately 36 miles south of Monterey, by way of State Highway 1. The proposed wilderness contains the headwaters of the Carmel, the Arroyo Seco, the Little Sur, and North and South Forks of the Big Sur Rivers. Elevations range from 1,200 feet on the Big Sur River to 4,800 feet on Ventana Double Cone. The area is ideal for use by hikers and horsemen. It contains superb mountain scenery, basin-like valleys, unusual species of trees and wild animals, and is close to the large centers of population in the San Francisco Bay-San Jose area.

There is a great variety of vegetation. The rain forest on the western boundary changes to a typical southern California brush-type vegetation in the easterly portion of the area. Numerous species of conifers and hardwoods grow here; one is the California coast redwood growing at the most southerly limit of its range. Another conifer found in the area in the Santa Lucia fir, or bristlecone fir.

California black-tail deer, mule deer, and wild boar are found in the area. The four main rivers and many other streams contain trout. Small mammals, ranging from possum to spotted skunk, are often seen, along with an occasional black bear or mountain lion.

XUM

NATURAL RESOURCES

The timber is classified as noncommercial because of inaccessibility and relatively small volume. There is no grazing by domestic livestock within the area. No commercially significant mineral deposits have been found in the area and there is no known mineral production.

NONFEDERAL LANDS

A total of 2,510 acres are in non-Federal ownership. These are in nine parcels ranging from 37 acres to 640 acres in size, and are not occupied. The Forest Service is continuing a plan of acquisition, by exchange or purpose.

AMENDMENT

At hearings on S. 714, the major problem centered around area G, or Willow Creek, comprising approximately 3,000 acres. Nearby residents and conservationists were anxious to have this area included. The Forest Service left it outside its proposed boundaries.

Willow Creek is a year-round stream bordered by meadows and scattered oaks and sycamores. The area offers good opportunities for backpacking, hiking, camping and other similar recreation activities. It contains several hike-in camps which are used regularly by Boy Scouts and other groups. The Forest Service left it out with the intention of managing it primarily for recreation without public road access and with no motor vehicle use permitted. Forest Service testimony indicated the only reasons for not including Willow Creek were to continue its present more intensive recreational use and because a fire line existed along the western side of Willow Creek to make a natural boundary on the ridge top. However, it was pointed out that fire line also exists on the eastern side along a ridge top to provide another natural boundary. The Forest Service also said it could manage the area either as wilderness or outside the boundaries as it had proposed. The committee decided to amend the bill and include the area.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably reports, as amended, S. 714, and recommends that it pass.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY HON. PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President and the people of the United States of America have had the opportunity, over the past 2 days, to meet with, to get to know, and, in a sense, to evaluate a distinguished statesman, the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

Mr. Trudeau represents a new generation in politics, a new outlook on the world, and an up-to-date understanding of the realities of the globe on which we all exist.

As the leader of the predominant party in Parliament—as the head of his government, in fact—he is a person who has assumed great responsibilities not only in his own country but in his nation's relations with all the other countries of the world.

Prime Minister Trudeau, in my opinion, represents a fresh breeze from the north. His talks with our President, I am sure, have been fruitful and understanding, and the results of their meetings will, I believe, offer a continuing hope for the future of our two countries and perhaps together, a new hope for the world.

No one should underestimate Canada, large in size, small in population, but with a voice which has been, still is, and should be heard in the world's councils.

Mr. Trudeau, on the basis of the impressions he made in Washington, on the basis of what he has said, what he has done, and what he is attempting to do since assuming the office of the Prime Minister less than a year ago, is a man of candor, understanding, wit, and sympathy. While he is appreciative of our problems, as the working head of a sovereign nation, he must and he will pursue courses which he considers to be in the best interest of Canada. This is as it should be for any nation.

There will be differences between Canada and the United States from time to time, but that, too, is as it should be. I do not see any problems or disagreements, however, which are not capable of solution if reasonable attitudes are maintained. It is not a case of Canada depending upon the United States or of the United States depending upon Canada or one accepting the dictates of the other. Rather what is most needed is a mutual understanding and a mutual restraint since the two nations have not only an independent destiny but also a large measure of common destiny.

As a Senator from the State of Montana, which shares a 700-mile border with British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and as the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, I wish to thank Canada's Prime Minister for honoring us with his visit and President Nixon for having extended the invitation which brought him here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of Prime Minister Trudeau's press conference at the Canadian Embassy and also of the press conference held at the National Press Club, both on March 25 and both in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU'S PRESS CONFERENCE AT CANADIAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 25, 1969

Prime Minister. From our point of view the Minister, the Ambassador and our delegation, I think we all seem very pleased with not only the cordiality of the welcome but the approach that the President and his Administration took to us. There was no hard line, no pushing around. It was asking questions, supplying their own impressions . . . I think I had better try and answer any questions.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, what was the emotion towards the achievement of this brief visit to Washington for Canada?

Prime Minister. I think the fact that we laid the foundations for future exchanges. We laid the basis for personal relationships which will make it easier, as the President says himself, for us to pick up the telephone and cut through the red tape and communicate with each other directly if there are any problems which demand such communications. It was, to me, a bit surprising that we should establish so quickly such a feeling of cordiality and I think it was due largely to a deliberate attempt on the part of President Nixon and the Americans to emphasize the role in consultation that this Administration plans to follow.

Question. Sir, how tough are these domestic problems that are coming up—wheat and oil and so on? And do you think the consultations here are really going to further the solution of these problems?

Prime Minister. Well they are very tough. I think the consultations will further the solutions to the problems and in the case of oil, as we announced, we will have meetings very soon, I believe the second of April has been chosen. The Americans as well as ourselves realize that the policy has to be revised, perhaps updated with new discoveries and the new levels of consumption and also with the reorganization of the North American market. We are encouraged in the sense that both countries have common interests in this, whether it be wheat or oil. It is not as though we are trying to score an advantage against the other country. We both have advantage in reaching common conclusions. The problem will be on wheat, whether we can convince the other producing nations to accept our point of view and on oil how we will envisage jointly the prospects for the future of this market and the future of this industry. In that sense it is encouraging that we have a community of interest but it does not mean that the solutions will be easy.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, in your report to the President, did you spend a substantial amount of time on social and student unrest?

Prime Minister. I did with the President and I did with the Vice-President. Most of my meeting with the Vice-President was on that problem. I found that he has a very great interest in the problem of community living but of course he has, as a politician, great experience with that area of our society, our social fabric. In the case of the President, we talked about it, we found that our approach was largely similar—I don't want to speak for him—but I was interested in feeling out whether their approach was strictly based on law and order or whether it had a broader sociological and psychological basis, and I found it was of the latter category. It is not merely a matter of re-establishing law and order, it is not either a matter of inventing new institutions to try to tackle these things. The President used the word "communication" very frequently in dealing with this, and my whole interpretation of the meeting was that in this field, as in others, he is a pragmatist and does not promise set solutions. He is willing to explore avenues with the other person. This I found very welcome. Only the future, of course, will tell what happens to pragmatists. I may be threatened by the same danger myself. If you're approaching too many problems on an "ad hoc" basis, you may suddenly find that the other guy with an ideology or a doctrine has outflanked you, but one must be wily enough, and I believe the President is, and I try to be.

Question. Do you think the President might come to Canada this summer, Mr. Prime Minister, any idea?

Prime Minister. Well, in inviting him, I tried to make it pressing on the one hand, because I do want him to feel extremely welcome, but on the other hand I so much sympathize with a man in that very high office of such a big country that I didn't want to make him feel that he had to come soon to please us. I feel that it will be a miracle if he has time to do more traveling before many months are up. But we did not explore any precise dates except that I think very clearly he mentioned that he had been to Canada at the opening of the Seaway, and I said it would be a good chance to come back and celebrate the anniversary, early in July. But I do not know if he will entertain that idea or not.

Question. (Unclear)

Prime Minister. One can only speculate and I would say very clearly that we were given the impression, we were not made to feel that there was some linkage or some bargaining here, that if we were nice on the military and strategic problems they would be nice on the other bilateral questions.

There was no connection in our talks between the problems, between the questions. Now what is back of the psychology of negotiation I can't say, but we were all very impressed. The Minister has told me that, as regards his own talks, was the fact that the Americans put their point of view, they asked us about ours, but there was no pressing, no compelling demand that we understand that point of view and that we behave accordingly. It was a simple statement of point of view and, as I say, no linkage between these questions.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, can you give us any idea when you expect to come to a decision concerning the ABM policy and, while you're at it, can you enlighten us by what you mean by possible participation?

Prime Minister. I didn't talk down here about possible participation, you mean in Parliament. We have found out, and I'm thinking because I want to make sure I'm not giving you any classified information, and I'm sure I'm not, we have found out that, in the system as now rearranged, the Spartan missiles won't create any problems for Canada, in the sense that they won't be using our air space. They will be exploding in the outer atmosphere . . . I shouldn't say the outer atmosphere, I should say outside of the atmosphere. They will not be causing problems of fallout or flash blindness in Canada. It's conceivable that the Sprint missiles which are part of the Safeguard system could cause, not problems of fallout we are told, but perhaps problems of air space. I say perhaps because there is no degree of precision to this and this is one aspect of it that we will want to look into, both from a technical and legal point of view. If the Sprints at any time are expected to use or to traverse or explode in Canadian air space, this could cause a problem. What the results would be I don't know. You see, it would be easier if such a problem didn't arise, but apparently there are circumstances in which it can. Now, should we just tell the Americans: "You use it and we'll close our eyes"? Or should we say: "We want you to ask us our general authorization"; or would we want to be consulted every time it's likely that a Sprint will use our air space? These are complex questions; depending on the way in which you answer them, you decide on whether you want to participate in some way in the control of the system; whether you want it within NORAD or not. These, as I say, are quite complex legal problems with technological basis, the answer of which we don't have completely yet and this may take some time before having all the answers.

Question. "Some time"—in weeks, months, before we make our decision?

Prime Minister. Well no, it's linked to our defence review, it's linked to what we want to do in or out of NORAD, the way in which we see the orientation of our future defence policy, and, according to the decisions we make in the next few weeks, then we will either have a simple next step to make or a complicated one. All these problems are inter-linked and the position we take on NATO will determine our orientation on many of the others.

Question. I wonder if you regret at all not having met the American people? It's all been "official" Washington, as I see it, and no contact, hardly at all, with the public in Washington.

Prime Minister. I regret it in the sense that the trip for me is always more interesting if I have a chance to meet old friends and make new ones amongst the American people, or the people of the country I happen to be in. But I know the Americans so well that it's just an added but minor frustration. I feel that perhaps I can meet other Americans in other American cities and make up for my laxity this time.

Question. Going back to NORAD, did Mr. Nixon ask you to reconsider the NORAD agreement, to include ABM?

Prime Minister. No they did not. We repeated our position that when NORAD was renewed last year we demanded that the anti-ballistic missile system be not covered by any new agreements. On that they didn't take any pressing position, or even a suggested one. I think they are leaving it up to us completely. They feel that they can go ahead with NORAD without us, obviously, and I think they want to have us make up our own minds, and this refers to the earlier question. If we want to answer these other questions we may have to involve ourselves with whether a control system in which Canada participates is desirable or not. But we're not ready to take that step yet. We're not ready to ask the question yet.

Question. Did the Quebec issue . . . come up in your meetings with the President?

Prime Minister. Certainly in no important context. I'm just trying to search my mind if there was any direct or indirect allusion to it. I think there was not. In my discussions with the Vice-President, when I was talking about urban problems and leverage on municipalities in the areas of housing and urban growth, I asked him about their state relations with the national Government, and we talked about the similar problem in Canada, provincial-federal relations, with no particular emphasis on any one problem, though.

Question. Could you tell us anything about the Administration's reaction . . . on Red China. Did you discuss it much . . .?

Prime Minister. Yes, we did. I don't think it would be fair for me to speak about their position on it, beyond perhaps repeating that here, too, there was no arm-twisting and no attempt to oppose our views with strong counter-views. The President indicated that he had his own thoughts on this, on which I am not authorized to speak. There was no effort to, shall we say, violently alter the course of our actions.

Question. In last week's debate in the Commons you said that you were coming to speak with Mr. Nixon and discuss the roles (of survivors). You also said that the ABM problem was giving you great concern. Are you coming back to Ottawa tonight with less concern than before? Are you reassured?

Prime Minister. No, I don't think the general question in my mind has been answered any more now than it was a week ago. I have more technical knowledge. We had some fairly elaborate briefings by officials of the U.S. Government. But our moral and political position on the ABM system, I am no more closer to being able to announce today than I was a week ago. With this new information I will be discussing in Cabinet how we answer the question I was asking in Parliament. Does this constitute escalation or not? Is this provocative or not? Is it, in the American mind, something which is irrevocable or not? On this I think the President and members of his Cabinet went out of their way to establish that this was to be implemented over a long period of time. I think the two sites which they want to be operational first will only be in operation around '73 under present time schedules. The President did emphasize that it's the kind of programme which could be accelerated or switched off, according to the way the East-West talks went. As a background to all this, what reassured me most is that the President repeated his desire to use NATO—not for confrontation so much as for dialogue and exchange between East and West. He sees an important linkage between NATO and between the whole question of nuclear escalation or de-escalation, the whole question of strategic arms limitation talks. He feels that the United States is in a better position to discuss the limitation of strategic arms with the Soviets, if the NATO rug isn't pulled out from under him, as it were.

* * * * *

Apparently I made a slip at one point, and I used NORAD instead of Safeguard. I know I mentioned this new Safeguard system, and I don't know in what context, but thank you, Romeo.

Question. When do you expect to make a statement on NATO policy?

Prime Minister. Well, I think it's an open secret now, that the Cabinet is meeting on Saturday and Sunday to consider the latest input, that of the Parliamentary Committee. I would think that we'd be in a position to make a general statement within a few days after that weekend meeting. I say general because according to whether the statement is broadly a decision to stay in or to pull out, all kinds of supplementary statements will be necessary: how do we phase the pulling-out, if that's the decision; or in what sense do we orient the staying-in, if that is the decision. But the decision of principle I should think would be known in about a week or ten days.

Press Secretary. You said the Americans can go ahead with NORAD without us—what you meant was Safeguard in that context.

Prime Minister. Ah, well this is the context, that we should strike out NORAD and put in Safeguard.

Press Secretary. The Americans can go ahead with Safeguard without us, instead of NORAD.

Press Conference Held by the Honorable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., March 25, 1969

Ladies and gentlemen, we are more than glad to welcome today a man of tomorrow, Canada's dashing young Prime Minister—and I would like to stress that "young" because he is not all that much younger than myself. He is pictured by reporters in Canada as a member of the Jet Set, an intellectual, nonconformist, a French bon vivant, a bold adventurer, a swinger. Well, he may be all of these things, and I notice his press clippings don't contain any disclaimers by him. But he is also pictured as a possessor of a tough and thoughtful mind, a pragmatist, and not an arch-radical.

Prime Minister, it has been said that you came on a "get acquainted" visit to President Nixon. I think all of us here have the same approach to the first official visit of a head of government to Washington since the change in Administrations here. We have read a lot about you in the last 12 months since you were elected leader of the Liberal Party in Canada after the comparatively short experience of some three years in national politics. But we would all like to get more about you.

Canadians look to you as a unifying force, one who has stirred their nationalism and their desire to have a greater identity in international affairs. You have promised changes in foreign policy such as recognition of Communist China. You have promised a major effort to advance bilingualism and biculturalism across Canada.

As a French-Canadian you have expressed your major aim to be "One Canada," a Canada in which French-Canadians can feel at home in all parts of the country.

You are, as Time Magazine has described you, "a fairly unstuffy man who, when asked by a pretty young Trudeaubopper for a kiss, can respond with, "Why not? It's spring!" (Laughter)

You are broadminded and cultured, a lover of canoeing, a diver of mere championship caliber, a practitioner of Yoga, a driver of fast cars, and a bachelor—one who can command the company of beautiful women.

Summed up Time, last July, after your overwhelming election in the national elections in Canada: "Whatever else he does, he is certain to give Canada four years of colorful and unpredictable government." (Laughter)

So there is little wonder, Prime Minister, that we here in the United States—indeed, all of us in the Western world—are hanging from the rafters to get a glimpse of this most interesting head of government. You are not the first Canadian Prime Minister to speak at this Club, but you are certainly the first one in memory—at least in my memory—who has been followed to Washington by a planeload of Canadian reporters and who has, moreover, induced about 200 young ladies to greet you in the lobby of the National Press Club. (Laughter)

But someone commented to me just prior to this lunch that your first day in Washington yesterday appeared to stress the formal and, shall we say, the more serious side of the trip. This is in character, I might say, with the picture we have of the Prime Minister of one of the staunchest allies in the Western Alliance.

I would like to welcome you, sir, as the man who appealed to the Canadian people last year to "Take a bit of a chance" by electing you with a clear majority.

You are the man to whom the Canadian people have given their overwhelming confidence and whose success is important to all of us.

Lastly, sir, if you will forgive me, and if the fine French-Canadian people will forgive an Englishman trying to use their tongue, I would like to say this: (Speaking in French.) (Laughter and applause.)

I now take great pleasure in introducing the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable Pierre Trudeau. (Standing ovation.)

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very warm welcome. Thank you for the invitation to speak to such a distinguished gathering.

The description you made of some of my activities is getting more and more difficult to live up to. I will tell you one aspect of it that comes rather easily, the bit about "It is spring!"

And I thank you for doing, as perhaps the Canadian people did a year ago, taking a chance on me, taking a chance on inviting me, to be patient with some of the ideas I want to express to you. They are meant essentially to indicate some of my approaches to the problem of government. They are not very original, as you will see, but as Winston Churchill said about another Prime Minister, "He is the only one we have." (Laughter)

The relations I have with the Press are always very warm. I feel very close to members of the Press, and especially abroad I feel they are very close—perhaps sometimes a little too close.

But one of the real pleasures of being here is really due to the fact that, being a Canadian, one knows that one always has a warm welcome in the United States.

There must be few countries in the world where individuals on either side of a border feel so much at home on the other. I hasten to add, however, that at times in our history we have paused to wonder whether your friendly invitations "to come and stay awhile" have not been aimed at Canada as a political unit rather than at Canadians as individuals.

Many of you will recall, I am sure, that your Articles of Confederation, as ratified in 1781, contained a clause which was an open invitation, and an exclusive one to Canada. And I read Article IV:

"Canada acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this union; but no other colony shall be admitted into the same unless such admission be agreed to by nine states."

So, we have always had a favored position. In any event, we did not join, and history has recorded our differences.

Two hundred years later, the results of our separate and distinct political existence are evident for all the world to see: Professional hockey is a major spectator sport from New York to Los Angeles, and "Peanuts" is one of the most popular comic strips from Halifax to Vancouver.

But Americans should never underestimate the constant pressure on Canada which the mere presence of the United States has produced. We are a different people from you. We are a different people partly because of you.

Our two countries have pushed against one another from time to time, perhaps more courteously in recent years than previously, when your invitation and your republicanism appeared more intimidating to us.

Canadians still smart when they recall President Theodore Roosevelt's tough instructions to Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., on the occasion of the Alaska-Yukon boundary arbitration. But how many of your historians have ever noted what Canada's first Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald was at one time contemplating as your fate?

In 1867 that gentleman wrote to a correspondent in Calcutta:

"War will come some day between England and the United States, and India can do us yeoman's service by sending an army of Sikhs, Ghoorkas and Beluchees across the Pacific to San Francisco, and holding that beautiful and immoral city with the surrounding California as security for Montreal and Canada." (Laughter)

You see, Mr. Chairman, that although Canadians may not always be able to follow through, we should never be sold short on imaginative proposals.

Indeed, a question which some of your Canadian newspaper colleagues are now beginning to ask about my government is whether our ideas are capable of implementation. It's a valid question.

Imaginative and original approaches to problem solving are always welcome, but they must be practical and, even more important, they must be effective.

Some of our policies may be of interest to this audience, and with your permission, I should like to speak about several of them in a few minutes.

But first, let me say that it should not be surprising if these policies in many instances either reflect or take into account the proximity of the United States. Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant: No matter how friendly and even-tempered is the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt. (Laughter.)

There is in Canada at the present time a growing sense of unease that in a nation as rich as ours there is a problem of widespread poverty; that among people as dispassionate and understanding as are Canadians there is linguistic apprehensiveness and inequality; that in a world possessed of the technological means to journey to the planets, there exist terrifying threats to our environment and to our very existence.

Canada, by itself, cannot solve all these problems, and perhaps not even some of them. But we firmly believe that we can and must apply our talents and our resources in such a fashion as to seek solutions and, where appropriate, to persuade other states to cooperate with us in seeking these solutions. We have some qualifications for these tasks, and we have had considerable valuable experience which might prove to be of assistance to other states afflicted with similar problems. This is so partly because these qualifications, this experience, and the conditions which have spawned them, are similar in many respects to the differences and the difficulties which are found in the larger world community. And I wish to list some of them.

Canada is a federal state, the same as the U.S.A. Yet, two of our Provinces—Ontario and Quebec—are so populous in comparison with the other eight as to give to them an immensely influential position.

Nor is wealth in our country any more equitably distributed. The per capita income of the richest Province is about twice that of the poorest, and we have elaborate arrangements for redistribution of tax revenues among the Provinces of Canada.

Only one-third of all Canadians are of a stock that had English as its mother tongue, although two-thirds of the population live and work in English; the other third speak French daily as their normal means of communication—socially, in commerce and with government.

Within Canada there are French-speaking universities, radio and television networks, newspapers and labor unions. There is a complete language community.

Another item: One economy is founded largely upon foreign trade. In this respect I should pause to point out that we sell more to the United States, and buy more from the United States, than any other country in the world. The immense size of this trade bears out this emphasis. Canada's purchases from the United States each year exceed in value the total purchases of your four next largest trading partners: Japan, Britain, Germany, and France combined—more than your total sales to all of Latin America.

So it is this pattern of uneven economic development, this heritage of linguistic diversity, and this dependence upon continued international intercourse that leads us to think that perhaps by way of some example we may be of benefit to a world which is so desperately seeking solutions to pressing problems.

As I say this, I hope that we Canadians do not have an exaggerated view of our own importance. We prefer to think that our place in the world is such that we can occasionally experiment with good ideas without risking a complete upset of the whole international order.

We are as pleased as is any country when our views are sought or our assistance requested. But we may be excused, I hope, if we fail to take too seriously the suggestion of some of our friends from time to time that our acts—or our failure to act—this or that way will have profound international consequences or will lead to widescale undesirable results.

But as an example to others we hope that we are able on occasion to serve a beneficial purpose. Our close relationship with the United States is an important illustration of what I mean. The fact that Canada has lived and flourished for more than a century as the closest neighbor to what is now the greatest economic and military power in the history of the world is evidence to all countries of the basic decency of United States foreign policy.

And I add in all seriousness that every occasion on which our policies differ from yours in an important fashion, that difference—if of course it is founded on good faith and sound evidence, as we hope is always the case—contributes to your international reputation as a good citizen as much as it does to ours.

When Canada continues to trade in nonstrategic goods with Cuba, or proposes the recognition of the Peoples' Republic of China, or—as sometimes happens—finds itself supporting a point of view different from yours in the United Nations, the world is given evidence of your basic qualities of understanding and tolerance.

Because a state's foreign policies are in substantial part a reflection of its domestic scene, I wish to mention to you some of our basic programs.

XUM

What we are trying to do in Canada is to ensure to every individual the dignity to which he as a human being is entitled. Much of the unrest and turbulence now becoming evident in Western societies originates in the belief by the young, by the poor, by the minorities, that the massive socioeconomic machines that we have developed in our countries are incapable of recognizing them as persons, and of catering to their individual needs.

My government has stated again and again that it is dedicated to preserving the right of every individual to do his own thing.

We have proposed to the Provinces the amendment of the Constitution to include a far-sweeping charter of human liberties, a charter that will protect not only the classical political and legal rights which your Constitution has done here, but as well egalitarian and linguistic rights.

We have amended our criminal laws to permit more freedom to individuals to engage in acts which, sinful though they may be or appear to many, are not possessed of that injurious quality that we normally associate with criminal conduct.

We are examining with increased vigor such debilitating side-effects of an urbanized, technological society as environmental pollution, urban housing and transportation, the protection of spaces in which to play, to think, to be free from the pressures of noise and fumes.

We are attempting to find some lasting and just solution to the problems of our native peoples—the Indians and Eskimos.

We have introduced new concepts aimed at rehabilitating the economy of entire regions by supplying tailor-made programs designed to improve the quality of education, increase the efficiency of agriculture and industry, upgrade transportation facilities and strengthen social sérvices and incentives.

All this is being done against the background of a federal political system and a bilingual society, as I mentioned earlier. If in these circumstances we are able to accomplish our goals, providing we do, it will be to achieve a better life for all Canadians, and if we manage to do it, we will demonstrate to our citizens that the social structure *is* capable of change, that it *is* sensitive to the needs and demands of individuals, that orderly processes do exist inside society able to act as a vehicle for the protestations and the challenges of the aggrieved, then we shall have succeeded not only for ourselves, but I believe we shall have illustrated that tribalism and withdrawal are not the answer, that diversity and nonconformity contribute to a more satisfying and culturally enriched life.

And, especially, Mr. Chairman, I think we will have demonstrated to the citizens that their government is capable of solving problems and of meeting crises when they arise, and perhaps preventing insofar as possible the arising of such crises.

Most of our advanced societies are now in the position where they practically have to reassure their citizens and demonstrate palpably that these crises can be met, that government, in short, can govern; and we have to do this by steering a mid-course between too much authority and too much liberty, and it is a great challenge for all of us.

It should not therefore be expected that this kind of nation—this Canada that I am describing—should project itself onto the international scene as a mirror image of the United States. Much as our two countries are alike, much as they have in common—both with one another and towards other nations—we are different. And each of us is healthier as a result of that difference.

It cannot be expected that a country which is so deeply involved in social changes within its own boundaries should not be examining as well its foreign policies. Canada is, as you know, now reaching the conclusion of the first methodical and total review of our foreign policy and our defense policy since the end of World War II. We have gone back to first principles in doing so, and we are questioning the continuing validity of many assumptions.

Some policies will, without question, be found wanting for the conditions of today and be changed. Others will be retained. I want to emphasize that this review is not an excuse to prove our independence; that independence needs no proving. Nor is it an exercise intended to illustrate to the United States our potential for irritation. We have no desire, and no surplus energy, for that kind of activity.

We are building a new society in Canada. It should not be surprising that the external manifestations of this society may be somewhat different than has been the case in the past. But just as one of the invariable principles of that domestic society is the primacy of the individual, so is one of the invariables of our foreign policy genuine friendship with the United States.

The usual way of stating this fact is to refer in somewhat grandiloquent terms to our 4,000-mile unguarded border, to our lengthy history of amity and harmony, and to the many projects in which we are jointly engaged. It could also be illustrated by proving how interdependent our two nations are in economic, in resource, in geographic, and in environmental terms.

I prefer, however, to express all this more on the level of hockey and Charlie Brown, however. One of our better known humorists, Stephen Leacock, put things in their proper perspective. Writing as an English-speaking person in a bilingual society, he said:

"In Canada we have enough to do keeping up with two spoken languages without trying to invent slang, so we just go right ahead and use English for literature, Scotch for sermons, and American for conversation." (Laughter)

Mr. Chairman, so long as we continue to behave like this, I think the warmth with which Canadians and Americans regard each other will protect us all from any sins our governments might in error commit. (Applause.)

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Prime Minister, perhaps I should explain that I only ask the questions as they are sent up from the floor.

The first one: After hearing Mr. Nixon's argument, are you now in favor of an ABM system?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Well, you know, in Canada we have a Cabinet system of government. We do not have the Presidential system. This really means, in effect, that all I can do now is go back to my Cabinet colleagues, report to them the new information we have received, report to them the new technological information that has been imparted to us, and we will have to assess the impact of this on our own approach to foreign affairs, and we will have to announce a decision. I could not say, therefore, if Mr. Nixon's arguments have changed my mind, because I don't believe any of you or anyone knows what my mind was before. (Laughter)

Mr. HEFFERNAN. We have a question in French, and the Prime Minister has kindly consented to read it himself and to reply in French.

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. If you know Quebec at all, you can be sure this is not a friendly question, or it is not put up by someone friendly. It is certainly bona fide. I can read French, but I cannot read everyone's writing. (Speaking in French.)

In a few words, this really means that though we were down here to meet the President and his Administration, we are aware of what the critics made of the decision on the ABM, and we did meet some of these critics socially yesterday, but that any formal discussion with them could not properly take place

Fortunately, thanks to gentlemen and ladies like yourselves, we are made aware in a very immediate though direct way of what these criticisms are.

As I entered this building, I found one of these persons making an argument, a man with a picket sign telling us what we should tell your government to do.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. A two-part question, sir, which represents many which have been passed up to me: What are the reasons for the seeming lack of progress on your proposal to recognize Communist China—that is, the lack of progress in the Stockholm talks? Do you think it is possible to have a two-China or one-China/one-Formosa arrangement?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Well, on the lack of progress, our Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Sharp, has indicated to Parliament that we were prepared to be very patient. I do not know how patient this really means.

One person has calculated that the Chinese intend to take as long in exchanging recognition as was taken by the country who delayed recognition, which would mean it would mean waiting 20 years. But this would be a frightening prospect. But there are more frightening ones: If we do decide to recognize the Vatican, we are 2,000 years late. (Laughter)

But, seriously, we do not think that there has been any undue delay. It is only two months now I believe since we made our first approach to the Peoples' Republic of China representative in Stockholm, and we have put to them our desire to enter into talks with a view to exchanging representation.

There has been, I believe, one meeting since, and there is really nothing more to report at this time. But it does not distress us at all. I think the important step has been made—that is our indication that we were prepared to embark upon diplomatic representations, and we were prepared—perhaps that is also by way of answering the other part of the question—to recognize Peking as the legitimate Government of China. This, in itself, is an answer to what we would do, or what we consider, to Formosa to be the legitimate Government of China. It is that we cannot recognize two governments. Therefore, we are indicating to Peking and to the world that we are now prepared to recognize it as the legitimate government.

What consequences will flow or not out of our determination, I suppose it would be even unwise to speculate too widely on them, and, as it were, to show all of our hand before reaching agreement with Peking.

But Formosa's claim to be the government of all China is one, of course, which we reject, once we recognize Peking as the government. What will follow, whether there will be one Formosa and one China, is really for these two countries to determine, more than ourselves.

As you know, the act of recognition of a country does not carry with it necessarily a recognition of that country's territorial claims. We can recognize the Argentine without recognizing its territorial claims over the Falkland Islands. Therefore, the fate of Formosa is really one which will be determined by the Taipei Government itself.

As to whether it will wish to continue asserting its claim of being the government of all China, or whether it will embark on some other course of being a sovereign state of its own, I cannot speculate on what course they wish to follow, nor what course Peking will wish to follow in its relations with it.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. There are a number of questions on the question of Canada joining the Organization of American States. The most direct of them:

Why doesn't Canada join the Organization of American States?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Well, as you know, we have been considering this for a long while. I think what has held us back most in the past is, as in the present, the sense that if we join the Organization of American States, we would be a pale reflection of the American image, and we did not find this useful.

To be quite blunt, we have never evolved a very coherent and organic policy towards Latin America. We have been turned towards Europe, other parts of the world, much more than we have towards South America and Central America. And, not having a clear, coherent policy, had we entered the OAS, I am afraid we would have brought no new knowledge and no new resolve, and the danger of that would have been that either we would have reflected the State Department's views in all matters, and this would have been, I believe, not only detrimental to ourselves, but it would have been detrimental to the kind of relationship that we hoped to establish with Latin American countries. Or, on the other hand, we would have necessarily felt obliged in many cases to disagree with the State Department just to prove our independence, but without any logical or consistent background or policy toward it.

So what we have done in this new administration is to send a high-level delegation to South America, a ministerial level, which toured most of the countries of Latin America and Central America, and which is now embarked upon defining for ourselves a policy as regards these nations.

The question of the OAS is really only secondary. I think we all feel we would like to be part of it, but only if we can be a useful part. And if we find that our policy is one on which we can make a clear statement, one on which we can seek clear guidelines and principles which we would follow, then I think a normal step would be to ask for admittance to the OAS.

I might only point out in passing that I believe that many of the Latin Americans—most of them—feel very much as we do in this, and it was rarely the first or the second question they asked us, whether we would join the OAS. They were more interested in knowing where we were going in relation to them. And we indicated to them we wanted to establish much tighter links with this vast land mass which will have some half-million people by the turn of the century and which, if we do not consider it as one of the important parts of the world, can become obviously a very serious source of disturbance to world order.

Because of this, we want to increase our relations with South America and with Central America. We want to do it in the areas of trade, in the areas of culture, of exchanges of many kinds—of people, of students, of ideas. And as a next step we will consider the OAS.

I would say that our inclination is towards asking admittance. but with the timing to be determined.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. In the same field, Prime Minister, a nice easy one:

Why does Canada support Cuban intervention in Latin America by trading with Cuba?

And along with it:

What should Uncle Sam do about Fidel Castro?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Well, I suppose a long dissertation on Cuba would be repetition of one that you have heard and read many times.

I would perhaps reject the premises of the question that we do support Castro's activities in South America merely because we are trading with them. Because if that were the principle on which we were to base ourselves, we could argue that the United States does trade with a lot of governments—most countries in the world trade with a lot of governments with policies of which they do not approve. And I believe that one of the best vehicles of understanding and closer relationships between countries is trade. The missionaries come first, and the traders come next.

I think that the Canadian approach to these problems—and it has not been an original one—is that in our relations with other countries we should not try and intermingle the two types of issues. Short of being at the state of war with another nation, we do not believe that curtailment of trade is in any sense conducive to a lessening of tensions between countries. On the contrary. We trade with Communist China. We trade with Cuba. The United States trades with many countries, the policies of which I am sure your people disagree.

Therefore, what should the United States do with Fidel Castro? I suppose anyone in this room now would say the thing you shouldn't do is ask the FBI.

I think it is important to realize that the force of nationalism, the force of independence, the feelings of independence of a nation are pretty hard to stifle, and that in international relations—as in domestic relations—the catchword, the key word is communication. The key word is dialogue, in the same sense that we are beginning to discover within our societies that you cannot repress sources of discontent and hope that you will have a peaceful society. But the only way is to talk about the values which the discontented groups feel. Talk about bridging this gap, whether it be a generation gap or color gap or geographical gap within a society or a rich-poor gap. The only way to prevent two societies developing within the nation, each with its own set of values which reflects the other person's set of values, is to discuss these values, to meet, to exchange, as you try to do in your politics—as we try to do in ours. And if this is true within societies where tensions are mounting, it is certainly true in international society. And that is why we have the United Nations. That is why we have forums where we discuss the other person's values.

And we think that in the case of Cuba this applies just as much as it applies in the case of Red China. It is once again only by discussion and communication that you can perhaps not convince the other person that your values are the right ones, but convince him that he has had a chance to make his point, and that the discussion is based on reason and appeal to thought rather than to emotion. (Applause.)

Mr. HEFFERNAN. On oil, Prime Minister, what is your position for or against the continental oil policy for the United States and Canada? And are you here to discuss it now?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Yes, we are. We did discuss it, both the President and myself, and then our Ministers and officials. We have a continental oil policy of sorts. It was set up in the past, and it worked reasonably well.

The technical details of it are perhaps a bit elaborate, but essentially it means that Canadian oil producers sell to Western Canada and sell to the United States an amount roughly equivalent to the amount of oil that Eastern Canada purchases overseas and, notably, from the Venezuelan producers. It is a deal between the American Government and the Canadian Government which is cost-saving for both parties.

The new oil discoveries and the implementation of this past policy is creating problems. We did discuss them and we are announcing in a press release that there will be further meetings on the 2nd of April with a view to looking at this continental oil policy and discovering the new avenues that might want to be followed.

I think we have arguments for the United States in the sense that our oil is not only cheaper, but it is more secure in terms of defense in any future conflict. It is continental oil. It is more easy of access. And if we do not continue exploring and discovering new sources of oil, there might come a time when there will be an oil gap that we won't be able to fill on this continent.

Discoveries at Prudhoe Bay perhaps retarded for some years the development of such a gap, but I think it is very present in our mind, both the American and Canadian Government, and we will now be seeking to establish new guidelines for a policy which will be in the mutual interests of both countries to permit the encouragement and development of oil resources in Canada, and at the same time not disrupting your internal markets.

We find that the discussions went very well, that there was a great deal of understanding between our government on the over-all aims, and we are very optimistic that there will be emerging a renewed oil policy which will be satisfactory to both governments.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. A bank of questions on the question of draft evaders. What is the attitude of your government in regard to Americans who travel to Canada to evade the draft? Has their entry noticeably affected the thoughts or policy of Canadians? And is there a limit to the number you will admit?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. When a question is restricted to draft-dodgers, the answer is a very simple one. The status of being a draft-dodger does not enter at all into our immigration policy. You can have your draft card in your pocket. If you are dodging the draft, you are not even asked about it and you are admitted to the Canadian border.

It is an irrelevant question from the point of view of our policy, and because it is not a relevant question, we do not have statistics on it. We do not know how many draft-dodgers have been admitted to Canada and have stayed there. I believe it is a policy which is similar to that practiced by the United States as regards draft-dodgers. We do know that a number of Americans come to Canada to evade the draft. We also know that a number, perhaps a superior number, of Canadians come to the United States to join the United States Army. We do not have statistics Some of them are even fighting in Vietnam.

But what effect these draft-dodgers have on our students is a question which, of course, I am no more informed on than you might be, sir. Their presence has been felt. They have aroused a great deal of sympathy on the Canadian campuses. By and large they have proved to be good students, orderly students, and much of their attitude, I believe, is dictated by reasons of conscience rather than by any desire to upset a particular order of things.

If the question were to go on and ask about deserters, I might be in a more delicate situation. Our policy as to deserters is not as clear as that regarding draft evaders. In general, we do have statistics on this and, in general, Canadian policy has been, shall we say, a little less free towards deserters than to draft evaders, on the basis that immigration does consider whether a prospective immigrant has any moral or legal commitment in the country of origin. And this applies, of course, not only to American immigrants but to immigrants from all countries. We do have statistics on this. I believe that we admitted 56 deserters in Canada last year and this, as you see, is a very small number. There may be others in Canada but who have not asked for immigrant status and, therefore, on which we cannot report.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Another question: Do you really think you can unify the French-English tradition in the Dominion? And how serious today is the threat of French Canada seceding from the commonwealth?

Prime Minister TRUDEAU. Well, this is a question on which there is no real answer except that many politicians have staked their political future on the hypothesis that there was no lasting danger of secession and, more important that we could unify, as the

XUM

question puts it, Canadians in spite of their linguistic differences.

I think the key to this—and it might be worth a word of explanation—is that we as a government—and it was the position of our party in the elections which, as you know, also scored resounding victories in the French part of Canada, which was an overwhelming return. Our approach is that there are not two nations in Canada, because if you are going to talk to two nations there is a danger that you will go towards two political nations and two distinct legal entities either called "states" or "countries" or "peoples."

Our approach to it is that language is merely a vehicle; it is a tool. We have one nation. We have one political nation and we want to remain one political nation. But in this nation we have taken the position that there will be two vehicles of communication. There will not be the French-Canadian and the English-Canadian. There will be French-speaking Canadians, which might include a lot of people of Italian, of Hungarian, of Rumanian ancestry, and there will be English-speaking Canadians which in fact include Canadians of all ethnic origins. Therefore, we do not try to distinguish two ethnic groups or say one ethnic group has a privileged status. We say there are in Canada many ethnic groups, as in the United States of America. And on the basis of history, we cannot say that English and French Canadians are the first or the best and that their languages should be the only official ones because if it were an historical basis, we would find that there were other people here before the English and French, the Eskimos and Indians and so on.

Therefore, we tend to look at this problem from a pragmatic point of view. We say, in fact, there are two large linguistic communities in Canada: the English-speaking and the French-speaking. And because of this, it will be important for members of those two communities to be able to communicate with the state in the official language of their choice. And this can be done. It can be legislated. We cannot legislate equality of two groups in the nation. It is not possible. I mean, you can say that the citizen of Guatemala is equal to the citizen of Germany. You can talk of an equation in international law, but within a society you cannot say the blacks will be equal to the whites, or the English will be equal to the French. This is not an operational concept. You cannot say there will be as many stores on Main Street of the French language as there is per capita French in the country. You cannot say there will be as many students in your school as there is a proportion of that group to the overall total. It is not an operational concept. But the language concept is an operational concept. It has worked in many other countries more or less well. (Speaking in French.)

It works in Switzerland where they have three and even four recognized languages. It works in South Africa; it works in Ireland; it works in Belgium. Not perfectly. It does not work perfectly in Canada, too, but we believe that the approach to the world of tomorrow is a pluralistic one, not based on ethnicity any more than it should be based on religion. And we reject any approach which tends to say that the state is the protector of an ethnic group—the French-Canadians in this particular instance. The state must be the servant of all citizens regardless of not only color and creed but of ethnic origin.

By rejecting this approach we do not reject, as I say, the legal declaration that the tools of communication shall be the English and the French language. This is once again not because they are superior or intrinsically better than any other language. It is because, as a pragmatic fact, we see that these are the tools of communication; that if the country is to hold together, each citizen of that linguistic community must feel that he can plug into his organs of government. And this is our approach. (Applause.)

Mr. Heffernan. Perhaps following that up, sir: Do many Canadians feel that the British-North American Act of 1867 is outdated? What would you propose to update it?

Prime Minister Trudeau. We have been embarked upon constitutional negotiations in the past year a little bit. Our approach for some years was that there were very few important problems in Canada that could not be solved under the BNA Act, 100 years old as it was. But the urgent priorities for government were at all levels. They were questions of poverty, questions of urban growth, questions of environmental control, questions of law and order, questions of economic development and the correction of regional disparities. All these problems are top priority, and we fear that too much of our mental energies and time would be diverted into constitutional debates.

We feel that by and large the citizen in our country, as I suppose in many countries, is not so much interested in arbitrating quarrels between one level of government and the other, not so much interested in the results of competitions between, in our case, the central government and the provincial governments as to who should have power over what. The citizen is interested in being well governed from all levels of government. And that is why our approach to the constitution has been that first we must state that which unites us, those principles which we hold in common, all Canadians, rather than begin by opening the debate on a division of power, on the respective jurisdictions of the federal and provincial governments which, as I say, appear only secondary to the citizen. We have tried to define those values common to all. One of them, as I just said in answer to the previous question, being the linguistic beliefs; and that is why we have brought before the Provinces this approach to the constitution which, as I said in my remarks earlier, is the belief in a charter of fundamental human liberties. If we can state that in the constitution, if we can protect the citizen from governmental invasion of these rights, then we would have gone a long way to establish the community of feeling and of thought in Canada which is essential to any consensus of any government.

That is the first step. We have gone well beyond that. I don't want to bore at least the Canadian people in the audience by summing up what we have proposed, but beginning February of last year, until the present day, we have had many, many, many discussions on the most vital parts of the constitution. They go all the way from a charter of fundamental liberties to the institutions of federalism themselves; the role of the Senate in the federal form of government; the role of the Supreme Court; how it should be set up; the role of the national capital and the desirability of having it reflect the bilingual and multi-cultural character of our society.

These are all propositions which we have put to the Provinces, upon which debate and negotiation is going on at the present time.

There has been in recent months an emphasis put on by some Provinces on the fiscal aspects of it, on the use of the spending power by the federal government. This aspect is being debated, too, and my government's feeling on what the constitution might be could be best gathered by reading a fairly lengthy booklet on it which our Ambassador would be delighted to hand to you.

This is our general approach.

Mr. Heffernan. There are many questions which we will not have time to ask. But maybe one we should deal with is: Did you and President Nixon have a meeting of the minds on the future of an international grains agreement; and more specifically, the world price of wheat; and do you think that price is too high?

Prime Minister Trudeau. Well, we did have a meeting of the minds at least on our approach to it. We did feel that this international agreement, which was drafted after considerable pain by producing, exporting and importing nations, it would be desirable if it could be respected.

We realize that beyond this pious wish there is much work to be done. One of the large and important exporters is, of course, the Government of Australia. The Prime Minister of Australia will be in this country and in our country in some days' time, and we have agreed that we should try and involve the Government of Australia in our approach to reestablishing respect for the international grains agreement. To this extent there has been a meeting of the minds.

We have not found out how we could get the world community to accept our point of view, but there has been called a meeting early in April of the exporting nations. They are to examine this problem. They will then examine the problem that was asked, sir, about whether the price has been set too high.

Our Canadian answer to this is that the price was set after a great deal of discussion and debate. It is perhaps easy or tempting now to say the price was too high because of the current situation of the producing nations and the surpluses in grain. But this is the basis of all commodity agreements. If we didn't have an agreement, we might be able to probably say the price is too high now; but in years of shortage, then the price would probably appear too low to us and we would be tempted, all of us exporters, to up the price considerably to the consuming nations. And that is why a balance must be established in all these international commodities, commodities which are internationally traded, and that is why we have this approach.

It is no longer the individual farmer who is selling his wheat or his sugar or his cocoa or whatever the other commodity is which is covered or should be covered by international agreements. It is the state itself which is involved. And we know that all of these policies, if they are not guided by an agreement, will tend to beggar each other, and the result will not be favorable.

In times of overproduction, it will be advantageous to the consuming nation; but in times of underproduction, it will be disastrous to them. And it is to average this out, sir, that we have these agreements. And on these general principles the President and his Administration agree very much with ours.

Mr. Heffernan. Prime Minister, we are very indebted to you for coming here today and answering so many questions. And in acknowledgment of this we would like to present this Certificate of Appreciation from the National Press Club.

Prime Minister Trudeau. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. Heffernan. Also, sir, we have a little gift—the official tie for the National Press Club. And we would implore you not to try to hang yourself with it, just to wear it.

Prime Minister Trudeau. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. Heffernan. One final question—I don't know whether we are going to get this into air time. When is General de Gaulle coming for a return visit? (Laughter.)

Prime Minister Trudeau. I believe you have invited him to visit your country. We will see what he does if he goes to Louisiana, and then we will report. (Laughter and applause.)

(Whereupon, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., the conference was concluded.)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I know we are all very much gratified by the results of the visit to Washington by our good neighbors to the north, not only of Prime Minister Trudeau, but of the entire delegation from Canada.

We have heard much about the Prime Minister, and I, for one, am very much pleased with what he did and said while he was in Washington. He turned out not to be a fire-eater; and I am sure that when the chips are down, it will be found that he is not a shrinking violet, either. He impressed me, as he did all others who had a chance to talk with him, as being a good listener, an excellent listener, a man who tries to be fair, one who is dedicated to doing what is right when he knows what the right thing is.

Last night, at the Canadian Embassy, we had occasion to meet many of the Canadian officials, including besides Prime Minister Trudeau the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Mitchell Sharp, the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Marcel Cadieux, and others, as well as leading citizens and officials of the United States. We had a good discussion, which lasted rather longer than we anticipated. In fact, it ran pretty close to midnight.

As an indication of how informative and interesting that discussion was, I may say that for the first time in a long time our majority leader did not want to go home early.

Not only will Canada and the United States benefit from this visit by Prime Minister Trudeau and other Canadian officials, but the whole world, as well, will benefit from this first visit. I hope that the exchange of visits by our leading officials may become a habit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I could not agree more with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the dean of Republicans in this body, has said about the meeting last night. I think it was the most interesting and informative one I have attended in my 27 years as a Member of Congress.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we should all be encouraged with the statement issued by President Thieu on yesterday to the effect that the Saigon government was willing to meet with the NLF in private and without conditions. President Thieu stated also that he opposed the renewed bombing of North Vietnam. This is the first encouraging sign in many months, if not the first during the whole period of talks and negotiations, to indicate that some movement is under foot and some progress may be made.

It is now possible, if the NLF and the Saigon representatives will get together, to begin laying the first building block toward the achieving of a responsible settlement of the war in Vietnam. I have no information of any kind as to what steps were taken leading up to President Thieu's statement, but I assume that the administration has been working in private and if it is responsible for this possible movement toward peace, then I want to give it full credit for what it has done in helping to break the impasse which has marked the Paris talks to date.

On the other hand, I am disturbed by the newspaper stories from Saigon that the U.S. military command has asked President Nixon to approve plans to attack bases in Cambodia.

It has been stated that Cambodian Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, indicated in a recent speech that he would not object to the United States bombing Communist targets in his country. I question this allegation because an attack on Cambodia would very possibly bring that nation into the conflict, expand the war considerably, very likely bring about an increase in American forces; and would reduce all prospects, in my opinion, for a reduction in the war, a possible deescalation and would hinder the chances of American withdrawals at a future date.

This is dangerous talk covering a delicate area which involves a potential enlargement of the war which would decrease rather than increase the chances for peace. If this report is true, I hope, most sincerely, that the President will give it short shrift and immediately, and with emphasis, turn it down.

SENATOR SAXBE'S WISE WORDS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, during my recent factfinding visit to Vietnam, under authority of the Armed Services Committee, I spent a large part of a month last year not only in South Vietnam but also in Laos and Thailand. While in Saigon for approximately a week, I had an opportunity to take side trips throughout various areas in Vietnam, ranging from the area in Khesanh and in the northern highlands to the area around Da Nang.

I observed, to my surprise, that our many thousands of marines in Vietnam were on the defensive in the Khesanh and Da Nang area. I say much to my surprise for the reason our marines are the best trained and best equipped offensive fighting men in the entire world. As a veteran of 37 months of service in World War II, but in reality never more than a civilian in uniform, my belief that our marines should be leading offensive operations in the Mekong Delta and spearheading amphibious landing operations there and along the South Vietnam coast was shattered by the policy then followed under the leadership of General Westmoreland. At that time, our marines were on the defensive throughout Vietnam. Not any were engaged in offensive operations along the long shoreline of Vietnam or in any of the rivers interlacing huge areas in the Mekong Delta.

While in Saigon I managed on several occasions to get away from the VIP schedule and program and on my own do some sightseeing and interviewing. I was informed from reliable sources that Madam Ky, wife of Vice President Ky, owned vast holdings not far distant from Saigon of highly productive rice lands and also that she was either sole owner or part owner of a huge rubber plantation taken over from the French. Furthermore, I do not consider it can be claimed by any advocate of our involvement in the civil war in South Vietnam that Madam Ky might have been a young women of wealth and might have inherited this property. She was an airline stewardess at the time Air Marshal Ky married her. In Vietnam and throughout Asiatic nations young women of wealth do not engage in gainful employment as they do in the United States. Here is a blatant example of absentee landlordism.

The gravest mistake any American President ever made was the mistake of President Lyndon Johnson and now his successor, President Nixon, in supporting the corrupt militarist Saigon regime and waging an American war in what was a civil war in Vietnam. This undeclared war in which nearly 40,000 Americans have been killed in combat and more than 200,000 wounded in combat has become the most unpopular war in American history. We Americans who consider ourselves the most revolutionary nation in the world are fighting on the side of the tories of Vietnam. We are supporting a corrupt regime of militarists who overturned the duly elected civilian government in Saigon in a nighttime coup in June 1965; and we have taken over from the defeated French the fighting against the forces of national liberation seeking freedom for what was known as the French Indo-Chinese colonial empire. The VC, or forces of the national liberation front, have been fighting in South Vietnam as they did victoriously in what is now known as North Vietnam to redistribute the vast property of absentee landlords giving that land back to the peasants who were subjugated into serfdom and third-class citizenship by the French.

Mr. President, I associate myself with the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Senator WILLIAM SAXBE, who recently stated in Columbus:

> In Vietnam we are backing the landlords and we should be backing the peasants. For what we are spending in Vietnam we should buy the land and give it to them. We should try land reform comparable to that done in Kenya and Mexico.

My colleague made a very perceptive and admirable statement. It is apparent to any observer in Southeast Asia that the Saigon regime is hopelessly corrupt and unconcerned for the lot of the South Vietnamese people and unconcerned regarding their welfare. They treat the mass of the Vietnamese in the countryside in the same manner as the French and Japanese colonial masters who preceded them.

Less than one-fourth of the arable land acquired by the Saigon government since 1954 for distribution to the peasants has actually been distributed. At the same time the National Liberation Front, or VC, have reportedly distributed some five times the amount of land distributed by the Saigon regime. In areas under control of the Saigon military regime, the old feudal system of absentee landlords still prevails. Top-level talk of winning the "political" war by "social reform" and "revolutionary development" remains empty verbiage. Wherever U.S.

XUM

troops, or friendly, so-called South Vietnamese soldiers establish "security" in the villages, the landlords return to collect back rents and reimpose a feudal system on the peasantry.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to and express my respect and admiration for my colleague from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) for speaking out loud and clear on this matter.

Unfortunately, more than $100 billion of American taxpayers' money has been dissipated, blown up into smoke, trying to crush the VC or forces of national liberation. During this month of March, an additional $2.6 billion or more will be spent in our undeclared war in Vietnam. It is most unfortunate that our new administration seems to be yielding subservience to the military-industrial complex and to the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who have been proven wrong from November 1963 to this time. I praise my colleague, Senator SAXBE, for the good advice he has given on this subject to the leaders of this new administration and to his highly critical denunciation of the policies of aggression pursued by us in Southeast Asia.

When President Eisenhower left the White House in January 1961 there were 685 American military advisers in Vietnam. When President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963 there were approximately 16,000 American military advisers in Vietnam. With President Johnson in the White House our involvement in this civil war was escalated to more than 550,000 ground forces and airmen of our Armed Forces supported by more than 40 percent of our naval forces and 50 percent of our airpower. It was largely due to the efforts and determination of Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford that the demand of General Westmoreland for more than 200,000 additional fighting men to be sent to South Vietnam was denied.

In Vietnam General Westmoreland told me that the bulk of the VC fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. Gen. Richard Stillwell, his chief deputy, informed me that 80 percent of the VC, or forces of the Vietcong, fighting in the Mekong Delta which is south and west of Saigon were born and raised in that area. When I stated "Well then, we are involved in a civil war," the response reluctantly given was "Well, it could be termed an insurrection."

The great American tragedy is that nearly 240,000 of the finest young men of America have been killed and wounded in combat in this civil war in South Vietnam and thousands have died of bubonic plague, malaria fever, hepatitis, and other tropical ailments, and thousands more killed in what the Pentagon terms "accidents and incidents." Nor is the horrible end in sight. This tragedy and great wrong has been perpetrated by myopic generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and by President Johnson. Now President Nixon appears—and I hope I am wrong—even more warlike in supporting a corrupt Saigon regime which all along has rejected land reform but connives with absentee landowners and corrupt provincial leaders. Thieu and Ky have the backing of less than 20 percent of the population of South Vietnam. Their regime would collapse except for our support. They propose to fight on to the last American.

Again I report that my colleague, Mr. SAXBE, is deserving of praise and commendation for the statement he has made.

SOMETHING IS RIGHT IN THIS WORLD

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island is happy to state this morning that something is right in this world. As the Monday news headlines bring details of the vandalism and violence that scars the Sabbath, one wonders if anything is right in this world.

Then the heart is refreshed by such an event as the "Rally for Decency" staged last Sunday, March 23, at Miami's Orange Bowl.

The 30,000 people gathered there may not have "made" the front pages of the Washington Star or the Providence Journal or the Boston Globe. But I was happy to see that the story was by no means "buried" by those newspapers.

Indeed, the story made its own headlines in the inside pages and its own heartlines for all whose eyes fell upon it.

I do not intend to sermonize. I could not improve on the truth and thrust of the Associated Press observer. His reporting speaks for itself.

Between the lines, the reader could find fresh confidence that the widely publicized vicious violence is but the madness of a minority.

When dignity and decency which mark the majority finds its voice, sanity will obliterate obscenity.

The Associated Press and the countless newspapers which carried the good news—all deserve the highest praise. Let me praise in the highest the stars of the entertainment world who participated so genuinely and so generously. The story deserves the utmost circulation.

To that end, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion and climax of my remarks.

The headline of the article reads, "Teens Draw 30,000 to 'Rally for Decency' in Orange Bowl."

Today, I say in the Senate of the United States, "Thank God."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEENS DRAW 30,000 TO "RALLY FOR DECENCY" IN ORANGE BOWL

MIAMI.—Some 30,000 hand-clapping people, some waving signs saying "Down With Obscenity," rallied in the Orange Bowl yesterday to support a teen-agers' crusade for decency in entertainment.

Teen-agers organized the rally after Jim Morrison, lead singer of The Doors was charged with indecent exposure during a Miami concert on Mar. 1. Six warrants have been issued for Morrison's arrest.

"This is not a protest rally," said Julie James, 18, a member of the teen-age Rally for Decency executive committee. "We're not against something. We're for something."

Teen-age speakers gave three-minute talks on God, Parents, patriotism, sexuality and brotherhood, sandwiched between appearances by professional entertainers who donated their services.

"Five virtues" selected as the keynote of the rally were: "belief in God and that He loves us; love of our planet and country; love of our family; reverence of one's sexuality, and equality of all men."

"Sex is definitely being exploited and it is because society has been losing its reverence for one's sexuality," Miss James said.

The shirt-sleeved crowd, basking in a warm sun, cheered for such entertainers as Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant and The Lettermen who appeared in order to applaud the teens' rally.

"I believe this kind of movement will snowball across the United States and perhaps around the world," Gleason said.

"I think it's great, there should be more things like that," said Tony Butala of The Lettermen.

"I always kid around on my show about how glad I am to be in Florida with the good golf weather and so on and after this decency rally, I can honestly add now that I am proud to be a Floridian," said Gleason.

He said after the rally that today's teenagers have many more temptations than teens in the past. "Perhaps I shouldn't say this, but television has a lot to do with it," he said.

The originator of the rally, Mike Levesque, 17, a senior at Miami Springs High School, said the idea grew out of a Catholic youth group discussion two days after The Door concert.

Levesque said he was thrilled by the rapid growth of the decency movement and the support it gained from adults.

The crowd was about evenly split between teenagers and adults.

Another member of the executive committee, Alan Rosenthal, 16, said telephone calls and letters poured in from around the country from teen-age groups interested in the movement.

He said, "We're going to try to come up with some kind of international youth organization. It could really tie the world together."

Numerous organizations, including major religious denominations, contributed to the rally. American Legion members passed out 10,000 small American flags.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT, OF COLORADO, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by the Senator from Colorado before the Republican policy committee on March 25, 1969, on the subject of student disorders on the campuses of American colleges and universities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT, REPUBLICAN, OF COLORADO, CHAIRMAN REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE, MARCH 25, 1969

I want to speak briefly about student disorders on the campuses of American colleges and universities. After I have completed this brief statement, I have arranged to show you a film clip prepared by KLZ, the Time-Life station in Denver, taken at the time student militants—shouting obscenities, hurling chairs and lighted cigarettes—delayed for an hour a speech at the University of Colorado by Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, acting President of strife-torn San Francisco State College. I believe this film clip dramatizes the problem and the reality of the present situation in a way which rhetoric simply cannot reach.

Until recently, many thoughtful citizens tolerated the hijinks of student disorder with an attitude similar to the aristocratic English lady who said that she did not care what people did, so long as they did not do it in the streets and frighten the horses. Perhaps in remembrance of the springtimes of yesteryear, when sap quickened the veins of youthful inventiveness, many parents were apt to dismiss sit-ins and free speech movements as the evolutionary outcropping of the kind of campus fun and games in which they also had participated.

There is, however, little relationship between goldfish swallowing activities and the deliberate attempt to impose student control over our educational institutions. In cases where student militants are unable to gain control, they seek to destroy.

When the average citizen reads about the "demands" of college or high school students, he can easily become confused, and that is exactly how the revolutionaries would have it.

What we have tragically underestimated is the fact that *sincere students* were expressing their disenchantment with policy matters of the university with which they believe they have a right to be concerned—including some that have long been thought to be the sole prerogative of university officials. These demands have now spilled over into the largest perhaps ethical, demands of what they conceive the relationship of the university to society should be, e.g. Viet Nam, the draft, crisis in the cities, unlimited personal license.

Very often the organizers of student protest interject themselves into intra-campus issues which have some legitimacy, or which at least enjoy widespread popular appeal on campuses.

They interweave, for example, demands such as "beer on campus" with demands for student control over faculty and curriculum. Thus, the organizers are able to use popular issues as a front for their real aims, which include control and/or destruction of the institution.

In this way, students who are concerned with contemporary problems such as the Viet Nam war, the draft, the crisis in the cities, have become ready prey for the professional agitator and malcontent, because the professionals are able to turn these issues into militant protests against the "establishment."

When many of these student activists first transferred their energies and concern about the civil rights movement in the South to the barricades of student protest on their own campuses, they discovered, almost by accident, that the rules and traditions of campus regimentation had become so brittle that they were capable of breaking these rules with impunity. They must have noted with grim satisfaction that when their demands were pressed beyond polite discussion that campus administrators began to waver, bend, and break when confronted with the politics of contempt and unremitting, violent, physical confrontation.

Revolutionary efforts were fanned by the excitement of being on the leading edge of "progress" in academic reform. The techniques of insurrection suggested by new student heroes like Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung, and Jules Debray showed increased signs of adaptability each time another campus administration was successfully overcome. Real or imagined social consciences, aroused by the works of Herbert Marcuse and the incoherencies of self-styled anarchists and fostered by trained revolutionaries, created a climate in which regard for the rights of their fellow man were dismissed by students in favor of wanton destruction of authority and all that represents it.

Inevitably, what was once regarded as isolated instances of militancy and violent disorder has become a pattern of conduct which, frankly to this Senator, now threatens the very fabric of our educational system in this country today. The techniques of responsible reaction by college administrators, have been marked by mounting frustration to say the least. In many, many instances college officials have, in good faith, tried to separate constructive student proposals from the more patently disastrous ones. Despite their efforts, however, the sounds of protest, orchestrated by groups like the Students for a Democratic Society, have been elevated into a crescendo of organized maelstrom, called rather euphemistically, student protest.

I have just returned from a weekend of meetings in Colorado. The people out there, still smarting at the rude response to Dr. Hayakawa, were treated to another outbreak of violence outside one of Denver's high schools on Friday. They want this kind of activity stopped and they are looking to those in authority to exercise judicious responsibility.

Recently, I obtained a document which was handed out at a meeting of the SDS East Coast Regional Offices held in Princeton, N.J., February 1–2, 1969. Because this document is so enlightening as to what the future portends with regard to the activist efforts of the SDS to continue insurrections in this country this Spring, I want to make excerpts available to you this afternoon. The entire document is, of course, available to any of you who might want to read it in its entirety.

I think after you read it, and you see the film clip, that you will share my deep concern with these pretentious little fascists. I sometimes think their only goal is to goose-step across the smoldering ashes of an academic wasteland holding the bloody scalp of capitalism in one hand and a Viet Cong flag in the other.

It is because of statements made in this document, and my continuing study of the problem, that I have already written to Attorney General Mitchell applauding his recent announcement indicating his intention to prosecute to the full measure of the law those professional agitators who are taking advantage of the freedom of this country in order to destroy the land, who in some misguided way equate forebearance with permissiveness and thus are willing to press the art of confrontation to its final, violent fulfillment.

Likewise, I applaud the President's statement over the weekend in which he indicated that federal funds should be denied to those who participate in this kind of anarchy.

I would submit to you that until we determine just how these revolutionaries and anarchists are financed, and then act to deny them funds for such purposes, we will not stop this problem. The best information I have indicates that prominent leaders in the student revolution movement have received financial backing from both public and private sources, such as tax-free foundations.

I believe that our federal government must keep a strict account of where and for what purposes its money is spent. I also agree with those Members of Congress who have called for greater scrutiny of money allocated by tax-free foundations. I believe Congress and the Administration should act on both counts without delay.

As Chairman of this Policy Committee, I have a deep concern over this matter, as I know you do, and I look to your guidance for suggestions of ways you may have in mind to cope with this problem.

Excerpts From SDS Document Obtained From Meeting in Princeton, N.J.

THE DEMANDS

After the agitation around the war, after Columbia, after Chicago, it is necessary to begin the creation of a self-conscious, mass, anti-imperialist movement throughout this country. Such a movement cannot be constructed without a real program to mobilize and struggle around: the left must establish itself in this country as not simply a disruptive agency, but as a social force that has a real power. This power can only come through the creation of a mass movement which identifies and fights in the interest of oppressed people in America and throughout the world. We believe that the best way of doing this is with a mass demand for conclusion of the issues that have been fought over by oppressed people and students for the last few years:

SMASH THE MILITARY IN THE SCHOOLS

No ROTC.

No war or counter-insurgency research.

No military or war recruiting.

No draft assemblies in high schools.

No high school sending of names to draft.

OFF the Pig; No Police Training on Campus.

No tracking in high schools.

Open admissions.

Such an attack would be defined by two considerations:

(1) The struggle should not be seen primarily as a university struggle; it is necessary to make students fight the universities not as students but as radicals attacking American imperialism . . .

(2) The demands are made in the interest of winning them. In the case of ROTC, a nationwide attack would severely hurt the military. ROTC exists on 348 campuses and in many Midwest high schools; in some places it is compulsory. As a result of VC and GI sharp-shooting, the military has been experiencing a severe shortage of officers. In the case of war company recruiting, a national attack might well begin a long-range attempt to deny the military-industrial complex a significant portion of its technicians. In the case of war research, a national attack on, for example, Project Agile, MIT, or the Research Analysis Corporation, could greatly hamper the efficiency of counter-insurgency from Bolivia to Watts. The strength of such a program obviously has to do with its national scope. Our demands, the comprehensive nature of our tactics, and the clarity of our arguments should show people that SDS indeed identifies with and fights for the liberation of oppressed people that, in terms of the nation is not simply a gadfly; that in terms of individuals, it is not simply concerned with students and others as IBM cards to be put through the radicalization computer. Both the demands and the struggle must be non-negotiable. Any anti-capitalist struggle today must, of necessity, be an anti-imperialist one. This means that the struggles against imperialism being waged in the Third World will define our struggle at home. Their battle is one of victory or death; and therefore the inflexibility of our position does not come out of romanticism, but rather out of the hard and intractable facts that necessitate social revolution for the great majority of the people in the world.

* * * * *

We must no longer resist imperialism, we must mobilize the people to combat it.

STRATEGY FOR CHAPTERS

(1) That chapters adopt as a base for their winter-spring offensives the eight demands outlined above, always making those demands explicitly anti-racist as well as anti-imperialist; that organizing at the chapter and regional level, as well as actions, be directed to these demands.

(2) That there be a national mobilization in early April, denoting the mid-point of the struggle, and providing a national focus for the politics and demands of the spring programs of SDS. That the politics and tactics of the mobilizations grow out of SDS programs, thereby directly trying into our on-going organizing, and, in its national character, helping in adding a national perspective to our daily work. The mobilization will carry a statement of the eight demands of the military program, and will be open to statement of other programs that may

XUM

develop later. The mobilization will be the clearest presentation since 1965 of SDS's position:

Support for black liberation, smash imperialism, negotiations are a fraud, U.S. get out of Vietnam, U.S. get (out) of Paris, immediate withdrawal. Our position on negotiations must be clear. The U.S. has used the Paris talks as a weapon in the waging of the war—as a cover-up for continued imperialism in Vietnam. At the same time, we do not condemn the NLF's use of negotiations as a tactic in their liberation struggle. Our slogan must be: Negotiations are a fraud; Immediate withdrawal.

Internationally the Vietnam struggle is the primary fight against American imperialism. If the Vietnamese people win their struggle against American imperialism, it will serve as the mightiest boost to the development of national liberation struggles yet seen. Clearly SDS as a revolutionary organization must create an anti-imperialist movement—a movement that supports the NLF and fights to end the war.

(3) That chapters and regions return after the national action to initiate militant actions around those demands, joining with high school and black groups wherever possible.

Step 1 will perhaps be the first attempt to co-ordinate organizing and local actions on a long-term basis around a national program and as part of a larger strategy. The necessity for regions to break down the demands to correspond to their real manifestations of imperialism in the local institutions is an absolute necessity. The movement within the U.S. has always partaken of a quality of uneven development—while this has allowed for isolated actions, such as Columbia or SF State to shock the entire movement into a qualitative leap in both ideological and political militancy it has also made the workings of the national program extremely difficult.

NATIONAL FOCUS

Step 2 therefore becomes the "common denominator" of the strategy, an action that gives national focus to the local organizing, that expresses the political and tactical level of the movement as a whole. Step 3, though, is the most important part of the program. It is here that the clarity of our national demands and nationally oriented politics will be matched by our local and regional actions. In the more developed regions, the militant and widespread nature of the revolts against imperialism and racism will clearly aid the whole strategy. In less developed regions and chapters, the national action and any low-level demonstrations that occur afterward will certainly contribute to the building of the movement at those chapters if not to the immediate winning of the eight demands, as may be possible in other areas.

How these regional struggles will proceed must be worked out at the regional level. At Boston, perhaps, a region-wide attack on MIT as a war-making institution which should (be) attacked nationally is possible.

* * * * *

IMPLEMENTATION

The creation of such a mass movement necessitates an amount of work that SDS has never yet engaged in: while we should be open to working with people in other organizations, SDS, primarily the local and regional chapters, should undertake to keep the organization and implementation of the program under its control, e.g., literature, fund-raising, tactics, advertising, travel. To meaningfully implement the program, the chapters and regionals must work collectively—a much more extended organizational version of the way things worked during the electoral program. In terms of building for a national conscious commitment of the movement and preparatory organization, we propose:

(1) Printing of this revised program in New Left Notes.

(2) Continued allocation of space by NLN for other papers—other regional models, longer analyses of imperialism and racism in relation to the program, organizer's articles, and reports of progress—region by region.

(3) Initial contacts from chapter to chapter and region to region, with high school groups and black groups.

(4) February 1 and 2 meeting of all chapters and regions that have approved the program or will do so, to cement the outlines of the national program, and to mandate, the NIC to call for the national mobilization and regional actions.

(5) Continuous contact between regions and chapters, exchange of organizing materials and regional strategies, perhaps setting up an office for co-ordinating the mobilization or elections of regional steering committees to implement regional strategies.

(6) April 12–13—National Mobilization.

(7) Spring Rebellion.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, early today I appeared before the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and made a statement with reference to coal mine health and safety.

I ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON MARCH 26, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee. I know of the diligent efforts put forth already by the Subcommittee in the conduct of hearings on mine health and safety, and I am particularly cognizant of the keen interest which has been manifested by my senior colleague, Mr. Randolph, a member of this Subcommittee. These efforts by my colleague and by you and the other members of the Subcommittee are to be highly commended, Mr. Chairman, and I want to assure you that I will exert every effort and utilize the full capacity of my office as a Senator toward the enactment of whatever Federal law may be considered feasible and necessary, in addition to state laws, to improve health and safety in our mines.

I was raised in the home of a coal miner in a mining community of West Virginia. From the time I was a child I have been conscious of the mining accidents that exact a heavy toll of human life. I have seen automation relieve the physical strain of men whose principal tools were the pick and shovel, but I have been disappointed because improved safety has not kept pace with mechanization. It is past time for Congress to demand immediate safety progress in every way possible and simultaneously to develop a blueprint for a long-range program which will serve to eliminate the dangers that have always been a threat to life and limb in the mines.

It is sad indeed to reflect on the senseless waste of life and impairment of health experienced by miners in this country. In spite of our advances in industrial technology and our great achievements in the natural sciences, we have allowed thousands of our citizens to die and many more to linger with poor health because of intolerable health conditions in the mines.

I am deeply concerned, particularly about the harmful effects of coal dust pollution that exists in America's coal mines today. In addition to being a serious safety hazard, coal dust has serious effects on the health of coal miners. Thousands have developed the terrible disease of pneumoconiosis. This disease not only causes miners to suffer for years with a serious impairment of health, but it has also resulted in the premature death of many of them.

Last December, Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Chief of the U.S. Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, emphasized the health hazards of coal dust. He stated that at least 100,000 miners are running the risk of developing pneumoconiosis. Approximately 1,000 coal miners in Pennsylvania alone die each year from the disease. Although we have no reliable estimates on the death rate from the disease in West Virginia, we could certainly expect it to be intolerably high, since employment in the coal mines has been substantially higher in West Virginia than in Pennsylvania for many years, and the coal dust problem is similar in both states.

The results of a U.S. Public Health Service study of the extent to which miners in certain leading bituminous coal areas were afflicted by pneumoconiosis appeared in the Mining Congress Journal in 1965. It was reported that nearly "one out of every ten soft coal miners working in the coal fields of Appalachia has radiographic evidence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis." The study revealed further that approximately one out of five inactive miners was afflicted. Moreover, the prevalence rates for those who worked in the mines for over 20 years showed sharp increases.

The symptoms of the disease are painful and often debilitating. Moreover, many of the affected workers will have other associated respiratory problems which include emphysema, silicosis, and chronic bronchitis.

Once the progress of the lung disease sets in, there is no medical treatment known to alter its course. After the process starts, its progression is steady and rapid. It results in a disabling breathlessness that usually results in death from heart failure, asphyxia, or pneumonia.

The testimony presented to date here by representatives of both industry and the United Mine Workers of America has been highly gratifying. Both the industry and the union are demonstrating a new determination to safeguard the health and safety of mine personnel.

A few days ago, for example, I was shown photographs of a number of safety devices that have been developed recently and are not in general use, but which have been discussed before your Subcommittee, and which will reduce the number of mine accidents.

It would also appear that dust particles, which present a menace to health, can be reduced if more care is given to ventilating systems and if water sprays are brought into wider use at the face. These are other precautions which, I am told, can be applied at once.

The mining industry has further indicated additional safety devices in the development state, and I favor whatever research or demonstration experience is necessary to bring them into use without delay.

I believe that, for the long term, the federal government must utilize scientific and engineering talent to develop systems engineering for coal mines.

Using the "systems" approach, the mining, processing and use of coal would be seen as a single continuum in which every operation is linked to all the others. The goals of the system would be to produce adequate quantities of low-cost fuel while minimizing hazards to the health and safety of those employed in the industry, as well as the environmental pollution associated with coal. Every operation in the system would be designed with these goals in mind. For example, mining

XUM

methods would be selected, not merely for high productivity, but to reduce mine safety and health hazards as well. Today, by contrast, many hazards are actually caused by the mining methods used, and techniques have had to be developed to cope with problems that need not ever have arisen.

The systems concept has been most spectacularly applied to the Nation's space program, and the recent flights of Apollo Eight and Nine show how well systems engineering can work. It is time we applied it on and under the earth to solve problems that are rooted in the haphazard and undirected growth of today's technology. Problems like mine safety are not the inevitable results of industrialization; they are instead the undesirable by-products of an un-systematic technology.

I made a statement on this subject on the Floor of the Senate on February 28 of this year and I ask that it be included in the record of these hearings.

Techniques of roof support, haulage, ventilation, and other mining procedures must be devised which will remove health and safety hazards from our mines at the earliest possible moment. Then, and only then, will we have fulfilled an obligation long overdue to a vital segment of our citizenry.

In the past several months, during which mine health and safety have come into national prominence, the coal industry has been exposed to considerable criticism from every direction. The industry is responding in a constructive way, and eagerly seeks solutions to the many health and safety problems inherent in the mining of coal. This is gratifying. Coal mining is a dangerous work, and it is of vital importance to the Nation.

Although relatively few homes are heated by coal furnaces, a majority of our residences would be without heat were it not for this source of energy. Most home heating systems, whether they be gas or oil, are activated by thermostats requiring electricity for their operation. In addition, an increasing number of homes, schools, churches, and office buildings are heated by electricity. For the record, it should be stated that coal generated 63.6 per cent of all electric power produced by fossil fuels in 1968.

Recently, the Monongahela Power Company announced that a new 1.3-million-kilowatt generating plant would be constructed near Shinnston, West Virginia. It is another of a series of power stations arising in the rich coal fields of the Appalachian range. A complex of power plants in West Virginia and Pennsylvania is connected with long-distance transmission lines to bring energy into the large metropolitan areas extending from New York to Virginia. At the same time, unit trains laden with thousands of tons of coal are leaving West Virginia's mines daily to bring energy to electric stations as far away as New England, Florida, and the Great Lakes.

Coal is a necessary ingredient of the steelmaking process and of numerous other industrial activities. If coal output were terminated, America's economic progress would halt and our defense structure would be weakened.

Coal is the foundation of the defense effort, for without it there would be no steel for weapons or equipment. Coal is, in addition, a source of explosives, synthetic rubber, and countless other war products of the chemical laboratory. So long as Communism attempts to encroach upon free peoples, coal will remain a vital component of our national security.

We must have coal, but it need not come at the unnecessary sacrifice of the men who mine it. The spectacular increase in productivity of mines in the past quarter-century is a tribute to mine operators and workers, and I am confident that by continued cooperation and determination they will achieve safety standards heretofore assumed to be unattainable.

Mr. Chairman, I know that your Subcommittee will adopt whatever amendments to the mine safety laws may be considered necessary, and I assure you that I shall do everything I can to insure that your proposals will be acted upon with expedition when they reach the Senate Floor.

The Subcommittee has already conducted careful and thorough hearings, and its work is not yet done. Undoubtedly, the information you will have accumulated, as a result of the hearings, will be valuable in your approach to the preparation of legislation for consideration by the full Committee and the Senate. Through the collective judgment of the members of your Subcommittee, therefore, you will arrive at conclusions based on the evidence that has been submitted during the hearings. In this respect you will be in a far better position than I—or perhaps than any other individual who has appeared before you—to determine what is needed in the way of new legislation to protect the health and safety of the men who work in the mining industry. I merely want to state that there is an evident need for federal legislation and that I have confidence in the membership of this Subcommittee to point the way. I want to support you as much as I can in reaching that objective.

I do wish to propose, Mr. Chairman, that a federal law be enacted to provide compensation to disabled coal miners suffering from "black lung" who are not covered by state laws.

This may or may not be a legislative matter over which your particular Subcommittee would have jurisdiction, but I believe that here is a legislative gap which should be bridged, and it seems to me the only way to do it is through the enactment of federal legislation. If you will indulge me for a few additional minutes, I shall outline the general idea of what I have in mind.

For example, the West Virginia Legislature recently enacted a new compensation law covering pneumoconiosis, but I am advised that some of the "black lung" sufferers may not benefit from it because such workmen's compensation legislation cannot be retroactive.

So, unless a federal law is enacted to include those who may have retired before the new state law goes into effect, or for whom the statute of limitations may have expired, I am told that some of these people may have no recourse to compensation. Therefore, I propose that legislation be enacted to authorize compensation in such cases on a federal/state matching basis. Such legislation would only affect those miners disabled from pulmonary diseases contracted through exposure to coal dust and silica, etc., and who are not covered by state laws. Such a law could run for, say, a twenty-year period, with the federal government providing 100 per cent of the compensation and administrative costs the first year, with a provision for decreasing each of these categories by five per cent annually. This would take care of most of the miners who have been forced to retire already, and would gradually shift the burden to the states. However, by the end of the twenty-year period, I think one could properly assume that there would not be much of a burden remaining outside a state's normal workmen's compensation fund caseload.

The benefits could be $25.00 per week—which would be lower than the benefits to which such miners would be entitled under the compensation laws of any state, but this amount would at least provide an income of from $100 to perhaps $115 per month. This would prevent some of the families from having to depend on public welfare, and it would also encourage miners to act before a state's statute of limitations expires rather than take the chance of receiving benefits under the federal/state program at a level lower than those provided in a state's workmen's compensation program. As the federal contribution decreased, the state's contribution would increase under the program I propose.

Such legislation could leave the definition of pneumoconiosis to the respective state laws, and the operation of such a federal law would be based on an agreement between the Secretary of Labor and any state for the purpose of assisting such state in providing compensation to individuals who, as a result of their employment in the mining industry, are suffering from pneumoconiosis, who are unemployable, and who are not entitled to receive compensation under any state workmen's compensation law. The state agency administering the compensation law of a state would be responsible for all payments of compensation made pursuant to the federal/state agreement.

I am glad that you have given me the opportunity to make this statement today, and I appreciate the courtesy accorded me. I deeply thank Senator Randolph for working out the arrangements with you, Mr. Chairman, for me to be present at a scheduled time. My colleague and I see eye to eye on many things, and in our several discussions concerning mine health and safety we have agreed that the possibility of federal legislation on the subject is one which should have high priority.

PRESIDENT NIXON BACKS THE PENTAGON

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the decision by President Nixon to deploy a modified ABM system, now called Safeguard, supposedly to protect our offensive silos has started the Nation down a multibillion-dollar road, the end of which is not in sight. In doing so, the President missed a magnificent opportunity to reverse the momentum of the arms race and to display clearly our desire for peace and workable disarmament agreements.

It is crystal clear that the President's decision was a political one designed to appease the rapidly growing opposition in the Congress and throughout the Nation to any ABM program, and at the same time to protect the vested interests of the Pentagon and defense contractors in keeping this boondoggle alive, subject to expansion at the first convenient crisis.

Mr. President, the President's decision is a political compromise that could well compromise the future security and well-being of the Nation, indeed of world peace. Robert Lowell, the great poet once said:

> Compromise makes a good umbrella, but a poor roof; it is a temporary expedient, often wise in party politics, almost sure to be unwise in statesmanship.

Changing the name of the weapon and moving it from city to country, supposedly reducing the initial expenditure, and promising greater research on it answer none of the fundamental agreements against an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The Sentinel ABM was to cost $5.5 billion when first proposed by President Johnson. President Nixon estimates Safeguard will cost $6 billion to $7 billion. However, a record of military spending replete with miscalculated costs has certainly taught us that if the estimate now is $6 billion to $7 billion Safeguard will undoubtedly cost nearer to $10 billion or $12 billion.

Furthermore, for years Defense Department officials have assured Americans that even if the Russians strike first we possess a second-strike capability with our Minuteman missiles in underground sites that would inflict unacceptable damage upon the Soviet Union. We were assured that the hardened sites were adequate and that we would not need additional protection for our intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Were we being misled then, or now? The argument that we need more protection of our land-based ICBM's completely ignores the fact that we have 41 Polaris submarines with more than 650 ICBMs which cannot be destroyed by a first-strike because they are underwater and moving all the time. These missiles have a maximum range of 2,875 miles and no area in the vast land mass of the Soviet Union or Communist China is safe from devastation from missiles fired from these submarines. The Poseidon program will soon increase this offensive power to 4,000 warheads capable of being fired from mobile bases under the oceans and seas of the world. If such a second-strike capacity will not deter an attack, nothing will. Placing the safeguard ABM around a small share of our land-based missiles will certainly not add one iota of credibility to our deterrent capacity.

Once an ABM system is installed—whether it be Sentinel, Safeguard or by any other name—it will follow as the night the day that the military-industrial complex will press for funds for a "thick" ABM system, so called, and for more powerful warheads. Then, proponents will probably claim that the Soviet Union intends to protect itself by placing its major industrial and defense facilities underground and that we must do likewise because of our greater concentration of industry and population. The cost—anywhere from $300 billion to $500 billion or more. It is not difficult to imagine the atmosphere of tension and terror that would result.

It is clear that deployment of the ABM will result in a squandering of national resources and treasure and will actually subtract from our national security rather than strengthen it. It would trigger an escalation of the arms race to a fantastically high and unbelievably costly plateau which would leave both sides with no more security than each has today. We should be considering arms cutbacks, not increases; encouraging disarmament negotiations, not a new arms race. Of course, this would terrify defense contractors, especially in the aerospace industry which is becoming a kind of national industrial welfare program.

Mr. President, last week the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of the great newspapers of the Nation, published an excellent editorial entitled "Mr. Nixon Backs the Pentagon." It clearly and concisely pointed out the inherent weaknesses of the President's decision to proceed with the so-called Safeguard ABM, and his inability to withstand the pressure of the military-industrial complex.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Nixon Backs the Pentagon

President Nixon has elevated antiballistic missile policy to new heights of absurdity with his decision to deploy a temporarily limited version of the Sentinel system. His thinner-than-thin ABM program, to which he gives the name "Safeguard," will not safeguard anything except the vested interest of the Pentagon and the defense contractors in keeping this military boondoggle alive, subject to expansion at the first convenient crisis.

The President deserves commendation for facing up to the fact that there is no feasible way to defend the population of our cities from a missile attack. In rejecting a 'thick" defense system he thus rejects all the rubbish that has issued from the Pentagon about building an ABM system to reduce casualties in a nuclear exchange from 100 million to 40 million. Even 40 million dead, as he recognizes, amount to an unacceptable loss which nobody but a war-games theorist can even consider. The population can be protected from a nuclear exchange only if the exchange does not take place.

But while abondoning the "damage limitation" rationale for the ABM, Mr. Nixon adopts an equally preposterous one of his own. The bases are going to be moved away from the cities, where the political opposition to ABM is strongest, and their alleged purpose will be to "protect" our deterrent power to launch a retaliatory second strike. This protection is to be accomplished by "safeguarding" only two of the Minuteman missile bases. What about all the others? Mr. Nixon's own war-games theory evidently assumes that they will be destroyed. If they are, millions of people will be destroyed at the same time, if not by blast then by fallout. Would an enemy who could knock out our population and 90 per cent of our missiles with a saturation attack actually be deterred by the possibility that 10 per cent of our missiles might survive?

There is, of course, very little probability that the 10 per cent would in fact survive. The ABM system, whether thick or thin, whether based near the cities or on the great plains, depends upon delicate radar and other electronic devices which many qualified scientists say would be rendered useless by a saturation attack. In knocking out the 90 per cent of our bases left unsafeguarded the enemy could confidently count on knocking out the other 10 per cent, by disrupting their controls, as well.

If Mr. Nixon's assumptions are accepted for the sake of argument, still his policy won't hold water. For if the strategy of deterrence is valid at all—a question nobody seems to ask—it is as valid without the ABM as with it. We now have more than 600 Polaris missiles ready to launch from far-ranging submarines, and the Poseidon program is in process of proliferating these missiles into 4000 warheads, all to be fired from untargetable mobile bases under the seas. If such a second-strike capacity will not deter an attack, nothing will. The highly questionable ability to protect a small share of our land-based missiles is not going to add credibility to our deterrent capacity.

Nor is Mr. Nixon's suggestion that the ABM will protect us from the kind of attack China might be able to mount in the '70's any more persuasive. If the Chinese ever reach the point of madness where they wish to invite destruction of their own country they are not likely to fire missles at the Minutemen sites safeguarded by the Sentinel. They need only fire them at San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, St. Louis, New York, Boston, and Washington, which are the places Mr. Nixon has decided cannot be defended. For that matter, a mad Chinese would not have to use missiles at all; he could plant nuclear bombs in suitcases at the bus depots.

The President's decision, unfortunately, is the kind that had to be expected from him—an act of political brokerage, giving everybody a little something, but in essence sustaining the military domination of foreign policy that has embroiled us in Vietnam and an insane arms race. In the pinch, although confronted with a unique opportunity to mobilize strong public support for a new and more promising policy, he could not withstand the pressure of the military-industrial complex in the opposite direction. One can only hope that Congress will do better.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on an extraordinary contractual adjustment authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions," for the fiscal year 1969, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Proposed Military Construction, Air National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the opportunity for savings by increasing transfers of excess property among Federal agencies, General Services Administration, dated March 21, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an audit of financial statements of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., calendar year 1967, Department of Transportation, dated March 26, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1968, Tennessee Valley Authority, dated March 25, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Service of Summonses for Jury Duty

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Claims Paid Under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant

XUM

to law, a report of all claims paid by this Department under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 for the period January 1, 1968 to December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Tenure and Retirement Benefits of Referees in Bankruptcy

A letter from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Denial for Extraordinary Relief of the American Shipbuilding Co.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Office of the Secretary of Transportation, reporting, pursuant to law, the Department denied the American Shipbuilding Co.'s application for extraordinary relief on a shipbuilding contract (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Legislation To Improve and Make More Effective the Veterans' Administration Program of Sharing Specialized Medical Resources

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"S.J. Res. 29

"Joint resolution recommending the confirmation of Charles Meacham as Commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas Charles Meacham has been nominated by Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel to be Commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States; and

"Whereas this office involves responsibility for the care and management of all fish, and wildlife under joint or exclusive United States control; and

"Whereas Charles Meacham has previously served in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game which manages one of the largest fisheries in the United States; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska has more fish and game resources than any other state in the United States; and

"Whereas Charles Meacham has been connected with the management of those resources as an employee of the Territory and then the State of Alaska for 12 years; and

"Whereas Charles Meacham has been active in International Fisheries negotiations since 1960, and since 1968 has served as the Advisor to the Governor of Alaska on International Fisheries matters; and

"Whereas Charles Meacham has 19 years of over-all experience in the field of fish and game management;

"Be it resolved that the Leigslature of the State of Alaska commends Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel for his nomination of Charles Meacham as Commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and respectfully urges the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate and the Senate as a whole to approve the nomination of Charles Meacham.

"Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Richard B. Russell, President Pro Tempore of the Senate; the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"AUTHENTICATION

"The following officers of the Legislature certify that the attached enrolled resolution, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29, was passed in conformity with the requirements of the constitution and laws of the State of Alaska and the Uniform Rules of the Legislature.

"Passed by the Senate March 7, 1969.

"Brad Phillips,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest.

"Betty Hanifan,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the House March 10, 1969.

"Jalmar M. Kerttula,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest.

"Constance H. Paddock,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"Keith H. Miller,
"Governor of Alaska."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"H. Con. Res. 93

"A concurrent resolution concerning national cemeteries

"Whereas, The men and women of the State of Indiana rise to rally around the colors when the state and nation are in peril and under attack by enemies both domestic and foreign; and

"Whereas, Many of these people pay the supreme penalty in the defense of the state and nation sacrificing their most precious possession, their lives; and

"Whereas, The congress of the United States has created and established national cemeteries for the burial of veterans of all wars; and

"Whereas, It has been brought to the attention of the 96th General Assembly of the State of Indiana that these national cemeteries both in Indiana and throughout the land are rapidly filling up leaving no room for present Vietnam and future veterans for burial; and

"Whereas, Veterans organizations such as the veterans of foreign wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Spanish American War veterans are urging the Congress of the United States, through resolutions passed through their national conventions including the national convention of the veterans of World War I, to establish national cemeteries throughout the land; and

"Whereas, The above named organizations and others including the last governor of the State of Indiana, Roger Branigin, have approved a location of a new national cemetery for the State of Indiana be on land owned by the government of the United States near highway # 63 south and just south of the Pfizer Corporation and which is now in the possession and jurisdiction of the United States prison which contains some 2600 acres, more or less; and

"Whereas, This location near Terre Haute is most desirable insofar as a large portion of land is available for the purpose of eliminating the shortage of burial space for veterans, and will in all probability work well with a proposed super jet air glide for Hulman Field which is in the general area; and

"Whereas, This land is not suitable and has been rejected by agricultural interests who refuse to purchase when offered for sale by the national government at $1.00 per acre: Now, Therefore

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the Senate concurring:

"Section 1. That our representatives in the Congress of the United States and the Congress assembled be requested and urged to pass and enact the proposed new national cemetery to be located at Terre Haute, Indiana, as the new national cemetery for the State of Indiana.

"Sec. 2. The principal clerk of the House of Representatives is directed to send a copy of this resolution upon the Senate's concurrence to each member of the Indiana Congressional Delegation and the principal clerk of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–117).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 170. Resolution to print a report entitled "Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," as a Senate document (Rept. No. 91–118).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John A. Nevius, for appointment as a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 60 flag and general officers of the Army and Navy and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Don C. Bowman, Jr., and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy; and

Harvey P. Lanham, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I also report favorably 1,569 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Bennett W. Alford, and sundry other officers, for appointment and promotion in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance:

Eugene T. Rossides, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

Paul W. Eggers, of Texas, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury; and

Randolph W. Thrower, of Georgia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development;

Nathaniel Samuels, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State;

Charles A. Meyer, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

William B. Buffum, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; and

Christopher H. Phillips, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of Col. John R. Frazier, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of William A. Gallagher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Yung-Kuang Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Augusto G. Usategui, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Szabo; and

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Cesar Romero Estoye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 1680. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," approved July 31, 1947, relating to the disposition by the Secretary of the Interior to moneys obtained from the sale of materials from public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Dennis Yiantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1682. A bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1683. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain injunctive relief in certain cases under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr Church, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1684. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1685. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1686. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Parks Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1687. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1688. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Dinosaur Trail National Monument in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Hart, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Goodell):

S. 1689. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substance Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Cely Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 1691. A bill to remove the limitation on the number of civilian employees in the Division of Indian Health, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1692. A bill to provide for an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions, to revise the laws relating to corrupt election practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pearson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1693. A bill to establish a National Commission on Federal Tax Sharing; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1694. A bill entitled "Immigration Act Amendments of 1969"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 1695. A bill for the relief of Jose Molina-Nieto, his wife, Maria Jorge (Georgina) Luna de Molina, and their children, Maria Asunction Molina, Jacinto Molina, Marina Molina, Beatrice Molina, Ignacio Molina, Pedro Molina, and Eulalia Molina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1696. A bill for the relief of Wong Sau Chi; and

S. 1697. A bill for the relief of Dr. Camilo C. Balacuit and his wife, Dr. Norma Balacuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1698. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Rodas;

S. 1699. A bill for the relief of Angela Maria Russano; and

S. 1700. A bill for the relief of Jose F. Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1680—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE COUNTIES WITH ADDITIONAL REVENUE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Idaho (Mr. Jordan), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the 1947 act providing for the disposal of certain materials on Federal lands.

Included in these materials is timber growing on the public lands, and this bill would direct that 25 percent of the gross revenues from the sale of timber on those lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be paid to the counties in which the lands are situated, to be used for public schools and roads.

This measure also would direct that the base for payment of the counties' share of receipts from other forest lands would be the gross, not the net, figure.

The sponsors mean by gross revenues all moneys paid or deposited by purchasers of timber and forest products from the unreserved public lands and the national forests.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to bring relief to the hard-pressed counties of Idaho and other Western States in the fulfillment of their responsibilities for public education and local roads. Any one of us from a public land State is painfully aware of the impact on local governmental responsibilities, such as the maintenance of schools and roads, of Federal ownership of large areas of the lands within a county. As an example, some 64 percent of our own State of Idaho is in Federal ownership.

Certain of the public laws do provide for payment to the counties of a share of the revenues from Federal lands within the county. However, in the case of forest lands, the percentage has been computed on the basis of the net, rather than the gross. Federal administrative costs have an inevitable tendency to rise and with each increase in these costs, the counties' share declines. It has not been unusual for the gross revenue to be rising while the counties' share is declining.

Mr. President, this bill is identical to S. 1385, which Senator JORDAN and I sponsored in the 90th Congress; it was favorably reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and approved by the Senate, but did not reach House consideration.

I hope it will receive early and favorable action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appriately referred.

The bill (S. 1680) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," approved July 31, 1947, relating to the disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of moneys obtained from the sale of materials from public lands, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SHARING OF PUBLIC LAND REVENUES WITH STATES AND COUNTIES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator CHURCH of Idaho, in sponsoring a bill making payments more equitable to States and counties from revenues earned from Federal public lands in such States.

With the Forest Service managing more than 20 million acres of land in Idaho and the Bureau of Land Management administering some 12 million acres of Federal lands of the 53 million acres within our State boundaries, the earnings, as well as the administration of these lands and resources, are of concern to the people of my State.

Thus, with approximately two-thirds of Idaho in Federal ownership, a more equitable sharing of revenues from reserved, classified, and unreserved Federal public lands is essential. This bill amends the Materials Act of July 31, 1947, pertaining to the disposal of materials from unreserved public lands, as well as the acts of May 23, 1908, and March 1, 1911, as amended, concerning revenues from Forest Service lands, in order to provide more funds for public land States and counties to maintain their schools, roads, and other facilities.

Mr. President, the same problems exist in the other 10 contiguous public land States and in Alaska. There is a wide difference in the formula for sharing revenues from reserved and unreserved lands. Existing laws provide that 5 percent of the net proceeds from timber sales on unreserved domain lands are distributed to the States and counties in which the timber is harvested and another law distributes 25 percent of the revenues from reserved Forest Service lands to States and counties. This bill will provide a uniform rate for both at 25 percent of the gross amount paid or deposited for timber or timber products purchased.

In a 1962 study, published in 1965, made by the Forest Service with the assistance of the Association of County Officials, it was found that after allowing for contributions in kind furnished by the Forest Service, such as roads, firefighting, insect control, and other costs, and with the 25 percent of revenues after Knutson-Vandenburg Act deposits had been deducted from the timber sales, the timber counties of North Idaho would have received some $2 million more each year if these Forest Service lands had been in private ownership and on the tax rolls. We are not recommending this course of action but we do call for a more equitable sharing of revenue.

Mr. President, a bill numbered S. 1385, identical to this bill, was passed by the Senate on July 12, 1968, but was not considered by the House. I hope we can have early approval of this proposal which is of such importance to public lands States.

S. 1684—INTRODUCTION OF RURAL TELEPHONE SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCING ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just introduced, on behalf of myself and 23 coauthors, including Senators ALLEN, BAYH, BURDICK, EAGLETON, GRAVEL, HARRIS, HART, HOLLINGS, INOUYE, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MOSS, NELSON, PROXMIRE, THURMOND, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio, a bill to amend the Rural Telephone Act of 1949, generally known as the rural telephone supplemental financing bill.

Under the Rural Telephone Act of 1949, which was an amendment to the REA Act, we have helped to build or improve 525,000 miles of rural telephone lines serving 2.3 million subscribers living on 79 percent of the Nation's farms. The service is now preponderantly outdated eight-party service and, as you know, because customers are relatively sparse, low-interest capital is necessary to improve and extend the lines. They average 3.7 customers per mile compared to 16 per mile on independent systems and 40 for the Bell companies.

As of June 20, 1968, the rural telephone systems had pending loan applications for $302 million for which no funds were available. Appropriation of 2-percent loan funds has not kept pace with needs.

The RTA's have developed a supplemental financing plan, through a rural telephone bank, which is authorized in the bill. The House Agriculture Committee has reported the bill favorably by a large, bipartisan vote and I feel sure it will pass the Senate with similar support.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1684) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation, presented by Mr. McGOVERN, is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED TELEPHONE SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCING LEGISLATION

Background

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, presently has two titles. Title I established the Rural Electrification Administration and provided for the present 2% rural electrification loan program. Title II provided for the present 2% rural telephone loan program. The proposed supplemental financing bill is drafted as an amendment to the original Act and includes Titles III and IV which deal with financing for rural telephone systems.

Proposed policy of the Congress

The growing capital needs of rural telephone systems require the establishment of a Rural Telephone Bank to furnish "assured and viable sources of supplemental financing", with the objective that the bank will eventually become a privately owned, operated and financed corporation. Many rural telephone systems will continue to require financing under the present terms and conditions of the RE Act (2% interest, 35-year loans) and nothing in this proposal changes the loan purposes, terms or conditions authorized under the present telephone loan program.

TITLE III

Rural telephone account

Establishes in the Treasury of the United States a "rural telephone account". Into this account would go all REA assets, undisbursed loan balances, principal and interest payments from the present 2% REA telephone loan program, appropriations, and shares of capital stock of the Rural Telephone Bank.

The funds in the account would be used for advances on REA telephone loans, payment of interest and principal on borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury, and investments in the Rural Telephone Bank.

TITLE IV

Rural telephone bank

Establishes a Rural Telephone Bank with the general purpose of obtaining an adequate supply of supplemental funds from non-Federal sources to be used in making loans to organizations which are telephone borrowers of REA. The telephone bank would be an instrumentality of the United States

XUM

and would have general corporate powers. As long as the telephone bank is an agency of the United States it would be authorized to use the REA services, facilities and employees, be subject to the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, and to specified provisions of various Federal laws.

Governor

The Administrator of REA serves as chief executive officer-Governor of the telephone bank.

Board of directors

Management of the telephone bank is vested in a 13-member board of directors which includes the REA Administrator, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and five members to be designated by the President, three of whom shall be from the Department of Agriculture, and two from the general public. The six other members of the board will be selected from the directors, managers, and employees of rural telephone systems. Initially these six will be appointed by the President but later will be elected, three from among the cooperative rural telephone borrower systems and three from among the commercial rural telephone borrower systems. The board will prescribe by-laws, regulate the manner in which the bank shall conduct its business, and will be required to meet at least four times each year and make an annual report to the Congress.

Capitalization

Federal equity capital will be furnished the bank from the net collection proceeds of the rural telephone account (Title III). This capital, for which stock will be issued, is authorized to be appropriated over a ten year period in amounts up to $30 million annually and until the total capitalization of $300 million is reached. The Federal capital contribution, evidenced by the issuance of Class A stock, will bear annual interest in the amount of 2% until repaid in accordance with the bank's charter. Borrowers from the bank will furnish equity capital through the purchase of stock in amounts equal to 5% of their borrowings.

Classes of stock

The capital stock of the telephone bank will consist of three classes—A, B, and C. Class B and C stock will be voting stock.

Class A stock shall be redeemed and retired as soon as practicable after an initial 15-year period, or after the total of outstanding class A and B stock reaches $400 million. The minimum amount of Class A stock then to be retired would be an amount equal to 5% of the bank loans made each year. Class A stock shall be entitled to a return, payable from income, at the rate of 2% per annum on the amounts of Class A stock actually paid into the telephone bank. Such return shall be cumulative and shall be payable annually into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Class B stock will be issued to recipients of bank loans. Each borrower will be required to invest in the bank a sum equivalent to 5% of the total amount of the loan. Holders of this stock would not receive dividends but would be entitled to patronage refunds.

Class C stock will be available for purchase by rural telephone systems eligible to borrow from the bank and organizations controlled by such borrowers. This stock will be entitled to dividend from the income of the bank, but such dividend shall not exceed the current average rate payable on telephone debentures.

Borrowing power

The telephone bank is authorized to obtain funds through public or private sale of its debentures, provided that the amount of outstanding debentures does not exceed eight times the paid-in capital and retained earnings of the bank. Debentures would be issued at interest rates, and with terms and conditions determined by the bank's board of directors.

Lending power

The bank Governor is authorized to make bank loans to corporations or public bodies which are REA telephone borrowers. Loans will be made for periods not exceeding 50 years for the same purposes for which loans are made under Section 201 of the original Act, and for the financing, or refinancing, the construction, improvement, expansion, acquisition, and operation of telephone lines, facilities, or systems, in order to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, or financial stability of a borrowers system. Two types of loans will be available to borrowers from the telephone bank—an intermediate type loan and a full market rate loan. Eligible borrowers will receive loans carrying the intermediate interest rate, which shall be determined by the current average market yield on marketable securities of the United States having maturities comparable to those of the loans, but with an interest ceiling of 4%. Authority to make "intermediate" loans will terminate after an initial 15-year period. Full market loans will be available to borrowers at interest rates reflecting the average rate payable on the bank's debentures and allowance for estimated losses. Telephone systems with an average subscriber density of three or fewer per mile would be entitled to loans under Section 201 of the Act.

Loan limitations

Loans to finance acquisition of telephone facilities shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such acquisitions must improve the efficiency, effectiveness or financial stability of the borrower's system and the size of each acquisition shall not exceed the borrower's existing system at the time it receives its first bank loan. Certificates of convenience and necessity from States with regulatory bodies, or a determination that there will be no duplication of lines, is required for telephone loans. No portion of any loan may be utilized to finance political activities.

Conversion of bank ownership and control

When, through retirement of the government's investment and the increase in borrower investment, the amount of stock held by the government represents less than one-third of the bank's capital, the process of converting the bank to borrower control and operation will begin: The REA Administrator will cease to be the Governor; the bank will cease to be a government agency; and the board of directors will consist of the REA Administrator and the FCA Governor plus six members elected by rural telephone voting stockholders of the bank. Special limitations on loan powers are eliminated after all government-held stock has been retired. Operations of the bank will continue to be subject to Congressional review.

S. 1685—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. The sole purpose of this bill is to help alleviate the severe losses to property and livelihood so often inflicted on the unfortunate victims of unforeseen natural catastrophes.

Damages to State and local governmental agencies caused by floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, and other major disasters have been eligible for Federal assistance on a continuing, standby basis since Congress enacted the basic disaster relief law in 1950. The same has not been true, however, for the private sector. Except for special acts adopted retroactively from time to time following a few especially devastating disasters, until 1966 losses incurred by private individuals, families, or firms were almost wholly dependent on charitable efforts for help. In the latter year, legislation was enacted which permits long-term loans at low interest rates for certain kinds of losses, and in 1968 a flood insurance program was authorized, but much still remains to be done to fill in the gaps and to provide supplementary aid if individual hardships are to be helped substantially.

My involvement in disaster relief legislation dates back to the spring of 1965. A series of destructive tornadoes swept over the Midwest in April of that year and wreaked great havoc over a wide area, including my home State of Indiana. After personally viewing the enormous losses, both in life and property, caused by this calamity, I invited a number of Senators and staff members to meet with me to determine what actions might be taken to provide relief for these unfortunate people. As a result of considerable deliberation and consultation with experts in the field, this group formulated a major disaster bill—S. 1861—which was introduced on April 30 of that year with the cosponsorship of nearly 40 other Senators.

The primary philosophy motivating this proposal was to make sure that statutory authority existed which would enable the Federal Government to extend significant aid of all types to disaster victims immediately after a Presidential declaration without having to wait several months for specific congressional action. Consequently, the bill proposed long-term, low-interest loans, refinancing mortgage obligations, supplementary Federal sharing grants, emergency shelter and housing assistance, and standby aid for damages to schools, highways, and unincorporated communities. Although this bill was adopted by the Senate on July 22 of that year, it was not until October 17, 1966, that a shortened version passed the House and became law—Public Law 89–769—a few days later.

Unfortunately, several basic sections of the original bill were not included in the final version of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966. While the loan adjustment and several other provisions were adopted largely intact, and a very commendable section extending help for the repair of disaster damages to higher education facilities was added, a number of others were eliminated. Consequently, on January 12, 1967, 30 other Senators joined me in introducing a second bill—S. 438—which was designed to rectify these deletions. Hearings were held on this bill in June and July of that year, and it was reported out with some modifications by the Public Works Committee on April 2, 1968, but no further action was taken on it during the 90th Congress. In view of the need which still exists for supplementary disaster relief legislation, I have decided to submit a new, updated, and partly revised bill for further consideration this year.

The bill which I am introducing today would provide meaningful additional assistance for those who are subjected to the ravages of natural disasters. First, the Federal loan adjustment feature of the 1966 act would be made more equitable and useful by providing that disaster loans for homeowners and business concerns could be made without regard to whether or not financing could be obtained elsewhere. Although the Senate did approve this section by adopting on May 28, 1968, two amendments to the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, they were eliminated in conference and did not become part of the final law.

Hearings which were held by a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee as well as evidence which has come directly to me indicates that application of the present law tends to penalize the person with a good credit rating and favor the one who may be a bad risk. In order to qualify for a Small Business Administration or Farmers Home Administration disaster loan, a victim now must first prove that he has been refused credit by private institutions.

This means that a man who has regularly paid his debts and has established an acceptable credit rating will have to borrow funds to repair or rebuild his home or business at much higher interest rates and often for shorter periods than one who has been a wastrel or whose business is failing. The latter may qualify for 30- or even 40-year loans or mortgage refinancing at 3 percent while the former, who has conscientiously and regularly met his obligations in full, perhaps at great sacrifice, will have to assume the burden of 7 percent or higher refinancing costs. This gives rise to the patently unfair situation where the owners of two houses or two businesses which are side by side and which suffer equal damage in the same disaster are treated exactly opposite by the Federal Government, even though the real loss will bear as heavily on the resources of one as on the other. It is time to wipe out this completely unjustified distinction.

Secondly, the bill would authorize a new cost-sharing program under which States would be encouraged to develop comprehensive disaster relief plans. Any State establishing an approved disaster plan would be eligible for Federal grants up to 50 percent of the losses sustained in major disasters; State governments and individual owners would each assume 25 percent of the remaining cost. The President could authorize grants up to $250,000 for the purpose of assisting a State in preparing a comprehensive disaster relief plan, which would have to include flood-plain zoning controls. Payments could be made by State administering agencies for losses up to $30,000 in the case of homes and $100,000 for business concerns, but no grant could be made for any damage for which private insurance is available and collectible. The maximum Federal share under the grant program, therefore, would be $15,000 for homes and $50,000 for businesses, which would have to be matched with a maximum of either $7,500 or $25,000 by the State and the homeowner or business owner.

A third important section would expand Federal authority to provide emergency shelter for disaster victims. Where places of residence have been made uninhabitable by a major disaster, the President would be authorized to provide suitable shelter for either owners or tenants who were unable to do so for themselves. For this purpose the President could either purchase or lease housing, including mobile homes, which could be rented in turn to disaster sufferers. Emergency housing of this type could be rented for as long as necessary, and for 1 year the level of charges for it could be adjusted according to financial ability of the renters. A maximum charge of 25 percent of a family's monthly income could be levied for such emergency accommodations.

Again, hearings and other evidence indicate that present Federal authority is not sufficiently broad and unrestricted to handle adequately the staggering housing problems which frequently result from major disasters. This section would make certain that delays and deficiencies now encountered in getting these sufferers prompt and suitable accommodations would not be attributable to any gaps in statutory authority.

Fourth, the bill proposes a new program to help reimburse severe losses suffered by farmers as a result of major disasters. Agricultural producers have not in the past received aid commensurate with the damages which have been caused to their lands and herds by such unavoidable tragedies as tornadoes, floods, blizzards, and earthquakes. Eloquent testimony has highlighted the problems faced by farmers in putting their land back into production or restoring their livestock in the wake of a disaster which has destroyed fences, strewn fields with rubble and debris, ruined crops, washed away topsoil, or brought death to herds. Up to $10,000 would be authorized in grants equal to two-thirds of the cost of restoring lands to cultivation or replenishing livestock herds. The producer would have to bear one-third of the cost up to $15,000 as well as all over that amount.

Hearings disclosed that at present Federal disaster relief agencies are not authorized to render assistance in the removal of pollution-causing debris from inland lakes. There have been occasions in which health and safety hazards resulted from obstructions and contaminating material blown into waters by tornadoes and hurricanes or carried downstream by floods. In order to provide some measure of help in these cases, the bill would authorize the Office of Emergency Planning to make grants to a State or local government in order to help clear such dangerous debris from lakes.

Another section has been added to the bill which would help States suppress grass and forest fires, either on State-owned or privately owned lands, which threaten to become major disasters. Senator JORDAN of Idaho, who proposed this section of the bill, has pointed out that a small conflagration, which might begin either on private or public property, could quickly become a major fire threatening large areas because of the lack of sufficient manpower and equipment to quell it at the start. Such a holocaust, which pays no attention to jurisdictional or ownership boundary lines, can in a short time devour huge quantities of timber and grassland.

Although the U.S. Forest Service employs a sizable number of well-trained, able firefighters and possesses ample, modern equipment, this is often not true in the case of tracts owned privately or even by State and local governments. To meet this need the bill would authorize grants or loans to States which would assist them in combating forest and grass fires, irrespective of land title, in order to help prevent and control the type of disastrous conflagration which swept the Northwest in the summer and fall of 1967.

Another deficiency in the present law is the lack of any assistance for the cost of removing debris deposited on privately owned nonfarm property as the result of a major disaster. Senator YARBOROUGH brought to my attention last year the plight of several landowners who could not secure governmental help in clearing their property of large quantities of material driven there in a hurricane, and he suggested an amendment which is now section 9 of the bill.

In some cases wrecked boats or other large objects were left on the lawns of homeowners who had no means of recourse to collect damages. Costs of such debris removal can be very high, and I concur in the view that it is proper for them to be shared with the general public.

The bill does not provide for any fixed authorization amount for a very simple reason: no one is able to predict the number or severity of disasters which may strike in any one year. Open ended authorization will permit ample leeway for Congress to appropriate sufficient funds from time to time to carry out the specific provisions of the act as required by developments. It is important to remember, of course, that only major disasters declared by the President after a specific request for help has been received from a State Governor would be eligible for assistance.

No accurate estimates can be made of possible costs if the bill were to be enacted. Losses from major disasters have varied considerably from year to year, and there is no way to chart what the future will hold. Moreover, data are not available which would permit an analysis reflecting what the additional cost would have been if the bill had been in force during past years. There do not appear to be any meaningful statistics on uninsured losses incurred by private property owners which might have been assisted under terms of the bill. A key factor in this connection is that not all losses would have been eligible for compensation; to the contrary, only those which were not insurable and for which no other benefits had been received could be counted.

It should be stressed also that authorization of a flood insurance program last year in no way reduces the immediate need for this bill. Present indications are that it may be some time before

XUM

property owners will be able to secure adequate insurance protection for water damage. In any event, the proposed disaster relief bill would be entirely supplementary and complementary to any such reimbursement. The bill specifically provides that no disaster assistance would be available under the grant program for any loss where insurance is available and collectible. In the meantime there will be continuing need for assistance to those suffering from floods.

There is no danger of duplicating benefits or of payments to those who have other kinds of protection, since the bill specifically prohibits grants for any losses where insurance is available and collectible. Likewise, the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 contained language in section 10 which directs the head of each Federal department or agency administering any disaster relief program to assure that no person, entity, or concern receives any aid for a loss if assistance has been provided under any other program. Until flood insurance becomes generally available, or in those areas or circumstances under which it cannot be obtained, the bill would provide means whereby such losses could be shared in part with the public. Again it should be stressed that help would not be given for the occasional flooded basement, broken window or damaged roof; only in areas of widespread disaster in which great havoc has been caused and massive assistance is needed would the terms of the bill apply.

Some criticism has been aimed in the past at the grant section of the bill because it would provide direct government assistance for private losses. Perhaps it should be recalled that this would not be the first time that the National Government has appropriated funds to reimburse or help citizens. Direct or indirect payments to individuals or companies are not unknown to law. To mention but a few, Congress has made substantial appropriations in the past to compensate for losses, to bolster prices, to encourage land improvements, to divert acreage from production, to subsidize land, air and water transportation, to finance individual higher education, to reimburse hospital and medical costs, and to provide decent housing. To a family whose home has been destroyed it is just as important to provide help in restoring that home as it is to provide assistance for education, health care, or any of the other many programs financed in part through Federal funds.

It seems to me that the important issue is whether the National and State Governments should be willing to assume a portion of the losses suffered by innocent families which have been subjected to the traumatic experience of catastrophic property damages. Private charity can and does lend much help, especially for immediate personal and temporary needs, but it cannot muster sufficient financial strength in a short time to offset the tremendous losses to private property in an extensive disaster area. This is especially true for long-term, major expenses, such as the cost of repairing or rebuilding homes and businesses.

The financial burden of property losses in disasters will eventually fall on one or more persons, families or companies. It may be shared in part by the individual owner, by friends and relatives, by the bank which holds a mortgage, by the insurance company—if there is such protection available—by charitable organizations, as well as by other private or public institutions. Employing public funds to assist those who have incurred sizable losses in major disasters in one sense is something like a system of enforced public insurance. That is, all members of society would help absorb individual losses through small contributions in general taxes rather than through payment of premiums to an insurance company.

Mr. President, the frequency with which destructive floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, and wildfires have in recent years devastated large areas and made thousands homeless graphically illustrates the need for a comprehensive, systematic approach to disaster relief. It is impossible to foretell when or where disasters will strike or the extent of the damage that will be done, yet there can be no doubt that they will continue to occur as they have in the past. Various sections of the Nation, some more than others, and persons in all walks of life and with different means, always suffer in the aftermath of such tragedies.

Nearly 100 major disaster declarations have been made by the President in the last half dozen years and more than $100 million in Federal funds have been extended for direct relief, but much of this aid has gone to restore public facilities. Three very serious major disasters have been declared already this year, and the threat of extensive flooding is so great that the Army Corps of Engineers has obligated more than $2 million for emergency flood preparations.

This Nation has always been generous in coming to the rescue of persons all over the world who have been subjected to serious unexpected misfortunes. No matter what the cause or the place, when thousands have been made homeless, injured or threatened with famine in foreign countries, our people and Government have always responded promptly and fully to appeals for assistance. Yet we have failed to establish a permanent, all-encompassing program which would help restore the property and livelihood of our own citizens who have had their homes or businesses demolished by similar cataclysms.

The purpose of this bill is not to provide a Federal handout; rather, it is to help unfortunate victims, dealt cruel blows by entirely unexpected and unpredictable natural forces, to recover at least some degree of their former economic status and living conditions. Those who involuntarily undergo the awful experience and full fury of a natural disaster may never be able to restore their possessions completely or return untouched to their former way of life, but the American tradition of extending a helping hand to our compatriots and others in time of need is very strong.

Mr. President, I reiterate my plea for prompt and serious consideration of this measure. In time of disaster it is proper for our people to look for help, not only from their neighbors, private organizations, and their own communities, but also from their National Government. Let us complete the job which other Congresses have well begun; let us prepare now for future disasters by adopting adequate legislation to minimize the devastating effects these catastrophes have on the lives and economic well-being of our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a brief summary of, and comment on its provisions, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1685) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster, introduced by Mr. Bayh (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Disaster Relief Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term "major disaster" means a major disaster as determined by the President pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g).

FEDERAL LOAN ADJUSTMENTS

Sec. 3. (a) In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less in the case of a homeowner, or $100,000 or less in the case of a business concern, may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

(b) In the administration of subtitle III of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, relating to emergency loans, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the required financial assistance can be met by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make or insure under any other provision of law).

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS AND BUSINESSES

Sec. 4. (a) The President is authorized in accordance with the provisions of this section to provide assistance to the States in developing and carrying out comprehensive and practicable programs for assisting homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as the result of a major disaster. For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of *Columbia*, the

XUM

Commonwealth of Puerto *Rico, the Territory of Guam, and American Samoa.*

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (i) the President is authorized—

(1) to make grants to any State, upon application therefor, in an amount not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of developing a program referred to in subsection (a): *Provided,* That the total grants made to any State under this paragraph shall not exceed $250,000; and

(2) to make grants to any State, upon the basis of an approved State plan, to pay not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out such a program.

(c) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under paragraph (2) of the preceding subsection shall designate or create an agency which is specially qualified to administer such a disaster relief program, and shall, through such agency, submit a State plan which shall—

(1) set forth a comprehensive and detailed State program for assistance to homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as a result of a major disaster;

(2) specify that the homeowner or business concern will assume 25 per centum of the property loss sustained by it as a result of such a disaster, and the State will agree to pay 25 per centum of such loss;

(3) provide that no homeowner or business concern shall be eligible to participate in such a State program unless the damage to the property of such owner or concern resulting from such a disaster exceeds 5 per centum of the value of such property prior to such a disaster, or $100, whichever is the greater;

(4) specify that the maximum amount of loss to be shared jointly by the homeowner or business concern, the State, and the Federal Government under such a program shall be $30,000 in the case of a homeowner, and $100,000 in the case of a business concern;

(5) provide a means of appraisal to establish the fair market value of the property of such owner or concern damaged or destroyed as a result of such a disaster;

(6) provide assurances that equitable treatment will be accorded all eligible property owners;

(7) contain satisfactory evidence that the State will adequately supervise such program;

(8) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the President deems necessary; and

(9) set forth such further information as the President may by regulation require.

(d) The President shall approve any State plan which complies with the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.

(e) No grant may be made under this section—

(1) for any loss for which insurance is available and collectible in such State at reasonable rates;

(2) for any loss in a State which does not have approved flood plain zoning controls or other similar preventive measures in force; and

(3) to any public agency or organization for the loss of any property owned by such agency or organization.

(f) The President shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this section, and to prevent the waste or dissipation of Federal funds.

(g) Each State receiving assistance under this section shall, through its designated State agency, make such reports as the President may require, and each such agency shall, upon request of the President, make available its books and records for audit and examination.

(h) The President may exercise the powers conferred upon him by this section either directly or through such Federal agency as he may designate.

(i) Such sums as may be necessary to carry on the purposes of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SHELTER FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

Sec. 5. (a) The President is authorized to provide dwelling accommodations for any individual or family whenever he determines—

(1) that such individual or family occupied a house (as an owner or tenant) which was destroyed, or damaged to such an extent that it is uninhabitable, as the result of a major disaster; and

(2) that such action is necessary to avoid severe hardship on the part of such individual family; and

(3) that such owner or tenant cannot otherwise provide suitable dwelling accommodations for himself and/or his family.

(b) Such dwelling accommodations, including mobile homes, as may be necessary to meet the need, shall be provided through acquisition, acquisition and rehabilitation, or lease. Dwelling accommodations in such housing shall be made available to any such individual or family for such period as may be necessary to enable the individual or family to find other decent, safe, and sanitary housing which is within his or its ability to finance. Rentals shall be established for such accommodations, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe and shall take into consideration the financial ability of the occupant. In cases of financial hardship, rentals may be comprised or adjusted for a period not to exceed twelve months, but in no case shall any such individual or family be required to incur a monthly housing expense (including any fixed exepnse relating to the amortization of debt owing on a house destroyed or damaged in a disaster) which is in excess of 25 per centum of the individual's or family's monthly income.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers and duties conferred upon him by this section, the President may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section;

(2) exercise such powers and duties either directly or through such Federal agency or agencies as he may designate;

(3) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, any real property acquired or constructed under this section;

(4) obtain insurance against loss in connection with any such real property;

(5) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any such real property; and

(6) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this section, such conditions and provisions as he deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this section will be achieved.

(d) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to farmers whose farmlands or livestock have been damaged as the result of a major disaster. Such grants shall be made (1) for the purpose of assisting such farmers to prepare such lands for cultivation and to restore such lands or livestock to normal productive capacity, and (2) only in the case of lands on the farm normally used in the production of an agricultural crop. No grant shall be made hereunder to assist in restoring lands or livestock to production unless the Secretary determines that the cost of preparing such lands for production has been increased as a direct result of such major disaster.

(b) The amount of the grant authorized under this section in the case of any farmer shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to two-thirds of the total cost of preparing the damaged lands for cultivation and restoring them to normal productive capacity, and in no event shall the amount of any such grant in the case of any farmer exceed $10,000.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to impose such reasonable terms and conditions on the making of such grants as he determines necessary to carry out effectively the purposes of this section.

(d) Such sums as necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Sec. 7. (a) The Office of Emergency Planning is authorized to make grants to any State or political subdivisions thereof for the purpose of lake clearance in cases where a major disaster has resulted in contamination of any lake by debris which has created conditions hazardous to health and safety.

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Sec. 8. (a) The Office of Emergency Planning is authorized to make grants and loans to any State to assist such State in the suppression of a fire or fires on State or privately owned forest or grass lands which threatens destruction of such proportions as to constitute a major disaster.

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Sec. 9. (a) The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning is authorized, upon application, to make payments to any person in reimbursement of expenses, not otherwise compensated for, which were incurred by such person in connection with the removal of debris deposited on privately-owned lands as the result of a major disaster. As used in this section, the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, association, firm, organization or local public body.

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 10. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to any major disaster occurring after December 31, 1968.

The summary, presented by Mr. Bayh, is as follows:

Proposed Disaster Relief Act of 1969—Brief Summary of and Comment on Major Provisions

Sec. 1. *Citation:* The Act would be cited as the "Disaster of Relief Act of 1969."

Sec. 2. *Definitions:* Retains the standard definition of a major disaster as one which is declared to be such by the President under the Disaster Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g). All other provisions of the act would be effective only in those instances where a major disaster has been determined and declared by the President.

Sec. 3. *Federal Loan Adjustments:* Disaster loans for homeowners up to $30,000 or for business concerns up to $100,000 under the Small Business Act, and disaster loans up to $30,000 under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, could be made without regard to whether or not the required financial assistance might be provided by private sources.

The purpose of this is to guarantee equal opportunity for all disaster sufferers who apply for disaster loans or readjustments to be treated on the same basis. The 1966 Disaster Act authorizes readjustment of loans for extended periods at minimum interest rates for owners of property severely damaged in major disasters. During the hearings considerable evidence was presented which indicated, however, that previously loans had been denied in some worthwhile cases on the ground that private financing, although at

XUM

higher rates and much less favorable terms, had been available. Section 3 would eliminate this kind of discrimination and should have been included with the other loan adjustment provisions.

Sec. 4. *Grants to States for Assistance to Homeowners and Businesses:* A new cost-sharing program would be established to enable homeowners and business concerns sustaining major disaster property losses to seek direct federal assistance. No state could participate in the program unless it first developed a comprehensive disaster relief plan and designated a state agency to administer aid to disaster victims. Grants up to $250,000 could be authorized by the President for the purpose of assisting a state in the preparation of such plans.

In states which had adopted approved disaster relief plans, the federal government could share up to 50% and the state government up to 25% of property losses in major disasters, with a maximum loss limit of $30,000 in the case of homes and $100,000 for business concerns. The property owner would have to bear at least 25% of the loss, and no grant could be made for any damage for which private insurance is available and collectible at reasonable rates. Likewise, no payment could be made for any loss in a state which failed to adopt flood-plain zoning controls.

Sec. 5. *Shelter for Disaster Victims:* The President would be authorized to provide necessary shelter for the owners or tenants of places of residence made uninhabitable by a major disaster and who are unable to provide suitable accommodations for themselves and/or their families. Housing could be acquired or leased, which in turn would be rented to disaster victims for such periods as may be necessary. Rentals for this emergency shelter, including mobile homes, could be adjusted for as long as one year according to the financial ability of the occupants, but in no case would they be required to pay more than 25% of the family's monthly income for such accommodations.

Sec. 6. *Assistance to Farmers in Major Disaster Areas:* A new grant system would be established for farmers who sustain extensive losses in major disaster areas. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make grants equal to two-thirds of the cost of restoring lands to cultivation or replenishing livestock herds, with the maximum amount paid to any farmer limited to $10,000. Reasonable terms and conditions could be imposed by the Secretary in making such grants, but no payment could be made to a farmer unless the Secretary determined that the cost of preparing lands for production had been increased as a direct result of a major disaster.

Sec. 7. *Lake Clearance:* Grants to States by the Office of Emergency Planning would be authorized for the purpose of enabling them to remove from lakes in disaster areas debris which would contaminate such lakes and which would create conditions hazardous to health and safety.

Sec. 8. *Grass and Forest Fires:* The Office of Emergency Planning would be authorized to make both grants and loans to any State to assist in the suppression of fires on either public or private property which threaten to become major disasters.

Sec. 9. *Debris Removal from Private Property:* The Office of Emergency Planning would be authorized to make payments as reimbursement of expenses incurred for the removal of debris deposited on privately-owned lands as the result of a major disaster.

Sec. 10. *Effective Date:* The Act would apply to all major disasters occurring after December 31, 1968.

S. 1686—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO APPOINTMENTS TO THE U.S. PARK POLICE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper referral, a bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

Last week during the National Park Service appropriation hearings, it was pointed out that of the 363 positions authorized for this service 80 vacancies are available for qualified applicants.

One of the reasons, of course, is the restrictions of the Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The second and more restrictive reason is the requirement that applications proceed through regular civil service examinations contrary to the requirements imposed in recruiting for the Metropolitan Police force and other local law enforcement agencies. These agencies have already established age limits for recruits as follows: Alexandria, Prince Georges County, and the District of Columbia have set the age at 29 years. Arlington County at 30 years and Fairfax County and Montgomery County at 31 years. The White House Police are recruited from the Metropolitan Police and the U.S. Park Police.

It would appear to me that if we are to have a U.S. Park Police capable of doing the job it is required to do, a maximum recruiting age similar to the other law enforcement agencies in the area is absolutely necessary.

I would point out, Mr. President, that a similar bill passed the Senate in 1963 and was approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but did not clear that body.

Since adequate law enforcement is more important than ever, I urge early and favorable consideration of this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1686) relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1687—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague in the House, Laurence J. Burton, has introduced a bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to set up a program in the elementary and secondary schools to educate our young people on the dangers and uses of drugs. Like our crime rate, we have in drugs a problem that is already reaching critical proportions. Unless we move now to meet the problem head on, the quality of life in this country will be further seriously damaged by elicit drug use.

It is the responsibility and burden of all Americans to meet the challenge head on. I can not emphasize strongly enough that it is primarily a family obligation. I believe every American parent should acquaint himself with the dangers of illicit drug use and impress upon their children the consequences that may befall a teenager who experiments with them. However, not all of the problems can be met in the home, and a unique opportunity exists for our schools to make a valuable contribution in this field. Because drug abuse is a national problem and because many of the narcotic drugs flow in interstate commerce, it is reasonable that the Federal Government now provide new machinery for combating this problem.

Consequently, I am introducing the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, which will authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to our public schools and other institutions for the purpose of setting up and conducting educational programs regarding drug use.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1687) to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1688—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE DINOSAUR TRAIL NATIONAL MONUMENT NEAR GLEN ROSE, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the Dinosaur Trail National Monument near Glen Rose, Tex.

This bill would authorize a national monument to protect the 135-million-year-old dinosaur tracks which have been preserved in the limestone bed of the Paluxy River, southwest of Fort Worth. These footprints can be clearly seen in the natural rock that forms the bed of the beautiful little river, and are believed to be the most numerous and best-preserved tracks in the world.

During the 90th Congress, my colleagues Congressmen BOB POAGE, of Waco, and JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, sponsored House bills to create this national monument. I introduced a companion Senate bill, S. 1113, to protect this unique natural phenomenon. The citizens of Glen Rose and Somervell County also favored the preservation of these tracks as a national monument.

Mr. President, no action was taken on this bill during the last Congress. However, on March 25, 1969, the Department of the Interior announced that the Texas dinosaur site on the Paluxy River has been declared eligible for inclusion in the

National Registry of Natural Landmarks by Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. It is commendable that the Park Service has recognized the significance of this area, but I do not think that recognition as a national landmark is enough.

About 30 dinosaur tracks are said to be visible today, left by dinosaurs in mud which has hardened into limestone. More tracks are likely to be uncovered. Previously, some of the tracks were quarried and are on display at the American Museum in Austin, Tex. All of these tracks might be subject to removal unless a national monument is created to preserve the tracks as they were originally created by the feet of the dinosaurs.

The Interior Department points out in their press release of March 25, 1969:

> Registration as a National Landmark does not involve change in land ownership and the National Park Service does not administer the sites or provide financial assistance.

It is for this reason that registration as a national landmark does not provide the necessary protection for this area. Though such recognition is indeed a significant and important step, it is just not enough to insure the preservation of these ancient tracks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Department of the Interior news release of March 25, 1969, entitled "Texas Dinosaur Site To Be Landmark" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This release expresses the concern of the Interior Department that the dinosaur site on the Paluxy River be preserved.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill to establish the Dinosaur Trail National Monument near Glen Rose, Tex., be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and news release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1688) to authorize the establishment of the Dinosaur Trial National Monument in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations significant scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior may designate as the Dinosaur Trail National Monument such lands and interests in lands near Glen Rose, Texas, and the Paluxy River as in his discretion are needed for establishment of such monument.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands or interests therein within the Dinosaur Trail National Monument by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. When acquiring property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the national monument, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, and develop the Dinosaur Trail National Monument in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 10 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The news release, presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH, is as follows:

TEXAS DINOSAUR SITE TO BE LANDMARK

Dinosaur tracks made in central Texas approximately 100 million years ago were declared eligible today for inclusion in the National Registry of Natural Landmarks by Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel.

The huge footprints have been preserved in the limestone bed of the Paluxy River, near Glen Rose, southwest of Fort Worth.

The Registry of Natural Landmarks, begun in 1964, is maintained by the National Park Service to identify and recognize significant areas of natural value for future generations.

The Glen Rose site, soon to be developed by the Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife, provides fossil evidence of the development of life on earth dating to the Cretaceous period as measured in geological time.

Then it was that central Texas was lapped by waters of a shallow, warm sea at the close of "the age of reptiles." While dinosaur track impressions and fossils have been found in other parts of Texas, the National Park Service deems the Glen Rose site is nationally significant in that it proves to paleontologists that the huge reptiles walked upright instead of crawling.

Paleontologists call the trace fossils "ichnites," literally footprints in stone. As the mud became limestone, the footprints preserved a drama of that far-away time in the earth's development. In the same rock is another trackway identified as made by a smaller, flesh-eating dinosaur apparently tracking the great but defenseless herbivorous reptile whose deep prints may be seen today.

Registration as a Natural Landmark does not involve change in land ownership and the National Park Service does not administer the sites or provide financial assistance. At the Glen Rose site, the State of Texas is planning a recreation area to include camping, hiking and swimming in the Paluxy River.

S. 1691—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN THE DIVISION OF INDIAN HEALTH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill first presented to the Senate in 1968 as an amendment to Public Law 90–364. The amendment was approved by voice vote of the Senate, but was dropped in conference.

I have proposed in this bill the exemption of the Division of Indian Health, within HEW, from the freeze provided for in Public Law 90–364, insofar as personnel requirements and vacancies are concerned.

Health services which are furnished to the Indians are being greatly diminished by reason of the freeze, and in the very near future will be diminished to a critically low point. Without going into great detail, I would like to mention a few examples of the problems which have en because of the freeze.

One major problem is the critical shortage of nurses which has been intensified by the freeze. Approximately 100 nursing service personnel have been lost in the last year. A few examples of shortages are:

First. The Oklahoma City area reports reveal that Clinton Hospital is operating with only three of five authorized nurse positions filled and Lawton Hospital, in my hometown, is operating with only 13 of 18 positions filled;

Second. The Aberdeen area reports reveal that the new hospital at Belcourt, N. Dak., has five of 13 registered nurse positions vacant;

Third. The Anchorage Native Medical Center has 12 of 71 positions vacant while the Tanana Native Hospital has two of six positions vacant;

Fourth. The PHS Indian Hospital at Mescalero, N. Mex., has two of six positions vacant;

Fifth. The Navajo area reports that the Gallup Indian Medical Center has 18 of 46 registered nurse positions vacant and the Crownpoint Indian Hospital has four of seven vacant.

These shortages are but a few examples, with comparable examples in most Indian hospitals in the Nation.

Staff shortages are becoming critical in other categories of health service. The laboratory standard of the Indian hospitals throughout the Nation is below the level required by the Laboratory Improvement Act of 1967. Personnel needed for the control of such communicable diseases as tuberculosis, measles, and trachoma cannot be hired by reason of the freeze.

Great advancement has been made in the past few years in maternal and child health and family planning programs, as well as mental health programs and programs designed to eliminate nutritional deficiencies; however, due to the freeze on personnel, these essential programs are being severely restricted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement outlining the current effects on the Indian Health Service of employment limitations resulting from implementation of Public Law 90–364.

It appears that if the freeze on personnel is not removed, the advancements we have made in the past few years in Indian health services will be lost and medical care for the Indian in this Nation will reach a deplorable state. I therefore urge that favorable consideration be given this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1691) to remove the limitation on the number of civilian employees in the Division of Indian Health, within the Department of Health, Educaton, and Welfare, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement, presented by Mr. HARRIS, is as follows:

XUM

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

EFFECT OF EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS

General

The first notification of the employment freeze was received on July 5, 1968 and established the following guidelines:

(a) Non-permanent employment was frozen until July 1967 levels are reached.

(b) Full-time permanent employment was frozen except for commissioned officers whose orders were out on or before June 30, 1968 for entry on duty July 1, 1968 or later. Extreme hardship cases were reviewed on an individual basis.

On July 10, 1968, the absolute nature of the employment freeze was confirmed by a memorandum from DHEW stating that no agency could fill any permanent position at any time during July until the prescribed July 31 ceiling is reached. (The ceiling was furnished HSMHA but not to Indian Health Service).

On August 5, 1968 advice was received that appointments could be made, effective August 11, 1968, to 50 percent of all vacancies in permanent full-time positions occurring on or after August 1, 1968 in direct patient care activities. At this point in time all Indian Health Service activities *except* the Washington Headquarters were considered Patient Care Activities. Any proposed employment for Headquarters, Indian Health Service required the prior approval of the Executive Officer, HSMHA. Monthly ceilings on other than full-time employment were issued by HSMHA.

On October 10, 1968 authority was received to fill 70% of vacancies occurring in patient care activities as defined above, which resulted from resignation, retirement, removal or death. Authority was also granted to fill on a one for one basis vacancies occurring as a result of transfers outside of HSMHA to another governmental agency.

On January 8, 1969 DHEW, HSMHA established a ceiling of 185 vacancies in direct patient care which may be filled on a one for one basis *provided* that the September 30, 1968 employment levels are not exceeded. However, on September 30, 1968 the Indian Health Service had accumulated 224 vacancies which could not be filled because of the freeze. In addition, the definition of what constitutes direct patient care positions specifically excluded the following categories of personnel: Public Health Educators, Community Health Professionals, Chauffeur-Interpreters, Sanitary Engineers and Sanitarians, and Sanitary Aides. Many positions previously considered to be in direct support of patient care activities are also excluded such as ward clerks, housekeeping, laundry and maintenance personnel.

The Departmental definition of Direct Patient Care activities, therefore, is more restrictive that that maintained by the Indian Health Service which considered that all field activities of the Service constitute Direct Patient Care and only the Washington Headquarters constitutes an overhead activity.

Attached is a tabulation reflecting the monthly accumulation of vacancies during the period July, 1968 through January, 1969.

Since June 30, 1966—the employment level target of PL 90-364—many new programs have been added or expanded including family planning, trachoma control, sanitation facilities construction for new Indian housing, field health clinics, and mental health services. Full-time medical officers are now serving 11 health centers which previously received only occasional medical service. These 11 new clinics serve Indians in Alaska, Kansas, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Washington. Program emphasis has been placed on preventive health services and on making comprehensive health services accessible and acceptable to the Indian people.

From FY 66 to FY 68 there was a 1.8% increase in admissions. Based on workload data for the first quarter of FY 1969 this trend would appear to be continuing and the resultant FY 69 workload is projected at a 1.7% increase over FY 68 and 3.5% over FY 66. Personnel in FY 68 increased over FY 66 by 2.3%. FY 69 personnel projections based on first quarter employment reflect a 2.5% decrease over FY 68.

Inpatient GM&S workloads reflected a 3.4% decline from FY 66 to FY 68 and FY 69 workloads reflect a decrease of 9.5% over FY 68 workload data. Although inpatient days and ADPL have shown slight decreases in projections for FY 69, admissions have continued to rise and the average admissions per hospital employee have risen from 23.7 in FY 66 to 25.2 in FY 69, which compares with a national average of 16.31 to 1 in community hospitals.

Average daily patient load reflects the approximately 11% reduction in average length of stay from FY 68 to FY 69. There are several apparent reasons for the reduced patient stay and average ADPL in terms of the increased workloads reflected in the outpatient data from FY 66 to FY 68. Patients are being seen in greater numbers in outpatient facilities, conditions are being diagnosed in early stages and treatment days in hospitals reduced as a result.

Operation of hospitals, health centers and health stations

The attrition process is affecting every form of activity—medical, para-medical, hospital administration, food service, maintenance—all types of personnel required to enable the Division's direct patient care activities to continue to provide health services of the quality and quantity required by the Indian people. The authority to fill 70% of permanent full-time vacancies has provided little relief. Because of the acute shortage of nursing staff—a staff which was marginal in number at best before the imposition of employment restrictions—54 of the 76 appointments made under the 50% and 70% formulas have been nursing staff. In spite of the priority given to nursing, approximately 100 nursing service personnel have been lost during the first quarter of this fiscal year. This loss includes nearly 70 registered nurses.

The critical shortage of nurses affects all areas. The Aberdeen Area reports that the new hospital at Belcourt, North Dakota, has five of 13 registered nurse positions vacant. The Anchorage Native Medical Center has 12 of 71 positions vacant, while the Tanana Native Hospital has 2 of 6 positions vacant. The PHS Indian Hospital at Mescalero, New Mexico, also has 2 of 6 positions vacant. The Navajo Area reports that the Gallup Indian Medical Center has 18 of 46 registered nurse positions vacant and the Crownpoint Indian Hospital has 4 of 7 vacant.

Another example of the critical staff shortage is found in medical and X-ray technicians. The Division has been attempting to bring the laboratory standard of its facilities up to the level required by the Laboratory Improvement Act of 1967. Progress toward providing the same quality of laboratory services for Indian patients as is accepted for the general U.S. population has been halted and reversed. From June 30 to September 30, 1968, the number of technicians serving the Division's 51 hospitals, 63 health centers, and over 300 health stations has decreased from 164 to 154—a loss of ten technicians in spite of the fact that 6 of the 76 permitted appointments have been technicians.

The 30-bed annex of the Phoenix Indian Hospital has been closed. The patients involved will receive care at the main hospital or in contract medical care facilities and in many cases not at all because of space and financial restrictions. Other hospitals, including the Gallup and Anchorage Medical Centers, have had to restrict patient services and specialty care.

The vacancy situation in support personnel is also becoming increasingly critical. The Alaska Area reports that only one laundry man is available on a full-time basis to process 18,000 pounds of laundry a week. The hospital at Kotzebue is authorized 16 maintenance positions, of which six are vacant, including that of a plumber. Maintenance projects which are essential if the installation is not to deteriorate cannot be accomplished before the freeze-up.

At all installations the concern for medical and nursing care is mounting daily and the stark fact is that at many of our hospitals current and foreseeable staffing levels will not be able to provide an adequate or safe level of patient care.

As part of the Division's continuing attempt to raise the health level of its beneficiaries and to assure their involvement in the Indian health program, the Division established a School of Practical Nursing at Albuquerque, New Mexico. On September 17, 1968, seventeen Indian girls graduated from that school after completing a one-year nationally accredited program in practical nursing. Before they entered training, the Division made a commitment for employment of these girls following their graduation and licensure. Although the Division of Indian Health has the vacancies and urgent need for all of them, the current freeze precludes their employment.

Field health activities

Current projections of outpatient data indicated a marked reduction in the trend towards increasing workloads established by the 17.5% increase in services rendered in hospital clinics in FY 68 over those rendered in FY 66. FY 69 projections indicate only a slight increase of 1% in hospital outpatient clinic workloads. The significant trend is reflected in the marked reversal in a trend established in field clinic outpatient services. In FY 68 these services represented a 12.1% increase over FY 66. The projections for FY 69 indicate a reduction of 17.3% in field clinic outpatient workloads. The current personnel limitations which face the Division have caused a realignment in staff from field health activities to provide support for hospital inpatient and outpatient clinic activities to maintain minimum care of acute GM&S illness.

Although both the Hospital Outpatient Clinics and the Field Medical Clinics each provide both preventive and therapeutic services on an outpatient basis, only 16% of the services provided at the hospital are preventive, while 37% of the services provided at Field Medical Clinics are preventive.

Finally, although 63% of field clinic visits are therapeutic, one must remember that field clinics have been established in the more isolated Indian villages precisely because the inhabitants of these villages are prevented by distance or terrain from regular visits to hospital clinics. In these villages, every therapeutic visit can also be considered a preventive visit, since early treatment prevents progression and complication of the disease.

The following are specific examples of the major program activities which will be curtailed by this dramatic decrease in field medical services:

Communicable disease control

It has been shown that about 2% of contacts of tuberculosis cases develop the disease within 5 years. In FY 68, 540 active new cases of tuberculosis were diagnosed. These cases will have from 5 to 25 contacts per case for a total of 2700–13,500 contacts who require immediate and continued follow-up. If follow-up cannot be provided, at least 54 cases of active tuberculosis can be expected to develop among these contacts. Reduction in the tuberculosis control pro-

XUM

gram will inevitably result in higher tuberculosis morbidity and an increasing reservoir of active cases to spread the disease.

Measles is one of the most communicable of the infectious diseases. It is also a very serious disease among Indian and Alaska Native children due to the frequency and severity of its complications, notably pneumonia and encephalitis. By providing an aggressive measles immunization program, the Indian Health Service has been able to reduce the number of cases by two-thirds in the past five years. This progress will be lost as unimmunized infants enter the population at risk.

Trachoma is the leading cause of blindness among Indians. Approximately 30% of school age Indian children had the disease prior to the intensive trachoma control program initiated in FY 1967. The prevalence of the disease has been reduced through this intensive program to 7% in this age group. Past experience has shown that trachoma incidence rapidly increases in the absence of an intensive control program. Progress in controlling this serious eye disease will be lost as field health activities are cut back.

Maternal and child health and family planning

Preventive health programs in maternal and child health have received high priority. Good prenatal care and comprehensive health services for Indian infants are essential if their excessive morbidity and mortality are to be reduced. Evidence is also mounting that adequate prenatal care is related to a lowered incidence of mental retardation.

Success of the Indian Health Service MCH program can be seen in the 25% increase from FY 66 to FY 68 in Indian mothers receiving prenatal care, in the 20% decrease in complications of pregnancy, 10% decrease in prematurity rates (1965–1967) and the decrease in mortality from 50.3 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 1960 to 34.5 in 1967.

Family planning is accepted as an essential to responsible parenthood and to the maximum growth and development of children. The percent of women of child-bearing age who have participated in family planning has increased from 9.2 in FY 66 to 28.5 in FY 68. During the same period births in Indian Health Service hospitals have decreased by 6.5 percent.

These activities are being severely restricted as the loss of IHS staff continues under the present personnel restrictions.

Mental health

The Indian people are not only subjected to most of the stresses of modern living but have the additional burden of cultural conflict. These factors have precipitated a diversity of social and personality conflicts and mental illnesses that result in high rates of suicides and accidents, excessive use of alcohol, family disorganization, child neglect, school dropouts and unemployment. The IHS community mental health programs are designed to combat these mental health problems through comprehensive programs stressing prevention. The success of this approach is shown in the reductions in the number of patients who must be sent away from their home community to a mental institution.

NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS TO STATE MENTAL HOSPITAL

Area service unit	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Percent decrease
Navajo area	11	30	73
Bethel service unit	13	8	38
Kotzebue service unit	22	8	64

While these are small numbers upon which to base precise long-term predictions, it seems reasonable to conclude that continued efforts to improve mental health will result in a decrease of hospitalization in State Mental Hospitals for acute mental illness in those areas where we initiate a mental health program.

As a result of the present personnel restrictions, two areas (Portland and Billings), which were to have the initial phase of a mental health program, have been forced to postpone their mental health program at least until next fiscal year.

In one area (Aberdeen), the psychiatrist has left to join the faculty of Yale Medical School and cannot be replaced. Progress in this Area thus has been halted.

In four areas, needed professional mental health workers have not been hired. The loss of psychologists and support staff diminishes the impact of programs.

Public health nursing

Public Health Nurses are the major providers of home health services to Indian families. Their role is critical in maintaining continuity of care between the health care institutions and the home, in case finding, health teaching in the home, and in the preventive health programs identified above. The projected result of the present personnel restrictions will be a minimum reduction in services provided in homes, schools, and clinics of 7% in FY 69 as compared to FY 68.

This, however, only represents a minimal loss in services to be anticipated as a result of the "freeze." What is more likely to happen is that, as the loss of clinical nursing personnel continues and the demands for care of the sick increase, it will become necessary to draw additional public health nursing personnel away from the preventive program. Care of the sick and injured must have the highest priority and public health nursing personnel will of necessity be utilized to provide care. As this occurs, the reduction in preventive services will be even greater than indicated.

Nutrition

The poor nutritional status of the Indian and Alaskan Native has recently received national publicity and resultant Congressional concern. Nutritional deficiencies in this population have long been recognized by the Indian Health Service which has focused special efforts on the needs of nutritionally vulnerable groups—the infant and preschool child and woman in the childbearing age. IHS nutritionists have been extending their skills through providing consultation and training to all health personnel and education to the Indians themselves.

New projects are now being introduced to support further improvement of the nutritional health of the Indian. These include the food stamp program; an increase in the variety and quantity of USDA commodity foods; nutritional studies; and the involvement of OEO workers, community health representatives and other non-professional aides in nutrition services.

Indian Health Service nutritionists are essential to the implementation and success of these endeavors. Yet one of the 13 nutritionists on duty June 30, 1968 has left the program and another vacancy is anticipated. Rather than increasing nutrition services to the anticipated FY 69 staffing of not less than 20, there will actually be a decrease of two positions. Two areas, including the Navajo reservation where inadequate nutrition is widespread, remain without any professional nutrition staff. Twenty-four percent of the Indian population received needed nutritional services in FY 66 and twenty-three percent in FY 68. Twenty percent are receiving services presently. With a staff increase to 20 nutritionists, 33% of the population would be provided these services.

Unless nutrition services for the Indian and Alaska Native, and consequently their nutritional health, can be strengthened, the morbidity and mortality from malnutrition itself, and from infectious and chronic diseases and other nutrition related health problems will remain high.

EFFECT OF DECREASE IN PREVENTIVE DENTAL SERVICES

The currently anticipated reduction in dental services due to the personnel restrictions include 5,000 topical fluoride (preventive) treatments in addition to 24,000 curative and other services. Topical fluoride treatments would prevent 40% of the tooth decay in the 5,000 individuals treated. This increase in decay will necessitate an increase in restorative care which cannot be provided with a reduction in manpower. These teeth must ultimately be extracted because dental decay caused an irreversible loss of dental tissue and eventual involvement of the pulp with pain and infection following. To maintain an adequate masticatory function and cosmetic effect it then becomes necessary to replace the extracted teeth with artificial appliances.

A Cost-Benefit-Analysis shows that the cost to construct a prosthetic appliance to replace a missing tooth is approximately 13 times greater than to fill it. The end result of loss of teeth is gross disfigurement which can never be completely corrected even by an artificial appliance.

It should be noted that one dental assistant will add approximately 33% to the services provided by a dentist. Two dental assistants will increase his capacity to provide care by more than 60%.

Therefore, a decrease in staff would greatly increase the backlog of need to a point from which the Indian Health Service has progressed several years ago. This fact is further complicated by the increase in the Indian and Alaska native population. It could take many years to return to the current level of dental health.

HEALTH EDUCATION

At present, 56% of the Service Units are provided with full time health education services. About 41% of all patients in all medical care facilities are provided organized educational services designed to maximize effectiveness of treatment, prevent recurrence and to prevent spread of diseases.

About 52% of the population at risk (community) receive organized education and information for motivation to reduce the risk. During FY 69 health education services were anticipated to provide organized programs for 65% of all service units, health education experience for 68% of all patients seen in IHS facilities for selected disease and injury problems, and preventive health education services to 70% of the population at risk from selected disease and injury conditions through organized community-based health education experience.

The personnel restrictions of PL 90–364 will permit no increase in IHS health education services this fiscal year and any loss of health education staff will further increase the disparity between need and services provided. By greatly intensifying efforts with present staff—this will probably hold the line at present level of operations.

The optimum level of operation is to provide full time health education services in all Service Units, provide all patients in all medical care facilities with organized health education to prevent recurrence and spread of disease, and to provide at least 80% of the target population (whole community) with intensified efforts in health education, information and learning experiences for motivation to reduce the risk from diseases and injury.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH WORKLOADS AND STAFFING SUMMARY

Sanitation facilities construction activities

Workloads in the Sanitation Facilities Construction activity are based on the level of appropriation and whether the funds are to construct facilities to serve existing homes or to serve new housing constructed under one of the Federal or tribal housing programs. A comparison of the workload and staffing requirements for construction of the facilities within an 18-month to 2-year period after the appropriation follows:

WORKLOADS AND STAFFING—SANITATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Workloads			Staffing		
	Number of project	Number of homes	Amount	Needs	Authorized	Deficiency
1966	67	6,500	$6.2	68	68	0
1968	125	7,400	10.5	111	106	5
1969	174	10,830	17.1	188	125	63

The table indicates that the SFC activity is 63 positions below the minimum staffing required to implement effectively the authorized construction activity on a timely basis. To accomplish the authorized program other methods (especially contractual) have been sought out and used. These methods are costing substantially more than the cost if our own staff were carrying out the work. These increased costs have resulted in reductions in the original number of homes to be served.

Any reduction in the on-duty staff that will result from personnel leaving the program, coupled with an inability to replace them, will further reduce the number of homes that can be served, or will delay construction beyond the normal 18-month to 2-year time to complete the authorized program. Should either of these developments take place, the Indian and Alaska Native tribes affected will most assuredly react strongly.

Environmental Health Services activities

Workloads in the Environmental Health Services activities are based on minimal services criteria for Indian and Alaska Native families and communities. The criteria include the necessity to provide technical assistance to Indian and Alaska Native families following the installation of basic sanitation facilities. These special continuing services are of utmost significance for the long term operation of installed facilities.

Workloads and staffing for these services are presented in the following table:

WORKLOADS AND STAFFING—ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACTIVITY

Fiscal year	Family and community services rendered	Family and community services required	Authorized [1]	Needed	Defici
1966	51,500	107,000	154	354	200
1968	83,100	130,000	192	380	188
1969	87,000	140,000	207	380	173

[1] Budget positions including prorata.

The staffing deficiencies in the authorized program cause serious delays in the provision of essential technical assistance to Indian and Alaska Native families and to community officials.* An example of these essential services is the provision of technical assistance to Indian families and communities on water supply and waste disposal facilities installed under PL 86-121. To the average urban or rural American, these facilities would generally be considered simple but to the typical Indian who has never had a water faucet, toilet, automatic water system, septic tank, etc., available to him before finds these installations very sophisticated and complex. From 1966 through the completion of facilities authorized in 1969 there will be nearly 25,000 homes receiving these complicated, little understood mechanical facilities. Experience dictates that the failure to provide adequate technical assistance to the recipients of the facilities can result in about 30% of the facilities having one or more inoperative components at any point in time. If timely assistance is not provided, these conditions rapidly lead to a complete breakdown and a subsequent need for major repairs or replacement of the facility. Therefore, any increase in the gap between needed and authorized staffing as a result of the inability to fill vacancies as they occur will further reduce the capability to deliver services to meet the essential needs of these disadvantaged people and contribute to the time required to accomplish the Indian Health Services' goal.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE PERSONNEL CHANGES—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES APPROPRIATION

Month	Gross vacancies	Accessions	Net vacancies
July 1968	238	115	123
August 1968	115	46	69
September 1968	84	52	32
October 1968	86	43	43
November 1968	49	34	15
December 1968	20	17	3
January 1969	61	54	7
Total	653	361	29

S. 1692—INTRODUCTION OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Campaign Finance Act of 1969" which I first submitted 2 years ago to reform and revitalize the present system of financing campaigns for Federal office.

In the many months since this proposal was first brought forward 2 years ago the need for its enactment has been made still more urgent. The cost of being nominated and elected to high political office has always been great, but it is growing so rapidly in both absolute and relative terms that it is beginning to endanger the democratic beliefs upon which our Republic is based. Indeed, many feel the point has already been reached where a candidate must be either rich himself or have rich friends if he is to successfully seek political office, particularly when the costs of campaigning for these offices are often 100 times the salary the winner receives.

Mr. President, the reported campaign finance figures in recent years lend conclusive weight to this disturbing forecast. In 1964, for example, the 107 Republican and Democratic committees operating at the national level reported spending $34.8 million, more than twice the $17.2 million disbursed in 1956 and 39 percent more than the $25 million spent in 1960. And in the 4 years since this enormous increase was noted, spending at the national level doubled once again in 1968 to roughly $70 million. Clearly something must be done to broaden the base of political contributions if these tremendous costs are to be met in a healthy manner.

Perhaps the most shocking fact of all is that high as these figures are, they represent only a small portion of total political spending for these election years. They cover only expenditures by national level committees which filed reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. They do not reflect State and local expenditures on behalf of national party tickets, nor do they contain the amounts spent in senatorial and congressional elections. Furthermore, these figures also exclude expenditures made in connection with primary or nomination campaigns which can be every bit as expensive as a general election. Money spent by nonpartisan groups in support of voter registration drives and other political activities is similarly ignored.

In 1964, the last Presidential year for which complete figures have been compiled and analyzed, it is estimated that the total cost of all political races—National, State, and local was really around $200 million. In 1960, this figure was between $165 and $175 million. In 1956, the total was $155 million, and in 1952, it was $140 million. Thus, campaign expenses are steadily growing at the rate of $5 or $6 million a year.

Mr. President, these high and rapidly multiplying costs of running for public office have created serious dangers to our system of choosing our highest political officials. Because men must often be wealthy to consider seeking public office, many individuals of great ability but limited means never even try or if they do, are often defeated by better financed candidates. The cost to the American public of this lost talent cannot be measured.

Perhaps the most serious problem, however, created by the rising financial demands of public life is the need for nonwealthy candidates to rely upon a few rich individuals and pressure groups for their campaign funds. This reliance is unhealthy, for it reduces the importance of citizen participation in campaigns and limits the political independence of candidates.

Large donations, per se, are not unhealthy. Big contributors, be they individuals or interest groups, often want no more than to donate to the democratic system under which they live. Others are merely using their contributions as a way to insure a full hearing for their views. Unfortunately, however, some expect direct favors for their donations and it is the need to rely on this type of contributor that often severely endangers the integrity of hard-pressed candidates of limited wealth. Even if their principles somehow remain uncompromised, the suspicion of collusion remains in the public mind and respect for our political system is lessened thereby.

---

* Services include all technical and consultative activities such as follow-up surveys of completed facilities, bacteriological sampling, food sanitation surveys, comprehensive surveys of institutions, individual homes and communities, rabies clinics, insect control actions and meetings with families and community leaders to promote good sanitary practices.

Mr. President, this dangerous financial marriage of convenience means that we must move quickly to insure that the massive amounts of money needed by our political parties come from as wide a variety of sources as possible. Only in this way can we insure that our traditional political principles will be successfully maintained. Let us act, therefore, to broaden the contributions base and thus expand the power and influence of the individual citizen over our election system. Let us do more to bring even larger numbers of average citizens into the campaign process. And let us act carefully to frame our efforts in such a way as to assure the right of easy entry into the political arena of new and independent candidates and groups.

The Federal Government has a proper and, indeed, necessary role to play in achieving these goals. The Campaign Finance Act of 1969 is designed to enable the Government to meet this obligation by using Federal tax incentives to stimulate small- and medium-sized donations. Thus, the bill provides a 50-percent credit against Federal income tax payments for gifts up to $20 to candidates for Federal office and to State and National party central committees. An individual giving the maximum $20 would be able to subtract $10 from his final tax payment. A contributor would not be allowed to abuse this benefit by giving a number of $20 contributions to a variety of candidates and committees, receiving a partial tax credit for each such contribution. Only one such credit is permitted in any given year. A husband and wife filing a joint return would be permitted to claim a 50-percent credit for up to $40 in contributions.

In addition, the bill for a tax deduction of contributions up to a maximum of $500 a year per tax return. This measure is designed to complement the small gift tax credit by encouraging medium-sized donations. These donations are needed, of course, but any tax incentive designed to stimulate such gifts must be kept within reasonable limits if we are going to be able to maintain some controls of over the size of campaign contributions. The $500 ceiling proposed in this legislation would help provide that control.

Mr. President, both the partial tax credit and tax deduction incentives are needed. Though a contributor may not take advantage of both during the same year, he may freely choose whichever incentive yields the greatest personal benefit. Thus, by offering such a choice, the two incentive measures proposed here will stimulate a much broader spectrum of the body politic than would exclusive reliance on either one.

Many individuals have asked why the Federal Government should offer a material reward of any kind for an act of citizenship that should be readily forthcoming on a purely voluntary basis. There is much merit in such a question and the view it expresses. That is why, for example, I oppose any form of direct subsidy from the Federal treasury. Such a subsidy would completely break the link between the contributor—in the case, the taxpayer—and the candidate. This link is important, not only for philosophic reasons, but also because it is a useful way to forge a feeling of identity between the giver and the recipient that is likely to lead to still greater campaign involvement at all levels by the giver. And one of the greatest needs in American politics today is more participation in the process by the average citizen. But clearly some type of incentive is needed. Good citizenship should indeed be its own reward, but if we are to broaden the currently low level of general public participation in financing campaigns for Federal office, then obviously some stimulus must be provided. Obviously, the Government has as much reason to provide for the election of unobligated candidates as it has to encourage fundraising through the present system of tax deductions for contributions to health, educational, welfare, and religious programs. If corruption exists, in part it is due to a lack of citizen support for political candidates. The twin benefits proposed in the legislation introduced today would help encourage this needed citizen support and, equally important, it would do it in such a way as to preserve that precious link between contributor and candidate that lies at the heart of our democratic election process.

Mr. President, these incentives are limited by this legislation to candidates seeking Federal office. Much as I sympathize with the grave financial problems of candidates who seek State and local office, the fact is that the tax incentives provided by this bill are derived from the Federal Government and should apply only to Federal candidates if the proper political division of our republic is to be maintained. If local contributions for local candidates are to be encouraged, then it is the State, not the Federal tax laws which should be modified.

At every level political parties have not been as successful in raising funds, in part because they lack the social respectability of the more acceptable charity drives. The reason for this, unfortunately, is that political donations are often viewed with a journalistic eye and politics is considered a tainted profession that is the exclusive province of the very wealthy and the special interests.

The difficulty with this attitude, Mr. President, despite the fact that it is sometimes justified is that it often brings about the very situation it decries. Dynicism and disrespect are not the elements upon which to build a sound democracy. Public affairs should be the concern of every citizen and all should participate fully. Any attitude which hinders or discourages the development of this ideal is to be deplored. If our political system is to function equitably and efficiently, political office must not only be regarded as respectable, but it must also be considered in the highest tradition of public service and good citizenship.

The Campaign Finance Act allows the Federal Government to give official sanction to the practice of political giving by offering tax benefits for contributions. Political donations may thus gain a measure of respectability they now lack. In addition, if these measures were coupled with an educational campaign, they would go far toward eliminating the cynical view of public life which now denies the campaign contributions the acceptability enjoyed by charitable and educational donations.

The cost of general elections is considerable. But, a fact often overlooked is that the influence of money in primaries is even greater. These expenditures, which do not have to be reported under Federal law, can be tremendous—especially in our larger States. For example, it has been estimated that senatorial primary costs in California and New York alone can reach $1 million to $2 million.

As Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University once remarked:

> Money probably has its greatest impact in the choice of public officials in the shadowland of our politics where it is decided who will be a candidate for a party nomination and who will not. The effect of money in politics is probably more certain in determining who the candidates will be than in determining the outcome of the elections.

Thus, Mr. President, if we are to insure that our highest public offices are to be open to all men of ability and not just to men of means, candidates in primaries or for nomination as well as nominees must be permitted to draw upon the broad base of financial support which hopefully will be created by the tax benefits contained in this bill.

In 1952, approximately 3 million persons gave money to some party or candidate. In 1956, the figure was 8 million; in 1960, 10 million; and in 1964, roughly 12 million people made political contributions. The complete 1968 figures are not yet available.

Projections indicate that between 25 and 33 percent of the 57.3 million American households would contribute if the tax incentive were effectively publicized and full cooperation achieved. Thus, between 14 and 19 million contributions total a maximum of $280 to $380 million would be available for campaign use. Of this, the Government in effect—by virtue of the tax incentives—would pay half, or $140 to $190 million.

Mr. President, it is true these estimates are based on current figures and that claims for tax benefits will probably increase as the public becomes more familiar with the program. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that contributions will increase as dramatically as maximum projections would indicate, for many, when polled, who say they will contribute, often do not do so when confronted by a party solicitor.

Thus, the costs to the Federal Government of these incentives will not be prohibitive. Indeed, in terms of the benefits these tax measures will bring, the cost will be quite reasonable.

Mr. President, while these benefits will be considerable, greater public campaign support must not be encouraged without also establishing adequate safeguards against its misuse. We must be careful to provide an incentive for political participation, but not an opportunity for illegal gain.

Tax credits may be easily abused by unscrupulous individuals. Thus, some system of verification must be established if we are to avoid creating virtually unlimited possibilities for corruption. This verification can take various forms and the exact procedure can be determined after a thorough review of the alternatives.

Stimulating contributions is one way of solving the current campaign finance crisis. Others exist, of course, among them being programs designed to actually reduce the costs that are now imposed on candidates, particularly by the publically-regulated broadcast industry. I will deal with some of these alternatives in subsequent legislation.

But still another area of campaign finance activity is in need of reform, Mr. President. I am speaking, of course, about the hopelessly inadequate system we now employ for controlling and reporting political contributions and expenses. Merely to funnel large sums of money into the present political structure through any type of Federal incentive could prove self-defeating unless accompanied by meaningful reforms of our control and reporting system, which is 44 years old and wracked with inconsistencies and unenforceable provisions.

In general, our campaign finance laws are more honored in the breach than in the observance. Indeed, they have become so ineffective that the integrity of our political system itself is often thrown into question. The fact remains that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code simply have failed to control campaign financing.

For example, experience has shown that the present limitation of $3 million imposed by section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code on the annual expenditures of an interstate political committee in no way limits national campaign spending. It merely leads to a proliferation of such committees, for the law imposes no limit on the number of committees which may receive funds up to the $3 million ceiling.

For example, in 1960, there were 70 national level committees in operation. By 1964, this figure had increased to 107.

In addition, Mr. President, committees which operate exclusively within one State are not subject to any Federal reporting regulations at all. Thus, there is a wide discrepancy between reported campaign expenditures and total disbursements.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act limits a candidate for U.S. Senator to $25,000 in campaign expenses and a candidate for U.S. Representative to $5,000. These figures are patently ridiculous and are easily circumvented by establishing a number of ostensibly independent committees to support the candidate's cause.

Similarly, an individual is legally prohibited from giving more than $5,000 to any one committee in a given year. Yet, he may make as many donations as there are committees supporting the candidate.

Mr. President, this bill would establish uniform reporting requirements for all such committees while removing any artificial limits on spending by individuals and committees alike. Past experience would indicate that merely tightening spending limitations would have little or no effect on actual disbursements and would prove to be administratively burdensome.

As the President's Commission on Campaign Costs said in its 1962 report on financing presidential campaigns:

> Full and effective disclosure is the best way to control excessive contributions, on the one hand, and unlimited expenditures on the other. Publicity has a cleansing and policing power far more powerful than that of limitations.

Under the provisions of the bill, every committee which received contributions of $100 or more would be required to report them to a Registry of Election Finance in the General Accounting Office. All committee expenditures of $100 or more would also have to be reported to the Registry. In addition, candidates, whether successful or not, would be required to make full disclosure of their campaign gifts to the Registry.

Mr. President, not only would penalties be levied against anyone who failed to comply with these provisions, but the Registry would be required to issue periodic reports summarizing the information it received, thus making it available for public consumption.

Moreover, while there would be no limit on the amount of money an individual could contribute to a committee or candidate, any person who donated more than $2,500 would have to file a report on his contributions with the registry.

In addition, this bill would prevent the selling of campaign souvenirs at more than $5 each. Thus, campaign magazines could not longer be used as ill-disguised devices for eliciting large amounts of money camouflaged as advertising from groups and corporations which otherwise would not be able to contribute.

Last year the Senate passed an election reform bill designed to meet some of these problems. It did not go as far as I would like and was not as comprehensive as the proposal I submit today, but at least it represented a start. Unfortunately, this bill failed to clear the other body and thus we must start from the beginning again. The combined tax incentive, reporting, and control program offered by the Campaign Finance Act just introduced will, I hope, provide the basis for the thoroughgoing reforms that the system obviously needs and which the American people have a right to demand.

Mr. President, no man, no matter how humble his means, should be denied the opportunity to hold elective office. Today, this is not the case. The exact nature of the reform needed is a matter of great controversy. Nonetheless, through the swirl of pros and cons, one fact is clear. As Erwin Canham of the Christian Science Monitor phrased it:

> Around the neck of every American candidate hangs the terrible burden of raising money. It is a tin cup that weighs a ton.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1692) to provide for an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions, to revise the laws relating to corrupt election practices, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1692

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Campaign Finance Act of 1967".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—TAX TREATMENT OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 101. Tax credit.
Sec. 102. Deduction from gross income.
Sec. 103. Effective date.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

Sec. 201. Definitions.
Sec. 202. Political purchases.
Sec. 203. Repeal.
Sec. 204. Contributions by contractors.
Sec. 205. Conforming amendment.

TITLE III—CORRUPT FEDERAL ELECTION PRACTICES

Sec. 301. Definitions.
Sec. 302. Registry of election finance.
Sec. 303. Organization of political committees.
Sec. 304. Registration and statements of political committees
Sec. 305. Reports by political committees.
Sec. 306. Reports by contributors.
Sec. 307. Reports by candidates.
Sec. 308. Requirements and regulations.
Sec. 309. Duties of the Comptroller General.
Sec. 310. Advisory Board.
Sec. 311. Penalty.
Sec. 312. Saving provision.
Sec. 313. Repeal.

TITLE I—TAX TREATMENT OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

TAX CREDIT

SEC. 101 (a) Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 40 as section 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"SEC. 40. POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULES.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount equal to one-half of the political contributions (as defined in subsection (c)' payment of which is made by the taxpayer within the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed $10 for any taxable year, except that in the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return under section 6013 for the taxable year, the credit shall not exceed an aggregate of $20.

XUM

"(2) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credits), section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), section 37 (relating to retirement income), and section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

"(3) VERIFICATION.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be allowed, with respect to any political contribution, only if such political contribution is verified in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section and section 218—

"(1) POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'political contribution' means a contribution or gift to—

"(A) the national committee of a qualified political party;

"(B) the senatorial or congressional campaign committee of a qualified political party, not to exceed one committee for each House of the Congress, as designated by the national committee of such party;

"(C) the State committee of a qualified political party as designated by the national committee of such party;

"(D) a local committee of a qualified political party as designated by the State political committee of such party; or

"(E) an individual who is a candidate for President or Vice President of the United States or Senator or Representative in or Resident Commissioner to the Congress of the United States in any general, special, or primary election in any State, or in any national, State, or local convention of a qualified political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for such office.

"(2) QUALIFIED POLITICAL PARTY.—The term 'qualified political party' means—

"(A) in the case of contributions made during the taxable year of the taxpayer in which the electors of President and Vice President are chosen, a political party presenting candidates or electors for such offices on the official election ballot of ten or more States, or

"(B) in the case of contributions made during any other taxable year of the taxpayer, a political party which met the qualifications described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph in the last preceding election of a President and Vice President.

"(3) STATE.—The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

"(d) ELECTION TO TAKE DEDUCTION IN LIEU OF CREDIT.—This section shall not apply in the case of any taxpayer who, for the taxable year, elects to take the deduction provided by section 218 (relating to deductions for political contributions). Such election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"(e) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"For disallowance of credits to estates and trusts, see section 642(a)(3)."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 40. Political contributions.
"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 642(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax for estates and trusts) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the credit against tax for political contributions provided by section 40."

DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME

SEC. 102 (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in section 40) payment of which is made by the taxpayer within the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT.—The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $500 for any taxable year.

"(2) VERIFICATION.—The deduction under subsection (a) shall be allowed, with respect to any political contribution, only if such political contribution is verified in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"(c) ELECTION TO TAKE CREDIT IN LIEU OF DEDUCTION.—This section shall not apply in the case of any taxpayer who, for the taxable year, elects to take the credit against tax provided by section 40 (relating to credit against tax for political contributions). Such election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For disallowance of deduction to estates and trusts, see section 642(i)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 218. Political contributions.
"Sec. 219. Cross references."

(c) Section 642 for the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for credits and deductions for estates and trusts) is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j), and by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"(i) POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—An estate or trust shall not allowed the deduction for political contributions provided by section 218."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 103. The amendments made by this title shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 591. Definitions

"When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, and 610 of this title—

"(a) The term 'election' means (1) a primary or run-off primary election, or a convention, or a caucus of a political party, held to nominate a candidate, and (2) a general or special election.

"(b) The term 'candidate' means—

"(1) an individual who has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify him for nomination for election, or for election, to the office of Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, or, if the State has no such law, an individual who has received contributions or made expenditures, or who has knowledge that any other person has received contributions or made expenditures, with a view to bringing about such individual's nomination for election, or election, to such office; or

"(2) an individual who has received contributions or made expenditures, or who has knowledge that any other person has received contributions or made expenditures, with a view to bringing about such individual's nomination for election, or election, to the office of President or Vice President.

"(c) The term 'political committee' includes any national, senatorial, congressional, State, or local committee, association, or organization or any branch or subsidiary of such a committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the result of an election of a candidate or candidates, and which receives contributions or makes expenditures in the aggregate of $100 or more.

"(d) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, or any transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make a contribution, whether or not legally enforcible and includes a donation of services of a person employed by the donor if the value of such services exceeds $100.

"(e) The term 'qualified contributor' means any person other than a person who is prohibited by any statute of the United States from making contributions.

"(f) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make an expenditure, whether or not legally enforcible.

"(g) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any organization or group of such persons.

"(h) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia."

POLITICAL PURCHASES

SEC. 202. Section 608 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 608. Limitations on political purchases

"(a) Whoever, being a candidate, political committee, or national political committee, sells to anyone other than a candidate, political committee, national political committee, or qualified contributor, any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or any services, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, other than a candidate, political committee, national political committee, or qualified contributor, buys from a candidate, political committee, or national political committee any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or any services, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall not interfere with the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any candidate.

"(d) In all cases of violations of this section by a partnership, committee, association, corporation, or other organization or group of persons, the officers, directors, or managing heads thereof who knowingly and willfully participate in such violation shall be punished as herein provided."

REPEAL

SEC. 203. Section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code is repealed.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY CONTRACTORS

SEC. 204. Section 611 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 611. Contributions by corporations, firms, or individuals contracting with the United States

"Whoever, including a corporation, enters into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the perform-

XUM

ance of such contract or payment for such material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, during the period of negotiation for, or performance under such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly makes any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits any such contribution from any such person, for any such purpose during any such period—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

CONFORMING AMENDMENT

SEC. 205. So much of the sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18 of the United States Code as relates to sections 609 and 611 is amended to read:

"609. Repealed.
"611. Contributions by corporations, firms, or individuals contracting with the United States."

TITLE III—CORRUPT FEDERAL ELECTION PRACTICES

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. As used in this title—

(a) The term "election" means (1) a primary or runoff primary election, or a convention, or a caucus of a political party, held to nominate a candidate, and (2) a general or special election.

(b) The term "candidate" means—

(1) an individual who has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify him for nomination for election, or for election, to the office of Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, or, if the State has no such law, an individual who has received contributions or made expenditures, or who has knowledge that any other person has received contributions or made expenditures, with a view to bringing about such individual's nomination for election, or election, to such office; or

(2) an individual who has received contributions or made expenditures, or who has knowledge that any other person has received contributions or made expenditures, with a view to bringing about such individual's nomination for election, or election, to the office of President or Vice President.

(c) The term "political committee" includes any National, State, senatorial, congressional, or local committee, association, or organization or any branch or subsidiary of such a committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the result of an election of a candidate or candidates, and which receives contributions or makes expenditures in the aggregate of $100 or more.

(d) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, or any transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make a contribution, whether or not legally enforcible and includes a donation of services of a person employed by the donor if the value of such services exceeds $100.

(e) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make an expenditure, whether or not legally enforcible.

(f) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any organization or group of such persons.

(g) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

REGISTRY OF ELECTION FINANCE

SEC. 302. (a) There is created in the General Accounting Office a Registry of Election Finance, hereafter referred to as the "Registry."

(b) The Registry shall be headed by a Registrar of Election Finance, hereafter referred to as the "Registrar", who shall be appointed by the Comptroller General of the United States without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and may be removed by him at will.

(c) The Registrar shall perform such duties as may be delegated or assigned to him by regulations or orders of the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General may designate an employee of the General Accounting Office to act as Registrar during the absence or incapacity of, or during a vacancy in the office of the Registrar.

(d) All officers and employees of the General Accounting Office serving in the Registry other than the Registrar, shall be appointed under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and shall be compensated in conformity with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(e) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(78) Registrar of Election, Finance, General Accounting Office."

ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 303. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution and no expenditure for the purpose of influencing a nomination or an election shall be accepted or made by or on behalf of a political committee at a time when there is a vacancy in the office of chairman or treasurer thereof. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer, or their designated agents.

(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the amount, the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received.

(c) All funds of a political committee shall be kept separate from other funds.

(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) the name and address of every person making any contribution, and the date and amount thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any expenditure is made, and the date and amount thereof.

(e) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure made by or on behalf of a political committee of $100 or more in amount and for any such expenditure in a less amount, if the aggregate of expenditures to the same person in any year exceeds $100. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for periods of time to be determined by the Comptroller General in accordance with published regulations.

REGISTRATION AND STATEMENTS OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 304. (a) Each political committee which anticipates receiving contributions or making expenditures in the aggregate of $100 or more in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the nomination or election of a candidate or candidates shall, within ten days after its organization, file with the Registry a statement of organization. Each such political committee in existence at the date of enactment hereof shall file a statement of organization with the Registry at such time as prescribed by the Comptroller General.

(b) The statement or organization shall include—

(1) the name and address of the political committee;

(2) the names, addresses, and relationships of affiliated or connected organizations;

(3) the area, scope, or jurisdiction of the political committee;

(4) the name, address, and position of the custodian of books and accounts;

(5) the name, address, and position of other principal officers, including officers and members of the finance committee, if any;

(6) the name, office sought, and party affiliation of each candidate whom the political committee is supporting; or, if the political committee is supporting the entire ticket of any party, the name of the party;

(7) a statement whether the organization is a continuing one;

(8) what disposition of residual funds will be made in the event of dissolution;

(9) a listing of all banks, safety deposit boxes, or other repositories used;

(10) a statement whether the political committee is required by law to file reports with State or local officer, and if so, the names, addresses, and positions of such persons; and

(11) such other information as shall be required by the Comptroller General by published regulation.

(c) Any change in information previously submitted in a statement of organization shall be reported to the Registry within a ten-day period following the change.

(d) Any political committee which, after having filed one or more statements of organization, disbands or determines it will no longer receive contributions or make expenditures shall so notify the Registry.

REPORTS BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 305. (a) At the times specified below, the treasurer of a political committee shall file with the Registry, on forms prescribed by the Comptroller General, a report containing the information required by subsection (b):

(1) Between the 10th and 20th days of June and September in each year;

(2) On the fifteenth day and on the fifth day, next preceding the date on which is held an election with respect to which such political committee has made expenditures; and

(3) On the 1st day of January of each year. Such statements shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement during such year, only the amount need be carried forward. The statement filed on the 1st day of January shall cover the preceding calendar year. Where no contributions or expenditures have been accepted or made within a calendar year, the treasurer of a political committee need not file a statement with respect to such year.

(b) Each report under this section shall disclose, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

(2) the name and address of each person who has made one or more contributions to

XUM

or for such committee (including the purchase of tickets for events such as dinners, luncheons, rallies, and similar fundraising events), in the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contributions;

(3) the total sum of individual contributions (as defined in section 301(d)) made to or for such committee during the reporting period and not reported under paragraph (2);

(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the reporting committee received, or to which that committee made, any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

(5) each loan to or from any person, together with the names and addresses of the lender and endorsers, if any, and the date and amount of such loan;

(6) the total amount of proceeds from (A) the sale of tickets to each dinner, luncheon, rally, and other fundraising event; (B) mass collections made at each such event; and (C) sales of items such as campaign pins, buttons, hats, ties, literature, and similar materials;

(7) each contribution, rebate, refund, or other receipt not otherwise listed under paragraphs (2) through (6);

(8) the total sum of all receipts by or for such committee during the reporting period;

(9) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure or expenditures have been made by such committee within the calendar year in the aggregate amount or value of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of each such expenditure;

(10) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses of $100 or more has been made, and which is not otherwise reported, including the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(11) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year; and

(12) such other information as shall be required by the Comptroller General by published regulation.

(c) No contribution or expenditure need be reported under this section which is made solely for the purpose of influencing the election of a person or persons seeking State or local office and from which no benefit will accrue to any candidate as herein defined.

(d) Debts or unpaid bills in the single amount or value of $100 or more which are incurred during a campaign for election, by or on behalf of the candidate, and which remain unpaid at the end of forty-five days following the date of the election, shall be listed separately on the first postelection report and shall be kept current on all subsequent reports until the debt is retired. There shall also be listed the total amount of debts and unpaid bills of less than $100.

(e) A national, senatorial, congressional, State, or county committee of a national political party, of which there shall not be designated more than one for each party for each such political unit, need not file separate reports for candidates supported, but may file the information required by this section at one time with respect to its entire activities for the period covered by the report.

REPORTS BY CONTRIBUTORS

SEC. 306. Every person (other than a political committee) who, singly or together with the members of his immediate family, makes contributions to a political committee, or makes other contributions or expenditures for the purpose of influencing the nomination or election of a candidate, aggregating in all more than $2,500 within a calendar year, shall file with the Registry, at such times and in such form as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General, a report of such contributions and expenditures. For the purposes of this section, the term "members of his immediate family" includes his spouse and a child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the candidate and any of their spouses.

REPORTS BY CANDIDATES

SEC. 307. (a) Every candidate, during the period he receives or expends funds on behalf of his candidacy, shall file with the Registry, on a form to be prescribed by the Comptroller General, reports of his receipts and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing his election. Such reports shall be filed on the same date as are specified for political committees to file. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his activities as a candidate, or for the purpose of influencing his election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305, and shall include amounts expended from his own funds and amounts received or expended by his immediate family (as defined in section 306).

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

REQUIREMENTS AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 308. (a) A report or statement required by this title to be filed by a treasurer of a political committee, by a candidate, or by any other person, shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths.

(b) A copy of a report or statement shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of time to be designated by the Comptroller General in a published regulation.

(c) The Comptroller General shall prescribe and publish such regulations as he shall determine to be required to carry into effect the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 309. It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General—

(1) to develop prescribed forms for the making of the reports and statements required by this title;

(2) to prepare and publish a manual setting forth recommended uniform methods of bookkeeping and reporting for use by persons required to make reports and statements required by this title;

(3) to develop a filing, coding, and cross-indexing system consonant with the purposes by this title;

(4) to make the reports and statements filed with him available for public inspection and copying during regular office hours, and to make copying facilities available;

(5) to preserve such reports and statements for a period of ten years from date of receipt;

(6) to prepare and publish, within ten working days after the 20th day of June and September, and after the 1st of January, of each year, and within three calendar days after the due dates of the preelection reports, summaries of the respective reports received; such summaries shall contain, in addition to such other information as the Comptroller General may determine, compilations disclosing the total receipts and expenditures appearing in each report by categories of amounts as he shall determine, and shall also include the name and address, and amount of contribution of each person listed alphabetically, shown to have contributed the sum of $100 or more; and such summaries shall be grouped according to candidates and parties;

(7) to prepare and publish an annual report including compilations of (A) total reported contributions and expenditures for all candidates, political committees, and other persons during the year; (B) total amounts expended according to such categories as the Comptroller General shall determine and broken down into candidate, party, and nonparty expenditures; (C) total amounts contributed according to such categories of amounts as the Comptroller General shall determine; and (D) aggregate amounts contributed by any contributor shown to have contributed the sum of $100 or more during any calendar year;

(8) to prepare and publish from time to time special reports comparing the various totals and categories of contributions and expenditures made with respect to preceding elections;

(9) to prepare and publish such other reports as he may deem appropriate;

(10) to assure wide dissemination of summaries and reports;

(11) to make from time to time audits and field investigations with respect to reports and statements filed under the provisions of this title, and with respect to alleged failures to file any report or statement required under the provisions of this title;

(12) to report suspected violations of law to the appropriate law enforcement authorities; and

(13) to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 310. (a) There is hereby established a bipartisan advisory board to be known as the Advisory Board of the Registry of Election Finance, hereafter referred to as the "Board". The Board shall be composed of twelve members at least half of whom shall not be in the employ of the United States. The President and the Comptroller General shall each nominate two members; the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives shall each nominate two members, one of whom shall be a Member of Congress. The Comptroller General shall receive such nominations and shall appoint the members of the Board. The Board shall select a Chairman from among its members. A member of the Board shall serve for a term of two years and may serve for more than one term. If for any reason a member of the Board shall fail to serve a complete term, his successor shall be nominated by the official who nominated such member and the successor shall be appointed by the Comptroller General to serve the unexpired term.

(b) The Board herein established shall be constituted not later than ninety days following the appointment of the Registrar.

(c) The Board shall advise and make recommendations to the Comptroller General and to the Congress with respect to (1) the means for effectively publicizing the information submitted in the reports and statements required by this title, (2) any need for legislation, and (3) such other matters as the Comptroller General or the Board may determine.

(d) Members of the Board, while attending meetings or conferences of the Board or otherwise serving at the request of the Comptroller General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by him but not exceeding $75 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

PENALTY

SEC. 311. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), whoever violates any provision of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

XUM

(b) Whoever willfully violates any provision of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 312. This title shall not be construed to annul the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless directly inconsistent with the provisions of this part, or to exempt any candidate from complying with such State laws.

REPEAL

SEC. 313. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 (2 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is repealed.

S. 1693—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAX SHARING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the 89th and 90th Congresses close to 200 pieces of legislation were introduced to provide a system of Federal-State tax sharing.

In January 1969 President Nixon's task force on urban affairs recommended a system of tax sharing, as did the National Commission on Urban Problems, appointed in 1967 by President Johnson and chaired by former Senator Douglas.

Tax sharing between the Federal and State governments is clearly an important issue today and will become more important in the future.

Throughout the United States, Democratic and Republican legislators and leaders are vigorously supporting plans to solve State and local fiscal problems by sharing Federal revenues.

A multiplicity of proposals already have been made, and many more are on the way. A monumental partisan contest is underway to see which political party gets the credit for helping the States and cities the most.

There are serious reasons for this national phenomenon. The needs of State and local governments are growing faster than their revenues. At the same time, the field of the Federal income tax is growing more rapidly.

It would be unrealistic to believe that a tax sharing bill will be enacted during the 91st Congress. Federal-State tax sharing is incredibly complicated and it would be irresponsible for the Congress to rush a plan through without exhaustive consideration. The enormous expenditures for the Vietnam war have not been stopped and the end is not in sight. We are told that the administration will favor retention of the tax surcharge beyond June 30 to maintain the Nation's fiscal balance, while it undertakes an open-ended spending commitment to a new missile program. This, then, is obviously not the year in which a new, innovative tax sharing plan will become law.

Our responsibility today is to determine what we can do in 1969 to begin deliberations so that a tax sharing plan can be enacted in the near future, when the current fiscal crisis has abated.

I believe the answer is to create a National Commission on Tax Sharing to work out the details of such a plan and report back to Congress in 1971.

THE STATES' PROBLEM

When I was Governor of Wisconsin from 1959 to 1963, I was constantly aware of the fact that State and local governments have increasing difficulty in raising necessary revenues.

I recognize the need for some kind of sharing of tax dollars between the huge and powerful Federal Government, with its growing revenue sources, and the State units of government.

It is almost impossible in many instances for the legislatures, city councils, and county boards to raise taxes to pay for vital State services, especially in the fields of education, health, and welfare.

Too often, Governors, State legislatures, mayors, and city councils, facing the choice of a tax increase or a cut in vital programs, must sadly choose the latter. Local and State governments sometimes are unable to discharge their responsibilities.

What is the answer to this problem? I do not believe any one person knows precisely—nor does any one group of economists, nor any one political party, nor does any group of Federal or State officials.

The riddle of the financing of State and local governments has no simple answer.

But this does not mean that we should not look at the problem of revenue sharing. It convinces me, however, that no plan we will see or hear about in the opening months of this Congress will be the ultimate plan we will want to approve.

BASIC CONCEPTS OF TAX SHARING

Generally, all proponents of revenue sharing favor some kind of plan which returns money to the States after it has been collected by the Federal Government.

Block grants were first used in 1836 during the Jackson administration and represented even then a radical departure from the conventional method of disbursing Federal aid. The disbursement of $28 million to the States under the terms of the Surplus Distributions Act of 1836 represents the only instance in U.S. history when Federal funds have been granted to the States without conditions governing the use of the funds.

There are a few instances now where some Federal funds are returned directly to a few States for education and road aids. These are derived to begin with from those same States in the form of sale of public lands and the sharing of grazing receipts.

Since 1836, therefore, this country has made no move to enact any other method of tax sharing as we are now defining the term.

In 1960, Walter Heller, then chairman of the department of economics of the University of Minnesota, proposed that rising Federal revenues be distributed to State and local governments with little or no strings attached.

This recommendation did not get serious attention until the spring of 1964, but other pressing matters of fiscal nature prevented this proposal from receiving congressional consideration. The tax reduction bill of that year was one important roadblock, and also because the Federal budget had been running chronic deficits since 1960. Heller based his plan on the supposition that the budget would have surpluses for the next 2 years and would, therefore, make the proposal possible.

The Democratic platform of 1964 also stated that its candidates would further "development of fiscal policies which could provide revenue sources to hard-pressed State and local governments to assist them with their responsibilities."

The Republican candidate for President in 1964 also embraced this idea by recommending that a portion of Federal income taxes be returned to the States and that these governments be given a larger share of revenues derived from inheritance taxes.

In a statement issued on October 28, 1964, President Johnson declared the intention of the administration to carry out the pledge of the Democratic Party. He proposed that the Federal Government should make available to State and local governments "some part of our great and growing Federal tax revenues—over and above existing aids."

President Johnson then appointed a task force composed of individuals from government and business and headed by the distinguished Joseph A. Pechman, director of economics at Brookings Institution, to study the possibility of setting aside a fixed percentage of Federal revenues each year in a trust fund for distribution to State and local governments.

TWO BASIC CONSIDERATIONS ARE INVOLVED

First, when this plan was suggested in 1964, the rapid growth of the gross national product and the closing down of military bases prompted thoughts of budgetary surplus by the end of fiscal year 1966. It was feared that a surplus before full employment of manpower and resources had been achieved would cause "fiscal drag." This in turn would retard the then current high rate of business expansion.

The second factor, and still the most important one, is that State and local governments are badly in need of new revenue sources for their ever-growing needs in schools, colleges, health services, and welfare problems.

State and local expenditures are still growing at an expanded rate. During the 10-year period from 1957–67 State and local governmental expenditures rose from $47.6 to $106.7 billion; a rise of $59.1 billion. Over 54 percent of this increase was expended on programs of health, education, and welfare. State and local revenues rose from $38.2 to $91.6 billion during the same period; a rise of $53.4 billion. While Federal tax revenues increased during that period by 65 percent, State and local tax revenues rose by 113 percent. Property tax increases equaled 41 percent of the combined State and local increases and almost all of the local increases. This places a tremendous burden on the moderate income property owner.

Mr. Pechman, of the Brookings Institute, forecasts that State and local expenditures will rise at a current level of 7 percent a year and will total $103 billion in 1970. At the same time revenues will rise according to the increase of the GNP at a rate of 5 percent a year, and will only total $88 billion in 1970, a deficit of $15 billion.

XUM

Most States have tax systems which place heavy emphasis on sales taxes, fees, and property taxes rather than progressive income taxes. Naturally, local governments find it difficult to support rising costs of necessary programs.

Nearly one-third of State and local revenue is derived from real property taxes. Almost one-half is raised through sales taxes and fees. Income taxes provide only a little more than 7 percent of the total.

Therefore, even if a difference between revenues and expenditures of some $20 to $30 billion a year could be raised from this existing State and local revenue system, the largest amount of the money would have to be derived from the highly regressive sales taxes and property taxes. Besides the fact that this penalizes the obvious group of poor and older citizens, this would also discourage homeownership and accelerate the trend of deterioration of property in our already troubled cities.

Nearly 80 percent of this money will be spent for health, education, and welfare—areas in which States not only have maintained but should maintain the principal responsibility.

Where is this money going to come from? These expenses can hardly be deferred.

EXAMPLE OF STATE TAXATION SYSTEM

Since I am most familiar with my own State of Wisconsin, let me bring the facts closer to home by citing some examples from figures compiled by the nonpartisan Wisconsin Taxpayers' Alliance. These figures will be updated by the alliance within the next few days, and I will place them in the Record then. This group states that Wisconin State and local tax collections in the last decade have grown much faster than the Federal collections—in 1954 State and local collections equaled 30 percent of all taxes collected. By 1964 they had grown to 39 percent of all taxes collected. This appears to be the average for other States as well.

Total States and local taxes raised in Wisconsin increased from $265 million in 1944 to $1,246 million in 1964. This represents an increase of 500 percent. The Federal tax collections for the same period increased from $822 million to $1,959 million or slightly more than twice.

Meanwhile, the percentage of money expended by the State of Wisconsin on education for the 5-year period ending 1964 rose from 22 to 26 percent of all money spent. Every 2 years the State must provide for approximately 100,000 more pupils than in the previous 2 years. Each biennium must provide for college classroom space equal to the entire pre-World War II enrollment at the University of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin, of necessity, had to resort to almost every possibility in order to raise the necessary revenues; the broadly based and progressive income tax, corporate and personal, a 3-percent sales tax, high property taxes in local communities, borrowing by local units to finance capital expenditures, gasoline taxes, sportsmen's licenses, tuition, and license fees.

But after all these taxes are raised, the State only keeps about 11 percent with which to finance its operations. Eighty-three percent of the taxes collected by the State—about $1 billion total collected—were spent by the local units of government. Six percent went into the highway fund by law, leaving the State to spend the final 11 percent for all the functions of the State and government.

UTILIZATION OF REVENUES

If Federal tax revenues continue to grow as expected, these courses of action would be open to the Congress:

First. Expansion of the Federal budget to use the full increase in revenue;

Second. Tax reduction;

Third. Retirement of national debt;

Fourth. Expansion of Federal spending through grants-in-aid for specific programs. This latter method has been used more and more in increasing amounts.

In 1934, 18 grant-in-aid programs were in existence to send money back to State and local governments for specific purposes. By 1964, there were 68 programs for State and local governments plus 60 more programs for disbursements of funds to individuals and institutions. As of last year some 140—depending on how you count them—programs existed in the grant-in-aid field.

In terms of dollars expended, $126 million was spent for Federal grants-in-aid in 1934 and this had risen to $10,060 million in 1964—a rise of eightyfold. Average expenditure per program for Federal grants-in-aid increased in the same period of time from $7 to $148 million. In 1965 the figure was $10.9 billion. By 1966, according to the Bureau of the Budget, $13.3 billion was being spent through grants-in-aid programs. I expect to have more figures within the next few days.

Naturally, along with the increase in the programs more and more strings have been attached and a growth in the Federal bureaucracy has been the direct result. This may or may not have resulted in some weakening of the State and local governments.

EFFICIENCY OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

State governments are vitally important to our system of government today in the late 1960's. Their function has evolved into one of greater responsibility than ever before, especially in the fields of education, hospitalization of the sick and mentally incapacitated, law enforcement, the control of traffic and safety, the system of highways, regulation of utilities, insurance, and conservation of our natural resources.

We should lend more emphasis, not less, to the role of the State governments. They should be made stronger, not weaker. The State unit is the most efficient unit and the most rational form of a government dealing with regional problems of any other in existence today. They should be given increasing responsibilities and nurtured so they grow in an orderly and logical fashion.

Nevertheless, State governments have many difficulties. They must modernize and reorganize their outmoded way of administering their responsibilities. In many cases they are still in the horse-and-buggy stage, still trying to serve an industrial society with a system that was designed to function in an agrarian economy.

The modern State government must develop, therefore, intensive plans and guidelines which will chart their future course through the expansion of our private enterprise economy, bearing in mind, that the local governments must be made a partner in this development.

State governments should evaluate their present situation and develop compresentive plans, projecting needs for the next half century in State facilities, recreation, land use, the State's economy, intercity and mass transportation, population growth and migration, and recreation resources and needs.

To do these things, both in the planning and in the implementation stages, States need money. And that is what all of these tax-sharing plans are designed to do—to get back to the State and local units of government, money which will enable them to do all of these things and more.

RECENT PROPOSALS FOR TAX SHARING

The newspapers have been filled with ideas coming from all sides, many of them with great merit, at first glance.

The best known, of course, is the Heller-Pechman plan, which basically is a return of 2 percent of the Federal income tax base, returned to the States on a per capita basis. In 1966, this would have involved the sum of $5.6 billion based on total taxable income returned with no strings attached. I recently read that Mr. Pechman said that there was no reason why the States should not be compelled to turn over a fixed portion of such income to the cities. I believe Mr. Heller on the other hand, feels that reapportionment of the State legislatures in time would mitigate the possible problems of rural legislatures refusing to share funds with urban centers.

Henry S. Reuss, Representative from Wisconsin, has also embraced the idea of revenue sharing with his own plan, but he gets a good deal more specific and does attach a few strings. He would like to provide $15 billion over a 3-year period to States which would take steps to modernize State and local governments. He would also like to see regional coordinating committees for each of four regions set up. His plan, as I understand it, would allocate money on the basis of population with no State receiving less than $500,000. The formula also apportions funds according to total population per State with up to 20 percent of the total set aside for supplements to States with low per capita income, or a high incidence of poverty, dependency, or urbanization.

The Senator from New York (Mr. Javits) also introduced a plan some time ago in this House, which was designed to establish in the Federal Treasury an amount equal to 1 percent per year of all total individual income taxes. In 1965 this would have amounted to $2.65 billion. Roughly, this was to be shared by means of a formula which tied the total population of the State to its revenue-raising efforts in comparison to the rest of the States. About 85 to 90 percent of the total fund would be divided up in that manner. In addition, about 10 to 15 percent of the total fund would be distributed in an income redistribution formula. Simply stated, the State which is lowest on the list of the 50 in terms of per capita national average income would receive more than the State next higher on the list and so on, until the more affluent States would receive none. Here again a string was attached, however, because all money returned would have to be spent for health, education, or welfare programs, State payments in lieu of property taxes, debt service, or disaster relief.

The plan which the Secretary of Defense, former Congressman Laird of Wisconsin, suggested when in the House was that of merely returning a flat percentage of Federal taxes collected from each State to that State with no strings attached. He cited precedence in the Wisconsin plan for tax sharing. In Wisconsin all income taxes collected by the State are shared to the extent that 50 percent goes back to the community from which it was collected, 10 percent to the county, and 40 percent is retained by the State. Former Representative Laird does suggest that some kind of equalization formula applied throughout the country would insure that poorer States would receive a greater percentage of the funds they collect because of their greater need for assistance.

In addition, this plan is designed to partially supplant rather than to supplement some Federal grants-in-aid programs.

Senator GOODELL, of New York, introduced tax-sharing legislation while a Member of the House of Representatives, and has introduced such legislation this year in the Senate. His plan would return a fixed percentage of Federal revenues to the States. In fiscal years 1970 and 1971, it would be 3 percent, in fiscal year 1972, 4 percent, and 5 percent in fiscal year 1973. In the first year of operation, it is estimated that $2.42 billion would be made available for the States.

ARGUMENTS FOR THESE PROPOSALS

In an expanding economy based on 1965 tax rates Federal revenues increased on the average by about $6 billion per year. Economists fear that additional taxes would siphon off too much money from the private sector of the economy. A Federal surplus would thus result before full employment of manpower and resources is achieved. Such a surplus has the effect of retarding economic growth, and in time, the forces of recession set in. It is believed that enactment of a sharing proposal would avert this so-called fiscal drag which such surpluses may exert upon the national economy. Naturally, 1969–70 expenditures for defense and Vietnam will preclude this possibility.

Tax reduction measures would also counteract the restrictive effects a budget-surplus would produce. Tax reduction bills usually take too long to get through Congress, however, and recessions can take effect faster than legislation. By making excess revenues available to State and local governments automatically, action would get underway immediately to offset the the contractive effect of such surplus.

It is apparent that the largest area of unmet needs lies in the services provided by State and local governments.

State and local governments have been increasing their outlays much more rapidly than the Federal Government during the past several years in attempts to meet mounting obligations.

Representative HENRY REUSS suggests that State and local governments may not use these Federal funds wisely if they are granted, nor will they increase their own taxes and expenditures for necessary programs. Past experience, I feel, proves that this would not be the case. A large proportion of total State and local outlays over the past years have been used for educational, health, and welfare purposes—an indication that they are cognizant of the needs of their people in these areas and are attempting to meet them.

The argument is made that grants made to State and local governments should be on a "no strings attached" basis, that these groups should be allowed to operate without tight supervision and restrictions—free from Federal control. The argument continues that the spread of "growing bureaucracy" will be halted. State and local governments will then be in a stronger financial position, and a better fiscal balance can be achieved between all three levels of government.

Other arguments for the scheme encompass the idea that unconditional grants will free Federal Government from much redtape and overhead currently necessitated under Federal programs. Present aid programs are becoming so numerous, diverse, and complex that it is difficult for the less sophisticated, governmental bodies to take advantage of them. It has been pointed out that more Federal listings appear in some phone books than do State listings.

During fiscal year 1963 the Treasury Department itemized some 66 programs of direct aid to State and local governments. These do not include numerous other programs of assistance disbursed directly to individuals and institutions within the States. During the recent past, direct payments to State and local governments have almost tripled—from $3.8 billion in fiscal year 1956, to $10.9 billion in fiscal year 1965. In 1965 alone, Congress added some 10 to 30 programs, depending upon how one considers a separate program. Despite the talk of "creative federalism" and "local responsibility" every one of those dollars has a string attached—and sometimes even hawsers and cables.

Making additional revenues available, it is argued, would enable Federal officials to devote more time and energy to more pressing problems of national defense, international relations, and so forth. Loosening restrictive Federal controls would relieve Congress of overseeing the programs. The Congress would also be freed from constant pressuring of lobby groups seeking special projects or benefits for their particular districts.

And, there are arguments which say that unconditional grants will be a boon to low-income cities and States. Stringent matching requirements currently imposed on numerous programs make it difficult for some units to take advantage of some grants-in-aid, or if they do, some of their own programs must suffer. If as some spokesmen recommend, Federal revenues are shared on the basis of population, rather than on the amount of Federal taxes paid, poorer States might be the principal beneficiaries.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSALS

In 1965, the plan Heller proposed presumed continued prosperity and Federal budget surpluses. Even though we still do have prosperity, much of which is based on a war economy, the surplus is nowhere in sight right now. Between 1961 and 1965 there was a full expansion of economic activity but a full utilization of industrial capacity and full employment was not attained. Budget surpluses have always been the exception rather than the rule in the past 30 years—only seven times as a matter of fact. Thus, with budget surplus an uncertainty the local government would have a difficult time in trying to determine their projected Federal share. Such uncertainties would certainly preclude them from projecting intelligent budgets. This would be an unfair hardship. And once they receive a tax share, it would be difficult or impossible to cut back or cut out the program in years of budget deficit. It would not be fair to make these distributions, therefore, based on surplusage. Indeed Congress can control its own deficits and surpluses based on the amount of spending it wants to engage in. Thus, the Heller argument for sharing, based on the Federal budget surplus, poses some serious problems.

Critics of tax sharing fear that without Federal supervision and control, the local governments will not use the funds properly. These local units may be tempted to reduce their own taxes and curtail vital programs. This has been evidenced in some sections of the country which are gearing up their economy through low local taxes, designed to attract industry and meanwhile waiting for Federal programs to help them with basic programs such as sewer and water, industrial parks, and the like.

There is apprehension that rural dominated legislatures will make allocations of funds which will not be in the best interest of the majority of the citizens. County leaders are fearful that money may never trickle down to the local level from the State level. Similarly, civil rights leaders fear that funds will be spent to support segregated schools, housing, and other facilities. Failure of the Federal Government to control the actual distribution of funds below the State level undoubtedly will cause bitter controversy among State, county, and city leaders as to just how these funds will be spent.

It is also possible that local level governments will be even more dependent upon Washington instead of becoming stronger and more self-reliant. It is also feared that Federal power will be enlarged rather than diminished by giving further aid to these governing bodies.

Rather than doling out public funds, some feel that any surplus funds should be used to reduce the national debt.

There is also strong opinion by other high Federal officials that the funds can be better spent on Federal programs such as mass transit, cancer research, welfare programs, and so forth, and that these programs should not be sacrificed for the sake of aiding State and local governments.

The main controversy, in any case, will revolve around just how much Federal control and supervision shall be exercised over the disbursement of these funds.

TAX SHARING RAISES MANY QUESTIONS

Why not simply cut taxes and let the State and local governments raise their own taxes as necessary to produce the same amount of new revenue?

Even though most plans do not advocate that Federal string, how can we be sure that asking for modernization is not really a string after all—or that the greater share going to less prosperous States is not a qualification at the outset?

Once such a program is begun, how can it ever be changed? Since each Federal legislator is affected, will this not become a giant "boondoggle" and "pork barrel"? Would not it become as unworkable and as ungainly as some of the giant grant-in-aid programs we now have?

How can we say that the Federal programs which may suffer cuts as the result of the return of money to the States are less valuable than those which the States will spend money on?

And how will the States ever know how much is going to be allocated to them during each succeeding year of Congress? How will they ever know how to budget wisely?

Is it not possible that putting States on the Federal payroll instead of letting them raise their own revenues for their own needs might weaken States even further rather than strengthening them and might this not shift even more power to Washington?

Some officials admit to a fear of tax sharing on other grounds. Many existing Federal programs are open end, that is, the cost to the U.S. Government is limited only by the ability and the willingness of the States to come up with matching funds. What would happen if the States used their tax-sharing money to match Federal grants under old programs? At least one Federal official believes that the States could bleed the Federal Treasury with its own money.

CONGRESS NOT THE PLACE TO DRAFT THE BEST PLAN

The complexities involved in tax sharing are so great, and the disparities in the plans already offered are so broad, that it is obvious that we need a thorough examination of this subject by a blue-ribbon commission. The Congress and its own committees will still have to give a thorough review of the commission's recommendations, but at least we will have the benefit of extensive considerations and we will have a broadly acceptable proposal to use as a starting point for congressional action.

I happen to disagree with those people who suggest that we should automatically plow back 1, 2, or 5 percent of the personal income taxes to the States, with or without strings, by whatever formula they have devised thus far. This is too great a departure from the usual method of expenditure to start on a program of this sort quickly. All the ramifications should be studied in a year-long recital of fact and opinion. With the state of our economy now being controlled to a great extent by the Vietnam war, this is no time to begin this program. We can afford to buy the time now.

Furthermore, I am not prepared to automatically agree that a program of this kind should supplant rather than supplement the Federal aid programs.

I think that both the urgency for haste and the arguments for gradually replacing the grants-in-aid program may be politically motivated, designed to embarrass rather than to be constructive. I urge a "go slow" attitude at this time.

Mr. President, I am sending to the desk a measure which will provide for a Commission to study the possibilities of sharing Federal revenues with the States and local governments. This Commission is designed to examine the entire issue by a cross section of the country's leading authorities; including economic leaders of the Congress, the Executive, business, labor, academicians, and the general public. In addition, a Federal interagency committee is authorized which will provide information, liaison, cooperation and coordination for the Commission. The bill further provides for an executive group which will provide continuity, staff, and technicians to administer and conduct the day-to-day operations of the Commission. The cost is limited to $1 million and it is to report back by January 1, 1971.

I urge again that now is not the time to rush.

The war in Vietnam almost certainly precludes the possibility of enacting any kind of a revenue-sharing plan in this session, at least.

There are many plans being formulated, all based on different premises, all designed to accomplish different goals, and all involving different sums of money.

The complex nature of the concept, and the somewhat radical departure from our previous way of doing business calls for a comprehensive study.

If an equitable tax-sharing plan can be developed that strengthens the States and does not expand the Federal bureaucracy, then we should do it. But any such new program requires the extensive and expert study which only a blue-ribbon commission can give.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1693) to establish a National Commission on Federal Tax Sharing, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a) that in recent years there has been an ever-increasing growth in the needs for State and local governmental services in areas of traditional State-local responsibility;

(b) that the rising demands for spending by State and local governments have strained their ability to meet all their revenue needs;

(c) and there are now being suggested several legislative proposals under which the Federal Government would assist the States and local governments in meeting their financial problems by sharing with them certain portions of the Federal tax revenues;

(d) that the problem of the financing of State and local governments is of great complexity and the proposals for its solution represent a radical departure from accepted methods of providing Federal financial assistance;

(e) that there is an urgent need for a thorough study and appraisal of all questions raised by revenue sharing proposals in order to enable the Congress to determine which of the available proposals or possible alternatives are best designed to provide financial assistance to the State and local governments and meet the needs of their citizens for essential public services; and

(f) that such a study and appraisal can best be carried out by a high level commission comprised of public and private members representative of a cross-section of the economy and the citizenry of our Nation.

Sec. 2. In order to carry out the objectives of this Act, there is hereby established the National Commission on Federal Tax Sharing, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-seven members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee;

(2) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or his designee;

(3) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, or his designee;

(4) The chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or his designee;

(5) The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, or his designee;

(6) The chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, or his designee;

(7) Fifteen members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons outside the Government, of whom three shall be drawn from labor, three shall be drawn from management, three shall be drawn from farmers' organizations, three shall be drawn from the academic profession, and three shall be drawn from among other private persons with a competency in the areas of study of the Commission;

(8) Three members to be appointed by the President from a panel of at least six persons designated by the United States conference of Governors from among its members; and

(9) Three members to be appointed by the President among a panel of at least six persons designated by the National League of Cities from among the mayors of our Nation.

(b) The President shall designate a Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Fourteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 3. The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive and impartial study and appraisal of all proposals to establish a system for the sharing of a portion of the Federal tax revenues with the States and local governments, including, but not limited to, making a determination of the following:

(a) The total amount of Federal revenues which might be available annually for sharing with the States and local governments.

XUM

(b) The portion of such revenues which should be allotted to each State and the extent to which each State should be required to distribute any of such revenues received by it to its local governments.

(c) The best manner of achieving an equitable allotment of any shared revenues among the States while helping to equalize the public services available to citizens in the different States.

(d) The extent of Federal control and supervision which should be exercised over the disbursement of any shared revenues to the States and local governments and the uses to which such revenues may be applied.

(e) The effect which the operation of any such system of revenue sharing might have upon the viability of the States as members of our Federal system.

(f) The extent to which any such system for the disbursing of Federal revenues should supplement or supplant alternative methods for the utilization of such revenues, such as specific grant-in-aid programs, direct Federal spending programs, tax reduction, and retirement of national debt.

(g) Any ramifications which might accompany the establishment of such a revenue sharing system not otherwise considered pursuant to a determination of the preceding questions.

SEC. 4. The Commission may transmit to the President and the Congress such interim reports as it deems advisable concerning its findings and recommendations and shall transmit a final report to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1971. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems appropriate. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after transmitting its final report.

SEC. 5. (a) A member of the Commission who is a Member of Congress, in the executive branch of the Government, a governor of a State, or a mayor shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular public employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) A member of the Commission who is from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per diem while engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. In addition, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

(b) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, an executive secretary to oversee the work of the staff of the Commission under the general direction of the Commission. The executive secretary may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 7. The Department of the Treasury shall provide for the Commission necessary administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private firms, institutions, and individuals to carry out such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission determines to be necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman.

SEC. 9. The Commission, or any subcommittee or panel thereof as authorized by the Commission, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or panel may deem advisable.

SEC. 10. There is hereby established an interagency committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Tax Sharing, consisting of the heads of any departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities of the Federal Government (or their designees) concerned with or interested in any areas of study considered by the Commission, to advise the Commission and to maintain effective liasion with the resources of such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities. Such Committee shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1612) the generic labeling bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 860) to create a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1589) the Hospital Emergency Assistance Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1291) to provide an expanded legal services program within the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1090) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1969.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 78) to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senators from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 28) the Water Rights Act of 1969.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1446) dealing with natural resources.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 309) to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. Goodell) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Gurney) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 335) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; and, to prohibit the interstate shipment of any domestic species taken contrary to State law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Miller), and the Senator from California (Mr. Murphy) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1478) to establish a commission to study the antitrust laws.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska (Mr. Gravel) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 607) the Utility Consumers Counsel Act of 1969.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 819) to exempt senior citizens from paying national parks and forests entrance, admission, or user fees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 364) to equalize the retirement pay of members of uniformed services of Allen, Mr. Allott, Mr. Baker, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cook, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dole, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. equal rank and years of service: Mr. Hollings, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mathias, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Yarborough.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1623), the Criminal Activities Profits Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 845), the ammunition redefinition bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1613) to rename Glen Canyon Dam the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1), the direct popular vote for President amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE FURTHER PRINTING OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 171); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 171

Resolved, that there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging two thousand nine hundred additional copies of its report to the Senate, "Developments in Aging—1968," pursuant to Senate Resolution 223.

SENATE RESOLUTION 172—RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE EMIGRATION OF IRAQI JEWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saxbe, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Griffin) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 172

Whereas there are approximately 2,500 Jewish people living in Iraq, many of whose families have resided in that land for generations dating back to the Babylonian era;

Whereas Iraq is engaged in a campaign of harassment, intimidation and persecution to the point of depriving them of a means of livelihood and of their civil rights and liberties;

Whereas many of these Jewish people now find it necessary and desirable to leave Iraq;

Whereas several nations, including the United States, offer opportunity for asylum and refuge to any of these persecuted people who may be permitted to emigrate from Iraq; and

Whereas it has been the traditional and historic policy of the United States to be actively concerned with those subject to persecution in foreign lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States undertake negotiations, alone or in concert with other heads of state to secure and facilitate the emigration to acceptable lands of refuge of the Jewish remnant in Iraq.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have today joined in sponsoring the resolution urging assistance to the Jews of Iraq so that they may escape from the nightmare existence which they are now experiencing. The 2,500 Jews remaining in Iraq are all that is left of a once proud and flourishing community dating back to ancient Baghdad. No Jews have been permitted to leave Iraq since 1963, and during this time they have become the scapegoats of a military regime.

Since June 1967 they have been living under virtual house arrest, under constant surveillance and harassment. They have been fired from their jobs and forbidden to sell their property. Their telephones have been taken away from them, and their mail censored.

Thet infamous spy trial and public hanging of 14 defendants, including nine Jews, which took place in Baghdad in January shocked the world. This action by the Iraqi military regime caused worldwide condemnation. The condemnation has not influenced the regime in power. They continue the systematic persecution of the Jews of Iraq.

The resolution we submit today urges that the President of the United States undertake negotiations, alone or in concert with other heads of state, to secure and facilitate the emigration to acceptable lands of refuge of the Jewish remnant in Iraq.

The U.S. immigration laws will permit them to come here, and they will be welcomed. Many other countries will also open their doors, if these unfortunate people are permitted to leave Iraq.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the persecution and harassment of Jews living in Arab countries, coupled with the flurry of anti-Semitism in other areas of the world, causes men of conscience to be greatly concerned.

The brutal and barbaric actions of the Iraq Government toward its Jewish citizens, along with the repressive atmosphere prevalent in Egypt, Syria, and Libya, deserve the condemnation of the civilized world.

This prejudice and bigotry have promoted irrationality and prevented a truly lasting settlement to the political problems of the Middle East. While the history of man is checkered with these illogical hatreds, it seems to me that modern man must make progress toward solving these primitive biases.

The persecution of innocent people must cease and the intolerable conditions ought not to be permitted by the Arab governments. Meaningful steps must be taken by responsible government officials to still the shrill cries of hatred that trumpet throughout many Arab lands.

Today I am cosponsoring a resolution calling for an end to the intimidation of Jews in Iraq, and the spirit of it applies equally to other nations of the world. This Senate resolution specifically urges that Jewish citizens be free to emigrate from their native land if they wish to do so.

The deprivation of basic human rights and civil liberties is senseless and cannot be allowed to exist free of dissent.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years, vice George A. Bukovatz.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, April 1, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON OMNIBUS JUDGESHIP BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery will begin hearings on S. 952, the omnibus judgeship bill, and related bills, including, S. 474, S. 567, S. 585, S. 852, S. 898, S. 1036, and S. 1216, on April 15 and 16, at 10 a.m. in room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

All persons wishing to be heard on these bills or on the need for additional Federal judgeships and related matters should contact immediately the subcommittee in room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold O. Bullis, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of North Dakota for the term of 4 years, vice John O. Garaas.

George W. F. Cook, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph F. Radigan.

James L. Treece, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years, vice Lawrence M. Henry.

Benjamin F. Holman, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for the term of 4 years, vice Roger W. Wilkins.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, April 1, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold an open hearing on the nomination of Mr. Harrison Loesch, of Montrose, Colo., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management. The hearing will be held on Monday, March 31, 1969, at 10 a.m. in the committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Any Member of the Senate who is interested is invited to attend and participate in the hearing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Mr. Loesch be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATA: HARRISON LOESCH

Family: Born Chicago, Illinois, March 10, 1916, to Joseph B. Loesch and Constance Harrison Loesch; married to Louise Mills, June 19, 1940; children, one son, Jeffrey H. Loesch, born June 14, 1946.

Education: Montrose Colorado school; B.A., Colorado College, 1936; Denver University Law School, 1936–1937; Ll.B. Yale University, 1939.

Military service: Enlisted Pvt. AUS, 3–1942; OCS, Field Intelligence training, commission 10–1942, assigned 314th T.C. Gp., 9th A.F., North Africa (1943), Sicily, England, France, Germany. Distinguished Unit Citation, Air Medal (Cluster). Discharged, major, 10-1945.

Bar admissions: Admitted to Bar, Colorado, 1939; United States District Court; United States Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit.

Professional associations: Moynihan & Huges, Associate, 1939–1942; Strang & Loesch, 1945–1956; Loesch & Kreidler, 1956–1961; Loesch, Kreidler & Durham, 1961 to date.

Bar association memberships: Seventh Judicial District (President 1956); Colorado (Board of Governors 1950–1952; 1960–1963; President 1961–1962); American.

Organizations: Rotary, Elks, University Club of Denver, VFW, American Legion, Boy Scouts of America.

Politics: Republican.

Religion: Protestant (Preference, Episcopal).

Public land law experience: As a Colorado lawyer, I have had extensive representational experience with the Bureau of Land Management and all phases of the Taylor Grazing Act including process, procedure, administrative appeals and litigation covering rights and duties of permittees, exchanges, sales of isolated tracts, withdrawals, grazing districts, and homestead entries.

During the uranium boom of the 1950's, I became experienced in the AEC procedures involving exploratory permits, leases and claims on withdrawn lands, as well as the ordinary process concerning mining claims on open public lands. These latter are of course the same as lode mining matters which had already been a substantial part of my practice.

In connection with the establishment and enlargement of the Black Canyon National Monument, I have dealt with the hierarchy of the National Park Service on trades, purchases, re-surveys and other administrative procedures, and have been instrumental in effecting compromises which benefited both the public and the land owners.

Of late years, I have handled the procedures provided for granting title to small residential tracts to long-time occupants of invalid (or invalidated) mining or mill-site claims.

I claim expertise in Colorado water law, and have handled all phases of individual and ditch company appropriation procedures, development, and litigation. I have dealt with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Uncompahgre Project Association, and the Tri-County Water Conservancy District on administrative accommodations for development of municipal and rural domestic supply for the entire area. Water matters have become of particular moment with progress of Colorado River development upstream from Glen Canyon, and have intimate connection with the use and disposition of public lands in the entire 5-state area, so acquaintance with Bureau of Reclamation rules, regulations and procedures is pertinent.

I have handled negotiations for access roads to public lands and have participated in litigation concerning them. I have some knowledge of the procedures involved in obtaining licenses for transmission line rights of way across public lands, and the rules and regulations involved in the process of building access roads to private lands.

This experience has afforded me a reasonable knowledge of the organization, structure and function of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Forest Service, the Geological Survey, the Land Office, the Bureau of Mines, and the state organizations which interact with and supplement them.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate and the public, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has scheduled the following hearings before the full committee through April 30:

March 27, full committee: 10 a.m., executive, room 3112. Briefing and information hearing on operations under Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

March 31: Nomination hearing of Harrison Loesch, Assistant Secretary for Public Lands.

April 15 and 16, full committee: 10 a.m., open, room 3110. S. 1075 and other measures to establish a national environmental policy.

April 22, full committee: 10 a.m., open, room 3110. S. 1076, Youth Conservation Corps bill.

April 29 and 30, full committee: 10 a.m., open, room 3110. Alaska native land claims.

XUM

At the April 15 and 16 hearings on S. 1075 and other measures to establish a national environmental policy, the committee will hear testimony from representatives of the administration and from the general public.

At the April 22 hearing on S. 1076, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, testimony will be received from representatives from the administration and the general public.

At the April 29 and 30 hearings on Alaska Native land claims, testimony will be received from the representatives of the administration, the State of Alaska, the Alaska natives, and the general public. At the present time, there are no bills pending before the committee on this subject. Last February I requested the Department of the Interior to draft legislation designed to implement recommendations for a proposed legislative settlement which were made by the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska. When this drafting service is completed, the measure will be introduced for the committee's consideration together with other bills which may be introduced prior to the hearing.

RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this month, I stated to the Senate my great pleasure whenever I see tribute paid to the extraordinary capabilities of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, one of the Senate's true true giants of all times.

It has been good to note the remarks of Senators on both sides of the aisle in tribute to him this week, and I want to add my own words to the expressions of warm wishes for more carefree days ahead for the able senior Senator from Georgia.

The news of his illness is hurtful to me, as it surely is to all who know him. I wish that it lay within my power to perform some deed that would take away this trouble which has come to him.

This legislative body and this Nation have real need of his wisdom, his tremendous capacities for dedicated service, his proven abilities for leadership and conciliation, and his talent for making his associates want to stand tall in relation to his own great personal stature.

Indeed, when I think of the current wide usage of the term "charisma," I feel surprise that many years ago it was not applied to RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL. Webster's dictionary describes the term as "a quality of extraordinary spiritual power attributed to a person capable of eliciting popular support in the direction of human affairs."

Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind, who has seen and heard the Members of the Senate speaking on the floor this week and in the years gone by, that the words spoken are testimony to a man—RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL—who through his own great quality of spirit leads others to rise beyond and above themselves to serve the best interests of this Republic?

I believe that deep measure of charisma would have redounded to even greater benefit for this Nation had the turn of the wheel of political fortune placed him in the White House, giving to all Americans a greater exposure to his influence and added opportunity to achieve new levels.

THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have introduced this year a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

The purpose of this legislation is to perpetuate for the benefit and enjoyment of people now and in future generations, the special beauty and values of the Sleeping Bear Dunes landscape.

The 61,000 acres which we have carefully designated for this national lakeshore encompass an expensive diversity of scenic beauty. Crowning it all are the great dunes, themselves. Yet, our objective is not only to preserve the dunes, but also the setting of forested hills and natural lakeshore in which they are found.

Again, today, I stress the urgency of this project. This nationally significant landscape stands poised on the edge of decision. This Congress must decide. We can act now to pass S. 1023 and the identical House bill, H.R. 4287, establishing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, to adequately protect and appropriately plan for the development of this landscape. If we do not, this special landscape cannot long withstand the threats of cottage subdivision, commercial development, and honky-tonk encroachment. These destructive forces have gathered pressure in recent years. Now, they are closing in for the kill.

Mr. President, never before in the 10 years that I have been actively working for this project have I felt this heavy weight of utter urgency. This is the year the die will be cast.

I am delighted, therefore, to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial support of the New York Times for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Of Men and Dunes," from the Sunday New York Times for March 16, 1969, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF MEN AND DUNES

Natural sand-dunes, the unending masterwork of wind and water, are among nature's more fascinating and useful creations. To the human eye, their clean lines and fantastic and changing shapes are a delight. To shore birds and migratory birds, they nurture and protect life itself. Birds nest in the beachgrasses and depend for food on the salt ponds and fresh-water pools behind the dunes. To the sea and the lakes, dunes are nature's own barrier to the devastation effects of violent storms.

But something there is in many men that does not love a dune. The only wild, clear call that they hear at the edge of the sea is the screech of profit and the bulldozer's mournful crunch. The land speculator and the summer cottage builder, the highway contractor and the jetport planner, all these see only a beach to be leveled and subdivided into lots and paved with blacktop and sold for dollars.

In recent years, the struggle to save surviving sections of the nation's seashores and lakeshores has made progress. From Cape Cod and Fire Island to Texas's Padre Island and California's Point Reyes, some dunes have been saved by Federal law. But more remains to be done, and old battles have sometimes to be won a second and a third time.

The dunes created by Lake Michigan provided two such battlegrounds. The Indiana Dunes, just east of Chicago at the southern end of the lake, were rescued after a long fight between conservationists led by former Senator Paul H. Douglas and steel companies which wanted to build a deep water port. But the Chicago, South Shore and South Bend Railroad is now pressing the National Park Service for permission to construct a marshalling yard within the boundaries of the lakeshore.

Before this railroad issue is even settled, there is already talk in Indiana that a new jetport may be built immediately south of the national lakeshore. If the so-called Chesterton site is selected, jets would spew oil and fumes as well as roaring noise over the dunes.

Far to the north at the western edge of the State of Michigan, the lake has created the beautiful Sleeping Bear Dunes, so named because their profile from a distance resembles a great bear curled in sleep. Ten years ago the National Park Service identified these dunes as one of the dozen shoreline areas in the nation most worth saving. Michigan's Senators introduced a bill to protect them as a national lakeshore in 1959. The years have passed but the bill has not.

Intensive private development now menaces the viability of Sleeping Bear as a national lakeshore. Meanwhile, the cost of the Government of acquiring the land has risen by one-third. The bill has been reintroduced in both houses of Congress, but hearings have been delayed until the Nixon Administration makes its position known. It is imperative that legislative action be completed this year. Congress waits, but the grasping hands of the land speculators are busy. Soon the Sleeping Bear may not be sleeping but dead.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this welcome expression from a great national newspaper well known for its concern with conservation is another illustration of the growing support for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. It is my hope now that the new administration will move with dispatch to support this legislation, and that the Congress will address itself to this matter with the sense of urgency that is required.

SENATOR GOLDWATER ADDRESSES THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN FIGHTER PILOTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on Friday, March 21, my good friend and colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, addressed the Association of American Fighter Pilots in Houston, Tex. His remarks on that occasion have, I believe, an important and significant bearing on numerous matters now under consideration in the Congress of the United States.

In short, Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona deplores what he describes as a deliberate campaign being directed against the concept of military strength in the United States. Because of its timeliness and importance I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Goldwater's speech be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona Before the American Fighter Pilots Association, Houston, Tex., March 21, 1969

Mr. President, Members of the American Fighter Pilots Association, as you probably all know, I returned recently to the political wars after a self-imposed sabbatical leave of four years in my native Arizona. Of course, in Washington everyone wants to know how it feels to be back. This is the question I get in the Senate, in the Senate Armed Services Committee, in the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and all of my other old haunts around the nation's capital. And I tell them all that I feel exactly like the first Kamikaze pilot who ever made a round trip.

I also dwell to some extent on the various changes that I have noticed since my return. Maybe I don't have to tell you that the change I like the best is the one I find in the Pentagon. Not only am I delighted that the office of Secretary of Defense is no longer held by our computer-minded, one-time Ford Company official, Robert S. McNamara, but I am even more delighted that the vital post is now occupied by former Congressman Melvin Laird.

This brings me to the subject of my remarks tonight. They are directed to a defense of the nation's military establishment and a defense of this nation's military men.

I wish to be very blunt. I believe it is nothing short of disgraceful that such a defense has to be made. But the actualities of the present situation in our national affairs are such that loud and strong voices need to be raised.

If they aren't, we will soon develop a national frame of mind against anything that smacks of defense. We will be permitting an erroneous public attitude to develop which can spell nothing but trouble for the defense of the United States and the security of the free world.

This nation, no matter what your sophisticated academic and scientific spokesmen would like you to believe, must be strong and powerful. This is an absolute necessity in today's world. We are a long way from reaching a point where we do not need weapons, defense systems and the military men to operate them. It would be wonderful if, by waving a magic wand, or passing a particular piece of legislation, or adopting some specific executive program, we could make mankind forever noble. If this could be done, we wouldn't need weapons or generals or admirals or soldiers or sailors or fighter pilots. We wouldn't even need policemen—the churches could handle all our needs.

But, unfortunately, man's nature is not susceptible to quick change of this sort. He will, despite all the education that the academic community can cram into his skull, still have traces of greed, hatred and avarice in his nature. He will still be susceptible to the temptations and impulses which today lead men to fights and nations to war.

This is no mystery. It's a fact of life. Any reasonable individual will understand and accept this premise because he knows that it is true and that it is not subject to questioning. However, when you listen to some of the self-styled pacifists, peaceniks and all-out enemies of the military, you begin to wonder if we might have missed something somewhere along the line. Because their arguments are founded on wishful thinking, they would have us believe that if the United States only stopped building military weapons that that would be the answer to peace throughout the world. They would have us believe that by some magic or miracle of ideology we could shame our enemies into following suit. The realities of power and strength and counter power and counter strength have no meaning for these people. They have developed an over-simplified and ridiculous idea that the way to promote world peace is to object to anything or anyone used in the waging of war. This is what causes protest movements against the Reserve Officers Training Corps on campuses, against service recruiters in colleges, against military draft boards, against any kind of service installations that might be used by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard in time of war.

It is this same attitude on a higher plain that causes trouble for our military men in the Defense Department. The great outcry against war has led almost automatically to a suspicion of our military brass. It's getting as though the liberal press treats any recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a form of evil, per se. To this element of our national media, anything connected with the military is dangerous. They would have the American public believe that every man who ever wore an officer's uniform is interested personally in unleashing nuclear war.

The attitude which I have been describing has already led us into trouble that may take many years to correct. This suspicion of the military; this deliberate attempt to minimize the voice of the military in the development of defense policies, was a hallmark of the McNamara regime in the Pentagon. You all remember that unhappy interlude. The "whiz kids" took over. The battle cry became "cost effectiveness to the end." The voices of experienced military men, trained in service academies and tested in combat, were drowned out by the whirrings and beepings of the computers. Sound advice on hard military matters gave way to chalk talks and glib televised press conferences wherein anyone holding a pointer to a chart passed as an expert.

What happened was this. To avoid or steer clear of the possible evil of centralizing power and authority in the hands of the military, McNamara permitted over-centralization in the hands of less qualified civil servants. We traded military expertise for scientific guesses based on computer findings. We didn't achieve a proper balance between military and civil authority. We achieved an improper balance of untrained civil authority over experienced military authority.

The result of all this has been that during the past decade the pendulum of defense organization has moved too far in the direction of economy and efficiency and too far away from defense readiness and force modernization.

The bomb shortage of the early 1960's; the efforts to save money through the concept of "commonality" in the TFX (now F–111B) program with no alternative available when it failed; and the low risk procurement policies typified by the current requirement that services have all technology "in hand" before a contract is let—all these are examples of this trend.

The mistakes stemming from overemphasis on civilian decision-making in the Defense Department are too numerous to mention. To tell you the truth, I don't like to think too much about it; because when I realize what happened in the Defense Department over the last eight years, it literally scares me to death. It makes me worried for the future of my country and the future of freedom throughout the world.

I'm sure you all know the old saying that one should not put all his eggs in one basket. Nowhere is this more pertinent than in the field of defense activities. To rely solely on missiles in order to save the cost of the backup bomber force is an example of what I mean. Others involved are the building of only conventional ships to save the cost of nuclear engines and to economize by not developing, testing, and stockpiling certain military space systems, or not to develop new and better tactical nuclear weapons on the wishful hope that our enemies won't do it if we don't.

Real and lasting economies in defense spending can only be realized, I am convinced, by optimizing military policies, strategy and tactics to most fully exploit all the products of technology. The inevitable need to develop and maintain the most advanced systems possible in order to guard against the fact that an enemy could build and use these against us means that any reliance on older systems—for whatever reason—will eventually add to the cost of defense.

Thus only by absorbing the increased costs of new advanced weapons through reduction in quantity of forces and systems that sole reliance on these will permit, can we hope to keep defense spending at a minimum and national security at a maximum.

I do not insist that the military should be in charge of everything. I do not recommend a general for the office of Secretary of Defense. I do not necessarily insist that civilian experts be replaced in the Defense establishment merely because they do not wear an admiral's stripes or a colonel's chickens. I do, however, argue strenuously and persistenly that military experience and military men be given their proper voice in the determination of policies upon which our safety and the protection of our millions of citizens must ultimately depend. In many areas of defense policy I am convinced that trained military opinion is not only desirable but essential to success. There are other areas where I believe top scientific and technical knowledge should prevail. However, we have nothing to gain and a great deal to lose by adopting the fallacious belief that because a military man is trained to fight that he is automatically a proponent of warlike or war-producing attitudes and policies. I might say here that the most eloquent and ardent proponents of peace that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing were military men who had seen at first hand the horrors of war. It has long been my feeling that to become a practical and effective advocate of peace in our times requires personal experience with the alternative.

I believe that the public debate now going on concerning President Nixon's advocacy of a modified ABM system will bring out even more latent distrust, and even hatred of the military. The radical left is even now busy trying to convince the American public that the ABM system is a device cooked up by the military men in the Pentagon to siphon off billions of dollars from antipoverty projects and other social welfare programs. Great emphasis is being placed upon the opinions of scientists who all of a sudden have become great experts in the whole area of military defense. It is reminiscent of the time back in the Truman Administration when many prominent scientists were opposing development of the H bomb. You may remember some of those arguments. The scientists told us that the H bomb would be inordinately expensive that it probably would not work and that its development would alter the world balance of power. Of course we know now that they were wrong on every point. Not only did the H bomb work but it proved to be less expensive than the scientific estimates and the Russians promptly developed one of their own. If President Truman had listened to the advice of scientists like Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer the balance of power *would* have been drastically altered—but in favor of the Soviet Union because while the scientists were trying to get the President to junk our H bomb program the Russians were pushing ahead at top speed.

It has often been said that if an Army general endeavored to tell the scientists about their theories on physics he would quickly be told to "get lost." But the scientists never seem a bit reluctant to tell the generals and the admirals all about their specialized business.

This is what is happening today in the debate over the ABM system. The greatest emphasis is being placed on the arguments of the scientists and others who oppose the system. Considerably less emphasis is being placed on the arguments of those who know that we *must* make some headway in the area of missile defense. The Soviets are already way ahead of us, not only in the development but in the deployment of an ABM system to protect their major cities. The very least that we must do is to develop a system to protect our deterrent to war. This, to my way of thinking, is little more than the maintenance of intensive research and development in a vital defense field where the Soviets are far ahead of us. It is the absolute minimum that the President could recommend in keeping with a proper regard for the safety of this nation. In this the President and his Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, need our determined help and assistance. And I believe that the wishes of the American people will finally be felt and this program adopted. In the meantime I would warn you to be aware, constantly aware, of the never-ending effort to down-grade and discredit the military establishment without which our country could not long survive. It is a determined and deliberate campaign which must be fought at all times.

And rest assured that you will have no trouble identifying these attacks on the military. Most of them contain certain key words and phrases taken from the utterances of American Presidents in attempts to justify a totally unwarranted premise. For example, I predict that you will hear more and more about a word President Nixon used not so long ago with regard to our nuclear strength. The word he used was "sufficiency." He said this perhaps was a better word than "superiority" in referring to our relative nuclear strength as opposed to that of the Communist world. I am sure I don't have to tell you that the word "sufficiency" can be taken to mean whatever the person using it wants it to mean. There is no doubt in my mind that when President Nixon used the word "sufficiency" he had reference to sufficient nuclear strength to close what he himself termed a "security gap" during the Presidential campaign. And, of course, to the proponents of unilateral disarmament, the word "sufficiency" could mean almost any level of strength.

In the attacks on the military also you will find repeated reference to a phrase once used by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This phrase, which incidentally turned up six times in a recent speech by former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, is "military-industrial complex." Time and again these words of our great ex-President are quoted in an effort to convince Americans that such a complex does exist and poses some kind of an evil, mysterious threat to our continued existence.

I would remind you that when Dwight Eisenhower mentioned the possibility of unwarranted influence being acquired by such a complex, he had some other profound things to say. I want to quote one passage in particular. He said and I quote, "We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is call for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment. . .

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

In closing, gentlemen, let me warn you that the anti-defense campaign in this country is accelerating rapidly. I predict that in the weeks to come you will see it reach an almost hysterical pitch among certain groups. And it will have many facets. One will be a new, all-out propaganda drive against the Nixon Administration's military effort in Vietnam.

Another facet of this drive will be an all-out campaign against every conceivable type of defense expenditure. This part of the campaign will get under way on March 28 and 29 at a Congressional conference on "The Military Budget and National Priorities." This conference, which has been arranged by a group of liberal House and Senate Democrats, is strictly a lobbying effort to drum up Congressional support for cutting defense budgets. It has no official standing with the Congress. In fact, it will temper with the jurisdiction of such duly established groups as the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

I believe it is important for everyone who has any interest in the defense of this nation to understand clearly what is going on today. This campaign is not confined to opposing military men or even a dominant military voice in preparedness matters. It is aimed directly at the concept of military strength itself. I tell you emphatically that we are seeing today a concerted and well-organized attempt *to destroy the military effectiveness of America* in the misguided belief that such action might somehow serve the cause of world peace.

VIRGIN ISLANDS REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on June 28, 1968, the Governor of the U.S. Virgin Islands signed into law an act of the Virgin Islands Legislature which established in the office of the Virgin Islands Representative to Washington, and provided for the election of the first Representative at the 1968 general election. At that election, on November 5, the people of the Virgin Islands elected Mr. Ron de Lugo as their first Representative to Washington.

Many Members of this body know Mr. de Lugo well. This Congress passed the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands in 1954. Since that time, Ron de Lugo has worked effectively to bring to fruition the processes of democracy which that document promised the people of the Virgin Islands.

The office of the elected Representative to Washington is another step on the long road to self-government within the context of the Federal-territorial relationship, and in the election of Ron de Lugo the people of the Virgin Islands have made an excellent decision.

Ron de Lugo is a man who brings to Washington broad experience and an intimate knowledge of the islands and of the people whom he represents.

He was born in Englewood, N.J., on August 2, 1930. Ron's father was the late Angelo de Lugo, a native of St. Thomas. His parents returned to St. Thomas where Ron lived until he enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1948. His military duty took him to Japan and included service with the Armed Forces Radio Service.

He returned to the islands in 1950 as program director of the newly opened WSTA radio station. Ron de Lugo is well known for his efforts in the revival of the famous St. Thomas Carnival in 1952. In that same year he was named "Man of the Year" by the New York Professional League. In 1954, he served as campaign manager for the Democratic Party of the Virgin Islands. In 1955, Ron joined WIVI radio on St. Croix distinguishing himself as a leader in the fight for a jet airport for St. Croix. The same year he was instrumental in organizing the Democratic Party on St. Croix.

At the age of 26, Mr. de Lugo became the youngest person to win a seat in the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in 1956 and he was also elected a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Senator de Lugo served as minority leader in the legislature from 1958 to 1967, except for the period when he served as administrator for the island of St. Croix, from April 1961 to August 1962. He resigned a year later, responding to a draft from the Democratic Party, to return to the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

In 1960, Ron was elected Democratic national committeeman for the Virgin Islands and was seated at the Los Angeles Democratic Convention. At 30, he was the youngest member of the national committee.

Ron de Lugo's most recent accomplishment in his career of public service was his landslide election on November 5, 1968, to this Washington office. His broad public support in the Virgin Islands is obvious from the 75 percent of the vote which he received.

Ron is married to the former Maria Morales, and they have moved to Washington with their three children: Jay, 17; Maria Christina, 10; and Angela Maria, 8.

I know that all the Members of this body join with me in welcoming Ron de Lugo to Washington, and I am sure that he will receive the consideration and the cooperation to which he is entitled as elected Representative of the people of the Virgin Islands.

THE HEADSTART PARENTS CHOIR OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it was recently my privilege to attend the 70th annual meeting of the Kansas Conference on Social Welfare in Wichita. At the conference a heart-warming performance was given by a unique choir made up entirely of parents of Headstart children in Kansas City, Kans.

This group does not receive any outside funds from public or private sources, yet its approximately 60 members not only trained themselves as an outstanding musical group but have made their own choir robes and dresses at costs some 90 percent below usual prices.

This kind of resourcefulness is characteristic of the parents of Headstart children at London Heights Methodist Church in Kansas City. I understand they have a motto:

> If you have courage yourself, you can do it.

Not only in the wonderful cooperative effort of the choir, which I heard and enjoyed so much, but also in the spirit of neighborliness they show in solving problems of babysitting, transportation, and finances, these parents are setting for their children the kind of example that offers great hope for the future.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this admirable group of parents is an interracial one, having as one of its purposes to promote "togetherness of the races." This goal is a high and difficult challenge for all Americans, but a group of parents so determined and willing to cooperate is a source of encouragement for all Americans, black and white, as they strive to meet the challenges of racial integration.

Mr. President, this unique group is a heartening example of how a Government program such as Headstart can stimulate very positive, if unexpected, results in communities where these programs are at work.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the senior government students of New Haven High School, New Haven, Mich., recently completed a poll. This exercise, I am sure, was very instructive to them and might be somewhat instructive to us.

New Haven is not a large community but it is a fine one and I think it could be considered a representative one.

These enterprising youngsters compiled a booklet giving pro and con arguments on our electoral system. The booklets were distributed in the community and later collected, along with the views of the readers.

The results were relayed to me in a letter from the project cochairman, Vicky L. Jackson. Her letter is clearly stated and I ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Haven Community Schools,
New Haven, Mich., March 18, 1969.

Senator Philip Hart: The Senior Government Classes of New Haven High School sponsored a campaign to determine how the community of New Haven felt about our present Electoral College system. The complete project took three weeks.

The students were divided into groups, which were responsible for finding out certain information concerning the Electoral College. This information was then compiled and put into booklet form.

The booklet consisted of the following sections. 1) An introduction, explaining to the public exactly what the Government Class was attempting to present. 2) Criticisms in opposition of the Electoral College. 3) Criticisms in favor of the Electoral College. 4) Exactly how the College functions. 5) An opinion sheet. The booklets were designed to give all views of the Electoral College. Then from there, the Electorate was asked to make its own decision.

A door-to-door campaign was conducted in passing out the booklets. The students then returned to the homes in a few days to pick the booklets up.

When all the booklets were turned in, the results were compiled. There was a total of four hundred booklets distributed. From these, a total of 313 was returned. From the total booklets returned; 20.4% of the people suggested we keep the Electoral College just as it is; 56.3% of the people suggested we eliminate the College; 23.1% of the people suggested we amend the Electoral College; and .2% of the people voiced no opinion.

We, the Government Classes of New Haven High School, would like to thank the Community of New Haven for its splendid participation in our project.

Respectively submitted,
Vicky L. Jackson,
Cochairman.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian independence, which was observed on March 25. I sincerely believe that the desire of any people to assert their national identity is a cause worthy of our attention.

Fifty-one years ago, the Byelorussian people declared their independence and were able, for a few brief months, to live according to their own ideals and beliefs. During its short-lived existence, despite the great difficulties created by World War I and its chaotic aftermath in Eastern Europe, the Byelorussian Government was able to make significant advances in education, culture and social welfare.

On March 25, 1918, the Rada—Congress—of the Byelorussian National Republic proclaimed the sovereignty of Byelorussia and published a Declaration of Independence which said in part:

> "A year ago, the peoples of Byelorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states.

Although these laudable objectives were to be lost beneath the inexorable westward march of the Red army, the right to rule their own destiny still lives in the hearts of many men and women who recall those fateful days.

Today all Americans join with our fellow citizens of Byelorussian ancestry in renewing our own devotion to the principles of freedom and in our prayerful hope that the day will come when the people of Byelorussia as well as peoples everywhere can join us in our full enjoyment of the blessings of liberty.

SURTAX NEEDS HAVE NO HIGHER PRIORITY THAN TAX NEEDS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has today proposed that the 10-percent surtax be continued for another year. I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly upon the single most important income tax issue facing the American people and the Congress, the urgent, immediate need for tax reform.

This issue is as clearly raised by President Nixon's request for an extension of the surtax as are the issues of national fiscal policy and inflation to which his message refers.

A simple extension of the surtax may, it is true, be of assistance to the needs of our overall economy. But it is not fair, it is not right, to impose the entire cost of anti-inflationary measures on the low and middle income taxpayers who are not able to take advantage of the loopholes and subsidies in our tax laws.

Is it fair, for example, to provide the billion dollar oil companies with an oil depletion subsidy while refusing to provide the average American taxpayer with a pocketbook depletion subsidy? Is it fair to expect a taxpayer with a tax bill of $600 to pay a $60 surtax, while men with net incomes of $100,000 paying no tax now escape the surtax completely?

I do not believe that the surtax, no matter how desperately it may be needed, can be extended this year without its being more fairly and evenly applied to all our citizens earning adequate incomes. The President said today:

> We are determined to keep faith with America's wage earners.

There is only one way that the Congress can keep faith with America's wage earners, if the surtax is extended. That way is to see that the burden of the surtax is shared by all Americans through effective tax reform.

CEASING PROLIFERATION OF FEDERAL POWER

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Utah State Legislature recently passed House Joint Resolution 12 memorializing Congress to terminate the expansion of Federal control and power over State and local governments.

I think President Nixon appreciates this problem and consequently created the Office of Intergovernmental Relations. I think the resolution by the State legislature is a clear indication that the people of Utah feel capable of dealing with their own problems with a minimum of Federal interference. Of course, the problem of adequate financing of public programs is always present. I think the wise approach and eventual solution is a program of Federal tax sharing which would provide financial assistance with a reduction in political controls.

I ask that the Utah Legislature's resolution be placed in full in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.J. Res. 12

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to cease and desist the proliferation of Federal power

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States continues to expand the proliferation of federal control over our cities, counties and states, and

Whereas, this proliferation of national government is contrary to the thinking of our founding fathers, contrary to the fundamental tenets of federalism, and

Whereas, if such proliferation does not cease, our federal system, which once mani-

XUM

> fested a delicate balance between federal and state powers, will become a giant state engulfing monster;
>
> Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 38th Legislature of the State of Utah, both houses concurring therein, that Congress be memorialized and respectfully requested to cease and desist from further encroachment on state and local powers reserved to the states under the Constitution of the United States;
>
> Be it resolved further that Congress immediately consider systematic withdrawal of many of the non-productive and expensive federal agencies which result in unnecessary taxation imposed upon citizens of this and other states, and allow states to appraise their own social and economic needs and levy and collect taxes to provide for these indigenous problems.
>
> Be it resolved further that the Secretary of State of Utah be, and he is hereby directed, to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to United States Representative Wilbur D. Mills, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress.

CRACKDOWN ON CAMPUS RIOTERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have long been a strong advocate of cracking down on campus rioters, and I urge the administration to take steps to enforce existing laws which provide the machinery for barring Federal aid to students involved directly in disturbances and riots at academic institutions.

As a longtime supporter of a more forceful stand against campus rioters, and having voted for such legislation which was passed last year, I hopefully anticipate the enforcement of those laws.

While students may have the right to peacefully petition for changes and improvements, they have no right to disrupt college activities or infringe upon the rights of those who do conduct themselves in accordance with decency and a respect for orderly processes.

The public is becoming thoroughly fed up with the overpermissiveness which has allowed young revolutionaries to run wild on our college campuses.

In speaking about contempt for law and order in this Chamber on August 23, 1965, I quoted Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter who once said:

> If a man can be allowed to determine for himself what is law, every man can. That means first, chaos; then, tyranny.

Since the occurrence of the Los Angeles riots which seemed to serve as a stamp of approval for wholesale rioting, a series of riots has continued to plague us from coast to coast and many of these militant activists, rioters, and agitators seem to believe that they can determine academic administration and policy by lawlessness and minority rule by force.

Justice Frankfurter went on to say:

> Lawlessness, if not checked, is the precursor of anarchy.

The time has come to check the lawlessness that is being witnessed on campuses across the country. And the time has come for academic administrators, parents, teachers, Federal enforcement agencies, and the majority of students who are seriously seeking an education to join Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, acting president of San Francisco State College, and Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Notre Dame, in demanding prompt ejection from the campus, arrest for disorderly conduct, and arrest where property destruction occurs. An automatic denial of Federal funds to convicted students is long overdue.

The 1968 Education Act received my support and it indicates quite clearly that students who are receiving a loan or guarantee of a loan or grant and who have been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of crimes involving force, trespass, or seizure of property to prevent officials and students from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies shall not receive said funds.

It is folly for the Government to continue to finance militant activity with taxpayers' money. Student loans are administered by college authorities and it is time that some of these same authorities eliminate the rioters, rabble-rousers, and radicals—for these are three R's that do not belong in any school.

Let me read to you today, Mr. President, from a speech I delivered last week at Shepherd College, located in Shepherdstown, W. Va., at which time I addressed a number of our West Virginia honor students at this distinguished institution. I will read only that portion of my address in which I refer to a letter written by the head of a university to a friend in 1825. Describing a campus riot and how it was handled, he said in part:

> The students have returned into perfect order under a salutary conviction that they had not before felt that the laws in future will be rigorously enforced, and the institution is strengthened by the firmness manifested by its authorities on the occasion. . . .
>
> We have no further fear of anything of the kind from the present set, but as, at the next term, their numbers will be more than doubled by the accession of an additional band, as unbroken as these were, we mean to be prepared, and to ask of the legislature a power to call in the civil authority in the first instant of disorder, and to quell it on the spot by imprisonment and the same legal coercions provided against disorder generally committed by other citizens from whom, at their age, they have no right to distinction.

The author of that letter was Thomas Jefferson, the first rector of the University of Virginia. There is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Jefferson, if he were alive today—great believer in a democratic society that he was and champion of the rights of all men—would take the same decisive action against college violence and destruction.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that this great Nation of ours has some of the finest institutions of higher learning to be found anywhere and I am certain that I stand with millions of other concerned American citizens that the time has arrived to replace Government paternalism with Government responsibility in the immediate enforcement of our existing laws.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the provisions of section 411 of Public Law 90–557, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, section 411 of Public Law 90–557 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 411. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan or a grant to any applicant who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involves the use of or the assistance to others in the use of force, trespass or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies.

KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues an article from the Wall Street Journal dated March 10, 1969, which focuses appropriate attention in the gravity of kidney disease in our country.

Senator JACKSON and I have introduced legislation which attempts to meet the problem of kidney disease in a comprehensive fashion and hopefully offer treatment to more than 8,000 Americans who die each year because of the lack of kidney machines and trained personnel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST OF LIVING: SOME KIDNEY PATIENTS DIE FOR LACK OF FUNDS FOR MACHINE TREATMENT—ARTIFICIAL ORGAN WORKS WELL, BUT USE IS COSTLY—FEDERAL GRANTS, DONATIONS DWINDLE—INSURANCE DOESN'T MEET BILLS

(By Jim Hyatt)

The effort to treat sufferers from chronic kidney disease by machine, which once promised to save thousands of lives a year, is floundering for lack of financial support.

High costs have plagued the so-called artificial kidney program from the outset. Hospital bills for the twice-weekly machine blood "washings" that take over the kidneys' vital function of removing blood wastes and adjusting body chemistry now run from $10,000 to $20,000 annually per patient. That's the main reason only about 1,700 Americans currently receive the treatments, while an estimated 8,000 people will die this year for lack of them.

But even this far from adequate situation is deteriorating. Federal grants have been running out at the 14 hospitals designated by the U.S. Public Health Service about three years ago as demonstration centers for the process; without Government help, some of them have had to reduce the number of cases they handle.

Some private hospitals have been forced into similar cutbacks because of difficulties in attracting donations to support patients who can't pay the cost themselves. Indeed, private support of any kind has been slow in coming.

COMING OUT SECOND BEST

"The cost per capita of the treatment is an overwhelming drawback when we approach organizations for help," says Dr. Frederic B. Westervelt, director of the kidney care demonstration center at the University of Virginia School of Medicine in Charlottesville. "They say, 'Look what we can do for $10,000 a year—we can give 20 people an artificial leg.' When they measure what they think is the greatest good for the greatest number, we come out second best."

As a result of this lack of funds, hospital committees that once spent weeks agonizing over which artificial kidney candidates would receive the life-giving treatments, called hemodialysis or simply dialysis, now find that the decision has been taken out of their

XUM

hands. "Who gets the care here now is determined purely by ability to pay—we don't like it, but that's the way it is," says Dr. Daniel Leb of the Louisville (Ky.) General Hospital's kidney center, run by the University of Louisville School of Medicine.

Physicians' chagrin over the financial obstacles to the treatment is heightened by the highly advanced state of artificial kidney technology. The prototype of the present artificial kidney machine, which resembles a squat old-fashioned washing machine, was developed in 1943 in Holland by Dr. Willem J. Kolff, who now is a resident of the U.S. The patient is connected to the machine, and his blood is pumped through a series of tubes, coils and filters.

The key element of the device is a thin cellophane membrane immersed in a saline solution. Through the process of osmosis, wastes in the blood that otherwise would accumulate and cause death pass through the membrane into the solution. At the same time, vital chemicals normally added to the blood by healthy kidneys pass from the solution into the blood. The "cleansed" blood then is returned to the body.

A SURGICAL BREAKTHROUGH

For a number of years, the machine could be used only when a few treatments would suffice—such as in cases of acute infections—because the surgery required to connect the patient with the machine was difficult and dangerous. In 1960, however, a team of specialists from the University of Washington devised a system that made the artificial kidney available to individuals who had suffered irreparable kidney damage and needed frequent blood washings. In minor surgery, they permanently inserted small plastic tubes in an artery and vein in a patient's arm or leg. During dialysis, the machine is easily connected to the body through those tubes; when the treatment is finished, the tubes are plugged and covered with a small bandage.

Recently, some doctors have improved on this method. By increasing the flow of blood through an artery and a vein, they enlarge them to the point where they can be easily punctured with large needles for connection to the kidney machine. This makes the mechanics of dialysis about as simple as giving blood.

Dialysis is time consuming; the twice-weekly treatments take from six to 13 hours each, depending on the patient and model of machine used. But it is painless, and patients undergoing the life-long treatment can lead a nearly normal life. Clyde Shields of Seattle, who nine years ago received vein and artery implants from the University of Washington team and became the first person to start regular dialysis by machine, still is regularly employed as a mechanic. He is 49 years old.

THE ROLE OF TRANSPLANTS

Treatment by kidney machine isn't the only alternative open to victims of kidney failure. Kidney transplant operations have been performed since 1954 with a high and growing rate of success. Up to last year, three-fourths of the transplant patients who received a kidney from a blood relative had survived for at least one year after the operation (people have two kidneys but can live with just one). The one-year survival rate for a person who received a kidney from a cadaver was 45%.

The utility of this operation is limited, however. Many kidney patients might not survive a transplant operation because of poor general physical condition, and not nearly enough suitable organs are available for those who could benefit. Only about 2,000 kidney transplants have been made in the past 14 years, an average of less than 150 a year.

Moreover, transplant candidates often require dialysis. They usually must undergo the treatment while awaiting an organ, and they must fall back on the machine if the operation fails.

Amid the general gloom over the outlook for artificial kidney treatment, some see a hopeful sign in the recent trend for more patients to receive machine dialysis at home instead of in a hospital. The savings from such a move can be substantial. The first-year bill for home dialysis, including $3,000 to $4,000 to purchase the artificial kidney machine itself and fees for training a family member to run it, usually total about $10,000. After that, it costs $3,000 to $5,000 a year to maintain the machine and buy the various components and chemicals that must be changed after every use.

About 200 of the 1,700 Americans on machine dialysis currently are treated at home, and some kidney specialists say they have high hopes that the number will rise sharply in the next few years. In 1967, the U.S. Public Health Service moved to accelerate the trend by setting up 12 home treatment training centers around the country and promising them $4 million over a five-year period.

But many experts in the field strongly doubt that home care will assume the majority of the treatment burden in the near future. They point out that some patients don't have a relative who can assume the job of operating the complex artificial kidney, others don't have homes where the treatments can be safely carried out and still more have strong fears about entrusting themselves to the care of a family member when a mistake could prove fatal. Moreover, even patients who intend to purchase their own artificial kidney must receive hospital dialysis for several months while a relative is being trained to run the machine.

THE FINANCIAL SQUEEZE

To date, the financial squeeze has been hardest on the hospitals picked by the Federal Government in 1965 and 1966 to demonstrate the feasibility of the widespread use of artificial kidneys. The Federal grants—which totaled $2.5 million—paid the operational costs of the kidney centers and permitted them to admit patients who couldn't pay for their own treatments. Federal funds for medical projects go only for research or treatment-demonstration purposes, not for daily general patient care, so the centers knew the funds might not be renewed when the grants expired. But many of them felt that the Government wouldn't cut them off after having made a commitment.

Since it became clear that the grants would stop in the wake of the Government economy drive caused by the war in Vietnam, the centers have moved to pare their rolls. None have summarily cut off any patients, but when a patient receives a transplant or moves to home care, he isn't replaced.

The center at Cleveland's Mt. Sinai Hospital, for instance, now has only 17 patients on dialysis, down from 30 in 1967; its Federal grant expired Dec. 31. The unit at the University of Alabama Medical Center in Birmingham now only accepts patients likely to receive transplants fairly quickly; if new funds can't be obtained, it plans to phase out its artificial kidney program as soon as other facilities can be found for its 15 present patients.

PAY IN ADVANCE

The center at Hennepin County General Hospital in Minneapolis, whose Federal grant expired Dec. 31, now requires some prospective patients to put $12,000—funds for at least one year's care—in an escrow account before they can begin dialysis. "A couple of people have felt they'd rather die than spend the amount of money involved," says one doctor at the hospital.

A bill now pending in Congress would commit new Federal money for artificial kidney programs, but its prospects for passage aren't clear now. A similar bill made little headway last year.

The outlook for developing other sources of funds is even less bright. Only a half dozen states support dialysis patients, and few others show signs of following. New York has the largest state program; according to Dr. Ira Greifer, medical director for the National Kidney Foundation. Medicaid in New York helps pay dialysis bills for more than half of the state's 400 dialysis patients and the state has set up a Kidney Disease Institute to coordinate the various public and private kidney treatment projects. But state officials say that about 900 New Yorkers a year need the treatments, and their efforts help only a fraction of those who need financial help.

Ordinary types of health insurance often pay some costs of dialysis but typically fall far short of meeting the actual expenses. The average maximum major medical policy benefit of $10,000 "just about covers the preliminary steps to start a patient on dialysis," says L. A. Orsini, an official of the Health Insurance Association, a New York-based trade group.

A few companies now offer kidney treatment policies. Western States Life Insurance Co. in Sacramento, Calif., for instance, sells a $50,000 maximum benefit group policy for an organ transplant or dialysis. However, most private insurers have been reluctant to enter the field.

Persons covered by the Federal Medicare program for the elderly receive little aid for dialysis. Medicaid, the Federally assisted program adopted by some states to help low-income people pay medical expenses, provides more aid—$25 for each in-hospital dialysis treatment—but still leaves substantial bills.

What's left for some kidney disease sufferers, then, is charity. While organized support for kidney care has been slow in coming, instances abound of local largess in individual cases. Last Christmas, for example, residents of Whitesville, Ky., a town of fewer than 1,000, raised $26,000 in four days for Roscoe French, a 33-year-old carpenter for whom machine dialysis represented the only chance at life.

Even well-off victims may end up needing charity. "If you aren't indigent when you start dialysis, you soon will be," says one physician.

WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the March 11, 1969, issue of the Chase Manhattan Bank publication, the Petroleum Situation, contains a concise, authoritative and balanced review of the problems raised by the recent proposal to construct an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine, to process foreign oil. This article bears out the points made by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) in his recent speech and confirms my fears, expressed at the time of his speech, that the issues raised by the Machiasport proposal involve questions of regional protectionalism, national security, and resource planning of the highest importance.

This importance was underlined, again, yesterday as Prime Minister Trudeau and President Nixon announced Canadian-American discussions to begin April 2 on reviewing the North American oil policy. Prime Minister Trudeau, in commenting on these discussions, emphasized the need for continuing exploration and development of North American oil reserves, both for national security and price stability. The discoveries at Prudhoe Bay in Alaska and such proposals as

XUM

Machiasport underline, I believe, the importance of maintaining our responsible oil quota program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Must Make a Choice

Probably more of the world's problems stem from the lack of effective communications than from any other cause. There is indeed much evidence of the difficulties that can arise from a breakdown of communications within the family, in business, in education, in religion, in government—and between nations.

In recent months, a highly unfortunate situation has developed—for the most part—because of both improper and insufficient communications. It is a development that has pitted one region of the United States against another. And from the earliest days of this nation the multiple and lasting dangers of that sort of conflict have been apparent.

The problem had its beginning last year with a proposal to build an oil refinery in Maine. Sometimes the announcement of a new refinery is met with vigorous objections from the area in which it is to be located. Recently, the residents of a community in another New England state—Rhode Island—successfully resisted the construction of a refinery in their area. But, in the case of Maine, the proposed new plant was welcomed. It would provide certain economic advantages. There would be some opportunities for employment—but not many, because modern refineries are operated mainly with automatic controls. The plant would also constitute a new tax base, of course.

But the foremost reason for wanting a refinery in Maine, reportedly, was based on the belief that it would provide lower priced petroleum products. Somehow, there has developed a widespread impression that petroleum products cost much more in New England than elsewhere in the nation because the region does not have any refineries. If this were true, the consumers of New England, or any other region for that matter, would understandably have cause for complaint. But the impression is erroneous—it is based upon misinformation.

Actually, prices in New England do not differ significantly from those in most other sections of the nation. Reflecting variations in the basic elements of cost, consumer prices naturally are not precisely the same everywhere—but the differences are usually minor. Let's look at the facts. Here is a summary table that compares the price of gasoline in Boston—the leading New England market—with prices in three other major markets and also the average for all of the United States. In each case, basic elements of cost contributing to the consumer price are shown:

REGULAR GRADE GASOLINE PRICES IN 1968

[In cents per gallon]

	Boston	Philadelphia	Norfolk	Chicago	U.S. average
Crude oil cost	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Refinery margin	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Transportation and terminal costs	2.0	1.9	1.4	1.2	1.6
Jobber/dealer margin	10.2	9.1	10.9	12.8	10.7
State and Federal taxes	10.5	11.0	11.0	10.0	10.8
Consumer price	33.3	32.6	33.9	34.6	33.7

For all of the markets shown, the cost of crude oil is based upon the U.S. average price. And the refinery margin is based upon the average at the Gulf Coast—the scene of the nation's largest and most competitive refinery complex. Chicago, Philadelphia and Norfolk all have refineries nearby that serve part of the local market needs—but the refinery margin is essentially the same as at the Gulf Coast.

Clearly, the price of gasoline in Boston is not out of line—it is neither the highest nor the lowest, and is below the U.S. average. A comparison for other petroleum products will indicate a similar situation. Because of variations in local distribution costs, prices in other parts of New England range slightly above or below the Boston level.

Although petroleum product prices in New England are currently in line with those elsewhere in the nation, this has not always been the case. For several years within the past decade, New England prices were substantially lower than the average for the nation as a whole. A combination of factors—slower market growth, a general business recession in 1958, and oversupply—brought about depressed petroleum prices throughout the nation. But for various economic reasons, conditions were even more severe in New England. Price warfare persisted for several years until 1964, when improved economic conditions led to gradual price recovery. In 1963, the price of regular grade gasoline in Boston was 3.4 cents per gallon below the national average. But, by 1968 it had recovered to a level of only 0.4 cents under the nationwide average. Let's see what happened to the elements of cost between those years.

CONSUMER PRICE OF REGULAR GRADE GASOLINE IN BOSTON

[In cents per gallon]

	1963	1968	Change
Crude oil cost	6.9	7.0	+0.1
Refinery margin	3.8	3.6	−0.2
Transportation and terminal costs	1.8	2.0	+0.2
Jobber/dealer margin	5.0	10.2	+5.2
State and Federal taxes	9.5	10.5	+1.0
Consumer price	27.0	33.3	+6.3

Although most of the increase occurred at the jobber/dealer level, that element of cost in 1968 was nevertheless still below the average for the nation as a whole. The jobbers and dealers—small local businessmen—are badly squeezed in periods of depressed prices. And they, like all other business men, have encountered sharply rising costs in recent years. Included are the costs of government, which rose between 1963 and 1968 by more than one-third at the federal level and in New England by nearly 50 percent at state and local levels. Taxes are a cost of doing business that ultimately must be passed on to consumers—to think otherwise is illogical. Under the circumstances, the petroleum industry has performed a commendable feat indeed in holding prices down. In thirteen years—between 1955 and 1968—the average consumer price of gasoline in the nation, excluding taxes, rose by only 1.5 cents per gallon. Over the same period, state and federal excise taxes increased by more than twice as much—3.1 cents per gallon. But, relatively few consumers are aware of these facts—because of insufficient effective communications. And there is a tendency to blame the petroleum industry for all of the increase.

From the figures presented in the foregoing tables, it should be apparent that a new refinery located in New England would be able to provide lower priced petroleum products only if it could obtain crude oil at a lower cost. And it could do that only if it obtained the oil from a foreign source. Generally speaking, crude oil from some foreign sources can be delivered to East Coast ports for 2.5 to 3.0 cents per gallon less than oil of domestic origin. It is cheaper because it can be found and produced at a lower cost. Various economic factors are involved. Oil in the United States is found in smaller reservoirs and the cost of material and labor is higher. Transportation costs are higher too. Oil transported from the Gulf Coast to New England—or any other U.S. port—must, by law, be shipped only in tankers registered in the United States. And the labor costs on these ships are much higher than on vessels of foreign registry.

If crude oil from a foreign source is available at a lower cost, why shouldn't a refinery located in New England use it rather than domestic oil? For that matter, why shouldn't refineries everywhere operate on foreign crude oil if the nation's consumers can thereby be provided with lower priced petroleum products? Why, indeed? There are reasons vital to the nation's welfare why they should not. Many good arguments can be presented for free trade between nations when the benefits derived outweigh any harmful effects. But the security of the United States is tied directly to the degree of its petroleum self-sufficiency.

It is absolutely essential to any developed nation that it have an adequate and continuous supply of primary energy. And in the United States as much as three-fourths of all the energy consumed is petroleum—oil and natural gas. It is used nearly everywhere in the home, in industry, in commerce, in agriculture, and by all the Armed Forces. For the nation's vast transportation system, oil is virtually the only form of energy used. Clearly, any prolonged shortage of oil would be devastating. And an adequate domestic supply is the only sure way of avoiding such a shortage.

Recognizing the dangers posed by rapidly rising imports of lower cost foreign crude oil, the President of the United States imposed mandatory controls in March 1959. In part, the Presidential proclamation reads as follows: "The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

To limit imports in a manner that would be entirely equitable is an impossibility. But the controls as originally established in 1959 were reasonably well conceived. They were, however, susceptible to manipulation for political reasons and were therefore difficult to administer. From the beginning there have been numerous efforts to alter or circumvent the regulations—and some have been successful. It is, of course, unrealistic to think that any change that gives an economic advantage to some indidividuals or companies or regions will go unchallenged. Others, understandably, will clamor for equal treatment for competitive reasons. And each change in the import regulations has to a degree undermined the original intent of the control. The extent of the erosion thus far has raised widespread concern over the future status of the control—and some doubts that it will survive.

Surely, if import controls were removed, the action would mark the beginning of the end for domestic producers. The price of domestic crude oil would doubtless fall by 35 to 40 percent. And this would remove much of the incentive to search for new reserves. Producers would continue to produce oil and natural gas from reserves already found, but they could not afford to use their capital to find more—it would instead be shifted into other fields of economic endeavor that provide a better rate of return. Within a few years the nation's dependence upon foreign oil would soar from 21 percent now to more than 50 percent. And, as a result, the nation would be placed in a highly vulnerable position. Based upon past experience, there is positively no reason for believing that petroleum imports would be continuously available—instead, there are obvious reasons for believing otherwise. And in the event of another international war, the position of the United States would be critical. A successful military effort would require fully adequate supplies of petroleum at all times. And, because the private economy is far more dependent upon petroleum now than during World War II, it would be impossible to ration supplies to the degree they were during that conflict—to do so would lead to a breakdown of activities that necessarily must go on in support of the military effort.

Unlimited imports of foreign oil would have a severely damaging effect upon the future supply of natural gas too. Most gas reserves are found incidental to the search for crude oil, and if the financial incentive to find oil is destroyed, new gas reserves would not be discovered either. The wellhead price of natural gas is much too low to warrant a separate search for gas alone. Natural gas can be imported, but only to a limited degree. For the most part, consumers would have to do without, if the supply from domestic sources was limited.

Over the past ten years, domestic producers have spent a total of 44 billion dollars in their efforts to find oil and natural gas reserves in the United States. In the next decade, they will need to spend twice that much if the nation's current level of self-sufficiency is to be maintained. These capital expenditures flow through, and favorably influence, many sectors of the nation's economy. But, under the circumstances created by unlimited imports of foreign oil, relatively little of this money would be spent in the United States. Oil and natural gas are now produced in 32 of the nation's 50 states—and all of them would feel to varying degrees the detrimental economic impact of uncontrolled imports. In addition, the nation's balance of payments would be affected adversely.

Clearly, consumers would benefit if the import controls were removed. But only to a limited degree.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is always interesting to read newspapers from various parts of the country to see how interpretations of the same events often vary from one section to another. An event may be seen one way in Washington and still another way in Michigan, in California, or in South Carolina.

In this connection, I found an editorial which appeared on Sunday, March 16, in the State of Columbia, S.C., quite interesting. I believe that my colleagues who have been following developments in the title VI school desegregation program might also find the editorial informative, and I ask that it be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1969]

Hope for the South

If reports from Washington are to be believed, Richard Nixon told the truth when he promised, back during the campaign, to remove the thumb-screws from Southern school boards. Desegregation is still the mandate. But the word from the White House is that Mr. Nixon will shun the advice of neo-Reconstructionists, out to take their pound of flesh in vengeance for 200 years of slavery.

Robert Finch, the new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare indicated as much weeks ago—first in an interview with the Associated Press and later in a more expansive conversation with *U.S. News and World Report*. Now comes confirmation from the White House, where Dixie Republicans, it is said, this week had their worst fears laid to rest.

The Nixon program like all Gaul, is divided into three parts. First, the administration will take into consideration the immense social problems involved in Southern school desegregation. Second, HEW will devise new guidelines, carefully avoiding the inflexible racial quotas that marked the Johnson years. Third, those school districts that need special technical and financial help in moving toward compliance will get it.

So far, the Nixon plan is apparent in only outline form—a hint here, a vague something there, a shadow glimpsed out of the corner of the eye. It would be nice to have the text of the new guidelines or some other concrete measurement of precisely what the Nixon White House has in mind. This will have to wait, but while we're waiting a little speculation cannot hurt.

First off, can anyone imagine the Johnson administration giving the kind of assurances that have come recently from the White House aides and Secretary Finch? "The court has never really said that segregation itself is unlawful—or at least *de facto* segregation," Mr. Finch told *U.S. News*. "The court has said if you commit deliberate acts of discrimination, then you are in violation of the law." The words are unmistakably those of Mr. Finch. It simply would never have occurred to any of LBJ's lieutenants to suggest such a thing.

Then there is politics to consider. Mr. Nixon is President by virtue of his Southern support. Let there be no mistake about it. His nomination, in fact, came about because the South held firm for Nixon at a crucial moment during the convention. Not only that, but Sen. Strom Thurmond, who held the South for Nixon, did so, despite considerable risk, because he had Mr. Nixon's assurance that school pressures would ease up.

It is simply unthinkable that President Nixon would fail to honor that kind of political commitment. To turn his back against the South almost certainly would be to pass a death sentence on Senator Thurmond and perhaps destroy the Republican Party in the South for years to come. For Nixon himself, it could mean a Dixie revolt at the next GOP convention and perhaps a one-term Republican President. Anything could happen once the word got around that presidential promises were being repealed like the Confederate debt.

All these things suggest that Mr. Nixon intended to keep his word when he gave it and will do so. This is not to say that the clock can be set back to *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. Those days are gone. But indications are that the days of Lyndon Johnson are gone, too, and that the Nixon days will be a vast improvement.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, although the Safeguard ABM debate is far from over, I personally believe that President Nixon has made a very wise decision and I shall support him as long as the evidence clearly shows that the ABM will, in fact, work and is needed for American security.

I find it rather strange that some Members of the Congress are attempting to defeat a purely defensive system on grounds that it will not work, that it is not necessary and that it is provocative to the Soviet Union. I think there is a preponderance of evidence that it will work and I see nothing provocative in a defensive system at a time when the Soviet Union has crushed the spark of freedom in Czechoslovakia, has reached near nuclear parity with the United States and is building an offensive force which may soon eclipse the power of the United States. If we do not preserve the necessary American defensive posture, it will not be too many months or years until these same opponents of the ABM will be crying that the United States has become a second-rate nuclear power. We heard such cries during the 1960 presidential election. We saw similar arguments during the long and bitter debate over the hydrogen bomb and we are now witnessing it again.

I am convinced that cooperation with the Soviet Union is possible, but it will never work if this Nation allows itself to fall behind the Soviet Union in military power. That is essentially what the opponents of ABM are saying. They are closing their eyes to the developments surrounding Russia's missile capacity. They ignore her emergence as a world naval power and her development of nuclear weapons, larger in many respects than this Nation now has. I am convinced that the people of America are not being fooled by the political rhetoric and the hollowness of the arguments used by the ABM opponents.

The Ogden Standard-Examiner recently published a very penetrating editorial supporting President Nixon's ABM decision. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Mar. 15, 1969]

ABM Decision Bolsters Minuteman

President Richard M. Nixon's decision to press for construction of a "safeguard program" of anti-ballistic missiles underlines the importance placed on the Utah-made Minuteman missiles as the "bedrock" of U.S. defenses.

The new Republican President, after lengthy conferences with military and civilian leaders, told a Friday news conference that two ABM bases will be operational by 1973 if his recommendations are followed.

One would help guard the 200-missile Minuteman silo complex, America's first, around Malmstrom Air Force Base at Great Falls in north-central Montana.

The second would protect the nation's newest Minuteman base at Grand Forks, N.D., where 150 of the latest models of the Utah-built, solid-fuel intercontinental bal-

XUM

listic missiles are war-ready in their deep silos.

The Nixon plan differs in several respects from the ABM program announced in October 1967 by the Johnson administration.

President Johnson and his then-secretary of defense, Robert McNamara, proposed putting a "thin line" of Sentinel Missiles around America's key cities.

This brought protests—ill-founded, we believe—that such placement would endanger the cities by making them prime targets as well as being subject to damage should the nuclear warheads accidentally detonate.

Some of the most vigorous protests came from Salt Lake City, one of the Sentinel sites proposed in the Johnson-McNamara program.

Mr. Nixon has taken this into consideration in ordering the initial ABM installations around the Montana and North Dakota Minuteman bases. Both are located in areas where population density is comparatively sparse.

If the Nixon plan is followed, we agree that our land-based retaliatory forces—the Minuteman missiles—will be protected against what the President termed any possible "direct attack" by the Soviet Union, as well as against any nuclear weapons launched by Red China.

The Great Falls and Grand Forks Sentinel squadrons, by their strategic locations on the northern approaches to 48 of our states, should also be capable of blunting the damage that might be caused by accidental missile launches by either Russia or China.

President Nixon's "safeguard" ABM system is, we feel, a logical compromise between an elaborate antiballistic missile network and the current, unguarded system of ICBM system of ICBM bases.

The "doves" will continue to maintain that any form of ABM network will jeopardize the possibility of long-range peace with the Soviet Union.

Russia will certainly issue statements following the same "soft" line and charging that the United States—only a few hours after the approval of our Senate of the nuclear test ban treaty—had escalated the arms race.

Such an attitude is typical of the Communists.

They already have an ABM network around their main cities and major missile bases, where the Russian version of the Minuteman is in place and readily capable of striking the heart of our nation.

So we can expect that the U.S.S.R. propaganda would favor keeping the United States ICBM network vulnerable to a missile attack.

The Reds always cry "do as we say, not as we do."

The $6–7 billion requested by President Nixon to construct the two Sentinel bases would, we believe, be a wise investment in security for our country.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, March 25, marked the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

In the Soviet Union, for obvious reasons, this anniversary will not be celebrated. But it will be the object of solemn observances by the Byelorussian community in this country and other parts of the free world.

It is all too customary to think of the Soviet Union as a single monolithic state. Actually, it is a vast prison house of nations, as a study published by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security many years ago pointed out.

When the Bolsheviks first came to power, Lenin promised the unconditional right of self-determination to the various minority nationalities who had been subjected by the czarist regime.

Taking this declaration at face value, the Ukrainian people, the Byelorussian people, the Georgians, and other non-Russian nationalities, moved to set up states of their own that would be independent of Bolshevik rule.

But as soon as the Bolsheviks were able to mobilize the military forces necessary to put down these independence movements, they scrapped their promise of self-determination and moved to destroy the dozen or more independent national governments that had sprung up at the time of the November revolution.

The fate of Byelorussia was characteristic of the fate that befell the other independent non-Russian republics. By way of telling this story, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at this point the text of a statement in the form of a letter which I received from Mr. Michael Bachar, chairman of the United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United Byelorussian-American
Commemorative Committee,
Kew Gardens, N.Y., March 7, 1969.

Hon. Thomas J. Dodd,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The day of March 25, 1969 will mark the anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian origin. On this day Byelorussians everywhere in the countries of the free world will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

In Byelorussia, however, this national celebration is not permitted. This year, instead, marks the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian SSR.

The Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state. Soviet Russia turned Byelorussia into its own colony by military conquest. At the time of the First World War, the Tsarist Russian Empire was disintegrating. All the non-Russian nations liberated and restored themselves as free, independent and sovereign countries. The Byelorussian constituent body—the First all-Byelorussian Congress—assembled on December 17, 1917 in Miensk, the capital of Byelorussia. It was composed of 1,872 freely elected delegates from all areas of Byelorussia. Their first task was to take the necessary steps for establishing an independent Byelorussian Republic. Since participating communist delegates were of a small minority, they were unable to change the trend. Therefore, an armed force, dispatched by the Bolshevik-Russian government, overran and dispersed the Congress. Immediately following this action, however, Congress met and chose the Executive Council which, on March 23, 1918, proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The elected Byelorussian government acted vigorously on the diplomatic arena and organized armed forces which fought for national independence.

The Soviet Russian government, in opposition to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, decided to create fictitious statehood for Byelorussian people. In Moscow in November 1918 the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) passed a resolution establishing the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The candidates for the government of BSSR were selected in Moscow and dispatched to Byelorussia. In connection with the departure of those candidates from Moscow on December 29, 1918 Stalin sent a telegram to Myasnikoff, a Russian ruler in Byelorussia, which read as follows: "The Byelorussian are departing for Smalensk today. They are carrying a manifesto. The Central Committee of the Party and Lenin is asking to have them accepted as younger brothers, who as yet may be without experience, but who are ready to give their lives for the Party and Soviet work."

In the city of Smalensk on December 30, and 31, 1918, the sixth north-western provincial conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) took place. This conference, consisting of Russians and internationalists, named itself after the first meet- of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia. There were participating 162 delegates with voting rights and 25 delegates with consulting right. This meeting sent a greeting to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Moscow, which also contained this statement: "By proclaiming the establishment of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia, the conference confirms its uninterrupted ideological, tactical and organizational connection with the Russian Communist Party, which was created during many years of common activity. The conference further confirms that in the future the communists of Byelorussia will follow the leadership of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and consider it as the higher authority of the Party".

On December 31, 1918 the conference approved "the provisional revolutionary workers' and peasants' government for Byelorussia", which had been previously appointed in Moscow and which consisted of communists only. As a matter of ethnic formality two Byelorussians: Zhylunovich and Charviakou, were added to this government. The leading part of this government, however, was composed of non-Byelorussians. On January 1, 1919 this government announced a manifesto which had been prepared earlier in Moscow. This date and this act are considered the foundations for the Byelorussian SSR.

On February 2, 1919 the first assembly of Soviets of BSSR convened in Miensk. It was composed of 230 delegates, of which number 213 were communists and 17 sympathizers. The representative of the Soviet Russian government, Sverdloff, had announced the decision of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee which recognized the Byelorussian SSR. Answering this recognition, the assembly decided to maintain close federal connection between the BSSR and RSFSR.

On February 3, 1919 this assembly accepted a constitution, a national emblem and a flag for BSSR, modeled after the Russian SFSR.

Created by Soviet Russian government in this way, the BSSR is camouflaging the actual colonial status of Byelorussia. For the entire 50 years of this Soviet Russian domination, Byelorussians have been subjected to a systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level.

This rule has been marked by economic exploitation, social oppression, mass terror, political deportations, imprisonments and murders. Denial of religious freedom to all faiths openly continuous. A low standard of living, malnutrition and substandard housing are permanent features of this Soviet rule. The end result is that during this period Byelorussian nation has lost over six million of her population.

At this time Byelorussians in the BSSR do not have any possibility to defend their own national interests. Therefore, we take the liberty to ask you for support of the aims of the Byelorussian nation for liberation

XUM

from the horrors experienced during these past 50 years of Soviet Russian occupation, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian State.

Very respectfully yours,

MICHAEL BACHAR,
Chairman.

SEWARD WILL PROSPER

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Senators have heard me speak of the economic problems facing the city of Seward, Alaska, and of the enterprising efforts of the people of that city to overcome these problems.

Seward has one of the finest deepwater, ice-free ports in the world. As the southern terminus of the Alaska Railroad, it has in the past served as the principal entry point for the railbelt of Alaska. Now with the growth of the port of Anchorage and the use of roll-on, roll-off facilities at the abandoned military port of Whittier, Seward finds itself without the economic base it depended on.

Seward was an all-America city; its recovery from the disastrous 1964 earthquake, tsunami wave and fire was remarkable. Its recovery was a tribute to its desire to survive and prosper. Mr. President, Seward will survive its economic problems. It will survive, and I will do all I can to help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the city of Seward Resolution 740 may be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF SEWARD RESOLUTION 740

Whereas, The City of Seward and its citizens are imperiled with economic transportation extinction due to a dramatic decline in the number of vessels using the docking facilities here, and

Whereas, The Alaska Railroad has consistently neglected its responsibility to the community as a major economic factor in the continued prosperity of the entire area, and

Whereas, it has become apparent to all citizens in the community that firm action must be initiated in order to prevent Seward's ultimate extinction as an important factor in Alaskan transportation and as a participant in the overall growth of the state, and

Whereas, the citizens of the City of Seward have exhausted their financial resources in the aftermath of the 1964 Good Friday Earthquake, never to regain these losses, now,

Therefore, be it resolved that the citizens of the City of Seward, Alaska through their elected officials propose that the following development plan for the Port of Seward, Alaska be reviewed by the members of the Alaskan Delegation to Congress and that they, Senators Stevens and Gravel and Representative Pollock, present this proposal for consideration before the United States Congress for final determination and action. Said Development Plan to be outlined as follows:

MISSION ONE

The citizens of the City of Seward, Alaska, propose that immediate consideration be given to the construction of two railslips to be located adjacent to the railroad dock. The installation of these railslips will provide needed accommodation to Trainships using the roll-on/roll-off method of loading and discharging railroad cars. In connection with the construction and operation of these twin railslips, it is also proposed that consideration be given to construction of a Truck terminal and warehousing area for the use and general convenience of truck lines and their employees who will be encouraged to utilize the expanded full-service facilities.

The citizens further propose that priority attention be given to the immediate need for construction of a railslip on the east side of the Alaska Railroad Dock which, in their opinion, constitutes the most feasible location for the initial construction activity. Next it is proposed that the second trainslip be constructed on the west side of the Railroad Dock in such a way as to permit simultaneous operation with the Dock itself and the twin railslip. It is proposed that action be initiated on an emergency basis, if necessary, to promote the return of economic well-being to Seward.

MISSION TWO

The citizens of Seward further propose that The Alaska Railroad freight tariffs as administered under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission be favorably revised to encourage shippers to utilize Seward's dock facilities. The proposal asks that consideration be extended for a 10-year period following the completion of the second railslip.

MISSION THREE

The citizens of Seward request the United States Congress to establish a Blue Ribbon Commission to investigate the feasibility and potentiality of a high speed transportation corridor linking the cities of Kenai, Soldotna and Seward by means of a highway and a railroad that would further expand the economic profile of the Kenai Peninsula.

MISSION FOUR

The citizens of Seward dedicate themselves to the tasks ahead and request this assistance in bringing Seward forward through dramatic economic improvement. The citizens, through their elected officials, petition the Congress of the United States to give this matter priority attention consistent with the needs of the Nation and to implement as soon as possible, positive steps toward fulfilling this request.

EXHIBITS

The following exhibits are attached hereto and made a part of Resolution No. 740:

Exhibit A: Aerial view of Federal Railroad Dock and proposed site for railslip-warehouse facilities.

Exhibit B: Drawing showing present layout of Alaska Railroad facilities and the proposed railslip locations. (T-S 3 shows alternate in case extra land area is required for second railslip.)

Exhibit C: Map of Seward and Harbor area.

And, be it further resolved that James R. Filip, City-Clerk Treasurer of The City of Seward, Alaska, be and is hereby directed to submit this Resolution to the Alaskan Delegation in Congress.

This Resolution shall be effective on the date of its passage and approval.

Passed and approved by The City Council of The City of Seward, Alaska, this 3rd day of March, 1969.

E. G. SKINNER,
Vice Mayor.

Attest:

JAMES R. FILIP,
City Clerk-Treasurer.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. RODNEY M. DAVIS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Vice President today will present the Medal of Honor posthumously to Sgt. Rodney M. Davis of Macon, Ga., who made the supreme sacrifice for his country and who gave his own life in order to save the lives of his comrades in battle in Vietnam.

Sergeant Davis' wife, two small children, and other members of his family from Macon are to be present for the ceremonies and to receive the Medal of Honor. All the Nation, and indeed all the free world, is indebted to the young men of America who are fighting so gallantly in Vietnam, and we are especially proud of those valiant men who have gone above and beyond the call of duty. Such a gallant man and brave marine was Sergeant Davis, and I join the Nation in saluting his memory today.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Sergeant Davis' citation, as well as a brief profile of his outstanding career in the U.S. Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the citation and profile were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States in the name of The Congress takes pride in presenting the Medal of Honor posthumously to Sergeant Rodney M. Davis, United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as the right guide of the Second Platoon, Company B, First Battalion, Fifth Marines, First Marine Division, in action against enemy forces in Quang Nam Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 6 September 1967. Elements of the Second Platoon were pinned down by a numerically superior force of attacking North Vietnamese Army Regulars. Remnants of the platoon were located in a trench line where Sergeant Davis was directing the fire of his men in an attempt to repel the enemy attack. Disregarding the enemy hand grenades and high volume of small arms and mortar fire, Sergeant Davis moved from man to man shouting words of encouragement to each of them while firing and throwing grenades at the onrushing enemy. When an enemy grenade landed in the trench in the midst of his men, Sergeant Davis, realizing the gravity of the situation, and in a final valiant act of complete self-sacrifice, instantly threw himself upon the grenade, absorbing with his own body the full and terrific force of the explosion. Through his extraordinary initiative and inspiring valor in the face of almost certain death, Sergeant Davis saved his comrades from injury and possible loss of life, enabled his platoon to hold its vital position, and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life for his country.

SGT. RODNEY M. DAVIS, USMC

Rodney Maxwell Davis was born April 7, 1942, in Macon, Georgia. He attended elementary and high schools there, and graduated from Peter G. Appling High School, May 29, 1961.

Shortly after graduation, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in his hometown, August 31, 1961; then reported for recruit training with the 1st Recruit Training Battalion, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina. Upon completion of recruit training in December 1961, he was transferred to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and underwent Individual Combat Training with the 2d Battalion, 1st Infantry Training Regiment, graduating the following February.

He then joined Company "K", 3d Battalion, 2d Marines, 2d Marine Division, FMF, at Camp Lejeune and served as a Rifleman until May 1964. While stationed at Camp Lejeune, he was promoted to private first class, April 1, 1962, and to lance corporal, January 1, 1964.

Lance Corporal Davis was ordered to London, England, for a three-year tour of duty as Guard with the U.S. Marine Detachment, Naval Activities. He was promoted to corporal, January 1, 1966, and to sergeant, December 1, 1966.

Ordered to the Republic of Vietnam in August 1967, he was assigned duty as a Platoon Guide with Company "B", 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division. While serving as the right guide of the Second Platoon against enemy forces in Quang Nam Province on September 6, 1967, he was mortally wounded when he threw himself upon a hand grenade to save his comrades from injury and possible death.

His medals and decorations include: the Purple Heart; the Good Conduct Medal; the National Defense Service Medal; the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; the Vietnam Service Medal; the Military Merit Medal; the Gallantry Cross with Palm; and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Sergeant Davis is survived by his wife, Mrs. Judy P. Davis; two children: Nochola Amanda (born July 21, 1965), Samantha Jane (born August 14, 1966), of 2120–B Meriwood Drive, Macon, Ga; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon N. Davis of 2154 Neal Avenue, Macon; three brothers, Mr. Gordon N. Davis, Jr., of 813 Whitney Avenue, Albany, Georgia, Howard H. and Robert C., of the parents' address, and one sister, Debra E., of the parents' address.

MARYLAND DAY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, yesterday we marked the 335th anniversary of the founding of Maryland on March 25, 1634.

The Free State enters its 336th year with many challenges, but with firm confidence; with difficulties, but with determination; with hazards ahead, but with a history of achievement from which to draw new guidance and strength.

As we face the tests of the future, we can gain comfort and conviction from the Marylanders of the past, the men and women who laid down firm principles in the midst of earlier turbulence, and gave the State and Nation sound leadership through critical times of change.

Charles Carroll of Carrollton was one of these Marylanders who excelled in vision and maturity. Member of the Continental Congress, first U.S. Senator from Maryland, and unrelenting champion of freedom, Charles Carroll of Carrollton was significantly the last survivor of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. It was typical of his very existence that he came to symbolize the Declaration and the ideals that it embodies.

His lifespan from 1737 to 1832 bridged the transition from the feudalism of Lord Baltimore's proprietary rule to vigorous democracy. His understanding bridged the distance from the traditional education which he received in Louis XV's France to the sturdy American ideals of national freedom and personal liberty which he advanced.

In 1774, Carroll wrote:

> I will either endeavor to defend the liberties of my country, or die with them: this I am convinced is the sentiment of every true and generous American.

He recognized, long before most of his countrymen, the inevitability of American separation from the English crown, and recognized too the need to secure liberty not only for the American flag, but under that flag for every citizen. In public and private life, he fought to banish forever the religious intolerance which had penetrated Maryland, the colony founded on toleration.

In 1776 Carroll witnessed many triumphs, for in that crucial year he served in the Maryland convention which voted for independence; went as a delegate to the Continental Congress, where he signed the Declaration of Independence; and led the State convention which, that fall, adopted Maryland's new constitution and the bill of rights which became a model for the new Nation.

Charles Carroll of Carrollton was a remarkably modest man, who continually declined honors while accepting service where he felt he could contribute most. Elected as Maryland's first U.S. Senator, he resigned that office to continue service as a Maryland State senator in 1792 when it became unlawful to hold both posts. Consistently he emphasized the strengthening of Maryland as a foundation stone in a durable Union.

The causes which Charles Carroll advocated, and the principles he advanced, are as vital now as they were in his time. Now, as then, Marylanders are responding to the threat of prejudice, to the shadow of injustices, and to the need to reshape and redesign institutions of government.

There is, however, a difference. The Maryland of 1776 had a population of only about 225,000 and by the time of Carroll's death was still under 500,000. Today, Maryland has grown so that her population is about 4 million and her human and material resources exceed those of many nations of the earth. The distinction between the Maryland of Carroll and the Maryland of 1969 is the greater obligation that our greater wealth and power impose. We must not despair of equaling the shining achievements of Charles Carroll. We owe both the past and the present, indeed, we owe Charles Carroll and his compatriots themselves, the establishment of even higher goals.

We are observing Maryland Day today both in the Free State, and in the National Capital which Charles Carroll of Carrollton was instrumental in bringing to the banks of the Potomac, to lands ceded by Maryland for the seat of Federal Government. In marking this day, we should both reflect upon the past and respond to the present—for the cause of liberty is as pressing today as ever, and our efforts and achievements can only be as great.

A SUCCESSFUL TECHNICAL COLLEGE AT LINN, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for more than a century Linn, Mo., has had national fame as the home of a newspaper with a unique name, the "Unterrified Democrat," established soon after the Civil War and published throughout those years, until recent months, by the Zevely family.

Now, thanks to the vision and leadership of the superintendent of the Linn R–2 School District, this county seat of Osage County, Mo., has another claim to fame in a successful 2-year school which could well be a pattern for other schools to meet this growing need in our modern technology.

As reported recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, on March 18, Linn Technical College was started in 1961 under the direction of Thurman L. Willett, superintendent of that school district with a class of 36. It now has an enrollment of 450.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY OF TOP U.S. FIRMS RECRUIT STUDENTS FROM LINN COLLEGE

LINN, MO., March 17.—Some of the nation's industrial giants regularly pay tribute to a small "college" in this central Missouri town of 1050 population.

Such nationally-known firms as McDonnell Douglas Corp., Ford Motor Co., Lockheed, Chrysler, Caterpillar, Honeywell, Ralston-Purina, Radio Corporation of America and International Business Machines Corp., regularly recruit graduates of Linn Technical College.

Recently a recruiter from McDonnell Douglas, Missouri's largest employer, was sent to the college. Before leaving he signed up 15 prospects.

Linn Tech is not a college in the sense that it offers degrees. But it does offer thorough training in electronics, design drafting, automobile mechanics and machine tool technology. Next year a course in aviation technology will be added.

Linn Tech was started in 1961 with 22 day students and 14 night students. The only course available was electronics. It has since grown to an enrollment of 450—all but two from Missouri.

The school was founded by Thurman L. Willett, superintendent of the Linn R-2 School District since 1955. It is the realization of a dream Willett has had for more than 25 years.

In 1942, while Willett was superintendent of a small school district in Southeast Missouri, he took stock of a high school graduating class.

He was chagrined to realize that none would go on to higher learning. Some could not afford college; some didn't want to continue. But many would have benefited from some type of additional training.

It was then that he conceived the idea of a two-year technical training school to help prepare young persons who couldn't afford the extra schooling needed to get better paying jobs in a society that was already embarked upon technological change.

World War II, and a 10-year stint in private enterprise intervened. But in 1955, Willett received his master's degree in education from the University of Missouri. He took his new degree along when he went to take over as superintendent at Linn.

He begged, borrowed and scrounged enough money and material to open the first electronics course in 1961. Classes were held in the basement of one of the Linn school buildings.

From that small beginning, the school has grown in stature as well as enrollment.

But the success of the school has created one of its biggest problems. As the school's reputation grows, so does the number of applicants.

Housing space in Linn is hard to find.

Two years ago, when local space ran out, Willett set up a billet in the basement of his home for 10 students. This year he has seven staying at his home. They are in addition to three preschool youngsters of his own, which make a full house.

Willett recently appeared before the Missouri House Education Committee to support a bill that would let his and other school districts sell revenue bonds to build dormitories.

Since that meeting the House passed the bill and sent it to the Senate.

Willett believes the bill is a must if Linn Tech is to survive. Although the technical school is part of the Linn R-2 district, it is operated separately. None of the taxes in R-2 are used.

"There are too many people who think we are using public school money for the tech school," Willett said. "Consequently, we have not been able to pass a single bond issue for the development of our regular schools."

Willett said the dormitory would be paid off from rentals charged the students.

He wants to build a dormitory housing about 60 students. This would relieve the crowded situation without taking away any income from local residents who have fixed up their homes to rent to students, he said.

The students clean up their own classrooms. They are paid the minimum wage of $1.25 an hour out of matching funds from the Federal Government. The fund is administered by the students.

In its short existence the school has established one tradition. Each Friday is "dress up" day when everyone must wear a coat and tie. The instructors feel this is good training for the day when most of the graduates will be working in white collar jobs.

It also has been noticed by companies who hire Linn Tech graduates.

BYELORUSSIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25 marked the 51st anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia, an independence of tragically brief duration.

During the centuries in which Byelorussia was governed by the Czars, its brave people tried time and again to free themselves from the embrace of the Russian bear; each time their efforts were crushed by force of arms.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence and a free democratic republic was born. Communist intrigue and military intervention soon strangled the new nation, and by January of 1919 Byelorussia was formally bound to the Soviet Union. The new government was not elected or approved by the Byelorussian people, and was made up largely of non-Byelorussians dispatched from Moscow.

Following the defeat of Hitler, the people of Byelorussia again tried to reestablish the independence of their homeland, but again the commissars proved themselves more imperialistic than the Czars.

For the entire 50 years of this Soviet domination, Byelorussians have been subjected to systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level. The striving and hope for national identity still lives, however, and the people of the free world join in hoping that the brief moment of freedom which Byelorussia once experienced will someday be restored.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE COAST GUARD AIR STATION AT LOS ANGELES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute as well as offer my sincere congratulations to 38 dedicated officers and men of the Coast Guard Air Station in Los Angeles.

In recent weeks, the Coast Guard Air Station has played a vital, life-saving role during crises in the area.

The first of these occurred on January 13 when a Scandinavian Airlines DC–8 crashed with serious loss of life off the Los Angeles coast. On January 18, a United Airlines 727 went down in the same vicinity.

In both cases, helicopters from the Coast Guard Air Station at Los Angeles International Airport were over the crash areas almost immediately. These helicopters were the first rescue units to respond, arrive on the crash scenes, locate survivors and direct surface units to the sites.

In neither case were these operations easy. During the SAS disaster, the Coast Guard operated with a ceiling of only 700 feet and visibility, in heavy rain and fog, of about 1 mile. They made 13 sorties to the scene, putting in almost 30 flight hours. Extremely hazardous flying conditions existed during the United Airlines operation, also. Visibility was often less than 1 mile, again in heavy rain, yet the helicopters flew 14 sorties lasting a total of 19.4 hours.

While the Coast Guard established its air station at the Los Angeles International Airport in 1962, to provide immediate assistance for any airline crash off the airport, no commercial air carrier had been involved in an accident requiring Coast Guard help until the SAS crash. During this period, however, the air station responded to an average of 175 calls for other types of assistance yearly.

These emergency calls, Mr. President, are extremely wideranging as well as being highly perilous. Only the other day one of the Coast Guard's helicopters was able to save an 80-foot commercial fishing vessel from going on the rocks by blowing it away from shore with its rotor wash. This is not an infrequent type of emergency to which these men are summoned. They have saved people stranded on nearby cliffs. They have removed many injured or sick seamen from vessels at sea. They conduct countless routine searches for overdue boats.

"The saving of life is the fruit of our efforts," Comdr. P. W. Tifft, Jr., commanding officer of the air station, has told me.

This was dramatically underscored during the recent Los Angeles-Santa Barbara flood disasters. Between January 25 and 28, Commander Tifft's men air evacuated 49 people isolated by flood waters. During these operations they flew 20 sorties during 26 hours. The lifesaving versatility of their work included flying bales of hay to horses stranded by water northwest of Santa Barbara and in delivering vital food and medical supplies to isolated regions near Carpinteria and Malibu. All this, Mr. President, with visibility often less than 440 yards and a ceiling of a mere 200 feet.

These dedicated men, as their commander expresses it, "are always ready and strive for a high degree of professionalism in responding to calls of distress from the people of Los Angeles."

I, and all who know of their work, commend and thank them.

HAROLD E. HUGHES: EVANGELIST FROM THE PRAIRIES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the current issue of Harper's magazine contains a profile of the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa which I commend to Senators. Larry L. King, a frequent contributor to Harper's and a writer of wit and perspicacity, sought out his subject in the town of Ida Grove, Iowa, on Harold E. Hughes Recognition Day. Not surprisingly, Ida Grove was recognizing a native son with all the pride and ceremony that a town of 2,300 can muster, and congratulating itself and him on his election to the U.S. Senate. That Harold Hughes had previously served his fellow townsmen and the rest of the people of Iowa for three successful and progressive terms as Governor helped to explain the intense excitement in that town on that day.

The author expected the visit to be a sentimental pilgrimage, enlivened by the clamor of rhetoric, well wishers, and favor seekers. Having witnessed other such scenes more than once, he was not prepared for Harold Hughes who reserved for himself 4 hours of that public day for private thought. From that point on, the author began to discern some of the unique qualities of his subject that have won Senator Hughes the trust of his constituents and the admiration of countless friends and associates.

The list of Harold Hughes' progressive accomplishments as Governor of a traditionally conservative State is remarkable. Larry King quotes a close associate explaining how it happened:

> His secret is his ability to communicate with people. . . . He's simply talked sense to them—told them the truth. . . . That kind of practical integrity is appreciated in Iowa.

That quality is appreciated by all of us. Senator Hughes is warmly and accurately portrayed in the article to which I refer. I ask consent that it be printed in the Record for the pleasure and acquaintance of his colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Harold E. Hughes: Evangelist From the Prairies

(By Larry L. King)

Turncoat Republican, Vietnam dove, advocate of international disarmament, latter-day disciple of Eugene McCarthy, ex-drunk, social do-gooder, Iowa's former Governor is now his state's Senator and may yet surprise his constituency with what he attempts to do.

The women were up and baking cookies, cupcakes, and fruit tarts long before the sun, having sent their husbands off to their shops and stock barns even earlier than usual. The children, having awakened to this day of rare promise, wandered sleepy-eyed about the warm winter kitchens of Iowa, sniffing baked goods, and asking questions: "How did a real Governor ever get borned in Ida Grove, Mamma?"

For weeks the citizens of Ida Grove, population 2,300, had been anticipating the biggest day in its history. Now, on the morning of Harold E. Hughes Recognition Day, Mayor Tony Schau, a shy country fellow who probably would prefer wrestling a bear to public speaking, and might have more luck, wor-

XUM

ried over the official proclamation he would attack—not without grave danger to the English language—at the banquet in Community Hall that night. Husky 4–H Clubbers and glow-faced little Future Homemakers promised themselves to cater the Governor's banquet with dignity and dispatch. Betty Hutchinson, who writes a column called "Pertinent Piffle" for the Ida County *Pioneer Record*, wondered what she should ask Governor Hughes in the personal interview he had consented to; finally she decided to solicit his suggestions on how Ida Grove might best court "progress." (The Governor, possibly expecting a grilling on the state budget or the Vietnam war, would blink at the question and reply, well, he couldn't say without making a detailed study of the situation; it is up to each town to declare its unique assets and problems and to measure these carefully and proceed accordingly, and this has apparently been done in Ida Grove and the town is definitely moving forward—a most un-Hughes-like speech, the antithesis of his usual blunt candor; one must remember that many good men have been softened by protective considerations of home.) In the lobby of the Ida County State Bank, workers and bank executives collaborated in the hanging of a huge streamer: "Welcome Home Harold, Eva, and Family." "Some have been hoping we can convince him to move back here," a local booster said. "It would be mighty sweet advertising for the town."

Two bodies of opinion existed over how the guest of honor should be properly addressed. One group held that since Harold Hughes would be Governor for another month he should be called by that title; a dissenting element, holding that the Governor had just been elected to a higher office and within the month would be sworn in as United States Senator, felt that any appellation other than "Senator" might constitute a personal insult. No such thing, the first group cried in rebuttal, because there are only fifty Governors as against one hundred U.S. Senators and so we must call him "Governor," else the town is ruined. Two signs erected some years ago reflected this community division: the sign at Ida County Airport welcomed its very occasional travelers to "The Home of Governor Harold E. Hughes"; another on the outskirts of town, near the main highway, had been altered to welcome passersby to the hometown of "Senator" Hughes.

Shortly before 11:00 A.M. Governor Hughes, driving a black limousine and accompanied by his wife and sixteen-year-old daughter, tooled by the sign prematurely welcoming him as Senator and, with not a surplus look nor sentimental pause, rolled on through the brief business district to the Ida Grove Motel on the far edge of town. One had, in old newsreels, novels, and real life, followed many men returning to their native earth: Wendell Willkie standing in an open convertible, cops sirening him through the hometown crowds, as he permitted Elwood, Indiana, a glimpse of him after his nomination for President; Willie Stark, exhorting the woolhats and rednecks from the steps of the Mason City courthouse in *All the King's Men* country, telling them how he was going out to the old home place and raid his pappy's smokehouse; Lyndon B. Johnson searching for his boyhood tracks in the poor dust of Johnson City. They had all come back with smiles on their famous faces, reveling in the parades and music and oratory.

So a moderately jaded observer of such political kingfish, sharing a trailing automobile with one of the Governor's aides-de-camp, was surprised to see the Governor roll on through town, neither calling attention to himself nor chasing old landmarks across the railroad track. "The Governor isn't that much of a sentimentalist," his assistant said. "He operates a little different than most politicians. He doesn't want you to interview him today. You can observe him in public but he doesn't want you talking to him—at least on issues; he'll be busy with old friends when he's out in public and when he's not in public he wants to meditate."

He wants to what?

Yes, the man said, the Governor simply likes to sit and think. He's of the opinion that public men don't do enough of that.

Cheers for the notion, but did the Governor expect to actually spend his day in solitary meditations when the whole of Ida Grove lay at his feet, anxious to honor him and trembling to begin?

The assistant noted that official events didn't begin until 3:00 p.m., and the Governor therefore had four hours of leisure time.

The visitor said he[illegible] there would be a march on the Ida Grove Motel once word got around that the Great Man had arrived: celebrity stalkers, job seekers, precinct czars, and other assorted old pests.

"People out here pretty well respect your privacy," the assistant said as we parked outside the Ida Grove Motel.

But, the visitor protested, I've flown all night to get here and talk to this man. He's been something of a middle-America folk hero back in the East: great things are predicted for him. He's hot copy. National exposure as he enters the Senate is the kind of break politicians pray for. Maybe you'd better tell him how advantageous this could be to his Washington career.

The aide smiled and said, "Don't ever try that approach on Harold Hughes. I *told* you he was different from most politicians."

Governor Hughes passed by en route to the motel office, a sober countenance upon him, a really bleak and cheerless look. When he emerged he offered only a token wave before disappearing into his rooms. The visitor did not then know an interesting bit of the Governor's history—that the Governor is an ex-alcoholic—or he might not have so readily observed, "He looks like a man who needs a drink."

There was a long and silent afternoon with the visitor restlessly rattling around his own motel room while the Governor presumably meditated behind an adjoining wall and traffic disturbed the distant highway some three times an hour. The visitor stared on the chilled, brown winter landscape of rural Iowa and wondered what sort of prairie guru the folks had elected here.

Iowa is not given to losing its head. Though it contributed a Henry Wallace who got involved in matters of the occult, observed exotic diets, killed little pigs, and flirted with radicals and Reds in his Progressive party phase, FDR and not Iowa got him to the Vice-Presidency. The only time Iowans gave us a President they offered that paragon of Old Guard virtue, Herbert Hoover. More often than not the Iowa electorate chooses cautious Stone Age Republicans whose endless peregrinations to Washington disturb neither the status quo nor anyone's mental processes, including their own. Senators such as Bourke B. Hickenlooper or Jack Miller serve their many terms untroubled by imagination or national travail. The most notorious Congressman from Iowa is cranky old H. R. Gross, a seventy-year-old knee-jerk best remembered for castigating the Reverend Bill Moyers for dancing the frug in the White House, for complaining when a State Department wife turned up at some official function "half naked," for trying to deny Harlem its preference for Adam Clayton Powell, and for going into a screaming snit at the merest thought of bureaucrats with new schemes in mind on spending.

Iowa is bedrock country. Faith-of-our-Fathers country; it is incredibly clean, and its quiet villages are trim and tree-lined. It is overwhelmingly white, instinctively Republican, and rural even in its cities. There is about it a joyless sense of order, rote, and commercial hustle common to the Germans between their holier wars; and refugees from the Eastern Seaboard or even the Southwest, when suddenly faced with Iowa, tend to be mesmerized by the supposition that such places exist only in stories by MacKinlay Kantor, paintings by Norman Rockwell, and old Walt Disney productions with Fred MacMurray, freckled boys, and big friendly dogs. It is capable of the Old Testament furies: in one recent issue of the Des Moines *Tribune* were articles reporting eighteen persons arrested in Ottumwa for conducting "a loud party" past midnight and a wife who received thirty years in prison for pinging her husband with a letter opener so slightly that he was home from the hospital within the week, and an upbraiding of Frank Sinatra after he'd had the temerity to suggest that "'The Star-Spangled Banner' is a terrible piece of music." One night after the visitor had been turned away from the most preferred hotel in Des Moines because the sweet old lady desk clerk obviously suspected his beard, he stood alone in downtown Des Moines—dark and dead as the grave at 9:00 P.M.—and with the terrible December wind punishing him for the ungodly hour, he knew why Ronald "Dutch" Reagan had torn himself away and gone out to California. Iowa is where the State Supreme Court awarded a man's eight-year-old son to his maternal grandparents because the father was an artist and presumably lived a bohemian life in the West. It is where a local grand jury recently urged efforts for "the elimination of moral pollution by faculty and paid speakers" at Iowa State University, Ames.

Such a catalogue is not intended to embarrass Iowans, but to stress how very amazing it is that Harold E. Hughes—turncoat Republican, Vietnam dove, advocate of international disarmament, latter-day disciple of Senator Eugene McCarthy, ex-drunk, social do-gooder—could get himself elected to statewide office not once but five times.[1] In the words of his friend, author Vance Bourjaily of the University of Iowa, Harold Hughes is one of those men of balanced contradiction who sometimes occur in our political life. . . . It is as if the checks and balances which our civic books speak of as being fundamental to the democratic structure were embodied in a single human system."

Though a Methodist Sunday School teacher and a persistent free-style moralist, Hughes won the Iowa Governorship in 1962 largely on a platform to make legal liquor-by-the-drink. An enthusiastic hunter in a hunter's state, he champions far-reaching gun-control legislation. The Governor of a rurally oriented state, he campaigned against and defeated a constitutional amendment to reapportion in favor of rural and small-town voting blocs. He has publicly identified with young dissenters by telling their critics, "I really worry a lot more about the long faces on adults than I do about the long hair on kids." In a state where the "non-white" population is less than one per cent and little or no political profit is to be gained by supporting civil rights, Hughes has condemned his audiences as hypocrites for doing little to accept blacks, Indians, or others of the poor. "The apostles," he tells them, "say that if you say you love God and love not your neighbor you are a liar." He has supported an open-housing law for Iowa, issued an executive order forbidding discrimination in employment by state agencies, established a state Civil Rights Commission, and virtually alone raised $600,000 from private sources to establish employment programs for the poor.

In a country known more for eye-to-eye vengeance than for enlightened criminology

---

[1] Commissioner of Commerce in 1958; Governor in 1962, 1964, and 1966; U.S. Senate in 1968.

Hughes managed effective prison reforms, established a State Law Enforcement Academy, reshaped the Highway Patrol along more gentle lines, and abolished capital punishment. He obtained Iowa's first alcoholic treatment facility and its first public defender; he tripled state aid to education and was aggressive in conserving parks and other public recreational works. His administration got an industrial-safety law and twice increased workmen's compensation benefits, pushed through a bill to control billboard advertising along state highways, and gave the state its first consumer-protection laws of any consequence. His fiscal reforms included repeal of the property tax on household goods and reduction of taxes for the elderly poor, an increase in state income tax, and a tax withholding system greatly aiding revenue collections which had in the past been hit-or-miss.

Most of these moves delighted the state's liberals or progressives, as did Hughes' anti-Vietnam war stance, his friendship with Bobby Kennedy, and his ultimate endorsement of Senator McCarthy for President. (As U.S. Senator, Hughes' first Washington act would be to back Senator Ted Kennedy over Senator Russell Long for Assistant Majority Leader.) The wonder, however, is that numerous conservative Democrats and even many Old Guard Republicans approved of the Hughes administration.[2]

"His secret is his ability to communicate with people," says Martin Jensen, now a legislative assistant to Senator Hughes in Washington. "He's simply talked sense to them—told the truth. When he urged liquor-by-the-drink he stressed the hypocrisy of the Iowa law. Officers had been winking at our liquor laws, and citizens routinely broke them. Key clubs existed all over the state: for fifty cents to a dollar a thirsty man could become a 'member' and theoretically buy anything that New York bartenders can mix. Governor Hughes convinced people that widespread breaking of the law couldn't exist unless it represented prevailing attitudes. He argued that liquor should be legalized for two good reasons. One, so the state would benefit from liquor taxes rather than making illegal operators and bootleggers rich. And two, just because it was the *honest* thing to do. That kind of practical integrity is appreciated in Iowa."

They began to gather in Ida Grove in mid-afternoon—locals for the most part, though some came from Holstein, Danbury, Arthur, Odebolt, Rockwell City, Battle Creek, Storm Lake, and Denison. They were country folk and wore their country looks honestly, the men fidgeting in the strangleholds their mid-week neckties had on them and the women's heads a little too obviously fresh from the Kurley Kue Beauty Shop on Second Street. Shy boys and girls of elementary-school age hung back while their parents urged them to go shake the Governor's hand in order to have something to tell their grandchildren; teen-agers giggled and smirked in their private conspiracies; and eyes stared weakly out of chalky old wrinkled faces with the winter of death on them.

Standing in the basement Community Room of the Ida Grove State Bank, shifting his considerable weight from foot to foot while attending his brow with one of a series of crumpled paper napkins, the big Indian-looking man in the rumpled olive-drab suit had a look on him—for all his grinning in the right moments or calling old friends by their proper names—that said he preferred to be in some less fussy and bothersome place. One remembered a similar reluctance to public exhibition in certain World War II veterans suddenly returned to the confusions of civilian life after months in the foxholes of Europe or the Pacific, but the visitors had never before seen it so obvious in a public man. When a rare lull occurred in the receiving line the visitor—mainly to test Hughes' reputation for candor—remarked that this was very hard work, fully expecting the standard disclaimer of clever old-pro pols. Harold Hughes indulged in no such falsehoods. He slapped another napkin to his sweating brow and said with feeling, "It's the hardest damn work in politics. It may be the hardest work in the world."

Harold Hughes is known for such unexpected answers. One night a couple of years ago some journalistic fraternity was doing black-tie honors to Hughes when somebody unwisely suggested how much fun His Excellency might be having. Hughes replied, "Frankly, I'd rather be at home eating a hamburger." When an American Legionnaire once told of Hughes' refusal to surrender when the Nazis broke through to reach his infantry position in Sicily, rattling on about how most of Hughes' comrades had surrendered, Hughes said, "They would have had me too, if I'd had anything white to wave." One morning last December as the Governor ate his breakfast eggs in a Sioux City restaurant he was attended by the executive of a large meat-packing company. "What do you people want when I get to Washington?" Hughes asked. The executive said, "Oh, not much—just a little statesmanship," "Yeah," Hughes said, "I guess that'll do until you *really* want something."

Little groups huddled here and there in the Community Room, sipping coffee or punchless punch, nibbling bake goods, and remembering when. "I remember when he played football," a bald-headed merchant said. "They called his older brother 'Big Pack' and called Harold 'Little Pack.' Somebody said the Hughes boys were so big they looked like pachyderms out there on the field, so that's where they got their nicknames. And they could play football!" These were people who had lived a typical rural American boyhood of the 1930s with Pack Hughes: there was an old swimming hole common to their experience, a certain Model-T Ford with no glass in the windows, skating at the roller rink on Saturday nights until they quit taking tickets at the big dance over in Denison at which time the alert might slip in free. There were hunting trips smelling of dew and dung, Amos 'n Andy on the radio, plenty to eat but not much money and no frills at all. Staid citizens may not recall it now but at Harlan—perhaps an hour's drive from Ida Grove—desperate farmers stopped milk trucks at gunpoint to pour out the milk rather than see it dumped on the market at Depression prices, and a mob of farmers threatened to lynch a judge if he held with the financial interests in attempts to foreclose on mortgaged farms. Still, for all its Depression woes, there was, in Harold Hughes' view, much to recommend life. He worked as a lifeguard at the local swimming pool and helped his parents with their commercial greenhouse, fell in love with Eva Mae Mercer (whom he would marry in 1941), won all-state honors not only in football but as a tuba player and discus thrower, and made respectable if not sensational grades. Optimists may have marked him down for a future head football coach or for a country lawyer, though his mother's secret wish was that he become a Methodist preacher.

Hughes entered the University of Iowa in 1940 on a modest football scholarship. He had to work nights as a steamfitter, and soon felt the full demands of his life as scholar, athlete, and worker. Under these pressures, and against the teachings of a Fundamentalist home, he took his first drink. Hughes immediately displayed a great and loyal sympathy for whiskey. "I didn't particularly enjoy drinking," the Senator has remembered. "I just couldn't quit drinking as long as anything remained in the bottle." After less than a year in college he dropped out never to return, and worked at a series of odd jobs. His whiskey consumption increased after his only brother and close companion, Jess, was killed in an auto crash. In December of 1942, by then a rather rootless and purposeless young man, Hughes was inducted into the U.S. Army.

In the spring of 1943 twenty-one-year-old Harold Hughes became a combat BAR rifleman; he saw action in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. He was one of several soldiers who "threw a big drunk in Oran, almost like a riot," only to wake up behind barbed wire in a military stockade. "They marched us out one by one past a court-martial board," he remembers, "and to the frontline soldiers the judge would say, 'You're going back to active duty at two-thirds pay. You'll probably get killed anyway.' " Such was the sentence passed on Harold Hughes, and though he cheated its execution he did pick up malaria, yellow jaundice, and a case of battlefield nerves. At the end of the war he returned to Ida Grove with the notion that "if I wanted to drink myself to death I had earned that right." People in Ida Grove are careful not to discuss their Senator's hellion days, though he has publicly remembered fistfights and an arrest for driving while intoxicated.

When he was sober enough, Hughes repaired washing machines from a rude shop located in the basement of a friend's home. There wasn't enough repair work to adequately support a wife and two small daughters, however, so he got a job driving a milk truck. He graduated to the huge semi-trailers that roll across the American mid-continent, taking cattle to their terrible slaughters in Chicago. He remembers a lot of all-night diners, roadside naps, cramped muscles, stockyard odors, and rowdy beer joints. By 1953, at age thirty-one, Harold Hughes was a small-scale cattle buyer and trader and manager of a small truck line—as well as an apparently hopeless drunk. "On weekends he drank," Vance Bourjaily has written, "and the weekends started earlier and earlier. They began to start as early as Wednesday." One morning Hughes woke in Des Moines, a hundred and twenty-odd miles from home, with no notion of how he came to be there and without a cent. It was one of those times when a man touches bottom, and knows it, and must decide whether to stay down or go to the considerable trouble of getting up. That morning Harold Hughes quit booze cold turkey. "If I hadn't quit," he says, "I'd either be dead or a bum by now."

The story goes that he came to seek public office because he lost his temper over what he thought of as an injustice; if the story is true it almost immediately distinguished Harold Hughes from the average politician. Not as many men leap into the public pit in the true crusader's spirit as our living politicians or our legends would have us believe. After all, he followed a rather conventional course favored preceding his first quest for public office: he had become active in community and church affairs, he had joined civic clubs and a fraternal order or two, he had even been a delegate to two Republican state conventions. Perhaps he was doomed to the political life, whether he consciously knew it or not, for there is so much in him of the preacher, the teacher, the missionary.[3]

---

[2] Portions of the Hughes record naturally appealed to conservatives: he gave local governments more control over their affairs and increased their state aid, strengthened the Iowa Development Commission, and conducted "Sell Iowa" trips to the nation's financial centers and led similar missions abroad. He established fifteen regional vocational-technical schools to train workmen for light industry (then wooed light industries to the areas where schools were located, thus achieving a balance of supply and demand in local labor markets); he required colleges and universities to pay taxes on their profit-making properties; he established a toll authority to finance interstate bridges, and though spending more than doubled, he kept projects on a pay-as-you go basis and boasted of balanced budgets.

In the mid-1950s Hughes worked as field representative for the Iowa Motor Truck Association; after a few months, dissatisfied with the organization, he quit to found a similar organization known as the Iowa Better Trucking Bureau. He decided that the three-man State Commerce Commission, which regulated trucking and railroad commerce, favored giants of the industry to the detriment of small truck lines or independent operators. Hughes tried without success to interest his fellow Republicans in demanding reforms. After an atypical Iowa election year, 1956, in which a Democrat, Herschel Loveless, won the Governorship, Harold Hughes took his complaint against the Commerce Commission to the state house. Loveless was impressed by the young man's zeal and reformer instincts. If you want to accomplish something, Governor Loveless suggested, then you should switch to the Democratic party and run for the Commerce Commission yourself. The next time they held an election—in 1958—Hughes was a Democratic candidate. He called on the help of truckers and truck drivers he had known, old friends from home, fellow Methodists, and long-suffering organizational Democrats as his campaign operatives. Campaigning Iowa vigorously he won an upset victory. He was not long in learning that a single junior member of a relatively obscure commission cannot perform many miracles; he also observed the need for reforms in others of Iowa's bureaucratic empires, concluding that only a strong Governor could adequately turn the antiquated bureaucracy around.

"Urged on only by a few friends in his native northwestern Iowa and by the voice of God," a Hughes friend wryly says, Commissioner Hughes declared for Governor in 1960. He was wiped out in the Democratic primary, losing to a candidate who would go on to lose to the Republican nominee, Norman Erbe. Governor Erbe did not start any prairie fires during the next two years—years in which Harold Hughes used every possible excuse to make speeches across Iowa. He was well equipped for calling attention to himself: a bulky six-feet-three with dark skin and midnight black hair, who spoke in a deeply muscled voice; the result was something close to a thinking man's John Wayne. He won the gubernatorial primary in 1962, then upset Governor Erbe by 42,000 votes in the general election at a time when Republicans captured all other statewide offices being contested. Organizational Democrats, possibly considering the Hughes victory something of a fluke and warning of the conservative preferences of his constituents, advised him not to try to turn Iowa into a paradise overnight. Harold Hughes gave his answer in his inaugural address before a Republican legislature: "It is sometimes said that the knack of skillful government is to hang back, do as little as possible, and make no mistakes. I hope there is another way—for between you and me, this prospect does not invite my soul." Making skillful use of press conferences, radio and TV and personal appearances, Governor Hughes forced reform bills through a reluctant legislature by appealing over their heads directly to the voters. "If the legislators expected him to plead with them, shower attention on them, or bribe them, then they were disappointed," Martin Jensen says. "Hughes is not just going to spend a hell of a lot of time wooing anybody." He wooed the public with continuing success, however; in the 1964 election, when Lyndon Johnson won landslide victories in virtually all states including Iowa, Governor Hughes was elected by a margin more than doubling the President's. In 1966, when a comeback Republican tide chased five Iowa Democrats out of Congress and gave Republicans an eleven-to-five margin in state offices (where Democrats had held a thirteen-to-three margin because of the 1964 avalanche), Hughes won a third term by a shade less than 100,000 votes.

It is axiomatic that the longer a politician stays in office the more enemies he accumulates, especially if he remains an active force. By 1968, Hughes had his share of critics: he was a big spender (Iowa's annual budget rose from $200 million to almost $500 million and taxes reached an all-time high); he had lost ground in an unsuccessful attempt to repeal the state's "right-to-work" law; he had so persistently lectured on the white man's maltreatment of blacks[4] as to make some voters suspect he loved them too much; he had angered Iowa's organizational Democrats by disavowing the Vietnam war so stubbornly defended by the Johnson Administration; he had found himself in such sympathy with most Great Society domestic schemes—and said so—that Republicans or other conservatives had grown disenchanted; he was said to be arrogant in his treatment of legislators and to have shown excess partisanship in replacing some Republicans within the state government just because they were Republicans and without regard to their records.

Governor Hughes, thinking he had led Iowa in progressive directions about as far as she would go, had privately decided late in 1967 to retire from public life. He mentioned his decision to Bobby Kennedy. Don't do it, Kennedy said: There are a number of young, concerned United States Senators who are beginning to have an impact on foreign and domestic affairs; we may hold the nation's destiny in our hands; come join us, we need you.[5] It was the perfect pitch. He would run for the Senate. He would win over a well-financed and articulate young Republican, State Senator David Stanley, but only after his hardest fight, and by a mere 7,000 votes.

Though the night was bitingly cold, more than three hundred persons paid $5 each to crowd into the testimonial banquet in a converted gymnasium adjoining the Ida Grove Fire Department. Pack Hughes had been born within two blocks of the drafty old hall, and had played basketball in it when you were judged "out of bounds" only when you crashed into the walls.

Long wall-to-wall tables were draped in white paper "tablecloths." There was neither rum nor go-go girls on this night, though the visitor did have the luck to sit directly across from the only man present in whom such spirits flowed that his poor wife affected not to know him. ("You goddam right, Pack," the happy fellow volunteered at irregular intervals during the Governor's speech. "If you ain't President by Seventy-six then I miss my guess and have wasted five dollars.") The typically dismal political "banquet" was served, American to the core, only marginally edible if one takes food seriously, with pasty mounds of mashed potatoes, sorry little green peas and—ironically, there in the heart of the beef belt—three hundred hunks of something masquerading as prime cuts of roast beef. (Immediately upon leaving the banquet, an assistant was assigned to get hamburgers from a local restaurant, which were gratefully consumed in the gubernatorial motel quarters.) Over their brick ice cream people chatted of business, crops, babies, and basketball with laments that the banquet conflicted with the Ida Grove-Storm Lake game. The evening was 100 per cent small town, from the little green peas to the prayers presuming God's undivided attention on this small corner of Iowa, down through the labored local jokes and table chatter. One who had been brought up on such innocent amusements many years and several assassinations ago, and who still had some of them in his bones, marveled on their indestructibility.

J. W. Lipton, president of the Ida Grove State Bank and obviously the town's big man (one noted how he was deferred to, the number of times he was pointed out as "the new president of the Iowa Bankers' Association," the ease with which he assumed a leader's prerogatives), as master-of-ceremonies acted as a bridge between reality and the larger-than-life recollections of old friends of Harold Hughes, Norman McIntosh, a classmate in the Class of 1940, and now a cattle auctioneer; Troy Wilkins, hardware dealer and old friend; Justice Snell of the Iowa Supreme Court, who remembered awarding Howard Hughes his high-school diploma. "I think of Hubert Humphrey, Abraham Lincoln, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon," Justice Snell cried out a curious roll call, "and I remember that like Pack Hughes they were once all poor boys. I think of Thurgood Marshall and Dr. Ralph Bunche—uncommon-men who succeeded by their individual efforts." Trop Wilkins, not to be outdone, compared the guest of honor to the New York Jets' quarterback Joe Namath. ("They are both $400,000 players in the big leagues.") The hardware dealer urged the audience to "conduct ourselves as loyal fans as we back our $400,000 player in Washington, and not expect him to score a touchdown on every play"; before he sat down he suggested, if the visitor heard him correctly, that Harold Hughes has his personal signals called by The Great Coach in the Sky.

"Years ago when I first decided to seek public office," Governor Hughes responded, "I asked a few people around town here their opinion of it. And if anyone recommended it to me, I can't remember it. . . . Now I'm a big United States Senator-elect and J. W. Lipton would like to bank my paychecks at his bank. But let me tell you a little something about that: here in Iowa I make $30,000 a year, have my own driver if I want him, a nice big house to live in free, and Eva has a maid and a cook. In Washington I'll still make $30,000 but I have to drive my own car, buy my own house, and Eva must do her own cooking and dusting. And you know, some people keep talking to me about my 'promotion' to Senator. Actually, Governors outrank Senators in matters of protocol. . . . I bought my first house here in Ida Grove with a GI loan. Had to make monthly payments of twenty-four dollars and seventy cents and I wasn't always sure I could make 'em. In the last month, I've received more notoriety for buying a house in Washington than *Howard* Hughes received for buying Las Vegas."

It was a curious, rambling opening and, though delivered in cheerful enough tones, one felt the Governor was attempting some vague defense of something. He went on, making small jokes and recalling older times, and then suddenly his voice became more measured and assured; this was the Harold

---

[3] Some fifteen years ago Hughes seriously considered a career in the ministry. He took enough correspondence courses in theology from Southern Methodist University to qualify as a lay minister.

[4] Like New York's Mayor Lindsay, Hughes is credited with having cooled ghetto areas by personally walking slum streets in times of tension. Even with its small number of blacks, there are dismal slums in Waterloo, Sioux City, and Des Moines—a fact that even Hughes didn't fully realize until an insurrection in Waterloo caused him to call in troops. "I was shocked by what I saw," he said of his initial ghetto experiences. "I couldn't believe the venom I found. I'd go home nights and couldn't sleep and felt like I couldn't face the world the next morning."

[5] Hughes was reportedly on the verge of endorsing Robert Kennedy for President at the time of his assassination; ultimately, he nominated Senator Eugene McCarthy at the Democratic National Convention and criticized Mayor Daley for the mess in Chicago.

XUM

Hughes one had heard of: "We have never learned the age-old message that we must live together on this planet. . . . I'm forty-six years old and I've never known a moment of peace. Little has changed, except our efficiency in destroying one another. . . . As Robert Kennedy put it, 'The great challenge of this age is to tame the savagery of man.' . . . We hear much talk of honor and death and war; of being willing to die for our country. I think it's time we did a little *living* for our country." He went at them on the racial issue, though not a single black is numbered among the 12,000 people in the several villages of Ida County. ("We had a Negro who shined shoes over at the hotel," Banker Lipton would recall, "but after six months he moved on.")

Hughes continued: "The only way you can help your county rid itself of ugly disturbances is to look into your own heart. Pluck the mote from your own eye. Unless people believe in the rights of *all* men, our laws will never work." For long moments and in eloquent simplicity ("We can no longer escape direct confrontations with our consciences. . . . Man must first find peace in his own soul. . . . We *are* our brother's keeper") he went on, and when he finished the people stood and applauded with more than routine warmth and verve, so that one thought *good, he reached them, they listened and he reached them.* And two days later, in Des Moines, a visitor asked one of the secretaries in one of the gubernatorial offices at the state capitol whether she would move to Washington to work for Harold Hughes. "No," she said. "My husband says he doesn't want to live with the niggers."

THE FLOWERS OF SPRING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in spite of today's somewhat bleak tenor, there are hopeful signs that spring has "sprung." The sap is rising, the buds are swelling, and that harbinger of annual floral renaissance—the crocus—is out.

Each of us welcomes the advent of spring. But perhaps the most impatient man among us is our distinguished minority leader. As is generally known, Mr. Dirksen, against formidable odds, has vigorously assumed an impassioned advocacy for the marigold. Although he has yet to succeed in securing for this unique vegetable the official national status of which he finds it so clearly deserving, he has, I think, endowed it with a certain vague preeminence.

It may come as a surprise to some, and a relief to others, to learn that the minority leader has room in his heart—and in his garden—for other species. Even the humble nasturtium, remarkably enough, meets with favor.

Mr. President, lest those who champion other flowers find their special favorites the victims of unjust discrimination, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Senator Dirksen entitled "A Senator's Notebook" be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Senator's Notebook

(By Everett McKinley Dirksen)

Long ago, the poet Shelley wrote, "O, Wind, If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"

It takes a careless spirit to write that, and today, in all the turmoil of our world, we would do well to take some moments to dream of careless things—like spring and marigolds and the other flowers that soon will come.

It is March. I look out the window and it is snowing, a wet kind of snow that clings to the branches like cotton and magnifies the appearance of winter. But I don't care, because on the desk before me is a chart of my garden and beside it are some seed catalogs—a feast for the eyes and the soul, too,

I wouldn't care at all about the bluster and cold of winter if I could only get results in my garden that would be something like the beauties painted by the seed catalog artist.

Now I begin to think about my garden to come as I turn the pages of the catalog. First, I look out to a shady spot that gets little sun. It's a place for blue ageratum and impatiens because they do so well in full shade, and what a color combination they will be.

The humble nasturtium grows almost anywhere with half a chance—not a showy creation, but as cut flowers nasturtiums are a comfort indeed.

Now to the tulips, those dark red, stately soldiers of the garden who defy the elements and come nosing out of the soil almost as soon as nature relents with the balmy breezes and the warm sun. How good it is that tulips come so early.

The daffodil and narcissus are not far behind. They can pop their gorgeous yellows before I expect it, and they are a joyous note in early spring.

Now I must leave the catalogs for a few moments to think of some other things in the garden. It's time to prune back the tea roses, cut away the dead wood and make ready for the grandeur of the roses in all their colors. Is there anything more beautiful than the rose?

Where do we put the snapdragons that will stand like gorgeous sentinels against the roughest of weather and the bugs? The garden closest to the roadway is best, where every passerby can enjoy them. And snapdragons are exquisite as cut flowers for all occasions.

The zinnias must have full sun. Somehow, more than any other flower, the zinnias seem to drink in the bright sunlight and the heat and then are transformed into deep, majestic colors—peach, salmon, deep red, yellow, ivory—with huge, many-petaled heads. But the zinnias should have some edging. The petunia is just the dish—singles and doubles, plain blue, white, crimson, peppermint-stick, candy-stripe in vast variety. How hardy they are and how determined not to be outdone.

Now a momentary detour to look at the climbing roses. They wintered well, but they must be tied up. What a rare diversion that will be after a day that has tried the soul and tired the mind.

Now here are the clematis, both regular and hybrid. How dead they seem. But wait a little while and suddenly they'll be there in the warming days in their red, white and blue. All this and much more with the resurrection of spring.

Could the Resurrection have come in any season but spring? It makes me think of the question that Job in all his misery propounded to his friends: "If a man die, shall he live again?" He will, surely, for the earth becomes vital all over again with spring.

Most important of all, I must not forget the marigold. For 10 years I have sought to persuade the Congress to adopt the marigold as our national floral emblem. Some prefer the rose (a shrub) or the carnation or the petunia, violet, daffodil or some other bloom. But the marigold is native to this hemisphere and grows in every one of the 50 states, evidence of a robustness against the elements and insects that is unequaled in performance by any other flower.

Let kings and emperors, Presidents and senators suffer highly important matters to furrow their brows. There must be a little time to draw back and think just about the noblest creations from the hand of a generous Creator—the endless variety of flowers.

Was it not the Galilean who said, "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these"?

And the flowers are there—for every man, woman and child—for the asking.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in every nation there is a certain spirit of nationalism, something difficult to put into words, but nevertheless something you can feel in its cities, towns, and wilderness areas. It is a unifying and inspiring idiom for a certain group of people, having the potential to fill them with a fierce pride in and commitment to their country. To a new or struggling state, the quintessence of this nationalism has usually been the lifeblood of its preservation, without which it could never exist. On the other hand, to a nation that has been denied the opportunity for self-determination, nationalism is a conglomeration of all the frustrations and aspirations, a true battle cry for independence. Such is the case with Byelorussia, whose eight million people are today secretly celebrating their Independence Day.

After World War II, the collapse of imperial power permitted many new nations to emerge throughout the world. Similarly did the fall of several nations of the pre-1914 Europe allow many small nations to assert their independence from foreign domination. The Byelorussian Democratic Republic was one such country. On March 25, 1918, the Congress of Byelorussia, as embodied in the Rada, "threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism," and proclaimed its independence. With this action, a century of domination and suppression by the Russian people was ended after long and bitter struggle.

But this independence was not destined to come as easily for the Byelorussians as it did for the Americans in 1776. For 2 arduous years the brave people of this small country fought tirelessly for their very existence. But the forces opposing them were formidable. Besides trying to curtail increasing friction with Poland over the west and south borders, the Byelorussians also had to cope with the aggressive Red Army of the Soviet Union. Therefore, despite tremendous resistance, the country was invaded from the east in 1921, and it became a part of the Soviet Union. Thus did the independence of Byelorussia dissolve after 2 short years, but still the light of hope burned in the hearts of its countrymen.

Mr. President, that hope is still present today. The constitution and individual culture that Russia tried to suppress with naked force are even stronger today. Thousands were killed or deported during that time. And yet today, 51 years after Byelorussia declared its independence, the fact remains that this country has always wanted to be free, a feeling that Russia could only suppress, never obliterate. Mr. President, the people of Byelorussia are forbidden to celebrate March 25, 1918 today, and we must do it for them. Therefore, I wish to add my best wishes to that country with the fer-

XUM

vent hope that their spirit and determination has not been in vain.

PROBLEMS OF THE EASTERN SHEEP FARMERS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, in a recent letter to me, a Maryland farmer has stated the case for prompt attention to the problems of east coast agriculture. His words are eloquent, concise and self-explanatory. They are supported by facts, figures, and graphs presented by the American Sheep Producers Council.

Because the letter needs no further elaboration from me, I ask unanimous consent to insert it and the supporting material in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a little pamphlet put out by the Sheep Producers Council and its contents show very plainly why every sheepman gets burned up when he takes sheep to market.

Selling market lambs at 20¢ per lb. is bad enough. But when we have to sell perfectly good mutton at 2¢ per lb., that in the face of an import of some 20,000,000 lbs. is downright ridiculous.

Not too long ago (month or so), I sent a yearling ewe over to market. She was fat and in perfect health except for a crooked hind foot. She weighed 190 lbs., and was less than a year old. I'll bet she was as good mutton as anything ever was yet she was graded as an old sheep and brought old sheep price, 2¢ per lb. I just wonder what she was sold out as? It would be interesting to know, I'm sure.

Maybe someday in the course of your duties you may have the opportunity to ask someone in the places that matter, just how come?

Maybe I'm just running off at the mouth somewhat, but it's really burning me up when I have to take an overnight lamb to market and have them grade it as old sheep and 2¢ is as high as they will go. There is no such thing as mutton with packers, it's either lamb or old sheep. . . .

Mr. and Mrs. R. D. Offord
Easton, Maryland

IMPORTANCE OF IMPORTS GROWS IN UNITED STATES

Lamb and mutton imports have been a pesky problem to the sheep industry for many years, but now they are fast becoming a very serious problem to the domestic sheep industry.

With the industry caught in a tightening ring of problems, from shrinking land resources to steadily rising costs, the imports have been taking steady chunks out of the domestic market. As the U.S. sheep population declines, more lamb and mutton are quickly put in place of the diminishing supply by those countries and processors in the importing business.

Thus, there is about the same amount of lamb and mutton available for consumption in this country during the past few years despite a drop in production in the United States (see Graph 1). [Not printed in the RECORD.]

For sometime the sheep industry has tried valiantly to stop imports, or at least slow them down, but they have been standing against the tide since imports continue to come in with some congressional sympathy for the problem but a tidal wave of consumer indifference.

The history of imports of lamb and mutton show a continuing rise of mutton imports (See Graphs 2 & 3) [Not printed in the RECORD] to compete with U.S. mutton and U.S. beef primarily, and a fluctuating supply of lamb imports, but always edging upward as the domestic supply of lamb decreases. It doesn't take much imported product to affect a key market.

As an example prices shown at New York wholesale level for the week of November 18, 1968, were as follows:

Cut	New Zealand	Australia	Domestic, New York
Carcass	0.36½	0.33–0.33½	0.56½–0.57½
Legs, trimmed	.60	.48	[1].64–.66
Loins, trimmed	.66	.48	[1].62–.72
Racks	.43	.36	[1].85–.90
Square shoulders	.33	.32	[2].43–.45
Shanks	.34	.34	-------------

[1] Untrimmed domestic prices.

[2] Chucks (neck on).

Primal cut prices quoted for New York are untrimmed, thus we have not only price differences, but also reduction in trim of the imported products.

Retail prices in Los Angeles chains and New Zealand were:

Cut	New Zealand	Domestic (Los Angeles)
Legs	0.69	0.89
Loin chobs	1.19	1.79
Rib chops	1.19	1.69
Square shoulders	.59	.69
Round bone chops	.79	1.09
Blade chops	.79	.89
Sirloin steaks	.89	1.29
Shanks		.54

It should be kept in mind that somewhere during the past few years the exporting countries shifted from shipping lamb in carcass form to a primal cut form. This makes quite a bit of difference in the total, since considerable trimming results from cutting the carcass up into primal cuts, such as the rack, the shoulder, the leg and chops. For example, it is estimated that 16 million pounds in primal cuts would amount to about 20 million pounds on a carcass basis.

Most of the lamb comes into this country from New Zealand, with comparatively small amounts from Ireland, Greenland and Australia. Mutton, however, comes in from Australia and New Zealand, with the wool-oriented Australia providing the bulk of it.

Lamb production in million pounds for the U.S., New Zealand, and Australia, is shown in Graph 5. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

In the United States about 90 percent of the lamb and mutton kill is lamb and yearling, and the remainder is mutton which goes largely into soup stocks, sausage and other prepared meats, and baby foods.

On the political scene, lamb was left out of the meat import quota bill passed in 1967 because it was felt by some that it did not represent a significant amount of tonnage. Mutton, however, is included.

Cattlemen have been thankful for the meat import quota bill, despite its inadequacies, and are now trying to eliminate some of the loopholes that foreign countries have taken advantage of to put more cow beef into this country. Some of the meat, for example, is being given a quick cook process to take it out of the category of fresh or frozen meat.

The quota law was not put into effect this past year because of the pledge of exporters to reduce shipments even though it seemed apparent that the imports to this country were headed above the trigger level of 110 percent of quota.

Not all exporters for the balance of the year agreed to cut their shipments and Canada flatly refused to go along with the reduction on a voluntary basis.

It is now quite apparent that there is a new drive to make some changes in the quota law.

The National Wool Growers, National Lamb Feeders, and the American Cattlemen have agreed to cooperatively support any legislation needed to keep imports of meat in line with planned expansion of United States production.

These groups agreed that the following points should be included in any legislation: that the base years for establishing quotas would be 1958–62; that expansion or reduction of quotas would be based on the expansion or reduction of U.S. production of that particular commodity; that quotas would be figured for each individual item based on the items number of the Tariff Schedule of the United States and would not be based on total meat; that quotas would be figured quarterly by dividing the average year into four equal levels; that quotas will not be at the discretion of the Executive Branch but would be mandatory enforced; that all quantities of each classification purchased by the United States inside or outside the country be counted in the set quota . . . thus purchases for military outside the United States would be considered part of the quota; and that one hundred percent of quota would trigger restrictions instead of 110 percent of quota.

It seems significant that the voluntary cutback by importers to the U.S. under the present quota bill did reduce the imports of mutton in November and December of 1968 by 70 percent from the same period a year ago. However, during the same period of the previous year, lamb imports were increased by 171 percent. (See Graph 4). [Not printed in the RECORD.] This apparently was to keep balance of payments at a similar level in the exporting countries and, of course, lamb is not under the present quota bill.

There is a high degree of concern over how much imported meat will come into the U.S. in 1969. According to some reliable sources there will be import quotas from 40 to 50 million pounds above the 1968 level, and yet others contend that it will be about the same as this year.

One of the most critical points in lamb and mutton imports is the time of the year. Even a small amount of lamb coming in at the wrong time can raise havoc with the market price in heavy lamb consuming areas, while the importation of lamb would have little or no effect should there be a small supply of domestic lamb on the market. Lamb imports during the year seem to peak in March and again in June, with a noticeable drop in August and October. Mutton generally follows this same pattern. As mentioned previously, just a little imported goes a long way toward bending the domestic market price if domestic supplies are high.

Almost as effective in bearing down on prices at critical periods are the "rumor runners" who pass out information that more lamb imports are coming in, and whether they do or not this sometimes accomplishes the same purpose of depressing the domestic market price.

This year's quota of 950 million pounds put the triggering point at 1,045,000,000 pounds, and that does not include canned and certain other processed meats, nor lamb.

Under the federal meat import law, quotas cannot be imposed unless the government estimates actual imports will go 10 percent or more above the base quota. Most livestock men would like to wash out the 10 percent override and board up some of the loop holes.

For many years there have been attempts made to discuss the import problems with New Zealand and Australian producers, but to no avail. New Zealand's Finance Minister, R. D. Muldoon in October said the U.S. is "not a free-enterprise nation in the field of agricultural produce. It is a protectionist nation . . . and one of the worst," he added.

On the heels of this pronouncement came an arrangement for the sale of lamb to U.S. military commissaries abroad, and this effort may be extended to the Antarctic and U.S. bases there.

This could be the time for sheepmen in the United States to discuss some sort of an agreement.

PROPOSED REREFERRAL OF SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 20, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) introduced a bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act with respect to the seaward boundary of certain States. This measure was assigned the number S. 1619, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

It will be recalled that the Interior Committee was the unit of the Senate to which in 1953 was referred the measure that formed the basis of the Submerged Lands Act which S. 1619 would amend. This measure was Senate Joint Resolution 13, 83d Congress, and it was sponsored by the able senior Senator from Florida (Mr. Holland), for himself and 39 Senators from both sides of the aisle. Senate Joint Resolution 13 was the latest in a long series of bills dealing with the so-called, but miscalled, "tidelands" issue.

Under the acting chairmanship of then Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, the Interior Committee held hearings on the Holland bill as it had on previous submerged lands bills in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Some 13 days of hearings were held, beginning on February 16, 1953, and concluding on March 4. The committee met in executive session for 4 days to work out amendments to the resolution; it was reported out with minority views, and the text of Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended by the Interior Committee, was passed by the Senate on May 5, 1953. The House accepted the Senate amendment, and the measure was signed by President Eisenhower on May 22, 1953, to become Public Law 31 of the 83d Congress.

I cite the details of the legislative history only to establish that in at least three Congresses measures in the Senate respecting the submerged lands have been referred to the Interior Committee, and it was the text, substantially, of the Interior Committee's bill that became the law that S. 1619 of this Congress would amend.

As the Members of the Senate know, the Submerged Lands Act was and is part of a legislative package, so to speak, with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The former deals with the lands inside the sea boundaries of the States, which were clearly established for the first time by the Submerged Lands Act. The other, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, deals with the lands beyond the States' sea boundaries.

Significantly, when the very able junior Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) introduced on February 28, 1969, his bill, S. 1219, which concerns operations under the Outer Shelf Act, this measure was, properly, referred to the Interior Committee.

Now, I am aware that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1948 provides that proposed legislation affecting "State and Territorial boundary lines" shall be referred to the Judiciary Committee. However, Mr. President, in view of the long and clear history of referral of submerged lands legislation to the Interior Committee, I submit that the quoted provision means, or certainly has come to mean, boundary-line problems between a State or a territory and another State or territory—not between a State or territory and the Government of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the legislative history and the precedents, when S. 1619 is called up I shall move that it be re-referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for consideration.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in announcing his decision on the anti-ballistic-missile system, President Nixon once again displayed those qualities of leadership which have made the beginning of his administration such an outstanding success.

It is heartening to see the favorable response which his studied and intelligent approach to the complexities of the anti-ballistic-missile decision has brought from the people. One such example is an editorial in the March 17 National Observer and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Verdict on ABM—A Soviet Temptation?

The President's decision on missile defenses must be viewed in psychological as well as military terms. As such, the decision made good sense, and could ultimately do much to slow down the arms race.

The most vocal critics of the decision won't see it that way. They will see it simply as a triumph of the "military-industrial complex" over those who would strive for arms-limitation agreements with the Soviet Union. But any talk of conferring with the Russians about arms or anything else requires a good measure of guesswork about what the Russians really intend. So any decision on an antiballistic-missile (ABM) system—even a decision to defer a decision—would be a gamble. Mr. Nixon has made the best gamble.

First of all, Mr. Nixon's decision is less likely to provoke the Soviets than would a decision to push ahead with the Sentinel system. A decision to protect the cities, if that were truly possible, could be interpreted by the Russians as a way to blunt a Soviet retaliatory attack against the American population after a U.S. first strike.

Mr. Nixon's decision also recognizes a brutal but apparently unavoidable fact. It is now not possible to provide adequate protection for the American population against Soviet missiles. The best defense, the President has concluded, remains the nation's second-strike capability—the ability of this country to inflict unacceptable losses on the Soviet Union, or any other nation, should that nation decide to launch nuclear missiles against the United States.

The United States and Russia each have the capability to destroy each other many times over. This raises a good question: Is a defense system really necessary to protect American offensive missiles, or aren't there already enough—or soon to be enough—land-based and seaborne missiles available to survive any first strike by Russia or anybody else?

Perhaps there are. But the arms race being what it is, the Soviet Union might easily be tempted to increase its offensive arsenal even more, with the goal of developing an attack that could destroy much of the American offensive arsenal. A defense system to protect U.S. long-range missiles could discourage such a step-up in arms competition.

The Nixon decision also means that the United States will go into any arms talks with Russia having made a determination to employ a missile defense. This certainly gives this country a better bargaining position than it would have had had Mr. Nixon decided against any deployment, or decided to delay a decision on deployment. A decision to delay would leave great doubt in Soviet minds about American intentions.

Mr. Nixon's decision has left the next move in the quest for weapons control up to the Russians. His statement last week was conciliatory, and left plenty of openings for the Soviets if they truly wish to slow down or stop the arms race.

OLDER DRIVERS RANKED HIGH IN DRIVER SAFETY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last year during hearings on automobile insurance coverage, I told the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee that older drivers are being penalized—because of their age—by the insurance companies. It seemed to me that preliminary data confirmed what I had long suspected: many motorists in their seventies, sixties, and even late fifties, are left without coverage because of arbitrary cancellation of their automobile insurance—in spite of consistently good driving records.

Now the point has been corroborated by the final results of a study conducted with funds from the Administration on Aging. The plain fact is that motorists over 65 may be among the safest on the road. For those who think that living past 65 automatically reduces an individual's capabilities, the study should be a revealing glimpse into the safe and steady world of the older driver.

Conducted by the University of Denver College of Law, the study examined the driving records of 30 States and the District of Columbia. It found that senior drivers averaged 37 percent fewer accidents than expected, based on their proportion of the driving population. Judge Sherman G. Finesilver, head of the study team, points out that the nationwide survey shows senior drivers to have better reords, by comparison, as their number increases in the total driving population of a given State.

Judge Finesilver supplied the following highlights of the State-by-State survey:

In Arizona, a State with a large senior population, the older driver ranks second lowest in accident involvement among the six age groups studied;

Delaware's senior drivers enjoy the lowest accident rate of any of the six age groups; namely, under 24, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64, and 65 and over;

In the District of Columbia, senior drivers had the lowest accident record of all age groups in both the fatal and nonfatal accident categories. Their rate was only one-third that of the rest of the licensed drivers.

In Illinois, a high-population State, not only do senior drivers enjoy the lowest accident involvement rate, but their accident propensities are less than half those of the youngest age group, and 12 percent better than that of the next best group.

Indiana's senior drivers have the lowest frequency of accidents of all age groups;

Kentucky's senior motorists boast the best accident avoidance records of all age groups, both with respect to the "all accident" category and to injury or fatality-producing collisions;

Senior drivers in Maine have proportionately fewer accidents than other age groups;

In Maryland, senior drivers excelled all other motorists as the most accident-free drivers;

Minnesota, where senior citizens represented 12.28 percent of the driving public—the highest proportion of any State surveyed—they are on record with the best accident avoidance performance of any age group in the State; also, the safety record of these senior drivers ranked third best among the 31 jurisdictions analyzed, after Washington, D.C., and New York;

Montana's senior drivers enjoy the lowest accident involvement rate among that State's motoring public;

Senior drivers lead New Jersey's safety parade both with regard to "all accidents" and injury-accidents; they average about the same as all other drivers with regard to fatal crashes;

The senior 8.8 percent of New York's drivers boast the second best accident avoidance record among the 31 jurisdictions studied;

In Ohio, another highly populated State, senior drivers outranked others in regard to accident avoidance;

Oklahoma's senior drivers ranked tops among the six age categories with regard to involvement in accidents;

Senior drivers ranked most favorably in Oregon both as to "all accidents" and injury-producing accidents;

South Carolina's senior drivers are involved in proportionately fewer accidents than any other age groups in the State.

Virginia senior motorists rank tops in accident avoidance among the State's drivers;

Washington senior motorists enjoy the finest accident avoidance record among all Washington drivers, Finesilver noted that these findings "parallel and confirm" an earlier noteworthy study, the Crancer report, on older motorists in Washington State.

Wisconsin's senior citizens also rank lowest in accident involvement among the State's six age groups.

The District of Columbia study shows that there is a direct correlation between an increase in age and a decrease of responsibility for accidents. The highest accident involvement in the District of Columbia is with the teenagers—78 out of every 1,000 are responsible for an accident. The middle-age driver ranks medium in accident involvement—50 out of every 1,000; and the senior driver enjoys the lowest accident responsibility factor—31 out of every 1,000.

These remarkable findings confirm that the older driver is certainly not the hazard some would portray him. Quite the contrary, drivers past age 65 represent a rational, responsible, and reliable segment of the motoring public. Insurance practices ought to reflect that fact.

The Washington Evening Star published a report of the University of Denver study at the time it was released. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record as a vivid reminder of the excellent safety marks earned by the Nation's older drivers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Drivers Over 65 Rated Among Safest on Road

Denver.—Motorists over 65—long a scapegoat in analysis of the nation's spiraling accident rate—actually are among the safest drivers on the road, a University of Denver study showed yesterday.

The study, covering 31 states in all regions of the country, showed senior drivers averaged 37 percent fewer accidents than the proportion of accidents to numbers of drivers would indicate.

Although senior drivers represented 7.4 percent of all drivers in the states surveyed, they were involved in only 4.8 percent of the accidents.

Denver Dist. Judge Sherman G. Finesilver, head of the study team said it "will be pivotal in refuting current popular thinking about older drivers."

Senior drivers averaged the lowest of all age groups in frequency of injury-producing accidents. Older motorists averaged 40 percent below their proportionate share of the driving population.

Senior drivers also averaged slightly less fatal accidents—about 7 percent—than their proportion would dictate. Finesilver said it was possible the difference in fatal accidents was less surprising because older persons are less able to recover from injuries.

Commissioner William Mechill of the Federal Administration on Aging said he hoped the study will eliminate misconceptions about licensing and insuring senior drivers.

"I hope that it will lead to a cessation of arbitrary practices and attitudes directed to older drivers and ultimately create fairer, more enlightened practices in licensing and insuring of older drivers," Bechill said.

The study was financed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

SMOG CONTROL IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 17 the Oakland Tribune published an editorial urging the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to grant to the State of California a waiver which is required under my amendment to the Air Quality Act of 1967, unless the Secretary proves that the California standards are not technologically and economically feasible.

I submitted a statement to the Department urging that the complete waiver as requested by the State of California to implement the State's pure air act of 1968 be granted.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this issue, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Smog Control Standards

The Federal Government assumed primary jurisdiction for establishing and enforcing automobile smog control standards when Congress passed the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967.

Because California's scheduled standards were stricter and were aimed at a more critical smog problem than exists elsewhere, Sen. George Murphy secured passage of an amendment authorizing the granting of a waiver for this state.

The Federal Government is required to grant the waiver unless the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare determines that California's proposed standards are not necessary and are not technologically and economically feasible.

A series of public hearings have been held on California's request for the waiver. When these formalities are concluded and when the testimony presented is fairly evaluated, we trust that California's request will be granted.

The Murphy amendment was passed because Congress acknowledged that the special conditions existing in California might require tougher state smog control standards than those incorporated in federal regulations. The State must and should have the authority to establish its own air pollution standards so long as they do not fall below the federal minimums.

THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT—GENERAL McKEE DOES ANSWER

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on March 4, 1969, I referred to views of the distinguished and able Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick) which suggested publicly raising some pertinent questions regarding the *Pueblo* incident. It was suggested that the Government respond to these questions, and there has been some response in the testimony of Lt. Gen. Seth J. McKee, U.S. Air Force Assistant Vice Chief of Staff, formerly commander of the U.S. 5th Air Force at the time of the *Pueblo* incident.

Also on March 4, 1969, the Senate gave its unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Let the Senate Investigate" from the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune of January 25, 1969, be printed in the Record. The editorial noted that a Long Island newspaper, Newsday, had alleged General McKee made a decision not to send Air Force fighters to assist the *Pueblo*. The Cheyenne newspaper suggested that General McKee be afforded the opportunity to testify publicly on what took place.

The House Committee on Armed Services Special Subcommittee To Inquire Into the Pueblo Incident gave General McKee that opportunity March 20, 1969.

General McKee's testimony shows he did, in fact, order Air Force fighter aircraft to assist the *Pueblo*, but that because of distance involved the aircraft were unable to reach the *Pueblo* before darkness.

Since questions were raised earlier as to whether General McKee did issue proper orders in regard to the *Pueblo* incident, I ask unanimous consent that his statement before the House subcommittee be entered here in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Lt. Gen. Seth J. McKee, U.S. Air Force, Assistant Vice Chief of Staff U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C., Formerly Commander U.S. 5th Air Force, Fuchu Air Station, Japan, From August 1, 1966 to July 1, 1968, Before the House Committee on Armed Services Special Subcommittee To Inquire Into the "Pueblo" Incident, March 20, 1969

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I am Lt. General Seth J. McKee, Assistant Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. At the time of the *Pueblo* incident, I was Commander of the United States Fifth Air Force, with headquarters at Fuchu Air Station, Japan.

I welcome this opportunity to answer questions you may have concerning the Fifth Air Force role in connection with the *Pueblo* incident. Based on public media statements it appears that two of the central questions relating to the Fifth Air Force role are: (1) Why were Alert Aircraft not provided; and (2) Why were aircraft not sent to relieve the *Pueblo?* Perhaps my response to these questions will further your investigation and provide a background for additional questions you may desire to ask.

In order that my response to the first question may be fully understood, I believe it appropriate that I provide some background regarding previous Fifth Air Force association with this type mission.

Prior to the *Pueblo* mission, her sister ship (the U.S.S. *Banner*) was used for this type of mission in the waters that were in the Fifth Air Force Geographical area. Of some sixteen missions known at Fifth Air Force to have been planned or conducted by the U.S.S. *Banner*, Air Force Alert Aircraft were requested of Fifth Air Force by the Navy for three of them. On one additional occasion, a request was made that air support forces be notified of the area and time frame of the mission, and this was done; however, no request was made for alert aircraft, and no aircraft were committed to alert. Of the three missions for which we planned air support, one request for support was cancelled by the Navy due to mission cancellation, and two missions were supported by Fifth Air Force with aircraft and crews on alert.

The first mission Fifth Air Force supported was mission number nine for the Banner. Coordination between CINCPACAF, CINC PACFLT, Fifth Air Force, and COMNAVFOR Japan, established the alert requirement, the rules of engagement, and the alert posture to be maintained. Coordination with elements of the Strategic Air Command was effected to provide in-flight refueling for the fighter aircraft. Copies of the CTF-96 Operations Order which detailed the ship's operations and procedures were distributed to Air Force units, and Fifth Air Force and subordinate units issued implementing instructions. The Banner was directed by the Navy to add the Air Defense Control Center at Naha, Okinawa, as action addressee on assistance requests, and to perform a communications check with the Naha Air Defense Control Center when the ship arrived in the operating area. The Defense Control Center at Naha was directed to forward any request for assistance to my Fifth Air Force Command Center by flash precedence, with information copies to CINCPAC, CINCPACAF, CINCPAC FLT, and COMNAVFOR Japan. Direct voice communications would be used as back-up. Additional communications procedures were established to be used by the ship and the alert aircraft, and standard visual and voice identification signals were established to aid in spotting the vessel in relation to other surface craft. Fifth Air Force aircraft were then committed to the alert (in Okinawa) with the stipulation that they would be utilized only when directed and as considered appropriate by CINCPAC or higher authority. The authority to launch aircraft was subsequently delegated to me as Commander, Fifth Air Force, with the restriction that it could not be delegated lower. Aircraft were placed in incremental launch reaction time of 5 minutes, 15 minutes, 30 minutes, and one hour, with the provision that upon call from the Banner, or upon launch of any aircraft, all others would go to cockpit alert. Reaction time from first notification to the Banner operating area would have been approximately 45 minutes. This Fifth Air Force alert posture was in fact maintained from the time the ship arrived in the operating area, until seven hours after it departed that area.

Similar coordination between the various command and control agencies occurred on each of the missions for which Fifth Air Force was requested to plan or to provide air support. In the case of the Pueblo, no Fifth Air Force support was requested. Therefore no alert was provided, just as no alert was provided the Banner in those instances where none was requested.

I have gone into these details, Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen, to underscore the fact that when aircraft are dedicated to an operation, and committed to an advanced alert, these aircraft are dedicated to the specific operation by command directive, and brought to that state of readiness only through carefully planned, coordinated, and directed actions.

With reference to the second question, as to why were aircraft not sent to relieve the Pueblo, I would like to emphasize that contrary to articles that have been published in the newspapers, no decision was made at Fifth Air Force to not send aircraft to relieve the Pueblo. In fact, I personally made the decision to send aircraft, issued appropriate orders to effect such action and Fifth Air Force fighters were launched.

We began launching fighter aircraft out of Okinawa (where my only operationally ready combat units were located) as rapidly as possible. Unfortunately, they could not get to the scene prior to darkness or prior to the time that the Pueblo entered the three mile limit. Therefore after they landed in Korea, it was too late to refuel and relaunch in support of the Pueblo.

The first notification to my headquarters of the Pueblo's predicament was by a secure phone call to a member of my staff. This was followed by two closely spaced critic messages citing the Pueblo's position and first call for help. These were received in the Message Center at 1357 and 1407 Local (0457Z and 0507Z) respectively. Following receipt of the phone call, my staff plotted the ship's position, checked the availability of aircraft, and proceeded to my office where I was receiving a previously scheduled briefing. The staff members brought with them the message that had been received at 1407. I was personally notified and promptly briefed on the Pueblo situation at 1415 Local (0515Z). I immediately proceeded to my Command Center which was a two to three minute walk from my office, and placed near simultaneous phone calls to CINCPACAF in Hawaii and to the 18th Tactical Fighter Wing in Okinawa. While waiting for CINCPACAF to get to the secure phone in his headquarters, I directed the Commander of the 18th Wing to prepare all available aircraft for launch as soon as possible. Knowing that available aircraft would be in a normal training configuration, I directed that the first six aircraft be launched armed with 20 mm cannon only in order to expedite their arrival in South Korea.

About this time CINCPACAF came on the phone. I advised him of the Pueblo and its state of stress and of actions that I was taking. I further advised him that it was my intent to strike in support of the Pueblo provided I could get aircraft to the scene prior to darkness and prior to the time the ship reached the three mile limit. CINC PACAF concurred in my actions and told me to carry on with my plans unless advised by him to the contrary. I then passed these instructions on to the Commander, 18th Fighter Wing, with the further instruction that his aircraft would stage through Osan, Korea, because the scene of action, with recovery in Korea, was beyond the range of the F-105s stationed in Okinawa.

I then directed all other Fifth Air Force units (which were all in the process of converting to a new type aircraft) to bring all possible aircraft to operational readiness and to prepare for deployment as rapidly as possible. The 18 TFW on Okinawa launched the first increment of aircraft at 1611 Local (0711Z), which was one hour and twenty-three minutes after I gave the order to launch. This involved recalling seven aircraft from training flights, diverting six from various stages of training preparation, servicing all aircraft, and briefing aircrews.

A later incoming critic message reported that the Pueblo had been boarded and had gone off the air at 1432 Local (0532Z). At 1645 Local (0745Z) CINCPAC Headquarters replotted the position of the Pueblo and reported the ship was estimated to be in the harbor at that time. It was somewhere around this time that I came to the unhappy conclusion that we would arrive too late to be of assistance to the Pueblo and so advised Headquarters PACAF. The first F-105s which were launched from Okinawa arrived at Osan at 1735 Local (0835Z). Sunset at Wonsan was 1741 Local (0841Z) and darkness at 1753 Local (0853Z). Obviously later arriving aircraft were also too late to be of assistance.

Therefore, in answer to the second question, Fifth Air Force aircraft were sent to relieve the Pueblo with orders to attack, but, regrettably, they could not get there before the ship was captured and in port.

Gentlemen, this concludes my prepared statement. I would be happy to respond to other questions that you may have at this time.

GENOCIDE: WE MUST ACT NOW—XXIX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President: take 5 quarts of water, 6 pounds of human fatty acids; add 8 ounces of caustic soda. Boil for 2 or 3 hours, then cool.

As late as 25 years ago, this formula was practiced and perfected for the manufacture of soap. The second ingredient is stated correctly—it calls for "6 pounds of human fatty acid." A civilized mind can only be disgusted by such an unappetizing recipe.

And for the victory gardens of the Third Reich, after wide research and experiment, the perfect fertilizer proved to be the ashes of human bodies.

Dachau, Treblinka, Belsen, Auschwitz—these are but a handful of the places where Nazis flirted unceasingly with the most precious commodity we know, a human life. For example, at Auschwitz alone, 17 tons of gold were extracted from the dental fillings of slaughtered men, women, and children. As a caveat for those unfortunate living dead, an infant would be torn in two by ripping apart his legs.

Mr. President, my purpose in citing these atrocities, these crimes against humanity, is not to rekindle old flames of hatred and revenge or to encourage further retribution of those guilty, but rather to make a plea to the living. We must respect the sacrifice of these mil-

XUM

lions of fellow human beings, and we must at this time make a solemn vow that we will never again, as civilized people, allow such inhumane annihilation to occur on this earth.

For the last 20 years, the Genocide Convention has been stalled in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. We cannot conveniently blame our inaction on the State Department, the Executive, or the House of Representatives. This time, the Senate alone and each of us as Senators must accept individual responsibility for our collective failure to act.

The very keystone in the defense of peace is universal condemnation of genocide. Let the Senate follow the lead of almost 70 other countries and now, in 1969, ratify the United Nations convention on genocide.

AN ABM APPROACH FOR HAWKS AND DOVES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the substantially modified anti-ballistic-missile system proposal endorsed by President Nixon on March 14 has given Members of Congress a rare opportunity. Those among us who have been labeled "hawks" or "doves," either by editorialists or self-professed, have the unusual chance to shed these labels and build themselves new images.

The administration's proposal bears the mark of the statesman—the mark of compromise, often so difficult to achieve but often so essential for the welfare of the United States and the people of this planet.

At the same time, this proposal does not compromise our national security, nor does it feed the costly fires of an arms race. It is a realistic and reasonable approach. It is the best offered to date.

Mr. Saul Friedman, of the Akron, Ohio, Beacon-Journal has made some observations about the administration proposal. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nixon's "Little ABM" Has Winner Signs

(By Saul Friedman)

Washington.—Once again, President Nixon is carrying water—or in this case anti-ballistic missiles (ABM)—on both shoulders.

But in his attempts to head down the middle of the ABM controversy, the President may have given his critics, especially Democrats, their first real reason to fight with the new administration. In short, the honeymoon may be at an end.

Yet a strong argument can be made that his plan for the deployment of the ABM, has given much more to the opponents of the missile system than to its supporters. For that reason it now has a better chance for approval in Congress.

At his Friday press conference, the President said he thought his plan would pass after a close vote. There were signs he may be correct.

Not only did Nixon withdraw the missiles from the cities, at least for the present, he also backed off even further from the original Johnson Administration deployment plan.

Here is what Nixon gave the ABM doves:

He rejected a "thick" or "thin" system to protect the cities, thus deflating criticism that it would not work, that it would be too costly, and that it would upset the strategic balance between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and begin a new round in the arms race.

He cut deployment of the ABM back from 15 sites in the Johnson Administration plan, to just two sites.

The primary purpose of Nixon's plan is to protect American Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) sites, rather than cities. This would protect the U.S. ability to retaliate, or give a better "second strike." The Nixon plan strengthens the U.S. "deterrent," and may stabilize rather than upset the arms balance.

Finally, Nixon has reduced by nearly $1 billion the Defense Department appropriations request for work on the ABM next year. The amount requested for the Johnson proposal was $1.8 billion.

Nevertheless the hawks were more satisfied than the doves, because they too got some significant concessions.

Most important, if Nixon's plan is approved, the ABM foot will be through the door. Citing the beginning of other weapons systems which have grown like topsy, ABM critics expect that once started, the system will be unstoppable and will expand into a $100 billion giant.

AN INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Urban and Rural Economic Development of the Select Committee on Small Business, I am well acquainted with the plight of the urban small businessman.

In my home State of New Jersey, which is, as Senators know, highly industrialized and urbanized, I feel that the Small Business Administration has done a splendid job in dealing with the many business problems facing the urban small businessman. SBA has several excellent programs which can be tailored to the need of either the urban or rural small businessman. That agency has in almost every case brought these programs to bear effectively in resolving small business problems in New Jersey.

I have always considered one of the great advantages of small business to be that a small shopowner or storekeeper has an opportunity to meet his customers, hear their complaints, and make sure that his business measures up to his own high standard of excellence.

This same analogy is true with regard to the SBA. It is a small, decentralized, Government agency. SBA has field offices in every State in the Nation, and it is highly responsive to the people and vastly more effective than some of the larger bureaucracies centered in Washington.

I am concerned over recent reports and rumors that the SBA will be transferred to the Department of Commerce or in some way lose its status as an independent Federal agency. I think the majority of the Members of Congress and the Nation's small business community, which consists of over 5 million small concerns, strongly feel that the American small businessman deserves a forum, free from conflicting responsibilities to the large business community, to protect and promote his interests.

In terms of the difficulties facing today's urban small businessman, I want to see the SBA remain independent; remain viable; and remain ready to translate its programs into responsive action without the lost motion engendered by cumbersome bureaucracy.

Mr. President, this matter of SBA's independence is not new to my colleagues in the Senate. Several years ago there was another effort to transfer the SBA into the Department of Commerce. The Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman), the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business at that time, led the fight to preserve SBA's independence, and now it appears that we must once again fight this same battle.

During the previous attempt to abolish the independency of SBA, I took the Senate floor to speak out against this proposed transfer. The remarks I made then are just as cogent today. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks printed following the conclusion of my statement.

In summary, I can only urge Senators to give serious consideration to any attempt to downgrade or dilute the independent status of SBA. This is not now, nor has it ever been, a partisan battle. For over a decade and a half SBA has lived up to its mandate to aid, counsel, and assist small businessmen throughout the Nation. It seems highly illogical to tamper with this proven formula for success in these times of business uncertainties.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Talk About Abolishing the Small Business Administration

Mr. Williams of New Jersey. Mr. President, continuing rumors that the Small Business Administration will be done away with or lose its status as an independent agency have become a matter of great concern to New Jersey voters and to me.

For the past 15 years there has been a clear line of support, on a bipartisan basis, for a program of intelligent concern for the problems of growing and dynamic independent businesses.

This has been shown in the formation of a Select Committee on Small Business in 1950, the enactment of the Small Business Act of 1953, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, several small business provisions to the Revenue Act of 1964, and of course, the creation of the Small Business Administration.

However, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who has been the acknowledged leader in this field during this period, was moved recently to comment on a current rumor that the Small Business Administration would be consolidated with the Department of Commerce and thus lose its identity.

It seems to me that the 15 years of solid support for SBA and its programs has reflected recognition by the Congress and the Presidency that the self-reliance and resourcefulness of independent business were basic national values.

The founders and those who are carrying on the nearly 5 million of these firms are not relying on quantities of Government aid or creating manifold problems. They are furnishing jobs, producing useful goods and services, and providing tax support for all levels of Government; and are thus helping to resolve many problems.

From my contacts with businessmen across the State of New Jersey, I know that the Small Business Administration is looked to by these people as a source of counsel, assistance, and individual consideration of

XUM

the special capital and other needs which they face. It is an instrument responsive to their special needs in this era when large numbers and large companies seem to be absorbing an increasing share of public attention.

I would deeply regret a departure from this position by the present administration which would be inherent in relegating the SBA to the status of a minor bureau in a large department which has many other responsibilities. Such a departure could be justified least of all on the basis of economy, since this little agency finances a large share of its operating expenses from the fees and interest it charges for loans and other services.

However, an unfortunate impression has already been created by the total abridgment of the small business loan program on October 11, 1965, and by the absence of action to fill the post of Administrator, which has now been vacant since September 8, 1965.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] has described, in considerable detail, the progressive tightening of credit during the last half of 1965. He pointed out that this makes the role of the Small Business Administration as lender of last resort proportionately more important. The wisdom of Senator Pell's analysis was confirmed by the article of the Wall Street Journal of February 3, reporting that the Federal Reserve System has embarked on an overt program of rationing credit still further through its own operations, and through its considerable influence on its member banks.

As the Federal Reserve readily admits, small businesses are the first to suffer. The article, which is entitled "Federal Reserve Urges Banks To Be More Choosy in Parceling Out Loans," is explicit as to such disadvantages.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and the Small Business Committee Newsletter of January 30, be printed following my remarks, for the information of the Members of this body.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Williams of New Jersey. Mr. President, it would certainly be curious to have an administration, which has expressed concern over quality in society, allow the impression to become more firmly established that an historically important group is not a part of this concern.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the administration will put a quick end to the rumor by taking the action necessary to restore leadership, funds, and morale to the Small Business Administration.

Exhibit 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1966]

RATIONING CREDIT—FEDERAL RESERVE URGES BANKS BE MORE CHOOSY IN PARCELING OUT LOANS—IT COUNSELS CHANNELING FUNDS TO SPUR PRODUCTION GAINS, CURB SPECULATIVE ACTIVITY—IMPACT ON VARIED BORROWERS

(By Lee Silberman)

New York.—Voluntary tight money?

The Federal Reserve System is not using that name for a policy it is now urging on the Nation's banks. But it does seem to be moving toward a domestic version of the program under which, since last March, U.S. banks have been supposed to hold down voluntarily their lending abroad, to help solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

In the foreign program, the increase in loans by U.S. banks is supposed to be held to a percentage figure set by the Government. No such formal limit has been set in the still unnamed domestic program. But bankers say the Fed has been warning them that it will not increase the lendable funds it supplies them with as rapidly this year as it did in 1965. Moreover, bankers say, there have been warnings that the Fed will restrict the growth of bank credit even more than it now contemplates unless bankers make sure the loans they do grant are made to further productive activity—and not to finance speculation of any kind.

Bankers thus may make heavier than expected use of a slim booklet, being mailed to them by coincidence this week by the American Bankers Association, which helpfully suggests 15 different reasons for turning down a businessman's request for a loan. Last year the Nation's commercial banks increased the total business loans on their books by a whopping $11 billion, or 19 percent and demand for such credit is expected to continue heavy this year. But assuming the present Fed policy wins their cooperation—and the Fed has potent weapons it can use to make sure that it does—the bankers in 1966 will find themselves saying "No" to many loan applications, and "we can't give you as much as you want" to many more. Interest rates on various types of loans are likely to rise at least a bit more, too.

Here's what this policy is likely to mean to various types of borrowers:

National corporations with top credit ratings probably will get smaller loans from banks where they now have lines of credit. Other banks will be reluctant to establish new lines of credit for them unless the banks are assured that the corporations will remain as customers for some time. Even then, the corporations will be urged to borrow more funds for long-term needs in the bond market rather than from banks.

Larger regional and local businesses will be able to borrow only for their most essential needs. And some will be encouraged to go after long-term financing, rather than seeking short-term loans.

Small businesses, such as "ma and pa" stores, probably will be able to borrow as much money as before. But they may have to pay interest on it at installment-loan rates, which are higher than the straight business-loan rates they have been paying.

Consumers in all likelihood will continue to get all the credit they qualify for to finance purchases of autos, appliances, and similar goods, and on personal loans.

Mortgage borrowers, however, may find loan money for both residential and commercial mortgages drying up at many banks.

Bankers see one "out" for many fundseekers: Borrowers, they believe, will turn more heavily to factoring and commerical-finance companies, personal-loan concerns and Government lending agencies for the funds the banks will not let them have.

But the bankers expect this to bring only temporary relief to the borrowers. Many of these lenders themselves borrow from banks the funds they re-lend—so, as credit tightens at the banks, these lenders also will have to become more choosy in extending credit, bankers believe. Their interest rates are likely to rise too, bankers say, if those rates are not already bumping against legal ceilings.

The reason for this Federal Reserve advice to bankers, of course, is fear of inflationary overheating of the economy, due largely to heavy spending for the Vietnam war. The Fed took an orthodox step toward tightening credit last December by boosting the discount rate it charges on loans to commercial banks to 4.5 percent from 4 percent. This already has kicked up interest rates on many bank loans. Larger commercial banks have raised to 5 percent from 4.5 percent their prime interest rate to their biggest and most credit-worthy customers, generally national corporations: most other bank lending charges scale upward from the prime rate.

ABNORMAL CONDITIONS

Normally the Fed, if it wanted to tighten up further, would proceed to reduce gradually the amount of reserves it supplies the banking system on a day-to-day basis. It has apparently been trying to do this, but various circumstances have prevented it from moving as fast as it may have wanted to. The New York transit strike and snowstorms in many areas of the country, for instance, have dictated temporary extensions of more credit to banks—and thus, indirectly, to their hard-pressed customers—than the Fed perhaps would have made available otherwise.

Moreover, it takes time for a policy of gradual credit restraint, pursued under the Reserve System's normal tradition of silence, to become obvious and to take effect. And the Fed apparently feels it can't wait to get its message across, as inflationary trends appear to be gaining steam. One indication: The Consumer Price Index in December rose to a record 111 percent of the 1957–59 average, up 2 percent from December 1964 for the biggest calendar-year rise in 7 years.

Accordingly, bankers have begun hearing some unusual speeches, such as one delivered early this week by William F. Treiber, first vice president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, to top commercial-bank credit policymakers at a New York conference sponsored by the American Bankers Association.

Mr. Treiber urged the bankers to be more selective in granting loan requests and went further to lay down some guidelines as to the types of loans he thought should be refused. One example: "A loan—to a company—to purchase an additional plant or company, where no overall increase of production will result."

Some bankers who heard him were well aware that, during the Korean war, Mr. Treiber helped run the New York end of a program under which district Federal Reserve banks organized committees that gave commercial banks and other leaders guidance on what kind of loans to grant. Ordinarily the committees advised refusal of loans that did not promise to help boost national production.

The week before Mr. Treiber's talk, Alfred Hayes, president of the New York Reserve bank, told a State banking group that the amount of reserves the Fed furnishes to banks this year will be determined in part "by the extent to which bankers themselves exercise good judgment and are selective in meeting credit needs."

OPEN-MOUTH POLICY

The bankers' interpretation: The Federal Reserve has embarked on an unusual "open-mouth" policy to achieve credit restraint by indirection. "In a word, the Fed wants us to get down in earnest to rationing credit," says a senior official of a leading New York bank.

At the same credit conference that Mr. Treiber addressed, Archie K. Davis, chairman of Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Winston-Salem, N.C., and president of the American Bankers Association, warned the assembled bankers that "failure to exercise voluntary but prudent restraints now can lead to stricter regulatory controls later." He was referring not only to restraint in granting loans, but to a feeling of concern, also noted by Mr. Treiber, that some banks may be paying too high an interest rate to obtain certificates of deposit, under which corporations deposit temporarily idle funds in banks for a stated time period. Certificates of deposit have become a major instrument by which banks obtain funds to make loans.

Credit rationing of a sort had begun even before the Federal Reserve launched its "open month" campaign. Many months before they raised the prime rate last fall, big banks went through their lists of prime-rate customers and pruned out many—in effect downgrading their credit status and forcing them to borrow at higher interest.

OUTSTANDING LOANS REVIEWED

More recently, many large banks have begun scrutinizing the credit-worthiness of

XUM

their customers more closely, and have become more choosy about what loans they would grant. Some weeks ago one big New York City bank gave each of its many lending officers revised policy guidelines. These instructions call for each officer to review the loans he has made and cull out the ones made to finance less essential activities. These loans probably won't be renewed.

Most banks further have become more insistent that business borrowers maintain minimum compensatory balances, ordinarily 20 percent of the loan, in their accounts. In the past 4 years or so, during which banks were beating the bushes to find borrowers, such requirements often weren't enforced.

The banks have been reacting to a squeeze resulting from an interaction of expansionary forces in the economy and Fed policy. Major corporations have been demanding more and larger loans because their plans for expansion are increasing faster than they can generate the funds internally from depreciation reserves and retained profits. At the same time, with less idle cash in their tills, they are no longer increasing their buying of certificates of deposit from the banks. And the Federal Reserve System has not been extending credit to the banks fast enough to supply the funds to meet all the loan demand.

Despite this policy, and the clear desire of the Federal Reserve to see tighter credit rationing by the banks, bankers believe the Fed will supply enough reserves to permit at least some modest continued expansion in lending.

GOAL: A SLOWER INCREASE

William F. Butler, vice president and economist of Chase Manhattan Bank, told the American Bankers Association credit conference that, while he expected the Federal Reserve to bring about some tightening of credit and higher interest rates, he did not believe the Fed's objective was "to choke off credit by excessive tightness (or) to raise interest rates for the sake of higher rates. The objective rather is to slow down a rate of increase in credit which threatens to feed inflation."

Another New York banker puts the same thought more pithily: "This won't be the year the money runs out."

Bankers disagree on whether the Fed's tighter credit policy is likely to be accompanied by another boost in the discount rate soon. Milton F. Darr, Jr., president of La-Salle National Bank, Chicago, speaks for many in predicting that the discount and prime rates will move up again in 60 to 90 days, to check inflationary pressures.

Andrew Benedict, president of First American National Bank, Nashville, Tenn., differs, "The System is going to see to it that the economy's credit requirements are met," he says, "and so long as the banks are selective enough to see to it that the credit gets into the hands of those who are entitled to it, no further action may be needed."

POLITICAL FACTORS

This disagreement on what is likely to happen to the discount rate partly reflects differing banker assessments of the political pressures involved. Treasury Secretary Fowler and several Congressmen vigorously opposed the discount-rate boost last December, on the ground that higher interest rates would slow the growth of the economy, and President Johnson himself expressed displeasure with the boost. Last Sunday, Mr. Fowler again said he didn't see any need for a further increase in the discount rate now.

Some bankers expect these views to weigh heavily with the Federal Reserve. "This is one area where you simply can't lose sight of the political ramifications," says a Philadelphia banker.

Other bankers, however, contend that lately the views of some administration aids have begun to coincide more closely with the Federal Reserve opinion that inflation is emerging as the major threat to economic stability. "The President in his recent messages to Congress seems to be putting himself in a flexible position of condoning tighter money if that's the only way out," says a New York banker.

Weekly Staff Report to the Senate Small Business Committee, January 29, 1966

SBA's regular business loan program termed Budget Bureau's "whipping boy" in hearings by the Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Small Business on S. 2729 and the plight of the small business agency's depleted revolving fund.

Pointing out that for part of 8 out of 11 years, "this program was either suspended or the loan limit vastly limited," Senator Proxmire, subcommittee chairman, stated: "I think a strong case can be made * * * that SBA's regular business loan program has long been made the 'whipping boy' by the Budget Bureau.

"There has been no suspension or curtailment of SBA's disaster loan program. To date there has been no shortage of funds for small business investment companies and State and local development company loans. There have been restrictions on these programs by Budget, but no shutdown has been necessary as has so often been the case in the regular business loan program."

Senator Sparkman, referring to hearings held on the same subject by the Senate Small Business Committee on December 15, said: "I do not know of anything that has distressed me more than the beating that the small business program has taken over the last 6, 7, or 8 months. I find it almost impossible to explain to small businessmen from my State what is happening to small business. I think it is a terrible situation and one that surely ought to be corrected."

Commenting on current rumors that an effort may be made to tamper with SBA's status as an independent agency, Senator Sparkman asserted: "I think it would be very bad to merge (SBA) with the Department of Commerce, and I certainly hope that these rumors we hear may prove to be baseless."

S. 2729, introduced last year by Senator Proxmire and Senator McIntyre, would replace SBA's present single revolving fund, in which funds for all of the agency's lending activities are commingled, by three separate funds: for regular business loans and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; for disaster loans; and for loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Committee's Subcommittee on Government Procurement held hearing to take testimony from top defense purchasing officials on the effectiveness of their small business programs.

Senator Montoya, presiding, said in his opening statement: "We expect to hear today that overall the small business program in the military departments reached an all time high during 1965. The complacency that this achievement could conceivably engender, coupled with problems of accelerated purchasing under the present international emergency, could bring on new problems for the small business procurement program during the current year."

John M. Malloy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Procurement, told the subcommittee that: "In fiscal year 1965, small business received 20.3 percent of the total awards to all U.S. business firms compared with 18 percent for fiscal 1964. During this period, there was a decided decline in awards for missiles and space systems, and increases in commercial type items, small purchases and construction. These changes in product mix have been favorable to small business firms."

The Defense Department's overall goal for small firms' share of defense purchases in fiscal 1966 has been set at 18.3 percent.

A DEDICATED CAREER OF SERVICE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article entitled "Friend of the Handicapped" in the March 23 Sunday Gazette Mail of Charleston, W. Va., provides an excellent insight into the work that is being done in my State for the physically and mentally handicapped.

In the little over 20 years that a real statewide program has been in effect to assist the mentally retarded, the deaf, the blind, and other handicapped persons, thousands of West Virginians have been given the means to help themselves toward a better and more productive life.

One man is due much of the credit for the very real progress that has been made. He is F. Ray Power, the former director of the State division of vocational rehabilitation, who is now retired.

Mr. Power is the principal subject of the article to which I allude, and the credit which is given him, in my judgment, is well deserved.

Under his guidance, the program which aided 60 persons in 1944 grew to the point that approximately 4,000 persons were rehabilitated in 1966. He expanded the State rehabilitation effort from a $20,000 budget and a staff of six to a budget of more than $6 million and a staff of nearly 600.

As he himself points out, all that should be done for the handicapped is not yet being done. But an effective and humanitarian program to achieve this end is under way in West Virginia, thanks in large measure to his farsighted dedication.

I believe others who are interested in rehabilitation will find the Gazette-Mail article by Edward Peeks of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Friend of the Handicapped

(By Edward Peeks)

The physically and mentally handicapped have a lot of friends nowadays, but none quite like F. Ray Power, former director of the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Power says an estimated 251,000 handicapped West Virginians need more friends, especially those who understand the difference between token help and community-supported programs for the mentally retarded, the deaf, the blind and other handicapped persons.

A substantial program, he says, "is the kind of thing that is hard to promote on an adequate basis. You get some token help, talk about it and put it in the newspaper. But that doesn't mean that the handicapped is being helped.

"The service in this area has been an evolving sort of thing and it has come pretty slow," he adds, looking back to 1941 when the Neely Administration appropriated $25,000 for "special education" to give West Virginia its first real start on a program for the handicapped.

That sum is a mere pittance by contrast with state funds today for educational and medical services for the handicapped, to say nothing of federal aid which usually amounts to $3 for every $1 spent by the state.

More money through the years has helped

to attract more friends for the handicapped. Some are fairweather friends who go for token help, but most are well-meaning and together they get results.

Although he retired in 1966 at the age of 68 as state rehabilitation chief, Power has continued his interest in various programs for the handicapped.

He hastens to add, "I don't interfere with the programs of the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. I don't want to get in anybody's way or create any problems for others." He smiles. "Those in charge have enough problems without my creating any for them."

Power continues his service on various advisory boards for the handicapped. As a private citizen, he makes it a point to attend public meetings and to talk with public officials about the needs and problems of the handicapped.

It is almost as though he prepared for the role of "roving ambassador for the handicapped" after he retired as state rehabilitation director.

For then he became director of a two-year statewide study of vocational rehabilitation needs. The project was funded by an $89,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The result was a comprehensive state plan turned over to Gov. Hulett C. Smith. The report contained recommendations to make vocational rehabilitation services available to all eligible West Virginians by 1975.

The study found that 71,832 persons were in need of rehabilitation or sheltered workshop services.

It was a fresh store of information for Power to add to a wealth of experience to be used in his continuing efforts for the handicapped.

A major concern is for better state mental hospital facilities which he believes are now run-down and completely inadequate to offer services that the mentally ill require.

He has written and talked to legislators about the problem. He wants the state to have a bond program for capital improvements to make mental hospitals safe and adequate for patients.

"We need a capital outlay program for state institutions," Power says. "In my judgment, it is something that has been neglected. There are liberal programs for campus buildings. In addition, they went around to the backdoor to do the same thing by authorizing the use of tuition fees for building.

"There has been very little capital improvement in state mental institutions which I think now are at a very dangerous point. They perhaps have a better case for using fees than colleges."

This problem, he contends, points up the difficulty of providing help for the handicapped.

"It is hard to get something for the handicapped as opposed to people who can help themselves," he says. "People who can help themselves do so by getting special appropriations and the use of fees, for example, for capital improvements."

The State Mental Health Department asked the legislature again this year to approve a bond program for capital improvements. A similar request died in committee last year.

Power says a capital outlay program is needed to help communities establish comprehensive mental health programs and sheltered workshops for the handicapped turned up by the federally sponsored study.

"A handicapped person pays 10 times more in taxes than money required to rehabilitate him," Power observes. "Token programs are good if they demonstrate how a thing can be done."

More help for the handicapped, like the question of more aid for any other group of citizens, brings up the matter of tax money.

"We overemphasize consumer taxes and they fall too heavily on poor people," Power says.

He thinks Gov. Arch Moore has the right idea to make business and industry put more in the tax till. The legislature lifted consumer sales and use tax exemptions on merchandise and equipment used by manufacturers and other industries, including wholesalers, retailers and contractors.

"One of the difficulties in helping the poor or the handicapped is that they are thought about after the tax money is divided among the people who can help themselves," Power says.

"There has been a change in public attitude about this, but it is a traditional way of thinking and doing," he continues. "It is one reason why we have gone only so far in special education for the handicapped. These children need more help because they have more problems, but the public doesn't look at it that way."

This attitude encourages specialists and counselors to work with the easy cases among the physically and mentally handicapped rather than the difficult cases.

"Federal-state programs offer a lot of leeway, not specifying the number of deaf, blind or any other group to be trained," Power explains. "The tendency is to work with the more promising cases."

The matter of selection brings up the charge of questionable practices by the national prize-winning State Rehabilitation Center during Power's administration.

Some West Virginia critics accused the center of juggling figures and indulging in statistical sleight of hand to win the national award year after year for most cases of rehabilitation per capita in the nation.

A Charleston columnist made the charge and drew swift reactions from Power, who wanted the public to have the facts about the matter, as opposed to endless speculation and sour grapes.

Power says he offered the columnist the center's records and the names of federal officials with whom he might discuss the question. The columnist accepted the offer on condition that he would publish his findings.

"Later, he said he was sorry he made the mistake," Power recalled, "but he never said a damn thing about it in the newspaper."

Power believes that the 1966 Community Services Report—a study of public and private health, welfare and recreation services in Kanawha Valley—raised some reasonable and understandable questions about the performance of the State Rehabilitation Center as a community group.

He says, however, that the center is a state agency, not a Kanawha Valley community institution. Criticism of the number of persons helped and the amount of money spent should be made and regarded in the light of the fact that the center is obligated to serve the entire state.

Then, too, Power says the center uses the team approach to help difficult cases and "work in depth" on the physically and mentally handicapped.

He stressed help for difficult cases among miners with broken bodies resulting from accidents on the job. Many would have been disabled for life without treatment, therapy and training in depth to overcome handicaps.

"Many were young men with several injuries," Power says. "Some were partially paraplegic and others were completely paraplegic.

"The United Mine Workers would send cases to New York and California for treatment. We made provisions to continue treatment of such cases or take care of them entirely at home."

The agency makes intensive treatment and training available to the blind, the deaf and other handicapped persons, including the mentally retarded.

The team approach offers medical, psychological and vocational services to meet the needs of the individual client. If a retardate, for example, needs corrective surgery and eyeglasses, the agency sees to it that he gets these and sheltered workshop training as well.

The workshop was established at the center in 1965, during what Power termed "an affluent period" for the handicapped which President John F. Kennedy started in 1961.

"The word from Washington was that if you had something (idea or plan) to help people, you could get money for it," Power recalls. "That was during the period we were developing the center."

Power and his staff had ideas about other facilities for the handicapped. The state made massive federal assistance possible by appropriating a half million dollars for the agency to match money from Washington.

The West Virginia rehabilitation chief further parlayed federal aid for the handicapped with the cooperation of other state agencies, particularly the Mental Health Department.

The department, for example, furnished staff for workshop facilities built on hospital grounds. In this way, the staff provided "contributions in kind" to match federal money for facilities at each of the state's five mental hospitals.

"To our knowledge, we were the first state in the nation to get Hill-Burton funds for a crib school at St. Marys," Power says of help for mentally retarded children through the federal program for building hospitals and health facilities.

"The appropriation doubled from $400,000 to $800,000 for the residential school," he adds.

A member of the State Board of Education quipped at a meeting after Power retired as rehabilitation chief, "Maybe we can find out now how F. Ray Power got all that money to build buildings."

It is no secret or mystery. "I learned where and how funds could be gotten and how they could be used," Power explains.

His agency started pilot projects in cooperation with county school systems for training retardates. Projects were set up in Wheeling, Huntington and Bluefield. They are now ongoing programs.

"All that is being done to help the mentally ill and the mentally retarded is still inadequate," Powers says.

He has received numerous awards and citations for his work with the handicapped, which actually began in a formal way in 1933. He was then made deputy assistant to the state superintendent of schools in charge of vocational rehabilitation. He became rehabilitation director in 1944.

In 1960, Shepherd College honored the native of Hampshire County as Outstanding Alumnus of the Year. He earned a bachelor's degree at West Virginia University and a master's at Columbia. He holds a Phi Beta Kappa key.

Power formerly taught in Hampshire County and at Glenville State College. He was once principal of Woodrow Wilson Junior High School in Charleston.

He expanded the state rehabilitation program from a staff of four and a $20,000 budget to a staff of nearly 600 and a budget totaling more than $6 million.

The program rehabilitated 60 persons in 1944 as compared with about 4,000 in 1966.

In addition to other volunteer work, Power is income and employment advisor to the West Virginia Commission on Aging.

With a sparkle in his dark eyes, he says, "Of course, I'm interested in maintaining some income for myself."

He and Mrs. Power are parents of two daughters.

A GENERATION IN SEARCH OF A FUTURE

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, many people have recently expressed alarm about the current student unrest in our

XUM

universities and on our college campuses, but very few have addressed themselves to the source of the discontent. I have often said that we ought to stop and listen to our youth because, just maybe, they are trying to tell us something.

Recently someone did stop and listen. In a brilliant speech printed in the current issue of the New Yorker, George Wald addressed himself to the causes of student unrest. The article is timely because it relates the problem of student unrest with the proposed deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system. I have made my opposition to the deployment of the ABM known. I have expressed my doubts about its military effectiveness, enormous cost, and adverse affect on possible disarmament talks. The proposed deployment of the ABM arouses my fear of the military-industrial complex of which President Eisenhower warned.

I believe that Professor Wald's speech should be called to the attention of all my colleagues because his insights cannot be confined to student unrest, but should be applied to the current malaise confronting our country. I, therefore, commend it to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENERATION IN SEARCH OF A FUTURE

(Speech by George Wald)

On Tuesday, March 4th, in the Kresge Auditorium at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a group of scientists assembled, with students and others, to discuss the uses of scientific knowledge. There is nothing we might print in these columns that could be more urgent than the extemporaneous speech, made before that gathering by George Wald, professor of biology at Harvard and Nobel Prize winner, under the title "A Generation in Search of a Future." We therefore quote from it here at length:

"All of you know that in the last couple of years there has been student unrest, breaking at times into violence, in many parts of the world: in England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Mexico, Japan, and, needless to say, many parts of this country. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what it all means. Perfectly clearly, it means something different in Mexico from what it does in France, and something different in France from what it does in Tokyo, and something different in Tokyo from what it does in this country. Yet, unless we are to assume that students have gone crazy all over the world, or that they have just decided that it's the thing to do, it must have some common meaning.

"I don't need to go so far afield to look for that meaning. I am a teacher, and at Harvard I have a class of about three hundred and fifty students—men and women—most of them freshmen and sophomores. Over these past few years, I have felt increasingly that something is terribly wrong—and this year ever so much more than last. Something has gone sour, in teaching and in learning. It's almost as though there were a widespread feeling that education has become irrelevant.

"A lecture is much more of a dialogue than many of you probably realize. As you lecture, you keep watching the faces, and information keeps coming back to you all the time. I began to feel, particularly this year, that I was missing much of what was coming back. I tried asking the students, but they didn't or couldn't help me very much.

"But I think I know what's the matter. I think that this whole generation of students is beset with a profound uneasiness, and I don't think that they have yet quite defined its source. I think I understand the reasons for their uneasiness even better than they do. What is more, I share their uneasiness.

"What's bothering those students? Some of them tell you it's the Vietnam War is the most shameful episode in the whole of American history. The concept of war crimes is an American invention. We've committed many war crimes in Vietnam—but I'll tell you something interesting about that. We were committing war crimes in World War II, before the Nuremberg trials were held and the principle of war crimes was stated. The saturation bombing of German cities was a war crime. Dropping those atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was a war crime. If we had lost the war, it might have been *our* leaders who had to answer for such actions. I've gone through all that history lately, and I find that there's a gimmick in it. It isn't written out, but I think we established it by precedent. That gimmick is that if one can allege that one is repelling or retaliating for an aggression, after that everything goes.

"And, you see, we are living in a world in which all wars are wars of defense. All War Departments are now Defense Departments. This is all part of the doubletalk of our time. The aggressor is always on the other side. I suppose this is why our ex-Secretary of State Dean Rusk went to such pains to insist, as he still insists, that in Vietnam we are repelling an aggression. And if that's what we are doing—so runs the doctrine—everything goes. If the concept of war crimes is ever to mean anything, they will have to be defined as categories of *acts*, regardless of alleged provocation. But that isn't so now.

"I think we've lost that war, as a lot of other people think, too. The Vietnamese have a secret weapon. It's their willingness to die beyond our willingness to kill. In effect, they've been saying, You can kill us, but you'll have to kill a lot of us; you may have to kill all of us. And, thank heaven, we are not yet ready to do that.

"Yet we have come a long way toward it—far enough to sicken many Americans, far enough to sicken even our fighting men. Far enough so that our national symbols have gone sour. How many of you can sing about the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air' without thinking, Those are *our* bombs and *our* rockets, bursting over South Vietnamese villages? When those words were written, we were a people struggling for freedom against oppression. Now we are supporting open or thinly disguised military dictatorships all over the world, helping them to control and repress peoples struggling for their freedom.

"But that Vietnam war, shameful and terrible as it is, seems to me only an immediate incident in a much larger and more stubborn situation.

"Part of my trouble with students is that almost all the students I teach were born after World War II. Just after World War II, a series of new and abnormal procedures came into American life. We regarded them at the time as temporary aberrations. We thought we would get back to normal American life someday.

"But those procedures have stayed with us now for more than twenty years, and those students of mine have never known anything else. They think those things are normal. They think that we've always had a Pentagon, that we have always had a big Army, and that we have always had a draft. But those are all new things in American life, and I think that they are incompatible with what America meant before.

"How many of you realize that just before World War II the entire American Army, including the Air Corps, numbered a hundred and thirty-nine thousand men? Then World War II started, but we weren't yet in it, and, seeing that there was great trouble in the world, we doubled this Army to two hundred and sixty-eight thousand men. Then, in World War II, it got to be eight million. And then World War II came to an end and we prepared to go back to a peacetime Army, somewhat as the American Army had always been before. And, indeed, in 1950—you think about 1950, our international commitments, the Cold War, the Truman Doctrine, and all the rest of it—in 1950, we got down to six hundred thousand men.

"Now we have three and a half million men under arms: about six hundred thousand in Vietnam, about three hundred thousand more in 'support areas' elsewhere in the Pacific, about two hundred and fifty thousand in Germany. And there are a lot at home. Some months ago, we were told that three hundred thousand National Guardsmen and two hundred thousand reservists—so half a million men—had been specially trained for riot duty in the cities.

"I say the Vietnam war is just an immediate incident because as long as we keep that big an Army, it will always find things to do. If the Vietnam war stopped tomorrow, the chances are that with that big a military establishment we would be in another such adventure, abroad or at home, before you knew it.

"The thing to do about the draft is not to reform it but to get rid of it.

"A peacetime draft is the most un-American thing I know. All the time I was growing up, I was told about oppressive Central European countries and Russia, where young men were forced into the Army, and I was told what they did about it. They chopped off a finger, or shot off a couple of toes, or, better still, if they could manage it, they came to this country. And we understood that, and sympathized, and were glad to welcome them.

"Now, by present estimates, from four to six thousand Americans of draft age have left this country for Canada, two or three thousand more have gone to Europe, and it looks as though many more were preparing to emigrate.

"A bill to stop the draft was recently introduced in the Senate (S. 503), sponsored by a group of senators that runs the gamut from McGovern and Hatfield to Barry Goldwater. I hope it goes through. But I think that when we get rid of the draft we must also drastically cut back the size of the armed force.

"Yet there is something ever so much bigger and more important than the draft. That bigger thing, of course, is the militarization of our country. Ex-President Eisenhower, in his farewell address, warned us of what he called the military-industrial complex. I am sad to say that we must begin to think of it now as the military-industrial-labor-union complex. What happened under the pleas of the Cold War was not alone that we built up the first big peacetime Army in our history but that we institutionalized it. We built, I suppose, the biggest government building in our history to run it, and we institutionalized it.

"I don't think we can live with the present military establishment, and its eighty-billion-dollar-a-year budget, and keep America anything like the America we have know in the past. It is corrupting the life of the whole country. It is buying up everything in sight: industries, banks, investors, scientists—and lately it seems also to have bought up the labor unions.

"The Defense Department is always broke, but some of the things it does with that eighty billion dollars a year would make Buck Rogers envious. For example, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, on the outskirts of Denver, was manufacturing a deadly nerve poison on such a scale that there was a problem of waste disposal. Nothing daunted, the people there dug a tunnel two miles deep under Denver, into which they have injected so much poisoned water that, beginning a couple of years ago, Denver has experienced a series of earth tremors of increasing severity. Now there is grave fear of a major earthquake. An interesting debate is in progress as to whether Denver will be safer if that lake of poisoned water is removed or is left in place.

"Perhaps you have read also of those six thousand sheep that suddenly died in Skull Valley, Utah, killed by another nerve poison—a strange and, I believe, still unexplained accident, since the nearest testing seems to have been thirty miles away.

"As for Vietnam, the expenditure of firepower there has been frightening. Some of you may still remember Khe Sanh, a hamlet just south of the Demilitarized Zone, where a force of United States Marines was beleaguered for a time. During that period, we dropped on the perimeter of Khe Sanh more explosives than fell on Japan throughout World War II, and more than fell on the whole of Europe during the years 1942 and 1943.

"One of the officers there was quoted as having said afterward, 'It looks like the world caught smallpox and died.'

"The only point of government is to safeguard and foster life. Our government has become preoccupied with death, with the business of killing and being killed. So-called defense now absorbs sixty per cent of the national budget, and about twelve per cent of the Gross National Product.

"A lively debate is beginning again on whether or not we should deploy antiballistic missiles, the ABM. I don't have to talk about them—everyone else here is doing that. But I should like to mention a curious circumstance. In September, 1967, or about a year and a half ago, we had a meeting of M.I.T. and Harvard people, including experts on these matters, to talk about whether anything could be done to block the Sentinel system—the deployment of ABMs. Everyone present thought them undesirable, but a few of the most knowledgeable persons took what seemed to be the practical view: 'Why fight about a dead issue? It has been decided, the funds have been appropriated. Let's go on from there.'

"Well, fortunately, it's not a dead issue.

"An ABM is a nuclear weapon. It takes a nuclear weapon to stop a nuclear weapon. And our concern must be with the whole issue of nuclear weapons.

"There is an entire semantics ready to deal with the sort of thing I am about to say. It involves such phrases as 'Those are the facts of life.' No—these are the facts of death. I don't accept them, and I advise you not to accept them. We are under repeated pressure to accept things that are presented to us as settled—decisions that have been made. Always there is the thought: Let's go on from there. But this time we don't see how to go on. We will have to stick with these issues.

"We are told that the United States and Russia, between them, by now have stockpiled nuclear weapons of approximately the explosive power of fifteen tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth. And now it is suggested that we must make more. All very regrettable, of course, but 'those are the facts of life.' We really would like to disarm, but our new Secretary of Defense has made the ingenious proposal that now is the time to greatly increase our nuclear armaments, so that we can disarm from a position of strength.

"I think all of you know there is no adequate defense against massive nuclear attack. It is both easier and cheaper to circumvent any known nuclear-defense system than to provide it. It's all pretty crazy. At the very moment we talk of deploying ABMs, we are also building the MIRV, the weapon to circumvent ABMs.

"As far as I know, the most conservative estimates of the number of Americans who would be killed in a major nuclear attack, with everything working as well as can be hoped and all foreseeable precautions taken, run to about fifty million. We have become callous to gruesome statistics, and this seems at first to be only another gruesome statistic. You think, Bang!—and next morning, if you're still there, you read in the newspapers that fifty million people were killed.

"But that isn't the way it happens. When we killed close to two hundred thousand people with those first, little, old-fashioned uranimum bombs that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, about the same number of persons were maimed, blinded, burned, poisoned, and otherwise doomed. A lot of them took a long time to die.

"That's the way it would be. Not a bang and a certain number of corpses to bury but a nation filled with millions of helpless, maimed, tortured, and doomed persons, and the surviors huddled with their families in shelters, with guns ready to fight off their neighbors trying to get some uncontaminated food and water.

"A few months ago, Senator Richard Russell, of Georgia, ended a speech in the Senate with the words 'If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve, I want them to be Americans; and I want them on this continent and not in Europe. That was a United States senator making a patriotic speech. Well, here is a Nobel laureate who thinks that those words are criminally insane.

"How real is the threat of full-scale nuclear war? I have my own very inexpert idea, but, realizing how little I know and fearful that I may be a little paranoid on this subject, I take every opportunity to ask reputed experts. I asked that question of a distinguished professor of government at Harvard about a month ago. I asked him what sort of odds he would lay on the possibility of full-scale nuclear war within the foreseeable future. 'Oh,' he said comfortably, 'I think I can give you a pretty good answer to that question. I estimate the probability of full-scale nuclear war, provided that the situation remains about as it is now, at two per cent per year.' Anybody can do the simple calculation that shows that two per cent per year means that the chance of having that full-scale nuclear war by 1990 is about one in three, and by 2000 it is about fifty-fifty.

"I think I know what is bothering the students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future.

"I am growing old, and my future, so to speak, is already behind me. But there are those students of mine, who are in my mind always; and there are my children, the youngest of them now seven and nine, whose future is infinitely more precious to me than my own. So it isn't just their generation; it's mine, too. We're all in it together.

"Are we to have a chance to live? We don't ask for prosperity, or security. Only for a reasonable chance to live, to work out our destiny in peace and decency. Not to go down in history as the apocalyptic generation.

"And it isn't only nuclear war. Another overwhelming threat is in the population explosion. That has not yet even begun to come under control. There is every indication that the world population will double before the year 2000, and there is a widespread expectation of famine on an unprecedented scale in many parts of the world. The experts tend to differ only in their estimates of when those famines will begin. Some think by 1980; others think they can be staved off until 1990; very few expect that they will not occur by the year 2000.

"That is the problem. Unless we can be surer than we now are that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. It's not good enough to give it tender, loving care, to supply it with breakfast foods, to buy it expensive educations. Those things don't mean anything unless this generation has a future. And we're not sure that it does.

"I don't think that there are problems of youth, or student problems. All the real problems I know about are grown-up problems.

"Perhaps you will think me altogether absurd, or 'academic,' or hopelessly innocent—that is, until you think of the alternatives—if I say, as I do to you now: We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war—nothing material or ideological—no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating. Those atomic bombs represent an unusable weapon. The only use for an atomic bomb is to keep somebody else from using one. It can give us no protection—only the doubtful satisfaction of retaliation. Nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror, and a balance of terror is still terror.

"We have to get rid of those atomic weapons, here and everywhere. We cannot live with them.

"I think we've reached a point of great decision, not just for our nation, not only for all humanity, but for life upon the earth. I tell my students, with a feeling of pride that I hope they will share, that the carbon, nitrogen, and oxygen that make up ninety-nine per cent of our living substance were cooked in the deep interiors of earlier generations of dying stars. Gathered up from the ends of the universe, over billions of years, eventually they came to form, in part, the substance of our sun, its planets, and ourselves. Three billion years ago, life arose upon the earth. It is the only life in the solar system.

"About two million years ago, man appeared. He has become the dominant species on the earth. All other living things, animal and plant, live by his sufferance. He is the custodian of life on earth, and in the solar system. It's a big responsibility.

"The thought that we're in competition with Russians or with Chinese is all a mistake, and trivial. We are one species, with a world to win. There's life all over this universe, but the only life in the solar system is on earth, and in the whole universe we are the only men.

"Our business is with life, not death. Our challenge is to give what account we can of what becomes of life in the solar system, this corner of the universe that is our home; and, most of all, what becomes of men—all men, of all nations, colors, and creeds. This has become one world, a world for all men. It is only such a world that can now offer us life, and the chance to go on."

THE SAFEGUARD SITE IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, one of the two initial "Safeguard" sites is to be in North Dakota. I believe Senators would be interested in reading the March 21 editorial appearing in the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak. on the decision to proceed with deployment of the "Safeguard." Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

XUM

CONGRESS SHOULD LOOK HARD AT ABM PLAN, EVEN FOR NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota has witnessed a small invasion of newspaper and television reporters and cameramen in the last few days, all because the area north of the Grand Forks Air Base near the Canadian border has been selected as the site of one of this nation's two anti-ballistic missile installations.

This sudden invasion comes as a bit of a surprise, because hardly anybody expressed much concern when the former president, Lyndon B. Johnson, proposed to spot about 15 such installations around the country. Now there is a big flap in Congress and in the press about whether these defenses against enemy missiles are really necessary.

President Richard M. Nixon has decided that two installations should be completed, one in North Dakota and one in Montana. Of course the eastern press thinks that this is a deserted area, but at the same time most of them apparently believe that the citizens around here are foolish for not putting up the same kind of protests some people in the East did when anti-ballistic missile sites were spotted next to major cities.

Probably the answer is that North Dakotans and probably the folks in Montana have gotten used to having nuclear warheads spotted across the land. Two of the nation's more extensive installations for the Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missile are located in North Dakota, one centered around the Grand Forks Air Base and the other around the Minot Air Base. As a result, we are used to the idea of having nuclear tipped armaments in our midst and no one has been unduly concerned.

The mere fact that the citizens are not overly concerned about the ABM project, or even the Minuteman installations, doesn't necessarily mean that we like the idea. Neither President Johnson nor President Nixon has convinced us that the ABM installations would do any good in defending this nation against either China or Russia. When the time comes that any two major nations of the world start hurling nuclear-tipped missiles at each other from thousands of miles away, there isn't going to be enough left of either nation to bother about.

It does seem peculiar, however, that members of Congress who would almost silently go along with the ABM installations near the big cities during the Johnson administration are now making the biggest howl about even the two installations that President Nixon has decided to complete. While some people in North Dakota think that the construction work necessary to complete the ABM installation will help this state's economy, they shouldn't expect any long-lasting results from it. Both Minot and Grand Forks experienced economic booms during the period when the ICBM silos were being constructed in their areas, but when the work was done, the construction workers moved out.

North Dakota gets only the smallest end of the money outlay when it becomes a site for one of these installations. The big money goes to the manufacturer of the hardware, whether it be missiles or a radar system. And none of those are built in this state.

President Nixon's decision will be closely examined in Congress, it is apparent, and it could well be that the Congress will slow down the project even more.

Congress should take a good hard look at the Nixon decision, and in the meantime we are happy that all the visiting reporters and photographers have had a good look at North Dakota in its winter blanket of snow. We look forward to reading what they all have to say about North Dakota's reaction to the ABM installation. The odds are that a lot of them will have more to say about a snow-covered countryside than they will about missiles.

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the remarks I made at the First National Convocation of the National Committee on United States-China Relations, at New York, on March 20, 1969.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOPEFUL NEW PATH FOR UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

The giant of Asia in the 1970's and 1980's—in terms of its power potential as a modern state—will be Japan and not China; and, this basic reality, so persuasively explained by Professor Reischauer, is the proper starting point for a rethinking of the United States' China policy in the years ahead. It permits us to shed many of the fears and shibboleths which have distorted U.S. policy in Asia since 1945.

Among these are the questions of membership in the United Nations and diplomatic recognition. Neither of these issues needs to dominate U.S. policy thinking about Communist China. Peking is not actively seeking U.N. admission and has placed what seem to be deliberately unacceptable conditions on its participation in the U.N.

It is my belief that if we revise our policy along the lines which I am going to suggest, a thaw may take place in U.S.-China relations over the next five years, making both admission to the United Nations and diplomatic recognition easy and natural—following a period of psychological readjustment on both sides. The point to be stressed is that our minds should not be set against it. Much the same point needs to be made with respect to Communist China as we get the strong feeling that its leadership right now values highly—for domestic reasons of its own—a policy of enmity toward the United States.

The Nixon Administration has a great opportunity to bury the lingering shadow of McCarthyism which continues subtly to inhibit thought and debate in this country concerning China. The United States paid a very heavy price during the McCarthy period in the destruction of many of our most perceptive China experts. It was not only a period of grave human injustice to some individuals but also a period of grave damage to our national stock of intellectual resources and experience which has seriously affected the clarity and accuracy of our perception of events in Asia.

Active measures should now be taken to banish the lingering inhibitions of McCarthyism within the State Department and other agencies of government. The fact that the policy-making process continues to be affected by thought-taboos with respect to China is illustrated, in my judgment, by the nervous timidity with which the State Department has floated a few cautious trial balloons in recent years. The liberalization of travel regulations, for instance, did not evoke the wrath in Congressional and editorial circles that some of our higher officials feared. On the contrary, the Congress and the nation at large welcomed the changes, frequently with expressions of mild surprise that they were so belated and so timid. The people are well ahead of the government on this matter!

The Nixon Administration has a unique opportunity to encourage and stimulate creative, new and unorthodox thoughts about China not only within the government but also in the nation as a whole. The overriding mandate given to President Nixon in the last election was to end the Vietnam War. The complicated drama of our national disengagement from that miscalculated war could well be used as an instrument for public education with respect to realities about China and Asia in general.

There are several lessons to be learned from the Vietnam war with respect to China. The first is that, for all its verbal violence, China has demonstrated unmistakable military prudence throughout that conflict. This prudence—China's deliberate abstention from any military involvement—has exposed to serious question much of the official rationale of the Johnson administration for the Vietnam war. The argument that our involvement in Vietnam is a necessary stand against Chinese communist expansionism is not borne out by the actual record of Chinese military action with respect to Vietnam, since, though it is only fair to say this may be due to its own internal disorders.

Available evidence also indicates that China is likely to continue to exercise prudence with respect to the nuclear weapons capability it is acquiring at such great cost. At one heated point during the Vietnam debate, Secretary Rusk conjured a frightening image of "a billion Chinese on the Mainland, armed with nuclear weapons." But not long afterward former Assistant Secretary of Defense Warnke summarized the Pentagon's official assessment of Chinese policy in the following terms:

"We see no reason to conclude that the Chinese are any less cautious than the rulers of other nations that have nuclear weapons . . . Indeed the Chinese have shown a disposition to act cautiously, and to avoid any military clash with the United States that could lead to nuclear war."

In addition, the sharply rising tension along China's northern border with the Soviet Union—which has produced a number of military clashes in recent days—may induce Peking to seek a relaxation of tension in Southeast Asia and thereby facilitate a Vietnam settlement. It is also conceivable that the new focus being placed in Communist China on the territories "lost" to the USSR through the so-called unequal treaties of the nineteenth century may, at some point, lessen Peking's obsession over the "recovery" of Taiwan.

I do not wish to suggest that we are about to witness an end to China's truculence. Rather, my point is that if we focus our attention on China's actions rather than her verbiage, and upon her actual military capabilities as opposed to her revolutionary aspirations, we must conclude that China does not necessarily present a significant military threat to our security.

It is really not surprising that Communist China should project an image to the world of being a desperate and hysterical nation. No nation has ever faced such a formidable combination of problems. The challenge of organizing 800 million people into a single political and economic unit is awesome in itself. The simultaneous effort to modernize and radicalize such a mass of humanity complicates the problems of leadership immensely. The collision in this the oldest of human societies between the force of tradition and the force of revolution will continue to reverberate throughout the world for years to come. It does not make this confrontation with the world any less dangerous but it tends to explain it somewhat.

China is struggling to become an industrial society while the United States, Japan and perhaps the Soviet Union are preparing their transition into a new order—the post-industrial nations of computers and nuclear and space technology—which is a quantum leap beyond the stage which China is now so painfully and laboriously seeking to attain.

The immediate task for the United States is to formulate a policy which will facilitate China's peaceful integration into the broader

Asia scene. In this regard, I believe that it would be to our interest to encourage, rather than discourage, trade and other contacts between Communist China and its non-communist Asian neighbors. Similarly, and of course strictly for non-strategic goods, we should encourage rather than discourage our European allies to trade with Peking.

There is a danger that the smaller nations of south and southeast Asia could be overawed by China in one-to-one encounters. But there is now widespread recognition of that danger as evidenced by the impressive trend toward cooperative regional organizations in noncommunist Asia. The United States should certainly support and encourage regional organization and economic and social integration in Asia, while we resist the temptation to try to lead it.

If a relaxaion of our own zealous ideological opposition to Communist China leads to a similar lessening of the anti-communist ardor of some of our close allies in Asia—such as the Philippines and Thailand—we must take this calmly. For, the lesson of the past twenty years has been that nationalism, and nationalism alone, is an effective barrier against the extension of Chinese-style communism in Asia. This requires a shift of emphasis in our education and information efforts in Asia. The virtues of viable and progressive national integrity, rather than the dangers and evils of Chinese communism alone, should be the focus of our efforts.

A more sophisticated and discriminating perception of the Asia scene on our part will alert us to numerous strains and tensions within parts of non-communist Asia. A recognition of these tensions—some of which are of great antiquity—can save us from the reflex response which, in the past, has tended to make us view all trouble in Asia as being caused by Peking.

However, the fact is that ethnic tensions and rivalry between Malays and Chinese—which play such a crucial role in the policies of Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines—are historic phenomena whose roots long pre-date the emergence of a communist regime in Peking. The defeat of the coup attempted by the Chinese-dominated communist party in Indonesia in November 1967 was due more to ethnic differences than to any ideological factors as understood by the West.

It would be well for our policy-makers to bear in mind that historic differences among the Thais, the Cambodians and the Vietnamese will persist beyond the Vietnam War.

Another, most poignant, human drama is being enacted throughout the Himalayan foothills stretching from eastern India to the central highlands of Vietnam. Throughout that broad expanse, ancient aboriginal tribes which sought haven in the mountains many years ago are being pressed relentlessly by the dominant lowlanders who are acquiring the means to extend their political, cultural and economic writ into areas never really governed before by central authority. In some respects this process resembles a slow-motion reenactment of the destruction of the American Indian in this country in the nineteenth century.

Some of these doomed peoples in desperation will seek Chinese arms and Chinese support, as the Naga tribesmen of India and Burma have now begun to do. When this occurs, the United States must refrain from viewing the resultant clashes with central authorities as holy battles against Chinese communist expansionism, but recognize them for what they are—the birth pains of the development of nations—again no less necessary but to be better understood.

Asia will be the scene of turmoil and commotion for many years to come. China, as the heart of eastern Asia in demographic and geographic terms, will be a leading participant in this turmult. Much of the turbulence we can expect will be of no legitimate security concern to the United States, and most of it will be beyond our power to control in any event.

But in addition to the clamor and the conflict there will be many creative and positive developments throughout Asia in which we can play a legitimate and rewarding major role. There is no need to fear that moving away from the role of an activist military involvement in Asia will lead to a U.S. withdrawal from Asia or to an abdication from our inescapable role as a major Pacific power. We can be sure that the nations of Asia will make demands upon our attention, our energies and our resources beyond our capacity to fulfill. We won't need to go looking for work in Asia. But we must see to it that our efforts there are concentrated on productive and worthwhile enterprises and are not frittered away on mistaken military or ideological adventures.

In closing, I repeat what I said at the beginning: I do not foresee the possibility of a dramatic improvement in U.S.-Communist China bilateral relations in the near future. Rather, we must anticipate—and use creatively—a period of mutual psychological readjustment. There is no justification for the United States to adopt a posture of *mea culpa* with respect to China—as some have advocated. Moreover, even if it were justified, I do not think such a posture would evoke a positive response from Peking. In my judgment, China will be much more impressed with, and responsive to, a policy of prudence and restraint but which is also a policy of conviction and dignity.

China today probably has the rawest nerves and touchiest sensibilities of any nation in the world. We should recognize the historical reasons for this but we cannot accommodate many of her neuroses. They can be worked out only internally, within China's national consciousness. For instance, no nation likes political partition—not the Chinese, nor the Germans, nor the Koreans, nor the Irish—as we saw on St. Patrick's Day. But there are times when the international situation is such that a nation has to live with partition for a time. The maintenance of a separate political status for the Republic of China or Taiwan doubtlessly is galling to Peking. But the fact that the peoples involved are Chinese does not raise the issue to a higher, almost apocalyptic level in the eyes of the other four-fifths of humanity. Peking's compulsive insistence that nothing can be discussed until Taiwan is first "returned" is a manifestation of Chinese racial arrogance which we ought not to placate for its own sake. In my judgment, the future of Taiwan can only be settled by the will of the people of Taiwan themselves.

Hopefully, as the United States adjusts its perceptions, attitudes and policies with respect to Communist China, Communist China will also begin to adjust its perceptions, attitudes and policies toward the United States. Perhaps this process could be expedited by gestures or actions on our part which neither require nor expect a response from Communist China. We have already heard suggestions about reciprocal educational and scientific exchange, especially in medicine and agriculture; about exchanging journalists; tourism and humanitarian food sales.

I suggest that we consider whether it might be possible to make available on a private, non-reciprocal basis, some of the fruits of our technology which might be of peaceful and humanitarian help to the Chinese people. For instance, the revolutionary-type of ecological, geological, and meteorological photography which has resulted from the Apollo space program could be furnished through non-official scientific channels. The result might be improved agricultural or flood-control programs which would ease the lot of the Chinese hard-pressed peasantry.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on March 21, 1969, the President's Consumer Advisory Council met and issued several recommendations concerning the future of consumer activities in the Federal Government. These proposals are timely and valuable, as the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization is now considering this matter.

Mr. President, there must be no slackening in the efforts of the Federal Government on behalf of the American consumer. The laws passed to protect him must be fully enforced and they must be administered efficiently. The members of the President's Consumer Advisory Council have made some excellent suggestions which merit the attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

The time has come to accord full recognition and justice to the American consumer.

This can be achieved by humanizing the machinery of government to overcome indifference to consumer problems, and by developing and implementing a comprehensive consumer program for the 1970's.

Recognizing that this is a field which the new Administration is carefully studying at the present time, we offer the following recommendations to improve Government organization and to give the consumer more adequate protection:

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Government can adequately protect the consumer only through the establishment of a structure that is truly responsive to his needs.

1. As a minimum, the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, the President's Consumer Advisory Council, and the Office of Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs should be continued until a more permanent arrangement can be established by Congressional action.

2. An Office of Consumer and Citizen Affairs should be established by statute within the Executive Office of the President. The purpose of the office is to:

(a) assure every American better access to his Government;

(b) represent, protect and inform the American consumer;

(c) assure that the consumer interest is heard by decisionmaking agencies;

(d) coordinate consumer protection programs within Government;

(e) provide the citizen with a government official who will assist him in redressing his grievances against government action or inaction; (the American concept of the ombudsman). (See Appendix for description of duties.)

The Office of Consumer and Citizen Affairs should also include a Consumer Counsel with authority to intervene on behalf of the public in administrative and judicial proceedings and establish a *Federal Register for Consumers*.

A Consumer Advisory Council, broadly representative of consumer interests in the United States, should be established to assist the Office of Consumer and Citizen Affairs.

When a permanent Office of Consumer and Citizen Affairs is established, adequate budget and staff must be provided to the office.

XUM

OTHER NECESSARY MEASURES

(1) Special attention to consumer problems of the poor;

(2) Better enforcement of existing consumer protection laws;

(3) Improvement of regulatory power so that Government can effectively administer Congressional directives;

(4) Elimination of loopholes and modernization of antiquated laws.

AGENDA FOR CONSUMER ACTION

From the Council's point of view, an Agenda for Consumer Action must also stress the following goals for both Government and the private sector:

1. Availability of information necessary for intelligent consumer choice;
2. Assurance of safe products and wholesome foods;
3. Assurance of an adequate supply of goods and services at reasonable prices;
4. Abolition of fraudulent and abusive sales and credit practices;
5. Protection of the consumer's right to an unpolluted environment;
6. Stronger enforcement antitrust laws and removal of anti-competitive restraints;
7. Provision for adequate housing, health care, and transportation.

APPENDIX

The Office of Consumer and Citizen Affairs should have the following powers and duties:

(a) Make recommendations to the President on questions of policy relating to consumer affairs;

(b) Coordinate the consumer programs of other Federal agencies;

(c) Maintain an Office of Consumer Counsel with authority to intervene on behalf of the public in administrative and judicial proceedings;

(d) Receive consumer complaints, hold investigatory hearings and recommend corrective action;

(e) Receive complaints on the operations of Federal departments and agencies and recommend corrective action; authority to investigate disposition of consumer complaints by Federal departments and agencies (the American concept of the ombudsman);

(f) Have authority to represent consumer interests before any Federal agency;

(g) Make recommendations and provide reports to the President, the Congress, and the public to assure that consumer or citizen problems are expeditiously and properly resolved by public agencies;

(h) Cooperate with and assist state and local agencies in consumer representation and protection;

(i) Cooperate with and assist industry and business in voluntary efforts to promote consumer protection;

(j) Conduct studies of matters related to consumer interests;

(k) Act as a clearinghouse for information and programs affecting consumers;

(l) Maintain liaison with consumer associations and councils at the national, state, and local levels;

(m) Encourage and participate in development of consumer education programs;

(n) Establish a Federal Register for Consumers.

Members of the Consumer Advisory Council present at the meeting included:

Bronson C. La Follette, of Madison, Wisconsin, Chairman.

Robert J. McEwen, of Boston, Massachusetts (Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Economics, Boston College).

William J. Pierce, of Ann Harbor, Michigan (Professor of Law and Director of the Legislative Research Center, University of Michigan).

Corwin D. Edwards, of Eugene, Oregon (Professor of Economics, University of Oregon).

Richard H. Grant, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire (General Manager, Peas Air Force Base Federal Credit Union).

Gerald A. Lamb, of Waterbury, Connecticut (State Treasurer, State of Connecticut).

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger, of Portland, Oregon (Former United States Senator).

Mrs. Otrie Taylor, of Los Angeles, California (Neighborhood Aid Participant for Neighborhood Aid projects in Watts, Los Angeles).

Louise Gentry, of State College, Pennsylvania (Assistant Dean for Resident Education, Pennsylvania State University).

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on February 27, the Los Angeles Herald Examiner did an editorial, entitled "Help the Indians."

Early this year I was appointed to the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, and recently testified on the importance of improving and expanding educational opportunities for the American Indian. Because of the importance of the subject of Indian education, I inserted my testimony in the Record on March 11.

Today, Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Help the Indians

Sen. George Murphy says the Bureau of Indian Affairs is "stagnant, blundering and inept" in dealing with American Indians.

The California senator wants sweeping reforms to improve the conditions and provide a future for the 600,000 Indians in this country.

Murphy has recommended that Indian education, health and welfare programs be transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He also has asked that federal funds earmarked for state educational programs for Indians be restored.

Testifying before a Senate committee recently, Murphy said 50 percent of Indian youngsters drop out before completing high school. One of the largest tribes, the Navajos, has a 30 percent illiteracy rate. The average education level of all Indians is only five years. The average income of Indians—$1500 per year—is 75 percent below the national average. Indian unemployment is 40 percent—10 times the national average. Tuberculosis among Indians is seven times the national average.

Exclusion of California from Johnson-O'Malley federal funds has caused the California Indian, both educationally and economically, to fail to hold his own with his contemporaries and to fall further behind, said Murphy. The senator said Indian students from Arizona and New Mexico are attending Sherman Institute at Riverside, but California Indians are not admitted. Relocated Indians from other states, while living in California, receive federal assistance while California Indians do not.

"The federal government's performance record insofar as the American Indian is concerned should give pause to those who believe that solutions to our problems should be packaged in and dictated from Washington," Murphy said. "The federal government must help, but however good its intentions, without local cooperation, initiative and commitment, chances for success are slim."

Senator Murphy's concern is well taken and his recommendations merit strong consideration.

"LEARNING, SCIENCE, AND ART"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recent studies have shown that as much as "one-fourth of our growth in per capita income can be traced to increased schooling and as much as one-third to inventions and advances in knowledge." Everyone is aware that money spent on education is an excellent investment, both in terms of the individual and in terms of the future of our country. It is surprising to find, however, that there is almost no information on the extent to which the specific resources we allocate to education actually result in the realization of intended goals. "Toward a Social Report" calls attention to this dirth of knowledge.

"Toward a Social Report" is a working model of the social report which the President would annually submit to Congress if the Full Opportunity Act of 1969—S. 5—were enacted. The Full Opportunity Act would also establish a joint committee to help the Congress evaluate the report. A Council of Social Advisors would be established to assist the President in the preparation of the report. S. 5 also declares that full opportunity for every American is a national goal.

One of the advantages of a social report is that it points to difficult policy questions which must be decided if full opportunity for every American is to be realized. For instance, the sixth chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Learning, Science, and Art" points out that we know relatively little about what or how much American children learn as a result of specific resource allocations.

We have also learned that those groups which "suffer social and economic deprivation systematically learn less than those who have more comfortable backgrounds." The situation is even more unfortunate since even those deprived students who manage to do well are still denied equal and full opportunity. Specifically, "of those high school seniors who are in the top one-fifth, in terms of academic ability, 95 percent will ultimately go on to college if their parents are in the top socioeconomic quartile, but only half of the equally able students from the bottom socioeconomic quartile will attend college."

It is indeed pathetic that some students who manage to overcome the handicap of poverty in high school cannot go on to college not because of their ability but because of the accident of their socioeconomic background.

The report goes on to note that merely increasing the number of schools or teachers will not by itself be a sufficient answer to the problem. If we are to tap this reservoir of talent, we must work to eliminate the cause of this inequity; poverty. It is, indeed, a difficult problem, but then this Nation has never before shied away from equally difficult problems. I sincerely hope that in the future we shall see as much progress in this realm as there has been in the realm of science and technology.

I want to also call to my colleagues' attention one other unfortunate situation discussed in the sixth chapter of "Toward a Social Report." The report notes that "however vibrant the cultural

XUM

life of the Nation may be, many of the live or performing arts are in financial difficulty." Thus, it can be seen that the report helps us to identify another problem which needs to be placed on the Nation's agenda.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sixth chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Learning, Science, and Art," be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chapter VI. Learning, Science, and Art

HOW MUCH ARE THEY ENRICHING SOCIETY?

Knowledge, intellectual skills and the creative capacity of scientists and artists are an important part of the Nation's wealth. Health, national defense, and the quality of the environment in future years depend on the success of research and education now. So does the future performance of the economy. Some studies have suggested that as much as one-fourth of our growth in per capita income can be traced to increased schooling and as much as one-third to inventions and "advances in knowledge." The decisive productive potential of the supply of knowledge is illustrated by the surprisingly rapid recovery of the German and Japanese economies after the devastation of World War II. However much physical capital had been destroyed, the stock of useful knowledge remained.

This chapter will first attempt to bring together available information on how much Americans are learning. It will then turn to the sources of the knowledge that there is to teach: to the stock of systematic knowledge which we call science, and to the unstructured collection of human wisdom and creativity which we call art.

LEARNING

Exposure to learning

The average American has spent far more time in school than his parents did. Today, three-fourths of the Americans just old enough to have done so have finished high school—roughly the same proportion that finished the eighth grade in 1929. Today, about 15 percent of Americans in their late twenties have graduated from college—about the same proportion that had graduated from high school at the time of World War I.

In addition there has been an increase in the proportion of each year that the student spends in school. Since 1900, 34 days have been added to the average academic year. Pupils are also absent much less often, so the actual number of days of school attendance per year by the average pupil has increased by more than half.

The difference in years of schooling received by different groups of Americans has at the same time decreased. Among Americans born in 1901 or shortly before, those in the 90th percentile had 13.5 years of schooling, and those in the 10th percentile 2.6 years of schooling, for a difference of almost 11 years. Among those born between 1932 and 1936, those in the 90th percentile had 16.4 years of schooling, and those in the 10th percentile, 8.4 years, for a difference of 8 years. This difference is projected to decline to about 5.5 years for those born between 1956 and 1960. The gap in median years of schooling between whites and Negroes has fallen from an average of 3.4 years for those born in 1901 or before to one-half year for those born between 1942 and 1946, and appears to be narrowing still further.

The amount of resources used to educate each pupil is also increasing. In 1956, there were 27 pupils for each teacher; now there are 24. Teachers have also had more formal training; 93 percent of the teachers now have college degrees, as compared with 78 percent only 13 years ago. The one-room school, commonplace in rural areas as late as World War II, has largely disappeared. Total expenditures per pupil in elementary and secondary public schools increased from $2.25 to $3.43 per day (in constant dollars) between 1954 and 1964. There have also been improvements in curricula, especially in science and mathematics.

It is generally assumed that these increases in the length of schooling and expenditures on education have brought about an increase in the amount children have learned. There is, however, almost no direct evidence on this point—unless it be the evidence that parents often have difficulty with their children's homework. The *Digest of Educational Statistics*, for example, contains over a hundred pages of educational statistics in each annual issue, yet has virtually no information on how much children have learned. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recently encouraged an attempt at a "national assessment" of educational achievement in the United States. This assessment would involve administering tests measuring standard academic skills to a representative sample of Americans of various ages. Such an assessment, if repeated periodically, would yield for the first time a series of estimates of the change taking place in the intellectual skills and knowledge of the population.

Are we learning more?

In 1870, 20 percent of the white and 80 percent of the Negro population were illiterate. Now only 2.4 percent are deemed illiterate. They are mostly older people and Negroes, and are concentrated mainly in the South. The rate of illiteracy among Americans from 14 to 24 years of age is only about one-half of 1 percent. These facts mark our progress in bringing most Americans up to the rudimentary but critical point of being able to read and write.

What about higher levels of skill and knowledge? Although there is no national assessment of what students are learning, testing is widespread and some clues to changes in test performance of school-age children are available.

The Educational Testing Service recently assembled 186 instances in which comparable tests have been given to large and roughly representative national samples of students at two different times over the past two decades.

In all but 10 of the 186 paired comparisons, the later group performed better than the earlier group. On the average an additional eight percent of the students in the more recent group scored higher than the median student in the old group.[1]

The results that have been described cannot be accepted uncritically; neither can they be casually dismissed. Until better evidence is presented, the tentative judgment must be that American children in the sixties are learning more than their older brothers and sisters learned in the fifties.

This collection of achievement test data also suggests that high school students, and perhaps students in the higher grades generally, have not improved as much as students in the lower grades. Typically, the test comparisons for high schools showed a smaller gain in performance than was usual in the elementary grades. In addition, the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test and the American College Test program, which are given to juniors and seniors in high school, showed no improvement on balance.[2]

One possible reason for this disparity is that the increase in the proportion of teenagers attending high school may have reduced the average level of intellectual ability and cultural background in high schools. The increase in preschool education may also have had a particularly beneficial influence on the lower grades. Television may have at the same time significantly raised the intellectual level of younger children, but seldom stretched the minds of high school students.

How much more could we be learning?

One way to answer this question is by comparing the performance of American students with those in other countries to see if we are doing as well.

One of the few sources on how well American students do as compared with foreign students is the International Study of Achievement in Mathematics. It deals with only one subject, but this is probably the one in which performance can best be compared among nations with different languages and cultures. The study considered only developed nations, and found that American students had one of the poorest levels of performance of the nations which were studied.

The fact that the United States did badly in this comparison is probably due in part to the fact that a larger proportion of young people go through the secondary education system in the United States than in most other countries. Still, American 13 year olds also did comparatively poorly, and this is an age at which none of the countries concerned have excluded many children from the educational system. Thus, if we contend that American youth have on the average as much aptitude for mathematics as children of other nations, we must conclude that we can do much better than we are doing.

In estimating the potential for improvement in American education, international comparisons are probably less relevant than measured differences in learning among different groups in the United States.

For estimating differences in learning among groups, the two best sources of information are the Armed Forces Qualification Test (with its forebear, the Army General classification Test), and the tests done for the *Survey of Educational Opportunity* (also called the "Coleman Report") carried out under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These tests, like others, inevitably incorporate cultural bias. Verbal performance, for example, tends to be measured in terms of the student's command of literary English or the standard conversation of the majority, not in terms of the special dialects of minorities. Mathematics tests include fractions and compound interest, but rarely deal with the probability of "making a six" in craps. Nonetheless, the tests measure skills which are needed in order to do well in contemporary American society.

The Armed Forces Qualification Test is used to evaluate the trainability of prospective servicemen for military service. Because the proportion of young men who are drafted changes from time to time, place to place, and group to group, the test does not provide entirely satisfactory information. Nonetheless it shows clearly that Negroes and Southern whites score, on the average, lower than whites from other regions, and Southern Negroes score less well than Northern Negroes.

---

[1] This amounts to an improvement of one-fifth, assuming a normal distribution of scores. These test results must be interpreted with extreme caution. There is the possibility students are becoming increasingly "test wise" as time goes on, and this might account for the improvement in test scores. Moreover, test results do not measure all types of intellectual achievement. There could have been retrogression along those dimensions of intellectual development that the tests did not measure.

[2] Average scores on the Medical College Admission Test and the Law School Admission Test have been increasing. But this does not show that college students are necessarily learning more, since the sort of students who apply for medical and law school admission may change over time.

XUM

These groups receive, on average, different amounts of schooling, but this difference accounts for only part of the differences in performance.

A 1964 study by the President's Task Force on Manpower Conservation revealed that a majority of young men failing the Armed Forces Qualification Test, white and black alike, were brought up in poverty. Forty percent had never gone beyond eighth grade, four out of five failed to complete high school, and half came from families with five or more children.

The *Survey of Educational Opportunity* was based on a nationwide sample of 564,000 students in grades 1, 3, 6, 9 and 12. The tests covered verbal ability nonverbal intelligence, reading comprehension mathematics, and general information in the practical arts, natural sciences, social studies and humanities. With the exception of Oriental American children, the average minority group pupil (Negro, Mexican-American, American Indian, Puerto Rican) scored distinctly lower on these tests than the average white pupil. Students in the South, both white and Negro, scored below students of their own race in the North.

The schooling which the disadvantaged groups had received had apparently done nothing to lessen the gap between them and more fortunate pupils. Their disadvantage was evident from the start of their school experience through grade 12. The relative position of the different groups was about the same for all the grades tested (except in the South, where Negroes fell to a lower relative position in the later grades). This means that in terms of absolute grade level the disadvantaged fell further behind. Negro pupils in the metropolitan Northeast, for example, were 1.6 years below the norm in grade 6 and 3.3 years below the norm in grade 12.

The Armed Forces Qualification Test and the Survey of Educational Opportunity thus show that persons from both poorer groups and poorer areas performed less well on achievement tests, and that the existing pattern of schooling does not compensate for the initial handicap entailed in being brought up in a disadvantaged group or area.

If talented individuals do not get a full education, the Nation is obviously not developing its capacities as much as it could. And as the chapter on "Social Mobility" showed, only half of those who are in the top ability quintile, but from families in the lowest socioeconomic quartile, go to college, whereas 95 percent of the equally able students from the top socioeconomic quartile go to college. Socioeconomic status also has a major effect on college attendance at other ability levels.

If high school graduates from all socioeconomic levels went to college in the same proportion as high school graduates of the same ability level in the top socioeconomic quartile, more than half a million additional students would enter college each year. This would increase the number who attended college from each high school graduating class by about one-half.

If the environmental and social handicaps of poor children could be overcome, and the elementary and secondary education they receive improved, an even larger number of high school graduates could profit from a college education.

We have seen that American students did less well in mathematics than students in a number of other countries, and that the pattern of results in the Armed Forces Qualification Test and the Survey of Educational Opportunity implied that there is an untapped reservoir of intellectual capacity in the Nation's disadvantaged groups and areas. It is also clear that those young people from poor families who do nonetheless score well on achievement tests are much less likely to enter college than those who come from a higher socioeconomic level. Thus there is no doubt that the Nation has failed to take full advantage of its children's capacity to learn.

The policy challenge

The greatest challenge to American education today is to find effective ways of helping low income children learn the basic intellectual skills so that they can be more successful in school and compete more successfully for jobs and rewarding positions in the community when they become adults.

How much a child learns depends upon his mother's diet before he was born, his own nutrition and health, his access to books, and the psychological and intellectual influences in the home. Most psychologists seem to agree that the preschool years are a period of particularly rapid development, and that attitudes acquired in these years can have enduring effects. Even after he reaches school age, a child typically spends only one-third of his working hours in school. Television programs and conversations with parents and playmates take up much of a child's time. The motivation to learn is obviously important, and there is every reason to believe it is decisively influenced by the home environment.

Some of the findings in the *Survey of Educational Opportunity* suggest the importance of the educational impact of factors outside of school. The *Survey* found that the socioeconomic status of a child's parents, and of his classmates, were major determinants of a student's academic performance. Once the impact of the socioeconomic status of parents and peers had been accounted for, such differences in quality of schooling as were observed and measured explained very little of the remaining variation in student performance.[3] The only observed school characteristic that had a significant effect was the verbal ability of its teachers, and this effect was much smaller than that of socioeconomic status of parents and classmates.

Despite the limitations of the *Survey* the conclusion that a child's socioeconomic environment is an important determinant of how much he learns is almost certainly right. This conclusion, in turn, suggests that we cannot take full advantage of the potential for learning simply by spending more on schools. Higher incomes and better jobs for parents may have more influence on their children's learning than any "compensation" which can be given to the children themselves. Better television programing and help for parents in how to talk with and stimulate their own children may also be important. Improved housing arrangements which give children from poor families the opportunity to attend schools and live in neighborhoods with children of different social and economic status may also be of crucial importance.

Nevertheless, it is clear that schools could do far more to stimulate and foster the curiosity and creativity of children—not just poor children, but all children. We must somehow find a way to do two things. First, we need to channel more resources into education especially in areas where the needs are very high in relation to the tax base and present spending. It takes money to attract sensitive, intelligent, and highly trained people into teaching and education administration, and to replace rat-infested old schools, especially in the center cities, with attractive convenient structures.

But resources alone will not solve the problems of American education. A new spirit of acceptance of change and desire for improvement is needed. Progressive industries often spend 5 to 10 percent of their funds on research and development. But expenditures on education research and development are now miniscule, perhaps a half of 1 percent of the total education budget.

Furthermore, much "research and development" in education consists of small projects having little impact on actual learning in the schools. There is a need for major departures, for developing whole new curricula and approaches to education, for trying the new approaches with real children and real schools. This kind of effort is expensive, by the present standards of education research, although not by the standards of military and industrial research and development.

But even a major effort to find more effective methods in education through research and development will not be sufficient unless the schools as a whole adopt a new attitude toward change. School systems must learn to see themselves as continuous laboratories trying new things, evaluating results, and making changes.

SCIENCE

The advance of science has an effect on the Nation's capacity to produce more goods and services, better health, and a stronger defense. Our society also values scientific truth for its own sake. And because it is clear that the state of a nation's science is related to its productivity, the health of its people, and even to national security, Americans are concerned whenever any other nation excels us in an important area of scientific capability.

Resources devoted to science

What is the state of American science and how much are we adding to the stock of systematic knowledge? Unfortunately, useful measures of scientific productivity do not exist.

A frequent measure of our scientific capital is the number of scientists and the amount of resources devoted to scientific pursuits. Between 1950 and 1965 the number of scientists and engineers nearly doubled, reaching about a million and a half in the latter year. About a million were engineers, a half a million scientists. This increase in the number of scientists and engineers was 4.5 times the rate of growth of the total labor force. The number of scientists and engineers getting doctorates has doubled in the last 10 years.

Between 1953 and 1965 the Nation's research and development expenditures increased fourfold, from 5.2 billion to 20.5 billion. This means that these expenditures increased at a compound annual rate of 12 percent per year, and that the percent of the Gross National Product used for these purposes rose from 1.4 to 3.0 percent. No other nation comes close to devoting a similar proportion of its resources to scientific research and development.

The diversity of science

Three hundred years ago all experimental sciences were grouped together in one specialty called "natural philosophy." An individual could attempt to master almost all important scientific knowledge. In 1958, the National Science Foundation counted 120 subfield groupings and 142 groupings in 1968. The number of particular specialties increased even faster: 695 specialties were listed in 1958, 1,235 in 1968.

---

[3] The *Survey* did not measure the quality of schools well and its conclusions are subject to varying interpretations. The conclusion that the socioeconomic status of the families of a student's classmates is an important determinant of a student's performance could be interpreted as evidence that differences in the quality of schooling are important, because high status parents usually want and can afford to live in neighborhoods with good schools. Since variations in the quality of schooling were measured only partially and crudely in the *Survey*, it is possible that the average socioeconomic status of the families of the students in a school measures the quality of that school better than the explicit measures of school quality used in the *Survey*.

This increase of specialization does not measure the pace of scientific advance. Classifications and new specialties are sometimes created for reasons unrelated to the growth of knowledge. Nonetheless, the statistics on the increasing diversity and division of labor in science reflect the rapid growth of scientific exploration and knowledge.

The advance of technology

The remarkable advances of industrial technology in recent years are too obvious to need documentation. Television, supersonic jets, computers, nuclear power and many other advances have revolutionized our lives and made possible feats, like trips around the moon, that earlier generations thought sheer fantasy. Whereas the *Mayflower* took 2 months to cross the Atlantic, in the 1890's it took 1 week, in the 1930's a day, and now about 7 hours. But advancing technology has also created problems for society—noise, congestion, pollution, and the like.

Some insight into the level of technological achievement in the United States can be obtained from what is called the "technological balance of payments." This is an accounting of payments foreigners have made to us for the use of patented techniques or technical expertise, minus our payments for their patents and technical expertise.[4] The United States enjoys a huge surplus in the technological balance of payments, and this surplus appears to be growing. Our surplus was $311 million in 1956 and $1,097 million in 1965. The ratio of our payments to our receipts was one to seven in 1956 and one to nine in 1965. If the transfers within multinational firms are left out, our surplus is still growing; it rose from $110 million in 1956 to $235 million in 1965.

These striking figures on our technological lead can easily mislead us. Science is international, and any major scientific achievement is likely to be of mixed ancestry. Moreover, many scientists have come to this country from other lands. Although the "brain drain" increases the inequality of income among nations, it is nonetheless an encouraging indicator about the state of American science.

The policy challenge

The main challenge presented by the state of American science is the need to lay the foundations for a science policy. We are confronted with burgeoning advance that offers great promise. Can we formulate policies that will nurture our invaluable scientific reources and ensure the fulfillment of prospects that lie ahead?

The competition for public resources will almost certainly be more intense, either between science and other programs, or between different scientific endeavors. The Nation will also continue to find itself at the center of controversies concerning the condition and needs of world science.

If there is almost sure to be more heat generated by issues of science policy in the future, ways must be found to generate more light. Priorities in science could be laid out more systematically, and farther in advance. Issues involving such priorities could be exposed to wider public debate. The very unpredictability of scientific breakthroughs could be made the basis for more rational development of scientific manpower, institutions, and communications with an emphasis on keeping these resources flexible.

The international character of the scientific enterprise poses a special challenge. The United States, as we have seen, spends a larger *percentage* of its income on scientific research and development than do other countries. One possible explanation for this is that some of the benefits of scientific advance are readily available to any nation in the world. For example, people of any country can take advantage of such medical advances as heart transplants. Because of its size and affluence, the United States gets a larger share of the benefit of a basic scientific advance than other countries, and therefore has an incentive to spend more of its national income on basic research. Even the biggest countries do not, however, reap all of the benefits of the basic research they finance. Thus the world as a whole probably tends to spend too little on basic science.

The benefits of basic research are international, and worldwide cooperation in science is essential. A cooperative recognition of the universality of basic science could benefit all mankind.

ART

Artistic creativity and its appreciation are an important part of our national life. There is art not only in museums, theaters, opera houses, and books but in every aspect of life—in cooking, dress and industrial design. Although this section concentrates on the conventionally most professional and "highbrow" forms of art, we must not forget that this is only a small part of the total and may not be the most important.

Access to art

Access to many forms of art is easier today than it has ever been before. Modern technologies of communication and transportation have given the entire population an access to a variety of art forms that could in an earlier age have been open only to a privileged few. Even the most fortunate in earlier periods could not possibly have heard as wide a variety of symphonies, or seen such a diversity of drama, as the connoisseur of records and motion pictures can enjoy today.

This improvement in the accessibility of art has continued even in recent years. Twenty-five years ago almost no one owned a television set; by 1952, 30 percent of the households owned at least one set, and this percentage rose to 67 percent in 1955, 88 percent in 1960, and 94 percent in 1967.

Notwithstanding the obvious shortcomings in television programing, the growth in the number of television sets has given more Americans an access to at least some serious attempts at artistic expression. National Educational Television's 148 stations now reach almost all metropolitan areas, and surveys have shown that the NET audience about doubled between 1961 and 1966, by which time it reached over 6 million homes and an estimated 14 million viewers weekly, apart from school programs. Of 260 hours of programing supplied last year to NET's affiliates, about half or more were in the field of art and culture.

Television is, to be sure, only one of the technologies that has made art more accessible. Even such an old technology as that involved in making books has changed with the "paperback revolution," which has made books more accessible to millions of Americans. This development, along with expanding incomes, increased education, and other factors, has brought about a 90-percent increase in the number of new books and editions between 1960 and 1967, and a 65-percent increase in books classified in the arts or humanities. These increases considerably exceed the rates of growth of population and income.

Improved methods of transportation and increased incomes have also widened the range of possible artistic experience for many Americans by facilitating foreign travel. In 1929 about half a million Americans traveled abroad, but in 1967 almost three and a half million did so.

New technologies have not only widened the access to art, but also permitted new forms of artistic expression, from films to new kinds of sculpture and music.

The performing arts

At the same time that technology and economic advance have improved the accessibility of many types of art, they have also created problems for other art forms, especially for those involving live performances. There is evidence that live performances of certain kinds are not increasing in proportion to the growth of population and the economy, and in some cases are perhaps even in an absolute decline.

The Broadway theaters are the largest single part of the American theater, and they have been keeping records in a consistent way longer than other theaters. These records reveal that Broadway attendance has not expanded in proportion to our population or economic growth. The Broadway theater reached its peak quite some time ago, probably about 1925. No new Broadway theater has been built since 1928.[5] There has been no clear trend in attendance since World War II, and there clearly has not been enough of an increase to offset rapidly rising costs. Since 1950, ticket prices have risen only half as much as costs. Though a few "hits" make great profits, the Broadway theater as a whole is in serious financial difficulty.

The off-Broadway theater grew rapidly from the late 1940's until the midsixties, but it has an attendance of about one million, compared with seven million for Broadway. More recently, the off-Broadway theater has suffered, too; the number of productions is now smaller than it was in 1961–62.

There has been little or no growth in the number of professional symphony orchestras since 1950. In 1967 there were 28 entirely professional symphony orchestras playing for seasons ranging from 22 to 52 weeks. There are about twice as many "metropolitan" orchestras, mainly professional but having smaller budgets, and a large number of partially amateur community orchestras.

Chamber music groups are generally less well organized than symphony orchestras. Receipts from ticket sales to the small halls appropriate for chamber groups are generally low, and the cost of the individual performer relatively high. Some orchestras are organizing chamber groups to achieve the advantages of a longer season for some of their members.

Opera is perhaps the most vulnerable of the arts because it is easily the most expensive, requiring large casts, an orchestra, a chorus, and a ballet company as well as expensive scenery and costumes. The only major opera companies are the Metropolitan, the New York City Opera, the Chicago Lyric Opera, and the San Francisco Opera. There are about 40 other professional and semiprofessional organizations, but they usually give no more than 25 performances in a year. Estimating total attendance at these performances requires a good deal of guesswork, but the figure has been placed at less than 2 million in 1963–64.

Ballet as a separate artistic undertaking is characterized by high costs in many of the same areas as opera. Annual attendance for dance performanes is estimated at less than 1 million, with dance tours showing a marked relative growth in popularity since 1952. At the present time, however, there is little chance to see a professional dance company perform any place except in one of the largest cities or in a college town.

Notwithstanding the paucity of information in this area, it does seem very likely that there is no "cultural boom" where direct attendance at live performances is involved. The rate of growth in such performances is probably slower than that of the economy as a whole, and expenditures on these art forms have certainly not risen at anything like the rate at which expenditures on science and education have increased.

---

[4] This is not an ideal measure because of problems of definition and the bias against basic science.

[5] Unless Lincoln Center is counted.

Vulnerability of the performing arts

To some extent, the relative decline in live artistic performances is probably a natural result of the development of modern communications technology. The new technologies offer a less expensive substitute for live performance.

But there is another factor at work. One explanation of the slow growth of audience participation in the performing arts is the tendency for this participation to become even relatively more expensive as the economy advances. There is little increase in productivity per worker in the performing arts: a string quartet continues to require four performers. In the economy in general productivity increases regularly, and so then do wage levels. Since this does not happen in the performing arts, someone must make sacrifices. If it is not the public or the patrons, it will be the artists themselves, who will have to choose other careers or forego higher incomes.

This systematic tendency for the relative cost of live performance to rise is made somewhat less serious by the technological improvements in ways of disseminating culture, such as by phonograph records, motion pictures, and television, providing substitutes for the audiences and additional earnings for some performers. But if there is presumably also a need to enjoy culture at first hand, these technological developments do not altogether fill the gap from the audiences' point of view. From the performers' point of view, the fact that only a relatively small number can expect careers in the media may be discouraging.

There is another cultural sector, where the problem of productivity can be considered not to exist at all. This is what we might call amateur or subsistence culture: artistic work carried on by the artist primarily for his own enjoyment. Increased incomes may allow more of this, as growth of amateur community symphonies, for example, seems to show. Sometimes amateur efforts can create or enlarge a commercial audience, as with rock music.

The probable long run tendency for a relative decline in certain types of live performances does not automatically indicate a "social" or "public" problem. Nevertheless, live performances are needed to give the typical performer (or composer or playwright) a chance to develop. The quality of records, motion pictures and television could decline if live performances fell off beyond some point, since the lack of this large testing and training opportunity could become critical.

The performing arts indirectly benefit others besides members of live audiences in other ways as well. Their quality is tied up with the capacity to educate, and probably also the capacity to communicate. The cultural inheritance of a nation is also a source of important values in a civilized society—understanding, appreciation, and respect for other people. Finally, the taste for art is in part an acquired taste: those who have a broader cultural experience tend to have the greatest concern for art. The demand for art might be greater if the opportunities to enjoy it were more numerous. These arguments suggest that the prospect of a relative decline in live performances is a matter of general public concern, and something to keep in mind in any assessment of the condition of American society.

BYELORUSSIA

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, today I rise to join my colleagues and all Americans in commemoration of the struggle of the Byelorussian people for their freedom and independence.

Fifty-one years ago, on March 25, 1918, the people of Byelorussia declared their independence, and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Despite the hardships, battles, and sacrifices endured by her people, the young state was unable to preserve her hard-won independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces—and in early 1921 the young Republic was made part of the Soviet Union.

Today the Byelorussian people do not enjoy the freedoms that we regard as our birthright, but they valiantly cling to their hopes of regaining freedom. And we salute their efforts.

DAVID K. E. BRUCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today marks the farewell for one of America's most accomplished diplomats. Our Ambassador to the Court of Saint James, David K. E. Bruce, is returning to private life.

With 8 distinguished years in London, Ambassador Bruce has held our Nation's most prestigious diplomatic post longer than any other man. Prior to 1960, he served in Paris and Bonn, the only individual to represent America at her three premier Embassies.

Throughout his public career David Bruce set a standard of excellence rarely equalled.

Throughout his life Ambassador Bruce has been known as a man of intellect and grace.

President Richard Nixon is said to have remarked that while he and his three predecessors in the White House disagreed on many things, they all "agreed that David Bruce was a giant."

Born in Baltimore, graduate of Princeton and the Universities of Maryland and Virginia, member of the State legislatures of both Maryland and Virginia, he has led a remarkably varied and decidedly brilliant career.

Lawyer, Foreign Service officer, businessman, Ambassador Bruce went to Britain as a Red Cross representative in the early days of the Second World War.

Shifting to intelligence work and the Office of Strategic Services, he ended the war as a colonel in charge of OSS operations in Europe.

He then began a career in public service which in time would include Assistant Secretary of Commerce, American Aid Administrator in France, and for 2 years Under Secretary of State.

I am proud to say that Ambassador Bruce is a good friend of the Tydings family and was for many years a close and trusted friend of my father.

His stepping down today is, in one sense, an occasion of sadness for the Nation is losing one of its finest diplomats and public servants. On the other hand a note of joy creeps in for Ambassador Bruce and his lovely wife, Evangeline, are now back in the States with us.

I have the feeling that their counsel and company shall be widely sought.

Our first Ambassador to Great Britain, John Adams, was noted, among other things, for his brilliance and commonsense. The same can be said, I think, of David Bruce.

The Nation owes him a vote of thanks, and I know that we all wish him well.

THE CHALLENGE OF VICTORY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it was my distinct honor and pleasure to take part last night, Tuesday, March 25, in the fourth annual Robert A. Taft Memorial Award presentation. On hand making the presentation was President George H. Williams.

The meeting, on the American University campus, presented the Taft Memorial Award to U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits.

The award was presented by the American University Young Republican Club in recognition of his distinguished service to the Republican Party and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's address on this occasion be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Challenge of Victory: Building a Durable Republican Majority

I am honored to receive the Robert A. Taft Award. I never served with Robert Taft in the United States Senate, for he was tragically taken from public life before I was elected to that Body in 1965. However, I worked with Senator Taft on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill (which I sponsored in the House of Representatives) and on Federal Aid to Education, and had great regard for his stature and achievements.

I am also pleased to appear before the Young Republican Club of American University on this occasion, for I owe the members of that Club a debt of gratitude. Last autumn, many members journeyed to New York City to spend several days working with me in my campaign for reelection to the United States Senate. I am deeply appreciative of that help, and, as a grateful and successful Republican candidate, I really should be presenting an award to you!

The Republican Party, led by President Nixon, won a great victory last November. Mr. Nixon received support in almost every section of the country, and, to that extent, both the Republican Party and he are in an admirable position to form a stable national majority—indeed, better placed, I would argue, than the Democratic Party. However, if we are to do so, it is important to remember that the Republican Party has not yet become the majority party in this country and that President Nixon was elected by a minority of the people. His 43 per cent of the popular vote and the almost 32 million votes he received in 1968 were both lower than the comparable figures he had obtained eight years before.

It has become almost axiomatic since last November to report the end of the New Deal coalition which was formed by Franklin Roosevelt in the midst of the Depression and remained in virtually uninterrupted power for almost four decades. As former Presidential Assistant Bill Moyers, paraphrasing Mark Twain, recently pointed out, the reports of that coalition's demise continue to be "greatly exaggerated." But, unquestionably, the Democratic coalition is in disarray, and the Republican Party now has a unique opportunity to transform its Presidential victory into a stable governing majority.

Whether we do so or not depends upon the development of an affirmative Republican program aimed at a national constituency and to the emerging "youth" sectors of American society. But, let us bear in mind, that majority status for the Republican Party will not be won automatically.

Specifically, it has been argued that a new Republican majority can be formed by an appeal to the previously "solid" Democratic South—to those who supported George Wallace in 1968—and to an as yet unformed social "backlash" which grips a large portion of alienated urban whites of the North. In my opinion, this would be a tragic error—as well as a grave disservice to the ideals upon which the Republican Party was founded—and we must renounce this course of action. An enduring national leadership cannot be built upon an appeal to short-term emotional issues or to the exploitation of racial unrest.

Similarly, a policy of "hard-line" nationalistic crusading, which "waves the bloody shirt" on the international scene, cannot be the basis for a new majority coalition. Such a program would overlook the mandate which President Nixon received in 1968 to move America into a period of peace, to end the impasse in Vietnam, and to correct the imbalance in our priorities which has made it impossible to allocate the necessary national resources to the dramatic improvement in the quality of our domestic society.

The Republican Party must be the party of the new America—the changing, emerging America; and that America is the technologically advanced and urbanized society—about three out of every four Americans now live in metropolitan areas—and there is much of that thinking in rural areas, too. New institutions—both private and public—have developed, and, in their wake, a new class, national in scope, has emerged. These men and women—most of them youth, plus those professional and managerial in orientation, plus the employees in large corporate structures—are generally found in great density in the exploding suburbs. While they seem to reserve a traditional American distaste for and impatience with extreme and violent militancy and are deeply concerned by urban decay and crime, their attitudes are often coupled with basic tolerance for different ethnic groups and with that respect for innovation which have always characterized the best in our society.

This emerging class, which is the "growth" element in almost every region of America, can be a force for urban reform and innovation. They seek leadership which—while moderate in temper—is pragmatic and imaginative in facing those issues which relate to the quality of American life in the last third of the twentieth century. They are capable, I believe, of reaching out to the poor and the dispossessed and of establishing coalitions with them, for Americans still have a determination to remove obstacles to opportunity and to assist those who must overcome hardship and discrimination. Americans everywhere still seek the objective of a truly integrated society.

The Republican Party can provide leadership for this newly powerful class, for, in the midst of our turmoil, the traditional Republican principles still have relevance. Upon those principles a new national majority can be built. It is for us to prove in the next four years that Republican values of individual freedom, local authority, the capacity of enterprise to operate in the public interest and the supremacy of the national interest can prove themselves anew in problem solving in the midst of urban convulsion.

Some contend, for example, that the plight of the urban Negro requires a vast expansion of the Federal government at the expense of private enterprise and state and local authority; that the public sector must expand its powers.

And yet, I know that it was private business opportunities that permitted generations to escape the slums in the past; I see that Negroes have greater dignity and power as constituents of local government than as clients of a distant bureaucracy. And, I see mayors and business leaders across the country addressing themselves with new courage and decisiveness to the problems of the slums, while the Federal government cuts back on poverty programs and imposes harsh new restrictions on welfare. So I remain unconvinced that the way to serve the urban poor is to decrease the influence of business and to deny the opportunity of service to local government.

As a matter of policy this means an emphasis on home ownership or integrated tenancy, rather than on economically segregated public housing projects. It means opening homes in the suburbs, not only reconstructing the slums. It means an emphasis on jobs rather than on welfare. It means a concerted effort to provide a variety of employment choice in the private sector rather than relying too much on dead-end jobs created by government as an employer of last resort. It means the development of minority group entrepreneurship and small business opportunities—not simply the establishment of subsidized corporate outposts in the central cities. And finally, it means a preference for a plan of Federal revenue sharing with the states and cities as against a proliferation of special Federal programs and prescriptions.

The program which I have outlined is a national program; it should—and I believe it will—be the Republican program. It is essentially a metropolitan program, though it is aimed at "metropolitan America," wherever it exists, rather than at any single region of the country.

The Republican Party can and must appeal to the emerging, growing groups in America—to the America which is changing and progressing, not to those who would turn inward, which would reject the present and abort the future.

We must, however, reach out to those left behind by progress and affluence or frightened by change. We must reach out to the alienated—whether they be black or white, Northern worker or Southern farmhand. Our task must be to reconcile the alienated to inevitable change and to peaceful reform. But we must lend confidence to their hopes; not counsel to their fears.

I firmly believe that, on this basis, a durable Republican majority can be built. It is this task which is the challenge and the responsibility of victory.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 25 marked the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I wish to assure the people of Byelorussia, who I am hopeful will hear these messages of encouragement, that they have not been forgotten by the people of the free world and that amidst the myriad of events which daily occupy the time of Congress, we now pause to remember and pay tribute to these courageous and valiant people.

We shall not forget the desire that the Byelorussians had to be considered a distinctive national entity. Out of Byelorussia emerged a growing interest in ethnology and language, the publication of books abroad in the Byelorussian language which were smuggled into the homeland, the founding of a teachers society for the propagation of the Byelorussian language, the establishment of separate Byelorussian journals and a Byelorussian theatre—all of which contributed to generating the deep Byelorussian interest and concern with their national culture.

We shall not forget the Byelorussian newspaper, Nasha Niva. This publication, which miraculously existed from 1906 to 1915, became a political organ which played a very important role in Byelorussia's national revival by becoming the spokesman for the Byelorussian intelligentsia, writers, and poets; in its pages appeared the first works of Bahdanovich, Yank Kupala, Yakub Kolas, Ales Harum, and many others.

We shall not forget the All-Byelorussian Congress which met in Minsk in December 1917 attended by 1,872 delegates democratically chosen and representing all Byelorussian organizations and political parties. Congress adopted a resolution by an overwhelming majority which endorsed the right of nations to self-determination and called for the establishment of a democratic government to be designated the Byelorussian National Republic. This was the first constitutional step toward complete independence from Russia.

We shall not forget that, sensing the danger to their own revolutionary interests, the Bolsheviks, who had seized power in November, surrounded the place at which the Congress was convening and with a display of armed power broke up the meeting. By this action, Byelorussia became one of the first victims of Communist aggression.

We shall not forget that on March 25, 1918, the representative body of the Republic solemnly proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia and published its official proclamation which read as follows:

> A year ago, the peoples of Byelorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that has been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states. . . .

We shall not forget the significant advances the Byelorussian Government made in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare. In addition, the Government was active internationally and received recognition from various countries. The Republic was recognized de jure by Austria, Poland, and the newly independent succession states of the former Russian Empire; namely, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine. In addition, it was recognized de facto by Bulgaria, Denmark, France, and Yugoslavia.

We shall not forget that in November 1918 the Red army advanced into Byelorussia. The Byelorussians, having insufficient military forces with which to oppose the Bolsheviks and protect their own national territory, were thus forced to move.

We shall not forget that on December 10, 1918, the Red army seized Minsk and established a government of military revolutionary committees. Byelorussia's efforts to establish an anti-Bolshevik force failed, and with the Treaty of Riga in 1921 ending the war between Poland and Bolshevik Russia, Byelorussia was divided, Poland receiving one-third of the country with a population

XUM

of 3,500,000 while the remainder, with the exception of that part falling to independent Latvia, came under Soviet control.

Through the years, these brave people have exhibited courage and determination against all odds. Free men should pause a moment to pray for the day when Byelorussians will once again enjoy the freedom and liberty that were theirs for those few moments in 1918. We shall not forget.

THE EFFECT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an article published recently in the New York Times has dramatically indicated the effect of recent increases in interest rates and in the cost of land and materials on meeting the goals of the Housing Act of 1968, particularly, the goals for low- and moderate-income families. That act set as a goal the construction of 26 million new units in the next decade. It has already become clear—less than 1 year after the passage of that bill—that it will be very difficult, to say the least, to meet that objective.

It is too soon to say what the exact effect of the increasing interest rates has been, but present indications are that a decline in new housing starts in the coming months is quite likely. That expected decline is partially the result of increases in the cost of land and lumber, but it should be emphasized that it is estimated that every 1-percent increase in the interest rate on mortgages decreases new housing starts by between 100,000 and 150,000. Thus, our necessary efforts to hold down inflation may, as a disastrous side effect, inhibit the realization of our commitment to provide every American with decent housing.

The interest rates continue to climb. The latest increase in the prime rate to 7½ percent will make mortgage interest at least 8½ percent—already beyond the limits of the usury laws of many States. Thus, those lending institutions which still engage in the residential mortgage market will discount mortgages. This practice will, of course, increase the cost of the money for home construction beyond the 8½-percent figure mentioned. More seriously, many financial institutions—such as major commercial banks—are no longer lending money for housing, at all.

To alleviate the undesirable effect of high-interest rates and tight credit on mortgage rates and on residential housing, I have strongly urged that the Federal Reserve System begin to buy and sell the securities of FNMA, GNMA, and the Federal home loan banks. I repeat that call today, for the situation may grow more critical in the next few weeks. In addition, it is crucial that the Congress take steps to protect the low- and moderate-income housing market from bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of combating inflation. We must take steps which will insure that a certain amount of capital will continue to flow into the construction and renovation of this housing, even as we use monetary policy to check inflation.

I am pleased to note that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is holding hearings this week—week of March 24—on the effect of high interest rates on the economy. I am sure that that committee has looked into this matter most seriously. The findings of those hearings—particularly, as to the effect of high interest rates on new housing starts and the objectives of the 1968 Housing Act are vital to the country. I am prepared to offer and support measures to alleviate this situation and to permit us to meet our essential housing goals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred be inserted in the Congressional Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Housing Program, Still in Infancy, Already a Prospective Failure

(By Gerd Wilcke)

It appears virtually impossible to build 26 million new or rehabilitated housing units in the next decade.

That is the view of a number of economists who have closely scrutinized the goals of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act.

There is no question about the need for such an ambitious undertaking. The things that bother the experts are whether enough funds can be made available for mortgages, whether new construction techniques can be applied to hold down costs and whether labor can increase productivity.

The question of building costs received new urgency last week when members of Congress asked for investigations of skyrocketing lumber prices.

Wright Patman, a Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, announced that his staff would begin gathering facts "immediately" and that the committee itself would meet on the problem "as soon as possible." The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has scheduled similar hearings March 19 to 21.

The Housing Act, as signed by President Johnson last Aug. 1, seeks to eliminate substandard housing within the next 10 years. The total of 26 million units to accomplish this includes at least 6 million subsidized units for lower-income families. If that part of the program is to be realized, the Government will have to subsidize 10 times more units than it did in the last decade.

One expert who has made a critical analysis of the program and has concluded that "categorically, something less" than the 26 million units can be built, is Charles B. Reeder, a senior associate economist of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc. Du Pont is one of the many chemical companies that have a large stake in the housing market.

Dr. Reeder, at a recent press briefing here, said that in terms of housing starts alone, the goal of 26 million units in one decade represented a level of activity nearly double the annual average of 1.4 million units started during each year of the decade ended in 1968. The capital requirements to build or rehabilitate 26 million units would be more than double the dollar volume that went into housing in the last 10 years.

The ratio of new housing activity to the gross national product, Dr. Reeder found, would have to rise from 2.7 per cent in 1968 to 4.9 per cent in 1976. For the entire period ending in 1978, the ratio would have to average 4.2 per cent, compared with an average of 3.2 per cent for the 10 years ended in 1968.

To reach a ratio of 4.9 per cent for any one year is not impossible or unreasonable, Dr. Reeder held, although a ratio higher than this has been achieved only once—in 1950 when it was 5.6 per cent. "But to expect the ratio for a full 10 years to average nearly one-third above that of the previous years is not reasonable," he asserted.

LAND NEEDS ARE NOTED

Citing findings of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, Dr. Reeder said that more than 10 million acres of land were necessary to provide—at today's densities—26 million additional dwellings and ancillary facilities by 1978. That rate of consumption would be roughly double the current rate of land consumption for new housing.

Since it would be difficult to acquire that much land, the committee recommended extending the powers of the Federal Government.

Specifically, the committee proposed the following:

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development should be granted limited powers to pre-empt local zoning codes and exclusionary state codes or local ordinances from application to Federally subsidized projects.

Legislation should be enacted to help local renewal authorities in their acquisition of land for subsequent resale or lease as sites for subsidized housing.

H.U.D. should be authorized to acquire land directly, by purchase or condemnation, for lease back to private or public developers who would be required to build subsidized housing and related community facilities on the leased sites.

Like Dr. Reeder, another expert, George A. Christie, chief economist of the McGraw-Hill Information Systems Company, has spent considerable time analyzing the housing act. He also concluded that it would be hard to reach a goal of 26 million units.

Discussing the cost problem in a recent speech and subsequent interview, Mr. Christie said that the publicly assisted part of six million units, or 600,000 units a year, would be about 20 times the annual volume of public housing in the last decade. He added:

"If we price it at $20,000 per unit, and that's how much public housing cost in 1968, the annual total comes to about $12-billion. The full total for all six million units is well over $100-billion."

Where is the money to come from in fiscal 1970? "Congress hasn't got $12-billion for housing next year, not when it's still looking for places to cut $6-billion from the year's budget," the economist said.

Mr. Christie added that perhaps the most important innovation in recent legislation was the part that no longer made it necessary for Congress to provide all the money, at least not all at once. Thus, the Federal Government's role is no longer to subsidize the construction of public housing but to subsidize the occupancy of privately built housing through rent and interest supplements.

In another development, the House voted last week to have its Banking Committee investigate recent large increases in the price of lumber.

IT MUST BE BUILT

However, he added, housing still has to be built and contractors still have to be paid.

"So, if Congress goes the rent subsidy route and spreads this cost over 30 or more years, it simply means that in the meantime the private capital markets will be putting up the $100-billion or so that it will cost to create six million low-income housing units," he declared.

As to the package of 26 million units, Mr. Christie said that allowing for higher costs and a somewhat different mixture of single-family and multi-family units, the total credits needed to support this level of building would be at least $40-billion. This would be double the mortgage requirement for today's new residential building.

"Projections of capital flows," he said, "show that the total of investible funds will not be growing at this rate, meaning that mortgages will require a bigger share of the credit pie, perhaps as much as one-third compared with today's one-fourth.

"And if the experience of the past few years is any indication of the housing industry's ability to attract financing when money is scarce, then our 10-year housing program may well run out of credit before it runs out of carpenters."

Reviewing the labor and productivity problems, Mr. Christie said that in 1968 about 3.25 million workers were involved in the creation of $84-billion worth of residential and nonresidential construction. That averaged a little over $25,000 of construction a man. In 10 years, measured at today's prices, the $84-billion will be more than $125-billion.

Ten years ago, he continued, 2.75-million workers turned out total construction valued at $66-billion, again at 1968 prices.

This was $24,000 worth of construction a worker. Since then the rate has grown an average of only 1 per cent a year, compared with a productivity growth rate of 2.5 per cent for the economy as a whole.

If there was an improvement in construction productivity beyond the 1-per-cent-a-year rate, the industry would need 4.5 million workers to meet the demands of 1978.

This, Mr. Christie said, implied the need for a net gain of nearly 1.25 million workers, or a growth rate in the work force of 3.25 per cent a year for the next 10 years, about twice as fast as the nation's total labor force will be expanding.

Mr. Christie cautioned that productivity measures were "crude at best," since there was no separate productivity index for the housing industry. If there were, it would probably show a better result than construction as a whole.

PREFABRICATION A FACTOR

One reason for this was said to be the expanding acceptance of prefabrication in home building. Another is the growth in production of mobile homes from 100,000 a year to more than 300,000 during the last decade.

Mr. Christie said mobile homes did not enter into the calculation of output per construction worker "simply because there units are not considered construction, nor are the people who build them considered construction workers".

The economist said he was convinced that there was more improvement in productivity than was shown by statistics. If the industry could count on an annual gain of 2 per cent, it would cut down the labor force requirement to meet the housing goal from 3.25 to 2.25 per cent.

Summing up his analysis, Mr. Christie said that instead of reaching the 3.3 million annual rate of housing starts in the final years of the program, the rate would flatten out to about 2.5 million in the middle nineteen-seventies. This would mean:

The 10-year total may fall short by perhaps three million units.

Manufactured units will play a large part, particularly in meeting the six-million-unit target of low-income, publicly sponsored, multi-family housing.

Housing costs will continue to rise sharply over the next decade.

There is need for substantial modification of building codes and union work rules. These may be the most critical areas of all.

SOME CRITICISMS

Dr. Reeder had this to say about improved productivity: "The answer lies not in new materials or dramatic breakthroughs in the building process, but in applying techniques that are already" known in the industrial field.

The du Pont specialist asserted that the techniques were rarely applied because most builders operated on too small a scale to utilize prefabrication and mass production of components and subassemblies.

Many governmental regulations, such as building codes and plumbing, electrical and mechanical codes as well as zoning ordinances hamper technological progress, Dr. Reeder said.

Some labor practices prevent the introduction of cost-saving technology and union work rules often make construction manpower inefficient and costly, he added. Another criticism was:

Lenders have been reluctant on occasion to provide mortgage funds for nontraditional dwellings and material suppliers may have been suspicious of innovations that threatened to displace their materials.

Finally, he said, consumers were not always enthusiastic about new materials and designs associated with modular or industrialized housing.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we all know that a "thin" anti-ballistic-missile system is to be deployed in Montana and North Dakota. What we do not know—and what has never been satisfactorily explained—is why.

In a very thoughtful and penetrating editorial on Sunday, March 15, the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press asks some questions on this subject which should be of interest to us all.

The Press points out, for instance:

> Three different sets of justifications have been put forward for Sentinel. First it was the "Chinese threat" only which was to be met. Then the Pentagon's public relations idea was to defend populous cities. After these two arguments were shot full of holes by critics, the Nixon administration came up with the new excuse that Sentinel is needed to protect the missile sites away from the cities. The whole history of ABM advocacy is marked by such deviousness.

Mr. President, in the past few weeks, in widely scattered parts of our Nation, in the shadow of incredible affluence that many take for granted, I have seen hunger and despair and degrading poverty the like of which I would not believe could have existed, had I not seen it with my own eyes.

And the ABM, as the Press points out:

> Will drain off more billions of the nation's resources into military hardware at a time when vast sums are needed to solve festering domestic problems.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S DECISION ON ABM SYSTEM IS DISAPPOINTING

In a highly disappointing action, President Nixon has plunged ahead on the Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

This will not safeguard America against devastating nuclear attacks. It will not help cool down the nuclear arms race.

It will drain off more billions of the nation's resources into military hardware at a time when vast sums are needed to solve festering domestic problems. It may bring on another tragic round of escalation of nuclear armaments by the United States and Russia. It may in that way increase the danger of eventual catastrophe through war between the two great powers.

"The safety of our country," said the President, "requires that we should proceed now with the development and construction of the new system . . ." Yet in the same statement he makes this admission: "The heaviest defense system we considered, one designed to protect our major cities, still could not prevent a catastrophic level of U.S. fatalities from a deliberate all-out Soviet attack."

He added that such a heavy system "might look to an opponent like the prelude to an offensive strategy threatening the Soviet deterrent." Arguing that the lighter Sentinel system will not have similar effects is unconvincing.

The basic factor involved is a switch from reliance on the principle of deterrence, the "balance of terror" system prevailing for the past decade. At present the United States and the Soviet know that if the other launches a nuclear attack it will be followed by an equally devastating retaliation which would leave both countries in ruins.

The importance of this principle will not be changed by deployment of Sentinel, which the President admits cannot defend the people of the United States. History indicates that each defensive preparation is followed by increased offensive developments by an opponent to overcome the defense. If Russia builds an ABM designed to protect Moscow, the United States certainly will plan missile capabilities to overcome it. And vice versa. The Maginot Line concept of defense is even less applicable to nuclear warfare than to older conditions.

As for the unlikely danger of a threat from China, the principle of deterrence still holds. China knows an attack on America would bring its own obliteration. That remains the best guarantee.

Three different sets of justifications have been put forward for Sentinel. First it was the "Chinese threat" only which was to be met. Then the Pentagon's public relations idea was to defend populous cities. After these two arguments were shot full of holes by critics, the Nixon Administration came up with the new excuse that Sentinel is needed to protect missile sites away from the cities. The whole history of ABM advocacy is marked by such deviousness.

The conflict over ABM policy now will continue in Congress. Because of President Johnson's original embarkation on this route, the Executive Department has both authority and funds to make the beginning which President Nixon has ordered. A fight against further new appropriations, however, can be carried on in the House and Senate. Public sentiment will play an important part in what happens.

One possibility which Congress should consider is the establishment of a nongovernmental commission of qualified citizen advisers to make further studies and recommendations on nuclear strategies and policies.

Another aspect of the situation is future negotiations with the Soviet on nuclear armament controls. Just one day before Nixon's Sentinel decision, the Senate ratified the nuclear nonproliferation treaty by a vote of 83 to 15. The spirit of this agreement calls for restraint by the two world powers in their own armaments programs. The theory has been advanced that the Nixon Administration might use Sentinel as a bargaining ploy—if the Soviet cuts back its nuclear plans, the United States might do the same. This is a doubtful and tenuous approach, but there is a bare possibility it might bring results. We hope so.

STANDARDS OF DECENCY ON TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on March 16, 1969, Mr. Thad M. Sandstrom, general manager of WIBW–TV, Topeka, Kans., commented upon the character

XUM

and nature of a particular TV show. The program itself does not need further attention, but Mr. Sandstrom's comments concerning the common practice of off-color and double-meaning jokes does deserve attention. He appropriately finds them below the standards of decency, morality, and good taste. Mr. President, I think this is a worthy statement and an excellent comment upon one of the very serious problems concerning the power and influence of television, and I direct the attention of my colleagues to this most excellent TV editorial and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARDS OF DECENCY

Last Sunday night, CBS and WIBW carried a re-run of an earlier "Smothers Brothers" broadcast. The program was scheduled to feature comedian Jackie Mason and folk singer Joan Baez, who has been widely publicized for her stand against the Vietnam war. In the unedited broadcast, Miss Baez chose an entertainment platform to plead the cause of her husband who will soon be going to prison as a draft dodger. Mason cracked some jokes that needed to go to the laundry. Smothers and his producers finished the show too late in the week for final review and editing.

CBS and its stations have insisted that every "Smothers Brothers" show be previewed in advance to try to make certain it conforms to the broadcast industry Television Code of Good Practices, and to attempt to eliminate off-color and double-meaning jokes. The broadcast wasn't ready in time for the regular preview on Friday . . . so CBS cancelled the nationwide telecast and substituted a re-run.

Now, Tommy Smothers is on his soapbox crying censorship and threatening to move his show to another network. "The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour" is supposed to be entertainment—not news. Smothers apparently objects to conforming to basic standards of decency, morality and good taste. CBS is accused of "stiffling creativity." What they mean is . . . CBS is insisting on cutting out the filth.

This week, a Senate committee has been questioning the network presidents because the networks supposedly are not doing enough to control sex and violence on TV. At the same time, CBS is in a first-class fight with the producers of a program with vast influence over millions of young viewers. The issue between CBS, its stations and the Smothers Brothers is simple. The networks and the stations are responsible for what goes on the air. They have an obligation to do everything they can to maintain high standards. Television has been deluged in recent months with "new" comedy shows like "The Smothers Brothers," "Rowan and Martin," "Jonathan Winters" and others. One program "Turn On," was in such poor taste that ABC cancelled it after one telecast. These shows thrive on music which attracts the young and on jokes which tear at the moral fibre of America. They appeal to millions of viewers . . . mostly younger ones. One of the reasons more Americans are not upset by shows like "The Smothers Brothers" and "Rowan and Martin" is that the blue jokes are often over their heads. But most kids understand them.

Television has an obligation to keep pace with the changing mores in America. But we question whether producers of shows like the "Smothers Brothers" should have a free hand, and be allowed to broadcast whatever the minds of Hollywood can think up. Should TV be giving the decline in morals in America a push forward? We think not.

"The Smothers Brothers Show" scheduled for last Sunday will be on March 30 . . . AFTER it has been properly edited. Even then, many will be offended. Yet this week, we've had plenty of mail and phone calls at WIBW protesting the decision by CBS to postpone last Sunday's show nationwide. A minister of a United Methodist Church in Manhattan is among those who questioned what he termed "censorship" of the Smothers Brothers. Yet a few weeks ago, the Smothers Brothers raised a furor in the TV columns because the Program Practices Department of CBS insisted on deleting a line which took the name of Christ in vain.

Television goes into millions of homes. It has great influence. And TELEVISION broadcasters must exercise more caution in making certain programs do not offend. Television should not, in our opinion, aid in breaking down the morals of America.

For a long time, WIBW has been telling CBS we've had enough of the "Smothers Brothers." We applaud CBS for their courage. If Tommy Smothers and his brother don't want to live by the rules of an industry which is making them fantastically wealthy, let them go off the air and back to the night clubs.

TAX-DODGE FARMING

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am sure that we are all aware that one of the finest newspapers in the country is the Wall Street Journal. But sometimes I think it well to reflect on just what it is that makes a newspaper great.

Just last week Mr. Ronald A. Buel, staff reporter of the Journal wrote perhaps the most comprehensive story that has been written to date on the subject of tax-dodge farming. I put that article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 20, the day after it appeared in print. Mr. Buel independently probed into this whole area and gave many new and informative examples of people who are more interested in farming the Internal Revenue Code than they are the land. On January 22, I introduced S. 500, a bill designed to remove inequities between legitimate farm operators and the tax-dodge farmers who are in the business of farming mainly because of the tax advantages, which Mr. Buel so ably pointed out, that serve to put their nonfarm income in a lower tax bracket.

The day after Mr. Buel's story appeared the Journal published an editorial that reflected exactly the opposite view from that just taken by one of its own reporters. This is why I regard the Wall Street Journal as a great newspaper. Its reporters are obviously not bound by the policy of its editorial page. In all fairness, I think that the editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 20 should also be available to other Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMING FOR FUN AND PROFIT

Some farm organizations and several Congressmen would like to crack down on citizens who alleged farm for fun, not profit. We find it a little difficult to share their concern.

Advocates of a crackdown contend that hundreds of wealthy Americans are buying farms and deliberately losing money. Since their farm losses can be deducted from their nonfarm income, the result is that they pay a lower Federal income tax.

In an effort to close this "loophole," legislation has been proposed to set a $15,000-a-year ceiling on farm losses that can be deducted from other income. The Treasury Department estimates that such a ceiling would affect fewer than 14,000 farm operators but would bring the Government about $145 million in additional taxes.

One objection to new legislation is that existing law already bars any deduction whatsoever for losses incurred on a farm actually run as a hobby. It isn't too difficult to tell whether a farm is run primarily for pleasure or profit; if the operator hires competent help and regularly tries to market his produce, the farm is plainly something more than a hobby.

Probing deeper into a farmer's motives is, to put it mildly, extremely tricky. The critical Congressmen surely aren't suggesting that all farmers, to qualify for normal tax treatment, have to hate their work.

Either full-time or part-time farms, moreover, can wind up losing money. Yet a loss is a loss, and an additional tax penalty for poor management or bad luck with the weather seems somewhat unfair.

Finally, the proposed $15,000 ceiling on losses is clearly arbitrary and only too likely to produce perverse results. If the legislators insist on separating those who farm for fun from those who till the land for profit, the present law seems superior.

All in all, it sounds like an effort by farm interests to keep city dudes off the land. Even if the effort is understandable, it isn't a proper project for Congress.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I would like to take just a few moments to comment on the editorial. First there is the comment that "some farm organizations and several Congressmen would like to crack down" on the tax-dodge farmer. I think it should be pointed out again that the principle of this legislation has the full support of all those who are sincerely interested in the working farmers of our Nation. For example, the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers Organization, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, the Farmland Industries Cooperative, the Mid-Continent Farmers Association—formerly known as the Missouri Farmers Association—the AFL–CIO, the Industrial Union Department—AFL–CIO—the United Steelworkers, the South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Inc., the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, and the Farmers Grain Dealers Association, have all called for action to be taken now. In the Congress, a bipartisan group of members from at least 30 different State congressional delegations have specifically endorsed this legislation.

The editorial also comments:

> One objection to new legislation is that existing law already bars any deduction whatsoever for losses incurred on a farm actually run as a hobby.

In answer to that here is the pertinent quote from the Treasury Department's 2-year study published on Feb-

XUM

ruary 5 as a joint print by the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees:

> The existing "hobby loss" provision of the Internal Revenue Code is ineffectual in dealing with this problem. While that provision disallows deductions for continuing heavy losses in a trade or business over a period of at least 5 consecutive years, the fact of a loss and its extent are measured by comparing the expenses of the business with the total income from the business including the full amount of capital gain income although only one-half of that income is subject to tax. Thus, to escape the hobby loss provision, it is merely necessary that the taxpayer realize capital gain farm income at least once every 5 years. If the capital gain income just equals the farm expenses for a year, the hobby loss provision is inapplicable for 5 years even though taxpayer will show a tax loss for that year equal to one-half of his farm expenses.

Next comes the criticism that "an additional tax penalty for poor management or bad luck with the weather seems somewhat unfair." Such a penalty would be unfair and this legislation was drafted with that danger in mind. That is why the bill in no event prevents the deduction of farm losses to the extent they relate to taxes, interest, the abandonment or theft of farm property, or losses of farm property arising from fire, storm, or other casualty, losses and expenses directly attributable to drought, and recognized losses from sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions of farm property.

An exception is made for these deductions since they are in general deductions which would be allowed to anyone holding property without regard to whether it was being used in farming or because they represent deductions which are clearly beyond the control of the farmer; such as, losses from casualty and drought. Under the bill, if the total of these deductions is higher than $15,000 then the higher figure may be used without any reduction because of nonfarm income above $15,000. In other words, the $15,000 limitation is directed solely at the type of deductions that are artificially created through the abuse of the special accounting rules designed for farmers.

It is not the purpose of this legislation to prevent outside capital from entering into farming. The problem is that high-bracket taxpayers, individuals as well as corporations, whose primary economic activity is other than farming, have entered into farming because by doing so they can then come under exceptions intended only for farmers. The tax-dodge farmer than elects the special farm accounting rules that enable him to deduct farm losses that are not true economic losses from his other high-bracket income. The result is large tax savings. As a matter of fact the savings can be so large that this form of investment is dangled in front of prospective clients of such management firms as Oppenheimer Industries, as an enticement to jump on the bandwagon.

Finally there is the criticism in the editorial that "the proposed $15,000 ceiling on losses is clearly arbitrary and only too likely to produce perverse results." The $15,000 ceiling is based on an analysis of available statistics of income which revealed an interesting phenomenon, that the average size of farm losses rise as nonfarm income increases. Does this mean that a given taxpayer's farming efficiency drops off as a sheer coincidence of his increased ability to earn other income?

Here is what Treasury's 2-year study had to say about the $15,000 limitation:

> If a taxpayer has more than $15,000 of nonfarm income, his primary source of livelihood is not likely to be his farming efforts, and thus, he is not the type of farmer for whom the special accounting rules were devised.

In discussing the effect of the present situation on the farm economy Treasury points out:

> When a taxpayer purchases and operates a farm for its tax benefits, the transaction leads to a distortion of the farm economy.

Yet the editorial alleges that any attempt to remedy the current situation "is not a proper subject for Congress."

This makes me wonder aloud: Where is your farm, Mr. Editor?

HERB KLEIN MAKES GOOD ON PLEDGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 21, the Wall Street Journal published an article acquainting readers with the functions and success of Herbert G. Klein as communications director of the executive branch. The headline stated that, "Herb Klein Makes Good on Pledge, Opens Doors for Capital Newsmen," and in the body of the article a reporter was quoted as saying that—

> Everybody knows you can appeal to Herb Klein on freedom of information.

At a time when public trust in Government is sorely needed, and when public dialog needs be reopened in all branches and at all levels of government, the fact that Herb Klein is succeeding in his mission of "getting more information out," is indeed heartening.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the article from the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nixon's Mouthpiece: Herb Klein Makes Good on Pledge, Opens Doors for Capital Newsmen but He Sometimes Verges on Management of News—What Is Left for Ziegler? No More Pleas for "Goodies"

(By John Pierson)

Washington.—Herb Klein has clout.

Not long ago, the Nixon Administration's Communications Director got a call from a reporter working on a story about "voluntarism"—President Nixon's program to enlist the help of private groups in solving social problems. The reporter hadn't been able to get in to see the man who's heading the effort, Secretary George Romney of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Could Mr. Klein help him obtain an interview?

Mr. Klein said he would try. A couple of days later, the reporter got to see Mr. Romney.

The story, with variations, has been repeated dozens of times during the first two months of the Nixon Administration. Mr. Klein has been getting newsmen in to interview otherwise-unavailable Cabinet members. He has encouraged high officials to meet the press and to appear on TV, and claims more than 100 such encounters have taken place so far. He has needled agencies to release facts they have become accustomed to sitting on; at his prodding, the Office of Education made public a letter sent to a New Jersey school district requiring submission of a desegregation plan.

Naturally, it hasn't escaped the skeptics' notice that if Mr. Klein has clout enough to make a department head see a reporter or an agency release information, then he has clout enough to prevent press contacts and suppress facts, should he or the President ever choose to do so.

So far, however, the soft-spoken Mr. Klein seems to have been using his newly created $42,500-a-year position more to combat secrecy. While it's too soon to judge whether "truth will become the hallmark of the Nixon Administration," as he promised, he is making good on his more modest pledge "to get more information out."

Mr. Klein's ability to coax or squeeze more facts out of a reluctant bureaucracy stems in part from a long and close association with Mr. Nixon, dating back to 1946, which gives a Klein request some of the weight of a Presidential command. But this tie will count only so long as Mr. Nixon makes it clear that he, too, wants the "open Administration" Mr. Klein speaks of. According to Mr. Klein, the President is doing just that. "It's all because of the President's orders and not because of me," he says modestly.

Doubters maintain, however, that Mr. Nixon is encouraging candor not so much because he believes in it as because he wants to capitalize on public dissatisfaction with former President Johnson's secretive ways.

ROOM WITH A VIEW

An important asset in Mr. Klein's efforts is the able staff of 11 he quickly assembled. He directs it from a high-ceilinged, gold-carpeted room in the Executive Office Building just west of the White House. Over his shoulder and out the window is a picture-postcard view of the White House's north portico. A battered typewriter and a cluttered desk recall Mr. Klein's long career as a working newspaperman, culminating in the editorship of the San Diego Union. But a vase of daffodils and baby's breath bespeaks the presence of a prerequisite few reporters can boast—a secretary.

In fact, Mr. Klein has three secretaries in all. And off the reception room where they sit, strung out in five more offices, are four senior assistants, one junior assistant, one researcher and two other secretaries.

Each of the senior assistants stay in touch with several Government departments. Paul Costello, a former Boston newspaper reporter and public relations man, keeps an eye on the State, Defense, Post Office and Transportation Departments. Mrs. Virginia (Ginger) Savell, a long-time Republican aide from California, deals with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development as well as the Congressional leadership. Mrs. Margita White, a former aid to the GOP National Committee, handles the Treasury and Justice Departments and the Budget Bureau. Herbert Thompson, a former Associated Press reporter who was on the staff of Vice President Agnew when he was governor of Maryland, handles Mr. Agnew's press relations and stays in touch with the Commerce, Interior, Agricultural and Labor Departments.

A FULL DRESS BRIEFING

Every day, an information man in each department tells the appropriate Klein assistant about the news releases he expects to issue that day and in the days ahead. Recently, Joseph Loftus, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor for communications,

XUM

told Mr. Thompson that Secretary George Shultz was about ready to announce plans for reorganizing manpower programs. Mr. Klein raised the subject at a White House staff meeting and it was agreed that the manpower move warranted a Presidential statement and a full-dress briefing by Mr. Shultz at the White House.

In President Johnson's time, the White House didn't keep such close track of coming news releases. But it did require advance notice of all good news, no matter how trivial, in case LBJ himself wanted to put it out first. Now the departments are supposed to handle their own releases, and a man at the Department of Housing and Urban Development comments with satisfaction that Mr. Klein's office "isn't pestering us for the goodies."

Mr. Klein keeps up with things by attending meetings of the Cabinet and Urban Affairs Council. He is also on hand when Mr. Nixon meets with Republican Congressional leaders. He's regularly in touch with all the top White House staffers and sees the President "two or three times a day and then maybe not for two or three days," supplementing these meetings with phone calls and memos.

While conceding that Presidential Press Secreary Ronald Ziegler may know more about Mr. Nixon's "personal" doings, Mr. Klein says, without boastfulness, that he knows "more about what's going on in the departments than anyone else in the Executive branch." With this knowledge, he's in position to help pull together the information that goes into the big briefing book Mr. Nixon uses to prepare himself for press conferences. And Mr. Klein is in a good spot to "coordinate," as he puts it, the Administration's information activities.

Thus, when the Post Office and the Pentagon were about to announce that troops were being dispatched to unload mail from strikebound ships, he discovered that neither department had checked with the Labor Department, which was trying to settle the longshoremen's walkout. If an agreement were imminent, Mr. Klein feared, the troop announcement might upset it. A check revealed that a settlement was several days off. So the Post Office and Defense Departments went ahead with their news release.

Among other things, Mr. Klein acts as a public relations consultant to the departments. For example, he has been directing the campaign to win public and Congressional acceptance of Mr. Nixon's plan to take the politics out of postmaster appointments. He advised Postmaster General Winton Blount on the timing and substance of his press conference announcing the plan, talked to important Congressmen he knows, mailed out copies of Mr. Nixon's statement and transcripts of Mr. Blount's press conference to some 400 editorial writers, helped draft a statement for the Postmaster General to read to key postal personnel throughout the country over a special phone hookup and booked Mr. Blount on two TV news shows. More recently Mr. Klein sent editors a packet of Administration statements on the decision to build a modified antiballistic missile system.

TIPS FOR TV PERFORMERS

Mr. Klein has encouraged all Cabinet members and several other high Administration officials to go on TV, which he feels is "the best way to reach mass audiences." Those with little TV experience, such as Treasury Secretary David Kennedy, have been booked first on local shows to help them "get the feel of it." Before a Cabinet man goes on the air, Mr. Klein and Mrs. Savell brief him about political and Administration-wide matters. The nervous are encouraged to relax and laugh a bit.

Mr. Klein has also attended press conferences and steered greener Cabinet men through trouble areas. He brought a halt to a session of Mr. Blount's when one reporter asked about a touchy subject: An investigation of contract awards. But at another Blount appearance, Mr. Klein did everyone a service when he handed the Postmaster General a note suggesting clarification of a muddled response about postmaster appointments.

While some of this activity may verge on "news management" designed to make this Administration look good, there are plenty of instances where Mr. Klein has helped to get information out.

He and Presidential Counselor Arthur F. Burns persuaded other White House officials to release summaries of Mr. Nixon's first 94 directives to the departments and agencies, unheard of in the previous Administration. And Mr. Klein pushed some reluctant Cabinet men into giving the press copies of the remarks they planned to make behind closed doors at the national governors' conference.

AN ERRONEOUS "LEAK"

His office is also in a position to give a reporter a good steer. When a prominent figure "leaked" to a newsman that he expected to be named Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mrs. White warned against using the tips. As it turned out, her information was better than the would-be appointee's; another man, Atlanta attorney Randolph W. Thrower, was appointed to the post this week.

Mr. Klien has also been acting as a sort of one-man complaint bureau for reporters—"an 'ombudsman,' if I could pronounce the word," he says. When an information officer at the Interior Department wasn't returning a reporter's calls, the reporter complained to Mr. Klein; now the official returns his calls. The Oil Import Administration refused to make public certain import-quota allocations until, at the request of a trade journal, Mr. Klein intervened.

"Everybody knows you can appeal to Herb Klein on freedom of information," says one newsman.

Part of Mr. Klein's leverage with the departments stems from the fact that the information chiefs at the Agriculture, Interior, Commerce and Health, Education and Welfare Departments have all worked for him or are friends of his. He helped recruit others. In additon to constant phone talks with the men in the departments, Mr. Klein meets with all of them every two weeks. At the first such session, he had Bruce Ladd, a former Congressman aide, speak on the Freedom of Information Act.

The relationship that still seems unclear is that of Mr. Klein and Mr. Ziegler, who holds the title of White House Press Secretary. Washington is wondering who really is the White House Press Secretary. The 29-year-old Mr. Ziegler, a former Los Angeles ad executive? Or the 50-year-old Mr. Klein, veteran journalist and confident of the President?

Mr. Ziegler has the title and an office in the White House, only a few steps from Mr. Nixon's, where he conducts twice-a-day briefings for the press. "I have the President and the White House," he says in a voice as crisp as his starched white shirt: "Herb makes information available throughout the Executive branch, which obviously relates to the White House."

But Mr. Klein has been performing some functions that traditionally belonged to the Press Secretary. He has been setting up some of the interviews and handling some of the press briefings given by Counselor Burns, urban affairs adviser Daniel P. Moynihan, economic adviser Paul McCracken and other White House staffers. He and his assistants have helped write many White House press releases. One visitor to Mr. Klein's office reports that their conversation was interrupted again and again by calls from Mr. Ziegler asking advice.

On the other hand, one newsman, noting that Mr. Klein inhabits an office outside the White House, contends that the Director of Communications is "only on the fringes of things." This reporter adds: "You're nobody in the press area unless you're the Press Secretary. Only he has the visibility, the ear of the President and the authority in Government."

This raises the question of whether Mr. Klein will, in the long run, be able to maintain his effectiveness—his clout—and thus keep the Nixon Administration as open as it seems to be now.

As time goes by, the departments' information staffs are sure to shape up, and Cabinet men may be calling less on Mr. Klein for help. Furthermore, his appointees in the departments are bound to develop their own relationships with their bosses and new departmental loyalties that could conflict with Mr. Klein's Administration-wide view.

The most crucial question, however, is not how long Mr. Klein can keep Government information flowing out freely but how long Mr. Nixon will. It may be easier to be candid with press and public now than during the rougher times that surely lie ahead.

"They're all great for telling it like it is, as long as it makes them look good," says one reporter. "But the first leak that hurts them . . . that's the end of the open Administration."

THE GOLDEN SPIKE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration is only 7 weeks away. On May 10, at Promontory, in the State of Utah, the Nation will commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the linking of the United States from sea to sea by transcontinental railroad.

I am hopeful that many Members of this body will be able to attend this important historical event. It offers us an opportunity not only to commemorate the leadership and vision which produced the railroad and the endurance of the men who laid the rails, but gives us a time and a place also to pay tribute to the modern railroad industry, and to the men and women who are a part of it.

The ceremonies at Promontory Point will be filled with drama and pageantry. The events of May 10, 1869, will be faithfully reenacted. Replicas of the Central Pacific's Jupiter and the Union Pacific's No. 119 will clank their snouts together, as they did 100 years ago, and the original golden spike will again be driven into a laurel railroad tie. At precisely 1:47 p.m., a telegraph key, hopefully the original one, will click out three dots, representing the hammer blows, and the message "done" will be sent over the wire as it was to President Grant and a waiting nation 100 years ago.

During the course of the ceremonies, the National Park Service will dedicate the visitor's center museum at the Golden Spike National Historical Site, and a number of other commemorative events will take place.

I think it appropriate to point out that the breadth and scope of the planning for the Golden Spike Centennial, and much of the success I am sure the day will have, is due to legislation introduced by the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) and enacted by Congress.

XUM

The bill which established the expanded Golden Spike Historical Site (S. 26) was introduced by Senator Moss in the first session of the 89th Congress, reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and became public law on July 12, 1965. This has made possible the development of the site by the National Park Service.

The joint resolution which established the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, Senate Joint Resolution 10, which has planned the celebration in cooperation with the Utah Centennial Commission, with the railroad industry and with other groups throughout the country, was introduced by Senator Moss in the first session of the 90th Congress, and became public law on August 7, 1967. He has served as the Commission's vice chairman.

And finally, the bill which provided for the striking of the Golden Spike Centennial Medal (S. 1909), the sale of which is financing the celebration to a large extent, was introduced by Senator Moss in the 90th Congress and became public law in May of 1968. Therefore, much of the credit for what is happening should and must go to Senator Moss.

Mr. President, the driving of the golden spike 100 years ago was not only an event of national importance, but it was a turning point in our history. It marked the end of one era and the beginning of another one. It should be roundly and brilliantly celebrated in this, its centennial year, and I am confident it will be.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have spoken out many times in favor of the concept of a limited antimissile defense. I am, of course, extremely pleased and encouraged by the President's decision to deploy the phased Safeguard system.

The editorial reaction of the Nation's press has, by and large, been favorable to the modified system. I myself am confident that a large majority of the American people favor the President's decision. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal appearing on March 23, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS RIGHT ON ABM?

Now that the debate over the antiballistic missile proposal has been aired before both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Congress must decide what is the best course for the nation.

What Congress must decide really is who is right.

What if Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is wrong in his assessment of the potential of the threat posed by the Soviet Union's missile capability or the possibility of Communist China acquiring some potential in this field and using it irresponsibly? Then United States taxpayers are being asked to spend a tremendous amount of money without real security or perhaps wastefully.

The concern that he might be wrong was heightened by the hypothesis posed by Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.). He wants to know why the ABM interceptors are necessary if to use them the United States must have a detection system that will inform the military that a nuclear missile is headed toward this country. He suggests that if an incoming missile can be detected, our own retaliatory attack can be fired before it is destroyed.

But what if Laird is right? Tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union have been reduced recently. But past experience teaches that there is no assurance that reasonableness is a constant thing in the Kremlin. There is still a strong belief that the militarists in Moscow are striving for a harder policy and that there might even be a return to a sort of Stalinism there. If such a regime should move into power and holds a substantial first-strike capability, would it be tempted to use it against the United States? Relations with Communist China are even more uncertain than those with the Soviet Union and the instability of the Peking government is even greater than that of the Kremlin.

And what of the other side of the Gore argument? What does it gain us if we fail to intercept an enemy missile and fire our retaliatory missiles before they are destroyed? Is mutual obliteration the objective? Or, worse still, what if the enemy missiles wipe out a large part of the United States and the retaliatory missiles fail to accomplish the same purpose on the enemy because it has an effective ABM system?

It would appear the wisest course is one of prudence.

The proposal at present is for a limited ABM system to protect certain of our nation's retaliatory missile sites from destruction.

If that is the honest intention of the administration, then it would seem reasonable as a sort of insurance policy for national defense. It would be no guarantee against severe damage by an irresponsible foreign power intent upon inflicting such damage. It would, however, serve as a deterrent to even an irresponsible government on the ground that it would increase the likelihood that the aggressor would also suffer severe damage.

Whether that sort of knowledge would be sufficient to eliminate the threat it is impossible for anyone to say at this time.

Under the circumstances, prudence would seem to dictate a policy of limited action which will be kept under constant review for adjustment upward or downward as later knowledge and events dictate. Such a limited defensive measure would have the added advantage, as Secretary Laird has already noted, of giving the United States some bargaining power when it begins discussions with the Soviet Union on disarment. Such disarmament remains the true ultimate objective of this nation.

WASTE IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite attention to an article written by the able Knight newspaper correspondent, Saul Friedman, regarding waste in defense spending.

We are all well aware that military spending does not receive the same scrutiny that is lavished on domestic spending.

There seems to be, in fact, an entirely different set of rules regarding defense spending as opposed to HEW or HUD, for example—with the latter two budgets provoking serious cost questions.

Is it illogical that we should study more closely waste in a department which annually spends 41 percent of our national budget?

Mr. Friedman's article paints a vivid picture.

He points out, for example, that $9 billion was spent on 66 projects before they were scrapped as unnecessary.

What kind of scrutiny went into congressional consideration of these proposals?

He cites the millions poured into development of two atomic airplanes—one Air Force and one Navy—which were abandoned last year.

How carefully did we look at these proposals?

And more millions spent on missile systems, likewise down the drain as obsolete.

Far less costly mismanagement practices by any other agency would immediately bring a cry of outrage from this body.

Why then are we silent over Pentagon waste of over $10 billion.

It seems to me that it is high time we stop okaying these kinds of gigantic military expenditures without first giving Pentagon proposals more than a passing glance.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Friedman's article, published in the Miami, Fla., Herald, be printed in the RECORD.

I have no doubt, given the subject matter, that great effort was involved on Mr. Friedman's part. The country is fortunate to have his report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENT ON MILITARY "WHITE ELEPHANTS"—HOW PENTAGON WASTED OVER $10 BILLION

(By Saul Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—Like a herd of white elephants, military projects which cost more than $10.5 billion during the last 15 years are now acknowledged by the Pentagon to be worthless.

And there is considerable doubt among some arms experts about the necessity of other weapons systems now in use, which cost billions more.

Pentagon supporters have always argued that waste and built-in obsolescence are inevitable in the arms field. It's the price the nation must pay to remain secure against threat.

But for the first time since the Pentagon became almost untouchable, this assertion is being widely challenged. It has become central to the debate over the anti-ballistic missile (ABM).

Sen. William Proxmire (D., Wis.) said in a Senate speech, recently: "The President and the Congress and, indeed, the country have lost control over military spending . . . we are paying far too much for the military hardware we buy . . . We often do not get the weapons and products we pay the excessive prices for . . . Weapons systems routinely do not meet the contract standards and specifications . . .

"After World War II . . . nothing was too good for the military. We have followed a policy of 'gold plating' . . . The military has had a blank check . . . The result is a system not unlike the medieval knight who was so encased in armor that he was unable to move . . . the day of the blank check for military spending must end."

SYMINGTON HITS WASTE

The Pentagon could have expected criticism from Proxmire. He is one of its old antagonists.

But a few days earlier, one of the defense department's best supporters, Sen. Stuart Symington (D., Mo.), a former Air Force

XUM

secretary, told the Senate: "Many billions of dollars have been expended on major missile systems that were never even placed into production; that is, were abandoned as obsolete or unworkable before the development work on them had been completed."

What's more, Symington said, "Over $15 billion of taxpayers' money has been invested in missile systems once produced and deployed but now abandoned, in many cases because in due course it was found they did not work."

Last Nov. 1, Sen. Richard B. Russell (D., Ga.), the most powerful friend the military has in Congress, made a rather significant admission during a speech on the ABM.

"One of the most serious mistakes I ever made (as a member of the defense appropriations subcommittee) was in allotting vast sums to the Navy for missile frigates before we knew we had a missile that would work on them," Russell said.

None of three missiles the Navy tried—the Tartar, the Talos and the Terrier—worked well.

"I made a mistake," Russell added. "It was an honest mistake . . . it probably cost the taxpayers $1 billion."

FEW PROTESTS

If someone in the Senate found a $100,000 mistake in the poverty program, it would probably have raised a cry for someone's head.

But there wasn't a peep of protest about the billion dollar mistake because in this age of rapidly advancing technology and hot competition for military contracts, such mistakes have become common at the Pentagon.

Indeed, despite assurances from the Pentagon, and three costly attempts to fix them, Talos, Terrier and Tartar still do not measure up to specifications, a source said.

There are two breeds of white elephants which have come thundering out of the Pentagon since its military budgets became huge during the Korean War.

The first are those projects, which after being highly touted by the military, its friends in Congress and industry, were cancelled at some stage in their development because they were unnecessary or did not work as they should.

The second are those weapons systems which go on and on, continuing to cost millions, although they have outlived their usefulness.

After several requests, the Pentagon has made available a list of "major projects terminated during the past 15 years." The list is not generally circulated and is typed on plain white paper without the usual Pentagon letterhead.

SEVEN NOW WORTHLESS

According to the list, more than $9 billion was spent on 66 projects before they were abandoned as unnecessary, unworkable, or useless. Among them were 19 different aircraft projects and 28 different missile systems.

In 1965, then secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara made a similar list available to a closed hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It included 59 projects which had cost about $6.8 billion. This means that, by Pentagon figures, seven projects costing more than $2 billion have been deemed worthless in the past three years or so.

The Pentagon figures, however, are not complete. The cost of several projects was apparently underestimated. For example, the amount spent on Dyna-Soar (an airplane reentry vehicle) was given as $405 million. McNamara has testified Dyna-Soar cost more than $800 million before it was dropped.

Nor does the list include about $500 million spent by the Atomic Energy Commission for nuclear materials on the ill-fated atomic airplane, or more than $600 million for the Navy version of the TFX—the F–111B, which was abandoned last year.

Therefore, not including considerable, but secret AEC costs for nuclear warheads on missile projects which were cancelled, a conservative estimate of the programs abandoned during the last 15 years is $10,533,700,000.

EXOTIC NAMES, EXOTIC PRICES

The missile systems were named after gods, birds, a mythical animal out of Alice in Wonderland, and a Greek philosopher who prized love and beauty. The prices for these mistakes were equally exotic.

Among the ten Air Force missile projects cancelled were: Navaho, which cost $670 million; Snark, $677.4 million; Rascal, $448 million; the land based Talos, $118 million; and the mobile Minuteman, $108.4 million. None cost less than $65 million.

The dozen cancelled Navy missiles, which ranged in cost from $12.5 million to $225 million, included: Sparrow I and Sparrow II, Regulus II, Petrel, Corvus, Eagle, Meteor, Rigel, Dove, Triton, Oriole, and Typhon.

The Army, which for years has been battling the Air Force and Navy for missiles it can call its own, had six of its project cancelled after nearly $400 million was spent. The missiles were called Hermes, Dart, Loki, Terrier, Mauler, and Plato.

The Pentagon list also included tanks, trucks, an atomic mortar, and several electronics systems. It did not include cancellations and mistakes on small arms, ammunition, and bases.

Conversations with arms experts and sources on armed services committee staffs disclose other projects which have been quietly cancelled or allowed to become dormant.

BOMBER BLOOPER COST $3 BILLION

The Air Force, for example, spent about $300 million on a communications satellite called ADVENT before the project was given to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and a public corporation.

Scores of millions were also spent on atomic artillery, from bazookas and recoilless rifles to cannons. Originally deployed in Europe, sources say, they are now considered too vulnerable and have been pulled away from lines of defense.

The most expensive white elephant on the Pentagon list was the B–70 bomber, cancelled in 1967 over objections in Congress and among the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Defense Department says $1.5 billion was spent on the project, but a member of the House Armed Services Committee says $3 billion would be more accurate.

For that price two prototype bombers were built. One crashed while posing for publicity pictures aimed at keeping the project going. The other one has been taken to an air museum in Ohio, where it will become an artifact more expensive than the Great Pyramid.

The other breed of white elephants—weapons systems which persist beyond their need—is more difficult to find. They are covered by a background overgrowth of technology, Pentagon claims, industry propaganda, cold war fears, and secrecy.

A major example is the nation's anti-aircraft defense system, which over the years has cost upwards of $30 billion. And each year costs more than $2 billion to operate and maintain. Congressional Quarterly and a former Pentagon official have suggested this annual expense could be dispensed with.

ICBM REPLACED BOMBER DEFENSE

The bomber defense system consists of a complex radar detection system called Semiautomatic Ground Environment (SAGE), and two types of missiles—Bomarc, and Nike-Hercules. SAGE has already cost $18 billion, and each year about $1 billion more is spent paying for improving and extending it. The missiles have cost at least $12 billion, not counting the price of the war heads (about $500,000 each). Each year more than $850 million is spent to maintain and improve the missiles.

The nation began deploying its bomber defense system shortly after the Second World War to counter a Soviet bomber threat. But beginning in 1957, when the Soviets launched their first Sputnik, American intelligence and arms experts informed Congress and the Pentagon that the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) was the threat for the future.

The U.S. began building ICBMs, but because the Soviets still had a big bomber fleet, deployment of anti-aircraft missiles continued. American intelligence has apparently proved correct, and as the Soviet ICBM force has grown, the bomber threat has declined.

By 1961, a former staff member of the House Armed Services Committee said, it had become evident that a Soviet attack would probably come with missiles, not bombers. Like McNamara and his "which kids," the Russians had learned that bombers were too slow, too vulnerable, and unnecessary for the destruction of an enemy.

Nevertheless, beginning that year the Army armed its anti-aircraft missiles with expensive nuclear warheads. Since then, aside from the closing of 25 Nike-Hercules sites last year, the anti-aircraft system has continued to grow to almost the same degree that the bomber threat has declined. Several experts, including former White House science advisor Jerome Wiesner, question whether it would have worked.

PRESTIGE RIVALRY AMONG SERVICES

Once a weapons system is entrenched, said Rep. Lucian Nedzi, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, it can be dislodged only by the President or his secretary of defense, and then usually only in exchange for newer, more exotic systems. Congress, overwhelmed by political pressure and Pentagon jargons, is helpless, he said.

Inter-service rivalry for prestige, congressmen and senators with installations and defense manufacturers in their districts, local chambers of commerce, and a new breed of traveling drummers called "strategic systems salesmen" (they are called the "SSS" by the Pentagon wags) all combine to put pressure on the Pentagon and Congress to keep old weapons systems and buy new ones.

There is, of course, one other pressure—the fear of the Soviet Union and international communism. This enables Pentagon supporters to argue, as does Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.), of the House Armed Services Committee: "I think the American people will always be willing to pay the price for having too much defense, rather than risk the inestimable cost of having too little."

With these pressures built into the weapons buying system, industry's salesmen and lobbyists (often former officers), and their scientists bring their ideas to the Pentagon, Dr. Foster once testified backed by rationales supplied for a price by consultants.

"We see threats on the horizon, possible threats, usually not something the enemy has done, but something we have thought ourselves he might do," Foster said, explaining how weapons are conceived.

Roback and other experts on military procurement acknowledge that many weapons become obsolete soon after, or even before, they are deployed.

BUILD BECAUSE OF THE THREAT

But Roback maintains this is inherent in the burgeoning technology of arms.

"Everything you build is going to be obsolete sooner or later, but you build it because of a threat or a possible threat," Roback said.

Against this argument, critical observers of the Pentagon like physicist Ralph Lapp, a worker on the first atom bomb project and former assistant director of the Argonne National Laboratory, said it is not necessary to overreact to every Soviet threat, real or imagined, or every technological gimmick.

"Quick, major breakthroughs which would give one side or the other a major advantage are no longer possible," Lapp said. "Therefore we should continue research and development, and spend even more on it. But we don't need to take the candy store approach to buying and deploying weapons—'Gimme some of these and some of those.'"

Unless the new offensive being mounted against the Pentagon forces a change in defense procurement policies, the Brookings Institution forecasts a new round of multibillion dollar weapons systems.

The Minuteman ICBMs are to be modernized and replaced by newer versions at an estimated cost of $4.6 billion; Polaris submarines are to be converted to carry Poseidon missiles at a cost of $2.5 billion; four nuclear powered aircraft carriers are to be built for at least $2.16 billion; and further in the future Pentagon planners see new manned bombers able to hurl missiles at an enemy, a manned orbiting laboratory, and more multi-warhead missiles.

Not even their strongest proponents can say with certainty that some or all of them won't be the white elephants of the future.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian independence—an anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian descent. They are a loyal group who have been doing everything they can to protest Soviet oppression, and to regain freedom in Byelorussia.

On March 25, 1918, the freedom-loving Byelorussian people proclaimed their sovereignty and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic with its capital in the historic city of Minsk. However, this freedom was enjoyed for a short time only, for despite all of the sacrifices made by its people the young Byelorussian state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of Soviet Communist forces which overran the country early in 1921.

Since that brutal takeover many millions of Byelorussians have been forced to live under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. But the flame of freedom continues to burn brightly in the hearts of these captive people, in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, imprisonment, and other repressive measures, and because their hope for independence is still strong, it is extremely important that the United States keep alive this hope of freedom. My respect for the self-determination of the Byelorussian people is well known, and I take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of efforts on their behalf and on behalf of the freedom of all the peoples of the captive nations.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: WE MUST RESTORE MOMENTUM AND CREDIBILITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, if we are stop the terrible drift toward separate white and black societies, chronicled in the Kerner Commission report, we have no more effective instrument than our public schools. If we can start there to teach youngsters of different races to live and work together, then we have a chance of avoiding a national catastrophe. The schools are crucial to any solution of our domestic crisis. Those of us who make the laws must make it absolutely clear that the elimination of dual school systems in both the North and South is essential to any effort to bring us together into one harmonious society.

That is the intention of Congress, and the courts have upheld that intention. It is tragic that the administration has not yet told us, unequivocally, that it, too, wants to end racially segregated schools. As of this moment many of the statements coming from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been ambiguous, to say the least. We now face new threats to the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly title VI, in which we authorized the Department to cut off Federal funds to any school district that refuses to desegregate.

Scarcely a day passes that we do not get fresh evidence of this vacillation. Others have already inserted much of the earlier evidence in the RECORD. The Washington Post for March 23, in the latest story of this kind, reports that there is presently a memorandum before HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch from his future General Counsel suggesting that the school desegregation guidelines should not be rewritten—they should, instead, be "quietly bent."

I hope Secretary Finch will announce publicly that he has no intention of taking this advice. He has already stated in a reply he made to the late Ralph McGill that he will "not turn back the clock" on desegregation. Last week he gave similar assurances to leaders of the leadership conference on civil rights, the coalition of national civil rights, labor, religious, and civic groups who have coordinated so many national campaigns in support of major civil rights and social welfare legislation.

He told the officials of this group that he intends to enforce the law and that the guidelines will not be rewritten. He told them, too, that the fall of 1969 is still the target deadline for the submittal of school desegregation plans. But that is not enough. He must tell all of us. He and the President must tell the Nation that they are committed to an unbending enforcement of the law as enacted by Congress and upheld by the Supreme Court. Silence allows doubt to grow among those of us who want to see this country fulfill its promise of full equality in an integrated society. Silence allows hope to grow in the hearts of those who cling to the injustices of the past.

I wish Secretary Finch would heed the advice of a former HEW official who had much to do with developing the desegregation guidelines and trying to get them observed—Peter Libassi, who formerly directed HEW's Office of Civil Rights and is now a vice president of the Urban Coalition. In a speech he gave to the 21st annual conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House on Friday, March 21, he made these observations:

The system of enforcement must be fair and built solidly on the law. The rights of school officials must be protected. Once HEW policy is based on what the law is, there must be no retreat. That policy is quite simple: "If a school district violates the Constitution it should not get Federal funds."

Once you build an internal system of enforcement that works, "leave it alone." Let it operate. Once the staff is trained and the quasi-judicial system of examiners and review boards set up, let it do its work. Do not pull cases up for special consideration. If you do that, you break the momentum of enforcement and hurt your credibility. And the whole object of your enforcement effort is to increase the momentum of desegregation and to establish your credibility with the district officials.

You must mean what you say. You must not threaten or bully. You can speak softly, but you must explain the consequences of violation and you must follow through. He said:

> It is difficult to build up momentum and credibility but easy to destroy them.

While it is tragically true that more Negro children go to segregated schools than attended them at the time of the Supreme Court decision of 1954, that is a result of population growth. At present, half a million black children are in integrated schools. Twenty-five percent of the black children in the South have escaped the dual school system.

Mr. President, we see that momentum failing today and the credibility of HEW undermined through hesitation and lack of clarity. School districts that were ready to comply with the law are now drawing back. In South Carolina, for instance, 11 out of 33 districts that had submitted acceptable plans for desegregation have now notified HEW that they either want to withdraw those plans or implement them over a longer period of time than they originally agreed to.

Secretary Finch and those who now assume the obligation of enforcement must recognize the crisis they are helping to create. They must speak out now or we shall see an even greater loss of momentum—a loss of credibility that strikes despair into the hearts of parents who want to see an end to segregation. We will be one society and one people, or we shall fail as a society. Secretary Finch must acknowledge this in what he says and in what he does. I do not question his honesty nor the sincerity of his intentions. But I am sure he does not want to carry on his conscience the awful burden of entering history as the man who destroyed the effort to integrate our schools. He owes it to the Nation to say he will enforce the law and to ask our help in carrying out his task.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE—A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a series of outstanding articles and editorials published by the McClatchy newspapers of California. The series deals with our archaic electoral college system and is aptly entitled "The Counterfeit Ballot," because, in truth, the American people do not elect the President. Furthermore, it is possible under the electoral college system that a popular vote winner can, through the mysterious arithmetic of

XUM

the electoral vote, be transformed into an electoral loser. As Reporter Martin Smith so vividly pointed out, "The Counterfeit Ballot could result in the selection of a brand X candidate."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to also have printed at the appropriate place in my remarks a column on the dilemma of electoral reform by the distinguished Washington Post writer, Merlo Pusey. Mr. Pusey asks the pointed question: "Is the old wreck worth patching up?" I was pleased to see this outstanding constitutional scholar conclude that it would be "better to work a little harder a little longer for a new model that is sound in every particular before resigning ourselves to costly repairs to an obsolete mechanism that would never be satisfactory." In short, Mr. Pusey believes that we should elect our Presidents as we do all of our other public officials—by direct popular vote.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTERFEIT BALLOT

"NOTHING BUT THE BEST" IS NEEDED IN REFORMING ELECTORAL COLLEGE

US Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., chairman of the Senate constitutional amendments subcommittee, made one of the best remarks about proposals to junk the antiquated Electoral College and replace it with a method more responsive to the public wishes. At the opening of hearings on the subject in Washington, DC, he told his subcommittee:

"Nothing short of the best method will suffice. What is at stake here is the vitality of our political institutions and their responsiveness to the needs of the American people. I strongly believe that direct popular election is the best electoral system with no ifs, ands or buts."

The movement toward reform of the Eelectoral College system began many years ago. Attempts at improvement often were beaten before they were sponsored by an intransigent leadership in Congress which was leery about giving the general public a more say-so in the selection of the president and vice president.

The ground swell favoring change has bubbled up with more force than ever and, therefore, this session of Congress may finally produce results. Vox populi vox Dei (the voice of the people is the voice of God.)

The series of articles in The Bee entitled "The Counterfeit Ballot," written by Martin Smith, Bee state Capitol staff writer, demonstrates the voice of the public is demanding action. This may be the year it will be heard. It should be, for it is a work postponed for too many generations.

The series zeroed in on the situation which almost developed in the 1968 election, which was viewed with horror by millions of television watchers. During the counting of the ballot, the outcome was indecisive and there were all sorts of speculations about the possible consequences. There were fears there would be no majority vote winner and the selection of the president would go to the House of Representatives. It was suspected the House would become deadlocked and subjected to the blackmail tactics of the George Wallace-types.

"The United States," Smith reported, "had teetered briefly on the brink of disastrous governmental instability, then veered back safely for another four years."

This happens every four years because American voters do not elect their presidents. The voters only choose members of the Electoral College who, in turn, choose the presidents and vice presidents according to their will.

If, regardless of how many popular votes a candidate might have, neither he nor any other has an Electoral College majority, the choice of the president is left up to the House of Representatives—where the politicking would be intense.

In the House the individual members do not not cast direct ballots either—each state has one vote regardless of population.

This ridiculous situation has been tolerated too long.

It should be changed before the next general election.

President Richard M. Nixon, perhaps more than any other man, holds the key to reform. US Sen. James O. Eastland, D-Miss., chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, said if the President pushes electoral reform, reform will be forthcoming. In Nixon be it said: "Yours is the leadership."

PUBLIC WANTS POPULAR PRESIDENTIAL VOTE, NOT WINDOW DRESSING "REFORM"

The process of reform of such magnitude as the proposed abolishment of the Electoral College is time consuming and arduous. It requires persistent public pressure to make sure it does not become bogged down in the semantics of special interest pleadings.

That the public wants its representatives in Congress to act is clear. Almost every major survey of citizen sentiment shows the choice is for a popular election of the president and vice president without any in-betweens. The voters do not want their senators and representatives to dream up some fancy window-dressing replacement for the Electoral College in the false name of "reform." They want to have their votes cast directly for those they prefer to lead the country. They want each vote to count equally.

The recent series of articles in The Bee, entitled "The Counterfeit Ballot" and prepared by Martin Smith, Bee Capitol staff writer, pointed out national polls in 1948 and again in 1960 showed the public—by a healthy 2–1 margin—wanted the Electoral College eliminated.

And instead of dwindling, the percentage climbed dramatically higher by 1968. A Harris Survey last November showed an overwhelming 79 per cent of those polled favored direct election of presidents and vice presidents and only 11 per cent opposed elimination of the Electoral College.

So great is this expression of the public's will the Congress should be quick to respond. After all, the Congress acts for the people and if the people want the government to be brought closer to home, to the grass roots as it were, then the congressmen should be most anxious to fulfill the people's request.

Perhaps one of the reasons the Congress has not acted before this is the public apathy which developed between presidential elections. But this time the public is more aroused than ever before. The anxious hours of election night last November which were shared by millions of viewers of television made more people aware of the dangers inherent in the present system.

The politicians no longer can ignore the public on this issue.

In this dangerous age of instant conflict which can embroil the nation in situations of frightful consequences, the nation cannot afford a moment without positive leadership. The possibility of having an "acting president" or one who has been previously rejected by a majority of the popular vote is too perilous to be tolerated.

Before a national popular presidential election can be established, both houses of Congress would have to approve by a two-thirds vote a constitutional amendment which would then have to be ratified by three-fourths of the 50 states. This task is so great the machinery should be placed in motion as soon as possible.

The Congress should start the wheels moving and the public should make sure they keep on turning so the presidential election of 1972 will be in truth a reflection of the will of the public.

NIXON IS THE ONE TO LEAD VOTE REFORM

A new administration, even one elected by a narrow margin, has advantages not enjoyed by the old in its first months in office. It can ride the buoyant winds of change, progress and reform with equanimity, assured of the chance of success where failure ruled before. The direction of change depends upon the head of the new regime. He sets the course; he establishes the leadership; he determines the emphasis.

President Richard M. Nixon almost exclusively holds the key to the problem of meeting the public demand for its rightful desire to have a direct voice in electing presidents and vice presidents. He and his advisers must be aware of the people's wish for a direct popular national vote. Nixon should convert that wish into reality by urging that Congress also hear the public's outcry.

Millions of people go to the polls every four years thinking they are casting their votes for the candidates of their choice. But this "sacred franchise" is not so divine after all because the voters, in fact, do not choose the winners among the various party nominees. Their votes go to "electors" who meet later to pick the president and vice president. No law binds the electors of the Electoral College to vote for the persons who were picked by the majority of the voters. They can vote for any person they want based on their own personal wishes. Over the years, several have done this, thwarting the will of the public.

Several years ago the American Bar Association, through a special commission on Electoral College reform, declared while there may be no "perfect way" to elect a president, the direct, nationwide vote is the best of all possible alternatives. The bar commission termed the present system "archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect and dangerous."

There is no need to perpetuate this ludicrous situation.

The people have spoken—they want a national popular primary with a national popular runoff election. Many responsible organizations, including the bar association, the United States Chamber of Commerce and organized labor, want the Electoral College junked.

Countless measures have been introduced in Congress session after session seeking reform. The McClatchy newspapers for decades have advocated the simplest, most representative way to give every voter the fullest voice in his government is to give him the direct ballot. Anything short of the direct ballot is a fraud. The recent series of articles published by the McClatchy newspapers documented the shortcomings of the present method in "The Counterfeit Ballot."

All this leads to the present. Congress, knowing the people's wants, and the new administration, having the opportunity to enunciate, finally could institute elimination of the Electoral College and establishment of the direct popular vote.

There certainly is no need to wait any longer. There is no reason to provide a "substitute" for the Electoral College, or a modification which would act to continue this "iron curtain" which divides the people from the presidency.

ACTING PRESIDENT WAS CHANCE UNDER ARCHAIC VOTING SYSTEM

(By Martin Smith)

It all sounded so strange that election night. The voting trend was indecisive, and the choice of the president might be left to the House of Representatives under the archaic constitutional procedures established nearly two centuries ago.

A deadlock in the House appeared to be a real possibility. The television pundits were talking of the chance an acting president might be necessary to take over the reins of government if the House could not reach a decision by Jan. 20.

An acting president? It sounded as if they were talking about a Central American banana republic, not about the United States.

But they were.

VOTERS DECIDED

It did not turn out that way, of course. Hubert H. Humphrey ran more strongly than expected, but George Wallace ran weaker and Richard M. Nixon won a majority of the Electoral College votes.

Once more, in the view of those who for decades have been warning that the nation's presidential election system is in need of basic revisions, the United States had teetered briefly on the brink of disastrous governmental instability, then veered back safely for another four years.

It is a drama occurring in one form or another every four years because—and this needs repeating—American voters do not elect their presidents. The voters only choose members of the Electoral College, who, in turn, choose the presidents and vice presidents.

TROUBLE ARISES

It is a system which only worked, more or less, the way it was supposed to in the first two elections in which it was employed. The third time around, in 1796, the system began to cause trouble.

Individual electors are expected to vote for the candidate on whose slate they ran, but they do not have to do so. Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of North Carolina proved that again last month.

He was one of the 538 individuals—members of the Electoral College—who decided who should be the president of the United States for the term starting tomorrow. Bailey is a John Bircher, which is his privilege, and although he supposedly was elected by North Carolinians to vote for Richard M. Nixon for president, he instead cast his vote in the Electoral College for George Wallace. As events turned out, that was Bailey's privilege, too.

SECOND, THIRD CHOICE

The system, coupled with an undemocratic, boss-controlled method of selecting party candidates, makes possible the election of a president who actually may be the second—or third—choice of most American voters.

United States Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, called this year's election another "brush with catastrophe."

The potential horrors of the present system long have been known. Sometimes the horrors have come to pass.

Three times in the 19th century—in 1824, in 1876 and in 1888—a candidate has captured fewer popular votes than an opponent but still has gone on to become president.

CLOSE CALLS

So far this has not occurred in the present century, but there have been three close calls—in 1948, in 1960 and again last year.

If, regardless of how many popular votes a candidate might have, neither he nor any opponent has an Electoral College majority, the choice of a president is left up to the House of Representatives, where the politicking for support would be intense.

A deadlock in the House always would be a possibility. Congressmen, when called on to elect a president, do not vote as individuals. Instead, each state is accorded one vote—no matter what its population is.

ONE VERSUS THIRTY-EIGHT

Nevada's single congressman would decide how his state's one vote for president would be cast, while California's 38 congressmen would decide whom their state's one vote would support.

In the opinion of many political scientists and also many hardheaded practical politicians, the worst possibility is that a cloud would hang over the head of some future president who won the office under what were regarded as dubious circumstances.

Stanford University political science Prof. Ray Wolfinger has warned that, under these circumstances, considerable numbers of the population "might feel freer to disobey the law."

OMINOUS TALK

It is ominous talk. But it is based upon real dangers.

An acting president? A president regarded by most Americans as a usurper?

It could happen because of the Electoral College.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM FALTERED IN 3RD ELECTION

(By Martin Smith)

The founding fathers offered an attractive rationale for the Electoral College system of selecting presidents.

Although the system simply was the result of a political compromise, the framers of the Constitution argued it offered a positive good. The system, as they saw it, would permit the very best men in the nation to sit down every four years and calmly, without rancor and partisan considerations, decide who would make the best president.

This vision quickly proved to be a mirage.

The founding fathers themselves promoted the development of political partisanship. The presidential electors were regarded as faceless individuals. They were unnecessary and sometimes troublesome middlemen in the process by which presidents were selected.

UNEXPECTED VOTE

In 1796 one of the Pennsylvania electors voted for Thomas Jefferson for president when everyone thought he had been committed to vote for John Adams. An angry Federalist politician wrote:

"What, do I chuse Samuel Miles to determine for me whether John Adams or Thomas Jefferson shall be president? No! I chuse him to act, not to think."

Other individual electors occasionally have broken their faith by thinking.

The most recent was Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of Rocky Mount, N.C., who, although he was elected as part of Richard M. Nixon's slate of electors, chose instead to cast his vote for George Wallace for president

One elector broke loose from Harry S. Truman's Tennessee slate of electors in 1948. Adlai Stevenson lost one of his Alabama electors in 1956.

AMBITIOUS SCHEME

The most ambitious renegade was an Oklahoman who had been elected in 1960 to cast his Electoral College ballot for Nixon. Instead, the elector promoted an unsuccessful project to persuade other electors to desert Nixon and John F. Kennedy and support instead, a strong conservative for the presidency.

His scheme simply was a variation of attempts by Southern conservatives since World War II to force the election into the House of Representatives where Alabama's voice would count every bit as much as New York's.

Strom Thurmond ran for president in 1948 in the hope the election would go to the house where a major party candidate then might have to bow to dictates from Dixie on race questions.

Thurmond failed, as did George Wallace who ran last year with more or less the same idea.

But Wallace's movement remains as a threat to the two-party system which most political scientists think has been a mainstay of political stability in an increasingly troubled nation.

Soon after Wallace announced his presidential candidacy last year, a Democratic congressman called for modifications of the Electoral College system to provide for a run-off election if no one candidate received a majority of the electors.

But it was a Republican, U.S. Rep. Clark MacGregor of Minnesota who called for abolishing the Electoral College and replacing it with a popular vote.

"The Wallace candidacy is a cynical attempt to capitalize upon the vagaries of our presidential election system to get a stranglehold on national policy," warned MacGregor.

"The American people would not wish us to stand by idly while a minority presidential candidate attempts to blackjack either major party candidate into such an unholy alliance."

WALLACE ASSESSMENT

Robert H. Finch, the incoming secretary of health, education and welfare, who was until recently California's lieutenant governor, assessed the Wallace candidacy in 1972 and observed that the former Alabama governor has "a pretty good piece of political machinery going for himself."

Finch acknowledges the process by which the United States Constitution is amended is an exceedingly slow-moving one, but he sees the Wallace threat as providing "a greater catalyst for change now than ever before."

CAMPAIGNING NIXON MOVED CLOSER TO POPULAR VOTE IDEA

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. James O. Eastland, the conservative Mississippi Democrat who, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, will have a lot to say about any changes in the system of electing presidents, has predicted the system will be revised—if the new president wants revision.

"If the next president pushes electoral reform, we'll get it," said Eastland. "If he doesn't, I don't assume so."

The new president is Richard M. Nixon who indicated during the campaign he favors changes in the system. He said once he was not proposing abolition of the Electoral College, but he also said he thinks the man with the most popular votes should become president.

NO DETAILS OFFERED

Nixon has not offered any detailed recommendations for revising the system but in his most extensive statement on the issue, he said on Sept. 3 in Cleveland, Ohio:

"I am not suggesting we go so far as the direct election of the president. But I do believe that in a particular state the fact that one man may win the state by a few thousand votes and then get all the electoral votes of that state—I think that, in effect, disenfranchises a lot of other people who may have voted on the other side. I would rather have proportional representation in the Electoral College."

MOVES CLOSER

But later in the campaign, Nixon seemed to be moving closer to the idea of deciding the presidential election by popular vote.

On Oct. 15: "I think that if the man who wins the popular vote is denied the presidency, the man who gets the presidency would have very great difficulty in governing."

On Oct. 21: "Whoever wins the popular vote should be the next president of the United States."

On Oct. 30, while challenging Democratic rival Hubert Humphrey to accept the decision of the popular vote: "I say again, the candidate who gets the most votes should be the next president. I stand ready to accept the decision of the electorate."

FINCH PREDICTIONS

Former California Lt. Gov. Robert H. Finch, a close friend and adviser of Nixon's and chosen by the president to be secretary of health, education and welfare, predicted in a Sacramento interview that Nixon will offer specific proposals for changing the presidential election system.

Finch said he does not know yet what forms these proposals will take. Speaking just for himself, however, Finch said he likes the idea of retaining the Electoral College but having most of the electors chosen by individual congressional districts. This would result in the electoral votes of most states being split among leading candidates.

Finch said this proposal "has great appeal to me because it would tend to develop a viable two-party system in the South. There would be an enormous incentive to try to develop strong congressional candidates in those Southern states."

FOUR PLANS

The congressional district plan is only one of four basic proposals expected to go before Congress at the 1969 session for changing the method by which American presidents are selected.

The other three basic plans:

—Retaining the Electoral College but simply apportioning each state's electoral votes on a percentage basis to reflect the popular vote in the state. The present winner-take-all system would be eliminated.

—Retaining the Electoral College system and also its winner-take-all provision so that a state's entire slate of electors still would go to the winner of the popular vote, but eliminating the office of elector. An automatic state unit electoral vote system would be substituted for the individual electors.

—Simply abolishing the Electoral College and deciding the presidential elections by a nationwide popular vote.

This last proposal has been given new support as the result of a special study by an American Bar Association commission which strongly recommended that a popular vote decide presidential elections.

INDIANA SENATOR SEES ONLY ONE WAY: JUNK ELECTOR COLLEGE

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, has been calling for reforms in the Electoral College system since he first was elected to the Senate in 1962.

But for a long time he opposed any plan to eliminate the college entirely and substitute in its place a direct popular vote for president.

Bayh changed his mind in 1967.

He called for going all the way and eliminating the Electoral College entirely in favor of a popular vote.

NEW ENGINE NEEDED

"Mere procedural changes in the present system would be like shifting around the parts of a creaky and dangerous automobile engine, making it no less creaky and no less dangerous," he warned.

"What we may need is a new engine, because we are in a new age."

What caused Bayh to shift his view is a report issued by a special American Bar Association commission which after a detailed study concluded:

"The Electoral College method of electing a president of the United States is archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect and dangerous. . . .

"While there may be no perfect method of electing a president we believe that direct nationwide popular method is the best of all possible methods."

The commission, headed by Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation and dean emeritus of the Southern Methodist University Law School in Dallas, offered detailed recommendations on how presidential elections might be decided by popular vote.

It recommended that a party's presidential and vice presidential candidates continue to run as a team. The presidential candidate and his running mate who captured the most popular votes would win—provided they had at least 40 per cent of the popular vote.

If no ticket won 40 per cent of the popular vote, then a runoff election would be held between the two tickets with the highest number of votes.

DATE SETTING PROCEDURE

Congress would have the power to set the dates for regular and runoff elections, but individual state legislatures would have the power to provide for places and manner of the elections. Congress, however, would retain reserve powers to overrule the state legislatures.

Persons qualified under state law to vote for members of Congress would vote in presidential elections except that a state would be empowered to make even fewer restrictive requirements for presidential voters.

Congress also would be given a reserve power to provide for uniform age and residence requirements.

Among those on the 15-member commission were leading legal scholars and attorneys, including Paul Freund, a constitutional law professor at Harvard Law School; four former ABA presidents; two state governors, and Herman Phleger, a San Francisco attorney and former adviser to the U.S. State Department.

They returned an eight-count indictment against the Electoral College system, charging it:

—"Allows a person to become president with fewer popular votes than his major opponent.

—"Grants all of a state's electoral votes to the winner of the most popular votes in the state, thereby cancelling all minority votes cast in the state.

—"Makes it possible for presidential electors to vote against the national candidates of the party.

—"Awards all of a state's electoral votes to the popular winner in the state, regardless of the turnout in the state.

"Assigns to each state at least three electoral votes regardless of its size.

"Fails to take into account population changes in a state between censuses.

"Employs an unrepresentative system of voting for president in the House of Representatives.

"Allows for the possibility of a president and vice president from differing political parties."

THE 12TH AMENDMENT CITED

The 12th amendment to the Constitution in 1804 was intended to eliminate this last possibility but the amendment did not shut the door completely on such a turn of events.

For example, if the 1968 presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives Republican Richard M. Nixon might well have been the ultimate choice. But the choice of the vice president would have been left to the United States Senate. Many observers think it likely that the senators would have chosen one of their colleagues, U.S. Sen. Edmund Muskie, the Democratic vice presidential nominee, for vice president instead of Spiro T. Agnew, the Republican nominee.

The ABA report has been made at a possible turning point in history—when the defects in the present system for electing presidents are becoming increasingly apparent to the public.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE DRAWS GOVERNORS' DISSATISFACTION

(By Martin Smith)

The Electoral College has existed for more than 180 years, although Americans have been dissatisfied with it for much of that time.

Few persons think it will be easy to replace it with a direct popular vote in the selection of presidents and vice presidents. But public unhappiness with the antiquated Electoral College is greater than ever, and many political leaders agree now is the time to eliminate it.

In 1948 and again in 1960 national polls indicated the public, by a 2–1 margin, wanted the Electoral College eliminated. The percentage of those opposed to it has climbed dramatically. Last November a Harris Survey showed that an overwhelming 79 per cent of those polled favored direct election of presidents and vice presidents. Only 11 per cent opposed elimination of the Electoral College.

Dissatisfaction with the system is widespread and increasing, but there is dissent, too.

While some Southern white conservatives are reluctant to eliminate the Electoral College completely, preferring instead to tinker with and retain the present system, an important minority group also shows a cautious if different, attitude on the issue.

Clarence Mitchell, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has told a U.S. Senate subcommittee his organization flatly opposes any move to divide a state's electors according to popular vote percentages within that state. This is one of the reform-but-retain proposals being heard in the debate over the Electoral College.

MINORITY FACTORS

Minority groups see an advantage for themselves in the winner-take-all system by which a candidate captures a state's entire slate of electors by winning that state's popular vote, no matter by how small a margin. Nominees now regard major groups of minority voters as possibly deciding factors in swinging some states. Minorities justify this possible advantage as necessary to offset the bloc of Southern white segregationist states.

Mitchell, however, also has told U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, the American Bar Association proposal to eliminate the Electoral College completely in favor of a direct popular vote is an excellent one.

But Mitchell added the NAACP would support the recommendations for a direct popular vote "only if there are absolute and foolproof safeguards against discrimination in registering and voting."

If there can be guarantees that minority groups will not be prevented from participating in a direct popular vote for president, the NAACP will support the ABA recommendations. But if the present system is to be retained, the proposal to divide a state's electors will only make existing inequities even worse, in the NAACP view.

REWRITING IS SLOW

Rewriting the Constitution is a slow-moving process. The usual way is for an amendment to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each house of Congress, and then be ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the 50 states.

The McClatchy newspapers sent inquiries to governors of all 50 states, seeking their views on the present system of electing presidents and vice presidents. Not all replied. Some of those who did said they had not reached a decision yet on proposed changes. Some thought the Electoral College might be retained if basically overhauled.

But not one of the governors said he likes the system the way it is. There was significant voices from both major parties calling for its outright abolition in favor of direct popular votes.

One of the most outspoken was Pennsylvania Republican Gov. Raymond P. Shafer. He noted that one of his state's delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention, James Wilson, thought even then that American presidents should be chosen by direct election.

"It is time that we add our strength to the lone voice of that great Pennsylvanian," said Shafer. "I will recommend that our General Assembly, when it next convenes, lead the nation in a call to Congress for a constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College."

REPLIES FROM OTHERS

Other governors who replied or otherwise expressed themselves in favor of outright abolition of the Electoral College included Democrats Warren E. Hearnes of Missouri and William L. Guy of North Dakota and Republicans Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois, John A. Love of Colorado, Russell W. Peterson of Delaware and Tom McCall of Oregon.

One who replied when he still was a governor of Maryland but since has assumed another office is Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

"There is no question in my mind that basic reform of this outdated process is necessary," said Agnew. "Maryland is one of the few states with a statute binding electors to cast their votes for the winner of the state's presidential election but even the constitutionality of this law is dubious."

UNRUH TAKES STAND

The strongest voice in California in favor of eliminating the Electoral College is Assemblyman Jess Unruh. He is asking the state legislature to urge Congress to begin the process by which the Constitution can be amended to provide for a direct popular vote for president and vice president.

"Today it is clear, as it has been for more than a century, that the Electoral College envisioned by the framers (of the Constitution) bears no relation to their intent, if indeed it ever did," Unruh has commented.

ELECTORATE IS COMPETENT

". . . No modern politician who values his profession dares to argue that the American electorate is incompetent to elect the president of the United States. If this is so, all rational argument against popular presidential elections disappears. The Electoral College is a useless and dangerous appendage to our body politic. It must be removed."

No matter how low the Electoral College ranks in the public esteem, the surgery proposed by Unruh and other prominent Democratic and Republican leaders will not be easy to accomplish.

Nearly everyone agrees that some surgery is necessary. So far, there is insufficient agreement as to its extent, and this could renew the Electoral College's lease on life.

DISASTER COULD OCCUR

Then, the disaster that most observers fear may occur: The Electoral College once again could award the presidency to a man who was the only runnerup in the popular vote.

The Counterfeit Ballot could result in the selection of a Brand X president.

Is the Old Wreck Worth Patching Up?

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

The dilemma of Congress as it surveys the weaknesses of our electoral system is not dissimilar to that of a motorist as he contemplates the 1958 wreck in his driveway. Shall he have it repaired at substantial cost and disregard the fact that it would still be a risky means of transportation? Or shall he recognize that it is obsolete as well as badly worn and fork out the price for a new model?

Some eminent witnesses before the House Judiciary Committee are contending that only mechanical repairs to the electoral system are essential. The extravagance of ordering a new model might offend the folks back home and cause the whole thing to be rejected. This was essentially the argument of Attorney General Mitchell the other day.

There will be little if any quarrel with the repairs that Mr. Mitchell and President Nixon wish to make. First, they want to do away with individual electors. Last November George Wallace took the country much closer than it wanted to be to the possibility of third-party electors actually selecting the President of the United States. There can be no doubt about it. The dummies who under the present system, stand between the President and the people must go.

The second repair for which Mr. Mitchell spoke is that the Presidency go to the top man if he receives 40 per cent of the vote—instead of the electoral-vote majority required at present. Third, the Administration plan calls for a run-off in case no candidate receives as much as 40 per cent.

Then there are a number of repairs designed to reduce uncertainties under the present system. If a presidential candidate who had received a clear electoral-vote plurality should die before the votes were counted, the successful vice presidential candidate would become President. If the winning vice presidential candidate should die before the votes were counted, the incoming President could fill the vacancy under the terms of the Twenty-fifth Amendment.

If both the winning presidential and vice presidential candidates should die before the electoral votes were counted, Congress would be authorized to order a new election. Congress would also be given power to provide for the possible death or withdrawal of a presidential or vice presidential candidate prior to the election.

Undoubtedly these would be useful repairs. But the question remains as to whether our ancient tottering electoral system is worth the time and effort that would be necessary to patch it up in this fashion. For with all the "mechanical" changes outlined by the Attorney General, it would retain critical weaknesses.

The foremost of these is the possibility that the so-called proportional system, which both the President and Mr. Mitchell regard as a satisfactory alternative to direct popular election of the President, might hand defeat to the candidate winning the highest popular vote.

There are some who believe that the danger of elevating the popular vote loser to the White House would be increased under the proportional system. With all its defects, the electoral college system, as it is currently employed, gives an advantage to the large states as well as to the small states. The small-state advantage is readily apparent. Alaska and Delaware, for example, have three electors each (one for each Senator and Representative) although a distribution of electors on the basis of population would give them only one apiece, or less. They would keep this advantage under the proportional system, and all electoral votes would be divided among the candidates in accord with their standing in the popular vote.

Under the present system this favoritism of the small states is offset in some measure by the general-ticket arrangement which gives the winning candidate in each state all the electoral votes of that state. A candidate may, for example, win only a slight plurality in New York and California, but the result is to give him all the 83 electoral votes of those states. Candidates from the big states thus have an inside track, and the presidential campaigns tend to center in the large states favorable to them.

Under the proposed proportional system, this big-state advantage would be largely gone, for electoral votes would be divided to reflect each candidate's popular strength. The small-state advantage would remain. So it would be possible for a candidate with special standing in the small states to obtain a winning electoral percentage without a popular majority.

Several studies indicate that Richard Nixon would have won in 1960 over John F. Kennedy if the proportional system had been in effect. In 1968 the proportional system would have given Mr. Nixon a fairly substantial edge, in part because most of the small states were in the Nixon column. It is interesting to note that a gain of 1.6 per cent in the votes for Vice President Humphrey would have made him the popular vote winner, but it would have taken a 2.74 per cent gain in his electoral vote under the proportional system to make him a winner.

This point calls for more detailed analysis. To what extent would the elimination of the big state advantage through the general ticket system magnify the effects of the little-state advantage? If the splitting of electoral votes would indeed increase the likelihood of electing a President who is not the choice of the people, the proposed amendment would to that extent, be moving away from electoral reform, not toward it.

This critical defect in the proportional system, even though the risk has not been precisely measured and may not be susceptible to precise measurement, has turned most of the reformers to the proposal for direct popular election of the President. It might be better to work a little harder a little longer for a new model that is sound in every particular before resigning ourselves to costly repairs to an obsolete mechanism that would never be satisfactory.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 113, H.R. 8508.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 113, H.R. 8508, to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at the outset of the consideration of the pending bill, let me say that some of us have plans for later in the day. For that reason I propose to insist on the germaneness rule. I ask the Chair whether that rule provides that during the first 3 hours of consideration of the bill the rule of germaneness is in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule of germaneness, for the first 3 hours that rule applies.

Mr. LONG. I direct the attention of the staffs of the majority and minority to the fact that, as manager of the bill, I shall insist on the germaneness rule. If a Senator enters the Chamber, it would be well to have that Senator informed, rather than to embarrass him by my insisting on the germaneness rule. If a Senator is so advised it will make it easier for both of us. It is our purpose

XUM

to proceed to action on the bill, so that Senators who have other plans can be about their business. Senators who have extraneous speeches can make them after action on the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to join in the expression of the distinguished Senator that we confine ourselves to our consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I am hopeful that, at least on this bill, we make the germaneness rule mean what it was hoped to mean. I say that because members of the committee felt this matter should be voted on some time in the immediate future. Therefore, the committee made it clear that we would vote the bill out of committee as it passed the House; and with regard to amendments on the overall problem that might be suggested later, we would reserve them for some later date. Various members of the committee had suggestions, but were not insisting on amendments, including even some that passed both the House and the Senate last year.

Mr. President, the bill before us today, H.R. 8508, is a bill to increase the public debt limit.

Probably the very first question a person is likely to ask in the case of a bill of this type is, Why is any debt limit increase needed at all when we are operating under a balanced budget? The budget for the fiscal year 1969, for example, in the last budget document shows a budget surplus of $2.4 billion. The same budget document shows a surplus of $3.4 billion for the fiscal year 1970.

While it is perfectly true that the unified budget—which is the budget which everyone refers to—is expected to be balanced for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970, what we used to call the administrative budget, or what the budget document now calls the Federal funds, is not in balance for these 2 fiscal years.

As is indicated in the committee report, the administrative budget, or Federal funds budget, according to the official budget estimates, shows a deficit of $7 billion for the fiscal year 1969 and a deficit of $6.8 billion for the fiscal year 1970.

With these administrative budget deficits, the only reason why the unified budget shows surpluses for these years is that the unified budget takes into account the surpluses in the various trust funds, primarily the social security trust funds. The surpluses for 1969 and 1970 in the trust funds amount to $9.4 billion in the fiscal year 1969 and to $10.3 billion in the fiscal year 1970. These surpluses in the trust funds more than offset the deficits in the administrative budget. Because of this there are small surpluses in the unified budget, with which concept all of us are familiar.

From the standpoint of the public debt limitation, however, it is the administrative budget, or Federal funds, which are important, and not the unified budget. This is true because the present debt limitation, with the exception of certain agency debt, reflects the total debt of the Federal Government, including both that held by the public and also that held by the trust funds.

Briefly, the bill before us provides a permanent debt limitation of $365 billion, but also provides a temporary additional limitation of $12 billion that will expire on June 30, 1970. In other words, under the bill, the total debt limitation will be $377 billion until June 30, 1970, at which time the limitation will drop to $365 billion.

Let me also give the debt limitation under present law so that one can compare the two sets of figures. Under present law, except for 1 day a year—namely, June 30 of each year—the debt limitation is $365 billion. On that 1 day of each year—June 30—the debt limitation, under present law, is $358 billion. In other words, the permanent limitation under the bill as reported by your committee is the same as the present applicable limitation for 364 days of the year.

In arriving at the public debt limit requirement provided in this bill, we used the traditional methods in making this determination. We asked the Treasury to prepare for us a table showing the debt limitation requirements on the 15th and last day of each month on the basis of their best current estimate of receipts and expenditures. In this it was assumed that the minimum operating cash balance would be $4 billion—even though the average cash balance we maintained this last year was $5.1 billion—and assuming a leeway of only $3 billion for contingencies.

At least a $3 billion contingency allowance has traditionally been provided, because receipts and expenditures, even with the best intentions in making estimates, can vary appreciably from the budget figures. This may occur because a given receipt item is difficult to forecast or because expenditures turn out in some particular category to be larger than expected, or occur earlier during the year than anticipated.

In addition, there is always the prospect that Congress may not exactly follow the recommendations of the past administration. There are at least $1.6 billion of items of this type which are taken into account in the figures I have given. For example, it is assumed in these figures that the $500 million postal rate increase referred to in the budget is enacted. On the receipt side of the budget, there are included $400 million of user charges which, if not enacted, will result in lower receipts by this amount.

All of these items taken together indicate the $3 billion contingency allowance is quite conservative. The last time we allowed $12 billion for contingencies, and this time the Secretary of Treasury, when he appeared before the House, requested $8 billion for contingencies. The bill reduces this $8 billion to $3 billion.

Table 2 in the committee report shows the required debt limitation computed on the basis I have indicated. If one will examine it, he will see that the figure for June 30, 1970, with the $3 billion contingency allowance, amounts to $364.4 billion—or is within less than a billion dollars of the permanent debt limitation which the bill before the Senate makes applicable after the close of business on that date.

Another way of arriving at this figure for the permanent debt limitation is by adding to the expected June 30, 1969, debt the deficit I referred to earlier in the administrative budget for the fiscal year 1970. This amounts to $6.8 billion, and when added to the anticipated debt on June 30, 1969, of $354.6 billion, gives exactly $364.4 billion, the debt for June 30, 1970, which I have already referred to.

Let me turn now to why we need a supplementary allowance of $12 billion up to the end of the fiscal year 1970. Federal expenditures during a year are spread relatively evenly throughout the entire year. Receipts, on the other hand, flow into the Treasury with periodic peaks, depending upon the various tax collection dates.

Although withheld taxes flow into the Treasury on a relatively even basis throughout the year, corporate income tax collections, which are paid on a quarterly basis, and declarations of individuals, which are also paid on a quarterly basis, result in the periodic peaks throughout the year that I have referred to. The two biggest peaks in collections, of course, occur shortly after the due date for the corporate and individual income tax returns on March 15 and April 15 of each year.

All of this means that in practically every year we run a higher deficit—or smaller surplus—throughout the first part of the year than in the last part of the fiscal year. As a result, debt requirements build up in each year until about March 15, or April 15, and then fall off again. This explains why we need the additional $12 billion leeway during the fiscal year 1970, as well as before April 15 of the current year.

If Senators will again turn to table 2 in the committee report, they will see that on March 15, 1970, it is estimated that the debt, subject to limitation on that date, will amount to $377 billion, taking a $3 billion contingency allowance into account. This is exactly what the supplementary allowance would provide for the fiscal year 1970. The peak debt requirement on April 15 is only slightly less—$376.7 billion.

This is certainly a tight limitation, and I do not see how, given the present budget, we can get by on anything less. In fact, it is entirely possible that we may have to be here before the end of the fiscal year 1970 should budget prospects not turn out as favorably as now hoped.

It is important that we act upon this bill promptly, because the debt is likely to be very close to the ceiling—too close in fact—during the mid-April period.

The situation then is likely to be even worse than our experience in mid-March. On the 14th of March, the Secretary of the Treasury informed the committee we had a debt subject to limitation of $364,717 million. In other words, we were within $283 million of the statutory ceiling, not much more than a third of 1 day's expenditures, and even to do this the cash balance had to be reduced to a level of $2.4 billion.

On April 15 the Secretary of the Treasury informed the committee that we can stay under the existing $365 billion ceiling only by drawing our cash balances down to a level of about $1.8 billion, a figure which is much too low for contingencies which might occur and which is much too low for good debt management practice. It is for this reason that I urge the Senate to act promptly on this bill and also not to amend it. Although there were some items the committee would have liked to have added to the bill, we refrained from doing so because of our desire to speed this bill on its way to the President without the necessity of a time-consuming conference. We wanted to be sure that adequate funds will be available to manage our debt in the period immediately ahead.

Before concluding, I would like to say that while I know it is popular to bemoan every increase in the debt limit—and surely none of us enjoys increasing the debt limit—nevertheless it seems to me that we should keep this matter in perspective. For that reason, I would like to include in the record at this point two tables prepared for me by the Treasury Department, Office of Debt Analysis. I ask unanimous consent that the two tables be inserted at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—ESTIMATED TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE DEBT, BY MAJOR CATEGORIES

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Dec. 31	Private			State and local	Federal			Total	Percent Federal of total
	Individual	Corporate [1]	Total		Public	Agency	Total		
1929	$72.9	$107.0	$179.9	$17.8	$16.3	$1.2	$17.5	$215.2	8
1930	71.8	107.4	179.2	18.9	16.0	1.3	17.3	215.4	8
1931	64.9	100.3	165.2	19.5	17.8	1.3	19.1	203.8	9
1932	57.1	96.1	153.2	19.7	20.8	1.2	22.0	194.9	11
1933	51.0	92.4	143.4	19.5	23.8	1.5	25.3	188.2	13
1934	49.8	90.8	140.4	19.2	28.5	4.8	33.3	192.9	17
1935	49.7	89.8	139.5	19.6	30.6	5.6	36.2	195.3	19
1936	50.6	90.9	141.5	19.6	34.4	5.9	40.3	201.4	20
1937	51.1	90.2	141.3	19.6	37.3	5.8	43.1	204.0	21
1938	50.0	86.8	136.8	19.8	39.4	6.2	45.6	202.2	22
1939	50.8	86.8	137.6	20.1	41.9	6.9	48.8	206.5	24
1940	53.0	89.0	142.0	20.2	45.0	7.2	52.2	214.4	24
1941	55.6	97.5	153.1	20.0	57.9	7.7	65.6	238.7	27
1942	49.9	106.3	156.2	19.2	108.2	5.5	113.7	289.1	39
1943	48.8	110.3	159.1	18.1	165.9	5.1	171.0	348.2	49
1944	50.7	109.0	159.7	17.1	230.6	3.0	233.6	410.4	57
1945	54.7	99.5	154.2	16.0	278.1	1.5	279.6	449.8	62
1946	59.9	109.3	169.2	16.1	259.1	1.6	260.7	446.0	58
1947	69.4	128.9	198.3	17.5	256.9	.7	257.6	473.4	54
1948	80.6	139.4	220.0	19.6	252.8	1.0	253.8	493.4	51
1949	90.4	140.3	230.7	22.2	257.1	.8	257.9	510.8	50
1950	104.2	167.7	271.9	25.3	256.7	1.1	257.8	555.0	46
1951	114.0	191.9	305.9	28.0	259.4	.8	260.2	594.1	44
1952	128.9	202.9	331.8	31.0	267.4	.9	268.3	631.1	42
1953	142.7	212.9	355.6	35.0	275.2	.8	276.0	666.6	41
1954	156.5	217.6	374.1	40.2	278.8	.7	279.5	693.8	40
1955	179.5	253.9	433.4	45.3	280.8	1.4	282.2	760.9	37
1956	194.8	277.3	472.1	50.0	276.6	1.7	278.3	800.4	35
1957	206.7	295.8	502.5	54.6	274.9	3.2	278.1	835.2	33
1958	222.0	312.0	534.0	59.8	282.9	2.4	285.3	879.1	32
1959	244.3	341.4	585.7	64.9	290.8	5.7	296.5	947.1	31
1960	262.9	365.1	628.0	70.2	290.2	6.4	296.6	994.8	30
1961	284.4	391.5	675.9	77.3	296.2	6.8	303.0	1,056.2	29
1962	311.8	421.5	733.3	84.9	303.5	7.8	311.3	1,129.5	28
1963	345.7	456.7	802.4	90.7	309.3	8.1	317.4	1,210.5	26
1964	380.2	497.9	878.1	97.7	317.9	9.1	327.0	1,302.8	25
1965	416.3	550.1	966.4	104.7	320.9	9.8	330.7	1,401.8	24
1966	447.3	607.9	1,055.2	111.6	329.3	14.0	343.3	1,510.1	23
1967	477.0	650.0	1,127.0	122.0	344.7	20.2	364.9	1,613.9	23
1968	517.8	724.1	1,241.9	132.3	358.0	15.1	373.1	1,747.3	21

[1] Includes dept of federally sponsored agencies excluded from the budget which amounted to $700,000,000 on Dec. 31, 1947; $9,000,000,000 on Dec. 31, 1967; and $21,300,000,000 on Dec. 31, 1968.

Source: Commerce and Treasury Departments; Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Mar. 21, 1969.

TABLE II.—TOTAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE DEBT RELATED TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

End of calendar year	Gross national product [1] (in billions)	Ratios of debt to gross national product (in percent)				
		Federal	State and local	Corporate	Individual and noncorporate	Total
1929	$96.7	18.1	18.4	110.7	75.4	222.5
1930	83.1	20.8	22.7	129.2	86.4	259.2
1931	66.9	28.6	29.1	149.9	97.0	304.6
1932	56.8	38.7	34.7	169.2	100.5	343.1
1933	60.3	42.0	32.3	153.2	84.6	312.1
1934	68.6	48.1	28.0	132.1	72.6	280.8
1935	77.4	46.8	25.3	116.0	64.2	252.3
1936	86.5	46.6	22.7	105.1	58.5	232.8
1937	87.6	49.2	22.4	103.0	58.3	232.9
1938	87.6	52.1	22.6	99.1	57.1	230.8
1939	94.8	51.5	21.2	91.6	53.6	217.8
1940	107.6	48.5	18.8	82.7	49.3	199.3
1941	138.8	47.3	14.4	70.2	40.1	172.0
1942	179.0	63.5	10.7	59.4	27.9	161.5
1943	202.4	84.5	8.9	54.5	24.1	172.0
1944	217.4	107.5	7.9	50.1	23.3	188.8
1945	196.0	142.6	8.2	50.8	27.9	229.5
1946	221.4	117.8	7.3	49.4	27.1	201.4
1947	245.0	105.1	7.1	52.6	28.3	193.2
1948	261.2	97.2	7.5	53.4	30.9	188.9
1949	$260.5	99.0	8.5	53.9	34.7	196.1
1950	311.2	82.8	8.1	53.9	33.5	178.3
1951	338.2	76.9	8.3	56.7	33.7	175.7
1952	361.0	74.3	8.6	56.2	35.7	174.8
1953	360.8	76.5	9.7	59.0	39.6	184.8
1954	379.8	73.6	10.6	57.3	41.2	182.7
1955	409.7	68.9	11.1	62.0	43.8	185.7
1956	433.2	64.2	11.5	64.0	45.0	184.8
1957	438.1	63.5	12.5	67.5	47.2	190.6
1958	469.2	60.8	12.7	66.5	47.3	187.4
1959	496.8	59.7	13.1	68.7	49.2	190.6
1960	503.4	58.9	13.9	72.5	52.2	197.6
1961	542.8	55.8	14.2	72.1	52.4	194.6
1962	574.7	54.2	14.8	73.3	54.3	196.5
1963	611.8	51.9	14.8	74.6	56.5	197.9
1964	654.0	50.0	14.9	76.1	58.1	199.2
1965	719.2	46.0	14.6	76.5	57.9	194.9
1966	770.2	44.6	14.5	78.9	58.1	196.1
1967	821.1	44.4	14.9	79.2	58.1	196.6
1968	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Implied level end of year, calculated as the average of the 4th and 1st calendar quarters at seasonally adjusted annual rates for the years 1939 through present. Prior to 1939, averages of 2 calendar year figures as the best approximations of Dec. 31 levels.

[2] Not available.

XUM

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, these tables show the estimated total Government and private debt by major categories from 1929 to as near the present as figures are available. The first table shows private, State, local, and Federal debt in terms of actual dollar amounts. This table shows that the total private and Government debt by the end of 1968 amounted to $1.7 trillion. Only 21 percent of this, however, represented Federal debt, and if one will examine the table I have inserted in the RECORD, he will note that the Federal debt as a percent of total debt has been declining steadily from the high of 62 percent of total debt reached in 1945 shortly after the end of the war to the 21 percent in 1968—relatively speaking, only one-third of what it was, as a percentage of the debt, in 1968.

Already the Federal debt in terms of percentages is back to the 1937 level.

The second table I have inserted also shows the Government and private debt from 1929 up to as near the present as figures are fully available, namely, 1967, but in this case these debt figures are shown as percentages of the gross national product for the same years. This table shows that as a percent of gross national product, the Federal debt has been decreasing almost year by year since 1944. This is probably the best measure of the burden of the debt since it shows the debt as percentage of everything we produce in this country. In 1967, the Federal debt was slightly over 44 percent of the gross national product. On this basis the debt in 1945 again expressed in terms of relationship to the gross national product was about 3½ times the size of the debt in 1967, which of course is a very fine improvement, and, in perspective, makes our situation look much brighter than some might think.

I am not trying to say that our debt is not larger than I would like to have it today. I would prefer to be able to say we have no debt at all, but I do think it is important to keep some perspective on this point. This Nation is in a very strong position, and, while we have a substantial debt, we are in a position to carry it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I have stated that I would insist on germaneness during the 3 hours it may be in effect; and I hope Senators who did not know of that will be apprised of it, so that we can stay with the bill until action is completed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, ever since the late distinguished Senator from Virginia, Harry Byrd, Sr., as chairman of the Committee on Finance, invited me, if I so desired, if it was agreeable with the committee on committees on my side, and if I enjoyed that much seniority, to come and be an active member of that committee—I do not know how long ago that was; I hesitate to think that far back—but, Mr. President, ever since I can remember, the debt ceiling has been a matter of some controversy in that committee and on the Senate floor. Year after year, we go through this exercise, which sometimes strikes me as a bit of futility, for a very simple reason: when the Treasury officials calculate about what they need by way of a contingent cash reserve at all times, inasmuch as the daily expenditure is about $750 million, they can project and see how close they get to the ceiling that is imposed by statute, and then, if it gets altogether too close, in the interests of our fiscal integrity and our monetary safety, the debt limit must be raised; and that, of course, is the function of Congress.

Sometimes we have raised it more and sometimes we have raised it less. But regardless of what the fiscal legerdemain might have been, I think the equation is rather simple: When you get perilously close to that debt ceiling, and there is some uncertainty, at certain seasons of the year, about your income tax collections, then the wise and prudent thing to do is to lift the debt ceiling.

We have hit upon a rather fancy attitude on this matter. We concluded, at some time way back, that perhaps it would be a good thing to do to have a temporary ceiling and a permanent ceiling, and, in due course, after we get over that difficult peak, to revert to the permanent debt ceiling. That is involved here, as it has been for a good long time; so we raise the debt ceiling today simply because we must do so, in the interests of our fiscal integrity.

There is no mystery about it: we continue to spend for a thousand and one diverse purposes, and in due time the spending catches up, and then the debt ceiling must be raised.

It has rather interesting to go back a number of years to those halcyon days when the debt limit was only about $40 billion. But progressively it has gone up. When we got into the complex business of carrying on a world war, and then the Korean war, the debt finally skyrocketed, by billions and billions of dollars. It goes up and up and up, even as spending goes up, and I have often wondered whether we would ever see the time when there would be an actual reduction in our permanent public debt.

Back in 1945 and 1946, when we had a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, we provided, among other things, for a legislative budget. There was to be a committee consisting of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee and Appropriations, and the Senate Finance Committee and Appropriations.

I remember the first meeting. We thought it was a novelty, and 107 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate appeared in one of the committee rooms. We promptly designated Senator Taft of Ohio as the chairman.

Of course, it was evident that the committee was entirely too big and unwieldy; so we soon agreed upon a smaller committee, consisting of 20 or 25 members.

We labored for a time with this legislative budget; but what intrigued me was that when we were supposed to be all through, and would have reported a legislative budget, if we went beyond the Presidential budget, we also had to report a tax bill, and if the legislative budget was under, then there had to be an agreement that what we might have saved would be applied to the public debt.

That was 23 years ago. Nothing ever happened, and nothing has been applied to the public debt. So, in the war terminology of today, that debt escalates and escalates; and I apprehend that if we continue to spend in proportion as we have done over a long period of years, the debt will continue to go up, and obviously, it has got to be reflected in the form of Treasury notes, bills, and bonds, which have to be sold to the public or to fiduciaries, banks, or insurance companies.

That means that, for practical purposes, the Treasury has to finance in the same market where business and industry must peddle their bonds; and when all is said and done, if you have got enough takers for money, and there is not quite enough to go around, the inevitable result is going to be an increase in the interest rate.

Only 10 days ago, the banks in New York indicated that the prime rate would go from 7 to 7½ percent. That means to their best customers, who always pay off their notes: they are going to have to pay 7½ percent for borrowing money.

The prime rate in Great Britain today is 8 percent. And I apprehend that probably we will see an 8 percent rate before too long at the rate we are going and in view of the intensity of the inflation fever and the inflation psychology that is gripping the country.

This is a difficult matter, but we cannot have our cake and eat it too. If this Congress is going to spend the money, then there ought not to be a single vote against an increase in the debt limit. We are the reason for it. We are the cause. We have set in motion the facts out of which that debt goes up and up, and the ceiling has to go up and up in the interest of our fiscal solidarity and our safety.

I do not know whether there will be a rollcall vote on the bill or not. I heard mentioned in the Finance Committee that there might be a Senator who probably would not vote for the debt increase. I thought he might be around to make a little speech on the subject and then ask for a rollcall vote. And, in the absence of a show of sufficient hands, he could ask for a quorum and then renew his request.

I will stick up my hand for a rollcall vote if that is the way it is, because I have no hesitation in going on record in this matter. The problem is very simple. The need is very great. And I for one am ready to meet it headon. So, if there is going to be a rollcall vote, I want to be present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there have been requests for a rollcall vote. When we get to a vote, I will ask for the yeas and nays.

In light of the changes made in the measure in the House of Representatives I do not see for the life of me why anyone on either side of the aisle would vote against this increase in the debt limit. If one looks at the matter from the point of view of the Democrats, the budget spending that has occurred and has required a debt limit increase occurred under the previous administration. And the budget was prepared under a previous administration.

If one looks at it from the point of view of a Republican, no matter how much he might bemoan the necessity of doing this, it was not his administration that brought it about. But I would think he would want to give his own administration enough fiscal elbow room to see what they can do.

In either event, I think one would vote to increase the debt limit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so. And the day for lamentation is long past.

I trust the quorum bells will be rung. I find it necessary to be off the floor for a while, but I would like to manifest my interest by holding up my hand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today the Senate is dealing with the question of raising the debt ceiling by $12 billion, and in addition the administration has just sent to the Congress a request that the 10 percent surcharge be extended for another year. I am disturbed, however, that no greater emphasis is being placed upon the need to hold down spending.

I recognize that the President's message promises some cut in the 1970 budget; and I appreciate this step, but I wish the amount were specified.

I regret very much, however, to see perpetuated the same claims of a budget surplus based on the premise that trust fund receipts can be treated as normal revenue. These trust funds do not belong to the Federal Government, and under the law they cannot be utilized to defray the normal operating expenses of the Government.

This method of claiming a surplus when in reality we are operating at a huge deficit was highly criticized when practiced by the Johnson administration, and it is subject to the same criticism today; namely, that it serves only to mislead the American taxpayers as to the true cost of operating the many programs of this Government.

War, crime, and inflation, are the three major problems confronting our country today, and while we would all place the need for a solution to the Vietnam war as of primary importance, nevertheless the question of inflation is the No. 1 domestic problem.

In fact, any decisions made either escalating or deescalating the war in Vietnam or any solutions proposed to solve the problem of crime must all be weighed as to their impact on our economy and the effect they would have on our efforts to check the spiral of inflation.

Today, I shall present my views on this latter problem of inflation; first, as to some of the causes and second, as to the steps which must be taken to cope effectively with this problem.

One of the major contributing factors to inflation has been the high spending policies of governments, both at the Federal and at the State levels and the high level of spending by consumers and private industry, much of which is financed by expanded debt.

Failure on the part of the Federal Government to tell the American people the truth about the extent of its own deficit spending policies has been one of the major faults. For the past 5 years the American taxpayers have been deluded into a false sense of security by an administration which by juggling its accounting practices was reporting surpluses when in reality it was creating staggering deficits. These are the causes; but what is the solution?

When we approach the solution to any problem, it is necessary to recognize that the problem exists, determine its causes, and then decide what steps need to be taken for correction.

No one needs to be told that the problem of inflation exists today.

Inflation today is not just a threat but a reality as is evidenced by the ever-rising costs of living. Interest rates are at the highest level in the past 100 years, and our Federal Government is still operating at a deficit averaging over $500 million per month—expenditures other than trust funds.

On January 29, 1969, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 2188 to 2194. I outlined the budget situation and pointed out that instead of a $2.4 billion surplus for fiscal year 1969 and a $3.4 billion for fiscal year 1970 our Government under the budget submitted by President Johnson will actually be operating with a deficit of $6.9 billion in 1969 and $10.7 billion in 1970. Instead of a $5.8 billion surplus as claimed in the next 18 months we are actually confronted with a deficit of over $17.5 billion.

To arrive at its boasted surplus the previous administration manipulated the accounts for the Commodity Credit Corporation and then claimed for accounting purposes that all trust fund receipts could be treated as normal revenue of the U.S. Government. That is wrong. The Government acts only as the trustee, and under the law these receipts cannot be commingled with the regular income of the Government.

Even that $17.5 billion deficit figure does not take into consideration other major discrepancies in the 1970 budget; for example, in this budget as submitted on January 15, 1969, the revenue from the Government's royalties in offshore oil, is overestimated by at least $350 million. The cost of the existing Veterans' Administration programs now mandatory under law are underestimated by around $250 million. The interest on the national debt is underestimated by at least $500 million. The cost of the salary increases which have already been approved or which are now pending are underestimated by at least $1 billion. New revenue of $519 million is claimed as the result of raising postage rates from 6 to 7 cents, and $400 million extra revenue is claimed from new user charges, both of which measures have yet to be enacted. Taking these factors, totaling around $3 billion, into consideration it means that we are actually confronted with a deficit in the next 18 months of around $20 billion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, word was given to the country that there was going to be a surplus on June 30, 1969, and a predicted surplus on June 30, 1970. If we remove all the iffy items—and I refer to such things as a prospective raise in postal rates that has not been enacted into law, and other items that are entirely speculative, all of which items were segregated in trust funds and not intermingled with the general funds—what is the Senator's best estimate of the true situation at the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1969, with regard to whether there will be a surplus or deficit?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At the end of this fiscal year the deficit would be around $7 billion. In the next fiscal year if the gimmicks were eliminated the deficit would be around $10.7 billion.

For the Federal Government to include these trust funds for accounting purposes as though they were normal revenue would be just as erroneous as it would be for a private corporation, in making its annual report to the stockholders, to include in its report the accumulations in the corporation's pension trust funds. The corporation would have no right to use the pension fund accumulations to defray the operating costs of the corporation. Neither does the Federal Government have any right, under the law, to use the proceeds of pension funds to defray the normal operating costs of the Government.

To include these for accounting purposes serves only one purpose: That is, to mislead the taxpayers as to the true financial picture.

The reason why trust funds are accumulating reserves at this time is that a large percentage of the country's labor force is comprised of younger people, young men and women who are paying into the social security trust fund or the railroad retirement fund. They are being taxed today for the purpose of building up an equity when they reach the age of 65. Since the larger percentage of the labor force are younger people, that means that the funds are being built up today to take care of the cost of paying pensions to those people when they reach retirement age.

For the Federal Government to assume that it can count those funds as though they were normal revenue and to spend that revenue today would mean that the Government was deliberately planning to bankrupt the funds. Certainly no one would stand for that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Delaware will agree with me that it is all right to give consideration to social security taxes and other taxes that go into the trust funds for the purpose of measuring the entire amount of money that the Federal Government is taking from the people, but the trust funds certainly should not be included among the funds which are available for general spending and should not, therefore, be included in determining the amount of the debt limit.

XUM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Our committee has always had to take such factors into consideration. It has always had to consider how much the Government as a whole is taking in at the moment as related to how much it is putting back into the economy. To that extent I support the principle of a unified budget, so as to get that picture before us. The Committee on Finance has always done that when it considered the subject of taxes.

We also have to take into consideration in evaluating the Federal tax rate the amount that State and local governments are taking from the same taxpayers in the various income brackets. All those factors must be taken into consideration. But that does not mean that we use that total figure and report it as though it were revenue available to the Government to pay the operating costs of the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. No; it should not be used to show a false position, to show that the Government is living within its income, when in reality the debt is being increased, and when, at the very time the calculation was made, it was said that there would be a surplus at June 30, 1969, and a surplus at June 30, 1970.

In the fine print, so to speak, the Treasury was being contradictory by asking for the very bill before us today, to wit, the raising of the debt limit. Is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It is rather significant that the original request of the Treasury Department as to the amount needed to carry it through the next 18-month period was for a $17 billion increase in the debt limit, which would be about the amount of the projected deficit, assuming it is not possible to roll back any of the spending. That was just about the same amount as the projected deficit of the Johnson budget that was submitted on January 15. That shows that the Treasury itself recognized that there was a bona fide deficit. The House, feeling that at least a $5 billion reduction in projected spending plans could be attained, reduced this request to $12 billion.

Certainly it would not be necesary to go to the bank and ask for an extended line of credit to borrow money to finance a surplus. It is utterly ridiculous for any official of the Government in Washington to come before us and say, "We actually expect to have a surplus of $1, $2, or $3 billion a year, but at the same time we have to borrow money to extend our line of credit by $12 billion, so we have to borrow $12 billion to finance the surplus."

That is utterly ridiculous. Any sixth-grade student who made such a suggestion would get a mark of zero in mathematics. I am surprised that anyone would try to offer that line of reasoning to the American people.

Mr. CURTIS. Coming back to the assumption that if we leave out the "iffy" items in the budget, there is likely to be a $10 billion deficit next year, is that assumption based upon a continuation of the surtax?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; all estimates are based on a continuation of the surtax at 10 percent and also upon the assumption that the cost of financing all the programs recommended in the budget will be continued without any change whatever. I certainly hope that later assumptions will not prove to be true. Those expenditures must be reduced.

Mr. CURTIS. I am thoroughly convinced that in the past administration and in the present administration, some well-intentioned persons have been drawn into the support of the so-called unified budget and have expressed a desire to fix the debt ceiling on that basis. They were well intentioned. They meant to recommend sound financing to the American people. However, I believe they have overlooked some very real problems.

First, to invest social security funds in Government bonds creates many problems under the very best of management, because it is the individual who is obligated to pay the benefit who is borrowing the money. It is the guardian who is borrowing his ward's money.

So even if the fund is managed with the greatest of skill, many questions and many problems are raised. The alternatives are not clear. Certainly we would not want the trustee of the social security fund to invest those funds in stocks, because in a short while the Government would control many of the country's major corporations. There are good reasons why the law has required that such funds be invested in Government bonds. But I believe that if the officials take the position that excludes bonds held by the social security fund as a part of the debt coming within the limit, there will be some unexpected political repercussions.

I think it will cause an uneasiness on the part of current beneficiaries of social security, it will cause an uneasiness on the part of those who someday will be applying for benefits, and I am convinced it will cause an uneasiness on the part of millions of Americans who are paying into the fund month after month.

Is it not true that social security taxes have reached a rather high rate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question about that fact. They have reached a rate higher than many of the most ardent supporters of that program had said could be sustained, and yet the question arises: Are we going to keep raising those trust fund taxes higher than necessary in order to build up an imaginary surplus for the Government?

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that there are millions and millions of Americans paying more money in social security taxes than all other Federal taxes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. So, in addition to this well-intentioned proposal submitted by honest people in both administrations, I think it carries a political danger that the beneficiaries and future beneficiaries are going to be uneasy; and it well could start a revolt among social security taxpayers and a demand for a lessening of the tax. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding. I wish to commend the Senator for his clear understanding and courageous presentation of the true budget picture, not only today but also throughout the past month. I think the Senator has rendered a service not only to the country but also to people who disagree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point excerpts from the testimony given before our committee under date of March 24 of this year, at which time I was engaged in a colloquy with both the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) and the Director of the Budget, Mr. Mayo, concerning the actual deficit.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Senator Williams. And based upon the accounting principles that we operated under prior to the last 3 or 4 years, you actually are confronted with a prospective deficit in 1969 and 1970 of around $7 billion instead of a surplus, isn't that a fact?
>
> Secretary Kennedy. Well, I don't know what definition you are using of——
>
> Senator Williams. I am using the same definition we have used for 175 years before this Great Society came in and before your definition, your confirmation of it.
>
> Secretary Kennedy. You have had three kinds of budget surpluses and deficits before, and now with a unified budget we use the one that has the impact on the economy, as you well know. If you want to relate it to the figures you are quoting that are in the budget message, Mr. Mayo has them.
>
> Senator Williams. And they are a prospective $17 billion?
>
> Mr. Mayo. They show a current deficit $6,962,000,000 and for the year beginning July 1, $6,848,000,000. Together that would be a total of $13.8 billion.
>
> Senator Williams. That is correct, and then when you take the manipulation of Commodity Credit it brings it up to $17 billion. It is a fact that is where you got your $17 billion request raising the debt ceiling, was really in recognition of the fact that you do have and are confronted with a $17 billion deficit—that is assuming we don't cut back or change anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in this colloquy it will be noted that the Director of the Budget confirmed the fact that the deficit for the 2 fiscal years 1969 and 1970 will be $13.8 billions; however, when we take into consideration the nearly $3 billion in manipulations of the Commodity Credit Corporation accounts it brings the actual projected deficit for the 2 years to $17 billion. These estimates are based on the assumption that we accept the budget as it was submitted on January 15.

Further evidence of this inflation is shown in the most recent report wherein it is indicated that private industry in 1969 is planning for a 14-percent increase in capital investment for new plants.

This 14-percent expansion in plant capacity will result in a tremendously increased demand for new capital investment, and this accelerated demand for new money will have a tendency to push our interest rates even higher than the

7½ percent prime rate recently established.

A shortage of capital with the resulting high interest is already having a serious effect on new home construction, and the operation of many small businesses are being jeopardized. State and local governments are being severely handicapped in borrowing for their needs.

Many States are now having to increase their statutory ceiling on interest rates both for private lending and for the sale of their revenue bonds. Just last week the State of Michigan passed a bill to raise the mortgage-rate ceiling to 9 percent. The cost of living is at an all-time high and climbing higher each month.

This accelerated spiral of inflation can no longer be ignored, and the hour is already late for starting the corrections. No longer can this situation be tolerated. Action must be taken now, or it will be too late.

It was in recognition of this delicate financial situation that I strongly protested earlier congressional action in raising the salaries of Members of Congress and other top officials of Government from 40 to 70 percent, and I still think this was a serious mistake.

How can either Congress or the executive branch appeal to organized labor or private industry, asking them to hold the line on both wages and prices in order to help combat this inflation when they have just raised their own salaries by 40 percent?

The Government is the largest employer in America, and its officials have a responsibility to set the example and demonstrate that they are willing to practice what they preach.

It should be noted that when these salary increases become fully effective for both the military and civilian personnel of the Government the additional cost will approximate $4.5 billion, or in other words they will absorb about one-half of the revenue that can be derived from the extension of the 10-percent surcharge.

If the additional $9 or $10 billion in revenue to be derived from the surcharge extension is to be used only to finance increased salaries and to expand some of the spending programs then its effect as a brake on inflation will be zero.

The question now is, what steps can we take to cope with this threat of inflation? I shall list six steps which in my opinion represent the minimum action we must take:

First. Either by Executive order or by congressional action declare a moratorium on new public works projects and public construction accompanied by a reappraisal of all existing projects to determine to what extent they can be slowed down or postponed.

Second. Repeal the 7-percent investment credit. It just does not make sense to subsidize and encourage accelerated expansion of new plant capacity when both materials and money are in such short supply and when our existing plant capacity is only being 84-percent utilized.

Third. Initiate a new savings bond program for the small investors of America, paying them 6-percent interest—maximum purchases could be limited to either $1,200 or $2,400 per year. This would siphon millions from the current consumer spending and direct the money into private savings.

Fourth. Extend the surcharge rate for the fiscal year 1970 at 7 percent instead of the recommended 10 percent. With a 10-percent rate in effect for the first half of the year and a 7-percent rate for the latter half it would in effect still be an 8½-percent rate for the full year or 1 percent higher than last year's rate for individuals.

Fifth. Extend a mandatory ceiling on expenditures for fiscal 1970 providing for a reduction of at least $5.3 below the $195.3 billion projected spending rates in the 1970 Johnson budget message. The ceiling on Federal employment enacted last year which was permanent law must remain in effect, and some of last year's exemptions should be repealed.

Sixth. Repeal the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

I shall now discuss each of these points in greater detail.

First. A moratorium on all new public works programs and new public construction.

This moratorium would affect all projects unless certification is made by the appropriate board that such project is essential to the war effort or to our national economy. Unless so certified all new construction projects would be held in abeyance pending the end of the Vietnam war or until such time as our financial situation is brought under control.

At the same time all existing public works projects should be reappraised to determine to what extent the work can be slowed down or held in abeyance without jeopardizing our national security or resulting in an uneconomical loss of money.

There is a precedent for such action. Under an executive order in World War II and again during the Korean war such a moratorium on public works was in effect, and such action should have been taken immediately upon the outbreak of the war in Vietnam. Why should we not tighten our belts on the home front? We just cannot afford to finance a full-scale war and have business as usual.

This moratorium could reduce the expenditures of government by at least one billion; and what is equally important, it would reduce some of the inflationary pressure.

Second. Repeal the 7-percent investment credit.

This 7-percent tax credit is back-door financing for the purpose of providing an indirect subsidy to encourage the expansion of the plant capacity of private industry at a time when this additional capacity is not needed and at a time when we do not have adequate investment capital with which to finance it.

The repeal of the investment credit would have dual benefits. First, it would reduce the pressure on an overheated economy; and second, it would provide approximately $3.3 billion additional revenue to the Federal Government of which $2.8 billion will come from corporations and $500 million from individuals. However, all of this $3.3 billion will not materialize in the first fiscal year.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to compliment the Senator for the suggestion he is making. As between simply extending the 10-percent surcharge and the particular suggestion the Senator is making to suspend the investment credit, I think his approach would be better. It would do more to restrict inflation and I think, on balance, would do greater tax equity and justice to the taxpayers. I believe that, so far as the rank and file of Americans are concerned, they would applaud that approach rather than the other.

Now I may have some additional suggestions to make myself, following the same general line of departure, but I do think that the investment tax credit is doing more than any single thing to overheat the economy in times of inflation. In other words, it is really pouring gasoline on the fire. That expression, by the way, is not original with me. At the time that President Johnson suggested the investment credit be suspended, I believe he used that expression in discussing the matter with some Members of the Senate—if not publicly, at least that was the expression he used about the investment credit under this kind of condition.

I believe that it is, undoubtedly, doing more to drive credit into the hands of those able to get it and making it available only at tremendously high interest charges to those who need it badly to build homes and provide for their essential personal needs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and he is right. I am not debating the merits or demerits of the principle of the investment credit; there may be times when we need it. The point is, we do not need this added incentive today. Private investment for new plant expansion or modernization has expanded about 24 percent in the past 15 to 18 months. Certainly at this time that is creating an excessive demand not only on the materials necessary to build plants, which is inflationary, but also for capital to finance plant expansion at a time when money is scarce and when the interest rate is already being pushed through the roof.

The way to control inflation is to remove some of the pressures. By reducing some of the demand for money we could then look for lower interest rates, but we must slacken the demand at this time. We have an overheated economy.

As I mentioned to the chairman, I am not offering this package as part of the pending bill, but it will be before our committee later. I think these additional measures must be considered in the context when we are extending the debt ceiling, to extend the debt ceiling is only taking care of an immediate situation.

It does not cure the problem which is excessive spending. Expenditures must be reduced if we are to reduce the cause of

XUM

inflation. We have no choice. First we should consider the causes of inflation—what is creating the problem so that we can deal with it. That is the reason I am discussing a series of recommended steps for later action.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Delaware will permit me to trespass for a moment further on his time——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. LONG. Here we are, in an inflationary economy, with a war on our hands, facing a tax credit to provide an almost compelling incentive, from the profit point of view, to greatly expand plant and equipment, when to do so means that we are making credit so difficult for homeowners and small businessmen and others to provide for their essential needs, so that the interest rates are almost usurious.

Here people are, being required to borrow at such a high interest rate that they will pay almost twice as much for interest as they pay for the house by the time they get through paying it with a long-term mortgage. Under these conditions when we look at the tax credit, we find that it is heating up the economy at a time when the economy can not stand the heat. Every argument that can be made that we should stimulate the economy, to stimulate employment, and the building of new plants, and new investments, falls right on its face when we look at the inflationary pressures which exist in the economy of this country today.

I agree with the Senator that this would be a better answer to the problem to suspend the investment tax credit than it would be to continue the 10-percent surtax.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I certainly concur.

Mr. President, the third step I recommend is to initiate a new savings bond program paying at least 6 percent to the small investors.

The present trend toward increasing wages in all segments of the labor force means additional consumer spending. As a step toward siphoning off some of this consumer buying power, the Government should initiate a new bond sales program for the small investor allowing him to benefit from today's high-interest rates. With today's 4¼-percent ceiling, he is just not buying series E bonds. These new savings bonds should bear interest at an annual rate of not less than 6 percent and should be fully guaranteed as to principal should the holder need to redeem them prior to maturity.

To limit this attractive feature to the small investor these bonds could be nontransferable and could be limited to $1,200 or $2,400 per year.

This higher rate on savings bonds is only fair. Our Government is already paying more than 6 percent on its borrowings today; and why should not the workingman be paid a comparable rate of interest? In addition, as an instrument toward siphoning off excess purchasing power, it would have a definite impact on inflation. At the same time, some adjustment must be made on the outstanding series E bonds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With reference to the savings bonds, some of those at the lower interest rate of 2¾ percent were issued many years ago—some of them for 1972 maturity. It could be that they go beyond that time. I think we can gather from that that older people are holding those lower interest savings bonds today, and getting such a small return compared with what the rate is today.

My understanding is that there are a total of about $8 billion worth of these bonds. About one-half of them have been put through the trust funds and the other half is in the hands of the public.

What kind of relief does the Senator propose for those who are holding those bonds today? They are the real victims of this inflation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the face of today's inflation all owners of Government bonds or industrial bonds are victimized. But I was referring to the owners of series E bonds. These are limited to small investors. The public does hold some of the outstanding low coupon bonds which mature from 1972 to as far as 1990. There are some a little longer than that.

However, a survey I conducted about a year or so ago showed that the overwhelming percentage of this type of bonds was held by institutional investors or by banks. I do not think the Senator will find that the small investors own to any large extent that type of bond. At the time those bonds were issued they were sold at par, at 2.5 and 2.75 percent interest, and at that time the small investor could invest up to $10,000 in series E bonds, which paid around 2⅞ or 3 percent. He would get more interest plus a guarantee on principal on the E bonds. Therefore it was the small investors who were buying E bonds. To be frank, I do not see how we could deal with that situation except to stop this inflation with its erosion, not of their interest, but of their capital. But the administration has had a policy of limiting the purchase of series E bonds to the small investor and trying to keep the interest rates somewhat in line with the prevailing rates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps the question the Senator from Delaware addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury this week should be pursued and we ought to ascertain where these small bonds with the small interest rates are, and see whether or not some assistance should be rendered to those people. If they cannot get it from that source, obviously they will have to become participants in welfare programs. So the matter is as broad as it is long. We do it either way. I would rather do it by the interest route, because then they receive that income with dignity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I have said so many times, spiraling inflation—of which higher interest rates are only one of the barometers or indicators—has gradually been pauperizing the aged or retired people of this country, whether they live on interest from Government bonds, pension accounts, or social security payments. This gradual erosion of their income is the No. 1 problem of our country. I think our committee should put it on its agenda as the No. 1 problem to be studied.

My suggestion made here today for a more realistic savings bond program would have the additional salutary effect of siphoning out of the spending stream some of the money going into consumer spending, and to that extent it would reduce inflationary pressures, which I think is equally important at this particular time.

I was encouraged earlier this week when the Secretary of the Treasury indicated sympathy for a new approach to that problem.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOK. With reference to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware on the series E bonds, is not the Senator saying in effect that the fact is that the people buying those bonds are really being shortchanged relative to the institutional investor and the large investor, and what we will see is a decrease in the income of the individual buying bonds monthly unless the interest competes with the interest being made available to the individual or institution buying bonds in larger amounts?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right, especially when we bear in mind that the purchase of series E bonds has dropped below the redemption of them. I understand a bond sales program is being conducted among the boys serving in Vietnam urging them to invest their money in those bonds. Why should not they be paid the same rate of interest that every other man in America can receive if he has a minimum amount of $1,000 to invest at one time?

It is interesting to note that bonds being sold by some of our agencies—bonds which carry the guarantee of the Government of the United States, bear a rate of interest which amounts to 6½ or 6¾ percent and oftimes are sold in denominations of $5,000. I think it is unfair.

Mr. COOK. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOK. Would the Senator agree that, even with the proposed increase in the debt limit of $12 billion, and the Government issuing notes paying 6½ or 6¾ percent, the average individual will not be able to buy them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. The buyer of a regular Government bond has to put up $1,000 at one time. If he has only $900 he has to invest it in bonds paying 4¼ percent interest.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My fourth point is to extend the surcharge at 7 percent.

When we take into consideration the $3.3 billion additional revenue from the repeal of the 7 percent investment credit and the savings that will result from a moratorium on public works the surcharge would then need only to be extended at 7 percent for fiscal 1970 instead of at the proposed 10 percent. This still means a rate of 8½ percent for calendar year 1969.

XUM

That is due to the fact that the rate would be 10 percent for the first half of the year, and with 7 percent for the last half this would make an overall 8.5 percent.

Fifth, I have suggested the inactment of a mandatory ceiling of $190 billion on Government spending for fiscal 1970.

The repeal of the investment credit and the extension of the surcharge should be accompanied by an additional section which again places a ceiling on Government expenditures for fiscal 1970. There should be a limit of not over $190 billion as compared to the $195.3 billion presented in the unified budget. This would mean a mandatory reduction of a least $5.3 billion in the projected expenditures as outlined in the budget of the last administration.

While the $3.3 billion additional revenue derived from the repeal of the investment credit along with the extension of the surcharge at the rate of 8½ percent for the calendar year 1969 is about equal to the revenue effects of the extension of the full 10 percent surcharge alone, the overall impact on the economy in controlling inflation will be much greater as a result of this combination, particularly when it is accompanied by a moratorium on all new public construction and public works projects and a mandatory ceiling on expenditures of $5.3 billion below the projected levels.

The sixth suggestion is to repeal the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

The repeal of the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term bonds will have no effect on the above-referred-to package, but the ceiling is a farce and should have been eliminated long ago. Moreover, while this ceiling has had the effect of monetizing the debt it has had no effect on holding down interest rates.

These six steps outline the minimum action which in my opinion should be taken immediately. Money is a commodity, and interest rates are the prices of that commodity in the market places; and the only way to reduce the price—or interest rate—is to reduce the demand.

I am not proposing this package as a cure-all for our financial problems. It is only the first step, and it would need to be backed up by the proper fiscal restraint as Congress considers the appropriation bills later this year. However, I am firmly convinced that congressional approval of the above-outlined package would go far toward acting as a check on this inflationary spiral. Such fiscal restraint would mean a reduction in the demand for new money, leading toward a reduction of interest rates and a leveling off of consumer prices.

It has been estimated that each 1-percent increase in the annual rate of inflation adds an additional $1 billion to the cost of operating the Government; therefore, by each 1 percent that we reduce this inflationary spiral we automatically lower the cost of Government proportionately, thereby moving toward the day when we cannot only talk of a balanced budget, but also talk of reduced taxes while at the same time, what is even more important, maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar.

Legislation dealing with tax reform to equalize more nearly our burden of taxation is long overdue, but it not being included as a part of this recommendation since it is understood that a special bill dealing with this subject will be coming over from the House of Representatives at an early date.

Mr. President, I am having drafted a proposed bill which will embrace the recommendations outlined in these six points. This bill will be introduced at a later date for referral to our committee and will be available for consideration together with the proposed extension of the 10-percent excise taxes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the following articles:

An article entitled "Outlay Boom Holds Danger," written by J. A. Livingston and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 23, 1969.

An article entitled "Business Loans Won't Slow Down," published in Business Week of March 22, 1969.

An article entitled "Investment Tax Credit," written by Paul A. Samuelson and published in this week's issue of Newsweek, wherein he concurs that the investment tax credit should be suspended.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Mar. 23, 1969]

Outlay Boom Holds Danger

(By J. A. Livingston)

The persistent rise in business expectations—the ever-increasing commitment of corporate executives to expansion—disconcerts President Nixon's economic advisers. The slowdown they hope for isn't materializing.

The recent Commerce Department-Securities and Exchange Commission data on expenditures for plant and equipment indicate a capital goods boom is in the making. Therein lurks danger.

The 15 prcent jump in planned outlays—from the fourth quarter of 1968 to the third quarter this year—can be interpreted in two ways:

1. Businessmen have now become permanently committed to inflation. They doubt that President Nixon will be willing or able to check it. At the first rise in unemployment, he'll repeat President Johnson's performance in 1966: React too soon.

Credit will be made easier. Spending will increase. Renewed expansion will reinstill faith in permanent inflation.

2. Businessmen are responding to immediate pressures. They can't produce and distribute goods fast enough to meet the needs of customers. They can't get skilled help. Therefore, they enlarge facilities and introduce labor-saving machinery.

TWO SETS OF FIGURES

But plant utilization isn't rising. According to Federal Reserve Board data, manufacturing companies are operating at 84 percent of capacity, down from nearly 91 percent in early 1966. The inference is drawn that new installations will only add to overcapacity.

Data compiled by the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School don't corroborate this entirely. They show that the decline in utilization from the 1966 high has been moderate—less than two points. Their inference is that some industries are surely pushing against an output ceiling. Therefore, expansion plans aren't an inflation hedge—a race to beat advances in cost.

Here are the two sets of figures on percentage utilization of capacity:

[In percent]

Year and quarter	FRB	Wharton School
1966:		
2d	90.8	96.3
3d	90.6	96.0
4th	90.0	95.5
1967:		
1st	87.1	94.0
2d	84.9	93.0
3d	84.1	92.6
4th	84.8	93.4
1968:		
1st	84.9	94.1
2d	84.8	93.3
3d	84.0	93.8
4th	84.2	94.4

In relation to projected plant outlays, retail sales lag. For eight months dollar volume has increased very slowly. And because of price increases, merchandise actually handled may have declined.

IT HAPPENED BEFORE

So we have these divergencies: Plant and equipment outlays are up sharply, plants operating below capacity and retail sales are traveling in a straight line.

The inference here is either retail sales must rise or industry will have more plant than it can profitably use. In that event a fall in contract awards for construction and equipment will follow. And fast. This happened in 1937–38 and in 1929. And rising interest rates—tighter credit—had an impact both times.

In 1929, the stock market got out of hand. Interest rates were forced up to check speculation.

In 1937, banks had large excess reserves. The Federal Reserve Board reduced them by raising reserve requirements. The reaction was excessive. Banks had ample excess reserves and lending capacity, but the financial and business community was in a worrisome mood.

NIXON VERSUS ROOSEVELT

That man in the White House—Franklin D. Roosevelt—wasn't regarded as friendly. The stock market collapsed. Retrenchment set in. Steel operations, for example, plummeted 56 percent from 1937 to 1938.

The mood today is quite the opposite. Businessmen are sure that President Nixon won't countenance a rise in unemployment. And investors "know" that inflation is here to stay. Bonds are bad to buy, stocks are protection.

Warnings from Washington are ignored. Tight Federal Reserve policy is looked upon as a temporary restraint which will be promptly removed when it begins to work as intended.

This worries the President's advisers. Their efforts to check a boom—to head it off from rollicking into a bust—are not taken seriously.

Will the bust they're trying to prevent be the only convincer?

[From Business Week, Mar. 22, 1969]

Business Loans Won't Slow Down— Spending Spree Goes On

Despite high-priced money and admonitions from Washington, companies are still raising capital investment plans. Competition and new technology are among the driving forces.

Despite soaring interest rates, business borrowing shows little letup. But the Federal Reserve Board still has cards to play in effort to slow economy.

Classic monetary theory holds that when money gets expensive enough, people will stop borrowing, and, in turn, reduce spending.

This week, with money more costly by far

XUM

than ever before, that bit of theory was undergoing its most severe test.

If today's super-high interest rates do knife into borrowing, then the Federal Reserve probably will win its fight to slow the economy, and the rate of inflation, without triggering a recession.

If business and consumers keep on borrowing as they have been, still more restraint—monetary and perhaps fiscal as well—will be needed. Then the financial markets could wind up in trouble, with the economy pushed into a tailspin.

At midweek, it still wasn't at all clear how things ultimately will go. So far, though it is hard to find much concrete evidence that record-high interest rates—or anything else the Fed has tried—are working out the way they are supposed to.

GOING UP

Interest rates haven't simply been moving up, they have been zooming:

Commercial banks last Monday raised their prime rate from 7% to 7½%, the fourth increase since last Dec. 2. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York led the way this time.

Bond market rates have climbed by around ¾ of 1% over the past three months, with the cost of selling a municipal bond up by more than ¼ of 1% in just two weeks.

Only Treasury bill rates have been moving down lately. But Treasury bills are a traditional haven for short-term funds when other markets turn scary—and both the stock and bond markets have looked scary lately.

LITTLE EFFECT

The Fed's tight money policy shows up in other areas as well.

The nation's money supply—demand deposits and currency—is up by 6% over a year ago. But it has risen at only a 3.5% annual rate over three months ago. A number of economists insist that changes in the money supply, not in interest rates, really determine what happens to the economy. Fed policy would seem to be restrictive by anyone's standards.

But, as a Business Week spotcheck of corporate executives shows even this degree of restraint doesn't seem to be swaying very many people.

Some borrowers have turned away from the bond markets recently. Corporations have put off at least $100-million of issues that were due to come to market in March. In the municipal bond markets, where the absence of bank buying has thrown dealers into a fret, more than $250-million worth of issues have been postponed this month.

HIGH DEMAND

Yet, the demand for bond market money continues strong; corporations still plan to sell around $800-million in bonds this month against $766-million in March, 1968. Bond dealers, moreover, figure that many of the called-off issues have merely been postponed until market conditions stabilize.

The demand for bank money continues strong—bank lending to business customers is growing at an 18% annual rate these days.

Even the mortgage market—typically the first victim of tight money—is looking perkier than most observers had expected. Housing starts still are running at a fast 1.7-million-unit annual rate. The flow of new money into savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks has slowed but not stopped as it did in 1966.

MATTER OF TIME

The situation could change, of course—and in a hurry.

The new 7½% prime rate, for instance, is largely just a reflection of the growing shortage of money at the banks. Most money market rates are higher than the banks can pay; the banking system has lost $5-billion in certificate of deposit money since early December. Banks have been borrowing heavily in the Eurodollar market. But Eurodollars are costly—around 8%—and increasingly hard to get.

Banks are trying new money-raising techniques. Morgan Guaranty, for one, has started selling participations in its loan portfolio. But the pinch is still hurting.

"Homebuilding," says a New York City bank economist, "is going to be hit. It's just a matter of time."

Already, the municipal bond market is a shambles—with rates far higher now than a great many municipalities are allowed to pay. This has developed, as one bond dealer points out, "without any significant selling of municipal bonds by the banks."

TWO WAYS OUT

Yet the Fed is far from being off the hook. Eventually the present degree of restraint probably will work through the economy, with some borrowers priced out of the marketplace and others turned away for lack of funds. But that will take time—how much time not even Fed policymakers can say.

The Fed does have a couple of avenues open to it. It has a good excuse now for again raising its discount rate—last raised on Dec. 18 from 5¼% to 5½%. As it is, the discount window is now a cheap source of money for banks; a higher discount rate would simply bring this rate in line with other short-term rates. At the same time, the Fed might raise its Regulation Q ceiling on what banks can pay for money—thus giving banks some room to compete for time deposits. A higher discount rate, without a higher Q ceiling, would really hurt the banks—forcing them to start dumping their holdings of municipal bonds in earnest.

Or the Fed could freeze hundreds of millions of dollars in bank money by raising the level of reserves banks must keep against deposits.

Scarce money, high interest rates, and government admonition apparently are not deterring business from pushing ahead with massive capital spending plans for 1969.

This is the almost unanimous conclusion drawn from talks Business Week reporters had with top executives following Monday's hike in the prime rate. And business determination to press on with big spending plans sets the stage for the great economic drama of 1969.

The quarterly capital spending survey of the Commerce Dept. and the Securities & Exchange Commission indicates that businessmen plan to boost their expenditures by 14%—and the government wants to bring that down. Mainly through tight money (page 33), the government hopes to reduce the figure to what it sees as a less inflationary and more sustainable growth—perhaps 7%.

GNP PICTURE

In contrast, executives see high capital spending as a way to fight inflation. It gives them the new technology needed to cut costs. And they feel they will have the financing no matter what is done to further tighten credit. The outcome of this war over capital spending has enormous implications for the business outlook.

Washington's expectation of a 1969 gross national product of $920-billion is based on a capital spending increase about half as big as the 14% figure now on the books. If this GNP figure proves out, profits would be about level, unemployment would rise slightly, and the rate of price increase would probably taper from its present 4½% to about 3½% by yearend.

A capital spending increase of around 14% would radically alter this picture. Total GNP would probably be close to $930-million for the year—profits would increase but unemployment would stay at its present level, and price increases wouldn't taper off at all. By the end of the year, the U.S. economy would still be in a roaring boom. The 14% capital spending increase implies a fourth-quarter GNP of about $955-billion, a full $20-billion above the fourth-quarter rate implied by the government's projections.

Plans can and do change, but judging by what companies are now saying about the firmness of their decisions, the government will have a hard time changing them.

MOTIVES

The principal motives leading companies to these decisions seem to be three: the lure of expected long-term growth, the need to economize on labor costs, and the opportunities presented by new products.

Says Harold M. Williams, chairman of the finance committee of Norton Simon, Inc.: "Historically, the capital outlays we defer turn out to be our most expensive ones. There's little to indicate the benefits of waiting."

Robert Wingerter, president of Libby-Owens-Ford Co., objects to Federal Reserve Board suggestions that high capital spending is inflationary when some capacity is idle, and says: "These figures [showing that some 17% of manufacturing capacity is now idle] are just to support the current line of propaganda. Most of the idle capacity is just not efficient. Much of the higher capital spending being forecast by manufacturers is caused by a desire to reduce costs by improving inefficient manufacturing facilities."

Says Henry G. Parks, president of H. G. Parks, Inc., "After all, there is such a thing as competition. And we're planning on a growth that will double in three years."

"Businessmen take a two-to-five year look at family formations and can't help getting pretty optimistic when they look beyond the current crop of short-range problems," says Paul Harmon, manager of economic research for Armco Steel Corp.

Scott Paper Co. plans a 10% increase in capital outlays this year, mainly to economize on labor costs. "Our plans include some labor saving equipment that might be considered marginal under slower wage increases, say about 4%," says G. L. Chamberlin, vice-president and controller. But his company is committed to a two-year labor contract that calls for 6% annual wage hikes. This helps push the decision in favor of some new projects "like automatic packing equipment which will eliminate handlers."

NEW TOOLS

For other companies, new technology, whether to cut costs or to introduce new products, is the dominant motive for spending. At Libbey-Owens-Ford, President Wingerter talks of the cost savings involved in shifting over to float processing plants for glass manufacturing "which eliminates costly grinding and polishing operations."

James F. Bere, president of Borg-Warner Corp., is scheduling a 33% increase in capital spending this year in part to update tape-controlled machine tools. The same kind of technological pressure influences Morris J. Vollmer, vice-president of finance for A. O. Smith Corp. His company plans a 30% to 40% increase in outlays this year, and most of this, says Vollmer, "is not for expansion but merely to keep abreast of advanced technology."

VITAL POINT

But whatever their motive for capital spending, big companies are agreeing on one vital point: The financing needed to carry out plans is already in the bag.

At Bucyrus-Erie Co., capital appropriations will be about one-third higher than in 1968. "Our plan is to use cash flow," says Norris K Ekstrom, vice-president of finance. "We look for sufficient payback so that cash flow will pay for capital improvement. If we do increase our debt in the process, it will be a very temporary increase." Eastman-Kodak Co. is planning a 24.8% increase for 1969. "We pay as we go," says Robert Miller, vice-president of finance at Kodak.

Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. expects to be

XUM

able to finance its spending plans out of cash flow for years to come. These plans call for a 10% hike this year and "probably 15% to 20% in 1970," says Irwin R. Hansen, vice-president of finance.

Big companies that won't be able to make it out of cash flow alone say that the outside financing they need is already lined up. O. W. Armstrong, treasurer of Phillips Petroleum Co., where capital expenditures will run "15% to 20% above last year" talks of "a revolving line of bank credit utilized off and on since 1966. We are just now getting to where we'll eventually use it all up, but it will take us into 1970."

ONE PROBLEM

With financing already in place, companies see only one serious threat to their high capital spending plans: getting caught with excess capacity in the event of a business downturn.

This is exactly the danger that is stressed by such government officials as Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Paul W. McCracken, when talking of the need for realism in business planning for a new economic environment. But companies also know that the Administration has coupled its pledge to get inflation under control with a promise that price stability won't be purchased at the expense of high unemployment.

Companies tend to think less about the short-term slowdown (needed to get inflation under control) than about the long-term high employment pledge. "Nixon is going to tighten up some, but not enough to halt inflation," says George C. Sells, president of General Shale Products Corp. "It's here to stay forever if politicians want to be re-elected."

For these reasons, a policy designed to bring inflation under control gradually tends to focus almost wholly on the capital spending plans of business.

It's just this kind of attitude that the new Administration is trying to change. When it first came to Washington two months ago, its new policy team proclaimed that fiscal restraint coupled with tight money meant that economic policy—in McCracken's words—was "on the right track." Their forecast, moreover, was for a gradual cooling of the economy.

What has happened in the two months that followed, has shaken business confidence in this outlook. Instead of slowing down from the fourth quarter, the U.S. economy has probably accelerated in the past two months. Government officials now estimate the final sales component of GNP—the best measure of total demand in the economy—will be up $20-million or more this quarter, compared to a subdued $13.3-billion rise in the final quarter of 1968.

The upgrading of capital spending plans, from a 10% rise in December to the 14% rise now reported, is the natural response to unexpectedly good business.

Clearly, companies are upgrading plans because they still have more confidence in the forces propelling the economy up than in the measures designed to rein it in.

[From Newsweek magazine]

Paul A. Samuelson on Investment Tax Credit

Inflation watchers were rocked last week by news from the SEC and Commerce Department that businessmen intend to increase their plant and equipment investments by almost 14 per cent.

The new outlook for excessive investment spending should, in my opinion, cause President Nixon to suspend the 7 per cent investment credit temporarily. Here's why:

1. The economy is still on an inflationary binge. To bring the rate of price increase down from 4 per cent toward a more moderate figure of, say, 3 per cent, some actions are going to be needed. Every weapon counts.

2. Already the Federal Reserve is being called upon to take Draconian measures to fight inflation. This will mean not only painfully higher interest rates; it will also bring in most of the discomfort associated with the money crunch of 1966—uneven rationing of credit between new and old business, growing and stagnant business, small and large business.

3. Experience demonstrates that tight money takes for its principal casualty the housing industry. When there is a scramble for more resources than the total resources available, it is right that housing should share in the restraint. But it is not, in my judgment, good national policy to have housing starts cut by 40 or 50 per cent as happened in 1966. In the 1970s, with their bumper crop of young marrieds, we shall pay in higher rents and zooming residential costs for any serious diminution of home construction in the waning years of the Vietnam war.

4. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by adding onto the present surcharge another 5 or 10 per cent tax. But I see no evidence that this would be politically popular or feasible. Nor is it clear that consumer spending is the prime villain in the present inflationary scenario.

5. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by still further tightening of the Federal Reserve money screw. And the impact of such tightness on the housing industry could be alleviated by special financial subsidies to home construction through the Federal housing agencies, through the U.S. Treasury, or through the Federal Reserve. Since all such measures will add to the nominal public debt, I don't expect that anything but tokenism would, in fact, be politically feasible in this area.

Even if it were possible to cushion the impact of tight money on residential housing, to get the same restriction of aggregate demand from enforced reductions on plant and equipment spending would, I suspect, require very high interest rates. These will cause difficulties for our partners abroad. And they may hang on to plague us in the years to come when the winds may be blowing up deflation rather than inflation.

6. In September of 1966, to alleviate the money crunch and moderate what looked like an excessive fixed investment boom, the Johnson Administration did suspend the 7 per cent investment tax credit. Almost at once relief was felt in the money markets of the country. On the whole (despite the protests of the Treasury, which naturally found it a headache), the operation seems to have been a successful one in accomplishing its purpose—namely, ensuring against an overexuberant fixed investment boom.

So historical experience, as well as the common-sense view that firms will invest less when their returns from doing so are reduced, justifies suspending the tax credit.

What are the possible arguments against suspension of the tax credit?

1. The Nixon Administration might be regarded as a pro-business Administration. Why should it take from business this accustomed source of profit?

2. Perhaps the inflationary danger is being exaggerated. Perhaps it will involve overkill if suspension of the investment tax credit reduces investment severely.

3. Vigorous growth requires as much capital formation as we can get. Adjusting to inflation by reducing investment will reduce our future capacity to produce an enlarged total of real national product.

4. It is a bad thing to use variations in the investment tax credit as a deliberate weapon of stabilization. Why? Because it is plain immoral. Because it involves discretion by government, which is wicked. Because it disturbs business planning.

5. Suspension creates administrative problems for the Treasury.

In economics, every decision involves pros and cons. Judgment is necessary. My advice to Mr. Nixon: suspend the investment tax credit.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are called upon today to once again raise the legal ceiling on the national debt. The measure before us provides for a permanent ceiling of $365 billion, as well as additional temporary borrowing authority of $12 billion. Such temporary authority would have the effect of making the limit $377 billion for fiscal 1970. The permanent limit at present stands at $358 billion, while the temporary ceiling permitted within each fiscal year is $365 billion.

During my tenure in the Senate, I have always believed that the ever-increasing obligations of this country should be comported with apparent fiscal responsibility. As long as we operate our Federal Government under the national debt concept I think it wise that we conform, whenever possible, to ceiling limits. However, it is not my belief that the need for fiscal responsibility can, or should, supercede the need for social and economic responsibility. And that I believe to be the issue here today. I have no desire to see this country put in a position where it cannot meet its just monetary obligations. But neither do I wish to see this Government renege on its patently more important obligation to the daily wage earner who today is beset on all sides by debilitating inflation.

I cannot endorse a measure which would have the effect of allowing the Federal Government to meet its obligations with procedural ease while ignoring the very real economic problems that are today faced by the vast majority of our citizens. What solace can be found in this bill for the low- and middle-income Americans who are plagued by rising prices on essentials and soaring interest rates? What encouragement can be discovered for the small businessman who finds himself increasingly belabored by the effects of inflation? Where in this measure lies hope for our elderly who must oftentimes make do on fixed incomes which are now being eaten into by cancerous inflation? The simple answer is that this bill does not afford relief to those who are most seriously in need of it. Rather it allows our Government to routinely meet what is viewed as its fiscal obligation while effectively ignoring the all too obvious economic ills which afflict most of our citizens. There can, in fact, be very little doubt that this measure, providing as it does the prerequisite to an increase in governmental spending, will contribute directly to an acceleration in the inflationary trend. Not only will an absolute increase in Federal spending contribute significantly to the problem but now the Federal Government itself is forced by the Federal Reserve Board to pay higher interest rates for the money that it must borrow in order to fund an increase in governmental operations. Thus, a cause and effect relationship is established; for the Government, in order to meet the demands of an inflationary society, is forced to borrow money as a prelude to increased spending. These funds can be obtained however, only at exorbitant interest rates which have resulted from the institution of improvident Federal monetary policy. Needless to say, this increase in interest rates, while it might very well deter a middle-aged couple from buying their first home because mortgage rates are too high, will not prevent the Government from obtaining additional funds regardless of the cost.

I would, Mr. President, be inclined to cast my vote for this measure, albeit reluctantly, if there were some definite assurance from the administration that it would soon take constructive steps to remedy the obvious inequities in our tax structure. It has been conservatively estimated that $6 billion is lost each year through the use of legal, but inequitable, tax avoidance devices. Yet in the hearings before the Committee on Finance I asked this very question, and they specifically indicated that whatever tax reforms are to be proposed, if any, certainly cannot hope to be acted upon this year.

Certainly the additional revenue that would be brought in upon an implementation of reform measures would go far to slow the inflationary trend. It is too much, then, that a quid pro quo be asked of the Executive? If it is true that one reason the national debt is so high is because billions of dollars in potential tax revenue are lost through tax loopholes each year, it would appear most reasonable that these loopholes be eliminated now.

As well, there is no doubt in my mind that very considerable reductions could be made in the budget for fiscal 1970. It is undeniable that execessive governmental spending is in large part responsible for the inflation that we labor under today. Last year, when the budget for fiscal 1969 was under our consideration, I proposed reductions in spending which amounted to more than $7 billion. I expect that like reductions could be made in the budget for fiscal 1970 without compromising either our defense posture of necessary domestic programs. Military expenditures in particular should come under close scrutiny. The current debate over the proposed ABM system is, I think, indicative of an inquisitive mood that has influenced the thinking of many of us in the Senate. Previously sacrosanct areas in the budget are sure to be more carefully considered in this session of Congress. It is to be expected that reductions in governmental spending, especially in the defense area, would have the salutary effect of stemming inflation. This would be true even if the funds so saved were in part, diverted into nonmilitary domestic programs.

What I have said so far necessarily presupposes that certain monetary and fiscal policies first instituted by the Johnson administration, and since confirmed and made more rigorous by the present administration, are not having their intended effect. And that I believe to be the case. I have seen no concrete evidence that these economic controls have begun to take hold, the feeble protestations of the administration's spokesmen, notwithstanding. President Nixon announced yesterday that he will request an extension of the 10-percent surcharge. Yet there is no significant indication that the surcharge device has been effective in curbing consumer spending.

In fact, all indications are to the contrary. At the same time President Nixon was announcing his intention to ask for a surtax extension, the Labor Department was releasing its consumer price index figures for February. The index for February indicates that consumer prices continued rising last month at the fastest rate in 17 years, rising four-tenths of 1 percent. Mr. Arnold Chase, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in commenting on this increase made what must surely be a classic understatement when he said:

> The effects of the fiscal restraints have been delayed longer than most people expected.

Mr. Chase commented further that it was the homeowner who was hardest hit by this increase for he now pays more for everything from mortgage payments to babysitter fees.

The Federal Reserve Board but recently once again raised the prime interest rate to an historic high, but where is the indication that its tight money policy is slowing down the economy? It is abundantly clear that capital investment by business is a major cause of worsening inflation, but where is there any indication that the rate of industrial expansion is being restricted?

In short, it is my belief that the current fiscal and monetary policies of this administration are both unwise and unworkable. They have affected most seriously those elements in our society that are least able to shoulder the additional economic burden imposed by these policies, while leaving the Federal Government and big business relatively unrestricted.

Mr. President, this measure, and the action to be taken thereupon, presents us with a most crucial question And that is, What are our national priorities to be? Must we favor fiscal responsibility at the expense of social and economic responsibility? Will we furnish the key for an increase in governmental spending that will in time further exacerbate our problems of inflation with the result that the economic position of the low- and middle-income wage earner is further compromised? Or will we demand that the National Government impose appropriate spending restraints upon itself before we consent to increasing the debt limit? As well, should we not require that the President indicate his intention to more efficiently restrict industrial expansion, before we endorse a measure that will surely contribute to an increase in the rate of industrial development?

In the absence of such assurances, I am unable to give my support to this measure. I want to make it perfectly clear that there are two points before us today. They are the surtax and the debt limit.

I opposed the imposition of the surtax and said then that I thought it would not work. It has not worked. It has been one of the chief fuels that have inflated our economy.

There is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the surtax has made the slightest contribution toward reducing inflation.

When the proposal was first brought up it was said that the measure was necessary to bring down the cost of living.

The cost of living is now at an all-time high, and the 10-percent surtax has actually added to our problem.

It was said at the time the measure was before Congress that it would hold down interest rates. Yet, interest rates are now at an historic high.

It was said then that if we were to pass the surtax, it would not be necessary to come back to Congress during the period of the imposition of the surtax and ask for an additional increase in the debt limit. Yet, here we are doing exactly that. And the chairman of the Finance Committee is arguing on behalf of the Republican administration that we should give them this advantage.

The ranking member of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), is really saying that the present administration has not done all of the things that he recommended last year, and for which he criticized the Johnson administration.

I think we should bypass the entire matter. I do not think we would have to forfeit on our obligations.

It would be a tight squeeze. However, we are on a monetary merry-go-round. Someone will have to get us off that merry-go-round.

The Government will get its money at whatever price it has to pay.

Big business will get its money, and it will pay whatever it has to pay.

Of course, the interest payment is deductible. That means that, to that extent, the money they would have to pay the Federal Government would be reduced. Therefore, the Government itself will pay the cost of the interest paid by big business.

That is of no benefit to us. But what about the little man? What about the small wage earner? What about those people that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) was talking about? What about the people on social security? What about the person who finds out that he has a lower standard of living than he had a year ago in spite of the fact that his wages have been increased? That man finds that he has a significantly lower income even with the increase in wages. There has been an increase in taxes, an increase in social security tax, and an increase in the cost of living. That man has less left now than when he started out last year.

As far as services are concerned, hospital costs are increasing. Any claim that we can reduce the cost and the demand for hospital services by continuing the surtax is fallacious. Those costs are not based upon the law of demand and supply. We cannot keep people from going in the hospitals when they are sick.

The question which must be determined and which we must face is whether we are going to close hospitals in New York City, for example, because cities can no longer raise the money to pay the bills. Are we going to close schools, as they did in Youngstown, Ohio, because they could no longer pay for the schools? Are they going to refuse to build any additional schools, to pay teachers' salaries, and to pay for garbage collection and all of the other expenses borne by local governments?

That is the issue, plus the overriding fact that we are spending between $3.5 and $4 million an hour to pay for a war in Vietnam which this country has been promised would be brought to an end. I would like to follow the leadership of my chairman and vote to extend the debt limit. I am certain that the debt limit will be extended by the $12 billion. However, I think it is a mistake.

We should have some guidelines as to where the country is going. People want to know where the country is going. They should be told. They should be told before we act, for we cannot turn the clock back.

Mr. President, I am going to do my best to make my voice heard by voting against an increase of the debt limit.

(The following colloquy, which occurred during the address by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Williams) is printed, by unanimous consent, at this point in the Record.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I commend the Senator from Delaware for the great service he has performed in analyzing the budget left by the Johnson administration and also in presenting what I consider to be a sensible program for controlling inflation. Today, as on many other occasions, the distinguished Senator from Delaware has pointed out the importance of keeping some sensible control on the number of Federal employees.

Not too long after I first came to the Congress, in 1956, I had occasion, while I was a member of the other body, and when it was considering an agricultural appropriation bill, to offer an amendment that at no time should the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture be allowed to exceed the number of farmers in America.

Since that amendment was offered, we have kept track of what has happened to the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture and what has happened to the number of farmers in America. One of my constituents, who does an excellent job of research, provided me with the latest figures. I think they would be interesting figures to insert in the Record.

In 1956 there were 7,869,000 farmers in America, and there were 89,398 employees in the Department of Agriculture.

In 1969, the number of farmers had gone down from 7,869,000 to 4,638,000—a 41-percent decrease in the number of farmers in America. But the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture has increased. There are now 212,113 employees in the Department of Agriculture, or an increase of 137 percent.

He has put it in other terms. In 1956 there were 88 farmers for every employee in the Department of Agriculture, and today there are only 22 farmers for every employee in the Department of Agriculture.

Perhaps at the time the amendment was offered, it may not have seemed important, but we are gradually approaching the time when that amendment may be needed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. I am wondering whether some groups are not finding it more profitable to cultivate the Federal Treasury than to cultivate the farm. Perhaps we had better examine the situation to see if their services are needed as badly as they say. Last year we incorporated a provision in the Expenditure Control Act which would provide some rollback in the number of Federal employees. I think it is high time that we take some action to bring the costs of this Government under control so we can live within the income, not of the Government's but of the taxpayers' who have to pay the bill. We are certainly living beyond what they can afford at the present time.

(This marks the end of the colloquy which occurred during the address by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Williams), and which was ordered to be printed in the Record at this point.)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it seems to me that the debt limitation is a tool—one of several tools—which can be useful in attempting to bring under control our uncontrolled Government spending. Let us look back for a moment to see how the national debt has been increased and by what amounts in recent years.

During the 8 years of the Truman administration—8 years minus 3 months—the national debt increased by $33 billion. During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, the national debt increased by $23 billion.

That brings us to the 8 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations. During that period of time, the national debt increased by $70 billion.

It was in June 1967, when Congress approved an increase of $22 billion in the debt ceiling. On the floor of the Senate, in 1 day, the Senate approved what the House had previously approved—an increase of $22 billion in the debt ceiling. I suggested on the floor of the Senate that day that that was taking the lid off Government spending; that that was saying, in effect, to the departments of Government, to the President, and to Congress, "The lid is off, boys. Hold your hats. Here we go again."

I say that that action by the Senate, and previously by the House of Representatives, in June 1967, did a great deal toward bringing about a $25 billion deficit for the last fiscal year of our Government. I say that that action by the Senate and House of Representatives, advocated by the President, added billions of dollars to the cost of Government and took billions of dollars or lifted billions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

That brings us to the pending proposed legislation.

I do not contend that all our problems can be solved by a tight debt ceiling. I do believe, however, that the debt ceiling is a tool—one of several useful tools—that must be used if we are to control the uncontrollable Government spending. In the latter part of February, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury made two requests of Congress: first, that the money which the Government borrows from trust funds be eliminated from the national debt limitation; second, that the debt ceiling be increased by $17 billion. I opposed both of those recommendations before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Were Congress to approve the administration's request for changing the computation of the debt, the Government would be permitted to spend $40 billion more than it takes in during the next 4 years, without the additional deficit being subject to debt limitation. Think of that, Mr. President. Were the original proposal approved, the proposal submitted by Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy, the Government during the next 4 years could spend $40 billion more than it takes in, and that amount would not be subject to the debt limitation.

Fortunately, the Committee on Ways and Means, next the House of Representatives, and yesterday the Senate Committee on Finance refused to remove trust-fund borrowing from the debt limitation. I applaud this action. I am also pleased that the House itself and the Senate Committee on Finance have reduced the proposed ceiling increase by $5 billion.

I recognize that a good case can be made for some increase in the ceiling. I recognize that; although the Secretary of the Treasury himself testified that by using the $4 billion cash operating balance he could get by without any increase in the debt ceiling during the next few months. But I could support a reasonable increase. I do not, however, approve raising the ceiling by $12 billion.

Estimates prepared by the Treasury Department itself indicate and make clear—I assume their estimates are correct—that it would be March 15, 1970—next year—before the public debt would reach $374 billion, which is $3 billion below what the new ceiling contemplates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the projected figures contained in the committee report on page 3.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED PUBLIC DEBT SUBJECT TO PRESENT LIMITATION (BASED ON CONSTANT MINIMUM OPERATING CASH BALANCE OF $4,000,000,000) FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

(With and without a $3,000,000,000 contingency allowance)

[In billions]

	Operating cash balance (excluding free gold)	Public debt subject to limitation	Public debt subject to limitation with $3,000,000,000 contingency allowance
Fiscal year 1969:			
Mar. 31	$4.0	$362.1	$365.1
Apr. 15	4.0	367.2	370.2
Apr. 30	4.0	356.9	359.9
May 15	4.0	361.1	364.1
May 31	4.0	361.9	364.9
June 15	4.0	362.7	365.7
June 30	4.0	354.6	357.6

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED PUBLIC DEBT SUBJECT TO PRESENT LIMITATION (BASED ON CONSTANT MINIMUM OPERATING CASH BALANCE OF $4,000,000,000) FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970—Continued

(With and without a $3,000,000,000 contingency allowance)

[In billions]

	Operating cash balance (excluding free gold)	Public debt subject to limitation	Public debt subject to limitation with $3,000,000,000 contingency allowance
Fiscal year 1970:			
July 15	$4.0	$359.4	$362.4
July 31	4.0	358.3	361.3
Aug. 15	4.0	362.8	365.8
Aug. 31	4.0	363.3	366.3
Sept. 15	4.0	367.6	370.6
Sept. 30	4.0	360.6	363.6
Oct. 15	4.0	365.9	368.9
Oct. 31	4.0	366.0	369.0
Nov. 15	4.0	370.7	373.7
Nov. 30	4.0	368.4	371.4
Dec. 15	4.0	373.3	376.3
Dec. 31	4.0	366.6	369.6
Jan. 15	4.0	371.7	374.7
Jan. 31	4.0	367.3	370.3
Feb. 15	4.0	370.2	373.2
Feb. 28	4.0	368.7	371.7
Mar. 15	4.0	374.0	377.0
Mar. 31	4.0	369.5	372.5
Apr. 15	4.0	373.7	376.7
Apr. 30	4.0	365.4	368.4
May 15	4.0	370.6	373.6
May 31	4.0	369.2	372.2
June 15	4.0	368.3	371.3
June 30	4.0	361.4	364.4

Source: Treasury Department.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not deal with the contingency fund for two reasons. First, the Government holds $4 billion as a cash operating balance. Second, what is a contingency? If there should be a contingency, if emergencies should occur, the administration can then come to Congress and seek whatever change is necessary as a result of the emergencies or the contingencies.

But if we take the administration's own figures, it will be a year from now—March 1970—before the national debt will reach $374 billion. Yet today the proposal is to put the ceiling at $377 billion.

Mr. President, I am convinced that if significant economy efforts are made, and these economy efforts have been promised, there is no need for a $12 billion increase in the debt limitation.

While many people may scoff at the debt ceiling, it serves several useful purposes. As I mentioned before, it is a tool, one of several tools, to help keep Government spending under control and to help keep the pressure on Congress, the President, the executive branch, and department heads to hold down the swollen Government spending.

The debt ceiling serves another good purpose. It focuses public attention every time the President has to come to Congress and ask for an increase in the debt ceiling. It focuses public attention on the fact that the Government is not living within its income. It focuses public attention on the need to set our financial house in order. I think the debt ceiling serves a good purpose.

Mr. President, somehow we must get Government spending under control. The people who are being hurt most by this inflationary spiral are those people in the low-income brackets and in the middle-income brackets because the majority of the personal income taxes paid into our Government are paid by those who earn $15,000 or less.

It has not been many days—only 2 weeks ago—since the prime interest rate went to 7.5 percent, the highest interest rate in over 100 years. I contend that a major reason for that increase is all of the Government borrowing, the competition of Government to borrow more and more funds, and individuals and businesses must compete with the Government in this regard. Unless firm steps are taken to curb inflation, the housewife's dollar will buy less and less. I do believe that those housewives who will go to the market every Thursday, or Friday, or Saturday, and try to make purchases, realize without having a lot of statistics thrown at them, just what has happened to the purchasing power of the dollar.

However, to use the statistics, for every $20 bill that an individual had a year ago, that $20 bill is now worth $19; or to state it another way, that $20 bill will buy goods to the tune of $19.

Now, the more we raise the debt limit the more leeway we give all branches of Government to spend in tax funds. To me, a very significant figure in the budget is the interest on the national debt. That interest which is under consideration by Congress, is $16 billion. The Director of the Budget testified that during fiscal 1970 that figure will be increased by a half-billion dollars, or, to put it another way, $500 million.

In the upcoming budget beginning July 1, the interest on the national debt—just the interest—will be $16.5 billion. To put that figure in perspective, the interest on the national debt for fiscal year 1968 was $13.7 billion. So between 1968 and the fiscal year 1970 there has been an increase in interest alone of almost $3 billion. There has been an increase in interest alone of 20 percent.

I suggest, Mr. President, that our country is in a very difficult financial situation. I think the President and Congress must jointly face up to this problem. I say it is a joint responsibility. Congress cannot say to the President, "You hold down expenses." The President cannot say to Congress, "You hold down expenses." We have to do it together; we have to work together; we have to cooperate if we are going to get our financial problems under control.

I am discouraged and disappointed that the President would ask or that Congress would grant an increase at one time of $12 billion in the debt ceiling. I say again that I could support a reasonable increase but I do not think the $12 billion is a reasonable increase. I do not think it is justified and I think it tends to take the lid off of Government spending.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote in the negative when the proposal comes before the Senate to increase the debt limit by $12 billion.

HIGH UINTA WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I introduced a bill to establish the High Uinta Wilderness Area in Utah, recommended for such designation by the U.S. Forest Service under the provisions of the Wilderness Act passed in 1965.

However, I deleted from the proposal the Forest Service has sent to the Congress one area—area D, totaling 102,000 acres—because planning has not been completed for the Ute Indian unit of the central Utah project, and it may be found necessary to build some of the project works in the area proposed for wilderness designation, or some of the water from one of the reservoirs may back up into the proposed area. I have indicated that if and when it is determined that structures of reservoirs in area D are not essential to Utah's water resource development, I have no objection to adding it to the High Uinta Wilderness Area.

The Deseret News, distinguished Salt Lake City daily, supports my efforts, and recently published an editorial which makes my case very well for me. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which appeared on March 11, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LARGE SHOULD UINTA WILDERNESS BE?

There's no question that Congress ought to designate the High Uinta Mountains, a region of supreme beauty and great natural value, as a Wilderness Area.

Here is a region that contains what is not only the highest mountain range in Utah but also the most prominent east-west range in the nation. Some 650,000 people live within 100 airplane miles of the proposed Wilderness Area, which contains more than 1,000 species of plants, some of which are found only there. More than 500 lakes are scattered throughout the area. At the same time, the timber is so hard to get at it would be difficult to harvest, and geologists report little or no prospects for commercial mining development.

Unless this area is granted wilderness status by 1974, it will revert from a primitive area back to ordinary forest land, and no one wants that to happen. (Primitive areas are being dropped as a designation in favor of the increased protection and more permanent status that goes with being designated by Congress as a wilderness area.)

The only question, then, is how big the proposed High Uintas Wilderness Area should be.

If the Forest Service had its way, nearly 323,000 acres in Ashley and Wasatch national forests would be set aside as wilderness. That's the recommendation the service made on the basis of field studies with the Department of Agriculture and following public hearings.

But the eastern 102,000 acres, referred to as Unit D, includes water needed for the Central Utah Project. That's why Sen. Frank Moss recently introduced a bill that would designate the High Uintas Wilderness Area but omit Unit D until the needs of the Central Utah Project can be pinned down.

The Forest Service takes exception to this approach on the grounds that the law already permits the President to authorize construction of reservoirs or water conservation facilities within a Wilderness Area if the public interest requires it.

But Utahns still remember how an executive order promised that extension of Dinosaur National Monument would in no way inhibit construction of Echo Park Dam, but the dam was still blocked by conservationists.

In resolving the dispute, Utahns need to know how many reservoirs are really needed in the area, how big they would have to be, and how much road-building and other excavation would have to be done that would gouge the landscape.

For more than two years now, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has been making a study that will help answer those very questions. At the latest, the study is due to be completed by the end of the year, but this week the bureau indicated the findings might be available as soon as early autumn.

Since we've all waited this long on the High Uinta Wilderness Area, a few more months shouldn't matter. With all the facts available, it may very well be possible to harmonize water and wilderness in Unit D instead of having them compete for preference.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Reclamation should expedite its study so that the wilderness proposal, in one form or another, can go forward as soon as possible.

S. 1689—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ENTITLED "TOY SAFETY ACT OF 1969"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Toy Safety Act of 1969. This bill will amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act so that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have the authority to preclude dangerously designed toys or other articles intended for children's use from the marketplace.

Recent hearings before the National Commission on Product Safety brought to light certain inadequacies in existing law. Certain dangerous toys are now on the market only because the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare lacks the authority under current statutes to block their sale. The hearings before the Commission revealed the seriousness of this problem; an alarming number of seemingly harmless toys were found to gravely endanger the health and safety of unsuspecting children.

For example, examination showed that when a "roly poly doll" was dropped it broke apart, revealing a series of frighteningly menacing horizontal spikes which could impale an unwary child. Another dangerous toy is a children's stove which, according to information given to the Commission, reaches temperatures higher than those achieved by stoves in the kitchens of our homes; a child who escaped serious electric shock while plugging the stove into a 120-volt wall socket would continue to be unknowingly subject to a threat of severe burns.

Mr. Morris Kaplan of Consumers Union told the Product Safety Commission about the Zulu gun:

> The Zulu Gun's dart can't be inhaled if the child puts the mouthpiece to his mouth. But it is easy to confuse the mouthpiece and muzzle ends . . . If the child put the muzzle end to his lips and took a breath, inhaling the dart would be difficult to avoid.

Mr. Kaplan went on to point out that there were 13 Zulu gun injuries reported in the Philadelphia area alone; in 11 of these cases darts had to be removed from the lungs of victims.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to ignore the health and safety of our children; rather, it is our responsibility to protect them to the fullest possible extent from injury. Education constitutes a valuable form of protection, but education alone is an inadequate response to the severity of the problem before us. Small children cannot read warning labels, and they cannot be constantly supervised by parents. Furthermore, parents themselves are not always aware of the dangers presented by poorly designed or manufactured toys.

Safety in design is an absolute essential element of consumer protection, particularly when the consumer is a child. The necessary safety in design must cover both the intended use and the foreseeable use, and, as all parents know, foreseeable use as applied to children's toys covers a very broad and imaginative spectrum.

Experience has shown that safety in toy design cannot be effectively achieved through a system of voluntary standards. According to testimony received by the Product Safety Commission, present voluntary standards do not address themselves to electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards; furthermore, in those areas where there is activity, progress has been painfully slow. The record indicates that safety in toy design will not be achieved unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is given authority to review the electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards of toys or articles intended for use by children. The Toy Safety Act of 1969 is intended to achieve that objective.

The Toy Safety Act would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act by adding to the Secretary's list of criteria for the banning of toys or other items intended for children's use the criteria of electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards. These additional criteria will permit the Secretary to evaluate the all-important design characteristics of toys and other items intended for use by children. I am confident that this procedure will result in more adequate protection of the health and safety of our children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Dec. 19, 1968]

STIFF TOY LAWS URGED

(By Bill McCaffrey)

A call for strict federal regulation of the toy industry was made yesterday by a Boston attorney who demonstrated the potential dangers of a group of toys now on the market before the National Committee on Product Safety at the John F. Kennedy Federal Building.

Atty. Edward M. Swartz, author of the "truth in lending" law and an authority on consumer protection, exhibited a cloth tunnel that was flammable, stoves that attained 660 degrees that a child cooks and bakes on, a jet with sharp edges, electric irons and mixers as examples of a host of toys hazardous to children.

Atty. Swartz, hired by the Commission on Product Safety to prepare a report on unsafe toys, said there must be some centralized authority which can supervise and check toys prior to the time they are marketed.

The Commission on Products Safety is holding three days of hearings on hazardous household items.

Atty. Swartz told the commissioners that the toy industry has been unable to eliminate dangerous toys from the market. He described "real life" electric toys as potentially deadly because they use household current.

"It is doubtful that electric toys for children should ever use electric current rather than safer forms of current," Atty. Swartz said.

He also charged that advertising copy for toys is "at times misleading, inadequate and unsafe—it has led some to conclude that the minds of our young are being raped."

Swartz recommended that the Commission launch a study and investigation of the toy industry, both domestic and foreign.

Atty. Aaron Locker, legal counsel for the Toy Manufacturers of America, took issue with Swartz' position, saying the industry preferred to develop safety standards without the mandate of legislation.

He said, "When somebody sits back and takes pot shots at the industry with a few toys he is doing the industry an injustice."

He told the Commission that the two and a half billion dollar industry "has taken the lead in developing safety standards."

Earlier, William G. Cole of Shelbourne Falls told the Commission that his nine-year-old son Ronald was part blinded in one eye last July by an exploding cap device advertised as harmless.

Dr. Carl C. Clark, chief of the Commission's task force for industrial self regulation, showed slow motion pictures of the device that injured the Cole boy traveling at a speed of 54 miles an hour when exploded by the cap.

Morris Kaplan, technical director of Consumer's Union, demonstrated the dangers of a toy "Zulu" blow gun now being sold.

Kaplan said some children armed the plastic pellet with needles, making the toy a "dangerous weapon." He said young children were endangered by the toy because they sometimes put the wrong end of the toy into their mouths and inhaled the pellet.

Federal laws on hazardous substances do not cover electric shock, burns, or cuts and punctures, Kaplan said.

"Toys with such hazards may be found in the marketplace." He called for stricter regulations.

The hearing continues today on the dangers of refrigerators in the home.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1968]

UNSAFE CRIBS HARM BABIES, GROUP TOLD

(By Morton Mintz)

BOSTON, MASS., December 17.—Federal safety investigators heard testimony today that baby cribs of unsafe design are sold throughout the Nation even though an estimated 200 infants a year strangle in their cribs.

One of the day's witnesses, the Rev. John R. Dryer, pastor of Covenant Presbyterian Church in Wellsville, Ohio, is the father of a victim.

He told the National Commission on Product Safety how, at the age of 1 year and 17 days, his first child Johnny, strangled in a crib.

The actual crib in which his son perished—placed on a table in a hearing room—was used by the Rev. Mr. Dryer to demonstrate how he believed the infant's throat had become locked between the lid and the side. As he described the tragedy, the cause was a long metal hinge so constructed that the more his infant son tried to pull away, the tighter it clamped the lid and side on his throat.

The manufacturer, one of the largest in the field, is Trimble Products, Inc., of Southern Pines, N.C. It has showrooms in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, San Francisco and Seattle. The slogan on its catalogue, the Commission was told, is "Since 1912. Your baby's health, safety and comfort . . . our only business."

The president of the firm, W. J. Donovan, rejected written and phoned invitations to appear. He wrote the Commission last Tuesday, "We will not able to testify . . ." The makers of an almost identical crib, the Jackson Furniture Co., of Jackson, Tenn., also was urged to appear, but made no response.

The Commission is holding three days of hearings under a directive from Congress to develop effective means to protect consumers from unreasonable hazards in products used in around the household.

The seven-member agency, created 13 months ago, is particularly concerned about hazards to infants and children, because accidents are the chief cause of death among them. In the age 15-and-under group alone, accidents take more than 15,000 lives a year.

Testifying at the new John F. Kennedy Government Center, the Ohio minister urged adoption of Federal safety standards for baby furniture. He told Commission Chairman Arnold B. Elkind that when he pleaded with Trimble Products either to make the "Kiddie Koop" safe or stop selling it, the firm responded only with "sympathy." He then sued, finally settling out of court for $15,000.

Two other witnesses testified that Johnny Dryer's death was not a freak one.

Dr. Brian B. Blackbourne of Miami, Fla., assistant medical examiner of Dade County, said in November 1965—only 3½ weeks before Johnny died in the New Orleans suburbs of Metarie—the 9-month-old son of a Coral Gables policeman died in identical fashion.

The primary sales feature of the Trimble and Jackson cribs is that they protect the occupant from mosquitoes and other insects with the web and a fine cloth mesh on the sides. But Schott emphasized that other makes offered the same advantage without hazards. He showed a picture of one which uses a zipper to secure a mesh top and has no hinges.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 26, 1968]

Take a Close Second Look at Those Gift Toys

(By Yvonne Horton)

Take a careful look at the toys your child received for Christmas. Even baby dolls may not be completely safe, according to Edward M. Swartz, a Boston attorney reporting to the President's National Commission on Product Safety. The commission held public hearings in Boston just before Christmas.

Mr. Swartz displayed a cuddle doll packaged in a box with a clear plastic window on top. The purchaser of such a doll might be unaware of how its dainty hair ribbon is attached. The one Mr. Swartz displayed had a huge straight pin thrust directly into the doll's head. He pointed out that, when the hair ribbon was pulled off, the attached pin would be dangerous to a small child.

A similar inch-long pin "with a handle that made it easily removable" had been previously called to the attention of the commission by a mother in Downey, Calif.

Another hazard to small "pretend mamas" was brought to the Boston hearing by Morris Kaplan, technical director of Consumers' Union. He displayed a tiny doll with flexible arms and legs. Protective plastic covering heavy wires inside the doll's anatomy had broken with the result that a sharp wire protruded from its hand.

The commission had previously received a complaint from a mother in Lexington, Mass., who gave her 16-month-old son a new doll. In a few moments, she reported, he had removed the legs exposing "three-inch spikes." After investigation by the National Commission on Product Safety, the doll was voluntarily removed from the market by its distributor.

The representative of Consumers' Union was not optimistic about the disposition of manufacturers to remove hazardous toys from the market. Mr. Kaplan said that many dangerous toys are identified in Consumer Reports magazine; but "as a rule, most products are not modified or taken off the market."

One toy Mr. Kaplan brought to the hearing was a small blow gun, or Zulu gun. He pointed out that one hazard of such a toy is that the muzzle and the mouthpiece are easily confused. A child who puts the muzzle in his mouth by mistake can inhale an inch-long plastic dart. The situation is further complicated if a child thrusts a pin through the soft plastic to create a spear from the dart.

Mr. Kaplan estimated that four to six million such blow guns have been distributed in the United States. Commenting about the one displayed at the hearing, he said, "I bought this two weeks ago. The cost is 10 cents."

Also displayed by Mr. Swartz and Mr. Kaplan were various plug-in housekeeping toys—miniature electric ovens, irons, and corn poppers—described as potential shock or burn hazards, especially when used unsupervised and by younger children.

The price of miniature ovens was said to vary from about $8 to in excess of $20. Mr. Swartz commented, "These are not low-priced toys."

In its effort to protect the American consumer from unnecessary injury from hazardous products used in the home, the commission wishes to be informed about potentially dangerous toys, identifying the toy and manufacturer by name. It urges: "Anyone aware of incidents involving unsafe products used in and around the home should write to the National Commission on Product Safety, Washington, D.C. 20036."

The bill (S. 1689) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1689

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Toy Safety Act of 1969."

Sec. 2 (a) Section 2(f)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 (f)(1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(D) Any toy or other article intended for use by children which the Secretary finds pursuant to the provisions of section 2(q)(1) of this Act meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) (iii) or (iv) of such section."

(b) The matter preceding the semicolon in clause (A) of section 2(q)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1151 (2) (q) (1) (A)) is amended to read as follows: "(A) any toy, or other article intended for use by children, which, pursuant to a determination made by the Secretary (i) is a hazardous substance, or (ii) bears or contains a hazardous substance in such manner as to be susceptible of access by a child to whom such toy or other article is entrusted, or (iii) is otherwise hazardous because of the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, or (iv) may cause substantial personal injury or substantial illness by, during, or as a result of foreseeable use of the toy or article, even if unintended by the manufacturer, where such injury or illness is attributable to electrical, mechanical, or thermal aspects of the design, processing, or assembly of that toy or article.

(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) The term 'electrical' means of or pertaining to the flow of an electrical charge or to electrons in motion; the term 'electrical hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness from electric shock or electrocution may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use.

"(s) The term 'mechanical' means of or pertaining to the design construction or structure of a substance; the term 'mechanical hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use because of sharp surfaces or protrusions, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, or other mechanical means."

"(t) The term 'thermal' means of or pertaining to the transfer or manifestation of heat energy; the term 'thermal hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use of articles: (1) which contain heated surfaces; or (2) which if ignited burn so intensely that (A) extremely high temperatures are reached, or (B) they cannot be readily extinguished by means ordinarily at hand."

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 3. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to support the request of the President of the United States that the permanent debt ceiling be increased to $365 billion, and the temporary ceiling during fiscal 1970 set at $377 billion.

And I would urge my Democratic colleagues to demonstrate the same nonpartisan attitude which they have displayed historically, to such requests from both Republican and Democratic Presidents. I think that we, on both sides of the aisle should answer the request of President Nixon by passing this measure

XUM

today. President Nixon has indicated that the temporary increase of $12 billion in the debt ceiling is "of the highest importance." Further, he has indicated that "if the present ceiling of $365 billion were not raised, we would be extremely hard pressed to meet the Government's obligations in April, and in the last quarter of this calendar year the projected resources, in the light of seasonal peaking of financial obligations, would be patently inadequate."

Mr. President, we know that all Senators, from time to time, may change their minds on any given issue. But I thought it would be interesting for the Senate to take a cursory glance at the votes of the Members of the Senate over the past 10 years on the question of the debt limit increase.

In 1958, Mr. President, there were three votes in the Senate dealing with the request of President Eisenhower to increase the public debt limit. On those three votes, an average of 78 percent of the Republican Senators supported President Eisenhower's request. The record of the Democratic Members of the Senate was nearly as good, with an average of 73 percent supporting that request.

In 1960, Mr. President, there were four votes on this same question. The average Republican support went up to 89 percent. There were no defections among the Republicans on final passage and passage of the conference report, with 100 percent supporting President Eisenhower, 4 months before election day in 1960. In that year, the Democratic support of the Republican administration was 65 percent.

Now, Mr. President, an interesting glance at what happened in 1962, when President Kennedy requested an increase in the temporary debt limit. With the same type of explanation, Mr. President, which President Nixon has made now, in support of his request, President Kennedy sought Republican votes. The record reveals, however, that the minority supported him only an average of 25 percent in votes considering that request. Some contrast, Mr. President. I would say that if President Nixon does not draw better support from the Republican Members of the Senate, today, than President Kennedy did in 1962, this measure may not pass.

In a request made by President Kennedy in May of 1963 for temporary increases in the debt limit, an average of only 27 percent of the Republican Members of the Senate supported the President on five test votes. In similar votes at different times in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, Republican support of the requests of President Johnson varied from 50 percent, to 43 percent, to zero percent, to 53 percent, to 50 percent, to zero percent, to 20 percent, to 17 percent, to 23 percent, to 20 percent to 50 percent, averaging only 29 percent.

I do not want to embarrass my Republican colleagues by calling their individual voting records to the attention of the Senate, but the average percentages of support which have been given to the President of the United States when he has asked for increases in the national debt has indicated some partisan tendency.

Of course, one can understand, Mr. President, that the attitude of a Member of Congress might change somewhat, depending upon the occupant of the White House. The distinguished leader of the minority in the other body was quoted in the press recently as saying:

> Republican reaction is different because of the fact that we now have faith in the Administration concerning fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, in my opinion, this increase is required for orderly conduct of the Government business. The Treasury is now operating too close to the current ceiling of $365 billion for sound debt management purposes. On March 14 of this year, the cash balance was only 0.3 of a billion dollars; according to the Treasury, its minimum operating cash balance should be $4 billion.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the failure of Congress to provide for an increase in the permanent and temporary debt ceilings would be a serious error and an unfortunate departure from responsibility.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am not aware of requests from any other Senator for time to discuss this issue. I have indicated that I intend to insist upon the rule of germaneness during the 3-hour period. Should some Senators desire to discuss the matter further, after a call of the quorum has been determined, I shall ask unanimous consent that time be allotted to them. However, I know of no such requests. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that after the call of the quorum has been determined, the Senate vote on the pending measure.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the Senator to ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. LONG. Yes; but there is not a sufficient number of Senators in the Chamber at this moment to obtain them.

Mr. KENNEDY. After the quorum call?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I talked with the manager of the bill earlier in the day, because I wanted to speak on a nongermane matter for about 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending measure.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be allotted to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPLY TO FORMER VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S STATEMENT ON NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was astonished by the statement by the former Vice President, Mr. Humphrey, which implied that if not all the problems inherited by the Nixon administration are solved within the first 100 days, the Democrats then will feel free to attack. How quickly the former Vice President has reassumed his old ways—those of issuing a volley of slogans as a substitute for responsible action.

Mr. Humphrey knows better than most the complexity of the basic decisions he is calling upon President Nixon to make in little more than 3 months. He also knows that his administration failed to resolve those problems in 5 years.

I fail to see it as a point of generosity by Mr. Humphrey when he says perhaps even more than 100 days should be allowed the President to solve the war in Vietnam. To set a deadline on Vietnam would be to allow the enemy to strengthen his bargaining position with the knowledge that political pressures will seek to force a compromise on any terms upon the President.

Mr. Humphrey must realize—and I think to his chagrin—that his administration left to the new President a legacy of problems unprecedented in our national history. It is a legacy of war, crime, violence, civil disobedience, runaway inflation, and poverty; and I do not know how anybody could refute it. I could go on—and on—but these problems cannot be erased by an outburst of rhetoric by a former Vice President of that administration, nor will slogans cause them to disappear.

Would Mr. Humphrey really have us believe that he would have resolved all these problems within this time had he been elected? That attitude would be laughable—if it were not so crucially serious. Any attempt to create such an impression would be deceptive, and doubly so coming from one of the former architects of the policies that created the problems.

I have noted in the past few days an increasing pace of attack on the President regarding Vietnam. I recognize that some of those who lead the attack are locked into the old positions they had staked out before and have not yet adjusted to the fact that we are in a new negotiating situation. But to have the former Vice President joining the critics with a call for a deadline is utterly incongruous.

My friend, the distinguished majority leader, only Monday of this week made reference to the high toll being paid in American lives in recent weeks in Vietnam. No one deplores this loss of life more than I. I speak as a former soldier who was in uniform 51 years ago on the Western Front, where I saw my share of fatalities.

Certainly the President is not insensitive to the sacrifices being made. But I would caution those critics that this is a war that President Nixon inherited, the casualties being sustained are being sustained by troops who were ordered to

XUM

Vietnam by a former President. Let me put the statistics showing deaths of American servicemen resulting from action by hostile forces in proper perspective, for January of 1968 they were 1,202—for January 1969 they were 795—for February of 1968 they were 2,124—for February of 1969 they were 1,073—for March of 1968 they were 1,543—based on present figures, they will be about 1,100 for March of 1969. President Nixon is determined that the killing will end, and he is committed to obtaining a decent and honorable peace; in this purpose I am certain he will succeed. But unjustified criticism will not produce peace sooner; in fact, it could very well delay it.

In terms of 100 days, again, anyone who thinks the festering sores of crime, violence, civil disobedience, inflation, and poverty inherited by this administration can be healed overnight is just as mistaken as one who expects the Vietnam war to be brought to an end in a few short days.

I had been impressed by the statesmanship of the former Vice President during the immediate days following the election. I would hope that he will not allow divergent elements within his party to push him into this type of posture, which I am sure he would regard as unfair were he the President.

As I said in my statement to the Senate last week, this is a responsible administration. It is not throwing ill-considered legislation at the Congress—and everyone who was in Congress during the past 8 years knows exactly what I mean by that.

President Nixon has repeatedly expressed his intention of settling the war in Vietnam. A plan is now being implemented, but slogans are not being shouted from the rooftops. Rather, action is underway. It will require patience and perseverance, but a just and honorable peace will be achieved, something that the previous administration was unable to achieve.

This administration is proceeding calmly, coolly, prudently, responsibly—laying the foundation before it tries to put up the walls and roof. And I urge that all who are anxious to achieve a satisfactory termination of the war in Vietnam—including the former Vice President—approach the task of finding one in a responsible way.

INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the bill before us (H.R. 8508) has been described incorrectly. It is not a ceiling on the Federal debt. I wish that it were.

This bill amends the second Liberty Bond Act passed many years ago. That act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow money and issue bonds to pay the Government's debts.

If this bill were not passed, the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue and sell the bonds required to pay the Government's debts. Refusal to pass this bill would not lessen the debts owed by the Federal Government.

I shall illustrate. If there is no money in the Treasury and if the Secretary of the Treasury cannot borrow more money, the Federal Government will be unable to pay salaries to the men in our Armed Forces, the employees in Government hospitals, amounts due contractors, interest on the national debt, or other items that the Federal Government owes. The Federal debt will still be there, but instead of only owing it in bonds we will owe it to the people who have money coming from the Government and can not get it.

The debt is increased when the Congress votes to authorize programs and then votes to appropriate the money. The debt increases when the Congress votes for and the Executive spends more money than comes in in taxes. The way to stop the debt from rising is to have the Congress stop voting for so many spending programs and to have the Executive stop spending.

To defeat this bill would not lessen the debt—it would invite chaos. The way to lessen the debt is to lessen the spending.

I judge no Member on his vote on any subject. An individual cannot vote for every spending scheme under the sun and then vote against this measure and claim to be an economizer. On the other hand, there are Members who vote for economy day after day and month after month who elect to vote against measures such as this as a protest. I do not wish to pass judgment on anyone's motives for voting "No" on this bill.

As the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, we will have a deficit at the end of this fiscal year on June 30 of $7 billion. This deficit is because there has been too much spending voted for, not only last year, but over many years in the past. Even if we extend the surtax, the momentum of past spending programs—unless reduced—will cause a deficit on June 30, 1970, of $10 billion. I hope and pray that steps can be taken to prevent such a deficit.

The real remedy lies in voting against spending—not in voting to prevent payment for spending that has already taken place.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, President Nixon has been in office for a period of only 2 months and 7 days. When he took office on January 20 the Government debt subject to the present limitation was $364.2 billion—only $800 million below the statutory ceiling of $365 billion. On March 14, Government borrowings reached within $282 million of the $365 billion debt limitation, an amount which does not provide sufficient latitude for good debt management practices to be followed. Moreover, the new administration has estimated that Federal debt needs with contingency of $3 billion are expected to reach a peak of approximately $377 billion in March of 1970 and thereafter decline to $365 billion by June 30 of that year.

The President is undertaking a thorough review of the budget in a determined effort to reduce costs. However, many of the budget items are largely beyond short-run control and a review of former President Johnson's budget has indicated that a possible increase in outlays, including farm price-support payments and a wide variety of past commitments, may be required. Moreover, the Johnson budget was based on several contingencies which are as yet unresolved.

There has been much talk about a Federal surplus in fiscal 1969 and 1970. As President Nixon has rightly pointed out, however, the unified budget concept shows a surplus for fiscal 1969 and 1970 only because they reflect substantial surpluses in Government trust funds—projected at $9.4 billion in fiscal year 1969 and $10.3 billion in fiscal year 1970. On the basis of a Federal funds account, the current budget estimates for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 show a deficit of close to $7 billion or more in each of these years.

Mr. President, I continue to be a strong supporter of economy in our Government and I would not want my vote on this measure to be misunderstood. I will continue to insist on economy and the elimination of unnecessary expenditures at the Federal level and I will continue to study closely each appropriation bill. In 1963, I warned that we would find ourselves in such a situation as exists today if the Government refused to be prudent in its fiscal matters. However, it would be unfair to hamstring the new administration in its attempt to resolve the fiscal problems that it has inherited from the previous administration and, for this reason, I will vote to increase the debt limitation as recommended by the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, during my 8 years in the other body it was called upon no less than 13 times to consider and vote on the question of an increase in the bonded indebtedness of the Nation—the so-called debt ceiling. On 11 of these occasions I voted against the increase, because I felt that the administration currently in power had contributed to its own financial problems and would benefit from the discipline inherent in the contemporary ceiling. But on two occasions, I voted to increase or raise the debt ceiling.

During the Berlin crisis the Kennedy administration, for example, was forced to undertake extraordinary expenditures consistent with the Berlin resolution for which I had voted. Accordingly, I felt that the administration merited help in coping with forces and circumstances beyond its control.

Today I have voted for the increase in the debt limit, not because I would allow to a Republican administration any greater fiscal latitude than I would to a Democratic administration, but because the Nixon administration, like the Kennedy administration in the Berlin crisis, is confronted with serious fiscal problems not of its own making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON (when his name was called): Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick). Were he present and voting, he would vote "nay." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCarthy), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee) is paired with the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell). If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cooper), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick), are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) are absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick) has been previously announced by the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton).

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cooper), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood), would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), is paired with the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond). If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cranston
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Eagleton
Fannin
Fong
Goodell
Gore
Gravel
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Harris
Hruska
Hughes
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Long
Magnuson
Mathias
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stevens
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—18

Allen
Bellmon
Byrd, Va.
Church
Cook
Dole
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hartke
Hatfield
Holland
Hollings
Jordan, N.C.
Stennis
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

PRESENT AND ANNOUNCING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED

Cotton, for.

NOT VOTING—14

Boggs
Brooke
Cooper
Dominick
Goldwater
Hart
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Montoya
Packwood
Pell
Russell
Thurmond

So the bill (H.R. 8508) was passed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the acting majority leader whether he contemplates that there will be any rollcall votes for the balance of the day.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourns today, it will meet at noon tomorrow. It will then consider House Joint Resolution 584, the supplemental appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation. If we finish consideration of that measure tomorrow, the Senate will then adjourn until noon on Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there will be no business and no rollcall votes for the balance of the day.

Mr. KENNEDY. It will be up to the individual Members as to whether they request such rollcall votes. It is my understanding at the present time that probably there will be no further rollcall votes today. However, that is subject to the request of any individual Senator.

THE ABOLITION OF THE COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF S. 1538

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced a bill (S. 1538) to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

Unless this is done, 4 years from now another commission will bring in a report on the salaries.

To let this law stand is an admission on the part of the Government that inflation is expected for the next 4 years. That is financially and psychologically bad. Furthermore, the plan is not a good plan. It sounds meritorious at first glance to have an outside group fix the salaries for Government officials. However, we usually end up with some captains of industry and some top labor leaders and others on the Commission. I cannot imagine any of them saying to the Supreme Court of the United States, every Federal judge, every Cabinet member, and every Member of the Congress: "You should not have a raise."

I cannot imagine them saying, "You should have a reduction."

In reality, it does not work out. The measure should be repealed.

Mr. President, I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska).

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1538) introduced by my colleague from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this year every Member of Congress received a substantial increase in salary. I opposed that increase at the time and my position was so recorded during the rollcall vote on the issue.

The manner in which the vote was taken on this issue was most unusual. Normally in the Senate we have the right to modify a proposal either on the floor or in committee. On an appropriations bill, for example, the dollar figure can be raised or lowered. The option of lowering the proposed salary was not available to us, however. It was offered on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. This procedure was most unwise.

My distinguished colleague (Mr. Curtis) has introduced a bill to reinstitute normal procedures in fixing salaries (S. 1538). I am most happy to join as a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. President, article I, section 1 of the Constitution provides that all legislative power of the U.S. Government is vested in the Congress.

The reason for this provision is obvious. The Founding Fathers wanted matters of setting national policy to be subject to open discussion under the scrutiny of the electorate.

The setting of salaries for Government officials is a legislative function of the highest order.

The setting of congressional salaries has been handled as normal legislation through the years. This method, of course, is awkward for the legislators, but I believe it is good for the electorate.

It has been pointed out on this floor, that over the years, the Congress has granted raise to its Members very begrudgingly. This is as it should be.

Mr. President, in 1967, the Congress devised a method by which its Members could get periodic raises without the usual hearings, debates and public expressions of indignation. This method was established by section 225 of Public Law 90–206, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Under section 225(a), a Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries was established to study the compensation of officials and recommend adjustments.

Mr. President, I would have no particular quarrel with the Commission if its function was to assist the Members of Congress in their legislative functions, however, its functions are not so limited.

Under section 225, the Commission recommends salary adjustments to the President, who in turn transmits his recommendations to the Congress. Congress then has the choice of accepting or rejecting the recommendations and the lack of action by the Congress is tantamount to acceptance.

Mr. President, the Commission plan is not a new concept. It has been advocated by certain Members of the House for several years. This concept has been rejected by the members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on at least two occasions prior to 1967. This concept was again rejected by the members of the committee in 1967.

Section 225 was added to Public Law 90–206 in conference, where the House insisted upon its inclusion. This compromise was accepted by the Senate in the closing days of the first session of the 90th Congress.

Mr. President, the Commission was duly organized, conducted its studies and reported to President Johnson who in turn, made his recommendations to Congress.

The recommendations were for pay raises for certain officials ranging from 40 percent to 100 percent.

These new pay scales went into effect on February 14 as a result of a rollcall vote in the Senate, and no action at all by the House.

I joined in the effort to reject the pay increase and I regret that our efforts were unsuccessful.

Mr. President, in deferring to the Commission and the Chief Executive, Congress has abdicated one of its most precious prerogatives.

The sequence of events leading up to the recent raise will be repeated in 4 years unless Congress asserts itself.

Mr. President, the Commission created by section 225 of Public Law 90–206 should be abolished.

REPORT ENTITLED "REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS" TO BE PRINTED AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 170, which has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without amendment. The resolution has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 170) to print a report entitled "Review of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations" as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 170) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 170

Resolved, That a report entitled "Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations", submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on March 17, 1969, be printed as a Senate document; and that two thousand six hundred additional copies of such document be printed for the use of that Committee.

SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS TO CALIFORNIA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there has been increasing discussion throughout the country involving concerns about the effect on the consuming public of large concentrations of power and money in the business community. In other words, antitrust, monopoly, and conglomerate have become household words to many Americans.

Under some circumstances, largeness has resulted in increased efficiency and, thus, lower costs to the consuming public. Under other circumstances, largeness has meant monopoly, restraint of trade and, thus, increased costs to the consuming public

An additional chapter to this discussion was opened yesterday by Mr. William Bennett, a California attorney and former member of the California Public Utilities Commission, in a press conference held to protest action by the Department of Justice in which it allowed the dismissal of an appeal to the case of Utah versus El Paso Gas Co. Mr. Bennett's press conference remarks quoted published reports in the Monday and Tuesday "Washington Merry-Go-Round" columns, written by Drew Pearson, devoted to the same case. Both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Pearson point out that the Justice Department, by its dismissal in this case, left unprotected the gas consumers of the richest gas market in America; and in doing so, the Department lessened the impact of important new case law in dealing with the antitrust problems which now face the country.

The El Paso Natural Gas Co. case is a long and involved series of legal problems covering the past 13 years.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss all the details of the 13-year experience in the courts, but the basic issues revolved around the question of whether or not additional competition in the transmission of natural gas is needed in the State of California and on the west coast of the United States.

The El Paso Natural Gas Co. line until recently provided the only direct link supply of gas to California from the massive reserves in Texas and Oklahoma. When consumer-minded groups sought to develop competition to the El Paso monopoly, El Paso acquired the Pacific Northwest pipeline to avoid the threat of competition. These moves were proved to be in violation of the Clayton Act, and El Paso was required by the Supreme Court to divest its holdings in Pacific Northwest Gas Co.

Pursuant to the court order El Paso divested its Pacific Northwest holdings to Colorado Interstate Gas Transmission Co., resulting in a situation very much like the first and similarly to violation of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, completely contrary to the spirit of the opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas in the original case. Instead of providing additional competition to El Paso, the divestiture to Colorado Interstate Gas Transmission Co. provides a safe haven for Pacific Northwest in the hands of an entity which has never sought to provide the kind of competition which growing gas markets such as California require in order to safeguard the interests of the consumer.

The stakes are high to California gas users. More than $400 million worth of natural gas is transmitted into the California market each year by the El Paso Natural Gas Co. Every penny increase in price of a thousand cubic feet of gas means nearly $10 million annually in increased costs to the consumer in California, and, although there have been a number of successful court suits waged against the El Paso monopoly, the cause of the consumer has always been lost after the cases have been decided.

In case after case, the courts have ruled conclusively that additional competition should be provided into the super-rich California gas market.

But the Justice Department decision to dismiss the El Paso suit designed to bring about a meaningful divestiture of El Paso holdings means that no viable new competition will be provided to El Paso in the California market. In dismissing its suit, the Justice Department has forsaken the cause of the consumer, after the courts have held time and again that more competition is required in this market.

But this case transcends the normal impact of a single case. The importance of the El Paso case as a benchmark in antitrust law was pointed out effectively last week by the chief of the Anti-Trust Monopoly Division of the Justice Department, Assistant Attorney General Richard McClaren. After the Justice Department's decision to dismiss the El Paso case, Mr. McClaren was quoted in an article in Newsweek magazine as suggesting that the precedent set by the El Paso case will be most useful and almost indispensable in the prosecution of Government cases to protect the public interest in cases involving large and complex corporate entities. Now the Justice Department finds itself in the position where on the one hand a division chief is suggesting that the case law made in the El Paso case is indispensable to the prosecution of his responsibilities, and, on the other hand, the Attorney General has dismissed the follow-on litigation designed to make the decision in the El Paso case meaningful.

It seems to me that this compromises the Department in its prosecution of additional antitrust cases and creates a basic inconsistency between what it has done and what it intends to do.

How can the El Paso case be used as a precedent in attacking the mergers of a conglomerate corporation if in fact the purpose of the case is not pursued in the gas industry? By its dismissal of this case, the Justice Department has weakened its own hand, at a time when it declares itself to be pursuing a new crusade in protection of the American public from large corporate monopolies.

One other factor brought to light in Mr. Bennett's statement as well as in Mr. Pearson's article deals with the disclosure that the law firm in which the

XUM

Attorney General and the President previously were partners represented El Paso Gas Co. in prior litigation. Because of this past relationship, it was unfortunate that decision to dismiss the case was made only 6 days after the new administration took office. In light of this fact, and also because the Supreme Court is presently considering this issue and will make a finding in the next few days, it would seem propitious for the Justice Department to reconsider its position in the hopes that the Supreme Court will hear the case on its merits. Or the Justice Department could take Mr. Bennett's advice and file a section 7 complaint under the Clayton Act in exactly the same manner and relying on the same Supreme Court case against the Colorado Interstate Gas acquisition.

The time has come when all in positions of public responsibility must give additional consideration to the all-too-often forgotten consumer. He has no well-paid lobbyist and can hardly afford the legal burdens necessitated by lengthy court battles. We in the legislative branch have a common purpose with officials in the executive branch to perform our duties in such a manner as to guarantee that the consumer is treated fairly.

I sincerely hope that the Justice Department will reconsider the impact its decision will have on this effort. I know that the appropriate committees of the Congress intend to relentlessly pursue this goal.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the point so effectively made by the able Senator from Indiana.

The Supreme Court twice considered problems created by the El Paso Natural Gas Co.'s merger with Pacific Northwest Pipeline Co. since 1962. A third aspect of this complicated proceeding now is on the Supreme Court docket. But the parties, having agreed on a proposed settlement, have asked the Court to dismiss the case.

Ordinarily, Mr. President, settlement among the parties to complex litigation is to be encouraged, but because of the nature of the issues involved and the history of this litigation, settlement without final Supreme Court review would be unfortunate.

The present situation grows out of the April 6, 1964, Supreme Court decision holding that the merger violated the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Proceedings then began in the district court to fashion relief and a number of utility companies and the State of California sought to intervene to protect their interests in the final decree. Intervention was denied and the district court ordered El Paso to divest certain properties and to set up an independent company. To the private utilities and the State of California, this final remedy was unacceptable. They argued that the decree did not conform to the Supreme Court's order and would not in fact restore competition. They appealed to the Supreme Court and on February 27, 1967, the Court reversed the lower court and authorized intervention.

The Court took the unusual step of ordering that the chief judge of the circuit assign the case to a different district court judge. Accusing the Department of Justice of knuckling under to El Paso in the settlement which became the basis for the decree, the Court reaffirmed its responsibility to insure conformity with its decrees by lower courts.

The case was assigned to a new district judge and the negotiations began anew. On June 21, 1968, the district court approved the sale of the new company to the Colorado Interstate Gas Corp. Both the State of California and the State of Utah had objections to this method of settlement and prepared a second Supreme Court appeal.

Appeals were perfected but the Department of Justice decided not to join the appeal. Subsequently, California, and later Utah, withdrew their appeals.

Under the circumstances, unless the Supreme Court reviews the disposition below, there is no assurance its basic direction has been followed. While the parties to this litigation may regard their interests as having been satisfied, the public's interest in maintenance of competition and adherence to the Supreme Court's initial direction may not. On these points, Mr. President, assurance can be had only if the Supreme Court does review the whole matter. This I hope it will do, with the Department of Justice renewing its participation.

I am delighted that the Senator from Indiana has given us this opportunity to express our concern.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughts and comments of the distinguished Senator from Michigan who has done more than any other Member of this body to bring his expertise to bear on those interests which desire to stifle competition and thus to penalize the consuming public. This matter is important to all of us.

The entire thrust of the issue is that divestiture, in itself, is not enough. The court has held, and we in Congress have a right to demand, that citizens on the West Coast have meaningful competition so the actual value of gas can be determined.

I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Michigan.

THE SURCHARGE AND THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in a special message delivered to Congress today, the President has asked for an extension of the 10 percent Federal income tax surcharge beyond June 30 for another full fiscal year. In doing so, the President has set the stage for what will almost certainly become one of the most significant debates of the current session of the 91st Congress.

In large part, of course, the debate on the surcharge will be significant because of the current strong inflationary pressures that now exist in the economy. In addition, however, the debate on the surcharge will be important for another reason, a reason that has received far too little interest in the heated debate over the economy. For the first time in many years, Congress has the opportunity to make a major start on tax reform. These two areas—the tax surcharge and tax reform—are inseparably related to one another, and it is important that they be considered together by Congress.

Therefore, I believe that the legislation to be proposed by the administration to extend the surcharge should also be the vehicle of a major first step toward tax reform. Once the first step is taken, we shall have laid the groundwork and smoothed the way for comprehensive tax reform in the near future.

This is not the occasion for a detailed discussion of the surcharge and the need for tax reform. With respect to the surcharge, the current inflationary spiral that now grips the economy argues strongly in favor of legislation to extend the tax for another fiscal year. Given the current state of the economy, I believe that it would be fiscally and economically irresponsible to let the surcharge expire as scheduled at mid-year. In the case of other measures of fiscal policy that have recently been proposed in some quarters, such as suspension of the investment credit and substantial reductions in Federal spending in fiscal year 1970, the issues are far less clear, and we must proceed with caution. In view of the urgent need for fuller funding of almost all our major domestic social programs, I believe it would be unwise to reduce the level of expenditures for these programs below the level already submitted in the 1970 budget. This is not to say, of course, that Congress does not have a major responsibility to scrutinize the budget for wasteful or inefficient expenditures. I understand, for example, that the administration intends to achieve substantial reductions in military spending in the coming fiscal year. I would prefer, however, that the savings gained by these and other actions be applied to important underfunded domestic programs.

With respect to tax reform, the need for prompt action is heightened significantly by the proposal to extend the surcharge. Essential as the tax increase was to reduce the budget deficit last year and to ease the inflationary pressure on the economy, the impact of the surcharge has been grossly unfair. It affects only those who already pay taxes on their income. It requires no contribution from those who now pay no taxes. Obviously, it is unfair that citizens who already pay their fair share in Federal taxes should be asked to pay even more, while those who pay nothing continue to escape the burden that all should bear.

The case for tax reform may be simply stated. The goal of our Federal income tax system is that each person should be taxed in accordance with his ability to pay, and that persons who are similarly situated should pay the same tax. Our present tax laws fall far short of this goal. Today, Americans are becoming increasingly aware that the basic structure of the tax system is inequitable, and that some citizens are paying a bargain basement price. As a result, other citi-

XUM

zens, especially the poor and middle-income groups, are required to bear far more than their fair share. The loopholes in our tax laws are widespread and are known to be widespread. When even the highest officials of the administration begin to speak of the danger of a taxpayers revolt, it is time for Congress to listen.

In the weeks to come, I look forward to the hearings and the debates that will take place in these areas of vital interest to the Nation's economic well-being. At the appropriate time, I expect to speak out on each of these issues, and I welcome the message of the President as a timely step in launching this debate in Congress.

S. 1694—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ALIEN COMMUTER (GREEN CARD) SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HARRIS, HART, MONDALE, MUSKIE, NELSON, PELL, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

A companion bill is being introduced in the other body by the chairman of its Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio.

Mr. President, unemployment rates exceeding 10 percent are common in many border communities from Texas to California. Earnings in border areas are lower than average earnings in the border States as a whole.

This is a deplorable situation, an indication of severe economic depression. There are many reasons for these conditions. There is, for example, no strong economic base along the border. The area is largely rural—agriculture is the major industry. Until recently, farmworkers were excluded from social legislation designed to protect most other workers in our economy.

And even now, despite such changes as the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to agriculture, farmworkers still receive far from equal treatment. Wages are low—and partly because new machinery and new patterns of production have been introduced in agriculture, a labor surplus situation exists. As a result, industries attracted to border communities are usually in the low-wage category. The kinds of jobs available in the border areas are not the better jobs found elsewhere in the American economy.

Moreover, border residents are often of Mexican descent—or recent immigrants from Mexico. They have suffered, and continue to suffer economic and social discrimination—a vicious and evil discrimination because of their national origin; and a more subtle discrimination, but no less evil—arising out of the fact that Mexican-Americans are so often poverty stricken, poorly educated, unable to speak English, and seldom able to compete for jobs and opportunities in a society dominated by Anglos.

But there is another reason for the poor working and living conditions along the border—a reason which this Nation largely ignores, but which it cannot deny. In a very important way, these living conditions are imposed upon our residents, by the presence of a readily available and low-paid alien work force from Mexico which undermines the standards American workers generally enjoy throughout the rest of the country.

This alien work force is a major factor contributing to the grinding poverty, high unemployment, and low wages in the border areas. The facts are in the record of hearings and in the last report of the Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. They are in the record of hearings conducted in California during the last Congress by Representative JOHN V. TUNNEY. They are in the record of hearings I conducted several months ago as acting chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration. They are in the final report of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, established by the Immigration Act of 1965, and in the record of hearings conducted by the Commission last year in San Diego, El Paso, and Brownsville. They are in a recent staff report issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and in additional surveys made by the Department of Labor, various unions, and other public and private agencies.

Mr. President, rather than give a lengthy recital of these facts, I ask unanimous consent that the staff report of the Civil Rights Commission, as well as a report prepared by Mr. Stanley M. Knebel of the Department of Labor, and excerpts from a statement I made in this chamber during the last Congress, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1, 2, and 3.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the alien work force from Mexico comes into the country through various channels. There is first of all the movement of workers under the so-called alien commuter system administered by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This system, a creature of administrative ingenuity without a statutory base, permits Canadian and Mexican workers who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and who hold alien registration receipt cards—commonly known as "green cards"—to reside in Canada or Mexico and regularly commute across the border to places of employment in the United States.

For reasons difficult to understand, until little more than a year ago—and only at the request of myself and others—no effect was made to routinely identify commuters in the operating reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. A census of the commuter movement was taken, however, during November and December 1967.

This census identified some 40,176 commuters, including 16,713 farm workers, employed mainly in California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a breakthrough of the commuter census be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the census figure undoubtedly represents a substantial segment of the commuter traffic, especially on a daily or weekly basis. But it does not include an undetermined number of individuals who remain in this country for many weeks or months, usually employed in areas far north of the border.

For this reason, former Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has estimated the number of commuters at some 100,000. The United Farm Workers Organizing Committee puts it closer to 150,000.

But whatever their numbers, there is no doubt that the commuter movement adversely affects the wages and working conditions of our own residents in the border cities and towns of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. Something must be done in the interest of these workers and the well-being of their families.

A second source of low-wage labor is found among Mexican nationals who enter the United States as bona fide visitors, usually on 72-hour passes—commonly known as "white cards." Statistics compiled by the Immigration and Naturalization Service are not adequate to gage the full extent of employment among these visitors. Nevertheless, it is estimated that some 1,250,000 white cards are currently in use, and that more than 200,000 new cards are issued annually.

Because the cards are undated and no record of entry is made at the border, Mexican nationals find them an extremely convenient vehicle to enter the United States—and with impunity acquire employment, remaining for extended periods of time in violation of their limited status as 3-day visitors. Moreover, there are no effective statutory or administrative regulations to deter employers from knowingly hiring the alien visitors. In fact, as it now stands, the Immigration and Nationality Act expressly facilitates their employment.

Section 274 of the act, which prohibits the harboring and concealing of aliens, contains this proviso:

> For the purposes of this section, employment, including the usual and normal practices incident to employment, shall not be deemed to constitute harboring.

During fiscal year 1968, Immigration and Naturalization Service officers located nearly 26,000 deportable aliens, nearly all for illegal employment, among white card holders in the United States.

I share the view of many, however, that this figure is probably an unfair representation of the number of white carders actually employed. But, again, regardless of their number, the 26,000 figure clearly underscores a problem in the illegal use of white cards by Mexican nationals. And the number of those apprehended is rising annually. The Immigration and Naturalization Service recognizes this disgraceful situation. But I fail to understand why stronger remedial action is not being taken. The long-term progress of our border communities, and the immediate well-being of American workers and their families, demands it.

Finally, the reservoir of low-paid Mexican labor is substantially augmented by an undetermined number of illegal entrants—the so-called "wetbacks." There is agreement in nearly all quarters that this has once again become a serious problem. An indication is seen in the growing number of illegal entrants located by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In fiscal year 1963, the number stood at 20,797. In the last fiscal year it reached 117,184. And tens of thousands have been added to this figure since last July 1.

In this connection, the smuggling of alien workers from Mexico has become a lucrative business. Aliens are paying up to $200 to be smuggled into the country, and brought to jobs as far north as Chicago. In the last calendar year, in the southwest region alone, some 7,833 aliens were located who allegedly were smuggled or assisted in entering illegally, or were subsequently transported within the United States in furtherance of an illegal entry. The border patrol reports that 714 principals were apprehended as violating the criminal statutes relating to the smuggling of aliens.

This traffic in human cargo which has resulted in the cruel death of several must end. A greater effort is needed to enforce the law—not only in stopping the smuggling of aliens, but also in deterring the entry of any illegal worker, whatever his means for crossing the border.

The influx of an alien work force from Mexico, to compete for the limited number of jobs available in border areas, is compounding an already serious situation, and, understandably, producing bitter resentment among the severely disadvantaged American workers.

In these days of increased agitation by those who find they have no redress of grievances, the alien worker issue could well become explosive, with grave local and international consequences. I believe the situation demands the very urgent and active concern of the administration and the Congress. It demands an orderly pursuit of justice and fair play. Some measure of relief is needed promptly. The bill we introduce today is a modest attempt to begin this effort.

Section 1 of the bill pertains to the commuter system. A major thrust of our immigration laws has always been to protect the working conditions and job opportunities of American workers. As it currently operates, the 40-year-old commuter system, not provided for in these laws, but directly related to them, does not carry out this objective. It is true that potential commuters among many of the current applicants for an immigrant visa are covered by the Labor Clearance Provisions of the Immigration Act of 1965.

But once an applicant is given permanent resident status as a bona fide immigrant—once he receives his green card—for all practical purposes he holds in his hand a permanent work permit for employment in the United States. I do not believe aliens should be given the unique privilege of being considered bona fide immigrants for purposes of employment in this country when they choose to reside across the border and fail to become immigrants in the sense contemplated by law and, more importantly, when their employment is so clearly detrimental to the economic conditions, the job opportunities, and the organizing and collective bargaining efforts of American workers.

The proposed amendment to section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act does not end the commuter system, but it does refine its current operations. The amendment simply says that each commuter alien must be regularly certified every 6 months by the Department of Labor, that his presence in the United States to seek or continue employment does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American workers similarly employed. The amendment provides for the revocation of a commuter alien's labor clearance, if he violates administrative regulations, such as a ban on strikebreaking—and this regulation needs strengthening—prescribed by the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to carry out the purpose of this amendment.

Section 2 of the bill removes the provision in section 274(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which exempts from criminal sanctions individuals who willfully and knowingly employ aliens who are in the country illegally. The proviso was placed in the basic immigration statute many years ago, to protect the use of the so-called "wetbacks" by American employers. The time is long overdue to strike it from the statute books.

I believe that the enactment of this bill, if coupled with a strengthening and a more effective implementation of administrative regulations, will contribute a great deal to a reasonable and humane remedy of the chronic problems posed by the influx of workers from Mexico.

I fully appreciate that the commuter system, and the flow of nationals from neighboring countries into the United States, evolved from a recognition of the special relations which we have had with these countries over the years. And I believe the parties concerned can continue to enjoy the mutual benefits of these relations, while at the same time curbing the adverse effects of commuter aliens, including the exploitation of the aliens themselves. In fact, a solution to these festering problems can only help to insure that the spirit of cordiality at the border will continue without difficulty in the years ahead.

I am hopeful that Congress will act on this bill promptly.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1694) entitled "Immigration Act Amendments of 1969," introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXHIBIT 1

"THE COMMUTER ON THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER," A STAFF REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

INTRODUCTION

One of the most commonly voiced concerns of the Mexican American community in the border area is with the commuter, the Mexican alien who resides in Mexico and commutes to work across the border in the United States,[1] forcing domestic workers to compete for wages with workers living in a much lower cost economy. Commuters represent a supply of workers in excess of the demand who depress the wage rate, displace the domestic worker, and lower his living standard. The commuter poses an even greater threat to the economic well being of the domestic worker when he serves as a strike-breaker, as he has done in Starr County, Texas and Delano, California, thus stifling the organizing and collective bargaining efforts of the American laborer.[2]

As viewed in the 1968 Report of the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee, *The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States*, "(t)he problems created by the commuter are manifest":

"The Mexican aliens, as a group, are a readily available, low-wage work force which undermines the standards American workers generally enjoy throughout the rest of the country. More importantly, the normal play of free enterprise principles is subverted and prevented from operating to develop standards along the border commensurate with the American standard. So long as Mexican aliens are allowed indiscriminately to work in the American economy, and take their wages back to the low-cost Mexican economy, the growth of the American standards will continue to be stultified."[3]

WHAT IS A COMMUTER?

The term "commuter" is taken by most residents of the border area to refer to all persons who travel to their work on the American side of the border from their place of actual residence in Mexico, whether they commute daily or on a less frequent basis. Several classes of persons commute to work across the border, including American citizens living in Mexico and Mexican citizens with temporary visas (commonly referred to as "white carders"). The latter group acquires employment here in violation of their limited status. In its strict legal sense (and as it will be used here) the term "commuter" is limited to immigrants lawfully admitted for permanent residence and gainfully employed here, but who retain actual residence in Mexico (sometimes referred to as "green carders", although, in fact, all immigrants, whether or not "commuters" are issued "green cards").

There is wide disagreement about the actual extent of the commuter traffic. The Immigration and Naturalization Service conducted a survey on January 11 and 17, 1966, finding a total of 43,687 commuters. The United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, on the other hand, has estimated the number to be closer to 150,000. While the former estimate includes only daily commuters working along the border, the latter including aliens remaining here for periods of weeks or months, usually working in areas farther North.

The commuter should not be confused with the non-immigrant Mexican contract laborer previously brought in for seasonal employment under Public Law 78 (known as the "bracero" program) and recently brought in under section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The bracero program was originally established during World War II to augment the American labor shortage. Thereafter, Congress con-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

tinually extended it (even when there was domestic unemployment) under pressure from an agri-business which had to come to assume a vested interest in this cheap labor supply.

In 1964, after the national conscience took stock of the rising rate of agricultural unemployment, the increasing of discrepancy between farm labor wage rates and those for comparable work, and the worsening conditions in migrant labor camps, Public Law 78 was terminated.[4] The effect of this termination was softened by the admission of a decreasing number of contract laborers under the above mentioned provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. During the last year of the bracero program 177,736 Mexican laborers were admitted; in 1965, under the new procedure, the number was reduced to 20,286. In 1966 the number decreased to 8,647 and in 1967 to 7,703. The year 1968 was the first year in which there was no admission of contract laborers and marks the final phasing-out of the contract labor program.

Like all persons immigrating to the United States, the commuter must apply for and obtain the status of a permanent resident alien and receive an alien registration card (Form I–151, commonly referred to as a "green card") as evidence of his lawful admission. Under section 212(a) (14) of the Act, in order to qualify for employment in the United States, the applicant must secure certification from the Secretary of Labor to the effect that: "there are not sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, qualified and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed.[5]

Under the present Immigration and Naturalization Service (hereinafter "Service") interpretation and enforcement of this section, compliance with this provision need only be made at the time of the commuter's original entry. Once his status is secured he may enter and leave the country at will, working wherever he pleases, regardless of the effect he might have on domestic working conditions.[6]

A 1967 amendment to the regulations[7] bars the employment of green card holders (commuters and residents) at locations where a labor dispute has been certified by the Secretary of Labor. On July 10 and 27, 1967, some 16 work stoppages were certified in Rio Grande Valley of Texas, El Paso, Texas and in Southern California, with the effect of preventing commuters from accepting employment at the struck concerns. Even commuters who have secured their immigrant status are covered by the section. A major exception exists, however, with regard to workers already employed at the struck concern at the time of certification. This exception renders the regulation somewhat ineffective in preventing commuters from working as strikebreakers since an employer usually has ample time after a labor dispute occurs to hire needed alien employees before the dispute is certified. This problem could be met if the regulation were modified so as to exclude all green carders not employed at the time that the dispute began.

Once admitted, a commuter is entitled to most of the rights and privileges of an ordinary citizen except the right to vote and hold public office. Unlike most of the more than 650,000 Mexican aliens currently possessing green cards, commuters are not seeking eventual citizenship. Instead they look upon their green cards as nothing more than work permits. In fact, by law commuters cannot claim naturalization benefits; it has been held that actual domicile here is a prerequisite to naturalized citizenship.[8]

LEGAL BACKGROUND OF AND LEGAL CHALLENGES TO THE COMMUTER SYSTEM

The commuter system has deep roots. People have commuted to work across the United States-Mexico border since the border's inception. Up until the 1920s this traffic was unrestricted. In 1924 a quota system was established which, while not restricting Mexicans directly, required Mexican immigrants to present immigrant visas for entry.[9] An exception to the Act's definition of the term "immigrant" ("any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States"[10]) was made for "an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure".[11] At first commuters were considered as being here "temporarily for business" and deemed not to be immigrants and, hence, were allowed to continue their employment pattern unrestricted. In 1927 immigration authorities reversed this position and classified commuters as immigrants.[12]

Two commuters contested this new classification and the Supreme Court, finding that one of the "great purposes" of immigration legislation "was to protect American labor against the influx of foreign labor", held unanimously that the term "business" was not meant to include everyday employment. The commuter was not to be exempt from the immigrant status.[13]

The Immigration authorities, however, saw their duty as the protection of diplomatic relations between the United States and Mexico rather than the protection of American labor. In a paper by the Immigration and Naturalization Service prepared for the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, the Service stated:

"In studying the problem (status of the commuter) at that time, the immigration authorities concluded that Congress had not intended to interfere with the established pattern of regular border crossings by workers from Mexico or Canada who commuted to jobs in the United States. While such aliens could obtain immigrant visas without difficulty, they would be faced with an impossible task if they were required to obtain a new visa for each daily reentry. Consequently, the immigration authorities devised a border crossing identification card which could be used by aliens who frequently cross the international boundary. The issuance and use of such border crossing cards received express sanction by the Congress in the Alien Registration Act of 1940.

"Thus a commuter was able to procure an immigrant visa and subsequent lawful admission as an immigrant. Thereafter he would obtain a border crossing identification card, and with that card he could enter each day to go to his job as returning to his immigrant status in the United States. This arrangement was in harmony with the established good-neighbor policy with Mexico and Canada, facilitated travel across the Mexican and Canadian borders, and avoided serious dislocations in the border areas."[14]

Actually, the commuter system is without express statutory basis. In fact, the term "commuter" is not to be found in the Act. Its special character has been described by the Board of Immigration Appeals in the following way:

"The commuter situation manifestly does not fit into any precise category found in the immigration statutes. The status is an artificial one, predicated upon good international relations maintained and cherished between friendly neighbors."[15]

In Gordon & Rosenfield, *Immigration Law and Procedure,* (1959) this description is found:

"Where this employment (of Canadians and Mexicans) is permanent in character administrative ingenuity has devised a 'commuter' status, which enables the Canadian or Mexican to obtain lawful admission for permanent residence in order that he may be able to pursue his employment here, and his right to enter each day is attested by his alien registration receipt card. *Of course, this device is an amiable fiction. . . .*"[16] (Emphasis added.)

Due to the absence of statutory foundation, immigration authorities have attempted to justify the commuter program's existence by its long-standing history, the fact that the program has long been well known to Congress and the fact that it was discussed and impliedly endorsed by the Senate Judiciary Committee study preceding the passage of the Act of 1952. "Nothing in the Immigration and Nationality Act or its legislative antecedents indicated that the Congress was dissatisfied with the commuter program or desired to change it in any way".[17] The continuation of the commuter program after the 1952 Act was endorsed by the Board of Immigration Appeals in the *Matter of H. O.,* 5 I. & N., Dec. 716, 1954.

It also has been argued that the structure of the statutory and regulatory provisions facilitating re-entry supports the commuter program. Section 211(b) of the Act provides that ". . . under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a) (27)-(B) . . . may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigration visa, reentry permit or other documents."

A "returning resident immigrant" is defined by the statutory definition alluded to as "an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad." In turn, section 101(a) (20) defines the term "lawfully admitted for permanent residence" as ". . . the status of having been lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the immigration laws, such status not having changed". As pointed out by L. Paul Winings, past General Counsel for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in defining the term "lawfully admitted for permanent residence", the Act ". . . does not say one who has been admitted for permanent residence and has established such residence in the United States. What it says is that it is the status of having been accorded the privilege of permanent residence. In other words, I have paid my way into the ballpark; if I want to go out temporarily, I can come back in."[18]

The regulation promulgated pursuant to section 211(b), however, does not provide for the re-entry of persons "lawfully admitted for permanent residence" as that term is defined by the Act. Instead it says:

"In lieu of an immigrant visa, an immigrant alien *returning to an unrelinquished lawful permanent residence* in the United States after a temporary absence abroad not exceeding 1 year may present Form I–151, Alien Registration Receipt Card, duly issued to him . . ."[19] (Emphasis added.)

Although the immigration authorities take the position that this section was not meant to be exclusive, a strong argument can be made that by its wording it in fact excludes commuters. As one commentator has noted, a commuter "is not returning to an unrelinquished, lawful, permanent residence after a temporary absence not exceeding one year because his residence is not in the United States and as a rule he ha[s] maintained . . . residence in a foreign country for a period exceeding one year."[20]

In *Amalgamated Meat Cutters* v. *Rogers,*[21] a case involving the Service's interpretation and enforcement of aforementioned section 212(a) (14) of the Act (precluding admission of aliens for skilled or unskilled labor when

---

Footnotes at end of article.

the Secretary of Labor certifies that such admission would adversely affect American labor), doubt was cast upon the Service's position. That case involved a strike situation where a certification had been made. In response, the Service instructed the authorities at the relevant points of entry that during the effectiveness of the certification no aliens applying for admission and destined for employment at the struck operation, "except returning lawfully domiciled resident aliens", should be admitted.

The Service took the position that commuters are "aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence". The Court disagreed—"It is clear that Mexican commuters do not reside in the United States, and that it therefore is not possible for them to be aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence." Any other construction, the Court felt, would ". . . make shambles of a provision which . . ." was designed to ". . . assure strong safeguards for American labor"[22] The suit had become moot by the time that final judgment was entered, and hence was not appealed by the Service. "However, the administrative authorities do not believe (the decision) is correct and do not follow it."[23]

The rationale in the *Amalgamated Meat Cutters* decision is equally relevant to the validity of the whole commuter system and, logically, should compel a conclusion contrary to that taken by the Service. The Court by way of *obiter dictum*, however, expressly limited its holding in this respect:

"This should not mean, however, that Mexicans or Canadians cannot commute to work in the United States. The defendants can utilize the documentary requirements and administrative procedures they think best under the applicable law for aliens who work in this country and live in Mexico or Canada. If the defendants are satisfied that an alien can enter the United States to work here, they could then permit the alien to commute. But when the Secretary of Labor has issued a certification under § 212(a) (14) pertaining to particular employment, such as an alien would be excludable. It is not sufficient to resort to an 'amiable fiction' to justify a wholesale evasion of the Secretary's certification—Mexican commuters destined for the employment covered by the certification must be excluded just as any other Mexican non-resident alien."[24]

The commuter program was squarely attacked in a 1964 case, *Texas State AFL–CIO v. Kennedy*,[25] where workers from the Texas border area, alleging economic detriment, sued the immigration authorities for injunctive relief against continuation of the commuter system. The Court avoided reaching the merits by dismissing the action on the grounds that the plaintiffs lacked standing to sue. Since 1964 the law of standing has changed radically,[26] and a similar suit has recently been brought by California Rural Legal Assistance in behalf of California farm workers displaced by commuters taking temporary employment in California and freely returning to Mexico for a period of weeks or months.[27] The complaint seeks an order requiring immigration officials to deny admission to "returning resident immigrants" who fail to demonstrate a bona fide permanent residence in the United States (e.g., commuters). "In determining the question of bona fide permanent residence . . .", the plaintiffs suggest the following indicia might be considered:

1. Possession of a U.S. Selective Service classification card in the alien's name, reflecting a United States address.

2. Possession of state and federal income tax returns in the alien's name, showing residence in the United States.

3. A driver's license in the alien's name issued by a State of the United States, reflecting a United States residence.

4. A vehicle registration in the alien's name reflecting a United States residence.

5. If the alien is married, the fact that both wife and children reside in the United States.

6. Evidence that his children attend school in the United States, or that a child was born in the United States.

7. Evidence of active membership in clubs, associations or unions organized or incorporated in the United States.

8. Convincing evidence of permanent employment in the United States.

9. Rent receipts, other than from a labor camp, hotel or motel, tending to evidence permanent residence in the United States.

10. Place of employment, occupation and length of employment.[28]

Although the Service deems the commuter status to be consistent with the letter and intent of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, it has been held that a commuter cannot even become a citizen (the assumed purposes for immigration under the Act) because, by definition, his assimilated status does not conform to the standard of residency (actual domicile in the United States) required by the Act for naturalization.[29]

Similarly, although a commuter must notify his Selective Service board of his current address,[30] he is not actually subject to be drafted since he is not a resident of the United States under current Selective Service regulations [31] because he did not reside in the United States for the required three month period.

Commuters also are treated differently from other "immigrants" with regard to Federal income tax status. An alien who has established residence in the United States is liable for Federal income tax on his entire income, from sources both within and without the United States. Whether an alien is a resident depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. The type of visa issued is only one of the elements considered. In response to an inquiry on this matter from the House Judiciary Committee, the Internal Revenue Service had this to say about commuters:

"It appears from the information submitted that the aliens about whom you are inquiring have never established a residence in the United States, but have obtained permanent visas merely to facilitate their entry into and departure from this country. Under such circumstances, the status of these individuals is that of nonresident aliens."[32]

Hence commuters, unlike other green card holders, are not subject to Federal income tax on income from sources outside this country.

THE IMPACT OF COMMUTER TRAFFIC

Much of the border area has relatively large labor surpluses, partly because of the large number of low skilled U.S. citizens and resident aliens residing in the area.[33] Commuters, however, make up a significant part of the work force in many of the border communities. Although accurate statistics are not kept by the Immigration and Naturalization authorities, sample counts of the number of commuters crossing the border are taken from time to time. One such count, taken on January 11, 1966, showed that 42,641 commuters, of which 17,653 were employed in agriculture, entered the United States. The impact of these commuters on the labor market has been enormous. It has been estimated that over 17% of the labor market in El Paso, Texas, are commuters. Further estimates have shown that 5% of the San Diego, California, labor market and 23% of the Brownsville, Texas, labor market are commuters. Their presence can be directly related to high unemployment rates in these areas.[34]

Many people have commented on the impact of the commuter traffic in the border area. Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, speaking on a proposed amendment to Section 212 of Immigration and Nationality Act, said:

"In El Paso, where unemployment is currently some 35 percent greater than the State average, the estimated number of commuters in 1966 was more than double the number of unemployed. In El Centro, California, where the unemployment rate is currently 13.1 percent, the estimated number of commuters in 1966 was nearly double the number of unemployed."[35]

A report by the Social Action Commission of the Catholic Diocese of El Paso indicated that one of the reasons for the low wages in El Paso is because ". . . the Mexican-American must compete with some 25,000 workers from Mexico . . . legal alien commuters, U.S. citizens, and illegal entrants . . . who daily cross the bridge from Juarez to work in El Paso. Generally speaking, the workers from Mexico find no inconvenience in working for the barest of wages in El Paso."[36]

The employment of commuters in areas of high unemployment is a characteristic of the communities along the border area. Data published by the Texas Employment Commission in 1966, shows that the unemployment rate in the border towns on that date was substantially greater than in the interior cities. (See Table I) Laredo had the highest rate—9.6%. The average rate for the four border areas (Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito; El Paso; Laredo; and McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg) was 6.6%, compared with the 3.4 percent rate for the other 18 interior areas for which data was given.[37]

In a special survey held in Laredo by the Department of Labor during the summer of 1961, when the unemployment rate was 11.3%, the Department reported that a large number of unemployed American workers had the same occupational skills as the employed alien commuters.

TABLE I.—UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN 22 TEXAS CITIES, 1966

City	Rate	Rank
4 border cities	6.6	
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	6.5	21
El Paso	4.4	17
Laredo	9.6	22
McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg	5.8	20
18 interior cities	3.4	
Abilene	3.6	11
Amarillo	2.9	4
Austin	2.6	3
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange	4.0	15
Corpus Christi	3.7	12
Dallas	2.5	2
Fort Worth	2.9	4
Galveston-Texas City	4.7	19
Houston	2.4	1
Longview-Kilgore-Gladewater	3.3	8
Lubbock	3.8	13
Midland-Odessa	3.4	9
San Angelo	3.4	9
San Antonio	4.3	16
Texarkana	3.8	13
Tyler	3.3	7
Waco	4.4	17
Wichita Falls	3.0	6

Source: The Texas Labor Market, Texas Employment Commission.

While two garment manufacturers employed 88 commuters as sewing machine operators, the Texas Employment Commission office had on file applications from 156 unemployed U.S. workers qualified for that position.[38] The survey showed that commuters were not limited to the garment industry, but were employed in hotels, restaurants, the retail trades and service establishments. The survey included a sample of firms employing 3,000 workers.

"(T)hese firms employed 438 Mexican aliens identifiable as commuters. In addition, the survey team suspected that other alien employees of these firms were commuters, although they had given U.S. addresses to their employers."[39]

Footnotes at end of article.

The survey also included data on 19 occupational areas:

"(T)he firms employing only domestic workers paid higher rates for 15 occupations; in one occupation the rates paid were the same; and for three occupations the firms employing alien commuters paid higher rates. There were also instances where the same firms paid its alien commuters less than it paid U.S. workers for the same work. The average of the wage rates for these 19 occupation areas paid by the firms employing only U.S. workers was 38 percent higher than the average rates paid by the firms employing alien commuters.[40] (See Table II)"

United States Commission on Civil Rights field investigations in Laredo showed similar discrepancies in the trucking industry. For instance it was reported that Brown Express Lines, which hires few commuters, pays drivers $3.39 an hour; Alamo Express Lines, employing proportionately more commuters, pays $1.85 an hour.[41]

TABLE II.—OCCUPATIONAL WAGE STRUCTURE, LAREDO TEX., JUNE 1961

Industry and occupation	Average wage rate (per week)	
	Firms employing only domestic workers	Firms employing domestic and alien commuter workers
Hotels and motels:		
Cook	$58	$34
Maid	20	17
Hallboy	25	20
Waiter	[1] 15	[1] 18
Busboy	[1] 25	13
Bartender	58	46
Bellboy	[1] 15	[1] 16
Drugstores and related firms:		
Cashier	27	12
Stock clerk	52	40
Fountain girl	16	[2] 23
Drug clerk	77	55
Grocery and related firms:		
Cashier	24	24
Stock boy	35	20
Produceman	45	35
Butcher	65	52
Warehouseman	37	31
Miscellaneous retail firms:		
Porter	53	35
Warehouseman	73	21
Stockman	53	45

[1] Plus tips.

[2] Plus $3 meal allowance.

Technical note: Data were collected in the survey concerning the different rates paid each occupation in each firm. For some occupations monthly rates were reported; these were converted to weekly rates by dividing the monthly rate by 4.33. The number of workers paid each rate was not reported in all cases, making it impossible to compute an average rate weighted by the number of workers paid each rate. The average rates shown in the table represent the average of the highest and lowest rates paid. These averages correspond quite accurately with the weighted averages computed for the few occupations where data were reported for each worker.

The pattern of commuter involvement in the Laredo labor market is found elsewhere with comparable effects. As in Laredo, a survey was conducted by the Department of Labor in El Paso, Texas, during the summer of 1961. About 1,000 commuters were employed in the 75 firms surveyed. It was noted, however, that ". . . these figures might be more because one firm indicated that it did not employ commuters but sent a bus to the border each day to pick up workers."[42] The average wage in manufacturing in El Paso is extremely low. That city ranked lowest of the eight major Texas areas for which the Texas Employment Commission supplied data. (See Table III)

In El Paso, nondurable goods employment is heavily concentrated in garment manufacturing—almost 75% of all nondurable goods workers are in this industry. The wage rate in garment manufacturing is little more than the minimum required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Large numbers of commuters (mainly women) are employed in this occupation. Many people believe that the presence here of the garment industry, a recent phenomenon, is due to the large supply of labor and low wages—both conditions owing, in part, to the commuter program.[43] The El Paso survey concluded by showing that out of 11 construction firms 5 employed commuters; out of 4 retail dry goods firms, 3 employed commuters; out of 4 wholesale and warehouse firms, 3 employed commuters. In all these cases the firms employing commuters paid the lowest wages.[44]

The impact of the commuter is particularly acute in agriculture, where mechanization is rapidly reducing job opportunities. Due to the high concentration of farms along the border and the fact that commuters often work in the lowest skilled, lowest paid jobs, farm workers, who are already underpaid, are the first to suffer competition from the commuter. Furthermore, the use of commuters as strike breakers (see discussion on page 17. *infra*) is especially damaging to this group's organizational struggles.

The wages paid farm workers in the border area are substantially lower than in interior regions. In the Rio Grande Valley, where 37% of the alien commuters worked on farm jobs, the 1966 wage rate was $.75 per hour, 31% less than the $1.10 average in the rest of the state.[45] Similarly, California farm rates are the lowest in the border areas where the bulk of the farm labor force is composed of commuters. The commuter's impact is also reflected in the agricultural unemployment rate. For example, "commuters constitute about 85% of the farmwork force in California's Imperial Valley, where unemployment in 1966 was 10% of the labor force. twice the average for the entire state."[46]

TABLE III.—AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 8 MAJOR TEXAS CITIES, 1966

	Average hourly earnings		
	All manufacturing	Durable goods	Nondurable goods
Texas	$2.57	$2.62	$2.52
El Paso	1.90	2.46	1.72
Austin	1.98	1.71	2.26
Beaumont	3.35	3.03	3.48
Corpus Christi	2.96	2.57	3.26
Dallas	2.37	2.52	2.10
Fort Worth	2.81	2.97	2.39
Houston	3.00	2.87	3.16
San Antonio	1.98	1.92	2.02

Source: The Texas Labor Market, Texas Employment Commission.

EMPLOYMENT OF ILLEGAL ENTRANTS AND WHITE CARDERS

It is important to note the role of illegal entrants and white carders (see discussion on page 2, *infra*) in the employment picture in the border area. During 1967 the Border Patrol apprehended 86,845 deportable Mexicans working illegally, many in the border area. Of this number 27,830 were working in agriculture, 5,906 in trades, crafts and industry, and 53,109 in other occupations.[47]

The border crossing statistics kept are inadequate to accurately gauge the extent of white card employment. There are approximately 1,250,000 current white card holders, and about 450,000 new white cards are issued annually. In 1968 there were 25,000 white carders who were deported, most of these for illegal employment.[48] But it is felt by many residents of the border area that deportation figures do not fairly represent the number of white carders actually employed.[49]

This is because many white carded workers employed in occupations with low visibility and even with the best efforts of immigration authorities, they cannot be easily discovered. Many white card holders use their 72 hour passes to engage in menial work as domestic maids, dishwashers, hotel and motel workers, and construction workers. Others work in such semi-skilled jobs as masonry and carpentry.[50]

One reason for this wholesale employment of white carders is the lack of legislation effectively preventing employers from knowingly hiring these workers. As it now stands, the law contains provisions expressly facilitating such employment. Section 274(4) of the Act, prohibiting the harboring and concealing of aliens, contains the following proviso: ". . . for the purposes of this section, employment *including the usual and normal practices incident to employment* shall not be deemed to constitute harboring."[51] (Emphasis added.)

The need for legislation correcting this situation is manifest.

USE OF COMMUTERS AS STRIKE-BREAKERS

Organized labor has been deeply concerned with the use of commuters as "strike-breakers, when workers were engaged in the process of trying to negotiate conditions covering their wages".[52] The recent strike in Starr County, Texas, presented an example of the use of commuters during labor disputes. In a hearing held by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Farm Workers Organizing Committee of the AFL–CIO, had this to say about one of the farms which his organization picketed:

"Mr. PADILLA. La Casita Farms, which we are on strike with. And this is a bona fide certified strike, issued by the State of Texas, the Texas Employment Commission. I witnessed that they load the bus full of Mexican nationals, and escort them right into the fields, and now they tell us that we don't have a right to picket, to talk to them."

"Mr. YARBOROUGH. You mean that La Casita Farms took their transportation to the bridge and picked these workers up with the green cards and brought them straight up to their farms, and put them on the farms?

"Mr. PADILLA. That is correct, sir."[53]

Domingo Arrendondo, Strike Chairman, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, said with regard to the Starr County strike:

"(T)he problem about these green carders is that they come to work from Mexico every day. They will come in the morning and they will go back at night. Now that the minimum wage came up, or a little bit right after the strike started, they raised the price on these workers from 85 cents or 80 cents to $1 an hour and to $1.50. That was just a symbol to break the strike movement, to keep these people from joining the strike for better wages, or for a contract, or a union contract. We went and talked to these people at the bridge, international bridge. We told them to cooperate with us for better wages and working conditions, but they will always say that if their friend had already signed that they would sign, that they would sign but they would probably get laid off their jobs. So, really we couldn't get no where convincing them that a union is something that a worker needs. (Sic.)"[54]

As a result of the misuse of green card workers as strike-breakers was the aforementioned 1967 amendment to the INS regulation, barring employment of green card holders at locations where a labor dispute has been certified by the Secretary of Labor.[55]

RELATIONSHIP OF COMMUTER TRAFFIC TO MIGRATION

As a result of its impact on wages, unemployment and working conditions, the commuter traffic contributes to the annual massive migration of Mexican Americans from the border area. The Social Action Department of the Texas Catholic Conference estimates that because of the lack of opportunities in South Texas, 88,700 farm workers must migrate to other areas of the country

---

Footnotes at end of article.

every year in order to find employment. These are people who live in the border areas and would otherwise seek employment there, but for the saturation of the labor market by the commuters. The Committee had this to say:

"Unfortunately, because of the vast supply of green carders . . . the domestic workers are unable to compete with the depressed wages that result from the availability of cheap labor to the growers. This accounts for the fact that almost one-half of the Texas migrant workers come from the four counties of the Lower Rio Grande Valley." [56]

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE COMMUTER PROBLEM

Various recommendations have been made to alleviate conditions caused by the commuter program. Henry Munoz, Jr., speaking for the Texas AFL–CIO, urged that the Department of Labor issue a regulation for a minimum wage law of $1.25 to be applicable to green-card holders and commuters.[57]

In a letter from Chairman Richard M. Scammon and Stanley H. Ruttenberg, of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, the following recommendations to the President regarding commuters were made:

"As of a date certain, all visas issued for immigration into the United States be firmly understood to include a clear commitment by those immigrating to establish and maintain their bona fide residence within the United States.

"A new form of border crossing authorization be established, this authorization being designed for use by non-citizens who do not intend to become immigrants in the ordinary sense of the word, but who do wish to work in the United States and continue to reside in their own "contiguous territory" country.

"Within a grace period, action should be taken to terminate the commuter status of present 'green cards' holders." [58]

On December 14, 1967 Senator Edward Kennedy, a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, introduced a bill in Congress to amend Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. As the Senator explained, the amendment would not eliminate the commuter system, but refine its current operation. The bill in essence provides ". . . that each commuter alien must be regularly certified every 6 months by the Department of Labor that his presence in the United States to seek or continue employment does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American workers similarly employed. The bill provides for the revocation of a commuter alien's labor clearance if he violates administrative regulations, such as a ban on strike breaking, prescribed by the Department of Labor and the Immigration Service to carry out the purpose of this bill".[59]

This bill has received strong opposition from Chamber of Commerce groups, farm grower organizations, and retailers. The Laredo Chamber of Commerce has gone on record as being opposed to any change in the commuter system.[60] This opposition is based on economic reasons. Laredo, last year, had retail sales of over 90 million dollars, much of this being to commuters. Business interests feel that if anything happens to change the status of commuters their towns will become "ghost towns." Organized growers are afraid that they will be cut off from a valuable supply of labor. Willis Deines, attorney for the Texas Citrus and Vegetable Growers, indicated why his group is in opposition to the Kennedy Bill: ". . . It is axiomatic that if our growers do not have a source of labor that can be depended upon to do their farming operations, particularly in the harvest of perishables, then of course we would not have an industry." [61]

Businessmen in the Valley area have indicated a fear that any effort to terminate the commuter program will result in a retaliatory refusal by Mexico to allow its citizens to carry on their extensive trade in American border towns. The suggestion by Antonio Carrillo Flores, Foreign Secretary of Mexico, that Mexican commuters have "acquired rights," lends authority to this suspicion.[62]

The American government also has officially voiced its concern with diplomatic relations in approaching the commuter problem. In the aforementioned case of *Texas State AFL–CIO* v. *Robert Kennedy, et al.,* where the legality of the commuter program was put into issue, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, submitted an affidavit opposing interference with the commuter program on the grounds that it would ". . . do harm to good neighbor relations in the area." [63] He stated further:

"(I) f as a result of a substantial reduction in the commuter traffic across the border between Mexico and the United States, a significant number of Mexican nationals would be deprived of their earning power, the trade between the two countries along the border would be substantially reduced. We could expect that this would have an immediate depressing effect on the economy of the region on both sides of the border. Moreover, the loss of gainful employment and dollar earnings by 30,000 to 50,000 Mexican nationals, estimated at over $50 million annually, might compel the government of Mexico to consider compensating steps, which would do further damage to the economic life of the region."

The Mexican American in the border area is thus charged with the responsibility of protecting our diplomatic relations. The economic burdens involved in this charge, he may justifiably feel, should be borne by the Nation as a whole, not thrust upon a minority of its citizens.

FOOTNOTES

[1] There is also, but to a smaller extent, commuter traffic across the American-Canadian border. Canadian commuters do not depress local economic conditions, as do Mexican commuters, because they live in a substantially identical cost-of-living economy, work in highly unionized occupations and are highly unionized themselves. Being well assimilated into the labor force, they offer no undue competition to American labor.

[2] *See* p. 17 *infra.*

[3] *Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee, The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States,* S. Doc. No. 1006, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 45 (1968).

[4] *Report from the Secretary of Labor, Year of Transition—Seasonal Farm Labor* 2 (1965).

[5] Immigration and Nationality Act, § 212 (a) (14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182.

[6] See discussion of Amalgamated Meat Cutters case p. 9 *infra.*

[7] Title 8, § 211(b).

[8] Petition of Wright, 42 F. Supp. 306 (1941); *In re* Barron, 26 F. 2d 106 (1928); Petition of Correa, 79 F. Supp. 265 (1948).

[9] Immigration Act of 1924, Ch. 90, 43 Stat. § 153.

[10] *Id.* § 3.

[11] *Id.* § 3(2).

[12] General Order 86 of Apr. 1, 1927.

[13] Karnuth v. United States *ex rel.* Albro, 279 U.S. 229, 243, 244 (1929).

[14] *Report of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration Commuters, Historical Background, Legal Challenges, and Issues* 101 (1968).

[15] Matter of M.D.S., 7 Immigration and Naturalization Dec. 209 (1958).

[16] *Gordon and Rosenfield, Immigration Law and Procedure* 127 (1959).

[17] *See* n. 15 *supra,* at 102.

[18] *House Judiciary Committee, Study of Population and Immigration, Administrative Presentations (III), Admission of Aliens into the United States for Temporary Employment and "Commuter Workers"* 167 (1963).

[19] 8 CER. 211.1(6).

[20] *Newman, The Legality of the "Commuters" or "Green Card Holders" Working in the United States, in Cabinet Committee Hearings on Mexican-American Affairs* 63 (1968).

[21] 186 F. Supp. 114 (D.C. D. C.) (1960).

[22] *Id.* at 119.

[23] *Immigration and Nationality Act, with Amendments and Notes on Related Laws* 231 (5th ed. 1966).

[24] *See* n. 21 *supra,* at 119.

[25] 330 F.2d 217 (C.A. D.C. 1964).

[26] *See* Flast v. Cohen, 392 U.S. 83 (1968), overruling the 45 year old barrier to standing, Frothingham v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), and repudiating its doctrine of judicial restraint in this area.

[27] Gooch, *et al.,* v. Clark, *et al.,* Civil No. 49500 (N. D. Cal., 1968).

[28] Brief for Plaintiff at 10, Gooch, *et al.* v. Clarke *et al.,* n. 28, *supra.*

[29] *See* n. 9, *supra.*

[30] *See* § 35 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, as amended, and regulations issued thereunder.

[31] 32 C.F.R. 611.13(a) (6), 611.13(b) (7), (1944).

[32] *See* n. 19 *supra,* at 170.

[33] *Report of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, The "Commuter Problem" and Low Wages and Unemployment in American Cities on the Mexican Border* 116 (1968).

[34] *Moore, Mexican-Americans: Problems and Prospects* 12 (1967).

[35] 133 Cong. Rec. 205 § 14 (daily ed. Dec. 14, 1967).

[36] Catholic Conference Office of Immigration (Oct. 11, 1968). Organized labor also has shown concern. The following resolution was passed by the Texas AFL–CIO in Jan. 1968: " . . . (T) housands of commuter aliens who cross the border daily to work, cause the unemployment of American citizens and create unfair competition in the labor market by working for sub-standard wages and then returning to Mexico at night where their living costs are much lower."

[37] These unemployment rates, supplied by the Texas Employment Commission, are somewhat conservative since they are based upon the number of persons registered with the T.E.C. offices. Many farm workers secure employment through the crew leader and never register with the T.E.C.

[38] *See* n. 34 at 120.

[39] *Id.* at 120.

[40] *Id.* at 121.

[41] Interview with Mr. David Jacobs, AFL–CIO, in Laredo, Texas, Sept. 10, 1968.

[42] *See* n. 34 at 121.

[43] *Id.* at 120.

[44] *Id.* at 122.

[45] *Id.* at 119.

[46] *See* n. 3 at 45.

[47] *Immigration and Naturalization Annual Report* 93 (1967).

[48] Interview with Mr. Donald Coppock, Deputy Associate Commissioner for Domestic Control, Immigration and Naturalization Service, in Wash., D.C., October 15, 1968.

[49] Interview with Mr. Henry Munoz, Jr., Texas AFL–CIO, in Austin, Texas, Sept. 10, 1968. The Service's recognition of the illegal employment of white carders was evidenced by a recent announcement of proposed regulation changes. Under current regulations white carders are issued undated cards and are expected to return within 72 hours and travel no farther than 150 miles from the border. "Government officials say the lack of dates on the present crossing cards makes it almost impossible to enforce regulations."

XUM

The proposed changes would limit the travel on undated cards to within 25 miles of the border. For those wishing to travel further a supplemental card that is dated will be issued allowing a 15 day visit. Of course these new limitations will not affect the employment pattern of white carders along the border area. *See* San Antonio Express, p. 1 (Nov. 29, 1968).

[50] *Id.*

[51] *See* Immigration and Nationality Act, n. 5, *supra.*

[52] *Hearings on § 8, 195, 197, 198 Before the Subcomm. on Migratory Labor of the Senate Comm. on Labor and Public Welfare,* 90th Cong., 1st Sess. pt. 1, at 170 (1967).

[53] *Id.* at 334.

[54] *Id.* at 363.

[55] *See* n. 7.

[56] *See* n. 52 at 61.

[57] *Munoz, View of Organized Labor* 3.

[58] Letter from Richard M. Scammon and Stanley H. Ruttenberg to President Johnson, July 22, 1968.

[59] 113 Cong. Rec. 205 (December 14, 1967): The amendment reads as follows:

"S. 2790

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 212 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(j) Any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence whose principal, actual dwelling place is in a foreign country contiguous to the United States and is returning from a temporary stay in such foreign country to seek or continue employment in the United States shall be admitted into the United States only if the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Attorney General within six months prior to the date of admission that the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed, and if such certification has not been revoked on any ground. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to any aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, whether or not such aliens were so admitted prior to or on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.' "

[60] *See Laredo Times,* p. 4 (Mar. 1, 1968).

[61] *Id.*

[62] *See Laredo Times,* p. 4 (Feb. 4, 1968).

[63] Brief for Defendant, Texas State AFL–CIO v. Robert F. Kennedy, et al., Civil No. 3468-61, n. 25, *supra.*

EXHIBIT 2

RESTRICTIVE ADMISSION STANDARDS: PROBABLE IMPACT ON MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS

(By Stanley M. Knebel)

Every weekday morning, thousands of residents of Mexican towns near the U.S. border commute to jobs in the United States. At the border, they show their I–151 identification cards, popularly known as "green cards," which entitle them to take employment in the United States. It has generally been recognized that the unrestricted admission of green-card workers on a daily basis adversely affects the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. residents. However, comprehensive data detailing the extent and significance of alien commuter employment have not been available before this year.

In November and December of 1967, the Immigration and Naturalization Service required that each holder of an I–151 identification card who was a daily border crosser complete a questionnaire which called for his occupation and place of employment. During January 1968, the Department of Labor conducted a special employment and wage survey of establishments that employed commuters in the Laredo, Texas area. Based on the data collected in these two studies, certain conclusions can be drawn in regard to the number, occupational distribution, and wages of daily commuters. It is also possible to estimate the impact on the commuter flow that would result from various restrictive wage standards. This article summarizes the two studies and discusses the probable impact of alternative restrictions.

NUMBER OF ALIEN COMMUTERS

The Immigration and Naturalization Service survey showed some 40,000 workers commuting daily across the Mexican border to work in the United States. Crossing points in Texas accounted for 49 percent of the total, while 38 percent crossed into California and 13 percent into Arizona. (See Table 1.) More than four-fifths of the commuters were concentrated at five ports of entry along the border: 29 percent at El Paso, Texas; 19 percent at each of the two major California ports, San Ysidro and Calexico; 9 percent at San Luis, Arizona; and 7 percent at Laredo, Texas. The only other crossing points with more than 500 commuters were Brownsville, Hidalgo, and Eagle Pass, Texas and Nogales, Arizona. (See Tables 2, 3, and 4.)

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS, BY STATE AND OCCUPATION, 1967

Occupation	Total	Texas	California	Arizona
Total	40, 176	19, 714	15, 284	5, 178
Building occupations	2, 421	1, 801	521	99
Carpenters	895	732	131	32
Painters	487	319	153	15
Other building occupations	1, 039	750	237	52
Business occupations	3, 285	2, 405	429	451
Cashiers	232	167	28	37
Clerks, office	354	233	47	74
Clerks, sales	1, 713	1, 248	207	258
Clerks, stock and receiving	309	232	64	13
Managers	377	309	41	27
Secretaries	199	150	24	25
Other business occupations	101	66	18	17
Hotel and restaurant occupations	2, 235	1, 308	812	115
Bartenders	93	56	28	9
Bellhops	35	25	10	0
Chambermaids	223	100	108	15
Cooks	651	390	232	29
Kitchen helpers	675	410	236	29
Waiters, waitresses	328	228	70	30
Other hotel and restaurant occupations	23	4	19	0
Other occupations	32, 235	14, 200	13, 522	4, 513
Automobile-shop workers	536	246	253	37
Beauty operators and barbers	72	53	19	0
Custodial workers	344	215	116	13
Drivers, truck	1, 093	647	315	131
Farmworkers	16, 035	3, 436	9, 171	3, 428
Fishermen	183	92	91	0
Florists	41	3	38	0
Food-processing occupations	848	524	299	25
Gardeners	534	210	301	23
Hospital helpers	88	53	17	18
Jewelers	39	16	22	1
Laborers, general	3, 668	2, 517	940	211
Laundry workers	590	292	245	53
Maids, private household	2, 779	2, 169	412	198
Metalworkers	1, 627	1, 435	147	45
Parking lot attendants	47	12	34	1
Professional occupations	342	244	44	54
Repair occupations	248	196	49	3
Sewing machine operators	1, 167	809	290	68
Service station workers	227	150	58	19
Upholsterers	222	125	94	3
Warehousemen	255	164	54	37
Miscellaneous	1, 250	592	513	145

Source: I. & N.S. Commuter Census, November–December 1967.

TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS IN ARIZONA, BY PORT OF ENTRY AND OCCUPATION, 1967

Occupation	Total	San Luis	Nogales	Douglas	Other ports[1]
Total	5, 178	3, 553	1, 118	380	127
Building occupations	99	12	56	12	19
Carpenters	32	5	17	5	5
Painters	15	0	12	1	2
Other building occupations	52	7	27	6	12
Business occupations	451	52	372	21	6
Cashiers	37	0	34	3	0
Clerks, office	74	5	69	0	0
Clerks, sales	258	40	201	12	5
Clerks, stock and receiving	13	3	9	1	0
Managers	27	3	22	1	1
Secretaries	25	1	22	2	0
Other business occupations	17	0	15	2	0
Hotel and restaurant occupations	115	12	77	13	13
Bartenders	9	0	7	0	2
Busboys	3	2	1	0	0
Chambermaids	15	1	14	0	0
Cooks	29	5	15	5	4
Kitchen helpers	29	3	15	6	5
Waiters, waitresses	30	1	25	2	2
Other occupations	4, 513	3, 477	613	334	89
Automobile-shop workers	37	9	21	2	5
Custodial workers	13	0	11	1	1
Drivers, truck	131	76	31	18	6
Farmworkers	3, 428	3, 146	73	169	40
Food-processing occupations	25	7	8	4	5

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS IN ARIZONA, BY PORT OF ENTRY AND OCCUPATION, 1967.—Continued

Occupation	Total	San Luis	Nogales	Douglas	Other ports[1]
Other occupations—Continued					
Gardeners	23	2	20	1	0
Hospital helpers	18	0	18	0	0
Jewelers	1	0	1	0	0
Laborers, general	211	22	138	38	13
Laundry workers	53	5	16	29	3
Maids, private household	198	41	118	29	10
Metalworkers	45	1	36	7	1
Parking-lot attendants	1	0	1	0	0
Professional occupations	54	1	50	3	0
Repair occupations	3	0	2	1	0
Sewing-machine operators	68	39	17	11	1
Service-station workers	19	1	13	4	1
Upholsterers	3	1	2	0	0
Warehousemen	37	1	35	0	1
Miscellaneous	145	125	2	17	1

[1] Sasabe and Naco, Ariz., and Columbus, N. Mex.

Source: I. & N.S. Commuter Census, November–December 1967.

TABLE 3.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS, IN CALIFORNIA, BY PORT OF ENTRY AND OCCUPATION, 1967

Occupation	Total	San Ysidro	Calexico	Other ports[1]
Total	15,284	7,535	7,690	59
Building occupations	521	431	87	3
Carpenters	131	112	17	2
Painters	153	142	11	0
Other building occupations	237	177	59	1
Business occupations	429	234	189	6
Cashiers	28	18	9	1
Clerks, office	47	35	12	0
Clerks, sales	207	80	122	5
Clerks, stock and receiving	64	43	21	0
Managers	41	31	10	0
Secretaries	24	16	8	0
Other business occupations	18	11	7	0
Hotel and restaurant occupations	812	749	62	1
Bartenders	28	22	6	0
Bellhops	10	8	2	0
Busboys	109	104	5	0
Chambermaids	108	104	4	0
Cooks	232	211	20	1
Kitchen helpers	236	223	13	0
Waiters, waitresses	70	60	10	0
Other hotel and restaurant occupations	19	17	2	0
Other occupations	13,522	6,121	7,352	49
Automobile shopworkers	253	184	69	0
Beauty operators and barbers	19	15	4	0
Custodial workers	116	108	7	1
Drivers, truck	315	109	206	0
Farmworkers	9,171	2,894	6,248	29
Fishermen	91	91	0	0
Florists	38	38	0	0
Food-processing occupations	299	264	35	0
Gardeners	301	281	19	1
Hospital helpers	17	12	5	0
Jewelers	22	21	1	0
Laborers, general	940	571	365	4
Laundry workers	245	236	9	0
Maids, private household	412	327	83	2
Metalworkers	147	135	12	0
Parking-lot attendants	34	33	1	0
Professional occupations	44	40	4	0
Repair occupations	49	42	7	0
Sewing-machine operators	290	277	13	0
Service-station workers	58	46	10	2
Upholsterers	94	88	6	0
Warehousemen	54	47	7	0
Miscellaneous	513	262	241	10

[1] Tecate and Andrade.

Source: I & N.S. Commuter Census, November-December 1967.

TABLE 4.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS IN TEXAS, BY PORT OF ENTRY AND OCCUPATION, 1967

Occupation	Total	El Paso[1]	Fabens	Del Rio	Eagle Pass	Laredo	Brownsville	Hidalgo	Other ports[2]
Total	19,714	11,760	279	317	1,635	2,669	1,917	937	200
Building occupations	1,801	1,208	2	26	67	196	169	123	10
Carpenters	732	458	0	14	35	79	89	53	4
Painters	319	214	0	9	11	27	25	33	0
Other building occupations	750	536	2	3	21	90	55	37	6
Business occupations	2,405	997	0	20	247	818	249	69	5
Cashiers	167	58	0	0	16	65	20	7	1
Clerks, office	233	93	0	2	27	92	17	0	2
Clerks, sales	1,248	454	0	10	148	419	167	49	1
Clerks, stock and receiving	232	145	0	1	7	70	5	3	1
Managers	309	171	0	7	24	77	25	5	0
Secretaries	150	51	0	0	15	69	15	0	0
Other business occupations	66	25	0	0	10	26	0	5	0
Hotel and restaurant occupations	1,308	965	0	23	52	141	96	30	1
Bartenders	56	42	0	0	5	4	5	0	0
Bellhops	25	21	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
Busboys	95	70	0	2	9	8	6	0	0
Cooks	390	254	0	12	18	54	32	20	0
Kitchen helpers	410	368	0	7	2	17	11	4	1
Waiters, waitresses	220	139	0	1	10	51	22	5	0
Other hotel and restaurant occupations	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other occupations	14,200	8,590	277	248	1,269	1,514	1,403	715	184
Automobile shopworkers	246	133	0	4	11	56	25	17	0
Beauty operators and barbers	53	45	0	0	4	4	0	0	0
Custodial workers	215	175	0	0	1	17	16	6	0
Drivers, truck	647	382	16	5	38	121	45	30	10
Farmworkers	3,436	1,461	204	2	682	312	168	459	148
Fishermen	92	1	0	0	0	5	86	0	0
Florists	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Food-processing occupations	524	164	1	4	11	19	319	6	0
Gardeners	210	123	0	6	11	46	23	1	0
Hospital helpers	53	42	0	0	1	4	1	5	0
Jewelers	16	8	0	0	2	2	2	2	0
Laborers, general	2,517	1,598	39	107	144	188	361	71	9
Laundry workers	292	203	0	8	8	38	27	8	0
Maids, private household	2,169	1,630	11	19	113	227	114	52	3
Metalworkers	1,435	1,217	0	60	32	23	82	21	0
Parking-lot attendants	12	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Professional occupations	244	145	1	3	15	51	26	1	2
Repair occupations	196	153	0	4	3	17	15	4	0

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—NUMBER OF MEXICAN ALIEN COMMUTERS IN TEXAS, BY PORT OF ENTRY AND OCCUPATION, 1967—Continued

Occupation	Total	El Paso [1]	Fabens	Del Rio	Eagle Pass	Laredo	Brownsville	Hidalgo	Other ports [2]
Other occupations—Continued									
Sewing-machine operators	809	554	5	15	128	70	32	5	0
Service-station workers	150	67	0	4	13	35	22	8	1
Upholsterers	125	84	0	2	5	25	7	2	0
Warehousemen	164	78	0	0	2	69	11	4	0
Miscellaneous	592	315	0	5	44	184	20	13	11

[1] Includes Cordova and Ysleta.
[2] Ft. Hancock, Presidio, Roma, and Progresso.

Source: I. & N.S. Commuter Census, November-December 1967.

OCCUPATIONS OF COMMUTERS

Farmwork was the occupation reported by 16,035 border crossers, or 40 percent of the total—a far greater number than in any other occupation.[1] The proportions were 66 percent for Arizona entry points, 60 percent in California, but only 17 percent in Texas. The major entry points for the Yuma and Imperial Valley vegetable and citrus areas are San Luis, Arizona and Calexico, California, where 89 and 91 percent, respectively, of the commuters were farmworkers.

Nine percent of the commuters designated themselves simply as laborers. They probably represent a large portion of the low-skilled segment of the labor force in a wide variety of industrial, service, construction, and other enterprises in some border towns.

Maids in private households were the third most numerous single occupation, comprising 7 percent of all commuters. Most of them entered at El Paso or San Ysidro (near San Diego).

Among business occupations, sales clerks were most numerous by a considerable margin. Commuters in business occupations, as a group, comprised 8 percent of the total. Those in hotel and restaurant occupations accounted for 6 percent and those in building occupations another 6 percent. Other significant concentrations were metal workers (4 percent) and sewing-machine operators (3 percent).

SCOPE AND METHOD OF LAREDO SURVEY

In the course of the I&NS Census, information was obtained about the place of employment and occupation for each commuter. In Laredo, Texas, data were obtained for 2,669 commuters. Of these, 20 percent were employed as farmworkers and household domestics. Excluding these workers from the totals reduces the number of commuters to 2,121. A sample of 90 establishments in which 5 or more commuters had been employed at the time of the I&NS Census was selected. In addition, a subsample of eight gasoline service stations employing less than five commuters was surveyed. Of the 98 establishments, one refused to provide data, one was out of business, and a third could not be located. The other 95 all provided data about the wage rates paid to commuters and U.S. residents employed in the same occupations. In all, wage data were obtained for 1,075 residents and 608 commuters employed in 48 broad occupational groupings.

There were 25 occupations in which five or more commuters were employed. These accounted for 84 percent of the residents and 94 percent of the commuters in the sample.

EMPLOYMENT AND WAGE FINDINGS OF THE LAREDO STUDY

The 608 commuters employed in the 95 establishments covered by the survey constituted 28 percent of the 2,121 commuters reported by I&NS who were not farm laborers or household domestics.

Although 48 separate occupations were reported for the commuters in the survey, there was a concentration of workers employed as salesclerks, laborers, general clerks, warehousemen, salesmen, and truck drivers.

Average hourly earnings for the 25 surveyed occupations in which five or more commuters were employed ranged from $.81 for busboys and $.86 for service-station attendants to $2.10 for customs appraisers. (Table 5.)

Commuters and resident workers employed in the same establishment received identical wages in each occupational classification.

A wage of $1.40 per hour was the rate most commonly paid to surveyed commuters (Table 6). This rate was the Federal minimum in effect at the time of the survey and, of the 608 workers in the sample, 48 percent were being paid precisely this amount. Moreover, 76 percent (including some workers not covered by the Federal minimum wage law) were receiving $1.40 per hour or less. This would indicate that the ready availability of alien commuters serves to keep the level of wage rates closely tied to the minimum, where applicable, and even lower for workers not protected by law.

IMPACT ON COMMUTERS OF RESTRICTIVE ADMISSION STANDARDS

Various proposals have been made to restrict the admission of the commuters. During the 90th Congress, a bill (S. 2790) was introduced in the Senate which would permit a commuter to reenter the United States ". . . only if the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Attorney General within six months prior to the date of admission that the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed, . . ." To implement this requirement, a test of adverse effect on wages would have to be specified.

---

[1] The survey was conducted in November and December when seasonal agricultural employment is at or near the peak of activity in border areas. The 16,035 farmworkers included 7,743 who had been doing migratory farmwork in the United States. They returned to Mexico during the survey period and began working as commuters. It is reasonable to assume that most of these workers would migrate again in the spring.

TABLE 5.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE RATES AND PREVAILING WAGE RATES FOR SELECTED OCCUPATIONS IN WHICH COMMUTERS ARE EMPLOYED AND THE PROPORTIONS OF COMMUTERS PAID LESS THAN SPECIFIED AMOUNTS, LAREDO, TEX., JANUARY 1968

Occupation	Average hourly earnings [1 2]	Prevailing wage rate [1 3]	Percent and number of commuters earning less than—					
			Prevailing wage rate		$1.40 per hour		$1.60 per hour	
			Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Total, specified occupations			14.0	175	24.8	311	80.0	1001
Appraiser, custom	$2.10	$2.15	41.7	8	0	0	0	0
Bookkeeper	1.71	1.65	45.5	8	0	0	36.4	6
Busboy	.81	.70	0	0	100.0	17	100.0	17
Butcher	1.65	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cashier	1.33	1.40	0	0	0	0	100.0	63
Clerk, general	1.49	1.40	0	0	0	0	54.5	81
Clerk-typist	1.54	1.60	8.3	1	0	0	8.3	1
Clerk, receiving and shipping	1.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	100.0	16
Kitchen helper	1.09	.95	0	0	100.0	9	100.0	9
Laundry machine presser	1.13	1.25	42.9	7	100.0	16	100.0	16
Laborer	1.43	1.45	0	0	15.0	22	85.0	127
Material handler	1.49	1.40	0	0	0	0	72.7	15
Chambermaid	.95	.95	15.4	3	100.0	19	100.0	19
Machinist, shop	1.47	1.40	0	0	0	0	80.0	5
Salesclerk	1.36	1.40	11.5	32	11.5	32	97.2	270
Salesman	1.65	1.40	66.7	42	66.7	42	88.9	56
Secretary	1.71	1.55	45.5	26	0	0	54.5	32
Sewing-machine operator	1.05	1.05	0	0	100.0	31	100.0	31
Service-station attendant	.86	.70	0	0	85.0	25	100.0	30
Stenographer	1.47	1.40	0	0	0	0	66.7	4
Stockman	1.34	1.40	17.8	8	17.8	8	100.0	45
Tailor	1.59	1.35	9.1	2	72.7	16	81.8	18
Truckdriver	1.76	1.40	0	0	0	0	50.0	31
Waiter-waitress	.87	.70	0	0	100.0	52	100.0	52
Warehouseman	1.47	1.40	28.7	22	28.7	22	73.7	57

[1] Based on rates paid to both commuters and U.S. residents.

[2] The data were tabulated in 10-cent intervals and the average hourly earnings were computed on the basis of the midpoints of the wage intervals.

[3] The midpoint of the wage interval containing the largest number of workers, provided this interval comprised at least 30 percent of all workers in the sample employed in this occupation. If there is no such interval, then the midpoint of the interval containing the median is the prevailing wage rate.

Source: Wage survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, January 1968.

For expository purposes, the following tests are considered in this paper:

1. Prevailing-rate concept—a commuter would be denied certification if he is employed in, or is seeking a job at, a wage rate less than that found to be prevailing in the occupation in the area of employment.

2. Adverse-effect wage rate concept—a commuter would be denied certification for employment at a wage rate below that specified by the Secretary of Labor, e.g., $1.40 per hour or $1.60 per hour.

In Table 5, estimates have been made of the percent and number of workers in principal occupations that would have been denied certification in January 1968 under the adverse-effect tests set forth above.

Only 14 percent of the commuters engaged in the 25 occupations shown in Table 5 would have been refused readmission if the prevailing rate in each occupation were the standard for certification. But if the wage test for certification were an adverse-effect rate of $1.40 per hour, nearly 25 percent of the commuters in the 25 selected occupations would not have been permitted to enter the United States at the wage rates they were then receiving. Approximately 80 percent of them would have been denied certification if the wage standard had been $1.60 per hour. Table 6, which takes into account a broader range of occupations, shows 28 percent of the commuters earning less than $1.40 an hour and 80 percent under $1.60.

Excluded from Table 5 and Table 6 are the farmhands and household domestic workers. Because their wages are very low, almost all of them would have been denied admission under either the $1.40 or the $1.60 adverse-effect standard.

Because the Laredo survey was conducted in January 1968, the estimated impact on the commuter flow at the $1.60 rate is probably overstated. At the time of the survey, the FLSA minimum was $1.40 per hour. A substantial number of establishments included in the survey are covered by the Federal minimum wage law. Wage rates in these establishments were increased to no less than $1.60 on February 1, 1968, and commuters in their employ, therefore, would not be denied certification because of standard wage offers.

A City of Laredo ordinance, which became effective February 1, 1968, shortly after the Labor Department survey was made, provides a minimum wage of $1.00 an hour (to be raised to $1.15 an hour after September 1, 1969). Several categories of employees are exempt, however, most notably domestic servants and employees covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Less than 12 percent of the commuters in the 48 occupations surveyed by the Labor Department would have been affected by the $1.00-an-hour minimum.

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUTERS[1] BY WAGE RATE, LAREDO, TEX., JANUARY 1968

Wage interval	Percent of total[2]	Cumulative percentage[2]
$0.70 and less	4.6	4.6
$0.71 to $0.80	1.1	5.7
$0.81 to $0.90	.2	5.9
$0.91 to $1	6.3	12.2
$1.01 to $1.10	5.0	17.2
$1.11 to $1.20	1.1	18.4
$1.21 to $1.30	3.9	22.3
$1.31 to $1.39	5.6	27.9
$1.40	47.7	75.6
$1.41 to $1.50	3.6	79.2
$1.51 to $1.59	.5	79.7
$1.60	7.9	87.6
$1.61 to $1.70	5.0	92.6
$1.71 to $1.80	1.3	93.9
$1.81 to $1.90	.3	94.2
$1.91 to $2	2.0	96.2
$2.01 to $2.10	.5	96.7
$2.11 to $2.20	.5	97.1
$2.21 to $2.30	.5	97.6
$2.31 to $2.40	.3	97.9
$2.41 to $2.50	.7	98.6
$2.51 to $2.60	.2	98.7
$2.61 to $2.70	.2	98.9
$2.71 to $2.80	0	98.9
$2.81 to $2.90	0	98.9
$2.91 to $3	.5	99.4
Over $3	.6	100.0

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUTERS[1] BY WAGE RATE, LAREDO, TEX., JANUARY 1968—Con.

[1] Excludes farmworkers and maids in private households.

[2] Percent of all commuters in the 48 occupations covered by the survey.

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add to totals.

Source: Wage survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, January 1968.

APPLICABILITY TO OTHER BORDER COMMUNITIES

The 2,669 daily commuters to Laredo constituted almost 11 percent of the total labor force in that area. By way of contrast, 7,535 commuters crossed daily through the San Ysidro border station into the San Diego area, but they were only 2 percent of the work force. Table 7 compares the commuters counted by I&NS at each of the major points of entry with employment in nearby U.S. border counties for time periods as comparable as possible to the time of the survey.

The employent of green-card commuters in the Laredo area is pervasive. They work in almost all establishments of any size, although they are concentrated in the relatively low-skilled jobs. In other border areas with a labor force comparable to Laredo's, commuter employment probably followed very much the same pattern. And even in a large area where the proportion of the labor force made up by commuters is relatively smaller, it is likely that, because of their concentration in unskilled jobs, the commuters considerably influence the wages and working conditions prevailing in certain occupations.

Another consideration is that the commuters who enter at such points as Calexico, San Luis, and Hidalgo are employed for the most part in agriculture. If an adverse-effect-rate standard of $1.40 or $1.60 per hour were established, then a significant number of the workers seeking admission to California would be denied certification, as would nearly all the commuters regularly employed in agriculture in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

In summary, the estimates of impact on commuter admissions which would result from establishment of restrictive standards that were derived from the Laredo wage and employment data are probably generally applicable, with variations dependent on the occupational mix, to other border areas.

APPLICABILITY TO OTHER BORDER COMMUNITIES

The 2,669 daily commuters to Laredo constituted almost 11 percent of the total labor force in that area. By way of contrast, 7,535 commuters crossed daily through the San Ysidro border station into the San Diego area, but they were only 2 percent of the work force. Table 7 compares the commuters counted by I&NS at each of the major points of entry with employment in nearby U.S. border counties for time periods as comparable as possible to the time of the survey.

The employment of green-card commuters in the Laredo area is pervasive. They work in almost all establishments of any size, although they are concentrated in the relatively low-skilled jobs. In other border areas with a labor force comparable to Laredo's, commuter employment probably followed very much the same pattern. And even in a large area where the proportion of the labor force made up by commuters is relatively smaller, it is likely that, because of their concentration in unskilled jobs, the commuters considerably influence the wages and working conditions prevailing in certain occupations.

Another consideration is that the commuters who enter at such points as Calexico, San Luis, and Hidalgo are employed for the most part in agriculture. If an adverse-effect-rate standard of $1.40 or $1.60 per hour were established, then a significant number of the workers seeking admission to California would be denied certification, as would nearly all the commuters regularly employed in agriculture in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

In summary, the estimates of impact on commuter admissions which would result from establishment of restrictive standards that were derived from the Laredo wage and employment data are probably generally applicable, with variations dependent on the occupational mix, to other border areas.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT ON SENATE FLOOR BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, DECEMBER 14, 1967

There is no doubt that the commuter movement adversely effects the wages and working conditions of our own citizens and residents, especially those living in the cities and towns along the Mexican border—in Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas. The commuter movement from Mexico is a factor contributing to the grinding poverty, high unemployment, and low wages in the border areas.

Border areas consistently have higher rates of unemployment than do interior areas. In many cases, the rates are very much greater.

The rates available in 13 border areas for the first 6 months of this year are typical of annual figures available since 1957. Last June, for example, in none of these 13 areas was the unemployment rate lower than the average rate for the State. Twelve of these border areas were in Texas—the unemployment rate in seven of the Texas areas was more than double the statewide rate of 3.7 percent. In one area, Crystal City in Zavala County, the rate was much greater—11.3 percent.

In 1966, in only one of 19 border areas for which data were available, was the unemployment rate lower than the average rate for the State.

Over the last 10 years, available data permitted 138 comparisons of annual average unemployment rates in border areas with those at the State level. In 129 cases, border area rates were higher than the State average.

It is a deplorable situation—an indication of severe economic depression—that unemployment rates exceeding 10 percent are common in such Texas communities as Laredo, Eagle Pass, Zapata, Brackettville, Cotulla, Crystal City and in El Centro, California.

The influx of commuters from Mexico is contributing to the high unemployment rates in border areas.

These commuters are a significant part of the work force in many communities. In some areas their number nearly equals the number of unemployed American workers. In El Paso, where unemployment is currently some 35 percent greater than the State average, the estimated number of commuters in 1966 was more than double the number of unemployed. In El Centro, Calif., where the unemployment rate is currently 13.1 percent, the estimated number of commuters in 1966 was nearly double the number of unemployed. There is every reason to believe the situation has not changed for the better. If anything, it has been aggravated by the frequent use of commuters as strikebreakers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks statistical summaries of unemployment rates in border areas over the last 10 years, and an additional table on unemployment and alien commuters in 1966 for selected border areas.

The **Presiding Officer**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 3, 4, and 5.)

Mr. **Kennedy** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, aside from the commuter influx contributing to high unemployment in border areas, it also contributes to depressed wage rates. Industry by industry, county by county, the pattern is the same—earnings in border areas are lower than average earnings in the State. This is true in more than 90 percent of those cases where available information has made a comparison possible.

Although the most definitive date available is based on nonfarm weekly wage rates in 1965, the Department of Labor informs me that the situation remains unchanged. The average weekly nonfarm wage in Imperial County, Calif., is $20 less than the average in the State as a whole—in Santa Cruz County, Ariz., it is $29 less—in nine of the Texas border counties it is at least $25 less, and often more.

The differential is even greater in wage rates for farmwork—especially in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. A year ago, hourly wages in the valley averaged approximately 75 cents—some 22 cents less than the 97 cents average at the State level. As a result of the new farm labor coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, there has been a sharp increase in farm wage rates in the valley, and the gap between farm wages in this area and the State as a whole is beginning to narrow. Currently it is some 16 cents—the differential between 89 cents in the valley and $1.05 at the State level.

But this is belated progress—because for at least 10 years, not only have farm wages in the valley been low, they have also failed to show the gains recorded elsewhere in the State. In 1956 the hourly wage in the valley was 84 percent of the State average—it had dropped to 77 percent by 1966.

Today, largely as a result of the new farm labor coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the ratio has climbed to some 85 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the **Record** at the conclusion of my remarks a statistical summary of average weekly earnings of nonfarm workers in border areas during the first quarter of 1965, and a second table listing average hourly wage rates for seasonal farmworkers in Texas border areas.

The **Presiding Officer**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 6 and 7.)

Mr. **Kennedy** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, to illustrate further the contribution of commuters to depressed wage rates in border areas, I will refer to the results of a special survey conducted in 1961, by the Department of Labor in Laredo and El Paso. The survey concerned the jobs held by commuters, the wages received, and the availability of domestic workers for these jobs. Again, the situation has changed little from the time the survey was made, in fact, there is reason to believe it has worsened.

The survey indicates that, although commuters were employed in most occupations and industries, they were heavily concentrated in the garment industry, hotels, restaurants, and retail trade and service establishments.

In the Laredo survey, the Department of Labor contacted a sampling of firms employing some 3,000 workers—of whom 438 were easily identified as commuters.

The survey team reported that additional workers were suspected of being commuters, but could not be readily identified.

The Laredo survey revealed at least two things. First, that a large number of unemployed American workers had the same occupational skills as alien commuters—this in a community where unemployment was heavy—11.3 percent. For example, the two garment firms in the sampling employed 88 commuters as sewing machine operators. Files of the Texas Employment Commission contained applications from 156 unemployed American workers with this same occupation.

Second, the survey shows that firms employing alien commuters paid lower wages than did firms employing American workers. This was not the exception—but a very common pattern, for 19 occupations where sufficient data were available. Moreover, there were cases where a single firm employing both commuters and Americans would pay the commuters less than the Americans similarly employed.

And finally, the average wage paid by those firms employing only American workers was 38 percent higher than the average wage paid by those firms employing commuters as well.

The El Paso survey produced similar results.

I should add here some recent information compiled by the Department of Labor which greatly adds to the seriousness of the wage problem.

The common pattern of low wages in the border areas has led to a high incidence of minimum wage law violations. The Department reports that in fiscal year 1967, 20 percent of the violations in the four border States occurred in counties contiguous to the Mexican border. Yet, these counties had only 6 percent of the nonfarm work force in these four States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the **Record** at the conclusion of my remarks a table listing occupational wage data obtained in the Laredo survey and a brief summary of the survey in El Paso.

The **Presiding Officer**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 8 and 9.)

EXHIBIT 3

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN BORDER AREAS, JANUARY–JUNE 1967

State and labor market area	Counties	1967					
		June	May	April	March	February	January
California		5.4	4.9	5.3	5.7	6.0	5.5
San Diego	San Diego	5.3	4.6	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.0
El Centro	Imperial	(1)	(1)	13.1	(1)	(1)	(1)
Texas		3.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.0
Border areas:							
El Paso	El Paso	5.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.9
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	Cameron	7.3	6.2	6.3	6.0	5.8	5.9
Laredo	Webb	10.6	7.4	9.0	9.0	9.9	11.4
McAllen	Hidalgo and Starr	6.8	5.6	5.6	6.3	6.2	6.3
Del Rio	Val Verda	5.6	(1)	6.1	(1)	8.8	(1)
Eagle Pass	Maverick	9.3	(1)	7.9	(1)	12.8	(1)
Zapata	Zapata	9.8	(1)	11.7	(1)	14.4	(1)
Areas close to the border:							
Brackettville	Kinney	8.8	(1)	8.5	(1)	8.5	(1)
Carrizo Springs	Dimmit	(1)	(1)	7.0	(1)	(1)	(1)
Cotulla	La Salle	7.8	(1)	4.4	(1)	12.4	(1)
Crystal City	Zavala	11.3	(1)	10.7	(1)	14.3	(1)
Hebbronville	Jim Hogg	7.3	(1)	6.0	(1)	7.6	(1)
Raymondville	Willacy	7.7	(1)	4.3	(1)	5.2	(1)

[1] Information not available.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 4

BORDER AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ANNUAL AVERAGES, 1957–66

State and labor market area	Counties	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957
California		5.0	5.9	6.0	6.0	5.8	6.9	5.8	4.8	6.4	4.1
San Diego	San Diego	5.2	7.2	7.5	7.7	7.9	7.5	6.4	3.9	4.8	3.2
El Centro	Imperial	9.6	10.1	9.6	9.2	9.0	8.6	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Texas		3.2	4.2	4.8	5.4	5.3	6.0	5.3	4.6	5.3	4.0
Border areas:											
El Paso	El Paso	4.4	5.8	6.0	6.2	5.5	5.6	4.9	3.4	3.9	4.0
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	Cameron	6.4	7.6	8.5	9.1	9.7	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Laredo	Webb	9.6	11.3	11.9	12.0	10.1	9.1	9.4	9.2	8.6	9.3
McAllen	Hildalgo and Starr	6.1	7.0	8.0	8.6	9.0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Del Rio	Val Verda	6.2	7.7	9.2	9.1	9.4	10.0	8.0	8.5	6.0	9.2
Eagle Pass	Maverick	11.2	14.4	14.7	15.1	13.8	12.4	9.5	11.4	10.4	14.4
Zapata	Zapata	11.0	12.8	12.6	14.3	13.1	12.4	13.1	12.2	6.7	6.9

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 4—Continued

BORDER AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ANNUAL AVERAGES, 1967-66

State and labor market area	Counties	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957
Texas—Continued											
Areas close to the border:											
Brackettville	Kinney	7.7	8.6	11.7	10.5	12.2	11.2	9.9	8.6	10.4	9.8
Carizzo Springs	Dimmit	10.6	7.1	7.0	6.7	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Cotulla	La Salle	10.0	12.2	12.3	13.2	11.8	8.4	7.4	8.2	11.7	9.7
Crystal City	Zavala	12.5	12.3	13.3	12.9	13.6	6.7	7.4	7.7	8.6	4.5
Hebbronville	Jim Hogg	9.5	11.5	11.8	10.1	10.6	10.9	9.3	9.8	10.6	10.2
Raymondville	Willacy	9.1	9.1	9.5	10.2	10.0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Arizona		3.8	5.1	5.1	5.0	5.1	5.8	4.7	4.7	5.7	3.9
Tucson	Pima	4.1	6.2	6.5	5.8	4.9	5.7	5.1	4.8	6.0	4.1
Douglas and Bisbee	Cochise	3.1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Nogales	Santa Cruz	5.0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Yuma	Yuma	5.1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Information not available.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 5

BORDER CITIES—UNEMPLOYMENT AND ALIEN COMMUTERS, JANUARY 1966

City	Unemployed U.S. residents		Alien commuters	City	Unemployed U.S. residents		Alien commuters
	Number	Rate			Number	Rate	
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	3,020	6.2	2,032	McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg, Tex	4,190	6.9	1,163
El Paso, Tex	5,050	4.8	11,772	El Centro, Calif	3,675	10.7	7,616
Laredo, Tex	3,365	12.6	2,581	San Diego, Calif	22,300	5.2	9,281

Source: Unemployment data from the Texas Labor Market, Texas Employment Commission, and labor market reports of the California Department of Employment; alien commuter data from I. & N.S. survey, Jan 17, 1966.

EXHIBIT 6

THE BORDER COUNTIES—AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS OF NONFARM WORKERS, JANUARY-MARCH 1965

Area	Total nonfarm	Selected industries							
		Mining	Contract construction	Manufacturing	Transportation, communication, and public utilities	Wholesale trade	Retail trade	Finance, insurance, and real estate	Services
Border States	$103	$117	$121	$125	$117	$121	$74	$101	$82
Border counties	91	132	116	122	106	98	68	94	66
California	113	147	142	132	128	131	83	106	92
Border counties	107	151	140	147	122	120	79	102	74
San Diego	107	152	140	147	122	122	79	102	75
Imperial	93	122	134	124	107	107	77	85	71
Arizona	94	139	124	117	115	108	68	97	67
Border counties	87	145	114	112	106	86	67	94	66
Yuma	74	101	102	84	110	57	74	90	61
Pima	88	145	117	116	108	104	67	96	67
Santa Cruz	65	(1)	70	53	85	82	61	87	45
Cochise	101	(1)	(1)	117	104	82	60	86	67
New Mexico	89	125	97	106	104	105	62	89	84
Border counties	78	85	92	138	82	97	60	78	61
Hidalgo	69	(1)	(1)	(1)	93	88	57	73	47
Luna	73	(1)	109	78	87	86	57	82	43
Dona Ana	80	85	86	165	79	100	61	78	64
Texas	87	126	91	108	98	107	60	91	61
Border counties	67	101	79	73	90	82	53	80	49
El Paso	76	94	85	78	113	103	60	85	54
Hudspeth	68	70	89	----------	(1)	----------	48	(1)	15
Jeff Davis	76	(1)	(1)	----------	(1)	68	31	(1)	38
Presidio	53	(1)	54	(1)	60	50	50	87	35
Brewster	52	(1)	78	(1)	67	74	44	75	37
Terrell	67	(1)	26	(1)	111	(1)	53	54	36
Val Verde	57	(1)	87	(1)	79	67	49	74	42
Kinney	58	----------	38	----------	(1)	(1)	32	(1)	37
Maverick	48	104	70	(1)	64	92	39	70	34
Webb	53	79	67	60	62	66	48	67	39
Zapata	54	86	(1)	----------	64	(1)	23	64	31
Starr	68	102	(1)	----------	68	43	38	68	35
Hidalgo	59	107	68	62	81	62	50	72	46
Cameron	58	111	71	65	58	70	49	78	48

[1] Data not published to avoid disclosing information from individual establishments.

Source: Based on data published in 1965 County Business Patterns, U.S. Department of Commerce. Average weekly earnings computed by dividing quarterly payroll by March employment by 13. Result rounded to nearest dollar.

EXHIBIT 7

TEXAS BORDER AREAS—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE RATE FOR SEASONAL FARM ACTIVITIES, MID-NOVEMBER 1966-56

Area	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
State of Texas	$0.97	$0.87	$0.78	$0.76	$0.73	$0.56	$0.55	$0.56	$0.52	$0.58	$0.51
Lower Rio Grande Valley	.75	.65	.60	.58	.59	.43	.43	.43	.43	.43	.43
Rio Grande Plains	.77	.73	.68	.68	.67	.49	.46	.46	(1)	.50	.47
Trans-Pecos	.83	.82	.71	.71	.71	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50

[1] Information not available.

Source: Office of Farm Labor Service, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Based upon reports prepared by the Texas Employment Commission.

EXHIBIT 8

OCCUPATIONAL WAGE STRUCTURE—LAREDO, TEX., JUNE 1961[1]

Industry and occupation	Average wage rate (per week): Firms employing only domestic workers	Average wage rate (per week): Firms employing domestic and alien commuter workers
Hotels and motels:		
Cook	$58	$34
Maid	20	17
Hallboy	25	20
Waiter	[2] 15	[3] 18
Busboy	[2] 25	13
Bartender	58	46
Bellboy	[2] 15	[3] 16
Drugstores and related firms:		
Cashier	27	12
Stock clerk	52	40
Fountain girl	16	[3] 23
Drug clerk	77	55
Grocery and related firms:		
Cashier	24	24
Stockboy	35	20
Produceman	45	35
Butcher	65	52
Warehouseman	37	31
Miscellaneous retail firms:		
Porter	53	35
Warehouseman	73	21
Stockman	53	45

[1] Data were collected in the survey concerning the different rates paid each occupation in each firm. For some occupation monthly rates were reported; these were converted to weekly rates by dividing the monthly rate by 4.33. The number of workers paid each rate was not reported in all cases, making it impossible to compute an average rate weighted by the number of workers paid each rate. The average rates shown in the table represent the average of the highest and lowest rates paid. These averages correspond quite accurately with the weighted averages computed for the few occupations where data were reported for each worker.

[2] Plus tips.

[3] Plus $3 meal allowance.

EXHIBIT 9

Following is a summary of the El Paso survey results:

Eleven construction firms. Six firms employed only U.S. residents; five employed alien commuters. Two-thirds of the firms employing only U.S. residents paid the union scale. Only 20 percent of the firms employing commuters paid the union scale. The lowest rates were paid by the non-union firms that employed commuters.

Four retail dry goods stores. Three firms employed alien commuters. They paid lower wage rates than the firms that employed only U.S. residents.

Four wholesale and warehouse firms. Three firms employed alien commuters. The firm employing only U.S. residents paid the highest wage rates.

All sample firms in the following industries employed alien commuters: garment manufacturing (11 firms); restaurants (five firms); meatpacking (three firms); and laundries (four firms). Of interest is the fact that in the one laundry where wage rate data were supplied for both alien commuters and U.S. residents, the commuters were paid less than $.50 per hour while the U.S. residents were paid about $.80 per hour.

Insufficient wage and employment data were obtained to make any comparison for seven *transportation and storage* firms; two *cotton processors;* and three *hotels and motels.*

In several industries, *refineries* (four firms); *miscellaneous manufacturing* (seven firms); and *miscellaneous* firms (five establishments), there was no difference in the rates paid by firms employing alien commuters and those employing U.S. workers. One refinery, two miscellaneous manufacturing, and two of the other miscellaneous firms employed commuters.

Six other *retail trade* firms were included in the sample, but meaningful comparison could not be made because the nature of their operations and the occupations of the workers they employed were too dissimilar.

EXHIBIT 4

COMMUTER WORKERS IDENTIFIED BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASS, NOV. 1, 1967, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1967

Port	Industrial workers	Building trades and construction workers	Agricultural workers	Sales and service workers	Private household workers	Total
California:						
San Ysidro	2,005	409	2,827	1,950	344	7,535
Tecate	6	4	30	14	2	56
Calexico	195	93	6,810	517	75	7,690
Andrade	1	0	2	0	0	3
Arizona:						
San Luis	39	14	3,325	146	29	3,553
Lukeville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sasabe	0	0	0	3	0	3
Nogales	179	136	6	682	115	1,118
Naco	3	31	10	47	3	94
Douglas	48	28	175	99	30	380
New Mexico: Columbus	2	1	26	1	0	30
Texas:						
El Paso:						
Santa Fe Bridge	1,801	844	1,088	2,725	1,388	7,846
Cordova	1,145	704	136	1,387	119	3,491
Ysleta	132	60	165	46	20	423
Fabens	60	14	195	1	9	279
Fort Hancock	3	1	46	0	3	53
Presidio	1	3	17	2	1	24
Del Rio	144	65	18	70	20	317
Eagle Pass	185	147	751	398	154	1,635
Laredo	106	212	321	1,825	205	2,769
Roma	1	7	54	10	1	73
Hidalgo	70	146	472	199	50	937
Progreso	0	6	41	2	1	50
Brownsville	724	215	198	632	148	1,917
Total	6,850	3,140	[1] 16,713	10,756	2,717	40,176

[1] Includes 7,743 agricultural workers who came to the border from the interior of the United States during the count and commenced working as commuters. It is anticipated these workers will return to the interior of the United States in the spring to work as migrants.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I join with Senator KENNEDY and others in the introduction of a bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act to regulate the green-card commuter problem.

"Green-card commuters" are persons who have been granted permanent alien resident status as bona fide immigrants, but who, nonetheless, reside in Mexico or Canada and regularly enter the United States solely for the purposes of employment.

The problems created by the commuter immigrant are manifest, particularly along the Mexican border. Given the poor working and living conditions along the northern border of Mexico, Mexican aliens, as a group, serve as a readily available, low-wage work force which undermines the standards workers generally enjoy throughout the rest of the United States. As a result, the forces of free enterprise are prevented from operating to develop standards along the border commensurate with normal American standards.

The depressed wage rates that result are satisfactory recompense for the commuter immigrant since he can return to Mexico daily or weekly with his earnings to live in a much lower cost economy. These green-card commuters simply fail to become immigrants in the sense contemplated by the law. And their employment in this country is clearly detrimental to the economic conditions, the job opportunities, and the organizing and collective bargaining efforts of American workers, because they have little or no stake in the resolution of domestic labor disputes. Indeed, it is clear that these nonresident commuters, as well as illegal entrants, are widely used as strikebreakers.

The bill seeks to remedy this serious problem. While it may need perfecting amendments, I believe the bill provides a sound basis on which to eliminate current abuses of our immigration laws. A major goal of our immigration laws has always been the reasonable protection of working conditions and job opportunities for American workers, and this bill is consistent with that goal.

The bill's purpose is consistent with my personal conviction that our Nation must promote an open border policy—a policy that permits people and trade to flow across our borders without undue restriction. The bill seeks merely to eliminate widespread abuses of our immigration policies—abuses that run entirely contrary to our Nation's dedication to justice and fairplay—and I support it for that reason.

DELAYS IN CAB INVESTIGATION OF CONGESTION AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on June 20, 1967, the Civil Aeronautics Board ordered an investigation to determine what steps should be taken to relieve congestion at National Airport and to improve the utilization of Dulles and Friendship airports. That was 20 months ago and still there has been no formal hearing.

Now we are told there will be a further delay while the Department of Transportation assesses the situation and crystalizes its position. Testifying before the Senate District Committee Wednesday, Chairman John H. Crooker, Jr., of the CAB, put the earliest possible date for the hearing at sometime in June, although it is doubtful anything will be done before the end of the year.

Mr. President, I sympathize with the problems of the Department. But I have greater sympathy for those who must live with the noise, pollution, and inconvenience resulting from the congested conditions at National.

In the 20 months that this hearing has

been delayed, the number of passengers using National has increased by 2,275,000 or 17 percent over the preceding 20-month period. And the problem will continue to grow until positive steps are taken to limit the number of flights at National.

In the beginning, it was hoped the airlines would do this voluntarily and they were granted a delay to work out an agreement. Nothing happened. And, judging from the testimony of former FAA Administrator E. R. Quesada, himself an airline director, nothing will happen. Competitive pressures in the industry are simply too strong for there to be any realistic hope of a voluntary solution, according to General Quesada. That leaves the problem squarely in the hands of the FAA and the CAB.

In requesting the most recent delay in this proceeding, the Department of Transportation expresses hope that new regulations concerning the use of high-density traffic airports, of which National is one, might resolve the congestion problem. Frankly, I see little chance of that happening.

The new regulations make no change in the number of commercial flights now using National nor do they remove the exemption for extra sections of commuter flights. In its testimony Wednesday, the FAA make it clear that under these flight limitations, and without introducing larger aircraft into National, the number of passengers will increase by 6 million in 1980.

The high-density traffic airport regulations are scheduled to become effective on June 1, 1969, and to expire 6 months later or December 31, 1969. If the Department of Transportation waits to evaluate the results, it could be another year before CAB hearings are held.

Mr. President, I am disappointed by the failure to move ahead with this investigation. Any further lengthy delays would be unconscionable. I hope the hearings now being held by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia will impress the Department of Transportation and the CAB with the urgency of the situation. We know the problem and we know the solution. What we need now is to act.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1969, under authority of the order of March 24, 1969:

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Harold B. Finger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Kenneth E. Frick, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles H. Rogovin, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Jerome M. Rosow, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 26, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Finally, brethren, be of one mind, live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you.—2 Corinthians 13: 11.

Eternal Spirit, who art ever speaking to man and always seeking to lead Thy children into the ways of peace, we pray for our country.

Strengthen our leaders that they may walk with Thee as they carry their responsibilities. Sustain our people that in true service and with humble hearts they may usher in a new day of peace by doing Thy will.

So unite us in our love for Thee and by our confidence in one another that together we may hasten the day when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

With this creative faith and this courageous spirit may we march forward together toward a greater nation and a better world.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 25, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 4:40 p.m., on Tuesday, March 25, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President transmitting the report for fiscal year 1968 on the international educational and cultural exchange program.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968 ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the report for fiscal year 1968 on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256). During fiscal year 1968, 6,777 teachers, scholars, and distinguished leaders were involved in this program in the United States and in 126 other nations and territories. This was a reduction of 10 percent from the preceding year. Since 1949, a total of 125,777 persons have participated in the exchanges.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1969.*

EXTENDING FOR ANOTHER YEAR INCOME TAX SURCHARGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-92)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Clearly this nation must come to grips with the problem of an inflation that has been allowed to run into its fourth year. This is far too long, and it has already caused substantial distortions in our economy.

Inflation is a form of economic aggression against the very young and the very old, the poor and the thrifty. It is these Americans who are largely defenseless against the kind of price increases for food, clothing, medicine, housing and education that have swept over the Nation in the last few years.

Government has two major instruments for dealing with this problem. One is monetary policy, which should continue its program of restraint. The other is fiscal policy—the management of the Federal budget—which must turn away from budgets which have propelled the inflation, and turn instead to one with a strong surplus that will help to curb it.

The prospect of a thin budget surplus or a return to deficits would again nudge monetary policy off course. The result, as always, would be further increases in interest rates, a dangerously overheated economic engine, and the threat of accelerating the advance of the price level. Because the problem of inflation was neglected far too long, we cannot risk even a neutral budget policy of narrow balance.

Only a combined policy of a strong budget surplus and monetary restraint can now be effective in cooling inflation, and in ultimately reducing the restrictive interest rates forced on us by past policies. This is fundamental economics, and we intend to deal with fundamentals.

We are determined to keep faith with America's wage earners, farmers and businessmen. We are committed to take every necessary action to protect every American's savings and real income from further loss to inflation.

The budget for the year beginning July 1, 1969, submitted in January, estimates the surplus at $3.4 billion. However, current examination of this budget reveals that some of its estimates of expenditures were low. For example, interest on the Federal debt will be far more than was estimated. This, along with such items as an underestimate of farm price support payments and a substantial overestimate of offshore oil lease receipts, means that a current analysis of the budget submitted in January shows a reduction in the surplus of $1.3 billion for this fiscal year and $1.7 billion for the fiscal year 1970.

Thus, half of the projected 1970 surplus has disappeared before the year begins. Similarly, more than half of this year's projected surplus of $2.4 billion will not be realized—and for the same reasons.

On the matter of cutting expenditures:

To produce a budget that will stop inflation, we must cut expenditures while maintaining revenues. This will not be easy. Dealing with fundamentals never is.

I intend to submit budget revisions which will reduce Federal spending in fiscal 1970 significantly below the amount recommended in January, even before those previous figures have been adjusted to reflect current conditions.

On the matter of maintaining revenues:

I am convinced that the path of responsibility requires that the income tax surcharge, which is expected to yield $9½ billion, be extended for another year. As I have said before, the surcharge is a temporary tax that must be ended as soon as our commitments in Southeast Asia and economic conditions permit. Because of budget and economic conditions, I reaffirm my support of the recommendation President Johnson made last January that the surcharge be extended, and I am transmitting to the Congress a request that this be done.

In addition, the scheduled reductions in the telephone and passenger car excise taxes must be postponed, and user charges equal in revenue yield to those now in the budget should be enacted. Together, these will produce close to $1 billion in revenue next year.

On the question of tax reform, this Administration remains committed to a more equitable and more efficient tax structure. In the coming month, the first specific proposals of that reform will be coming up to the Congress from the Treasury Department.

Taken together, these actions to reduce spending and maintain revenues will produce the strong budget surplus urgently needed to meet the inflationary threat.

Moreover, by proving Government's serious intent to counter the upward spiral of prices and wages, we will create conditions which will encourage the private sector to stop assuming a high rate of inflation in long-range planning.

Courageous Government action will modify the inflationary psychology which now afflicts business, labor and consumers generally. It is particularly hard on small business, and those of modest means in the management of their incomes and savings.

This ordering of our economic house—distasteful as it is in many respects—will do much to slow down the rise in the cost of living, help our seriously weakened position in international trade, and restore the sound basis for our on-going prosperity.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1969.*

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON SURTAX

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inflation which has been with us for more than 3 years has reached a new peak of intensity and peril. President Nixon has therefore seized this moment to lay a challenge before Congress and the American people and to spell out the course of action we must follow to bring inflation under control. A majority of us in this House voted last year to approve a 10-percent surtax on individual and corporate income taxes. That took political courage, but we later found that the voters did not visit retribution upon us. Now, with the inflation battle still to be won, President Nixon has exhibited the same kind of courage and has asked us to act in the best interests of the United States and its people. I do not think this House of Representatives will flinch from that responsibility. I feel certain Congress will do what we know to be sensible and right in this time of inflationary stress and psychology. There is no question that President Nixon has made the proper recommendation in urging a 12-month extension of the surtax at the existing level. And there is no question in my mind that Congress will approve that recommendation. We know what the evil consequences of runaway inflation would be. We know that if inflation forces are not thwarted, prices in this country will double within 14 years. We know that men and women who have set aside savings to live on in retirement will see half of those savings destroyed unless inflation is curbed. What Mr. Nixon has proposed in a consumer program—a program to protect what the consumer has to spend. This is not a problem that the President alone can solve. He needs the help of Congress and he needs the help of the American people. Business, labor, and consumers—all must make a commitment to the goal that President Nixon has set, that of erasing the current inflationary psychology and halting the steady erosion of the dollar's purchasing power. If America whips inflation now, Mr. Speaker, our people can have a strong, growing economy with low unemployment in the future. Mr. Speaker, let us all have the courage to back the President in the fight against inflation, for the long-term good of the Nation and especially the poor and the pensioners.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON SURTAX

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, President Nixon submitted his message urging extension of the 10-percent tax surcharge for 1 more year.

Here we go again. When the surtax debate took place last year, we were assured that within the surtax year, the

XUM

administration would present a program of revenue-raising tax reform.

It was my expectation that these new tax reform revenues would replace the surtax in the second year. It appears from the President's proposals that this is too much for the American taxpayer to hope for.

I expect to vote against the extension of the surtax, since it has been an utter failure in controlling inflation. The American taxpayer has a right to rebel against this needless tax which sensible and proper tax reform would make unnecessary.

The taxpayer has a right to expect action on tax reform in this Congress. This is the very hour for performance. The extension of the surtax would only serve to extend the privilege of tax shelters which have eroded the integrity of our tax system and the public confidence.

The surtax has also served as a fiscal crutch. If it is taken away, revenue-raising tax reform becomes an immediate necessity. The Treasury loss of the tax surcharge could be easily replaced by suspension of the investment credit; the imposition of capital gains tax at death; the modification of the oil-depletion allowance; the imposition of a minimum tax on the super-rich; the elimination of farm loss abuses; and a limitation on tax-free bond holding.

Now is the best time for tax reform. The issue must not be delayed, detoured, or destroyed.

SPECIAL ELECTION

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to congratulate the good people of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee on the election of Edward Jones, Democrat, to Congress yesterday. I congratulate Ed Jones also and join my colleagues in welcoming him as a new Member of the House.

Mr. Jones, a farmer and former State commissioner of agriculture, carried 12 of the 14 counties in the large rural district which covers the entire western part of the State north of Memphis. Significant in the election is the fact that there were 11 candidates in the race, including a Republican, an American Independent Party candidate, and eight other candidates. Ed Jones won his nomination in open convention, campaigned as an organization Democrat and pledged to his constituents to support the Democratic Party. Ed Jones took the Democratic record of leadership and accomplishment to the people and won by a majority over both the endorsed Republican and the American Party candidate.

He ran his campaign by taking a stand on the issues and meeting the people to discuss with them the problems of the area. Again I congratulate Ed Jones and the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a table showing the election results on yesterday in the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee:

Jones	32,874
Davis	16,341
Dunavant	15,616
Lanier	2,018
Pickett	1,379
Total	68,228

CONGRESSMAN-ELECT ED JONES

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the dean of the Tennessee delegation, Congressman Joe L. Evins, who is out of Washington on official committee business, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I inform the House that Mr. Ed Jones, of Yorkville, Tenn., has been chosen in a special election held yesterday to succeed our late, esteemed and beloved colleague, Congressman "Fats" Everett.

Mr. Jones, upon certification, will represent Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District.

This race had become nationally significant because it is the first special congressional election held since the presidential election last November.

As a consequence both major parties and the leading independent party made an all-out effort to capture this traditionally Democrat seat.

Former Gov. George Wallace called upon his supporters to back the American Independent Party candidate and visited the Eighth District in his support. The candidate failed to run as well as Governor Wallace had last November, but did run better than his Republican opponent.

This, despite an outpouring of Republican money, effort, and personages into the race in the GOP candidate's behalf and a visit into that district last week by our distinguished minority leader who stated:

> This is the year for the Republicans in Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Jones is a former commissioner of agriculture of the State of Tennessee and has been long and effectively active in civic and governmental affairs. He is a man with a great knowledge and broad understanding of the problems and aspirations of the people of his district. His election and service in Congress will provide his constituents with a worthy and able Representative and will add to this body a Member of proven ability and value.

CONGRESSMAN-ELECT ED JONES

(Mr. BLANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for Tennesseans and for this House, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce to the House the election of a great Tennessean and fellow Democrat to this great body.

Ed Jones won a sweeping victory, capturing 50 percent of the votes in a nine-man race, showing a 2-to-1 victory over the minority party candidate. This is truly indicative of the kind of man that Ed Jones is and how the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee feel about him. We welcome him to the Tennessee delegation.

I wish to remind the distinguished minority leader and other members of the minority party who recently visited Tennessee in behalf of their candidate of the statement he made as quoted in the news media and I quote:

> Mr. Ford said, the election could establish Guidelines for the 1970 and perhaps the 1972 elections.

I wish to associate myself with that statement and concur wholeheartedly in its accuracy because I believe sincerely that this special election and Democratic victory is an indication of the outcome of the 1970 elections.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement, and his association with the views of the minority leader. I would like to associate myself with his views also because I believe this election did establish a guideline. The fact of the matter is that there were about eight Democrat candidates in that race. Mr. Speaker, on a business trip to Tennessee I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Edward Jones. I was sure he was going to win, because of the kind of man he is. I believe it demonstrates the fact that the Democratic Party in fact is the party that is going to be the majority party down there in Tennessee for a long time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Hays).

I yield back the balance of my time.

MOORHEAD ASKS FOR VIETNAM MILITARY DEESCALATION

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago—on March 11, 1968—when there were press stories to the effect that the military was requesting an additional 206,000 troops in Vietnam, several of our colleagues joined me in cosponsoring a resolution that provided:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe that our resolution made a contribution to the decision against further escalation of the war in Vietnam. Less than 3 weeks later the decision to restrict the bombing was announced and the initial steps were taken which led to the opening of the Paris peace talks.

The peace talks have been in progress for 10 months and Mr. Nixon has been in office for 2 months; yet the level of the war and, more importantly the level of American participation in it continues unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, the time has again come for Congress to make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to express to the administration the desire of the American people to begin the process of deescalation of the American military effort.

Accordingly, on behalf of myself and 33 cosponsors I am today introducing another very brief resolution which provides:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

I invite all Members who believe that the time has come to begin the deescalation of our military involvement in Vietnam to join with me in introducing similar resolutions.

The following Members cosponsored Mr. MOORHEAD's concurrent resolution: JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN H. DENT, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, JACOB H. GILBERT, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, EDWARD I. KOCH, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, ABNER J. MIKVA, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY T. MINK, JOHN E. MOSS, BERTRAM PODELL, THOMAS M. REES, HENRY S. REUSS, PETER W. RODINO, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, JEROME R. WALDIE, CHARLES H. WILSON, and GUY YATRON.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI SLANDERED BY CRUDE, UNFUNNY COMEDIAN

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening on national television, the State of Mississippi and her people were viciously slandered by a crude and very unfunny comedian.

I would suggest that the Senate subcommittee now investigating sex and violence on television might do well to turn their attention to this problem faced by Mississippians on Monday night.

No apology can erase from the viewers' minds that terrible, ugly remark about Mississippi. I think that Americans, in this instance, will consider the source of the remark and dismiss it accordingly. However, the State should be protected from any future comments of the same nature which might be made by someone standing a little taller in the public's esteem.

Mississippi has no practical recourse in this matter, and it should.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO REDUCE ADVENTURISM

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recent reports indicate that American top-level strategists are seriously considering expanding military operations in Vietnam to create—in their words—"greater pressures for a political solution."

This same sort of nonsense put the United States into the current muddle in Southeast Asia. It is the same sort of logic now being used to push the ABM system. And it is the same sore of idiocy, if allowed to continue, that will entangle this country again and again.

It must not be allowed to happen again.

Congress must take a positive stance to halt any U.S. escalation in Vietnam. Today I join with many of my colleagues in cosponsoring the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) stating the sense of Congress that military involvement should begin to be reduced in Vietnam.

I view the Moorhead resolution as a strong first step of congressional policy to end our tragic adventurism in Vietnam.

MIAMI TEENAGE RALLY FOR DECENCY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday, the Members will recall, a great event which occurred in Miami last Sunday afternoon, when 30,000 teenagers gathered in the Orange Bowl in a great declaration for decency on behalf of the younger people in this country.

The young man who started this rally, Mike Levesque, lives at Hialeah, Fla., where the racetrack is located, I am proud to say in my district. I am advised that he is receiving thousands of letters and telegrams from all over the country, in which other young people are asking how did he organize this rally and how could they organize a similar one.

I thought Members might be getting inquiries of that sort. If they want to, they may send the inquiries to my able colleague DANTE FASCELL, or to me, or they can get in touch with this distinguished young man, 17 years old, a senior in Miami Springs High School, who did this great thing, Mike Levesque of Hialeah, Fla.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Brademas
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Cowger
Dellenback
Diggs
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fraser
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gray
Gross
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Kirwan
Landrum
Lowenstein
McCloskey
Mailliard
Mann
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pike
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Ronan
Rumsfeld
Scheuer
Schwengel
Snyder
Stafford
Stokes
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Watson
Watts
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI(8), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–131) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 214

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $900,000, including expenditures, for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

XUM

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is going to submit an amendment to House Resolution 214?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand there is a series of about eight of these authorizing or expenditure committee resolutions to be submitted to the House today?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is correct. The reason I have asked that further reading be dispensed with, after the amount is read, is because all of the resolutions are identical after that point.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I ask these questions only in the interest of expediting the business of the House——

Mr. HAYS. I understand.

Mr. HALL. Could the general statement be made that these expenditure resolutions are in the customary form we have handled for the committees in previous years and that there is nothing more than a so-called cost-of-living increase in the various committee proposals?

Mr. HAYS. I would not go so far as to agree with that 100 percent. I would say that none is above what the committee asked for. In all cases except one, I believe, both the minority and the majority agreed on a figure. In some cases they were cut. In some cases there was a substantial raise, as high as 30 percent over what was granted a year or so ago.

The committee felt the increases were justified, by the pointing out that they were going to undertake considerably more activity than undertaken in the last Congress.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have one final question.

Are these resolutions to provide expenses for the committees for the first session, or presumably for the entire Congress?

Mr. HAYS. For the first session only.

Mr. HALL. Then we may expect at the beginning of the second session further funding for these committees, with proper justification to the Committee on House Administration?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 5, strike out "$900,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$850,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 189, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–132) on the resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 259

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 189 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $486,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 152

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–133) on the resolution (H. Res. 272) authorizing the expenditure of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 152, Ninety-First Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, line 5, strike out "$300,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000".

On page 3, starting on line 1, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 152, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administra-

XUM

tion, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–134) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 271

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 152, Ninety-first Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $442,500 for the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on voucher authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, immediately after line 8, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 200

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–135) on the resolution (H. Res. 273) providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 273

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 200 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $769,600, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Of such amount $60,000 shall be available for each of six standing subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed $409,600 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXPENSES FOR CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 268

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–136) on the resolution (H. Res. 301) authorizing expenses for conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 268, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 301

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 268, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $412,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–137) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing funds for the Committee on House Administration, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 315

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, in carrying out its duties during the Ninety-first Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $300,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation on any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–138) on the resolution (H. Res. 320) providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 320

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1969, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 116, Ninety-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $595,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAXIMUM PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 337 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 337

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 337 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 337 to increase existing travel expenses for Government employees. The bill would increase the maximum per diem allowance within the United States from its present rate of $16 to $22 per day. Thus, where an agency or department determines that the expenses are warranted, any amount up to the maximum may be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a great effort being made to curb expenditures of the Federal Government, but I hope that the departments or agencies for which an employee is working will grant to that employee his actual expenses incurred up to the $22 per day so that the employee will not have to bear that additional expense. I hope the authority will not be exercised to reduce this amount because I think the Federal Government has been making it necessary for faithful and loyal employees of this Government to go heavily into their savings or salaries in order to pay their necessary traveling expenses which they incur on their part. Even the $22 a day, with the high cost of motel and hotel bills and traveling in the continental United States is really not enough for actual travel expense within the United States for Federal employees, and I certainly hope that the $22 maximum which under H.R. 337 will not be reduced by the executive agencies of the Government.

When, due to unusual circumstances, the actual expenses of a trip within the United States are greater than the maximum per diem, the employee's actual and necessary expenses may be paid up to a present maximum of $30 per day. H.R. 337 increases this maximum to $35 per day.

When traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department determines to be adequate. There are occasions, however, when the per diem may be exceeded by the expenses. Presently the law permits the payment of an additional $10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. The bill if adopted, would increase the $10 allowance to an additional $15 per day.

The legislation makes the same changes in payment of travel expenses for intermittent employees of the Government, such as experts and consultants, as have been made for regular employees. Thus, the maximum per diem is increased from $16 to $22 per day and maximum actual expenses within the United States from $30 to $35 per day and, outside the United States, from the $10 added to the per diem to $15 added to the per diem for the country involved.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is legislation too long delayed by our Government and I hope this rule will be adopted so that H.R. 337 may be considered and I hope adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is rather interesting to note that the number on the resolution, No. 337, and the bill which we will be considering is the same, H.R. 337.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is to provide a rule with 1 hour of open debate for the consideration of the bill H.R. 337, having to do with the maximum per diem allowance for Government employees.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 337 is to amend current travel expense legislation for Government employees.

The per diem allowance is increased from $16 to $22 per day.

The maximum allowance on an actual expense basis is increased from $30 to $35 per day.

Finally, the bill increases the foreign travel allowance above the established per diem from $10 to $15 per day.

The estimated cost of the increases contained in the bill, exclusive of travel abroad, is $27,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget expects the additional cost to each agency to be absorbed.

The bill is only slightly different than a similar bill which passed the House last year but was not acted on by the Senate. The difference is an increase in the per diem from $20 to $22 to reflect the approximate cost increase since 1967 when the last Bureau of the Budget study was completed.

There are no minority views.

The administration supports the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 337, with Mr. ANNUNZIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 337 would increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for civilian employees of the Government traveling on official business. Per diem, as we all know, is a flat-rate reimbursement which covers the average cost of subsistence when Government employees must travel in carrying out their responsibilities. This flat rate covers hotels, food costs, and certain other expenses. The present rate is $16 per day set by the Congress in 1961. Last year we passed H.R. 13738, raising the per diem rate to $20, but that bill was not acted upon by the Senate.

In summary, the bill, as amended by the committee, raises the maximum per diem rate from the present $16 per day to $22 per day and raises the maximum reimbursement for actual expenses—only allowed in unusual circumstances—from $30 per day to $35.

When our Government officials are traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department sets, but there are occasions when the per diem may be exceeded by actual out-of-pocket expenses. The law now permits the payment of an additional $10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. H.R. 337 increases this per diem from $10 to $15 per day. The bill makes the same changes in the per diem rates and payment of actual expenses for intermittent employees of the Government, such as experts and consultants, as would be made for regular employees.

Other than the increase in the basic per diem rate to $22 and the elimination of certain features of that bill affecting judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals and mobile employees of the Post Office, the bill is the same as the one which passed the House last year. The House-passed bill provided for $20 per day. H.R. 337, as introduced in this Congress, called for $25 per day, but the committee agreed with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget that the figure be set at $22 per day. The Bureau reported that its studies showed a 10-percent increase in travel subsistence costs since our hearings of 2 years ago. The Government employee unions, however, all supported the $25

XUM

figure and submitted their own evidence of the need for that maximum.

This bill, as we present it, is a very conservative one and may still be less than adequate to meet the expense of those Federal workers who must travel at the direction of their agencies. Action must be taken, however, to remedy the obvious inequity of the present $16 per diem.

The action of the committee and our recommendation that this bill be passed by the House are based on the hard statistical facts of increased cost of travel that were presented to us during our hearings. They have been summarized in our committee report. The committee has always taken the position that Government employees should not be expected to pay out of their own pockets the cost of doing the Government's work. Travel is as necessary to conducting our Government's business as it is in private industry.

I would direct the attention of my colleagues to page 3 of the report which indicates the findings of the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Census and numerous independent accounting offices which shows that there has been an increase in the cost of travel and the cost of hotel and meals and other expenses over and above what the Bureau of the Budget reported in 1967. All other reports and investigations by outside agencies support the figures as provided in this bill.

May I also state, Mr. Chairman, that our former colleague, Chairman Ramspeck testified in support of this bill and he cited his own personal experiences in spending considerably more than $16 per day in traveling on official business.

The Bureau of the Budget has estimated that the increase in the maximum per diem rates it recommended would add approximately $27 million to the annual cost of official travel to civilian agencies. Since the provisions of the reported bill provide lesser increases than those recommended by the Bureau, the corresponding added annual cost should be somewhat lower than the above estimate. The Bureau expects the executive agencies to absorb the increased costs within available appropriations.

Payment of travel expenses such as hotel, food, and other subsistence costs to Government employees traveling on official business is authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949 and subsequent amendments, now codified in sections 5701 to 5708 of title 5 of the United States Code. The pertinent provisions affected by H.R. 337 are sections 5702 and 5703. The act provides maximum amounts which may be paid by departments and agencies and it was not anticipated by the Congress that the maximum would be set for all travel. Based on the expected costs of the particular travel, the agencies exercise their discretion to set rates that in many cases are lower than the maximum. Overall policies and regulations are made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Section 1 of the bill, as amended, raises the maximum per diem within the United States from the present $16 to $22 per day. Thus, where a department or agency determines that the expenses to be incurred warrant it, any amount up to the maximum may be paid.

Per diem is the customary way of paying travel expenses but the law provides that when the actual expenses of a trip within the United States are greater than the maximum per diem due to the unusual circumstances of the travel assignment, the employee's actual and necessary expenses may be paid up to a present maximum of $30 per day. Thus, when the unusual circumstances of the travel or conditions at the destination result in costs to the employee that exceed the per diem, he may be paid his specific out-of-pocket expenses up to $30 per day. The bill increases this maximum to $35 per day.

When traveling in foreign countries, travel expenses are paid on the basis of a per diem for that country which the State Department determines is adequate. But there are occasions when the per diem may be exceeded by the expenses. The law now permits the payment of an additional $10 above the per diem for such cases if accompanied by unusual circumstances. This bill increases the $10 to an additional $15 per day.

Section 2 makes the same changes in payment of travel expenses for intermittent employees of the Government such as experts and consultants as have been made for the regular employees by section 1. Thus, the maximum per diem they may be paid is increased from $16 to $22 per day. Maximum actual expenses within the United States are increased from $30 to $35 per day and, outside of the United States, from the $10 added to the per diem to $15 added to the per diem for the country involved.

Sections 3 and 4 have been deleted from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill, in my judgment, is a matter of simple justice and fairness to our dedicated and hardworking Government employees. In many, many cases and perhaps in the majority of cases, these employees, while traveling on official business, have had to spend personal funds beyond the per diem allotment of $16 per day.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will be overwhelmingly passed by the House today.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BETTS. I wonder if the gentleman would explain the difference between Government employees and others as is set forth in the second section and why there has to be a discrepancy in the maximum allowances?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes; section 1 of the bill provides the regular per diem of Government employees and raises the per diem from $16 to $22 and from $30 to $35 under unusual circumstances. All of this was documented by actual experience by the commission.

Section 2 of the bill applies to intermittent employees such as experts and consultants. I might suggest that, while we fix a maximum of $22 per day, each agency will establish regulations for its own travel and may well fix some lower amount if appropriate.

Mr. BETTS. I was just wondering why there should be a difference so far as these travelers are concerned under section 2 and the Government employees? The only thing I can think of is that section 5712 of the code should be appropriately amended to follow this procedure.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I wanted a point of information, and I want it understood crystally clear that I believe all of those who travel on official business should have a better per diem rate as we of the Congress who travel on official business on rare occasions, perhaps once a month back and forth to our homes. But pertaining to the gentleman's comments about the Bureau of the Budget estimates, is it not true that the estimate made increase above or below the $27 million because they estimated that there were 9 million man-days of travel each year by all classes of Federal employees, if I may use that term loosely, and that if we increased the maximum per diem allowance by $6, as I understand this bill provides, it would cost $54 million. However, the Bureau of the Budget estimates that only 50 percent of those who drew per diems last year spent more than the present $16 per day maximum, while the other 50 percent were spending something less than 60 percent. So that they figured that on the average the employees would qualify only for a $3 increase, or a total of $27 million. Does the gentleman have any idea about how this $27 million of additional cost in this time of approaching austerity would hold up under the sections of the bill?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman is correct in what he has reported, and I appreciate his comment and his support. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget suggested that their budget was $27 million, and in view of the fact that we made a reduction in their proposal, it would be something less than that. They also suggested it was not possible to make an accurate and precise projection. This was their best estimate and they anticipated the agencies could absorb this increase within the existing appropriation. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget did not go beyond that.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 337, a bill to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business.

Sections 1 and 2 of the bill as amended by the committee would increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for travel within the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia from $16 to $22, or a 37½-percent increase, and it would increase the maximum allowance for reimbursement on an actual expense basis for such travel from $30 to $35 per day, or 16⅔ percent.

For travel outside the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia, the bill would increase the maximum allowance for travel on an actual expense basis from $10 plus the established maximum per diem rate to $15 plus the established maximum per diem rate.

Sections 3 and 4, as noted, were stricken from the bill.

Section 3 was stricken because it would amend section 3581(d) of title 39, United States Code, and thus is properly within the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Section 4 was stricken because it would amend section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, thus coming properly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Moreover, the provisions of section 4 have already been enacted as a part of Public Law 90-340.

There was complete agreement in the subcommittee with the need to raise allowances to keep pace with rising travel costs, and it was felt that the allowances proposed in sections 1 and 2 of the bill were appropriate.

The percentage increase, 37½ percent, from $16 to $22, for unlisted expenses, may seem large, but it must be remembered that 8 years have elapsed since the act was last amended, and the proposed changes do no more than reflect the present costs of travel As a matter of fact, in the testimony—and this relates to the questions asked by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr HALL)—in the testimony that was presented to the committee it was noted that in the spring of 1967 a survey was conducted by the Bureau of the Budget in which they requested 18 principal Federal agencies for information on subsistence costs representing over 12,000 employee travel experiences covering almost 64,000 man-days of travel.

An analysis of these data showed 6,171 travel experiences, 51.3 percent of the total, where subsistence costs exceeded $16 per day, the average of these being $19.21. On this basis, the Bureau recommended to the Congress a national per diem of $20 in lieu of subsistence expenses last year. I presume that the $27 million estimate was based on this 51 percent of maximum as exposed by this survey, and that it was assumed 50 percent of the potential $54 million would bring it to $27 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman's statement is correct, except for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget estimates that even if the per diem ceiling were raised $6, as proposed, only 50 percent, or perhaps less, of those employees drawing per diem would get the maximum, and that 50 percent is why they reduced it to $27 million.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think that is correct. I think there is also the possibility that because this money is going to have to be taken out of presently available funds, there may be some reduction in travel, because of the increased per diem allowance, that might otherwise have been authorized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, as long as we have interrupted the gentleman's remarks, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder—and as I stated in my first question to the gentleman from New York, I seek equity—I certainly do not want any of our employees paying money out of their pockets for expenses while traveling on official business.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That has been done on a number of occasions.

Mr. HALL. I understand that from the committee's well-written report.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, does this apply to members of the executive branch while traveling on official business?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It applies to all Government employees who are authorized to travel on official business in this way.

Mr. HALL. It is applicable to the judicial and legislative branches as well as the executive branch?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. My understanding is that it will be probably the executive alone, but perhaps the gentleman from New York can assist me in that regard.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, that was my understanding in April last year when we passed the previous bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It also covers the quasi-legislative bodies of the executive agencies.

Mr. HALL. There was for travel an increase in the travel budget of fiscal year 1969 over 1968 a total of $2,050,000,000. Does the gentleman know what the figure is in the anticipated 1970 budget, and is it provided for?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know the figure in the 1970 budget. The anticipation was that this legislation would have no significant effect on the budget figure in the 1970 budget, again for the reason that the agencies would be required to live within the previous request they had made in preparation of that budget, and that only on the occasion of absolutely necessary overspending, where they would be obliged to come back and ask for additional funds, would those funds be considered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a final question, what I am trying to get at is whether this is a cost of travel of cost of living or inflationary increase in order to keep up with the actual expenditures or whether there is poor travel discipline in the agencies of the executive branch, and did the gentleman's committee go into this problem?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's committee did not go into this problem as to whether the travel expenditures generally had been authorized with circumspection by the various agencies.

This legislation, however, relates not to whether or not the agencies have been circumspect, but as to whether or not Federal employees traveling on per diem allowances were being compensated for the actual expenses incurred. In other words, the recommendations here relate only to the cost-of-living increase or the cost-of-travel increase, maybe I should say, in the per diem that has occurred since the last authorization by this committee.

Mr. HALL. Of course it follows, therefore, that unless some circumspection or oversight or surveillance is exercised on necessary travel, if we recompense completely for travel, there might not be the restriction on unneeded travel, which would otherwise occur.

I am still not recommending that those who travel in the executive branch on necessary business be restricted or be underpaid; but just as in communications there must be some discipline exercised to see that unnecessary messages are not sent, the same is true with respect to travel in the executive branch. If it gets to be over $2,050 million as an item in the executive budget per year, it is certainly worth oversight.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Since these increased individual allowances will come out of the requested budgets for 1970 rather than creating an increase in those budgets, it is assumed, at least for this first year, that any unnecessary travel will be spotlighted, because the agencies may be hard pressed to fit their travel requirements into the requested budget, in view of the fact that they made their requested budgets on the basis of $16 per day rather than $22 per day.

To continue with my statement in explanation of the various aspects of this legislation:

Finally, for travel outside the continental United States, the bill would increase the maximum allowable per day on an actual expense basis from $10 to $15 above the normal per diem rate for the locality involved. The Bureau of the Budget had recommended an increase to $18 a day above the per diem.

Rates set for travel to States and U.S. possessions outside the continental United States are established by the Secretary of Defense, and they are established by the Secretary of State for travel to foreign countries.

While the figures agreed to in committee were not everything the employee representatives asked for, they appear adequate on the basis of statistics furnished the committee. Moreover, the more modest proposals of the committee assure a greater likelihood of congressional approval and hence are more meaningful to the Government employee.

In shaping the bill to its maximum acceptability the committee resisted urgings for an amendment that would ask agencies to encourage their professional employees to travel first on airplanes. The committee was not persuaded by the argument that such a fringe benefit would be helpful in retaining the best people in Government.

The committee rather felt perhaps we should keep some people in Government who are economy minded.

The annual additional cost of official travel to civilian agencies should be somewhat less than the $27 million estimated by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau estimate was based on the figures which it recommended and which were somewhat higher than those agreed upon by the committee. The Bureau expects the executive agencies to absorb the increased costs within available appropriations. In some agencies it will have to

XUM

come out of substantive programs, but in some agencies it will come just out of the standard salaries and expenditures type of appropriation.

We feel that the increases are fully justified, if a bit on the conservative side. But in the face of the Nation's economy and the concern for our Federal deficits and our Federal budget this year, such conservatism appears fully justified in the interest of the taxpayers. There will still be cases in high-cost areas where Government employees may have to pay a part of their travel expenses out of their own pockets. This is to be regretted and avoided where possible.

The legislation represents, however, a reasonable compromise between equity and economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New York, the sponsor of the bill; the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of our subcommittee; and the gentleman from Ohio, who is handling the bill for the minority; on what I consider to be a good compromise that has led to the consideration of H.R. 337.

I hope this bill passes in this form, because it will grant more equity to Federal employees required to travel on business.

Mr. Chairman, this does represent a compromise. The gentleman from New York, its sponsor, I am sure, would like to have some higher figures in here. The Bureau of the Budget did recommend some higher figures in some instances. They had $40 here as actual reimbursement, whereas the committee recommended and the bill contains $35.

I hope that the other body will act with dispatch this year, in contrast to their lack of action last year, because it is not at all fair to require Federal employees when traveling to cover any part of their expense from their own pockets. They should be reimbursed for their actual expenses.

Testimony before our subcommittee was clear and uncontroverted that increases in travel cost, in hotel rooms and meals, make the present $16 per day allowance no longer fair. We believe a maximum of $22 will constitute a fair reimbursement for the cost of per diem travel.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the subcommittee, I would like to express my support for this legislation and also to congratulate the leadership on both sides of the aisle on a job well done.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 337, to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business.

Anyone who has traveled within the past few years knows that $16 per day is woefully inadequate to cover the expenses of food and lodging in most parts of this Nation. I believe an increase to $22 per day is the minimum we can do to make certain that our Federal employees, traveling on the Nation's business, are not forced to pay from their own wages a sizable part of the expenses they incur.

During the 90th Congress, Mr. Chairman, we acknowledged the fact that $16 per day was insufficient to cover expenses of travel, and we passed H.R. 13738, which would have increased the amount to $20 per day. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act. Two years ago, in considering the legislation, we were told that the Bureau of the Budget had determined after extensive study that the actual average total daily subsistence for travelers in 1967 was $19.56. Today, 2 years of continuing inflation have again increased the figure, and I am convinced that $22 per day is at best merely adequate.

Provision also needs to be made for the unusual situation when an employee incurs out-of-pocket expenses greatly in excess of normal per diem, for reimbursement of a greater amount than the $30 per day present maximum. This amount, too, is raised in H.R. 337 to $35 per day, and again I believe this is the minimum we can do to assist employees faced with such emergencies.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is long overdue, and should be acted upon favorably, not only by the members of this House but by our colleagues in the Senate as well, at the earliest practicable date, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$16" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25", by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$35", and by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15".

SEC. 2. Section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$16" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20", by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$35", and by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15".

SEC. 3. Section 3581(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15".

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Upon his certificate, each judge, while attending court, or transacting official business outside the District of Columbia, is entitled to be paid all necessary traveling expenses and allowances as provided for each Jusitce or judge of the United States under section 456 of title 28.".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$25" and insert "$22".

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$20" and insert "$22".

Page 2, strike out lines 3 through 12.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 337, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CANADIAN AND MEXICAN COMMUTERS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today along with 24 cosponsors, I have introduced H.R. 9505, a bill which amends the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection to section 212. The amendment is geared specifically to regulating more effectively the influx into the United States of nationals from Canada and Mexico under the so-called alien commuter system, which is administered by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This system—a creature of administrative ingenuity without a statutory base—permits Canadian and Mexican workers who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and who hold alien registration

XUM

receipt cards, commonly known as "green cards," to reside in Canada or Mexico and regularly commute across the border to places of employment in the United States.

Sample counts of commuters crossing the border have been taken periodically. On January 11 and 17, 1966, 54,375 commuters entered the United States, 43,687 of whom entered from Mexico. This number was slightly lower during November and December 1967, when 40,176 commuters from Mexico were identified and their green cards were suitably marked to distinguish them.

Regardless of the exact number involved, however, there is no doubt that the commuter movement adversely affects the wages and working conditions of our own citizens and residents, especially those living in the cities and towns along the Mexican border in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. The commuter movement from Mexico is a factor contributing to the grinding poverty, high unemployment, and low wages in the border areas.

Much of the border area has relatively large labor surpluses, partly because of the large number of low-skill U.S. citizens and resident aliens residing in the area. The impact of these commuters on the labor market has been enormous.

A report by the social action commission of the Catholic diocese of El Paso indicated that one of the reasons for the low wages in El Paso is—

> The Mexican-American must compete with some 25,000 workers from Mexico . . . legal alien commuters, United States citizens, and illegal entrants . . . who daily cross the bridge from Juarez to work in El Paso. Generally speaking, the workers from Mexico find no inconvenience in working for the barest of wages in El Paso.

The employment of commuters in areas of high unemployment is a characteristic of the communities along the border area. Data published by the Texas Employment Commission in 1966 shows that the unemployment rate in the border towns was substantially greater than in the interior cities. Under unanimous consent I shall place a table showing unemployment rates in Texas border cities in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The impact of the commuter is particularly acute in agriculture where mechanization is rapidly reducing job opportunities. Due to the high concentration of farms along the border and the fact that commuters often work in the lowest skilled, lowest paid jobs, farmworkers, who are already underpaid, are the first to suffer competition from the commuters.

The bill we have introduced does not end the commuter system, but it does refine its operation. The bill simply provides that each commuter alien must be regularly certified every 6 months by the Department of Labor that his presence in the United States to seek or continue employment does not adversely affect wages or working conditions of U.S. workers similarly employed. In determining whether their employment does adversely affect wages and working conditions of American workers, the standard would be the wages and working conditions of American labor similarly employed. Thus, the employer must pay his commuters wages commensurate with U.S. labor engaging in the same employment.

The bill applies to aliens having a "principal, actual dwelling place" in a foreign country. Thus, it is strictly geared to those commuters working in the immediate border areas who travel across the border regularly. This is the "commuter" in the true sense of the word.

It would be my hope that in implementing this bill, if enacted into law, there would be some period of phasing it into effect so that it would not suddently impose a difficult burden on the aliens involved.

Section 2 removes a provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act that exempts from criminal sanctions individuals who willfully and knowingly employ aliens who have entered the United States illegally. Such an amendment is necessary since the number of immigrants illegally entering the United States from Mexico is rapidly rising. For instance, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended 115,000 illegal aliens last year. The majority of these illegal entrants come into the United States in hope of finding agricultural and factory employment. Many employers lure them into the United States to obtain inexpensive labor. Criminal sanctions against such employers would help stop the high number of illegal entrants.

Before closing, I must emphasize in no way does section I of this bill ban the use of green cards or terminate the commuter system. What it would attempt to do is to provide that holders of green cards will not use what is a continuing privilege in such a way as to depress wages and working conditions within the United States.

The combined effect of both sections will be to substantially improve working conditions in our border areas. We feel it is necessary legislation.

H.R. 9505 is cosponsored by Mr. Celler, Mr. Adams, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Dent, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Mann, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Tiernan, and Mr. Charles Wilson.

The table mentioned above follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN 22 TEXAS CITIES, 1966

City	Rate	Rank
4 border cities	6.6	
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	6.5	21
El Paso	4.4	17
Laredo	9.6	22
McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg	5.8	20
18 interior cities	3.4	
Abilene	3.6	11
Amarillo	2.9	4
Austin	2.6	3
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange	4.0	15
Corpus Christi	3.7	12
Dallas	2.5	2
Fort Worth	2.9	4
Galveston-Texas City	4.7	19
Houston	2.4	1
Longview-Kilgore-Gladewater	3.3	8
Lubbock	3.8	13
Midland-Odessa	3.4	9
San Angelo	3.4	9
San Antonio	4.3	16
Texarkana	3.8	13
Tyler	3.3	7
Waco	4.4	17
Wichita Falls	3.0	6

Source: The Texas Labor Market, Texas Employment Commission.

UNIVERSAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years, we have seen the development of many programs aimed at providing the disadvantaged student an opportunity to attend college but they are grossly inadequate to meet the need of all high school students demanding additional free public education.

We have seen recently black students at Rutgers University demonstrating in support of the right of all black high school students graduating this June to enter Rutgers next September.

And we have seen middle-income parents complaining that their children, although academically qualified, are threatened with the possibility of being shut out of colleges and universities because of reductions in college admissions.

And finally there are the college administrators who are caught in the middle between aspiring disadvantaged kids and middle-class kids competing for college seats that are limited because of lack of funds, facilities, and personnel.

Just today in the New York Times, the chancellor of the New York City University is quoted as saying that hundreds of parents, alarmed by the possibility that the university will be forced to reduce the size of its freshman class, are urging that special programs for slum students be reduced before regular admissions are cut.

This is an intolerable situation. It pinpoints quite clearly the urgent need for a universal postsecondary education, available to all.

During the 90th Congress, we approved an amendment to the Higher Education Act which I sponsored and which requires the President to submit to the Congress on or before December 31, 1969, proposals relative to the feasibility of making postsecondary education available to all young Americans who qualify and seek it.

In view of the immediacy and urgency of this problem, which is affecting our colleges and universities across the Nation, I urge the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to come forward now with proposals on universal postsecondary education so that they can be considered by this body in the present session.

The situation is critical and the time is now, if we are to afford any relief

XUM

on this issue to our strife-ridden, anxiety-torn urban communities. Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access of education, and we must move quickly and decisively to see to it that access is made available next fall to every young American who has the will to learn.

Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of this matter, I have written the following letter to HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Over the years, and particularly in recent months, there have been periodic proposals to make universal educational opportunity at the post-secondary level a reality. The proposals range from outright grants covering all tuition and expenses—like the G.I. Bill, to various tax deductions, credit proposals, and loans of one sort or another.

Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access to education, and yet millions of students, black and white, are being denied this opportunity because of the lack of funds to finance their education. The Carnegie Commission report on Higher Education reported that almost half of the undergraduate college students in the United States now come from the country's highest family income quartile; and only seven per cent come from the lowest income quartile. There is an urgent need to change these long odds.

In recent months, we have seen New York City beset by problems arising from the controversy over the SEEK program and the City University's proposed One Hundred Scholars program, which would admit to the City University the one hundred top graduating students in every high school. This could mean that other students who might score higher on the New York State Regents or have higher scholastic averages would be displaced.

I am enclosing an article from the March 26th edition of the New York Times which indicates the pressure—justifiable or unjustifiable—from middleclass parents "urging that admissions to the University's two special programs for slum students—the College Discovery Program and Search for Enlightenment, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK)—be reduced before regular admissions are cut."

At the same time, disadvantaged black and Puerto Rican students in New York City are insistently demanding their rights to post-secondary education.

We have seen black students at Rutgers University demonstating in support of the right of all black high school seniors graduating this June to enter Rutgers next September, regardless of test scores, etc.

It is hard to argue against the right of educationally disadvantaged kids to post-secondary education, and it is also equally difficult to ask middle-class kids with higher education attainments to step aside and give up their places in our free, tax-supported colleges. The only answer is a massive expansion of post-secondary education opportunities sufficient to provide universal education at the college or junior college level for all who desired it and could benefit by it.

During the 90th Congress, I sponsored an amendment (Sec. 508) to the Higher Education Act which requires the President to submit to the Congress on or before December 31, 1969, proposals relative to the feasibility of making post-secondary education available to all young Americans who qualify and seek it. I am particularly interested in knowing what steps have already been initiated by your Department to carry out this Congressional assignment. I urge you also to consider making proposals along these lines to the Congress within the next few months so that they can be acted upon during the first session of the 91st Congress. Our already strife-torn and anxiety-ridden urban communities should not be called upon to face the resentment of large masses of middle-class students and underprivileged minority students competing for limited post-secondary education opportunities. The only answer is opportunity for all, and the urgency and critical need is now.

I would very much like to have the opportunity to discuss this matter with you.

With every warm best wish,
Sincerely,
JAMES H. SCHEUER,
Member of Congress.

Also illustrative of my concern, is the following article published in the March 26 edition of the New York Times:

BOWKER SCORED BY JEWISH UNIT FOR PREDICTING RACIAL TENSION

(By Leonard Buder)

The Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress charged yesterday that Dr. Albert H. Bowker, chancellor of the City University, was "fomenting racial and religious tension by predicting it."

The council, in a sharply critical statement, challenged Dr. Bowker's comment on Monday that tension between Jews and Negroes in the city might "explode" if the City University were forced to reduce the size of its freshman class next fall because of budget cuts.

Dr. Bowker said that the University had received hundreds of letters and telephone calls from Jewish parents urging that admissions to the university's two special programs for slum students—the College Discovery Program and Search for Enlightenment, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK)—be reduced before regular admissions are cut.

"The surest way of arousing hostility between racial and religious groups is to forecast that it will occur," declared Theodore J. Kolish, chairman of the Metropolitan Executive Committee of the congress.

STATEMENT CALLED DAMAGING

"Mr. Bowker's self-fulfilling prophecy does a disservice to all of those—Jews and Christians, black and white—who have joined hands in opposing cutback in funds for the City University."

Asked to comment on the council's criticism, Dr. Bowker said this his statement on Negro-Jewish tensions was his paraphrase of one made earlier this month by 10 Negro and Jewish leaders.

The 10 leaders, who had formed the Temporary Committee on Black-Jewish Relations, said that potential cuts in the budget and admissions at City University threaten a new confrontation between religious and racial groups "that could exceed the destructiveness of previous controversies."

Among those who joined in that statement were Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League; Robert Bernhard, an investment banker and the president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, and Rabbi Abraham Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

Mr. Kolish said that the congress was one of nine major Jewish organizations that had urged Governor Rockefeller and legislative leaders to provide greater funds both for regular college admission and for the College Discovery and SEEK programs.

"But our organization," he continued, "does not believe the effort to frighten Albany into restoring the cuts by raising the specter of race riot is either good tactics or accurate sociology."

FISCAL STANDING EXPLAINED

In explaining the City University's financial difficulties, Dr. Bowker had noted that the university's original budget request this year was for $270 million. That amount, the chancellor said would have accommodated 17,000 incoming regular students and 3,000 special students.

The chancellor said that cuts by the Governor's office in proposed state support reduced that figure to $225-million, which would only accommodate a total of 14,000 students.

Further cuts by the city government, the chancellor said, would bring the projected total budget down to about $180-million—enough, he said, to maintain operations but not enough to admit any new students.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

(Mr. HALEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Frierson-Nichols Post No. 8, the American Legion, of Winter Haven, Fal., are among those many Americans who view with alarm the battle which must be fought in every Congress to protect the authority and the functions of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and now the authority and functions of the House Internal Security Committee. They are also alarmed by the increasing strength of the opponents of this important committee of the House.

I share the respect that these Legionnaires and other sound-thinking Americans have for the valuable work the House Internal Security Committee and its predecessor, the House Un-American Activities Committee, has done and is doing for our Nation.

I place in the RECORD at this time the resolution adopted by the Frierson-Nichols Post so that Chairman RICHARD ICHORD and his committee members will know of the strong support they have from these veterans of Winter Haven, Fla.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY FRIERSON-NICHOLS AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 8, WINTER HAVEN, FLA., MARCH 18, 1969

Whereas, the U.S. House of Representatives on February 18, 1969, passed House Resolution 89 changing the name of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) to the House Committee on Internal Security, clarifying its mandate, and retaining its independent status as in integral Committee, and

Whereas, the record of the House debate on the Resolution discloses that a number of House Members voted against its passage in the apparent attempt to defeat its passage and pave the way to have the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) abolished and its functions transferred to the House Judiciary Committee in a a sub-ordinate sub-committee status, and

Whereas, HUAC has been a constant target for communist and other subversive elements in their determined efforts to ridicule and downgrade its activities, to disrupt its proceedings, and to have it abolished, and

Whereas, in light of past and present communist and other subversive activities in the United States, in Communist Cuba, in countries of Central and South America, and elsewhere, and

XUM

Whereas, the United States is presently at War in Vietnam on the premise of democracy, self-determination, and freedom as opposed to communism, totalitarianism, and slavery, and

Whereas, the United States must have in its protective arsenal an effective, strong and dedicated House Committee on Internal Security to investigate, uncover, counter and defeat communist and other subversive forces who defy the authority of the United States government, create turmoil and strife in our cities and educational institutions, and direct their efforts to the overthrow of our form of government by force or otherwise.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Frierson-Nichols American Legion Post No. 8, Winter Haven, Florida, go on record as strongly and determinedly opposing any Congressional action which would in any sense weaken or downgrade the House Committee on Internal Security, minimize its mandate, or abolish it and transfer its functions to another House Committee in the subordinate status of a subcommittee.

CHARLES L. MCCARTY,
Post Commander.

PROPOSED MULTILATERAL TREATY TO BAR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FROM THE SEABED

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with the support of 12 of my colleagues, a brief concurrent resolution proposing that the United States actively seek a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the seabed. Such a pact would be consistent with our previous stance in concluding the Antarctic and Outer Space Treaties, and would contribute greatly to strengthening and extending the rule of law as a basic foundation for world peace.

As I noted last week, the United States gave an essentially negative response to a Soviet proposal at Geneva which followed this general line. Our initial position was apparently dictated largely by the Navy's concern for the submarine-detection devices it has already implanted on the ocean. It has also been suggested that a total ban on military installations on the seabed might even prevent the transmission of military messages through undersea cables. These, however, are clearly matters for conscientious negotiation. Only through detailed discussion can we learn what mutually acceptable definitions of prohibited military installations or activities can be reached, and whether in fact we can find agreement on treaty language that would in no way impair operations such as those outlined above.

I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we must negotiate from a position of support for the principle of full demilitarization of the seabed, and not from a reflex of resistance to the principle because it might inhibit full freedom of action for our military planners. I hope that other Members will share this view, and that they will add their voices in support of the resolution which we have offered today.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 184

Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the seabed

Whereas the United States has previously entered into treaties providing for the demilitarization of outer space, including the moon and other celestrial bodies, and of Antarctica; and

Whereas the seabed should be kept free of military installations of all kinds so as to eliminate a source of potential conflict among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should actively seek to conclude a multilateral treaty, along the lines of those which govern activities in outer space and in Antarctica, which would bar all types of military installations from the seabed and would make appropriate provision for inspection to insure compliance.

WISDOM FROM THE OIL INDUSTRY—OR HOW TO STRETCH TRUTH LIKE CHEWING GUM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to remove entirely the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion allowance. Recently a group of gentlemen representing the oil industry came to Capitol Hill to argue for retention of tax privileges this segment of our economy now enjoys at the expense of the entire American public. I was much moved by their reasoning. Reading their comments, I panted under the effect of their eloquence. Never was a more ignoble cause defended so ably. Unfortunately, their arguments are mere sleight of mouth. They plead poverty. They plead high operating costs. I would sooner believe that a barracuda is a vegetarian. I would sooner believe in perpetual motion or squaring the circle then accept their futile testimony.

It is almost tax time, and scores of millions of citizens are beginning to grope for cash to pay Uncle Sam. Let every single one of them take a close look at the American oil industry. See it for what it really is—a fourth level of government. A prime cause of inflation. A major reason why millions pay staggering taxes.

As taxpayers painfully look at their tax writeoffs, let them note the 27½-percent tax-free allowance given the oil industry annually to cover depletion of wells they drill and operate. Let them see a statutory provision enabling oil well drillers to deduct, in 1 year, most capital costs of their drilling that are spread out over a period of years in other industries.

Let them see how oil companies are allowed to deduct from taxes, as a credit, payments of royalties to foreign governments. Such business expenses in most industries are simply deductions from income, taken before taxes are computed.

Let lower and middle income taxpayers take a searching look at tax rates paid by these companies, as they pollute our environment, raise gasoline prices at will, merge to form ever larger corporate units and fight desperately to keep cheap foreign oil out of this country because it would lower prices slightly to scores of millions of gasoline and oil consumers. Bulging with profits and swollen with privilege, they come to Capitol Hill, confident of their power and contemptuous of the vast majority of our American people.

As every man and woman in this country digs deep, deeper, deepest, for their taxes this year, I pray they will examine our American oil industry. It is a national scandal and outrage to allow this unbelievable situation to continue unchecked.

We are even now engaged in a search for tax reform. Let us be blunt, spelling out truth in the straightest terms. Oil industry privilege now rages unchecked at the expense of every citizen of this country. How long are we to tolerate this?

READIN', RITIN' AND RIOTIN'

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the news item I am inserting here in the RECORD were not such a tragic account, it would be a satire beyond belief. Had it been written a dozen years ago, no newspaper would have printed it because the editor would have been convinced the reporter was having hallucinations. But, time marches on in the Alice in Wonderland of Higher Education and the bizarre has now become the plain and ordinary. As Shakespeare put it—

> O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts
> And men have lost their reason.

The modern-day brutish beasts have found a home, it would seem, at San Francisco State College, among other institutions which have specialized in permissiveness in the past. I am certain this article could have been written about a number of other colleges and universities because this kind of classroom conduct is permitted almost universally these days. Thank God for the few places of higher learning which continue to resist and attempt to cling to the old-fashioned concept of a school being a center of reason, logic, and learning.

The article referred to follows:

ALL IS "RACIST" TO BLACKS: HARASSMENT JARS LIBERAL

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 24.—As Prof. John H. Bunzel faced his class for the first time in the semester at San Francisco State College, he knew he was in for trouble.

In the unusually large group before him he saw a sizable number of black militants—to whom, he knew, he symbolized the enemy.

For months now—ever since he had published an article critical of the black studies program as proposed by Associate Professor Nathan Hare—Bunzel had been a target of abuse and intimidation.

XUM

He had received anonymous threatening telephone calls at home and became accustomed to being called "pig Bunzel." His two cars were covered with the words "Fascist Scab" one night and all the tires were slashed. A homemade bomb was found one morning outside the office of the political science department, which he heads.

Nevertheless, Bunzel, 45, tall and tweedy, looked at the group before him calmly and began to explain what he had in mind for the course.

FLOOD OF HOSTILITY

His voice was drowned in a flood of hostile questions and remarks. Someone stood up and began to read aloud from "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung." Bunzel tried for ten minutes to restore order, then, stunned, he dismissed the class.

Two days later, on Wednesday, he tried again. The class now had become, for him, a testing ground of "whether those of us committed to the use of reason can still have his voice heard in an increasingly irrational environment."

He tried to respond to the hostile questions. The course, he said, was titled "community power and the politics of leadership." It would not deal with today's headlines (here a girl's hand shot up) but would follow an academic form and would prove the complexities of community, he said. Then he gestured to the girl.

"Some of the things you say we don't understand," she told him. "I'm asking you to come down to our level. And when we raise our hands, you should respond immediately. It took you about four mintues to respond."

"If it's all right, I'd prefer to finish a thought, then answer questions," Bunzel replied.

"Man, what you're saying doesn't mean anything anyway," a black student shouted. Others joined in a cacophony.

"I can't hear your questions," Bunzel told the class.

"Man, you haven't been hearing all your life," a student said.

TWO MILLION OMITTED

The black students demanded to know why no readings from Stokely Carmichael or Huey P. Newton were assigned. Bunzel replied that some two million other choices had been omitted.

The books on the list, the students charged, were racist.

C. Wright Mills and Talcott Parsons racists? By what standards? Bunzel asked. Had anyone read them?

"If you put it on the list, nine times out of ten it's a racist book," a voice replied.

At the end of half an hour, Bunzel dismissed the class, telling the students: "I intend to teach this course as it has always been taught."

"If we have to bring guns in here you won't teach it," a youth replied. "We'll teach you about community power."

On Friday, Bunzel again pleaded with the students to be allowed to begin. When the heckling continued, an administrative official was called and ordered two of the Negro students suspended. The class was again dismissed, with the first lecture still to be given.

INTIMIDATION CHARGED

At a press conference later, Black Student Union members declared that "black students were harassed, intimidated and suspended" in Bunzel's class that morning.

Tony Miranda, a leader in the Third World Liberation Front, said the militants were determined to "stop the functioning of the class and educate people on what the class is about. Any class he'll be teaching will have his attitudes and perceptions of our society and that is hurting the people. We're saying he's in direct opposition to our struggle at this point. And as such he's an enemy."

Bunzel, a cool, calm scholar, is somewhat puzzled by the vehemence of the attacks against him, for he prides himself on his long liberal record—the fight he led for admission of Negroes into clubs at Princeton in the 1940s, his outspokenness against Sen. McCarthy and against the California loyalty oath in the 1950s, his support for a black studies program at San Francisco State College as long as four years ago.

He became a special target of the militant students last October, when he published that article in the quarterly, "The Public Interest." In it, he questioned whether the black studies program being drawn up for the College by Nathan Hare would allow for enough diversity in points of view on racial questions.

"It was a cautious piece, hardly something to provoke a kamikaze attack," he said.

Yet it is exactly that caution which angers the militants. For Bunzel, with his careful weighing of all sides of the question, represents to them a liberal enemy—the man in the middle who fails to take sides clearly and so blocks the revolution.

He not only questions their black student studies program but also has failed to support the American Federation of Teachers' strike, explaining that he believes "it is the wrong strike at the wrong time, and besides, I'm not completely persuaded that the industrial trade union model is appropriate to the academic community."

WORSE THAN WALLACE?

"He's much more a dangerous thing than a man like George Wallace," a BSU member told me. "With Wallace, everyone knows where he stands. But when Bunzel says something people say, yeah, he's a liberal so that must be right."

But to Bunzel, the right to say or write what he believes and to teach the class as he wants to is "the irreducible minimum of academic freedom."

"I will not be intimidated but I will not be afraid to acknowledge that sometimes I'm scared," he told me. "I've had police protection at home now for four months and that's a lousy way to live."

FASCELL INTRODUCES BILL TO ALLEVIATE INEQUITIES IN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today legislation to correct a Government practice which affects only a few people but is of extreme importance to those few who are involved.

I refer to the policy of cutting off a Federal employee's pay as soon as he files a compensation claim for injury suffered on the job. In many cases the paperwork delay in processing a justifiable claim amounts to weeks or months. Meanwhile, the injured employee is expected to meet all of his continuing expenses—which may include supporting a family of many children—without any income.

Clearly this is an unfair and inequitable situation, since the employee is injured through no fault of his own. He was carrying out his official Government duties when injured, and therefore the Government has an obligation to provide for his support until he is able to work again.

Under present practices, the Government's obligation to such employees is not being met. Rather, the faithful employee's urgent need during the critical period of his on-the-job injury is ignored as the Government slowly processes his justifiable request for compensation. We cannot allow this treatment to continue.

My legislation would allow Federal employees injured on the job to continue to receive their regular pay until there is a decision and compensation payments may begin. I think it is only fair that we enact this system so that an injury on the job will not result in an automatic lengthy cutoff of all income.

My bill would amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to accomplish this goal. It provides safeguards so that any differences or discrepancies would be adjusted by withholding portions of the compensation payments in a manner that will be equitable to the employee and the Government.

My bill also makes another amendment of the Compensation Act, to provide that employees who are on the compensation rolls will continue to earn annual and sick leave.

Under existing law, an employee receiving compensation payments because of duty-incurred injuries is deprived of the right to earn annual or sick leave for those periods which exceed 80 hours of leave without pay.

This practice is just the opposite when the employee is on annual or sick leave. When an employee is away from his job on such leave, he is earning more leave credits.

I fail to see why a different rule should apply to those who have been injured on the job. Consequently, I seek to amend the law to provide equal treatment for those who are injured.

I have introduced this legislation for the past several Congresses, but to date it has not become law. This session, I hope we can enact these needed reforms which will help produce equitable treatment for our injured Federal employees.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM CO., THE HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT AND U.S. RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year, President Nixon may be forced to commit our Latin American policy to a course that would irreparably damage future U.S. relations with that region. I refer to the April deadline upon which, under the statutory sanctions of the Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, the U.S. Government must suspend all assistance to the Government of Peru, if the conflict between that Government and the International Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, remains in stalemate. The IPC oil expropriation

XUM

case has made headlines in the United States and throughout Latin America, and well it should—it is creating perhaps the greatest crisis in United States-Latin American relations in our time, and the manner in which the U.S. Government reacts to this incident could propel us into a future of total alienation from the Southern Hemisphere.

In my mind, the IPC case points up the vital necessity of an immediate reassessment of U.S. policy toward Peru, and indeed, all of Latin America, and calls for, in particular, a thorough study of two aspects of that policy: first, the Hickenlooper amendment and it seriously negative effects on overall U.S. relations with Latin America; and second, the future course of U.S. private investment in that region, and U.S. Government policy concerning investment.

With regard to the Hickenlooper amendment, I seriously question the wisdom of such a statutory prohibition as an instrument of our foreign aid policy. Its application to the current IPC expropriation case is a prime opportunity to evaluate its validity in our aid policy and to determine its effectiveness in protecting and encouraging private investment in Latin America.

The confusing and complex issues of the IPC case have been aired many times in the press, and I will not attempt to explain them here. But I feel that the most important point, and one which many of us have lost sight of in the current hysteria of this confrontation, is that Peru's expropriation of the IPC holdings is a unique case, and it is regarded as such by the Peruvian Government. It is based on a recurring dispute between IPC and Peru that has persisted for 45 years. During that time, it has been a constant source of resentment on the part of the Peruvians against what they believed, perhaps unjustly, to be economic exploitation of their natural resources by U.S. business interests. It is not a preview of a new anti-American wave surging through Latin America and it will not result in a massive seizure of U.S. business interests in Peru and elsewhere, or in a general rejection of U.S. influence in the Latin nations unless the United States, through acts of sanction and retaliation imposed by the Hickenlooper amendment, causes that alienation to occur. I cannot emphasize this point too strongly—the manner of official U.S. action on this matter is all important—we must be willing to show the Peruvians and other Latin American nations that we are approaching this situation from a sound, reasonable policy, and that we are actively seeking a just and equitable negotiated settlement in the interests of both sides. The danger is in leaping too fast to impose punishment before there is a reasonable opportunity to settle the case by negotiation, and this dangerous leap is precisely what the United States must make if the provisions of the Hickenlooper amendment remain in force.

In the view of the current Peruvian Government, the expropriation of the IPC holdings was a lawful and just act to recover Peru's national rights. The act represents reparations for what the Government at this time believes—correctly or not—was IPC's illegal exploitation of Peru's oil wealth. Gen. Juan Velasco, Peruvian head of state, has stated his Government's position on the invocation of the Hickenlooper sanctions as follows:

> As a free and sovereign nation, Peru is not able to understand nor can it accept the fact that a powerful nation . . . would attempt to enforce its laws outside its territory, and even worse, to use these laws to protect the interests of an enterprise which openly acts outside the Peruvian laws and morals and acts overbearingly without caring for the dignity and sovereignty of this country.

In his view, if the U.S. Government enforces the Hickenlooper amendment, it would be a clear case of economic pressure, aimed at usurping the dignity and sovereignty of a small nation.

And we are only deluding ourselves if we believe that the other nations in Latin America will be sympathetic to U.S. retaliation in Peru. The threat implicit in the Hickenlooper amendment has led to charges throughout the Latin nations of economic imperialism, a U.S. return to the big stick policy, and a modern version of landing the Marines. To say that enforcement of the Hickenlooper amendment would be gravely injurious to the U.S. image throughout Latin America is hardly an exaggeration.

The issue of foreign economic influence in Latin America, especially U.S. influence, is an extremely sensitive one. It has resulted in strong nationalistic sentiments stemming from a deep-seated resentment of the massive U.S. economic presence and the control exercised by outside business interests. The "big stick" method of the Hickenlooper amendment is contributing to this rising tide of Latin resentment, and fanning the flames of Latin nationalism and anti-Americanism. Peru's General Velasco is regarded as somewhat of a hero among his people and other Latin nations. Convinced of his righteous cause, he has dared to defy U.S. demands and strike back against the "Yanqui aggressor," regardless of the disastrous economic effects which that defiance will wreak on the Peruvian economy. For many Latin Americans, he is becoming a symbol of Latin courage and independence.

The intent of the Hickenlooper amendment was to protect our private investors against foreign expropriation without just compensation, while at the same time encouraging them to invest in foreign economies for the mutual benefit of the United States and the nations concerned. It was meant as a warning to foreign governments concerning the repercussions which such action would provoke in U.S. policy. In the case of Peru, its warning has proved to be totally ineffective—the Peruvian Government acted in reprisal for what it considered illegal acts, the Hickenlooper amendment notwithstanding. Moreover, the amendment is detrimental to the U.S. policy of encouraging private investment in the less-developed countries. Rather than encouraging a nation to solicit private investment, it serves to warn that nation that to encourage U.S. private investment is to incur the risk of being subject to U.S. economic pressures, supported by the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Government has always stood ready to support the American investor in cases where his property is illegally seized. Our Government has never accepted any principle other than fair compensation for expropriated property. There are well-established diplomatic and legal procedures for securing just settlements in these cases, and diplomatic channels have been successfully utilized in the past. The Hickenlooper amendment can only serve to impede progress through negotiation.

President Nixon has dispatched his special emissary, John N. Irwin, to enter talks with the Peruvian Government concerning the IPC case and other issues creating friction between our two nations. We place in him the highest hopes for an amicable solution to the problem and wish for the successful conclusion of this important mission. Diplomatic initiatives like this, and not arbitrary legislative enactments, are the way to solve delicate problems of conflicts between nations.

U.S. policymakers have consistently rejected such sanctions in our foreign policy on the grounds that they could seriously injure vital U.S. national interests, including those pertaining to our national security; that these sanctions subordinate the conduct of foreign policy and perhaps our entire relationship with certain foreign nations to a single foreign policy interest; and that by making it appear that U.S. aid programs are substantially motivated by a desire to protect U.S. private investment, provisions such as the Hickenlooper admendment play into the hands of the Communists, who have long alleged that U.S. foreign aid is actually designed to facilitate the exploitation of underdeveloped nations by Western capitalists.

It is my feeling that the existence of the Hickenlooper amendment is negating its own purposes, obfuscating a responsible U.S. position in this situation, and placing us on a direct collision course with Peru, and perhaps all of Latin America.

Such a dollar diplomacy scarecrow should be repealed before it does serious damage to U.S. standing throughout the world.

I would like to address myself now to another aspect of our foreign policy which, I feel, must be reassessed; namely, the future course of private investment in Latin America and what U.S. policy will be.

President John F. Kennedy once stated:

> Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened U.S. businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital.

Peru, like the rest of Latin America, needs a tremendous amount of foreign capital investment in order to develop its resources and raise its terribly low standard of living. Much of this capital

XUM

must come from private sources, and Latin Americans generally acknowledge that U.S. business is beneficial to their nations. It has entered industrially depressed areas and raised the living standards of the people there; it has introduced modern methods and technical skills; it has stimulated local industry; it has created job opportunities for thousands of unemployed; it has helped train a managerial and technical class; it has improved the living standards of the small consumer; it has contributed to the beginnings of a modern industrial plant in many nations. All these elements are essential to Latin American development.

But American business has failed to make these accomplishments understood or appreciated by the great mass of Latin people. And Latin American business and government leaders, while appreciating the widespread benefits of U.S. business for their nations, do not want to be dominated by U.S. business. There is a broad spectrum of relationships between our investments and the economies of foreign nations, and I feel that these should be defined.

In February, President Nixon announced that he was sending Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, a man highly respected by Latin Americans for his knowledge and interest in their nations, on a formal mission to Latin America. Governor Rockefeller's trip is to be the first step in an administration plan to reassess our entire policy in Latin America and to discover what is lacking in that policy—why the Alliance for Progress has not been as effective as was hoped; why government instability persists in that region; why there has not been a substantially greater improvement in the lives of the people. I propose that a team of first-rate economists be sent with him to examine the aspects of U.S. private investment in Latin America, with a view toward further encouraging those investments. This proposal is wholly in keeping with President Nixon's announced goal of putting more emphasis on trade and business in Latin America.

It can be hoped that the Rockefeller trip, followed up by a comprehensive reassessment of the overall U.S. policy toward Latin America, will dispel widespread Latin criticism that the United States has turned away from its southern neighbors and is not concerned with their problems.

Our future policy toward Latin America is all important—not only with regard to the way in which we handle this explosive situation in Peru, or the formulation of a new posture toward private investment, but overall, in our concrete dealings with the people of that region.

Too long this Nation has lacked a strong positive policy toward Latin America. Too long our policy has been a meandering, inconsistent one. Too long that region has occupied very low priority in this Government. Too long the United States has lacked a positive image there.

In a recent speech in Washington, Galo Plaza Lasso, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, voiced concern about current United States-Latin American relations. We would do well to concern ourselves with his statement:

> Obviously it is in the United States' interest to have stable and prosperous neighbors, but it is also its obligation . . . to collaborate with its fellow men as they strive for a better life. Time is running out in which we can develop a policy of genuine benefit to the entire hemisphere and make an indispensable contribution to the peace and stability of the world.

I say that it is time that we in the Congress, those in the executive branch of our Government, and the people of this Nation apply our efforts to the task of creating an atmosphere of mutual respect and fraternity among the peoples who share this hemisphere. It is time that we begin to create a long-term, consistent policy toward Latin America, a policy in which we deal with our neighbors as equals and as partners in the desire to create, throughout the Western Hemisphere, a better and more creative life.

KOCH: NO MORE WAR APPROPRIATIONS FOR VIETNAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, here we are more than 2 months into a new administration. An administration that indicated in the course of the recent campaign that its goal was to bring the war in Vietnam to a conclusion. In the course of that campaign, everyone agreed, including the new administration, that a military victory was impossible and ought no longer to be discussed. Our generals have been saying for years that they can see the "light at the end of the tunnel." In truth, the tunnel has become an abyss filled daily with the blood of our soldiers.

Since March 1968, when President Johnson decided to pursue a negotiated settlement of the war, 11,500 American lives have been lost and 37,000 Americans have been seriously wounded in combat. Last week there were 351 deaths and 1,401 wounded. The week before there were 336 deaths and 1,694 wounded. And all for what? To keep in power two South Vietnamese generals, both of whom will do all they can to prevent peace from being achieved at Paris. Why? Because they know that in any settlement, they will be deposed. It is not in their self-interest to seek peace. Dictators thrive on war, and these two are no different.

We must demonstrate to the South Vietnamese military clique that they cannot depend on our bayonets and the blood of our soldiers to keep them in power and make it clear that we do intend to withdraw and withdraw completely.

I am in complete accord with the view of the junior Senator from South Dakota that—

> We are trying to win, on the battlefield and in Paris, what the Saigon government long ago lost beyond all recall: the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.

Our policy must not serve the interests of these petty tyrants. Our policy must serve the interests of the American people. And without question, Mr. Speaker, the interests of the American people demand that we begin to withdraw our soldiers now.

If the Nixon administration will not promptly heed the anguish and anger of the American people seeking to terminate our military involvement in Vietnam, then Congress must exercise its power and refuse to appropriate the billions of dollars being spent for killing in Vietnam.

We must not defer to the insiders and the experts on this paramount issue. We know the magnitude of our blundering—we know the depth of our shame. I for one will vote against any appropriations for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war.

TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designed to stiffen U.S. policy in establishing and enforcing our territorial waters claims and ocean fishing limits.

This action is, in my judgment, required for two very good reasons. First, U.S. fishing boats are being subjected to outrageous humiliation by nations which themselves are undercutting our own fishing industry which is in a badly depressed condition.

Second, our shorelines are being subjected to intense electronic surveillance by Communist nations which enforce claims to territorial waters to far greater extent than we do.

International agreements and understandings with regard to territorial waters, if they ever were significant, today are without any meaning. Effectively every coastal nation sets its own claims without regard to others. This means chaos which will, if not corrected, become extremely serious.

My resolution proposes two steps. First, it says that we should adopt a policy of reciprocity in our territorial waters and fishing limits. This means that we would impose on any ship the same territorial and fishing limits which that ship's national government imposes in its own coastal waters. Of course we would in any case maintain our 3-mile territorial limit and our 12-mile fishing limit.

Second, my resolution calls for a new international conference for the purpose of reaching agreement between all coastal nations on territorial limits.

Mr. Speaker, the United States follows the normal traditional practice. This provides for a 3-mile limit for the purposes of sovereign territorial jurisdiction and for a 12-mile limit for the purposes of fishing.

Actually, we have entered into certain agreements liberalizing these limits. A Soviet-American fishing agreement in late 1967 provided that Soviet fishing trawlers could venture to within 6 miles

XUM

of certain areas off the Long Island and New Jersey coasts.

In exchange for this concession the Russians agreed not to fish certain other areas off Cape Cod, but proceeded to violate the spirit of the agreement by sending trawlers flying the Polish flag into the areas in which their own ships were prohibited.

Legitimate fishing is only a part of the consideration at hand, since it is common knowledge that Russian and other Communist fishing trawlers are fitted with highly sophisticated electronic surveillance equipment.

On February 8 of this year the Coast Guard observed a fleet of 60 Communist-bloc trawlers off the Virginia coast well within the 12-mile limit. It must be assumed they were both fishing and engaging in surveillance.

And we took no action to enforce the traditional limit. Clearly it is ludicrous to speak of any effective traditional limit either in terms of what we enforce on our own coasts or what others both claim and enforce.

Only yesterday it was reported that a fleet of some 175 Soviet-bloc trawlers were operating in a formation 40 miles long and 15 miles wide off the Virginia-North Carolina coast.

This represents a new high level of Soviet fishing strength in and near American waters. And although we are told these trawlers were some 35 miles off the coast, what assurance do we have that they may not venture up to within 3 miles?

And what assurance do we have that if they do indeed violate the 12-mile limit that we will take any action beyond yet another warning?

If the traditional limits were ever considered to be binding the day has passed when this is realistic. The brutal fact is that we invite, through our practices, both espionage and unfair invasion of our coastal fishing grounds.

Only 29 of 98 coastal nations of the world now observe the so-called traditional limits. The others all claim wider limits.

The 3-mile sovereign limit is a thing of the past. The U.S.S.R. and most Communist nations claim 12 miles. And we can be assured that the claim is rigidly enforced.

The *Pueblo* tragedy provides evidence that at least in some cases Communist nations are fully prepared to seize ships even beyond the 12-mile limit when they believe they can get away it.

Peru and Ecuador go to the extent of claiming 200 miles for both sovereign territorial waters and fishing limits. We all know of recent cases in which U.S. tuna boats have been seized when within these 200-mile limits but well beyond the 12-mile limit.

On February 15 a U.S. boat was attacked while located from 26 to 50 miles off the Peruvian coast. Again last week two more U.S. boats were seized at about the same distance.

It must be emphasized that these incidents are not uniquely recent. They have been going on for far too long. And so have efforts to correct the problem.

More than 2 years ago, in early March 1967, our Assistant Secretary of State Lincoln Gordon spent 5 days in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador in an effort to solve the problem. Even at that time seizure of U.S. trawlers within 200 miles but well beyond 12 miles was a long-standing fact.

We were talking in those days about enforcement of the Kuchel amendment which requires that U.S. aid be cut off to any nation that seizes American property. We are today in 1969 still talking about enforcing the Kuchel amendment, and chances are that 2 and 5 years from now we will still be talking about it.

The "tit for tat" policy I recommend will, of course, not solve the entire problem. What it can be expected to do, however, is put some backbone into U.S. behavior on the high seas where other nations have come to believe that our patience is inexhaustible.

Just as important it could provide the thrust needed to convince other nations that a new worldwide agreement is needed. International conferences in Geneva failed to produce agreement in 1958 and again in 1960.

Presumably, one of the reasons they failed was that too many nations believed it was in their national interest to set their own policies while others, such as the United States, adhered to the so-called traditional international standards.

This issue is of serious concern to the American fishing industry. But it is an issue which transcends the interests of our country and involves world stability.

I earnestly solicit the support of this House in early consideration and approval of this resolution.

CONGRESS SHOULD CLOSE INCOME TAX LOOPHOLES AND LET THE SURTAX EXPIRE

(Mr. **KARTH** asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **KARTH**. Mr. Speaker, it is being made clearer each day by various spokesmen that the administration will request the extension of the "temporary" 10-percent income surtax.

I cannot help but feel this is an "easy way out" which will bear most heavily upon the 50 million low- and moderate-income taxpayers who are being squeezed by inflation.

There is a better way, a more equitable way, of obtaining the additional money which is urgently needed to finance the added expenses of the Vietnam war.

I am proposing, through my bill H.R. 7045—and it is being proposed in similar bills—that this Congress let the surtax expire and obtain the $9 billion in revenues which the surtax is expected to raise, by closing those tax loopholes for individuals and corporations who are profiting unduly at the expense of our overheated war economy.

Through these tax loopholes some giant corporations and millionaires escape paying taxes on most or even all of their income.

In a memorable appearance before the Joint Economic Committee on January 17, 1969, outgoing Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr warned of a brewing "taxpayers revolt" incited by the flagrant inequities made possible by loopholes in the law. Mr. Barr cited chapter and verse and explained that in 1967 there were 21 Americans with incomes over $1 million who paid no Federal income tax at all; there were 155 individuals with 1967 incomes of over $200,000 who paid none.

Some corporations, too, have enjoyed special tax favors at the expense of other corporations and the low- and moderate-income taxpayers. Oil companies are especially notorious for their "piggy-backing" on the public. The Treasury Department estimates that the cost of the average oil well is recovered 19 times over. Through the 27½-percent depletion allowance gimmick the 20 leading oil companies in the United States, in 1966, legally paid Federal income taxes at the rate of 8½ percent on their $4¾ billion profit. This is about the rate paid by a wage earner and his wife at a poverty-level annual income of $3,000.

My bill would raise the $9 billion in additional revenues which are needed to replace an expiring surtax by: reducing mineral and oil depletion allowances, eliminating a tax "break" for multiple corporations, repealing the 7-percent investment tax credit which is causing inflationary industrial overexpansion, limiting the "hobby farm" income-loss gimmick, and other unwarranted subsidies or preferences which enrich favored classes of people and firms. I believe these reforms could speedily be considered by Congress and enacted into law to replace the expiring surtax provision.

It is certainly not my intention that this tax reform bill be a substitute for the comprehensive revision of the income tax laws now being studied by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I would hope, however, that all the essential features of this bill would, at least, be incorporated in the long-awaited revision. They would be a long-desired first step to bringing a greater measure of justice to our tax system.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON TAX REFORM, LOOPHOLES, ETC.

(Mr. **MADDEN** asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **MADDEN**. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and testified regarding the necessity for early action by the committee and the Members of the 91st Congress to enact effective legislation that will curtail and repeal some of the fabulous and, in many cases, fraudulent tax loophole bonanzas that have been placed on our statute books over the years. I appreciated the remarks and questions of many members of the Ways and Means Committe as to the necessity of effective Federal tax reform.

I include my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee this morning:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 26, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Chairman and the Members of the Ways and

Means Committe for giving me an opportunity to testify on this much-needed Federal tax reform legislation. I also want to commend your committee for calling these long-delayed hearings in order to secure first-hand information for the American public on the deplorable conditions which our Federal tax system has reached in recent years. During my 27 years in Congress I have been shocked by the gradual increase in power, year by year, of specially privileged and powerful segments of our economy slowly and cleverly securing favorable legislation until, in some cases, they are totally exempt on Federal taxes from their exorbitant profits.

Our Federal tax laws, as of today, have become riddled with tax concessions, loopholes, tax credits, and depletion exemptions to a favored few who have the finances to employ powerful lobbyists to relieve their clients of the responsibility for providing the revenue necessary to finance the enormous cost to keep our land the No. 1 nation in the world.

Former Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr revealed in January that 21 persons with incomes over $1 million paid no taxes at all in 1967, while 155 with incomes of over $200,000 also escaped taxes entirely.

When the wealthy escape taxes, it is the average taxpayer who gets hit for higher taxes to make up the difference. The best example of this is the 10 percent tax surcharge. Faced with the need for more revenues, the Administration came running to the average middle class taxpayer, while doing nothing to make wealthy foundations, oil millionaires, real estate speculations, and highly-paid corporate executives pay their fair share. Those with incomes of around $15,000 a year or less already pay nearly two-thirds of all personal Federal income taxes, and the surcharge simply adds to their burden. But to the wealthy exploiter of loopholes the surcharge is no problem at all—*10 percent of nothing is still nothing.*

If just a modest number of the fantastic and excessive tax loopholes and exemptions were eliminated there would be no need for an extension of the 10% surcharge tax. I have introduced H.R. 9195, which if enacted into law would bring in more than $9 billion in additional revenue by plugging 13 of the more notorious loopholes in our Federal tax system. This happens to be the same amount that an extension of the 10 percent tax surcharge would yield in fiscal 1970. Thirty-one other Congressmen have sponsored identical legislation.

Among the loopholes this bill would close is the depletion allowance for oil and other minerals. Largely because of the oil depletion allowance, the 20 largest oil companies in the country paid only 8½ percent of their net income in taxes in 1966. One large company with profits ranging from $61,110,000 in 1962 and similar increased amounts of income in 1963, 1964, and 1965 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever.

Standard Oil of New Jersey had an income of $1,271,903,000 in 1962 but paid only six-tenths of one percent of their fabulous profits. In the following four years their percentage tax on similar profits ranges as follows:

	Year	Net income before tax	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	1962	$1,271,903,000	0.6
	1963	1,584,469,000	4.3
	1964	1,628,555,000	1.7
	1965	1,679,675,000	4.9
	1966	1,830,914,000	6.3
Atlantic Oil	1962	61,110,000	0
	1963	56,747,000	0
	1964	61,081,000	0
	1965	105,299,000	0
	1966	127,384,000	------------

Some companies do not do as well as the oil companies, however. Perhaps they do not have as powerful a lobby in Washington as "big oil."

The following statistics on three coal companies illustrate the contrast:

	Year	Gross profit	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Consolidation Coal Co	1964	$44,863,073	26
	1963	39,568,737	28
	1962	32,918,065	26
Pittston Co	1964	13,721,024	30
	1962	14,699,420	35
Island Creek Coal Co	1964	7,713,060	18
	1963	5,149,930	24
	1962	3,459,563	(1)

(1) Lost by SEC.

The oil lobby will of course argue that the 27½ percent depletion allowance is needed to insure an adequate supply of reserve oil in emergencies, that it is vital to our national defense, that our economy will collapse without it. Fortunately the Treasury has just released a thorough-going study of the tax breaks currently enjoyed by the oil industry and their effect on the level of oil reserves. The study, done by the CONSAD Research Corporation of Pittsburgh, challenges these oil industry arguments, concluding that the depletion allowance and special expense deductions enjoyed by the oil companies add only a small amount to the Nation's petroleum reserves. Furthermore, the Report goes on, the depletion allowance encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources. I don't think this is a very good bargain for the $2.25 billion worth of loopholes we gave to oil men in 1958. Big oil has been enjoying this financial bonanza for years. Real estate speculators are almost as generously treated at tax time as oil men.

Former Treasury Assistant Secretary Surrey, in a speech last year, said, "The Treasury recently examined the 1966 tax returns of 13 real estate operators, all of whom had very substantial gross incomes, and found that depreciation 'losses' reduced the tax liability of nine of them to zero and of two others to less than $25."

Doing away with the accelerated depreciation gimmick on speculative real estate would head off operators of this sort and bring in an extra $150 million in tax revenues each year.

Another gaping tax loophole is the 7 percent investment tax credit, enacted in 1962, which permits business firms to subtract from their tax bills 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was intended to stimulate the economy by providing a subsidy to private investment.

However, our economy has been overstimulated and we are now in a period of serious inflation, fed in part by the 7% investment tax credit. The credit concentrates inflationary spending power on precisely that portion of the economy that is already most overheated—the capital goods section in the first place, it creates a second round of inflation by causing business to hasten to invest before inflation drives up capital goods prices even further.

The Commerce Department Survey of business fixed investment plans for 1969, released on March 13, underscores the need for repeal of the investment tax credit. The survey predicted that total 1969 expenditures for new plant and equipment will reach a whopping $73 billion, a 14 percent increase over 1968. This contrasts with year-to-year increases of only 4 percent in 1968 and 2 percent in 1967.

This survey indicates strongly that it is capital goods inflation that is most serious, yet the Administration still insists on a 10 percent surcharge on the average consumer to combat inflation. If it is inflation they are concerned about, why not get at the real culprit by repealing the 7 percent investment tax credit?

The list of tax loopholes can be extended almost to eternity, as this committee well knows.

Capital gains which pass through an estate at death are not taxed.

The unlimited charitable deduction allows many millionaires to escape taxation entirely.

Special tax treatment for stock options allows highly paid corporate executives to get tax advantages not open to the average wage earner.

The tax exemption for municipal industrial development bond interest encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations, while costing the Treasury millions in lost revenues.

As an example, certain states of the Union who enjoy the exemption privileges of Section B of the Taft-Hartley Law are paying sub-standard wages to millions of factory workers in their localities. These sub-standard wage workers are practically out of the buying market in regard to $3–$4 thousand dollar automobiles, $400 refrigerators, etc., etc., and are adding nothing to the employment and prosperity in factory production of our Nation. This, of course, is an exemption over which the Ways and Means Committee has no responsibility. On the other hand, your committee has recommended, and the Congress has enacted, tax exemptions for municipal industrial development bonds. This exemption encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations and industrial factories to move into these 14B states. Thousands of towns and cities in these areas have taken advantage of the tax exempt industrial development bonds with cheap land and cheap wages to capture thousands of industrial factories from states paying a living wage to its workers. Multi-millions could be brought into the Federal Treasury by the repeal of the interest on municipal and other local civic bond promotion.

The hobby farm loophole allows wealthy part-time farmers to escape taxes by using fictional farm "losses" to offset income.

I will not take more of the committee's time by extending the list of loopholes, for time is something we don't have very much of because of the need for immediate action in repeal of tax loopholes, exemptions, etc.

The American people are weary of being told that we are all very concerned about tax reform, that we are working very hard on it, and that it is very difficult and complicated and it is going to take a long time. The taxpaying public is running out of patience, and the surcharge is doing little to make them more tolerant.

Therefore, I would urge the committee to act within the next two months on as many major tax reform items as possible. Tax reform should not be postponed until we can put together a neat, tidy, "skim milk" package that everyone can agree on. We will be here until the year 2000 if that is the goal.

I am not going to take the time of this committee in detailing the fabulous and fraudulent raid on the Federal Treasury by thousands of tax-avoiding estate foundations. A former Secretary of the Treasury stated before a Senate Committee that he could not speculate as to how many foundations are operating and enjoying tax exempt benefits. Some foundations are engaging in free enterprise industry in competition with regular tax paying corporation and non-exempt business and industries. One official in the Treasury Department testified that he could place the number of foundations enjoying tax exemptions at approximately 25,000. Congressman Wright Patman and other Members have gone into the foundation tax bonanza in detail before your committee, and I know your committee and all Members of Congress are familiar with its tax-avoiding ramifications.

Every tax dollar lost through these loopholes must be paid by another source. For the most part, this loss—and it has been estimated to be a whopping $50 billion—is paid by moderate income groups, by small people with incomes of $15 thousand and less, who cannot afford to hire high-priced accountants and tax lawyers to enact loopholes, credits and exemptions.

The House should be given an opportunity to work its will on tax reform at the earliest opportunity. I firmly believe that the heavy financial obligation of Government would warrant your committee concentrating on major loopholes which involves literally billions of escaped taxes by certain segments of our economy. Your committee, I hope will report a bill closing the top-bracket tax-escaping loopholes so the Congress can act immediately on the same. The minor loop holes can be taken up by your committee and considered later in the year. The American public has become familiar in recent years with the necessity of taking the gigantic tax load off the wage-earner and the salaried citizen while mammoth corporations and gigantic mergers of corporations profiteer on the American public. I do hope your committee will not submit a weak, and ineffective recommendation on the closing of the tax loopholes. As a Member of the Rules Committee, I for one, and I know of others that for the first time in years, will insist on an open rule on this legislation. This will give the other 410 Members of Congress an opportunity to answer the demand of the almost unanimous cry of the American public for effective tax reform.

It has been suggested by some Members that this legislation could be enacted in the next few months if the major loophole recipients, whose payments on their huge profits is but a pittance, would start paying into the Federal Treasury a blanket minimum Federal tax ranging from 15 percent to 30 percent of their profits. They then would join with the small businessmen and the wage and salaried citizen in supporting our huge domestic and foreign programs and Federal obligations.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order which I am about to undertake.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, the National Urban Coalition under the chairmanship of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, issued a report on progress made during the last year in meeting the challenges posed by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder. In area after area of domestic need—housing, education, unemployment, discrimination, pollution of our atmosphere and water—the report of the Urban Coalition concluded that no progress had been made in the year since the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders issued its call to the Nation to respond to these pressing urban problems before our cities deteriorated beyond repair.

As the situation in our cities becomes daily more crucial, the war in Vietnam, which has consumed more and more of our Nation's resources and, even more tragically, cost the lives of over 33,000 American servicemen, continues. While our cities disintegrate and our country becomes increasingly disunited, a war which was ill conceived from the beginning rages on with undiminished fury.

From the beginning of this tragic conflict I have consistently warned of the threat which the war poses to both the welfare of the Vietnamese people and the stability and integrity of the United States. Since 1964 the domestic needs of our people have been neglected as our Nation's resources and energies have been committed to the Americanization of the war and the constant escalation of our military role—an escalation carried on with the consent, if not the advice, of the Congress, which, despite the opposition of a few of us, has readily authorized and appropriated some $30 billion annually to conduct the war in Vietnam.

Last March, in the wake of mounting opposition to the war—opposition which spread from the campuses to important segments of the labor movement, business community, and even within the policymaking apparatus of the Government itself, and which was then finding expression through the political process—the Johnson administration changed course. The President declined to commit the 206,000 additional troops which General Westmoreland had requested. On March 31 he announced a curb in the bombing of North Vietnam, said he would move toward peace through negotiations, and removed himself from consideration as a candidate for reelection. A short time later, in May of 1968, the preliminary peace negotiations got underway in Paris.

For those of us who had long opposed our deepening involvement in Vietnam, and who had urged that the President stop the bombing in the North and rely on diplomatic means for a settlement of the war, the President's announcement appeared to signal a deescalation in the war and at least the beginning of a move toward a negotiated settlement.

That was 1 year ago.

What is the result of that "change in direction" today? Has the level of violence in Vietnam declined?

Last week, the Pentagon announced that 351 American servicemen had been killed during the week ending March 15. 1,401 Americans were wounded.

In the week previous to that, 336 Americans were killed and 1,694 wounded. And in the week ending March 1, 453 Americans died in combat and 2,593 were wounded.

This makes a total of 1,140 deaths during 3 weeks of the current North Vietnamese-Vietcong offensive.

These statistics by themselves, however, do not fully reveal the intensification of the fighting that has occurred since the so-called reversal of direction was announced by President Johnson. It is significant that almost one-third of the total number of 33,063 American servicemen who have died in Vietnam since 1961—10,565 men—have died since the preliminary Paris peace talks began on May 10, 1968.

As these grim figures show, despite the general expectations of the American public that the advent of negotiations would produce a deescalation of hostilities in Vietnam, the fighting has intensified to the point that 3,459 lives have been lost in the 3 months since South Vietnam joined the Paris talks on December 7.

Moreover, the death and suffering which have been the lot of the Vietnamese people for over two decades now continues unabated. The Senate Select Subcommittee on Refugees has estimated that between 3 million and 4 million people in South Vietnam are presently without shelter or occupation, with very little hope that their condition will improve in their own lifetime. No one knows how many Vietnamese have been killed or maimed during the past 4 years, but estimates run to the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **RYAN**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. I am rather disturbed that there are only about 20 Members on the floor for such an important address. If the gentleman wishes that I suggest the absence of a quorum. I will unless the gentleman does not care to have an audience.

Mr. **RYAN**. That is a point of order which the gentleman from Illinois may raise in his own discretion.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. The gentleman will be discreet.

Mr. **RYAN**. A number of Members plan to participate in this discussion during the course of the afternoon, many of whom are on the floor already. Others will join us, and I assure the gentleman that we will be making recommendations to the Nixon administration and to our colleagues which I hope will be heeded.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has said that the blame for the renewed intensification of the fighting rests squarely with the "enemy." "I want to state unequivocally," he stated on March 11, "that if these attacks continue unabated, an appropriate response will be made."

President Nixon on March 14, also said that an "appropriate response" would be taken if the North Vietnamese attacks continued.

According to New York Post columnist James Wechsler, however, Ambassador Averell Harriman, the chief Paris negotiator for the Johnson administration, has said that the "present North Vietnamese offensive is essentially a response to our actions rather than a deliberate attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks." Ambassador Harriman's comments echo an earlier warning which the New York Times made last

XUM

December 14, when it warned that an escalation in U.S. military activity—coupled with a decline in the number of battalion-scaled assaults by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong—was endangering the Paris talks. The editorial cautioned that an upset in the military balance in Vietnam in advance of a settlement "is bound to produce a reaction sooner or later" that could "wreck the chance for a negotiated peace."

Stepped up offensive military actions by the United States is being used, however, to attempt to upset the military balance. In the hopes that the occupation of territory long held by the Vietcong will produce a settlement more favorable to the Saigon regime, the U.S. military has continued to make extensive use of aggressive "search and destroy" missions. In spite of the fact that in the past each U.S. escalation has been matched—and that the only result of an intensification of hostilities has been more death and destruction—the American military command appears to persist in its belief that "just one more sweep" will tip the military balance in their favor. This strategy has failed to produce any significant military gain in the past. For, as I have repeatedly stated in numerous speeches to this body, the Vietcong does not intend to dissolve in the face of U.S. firepower. The National Liberation Front, and its predecessor the Viet Minh, have been fighting for over two decades to rid Vietnam of foreign influence. Any amount of American military pressure, short of total destruction, will only produce an "appropriate response" on their part. And the destruction will go on.

A little more than a year ago, on March 11, 1968, when General Westmoreland was asking for an additional 206,000 troops, I said that the choice was clear. "Will additional thousands of American young men be sent to their death in Vietnam? Will more billions of dollars be spent, which should be spent on our domestic crisis, only to reach new levels of destruction in Vietnam, only to achieve a continued stalemate at a new plateau? Or will the administration negotiate a political settlement?" The lack of progress at the Paris peace talks and the actual intensification of the war since the talks began leaves little doubt that neither the Johnson administration nor the Nixon administration has taken the steps necessary to obtain a negotiated political settlement. Instead, more treasure has been spent, and more lives have been sacrificed.

At his last press conference on March 19, President Nixon ominously threatened that "he had warned North Vietnam once" and that he would not "warn them a second time."

With the possibility increasing that President Nixon may take some retaliatory action against the latest offensive by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, it is imperative that the Congress make clear its opposition to any renewal of the policy which I described on March 1, 1966, as "mindful escalation." As I have stated, such retaliatory action will only lead to a counterresponse and a new round of escalation of the war. And the result will only be the unnecessary prolongation of the suffering of the Vietnamese population.

By speaking out now—before the Nixon administration takes such measures—the Congress can prevent any new escalation. If Congress fails to define our objectives in Vietnam, the President will have only the counsel of those in the Pentagon and the foreign policy establishment who have led us into this morass from the outset.

The presidential primaries of last Spring—in which both Senator Kennedy and Senator McCARTHY won decisive victories on programs advocating a deescalation of the war and an emphasis on diplomatic negotiation as the means to peace—made it clear that the American people want this war ended. Indeed, that feeling seemed to be almost universally accepted by all candidates.

As long ago as March 1968, in the course of the New Hampshire primary, Presidential candidate Nixon said, "The next President of the United States must end the war." He declared that his statement about ending the war "was not a vague campaign promise." "I do have some specific ideas on how to end the war," he said. "They are primarily in the diplomatic area."

In his testimony before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee on March 20, Secretary of Defense Laird said that if the Paris talks "failed to produce a negotiated settlement" of the war, the Nixon administration had "other alternatives" which it was prepared to pursue.

The Congress should demand that the administration make clear the nature of these "other alternatives."

In March 1968, Presidential candidate Nixon had "specific ideas on how to end the war." In March 1969 President Nixon has "other alternatives." Vague "alternatives" are no substitute for a clearly defined statement of our goals and objectives in Vietnam.

It is time for the President to explain those "specific ideas" and "alternatives."

Moreover, it is time for the Congress to assert its own role in the formulation of foreign policy and insist that the administration take steps to get the Paris negotiations off dead center and on the road to a prompt and early settlement.

What should those steps include? For the most part, those of us who have long advocated an end to the war have already spelled out—on numerous occasions—what must be done to bring this war to an end. Let me reiterate them, however.

First, the Congress must refuse to approve any further appropriations for military activities in Vietnam.

As I said on May 5, 1965; March 1, 1966, March 2, 1967; and June 11, 1968—when I voted against funds for the Vietnam war—the authorization and appropriations process offers the only opportunity to debate our policy in Vietnam; it is the only way in which we can exercise influence over the administration's war policy. We have never had before us the question of a declaration of war. Approval of appropriations for the war has been interpreted by President Johnson as congressional approval of the administration's war policies. It will continue to be regarded as approval so long as we continue to vote funds for the war.

Proponents of the present policy have in the past attempted to pose the question of war appropriations as one of support for our boys who are fighting the war. No doubt they will continue to pose the question in this manner. But that ploy is nothing less than an attempt to hide the catalog of error and bland assurances of progress that repeatedly have been belied by events in the cloak of providing adequate protection for our fighting men. No one in this House has ever suggested that our courageous fighting men in Vietnam should not have whatever they need to protect and defend themselves. But the appropriations have been used to escalate the war. Let us not forget that our fighting men are not responsible for the policies that send them into battle to risk their lives. If those policies have resulted in the needless sacrifice of thousands of American young men, it is at least partially because Congress has been unwilling to halt those policies by halting the appropriations which support them.

Second, the administration must accept the participation of the National Liberation Front in the future political life of South Vietnam. Our present refusal to grant the NLF any role in the postwar political environment of South Vietnam is a major obstacle to progress at the Paris talks. To expect that either the NLF or the North Vietnamese will agree to a settlement which does not permit them a political role in South Vietnam after nearly 25 years of struggle on their part to achieve power is totally unrealistic and out of keeping with the political realities of South Vietnam. We do nothing to further the evolution of democracy in South Vietnam by propping up a regime so corrupt and unrepresentative that even its proponents believe it would immediately collapse in the face of United States military withdrawal.

So long as our own policy continues to emphasize military strategies over political compromise, the Saigon generals will retain the power to destroy the prospects for a negotiated settlement of the war. For, despite their undemocratic ways and lack of popular support, they seem to have prosecuted the war with greater efficiency than their predecessors. However, if the United States makes clear its determination to achieve a negotiated settlement of the war, Thieu and Ky would have no choice but to pursue a course of conciliation and compromise, since they are completely dependent upon support from the U.S. Government.

Once the President expressed his willingness to accept a coalition government in South Vietnam which included the NLF, the Saigon regime would have no recourse except to broaden itself to include those non-Communist elements which favor some sort of compromise with the NLF. For they could neither prosecute the war on their own nor hope to withstand the pressure from the Vietcong without the aid of those groups which they now imprison and repress.

What about the argument of those who say that a coalition government would only be rapidly taken over by the NLF?

XUM

I must say, in all candor, that I do not believe there is any way we can be assured that that will not happen. The NLF has sought to become the ruling force in South Vietnam for many years now. But there is reason to believe that the NLF would not be able to eliminate all political opposition in South Vietnam.

Richard Barnett, the codirector of the Institute of Policy Studies, who has recently met with both the North Vietnamese and the NLF negotiators in Paris, has said in a recent statement that—

> The NLF is under no illusions that political opposition to them will disappear once the Americans leave. They are going to have to accommodate the various factions or else continue a bloody civil war which it is the interest of no Vietnamese to prolong.

Several of the religious groups are well organized and ready to compete for power once they no longer have to face the day-to-day harassment and persecution which the Thieu-Ky regime perpetrated against them. As Dr. Barnett concludes:

> The sooner such groups are released from prison and harassment and can rehabilitate themselves, the sooner they can unite their forces and deal with the Communists from greater strength.

So long as the United States acquiesces in the face of the present regime's suppression of these groups, potential opposition to the NLF will remain fragmented and disunited.

A third important step by which the United States can advance the peace talks is by withdrawing significant numbers of troops from Vietnam. This would speed the belief in the mind of the North Vietnamese that the United States indeed intends to withdraw its troops from Vietnam, which, as James Reston pointed out on March 7, is essential to achieving a negotiated settlement.

In his March 19 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird revealed that the assumption of the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam—MACV—was "that no reduction of U.S. personnel would be possible in the absence of total withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops." If James Reston's conviction that the withdrawal of some U.S. troops is essential in order to convince the North Vietnamese of our willingness to eventually withdraw all troops is correct, then the military's "assumptions" will clearly prevent any progress at the talks in Paris. The result will be a continuation of the stalemate in Paris and the killing in Vietnam.

The time has come to indicate our commitment to a diplomatic settlement of the war by withdrawing a significant number of U.S. troops—at least 100,000—as soon as is logistically possible. Moreover, the withdrawal process should be continued by not replacing those portions of our military force which are rotated back to the United States after their tour of duty in Vietnam. This would have two effects:

First. It would provide concrete proof to the North Vietnamese of our sincerity in seeking to deescalate the level of hostilities on the battlefield and thereby expand the possibility of achieving a breakthrough at the Paris negotiations, and

Second. It would serve notice on the Saigon regime that the United States does not intend to remain indefinitely in South Vietnam and thereby accelerate pressures on the Saigon generals to broaden their own political base in preparation for serious discussions with the NLF. This strategy would additionally—and not unimportantly—greatly reduce the level of fighting which has characterized the war during the past 10 months.

To continue to pour vast amounts of men and money into South Vietnam in the ill-founded hope that the South Vietnamese Government will someday be able to carry on the war without U.S. aid is to commit this country to an indefinite presence in Vietnam and to condemn the Vietnamese people to still more suffering and destruction. My reply to Secretary Laird's statement that he was "encouraged and impressed" in his talks with South Vietnamese leaders "with their repeatedly stated desire to take on more of the responsibility for fighting" is to refer him to one of his predecessors, Robert McNamara, who said in June of 1965:

> The South Vietnamese are fighting effectively. We continue to see increases in their recruitment. We continue to see some increases in their strength.

As the Washington Post said on March 20:

> We've heard it all before.

How many times will we accept these bland assurances of progress, assurances that are repeatedly repudiated by the continued ability of the enemy to inflict high casualty rates on both American and South Vietnamese troops?

The Congress must reject the bankrupt solutions of the military strategists and make clear its own determination to end this tragic war by refusing to approve any further appropriations for the Vietnam war. The people of this Nation through the political process have repudiated the very policy which still prevails. Too many lives have already been sacrificed in a vain attempt to save the faces of those who conceived and carried out this wasteful war. The only recourse now is to promptly terminate this war and to turn our attentions to the urgent problems in our own society which are even now ripping apart the social fabric of the United States.

It is time to stop saving faces and to start saving lives.

Let me emphasize that I do not speak in a partisan way today. This war is not of President Nixon's making; he inherited it. But it is now his responsibility to follow the mandate of the American people and end it. If the President does not take immediate steps to get the Paris negotiations off dead center, he will be responsible for the continued death and destruction in Vietnam, and his capacity to direct the resources of this Nation to the solution of domestic problems will be curtailed, even as his predecessors ability to respond to those problems was curtailed.

The message to the President from Congress must be clear: Get us out of Vietam now, for the urgency of our crisis here at home demands your full energies and preoccupation. More importantly, that message must be backed up by the exercise of the only power Congress has to regulate the conduct of foreign policy, the power of the purse. If Congress refuses to appropriate additional funds to prosecute the war, the President will withdraw troops because he will have no alternative. If Congress fails to end its support of the war, it cannot shift all of the responsibility for the continuation of the war to the President. Congress must recognize that it can stop the war and that, if it does not, it will be at least partially to blame for the additional violence and suffering that will ensue.

It has been argued that the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, before the security of the Saigon government is assured, would make all that we have poured into that country—including the men we have lost and the vast amounts of money we have spent—a waste. How could the American people ever accept this, it is asked. How could any American Government ever explain that the sacrifices made by over 33,000 young American men have been in vain? There is no simple answer. But pouring more and more money into this war, and sacrificing thousands more men, is surely no answer.

The blunt fact is unavoidable that this country has erred tragically in the conception and carrying out of this war.

There really are only two courses. We can continue—like the poker player who stays in the game for the one more deal that will salvage his losses—to pour more men and money into Vietnam in a foredoomed attempt to gain something from our sacrifices. Or we can admit frankly to the American people that the best way to correct bad policy is to simply stop perpetuating it. Surely our stature in the eyes of the world would be improved if we admitted the error of our policies and rectified them. I believe the American people as well would prefer that course to the continued destruction of Vietnam and indeed, our own society.

As I have said, President Nixon is not responsible for the tragic consequences of our policy. Yet, he has an unparalled opportunity to correct mistakes that are not of his doing. So does the Congress. Both must exercise their mutual responsibilities of explaining to the American people that the war has been a disastrous and tragic mistake.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago next Monday an incumbent American President renounced renomination because the war in Vietnam had shattered his role as party and national leader.

Today we watch his successor closely, seeking assurance that the lessons of Vietnam animate President Nixon's search for peace.

Those lessons are:

An exhausting, cruel, and tragic war was fought for the empty delusion that American arms could impose conformity to our political ideas. We should ex-

XUM

pect other strange ideas in other strange countries. What shall we do?

Our military leaders, who promised a military victory time after time, have led us instead to a political catastrophe. We should weigh their advice more carefully in the future.

We have paid over 30,000 American lives and $150 billion in this vain war effort. Comparable sacrifices for genuine domestic needs elude us.

We have been told that we should give the new administration 100 days in office before criticizing its conduct. I would wait forever to criticize our present policy in Vietnam if I thought such forbearance would end the war 1 day sooner. But the new administration gropes, with little apparent difference from its predecessor, toward an illusory military victory.

Peace will not come at the Paris conference table any more than it will come in the jungle fighting in Vietnam. Peace will come when we Americans begin to withdraw our forces—which are the only foreign troops in Vietnam—and let Vietnamese political processes achieve the equilibrium which arms could not impose.

It seems to me that the critical judgment is not necessarily whether they put all their energies into a peaceful settlement. I suspect that each administration, past and present, would assert that they did do that. But it may be that they misunderstood the nature of the conflict in Vietnam. Maybe they misunderstood what has to be done. It seems to me that the original mistake in 1954 was the belief that we could achieve through military means a political objective. We did not fully understand that we cannot decide for ourselves what style, type and quality of government there should be in another land.

And even if we were able to make that decision, as General Ridgway suggested, our military imposition was not manageable. We saw this from 1965 to 1968—the period of escalation—that the administration felt that we could achieve through military victory, a political solution. President Johnson finally determined that the military was leading him down a primrose path. He finally saw no success at the end of it, because a viable, tranquil peace can never be achieved in any country unless the people involved in that country are involved in trying to make that peace obtainable and workable.

The biggest stumbling block I think was not an inadequate desire to make peace but our inability to understand the nature, quality, and style of the government in South Vietnam. Until the elements of the populace in South Vietnam could join together, live together, and build together, their own political entity, there could not be peace. Our tragic misunderstanding was in not seeing that there could not be peace imposed at a military price that either the people of the United States were willing to pay or the world was willing to let us pay.

We should look to the past to see where we made our mistakes, but not to inquire to the motivations of the individuals involved. I would like to look to the future.

I think the Nixon administration ought to learn the lesson that others failed to learn: there must be a government in South Vietnam that is going to deal with all political elements. Past governments in South Vietnam simply were not going to take themselves out of office. I do not know how credible recent statements to the contrary are.

These governments knew that maintenance of the war and maintenance of their military posture kept them in a position of power. As long as they refused to deal with other elements in Vietnam society, there could not be a viable, meaningful peace. Yet only through such refusal could they keep their power. It may well be that President Nixon has secretly indicated or perhaps he could do it publicly also that the American Government is dissatisfied with the posture of the autocratic regime in South Vietnam. If we were to begin withdrawal of our troops, that regime would be pushed into a position of compromise. Other leaders could come to the fore in South Vietnam who would be willing to make a durable and lasting peace.

It may well be that that has happened. I certainly hope so. I believe President Nixon and his administration must be reminded that it cannot achieve a military victory, because it is absolutely unobtainable. We have to resort to the political process, painful as it might be. That is the lesson of Vietnam.

What type of government will follow from a coalition of political elements? What kind of peace will follow? It may be to our liking and it may not be to our liking. But the hard, cold fact is that we do not have a choice. We clearly cannot dictate the style and the quality of government they have.

I would hope that it would be a democratic government with legitimate representation of all interests in society there. It does not necessarily have to follow our style, but I think it should have at least a basic element of democratic representation. But if it does not have that, if it is something more than that or something less, whether it violates my own poor judgment is somewhat irrelevant. The Vietnamese will have to deal with their own government, as we must deal with ours, at their own pace, under their own conditions. We cannot impose our will there. Military events cannot be permitted to make policy in the United States. The President must clearly enunciate what American objectives are.

I commend the gentleman and his colleagues for taking this time to make these very important statements. I hope the message is clear for the present administration; we cannot sit back and let military events overtake policy.

To summarize, I urge our Government to make clear:

First, we want peace; second, we want it under conditions that are satisfactory to the people in South Vietnam; third, that it is our intention to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as rapidly as possible, and fourth, the Vietnamese must make their own way in the world.

As soon as Americans and Vietnamese understand that, the world will applaud us for supporting principles of democracy and fair and honest and legitimate representation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I certainly think he has put his finger on the key element; that is, the determination of past policymakers to pursue a military victory and their failure to understand that this was essentially a political problem which required a diplomatic solution.

Furthermore, of course, there must be a recognition of the need to broaden the Government to include all elements of the population. The refusal on the part of the past administration—I hope there will be a change by this one, but so far there has been no indication of any change—to recognize that the NLF—the National Liberation Front—has a role in the future political life of the South Vietnamese people is, of course, the stumbling block, in my judgment, to a negotiated settlement. Once that is accepted, it may be possible to bring about a settlement.

The immediate withdrawal of 100,000 American troops from South Vietnam would make it clear that we do not intend an indefinite military presence in South Vietnam.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is one further point I want to make, to reaffirm the point made by Ambassador Harriman, who suggested, in an article published by the International Press, that, when President Johnson decreed there should be no bombing in the North, most of us felt there would be a reduction of military activity. What Governor Harriman suggested happened was an increase in our search-and-destroy efforts in South Vietnam, by which we replaced cessation of bombing in the North with increased bombing in the South. So, most regrettably, I think, we initiated increased military operations in South Vietnam, and that is contrary to what most Americans understood would be the situation when the President made that speech.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York and I subscribe to the remarks he has made thus far, and I would add the following comment.

I think this Congress must take an independent course of action. It cannot wait for the President to do what he said he would do; namely, end the war in Vietnam.

Though the Congress does not make foreign policy, we can seriously affect it by our power to provide or withhold the billions of dollars that the military wants for the further prosecution of the war.

When military appropriations are requested, we have the right to know how much money is specifically earmarked for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war. If this is done, I will oppose the appropriation of those amounts so earmarked. If such information is not provided, I will oppose the total appropriation.

XUM

I will not vote a single dollar for more killing—not a single dollar.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman. I agree that Congress must assert its role. Congress has acquiesced in this war by voting funds for it during the past 4 years. If Congress simply cuts off the funds for the war, then the executive branch will have to pursue a different policy.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, on the same day President Nixon announced he had decided the United States will not be safe unless we start to build a defense system against missiles, the Headstart program in the District of Columbia was cut back for the lack of money.

As a teacher, and as a woman, I do not think I will ever understand what kind of values can be involved in spending $9 billion—and more, I am sure—on elaborate, unnecessary, and impractical weapons when several thousand disadvantaged children in the Nation's Capital get nothing.

When the new administration took office, I was one of the many Americans who hoped it would mean that our country would benefit from the fresh perspectives, the new ideas, the different priorities of a leader who had no part in its mistakes of the past. Mr. Nixon had said things like this:

> If our cities are to be livable for the next generation, we can delay no longer in launching new approaches to the problems that beset them and to the tensions that tear them apart.

And he said:

> When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is short-changing the American future.

But frankly, I have never cared too much what people say. What I am interested in is what they do. We have waited to see what the new administration is going to do. The pattern now is becoming clear.

Apparently launching those new programs can be delayed for a while, after all. It seems we have to get some missiles launched first.

Recently the new Secretary of Commerce spelled it out. The Secretary, Mr. Stans, told a reporter that the new administration is "pretty well agreed it must take time out from major social objectives" until it can stop inflation.

The new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, came to the Hill to tell the House Education and Labor Committee that he thinks we should spend more on education, particularly in city schools. But, he said, unfortunately we cannot "afford" to, until we have reached some kind of honorable solution to the Vietnam war. I was glad to read that the distinguished Member from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) asked Mr. Finch this:

> With the crisis we have in education, and the crisis in our cities, can we wait to settle the war? Shouldn't it be the other way around? Unless we can meet the crisis in education, we really can't afford the war.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird came to Capitol Hill, too. His mission was to sell the anti-ballistic-missile insanity to the Senate. He was asked what the new administration is doing about the war. To hear him, one would have thought it was 1968, that the former Secretary of State was defending the former policies, that nothing had ever happened—a President had never decided not to run because he knew the Nation would reject him, in despair over this tragic war we have blundered into. Mr. Laird talked of being prepared to spend at least 2 more years in Vietnam.

Two more years, 2 more years of hunger for Americans, of death for our best young men, of children here at home suffering the life-long handicap of not having a good education when they are young. Two more years of high taxes, collected to feed the cancerous growth of a Defense Department budget that now consumes two-thirds of our Federal income.

Two more years of too little being done to fight our greatest enemies, poverty, prejudice, and neglect here in our own country. Two more years of fantastic waste in the Defense Department and of penny pinching on social programs. Our country cannot survive 2 more years, or 4, of these kinds of policies. It must stop—this year—now.

Now I am not a pacifist. I am, deeply, unalterably, opposed to this war in Vietnam. Apart from all the other considerations, and they are many, the main fact is that we cannot squander there the lives, the money, the energy that we need desperately here, in our cities, in our schools.

I wonder whether we cannot reverse our whole approach to spending. For years, we have given the military, the defense industry, a blank check. New weapons' systems are dreamed up, billions are spent, and many times they are found to be impractical, inefficient, unsatisfactory, even worthless. What do we do then? We spend more money on them. But with social programs, what do we do? Take the Job Corps. Its failures have been mercilessly exposed and criticized. If it had been a military research and development project, they would have been covered up or explained away, and Congress would have been ready to pour more billions after those that had been wasted on it.

The case of Pride, Inc., is interesting. This vigorous, successful black organization, here in Washington, conceived and built by young inner-city men, has been ruthlessly attacked by its enemies in the Government, in this Congress. At least six auditors from the General Accounting Office were put to work investigating Pride. They worked 7 months and spent more than $100,000. They uncovered a fraud. It was something less than $2,100. Meanwhile millions of dollars—billions of dollars, in fact—were being spent by the Department of Defense, and how many auditors and investigators were checking into their negotiated contracts? Five.

We Americans have come to feel that it is our mission to make the world free. We believe that we are the good guys, everywhere, in Vietnam, in Latin America, wherever we go. We believe we are the good guys at home, too. When the Kerner Commission told white America what black America has always known, that prejudice and hatred built the Nation's slums, maintains them, and profits by them, white America would not believe it. But it is true. Unless we start to fight, and defeat, the enemies of poverty and racism in our own country and make our talk of equality and opportunity ring true, we are exposed as hypocrites in the eyes of the world when we talk about making other people free.

I am deeply disappointed at the clear evidence that the No. 1 priority of the new administration is to buy more and more and more weapons of war, to return to the era of the cold war, to ignore the war we must fight here—the war that is not optional. There is only one way, I believe, to turn these policies around. The Congress can respond to the mandate that the American people have clearly expressed. They have said, "End this war. Stop the waste. Stop the killing. Do something for our own people first." We must find the money to "launch the new approaches," as Mr. Nixon said. We must force the administration to rethink its distorted, unreal scale of priorities. Our children, our jobless men, our deprived, rejected, and starving fellow citizens must come first.

For this reason, I intend to vote "No" on every money bill that comes to the floor of this House that provides any funds for the Department of Defense. Any bill whatsoever, until the time comes when our values and priorities have been turned right-side up again, until the monstrous waste and the shocking profits in the defense budget have been eliminated and our country starts to use its strength, its tremendous resources, for people and peace, not for profits and war.

It was Calvin Coolidge I believe who made the comment that "the Business of America is Business." We are now spending $80 billion a year on defense—that is two-thirds of every tax dollar. At this time, gentlemen, the business of America is war and it is time for a change.

Mr. RYAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York for her very stirring remarks. Her contribution is very valuable to this debate. She has brought deep understanding and compassion to the House which has strengthened our cause.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to join with him in what I consider a very important issue, or the most important issue today facing the American people. I would like to commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the American

XUM

public and to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am growing increasingly apprehensive over the Nixon administration's stand and activities on Vietnam and our involvement there. We hear of proposals by military people to bomb in Cambodia. We hear murmurings of hardening positions from the military. The pace of the war and attendant casualties have risen in an ever-ascending curve in recent weeks. I know that the President wishes peace. Nor do I question his good will. It is the methods and progression of events that cause my disquiet.

In spite of the fact that secret discussions are progressing, the casualty lists inexorably continue to appear in our papers, and the evening news reports continue to present the depressing sadness of the tragedy that is Vietnam.

During the campaign, Mr. Nixon said that "the best policy is to walk softly and carry a big stick." Perhaps so. But it seems that this big stick is not preventing American casualties.

In October, President Nixon said that he wanted a generous peace which won't destroy either North Vietnam or South Vietnam. It is my hope that with this thought in mind, we are acting accordingly in the secret discussions, aiming at a reasonable middle ground which will allow the United States to begin to phase out its presence there.

I also look with increasing impatience for signs that the armed forces of South Vietnam are carrying increasing portions of the defense of their own country. Certainly, this is one avenue of improvement we have every reason to believe the administration is pursuing.

I look with increasing impatience to the day we start bringing our boys home.

Mr. Nixon said at the National Republican Convention that Vietnam "was a war for people, not for territory." I yearn for a day when this will be a conflict strictly between the people of Vietnam and perhaps a coalition government that can settle the conflict there, and pray the administration is keeping this thought in mind during these talks. For the sake of seeing the beginning of the end of America's intervention in this iternecine struggle, I am willing to restrain impatience for the immediate present. But I simply offer these figures to my colleagues, to the people, and to the secret negotiators and to the administration. From election day to today, approximately 4,200 Americans have been killed in Vietnam. Wounded for the same period are approximately over 25,000.

Since President Nixon was inaugurated until now, there have been approximately 2,600 Americans killed in action. The figure for the wounded is approximately 15,000 for this same period.

These are sobering statistics indeed.

I recall very well President Nixon in his campaign stated that he has a plan for the ending of the war. I only suggest to the President that in view of the acceleration of these casualty figures I believe it is time to divulge the plan now.

For now I shall say no more, except to hold up these figures prominently to President Nixon, and remind him that many are remembering the campaign slogan about finding that new solution to Vietnam. They are also willing to wait the short-term outcome of these secret talks—but no longer. The voices of the generals of this country have been heard for far too long. The voice of the citizenry awaits its turn.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the contribution he has made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year has now passed since the Vietnam watershed of 1968—the critical moment in American history when the United States admitted that military victory in Vietnam was not attainable at an acceptable cost and opted for negotiation as the only feasible path toward settlement. At the time of President Johnson's speech last March 31, the way seemed open to move seriously toward peace. Bombing of North Vietnam was curtailed. Talks began shortly afterward in Paris. But as spring and summer passed, men continued to die on the battlefield and hope for an end to conflict dimmed. Then, in the fall, bombing of North Vietnam was totally halted and the Paris talks were broadened. New hopes were raised. Now, these, too, have faded.

Since last March, nearly 12,000 Americans have died in battle, along with countless thousands of Vietnamese soldiers and civilians on both sides of the war. Every day during the past month, an average of 50 American soldiers have fallen. It behooves us to ask, Mr. Speaker, what is being accomplished by this continuing carnage. The patience of the American people, limited at best, is wearing dangerously thin. A recent Gallup poll graphically demonstrated American war weariness. Over three-fourths of those who expressed a view as to what the United States should do next in Vietnam felt we should either "go all out," "pull out," or end the war "as soon as possible." Alarmingly, the largest percentage—nearly one-third of all respondents—favored greatly escalating the war, a course which past experience has shown cannot bring about the victory it is intended to achieve.

Clearly, we cannot tolerate continuation of the appalling waste of human life that characterizes the scene in Vietnam. Nor can we simply continue the stately gavotte that passes for negotiations in Paris. Escalation is a dead end. What, then, should be our choice?

As I have previously stated in this Chamber and elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, we must make up our minds that the ultimate settlement in Vietnam will be political, not military. Once we fully accept this premise, we can more readily accept the scaling-down of American forces, and of military operations generally, which is its immediate corollary. This has always been a struggle without firmly fixed lines, in which the nominal control of a hundred villages more or less will have little if any effect on the final settlement. The monthly returns from the Hamlet Evaluation Survey, for example, neatly cataloging "our" villages and "their" villages in hopes of showing an encouraging trend, are an exercise in self-delusion. This is an amorphous war, not given to facile quantification. Any of my colleagues who are inclined to take seriously these measures of "progress" would do well to ponder a recent report warning that the entire militia—half the armed force responsive to Saigon—might defect to the enemy if the National Liberation Front appeared likely to enter the government. Under these circumstances, how solid are "our" villages really likely to be?

At some point, whether tomorrow or next year or 5 years hence, American troops will leave Vietnam. The situation they leave behind will presumably be one which has been worked out by the Vietnamese themselves—Saigon, the NLF, and all the other groups who together probably represent a majority of the South Vietnamese people. If lives are to be spared, the process must begin promptly—and the fighting must be reduced or stopped while it is underway.

How can we move in this direction? An encouraging note has been sounded by President Thieu. His invitation to the NLF to meet in private talks suggests an initial recognition by the Saigon government that political settlement is inevitable, and that the NLF must be part of such a settlement. Until now, Saigon has been the greatest barrier to introducing political questions into the negotiating process. It is not surprising that this should be so. While the war continues, the present regime in Saigon has excellent prospects of retaining power. The Thieu-Ky government is probably the best one that the United States could find for the purpose of single-mindedly prosecuting the war. With the American support which results from this convergence of interests, they are relatively immune to internal challenge. Their principal opponents are either on the other side of the war or in their own jails. Any political negotiation must inevitably give those opponents new legitimacy and, eventually, at least a share in the power they now wield alone.

Nevertheless, it is clearly better for the Saigon government to negotiate under an American umbrella than to risk being left totally exposed if American war weariness were to dictate a rapid withdrawal from Vietnam. And it may well be just such fear of a change in the American national mood that prompted this limited first step by President Thieu. The invitation to the NLF will not be followed up by serious negotiations envisaging an eventual sharing of power, however, unless American pressure on Saigon is exerted in this direction. To date, we have all too often encouraged the South Vietnamese to take a hard line, for this has suited the convenience of our military commanders and matched the basic American preference for a "clean" military solution. Now, however, we must ourselves accept the full implications of the watershed decision of 1968 and move wholeheartedly toward

XUM

political settlement—and we must not permit Saigon to slow the pace, much less to exercise a veto.

Several immediate steps have been suggested before, Mr. Speaker, but warrant reiteration because they still point us in the necessary direction. First, the President should announce a schedule for initial withdrawals of American troops. Only as the protective umbrella actually begins to shrink will the Saigon government be given a real incentive for serious political negotiation. Withdrawals would thus combine a political benefit with the immediate prospect of reduced American casualties. Second, we should discontinue search-and-destroy operations or at least limit American participation in such operations to those directly concerned with the protection of American installations. Other than the past 4 weeks of the North Vietnamese-Vietcong counteroffensive, the distressingly high American losses in recent months were reportedly due in large part to stepped-up offensive operations by our forces. Since such operations cannot destroy the enemy nor seize and hold territory as a means of strengthening the South Vietnamese negotiating position, no rational purpose is served by permitting them to continue as before.

As a third step, we should propose an immediate cease-fire. This goes beyond the suggested withdrawals and limited offensive operations but like them is fully justified by the essential irrelevance of military actions in determining the future of South Vietnam. Military operations have become almost a reflex action—the opposing armies fight because they are there and because that is what opposing armies are supposed to do. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong seemingly came closer than did we to recognizing the lack of purpose in further fighting when they scaled down their own operations, and withdrew substantial forces beyond the borders, during the fall of 1968. Not surprisingly, they responded last month with a fresh offensive to prove their continuing military vitality when we failed to respond in kind to their tentative move toward disengagement. Since military operations are basically irrelevant, however, we should now take the further step of proposing a cease-fire as the only effective means for halting the death and destruction which now prevail in Vietnam.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Did I correctly understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) to state that last fall the North Vietnamese deescalated their troop involvement in the south and, if so, would the gentleman restate that so I may understand it more clearly? In the restatement, will the gentleman indicate what response and mutual deescalation, if any, took place either on the side of the ARVN forces or the U.S. forces?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is my understanding that the North Vietnamese did withdraw a substantial number of troops last fall, that there was a slowing down of military activities on their part, and that this was not met by a corresponding deescalation on our side. But, on the contrary, we stepped up our bombing operations. We intensified the level of our activities, as is shown by the casualty figures, and this, by the way, was referred to not long ago in a column written by James Wechsler of the New York Post in which he quoted Averell Harriman to that effect. That quotation has since been confirmed. So I think it is fair to characterize, as I did, the recent North Vietnamese offensive as a counteroffensive.

Mr. BURTON of California. I commend the gentleman for underscoring this very important development which has been all but obscured from the American people, and I for one am most grateful to the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter to the attention of myself and my colleagues.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. On this very important point brought up by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), and commented on by the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), I asked the Library of Congress about the tonnage of bombs that have been dropped in Vietnam since the beginning of the war. They checked with the Pentagon and advised me that more bombs, the highest tonnage of bombs in the entire Vietnam war, was dropped in January 1969. And I might point out as an aside that all of these bombs were dropped on South Vietnam. So the only conclusion that one can arrive at is that there has been a huge escalation insofar as bombing is concerned in South Vietnam since the bombing halt.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

A cease-fire is, of course, peculiarly difficult to apply in a guerrilla war. Certainly, any cease-fire must include, at least in principle, an end to terrorist attacks as well as to larger scale military operations. It is an open question at best whether the other side would agree to such a restriction on their operations. Indeed, it is doubtful that they could afford to accept this kind of restriction, in view of the problems they would face in keeping a guerrilla force together under conditions of inactivity. But there is surely no reason why we should not at least propose a cease-fire. It would demonstrate our interest in stopping the needless killing now taking place, and, if accepted, would also create more favorable conditions for such programs as land reform and institution building which are the real keys to relative influence of the various factions in a final settlement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should add further weight to our insistence that Saigon negotiate the key political questions both promptly and meaningfully by insisting that the current repressive domestic policies of the South Vietnamese Government be abandoned. Unless the non-Communist opponents of the present regime are free to undertake political activity, the NLF will emerge from any settlement as the best organized political force in the country. Saigon, with its eyes firmly fixed on war, is doing all the wrong things in terms of preparing for peace. And these pragmatic considerations apart, it is certainly inappropriate, to say the least, for the United States to offer so enthusiastic an embrace to an ally which is behaving in so blatantly undemocratic and dictatorial fashion.

In addition, we should make clear to Saigon that talking with the NLF in Paris, while denying it a future political role in Vietnam, is not a realistic posture. For the NLF, with its established infrastructure and long history in South Vietnam, must inevitably play some part in the future of the country. To refuse this, as Saigon persists in doing, is to refuse the route of political settlement—and this is a course we cannot afford to tolerate.

Mr. Speaker, these proposed actions flow naturally from the basic decision taken a year ago to pursue a Vietnam settlement through negotiation rather than through interminable and costly warfare. They are actions which, indeed, should have been taken as an immediate consequence of that basic decision. The delay has already cost this country nearly 12,000 dead. There is no reason, and no excuse, for delaying any further.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this time.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from New York for their remarks.

Let me summarize briefly, Mr. Speaker, the three points which I think are basic to moving the Paris peace negotiations off dead center and bringing about a prompt settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

First. Congress must refuse to appropriate any additional funds for prosecution of the war in order to make it clear to the administration that this war must end.

Second. There must be immediate recognition on the part of the President, and a statement to that effect, that the United States is willing to accept a coalition government in South Vietnam, including participation of the NLF.

Third. The immediate withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops from South Vietnam as evidence that the United States does not intend to maintain a continued military presence and also to encourage the Saigon government to broaden itself in preparation for serious deliberations with the NLF.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for the leadership he has given us this afternoon in this very important discussion.

XUM

As the gentleman from New York knows, he and I have been two of the half dozen or so Members of the House who have opposed every single one of the supplemental appropriations reflecting the escalation of the most unhappy war in Vietnam. It was about 4 years ago this coming May, when we had the first supplemental appropriation sought by the then Democratic administration, that a number of us pointed out during the course of that discussion, that the war in Vietnam was essentially an indigenous conflict and that it would not be resolved until such time as the Nation Liberation Front would be involved meaningfully in the discussions. We said then that the Saigon government should be a participant in those discussions with the NLF.

I noted in reading the papers this morning that it has been announced that the Saigon government has finally openly admitted this course of action must be followed. I wonder if there is not some similarity between the response, or the leaking of the response, of the Saigon government late yesterday, immediately prior to the special order, and the releasing of information by the Defense Department just prior to the special order we had with reference to the mutiny trials at the Presidio of San Francisco.

Just 2 or 3 hours prior to the beginning of that discussion and debate the executive branch sought to take some of the sting out of the criticism that was to take place on the floor.

The gentleman from New York would agree, I am sure, that the executive department—and all too many of our colleagues in the Congress—made a very grave mistake when we began bombing the north in 1965 or 1966. It was this escalation of the war, this carrying of the military effort to the north, this widening the scope of the effort, which Americanized the conflict. In my judgment, the conflict has been, and still is, essentially a civil war.

We have sent over tens and tens of thousands of troops. Every time the situation did not reflect any particular improvement, the military experts would tell us, "Just give us a little more arms and a little more in the way of troops and we can bring this situation into focus." Time after time, month after month, year after year these military experts have been in error.

Our Democratic administration in the past, but for the events of March 31 and thereafter last year, all too often heeded the advice of these so-called military experts.

I am sure the gentleman from New York would agree with me that a number of us had hoped that the new administration, viewing the election results of the primaries, particularly of the Democratic primaries throughout the country, evolving around the candidacies of Senator McCarthy and Senator Kennedy, would have gotten the message. The message becomes even clearer when coupled with the fact that they won the election, due in no small measure to the decision of a considerable number of persons concerned about the American involvement in Vietnam that they either not support the Democratic candidate or they support a new administration that would hopefully provide us with a fresh look at this matter. A number of us had hoped this administration would, in fact, take a fresh look at this question. Being essentially unfettered, because it was not in power at the time the judgment was made, it might therefore hopefully bring a rational solution to and rational extrication from the American involvement in Southeast Asia.

I, for one, did not hold out much hope in this regard, but some hope I did have. I must confess the decision of this administration on the antiballistic missile system, coupled with the statement of the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, here within the last week, has pretty well disabused me of any optimism that this administration has any magic formula or is going to take any meaningful look at the American position in Southeast Asia.

I think the administration is making a very serious mistake. I think they are going to find that so many problems confronting American society cannot be and will not be resolved in any measure so long as we are involved in an effort costing us directly out of the National Treasury some $30 billion or $36 billion or $40 billion a year.

I fear time is passing, time we had hoped would be used by this new administration to bring this very ugly war to an end.

I fear very profoundly that once again the military experts have won the battle in the policy councils of the Executive. I fear that this new administration, just as our previous Democratic administration, has been hoodwinked by the military experts.

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. Bingham) noted that last November the North Vietnamese withdrew substantial numbers of their troops from the southern part of the demilitarized zone back across to the north.

This withdrawal was not met by reciprocal deescalation of the military effort either on behalf of the South Vietnamese Army or the American military presence. The American military experts have told us that this withdrawal was not a sign, as many of us viewed it, of the fact that the north was sincerely interested in deescalating the conflict but, rather, the military told us that it was merely because of the enormous pressure of the American military presence on the north that they had to take this action.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, when the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese Army do not engage in the shelling of cities or in massive or meaningful military offensives, our military says this is because we are so strong. I would prefer to think that on a number of these occasions this was an effort being made by the NLF through the Vietcong to invite a reciprocal deescalation on our part.

On the other hand, when these armies of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese engage in major actions like the Tet offensive, then our military experts tell us, "You see, you cannot trust them. They say they want to deescalate and yet they proceed to escalate."

The long and short of all of this is that the American people want this war to end. The military experts have hoodwinked, in my view, the Executive under the previous administration and I fear are now doing it again. I must state that our American policy, I think, is dead wrong in Vietnam. I hope that none of our colleagues will pay heed to the so-called military experts who were wrong from the inception of this conflict about our ability to suppress this civil war. Who have been wrong throughout the course of the involvement. Who will be just as wrong today if they think there is a possibility that this matter can be resolved in any way but by a meaningful, negotiated settlement with the parties indigenously involved in this very unhappy situation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam and the military approach to foreign policy are being repudiated by thousands of citizens. Today, members of Women Strike for Peace are in Washington to protest the war and to urge the President and Congress to bring it to a prompt end. Mrs. Bella Abzug, chairman, National Political Action Committee, Women Strike for Peace, estimates that some 1,200 women are participating in this outpouring of concern.

Mrs. Abzug said:

> We have given this day and made this journey to Washington to remind Congress and the President that the American electorate, especially the women, have rejected this immoral war. We demand that President Nixon move toward a political settlement and announce plans for the withdrawal of America from Vietnam. We will fill the gallery of Congress to demand that Congress use its power over appropriations to bring about peace by diverting the billions from the Vietnam war and the ABM missile race to the critical needs of the black, the poor, the hungry in our cities and throughout the land.

Mr. Speaker, Americans in increasing numbers are marching across the country for peace. It is imperative that the President and Congress respond to this call.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues who participated in this very important discussion this afternoon. Let us hope that our discussion will make clear to President Nixon and his administration that the Nation cannot afford to wait any longer.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the United States enters the fifth year as a combatant in Vietnam, I have come to the conclusion that the Nixon administration must immediately make a choice between continuing the tragic and immoral course of the past or charting out a new policy designed to get the United States out of the Vietnam quagmire. The Vietnam war is now the longest conflict in American history. It has now surpassed both World War II and the Civil War in length of time, and I find it distressing to compare the lofty ideals and goals of these two struggles with the ignoble aims of our Vietnam policy. This is no war to free the slaves and preserve the Union. It is no war to defeat Nazi and Fascist aggressors and liberate millions of oppressed peoples. Rather, it is a war designed to maintain in power a group of generals in Saigon with questionable motivation, who for years have exploited their own people. If the militarist in Saigon had any popular support at all, the United States would never have had to send troops into South Vietnam in the first place. History will decree that no action ever squandered so many of its human and material resources in so unworthy a cause.

Before the United States became bogged down in the quicksand of the Vietnam conflict, it was interesting to note how administration officials and the Congress could heatedly argue and debate over spending an additional $1, $2, or $3 billion on the needs of America, particularly to help the Nation's poor and underprivileged. Yet, within 2 years after the first American combat troops landed in South Vietnam, the administration was proposing and Congress was appropriating with scarcely a whisper of disagreement some $20 billion per year for the war. Vietnam war spending today is running close to $35 billion a year. I am appalled when I think of this money being spent thousands of miles away from home in what is literally a dot on the map to support someone like Nguyen Cao Ky, who once said that Hitler was his idol. If the executive branch and Congress had been as free with the purse string in waging the war on poverty as they have been in waging the immoral war in Vietnam, the year 1970 might have gone down in history as the year in which the bounty of America reached all of its citizens. And, again, it is so senseless to be contemplating a new cycle of military spending in the form of the antiballistic missile. If Congress approves this project, and I hope it turns it down completely, it will once again turn its back on the real needs of the Nation in favor of another scheme of the military-industrial complex designed to perpetuate its dominant position in American life.

It has never been more necessary for an American President to chart a new direction for the United States than it is for President Nixon to do so now. It is all very well to be cool and guarded in press conferences, to issuing warnings only once, to evince concern, to appear in control and build public support. But at some point the administration is going to have to choose, and it appears to me that the time has arrived. The President must first begin by disengaging the United States from Vietnam totally and permanently, leaving the Vietnamese people to settle their own internal affairs. It must be made clear that the United States has no desire to be engaged in an internal conflict of this type. The administration must alone draw a firm line against new, multibillion-dollar military projects such as the ABM. Finally, both the administration and the Congress must show the same zeal in attacking problems of America's needs as they have shown in throwing billions away in places like Vietnam.

America's vast problems can be solved but only if we, as a people, determine a new path for the United States. At the end of this path should stand the elimination of human suffering at home—and not the decadent and immoral pursuit of power politics abroad. The Nixon administration won the November election by promising a new team and a new approach to the vital issues of the day. The time has come for the administration to deliver on its promise. The American people will settle for nothing less. The future of our country depends on this promise.

The time is at hand for an immediate and permanent cease-fire in Vietnam. Let us stop the killing, the wounding and the physical destruction in Vietnam. This should be our uppermost objective and the highest priority of action for America.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last several years I have registered my misgivings and my personal suggestions on Vietnam policies to high ranking individuals in the administration, including the President, and I have joined in introducing legislation in the Congress which called for greater effort on the part of our Government to place this issue before the United Nations.

I have never issued public statements approving or endorsing the conduct of the war unless I sincerely believed specific action on the part of our Government had been in the interest of the peaceful goal all of us seek.

It is my firm conviction that I have a responsibility to support the people's President in matters of foreign policy. I believe any disagreement should be—as it has been with me—a matter between me and the President and not between me and the press. In matters of foreign policy it cannot be my administration, your administration, or their administration. It is our administration, elected to represent us by a majority of our citizens.

Now we have a new administration. For myself, I pledge complete support to President Nixon in the conduct of foreign affairs. I will inform the President of my views and recommendations with full realization that he is the only man in this Nation with full access to all of the intelligence and other information on the situation in Vietnam and elsewhere. The final decision is his and I will accept it.

In regard to the Vietnamese situation, here are the recommendations which I am making to President Nixon. For the most part, I share the position of Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

We accepted the responsibility of assisting South Vietnam in its effort to defend itself. But we cannot be South Vietnam. We cannot govern South Vietnam. We cannot accept full responsibility for the war. Our commitment must be limited. The outcome of that struggle depends now, as it always has, on the courage, determination, and ability of the people of the South.

There have been many disappointments in our relations with the people and government of South Vietnam. We had hoped that we could help them to help themselves build a nation and a government that could attract the support of its own people and achieve a political victory over the Vietcong.

Time and again our hopes seemed to be dashed by the apparent incompetence and corruption of our South Vietnam ally—a government, as Senator KENNEDY said, that "has consistently proved incapable or unwilling to meet the needs of its own people, a government that has demanded ever more money, ever more American lives to be poured into the swamp of their failure."

Our Nation began taking steps some time ago to persuade the South Vietnamese to take eventual complete control of the war. We have helped and we can continue to help, but I believe it is imperative that we establish immediately a timetable for our withdrawal from South Vietnam. Although I continue to believe we have a responsibility to be of assistance, I think our responsibility is equally great to insist that South Vietnam remove itself from reliance upon us.

It would not be right to abandon them. I do not, therefore, call for immediate withdrawal, but for a systematic, orderly reduction in our participation and an increase in South Vietnam's own commitment to itself. We must begin now.

Further, I encourage the President to do anything feasible that might enhance the chances of success in the Paris peace talks including extension of the bombing halt. Of course, every precaution must be taken to protect the lives and safety of American boys whose only protection is provided by the cover of bombing.

Finally, after establishing a systematic timetable for the deescalation of our participation in the war, I believe we must follow it.

To those who ask, "Will this fulfill our commitment?" or "Would this be an honorable way out?" I respond "Yes."

Never before in history has one nation done for another what we have done for South Vietnam. It seems to me that with our generous contribution of resources—human, monetary, and material—South Vietnam should have triumphed long ago if it had a government with the desire or ability to meet the needs of its people.

I do not think our limited commitment included or implied a commitment to take brinksmanship risks which could lead to a confrontation between the world's great powers in a third world war. Our commitment is to maintain peace, to withstand aggression, and to assist in preventing a lighted fuse for reaching the powder keg.

The new administration, I am sure, is taking a fresh look at our involvement and our commitment in Vietnam. It must review what has been done and, using the facts available to it, decide a future course. It cannot and will not be guided completely by past decisions, good or bad.

I have summarized for you the direction I hope our Nation will take in Vietnam. I submitted these proposals to President Johnson, and I will submit them to President Nixon. The President will have my support because he is the people's President and I have confidence in his ability to steer this Nation toward lasting peace.

Let us begin now to end this conflict with action rather than words.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to elaborate in detail on the statements made today concerning Vietnam. Enough has been said on this floor—indeed, enough has been said in recent years—to impress upon us all the necessity for ending this tragic war.

Today, I want to associate myself with the desire for peace of the American people and the demand for peace being made here on this floor.

The events of the past few days once again give us hope that concrete steps toward a settlement will be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

President Thieu's stated willingness to meet privately with the national liberation front is encouraging.

Even more interesting is President Nixon's comment to the National Association of Broadcasters yesterday that "a few months from now, I think you will look back and say what we did was right."

I deeply hope that the President will be right and that is why I want to express my own support of the efforts being made by the administration to negotiate a settlement.

The experience of the past has taught us that peace in Vietnam is an elusive goal.

Diplomacy—whether public or private—is a difficult art, but I hope that the administration will employ every diplomatic means at its disposal to bring about a cease fire and a negotiated settlement.

At the same time, I think it is our responsibility here in Congress to remind the President and his advisors that business as usual will not bring the desired results. The policy of alternating military pressure with diplomatic initiatives has been the story of the past but it has, unfortunately, been a story without an ending.

It will not do to stop the bombing of the North while, at the same time, the volume of bombs dropped in South Vietnam and Laos is greater than it was when the North was being bombed.

It is somewhat inconsistent of the Saigon Government to express a willingness to negotiate privately while they have increased their demands for more American military support.

We cannot accept a policy which one day tells us that the troops will be coming home, only to say the next day that such a proposal is unrealistic.

We cannot pretend today that the South Vietnamese Army can take a fuller share of the military burden only to have our experts come up to Capitol Hill and deny that possibility.

We cannot seek peace in Paris and, at the same time, seek a wider war in Cambodia.

These are the type of inconsistencies which have marked the policies and pitfalls of the past.

But we are not here to regret the past. We are here to express a sense of urgency, to make responsible suggestions and to express our support of the administration's diplomatic efforts.

I hope that the President can end this war—speedily and honorably—so that we can get on with the urgent domestic priorities and responsibilities facing us as a nation.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has been with us so long it is difficult to remember when there was peace. It began hard on the heels of another war in Asia. And that war in Korea broke the short peace on the timeclock of history which followed the Second World War.

Through this whole period there has been the silent, chilling war of nerves, the war that we kept cold because the alternative was too terrible to consider. Perhaps we have forgotten the ways of peace. Perhaps war has been so much with us in the nearly 30 years since Pearl Harbor that we would be uncomfortable were we forced to live in peace.

But finally we must ask if this price we pay for the familiar, the comfortable, is too high. Indeed, if we cannot adjust to peace, if a world truly at peace would make us feel ill at ease, then we are living on borrowed time.

This seems to me, finally, to be the case in Vietnam. We are there on borrowed time, and we have borrowed time too long from the important task of facing up, finally and ultimately, to the question of war or peace.

The deception is easy. It, of course, is not ever really considered a matter of war and peace, but a practical, hardheaded matter of national self-interest, loyalty to friends, defense of the North American Continent. These are easy issues to deal with. They lend themselves to hardheaded practical answers, which we are good at. We approach Vietnam on that basis all the time now because we know, given this approach, the issue of war and peace need never really be faced.

But great men, and I number Lyndon Johnson among them, have chosen this approach only to learn too quickly that this really does not work. We must finally face up to the war, its horrible reality, its corruption of American life, its divisive nature in the land itself, the dead and the bleeding, the young widows and the mothers old before their time.

This was indeed the mandate that was given to Richard M. Nixon. He promised—or was it only a dark hint—a new approach to the war and to the peace that must follow.

Must we disabuse ourselves of that conceit?

There was a feeling on the land that with the Paris talks there would be peace. Oh, maybe not tomorrow, not next month, but certainly next year or was it the year after.

This has been the tone for months and the American people, despite the bitterness, the mourning, the new graves, waited patiently with trust, and more importantly, with hope.

I say to President Nixon that we are a patient people and we will wait—but how long must we wait? I ask are we going to kill more so that fewer will die? That is the algebra of field commanders, of generals who escalate.

We have been asked to defend the house of a friend. Whether he was a true friend or not is a question we no longer ask. All we know is that he asked for help and we gave him help. But what is to be done now? We have neglected our own house, while shoring up his. We have given of our blood and strength while defending his house against marauders. We have been so zealous in our defense of his home, we have come to know it as our home too and we seem more zealous in its defense than he does. We have been gone for years to Troy and now long for home, where trouble and unrest threaten.

I caution President Nixon. He will not be a leader with a fresh opportunity for long. I do not say abandon Paris. Stay in Paris. Make them sit with us for long hours around the table. Paris may help. Take chances in Paris rather than risking lives in the Iron Triangle. I encourage President Nixon to explore private talks and unexplored avenues in Southeast Asia or anywhere else. I do caution him against old errors, old solutions which solved nothing.

This is not a bipartisan issue. The 33,000 dead do not array themselves on an aisle. They were Americans. The war must end. There is other work to be done and we must be around to do it. And the time is short.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago next Monday an incumbent American President renounced renomination because the war in Vietnam had shattered his role as party and national leader.

Today we watch his successor closely, seeking assurance that the lessons of Vietnam animate President Nixon's search for peace.

Those lessons are—

An exhausting, cruel, and tragic war was fought for the empty delusion that American arms could impose conformity to our political ideas. We should expect other strange ideas in other strange countries. What shall we do?

Our military leaders, who promised a military victory time after time, have led us instead to a political catastrophe. We should weigh their advice more carefully in the future.

We have paid over 30,000 American lives and $150 billion in this vain war effort. Comparable sacrifices for genuine domestic needs elude us.

We have been told that we should give the new administration 100 days in office before criticizing its conduct. I would wait forever to criticize our present policy in Vietnam if I thought such forbearance would end the war one day sooner. But the new administration gropes, with little apparent difference from its predecessor, toward an illusory military victory.

Peace will not come at the Paris conference table any more than it will come in the jungle fighting in Vietnam. Peace will come when we Americans begin to withdraw our forces—which are the only foreign troops in Vietnam—let Vietnamese political processes achieve the equilibrium which arms could not impose.

OUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIETNAM WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to thank the gentleman from California for providing me this opportunity to speak on the issue of our involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, I directed an inquiry to the President of the United States as follows:

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The war in Vietnam has divided and troubled the American people as has no other war of the 20th Century. Many of our people regard the war as necessary and just, but many others are doubtful and troubled. Some are unconvinced that the Saigon Government is worth saving; some fear that the United States has inadvertently taken over the role of the old European colonial powers; some simply cannot understand what vital interests are served by sending American soldiers to fight and die in a civil war almost 10,000 miles away from their own country.

During the first three weeks of the current North Vietnamese and Viet Cong offensive, 1,140 American soldiers were killed, or just 219 fewer than died in the first three weeks of the devastating 1968 TET offensive.

Present realities require a revision of priorities in American policy. It is true that we cannot undo the past, but the assessment of past errors is absolutely indispensable to efforts to correct them and to avoiding their repetition.

Mistakes are not liquidated without a price being paid. No responsible critic of the war advocates a disorderly withdrawal of American forces and the abandonment of South Vietnam to the Viet Cong, but many point to the need for a peace short of absolute victory—on either side, for a peace involving some mutual concessions. A concession, however, is not a humiliation and may indeed be turned to one's own advantage, as General De Gaulle demonstrated by giving independence to Algeria and as Khrushchev demonstrated by proclaiming himself a peacemaker while yielding to the American ultimatum in the Cuban Missile Crisis.

It seems to me that the concessions we must make are necessary as an act of common sense; they are also honorable in a tragic situation.

I believe, therefore, that the key to peace is mutual disengagement through political arrangement for the neutralization of Southeast Asia.

It is my belief that the United States should pledge the eventual removal of American military forces from Vietnam in an all out effort to achieve meaningful results from the current negotiations.

The date and conditions for the removal of American military forces from Vietnam could be set forth in an international agreement defining the status of a neutralized South Vietnam and establishing certain international guarantees.

A forthright pledge to remove American forces is of great importance for the persuasiveness of peace initiatives because of the well-known Chinese and North Vietnamese fear that, despite assurances to the contrary, the United States wishes to maintain permanent military bases in South Vietnam.

If tangible evidence of progress is not derived from current peace talks within a reasonable time—perhaps a period of 60 days—it is suggested that, in addition to the current participants, the following countries should be represented in peace negotiations: The Soviet Union, China, France, Great Britain, Japan, India and Pakistan, and the countries of the Southeast Asian mainland: Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma and Malaysia. The larger nations—that is, the United States, China, Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, Japan, India and Pakistan could be expected to act as guarantors of a final settlement.

These are alternatives that I have considered most carefully; alternatives that I believe could stimulate meaningful negotiations and result in an honorable peace. If, on the other hand, there are other alternatives under advisement which can also offer the prospect of an honorable peace in Vietnam in the foreseeable future, I, as a Member of Congress, would appreciate the knowledge of their status and whatever other particulars could be afforded me.

Respectfully yours,
Mario Biaggi,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California and my colleague from New York for providing this forum for the Members of Congress to discuss this most prominent issue in the world today, as it relates to all of us.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we are engaged in a long-overdue discussion of the single most important issue facing our Nation—the continuing war in Vietnam. This war has dragged on for so long that it threatens to become a permanent part of our existence, or nonexistence, as the case may be. This war continues to be an excessive moral, physical, and monetary drain on the resources and lives of all Americans.

A satisfactory conclusion to the war must be found, and it must be found promptly. There are too many demands here at home for the men and money we are pouring into Vietnam. Instead of perpetuating a stalemated war, the United States must take the necessary steps to secure the negotiated settlement that will finally end the carnage in Vietnam and bring about lasting peace.

Those of us in Congress who have in the past criticized American policy vis-a-vis the war in Vietnam find it ironic that our recommendations of 2, 3, and even 4 years ago are finally bearing fruit today. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam did bring a beginning toward peace negotiations and did not jeopardize the safety of our servicemen. Yesterday President Thieu publicly acknowledged a basic fact of life: the South Vietnamese Government and National Liberation Front will have to enter into private bilateral talks to ultimately bring an end to the war.

President's Thieu's announcement is, of course, most welcome. I applaud his frankness and hope this will expedite the negotiations. An appropriate response by the National Liberation Front would pave the way for a cease-fire and ultimately for a final peace agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I could well go on at length about the military and political problems of the situation in Vietnam. But this is ground we have traveled across time and again and my colleagues are admirably discussing these issues today.

I should, therefore, like to direct my attention to an ancillary problem that will, in the final analysis, be as crucial to the future of South Vietnam as the fighting and the Paris negotiations.

I have reference, Mr. Speaker, to the failure of the South Vietnamese Government to establish the proper base for a free and democratic society and the directly related problem of continuing corruption and graft throughout South Vietnam. As long as these problems remain unresolved it will be impossible for South Vietnam to establish a viable social, political, and economic order. And without that foundation for a strong government no amount of military successes or diplomatic coups will provide South Vietnam with the basis for a viable government.

The most glaring and inexplicable example of how the basic principles of democracy are not being adhered to is the case of Truong Dinh Dzu, once a leading candidate for the Presidency of South Vietnam, and now a civilian prisoner of the military, sentenced to 5 years at hard labor in a closed, secretive military trial that completely ignored his fundamental rights.

Mr. Dzu, it is alleged, made treasonous statements against the South Vietnamese Government. When I was in Vietnam last December I visited with Mr. Dzu's family and returned to the United States, not with any knowledge of his guilt or innocence, but with the definite knowledge that Mr. Dzu was denied the most fundamental rights of a free society. It is imperative that he be granted a new, fair trial and I believe the United States should make clear to South Vietnam our unhappiness with the Dzu case.

It is most ironic that, according to news reports, the statements for which Mr. Dzu has been incarcerated directly parallel President Thieu's recent comments on the desirability of direct, private talks between the Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

As long as Mr. Dzu remains a political prisoner without fulfillment of a just demand for a fair trial there is serious reason to question whether South Vietnam will ever adhere to a democratic order. But, as a case in point, Mr. Dzu's imprisonment raises a more tragic and telling question: What, Mr. Speaker, have 30,000 American men died for? It must never be said that we have fought a war and given 30,000 American lives to substitute one "ism" for another.

And an equally important situation exists in Vietnam in the matter of uncontrolled, unpoliced graft and corruption. This problem moves vertically and horizontally through South Vietnam including private citizens, military personnel, and Government officials. And not only are the South Vietnamese guilty of laxity on this matter; the allied nations, including the United States, are also seriously implicated.

Recently the State Department notified me that on the basis of information I provided to the Department after my most recent visit to Vietnam that a major crackdown will be conducted against

XUM

American civilians who engage in the insidious practice of currency manipulation. This problem, like the general problem of the commodity black market, involves American, South Vietnamese, and allied civilian and military personnel.

The South Vietnamese must act and not delay any longer in implementing a greatly needed crackdown against war profiteering and corruption.

Not only are there substantial black markets in currency and goods, there is also the perpetual problem of diversion of commodities and military supplies shipped to Vietnam by the United States.

This war profiteering in its many ramifications aggravates a prior problem of graft and corruption in all levels of the South Vietnamese Government from the small village through the provinces to Saigon.

The values that obtain today in Vietnam are simply not conducive to the establishment of a lasting, free and independent nation. This is the unhappy prospect after 30,000 American lives have been lost and more than $100 billion spent.

It is especially necessary, therefore, that the United States and our allies take the following steps without further delay: Decrease the level of military activity, escalate the intensity of negotiations, and dramatically overhaul the entire approach to civic action, pacification, and civil order in Vietnam.

To do anything less would guarantee the continuation of a war that is as costly, in lives and dollars, as it is unproductive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I call today upon the South Vietnamese Government to announce publicly at the Paris talks its willingness to include all South Vietnamese in free elections as part of any solution to the Vietnam war.

This does not mean imposing a government on South Vietnam, but it does mean the full exercise of the democratic process.

Anything less than full participation of all political factions would not be democratic. The goals of self-determination and democracy that we are committed to in Vietnam require that all the South Vietnamese participate in the electoral process regardless of political beliefs.

I am confident that free elections would affirm the South Vietnamese desire for a true democracy and reject Communist control of the country.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman's suggestions are indeed excellent and I certainly want to commend them to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that March 1969 has brought forth a new upsurge of concern over the war in Vietnam; for this month marks the start of the 5th year in which the United States has participated in the role of a direct combatant. The Vietnam conflict is now the second longest war in American history, ranking behind only our Revolutionary War in length of time. And the end is still not in sight.

Therefore, the new concern expressed over Vietnam comes at a most appropriate moment. Americans are weary of battle reports and mounting casualty rates. Many feel that our undue concentration on Vietnam has caused the United States to neglect its interests in other parts of the world, thus inviting new troubles in the 1970's. Americans have also concluded to a greater and greater extent that the United States has squandered too many of its material and human resources into this conflict and that it could have better employed them to solve our multitude of domestic problems. There is a growing belief that the returns on our nearly $30 billion per year investment in Vietnam have been meager indeed, especially when one considers the vast possibilities for utilizing these funds in the United States to alleviate such social ills as poverty and the decay of the cities.

I share many of these misgivings. It has become more and more apparent to me that the United States cannot achieve its other objectives at home and around the world by continuing its present course in South Vietnam.

In Paris, we face the unhappy prospect that the negotiations will drag on for many months while the casualty rates rise. Since the bombing halt last November no significant progress has been made. I believe that the road to getting the Paris negotiations on the move lies in the United States taking a firm position with respect to our role in Vietnam.

Previously many of my colleagues discussed what that stand should be, and certainly I do not intend to disagree with them. However, I believe personally that the most significant and meaningful stand that the United States could take with respect to the negotiations is to reaffirm the principles as outlined in the 1954 Geneva accords. I think it is important to note that the violations of these accords is what led to resumption of the fighting in that war torn area.

Basically the principles of the 1954 Geneva accords which America should support are: an immediate cease-fire, and mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam, the establishment of international machinery under the United Nations and/or neutral nations agreeable to both North and South Vietnam to supervise the troop withdrawals and supervise national elections to resolve the political question and unify Vietnam.

The United States must then firmly and unequivocally state in public its intentions to abide by the results of any such election. The United States and the American people should not find this key to a political settlement in Vietnam overly troublesome, since we have already affirmed the principle of one man, one vote. I think that while we advocate this position we must realistically, in the absence of any progress, work toward disengagement on another level, and that is building up the ability of the South Vietnam Armed Forces to take over the combat burden from the U.S. troops.

To this end the Nixon administration must give the highest priority to improving the effectiveness of South Vietnamese fighting forces and develop a specific plan to phase-out all of the U.S. combat troops in South Vietnam. Regardless of what one may think of the Vietnam war, we have commitments in Southeast Asia. The task of the 1970's will be to preserve the freedom of Southeast Asia while avoiding another quagmire like that of Vietnam. To that extent I think it would be helpful if we, in anticipation of the conclusion of this war, would provide for a program of economic development to that area, coupled with an opening of recognition of mainland China with a view toward the resumption of diplomatic relations with them.

The voice of the American people has been heard long and loud in dissent to the war in Vietnam, and I think that what they are saying is that we in America must be the example not merely of peace, because we will not fight, but peace because peace is the healing and elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a nation being so right that it need not convince others by force that it is right. We are basically saying we do not wish our Government to abandon its interests in promoting freedom throughout the world, but we would rather do it at the negotiating table than on the battlefield.

Mr. BROWN of California. I wish to thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and my colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN) and the other gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for providing this opportunity for many of us in the House to express our views with respect to the war in Vietnam.

Our efforts in the past, I think, had some marked results in changing attitudes in the country and starting to reverse the policies of the previous administration. I am hopeful that the new administration will be responsive.

There is no question about it, it is time to end the war in Vietnam. Measured from the first combat death, this is the longest war in our history. It will soon be the fourth bloodiest. It is already the second costliest. If we add to the $100 billion, the cost of a divided nation, of an alienated generation, of a nation diverted from critical domestic needs, of a country torn by self-doubt, this is surely the most devastating war for our national spirit in our whole history.

To what end? Whether we make the compromises necessary to terminate the war now, or 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, the settlement is unlikely to be any better. In the meantime, the costs and dislocations of the war will escalate in every aspect.

What is the new administration's response to the demands from all over the country that our policies be changed? What is the secret plan that the President promised, but withheld for fear of jeopardizing foreign relations, before his term began? Perhaps it will unfold at secret talks in Paris. I hope so.

But today we have only the evidence of deeds. That evidence consists of continued increase in search and destroy missions, continued increase of deadly fire on the towns and villages of South Vietnam, the apparent total capitulation of the Secretary of Defense to the machinations of the military-industrial complex, and utter silence in the face of dictatorial tactics by the South Vietnamese Government in censoring the press and jailing its opposition for merely talking of peace.

All this suggests that the "new" policy is simply more of the same.

I think we are strong enough and honest enough to recognize when we have made mistakes. I think, however hard the decision may be, a commitment at least for once to try genuine deescalation and genuine political negotiation based on the realities in South Vietnam is long overdue. It is certainly better than continued reliance on military solutions that prove so elusive and take the lives of hundreds of Americans every week.

We have just received the very discouraging disclosure that the American military command has asked President Nixon to approve plans to attack military bases in Cambodia—a request which is apparently receiving serious consideration at the White House.

This is further evidence that we are embarked on the same tragic merry-go-round which has characterized our involvement in Vietnam for the past 5 years, which prolonged and widened the war there; which disrupted our own economy, divided our Nation, alienated our youth, and diverted us from critical domestic needs: a policy of military action and response which can only lead to further escalation of the war and its terrible tolls.

It would seem each time political developments offer an opportunity to achieve a breakthrough toward peace, military counterpressure makes such a breakthrough impossible. So we find American deaths in Vietnam approaching the figure for the Korean conflict; the President denying any prospect of a reduction of U.S. forces in Vietnam; and the Secretary of Defense calling on Congress to provide more money to feed the fires of this war.

Can we, as Members of this Congress, simply sit by and silently accept the message that there is no prospect of withdrawing our troops; that there is no political initiative to be made to achieve peace; and that all of the discredited objectives of our past policies in Vietnam must remain intact today?

Are we really to pretend that nothing happened last year? That there was no election? That there was no mandate for change? That there is no new administration, no demand that this new administration deliver our Nation from the war that has so devastated the American spirit?

It is to the President's credit that he did not respond to recent Vietcong actions by renewing the attack on North Vietnam. But maintaining the status quo, if that is what we are doing in South Vietnam, is not sufficient. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam proved necessary to at least get the combatants to the bargaining table, but an intensification of ground action, and especially a broadening of the war to Cambodia, may well preclude any further progress.

Why is it that we must accompany every gesture for peace with a contradictory military spasm that implies a wider war?

Yes, we stopped the bombing, and we went to Paris, but at the same time we vastly increased our offensive actions in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese made a gesture toward peace by withdrawing a sizable number of their troops, and instead of responding with a reduction of our own forces to achieve a mutual deescalation, which is the path many of our own experts in the Defense Department say is the way this war might be ended, we did just the reverse.

A change in Presidential personality and style is no substitute for a change in policy. The unrest and divisiveness in our Nation will not simply disappear because administration statements have been toned down and dissenters are no longer called "nervous Nellies."

It is time the new administration made clear its objectives in Vietnam. If those objectives are the same as those of the previous administration—an unachievable military victory and a total political defeat of the National Liberation Front, despite the realities of the NLF's influence in South Vietnam—Congress and the American people must know it.

If the President's objectives are more realistic, the entire world should know it, for such a policy change could create a climate in which meaningful concessions from the other side would be made.

If the war is to end during this administration, the President is going to have to arouse the American people from the long dream of our omnipotence and all-righteousness in Vietnam. He will have to admit the mistakes of the policies of the past and articulate sound, new policies for the future.

We have a responsibility to the American people to make the President see the urgent need for new directions and new initiatives in Vietnam, for a realistic strategy to end this tragic $100 billion war.

Perhaps progress will be made in secret talks hinted at in Paris. We all profoundly hope so. But it certainly will not be achieved without basic changes in our policies and objectives which the American public must be made to understand if they are going to accept them.

Let us resolve that our discussion here today is just a start. The time is now.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join the gentleman from California this afternoon in his comments about Vietnam.

I should like to say at the outset, I am in my 11th year of service in the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), in my estimation, is without a peer in his fearless, unremitting pursuit of world peace and particularly the question of peace in Southeast Asia. This is another reason why I am proud this afternoon to associate my remarks with his.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can say about the Vietnam war which has not been said before and said with much eloquence and deep conviction. For, after all, the war is not a new one. Vietnamese have been fighting and dying for almost 30 years, and we have been burying our own dead since 1961. Despite the bloodshed and the destruction in Vietnam, and despite the real price we are paying here in America by the rending of our own social fabric, there is still scant assurance that the end is in sight. The new administration's opportunity for bold action is waning, and with it, our hopes for a deescalation of the violence, and at least a reduction, if not an end, to the killing.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to fight a war we cannot win—not for lack of valor on the part of our servicemen, certainly not for lack of funds provided by this Congress, but for lack of political courage. It is the easy way out to continue to see military victory around the corner, or to be more in vogue, at the end of the tunnel; it is the easy way out to accuse the other side of actions we ourselves blithely engage in and conveniently overlook; it is the easy way out to stake our national prestige on the outcome of an internal conflict in a distant land, and to insinuate that critics of the war lack faith in America.

Mr. Speaker, we are once again on the escalation merry-go-round. It is now common knowledge that the bombing halt over North Vietnam has been offset by increased bombing elsewhere, inferentially in the south, and ominously in Laos. The announced reductions in battalion-size U.S.-initiated actions in recent months has been more than offset by increased small unit actions by our forces. But these hard facts are too conveniently ignored by our own Government. The latest Tet offensive attacks by the enemy have been described by Ambassador Lodge as not being a response to any recent Allied initiatives. They were instead, Ambassador Lodge insisted, the "long-heralded winter-spring campaign of 1969." But how can we be certain of this assumption beyond a reasonable doubt? A sharp increase in the frequency of American-initiated contacts since last November 1 has been clearly documented by our own military command. Such a knowledgeable figure as Governor Harriman is reported to have described the current enemy attacks as essentially a response to American actions, rather than a deliberate move to affect the peace talks. Not only is there doubt as to who is responding to whom, but we have not been told the exact nature of the understanding with North Vietnam which preceded our bombing halt.

Mr. Speaker, the new administration must decide whether it has sufficient courage to take over the conduct of the war from our professional military men, who, while admitting they do not like

XUM

the war, claim it is the only war they have—and indeed they seem to be making the most of it. When will we admit that our actions, since the bombing halt began, have not been particularly reassuring to the North Vietnamese that we desire peace? Have we been able to show by our deeds that we indeed are seeking a political settlement of the war, rather than a military victory?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our Government to be honest with itself, and to realize that there is a special kind of price to be paid for peace in Vietnam. It is not the price we would usually be called upon to pay in blood and treasure, but a price to be paid in false pride. Our Nation's greatness will in no better way be demonstrated, and our national interest will be no better served than by admitting to ourselves that we have made a mistake. Once we have done this, it should not be beyond our ingenuity to devise a means of extricating ourselves from what has become an untenable position. Instead of creating consternation among our allies, as has been forecast by those who would continue the war, this course of action should reassure our friends that we have not become the prisoners of our own rhetoric and self-righteousness, and that we will seek nonviolent solutions to world problems while continuing to adhere to our own basic principles.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's real strength lies in its dedication to the value of human life and the dignity of man. These noble aspirations are ill served by our current role in Vietnam. The problem is enormous—but it will not be solved by applying the tried and proven wrong policies of the past. A start must be made somewhere, and we are certainly in a better position to be magnanimous than the other side. At worst, we may be rebuffed, but we must be certain this time, beyond any doubt, that our deeds match our words. We owe this effort to ourselves, the world, our 33,000 dead, and to the young, here and in Vietnam, who will inherit the future we are preparing for them. Hopefully, they will be able to live in a less violent world.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks and welcome his contribution to this discussion.

I should like to point out that although this discussion has appeared to be rather one-sided this afternoon, coming entirely from the Democratic side of the aisle, there was in yesterday's RECORD a contribution by two of our distinguished Republican colleagues which I think is worthy of note. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) used the opportunity to discuss at length their own antipathy to the course of the war in Vietnam and to express their hope that we might be on the verge of a change in the policy which this country has been following. It should also be noted, I think, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) inserted in the RECORD yesterday the names and addresses of all of the 33,000-plus casualties that we have experienced to date in the war in Vietnam. I think this was a worthy service in itself, because it points out to all of us in the most forceful possible way the impact that this war is having in terms of the deaths of some of America's finest young men.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my hope that this debate will not be construed as partisan in its nature or as an effort necessarily to attack the present President because he is of the opposite party. I think it is well known that many of us who are participating in this debate were just as strong in our opposition to these policies when they were the product of a Democratic administration, and I think we will continue to be equally strong in our efforts under a Republican administration.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), for his leadership not only today but through the entire course and period that the war has been going on.

I would like to make a note for the benefit of those who have just joined us that Congressman KOCH, of New York, informed me that there had been some temporary difficulty for some of those wanting to hear this debate. We brought this matter to the attention of our distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and discussed the matter with Speaker MCCORMACK, who indicated that he had been unaware that people were having to wait any undue length of time to hear the debate and he urged and ordered the Sergeant at Arms to open up the doors.

I might state preliminary when this special order was first set that we had no idea how many hundreds or thousands of people might want to come in from all over the country to hear it. As a consequence, there was some understanding that there would be an effort made to limit each group to 50 and require each group of 50 after listening to the debate for a while to move out so that others might hear it. It was not anticipated at that time, as we have experienced for the last half hour at least, that there would be some empty spaces in the balcony. And, for that reason, the Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts; and the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), when this was brought to their attention made sure that the Sergeant at Arms made these seats available.

I would like to note also, if I may, as my distinguished colleague from California is well aware, that earlier our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York, WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, held the floor for approximately 1 hour.

We have been debating or discussing this matter for something on the order of an hour and 50 minutes or 2 hours. Also, there are a good number of our colleagues who have already expressed their opposition to the war and there are still a few of our colleagues who will seek recognition for the purpose of discussing this situation. Therefore, for that reason I yield back the time which the gentleman from California has so generously yielded to me.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) for his explanation of the situation and I appreciate indeed the contribution which he also made to the debate a little bit earlier.

I was trying to make it clear that while the proceedings this afternoon are not exactly in the nature of a debate and there is not an adversary present, that, nevertheless, the kind of views that are being expressed here are representative of a larger and larger number of Members of Congress who serve in the House of Representatives from both the Republican and Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that none of us wish to be in the position of attempting to pressure a new President at an early stage as he takes office and attempts to grapple with these extremely difficult problems. All of us are willing to be fair and be generous in terms of allowing an opportunity for policies to be developed. But I think at the same time all of us want to make it clear—and it is my opinion that the American people want to have it made clear—that we do not wish to see the continuation of certain policies, continuation of the same kind of military escalation, the same kind of intervention, resulting from certain foreign policies which have brought this country to the position in which it finds itself today.

I wish to make it clear that for my part—and I think this is true of most of my colleagues—this attitude does not stem from a lack of concern for America's security or for America's defense. All too frequently we find some who say that those of us who are critical of the Vietnam war are not concerned about American security and American defense. But, in fact, just the opposite is true. We are the most deeply concerned about America's security and America's defense.

We feel that if history demonstrates anything above all else, it is that a policy of unrestricted military intervention—or a semi-imperialist desire to have our presence felt around the world, that we should be able to exercise our control in every dispute or every difficulty that may arise in any part of the world—does more to undermine America's security than any other possible action that this country could take.

I think all of us who have studied intently the present policies and the present situation in Vietnam believe that at the root of this involvement lies a concern with the desire to continually expand America's power, to continually serve as safeguardian of the world.

I believe, and I think most of my colleagues agree with me, that no country in the world, no great imperialistic power in Rome, in Greece, in Britain, or in France, has ever been able to make this kind of policy stick. Hence, one essential aspect of ending the war in Vietnam is to look closely at the kind of

XUM

policies which have resulted in that involvement.

There have been a number of excellent articles written on this overall subject recently, and I would like to commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The distinguished former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Shoup, for example, in the current issue of Atlantic Monthly, has an excellent article on the way in which our militaristic policies—the very existence of the largest military force in the world—has led us into situations such as Vietnam from which we cannot extricate ourselves. I place the article in the Record at this point:

THE NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM

(By Gen. David M. Shoup)

(Note.—Its roots are in the experience of World War II. The burgeoning military establishment and associated industries fuel it. Anti-Communism provides the climate which nurtures it. "It" is a "new American militarism." General Shoup, a hero of the Battle of Tarawa in 1943, who rose to become Commandant of the United States Marine Corps for four years until his retirement in December, 1963, doesn't like it. He has written this essay in collaboration with another retired Marine officer, Colonel James A. Donovan.)

America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation. Our massive and swift invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, concurrent with the rapid buildup of U.S. military power in Vietnam, constituted an impressive demonstration of America's readiness to execute military contingency plans and to seek military solutions to problems of political disorder and potential Communist threats in the areas of our interest.

This "military task force" type of diplomacy is in the tradition of our more primitive, pre-World War II "gunboat diplomacy," in which we landed small forces of Marines to protect American lives and property from the perils of native bandits and revolutionaries. In those days the U.S. Navy and its Marine landing forces were our chief means, short of war, for showing the flag, exercising American power, and protecting U.S. interests abroad. The Navy, enjoying the freedom of the seas, was a visible and effective representative of the nation's sovereign power. The Marines could be employed ashore "on such other duties as the President might direct" without congressional approval or a declaration of war. The U.S. Army was not then used so freely because it was rarely ready for expeditionary service without some degree of mobilization, and its use overseas normally required a declaration of emergency or war. Now, however, we have numerous contingency plans involving large joint Air Force-Army-Navy-Marine task forces to defend U.S. interests and to safeguard our allies wherever and whenever we suspect Communist aggression. We maintain more than 1,517,000 Americans in uniform overseas in 119 countries. We have 8 treaties to help defend 48 nations if they ask us to—or if we choose to intervene in their affairs. We have an immense and expensive military establishment, fueled by a gigantic defense industry, and millions of proud, patriotic, and frequently bellicose and militaristic citizens. How did this militarist culture evolve? How did this militarism steer us into the tragic military and political morass of Vietnam?

Prior to World War II, American attitudes were typically isolationist, pacifist, and generally antimilitary. The regular peacetime military establishment enjoyed small prestige and limited influence upon national affairs. The public knew little about the armed forces, and only a few thousand men were attracted to military service and careers. In 1940 there were but 428,000 officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy. The scale of the war, and the world's power relationships which resulted, created the American military giant. Today the active armed forces contain over 3.4 million men and women, with an additional 1.6 million ready reserves and National Guardsmen.

America's vastly expanded world role after World War II hinged upon military power. The voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent. During the postwar period, distinguished military leaders from the war years filled many top positions in government. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Taylor, Ridgway, LeMay, and others were not only popular heroes but respected opinion-makers It was a time of international readjustment; military minds offered the benefits of firm views and problem-solving experience to the management of the nation's affairs. Military procedures—including the general staff system, briefings, estimates of the situation, and the organizational and operational techniques of the highly schooled, confident military professionals—spread throughout American culture.

World War II had been a long war. Millions of young American men had matured, been educated, and gained rank and stature during their years in uniform. In spite of themselves, many returned to civilian life as indoctrinated, combat-experienced military professionals. They were veterans, and for better or worse would never be the same again. America will never be the same either. We are now a nation of veterans. To the 14.9 million veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees, and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968 the total living veterans of U.S. military service numbered over 23 million, or about 20 percent of the adult population.

Today most middle-aged men, most business, government, civic, and professional leaders, have served some time in uniform. Whether they liked it or not, their military training and experience have affected them, for the creeds and attitudes of the armed forces are powerful medicine, and can become habit-forming. The military codes include all the virtues and beliefs used to motivate men of high principle: patriotism, duty and service to country, honor among fellowmen, courage in the face of danger, loyalty to organization and leaders, self-sacrifice for comrades, leadership, discipline, and physical fitness. For many veterans the military's efforts to train and indoctrinate them may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had—especially so for the young and less educated.

In addition, each of the armed forces has its own special doctrinal beliefs and well-catalogued customs, traditions, rituals, and folklore upon which it strives to build a fiercely loyal military character and esprit de corps. All ranks are taught that their unit and their branch of the military service are the most elite, important, efficient, or effective in the military establishment. By believing in the superiority and importance of their own service they also provide themselves a degree of personal status, pride, and self-confidence.

As they get older, many veterans seem to romanticize and exaggerate their own military experience and loyalties. The policies, attitudes, and positions of the powerful veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS, totaling over 4 million men, frequently reflect this pugnacious and chauvinistic tendency. Their memberships generally favor military solutions to world problems in the pattern of their own earlier experience, and often assert that their military service and sacrifice should be repeated by the younger generations.

Closely related to the attitudes and influence of America's millions of veterans is the vast and powerful compelx of the defense industries, which have been described in detail many times in the eight years since General Eisenhower first warned of the military-industrial power complex in his farewell address as President. The relationship between the defense industry and the military establishment is closer than many citizens realize. Together they form a powerful public opinion lobby. The several military service associations provide both a forum and a meeting ground for the military and its industries. The associations also provide each of the armed services with a means of fostering their respective roles, objectives, and propaganda.

Each of the four services has its own association, and there are also additional military function associations, for ordnance, management, defense industry, and defense transportation, to name some of the more prominent. The Air Force Association and the Association of the U.S. Army are the largest, best organized, and most effective of the service associations. The Navy League, typical of the "silent service" traditions, is not as well coordinated in its public relations efforts, and the small Marine Corps Association is not even in the same arena with the other contenders, the Marine Association's main activity being the publication of a semi-official monthly magazine. Actually, the service associations' respective magazines, with an estimated combined circulation of over 270,000, are the primary medium serving the several associations' purposes.

Air Force and Space Digest, to cite one example, is the magazine of the Air Force Association and the unofficial mouthpiece of the U.S. Air Force doctrine, "party line," and propaganda. It frequently promotes Air Force policy that has been officially frustrated or suppressed within the Department of Defense. It beats the tub for strength through aerospace power, interprets diplomatic, strategic, and tactical problems in terms of air power, stresses the requirements for quantities of every type of aircraft, and frequently perpetuates the extravagant fictions about the effectiveness of bombing. This, of course, is well coordinated with and supported by the multibillion-dollar aerospace industry, which thrives upon the boundless desires of the Air Force. They reciprocate with lavish and expensive ads in every issue of *Air Force.* Over 96,000 members of the Air Force Association receive the magazine. Members include active, reserve, retired personnel, and veterans of the U.S. Air Force. Additional thousands of copies go to people engaged in the defense industry. The thick mixture of advertising, propaganda, and Air Force doctrine continuously repeated in this publication provides its readers and writers with a form of intellectual hypnosis, and they are prone to believe their own propaganda because they read it in *Air Force.*

The American people have also become more and more accustomed to militarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun, and to the violence of combat. Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth. Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior pro-

XUM

fessional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.

It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism. There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals, and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion. How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exert so much martial influence upon the government and life of the American people?

The military will disclaim any excess of power or influence on their part. They will point to their small numbers, low pay, and subordination to civilian masters as proof of their modest status and innocence. Nevertheless, the professional military, as a group, is probably one of the best organized and most influential of the various segments of the American scene. Three wars and six major contingencies since 1940 have forced the American people to become abnormally aware of the armed forces and their leaders. In turn the military services have produced an unending supply of distinguished, capable, articulate, and effective leaders. The sheer skill, energy, and dedication of America's military officers make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from the federal Cabinet to the local PTA

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter for the rest of their careers they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions, or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques, or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others. Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions, and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The men who rise to the top of the military hierarchy have usually demonstrated their effectiveness as leaders, planners, and organization managers. They have perhaps performed heroically in combat, but most of all they have demonstrated their loyalty as proponents of their own service's doctrine and their dedication to the defense establishment. The paramount sense of duty to follow orders is at the root of the military professional's performance. As a result the military often operate more efficiently and effectively in the arena of defense policy planning than do their civilian counterparts in the State Department. The military planners have their doctrinal beliefs, their loyalties, their discipline—and their typical desire to compete and win. The civilians in government can scarcely play the same policy-planning game.

In general the military are better organized, they work harder, they think straighter, and they keep their eyes on the objective, which is to be instantly ready to solve the problem through military action while ensuring that their respective service gets its proper mission, role, and recognition in the operation. In an emergency the military usually have a ready plan; if not, their numerous doctrinal manuals provide firm guidelines for action. Politicians, civilian appointees, and diplomats do not normally have the same confidence about how to react to threats and violence as do the military.

The motivations behind these endeavors are difficult for civilians to understand. For example, military professionals cannot measure the success of their individual efforts in terms of personal financial gain. The armed forces are not profit-making organizations, and the rewards for excellence in the military profession are acquired in less tangible forms. Thus it is that promotion and the responsibilities of higher command, with the related fringe benefits of quarters, servants, privileges, and prestige, motivate most career officers. Promotions and choice job opportunities are attained by constantly performing well, conforming to the expected patterns, and pleasing the senior officers. Promotions and awards also frequently result from heroic and distinguished performance in combat, and it takes a war to become a military hero. Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.

The professional military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures. Unlike some of the civilian policy-makers, the military has not been obsessed with the threat of Communism per se. Most military people know very little about Communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government. But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil. When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the armed forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from Communism. In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The armed forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its *General Purpose Forces* in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances. To do this it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the Unified Commands, and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Important features of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sealift forces and the Army-Air Force team of air-mobility proponents. At the senior command levels parochial pride in service, personal ambitions, and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe. The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves. This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the Marines, and to attain overall command of U.S. Forces Dom. Rep." Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82nd Airborne Division to the scene, including a lieutenant general, and took charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965 the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Viet Cong and North Vietnamese aggression. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!) So by early 1965 the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims, and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause. Much of the reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes. In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in both North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people. Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots, and opportunity for career officers.

The highly trained professional and aggressive career officers of the Army and Marine Corps played a similar game. Prior to the decision to send combat units to South Vietnam in early 1965, both services were striving to increase their involvement. The Army already had over 16,000 military aid personnel serving in South Vietnam in the military adviser role, in training missions, logistic services, supporting helicopter companies, and in Special Forces teams. This investment of men and matériel justified a requirement for additional U.S. combat units to provide local security and to help protect our growing commitment of aid to the South Vietnam regime.

There were also top-ranking Army officers who wanted to project Army ground combat units into the Vietnam struggle for a variety of other reasons; to test plans and new equipment, to test the new air-mobile theories and tactics, to try the tactics and techniques of counterinsurgency, and to gain combat experience for young officers and noncommissioned officers. It also appeared to be a case of the military's duty to stop "Communist aggression" in Vietnam.

The marines had somewhat similar motivations, the least of which was any real concern about the political or social problems of the Vietnamese people. In early 1965 there was a shooting war going on and the Marines were being left out of it, contrary to all their traditions. The Army's military advisory people were hogging American participation—except for a Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron at Danang which was helping the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. For several years young Marine officers had been going to South Vietnam from the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa for short tours of "on-the-job training" with the small South Vietnam Marine Corps. There was a growing concern, however, among some senior Marines that the Corps should get involved on a larger scale and be the "first to fight" in keeping with the Corps' traditions. This would help justify the Corps' continued existence, which many Marines seem to consider to be in constant jeopardy.

The Corps had also spent several years exploring the theories of counterinsurgency and as early as 1961 had developed an elaborate lecture-demonstration called Operation Cormorant, for school and Marine Corps promotion purposes, which depicted the Marines conducting a large-scale amphibious operation on the coast of Vietnam and thereby helping resolve a hypothetical aggressor-insurgency problem. As always it was important to Marine planners and doctrinaires to apply an amphibious operation to the Vietnam situation and provide justification for this special Marine functional responsibility. So Marine planners were seeking an acceptable excuse to thrust a landing force over the beaches of Vietnam when the Viet Cong attacked the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at Pleiku in February, 1965. It was considered unacceptable aggression, and the President was thereby prompted to put U.S. ground combat units into the war. Elements of the 3rd Marine Division at Okinawa were already aboard ship and eager to go, for the Marines also intended to get to Vietnam before their neighbor on Okinawa, the Army's 173rd Airborne Brigade, arrived. (Actually the initial Marine unit to deploy was an airlifted antiaircraft missile battalion which arrived to protect the Danang air base.) With these initial deployments the Army-Marine race to build forces in Vietnam began in earnest and did not slow down until both became overextended, overcommitted, and depleted at home.

For years up to 1964 the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was then one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia. In 1964 there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what has become the quagmire of Vietnam. The intention at the time was that the war effort be kept small and "limited." But as the momentum and involvement built up, the military leaders rationalized a case that this was not a limited-objective exercise, but was a proper war in defense of the United States against "Communist aggression" and in honor of our area commitments.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery, and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders. Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam, they have managed the details of its conduct; and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to question the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Some of the credibility difficulties experienced by the Johnson Administration over its war situation reports and Vietnam policy can also be blamed in part upon the military advisers. By its very nature most military activity falls under various degrees of security classification. Much that the military plans or does must be kept from the enemy. Thus the military is indoctrinated to be secretive, devious, and misleading in its plans and operations. It does not, however, always confine its security restrictions to purely military operations. Each of the services and all of the major commands practice techniques of controlling the news and the release of self-serving propaganda: in "the interests of national defense," to make the service look good, to cover up mistakes, to build up and publicize a distinguished military personality, or to win a round in the continuous gamesmanship of the interservice contest. If the Johnson Administration suffered from lack of credibility in its reporting of the war, the truth would reveal that much of the hocus-pocus stemmed from schemers in the military services, both at home and abroad.

Our militaristic culture was born of the necessities of World War II, nurtured by the Korean War, and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc. Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope, and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives. The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and matériel development, and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts, and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single service doctrinaires, to create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anti-Communism, national defense, and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow, and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines and to self-maintenance and management. Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field test. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals. Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action. Being recognized public figures in a nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician. Flag officers are considered "experts," and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obliged not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive, and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems. Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them, are the rich and powerful defense industries. Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons, and lapel emblems, is a nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic, and well intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.

(NOTE.—The opinions contained herein are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.)

Mr. Speaker, another article appeared in last month's issue of Harper's—by Arthur Schlessinger, if I recall correctly—entitled "The End of the Age of Superpowers," in which it is pointed out that we have become a warrier nation, a nation concerned with militarism; that this militarism has become the dominant ethic of our society, and that it was the major factor which was leading us into the kind of difficulties that now face us all around the world.

On the long run, this kind of a development in America is bound to bring the United States into defeat and decay. It is bound to destroy our possibilities, our hopes of ever achieving the great strength which we all want to see for this country. It is this kind of concern we have—this kind of attitude toward American security. We desire to see America great because she has established her own greatness as a just power, as a power able to solve her own internal problems, and as a power concerned with liberty and freedom around the world; but not as a power concerned with enforcing by military means her own conception of what is good for a country.

These are the kinds of motives, the kinds of attitudes towards American security which motivate most of us who are opposed to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I could say a great deal more about this concept of security we find today—and I will not belabor it at great length—but we find today that the greatest demands upon the American budget—and this has been pointed out by many of the other speakers—are coming from our Department of Defense. We find that uniformly in the past requests for appropriations by the Department of Defense have been not only accepted by the Congress; they have even been added to. The militarists cannot seem to ask for enough money, even though they are now taking from a half to two-thirds of the total American Federal tax dollar.

This, of course, has happened because here in the Congress most of the leadership has believed that American security and American defense could be bought by a proliferation of additional hardware. But that is not true. It is impossible to buy defense against the kind of threats that exist in the world today by adding to the already bulging stockpile of nuclear weapons.

There is, of course, defense against conditions created by mass poverty, by mass hopelessness around the world and in our own country. However, there is no defense, in terms of bombs, against the power of ideas which seek to restructure the conditions of mankind. These things cannot be defended against by the expenditures now made by the Department of Defense.

If we do not recognize these concepts, then surely our security will become less and less strong in the years to come.

XUM

Unfortunately, what motivates a great part of the support by Congress for these huge military expenditures and what motivates the Department of Defense to a great degree to ask for these allocations is not really a concern for the defense of this country—even in military terms.

I do not think there is any rational Member of this body who thinks that any other country in the world is about to attack us. They did not attack us when we were a second or third or tenth rate power. There is very little logic in assuming that this great country, minding its own business, is likely to be attacked by any other power in the world.

Instead, what those people who seek high military appropriations want—and I think most of the time they perhaps do not even recognize themselves what they want—is to be able to continue down this road that America has been going on for the last generation—of putting a million or 1,500,000 troops overseas—of circling the globe with our Navy—of having bases in hundreds of locations around the world—of having our Air Force traverse all the skies of the world—and of being able to say that at any place in the world the end and the political goal which we seek will and must be obtained simply because of the fact that we have the power to obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a defense of America. That is a role of militarism around the world.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. I gather from the gentleman's statement that he has the same mistrust as I do with reference to the opinion of the so-called military experts—the experts who told us in February 1965, that if the Air Force were only unleashed that we would bomb the Northern Viets, the Vietcong, to the conference table; the experts who told the executive leadership and the congressional leadership of this country that only if we would increase our troop involvement, which at that time amounted to some 30,000 men—up to a quarter of a million men that we would prevail militarily; the military expertise that has been wrong time after time in their evaluation of this problem in Southeast Asia.

I wonder if the gentleman from California would comment just a little as to his view on just how much reliance the American people and the American political leadership should place on the opinions of our so-called military experts.

Mr. BROWN of California. I would be happy to do that. But let me say to the gentleman that what I am saying is not intended in any way to derogate the loyalty and patriotism or the honest desire of military experts to serve this country. It is only that they make their judgment within the framework that has only one value—the value of force. But today judgments can no longer be made on the basis of this one single value, even though there are other powers—other than the United States—which still feel this to be true that goals can be achieved in the world by simple utilization of superior military power, and that superior military strength is all that it takes.

American military men are not unique in feeling that this is true. There are persons with a similar point of view in every country, including countries that we conceive of as being our enemies, and it is this attitude—both in the U.S. military and around the world—which must be reversed today. The concept of war involving nuclear weapons is no longer absolutely impossible to contemplate. War under these terms is obsolete today. This kind of war would mean destruction of the human race. Yet, instead of recognizing that simple and elementary fact and proceeding to establish conditions under which such war becomes less probable, we move in exactly the opposite direction and proceed with policies which make inevitable such a war within our lifetime.

I do not wish to elaborate at any undue length on this subject. I think it is important to recognize that it is my concern—our concern—for American security and for a realistic defense of America which prompts the kinds of expressions we have been making about the war in Vietnam, the anti-ballistic-missile system, the role of the military, and the extensions of American power around the world.

It is not a desire to have America show a lack of concern for defense or security, or to have America play a second- or a third-rate role in the world. America is and probably will be for many years the world's greatest power and should act as the world's greatest power.

But that does not mean that America should take upon itself to give answers to problems of every other country in the world.

By way of conclusion, I merely wish to say that it pleased me a great deal to have two Members of Congress arise earlier today and indicate in connection with their concern about Vietnam that they were not going to vote for war any more, and that they were going to refuse to approve any additional appropriations for the war in Vietnam. I wish to commend those two Members for their statements, and I wish to associate myself with them.

I have never voted for any money for the Vietnam War. I wish to go even further. I feel that under the present circumstances I cannot vote for any military appropriations which are part and parcel of the policy of American imperialism around the world. I can no longer support, nor will I vote for, additional taxes on the American people to uphold this kind of policy, and hence I will vote against continuation of the 10 percent tax surcharge, an issue which will come before the House shortly.

I can no longer vote to allow this country to borrow money for militaristic purposes. Hence I shall vote against any further increasing of the debt ceiling or against any bills which would make it easier to borrow money to carry on our adventurism. And, much as I hate to say so, I can no longer support a foreign aid program which is primarily the instrument of a bilateral policy aimed at carrying out American security policies in the underdeveloped world.

So what I intend to do—and what I hope my colleagues will join me in doing—is to use the power granted to us by the Constitution to make clear our stand on these vital issues. If they do so, if they speak up as they should, I think that this great body will again assume the prerogatives which it was intended to assume under the Constitution. I look forward to that day.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am happy to have him here, and certainly hope that he will participate if he feels in the mood to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not want the RECORD to show that I was silent, in view of what the gentleman said in reference to my presence in the Chamber. I came to the floor in an effort to be constructive. I would like the RECORD to show that I have cooperated in every way possible with the gentleman's special order today, particularly in arranging for the attendance of the ladies in the gallery. But I wish also to point out that my effort does not indicate my approval of the gentleman's statements.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the Speaker. The reputation for fairness and generosity of our distinguished Speaker, even with those with whom he differs, is very outstanding. We are, of course, very grateful to the Speaker for it.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleagues for having the wisdom and concern to reserve this important period for debate on our continuing involvement in Vietnam, probably the most critical issue facing this country today. It is certainly the responsibility of the Congress, as a full and equal partner in our balanced federal system of government, to consider and debate both domestic and foreign issues. With the Nixon administration now apparently conducting a full-scale review of Vietnam policy, I think it is very much in the national interest for us to offer our thoughts and our counsel in this effort to seek sensible goals and objectives. As a Member of Congress, I have given countless hours of thought and study to the questions surrounding our commitment in Vietnam; like many Americans who are looking searchingly at this issue, I have encountered much that is doubtful and little that is certain. I think the time is at hand for an honest appraisal of the situation and a frank discussion of our alternatives at this point.

In terms of human life we are bearing a tragic burden; in terms of economics we are bearing a dangerous burden. While the peace talks continue in Paris, our casualty rates are again reaching record levels; while our cities and our poor go begging, war spending is continuing at record rates.

Before and during last year's campaign, the general consensus of American opinion indicated rather strongly that patience with this war is wearing thin, and that our priorities are seriously inverted—that we have allowed what was intended to be a limited war with limited objectives to become an intolerably open-ended drain on our human and economic resources. I submit that we have no justification for allowing those conclusions to be ignored or forgotten while this Nation drifts toward foreign or domestic disaster. Instead, we must examine our commitment and our objectives in order to determine a reasoned set of goals and expectations.

I am unequivocally opposed to any further escalation of this war. Again and again we have escalated and again and again the enemy has matched us, man for man, weapon for weapon. The conflict is clearly a stalemate, with neither side able to declare victory or willing to accept defeat.

The lessons which the United States has learned in Vietnam have been bitter ones. The kind of allout military victory which we have achieved in past wars is not possible in this new guerrilla warfare except, possibly, through near-total destruction of Vietnam, both North and South. This is not our objective. We have also learned that even the mightiest nation in the world cannot expect to extend itself halfway around the world and easily thwart the plans of a small, relatively weak people. These lessons, unpleasant as they are, ought not to be wasted or rationalized; they should serve as an impetus for an objective reassessment of the situation leading to the quickest possible end of our involvement.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have consistently advocated full military preparedness and the strongest possible support of our troops wherever they serve. I do not, however, agree with those who view a desire for peace in Vietnam as being in conflict with these principles; full support of our troops certainly must include acting to bring them home.

In 1962, President Kennedy stated that though we could aid, support, and train South Vietnamese forces to protect their nation, it is still their war, and it must be fought by them and won by them. I think our experience in this war bears our late President out. The time has come for us to initiate a major shifting of responsibility from United States to South Vietnamese forces. Much was said recently about reducing our present combat force in South Vietnam, but it does not seem to be coming to pass. Though the President and the Secretary of Defense did talk earlier about significant troop withdrawals, they are now on record as saying there is no possibility of reducing troop levels now or in the immediate future. We have been told that the Army of South Vietnam has made a great deal of progress, but it is apparently not adequate to permit any changes in the number of American troops currently in combat. When will the progress be adequate? How soon will we be able to actually de-Americanize this war and allow South Vietnamese to determine South Vietnamese destiny? This is now the longest war in our history. I am deeply concerned that a continuing and excessive fear of any Viet Cong threat in South Vietnam could solidify the foundations for an indefinite, costly commitment of men and materiel; in other words, a long, open-ended Asian land war against which we have been repeatedly warned for years by many leading Americans.

It is clear that the civilian and military ruling class of South Vietnam are not anxious to compromise with the enemy or witness a reduction in the level of our involvement. While billions of dollars continue to flow into South Vietnam, reports of corruption and war profiteering continue to flow out. The Thieu-Ky regime is a product of the American commitment, and that commitment is apparently the only force which can sustain that regime. Therefore, can we rightly claim that what we have accomplished in Vietnam is the creation of a stable, independent, and popularly supported government, or are we, in fact, really an occupying force sustaining a regime which will exist only as long as our force remains?

I am well aware that the forces of North Vietnam continue to be strong and determined; such a threat obviously does not disappear overnight. Nevertheless, I believe that the most rapid possible disengagement of American troops, with the Army of South Vietnam taking over the largest possible share of the fighting, should now be our primary objective. If the South Vietnamese are honestly intent upon defending their nation, the time is at hand for them to shoulder the responsibilities and assume the burdens.

President Thieu's recent offer to hold private unconditional talks with the National Liberation Front is, however, a hopeful sign. This conflict must ultimately be settled through negotiation, not escalation, and private talks with little fanfare or publicity are likely to be the real source of progress in Paris, rather than the larger, more open talks involving all parties. A logical objective for us to pursue would be simultaneous progress in both secret and official talks in Paris and in a program of military disengagement in South Vietnam. It is also worth noting that President Thieu now appears to accept the belief that escalation is not the answer, as he has now stated that, in his opinion, a resumption of the bombing of the North will not constitute an appropriate response to the enemy offensive in the South.

To those who continually insist that we are in too deep to turn back, I suggest the analogy of the cardplayer who, having bet the limit, decides to remain in the game despite the fact that he has already gone too far; he cannot retrieve his losses, but rather than accept reality, he digs in deeper, thinking he can reverse his fate. I am persuaded that our present dilemma in Vietnam is of a similar nature. To dig in deeper would be a tragic mistake. Other obligations, especially with regard to our domestic crises, are simply too urgent to permit such a massive war commitment to be prolonged or enlarged.

We are now at a crossroads; this is the time to initiate a prompt and decisive timetable for this disengagement. I fear the only alternative is to become hopelessly mired in the quicksand that is the endless squandering of our previous human and economic resources. To conclude that such a costly burden is in the best national interest of the United States would be a disasterous misjudgment.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war continues as the most urgent and pressing problem facing our country. That it must be ended and soon, there can be no doubt. The real question is the willingness of the American people to accept the realities of this war, and to acknowledge that indeed the political issues must be left to the people of South Vietnam to resolve by themselves. This is what President Johnson said when he reiterated so often the right of self-determination as belonging to the South Vietnamese. It appears still to be the position of the new Nixon administration. This I feel is the crux of the problem as well as the heart of the solution.

I am greatly encouraged to hear that despite all indications of a military escalation following the Tet observances, that private talks are now endorsed by both our Government and the Thieu-Ky Saigon regime. If indeed the military aspects can be resolved by the United States and North Vietnam, then it will fall upon the leaders of the NLF and the South Vietnamese Government to resolve the internal political issues concerning the future governance of South Vietnam. This is the prospect for peace that promises the greatest hope so that we shall be able as a nation to return to the real priorities of this century.

The peace conference in Paris must succeed. The military pressures within our country to escalate the war must be subdued. Instead we must use all our efforts to persuade our policymakers that indeed the people of this country are prepared to accept terms of settlement which will bring an end to our military commitment, by stages if necessary, and which will reserve to the people of South Vietnam the responsibility for determining the form and content of their future government. Once this determination is agreed upon, then I would hope that the United Nations would be called upon to preserve the stability of the settlement which has been achieved.

The formula for peace in Vietnam seems so obvious to me. I hope that it is as equally obvious to our new administration.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the year since former President Johnson's speech urging a prompt settlement of the war, and particularly in the 4 months since the bombing halt on Hanoi, our involvement in Vietnam has become more entrenched. The speech and the bombing halt seemingly deceived a lot of Americans—they thought the war would soon be over, and they have proceeded accordingly to halt the protests, stop the debate, and wait for the troops to come home.

XUM

The intent of this special order today is to alert the country to the continuing escalation of the war in Vietnam. For, while we had our backs turned on the war, the situation has deteriorated; more American boys have died; we have increased rather than decreased the number of battalion-sized operations by American and South Vietnamese troops; and we have allowed the Paris Peace Talks to dwindle to mere rumors of "possible peace in the unforeseeable future." I want to congratulate the various peace groups in the country, such as the Women's Strike for Peace, which have kept the vigil over the interminable war in Southeast Asia and have urged Congress to reopen the debate.

The war must be ended as soon as possible because so many things hinge on its settlement. We are pouring money, manpower, and lives into a hole that keeps getting larger; it can never be filled. The crisis in our cities demands attention before it, too, becomes totally unmanageable. We cannot seek "peace and democracy," if indeed, that is what we seek in Vietnam, while we allow the conditions which spawn tragedy in the cities to go unremedied. We must reassess our priorities, now—negotiate a settlement in Vietnam, and withdraw American troops as soon as possible, or we chart a perilous course for America which will cost us dearly in human suffering. We must obtain peace in Vietnam so that we can maintain peace in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, that we will never "win" the war in Vietnam, the enemy clearly is not on the run and is prepared to fight for another 10 or 20 years if we do not decide to come home. A negotiated peace among all the parties to the war will not create a loss of face for the United States. In fact, turning our attention and treasury away from Vietnam and back to our domestic crisis will probably increase our prestige among all those at home and abroad who are still trying to figure out what we were doing in Vietnam in the first place. No one respects a man who gambles away his assets while his children are starving.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, w'll the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may, in noting the presence of the distinguished Speaker on the floor, I want to express my appreciation to him for having made the caucus room available to me today so that the ladies from Women Strike for Peace may gather there. I know that they also appreciate the courtesy which the Speaker extended.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. It is a pleasure to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Perhaps my presence on the floor is not as markedly evident as that of the Speaker, but I would like to suggest that when a colonel of infantry in World War II, who has done his share of killing and sending others into the horrors of war, joins in this debate as a friend of the man in the well and one who admires him for speaking out and speaking out now, I hope it will be noticed to some extent.

Justice Frankfurter said one time: Wisdom is a virtue which comes so seldom that even when it comes late, it should not be rejected.

I have gained considerable wisdom over the past couple of years. I went along with the designs and the desires of our military people and I supported my party and my President—I had hoped for the best.

During the course of my study of this conflict, I found we must do more than study and wait and support. And if a small collection of Members go into the well today to suggest to the State Department and to the Defense Department and to the administration that we have had enough of waiting and that peace is too precious to wait for in silence, then I am closer to the number engaging in this dialog than I have ever been before.

I have studied day by day the reports of the military in behalf of our forces and read the daily bulletins. I read that the B-52's are still striking day by day and province by province. I read that we are moving away from the old concept of search and destroy, but we are still engaging in what they call sweep and clear, or search and clear.

This may not mean much to the layman, but to me as an infantryman it means day-by-day offensive military operations.

I know belligerence begets belligerence, and at a time when we are discussing compatibility and exchange of ideas in Paris, I would hope that a restraint could intrude itself upon the military in their day-by-day operations in the theater of combat. I have not seen this in a sufficient degree yet.

I am constrained to object when the commander in chief of the Pacific, Admiral McCain, sets forth in no uncertain terms a statement of belligerence in behalf of my Government in the February Reader's Digest. I suspect Ho Chi Minh reads the Reader's Digest, or has it read for him, and when he finds out we mean to fight to the finish, and the peace talks should produce not just a peace, but some sort of determination of victory for our side, I think that probably has and will cost us more American lives, because the North Vietnamese were moved to fight harder and to fight in response.

I do not think the peace policy of our country should be formed in the Reader's Digest. I would hope that would not happen.

I would hope that what the Secretary of Defense has learned from his recent visit to the theater of operations in Vietnam could just as well educate us as it educates him, and that his communication of knowledge would not be confined to the Armed Services Committee. Perhaps it would be fitting for him and for the Secretary of State to visit with us in this Chamber in executive session and tell us what their plans are toward peace and their plans toward the reduction in hostilities that they have in mind for us in the months to come. I would like to know.

I am not entitled to be privy to the high councils of our Nation in the search for peace, but I must respond to the people who have told me that mothers and fathers do not want to go any further with the war. I must respond to them.

What I know now disturbs me as I assess our recent operations in the field.

I read the calendar. I saw that there were ultimate preparations made to respond to the projected Tet offensive. I am wondering if some of our preparations did not add to the intensity and the ferocity of the enemy Tet offensive. Perhaps our preparations begot the offensive to some degree.

These are military operations which are beyond the knowledge of a Member of the House. I wonder how long we can allow these operations to be beyond the knowledge of a Member of the House if we are truly to represent all our people in the search for peace.

As I study the calendar I see we did respond in February to a degree to try to secure some reduction of hostilities. In the words of the last Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, I was told we were trying to bring about disengagement. I thought disengagement made sense. We tried it on a unit-by-unit basis, to pull our troops back and to pull them away, hoping the enemy would do the same. In some cases I was informed they did the same in response to our initiatives and casualties fell.

If this was possible under Secretary Clifford's policy, why is it not still possible today? Can we not engage in disengagement in that theater while we talk at Paris? These should be a parity of effort, so that we say what we mean in Saigon and we say what we mean in Paris, and do what we mean in Saigon as we say what we mean in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Post, written by Clayton Fritchey, entitled "Of War and Words," where our actions and our words are in diametric contrast.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

Of War and Words

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—Through the courtesy of official spokesmen, on the one hand, and the American press, on the other, this column brings you a special report on the progress of the Vietnam war:

"We have the enemy licked now . . . He cannot even mount another major offensive."—Adm. John McCain, U.S. commander-in-chief, Pacific, in the February issue of Reader's Digest.

SAIGON, March 6.—U.S. military forces in South Vietnam suffered 453 battle deaths during the first week of the Communists' current offensive. Not since last May have more Americans been killed in combat in one week. (Washington Post.)

SAIGON, February 27.—On Feb. 6 President Thieu said some U.S. combat units could begin leaving this year. Today he offered this clarification: one and possibly two U.S. divisions could leave South Vietnam during the last six months of 1969. (news dispatch)

WASHINGTON. March 14.—President Nixon said today there was no prospect for reduction of American military forces in South Vietnam in the foreseeable future because of the current enemy offensive. (New York Times)

SAIGON, January 3.—It is a large measure of agreement among military men that Viet Cong attacks these days show poor planning, poor execution and poor tactical leadership. (New York Times)

SAIGON, February 26.—More than 1000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese pushed to within 15 miles of Saigon today, seized a group of refugee villages in Bien Hoa and fought their way to the edge of the busiest American air base in South Vietnam on the fourth day of the enemy offensive. (Washington Star)

SAIGON, January 31.—Premier Huong declared tonight that his government's goal is to control 100 per cent of South Vietnam's population at the end of 1969. (Washington Post)

SAIGON, February 4.—Viet Cong terrorism increased nearly 30 percent in South Vietnam last month, allied officials reported this evening. (New York Times)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said today that he was accelerating the program to prepare South Vietnamese troops to replace some American soldiers . . . in Congressional testimony last May 28 former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford said that the South Vietnamese "are ready to bear an increasing burden and thereby enable us to level off and in due time reduce our contribution." (New York Times)

SAIGON, December 5.—South Vietnamese army desertions have climbed sharply in the last six months, allied military sources said today. (Washington Post)

"The enemy seems to be approaching a point of desperation," Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff, told reporters last year. (As reported in The Progressive)

SAIGON, February 25.—American casualties rose steadily today as the Viet Cong's new offensive continued for a third day. (Washington Post)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Chairman John C. Stennis (D-Miss.) of the Senate Armed Service Committee yesterday asked the Pentagon to provide Congress with facts—no "rosy pictures"—on the Vietnam war: "We've gone along for years with the same rosy, rosy picture."

Mr. CAREY. I think to our friends and allies and to our so-called enemy alike, we had better begin saying what we mean, and that we mean peace, and that this be portrayed in actions consonant with the search for peace.

If I were a Vietnamese or a Vietcong living in Kontum Province or one of the other outlying Provinces 25 miles or more from Saigon, and I saw a B–52, with eight engines, drop its bombload on my neighborhood, whether under the military control of the Vietcong or not, I simply would not know and understand the bombing had stopped. It would not do me any good to know that the Americans are not bombing near Hanoi any longer or above the DMZ, because they are still bombing my hamlet, my village, my area.

As I study the calendar, again I say to my friend in the well, Mr. Speaker, the greatest day in the history of the world in the making of peace, the rebirth of man, is just ahead of us. Easter is coming, and Passover. And all men will commune with themselves and with their neighbors on what we have done to bring about the peace.

Perhaps this is a time for us to urge upon the Chief Executive of the United States and the administration now in power and upon the Secretary of State that there is here a chance for a new initiative.

If it is right to respond to the Vietcong, to the North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese, in order to suspend hostilities for the Tet holiday, and we are in doubt about who caused the offensive and who carried away the day, can we not, as Christians and Jews alike, celebrating Easter and Passover, call upon the world in the days of Easter and Passover to come, to reduce the hostilities now and forever, once and for all, with a ceasefire, a suspension of all bombing, and a disengagement of forces without delay, beginning during the week to come, Holy Week and Easter Week?

No one could mistake our meaning. No secret talks are needed, simply the appeal to conscience in the world.

I say again, if I have been late in coming to your numbers and adding to your words I will have to live with this for the rest of my life, with my family, with my children, and my countrymen, but there are too few here today to hear what you are saying and to join in what you are doing.

I am pleased at least on the minority side we do have Members present—not as many as there are on this side.

However, numbers are not important any more excepting the numbers that we hear day after day in terms of casualty reports from the other side of the world. There will always be another side of the world, Mr. Speaker, if we can take and continue to take joy or consolation or horror from the fact that we have outnumbered them in killing 10 to 1, that they have lost 300,000 and we have lost 30,000. The day of the body count must end. Every human being in this world is entitled to another day of life. We gain nothing when we point to a victory against our so-called enemy. The world wants to hear only that we have stopped killing and that we have done our utmost to use our power for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman in the well for giving me this opportunity to say in this day and hour that I hope, I pray, and I aspire that your numbers will grow and that your words will be heard, because until they are heard I fear for my children and for the children of this world because the elders did not stay and listen.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) for his moving contribution.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from California in yielding, and appreciate this opportunity to comment today on events that crowd in on all of us.

We have come a year since the startling week when a shaken America lost Martin Luther King, Jr., and heard an incumbent President announce his decision to retire. What a year it has been.

We round now into another year with frustration and impatience abroad in the land; with fundamental problems unattended; with the national malaise poised, as it were, in midair; with the confidence of the people in their ability to affect the direction of their Government wobbling; with some men talking intermittently in Paris and others dying uninterruptedly in Vietnam.

Some have asked why those of us who are opposed to the war have seemed so quiet during the opening months of the new administration. Some have been quiet because of the patience traditional among Americans toward new Presidents as they assume office. Some have been quiet because in a national mood of expectancy and hope, noise might fall on ears determinedly deaf. Some have been quiet in response to President Nixon's suggestion in his inaugural address that affirmative virtue might in fact reside in a period of relative silence.

But if many have been quiet, none have become quiescent. And the quiet has come not because the American people will accept a decision to continue the war, but because they expect a decision to discontinue it.

Why then do some of us speak now, when clearly it would be unfair to expect a new President to bring peace overnight where there has been war for over a quarter of a century.

And indeed, the dilemma is a difficult one. For if we speak now, some will say our voices may undermine the negotiations and thus delay peace itself. And some may even say that we betray a lack of faith in the good will or the high purpose of the new President.

Yet, if we remain silent in the aftermath of recent remarks by the Secretary of Defense and in the backwash of developments in Vietnam, we may by that silence be helping to seal decisions by the administration based on miscalculations of the public mood. Should such decisions lead to a repetition of the errors of the last years of the Johnson administration, we would all be ensnared in the spiral of calamities that must then befall America.

So there is a responsibility to speak now, to do what we can to make visible the fears and hopes of that vast number of Americans who participated in the events that led to the collective national decision to reverse course in Vietnam and to get on with the business at home.

And we speak in a spirit not of accusation against the President nor of attack against his motives, but rather in support of what we hope and believe from his inaugural address and from many of his comments since then, are in fact his goals, too.

We hope he will accept our suggestions and the public energies that will be displayed in furtherance of these suggestions as part of the effort to make it easier for him to do what he wants to do, to lead where he wants to lead, to make America what he wants America to be. For we know that President Nixon is a man who craves peace for his country and for the world as deeply as anyone; but we know that President Johnson before him was such a man also, and we know how far from peace his course wandered.

Thus the Johnson administration found itself caught in what became an endless circle of disaster—a disaster that became inexorable once policies were adopted that were based on logic that was as unyielding as it was faulty in its premises. Thus, the Johnson administration, in what must stand as a classic example of a syllogism in reverse proceeded with flawless logic from tragic error to tragic error, unwilling or unable to reexamine original defective premises on which the whole structure of its Vietnamese policy first foundered, tottered, and then collapsed. We speak now in the hope that the new administration is engaged in the kind of determined reexamination of those premises—premises about the nature of the war, about the requirements of national security, about the arrangement of national priorities, about the way in which America should face her obligations as a world power.

It seems inconceivable at this juncture that any such fundamental reexamination would not conclude that the purpose of negotiations about Vietnam must now be limited to three goals:

First. To make possible the orderly withdrawal of American troops.

Second. To provide protection for South Vietnamese who would rather relocate themselves than stay on after American troops have withdrawn.

Third. To allow time for the transition in both South Vietnam and the United States—time during which the present Government of South Vietnam could take over the war if it should decide to do so or could enter into negotiations for an acceptable settlement if it should choose to do that.

I would suggest that these goals are consistent with the original purposes of the American intervention in Vietnam and are in fact negotiable now.

If these are not the goals now being sought by our negotiators in Paris, we must face again the consequences of an endless unwinnable and disastrous war, disastrous to the American people even as to the Vietnamese. But if these are the goals, the American people, even in their impatience to have done with war, will not begrudge the time necessary to achieve them.

Too much is happening to feel secure that these are in fact the goals. American offensive activities on the ground in South Vietnam have increased since the halt in the bombing of the north, and Admiral McCain, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and others equally eminent, have told us that this is necessary to secure a better bargaining position.

The Secretary of Defense has told us that he does not think there is a possibility "for any American troop withdrawal in any significant numbers," even as Admiral McCain assures us:

> We have the enemy licked now; he is beaten.

So once again the familiar contrapuntal ambivalences of pronouncements of imminent success and predictions of long-range difficulties begin to rain upon the American people in the same disquieting pattern that led the Johnson administration from national consensus into credibility gap and eventually into discredited chasms where it was abandoned by the American people.

And so, with anniversaries pressing on the calendar, with young men dying in greater numbers than a year ago, and with confusion about the meaning of events and statements that threaten to drown out the President's own words, it becomes our obligation to discuss the situation and report the facts as we find them:

First. The cost of the war, still running at more than $30 billion a year, still preempts the resources and energies of the Nation.

Second. The revolt of young people smolders in the mainstream and erupts with increasing irrationality and bitterness at the edges.

Third. The erosion of American influence in a world community faced with the great problems of Central Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa, continues, with sad consequences to the best interests of the American people and of countless other people elsewhere.

Fourth. The decline of the United Nations as an effective force for peace and social justice proceeds unchecked toward a point perilously close to no return, at the very moment when men concerned with survival itself should be harnessing their best energies to deal with the massive problems presented by new advances in technology and weaponry, by the population explosion, by the opportunities and challenges of outer space, and by the horrors of the widening gap between those who have and those who have not, all over the world.

Fifth. More than 11,000 American servicemen are now dead who were alive at this time a year ago. A thousand more die each month so that this week, the total of American deaths in Vietnam will surpass the total of American deaths in Korea, and this year will surpass the total in World War I.

And all these facts, these leaden reminders that weigh on the hearts of so many men and women who love this country, are made ever more unacceptable by the additional circumstance that our people have in two presidential elections voted as clearly as our system made possible for change to policies in the direction of peace; and by the horrifying awareness that no additional number of killed or maimed Americans can in fact contribute to the national security or protect the national interest, or advance the national purpose.

So before thousands more are dead and thousands more are in exile or in jail, and before millions more have joined those who doubt the meaning of the electoral process itself; and before another anniversary has come round with another commission to report that we are not embarked on the great national agenda laid forth by the Kerner Commission, and before another administration finds itself trapped into inevitable error by choosing continually between false options and then defending false options with inconsistent and sometimes dishonest explanations; and before the very fabric of the unity of this Nation unravels in an acid sea of hate, and self-doubt, and self-recrimination, we address as urgently as words can manage this plea to the President to begin the implementation of the reversed course which will help to buy the time necessary to finish the reversing of course.

Soon we in the Congress will be asked again for the funds to continue prosecution of the war and then, as before, Members of Congress will face the most unacceptable of alternatives: for they will be told that to refuse to appropriate money to protect our fighting men is to consign to death yet more of those Americans least deserving to die—those Americans who in carrying out the orders of their Government have displayed a valor and a loyalty to country that in the face of the difficulties and uncertainties of the situation which they have been placed in must rank with the highest such response of our history.

Yet valor and loyalty do not make wrong things right, or senseless policies sensible, or hopeless pursuits hopeful. So there will be those who feel that to vote money for the further prosecution of the war is not to protect lives but indeed to make more certain that more lives will be pointlessly lost.

It is the imminence of this decision and the existence of stalemate and escalation in Paris and Vietnam that leads me then to urge upon the President the following steps:

First, the United States should begin at the earliest possible moment to withdraw with all deliberate speed as large a part of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam as would be consistent with the continued safety of those men who remain behind.

Second, this Government should make clear to those whom we have supported and opposed alike that it is our intention to continue to withdraw American

XUM

troops from South Vietnam until none shall remain, providing only that during this continuing withdrawal the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong will participate in good faith efforts to resolve by negotiation the negotiable questions mentioned above.

Third, the United States should reiterate its willingness to assist in the relocation of people who do not wish to remain in South Vietnam under new circumstances that must arise in any peace settlement and to assist through international agencies in the reconstruction of the land devastated by so many years of war.

I am convinced on the record of the past year that should these steps be taken by the President now, the effect would be to facilitate negotiations rather than to hinder them, to remove roadblocks between the American people and the most nearly satisfactory resolution of their most difficult dilemma, and to shorten the tragedy already too long in progress.

Should the President take these steps, it would signal at last the determination of the American people to let the Vietnamese people settle their own affairs, and would in fact "strengthen the bargaining position" of our negotiators in seeking on both sides the quickest possible end to war and the least painful transition to reconstruction.

Once these steps were taken and the American purpose were clear, there would be new unity in support of those who are negotiating, new hope for healing of the spirit of the land, an irrefutable rebuttal to those who have denied the efficacy of the democratic process and who would tear it down on the pretext that it has become irrelevant.

The money necessary for the protection of the lives of those Americans still in the combat area would then be voted without the haunting sense that each dollar proclaimed as protection might in fact increase the likelihood of destruction.

And above all, the President could get on with the pressing national business so long deferred and already so difficult to address. The recitation of this national agenda has become almost a national litany, repeated as if repetition somehow will remove the need for action.

The reform of electoral and legislative process; the reform of the tax structure; the end of compulsory military duty; the development of programs to end hunger and malnutrition and to place a floor below which no American need live; the building of adequate houses; the development of mass transport systems; construction of schools and the paying of livable wages to teachers and other public servants; the checking of the poisoning of the environment so we may again breath the air, drink the water, and enjoy the beaches of this fair land; the ordering of our relationships with other nations in the tradition of the good neighbor; the reconstruction of the United Nations so that it can begin again the painful task of building world order where the words peace and justice will not ring as cynical reminders of lost dreams; and, above all, the beginning of the healing of the national spirit, the beginning of the accomplishment of the revolution in attitudes and values that, accomplished in a spirit of national reconciliation, can alone make America what America must be if she is not to become the greatest monument to the failure of self-government in the history of the human race.

It is almost 1 year ago today that Senator Robert Kennedy, speaking in Kansas said:

> But I am concerned . . . that the course we are following at the present time is deeply wrong. . . . I am concerned that, at the end of it all, there will only be more Americans killed, more of our treasure spilled out, and because of the bitterness and hatred on every side of this war, more hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese slaughtered; so that they may say, as Tacitus said of Rome: "They made a desert and called it peace," I don't think that's satisfactory for the United States of America. I do not think that is what the American spirit is really about. I do not think that is what this country stands for.

We are standing here in this House today in the absence of Dr. King and Senator Kennedy, with the memory what it was they told us to do and with the determination that what they wanted done will be done even with the greater difficulties that attend doing it in their absence.

It is because nothing less than the course of the history of this great land and its favored people is at stake at this moment of anniversary and rededication, of despair and opportunity, that we address ourselves so urgently and prayerfully to the President.

We attend his response, patiently, but in the hope that he shall not confuse patience with acquiescence in too long continuing a silence.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman and to commend him for his very thoughtful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that it is of the utmost urgency that the fighting in Vietnam be brought to a halt soon. I am hopeful that this discussion on the floor of the House today will have the effect of adding to the sense of urgency attached by the White House to achieving such a prompt cessation of hostilities.

Accordingly, I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. EDWARDS of California for arranging this special order.

Mr. Speaker, for almost a year the war in Vietnam has been practically a dormant issue. On March 31, 1968, then President Johnson announced a partial halt in the bombing of North Vietnam and said further that he would not seek another term as President. Within a few days the North Vietnamese had agreed to negotiations. And, in an instant, the differences between hawks and doves were blurred—no longer were doves those who favored a halt to the bombing and a negotiated settlement and the hawks those who did not. In fact, since last March the only real discernible difference between hawks and doves has been the degree of willingness to tolerate continued death and enormous expense in Vietnam.

But because public positions have become less clear and public interest has appeared to wane, I do not believe it is correct to say that the American people attach any less importance to a cessation of hostilities.

The American people are fed up and embarrassed by the war. Moreover, they are even guilty, anxious, and tired just thinking about the war.

Vietnam has retreated from the front page. Most people have ceased to read the casualty reports and the battle accounts in the newspapers. The television news is less replete with film footage on the progress of the war.

How many people have lulled and sedated themselves to the issue, wishing only that it would go away?

As I sense the mood, the American people basically do not like the war. They are not convinced of its necessity, and they feel it is not worth the high taxes and inflation and death it has caused. But, most Americans, too, are stoic—almost as if the war were beyond their control. Protests and demonstrations are not their thing, and besides they seem not to work. And so it is, I think, that the American people have resigned themselves with a hope and prayer—a hope that their leaders will lead them out of the war, and back to the work of making American life a joyful, significant pioneer experience—a fulfillment of the Whitman vision and the American dream.

At this point what is needed is for this popular distaste for the war to be translated into a greater sense of urgency on the part of the new administration. The public does not condone a honeymoon of harmony but inaction on the Vietnam question. I would hope that this discussion today will help translate this popular sentiment into that greater sense of urgency.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House to suggest any strategic proposals for a solution. And while I seek to convey a sense of urgency, I do not intend to limit the public options available to the President. Only if time passes without sufficient progress, will it be appropriate to force specific suggestions upon the President's attention.

For the moment, then, I will content myself with one very significant procedural suggestion.

In my view the first step toward any solution in Vietnam is for the new administration to define its objectives in Vietnam. In this Congress can be of help.

It will not be possible to adequately assess any proposal, or to make any offer or counteroffer, unless and until we know what at a very minimum we are seeking in Vietnam.

This does not mean that it will be necessary to make public these conditions of a minimum acceptable compromise, but it does mean that within the administration it is essential that a minimum position be worked out.

XUM

Moreover, it will be necessary to decide what objectives in addition to these minimum conditions we would like to negotiate, and in turn to decide the relative priority to be attached to each of these additional marginal objectives. With these goals well in hand it will then be possible to make new and imaginative steps toward a negotiated peace, and to discard those past positions which bear no real connection with our minimum intentions.

In the formulation of these minimum and additional goals, I believe it will be necessary to assess long-range American policies in Asia—to put into perspective and real terms the roles of the United States, our present allies and our present adversaries. We will have to ask whether a particular approach to Vietnam negates another approach to the problems of Japan, or the Philippines, or Korea. We will have to ask whether a particular type of involvement in Vietnam will necessitate a similar continued involvement in other countries. In short, we will have to consider the Vietnamese questions in the whole fabric of Asian Pacific relations over the long term.

In the formulation of these goals, too, we will have to weigh the merits of solutions calling for a continued American involvement against those which would allow a larger involvement with domestic problems. We will have to measure the need for our resources in Vietnam against the needs for them in other parts of the world and at home. In sum, we will have to put Vietnam solutions into the context of competing demands on severely limited fiscal and manpower resources.

It will also be necessary to evaluate the situation on the ground in Vietnam today to formulate these minimum goals. This will mean not only evaluating the military situation, but evaluating the toll of more fighting on the morale of the Vietnamese people and the prospects of reconstruction of the Vietnamese nation. It will mean evaluating the possibility of imposing a solution on the competing groups or merely withdrawing ourselves and allowing the forces then existing to shape a solution. It will mean choosing ultimately between solutions more or less likely to yield pro-American regimes. But hopefully too, it will mean evaluating the costs of solutions which are relatively more likely to yield pro-American regimes against the backdrop of their costs in dollars and lives at home, and in loss of respectful public opinion at home and in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can find an acceptable solution in Vietnam if we make these evaluations, and in the process release ourselves from goals and strategies unrelated to prompt cessation of hostilities at minimum cost. I most respectfully urge the new President and his administration to carry out these evaluations and to seek these new avenues. The alternative is continued war, and perhaps as our patience wanes, a very great risk of further escalation in this already overheated conflagration.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that after this evaluation we will find that—as President Kennedy reminded us years ago—this is a Vietnamese war, and it will be won or lost by the Vietnamese. Our continued military presence can only sap the national spirit of the Vietnamese and allow a certain air of unreality to permeate the thinking of certain Vietnamese. The Vietnamese will be able to find a solution to this Vietnamese problem—and a continued American involvement may make it more difficult, rather than less difficult, to achieve this Vietnamese solution.

Despite the fact that the findings on reevaluation of our Vietnam objectives may be much different from our present and past objectives, I strongly commend the exercise to the new administration and to my colleagues here in the Congress.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman now in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), and others of our colleagues who have partaken in this discussion today.

The country ought to be grateful to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the three gentlemen from California (Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. EDWARDS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for providing an opportunity for this body to look at America's agony—the war in Vietnam. There are some who say that any discussion of the war by members of Congress is not met because the President is entitled to 100 days free of criticism. On the possibility that there is indeed something magic about 100 days—as opposed to 173 days—I would agree. Indeed, if the purpose of discussing Vietnam is to criticize President Nixon or criticism in general, I would agree whatever the time limit. Too many people in public life have suffered too much anguish from criticism for the sake of criticism about the war in Vietnam. If there is anyone who believes that any occupant of the White House can be comfortable while the war in Vietnam continues, my words cannot reach him nor are they intended to.

I assume that President Nixon, like his predecessor and like all of the other candidates for President, before and after the national nominating conventions earnestly desires to see a termination of our part in the war in Vietnam.

The purpose of this discussion rather is to remind ourselves and the people we represent that the burden is not only on the Chief Executive; that burden under our system must be shared by the legislative branch as well. Just as former President Johnson pointed to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as the authorization for our military activities in Vietnam, so the Congress continues to possess the awesome power to continue, modify or terminate our participation in the hostilities.

It has been argued that while the negotiations pend at Paris, any public discussion of strategies or fall-back positions is impolitic, if not downright treasonable. Those arguers forget that the great strength and weakness for democracy is that ultimate decisions are made by the people. I am not suggesting that this body or the other body deliver ultimatums either to our negotiators or their negotiators as to when a formula for peace must be reached ere some other alternative course of action is taken.

I am saying that every Member of Congress bears a joint and several responsibility for deciding, with or without the administration, the war and peace posture of this country as it relates to Vietnam. That decision cannot be delegated, not even to our negotiators at Paris, let alone to the negotiators for South Vietnam, let alone to the negotiators for the Vietcong or North Vietnam. Put another way, is there any doubt that at some point the best interests of this country, and indeed the world, would be served best by terminating our participation in the hostilities even if some other team of negotiators, allied or enemy, did not agree? I would remind the members of this body that former President Johnson stated over and over again that if the South Vietnamese Government ever told us to get out, we would get out. That pledge was not conditioned on any reciprocal action on the part of the North Vietnamese.

If our continued participation in the hostilities was then, and presumably is now, conditioned only on the will of the South Vietnamese Government, should it not be conditioned similarly on the will of the people of the United States? Is there not some point when our capacity to continue fighting in this war, either because of will or wherewithal, is just as relevant a consideration as the desires of the South Vietnamese Government—or the tractability of the North Vietnamese negotiators at Paris?

As the branch which authorizes the size of our Armed Forces, as the branch which allocates the wherewithal of this country, as the branch which states the broad policy aspirations, which the President seeks to execute, Congress cannot escape the responsibility for its decisions. No one will be around to justify or interpret the decision or lack of decision by this Congress either of which may cause the greatest recorded democracy to crumble into chaos. We must ask ourselves, and re-ask ourselves, what is our breaking point?

When is the plight of our cities and our schools so great that we must devote the money and manpower now seeking to save Saigon to seek to save Chicago instead or New York, or Detroit? When does the tension and hostility between the young and the not-so-young, the black and the white, the have-nots, and the haves, become so great that we must devote our wherewithal to easing that tension and hostility rather than finding a modus vivendi between North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese? When does the alienation of our youth become an anxiety so acute that we must turn all our attention to the tears in this society—even at the expense of terminating our involvement in Vietnam less than gracefully. The French left Vietnam less than gracefully; they left Algeria less than gracefully; who is so great a seer as to say they did not act from a desperate concern for the life of France as a country?

Those decisions—as to when and how, and whether—unfortunately are not the exclusive agony of the President; whether a President of 60 days, 90 days, or 5 years. So long as Congress retains the power that it unquestionably has, we similarly retain the responsibility. No one understanding our system can reject the proposition that Congress is more than a repository of advisory impotency. If the country's existence is indeed threatened by the Vietnamese venture, who says we are powerless? And if it is not so threatened, than why are the signs so ominous? Why do we now have a huge command center at the Pentagon for communication and deployment use for riots and disorders? Why does every large city in the country, including the District of Columbia, seek more policemen, more riot equipment, and express more concern about law and order? Why do most of the colleges and many of the high schools have one brush with disaster after another? Has the whole younger generation gone mad? Do we really think that all of the campus disorders are caused by a small group of revolutionaries operating with Cuban gold or Moscow gold? Or are the young people trying to tell us something? Are they trying to give us perhaps the last clear chance to restore domestic tranquillity by devoting the great wealth and strength of this country to that prior item? There are courses that this Congress will follow and decisions that it will make. If and when it votes on a resolution—such as the one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Moorhead) that it is the sense of Congress that we should commence phasing out the use of American troops in Vietnam—this Congress will act. If and when this Congress decides to appropriate such sums to carry on our participation in the Vietnamese hostilities as it deems proper, it will have acted. If and when it decides that the continuation of our involvement in Vietnam must be weighed against the possibility that we may not survive ourselves, it will have acted. No one denies the primacy of the President's responsibilities in terminating our involvement in the Vietnamese hostilities. That primacy however, does not permit Congress to cop out altogether. When all is said and done, our misery is less than the President's only because we have the company of 534 Members with whom to share that misery.

The people are no less anxious to end American involvement in the Vietnamese war than they were in the prior administration. Most people, as voters, were of the opinion that they expressed that anxiety when they elected the present administration and the present Congress. I know of few candidates who did not express themselves as sharing the people's anxiety. What better place to express a continued commitment to that anxiety than in this House—"Where the people shall govern"?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson won the 1964 election by more than a 15-million-vote majority. Yet 3 years and a few months later he found the country hopelessly divided under his leadership and he withdrew as a candidate for reelection.

I hope that President Nixon understands what happened to Mr. Johnson. It is important for his welfare and that of the people of the United States and of the world. Mr. Johnson entangled us in a land war in the morass of Asia—a war that cannot be won—a war where we supported one side in a civil war, a civil war that was none of our business.

Mr. Nixon won the 1968 election because the social, economic, and moral life of the United States was devastated by this cruel war in a small, poor, Asian country, a nation most Americans had never heard of before. Nearly 30,000 young Americans were dead by election day, 184,000 wounded. The dollar was under attack; inflation had sapped its buying power. Outrageous Federal taxes had sucked dry the reservoirs of capital needed by business and local governments to meet urgent needs in education, housing, transit, jobs, and environment. Solemn commitments to redress the grievances of black citizens had not been honored. The young people of America, dismayed by the draft, the war, and the threat of nuclear holocaust, were in various stages of unrest and revolt.

We trust that Mr. Nixon understands the roots of his minuscule victory over Mr. Humphrey. He won because Mr. Humphrey was looked upon by the American people as a coauthor of the Vietnam policy. Mr. Nixon did not win because of public dislike of medicare, Federal aid to education, the OEO or the Democratic civil rights bills. He won because of the Asian war.

Mr. Nixon's credentials as a peace President are shaky. His past record is hawkish. In 1954 he wanted American troops in Vietnam to replace the withdrawing French. In 1964 he advocated carrying the war into the North. In last year's presidential campaign he wanted the war pushed harder.

But in the campaign he promised peace. He said he had a plan that could settle the war. The Republicans could not fairly be charged with the war, escalated to its present furious level by a Democratic President and Congress. And Mr. Nixon was elected because of his promise of peace and because he was the other choice.

It is now time for Mr. Nixon to produce the peace in Vietnam he promised. Any further delay in proceeding to the settlement is unacceptable as well as immoral. Last week 351 Americans were killed in Vietnam, the week before 336. Over 10,000 Americans have died in Vietnam since the peace talks started 10 months ago. At the present rate 8,000 more Americans will die in the next 6 months.

A further delay in achieving peace might be tolerable if the formula for settlement had not been spelled out—over and over again—by distinguished Senators, such as the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy and Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, experts in Asian affairs, and other men and women knowledgeable on Southeast Asian affairs.

The formula has to do with the present government in Saigon—the Saigon government wants a military victory so that it can maintain itself in power. For the Saigon regime only military victory can assure its continuance because it has little popular support and governs by terror.

Senator McGovern said it best on March 17:

> We are trying to win on the battlefield and in Paris what the Saigon government long ago lost beyond all recall; the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.
>
> There is no more time for "considering military options," no more time for "improving the bargaining position." In the name of decency and commonsense, there must be no further continuation of the present war policy, however, disguised in rhetoric or more hollow predictions of victory yet to come.
>
> At this important crossroads for our Nation, I would hope that America could reap the bright promise of the President's inaugural address; and that in the spirit of that excellent speech, Mr. Nixon will reject the counsels of war and move to end the killing, and turn American energies back to the solution of our own problems and the search for a more decent world.

The voices of the American military are once more telling their old, and sad story—"Escalate the war a little bit more, bomb Cambodia, start another offensive, resume bombing of North Vietnam, and we will win."

The truth is clear. Escalation will not win any victories in Vietnam. Instead, it will increase the total of the dead, American and Vietnamese. Today, we have more troops in Vietnam than we had in Korea, and we have suffered as many or more casualties, but we have no victory, not even a stalemate. The truth is American military forces cannot win a victory in Vietnam, except by either killing every Vietnamese, or placing one guard over every Vietnamese.

Mr. Nixon, the unholy record of Vietnam is clear.

The only option left is peace.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California. (Mr. Burton).

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to express my own profound admiration and thanks to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. Edwards), not only for his leadership today in helping bring this dialog to those here in the Chamber and throughout the country, but much more importantly, for his leadership over the past 4 years in this hitherto somewhat lonely effort to arrest and change the direction of our country's policy in Southeast Asia.

His record has been one of courage and principle, his numbers have been added to in recent months, but there are many more of our colleagues—I am sure he will agree with me—whom we need before this battle can be won on this floor.

We are grateful to those who have recently joined our ranks, and we are even more grateful to those in the country—who with their letterwriting and communications have expressed their con-

XUM

cern that this war be ended and ended now. I am sure the gentleman shares with me my gratitude to all those concerned citizens in the land who have been so very helpful in this very, very important effort to achieve peace.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). I cannot add words that will say it any better.

I do hope this dialog we have had today with so many Members of the House of Representatives from every part of the United States participating, will have its effect throughout the land, and the Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—will be overwhelmed with messages from the people of the United States instructing us to do everything possible to bring peace—not next year, but this year, immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), for his very splendid statement this afternoon and for his abiding concern with peace and the question of Vietnam. The need to reassess past assumptions has been clear to the gentleman for some time, and he has constantly and forthrightly brought before the House his deep concern about the course of our foreign policy.

In these endeavors he has also been joined by two other distinguished Representatives from the State of California with whom I have been privileged to associate myself this afternoon, the gentleman from California, Mr. GEORGE BROWN, and the gentleman from California, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. These three distinguished Californians have been in the forefront of the battle to bring about a change in our policy toward Vietnam and have voted with me against appropriations for this war.

We were pleased that our colleague from California (Mr. BURTON) was selected last August at the Democratic National Convention to manage and lead the floor fight for the minority plank on Vietnam. He performed an excellent service in crystallizing for the American public the issues and in leading that fight.

Although the minority plank was not adopted by that convention, it is clear that the American people have overwhelmingly supported that plank and want an end to the war.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the presentation we wanted to make today. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE DANGER OF ARAB TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government now appears to be moving toward "Big Four" talks with the Soviet Union, France, and England in pursuit of peace in the Middle East. President Nixon recently met with Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban on this problem. And early next month, the President will see King Hussein of Jordan, who is coming to Washington as the official guest of this country.

I am confident that these initatives taken by our Government to effect a settlement in the Middle East are based upon the soundest premises. I know the President is carefully assessing the problem and feel confident that we will not find ourselves in the position of being trapped into imposing a dictated four-power peace in the Middle East, when I am aware that many of my colleagues in Congress believe that peace in that area can only come from direct Arab-Israel negotiations.

Yet, even as these Mideast moves are taken, as a freshman Member of Congress, I am puzzled by certain policies initiated during the last administration—policies which I feel have borne no fruit. One such policy that is difficult for me to understand is our lack of response to terrorist actions and guerrilla warfare waged against Israel from bases in neighboring Arab States, especially the kingdom of Jordan. Sporadic Arab terrorism against Israel, of course, has existed for decades. This was true both before and after the establishment of the independent State of Israel. It was true both before and after the 1967 war. Terrorism is not a result of the 1956 or 1967 Arab-Israeli wars, but was one of the underlying causes of them.

The significant fact though, is that these terrorist activities have escalated in recent months, and have taken on new dimensions and gained new status since the 1967 6-day war. There is increasing evidence of new purpose, new direction, and new importance of terrorism in the Middle East. An activity that was largely sporadic, seems now to be assuming the proportions of purposeful policy.

Gen. Moshe Dayan, Israel Minister of Defense, has recently offered evidence to indicate a considerable number of Arab guerrillas have been trained in Communist China, and are now operating in Jordan as cadre elements. Techniques of the Vietcong are reportedly being used in underground terrorist warfare directed against Israel from Jordanian territory. There has been evidence that even Cuba is involved.

From June 6, 1967, to December 31, 1968, the time that an apparent new policy and direction of Arab terrorist activity was taking form, 1,288 acts of sabotage and border incidents occurred, in which Israel suffered 282 killed and 1,095 wounded.

On November 23, 1968, a time bomb killed 12 shoppers and wounded 60 other civilians in Jerusalem. On February 21, 1969, terrorists again exploded a bomb in a crowded Jerusalem supermarket killing two and wounding 33. On March 6, 1969, a terrorist bomb exploded in a Hebrew University cafeteria injuring 29.

A clear pattern to disrupt Israel's airline, El Al, is also apparently developing. The fleet of eight airplanes have been brought under increasing attack: a hijacking in Algeria, a machinegunning in Athens, and a machinegun and bomb attack in Zurich. This is only a rough outline of the occurrences of the past few months, but form a significant pattern.

In this same time there is increasing evidence to make it appear that terrorists have sought and found a privileged sanctuary in Jordan. This has occurred while Jordan is being supplied with U.S. military assistance, including Patton tanks, antiaircraft weapons, field artillery, mortars, communications equipment, radar, and jet aircraft. It has occurred at the same time that Jordanian Air Force pilots are being trained at U.S. bases under a military assistance program initiated during the last administration.

So we see a situation that even while Jordan is receiving the benefit of American weapons and training, Arab terrorist organizations operating from Jordanian territory, such as the "El-Fatah" and various other so-called national liberation fronts, are receiving arms and training from the Soviet Union and Communist China. The obvious conclusion is that either King Hussein is willingly permitting the terrorists to operate on his soil, or he has become so weak that he has no alternative than to permit such abuses. In any event, the terrorists of Jordan have virtually become a state within a state.

We see consistent terrorist violations of the cease fire agreement. We are told that they are operating independently of the Arab States or States from which their attacks are launched. We are assured by terrorist leaders that no cease fire agreement is valid, as they maintain that Israel has no right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, this is the picture that raises some vital questions that perplexes me. What will be the value of the projected Four Power talks if terrorists do not consider themselves bound by any agreement which recognizes Israel's right to exist as a nation. I raise this question as it has been amply demonstrated that the terrorists influence the Arab governments, but where is it evident that the Arab governments either can or will influence Arab terrorists?

I question also the wisdom of training Jordanian military personnel at U.S. bases, at the same time we are training Israeli military personnel, especially pilots, in this country. I question the wisdom of a policy of selling both Israel and Jordan identical weapons.

I raise these questions as the facts indicate clearly that Jordan is part of a unified military command linking it with Egypt and Syria, nations whose military establishments are trained, equipped, and advised by the Soviet military establishment. The fact that the regime of King Hussein is so shaky that there is the strong possibility of our technical manuals and classified equipment becoming immediately available to pro-Soviet Arab officers and their Russian advisers, should also be given consideration. We are helping to arm Israel

XUM

through the sale of Phantom jets and the training of some personnel because of the obviously mounting Soviet threat in the eastern Mediterranean. We know that Moscow, both directly and through heavy support of the Arab States, is exerting not only an ever increasing pressure on Israel, but upon the entire Middle East. Should we then assist in this Soviet thrust with our arms and our training?

The United States should unequivocally condemn Arab terrorist harassment of Israel as inimical to peaceful, direct Arab-Israel negotiations, and as a threat to world peace. The world community which holds Israel responsible for acts of retaliation against this well organized Arab terrorism, should likewise hold Arab governments fully accountable for terrorist activities that are launched from bases in their countries.

Unless Arab violence can be effectively brought to an end by the Arab governments, the United States should view Israel retaliatory acts as justifiable and necessary responses to the condoned, organized harassment of her people and property.

Also, unless King Hussein can be shown to be taking effective steps to deal with terrorist groups which now flourish in his country, it would seem well to terminate the present program of military assistance with Jordan. For to arm both sides under the present situation is self-defeating. As to condemn one side for retaliating without condemning the other for terrorism is detrimental to world peace.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East is complex, but I believe that the responsibility of the United States there is clear. I believe we must pursue a policy of reducing tensions with the Soviet Union, so that we can take the Middle East out of the cold war. In this way alone, it seems to me, will the Arab States be persuaded to negotiate a meaningful peace. We must not seek to impose a settlement in that region, because it would be both unjust and transitory. No outside force can dictate the terms of relations between nations and expect them to endure. Meanwhile, we must see that the balance of power is not tipped in a fashion which would persuade the Arab states that they could win a war with Israel. We must, in other words, match Russian arms shipments, especially in modern aircraft. If we fail to prevent another outburst of hostilities, Mr. Speaker, I fear that the superpowers will inevitably become involved and that global disaster will ensue.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 21 years since the State of Israel came into being. Twenty-one years since the ram's horn sounded on the radios of the world proclaiming Israel's independence, while the Jews of the world wept and celebrated. It seemed then as if a corner had been turned in the long history of Jewish suffering at the hands of the Western nations.

Then the armies of seven Arab nations attacked the new state, with the avowed purpose of totally destroying her. And once again, the world stood by and watched the Jews fight alone. Those men and women who only 3 years before had left the death camps of Europe were once again facing annihilation. This time, however, they also had the visible support of the world's Jews, which could be translated into money and weapons and volunteers. And this time there was no annihilation.

Twenty-one years have passed, and one must wonder: Was a corner turned, after all, on that historic day back in May 1948. Or must Israel become just another chapter in the Jews' long struggle to survive?

We look around at the world as it is today and we must wonder if all sanity has been lost.

We see the Security Council—including as it does the Russians, the French, the Arabs and the Asians—going through the motions of dealing justly with the Middle East. Going through the motions, I say, because no resolution condemning the Arabs is justified enough to even be submitted.

We see half the nations of the world falling all over each other to villify and harass Israel at every opportunity, while blindly supporting and encouraging the Arabs. And we see the other half of the world bending over backward to appear objective or neutral or evenhanded.

We see the world's statesmen rush to excoriate Israel each time she employs her armed forces to combat the Arab terror. And we see the same statesmen hang back in total silence while the Arab madness reaches out of the Middle East to strike in Rome and Athens and Zurich and, yes, even in Los Angeles.

We hear the Soviets and the Arabs, echoed by the black nationalists and the mindless radicals of this country, call the Israelis "neo-Nazis" and compare the Arab refugees to the Jews of Europe as victims of a "Nazi-like genocide."

The Israelis are neo-Nazis? The Arab refugees are victims of Israel's Nazi-like genocide? I first heard those words with a kind of sick shock. And then I heard those words said again, and repeated, and then printed in the newspapers. And I asked myself: How is it the world can listen to those words and neither laugh nor cry nor roar with anger?

Is there no lie too big, no outrage too great, for the world to swallow when it is directed against the Jews, against Israel?

All the world is free to examine the strength and the depth of Israel's democratic society. And what is she surrounded with? For the most part, feudal monarchies and the military dictatorships. Nations where political prisoners are jailed without trials, executed in secret and hanged in the public squares. Where secret plots, political assassinations and bloody coups are a fact of life. Where the bullet-riddled body of a deposed, elected leader can be exhibited on television. Where the news media spews out vicious and obscene lies against neighboring states and all the countries of the west. Not only against Israel, but against fellow Arabs, too.

At this very moment, Israel's future may hang in the balance while representatives of the four powers confer. Two of them—Russia and France—are totally dedicated to the Arab cause. Britain is, at best, indifferent. And what is the U.S. position?

If Israel was not Israel, but was instead some small Asian country, friendly to the United States, surrounded by countries which had been armed to the teeth by the Soviet Union, could we doubt then what the American position would be?

Suppose a neighboring government to the United States harbored terrorists who set off bombs in department stores and shopping centers, who machine-gunned American airliners in London and Paris, who planted land mines on roads traveled by suburban schoolbuses, and sent mortar shells across the borders into our farms. Suppose such a neighboring government permitted all this, and her prime minister praised the terrorists on national television, gave them weapons and money and all sorts of honors. Can any of us doubt then what the American position would be?

In view of all this, why has not Israel received more vigorous support from the democracies of the West? Why is it she stands virtually alone? Why has the most outrageous Arab propaganda fallen upon so many receptive ears?

We must insist that President Nixon keep his campaign promise and see to it that Israel maintains military superiority to the combined Arab nations, her only guarantee against annihilation.

We must insist that Arab governments be held responsible by the U.N. and the free world for the actions of the Arab terrorists.

We must insist that no outside powers impose a settlement on the Middle East which would, in fact, be a capitulation to and appeasement of the Arab nations, that any settlement be negotiated between and assented to by both parties.

We must never forget the Biblical injunction:

> If I forget thee o Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the French capon acts as guide dog for the Russian bear. Of late I have been greatly saddened to see the United States succumb to French blandishments regarding major powers talks over the Middle East. France is not a major ally of the United States any longer. She works against major American interests at all times, as evidence of recent years amply shows.

France under De Gaulle is now acting in the best interests of the Soviet Union, slavishly obeying Kremlin orders in order to snap up a crumb from the tables of the mighty. Now she seeks a Czechoslovakia-style settlement at Israel's expense through four-power talks. She seeks to pull Arab chestnuts out of the fire of military disaster. France is seeking to set up a situation Russia can take advantage of for her own and Arab benefit at United States and Israel expense.

France seeks respectability by association with the mighty, not because she actually deserves consideration because of great military strength, moral force, or a powerful economy. The Gallic rooster is merely a barnyard relic, afflicted with

XUM

military mange and drooping international feathers.

How many divisions does France have in being? How many thermonuclear warheads and strike forces for delivering them does she possess? Shredded in 1870, drained in 1918, flattened in 1940, and forced to run like a whipped dog from Vietnam, France has as much of a military reputation as a herring has fur. Her economy is weak. Her empire has vanished. All she now possesses are delusions of grandeur and a vindictive leader who seeks to ruin America, enshrine 19th-century realpolitik, and destroy Israel so Russia may dominate the Middle East.

The only powers who should negotiate are the United States and the Soviet Union. France is less than a cipher. Fortunately, the Israelis are already forthrightly telling all parties involved they will not for one instant be dictated to by such a gathering. They know better than to trust in the fruits of such bargainings. If Czechoslovakia was awarded a posthumous Peace Prize in 1938, Israel does not seek to match this dubious distinction in 1969.

As for France, I can only think with pity of the shades of her past glory, when a Frenchman would never stoop to crawl on his knees to the Russians.

Heroes of Valmy would blush with shame. The Imperial Guard which held the Charleroi Road until Napolean could flee would down their bearskins in rage. Paris' defenders in the siege would not recognize their posterity. Those men buried in the Trench of the Bayonets at Verdun would only gaze in stupefaction and horror at recent policies of present day France. But Pierre Laval would gleefully understand today's French Government, recognizing them for what they are.

I do not want to see Americans seated at the same table with the De Gaulle regime, discussing the fate of the Middle East. France has no right to be there. Not by might. Not by right. Not by courtesy.

Let America look to her conscience. Let the Israelis look to their weapons. As for France, as Jim Fiske once said:

> Naught is lost save honor.

One thing is certain, however. The price of a modern Judas has gone up. De Gaulle will surely get more than 30 pieces of silver. Perhaps 31.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with great interest the statement on Arab terrorism by Congressman Hamilton Fish and feel that it is a valuable contribution to the formulation of policy in a very important situation.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have carefully observed the evolution of the current dilemma. Congressman Fish is correct in focusing attention on the role of Arab terrorists and the service these extremists are performing to the nihilistic Communist cause. Indeed, I feel that the proposed "Big Four" conference of our country with the Soviet Union, France, and Great Britain is jeopardized not only by Soviet and French bias favoring the Arab cause, but by the rise of the Arab terrorist movement. Even if the Soviet Union, the French, the sovereign Arab States, and the State of Israel agreed on a settlement, it could be vetoed by the terrorists who proclaim themselves the only qualified spokesmen for the people of Palestine.

During the forthcoming visit of King Hussein to Washington, it is essential that we establish the extent of Communist supply of weapons to guerrillas and terrorists based in Jordan, the degree of Jordanian Government collaboration with such underground forces of so-called national liberation, and determine whether continued American arms shipments to the Jordanian Army, a force collaborating with Cuban-trained, Peking-trained terrorists, is indicated.

I urge a careful review of Congressman Fish's proposals in light of the foregoing observations and those of the executive department of our Government. The time has obviously come that some assessment must be made by our State Department of the insidious role of the Arab terrorist front.

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, there are renewed reports that the United States is taking the lead in imposing a four-power settlement for the Arab-Israel crisis. I need not remind you that this flies in the face of the Western World's stanchest ally in the Mideast—Israel. The Israelis want, and deserve, the dignity of coming face to face with their longtime tormentors. What kind of lasting settlement can we expect without the protagonists themselves coming to terms, among themselves? There are also indications that this settlement is to be worked out within the framework of the United Nations. The United Nations, through its Secretary General U Thant, has shown us how much objectivity we can expect from that organization. U Thant seems more concerned with Israel retaliation that he is with Arab terrorist provocations.

Finally, I would like to point out the inroads communism is making in the area. One of the Arab terrorist groups has finally surfaced as openly Marxist. This is the same group which claims what they call credit for attacking civilian-bearing El Al airlines.

As a matter of interest to the Members of this House, I am leaving for Israel on the 3d of April to see at first hand the situation as it exists and discuss the situation with Israel leaders.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Arab world are largely illiterate, wracked by disease and poverty, without the education and organization to enrich their harsh desert land. For decades, even the wealth of their oil fields has gone into palaces and Cadillacs, and above all into the armaments and trappings of war. For decades, irresponsible leaders have turned their people's frustration outward—toward the West, and to that tiny outpost of Western culture and ideals which is the State of Israel.

Israel has been fighting for her very existence too long. Only her arms and courage have allowed this tiny nation, with less than the population of New York City's Queens County, to defeat the armies of nations with total populations of tens of millions.

This gallant democracy, this nation of survivors from history's greatest example of man's capacity for senseless cruelty to his fellow man, cannot be allowed to succumb to the threats and assaults of her neighbors. And while this period of danger continues—until lasting peace settlement is achieved—we must maintain our vigilance in her behalf.

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East has been the setting for three bloody wars linked by border skirmishes and verbal threats. These conflicts have been both the flame and the fuel of an intense level of hatred in the area.

The loathing and hatred between Arab and Jew is an all-consuming thing. Why has such mutual hostilities developed?

As many of us know, the story goes back nearly 2,000 years to the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine by the Romans in the year 70 A.D. This Diaspora marked the birth of a dream harbored by Jews throughout the world that someday they would be able to return as a people to the promised land. At last, in 1917, their chance came. Britain consented to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

However, the Jews who immigrated to Palestine in the 1920's and 1930's, to buy land and to create a new state, were regarded as unwanted outsiders by many of the Arabs, who had been living in this barren land since the days of Christ. Under the yoke of foreign oppressors themselves for centuries, these Arabs dreamed too of an independent Palestine. Increasingly, growing Arab nationalism and Zionism clashed, often violently.

After World War II, under mounting pressure, the British proposed dividing Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish. The Arabs protested that they wanted nothing less than one Palestine under Arab control. It might be true, they argued, that the Jews had been persecuted terribly in Europe. But then let Europe bear the cost of solving its own conscience, not the Arab world.

Without first reconciling these grave differences, the United Nations adopted the British partition plan, and in May 1948, Israel formally became a state. Outraged, the Arab armies attacked the new nation, vowing to drive the Jews into the sea. But, Israel, even in its infancy, had much more spirit, zest, determination, and discipline than the Arabs. They were tougher inwardly and outwardly than the Arabs.

Israel did win the 1948 war, but peace in the Middle East was not realized. The Arab nations steadfastly refused to sign a peace treaty for this would have amounted to an unpalatable concession—recognition of the State of Israel. Instead, they declared they would not rest until our Jewish brethern were destroyed.

In less than a decade, the Middle East was ablaze again.

Following Egyptian President Nasser's nationalism of the Suez Canal in 1956 at which time he barred the passage of all Israeli ships, and his blockade of the

Gulf of Aqaba—Israel's only remaining outlet to the East—Britain, France, and Israel together invaded Egypt.

Within a matter of days, Israel had routed Nasser's Army and driven across the Sinai Peninsula to the Suez. But again victory did not result in a peace treaty. A cease fire was arranged which called for Israel to withdraw her armies, and the situation remained as explosive as before.

Since then, the Egyptian Army has grown in power—and continues to grow in power. Unified Arab command has forced Jordan to double the size of its Army. Sophisticated weapons—jets, guided missiles, and submarines—continue to flow in from the Soviet bloc.

These arms are a threat to peace. They waste valuable development capital; they threaten the only near Eastern state with traditions of democracy.

The irresponsible and dangerous nature of the course chosen by Israel's enemies is becoming more clear to the world every day. And our commitment to Israel must be equally clear; it must be a total one. We owe our Jewish brethren nothing less.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deep concern and outrage at the increasing level of terrorist attacks against the people and the State of Israel. These attacks indiscriminately made against civilian and noncivilian alike, are repugnant to any civilized human being. It seems almost impossible to comprehend the depths to which these killers and assassins have plunged. The blowing up of school buses full of young children or the exploding of bombs in a university are acts that only can be characterized as subhuman.

The responsibility for the murders committed by these packs of savages lies not only with the terrorists and their sympathizers—for they make up only a small percentage of the population of the Arab States—but with those that give them aid and shelter. These are the officials of the Arab countries that surround Israel who let themselves be caught up in the demagoguery of the terrorist leaders. The spilling of Jewish blood seems to have greater priority for them than the economic and social development of their countries. It is they that fan the flames of the Middle East crisis by refusing to stand up against the terrorist. I suspect if they did, the power of the terrorist band in their countries would subside.

Backed up by Russian and American arms, the Arab States are beginning to harass Israel with increasing frequency along its borders. They delude themselves into believing that they can one day exterminate the people and State of Israel as Hitler's Gestapo attempted to do 30 years ago. If they attempt this, their dream will turn into a nightmare.

These acts of terrorism must stop. If they do not, the situation in the Middle East will reach crisis proportions even beyond the current level. The Arab States must be induced to control the terrorists within their borders and to prohibit them from carrying out their missions of murder and destruction.

It is the duty of every civilized human being, no matter what his nationality, to see that these murders are terminated.

There is much that the United States can do to help leaders of the Arab countries face up to the terrorist marauders within their borders. One mechanism is to provide an economic incentive. To this end, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the able gentleman from New York, (Mr. FISH), for his presentation on the grave danger created by the unrelenting use of terrorism by Arab extremists.

It is especially appropriate that the gentleman has raised this question today. We have just received the sad news of the death in a Zurich hospital of a young Israeli commercial airlines pilot, shot from ambush by Arab terrorists when his El Al airliner was attacked on the ground at a Swiss airport last month. This cowardly attack represents the first instance in which a pilot has died of wounds inflicted by terrorist hijackers in this series of attacks by Arabs and pro-Castro Cuban fanatics.

A touch of irony is added by the receipt of additional news that the Chief of Staff of the Cuban Communist Army was wounded by Israel forces when he accompanied an Arab guerrilla raid into Israel. The Cubans apparently are training and assisting the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

I am in total agreement with the gentleman that our Government should review the provision of arms to the State of Jordan in the light of the obvious collaboration of the Jordanian Government with the terrorists. A first order of business during the forthcoming visit to Washington by King Hussein of Jordan would be to clarify this question of collaboration with terrorism. It appears to me that evidence is already compelling to the point that arms shipments to Jordan should be discontinued.

I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of this Congress to a report by Milton Friedman, a veteran White House correspondent, on the role of Communist China in the Arab terrorist movements. The report was published worldwide in the newspapers served by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

In the light of the obvious links between the Communists and the Arab terrorists, I feel that King Hussein must either stand up against the terrorists or face the immediate cancellation of American arms shipments.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Friedman's report for the information of all Members:

AID ARAB TERRORISTS: MAO EMERGING AS NEW FORCE BEHIND MIDEAST CONFLICTS

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—China's chairman Mao has incited and aided the Arab terrorist movement to such an extent that Washington officials are now newly assessing the Chinese role in the Middle East.

The Chairman wants much more than the liquidation of Israel. He hopes to embroil the United States and the Soviet Union in a fatal confrontation over the "Palestine Liberation" issue.

Chairman Mao's new line, as voiced by Radio Peking, is that Washington and Moscow, by discussing Middle East solutions, have actually entered "a criminal intrigue to establish American-Soviet hegemony in the Middle East by way of liquidating the Palestine question, stamping out the Palestine (Arab) peoples' armed struggle, and forcing the Arab nations to compromise with and surrender to the Israeli aggressors.

Aiming to perpetuate bloodshed between Israel and the Arabs, Chairman Mao has termed any pursuit of peace by Arab regimes or Washington as "counter-revoluntionary political bargaining with the Soviet revisionists." Any political solution is rejected. The struggle must go on, until Israel is wiped out, he maintains.

The Chairman's thinking is that endless violence in the Middle East can be exploited by Peking. Moscow can be accused of "revisionism" and treachery if any accommodation is made with Israel. It is hoped this will force the Russians to identify with the terrorism and the rage Peking seeks to foment among the Arab masses. Such identification with Arab extremism may bring the Russians into an armed confrontation with Israel and the United States, he believes.

Peking's emerging line coincides with the disclosure that Communist China is arming, training, and instigating Arab terrorists. Hundreds have been to China and many are there now. Attacks on civilian airliners, bombing of supermarkets and universities, mining of roads—the strategy of terror perfected in Saigon—is designed, Mao-style, to convert Israel into "another Vietnam."

U.S. intelligence has substantiated Israel Defense Minister Moshe Dayan's recent charge that Arab terrorists are being trained and equipped in China. A pipeline has thus been established to transport terrorism from the Far East to the Middle East.

The growing Chinese involvement is one reason for President Nixon's desire to seek speedily a Middle East settlement. It is also a factor in Russian policy. But Moscow has yet to translate this into a settlement that Israel could accept. The Kremlin hopes to exploit what it sees as hysteria to avoid another Vietnam by getting Washington to impose unilateral pressure on Israel to withdraw from occupied territory without a genuine peace.

Peking's main assault, however, is not on the rulers of the Kremlin but against President Nixon. "Nixon's words and deeds indicate that U.S. imperialism will continue to go all out to foster Israel and back the criminal policy of the Zionist aggressors," he declares. The sale of Phantom jets to Israel "shows that U.S. imperialism will never change its ambition to use Israel as a tool for aggression and expansion in the Middle East."

In Peking's assessment, the President is manipulated by such persons as Sen. Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican. Sen. Javits is described by the Chinese as "a representative of the Jewish capitalist class."

Peking has asserted in its broadcasts that the Arab people have seen through Israel and recognize it as a U.S. base that must be destroyed. The Arab terrorist movement, El Fatah, is being quoted in the Chinese capitol as believing that "the policy of the United States is worked out by plutocrats and concerns of capitalism and imperialism."

The Radio voice of El Fatah, "Saut al-Asifah," is rebroadcast by Peking with an assertion that "whatever tricks the new U.S. Administration may play, it can never subdue the Palestinian people who are determined to carry their armed struggle through to the end."

China welcomed the condemnation of

XUM

Nixon by an important Iraqi newspaper, "An-Nu." The newspaper called on Arabs "to carry through to the end the struggle against Zionism."

Peking asserted confidently that, in seeking Arab favor, "no matter what tricks and sly measures Nixon might resort to, he can never save U.S. imperialism from defeat." In the Middle East, said Peking, Nixon "and Soviet revisionism have been colluding and struggling with each other with the purpose of redividing it and enslaving the Arab people."

Soviet "social-imperialism" has "stepped up its infiltration and expansion" into Arab states, said Peking. France hopes for "an imperialist return to the Middle East," as does Britain, according to Peking. So much for the Big Four.

Great changes are seen in Peking with "the daily awakening of the Arab people and the further development of the national liberation movement, particularly the surging of the Palestinian people's armed struggle . . . The Arab people are now rising up to master their own destiny."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in connection with my special order today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SOUTH AFRICAN AIRWAYS SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the inaugural flight of South African Airways to the United States has arrived today, March 26. We oppose this extension of the South African apartheid system to this country. We oppose this extension for several reasons.

First, this new relation with South Africa is inconsistent with our relationships with the black, independent states of Africa. This inconsistency is well known to African states.

Just recently, in the pages of the Nationalist newspaper in Tanzania, the editor wrote:

> In the final analysis it is not only insincere but also criminal on their part to continue soliciting the goodwill and friendship of the Africans while at the same time they continue to hob-nob with the enemies of Africa.

He continued:

> If the American government had any regard for the conscience of the Africans and the suffering of their brothers in South Africa, it would not, in the first place, have continued to consolidate its relations with the fascists of South Africa.

These sentiments expressed by one of the leading newspapers in independent Africa echoed the sentiments of a recent resolution by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. This resolution stated:

> The Council of Ministers has been informed of the air transport agreement concluded between the Pretoria regime and the government of the United States. The Council condemns this agreement, and deplores the uncooperative attitude on the part of the United States Government, which is contrary to United Nations resolutions, and to the assurances repeatedly given by the United States itself that it is only some U.S. private companies that still maintain economic and trade relations with South Africa. The Council addresses an urgent appeal to the United States Government to reconsider this agreement.

These sentiments are representative of the indignation felt by the governments of the African nations at the callous way in which our Government tries to play both sides of the street in Africa, or both sides of the color curtain.

The action by the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting South African Airways a permit was in clear defiance of a resolution passed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1962 which requested member states to act against apartheid and the measures specified included one which read:

> To refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and companies registered under South African laws.

But it is not only our Government which is trying to play a two-faced role in Africa. It is also American commercial airlines which practice the same callous maneuvers. Pan American Airways, for instance, flies to a number of West African states and then uses the facilities in those West African states to fly on to Johannesburg. I am sure it will not be very long before they are faced with a choice between abandoning their South African trade in order to maintain their operations in West Africa. What is particularly ironic about Pan American's action is that while they have applied for an additional route to Johannesburg through Rio, they have also promoted one of their black employees to a high-level executive position to direct the development of black American travel through the use of Pan American facilities. How in good conscience can they advertise for the travel dollars of black Americans at the same time that they are planning to expand their service to South Africa, services that will not be available to black Americans. Black stewardesses, flying for Pan American in West Africa, have also been removed from the aircraft before it proceeds to South Africa.

Trans World Airways and Braniff are also playing this game. TWA has applied to the CAB for rights to fly to South Africa as an extension of its current route to Nairobi. They, too, are trying to play both sides of the color curtain in Africa.

Braniff, meantime, has applied for rights to travel to South Africa via Brazil. Does Braniff, too, mean to affront black Americans?

I am appalled by this callous disregard by both the American Government and three American airlines of the feelings of independent Africans and Americans of conscience, both white and black.

The second reason that we oppose this extension of the apartheid system to the United States is because of the manner in which it was carried out. It is certainly bad judgment and bad government when an official agency of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, can unilaterally act to extend our relationship with South Africa. The Board, in its own words, found:

> It is in the public interest to issue a foreign air carrier permit to South African Airways, authorizing it, for an indefinite period, to engage in foreign air transportation . . . between a point . . . in the Republic of South Africa . . . and the terminal point New York.

This was their recommendation to the President who then issued the enabling order on November 7, 1968.

The American Committee on Africa has asked the President to now reconsider this order and to ask the CAB to reopen hearings on whether or not such granting of these facilities is in the public interest. The replies to the American Committee on Africa by the White House maintain that the President has no power to reopen the case before the CAB. The CAB, on the other hand, has indicated that "the matter is now under study."

I do not feel that the grant of these facilities to South African Airways is in the public interest. I know from personal experience that these facilities will be available only on a racially discriminatory basis. I do not believe that the bilateral air agreement, initiated in 1947, before the advent of the apartheid system, is conclusive evidence of the public interest. I support the request of the American Committee on Africa that they be allowed to testify on behalf of the public interest before the CAB. If this request is not granted, I will consider it necessary to examine this whole affair through the Subcommittee on Africa of which I am the chairman.

Indeed, it is time that the hearings on American-South Africa relations begun by my distinguished predecessor, Barratt O'Hara, be continued.

The third reason why I oppose the extension of apartheid by South Africa to our shores is because of the grave insult it represents to my fellow black Americans. Normally, I consider myself the representative of all my constituents, both black and white. But in this matter I feel a particular responsibility to voice the outrage of black Americans over this action.

The foreign policy of the United States should be a non-racial one. It should be a foreign policy which Americans of all races and creeds can find moral justification. This, and any, action which extends and expands the relationships between our country and the Government of South Africa are not sections in which we can find any justification. The inequities of the South African system toward its nonwhite majority are well known. How then can we regard this latest action as any other than a callous insult by our foreign policymakers to the black citizens?

Already black Americans are sorely vexed by the inability of the establishment to respond to their very real needs and feelings. Black Americans can only regard the extension of racially discriminatory facilities to John F. Kennedy International Airport as a retrogressive step against the achievement of full human rights in this country.

The fourth reason which causes me to speak out against the latest racial injustice is that it disregards the growing prospects of a Vietnam situation in southern Africa. Already the prospects of a racial and ideological war in southern Africa loom large. The liberation struggle in southern Africa has begun. Freedom fighters representing the nonwhite majority are already on the offensive in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia and parts of South Africa. We should be supporting their struggle for freedom. Instead we find ourselves increasingly engaged on the wrong side. This extension of rights to South African Airways is just another accelerating step toward engagement on the wrong side of human justice and liberty.

This engagement with the suppressive regimes of southern Africa if it continues, will find us heavily involved on the wrong side in yet another country. We are not so naive to believe the development of American economic interest in South Africa does not carry with it the implied possibility of action to "safeguard" these interests at some date in the future. If that happens, then the just struggle for liberty and self-determination will take on unattractive overtones of race and ideology.

We cannot be comfortable with the knowledge that this new link with South Africa through the extension of South African Airways has just begun. The implications of this new engagement cannot be disregarded.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the subject, and also appreciate his alerting the members of the African Subcommittee to the fact that he would address the House.

I am sure the gentleman would not mind my making perhaps an observation just to keep the record clear.

Obviously the U.S. Government is not alone in granting air rights to the South African airline. I guess they do have an excessive area they serve; Australia, among others. They will be stopping in Brazil, I understand, on the flight up to New York.

It would seem we are following, rather than leading a trend of recognition—that is, through the CAB—of their service.

Is that not at least an accurate analysis?

Mr. DIGGS. Well, we need not follow the precedents of other countries with respect to granting of this airline permit, if that is the gentleman's point. I can think of a lot of precedents that we have followed in the wake of policies of other countries from which I wish we could extricate ourselves. The situation discussed in the previous order, on our policy in Vietnam, is a classic example.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Again, if the gentleman will permit me, the thing which disturbs me is the fact that the CAB has a complicated enough procedure in and of itself. If it is to weigh our domestic political considerations or the domestic political complications in another land, this would place an intolerable burden on the technical problems which are in and of themselves quite great.

For example, I happen to be one of the Members who take a dim view of the Soviet airline flying into New York City, for reasons of the domestic policy of the Soviet Union.

Yet the CAB granted that permission over a year ago, and now the Soviets fly into New York. I think we are at the stage where we are faced with the facts of life. If in this particular case the South African airlines meet the technical criteria, I imagine on that basis the certificate was properly issued. This is an observation that I believe should be considered.

If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I was intrigued when the gentleman did advise us of his interest in this subject and pointed out the special concern he had that the South African Airways was completely owned by the Government of South Africa. Out of idle curiosity I did check all of the foreign airlines which have been granted permits to serve the United States and found something like 75 percent are entirely Government owned. So from a technical standpoint, at least, this fits the pattern. The lack of private enterprise investment is really not a major concern. I want to emphasize that I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his position and his responsibility in heading up our Subcommittee on Africa. I appreciate that he is always interested in having us probe these matters with as much objectivity as possible.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following list of the airlines I mentioned:

Percentage of ownership by foreign governments of airlines which have been granted permits to service the United States

[In percent]

Argentina	100.00
Australia	100.00
Austria	79.58
Belgium (another 35 percent owned by Government in Congo)	65.00
Canada	100.00
Chile	100.00
Colombia	62.00
Costa Rica	33.33
Scandinavia (Norway, Sweden, and Denmark)	50.00
Dominican Republic	100.00
Finland	73.00
France	98.55
Germany	74.33
Guatemala	100.00
Honduras	19.00
India	100.00
Ireland	100.00
Israel	50.00
Italy	90.00
Jamaica	60.00
Japan	58.00
Mexico:	
Aeronaves	100.00
CMA	9.00
Netherlands	50.50
Netherlands Antilles	90.00
New Zealand	100.00
Nicaragua	10.00
Nigeria	100.00
Portugal	48.00
South Africa	100.00
Spain	100.00
Switzerland	30.00
Trinidad and Tobago	100.00
Union Africain et Malagache (12 African governments own a 6 percent share each)	72.00
United Kingdom	100.00
U.S.S.R.	100.00
Venezuela	55.00

Mr. DIGGS. Permit me to clarify my reference to the South African Government's ownership of the airline in question. It means that all policies controlling that airline, many of which are based on blatant racial discrimination, represent official South African Government policy. It is not a private enterprise over which the South African Government has no control.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and to commend him for bringing to the attention of the House the matter of the South African Airways service to New York, which was inaugurated today.

As a member of the subcommittee, I am pleased that Chairman DIGGS has indicated his intention to conduct a subcommittee investigation of the matter, if the CAB refuses to reopen the case.

I too am deeply disturbed about the implications of this decision in terms of our relations with other African states, and in the context of our own internal racial problems.

The United Nations General Assembly, in a 1962 resolution against apartheid in South Africa, specifically called upon the members of the United Nations "to refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and companies registered under South African laws." The CAB decision directly defies that resolution.

The South African Airways is a department in the South African Government's Railways and Harbours Administration, and thus is not only bound to follow the discriminatory policies of that Government, but is actually an integral part of it.

In my judgment, the U.S. Government should not expand official contact with the South African Government at this time, but should instead be reexamining those contacts which already exist.

In addition to these foreign policy implications, I am also concerned about the manner in which the decision was made by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and

XUM

question whether the public interest received adequate consideration.

It is my understanding that the testimony received on the proposed agreement was limited primarily, if not exclusively, to witnesses of airlines with direct private interest in extension of such service. On the basis of that investigation, the CAB unilaterally determined such service to be in the public interest, and submitted its recommendations to the President, who in turn issued an enabling order.

Since that time, representatives of the American Committee on Africa, the National Student Association, the United Automobile Workers, and the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church all have indicated their opposition to the order, and requested that the case be reopened to provide them an opportunity to present evidence as to why such service is not in the public interest.

President Nixon has already set a precedent for such action, in his reconsideration of the extended transpacific service, which was originally approved at the same time as the South African service.

I urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to reopen this case and am hopeful that the decision will be reversed in the best public interest.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there are several things disturbing about the authorization to South African Airways to initiate flights from South Africa to the United States.

The most disturbing is the way in which it reflects the growing engagement of our country with South Africa. It is often said that our relationships with South Africa are normal, and that in their normality we are neutral as to the internal affairs of the South African state. But "normal" relationships, as witnessed by the almost automatic award by the CAB of a landing permit to South African Airways, bring us closer and closer to acquiescence in the system of government in South Africa.

The administrative inertia set up by our agreements with South Africa compound the inevitable commercial pressure toward further engagement with South Africa. In the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and in the Department of Defense, our "normal" bureaucracy clears the way for a closer engagement with South African society and the South African Government.

In March 1968, for example, our Department of Commerce produced a report "Selling in the Republic of South Africa." This 16-page pamphlet facilitates the flow of American economic investment in South Africa. The American taxpayer, therefore, thus underwrites the continuation of a process of deeper engagement with South Africa.

An additional matter of concern with the award of a landing permit to South African Airways is the fact that this move by the South African Government—which owns the airline—marks the beginning of a new propaganda offensive in the United States. South Africa is seeking to clean up its name in international circles.

The South African Government is appealing to American tourists to visit South Africa in a very high-powered and high-financed public relations campaign. The South African advertisements are a cover up for racism. They are inviting only white Americans to use the facilities of South African Airways and to use the facilities in South Africa.

Not only will the average visitor, who will be mainly interested in the vacation aspects of his trip, be shown only the good side of South Africa, but he will come back and remark to others in his community as to how well he was treated by the white South Africans.

Since South Africa is a police state, these visitors will not see or hear the other side when they get there. Transit camps and black relocation areas are hidden in barren country far from the main centers. All nonwhite areas are off limits without an official permit. Not only will the U.S. tourist be unable to make inquiry to black South Africans about the social system in South Africa, but such inquiries, if made, would endanger the black South African, for they would be in violation of the laws of South Africa.

Even if a trip to South Africa does not mean conversion to a belief in its racialistic system, it does mean aid and comfort to the white South Africans instead of aid and comfort to the depressed black South Africans and to the freedom fighters who are now launching an offensive against the terrorism and suppression of the system.

There are other indications of the extent to which South Africa is prepared to go in its propaganda campaign. A recent issue of the South African Digest announced that the South African Tourist Corp. is about to launch its biggest overseas advertisement campaign in the United States. They plan to send a letter and brochure in a direct mailing to 250,000 Americans, 25 percent of which will be presidents of multimillion-dollar corporations and 40 percent of which earn more than $40,000.

This is in addition to the almost $2 million which has been budgeted by South African Airways for publicity related activities. South African Airways has engaged a Madison Avenue advertising agency, Harry W. Graff, Inc. Already enticing advertisements are appearing in the pages of Holiday magazine, Newsweek and the Sunday New York Times.

It is also worth noting the activities of the American-African Affairs Association. This group, which claims tax deductibility status, has, in fact, dedicated itself to the distribution of materials favorable to the racist regimes of southern Africa. In their recent report, they have indicated that they plan to expand their activities in the United States. Their budget for 1968 is about $108,000, an increase of 40 percent from their 1968 budget. Their budget for publications is $67,000, an increase of 80 percent over last year's.

This new propaganda offensive in the United States coincides with the new offensive of South Africa in southern Africa. I attach an article from the Tanzania Nationalist, which discusses the attempt of South Africa to create a coprosperity sphere in southern Africa.

Americans should be aware that the arrival of South African Airways in New York is only the beginning. It represents only part of the effort of South Africa to win friends for its vicious system of apartheid.

The article from the Tanzania Nationalist follows:

SOUTHERN AFRICAN COMMON MARKET

The white bloc in South Africa, consisting of the industrialists, financiers, farmers, landbarons, and intellectuals may differ amongst themselves on how best to keep down the 15 million oppressed. They continue arguing on this in their clubs and over copious cups of tea. But today there is one important area of agreement where Vorster sees eye to eye with the "progressive" Oppenheimer and that is the need for the establishment of a common market for Southern Africa.

This concept in its modern form originated in the fertile brain of the late Dr. Verwoerd, the architect of apartheid in its most brutal and vicious form. At first the Oppenheimers and the liberal establishment resisted the idea, not because they objected to it on principle, but with Verwoerd's apartheid policy having gained South Africa the well merited title of "The Polecat of the World" there was little chance of any state joining it voluntarily.

The common market pursued by the Pretoria planners since Verwoerd's death is visualized as consisting of South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Malawi and Zambia. This vast territory two million miles in extent world embrace 45 million people. The guiding principle governing the relationship of states in this common market would be based on political independence and economic interdependence. There would be no interference in the internal affairs of each state and they see believers in apartheid. (They prefer to call it separate development) working side by side with African states happily for mutual benefit. In fact, Vorster in his New Year's message forecast an era of unprecedented prosperity of black and white states of Southern Africa if they came together to fight "Communist terrorism."

The Pretoria planners argue rather eloquently that South Africa is linked with the rest of Southern Africa not only through trade but in other ways. Zambia for instance is connected by road and rail via Rhodesia. A gas pipe line through more than a thousand miles from Mozambique to the Transvaal. The giant Caborra scheme aimed at supplying electricity will strengthen the links further. The three ex-High Commission territories now independent use the South African currency. A road is being constructed from Cape Town to Luanda in Angola.

NEW ERA

These Pretoria planners while not blinking an eyelid at the brutal and inhuman exploitation of the millions in their own country, enthusiastically point out that with the formation of the common market a new era would dawn for all. There would be joint exploitation of international rivers, joint efforts at water and soil conservation and joint efforts at eradicating stock disease. There is certainly no shortage of "joint efforts", all of which are just paper blueprints.

In this scheme, there is little attempt to hide that it will be South Africa which will be the leader and pacesetter. Said Vorster arrogantly in only November 1968 at a rally in Nigel: "We are of Africa; we understand Africa and nothing is going to prevent us from becoming leaders of Africa in every field." The first step in this grandiose plan is to see that the Southern African common market becomes a reality.

Before we examine the implications of the Southern African market which will include almost a third of Africa, let us examine the mini common market that has been in existence for sixty eight years between South Africa and the three ex-High Commission territories now Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

There is no need to emphasize that the people in those three territories had nothing to do with this. This customs union was foisted on to the three territories by British imperialism when it handed over political control to the whites of South Africa in 1910.

Its essential features have not altered to this day. The four aspects of this agreement are:

1. The maintenance of a common external customs tariff.
2. Free interchange for manufactured products of South Africa and the territories.
3. Payment by South Africa to the territories of a share of the total pool of customs revenue.
4. Conformity by the territories to the relevant tariff laws of South Africa.

In 1967, South Africa collected K300 million in customs and duties. Its share was 98.6% of the total. To put it differently it retained K296.1 million and gave the three states together K3.9 million. Of this Lesotho got K1.48 million; Swaziland K1.21 million and Botswana had to be content with K1. million.

The sheer inequality and the daylight robbery can only be gauged if we examine the estimated budgets of the four territories in the period 1967/68.

South Africa: estimated revenue K1438. million; Botswana K14.00 million; Lesotho K6.3 million and Swaziland K7.0 million.

This rich state can measure its revenue in terms of over a thousand million Kwacha, grabbed a lion's share and dropped a few crumbs to the three countries. This then is Vorster's idea of unprecedented prosperity for "Black" states.

The customs union envisages a free exchange of manufactured goods between South Africa and the three countries. It does not include primary products. But the three territories have no industry to speak of. The British government saw to that. Lesotho for instance had its first industry when a quarry was established with South African capital. In fact this provision had only one aim and that was to benefit South Africa for it allowed South African manufactured goods free entry in these three countries.

LION SHARE

But this free entry of South African goods came at a time when South Africa was developing its own secondary industry and therefore imposed tariffs on all foreign goods to protect this industry. What this in effect meant was that Botswana for instance was prevented from buying a blanket from Britain for K1.10 and paying K1.50 to South African manufacturers for a similar one.

The protection of secondary industry weighed heavily against the South African primary producers like the farmers. The result was that the South African government granted heavy subsidies to its local farmers. But these subsidies did not apply to the farmers in the three territories. Thus the latter had to pay 50n extra on a 100 lb. of flour and K1.25 on every 100 lb. of sugar.

And as far as the South African manufacturers were concerned they benefit for they were protected by a duty of 25% on clothing and soap; 30% on boots and shoes, and 20% on hardware and furniture. But the people in the territories lost correspondingly for the goods landed at a higher price, without the governments benefiting.

To illustrate what this means, let us take an example. In 1966, Botswana imported K12 million worth of goods from South Africa representing 65% of the total in that year. Her exports were negligible. If what she in fact has been paying to subsidise the South African manufacturers she imposed a duty of 25% then on that alone she would receive revenue to the tune of K3. million. This is treble the amount of what she is at present getting from South Africa.

The imposition of this tax would make no difference to the standard of living for that is what she is paying now to buy South African manufactured goods. Her export to South Africa would not be subjected similarly for these are small, for Botswana has a large unfavourable trade with her powerful neighbour. It is not that Botswana, a leading cattle country has nothing to export to South Africa. Rather Botswana has been prevented from entering the highly profitable and lucrative market of selling her beef by the imposition of stiff quotas. This is being done to protect South Africa's own farmers.

The Pretoria "visionaries" are loud in their protestations that in the common market all relations would be conducted on a basis of equality. But what is the position in actual practice? In a common market, there is to be free movement of labour between the territories. But the citizens of the three newly independent states have learnt the hard way that independence has not altered one iota of South Africa's attitude to them. They are treated in the same way as the Vorster treats the oppressed blacks in South Africa. They are subjected to the rigours of the pass laws. Group areas Acts and Job Reservations. They are subject to the same humiliations and indignities as their 15 million black brethren who are still unfree.

No one could rightfully accuse Sir Seretse Khama of being an enemy of Vorster. He has stressed again and again that his relation with South Africa is good. But even he has complained. "If we go into South Africa officially, we do not know there is such a thing as apartheid—we are treated in the same way as we treat all people in Botswana. But if a non-diplomat crosses the border, he is immediately hit by discrimination. The "non-diplomats" Sir Seretse is referring to are the 50,000 Botswana who are driven to work in Vorster's South Africa.

This mini common market has been ruinous to the territories. Not only were they unable to develop their own secondary industry, but they were subject to legalised plunder for over sixty eight years. They have been bled white by the iniquitous customs agreement of 1910. Vorster rushed to grant Malawi a loan of K8 million. To the world at large he gave the impression that he was the blood donor. But that is not so for it is the three territories who are the true donors, for he has given to Malawi funds which he has appropriated from the three territories.

MINI MARKET

The Vorsters believe that the emergent African states attitude to economics is the same as in the mercantilist era where cattle, sheep and land were bartered for a few beads and trinkets. They believe the intricacies of high finance are beyond the comprehension of the African states. They believe that with a few concessions here and there to the governments they would keep quiet. But in this they are mistaken.

The three governments have seen through this agreement and they want a revision. But the Vorsters so keen to peddle the idea of a southern common market are in no haste despite repeated requests. Said Sir Seretse Khama in opening the third session of the National Assembly in Gaberones: "Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland are not finding it easy to negotiate a more favourable customs agreement with South Africa. In view of the frequently desire for friendly co-operation by South African government, I am hopeful for an imminent and successful conclusion to the present negotiations in the spirit of good neighbourliness . . ." And turning to Africa he added "In the meantime, Botswana will continue to explore means of improving trade relations with other African countries."

In two important respects, Southern Africa is tied to the apron strongs of the Vorsters and Oppenheimers. These are through capital and labour. Although no precise figures are available for each country, it is well known that giant monopolies like the Anglo-American, Rembrandt, General Mining and other institutions like the Netherlands Bank, SANTAM have subsidiaries or branches in these territories. In Botswana these would be prospecting for diamonds and coal. In Angola and Mozambique, it is for oil. Some of the large capital projects like the Kunene Oxbow, and the Giant Caborra Bassa Dam are being backed with South African finance. Lesotho's first industrial enterprise, a quarry has been established with South African capital. In Swaziland one third of the country's agricultural exports are from South African farmers operating there.

Zambia has about K100 million invested mainly in the copper mines. In Rhodesia such has been the massive penetration of South African capital that the people in high places refer to Rhodesia's and South Africa's economies as being complementary which is another way of saying that this country has become the satellite of South Africa. And Smith has been told that should he settle with Wilson, then he could expect another "bonus" of over K100 million just waiting to be invested. Over K200 million is lying idle in South Africa and the financiers are reluctant to invest because the climate is not proper.

CHEAP LABOR

It was British imperialism that tied the various Southern African territories to the South African mining economy. This was over seventy years ago and they had to supply cheap labour to the then and now the largest industry in Africa. This employs over half a million workers ranking it in the same category as the auto industry in the USA. The tie was based on recruited system of labour and the worker was sent back to territories once there was no use for him.

Recruitment was developed into a fine art WANELA (Witwatersrand Recruiting Organisation) not reluctant to use aircraft to transport the thousands of workers from the most inaccessible places to the mines. In 1965, it was estimated that South Africa used 497,000 workers from outside of the territories of which 294,000 were recruited. A partial breakup of the latter figures show where the labour was recruited.

Lesotho: 61,000; Botswana: 20,000; Malawi: 30,000; Mozambique: 102,000 and Swaziland: 12,000.

These are figures of recruited labour only. Lesotho for instance with a population of 700,000 (1965) sent out 180,000 to work in South Africa. Malawi has over 80,000 of its citizens there, while Sir Seretse Khama has estimated that 50,000 of his citizens are in South Africa. Zambia on the attainment of independence stopped this recruitment to the anger of WANELA.

Today South Africa is proud when it is described as "the only industrial complex, south of Milan. It already produces 3.5 million tons of steel, uses 57% of the continent's electricity. It also boasts that its group industrial production is 80% of the entire continent. And there is no shortage of money in the large finance houses in South Africa. Oppenheimer who was not able to find a mere K20 million to expand the copper mining in Zambia and therefore had to borrow from Japan on unfavourable terms is building a mammoth complex of steel plants worth K117 million in the Transvaal. The financiers have plenty of capital to export.

This surplus capital has been generated due to an ingenious system of exploitation unparalleled anywhere in the world. Should this be used anywhere else in the world, there would have been a scandal long ago. But it was possible in South Africa for the exploited people were black and those who benefited were the white financiers.

British imperialism evolved this system in the era of Rhodes and all the successive South African governments have continued with this outrage known as the migratory labour system.

It is well known that it is the labour power of the workers that create any wealth in society. But for the labour power to be generated continuously the worker has to be fed, housed and clothed. His wage is intended to cover that. But since it has to be continuous over generations this wage is intended to cover food, clothing and housing for the children and wife as well. It is on this that the minimum wage is calculated. Wives and children are included because they will provide the labour force of the future when the worker is himself too old to work.

MINIMUM WAGE

But the South African migratory system gets out of that in the most cunning way. They provide food clothing and shelter as long as he is in employment, and exclude his wife and children from their calculation, for they are hundreds of miles away. Under the migratory system the wives and children are left in the reserves or in the territories. Here they may have a patch of ground and a few animals if they are lucky. With that they have to feed for themselves. The worker on the completion of the contract joins them for a few weeks when economic considerations force him back to the land.

In practical terms this is how it works out. A white miner on the average gets K 140 a month. This is what the Oppenheimers regard as a minimum wage to feed, house and clothe himself and his family. But an African miner only gets K 14 a month. This is what the Oppenheimers think an African needs to clothe, feed and house himself. The apologists try to explain the difference by saying that the one is skilled and the other unskilled. That is not true for it is the blacks who do the skilled jobs in the mines.

In any event the ratio between the skilled and unskilled workers is that the latter gets 80% of the former in mines in Australia, Canada and America. Thus from the capitalists own standards, the Oppenheimers are guilty of the worst possible cheating known to modern history. They are guilty of pinching from the mouths of black children and their mothers. They take what belong to the worker's wives and children and pocket these in the form of higher dividends and increased profits. From the proceeds of this legalised robbery, they hand out a few thousands to various cultural, scientific and artistic bodies in order to worm their way as patrons of these.

The South African state legalises this robbery in a hundred ways, by not only enforcing this migratory system, but heaping law upon law specifically designed at controlling and suppressing him. Apart from the taxes, it shares in the exploitation in another way.

The task of a modern state is to see to it that those who produce the wealth in society are provided with certain basic essentials, necessary for their existence and development. Thus in all modern societies, provision is made in the budgets for the establishment of schools, hospitals, clinics, roads and other means of communications. But there is no such provision in the South African budget for the 497,000 migrant workers and their families. It is the territories to provide for all that for the worker and his family. When the children are grown up, that is when they are in a position to contribute to society by their own labour, South Africa now steps in and snatches them.

They are put to work to create the wealth for South Africa. They remain there as long as they have the labour powers to create the wealth. Once they are sick, from the miners pthisis, or become too old to work, then they are dumped back to the territories. In other societies these workers get a pension, but then South Africa does not regard them as those who should get pensions. In any event it is the territories responsibility. They have to look after him till he dies.

The South African state makes the best of both worlds. It squeezes labour from about half a million workers without accepting one iota of responsibility. It appropriates the surplus which the worker generates while it gives to others the responsibility of care at a time when he cannot contribute to the society.

One of the reasons why the economies of these countries are not developed is precisely because the able bodied men who would produce the wealth in society are in South Africa.

STEP LADDER

The money which the South African state saves is really money that belongs to the territories. If it gives aid to Malawi, it is in fact giving what really belongs to the territories. It is appropriation of such surplus that South Africa from being a mere semi-colony has become one of the developed nations of the world. If it has climbed high then its step ladder has been the backs and shoulders of the African people.

It is this relationship which it wants to entrench in the Southern African common market. South Africa wants the black worker in the most productive years of his life, while before and after that is when young and old, the territories will be responsible. In this way, South Africa will become richer and richer while its "partners in the common market" will become poorer and poorer. In this way, South Africa hopes to dominate Africa, and at the same time become one of the richest countries in the world.

One obstacle that stands in the way of Vorster and his financiers schemes is ZAMBIA. Unlike some of the leaders of African states who have publicly stated their desire to join such a community," Zambia has made it clear that it will have none of it. This is despite the fact that departing imperialism had tied her economy to that of the south.

Zambia being landlocked had to rely on the south both for her imports and exports. Zambia began to look for alternative routes and when Smith illegally seized power in Rhodesia, Zambia realized how right it was in its original suggestion for Smith had blackmailed her on a number of measures. It was that Dr. Kaunda had in mind when accepting the principle of the construction of the TANZAM railway he said: "All we want to see is TANZAM railway being built so that we are never again dependent on the route to the south." Zambia thus looked to the North to Tanzania and the other East African states for co-operation and large regional unity.

The Pretorian planners cannot view the direction that Zambia is pursuing with alarm and hatred. It threatens their grandiose schemes and to reduce them to mere bubbles.

Firstly, on the attainment of independence, Zambia stopped WANELA, that recruiting organization from the Chamber of mines from operating in her territory. It rightly regarded it as an insult to the dignity of the young nation. But more was involved. In taking this action, Zambia was saying that it was possible for Zambians to live a life free from insult, discrimination, and degradation. WANELA's road was one where the workers would be doomed to lead a life of unskilled workers with a miserable wage. The new way that Zambia showed was that although there would be initial difficulty, it would be one where they could rise to the highest in Zambia society.

Now what worries WANELA and the others is not the number of those recruited, for in the overall picture these were small and hence could easily be replaced. But it was the principle of it. If Zambia could cut this tie forged by imperialism and get away with it, then other states who believed that they would become bankrupt if they stopped labour would also follow suit. If this came about, the whole edifice on which this system of exploitation had been built would indeed be in serious jeopardy. It would seriously affect the long term strategy of dominating Africa.

Secondly, Zambia is the only country whose resources are such that if and when completely harnessed could be a real competitor to South Africa. At present South Africa's revenue for her 18 million people is about K 1400 million (1968); Zambia with her 4 million stands at K 300 million, which is almost the same in relation to the population. In comparison, the total amount for Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland is under K 30 million.

REAL COMPETITOR

Today, despite South Africa's outward prosperity, there is increased poverty not only for the blacks which is well known, but also for the whites. The Tomlinson Committee's Report recently (not to be confused with the Tomlinson Commission's report) stated that half of the South Africa's farmers are bankrupt. Amongst other things, one of the chief factors has been the high cost of land. In this respect Zambia's agricultural policy is superior to that of South Africa, for it is based in co-operatives with state ownership of land.

Thirdly, Zambia through her deeds has shown what an independent African state can do if it has the resources. At present there are 70,000 Africans in secondary and high schools in South Africa. This is Vorster's boast of what he has done for the Africans. But this is almost after over sixty years of rule for over 13 million people. Zambia with less than a third of the population has 40,000 in this category within four years. It shows that Zambia is really interested, while in South Africa education growth has been deliberately stunted.

However, the biggest crime in their eyes is that Zambia has gone ahead with Tanzania and China to build the railway line. This was unpardonable in their eyes, for they have let China in the area which was regarded as the British sphere of influence.

TIE UP

It is for this reason that their strategy is one destruction of Zambia as a nation state. They would much prefer to change the government constitutionally through Mr. Nkumbula and hence alter its course. But failing that other means will be resorted to one of them being secession.

In this plan for a Southern African common market, the Vorsters have the backing of imperialism. It is not only that Britain and America have investments 70% of the total investments in South Africa, but also for military reasons. Vorster has been alloted the role to act as the policeman to safeguard their interests in Central, East and Southern Africa.

To the west, South Africa's strategic importance has been highlighted by the closure of the Suez Canal and the decision of Britain to withdraw her forces East of Suez. This leaves a vacuum in the western global strategy and it is here that South Africa is expected to fill the breach.

There is the Simonstown Agreement between Britain and South Africa to patrol the East and South Coast of Africa. Selwyn Lloyd, the architect of the agreement was royally received in his recent visit to South Africa. The Vorsters are banking on a conservative party victory to give full force to this agreement. Further, there is also a project defence

XUM

pact between France, Portugal and South Africa to guard the East and South Coast of Africa using France's naval base at Madagascar. The west knows too well that South Africa in Simonstown has a dry dock that is capable of handling heavy guided missile cruisers, while the one in Cape Town can service aircraft carriers and super tankers of 90,000 tons.

The aim of the Pretoria planners of the Southern Africa market is but a reflection of the needs of the South African white bourgeoisie. The common market will help to consolidate the system migratory labour, while at the same time it would be stable area of investment and a large hinterland to dump its manufactured goods. In this association, it will be South Africa which will play a dominant role, while the African states would be treated as very, very poor relations. The relationship which exists between it now and the three ex-High Commission territories is what it wishes to incorporate to the rest of Southern Africa. But this can only mean progressive enrichment of South Africa and the progressive impoverishment of the rest.

But the Pretoria planners and the financiers whose interests they serve in no uncertain terms, are mistaken. For one thing Zambia through Dr. Kaunda stated that there could be no compromise on principles. Vorster cannot come to a conference table after having wiped his boots on the necks of the 15 million oppressed people.

BURNING DESIRE

They also ignore the burning desire of the oppressed people of Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa to be free. Armed struggles have already been launched in these areas and in the two territories of Mozambique and Angola large areas have been liberated. All these are dealing death blows to their grandiose schemes.

This does not mean that a Southern African community will not arise in the future. It will and must arise. But it will be when S. Africa will be rid of the minority regimes and where new governments will arise based on the popular will of all the people irrespective of race, colour and creed.

In such a community, the nations will gather as equals, and discuss and plan as equals. That will be a really genuine Southern African community which will serve the interest of the inhabitants of their territories.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to join my colleague and chairman of the Foreign Affairs African Subcommittee today in support of his call for a reopening of the case of the permit granted last year by the Civil Aeronautics Board to South African Airways to fly into New York. It is the most direct route between South Africa and the United States permitted to date, and I am deeply concerned that its authorization has diminished our dedication to justice in the eyes of black Africans and black Americans alike.

Although the right of South Africa to fly into the United States was established by a reciprocity protocol under an agreement between the two Governments in 1947—a year before apartheid became the national policy of the Republic of South Africa—no route was defined. Since then this policy of injustice has become common knowledge, yet in 1968 the Johnson administration agreed to amend the 1947 agreement and define a specific air route for South Africa. This was the time for a review of the basic agreement, in light of the situation in South Africa. Yet on November 7, 1968, the certification of a Johannesburg-New York air route was issued to South African Airways.

The permit to South African Airways has far greater implications than a mere commercial bid for business by an airline. It involves an action that can easily be interpreted by sensitive observers not only in Africa but also in the United States as official "sanction" of the system of apartheid which prevails in all institutions under the direct control of the Government of South Africa. South African Airways is administered by the Minister of Transport as a subdivision of the South African Government. Given the nature of the segregated and discriminatory conditions which exist in South Africa, the extensive advertising campaign being waged for American tourism is a bid for white tourism.

This policy of discrimination is in direct contradiction to the goals we have espoused and the progress that has been made by the civil rights legislation passed by the Congress. It is, in addition, in direct contradiction to our efforts in the foreign policy area to strengthen our relationship with the African nations. In the then Vice President Nixon's report on his trip to Africa in 1957 he said:

> The understanding of the principles for which we stand as a nation is a tremendous asset to us in this area. The maintenance of (our) . . . prestige . . . will depend upon whether the people of the Continent continue to understand our dedication to the principles of independence (and) equality . . . to which they are so deeply devoted.

I certainly agree that progress to eliminate discrimination in the United States is vital to our good relations with Africa. Just as important, however, is that the need to demonstrate the sincerity of the principles we espouse extends beyond our efforts at home. We must also oppose discrimination in Africa itself, and a reexamination of permit to South African Airways would be an important step in this direction.

Section 402(b) of the Federal Aviation Act requires that a permit be granted if "such transportation will be in the public interest." As I have suggested, there is considerable doubt that the South African Airway route is truly in the public interest. Although the law requires furthermore, a public hearing when a permit such as that granted to South African Airways is under consideration, the general public learned of this action only after it had been completed. The public has, I feel, a direct stake in the basic issues involved in the granting of this permit and should be afforded every opportunity to give full and careful consideration to the case and to make itself heard.

Mr. **CONYERS**. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and fellow Detroiter, Charles C. Diggs, for his leadership in this special order to protest the initiation of direct flights from South Africa to New York. His speech today is a small addition to his already outstanding record as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His constituents and black Americans across the country greatly appreciate his action in bringing this very serious matter to the floor of the House of Representatives.

My colleague has eloquently stated our opposition to the granting of facilities at the John F. Kennedy International Airport, or any American airport. I join him and the American Committee on Africa in requesting that the Civil Aeronautics Board reconsider its decision to permit South African Airways the right to land at Kennedy Airport. Of all the places in the world with which the United States does not need a direct link, South Africa is undoubtedly the most undesirable. The Civil Aeronautics Board has certainly gone far beyond its authority as an agency of the United States in issuing a foreign air carrier permit to South African Airways—a firm which bears the name of, and is based in a country which we have severely condemned for its policy of apartheid. I have not found during my service in the Congress that the CAB has the right to make foreign policy.

The utter lack of consideration for the African nations with which we are friends is obvious. Some of these countries are in imminent danger of infringement of their territorial rights by South Africa and are no doubt appalled by this gesture of friendship toward South Africa. Direct flights between South Africa and the United States can only serve to heighten tensions in that area and to impair our own diplomatic relations with the African nations who abhor South Africa and everything it symbolizes.

I cannot express the frustration and disgust I have for the ludicrous idea of permitting anything that smacks of South African apartheid into the United States. Do we not have enough racial problems in the United States without seeking to create others? No black man is welcome in South Africa—are we going to see separate ticket counters instituted for white Americans who want to travel to South Africa and black Americans who want to go elsewhere? Or perhaps separate waiting rooms? It is bad enough that there are American airlines who fly to South Africa at all. I would hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board would not only rescind the permit to South African Airways and to Pan American Airways for flights to South Africa, but that it would not even consider issuing such rights to any other airline which operates in the United States, whether domestic or foreign.

I certainly hope that the CAB will hold public hearings on this matter and reconsider the issuance of this permit to South African Airways, so that the matter will not require a full-scale congressional investigation. I am gratified, however, to know that the distinguished chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has offered to the American Committee on Africa and all other aggrieved persons the recourse of an investigation by his subcommittee should the CAB fail to act in the public interest.

March 26 is, indeed, a dreadful day for America, especially for black America as it marks a beginning of a tie between our country and one which stands against

XUM

everything in which we believe. My opposition to these flights will not end until I know that the last South African Airway flight from New York has left and that no more shall come.

MOORHEAD AND 33 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ASK FOR VIETNAM MILITARY REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Moorhead), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago—on March 11, 1968—when there were press stories to the effect that the military was requesting an additional 206,000 troops in Vietnam, several of our colleagues joined me in cosponsoring a resolution that provided:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe that our resolution made a contribution to the decision against further escalation of the war in Vietnam. Less than 3 weeks later the decision to restrict the bombing was announced and the initial steps were taken which led to the opening of the Paris peace talks.

The peace talks have been in progress for 10 months and Mr. Nixon has been in office for 2 months; yet the level of the war and, more importantly, the level of American participation in it continues unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, the time has again come for Congress to make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to express to the administration the desire of the American people to begin the process of deescalation of the American military effort.

Accordingly, on behalf of myself and 33 cosponsors I am today introducing another very brief resolution which provides:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

I invite all Members who believe that the time has come to begin the deescalation of our military involvement in Vietnam to join with me in introducing similar resolutions.

The following Members cosponsored Mr. Moorhead's concurrent resolution: Jonathan B. Bingham, George E. Brown, John Conyers, Jr., John H. Dent, Don Edwards, Leonard Farbstein, Joseph M. Gaydos, Jacob H. Gilbert, Seymour Halpern, Augustus F. Hawkins, Ken Hechler, Harold T. Johnson, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Edward I. Koch, Robert L. Leggett, Paul N. McCloskey, Abner J. Mikva, Joseph G. Minish, Patsy T. Mink, John E. Moss, Bertram Podell, Thomas M. Rees, Henry S. Reuss, Peter W. Rodino, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Edward R. Roybal, William F. Ryan, James H. Scheuer, Frank Thompson, Jr., Joseph P. Vigorito, Jerome R. Waldie, Charles H. Wilson, and Gus Yatron.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Moorhead) in cosponsoring his resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should make every effort to bring a reduction of our military involvement in Vietnam.

Obviously, because of the current situation where we are undertaking three offensive actions to forestall a threatened massive attack by the North Vietnamese, we recognize that immediate implementation of our objective is difficult. Military necessities and the need to protect our valiant servicemen fighting there now preclude precipitous withdrawal of troops.

But I most strongly believe that we must begin to bring home our U.S. and allied military forces as rapidly as possible. We all hope, I know, that the Paris negotiations—both the formal meetings and the private talks—will result in a settlement. In the meantime, however, we should not hesitate to begin a reduction of our military commitment to the maximum extent feasible without jeopardizing our young men now engaged in combat in the cause of freedom and independence for South Vietnam.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania which I hope will win prompt approval. It is right and proper at this time that Congress express its support of ending the Vietnam conflict by negotiation, not escalation.

A year ago this month I wrote the President and stood here in the House to urge that our Nation take the initiative in seeking a speedy resolution to the war which held the threat of steady expansion with no end in sight. Much has changed and yet little has changed in the long, tortuous months since then. The battles continue with their grim toll of suffering and death to our gallant young men and the helpless people of Vietnam. It is obvious that victory belongs to neither side, that the war is not winnable by either side. Clearly it is time to bring to the Paris talks the intensity of purpose, the sense of urgency for peace with which mankind always pursues military effort. The stakes are too high for us not to seize boldly this moment to work out a compromise settlement in Paris. Let us approve this resolution as an indication of the earnest desire of the American people for a genuinely negotiated settlement at Paris without protracted haggling and hairsplitting.

Over and above all men must learn in this nuclear age to substitute the rule of force with the rule of law. It has been truly said that what people can get in terms of a rule of law would contribute more to their security than what they have stockpiled in the form of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, when the Nixon administration took office, we looked to it for new initiatives to end the war in Vietnam. The President was unburdened by old commitments and imprudent allegiances. His newness gave him momentum. But more than 2 months have passed and it is difficult to discern a change in policy, either in Paris or on the battlefield. Some 300 of our young men are dying every week. Surely the casualties alone are ample reason for rushing this war to an end. I cannot conceal, Mr. Speaker, my growing disappointment with the administration's failure to achieve peace. I think it is now time that Congress suspend its silence, lest the new government overlook our concern or mistake the nature of the mandate it received last December. Peace is the first order of business of our Government. It must not be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined a number of my colleagues who feel the same way I do in sponsoring a resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam. Almost exactly a year ago, I cosponsored a resolution in Congress "that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam." I believe our resolution then made some contribution to the decision against further escalation. The time has come for Congress to again make its influence felt on the war in Vietnam. We must turn our efforts toward ending the war and to giving priority to the crises in our cities—to the needs of the poor, the hungry, and minority groups at home. I repeat, peace should be the first order of business of our Government.

SOME PERSPECTIVE ON "RIGHTS"—OUR RIGHTS COMPARED WITH OTHER'S RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Talcott), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the cavalier and uncaring attitude which some of our comfortable, affluent free citizens have assumed relative to the "freedoms" and "rights" of other human beings on our little planet.

I once understood that early Americans fiercely fought for certain individual freedoms and rights—albeit for themselves.

I once understood that our Nation fought and sacrificed the cream of her men and resources in several wars to defend and preserve certain individual rights and freedoms, for others—the French, the Belgians, the English, the Greeks, the Turks, the Filipinos, the Koreans, and others.

Once these freedoms and rights were as important as life and death to ourselves, our families, our countrymen, and others. Certainly if they were important to us, they were important to others.

Today there are individuals and groups of persons who know so little about a society devoid of those personal freedoms and individual rights and assume unconcernedly that they do not appreciate their rights and freedoms. These people take them for granted—or naively assume that they will remain inviolate forever.

There is also a cabal of malcontents and misfits who rant and rave and threaten to bring huge campuses or cities to a standstill because some fancied privilege must be slightly impinged in an ordered society.

There is a coterie of people who are so cozy and satisfied with their cherished

XUM

rights and freedom that they are not interested in helping others to secure comparable freedom or to preserve their rights because it would cost them something or interrupt their comfortable way of life.

I do not pretend to know all about an existence without freedoms or the best means to safeguard and preserve any particular rights. However, I speak with some experience and study. I spent 14 months under a totalitarian dictatorship—in a Nazi prison camp—where my individual rights and freedoms were severely restricted, although not nearly so completely curtailed as in Russia, China, or North Vietnam today. We may hate war with a vengeance; but we would hate even more the abolition of individual freedoms, if we only knew.

We, in the United States, probably enjoy more personal freedoms and individual rights than any other citizenry in recorded history. Just to mention a few—freedom of speech, which is so free that one can libel public officials, utter outrageous obscenities in public, or send vulgar pornography through the U.S. mails with impunity. Freedom of assembly—so free that large groups are often permitted to crowd others from public streets and buildings, even from private business property. Freedom of travel—so free that we can go anywhere without a single question asked or a single credential required. The right of privacy—no one can enter our home or touch our person, or tap our telephone, or inspect our bank account or tax returns, without our consent. The right to own and bear arms for the protection of one's self, family and property. The right of "habeas corpus"—a fundamental right "to have the body produced"—to require the presentation of a person for inspection or inquiry whether he be jailed, hospitalized or institutionalized; to ascertain where a deceased person is buried.

Freedom of the press—so free that reporters and photographers can report the minutest detail of our defenses—troop strength and condition at Khe Sanh—for not only their own profit but for enemy edification. The right of equal opportunity in education, public accommodations, jobs, voting, and office holding. The right to pursue a business of one's choice. Freedom from having militia quartered in one's home or business. Freedom from search and seizure of one's person, home or property. Freedom of religion—to practice and express one's personal religious convictions and to attend the church of one's choice—so free that one can criticize, even condemn, another's religious convictions with impunity. Political freedom—so free that anyone can advocate and practice any political philosophy he chooses. The right to vote by secret ballot. The right to seek and hold public office; the right to publicly criticize public officials—from unpaid irrigation district directors to the President. The right to petition the Government for redress of grievances. The right to sue our own Government. Freedom to marry whomever we please—and the right to rear our children in almost any manner we desire. The right to work or not to work. The right to own property and to sell or exchange it at our own prerogative. The right to inherit property and the right to give it away. Freedom from arrest without a warrant or good cause. The right of reasonable bail and freedom from self-incrimination. Freedom from conviction without due process of law. The right to a speedy trial by a jury of one's peers. The right to be confronted by one's accuser and the right to call witnesses in one's defense. The right to equal protection of the laws regardless of sex, political party, religious persuasion, race, economic or social status, national origin, or age. Freedom from imprisonment for debt or political activity.

No other nation or citizenry has ever enjoyed so many rights or freedoms—or even a substantial portion of them.

It seems preposterous that anyone would do anything to destroy the system that has guaranteed these innumerable rights for so long. But many persons are doing just that—some intentionally, some unknowingly. Some who insist that all our rights and freedoms be preserved for their own benefit are absolutely unwilling to lift a little finger to insure these rights for others.

Students, for instance, have often asserted their "right to protest" and "academic freedom" to the extent of vulgarities, the interruption of the study of others, and the destruction of property simply because university officials denied absurd and outrageous demands.

Even the slightest imagined infringement of one right or one freedom brings howls from the mass media, massive demonstrations, sheets of petitions.

It seems strangely and terribly incongruous that the very people who are so quick to protest and demonstrate about the least impingement of one of their innumerable rights here, are the least concerned about the total, complete annihilation of every one of these individual rights and personal freedoms in the Communist countries of Russia, China, and Cuba, and North Vietnam.

In North Vietnam a citizen does not possess or enjoy a single one of the rights, freedoms, or privileges that we take for granted. No privacy—they can expect a knock on the door at any hour of the day or night—or more likely, governmental intrusion without even a knock. No right of assembly or petition; no freedom of speech or press. No one can travel 10 miles without close inspection and thorough verification of credentials. If a friend or relative disappears in a Communist country, there is no right or possibility that his body or burial place can be viewed or located. Jury trials and bail are unknown. Only the Communist elite could own property and this can be confiscated without notice. Even one's children are likely to be removed from the home. It is not simply a matter of a few rights being abolished; most freedoms which we have long enjoyed were never known; none are exercisable. Even if some semblance of a right is temporarily acknowledged or permitted, no right or freedom is secure. No right or freedom is guaranteed by written constitution or the consent of the governed.

It is little wonder that most human beings would rather fight than exist under a system without even the most elemental individual freedom or personal right. In fact, what would there be to live for without the freedoms and rights which we take for granted—or which we expect our fellow citizens to preserve and defend for us.

Persons who have once known personal freedoms, individual rights and liberty, and then lost them, are likely to fight to the death to regain them whenever the opportunity presents itself—the Indonesians, the Hungarians, the Israelis. How can we become so exercised when one of our myriad rights is impinged, yet be so totally uncaring when all rights and freedoms of others are being completely destroyed?

If all of our rights and freedoms were being totally obliterated, would we solicit or welcome assistance?

I believe each of us should take a little time to contemplate the condition of our own personal existence if we were forced to live under the conditions now existing under a Communist regime—Russia, China, North Vietnam, or Czechoslovakia. Such a situation is almost impossible for us to imagine—but I believe you would rebel, you would seek assistance, and you would be eternally grateful for any aid. Ask yourself if you would want to be in the vanguard for assisting other human beings who are existing under terror and oppression without any of our personal liberties, individual freedoms and inalienable rights.

Before we abandon other people or nations who are struggling for the most basic of the many rights we enjoy, should we not consider what we would expect of them if our situations were reversed? Or should we perish such a thought?

SAGINAW, MICH., ALL-AMERICA CITY FOR 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, along with at least 10 other Members of this body, this is an exceedingly proud moment for me. It is with the greatest of pride to bring to the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives the selection of the city of Saginaw, Mich., as an All-America City for 1969. Only 11 cities are chosen each year by the National Municipal League and Look magazine to receive this distinguished nationwide honor.

I could not be prouder of my "hometown" and its 100,000 citizens who brought this tremendous honor to our community. Like many communities, Saginaw has had its difficulties, its differences, and its turmoil in recent years. Some old matters still must be resolved, others must be improved, and new situations must be confronted and conquered.

But, like thousands of others, Saginaw is trying and it was primarily for a complete community effort in bettering and easing race relations that it was one of the cities selected.

No one claims that Saginaw is a utopia. Not just yet. But Saginaw may well achieve that impossible dream in later years, because it already possesses the

XUM

most important ingredients—good, solid people.

In behalf of all Saginawians, I would also like to take this opportunity to "tip our hat" to the other 10 winners: Edinburg, Tex.; Savannah, Ga.; Snyder, Tex.; Jacksonville, Fla.; San Diego, Calif.; Cottage Grove, Oreg.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Danville, Ky.; Charlotte, N.C.; and New Albany, Ind.

CULVER PROPOSES TAX REFORM TO BENEFIT LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME TAXPAYERS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which will reduce the tax burdens on those individuals least able to pay taxes at the present level and still provide a decent living for their families—the low- and moderate-income taxpayer.

This legislation would increase the minimum standard deduction from $200 plus $100 for each exemption to $600—$300 for a married person filing separately—plus $100 for each exemption. Because the present ceiling of $1,000—$500 for a married person filing separately—will be retained, the costs in lost revenue of this bill will be limited. Furthermore, the ceiling will insure that low- and moderate-income taxpayers—not those whose incomes place them in high brackets—will be the sole beneficiaries of this measure. Finally, the increased minimum standard deduction will enable many low-income taxpayers to shift from the complex itemizing procedure to the simple standard deduction procedure.

Under existing law taxable income is computed by subtracting a taxpayer's allowable deductions and personal exemptions from adjusted gross income. As an alternative to itemizing his allowable deductions, a taxpayer may elect to claim a standard deduction equal to 10 percent of his adjusted gross income up to a maximum of $1,000. A separate minimum standard deduction provides that in all events an electing taxpayer is entitled to a minimum deduction of $200 plus an additional $100 for each exemption claimed subject to a ceiling of $1,000. It is this latter provision that the legislation would alter by increasing the amount of deduction to $600 plus $100 for each exemption.

The Department of the Treasury has indicated that increasing the minimum standard deduction in this manner "represents the most equitable and efficient method available of directing tax relief to persons in the lowest income ranges." And in my judgment, that relief is urgently needed. Over 2 million families with incomes considered below the poverty level by one agency of the Federal Government are nevertheless taxed on those incomes by another Federal agency. With unanimous consent I place at this point in the RECORD table 1 which was prepared by the Treasury and which shows this result:

TABLE 1.—BEGINNING TAX LEVELS AND POVERTY LEVELS

	Exemption and minimum standard deduction	Poverty income levels 1969[1]	Estimated number of poor family units (thousands)	
			Total	Presently taxable
Family size:				
1	$900	$1,735	4,620	1,150
2	1,600	2,240	2,600	620
3	2,300	2,755	880	150
4	3,000	3,535	640	120
5	3,700	4,165	520	50
6	4,400	4,675	430	40
7 or more[2]	5,800	5,755	940	50
Total family units			10,630	2,180

[1] Assumed to be 6 percent above the HEW nonfarm poverty levels for 1966.
[2] Averages 8 per family.

The proposed increase in the minimum standard deduction would relieve this situation. It would reduce the income tax payments for individuals with moderate incomes above the poverty level; and it would completely exempt from tax the majority of those persons below the poverty level who now pay some income tax.

Some 28 million taxpayers, of which almost two-thirds have incomes of less than $5,000, would benefit from the proposed changes—about 2.6 million of these individuals becoming completely nontaxable. In terms of family units, nearly 2.2 million families out of about 11 million poor families are taxed under the present law. Under this legislation, tax relief of around $1 billion would result in 1¼ million families becoming nontaxable and about 1 million more families receiving tax relief although they would continue to pay some taxes. With unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point tables 2 and 3 prepared by the Treasury which show these effects.

TABLE 2.—EFFECT OF CHANGES IN THE STANDARD DEDUCTION UNDER THE PROPOSAL ON PERSONS BELOW THE POVERTY LINE, CALENDAR YEAR 1969

Family size	Exemptions and minimum standard deduction allowed		Poverty income levels, 1969[1]	Estimated number of poor persons (in thousands)[2]			
	Present law	Proposal		Total	Number of poor now taxable	Number made nontaxable	Number helped, but still taxable
1	$900	$1,300	$1,735	4,620	1,150	550	600
2	1,600	2,000	2,240	5,200	1,220	790	430
3	2,300	2,700	2,755	2,640	460	400	60
4	3,000	3,400	3,535	2,550	490	360	130
5	3,700	4,000	4,165	2,620	270	220	50
6	4,400	4,600	4,675	2,590	250	180	70
7 or more[3]	5,800	5,800	5,755	7,600	450	50	400
Total				27,820	4,290	2,550	1,740
Total family units				10,630	2,180	1,250	940

[1] 1969 poverty levels are assumed to be 6 percent above the HEW nonfarm level for 1966. This conforms to the method by which the number of poor was projected.
[2] Includes both adults and children.
[3] Averages about 8 persons per family.

TABLE 3.—EFFECT OF INCREASING THE PRESENT $200 PLUS $100 MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION TO $600 PLUS $100 WITH $1,000 CEILING

[Dollar amounts in millions; number of returns in thousands]

AGI (in thousands of dollars)	Present law tax	Tax decrease	Tax decrease as percent of present law tax	Number of returns with tax decrease	Number of returns made nontaxable	Number of returns shifting to standard deduction
0 to 3	$1,159	$415	35.8	9,760	2,025	870
3 to 5	3,177	420	13.2	7,870	320	1,120
5 to 7	5,439	200	3.7	5,940	15	980
7 to 10	13,925	95	.7	4,330		400
10 to 15	18,916					
15 to 20	7,550					
20 to 50	12,795					
50 to 100	6,326					
100 and over	6,202					
Total	75,490	1,130	1.5	27,900	2,360	3,370

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Treasury has cited a need for this type of legislation in its report of February 5, 1969, entitled "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals." With unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a Technical Explanation prepared by the Treasury which explains the proposal. A text of the bill is also included:

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

Under existing law each taxpayer may, as an alternative to itemizing his personal expense deductions, elect to claim a standard deduction equal to 10 percent of his adjusted gross income subject to a $1,000 ceiling. For electing taxpayers the law presently provides a minimum standard deduction of $200 plus $100 for each exemption subject to a ceiling of $1,000.

Under the proposal the minimum standard deduction available to electing taxpayers would be increased from $200 plus $100 for each exemption, to $600 plus $100 for each exemption. Thus, a single person would have a minimum standard deduction of $700, a married couple $800, a married couple with two dependents $1,000.

A $1,000 CEILING

The provision of existing law which limits the minimum standard deduction to $1,000 would be retained. Thus a married taxpayer with two dependents would be entitled to a minimum standard deduction of $1,000 and the amount of deduction could not exceed

XUM

this amount even if the particular taxpayer had more than three dependents. A married taxpayer with two dependents who did not itemize his deductions would be using the minimum standard deduction unless his income exceeded $7,142. . . .

MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS

For a married taxpayer filing a separate return, the minimum standard deduction would be $300 (rather than $600) plus $100 for each exemption and would be subject to a $500 ceiling (rather than a $1,000 ceiling).

As under existing law, if a taxpayer is married and files a separate return, he may not use the general standard deduction if his spouse itemized deductions and may not use the minimum standard deduction if his spouse either itemizes deductions or uses the general standard deduction. If a taxpayer's general standard deduction is greater than the minimum standard, he may nevertheless elect to use the minimum standard if his spouse's minimum standard deduction is greater than the general standard deduction.

DEPENDENTS OF OTHER TAXPAYERS

Under the proposal the minimum standard deduction may not be used by taxpayers who are claimed as dependents by other taxpayers.

Under existing law a taxpayer is entitled to a $600 dependency exemption for each of certain specified relatives who receive more than half of their support from the taxpayer and have less than $600 of gross income.

An exception to the gross income limitation is made in the case of children of the taxpayer who are under 19 or students. As a consequence, under existing law children of the taxpayer may have gross income in excess of $600 as to which they may claim their own $600 personal exemption and also claim the minimum standard deduction even though they are supported by a parent who also claims them as a dependent for tax purposes.

The minimum standard deduction is intended to aid taxpayers and their families in the lowest income ranges. There is no justification for permitting that deduction to taxpayers who, while nominally in the lower income ranges, are in fact receiving in addition to their own income more than half of their support from parents. For example, were the proposed minimum standard deduction extended to such persons, a wealthy parent would be able to create $1,300 of tax-free income annually for each child by transferring property yielding that amount to each child.

Under the proposal a dependent would still be permitted to claim a $600 exemption against his own income even though the person supporting him also claimed a $600 exemption, but the dependent would not be permitted to use the minimum standard deduction as an alternative to the general standard deduction.

PERSONS OVER AGE 65

Persons over age 65 will be entitled to the same minimum standard deduction as persons under age 65. . . .

EFFECTIVE DATE

The recommended changes in the minimum standard deduction would be applicable to tax years beginning after December 31, 1969.

H.R. 9523

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the minimum standard deduction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 141(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to minimum standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$200" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$600"; and

(2) by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300".

(b) Section 141 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to standard deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Dependents of Other Taxpayers.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the minimum standard deduction shall not apply in the case of a return of an individual, if a deduction with respect to such individual is allowed under section 151(e) to any other taxpayer for any period which overlaps in whole or in part the taxable year of such individual."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

OKLAHOMA'S WINNINGEST COACH

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 15, 1969, the Byng, Okla., girls' basketball team, coached by Mrs. Bertha Frank Teague, won the Oklahoma class A championship. It was the eighth State title won by one of Mrs. Teague's teams, making her the winningest coach in the history of Oklahoma basketball. During her 43 years of coaching at Byng High School, her teams have won 1,217 games and lost only 88. In addition to the eight State championships, her teams have won seven runnerup trophies and many other titles.

An article by Ernest Thompson in the Ada, Okla., Sunday News for March 16, 1968, describes Mrs. Teague's career. I am happy to commend it to my colleagues who, I am sure, will join me in saluting Mrs. Teague:

BYNG-O: BERTHA BOWS OUT

(By Ernest Thompson)

When one speaks of Bertha Frank Teague's record as a basketball coach, the supply of superlatives suddenly runs out.

She has been praised and eulogized by congressmen, college coaches, national magazines, U.S. Senators, metropolitan sportswriters, state athletic directors and just plain folks.

Saturday afternoon, as Mrs. Teague ended more than four decades as girls' coach at Byng High School, she received her last hurrah before a huge crowd at the Fairgrounds Arena in Oklahoma City.

Gov. Dewey Bartlett declared it "Bertha Frank Teague Day" across Oklahoma.

The State House of Representatives and Senate passed resolutions praising her.

Her girls team had put a storybook finish on the saga of Mrs. Teague by winning, once again, the state championship.

And, in an unprecedented move, a special ceremony was staged on the court following the championship game.

Never, in the history of Oklahoma high school athletics, has such an accolade been accorded an individual.

So, what's it all about?

It goes something like this:

Mrs. Teague coached 43 years at Byng High School.

She won 1,217 games.

She lost only 88.

She took eight state championships and seven runnerup trophies.

She appeared in the state tournament a record 22 times.

She won a national A.A.U. championship.

She won 40 district tournaments and 22 regional meets plus uncounted invitational tourneys.

She won 98 games in a row in the 1930s—still a record.

She founded the first girls' coaching clinic in the Southwest.

She launched the Oklahoma Girls' Basketball Coaches Association and was its first and only president to this date.

She authored what is believed to be the only book devoted entirely to girls' basketball (Basketball for Girls, Ronald Press, New York).

She is the only woman ever nominated for the National Helms Foundation Basketball Hall of Fame.

She is, in fact, the winningest coach in the history of Oklahoma basketball.

That covers a part of the story.

It all began back in 1927 when Mrs. Teague moved to Byng.

A native of Missouri (Carthage), she graduated from Amity, Ark., High School. After teaching stints at Delight, Ark., and Cairo, Okla., she married Jess E. Teague in Arkadelphia, Ark., in 1926.

They came to Byng—he as superintendent of schools (a post he held for 39 years) and she as first-grade teacher (a position she was to keep 40 years).

As a sideline, she also began to coach basketball. In those days, Byng School was a tiny place, inhabited by about 220 kids. Few could foresee then the fabulous record in basketball Bertha Frank Teague would amass, or the incredible growth of the school to more than five times its size in 1927.

Things didn't really get going until 1936. That's when Byng won its first championship in girls' basketball. Many more were to come.

"I just got interested in it, that's all," Mrs. Teague says today. "I didn't really set out to coach 40 years of girls' basketball. It was sort of a sideline at first. But, I guess you can say I sort of fell in love with the sport and I learned how much good could be done for young women in interscholastic basketball. Besides, I'm competitive by nature and it was (and still is) fun."

It is said that winning is not the main thing in athletics, but few question that it's more fun to win than lose. Mrs. Teague has been having a lot of fun for 43 years.

After that first state championship in '36, Mrs. Teague's teams launched a string of records that made the school nationally famous in athletics. Even now, three decades later, longtime sports fans remember "those Byng gals back in the late '30s."

What happened was that Byng won three consecutive state championships and an unprecedented 93 games in a row in 1936–37–38.

Not only that, but in 1938, Mrs. Teague decided to go into the big time. She took her high school team to Wichita, Kans., to compete in the national A.A.U. girls' tournament.

A.A.U. women's sports were big things in those days. One just didn't have the effrontery to enter a high school team against all-star aggregations from across the United States.

Bertha Teague did. And she won . . . against industrial teams, college teams, state all-stars. In the final game, her club whipped the highly touted champion California All-Stars, 34-15. Nobody in the A.A.U. tournament laughed again.

Since that time, the name of Teague and "girls' basketball" have become synonymous.

Her reputation has grown to such proportions that Bill Mokray, information director of the Boston Celtics, famed pro basketball team, was moved to write a letter favoring her election to the National Hall of Fame.

Said Mokray, "No woman has ever been elected . . . but her reputation is such nationally that in any discussion of high school girls' basketball, one inevitably gets around to Bertha Frank Teague and her superb record."

XUM

She has also been nominated for the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame.

Austin Core, head of the sports department of Look Magazine, says simply, in his letter of recommendation to the Naismith Hall: "—I feel sure no coach in the United States can boast a record such as that of Mrs. Teague."

Carl Albert, majority leader in the U.S. House of Representatives, said: "She is highly esteemed as a leader in women's sports activities and as an outstanding humanitarian in her community and state."

Ray Soldan, assistant sports editor of The Daily Oklahoman, wrote: "I can think of no other coach, man or woman, other than Coach Henry Iba, who is as deserving of national honors."

Dr. Rhea Williams, who heads the Texas Athletic Association, noted: "Mrs. Teague is the most respected and honored girls' coach in the nation. I have never met a more remarkable individual."

Tributes also came from Lee K. Anderson, former czar of prep athletics in Oklahoma; Congressman Tom Steed; Sen. Henry Bellmon; State Rep. Lonnie Abbott; Gov. Bartlett; Lt. Gov. George Nigh; State Sen. George Miller, and many others.

How does Mrs. Teague feel about quitting what is not only her life's vocation, but, indeed, her "life" itself?

"Of course, I really don't want to quit," she says. "But, there comes a time in everybody's life when they must retire from the scene. I think it is better now than later. I will be leaving some good players for a young coach. That's better than quitting after you've run through a good bunch of material and then leaving your successor with players who may not be quite as good."

As for her 43 teams at Byng, Mrs. Teague, quite naturally, is not anxious to make comparisons.

Asked to do so, she exclaims, throwing up her hands: "Oh, law, that's the hardest question I was ever asked.

"Back in the old days, of course, we had different rules and different styles of play. Usually, we had a 'star' on the team—more often than not a tall post forward. Today, all these girls can hit the basket and they can handle the ball. Nobody's a star. They're all fine athletes."

How about individual players?

Mrs. Teague again hesitates. She mentions the stars of long ago, girls who won the A.A.U. and 98 games in a row—girls such as Emma Lela Fulkerson, Lorene Daniels, Evelyn Casey, Alma Landrith, Nora and Dora Muncrief, Marguerite Eppler.

Casey still holds many state records. Daniels was a professional player and coach later with the All-American Red Heads. Landrith was the only freshman player in the history of the state tournament to make all-state as a freshman. Eppler is still regarded as probably the finest guard ever turned out in Oklahoma.

About the "later days," Mrs. Teague is also hesitant to pick out individuals, but some names keep cropping up. Names such as Christine Linker, now Pontotoc County tag agent, who led Byng to undefeated seasons in 1951 and 1952.

"Christine was probably the best all-around girl basketball player I've ever seen," Mrs. Teague says. "Even Abe Saperstein (founder and coach of the famed Harlem Globetrotters and the All-American Red Heads) was interested in her. He offered to train her in basketball, tennis, golf . . . anything she wanted to try."

Also mentioned is Bettie Taylor, who holds the state scoring record and paced Byng to championships only a few years ago. Offensively, Mrs. Teague says, she's never had a better one, not even the prolific Rebecca Kaiser.

Aside from the high school team, Mrs. Teague has also coached grade school and junior high teams. Add to the 13,000 games she's coached in high school about 3,000 more for the lower grades and you come up with another astounding figure.

And, Mrs. Teague has also had time for her family, community and church.

Her daughter, Geneva (now Mrs. Ted Billey, Oklahoma City), played on her mother's teams in the early 1950s.

She has been an active member of the New Bethel Baptist Church since it was built in the 1930s.

She is also a member of the Ada Kiwanians and Pi Kappa Delta sorority.

When she's not coaching, Mrs. Teague may be found in Des Moines, Cleveland, Columbus, Chicago—just about anywhere a girls' rules meeting is scheduled. Some say she has practically rewritten the rulebooks.

Listening to her talk now, it hardly seems like she intends to sit around and twiddle her thumbs when she retires.

She and her husband, who retired in 1965 as the first and only superintendent Byng had up to that time, will probably do a bit of traveling.

And, don't be surprised if Mr. Teague often finds himself at a few state girls' basketball tournaments or at a national rules meeting.

Habits are hard to break, especially after 43 years.

CIVIL RIGHTS IN REVERSE

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, civil rights programs, ordered by the Congress, are in trouble.

Both in the areas of the title VI school desegregation program and in the field of equal employment, the Nixon administration is failing to meet necessary standards.

Sunday, March 16, the Washington Post carried what I believe is a very significant article on the school desegregation program. It is not a happy story. The final sentence tells the tale: "The desegregation program is in trouble."

And why is the program in trouble? There are several reasons, not the least of which is that in the 2 short months of the Nixon administration, the program has been administered so as to seriously cripple it. Until 2 months ago the program was picking up momentum and it was on verge of achieving substantial progress. HEW reported a 6-percent increase in school desegregation in 11 Southern States during the past year. We could expect more progress, if the program received the kind of support it deserves from the administration.

Sadly, the area of school desegregation is not the only area in which the administration is failing to carry out the goals of the Congress.

The New Republic in its March 22 issue spells out the failures in the area of equal employment opportunities. It tells the sad story of David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and his private and extra legal agreement with textile firms.

Mr. Speaker, I place the Sunday Washington Post article by Mr. Peter Milius and the March 22 article in the New Republic by Mr. Barney Sellers at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 16, 1969]

INTEGRATION RESISTANCE RISES

(By Peter Milius)

Outright Southern defiance of the Federal school desegregation guidelines has increased markedly in recent months.

More Southern school districts than ever before are flatly refusing to file acceptable desegregation plans.

Ironically, the new wave of defiance comes at a time when there are also more Southern districts than ever before complying with the guidelines; the five-year-old desegregation program is rather clearly at a crossroads.

The renewed Southern resistance is due in part to changes last year in Federal enforcement tactics.

Civil rights officials are now moving into the most recalcitrant Southern school districts, often those with Negro majorities, and are insisting on prompt and complete instead of gradual and partial desegregation.

There are thus more showdowns now than before.

At the same time, the Nixon Administration has shown signs of wavering on desegregation.

Some of the President's campaign statements last fall led Southerners to think he would let them off the hook if elected. The President has since taken a firmer position. But Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch's public statements on enforcement since the inauguration have dismayed some Southerners but have also been ambiguous enough to keep alive the Southern hope and the political support that lies behind it.

A high Federal civil rights official said last week that "there has definitely been a slowdown in voluntary compliance."

Last June there were 412 school districts that had refused to file acceptable desegregation plans and had either had their Federal funds cut off or were somewhere in the enforcement process that can lead to a cutoff.

Last week that figure had risen to 582 districts, an increase of 41 per cent.

Last spring HEW sent letters to about 320 districts, asking for complete desegregation plans. It got back acceptable plans from all but about 60.

Last fall, as the presidential campaign was beginning, the Department sent similar requests to another 350 districts, the last and stubbornest on its list of holdouts. About 220 have refused to comply.

EARLIER PLANS WITHDRAWN

More ominous, in the judgment of some civil rights officials, is the fact that some districts—a small but increasing number in Texas, Arkansas, South Carolina and other states—are withdrawing desegregation plans they filed earlier.

"The outcome," one official said last week, "is that Finch is going to have to cut off funds to a lot more districts than if he'd made clear what the districts have to do."

Finch has withheld or cut off funds to eight unbending districts since taking office two months ago.

RELAXATION SEEN

But Finch also, in a recent rambling, widely-read interview in U.S. News and World Report, said he is having the desegregation guidelines reviewed, that the salient issue is discrimination rather than segregation—a remark particularly heartening to Southerners clinging to freedom-of-choice—and that he is more concerned about the quality of schools than their racial makeup.

In the same vein, under pressure from key Southerners in Congress and some members of the White House staff, particularly Harry S. Dent, former administrative assistant to Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), Finch has made himself and his immediate staff directly accessible to Southern delegations here to protest their treatment at the hands of regular HEW enforcement officials.

RIGHTS HEAD QUITS

Ruby G. Martin, former director of HEW's Office of Civil Rights, refused reappointment and an increase in pay under the Nixon Administration, mainly because she felt high-level vacillation had undercut the office and robbed it of its effectiveness.

She said last week that the desegregation program has been set back one or two years no matter what Finch says or does next.

An Office of Civil Rights official noted several days ago that "they haven't made us buy any bad plans yet."

"But Ruby's right," the official added. "Those statements have set us back tremendously. . . . They're just killing us down South. Everybody believes there's going to be a change. As a result, they don't even want to talk to the people in our regional offices. They want to come to Washington. The problem is they can get away with it."

CHANGE IN TONE

Finch has said several times that he intends to uphold the law, that he is not going to back off from present target dates—complete desegregation by this September in most cases, next September at the very latest—and that the only real change he has in mind is in the desegregation program's tone.

A member of his staff noted last week that "there was nothing in that U.S. News interview directly contrary to the law."

Letters coming in to HEW suggest that the South may have read it otherwise. A Mississippi woman wrote "I'm glad to read you think segregation is legal." An Arkansas superintendent who was ready to desegregate said that the interview cost him three like-minded school board members. They were beaten in an election last week by three freedom-of-choice advocates.

MAIL IS BITTER

But most of Finch's mail from the South so far has been the other way, bitter and even vituperative letters of complaint about the cutoffs he has ordered.

The increased Southern definance comes at a time when civil rights officials are starting to carry the guidelines into the North and the Nation's colleges, steps which may precipitate fresh opposition. There is also noticeable opposition for the first time from Negroes, those who have given up on desegregation and want now to go their own way. The desegregation program is in trouble.

"It's the pressure," one well-placed official said last week. "From Thurmond, from Tower (Texas Sen. John G. Tower, Republican), from all the Southern Republican state chairmen, from Dent in the White House.

"These people feel they stuck their necks out in the campaign. It paid off for Nixon. Now they want to see something indicating there has been a change.

"Finch is a political person, and all the political pressure's coming from one side now."

Packard's Deal With the Textile Big Three

(By Barney Sellers)

By May 1, three of the nation's largest textile mills will report to David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, on their progress in meeting his fair employment standards. The reports will be filed as part of undisclosed, verbal agreements between Packard and the firms' chief executives to meet documented charges by the Department that the textile mills discriminate. In return for their efforts, Packard has awarded the firms—Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries, and J. P. Stevens—$14 million in Defense contracts. When the reports are received only Packard will know whether they meet the original "terms." His cryptic announcement approving the new contracts abruptly killed a two year, multi-agency attempt to enforce the government's long neglected power over discriminating contractors and set a poor precedent for future enforcement action.

There are 7,000 textile mills in the country, located mainly on the East Coast and principally in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Though the industry has been traditionally competitive, with small, family-owned firms the rule, recent mergers and acquisitions have resulted in a decreasing reliance on labor-intensive methods and increasing mechanized production in large plants. While there are almost one million textile workers, many female, the work force is declining and dropped by about 15,000 last year. Labor relations in the industry have been marked by management's virulent anti-union policy, which continues to this day, and racial exclusion, which has been broken minimally within recent years. Today, about a tenth of textile jobs are unionized. In the past two decades Dan River, Burlington and J. P. Stevens have been found guilty of violating federal labor practice legislation. Since 1966, the NLRB has found J. P. Stevens guilty of illegal labor acts six times. Four of these findings have been upheld by federal courts and in 1968 the Supreme Court affirmed findings of "massive" violations of the National Labor Relations Act, including firing, demoting, threatening, unlawfully interrogating and spying on employees.

Since 1960 the growth of new Southern industry has created a tight labor market for the mills as white workers have moved to higher paying jobs in other industries. As a result, the mills have been forced to raise wages and break the near-total exclusion of blacks. Ironically, the token breaking of the race line has given management new problems: young black workers, inspired by the organized successes of the civil rights movement, have concluded their main hope for improved working conditions rests with union growth; picketing by black female production workers has received national attention.

In January 1967, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission launched its first industry-wide fair employment project. The textile industry was chosen because it is a major provider of jobs in the Southeast; it uses workers with a wide variety of skills; it traditionally serves as an industrial entry point for unskilled persons; and because it has had a pattern of discriminatory employment. As part of the effort, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which has authority for overseeing the government's contractor fair employment program, agreed to help organize field visits to eight major mills and to develop programs for change where they would be needed.

In January 1968, OFCC and the Defense Department—which is assigned review responsibility for the textile firms—agreed to visit a limited number of the largest textile mills in the South. The agreement reportedly was for Defense to visit the plants, document discrimination where it existed and consult OFCC prior to making final agreements.

Dan River Mills was picked as the model for the plants and a visit to five facilities was made in January 1968. The main problems found included a very low utilization of black female production workers (even in counties with a one-third black population); virtual exclusion of Negro women from clerical jobs; assignment of black males to low paying, low status jobs; and segregation of facilities, including company-owned housing. In one plant, for example, blacks working for twenty years were in lower paying positions than white employees hired in 1967. A similar pattern was found in 6 other South Carolina plants, where only 5 Negroes were working in almost 700 advanced job spots. (Discriminatory treatment at an Alabama Dan River plant was also exposed in a Civil Rights Commission hearing in April 1968.)

After that field review, Defense made its findings known to the plants and a long series of calls, letters and conferences began in order to work out an acceptable plan. In 1968, Dan River was given more than six extensions of time to develop an adequate plan for change—in government terminology an "affirmative action" plan—even though the basic issues never really changed: how would the company act to redress the present effects of past discrimination, and when would it do it?

The company refused to meet these two key issues. It would not act to correct past injustices by giving black workers a compensatory chance for promotions or pay raises over white workers; it refused to propose time goals. Government officials who argued that present effects of past discrimination must be affirmatively removed relied on two federal district court cases decided last year, the essence of which was stated in a decision involving a paper union and the Crown Zellerbach Company of Bogalusa, Louisiana:

> "Where a seniority system has the effect of perpetuating discrimination and concentrating . . . the effects of past discrimination against Negro employees into the *present* placement of Negroes in inferior positions for promotions and other purposes, that present result is prohibited . . . and must be replaced with another system."

The principle of this case, applying to actions by both unions and employers, was affirmed in mid-January 1969 by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and clearly supports efforts to overcome entrenched segregation and discrimination. The details of the discussions with Dan River were known to both OFCC, who reportedly urged that negotiations be dropped and sanctions started, and the highest Defense officials. The talks dragged on and were bucked back and forth in Defense until just past the 1968 elections, when a final meeting was held four days before the end of the Democratic incumbency. The company was required to reply to the government's proposals with a final response—one week after the new Administration was to take office. The final ingredient in the slowly escalating case was notice from the Defense Supply Agency—the Defense organ in charge of contractor employment—that the Department was due to award $16 million worth of cloth contracts for uniforms, and the three low bidders were Dan River, J. P. Stevens, and Burlington. (During the one-year period of negotiation in 1968, Defense awarded almost 70 contracts worth $77.5 million to the three firms.) DSA pointed out that maintenance of principle in this case might cost the agency $800,000 if the low-bidders were bypassed. It was up to the new Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Packard, to decide.

Shortly after submission of the company proposal, essentially the same plan that had been discussed for over 12 months, the textile firms turned on the heat. Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.), contacted the White House to get Defense officials in his office to discuss the case. Senator John Stennis (D., Miss.), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, wrote to the Secretary's office complaining about the military need for the service uniforms and the "unreasonable" fair employment demands. L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, Stennis' counterpart in the House also indicated his displeasure. And finally, former Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens, now president of J. P. Stevens, visited several former colleagues in Defense. Senators Javits and Brooke, almost alone among the Republicans, urged Defense to take a firm position.

Packard's office announced a decision would be made on February 10, and Defense later indicated to civil rights groups, which

XUM

were preparing to muster support in Congress, that the decision would be delayed even further. On February 7 Packard's office announced the matter had been settled.

As a result of a session with the chief executive officers of the three firms, the Deputy Secretary "received assurances" the law would be met. No written agreement was made, even though one is required by federal regulations. No representatives of any government agency formerly involved in the case—including civil rights staff—were present. No subsequent information concerning the talks, other than the Secretary's press statement that he would give "personal attention" to the case, was released—even within the Defense Department. OFCC and the Secretary of Labor belatedly asked for copies of the "agreement." Though none was delivered, the arrangement was subsequently approved by Secretary of Labor Shultz. Labor and Defense announced that "to insure" company commitments would be kept, they would develop a quarterly report for the mills which would contain specific questions to be answered.

The tragedy of the case—the first major enforcement effort for Defense—is that it was unnecessarily bungled. Civil rights supporters in and out of government saw the issue as the Administration's test in employment enforcement and likened its importance to Secretary Finch's pending school desegregation decisions at HEW. The Defense decision made clear the new Administration's willingness to continue past government enforcement policies that allow more than a score of federal agencies to decide unilaterally when and how the law shall be enforced for minorities. There is even some indication now that Defense procurement officials are preparing to press for scuttling of pre-award compliance reviews

More important, the decision's handling may reinstate personal law enforcement in civil rights—the government approach to civil rights enforcement wherein decisions are not made routinely and fairly, but through interventions by high political appointees. The danger of the personal approach are amply demonstrated in the past trials of Commissioner Harold Howe, who spent most of his time at the Office of Education denying he was an "integration czar." Decisions concerning law enforcement in civil rights, as in other areas, should be routinized through regular due process wherever possible.

Finally, Packard relied upon the good word of "fellow" executives in the industry. One need not distrust their personal honesty, but clearly, their economic interests (anti-union) and hiring policies (racist) argue against their ability or willingness to actively recruit, hire and promote blacks. Packard was dealing with the lives of thousands of present and potential minority employees who have traditionally been without support from these firms and who must rely upon the fair working of government due process to protect their rights. Who but David Packard will be able to judge the appropriateness of industry steps toward fair employment? And by what standards will those steps be measured? Gentlemen's agreements are no longer sufficient.

Further, Mr. Speaker I place the following letters, on the same subjects, sent by the Democratic Study Group to President Nixon be printed at this point in the Record:

Democratic Study Group,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are disturbed to learn that Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Finch has deviated from the procedures previously established to carry out Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits the use of federal tax revenues for programs which discriminate on the basis of color or race.

Effective and consistent enforcement of Title VI is essential if we are to end discrimination in America. Yet five school systems in Mississippi and North and South Carolina which have not complied with federal law requiring desegregation of schools have been afforded special treatment. These five districts, with which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had been negotiating for two years, had already exhausted the hearing and appeal procedures within the Department and had been adjudged not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. These school districts were notified on December 29, 1968 that procedures had been started which would result in a cutoff of federal funds on January 29.

While the order terminating federal assistance has been permitted to take effect, the school districts in question have been notified by Secretary Finch that if they come into compliance within 60 days they will receive the funds retroactively. In the meantime, the funds will be held in trust by the respective states. The Secretary's action is unprecedented and unwarranted since such fund cutoffs occur only after lengthy negotiations, thorough review of the facts, and persistent refusal by local school officials to obey the law.

Secretary Finch has declared that this action is being taken because he has not had time to review the facts of the cases. He implied that the new procedure is not a permanent deviation from established procedure. Nonetheless, his decision is regrettable because it will lead many school districts which are not in compliance to believe that the HEW guidelines will be relaxed.

This danger is heightened by several statements of Senator Strom Thurmond, who was closely identified with your campaign, suggesting that the Nixon Administration will not require full and effective compliance with federal desegregation requirements. An example is the enclosed copy of a news report from the December 19, 1968 issue of the Columbia, South Carolina newspaper, *The State,* in which Senator Thurmond is quoted as telling Southern school administrators to ignore HEW demands and "wait for a better deal" under the Nixon Administration. Senator Thurmond also expressed approval of Secretary Finch's action this week.

We therefore think it imperative, Mr. President, that you make it clear that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and HEW's guidelines for its implementation will continue to be firmly enforced, and that your Administration does not intend to establish a "better deal" for those who refuse to obey the law of the land.

Otherwise, there is great danger that the action of Secretary Finch and the statements of Senator Thurmond will stimulate further footdragging and evasion on the part of school districts which still discriminate against children on the basis of race. Also, as indicated by the enclosed editorial from *The Atlanta Journal* of January 30, vacillation on the part of the federal government would undermine the efforts of those Southern school officials who have attempted to obey the law.

Respectfully,
Donald M. Fraser,
John Brademas,
James C. Corman,
Members of Congress.

Democratic Study Group,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are writing to you again about the matter of civil rights enforcement. We are concerned that Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard's disregard of regulations established to carry out Executive Order 11246, which bans the award of federal contracts to companies which engage in discriminatory employment practices, may signal a serious breakdown in federal civil rights enforcement efforts.

Executive Order 11246, together with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, is designed to assure that the federal government will not subsidize companies which practice employment discrimination. The Executive Order directs that the Office of Federal Contract Complaince, Department of Labor, shall have supervisory responsibility over enforcement of the Order and will coordinate the efforts of the various federal contracting agencies.

In the past month, defense contracts totaling $14 million were awarded to three textile firms—Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co.—despite the fact that investigations by the Defense Supply Agency revealed that all three companies discriminate in hiring, promotion and other practices. OFCC regulations of May 28, 1968, specifically provide that once a contractor is found deficient in civil rights compliance, "it must make a specific commitment, *in writing,* to correct any such deficiencies. The commitment must include the action to be taken and the dates for completion." (Sec. 60–1:20)

Compliance with this regulation is sorely lacking. On February 8, 1969, despite finds of deficiency, contracts totaling $9.4 million were granted the three non-complying companies. Further, contracts totaling $4.5 million were announced on February 19 and 20. In each case, the requirement of written assurances was ignored. Deputy Secretary Packard claims to have received oral assurances that the companies would henceforth comply with the Executive Order. Such a procedure is not totally inadequate, but is a gross violation of the OFCC regulation cited above. In addition, despite its responsibilities in this area, the OFCC was not even consulted regarding the decision to award these contracts.

Such actions seriously undermine federal civil rights enforcement efforts. As we pointed out in our letter of February 1, expressing concern at relaxation of Title VI school desegration procedures, any letup in enforcement of civil rights inevitably leads those who would disobey the law to believe they can do so with impunity.

We therefore think it imperative, Mr. President, that you make it clear to all federal contracting agencies and the business community that Executive Order 11246 will be firmly enforced. Such action is necessary in order to correct any misimpression that may have occurred due to Deputy Secretary Packard's action in awarding the contracts without proper written assurances of compliance with the Executive Order.

Further, we understand that the Department of Defense may award several million dollars in additional contracts to the same three companies, as well as contracts to four of five other textile companies whose employment policies are now under review by the Department of Defense. We urge that these contracts not be awarded unless and until such time as the companies involved meet all legal requirements not to engage in discriminatory employment practices. Any other course of action would completely disrupt orderly governmental procedures and would give notice that federal laws against discrimination may be flaunted with abandon.

We understand that Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co. will be required to file periodic reports of their progress in eliminating discriminatory practices. Until such time as those reports are filed and evaluated by the Department of

Defense and the OFCC, further contract awards to these companies would be reprehensible. In addition, contracts should not be granted those companies now under investigation until it is found that they do, in fact, comply with federal law.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Fraser,
Chairman.
James C. Corman,
Secretary-Chief Whip.
John Brademas,
Vice Chairman.
Don Edwards,
Chairman, Task Force on Civil Rights.

THE 1968 DEAL WITH HANOI IS OFF

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I took the well of this House to express my concern that if we did not respond promptly to Hanoi's obvious violations of the 1968 bombing halt agreement, the mutual concessions which that agreement represented would have in fact disappeared. I said then too, that if we could not count on Hanoi to carry its share of a partial deescalation of the Vietnam fighting—where we stop doing certain specified things, and they stop doing certain specified things—how can we possibly expect them to live up to any full-scale peace agreement?

Not many persons have stood up since then, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say, to echo that sentiment. But I was glad to see this morning that one distinguished commentator, Mr. Joseph Alsop, made precisely the same point in his column in today's Washington Post.

Because the point is one that goes to the very heart of the validity of an agreement with Hanoi, it deserves to be carefully considered by all who want a genuine—as opposed to a phony—peace in Vietnam.

I recommend the Alsop column to your attention, as follows:

THE 1968 UNDERSTANDING WITH HANOI HAS BECOME A DEAD LETTER

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is easy to guess the main topic of President Nixon's talks with Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Gen. Andrew Goodpaster. The all-important understanding with Hanoi, which permitted President Johnson to end all bombing of North Vietnam last October, has now become a complete dead letter.

To be sure, the South Vietnamese delegates still attend the meaningless meetings in Paris. But the military clauses of the Johnson understanding, which had very great meaning, are now being as flagrantly violated by Hanoi as the accord on Laos, which Averell Harriman negotiated in 1962.

Walt W. Rostow has correctly said that the greatest American error was the failure to respond, both vigorously and promptly, to Hanoi's instantaneous violation of all the most important clauses of Gov. Harriman's 1962 accord. These were the clauses by which Hanoi solemnly promised to withdraw all North Vietnamese troops from Laos, and never to use Laos as a troop-transit route to South Vietnam.

President Nixon must now face a similar problem, but in much more acute form. The Johnson understanding, apparently reached with the Soviets as intermediaries, had two important military features. In return for the final cessation of the bombing, Hanoi was to refrain from two crucial kinds of activity.

First, there was to be no shelling or rocketing of the major cities of South Vietnam.

Second, the ludicrously misnamed Demilitarized Zone, on the border between North and South Vietnam, was not to be used for any military purpose, as agreed by Hanoi in 1954.

As might have been foreseen from Hanoi's way of keeping the promises so hopefully accepted by Gov. Harriman, the understanding that ended the bombing began to be violated not very long after the bombs ceased falling. The first probes—and that is really the right word—took the form of rocket and other attacks on various cities, finally including Saigon itself.

Though viciously cruel to some unlucky civilians among the cities' populations, these attacks on the cities have had little more military effect than Chinese firecrackers. Their sole purpose, so far as one can judge, has been to make headlines in certain American newspapers with strong Chicken Little tendencies. Because they had no military effect, these first violations were perhaps unwisely ignored.

What is happening now is altogether different, however. Reports have already appeared of ten or more North Vietnamese regiments massing above the DMZ using the rebuilt bases and restored communications which are owed to the final bombing halt.

In fact, however, the DMZ clause of the Johnson understanding is not just threatened with violations, as these reports suggest. It has instead been violated during the past fortnight in the customary flagrant, big-scale manner. In other words, whole North Vietnamese regiments have been crossing the DMZ, to operate in the two most northerly provinces of South Vietnam.

This is a very serious matter indeed. Because of the DMZ clause in the Johnson understanding, Gen. Creighton Abrams was able to reduce his forces in Quangtri and Thuatien provinces to the 3d Marine Division and the 173d Airborne Division, plus the excellent 1st South Vietnamese Division. With much reduced forces, great progress was nonetheless being made in rooting out the whole enemy structure in Quangtri and Thuatien.

All progress will of course come to an end, and acute dangers will of course arise, if entire enemy divisions begin transiting the DMZ in happy impunity, and in gross disregard of the understanding with President Johnson. This has, as noted above, begun to happen already.

It has the most vivid military significance, moreover. If it continues, for instance, it could force Gen. Abrams to go back to the fire brigade-like use of his forces to which Gen. William C. Westmoreland was too often driven by hard necessity.

Hanoi's motive for shifting the threat to Northern I Corps is pretty certainly the sanguinary failure, at least to date, of the first main thrust of the "winter-spring campaign" on the approaches to Saigon in III Corps. Once again, as in mid-December, there is hard evidence of the bitterest recriminations between the Communist high command, COSVN, and the enemy's divisional and regimental commanders in III Corps. These latter enraged COSVN by their reluctance to hurl their bomb-decimated units into suicidal ground battles.

That does not change the DMZ's challenge to the President, however. Either he must blandly ignore the total violation of the Johnson understanding, thereby incurring very grave military risks, or he must authorize Gen. Abrams to respond to the challenge in a suitably harsh manner, "at a time and place of his own choosing."

SOME BALANCED THOUGHTS ON THE ABM

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much nonsense spoken on the subject of the ABM in recent weeks, some of it on this floor, and a good deal more of it in the other body, that it is refreshing to see in print a direct, simple statement of what is really the basic issue involved.

Such a statement appeared in Mr. Joseph Alsop's column of March 24 in the Washington Post. To add light rather than heat to the discussion of this vital issue, I hereby include the full text of the excellent Alsop piece:

ABM FOES ARE ASKING NATION TO GAMBLE WITH ITS FUTURE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The vice of the anti-ABM crusaders can be very simply stated. They are really talking about a subject of which they know nothing whatever: Namely, what the Soviets may do if they can believe they enjoy decisive strategic-nuclear superiority.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and Deputy Secretary David Packard have now testified that the costly Soviet weapons programs are clearly aimed to gain that kind of superioity. This has nothing to do, moreover, with the numbers of nuclear warheads in the U.S. and Soviet arsenals, a subject that the crusaders endlessly babble about.

The Soviets are spending their billions on weapons intended to destroy our *delivery systems*. And if the delivery systems can be destroyed by surprise attack, our thousands of warheads will of course be worse than useless.

As already pointed out in this space, moreover, the seemingly defensive ABMs that the Soviets are already deploying must be regarded, at least in part, as the other half of the above equation. No surprise attack can be counted upon to destroy all of our different delivery systems. But it can so enormously reduce the weight of the counterattack that an ABM defense will be rendered effective and useful.

These, then, are the real terms of the problems, which has one further, purely psychological, factor. American deterrence depends, in brief, not on what Dr. Jerome Weisner believes, but on what the Soviet defense planners believe. And these are not civilian scientists; they are the Soviet marshals, all of whom strongly resemble Gen. Curtis LeMay cubed.

Their types of expenditure, especially on "counterforce weapons," quite obviously reveal what the Soviet marshals believe they can achieve over time. So you come back to the problem of what the Soviets may do if they think, even if wrongly, that they enjoy decisive superiority.

No one at all can know with certainty the answer to this question, simply because until now, thank God, the Soviets never have enjoyed anything remotely resembling superiority. You can only say that the Soviets have been sharply responsive, in at least two great crises, to the strategic-nuclear superiority enjoyed by the U.S.

XUM

For first time, and perhaps the most interesting, was immediately after the death of Stalin. The aging paranoid had spent untold sums on the early versions of the MIG fighter, although these planes were actually incapable of laying a machine gun, so to say, on the American strategic bombers of that period. Obviously, the marshals did not dare to tell the truth to the terrible old man.

With Stalin gone, however, the truth was at last told to the no doubt horrified Politburo. The result was the most important tension-relaxing move the Soviets have ever made. Austria, in fact, almost certainly owes its freedom and unity to the poor performance characteristics of those early MIGs, which at that time left the Soviet Union naked as a jaybird in the event of U.S. nuclear attack.

The Cuban missile crisis was of course the second test above-mentioned. In 1962, the U.S. margin of strategic-nuclear superiority was still on the order of five to one. In his authoritative work "Power in the Kremlin," Michel Tatu leaves no room for doubt that the aim of the secret deployment of medium-range missiles in Cuba was to change this margin, so unfavorable to the Soviets.

Tatu leaves no room for doubt, either, that the greatness of the U.S. margin played a major role in the outcome. In this respect, however, there is much food for disquiet in Tatu's remarkable Kremlinological pendant to the late Robert Kennedy's account of the Cuban missile crisis.

There is food for disquiet because Tatu produces such detailed and impressive evidence that it was a "damn near-run thing," as the Duke of Wellington said of Waterloo. In other words, the Kremlin leaders were deeply divided, and it was touch and go for some time before the Soviet backdown that ended the Cuban crisis.

If it was touch and go when the U.S. margin was on the order of five to one, it really is rather urgent to ask oneself how the Soviets may respond in some future crisis, after they have changed the margin to favor themselves. Mind you, moreover, it will matter not one whit whether this change in margin is real, in the sense of being recognized by Dr. Wiesner.

What the Soviets think will be all that matters. Sen. Fulbright and the rest are in fact asking President Nixon to take pretty awe-inspiring risks with the U.S. future. But that is far more normal than asking Sen. Fulbright to do his homework, by reading Tatu.

THE HIDDEN WAR

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, does anyone doubt that this hideous war has come full cycle? If so—if there are still doubters—I would like to recommend that my doubting colleagues read an article that appeared on the front page of the Wall Street Journal. The article described the operation of the elite "Phoenix" forces that hunt the Vietcong infrastructure in the countryside. Conceived largely by CIA men and other American planners and carried out by South Vietnamese, Operation Phoenix uses "calculated brutality applied to suspected Vietcong," and on-the-spot executions, while the participating troops indulge in the looting of homes and the "systematic destruction of village installations."

The Journal asks the question: "Because the Vietcong torture and assassinate, should the allies?"

Let us ask the question I posed before: When Americans are a party to assassination, torture, terror, and looting as a matter of military tactics can there be any doubt that this war has come full cycle and that we are truly the enemy of the country we went to defend?

I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and with the intent of his resolution. I include in the body of the RECORD the full article, "The Hidden War," that appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, March 25, 1969:

THE HIDDEN WAR—ELITE "PHOENIX" FORCES HUNT VIETCONG CHIEFS IN AN ISOLATED VILLAGE—RAID PROMPTED BY INFORMERS FINDS MOST OF FOE GONE AND NATIVES TIGHT-LIPPED—DEMOLISHING A VC MONUMENT

(By Peter R. Kann)

DON NHON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Was it a trap? There was reason for suspicion.

But the risk had to be taken. An unsolicited bit of information offered an opportunity to strike at the local unit of the Vietcong "infrastructure" (VCI), the clandestine political and administrative apparatus through which the enemy lays claim to control much of the Vietnamese countryside.

The affair began like this:

Two ragged Vietnamese, one short and squat, the other tall and thin, recently walked into Don Nhon, a village about 50 miles southwest of Saigon that is the capital of Don Nhon District. The pair told American officials that they wanted to talk about the VCI in their home village of Vinh Hoa, a nearby community of about 2,000 persons nestled deep in Vietcong territory along a Mekong River tributary. A Vietcong-sponsored "Liberation Committee" had been elected to govern Vinh Hoa five months previously, the informers said.

The U.S. advisers were dubious about taking military action on the basis of this intelligence. An ambush might be in the offing. Vinh Hoa was dangerous territory, several miles from the nearest government-controlled village. And the informers said they were refugees, rather than Vietcong defectors, who normally could be expected to be more eager to talk. But the two stuck to their story of overt Vietcong control in their village, and their information checked out with that in allied files.

HIGH PRIORITY

Vinh Hoa clearly was a target for "Operation Phoenix," the high-priority allied effort to root out the VCI across South Vietnam. The year-old Phoenix campaign obviously is related to the Paris negotiations. When peace comes, South Vietnam's claims to control the countryside will be strongest where the VCI cadre are fewest.

The Vietcong claim that about 1,800 governing bodies have been freely elected in "liberated areas" of South Vietnam. The U.S. dismisses most of the committee as fictions existing only on paper and claims VCI cadre are being wiped out at a rate of better than 2,300 a month. Total VCI strength is estimated at about 70,000.

Although conceived largely by CIA men and other American planners, Operation Phoenix is executed primarily by Vietnamese troops. Its methods range from after-dark assassination strikes by small killer squads to battalion-sized cordon and search efforts. A small strike clearly wasn't indicated for Vinh Hoa. The village might be heavily defended. U.S. officials finally settled on a plan for a daylight assault with helicopter transportation. The U.S. 9th Division would provide support.

HUNTING THE ENEMY

Phoenix operations are reputed to be highly sophisticated and productive affairs. The Vinh Hoa effort proved to be neither. It involved intricate—and apparently flawed—planning, largely fruitless interrogation of fearful, tight-lipped villagers, calculated brutality applied to suspected Vietcong, the execution of one suspect, looting of homes by Vietnamese troops, systematic destruction of village installations and a largely unproductive hunt for Vietcong officials who apparently had fled by sampan long before the allies arrived.

The operation highlighted agonizing questions about Phoenix and the allied methods for waging war in Vietnam. Because the Vietcong torture and assassinate, should the allies? Is there value to an operation that "sweeps" a Vietcong area and then departs, leaving no permanent allied presence? Who should be considered Vietcong? Does the VC include a farmer who happens to own ancestral rice land in a Vietcong-controlled village and pays taxes to the enemy?

The counter-infrastructure experts are the Provincial Reconnaissance Units, called "PRUs." Along with the Vietnamese, they include Cambodian and Chinese Nung mercenaries. All are recruited, trained and paid by the CIA. In two days of planning the Vinh Hoa force grew to include about 40 PRUs, about 30 Vietnamese special combat police and a handful of interrogators from the Police Special Branch, Census-Grievance men and psychological warfare cadre. The Americans taking part in the operation were two civilian PRU advisers, two civilian advisers to the special police, two young Army officers working in Don Nhon District and several radio operators. Two companies of the 9th Division, about 110 men, were to form a cordon around the village to prevent Vietcong escapes.

THE LAST MEETING

Final plans were coordinated at the Tactical Operations Center of Kien Hoa province (which includes Don Nhon) the night before the strike, with more than a dozen Americans and Vietnamese attending or within earshot. The size of the meeting troubled CIA men. They worried, justifiably as it turned out, that confusion and intelligence leaks would follow.

At 7 a.m. the next morning, the operation force is waiting for its helicopter transport at the airfield at Ben Tre, the Kien Hoa provincial capital. And waiting. It turns out that the 9th Division is having difficulty arranging its "air assets." An outpost under siege in a neighboring province has to be aided.

The civilian U.S. advisers begin to get restless and irritable: "The U.S. Army is more trouble than it's worth . . . all their maps and charts and crap . . . goddamned army must have schools that teach delay and confusion . . . never seen a 9th Division operation go off on time. . . ."

One adviser spots a plane to the west circling roughly over the area of the target village. Fluttering from it are thousands of propaganda leaflets. He explodes: "Great. Just great. The army is really good at this crap. Pick up a paper and read all about it. Read about the operation that's coming in to get you."

The PRUs and Vietnamese special combat police are wearing a wild variety of jungle fatigues, flak jackets, bush hats, berets, combat boots, tennis shoes and sandals. Some are barefoot. Initially they are sitting in orderly rows along the runway. Soon they begin dispersing about the airfield.

The PRUs invent a game. As a big C130 cargo plane comes in to land, they sit on the runway, then duck their heads as the plane's wings whip past just above them. "They're the toughest men in this war," says one adviser. "They join this outfit because they want action."

The American points to a small Vietnamese half-dozing on the grass. "That man used to be a VC. He got disillusioned with them, so they killed his family. He lit out for the bush.

XUM

Spent two years out there alone, conducting a private vendetta against Charlie. God knows how many VC he killed. Finally he came in and joined up with the PRUs. He wants to kill more VCs."

HOVERING CLOSE

Shortly after 9 a.m., two hours late, 10 helicopters arrive. The Phoenix force piles aboard and is flown for 15 minutes across flat rice land and coconut groves to the landing zone, a rice paddy less than a mile from the center of Vinh Hoa. The helicopters hover close to the ground, and the troops leap out, wading cautiously through thigh-deep mud and water toward a treeline from which they expect enemy fire.

There is no firing. At the treeline the troops are joined by the Don Nhon District U.S. advisers and the two Vietnamese informants who prompted the operation. They have been separately helicoptered to the scene. The informers, garbed in baggy U.S. Army fatigues, are to remain mystery men, for their own protection. Their heads are covered with brown cloth bags with eye and mouth holes. The two present a part comic, part frightening spectacle.

The local advisers have bad news. They say the 9th Division cordon along the southern fringe of the village didn't get into place until about 9 a.m., two hours late, leaving the Vietcong an escape route. (The 9th Division later denies any delay.) Now the informers claim not to recognize the approach being taken to the village. One American sharply questions them. Another is cursing the Vietnamese "psywar" operatives trampling along with the troops: "All we need are these goddamned guys with their leaflets. And they're wearing black pajamas. Beautiful. Now the army (the 9th Division troops) will zap 'em as VC."

LOOKING AROUND

Several of the Vietnamese special police have found an empty farmhouse, recently deserted judging by damp betel-nut stains on the floor. They are passing the time knocking holes in a water barrel. In another farmhouse, the occupant, an old lady, stares at a wall while two carefree PRUs boil eggs on her wood stove.

A lone PRU wanders along the treeline shaking his head and muttering, "VC di di, VC di di . . . (VC gone, VC gone)." The troops presently advance toward a cluster of houses nearer the village center. Spaced along the mud trails at intervals of about 10 yards are thick mud bunkers, each large enough for several men. The houses also have bunkers, inside or out. Vinh Hoa, being within an allied "free strike zone," is subject to air and artillery pounding.

No booby traps materialize. The troops arrive at a substantial farmhouse with flower beds in the front yard, a manicured hedge and pillars flanking the front entrance. It is one of many prosperous homes in Vinh Hoa—surprising, since Vietcong villages usually are poorer than government-controlled towns. Isolation from major markets, high Vietcong taxes and allied bombing are among the reasons.

Behind the house some leaf wrappings are found. "The VC must have been here," an American says. "That's what they wrap field rations in." (Leaves are used by most rural Vietnamese, VC or not, to wrap food.) The occupant of the house, an old man who stares at the interlopers through wire-rim spectacles, is shaking, through age, or fear, or both.

The aged Vietnamese is questioned briefly. "Bring him along," an American says sharply. "Let's move." Another adviser says, "That old man could be the top dog VC in this village. You never know." The old man totters along with the troops. He is released in mid-afternoon when one of the two informers claims him as an uncle.

INTERROGATION

At about 11 a.m., an American adviser and two special police turn up with three captives. "Found them hiding in a house," the American says. The informers inspect the captives and whisper, through an interpreter, that one is a Vietcong village guerrilla, the second a Vietcong "security section chief" and the third a non-Vietcong, perhaps a deserter from the South Vietnamese army.

The two identified as Vietcong are bound, and one of them, a narrow-shouldered, bent young man with protruding teeth, is leaned against a tree trunk. Several police interrogators and PRUs gather around him and fire questions. They want to know where Vietcong weapons and ammunition are hidden.

The suspect doesn't know or won't say. Soon the questions are interspersed with yanks at his hair and sharp kicks to his head, face and groin. The prisoner sags against the tree, face bloodied.

"Americans don't want to be here for any more of this," says one U.S. adviser, moving away. "It's a nasty goddamned business." He adds, "You know, it's a whole cycle of this stuff. Last week in another village near Don Nhon the VC marched five government sympathizers into the marketplace and beat their heads in with hammers. So we return it on this guy. It goes on and on."

By now the informers have gotten their bearings. They lead most of the troops along a trail to a hospital building behind a hedge of blue flowers. It is a straw-thatch structure containing eight wide plank beds separated by white plastic curtains. In one corner is a mud bunker, in another a crude case of glassware and medicine bottles, some with French and American labels. There are no patients or traces of them.

The Americans decide it is a Vietcong hospital for wounded enemy troops. "Burn it," an American adviser directs. Ignited with cigaret lighters, the hut burns readily.

VINH HOA VILLAGE

In single file, the troops wind along a trail toward the center of Vinh Hoa. Since there hasn't been any firing, the possibility of an ambush is discounted. Some of the PRUs and special police are carrying food and household articles taken from the outlying farmhouses. The "psywarriors" are strewing the trail with propaganda leaflets carried in plastic bags. Some of the PRUs have ringed their helmets with garlands of flowers. The procession takes on a festive air.

Ten minutes later the column reaches the center of the village, a small cluster of houses and shops facing a square that previously contained a covered marketplace. The marketplace has been bombed out. In the center of the square is a concrete obelisk about 10 feet high—a Vietcong memorial, say the Americans, dedicated to the enemy dead. It is one target of the Phoenix strike.

The PRUs and Vietnamese special police begin searching—and sacking—the homes. They are bored, and restless, because there has been no "action." The psywarriors' plastic bags, emptied of propaganda, are commandeered for loot ranging from clothing to chickens. "Trick or treat," say an American, not really amused. In one house, some of the Vietnamese troops are having a small celebration. They have unearthed a bottle of rice wine.

A few village residents, women, children and old men, are assembled along one side of the square. They squat on their haunches in the dust. Several male captives are bound a few yards away. Against a wall, the narrow-shouldered prisoner is rocking back and forth, a trickle of blood running down his head.

Amid whirling dust, a 9th Division helicopter lands in the square. A lean U.S. lieutenant colonel in polished boots and trim uniform steps out with aides in tow. Displaying a map marked with red grease pencil, he reports the kill totals of the support troops: "Charlie Company got three KIAs (Killed In Action), Delta Company two, we got one from my chopper. . . ." All the fatalities, he says, were armed Vietcong, carrying packs. They were shot trying to flee through the cordon. "They had low-level documents on them," the colonel reports. Presently the chopper leaves.

In the middle of the square, two Americans are strapping demolition charges around the Vietcong monument. A one-minute warning is sounded. Everyone takes cover. As the charge explodes, the monument disintegrates into chunks of brick and concrete. It is exactly noon.

THE VILLAGE CHURCH

The explosion seems to galvanize the foraging troops into action. "Don't they have anything to do but loot those houses?" an American PRU adviser shouts to a Vietnamese lieutenant. "Get the men out combing the rest of this village." Two search parties move out. A third group, mostly Americans, crosses a narrow footbridge spanning a canal to investigate a church.

Crossing the bridge, the Americans spot fresh footprints on both sides of the river connected with the canal. For the moment, they pose a mystery.

The church, a Roman Catholic structure, is bolted shut at front and rear. Just as two Americans warily advance to smash a lock, the front door opens and an elderly man in white pajamas appears, smiling as though to welcome parishioners to services. The inside of the little church is newly painted and neatly scrubbed. A row of angled bullet holes along the metal-sheet roof attests to a visit from a helicopter gunship.

In the rear are a large drum and a brass gong. An American points to them and questions the elderly church attendant.

"What are they for?"

"To call the faithful to worship."

"Did you see any people leaving the village this morning?"

"No. . . ."

"We have information on how much this church pays to the VC in taxes. How much do you say it pays?"

"Maybe the people pay 100 or 200 piasters (80 cents to $1.60)."

"The church, how much does it pay?"

"The church does not pay taxes. The church never pays taxes."

"The hell it doesn't pay," the American says. "This may be a Catholic church, but it's Charlie's Catholic church."

A TACITURN LADY

The Americans follow a path past the church to a cluster of solidly built homes. Most are empty. In one, two candles burn before a postcard picture of Christ. In another, a picture of Pope Paul sits on a small altar beside a mud bunker. One house is occupied by a woman with six children. She is interrogated.

"Did you see people crossing the river this morning?"

"No, I was in my bunker."

"Where is your husband?"

"He went to the market at Cai Mang."

"Why?"

"He always goes when the soldiers come here. . . ."

"Do you know who are the VC in this village?"

"No. We don't know VC. We are Catholic. Catholics don't know VC."

"We know that a Liberation Committee was elected here. When?"

"I just heard about it recently."

"Who is the Vietcong village chief here?"

"I don't know. . . ."

"How much tax do you pay to the VC?"

"More than 1,000 piasters." (About $8.)

XUM

"How often do Vietcong song and dance (propaganda) teams come and visit?"

"Not often."

"What do they say?"

"They say the Americans will go home soon."

"How often does your husband stand guard for the VC?"

"Every five or six days."

"How often do the women here have to make punji stakes (poisoned stakes) for the VC?"

"Once or twice a year."

"That's pretty typical," says the American, heading back across the footbridge to the village square.

DISAPPEARING ENEMY

An American adviser has figured out the footprints on both sides of the river. There are no sampans around the village. Adult males except for old men, seem almost nonexistent. The village population is estimated at 2,000, but no more than 200 persons have been seen on this day.

The American finds a youngster hiding in a farmhouse. He poses a few perfunctory questions, then suddenly demands: "At what time this morning did all the people leave here by boat?" Perhaps startled by the suddenness of the query, the boy replies, "At four o'clock."

The conclusion: Most of the village's Vietcong guerrillas, VCI cadre and Liberation Committee members have eluded the Phoenix troops. "They just had to have that big meeting last night," fumes an American adviser, recalling the last planning session for the operation. "Everyone had to get in on this * * * operation. The VC must have known all about it by midnight last night. So they blew the place. Just sailed down the river on their sampans."

But there may be something to salvage from the operation. In the square, the group of squatting villagers has grown to 50 or 60. Census-Grievance operatives examine their identification cards. Few have them; in Vietcong-controlled areas, the enemy forbids the people to carry government ID cards and often punishes those who do.

The two informers, still with bags on their heads, stand behind a nearby wall, peering at the villagers. Occasionally they point to a resident and whisper to a PRU. Those put under suspicion are pulled to their feet, bound and taken aside to the prisoner group. The others remain on their haunches staring silently into the dust.

THE MOVING FINGER

One villager "fingered" by the informers is a bowlegged woman clutching a baby. She is identified as a member of the village "women-farmer association," a Vietcong citizen-involvement organization not normally considered important enough to classify as Vietcong cadre. ("No point picking them up," a U.S. official says later in Saigon. "They're more trouble than they're worth to process and hold.")

But the woman is moved to the prisoner group, clutching the baby. Her two other children, a boy about six and a girl about 10 years old, begin to cry loudly. A PRU raises a rifle butt over their heads menacingly, and the wails subside into muffled sobs.

From behind a nearby house two shots are heard. The narrow-shouldered prisoner has been executed. His body is dumped into a bunker.

One of the psywar operatives lectures the villagers on the perils of supporting the Vietcong and outlines the benefits of backing the Saigon government. Propaganda sheets bearing a smiling portrait of President Nguyen Van Thieu are handed out.

At one side of the square an American adviser muses about the operation and what it has to do with the war: "There are 30 people sitting around a table in Paris, and they just aren't going to hack it. How can they solve this thing? The people in this village have been VC for 10 years, maybe 20. How are you going to change that? We come here on an operation, and what does it prove? We've got some crook sitting in Don Nhon picking up a salary every month because he claims to be the government village chief here. He hasn't dared to visit this village for seven years. The district chief was too chicken to come on this operation. So we come in, pick up a few Charlies and leave. The VC will be back in control here tonight. . . ."

HEADING BACK

At 3 p.m., with five prisoners in tow, the troops start hiking back to the landing zone in the rice paddy for transportation home. Near the paddy they meet two U.S. soldiers from the 9th Division cordon, leading two prisoners. Each of the captives wears a neatly printed "Detainee Card."

The taller and more talkative of the two informers is brought forward to examine the new prisoners. One is identified as a deputy Vietcong village chief, the other as a non-Vietcong. Both are placed with the other prisoners.

A deputy Vietcong village chief would be the most important captive of the day by far, the others being low-level cadre at best. "Hey, we got us a big one," says an elated American adviser, who then cautions nearby PRUs: "You keep this one alive, you hear. We want him alive."

Half an hour later the troops have been helicoptered back to their compound in Ben Tre, and the prisoners are on their way to the Police Special Branch interrogation center. Results of the operation: Eight kills, one after torture. Seven prisoners taken for interrogation. One war memorial dynamited. One hospital burned. No friendly casualties.

CULTURAL VANDALISM

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, every American aspires to preserve a national culture. I think this is best indicated in the grants by some tax-free foundations, through Federal subsidies and with tax-free bequests to improve the theater, making it more inviting to the average citizen.

Now it becomes apparent that the easy money is not being used to display our culture, advance the arts, or to improve the quality of the humanities but rather the programs are designed to destroy everything that is sacred, moral, and holy to the American people.

In just the past few days in New York the actors and all connected with the performance of "Che" were arrested on various charges of indecency.

In another region at New Orleans, La., the Repertory Theater, financed by $1½ million in tax dollars, has been found so repulsive to the New Orleans community that the educational chairman of the women's auxiliary of the chamber of commerce is surveying the disillusioned community toward registering a formal protest.

It is time that someone in the leadership of this country take heed to what is going on and who is promoting it before the American people rise up to perpetuate their culture for the next generation.

Until such time as the drama leadership polices its own ranks I urge that this administration cut off any further funding and that the Congress not appropriate any funds for theaters, drama and thespian arts.

Mr. Speaker, a UPI release from New York City of March 25, a copy of a circulated letter from New Orleans, and an article from the Summit, Miss., Sun for March 13, follow:

"CHE!" GETS ARRESTING REVIEW

NEW YORK.—Several policemen and a judge sat quietly through a performance of "Che!" last night.

When it was over police arrested the actors, the producer, the director, the writer, the set designer, the costume designer and the box office manager. They were charged with public lewdness, obscenity and consensual sodomy. Nine of the 10 persons involved also were charged with "unlawful dealings with a child"—a youth of 17 who was in the play.

The off-Broadway show is supposed to depict symbolically the last hours of Cuban revolutionary leader Ernesto (Che) Guevara. The on-stage "Che"—played by Larry Bercowitz—devotes much of his time to stimulating sexual intercourse with Mary Anne Shelley. Both Bercowitz and Miss Shelley played their scenes nude.

The play ends with an actor playing the president of the United States and wearing nothing but an Uncle Sam hat and a red, white and blue sash around his waist shooting Guevara.

A PARENT, NOT HYSTERICAL BUT VERY CONCERNED, PROTESTS ABOUT "PROTEST: MAN AGAINST SOCIETY"

Repertory Theatre was inaugurated to open the world of theatre to those who had rarely, if ever, had the privilege of enjoying live theatre. It was intended to preserve our cultural heritage. As such, one would expect it to be not only entertaining, but somewhat inspirational and pro-American since millions of tax dollars go to support it. (Locally, New Orleans Educational Laboratory Theatre has been federally funded with approximately one and a half millions of tax dollars.)

For several weeks now, Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* has been shown to high school students—public, parochial, and private—in the New Orleans Area. The selection of the play itself was amazing since the theme is pessimistic, bitingly ironic, scornful of those in authority and bleakly depressing. (Not exactly the type script that would make a theatre-goer out of a non-discerning teenager.)

Before attending the production, our high school population was given *free* a book entitled *Protest: Man Against Society. An Enemy of the People* (new translation by David Scanlan commissioned by Repertory Theatre, New Orleans—footnote, page 15) is printed therein, but so are essays completely incendiary in nature, violently critical of our democratic institutions, and encouraging revolt in our youth. But it is all done with finesse. Thus, the opening selection is Matthew's gospel wherein Christ commissions his twelve to go out and preach. In crescendo fashion, the essays become anti-democratic-state, more violently critical of our American institutions, more flagrantly revolutionary, until the book concludes with recommendations for militant protest.

Who are some of the authors? Robert Williams—now living in Communist China—a close friend of Mao Tse Tung. Andre Malraux—an active participant in the communist revolutionary movement in China, Southeast Asia and the Loyalist Cause in Spain. In *Man's Fate* Malruax portrays a man who realizes he must murder in cold blood for the good of the revolutionary movement. In the book, the reader is urged to subvert, to spread the ideology that would undermine

XUM

the American system and destroy her symbols—from draft registration, the Flag and even our currency: (page 159, line 7) Mario Savio—the leader of The Free Speech Movement (filthy speech) and one of the prime movers of the riots at Berkeley—is also included, as is Jerry Rubin—a well-known hippie or yippie, and a leader in the Chicago demonstrations and riots.

In his essay *What the Revolution Is All About* or *We are Vietcong and We are Everywhere*, Mr. Rubin does not attempt to be subtle. He describes America as being on the run—he claims that sex, rebellion, drugs, youth, music, open defiance, and giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our country is a combination that is hard to beat: (page 157, 5 lines from bottom of page).

There's more, much more, shock appeal in *Protest*. Of course interspersed with the authors mentioned are some who do not advocate the accomplishment of change through violence. Even Mayor Daley is a contributor, but the overall emphasis is on change through violence and civil disobedience.

Why not read the book yourself and decide if this is what you wish our children to be reading. Remember, it's paid for by You, the tax-payer!

AUXILIARY MEMBERS: This letter was referred to me, your Education Chairman. If you feel that the Women's Auxiliary of the Chamber of Commerce should register a complaint about *Protest: Man Against Society*, please check and sign the following blank, tear off, and return to the Women's Auxiliary, Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 30240, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130.

MARION DURST,
Education Chairman, Women's Auxiliary.

[From the Summit (Miss.) Sun, Mar, 13, 1969]

LOOKING AHEAD: THE MORAL POLLUTERS

(By Dr. George S. Benson)

In a University of Michigan auditorium crowded with men and women students and faculty, ten members of the cast of the stage play "Dionysus in '69"—six men and four women—performed naked according to the Associated Press, during 35 minutes of the three hour play. Several hours after the performance, they were arrested for "indecent exposure". University President Robben Fleming said, following the show and the arrests, that "academic and professional people regarded the production as worthy of serious consideration." Nudity is difficult to describe as obscene, President Fleming said, and the question was "the context within which nudity occurred."

The incidents of public display of nakedness at Ann Arbor followed several similar reported incidents on college campuses—some in which men and women university students were the "actors". A group of students gave such performances at the University of Wisconsin. The University of California at Berkeley and the University of Colorado at Boulder are reported to have permitted public nudity displays. Generally speaking, University authorities have taken a "permissive" attitude toward such activities.

REVOLUTIONARY "STANDARDS"

After the murder of a co-ed at Iowa State University at Ames, a County Grand Jury investigated and subsequently issued a report warning the parents of ISU students and the people of Iowa generally of "moral pollution by faculty and paid speakers" at the university. One of the documents in the Grand Jury's report was a news clipping reporting on a big campus event—a lecture by "Dr. Albert Ellis" of the "Institute for Rational Living, New York". The lecture was sponsored by the YWCA, YMCA and the University Lectures Committee. Ellis urged the young men and women students to throw off the "old standards" of behavior and participate freely in sex "outside marriage". Those who didn't, he said, "need a psychotherapist". He advocated breaking down "taboos" and explicitly recommended that after marriage the man and wife should both participate in extra-marital sex; he recommended that "the husband and wife go out separately looking for extra marital sex." Undergraduate students and faculty crowded the university's Great Hall in Memorial Union for the lecture.

JURY REPORT ATTACKED

After the Grand Jury report, the University President W. Robert Parks attacked the Jury. "No amount of vague wording," he said ". . . can cloud the fact that the main thrust of the Grand Jury report is a demand for censorship. I need not point out", he said, "how dangerous to a free society the imposition of such controls can be—far more dangerous than permitting ideas to be heard with which we may not agree."

The foregoing facts of campus life in some Universities have been cited, and the permissiveness of some University officialdom documented, because the American people, especially the parents, need to know about the activities, the institutional attitudes, and particularly the forces working to expand the "moral pollution" and set the stage for revolution. Not enough Americans are aware of the fact that Communists are working to break down "old standards" of decency and morals as a means of creating and entrapping an army of young revolutionaries. The proof of this is voluminous and undeniable. Their participation in many college outbreaks is evident to all who investigate.

STRATEGY: POLLUTE MORALS

At a Seminar held by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California, 30 campus leaders from throughout the country discussed "Toward a Strategy of Disruption" and other revolutionary subjects. Devereaux Kennedy, Student Body President at Washington University, St. Louis, said that one of the strategies of student revolutionaries dedicated to overthrowing the United States was to establish University rules permitting men and women students to spend as much time as they wished together in dormitory bedrooms.

"If you want to get kids interested in the other kinds of issues (Ed's note: stopping the Vietnam war on Vietcong terms, overthrowing the United States), you have to show that your interests lie with them, too. And we all realize parietal hours (restricting unlimited bedroom "dating") are a big thing on campuses because kids want to get rid of them. So let's get rid of them! But let's not stop there." Then he spoke of revolution (the kind being organized by the Communists). "What I mean by revolution," he said, "is overthrowing the American government—starting up 50 Vietnams . . . black rebellions . . . giving these people guns . . . performing acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto . . ."

As parents and taxpayers, the mothers and fathers of America should awaken to what is happening to youth in many American Universities today.

MIAMI—OCEANOGRAPHIC CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the selection of Miami Beach, Fla., as the site of the Marine Technology Society's fifth annual conference and exposition during June 16 to 19, 1969, is fresh evidence of the fact that the Miami area has become a center for the growing science of oceanography—truly, Miami is the oceanographic capital of the world.

Some 2,500 members of the society from maritime nations the world over will gather in Miami to discuss developments and techniques in marine technology anticipated during the next 10 years. The conference theme will be "The Decade Ahead—1970–80," and papers will be presented on such important subjects as national ocean policy, ocean law, education and training, marine science status reports, marine systems and technologies, economics and investments, review and forecast.

Since the United States has invited the nations of the world to participate in an "International Decade of Ocean Exploration," the discussions of the conference will be entirely appropriate for this monumental undertaking. Miami is indeed proud to serve as host for this outstanding conference, which points up that man's study of the ocean's depths ranks in importance with his exploration of outer space, for both are vital to his future.

For years, Miami has attracted oceanographers as a natural location and jumping-off point for their activities. Its geographical location and climatic environment are ideal for many oceanographic purposes; the climate which allows year-round research is essentially tropical, although Miami is situated 150 miles north of the Tropic of Cancer. It is one of the few North American areas from which it is possible to study, in nearby waters, living coral reefs, mangrove swamps, limestone rock formations, and other phenomena associated with tropical seas and shores. The Gulf Stream, with its almost boundless opportunities for oceanic research and study, passes almost within sight of shore.

Miami-based oceanographic research vessels can help man harvest the Continental Shelf, the vast sloping undersea area between the east coast land mass and the deep waters of the Atlantic, for food and mineral resources. Small craft and research vessels can easily reach the scientifically interesting Bahamas Banks, the Gulf of Mexico, and many Caribbean areas. Southeast Florida is also admirably located for deep sea studies in the area between West Africa, Brazil, Bermuda, and Florida, whose waters teem with a wide variety of valuable marine life.

One of the first organizations to take advantage of these natural conditions was the University of Miami, whose institute of marine sciences now ranks with such other respected marine research and educational institutions as Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, and the Scripps Institute in California. Its outstanding faculty and facilities have helped attract other oceanography-centered organizations to Miami in increasing numbers.

Located with the institute on Miami's Virginia Key is the Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory, an agency of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. The laboratory is engaged in oceanographic biological research activities including the

XUM

study of marine food resources of the entire tropical Atlantic Ocean; the design of research programs to support and increase the efficiency of the total catch by the Nation's commercial fisheries; the acquisition of knowledge for use both in harvesting and conserving stocks of surface schooling tunas in the tropical Atlantic and adjacent seas; and the aiding of the peoples of underdeveloped nations bordering the tropical Atlantic to find better means of acquiring protein rich resources near their shores.

A third major addition to this bustling scientific community will be the Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratories—AOL—of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—which recently acquired a 12-acre site on Virginia Key adjacent to the two other facilities. Miami was selected as the best location for this laboratory after keen competition among 114 other locations ranging from Maine to the Virgin Islands.

Now occupying rental quarters in the Miami area until a permanent $2.5 million AOL building is constructed on Virginia Key are five major ESSA components: The Physical Oceanography Laboratory, the Marine Geology and Geophysic Laboratory, the Sea-Air Interaction Laboratory, the National Hurricane Research Laboratory, and the Experimental Meteorology Laboratory. Space is also to be provided in the AOL building for the southern regional office of the National Oceanographic Data Center. Housing all of these units in the same structure will immeasurably strengthen the stated national requirement for sea-air interaction studies.

The Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratories provide scientific services relating to the environment which are needed by the nearby Institute of Marine Science and the Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory, for their research on the ocean. In addition, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Discoverer* operated for the ESSA laboratories is already stationed at nearby Dodge Island, and the Survey's ship *Researcher*, for which construction funds have been appropriated, is nearing completion and will join the *Discoverer* in Miami early next year. These ships will utilize the shore "backup" facilities of the ESSA-oceanographic complex.

Thus, when AOL is able to locate on Virginia Key—hopefully, in the near future—a scientific oceanography community will be formed whose close association will allow many opportunities for mutually advantageous exchanges. The University of Miami supports this concept to the extent that it will move its Institute of Atmospheric Sciences to the key to join the "community" once the ESSA facility is there. In fact, the university plans to erect a special building very shortly, to serve as a center for the Government laboratories as well as the university's own facilities on the key.

These developments are all accomplished or in progress. Of course, Miami's role as the oceanography capital of the world envisions even greater progress in the future. For example, the January 1969, report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources recommended that a new agency be formed—a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, which would combine and coordinate all of the existing Government functions and more. It would include, among other services, ESSA and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. If this recommendation is approved, the basic nucleus of the new Agency's field activities will already be clustered on Virginia Key.

Beyond this, Miamians visualize ultimate creation of a major oceanographic science park on Virginia Key which will be the hub of the international effort to harvest the seas. Such a park would be an outstanding asset for the scientific community. Tied in with a deep water seaport in south Dade County—and including a 25-foot-deep channel through Biscayne Bay—this park-port complex would attract a large percentage of the more than 400 national firms with sizable research staffs interested in one phase or another of oceanography, ocean engineering, or the manufacturing of equipment and supplies to support these fields.

Such a tremendous aggregation of Government, scientific, and commercial groups would provide a tremendous boost to the oceanographic field—which, unfortunately, has not received the Government support that most of us would like, in the past several years, due to the Government's fiscal difficulties.

By following through with this extraordinary plan of action, Miami can become an oceanographic capital of unprecedented scope, setting the international pattern for this increasingly important science. The many Miamians who have worked so long and hard to achieve our existing progress are continuing and strengthening their efforts to make this vision a reality.

The seas, earth's last great untapped resource, offer a bonanza of food and mineral wealth unrivaled in value and importance. Miami is proud of its status as the world capital of oceanography—the scientific key that can unlock this great treasure of the oceans.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—A CONTINUING NEED

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the need for congressional reform is a continuing one. For the record, I would recite an example that occurred just today.

The Committee on House Administration this morning voted favorably on House Resolution 259, to provide funds for studies and investigations by the Committee on Public Works.

Because requests by the minority for additional staffing had not been fully met, I had intended to file minority views in a report on this resolution; however, because both the committee and the House have acted immediately, I was not given an opportunity to file minority views. Without minority views, it would be difficult and futile, if not impossible, to explain to the membership sound reasons for not approving House Resolution 259, or amending it to provide for additional and badly needed staffing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the needs for minority staffing on the Public Works Committee can be worked out in the future by agreement. It is regrettable, however, that when situations like this do come up, it is not possible for a member, as a matter of right, to have time to file minority views which can be considered by the membership of this House when acting on legislation such as House Resolution 259.

FOREIGN POLICY: MORE EFFECT FOR LESS EXPENSE—A COMMENTARY BY AMBASSADOR BRIGGS

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk in recent months about "cleaning out the State Department." Most of it has been sloughed off in the press as the irresponsible remarks by the overly simplistic or the naive suggestions of well-meaning people who do not really understand the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this may sometimes be true, but before my colleagues in the House dismiss the matter as such, I hope they will take the time to read the following article which recently appeared in the March 1969 edition of the Foreign Service Journal.

The article is entitled "Why Not Give Diplomacy Back to the Diplomats?" and was written by one of America's most knowledgeable men in the field of foreign affairs, Ambassador Ellis Briggs of Hanover, N.H.

Ellis Briggs began his career in the Foreign Service in 1925, and in 1960 attained the rank of career Ambassador. During that period he served as Ambassador to seven posts, which I believe is something of a record. They included Uruguay, Czechoslovakia, the Republic of Korea, Peru, Brazil, Greece, and Spain.

Ambassador Briggs is also the author of two books, the most recent of which was entitled "Farewell to Foggy Bottom."

Here is a man who knows intimately the problems of diplomacy and policymaking. In this articulate, well-reasoned essay, he clearly demonstrates that there is in fact a need to clean out the State Department, the simple reason being so that it will function more effectively. I heartily commend his article to the attention of my colleagues for it provides some enlightenment on why our foreign policy does not always operate in the smoothest manner and in our best interests.

The article follows:

Why Not Give Diplomacy Back to the Diplomats?

(By Ellis Briggs)

(Note.—Ellis O. Briggs, writer and ambassador to seven countries, was born in Watertown, Massachusetts. He is the recipient of the Medal of Freedom for meritorious service as Ambassador to Korea in 1955. His prolific pen has produced numerous magazine articles and he is the author of two books, "Shots Heard Round the World" in

1957 and "Farewell to Foggy Bottom" in 1964.)

No one dealing with the operational aspects of foreign affairs can be unaware of the problem of personnel proliferation—the dismal and frustrating drag on performance resulting from too many people. It is therefore disappointing to find that the organization which purports to represent those engaged in American diplomacy—the American Foreign Service Association, control of which was recently captured in Washington by its junior State Department echelon—fails to cope with this major problem of excess staff and superfluous people. On the contrary, the drift of the Association's activities, which they have brought to the attention of President Nixon and his principal advisers, is that "modern diplomacy" will need even more people than there are on the payroll at present.

The facts of diplomatic life support no such conclusion.

The American Foreign Service, at upwards of thirty-six hundred commissioned officers, is already at least one thousand men and women too large. At every Embassy which the writer is familiar—as Ambassador to seven countries on three continents, plus continuing study of our operations abroad—the business of the United States could have been transacted more effectively by one half, or less, of the personnel assigned to each mission.

Outside the Foreign Service, overstaffing abroad by other agencies is even more serious. These Peripheral Performers—the dispensers of foreign aid, of development, of prescriptions for "emerging societies," of magic and martial music, of propaganda, and of the Crusading Spirit—are all more proliferated than the diplomats, and their ranks are in correspondingly greater need of fumigation and retrenchment. (Former President Johnson's 1968 reduction-in-force program, albeit in the right direction, turned out to be mostly hocus-pocus: the reductions were minimal, and the repatriates remained on the payroll.)

Just as during the so-called missile crisis in Washington in 1962, only a handful of persons were involved in decisions, so in even the most important of Embassies, confronting the gravest of situations, the Ambassador needs few aides to assist him. An Ambassador is supported by his Deputy, a seasoned and senior official, and between them they do what requires to be done with the Chief of State, the Prime Minister, or the members of the Cabinet of the country to which the Ambassador is accredited. In addition the Ambassador may be advised by the Political Counselor (or by the Counselor for Economic Affairs, depending on the subject matter) and perhaps by one or two subordinate Embassy officers who possess special training or experience in the area in question. Including secretaries, stenographers and clerks, an Ambassador uses a maximum of ten people to confront a critical or emergency situation; less, of course, for normal operations.

The rest of the Embassy cast contribute little except confusion, delay, cross-purposes and unread "position papers." In short, there is not enough substantive, useful, challenging or interesting work for an American Embassy of hundreds upon hundreds of people. The consequent featherbedding is as unprofitable to the taxpayers as it is stultifying to the individuals concerned.

The presence of these gigantic staffs in foreign capitals has an ill effect in another direction. It is a source of derision and disrespect on the part of the very foreigners whose good will the United States is theoretically cultivating. They manifest their attitude by destroying with monotonous and humiliating regularity such well-meaning tokens of the conspicuous American establishment as libraries and cultural centers, and even by attacking the Embassy premises. No other country in the world maintains outside its borders a fraction of the personnel camped in successive "Little Americas," where teeming administrators seek to reproduce the suburban way of life, but often merely succeed in reducing the natives to popeyed resentment. (Evacuating these communities before a threatened political upheaval costs the United States millions of dollars—for instance in the Near East in 1967.)

In searching for reasons why these truths, which are self-evident to so many professional practitioners, seem to have escaped successive administrations since World War II, it is clear that what is lacking is agreement as to the nature of foreign affairs, and above that, an understanding of the purpose of diplomacy.

The object of diplomacy is to influence the *policy* of another country, in ways favorable to the first country. It is as uncomplicated as that. That is the same object diplomacy has sought since cavemen inhabited adjacent cliffs, and pastoral societies coveted contiguous grazing areas. It is the same purpose that diplomacy will always have; the label "modern diplomacy" is therefore a misnomer, denigrating to the past and unhelpful to the future.

This definition of diplomacy as inseparable from *policy*, can be expanded to render it more specific. Take the statement: "the object of American diplomacy is to influence in ways favorable to the United States the policy of governments important to the United States." Such a declaration is both accurate and intelligible. It encourages the establishment of the priorities essential to the orderly transaction of business, without which American resources are in danger of being frittered away. It implies that the demands of Abidjan, Tegucigalpa and Reykjavik, although not necessarily unworthy, may nevertheless be less important to the American people than the problems emanating from Moscow, Rio de Janeiro or Tokyo.

Within this true definition of diplomacy, the foreign business of the United States is not ideological warfare, nor evangelism, nor huffing and puffing to accelerate alien development, nor the preservation of a balance of power or any rigid *status quo*. The business of American diplomacy is the promotion of the national interests of the United States, and the protection of those interests, in a changing and turbulent world, from whatever menace that is capable of producing an intolerable explosion.

Diplomacy as influencing the *policy* of other governments is hardly the definition that has prevailed in recent Potomac councils. For instance, the young soothsayers of the Foreign Service Association, writing in collaboration with assorted Peripheral Performers (who perhaps cannot be expected to advocate measures tending to thin their ranks or curb their activities), appear to view diplomacy, and especially what they characterize as "modern diplomacy," as something far more gaudy and uninhibited than influencing policy. Not content with that, they desire to *transform institutions*.

Now *transforming institutions* is a different proposition altogether from *influencing policy*, and it is at that point that the paths of diplomats and reformers most frequently diverge. Influencing policy involves discipline, analysis, understanding of facts and possibilities, and comprehension of their bearing on the national interests, seen in realistic perspective. It involves attention to detail, and patience, and "the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations."

Transforming institutions, in contrast, would seek for diplomacy—"modern diplomacy," to be sure—a worldwide hunting license of infinite scope and unlimited validity, encouraging the participants to thrash about in hemisphere briar patches, brandishing megaphones and bazookas.

Under that definition of diplomacy, a case can of course be made for the retention of almost limitless performers, all allegedly assisting the hunters; for an army of beaters, making the forests echo and startling the game from habitat to Helsinki; for guides tying goats to *ceiba* trees, scattering cracked corn on the ponds, and locating saltlicks; for researchers and biologists to plot the flyways and locate the spawning areas; and even for missionaries to explain to the penguins that they would really be happier if they laid their eggs along the Amazon River, where the water is comfortably warm, instead of along the shores of McMurdo Sound, where the water is uncommonly cold.

Under that definition of diplomacy, there is no end to the legions that can be recruited. Battalions of imagemakers, flashing their mirrors; gaggles of wreakers-of-good, waving lofty intentions; regiments of attaches, measuring culverts and bridges; prides of welfare workers, one foot on the accelerator and one eye on the cookie jar.

That, in fact, is precisely what has been happening.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to trace how this came about, gradually, in the wake of World War II, sometimes over the protests of an ineffectual State Department, sometimes with its blessings. But come about it did, with results that now confront us.

The American Government has been in the transforming institutions business for nearly a quarter century. To show for it, the United States has a balance of payments problem, and microscopic return on an incalculable investment.

It is time for the American people to dedicate themselves not to "modern diplomacy" but to *effective* diplomacy, with less freeloading of international freight, and no freewheeling by crusaders.

That does not mean abandoning compassion as a legitimate ingredient in the foreign affairs equation. It does imply that a decent regard for self-interest ought no longer to be considered discreditable and that a *quid pro quo* in the diplomatic marketplace should once again have value.

That does not mean the extermination of the Peripheral Performers, whose operations, nevertheless, should henceforth be understood as *adjuncts* of diplomacy, and no longer as controlling components. Projects to foster cultural osmosis, public relations planning (labeled propaganda when someone else does it), aid of one sort or another to selected developing lands, military assistance, credits, sharing of scientific knowledge and the paraphernalia of technology—each of those things, in given circumstances to be decided upon one country at a time—can sometimes provide fruitful though usually limited assistance in the functioning of diplomacy and in the conduct of international relations.

Thus, while peripheral activities should not all be abandoned, past experience with them, their cost and their limitations, ought to be brought into focus. And future operations should be both closely scrutinized and sharply patrolled by the Department of State. Moreover, most of the personnel concerned are not diplomats, and those who are not should be detached from the diplomatic establishment.

Tools needed to bring these things about are already at hand—two tools, forged during this decade. The first is the Presidential letter of May 29, 1961, outlining the responsibility and authority of the American Ambassador. Thus equipped, there is no reason why the voice of a determined representative abroad should be inaudible through the hum of Virginia Avenue traffic, or contradicted by the bleats of bureaucratic sheep folded in Foggy Bottom. The other is the charter of March 4, 1966, from the President to the Secretary of State. This, known as National Security Action Memorandum 341, returns to the State Department the "overall direction, coordination, and supervision" of American Government activities overseas. NSAM 341 is a delegation of power of formidable proportions, but in the ensuing three years the State Department, its leadership mired in Asian dilemmas, failed to take advantage of this grant of White House authority.

These two existing directives constitute ample ammunition for a fresh President and Secretary of State to mount an overdue campaign against the entrenched agencies and organizations that for years have been chipping away at the State Department, invading its field, and seeking to substitute the activism of the eager beaver for the voice of experience. Today, shrinking the American diplomatic service to manageable dimensions and then returning to it the necessary attributes for achievement may not prove an easy task, but it is a job to be undertaken if diplomacy is to be of maximum value to the American people. It is a job for a new Secretary of State, unmortgaged by the mistakes of the 1950s and 60s.

There is no area of the federal government that has been the object of more solicitude on the part of uninformed kibitzers and aggressive reformers than the American Foreign Service. Most of them have operated under the banner of "modern diplomacy," discredited though that emblem may be as a result of costly, futile and interminable experiments. It may be that in the nature of his work, a diplomat finds himself unable to cultivate the kind of grassroots constituency that supports other government operations. He can boast of no lobby comparable to those beating drums for the Departments of Defense or Agriculture, for example. That does not mean that the Foreign Service must cultivate a supple spine, or that diplomats should hesitate to stand up and be counted. In fact if they do not stand up, they are likely to be counted out, and at no distant date in the future.

It is high time that diplomats do speak up, for improvements generated from within testify to the vitality of the organization, and moreover among the assets possessed by professionalism is an aroused awareness on the part of the American people of the importance of foreign affairs, properly conducted. That awareness should include simultaneous acceptance of the proposition that if an American householder has a broken-down furnace, he does not call in an astrologer, a paperhanger, or a professor-who-says-he-knows-all-the-answers. Nor does the home owner invite to his cellar a traveling circus. He summons a plumber who knows about furnaces.

It is perhaps reassuring to the general public that diplomats and plumbers have that much in common. At any rate, having tried without success practically everything else since World War II ended, it might be a good idea to try giving diplomacy back to the diplomats. There would be a saving in fuel oil, and they might even repair the furnace.

CONGRESS WANTS TO KNOW ABOUT CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is considering a number of major defense questions, from the merits of the ABM, the number of troops that should be kept in Vietnam, to the need to revise the draft. In each case, we have been able to obtain from the Department of Defense and the Department of State a rather thorough explanation of the public policy questions relating to these problems. Although we may not have agreed with the position taken by these Departments, there has been no lack of information about them.

This has not been the case for chemical and biological warfare, however. When some questions were raised recently concerning the safety of the chemical and biological warfare programs being carried out by the United States, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCarthy) asked the U.S. Army to brief Members of Congress on the public policy and safety aspects of these programs. The questions to be answered were of the same type that we would normally ask about troop deployment in NATO, our commitment to South Vietnam, procurement of the ABM or similar military subjects.

The U.S. Army presented an interesting briefing, much of it classified for reasons not altogether satisfactory. I attended that briefing but was disappointed, as were others, for the briefing did not answer the public policy questions. It was not made clear, for example, whether or not we had adequate chemical warfare deterrent and whether or not we need such a deterrent.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCarthy), in his usual determination and diligence, has followed up this briefing by writing to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, and other agency heads for their answers to a comprehensive series of public policy questions on chemical and biological warfare. Answers to these questions should help Congress and the public make an intelligent evaluation of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare. I look forward with interest to the replies that the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCarthy) will receive.

The widespread public interest in this area is shown by the editorial that appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on March 10, 1969. I include the editorial in the Record for the information of my colleagues:

Unjustifiable Secrecy

The stockholders of a corporation who found out its directors were hiding various expenditures, all for the same item, in order to deceive these same stockholders probably would find themselves a new board of directors.

This, in effect, is what is happening in Congress. The Pentagon, with the connivance of a few senior committee members, has been spreading expenditures of about $350 million a year on chemical and biological warfare weapons.

It was like salting a mine in the days of the Old West. Nobody but the people who planted them knew where the nuggets were.

Now comes a congressman, Rep. Richard D. McCarthy, D-N.Y., whose wife saw a television program on CBW, as chemical-biological warfare is called. She asked her husband what he knew about it. "Nothing," he said, and meant it.

But McCarthy went to work and found out that during the last four years the Army, with the cooperation of senior members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, has managed to keep secret how much the Pentagon was spending on CBW research and production.

The funds were scattered throughout the defense budget in such a manner that it was virtually impossible for individual members of Congress to determine how much was being spent and for what. References to the over-all total were customarily censored out of the testimony given to committees.

At a hearing a Pentagon spokesman refused to disclose the amount spent, saying it was "confidential." McCarthy got around this by quoting from a Library of Congress study, which was not confidential at all, though it gave the information desired.

The reason for CBW development, said the Pentagon man, is that the Russians have enough of the stuff to kill everybody.

If we know this about the Russians, and surely they know about ours, why the secrecy?

The answer, of course, is that the Pentagon and its confidants in Congress would like to keep the matter secret from the American people, who get nervous about such things, who pay the bills and who must stand responsible if this kind of weapon is ever used.

We need more congressmen like Rep. McCarthy. Why should the military hide from us what it can't hide from the Russians?

THE BURDEN OF COLLEGE EXPENSES

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide tax credits to parents and students who are burdened with the heavy expenses of college education.

There is no question that the average family trying to put its sons and daughters through college faces a terrific strain on its savings and income.

Most tax credit proposals for higher education give some relief for expenses of tuition and fees. My bill would also recognize the unavoidable charges for room and board which are a major part of most college expenses—a major part of the burden.

According to figures provided by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there are now 4,975,000 full-time college students in the United States. About two-thirds of these students are in public colleges and universities, where they must pay, each year, an average of $1,122 for tuition, fees, room, and board. Students attending private institutions pay an average bill that is more than twice that amount: $2,389.

In my own State, California, students and their families must pay large amounts for 1 year at a university. At public universities like the University of California at Riverside, the annual cost, including the charges for room and board, is $1,524. At the Berkeley campus, the financial burden on students and their families is $2,031. Overall yearly expenses at private institutions, including charges for room and board, are even greater: for example, $3,000 at the University of Southern California, and $3,160 at Stanford University.

Whether their sons and daughters attend public or private institutions, American parents today are paying between $800 and $1,000 annually for each student's room and board, if the student is not able to live at home. When this is figured into the average bill paid to a private institution, room and board is about 40 percent of the total cost; but it constitutes over 70 percent of the average financial burden imposed on students attending public colleges and universities.

In a short span of 4 years, families sending their youngsters to public institutions must, on an average, pay a $4,488 education bill for each child. The 4-year figure at a private institution is $9,556. And these expenses are increasing all the time. On a nationwide basis, it is estimated that college expenses go up an average of between 3 and 5 percent every year.

College expenses place a heavy strain on a family in a short period of time, with no relief comparable to relief that is available under present tax laws for medical expenses or casualty losses.

Many provisions in our present tax laws give tax advantages to wealthy individuals and corporations. Reporting on tax loopholes, a recent article in Newsweek magazine noted:

> The low rate on capital gains costs between $5.5 billion and $8.5 billion annually. The tax exemption on interest paid by local bonds costs $1.8 billion, the depletion allowance for oil and gas deprives the government of $1.3 billion and the real-estate tax shelter takes away an added $750 million in potential revenue.

Richard Goode, formerly a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution, who now is with the International Monetary Fund, has observed that—

> The present tax treatment of educational costs gives rise to inequities and is especially questionable at a time when the need for highly trained persons is growing. . . . For example, a person who attends engineering school is usually not allowed to deduct his educational expenditures from his earnings, whereas a taxpayer who buys a truck can recover the cost through depreciation allowances.

The 1962 investment credit tax bill and revised depreciation guidelines provided over $2 billion in tax relief for investment in machinery.

Yet the ordinary taxpayer continues to be taxed at full rates. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the best form of investment we can make is our investment in education. In sheer dollar economy, it is estimated that the college-educated wage earner will earn $200,000 more than the noncollege man, over an average life span. This would mean a long-term gain in Federal revenue of at least $40,000 for each college-educated youth. Even granting maximum credits, under this bill, of $440 a year for 4 years, the Federal Government would get back $40,000 for each $1,760 it loses in allowing credits to the student or his parent.

The tax credit method of offering relief to parents is clearly more equitable than the tax deduction method, because tax credits, unlike deductions, give uniform relief, without regard to the taxpayer's tax bracket. A credit is subtracted directly from the amount of tax paid by the taxpayer. A deduction, subtracted from total income, would grant proportionately more relief to high-income families than to low-income families, giving the largest benefits to those with the least need for assistance.

Under the deduction method, a wealthy taxpayer in the higher income bracket, who may be paying taxes that amount to 50 percent of his income, for example, could deduct a $1,400 college expenditure and save half of that amount, $700, in taxes. A parent with a much smaller income, in the 20-percent bracket, would save only $280, or 20 percent of the same deduction. Under my bill, both taxpayers would save the same amount—$390—in taxes.

Again quoting Richard Goode:

> A considerably greater part of the total tax reduction would accrue to low-income and middle-income families under a tax credit than under a deduction plan costing the Government the same amount of revenue.

I grant that tax credit legislation is not the complete answer to college expense burdens. It would give no direct assistance to the small proportion of students from families with incomes so low that they pay no income tax. It would not give full advantages to those whose tax liability is less than the amount of credit.

Ways must always be sought to help these particular students, who already are the principal beneficiaries of scholarship aid. But tax credits to taxpayers will help in this area, too. Dr. Roger A. Freeman, a senior staff member at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, located at Stanford University, points this out:

> The granting of tuition credits would not only free more scholarships for students from a low-income background, it would also stimulate thousands of potential donors to offer scholarships to needy students for which they would receive credits on their income tax.

While tax credits under this bill would provide greater dollar benefit to those paying high college costs, they provide a relative greater benefit to the student in a low-tuition university or college; the less he pays, the greater percent of his cost he gets as credit.

Dr. Freeman also notes:

> Tax credits would provide assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations.

In other words, a relationship would exist only between the Internal Revenue Service and the individual taxpayer. Dr. Freeman adds:

> Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

My bill would allow the taxpayer—the parent, the student himself, or any other person who pays part or all of the student's expenses—to receive a tax credit up to a maximum of $440 for up to $2,400 in school-year expenses, including room and board. I note that this maximum credit is close to the amount, $450, recommended in the past by the American Council on Education.

Taking public and private university and college students together, the average annual expense per student, living away from home, is $1,544. Thus the average credit to be allowed under this bill would be $414 per student, the amount that would be granted to taxpayers for a $1,544 expenditure.

I recognize that the total relief to those who support students in higher education could amount, roughly, to $2 billion a year. But this investment, as I have said, would offer many returns. It should be a new commitment in the interest of education, a commitment to help families making large sacrifices for higher education. Let me emphasize that it should not be an excuse to cut back on direct Federal aid to higher education. Tax credits should be taken at their face value, as a sensible way to bring help to families burdened by college expenses, and not to the institutions themselves. Other programs help the institutions.

Help to families paying for education is needed just as much and in some cases more than the relief afforded to other taxpayers under existing tax laws. And if we can talk of investing in a multibillion-dollar program in the national defense—in dubious, costly, and often obsolete devices such as "thick" and "thin" antiballistic-missile systems—we can give priority to our best defense—affordable education for the young.

AUTHORIZING PROFESSIONAL PAY AND CONTINUATION BONUSES FOR JUDGE ADVOCATES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing professional pay and continuation bonuses for judge advocates in the uniformed services.

In short, the bill provides retention incentives for attorneys in uniform at the rate of $50 per month through the grade of captain—lieutenant in the Navy; $150 per month for the grades of major and lieutenant colonel—lieutenant commander and commander in the Navy; and $200 per month for the grades of colonel or Navy captain and above. Additionally, the bill authorizes the payment of a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year up to 6 years which the judge advocate agrees to remain in active service, first, beyond his obligated initial service, and second, beyond the time he becomes eligible for voluntary retirement. Under my bill the payment of the second retention bonus is not contingent upon the officer having received or having been eligible for receipt of the first bonus. I should also mention that my bill allows the service Secretaries to establish regulations for the administration of the continuation bonus program. This is designed to assure that only qualified officers who have demonstrated their worth by performance will be offered the retention bonus.

The purpose of the bill is to make legal careers in the services more attractive as the present retention rate is critically low. As a former judge advocate in the Air Force, I am personally acquainted with this personnel sieve and its ill effects upon the quality of the administration of military justice. From 1951 until 1964 the

XUM

retention rate of attorneys in the Army was only 12½ percent. As of late last fall the Navy had only 38 regular lieutenants out of 630 lawyers on board. Since 1960 the Navy has retained an average of only 12 attorneys a year. One could hardly be sanguine about the Air Force situation. Exclusive of recallees, that service over the last 13 years has retained only 14 percent of its judge advocates.

These are alarming statistics. And the problem is decidedly more real than apparent. Since 1951 with the advent of the Uniform Code of Military Justice the need for experienced attorneys in the armed services to make workable an enlightened system of justice has ever increased. From the statistics I have related it is evident that as the need grew the supply of experienced attorneys diminished. The action of the 90th Congress in passing the Military Justice Act of 1968 renewed and strengthened the commitment of the Congress and of this Nation to provide for our men in uniform a judicial system modeled fully after the present Federal court system. That action was unquestionably right. But it added a requirement for more than 700 additional military lawyers.

The true test of our resolve comes then in this Congress, not the last. It was easy and painless enough to write judicial guarantees into the law. But where are the means to make those guarantees meaningful? Where are the military judges and counsel which we guaranteed to the serviceman in the last Congress, The rights are hollow indeed if there are simply no attorneys in uniform to effect the reforms we decreed.

The bill I introduce today hopefully will provide a solution to the critical problem of lawyer retention in the armed services. In fact, my solution is the very one recommended by a Department of Defense study group in late 1968, after being specially commissioned in 1967 to study the problem. As I have indicated before, events have now overrun the the study and over 700 more uniformed lawyers than the study ever contemplated are now required.

I am sure that many of you will be surprised to learn that professional pay in the Armed Forces is now authorized for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, but not for attorneys. Is it small wonder that the services are faced with a virtually hopeless retention problem with lawyers? The special pays for these groups of officers in other professions range in amounts from $100 to $350 monthly. My proposal for lawyers is more modest as it provides for a maximum of $200 per month professional pay. You might also be surprised to learn that physicians and dentists receive longevity pay credit for their advanced education; lawyers do not. My bill does not address this subject. Additionally, I should mention that the cost of this legislation is not large for I am speaking of a total of some 3,800 military lawyers through the entire Department of Defense at this time.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not disagree with the concept of professional pay for the categories of officers I have mentioned. But I want to make it equally plain that I strongly believe we must provide attorneys in uniform substantial equality with their professional brothers both because it is right and now because it is patently necessary to secure to our servicemen the judicial rights to which the Congress has determined they are entitled.

It has been my observation that Congress has generally been the instrument for leading in the effort to guarantee to every serviceman his full constitutional rights. And unless I seriously misjudge the relative interests of the branches of our Government in the area of individual rights, I rather suspect that it will also fall to the Congress to spearhead this effort to provide resources for assuring that these rights are not illusory, but real and meaningful. As is apparent, this case virtually argues itself. I am confident that this proposed legislation, supported as it is by the American Bar Association, the Judge Advocates Association, and numerous concerned organizations across the country, will also have the support of this body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOLEY, for the balance of week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business in district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT, for 60 minutes, on April 2, 1969.

Mr. MOORHEAD, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TALCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIGGS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 1 hour, on March 27.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on March 27.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 30 minutes, on March 31.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATSUNAGA and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the Extensions of Remarks:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. COUGHLIN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. MACGREGOR in two instances.

Mr. BETTS in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. OLSEN in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. CONYERS in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. MIKVA.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. BURTON of California in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1968, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During Calendar Year 1968, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

1. Extraordinary contractual adjustment authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board.

Under date of December 27, 1968, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for the fabrication and delivery of earth station receivers and associated test equipment with RCA Victor Co., Limited, of Montreal, Canada. Relief was granted on the ground that the parties to the contract were mutually mistaken in failing to foresee the extent of engineering development work required to overcome state-of-the-art limitations which were not apparent when the contract was negotiated. Relief was authorized only in an amount which may fairly be regarded as representing that portion of RCA's engineering development loss which is allocable to the effort expended in actually seeking to overcome the state-of-the-art limitations. The precise amount of relief was left to be determined by the Contracting Officer through discussions with RCA. It is expected that this amount will not exceed $144,000, the amount of relief originally requested by RCA.

2. Actions under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at Cape Kennedy, Florida.

Under date of September 26, 1962, the Administrator of NASA made a determination pursuant to the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–804), that from and after September 26, 1962, all contracts, or amendments, or modifications thereof, for the performance of construction work at the Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Kennedy, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, should include a clause requiring contractors and all subcontractors thereunder to abide by money provisions of a Project Stabilization Agreement, to the extent such money provisions are determined by the Government to be reasonable. The Project Stabilization Agreement referred to is an agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractor's Association and other local and national associations of contractors, and the Brevard Building and Construction Trades Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO. The purpose of this agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy of performance of contracts involving construction work at Patrick Air Force Base and the Cape Kennedy complex. The agreement was originally negotiated in 1962, and amendments were re-negotiated again on April 1, 1964 and April 1,1967.

Pursuant to this determination, two NASA contracts for construction work in the Cape Kennedy area, of a total value of $13,854,271, which were awarded during 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the above Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase or decrease in costs under the contracts involved in an amount not readily determinable, the purpose of the Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

3. Action under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility.

Under date of June 22, 1967, the Deputy Administrator of NASA made a determination similar to that described in Paragraph 2 above with respect to contracts and subcontracts for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, in implementation of a revised Project Stabilization Agreement dated July 1, 1966, which had been negotiated for that area. (The original Agreement expired on June 30, 1966.) Pursuant to this determination, one amendment to an existing contract and one contract was awarded for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, of a value of $850,000, which was executed in 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the revised Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase or decrease in costs under the contract involved in an amount not readily determinable, it is noted again that the purpose of negotiating a Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

Sincerely,

T. O. PAINE,
Acting Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

623. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of financial statements of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1967, Department of Transportation (H. Doc. No. 91–93); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

624. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233 a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

625. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 for the period January 1–December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of Public Law 88–558; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

626. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

627. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of action taken during calendar year 1968 under the authority of section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–804) (72 Stat. 972), pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

628. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia City Council, transmitting the first annual report of the City Council, pursuant to the provisions of section 402(10) of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on the future of U.S. public diplomacy (Rept. No. 91–130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 214. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–131). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 259. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189 (Rept. No. 91–132). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 272. Resolution authorizing the expenditures of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–133). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 271. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–134). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200 (Rept. No. 91–135). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 301. Resolution authorizing expenses for conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 268 (Rept. No. 91–136). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 315. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration without amendment (Rept. No. 91–137). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 320. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 91–138). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 8794. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4148. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–140). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9328. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service,

XUM

and for other purposes without amendment (Rept. No. 91–141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9505. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9506. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9507. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the uniform application of selective service policies, to raise the incidence of volunteers in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9508. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9510. A bill to improve the accounting systems used by agencies and departments, to reduce waste and inefficiency in the use of Government funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9511. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of State for Food and Population, an Assistant Administrator for Population in the Agency for International Development, and a National Council on Food and Population, and to amend the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 related to family planning and population control programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9512. A bill to include air traffic controllers within the provisions of section 8336 (c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of certain Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. PRICE of Texas):

H.R. 9513. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9515. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9516. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish an equitable survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age, to increase the outside earnings permitted without loss of benefits, to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits, and to pay benefits despite marriage or remarriage if it occurs after attainment of age 55, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3- and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9518. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9520. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9521. A bill to regulate trade in drugs and devices by prohibiting the dispensing of drugs or devices by medical practitioners and their participation in profits from the dispensing of such products, except under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9522. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 9523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the minimum standard deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9524. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9525. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9526. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9527. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9528. A bill to require students and teachers in the District of Columbia public schools to wear protective devices for their eyes while engaged in certain activities in those schools; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9529. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9530. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 9531. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sale or delivery of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9532. A bill to alleviate certain hardships to employees in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9533. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9534. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9535. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9536. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9537. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9539. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include certain joint hospital laundry ventures among the cooperative hospital service organizations entitled to tax exemption thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9541. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of law under which assistance is provided for the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9542. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9543. A bill to add a new title XII to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9544. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9545. A bill to designate certain lands in the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine as "wilderness"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9546. A bill to amend section 4 of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9547. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with a supplementary loan to the King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9548. A bill to amend section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9549. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9550. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9551. A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9552. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 9553. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to authorize the computation of overtime compensation for hospital employees on the basis of a 14-day work period; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9554. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of certain nonimmigrants into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9555. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9556. A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination, to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities, to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources, to establish the National Council on the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 9558. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon the railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9559. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9560. A bill to authorize the acquisition and maintenance of the Goddard rocket launching site in accordance with the act of August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9561. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9562. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs which require a doctor's prescription, and which are prescribed by their generic names, among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H.R. 9563. A bill to repeal percentage depletion for oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9564. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9565. A bill to amend section 837, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain acts involving the use of incendiary devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9566. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit deceptive practices in news broadcasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9567. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9569. A bill to amend section 809(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat retrospective rate credits as return premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9570. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 9571. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9572. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 9573. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at or near the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9574. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9575. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 9576. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9578. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9579.—A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 9580. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9581. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9582. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9583. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to foster and promote broadcasting in the public interest and to prevent conglomerate organizations from impairing regulation of broadcasting in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9584. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information

Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 9585. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9586. A bill for the establishment of a Commission to study and promulgate a national policy respecting dispersal of population and industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution, reciprocity in U.S. territorial waters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Koch, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Podell, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Scheuer):

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the sea bed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Dent, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Koch, Mr. Leggett, and Mr. McCloskey):

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Moss, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Vigorito, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Waldie, and Mr. Yatron):

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 341. Resolution to provide for an International Conference on Problems of Human Environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 342. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 343. Resolution creating a special committee to conduct an investigation and study into the legal, political, and diplomatic status of lands which were the subject of grants from the King of Spain and from the Government of Mexico prior to the acquisition of the American Southwest as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo concluding the Mexican-American War in 1848; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 344. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Res. 345. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 346. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Report of the Joint Economic Committee"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. Dent, and Mr. Erlenborn):

H. Res. 347. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of production of foreign-made goods competing with domestically produced goods and of new developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

93. Mr. ULLMAN and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to refrain from implementing the recently proposed increase in fees of grazing on public land because the agricultural sector of this Nation's economy is undergoing a period of recession, and the increase would have such detrimental economic impact on the livestock industry that the entire profit margin in many livestock operations would be removed, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 9587. A bill for the relief of James J. Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 9588. A bill for the relief of John Acerbi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9589. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Blasi and his wife, Grazia De Blasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9590. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66–55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9591. A bill for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9592. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Muscas and his wife, Christina Muscas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9593. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66–55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9594. A bill for the relief of Iraj Rigi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9595. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66–55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Guisappa Guarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9597. A bill for the relief of Rafael Martinez-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9598. A bill for the relief of Sea Oil & General Corp., of New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 348. Resolution to refer the bill H.R. 9598 entitled "A bill for the relief of Sea Oil and General Corporation, of New York, New York" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TIME TO STOP THE NONSENSE ON CAMPUS

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, throughout our Nation thousands of concerned citizens have gazed in wonderment at the brazen destruction of property and thoughtless disruption of the learning processes on our Nation's college campuses.

Few, if any, of our people question the right to dissent and to make grievances known through peaceful means. But the right to dissent does not include the right to destroy. The case for change confers no privilege to invoke anarchy, for if there is to be reasoned change, orderly processes must be preserved.

I am happy to say that in my own State, school administrators, faculty, and students have thus far succeeded in reaching mutually satisfactory solutions to campus problems. Needless to say, I hope this atmosphere of cooperation continues.

The Washington Post on March 17 published an editorial entitled "Time To

Stop the Nonsense on Campus." It is a cogent article placing in perspective the problems which confront our college campuses. I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STOP THE NONSENSE ON CAMPUS

The disgraceful episode at Georgetown University Thursday night, when a handful of young hoodlums, most of them with no connection with the University, refused to permit the Mayor of San Francisco to make a speech, is the logical outcome of the attitude that previously led to the seizure by students of offices and buildings at Howard University. It is an attitude, common these days among some students and nonstudents who like to foment trouble, that no one's rights matter but their own and that society must allow them to do their thing regardless of what it is or where they do it.

It is long past time for an end to this kind of nonsense. There is room on every college campus for dissent and for criticism of the status quo. A campus without those elements is likely to stagnate and deserves to die. But there is a place and a time for dissent and for demonstration and there are limits on protests, whether by faculty, students, or nonstudents, that every university ought to enforce.

Two recent actions of the Supreme Court provide some guidance as to what those limits ought to be. A couple of weeks ago, the Court upheld the right of students to wear black armbands to class as a demonstration of their opposition to the war in Vietnam. This was a proper exercise of the right of free expression, the Justices said, and was protected by the Constitution against interference by school administrators. But the Court added that "conduct by the student, in class or out of it, which for any reason—whether it stems from time, place or type of behavior—materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others is, of course, not immunized by the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech." As if to underline that sentence the Court refused last Monday to review the expulsion of ten students from Bluefield State College in West Virginia for "riotous" behavior. Justice Fortas, speaking only for himself, pointed out the difference. These ten students, he said, were "engaged in an aggressive and violent demonstration, and not in peaceful, nondisruptive expression."

That is precisely the distinction that needs to be drawn in all campus protests. Students must be free to air their complaints and grievances, real or imaginary, in meetings, speeches, handbills, newspapers, conferences, and any other form of nonviolent persuasion including noncoercive picket lines. But they ought not to be free to disrupt classes, destroy property, deprive others of the right to speak, bar anyone from going into or out of a building, or interfere with the normal functioning of any part of a university's activities.

Merely saying that such a distinction ought to exist is quite a different thing from establishing it on campuses as different as Howard and Harvard, Georgetown and Berkeley. The primary burden, of course, for putting an end to the current nonsense is on those who administer colleges, who teach in them, and who attend them. About the last thing any university wants to do is to call in the police. If student groups, aided by campus police, can organize themselves sufficiently to cope with disruptions, so much the better. But, if they cannot, the formal power of society, in the form of the police, must be called upon to maintain order.

Father Hesburgh's formula for handling disorders at Notre Dame is still a good one. He has warned students that anyone disrupting a university activity will be given 15 minutes to think about it, then suspended if he continues to disrupt, and then expelled if he persists; nonstudents participating in disorders are to be arrested. But it takes more than an *ipse dixit* to establish such a policy. To make it stick, administrators must have done their homework—unifying behind them the great mass of faculty members and students who are interested in learning even while reforming the universities and making clear to all students what the penalties for riotous behavior are to be.

These are two great dangers in the current wave of unrest on the campuses. The first is that if disorder continues unchecked some great educational institutions will be destroyed. The second is that a wave of repression, aimed not at confining protest to its proper scope but at eliminating it, will follow. One of the major causative factors of the current problem is that many colleges refused for too long to listen when student and faculty members were protesting quietly. The affair at Columbia University a year ago demonstrated, much too well, that violence could produce changes that peaceful dissent had failed to produce. Thus a wave of repression unaccompanied by needed reforms will lead eventually only to greater trouble.

The Gallup Poll noted last week that campus disorders have replaced the Vietnam War as the No. 1 topic of serious discussion in homes across the country. When you add to this ferment the rumblings from state legislatures, alumni groups, and moderate students the message should be clear enough not only to those who would rather disrupt and destroy than learn and reform but to those who administer the institutions of higher education as well.

A BILL TO PROVIDE HAZARDOUS RETIREMENT FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill supported by the Air Traffic Control Association, an association of air traffic controllers in the employ of the Federal Aviation Administration, to obtain for them the same privileges of retirement at age 50 after 20 years of service as are now provided to other classes of Federal employees who have hazardous or arduous duties under section 8336 of the Retirement Act.

Already included in this category are Federal law-enforcement officers such as FBI agents, employees of the Bureau of Prisons, employees of military disciplinary barracks, and employees of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia. As my colleagues know, there are other classes of Federal employees who have these same benefits through separate legislation, such as Public Health Service officers and Foreign Service officers.

Mr. Speaker, the hazards of air traffic control duties are not newly discovered. This is something the Congress knew 10 years ago. When Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Act in 1958, it inserted section 302(g) which directed the Administrator of FAA to prepare a report and submit it to Congress with respect to the need for early retirement for controllers. The Administrator did so. It is identified as Senate Document No. 57, 87th Congress, second session. The Administrator found there were unique pressures and tensions in this profession, and that it was a young man's game. He found that controllers should have early retirement, not only for their own good, but for the good of the service and the safety of the air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, to further point up the need for this legislation, I want to place in the RECORD a portion of the testimony of Mr. James D. Hill, general counsel of the Air Traffic Control Association, on May 7, 1968, before the Senate Subcommittee on Retirement, when the subcommittee was considering Senator RANDOLPH's bill, S. 3424, 90th Congress:

We respectfully suggest to the Committee that there is no more deserving group in the entire Government for twenty-year retirement than air traffic controllers, with due deference to all the hazards foreign service officers or others may have.

An air traffic controller's job was difficult ten years ago and it has been made twice as hard since that time because of the fact that air traffic volume has doubled in the last ten years.

When the Act was passed in 1958, towers handled 25 million operations a year; now it is 50 million. Centers handled 8 million instrument operations a year; now it is 17 million. Flight Service Stations assisted 17 million aircraft; now it is 34 million.

The Administrator issued his ten-year aviation forecast last month and estimated that aviation traffic will triple or quadruple again in the next ten years.

The trouble is, the size of the air traffic control work force is about the same today as it was ten years ago, and no provision is being made to meet the future.

Many controllers who were supposed to handle four or five aircraft at a time are handling 35 or 40 at a time. Because of personnel shortages in the system, they don't even get a coffee break and they have to eat lunch at their position. They work eight hours a day, six days a week, in concentrated effort. When they get up, their pants stick to the seat. One controller tells of spilling a hot cup of coffee on the hand of the man next to him, who did not even notice it, as he was so involved in his work.

This is not just the opinion of the controllers' group; a great deal of medical research has been done on the subject by many people. This includes the FAA medical staff at Georgetown Medical Center; the FAA Aeromedical Institute at Oklahoma City; the Flight Safety Foundation; the U.S. Air Force Human Factors Research Laboratory; Carnegie Institute; the British RAF Institute of Aviation Medicine; the Medical Center at New York State University; Harvard's Guggenheim Center for Aerospace Health and Safety—I could go on and on. All of these groups have made studies of the effects of tension and pressure and aging on air traffic controllers. All report that these people have an undue amount of tension and pressure, which in time worsens into serious ailments. Initially they may just suffer irritability, inability to sleep, nervousness, tremors, cramps, headaches or nausea, but with time, as with any tension or pressure when not relieved, it degenerates into the three usual products of unrelieved tension and pressure—heart attacks, ulcers and mental illness. All of these affect controllers, to a much greater extent than the general population.

The FAA puts out a monthly list of people who retire, and when I examined the list last month, I noticed that 11 controllers retired. Over half—six of them—were disability retirements. I suggest to the committee

XUM

where more than half of the people of any Federal occupational specialty can't make it to age 55 and must retire on disability because of the debilitating, arduous nature of their job, you have per se, a hazardous occupation.

If we were to consider that "hazardous" in the statute means hazardous to life, such as being shot to death in law enforcement duties, rather than hazardous to health, we would be glad to compare our profession with the others on this basis also. Within the last month we have received reports of five of our members who suffered heart attacks on the job. Two died immediately. Let me refer just to one for the committee's enlightenment. This is a typical example of the problem. This man was a controller at the Kansas City Center on the 4:00 p.m. to midnight shift with heavy traffic all the time. At about 9:30 he got an unusually complex traffic situation, the kind that can result in a midair collision if not speedily corrected—it took him about twenty minutes, working in cold perspiration, I am sure. When he finished he said he was sick, got up holding himself, slumped to the ground and died within a few minutes. He was 32 years old, and left a wife and three small children.

Let me emphasize, this man did not have a bad heart when he came into the service. Controllers have to pass a medical examination which is more rigorous than the examination which the agency requires for commercial pilots. Also, a psychological examination; and they must repeat these exams and pass them every year to stay in the service. This was a man with a perfectly sound heart a few hours before, but these are the kinds of things that happen all the time in the Air Traffic Control Service.

We think that this situation raises some questions. First is the moral question: How much should the Federal Government, as an employer, expect of an employee? Should it require him to continue to work until the day he is carried out on a stretcher dead or a useless hulk of a man for the rest of his life or should it give him freedom before this happens?

Second, is the question of safety. FAA medical research has found that the ability of a controller to handle heavy traffic starts to slide down hill fast after he becomes forty years of age. Yet he can't quit because of this; he has to stay on until he is 55, although he can't really do the job any more. It is like asking an athlete to play major league baseball at age 55. He can't do it, and neither can a controller. But, under present law, he is forced to hang on like grim death to a job he can't really do. His comrades on each side "carry" him, and try to conceal it from the facility chief—so he must hang on until the "lucky" day when he is "fortunate" enough to have a heart attack or ulcer and can get out on disability. This is not a safe way to operate the air traffic control system.

Third, it creates recruitment, retention and staffing problems; people no longer want to enter the service because of the job pressures. This is especially true of the high density terminals like Chicago, New York and Los Angeles. I saw a report last week stating that O'Hare Tower, which has 64 journeyman positions, had 39 journeymen on duty and 25 vacancies. When this occurs, it means the facility chief must use trainees who have not checked out, or he must double up positions, or must call fatigued controllers back on overtime. All of these have safety implications.

Mr. Speaker, various measures to achieve earlier retirement for air traffic controllers have been introduced in prior Congresses, but none have been enacted. Daily we are asking these men to control the lives of thousands of people. We can't keep putting off a decision in a matter as important as this. I urge the Congress to act on this legislation without delay.

YOUNG MARYLANDER WINS SCHOLARSHIP

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Westinghouse Corp. recently conducted its annual talent search for outstanding scientists and mathematicians. Over 22,000 students from high schools cross the country submitted projects to this year's conference in Dallas.

Among the top 10 national winners was a young Marylander, Justin C. Schaffert, of Silver Spring, Md. Justin's project, which dealt with the patterns of numerical coefficients of Pascal's triangle, won the young mathematician a $4,000 scholarship. Justin, who now attends Springbrook High School, hopes to use his scholarship at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology this coming fall.

Our technological society is demanding that each of us acquire a greater understanding of the physical sciences in order to be able to handle the exigencies of modern life. I bring the accomplishments of this young man to the attention of my colleagues not only because Justin is an outstanding scholar but also because he recognizes the impact of technology on our society and environment and the need to apply our knowledge of the sciences in solving the problems that confront us.

I ask unanimous consent that an article honoring Justin, published in the Washington Star on March 4, 1969, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Young Math Wizard Gets $4,000 Award

A 17-year-old mathematics wizard from Silver Spring has won a $4,000 scholarship in competition in the 28th annual Westinghouse talent search.

Justin C. Schaffert, a senior at Springbrook High School and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Justin C. Schaffert of 1039 Cresthaven Drive, was selected among the top 10 young scientists in the country for his study of Pascal numbers. Schaffert's project deals with the aspects of a pattern of numerical progression first explored by Blaise Pascal.

Complex number theories are nothing new to the young mathematician, who wants to attend Massachusetts Institute of Technology and study pure math. Last summer he attended a special session on math at Ohio State University. He has founded a chapter of a national mathematics society at Springbrook and has organized a math tutoring system there.

Schaffert also is working with other students to build a permanent 10-inch reflector telescope on the school grounds. Montgomery County is sponsoring the materials for the telescope, which Schaffert says will be worth about $3,000 when finished.

Schaffert's father is an electrical engineer at the Goddard Space Flight Center.

The top winner of the national contest is a Dallas high school senior who won a $10,000 scholarship for a mathematical theory on the origin of the universe. Seventeen year old Lane P. Hughston, who last year was victorious in the International Science Fair competition, won on a project dealing with the theory of collision of interstellar bodies.

Other area winners of the contest, which drew more than 22,000 entrants, were two Virginia high school students who each won $250.

Jack R. Woodside Jr. of W. T. Woodson High School in Fairfax won for computing the radius of the moon's orbit. Joseph B. Jordan Jr. of McLean High School won for surveying two types of stars and evaluating their characteristics from variations in brightness.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING HONORS GENEVA MATHIASEN

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Ollie A. Randall Award is presented each year by the National Council on the Aging to a person who has performed especially meritoriously to help make life better for older Americans. This year, the award was given to Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, who had served as executive director of the NCOA until her retirement late last year.

The honor paid to Mrs. Mathiasen can be well appreciated by members of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Mrs. Mathiasen has been an informative and very helpful friend of that committee on many occasions during the past 8 years. In fact, her suggestions have led directly to several committee or subcommittee studies in areas that needed close attention. Her concern about the problems facing the elderly is genuine and far-reaching; but she also sees that great new opportunities open up to a nation as large numbers of the elderly assert their determination to enjoy satisfying and rewarding lives in retirement or in second or even third careers.

Perhaps the best description of Mrs. Mathiasen's contribution to the field of aging can be found in the citation for the Ollie A. Randall Award. I ask unanimous consent that this tribute to one of the pioneer leaders in her field be printed in the Record.

I also wish to note that the NCOA is fortunate in having Mr. William C. Fitch as Mrs. Mathiasen's successor. Mr. Fitch has served inside of government and in other ways for the well-being of older citizens, and his past experience bodes well for his present responsibilities.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Ollie A. Randall Award, 1969

To Geneva Mathiasen, our esteemed associate and former Executive Director, the National Council on the Aging is honored to present the 1969 Ollie A. Randall Award for Distinguished Service to Older People.

For two decades as Executive Director of NCOA and its predecessor organization, The National Committee on the Aging of the National Social Welfare Assembly, Mrs. Mathiasen has exemplified the nation's concern for the well-being of its older citizens.

As a writer, editor, speaker, and more than these as a humanitarian, she has had a major part in the achievement of the most significant programs for the elderly. In forums as diverse as the Congress of the United States and the small neighborhood meeting hall she has been the spokesman for those who are often neglected and forgotten.

Mrs. Mathiasen has long been the guiding spirit of the National Council on the Aging. We are proud to be associated with her, and we are honored that she joins the other distinguished Americans who have been recipients of the Ollie A. Randall Award.

S/Edwin F. Shelly, President,
William C. Fitch, Executive Director.

THE PARIS PEACE TALKS

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Peace Talks: All Talk, No Peace," written by Mr. James McCartney and published in the Chicago Daily News of March 25, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE TALKS: ALL TALK, NO PEACE—BOTH SIDES SHY AWAY FROM MAKING REAL CONCESSIONS OR TAKING FIRST STEP TOWARD ENDING VIETNAM WAR

(By James McCartney)

PARIS.—To this date the Vietnam peace talks have been a flimsy facade, an exercise in "let's pretend."

A year from the time that President Lyndon B. Johnson withdrew from politics to make peace talks possible, the situation is grim.

There is no sign the Communists came to Paris with the intention of making peace. And the United States has put nothing on the table that could be called a solid, give-and-take negotiating proposal.

If President Nixon has a "fresh approach," as promised in his campaign, it is the best-kept secret in Paris.

The struggle over Vietnam is not being fought here at all, but on battlefields half a world away.

Those who know the situation best predict a road so long and hard that they may have to sell it to President Nixon as well as to the public.

Mr. Nixon has said he is pinning his major hopes for peace on these talks. But those in key spots here can't see how the talks are going to do it.

Neither side is speaking to the other. Each is talking only in its own language, for its own people.

You can't really call these round table sessions negotiations. As one high U.S. official puts it: "We talk past each other."

The urbane Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. negotiator, still believes that the most significant achievement so far was getting the Communists to come to Paris.

One top man in the U.S. delegation frankly doubts if the Communists came expecting to make peace. He points out they didn't agree to do so—they only agreed to show up in Paris if the United States would stop bombing North Vietnam.

So far the U.S. approach has been extremely cautious.

Ambassador Lodge has said he would like to talk about three things—the demilitarized zone, prisoner exchange and mutual troop withdrawal. But the United States has not offered to do anything, specifically, to end the war.

There is some question whether either side is ready to end the war as matters stand. Each is still attempting to influence the talks by what it does on the battlefield. The war, once again, is escalating—and each side, in a pattern that goes back for years, accuses the other of starting the latest round.

The two sides don't agree on the most fundamental question—who is winning? This is what is causing the continuing struggle on the battlefield, as both sides attempt to win negotiating points.

Each believes it must "negotiate from a position of strength." Each finds it easier to apply military pressure than to make a first step toward stopping the war.

North Vietnam, in fact, came to these talks with the swagger of a conqueror. "They talk like conquerors, with a hobnailed boot on our heads." says one U.S. negotiator.

The Communists argue they have won, and that the United States is too proud, corrupt or stubborn to admit it. "Defeated and yet trying to seek a position of strength on the battlefield and at the conference table, the United States is nurturing sheer illusions," the chief negotiator for the Viet Cong, Tran Buu Kiem, said recently.

U.S. negotiators insist that the Communists know better than to think they have won. Both sides know all too well that the war is a stalemate, according to the sources.

But the battlefield struggle suggests strongly that a more convincing settlement may have to be reached there before any settlement at all will be possible here.

"It's going to be messy," says a high U.S. official. "Everything about Vietnam has always been messy. It's going to be fight and talk, fight and talk. It's likely to go on a long time."

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) said that Mr. Nixon told congressional leaders he had a "peace plan" he intended to bring to Europe on his recent trip. Nobody here seems to know anything about it.

Mr. Nixon also has referred to a "phase two" of the Paris negotiations, in which the parties get down to brass tacks. There is no evidence of a "phase two" here yet.

At the moment, U.S. officials, including the President, are hinting strongly that secret negotiations—or "private talks," as Mr. Nixon has used the term—may provide the ultimate breakthrough.

It is a measure of the desperate state of the U.S. position that the possibility of unpublicized talks had to be discussed openly—possibly in the hope it might advertise U.S. willingness to participate.

FAINT WISP OF HOPE

On such a slender reed do U.S. hopes currently rest. It is a slender reed because the objective is so limited.

The question is not what might be said in secret negotiations—what the basis of a settlement might be—but whether the Communists can be persuaded to talk.

There is almost no suggestion of compromise or new initiatives to try to break the deadlock. There is, on the other hand, complete awareness that the U.S. public would not accept a huge escalation of the war to try to win it.

The present U.S. program, from all indications, is simply this:

We will continue battlefield pressure to try to convince the Communists we can't be beaten.

We will attempt to get discussions started on small items in the hope of broadening them eventually to major, important issues.

We will concede nothing.

We will be prepared to stay as long as necessary to hammer out some kind of a peace agreement.

All of this is another way of saying: We will not try for a dramatic breakthrough.

NO CLEAR-CUT ANSWERS

So the questions remain: What might we do? How do we get out of Vietnam?

There are no clear-cut answers, but in the months that there have been contacts with North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (NLF), the United States has learned a lot. It has not been able to find the ground rules for a settlement, but it has been able to see the kinds of choices available.

At least some members of the U.S. delegation believe a major mistake may have been made last fall after President Johnson's bombing halt.

As is now well known, the bombing halt was a result of an "understanding" between the North Vietnamese and the United States. The United States was to stop bombing—the Communists were to lessen tensions in the demilitarized zone and stop shelling civilians in major cities.

On their own and without announcement, the North Vietnamese withdrew 30,000 to 40,000 troops from the demilitarized zone before the United States actually stopped the bombing. They also abruptly stopped shelling cities the day the bombing halt began.

At this time the United States had an option of lowering the intensity of combat in South Vietnam as a further gesture of good faith.

It did not do so. U.S. commanders, in fact, may have increased it—although this is still a matter of dispute.

The bombers that weren't bombing the North were put to work in the South—and thus the volume of attacks there increased.

Says one official: "We might have taken a step to lower the intensity of fighting. Perhaps it would have worked."

A time may come in the talks when someone will have to take a first step—or there won't be one.

There is a quality of rage, either real or artificial in all of the Communist invective now. The Viet Cong's Kiem recently launched a tirade in which he said:

"With millions of tons of bombs each year, with hundreds of thousands of tons of toxic chemicals, the United States has razed to the ground vast rural and mountainous areas, heavily damaged many cities and towns of South Vietnam, killed or wounded hundreds of thousands of persons, made tens of thousands of women widows, and children orphans, and millions of people homeless. . . ."

In the Communist view, the United States is always the "aggressor," intervening in Indochina in 1950 and escalating ever since. Thus they formally recognize only one approach to ending the war.

As stated by the adroit Xuan Thuy, the gray-haired chief diplomat for North Vietnam: "There is no other way but the United States stopping its aggression, unconditionally withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam, and letting the South Vietnam people settle their internal affairs. . . ."

There is a hooker, of course: The settlement must be made "in accordance with the political program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, without foreign interference."

In the U.S. view, the NLF political program is designed to turn the country over to the Communists.

SOUTH VIET SETTLEMENT

The impasse has led some members of the U.S. delegation to believe that nothing is really going to move at the talks unless agreements can be reached first on a political settlement in South Vietnam.

The political future of South Vietnam, of course, is what the war is all about. The question is: Who is going to run it?

Strangely, the positions of the two sides on this all-important settlement appear to be coming at least a little closer.

The United States strongly believes that the Saigon regime and representatives of the National Liberation Front (the Viet Cong) eventually will have to sit down together to hammer out a program.

The NLF continues to insist that a settlement must be reached in terms of its long-range program. And Saigon continues to consider the NLF all but traitors—but is willing to sit down with them.

The key concept now is the idea of a new "peace cabinet" for South Vietnam that would include NLF representatives.

The issue is whether the present Saigon regime would be represented in such a cabinet. Lodge would have President Nguyen Van Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky in the cabinet. The NLF wants an entirely new cabinet without them.

The United States is clearly willing to accept elections in South Vietnam in which the Communists would be on the ticket. If a breakthrough is going to come in the political area, it is probably going to involve U.S. pressure on Saigon to loosen up and accept a greater role by the NLF.

The alternative may well be to keep scrapping on the battlefield until one side or the other is ready to make concessions.

RELEVANCE IN EDUCATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, there is currently an experiment of great importance being conducted by Walt Whitman High School in Bethesda, Md. It is the result of an openness to life and a creative boldness to contend with things new; it promises an improved perspective on education for students and faculty alike, a perspective born from relevance.

This week the students at Walt Whitman High School have been given the opportunity to study whatever interests them. The student-planned curriculum reflects the diversity of their interests, the breadth of their awareness, and the depth of their involvement. The administration at Walt Whitman has assured us that this is not a student protest, but, on the contrary, is a positive educational experience. That the program stands in refutation of the otherwise widely held opinion that many of our students today lack responsibility bespeaks one of its greatest advances.

It is my good fortune and pleasure to have two Whitman students in my office for the week. We are seeking to advance their "studies" by providing them with an inside look into the operation of a congressional office, and, just as importantly, we are finding ourselves being educated by their presence, too.

I would like to commend to my colleagues the following article from the Washington Star of March 25, 1969, which outlines the details of this impressive and inspiring program:

Relevance Is the Whitman "Classword"

(By Barry Kalb)

Here's a very contemporary riddle: What do sex education, world protest, the hazards of night driving, current trends in the Catholic church, the stock market, the draft, Balkan Kolo dancing, marijuana and the way a football game should be watched have in common?

A very contemporary answer: They're all relevant.

At least the students at Walt Whitman High School in Bethesda think they're all relevant to the students at Walt Whiteman High School.

Among complaints that have cropped up most frequently in student protests of late are that the current course offerings—such as earth science and trigonometry—have no meaning for the student, or that they are just plain boring.

BLESSED BY AUTHORITIES

Whitman students were given the opportunity to outdo professional curriculum designers. The result of their efforts, including the above courses, began yesterday and will run through Friday under the title, "An Experiment in Free Form Education."

But this is no protest, and the students had the full blessing of the administration, faculty, PTA and county school board in their endeavors.

"We didn't sit down and say the school system is tearing us down, and hurting our minds, and we hate it, and therefore we're doing this," explains Lance Dublin, a student and prime mover behind the program.

"Obviously, the school has done something for us, or we wouldn't have this," he continued, pointing to the mild pandemonium that accompanied EFFE's first day of operation.

The whole thing began back in October with a few students and a couple of teachers talking about new ideas in education. The idea for EFFE quickly took shape, Dublin says, and in December, the school was presented with a proposal for the experiment.

"Some people were dubious of the scope and size, but by February, we had pretty much 100 percent backing," he says.

Students were polled as to what courses they would like to have taught, teachers were recruited to help plan and eventually teach the experimental courses, and parents—"the parents were fantastic," Dublin says—pitched in with advice and special parttime jobs.

The courses are of two major types: Those that are completely new, such as the seminar on "What It's Like to Be a College Professor," and regular courses that "aren't being taught the way they are normally."

In addition, 268 of Whitman's 2,200 students are spending the week on special work study programs, doing such things as teaching school, working for United States congressmen, learning how a newspaper is put together, and working at the Montgomery County Board of Education in Rockville.

Courses are non-graded, attendance is optional, and if the student decides to show up for classes, there is nothing to turn in at the end of the week to show that he actually got something out of it.

A good many did show up, and a leisurely stroll around Whitman's long, narrow corridors revealed a glimpse of what free form education is like.

In the class called "Honest to God Debate," a visiting priest—Dublin says more than 250 outsiders volunteered as teachers and speakers—was asked by a boy:

"Can I ask you a question, sir? When you say 'God,' what do you—I'm not asking you to defend your faith—but when you say 'God', what do you mean?"

In "Four Modern Underground Writers," a young teacher with a beard and muddy boots and a peace symbol around his neck instead of a tie read excerpts from Norman Mailer's "The Siege of Chicago," and told his students:

"If you remember that as a human being you have the potentialities to do harm to people or to concur in doing harm to people, you may not be so quick to condone some of the atrocities that are committed in your name."

Robert George, a chemistry teacher, looked over his busy organic chemistry class. "This week, they're making some common things like soap, aspirin, DDT, nylon," he said.

"Normally, they just work with conceptual things, to prove a particular point. I thought this would be a nice departure."

The program will be evaluated next week and the week following the Easter vacation, Dublin says. The University of Maryland, the National Institute of Mental Health and the Board of Education are all at work designing evaluation procedures.

THERE'S A BEALL BACK IN CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the name J. Glenn Beall is well known in Congress. J. Glenn Beall, Sr., served in the other body from 1942 to 1952, when he was elected to the Senate and reelected in 1958. Now his son, J. Glenn Beall, Jr., is representing the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland.

Charles S. Mack, a columnist for the Suburban Record, Silver Spring, Md., has written an excellent article on the Beall family. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mack's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There's a Beall Back in Congress

(By Charles S. Mack)

When does a politician decide he wants to be a Congressman? If your name is J. Glenn Beall, Jr., you set your cap for Congress at a pretty early age.

Of course, you've got some incentive if your father was in Congress. J. Glenn Beall, Sr., sat in the U.S. House of Representatives from the Maryland 6th District for ten years before being elected to the United States Senate in 1952. Beall served two terms before being unseated by Joseph Tydings in the Goldwater debacle of 1964.

Two years before his father's near-quarter century in Congress came to an end, Glenn Beall, Jr., was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates. 1962 was a year of Republican resurgence in Maryland. Four years earlier, the GOP contingent had all but been wiped out in the state's legislative elections. When the dust of the 1962 elections had blown over, the number of Republicans in the House of Delegates had grown from seven to 25.

Some illustrious Republicans were among those 25. Names like Jim Miller, Charlie Bresler, and Louise Gore. And Tom Ander-

XUM

son, Stu McInerney and Perry Doing. All of the new faces, and looking for the one man among them who could do the best job to mobilize them as an effective minority. The gentleman from Alleghany County, Glenn Beall, Jr., was their choice. He continued as House minority leader until his election to Congress in 1968.

OLD-LINE NAME

"Beall" is one of those old-line Maryland names that literally goes back to the founding of the Republic: One Samuel Beall sat for the upper district of Frederick County in the Maryland Constitutional Convention of 1776. A few years later, in 1779, a Delegate from Prince George's County, Josias Beall, served as the state's fourth Speaker of the House of Delegates. Today, there must be a Beall in nearly every part of Maryland.

But no Beall ever served in Congress until J. Glenn, Sr. made it in 1942. He succeeded Katherine S. Byron, a Democrat who had been elected to represent the Western Maryland district—which included Montgomery County in those days—in a 1941 special election. Mrs. Byron was elected to the seat vacated at the death of her husband, William D. Byron.

Ironically, Glenn, Jr. won the district in 1968 by defeating the Byrons' son, Goodloe, currently a State Senator who represents Frederick and Carroll Counties.

The new Representative sits for a district shaped a bit differently than his father's old constituency. The 6th district still starts way out at the Garrett County line where the stream that will become the Potomac River trickles slowly out of a mountain spring. The district moves east to include the Bealls' home county of Allegany, and then Washington and Frederick Counties.

But where Beall, Sr.'s district ran southeast at that point to take in the Washington suburbs of Montgomery County, the redistricted 6th runs due east to include Carroll County, the northern half of Howard County, and the Baltimore suburbs around Catonsville.

UP FROM THE BOTTOM

J. Glenn Beall, Jr. makes no bones about having wanted to go to Congress a long time before he made it there. "I ran for the legislature in 1962 because I wanted one day to be in Congress. I wanted to get good experience, and I believe people should start at the bottom."

He worked his way up in leadership positions. In 1953—the year his father was sworn in as a United States Senator—Glenn was elected President of the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans. In 1958 he won election to the Republican State Central Committee for Allegany County and served as its chairman for the full four-year term.

During his years in the General Assembly—especially the years before Spiro Agnew became Governor—Beall recognized that one of the responsibilities of legislative eminence was representation of the GOP leadership around the State. No Republican club was too small, no distance too far to travel. If he could possibly make it, Beall accepted every speaking engagement. Glenn spoke everywhere from Oakland to Ocean City.

DIFFERENT PROBLEMS

Constituents' problems in those days in the legislature dealt with road location and recreation, sewers and schools, liquor licenses and zoning laws. No more.

Not long ago, he took a seven-day tour of the district to meet his constituents and listen to their problems. They turned out by the busload. In one day in the Hagerstown post office, 55 people came to talk to their Congressman. The problems they brought to him were a lot different than the ones he used to get when a road was going to trim a few feet off somebody's cornfield.

One 62-year-old widow told him that she made $3108 in wages in 1968. More than $500 of it was withheld in Federal and state taxes—one-sixth of her income—even though the poverty level is officially defined as $3000 a year. After paying for her food, rent, and other necessities, she had exactly $130 left to take care of clothing, entertainment, and any medical expenses she might have. She was distressed because she would have to pay more in taxes in 1969, and she didn't know where the money would come from.

As a state legislator, Beall was aware of poverty problems. "You couldn't escape it in areas up home like the one we used to call Mosquito Flats." But it didn't have the impact on him it does now.

"I was more concerned with making sure of state financial aid for my county." As a federal legislator, though, he's got only two major public works projects in the whole district instead of the large number of small ones he had before. As a result, he can give more of his attention to public policy issues like tax reforms to help the Hagerstown widow.

"People come to their Congressman for everything," Beall says. "A couple came to me because they wanted to fight an application for a liquor license. A divorced woman wanted my help in wrestling with her county's welfare department over custody of her child. The welfare people won't approve her well water."

FULL-TIME CONGRESSMAN

Washington is a far cry from Annapolis. "As a state legislator, I had full-time responsibility with part-time involvement. Now I can give it my full time. You can accomplish so much more full time. State government should be a full-time vocation."

There's another difference, too, Beall notes. "As a member of Congress, I'm adequately staffed. As a state legislator, I wasn't." That makes a world of difference. Serving as his chief aide is David Markey, a young lawyer from Frederick County who had been assistant legislative officer on Governor Agnew's staff.

Glenn was fortunate in his committee assignment in the House. He was named to the Banking and Currency Committee, a body which, despite its name, deals with everything from housing and urban programs to consumer credit. It's a good opportunity for a freshman Congressman who wants to make his mark.

He'll make that mark with little trouble. As one of the brighter lights of the "class of 1969," he'll do well.

How well? Congressmen from Maryland's 6th district have a habit of going far. Beall's father moved into the Senate from the 6th. So did Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., whose successful 1968 Senatorial campaign opened the way for Beall to make the House race.

1970 is probably too early to make a move. But Beall is only 42 with lots of time and the seasoned judgment to use that time wisely to his best advantage.

Meanwhile . . . it's good to have a Beall back in Congress.

MITCHELL KILLED SUIT AGAINST EX-CLIENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the new administration announced that it was going to sue one of the biggest of the conglomerates—Ling-Temco-Vought—to force it to unload Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

This was welcome news indeed, particularly in the light of the failure of the preceding administration to take effective action against the current rash of conglomerate mergers.

However, today's column in the Washington Post by Mr. Drew Pearson raises very grave questions about the dismissal of an antitrust case affecting the El Paso Natural Gas Co. by the new Attorney General, just 6 days after taking office. According to Mr. Pearson, this case was at one time described by Attorney General Ramsey Clark to be one of the most important antitrust suits in the country. Also according to Mr. Pearson, during the years 1961–67 the El Paso Natural Gas Co. paid to the law firm headed by Mr. Nixon, of which Attorney General Mitchell was a senior partner, a total of $771,129.83.

At the very least, the Congress and the public are entitled to know the facts of the matter.

Mr. Pearson's column follows:

MITCHELL KILLED SUIT AGAINST EX-CLIENT

(By Drew Pearson)

SPOKANE, WASH.—The powerful El Paso Natural Gas Company, which paid the Nixon law firm $771,129.83 during the years 1961–67, has managed to get the Justice Department to dismiss an antitrust case involving the 11-year battle over competing pipelines in the Far West. John Mitchell, now Attorney General, who dismissed the case on Jan. 26, six days after taking office, is a former senior partner in the Nixon law firm.

A spokesman for the Justice Department stated that "the decision not to appeal the case was made on Jan. 17, before Mr. Mitchell's succession as Attorney General."

A check at the Justice Department revealed that on that date Solicitor General Erwin Griswold did recommend that the Justice Department dismiss its appeal. However Prof. John J. Flynn of the University of Utah, who has petitioned the Supreme Court to retain its jurisdiction, informed this column that he had flown to Washington on Jan. 20, and discussed the case with Griswold on Jan. 21, one day after President Nixon was inaugurated.

"At that time," said Prof. Flynn, "the case was wide open. There had been no decision. I mentioned to the Solicitor General the interest of the Nixon law firm, and he said the case was being cleared upstairs, obviously referring to Attorney General Mitchell."

William Bennett, former Chairman of the California Public Utilities Commission, who handled the three El Paso cases before the Supreme Court, commented: "Assuming the Justice Department's statement to be true—which I doubt—the Nixon Administration has not gone along with other Johnson recommendations. Nixon dropped the Johnson appointment of Cecil Moore as the first Negro judge on the West Coast and the appointment of Barefoot Sanders to be U.S. Court of Appeals judge. Why the haste to drop one of the most important antitrust cases in this decade?"

Gov. Ronald Reagan's administration in California also dismissed California's suit against El Paso, as did Gov. Calvin Rampton of Utah, under very peculiar circumstances.

The case involves the attempt by El Paso Natural Gas, biggest pipeline company in the world, to monopolize the supply of natural gas to the Far West by buying up and merging with Pacific Northwest Gas, its chief competitor, on Dec. 31, 1959. The Supreme Court overturned this merger in 1962 with a strongly worded opinion.

Three times the Supreme Court has spoken out on this case, each time vigorously ruling against natural gas monopoly. The last time it spoke out, it severely critized U.S. District Judge Willis Ritter of Salt Lake City, and ordered him removed from the case. "Judge

XUM

Ritter," the Supreme Court stated, "has knuckled under to El Paso."

The case then was turned over to U.S. District Judge Olin Hatfield Chilson, who okayed a merger between Pacific Northwest Gas and Colorado Interstate Gas.

Because this would give two companies a monopoly of the entire West, the Justice Department under Attorney General Ramsey Clark filed a new antitrust suit. The State of California and the State of Utah joined in the suit. The merger of Pacific Northwest with Colorado Interstate, they contended, would let El Paso and the new combine divide the Western market between them.

Attorney General Clark stated that he considered the case one of the most important antitrust suits in the country.

MITCHELL DISAGREES

He had only been out of office six days, however, when his successor, who had been Nixon's campaign manager and a partner in the firm which received $771,129.83 from El Paso, dismissed the suit.

In Utah, one interesting aspect of the dismissal is that the letter of dismissal was signed not by Attorney General Vernon Romney of Utah but by the Governor, who normally does not sign legal papers.

Furthermore, notice of the dismissal was mailed to other attorneys in the case in the envelopes of Colorado Interstate Gas in Colorado Springs, not in the envelopes of the Utah state government, nor from Salt Lake City, Utah's capital.

Gov. Rampton, in telling the press why he dismissed the case, lamely explained that Colorado Interstate had promised to deposit some of its funds in Utah banks, which, of course, has nothing to do with the rates which Western gas consumers will now have to pay as a result of monopoly.

El Paso has already been forced to refund $155,000,000 to California consumers for overcharging, and at the present moment is passing the Federal surtax on to Pacific Gas and Electric, which in turn is passing it on to consumers. Congress, of course, never intended that the surtax be passed on to consumers.

As a result of the petitions from former California Public Utilities Chairman William Bennett and two University of Utah professors, John J. Flynn and Daniel Stewart Jr., the Supreme Court now has the case before it.

DR. M. NOEL STOW

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I would like to recognize an individual who is doing outstanding work in an unheralded field, Dr. M. Noel Stow, one of the founders and the driving force behind the Ophthalmic Research Foundation of Washington, D.C. Created for the purpose of supporting research in ophthalmology, the foundation was established initially in February 1967 through the generosity of a gracious lady who was almost blind, but had her normal vision restored through surgery by Dr. Stow. Dr. Stow is now the president and medical director of the foundation.

One million Americans are blind and 3½ million have permanent, noncorrectional vision defects. Americans are becoming blind at twice the rate that the population is increasing. From 1940 to 1960, while the total population increased by 36 percent, the blind population increased by 67 percent and it appears that new factors are arising which will accelerate the increase in serious visual disability in this country. Despite these alarming figures, only $1 million is spent annually to prevent blindness, while $1 billion is spent every year to restore sight.

Dr. Stow's group plans research into the use of lasers to cauterize veins in the eye and to remove part of the pituitary gland by X-ray or surgery in the early stages of diabetes to prevent blindness. It is his hope that the Ophthalmic Research Foundation will receive contributions from many sources. As a physician and surgeon, he has been especially grateful for pledges and contributions that have come to the foundation from men and women who have been given the miracle of restored sight through eye surgery. Help for future generations, Dr. Stow emphasizes, is the real purpose of the foundation.

Dr. Stow, a native of Jesup, Ga., is the son and grandson of physicians and his son is also preparing to enter the medical field. A graduate of Emory University, at Decatur, Ga., Dr. Stow continued his studies at Emory School of Medicine where he received his medical degree in 1939. Following his internship in Baltimore at the West Baltimore General Hospital, he was a resident in ophthalmology at the Eye Institute of the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City. Dr. Stow has been in the practice of ophthalmology in Washington for 22 years and during those years he has served on the staff of many local hospitals. He has been a faculty member in the Department of Ophthalmology at George Washington University for several years.

Certified by the American Board of Ophthalmology in 1943, he is a member of the American Medical Association, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, and the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology. A member of the teaching faculty of the latter for 22 years, he was awarded the academy's honor key in 1951.

There appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on March 16, an article on the works of Dr. Stow at George Washington University, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLIND RESEARCH GROUP TAKES QUARTERS AT GW

The Ophthalmic Research Foundation, formed here in 1967 by a number of people concerned with the need for basic research to prevent blindness, will move into the same building and be associated with the George Washington University Medical School's ophthalmology department, it has been announced.

Dr. Noel Stow, president and medical director of the foundation, said his group plans research into the use of lasers to cauterize veins in the eye, and into removal of part of the pituitary gland, by x-ray or surgery, in the early stages of diabetes to prevent blindness, among other methods.

The group also is interested in work with the causes of blindness from cataracts, glaucoma and cancer. Dr. Stow said that while $1 billion is spent every year to restore sight, only $1 million is spent annually to prevent blindness.

The university and foundation ophthalmic researchers will occupy the former Warwick Memorial Cancer Clinic building at 2300 K St. NW; no date has been set yet for the move from the foundation's present offices at 3900 Wisconsin Ave. NW.

"The rate of blindness has gone up appallingly fast," as the number of older Americans increases, Dr. Stow said. "We hope to prevent certain of these blinding diseases."

AMERICANS OF LITHUANIAN ANCESTORY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have received an interesting letter from a constituent, Mr. Kestutis K. Miklas, of Plainview, N.Y., on the subject of Lithuania and the large community of Americans of Lithuanian ancestory. This letter makes certain cogent points about the need for refusing to accept Soviet control of Lithuania. Also included in Mr. Miklas' well-thought letter is a history of activities on Long Island in commemoration of the recent anniversary of Lithuanian Independence.

I commend Mr. Miklas' letter to my colleagues' attention and wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Over 40,000 Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent here on Long Island and their friends in February of this year commemorated the 718th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into kingdom in 1251, and the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania that took place on February 16, 1918.

Since its ancient settlement along the Baltic Sea coast for centuries the Lithuanian Nation has played an important role in North-Eastern Europe. Especially that role became significant when Lithuania assumed the responsibility of protecting the Western culture from the Asiatic onslaughts.

The growing strength of Russian Imperialistic power continually threatened Lithuanian lands, and finally at the end of eighteenth century Russia invaded and occupied Lithuania. Foreign subjugation, however, failed to destroy the spirit of the people who, for 120 years continually objected to foreign domination by civil and cultural resistance, by numerous uprisings and revolutions against the invaders.

The intensive and determined struggle for freedom and independence from Czarist Russia was climaxed on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of the Lithuanian National Council, proclaiming the restoration of the Independence to Lithuania.

It is tragic that Lithuania enjoyed such a brief period of freedom. Since 1940 the once great Lithuanian nation of the Middle Ages and the proud and progressive Republic of the period between the two world wars still lies under the yoke of Soviet despotism.

In the United Nations and elsewhere the Soviets are still accusing the United States and other western powers of imperialism and colonialism. As part of their unceasing campaign to win power and influence among the

XUM

underdeveloped countries, Kremlin propagandists never tire of boasting that Russia is an implacable foe of imperialism and a dedicated champion of "self-determination." Yet Moscow brusquely dismisses any suggestion that non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union are entitled to determine their own destinies, too.

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction.

The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process. During the Second World War, the Republic of Lithuania became a victim of Soviet Russia's and Nazi Germany's conspiracy and aggression, and as a result of secret agreements between those two powers of August 23rd and September 28th, 1939, became invaded and occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces on June 15, 1940.

Since the days of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanian people have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1944 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or driven to Siberia. Though that resistance movement was weakened and finally subdued to a failure to get any material aid from the West, nevertheless, the Lithuanian people are continuing their passive resistance against the Soviet Russian genocidal aggression to this very day.

The United States of America, mindful of its own struggle for freedom and independence, has remained sensitive to the aspirations of other people for self-determination. For this reason, we, the American-Lithuanians are grateful to the Government of the United States for denouncing the Soviet Russian aggression in Lithuania and for refusal to recognize the alien subjugation of Lithuania since 1940.

I am very thankful to you for the kind words you said at U.S. Congress and for the understanding of Lithuanians struggle for freedom.

You should feel free that the Lithuanians on Long Island are with you. I think that it would be proper at this time to brief you about the activity and the accomplishments of the American-Lithuanians living on Long Island on the occasion of this commemoration.

Nassau County Executive Mr. Eugene H. Nickerson issued a proclamation declaring February 17–23 as Lithuanian Independence Week and raised the flag of free Lithuania at County Executive Office Building in Mineola, N.Y.

Suffolk County Executive Mr. H. Lee Dennison through his proclamation declared the week of February 17 as Lithuanian Independence Week and raised the Lithuanian flag to be flown during this entire week at his office building in Riverhead, N.Y.

Presiding Supervisor of Town of Hempstead Mr. Ralph G. Caso proclaimed the week of February 17 as Lithuanian Independence Week and raised the Lithuanian flag at the Town Hall in Hempstead, N.Y.

Town of North Hempstead Supervisor Mr. Robert C. Meade through his proclamation declared the Lithuanian Independence Week February 16 through 23 and raised the Lithuanian flag at the Town Hall in Manhasset, N.Y.

Town of Oyster Bay Supervisor Mr. Michael N. Petito issued his proclamation declaring the Sunday, February 16, the Lithuanian Independence Day and raised the Lithuanian flag at the Town Hall in Oyster Bay, N.Y.

The Long Island radio station WGBB presented a special program about Lithuania and the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-determination and to national independence in their own country, on Sunday, February 16 at 12:45 p.m. The presentations on the occasion of this anniversary were made by the Consul General of Lithuania at New York Mr. Anicetas Simutis, by the member of the Executive Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania and the press officer of Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN) Dr. Algirdas Budreckis and by the member of the Supreme Council of American-Lithuanian Community of USA Mr. Kestutis K. Miklas.

The American-Lithuanian Community of Great Neck, N.Y. held a mass meeting on February 15 at the local Elks Lodge Hall with guest speakers and with a special program prepared for this occasion. The following day, on Sunday, there was a religious service held in St. Aloysius R.C. Church in Great Neck with prayers for Lithuania and the Lithuania's freedom fighters who lost their lives in fight for freedom of their beloved country.

The news media of Long Island provided a wide coverage on this occasion. The three major daily newspapers (Newsday, Long Island Press and Suffolk Sun) as well as the local weekly newspapers (Bethpage Tribune, County Seat Press, Great Neck News, Great Neck Record, Herald Courier, Manhasset Mail, Manhasset Press, Garden City News, The Eagle, Newsgram in Bethpage, Centre Island News, Bellmore Life, Oyster Bay Guardian, Roosevelt Press, Syosset Guardian, Syosset Advance, Mid-Island Times, Levittown Times, Mid-Island Tribune, Mineola American and Williston Times)—in toto 24—in their issues to date published articles about Lithuania, about the issuance of proclamations by counties and townships, and pictures of the American-Lithuanian delegations (dressed in Lithuanian Folk costumes) with governing officials of Long Island.

I would be very pleased if you could make possible to record this activity of the American-Lithuanian Community on Long Island in the United States Congress.

With all good wishes and regards,

Sincerely,

Kestutis K. Miklas,

Member of the Supreme Council of the American-Lithuanian Community of USA.

RIGGIN S. EVANS

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on Friday, January 31, Riggin S. Evans, of Somerset County, Md., passed away at the Perry Point Veterans' Administration Hospital. Mr. Evans was one of six brothers, all of Crisfield, Somerset County, Md. The Evans family for many years has been a leader in civic and community affairs in Somerset County on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Riggin Evans himself was typical of the solid American tradition of the Evans family. For many years he was supervisor of buildings of the Havre de Grace High School, admired and beloved by all who came in contact with him. During the last years of his life he was closely associated with me and my family. He possessed all those characteristics which we prize so highly in this country: integrity, industry, ability, imagination, and kindness. His passing was a great loss, not only to the community in which he lived but to my family personally as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Bel Air Aegis be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Riggin S. Evans

Riggin S. Evans, 48, of Havre de Grace, died on Friday, Jan. 31 in the Perry Point Veterans Administration Hospital.

Mr. Evans was a maintenance supervisor on a farm belonging to Senator Joseph D. Tydings.

He is survived by five brothers, Horace Evans, Carey Evans, Frank Evans, Wesley Evans and Richard Evans, all of Crisfield; and a number of nieces and nephews.

Funeral services were held on Monday, Feb. 3, at 2 p.m. from the Bradshaw Funeral Home, Crisfield, Md.

HIPPIE-CARE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers will be very happy to know that HEW has now extended a $25,000 grant for the hippies in New York City.

Under unanimous consent I submit a report by Peter Kihss of the New York Times, March 18, 1969, for inclusion in the Congressional Record, as follows.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1969]

Program To Aid Hippies Here Given $25,000 by Washington

(By Peter Kihss)

A Federal grant was announced yesterday for a pilot project to develop "bridging mechanisms" between the community and what was described as "a population of dissident youth (known as the 'Hippies')" in the East Village.

The $25,000 grant by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare went to the Educational Alliance, a 79-year-old settlement house, to carry on an effort it has had under way since March, 1968, in a store front at 220 East Seventh Street.

Robert Meltzer, assistant director of the Educational Alliance and director of the hippie project, estimated the number of hippies—"young people running away, lost, angry"—as "still very heavy, probably in the thousands" despite some reports that the phenomenon was fading away.

Mrs. Bernice L. Bernstein, regional director of the Federal agency, said it was "essential that we understand—and in turn gain the understanding of—all the dissident groups in our society."

TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION SOUGHT

The pilot effort, she said, sought two-way communication with and help for the hippies in the East Village. She said she hoped it would "show us how to return to the community at large the skills, the talents and the abilities that are locked up in the disaffected young and young women."

Mr. Meltzer said a number of young people living in "communes" had asked for Educational Alliance help 18 months ago to deal with hospital, legal and police problems.

The storefront named Contact by some hippie leaders, was set up to provide medical service; emergency food and help in finding sleeping arrangements; a place for craft work, and counseling.

The storefront has been open Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday afternoons and evenings. Help has also been provided by St. Brigid's Roman Catholic Church and the New York Infirmary.

Mr. Meltzer said therapy and psychiatric aid had been provided when requested by the hippies. The numbers visiting the storefront, he said, have ranged from as few as four to as many as 40 on any day.

The effort, he said, has indicated, some "visible influence" on about half the hippies coming in—in some cases helping send them home or find jobs, in others reducing drug use or stopping the carrying of weapons, in some cases at least some change in basic attitudes.

The application by the Educational Alliance for the grant described the hippies as "social retreatists—that is, rather than engaging in direct confrontation with the established community and its institutions, they have withdrawn into what they hope to be a separate, self-sustaining subcommunity and subculture."

The hippies' chances for sustaining themselves were described as jeopardized by "gross educational and vocational handicaps." Thus far, the Educational Alliance reported, there has appeared to be "a progressive deterioration for most into poor health and functioning."

The project is to include "crisis service" on food, clothing, shelter, medical and legal problems, "mediation services" on relations with police, courts, families, landlords and welfare agencies, and "groups involvement" of hippies in planning and operating programs.

ELIMINATION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMITATION—REPORT OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long been in favor of eliminating the earnings limitation under the social security laws. While the earnings limitation was raised during the last Congress, I still believe that it unduly penalizes those of our older citizens who are willing and able to work. Moreover, at this time, there is a distinct shortage of skilled manpower. Therefore the retention of the earnings limitation at this time is not only unfair to the individuals concerned, but is a disservice to the Nation.

The Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York State Bar Association has recently issued a report on some of the bills which have already been introduced in this Congress to increase or remove the earnings limitation. The committee report endorsed the June, 1966, report of the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York recommending the elimination of the earnings limitation. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York State Bar Association Committee on Federal Legislation: Report on Bills To Increase Permissible Outside Earnings of Social Security Beneficiaries

Several bills have been introduced in the 91st Congress to amend Title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,500 to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted without loss or deduction from benefits. H.R. 80 introduced by Mr. Anderson of Illinois makes this change as to both covered beneficiaries and their dependents; H.R. 201 introduced by Mr. Eilberg of Pennsylvania for the breadwinner only. H.R. 1372 introduced by Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin would remove the limitation entirely.

In June 1966 the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York unanimously recommended elimination of the limitation. Its report stated in part:

BILLS TO PERMIT SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES TO EARN INCOME TO THE EXTENT OF THEIR ABILITY WITHOUT DEDUCTIONS FROM SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Several bills are before the Congress to permit receipt of full Social Security benefits by otherwise qualified employees over 65 who are able to continue to make a contribution to their own welfare and to society by part-time or full-time work.[1] This Committee endorses the purposes of the bills.

Under present law, persons over 65 receiving Social Security benefits cannot earn more than $1,500 per year without having their benefits reduced.[2] Penalties are provided for failure to report earnings.[3]

These income limitations were initially enacted in 1935 [4] during the period of the Great Depression, when the notion was widespread that as many persons as possible should be removed from the labor force in order to spread the available work. In our opinion the limitations serve no useful purpose today and should be removed.

We have found other ways of promoting high employment than discouraging people anxious and willing to work. Social Security benefits are frequently insufficient by themselves to maintain our older citizens in the dignity which should be their lot. These citizens in our opinion should be encouraged in their efforts to supplement their income by constructive work which also redounds to the benefit of society. This seems particularly true today when many employers are reporting a shortage of qualified personnel for many jobs.[5] Older citizens who possess skills accumulated during many years of experience may be especially qualified for many of these very positions. Indeed it is now recognized that an important segment of retired persons as the average life span lengthens, will want and need to continue to work beyond 65 in order to feel a sense of constructive usefulness in their lives.[6]

The earned income limitation is also contrary to the basic philosophy of the Social Security Act, which has always been that benefits were available as a matter of right on the basis of the contribution paid in through Social Security taxes, without resort to a "Means test" of any kind.

In addition we note that under present law a person over 65 can receive an unlimited amount of income from investments, whereas he is penalized if he works to earn additional income. Similarly, those over 72 can now earn more than the limit without losing benefits. In our opinion such distinctions have no basis and should be abolished.

We, therefore, endorse the bills calling for repeal of the income limitation."

We concur with this reasoning. We also note that at least in New York City, welfare authorities have concluded that a family of 4 needs $6,000 for bare necessities.

We believe that an increase in the ceiling to $3,000 would be desirable and we endorse this proposal even though we also favor complete removal of the limitation for the reasons given.

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Richard A. Givens, Chairman.
Anthony P. Marshall, Secretary.
Leslie H. Arps, New York City.
Harold Baer, Jr., New York City.
Mark K. Benenson, New York City.
Edward S. Blackstone, New York City.
Vincent L. Broderick, New York City.
Mason O. Damon, Buffalo.
David M. Dorsen, New York City.
John T. Elfvin, Buffalo.
Robert B. Fiske, Jr., New York City.
Lawrence W. Keepnews, New York City.
Norman Kellar, Kingston.
Herbert C. Miller, New York City.
George W. Myers, Jr., Buffalo.
Bernard Nussbaum, New York City.
Robert Patterson, Jr., New York City.
Arthur C. Stever, Jr., Watertown.

THE BEGINNING OF THE COLD WAR

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I inserted in the Congressional Record part 1 of a study entitled "The Beginning of the Cold War" which was written by Mr. Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University.

The second part of the study has just appeared in the March issue of the Central Europe Journal and I submit it herewith so that readers of the Record will have the benefit of this excellent work in its entirety:

---

[1] Referring to bills in the 89th Congress, omitted.

[2] 42 U.S.C. Section 403(b) and (f). The limit was raised from $1,200 to $1,500; 79 Stat. 363 (1965).

[3] 42 U.S.C. Section 403(g). Enforcement problems are also created where erroneous certifications are given by Social Security recipients as to their outside income. The amounts due the Government are often relatively small, yet the beneficiary may be unable to pay them except over a period of years which may frequently be less than his or her anticipated lifetime. False statements are, of course, a source of possible criminal penalties. E.G., 18 U.S.C. Section 1001; 42 U.S.C. Section 1307. Older citizens who erroneously report income for Social Security purposes are thus subjected to potential prison sentences in connection with the income limitations under discussion here. Questions necessarily arise in such cases whether the individual understood the requirements of the law or was sufficiently aware of the discrepancies to be liable.

These issues in this context create difficult problems for prosecuting authorities and the courts which would be obviated by repeal of the income limitation.

[4] Stat. 623 (1935)

[5] See N.Y. Times, March 27, 1966, p. 1, col. 2 and p. 82, col. 4; Rosenthal, Letter to the Editor, N.Y. Times, March 20, 1966.

[6] As stated by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first inaugural address: "Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort." N.Y. Times, March 5, 1933; 2 Hofstadter, Great Issues in American History 351, 353 (1958). Compare Pope John XXIII, Mater et Magistra, Part II, Par. 82–83 (1961); Peter F. Drucker, Concept of the Corporation 140, 179 (1960); Drucker, The Future of Industrial Man 101–117 (1942); Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man 16–18, 118 (Denny Trans. 1964); Givens, The Coming Industrial Citizenship, 17 Labor L.J. 99 (1966); Khalil Gibran, "On Work" in The Prophet 27–31 (Pocket ed. 1955).

The Beginning of the Cold War: Part 2

(By Julius Epstein)

(NOTE.—This is the second part of an article by Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace treating of the recently published Diplomatic Papers of the U.S. Department of State from 1945. In this present article the content of a telegram from George Kennan, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, to the U.S. Secretary of State, on January 25, 1945, gives a primary pointer to the fact that Czechoslovak-Soviet Russian relations were headed for tension and double-play between the Soviets, and Czechs and Poles. Although eager for boundary rectifications, Czechoslovakia had agreed to discuss the matter in accord with Allied governments, desiring of course that frontiers be drawn as of pre-Munich Agreement status.

(In a telegram sent by Czechoslovak Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs to U.S. Chargé d'Affaires in Czechoslovakia, Mr. Klieforth, on May 31, 1945, this desire for revision of borders is clearly expressed. It tells, however, of steps taken by Poland in areas the Czechs claimed — especially Kladsko (German Glatz)—where the Polish authorities, not waiting for final settlement of border issue, denationalized, persecuted, and drove to the brink of economic ruin the Slavonic people there. The Czechoslovak government planned to take over control, despite Poland's pro tem administrative rule there, "not as a final act" but in amicable accord with Poland. The United States had also left room open for treatment of this issue by the Allied Control Council on a temporary basis.

(The information given here shows that a term, taken in all seriousness by the other participant countries, was used as a smokescreen by the Soviets who paid lip-service to the agreement of waiting for a final "peace conference" to solve the Kladsko and other territorial issues, but in reality playing Czechs against Poles.

(Here are reproductions of telegraphic messages between the countries concerned that will serve as valuable references in weighing these disputes and applying the principle of holding them in abeyance until a final peace settlement is reached, also for all persons who plead for the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line as a permanent boundary between Poland and Germany.)

Long before V-E Day (May 8, 1945) it became clear to the Czech Government-in-Exile in London that Soviet-Czech relations were headed for collision rather than for a road of friendly relations. This became especially clear after Soviet troops had entered Ruthenia (Carpatho-Ukraine). The documents as published by the Department of State in its recently released volume "*Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers, 1945, Volume IV, Europe*", United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968, show beyond the shadow of any doubt that as early as January 1945, the Beneš Government must have realized that the road of Czech-Soviet relations would be a rather rough one.

One of the first diplomatic papers bearing upon this subject is the telegram, sent by the American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, George Kennan, to the Secretary of State in Washington. The telegram bears the date of January 25, 1945. The pertinent parts read as follows:

"Němec (Frantisek Němec, Delegate for Liberated Territories for the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile in London. Delegate Němec and his staff arrived in a portion of Ruthenia liberated by the Soviet Army in October 1944); returned to Moscow beginning of December (1944) to establish contact with his Government. During the month he and his delegation had spent in liberated area they had been allowed to reside in Chust but not to visit larger centers of Uzhorod and Munkacevo nearer to front. He had also not been able to communicate with his Government. Local executive power was exercised by Ruthenian National Council, a local political, Communist-controlled organization, ostensibly representing resistance and patriotic elements. Němec and other members of delegation had functioned as liaison officers of London Government vis-à-vis Ruthenian National Council and Red Army. Council had come out in favor of annexation with Soviet Union. Formal resolution to this effect passed November 26 (1944). Red Army had been entirely correct and had remained aloof from this agitation. Czechs recognized, however, that movement enjoys at least tolerance of Moscow party circles, and realized that choice before them was whether to retain province nominally part of Czechoslovakia though penetrated and dominated from Soviet side or to cede it entirely, which could be done only after liberation of entire country and consultation of electorate."

PEACE SETTLEMENT TO DETERMINE CZECHOSLOVAK FRONTIERS

In April 1945, the question of Czechoslovakia's boundaries preoccupied the European Advisory Commission in London. It confirmed "the full political authority of the Czechoslovak Government within 1937 boundaries" and reserved "final determination of Czechoslovak frontiers until frontiers in central Europe are defined in the peace settlement." The document referred to is a telegram from the American ambassador in the United Kingdom, *Winant*, to the Secretary of State in Washington. It is dated April 28, 1945.

The British representative at the meeting of the European Advisory Commission of April 25, 1945, on which Ambassador Winant reported to the American Secretary of State was Sir *William Strang*. As Winant telegraphed:

"Strang proposed that a statement like that contained in the second paragraph of the United Kingdom formula be made to the representatives of the Czechoslovak Government by the Allied Consultation Committee of the EAC in reply to a question raised by the latter regarding steps for declaring invalid the Munich Agreement and German acts deriving from it. (The statement contained in the second paragraph of the United Kingdom formula read as follows: His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for their part agree that the Czechoslovak Government should exercise full political authority from the date of unconditional surrender of Germany throughout the area bounded by the frontiers of Czechoslovakia as these existed before December 31st, 1937. His Majesty's Government consider, however, that the question of the final settlement of Czechoslovak frontiers must remain in abeyance until international frontiers in Central Europe are definitely laid down in the peace settlement)".

The only Soviet comment on this formula was that the Soviet Government had had nothing to do in any form with the Munich Agreement. This brief comment gave no indication whether the Soviet Government agrees with the United Kingdom position that the final settlement of the Czechoslovak frontiers should be held in abeyance pending the general peace settlement.

"Since the United Kingdom formula is in general accord with previous expressions of United States policy I propose to agree to the step proposed unless otherwise instructed." Ambassador Winant was not "otherwise instructed," a fact which spelled out the United States' agreement.

While the Czechs agreed to the restoration of the 1937 frontiers—with the exception of the Carpatho-Ukraine, to be ceded without any plebiscite to the Soviet Union—they were by no means satisfied with this solution. They wanted more than the 1937 frontiers. This evolves from a written communication from the Czechoslovak Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, *Clementis*—later purged and hanged by the Communists—to the American Chargé d'Affaires in Czechoslovakia, Mr. *Klieforth*, dated May 31, 1945.

FOR A "RECTIFICATION" OF BOUNDARIES

Mr. Clementis wrote: "Sir: I have the honour to address to you the following information: The Czechoslovak Government has always claimed frontiers for this country which were in existence before Munich, at the same time never failing to emphasize to the competent bodies that this point of view must not be prejudicial to future claims of rectification of frontiers to be raised at a suitable time in full accord with the Allied Governments, in favour of the Czechoslovak Republic and to the disadvantage of the enemy states. The period immediately following the end of war operations has on our part been considered as most suitable for this purpose. The Czechoslovak Government has therefore prepared proposals along this line in order to lay duly substantiated claims before all Allied Governments and, should such rectification concern the boundaries of the friendly neighbouring Polish State, naturally also before the Polish Government."

"In the meantime, however, it has been brought to the knowledge of the Czechoslovak Government that the territory of Kladsko (Glatz) was placed under the administration of the Polish authorities and that, by a proclamation dated in April 1945, Mr. St. Piaskowski was appointed commissioner of the Polish Republic for the administrative province of Lower Silesia. This proclamation which was addressed to the population of Lower Silesia and South Brandenburg, and which having been posted also in the area of Kladsko, was evidently supposed to cover this area too, asserted that this province, Slavonic from time immemorial, had been taken from Poland."

"With respect to the arguments contained in the aforesaid proclamation, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the fact that the area of Kladsko, up to the year 1742 when first annexation by Prussia took place, had been a possession of Bohemia to which it belonged also ethnographically to such an extent that even at the present time, after more than two hundred years of forced Germanization, entire groups of communities have never been deprived of their decidedly Czech character."

"It should be added to the statement of the Polish proclamation that the primary origin of these inhabitants is Slavonic, that these primarily Slavonic inhabitants used to and still do belong to the Czech branch. For this reason these people applied to the Czechoslovak Government to take charge of Kladsko until final determination of the frontiers should be made."

CLAIMS AIMED AT GLATZ

"Owing to the fact that Kladsko gravitates to Czechoslovakia also economically and by its system of transport, it is the intention of the Czechoslovak Government to take over the control of this territory, as shown in the map attached hereto, without any further delay. The Czechoslovak Government would not consider the taking charge of Kladsko as a final act, being fully aware of the fact that this problem will ultimately have to be solved at the Peace Conference. The Czechoslovak Government, knowing that such regulation of northeastern boundaries of Czechoslovakia in her favour may concern future Polish frontiers, is determined to settle this point in amicable accord with the Polish Government."

"I may add that the Czechoslovak Government does not consider the present note as providing for all claims concerning rectification of frontiers which may have to be raised in connection with ethnological, historical, geographical, economic, transport and other motives."

"A similar note is being addressed to the representatives of the Governments of Great Britain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France and to the Polish Government."

"Accept [etc.] "Under Secretary of State:"
"Dr. V. Clementis M. P."

XUM

A memorandum prepared in the Department of State to be used as background information for President *Truman* and his advisers at the Potsdam Conference clarifies the American point of view in regard to frontier changes concerning Czechoslovakia. The document bears the date of June 23, 1945 and reads in its pertinent parts as follows:

The specific territorial questions are as follows: (a) *Sudetenland*. The Munich Agreement of 1938 incorporating Sudeten territories into Germany was not recognized by the United States. These areas should be returned to Czechoslovakia and incorporated immediately into the Czechoslovak State.

(b) *Teschen*. The United States favors a direct settlement of the Teschen question by Poland and Czechoslovakia. If the two states do not reach an agreement, this Government favors the resumption of Czechoslovak administration in the Teschen area since it does not recognize the transfer of this territory to Poland in 1939. (The date should be 1938, since the Czechoslovak Government yielded to a Polish ultimatum for the immediate cession of Teschen on October 1, 1938. J.E.)

(c) *Ruthenia*. The United States favors a direct settlement of the question of Ruthenia by Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. It is hoped that the Ruthenian question is settled as a whole and that the final settlement is based on the desires of the Ruthenian people as ascertained in a free and fair plebiscite.

(d) *Glatz*. The Czechoslovak Government has announced its intention to occupy Glatz (Kladsko) in the Silesian salient without prejudicing the final settlement of the question at the Peace Conference. This area is now reported to be under Polish administration. The United States assumes that, if the Allied Control Council in Germany agrees to this proposal, the Czechoslovak Government will agree that the territory in question remain subject to the authority of the Allied Control Council until a final decision is made concerning the disposition of territories lying within the 1937 frontiers of Germany.

DUPLICITY OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

The symptomatic question of Teschen appears again in a noteworthy State Department Paper, dated July 2, 1945. It is a telegram from Mr. *Klieforth* to the American Secretary of State, reporting Klieforth's conversation with Mr. *Clementis*, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of the same day. The document and an attached footnote by the editors shows the duplicity of Soviet foreign policy. The brief document reads:

"Clementis, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, requested me to see him this morning (July 2, 1945)."

"He said negotiations with Poles in Moscow regarding Teschen resulted in no decision. Neither side surrendered its claims but both parties agreed to avoid frontier incidents. Russians maintained formal neutral attitude but recommended that dispute be referred to peace conference."

"He added that Czechoslovakia 'was pleased' to complete transfer of Ruthenia to Russia. Full text of agreement followed by pouch. In return Russians agreed to evacuate all Russian troops from Czechoslovakia by July 5th except for 9 divisions about 90,000 troops which would remain along Czechoslovak-German frontier."

"Czechoslovak Commission in Moscow also discussed with Russia all Czech claims for rectification of frontier including Glatz and Leobschuetz area together with quite an extensive but narrow strip along practically entire Czech-German frontier. He promised to send me full description of this area at an early date. Russians told Czechs that boundary changes would have to be settled at peace conference."

Playing up the final settlement of all frontier questions at the "peace conference" was the official stance of Soviet diplomacy. Behind the diplomatic scene the Soviets played quite another game.

In the footnote mentioned above, the Department of State reveals that the American Ambassador in Moscow, *Harriman*, had reported a conversation with the Czech Ambassador in Moscow, *Fierlinger*, in which the latter stated "that negotiations with the Poles at Moscow regarding Teschen had come to no conclusion, that Poles were pressing their claim particularly because of their loss of territory to the Soviet Union, and that the Poles also rejected Czech claims to Kladsko".

The same footnote informs the readers that President *Benes* had told the American Chargé d'Affaires *Klieforth* that "Czechoslovakia would never give up its claims to Teschen." It also reveals that the American Ambassador in Warsaw, *Arthur Bliss Lane* "reported the opinion of the Czechoslovak Ambassador in Poland, *Joseph Hejret*, that Polish agitation over Teshen had been fostered by the Soviet Government in order to make its influence further felt in Poland and Czechoslovakia."

STRATEGIC ANNEXATION OF CARPATHO-UKRAINE

That the Americans never fell for the flimsy "justifications" of the Soviet annexation of the Carpatho-Ukraine can be seen by the despatch which the American Ambassador in Moscow, *Harriman*, sent to the Secretary of State on July 3, 1945. He telegraphed:

"Citation of ethnological affinity and of Ruthenian people for reunion with Ukrainian Motherland can only bring a smile from anyone familiar with province of Ruthenia. Ruthenia was last associated with Uraine, as far as we are aware, in 1220: a period not likely to evoke any lively associations in minds of present population. Bulk of people are illiterate and politically apathetic. Most of them are probably inclined for economic reasons to look back on their inclusion in Hapsburg Hungary as most prosperous and happy time in recollection of living people. Outward manifestations of Ruthenian political sentiment have usually been chiefly a matter of a few intellectuals, usually not natives of the province. Claim of cultural affinity with Ukraine is tenuous and debatable. It is of fairly recent origin and its protagonists among whom the Nazis in 1939 were some of the most prominent have generally had ulterior motives."

Province contains no economic resources of any importance; its population is in a pitiable state of squalor and backwardness; and it has always been a financial burden on any larger state it was associated with. It could therefore hardly be desired by Russia for economic reasons."

"In view of the above it seems clear that main reasons for cession was its strategic position and desire of Moscow leaders to have common frontier with Hungary. (This motive became evident when Khrushchev decided in 1956 to march into Hungary in order to crush the Hungarian revolution. J. E.) Extensive connection of Ruthenian economy with Hungary, favored by geographical factors will give Soviet authorities another channel of entry into Hungarian economic affairs."

On July 9, 1945, the American Chargé d'Affaires in Prague expressed his agreement with Harriman's opinion concerning Ruthenia. He wired the Secretary of State:

"I agree fully with Harriman's views regarding incorporation of Ruthenia. While Czechoslovakia gladly got rid of Ruthenia, as it was a real burden on the state, the authorities are very apprehensive of public opinion in US fearing that they will be accused of 'selling Ruthenia down the river' as a matter of appeasement. The Czechs frankly are ashamed of the deal, as it was realized that the vast majority of Ruthenians would have voted against it given a chance. I learned reliably that the main objection to Allied diplomats landing in Constanza en route to Praha (Prague) was desire to prevent them from learning true situation in Ruthenia."

POLISH MEASURES AGAINST THE LOCAL CZECH POPULATION

An interesting light upon the Polish practices in the areas claimed by Czechoslovakia is being shed in a despatch from the Czechoslovak Ministry for Foreign Affairs to the American Embassy in Czech * * * slovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a similar note to the Repre * * * ber 13. The following parts may be quoted:

"By a note of the beginning of June 1945, concerning Czechoslovak claims on the area of Kladsko, the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs took the liberty of informing the Representative of the Government of the United States of America that the Czechoslovak Government were preparing proposals for the rectification of the frontiers of Czechoslovakia to the disadvantage of hostile powers. The Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a similar note to the Representatives at Praha (Prague) of the Government of Great Britain, of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and of France."

"At the same time, the Czechoslovak Government informed the Polish Government through their Minister at Warsaw of the preparation of such proposals. The Czechoslovak Government did this in the knowledge that a rectification of the northeast boundaries of Czechoslovakia to its advantage could affect the future boundaries of Poland, and with the determination to settle problems of this kind in amicable accord with the Polish Government. From the note of the Czechoslovak Minister, as well as from oral communications, made by competent persons, the Polish Government learned that the Czechoslovak proposals also concerned Kladsko, Hlubcice and Ratibor districts and that the Czechoslovak Government intends supporting their claims to those regions also by ethnographical arguments."

"It is true that, by the Potsdam Agreement, the administration of the Kladsko, Hlubcice and Ratibor districts has been entrusted to Poland, and therefore, the settling of the question into which State these districts should be incorporated, has been reserved for the peace conference. The Czechoslovak demands for the rectification of the frontiers in these regions have not, therefore, become meaningless and, for this reason, the Czechoslovak Government cannot be indifferent if the Polish authorities in the said districts take measures against the local Czech population which create the impression of having as their object the eradication of the Czech element in these regions and thus the depriving of the Czechoslovak Government of one of the arguments which they intend to put forward in favour of their territorial demands; neither can they be indifferent if the Polish authorities and Polish troops act in a manner which must necessarily result in the total cessation of all economic life in those districts."

OPPRESSION OF CZECH NATIONAL MINORITY

"According to authentic reports, the population of Czech nationality in the Kladsko (Glatz), Hlubcice (Leobschütz) and Ratibor areas is being constantly changed, requisition, expel, beat and persecute, and Polish state authorities. This population is constrained by all means to take part in demonstrations for the annexation of these regions to Poland and is compelled to sign manifestoes calling for this annexation. The Polish authorities have started a forcible action for the acquisition of Polish State citizenship. They summon inhabitants of Czech nationality, particularly supporters of families, and confer upon them Polish State citizenship. Everyone is obliged to sign and protests are of no avail. In communities where Czechs are living, Polish schools are being established and church-services in Polish are being introduced: sermons in the mother-

XUM

tongue of the people, customary from time immemorial, are interdicted."

"Hand in Hand with nationality oppressions goes unscrupulous economic oppression. The economic situation in these parts is so dreadful that they are faced with absolute ruin. The army units, which are being constantly changed, requisition, expel, beat and persecute, and the administrative authorities do not remain far behind in similar activities. The local population is driven to despair by the terror reigning everywhere. Bedding, furnishings, including wall-clocks and sewingmachines, as well as agricultural machines and implements, cattle—down to the last cow—and even crops are being taken from the inhabitants. Czech farms are being occupied by Polish colonists from the East, who force the Czech population to work in the fields; for their work they give them neither food nor money. In some places the inhabitants are being driven out altogether from their farms and dwellings, are being assembled in camps and then taken away; the Czech inhabitants, in some places, have been tortured by official Polish organs in rooms especially equipped for that purpose."

"It is no wonder that, in this dreadful economic situation, famine is setting in and, in consequence of that as well as of the severe mental and physical torment to which this population is being subjected, mortality is increasing at an amazing rate. In Ratibor, for instance, between twenty and thirty persons die every day, mostly children. There are no hospitals, no doctors, no medicaments and, in some communities, typhoid fever is beginning to spread."

"FOR THREE DAYS NEITHER GOD NOR MERCY"

"These horrors are crowned by the fact that both soldiers and civil commissaries and their assistants every day utter threats to the effect that, if the population does not remain in those regions, the time will come when *'trzy dni nie bendzie Boga a slitowania'* ('For three days there will be neither God nor mercy'). Under these circumstances, and for fear lest they should be transferred to Poland, the inhabitants, often with only a small suitcase, are fleeing across the frontier into Czechoslovakia."

"Since it cannot be concealed that by this method of proceeding, the Polish authorities are pursuing in the Kladsko, Hlubcice and Ratibor districts a policy of faits accomplis which, in their consequences, might impair some of the premises in favour of the satisfying of the Czechoslovak claims to the said districts or, on the satisfying of those claims, might, to say the least, cause Czechoslovakia to come into possession of territory ethnically estranged and economically depreciated, the Czechoslovak Government take the liberty of drawing attention to this state of affairs."

"It is true that the Potsdam Conference entrusted Poland with the administration even of those parts, but at the same time it stressed the fact that the definite frontiers would be determined by the Peace Conference. Hence, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government, it plainly follows that the Polish Government are not empowered to effect in those districts changes in the situation such as would prejudice the decision of the Peace Conference. The settling of those areas with Polish population alone creates a state which is of itself prejudicial. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs drew the attention of the Polish Government to the matter in their note of August 20th, 1945, with the request that they should remedy it and now take the liberty of requesting the Government of the United States of America to be kind enough to act accordingly."

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to express to the Embassy of the United States of America the assurance of their highest consideration.—Praha, August 26, 1945."

FINAL SETTLEMENT ONLY BY PEACE CONFERENCE

This truly remarkable diplomatic document should be of interest to Germans who plead for the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line as a permanent frontier between Poland and Germany. Every single argument brought forth by *Jan Masaryk's* Czech Foreign Ministry can and should be applied to the dispute about the Oder-Neisse line. The Czechs were right in stressing the fact that Polish administration of the Hlubcice-Ratibor areas was—under international law—of temporary character and that the final settlement could only be made by a Peace Conference.

What was the reaction of the U.S. Department of State?

The reaction is contained in a telegram from the American Acting Secretary of State, *Dean Acheson* of September 29, 1945, addressed to the American Ambassador in Prague, Steinhardt. Acheson's answer to the Czech document reads—in its decisive part—as follows:

"Since Polish control of area is temporary pending final decision of German frontiers, Dept. considers that problem contained in Zecho note should be brought to the attention of Council of Foreign Ministers by Zecho Govt as a development which prejudices final settlement of frontiers as contemplated in Potsdam agreement."

"Repeated to London as 8640; repeated to Warsaw as 150.—Acheson."

This was the correct position of the American Department of State.

The purpose of this study was not to exhaust the evaluation of the documents produced. Its purpose was to produce a selection of the documents contained in the latest State Department publication, documents which shall for years be the subject of historical and political consideration by present and future historians.

GIDEON OPPENHEIMER—RENAISSANCE MAN

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently in Boise, Idaho, a gentle man by the name of Gideon Oppenheimer died, the victim of a heart attack. Gideon was a close personal friend and certainly one of Idaho's most illustrious adopted sons, for he was born in Berlin, reared in Prague, and spent much of his life in New York. It was a flip of a coin 16 years ago that made him decide to move to Idaho, where he purchased a small weekly newspaper. Idaho was fortunate the coin brought him West from New York.

Gideon Oppenheimer was a man of many talents and many interests. He was a newspaperman, a lawyer, a scholar. Little failed to interest him, from athletics to politics to chess. But his special interest was recruiting young Idahoans with outstanding scholastic talents for his alma mater, Columbia University. Through his efforts, scores of Idahoans of high scholastic ability were given the opportunity to study at Columbia, and the university recognized his efforts by awarding him its Outstanding Alumni Award.

In the words of Suzanne Dabney Taylor, who wrote movingly of Gideon in an article published in the Intermountain Observer following his death, "With the I.Q. which hovered around the genius level, Gideon lashed into activities so diverse that he smacked of the Renaissance Man."

Gideon Oppenheimer was this and more, Bob Lorimer, whose sensitive, well-written columns grace the pages of the Idaho Daily Statesman, captured another side.

> His secret was empathy. He understood people and was kind and thoughtful when kindness and thoughtfulness counted.

Mr. President, Idaho has lost an unusually gifted citizen. But Gideon Oppenheimer will long linger in the memory of his adopted State.

I ask that the articles by Suzanne Dabney Taylor and Bob Lorimer be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIEND'S DEATH ROUSES MEMORIES OF BOISE LAWYER'S VARIED LIFE

I lost a friend a few days ago.

The whole thing seemed unreal when I glanced at the death notices. It had only been two months since his charming mother had died—also suddenly and also of a heart attack. He was only 46 and I hadn't even known he was sick.

He was part of Boiseana even though he had been born in Berlin, reared in Prague and had attended New York schools. He worked hard at being a westerner in general and an Idahoan specifically ever since he moved here 16 years ago to take over management of the Meridian Times.

It took a little time to get acquainted with Gideon Oppenheimer. When I first met him I wasn't too sure I even liked him. He brought with him the coolness of many easterners augmented with the influence of formal European upbringing. Frankly, I felt he was a little snooty.

I was wrong. Actually, I believe he was instinctively very shy. He sometimes tried to cover up with brusque mannerism and, occasionally, impatient outbursts when faced with people who hit him the wrong way. Then he would do an about-face and treat a child or an animal in a way that was well beyond what either deserved.

Unlike some people who exploit their past, he seldom talked about his war years. I knew that he earned a Purple Heart but I didn't know he had two of them—or five battle stars—until I read the obituary.

He once showed me some pictures he had taken when American troops liberated one of the Nazi torture camps. It was too late for liberation of many of the prisoners. It must have been a terrible emotional experience for Gideon. In spite of his special training as an interpreter for his work as a combat intelligence officer, he had a personal stake in the mess.

As I recall, at least six of his mother's relatives had fallen victim to the horrors perpetrated by Hitler's butchers. In addition to first-hand knowledge what the Nazis did to members of his own race, he was aware of how other minorities had been mistreated for their refusing to compromise to demands of storm troopers.

The funny thing was Gideon and I had few mutual interests. I mentioned the wonders of the Dodgers when he talked about Mickey Mantle. When he lauded Columbia College, I would take another side. I didn't share his avid interest in politics nor literature for literature's sake.

Gideon lacked natural ability to work with his hands but he had a brilliant mind—not only full of facts but also possessing the abil-

XUM

ity to put it into gear as evidenced by his prowess at the chess board and bridge table. Incidentally, I play neither nor am I interested in learning.

His secret was empathy. He understood people and was kind and thoughtful when kindness and thoughtfulness counted.

He had other friends. This was proven by the acid test, a funeral attended by but one living relative (as far as I know), a cousin who participated in the simple Jewish service. But there were a number of persons attending. They were of various ages. It was obvious from the looks on the faces of the young pallbearers that they felt personal loss.

It was windy and cloudy at the cemetery. I couldn't hear very well but what I did hear sounded like: "A thousand will fall at your very side and ten thousand at your right hand; to you it will not come near . . ."

THE COIN FELL TO THE WEST FOR GIDEON OPPENHEIMER

One day about a decade ago Gideon Oppenheimer tossed a coin in his New York apartment to decide whether to buy a newspaper at Meriden, Conn., or Meridian, Idaho. It was Idaho's luck that the coin fell west.

Gideon was a degree-carrying lawyer from Columbia University, a member of the bar of the City and State of New York, and the architect of the law course designed for the American Legion Boys State delegates and the YMCA Youth Legislature, in which Idaho is a participant. However, he had another field that called him, the challenge and excitement of newspaper work. He had come under its spell while editor of his school newspaper and as a writer for university publications.

Shortly after coming to Boise he made a deal for a weekly published at Meridian which he promptly re-named the *Meridian Times*. Later when he bought a daily at Caldwell he also re-named this the *Caldwell Times*. Both were in honor of his model, the *New York Times*, which he read without fail every day until his death last week at the age of 46.

After a period spent with these newspaper enterprises he sold out and opened a law practice in Boise where his mother, Mrs. Carol Oppenheimer, had joined him. She died last December.

During this newspaper experience he had become an active participant in Idaho Democratic politics and worked in the early campaigns of Sen. Frank Church. As a campaign manager, he piloted Robert McLaughlin of Mountain Home to the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator in 1960, but lost in the general election to Republican Henry Dworshak.

With the I.Q. which hovered around the genius level, Gideon lashed into activities so diverse that he smacked of the Renaissance Man.

He adored games, but how he hated to lose! Eugene Thomas, Boise attorney and a classmate of Gideon's at Columbia, recalls on one pleasant day a dozen tables for chess were set out in the university close under the lofty plane trees. Gideon was the challenger for each. He took every game with scarcely a furrow of concentration on his brow.

During World War II he served as a combat intelligence officer in the infantry. He was severely wounded and received two purple hearts and five battle stars.

His driving passion was the development of young men of the highest intellectual ability toward university experience. Specifically, that meant the recruitment of bright young Idahoans for Columbia.

To these he opened his excellent library as well as the pages of his sophisticated mind, which had been nurtured in Germany where he was born in 1922. He was a school boy at Prague, Czechoslovakia and experienced travel in other European countries, where his father's business as a metals buyer took him (Gideon's father died shortly before his son's removal to Idaho).

The young students whose scholastic records would seem to fit them for undergraduate work at Columbia were Gideon's project. In his search for the worthy he was as relentless as a blood hound and scoured the state for those whose attainments reached his ears. For these efforts, which gave Columbia scores of Idahoans, many of them of the highest calibre, he received his alma mater's Outstanding Alumni Award.

The achievements of these young men will serve as Oppenheimer's memorial long after his personal memory has vanished like the blue haze of autumn from the Idaho hills.

THE URBAN CRISIS—EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, an outstanding American, Mr. David Rockefeller, spoke at Long Island University on the problems faced by our Nation's urban centers. His speech was a good one and to the point, stressing the responsibilities of free enterprise in solving the problems of our cities. The text of the speech follows:

THE URBAN CRISIS—EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

(Address by David Rockefeller)

When Alexander Aldrich and his academic colleagues invited me to participate in this Conference, they neglected to explain the historic antecedents of the area. It was only later that I learned that we are meeting in the shadow of a shrine of rock 'n roll music—the old Brooklyn Paramount Theatre!

To me, it is reassuring to find that there is actually one place in our city where the three R's of learning have displaced the two R's of music!

One place, that is, where "Beatlemania" has given way to entomology!

Of course, there may be some who would take issue with this shift, but I'm sure the chorus of dissent would not be nearly so loud as the one that greeted the news that, on our Avenue of the Americas, there are now more banks than bars!

I've heard a number of people express grave doubts that this trend represents urban progress!

At any rate, it seems to me the site of today's meeting provides an appropriate setting for a discussion of one of our most pressing long-term economic problems—a problem known perhaps too familiarly as the crisis of our cities.

Within a short distance, we have numerous examples of the activities, hopes and frustrations that surround efforts to bring about a better life for all our citizens.

A few blocks to the north, plans for development of the Brooklyn Navy Yard complex hold out the prospect of a significant increase in job opportunities. The adjacent Bedford-Stuyvesant area, which houses the nation's largest non-white population, is the focus of ambitious training and redevelopment programs. And in the nearby Ocean Hill experimental school district, recent events demonstrated that change does not come easily and that even the best intentioned efforts may inflame feelings of resentment that have smoldered for years.

All these activities, I think, reflect an expanded growing public awareness of the problems of our cities. But unhappily they reflect, too, the fact that far more intensive efforts are needed if we are to cure present ills, while retaining the representative character of our Government and insuring the freedom of individuals and enterprises to pursue the quest for betterment.

While solutions to specific urban problems are immensely complicated, I feel that the experience of the past few years has clarified at least the general approach that must be taken. It is not a Government approach exclusively. Nor is it a private sector approach. It is a massive cooperative effort that mobilizes every segment of our society for a sustained campaign.

Anything less, in my judgment, is doomed to failure. The crisis of our cities must be everybody's concern and everybody's business.

As John Gardner put it recently, "We have an ample supply of handwringers, but we are in very short supply of people willing to lend a hand."

The cooperative approach I mentioned is perhaps best exemplified by the concept of Mr. Gardner's National Urban Coalition. As you know, this is an organization that embraces business, labor, education, church groups, community leaders—the entire spectrum of our society—and reaches out to local areas where these problems must ultimately find their solutions. It is unique in two respects: first, because it is not sponsored by any one constituency but by all significant elements of the community; second, because it does not focus on a single problem but on the whole range of urban problems.

To understand why such a broadly based effort is indispensable, we need only remind ourselves of the issues that are straining the sinews of our social structure—issues rooted in social, technological, political and economic conditions of incredible complexity.

From a social standpoint, a critical factor has been the migration of Negro farm labor from the south to our northern urban centers, a movement involving almost four million people over the past 30 years. Although much progress has been made in assimilating these people, much more remains to be done. And, paradoxically, even as progress is accelerated, it has given rise, in some quarters, to strident demands for a fragmented rather than an integrated society.

The technological implications of this rural-to-urban migration have been awesome, indeed, especially in the field of transportation. The task of getting people into and out of our cities, as well as moving them around inside, is a long way from being mastered. We are equally far behind in dealing with air and water pollution and the provision of adequate recreation facilities.

The political and economic impact of this population shift is further cause for grave concern. For the most part, suburban areas do not fall within the same political jurisdiction as the major cities themselves. Our metropolitan areas are made up of a host of autonomous political entities—some 1,500 in the Greater New York region alone—and each is understandably jealous of its independent status. From the point of view of effective municipal administration, this constitutes a major obstacle. Beyond this, the influx of low-income families and the exodus of middle-income families from the central cities have reduced tax revenues at the very time when the costs of providing education, police protection, sanitation, health services and welfare have all risen astronomically.

In view of the magnitude and complexity of these problems, it is clear that we must come to some firm conclusions on national priorities. Without a realistic schedule of goals and a commitment of resources to meet them, we are certain to experience duplication of effort and a consequent lack of accomplishment. Regrettably, the resources available to deal with the urban crisis are far more limited than our aspirations, so we can scarcely afford to squander anything through lack of planning and coordination.

In recent months, as the new Administration in Washington has developed plans for the future, we have heard a great deal about the private sector's shouldering an increasing burden in managing projects to improve training, education, health services and housing among the disadvantaged.

I think this move, toward what Peter Drucker calls "reprivatization" of the economy is most encouraging, and I hope that more will come of it. Business must assume greater responsibility in the urban area if it wants to preserve the rights it has enjoyed up to now. And, in my view, it has much to contribute through the application of the efficiency and economy of business practice to public problem-solving.

The particular credentials business has for this role rest in the procedures by which private managements establish goals and move to their accomplishment. Wherever the condition of voluntary enterprise governs and the consumer makes independent decisions, a business has to plan how to produce and distribute at a cost the market is able to absorb. Because failure is costly, every effort is made to seek each new objective with more science and exactitude, less intuition and compromise.

Above all, business is an innovator. It is the only institution in our society created specifically for managing change. It is also the most flexible and adaptable of our institutions at a time when these qualities are needed as never before.

Government now faces the necessity of providing greater benefits and satisfactions within the increasingly limited resources that can be mustered. There is questioning whether a limit has not been reached in a tax load that can be borne without slowing down the economy. There is also evidence of a serious shortage of capital to supply the houses, schools, service facilities and machines needed to provide jobs and produce goods for our growing population.

There must be dramatic breakthroughs in providing better education, health services and housing at reasonable cost. Here, typically, the innovative leadership must come from business, with Government furnishing appropriate incentives.

The best example of this we have had, to my way of thinking, is the Federal Housing Administration, which was introduced during the 1930's as a guarantor of home mortgages. Originally, the Government appeared to be taking a substantial risk. In point of fact, though, there have been virtually no losses. Because the Government stood behind these mortgages, private funds flowed into the market and enabled people to build and to own homes.

More recently, Business-Government cooperation in construction has been stimulated with the formation of the New York State Urban Development Corporation. Through this body, the state will initiate and plan large-scale community projects and, in some cases, handle land acquisition and demolition. Then private enterprise will be brought in to acquire the vacant land and develop the various elements of the project, except in instances where additional public funds may be required for subsidized low-income housing.

The passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 has also opened many avenues for cooperation and business action in this field. One of the most promising new features of that legislation is the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships, which has as its goal the construction of 50,000 additional low- and middle-income homes each year. A significant effect should be to stimulate research into advanced construction technology so that low-income housing will become even more attractive to private developers.

These examples suggest that the cooperative approach to urban problems is not merely desirable, but, in many cases, essential to success. This applies to cooperation among Federal, state and local Government units as well as to cooperation within the private sector.

For instance, the Urban Coalition's Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, on which I serve, includes representatives of labor, the financial community, the construction industry, and the academic community, urban affairs specialists and city and state officials.

Such a diverse membership provides a broad base from which to attack problems that could not be adequately dealt with by any one segment. This Task Force is currently coordinating information on the contributions that corporations, universities, the states and local governments can make to the physical rebuilding of our cities. It is also studying the formation of national housing markets—markets large enough to take advantage of advanced technology in construction and make low-income housing economically attractive to builders.

I believe the type of partnership exemplified by the Urban Coalition can usefully be carried a step further. The Coalition, with its wide cross-sectional representation, should be able to contribute enormously to the setting of realistic national priorities and goals, and I would hope that arrangements could be worked out with the appropriate Government agencies to make such a contribution possible.

The primary task of Government, of course, is to focus the political energies of the people, to dramatize the issues, to present the fundamental choices, and to make decisions.

Once we have achieved a measure of consensus on goals and priorities, though, there remains the formidable task of implementation. And here, as I have indicated, there is a pivotal role that business and individual businessmen can play.

Too often, I'm afraid, the measures chosen by Government are those that survive the executive and legislative obstacle course after every interest group has exerted its maximum pressure. Frequently the best measures have the least support, placing an intolerable burden on responsible public servants who want to achieve the best possible results for the underprivileged while keeping the country economically strong and able to continue improving itself.

It is my thought that the business community—with the great capacity it has for searching out methods, devising techniques, and programming operations economically—cannot do less than vigorously promote the adoption of the best projects and policies proposed, in the interests of all our citizens.

What is needed, in my view, is some means of mobilizing the opinions and resources of the business community behind workable approaches to urban problems, and then persuading Congress to do the things that must be done. The influence and ideas of businessmen are needed now as never before, and we should apply them in the area of social legislation as we have, in the past, on issues such as taxes and tariffs.

Not long ago, I suggested that one means of doing this might be through a Business Committee for Social Progress. This would be a policy-making group which would unify and coordinate the otherwise isolated efforts of the business community in this field. It could perform a highly useful function by enlisting wider public and legislative support for constructive proposals to encourage and reinforce national, state and local efforts to cope with urban problems. It could also help, on Capitol Hill, to promote the aims of the Urban Coalition. It seems to me that such a Business Committee could do much to sift through the many studies of the urban problem and help put together a realistic program for action.

In any event, regardless of the mechanism, I think the business community must involve itself even more deeply in urban issues in the future than it has in the past. And that future is not likely to be two or three or five years, but the rest of your lifetime and mine.

Yet I don't think we should allow ourselves to become unduly discouraged, either by the magnitude of the problem or by its likely duration. All of us can perhaps draw inspiration from the example of the French Marshal Hubert Lyautey who asked his gardener to plant a tree near a bench on which he particularly liked to sit. The gardener protested, saying that the tree grew only slowly and would not reach maturity for 100 years.

"In that case," replied the Marshal, "we have no time to lose so plant it this afternoon."

In dealing with the urban crisis, we, too, have no time to lose. We must think hard about how our cities can be made to work, then get down to the tough practical details of implementing our thoughts in employment, housing, education and elsewhere. This is a job for all of us—government, business, labor, the academic world, religious and civic groups all working together. We must remain everlastingly at the job if our cities are ever to realize their full potential and to hold out for all our citizens the actuality of the American Dream.

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES: NRTA–AARP

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a statement of "Legislative Objectives" was adopted on February 25, 26, 1969, by the Legislative Council of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons. The legislative council represents the one and a half million members of these sister organizations, and the council statement serves as a guide to those who are authorized to speak for these organizations on legislative issues, including their executive director, Cyril F. Brickfield; their legislative representative, Ernest Giddings; and their legislative counsel, James S. Rubin.

This statement of "Legislative Objectives" is significant not only as a statement of the aspirations of these one and a half million older Americans, but also as an informative indication of the desires of millions of others of this age who are not affiliated with NRTA and AARP.

Included among these legislative objectives are recommendations to increase and improve social security and medicare benefits, to protect fixed incomes against the ravages of inflation, to enact new laws and implement existing laws to promote safety in the streets and at home, to provide equitable tax treatment, to improve employment and service opportunities for the elderly, and to protect consumers against frauds, misrepresentations, and other undesirable practices.

The statement urges the President to issue a proclamation calling the White House Conference on Aging for 1971, as authorized by Public Law 90–526, enacted last year, and urges the appropri-

XUM

ation of funds for allocation to the States to permit immediate beginning of planning at State and local levels in preparation for that Conference.

Time does not permit me to discuss other recommendations in this statement of legislative objectives. In order that the full text may be available to Senators and others who may be interested, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS

1. We support legislation to increase the minimum Social Security benefit to at least $120 a month and provide corresponding increases at all Social benefit levels.

2. We recommend that the Social Security earnings limitation be amended to permit annual earned income of $3000 without reduction in Social Security benefits.

3. We urge that the widows Social Security benefit be increased to 100 per cent of the worker's benefit.

4. We favor legislation to establish minimum Social Security benefits for all persons age 70 or older who are not otherwise eligible for cash benefits under the Social Security program.

5. We urge Congress to assure that all persons will be eligible for Medicare upon attaining age 65.

6. We urge the Congress to include prescription drug costs in Medicare.

7. We support the principle of preventive care to promote the physical and mental health of the aged.

8. We urge a bipartisan study of the whole Social Security system in relation to today's economy.

ADEQUATE RETIREMENT INCOME

9. We urge the states to increase pension benefits of all retired teachers to at least a $2400 a year minimum based on 25 years of service, with proportional benefits for all service of shorter duration.

10. We urge adoption of a national policy of (a) the transferability of public and private retirement credits, (b) five-year or earlier vesting of retirement benefits, and (c) adequate funding.

11. We urge the Congress to provide federal funding to encourage the States to accept the transfer of outstate teaching credit.

12. We urge the Congress to provide adequate pension increases for railroad retirees.

13. We urge the Congress to provide adequate pension increases for civil service retirees.

14. We urge the Congress to protect veterans, their dependents, and all other older Americans in their benefits when increases are voted in Social Security or pensions.

SAFETY IN THE STREETS AND AT HOME

15. We urge effective implementation and strict enforcement of criminal laws, and enactment of new ones where necessary.

PROTECTION AGAINST INFLATION

16. We urge the Members of Congress and the President to intensify all efforts to protect the purchasing power of persons on fixed retirement incomes.

17. We urge that all public and private pension programs be revised to provide automatic pension increases tied to a rise in the cost of living.

EQUITABLE TAX TREATMENT

18. We urge that the entire economic community of the Nation contribute to the financial improvement of needy older Americans.

19. We urge the Congress to permit persons age 65 and over to deduct all unreimbursed expenses for drugs and other medical expenditures from their Federal income taxes.

20. We believe that single persons over age 65 with incomes up to $3500 a year and married couples over age 65 with incomes up to $6000 a year should be exempt from paying a Federal personal income tax.

21. We urge the Congress to adjust the retirement income credit base in accordance with the increase and the maximum Social Security.

22. We favor replacing the retirement income tax credit with retirement income tax exemption.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

23. We urge more effective enforcement of the Age Discrimination Act passed by the 90th Congress and expansion of its provisions to better assure those over age 65 who want to work, the opportunity to do so.

24. We urge the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to see that applications under the Model Cities Act take into account the needs of older persons in the affected areas and the community at large.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

25. We support legislation to expose and restrict all categories of misrepresentation and fraud to consumers.

26. We favor legislation to provide additional protection for the aged against high drug expenses.

27. We urge that there be a Consumer spokesman at the highest Executive level of Federal Government.

28. We oppose the adoption by any State of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code until at least July 1970, to afford adequate study of the complex provisions of the Code.

29. We urge that organizations be established to study and promote the interest of people as consumers, encourage protective legislation, and further consumer education.

INDEPENDENCE, SELF-RESPECT AND DIGNITY

30. We urge that the method of choosing the President of the United States be reformed.

31. We reaffirm our support of the Older Americans Act and the principles upon which it is based; we urge Congress in its consideration of the extension of the grants program to continue support of those projects which have proved successful, but to terminate those which have not fulfilled their original purposes, redirecting funds into other more promising programs; we further urge that amendments to the Older American Act fulfill the objectives established by Congress.

32. We urge the Congress to appropriate the funds necessary for allocation to the states by the Administration on Aging in order to permit immediate planning by states in preparation for the White House Conference on Aging.

33. We reconfirm our belief in the need for an independent Federal Commission on Aging and independent State Commissions on Aging.

34. We urge an appraisal of the effectiveness of the President's Council on Aging in coordinating the various Federal agencies having jurisdiction over the problems of the elderly.

35. We urge immediate implementation of the National Community Senior Service Corps concept under the Older Americans Act to provide programs of employment and service opportunities for older persons.

36. We urge the Congress to support more dynamic educational programs for older persons.

37. We urge that the several states develop and adopt a uniform probate code.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolved, That the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons urge:

38. That President Nixon, at an early date, appoint a Special White House Assistant on Aging.

39. That President Nixon issue a proclamation calling for the White House Conference on Aging for 1971.

40. That the month of May be proclaimed "Older Americans' Month".

PRICE COMPETITIVENESS

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas wheat industry plays a most important role in our Nation's economy and in addition represents a mighty weapon to be used in our Government's concerted attack on the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

Today, Mr. Carl Dumler, the president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., at the third annual congressional breakfast sponsored by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc., and National Association of Wheat Growers, made some very pertinent and timely remarks concerning several new barriers that those of us vitally interested in the wheat industry are facing this year. I feel that Mr. Dumler's remarks and suggestions concerning the present gulf port dock strike and the need for the United States to adopt a more aggressive export price competitive program represent the kind of thinking we must have to find workable answers to these pressing problems. I commend Mr. Dumler's remarks to the attention of my colleagues and all those interested in agriculture:

PRICE COMPETITIVENESS

(Remarks by Carl Dumler, president, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., at the third annual congressional breakfast sponsored by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc., National Association of Wheat Growers, Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969)

Senator Goodell, distinguished Senators and Congressmen, and fellow wheat producers. Like most people today, we farmers are prone to complain about our problems while taking many of our blessings for granted. Before I go any further, I would like to take note of one of our blessings—these gentlemen of the Congress who have made a special effort to visit us this morning and the interest they express in our problems by their attendance. Thank you, gentlemen, for attending.

The year since our last meeting here in Washington, however, has really not been one with many blessings to count in the export market, let alone take for granted. It has been a crucial year with many factors combining to send U.S. wheat exports sliding downhill. Shipments of wheat from July 1 to the end of February were down more than 40 percent compared to the same period last year. I will discuss here new barriers which have faced U.S. Wheat this year.

Of immediate concern is the dock strike, resolved in some areas, continuing to stifle export movement in others. The strike has taken its toll in our exports. Up to the end of December, U.S. shipments for dollars showed a gain of more than 461,000 bushels compared to the same period last year. These same dollar shipments, however, have now slipped into a 14 percent deficit since the beginning of the dock strike.

Another deterrent to sales was the embargo initiated by Japan. Shipments to this leading cash customer are off about 25 per cent. We are pleased that shipments have been resumed and the important role played by marketing organizations in the negotiations leading to the lifting of the ban.

But the principle barrier to U.S. Wheat exports has been the loss of price competitiveness. Precipitating this crisis has been an abundant world supply of wheat. The fears of world starvation a few years ago have now been replaced by concern of oversupply. Wheat production soared in the major food-deficit countries last year. Coupled with recent high levels of production in the developed countries, world wheat output has surpassed the 10-billion-bushel level, something like the four-minute mile in track, for the last three years. This year's production set a record at 10.8 billion bushels.

Also influencing the loss of price competitiveness has been the International Grains Arrangement. The wheat marketing organizations supported the I.G.A., providing we could remain competitive in our traditional markets. This we have not been able to do. In fact, we have had to price below the I.G.A. minimum in order to make sales. And we have lost sales because of this non-competitiveness.

For instance, Brazil issued a worldwide tender for 100,000 tons on October 23. The United States sold 75,000 tons. To make this sale, however, we had to price our wheat 10 cents per bushel below the I.G.A. minimum. And in spite of being below the minimum, Argentina, whose I.G.A. pegged price at the Gulf is the same as the United States, offered at three cents per bushel below our price and sold 25,000 tons. Other f.o.b. offers were received from Australia at six cents under the U.S. price, France at 21 cents under and Spain at 17 cents under. Romania offered wheat at the same price as the United States.

Also, the United Kingdom estimated a need for 500,000 to 700,000 tons of filler wheat this year. We have not been able to take advantage of this opportunity because our wheat has been priced 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher than wheat offered by the EEC, Sweden, Spain, Bulgaria and Romania.

A French sale was made to Turkey at more than 12 cents per bushel under the I.G.A. minimum due to freight interpretations of the agreement. This again prevented a possible U.S. sale.

Other freight interpretations and quality up-grading of I.G.A. pegged wheats has made the United States non-competitive in many areas. Non-member wheats are being priced under U.S. Wheat. For instance, Russian 441 is priced at more than $2.00 per ton under Hard Red Winter, 13.5 per cent protein, in Rotterdam and Russian SKS, 14 per cent protein is about $4.80 per ton under U.S. Spring, 14 per cent protein, in the United Kingdom around the first of March.

The facts clearly show the United States is not price competitive in many of our traditional markets. And we must be competitive if we are to sell. Our wheat exports can bounce back with an aggressive price competitiveness program through the coordinated efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, grain trade and producers.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS BEFORE LIONS CLUBS OF ARBUTUS, LINTHICUM, AND GLEN BURNIE

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, early this month, in Baltimore, I had the pleasure of speaking before three Lions Clubs, Arbutus, Linthicum, and Glen Burnie.

As an individual who is concerned with the quality of our environment and as a Senator from a State which is trying to preserve and enhance this quality, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks to these groups be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS BEFORE LIONS CLUBS OF ARBUTUS, LINTHICUM, AND GLEN BURNIE

Few concerns of mankind today are as important as the preservation of the quality of the environment.

Before telling you how we in Congress are alarmed by the shocking decline in environmental quality and what some of us are trying to do about it, let me just relate some facts which indicate the degree to which man has abused his natural environment.

Every river system in this country is polluted.

Toxic matter is being released into the air over the United States at a rate of more than 142 million tons a year, or three-fourths of a ton for every American—a new and invidious form of overkill.

Not counting industrial and agricultural wastes, we discard more than 165 tons of solid wastes each year. While we send 3 men to the moon and back in an unprecedented display of technological skill, the rest of us on earth are being buried in our own trash. It has been said, "We reach for the moon standing knee deep in garbage."

There are over 19 thousand communities whose public water supplies serve about 58 million people which are not covered by U.S. public health standards.

Each year over 300 new chemical compounds are introduced into industry without sufficient concern shown for the health of the individual and ecology of the country side. Damage to materials and crops is $65.00 per person, 11 billion per year.

I could go on but I won't. I'll just mention that this senseless destruction of the environment is taking place close to home as well as nationwide.

Here in the Baltimore metropolitan area as well as in other metropolitan areas, air pollution is reaching crisis proportions.

Our factories, automobiles and office buildings spew forth sulfur oxides, hydrocarbons and particulate matter in dangerous quantities. These damage our health, causing bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema.

Air pollution covers this area with dirt and smoke, destroying its attractiveness and giving the area a bad name.

Air pollution increases the cost of living, as cleaning expenses rise.

And scientists tell us now that air pollution may be damaging and upsetting the world's weather.

What is needed in the Baltimore area and elsewhere are stiffer laws and stiffer penalties. At State and local level our present lax attitude no longer can be tolerated.

Very simply, the blatant pollution of our skies must stop.

We can no longer afford to treat our air as an aerial sewer.

Government and industry must join together in a massive effort to bring back clean air to the Baltimore area. We have the technology available to do the job. What we lack is the will.

The greatest natural resource in Maryland is the Chesapeake Bay. But even this has not escaped the heavy hand of man. The Director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's mid-Atlantic regional office in Charlottesville recently reported that each year $3 million worth of fish are lost because of pollution in the bay and its tributaries.

The point of all this is that man is now in the process of destroying his environment.

And let me interject here that man is part of this environment. It is a small point, perhaps, but an important one and is too frequently overlooked. Man does not exist on his environment. He exists within it.

Dr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., the Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service within the Public Health Service has said "unless our Nation learns and learns quickly to apply the scientific knowledge we have to the problems of the environment, we are courting inevitable disaster."

I would like to briefly review how the Congress has responded in the past years and what I think must be done if we are to restore the quality of our environment.

You may be surprised to know that in the past eight years Congress by and large has recognized the seriousness of the problems we face and has enacted into law a wide ranging and far reaching package of environmental legislation. Since 1960, under two Democratic administrations, we have passed more and better legislation than in any other period of our history.

Let me run down the list of legislative achievements.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 which provides for the establishment of quality standards for both State and interstate waterways.

The 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act which encourages the river basin approach and provides a massive financial authorization to construct water quality treatment plants.

The 1964 land and water conservation fund which provides financial assistance to the States for planning and acquisition of outdoor space for recreational purposes.

The 1968 wild and scenic rivers systems which seeks to protect the few remaining rivers we have that are in their natural state.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 which establishes a research and planning effort for means to dispose of millions of tons of garbage, rubbish, junk autos, and other litter that clog our cities and countryside.

The Clean Air Act of 1967 which authorizes the setting up of our quality control regions and directs HEW to establish air criteria for certain pollutants.

The list is, I think you will agree, an impressive one. Let me add to it 2 bills of my own that have been signed into law.

The first established an office of estuarine studies in the Department of the Interior to conduct a nationwide study of pollution in our estuaries. The bill was drafted so as to provide us with the first real analysis of the Nation's estuaries. This should be completed by this fall and will contain a follow-up program of action.

The second directs the Corps of Engineers to undertake the first nationwide survey of coastal erosion, to establish a list of priority control projects and to submit to the Congress a series of recommendations for the sensible, comprehensive protection of our shoreline.

Overall, then, the achievements of the last eight years have shown a remarkable awareness of the depth and scope of the problems involved in the restoration of our environment.

But there is a hitch, and that hitch is money. There does not seem to be enough of it.

The acts which I have mentioned are all authorizations. They permit the executive branch to spend money but they do not provide it with any funds. For this you need an appropriation. It is a double barrel process. First the authorization and then the appropriation.

But in the field of environmental legislation, the appropriations have been way below the authorizations. We have, in effect a money gap.

The 1969 fiscal year authorization for construction of water quality treatment plants was $700 million. Yet only $214 million of this was appropriated.

The combined total of the appropriations for the land and water conservation fund in fiscal 65, 66, 67, and 68 was less than the cost of a nuclear powered aircraft carrier of which we have one, are building a second, and planning a third.

Yet even with more money and with all this legislative authority, and with the growing recognition of the need to restore the quality of our environment, I believe very strongly that an essential element of any successful effort is absent.

We have legislation for trails and recreational funds. We have legislation for our pollution and desalinization, and so on and so forth.

But what we don't have is legislation providing for an overview. We haven't pulled it all together. No one in our government is looking at the big picture. Our efforts at environmental control are diversified and fragmented.

Some Federal agencies are involved in a portion of the environment but none of them is viewing it in its totality.

This is a great mistake, for our environment is a complex system, made up of different parts, but parts that are completely interrelated and form a single entity. It is also a great tragedy, for unless the environment is considered as a whole, our efforts to restore its quality will be half measures.

I am going therefore, to introduce legislation that will establish a new, small yet select office within the executive office of the White House to consider the overall environmental effects of the policies and projects of the many agencies within the Federal Government.

This office will be called the Office of Environmental Quality. It will be well staffed and amply financed. It would operate much like the Bureau of the Budget.

Its principal purpose, however, would be to review, through in-house research or by contract, Federal activity affecting the environment, and to render judgements on such activity.

I cannot help but be impressed by the tremendous resources we have in this country, their basic unity, and the need for all of us to try to maintain their quality. In this country today there is no more serious problem than the restoration of the environment. We simply must make the effort and spend the time and money to stop the abuses that have been taking place. Very simply. We must regain the integrity of our environment. As rational men in a rational age, we can do no less.

THE DAY I KNEW I BELONGED TO THE FLAG

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that those elements in our society who are working ceaselessly to subvert our youth have robbed so many young people of the deep pride and pleasure that comes from a sense of patriotism and from the knowledge of the glorious history of America.

Former President Eisenhower experienced this thrill countless times and expresses his feelings so wonderfully in his article "The Day I Knew I Belonged to the Flag," which appeared in the March 1969 edition of the Reader's Digest. I believe everybody should read it.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include it in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD:

THE DAY I KNEW I BELONGED TO THE FLAG

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States)

My first day at West Point—June 14, 1911—had been rough. My classmates and I had been barked at and ordered by upperclassmen to do all sorts of ridiculous chores, on the double. All 285 of us were weary and resentful.

Toward evening, however, we assembled outdoors and, with the American flag floating majestically above us, were sworn in as cadets of the United States Military Academy. It was an impressive ceremony. As I looked up at our national colors and swore my allegiance, I realized humbly that *now I belonged to the flag*. It is a moment I have never forgotten.

Later I became color sergeant of our class, and my final year at West Point it was my privilege to carry the American flag at all official parades and ceremonies. No honor could have meant more to me.

To tell you why I love and respect our flag so much would take a book, for it would be the long, brave story of America. Briefly, I love our flag because it is the most beautiful national banner of all, and because it stands, today as always, for the finest nation on earth.

Today we urgently need a new commitment to the basic principles that made our nation great. Our flag is the symbol of these principles, and I would hope that all of us might find some way to display it, not merely on patriotic holidays but every day in the year. Such a visible upsurge of respect for flag and country will do much to help bring about a new national solidarity, a renewed pride and faith in America.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR FINE YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, almost every day our newspapers and our radio and television newscasts report to us about the growing unrest among the Nation's youth. Hardly a day goes by that we do not hear of a campus riot or some sort of antiestablishment demonstration by protesting youth.

As a result of this spotlight on the negative aspects of a few young people an entire generation has been stigmatized as way-out hippies, yippies, and kooks.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Today, I would like to call my colleagues attention to a project undertaken by responsible young adults who more typically personify the majority of our Nation's youngsters.

In Fairfield, Conn., there is a young people's group called "Kids Who Kare."

A year ago this month, a young lady at Roger Ludlowe High School, Claudia Stephens, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Claud Stephens of Fairfield, Conn., brought together a group of her school friends to discuss what they could do for the servicemen fighting in Vietnam.

The teenagers decided to form a group to write letters and send packages of cookies, reading material, and other useful items to the boys from their town, serving their country in Vietnam.

From this meeting "Kids Who Kare" was born. The energetic young people set out with the drive and enthusiasm of youth and their contagious spirit infected their town's adults.

The first adult recruited was a banker, Jesse P. Sanford, vice president of the Connecticut National Bank, who was asked to handle the finances of the group and to receive any contributions that were sent in.

The young people then got the Remar Printing Co., of Bridgeport, to donate posters and forms which were placed in local stores and sent to GI's. The posters asked for donations of soap, cigarettes, shaving equipment, reading materials, and other items requested by the GI's. The forms were sent to each serviceman asking his needs.

For the past year, the dismal days of lonely GI's, in far-off Vietnam have been brightened by a package or a letter from a young person back home who cared enough to think of them.

How has their project been received? First, they have been an inspiration to the adults at home. The Fairfield Elks have loaned their hall for the packaging of monthly parcels to the GI's. The Fairfield Emblem Club helps the youngsters with the packaging and have given their all-out support.

The residents of Fairfield have also gone all out to help with donations of money and materials.

Most important, the servicemen know that someone at home really cares about them. The letters the men send back praise the young people and tell how their buddies wish that there were similar groups in their hometowns.

Here are a few examples of the GI's feelings. A U.S. marine, Ken Athens, wrote the young people:

> Hope you all do real good with school because it will show in the future. We are trying our best to win the hearts and minds of these people. And we are trying to show them the right road. I will never forget you and how you've treated me so good. Be good and take care. May God bless you now and forever.

Airman Mark E. Trupp, wrote the youngsters:

> There are not words that can express the way I feel about what you young people are doing for us over here.

Pfc. Richard Skudlarek wrote:

> Gestures like yours are a clear indication that there are some people back home who are aware that we are here.

Pvt. Bohden Howcra wrote:

> It really makes a guy feel great when he knows there are people like you back home who care.

The letters of thank you from our servicemen would fill a book and each one is treasured by these young people who care.

When you have youngsters in this country like the young men and young ladies of "Kids Who Kare" can there be

XUM

any doubt in anyone's mind that there still is a big, bright, beautiful tomorrow in store for America.

THE DEMISE OF FREE TELEVISION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of weeks ago I inserted in the RECORD my thoughts and comments relative to what I consider disturbing trends toward the possible and eventual elimination of free television to that of paid television. Preliminary hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the Federal Communications Commission has failed to allay my concerns.

In the last day or so I have observed further public announcements which, unfortunately, substantiate my fears. For example, I would like to insert an article from the March 23 edition of the Washington Post, in which the famous name of Howard Hughes appears concerning this matter. In addition, I would like to include an article which appeared in the March 21 edition of the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich., which touches on the matter of paid television.

While both of these articles, which will follow at the conclusion of my remarks, center on the sports field, I think it is quite obvious that such paid television operations could and would be quickly expanded to include practically all free television as we know it today. The news articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1969]

BID FOR FOOTBALL TELECASTS IS NEXT MOVE: HUGHES MINES PAY-TV GOLD

(By Dave Brady)

PALM SPRINGS, CALIF., March 22.—On a clear day in the sparkling desert air of Las Vegas, Howard Hughes can see beyond the outer limits of free television. And into the golden horizon of pay TV.

As a first step toward making that vision a reality, he has bought Sports Network, Inc., from Dick Bailey for some $16 million. Bailey built it from a "country store" operation into its present worth. Hughes is taking it from there.

Bailey is still minding the store for Hughes in the canyons of Manhattan, but the firm is doing business as Hughes Sports Network.

As a warning signal to the established major networks that he is ready to poach on their domains, possibly to the extent of eventually building a conventional news and entertainment rival, Hughes has bought for nearly one-half million dollars the right to carry highlights of National and American football league games in 1969 and 1970.

It is a trifling deal for a man of Hughes' stature, but it is a sampling of what he has in mind. Bailey was a bit prudent when he was asked whether Hughes would bid against the three major networks for pro football game telecasts in 1970, when the contracts of the Columbia Broadcasting System and National Broadcasting Co. expire.

"I'll say this—we are very interested in pro football," Bailey said in New York. "We can handle anything."

A source closer to Hughes was not nearly so cautious once he was assured anonymity. "Hughes is going to bid for the pro football game telecasts," he said.

Commissioner Pete Rozelle said that CBS and NBC, which have been televising the NFL and AFL games, respectively, would be extended the courtesy of bidding first on a combined package in 1970. He also said that the complexity of it might require two networks.

But despite Rozell's enthusiasm for prime-time Monday night telecasts to attract more revenue, the networks have not shown a mutual interest because of conflicts with high-rated entertainment programs.

Also, the talk along Madison Avenue is that sponsors have reached the choking price for game telecasts on Sunday, when there are no serious conflicts.

It is into this vacuum that Hughes is tempted to test his big-dealing expertise, backed by indeterminate financial resources.

As his man Bailey said, "We can handle anything the other networks can. We have the equipment, the personnel and the know-how. Ten of our key people represent more than 200 years experience in radio and TV.

"Mr. Hughes has the resources. All we have to have is the product."

Queried about the dream of zillions of dollars to be made from pay TV, which pro football owners secretly nurture, Bailey said, "We are in a position to handle it but what our policy will be on it, I am not prepared to say until the right time."

Pro football has reached a plateau of diminishing returns with costs still rising and other sources of revenue such as gate receipts drying up. The commissioner's office admitted as much here this week, when it pointed out that the NFL is already playing to 87.1 per cent stadium capacity and the AFL 74.8.

The clubs are reduced to inching up their ticket prices in an era when the population of 21,000 in mountain-locked Palm Springs has learned to live with the idea of paying $7 a month to pull in its entertainment by Community Antenna Television, or doing without. CATV is pay TV, any way you slice it.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Mar. 21, 1969]

HARVEY POINTS OUT DANGERS OF "COMING-SOON" PAY-TV

(By Robert D. G. Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Sports fans, don't be surprised if the time comes when it will cost a dollar or two to watch your favorite team on television.

The Federal Communications Commission is scheduled to start accepting applications in the next few months for pay television stations.

At the start, Subscription Television (STV) will be limited to the largest cities. Under FCC rules, Detroit will be immediately eligible for a pay-TV outlet. Three outstate markets—Grand Rapids-Kalamazoo, Flint-Saginaw-Bay City and Lansing-Jackson—do not qualify for a STV station but are close to the line.

FCC regulations scheduled to take effect June 12 are written to prevent pay-TV stations from "siphoning" away sporting events and other programs now shown free on television.

But there is a large body of opinion that holds that once STV gets a foothold, it will swallow up the best of network television. Viewers will have to pay for the most popular movies, programs and sporting events that they now see free, the argument goes.

Others contend that pay-TV will be just another medium in the entertainment field, taking its place alongside television, radio, movies and the theater.

Rep. James Harvey, R-Saginaw, a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which oversees the FCC, believes the siphoning away of sports events from free television to STV is about to begin.

FCC rules would prohibit this, but Harvey believes professional sports sooner or later would find a way around the prohibition.

"As objectionable as the average American may often find 'commercials' on TV today, I do not believe he would took favorably upon the necessary for paying outright to see a sporting event that he has been watching for free," Harvey said.

"The FCC would, of course, deny that this will come about. But the testimony at our hearings, coupled with events described in the articles to which I have referred, makes clear that professional football on pay-TV is indeed what is in store."

NATIONAL CONCERN FOR DECENCY LED BY OUR YOUTH

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a national concern for decency spreading across the land today, and it is being led by the youth of America. This is one of the most refreshing and exciting things developing in our beloved country today.

The scope of the "Crusade for Decency" is reflected in last Sunday's rally at the Orange Bowl Stadium in Miami, Fla., when 30,000 young people demonstrated their interest against the flow of obscene materials and pornographic magazines and movies.

In my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., a group of young people are forming a decency drive, emulating the Miami youth. I plan to assist them in this effort through a congressional youth forum I am sponsoring in Jacksonville on April 12, 1969. I include two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the Miami rally and on the youth plans in Jacksonville.

On January 29 I introduced a bill, H.R. 5171, which is designed to curb the alarming flow of obscene materials to our youth. It is pending in the House Judiciary Committee. This bill, together with two identical subsequent bills, H.R. 6186 and H.R. 7167, has 40 cosponsors. Because it is similar to a New York State statute which was upheld by the Supreme Court last April in Ginsberg against New York, I am confident that my legislation will also be upheld.

Similar legislation is being introduced in the Senate today by Senator JAMES B. ALLEN, of Alabama, with a group of important cosponsors.

Since I introduced H.R. 5171, I have received hundreds of letters from all over the country expressing support for this measure.

John Grace, lieutenant commissioner of the Salvation Army, stated in a recent letter:

> We are appalled at the volume of pornographic literature that seems to find its way into the hands of youth, and certainly, any move that can be made to protect our young people is a move in the right direction. We have written Chairman Celler . . . asking that he expedite action on this bill.

Winfrey C. Link, a member of the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, wrote me:

XUM

> I hope your bill is successful. We desperately need controls for minors.

Sam Wolgemuth, president of Youth for Christ International, said in a letter to Chairman Celler:

> I am joining with others in urging hearings on the bill sponsored by Congressman Charles E. Bennett, H.R. 5171. I wholeheartedly support this bill, believing that there would be tremendous value nationwide in its passage.

The President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Walter Varney Magee, told me:

> The General Federation of Women's Clubs would wish to go on record as being strongly in favor of the legislation. . . . We intend to make H.R. 5171 the subject of a Legislative Bulletin in the near future. . . . We shall consider it a privilege to support it in any way we can.

These are but four of the many distinguished Americans who have offered their support and help in the effort to obtain the enactment of this vital legislation. Others include: The International Association of Chiefs of Police; Columbia; the Knights of Columbus magazine; the Young Men's Christian Association; Billy Casper, the famous golfer; the National Urban League, and the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, there exists today a tremendous need to create some kind of control over what may be distributed to minors through the mails, and in interstate commerce. It is no longer possible for a parent to protect his children from pornography by himself. If any Member wishes to join the 40 cosponsors of this measure, I hope he will contact my office.

The cosponsors are: E. Ross Adair, Republican, of Indiana, Watkins M. Abbitt, Democrat, of Virginia, Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York, Walter S. Baring, Democrat, of Nevada, Benjamin B. Blackburn, Republican, of Georgia, Tom Bevill, Democrat, of Alabama, James A. Byrne, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Earle Cabell, Democrat, of Texas, R. Lawrence Coughlin, Republican, of Pennsylvania, Tim Lee Carter, Republican, of Kentucky, Edward J. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois, William L. Dickinson, Republican, of Alabama, Harold D. Donohue, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Edwin W. Edwards, Democrat, of Louisiana, O. C. Fisher, Democrat, of Texas, Louis Frey, Jr., Republican, of Florida, George A. Goodling, Republican, of Pennsylvania, Charles H. Griffin, Democrat, of Mississippi, Tom S. Gettys, Democrat, of South Carolina, James A. Haley, Democrat, of Florida, F. Edward Hébert, Democrat, of Louisiana, Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California, Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York, Richard Ichord, Democrat, of Missouri, Carleton J. King, Republican, of New York, John Kyl, Republican, of Iowa, Donald E. Lukens, Republican, of Ohio, Glenard P. Lipscomb, Republican, of California, Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois, W. R. Poage, Democrat, of Texas, Alexander Pirnie, Republican, of New York, Howard W. Pollock, Republican, of Alaska, John R. Rarick, Democrat, of Louisiana, Herman T. Schneebeli, Republican, of Pennsylvania, Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat, of Florida, Frank A. Stubblefield, Democrat, of Kentucky, James B. Utt, Republican, of California, Joseph P. Vigorito, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Lester L. Wolff, Democrat, of New York, Lawrence G. Williams, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

The following news story and editorial are pertinent:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Mar. 25, 1969]

YOUTH MAY STAGE DECENCY DRIVE HERE

(By Tom Sawyer)

A teen-age "decency crusade" may be staged in Jacksonville this summer.

Representatives of the county's high school student councils say the possibility is being explored.

Sunday, a youth crusade for decency in entertainment drew 30,000 persons to the Orange Bowl in Miami.

Jim Lanahan, 17, president of the Bishop Kenny student council, said a local program may be staged at the Gator Bowl.

The possibility of a rally was revealed during a press conference Monday by the Student Action Committee of the county's associated student councils.

The students said they hoped to expand on the program presented at Miami, but added that nothing yet has been arranged.

The committee currently is studying drug abuse in local schools, and indicated it also plans to look into other problems such as student unrest, dress codes, drinking and sex.

Drinking currently is a much bigger problem here, but drug use has received more publicly, the student group said.

It estimated that only 5 percent of students have experimented with pep pills, glue-sniffing or drugs, but one female member of the committee called the estimate low.

EASILY OBTAINED

"I could get drugs whenever I wanted to," she said, adding they were widespread at her school.

While declaring that the drug problem has been "blown up" here, the committee said it is establishing a five-point program for dealing with the situation in schools. It includes:

Presenting an assembly program at each high school, featuring experts in the fields of drug abuse.

Supplying students with a list of doctors they can go to for confidential counseling.

Sending drug experts to the schools for individual counseling.

Distributing literature on drugs to all students.

Supplying through local news media drug information for parents and students thereby "helping to close the generation gap."

Paul Harden, 17, of Andrew Jackson High School, said if the program proves successful in high schools it will be expanded to junior high schools.

"We feel education is the best road to take in reaching the drug user or potential drug user, because if students knew the physical and mental damage they faced when they experimented with drugs they would never begin," Harden said.

Tom Cornelson, editor of the school newspaper at Forrest High School, said that when he was a sophomore students would laugh if you talked about a drug problem in school; when he was a junior it was acknowledged and now as a senior the use of drugs is accepted and expanding.

The Student Action Committee meets every Monday night at the Duval Medical Society building. Its meetings are open to the public.

FED-UP YOUNG PEOPLE SPEAK OUT

The "Crusade for Decency" launched at a rally of 30,000 in Miami's Orange Bowl under the initiative of that city's teen-agers and which snowballed under spontaneous, community-wide backing is the sort of good news for which most of the nation hungers.

Most of the big names in show business who were in Miami at the time, including Jackie Gleason, Anita Bryant, Ted Mack, the Lettermen, and many others, appeared at the rally not to lead, but to applaud the determination of the young organizers to demand entertainment free of vulgarity and obscenity and to boycott all those who refuse to get their message.

The rally was sparked, strangely enough, when a popular rock and roll group put on a nauseating show in Miami.

Mike Levesque, a Miami Springs High School student, and other members of his church study group, were credited with originating the rally idea as an answer to the offensive performance and to demonstrate for established beliefs including love of country, love of God and equality of all men.

Clergymen of all faiths gave their help, but left the leadership in their hands.

The electrifying response by the people of Miami, sometimes regarded as blase and sophisticated, is an encouraging barometric reading on the nation's mood. It is a testimonial that the great majority of the nation's youth are at least keeping pace, if not ahead of their elders in their digust with the open commercialization of depravity. It is reassuring to all who recognize that today's youth are the only hope for the nation's future.

Alert and responsible young people in Jacksonville and elsewhere are moving in the same direction as the Miami rally-organizers in their efforts among their peers to fight the evil of drugs through friend-to-friend logic free of preaching.

When enough Americans, young and old, become sufficiently fed up with filth to speak out for decency, filth will recede down the drain.

CCC SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 584, which requests a supplemental appropriation of $1 billion to restore the capital funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This request has become necessary this year, rather than next year as originally scheduled, because of a whole series of unexpected developments. Lower market prices for our 1968 crops, a most harmful and prolonged dock strike, and thus a larger backup of grains here in the United States, have all been factors in the need to advance this funding authority.

We are advised that the borrowing limit of $14.5 billion for CCC is nearly exhausted or will be this month, so that it is necessary to take prompt action.

I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this resolution in order to prevent further financial hardship on our producers.

It should be pointed out that emergency of CCC loan funds should not be considered as a fault of either the CCC or of farmers. Farmers have lived within the lines as laid down by the Congress. The CCC has only been carrying out the provisions of the charter as approved by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this resolution is an urgent necessity, it will not upset the budget, and the limited relief that it provides to our producers is most important.

HARRY S. GENUNG: HE SPREADS THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Harry S. Genung of Minneapolis, a longtime friend of mine, epitomizes the patriotic American who is seeking, as an individual, to instill the values of democracy among people throughout the world.

He and his wife conceived the idea of spreading democracy's value through the distribution of school yearbooks. The opportunity for young people in other nations to see another side of American youth is an enlightening experience. It will lead to a greater understanding of our Nation.

The Genung's program is called "Y-O-U—Yearbooks Offer Understanding." I feel very strongly that this program can do much to contribute to teach ing the values of democracy in foreign lands. It is a project which deserves support and encouragement.

I insert in the Record two articles which more fully explain this imaginative program. The first is an article in the November 1954, issue of Torch and Trefoil, published at North Dakota State College, entitled "Yearbooks Offer Understanding." The second is an article contained in the January 1969, issue of NEW, published by the Unity School of Christianity, Lee's Summit, Mo., entitled "Harry S. Genung: He Spreads the American Dream":

Yearbooks Offer Understanding

(By Ardean Rystad)

"Yearbooks Offer Understanding," originated by Mr. Harry Genung of Minneapolis, Minnesota, is a program that consists of mailing copies of yearbooks or college annuals to colleges, universities, and schools of other nations, in hopes that they, through the media of pictures, illustrations, etc., will lead to a true understanding of the average American student by the students and youth of other lands.

Alpha Lambda Chapter at North Dakota State in Fargo, North Dakota, took on this program as one of its projects for 1954. The chapter was able to obtain about 200 college annuals from two other colleges together with those rounded up on our own campus. The College Blue Book was used to find the names and mailing addresses of colleges in other nations. A letter was inserted which explained the program and stated that we would be pleased to receive any information about their school and themselves which would help us to get a true picture of them. Quoting from the letter itself, "Troubles among nations begin with misunderstandings. We want you to better understand the American college student through examining this book. We hope that you will use this book. If you care for another book next year, we would appreciate a letter from you." A mimeographed list of Alpha Phi Omega members of this chapter was also enclosed, together with complete addresses.

Books were sent to thirty-two different countries including most of South America, Mexico, much of Europe, and even behind the Iron Curtain into Russia and its satellites.

An assembly line for getting the books ready for mailing was set up one evening after a chapter meeting, in the basement of our college library. We wrapped each book with a light cardboard called "flexpack" and then inserted them in No. 20 envelopes.

The activity was publicized by the local newspapers, our college paper, and was mentioned at one of the student senate meetings. It was well thought of by everyone and Alpha Lambda Chapter gained new friends.

We had lots of fun, and if we're able to obtain yearbooks next year, we shall continue our participation in the program of Y.-O.-U.

This is an excellent project, and we recommend it to all chapters of Alpha Phi Omega. Any chapter desiring further information about Y.-O.-U. may obtain it by writing to Donald Hanson, President of Alpha Lambda Chapter, 1016 Fourth Street, North, Fargo, North Dakota.

He Spreads the American Dream

For 25 years Harry S. Genung stood before students—in this country and the Philippines—teaching the values of democracy. Today, from his home in Minneapolis, the 66-year-old teacher and world traveler is helping instill those same values in young people around the world.

Genung is the founder of YOU (Yearbooks Offer Understanding), a project sparked by a German student's letter, received while Genung was teaching in a Minneapolis high school. Europe was still recovering from World War II in 1948, and Genung helped some of his students send a CARE package overseas. Soon a thank-you letter arrived from Martin Girschner, a former Hilter youth who had since become president of a German Boys Club. Girschner asked many questions—about the school, the country, about the American people. *Der Fuhrer* had commanded him to hate. There was one question Genung couldn't forget: "Do you teach democracy in your school?"

The next year Genung and his class sent another CARE parcel to the same German boys and included a high school yearbook. A boy wrote back: "Your book is a gesture of friendship and goodwill which will help make peace in the world."

Genung had found a way to answer the questions of Martin Girschner and others like him who wonder if America really does practice what it propagandizes. Since then Genung has sent yearbooks from high schools and colleges in every state to more than 50 foreign countries.

"What better way to show democracy in practice," he asked, "than to show the youth of other countries how our own young people live? And what could be a better barometer of American youth than a school yearbook!"

Genung's voice projects a contagious excitement as he explains that YOU feeds minds, just as CARE feeds bodies. "Yearbooks don't say in bold print, 'Here is democracy'—they show it.

"How can a Japanese youth accuse the United States of intolerance when he sees a Japanese-American pictured as president of the senior class in some yearbook? And how can an African label all of us 'prejudiced' when he sees a Negro boy as captain of an American school's debating team!

"Another thing, yearbooks show teachers and students working together—through student councils, student papers, on the yearbook itself. These active examples of democratic life, along with pictures of scholastic Societies—French clubs and foreign affairs groups and all the rest—show foreign students that American kids are more than hotrodders and juvenile delinquents."

Quoting from memory, Genung explained, "Right now the Russians are publishing 720 times as much information for overseas distribution as we are. Last year they shipped over three and one-half billion pieces of propaganda into democratic and uncommitted nations; the best USIA (United States Information Agency) ever did in one year was five million pieces."

Genung insists YOU is a joint effort of many people. "One company furnishes me yearbooks—I had to buy some in the early days, but that doesn't happen too often anymore. Another company furnishes the cartons People-to-People (ex-President Eisenhower's international good will program) coordinates distribution."

In addition, young people at youth centers and settlement houses and boys' homes stamp each book on the inside cover (the stamped letters to Americans shown in the book). "This stamping is a big thing with the youngsters," says Genung, "and it gives our own young people a chance to do something for world peace."

Harry Genung—educator, statesman, traveler, crusader—summarized the reasons behind his years of work when he explained a void in his own life: "My wife and I never had any children of our own. So, we've adopted the youth of the world instead."

CONGRESS FORCING CENSUS INVASION OF PRIVACY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted intrusion of Government into the private lives of the people is illustrated by the growing and understandable resentment of Americans against questions asked them under provisions of the U.S. census.

In an era when the Government's tax bite so deeply affects citizens economically, it adds unconscionable insult to monetary injury when census takers delve into the intimate aspects of family life. I support congressional reform that will eliminate this invasion of privacy and put the census back into its proper perspective—a count of the number of people living in this country.

On February 20, 1969, WCAU radio in Philadelphia, Pa., broadcast an editorial which cuts to the heart of the census matter. I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial and am pleased to enter it into the Congressional Record.

WCAU radio believes the American people are getting sick and tired of being numbered, indexed, cataloged, pigeonholed, and having their privacy invaded.

We believe most of them will be outraged by the mandatory provisions of the 1970 census. Fines of $100 and 3 months in prison may be the lot of anyone refusing to answer some of the very personal questions they would not think of answering for their neighbors.

The U.S. Constitution calls for a count of the number of people in this country every 10 years so that Representatives and direct taxes may be apportioned among the States. It calls for nothing more. But Congress has seen fit to make mandatory, under threat of severe penalty, the answering of questions having nothing to do with a head count.

There is a 20-question short form that more than covers the needs of the Government, but the House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics has approved a long form checking into 68 areas of our lives.

It inquires into whether you share a bathroom, what are your savings, dividends, stock, interest, alimony payments, tips, bonuses, physical disabilities, marital record, and ownership of appliances. We have no doubt such information would be of great value to many phases of business. WCAU radio does not believe, however, answering such questions should be mandatory, but given voluntarily. WCAU radio holds Congress should adopt regulations making the bare enumeration mandatory as prescribed in the Constitution. We think forcing people to answer personal questions for the benefit of any segment of our society is revolting.

MOLLY LUDWIG HAYS McCAULY OFTEN KNOWN AS "MOLLY PITCHER"

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, recognition has again come to the Hal J. Rucker family, of Midland, Tex. This time, the youngest son, Douglas, age 12, has brought honor to the family and he is the third member of the family to be awarded a medal in the American History Month essay contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Douglas received the medal for an essay on Molly Pitcher. He has now won first place in the city of Midland, and first place in the State for 1969.

I submit this interesting and stimulating essay for the consideration of the readers of the RECORD.

The essay follows:

MOLLY LUDWIG HAYS MCCAULY

Molly McCauly was a heroine of the American Revolution. She was born near Trenton, New Jersey, the daughter of John George Ludwig, a farmer who had come to the colonies from Germany.

In 1769, at the age of 15, Molly took a job in Philadelphia as a maid. Later that same year, she married John Caspar Hays, a Philadelphia barber, who enlisted in the army in December, 1775.

After Hays left with the Seventh Pennsylvania Regiment, Molly's parents sent a courier to pick her up and bring her to their home. It is said that the courier brought a secret letter to Molly, sent by her husband for her to come to her parent's farm so that he might possibly see her. She had a long, tiresome ride because of poor roads and the only way to get there was on horseback.

Molly was with the army during the Battle of Monmouth. Molly was 24 years old at this time. The battle was fought on a June day in 1778, one of the hottest days of the year. The battle was from nine o'clock in the morning until night. It was so hot that it was said that fifty men died of thirst and others were very thirsty. Molly found a spring that is today still a historic spot, and carried the water to the men in a cannoneer's bucket. This was done under fire and shelter and the sight of Molly with her "pitcher" was a joyful sight to the tired and thirsty soldiers. The soldiers gave her the sobriquet, "Molly Pitcher".

Molly constantly watched the battery where her husband was a gunner and when she saw a soldier lying by his gun, she rushed there to see if it was her husband. She found him wounded and she sprung to his place and kept his gun in action the rest of the battle.

For this brave action she was praised by General Nathaniel Greene and was made an honorary sergeant by George Washington. She was also called "Major Molly" by the soldiers.

Molly always wanted to help other people. She was very interested in the war, and being a good patriot and an enemy in her heart of the redcoats. She felt it necessary to risk her life by taking her place at the gun and to transport water to the thirsty men.

The battle was won with the help of this strong, courageous woman. The state of New Jersey was the first to give honor to Molly Pitcher. At Freehold, New Jersey there is a monument with five tablets around it, one of which commemorates her heroism.

Several years after the death of John Hays she married a man that was a comrade of her husband, named George McKolly. This name was changed so that after her death it became McCauly.

The last years of her life were spent in Carlisle, where she had kept a small store, located not far from the house where Major André and Lt. Despard had been confined in 1776. Molly died the 22nd day of January, 1832 and was buried in the old Graveyard, then known as the English Graveyard in Carlisle, where many of the prominent citizens are buried.

Mrs. Mary McKolly was 90 years of age when she died. Her last name was written McKolly, McAuley, and on her tombstone it was McCauly.

She had served her country so well that she had been honored by the different states and had received a pension from the government during the latter years of her life. We remember her with honor.

HOW CAN I EXIST ON SOCIAL SECURITY ALONE?

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills aiding those who live on social security. Many of the estimated 80,000 people in my district who receive social security checks each month have this as their only means of income. This is true throughout the country. Most of these people have worked all their lives—but inflation, medical expenses, and the cost of living have consumed their savings. I have been in many of their homes and have been unable to answer the question, "How can I exist on social security alone?" A change is needed.

The bills I have introduced are not the complete solution, but they are positive means which will help. The first bill provides for an automatic increase in social security benefits each time the Consumer Price Index rises by at least 3 percent. In this manner, the increase in the cost of living can be met. The second bill would allow those living on social security to earn up to $3,000 annually and still receive full benefits. The present earning restriction of $1,680 is unrealistic based on today's living costs.

BIG JIM FARLEY: TUMULT, GRACE

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an interesting article on the Honorable James Farley by Richard Ryan which appeared in the Tablet of Thursday, March 13, 1969.

Mr. Ryan has given us an interesting account of this outstanding American:

BIG JIM FARLEY: TUMULT, GRACE

(By Richard Ryan)

There is, on the walls of his office, the kind of wordless biography that speaks quietly about James Aloysius Farley. The paneled office at Coca-Cola serve as a gallery for all these pictures that speak of Big Jim's time and epoch in American history when politics was boisterous and intense, pushing and shoving, fierce, loud, and terribly human. There are pictures of this man at a dinner or walking the street or standing in a room with someone like Lyndon Johnson or Pope Paul or Richard Nixon. There are bright new glossies and photos tanned by time and on each of them there are these affectionate apostrophes to a great patriot, a good friend, a loyal advisor. There are pictures of his family and his grandchildren. There are pictures of Jim Farley sitting in a room with Franklin Roosevelt and there is a picture of Jim Farley leaning over the shoulder of John Kennedy at a dinner in New York two weeks before another dinner in Dallas.

They are part of the memories of this man who, across his 80 years, has been the personal friend of seven Presidents, the confidante and campaign manager of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the architect who has watched the Democratic Party mature and become petulant and discover some of its own dignity and turn cranky and edgy and then move back again toward its own adulthood. The chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation since 1940, he has in his office relics that speak of things that will always be fond, cherished, part of him.

EX-POSTMASTER GENERAL

There are, you see, things in his office that speak of things that are gone, from another day, the seed of everything that is now and future. Over in the corner, a tinted majestic bronze bust of Farley by Paul Manship that was given to him by the employees of the New York City Post Office after his retirement as U.S. Postmaster General in 1940, seems to look out solemnly at the desk and the newspapers strewn on the floor and at the street below on Madison Ave. There is a samurai sword given to him in the Orient, as well as a delicately magnificent replica of a rickshaw encased in glass.

And if the pictures and the inscriptions and the long-ago gifts carry with them a nostalgia for the man and his era, there is in another corner of the room something that recalls the memory of any childhood when the name of James Farley was gospel for the Irish and for the people coming off boats, coming here to this country to make their fortune and climb their mountain.

In one corner of the room there is one of these proud old cabinet radios that was in every home years ago when the voices of Gabriel Heatter and Lowell Thomas brought into the living room and into the kitchen, solemnly and gravely, the good news tonight.

And for those of us sitting around waiting for the half-hour miracle of the Lone Ranger or I Love a Mystery, there were always the shushing from an intense father who nodded silently at the adventures of the people like Jim Farley and Al Smith and Jimmy Walker, who dominated and cajoled his age.

CHARM AND PASSION

For the Irish coming into this town during the Depression, the stature and achievements of men like Farley and Smith and Walker sustained them and lifted them over the lean weeks and prodded them on with the dream that perhaps they, their own children, their own family might one day bring into politics some of the charm and some of the passion that people like Farley held out as good and noble, something to be admired, a rough and tumble sacrament that could lift up and transform a whole city, a nation.

For the black man looking up and out, the thread of hope for tomorrow was there in the glories and achievements of Joe Louis. For the Irish it was there in the 6'2½'' outline of Big Jim Farley, with his straw hat and unrehearsed smile and the massive imprint he had made in politics and the standard he had left for those who would come out of the tenements and the local wards later on.

And now sitting in his office and talking casually about the young in this country and about some of his own mildly disappointing memories like losing the re-election to the Assembly in 1923 and of never having achieved his dream of sitting in the State Senate, the words bring back some of that warm, gentle orthodoxy from an Irish living room when parents and uncles and relatives would, in another day, respond to Heatter and the cabinet radio and the news of their day with the kind of reverent awe that has gone out of our conversation on politics and society.

HUMOR, HOPE, HUMANITY

There is in any conversation with this man the memory of some long ago Irish uncle because there is in everything he says, whether in speaking of Presidents or Popes or young people or another election, there is always the husky-throated humor and hope and simple, shimmering humanity. Jim Farley can sit in a room with you and tell you that perhaps the two greatest Presidents who ever lived in this country were, if only for the social legislation they passed, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Lyndon Baines Johnson. He numbers Harry Truman among the five greatest Presidents of our country and will tell you that New York has never had a Governor like Al Smith or a Mayor as popular and friendly as Jimmy Walker. "This man, with all his faults, was the acme of loyalty."

Warming to his subject, he will also tell you that Hubert Humphrey would be sitting in the White House today if the McCarthy and Kennedy forces had dropped their differences, closed ranks after the convention and supported Humphrey and Muskie. The name of McCarthy comes out and the smile dilutes into puzzlement, disappointment.

The future leadership of the Democratic Party, he will tell you, will have to come out of the Senate and the House because it is in these two chambers, according to Farley, that the ball game is played. He talks of his time as campaign manager for Roosevelt and of his disagreement with him over a third term. He talks also of his disappointment when Al Smith was defeated in the presidential nomination of 1924 and defeated for the presidency in 1928. He talks of the differences that television has made in political campaigns and noted how men of real ability sometimes simply don't appear as well on television as a flashier, more charming, no-talent opponent. He talks optimistically of New York City as the greatest city in the world "despite all of its new buildings," calling it "a strong religious city" with probably more to offer the people coming into it than any place in the country.

NEW POLITICS: A HOAX

The Democratic and Republican Parties will never, he feels, be replaced by the Conservative or Liberal groups. You see, for Jim Farley, there is only little boy optimism when speaking about the Democratic Party. He knocks no one. And the idea of a New Politics is, as far as James Aloysius Farley is concerned, a hoax. But all of it, the memories, the optimism about tomorrow, the conjectures on past elections and what-might-have-been defeats, the comparisons of the strong, other-era personalities, all of it is the blood and adrenalin and breath of this man.

You don't talk about this man and his time as something out of the past because there is in everything that he did and in everything that he talks about so much of the flare and virtue that have gone out of politics but that are still possible, still a hope. He has given to politics an elan and an honesty that in some areas have gone out of style. He has given to it much more than he has received. And no one, in any career or in any age, can be asked for more than this. In an era of tumult, he has been part of its grace.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STAND ON THE QUOTA ISSUE

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the domestic mink rancher has been outlined several times on the House floor and has been heard in 1967 before the U.S. Tariff Commission and in 1968 before the House Ways and Means Committee. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that mink imports today make up 53 percent of the total domestic consumption and have driven 56 percent of our mink ranchers out of business since 1960. Because of this serious situation, mink ranchers have repeatedly asked Congress for a quota limitation of imports, but failing in that, they are willing to work for voluntary quotas with their main competitors.

To illustrate this I am inserting an article which appeared in the March issue of the National Fur News:

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STAND ON THE QUOTA ISSUE

(By Galen E. "Gene" Broyles)

The first hint of President Nixon's stand on the quota problem came out during his February 6th press conference.

The question asked was: "Mr. President, during the election campaign, you said you would seek international agreements to limit the import of certain textiles. Can you tell us when you plan to get around to doing that? Also, can you give us some idea as to what you feel about the growing of protectionism in Congress?"

"I take a dim view of this tendency to move toward quotas and other methods that may become permanent, whether they are applied here or by other nations abroad," Nixon said.

"Second, as far as the textile situation is concerned, that is a special problem which has caused very great distress in certain parts of the country, and to a great number of wage earners, as well as to those who operate our textile facilities.

"For that reason, exploratory discussions have taken place, and will be taking place with the major countries involved to see if we can handle this on a volunteer basis, rather than having to go to legislation, which would impose quotas and, I would think, turn the clock back in our objective of trying to achieve freer trade."

Could the mink industry, with government help, explore the possibility of voluntary quotas with our principal competitors?

Others are turning in this direction. The steel industry has been working for many months on voluntary quotas. Effective January 1, 1969, the European coal and steel community and Japan have agreed to reduce their exports to the U.S. This year, they will be cut back by some 2½ million tons. They will then be allowed to raise their exports no more than 5% in 1970 and another 5% in 1971. These arrangements were worked out in co-operation with our State Department. They intend to maintain the present mixture of steel products in their sales to the United States.

Will this be the trend? Dozens of industries in the United States are being hurt by excessive imports. Senator Everett Dirksen thought President Nixon made a mistake by not mentioning steel as a special problem in his press conference on February 6th. His state is a major steel producer. Dirksen questioned whether voluntary restrictions, agreed to by other nations, will reduce imports to a satisfying level. He stated that he would not rule out a quota bill for steel. Senator Vance Hartke, of Indiana, who has sponsored a steel bill, said he welcomed Dirksen's support.

As has been said many times, the pressure mounts on both sides. Some industries are profiting by freer trade. Others are suffering. Perhaps there is a ray of hope in that our new president has stated that he will work with industries that are in trouble.

As mink ranchers, we must work every angle. There is only one course of action. Whether it's by quota, or on a voluntary basis, the pressure must come from our congressmen. They are representatives of the people who make up our various industries.

The pressure has got to be put on through introduction of bills in the Senate and in the House as we did in last year's session of the Congress. Because of the work we did last time. I am confident we can double our support. We are now more experienced in how to go about getting bills sponsored. Last time, we introduced 60 bills in the House and the two bills in the Senate were supported by 25 Senators.

This gets our problem in front of government officials so they can logically study our position. The previous administration, at the executive level, refused to even look at the problem. President Johnson repeatedly stated that any quota bills laid on his desk would be promptly vetoed.

Mr. President, you've recognized that the textile people have a problem and you will work on it. The mink ranchers of the United States also have a problem and we have a right to expect that you will give the same kind of attention to our good citizens.

The United States founded the mink industry as a sound agricultural pursuit. American mink ranchers are entitled to live and prosper in a market that has now become world-wide.

LIBERAL NEWSMAN FIRED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes forget how hard free speech is to come by and how much harder it is to preserve. While we think of ways and means to tell the media what to do and what to say, we should be reminded that there are already too many people offering that advice. Last week a bright young radio newscaster lost his job in Chicago—not because he was faithless to the traditions of integrity, rather because he took them seriously.

The airwaves are less free in Chicago with Jeff Kamen not broadcasting. Hopefully, that will be remedied. The more difficult question is how we curtail our itch to silence anybody that disagrees with us. Two columnists from Chicago described the circumstances of Mr. Kamen's discharge very well. An article by Jack Mabley of Chicago's American and an article by Dean Gysel of Chicago's Daily News tell the story.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Mar. 19, 1969]

MABLEY'S REPORT

The climate inside the office is uniform, 365 days of the year. We can't open the windows to let in the fresh air because it throws off the regulators, or something. At least our windows open. On the new buildings you're sealed in.

Jeff Kamen, a news reporter of WCFL, owned and operated by the Chicago Federation of Labor, William A. Lee, pres., called. "I got fired," he said.

It was hard for me to grasp how one news organization, WCFL, could at one and the same time provide air time for Howard Miller and Jeff Kamen, who represent, respectively, as far right and as far left as you can reasonably go on the mass media. My puzzlement was justified. There is not room for both.

Kamen said that Lew M. Witz, general manager of WCFL, told him:

"I'm sick and tired of hearing all those niggers and Puerto Ricans screaming on our radio station. I just can't stand to have Mr. Lee upset by the mayor's calling him up on the telephone and complaining about you."

Witz said this morning:

"I never made that statement or any statement resembling it to Mr. Kamen. I am shocked that he would say such a thing."

WCFL said Kamen was fired, as of 8 a.m. yesterday, because of a "policy rift." For a 25-year-old, that's pretty big potatoes.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 19, 1969]

WCFL FIRES LIBERAL NEWSMAN

(By Dean Gysel)

WCFL radio has fired its zealous young newsman Jeff Kamen in what station general manager Lew M. Witz called a "policy difference."

Kamen said he was fired because of his liberal social-political attitudes.

He said City Hall and William A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor-Industrial Union Council, which owns WCFL, criticized his anti-establishment documentaries and Sunday night reports.

Kamen said Witz complained that he (Kamen) paid too much attention to the problems of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, and too openly espoused left wing views.

Witz in turn said, "It was a long series of things that we weren't pleased with. It was very painful for us to do it. He's an aggressive reporter but sometimes he goes past the stage of reporting and injects his own feelings, which is not our news policy.

"It really doesn't bear any more discussion than that."

Kamen, who is 25, had trouble with WCFL policies in 1966 and left briefly to join WBBM radio. He returned to WCFL under a change of management.

WBBM, which now has an all-news operation, is a likely attraction again for Kamen since WBBM's chief correspondent, Dick Westerkamp leaves next week to become editorial director of WBBM-TV, replacing the late Carter Davidson.

Although controversy seems to follow Kamen—indeed, he courts it—he is regarded in the trade as a very skilled newsman.

His coverage of James Meredith's civil rights march in Mississippi in 1966 won high praise. Last year he made headlines by volunteering to be maced by the sheriff's office to test the medical effects of the chemical.

He suffered it more easily than a fellow reporter, Joseph Cummings, who got a whiff and was hospitalized for a week.

For a couple weeks last fall Kamen was half of a striking mixed marriage when he aired the news on conservative Howard Miller's early morning disk jockeyship.

While Kamen's professional intensity can be overbearing at times, I can understand the mutual disenchantment at WCFL. Any relationship between the Chicago Federation of Labor and the liberal ideals of the laboring class is purely historical.

NEWSLETTER ISSUED BY THE HONORABLE BILL DICKINSON

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the March newsletter issued by my colleague, the Honorable BILL DICKINSON of Alabama's Second Congressional District:

DEAR FOLKS: The 1968 elections and the Presidential Inauguration are now history. I deeply appreciate your again choosing me as your Representative in Washington.

The Inaugural meant something special, not only to me, but also to most of the Second Congressional District. With our new Postmaster General, Red Blount; Governor Brewer; Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Moorer (who was born in Lowndes County); Johnny Long and the Troy State Band; and the lovely girls who rode on Alabama's float, our District must have been the best represented in the parade.

Miss Sharan Fay Hill of Andalusia, Miss Marian Jones of Troy, and Miss Colleen Smith of Brewton represented our District on the Inaugural float.

There is surprisingly little difference between the old Congress and the new 91st. There is the smallest crop of freshman Members in years. Of the 435 Representatives elected, 396 were incumbents and 39 newcomers—20 Democrats and 19 Republicans. Of these, Republicans took 9 seats from the Democrats and lost 5 Republican seats, for a net gain of 4 seats. In the Senate, there are 58 Democrats and 42 Republicans—a net gain of 5 for the Republicans.

I hope the product of the current Congress will be different!

Red Blount is the first Alabamian of the 62 men who have served in the office of Postmaster General since it was established in colonial America 215 years ago. He is only the second Alabamian ever to serve in the President's cabinet.

Real gone dollar: The value of the dollar, over the past 29 years, looks like this: 1939 equals 100 cents; 1945 equals 77 cents; 1950 equals 57.6 cents; 1955 equals 51.7 cents; 1960 equals 47 cents; 1965 equals 43.7 cents; 1967 equals 42.2 cents. Wonder what it will be at the end of this year?

Freshman Congressmen are finding out fast about crime in Washington. Rep. Shirley Chisholm (D–NY), the first Negro woman in Congress, wasn't in town a week before housebreakers looted her apartment (she moved and got an unlisted telephone number). Thieves also drove off with Senator Barry Goldwater's rented gold Mustang not long ago.

Inaugural pictures: If you wish to acquire color slides of the Inauguration, including the Troy State University Band and the Alabama float, write to Lt. Col. M. W. Arps (Ret.), P. O. Box 1715, Washington, D.C. The slides are 35 cents each and Col. Arps will send you an order form. Please do not write my office.

Public Law 90–301: Increases maximum guarantee on VA home loans from $7,500 to $12,500.

Public Law 90–491: Prevents employment discrimination against Reservists and National Guardsmen for their periods of Reserve and active duty training.

My mail indicates a popular interest in revision of our Internal Revenue laws. Most writers want "loopholes" plugged and are irritated by reports of some citizens with enormous income paying little or no federal taxes.

The Committee on Ways and Means has opened hearings on the subject of tax reform, the first since 1954. The Committee began by considering tax-exempt foundations, and other subjects on the agenda include tax treatment of the elderly, taxation of single persons, maximum and minimum tax on individuals, and various deductions relating to farm losses, gasoline taxes, and moving expenses.

Over 60 Congressmen, myself included, are sponsoring legislation to eliminate the $100 fine and 60-day jail sentence which can be imposed on citizens who refuse to reveal personal information about themselves and their households on the forthcoming decennial census form. Some of the questions would be of a very personal nature and would certainly be an invasion of personal privacy if the law required the householder to answer them. Counting heads is the proper function of the Census—counting the number of people using a bathroom is not!

All of the living Congressional Medal of Honor winners were invited to Washington as guests of the House of Representatives to attend the Inauguration. Two of Alabama's seven recipients of the Medal of Honor attended the festivities and the special reception given for them.

On the left (not printed in the RECORD) is Col. William R. Lawley, Commander of the 3825 Support Group at Maxwell Air Force Base.

On the right (not printed in the RECORD) is Col. Charles Davis, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, 6th Army. He is a native Montgomerian.

Did you know? Alabama is probably the pimento capital of the world. From 9543 acres growers harvested a $2.6 million crop in our State last year. What's more, there's a future in pimento peppers: Alabama's only processor still has to "import" some from out of state.

Pictured above (not printed in the RECORD) is Mr. Charles Kelley, Director of the Fish and Game Division of the Alabama Department of Conservation, who was recently in Washington to accept an award as Conservationist of the Year from the American Wildlife Federation. Congratulations!

Radio stations which carry my weekly newscasts:

WHEP, Foley, Saturday, at 2:35 p.m.
WTBF, Troy, Thursday, at 12:20 p.m.
WAMI, Opp, Sunday, at 1:55 p.m.
WATM–FM, Atmore, Friday, at 7:30 a.m.
WCTA, Andalusia, Sunday, at 12:15 p.m.
WEBJ, Brewton, after receipt, at 7:30 a.m.

XUM

CRIME ON THE CAMPUS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us supported the action in the 90th Congress which provided for denial of Federal moneys to students found guilty of criminal violations in campus disorders. We are therefore heartened by President Nixon's stated intention to use that provision of the law to assist in bringing an end to crime on the campus.

The Nation has been shocked by the irresponsible student rebellions that have spread throughout many of America's colleges and universities. The seizure of buildings and the disruption of educational activity by small bands of student and nonstudent roughnecks on the campuses has been a totally deplorable situation. The rights of the student majority have not only been threatened by organized minority groups of militants, but in some cases overt physical violence has endangered the lives of professors, college administrators, and law-abiding students.

I noted with great concern the disclosure out of Philadelphia recently that pamphlets are being distributed among college students which describe in detail how to deal with police during campus disturbances. One of the recommendations read: "If you can't kill them, harass them." In addition, that outrageous document was complete with crudely drawn illustrations of how to make bombs.

One may hope that school authorities will cooperate with the Nixon administration in dealing with hard-core student leaders who promote campus turmoil. The fund-cutoff legislation is definitely not intended to interfere with peaceful and orderly protest, but would aid in preserving the public order which is so necessary to the functioning of any institution. Attorney General John N. Mitchell has said that his department is having a "terrible time" with college presidents and professors who do not want the Justice Department to proceed with enforcement of statutes designed to curb campus riot leaders. I am hopeful that these educators will see fit to cooperate in the new pattern which will allow the university community to make the basic decision as to which of its student militants are undeserving of continued Federal support. College administrators have responsibilities under the law to use the authority which they unquestionably have to deal appropriately with all students who participate in the proscribed illegal activity.

President Nixon summed up the need to deal decisively in the area of campus crime when he stated:

> Violence or the threat of violence may never be permitted to influence the actions or judgments of the university community. Once it does the community, almost by definition, ceases to be a university.

The congressional command is that college students who are guilty of law violations must not be the beneficiaries of public funds. The action to implement that command is long overdue, and I am hopeful that the administration's determination to take the needed steps will aid the universities in coping with the crime problem on the campus.

CURBING MISMANAGEMENT AND WASTE IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in recent Congresses I have sought to focus attention on the need to save tax dollars through adoption of improved accounting procedures by many agencies and departments. I have also urged creation of a complaint desk at the General Accounting Office, under the direction of the Comptroller General, where any citizen or Government employee could present, on a confidential basis, reports of improper management or expenditure of funds or in other ways mishandling public moneys. Today, I introduce legislation to accomplish these objectives and call on the 91st Congress to take appropriate action.

Anyone who reads the annual reports of the Comptroller General, inspects the hundreds of GAO audits and special investigations, or scans newspapers for articles on Government waste and inefficiency can find a wide array of examples my bill seeks to curb. Let me summarize its major provisions:

First. To require publication in General Accounting Office reports of the names of Government employees personally responsible for failing to comply with the laws or administrative procedures in spending public funds after this has once been reported by the Comptroller General to the appropriate agency head.

Second. To require that before 1 cent of taxpayers' money can be spent by a newly established Federal agency, the head of that agency must consult with the Comptroller General to become well acquainted with requirements for the disbursement of funds and contracting procedures.

Third. To suspend from all agencies whose accounting systems have not been approved by the GAO within 2 years after passage of the bill, and requiring all new agencies to meet these approved standards within 2 years after they begin operation.

Fourth. To require that every agency which receives GAO recommendations because of findings of mismanagement of funds must submit to the Bureau of the Budget a report of corrective action to prevent recurring waste.

Fifth. To require the head of each executive agency to transmit a report to Congress on the status of the development of its accounting system or systems at the end of any calendar year during which its systems have not been approved.

Sixth. Each agency shall be required within 1 year following the approval of its accounting systems to submit to Congress a report setting forth the manner and extent to which such systems are being used by the agency's management and the benefits derived therefrom.

Seventh. Provides for the creation of a complaint desk at the GAO designed to receive, review, and investigate reports from citizens and Government employees of cases of waste and mismanagement in any department or agency.

Mr. Speaker, little has been accomplished so far as I can ascertain to upgrade the accounting systems of laggard agencies which still do not meet GAO standards. I am hopeful this Congress will press for progress in this area and that President Nixon will call on each unit under his jurisdiction to upgrade administrative and financial practices to reduce drastically the amount of mismanagement in the executive department. In order to underscore the importance of the legislation I present today, I will include at this point an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of October 4, 1967, which is still most timely on this subject:

NO-ACCOUNT FEDERAL ACCOUNTING

Eleven years ago Congress took a look at all the money the Government was spending, and at the antiquated, helter-skelter accounting systems most Federal agencies were using. Alarmed by what it saw, it amended the Budget and Accounting Act to require the agencies to adopt up-to-date, cost accounting systems.

At the time, in 1956, annual Federal expenditures totaled about $66 billion and the public debt stood at $273 billion. This fiscal year, spending is expected to reach about $143 billion and the debt may exceed $335 billion.

However, of the 173 Federal agencies subject to the law requiring them to set up Government Accounting Office-approved, modernized accounting systems, only 61 have complied. And most of those are small agencies with small budgets.

The big agencies are still dragging their feet, for the most part using what are called obligation accounting systems. These show the amount of money agencies are authorized to spend, but fail to show the actual costs of particular programs or operations.

Properly designed cost accrual accounting systems, on the other hand, provide not only better control over funds but also up-to-date cost data on operations. They help to determine whether money is being spent wisely and used efficiently, and whether results justify the costs. Adequate cost accounting systems, says the U.S. Comptroller General, are "basic and fundamental to the whole operation of the Federal Government."

If that is so, perhaps it helps to explain some of the deficiencies evident in Federal agency operations. The Health, Education and Welfare Department, for instance, has 12 accounting systems subject to GAO approval; the number so far approved is zero. HEW has been found, by GAO, to be guilty during fiscal 1966 of inefficient record-keeping and property management.

The Agriculture Department has 15 accounting systems subject to approval; only five have been approved. Interior has 17 systems with six so far approved. And Treasury, which surely ought to be setting an example, has only four approved systems out of 18.

Rep. Jackson Betts of Ohio is leading a move in the House to compel all agencies to speed up the accounting reforms they were obligated by law to adopt 11 years ago. Since no-account Federal accounting tends to breed no-account Federal programs, that move deserves full Congressional support.

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS IN SAN ANTONIO

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the public information program of the Social Security district office in San Antonio was singled out for praiseworthy coverage in the February regional newsletter of the Social Security Administration's Dallas region.

The article points out that San Antonio maintained one of the best operation records among class I offices in the Nation. Not only is the office in my district efficient, but it reaches out to the people it serves. Mary Ruiz recently directed 20 bilingual students in a door-to-door survey of the inner city area to determine if potential beneficiaries had failed to apply.

The value of the public information program of the San Antonio office is explained by Roy Swift, the district manager:

> (The people) know the office as a friendly, human place, and so they just simply work better with us. That's why our staff has time to carry out this program—they know it saves time in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, having received permission, I include the full text of the article at this point in my remarks:

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS IN SAN ANTONIO

HemisFair '68, the April-to-October Texas World's Fair in San Antonio, brought millions of guests to that city. It was also the theme of a "Social Security in America" film featuring 27 beneficiaries in all walks of life.

San Antonio is a colorful city with a colorful history. The Texas Pavilion at the HemisFair had a special exhibit for each of the racial, national and cultural groups which contributed significantly to population, culture, and development. There were 26 such groups. In San Antonio, the predominant group is the Mexican-American, and it is to this group that many of the public information activities in San Antonio are directed.

And San Antonio has an active, ongoing public information program. During the last five years, this one office has published 14,890 news articles; broadcast 5,851 radio programs; published 365 magazine articles; telecast 659 local talent television programs; displayed 136 exhibits, and delivered 1,379 talks. During the same period, San Antonio received 123,276 claims and cleared 123,810, and maintained one of the best operational records among Class I offices in the Nation. Some specific projects of their public information activities are:

Special projects and activities are a routine part of the ongoing public information program. This season's programs include personal visits to all high schools and colleges in the district, crew leader meetings with guest speakers, presenting informational material and talks to all ministerial associations in the area, distribution of 10,000 SSI-32 booklets ("Self-Employed Farmers—Are You Getting Your Social Security Credit?") through farm agencies, and a locally developed exhibit (for the 9th year) aimed at farm and ranch people at the San Antonio Livestock Show and Exposition. Weekly classes in Spanish language uses on technical SSA matters are conducted, and a weekly news-writing course for field reps and selected claims reps has been initiated.

Social Security in America Participation—This SSIA Film used all local background and cast and is an all-out "significant beneficiary story." It was developed by Field Reps Sybil Boland, Charles Adcock, Evelyn Heny, and William Watson, and Claims Reps Esther Garcia, Louise Joplin, Bart Irby, and Dennis Beran. The crew from the Office of Information was able to shoot the show in one and one-half days. The film was promoted by the DO through mass media and selected groups. The premier telecast was over a local station.

Headquarters for the Regional Informational Materials Exchange—The San Antonio DO sets up production quotas and reviews, types, proofreads, assigns item number, and requests printing and distribution of some 850 RIME submittals yearly with coordination by Oper. Supv. Jack Jones, backed up by the field and administrative unit members.

With Evelyn Heny, Field Rep, as national chairman of the Spanish Informational Materials Exchange, the office is responsible for translations, editing, typing, and forwarding for printing and distribution of Spanish radio monologues, press releases, and spot announcements.

The office has also produced a continuing series of Spanish radio programs, monologues, and spots for national distribution to Spanish radio stations, translated and prepared Spanish informational leaflets and booklets for national distribution by the Office of Information, and produced weekly TV programs both in Spanish and in English.

Reaching the Disadvantaged—among the Mexican-Americans of the area (comprising 37 percent of the total population with a much higher concentration in metropolitan sections) is of continuing priority in San Antonio. Mary Ruiz, Officer-in-Charge of the new metropolitan branch office, spearheaded a door-to-door survey of the disadvantaged area where her office was established. It was conducted by 20 especially trained bi-lingual students. The 1968 survey, an effort to determine whether any potential beneficiaries had failed to apply, followed along the lines of the 1966 door-to-door Medicare enrollment campaign conducted by district office trained SANYO (Spanish American National Youth Opportunity) employees.

Every District Office Employee Is Involved—in San Antonio's public information program with employees using a special district office form to jot down questions claimants are asking and also notes about confusing situations, trends, documents claimants should bring to the interview, and cases of significant beneficiaries interviewed to route through the field unit for consideration as basis of press, radio, and TV release.

With special impetus under the leadership of John Palmer (now Asst. Reg. Dir. for Information, DHEW) when he was district manager in San Antonio, the district office employees learned to understand and fulfill SSA Objective 9: "Let people know about their rights and responsibilities under the program." This philosophy has played a major role in the leadership continued by those who followed Palmer—George Clark, now Dist. Mgr., Pasadena; Weldon McNeely, Asst. Reg. Rep. DI, RO; Jim Forbus, Dir. of Mgt., KCPC; D. G. Hudson, Asst. Dist. Mgr., San Antonio, and Roy Swift, Dist. Mgr., San Antonio.

"Even more significant," says Swift, "I find this office long ago recognized that an informed community, developed through continuing long-range programs, makes all operations easier and more efficient. People are better prepared for the claims interview; thus we have more single interview claims. They have learned to respond to advice on the best times to come to the office for faster service. They know the office as a friendly, human place, and so they just simply work better with us. That's why our staff has time to carry out this information program—they know it saves time in the long run.

"I firmly believe that the touchstone of social security's success over the past third of a century is that its leaders from the start determined to administer it in human terms rather than the dry abstractions which have doomed many programs. Therefore, the public has been able to identify with social security—to feel that it is their own."

Wayman Register, Reg. Com., commented, "The record of San Antonio in public information and public affairs is a remarkable example of what a dedicated staff, working together, can accomplish. Their work processing record illustrates the contribution an effective informational service can make."

FLOODS HIT EASTERN MASSACHUSETTS; MORE FEARED

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. **BURKE** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress the terrible threat of floods being faced in the eastern section of Massachusetts this spring. The need of coordinated effort on the part of Federal, State, and local governments is very clear. From past experience it is expected that the cities of Brockton and Quincy will have flooded conditions, the towns of Canton, Dedham, Milton, Braintree, and surrounding towns could suffer from flood damage. Recently in a short period over 51 inches of snow fell in the Greater Boston area and in the southeastern section of Massachusetts. These snows have melted. Heavy rains have fallen threatening the rivers and streams with overflowing. I have contacted the Army Corps of Engineers and I have requested their complete cooperation with local and State officials on the serious threat of floods. I have been assured that every reasonable precaution has been taken.

I insert a news item on flood conditions that appeared in today's Boston Globe:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Mar. 26, 1969]

FLOODS HIT EASTERN MASSACHUSETTS—MORE FEARED

(By Ken O. Botwright)

Widespread flash flooding occurred in Eastern Massachusetts and other areas of Southern New England yesterday, as small rivers and brooks boiled over their banks following a 12-hour storm that deluged the area with 1 to 3 inches of rain.

Muddy floodwaters inundated streets, cut roads and poured into thousands of basements in Greater Boston.

Brockton was hardest hit. It declared a state of emergency. Hundreds of homes were flooded by the Salisbury River and about 50 persons were evacuated from houses and a school for retarded children.

But river-watchers called the flooding "minor." They said the danger had abated by nightfall because most of the streams had receded.

They warned, however, that fast-rising large rivers, like the Charles, the Merrimac, Housatonic and Connecticut, could pose a fresh flood threat within 48 hours as they became swollen by runoff from the storm and melting snow. Said state Civil Defense Director Allan R. Zenowitz: "We've just had a taste of what could come."

The U.S. Weather Bureau at Boston predicted that the Charles was due to crest tomorrow at one foot above flood stage. The river lapped over its banks in lowlands at Charles River Village yesterday afternoon, after topping its flood stage of 93.4 feet above sea level. "We don't expect a major problem when the Charles crests because the flood stage will be about four feet below that of last Spring," said Oscar Tenenbaum, weather bureau chief.

Tenenbaum said dry weather was expected to prevail throughout New England for the next two days at least, and that should help alleviate the threat.

Outlook for today is fair and colder, with high temperatures ranging from the low 40s in Boston to the low 30s in the snow-covered mountains of northern New England, where the big rivers rise. Tomorrow ought to be fair with little temperature change.

While southern New England was being soaked by torrential rain, blasted by gales and rocked by thunderstorms yesterday, the ski country in central and northern New Hampshire, Vermont and in Maine was blanketed by from 6 to 13 inches of new snow.

FIFTY FAMILIES FLEE

The rain began late Monday night and sluiced down until shortly after noon yesterday. The Weather Bureau at Boston's Logan International Airport measured 1.18 inches and Falmouth on Cape Cod reported nearly 3 inches.

In Brockton, scene of serious flooding last year, rising water forced 50 families out of their homes on the West Side. In the South End of the city, police and firemen rescued 18 youngsters from the headquarters of the Brockton Area Assn. for Retarded Children.

Although city officials declared a state of emergency, Civil Defense experts said the flooding was not as grave as that last Spring.

There was some isolated flooding in Canton—kids paddled canoes on Park drive and Short street—and overworked drains inundated streets in Braintree, Quincy and other communities.

However, the major trouble spots during last year's floods posed no danger because the levels of the Charles and Neponset Rivers had been lowered before the storm struck.

For instance, at Taunton, the Mill River remained within its banks. But just to be safe, city officials ordered 10,000 sandbags from Civil Defense headquarters in Framingham.

Taunton had trouble of another kind, though. Three homes and the Pilgrim Congregational Church were struck by lightning.

West of Boston, streets were flooded in areas of Framingham, Sudbury, and Tewksbury. Wayland firemen kept sandbags ready as the Sudbury River rose steadily. The river flooded last year and isolated the residents of the Pelham Island section.

On the North Shore, the flooding Ipswich River menaced scores of homes in North Reading, West Peabody and Middleton.

More than 2 inches of rain fell in the area, and nearly every community had some flooding. Roads, backyards and fields were under water in West Peabody, Wenham, Lowell, North Reading, Middleton and Topsfield.

DISTRIBUTED 200,000 SANDBAGS

During a morning thunderstorm, power failures blacked out sections of Hamilton, Lynn, Saugus, West Peabody, Beverly, Wenham and Essex.

CD Director Zenowitz said more than 40 Bay State communities had requested emergency flood control assistance and technical aid. Flood control experts were dispatched to many towns by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, he said.

A Corps spokesman in Waltham said 200,000 sandbags had been distributed and 100,000 were being stockpiled at Ft. Devens.

The state CD agency has begun transporting 50,000 sandbags from Devens to the Public Works Department depot in Wellesley.

They'll be available to communities who need them.

Brook Overflows, Homes Periled in Tewksbury

TEWKSBURY.—During the Summer the brook that runs beside Fred Merrill's home on Deering drive is only a trickle, but yesterday it turned into a rushing, destructive flow of water that threatened to flood 25 homes.

"When I left at 8 in the morning the brook looked to be all right. But my wife called me around 10 and said that in 15 minutes time the water had gushed over the top and began running down the street.

"By the time I got home at 10:30 the water had ripped up my asphalt driveway and run into the house. The entire basement was filled with six inches of water and we have to move all the furniture upstairs," Merrill said.

"All the houses on the street were in danger so I called the town's highway department and the Civil Defense people to try to get a truckload of sand. It took about four hours—until at least 3 p.m.—for them to bring the sand and by that time it was too late to help much.

"I used snow, linen, logs and carpets to keep the water from coming into the house but it didn't do much good. There's about $3000 damage to my house alone. And the stink from the water picking up the sewerage is terrible," Merrill added.

Merrill blamed an inadequate drain pipe running under Deering drive for the problem.

FOCUS ON THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART I

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a result of an article in a local daily, an assertion was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 6, 1969, which states:

> The people at Federal City College must be naive if they feel the taxpayers of the United States are going to continue to fund a university specializing in teaching the catechism of revolution, confiscation of lands, and destruction of culture of the United States, and as a base of operation for a bunch of loud-mouthed anarchists.

From my reading of material on Federal City College including a statement made by the interim college commission of Federal City College, composed of representatives of the entire college community—faculty, administration, students, classified personnel, and so forth, and statements by the board of higher education and the student government association, I find that, contrary to the assertion, there is tremendous momentum by a wide representative group of the college to develop a truly profound and meaningful urban community college.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to your attention and that of my colleagues what I believe to be a clearer picture of the District's new institution of higher education.

In November 1968 the interim college commission prepared a news release which was distributed widely to local press agencies. The statement indicated that Federal City College, perhaps uniquely in American higher education, had tried to establish a genuinely democratic and interracial faculty. The release stated in part:

> We can see the beginning of many innovative and exciting programs and ideas, such as a Community Education Program, an interdisciplinary curriculum, a Black Studies Program and a College-wide senate where faculty, students and staff are equally represented. So far, these efforts have attracted widespread attention and interest from educators and students. . . .
>
> In addition to these innovative programs and activities, FCC has developed a number of high quality programs that are within the best traditions of institutions of higher education. Programs in this area include nursing, family life, health education, business, social science, natural science, liberal arts, etc.

The student government association of Federal City College recently held a press conference to present a statement concerning their views on the state of the college. The statement had been read to the student body and overwhelmingly approved. The student government association's press conference was held with the advice and consent of numerous representatives of student organizations, thereby providing a cross section of the student body. Their statement indicated that the principal responsibilities of the student government is to take those actions which will result in benefits for the students and which will enable the college and community to act in accordance with the needs and aspirations of the students.

The student government association made three basic statements:

> (1) The students attend Federal City College to obtain a high quality education; this is our basic and primary purpose, (2) the students accept the need for several different types of educational programs to co-exist as part of the urban higher educational experiment, with the qualification that all such programs must be academically sound in content, philosophy, and instructional method, and (3) the students remain dedicated to the growth and development of the College and consider as irresponsible any discussion of the need to terminate or restrict the growth of the College.

The student government association also stated that the black studies program that is presently available within the college already has the support of a large number of students. The black studies program as pictured in the news accounts has little or no support, except from those who wish to use this inaccurate view as a means of causing additional confusion and to achieve some objective other than support of the institution. It is unfortunate that outsiders are attacking the college on this biased information.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is an urgent need for consideration of a legitimate black studies program within the broader context of education and I will discuss at another time my views on this. I submit at this time the following class schedule at Federal City College which has just concluded:

CLASS SCHEDULE, WINTER QUARTER 1968-70

[Explanation of course numbering system: 1st digit indicates division: Blank, skills center; 1, humanities division; 2, social sciences division; 3, natural sciences division; 4, professional division; 5, black studies program. 2d digit indicates level: 0, noncollege course; 1, freshman courses; 2, sophomore courses; 3, junior courses; 5, graduate courses]

Course No.	Section	Title	Instructor	Qtr. hrs.	Days	Time	Room
		SKILLS CENTER					
.001	01	Basic communication skills	Coffey	5	MTThF	9-12 a.m	3304
	02		Johnson		MTWTh	1-4 p.m	3304
	03		Anderson		MTWTh	6-9 p.m	3304
.002	01	Developmental reading	Hausman	2	TTh	9-12 a.m	3318
	02		Tannenbaum		Daily	10-11 a.m	3375
	03		Tannenbaum		Daily	11-12 a.m	3375
	04		Pickney		MWF	1-3 p.m	3429
	05		Tannenbaum		TTh	1-4 p.m	3305
	06		Dobbins		MW	6-9 p.m	3429
.003	01	Advanced reading	Burstein	2	MWF	8-10 a.m	3429
	02		Burstein		TTh	10-12 a.m	3429
	03		Maben		MWF	1-3 p.m	3305
	04		Maben		TTh	1-4 p.m	3318
	05		McMillan		MW	6-9 p.m	3305
. 004	01	Basic writing	Hutchinson	2	MWF	8-10 a.m	3359
	02		Thomas		TThS	8-10 a.m	3305
	03		Schaeffer		TThS	10-12 a.m	3375
	04		Schaeffer		MWF	1-3 p.m	3318
	05		McMillan		TTh	1-4 p.m	3429
	06		Thomas		MW	6-9 o.m	3318
.005	01	Fundamental concepts of math	Hutchinson	3	Daily	10-11 a.m	3359
	02		Hutchinson		Daily	1-2 p.m	3359
	03		Pinckney		Daily	6-7 p.m	3359
	04		Pinckney		Daily	7-8 p.m	3359
.006	01	Beginning typewriting	Dobbins		TTh	8-10 a.m	3303
	02		Dobbins		TTh	10-12 a.m	3303
		HUMANITIES DIVISION					
		Freshman courses:					
1.100B	01	Revolutionary tradition	Rodgers	5	TTh	1-3 p.m	B105
	02		Haskett, M	5	TTh	1-3 p.m	B105
	03		Brent	5	TTh	6-8 p.m	B105
	04		Taylor, A	5	TTh	6-8 p.m	B105
1.101	01	Man's quest for the good life	Van Ness	5	M	10-12 a.m	1247
					WF	11-12 a.m	
	02		Kuhnle	5	MWF	11-12 a.m	3370
	03		Burress	5	MW	8-10 p.m	1177
1.102							
1.102B	01	20th century American civilization	Lynn	5	TTh	8-10 a.m	1239
	02		Lynn	5	MW	1-3 p.m	1177
	03		Ellery	5	TTh	8-10 a.m	1178
	04		Ellery	5	MW	1-3 p.m	1239
	05		King	5	MW	1-3 p.m	2332
	06		King	5	MW	8-10 p.m	2332
	07		Butcher	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	2332
	08		Butcher	5	TTh	1-3 p.m	2332
1.103	01	Communication arts seminar	Staff	2	M	8-10 p.m	1231
1.111	01	World civilization	Robinson, H	5	MW	10-12 a.m	1239
	02		Simmons	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	1239
	03		Simmons	5	TTh	6-8 p.m	1239
1.112	01	U.S. survey	Brent	5	MWF	1-3 p.m	2331
	02		Rodgers	5	MWF	1-3 p.m	2332
1.120A	01	Criminal and madman	DeGrazia	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	1178
1.120B	03	Man, ideas and society	Lawson	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	3370
	04	The student	Butterworth	5	TTh	6-8 p.m	3310
1.120C	05	Man, ideas and society: The artist	Bowen	5	MTWThF	9-10 a.m	2331
1.121	01	Intro to logic and critical thinking	Bowen	5	MTWThF	8-9 a.m	2331
1.140	01	English composition	A. Taylor	4	MWF	8-9 a.m	3309
	02		B. Lawson	4	MWF	9-10 a.m	3309
	03		A. Lefcowitz	4	MWF	9-10 a.m	3310
	04		Kuhnle	4	MWF	10-11 a.m	1178
	05		Lawson	4	MWF	11-12 a.m	1178
	06		Wiley	4	MW	10-11:30 a.m	1177
	07		Burress	4	TTh	10-11:30 a.m	2333
	08		Mayfield	4	TTh	10-11:30 a.m	1177
	09		Lefcowitz	4	TTh	10:30-12 a.m	2331
	10		Couch	4	TTh	10:30-12 a.m	2332
	11		Quigless	4	MWF	1-2 p.m	3309
	12		Mayfield	4	TTh	1-2:30 p.m	3309
	13		Gordon	4	MW	6-7:30 p.m	2333
	14		Staff	4	MW	6-7:30 p.m	2332
	15		Mayfield	4	TTh	6-7:30 p.m	1178
	16		Staff	4	TTh	6-7:30 p.m	2331
	17		Staff	4	TTh	8-9:30 p.m	1239
	18		Staff	4	MW	8-9:30 p.m	1239
	19		Gordon	4	MWF	10-11:30 a.m	2333
	20		Brady	4	MWF	8-9 a.m	
	21		Brady	4	TTh	9-10:30 a.m	
1.150	01	French I	Labat	5	MW	6-8 p.m	3310
	02		Labat	5	MW	8-10 p.m	3310
1.151	01	German I	Turpin	5	MW	10-12 a.m	3309
1.153	01	Spanish I	Grady	5	MTWTh	10-11 a.m	3310
	02		Grady	5	MTWTh	11-12 a.m	3310
1.160	01	Drawing	Rode	5	TTh	1-4 p.m	3319
	02		Rode	3	Sat	9-12 a.m	3319
	03		Rode	3	TTh	1-3 p.m	3319
1.161	01	Painting	Young	5	MTTh	1-3 p.m	3367
	02		Young	3	MT	1-3 p.m	3367
1.162A	01	Sculpture I	Taylor, W	5	MW	9-12 a.m	3319
	02		Taylor, W	3	MW	9-11 a.m	3319
1.162B	01	Sculpture II	Taylor, W	5	TTh	6-9 p.m	3319
	02		Taylor, W	3	TTh	6-8 p.m	3319
1.165	01	Afro-American art history	Young	4	TTh	10-12 a.m	3367
1.170	01	Speech arts	Staff	3	MWF	10-12 a.m	2334
1.171	01	Public speaking	Niles	4	TTh	8-10 a.m	3309
	02		Niles	4	MTh	6-8 p.m	3309
1.172	01	Dramatic reading	Williams	3	TTh	10-12 a.m	B105
	02		Williams	3	TTh	6-8 p.m	1247
1.173	01	Introduction to television production	Robinson, M	5	MWTh	6-8 p.m	2334
	02		Robinson, M	3	MW	6-8 p.m	2334
1.174	01	Dramatic literature	Tucker	3	MWF	10-11 a.m	2334
1.175	01	Acting	Staroba	3	TTh	10-12 a.m	2334
	02		Staroba	3	TTh	8-10 p.m	2334

See footnotes at end of table.

CLASS SCHEDULE, WINTER QUARTER 1968-70—Continued

[Explanation of course numbering system: 1st digit indicates division; Blank, skills center; 1, humanities division; 2, social sciences division; 3, natural sciences division; 4, professional division; 5, black studies program. 2d digit indicates level: 0, noncollege course; 1, freshman courses; 2, sophomore courses; 3, junior courses; 5, graduate courses]

Course No.	Section	Title	Instructor	Qtr. hrs.	Days	Time	Room
		HUMANITIES DIVISION—Continued					
		Acting—Continued					
1.180	01	Introduction to music	Warner	3	MW	1-2 p.m	1247
1.181	01	Materials of music I	Roach	3	TTh	10-12 a.m	1247
1.182	01	Applied piano	Roach	2	Arranged		
1.183	01	Voice	Warner	2	Arranged		
1.185	01	Afro-American history of music	Roach	4	TTh	1-3 p.m	1247
1.189		Chorus.					
	01	Permission of instructor	Warner	2	MW	12-1	1247
	02	Permission of instructor	Warner	2	MW	5-6	1247
		Advanced (nonfreshman) courses:					
1.211	01	History of Russia	Robinson, H	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	3309
1.213	01	History of Latin America	Cortada	5	MW	10-12 a.m	2331
	02		Cortada	5	MW	6-8 p.m	2331
1.270	01	Creative dramatics	Tucker	3	Sat	9-12 a.m	2334
1.281	01	Materials of music II	Warner	3	MW	6-7 p.m	1247
1.282	01	Advance applied piano	Roach	2	Arrangeo.		
		SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISION					
		Freshman courses:					
2.100	01	Reason and society	Stern	5	M	10-12 a.m	—
					TTh	8-10 a.m	—
	02		Stern		M	10-12 a.m	—
					TTh	10-12 a.m	—
	03		Haskett, M		M	10-12 a.m	—
					WF	10-12 a.m	—
	04		Haskett, W		M	10-12 a.m	—
					WF	10-12 a.m	—
	05		Sugarman		M	10-12 a.m	—
					TTh	8-10 a.m	—
	06		Haskett, W		MW	6-9 p.m	—
2.101	01	Introduction to political theory	Butterworth	5	TTh	1-3 p.m	2477
2.102	01	Introduction to scientific method	Becker	5	TTh	10-12 a.m	2274
2.103	01	The individual in urban society	Sugarman	5	TWTh	10-12 a.m	—
2.104	01	Introduction to communism	Reeves	2	To be arranged.		
2.110	01	Introduction to American government	Klonoski	5	MW[1]	8-10 a.m	2271
	02		Simms		MW[1]	1-3 p.m	2288
	03		Ruddy		TTh[1]	8-10 p.m	2285
2.111	01	The family	Rose, C	5	MTW	6-8 p.m	2—
2.112	01	Introduction to urban social institutions	Collier	5	TTh[1]	10-12 a.m	2—
	02		Kiblan		TTh[1]	1-3 p.m	2279
	03		Brooks		MW[1]	8-10 a.m	2278
	04		Frankel		MW[1]	10-12 a.m	2279
2.113	01	The courts and the judical process	Cohen	5	MW[1]	1-3 p.m	233-
	02		Zeitz		MW	6-8 p.m	2338
2.114	01	The political life of black peopje in America	Cox W	5	MWF	1-3 p.m	2275
2.119		Carrer psychology	Parks	2	To be arranged.		
2.120	01	Urbanization in traditional societies	Cownie	5	TTh[1]	1-3 p.m	2275
	02		Cownie		TTh[1]	6-8 p.m	2275
	03		Weinberg		TWTh[1]	8-10 a.m	2275
	04		Simms		MW[1]	6-8 p.m	2275
2.121	01	Non-Western societies	El-Alfi	5	W	1-3 p.m	3371
					TTH	1-3 p.m	2271
	02		Tinker		W	1-3 p.m	3371
					MF	1-3 p.m	2271
	03		Brown		W	1-3 p.m	3371
					MF	1-3 p.m	2273
	04		Morris		W	1-3 p.m	3371
					TTh	1-3 p.m	2273
2.122	01	Social evolution of the Black race in the United States	Scarborough	5	TTh[1]	1-3 p.m	2288
2.123	01	African civilization	Oneywu	5	TTh[1]	10-12 a.m	2288
	02		Oneywu		MW[1]	6-8 p.m	2279
2.130	01	Group conflict	Nye	5	MW[1]	6-8 p.m	2273
	02		Rose, C		MW[1]	8-10 a.m	2279
	03		Kiblan		MW[1]	10-12 a.m	2275
	04		Reeves		TTh[1]	6-8 p.m	
	05		Cousins		TTh[1]	8-10 a.m	2288
	06		Cousins		TTh[1]	6-8 p.m	2279
2.131	01	Roots of urban America	Richter	5	TTh[1]	10-12 a.m	2275
	02		Richter		TTh[1]	8-10 p.m	2278
	03		Rose, T		MTW	10-12 a.m	2336
2.132	01	Urban problems	Brown	5	MWF	10-12 a.m	2288
	02		Bartholomew		MWF	1-3 p.m	2279
2.140	01	Introduction to community development	Rooks	5	W[2]	1-3 p.m	2271
	02		Scarborough		M[2]	10-12 a.m	2271
	03		White		Th[2]	1-3 p.m	2285
2.141	01	Community development—Labor and the black community	Searles	5	Th[2]	10-12 a.m	2313
	02		Searles		W[2]	6-8 p.m	2274
2.142	01	Community development—Police and judicial practices	Cox, W	5	Th[2]	10-12 a.m	2336
2.143	01	Community development—Economic problems of black people in the United States.	Parker	5	MW[2]	8-10 p.m	2273
2.145	01	Community development—Cooperatives	Staff	5	W[2]	6-8 p.m	2289
2.146		School decentralization	Marksman	5	T	10-12 a.m	2285
		Advanced (nonfreshman) courses:					
2.201	01	Social research	Becker	5	TTh[2]	1-3 p.m	2336
	02		Jones		TTh[2]	6-8 p.m	2285
	03		Joees		W[2]	6-10 p.m	2285
2.202A	01	Principles of economics	Bartholomew	4	MW	6-8 p.m	2336
2.202B	01		El-Alfi		TTh	10-12 a.m	2289
2.203	01	Principles of psychology	Nye	5	MWTh	10-12 a.m	2285
2.204	01	Urban violence in America	Rose, T	5	MTW	1-3 p.m	2285
		NATURAL SCIENCES DIVISION					
		Freshman courses:					
		Mathematics:					
3.030	01	Elementary algebra	Schwarz	3	MWF	9-10 a.m	3369
	02		Brown or		MWF	11-12 a.m	3369
	03		Carcione, S		MTTh	2-3 p.m	3368
	04		Katz		MWF	6-7 p.m	3369
	05		Wells		TTh	6-7:30 p.m	3369

See footnotes at end of table.

CLASS SCHEDULE, WINTER QUARTER 1968-70—Continued

[Explanation of course numbering system: 1st digit indicates division; Blank, skills center; 1, humanities division; 2, social sciences division; 3, natural sciences division; 4, professional division; 5, black studies program. 2d digit indicates level: 0, noncollege course; 1, freshman courses; 2, sophomore courses; 3, junior courses; 5, graduate courses]

Course No.	Section	Title	Instructor	Qtr. hrs.	Days	Time	Room
		NATURAL SCIENCES DIVISIOd—Continued					
		Freshman courses—Continued					
		Mathematics—Continued					
3.031	01	Algebra and geometry	Brown or	3	MWF	9-10 a.m.	3431
	02		Schwarz		MWF	11-12 a.m.	3368
	03		Wells		MTh	1-2:30 p.m.	3312
	04		Carcione		MTTh	6-7 p.m.	3368
	05		Katz		MWF	7-8 p.m.	3368
3.130	01	Elementary functions	Wells	4	MWF	10-11:15 p.m.	3431
	02		Carcione		MTThF	1-2 p.m.	3368
	03		Brown or		MW	6-8 p.m.	3342
3.131	01	Calculus II	Katz	4	TTh	6-8 p.m.	3431
		Natural sciences 100:					
3.100	01	Physical science	Bolten	4	TTh	9-12 a.m.	3363
	02		Bolten		MWF	1-3 p.m.	3369
	03		Posey		MWF	1-3 p.m.	3407
3.101	01	Computer programing	Thomae, I	2	MW	1-2 p.m.	3431
	02		Bertaut		MW	1-2 p.m.	3432
	03		Bertaut		MW	2-3 p.m.	3432
3.102	01	Chemistry of life	Romain	4	MWF	1-3 p.m.	3370
	02		Phelps		W	1-5 p.m.	3416
3.103	01	Chemistry of the photographic process	Thomae, S	4	MWF	1-3 p.m.	3401
3.104	01	Physiology of perception	Thomae, I	4	MWF	6-8 p.m.	3402
3.105	01	Introductory astronomy	Brooks	4	TTh	1-3 p.m.	3369
	02		Schwarz		MW	6-8 p.m.	3431
		Chemistry:					
		Nonmajors:					
3.110	03	Introductory chemistry LEC	Posey	4	M	10-11 a.m.	3371
		REC			WF	10-11 a.m.	3369
		LAB			Th	8-11 a.m.	3401
	04	Introductory chemistry LEC	Posey	4	M	10-11 a.m.	3371
		REC			TTh	10-11 a.m.	3431
		LAB			W	8-11 a.m.	3401
	05	Introductory chemistry LEC	Posey	4	M	10-11 a.m.	3371
		REC			TTh	10-11 a.m.	3369
		LAB			F	8-11 a.m.	3401
	06	Introductory chemistry LEC	Bertaut	4	W	6-7 p.m.	3371
		REC			M	6-8 p.m.	3370
		LAB			W	7-10 p.m.	3401
		Majors:					
3.111	01	General chemistry LEC	Savitz	4	M	9-10 a.m.	3371
		REC			WF	9-10 a.m.	3370
		LAB			T	8-11 a.m.	3401
	02	General chemistry LEC	Romain	4	M	6-7 p.m.	3371
		REC			W	6-8 p.m.	3370
		LAB			M	7-10 p.m.	3401
		Biology:					
3.120		General biology lecture	Staff	4	TTH	9-10 a.m.	B105
	01	LAB			MW	10-12 a.m.	3404
	02	LAB			MW	10-12 a.m.	3409
	03	LAB			TTh	10-12 a.m.	3404
	04	LAB			TTh	10-12 a.m.	3409
	05	LAB			MW	1-3 p.m.	3404
	06	LAB			MW	1-3 p.m.	3409
		General biology lecture	Staff	4	TTh	6-7 p.m.	B105
	07	LAB			TTh	7-9 p.m.	3404
	08	LAB			TTh	7-9 p.m.	3407
3.121	01	Basic biological techniques	Staff	2	F	9-12 a.m.	3407
		Physics:					
3.140	01	Matter and its properties (physics I)	Staff	4	MWF	10-12 a.m.	3432
	02				TTh	6-9 p.m.	3432
3.141	01	Energy, fields and waves (physics II)	Staff	4	MWF	8-10 a.m.	3432
	02				MW	6-9 p.m.	3422
	03				TTh	1-4 p.m.	3432
3.142	01	Atomics and nuclear phenomena (physics III)	Staff	4	MWF	8-10 a.m.	3422
3.240	01	Sound optics (physics IV and V)	Staff	4	MW	6-9 p.m.	3432
		PROFESSIONAL DIVISION					
		Business:					
4.100	01	Business in society	Clement	3	TTh	10-11:30 a.m.	1190
	02		Staff		TTh	1-2:30 p.m.	1190
	03		Staff		MW	6-7:30 p.m.	1190
	04		Staff		MW	1-2:30 p.m.	1190
	05		Staff		TTh	6-7:30 p.m.	1190
	06		Freeman		WF	10-11:30 a.m.	1190
4.200	01	Management and organizational behavior	Crump	3	TTh	10-11:30 a.m.	1187
	02				T	6-9 p.m.	1187
4.201	01	The marketing environment	Clement	3	MW	10-11:30 a.m.	1187
	02				Th	6-9 p.m.	1187
4.202	01	Elementary accounting	Staff	4	MW	8-10 a.m.	1187
	02				MW	6-8 p.m.	1187
4.203	01	Principles of data processing	Cross	4	TTh	8-10 a.m.	1187
4.204	01	Readings in management	Staff	3	Arranged by permission of instructor.		
4.205	01	Readings in marketing	Staff	3	Arranged by permission of instructor.		
		Education:					
4.110	01	A social history of American education	Arrington	3	MW	10-11:30 a.m.	1179
	02				TTh	10-11:30 a.m.	1179
	03		Wiegman		M	6-9 p.m.	1179
4.310	01	Seminar in curriculum development for programs in teacher education	Staff	3	TTh	4:30-6 p.m.	1179
		Human services:					
4.120	01	Human services, past and present	Denham	5	MWF	10-12	
4.121	01	Intervention methods in human services Problem solving and interviewing.	Kestenbaum, Acker	5	TWTh	10-12	
4.221	01	Seminar in group leadership	Kestenbaum, Acker	3	W	10-11 a.m.	
		Physical education:					
4.130	01	Introduction to physical education, health education, and recreation education.	Hall	4	MTThF	11-12 a.m.	
		Graduate courses:					
4.512	01	Individual development and behavior	Staff	3	M	5:30-8:30 p.m.	2314
4.513	0	Influence of social context on presonality and behavior	Staff	3	W	5:30-8:30 p.m.	2314
4.514	01	Philosophies and pracitce of counseling	VanNess	3	T	5:30-8:30 p.m.	2314
4.515	01	Practicum and field experience in counseling	Staff	3	(3)		
4.516	01	Independent research study	Staff	3	(3)	5:30-8:30 p.m.	2314

See footnotes at end of table.

CLASS SCHEDULE, WINTER QUARTER 1968-70—Continued

THE BLACK STUDIES PROGRAM

[Explanation of course numbering system: 1st digit indicates division; Blank, skills center; 1, humanities division; 2, social sciences division; 3, natural sciences division; 4, professional division; 5, black studies program. 2d digit indicates level: 0, noncollege course; 1, freshman courses; 2, sophomore courses; 3, junior courses; 5, graduate courses]

Course No.	Section	Title	Instructor	Qtr. hrs.	Days	Time	Room
		PAN AFRICAN WORLD					
5.11	01	History and society in the African world	Cobb, C.	5	MWF	11-12 a.m.	1191
(2.123.01)	02	(African civilization)[4]	Oneywu, N.		TTh	10-11:30 a.m.	2288
	03		Cox, C.		MW	1-2:30 p.m.	1179
	04		Njoku, M.		WF	1-2:30 p.m.	1178
(2.123.02)	05	(African civilization)[4]	Onyewu, N.		MW	6-7:30 p.m.	2279
	06		Garrett, J.		TTh	8:30-10 p.m.	1247
		NATURAL SCIENCE[4]					
5.12	01	Uses of science in history	Wells, C.	2	MWF	10-11:15 a.m.	3431
	02						
		COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS					
5.13	01	Uses of language (public speaking)[4]	Wiley, J.	4	MWF	9-10 a.m.	1177
(1.171.01)	02		Niles, L.		TTh	8-10 a.m.	3309
	03		Taylor, A.		WF	10-11:30 a.m.	1247
(1.172.01)	04	(Dramatic reading)	Williams, S.		TTh	10-11:30 a.m.	B105
	05		Wiley, J.		TTh	1-2:30 p.m.	3309
	06		Mayfield, L.		TTh	1-2:30 p.m.	1247
(1.172.02)	07	(Dramatic reading)	Williams, S.		TTh	6-7:30 p.m.	1247
	08		Njoku, M.		TTh	8:30-10 p.m.	1178
(1.141.01)	09	(English composition)	Taylor		MW	8-9:30 a.m.	3309
(1.171.02)	10	(Public speaking)[4]	Niles		MTh	6-8:00 p.m.	3309
		AFRICAN PEOPLES AND WORLD REALITY					
5.14	01	Uses and techniques of pacification	Garrett, J.	4	MW	1-3 p.m.	1178
	02		Rooks, B.		TTh	1-2:30 p.m.	1179
	03		Scarborough, S.		TTh	1-2:30 p.m.	2788
	04		Cox, C.		MW	2-3:30 p.m.	1179
	05		Cox, W.		MWF	1-3 p.m.	2275
	06		Cobb, C.		TTh	7-8:30 p.m.	1178
	07		Parker, J.		MW	8-9:30 p.m.	2273
		LANGUAGES[4]					
5.15(1.153)							
	01	Spanish	Grady, C.	5	MF	10-11 a.m.	3310
	02		Grady, C.	5	MF	11-12 a.m.	3310
(1.150.01)	03	French	Labat, A.	5	MW	6-8 p.m.	3310
(1.150.02)	04		Labat, A.	5	MW	8-10 p.m.	3310
	05	Swahili	Wamboi		MWF	To be arranged.	
	06		Wamboi				
		BLACK STUDIES LIST OF COURSES					
5.16	01	Afro-American art history	Young, C.	5	TTh	10-12 a.m.	3367
(1.165.01) 5.17	01	Afro-American history of music	Roach, M.	5	TTh	1-3 p.m.	1247
(1.185.01) 5.18	01	African heritage in Negro music	Turpin	5	TTh	10-12 a.m.	1191

[1] 1 period to be arranged.

[2] To be arranged.

[3] Days and times to be arranged.

[4] The details in parentheses are the identical sections numbered and listed according to their other appearances in this schedule.

NEW CITIES FOR AMERICA

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed the Housing Act of 1968, which, if implemented, will prove to be the most farsighted housing act ever developed by Congress.

One title of the act called for the establishment of new cities throughout our country, and I would like at this time to have printed in the RECORD an article, "New Cities for America," by Edgardo Contini, who is a partner of Victor Gruen Associates, Los Angeles. The Gruen firm and Mr. Contini have been pioneers in the development of the new city concept. The article follows:

NEW CITIES FOR AMERICA

(By Edgardo Contini)

In the next thirty-five years we must literally build a second America—putting in as many houses, schools, apartments, parks and offices as we have built through all the time since the Pilgrims arrived on these shores.—PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

This statement puts into focus the enormity of the task before us better than any set of statistics. Yet it may be worthwhile to refer to a set of figures derived from U.S. Census statistics applicable to metropolitan areas. They summarize past conditions and projections of population growth and its distribution between rural and urban locations.

The tabulation tells us that between the present and the turn of the century urban population in the U.S. will be more than double what it is now, and will represent seventy-five percent of the total population.

All present trends and predictions indicate that without a serious national effort to encourage other patterns of growth, most of the increase will occur around existing metropolitan complexes.

Year	U.S. population	Population inside SMSA[1]	Percent of total	Population outside SMSA[1]	Percent of total
1940	132, 165, 000	72, 834, 000	55. 1	59, 331, 000	44. 9
1950	151, 326, 000	89, 317, 000	59. 0	62, 009, 000	41. 0
1960	179, 323, 000	112, 885, 000	63. 0	66, 438, 000	37. 0
1965	192, 185, 000	123, 813, 000	64. 4	68, 372, 000	35. 6
1970	208, 249, 000	137, 444, 000	66. 0	70, 805, 000	34. 0
1980	244, 566, 000	168, 751, 000	69. 0	75, 815, 000	31. 0
1990	287, 472, 000	206, 980, 000	72. 0	80, 492, 000	28. 0
2000	337, 472, 000	253, 104, 000	75. 0	84, 368, 000	25. 0

[1] Standard metropolitan statistical areas.

Growth of the city contributes increasing opportunities for employment, residential choice, education, recreation and culture. But growth also aggravates the problems of the community, increases the complexity of transportation and service sytsems, and generally requires more for the support of public facilities and services.

As growth continues indefinitely, there is a point of diminishing return. Benefits tend to decline while problems and liabilities increase. There may be disagreement about exactly where this point occurs, but when urban settlement reaches the order of ten or twenty millions, the residents of Megalopolis pay a high price for the dubious advantages of bigness. The only residual benefit is an increase in business or employment opportunities. Yet it can be argued that the average level of employment results from the over-all rate of national population growth and productivity, not from the size of population in any specific area. As for increased cultural and educational opportunities, beyond a certain point they fail to follow urban growth. When Megalopolis requires duplication of museums, theaters, civic centers, and multiple urban centers, each center remains limited in its influence. As Megalopolis continues to grow its residents limit themselves to their immediate neighborhood and actually enjoy fewer cultural and recreational advantages than residents of a smaller city.

Other disadvantages of Megalopolis are more obvious. The resident is robbed of the benefit of leisure time. Travelling through mile after mile of uninterrupted urban structure to reach the country for a breath of fresh air is a depressing experience, regardless how well designed the freeway, how comfortable the seat on the commuter train.

If the projection of growth cannot be challenged and the trend toward urbanization is not reversible, are there alternatives to the predicted image of the United States of tomorrow—two-thirds of its population concentrated in a dozen clusters of urbanization of fifteen to twenty million each? Are our children destined to have no other choice than Megalopolis?

The alternative consists of undertaking as a matter of national policy the creation of *New Cities*—"new" in that they must be viewed as urban organizations responsive to human needs and aspirations; "cities" in that (unlike the "new towns" dependent upon an adjacent metropolis) they must from the beginning be complete urban structures; "New Cities" in that their self-sufficiency, independence of existing political forces and interests will permit experimentation with techniques that are not possible in the existing cities.

The *New Cities* must be large enough to support a full range of cultural and educational facilities. The optimum size will have to be determined by regional characteristics, the local economic base and other factors. Indefinite expansion beyond optimum size should be discouraged. New political and economic devices and incentives should initially encourage and, at later stages, limit their growth.

The hardening of the social, political and economic structures of the nation's cities is so advanced that experimentation with new techniques has become almost impossible. People are becoming impatient with the slow pace of accomplishment. But no amount of indignation can alter the fact that our existing cities simply do not respond to reform. The *New Cities*, as laboratories for experimentation, may prove to be the best investment in terms of long-range returns.

Aristotle's words, "The aim of the city is to make man happy and safe," remain to this day a valid prescription. It is easy to evaluate urban structure in terms of safety. The definition of happiness may be more elusive, but where urban amenity is concerned, it is not difficult to recognize certain of its ingredients.

The contribution of *New Cities* to urban amenity must be based on greater sensitivity toward environmental design. Some of the values that our present cities have either never possessed or have lost can be recaptured. Imaginative design can also create new ones by being responsive to our emerging way of life.

Technological improvements that have lifted our standard of living at almost all other levels have failed to make an equal contribution to the building industry: techniques and materials, like attitudes, are in many ways those of our grandfathers. Obsolete and inconsistent building ordinances and union featherbedding, as well as romantic and irrational public attitudes toward shelter, have blocked efforts to produce housing of adequate standards at lower cost. To this day, we cannot produce new housing within the reach of one-third of the population, without subsidy. As a consequence, we are forced to fall back on the "hand-me-down" solution that is one of the prime causes of urban deterioration.

If the technology employed for the production of appliances, automobiles or farm produce was applied to housing, within a few years we could bring unsubsidized housing within the reach of everyone.

For *New Cities*, building ordinances should be prepared by professionals to encourage rather than penalize technological innovation. The building unions might more readily accept innovations for the *New Cities* (where they would not disturb the existing structures of economy and power) than if they were applied to existing urban areas.

Technological innovation for the *New City* should go far beyond the more efficient building of shelter. For example, the possibility of total climate control should be explored. The covered airconditioned pedestrian areas of recent years are just modest forerunners of the potentials already technologically available. Through them regions previously bypassed because of climate can be opened to urban settlement. Furthermore, new approaches to water supply and disposal, new techniques of power generation and distribution, and new methods of communication should readily be introduced in the design for the *New Cities*.

One of the most promising innovations in the *New Cities* should be in the field of transportation. The building of a *New City* offers an unparalleled opportunity to retain the benefits of private mobility without sacrificing the characteristics of compactness, efficiency and variety that must prevail in the new urban complexes. A system of private and public transportation designed to maximize the benefits of both, and new techniques of rapid mass transit should be developed as integral elements.

The major difficulty encountered in eliminating the ghettoes of existing communities is that efforts to redistribute housing, schooling, and recreation run up against prejudice and natural resistance to change established patterns.

Obviously, in the case of existing cities, change by fiat cannot be enforced. In the *New Cities* there would be no *status quo* to defend, no change to enforce. Its urban structure would be conceived to make racial and economic integration an element in its basic design. Its residents' sense of belonging and their desire for participation in civic affairs should be reinforced by structuring the complex into identifiable elements, comprehensible in size and organization, correlated to each other and to the city's center, by interspersing public spaces at the neighborhood level and providing for recreational facilities related to the over-all urban structure.

The functioning of the urban structure as a whole has not yet been subjected to the critical analysis applied to major private industrial complexes or the nation's defense system. The present pattern of urbanization is conductive to inefficient and uneconomical public services and improvements. Discontinuous development, fragmentation of government and authorities, and obsolete habits and institutions result in unnecessary costs for the support of public services and facilities. These in turn are reflected in the high rate of taxation.

Even if it were possible to unravel the complex tangle of functions and services within the urban structure, and, by sophisticated analysis, develop a system of optimum relationships for minimum cost, it would be extremely difficult to bring about the political reforms necessary to implement such a system in our existing cities.

But a careful analysis of functions, services, costs and techniques for a *New City* should be undertaken prior to the plan and the administrative scheme of the *New City* should be based on the findings. It will thus be possible to expand the range of public services and amenities without increasing taxes.

The role of the educational institutions is changing and expanding. Pre-school headstart programs and adult extension programs have widened the range of educational services. New relationships are emerging: the elementary school as a neighborhood center; the high school as an integral element of the community center; the use of school facilities to fulfill civic as well as educational needs; the university conceived as an urban campus reflecting its relationship with private institutions of research and industry, as well as the broad cultural influence it can exert on the entire community. These are just beginnings.

Similarly, in the field of community health, the emphasis is shifting from curative to preventive medicine; mental health is being tied in with environmental amenity, and the problems of the aged are viewed as a community responsibility.

Both in terms of educational and health facilities the *New Cities* should provide an opportunity for experimentation that would be valuable elsewhere.

The political systems inherited by our cities have proved cumbersome in coping with the problems of the metropolis. Conceived and structured at a time of slow change and limited range of public service, they were directed more toward maintaining democratic processes at the local level than providing efficient government.

The challenge for *New Cities* thus is clear: to devise and adopt a government structure that will not only retain but will reinforce the democratic process in contemporary urban life and, at the same time, function effectively in administering the complex machinery of the city. The multiplicity of independent (and often competing) governments should be replaced in the *New Cities* by a new form of municipal government structured to respond quickly to metropolitan problems as they arise and yet sensitive to neighborhood and community needs. It will have to combine the best characteristics of corporate management with the tradition of representation and participation by the residents.

It is an open secret that our cities are in dire economic straits. Growth and deterioration, operating simultaneously in the framework of an obsolete system of taxation and financing, have resulted in land speculation and fiscal insolvency. A large measure of the difficulty results from the conflict between the concept of private ownership of land and rapid growth.

Individual ownership of land served the urban community as long as growth rate and obsolescence were slow. But as soon as growth became pressing and, more recently, as obsolescence tended to accelerate the pace of change, ownership of urban land was overshadowed by speculation, which led to the frustration of efforts to guide urban growth.

Thus, as other democratic countries have done already, we must come to view urban land as a public asset, a resource to be used wisely and efficiently for the greatest common good.

This concept has already been adopted on a limited scale by the urban renewal process: eminent domain is exercised when hope of self-improvement has faded; land is assembled as a community asset and returned to private development. The differential between acquisition cost and disposal price is borne by the community, with substantial federal assistance.

Can this concept be expanded? Why should the instrument of community guidance and control be instituted only after things get desperate and the price of rehabilitation is sky high? Why not reverse the process, and, from the beginning, introduce community control of the development rights of all land destined to become urban?

In this manner it would be possible to program the pattern of urban growth efficiently, to install services and utilities of adequate size. The community, by making land available to the private developer when it is required, and pricing it at its fair market value, could retain the differential between the cost of raw land plus improvements and the disposal price. Thus it could accumulate a rotating capital to finance the process of growth and the added services growth requires. The result: not subsidized renewal but urban administration on a self-supporting basis, with a lower and more equitable tax burden.

The implementation of the *New Cities* program—like many of the new ventures recently undertaken as a matter of national policy—can best be accomplished by joining the initiative and financial support of government and the imagination, technological skill and investment of private enterprise.

The scale of the *New Cities* program is too overwhelming for private initiative. Its purposes and implications are too relevant to the country's future to be sacrificed to the profit motive alone. Nor should the venture be undertaken entirely by government. Not only would this represent a departure from the nation's tradition, it would deprive the undertaking of the contribution of ingenuity, motivation and capability that private enterprise can provide. Through a joint venture involving the coordinated participation of three principles, government, industry in general, and the building and urban development industry in particular, the program can be carried out.

The government should formulate the program and provide the financial support or guarantees necessary to generate incentive.

The role of industry should be to develop research and production facilities to establish employment possibilities for this new community.

The building and development industry would have responsibility for translating the program into reality.

I have attempted to outline the benefits of such a program. Beyond such specifics, a national commitment to the bold new venture of establishing new urban settlements would have extraordinary psychological value. As long as we view urbanization essentially as a generator of problems and grief, and address our public efforts to remedy, relief, or repair, we lose the spirit of our heritage.

We should view the urban revolution as we viewed the industrial revolution—as an extraordinary opportunity: the opportunity for the joint exercise of public vision and commitment and private ingenuity.

A RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PERMITTING OF OFFSHORE DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS IN LAKE ERIE

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the matter of exploration of oil and gas drilling on the floor of Lake Erie is one of increasing concern to the residents in the areas bordering on the lake.

Recently the city council of Sandusky, Ohio, passed a resolution opposing this offshore drilling, and I am taking this opportunity to make its contents available to every Member of Congress. I sincerely urge that Members read it and take note of this problem which is developing in the Great Lakes area.

The following is the text of the resolution:

RESOLUTION 1441–C: A RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PERMITTING OF OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS IN LAKE ERIE

Whereas, Lake Erie is a great natural resource as a primary source of water supply, for commerce, for many forms of recreation, and

Whereas, although Lake Erie has been neglected for many years by the public and by the various governments that have jurisdiction in the matter and they have permitted it to become polluted and be otherwise misused, principally by private interests, to the great detriment of the public generally, and

Whereas, there is now a great awakening and much concern is now being shown and vast sums of money spent by the public, and the various governments toward the preservation of Lake Erie as a great natural resource, to keep it from being further polluted and otherwise misused, to restore it to its former state of relative purity and natural beauty, but there is still a great deal more to be done, and

Whereas, private interests still persist in their efforts to get permission to drill offshore in Lake Erie for oil and gas primarily for their own interests and to the detriment of the interest of the public generally, particularly when it has recently been demonstrated through off-shore drilling in California that the same may be a source of pollution of monstrous proportion, now therefore

Be it resolved by the City Commission of the City of Sandusky, Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the City of Sandusky be and it is opposed to the permitting of offshore drilling in Lake Erie for oil and gas.

SEC. 2. That our representatives in the legislature of the State of Ohio and the Congress of the United States be made aware of our concern for the preservation of Lake Erie as a great natural resource and its restoration to its former state of relative purity and natural beauty, and that they be urged to have the same concern when considering legislation that is proposed which directly or indirectly relates to these things.

SEC. 3. That this Resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

J. ROBERT HANLON,
President of the City Commission.

Attest.

VIRGINIA SCHAEFER,
Clerk of the City Commission.

Passed: March 10, 1969.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal pride that I rise today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the American Legion on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

As a member of Post No. 314 of Hawthorne, Calif., for 25 years, I have long been familiar with the outstanding work of the American Legion in the field of community service.

The Legion, for example, has trained our young people for positions of leadership and responsibility through sponsorship of programs such as Boys State, Boys Nation, American Legion junior baseball teams, American Legion oratorical contests, and Boy Scout troops. These programs have given millions of young Americans an opportunity to develop their talents in a constructive and responsible manner while at the same time strengthening their character.

During its five decades, the American Legion has compiled an impressive record of legislative achievements. The establishment of the Veterans' Bureau in 1921 and its successor, the Veterans' Administration in 1930; the World War Veterans' Act of 1924; the first non-service-connected pension program for widows and orphans; the World War II GI bill and similar programs for veterans of more recent conflicts are but a few of the major pieces of legislation in which the American Legion played a leading role.

Ever since that historic day, March 15, 1919, when a group of World War I veterans, known as the Paris Caucus, met in Paris, France, the American Legion has grown from 500 then to almost 3 million veterans today of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and Vietnam.

The work they have done for our young people, for veterans and their families, and for the community has shown their great concern for the future of our country and serves as an inspiring example of what a dedicated organization can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to salute this great organization and wish the American Legion well in its next 50 years.

OREGON HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I testified before the House Interior Committee recently requesting a reversal or major modification in the proposed increases in grazing fees on public land. At that time I expressed my belief that this increase is not equitable and that the departments should reconsider this decision. The Public Land Law Review Commission is now in the process of studying these questions, and I believe it is appropriate to delay the increases until the study is completed and the Commission has submitted its recommendations.

The people of Oregon feel strongly about this issue and I think this feeling is well demonstrated by the joint house memorial which the Oregon Legislature recently passed in opposition to the fee increases. The gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and I have asked that this memorial be introduced to the House today and referred to the proper com-

XUM

mittee. I would like to have it printed in full at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

TO THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND SECRETARY OF INTERIOR:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the agricultural sector of this nation's economy is undergoing a period of recession; and

Whereas the increase in the fees for grazing on public lands that has been proposed by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior would have such detrimental economic impact on the livestock industry that the entire profit margin in many livestock operations would be removed; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior are memorialized to refrain from implementing the recently proposed increases in fees for grazing on public lands.

(2) The Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall send a copy of this memorial to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

NIXON AND ATLANTIC UNION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist Roscoe Drummond discussed the question of President Nixon and the movement for Atlantic Union in his column for Sunday, March 9, 1969. This was the second of a series of two Drummond columns on the Nixon-in-Europe trip. Unfortunately, the Washington Post published only the first of the articles but omitted the second. Therefore, I present it at this point in my remarks:

NIXON AND ATLANTIC UNION

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

Will Richard Nixon as President act on his conviction that patching up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization just would not be good enough?

And will he take bold initiative on his long-held view that the Atlantic Alliance should be an Atlantic Union?

Mr. Nixon has strongly backed the proposed congressional resolution to invite interested NATO countries to prepare the way to turn the present military alliance into a federal union.

When the Atlantic Union Resolution was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1966, he spoke for it:

"It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations."

As President, he can turn promise into performance.

In 1966, Mr. Nixon noted that "the concept of an 'Atlantica' is at present only a dream, but, in the age of the rocket, dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine."

On his recent European trip the President found ample evidence that every nation he visited, except France, wanted to be partners in a more unified Western Europe.

Three years ago Mr. Nixon was "deeply disturbed" by the "renewed nationalism of France" and on his latest trip he found President de Gaulle as nationalist-minded as ever.

But in 1966 Mr. Nixon said that "by adopting a measure such as the Atlantic Union Resolution we could give new impetus to the spirit of federalism in Western Europe."

And there is more support for further unifying the Atlantic community now than there was three years ago. Most European nations now outside the Common Market—Britain, Scandinavia, Greece, Switzerland and others—want to join, and all the Common Market countries, except France, want them to join.

In the United States there is a wide political base to encourage the President to actively help the move for a Citizens' Convention to see what first steps can be taken to enable the free nations of the Atlantic world who want to join closer together to do so.

Time was when it was venturesome, even perilous, for American political leaders to show that they favored any moves toward a federation of like-minded free nations.

No longer. And President Nixon would have no reason to fear any serious political opposition either from the responsible right or left if he put his prestige behind the Atlantic Resolution.

Few, if any, congressional proposals have won such wide and prestigious backing as the Atlantic Resolution. It is supported by nearly every national Republican leader—Dwight Eisenhower, Mr. Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller, Barry Goldwater, George Romney, William Scranton, Charles Percy, Mark Hatfield and others. It was supported by the contenders for the Democratic presidential nomination—Hubert Humphrey, Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy.

It probably wouldn't take either courage or daring for President Nixon to put himself behind an Atlantic convention. But it would take something because the tendency of many Presidents, once they are in office, is to feel that it is unwise to rock the boat in foreign relations.

But the President may well feel on the basis of his trip to Europe that now is the time to act more boldly if the Atlantic world is, in Mr. Nixon's own words, to respond adequately to "the incredible change which is going on in the world around us."

FOCUS ON THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART II

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the black studies program at Federal City College is a tentative and projected curriculum which, like all other majors, has not yet come to the administration and the board of higher education for final approval.

Recent newspaper stories, nevertheless, have given the public a distorted and confusing view of the proposed black studies program. I feel it important, therefore, to bring to the attention of my colleagues the details of the program, its objectives and goals, as outlined in the following report on the activities at the Federal City College from the college information office:

FOCUS ON THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—A PERSPECTIVE: BLACK STUDIES PROGRAM AT FCC

"There must be a way to legitimize black thought—the intellectual concerns of black people," says FCC Associate Professor of English Andress Taylor. "The Black Studies Program at Federal City College and other colleges in the country will provide the leadership in the challenge to take manifestations of black culture out of the streets, institutionalize it, discover its relationship to the past and transmit it to present and future generations," he continues. This is the goal of the Black Studies Program at Federal City College.

The Black Studies Program at FCC is a comprehensive and complete rather than the usual fragmented approach to black studies. According to Black Studies Program Director James Garrett, "It focuses upon the realities and prospects of those of African origin where they exist or, the Continent of Africa, in the West Indies, and in the Americas. In essence, the Program is at once a cultural and educational vehicle for creative awareness, confidence, and determination of black people."

The objective of the Program is to provide sorely needed manpower in black communities at home and abroad in areas of (1) food and medicine for nutriment planning assistance and care for the ill, (2) architecture for physical development of the community, (3) communication for communicating effectively within and between communities, (4) political and economic structures for effective contributions in productive and conciliatory activities in the communities, (5) historical and cultural structures for development of knowledge and appreciation of heritage and aesthetic activities, and (6) teacher education for expertise in training people of the communities to train each other. To achieve this end, the Program proposes to encourage black people to understand the disciplines of science, mathematics, and other technical areas as they apply to these black educational needs. It will seek to provide an arena for the perfection of those skills necessary for the vitalization of black communities.

FCC Professor of English and Chairman of Humanities Division William Couch, Jr. says, "It is normal for any school to serve the interests of its citizens. Black Studies defines and furthers the interest of students whose lives are rooted in black existence."

The Black Studies Program has as its purpose revitalization and maintenance of values, attitudes, social structure, and technology relevant to black people through (1) development of undying love for each other; (2) realization that black people are descendants of Africans; and (3) realization that security, respect and equality shall be the necessary foundation of black life.

Community involvement and dedication will be the means for achieving the goal of love among black people. Accordingly, the Program will seek to develop a relationship among black people that manifests itself to the black community. It will advocate an African cooperative family concept of dedication to the black community as opposed to the individual concept of "me first." For example, a black doctor would go into the black community that most desperately needs his talent. He would seek *only to make a living* and not accumulate great amounts of wealth. In time the black community would support him and he would serve that black community. He would also devote himself to encouraging black youth to become interested in medicine and serving the black community. The black community in return would pay for the education and training of the black doctors who would come back to serve them. The same model would apply to all technical and professional areas, including architecture, engineering, food processing, biology and chemistry.

In the second instance, Black Studies will provide a physical and emotional setting for strengthening the currently vaguely perceived ties between black people throughout the world. This will mean the institution of methods of communication and vehicles of exchange which will serve to bring together

XUM

the information and talent of black people everywhere.

In addition, it is hoped that various kinds of exchange programs between African, Caribbean, and the North and South American blacks will be instituted to lead to a knowledge of an empathy politics, cultural and economic with black people in those countries.

In connection with this, the Program will include in its activities a series of group-travel plans through which students will be able to visit, work, and learn in various areas of the country, such as black cooperatives in the South, and the rest of the black world including the Caribbean, Africa and Latin America. In this way real contact will be established and maintained between black people in countries around the world and black people in America.

The Program proposes that meaningful education for black people must insure security. Black security must mean security from hunger, sickness, and shelterlessness. Black security also includes a psychological well being. Respect represents a basic principle which must be strengthened through the Black Studies Program. This will increase the dignity and sense of security of black people.

In order to achieve these specific objectives and goals, the Program will take total responsibility for the academic pursuit of students enrolled in Black Studies. The Program will be composed of two major parts—a degree program and a series of individual course offerings. The degree program is a systematic four-year course which will lead to a degree in Black Studies. The first two years will focus primarily on channelling the student to a spirit of dedication and community work, and development of interpretive skills necessary to define for themselves the relationship between the history of black people and their present situation so that they may better understand how to create their future. The latter two years will focus on specialization in one of three curriculum cores—technical, political, or cultural.

"All courses in the degree program are mandatory. They are divided into the following areas with students taking one course in each area each quarter:

FIRST YEAR

Pan African World—The study of the historical, social and cultural development of African communities in the Caribbean, on the Continent, and in the Americas.

Natural Sciences—Basic courses for a historical survey of the general principles and uses of the sciences and an introduction to practical application of these principles of the social life of the community.

Communicative Skills—Courses designed to advance the concepts and applications of reading, writing, and speech.

African Peoples and World Reality—Survey and analysis of the dominating forces and facts and the relationship of African peoples to this context.

Languages—Choice of Swahili, Kikuyu, Arabic, French, Spanish, or Portuguese. (Students must specialize in one language).

Physical Development—Program of study and activity in the arts which strengthen the body and discipline the mind, including Akikdo Karate, Aquatics, Gymnastics, the African Hunt, and Dance.

SECOND YEAR

Interpretation of the African Experience—History and analysis designed to develop the student's interpretative understanding of political developments in the African world.

Cultural Concepts of African Peoples—Discussion of cultural themes in specific areas of the African world.

World's Great Men of Color—Courses concerning life and time of outstanding black men.

THIRD YEAR

Concentration in one:

Technical Core—Training and instruction in the specific skills, scientific and technical, relevant to black education, such as courses emphasizing food technology, biomedics, and physical planning and development.

Political Core—The exploration and development of social techniques in response to the situation of the Pan-African world.

Cultural Core—The transmission of the culture and heritage of the African peoples.

(In all cores, a course in geography is required in the first quarter, one on institutions is required in the second quarter, and a course in black intellectual thinking and development is required in the third quarter.)

FOURTH YEAR

A yearly rather than quarterly program will be pursued in the fourth year, with major emphasis on the development of areas for the application and acquisition of advanced skills with direction always toward applications.

The fourth year will be a cooperative effort among the cores of three different levels—individual level, intra-core level, and inter-core level—within a particular part of the African world. With the shift to the yearly basis rather than the quarterly, there will be closer personal supervision between instructor and student. The fourth year also provides time for extensive travel. There is a good possibility that some of the courses of study will require a fifth or sixth year. Also in some cases students will be sent to other institutions for further study and skill development.

The several individual courses offered by the Black Studies Program to the entire student body for credit will not lead to a degree in Black Studies, but will focus on various aspects of black history and culture. These courses include "Afro-American Heritage of Music," "African Heritage in Negro Music," and "Afro-American Art History."

The Black Studies Program has set its list of priorities as:

1. The Community—Institution of a carefully designed segment of the program dealing specifically with such areas as participation by students and staff in projects being carried on in black communities, including schools, churches, political organizations, and businesses. The community will be a crucial part of the Program and it will become equally important to the lives of the people in the community.
2. Students in the Program—Understanding and acceptance of the Program aims and objectives by the students and complete training of the students in the area of study.
3. The Staff—General acceptance of the principles of the Black Studies Program, willingness to function in a staff position as opposed to the usual faculty positions, and thorough knowledge of area of specialty—not necessarily expressed in the form of degrees.
4. The Program itself—Achievement of the program goals and objectives.

Black Studies now has proposals under discussion for establishment of formal relationships with all College divisions, especially in teacher education which will be a major focus of the Program. A formal relationship has already been established with the College Humanities Division and will include such cooperation as joint faculty appointments. Later such relationships will be established with professional schools of certain area universities. These relationships will strengthen the Black Studies Program and insure more definite achievement of the Program goals.

The need for establishment of Black Studies as an area of formal studies has been demonstrated nationally. An editor of a large metropolitan daily newspaper recently asserted that those persons thinking that they will "find the sites of a black Rome or Greece in Africa, are in for a sad disappointment." He was in fact saying that the current surge in black history, black awareness and the study of black culture, is more equated to the fabricating of black cultures and civilizations of our fantasy and legend into pseudo facts.

His assumption is incorrect. Evidently he has not read the *Tarikh al Fattash* (*Chronicle of the Searcher*), which Daniel McCall in his book, *Africa in Time-Perspective*, states as being "the oldest *written* history now extant that was composed by a West African." He apparently has not read other works (mostly in Arabic) describing the great Sudanese empires of Ghana, Mali, and Songhai. One ancient manuscript was not discovered until 1911 and it is apparent that few of us know much of its contents now. There is much to learn from the works of the *Tarikh al Sudan* and the *Tarikh al Fattash* as well as many facts to glean from the scholars of Sonike and Timbuktu.

The need for information on what has transpired culturally and historically between the Niger and the Nile is a significant part of the thirst that has stimulated the growth of the fairly new discipline of Black Studies.

HANDLOADING AND CRIME?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Handloader publication of March-April 1969 pointing out some of the follies attendant upon the passage of the recent firearms control legislation and some of the foolish administration which has been attendant thereon:

HANDLOADING AND CRIME?

The legislative record of the Gun Control Act of 1968 comprises transcripts of public hearings, committee reports and House and Senate floor debates during some five years of arguing the pros and cons of attempting to control crime by controlling firearms. These records include thousands of pages and millions of words. Stacked one atop the other they make a pile almost three feet tall.

Yet in all this mass of material there is not one suggestion that there is a relationship between reloading and crime. At no time during any of the hearings or debates did *anyone* offer even an opinion that the availability of reloading components has any effect upon the crime rate.

But when the "gun law" was passed, reloading components were given almost the same treatment as guns. Why? Where is the evidence of any need to regulate and prohibit the sale of components?

Is the Congress of the United States so docile that it will enact a major provision of law without a single word in its support, without a single reason why it should be enacted? Apparently so, for that is precisely what the 90th Congress did when it included reloading components in the Gun Control Act of 1968!

In the editorial in the last issue of *The Handloader* we pointed out that there were never any public hearings in regard to *any* federal law which would control ammunition or reloading components. Had there been hearings we doubt that either ammo or components would have been included, for both are patently impossible to effectively regulate,

XUM

even if there were a valid reason for attempting to do so.

In any event, the proponents of the law should have been made to offer some form of reasonable evidence in support of component controls, and handloaders should have been given an opportunity to present the reasons why such controls should not have been enacted. But neither happened. The handloading components controls simply became law, without public argument either for or against, simply because someone in the Johnson Administration wanted components "regulated." *That kind of shenanigan is expected in a dictatorship, but we didn't think democracy was supposed to work that way!*

Until the Johnson Administration pulled H.R. 17735 out of the hat after Sen. Robert Kennedy's assassination, no Administration bill had called for ammunition controls—and the Treasury Department had testified that it didn't want such a law because experience with the ammo controls of the Federal Firearms Act had shown that ammunition could not be effectively controlled or traced.

In the furor created by President Johnson's call for passage of a firearms registration and licensing bill, too little attention was paid to the "lesser" bill to extend "mail order" prohibitions to long guns and ammunition. As a result, few people noticed that "ammunition" was defined to include "cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder."

Since the last *Handloader* editorial was written, Treasury Department regulations on the new law have been published specifically exempting ammo and components for "antique firearms," loose shot and unloaded, unprimed "non-metallic" shotgun hulls from the law's prohibitions. The Treasury Department did not explain why brass shotgun cases are considered more hazardous to the public safety than paper or plastic cases!

Had there been hearings on ammunition—and reloading component—controls, someone would have been expected to explain why the bill included ammo and components and would have been expected to establish some sort of relationship to the crime problems. But no hearings—no explanation.

Bills are reportedly being prepared by Sen. John Tower (Texas) and others to repeal the ammunition section of the new law. The nation's handloaders need to get behind those bills by asking our congressmen a few questions:

"Where is the evidence that reloading or the availability of reloading components has anything to do with crime? Why were reloading components—and ammunition—included in the law without benefit of public hearings? How are you going to vote on the proposal to remove reloading components and ammo from the law's prohibitions?"

We'd like to see some answers to those questions—and the ammunition section of the law repealed!—NEAL KNOX.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share the following speech, given by a fine, young man in my district, upon his election as Governor of the American Legion Boys' State, with the readers of the RECORD.

I am mighty proud of Kent Stair for this outstanding achievement, and his speech is an accomplishment which I feel deserves recognition by all of us:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. Chief Justice, Distinguished Guests, My Friends and Fellow Boy Staters: I come before you on this Inaugural Day of June 5, 1968 with the hopes and beliefs that tomorrow will be a brighter day.

Today, a dark cloud of hatred and confusion hangs over the world. Today, a storm of prejudices divides our nation and our world. Today, self is put first, while country is a distant second. You may ask yourself when will it ever end? . . . Will it ever end? Is there any hope for tomorrow? What is the hope for tomorrow?

Fellow Boy Staters, we are the hope for tomorrow. It will be up to our generation to end this hatred. It will be up to our generation to end this turmoil. Our generation will end this gloomy day one way or the other.

Will we work for peace and live, or hate our neighbor and die? The answer lies in our own hearts. Tomorrow belongs to us! We are the hope for tomorrow!

As governor-elect of American Legion Boys State, I have appointed what I believe to be a capable and qualified staff. Each and every one of these gentlemen is here to serve you. Come share your problems with them. They want to help you. Each and every one of them is looking for a brighter tomorrow.

The keynote we sound here today is that we understand, appreciate, and educate our youth.

Too many times in our world today, the word "teen-ager" has been used as a bad word. We, the Governor's Staff at Boys State, disagree.

You read about the hippie from Columbia University, but do you hear about the clean-cut law student. You see and read about the marches on our national capital, but what about the young man who is out having to work his way through college. You hear of the black power advocates, but you never hear of the young Negro out trying to constructively help his race. You see the draft-card burners, but you never see the boy lying dead in Vietnam because he put his friends and his country before himself.

Too many times in our world today, adults look down upon teenagers. They contend that the teen-agers are gradually digressing to an immoral state. We, on the Governor's Staff, disagree. Some adults point to the problems of liquor, drugs, obscene literature, and a lack of morals. Have these adults ever stopped to figure out who is promoting all of these items? If they take a deep look, they will see that it is not the teen-ager, it is the adult.

No, fellow Boy Staters, the word "teenager" is not a dirty word. It is the greatest word in our vocabulary because it is our hope for a better tomorrow.

As governor of your state, I would like to see better education and better opportunity. I want every one in our State to have a chance to live and be truly free . . . free from fear, free from prejudice, and free from hatred. Not until that day will our society be truly free.

Tomorrow draws closer. We must not wait on it to come. We must meet it and we must conquer it. This is what we, the citizens of American Legion Boys State, can do. We can lead the way. We can show a sincere desire to help others. We can make a brighter tomorrow.

I stand before you a proud and honored young man. I have come to realize that when my term as governor ends, my wonderful memories of Boys State will continue. I realize that when my term as governor dies, that the thrill of knowing you all will live in my heart forever. I realize that this week I have made friendships which neither time nor distance can ever break.

I am honored to be your governor, but I am even more honored to be your friend and fellow-citizen in American Legion Boys State.

I sincerely hope that someday, we can all wake up to a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. Chief Justice, I am now ready to take the oath of office.

PASSPORT CLUB, INC.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in recent years steps have been taken both in the private and public sectors to help foster a better image of the United States throughout the world. The Peace Corps in particular is a noted example of a people-to-people program that has met with outstanding success and has enabled our citizens to better understand other cultures and other people while at the same time extending to them an understanding of the American spirit.

We know that individual contacts with citizens of foreign lands, for both business and pleasure, may someday be the ultimate answer to peace in our time. Recently, I learned of a very unusual enterprise that is about to begin in the United States that I would like very much to bring to your attention. Passport Club, Inc., which is headquartered in New York City, offers to its members an opportunity to see the world and its people, their philosophies, their ideas, their difficulties and their heritage. For the first time the average American will be able to participate in a 3-year travel program.

The program offers to its members an opportunity to travel within their own hemisphere and to the far reaches of the globe including Europe and the Orient. An important feature is the awareness by those who have founded Passport Club that, in addition to people-to-people communication, there is another problem which we must face—that of our balance of payments.

Passport Club has made a commitment to use U.S. carriers wherever possible. Arrangements for first-class hotels and car service overseas will also be made through U.S.-based companies.

Last, plans are currently afoot to organize similar clubs in other countries so that those who live in Europe, in the Orient, in South America, in Africa, will have a similar opportunity to travel and experience the joys of other people, other worlds, and other countries including the United States. In addition, to further this communication, the Passport Club is embarking on a unique series of services for its members including the offering of foreign language courses prior to their visiting a country, regular group meetings so that members will be able to get to know each other better, special arrangements with large companies offering all the advantages of group purchasing power at the individual level and, within the framework of the club, a special travel insurance policy for each member.

I feel this is a program that offers to its members a unique opportunity to be a great help to our country in promoting better relations throughout the world. And, at the same time, offers them the opportunity to see sights and places that only a few short years ago they never would have dared to dream about. Those who are responsible for Passport Club should be commended for offering this opportunity to so many.

PRESIDENT ACTS TO CURB ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to note that the President has now taken concrete action in proposing legislation to eliminate loopholes in the Bank Holding Company Act which allows banking and nonbanking interests to mix. I feel strongly that this type of mixing threatens the financial stability of our country and for many years have sought to close these loopholes. In 1956 when the Bank Holding Act was passed, it was agreed that everything that should be done had not been done in passing the bill. President Eisenhower said on signing the law:

> The legislation falls short of achieving these objectives—the exemptions and other special provisions will require the further attention of the Congress.

In 1966 as a result of legislation I introduced, the House voted to eliminate all exemptions to the Bank Holding Act, but only four exemptions were removed in the Senate. Of the two remaining provisions, the one which allows bank holding companies to escape Federal regulation has become a major concern. Until the mid-1960's this exemption allowed relatively small financial institutions to offer services, usually in nonmetropolitan areas which may not have been available otherwise. In 1965 the average deposits of the 550 one-bank holding companies was $15 billion. The most recent figures available show that there are now almost 800 one-bank holding companies controlling over $100 billion. A recent report published by the House Banking Committee indicates that nine of the 12 largest commercial banks in the country have recently formed one-bank holding companies.

In his communication to the Congress the President underscored the importance of this legislation when he stated:

> Left unchecked, the trend toward the combining of banking and business could lead to the formation of a relatively small number of power centers dominating the American economy. This must not be permitted to happen. It would be bad for banking, bad for business and bad for borrowers and consumers.

I agree fully with the President in this and I commend him for his foresight in this regard. Legislation which I have introduced in this Congress will eliminate these exemptions which provide for one-bank holding companies. I hope the Congress will act promptly in resolving this matter which has the potential of undermining the diversity of business on which the economic foundation of this country rests.

SAGINAW: ALL-AMERICA CITY

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the membership some very pertinent newspaper articles on the selection of Saginaw, Mich., as an All-America City. The articles, from recent editions of the Saginaw News, follow:

[From the Saginaw News, Mar. 20, 1969]

IN WHICH OUR FINEST HOUR DAWNS UPON US

Saginawians awoke to a very special first day of spring today.

There may not ever again be another one quite like it. If there ever is, there will never be a second realization like the first.

A flag flies over City Hall. It bears a simple inscription.

"Saginaw: All-America City."

Equally unstrained but eloquent ceremonies this morning at the seat of city government acknowledged Saginaw's official designation as one of 11 cities in the United States of America receiving today this signal honor. There are more than 16,000 in the U.S. that makes us "one in fifteen hundred."

How does that grab you? It ought to grab you pretty good, dear reader, because the honor is yours. It doesn't belong to any government. It is yours and yours alone.

No tricks. No double talk. No gimmicks. The National Municipal League and Look Magazine, co-sponsors of the annual All-America City judging, run a hard-nosed event. The only basis on which the award is given is the tested measure of citizen participation in and commitment to the solution of urban problems. That and the measure of accomplishment.

As Look says, "in keeping with today's epidemic of urban ills, each of the winners had problems or sins-in-the-past to confess. But the winners . . . are not being recognized for the quality of their confessions. Their citizens went beyond identifying their troubles to do something about them."

In our case what we've been honored for doing something about is the nation's No. 1 problem—race relations. Only one other among the 11 designated was similarly recognized. This makes it something very, very special. It focuses the eyes of a nation on us.

This is a joyous day, of course. It is a historic moment. Few things nicer have ever happened to Saginaw. It is an appropriate time, moreover, to try to capture the perspective and the enormity of what has come to the people of this community.

We in Saginaw know very well what we are about in the entire field of endeavor for which we are now singled out. We know where we were, we know how far we have come to get where we are and we should know just how far we have yet to go.

Most of us are pretty familiar by now with what Look calls "pace-setting programs" begun here in the area of improved race relations . . . passage of an open housing ordinance . . . the creative work of the Mayor's Committee of Concern ranging over the whole spectrum of problems that keep so many out of the mainstream of attainment . . . passage of an 8-mill tax to improve educational opportunities for all of the city's school children and the deep personal involvement of our teen-age youth that made public approval possible . . . First Ward Community's Center's fully-funded program to secure jobs and job training for the hard core unemployed . . . the city's rental housing inspection program . . . United Fund's activist support of social agencies reaching to the very heart of these ills.

We could go on. Project READ. Opportunities Industrialization Center. The involvement of the churches, the ministry and lay leaders. The list is long. It is made up of efforts large and small, many being conducted on a quiet, more personal basis of man-to-man involvement—some drawing fewer headlines than others, some moving faster than others.

These are the things that deeply impressed the national panel of judges who heard them and asked to know more.

Now, of course, what strikes us about this title which has been bestowed upon the citizens of Saginaw is what it means.

Titles, awards are transitory things. It is what they impose upon their recipients that matters. And what they impose is challenge to live up to them.

Today and the days of official observance that follow will be joyous and prideful ones. That is as it should be. It is not wrong, it will never be wrong to view with satisfaction what we have done in commitment that has brought this honor.

The deeper impact, however, is that the designation "All-America City" marks the end of the beginning.

It is, as Mayor Henry G. Marsh said this morning, necessary to remind ourselves that this award in no way spells municipal perfection in solving the maladies associated with modern urban life of which he spoke in New Orleans before the reviewers—discrimination, low educational achievement, unemployment and poor housing. We are far from that. But we are discovering that an enormous amount is possible by government, business and individual working with each other.

What this award says is that the task of healing the ills has begun in this community. The mayor laid heavy emphasis upon the words "challenge" and "responsibility." They are the key words today in Saginaw for every resident.

"If we can use the title we have received as a foundation upon which to build, look upon it as a landmark telling us that we are heading in the right direction—then we will be truly worthy of the award," said the mayor.

This is a good day for walking tall. As we pass through this period of euphoria, however, let each of us do so with perspective and humility. Let us resolve that this happy moment in our lives will not be merely an anthem to past and present but a pledge to the future.

FLAG RAISING LAUNCHES ALL-AMERICA CITY WEEK

(By Frank J. Koontz)

Official anouncement this morning that Saginaw has been named an All-America City launched a round of celebrations which will climax April 1.

The not-very-kell-kept secret was "made public" this morning at a press conference and flag-raising ceremony at the City Hall.

Mayor Henry G. Marsh has proclaimed the period from now until April 1 as "Saginaw All-America City Week."

A red flag with white lettering spelling out, "Saginaw: All-America City" was hoisted up the flagpole shortly after 9 a.m.

under the overcast sky and Central Junior High School's band played several selections.

Mayor Marsh stressed that the award is for citizen action rather than governmental accomplishment. He also noted that the award which he called "the highest honor that can be earned by an American community," could have been made to any of more than 16,000 cities in America.

Only 11 cities are chosen each year by the National Municipal League and Look Magazine to receive the honor.

(The magazine scheduled the announcement for national release today. The release was broken Wednesday by a Saginaw radio station and also by a newspaper in a Texas city receiving the same honor. As a result, the national wire services carried the story Wednesday evening, too late for The News to print an account prepared several days ago.)

The proud celebrations planned for the next dozen days will touch almost every citizen.

Decals of the red, white and blue All-America City shield have been attached to all city vehicles; shoulder patch shields will be worn by all uniformed city employees; the All-America City shield has been affixed to all entrance signs welcoming motorists to the city.

The Saginaw Post Office will start using a new cancellation stamp proclaiming Saginaw's proud accomplishment; stewardesses on airplanes going to and from Tri-City Airport will tell the passengers that Saginaw is an All-America City; city schools have scheduled art and essay contests, dances and special flag presentation ceremonies.

The main festivities will end April 1, when Gov. William G. Milliken and other officials are scheduled to come to Saginaw to participate in the official award presentation.

On that date, representatives from Look and the Municipal League will present the All-America City award to Mayor Marsh at a public ceremony at 6 p.m. in the Auditorium.

Because the award is given for constructive citizen action—rather than for governmental action—the public is urged to attend the ceremonies at the Auditorium.

A parade involving local school bands, local and visiting dignitaries and perhaps floats will leave City Hall at 5:15 p.m. and proceed to the Auditorium.

There, the award is to be presented to Marsh, acting as the representative of the citizens of Saginaw. The Saginaw Youth Band is scheduled to entertain the audience.

A banquet at the Bancroft Hotel is scheduled for 7:30 p.m. More than 425 invitations have been mailed for the $7.50-a-plate dinner, which is designed to honor some of the citizens who have helped to earn Saginaw her "All-America" title.

In making the announcement this morning, Mayor Marsh noted that the award is by no means an indicator of "municipal perfection."

"In accepting this award on behalf of the citizens of Saginaw, I am obligated to remind them of the challenge and responsibility that accompanies being singled out as an example," Marsh said. "There is, as we have often said, much left to do—the agenda of needed improvements is long."

Marsh cautioned citizens not to "rest on our laurels." He said that "the real strength of our community is in the people of the community. This award is tangible expression that this particular strength does exist in Saginaw and has been exercised to the common benefit of all," he added.

"If we can use the title we have received as a foundation upon which to build—looking upon it as a landmark telling us we are heading in the right direction—then we will truly be worthy of the award," he said.

"All of us know that even in the short time that has passed since we entered the All-America City competition, new problems have arisen and many old ones have become complicated with age. To meet these, greater efforts will be required."

To the many city employes who attended the flag-raising ceremony, Marsh urged even greater cooperation with citizens. He said steps toward solutions of Saginaw's problems were taken "when we in government turned to the people for help.

"I think most of us in government—at both the administrative and policy levels—learned that common goals were more easily attained and our tasks are made more meaningful when we work with—not simply for—our citizens."

During a press conference following his speech, Marsh noted that suburban areas of Saginaw played a part in earning the title for Saginaw.

"When I speak of a 'community,'" Marsh said, "I don't stop at governmental boundaries. I include the suburbs. The city received the award, but it took a 'community attitude' to do it."

He added that it is his hope that "the suburbs will play an increasing role in realizing what it means to be an All-American City."

CITY'S RACE RELATIONS EFFORTS KEY TO ALL-AMERICA TITLE

Saginaw was named an All-America City today, being cited especially for "pace-setting programs to ease the nation's No. 1 problem—race relations."

Only one other Midwestern city was among the 11 All-America title winners and only one other was cited for efforts in the area of race relations.

New Albany, Ind., was the only other Midwestern title winner and Savannah, Ga., was the winner cited for its work to overcome racial barriers.

The awards are cosponsored by Look Magazine and the National Municipal League.

Other winning cities are: Charlotte, N.C.; Cottage Grove, Ore.; Danville, Ky.; Edinburg, Tex.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Jacksonville, Fla.; San Diego, Calif., and Snyder, Tex.

In keeping with today's epidemic of urban ills, each of the winners had problems or sins-of-the-past to confess.

"But the winners of the All-American Cities Awards are not being recognized for the quality of their confessions. Their citizens went beyond identifying their troubles to doing something about them," LOOK says in an article on the cities appearing in the April 15 issue, out April 1.

In announcing that Saginaw was a winning city, Look sketched this picture of the city:

"Saginaw's primary race problem is one of job opportunities. The General Motors plants and satellite industries provide work enough to go around, but as elsewhere the lowest paying jobs are held by the city's 25 per cent nonwhite population.

"Shaken by the black revolt that rocked Detroit in 1967, Saginaw took stock of its own situation and appointed a commission to study the problem.

"The City Council caught the spirit and elected fellow-member Henry G. Marsh, a Negro attorney, as mayor of the city. While Saginaw still struggles with the problems of race and air pollution, the barriers are crumbling between whites and blacks. Even a black militant leader admits he "has hope for this place."

Saginaw made her pitch for the title in New Orleans, La., last December.

Harry W. Browne then a Saginaw labor leader, explained to the All-America Cities jury what the Committee of Concern was and what it has done. He cited the establishment and financing of an employment center at the First Ward Community Center as an example of the committee's work.

Marsh noted that citizens approved by a better than 2–1 margin a local open housing ordinance in a May election. He also noted progress in improving the quality of housing available in the city, especially through the city rental inspection program and the city's scattered housing project.

Michael R. McCormick, a former Arthur Hill High School student who now attends Michigan State University, explained to the jury how students campaigned for approval of the 8-mill "Project BRITE" program.

His presentation seemed to greatly impress the jury. Panelists were interested in how Saginaw had been able to involve its youth in constructive activities.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S OPEN ADMINISTRATION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are in the process of experiencing a renewed and healthy rapport with the Presidency. The "new" and welcomed open approach by President Nixon toward the affairs of his office makes evident the sincere efforts being made by his administration to create a forthright and credible atmosphere for greater trust and unity between the people and their Government in the United States.

This greatly hoped for occurrence is being confirmed by much of the Nation's press. In this connection the following editorial by Hugh Sidey entitled "The Presidency: The Surprising Asset of Normality" which appeared in the March 21 issue of Life, is particularly expressive of the situation:

THE PRESIDENCY: THE SURPRISING ASSET OF NORMALITY

(By Hugh Sidey)

By conducting the Presidency steadily and sensibly so far (in "normal" fashion), Richard Nixon has astounded the Washington galleries, which says almost as much about the state of affairs among the experts down along the Potomac as it does about the 37th President.

What seems to stun resident critics is that the new President doesn't use notes or TelePrompTers or cue cards or have aides tugging at his sleeves and whispering instructions when he talks about the business of the day. He simply walks into the spotlight, stuffs a hand into his pocket, grabs the mike and then thrashes through matters with reasonable coherence and knowledgeability. The chief columnist of the left-liberal *New Republic,* who signs himself TRB, has in the past carved Nixon up like a turkey. The other night he walked through the moonlight to the White House to watch the President give an hour-long extemporaneous report on his European tour and came away absolutely lyrical. "Dazzling . . . death-defying tightrope act. . . . He talked swiftly, deftly. . . . It was a brilliant performance."

The moon was strong that evening and TRB did seem a little sad at such success: "But can it last? The iridescent bubble of harmony floats up in a draft of words. Deeds are when the trouble starts." But he and many others who reacted the same way raise

XUM

a fundamental question. Why is it so unusual for the President of the United States to know his job and be able to talk about it without going into a spasm? The rather unfortunate truth seems to be that it *is* unusual. Over the last decades the Presidency has been encased in such manipulation and mystique that those routine practices which go on every day in thousands of PTA meetings, business conventions and Elks luncheons across the country are hailed as genius when they are applied in the White House. Certainly the environment of the Presidency is far more critical than any other, but one might suppose that the men who arrive there would be conditioned to demands. Richard Nixon spends at least 10 or 15 hours of every day immersed in the major issues of the moment. It is not so illogical that he should have a good working understanding of them. Another thing Washington seems to have rediscovered through Nixon is that knowing what you are talking about—and not talking about what you don't know—is a pretty good idea even in the Oval Office. Most of America runs on such candor, and it is always a little alarming to discover that it is such an unusual commodity in the federal environs.

A while back, when the President was asked about the doubts that black Americans have about him, he did not try to deny the premise of the question—the truth of which was known to any observer of the scene—but devoted himself to pledging action and asking that he be judged on that. Such a semi-confession won a whole half-column of startled praise from the New York *Times*. Again, when he was asked how come so few women were in his government, he simply said he didn't know the facts but would find out. That kind of frankness, practiced without much forethought in places like Pocatello and Pontiac, brought more gasps of astonishment. And just a few days ago one of the Washington *Post's* hard-eyed columnists added it all up and declared that in less than two months Nixon had broken the habit of secretiveness in the top government ranks and was well on his way to redeeming his campaign pledge for an "open administration."

In fact, Richard Nixon has performed no miracles yet. He has not even been put to anything that could rightly be called a mild test. The catalogue of national woes is still intact, just put off for a while. Nixon has done his work routinely and rationally and with a minimum of ostentation. The hunger in and around the capital for a return to normalcy has seized on his quiet approach and built it into the image of a man about to conquer all. He may, but nobody can say for sure just yet.

Happily, Richard Nixon himself is one of the biggest skeptics, and in that may lie his greatest strength for the inevitable tests to come. He was wary from the start. He pored over the final drafts of his inaugural address to make sure that it contained no heart-lifting slogan or even some unintentional phrase that could be pounced upon by a public anxious for a panacea. Once when a friend came to him and declared that he had given "a great speech" Nixon shot back instantly, "Not a great speech, but a good speech." A few days ago, when visitors in his office began to express their optimism over the course of the shooting war in Vietnam, it was the President who spoke up to remind them that he had heard that before.

Riding back from Europe on Air Force One he called his staff members to his cabin and asked their judgment on how the journey had gone. Their vote was unanimous—a success. Nixon thought a second and then gave an answer that could apply to almost everything now. "Too soon," he said. "Too soon. A year from now we will know if it was a success."

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL, OPPOSITION TO ABM

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit to this body a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Cambridge, February 24, 1969. The Cambridge City Council expressed its support of Senator KENNEDY and Senator BROOKE of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in their call for reconsideration, by President Nixon, of the decision to build the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile site. Although the President has recently changed the structure of the ABM and called for different locations, this resolution is still entirely valid for criticisms of the ABM as an effective system have not been answered. I firmly believe that the ABM system is exorbitantly expensive, ineffective, and not at all necessary to our country's defense system. It is my pleasure to submit this resolution to my colleagues for their consideration:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: The United States Department of Defense and the President of the United States did designate Camp Curtis Guild—located in parts of Reading, Lynnfield and Wakefield—as the site of the nation's first Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile System, and

Whereas: The City of Cambridge and other cities and towns throughout the Commonwealth and nation are experiencing great financial crises which can only be relieved by devoting a greater portion of our national resources to the solution of the problems afflicting our cities and towns; by curtailing non-essential defense spending and by returning more of the federal revenues to the cities and towns, and

Whereas: Senator Edward M. Kennedy, knowledgeable scientists, and other residents of Metropolitan Boston, the Commonwealth and other parts of the country have questioned both the technical justification of this so-called "Thin Missile" system, and the $5 to $6 billion expenditure necessary to build it, and

Whereas: Many citizens of Reading, Lynnfield and Wakefield expressed concern about the possible impact such an installation might have on their communities, and

Whereas: Many citizens of Cambridge also expressed alarm at the potential danger to the City of Cambridge and to other heavily populated cities and towns by the installation of such a site within the Boston metropolitan area, and

Whereas: Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, in response to said public pressures, has recently said he may move the site and cut down on the size of the program, thereby suggesting that this enormously expensive program was undertaken last year without sufficient proof that it was absolutely necessary, and

Whereas: It is in the interest of the City of Cambridge to participate in the development of a unified response by the cities and towns in the Boston metropolitan area to the various questions posed by the proposed Anti-Ballistic Missile System and sites selected for that System, and

Whereas: The Boston City Council has adopted a resolution instructing its Committee on Public Welfare to explore the feasibility of establishing a Metropolitan Boston Elected Officials Emergency Council on this matter,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Cambridge City Council that: 1. We support the positions taken by both Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Edward W. Brooke urging a full reconsideration by President Nixon of the decision to build the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile site, and the position taken by Senator Edward M. Kennedy in calling for a freeze on any further expenditures of funds or development at Camp Curtis Guild for the proposed Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile System, pending a full review by the Congress and President, which freeze is presently in effect pursuant to orders of the Secretary of Defense;

2. We instruct the City Manager to communicate with the chairman of the Boston City Council Committee on Public Welfare, and to offer the cooperation of the City of Cambridge in efforts to develop a unified response by the cities and towns in the Boston metropolitan area to the various questions posed by the proposed Anti-Ballistic Missile System and sites selected for that System;

3. We respectfully request our congressman and senators, when considering authorization and appropriations for anti-ballistic systems and for other defense programs, that they consider the critical plight of our cities and towns and the plight of the taxpayer.

In City Council, February 24, 1969. Adopted by the affirmative vote of 8 members. Attest: Paul E. Healy, Temporary Clerk.

PAUL E. HEALY,
Temporary City Clerk.

BILL TO PROVIDE PERIODIC RECHECK ON COMMUTER ALIENS CROSSING BORDER FROM CANADA AND MEXICO TO U.S. JOBS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to provide a periodic check on the alien commuters who live in Canada or Mexico and commute to jobs in the United States.

My bill calls for an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act to assure more effective regulation of the influx of these workers into the labor market on the U.S. side of the border.

I have no intention of halting this practice. Rather, my proposal is simply to require that each of these so-called green-card aliens obtain recertification every 6 months by the U.S. Department of Labor.

This certification would show that the alien's continued presence in the United States to seek or to continue employment does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of U.S. workers similarly employed.

I am informed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that, at last count, there were 1,488 registered green-card holders who are coming into the Niagara frontier from Canada regularly for full-time jobs. The total crossing through Canadian and Mexican borders

XUM

is estimated at about 50,000, of whom 80 percent are crossing from Mexico.

The bill also would eliminate the current exemption from criminal statutes for those who knowingly employ aliens who have entered the United States illegally.

This is a particular problem on the Mexican border where the U.S. Border Patrol has reported an increase in the number of apprehensions of immigrants illegally entering the United States, many of them lured by U.S. employers who are now exempt from prosecution.

RESOLUTION BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over whether to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine, has quite clearly established the fact that the people of New England pay more for fuel oil. The rigid import quotas, about which I plan to speak in the near future, have resulted in much higher prices on the New England markets.

I would like at this point to introduce a resolution by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that sets forth in greater detail how the people of New England have been discriminated against. The resolution also supports the efforts of the Massachusetts congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish a foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine, and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ORDER AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE IN THE DISCRIMINATORY ALLOCATION OF BARRELS OF IMPORTED NO. 2 FUEL OIL TO NEW ENGLAND AND TO ESTABLISH AN OIL REFINERY AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

Whereas, The consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Whereas, According to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas, Said Consumers' Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas, There has been no decision to rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall during his term of office reportedly indicated a willingness to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas, The proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the No. 2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by (allowing) making available an additional 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of No. 2 fuel oil in New England at reduced prices; and

Whereas, The establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of No. 2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Nixon to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of additional oil imports to New England; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, March 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

MR. ZIMMER AND THE NAB

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to learn of President Nixon's nomination of William H. Zimmer to the post of Director of the National Alliance of Businessmen in Cincinnati, Ohio. I would like to congratulate Mr. Zimmer on this occasion and urge him on behalf of the Cincinnati community to continue with this challenging work.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer commending Mr. Zimmer:

President Nixon's choice of William H. Zimmer, president of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., to direct Greater Cincinnati's participation in the National Alliance of Businessmen puts one of the Queen City's most energetic business figures at the head of a cause that can stand no diminution of effort.

The NAB is a nationwide campaign designed to create useful, productive employment opportunities for the hard-core jobless.

Mr. Zimmer will succeed Howard J. Morgens, president of the Procter & Gamble Co. Mr. Morgens was the campaign's initiator in Cincinnati, and he leaves behind a record of achievement that will not easily be duplicated. At the moment, some 1852 men and women are now gainfully employed in the seven-county Greater Cincinnati area under the program's auspices—more than 200% of the target quota.

In addition, some 36 companies have pledged to hire 420 more from the ranks of the hard-core unemployed.

The National Alliance of Businessmen is the most ambitious attempt thus far to enlist the energies of the private sector to find jobs for those who lack the experience and qualifications normally required of job-seekers.

Cincinnati's answer to the challenge thus far has been that private enterprise can indeed do the job. Mr. Zimmer's resolve is to sustain and enlarge the momentum.

STOP MIND POLLUTION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial by Mr. John Troan of the Pittsburgh Press, in which he lucidly illustrates the magnitude of the pornography problem and extent the purveyors of filth are reaching to promote their mind polluting wares.

I wish to commend Mr. Troan for his observations and submit for the RECORD the following editorial:

STOP MIND POLLUTION—SMUT PEDDLERS MUST BE CURBED

(By John Troan)

Walking along the street the other day, I glanced into the window of one of those cut-rate book stores.

And I was compelled to conclude that although we have made good headway against the perils of mine pollution, we have yet to mount a meaningful attack against the menace of mind pollution.

What I'm referring to is the flood of filth that is swirling about us—engulfing the minds of young and old alike.

True, there always have been dirty books. But never have I seen such a mess of muck as that which is today transforming many of our book stalls and magazine racks into pornography pits.

Frankly, I am apalled by the way the smutsmiths have perverted freedom of the press into a license for licentiousness. And I am disturbed by our inability to curb them.

Our courts have ruled that freedom of the press does not include obscenity.

BLAME THE READERS

But when it comes to defining what's obscene, our courts have weaseled and re-weaseled so much that even a decent man is tempted to resort to the latrine language they have condoned to tell them where to shove their decisions.

The courts, however, are not alone to blame. After all, what keeps the purveyors of pornography in business are not so much the courts as the customers.

And there obviously are plenty of goggle-eyed customers—of all ages—panting in the wings to explore the clinical details of the latest sex-ploits of the horizontal heroes of a cesspool society.

Some of the smutsmiths try to pass off pornography as literature. And we reward them by elevating their slush to the best-seller lists!

Others make no pretense about their wares. Witness this excerpt from a letter a pulp pornographer sent to prospective writers several years ago:

"We are starting a new line of paperbacks and need tough, hard-hitting, sex-action-filled books, geared to the demands of today's competitive market.

PSYCHIATRIC VIEW

"What we seek is offbeat sex, with emphasis on deviations. The sex must be as strong and as offbeat as possible."

One of my favorite psychiatrists, Dr. Max Levin of New York, summed up this sleazy business when he wrote in the Current Medical Digest:

XUM

"One of the uglier pimples on the face of our society is the pornography business.

"Unscrupulous publishers cater to the sex hungers of our people, and their lurid books and magazines are hot numbers on newsstands, in candy stores and wherever teenagers gather.

"These panderers of literary aphrodisiacs are lower than worms."

I can't say it any better. Except perhaps to note that the pimple has become a boil. Or maybe even a cancer.

A BILL TO MODERNIZE CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION LAW

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to facilitate the entry as nonimmigrants of specially skilled foreign nationals and aliens of distinguished merit and ability into the United States for temporary employment or training.

This bill is designed to modernize certain provisions of the immigration law to bring them in tune with the increasingly international nature of our economic and cultural society.

Presently, a specially skilled foreigner can come temporarily to the United States to fill a universty post, for example, only if the teaching post is classed as temporary. He cannot come to occupy the endowed chair of an educational specialty for 2 or 3 years, let us say, because the position is not temporary, although his tenure is. In other words, the position he comes to fill must be temporary in the sense that it will go out of existence in a short time.

This restriction results in the exclusion of aliens whose temporary services in permanent positions in hospitals, symphony orchestras, and both profit and nonprofit corporations as well as educational institutions would be of inestimable value to this country.

In this modern age we have many U.S. corporations with branches throughout the civilized world. They are truly international in the range and scope of their operations. Under present law there is no way, for example, by which such a firm can bring to the United States an alien officials from a foreign branch to fill a permanent post for 3 or 4 years. It is an increasingly common practice for international corporations to rotate officials throughout the world for relatively short tours of duty.

Our present immigration law makes such practice very difficult if not impossible. Presently such firms are forced to bring in foreign officers as immigrants for permanent residence even though they do not intend to become U.S. citizens, but usually plan to return to their home country or move on to another foreign assignment. A wait of 2 or 3 years is now required before such an intending immigrant can be admitted. Thus, the desires of U.S. firms to bring in executives for training or short tours of duty in positions of importance are thwarted and our economy suffers.

The same situation exists with reference to the temporary use by American hospitals, symphony orchestras and other institutions of persons of exceptional and outstanding ability. Under present law, we are often denied the economic, cultural, and educational advantages of the free exchange of international talent.

My bill will not only permit such persons to come temporarily to permanent positions, it will also broaden the "training" category of nonimmigrants desiring admittance to improve their techniques and skills. Presently only industrial trainees may come temporarily. By removing the industrial limitation, all fields of economic and cultural endeavor can offer training opportunities to aliens.

This proposed legislation contains safeguards to protect our economy and national security. In all instances the alien coming for temporary and short run service will be admitted only if unemployed persons performing such services cannot be found in the United States. Additionally, all such temporary nonimmigrant admissions—be they exceptionally gifted musicians and artists, physicians, business executives, professors of distinguished merit and ability, or trainees—must satisfy all the present rigorous requirements pertaining to health, character, and security clearance before admission.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, under my bill American industry, education, and culture will benefit through the international exchange of special skills and talents.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS' CREDIT RATING PROPOSED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the public is only beginning to realize the immense power over individuals wielded by the more than 2,100 credit bureaus in the United States. With the use of computers and new transmission methods, it is now possible to retrieve and send a person's complete credit history to any city in the Nation in less than a minute.

I strongly believe that legislation is needed to protect the consumer against erroneous credit ratings and the unwarranted publication of credit information.

A special report featured on "CBS Evening News With Walter Cronkite," March 17, 1969, illustrated the serious problems posed by careless credit bureaus that ignore the rules set out by their national organ, the Associated Credit Bureaus of America.

The transcript of the telecast follows:

EXCERPT FROM CBS EVENING NEWS WITH WALTER CRONKITE, MARCH 17, 1969

CRONKITE. One area of recent concern to many people is the question of credit ratings and the invasion of privacy. CBS News Correspondent Mike Wallace investigated that question.

WOMAN. May I help you?

WALLACE. Yes, please. My name is Wallace and I'm starting a small business. We're not going to have an office to begin with, and I understand that you take telephone calls.

WOMAN. Oh, you want to use our address and telephone number?

WALLACE. Exactly.

WOMAN. Oh, yes, of course, we can arrange that. Do you know what the rates are?

WALLACE. No, I don't.

WOMAN They are $15 a month for both, and the only thing that you . . .

WALLACE. For, for both?

WOMAN. For both, mail and telephone service, per month.

WALLACE. I can have my mail sent here and my calls received here.

WOMAN. Exactly. That's right.

WALLACE. Fifteen dollars a month.

WOMAN. Right. The only thing that's required is that you fill out a form from the Post Office that permits us to act as agents and accept mail for you.

WALLACE. Understood.

This is where the experiment began, a building at 200 West 57th Street, in New York City. That is the home of Accurate Secretarial Service. The firm provides a business address for small enterprises that don't want to rent their own offices. We signed a standard Post Office form permitting delivery of mail through an agent. We filled in the name of our non-existent company, Transitair Systems, and the nature of the business, systems consultants.

WOMAN. And would you also like some business cards?

WALLACE. Huh uh.

WOMAN. Just letterheads. That's 20, that's 24.15 for the letterheads.

WALLACE. So Transitair Systems was in business, an office, a telephone number, and a letterhead. What we wanted to find out was this: Is it possible for a small, unknown firm having nothing to do with credit to obtain supposedly confidential credit ratings? How easy is it to crack the files of local credit bureaus around the country?

There are more than 2100 local credit bureaus in the United States. They collect and file information on the finances of persons living in their localities, information obtained from a variety of sources, from banks, department stores, employers, court records, to name a few. The local bureaus are joined together in a national organization. They exchange information among themselves and sell that information to clients, those clients being firms that are considering granting credit. According to industry spokesmen, that information is not available to outsiders.

John Spafford, Executive Director of Associated Credit Bureaus of America, talked with Reporter Norman Glubok.

GLUBOK. Could anyone who's interested buy a credit report on anybody?

SPAFFORD. No, sir, they could not. First of all, as I mentioned earlier, they have to be a bona fide creditor, and by that I mean they have to be in the business of extending credit to individual consumers. They go make an application to become a member of the local credit bureau. The local credit bureau will investigate them to find out that they are in the business of extending credit, and if they find they meet the qualifications of that bureau, they will sign a contract with that individual credit granter. And then, and only then, do they have access to credit information in the files of that bureau.

GLUBOK. Then in your opinion a person down here in Houston couldn't write to Chicago, for example, and ask for information about some Chicagoan—would he receive that information?

SPAFFORD. No, he would not. He would not.

WALLACE. Transitair Systems, of course, had nothing to do with granting credit, because in fact it did no business at all. But we sent off letters to 20 credit bureaus around the

XUM

country, bureaus picked at random from an industry directory. In each case, we asked for a credit report on an individual, a name picked, again at random, from the local telephone book. We said we were considering granting credit to that person. Under the industry guidelines we should have been told to contact our local New York credit bureau, which could then have checked out our credentials.

That isn't exactly the way it happened. Out of that mailing of 20 letters, we received, without further question, full credit reports on ten individuals. We received them directly from credit bureaus in Norwalk, Connecticut, in Corbin, Kentucky, Huntington, West Virginia, Belvidere, Illinois, Fort Smith, Arkansas, Greenville, Mississippi, Bismarck, North Dakota, Blytheville, Arkansas, and Bowling Green, Kentucky. Two other local bureaus offered to send information if we would sign a contract with them. Three others reported they had no file on the individual requested. Four did not reply. Only two of the 20 referred us to our local credit bureau, the procedure ostensibly required by the industry code. So on that first mailing of 20 letters, we batted an even .500, in spite of assurances that it could not be done.

Glubok. And in your opinion it's not easy for people who are not entitled to information to get it?

Spafford. It's impossible.

Wallace. Perhaps you'd like to see what a credit report looks like. This is a composite. We typed up a report using entries from several of the reports that we received, and of course we changed the names and addresses so as not to identify the subjects.

The top half of the form gives general information, name, address, employment, income, size of family, that kind of thing. But the bottom half gets down to the crux of the matter, credit history. This column on the left shows the kind of credit involved, B for bank loan, F for finance company, D for department store, and so on. The form shows the highest amount of credit involved in each transaction, the amount remaining, the amount past due, if any. But perhaps the most significant column is over here at the right, terms of sale and usual manner of payment. Here, for example, I stands for installment payments, $129 per payment, and that last number, one, is a code. It means the subject usually pays within 30 days. That's pretty good. But here, a code number, two, 30 to 60 days. Down here O stands for open account, and the code number, three, payments more than 60 days but not more than 90 days late. You'll notice the higher the code number the higher the credit risk, so this worst number of all, nine, is usually reserved for deadbeats. This man would have a hard time getting credit.

Then there is a section called public record. Here we show a collection agency record, a couple of lawsuits, and the fact that the subject was divorced and remarried. Up here, in small type, is a warning that the information is confidential. But in one case, the report from Greenville, Mississippi, there was an additional warning. It says right there in red ink under no circumstances should the subject be allowed to see or have possession or knowledge of this report or a copy of it.

We decided to try one more mailing, but to make it a little more difficult. There were three differences this time. First, we no longer stated that we were thinking of granting credit. We simply asked for a full credit report with no explanation why. Second, we no longer chose individuals at random. Instead, we chose persons who had complained to Congressional investigators about their credit problems. And third, although we didn't know it at the time, the industry had just issued new, tougher guidelines. They state that local credit bureaus must require contracts with clients in which the client certifies that inquiries will be made only for purposes of granting credit. This time we sent out 28 letters, and, as expected we had a tougher time. Only one-fourth of the credit bureaus sent us reports directly. This one came from Boston, Mass, this one from Alma, Michigan, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, Rice Lake, Wisconsin, Austin, Texas, Dallas, Texas, and this one came from Peoria, Illinois. The Peoria report had another of those special warnings attached. "Strictly confidential," it said, "don't subject yourself to libel suits."

But there were some bright spots. This time 12 credit bureaus referred us to the New York bureau, and one flatly refused to help us at all. Five did not reply, but three others said that they would help us if we'd fill out application forms and sign contracts. In one case we decided to see what would happen. The credit bureau of Dalton, Georgia, asked us to sign a written contract affirming that we were intending to grant credit and agreeing to keep the information confidential. We did so. The letter also asked us to advise what type of company we were. We replied, "We are a systems company." We mailed that off and within a few days received the credit report that we'd requested. It would seem that signing a written contract is not much of a safeguard; all the client has to do is lie. But seven of the 28 bureaus provided us with credit reports without even that precaution.

Glubok. What about your members who violate your rules, who give out information to people who are not entitled to it? Do you have any penalties?

Spafford. We have some 30-odd membership qualifications and requirements, and any member who is found to be violating these and is, does not correct the violation, their membership is subject to cancellation, and we do cancel them on occasion.

Glubok. About how many members have you cancelled over the years?

Spafford. Over the years I couldn't tell you; I would say it might average ten to 15 a year.

Glubok. Out of 2200.

Spafford. Uh huh.

Wallace. We found more violations than that just by mailing out 48 letters. Perhaps things will be better as the industry's new guidelines receive more attention. One would certainly hope that things will be better. In the meantime, Transitair Systems has been quietly phased out of the credit business.

Mike Wallace, CBS News, New York.

SENATOR KENNEDY DEDICATES BOSTON'S CITY HALL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1969, the new city hall of the city of Boston was dedicated to the people of Boston. This building is extremely controversial, both in Boston and I believe, in architectural circles around the country. But only its design and appearance are controversial for the construction of the new city hall indicates the beginning of a new era in urban growth and the commencement of new programs to end urban ills in the great city of Boston.

Senator **Edward M. Kennedy** dedicated the building and addressed himself to the problems of the city in his speech.

We all have warm spots in our hearts for certain places. For those of us from the country, it may be a particular field or stream or hill, and for those of us from the city it can be that city or special places therein. The people of Boston love their home, for it is perhaps one of the most beautiful and certainly the most historically significant in the United States. She is a varied city—a port, commercial hub, home of the descendants of the first settlers and the newest immigrants. She reflects the contributions of every ethnic group to have come to this land of freedom. Her buildings and monuments tell the history of our Nation.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts is certainly a man of the world, but he is a man of Boston. I believe his speech on February 11 indicates the important position that Boston and the Commonwealth have in his life. Its history has affected him, helped to shape him, and has prepared him for his great undertakings in helping to solve the problems of the present and the future. Senator **Kennedy** is an optimist and believes that we, and the people of our Nation, can solve our problems and end our differences if we truly care enough about our Nation and our neighbors. He sees the construction of a new building to house the seat of the city's government as a step toward ending those problems. It signifies the future, progress, and growth. I commend this speech to my colleagues and am happy to have it placed in the **Record** at this time. I also include a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., congratulating Senator **Kennedy** for his timely and understanding remarks on the problems of the city.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL,
March 10, 1969.

Whereas: Senator Edward M. Kennedy recently delivered a thoughtful and engagingly personal address at the dedication of Boston's new City Hall (more distinctive than attractive in the opinion of many), and

Whereas: His remarks included, in listing major municipal contingencies, the following excerpt: "If the City of Boston becomes a city for highways rather than for people then our problems will overcome us, Boston will have failed its heritage, will have failed its own people, its neighbors and the people who love it all over the world"

Whereas: Senator Kennedy expressed his hopes and satisfaction in observing that a local "community council is making sure that people are consulted on where the Inner Belt should go", be it

Resolved: That the Cambridge City Council congratulates our Senior Senator from Massachusetts for his timely alert and commentary on the works and pomps of the lush urban assassins whose plans and biddings for thru-city expressways threaten to destroy our community way of life, and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Senator Edward W. Brooke, Speaker John W. McCormack, Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, and Francis C. Turner, federal Director of Public Roads and more recently nominated for the position of Federal Highway Administrator.

Attest:

PAUL E. HEALY,
Temporary City Clerk.

DEDICATION OF NEW BOSTON CITY HALL, FEBRUARY 11, 1969

Senator **Edward Kennedy**. I am happy to be here today and delighted to be able to

XUM

participate in dedicating—to the people of the city of Boston—this historic and impressive building. I am glad that this building is controversial. Every important building is controversial. The Parthenon was called "remote" because it was set upon a hill; and Fanueil Hall was called "a scar upon the landscape." I think we owe a debt of gratitude to those who had the vision to design this city hall and those who had the courage to accept the design. It adds a new dimension not only to the architecture of the city of Boston, but to the entire concept of what public buildings should be in the United States.

Boston is an old city, which has allowed the present to be imposed upon her without complaint. She is a busy city—the center of New England; she is a proud city—proud that she has been the stage of so much history; proud that she has been the gathering place for so many people from different lands and different heritages; proud that she has a river and a harbor; gardens and museums; beauty in her buildings and excitement in her streets. All of us are here today because we love Boston—each of us in our own way, with our own favorite places, our own special memories, our own private feelings of fondness.

My love of Boston began when I was a little boy. I would walk around town with my grandfather, Mayor John F. Fitzgerald. We would go to the Common where the British soldiers used to train during the Revolution. (When he was mayor the most distinguished people on the Common wore beards.) He would take me to Spring Street and show me where the city got its water; we would go down to the docks where the ships came in from Europe. Later my brothers and I used to walk up Hanover Street and through the north end markets; go out to East Boston to see the houses of the old sea captains; over to Beacon Hill to see the lights in the windows and hear the carollers on Christmas Eve. Each of us found special things that Boston meant to him.

Boston means something to many more than live within her city limits. This is where the growth of Massachusetts began. This is the place the people of Massachusetts and all New England look to as the center of action in communications and culture, in sports and entertainment, in business and fashion and modern life. When people from the towns around Boston go to other parts of the United States and to other parts of the world, and are asked where they come from, they do not say they are from Reading or Wakefield or Hingham or Scituate—even though that may be their home—they say they are from Boston. That is the name that is known and respected around the world. This is their city, their symbol, their mecca, even though their houses are in other towns.

Boston may not be the hub of the universe. It probably never was. But it is the hub of urban life for 15 million people, the center of thought and vitality for all New England, and that, we hope will be true forever.

The task we undertake, with the dedication of this building, is nothing less than making sure that Boston will be as powerful and positive a symbol of New England life in the future as it has been in the past.

This will not be easy. For it is obvious that all of the problems that afflict urban life in the United States today—the problems of change and growth and tension; of congestion and crime; of schools and budgets and medical care—and above all the problem of the dignity of the individual in a huge urban society—all of these problems have come to Boston as they have to other large cities. They are testing us, challenging us, calling on the best that we can offer for the future of us all.

Urban life in the United States has come to a critical point of decision, caught between the narrowing walls of change and decay on one hand and, on the other, priorities created for another age. If we were to be told that our nation was in danger from without, and that enormous expenditures and sacrifice would be necessary to save it, there is no doubt what our answer would be. But at a time when our urban way of life is in equal danger from within, there is doubt what the answer will be.

Despite the dedicated effort of the public officials here today, and all that has been done by dedicated private groups and citizens, we know the things that Boston needs have often been ignored. They have been frustrated by lack of understanding, by dogged resistance to change, by bickering and friction, by the attitudes and prejudices of an older age. They have been crippled badly by advocates of violence and by those who prefer dissent and defiance for the sake of drama rather than as a means for change and progress. They have lost the support of those who see traffic and pollution and congestion as plagues to be suffered instead of evils to be overcome. And they have been blocked, most of all, by the spirit of resignation and cynicism and powerlessness on the part of so many people who have concluded it is far better to spend their money and their energy on their own private comforts rather than on the tasks of the community that affects us all.

These attitudes have not always prevailed. They are constantly challenged and progress has often been made. But if they do prevail, if the city of Boston becomes a city filled with crime; if it becomes a city lived in only by the very rich and the very poor, a city for highways rather than for people; if, over the next 50 years, it gradually becomes an all black city, rather than an integrated city; if our schools are not stimulating and our playgrounds are not adequate; if our harbor grows idle and the air above our streets grows foul; if the citizens of Boston come to feel that the greatest goal of government is the stability of the tax rate; then our problems will overcome us. Boston will have failed its heritage. It will have failed its own people, its neighbors and the people who love it all over the world.

But if the city of Boston can set about its tasks with the same spirit of cooperation and sacrifice that the patriots had, that the immigrants had, then we can be sure that Boston will be great forever.

This is the challenge to everyone who works in this building. This is the opportunity represented by the dedication of this hall.

I for one am an optimist about Boston and one who appreciates all that has been done. Meeting here, we should salute the beginning of the new Boston under Mayor John Hynes; and the important work of rebuilding continued by Mayor John Collins, one of the great progressive mayors of the United States. We pay tribute to the activities of the administration of Kevin White which have turned us away from group conflict and brought a new and imaginative approach to the problem of making the big city government responsive to the people. There are, as well, the continuing efforts of the many organizations that have served Boston for years—the Chamber of Commerce, which speaks around the country about our virtues as a place to live and work; Father Joyce and his Boston College Forum where the most difficult problems are examined with candor and intelligence; and all of those corporations and labor organizations that have been willing to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in the future of Boston as a center of commerce and industry.

Yes, there are difficulties all over Boston—but there are also signs of hope. When a city becomes as large as Boston has become, no impressive building, no city government, can re-create by itself the sense of living in a community which people need so much. A community has to be a place where people can see and know each other; where children can play and adults can work in an environment that gives them satisfaction. I see hope, as well, for this, the most difficult part of urban living. I see it in Jamaica Plain, where the community council is making sure that people are consulted on where the inner belt should go. I see it in East Boston, where citizens are saving vacant lots so their children can play. I see it in Southie, where the people of a neighborhood created Sister Mary Veronica Park, as a shelter of rest in memory of a beloved lady. And in Roxbury, I see great hope in the beginning of the concept of community corporations, where black people come toogether to form businesses and build theatres owned and controlled by themselves—just as the fathers and grandfathers of those of us who are Irish or Italian or Jewish tried to do when they were new to the city.

And most of all, perhaps, I see the growing number of young couples, many from suburban backgrounds, who have decided to make their homes in the south end, and improve the neighborhood, rather than flee to the suburbs. They deserve our special thanks, for they have been willing to stake their futures and those of their families on their love of this city and on their vision of what it can be.

These activities are participation in its finest sense. They are the future of the city of Boston—a city not only of fine buildings and stores and jobs and education and culture but a city of neighborhoods strong and vibrant where people learn to know and trust each other once again, and work together in the tasks of better living. Each of the efforts I spoke about may be small, important only to the people involved and the people they touch. But taken together, they can be very large, and if they can be multiplied in every neighborhood and block in the city of Boston, it will be the greatest investment in the future of the city.

Boston was built in the early days by giving of herself. The earth from the hills was taken and used to fill in the waters, so that people would have room to live. Now each of us must give of himself to the tasks ahead, so that the hills of opportunity may rise again to where they were in the eyes of those who came here 330 years ago.

And so we dedicate this building with the confidence that city hall will not just be a center of the government but it will be a motive force in making Boston, in the fullest sense, a community once again, and by doing so to repay the confidence of those who have loved this city for all she has been to so many of us.

CAMDEN COUNTY COLLEGE: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ON STUDENT DISSENT

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my position—that student militancy can be no substitute for the rule of reason—I have occasion to recognize and commend the stand taken by the Board of Trustees of Camden County College, situated in the First Congressional District of New Jersey. While recognizing the right to dissent, the board has ex-

XUM

plicitly set out a "code of behavior" for all of the students at the college:

> 1. That dissent *shall not* interfere with the normal operation of the college.
>
> 2. That dissent *shall not* lead to the destruction of public or private property.
>
> 3. That dissent *shall not* interfere with classroom instruction. (Emphasis added.)

Violation of this code will result in suspension or expulsion from the institution and any nonstudent found to be engaged in activities contrary to the code will be prosecuted under the laws of the State of New Jersey. The deliberate utilization of the terminology "shall" and "will" in lieu of "may" makes the intent and determination of the Board of Trustees unmistakably clear. It can be said that the wording of the board's resolution is not so as to make it understood, but so that it cannot be misunderstood.

A word of praise is in order, too, for the conduct of those students who concede the point that their demands are more apt to be met by understanding if promulgated in the form of proposals with the honest desire to have them evaluated on their merits by representatives of the student body, faculty, and college administration. To challenge the authority of the administration to establish the curriculum, policies, and standards of an institution of higher education by use or threat of violence and intimidation is an outright admission that such an institution should be nothing more than a forum for shallow and arbitrary academic deliberations in the mistaken name of intellectual freedom. An education under these circumstances would be without foundation and substance.

For the benefit of objectivity, I include at this point in the Record the list of proposals of the Society for Black Cultural Awareness, as presented to the Camden County College administration, and the board of trustees' response to each; an open letter concerning the proposals from the president of the college, Dr. Otto R. Mauke; the board's resolution with respect to student dissent; and, an editorial from the Camden Courier-Post commenting on the board's action:

Proposals of the Society for Black Cultural Awareness

["(P)" indicates proposal, "(R)" indicates response]

1. (P) We propose the acknowledgment of Black Martyr's Day, February 21, be recognized as a holiday with leave of absence from college.

(R) Black students were authorized to be absent without penalty on Black Martyr's Day February 21, 1969. This policy will be continued in the future.

2. (P) We propose the passing of the constitution for the Society for Black Cultural Awareness with no restrictions and all the benefits that accompany its passing.

(R) The Constitution for the Society for Black Cultural Awareness will be handled by the Student Government Association through normal channels.

3. (P) We propose social activities for Blacks, something that we can identify ourselves with, or the refund of our activity fees.

(R) Camden County College has one of the most active social programs in the State of New Jersey. These affairs are designed to meet the needs and taste of all of the groups on our campus and are available on a free basis to students upon presentation of ID cards.

4. (P) We propose a bus for students (day and evening) that have to walk Little Gloucester Road.

(R) We asked Public Service to provide bus service from the City of Camden to our campus in the morning with a return trip in the late afternoon. The request has been denied twice, but we are still pursuing this objective. We are planning to purchase a nine-passenger vehicle for all College use and we will provide service of the type requested on an experimental basis when the vehicle is available.

5. (P) We propose equal time on the radio station—Disc Jockeys installed with pay.

(R) The Radio Club is responsible for the operation of the campus radio station. The club is open to all students who may make their wishes known through their membership. All students are free to make known their tastes to members of the Club. Students are not paid for serving as announcers.

6. (P) We propose that this college hire Black personnel other than faculty that are qualified for their position.

(R) The College does not practice discrimination in its hiring policies. All qualified individuals regardless of race or creed are invited to apply for positions of all types on this campus. We have advertised several of our openings during the past two weeks and would appreciate receiving responses to these advertisements.

7. (P) We propose the removal of all "racist inspired" faculty and administrators in this college.

(R) One must define the term "racist inspired" and determine the means of testing for this particular characteristic. We would like the Faculty Association to deal with this item in cooperation with representatives of the black students and the administration.

8. (P) We propose seminars at this institute that correspond to urban problems of the Black community.

(R) Seminars dealing with the varied problems of urban life will be developed for initiation next Fall.

9. (P) We propose qualified Black instructors to teach Physical Education and Health: (a) recruitment of more Black athletes, (b) addition of a scholarship program.

(R) Qualified blacks are invited to apply for teaching physical education at Camden County College. Athletes of both races are invited to apply for admission. Our scholarship programs do not include athletic scholarships for students of any race.

10. (P) We propose that a board for the recruiting of Black and Spanish-speaking high school seniors be set up to recruit students from Urban Camden and Lower Camden County.

(R) We have had an extensive recruitment program for black students and Spanish-speaking students. We would be happy to receive recommendations of names and individuals qualified to assist the College in recruitment in these areas.

11. (P) We propose various lecturers to elaborate on racism.

(R) Lecturers on racism can be incorporated into the seminar program discussed in number 8.

12. (P) We propose that the college open its facilities for the community.

(R) No college in the State of New Jersey has been more community-minded than Camden County College. Our facilities have been available and will continue to be available to community groups. Our extensive cultural series is available without charge to the general public.

13. (P) We propose a more concise and increased Black Section in the library.

(R) We have an extensive Black Section in the Library which is being expanded continually. A list of books available is attached.

14. (P) We propose that the students of the "100 Go-to-College" program be allowed to participate in all college activities.

(R) The "100 Go-to-College" students are permitted to participate in all activities on campus with the exception of athletics and student government. NCAA regulations do not permit non-matriculated students to participate in intercollegiate activities. The "100 Go-to-College" students have formed their own representative government.

15. (P) We propose the lowering of the College's food prices.

(R) A.R.A. will be asked to submit results of a survey to be conducted by that organization on comparative food prices. S.G.A. has been working in this area.

16. (P) We propose a course in practical application in the Black Ghetto.

(R) A course in Urban Sociology will be introduced next Fall.

17. (P) We propose jobs for all students on the campus.

(R) No deserving student has been denied financial assistance on this campus. Job opportunities are open to all who are interested regardless of race or creed.

18. (P) We propose that Black instructors that are qualified to teach African-Civilization.

(R) Qualified black instructors are invited to apply for teaching African-Civilization as well as other courses at Camden County College. The College has actively sought the services of such individuals since its inception.

19. (P) We propose the removal of the police officers patrolling the building at night, while college is in session, with their riot clubs.

(R) Security personnel are employed by the College for the protection of all of our students. No officer carries a riot club on this campus.

20. (P) We propose the capacity of classes be distributed evenly.

(R) The Registrar makes every effort to balance class size. Open registration procedures may create minor imbalances as students make their own section choices. This can be rectified by arbitrary assignment of students to course sections.

21. (P) We propose that the Black students, out of popular vote, be able to vote for three Black students that can truly represent them in the student government.

(R) All matriculated students who meet academic requirements are free to run for any position in Student Government.

22. (P) We propose a Black Financial Director for Black students.

(R) Financial aid must be centralized in one office for the purpose of coordination of the program and the recording of disbursements.

23. (P) We propose Black instructors to instruct Black Studies Dept. in the following: (a) History, (b) African linguistics, (c) art, (d) music, (e) politics.

(R) The HEW decision relative to Antioch College indicates that federal funding will be suspended where a college segregates black students even though black students have themselves made such a request. We will attempt to integrate into existing courses information relative to the preceding points where relevant and then to develop courses dealing with the culture, art, language, and music of the African people.

24. (P) We propose that Black Guidance programs be set up for the Black students to help them in choosing the proper subjects in their particular curriculum.

(R) Counseling is an integral part of the community college philosophy. Qualified counselors of all races make a positive contribution in this vital area. Qualified black counselors are invited to apply.

25. (P) We propose that a Cultural Education Plan be established for the college and community.

(R) The contribution of all minority groups to American Culture is incorporated in the context of appropriate courses and will be expanded where possible.

OPEN LETTER FROM DR. OTTO R. MAUKE, PRESIDENT, CAMDEN COUNTY COLLEGE

MARCH 11, 1969.

"The members of the Board of Trustees, the faculty, staff and administration of Camden County College are interested in all of the students at this College—white and black, male and female, Christian and Jew and other religions. We are interested in serving the needs of all of our students and in maintaining the integrity of the College.

"For these reasons, when certain proposals were presented by black students to the administration last Thursday, it was decided to work jointly with representatives of Student Government and the blacks on these areas affecting the entire student body. At the conclusion of the meeting Friday it was decided by all present not to publicize these requests since it was generally understood that they could be resolved through existing government and academic structures. Because of the concern of all students and the general air of confusion following yesterday's faculty meeting, it was decided to make the proposals public at this afternoon's meeting.

"I believe that all of us working together can resolve issues on this campus without calling upon outside assistance or interference. I have faith in the students of Camden County College and this faith has been revealed by me in the past few days and upheld by them in their actions to date."

DR. OTTO R. MAUKE,
President, Camden County College.

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Whereas the Board of Trustees of Camden County College recognizes that the right of dissent is part of our American heritage, and

Whereas minority groups and majority groups share a wide spectrum of rights, privileges and responsibilities under the laws of the State of New Jersey and the laws of the United States of America, now therefore

Be it resolved that this Board does adopt the following code of behavior for all Camden County College students:

1. That dissent shall not interfere with the normal operation of the college.
2. That dissent shall not lead to the destruction of public or private property.
3. That dissent shall not interfere with classroom instruction.

Be it further resolved that any student who engages in such behavior shall be suspended or expelled; and that any non-student engaging in such behavior on this campus will be liable for prosecution under the laws of the State of New Jersey.

MAXINE COLM,
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Camden County College.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Mar. 15, 1969]

THEY HANDLED IT WELL

Camden County College officials are to be commended for their warning to students that dissenters interfering with the school's normal operations would be suspended or expelled.

The ground rules have been laid down:

Dissent shall not interfere with the normal operation of the college, lead to the destruction of public or private property, or interfere with classroom instruction. Any student who engages in such behavior shall be suspended or expelled and any non-student engaging in such behavior on this campus shall be liable for prosecution under the laws of the State of New Jersey.

That position made known, the college officials handled the requests, made by black students at the college, with commendable understanding, restraint, and good sense.

A delicate situation was handled well as the trustees showed a disposition to begin seminars on urban life, accept black assistance in the recruitment of black students for the school, start a course in urban sociology at the school, develop courses dealing with the culture, art, language, and music of the African people, and in agreeing to other requests.

At the same time, the school pointed out it could not accede to requests that black instructors be hired or that black students be separated for black studies. That would be discrimination for blacks instead of against blacks.

The authorities made it clear, we believe, that they already have excellent policies concerning policing of the campus and the opportunities for jobs for students.

Dr. Otto Mauke, college president, also scores with his assertion that "all of us, working together can resolve issues on this campus" and that he has "faith in the students."

It is good, too, that all know the ground rules—that for disruptive demonstrations offenders must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 21, 1969, was a significant date in the career of one of the most distinguished Members of this House. This date marked the 25th anniversary of service in Congress by the Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS, dean of our Alabama delegation.

It is a great honor for me to praise him on this occasion for his long history of effective service to his district, his State, and his Nation.

As a first-term Member of Congress and the newest member of in the Alabama delegation, I would like also to pay tribute to him for his kind and unselfish help to me. I am sure that his assistance in many ways has enabled me to begin serving my district in an effective manner sooner than might otherwise have been the case.

I salute our colleague, GEORGE ANDREWS, and wish him at least 25 more years of outstanding service.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months we have recognized the struggles of several small nations in their fight for independence. On March 25, those citizens of our Nation of Byelorussian origin, celebrated the 51st anniversary of their independence. Once again, however, we are faced with celebrating an anniversary of a fact which is, sadly, no longer a fact, but rather, has become a dream of hope.

During the decade prior to World War I, the Byelorussian people, who had been ruled by the Russians, began to redevelop their own national culture and language. This cultural revival was later to have distinct political relevance as well.

The outbreak of World War I created unique opportunities for those non-Russian peoples residing along the borderlands betwen the Russian Empire and Europe proper. The Byelorussians, like the Ukranians, Lithuanians, Estonians, and others within the empire, seized the opportunity to establish their own national independence.

During the German occupation, during the war, the Byelorussian leaders were able to carry on their political work. Further, they were able to carry on the redevelopment of the cultural aspects of their nationalism.

During 1917 and 1918, the Byelorussian people constructed a democratic constituiton, and finally on March 25, 1918, they declared their independence and set up a government at Minsk, the capital city. Although the existence of the Byelorussian National Republic was greatly dependent on the fortunes of the occupying military forces, it is generally agreed that the government made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare.

With the end of the war and the dissolution of German Armed Forces, the Red Army advanced into Byelorussia, and on December 10, 1918, seized Minsk. In 1921, the Treaty of Riga divided the Byelorussian territory, and their national efforts were defeated.

Today, however, the 8 million Byelorussian people still hope, and it is appropriate that we commend them on their continuing efforts to become, once again, a free and independent nation. We must all continue to pray for the release of these captive nations, that they may once again stand with heads high in the world of free men.

XUM

BISHOP JOHN J. WRIGHT HELPS PLAN WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people the plans which are being developed for a world conference on religion and peace to be held in Kyoto, Japan in September of 1970.

We in Pittsburgh are especially proud that His Excellency John J. Wright, Bishop of Pittsburgh, is a member of the advisory committee planning for this conference. He has recently returned from attending a meeting of this committee in Istanbul, Turkey, where groundwork for the peace conference was mapped.

I want to compliment Bishop Wright and the other religious representatives on this fine example of international cooperation and on their concern and work for a peaceful world.

I submit the article from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, 5 March 1969, that gives Bishop Wright's report on his trip. The proposed world conference on religion and peace can well be a major turning point in world affairs and religious history of our times.

The article follows:

NEW THEOLOGY OF PEACE DUE—BISHOP TELLS PLANS FOR WORLD PARLEY IN JAPAN IN 1970

(By Thomas M. Hritz)

Bishop John J. Wright said here yesterday that a "new theology of peace" will emerge from a world conference on Religion and Peace scheduled to be held in Kyoto, Japan, in September of 1970.

The Roman Catholic prelate, who returned early yesterday from an advisory committee in Istanbul, Turkey, where groundwork for the peace conference was mapped, said a "solid passion for peace" now exists among religious leaders all over the world.

CITES "EXPLOSIVE" SITUATION

"The political situation in the world is sufficiently explosive and critical to justify intensive concentration on the problems of peace and utilizing the moral and spiritual resources of all religions to promote a climate of peace without which it would be impossible for the human community to survive with dignity and decency," he said.

Bishop Wright said the old imperial city of Kyoto was chosen as the site of the world forum so the conference will coincide with the world's fair, Expo '70, scheduled to be held there next year.

He added that Japan is a neutral country—both religiously and politically—where the Arab and the Jew can meet.

The bishop reported that the Japanese especially are looking to the conference as a source to a lasting world peace.

JAPAN OFFERS AID

He said that country's hideous experience with the horrors of the atomic bomb a quarter of a century ago inspired a desperate quest for peace.

The bishop added that Japan sent more representatives of its religions to the committee meeting than any other country.

It even offered to render financial aid to some African and Latin American countries who said they may not be able to afford to participate in the conference, he added.

Bishop Wright said representatives at the committee meeting worked in harmony. "We often found ourselves agreeing on many theological matters," he said, noting that Christians, Buddhists, Moslems, Hindus, Shintoists and representatives of other religions attended the meeting.

AN OIL REFINERY AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE, SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN FAIRNESS TO NEW ENGLAND CONSUMERS

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the very timely resolution, recently adopted by the Massachusetts State Senate, urging the President to order an immediate increase in the present allocation of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine.

The objective of this resolution is to provide a too long withheld measure of economic equity to the consumers in Massachusetts and throughout the New England region. I most earnestly hope that the President will see fit to promptly initiate the just action requested in the resolution, which follows:

RESOLUTION URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ORDER AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE IN THE DISCRIMINATORY ALLOCATION OF BARRELS OF IMPORTED NO. 2 FUEL OIL TO NEW ENGLAND AND TO ESTABLISH AN OIL REFINERY AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

Whereas, The Consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Whereas, According to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas, Said Consumers' Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas, There has been no decision to rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall during his term of office reportedly indicated a willingness to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported #2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas, The proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the #2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by (allowing) making available an additional 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of #2 fuel oil in New England at reduced prices;and

Whereas, The establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of #2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Nixon to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of additional oil imports to New England; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine, and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

A BILL TO REVISE THE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAWS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to establish procedures for the fair and equitable selection of qualified young men to meet the continuing military manpower needs of the Nation.

Let me state initially that I agree with the conclusion of the single most thorough public study of the draft, that of the Marshall Commission that "the Nation must now, and in the foreseeable future, have a system which includes the draft."

This is simply because our first concern must be to guarantee a continuing supply of manpower for national defense purposes and past experience has amply demonstrated that the draft provides such a guarantee.

In any revision of our draft laws I believe we must be concerned with flexibility so we can adjust to high or low manpower needs and with uniformity so that every young man will know to as great an extent as is possible at any time if and when he might be called to duty. We must also be concerned with fairness so that every young man in every population group can expect and get equal treatment. I further believe that we can achieve these goals by drafting the youngest first at age 19 and by drastically curtailing deferments with the choice for service made by a random selection system.

The bill I am introducing today would deal with the many problems raised by our present Selective Service System. In summary my bill's principal provisions are as follows:

First. It requires that the youngest—the 19-year-olds—be drafted first;

Second. It requires use of random selection to select those young men to be drafted;

Third. It provides for a 3-year transitional period in establishing the random selection system from among 19-year-olds;

Fourth. It eliminates occupational deferments except where ordered by the President;

Fifth. It permits students to postpone their exposure to the draft during the course of bona fide study, but does not permit this postponement to become an exemption;

Sixth. It discontinues this postponement feature whenever casualties in a shooting war reach 10 percent of those drafted in a given month;

Seventh. It grants conscientious objector status to atheists and agnostics, so long as they are genuine pacifists, as well as to those whose objection is based on conventional religious training and belief;

Eighth. It requires the adoption of national standards and criteria in the administration of the draft law, and requires their uniform application;

Ninth. It prohibits use of the draft as a punishment for protest activities, by limiting draft delinquency to acts relating to a registrant's own individual status;

Tenth. It permits judicial review of questions of law regarding classification proceedings, and permits use of habeas corpus proceedings by those who comply with induction orders;

Eleventh. It restores the role of the Justice Department in reviewing conscientious objector cases;

Twelfth. It gives registrants the right to appear in draft board proceedings affecting them, and to be represented by counsel;

Thirteenth. It conforms our draft treatment of aliens to our treaty requirements, as recommended by the State Department;

Fourteenth. It limits the term of the Director of the Selective Service System to 6 years;

Fifteenth. It prohibits discrimination of any kind in the makeup of any selective service panels which determine an individual's draft status;

Sixteenth. It calls for a thorough public study of a National Service Corps, in which individuals seeking nonmilitary service might fulfill their obligation of service to the Nation;

Seventeenth. It calls for a thorough public study of all aspects of a volunteer army;

Eighteenth. It calls for a thorough public study of military youth opportunity schools, which would offer special educational and physical assistance to those falling below induction standards who desired to volunteer for military duty:

Nineteenth. It calls for a thorough public study of the ramifications of granting amnesty to those young men who fled the country rather than face the draft;

Twentieth. It encourages use of civilians to replace military personnel in nonmilitary jobs; and

Twenty-first. It closes a number of loopholes in the present law.

I believe that each of the changes enumerated above is essential and must be enacted if we are really to reform our Selective Service laws to provide a fair, certain, and flexible system.

For example, under the present system, men between 19 and 25 years of age are drafted in reverse order of their age; that is, oldest first. The oldest-first system has been unanimously condemned by all who have studied draft reform, including the Marshall Commission, combat commanders, and the Defense Department. Obviously it forces young men to plan their careers and families in an atmosphere of uncertainty and unpredictability. Furthermore, the incidence of deferment rises sharply with age. According to a 1966 Defense Department study only 3 percent of classified registrants had dependency deferments at age 19 and only two-tenths of 1 percent had any form of occupational deferments. But at age 24, nearly 30 percent of all registrants were in just these two deferred categories. Consequently, a rising average age of induction multiplies the number of deferment decisions each local registrant faces.

It should be pointed out, too, that our military commanders have consistently preferred 19- and 20-year-olds because they are more adaptable to the combat training regimen.

That the youngest should be drafted first has had unanimous support of the Marshall Commission, the Clark Panel, President Johnson's special message to the Congress on the draft, and the report of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

Those who might be deferred for one reason or another during all or part of their 19th year would be draft eligible upon expiration of the deferment as "constructive 19-years-olds." Drafting the youngest first would be mandatory.

My bill contains a random selection system to determine who shall serve when not all serve and I believe this would do away with that inherent element of unfairness which is suspect in any system that must choose a few from among many. When a person is called upon to serve his country and risk the possibility of death or dismemberment, no one can presume to judge which life may be less valuable. As the system now works, each local draft board determines, with minimal national guidance, classifications, deferments and other elements of draft procedure; that is, who shall be drafted. It is imperative that we change this subjective system to an objective one of random selection, thereby creating a more equitable distribution of risk.

The need for a lottery is also clearly shown by the "imperative of numbers." Over the next decade we will have a pool of 820,000 eligible 19-year-olds each year from which 260,000 must be drafted. Thus even when the Vietnam war demands high draft calls as it does this year we will only be selecting one man from among four eligible and it is estimated that during peacetime we will have to choose only one man from among seven or eight eligible.

Briefly the random selection system I propose would work as follows:

Young men would be eligible for induction only so long as they were in the "prime selection group" and they could be in this group for no longer than a total of 12 months. Basically, the young men in this prime selection group would be 19-year-olds who met the mental, physical and moral standards for induction. Also in this group would be the "constructive 19-year-olds," those who were deferred for all or part of their 19th year, but who would be placed in the prime selection group upon the termination of their deferment. Only those individuals actually in the prime selection group would be subject to induction.

To effect the change from the present oldest-first subjective selection procedure to my proposed youngest-first random selection procedure, my bill adopted the 3-year transition feature recommended by a number of experts. Under its terms, those men 20 years and older and still eligible for induction would be phased into the prime selection group as follows: In the first year those over 24; in the second year those between 22 and 24; and in the third year those between 20 and 22. After the end of this 3-year transition the system would be fully operative and the impact upon those older than 19—primarily graduate students—would be largely minimized.

Occuptional deferments would be discontinued under my measure unless the President were to determine that the efficacy of our national defense required that certain occupations were critical and that those holding these occupations should be deferred. If he so determined, he would be required to identify the particular occupation and require deferments on a uniform national basis.

Student deferments, particularly when this country is engaged in armed combat, stand out as a major inequity. To meet this problem my bill proposes a number of changes.

High school students would be deferred until they finish high school as the law now provides. Upon graduation from high school they could enter the prime selection group at 19 or choose to go on to college thereby postponing their entry into the prime selection group. Upon completing college or at 25, these men would become "constructive 19-year-olds" and be within the prime selection group for 12 months. Thus, all those who did not voluntarily enlist would at some point in their 19- to 26-year-old span be in the prime selection group equally with their contemporaries.

So that no young man could use college to avoid a shooting war, my bill provides that student deferments would be discontinued when the number of casualties in a shooting war exceeded 10 percent of the number of draftees for 3 consecutive months. And when the discontinuance did take place, it would stay in effect for the following 12 months.

This discontinuance insures that when draftees face an appreciable risk of being sent to a combat zone, all young men must stand as equals at that particular time before the draft process. To permit some to elect to enter college and postpone exposure to the draft for 4 years while denying this election to others would be to continue one of our present system's worse features.

It is important to note that the discontinuance would not apply to students already in college or occupational training when the 10-percent figure was reached. These students made their choice to enter college or training not out of a desire to avoid being drafted into a shooting war because the shooting had not reached an appreciable extent when their decisions on whether to take up the option was made in the light of combat casualties.

My bill would make no change in our tradition of according conscientious objector status only to those conscientiously opposed to war in any form. However, it would repeal the amendment adopted in 1967 designed to overrule the Seeger decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. My proposal reinstates the language of the statute in effect before the 1967 amendments, a result which seems in conformity with the principle underlying the conscientious objector exemption—a genuine objection to wars in any form based on conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the need for draft reform is very clear. Our present law is patchwork and outdated. It provides neither flexibility nor fairness nor certainty. I believe we have an obligation to our young people and to the country to change it and I urge this Congress to react to this cry for change now.

JIM FARLEY GRADUATES AT 80

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Rockland County Journal of Nyack, N.Y., recently printed an interesting article telling how the Honorable James A. Farley, elder stateman of the Democratic Party, and chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., received his high school diploma 64 years after completing his secondary school studies, at the age of 80.

Mr. Farley is a highly respected expert on international trade, and has for many years been acclaimed as one of this Nation's most astute authorities on American politics. His determination to succeed in life, regardless of his educational handicap, should be an inspiration to today's school dropouts, and other youth who experience difficulty with their studies.

The article by Scott Webber also contains some cogent observations by the distinguished former Postmaster General, which I think my colleagues will find of interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

FARLEY CAST IN NEW ROLE: THE GRADUATE

(By Scott Webber)

James A. Farley, a native of Grassy Point who rose to be Postmaster General of the United States and who has known 7 Presidents personally, always had one regret in his life: He never got his New York State Regents' High School Diploma.

Sixty-four years ago he took his English Regents and got a 78. But when his paper got to Albany for checking, the mark was reduced to 73, which meant he had failed.

"I didn't have enough sense in those days to go back and take the test over," Farley said the other day, noting that the oversight prevented him from getting his Regents diploma.

In the years that passed since the Class of 1905 left the Stony Point High School (now the administrative offices of the North Rockland Central School District on W. Main Street), Farley became Stony Point town clerk, supervisor and a member of the Assembly before joining up with Franklin D. Roosevelt as his 1932 campaign manager.

The new junior high school that opened in Stony Point in 1967 is named after him. On the day of its dedication, he told the assembled audience that the one big disappointment of his life was that he never got his diploma.

Then one day last summer, he was sitting next to the State Commissioner of Education, Dr. James E. Allen (soon to be the new U.S. Commissioner of Education), and in jest told him that he had a bone to pick with his department.

A few weeks ago Dr. Allen walked in to Farley's office in New York, where he is chairman of The Coca-Cola Export Corp., and presented him with the diploma, Stony Point High School Class of 1905.

Farley keeps active on the political front. He was a delegate last summer to the Democratic convention in Chicago and he sides with the efforts of the police to keep the rioters from breaking up the convention. He said the rioters had one purpose in going to Chicago and that was to disrupt the proceedings by provoking trouble by any means necessary.

In 1936, Farley had accurately predicted that Roosevelt would carry all but two states. Last year Farley saw that unless the Humphrey-Muskie ticket got the support of the McCarthy, Kennedy and liberal elements of the party, it would lose to Nixon. And this is what happened, he says.

"I never will understand why they refused to back the candidate once the choice had been made," Farley added:

Because he knew the ticket would lose, he made no public predictions, he pointed out.

Farley now lives in the Waldorf-Astoria where his neighbors have included Herbert Hoover and Douglas MacArthur.

While noting that some of Hoover's political judgment "might not have been too good," Farley said the former President was one of the "most dedicated unselfish Americans I ever knew" and a person with whom in later years he often had very friendly and frank discussions about politics.

Farley recalled that Hoover and Roosevelt were very good friends up until the time of the 1932 election, having known each other in Washington during the Wilson Administration. Roosevelt was the only person whom Farley ever heard call Hoover "Bert."

Pointing out that he knew Lyndon B. Johnson beginning in 1934, Farley said that the Vietnam War was his downfall. Roosevelt was hurt by the secret agreements made at Yalta; Johnson by the Vietnam war, which Farley personally believes was the right thing and something the President had to do.

(The walls of Farley's New York office are lined with autographed pictures of many of the people in public life he has known over the years, and quite a few of them are of Lyndon Johnson with warm inscriptions.)

Dwight Eisenhower would have been a third term President in 1960 except for the constitutional prohibition, Farley says. "No question about it, no one could have beaten him, not even John F. Kennedy."

Farley believes that Ike "made a good President" and "fitted into the demands of that period," adding that he is a "fine man whose place is secure in history."

MacArthur, whom he first knew in the early years of the Roosevelt administration when he was Army Chief of Staff, was "an extremely interesting conversationalist," says Farley.

Asked about proposals for making all postal appointments by Civil Service, Farley said he believes it will still be done by appointing those from the list who are members of the party in power, the system that he used when he was Postmaster General.

"That was the best system then and I still think so," he added.

His future plans? He wants to write another book about the Roosevelt years, explaining that when he wrote his book, "Jim Farley's Story," back in the 1940's, much of what can now be told couldn't be told then.

And on May 30, his 81st birthday, he will arrive at St. Peter's Cemetery in Haverstraw to visit the graves of his parents and then ride through Grassy Point, stopping at homes and calling on those with whom he grew up.

FEDERAL LAW TO BETTER PROTECT HOUSES OF WORSHIP FROM ARSONISTS NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to apply more comprehensive protection under Federal law to houses of worship that are the targets of arsonists.

Although the Bill of Rights guarantees Americans freedom of worship and the Civil Rights Act of 1968 extends Federal protection to individuals whose civil rights—including the right to worship—are violated, Federal law only makes it a Federal crime to use explosives to destroy houses of worship.

Although arson is a common law crime, many States have adopted statutes directed at specific acts of arson that provide penalties with varying degrees of severity. My bill would close the gap among State laws and between Federal and State law, in those instances where States have weak or ineffective protection for houses of worship victimized by arsonists. This legislation—by extending the acts of arson subject to Federal jurisdiction—would provide stricter coverage in those States where penalties for certain crimes of arson may be nonexistent. And my bill provides a uniform standard for dealing with this serious problem.

Violence against houses of worship threatens one of our most basic rights; we must secure full protection of our freedom to worship.

THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS OUT

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently Rio Grande College in Ohio was the scene of an attempt by protesters to wreck orderly campus activity at this fine institution. The attempt failed because the school administration under Dr. A. R. Christensen swiftly enlisted the assistance of local law-enforcement officials and made it clear that disruptions would not be tolerated. Perhaps there is a lesson here that violence-plagued schools in other parts of our country might heed. A timely evaluation of the Rio Grande incident and of campus disorder in general was recently published in an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Gallipolis Daily Tribune, Mr. Hobart Wilson, Jr.

The editorial follows:

IT'S TIME FOR SILENT MAJORITY TO SPEAK OUT

Giving in to the anarchists—and there is no better word to describe the mindless militants who in recent months have made it quite plain their bag is to destroy, not create—is only asking for more of the same.

Tuesday, Rio Grande College officials let it be known that they are responsible for running that institution, not a handful (41) of student dissidents urged on by outsiders and controversial instructors.

We admire the Rio Grande administration for its stand, and back them 100 percent. We urge all Gallia Countians to do likewise.

In our opinion, it's a stand that will "catch on" across this great nation, because the majority of responsible American students attending college for a higher education, along with the taxpayers, are "fed up" with acts of vandalism, riots, demonstrations and other nonsense.

The academic back is stiffening, and it should be pointed out Rio Grande College is

XUM

among the first in the country to take such a stand. Other colleges have formed "counter-revolts" to combat the minority dissidents. One group calls itself SPASM—the "Society for Prevention of Asinine Student Movements."

The time has come for all of us to take a stand on today's problems, stop beating around the bush like a bunch of scared rabbits.

We will glady be the first to speak out and tell you exactly where we stand.

We suggest student body president Michael Graham resign if he continues to favor the minority over the majority at Rio Grande College.

We are fed up to the gills with the publicity (and this is what radicals thrive on) given the militants, draft card burners, the acid heads and all their ilk, be they green, blue, black, white, or just plain yellow.

We are sick of the false aura of grandeur that we have permitted these people to assume through excess publicity.

Every time one of these public bleeders climbs up on his soap box and berates the United States, its laws, courts, enforcement and economy, he is doing it with our money.

Our taxes make it possible for him to exist without visible means of support. Our obedience to the law makes it possible for him to flout it. The willingness of others to serve under arms makes this country safe for him to point with scorn and burn his draft card.

We, as a majority of Americans, hold no brief for wrong in high places. We subscribe wholeheartedly to the doctrine of change. We know that growth is one of the inexorable laws of life. Grow or die. (In the past five years, under the capable leadership of Dr. A. R. Christensen, Rio Grande College has made its greatest progress ever in total development.)

But, we do not subscribe for one moment to the theory that every cockeyed nut, confused in economics, bewildered in politics, and pinked by "pie in the sky" has the right to tear down the government or our schools under which we live and learn by whatever means he may see fit.—Hobart Wilson, Jr.

EQUAL HOUSING—UNEQUAL TAXES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, public housing at reduced rentals to indigent nonworking citizens subsidized by the taxpayers is most certainly charitable.

However, the same taxpayers who are already supporting an exorbitant load are awakening to the realization that once the Federal Government moves in and buys the housing developments it not only contributes to the inflation faced by the taxpayers but removes the real estate from the tax rolls. Too late the poor taxpayer comes to realize that he will be faced with even a greater percentage of taxes to compensate for the property's being taken out of the private sector.

One wonders how far the Federal planners will be permitted to go in this socialistic maneuver before there is no longer any taxable property in the private sector to subsidize the rentals or before the borderline worker gives up trying to pay his own rent and also enters a Federal housing unit on the Federal dole.

I think our colleagues will find of interest a recent report indicating that HEW was now moving its tax subsidized socialistic experiment into Fairfax County and I present a clipping from the Sunday Star for March 23, and letters to the editor from the Star of March 26, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 23, 1969]

FAIRFAX GARDEN APARTMENT—PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES MOVE INTO COMPLEX

While a controversy raged in the District of Columbia over the purchase of Regency House for public housing, Fairfax County quietly moved public housing families into what had been an all-white garden apartment complex near Baileys Crossroads.

Before the Fairfax County Housing Authority purchased the Spring Hill Apartments in October for $1.12 million, neighbors objected to the acquisition as strongly as Upper Connecticut Avenue residents protested the District's plans.

Now, however, original tenants of Spring Hill, still living there, say the coming of public housing families has not interfered with their way of life.

One of them, Mrs. Alice McNey, who has lived there five years, even volunteered to act as resident manager for the housing authority.

WILL BE SORRY TO MOVE

"I will be sorry when October comes and I will have to move," she said yesterday. The authority gave the original tenants a year to find another home.

Mrs. McNey's opinion was echoed by 27-year-old George Deihl, another of the original tenants.

"The biggest difference now is that I can find a parking space easier," he said. Many of the public housing families do not have automobiles.

The garden apartment complex is located off Columbia Pike, one block east of Baileys Crossroads. Its three buildings have one efficiency unit, 26 one-bedroom units, 56 two-bedroom units and 13 three-bedroom units.

During the first two weeks after the purchase, about 15 families moved out.

"They were the ones who had objected the most," said Warren R. Nellis, executive director of the housing authority.

SIXTY-SEVEN FAMILIES MOVE IN

Since then 67 public housing families have moved in, 17 of them white, the rest Negro.

One of the original families who thought they would have to move discovered they could stay.

The couple, who live with their 8-month-old son in their two-bedroom apartment, had been paying $130 in rent before the authority's purchase. But because their net income of under $4,700 a year qualified them for public housing, they now pay $80 a month.

Before the authority purchased Spring Hill, rents ranged from $124 to $185. Public housing families in the complex pay from $33 to $85.

Mrs. Donna Gibson, who is white, lived in a house in Centreville with her husband and four children.

"It had a bathroom but it was cold in the winter," she said. "When I heard about this public housing, I told my husband, William, that I was moving there and if he didn't like it, he didn't have to come. He came."

TENANTS ORGANIZE

A tenants association has been organized by the authority with Mrs. Sarah Ward, a Negro mother of two, as chairman.

"If we have had any problem it may be noise," she said, explaining that the older tenants, under their leases, had to keep rugs on their floors. This is no longer required.

However, Deihl said the public housing families have been quieter than the ones who moved out.

The newest family at the complex, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Jackson, their three children and Mrs. Jackson's uncle, moved into a three-bedroom apartment Friday. The Jacksons are Negroes. "We lived in a house in Vienna that was being torn down for an office building," said Jackson, who works as a laborer. "We couldn't find any place else but here to go," he added.

Mrs. McNey said the old residents enjoyed Spring Hill "because it was just like a small town. Everybody knew each other and got along fine—and now I think it's going to stay that way."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 25, 1969]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—REGENCY HOUSE

SIR: Your editorial endorsing the decision of Mayor Washington for the purchase of Regency House by the National Capital Housing Authority for Public Housing set another fire of resentment. It is not against the poor who will live there, black or white, but because the city finds it desirable to house them in a luxury building rather than one less expensive and more in keeping with persons of modest means. Thousands of citizens who have lived and worked in Washington many years and are now retired cannot afford to live in new luxury buildings and are wondering why public housing, regardless of where it is located, should be so lavish.

If the compelling reason for the purchase of Regency House is to go beyond Rock Creek Park to the west, and upper Connecticut Avenue in particular, that still does not justify acquiring one of the newest and most modern properties in the area. Some other way can and should be found to accomplish this objective.

GLADYS HARLEY.

SIR: Last year the real estate taxes, the largest single source of revenue in the District, were raised. Preparations are now under way for still another increase in real estate taxes. Paying increased taxes in conjunction with many increases in the cost of living in general is a hardship for many District taxpayers and of concern to everyone.

It is therefore of the utmost importance for the taxpayers of the District to be alert and informed as to how this money is being spent and to take effective action to prevent the use of tax money in ways that are not only grossly unfair to the taxpayer, but ruinous to the community as a whole.

I write to call to the attention of your readers the economic philosophy behind the purchase of Regency House for use for public housing. Many of your readers may consider this a matter of concern primarily if not entirely for the residents of Chevy Chase. On the contrary it is a matter of vital concern to every tax payer in the District because it is in line with policies stated by public officials and reported in the public press.

Regency House is a luxury apartment: swimming pool, air conditioning, high rent location, etc., etc. Using tax money to provide luxuries for people unable to support themselves is grossly unjust to the taxpayer and ruinous to the economy of the community as a whole. Only a minute fraction of the District's taxpayers can afford to buy swimming pools for themselves. A majority of the houses in the District are not air conditioned. Most District residents live in areas less attractive and otherwise less desirable than the location of Regency House. Yet public officials advocate and implement the strange view that the taxpayer of the District should provide for those who live not by their own labors but by the taxpayer's labors with luxuries which the taxpayer in the majority of cases cannot afford to buy for himself.

ELIZABETH BRITTON.

XUM

SIR: Very seldom do I disagree with your editorials, but the one regarding the Regency House shows you see but one side of the picture. Those of the middle and lower middle class who pay taxes and have for years cannot pay $200 a month for an apartment and yet they are being told their tax money is to pay for others, who do not or have not contributed, to live in better apartments. This is enough to make anyone angry. Those who scrimped and saved to purchase homes in certain areas and build apartments for income are asked to sacrifice, for without a doubt the value of property is of less value once such a plan takes place. All one needs do is look around D.C. and see the deterioration; it is a most sickening sight for those who lived here for many years.

LILLIE.

SIR: Your editorial support for the purchase of Regency House for public housing purposes needs further elaboration before your judgment can be condemned or even accepted.

Agreed that the price is comparable to that paid for recent prior acquisitions for similar public housing. Do you contend that such price is proper? You should be aware of testimony given the D.C. government in open hearing, by representatives of the Washington Board of Realtors, that there are many apartments of better than standard quality available on the present market at a price of about half the unit cost of Regency House. For the same outlay, twice the number of indigents could be housed satisfactorily. These available apartments are not concentrated in one locality; they have adequate dispersion, if that is a factor to you, which it is not to me. Communities of persons of similar circumstances and complexions are always the more harmonious.

It seems to me that you are advocating better than standard housing for indigents, so the sensible thing to do is to become an indigent in order to qualify for appropriate quarters, at somebody else's expense. This is not a matter of charity; it is the flaw of socialism, whether Communist or fascist type does not matter. I want no part of either. I do want to live in a compatible community of my own choosing and at my expense, whatever my income. And I would expect my government to protect that way of life, not charge me for its destruction howsoever indirectly.

EDWARD U. DENISON.

SIR: I don't agree with your editorial about the Regency House.

The purchase of the Regency House is taking our hard working D.C. citizens' good tax money away from the D.C. and spending it where we don't want it spent!

The Mayor and George Romney should and could at least find or build something more suitable for the elderly (would give some people work, too!) and in an area where they might be accepted, and in turn spend our tax money on something more relevant.

VALERIE W. TOMPKINS.

SIR: I was surprised and disappointed in the Regency House editorial which appeared in The Star. I did not believe that The Star could be so callous and so insincere.

To be really honest and fair with your reading public, the people living in Chevy Chase, and others in the vicinity of Regency House, would you write another editorial explaining your motives and showing the relationship of Regency House to where you and other top officials of The Star live? It is my observation that the proponents of this scheme do not live anywhere near the affected area.

There are two other aspects to the sale of Regency House for subsidized housing. First, it removes high rate taxable property to nontaxable status, and everyone knows that the District sorely needs tax money. Our taxes have risen 60 percent in two years. Second, what about the cruelty forced upon the old people, think of the effect of forcing them to leave their present homes, surroundings, friends, and relatives to move into a totally new environment and a hostile neighborhood. All of the studies on retirement and aging show that old people cannot adjust to such a sudden wrench in their lives.

GUSTAVE BURMEISER (retired).

FUEL OIL COSTS: A GROWING BURDEN IN NEW ENGLAND

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the cost of home heating oil to New England consumers is inching upward at a rate unprecedented in this Nation's history. The giant domestic oil industry—an industry that has a veritable stranglehold on the New England market for petroleum products—has been increasing its prices at whim. Concentrating on the manufacture of lucrative products like jet fuel, the oil industry has created what can only be described as an artificial shortage in home heating oil. The industry, in turn, has used this shortage as a spurious justification for its steep and steady increase in prices.

New England—the regional market furthest from the oil industry's drilling sources—is paying the highest prices in the United States for petroleum products. These prices constitute a major financial burden for the New Engalnd consumer and threaten to drive out of business many small independent fuel oil dealers. Quite plainly, Mr. Speaker, the administration must act to rectify this situation.

Liberalizing revisions in the oil import quota system and swift approval of the proposed foreign trade zone complex near Machiasport, Maine, would go far toward achieving reasonable petroleum prices in New England. All available evidence—economic, financial, technological—demonstrates that the Machiasport plan would cut petroleum product prices by at least 10 percent throughout New England.

I, and my fellow Members of the New England congressional delegation, are continuing to urge President Nixon and Interior Secretary Hickel to take the steps necessary to put this plan into operation.

Just one index of the strong popular and legislative support for the Machiasport proposal in the resolution adopted by the Massachusetts senate this week calling for immediate approval of the plan. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a copy of the resolution:

Whereas, The consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of #2 fuel oil; and

Whereas, According to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas, Said Consumer's Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas, There has been no decision to rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall during his term of office reportedly indicated a willingness to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported #2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas, The proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the #2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by (allowing) making available an additional 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of #2 fuel oil in New England at reduced prices; and

Whereas, The establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of No. 2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Nixon to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of additional oil imports to New England; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, March 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CUTS IN SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM TRULY SHOCKING

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed about the sharp cuts in the budget of Small Business Administration.

As we all know, this agency was set up some years ago as a result of the long continued, vigorous efforts of some of us in the Congress who are interested in the problems of small businessmen, with particular reference to their need for new operating capital or refinancing.

Throughout the years, the agency has helped very many small businessmen by giving them loans on reasonable terms, which, in many instances swung the balance between going out of business or staying in business for these small concerns.

When I consider the many benefits that the Small Business Administration has brought to ambitious, hard working, imaginative small businessmen, and the valuable help that has been rendered in this regard in strengthening our free enterprise institutions, and in making it possible for many of our most ambitious citizens to take advantage of the incentive and opportunities that exist in our private economy, I am shocked that Congress should tolerate, let alone give impetus, to the cuts that have been recently made in the SBIC budget of Small Business Administration.

There has been very little funding available for this program since the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 1968.

I am very reliably informed after careful inquiries into the situation affecting this agency that the curtailment of Government expenditures in fiscal year 1969 as a result of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 resulted in a reduction of planned loan level to the SBIC program from $30 million to $8.7 million.

This amount of money permitted the SBA to honor and take care of only those sound applications on hand as of June 30, 1968.

The volume of applications on hand as of June 30, 1968, resulted from funds curtailed in the fiscal year 1968 when the planned lending level was reduced from $55 million to $24 million.

This amount was $8.7 million less than requested to cover all pending approved loan applications on hand June 30, 1968, and, to my mind, this is a truly incredible and totally unjustified situation.

In an endeavor to cope with the situation, SBA itself has sought and obtained authorization to utilize a 100-percent default guarantee program to finance the SBIC loan requirements. This guarantee provides for a 7-percent-per-annum rate with no guarantee fee and with all servicing to be done by SBA.

In view of the current money market and after extended effort, as yet, I am advised that SBA has found no takers and as of the first of March or thereabouts, it has in excess of $20 million in approved loan applications awaiting funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it was ever the intention of this Congress to bring about a situation like this, and literally to starve an agency designed to serve and help small business, and to deny well-justified loans to small entrepreneurs and businessmen who have demonstrated clearly to SBA the soundness and feasibility of their loan applications.

This situation is all the more incomprehensible and incredible in the light of the experiences of the SBIC program during the past 10 years, since the last fiscal year has been its most profitable one in terms of SBIC viability and small business growth.

This has generated much interest in the SBIC program by the private sector desiring to enter the venture capital field. To think that adequate loan funds should not be available when this activity occurred is indeed most unfortunate.

I do not believe it was ever the purpose of Congress when it acted on the so-called tax package deal, to make such shocking reductions in the funds for SBA leaving it in the position where it has such a large backlog of worthy loan applications pending and thus handicapping small business enterprise, in effect, nullifying the advantages and services of the entire SBA program.

I hope and strongly urge that immediate steps be taken by the committees involved in this matter and the Government to provide adequate funding and resources for SBA to do the job that has to be done for small business, and I urge immediate action be instituted to provide supplementary funds so that this agency can function, and take care of existing meritorious loan applications.

It would be a great mistake and an anamolous situation for Congress to strangle an agency like SBA, which is performing such valuable services for our free enterprise system and worthy small businessmen of the Nation.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND THE DEMANDS OF THE COMPUTER AGE

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the awareness of the need for legislative reorganization is growing, partly because of the realization that Congress, if it is to deal with the problems of today, must be willing to utilize new technology that can help to improve the decisionmaking process.

In an article for the December issue of "Technology Review," John Saloma, an associate professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has analyzed the implications of computer-based information techniques for the Congress and the Presidency in the next decade. He is optimistic that computer analysis can help Congressmen stay on top of the information explosion and develop a more rational strategy of problem solving.

Mr. Saloma's article outlines the possible development of these techniques in the legislative and executive branches of Government as increasingly more sophisticated machines become available. His analysis suggests that Congress will be faced with continual decisions regarding the use of newer and more sophisticated equipment.

This probability makes it all the more desirable for the Congress to establish a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, which would have the charge of continual review of new data processing and information retrieval systems.

The proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969—H.R. 6278—which has been cosponsored already by more than 90 Members of Congress, would establish such a joint committee.

Mr. Saloma's article follows:

System Politics: The Presidency and Congress in the Future

(By John S. Saloma, 3d, associate professor of political science, MIT)

(NOTE.—Is the demonstrated success of new information technology in business, industry, and private institutions transferable to the arena of public policymaking? The author avers that it is and supports a case for imperative action.)

The new directors of our political destiny whom we have sent to Washington will perform their duties for us with superior dispatch and wisdom if they call into use quickly the rapidly developing resources of new information technology. It is the thesis of this presentation that the availability of comprehensive information systems can today improve the quality and rationality of decisions reached in the political process. I believe further that with responsible support some of the impressive advances forecast for computer technology can by the mid-70's be adapted for the personalized use of the President, congressmen, and a wide range of public officials.

Computer-based analysis as it is refined over the remaining decades of this century will make possible an advance in human intellectual capacity comparable to the invention of language, arabic numerals, and calculus. With his new ability to understand the dynamics of complex organizations and social processes, the congressman of tomorrow will explore a range of problems previously beyond the grasp of his predecessors.

Decision-making, by one definition, is simply the "process of converting information into action." First-quality information is intelligence that is clear, timely, reliable, valid, adequate, and wideranging. It is information that lays a solid foundation for decision and action—the kind of intelligence a conscientious legislator must have whether it is *technical* information (defining the content of a policy issue) or *political* information (concerned with the relative strength of competing claims and the consequences of alternative decisions).

Mid-1970 is only six years away—is it possible that improvements in the legislative process from wide use of advanced data systems will actually be achieved by 1975? Studies by RAND Corporation experts suggest that by the early 1970's computers will be small, powerful, plentiful, and inexpensive. Computing power will be available to anyone who needs it, or wants it, or can use it either by means of a personal console connected to some large central facility, or by a small personal machine. Additional projections foresee, by 1975, a computer that will make possible automatic libraries able to look up and reproduce copy; by 1978, automated looking up of legal information, and the widespread use of automatic decision-making at the management level for industrial and national planning. By the mid-1980's, the computer will begin to realize its potential as a research tool through modeling and experimentation, as an integral part of the educational system, and in areas such as medicine and biological sciences. The chances are that technical advance will continue to outpace political applications. The issue is not whether Congress will adapt to this potential but at what speed. The sequence of acceptance may go something like this:

First, congressional resistance to computer technology, notably the failure to fund any central computational facility for use by the Congress, the failure to budget any allowance for congressmen to utilize other facilities, and the failure to provide analyst staff for the use of the committees and/or members;

Then, limited congressional acceptance of computer facilities and analyst staff with access tightly controlled by the individual committees and/or party leadership; and

XUM

Finally, open congressional acceptance, with all members enjoying "free" use of computer facilities and full access to staff and data resources. According to our assumed projection, Congress could have moved all the way to the third situation by the mid-1970's.

THE NEW CONGRESS—1975 EDITION

What would a Congress look like in this third stage of free exchange and availability of information? We can suggest a few intriguing possibilities:

1. The contributions of the individual legislator would be considerably enhanced. Although only minority of congressmen will choose to play the role of legislative inventor or watchdog, the effectiveness of such members will be enormously increased by computer-assisted techniques of search and analysis. Members will be free to "browse" through the data archives in developing and assessing legislative alternatives. Some legislators will hire professional analysts on their office staffs or acquire analytical skills themselves. While such legislative diligence will still be the exception, one can readily foresee a congressman sitting at a console in his office pouring over computer print-out into the late evening hours or over the weekend and cutting through the paper arguments and justifications of executive programs with penetrating lines of questions. The possibility of abuse also exists, but the weight of past congressional experience suggests that most congressmen will use such new investigative power wisely. In situations that invite adversary argument, alternative positions and points of view will be more thoroughly developed and cogently presented.

2. *Ad hoc* congressional study and work groups would freely form and disperse as new and challenging tasks arose at the interstices of committee power. Warren G. Bennis, Ph.D. '55, and others have suggested that transient work groups composed of interdisciplinary teams of highly skilled specialists will replace hierarchial bureaucracy as the dominant form of organization in the post-industrial society (see Technology Review, *Apr., 1966, p. 36 and Apr., 1968, p. 37*). The congressional milieu with its weak hierarchial structure offers a logical setting for such work groups. Congressmen who might lack the requisite skills or resources to tackle a legislative problem by themselves could easily pool their efforts. The work of study groups would be "collateral" to that of the standing committees, but would introduce a "helpful and needed resilience into the congressional posture," in the words of George E. Agree, former Executive Director of the National Committee for an Effective Congress. To the extent that such work groups succeeded and posed a competitive challege to the existing committee structure, they might serve to improve the quality of committees generally. Standing committee leaders might seek to co-opt able young members, according greater weight to subject matter expertise. They might also advance talented members to subcommittee chairmanships faster than might otherwise have been the case. The committee system of Congress will still be organized in terms of the norms of specialization and reciprocity, but specialization will be much less dependent on the opportunity of one's initial committee assignment and accumulated seniority than it will be on the individual member's motivation and time commitment to mastering a given area of substantive policy and appropriate instruments for analysis.

3. While information systems afford new possibilities for specialization and increased committee power—especially in the area of legislative oversight or control of the executive bureaucracy—they should also afford possibilities to "democratize" committee power. Where limited information previously conferred important advantages on those few individuals who had the legislative seniority and central committee positions to accumulate such information, now generalized availability of information and program analyses would enable junior committee members and interested congressmen not on the committee to gain a better understanding of the issues involved. The majority would have greater opportunity to influence committee action and to prevail against the committee on the floor when its action was not representative of the views of the entire membership.

4. Generalized information systems should enable Congress to satisfy both the necessity for specialization and the goal of comprehensive policy review. Where information on executive agency activities has been compartmentalized within the executive budget and the congressional committee system, it would now be available on a comprehensive basis. The "special analyses" of the federal budget already being developed by the Bureau of the Budget are a prototype of the kind of comprehensive information that congressional committees will be able to tap. Individual congressional committees, no longer limited to information within their agency jurisdiction, could become important points for government-wide program review and co-ordination. Where the President alone has had the information to develop a measure of agency co-ordination, congressional committees would now share that information, and the authority to use it, subject to the majority support of Congress.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPERATIVE

These desirable goals are not outside realizable range—already they are within the gunsights of some forward-thinking legislators. A resonant note of anticipation can be heard on Capitol Hill. Members privately express the desire to be aware of coming problems so they can "gear up" for them. A few senators and congressmen already sense that information technology is the coming thing and are investing their own time as well as that of their committee and office staffs in developing closer familiarity with information systems.

Most articulate among spokesmen for congressional action is Representative Robert McClory of Illinois, who, during the 89th Congress, introduced the first bill in either House or Senate directly applying automatic data processing techniques to the work of Congress. In January, 1968, the legislative branch acquired its first automatic data processing installation—an on-line terminal system, installed in the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. It enables L.R.S. to record and store on magnetic tape descriptions of all bills and resolutions introduced in the 90th Congress. After reviewing the system, Mr. McClory anticipated that some of the next automatic data processing applications might be:

1. Daily print-outs summarizing the previous day's congressional action.
2. An automated index of congressional documents and legal periodicals.
3. Up-to-the-minute information on legislative issues scheduled for debate.
4. Vote summaries on bills already passed.
5. Status of legislation pending in committee.
6. Description of information stored on computer files in the executive departments.

Although several state legislatures have been well in advance of Congress in developing applications of the computer in the legislative process, the Washington atmosphere is now thick with interest. Committees of the Congress are giving increasing attention to A.D.P. possibilities; the Legislative Reference Service has developed several papers on the subject for congressional consideration; the General Accounting Office has installed a new Systems Analysis Section in its Office of Policy and Special Studies; several privately sponsored Washington seminars have been held on information technology including those convened by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, the Brookings Institution, and evening panels brought together by the Washington Operations Research Council and the Institute of Management Sciences.

A number of competitive dimensions in Congress are likely to accelerate acceptance of innovations in decision-making developed in the private sector or Executive branch: the built-in tension between authorizing and appropriations committees both eager to control program decision; the publicity incentive for committee and subcommittee chairmen generally to identify themselves with innovations and to push for their implementation; the perennial congressional fear that Congress is yielding initiative and authority to the President; party competition; and the generational divide between "activist" and high seniority congressmen. While there are many factors that will reinforce traditional ways of making decisions within Congress, change is inevitable if for no other reason than that Congress cannot afford *not* to follow the rationalization of Executive decision-making.

The real change in congressional attitude and skills will probably not be felt, however, until a new generation of political talent with practical experience with computers—through universities and the private sector—begins to enter Congress. This change will come sooner than most realize. One freshman congressman, formerly employed by the International Business Machines Corporation and a candidate for the doctorate in business/government relations from the Harvard Business School, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., of Michigan, caused somewhat of a stir in Washington in the fall of 1967 by sending then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara a request for a matrix of 85 specific data items for which he (Riegle) had written a computer program. Another freshman senator with a combined engineering and law background, Howard H. Baker, Jr., of Tennessee, lectured the Association for Computing Machinery about the impending nuclear power breakthrough in breeder reactors that could produce power at almost zero fuel cost and the need for a much broader congressional overview and plan for the technological and social revolution that this implied. Senator Baker has been an articulate spokesman for a new Senate Select Committee for Technology and the Human Environment. However impressive individual examples may be, Congress as an institution has yet to experience the potential of information technology.

FIRST IMPACT: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Whether the Congress acts sooner or later to improve the legislative process by using new information technology, its most explosive immediate political impact will be within the Executive Branch. The rationalization of program choice through greater availability of information and a more careful and explicit statement of program objectives, alternatives, and results will move the locus of program decision toward the cabinet secretary and the President. More adequate information systems will permit some functional decentralization of subordinate program decisions although the thrust will be toward more effective policy control from the top. As the compartmentalized information resources of individual agencies are integrated into comprehensive information systems, political executives will have greater leverage over the bureaucracy. The new information technology will accentuate hierarchical control and reduce legislative bargaining within the Executive. The decision-making process will accordingly become more closed.

The Executive Branch is already a leg up in A.D.P. on the Legislative through its recent experience with P.P.B.S. (Planning-Programming-Budgeting-System). The likely extrapolation of this experience is toward the development of a corps of highly trained professional "analyst" staffs within the Bureau of the Budget and the departmental secretary level. The power of these trained experts in the technology of information processing will pose new problems for congressional oversight. At a minimum, Congress will have to develop its own analytical staff if it is to monitor Executive decision-making. More important, it must watch for and correct new biases of specialization. Some observers question whether the new profession of systems analysis, drawing on multiple backgrounds of economics, physics, and engineering, can adequately deal with political decisions, over-all strategic planning, and public policy-making. Required instead may be more advanced professional knowledge and training that integrates the disciplines of political science and public administration with systems analysis, decision theory, and economic theory—i.e., political analysis.

Whatever their training, such well organized and technically sophisticated groups will gain power at the expense of less well-organized, less articulate groups. Political leaders who combine technical education and sophistication with good political judgment will enjoy an advantage over old-line politicians. The government bureaucracy as a whole, with continuous "inside access" to information systems, will enjoy an initial power advantage vis-à-vis the legislature, the general electorate, and nongovernmental groups. As it becomes more pervasive, the new information technology will introduce qualitative changes beginning in the Executive Branch and extending outward—in the nature of the American system. The need to make one's political objectives or goals more explicit within the budgetary process will expose more conflict and disagreement than Americans have been accustomed to. The chances are, however, that we will know much more about ourselves and our politics and that this will both ease and complicate the problem of building political consensus. If the Executive decision process limits internal bargaining, the Congress may gain an enhanced role in developing political consensus.

Three major consequences, therefore, are likely to follow increased rationalization of Executive decision-making, especially in the budget process:

1. Centralization of effective decision-making under the President and his chief cabinet officers;

2. Development of a professional "analyst" class within the government and the need to reconcile new forms of specialization with broader social and political perspectives; and

3. A more explicit, candid style of politics which may complicate the problem of achieving political consensus.

SOME PAYOFF PROJECTIONS

Let's project ourselves into the mid-70's, and beyond when advanced information technology has been widely adapted for governmental decision-making. We have suggested some of the changes this will bring at the level *systems politics* (the way decision structures are organized in both the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. What will be the gains or payoffs for the policy-maker himself? From analogies drawn largely from experience in industrial organizations, I believe the following projections of computer application to governmental decision-making to be neither exaggerated nor unrealistic for the potential of new information technology:

1. *Improved quality of information and information processing*. One of the most obvious advances that will be made possible by the new information technology is increased quality of information (including factors such as relevance, precision, completeness, and timeliness) and quality of information processing (accuracy, speed, ability to handle complex relationships, flexibility, and potential for codification in standard rules).

The resource and delay costs to the individual decision-maker who has access to governmental information systems will in time be minimal. Assuming for the time being no political restraints on access, the decision-maker should be able, through proper specification, to locate all relevant information anywhere in the system almost instantaneously. Geographical and other forms of information "isolation" will end with a nationally (and eventually internationally) integrated information system. The inefficiencies and costs of information communication within human systems will be largely eliminated as many of the information processing functions of bureaucracies are assumed by programmed machines. The elimination of middle men between top officials and data gatherers or their replacement by top level data analysts will effect a major reduction in hierarchical distortion.

A vivid example of this potential of the computer to eliminate inefficiencies in information processing and retrieval is the current congressional concern with the "government dossier." Each individual citizen leaves behind him a trail of public and private records from the time of his birth. Much of this information is retained in the files of government agencies scattered around Washington and the country: income tax returns, applications for government employment, security clearance checks, social security and unemployment benefits, census data, etc. While access to some files is limited by confidentiality restrictions and limits of disclosure, it is still technically feasible to collect an enormous amount of information on a single individual.

On the positive side, the computer will give man the capacity to interrogate and reorganize massive data files almost instantaneously for social science research. Usable information which is accessible to decision-makers acting under time pressure should be increased by several orders of magnitude.

2. *Improved channeling of information—easing the problem of information overload*. In our foreseeable future there will always be more problems calling for the attention of a congressman than he can possibly consider. But with the computer the problem of information overload will be more subject to the control of the individual decision-maker. He will have the potential to get "on top" of his work. The computer can be programmed to provide top decision-makers with "exception" information demanding attention or action. The problem of management information, according to Gilbert Burck, is "not how to get information to the top, but how to keep useless information from coming to the top." Decision-makers may specify in advance what types of information they wish to receive on given subjects of interest as new information becomes available. Central libraries or document centers can then service the individual decision-maker according to his "interest profile" through a technique of "selective dissemination of information."

The computer will enable the decision-maker to specify one or more of several information formats and to reorganize data in terms of a desired format. Instead of being a largely passive recipient of information, the decision-maker will be able to interact with the data system using it as an active search mechanism as well. Whether he uses such control to enhance his legislative performance will depend on such human factors as courage, perception, imagination, sensitivity, and achievement motivation.

3. *Improved quality of the human decision process*. The computer has already demonstrated its capacity to discipline human thought processes. It requires clear and precise instructions. It must be told in every detail what it is to do and it follows orders—even incorrect orders—with exactitude. The computer is not only enabling but forcing the modern executive to think more explicitly and analytically—to make more formal his decision-making process and specify his judgments. More advanced computer programs reduce the amount of necessary detailed instruction but reprimand the programmer when he makes an error. Eventually, as computer languages are continually simplified, men will "tell" the computer what they want and delegate to the computer the authority to "tell" them what they must do to get it.

4. *The capacity for systems thinking and systems analysis*. The analytical concepts and techniques associated with the new information technology—systems analysis, program budgeting—are not particularly new. What is new is the capacity of automatic data processing to make "operational" the concept of an organization as a total system. "Men are not good calculators of the dynamic behavior of complicated systems," according to Professor Jay W. Forrester, S.M. '45, who has pioneered research in industrial dynamics. "The intuitive judgment of even a skilled investigator is quite unreliable in anticipating the dynamic behavior of a simple information-feedback system of perhaps five or six variables," he writes. A computer can handle such a problem with relative ease.

Melvin Anshen considers this "enlargement of the total range of decision-making" as potentially the most valuable contribution of the new information technology to management practice. It is now possible for the first time for the human decision-maker to consider the total activity of an organization as "a simple integrated system. Within this system, a dynamic network of relationships can be discerned and measured, with feedback loops and forces for multiplying and dampening the effects of actions at earlier stages in the continuous process. Analytical techniques based on the programmed computer permit managers to simulate the performance of such a system and test its output under a range of changing variables within and outside the system. This technical advance is only one among many possibilities now available for extending the scope of decision-making."

5. *A lengthened time-perspective with greater opportunity for strategic planning*. The new information technology should effect important changes in the time perspective of the decision-maker. The amount of crisis decision-making, i.e., time spent in reacting to unanticipated crises, should be decreased by the development of better warning indicators and monitoring systems. Simulation will permit the economic preparation of major contingency plans. The management information cycle will be reduced significantly by real-time information systems. The concept of "feedback" defined as "the decision response to the *state* of the system" will be supplemented by a new concept of "feed-forward" relating to "decision responses to *anticipated future disturbances* of the subsystem being controlled by the decision-maker," in the words of Martin Greenberger.

The programming of routine decisions and the control of information overload through techniques of selective dissemination will both serve to free the decision-maker from the burden of repetitive operations and detailed information. The "remedial orientation" of incremental policy-making will be replaced by an orientation toward the future. The policy-making as opposed to the administrative role of the public official will be enhanced. The new information technology will draw the attention of analysts and decision-

XUM

makers to higher-level, longer-term problems.

6. *The breakthrough in collaborative research—"the on-line intellectual community."* The computer will enable or facilitate two types of significant advance in collaborative research—which in the long run may well be its greatest contribution to man's capacity for problem solving. The first of these gains in the cumulative storage and preservation of solutions—a kind of division of intellectual labor—and the second, in the potential for man-machine-man interaction.

New and more refined computer programs are constantly being developed, tested, and stored. The compiler allows the computer programmer to call, combine, co-ordinate and use routines or programs that are already perfected and stored in the computer. In theory, once a particular problem situation is solved, it is solved for all time. Other users of the computer network can draw on any approved program that is in the system. Given the virtually infallible memory of the computer, all gains or improvements in techniques of computation and analysis, no matter how incremental, are preserved until better techniques are perfected and may be retrieved, used and refined by contemporary and future generations of decision-makers.

Computers will rapidly take over most of the routine, repetitive decisions that can be programmed at the lower levels of government and other large organizations. Even in the area of nonspecifically programmed or ill-structured, novel problems, the computer will become a powerful tool. If most human decisions have an underlying structure, as disjointed, incremental, restricted in scope as that structure may be, in time computer programmers and analysts will discover and program the implicit decision techniques, rules, and coefficients. Already computer programs based on the analysis of past managerial behavior have proved more efficient than continued management practices (i.e., rules of thumb) based on experience. Most computer experts do not expect the computer to replace the human decision-maker but rather to extend his planning and decisional capacities through the continued refinement of man-machine interaction.

Even more significant than the steady development of computer programs is the advent in prototype form of "the on-line intellectual community" based on man-computer interaction and computer-facilitated co-operation among men in university setting. Carl F. J. Overhage and R. Joyce Harman, '45, describe the potential breakthrough based on the experience of Project MAC (research and development of Machine-Aided Cognition and Multiple-Access Computer systems) at M.I.T.:

"Because communication among men is fallible, and because heretofore men did not have effective ways of expressing complex ideas unambiguously—and recalling them, testing them, transferring them, and converting them from a static record into observable, dynamic behavior—the accumulation of correlatable contributions was opposed by continual erosion; and melding of contributions was hampered by divergencies of convention and format that kept one man's ideas from meshing with another's. The prospect is that, when several or many people work together within the context of an on-line, interactive, community computer network, the superior facilities of that network for expressing ideas, preserving facts, modeling processes, and information and the same behavior—those superior facilities will so foster the growth and integration of knowledge that the incidence of major achievements will be markedly increased."

Comparable networks will in time be available in business and government and between sectors of each of these communities with overlapping research interests. The promise of man-machine-man interaction for pure and applied research is one of the scarcely realized but most staggering potentials of the new information technology.

OBSTRUCTIONS TO THE INFORMATION REVOLUTION

Having thus surveyed some of the more impressive rewards that unquestionably await both managers and law-givers of government when they discover and develop the full potential of information technology, we must plant a few red flags along the computer highway. Lessening information constraints on and increasing the potency of analytical tools available to decision-makers will not remove many current dilemmas in decision-making. These limitations go well beyond information as such.

1. *The problem of values.* If we define politics as a struggle for control stemming from conflict over the direction of social life, over policy, it is clear that the central problem of politics is one of values, not information. Decision-making involves values at all stages. Choice activity especially requires levels, it may be possible to compare alternatives and choose a more efficient means for achieving an agreed upon objective such as disease control, improved maternal and child health care, or improved income maintenance. (Even this approach, it should be noted, ignores the problem of interpersonal comparison of utility.) But at higher program levels, can improved information help a decision-maker weigh major dissimilar program alternatives such as an anti-ballistic missile system or a domestic Marshall plan for the nation's urban centers? Only insofar as such information gives the President, the budget director, or the congressman better understanding of what X million dollars allocated to program alternative A or B will actually buy in benefits. In government, budgeting is a political activity and the problem of choice or allocation ultimately remains one of values.

The decision-maker's values will also shape his intelligence activity, i.e., finding occasions for making decisions, and his design activity—how he structures alternatives for choice. Data must be structured or organized before they become meaningful. Predetermined data-structures can help, but the decision-maker himself must constantly synthesize knowledge in an interdisciplinary fashion. He must interpret, project, and interconnect fragmented information. The political decision-maker has a natural tendency to select and adapt information and to screen out that which is "politically undigestible."

In a decision-making environment where resources are relatively plentiful (i.e., where economic criteria for resource allocation are less relevant) and where the decision-maker has the analytical and information processing capabilities to structure in advance innumerable alternative solutions, the value perspective of the decision-maker will become increasingly important. With these reservations, information can still make an effective contribution to decision-making. If we are correct in our estimate that computer-based techniques such as systems analysis and simulation will afford decision-makers in the Executive and Congress much greater understanding of complex problems, such as those of our urban centers, then the gains may be substantial. As social problems appear more susceptible to rational solution, it should be easier to develop a political consensus to do so. As to the final judgment on values, the American political system will continue to specify the goals and objectives toward which political decision-makers must move.

2. *The political use and abuse of information.* It follows from the preceding remarks that information systems in government may be used to serve the political purposes of the political actors who have the resources to control them. Information may be processed with conscious policy or partisan biases. Both information and analysis may be abused in the furtherance of specific political objectives. Bargaining and compromise will remain a principal feature of the democratic process although they may involve different participants and a new language.

Decision-making in government cannot be abstracted from the political system within which the decision-maker operates. How then can one prevent the President or program-oriented bureau chief from consciously or unconsciously biasing an information system that Congress must use? Can the same information system in Congress serve both Democrats and Republicans?

The answer lies in two directions. First, major data sources of the Federal Government, with multiple users, could be kept as "neutral" as possible through statutory control, reinforced by regular checks by inspecting authorities such as the General Accounting Office. Second, specialized users including the President, the Congress, and the party leaderships within Congress could develop their own private information systems in parallel with the central data system and in accord with their own needs. Through this differentiation it should be possible to keep the policy and partisan biases of central governmental information systems under control and to recognize explicitly the use of competing information systems for some adversary situations.

3. *Additional cost factors.* The introduction of information systems will mean some new costs as well as increased capabilities. The obvious immediate cost is that of capital, both for hardware (the basic computational facility) and software (the development of programs appropriate to the specific user). We suggest that this economic cost factor will rapidly decline in the coming decade or two and be minimal by the end of the century. A second cost factor is the need for much more highly skilled personnel. As already noted, a new profession of "analysts" will be needed in government. However, the computer will not necessarily become more "distant" from the lay-user, including the congressman. The educational and skill levels of the general population and "familiarity" with computers should also rise. And more advanced computer technology and programming should lead to the development of some computers that can be operated with relatively low skills. The decision-maker who wants to use the full potential the computer of the future will offer will probably employ and work with specialized analyst staff.

Other "technical costs" must be anticipated in adapting information systems for government. These include: (a) a natural tendency towards greater reliance upon quantifiable data, (b) programming bias that may reduce the sensitivity of the system to new types of data and significant changes in the environment, and (c) the elimination of inputs—interpretations, opinions, and statements of self-interest—previously provided by intermediate level officials replaced by the information system. All of these tendencies suggest a new need for congressional oversight or review of the Executive. The computer improperly used could well lead to new rigidities in official behavior that would be inimicable to an open system of decision-making.

4. *The problem of final payoffs.* Anthony Downs, in a searching critique of the expectation of "urban-information-systems" enthusiasts, calls into question "the intuitively plausible but actually misleading assumption" that "better data in urban decision-making would have huge final payoffs, because . . . better information would reduce both the frequency and the magnitude of planning mistakes." Downs argues that three factors make it difficult to prove that better data will lead to more effective decisions: (a)

the extreme difficulty of measuring the effectiveness of decisions; (b) variances in measurable effects caused by factors other than data inputs; and (c) the problem of whose values to use in calculating payoffs. He concludes that many urban decision-makers will be reluctant to make large initial investments for what will "probably seem like only marginal gains in final payoffs."

The basic point is well taken—one must go beyond the technical payoffs of improved information in assessing the value of information systems in government. I am more optimistic than Downs, however, on three points: (a) the assumption that capital costs to users will steadily decline; (b) the possibility for controlled simulation of systems behavior; and (c) the cumulative effect of marginal gains over time.

5. *The power consequences of information systems.* Information systems have important power payoffs as well as technical payoffs. Their introduction involves relative power shifts among political actors. These power consequences of information systems greatly influence the form in which they are adopted and how they are used. For some, the threatened loss of power may be sufficient to lead to active resistance to the new systems.

Acknowledging these reservations, I am still persuaded that the combined and cumulative impact of the new information technology suggests some radical changes in the environment of governmental decision-making. The shift will be from a negative to a positive orientation toward problem solving. The incrementalist's view that "public policy problems are too complex to be well understood, too complex to be mastered" and that decision makers develop "a strategy to cope with problems, not to solve them" will be replaced with a more optimistic perspective. The decision-maker will be "on-top" of information. He will have analytical techniques and information processing capabilities that will give him new understanding of governmental and social systems and with this a sense that he can manipulate and control them. Where the incrementalists have rejected "the impossible prescription to be comprehensive" in favor of a more manageable strategy of "outright neglect," the new information technology will enable the decision-maker to develop a *more rational* and *aggressive* strategy of problem-solving. The distinction is fundamental.

CHALLENGE TO SEPARATION OF POWERS

While the application of information technology in government will have its greatest immediate political impact *within* the Executive (with important secondary consequences, as we have observed for the Congress), the longer term consequences of better information in government raise fundamental questions about the American system of separated powers. Congress and legslative bodies generally need *not* lose power to the Executive. The potential advance in information technology is theoretically equally accessible to *both* the President and Congress, with *Congress* standing to enhance its powers versus the Executive considerably. The central dilemma of American politics—how power should be organized in the American political system—will be faced once again, but this time in its starkest form.

The policy or control functions of the President and Congress will become less distinguishable as both develop the capacity to ask program questions and undertake analyses of data from the same generalized information systems or specially developed systems for their own use. One restraint on a fully developed congressional policy role in the past has been the unwillingness of Congress to build a parallel legislative staff bureaucracy. As a result, Congress has often had to "second guess" the Executive without the information to back its hunches. Now, as technology generalizes the availability of information, Congress can tap into Executive-based information systems, establish quality controls, and develop more limited information systems for its own specific requirements. Program budgeting suggests the potential leverage that may accrue to Congress. The Executive bureaucracy, under the direction of the President and Budget Bureau, will structure program choices and undertake analysis of various alternatives. Congress will be presented with a program budget which may easily be rearranged by traditional line-item categories or into other desired formats. Congress will review program choices, evaluate analyses with its own analyst staff, and make it own determination of priorities. The process of making choices and analyses more explicit enables Congress to participate much more intelligently and vigorously, with a *limited* staff, in the decision-making process. In fact, there may even be a danger of too vigorous participation.

Will the President permit Congress to have access to the information resources and analyses of the Executive branch? Insofar as analyses are used, he will have to justify his program requests. Other background analyses and alternatives may not be presented to Congress. In such case, these would have to be duplicated by congressional analysts. (Congress would want the capacity to go beyond alternatives presented by the Executive in any event.) In fact, the effectiveness of implementation of the right of Congress to information will be a critical test in the future of the degree of congressional autonomy within a system of separated powers.

We can only speculate on the new definition of the separation of powers that will evolve. Distinctive presidential and congressional biases may soon develop in the decision-making process. We might expect the Executive to overemphasize the benefits of rationalization in program formulation and administration, to overvalue economic and technical criteria of performance. If, as some observers anticipate, the new information technology leads to "an increasing separation between operating missions, life-styles, and social roles for those institutions and individuals involved in rationalized activities compared to those involved in nonrationalized ones," Congress, representative of a society embracing both life-styles, would inherit the difficult task of mediating the impact of the former on the latter and restraining the tendency toward irrational and frustrated response. Congress would add elements of "political rationality," considerations of human costs and benefits to the decision-making process.

In this context, one rationale for the separation of powers—"systemic dissonance"—takes on new significance. We have suggested through this discussion that the revolution in information technology represents an almost immeasurable potential increase in man's knowledge—especially in his under standing of and ability to control his environment. The intelligent use of that knowledge and the power it confers is an awesome responsibility. In a political democracy it involves the democratic consideration of emerging technological possibility and consequence. The multiple perspective of the American system, the numerous points of access for developing, testing, and advancing ideas may ultimately prove to be among the greatest assets of American democracy in the future.

SPYROS P. SKOURAS: 75TH JUBILEE DINNER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most extraordinary living Americans is Spyros P. Skouras, whom I have had the privilege of knowing as a friend for a number of years. This year marks the retirement of Mr. Skouras after over 50 years of activity in the American film industry.

Not only has Spyros P. Skouras carved a name for himself as a pioneer of American motion pictures, but he has also given generously of his time, his extraordinary energies and his resources to the support of a wide variety of philanthropic activities, particularly those identified with his native Greece.

Spyros P. Skouras came to the United States from Greece as a young man and rose to a position of eminence as a business and civic leader in the classic American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the honor of being present at the Spyros P. Skouras 75th Jubilee Dinner held in New York City on January 28, 1969.

Outstanding persons from every walk of life, business, politics, the motion picture industry, education, and religion—were present to do honor to Mr. Skouras and to raise funds to build the Skouras Center for the Creative Arts at an institution very dear to Mr. Skouras' heart—Hellenic College in Boston.

Honorary chairman of the dinner was Mr. John J. McCloy and the honorary committee cochairmen were the following distinguished Americans:

Hon. Spiro T. Agnew, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Hon. William P. Rogers, Hon. John A. Volpe, Archbishop Iakovos, Rev. Dr. Leonidas Contos, Nicholas B. Macris, and Hon. John C. Pappas.

Mr. Speaker, I know that everyone present at the dinner to which I refer was moved by the eloquent remarks of the guest of honor on that occasion, and I insert at this point in the Record the text of the address by Mr. Skouras at his 75th jubilee dinner:

Address of Spyros D. Skouras at the 75th Jubilee Dinner, January 28, 1969

Mr. McCloy; Mr. Vice-President; Governor Rockefeller; Your Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos; Your Excellency, Archbishop Cooke; reverend clergy; Senator Javits; Senator Goodell; distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, your presence here tonight—and the kind words that have been spoken—have caused my heart to burst with joy and gratitude.

Just as we confess our inmost thoughts to our God—when we worship—listing them as carefully as we can—so I would like to list my reflections—very briefly—a kind of litany of thanksgiving.

AN IMMIGRANT'S LITANY OF THANKSGIVING

For the hand that led my brothers, Charles and George, and me to this land—I give thanks. Some of you in this room—not all, but some—will know what America has meant—and means—to an immigrant. The common words—*country, flag, citizenship*—have meanings and depth that cannot be expressed—but only *felt*.

Perhaps Plato most nearly expressed our feelings when he said: More honorable and righteous and sacred among the gods and wise men, above and beyond father and mother and all other ancestors—is the country . . . "Patrida."

For my noble parents, noble though poor, noble though unlettered, noble though humble—I give thanks. I can still hear my mother's voice through the years saying: "Spyros, my son—patience, perseverance—and humility." These words have been my guides throughout my life.

XUM

For two brothers—my adelphi—such as few men are blessed with—and a relationship that was truly legendary—I give thanks. When each in his turn died, a part of myself was lost. *Their* memorial consists in the many friends they earned—many of whom are here tonight—honoring *their* memory as they pay me honor.

A HEARTFELT THANKS TO AMERICA

For the generous and warm-hearted people of St. Louis, Missouri—who welcomed us to this land—and embraced us in their city—I have a special feeling. It was there that my brothers and I first experienced America's love of democracy and were given the opportunities she offers to all who come to this wonderful land.

It was there that we received first-hand knowledge of the lofty ideals and ideas of the American people—who were always ready to aid the under-privileged people of the world. In the history of mankind, no other nation has ever so devotedly and unselfishly served people everywhere as the United States has done—and is still doing. To this country, I give my heartfelt thanks.

PRAISE OF THE FILM INDUSTRY

For the high privilege of serving in one of the great guilds of our age, the film industry—I give thanks, not merely an industry, it is an art—not an art only—but an instrument of immense potential—to civilize and instruct—to elevate and refine—as well as to entertain.

To the people of 20th Century Fox—the New York office, the studio—to all those who are a part of that great company throughout the United States and in foreign areas—for their kindness and support over so many years—for their loyalty and devotion to the best interests of the company—I will be forever grateful.

DEEP APPRECIATION FOR FAMILY

For my beloved wife, Saroula—I give thanks—although she would not marry me until I had 45 theaters! We have experienced many happy moments—and some tragedies in our life—and we have shared them both—together.

For my four dear children—Daphne, Spyros, Diana, and Plato—and our 14 lovely grandchildren—I give thanks.

We are grateful to God for sending back to us our eldest grandson—George Fowler—who, after being wounded twice in Vietnam—is home again.

My wife—my children—my grandchildren—share in my happiness this evening—as they have throughout all the years.

THE BLESSINGS OF FRIENDSHIP

I give thanks for the blessing of friendship—for his eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, who enjoys my total respect as a spiritual father.

I owe, too, a profound debt to a giant of a man, a prophetic and holy figure—His Holiness, Patriarch Athenagoras—who this week marks twenty years as ecumenical patriarch in Istanbul—who is one of the two prime movers of church unity. The loving, spiritual guidance he gave me, showing the riches of my orthodox faith, have put me forever in his debt.

My thanks go, too, to the memory of the late Cardinal Spellman, who aided me in many ways and whose friendship I was proud to have. For many years we worked together for the Alfred E. Smith Memorial—on which I'm one of the trustees.

And thanks, too, to our beloved Archbishop of New York, His Excellency Terence J. Cooke, whom I have known for many years.

I think too of the late Rabbi Stephen Wise with whom I worked on many humanitarian causes, and of Rabbi Julius Mark with whom I have served on many committees.

To my dear friend, Senator Jacob Javits, I say thank you for all the work he does to make life easier for the unfortunates and for his continuous fight for the principles of democracy—and for the efforts he has put in on the Javits Committee of the Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation Project.

And to our junior Senator from New York, Charles Goodell, I thank you for a new and what I am sure will be a long friendship.

I am honored by the friendship of our Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, and his charming Happy, who honors us here tonight by her presence. For the Governor's thoughtfulness, and for his generosity to Hellenic College, I will be forever grateful.

To Mr. Jack McCloy—for being the chairman of this drive to raise funds for Hellenic College, I am more thankful than I can say.

And to John Pappas, who conceived this event, and who has devoted so much of his time to it and to Hellenic College—and to his brother, my friend, Tom—a heartfelt thanks.

GRATITUDE WHO WORKED TO MAKE THE EVENING SUCCESSFUL

And to some of the others who have worked so hard to make this affair such a success:

His grace, Bishop Silas—Father Leonard Contos, President of Hellenic College—Father Basil Gregory of the Archdiocese.

Dore Schary, the great motion picture and theatrical producer, and the President of the Anti-Defamation League.

Eliot Hyman—Chairman of the Board of Warner Bros. 7 Arts.

Si Fabian—President of Fabian Theaters.

Harry Brandt—President of Brandt Theaters.

Louis Nizer—Attorney and friend for many years.

General James Van Fleet—who will always have a special place in the hearts of all Americans—especially those of Greek origin.

Don Miller of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Joe Barkan of Prudential Lines and my colleagues at the United Greek Orthodox Charities—Nicholas Macris, Theodore Allis and Michael Sotirhos.

To all—and the many others—my heartfelt thanks.

A FINAL WORD

Finally, I give thanks to all of you who have honored me by coming here tonight. I have been involved with many projects—which have been a source of deep satisfaction to me—but this one is the nearest and dearest to my heart—for it symbolizes all the principles which I cherish.

I am happy because I consider the center dedicated tonight to be in the *Skouras* name—not in my name alone.

It will train the artists and craftsmen to develop the creative arts to their best potential.

My friends, this gives me satisfaction beyond any personal honor. You are helping fulfill my life's dream—to serve my industry, my country and humanity.

Thank you.

SOVIET NAVAL BUILDUP IN THE MEDITERRANEAN—PART II

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on March 18 I inserted in the Record the first part of the four-part series on the Soviet naval buildup in the Mediterranean which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and was written by Michael McGuire of the Chicago Tribune Press Service. For some time now, military experts here in the United States and in the NATO nations have expressed concern about the Soviets "peaceful" aims in this area. Distasteful though it may be, the Soviet goal of world domination is truly the motivating force behind such programs as the Mediterranean expansion. We can scan official Soviet statements to find reassurance that they are sincerely searching for peace, but one look at situations such as the present one in the Mediterranean tells the real story. One is reminded of the bank robber who extols the merits of the free enterprise system while the cashier hands him the money. Needless to say, the barrel of the bandit's gun is a thousand times more eloquent and self-explanatory than any statement he might make concerning the desirability of peaceful competition.

I place the article, "Assess Political Impact of Russian Fleet," by Michael McGuire, from the Chicago Tribune of March 17, 1969, in the Record at this point:

Assess Political Impact

(By Michael McGuire)

Naples, March 16.—Psychological and political effects of the Russian naval fleet in the Mediterranean deliver a more important impact in Europe and the middle east than does the military potential, Adm. Horatio Rivero, commander of NATO forces in south Europe, said here yesterday.

"Its presence has both political and military impact," said Rivero in an interview at his NATO headquarters. "I would say that in peacetime, however, the political and psychological aspects are the most important."

BELIEVES IT'S MANAGEABLE

"As long as we have the air superiority and total naval superiority that we have, I think this [military] threat is manageable," Rivero said. "I have more concern about the submarine threat which doesn't get publicity because you don't see submarines, you see surface ships. On the other hand, the submarines have very little political impact, but they have military impact."

Approximately 35 Russian naval vessels, including nine submarines, are in the Mediterranean at present. The presence of Russian warships in the Mediterranean started getting world attention when their numbers increased sharply after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Last fall, the number of soviet naval vessels reached an all-time high of about 60, including 7 to 10 submarines, following the Czechoslovakia crisis. Later, the number gradually diminished to its present status.

COUNTERED BY 6TH FLEET

Countering the soviets in the Mediterranean are approximately 50 ships, 25,000 men, and 200 aircraft of the 6th fleet. Augmenting the 6th fleet forces are the navies of allied nations ringing the Mediterranean, which American naval authorities here said are improving constantly.

Military strategists have said the soviet surface vessels in time of war most likely would be obliterated quickly, in part because the Russians lack the air power which would allow those ships to survive. Also, it would be difficult for the Russians to deploy a large amphibious force.

First, they would have to bring such a force thru the Turkish straits, which could speedily be plugged. Second, a very large buildup of amphibious forces would still require them to have the air power in the area that they may not be able to muster.

HAVE CREATED CHANGE

In a psychological and political sense, the Russians already have created a change in the status quo thru their presence.

When the Israeli destroyer Elath was attacked by missiles fired from an Egyptian patrol boat in June, 1967, at Port Said harbor, there were Russian ships in the same harbor. Their presence prevented the Israelis from taking counter-action against the patrol boat unit if they had wanted to do so because it would have created a direct confrontation with the soviet forces.

"The mere presence of one soviet ship in a harbor causes another nation to make an evaluation of whether any move toward that harbor could cause retaliation by the soviets; thus you can see the political effect," said a senior naval officer attached to the American naval staff in Naples.

EXPECT NO U.S. ACTION

The Institute of Strategic Studies in London reported that the Red fleet rules out a repeat performance of the American landing in Lebanon in 1958 and makes unlikely American aid to Israel in case of a new Arab-Israeli clash. Soviet ships stationed in the vicinity might be a cause of confrontation.

From a psychological aspect, nations ringing the Mediterranean may have had little fear of the Russians when evidence of their power was not present.

If one of the NATO nations in the Mediterranean thought the Russian force was getting so strong, its leaders might think NATO forces would be unable to provide adequate defense. Out of fear, they might begin making friendly overtures with the soviets, resulting in increased trade and political submission.

SEE NEW KREMLIN POLICY

Some military experts predict the Russians' Mediterranean fleet is only the beginning of a new Kremlin policy aimed at challenging American naval supremacy thruout the world, a supremacy that forced the Kremlin to back down after sending missiles to Cuba and to accept Egypt's defeat by Israel in June, 1967.

"The Russians have learned that naval forces can be used as a form of diplomacy and for political pressure," Rivero said.

Many experts here believe there is a strong military basis to the Russian diplomatic interest in middle east. The Russians want the Suez canal to be open, a need that undoubtedly will not be realized so long as Israel holds Sinai.

"The Russians are highly interested in the Suez canal, their only way of passing thru to the Indian ocean, receiving supplies and reinforcements, and eventually linking up with the fleet they have at present operating in the Persian gulf," Rivero said.

"Probably, in this case, the political and diplomatic factors are largely the consequence of a military requirement," said Rivero, who is responsible for the NATO defense of Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

Also of concern to American and NATO naval forces are the auxiliary fleets [those of Yugoslavia, Syria, Egypt, and Algeria] equipped with a missile capability. Such vessels are called Osa and Komar class boats and are a speedier and more sophisticated version of the American torpedo [PT] boat of World War II.

"I believe that these two classes of vessel represent a real threat to our lines of communication," said Rivero. "This would be all the more true if Syria, Egypt, and Algeria were seriously involved against our countries.

"However," said Rivero, "these vessels' missiles have a very limited range whereby, if the vessels operate far from convoys and escorts ships, it is very easy to keep a check on them, especially by means of aerial observation, which is always intense in our units' operational area. The most important thing is never to be taken by surprise."

ALLIES WATCHED FROM AIR

Another naval officer said, however, that an Osa and Komar-type vessel could approach an allied naval warship by moving amid one of hundreds of small fishing fleets in the sea. Tho naval authorities assert their ships would operate beyond the range of the Osa and Komar boats, some officers contend the boats might be able to obtain fuel, as well as cover, from the fishing boats with which it traveled.

Steady surveillance activity by Egyptians flying Russian manufactured reconnaissance aircraft also causes concern among the allied navies.

"These planes are equipped with highly sophisticated gear," said Rivero. "Whenever there is a NATO or 6th fleet exercise, they keep watch."

Asked if Russian crews manned the planes, Rivero said:

"I can say that you can hypothesize that due to the very highly sophisticated equipment in those aircraft that at least some of the crews probably are soviet, but you can't prove it."

Tho the Russians use four Mediterranean ports (Algiers, Alexandria, Port Said, and Latakia in Syria) extensively, and one port (Tartus in Syria) to a lesser degree for repair and resupply, they depend mainly on anchorages, areas where the sea is more than 100 feet deep, across the Mediterranean.

RUSS KEEP INDEPENDENT

While tied in anchorages under relatively calm circumstances, the crews can carry out repair, load supplies, and rest. NATO authorities believe the Russian admiralty makes use of these anchorages in order to reduce to a minimum its having to depend on the good will of any other country.

The use of anchorages are said to be a great inconvenience in bad weather and rough seas, and can be a factor in limiting higher crew morale thru offering little exercise and eliminating the purchase of fresh foods in shore markets.

LACK OF BASES A PROBLEM

Among the anchorages most frequently used by the soviets are the international waters near the coast of North Africa off Alboran, Hammamot, and the Island of La Galite; one off Greece at Kithira; and one between Cyprus and the Levantine coast. An area east of Malta, known as Hurd bank, also is frequently used.

The lack of bases they can call their own poses a serious problem for the soviets. Many Europeans and American naval commanders are concerned the Russians may try to develop such a base at Mirs-el-Kebir, the large naval facility at Oran, Algeria, which was turned over to that nation by the French in 1967 after they withdrew from NATO.

"Bases are not essential for a fleet operating far from its home ports, but without doubt they can greatly facilitate operations," said Rivero. "The soviets cannot do important maintenance in the anchorages which they have in the Mediterranean area. They can do more in ports such as Port Said and Alexandria, where their ships have free access.

USE PORTS AS THEIR OWN

"But the importance of a port also depends on the equipment existing and the supplies stored there," he said. "In these two Egyptian ports there are also docks which enable the soviets to carry out work on their ships' hulls. This is of course less than what the soviets could do at home.

In any case, the soviets calmly use Port Said and Alexandria as if they were their permanent bases. It does not much matter whether these bases belong to Egypt or to the Soviet Union, because the Egyptians give them a free hand. On the other hand, the soviets do no have this possibility in the western Mediterranean.

Asked if he thought the presence of the soviets at Mers-el-Kebir would be dangerous for the defense of the Mediterranean, Rivero replied:

"I don't think it would be any more dangerous whether they were there or not. The great advantage for them would be that of being able to effect all their maintenance work and supplies in the western part of the Mediterranean, without being obliged to return to the eastern part each time. However, all this would not appreciably alter the military operation capability of the soviet fleet."

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, our friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN L. OTTINGER, on March 1, 1969, made an address to the 33d annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation in Washington, D.C. In his considered and thoughtful address, the gentleman from New York called for the creation of a Federal "environmental ombudsman" to protect our natural resources from damage and destruction by reason of actions of Federal departments and agencies.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to be familiar with Congressman OTTINGER's views on this matter, I include the text of his address at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION—33D ANNUAL MEETING, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1969

I am indeed honored to have been invited to participate in this 33d annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation.

This is one of the really outstanding events of the year for all who are concerned with conservation of our dwindling natural resources and preservation of our threatened environment.

But this annual meeting has a particular and personal significance for me. First, because of the Federation's decision to honor the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference as the Conservation Organization of the year. And second, because—by that action and by the agenda for this general session we are opening here this morning—the Federation is taking the lead in expanding the horizons of traditional concepts of conservation to include resource and environmental problems of the urban-suburban complex.

The honor to be paid to Scenic Hudson tonight is particularly gratifying to those of us who have been identified with that organization's long, and often seemingly hopeless, battle to save Storm King Mountain and the incomparable assets of the Hudson Gorge and Highlands.

For many years Scenic Hudson stood alone in asserting that a natural asset has a value over and above that which can be measured in terms of development potential. The Conference fought for the principle that this value is enhanced rather than diminished by the fact that the asset is a part of a growing urban complex.

Whatever the final outcome of the Storm King fight—and I am pleased to note that the odds have changed considerably over the past six years—Scenic Hudson will have made an important contribution to the national conservation effort and thereby to the quality of life in this country.

Through the decision of the Second Circuit Court, Scenic Hudson has established that the concerned public has a defendable interest in the disposition of a natural resource—and that government agencies have an affirmative responsibility to protect that interest.

Equally important, through its patient, persistent educational efforts, Scenic Hudson has created a new public awareness of importance of environmental factors in every action that we propose to take to meet the needs of our growing urban-suburban complex.

By honoring Scenic Hudson for these achievements, the National Wildlife Federation has helped to focus the attention of the conservation community on its vital problem and, as I am sure Secretary Hickel could tell you, that community has come to represent a very potent force in our society.

The environmental pollution generated by urbanization has a very direct effect upon the natural resources that have been the traditional objects of conservation concern. I doubt if there is any park, refuge or wildlife preserve that has not felt the impact in some way. It may come in a direct way from the growing volume of water pollution and air pollution. It may come from the effects of highway proposals, powerlines, industrial encroachment or just plain people pollution.

If we need justification for turning our attention to the wise conservation of urban resources, it is very simply stated: survival.

We have to face the fact now that we live in a finite environment. Perhaps there was a time when we had so much elbow room that we could ignore the limits of our resources. But now, our growing population and the tremendous technological development that is necessary to support it, are demanding so much of our environment that the end is, if not in sight, at least in mind.

Not only is our environmental system finite, it is also complex and its factors are closely inter-related. Everything we do can have a significant and unexpected impact on crucial environmental factors—often an adverse impact.

We hear a lot these days about the dangers of the "finger on the nuclear trigger" and its potential for the cataclysmic destruction of life on this planet. It is a very real danger and one that deserves a lot of attention. But I would point out that a nuclear catastrophe requires a positive, deliberate action—a decision to destroy.

Today, man has his finger on an "environmental trigger" which is, in the long run, no less real, no less dangerous to our survival than the nuclear trigger. And the environmental trigger can be pulled by accident, by indifference, by merely continuing to do the things we have always done in the same careless way. Each resource we squander, each infusion of pollution that we dump into our environment brings the apocalyptic day of reckoning closer.

Take a simple thing like transportation. One of the keys to making one of these vast new urban complexes work is the development of an efficient transportation system. Why should this be a conservation concern? Because our traditional approach to transportation, the highway, is rapidly assuming major proportions as an environmental threat.

We are caught in a vicious cycle. The more highways we build, the more we rely on cars, trucks and buses. The more we rely on cars, trucks and buses, the more highways we need to keep pace with our growing population.

In many areas, the citizenry already finds itself locked in mortal combat with this highway monster that would disrupt and even destroy their homes and communities.

In our cities the public health is seriously threatened by pollution from the internal combustion engine which accounts for two-thirds of the poison that we dump in our air. Even the most optimistic view of the effectiveness of abatement devices indicates that we would barely manage to maintain this unhealthy status quo if we stopped growing right now.

These are obvious and quite serious problems, but by no means the only ones.

Highways, for example, have a real, if unheralded, impact on water resources. Not just in run-off pollution but through actual curtailment of supply.

An important source of fresh water is the aquifer, the underground supply that is replenished largely by rain seeping into the ground. However, a growing amount of rain never gets there. It falls on highways, pavements or other run-off areas, is collected in sewers and carried directly into streams and rivers to be lost forever in the oceans. Major U.S. highways alone are estimated to cost us well over 335 *billion* gallons of water a year and the highways that are to be built by the year 2000 will cost another 1.5 *trillion* a year.

Viewed in light of the Water Resources Council's report to the President, this highway issue takes on new long-range significance. The Council warned that by the year 2010 the demand for fresh water will match the total available supply. We will then be able to expand our resources only by desalination, by a massive conservation effort, and by recycling and reuse.

The alternative to highway madness is the development of clean, fast, efficient mass transit. Yet today under pressure from the highway lobby we allocate $2.5 billion to urban highways and only 7 per cent as much, $175 million, to mass transit.

The lengths to which the modern highwaymen will go just to keep building are amazing and sometimes ridiculous. In some cities we are building highways over highways and in my own Westchester County the state highwaymen, having run out of space on land, now propose to pave a substantial stretch of the Hudson River.

Perhaps the ultimate absurdity was reported in a news item in the New York Times three months ago, which reads:

"Trenton—December 13—New Jersey's Department of Transportation is constructing an inter-state highway link that could wind up under water if the State's Department of Conservation and Economic Development goes ahead with its present plans to build a dam on the Passaic River . . .

"A spokesman for the transportation Department said its engineers had completed the designs for the highway two years ago. Conservation officials countered that plans for the development of the Passaic Valley had been under consideration for 35 years . . .

"(The) Commissioner of Transportation said that he was not completely familiar with the plans for the reservoir but it seems there will be a substantial impact on present and planned highway construction especially on Routes 78, 80 and 280.

"(The) Conservation Commissioner . . . could not be reached for comment."

Isn't that grand?

For the first time, it's the dam-builders versus the highwaymen, and the mind boggles at the consequences.

Fish ladders for commuters?

Spillways for the evening rush hour?

In the words of the late Henry Ford, "Let's you and him go fight."

Make no mistake about it. The highwaymen are no more than a modern version of the ruthless exploiters that would already have ravaged our forests and stripped our land in the name of economic progress if they had not been resisted by earlier conservationists.

Today we fight the same battle, this time in a complex new urban environment and for even higher stakes.

Of course, highways are not the only, nor even the worst, threat to our urban environment. Power plants, transmission lines, ill-considered land-use planning, industrial development, and hundreds of other actions, all pose challenges to the quality of environment that are at least equally serious.

But highways are illuminating in that they do provide a good illustration of the way thoughtless development that seems merely irritating can eventually result in quite important environmental conflicts.

Even the very actions we take to protect our environment can themselves be perverted to environmental threats in the new, highly complex, urban experience.

Take waste treatment for example.

The main thrust of our waste treatment effort has been to reduce raw sewage to a level of purity such that it could be accommodated by the natural cleansing actions of our waterways. The process produces water that is rich in nutrients but deficient in the oxygen that is essential to keeping our waterways alive.

The cumulative effect of this effluent could well be to "kill" our rivers and eventually to turn them into noxious algal breeding grounds.

The simple fact of the matter is that the demands of new urban-oriented way of life are so great that we are continually embarking on small projects which taken in themselves have only minimal effect, but which taken in the whole add up to major environmental assaults.

It's interesting how each example of the issues of new conservation reveals significant parallels with the experience of the traditional conservation.

The key to the success of the earlier effort was convincing the general public that our resources were not limitless and that only through the wise husbanding of those left in our stewardship could we assure abundance for the future. Step by painful step, a legal structure was enacted to protect timber, land, recreation and scenic assets, wildlife and the other resources that could be identified as finite and threatened.

Considering the so-called frontier psychology of Americans which viewed such resources as pouring forth from a never ending horn of plenty for the express purpose of exploitation and development by man, this was no mean achievement. Can you imagine trying to persuade a frontiersman of the early 19th Century that he had to practice selective harvesting of resources or leave some area forever wild?

We are in much the same position today with regard to the developers and the essentials of our urban environment. Obviously we face a tremendous educational effort. And, in my opinion, our most important priority is to create a new legal structure that can provide the new protections that we need. Unfortunately, this is easier said than done.

In the first place, there is a great need for more knowledge and better dissemination of knowledge about the new threats to our environment that are being discovered by the scientific community. To achieve this end I recently joined with 90 Congressmen and 97 leading environmental scientists in the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment.

It is my hope that this committee will give the scientific community the opportunity to evaluate each new legislative proposal and to alert lawmakers to possible adverse environmental consequences. The Committee will also provide an effective vehicle through which lawmakers can be informed of environmental issues which require legislative action.

Already this program has made significant contributions. As a result of the advice from the scientific community Senator Kennedy, Congressman Moss and I recently introduced legislation proposing a major revision of the Federal Power Act which we believe proposes the first effective and comprehensive environmental protections in the important area of power generation and transmission.

One provision of this new legislation sets forth a new concept in government. It creates a National Council on the Environment to act as "devils advocate" on behalf of natural resources in Federal Power Commission proceedings. You might call it an "environmental ombudsman." The Council consists of five representatives of the scientific and conservation communities appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and will be wholly independent of the Federal Power Commission.

It will have its own expert staff and independent funding. It will have the authority to suspend Power Commission actions if it finds they would have an adverse affect on the environment. If, in the end, it is overruled by the Commission it would have standing in court to challenge the Commission's decision.

As envisaged in the existing legislative proposal, this Council would only have authority over projects covered under the Federal Power Act. However, I propose to introduce legislation next week which will expand the power of the Council to cover the procedures of *all* Federal agencies insofar as they can effect the environment.

As you are all aware, there are a number of proposals before Congress now to create Councils to advise or consult on environmental problems. These are simply not adequate to meet the challenge. If such a Council is to make an effective contribution it must have meaningful enforcement powers.

I would point out for example, that a Council with such powers could well have prevented the current oil disaster off Santa Barbara, California.

As you know, the proposals for drilling in this area were opposed by many informed conservation and scientific experts. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall approved the licenses in spite of this opposition and against the advice of several of his Department's own top officials. In doing so, he bowed to pressure from the oil companies because they represent an effective constituency which can influence Interior's actions. The environment as yet has no equally powerful constituency to represent its interests.

The Interior Department, of course, is not alone in this problem. Practically every agency of the Government has a constituency that dominates its deliberations and actions. For the Federal Power Commission, it is private utilities. The Federal Highway Administration has the highway lobby: the Federal Aviation Administration, the airline industry. And so on down the list.

Each agency has a tendency to become the captive of the industry that it is to regulate.

To meet this problem an intervenor is required whose constitency is the environment and our natural resources and whose sole concern is their protection and enhancement.

The creation of a National Council on the Environment with the power to stay disputed Federal actions and to challenge adverse rulings in the courts would be an important advance to this goal.

Beyond such an intervenor, however, what is needed, in my opinion, is a broad new mandate setting the protection of environmental quality as a matter of national policy much as we set the protection of individual rights over and above all the rest of our legal structure in adopting the Bill of Rights as amendments to the Constitution.

To achieve this further goal, I have proposed a new constitutional amendment which has come to be known as the "Conservation Bill of Rights." Personally, I think it would be more accurately described as the "Environmental Bill of Rights." But by whatever name it is called, I believe that such a broad statement of national policy is an essential element needed to meet the environmental challenge of the future.

The proposal is not complicated. It merely recognizes the established and undeniable national interest in preserving and protecting the essential elements of our environment. It defines this interest as an individual "right" no less important than our rights to free speech, free assembly and due process. By declaring this as national policy we are providing the most effective protection within our power. Each law, each governmental action would be subject to test against this standard: does it diminish the common interest in a livable environment? Any action which would endanger the individual interest in such essentials as breathable air, drinkable water or any other natural resource would be against national policy and subject to the same legal challenge as any abridgement of our other constitutional rights.

This general session today offers an exciting and promising new departure. We will have an opportunity to learn in greater detail of the specific challenges facing the urban environment. Our authority will be no less than Governor Theodore McKeldin who will draw upon his extensive experience first as mayor of one of the nation's leading cities and then as governor of one of our fastest growing states.

Then one of our foremost scientific pollsters, Dr. George Gallup, will give us the invaluable guidance in planning our course of action for the future by revealing a scientific measurement of public attitudes towards environmental problems. I am not privy for the results of this study but from polls I have had taken in my own Congressional District, I feel sure that you will be both amazed and heartened at the extent of the public demand for effective action.

The noted lecturer and writer, J. Lewis Powell, and air pollution expert, Dr. John Middleton, will give us an idea of what we must do to keep abreast of the new demands of our environment in this changing world. I am convinced that each person will leave this program with a renewed sense of the urgency of the challenge of the new conservation.

It is none too soon.

One of our leading biologists has recently reminded us that of all the forms of life that existed on this earth 99 per cent are now extinct and—to take literary license with the imperatives evolutionary theory—they were all *trying* to survive.

Man alone of all the species has the capacity to exercise control over his environment. Yet, as Dr. Ernst Mayer, director of the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology recently noted, "almost everything we do is harmful to the species and works against our survival."

Whether we pull the environmental trigger; whether we follow the well-traveled road to extinction or blaze a new trail to a better world through the enhancement and preservation of our great environmental assets is entirely up to us.

Thank you.

"BLOCKBUSTING" IN BALTIMORE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of Americans have either welcomed or peacefully accepted the movement of Negroes toward full enjoyment of equal rights. To better secure and protect these rights the last Congress passed additional legislation known as the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which includes a new Federal open housing law.

Among the many provisions of the new act of Congress is one designed to eliminate so-called "blockbusting" practices which make it illegal for anyone "for profit to induce or attempt to induce, any person to sell or rent any dwelling by representations regarding the entry, or prospective entry into a neighborhood of person or persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin."

In this connection, the Baltimore Sun recently carried a very illuminating and interesting article entitled, "Blockbusting in Baltimore: Less Blatant and Rapacious," written by a gifted member of the Sun of Baltimore staff, Douglas Connah, Jr. This article is based on a paper he had presented at a seminar at the Law School of the University of Maryland.

Believing this article to be of such importance and interest to my colleagues as well as the general public, I, under unanimous consent, would like it to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article is as follows:

BLOCKBUSTING IN BALTIMORE: LESS BLATANT AND RAPACIOUS—THE OLD PHENOMENON IS BEGINNING TO APPEAR IN SOME SUBURBS AS WELL

(By Douglas Connah, Jr.)

Between April, 1965, and July, 1966, a well-known Baltimore real estate speculator bought 25 row houses from white people along two blocks of the Alameda south of 33d street and sold or rented them to Negroes. Typical among the houses was one that was bought for $6,500 and sold two months later for $11,950.

In Baltimore county, during a six-month period in 1968, eight single-family houses were sold to Negroes in a single block of a once all-white subdivision off Liberty road.

Residents of some parts of Northwood have recently begun to notice speculators expressing renewed interest in their homes. This follows a decision by the state's attorney's office not to prosecute a speculator for admittedly breaking the city's anti-blockbusting ordinance.

RAPID TURNOVER

These are all examples of a common Baltimore phenomenon—the panic flight of white families and creation of Negro ghettos by the systematic sale of homes to Negroes only, with the encouragement of the real estate community, once the first Negro has moved into a neighborhood.

This is called blockbusting, using the term broadly. Ten years ago, a blatant, nakedly rapacious form of blockbusting flourished here and caused rapid neighborhood turnover until laws were enacted to curb it. Although this open phase of the practice seems to have passed its peak, a more patient, subtle form continues to drive out the whites, more slowly, but at a tidy profit, undisturbed by the law or real estate ethics.

Even today, when a Negro family moves in next door or across the street, Baltimoreans tend to think of the block as "broken," and real estate people regard it as fair game for stepped-up activity.

Stuffed with poor people

With the city's Negro population expanding steadily since World War II, the process of neighborhood change, and the deterioration that has often accompanied it, has tended to develop a life of its own that is hard to stop. The whites move to new suburbs, the Negroes of means follow to the abandoned older white suburbs and the poor Negroes and Appalachian whites expand the crowded inner city.

Houses once occupied by single families are bought by speculators, stuffed with poor people, and "milked"—allowed to deteriorate so badly that the neighborhood becomes ripe for urban renewal and the government pays the speculator back his original investment.

XUM

Then he takes his money and starts the process all over again in the next neighborhood up the road, into which the middle-class Negro settled when he thought he was escaping the slums.

IT IS NOT JUST AN INNER-CITY PROBLEM

This is going on today all through Baltimore, not merely in the inner city. Only a month ago, for example, the city housing commissioner, Robert C. Embry, Jr., announced an experimental program to curb blight in outer portions of the city—in Pimlico and Govans.

Furthermore, the leading edge of this process has not stopped at the city limits. Middle-class Negroes are now settling in newer Baltimore county suburbs. And although two elements of old-style block-busting seem to be missing here—the speculative buyer and the rapid depression of property values—an almost hysterical atmosphere has gripped many white people, who are preparing to leave once again.

The classic blockbuster is a real estate speculator who specializes in neighborhoods he decides are ready to "go" Negro. Instead of acting as broker between a willing buyer and a willing seller, he buys the houses himself, then resells them or rents them to Negroes.

He works best in older neighborhoods, where mortgages are likely to be low and people receptive to cash sales He makes his money by exploiting the fears and prejudices of white owners to induce them to sell for less than their houses are worth; by selling to Negroes at inflated prices; and by financing the sales himself on long-term, "buy-like-rent" land installment contracts.

Racial zoning ordinances

The blockbuster has been aided by many outside forces, beginning with the basic prejudice of fear of the white homeowner, and including the traditional, self-fulfilling, belief of the real estate community that Negroes lower property values; the reluctance of mortgage lenders to make financing available to Negroes, and the federal government's active encouragement, until relatively recent, of segregated housing.

Traditional efforts to confine Negroes included the use of racial zoning ordinances—Baltimore's, enacted in 1910, is believed to have been the nation's first—and racially restrictive covenants prohibiting successive owners from selling to Negroes and other minorities.

Although the Supreme Court quickly held racial zoning unconstitutional (in 1917), the restrictive covenant remained legally alive until 1948 and became so popular that it, more than anything else, molded today's widespread neighborhood segregation. It was reinforced by the federal government, since the Federal Housing Administration, whose creation sparked the post-depression building boom, insisted on the restrictive covenant (and even wrote a model covenant) as a condition to insuring mortgages.

"In-migrant Negroes"

Soon after new Negroes, lured by war-industry jobs, began moving into Baltimore during World War II, controversy broke out—not over whether to put them in white neighborhoods, but whether to provide housing for them at all. The following excerpt from a newspaper article of 1943 is typical:

"Washington, July 21—Senator [Millard] Tydings today joined those opposing the erection in or near Baltimore of a federally financed public housing project for 'in-migrant' Negroes, asserting there is 'no justification' for continued importation of Negro workers but on the contrary there is a 'surplus' of Negro labor in the area."

The Negroes kept coming, however, and they were faced with a housing famine. Throughout the 1940's, the Negro expansion was confined to older rowhouse neighborhoods adjacent to the ghetto, but after the racially restrictive covenant was held legally unenforceable in 1948 and Negroes began to share in the post-war prosperity, the expansion poured into the middle-class inner suburbs, particularly in West and Northwest Baltimore.

This rapid expansion, aided by the speculators, did much to terrify the white population, which began moving to the counties in earnest. In 1955, the hysteria was real enough to bring a death threat to a man who had advertised an apartment house for sale in the Afro-American.

The man answered his telephone one night and a voice said: "If you sell that house on Talbot road to a colored person, I am going to have you killed by a professional killer and I mean it."

THEY FOUGHT BACK IN ASHBURTON

This kind of atmosphere made Northwest Baltimore easy prey for speculators. A typical target of blockbusting in the 1950's was Ashburton, a tree-shaded prewar suburb above Liberty Heights avenue, west of Hilton street. In 1958, about 10 per cent of its residents were Negroes; today perhaps 10 per cent is white.

Ashburton's first Negro was a high-school principal, who moved there in 1956. He was followed, not only by more Negroes, who were engaged in a legitimate quest for better housing, but also by real estate men.

Residents were harassed by a barrage of telephone calls, soliciting sales and warning that the neighborhood was "going colored." Dealers went from door to door; they mailed cards and circulars (one firm sent 2,400 panic circulars); they put up "For Sale" and Day-Glo "Sold" signs.

"The pressure is terrific," an Ashburton resident told a newspaper reporter at the time. "Sometimes a whole block becomes a garden of 'For Sale' signs. And once a house is sold they put up one of those big fluorescent orange 'Sold' signs. It's there all day and it glows at nigh. Sold. Sold. Sold."

Beginning to resist

Ashburton residents said they were not opposed to integration but they accused real estate firms of deliberately turning the neighborhood into a black ghetto. "The problem is not that a Negro finds a home; it's what some real estate operators do after he gets it," a lawyer living there said.

In the late 1950's people realized this was happening all over Northwest Baltimore, and they began to resist. They organized, they took legal action against one alleged blockbusting partnership, and they tried to attract citywide interest in their problem.

The key to neighborhood stability seems to be the white buyer, and searching for him became the aim of neighborhood improvement associations throughout Northwest Baltimore. They said this was necessary because real estate dealers wrote off a neighborhood as available only for Negro sales, and refused to bring prospective white buyers there, after any Negroes at all had moved in.

In 1958, a group of neighborhood associations and interracial organizations asked the Greater Baltimore Committee to help work for neighborhood stability, for the long-term health of the city. From this effort, an agency was formed to promote open housing in the metropolitan area — Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc.

The panic subsided, but the ghettoization of Northwest Baltimore continued, as it does today. "We thought we could stabilize if we could curb blockbusting and organize the neighborhood," Melvin J. Sykes, a lawyer who lived in Ashburton from 1954 to 1965, said recently. But other urban pressures followed the blockbusters: commercial land use increased; schools became overcrowded and fell victim to de facto segregation; people with children moved away, leaving large houses ripe for multi-family occupancy.

The Ashburton fight included an attempt to mount a legal counterattack against blockbusters, which produced the only Maryland court case on record with alleged blockbusting at its roots. It took place before any anti-blockbusting legislation was passed and utilized the power of the Maryland Real Estate Commission to suspend brokers' and salesmen's licenses for misconduct.

In September, 1958, members of the Ashburton neighborhood association filed a complaint with the commission against Manuel M. Bernstein and Warren S. Shaw, partners in the Manning-Shaw Realty Company and the Eutaw Realty Company. The gist of the charges was that Manning-Shaw deliberately placed a Day-Glo "Sold" sign at a house at 3800 Grantley road which Eutaw owned, but had not sold. The idea, according to the complaint, was to get real estate listings by scaring the neighborhood into thinking that Negroes had bought the house, since Manning-Shaw was widely known as a company specializing in Negro sales.

WIDELY PUBLICIZED CASE

On April 22, 1959, after a stormy series of hearings, the Maryland Real Estate Commission found Mr. Bernstein and Mr. Shaw guilty of having violated state real estate statutes against misrepresentation, bad faith and fraudulent advertising. Their licenses were suspended for three months, after the Maryland Court of Appeals sustained the commission's findings.

Although the case was widely publicized as a blockbusting case, the commission refused to consider the racial elements. The issue before it was whether, in fact, there had been a sale. At the time, there was no legislation against the common practices that constitute blockbusting—soliciting mass sales, inducing panic by telling people Negroes are "invading," and so on. But the storm of publicity generated by the Manning-Shaw case, and the realization of what was happening to the city's neighborhoods has led to a series of local ordinances.

In addition, the General Assembly enacted an anti-blockbusting statute in 1966, and Congress inserted an anti-blockbusting provision in the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as part of that statute's comprehensive open-housing laws.

Together, the local, state and federal laws seem to say:

1. Throughout Maryland, it is a misdemeanor to induce or discourage a sale on the basis of race.
2. In Baltimore city, it is generally a misdemeanor to solicit properties door-to-door, by telephone or by distributing circulars.
3. It is a federal civil offense to attempt, for profit, to induce a real estate transaction on a racial basis.

But the scope and constitutionality of these statutes are untested by court decisions, and not one in Maryland appears ever to have been held accountable for violating them.

In Baltimore, only one person has ever been indicted under the anti-blockbusting ordinance and that indictment was dismissed when the ordinance was held invalid in Baltimore Criminal Court in 1967. Last year, the City Council re-enacted the ordinance to cure the defect found by the court.

Decided not to prosecute

Upon signing the most recent bill, Mayor D'Alesandro said: "The big question will be with the enforcement of the law." That question is still unanswered.

Last September, it developed that the state's attorney's office had investigated blockbusting charges against a real estate man, had determined that he was violating the ordinance by passing out circulars and soliciting Northwood homeowners en masse, but had decided not to prosecute.

The dealer, whose offices are in Howard county, reportedly claimed ignorance of the city ordinance. Nothing was ever said about the state statute.

The decision not to prosecute was made by Robert S. Fertitta, an assistant state's attorney, who was supported by the state's attorney, Charles E. Moylan, Jr., who compared the incident to juvenile cases in which youths are often let off with warnings.

Many persons who worry about blockbusting in Baltimore are inclined to read sinister motives into this incident. A more likely explanation, however, is probably that the blockbuster was not prosecuted because he was regarded as a "businessman," not a criminal, and the state's attorney's office has its hands full handling real criminal cases.

This is a familiar point of view in cases involving landlords and loan sharks and other persons who deal with the poor. But the decision not to crack down on the Northwood speculator is now said to have prompted other speculators to think they can return to business as usual.

THREE AREAS AND HOW THEY ARE FARING

Legally, open housing exists today, owing to last year's passage of federal housing legislation that within another year will apply to something like 80 per cent of the nation's housing, and to a Supreme Court decision last summer, which held that an 1866 federal law barred purely private discrimination in real estate transactions.

These developments deserve to be noted because for years, people have been saying that the blockbusting problem would disappear if only there were enforceable open-occupancy laws. The idea is that if there were some Negroes everywhere, there would be nowhere for scared whites to run. Whether this reflects reality remains to be seen.

Let us now see what is going on in three local neighborhoods today—the City College area, south of 33d street; Northwood; and the Liberty road area of Baltimore county. These sections represent three different aspects of the problem of neighborhood stability.

Numerous other parts of Baltimore face similar problems, however. A few weeks ago, for example, the Real Estate Commission received complaints that "unscrupulous real estate operators" are using "blockbusting tactics in an effort to scare homeowners into selling their houses in an East Baltimore neighborhood known as Ellswood Park.

South of 33d street, between Clifton Park and Memorial Stadium, is a typical old Baltimore neighborhood of row houses 40 to 50 years old. It is speculator's territory these days. Many of the houses were either fully owned by their long-time occupants or subject to low mortgages, which made them sitting ducks for the pressure of depressed-value cash sales.

White people in this kind of neighborhood are particularly vulnerable to the speculators because they often are old and alone. Their children have grown up and left. Their houses often are the only thing of value they have accumulated. When they see the black tide advancing up the hill one street at a time, it becomes easy to give in to the loud, insistent men with cash in their pockets.

Donald J. Miller, associate director of Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc., recalls one widow in the stadium area who was visited by a speculator shortly after her husband died. He pounded on her door, screamed about "the niggers coming," offered her a price and told her it would drop by a thousand in a week "She was really shaken because of her future," Mr. Miller said. "This was her security in life, and now she was going to lose it."

The change started at the Harford road end of the Alameda about five years ago and has worked its way row by row almost to the next major boundary—33d street. A year ago, 32d street between the Alameda and Hillen road, was just beginning to feel pressure, and there were no "For Sale" signs yet on Chilton street or 33d street. Today, 32d street is predominantly Negro, Chilton is under heavy pressure and the south side of 33d street is sprouting "For Sale" signs.

When he resells, the speculator actually gets even more than is shown, because he usually creates a ground rent where none existed before. Capitalized at 6 per cent, a $96-a-year ground rent adds another $1,600 to the purchase price. However, many poor persons have no notion that a ground rent may be redeemed for its capitalized value after five years, and even if they did, they would not have the money. So they go on paying for years and years.

Some neighborhood leadership to try and stop this sort of thing is being exerted through the churches, which have formed an organization called Homestead-Montebello Churches, Inc.

St. Bernard's Catholic Church, for example, at Gorsuch avenue and Independence street, behind Eastern High School and west of Loch Raven boulevard, is in an area still mostly white but already looking over its shoulder. Vincent Quayle, a Jesuit theology student at Woodstock College, who has been helping to organize the neighborhood, says that one investor has recently bought 23 houses in this area and is dividing them into two-family apartments.

Northwood has been edgy about Negroes for years. Thousands of row houses, built after World War II, sweep northward to the city limits between Loch Raven boulevard on the West and Hillen road and Perring parkway on the east. They are well-built, well-kept houses, with club basements, and are priced in the $10,000-$15,000 range. Curving streets, front and back yards, and plenty of trees and other greenery give Northwood a more suburban character than the city's older row house neighborhoods.

Some recent incidents

Long before there was any direct pressure from south of 33d street, Negroes were moving into the Cold Spring lane-Alameda area just west of Northwood. In the early 1960's, real estate people were predicting that Northwood would be "gone" in 10 years.

A 1966 Chamber of Commerce profile of the larger Northwood-Govans-Ramblewood area listed as its ethnic characteristic "a growing Negro market." It said the area's Negro population would rise from 7.3 per cent in 1960 to 15 per cent by 1975.

Some recent incidents in Northwood will illustrate what seems to be happening there:

1. A man advertised his house for sale and several speculators called him, offering what were described as "ridiculous" prices. The upshot of their advice was: You had better take it; "they" are coming.

2. A man went from door to door canvassing for a charity drive one night not long ago. Once inside a house, he indicated his main interest was in buying real estate, and he reminded his listeners that some Negroes had moved in down at the end of the block.

3. On one major street, a landlord bought a two-apartment house for $7,300. The tenant in the upstairs apartment, who had lived there five years and whose rent was $75 a month, was notified that the rent was being changed to $27.50 a week—an increase of about $35 a month and an indication that the new landlord wanted whites out.

Easing the pressure

Blockbusting in the Northwood vicinity started in the mid-1950's in the area around Cold Spring lane and the Alameda, where row houses built soon after the war were placed adjacent to an older Negro "island" settlement. The blockbusters went to work in the area bounded by the Alameda and Loch Raven boulevard, Cold Spring lane and Woodbourne avenue, a section of about 2,000 houses. The area today is about 80 per cent Negro.

The city's anti-blockbusting ordinance is said to have eased the pressure on Northwood after 1960 (indicating that even though there have been no prosecutions, the law has perhaps had a deterrent effect), but it has never quite gone away. It started up again after the city's only blockbusting indictment was dismissed in 1967 and is reportedly on the increase since the recent decision not to prosecute the Howard county real estate man.

Northwood seems to be betting heavily on community organization to supply political muscle to lobby for its interests, whatever they may be. Led by an interfaith group of churches, and inspired by the example of Saul Alinsky, a sociologist-organizer from Chicago, Northwood and neighboring communities are forming the North East Community Organization, a mass-base group with plans for a paid staff.

Fifty Negro families

Various sections of greater Northwood have been formed into neighborhood improvement groups, and although some of these exist on paper only, others are functioning.

The Perring-Loch Improvement Association, for example, consists of 1,800 houses between Loch Raven boulevard and Perring parkway, and between Belvedere avenue on the north and Hartsdale road on the south. This section is said now to contain about 50 Negro families.

The first Negro, a dentist, moved there in 1962. On his street, only one or two other Negro families have moved in since then, but on another street, panic struck after a Negro law student settled there about four years ago. Now his block is predominantly Negro. About 60 houses in the Perring-Loch section were sold last year, 15 of them to Negroes, according to a neighborhood real estate dealer.

COUNTY'S GHETTOS HAVE SIMILAR ROOTS

When Baltimore county's government officials stop and wonder 8 or 10 years hence how it was that a Negro gretto grew up in their western suburbs, they will not be able to say they were not warned. The beginning of that ghettoization is taking place right now and has been closely followed by the county's Human Relations Commission.

In some ways, the racial patterns now evolving in Baltimore county are the most interesting of all to observe—not because they are different from what has happened in the city, but because they are so similar: A Negro, pursuing the American dream, manages to buy a house in a county subdivision. After he moves in, real estate activity is stepped up and, one by one, the houses on the block are sold to Negroes. The more the Negroes move in, the faster the white people leave.

There are differences in the county pattern—mainly the absence of speculative blockbusting and the apparent stability of property values. But gradually—"very systematically," says a Negro suburbanite—the whole subdivision will move toward all-Negro status.

"BUT THEY'RE SCARED"

At first, the white residents try to stop it. They organize; they search for white buyers; they appeal to the county government and the real estate industry—in short, they do the same thing people in Ashburton and Windsor Hills tried to do 10 years ago. But eventually, as more and more white people move away and the number of Negroes increases, they become gun-shy and come to feel they have been sold out not only by the real estate men but also by their own neighbors.

The atmosphere generated by this sort of experience puts terrific emotional pressure on people. "The homeowners are all suspicious of one another," a resident of Robin Hills, a 60-house development off Liberty road, said at a public meeting conducted by the Human Relations Commission in 1967. "Some people won't tell if they are going to sell their houses. They are ashamed of what they're doing, but they're scared."

More recently, residents of a still all-white development ringed by integrated ones told county officials that as soon as the first Negro bought a house in their development, from 24 to 40 houses would go up for sale the next day.

Within the last five months, Robert M. Thomas, chairman of the Baltimore County Human Relations Commission, has warned the County Council emphatically that the county's most serious racial problem is the one of neighborhood stability and that concentrating Negroes in a few "broken areas is likely to lead to later deterioration of community services, school segregation—and all the old problems people are running from the city to avoid.

Such warnings do not seem to trouble the County Council. The Human Relations Commission has tried to keep councilmen informed of the situation for several years and, as long ago as 1966, suggested that the council ought to give it a full-time executive director, who could work with neighborhoods that were having stability problems. Last year, the commission made a budget request for a full-time executive director.

Out Liberty road

The council's response was to cut the commission's budget instead of adding to it, after groups like the National State's Rights party and the White Citizens' Council complained of the commission's work.

"I can only conclude," Mr. Thomas said in a public statement at the time, "that while the County Council wishes this commission to continue in existence to serve as a shield and buffer for the county government in the troublesome area of race relations, it does not wish this commission to have any positive, effective educational program of its own to help prepare the county for the inevitable changes of the future."

The county neighborhoods under pressure are west of the city limits, extending roughly from Woodlawn to Pikesville. Liberty road is the spine, in a logical extension of the movement out Liberty Heights avenue. (The invisible county line has proved to be no barrier, to the dismay of many people who fled across it 10 years ago.)

Negroes have moved into some subdivisions as far out as Old Court road. There are thousands of houses in these neighborhoods, typical post-war, FHA tract houses—split-level, ranch-style with few trees and many charcoal grills. So far, the relative number of Negroes is very small, but there are enough of them to make the area fair game for real estate activity.

Occasional signs of panic

One typical neighborhood of about 70 houses that was all-white in 1965 had 21 Negro families by the summer of 1968. Another, with 200 houses, was all-white in 1966 and had 20 Negro families by the spring of 1968. Still another, one of the first to get Negroes, was integrated in 1964, by last spring, 30 of its 100 houses belonged to Negroes.

This rate of change seems a good deal slower than the turnover in older city neighborhoods where speculators concentrate, but the point is that, no matter how gradually, whites eventually move away, and only Negroes take their place.

Housing integration first came to the Human Relations Commission's notice in 1964, when scattered calls began coming in—someone's window has been smashed by a brick here, someone's door smeared with paint there. Occasional signs of panic and rumors of blockbusting broke out through 1965.

At the beginning of 1966, things picked up considerably and have been increasing ever since. In one large subdivision numerous complaints were made against real estate men over what the residents felt was persistent harassment. For Sale signs went up in many areas, and many meetings were held, both with the nervous residents in an effort to ease the panic, and with real estate men to persuade them to take down the signs and stop soliciting.

THOSE WHO WAIT ARE VULNERABLE, TOO

If there is one recurring theme that runs through the descriptions of people living in subdivisions into which Negroes have moved, it is that real estate men descend like locusts wherever a Negro has settled. The common complaints are that they refuse to show houses in integrated areas to white buyers and steer whites to other neighborhoods, that they advertise for these subdivisions only in the Afro-American, that they canvass in person, send out postcards, put up rows of "For Sale" signs.

"We are experiencing much pressure from realtors," a resident of Robin Hills said at a 1967 meeting. "We have mail solicitations and telephone calls. . . . Now they are saying a house has to be sold to colored because the whites won't buy. They say we should sell immediately before the area becomes all-colored. Some of us have posted signs saying 'This house is not for sale,' but it isn't doing much good."

"I called one realtor and said, 'Stop. You're creating panic'," the president of another neighborhood association said. "She replied, 'Everyone else is doing it; all the big companies are doing it.' To us, open housing means for sale to anyone but to realtors it means colored only."

From time to time, the real estate people take down their signs and stop soliciting, after appeals have been made to them, and the panic eases for a while. They are persistent and give way to resistance, "but they always come back," says a Negro resident of a county subdivision who moved out from Ashburton two years and has watched the whites slowly but steadily move away.

PROSECUTION DIFFICULT

Last September, Samuel A. Green, Jr., the Baltimore county state's attorney, took public notice of the problem, warned real estate dealers that blockbusting "won't be tolerated" and reminded them of the state anti-blockbusting statute. He said that most complaints he had received dealt too much in "generalities" but that he was considering two specific complaints for prosecution.

In a telephone conversation almost two months later, Mr. Green said all cases so far had been too hard to substantiate. He asserted that he was sincere about prosecuting blockbusters, "if I get the necessary evidence," and that he had not been making idle threats. However, he expressed the opinion that the root of the problem was that "an overwhelming number of people don't want to live next to Negroes."

Real estate men, even thoughtful ones, are prone to lay the blame where Mr. Green did—in the lap of the prejudiced white homeowner. It seems clear that the problem does begin here, and that some talk of blockbusting is simply an expression of fear about any Negroes moving in at all.

If this were all there was to it, one could say that people who sell at a loss and run get nothing more than they deserve. But it seems equally clear that people who are not so prejudiced and are willing to rise above their fears are often afraid, not of having Negro neighbors. but of what will happen to the neighborhood once Negroes arrive.

Too many people have seen precisely what happens: Everyone eventually gives up on it—real estate dealers, mortgage lenders, local government agencies, the school system—and abandons it to the people who can profit by deliberately disrupting it.

And it also seems clear that many members of the real estate community, even if they cannot be called blockbusters themselves, encourage this fear and prejudice—by steering Negroes into and whites away from certain areas, by assuming open housing will not work and by refusing to question old assumptions about property and race.

What do they mean?

So even the least prejudiced homeowners get tired of fighting this kind of pressure. No one who has been through a neighborhood turnover once wants to go through it again.

There does not seem to be a need for new laws (unless the slums speculator could be outlawed—but an apparent attempt to do this was stricken from the 1966 state anti-blockbusting statute). The meaning of current laws is uncertain since no one is enforcing or interpreting them.

Some vigorous prosecution might help, but there is no sign of any. It may be that the stock excuses are true—it is too hard to get evidence, and the laws are easy to evade—but evidence does not seem to have been a problem in the case of the Howard county speculator.

It is not yet clear how open-housing laws are going to affect neighborhood patterns. They may cause more panic; they may be ignored.

Follow the leader

The process of neighborhood change has been a dramatic demonstration of a certain kind of black power—the power to terrify a whole population into leaving at great cost. But the power is not in the hands of the blacks, for whom the system is also costly. The power belongs to the speculators, who can choose almost at will (and apparently indefinitely) what neighborhood to "change" next.

One is tempted to conjure up a vision of a great, never-ending game of follow the leader, with the white man out in front, running as hard as he can one step ahead of the middle-class Negro in Bermuda shorts, himself one step ahead of a slum landlord dragging a fatherless welfare family along, the whole group spreading out Liberty road, out Reisterstown road, out Loch Raven boulevard, with the government man bringing up the rear, cleaning up everything with urban renewal. In time we may arrive at a condition predicted only half-jokingly by a Negro suburbanite: An all-Negro county and an all-white city.

VIETNAM VETERAN IS REFUNDED MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTION DEPOSIT PAID TO "SWEET TALKING" SALESGIRLS IN HAWAII

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week I described an incident involving magazine subscription sales practices in which a Vietnam combat veteran was "sweet talked" by two salesgirls in Hawaii into signing sales contracts for 8-, 10-, and 12-year magazine subscriptions.

The sales approach used by these salesgirls violated the magazine subscription sales industry's self-regulatory code of ethical practices in a number of respects but that fact did not prevent the sale from being made.

It is this type of failure of self-regulation which I am convinced cries out for correction by effective Federal legislation.

My files are literally filled with clear examples of violations going on throughout the magazine sales industry day after day after day. Although refunds are made and fines may be levied by the industry's self-policing agency, Central Registry, after the violations are exposed, this has not halted these violations from occurring again and again under slightly varied circumstances at another time and perhaps another place.

I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the letter I received from the sales company involved, Publishers Continental Sales Corp., as well as a letter directed to that organization by Central Registry:

PUBLISHERS CONTINENTAL SALES CORP.,
Michigan City, Ind., March 21, 1969.

Hon. FRED B. ROONEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: Thank you for your letter of March 18th and for sending us a copy of the press release dated March 18th.

Please be advised that we have refunded in full to the American Serviceman, Stan Garis of Kunkleton, Pa.

We have instructed our crew manager in Hawaii and all other sales people that this sales practice must be discontinued immediately and should we receive any complaints similar to the above, we will refund in full.

Very truly yours,
MABEL GRAY,
Subscription Department.

CENTRAL REGISTRY OF MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTION SOLICITORS,
New York, N.Y., March 24, 1969.

Mr. WALTER H. LAKE, Jr.,
President, Publishers Continental Sales Corp., Michigan City, Ind.

DEAR WALTER: I am sure your attention has already been called to remarks reported in the Congressional Record made by Congressman Fred B. Rooney on the House Floor last week.

I am now in receipt of a copy of the letter that Congressman Rooney has written your agency under date of March 18th, together with copies of your receipts A 855510 and A 855516, each in the amount of $259.00 of which total Stan Garis, RD #2, Kunkletown, Penn. 18058, paid the two girls $169.00. CR records show that Jacque Halgelien is registered in CR as an authorized representative of PCSC in the crew of David L. Taylor, but we do not have a registration for Michele Laurendeau.

The seriousness of this situation cannot be over-emphasized, Walter, and warrants your immediate attention.

Will you please tell us of the action taken to prevent this type of solicitation by these persons and others of the crew and of your follow-through with the manager concerned.

Since this solicitation involved stemming, a violation of the CR Standards of Fair Practice, a refund obviously is in order.

Please let us hear from you in full detail as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,
BOB,
Secretary.

DRUGS UNDER MEDICARE: HOPE FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today elderly outpatients covered under medicare are faced with major drug requirements. Prices of these drugs are rising with breathless rapidity, placing major strains upon the limited incomes of these older citizens. It is a situation which must be alleviated, and can be through a natural extension of medicare to include drugs in their generically prescribed form.

Today I am introducing legislation to relieve those persons not now covered by medicare of the catastrophic burden of prescription drug costs. Under the present program, prescription drug costs for patients under continual hospital care are covered by title XVIII. They are not covered for outpatients—persons not continually housed and cared for in hospitals, but who live at home, under varying degrees of drug medication. Their lives often depend completely on drugs they must take. It has too often been revealed that because of the astronomical costs of drugs, elderly patients have often denied themselves basic necessities such as food, clothing, and housing of even a minimal nature.

In 1966, more than half of the elderly men and women living alone had income of less than $1,500. Eleven percent of elderly families and 53 percent of elderly individuals in the nation received less than $30 weekly. Another 30 percent of each category had incomes of between $30 and $60 weekly. These are the total resources our elderly citizens had to obtain food, clothing, shelter, and all other necessities, including drugs.

It is best to bear in mind that these are not people seeking a "free ride." Almost always they have lived useful, working lives, and are now attempting to make retirement income cover necessities like drugs, whose prices are being stretched like chewing gum.

Private insurance is definitely not meeting needs brought about by these rising prices. A Task Force on Prescription Drugs established by HEW in 1967 found that only 9 percent of older persons had any protection under private insurance plans. It was also found that private insurance met only 2.8 percent of all nonhospital and nonphysician medical care expenditures. We can now see that some type of protection for the elderly against rising drug prices is imperative. My legislation amends title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend regularly provided prescription drug coverage to outpatients in the same manner as to those now covered by existing legislation.

Additionally, it requires that only drugs prescribed by their generic name be covered. This is an initial attempt at providing guidelines for physicians and drug companies in pricing drugs more equitably.

My bill in no way restricts the physician in what drugs he prescribes. It only asks that the drug be prescribed by its generic rather than commerical name. Nor does it in any way restrict the pharmacist in filling the physician-prescribed drug. Most important of all, it in no way restricts the patient in his choice of either physician or druggist.

Mr. Speaker, none of us are immune from eventually being placed in exactly this situation. The most beautiful word in our language is compassion. It is not pity. It is not meant to be patronizing. We are simply being asked to understand the realities of an unjust and unbearable situation affecting millions upon millions of older Americans. It is incumbent upon us to act.

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the ABC Television Network recently broadcast a program called "Three Young Americans in Search of Survival." This program, sponsored by Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, portrayed the activities and concerns of three young Americans in relation to their environment. One young man is a graduate student at Utah State University preparing a recreation plan for the southeast corner of Utah. A second young man is a gang worker in Philadelphia working with street gangs. A young lady is a conservationist with a special interest in the marine environment.

Each one of these young people demonstrate their concern with the negative aspects of our environment, whether inadequate education, misuse of natural resources, or contamination of our air and water. And through their activities they work to solve these problems.

This program was particularly timely. We have just witnessed a major pollution disaster off the coast of California. We also face a serious shortage of lumber needed for the construction of housing. And our youth is in turmoil, searching for better answers to our pressing problems. I insert the text of this program in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

THREE YOUNG AMERICANS IN SEARCH OF SURVIVAL

(Broadcast over the ABC television network, March 17, 1969)

Produced, written, and directed by Stephen Fleischman.

Narrated by Paul Newman.

PAUL NEWMAN. We are going to spend the next two hours with three young Americans involved in the search for the betterment of man and his environment. With them we are going to explore the most compelling problem facing the human race—survival. This is Gary Smith.

XUM

Gary Smith. And I'm studying the past to see where some species have stepped out of the parade so to speak and disappeared, and extincted themselves.

Paul Newman. Gary's a graduate student at Utah State University. He's 26 years old. He has a commitment to the physical world around him at a time of crisis in the balance of life. This is Harold Haskins. He's 32. He's a gang worker. He is also Associate in Community Planning at Temple University in Philadelphia. His hope and belief in America is reflected in the work to which he is committed—making his community as good as any in the United States. This is Mary Margaret Goodwin.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. It's not a question of being on the verge. We have fallen off the cliff and our only hope is through a conservation program, quickly, which will hopefully land us on a ledge halfway down.

Paul Newman. Mary Margaret is 30. She's a student of marine environment and a conservationist. She is concerned about water quality and the future of aquatic and land animals threatened by man's encroachment on nature and committed to working for the survival of an endangered specie—man himself. This program has to do with the interrelationship of all life—plants, animals and the community of man. Our fate is closely linked with the fate of every living organism on this earth. There is an inner connection between the timbering of a 1000-year-old virgin redwood and a black child in a ghetto where a tree does not grow. There is a connection between a man-made system and a natural system between a city and a forest and the life within them.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. I love to dream dreams, but as soon as you finish the dream. you come back to reality and unless you can take a dream of, of what kind of a world you would like to live in and, make it a reality, dreams are hopeless.

Harold Haskins. Maybe I have as much hope as some people and I know that I have more hope than many people now, especially many black folks, and my interest is to be able to show society some program that can make it on its own merits.

Gary Smith. Time's run out for America, there are no more frontiers, you must kind of step back now, instead of looking toward the frontier, we must look to the interior, we must look interiorally within ourselves and with our relationship, our personal relationship with the environment around us. We must return to this old idea of the love of the earth as our mother, and must give her the necessary respect, that she can sustain us, and we can sustain her.

(Gary Smith, singing, "This Land Is Your land.")

Paul Newman. The river, once known as the Grand, now called the Colorado, is a strand of water that winds through five states and flows fourteen hundred miles to the sea. It is also a strand of history, of beauty and of controversy that has touched the lives of millions in the southwest. The states of Arizona and California have fought over its water rights. They will again. Battles have raged over the dams built on the Colorado and they will again. Its cutting edge sometimes a mile deep slices a cross-section of geologic time in the canyon walls. The Colorado River also cuts right through the middle of Gary Smith's research study area. Gary is a graduate student at Utah State University, working toward a master's degree in recreational development.

Gary Smith. I'm basically a creative person, I think. I like to write music, I like to write articles, and work with a camera, things like this. I have a great love for nature, and a great concern for what we've done to her. Well, this is a kind of ironic thing. To get through graduate school I found it necessary to enlist in a branch of the service. The only service that would give me enough time to finish my master's degree was the Marine Corps. They granted me about eight or nine months extension. So, I enlisted in officer's training program hoping that I will be able to finish up my master's degree by this December 30. But, whether I do or not, that's another question.

Paul Newman. Gary must write a paper, a thesis on his research project. He must contribute new and creative thinking on recreational planning in his study area—the southeast corner of Utah.

Gary Smith. The southeastern corner of Utah is one of the wildest and most remote, rugged areas in the United States. From an aerial view, from flying over it in the Canyon and looking down from an airplane, my God, it's unbelievable. The tremendous ruggedness and the tremendous amount of rock sculpture that's gone on there. When you go into a place like Chesler Park, or you go in a place like the maze or you fly along in the evening time about 50 feet off the deck the visual assault that takes place there, is just unbelievable—the colors, the shapes, the forms, the silence. That country is so big, out in the canyon country of Utah, it is so big and indescribable, that I think the sun has to sort of sit and rest on the horizon for a while before it finally goes down. After I become acquainted geographically from the air, I also like to become intimately acquainted with the area on the ground. I like to feel it. As a recreationist specialist, I have to know, for instance, how hot it is, how comfortable a particular area would be for a person who wants to camp there. So therefore that necessitates on-the-spot checking, on site analysis, as we would call it, jeeping, hiking, or driving through the area, and stopping at various points of interest, and getting out of the car and studying these areas on the site. Well, do you think people should go through there slowly or 80 miles an hour?

Tex McClatchy. Well this is kind of what I'm talking about. You put a paved road through here and they'll never see what we're seeing.

Gary Smith. Yeah, it's nice a lot of times to stop and talk to people because, essentially, that's who you're developing the area for—is people. Through past experience as a naturalist, and a wilderness patrolman for five summers, I think this is probably my greatest source of decision-making information because I kinda get an idea what people really want.

Well, you're not advocating complete grazing of the national parks system are you?

Charlie Redd. Of course, I would like to.

Gary Smith. It's nice to go in and ask them questions, and perhaps see your own philosophies kind of unfold within somebody else. Maybe see either something that you believe is contradicted, or maybe supported. If at any time we start preserving attractive land in the United States, whether it's a national parks system, a recreation area, in a wilderness area, or something like this, we have to also remember that our land must supply the wants of people. Now, when you're dealing with large in-holdings of what you might call wilderness land like this and you begin developing a large recreation system within this kind of country, you have to be in tune with this environment, you have to know what you're dealing with and you have to avoid making what are called irreversible decisions. We try to govern our decisions so that we will not put a road in some place where some day we might wish that we hadn't—you want to pull it out. That is, you don't want to—in your planning you don't want to make a mistake that you're going to have to correct 100 years from now or 50 years from now.

Harold Haskins. And what we're trying to do now is get into the community development in such a way that these guys have housing, develop housing for their families—mothers and fathers—black businesses, entrepreneur stuff where they can really take care of business for their own community. Service industry, export industry, meaning simply want to get some factories, or something enough to get two or three hundred people employed out of this neighborhood. You know what this neighborhood looks like, it's a shambles.

Paul Newman. Harold Haskins, gang worker, Associate in Community Planning for Temple University in Philadelphia, takes a visitor through the ghetto. Sidney Poitier, movie star, writer and film producer, is also an American involved in the problems of the urban poor and the urban black.

Harold Haskins. We need some help, we need help from everybody, and I know that you're interested and we need your help too.

Sidney Poitier. It, yes, well I think that—the help is where the problem is. The help has to come from the established community, the establishment, and I don't think, personally, that the establishment is that interested in helping the ghettos. You see, it somehow seems to me that the establishment has the attitude, the opinion, that ghetto life is apart from the total structure of city existence. Consequently, they don't have a sense of being part of a total whole and recognizing that a portion of the total whole is diseased, and they are subject to the deteriorative process the same as the people that are standing around here.

Harold Haskins. Right.

Sidney Poitier. You see, you can multiply this ghetto here by every major city in the country and if you take, you take New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Boston and on and on you will find that hundreds of thousands indeed millions, of people are trapped in this kind of a circumference.

Paul Newman. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one of America's oldest cities—first capital of the United States. One of the most historic cities in the country with some of the worst slums of any city in the country. Philadelphia has a fine program of restoration for America's historic shrines but there are dwellings that haven't been renewed since the Revolution. If blight is the current curse of America's urban centers, Philadelphia has more than its share. North Philadelphia is about the nation's largest black ghetto, and planner and landscape architect of the University of Pennsylvania, Ian McHarg, says of it:

Ian McHarg. I think they should be described as disaster areas. I think they should be evacuated immediately. They're a blemish upon the American concept, the whole American dream, the origins of the United States cannot tolerate this indictment which is represented by Bedford Stuyvesants and Harlems and North Philadelphias. The place is scaberous, rancorous, and I mean it's permeated with unhappiness and disappointment and misery and abjectness. The place smells of fear and horror and oppression. I don't know, I don't think there is enough art, there is enough intelligence or art in all of architecture, landscape architecture and planning in the United States to be able to redeem these places. And why should we bother?

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. This is where we've been living all our lives. We want to stay there. We want the people who live there to stay there also. I mean, we want our community the way it is now. We want it to stay that way. The only thing we want is better housing, better stores and so on down there. We want the same people to stay down there because they've been living there all their lives.

Paul Newman. This is a scene from a film called "The Jungle." It tells the story of gang life in a black ghetto. It was produced by a North Philadelphia fighting street gang. Harold Haskins was the "project con-

XUM

sultant." Evacuation of the ghetto may be a simple answer. But there are those who live and work in the ghetto day after day to make it viable. Harold Haskins is one of those. A city is not unlike a forest or a field or a seashore. It has its own web of life and the forces within the system are interrelated. A city is made by men. The laws which govern its functions are made by men. The principles of its life are made by nature. The least used natural resource left to man is man himself. Harold Haskins works in two worlds—from the streets of the ghetto to his office at the Health Science Center of Temple University.

Harold Haskins. Community Planning. This is Harold Haskins. Hi!

Paul Newman. Harold Haskins was instrumental in turning a fighting street gang into a business corporation. He saw young men going to waste—their energies misspent.

Harold Haskins. I wanted a group that's been labeled hostile, angry, and a group that really had been in trouble. And Twelfth and Oxford was the group that I picked. I got together with a number of the members of the, of the leadership hierarchy, and we sat down and talked about the possibility of making a film. They knew nothing about it and neither did I. So finally we began to shoot in the streets. And the young men, after they saw their first rushes, really became interested in film-making. For ten years, I've been working with gangs, and for eight of those years I didn't have any kind of answers. I saw a lot of futility but a lot of talent, a lot of ability, a lot of frustration, and what bothered me was I had no answers, and I was motivated, like it was an obsession with me to try to find a way to have these guys realize something that they could call their own. And this opportunity to make a film, the one we made called "The Jungle," was the beginning of it all.

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. My attitude towards this film-making thing and the corporation wasn't too cool. Because I didn't like it. I mean, I was still in gang war and things. I wanted the gang war. I wanted to do, you know, a lot of things that I shouldn't have been doing, you know. And Harold Haskins convinced me that this corporation thing could work, if we stick together.

Garfield Peacock. Like and I don't know if I would be in jail the next day or in school or what, you know. But now, like you know, I have responsibilities now for the corporation. I have things to do, you know.

James "Country" Robinson. After the movie was finished we knew that everybody couldn't be film-makers so we started coming up with more ideas about the things our neighborhood needs.

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. We want playgrounds, we want nice stores, we want teenage nightclubs to keep the people off the streets, we want adequate laundromats. That's something we don't have down there. We got one laundromat. It took two days to get your clothes done. And, as far as other black people, we want to set the goal. You see, because, I mean, I'm not trying to brag on the Corporation, but people have already told me that, if we do what we say we want to do, we can set a forefront for the rest of the black people and they try the same thing.

Paul Newman. Dr. Paul Ehrlich——

Dr. **Paul Ehrlich.** There are a great many places where we have raw sewage just being dumped into inland waters and into the ocean. This means that we are really very close on the margin of epidemics and things like hepatitis. And, oh, by the end of the century we're going to be very sick people by that time, should we survive that long.

Paul Newman. There is a new breed of conservationist in America. They are concerned young people, concerned about the future, concerned about the possibility of their children or their children's children having a future. One such American is Mary Margaret Goodwin. She is a conservationist, a student of marine environment, a researcher in water pollution. Her life and work revolve around water, and the range of her activities mirrors the complexity of man's relationship to this vital resource—water. Her interest extends from the purest marine environments and how to preserve them to polluted areas and what can be done to rehabilitate them. Dr. Donald Pritchard is oceanographer of the Chesapeake Bay Institute at Johns Hopkins University.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. Why is it, Dr. Pritchard, with our vast fund of scientific knowledge, and with our technical capabilities in our modern society, we cannot control these problems of pollution? Whose fault is it, really?

Dr. **Donald Pritchard.** Well, I think it's your fault and my fault and the—everyone who might be watching us. Man just doesn't want to accept the responsibility or doesn't want to blame himself.

Paul Newman.—The Chesapeake Bay is one of her research areas. A major estuary, a nursery area for fish and shell-fish is threatened by the increasing pollution. Mary Margaret is also Field Director of the Caribbean Conservation Association working out of St. Thomas in the U.S. Virgin Islands. She is as much at home underwater as she is on land.

Mary Margaret Goodwin.—My diving is really an extension of my land ability and the fact that one cannot be concerned with island ecology and not be able to survey the underwater sites as well as the land sites. Simply, you can't separate water and land ecology when you're dealing with an island. As a conservationist, I'm particularly keen on preserving undersea life really because I love it so much. It hurts me very much to see the destruction occurring, particularly on some of the coral reefs. And the fact that man is an integral part of his environment. He has his role to play in relationship not only to plants but to animals, to the land, to the sea and to the air. When I'm in the air flying from island to island I have a very good overview of the kinds of industrial problems that are being created for pollution and destruction of marine habitats, as well as the destruction of some of the great beaches in the Caribbean, which after all is what supposedly brings the tourists. And the industrialization of these islands is going to destroy this marvelous natural environment that people come to relax in. When you land, in St. Thomas and suddenly you're hit by the sounds of tourists and the cars and so forth and it's really no different than being in any city as far as I'm concerned. When I go down-island through the Leeward Islands, the Dutch Antilles and down through Dominica St. Lucia, down towards St. Vincent and Barbados, I begin to relax a bit more because the further away from this area of St. Thomas that you get, the closer to nature you can get.

Frequently I have the opportunity in my conservation work in the Caribbean to photograph for documentary purposes some of the great wildlife scenes. In Barbuda I saw one of the greatest sights that I think I probably ever will see—the mating and nesting of the frigate birds. I'll never forget those incredible wings on those frigate birds, soaring over and over and over and around this area. I had never seen a frigate bird nesting before. I had no idea that what really appeared to be a big red balloon on their chest, like a piece that hangs down from a turkey, that this would puff up like a black speckled red balloon and this to me was the most incredible sight in the whole world. It would be my hope to get the Antiguan Government to guarantee that it will be made into a bird and wildlife sanctuary. You may never be able to come back to this spot and do this again, because within a year or two years or five years, this area, like every other area in the Caribbean is going to be developed and possibly destroyed unless people who care about nature can do something to help.

(Gary Smith sings—"Colored Crayon Morning.")

Gary Smith. For myself I feel very fortunate that I could be raised in an area where there was less confusion. I could look out upon the world scene and at the same time I could withdraw into a rather uncluttered society like wilderness. I could withdraw, personally, into wilderness. And by simplifying, by cutting out city streets or this mass confusing pandemonium that exists around, I could withdraw to some of these areas and reflect interiorally.

Paul Ehrlich. Ecology is the science that studies organisms in their environment. The relationship between organisms and their environment, is the way it's usually defined. And, of coures, human ecology would be the relationship of man to his environment.

Paul Newman. At Stanford University, biologist Dr. Paul Ehrlich.

Dr. **Paul Ehrlich.** And one of the saddest things about Western culture is that it's based on a Judaeo-Christian idea of man dominating nature. You know, the earth was made by God for man to dominate and use. And, unfortunately, the biological facts are that man has to live within nature. We haven't risen above the very basic biological laws. We still have to eat food and breathe oxygen and depend on the nitrogen cycle and so on for our very existence.

Ian McHarg. There's a closed cycle of oxygen, carbon dioxide, a closed cycle of water and a closed cycle of food, and the question is, is that the way the world works, and the answer is, you're damn right, that is the way the world works. Man is a plant parasite.

Gary Smith. Ecology means the study of one's house. Ecos in Greek I believe means home, and ology means the study or science of one's house or one's surroundings. In the broader sense this entails quite a bit you see, it entails every type of relationship, every relationship you have within your environment. It deals with the plants, the animals, with your social aspects, the people you deal with, anything that you do. Each organism or species of nature has survived and existed today because it has been successful in competing for an environmental niche, or zone, or an area where it can successfully out-compete other plants or animals. In the desert it's very well illustrated where certain plants have been able to grab hold of a piece of land and hold onto it, and keep other plants from invading this, because this plant is more adapted to surviving under the environmental conditions that are found around it. As we gain in altitude, we see a great change in the types of species that we run into, plants that are used to living where there is more moisture available, we see more abundance of plants growing in closer cooperation you might say with each other, more complex plants, in some respects, high water loving plants like your firs and spruce.

Ian McHarg. So that when one looks at a tree, looks at a plant, looks at the birds, the thing to do is to say, be, live, grow, breathe, so that we may breathe, live and grow. And the same is true—one picks up a handful of soil, a decomposer you see, that reconstitute all the wastes during life and the waste of life after death, and without them, you know, life would be impossible, because there is the return stroke in the cycle of the universe, and so one has to say to the decomposers, be and work, that we may be and live. When an organism finds an environment which is propitious and adapts that environment to make it more propitious, more fitting, and adapts itself to accomplish a creative fitting, then it's likely that organism will have over evolutionary time have been successful. It will have survived and in a shorter period of time and it will be healthy in the present. And where you

XUM

find an environment which is unfit for an organism, where the organism cannot make the environment more fitting, where it cannot adapt itself to accomplish a creative fit that that organism over evolutionary time will not have survived and will have failed, and if this is so, we can start examining cities in terms of pathology. That is if you see a place where there is a high incidence of physical social mental pathology you say this is the area of the destructive misfit, that is the environment is unfit for the organism, the organism cannot make the environment fit and so we can start from pathology you see, and I would say if you find such areas and they do exist, I'd put up markers. They're unfit for human life.

Paul Newman. The life of a city can be compared to the life of a living organism. One person trying to make the city more fitting for human life is the Director of Philadelphia's City Planning Commission, Edmund Bacon.

Edmund Bacon. I think that in terms of the city it's extremely important to make a distinction between two basic aspcts of it—the one I might call the organic structure, which is comparable in the body to the eyes, the lungs, the nervous system and so forth, which is a system with central organs that give form and function to the entire thing. In this area, are for example, the community centers, the churches, the schools, the neighborhood shopping, the branch libraries and health centers, and these are focal centers that make community life possible. And in strong contradiction to this is the flesh of the city which is the residential spread which moves through all of these organic centers, and the flesh of the city in my opinion, has got to be thought of as a series of individual cells which have their own life of creation and decay and I think this failure to think in these terms is one of the great problems, of all approach to the city problem. Every single structure in the city, whether it's your house or mine, is continually going through a simultaneous process of recreation and decay.

Larry Morrison. I think it's important that Ed Bacon is going to the Area-Wide Council meetings. I think it's important that Mayor Lindsay gets out and walks the streets of Harlem.

Paul Newman. Larry Morrison, City Planner in the Philadelphia Commission, is working toward getting people from all neighborhoods involved in planning their communities.

Larry Morrison. We can no longer afford to have the rigid separation into planning boxes throughout the city. We've gotta' have involvement across scales and across problems. We've got to orient our planning around issues, around specifics instead of around functions that no longer have any meaning. And I think that, when this happens, it'll be a lot easier for us to reconcile both the natural needs and the human needs that we face.

Paul Newman. If we are to accommodate human diversity, the community must be responsive to all of its people. Harold Haskins brought a fighting street gang into a constructive relationship with the Philadelphia Planning Commission. The film, "The Jungle" brought the 12th and Oxford Street gang and Harold Haskins to the attention of the Commission.

Harold Haskins. I met some of the city planners, and they were interested in doing an experiment with me, in which we would employ, or they would employ a number of the young men from 12th and Oxford to teach them basic planning. They could be dropouts. They could be anything, in that regard. One of the very basic things that this experiment shows is that first of all, we picked a group of guys who now are working for the planning commission and who are involved in the planning of their own community. The gang in Philadelphia, in North Philadelphia in particular, is a highly organized institution, that has been overlooked by many people, especially planners. And one of the first maps they drew after we talked about community development, was this gang map, that sort of defined the areas of all the gangs in North Philadelphia—like Eighth and Diamond, Commack-Diamond, or 12th and Poplar, 10th and Thompson, because many of these boundaries have been in existence since 1930. Many of the members of this group had brothers and uncles who belonged to the same gangs. These young men have lived in the street all their lives, and frankly, have banded together because they've had to protect themselves. And one of the interesting things that I want to mention here is that, when they first talked to me, Twelfth and Oxford, they thought I was trying to break them up. They said to me, "Haskins, Social workers can't break us up, our mothers and fathers can't break us up, teachers can't break us up, the police can't break us up, so you can't break us up." So this simply means that their institution can go from the graffiti on the walls in the neighborhood to the graffiti on the walls in prison. And they come back with more status in their own group. So, in effect, my interest was to just turn this group over, intact as it was, not break it up. Each gang has a runner, and a second runner, and a third runner. They're the leaders. Then there's a war chief and a warlord, who are people who handle the mechanics of gang war.

Gang Member. J. P., man, why didn't you come with us?

J. P. Oh, man, I was getting my groove again, man.

Gang Member. Oh, man, shut the hell up.

Harold Haskins. And then there's a council, which is a group of young men who decide on the issues that govern this group. And this council is stronger, in effect, I daresay, than the families in which these young men come from. And this hierarchy is as plain as any corporation or any kind of business or anything.

Paul Newman. A fighting street gang was transformed into a business corporation. The 12th and Oxford Street Film-makers Corporation was formed. Each week the corporation's Board of Directors meets in the board room of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Jim "Country" Robinson is Chairman. Decisions are made regarding the corporation's film-making, real estate, small business and community betterment concerns. Harold Haskins?

Harold Haskins. You have many, many youth that you see walk on the corners who could be channeled in the same directions.

Larry Morrison. Harold Haskins played the most significant role in everything Twelfth and Oxford's done. He was able to help the fellows realize that the abilities and the energies that they were devoting to gang warfare and other activities, could be redirected into another area of endeavor.

Harold Haskins. It's a known fact, that in Philadelphia, the ratio in terms of male Negro youths between tenth and twelfth grade—drop-out rate is about, at least forty per cent. And most of the schools in North Philadelphia, high schools and junior high schools, are controlled by gangs in terms of territorial boundaries. Then if you placed, for instance, a new school in the heart of the Zulu nation you come up with the possibility that that school will be controlled by the Zulus and the other members of the community who live in the general community, especially males, will drop out of school, and not attend that school, because they have to fight their way to get there, they have to fight their way while they're in there, and fight their way home.

Larry Morrison. There is one other thing in how we are going to take care of this one. One important thing is employment, at least as far as the people up there are concerned is how many of the people who work there are from the North Philadelphia area.

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. Well, when we go in to talk to the owner of the building, or the manager, and they give us the number of employees they have there, we can ask him to give us an estimate of how many people they have living in the area.

Larry Morrison. What do you think, Country?

James "Country" Robinson. I don't think they'd cooperate with you. You're crazy. They're not sayin' who's working for them 'cause they don't want to take the time out. You know, when people doin' their work and the people go around and ask the employer where you live.

Larry Morrison. If that's the situation, how're we gonna' deal with this problem?

James "Country" Robinson. One way might be possible—if you ask the man, or catch him on lunch breaks, twelve o'clock. Colored people do not want you to disturb them at their employment while they're doin' their work. And that's a known fact.

Edmund Bacon. We've learned an enormous amount from them, simply practical things like a precise definition of the edges of the turf. They have certainly enriched and deepened our concept of the social structure of the city, and of the dynamics of neighborhood leadership, and I believe that they have learned from us something quite new to them, which was to visualize their own concern about their own environment as being a part of a bigger thing.

Herman Fuller. Since we started our corporation we bought a couple of properties. We own a house on Commack and Susquehanna and we have people living in there. And we are starting a laundromat in our own community.

Policeman. And we've had numerous occasions to have contact with the 12th and Oxford organization, but it seemed to have improved now that they've been redeveloping the neighborhood. Everyone seems more or less taking more of an interest in their houses since all these different developments had started. It seems like it's sort of a challenge to keep up with each other's residences.

Larry Morrison. I was able to develop some appreciation of what the causes of the problem were. But I think it was through Harold that myself and others that have been involved with Twelfth and Oxford, have been able to see what some of the specifics, the nitty-gritty really are, of how we work ourselves out of this. And, I don't think there's any magic potion except that there's gotta be communication between the races, and there's gotta be a commitment too, once we get beyond the racial hangups, to getting down to fundamental problems of economic development and education. I think that's what Twelfth and Oxford's about. And I just consider myself very fortunate that Harold Haskins happened to think that myself and others at the planning commission were capable of relating to the guys in a way which would help them do what they wanted to do. The role that myself and other people like Riggs Parker and Jay Scherer who are in business and law, play, is that of a technical advisor. And what's evolved is, is a planning package of expertise, with no middlemen involved. I think Harold Haskins always makes the point that what he is trying to do is to get the guys on the corner in direct communication with the institutions.

Phil Galligan. By the way, Back Bay has got instructions, as per your instructions, that no one is to purchase a print of that film without your approval.

James "Country" Robinson. That's all right, we settled that at the last Board meeting.

Phil Galligan. Okay, I'm all through. You got anything more you want to ask?

James "Country" Robinson. We've got some showings coming up.

XUM

Harold Haskins. That's a $200 showing plus $65 expenses for 3 guys. We got offers to bring the film and the young men, because one of the instrumental things I wanted to do was to make sure the guys traveled with their film, to give them exposure to the larger society, so to speak, but also to help other people understand them, because I'd like to make sure that people begin to understand each other, as much as possible. The guys got involved in traveling quite a bit. They've been to California a number of times and have been all over, and they never would have gone without making this film. This film gave these guys mobility. And, athletics gave me mobility, and I saw that I had more or less the experiences of traveling around and playing ball and meeting different people. And this gave me an opinion about people and life and, that young men who are locked in to an immediately neighborhood to protect their turf, never really get the chance to experience.

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. Well, let me start with what Harold Haskins told me. Like, he was the one that came up with the idea, that, wherever the film go, some of the fellows go with it. Now, the reason why he told me this, because, he say, this is exposure. And, when you're being around people that you think is society, you get used to 'em, he said, you get used to talking to 'em, walking with 'em and being with 'em, you know. Instead of saying, this man is taller than me. I'm down here, and he up there. Now, anywhere I go—I don't care if the President of the United States—I can talk to him the way I want to talk to him, because he's just a man just like I am.

Harold Haskins. Jerome Johnson, Slack, is in our book, out of sight. He's one of the first young men to go to the City Planning Commission to learn base maps and he is the planner for the group, the physical planner for the 12th and Oxford Film-makers Corporation. He's also the real estate man who negotiates.

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. The status on the 1223 property. I haven't collected rent there since September 29 because of the repairs that was needed. I told the people that live there, the tenants, that rent wouldn't be collected until repairs were started.

James "Country" Robinson. You say you told the people that no rent would be collected until repairs were made?

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. No, until repairs were started.

James "Country" Robinson. Until repairs were started. Did they agree to pay the rent when repairs do get started?

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. Yes.

James "Country" Robinson. You think that was a wise decision?

Jerome "Slack" Johnson. I think it was.

Harold Haskins. David Williams, Bat—they call him, Bat—is the actual leader of the group.

David "Bat" Williams. Well, my job is the president. I guess my job is more than one job. My job is like going around, making sure everybody else get their jobs done, I mean, showing the film and talking to people, you know going all around, traveling all over.

Harold Haskins. He's the kind of a guy who knows all of the operation of the gang. He and Country together make a beautiful combination because Country, now becoming the corporate director kind of guy, and Bat being the gang leader kind of guy, sort of get together and get business taken care of. Because, whatever the corporation cats don't take care of, they make sure the gang cats do. Country, Jimmy Robinson, is a very quiet guy, basically. He's the second runner, or the second leader of the group. They call them runners. He is basically one of the real supporting thinkers of the group, one of the guys who really gives the group its direction in certain areas, especially in this corporation. And he emerged logically as the spiritual, inspirational leader of the corporation.

James "Country" Robinson. Most of the guys they want to do things right, and want to do something constructive. But, some of 'em, maybe now and then, you might, you know, have to get on their back, every now and then, and remind 'em, or something like this. And, in a real sense, you know, like, I might be, you know, on their back of the idea of doing something.

John Lee, you got a assignment. You say you sent that guy a letterhead? Right?

John Lee. Right.

James "Country" Robinson. The guy say he never received it.

John Lee. No?

James "Country" Robinson. The guy say he never received it.

John Lee. Well, I gave it to my sister to mail off for me.

James "Country" Robinson. You gave it to your sister to mail off. The guy say he never received it.

John Lee. Well, I don't know what happened to it. It must have got lost in the mails.

James "Country" Robinson. Must have got lost in the mail.

Harold Haskins. John Lee is one of the influential guys in the group, and he's sort of a, aesthetic type of guy. He's, he's an artist. He loves to paint. Recently he's become quite active in taking over the operation of the laundromat. And this will be the first business, per se, and he's got a lot of responsibility, and he sees his role now as being manager of this corporation's laundromat. David Leach is probably one of the best fighters. He's a militant guy and, he doesn't mind defending the creed and the credo of 12th and Oxford. He, in effect, is the guy who handles the sticky business. He can do a number of things well. And we don't talk about what he can't do too much, but he's the enforcer.

David Leach. Like if another gang moves on one of our boys or a couple of our boys they come down and tell us. They scream gang war and then when the war lord take over then and tell them how to go down and what way to go down and what kind of guns and things we going to use and how to use them. Now I'm just a businessman but I'll fight if I have to.

James "Country" Robinson. Peacock, he'll make a report.

Garfield Peacock. I have a report to make?

James "Country" Robinson. Yeah. On that press showing.

Garfield Peacock. Who was talking? Because they had different people talking on different subjects.

Harold Haskins. Garfield Peacock is a very talented young man. He's the cameraman for our film, "The Jungle." In fact, hopefully, he'll become a cameraman in the Film-makers Corporation. There's a few other guys. One of 'em's called Skinny Butch. His name is Forest Outing. He is one of the young men who took a course at Price-Waterhouse, to learn accounting. Fat Butch, or Carlton Coleman is the other accountant. So we have Fat Butch and Skinny Butch, who are the financial wizards of our group. Herman Fuller is our music man. He wrote a song that goes like this, for the new movie: "I got my shirttail out, and my hair all conked with grease. I got my khakis on, and they don't need no crease. I want to go to school to learn the Golden Rule, but I hookey every day. The teachers wonder what's wrong with me. That's why I am in Boon today."

(Herman Fuller and group singing "Shirttail.")

Paul Newman. Herman Fuller who wrote the song "Shirttail" draws on experiences from ghetto life and the language of the ghetto. His feelings and his talent are being recognized in wider circles. The establishment, in present planning, now takes into account the factors in the community that have decisive influence in making a program work, such as the strong organizational structures of street gangs. The human ecology of this city is in better balance. The man on the corner relating to the establishment—the establishment relating to the man on the corner. The impact—the potential for a new American future.

Harold Haskins. I think we're really on the road now of the company, or the corporation, becoming self-sufficient. And since my role is to pull back further and further as I go along with the guys, I'm seeing that now I can get involved in the normal, everyday operation of maybe being a husband and a father as opposed to being just a father to over a hundred guys, which is a pretty difficult role to play. Community Planning. Hi. I'm being interviewed by ABC. Yeah. That's my fiancee.

Yvonne Booker. Oh, yes, he loves to play football. He says they get out there—they call themselves the 'has-beens' and the 'never was's'—and they all get out there on Sunday and they think they're doing something.

Mr. Joseph Haskins. He always had the idea he wanted to be something. He used to always tell me, he said, "I'm going to be a good help to you someday, I'm going to be a man," and I'm proud of him, real proud of him.

Mrs. Joseph Haskins. I don't understand his work too much, but I know he's doing good work. Everybody talks to me they say that he's doing wonderful work and tell me to tell him to keep it up and so he's doing real good.

Paul Newman. In the last month of President John F. Kennedy's life, he said to a college audience "Look forward to the day when we will build handsome and balanced cities . . ." The remaining years of this century hold unlimited promise for man to realize human potential. It has been a failure of our society to see our cities, our wilderness, our water and air diminished by our predacious use. The diminishing of our environment has also diminished our lives. We can invade our waters by dumping biologically active waste materials and raw sewage into them. We can uproot our trees to make way for a super highway. We can burn waste materials and envelop ourselves in unbreathable air. We can do all these things if we want to. The greater commitment, however, is an inspiring dream of a common plan to build and preside over an environment which includes and interlocks human relationships. Such is the commitment of Harold Haskins, Gary Smith and Mary Margaret Goodwin.

The land is tired, the air is used, the waters are fouled. They have aged before their time. Man has been a predator of his own environment. We damage the promise of a future with each sunrise. Tomorrows are scarce. If men are to decide their own destinies and the destinies of tomorrow's children, then shouldn't they love that which supports life? The land, the sea, the air are one—they are the gifts to man's existence. The secret suicide that we are committing by polluting our environment is no longer a secret. It's premediated self-destruction. There are seven hundred and seventy-one million acres of land in the United States owned and administered by the Federal Government. These public lands belong to all the people. A good part of this is national forest and national park land. The national park idea is a major and unique contribution by the United States to the whole concept of the preservation of natural wonders, beauty and wilderness. In this caravan on a field survey trip in a wilderness area of southeastern Utah, are representatives of the agencies responsible for our public lands.

Gary Smith. We have so many diverse interests there and management agencies. For instance, we have, Forest Service, the Na-

XUM

tional Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, State Highway Department of Utah, State Fish and Game Department, the Utah Parks System. We have tremendous variety of different management agencies in the area alone. This is not counting the tremendous vested interest groups that are down there. In the past we've had a lot of friction between agencies. There's been a great deal of conflict. We take a virgin area like this and we look in the past. We look at Yosemite slum, national park, we look at the bumper to bumper traffic jam in Yellowstone, and we look at the mistakes we've made in the past with regards to recreation planning, and we try to learn from these.

PAUL NEWMAN. As population and commercial interests mount, there are strong pressures from many directions on those who must make decisions about the use and management of public land. Every day in our nation, irreversible decisions are being made. Some good, some bad. All of them affect our future for generations to come. Gary Smith is here to study the making of two decisions, both irreversible, for his research project—one that has already been made, one in the process of being made.

GARY SMITH. This interagency field trip, with regards to road location in Canyon Lands National Park would make available this beautiful, lush green forest areas for people to withdraw to, providing climatic relief. And so, through this coordinated planning among agencies, you look at the recreation, or the development, for instance, of Canyon Lands, not in a vacuum, but with the outlying areas, also, trying at all times to plan your decisions in such a way that you won't regret them in the future.

PAUL NEWMAN. From his observations of overlapping and conflicting jurisdictions in the field, Gary traces the process of decision-making from its branches to its base. He makes a trip to Washington, D.C., to further his research.

(Gary Smith singing "Something Big.")

GARY SMITH. My trip to Washington helped me get a perspective about how plans that are being made out here on the ground are carried up through the channels to the final approval of the people on top. Coming from the sticks, so to speak, into a maze or a network of offices that exist in Washington, like, say, for the Department of Interior was quite staggering and at first it seemed quite impersonal and complex, quite un-understandable and unfathomable. I was amazed at the extreme complexity of our form of government. This complexity, of course, is confusing to me. I often wondered as I wandered from office to office, and talked to some of these men in high places, how anything really gets done.

Secretary STEWART UDALL. I'm a little more skeptical about roads than I was six or eight years ago. I think you've got to have them in the right places.

GARY SMITH. I didn't really expect to have had the opportunity to interview someone as busy as Secretary Udall. You see, the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Interior wield a tremendous amount of power. They've been accused, sometimes of having too much power, being too unresponsive to things on the ground.

Secretary STEWART UDALL. We've made a big mess out of things, in my judgment, this century. I think the country's much less livable. It's much less inviting than it was, say, in the year 1900.

GARY SMITH. It helped me gain a perspective on how the decisions and how the information filters up to his position and what his viewpoints are, what would possibly be done to the areas I'm working in, from the command position—before a lot of irreversible decisions are made, in this area. That is, before we've made mistakes like we have in the past in our land management programs.

PAUL NEWMAN. The Glen Canyon Dam is a monument to the irreversible decision. It is one of the five major dams on the Colorado River, from Utah to Southern California. It pinches off the river at a narrow point just below the Utah State Line and backs the water up one hundred and eighty-six miles to form Lake Powell, the longest man-made lake in the world. The dam was built to generate hydro-electric power, and for flood control and water conservation. But, if in the long view of history, the Glen Canyon Dam may prove to have had only temporary economic value, since the lake is destined to be silted up eventually—then will the irreversible decision have been worth it, inundating an American scenic wonder for its other major purpose, a recreational haven for boaters, swimmers and fishermen?

GARY SMITH. Lake Powell forms what you might call the water-based recreation heart of the area. Lake Powell will provide a boater's paradise, now it's built. And yet, Lake Powell is more than a recreation area. It's a magnificent lake. It's a huge lake. Yet, at the same time, Lake Powell represents a controversy, which I was interested in.

NARRATOR. Dr. Paul Ehrlich?

Dr. PAUL EHRLICH. Do you flood beautiful valleys and so on, in order to be able to have maybe a million or two million more people somewhere, and to put off the day of reckoning one step further? Because, whatever else you know about population, you know sooner or later the growth has to stop.

Secretary STEWART UDALL. It's one of these excruciating problems where you have to, have to reconcile values. And you have to weigh the long term national interest in terms of protecting against the values that would be gained by some plan of development. This is essentially what you're confronted with. And when you, when you look at something like the Grand Canyon which is irreplaceable, I think the preservationists were essentially right. That you might do something that appeared to be good now, but if you had a dam that filled up with silt in even two hundred years, well, the people two hundred, even three hundred years from now, they have an interest in this. And what will they think if we build something that is simply an enormous silt bed and we destroy the canyon which was a unique thing in terms of the world as a whole?

GARY SMITH. Lake Powell was bitterly fought and opposed by preservation groups like, for instance, the Sierra Club. They, they felt that the dam could not be justified economically by the electricity it produced or the water it saved. And they felt that it was destroying a very beautiful, irreplaceable part of American geography, with regard to Glen Canyon.

Dr. PAUL EHRLICH. It was once said to me that the Army Engineers have a beaver complex and won't be happy until they have thrown a dam across every gutter in the United States. And one of my friends suggested that what, since we pay farmers not to grow food, that we ought to pay the Army Engineers not to build any more dams. Any dam is a stop gap measure as far as water supply is concerned, among other things, they silt up. I mean, dams are, as I think most people realize, temporary structures. And they only have a certain useful life. And, pretty much, we've dammed the areas that ought to be dammed in the United States.

PAUL NEWMAN. In Los Eden, a side canyon, flooded by the rising waters of Lake Powell, Gary Smith talked with John Flannery, an official of the Sierra Club, a preservationist group that fought the building of the Glen Canyon Dam.

GARY SMITH. I'm kind of interested in the Sierra Club's position on, in the contest for this area.

JOHN FLANNERY. Well, it's tough. We're in a battlefield where, where we took a beating. And I think if places were appropriately named, this is the closest thing we've come to a canyon today. The rest of Glen Canyon is drowned. It was a beautiful place. It's not an aquatic desert, I feel. This is destined to go underwater about what, another hundred feet?

GARY SMITH. A hundred and forty feet.

JOHN FLANNERY. And the beauty will be gone. It will be like riding through small hills, areas of small hills.

GARY SMITH. Why'd you lose it? Why'd you lose the battle?

JOHN FLANNERY. We lost it because we got into it too late. And, at the time the battle was on, we were too small. And, we pretty well agree on this. And we wouldn't let it happen again. There's the example of the loss. I think that tells the whole picture of Glen Canyon. We've lost a whole ecology. The wild life has drowned. The trees are drowning. Who knows how many forms of life, unique forms, are lost in this inundation.

GARY SMITH. Do you think that the Bureau of Reclamation doesn't think and isn't concerned?

JOHN FLANNERY. Oh, they think. Certainly. But they have one point of view, normally. They're thinking about water supply just like the Corps of Engineers is thinking about damming rivers. We're not thinking about that. We're thinking about the good for the American public in the years to come, and the losses to man. We're down to ten per cent of our country in wilderness and every compromise that we make is a loss that can't be brought back. What's going to happen here in two hundred years, when this is a mud flat? Well, the problem is, with almost all of our protected lands, our Federal lands in this country is that, when you put a road in, then the agency is not satisfied, with that road. They want to put another road off, and then soon after that they have a series of roads.

And then they want to put in camp grounds here and there and there and there. And pretty soon, that wilderness is gone; that feeling of wilderness is gone. You've got motor boats, and you've got cars running all over the place.

PAUL NEWMAN. An irreversible decision in the making. Gary Smith is an involved observer in the decision over a proposed road into the wilderness area of Dark Canyon. Should a paved highway be put through an area of wild and exquisite beauty? And if so, where, and how should it be built?

GARY SMITH. There was a lot of controversy on this trip, mainly from the fact that Canyon Lands National Park has been in existence for four and a half years and there still isn't a road into it. And the people of Utah who will derive some economic benefit from this national park are concerned because they've made investments around the area. And they were consulted, and they helped push the park proposal through Congress with regard to the original road location. They were all in favor of this original road. Now, all of a sudden, things grind to a halt. The road doesn't go in. In fact, the road's changed, in favor of a road that will take many more years to build and will come in from the south.

DICK SMITH. What it takes for people to enjoy it. I mean, some of these people might enjoy just driving in and looking around in their cars.

BATES WILSON. This is fine, Dick. They can do this. Not everybody is gonna' come in from U.S. 160 to Squaw Flat. And I think you're gonna' find you're gonna' have a lot of traffic in from the South.

PAUL NEWMAN. Bates Wilson, Superintendent of Canyonlands National Park.

BATES WILSON. As a matter of fact, may be more than you're gonna' get off of U.S. 160, because they're gonna' be feeding in from Bryce, from Zion, from Grand Canyon, from Glen Canyon.

Man. We can work together because this scenery doesn't stop at the park boundary.

Man. And the visitor couldn't care less.

Man. Well, again, we're gonna' have multiple use, but we're gonna' segregate this land as to what we think is in the best public interest as to whether we allow grazing, whether we allow hunting and so on, will be determined upon the characteristics of the country and its capabilities to provide the kinds of goods and services that people want. We can't make these projections into the distant future, but we think we know, generally, what they want now. And I don't think we should, should plan any road that would take people through this country fast. This is an unusual country, and they should spend some time and we shouldn't build speedways, in my opinion.

Tex McClatchy. But the masses probably wouldn't go along with your comments, I don't think. The masses—you got to eliminate it to the per cent, like Bates says, that want to see and enjoy this kind of country. If you turned it over to the masses and asked them, they'd put that short road, just like you started now, that's right.

Bates Wilson. I think we're gonna' have something for everybody. We're gonna' have something for the guy in the pink Cadillac—a great deal. I think he's gonna' be able to drive in and get a terrific experience. But we're also gonna' have something in Canyon Lands, and you're gonna' have it here, right here, where the guy who wants to get out and get away from the carbon monoxide, and get away from the rat race, can do it.

Tex McClatchy. But I'm worried about the masses.

Bates Wilson. Because you're worried about the dollar.

Tex McClatchy. Right!

Gary Smith. The original proposal had a road located in the park that was greatly favored by community interests and people like this who have an economic interest in the area. Now, Bates Wilson is Supervisor of the National Park and members of their engineering staff, and people like this from San Francisco, with the National Park Service decided that the original road proposal endangered too many of the prime park qualities. In other words, to put a road in there, they would be destroying more scenery than it would be worth to put a road in. So they began looking for an alternative road location to help avoid what they considered a bad judgment.

Paul Newman. Gary Smith has learned that our wilderness areas are fast disappearing. The pressures of population growth are putting greater demands on our national parks and forests for recreational use. Mining, ranching and timbering interests want increasing acreage for development and have opposed most of the conservationist pleas for setting aside wilderness land. Representing the Utah Mining Association, Miles Romney says:

Miles Romney. It is forecast that by the year 2000 we're gonna be consuming three times the amount of minerals in this country that we're consuming today. And in the major portion they come from the land, and in the major portion they will continue to come from the land, and if the access to the land is continually blocked off, we're gonna find ourselves in real difficulty in developing the resources that are anticipated will be needed to maintain our way of life, our standard of living, and our production complex that we have in this country today.

Gary Smith. We have to have timbering. We have to have logging. We have to have mining, grazing. And the only way that we can effectively justify locking up lands in a wilderness condition or within national parks, is that we can provide for the material wants of our people on the rest of our lands. In other words, so that the productive aspects of our lands can justify setting aside the pristine. Now, through coordination and through cooperation, and planning on a regional basis, I believe that we can achieve most of these needs.

Paul Newman. Mary Margaret Goodwin is Field Director of the Caribbean Conservation Association.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. What are we going to see today?

Paul Newman. Bob Brody is a marine biologist. Mary Margaret is an expert swimmer, a scuba diver and an underwater photographer—skills that she uses in her work. They are here, at Chocolate Hole, off the coast of St. John in the Virgin Islands preparing to go underwater.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. Loudy Bottom with little patches of sea urchins all over the place. We're hoping to make a documentary file of still photographs of the natural and wildlife resources for each of the islands.

Paul Newman. They are studying a living coral reef in the lagoon that may be threatened by future development of the area.

Bob Brody. It's starting to happen in the harbors and in the rivers in the States and in other places in the world. It's beginning to start to happen here in the Virgins. We're destroying our natural communities to the point where they can't come back by themselves. Man is an interferer at best, in any environmental situation, and changes that environment all the time. Some of the changes are for the good and some are for the bad. And the more we change even in-shore areas like the reef areas, the more we are eventually changing the balance of nature—the chemical balance, the biological balance in the sea. But the changes that exist are frequently irreversible, or we can't say that we will ever be able to go back to where we were before or that we will be able to produce as much for our use as we had before. And how long this change can go on—probably not very much longer before we start to show some really drastic major effects.

Paul Newman. Pollution of inland waters as well as the ocean is another of Mary Margaret's concerns.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. I feel very embarrassed as a human being when I walk along a beach or when I fly over a harbor or when I go over a bridge and see water which is so brown with pollution that you know that no amount of major scientific creativity will ever be able to bring this water back to the living thing which it used to be. I don't really think it's possible to walk on very many beaches either in the United States or in the Caribbean without putting your foot into a mass of tar.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich. The only remaining problem as far as the water supply, at least in California goes, is whether we run out of quantity or quality first.

Paul Newman. Dr. Paul Ehrlich.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich. Two things are happening. We are exhausting water supplies that built up over a very long time in our water tables. We are lowering our water tables and using up what might be thought of as fossile water. That's one thing we're doing. And, of course, when you do this it can have permanent effects because in areas near coasts when you pull the fresh water out of the ground salt water from the sea intrudes and permanently ruins the water-bearing areas. And then, of course, we are polluting our waters in great many ways.

Ian McHarg. In Philadelphia we drink something which I normally describe as a——

Paul Newman. Professor McHarg.

Ian McHarg (continuing). Rather brown liquid which consists of a soup of dead bacteria in a chlorine solution. And this, of course, is what most of us drink. We really have a soup of dead bacteria.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich. In the lower Mississippi they say that every glass of water you drink has been through eight people already, and I can believe it.

Ian McHarg. We operate on the presumption that you have to dirty water before you can drink it. Because it's dirty you have to super-chlorinate it in order to kill all the bacteria. And, you know, we are posing enormous problems to ourselves and some of these are really quite tragic.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich. Many of our pollution problems have come from too much organic matter, manure and fertilizer going into them, which creates a rather complicated process which leads to the end of the stream or lake as a source of fresh water. This is largely what has happened to Lake Erie, for instance.

Ian McHarg. Well, Lake Erie is now commonly reported as septic. The Delaware River gets to be septic quite often, as the condition where there is simply no oxygen and where only bacteria can live. The great Florida aquater, you know this is a major source of ground water which serves all of Florida, is drying up. I was down in Po County recently and I found that lakes have fallen about ten feet in ten years. Again, this is a prodigality of unbelievable dimensions. You know, this is a geological resource of water which is being dissipated for very, very small gains.

Paul Newman. Mary Margaret Goodwin, investigating pollution by industry on the Chesapeake Bay, finds some industries are making an attempt to produce without polluting—but the results are still too little and the efforts perhaps too early to judge. She visits the Bethlehem Steel Sparrow's Point plant, one of the largest steel mills in the world. In this sensitive and controversial public relations area, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation has been willing to discuss the problems of pollution and its control frankly. Manager of Environmental Quality Control—Dr. Allen Brant.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. Dr. Brant, what are the major water pollution problems for the steel industry?

Dr. Allen Brant. In the first place, the most important pollutants in the steel industry are, first, solids, in the nature of particulate matter. They're largely scale, from the blooms and from the material that is going through the rolling mills and the rolling operations. In addition to that there is the dust that is collected in some air pollution control facilities and collected in wet collectors, which then pollute the waters, so it's very fine dust, but all being, essentially iron in nature. The second major pollutants is oil. We use a lot of oil, of course, in lubrication, and also, in some of the mills, and some of it gets into the water-courses. And thirdly is the acid. There are all varieties of acid, but principally hydrochloric and sulfuric acid. The three major problems in the steel industry. Steel is the backbone and the sinew of our society. It takes the use of 25,000 gallons of water to make a ton of it. If we want nine million new cars a year and all the trappings of an affluent society that this implies we are going to rob nature. We have not learned to afford a modern economy without polluting our bays and streams and fouling some air—at least, not yet. But nature has a way of striking back. Dr. Paul Ehrlich.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich. Ecologists have been worried for a long time about the possible consequences of an accident in our off-shore oil drilling operations. Their worst fears were confirmed on Midnight, January 30, 1969 when an oil drilling operation produced a very large leak of oil into the Santa Barbara channel off Santa Barbara, California. This leak lasted for some eleven days—it poured out roughly one-thousand gallons per hour of oil into the environment—it coated many hundreds of square miles of the sea. It befouled many, many miles of beach

XUM

and it certainly will prove to be an ecological disaster for the wildlife in the area. Unfortunately, it is not just the loss of a few birds. It is the disruption of a very important ecological system. It is one more example of how we are threatening the sea as a unit and we are threatening our ability to get food from the sea. It will be many years before the ecological balance in the area can be restored.

Paul Newman. Off Florida's coast, south toward Cuba to Puerto Rico, and down to the Northeastern coast of Venezuela are a chain of islands known as the West Indies. Hundreds of islands, large and small, some populated, some barren, form a 1,500 mile long web, with 65 principal islands supporting the 25 million native inhabitants. It is said "there are seven seas"—but for man, there is only one sea, one ocean. All the oceans of the world are interconnected.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. There are Dutch, there are Spanish, there are Portuguese, there are English, there are French. It's really a very international group of islands. And when you try and put all of these people together and come up with sound conservation policy it's very, very difficult.

Paul Newman. This was the first America, the America discovered by Christopher Columbus. He found a land untouched by civilization. These are the Virgin Islands, three of which are now United States territory. Since their discovery, they've had a history of exploitation and conquest. The most recent conquest of St. Thomas started with the invading tourist.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. Isidore Paiewonsky is a business man, an ardent conservationist, here in St. Thomas.

Isadore Paiewonsky. I happen to have been a member of the planning board here for 15 or 16 years and we have always got to be a year ahead of the bulldozer and two years ahead of the subdivider, because unless we put in rules and regulations for them they violate every rule and regulation, which they could not do in places where they came from. They figure this is virgin territory and no one should stop them. And I think a real danger to these islands is not from the little shacks that you see on the hills but from these bulldozing, subdividing, so-called builders who rush into the picture to build West Indian Levittowns. And before you know it your trees are gone, and the green spaces are gone and the beaches are polluted. Here we're not aware of these things until we suddenly find they are dumping raw waste right into your harbors, and they're dumping everything that they have on board into the harbor. They make of our beautiful harbors I should say a receptacle for receiving waste. And all of the conditions that people run from they re-create in this area because your pollution comes from people and congestion.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. The reason I think we have to do something is because St. Thomas is going to become the key to the over-spill into all of the rest of the Caribbean. And unless we can control what's happening in St. Thomas, the same thing will just go on throughout all the islands. It's a question of American and Canadian interests coming into the Caribbean and taking everything they can in as short a period as they can, and then walking out leaving nothing but devastation in their wake and, the native people are left with nothing.

Paul Newman. Dr. Arthur Dammann of the Virgin Islands Ecological Research Station——

Dr. **Arthur Dammann.** It would be easy for St. Thomas to become one big mass of concrete and houses, you see, and I think if it did that it would lose all the qualities that it has that make people come here now. Well, with respect to the role of man in his environment there is really no need to separate man from the sea anymore than you separate him from the land. Man, of course, is a land animal but the relationships between the ocean and the land mass and the things that live on the land and that live in the sea are still there and man will enter the sea and take his place there the same as he has on land, probably never to the same extent because it still is a very hostile environment as far as man is concerned. But we have to remember, of course, that man probably modifies his niche and occupies the niche of other organisms more than any other organism. And this is where the problem comes, is when he eliminates a niche that some other organism occupies and that organism is gone. Economics largely dictate this. The pressures of population and the fact that people, developers in order to exist have to do things the most economical way they can, and I don't agree with that. I think that uneconomical means should be employed many times.

Dr. **Paul Ehrlich.** We are going to have to get rid of the idea that a river running past somebody's back yard is something that he or an industry is free to dump any kind of garbage into. We are going to have to see to it that polluters pay to clean up their own pollution. It's really pathetic. You hear about some plant which has destroyed an entire river and after ten years of litigation it gets fined $200, you know, a huge multi-million dollar industry. Well, the fines are going to have to move up to multi-million dollar. And you take the money that you extract from the big polluters, and believe me they'll stop polluting very fast when you start hitting them with ten million dollar judgments and so on. And you pump that back into cleaning up the environment, as well. A tremendous amount can be done in the United States and elsewhere to control environmental problems.

Paul Newman. If economics is a determining factor, it can also be used to improve environments. It is the consensus of scientific opinion today, that we can use our natural resources in a rational way. We can no longer take without returning. We can no longer use without restoring. One example, the new facilities of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. Dr. Allen Brant.

Dr. **Allen Brant.** If we were starting with a new plant, as for example, our Burns Harbor plant, of course, it would be different. In the Burns Harbor plant, there are, for example, three different steps for treatment. Primary facilities are available directly at the sources, wherever the polluted water first flows out of an operation, there's a primary treatment operation there. All of the effluents from the primary treatment facilities then are conveyed to a common, one, central, secondary treatment plant, and then, from there, they go to a terminal lagoon, which is a seventy-five acre pond, in which all of the water flows through, very slowly. Consequently, the discharge from that is very clear. You can be sure that it'll be clean, because of the checks and balances that we have in the system.

Paul Newman. The human spirit yearns for relief from the frustrations that come with jammed living and masses of people attempting to do the same thing at the same time. The locked-in-ness of human habitation carries with it consequences of human behavior. We are building a world which is becoming unsuitable for human life. A world of concrete and steel. If the human spirit seeks nature as a place to regroup its energies then we must suffer the consequences of shrinking refuges for people. The fragments of wilderness left to man will soon not exist for our children.

Mary Margaret Goodwin. My heart really breaks for the children that grow up in the United States in the future, and will never know these sort of things unless we do something to conserve them. I know that my children won't be able to grow up in that kind of environment, where I can take them to vast areas of wilderness, and they can go and learn and live and have the same kinds of experiences that I had as a child in the wilderness.

Secretary **Stewart Udall.** I think we all have a stake in the wilderness. And I'm all for the small wilderness near the big cities. We've done too little of that. I'm not willing to settle for the idea that somebody may get to see the Grand Canyon once in their old age. I think we have a lot of superb little grand canyons and superb scenic areas and seashores right near the big cities that we could save where people can enjoy the out-of-doors. But what we're talking about is the welfare of man, the health of man, his mental health, his well-being. The more we drive man into an environment which is unclean and noisy and we put more and more pressures on him, I think we're inviting disaster in the long run to mankind as a whole.

Harold Haskins. There's a lot of lack of communication about what beauty is in this world and one of the biggest problems that everyone agrees upon is that the ghetto and the community is ugly. The Grand Canyon would be relevant if they had enlightenment to see why it is but there is no contact. There is no bridge between here and there and this is the same problem with black and white society—no bridging and great big canyons in between.

Paul Newman. Our shrinking wilderness is only a part of the ecological crisis man is facing. The Greeks saw problems as parts of a whole. They mastered the art of interrelatedness. It would seem that today we have lost touch with this reality. We view too many of these problems separately. Somehow the city and its people, the forests and their organic life, the seas and their aquatic life, share a life cycle—a balance that is the key to our common survival.

Dr. **Paul Ehrlich.** I think the most important lesson to be learned from ecology in general, perhaps, for humanity in general is you don't get something for nothing. And when you disturb a situation at one point, you almost always get a reaction at some point you hadn't anticipated. We have made the world so small as an ecological system, as a human system, that we know that when you intrude at one point on it, you're gonna get reactions in another place. If you go into a situation and you put poison out to kill one animal, you'll find that, besides killing that animal, you'll do thirty-seven other things you hadn't expected, of which thirty-five are very bad. And, I think that, what we need is a systems approach, the kind that's used in systems ecology, to the entire planet. We can no longer continue pushing on one thing without thoughts about what's going to happen to the rest of the system. You can't think of pesticides simply as something which kills our competitors. You've got to think of it as something which also helps to poison us, turns down the photosynthesis in the sea, gets rid of predatious birds, all of which have other effects. And, until we can get people to do the real accounting on these problems—until you can make them see that a dam does something more than pile up water behind it—that it changes water tables, and it changes ecological situations and so on—until you can get them to looking at the entire picture, the very complex interrelationships, you're not going to win the game.

Ian McHarg. We have got to be eternally grateful to these people who have cared enough to ensure that certain areas have not been totally destroyed, and as long as there is an enormous destructive impetus in the world, then we depend enormously upon the preservationist. In a better world instead of oscillating between these extremes of absolute preservation on the one hand, and limitless destruction on the other, one wants to find a position where you realize that man in fact can be the steward, and

XUM

again, those people who care a great deal about religious injunctions in this matter, can see in the second chapter of Genesis the injunction to dress a garden and keep it, and I think this conception of man in fact is a steward, is a husbandman of the earth, is a better one. Not a preservationist. Not a destroyer, but a husbandman.

Dr. **PAUL EHRLICH**. The President's Commission on the world food problem which was basically a very cheery group—they didn't, they didn't even consider environmental deterioration—said that, without population control starting now, the situation is hopeless. We have a finite planet. We have finite water supplies. We have finite food supplies. We have finite resources. We cannot, therefore, have infinite people. So, then you come down to the question, well, where do you stop your population growth? You've got to stop it sometime. Do you want to go on until the United States resembles India or China, or do you want to stop it now, while we still don't have to have eight years ahead reservations to go into Yosemite Valley, and where we still have a chance of seeing some green, and where people who would like quiet, or don't want to live in a big city, have an opportunity not to live in a big city. Let me point out to you that if current trends continue, in seventy-three years every person in the world will live in a city of a million or more. So, as population increases, you increase the chance of thermonuclear war. When you consider the ecological effects of a thermo-nuclear war, the soil sterility, the material that will be lofted into the atmosphere, the increased erosion polluting the sea, the rays of radioactivity, it's quite conceivable that mankind could become extinct. When you have the world's largest population and the world's weakest population in all of history, and you have jet airplanes that can carry sick people from one end of the earth to the other in a matter of days, you have the potential for a colossal world-wide pestilence of some sort or another. We know that viruses become more virulent when they circulate in large populations. So, you could very easily have a death rate solution to the population explosion which would consist of a massive die off of humanity from a virus plague which spread over the entire earth. Then we have the situation of the under-developed world going further and further into famine, instead of maybe ten million people a year dying of starvation as happens now, that could escalate to fifty or a hundred or two hundred million a year or even more. Now, in this country, we could probably bring our population growth to a halt very rapidly, if we wanted to. But that's the critical question. Do we want to? Do enough people recognize the problem, and are they willing to do what's necessary to solve it?

IAN MCHARG. We now exist, and we exist with the plants, the animals the other micro-organisms who are the co-tenants with us in this phenomenal world today, in cooperative venture, which contains their dreams and our dreams. So we cannot preserve and we cannot destroy because this is our own inheritance. All we can do is manage, and we cannot manage very much. We can only manage insofar as we can. But man can be the enzyme of the biosphere. He can be an agent which is a constructive agent.

GARY SMITH. This love of the earth is nothing new. The Indians used to have beautiful philosophies about that. Let me see. Perhaps an extreme example would be a quote from the Nez Perce Indians. Chief Joseph is a favorite subject of mine and you might be interested in hearing what their philosophy was. Their whole religion was built around a love for the earth. These people looked at the earth as their mother. And we, in turn, as a modern society, must start looking at the earth as a mother and we must treat her with the respect as we do our mother. But these people in their earth/mother type of philosophy talked about dreams. They were great visionary people and they say here: "You ask me to plow the ground. Shall I take a knife and tear my mother's bosom?" And they say, "You ask me to dig for stones. Shall I dig under her skin for her bones?" "You ask me to cut grass and make hay and sell it and be rich like white man. But how dare I cut off my mother's hair?" And these primitive, so-called ignorant people were concerned with what the white man was doing to the earth at that time, because they had lived successfully in balance with their environment. They had taken from the land just what they needed and they put back what they needed. They saw people coming in using practices that alarmed them. So, they were a small voice at that time, the American Indian. We inundated them, we drowned them, we trounced them, we defeated them, we raped them and now we're doing the same thing to our environment.

PAUL NEWMAN. With the Apollo Eight flight, earth-man for the first time has been able to step back and physically view his world from space through human eyes. He has finally seen his world objectively. The dream of Galileo, of Copernicus, of every dreamer and scientist of the past and recent past, of Einstein, of Shapley, has become a reality—and the reality, how accurately imagined! As astronaut Jim Lovell put it at that indescribable moment from space: ". . . in the vast loneliness up here on the moon, it's awe-inspiring and it makes you realize just what you have back there on earth. The earth from here is a grand oasis in the great vastness of space." The earth, indeed, is a very small planet. Each of us can see for himself now how finite our land—our air—our water. Even the number of grains of sand in our world is a finite number. With this vision, how clear it has become that any destruction of earth resources, by war or any other destructive act, even carelessness in its use, is an act hostile to life's well-being, a crime against humanity and every other form of life on earth. We are living in an age of danger but it is against life's drive to allow our earth to become like our moon—a dead planet. There are alternatives to doom. The growing consensus accepts as imperative to man's survival, the establishment of an equilibrium between population and resources. Diversity of life in nature is a prerequisite for the continuation of man's existence on earth. The problems of having a diverse and balanced existence for man are staggering. Perhaps, just perhaps, we are capable of meeting these challenges by our commitment to the future. This is the commitment of three young Americans—and surely must be for all Americans today.

SEXUAL REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, seemingly the academic leadership have adopted the totalitarian policy that the educable youth of the United States become the property of the State. Educating the mind in science, philosophy, and mathematics now ranks secondary to sex.

The whole sordid mess can but damage the direction of the next generation and greatly aggravate the already serious moral crisis in our country which has resulted from an overexposure of sex excitement and encouragement.

Our educators should see by now that the sex crisis was not caused by lack of knowledge but rather by our youth being prematurely exposed to lewd and sensuous movies, TV, and magazines, all of which in turn can be attributed directly to the action of the U.S. Supreme Court hampering the ability of a community to establish and maintain a wholesome moral environment.

Will sex education offer any remedy to a cause or merely serve to aggravate an effect?

Mr. Speaker, the Dan Smoot report for March 24, and a copy of the lawsuit filed by the Mattachine Society of Washington, D.C., against Internal Revenue Service follow:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Mar. 24, 1969]

THE LUST FOR MORE IN SEX EDUCATION

An article in the September 9, 1967, issue of *The Wall Street Journal* says, in essence: Sex education is coming to the nation's schools at a rapid clip; PTA groups (national, state, and local) have asked for it; the National Education Association and the American Medical Association have endorsed it; the federal government supports it financially; SIECUS (Sex Information and Educational Council of the U.S.) has been established to promote it; big corporations are spending millions on the planning and production of teaching materials for it.

In January, 1968, the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators issued a statement saying:

"School systems throughout the United States are presently being pressured to offer courses in sex and family life education. . . . Well-intentioned groups . . . are eager to reach the school-age population of over 50,000,000 young people."[1]

The Joint Committee was not criticizing sex education, as such, but was objecting to adding it as a special, or categorical, topic to overburdened public-school curricula. The joint Committee thinks sex education should be integrated into a comprehensive program of health education in all grades from kindergarten through high school.[1]

In October, 1968, Dr. Mary Calderone estimated that SIECUS had distributed, in one year, 61,000 kits of sex-education materials to educators, PTA groups, medical associations, and others.[2]

In an article in July-August, 1967, issue of *Children* (periodical published by the U.S. Department of HEW, Dr. Eleanore Braun Luckey (special consultant to HEW's Children's Bureau) says:

"Community agencies, youth organizations, churches, and schools are all scurrying to initiate programs of sex education—sometimes called family life education, boy-girl relationships, or interpersonal development. . . .

"Nevertheless, the goals of sex education are not altogether clear. . . ."

"What's Happening," an article in the November, 1966, issue of *American Education* (periodical published by the U.S. Department of HEW) also noted the nationwide scramble for sex education *now* in the public schools. The article mentioned SIECUS, National Education Association, American Medical Association, and the National PTA as organizations which can help establish or improve sex-education programs, and provide materials for classroom use. The article cites, as the exclusive reason for the intense interest in sex education, the alarming increase in illegitimate babies born to teenage girls and young women, and the spiraling incidence of venereal diesases among teenagers, especially boys.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Doubtless, most *parents* who want sex education in schools naively believe it will help reduce sexual promiscuity among youngsters—or, at least, help them avoid some of the harmful consequences of promiscuity.

Professional sexologists sometimes *promise* that sex education in schools will help reduce premarital pregnancies, abortions, and venereal diseases among teenagers; but they also admit that the promise is false.

In an article published by *Reader's Digest*, June, 1968, SIECUS board member Lester Kirkendall, speaking of sexual activity among youngsters, says:

"And if present trends continue, premarital intercourse will almost certainly increase. The need for sex education, therefore, is that much greater."

This clearly implies the promise that sex education will help reduce the volume of premarital sex activity among young people. Elsewhere in the same article, however, Kirkendall says:

"Most people have the vague hope that it [sex education in schools] will somehow cure half of the world's ills—reduce casual sex experience, cut down on illegitimate births, eliminate venereal disease. To be perfectly blunt about it, we have no way of knowing that sex education will solve any such problems."[1]

One pamphlet which Lester Kirkendall uses in some of his sex-education lectures is entitled "An Experiment in Sexual Communication Between Youth and Adults." He conducted the experiment at the University of Oregon, when he was on the faculty there as a sexologist. He got seven young men to sit as a panel and discuss their actual experiences in sexual intercourse—before an audience composed of men and women, teenage boys and girls.[2]

In lectures to mixed groups, Kirkendall sometimes uses a four-letter obscenity meaning sexual intercourse.[3]

Dr. Mary Calderone (executive director of SIECUS; a grandmother in her middle-sixties; niece of Carl Sandburg; daughter of Edward Steichen, a well-known photographer; graduate of Vassar; a Quaker; a member of the Family Life Committee of the National Council of Churches) also uses four-letter obscenities in lectures to mixed groups, including teenagers. Her excuse is that "euphemisms" in sex discussion are dishonest.[4] She says, for example, that it is wrong to tell five-year-old children that the father "puts" or "places" the seed of a baby in the mother. To illustrate the "correct terminology" to use with five-year-olds, she describes the sex act, in detail, using explicit terms, naming the sexual organs involved, explaining their role and use in coitus.[4] [5]

Calderone and her fellow sexologists in SIECUS say children should be taught that self-gratification is a normal, expected, almost-universally practiced, and often helpful manifestation of sex.[5]

SIECUS advocates "responsible sexuality" (or "situation ethics") as a guide to sexual conduct—which means that any kind of sexual activity is good if participants feel good about it. Conversely, SIECUS holds, religious taboos and society's conventional moral codes about sexual behavior are harmful because they create repressions and feelings of shame about sex.

SIECUS sexologists must know (if gullible parents, PTA leaders, and school officials supporting school sex programs do not know) that the SIECUS kind of vulgar, permissive, amoral sex education, far from curing any of "the world's ills," can only have a debasing effect on young people. There is statistical proof of this, not only in Sweden where the SIECUS kind of sex education has been compulsory in all grades of all schools for ten years,[6] but also in the United States where such official debauchery of school children is relatively new.

The November, 1968, issue of *Today's Health* published statistics revealing that incidence of venereal disease in recent years has risen 78% in the United States, 123% in California. California has had more of the SIECUS kind of sex education than any other state.

The SIECUS sex-education program was begun in Anaheim, California (Orange County), public schools in 1965. In 1966, 300 Orange County girls had to drop out of high school because of pregnancy—30 of them from junior high schools. In 1967, the Orange County Public Adoption Agency was receiving three or four unwed mothers a day—the youngest unwed mother reported being age 13. At a home for unwed mothers in nearby Los Angeles, one out of every five was from Orange County.[7]

A line from a news article in the March 2, 1967, issue of the *Anaheim-Fullerton Independent* sums it up:

"The new sexual morality is leaving a broad trail of heartbreak in Orange County."

Jo Hindman, in a column on "School House Pornography" in the February 27, 1969, issue of *The Eagle*, sketches a picture that is beginning to emerge throughout the United States:

"An increasing flood of revoltingly crude and pornographic material, mislabeled as 'education' by some school hierarchies, continues to trigger childhood tragedies: unwed pregnancies, illegitimate births, incestuous brother-sister attacks, abortions and venereal diseases—welling from the bog created by the too young knowing too much too soon."

Leading parents to expect benefits, which SIECUS officials know sex education in schools will not produce, is only one SIECUS stratagem. There are others.

SIECUS board member Lester Kirkendall denounces opponents of sex education in schools as a "fringe group of dissidents who do not think rationally"; who "have hangups about sex" because they think sexual behavior should be guided by moral codes and religious prohibitions, not understanding that "morals are relative" and that the only valid "moral" restriction on sexual activities is concern for "exercising responsibility toward another person." He says parents become traumatic about their youngsters engaging in sexual activity, because they do not realize that premarital sexual intercourse, even for children, is all right, provided "consideration is given for the partner."[8]

Kirkendall says sexologists can, however, slip sex education into school curricula without unduly alarming parents, if they will start with the premise that all children receive some sex training by simply living. "Any school," he claims, "is fully warranted in saying that it is 'expanding and improving' rather than 'starting' a sex-education program. The public is less afraid of expanding than of innovating. . . ." He suggests weaving sex education into regular school courses, in preference to establishing it as a separate course, because, he says, "the more sex education can be set within the normal program the less it will be singled out as unusual and threatening."[9]

To school officials who want separate sex-education courses, Kirkendall says: "Don't say that you are going to start a sex-education course. Just sneak it in as an experimental course and see how people react." Once school officials sneak sex education in "experimentally," they should never retreat, Kirkendall says. He advises: "Always move forward. Say that you are going to enrich, expand, and make it better. The opposition can't stop something that you have already started."[8]

And, he urges: "Go to your PTA and get support. That's where the power lies."[8]

An insatiable lust for more seems to be trait of many sexologists. No matter how bad a sex-education program may be, there are always some sexologists agitating to make it worse.

In England, where sex education in the schools is already of the "frank" variety recommended by SIECUS in the United States, a producer of sex-education movies plans to make, for classroom use, the kind of film that, in the United States, is generally shown only at stag parties and is still outlawed in most states and barred from interstate commerce by federal law: a film showing a nude couple engaged in coitus. Frank Sandy, chief of Brodie Educational Film Strips, Ltd., which supplies educational materials to 10,000 schools, says:

"We are looking for a young, married, church-going couple of fine moral character for our film. The film is intended for an audience of 15- and 16-year-olds.

"We feel that a film like this is the best way to give sex instruction to children."[10]

Several London school authorities are "reserving judgment" on the proposed film. They do not yet know whether to use it in schools.[10]

In Sweden, sex education in schools seems to have gone the limit; but that is not far enough for some sexologists. In April, 1967, Tore Robertson, 24-year-old public school teacher in Stockholm, said every good high school needs a sex room, where teenage lovers can seek respite from the daily school grind. A powerful student organization branded the suggestion "idiotic." Robertson said this was merely a temporary setback, because "future schools will have such rooms."

What's happening in England and Sweden is a harbinger of things to come for the U.S.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Leaflet published by the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association, available free from the U.S. Office of Education

[2] *The Daily Oklahoman*, Nov. 12, 1968

[3] *Anaheim Bulletin*, Dec. 20, 1968

[4] *Saturday Evening Post*, June 29, 1968

[5] "Goodbye to the Birds and the Bees," by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, *American Education*, Nov., 1966; *Masturbation*, by Warren R. Johnson, SIECUS Study Guide No. 3

[6] "Debauching Our Children," *The Dan Smoot Report*, Mar. 10, 1969, pp. 37–40 (available at prices listed below)

[7] *Anaheim-Fullerton Independent*, Mar. 2, 1967; "School House Pornography; Road to Pre-Marital Sex," by Jo Hindman, *The* (Yakima, Wash.) *Eagle*, Feb. 27, 1969

[8] "School Sexology Plans Charted at Hush-Hush Session," by John Steinbacher, staff writer, *Anaheim Bulletin*, Dec. 18, 1968

[9] "Some Practical Suggestions For The School Starting A Sex Education Program," by Lester A. Kirkendall and Helen M. Cox, *Children*, July–Aug., 1967

[10] *Parade*, Oct. 6, 1968

[11] *Tulso Daily World*, Apr. 5, 1967

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CIVIL ACTION NO. 752–69

Franklin E. Kameny, Washington, D.C., and the Mattachine Society of Washington, Washington, D.C., and the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations, Kansas City, Mo., plaintiffs, against William H. Smith, Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C., defendant.

Plaintiffs, for their complaint against defendant, herein allege:

1. Plaintiff, Franklin E. Kameny, a citizen of the United States, is a resident of the District of Columbia. Plaintiff, the Mattachine Society of Washington, is an unincorporated organization existing under the laws of the District of Columbia. Plaintiff, the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations, is an unincorporated organi-

XUM

zation existing under the laws of the State of Missouri. Defendant resides in or may be found within the District of Columbia. This action concerns questions which arise under the Constitution of the United States. The matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000). Jurisdiction is based upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1361 and § 11–521 of the District of Columbia Code.

2. Plaintiff, Kameny, is a homosexual by inclination and by life-style. Plaintiff, The Mattachine Society of Washington, is a civil liberties, information-education, social-service organization dedicated to improving the status of homosexuals. Plaintiff, the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations, is a nationwide assocation of approximately twenty-five organizations similar to The Mattachine Society of Washington and is working in behalf of the entire United States homosexual community.

3. William H. Smith is Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In accordance with policies and delegations of authority made by the Secretary, U.S. Treasury, he is responsible for the promulgation and administration of the rules of conduct for Internal Revenue Service personnel.

4. This suit is brought to compel defendant to revise § 1942.31 of the Internal Revenue Service Manual as contained in the "Rules of Conduct for Internal Revenue Service Employees" (Rev. 10–63) in order to make it clear that Internal Revenue Service employees may associate with persons believed or known to be homosexuals, whether or not in connection with official Internal Revenue Service business, without jeopardizing their employment status with the Internal Revenue Service. Because of the inhibiting effect on employees of the Internal Revenue Service of § 1942.31, plaintiff, Kameny, an admitted homosexual, is deprived of his right under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution to associate freely and openly with any person employed by the Internal Revenue Service. Also, because of the inhibiting effect on employees of the Internal Revenue Service of § 1942.31, plaintiff, The Mattachine Society of Washington, and plaintiff, The North American Conference of Homophile Organizations and its member organizations, are denied their right not to be deprived of liberty and property without due process of law as provided in the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

5. The Internal Revenue Service has a rule of conduct, which, among others, may be found in a pamphlet entitled "Rules of Conduct for Internal Revenue Service Employees" (Rev. 10–63), and which provides:

"Except in connection with official business, employees may not associate with individuals or groups when the association tends to discredit, directly or indirectly, the character, reputation, or integrity of the employee or of the Revenue Service. Unjustified association with persons who are believed, or known to be connected with illegal, immoral, or reprehensible activities, is forbidden because the association by the employee might tend to connect the employee or the Service with such activities of these persons. Employees should bear in mind that they will be held responsible in the event of adverse publicity stemming from, or connected with, their association. Section 1942–31."

The Internal Revenue Service uses § 1942.31 of its Rules of Conduct to interrogate, discipline and/or terminate the employment of Internal Revenue Service employees who are alleged or have been found to have associated (other than in connection with official business) with persons alleged or known to be homosexuals.

6. In interpreting and applying § 1942.31 of the "Rules of Conduct for Internal Revenue Service Employees" (Rev. 10–63) to preclude Internal Revenue Service employees from associating with homosexuals, except in connection with official business, with violation of such rule subjecting Internal Revenue Service employees to interrogation, disciplinary action or termination of employment with the Service, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is effectively denying plaintiff, Kameny, a homosexual, his right to associate with any or all Internal Revenue Service employees. Internal Revenue Service employees' rights to associate with plaintiff, Kameny, are denied to them by the inhibitory and chilling effect of § 1942.31 and, *a fortiori*, plaintiff, Kameny, is denied his right to associate with such employees. In effect, the Internal Revenue Service's action results in a kind of "American Apartheid," directed not at Negroes but at homosexuals.

7. As a result of the effect of § 1942.31 (see "5" above), The Mattachine Society of Washington and the member organizations of The North American Conference of Homophile Organizations are denied the right to receive contributions from, and grant memberships to, Internal Revenue Service employees. Because The Mattachine Society of Washington and The North American Conference of Homophile Organizations and its member organizations, although being lawfully constituted and lawfully operating organizations, are dedicated to improving the status of homosexuals and contain as members numerous homosexuals as well as heterosexuals, contributions to, and membership in, the Society or any of such similar member organizations by an Internal Revenue Service employee would immediately subject such employee to interrogation, disciplinary action by, or termination of employment from the Internal Revenue Service.

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray that:

1. The Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue be enjoined from interrogating, disciplining and/or terminating the employment of any Internal Revenue Service employee solely because he is alleged or found to have associated with a person alleged or known to be a homosexual.

2. The Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue be ordered to revise § 1942.31 of the Internal Revenue Service Manual contained in the "Rules of Conduct for Internal Revenue Service Employees" (Rev. 10–63) to make it clear that Internal Revenue Service employees may associate with homosexuals, whether or not such association is in connection with the official business of the Internal Revenue Service.

3. Plaintiffs have such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: March 25, 1969

WILLIAM L. SOLLEE.

WHEATGROWERS THIRD ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mrs. MAY, my colleague from Washington and I had the very great pleasure and privilege of attending the Third Annual Wheatgrowers Congressional Breakfast sponsored by the National Association of Wheat Growers, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and Western Wheat Associates, USA, Inc.

These annual meetings provide an excellent opportunity for wheatgrowers and Members of Congress to exchange ideas and maintain solid lines of communication and understanding, and I want to commend and congratulate these three fine organizations for making this possible.

On the program this morning was a presentation by John Thomsen of Mansfield, Wash., president of Western Wheat Associates, USA, Inc., and a member of the Washington State Wheat Commission. Mrs. MAY and I feel that Mr. Thomsen's remarks merit the attention of all our colleagues in the House, and include his statement in the RECORD for their consideration:

REMARKS BY JOHN THOMSEN, PRESIDENT, WESTERN WHEAT ASSOCIATES, USA, INC., AT THE THIRD ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 26, 1969

Senator Goodell, Congressmen, Guests and fellow wheat producers. I would like to make a few brief remarks which, I hope, will help emphasize the importance of our wheat market development program.

Western Wheat Associates is a regional organization directly representing the wheat producers in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Nebraska. Great Plains Wheat, representing six additional wheat states, contributes to our program. Our only objective is to expand and maintain the markets for U.S. wheat in Asia.

The twelve states represented by wheat growers here this morning produced 80% of the wheat grown in the U.S. last year. More than anyone else, we know how vital our wheat exports are to our economy, because of the direct relationship to our income and our personal lives.

Today, U.S. wheat exports are reeling from the effects of increased world production of wheat and other food grains, intensified competition for dollar export markets and decreased programming to PL 480 countries.

Just two years ago, there was an almost universal belief that there was not enough food to feed the hungry world. This philosophy has suddenly changed to recognize the world surplus of food grains relative to an *effective* demand. The present world oversupply of wheat can be directly related to almost ideal weather conditions, improved varieties, greater fertilizer usage, better farming practices and increased acreage.

In 1968, world wheat supplies reached 305 million tons which was 10% above the previous year and 7% over the 1966 record. Stocks are building up as import demand has slackened. The United States, Canada and Australia have been joined by Argentina and France as major wheat exporters. Even countries that were once deficit—such as the U.S.S.R., Spain, Sweden and Greece—are now exporting wheat.

Total world wheat trade this year may be the lowest since the 1962 crop year when it was under 44 million tons. World trade peaked in the 1965 crop year at over 62 million tons and has steadily decreased since then. This year it is expected to fall below 50 million tons.

These factors and others will reduce our wheat exports this year to some 80% of last year at the present rate. Obviously this is one of the major contributing factors to the disastrous level of farm income and our narrowing balance of trade position. Last year, wheat shipments were valued at $1.3 billion—one fifth of total U.S. agricultural exports. The very size of wheat exports—which normally run well over 50% of our production—indicates their importance to the domestic supply situation.

The current wave of protectionism is a definite threat to our export outlook. Such policies would almost certainly lead to retaliation from abroad—which is authorized under the General Agreement on Tariffs and

Trade. Since food imports by a majority of the countries are closely controlled by government regulations, wheat would be particularly vulnerable since tariff restrictions could be easily applied and regulated.

Clearly, we need to redouble our efforts to develop new markets and increase our share of existing markets for U.S. wheat abroad. We cannot allow other exporting countries to "skim off the cream" leaving us as residual suppliers.

The "challenge" to help ourselves was first accepted by American wheat producers some 15 years ago. The pioneers of this program, some of whom are in this room today, foresaw the need to expand foreign markets to provide an outlet for our excess production capacity. We banded together into associations, and then commissions, and assessed ourselves to raise funds in a grass roots self-help program.

Foreign wheat market development is a joint effort between all of us here today. We producers contribute our own dollars through local and regional organizations. The U.S. government contributes foreign currencies, generated by PL 480, which are administered by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S.D.A.

Positive and clear cut success has been achieved in many of the world wheat markets. Wheat is one of the world's most important foods. It is by far the most widely traded food internationally, but there are many countries in the world where we have barely scratched the surface.

The per capita consumption in Thailand is only 2 pounds of wheat per year compared with our 115 pounds. Africa is a sleeping giant that is slowly awakening and must be fed. The Middle East and Eastern Europe could again become major markets for U.S. wheat once the political considerations have been settled. We must fight to maintain our position in the European Economic Community where trade barriers are hampering our efforts. Much more can and must be done if our industry is to survive.

In the meantime our priorities—which are limited by personnel and funds—must be directed toward those areas which show the greatest immediate potential. We cannot, however, afford to neglect the many countries which are slowly emerging as prospective customers for *the best wheat in the world.*

The marketing of wheat is a fluid situation. It is influenced by climate, economic and political considerations that change weekly, monthly and from year to year. The changing situation in turn influences what we can do in a specific country at a particular time in market development. The key to success is to be alert to these changes and to be equipped with the proper resources to take advantage of the circumstances.

On behalf of Western Wheat Associates, I would like to thank each of our guests for taking the time from their busy schedules to join us for breakfast this morning.

Thank you.

GARY JOB CORPS CENTER VISITED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last week members of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted an onsite inspection of the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex. It was a rewarding trip, and I believe those who made the tour gained valuable insights into a highly successful operation.

Briefly, I would like to share the experiences of this trip with my colleagues; because, in the coming weeks, Congress will begin hearings that will determine the future of the Job Corps, OEO, and all programs involved in the war on poverty. Any congressional action will bear heavily on the social and economic welfare of this country. Because this program is at the threshold of crisis, I would like to briefly share the experiences of the tour of Gary.

The real story behind the congressional tour of the Gary Job Corps Center last week will be told and retold in testimony and hearings during the coming weeks in both the House and the Senate.

The congressional factfinding team, led by ranking members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, was openly enthusiastic by what they found in San Marcos.

It was, of course, a great source of pride to me and other members of the Texas delegation to host the group that visited Gary, particularly in light of the significant accomplishments of the center in regard to efforts of rehabilitation of young men.

Committee members were not hesitant to point out that they were impressed with the work of Gary officials in administering the lowest costing per Corpsman operation in the Nation. Time and time again, my colleagues confided to me that they felt the Gary operation was reason enough to see why I had been a longstanding and strong supporter of the Job Corps idea to educate and train the uneducated and unemployed. What the touring lawmakers saw was proof of the concept that it does not necessarily take a Ph. D. to be a good cook, mechanic, welder, clerk, or stone mason. They saw in fact, not policy or theory that the disadvantaged of our Nation can be turned into useful citizens; citizens, who after completion of training, become taxpayers instead of taxeaters.

Center director, Wallace Dockall, and his staff did an excellent job presenting the facts—cost figures, academic accomplishments, training procedures, and the like to the committee. These figures and the firsthand impressions of a highly efficient residential vocational training center will form the core of debate among lawmakers, whose decision it will be to continue operation of these training programs in the immediate years.

Members from the committee who made the trip were: Congressmen Roman Pucinski, William Ford, William Clay, John Erlenborn, and Orval Hansen. In addition to these Members, several from the delegation were in attendance: Jim Wright, Henry Gonzalez, Senator Ralph Yarborough, and a representative from Senator John Tower's office, Paul Reeve.

Several staff members also made the tour from the Education and Labor Committee—William Gaul, Austin Sullivan, William Henderson, and John Buckley; from the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee—Bob Harris and James Guest; two Senators on that committee were also represented—Bill Bechtel, from Senator Gaylord Nelson's staff and Sam Culberson, from Senator George Murphy's staff.

In abbreviated form, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share highlights of the remarks made by Corpsmen, staff directors, and members of the inspection party. I would call your special attention to the following welcoming remarks made by two of the Corpsmen. They are the simple and honest statements of two young men who asked for—and received—help:

WELCOME—BREAKFAST, MARCH 21, 1969—REPRESENTATIVE, CORPSMAN'S ASSEMBLY

Good Morning Ladies and Gentleman: On behalf of the 3,000 Corpsmen and myself, I would like to welcome you to the Gary Job Corps Center, and I hope your stay will prove to be a pleasant one.

I am Earl Matthews of the Corpsman's General Assembly. I have been enrolled at Gary for 13 months and my vocation is Drafting.

Prior to my enrollment in Job Corps, I had to leave school with a 10th grade education. I worked several jobs as kitchen help, and the pay ranged from $1.00 to $1.25 per hour. After consideration I enrolled in Job Corps.

I now have a GED and I am working on a trade and the ability to get and maintain a job which will enable me to become a better citizen.

Just as Job Corps has helped me, it has helped thousands of others. Therefore, I sincerely believe the program should be maintained and I hope that you share my belief.

We are all so glad that you came today to visit our Center. If any Corpsmen can be of assistance to you during your tour or to answer any of your questions, please feel free to call on any of us. We are proud of the Gary Center, and we enjoy showing it to our guests—especially to such a distinguished group like you.

Thank you very much.

WELCOME—LUNCHEON, MARCH 21, 1969—CORPSMAN ARMANDO LIMA, PRESIDENT, CORPSMAN'S ASSEMBLY

In behalf of the Corpsman's Assembly and the 3,000 Corpsmen at Gary, it is my pleasure to welcome you to our Center. It is our hope that you will enjoy your visit to Gary and to the great variety of trades that, thanks to each of you, we are able to learn and prepare ourselves to face the world.

I'm a Cuban refugee who came to the United States in June, 1962, to the Catholic Welfare Bureau in Miami. It's a program for cuban children without parents—and I spent four years in it going to school from the 8th to the 11th grade. I had to drop out of school at that age because the program only goes up to the age of 18. I found a job and started going to night school to finish high school, but it became too hard for me to work $8\frac{1}{2}$ hours and go to school 4 hours so I had to quit night school.

By this time I heard about Job Corps from a friend and decided to join. I did so with the idea of getting ahead and having a better future and getting my GED.

In August I was sent to Camp McCoy in Wisconsin where I took welding as my vocation. Six months later OEO closed 16 camps in which Camp McCoy was one. Because of my record of improvement in every field, I was given three choices of transfer into other camps.

I decided on the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos. I have now finished the welding program and have started on a second trade—Machine Shop, which I'm now planning to finish. But this is not my last goal—I am working on my GED to be able to get a scholarship for college in order to become a vocational counselor.

During this time of 19 months in Job Corps, not only have I gained knowledge in Metal

Trades, but in the complicated society of human relations and the English language. Thanks to Job Corps and the good people who run the Government of the United States, many hundreds of teenagers like me have found a second opportunity for living, have made it successfully and are now a part of that big society willing to help make this country a great nation.

For those teenagers, and myself and the 3,000 Corpsmen here at Gary, I am proud to say thank you, and hope that you find in Gary the true facts of the great need for this kind of program in our Nation.

Thank you very much.

The remarks from these young men set the stage for the tour of Gary facilities, which included the upholstery shop, advanced welding, reading lab, math lab, masonry work, heavy equipment operation, dorms, cafeterias, and other areas.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a brief factual summation of Gary prepared by Dr. O. J. Baker, executive secretary, Texas Educational Foundation, Inc.—the nonprofit operation behind the success of Gary:

The following information is respectfully submitted with regard to Corpsmen placements and follow-up studies from the Gary Job Corps Center.

We invite your attention to the data contained in the attached chart which reflects the percentage of those who have completed their training and are employed in the skills for which they were trained.

You will note that in Fiscal Year 1968, 83% of the 3,524 Corpsmen processed for employment were hired, and that 58% were employed in the skills for which they were trained at Gary.

In addition, 698 entered the military service, returned to school or entered colleges. While these men were not actually working within their job skills, it must be noted that their overall training here provided them with the necessary entry-level qualifications for equally worthwhile endeavor.

Also, our records show that 610 more job placements are still pending verification. This means that we have not received notification from various employment services on that number. (Center policy is to write the employment service if such verification is not received within three months after a Corpsman leaves. Other follow-up procedures are initiated every six months.)

It is entirely possible, therefore, considering the school-military placements and those pending verification, that the percentage of young men working at jobs for which they were trained at Gary in 1968 could more accurately be estimated at approximately 70%.

In the first six months of Fiscal Year 1969 our records show a total of 71% known to be employed in their job skills, with a possibility of reaching 80% or more, considering nonverifications and school-military placements.

Among those who are not working within their job skills, our surveys reflect two major causes for the change: 1) many Corpsmen enter the program at age 16 and upon completion of their training may not be acceptable to employers in certain jobs. Generally they will accept interim employment until they are a year or two older; and 2) some choose to relocate, usually nearer their hometowns, and will accept whatever employment is available to them at the time.

What appears to be of greater significance than the fact that these young men may not all be employed in the identical job skill they followed at Gary, is the fact that such large numbers of them have learned how to work and are employed.

We know you will agree that while a particular skill is important to success, equally important and often much more difficult to accomplish is the necessary motivation to achieve, proper attitude, social skills and behavior necessary to get and hold a job.

Indications are, however, that this center is making steady progress in the area of placement on jobs to utilize job skills, and we will continue to work for further improvements of this as well as in all other phases of our operation.

Two phases of our program that bear mentioning are Driver Training and General Educational Development (GED). Since opening four years ago, 4,832 Corpsmen have completed the Driver Education Program and presently over 200 Corpsmen are completing driver education each six to eight weeks. To date 1,765 Corpsmen have completed the GED program and are equipped with high school equivalency certificates. There are 592 Corpsmen presently enrolled in the GED program. Both of these programs add to the employability of the young men.

As always, we are grateful for your interest in the Gary Job Corps Center and are happy to offer any further information you might desire.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. BAKER,
Executive Director.

At this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to include the remarks of Dr. Arleigh Templeton, president of TEF, and president of Sam Houston State College at Huntsville:

WELCOME TO GARY

Mr. Chairman, members of the congressional committee, staff members, members of the press, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: on behalf of the Texas Educational Foundation, Inc., prime contractor for both the Gary Job Corps center for men and the McKinney Job Corps Center for women, it is my sincere pleasure to welcome you to Gary.

You are having lunch today where the first job corpsmen sat down to their first meal here at the center just a little more than four years ago on March 3, 1965.

None of us knew then, certainly not those first frightened young men who entered this building, what history would say of Job Corps—not even what the papers would say the next day.

In these four years after some 16,000 men have passed through our gates and approximately 12,000 have been placed on jobs, the papers have been full of their actions, sometimes the sensational actions—which I can tell you as a college president, are fewer per capita than in other institutions of education. Many thousand words have been written questioning the cost of training; the effectiveness of the training; staffing; members of Congress; and I suppose anyone who has ever supported the Job Corps program.

As far as what history will say about Job Corps, it is still too early to say. But I know what I would like for history to reflect. I would like first for the record to depict vividly and accurately the kind of young man or woman who enters Job Corps. (Under-privileged, under-educated, abused, health problems, dropouts, etc.)

I would like not to take any short cuts to the end of a stay in Job Corps, but to follow day by day as people daily struggle with the almost insurmountable task of turning this kind of youth around, bringing him inch by inch along the way—catching him when he slips back and starting all over again.

Then I would like very much to see a true comparison between the lad who entered this center and the one who left. In my opinion the one who came in without a skill and left here, perhaps not with the greatest job skill, able to make the most money, but with a desire to get a job for the first time in his life—any kind of job—to feel perhaps the world is not such a bad place after all, who can read better, do simple arithmetic, have respect for authority, look better, feel better—know about clean clothes, sheets on the bed and how to eat with a knife and fork. And likely he will never return to the street. I think a $4500 price tag on this is a fair price—if not a bargain.

Then I would like also for history to footnote these facts that while flower children and protesters, demonstrators and rioters are running rampant in all parts of the country, 3100 men at the Gary Center . . . and, of course, thousands more in Job Corps elsewhere, are going right on with their training with a bare minimum of disturbance—something like one-half of one percent—ever getting into any kind of trouble.

These are some of the things I would like to see counter-logged for posterity.

In closing I would like to say again that we welcome you to this center today. It has been from among such visitors that we have made our best friends—people who bother to come and see what goes on, rather than speculate from afar. Hopefully you will feel free to make any recommendations for improvement where you see a need. This is what we consider to be the finest form of support. We appreciate suggestions in any way that will in turn help us to do a better job of helping the young men and women that are out of school and out of work to become responsible and productive citizens.

As we in Congress well know, Mr. Speaker, Job Corps centers have not always been well received by their foster communities. When this happens, it is a tragedy and a waste. Fortunately, this is not the case in San Marcos. The following remarks were made by the mayor of San Marcos:

WELCOME—NOON LUNCHEON, MARCH 21, 1969—ELLIS SERUR, MAYOR, SAN MARCOS, TEX.

It is not only a pleasure but a privilege to extend official greetings from the City of San Marcos to this distinguished group of guests of the Gary Job Corps Center. While Gary's location lies beyond the legal limits of our City, I welcome you to the Job Corps Center to, for in many important respects we consider Gary a very real part of our community.

It has been four years since this fine installation opened, and we in San Marcos feel that its operation has performed a great service to the many young men who would otherwise have no opportunity to learn a trade and become useful citizens and taxpayers. Citizens of San Marcos have seen the value of this program, and we feel that the cost of operation has been government money well spent.

We have had excellent cooperation from Dr. Baker, Mr. Dockall and the entire Gary staff. They have shown a great interest in our community, and have performed many services for which the people of San Marcos are indeed grateful.

I have toured this Center a good many times in the past years, and every time I have been impressed with the type of training that is offered in the various departments, as well as the efficiency of the instructors and counselors. I have no doubt that the Gary Job Corps is the best staffed center in the nation. There is no doubt why it is considered the most outstanding of all the Job Corps Centers in the United States.

I sincerely hope that this fine Job Corps program will be continued by our government. The rehabilitation of the thousands of young men who have come here to learn a trade has been well worth the cost.

It is my pleasure to be with you.

Obviously, we had a full day. This capsule summation barely hits the high spots of the day's activities. There is much more that could be told; the in-

XUM

dividual stories of the boys, their successes upon leaving Gary, the dedication of the staff, and more. If it were possible, I would have each Member of Congress personally tour Gary before reaching a conclusion about the future of the Job Corps. Once the facts are in, the dissension diminishes in rapid order.

At the conclusion of the official trip, a separate visit was made by Members to visit President Johnson at his ranch. This was not on the official agenda; it was merely a social call. Mr. and Mrs. Johnson graciously received the group, although it meant the President had to rearrange a rather busy schedule. We found him hale and hearty and thoroughly enjoyed a drive through the hill country as only he can show it. It was a privilege and a thrill, especially for those in the party making their first visit to Texas.

RESIDENCY VOTING ACT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Residency Voting Act of 1969. This bill is designed to enable citizens who change their residences to vote in presidential elections.

Voting is a fundamental right of our democratic system of government. As a nation, we have done much to secure the right of every American to vote. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a milestone in securing the franchise for all our citizens.

Even though we have done much, more still needs to be done. Today there are still millions of Americans who are still deprived of their right to vote because they have moved their place of residence from one locality to another. These otherwise eligible voters are effectively disenfranchised because they are unable to satisfy the lengthy residence requirements which are now in effect in many of our States and localities.

The bill I have introduced today provides that a citizen who is otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State or political subdivision may not be denied his right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States if he has been a resident of that State or political subdivision since September 1 preceding the presidential election. The citizen would, of course, have to comply with any voter registration requirements to the extent that they provide for registration after September 1.

The effect of this particular provision of my bill will be to establish September 1 as the uniform qualifying date for presidential elections. State and local residency requirements would then be limited to a maximum of about 60 days.

The September 1 qualifying date does not solve all the problems, however. It does not improve the lot of those citizens who move their residence after September 1, but before the date of the presidential election. To prevent these citizens from being disenfranchised, my bill contains a provision which states that if a citizen has begun residence in a State or political subdivision after September 1 preceding the presidential election, he shall be given the opportunity to register and vote in person or by absentee ballot in the State or political subdivision from which he moved most recently.

My bill would require that many States alter their election laws with respect to the residency requirement. However it would not in any way abrogate the legitimate interests of the States in maintaining their voting rolls up to date and preventing vote frauds.

Another section of the bill I have introduced today addresses itself to the problem of arbitrary disenfranchisement among another group of citizens—those temporarily residing abroad. All too often these citizens are denied the right to vote because of State registration requirements particularly those which call for registration in person. All but two of the States presently provide for voting by absentee ballot but only 12 States permit absentee registration for citizens unconnected with the Federal Government or the Armed Forces. Thus many private citizens such as businessmen, teachers, and students are disenfranchised because they are unable to register in person. My bill would remedy this situation by requiring any State which permits absentee voting in a presidential election to provide an absentee registration system as well. In doing so this bill will reinforce legislation enacted in the 90th Congress which amended the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 to recommend to the States that they extend to their private citizens who are temporarily residing abroad the right to register and vote as absentees.

On May 25, 1967, President Johnson declared in "The Political Process in America," a message to the Congress proposing legislation to strengthen the political process:

> This nation has already assured that no man can legally be denied the right to vote because of the color of his skin or his economic condition. But we find that millions of Americans are still disenfranchised—because they have moved their residence from one state to another. The people's right to travel from state to state is constitutionally protected. The exercise of that right should not imperil the loss of another constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

An analysis of the voting results of the 1960 presidential election, the last election for which studies are available, shows that between 5 and 8 million eligible voters were deprived of their right to vote because of unnecessarily long residency requirements in many States. Almost half the States, for example, require that a citizen be a resident for 12 months prior to qualifying to vote for the only two nationwide elective offices—the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

Public participation in government is the essence of democracy. The voting process is democracy's ceremonial, its feast, its great function. No government can survive if it does not heed the public will. The American system has endured for almost two centuries because the people have become more and more involved in the process of governing. But government has a continuing obligation to make sure that the maximum possible number of people take part in this process of governing. Mr. Speaker, my bill will take a long stride toward this goal by allowing citizens who change their residences to vote in presidential elections

SECRETARY SHULTZ CONTINUES TO WIN PRAISE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Shultz continues to win praise on his reorganization of the Manpower Administration. I would like to include as a part of my remarks the following article by Richard J. Levine which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 21, 1969:

GOP REORGANIZERS OFF TO A START

(By Richard J. Levine)

WASHINGTON.—Labor Secretary Schultz was greeted by good-natured laughter as he prepared to brief the White House press last week on his plans to streamline the Labor Departments cumbersome Manpower Administration.

On the Secretary's right stood an organization chart so complicated that even Mr. Shultz was forced to concede, with a grin, that the tangle of lines and boxes resembled "a wiring diagram for a perpetual motion machine."

It was an apt description. The Manpower Administration—which spends some $2 billion a year in running an ever-expanding array of job-training programs plus the U.S. Employment Service and the unemployment insurance system—has grown into a massive maze. Within are found all the ills of bureaucracy: Overlapping functions, clogged chains of command, petty jealousies, an overriding instinct for survival.

An effort last fall by Mr. Shultz's Democratic predecessor, Willard Wirtz, to alter its structure failed dismally. Yet less than two months after taking office the Republican reorganizers have revamped the Manpower Administration.

To do so, Mr. Schultz—strongly backed by the White House—moved quickly, consulted widely and compromised modestly.

It is too early, of course, to tell how well the reorganization will accomplish Mr. Schultz's primary objective: More efficient delivery of manpower services at the local level. Yet even if the bureaucrats partially succeed in frustrating this long-range goal, the streamlining itself is a substantial achievement.

Moreover, in an Administration pledged—as President Nixon has said—"to eliminate duplication, to consolidate functions (and) to bring better management to all areas of the Federal Government"—it takes on added significance. For the techniques used in the Labor Department may well be applied elsewhere.

The Nixon people eliminated the Bureau of Employment Security, an old-line agency that administered the U.S. Employment Service and the unemployment insurance program and never fully adapted itself to meeting the needs of the disadvantaged. The tax also fell on the Bureau of Work-Training Programs, which ran such efforts as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Concentrated Employment Program. These and related activities will now reside in a newly established U.S. Training and Employment Service.

The reorganization went into effect March 17 at the national level, just six weeks after the Secretary ordered a review of the Manpower Administration's structure with an eye to making major changes. The speed limited the opportunity for opposition to build.

However, the key element in the reorganization was Mr. Shultz's willingness to discuss his plan with concerned individuals and groups, including governors, state employment security officials and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Affairs. This was not happenstance; Mr. Shultz was well aware that last fall governors and state employment officials, fearing that abolition of the Bureau of Employment Secuirty would lessen their influence in Washington, thwarted the Wirtz plan by taking their opposition to the White House (President Johnson ordered Mr. Wirtz to abandon his reorganization after it had already been announced in a press release).

The states were "very much concerned" with the Wirtz plan because "it was sprung on them without consultation," says a source close to state manpower officials. "It was a high-handed approach to reorganization."

To allay the fears of the states, Mr. Shultz created a new post, Deputy Manpower Administrator for Employment Security, giving State Employment Security officials a high-level voice in the Department and helping the Secretary sell his plan.

While the reorganization of the Manpower Administration is hardly a headline-grabbing event, Labor Department officials consider it an important "preliminary step" to any consolidation and re-packing of individual job-training programs, and *that* would make headlines.

Indeed, as White House aide Stephen Hess observed recently, Republican administrations "seem especially fascinated by structural changes in Government. . . . It may turn out that the most important achievements of the Nixon Administration will be structural or institutional."

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—ALL-AMERICA CITY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., in the Third Congressional District, was greatly honored when the National Municipal League and Look magazine selected the Nation's largest city as an "All-America City."

Look magazine said in announcing the honor:

> The award goes to Jacksonville for the vigorous action of its citizens in bringing about major improvements in their city, and thus setting an example of good citizenship to the nation.

I congratulate the city officials and city fathers of Jacksonville on this outstanding honor. Jacksonville, to paraphrase what Paul in the Bible said of Tarsus, is "no mean city." It was Alcaeus who wrote:

> Not houses finely roofed or the stones of walls well-builded, nay nor canals and dockyards, make the city, but men able to use their opportunity.

In Jacksonville, men are making their opportunity for the over 550,000 citizens, and the "Bold New City of the Nation" is facing the future with new vigor and freshness. I commend to the House of Representatives and to the Nation, the Jacksonville story, as reported in Look magazine, and also editorials from the Florida Times-Union and WJXT-TV of Jacksonville, Fla.:

[From Look Magazine, Apr. 15, 1969]

All America Cities: Jacksonville, Fla.

A tourist driving south along the coast, sampling the Southern charms of Charleston, S.C., and Savannah, Ga., is in for a bit of cultural shock at the next rest stop. Jacksonville seems hardly a Southern city at all. Unsoftened by storybook romance, and too far north, and too far from the Gulf Stream, to share Miami's resort climate, Jacksonville has chosen instead to vie with Atlanta as the center of commerce for the Southeast. So far, Jacksonville claims only to be "the commercial, financial, port, cultural, medical and urban heart of northeast Florida and southeast Georgia," just for starters. Surrounded by quiet countryside, with no metropolitan area of over 50,000 people within a hundred miles, the city has built a skyscraper-studded skyline and a population of half a million. Jacksonville is where the action is, all kinds of action. "If it's action you want," the man at the Chamber of Commerce purrs to visitors without specifying further, "you can find anything you want in Jacksonville."

The serious action steamed up in 1966, when a grand jury of 23 citizens indicted eight high city officials, charging them with a total of 104 separate criminal acts committed out of the line of duty: "Many of our city officials have apparently considered the city government as their private business, with a never-ending source of revenue." Bleeding Jacksonville's boom for all it was worth, the government had so starved the city's schools that they were disaccredited. Jacksonville was ready for reform. The grand jury prescribed: "Such a governmental structure must be changed." As early as 1965, 23 city leaders had called for a study of the local government. The resulting commission had recommended a completely new system, consolidating city and county under strong mayor-council leadership. Consolidation had been defeated before by suburban voters who wanted no part of the city's mess. The black community was also wary, for its near-majority in the city would be diluted by suburban whites. But this time, with scandal fresh in mind, a volunteer citizens campaign rallied the voters. On October 1, 1968, the new city of Jacksonville was born. With the whole 827-square-mile county now in city limits, it could add to its credits the title of "World's Largest City."

Mayor Hans Tanzler, who stepped down from the bench to head the reform ticket, warns that consolidation itself is no solution to Jacksonville's problems. The "World's Largest City" can hardly escape big-city problems, aggravated by Jacksonville's long history of mismanagement. But the new government is moving to meet the problems on all fronts: providing money to bring the schools back up to standard; planning a sewer system to service outlying areas and control a serious water-pollution problem; and promoting job-training programs. After almost falling apart, Jacksonville is beginning to pull together.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Mar. 21, 1969]

An Honor Brings a Challenge

Selection of Jacksonville as an All America City by The National Municipal League and Look Magazine is an honor for the community. It is also a challenge.

Already "on the spot" as a showcase of consolidation, the city now must measure up to the confidence shown by the bestowal of the "All America" accolade. Like a football team rated highly in the polls, Jacksonville will be expected to win the contests in which it is engaged.

If the community reaction is as forceful in meeting praise as it has been already in meeting adversity, then success is more than a mere probability.

The city's claim to the All America recognition was presented by J. J. Daniel who headed the committee which recommended the form of the new government and then fought for its creation.

Daniel made no attempt to gloss over the city's problems. He emphasized, however, the moves being made to meet and conquer them.

"We are," said Daniel, "a stronger people for our ordeal. We have experienced a political renaissance and the determination that flows from this rebirth will equip us well to solve the problems of urban civilization of the 21st Century."

The emphasis placed by Daniel and by the committee of judges on citizen action, on community action, was perceptive and proper. Without the active interest and participation of citizens within a community, there is no cure for community ills nor is there hope for the fulfillment of community dreams.

Not only did the case for Jacksonville include the change in government but another aspect was stressed in the presentation—neighborhood self-improvement programs, a project to upgrade skills in the labor market and the like. This is community action at the grass roots where community action bears the best results.

While on the subject, it is proper here to extend congratulations to the Georgia port city of Savannah, Jacksonville's neighbor, sometimes a commercial rival, and now fellow All America City, Savannah was honored for "pace setting programs" in the area of race relations.

Savannah, says Look Magazine, "has under way a highly-successful self-help project for cleaning up and rehabilitating its Negro slums. Originated by a local bank president, the Savannah Plan has involved thousands of citizens, black and white. . . ."

After an initial dramatic cleanup plan which involved a broad spectrum of the citizenry, the program in its long range phase is "furnishing sympathetic loans to the poor for home improvement and ownership and to small businessmen in the area."

Over the years, the two cities have been known to lift an idea or two from each other and in this instance, each might profit by finding out more about what the other is doing and perhaps emulating it.

It would indeed be ironic if Jacksonville and Savannah—so long regarded in Miami and Atlanta as stodgy and resistant to progress—were to develop new and demonstrably successful approaches to some of the core problems of the nation's cities.

That very challenge, however, is the one that has been posed by the award of the "All America City" designation.

[From WJXT-TV, Jacksonville, Fla., Mar. 20, 1969]

All-America City

Jacksonville's selection as an All-America City is recognition of a remarkable achievement in local government. With consolidation, Jacksonville has the envious opportunity of abolishing the duplication, waste and buck-passing that handicaps local governments across the country.

The All-America honor salutes the reform movement that established a government carefully designed to cope with the terrible problems that plague American cities.

As in every other city, there are a lot of things wrong with Jacksonville. Jacksonville has shameful slums and disaccredited schools,

XUM

polluted air and water, poverty, crime and almost all the other ills that have caused the crisis in our cities.

But consolidation provides Jacksonville with the unique advantage of a community-wide approach to solving problems. No longer are the too-tough-to-solve problems being blamed on the government across the street, no longer are they being swept under the rug.

That determination to right the things that are wrong with Jacksonville has made consolidation a controversial government. It will probably become even more controversial as it fulfills the promise of meaningful local reforms.

The public's willingness to approve consolidation is one of the best things that ever happened to Jacksonville. As the years go by, more and more people will realize just how necessary it was to reform the structure of our local government so we could get on with the business of improving Jacksonville.

This was a WJXT Editorial.

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD OPPOSES CONTINUANCE OF GASOLINE GAMES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, held hearings on the use of games of chance in conjunction with the marketing of automotive gasoline. Subsequently, we recommended that the Federal Trade Commission take steps to correct the abuses we discovered with respect to the use of so-called gasoline games.

During the FTC hearings on this subject my distinguished colleague, Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, the ranking member of the subcommittee, and I appeared before the Commission urging that they utilize section 5 of the Federal Trade Act to prohibit the further use of games.

We had anticipated monolithic opposition to this position from the major gasoline refiners. It was, therefore, particularly pleasing to learn that the Atlantic Richfield Co., had joined us in our position. Because of its broad interest to the Members of the House, I include the Atlantic Richfield statement, as submitted to the FTC on this subject, at the conclusion of these remarks.

Atlantic Richfield is to be commended for taking this position in behalf of the public interest.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY L. M. REAM, JR., ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO., AT FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS ON GAMES OF CHANCE IN THE FOOD RETAILING AND GASOLINE INDUSTRIES, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 19, 1969

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, my name is L. M. Ream, Jr. I am Executive Vice President of Atlantic Richfield Company. I am in charge of the Products Division, which is responsible for all domestic oil marketing, manufacturing, supply and transportation activities of the company.

I do not appear here today to debate the Commission's proposed trade regulation rule or the legal status of games, themselves. Earlier in this proceeding, Atlantic Richfield, through its attorneys, submitted a statement commenting on the Commission's proposed rule. At that time, the company stated that we took no position on the merits with respect to the use of games of chance as a promotional device in the marketing of gasoline, but we did criticize certain procedural features of the proposed rule.

It is Atlantic Richfield's belief now that there remains little competitive or economic justification for use of games. We believe that the interest of the public, of the Commission, and of our industry would best be served if the promotional use of all games of chance were eliminated.

I wish here to emphasize two points: *First,* I necessarily speak from the vantage of a gasoline marketer; I do not have sufficient information to judge whether the same considerations are applicable to other industries, where the use of games has also been prevalent. *Second,* I am speaking only of the type of games that have been in widespread use during the last several years and on which the Commission has focused in this proceeding. We believe that whatever action is taken by the Commission should be sharply delimited to these games only. Any broader action would place unwarranted restrictions on a wide variety of promotional activity as to which no question of legality or fairness has ever been raised.

Certain realities emerge from the current controversy: The value of games has steadily diminished; it is now doubtful whether they have any real utility for the future. Recurrent attacks have undermined the public's confidence in the fairness of games. Continued use of games will almost inevitably engage the industry in wasteful conflict with the Federal Trade Commission and state regulatory authorities. Thus, on the most pragmatic level, we conclude that some formula or procedure should be developed to phase out games of chance at the earliest practical time.

Atlantic Richfield has used games since 1966. In a very basic sense, the practice has been defensive. The competition was using games of chance; it was necessary to arm Atlantic Richfield's dealers to compete on an even basis. Any other course would have placed our dealers at a heavy competitive disadvantage. We acted in good faith; to the best of our ability and knowledge, our games have been administered fairly. Our dealers have always been free to accept or decline games. We have never, directly or indirectly, coerced our dealers or otherwise imposed any improper pressures upon them to participate in games. But recent history, we think, now records the obvious fact that the widespread use of games in gasoline marketing has become self-defeating. The impact of one company's game promotion is only to neutralize the games used by its competitors.

Very simply, Atlantic would like to give up games. We take this occasion to declare our immediate willingness to do so. But if it were feasible to achieve this result by unilateral action, we would not be here. This is an industry-wide problem and the cessation of games must be brought about by an industry-wide solution.

Because of obvious antitrust considerations, we cannot explore whether other companies also might like to dispense with games of chance. Matters so vitally touching upon inter-company competition are clearly not appropriate for discussion among competitors. Therefore, it seems apparent to us that if game promotions are to be terminated, it will require action by the Federal Trade Commission.

The proposed trade regulation rule plainly does not accomplish this—it presumes only to regulate games, not to eliminate them. While one witness in these hearings has suggested that rigorous enforcement of the proposed trade regulation rule might constructively result in a discontinuance of games, because of the difficulties of compliance, we suggest that such an oblique approach merely confounds the basic question.

Nor do we believe a trade regulation rule flatly prohibiting games is the appropriate method for accomplishing an end to games. Almost certainly this will result in lengthy litigation attacking both the reasonableness of the rule and the Commission's authority to issue it. I am advised that in connection with an earlier trade regulation rule proceeding, the Chairman of the Commission estimated such litigation might consume up to four years, during which period, of course, the rule would not be effective* and games might well continue.

We suggest that the Commission consider a different industry-wide approach to the problem, utilizing established voluntary procedures.

Based upon its staff report and the evidence generated in these hearings, the Federal Trade Commission might issue a public announcement of its policy and enforcement intention with respect to the use of games of chance. Such an announcement might state that in the Commission's view the use of games of chance as a promotional device in commerce was contrary to the public interest and should be terminated within a stated period of time. The announcement would clearly advise all companies continuing to use games after the stated date that they might be subject to proceedings under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Combined with the announcement would be an invitation to all those who have used games to file with the Commission, prior to a stated date, assurances of discontinuance under the Commission's established procedures.

It would then be clear that those who contemplated the continued use of games did so with the plain understanding that they might be called to account in a formal Federal Trade Commission proceeding. Any company determined to go ahead would thus have full opportunity to defend its practices. However, any such proceeding would be particularized as to that company and would not involve the different legal issues raised by the promulgation of a general trade regulation rule.

What we propose is, of course, simply suggestive of how the Commission might resolve this difficult situation expeditiously and without lengthy, tortuous litigation. Other voluntary procedures may commend themselves as well. I am advised that on a number of earlier occasions, where the Commission has concluded that a prevalent industry-wide practice should be terminated, it was able to accomplish that result through prompt, simultaneous voluntary action of industry members. Those precedents may also be instructive here.

---

*Hearings, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, June 23, 1964, p. 132:

"Representative HARRIS. If you proceed with this, and a proceeding is started by the industry or anybody, what would be your estimate as to the length of time it would take to resolve the litigation?

"Chairman DIXON. If the industry or interested party should seek out the avenue of going to a district court and seeking an injunction to enjoin us from proceeding to put into effect this rule, and, accordingly the review goes up through the circuit and possibly to the Supreme Court, and if the procedure were approved by the Supreme Court, we would still have the possibility that the rule would be violated. If that rule was violated then we would start back toward the final day of cease and desist and perhaps again a review. I would think 4 years, sir."

ANTIPEACE DEMONSTRATORS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the shenanigans of the so-called antiwar militants expose their true goals as being antipeace.

With 33,000 Americans already dead and a prolonged war attributed at least in part to the vacillations created by the Ameri-cong it is becoming more and more obvious to the mothers and dads that the antipeace demonstrators are but prolonging the war perhaps in the hope of wearing down the American people, demoralizing our morale but ever encouraging the Communist enemy not to negotiate peace.

The greatest militaristic threat in our land today comes from the falsely named antiwar demonstrators.

Mr. Speaker, one such Ameri-cong war encouragement session was recently held here in the Nation's Capital promoted by a tax-exempt foundation, and I include a report by Alice Widener from Human Events for March 22, 1969, as follows:

PIG ON A PEACE PLATE

(By Alice Widener)

A disgrace happened at the First National Convocation on "The Challenge of Building Peace," held by the tax-exempt Fund for Education in World Order, at the New York Hilton this month. Not an American flag was in sight at the luncheon gathering of two thousand pacifists. But Viet Cong flags were hanging from the balconies at both ends of the Grand Ballroom all during lunch, during introductory speeches made by officers of the Fund, and during speeches made by Chet Huntley and by United States Senators J. William Fulbright, Jacob Javits and George McGovern.

Until a handful of militant demonstrators made TV news by heckling Sen. Fulbright and striding onto the dais to put a pig's head on his plate, not one of the persons on the dais, including the three U.S. Senators, said a word of protest. When they did voice objections over the microphone, it was to denounce "the poor taste" and "undemocratic behavior" and "discourtesy" of the hecklers and demonstrators. Not one of the senators demanded over the loudspeaker that the Viet Cong flags be removed from the premises.

Though the main theme of the Hilton meeting was supposed to be "peace," it actually was an anti-ABM system and anti-Viet Nam war propaganda affair. There were morning and afternoon discussions on subjects such as "Is America Becoming a Militaristic Society?" and "Can We Build an Effective Constituency for Peace?" and "Are National Self-Interest and World Peace Compatible?"

Among unchallenged statements made at the convocation panel discussions were:

Rev. William Sloan Coffin, Jr., chaplain, Yale University: "Marx was essentially right when he said religion is the opiate of the people."

Betty Goetz Lall: "We must work up enough lobby so that it becomes competitor to the defense establishment. I learned in the Soviet Union last year that they have a new approach to the international law of disarmament. They said, 'We will add treaty by treaty and the sum total will become international law.' . . . I offer it as a possible substitute for limiting offensive and defensive weapons.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner: "Just as we can unilaterally escalate, we can unilaterally deescalate. I would like to invite my Russian friends to come over here and see some empty missile holes. Even if they didn't reduce, maybe we can. Maybe we can have a disarmament treaty by ourselves; maybe we can have two peace races, one between ourselves with the Armed Services Committee and one with the Soviet Union. . . . The U.S. pioneered both offensive and defensive systems. . . . The U.S. is running an arms race with itself."

Howard Zinn, professor of government at Boston University: "At this moment we are the Italians, the Japanese, the Germans, of 1936. We have the title 'robber of our time.' "

Richard M. Pfeffer, Fellow of Adlai Stevenson Institute, research Fellow at University of Chicago Law School: "America is an imperialist power. We should withdraw from Viet Nam unilaterally and immediately. We have failed to understand Mao Tse-tung, one of the great men of our century."

Well, that was about the drift of the Hilton Peace Convocation. Nobody said a word in praise of the United States, not even the United States senators, and not one of them said a word over the microphone about the absence of the American flag and presence of the Viet Cong flag.

Breathes there an America, with soul so dead, who never to itself hath said, "Can these be our own, our native sons?"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 27, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Earl S. Cox, Colonial Beach Baptist Church, Colonial Beach, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we come this day with grateful, but unhappy hearts. Grateful for the free land in which we live, unhappy because many still live without the freedom that we know. We ask that Thy spirit strive mightily with the leaders of all nations as they seek means whereby all men might live free and at peace with one another.

Impress upon our minds that we must first be at peace with Thee. That freedom exists only as it exists everywhere. That the strength of our Nation lies in the integrity of her people. That peace is born out of righteousness.

Lord, today is ours. Give special strength and wisdom to those who lead our Nation. Fill them with Thy spirit that Thy will might be done. We make our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 714. An act to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

THE LATE MRS. HAMILTON FISH

(Mr. WEICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened this morning to learn of the tragic death of Julia Fish, wife of Congressman HAMILTON FISH of New York.

To our esteemed colleague and his children, may I express the heartfelt sympathy of his freshman colleagues of the 91st Club and indeed, all Members of this House. May the good Lord in whose arms Julia rests give strength to sustain him during this time of great sorrow and a time which is, indeed a time of our sorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Connecticut in expressing to HAM FISH and his family our deepest condolences. It was my privilege to know Mrs. Fish and to see her many times during 1968 and subsequently. She was a wonderful wife and a wonderful mother. Her loss will be deeply felt by all.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the hearts of all of us go out to our colleague and his children who have been the victims of such a tragic accident. We were all shocked when the news of Mrs. Fish's death reached us. May God be with her family during this time of sadness.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the colleagues of Mr. FISH in the Committee on the Judiciary, we have all quickly come to know him, and he is an extremely able man. We all extend sympathy to him at this time.

TAX BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our tax laws provide appropriate benefits to servicemen stationed in and around Vietnam. But, inexplicably, those same tax laws do not provide similar benefits to servicemen in and around Korea.

I am today introducing legislation to correct this inequity.

The unhappy fact is that Korea continues to be a hostile area in which the tenuous peace is often broken by Communist attacks near the demilitarized zone. And, of course, the ill-fated *Pueblo* mission is evidence of the potential danger that can befall servicemen on ships in the waters around Korea.

It is only appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we accord servicemen facing danger in Korea the same benefits accorded to servicemen facing danger in Vietnam. I trust my colleagues will agree on the need for this legislation and I urge prompt action by the Congress.

PENNSYLVANIA NEARER GOAL TO LOWER VOTING AGE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I can now report to my colleagues that Pennsylvania has taken a big step toward lowering the voting age. Last Tuesday, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives gave its overwhelming approval to a proposed constitutional amendment that would reduce the minimum voting age in Pennsylvania to 19.

The measure will now go to conference with the Pennsylvania Senate which has already passed a measure to lower the voting age to 18. Though the two measures differ as to the minimum age, the important thing to note is that both houses gave their approval to the concept of reducing the voting age.

I am confident that the compromise will result in a lower voting age in Pennsylvania in the next few years and I take this opportunity to congratulate both bodies of the Pennsylvania Legislature for their action.

THE REVEREND EARL S. COX

(Mr. SCOTT was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of our Chaplain, Dr. Edward Latch, in affording one of my constituents and friend, the Reverend Earl S. Cox, the opportunity to open our session today with prayer.

I have attended church services at the Colonial Beach Baptist Church of which Reverend Cox is the pastor and have spoken to the membership of his church.

These are very fine Christian people and I welcome Reverend Cox and his wife who accompanied him to our session.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION TO THE NINTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that I wish to be released from my assignment as a Member of the United States Delegation to the Ninth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

I very much appreciate receiving the appointment to be one of the delegates from the United States, but because of some unexpected circumstances which have come up, I find it would not be possible for me to attend the Conference and herewith submit my resignation.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE U.S. DELEGATION OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. LUJAN, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7757, SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 336 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 336

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 336 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7757 to authorize supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces. The resolution also provides for waiving points of order against the committee amendment in the bill. The waiver was provided against the amendment due to the fact that the original bill had only one money item in it and there might be some question as to germaneness.

The total authorization proposed in the bill is $76 million—$62 million for the Army aircraft procurement account and $14 million for the Air Force procurement account.

Also, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the pay and allowance of not to exceed nine persons, including personnel detailed to International Military Headquarters and military organizations, at rates provided for under section 625(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

The $62 million authorization is for procurement by the Army of aircraft related items. The legislation does not authorize any additional fixed wing airplanes or helicopters. The $14 million authorization is for tooling and development of an improved F-5 airplane which will be used primarily in the military assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 336 in order that H.R. 7757 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has very ably explained House Resolution 336, providing for 1 hour of debate and waiving points of order and the reasons therefore, for consideration of H.R. 7757.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1969 for aircraft procurement and modification. The total authorization contained in the bill is $76,000,000.

Of this amount $62,000,000 is earmarked for the Army. Included are funds for the following:

XUM

[In thousands of dollars]

Operational improvements in the design and equipment of military observation planes	6,000
For helicopter modification	1,600
For purchase of aircraft spare parts and support material	50,800
Replacement of Government-owned plant equipment	2,700

The bill also provides $14,000,000 in authorizations for the Air Force. This is to be used to upgrade and improve the F–5 airplane, now being widely used by allied nations. As Russia puts more Mig-21's in use to replace the older Mig–17's and Mig–19's, we must meet this increased threat. The improvements in the F–5 will include improved onboard avionics and armaments and an increase in engine thrust.

Finally, ths bill authorizes appropriations of "such sums as may be necessary" for pay and allowances for up to nine persons detailed for duty at the International Military Headquarters and Military Organizations. These are such operations as the NATO headquarters.

There are no minority views. The prior administration supported the bill; no letter from the present administration is included in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE DURING THE WEEK BEGINNING MARCH 31

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have permission to sit next week during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER ON TUESDAY OR WEDNESDAY NEXT, H.R. 9328, PROVIDING SPECIAL PAY TO NAVAL OFFICERS IN SUBMARINE SERVICE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider under the general rules of the House on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week the bill H.R. 9328, to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this legislation which is for all members of the crew of a nuclear submarine?

Mr. RIVERS. Only the officers.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Only the officers?

Mr. RIVERS. Only the officers. The others are taken care of under the variable reenlistment bonus concept, for the enlisted men.

This is vital, Mr. Speaker. It involves about $2.4 million. It is so vital to our nuclear submarine program, both the Polaris and attack submarines. That is the reason why I take this unusual procedure. It is highly important for the retention of these people and the operation of our submarine fleet.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Has this bill been unanimously agreed to by the committee?

Mr. RIVERS. Unanimously.

I add this: It was sent over with the highest urgency by the Department of Defense and the Navy Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be a report accompanying the bill, and have hearings been held?

Mr. RIVERS. We had hearings. The report will be available on Monday.

Mr. GROSS. The report will be available on Monday, and the bill might be called up on Tuesday?

Mr. RIVERS. On Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7757, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 7757, authorizes appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

It authorizes $62 million additional appropriations for procurement by the Army of aircraft related items. It does not authorize any additional fixed-wing airplanes or helicopters. It does authorize an additional $14 million for tooling and development of an improved F–5 airplane which will be used primarily in the military assistance program. So the total amount to be appropriated in this bill is $76 million.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for procurement of missiles, naval vessels, or tracked combat vehicles.

The specific aircraft related items authorized are listed and explained on pages 2 and 3 of the report. The aircraft repair parts and support materiel lumped at $50.8 million is broken down further as follows; $4.3 million to support increased aircraft operations in Southeast Asia; $33 million for Army aircraft operations in Southeast Asia, to cover higher than anticipated wearout rates in some particular helicopter subassemblies; and $13.5 million necessary because of an increase in the pipeline requirement to support earlier than planned deployment of the new light observation helicopter in Southeast Asia.

You will notice in the report that the committee added $14 million to the authorization bill for modifying the F–5—Freedom Fighters—aircraft into an improved version which will be called the F–5–21. By taking advantage of the several improvements that have been funded by Canada, Norway, and the Netherlands, at a cost of more than $50 million, and by installing the increased thrust J85–21 engines, a significant increase in military effectiveness will be attained while retaining the desirable low-cost, high-utilization rates and excellent maneuverable qualities of the F–5 aircraft.

The characteristics of the F–5 offer a relevant solution to the question of essentially equipping our allies with modern fighter aircraft capable of defeating the advanced threat aircraft dispersed throughout the world by the Soviets. The need for superior fighter aircraft by the forward defense nations creates a requirement for an air-to-air fighter capable of successfully competing with the Mig–21 in large numbers but with supportable costs. The F–5–21 meets this requirement.

The F–5–21 is an aircraft that many of our allies can afford to purchase and most have the skills and resources to support. Our experience with the current F–5 in 15 foreign countries shows that even the less-developed nations will be able to support the F–5–21 with high availability rates. All of us recognize the fact that we must leave Vietnam just as soon as we can—honorably. The acceptance of this aircraft will permit the sustaining of an effective military air capability in Southeast Asia without our presence.

The F-5-21 program will also provide an improved fighter production base for potential needs of the United States.

Title II of the bill, "General Provisions," does not involve a request for supplemental funds for Southeast Asia. It provides authorization for appropriations for nine supergrade positions for personnel allocated to NATO-related agencies currently paid at rates prescribed under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The need for this authority arises from the decision to transfer the subject costs of international headquarters and organizations from the military assistance budget to the Defense budget.

This year, for the first time, the administration has included in the Department of Defense budget approximately $31 million of funding for operation and maintenance funds to support the U.S. share of the cost of the operation of NATO.

If the appropriations for this, as requested by the administration, are transferred to the Department of Defense from the military assistance program, then the authorizing legislation for these positions would no longer be valid, and the holders of these positions would have to be reduced to the level of grade 15.

I agree with the administration position that the expenses are incurred because of military functioning of our own Armed Forces and are not, in fact, of primary assistance to other participating countries. Thus the funding should be within the Department of Defense rather than as a portion of the military assistance program. We have cleared this matter with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as is shown by our report, and there is no objection on their part for this bill to authorizing these nine positions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a rather austere supplemental appropriations authorization to support our efforts in Southeast Asia. The request earlier submitted by the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clifford, was reviewed in detail and approved by Secretary Laird and his Deputy, Mr. Packard.

I urge the Members to support this supplemental authorization bill.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. KOCH. I very much appreciate the statement of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. What I would like to say is this: On the floor of the House yesterday when we were debating the course of this country's action in Vietnam—I made a statement that I would not from this point on—although I am only a freshman Member of the House of Representatives—that I would not vote for a single dollar for Vietnam war appropriations.

I notice that the gentleman from South Carolina particularly emphasized the fact that these moneys would be used in Southeast Asia and I assume he includes the Vietnamese war.

If that is the situation, then I would be opposed to such appropriation in its entirety, because I am not able to separate what will be used in Vietnam and what will be used elsewhere.

I would also like to advise the distinguished gentleman that I am not opposed to defense appropriations. I support them. I served, myself, in World War II as a combat infantryman. I know how important our defense needs are. But I am opposed to the War in Vietnam. I think it is an unconscionable war; I think it is an immoral war; and I believe we cannot wait for President Nixon or his administration to get us out of it. I want this Congress, myself included, to do something to demonstrate how our opposition to the present situation as it exists in Vietnam.

Therefore, I ask the gentleman whether one single dollar of this appropriation will be used in Vietnam?

Mr. RIVERS. As sure as the gentleman has two feet to stand on I can assure the gentleman that it is going to be used in Vietnam and the gentleman is entitled to his opinion. We have over 500,000 men in Vietnam and someone has got to provide for them and I am unwilling to expose our men to the dangers in that part of the world without the proper equipment and materiel which they needed yesterday. I am sure the gentleman has got to live with his conscience and that is his business. I do not impugn the gentleman's statement, nor do I depreciate any of his efforts. But if the gentleman does not want to vote for this bill, that is his prerogative.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KOCH. I would like for the gentleman to know that the depth of my feelings and love for this country and the security of our soldiers are, I believe, as strong as are the feelings of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. No question about it. I am sure of it.

Mr. KOCH. And the depth of my feelings for the defense of my country are as strong as anyone in this House. I love this country.

Mr. RIVERS. I know you are concerned about it.

Mr. KOCH. It is because I love this country that I think we ought to have a moral position. I think the war in Vietnam is immoral and unconscionable. Would not the gentleman agree with me that I ought not to vote a single dollar to be used in an immoral and unconscionable war?

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. But I am not going to get in any argument with the gentleman. The gentleman can do as he pleases. The gentleman has to live with his own conscience. I have no quarrel with the gentleman. I have been delighted to yield to him and I would not want him to feel for a million dollars that I do not want him to believe in what he believes. I have no quarrel with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the exception of the $14 million, I take it that this in the nature of a deficiency authorization; that is, the $62 million is in the nature of a deficiency because of the failure to appropriate enough money last year to take care of the needs set forth in the bill?

Mr. RIVERS. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that that was not entirely the case.

Let me answer the gentleman in this way: We cannot estimate the wearing out of helicopter parts, because there is some calculated risk involved. Part of this is due to wear and tear, and part of it for modifications to improve the equipment.

Mr. GROSS. Due to unexpected aircraft losses in Vietnam, the gentleman is saying, I assume?

Mr. RIVERS. We have lost quite a bit in this offensive that is going on now. We have lost an awful lot of things that we did not anticipate, but this is not in the manner of a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have been concerned—as have other members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—about the transferring of nine supergrades from NATO. I am satisfied with the letter which the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service put into the record. I want to say only that I believe the RECORD should, at this point, show that the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are agreed that this is a unique situation, and is not to be considered in any way as a precedent for the future.

Mr. RIVERS. Absolutely. And when we saw the possible conflict in jurisdiction I immediately addressed a letter to the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and received his approval before we even touched these people. And we did not want it to be considered as a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina for so doing.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7757, a bill authorizing appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. In rising in support of this bill, I do so as a substitute for the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BATES), who presently is in the hospital and, thus, unable to be here.

After hearing the chairman's statement, I realize there is very little left for me to say because he has covered this bill

XUM

in detail. I do want you gentlemen to know, however, that even though this is a small bill, it required 2 full days of committee hearings, and was unanimously passed by the House Armed Services Committee. We feel this measure is essential to provide the support required for our troops in Vietnam.

As the chairman has explained, this bill represents $14 million more than was requested. We feel this authorization for the additional $14 million will result in solid savings to the United States in the years to come, for it will enable our allies to equip their own forces with an efficient, modern airplane to cope with the ever-growing air strength of the Soviets.

Let me try to anticipate some of the questions you may have concerning this authorization:

First. Why should the United States invest $14 million at this time in an aircraft not in the U.S. inventory?

It is in the U.S. national interest that free world nations be able to maintain military air capability adequate to counter the threat of high performance Mig's dispersed throughout the world by the Soviets. The F–5–21 is a high performance improvement of the basic F–5 introduced into the U.S. mutual security program in 1959, both for grant aid and direct export sales. There are more than 700 of the aircraft programed for 16 different U.S. allies. Major purchasers such as Canada, the Netherlands, and Norway have invested more than $50 million in improvements. By minor U.S. investment we can take advantage of these and other advances now available to modify the F–5 into an improved production version. More recently, national policy has come to recognize, as President Nixon has pointed out, that the weapon systems we supply to our Allies should enable them to serve as a buffer to separate the United States from local and immediate threats of aggression. If these weapon systems make it possible for the using nations to contain the threat, the United States may be spared involvement and the world spared the consequences of great power action.

The aim is to make deployment and involvement of U.S. Air Forces unnecessary. We seek by every means, to every extent possible, to enable indigenous forces to contain local threats. This is the policy context in which the F–5–21 weapon system was initiated in 1959. It is within the same context that these improvements should be added. A reasonable basis for establishing the market potential for this aircraft is the replacement of the 2,000 obsolete F–84, F–86, G–91 and F–100's currently being operated within the force structure of free world nations. These aircraft cannot operate successfully in an active Mig environment. Obsolescence, high operation and maintenance costs dictate that these aircraft be replaced if combat capable force levels are to be maintained.

Some of these nations may not buy the F–5–21; and it may be judged not in the best interest of the United States to make high performance aircraft available to others. Even so, it is conservatively estimated that the F–5–21 will be selected as the replacement for 20 to 50 percent of the current inventories of F–84's, F–86's, G–91's and F–100's. If it is the upper number, this would result in production of at least 1,000 aircraft. If it is the lower number, 400 aircraft would be produced or a potential dollar flow of from $800 million to $2 billion.

Second. Will the U.S. recoup its investment in the $14 million? The U.S. objective is to provide underwriting as a means of capturing a sizable portion of the market potential that has been identified. A DOD armed service procurement regulation provides policy guidance for recoupment of R. & D. investment. Under the provisions of this directive, surcharges are applied and the funds so obtained are returned to the U.S. Treasury. Military sales negotiations for this aircraft would consider terms and degree of recoupment, and it is reasonable to expect that most, if not all, would be recovered.

Third. What is the precedent for the United States to invest in a project of this nature?

The N–156—F–5—aircraft was developed by the U.S. Government for the express purpose of providing free world forces with an economic and effective weapon system under the Mutual Security Act of 1959, as well as for direct sales. To date, 405 F–5's have been sold to eight different countries. An additional 300 were provided under grant aid.

Fourth. How does Conte-Long amendment affect this program?

The Conte-Long amendment would apply. Sales or grant aid provisions of the F–5–21 to underdeveloped nations would require presidential determination.

Fifth. Why does not Northrop, the aircraft company responsible for this airplane, invest the $14 million?

U.S. foreign policy is always a predominate factor in determining the extent of military equipment sales to foreign governments. Most such sales are conducted on a government-to-government basis, and all must support foreign policy and be in the best interest of the U.S. Government. Necessary and basic government constraints limit contractor freedom in the development of foreign military business and preclude contractor investment risk to develop these markets. Government leadership in the development of major weapon systems is therefore necessary. The F–5 program has been carried out under the procedures for weapon systems development established by the Department of Defense, and the modification into F–5–21 is part of the same program.

I am hopeful that this answers any questions you may have had as far as the $14 million add-on is concerned.

Insofar as title II of the bill is concerned, we realize that this is a somewhat unique departure from the course which has been followed in the past. But both the former and present administrations have recommended funding for NATO headquarters be made from the Defense budget rather than the foreign assistance budget, beginning with fiscal year 1970. Title II is thus necessary to continue these positions to remain at their current levels if the appropriations are transferred to the Defense Department.

We very carefully checked this with and have the concurrence of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I urge your support of this bill which unanimously passed our committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote "no" on this supplemental military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1969.

I do so, first, because a substantial proportion of this authorization is required "to support increased aircraft operations in Southeast Asia." I believe that instead of intensifying our aircraft operations in Vietnam, we should be slowing them down. As I stated on the floor yesterday during the special orders on Vietnam, I believe the recent offensive launched by Hanoi and the Vietcong was a response to our intensified operations undertaken in the last few months. The road to peace in Vietnam lies through a cease-fire, or at least deceleration of military activities, accompanied by more intensive efforts to negotiate a political settlement. The bill before us points in the wrong direction.

I am also opposed to H.R. 7757 because certain aspects of this legislation involve matters of foreign policy which should have come before the Foreign Affairs Committee for review. I refer particularly to the $14 million added to the bill, although not originally requested by the administration, for the purpose of modernizing at U.S. Government expense aircraft sold to allied countries. This clearly constitutes military assistance and should be considered as part of the foreign aid program. I refer also to title II which concerns pay and allowances for personnel performing functions under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This title was proposed by the Department of Defense and reported out by the Armed Services Committee without even any notice to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

It is essential, in my judgment, that the constant efforts of the military to take action affecting foreign affairs without adequate consultation with those responsible for the foreign policies of this country be resisted.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity we have had in the 91st Congress to consider funds for the military. While H.R. 7757, which authorizes a supplemental military appropriation, contains no provision for new procurement, I feel this is an appropriate time to discuss the overall problems connected with the military segment of the Federal budget.

This bill comes to the floor in the midst of a flurry of public discussion of national issues. I would like to take this time to make some recommendations to the new administration on what national priorities should be followed in our foreign, domestic, and fiscal affairs.

There is no question that our economy is in dire straits. Both fiscal and monetary restraint are needed to reverse the trend.

The core of the problem, is not the reduction of domestic expenditures and domestic programs which have already been substantially reduced from authorized levels.

XUM

The American people, through taxes and through reduced Federal spending on urban, social, and environmental problems, have already undergone considerable sacrifice in an attempt to stem inflation in this wartime economy.

In large measure, these sacrifices have been borne by the American people in behalf of the people of South Vietnam. I think that the target of efforts to curtail Federal spending must be in the defense and the military field—and the emphasis must be on reducing the cost, in lives, in dollars and in frustration, of the war in Vietnam.

I believe that the Nixon administration is concentrating a great deal of effort on the solution of this war. The President's responses to questions on this subject have been forthright, accurate, and honest, as have those of his Cabinet. The picture in Southeast Asia is gloomy. But it has been gloomy since the beginning of this decade. The picture here at home grows even gloomier as the war drags on.

Many Members of this body and of the Senate have underscored the growing problem of inflation and skyrocketing interest rates in our overheated economy.

Yesterday, the President asked Congress to continue the surtax for another year, and to delay reductions in certain excise taxes, in an effort to stem the tide of inflation. He coupled his request with a pledge to recommend substantial reductions in Federal spending.

Earlier this week, it was recommended that an all-out moratorium on public works of every variety be declared as the core of a Federal attack on inflation and rising interest rates.

In the midst of high-level discussions on the necessity of making reductions in domestic spending, and on the necessity of continuing the surtax, we have not made any moves toward reduced military expenditures.

Quite the contrary, the administration has asked for minimum deployment of the "safeguard" ABM system, costing upwards of $6 to $8 billion. It is in the process of finalizing an agreement with the totalitarian government of Spain, under which we would pay Franco for permission to maintain four military bases in his country for the next 5 years.

I understand that the negotiated settlement with Franco is to cost upwards of $100 million in military aid. The bases themselves cost $50 million a year to operate.

I think that the need for these facilities, particularly when their retention hinges on our support of a totalitarian government, must be very carefully reviewed before we finalize this agreement or curtail any domestic programs.

Troop commitments in Europe and elsewhere in the world should also be carefully combed to determine their necessity. I was most encouraged by the President's stated intention to seek more equitable participation from our NATO allies which could hopefully result in some reduction in U.S. military costs in Europe.

But even careful and cost-conscious reviews of these military expenditures will produce little, without an all-out effort to end the $35 billion per year drain of the Vietnam war.

Conditions which I will allow the United States to drastically reduce its manpower commitment in Vietnam must be brought about immediately. The temper of Congress and the people of this country will tolerate no hint of the dragging escalation we have faced over the past 5 years.

The U.S. economy is about to burst. Inflation is almost uncontrollable. Interest rates are climbing past record heights. And no let up is in sight. The people of the United States are fed up with increased spending necessitated by the war. They are few up with diversion of these moneys from urgently needed domestic programs.

The people of this country are not going to allow our present prosperity to go out the window because of the exorbitant cost of this war. Strong and immediate action is indicated to resolve this problem.

Secretary Laird, in a gloomy report to the Congress on the military status of the war, said he could not foresee any early withdrawal of American ground troops.

The North Vietnamese and Vietcong have clearly violated whatever private understanding led to the cessation of our bombing in the north. Once again the cities of South Vietnam are under mortar and rocket attack. To ward off a repeat of last year's pitched battles in the streets of Saigon and Hue, United States and South Vietnamese ground action has put us on the brink of a serious escalation.

If we respond to this state of affairs by escalating our role in the ground war, we will make the Paris talks even more fruitless and hopeless.

Thirteen months ago, I returned from Vietnam, urging our Government to sit down with the South Vietnamese and set a deadline for withdrawal of U.S. troops. Their battle stations would be manned by U.S.-equipped Asian troops, mostly the ARVN. In February 1968, I suggested 6 to 12 months as a reasonable deadline for the start of gradual American troop withdrawals.

Since then, our Defense Department stepped up efforts to prepare the South Vietnamese forces for eventual takeover of the fighting, but we have made no effort to set up a firm timetable under which such a takeover would take place.

So far, this "talk and fight" waiting game has grown ever so costly in terms of American lives lost, American dollars spent, and in terms of inflation and budget acrobatics needed to remain true to commitments at home.

How long will we wait to make the judgment that the Vietnamese are ready, with our financial and equipment support, to resume their own defense? Will we wait until the level of the fighting has escalated to a point where they could not possibly step into our shoes and hold their own?

The time has arrived for curtailing U.S. involvement in this Asian land war. The time has passed for waiting and postponing.

We have already learned that we cannot rely on the North Vietnamese and their Vietcong allies to behave honorably or honestly. They serve only their own interests. If we wait until the Communists agree to make real sacrifices to achieve peace or deescalation, we may wait forever—which means losing 100 to 400 American men a week for as long as it takes. This price is intolerable.

While it is possible for the Vietnamese to fully relieve us from the ground combat responsibilities, it is far less likely that their air force and navy can be improved to the point where these forces would have the same effectiveness as our own air and sea strike, and firepower potential.

The edge that the United States has gained against the elusive Communist guerilla is largely a result of the firepower and mobility of our air and sea forces.

Our cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam was a sincere effort to bring about a deescalation of action on both sides, and to bring about meaningful peace talks. Despite our hopes and our understanding that attacks on South Vietnamese cities would be cut back by the Communists, the North Vietnamese have so far sacrificed only the air fare of their delegation to the Paris peace table. They have curtailed neither infiltration nor their attacks on South Vietnam's population centers.

My proposal is straight forward and simple. The United States immediately should withdraw one combat and one support unit from the U.S. Army or U.S. Marine contingents in South Vietnam. We should determine with the South Vietnamese, a schedule for further gradual withdrawals to reduce the total of Army and Marine units substantially by the end of this year.

Until the South Vietnamese are convinced that we really intend to pull out, they will drag their feet and try to put off our first withdrawal date as long as possible.

So far, they have successfully held us back from pursuing any plan of gradual withdrawal in earnest. They have prevented us from giving proper attention to our economic and social problems at home, and our friendships elsewhere in the world.

We should announce this initial withdrawal as a unilateral, deescalatory move on our part.

At the same time, we must openly declare that the North Vietnamese have violated the understanding of October 31, 1968, and, that we expect, if the peace talks are to be meaningful and mutual, that the North Vietnamese will make some similar move to deescalate.

The President has already issued the one and only warning he need make. He has put the North Vietnamese on notice that further escalation on their part will be responded to.

This would serve to affirm our pledge to the South Vietnamese that our air and naval forces will be ready to repel all escalatory moves by the Communists despite the fact that we plan to quickly scale down our ground war participation.

We can no longer arrest progress in America because of our heavy involvement in a war whose course is determined by the whim of our Communist enemies and by the lack of self-confidence of our South Vietnamese friends.

Their dependency on American young men for the defense of their country must end. The timetable for ending this dependency must be based on the needs and priorities of the American people and not solely on those of the South Vietnamese.

Within a few days, more young men will have been killed in Vietnam than in the Korean war. Earlier this week the names of more than 31,000 servicemen who died in this war were put before this House.

Increased casualty figures, the stagnant situation in Paris, and the unpromising report of the Secretary of Defense on the curent military situation are all discouraging.

The figures add up to the need for American initiative at this point to break the threatening cycle of escalation on the ground, and to end the continuing dependency of the South Vietnamese on American lives for their defense.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, Congress has already appropriated $74,139,000,000 for fiscal year 1969 to the Defense Department—the largest military allocation in the history of the United States. In the debate on the military appropriations bill on September 12, 1968, I said that the size of the Department of Defense's budget was the product "of the outdated cold war mentality, the excessive growth of the military-industrial complex, and, most of all, the war in Vietnam, which is the culmination of disastrously mistaken policies." Nevertheless, the arguments of those of us who opposed this disproportionate emphasis on military spending did not prevail.

In spite of the fact that the Department of Defense's budget for fiscal year 1969 is the highest allocation by the Federal Government to a single agency in the history of the United States, the Department of Defense—or at least some of its proponents—are still not satisfied with their billions. For the bill we have before us today, H.R. 7757, asks for the authorization to appropriate an additional $76 million to the Army and the Air Force for the procurement and modification of aircraft.

Above and beyond the question of the need for this authorization, there is a serious question about what kind of planning is represented by this request for additional authorization of $76 million. This is not a request for a supplemental appropriation for funds authorized but not appropriated by Congress. The items for which authorization is sought in this bill were not even included in the Department's fiscal year 1969 budget presentation. Yet, the Department—scarcely 6 months after their budget was considered by Congress—is back again, requesting authorization for the allocation of funds which it apparently did not think important enough to include in its fiscal year 1969 budget. I think this request demands the closest scrutiny by Congress—a scrutiny this body has been far too reluctant to invoke in the past.

The Army already has an authorization of $735.4 million for the procurement of aircraft during fiscal year 1969, and was appropriated $735.2 million for that purpose.

The Air Force received an authorization of $5.2 billion and an appropriation of $3.86 billion for the procurement of aircraft during fiscal year 1969.

Why cannot the Army and the Air Force simply shift priorities within the budget appropriated to them by Congress if these items are so imperatively needed? Why do they seek additional authorization above and beyond that sought in the fiscal year 1969 budget which they submitted to Congress?

In the case of the Army, according to the hearings held on March 11 and 12, 1969, before the House Armed Services Committee, the Army is requesting $62 million in additional authorization because the need for modifications of existing aircraft became clear only "as a result of lessons learned during the Communist Tet offensive in early 1968." The effects of that offensive, General Miley testified in the course of the hearings, motivated the decision "to accelerate the improvement and modernization of the Republic of South Vietnam Armed Forces." At least part of this additional authorization is needed, however, according to the testimony of John Blandford, chief counsel for the Armed Services Committee, because the Army did not have the forethought to request the modifications now deemed necessary when it placed the order for the AH–1G light observation helicopter with Hughes Aircraft. In the words of Mr. Blandford, "the Army did not know what they wanted."

The portion of this bill which requests an additional $14 million authorization to the Air Force for the F–5 and F–5–21 aircraft was apparently not sought at any time by the Air Force—neither during its budget presentation to the Congress last year nor even, for that matter, from the Armed Services Committee 2 weeks ago. At page 535 of the hearings, Gen. Duward Crow, the director of the budget for the Air Force, said: "We are not asking for authorization, sir." The impetus for the request for the additional $14 million authorization apparently came primarily from the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The money sought would be used, in Chief Counsel Blandford's words, as an "initial increment for the retooling of the Northrup Aviation plant to go from the production of F–5's to the production of the F–5–21" which entails, among other things, a new engine, better radar coverage, and the installation of two machineguns.

The Department of the Air Force, according to the testimony of General Crow, has no plans for utilizing this plane in our own aircraft inventories. In response to a question from our colleague, Congressman Pike as to whether the Air Force intended to acquire this plane itself, General Crow replied:

> We do not have an approved program for this aircraft in our inventory.

Mr. Pike went on:

> So the purpose of this expenditure is to build a plane which we can sell to other countries, under our military-assistance program.

General Crow affirmed that "that is the primary purpose"—hearings page 525.

If the Air Force does not plan to use this plane itself, it would seem that this $14 million—and the additional $62 which the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has indicated he will later seek for this plane—is nothing more than a subsidy to Northrup Aviation designed to encourage them to convert their production line so as to be able to turn out greater quantities of the F–5–21 for sale abroad.

This raises several questions. First, does this authorization mean that the Armed Services Committee, and not the Foreign Affairs Committee, now has authority over the military assistance program? Chairman Rivers believes it does. If he is correct, I think this committee's approval of a subsidy to Northrup Aviation—for a plane which our own Air Force has no plans to utilize—should prompt Congress to question whether or not control of our military assistance program should be with the Armed Services Committee. Second, is not this appropriation inconsistent with the provisions of the Conte-Long amendment, which is designed to discourage the sale of sophisticated weaponry to underdeveloped countries? I think it is.

More importantly, however, I think both of these requests for authorization for the expenditure of more funds on weapons—and especially the $14 million sought for the manufacture of a plane which our own Air Force has no plans to incorporate into its inventory—are yet another example of the tragic imbalance of our spending priorities. While our cities rot and our air is polluted, while millions of Americans continue to suffer from inadequate educational and economic opportunities, Congress is being asked to pour still more money into the hands of the strategists who have led us into the bloody morass of the Vietnam war.

To support these requests for more money is to support our present budgetary imbalance. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and to turn the money requested instead tc the urgent domestic needs of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Sec. 101. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 90–500, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: for the Army, $62,000,000.

XUM

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 2: Strike the period, and insert a semicolon and insert "for the Air Force, $14,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the pay and allowance of not to exceed nine persons, including personnel detailed to International Military Headquarters and Military Organizations, at rates provided for under section 625(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 336, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 21, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—341

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Kee
King
Kleppe
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McCulloch
McKneally
McMillan
Mass.
Macdonald,
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—21

Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Chisholm
Clay
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Hawkins
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Koch
Lowenstein
Mikva
Mosher
Nix
Podell
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Stokes

NOT VOTING—68

Abbitt
Alexander
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Blatnik
Brademas
Brock
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cowger
Dawson
Dent
Dingell
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Fish
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gray
Hébert
Howard
Jonas
Keith
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
McDonald, Mich.
Mann
Miller, Calif.
Mizell
Morton
O'Hara
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Price, Tex.
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Sebelius
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Teague, Tex.
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Keith.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Price.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Mann.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 7757, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I was in the city of Boston this morning attending a funeral of a very close personal friend, and I had hoped to get back in time for the debate and the rollcall on the appropriations bill for aircraft.

Unfortunately I was unable to arrive at the Capitol until after the vote had been completed. Had I been present and able to vote I would have voted in favor of the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT TODAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate and special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A 5-YEAR LABOR CONTRACT SIGNED BY LOCAL NO. 5

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 11 a.m. a 5-year labor-management contract was signed between Local No. 5 of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America—AFL-CIO—and the Quincy, Mass. division of General Dynamics.

A similar long-term contract was signed and ratified last December by local No. 90 of the same union. Thus the 6,300 production and clerical workers of the Quincy Shipyard are covered by labor-management contracts extending to March 16, 1974.

This is an important labor-management agreement of unusual significance. It is a long-term commitment by this company and this union to the future of shipbuilding in the United States. It assures that this shipyard, with its long and distinguished history, with its outstanding technical capabilities, and its broad design and shipbuilding experience is totally devoted and committed to the marine requirements of this country.

I congratulate the union and the company on this honorable agreement and particularly on their expression of mutual confidence in what they can do together at Quincy.

I also commend the employees in both unions for their overwhelming and enthusiastic endorsement and ratification.

This is certainly good news for all concerned: The 8,500 employees, the community, the Commonwealth, the Navy, and the Maritime Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I welcome the statement made by my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts. This is good news not only to the southeastern section of Massachusetts but also for our Nation. It means that a labor agreement has been reached under the highest traditions of good labor-management negotiations. The officers of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America—AFL-CIO—and the officials of General Dynamics Division at the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., are to be congratulated. The labor-management stability at the Fore River yard should go a long way in convincing private shipping companies, our Maritime Commission, and the Department of Defense that the Quincy Fore River Shipyard is a good place to build ships. I conclude by saying the able and hard-working Congressman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) has been in the vanguard in Congress leading the fight for a strong Navy and effective merchant marine.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the Speaker and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) in noting the successful resolution of differences at the General Dynamics Fore River Yard. It is most gratifying to learn that the Ship Building Workers of America—in particular, local No. 5—and General Dynamics have resolved their differences, and that stability of operations can be anticipated for at least a 5-year period.

The shipbuilders of this Nation have a long and glorious record. Much of it has been written in southeastern Massachusetts. I hope and I believe that we can recapture our preeminence in this field.

Our Nation needs not only the world's best Navy, but we also need the world's foremost merchant marine. To achieve and maintain these desirable objectives we need the capability and we need the cooperation which is evident in this new contract.

I join with JIMMY BURKE and Speaker McCORMACK in congratulating both management and labor, and especially Bob Laney and Ronnie Orcott, representing management and labor. They worked diligently and effectively to keep the Fore River Yard of General Dynamics turning out the world's finest ships.

PERSONAL TAX EXEMPTIONS MUST BE RAISED

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, all of us here are personally familiar with the rising cost of living which has plagued our Nation almost continuously for the past two or three decades. On occasion even the Government has addressed itself to the problem of inflation, usually without much success. Meanwhile, our national tax structure continues to exact its measure from the pittance of the poor, a class created in large measure by the very taxes they are required to pay. The burden of taxes, including the silent tax we call inflation, rests most onerously upon the working man and woman, the small businessman, the aged, the disabled, the young who are just starting out in life, and all those who for whatever reason are destitute. I can think of no better way, in the absence of a complete overhaul of the Internal Revenue laws, to ease the financial burdens of these millions of citizens than by increasing the present personal and dependent exemptions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to increase the individual taxpayer's personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $1,200. This increase would also apply to a spouse and dependents, and additional exemptions are provided for the aged and the blind.

I think it is important to remember that personal exemptions under the Revenue Act of 1913, which established the foundation of our present tax system, were $3,000 for a single person and $4,000 for a couple. And as late as 1939 the personal exemptions were $1,000 for a single person and $2,500 for a couple. In light of such liberal exemptions in those years when living costs were small in comparison to our present standards, my proposal certainly is not exorbitant.

It is a sad commentary on the honesty of the Federal Government when we see some of the very wealthy completely escape taxation while the Internal Revenue Service hounds the last nickel from the pockets of the worker, or when we see giant financial corporations evade taxation because they are technically nonprofit while scores of small businessmen are driven out of business each year because they cannot make a profit under our tax laws. These familiar inequities have suddenly become the Nation's greatest injustices. And I need not remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that unless we act to relieve the tax burdens of the needy, it will be fairly said of us that we saw our way clear to end our own financial hardship but that we did not have compassion enough to relieve the suffering of our fellowmen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE GREAT OIL CAPER

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Humble Oil Refining Co., domestic affiliate of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and largest purchaser of crude oil in the United States, has announced increases in the price it would pay for crude. This price increase was announced on Friday, March 21, 1969.

Taking note of "competitive conditions" in which many other oil companies have raised prices in recent weeks, Humble has posted increases between 5 cents and 10 cents a barrel at various points throughout the Nation. These new prices are effective right now.

This is the second round of increases recently. Marathon Oil Co. said it raised its posted prices 5 cents a barrel in Illinois and Michigan, effective March 15.

Charming. Smoothly done. Superb. The oil barons have sunk another well into the pockets of the American consumer in a way to make Machiavelli applaud.

As the largest purchaser of crude oil in the Nation, Humble has cracked the whip, and the rest of this "very competitive" industry will follow, in the name of competition. Heaven help us. But Humble is an umbrella corporation, buying crude oil from subsidiaries it owns. Please note that Standard Oil Co. is another name for Humble Oil Co. So again we see that a group of oil barons in a board room have decided to raise prices they charge themselves for crude oil, thus

XUM

allowing them to take greater oil depletion allowances. Then these altruistic, courageous, patriotic oil barons will turn to the American public with long faces, stating that because the price of crude oil has gone up, they will have to grudgingly raise prices of oil, gasoline, and related products.

We should applaud such performances. It is the shrewdest, cleverest, and most diabolical method of extortion by an industry of the consuming public ever attempted—in broad daylight. No reason in the world exists for this rise in prices. Let every consumer in America now digging so deep to pay taxes examine this. Taxes are high for lower and middle income wage earners, while they stay low or virtually nonexistent for the wealthy. All the while, major malefactors such as the oil industry gleefully add that last straw by accomplishing this latest extraction from the pockets of millions upon millions of people.

If this is public service, then so will your local sheriff dance "Swan Lake" in a tutu in the business district during rush hour. Then so do we need to give distinguished service awards to presidents of oil companies.

Standard of New Jersey is quite a giant. In 1967, it paid $166 million in Federal taxes on net income before taxes of $2,098,283,000—or 7.9 percent of its income.

Mr. Speaker, today and tonight, several hundred poor American youngsters will be arrested by police throughout the Nation for small crimes. Petty thievery, petty larceny, breaking into a place of business, and so forth. Many of these young people will be arraigned, brought to trial, convicted, and sent to reform school or jail. Yet I do ask: If we send these youngsters to reform school or jail for such crimes, what do we do about a major oil company that does what Humble has just done? Throw them a testimonial dinner and bleat about patriotism and public service? Present them with a plaque? Or perhaps it might be a silver wheelbarrow for them to use in taking home all their loot? Let the people ponder it. Let the oil barons think about it.

UNITED NATIONS SHOULD ESTABLISH RELIEF FOOD FORCE FOR NIGERIA-BIAFRA

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly today about a matter that is increasingly bothering my conscience. I speak of the tragedy of Nigeria/Biafra where hundreds of thousands are starving because of a lack of food. Hunger and death from starvation in Nigeria/Biafra is not a matter of debate; the international relief organizations, the responsible press, members of the United States Congress have all witnessed the daily toll of children, the elderly, the sick and even mature adults.

Up until now it appeared that there might be a reasonably prompt resolution to the conflict in Nigeria. United States policy and that of the Organization of African Unity was to work only through the usual procedures of the international relief organizations to relieve the suffering of civilians in the federal and Biafran regions of Nigeria.

But it has become clear that this reliance on the usual relief procedures is not working. Already short protein food supplies being flown into Biafra are likely to decrease because of the rainy season which is about to begin and because of the aggressive actions of the federal air force. In addition, supplies of carbohydrates are dwindling, adding to the already tragic situation.

In the face of this international tragedy, I do not believe that the United States can refrain any longer from exerting its leadership. As the only major power not directly involved in this conflict, we have a responsibility to find an effective method of preventing further starvation.

I have proposed to Secretary Rogers that we use all our influence to get the United Nations to establish a relief food force for Nigeria/Biafra. As a part of that influence, I suggest that we offer transportation, food, and security forces for use by the United Nations.

Failing our attempts to get the United Nations to set up relief food centers, I suggest that the United States establish such centers with the international relief organizations or even unilaterally. I believe that we can do no less.

Some excused the failure of other nations to prevent the deaths of millions of Jews prior and during World War II on the basis that most people did not know of the situation. We know about the starvation in Nigeria/Biafra—the conscience of our citizens demands that we do something about it.

I include my letter to Secretary Rogers in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Shortly after you took office I wrote to you expressing my concern about the tragedy of Nigeria/Biafra. Verified reports of massive starvation in the Biafran region of Nigeria and in the Federal area as well led me to urge that you and President Nixon place this problem high on the list of priorities for attention. I welcomed your thoughtful reply and subsequent appointment of a personal representative by President Nixon, Professor Ferguson.

I am concerned, however, that the efforts of international relief agencies to feed the starving of Nigeria/Biafra are proving totally inadequate. Even the limited protein food shipments that are now reaching Biafra via Uli Airport are probably going to be curtailed by bad weather and air action by the Federal forces. And shortages of carbohydrates, further increasing the death rate, are expected to occur in April and May. These food shortages can only increase the already appalling death rate.

I, for one find it difficult to understand the actions of the Federal and Biafran forces that stand in the way of efforts to supply emergency food. But I find even more incomprehensible the inaction of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in the face of this disaster. If international organizations are unable even to provide relief to non-combatants, there would appear to be little future for them. Some excused the failure to prevent the deaths of millions of Jews prior and during World War II, for example, on the basis that we did not know of the catastrophe. In Nigeria/Biafra we know—but our relief efforts remain ineffective. Is it any wonder that our young people question our commitment to the moral values that we profess?

I suggest that the United States exert the world leadership in the Nigerian/Biafran situation that falls on us as the only major world power not directly involved in this conflict. I believe that we should:

1. Ask for a meeting of the Security Council to consider a resolution establishing a relief food force in Nigeria/Biafra on the basis that failure to provide effective relief may lead to further involvement of other countries in this conflict. If necessary, ask for a special session of the General Assembly to consider the same resolution. A vote on this resolution would show clearly which countries stand in the way of attempts to resolve this conflict.

2. Offer transportation equipment, food and personnel as well as any necessary security forces to establish relief food terminals in Nigeria/Biafra under the auspices of the U.N. and the O.A.U.

3. State that we will set up such terminals in cooperation with I.C.R.C. and other international relief organizations if U.N. and O.A.U. won't sponsor them.

4. State that we find unacceptable the international failure to provide relief in face of the know tragedy and exert the strongest pressure on involved nations to see, that as a minimum, effective relief measures are taken.

I do not feel that the United States can delay strong positive actions any further. To do so would be to cast doubt on our humanity. Although there may have been some arguments for refraining from involvement in the affairs of another country when it appeared that the conflict would be resolved quickly that condition no longer seems to apply. Our international responsibility now is to the starving of Nigeria/Biafra—not to the political powers engaged in civil struggle. I believe that we can and should move to set up effective food relief centers now. I urge you, Mr. Secretary, to give these recommendations your most careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT-IMPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS VENTURES ABROAD ARE DAMAGING ECONOMIC INTERESTS

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern that Government-imposed restrictions on American business ventures abroad are damaging the economic interests of our country. Restraints on U.S. foreign direct investments were imposed in February of 1965 as a temporary measure to alleviate our balance-of-payments difficulties and the drain on our dollars.

The temporary restraints were reluctantly adopted in order to buy time to get at the root causes of our balance-of-payments problem. Our difficulties are owed mainly to large and continuing government offshore expenditures for defense purposes, foreign aid, military assistance, and other international commitments. Our allies and trading partners are not bearing a fair share of the burdens of maintaining a defense shield for the free world nor of providing assistance to less developed countries.

U.S. exports and our dollar-earning assets abroad are the mainstay in our balance of payments. The private sector has made a net contribution of $60 billion to our international accounts since 1950 but Government outflows amounted to more than $92 billion.

Restrictions on American overseas investments are now in the fifth year. They are damaging the competitive position of American companies in world markets while mortgaging the future of our balance of payments.

The President has pledged that he will end these self-defeating controls and restore to American businessmen freedom to invest abroad. Secretary of Commerce Stans has expressed good intentions for terminating the mandatory program. The question is when.

We have been repeatedly assured the restraints would be ended "as soon as possible" but we are in the fifth year and the controls are assuming the look of permanency. Business is entitled to know now when the program will be terminated so that companies can proceed with the forward-planning essential to the expansion of our dollar-earning assets abroad. This is the proper approach for strengthening our balance of payments.

James G. Morton, director of government relations for the Manufacturing Chemists Association, astutely summed up the case for terminating the mandatory program in an appearance before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.

I wish to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Mr. Morton who has earned the trust and respect of Members of Congress in both parties because of his objectivity, intellectual honesty, and grasp of economic affairs:

STATEMENT OF JAMES G. MORTON, FORMER SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1969

My name is James G. Morton. Before returning to private industry I served successively as special assistant to three Cabinet officers during a five and a half year period from 1962 to 1967. I was a principal assistant to Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor when the United States Government curtailed foreign direct investments in February of 1965 and am testifying as a former official involved in the program.

It is a privilege to appear before this Committee to discuss U.S. foreign economic policy and to urge adoption of the bipartisan House Concurrent Resolutions 85 and 86 calling for an end to the self-defeating restrictions on American business ventures abroad.

These resolutions offered by Representative John V. Tunney of California, together with 42 Republican and Democratic members of the House, reflect the mounting concern over the mandatory controls on foreign investments which are damaging the competitive position of American companies and mortgaging the nation's economic future.

The decade of the sixties has been an era of unparalleled economic expansion for the world. We have been following an unwise and harmful policy of restrictionism when we should be encouraging American businessmen to seize the opportunities of the times.

Restrictionism represents a confused negative, and contradictory approach to the pursuit of our economic and foreign policy objectives and to the world's needs. It offers no meaningful or durable solutions to our complicated international problems, only the crutch of expediency.

Full participation of American companies in the growth of foreign markets is fundamental to our economic well-being. The expansion of our foreign earnings is a critical factor in supporting U.S. foreign policy objectives and in attaining a favorable balance of payments.

The mandatory controls, invoked as a stopgap measure during a monetary emergency, will in the longer term reduce the foreign income needed to offset the large and continuing government offshore expenditures which are responsible for the deficits in our international accounts.

Between 1950 and 1967 the net contribution of the private sector to the balance of payments was nearly $60 billion whereas net government outflows amounted to $92.6 billion.

Dollar outflows for U.S. foreign direct investment totaled $33.7 billion from 1950 to 1968 compared with inflows in the form of earnings, royalties, and fees of $69.5 billion. Overseas investments during the period of our balance of payments difficulties bulwarked the private account with a net contribution of $35.8 billion.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the host of restrictions placed on the private sector, rather than materially improving our future balance of payments outlook. may worsen it by "killing the goose that lays the golden egg."

The time has come to call a halt to the restrictionist course that has pervaded our foreign economic policy throughout this decade and inhibited U.S. gains in the world's growth.

Long-term credits were restricted through the Interest Equalization Tax in 1963 and bank and non-bank controls by the Federal Reserve Board. President Johnson later invoked the Gore amendment to apply the tax to foreign loans by banks and other financial institutions.

Voluntary restraints were imposed on U.S. foreign direct investments and on foreign lending in 1965 and were extended and progressively tightened in the two years to follow.

There were several attempts to restrain the overseas travel of American citizens but the administration backed off in the face of bitter opposition on the part of the public and on Capitol Hill.

Within the government the possibility of restricting the overseas transfer of American technology which is of vital importance to continued world development is now being examined. This would add a new and tragic dimension to the policy of restrictionism.

The imposition of stringent mandatory controls on foreign investments with criminal penalties for violators was effected in January of 1968 by executive order based on grounds of dubious legality. While the negative effects of the mandatory program are the immediate consideration of these hearings, there is the larger fundamental question whether it is not time to reorient our foreign economic policy outward to the realities and opportunities of an expanding world economy.

The hearings before this Committee will serve to illuminate the vital importance of U.S. private investments abroad and the need for compatible, forward-looking foreign trade and investment policies which will release the creative forces of American enterprise to achieve the maximum benefits for our country.

International investment has been one of the most powerful forces for progress in the free world in the resurgent years following World War II. The dynamic growth generated by capital ventures has lifted living standards across the continents and demonstrated vast potentials for attacking hunger, poverty, ignorance, and human despair.

International investment has opened up new fields of production, employment, and income. It has broadened the flow of technology and trade. It has strengthened the economic structures which support our efforts to achieve a rational, stable, and progressive world order.

The United States has been the leader in committing capital, technology, management skills, and other private resources to world development. While benefitting our own country economically, our foreign investments are also contributing to the growth and prosperity of our free world trading partners.

U.S. private investments, along with foreign assistance programs, have been indispensable in establishing the conditions for stability and progress in the less developed areas of the world, most particularly in those nations which are our hemispheric neighbors.

American investment in other countries has provided a major stimulus to production at home and abroad; and we are mindful that production is the wellspring of wealth.

Continued restraint on these investments will inevitably affect the level and structure of world trade and retard the growth rate. Should the world's growth rate fail to stay apace of the world's growing needs, we would face problems of a magnitude that would dwarf our balance of payments difficulties. We would face not monetary crises but worldwide convulsions.

U.S. businessmen have invested some $60 billion or more outside our borders. These investments have created and expanded foreign markets, strengthened the competitive position of American companies, and increased the flow of exports.

Our offshore producers are quick to seize opportunities to create markets for the manufactures of their home-based parent companies and are constantly increasing exports by adding to product lines.

About 25 percent of all U.S. exports are shipped to foreign subsidiaries and affiliates of American corporations. In fact, shipments to affiliates account for an even more substantial percentage of the exports, up to 35 percent or more, of some of our larger international companies.

The interrelationship between trade and investment has been well established, although not in precisely quantifiable terms. It is an indisputed fact, however, that our exports expand as our foreign investments climb.

On this interaction a National Industrial Conference Board study observes, "Total foreign investment, now approaching $100 billion, with its related output which is still larger, constitutes a fundamental link between the U.S. economy and foreign economies which is not only of greater magnitude than the $40 billion of receipts and payments recorded annually in the balance of payments, but it is a phenomenon with direct implications for the world pattern of production and trade."

"The growth of production abroad," the Conference Board report notes, "has been in fact accompanied by an increasing stream of exports from the United States, reflecting not only the orientation of foreign subsidiaries to supply sources within the United States, and the importance of their location as a stimulus to and channel for other U.S. exports, but also a substantial factor in the level of output in foreign countries, and hence in the rising level of foreign demand for imports."

The United States benefits from increased foreign demand for imports to the extent that American products are competitive or

XUM

that we are the exclusive source of supply. Due to our technological superiority, capital resources, and the scale of our economy, we enjoy many advantages in satisfying demand for sophisticated products. Computers and jet aircraft are case examples.

American production abroad spurs the growth of foreign economies and incomes with the result the countries become better customers in the world market. The United States share of the market growth is translated into more jobs and rising incomes at home.

President Kennedy expressed the benefits of broadly shared growth in his memorable comment, "A rising tide lifts all the boats." That is the phenomenon of production generating wealth and buoying trade levels in both the producing country and the investing country.

The implications of production and its trade effects are difficult to quantify, but there are indications the interaction may go much farther than we realize. The benefits are at least sufficiently discernible as to remove all doubt our policies should facilitate international growth, not retard it.

It is clear, then, that restraint of capital movements committed to production depresses the level of trade. It is thus contradictory to restrict foreign investments while attempting to expand exports. That is precisely what we are doing under existing policies and serious harm can be done our exports as well as our competitive position abroad by hampering our foreign production.

The irrationality of our policies becomes more evident when one examines the business realities of the international marketplace. It is a business fact of life that after an export market reaches a certain scale the economics and other competitive factors very often dictate it be served from local production.

If we fail to establish production within a foreign market when business circumstances require it, our industrial competitors will quickly take advantage of the opportunities. More often than not, direct investment is the next logical and necessary step in developing foreign markets if the product can be manufactured economically by local production.

In exhorting American manufacturers to widen export markets we must accordingly be mindful of the realities which may at a given point require foreign direct investment, and we must fashion compatible trade and investment policies to facilitate the retention of overseas markets.

The facts of trade disprove the contention that foreign production displaces exports. There will perhaps be a shift in the kind of exports, the substitution of capital goods, raw materials, intermediates and other supplies for finished products. But we maintain export growth and potentials while deriving the added benefit of foreign income from production.

This combination of earnings constitutes the backbone of the U.S. balance of payments and we should exert every effort to build upon it rather than sap its strength.

For many reasons American companies would normally prefer to export than produce abroad. In Western Europe, for example, land costs are frequently exorbitant, skilled labor is in short supply, the margin of profitability has diminished, and numerous other business circumstances make it more desirable in many instances to produce at home.

Trade barriers and other unfair practices denying U.S. manufacturers equal access to markets, as well as the pure economics, have strongly influenced decisions to produce abroad. The prospect of common walls around the Common Market doubtlessly played an important part in the large capital outflows for investment in Western Europe.

Government policy makers are well aware that trade barriers exert this influence and they should be working energetically either to remove the obstacles to U.S. exports or to equalize the advantages for our producers.

In some countries national policies have prompted direct investments by American companies as the only means of creating and serving markets for certain manufactures such as, for example, in Australia and Mexico, both important trading partners of the United States.

When Luther H. Hodges was the Secretary of Commerce the major thrust of the department was the promotion of two-way trade, two-way travel, and two-way investment. That was a sound, realistic, and productive policy and we should go back to it.

An expanding world economy, fed by increasing flows of trade and investment, offers the only realistic prospect for stability and order and progress on which we can build a durable peace.

It is illusory to think we can restrict American capital resources which the world needs while hoping to eliminate the conditions which foment insurrection and war.

To what avail has the United States poured out $100 billion in foreign aid if we are to restrict private investment which has proved far more effective in increasing foreign production and income?

How does one rationalize the spending of billions to be the world's policeman while restricting the economic processes which will help eliminate the conditions requiring a policeman?

We may well have miscalculated the benefits of temporary measures in our haste and anxiety to deal with the balance of payments crisis. A recent survey by Jack Behrman, University of North Carolina international expert who served as assistant secretary of commerce in the Kennedy Administration, indicated that recoupments on capital outflows for production are more rapid than the minimum of five to seven years which has been assumed.

Dr. Behrman undertook a fresh calculation of the balance of payments payout period on U.S. foreign direct investment. The payout is the length of time required for an investment to generate foreign exchange returns equivalent to initial dollar outflows.

He concluded on the basis of typical investment experience, ascertained from data available in the Commerce Department, the payout period of just over two years could be justified. The data included experience in the European area.

Actual dollar outlays for new investments were calculated at 40 percent of the total expenditure, the balance being financed through funds abroad. Of the actual dollar outlay 8 percent was used for immediate equipment exports from the United States, more than 12 percent for components, raw materials, and supplies from the United States, and about 2.5 percent in remitted earnings.

Dr. Behrman's computations thus indicated the actual drain resulting from capital ventures for offshore production may be reduced to an abbreviated period with relatively unimportant effects on our external accounts.

It is the collective judgment of the American business community that the continuation of mandatory controls will damage the nation's economic interests while providing only temporary and costly nostrums for our balance of payments difficulties. That judgment is based on a great weight of experience in the practical workings of international business.

Every sign suggests we are well beyond any short-term benefits of value and are now headed down the road of diminishing returns. As President Nixon has noted, "Every dollar of investment which is blocked by administrative edict costs us more than one and one half dollars of future earnings."

We are now in the fifth year of investment restraints and they are assuming the look of permanency. Even now the massive debts incurred by American companies through costly foreign borrowings as a result of this program are being argued as a case for its continuation.

It is contended that future capital outflows to repay or refinance the huge backlog of indebtedness, estimated at $5 billion for 1968, will require regulation; and thus the program feeds on its own consequences.

Charles E. Fiero, then director of the Office of Foreign Direct Investment, testified before the Joint Economic Committee in January that the program is creating its own set of balance of payments liabilities. He said:

"Repayment of foreign borrowing used by U.S. companies and their foreign affiliates will, of course, result in reduced direct investment income or increased capital outflows in the future. In this sense, current balance of payments gains may have been made at the expense of future balance of payments reductions."

"There has been a mortgaging of future balance of payments gains and a considerable imposition upon freedom of action of the business sector," Fiero acknowledged.

The adverse effects go far beyond balance of payments considerations. American companies are being forced to take financial actions undesirable from a business standpoint—borrowings they do not need, the restricting of trade credits to foreign subsidiaries, early repayment of loans to affiliates.

The high costs of foreign borrowing are detrimental to earnings. Foreigners are gaining increasing equity in American overseas business ventures, further reducing the income flows to the United States.

The restraints inhibit our companies from building and expanding plants with the result both earnings and exports are retarded. New projects are in some cases postponed or abandoned and the opportunities they represent may be lost to foreign competitors.

The curtailment of acquisitions also reduces our future earnings potentials while fortifying the competitiveness of foreign companies through mergers which could have expanded our markets.

Situations are developing where lending sources for local borrowing by U.S. foreign affiliates are substantially exhausted, reducing working capital and hence sales. Where working capital may not be available or obtained at prohibitive cost the continued existence of these operations is brought into question.

Much of our overseas investment is in the extractive industries which supplement our own supplies of oil and ore or which supply raw materials we do not possess in this country. Reports indicate the restrictions are causing postponement or abandonment of explorations in certain countries due to the limited exemptions allowed under the law.

Prudent financial management will not permit American industry to continue indefinitely the financing and refinancing of its foreign investments without being able to meet the commitments undertaken. The regulations on retention obstruct this.

The heavy debt load incurred by American companies has severely restricted freedom of financial planning and of financial assistance to foreign affiliates. Certain affiliates are under-capitalized in relation to debt incurred. Recapitalization is prohibited by low authorizations under the mandatory program. Those companies with affiliates having high debt to equity ratios in the Schedule B and C countries are placed in an especially difficult position.

The regulations are creating a situation in which American companies are finding it difficult to formulate rational financial plans for their foreign operations.

Perhaps the most serious consequence from a balance of payments standpoint are the trade effects. For example, a major American chemical manufacturer with world-wide operations estimates $1 million loss in sales this year, $5 million next year, and over $100 million total export losses over a protracted period.

While export losses may principally result from the curtailment of new capital investments and plant expansions abroad, and from diminished competitiveness, the shortage of working capital aggravates the situation.

Much can be said of the extra-territorial consequences of the mandatory program. Suffice it to point out the regulations have marked our foreign affiliates as aliens which will make U.S. direct investments less welcome in the future.

It is relevant to note Representative Tunney's appraisal of foreign reaction. "It is well known that though host countries recognize the need for foreign investments they also have shown some concern lest foreign investors dominate their economies or follow policies laid down by local authorities," he said. "The program for controls of direct foreign investment have given evidence the concern is not unwarranted. The assurance of local management that companies intend to be good citizens ring hollow in the light of the official U.S. view expressed in the mandatory program that the operations of these companies must be conducted subject to the overriding needs of U.S. foreign economic policy."

While some of our government policy makers have derived comfort from temporary balance of payments gains achieved by the program, it should be restrained gratification for the United States is no longer accumulating net assets in the rest of the world.

Historically de-regulation has proved extremely difficult and cumbersome in our bureaucracy. It is important that a firm date be set now—not later—for eliminating mandatory controls, recognizing that certain transitional rules will be required to phase out the program in an orderly manner which will minimize balance of payments effects.

One hopes this Committee will urge the President *to fix a firm date on which the program will be terminated;* simply relaxation of regulations would leave residual in the bureaucracy, the framework for reimposition of controls as expediency dictates.

If restraints on capital outflows should in the future be essential to the national interest in time of a declared national emergency, they should be imposed by Congressional action, not by administrative fiat.

One hopes these hearings will serve to reassert in emphatic terms the authority of the Congress, under the Constitution, to regulate foreign and domestic commerce. In the exercise of that authority the Congress ensures every citizen a voice in public policy making.

The mandatory program with its basic fallacies, burdensome restraints, high costs, and transparent failings was invoked under a fifty-year-old law relating to "Trading with the Enemy" and predicated on a national emergency declared by President Truman in response to communist aggression in Korea. It would strain credulity to maintain that dubious legal action represented the intent of Congress a half century later.

President Nixon has pledged he will end this self-defeating program and has promised, "We will reestablish the spirit of cooperation with other nations which our investment curbs have damaged, and we will encourage investments which stimulate U.S. exports and a healthy return flow of capital."

"For the greatest nation in the world to withdraw within its own shell and to stifle American commerce abroad," he said, "is economic isolationism at its worst."

The President merits the fullest support of the American people in this determination. Adoption of the bipartisan House Concurrent Resolutions 85 and 86 will express the sense of Congress that curtailment of American business abroad should cease and it will discredit the policy of restrictionism as contrary to the foreign policy objectives and the economic well-being of the United States.

END UNFAIR TREATMENT OF SINGLE TAXPAYERS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to rectify one of the inequities now contained in our tax code. At this time when the Congress is addressing itself to closing up loopholes and making our tax code more rational and equitable, I would hope that the Members of this Congress would consider the inequitable tax burden now carried by the single individual.

Under our prevailing tax code, married individuals have one schedule of taxation, heads of households have another, and lastly, there is the single individual who pays the highest rate of tax, since neither he nor she is entitled to head of household status. To make my point more vividly: a single individual with a taxable income of $10,000 will pay $2,354. A married individual, using the joint return, with the same taxable income will pay $1,956. And the head of household individual will pay $2,150. In other words, if a single individual were given head-of-household status, he would, under my bill, pay $204 less than he is currently paying. And, indeed, a single individual is, in fact, head of his own household if he maintains his own home.

Some legislators take the position that a single person should be at least 30 or 35 years old before being favored with head-of-household tax status. I strongly disagree. Every single individual who pays over half the cost of maintaining his or her own home should be given the same tax consideration. That cost, which in my district is rising steadily, has nothing to do with age.

When this Congress, as I hope it does, revises the tax code, its goal should be that of having everyone pay his fair share and no more. So let us close the tax loopholes which the wealthy use to avoid paying their fair share, and at the same time let us end the unfair treatment of the single taxpayer.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a dear friend of Texas and the Nation—Mr. H. N. Smith of the Soil Conservation Service.

For 15 years until his death March 13, "Red" Smith served as SCS State conservationist for Texas. His modest, unassuming manner belied an unflagging zeal for solving resource problems in Americas largest conservation State. "Red" Smith capably administered a complex conservation program that has the largest appropriation and the largest number of employees of any State in the Nation. His personable leadership literally changed the face of Texas—gullies have healed, streams flow clearer, dust storms and floods have been lessened, grass grows green and lush on tens of millions of acres of fine rangeland. Communities throughout Texas have a wealth of technical information to aid in their land-use planning.

"Red" had a remarkable ability to inspire cooperation, understanding, and teamwork among the State's nearly 200 soil and water conservation districts, scores of special purpose districts, county governing bodies, and other agencies. It can be noted especially in the small watershed programs in Texas that more than 1,400 structures have been built to retard flooding and create new water supplies for irrigation, recreation, and many other uses.

"Red" Smith quietly took on a personal vendetta against moisture-robbing brush that encroached on 88 million acres of range and pasture and threatens the cattle industry. He directed many studies of the problem, and the preparation of five publications. These publications have been hailed throughout the United States where brush is a problem as a significant milestone in the study of brush invasion, causes, effects, and remedies. But "Red" did not stop with studies—he saw to it that over the past two decades an average of a million acres a year was treated to control brush.

Mr. Smith joined the Soil Conservation Service at Dublin, Tex., in 1935, the year that agency was formed, after serving for 10 years as head of the animal husbandry department at John Tarleton Agricultural College. He advanced through several positions to acting regional director with wide-ranging technical and administrative responsibilities in Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, and in 1954 began directing the most rapid advance in resource improvement in Texas history. He received USDA's Superior Service Award in 1960.

In all this activity and responsibility "Red" Smith remained a warm, personable individual known and respected throughout the State. He was a good friend as well as leader to the 2,000 SCS employees in Texas.

I am happy that Clyde Graham, who served under "Red" Smith for several years as assistant and deputy State conservationist, has been chosen to succeed him at the helm of conservation in Texas. Clyde for the past 2½ years has been serving as Director of the SCS Watershed Planning Division here in Washington, and brings to his new job broad experience and wide knowledge of SCS programs and activities.

"Red" Smith was a great conservationist. We will miss him and his work for Texas and the Nation.

A POLICEMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

XUM

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently Robert B. Murphy, the police chief of the city of Richmond, Calif., in my congressional district posted a memorandum to all of the members of the police force of the city of Richmond in which he responded to some accusations that had been directed at the conduct of policemen in that city.

I believe several paragraphs within that memo that describe the reponsibilities of police officials are so well put that it would be wise to have it shared with more than the members of the Richmond Police Department.

Although all of the statement is of value, I particularly found a great sensitivity expressed in the paragraph that states:

> Most of the work of policemen is human management. We come to our job with good schooling, some experience and our personalities. Our success in our job is directly related to our ability to wisely manage ourselves, and where management of others becomes involved, to warmly manage them.

I am including a copy of Chief Murphy's memo along with my remarks.

MEMO

FEBRUARY 26, 1969.

To: All officers.
From: Robert B. Murphy, Chief of Police.

Recently our department has received some adverse publicity, expressed in generalities. I'm aware that this kind of publicity creates an atmosphere of distrust and doubt of the police. I'm also aware that most members of the department are embarrassed and/or disgusted by it.

The purpose of my writing is to encourage all of you to remain as objective as possible; to be businesslike, and continue to fulfill our responsibility in a legal manner. It takes great courage and patience to do the work expected of police officers in today's society, but in my opinion there is no more essential assignment than that of police officer.

Our purpose is worth much sacrifice. I appreciate your displayed abilities to date. You may feel you aren't understood or appreciated, but let me assure you that most of our citizens are well aware of what we are going through, and will support us heartily when we're right. We cannot expect anyone to support us when we're wrong.

I assure you that any administrative action from my office will always be based on facts, not on general or unsupported statements. To my personal knowledge, since 1960 our department has not failed to hear, investigate and properly dispose of complaints against us. We must remember that there will be complaints and that we're not perfect. We must also remember that the nature of our work creates some friction. We should help always to reduce tensions while performing our tasks.

We cannot fail or refuse to do our law enforcement tasks, but we must remember that much of our work is non-enforcement services to the community. We must be receptive to suggestions about the latter kind of services. We must be willing to account for ourselves in all our work.

Most of the work of policemen is human management. We come to our job with good schooling, some experience and our personalities. Our success in our job is directly related to our ability to wisely manage ourselves, and where management of others becomes involved, to warmly manage them.

It's my hope that we can restore and maintain a climate which will help you feel proud to be a police officer in Richmond. We have a very fine department, doing an excellent job under some very adverse conditions. It's our individual responsibility to help keep it that way and let the people know that we don't need sympathy. We need their voluntary compliance with society's acceptable rules and their support when we enforce their rules against non-conformists to law.

ROBERT B. MURPHY,
Chief of Police.

LEGISLATION WOULD INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a social security legislative package which would provide increases in benefits based on the cost of living as well as increase the survivors' benefits and the amount a person may earn and still receive all the benefits to which he is entitled.

This legislation would result in a major overhaul of the present Social Security Act which now requires congressional approval for each change in benefits and qualifications. It includes the following major changes in present law:

First. An automatic cost-of-living increase whenever the Consumer Price Index jumps by at least 2.5 percent during the preceding quarter. The index increased nearly 5 percent in 1968 and has climbed nearly 20 percent since 1960. This would eliminate the necessity of congressional action.

Second. Increase the amount a person may earn from $1,680 to $3,000 a year without forfeiting part or all of his social security benefits. The present law penalizes those who want to help themselves. A person should be able to receive the benefits regardless of whether he chooses to work after 65.

Third. Increase the survivors' benefits on retirement to 150 percent of the primary cash benefits for which the deceased would have qualified under social security. Under present law, the survivors' income is cut at a time when the cost of operating the household may actually increase.

These reforms are urgently needed to spare older Americans the hardship that results from inflation.

Most older Americans are defenseless against higher living costs produced by the inflationary trend. It seems only appropriate that we provide these retirees with help as soon as they are hit by a loss in the purchasing power of their pension dollar.

These people should not have to wait 1, 2, and 5 years for such relief through general amendments to the Social Security Act. This is especially so when the increases do not compensate fully for changes in living costs anyway.

I believe that compassion, equity, and commonsense demand that we stop making older people wait until some future Congress chooses to make good on campaign promises. This legislation would, in effect, remove social security from the political arena.

I have given considerable thought to this proposal, and I am convinced it is one which offers protection for our senior citizens, who through no fault of their own are in real and dire need of positive assistance against circumstances that could destroy independence, dignity, and sense of purpose.

Almost all citizens are hurt by rising living costs. Only the very wealthy escape. No single group suffers more, however, than older Americans.

I supported this type of approach in the 90th Congress but it failed. Hopefully, with the support of the Nixon administration, we will be able to remove social security from politics once and for all and provide our senior citizens with the security and peace of mind they so richly deserve.

ALL-AMERICA CITY

(Mr. McMILLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement by Mayor David McLeod of Florence, S.C., which is my hometown, concerning an article appearing in the Sunday Star of March 23, 1969. It seems that a reporter from the Star visited Florence, S.C., for a few days recently and talked with a number of the citizens of that community. The reporter did not talk with me since I was here in Washington at the time. Also, he did not talk with Mayor McLeod.

We are all wondering what the motive of the editor of the Star was in sending reporter Donald Smith to Florence, S.C., as he prepared an unusual article that has no meaning whatsoever other than there seems to be no truth in connection with the article. I presume the reporter made a trip to Florence to see if he could find someone that would say something detrimental about me. I certainly could not make any sense out of the article as reporter Smith seemed to intentionally or unintentionally get all of his facts incorrect. We have a good prosperous city which has almost doubled in size during the past 10 years and we have 52,000 people who receive their mail at the Florence Post Office, both black and white, and they seem to get along as harmoniously as any people could anywhere in the United States. We have several excellent colored policemen and several excellent colored members of the fire department, in addition to three colored deputies in the county sheriff's office.

I didn't think any newspaper in Washington would have the gall to send a reporter to Florence or any other city where good relations exist between all people when we have so much confusion and crime here in the Nation's Capital. As chairman of the House District Committee, I have not been able to secure very much assistance from any of the news media in the Nation's Capital in connection with my efforts to solve the crime problem.

I have been successful in having the Members of the House of Representatives approve approximately 900 bills, the majority of which vitally affect the Nation's Capital: for instance, a bill we enacted last year granting $80 million to the hospitals in Washington, D.C., without any strings attached.

We are very proud of our mayor in Florence and the progress our city has made during the past 12 years. We have excellent community leaders, both colored and white, and it is refreshing to know that we do not have people of different races calling names at each other and making all types of accusations as exist here in the Nation's Capital. We have very little crime in Florence for the simple reason that law enforcement is excellent, punishment is swift and certain when a crime is committed.

Shaw Field that was mentioned in the reporter's article is not located in my congressional district and I am not acquainted with any street by the name of "Square," however, the reporter states that my residence is located on "Square" Street. The mayor, city council and other officials in the Florence community have reason to be angry over this article as it portrays anything but true facts concerning the fine city of Florence, S.C., which was recently designated as an all-American city.

I, of course, am accustomed to this type of treatment here in Washington as I have been accused of everything in the book by the news media in Washington since I have been serving as chairman of the House District Committee, simply because I do not hold the same philosophy concerning crime and the solvency of the Nation's Capital as the news media in our Capital City.

I could write a book several inches thick quoting the outright misrepresentations and other accusations that have been heaped on my shoulders for the simple reason that I do not cater to these people's way of thinking in connection with my position in making laws for the Nation's Capital. I, nor any other Congressman, has any jurisdiction over the administration of the affairs of the District of Columbia and we do not have an opportunity to make any appointments. They are all made by the Commissioner and the President of the United States and the laws are administered through the Mayor, the Attorney General and the District Corporation Counsel under the supervision of the Department of Justice.

I am making these statements for the simple reason that the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in my hometown and in every town in the United States will understand some of the reasons why we have certain conditions in the Nation's Capital at the present time.

The article incorporating Mayor McLeod's statement follows:

WASHINGTON STAR STORY CRITICIZED

An article in the Sunday magazine section of The Washington Star was highly critical of Florence as an All-America city and was in return criticized by Mayor David McLeod.

The article, by Donald Smith, was to "discover if the All-America city might have some influence on McMillan's (Cong. John L. McMillan) manner in dealing with Washington. Cong. McMillan is chairman of the House of Representatives D.C. Committee.

The article discussed race relations in Florence and was critical of the city's action in this field.

Mayor McLeod said Tuesday "I have never seen the gentleman that wrote the story or talked with him on the telephone.

"Many statements in the story are erroneous, misleading and are not at all factual.

"It seems to me that if a reporter wrote a story on Florence and used the mayor as part of a story he should at least discuss it with him (the mayor) before writing any such misleading information."

ONE NATION, UNDER GOD

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Broadcasters are in Washington this week. A speaker at one function was reported to be Tom Smothers, who is concerned about network and affiliate censorship of his program, broadcast by CBS.

One of the more interesting things about the Smothers show is its slip from among the top-rated programs in the Nation. It is reportedly below 40 now, indicating that perhaps there is some relationship between listener approval and ratings after all.

Last Sunday night the Smothers program began with a reservation of their own version of the pledge to the flag. Their version omits "under God." In fact, the only apparent reason for what might otherwise have been a welcome bit of patriotism was actually an affront to the traditions of this Nation.

As Senator PASTORE noted in a speech before the NAB this week, ABC and NBC have agreed to submit their own programs to the code authority of the NAB, but CBS has refused.

CBS may well be concerned about code approval, if the Smothers show is an example of what they feel is good Sunday night listening. It was a CBS affiliate in Chicago which staged a pot party, in an apparent effort to help sagging ratings there. Maybe they are trying to use a little shock value to help the Smothers' sagging ratings.

CBS has placed itself in the position of opposing regulation of networks, regulation of programing, and even self-regulation within the industry. CBS has written Senator PASTORE that—

> In our society the determination of taste and propriety as to TV programing must be pluralistic. A single last word would be harmful, indeed dangerous.

What about CBS's own "last word?" If CBS continues to refuse any advice on programing from any source but its own, where does "pluralistic" come in at all? Far from accepting a pluralistic approach, CBS is saying to the National Association of Broadcasters, and to the Federal Communications Commission, and to the Congress, and to the listening public, that CBS will not listen to anyone, regardless of the violence, sex, or poor taste involved in its programs.

Well, CBS, "under God" is an important part of the pledge to the flag. One segment of the pluralistic approach you cannot long deny is the listening audience, and perhaps you had better go back and read the ratings again.

ABC and NBC are not without fault, but are to be commended for their interest in arriving at a voluntary industry solution. CBS apparently wishes to continue down the road on its own, with the likes of the Smothers show.

An increasing number of people throughout the country now demand Government intervention. I sincerely believe most Members of Congress would like to avoid that if at all possible.

Self-regulation within the broadcast industry seems to be the best answer for the present. ABC and NBC are willing. CBS is not. I suggest that the American people let CBS know what they think. This can be done by switching the channel receiver away from offending programs. And it can be done by writing product manufacturers and letting them know what the public thinks about such programs. And writing or calling the local network affiliate and letting them know. It has been my experience that local stations, which are licensed and are deeply committed to good community relations, act in a responsible and reasonable manner to public opinion. In the end, CBS will get the message. And perhaps at last there will be some industry solution to a serious problem of public concern.

DECENTRALIZATION AND RESTRUCTURING OF FEDERAL FIELD OFFICES

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the announcement today by President Nixon of his first steps toward the decentralization and restructuring of Federal field offices convincingly demonstrates that he intends to keep his campaign pledge "not to dismantle Government but to modernize it." The field offices of the five related departments and agencies which have been operating under the handicap of a crazy-quilt of different boundaries and regional headquarters will be able to serve the public more efficiently. The public will be spared a great deal of confusion and wasted time in doing business with the Government.

The President's expansion of the regional council concept to all eight of the new regional centers, and his directive to other executive agencies to study further means of decentralizing decisionmaking and bringing the administration of Federal programs closer to the people should also be welcomed by the Congress. We have long urged greater coordination and more businesslike methods upon the executive agencies that come before us for funding and support of their programs. We should now unhesitatingly back up the President's move to bring this about.

There will be temporary dislocations and discomforts for some Federal employees but the President's plan has minimized these and its implementation will be spread over the next 18 months to permit the necessary readjustments. In the end the benefits to all our citizens will far outweigh the inconvenience of making these urgent and sensible changes in a system which has, unfortunately, grown up without a clear pattern and desperately requires reorganization.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Rogers) would be willing to answer a question in connection with what he has said. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, in view of his statements, which accurately reflect correspondence that I have had with officials of CBS, because of a highly distorted, unfair, inaccurate, and untruthful report last year with respect to the hunger question. The Nation and the world were absolutely horrified when CBS put on a show that opened up by purporting to show a child starving because of malnutrition. It was completely untrue. The child was a premature, 2-months-old child. The parents were healthy, and well nourished. That fact was established beyond any question of doubt.

CBS admitted that they did not know there was any other way, but they felt that even if a hoax containing untruth were perpetrated on the listening and viewing audience of the world, it was justified as long as they thought their cause was a good and holy one. Later the president of CBS substantiated his view that it would be perfectly all right to lie to the viewing public if, in their opinion, it was justified. So I am glad to hear the gentleman say what he has said. I think the time has come when Congress should look into this whole question. I agree with him that none of us wishes to inject regulatory authority, but if it comes to that, I think we cannot escape the clear responsibility that reposes in the Congress to do something about this vast network system that controls 93 percent or more of the prime viewing time of the American public with no restraint whatsoever.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. Judging from my conversations with Members of Congress, there is great concern with this problem. Chairman Staggers of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, has said, "We are going to look into some of these problems." And I think it is very needed.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have not seen the program in question. Certainly the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas are correct in calling to the attention of Congress the shortcomings of this network. It is particularly unfortunate that this would occur, because this particular network, CBS, did do an excellent job the last two Sundays when they brought to the attention of the American people a two-part series on the growing problem of pollution in this country.

In their 21st century series, I thought they had done one of the greatest jobs I have seen in reporting in calling to the attention of the American people the great problems that are being created for our American public in this problem of air pollution. So on the one hand they do a great job, and then on the other hand they undo the good they do with the kind of program the gentleman from Texas mentioned.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if CBS will take care of its own pollution, I think everything will be OK.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—WEEK OF MARCH 31, 1969

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader about the legislative program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority whip's inquiry, we have finished the legislative program for this week, and will ask to go over until next week.

There is no legislative business for Monday.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, we have House Resolution 270, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security, and H.R. 9328, to provide special pay to naval officers who agree to remain in active submarine service.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma could tell us, in view of the staggering workload for next week, whether he thinks it will be possible to get out of here by midnight of Wednesday? When does the gentleman think it will be possible for the House to adjourn next week, so we may have some idea as to when the Easter recess will be started?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because we are going to try to finish the business by not later than early Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. By Wednesday afternoon?

Mr. ALBERT. By not later than that, and hopefully Tuesday evening.

Mr. GROSS. Then it will not be Wednesday midnight or some such time as that?

Mr. ALBERT. That is true unless some unforeseen event happens. The gentleman understands the program is always announced with that reservation.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM NINTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I sincerely regret that an unexpected demand from my constituency will prevent my taking part in the Ninth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, which will be held in Mexico, beginning April 2nd through the 8th. For this reason, I am constrained to resign from the House Delegation.

With high regard, I am,
Sincerely,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Lloyd), to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION OF REPUBLICAN STATE SENATOR IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I noted in the Record yesterday that there was some enjoyment on the other side of the aisle over an election in Tennessee which was considered to set some sort of guidelines for the election results in 1970.

I want to advise the House and my colleagues that there was also an election on that same day in California, in a State senatorial district including Contra Costa County, and coterminous with the district of our esteemed colleague (Mr. WALDIE). Our Republican senatorial candidate, John Nejedly, won in a democratic district by a 4-to-3 margin. I hope the Members on the other side of the aisle will, therefore, view with increased respect the words of our distinguished minority leader to the effect that Tuesday's elections may be an indication of things to come.

THE CASE AGAINST THE ABM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, our highly respected former colleague, the able and articulate Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, as those of us who served many years with him know, can be a powerful and persuasive advocate of any cause he chooses to espouse. In the well of this House, he demonstrated that year after year, and as I say, his reasoning and insight are highly respected. Many times I have listened to his argument on legislation and followed his recommendations when the time came to vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, I strongly differ when Mr. Laird says, as he has recently, that the modified anti-ballistic-missile program, newly named by the Pentagon as the "Safeguard" system, is a building block for peace. On the contrary, I feel that proceeding at this time with an ABM deployment could actually result in the building of more Soviet nuclear blockbusters and accelerate the entire atomic arms race with the Russians increasing their offensive capacity and causing another tragic stepup in the spiral of the arms race.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the time will come when the United States will be forced into deploying a so-called Safeguard system or perhaps indeed a thick-shield anti-Soviet missile defense. Pray God, as a deterrent to nuclear war, this country will not be forced to construct any such defense system against a Soviet capability to render our retaliatory striking power ineffective. But, as to now, as testified by Director Gerard Smith of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, such second-strike capability, which we presently have as a deterrent to enemy attack, would not be jeopardized by a halt in the antimissile program until after nuclear disarmament talks with the Soviet Union.

If I thought for a moment a halt in the ABM program would risk our losing our retaliatory deterrent striking strength, I would support Mr. Laird. For who will deny that until disarmament, the real deterrent is the knowledge by Moscow, and perhaps in a few years by Peking when Red China acquires nuclear missiles, that either of them if they attacked us would in truth be obliterated.

My conviction is that momentarily there is no need and no sense in initiating this program until the United States and the Soviet Union have discussed a limitation by both nations in offensive and strategic weapons. The fact is that if such talks fail, either country could overcome any ABM system by the use of multiwarheads and decoys and other penetration aids.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trust the Communist leaders in the Kremlin any more than does my distinguished friend, Mel Laird. I do not doubt his so-called firm and solid information that the Soviets are deploying the SS–9, a 20 to 25 megaton weapon which in turn might destroy a portion of our Minuteman launch sites. But, surely an attack by such a weapon would be deterred by the U.S. retaliatory capability of our Poseidon and Polaris missiles from submarines underwater.

Right now, it seems to me, there is still time for a return to commonsense and reason. From the layman's point of view, it is not easy to oppose any new means of defense, but in all sincerity, I say, let us delay and not set off another expansion in the suicidal arms race.

Mr. Speaker, last year when I voted for funds to deploy the Sentinel missile system, I felt that such action on the part of the United States would give us greater strength over the disarmament bargaining table. However, now certainly the Russians are on notice of our intentions just as much as if those Sentinel missiles were located throughout the country. They know that we will never be second in any arms competition. They know we will insist on maintaining such strategic defense and offensive weapons as are needed for our national security.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say, let us talk—talk softly as President Nixon has suggested—and not feel impelled to spend billions of dollars on a new defensive system that will be, I am sure, out of date, obsolete, and ineffective by the time it would be completed. The Safeguard missile would, in reality, be no bargaining tool for dealing with the other nuclear superpower, nor is it a building block for peace as Secretary Laird would have it.

Let us negotiate and not lay waste our strength in this $10 billion unneeded gesture in muscle flexing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am interested in the gentleman's deep interest in this subject. He has a problem in his immediate area on this, which I am sure the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman would not mind, I will say that that problem has been removed by President Nixon's decision to remove the antiballistic missiles from the populated areas.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am mindful of that, but here is the question I want to ask the gentleman. He said that he voted last year for this. Actually this House and the other body voted on eight different occasions for this country to move ahead with a deployment of the ABM. I would like to know if the gentleman would be good enough to tell me what has changed.

Has the Soviet Union changed in any way? Has the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia in any way given us reason to believe that the Soviet Union is ready to start changing and behaving like a civilized nation? Has the Soviet Union in any way deterred its own research in ABM development? Has the Soviet Union stopped building the 65 ABM's around Moscow? Is there an iota of proof that the Soviet Union has in any way deterred its own development? On the contrary, the best evidence that we have is that the Soviet Union has substantially accelerated its research in an attempt to knock out the offensive deterrents that we have in this country. I am at a loss to understand why, in the face of the overwhelming evidence presented before the American people by Secretary Laird and by the President of the United States, we continue to hear those who would have us stop. Finally, is it not correct that the chairman of the Disarmament Commission stated that in his judgment our continued deployment of the ABM would in no way alter or interfere with any future discussions we may have with the Soviet Union on some form of a mutual inspection treaty?

Is not that what the chairman said?

I noted with interest the gentleman's statement that he said it would not in any way affect our deterrent power. But he also said very unequivocally that if we proceed with the deployment which we are now planning to do, it will not in any way alter the basic approach in this country to ask the Soviet Union to sit down and start talking about some meaningful inspections. However, I would like to remind my colleague that President Eisenhower proposed an open skies treaty and the Soviet Union wrecked that proposal with the phony shooting down of the U–2. Every President Nixon, has indicated that we in- Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon, have indicated that we indeed want an open skies treaty. We want to come to some agreement with reference to this proliferation of the nuclear arms race, but the Soviet Union has not given one iota of evidence or hope that it is ready to start acting like a civilized nation.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Illinois has presented me with a long question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have a 30-minute special order and I shall give the gentleman some of my time.

Mr. PELLY. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that insofar as I am concerned there have been changes since the gentleman and I both testified before the Real Estate Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on January 15, and I have changed my mind.

I will say for one thing, of course, the Soviet Union has indicated that they were interested in talks which I understand are designed to curtail the arms race. I think President Nixon has indicated that he intends to talk with representatives of the Soviet Union.

XUM

I would say further, because the gentleman from Illinois referred to the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. Smith, he has stated and testified before a Senate Committee that a delay in deploying this program would not jeopardize our defense; otherwise, I would not be standing here in the well today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, did not the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. Smith, also say that in proceeding with the deployment it would in no way interfere with our talks with the Soviet Union, because they have not stopped their deployment of such ABM systems?

Mr. PELLY. I would say the gentleman was correct. However, I am in favor of continuing the research aspects of this system but not actually deploying these missiles which I am sure will be out of date and obsolete at the time of their deployment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that two points have to be made. The first point that has to be made is that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) has very cleverly sought to place those in favor of the position of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and the position which I espouse in opposition to the ABM in opposition also to maintaining and fostering and enhancing our national security. This is totally untrue. The fact that we oppose the ABM system does not mean that we are not seeking to promote and foster the national security of the United States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. PELLY. Let me say this to the gentleman, that I believe the Secretary of Defense has indicated that he has hard and firm information that the Soviet Union is proceeding to develop the SS-9.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. With 20 to 25 megaton capacity.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want to comment on the remarks of my colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. PELLY. I just want to finish this statement by saying that the way I feel is that if we proceed with the anti-ballistic-missile system that we are going to get hard and firm information that the Russians are proceeding with the SS-9, with multple warheads, which would overcome the "safeguard" missile defense. It would take 500 of the present SS-9's, we are told, to put out of commission half of our Minuteman installations. I believe we have time now to discuss disarmament. That is the way I see it. Otherwise I am certain that if we continue on with an antimissile defense program we may not be able to talk.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) had been making a statement, and I will yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The second point that I wanted to make was this: that with respect to what the Russians are doing in developing their offensive strength. We are not laggard in this respect. We, too, are moving to increase the already awesome power of our ICBM's and Poseidons with MERV warheads. We are going forward with that. So that we are expanding our power and that is certainly offsetting what the Russians are doing. We are doing this without reference to deployment of the ABM.

It is true that they are going forward with the SS-9, according to Secretary Laird, and that it is a very powerful weapon, but the United States is moving forward also.

I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Washington. It is unfortunate that both the Soviet Union and we are going forward with such weapons when we should be trying to stop this ever-increasing buildup of nuclear arms.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one further point.

The gentleman from Washington rightfully said that in his judgment the building of these weapons will not be building blocks for peace.

I fail to understand the rationale behind Secretary Laird's statement that if we build these ABM's that it will not be stimulating to the arms race. I am under the impression that a credible deterrent on both sides requires a balance, that there must be the ability of both sides to destroy the other. I believe that we must maintain the credibility of our deterrent force.

If we were to build an ABM system which would be successful—and there is great doubt whether that is possible at the present time—but if it were successful, and if thereby the ABM system could thwart the Russian missiles from their destructive mission, I feel quite sure the men in the Kremlin could very well be impelled to increase their offensive strength further by additional missiles to overwhelm this new defense. They would want to build additional destructive missiles in order to overcome our anti-ballistic-missile system. Therefore, I cannot see where this would be a building block for peace. I believe that instead of a building block for peace, the Soviet Union would conclude they must increase the number of their offensive missiles to balance the new advantage possessed by the United States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will again yield, my colleague talks about the fact that there are those who say there is no possible ABM system that is capable of defeating the Russian missiles. That is a matter of opinion.

I believe that these are the same people who for 20 years have been taking such positions. We have tried in the Congress, and it has been a hard job to do, to maintain an effective defensive posture, because this has been the greatest containment of the Soviet Union. For 20 years the Soviet Union has embarked upon a policy of causing turmoil throughout the world.

Is there anyone who believes that they are not present in Vietnam? They are the ones who started the turmoil in Vietnam, not us. Is there anyone who is naive enough to believe that the Soviet Union is not knee deep in the Vietnam war?

We have seen the Soviet Union try to cause turmoil throughout the whole world. They started the civil war in Greece in 1947. Yet there are those who continue to be naive enough to think, even at this late date, that somehow or other we are going to be able to get the Soviet Union to sit down and behave like a civilized nation, when the record of the past two decades disproves that theory.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, why did the Soviet Union stop, in the last few days, putting together their fourth segment of the anti-ballistic-missile system around Moscow? The Russians have 67 ABM's over there right now. The reason they have stopped it is because, as the gentleman himself has said, and as the Secretary has said, they have developed more sophisticated weapons. They are now moving ahead with more sophisticated weaponry.

There is not an iota of proof anywhere that the Soviet Union has stopped or deaccelerated its development of its ABM system, and for me to hear responsible members of this Government and of this country say that we should put everything aside until the Soviet Union is willing to sit down and talk. Mr. Eisenhower tried desperately 12 years ago and the Soviet Union has had more than 12 years to show one iota of good faith in trying to bring this nuclear race to a halt. It has been this country that has made move after move after move to try to bring this nuclear race to an end and it has been the Soviet Union that has in every instance said, "We are not interested—we are moving ahead."

Mr. PELLY. I agree with some of the things that the gentleman has said, but he overlooks the fact that now the nuclear weapons race has accelerated so that even the Soviet Union indicates that it wants to talk about disarmament and that is a changed situation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Listen, they could start talking right now. The first thing they can do is to get hold of Hanoi and say, "Listen, sit down in Paris and start talking like decent people and work this thing out."

But there is not one iota of proof anywhere that the Soviet Union has given up its design of ultimate conquest. I say that those who read into the Soviet Union some hope, are looking at the world through rose-colored glasses—not pink—but rose-colored glasses.

Mr. PELLY. Let me say to the gentleman that he does not have any monopoly when it comes to opposition to communism. So far as I am concerned, I think that the times are such now that we should not continue on a suicidal arms race which is just producing a two-nation overkill capacity.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington at this point.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks and I join the gentleman in his remarks. I will go just this one bit further and say, as the gentleman in the well knows, that our Navy is in such sad shape that I would like to see the money that is proposed to be spent on deployment of this ABM placed in Navy construction. I agree with the gentleman that we must continue with research and development of the ABM system.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) has again wrapped himself with the mantle of anticommunism and thereby has sought to cast aspersions on those who take the opposite position. He used the phrase about all of those who opposed military appropriations over the last 20 years.

The fact is the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Illinois have supported the efforts to keep our country strong all during these years.

That kind of a charge is grossly unfair.

"CLASSICAL CASE" OF NAVY CONTRACT BUNGLING EXPOSES THE WASTE IN DEFENSE SPENDING THROUGH NEGOTIATED, NONCOMPETITIVE "EMERGENCY" PROCUREMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last August 1 in this Chamber, I announced that I had asked both the Department of the Navy and the General Accounting Office to investigate the Navy's award of a negotiated, noncompetitive emergency procurement contract which was about to cost the American taxpayer nearly three times more than necessary.

At that time I expressed my view, based on an investigation carried out by my staff, that this particular contract was an example of "gross abuse of emergency procurement authorization."

The target of my criticism then was an "emergency procurement" contract awarded to the York, Pa., division of American Machine & Foundry Co. to produce 2,000 breechblock locks for the Mark–12 20-millimeter aircraft gun at a unit price of $97.13. This "emergency procurement" was authorized more than a month after a routine supply-replenishment contract for the identical gunpart had been awarded to Newbould Tool Co., also of York, Pa., at a unit price of only $37.75, or slightly more than one-third the price of the AMF negotiated contract price.

In my remarks at that time I cited a letter I had sent to then Secretary of the Navy Paul R. Ignatius, requesting a Navy investigation of this contract award. I quote in part from that letter:

> I submit that this entire procedure is indicative of a plan to reward York AMF with a substantial and profitable contract for some reason unknown to me. It is possible that the contract was to help York AMF offset some loss it may have suffered in the redesign of the breechblock lock, if indeed any loss was suffered under that contract.

In that same letter to Secretary Ignatius I also charged that the "emergency procurement contract was contrived as a means to carry out the—thwarted—original plan to provide York AMF with a fat profit."

Under date of August 27, 1968, the Navy Department forwarded to the General Accounting Office a report of the Navy's findings regarding its own investigation of its noncompetitive contract award to York AMF. After thorough review of the Navy's report, I again addressed my colleagues in this Chamber to label the Navy report "an attempt to whitewash a needless, an outrageous, waste of public funds for reasons which are not yet clear." I conveyed those exact words, plus a detailed dissection of the Navy's findings to Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats in a letter dated September 6, 1968. My letter to the Comptroller General included these observations:

> It is more important than ever, in view of the contradictions and inadequacies of this report, that you begin a complete investigation of this matter immediately. I earnestly urge that you do so.
>
> I anticipate that an independent investigation of the procedures followed in this instance could lead to development of specific recommendations for a thorough overhaul of contract award procedures in the Navy Department and other Defense units. Such an overhaul is long overdue and most essential to the public and the National interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the General Accounting Office has now completed its independent investigation. An extensive study of the GAO report by my office has been completed, and additional questions for purposes of clarification have been submitted to GAO informally and answered during a personal briefing session in my office. I shall place the entire GAO investigative report, plus an appendix containing 14 pertinent questions I originally submitted to the Navy, the Navy's replies to each question and GAO's comments upon those replies in the RECORD with my remarks.

In view of the evidence reported by the GAO, I renew here and now the charges I made in this Chamber on August 1, 1968. The report speaks for itself. I personally find it difficult to put into words the almost unbelievable manner in which the Navy Department, in this instance, handled a small but extremely critical procurement matter.

A GAO representative who was directly associated with the investigation described the situation perfectly when he said it is "a classical case" of procurement bungling. And as always, when public funds are involved, it was the American taxpayer who was the loser.

In this instance, however, I am pleased to report that the American taxpayer may have lost an instant battle but could very well win a broader war.

The Navy's procedures in this classical case were so inept that GAO has agreed with me that a broader investigation of emergency procurement procedures is warranted.

GAO has already begun an investigation of $5 billion worth of annual emergency procurements on a Defense-wide basis. GAO's investigation will focus particular attention on those emergency procurements which involve noncompetitive negotiated contracts with so-called sole-source producers.

In this instance, the Navy Department insisted that the York Division of AMF was the sole-source capable producer of the breechblock locks for the Mark–12 aircraft gun. So ingrained within the Navy Department's procurement system was this allegiance to York AMF that various sectors of the Navy supply system specifically designated York AMF as the supplier when they issued purchase requests for the breechblock lock. The term "competitive bidding" apparently was taboo.

Nevertheless, when the Navy set out more than a year ago to replenish its almost exhausted supply of breechblock locks by entering into negotiation with sole-source York AMF, two competitors appeared on the scene and submitted bids, both of which were lower than the price proposed by AMF. Suddenly there were three potential manufacturers of the breechblock lock.

And, on January 3, 1969, the Navy opened "competitive" bids on yet another breechblock lock contract and found—undoubtedly to its surprise—that nine potential manufacturers had submitted bids. Since then, those bid proposals have been thrown out, slight revisions made to the breechblock lock specifications, and the pending contract for 4,500 locks again put out for competitive bidding. On March 13, when bids were received, fully a dozen companies had submitted proposals—the lowest of which was $22.80 per lock, or about $75 per unit cheaper than the Navy paid York AMF for 2,000 units in 1968.

GAO has estimated that about 70 percent of the $5 billion worth of Defense-wide emergency procurement contracts it plans to investigate, or nearly $3.5 billion worth, are noncompetitive contracts negotiated with so-called sole-source suppliers such as York AMF. Based on the investigation of the York AMF contract, this broader GAO investigation could produce recommendations for procurement policy changes which can save hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars, annually. The potential for such savings clearly exists and must be made fact, in the public interest and the national interest.

I commend GAO and those GAO personnel directly responsible for the results of this "classical case" investigation for a job well done. By applying such diligence to the extraordinary investigative task before them, they will perform a public service of tremendous impact.

XUM

THE NAVY'S STRANGE RELATIONSHIP WITH AMF

While the noncompetitive "emergency procurement" contract awarded to York AMF has served as the springboard for the GAO's Defense-wide investigation of similar procurements, a great deal more remains to be said about the springboard case itself.

To define clearly the relationship between the Navy Department and the American Machine & Foundry Co., as it specifically involves York AMF, is a most difficult undertaking. Additional information gaps still exist. To overcome these gaps, I have asked the Navy Department, the General Services Administration and GAO for complete details regarding the sale in 1964 of the naval ordnance plant at York, Pa., to American Machine & Foundry Co. It is this former naval ordnance plant which is known today as the York Division of AMF.

I already have learned that a condition of that sale required that AMF maintain the production capabilities of the naval ordnance plant for 10 years from the date of the sale. I have specifically asked GAO to determine if the sale agreement, either in specific terms or by implication, obligated the Navy Department to provide York AMF with defense contracts for that same 10-year period. Commonsense would dictate that the Navy not obligate itself in such a manner, but until now I have found little in the Navy's handling of its breechblock lock procurement from AMF to indicate that sound commonsense prevails in Navy contracting.

Further, I have learned conclusively that a noncompetitive, negotiated, fixed-price $33,000 contract which the Navy Department awarded York AMF on June 3, 1966, to develop a new breechblock lock for the Mark-12 aircraft gun netted AMF a profit of some $21,000, or a profit rate of 180 percent of the actual cost to develop the new lock. GAO has confirmed this 180-percent rate of profit on that noncompetitive contract. It is a disgrace that the Navy then continues to deal with an industry which bleeds the American taxpayer in this manner.

The GAO investigation just completed has identified York AMF as a "high-cost producer," virtually incapable under its present system of operation of being able to secure Government contracts of this type on a competitive basis. Inefficiency on the production line and extraordinarily high overhead costs result in its high production costs, GAO found.

For example, in financial data submitted to justify the $97.13 per unit price it negotiated with the Navy for the 2,000-unit emergency procurement contract, York AMF cited a per-unit overhead cost which was higher than the total unit price of $37.75 bid by Newbould Tool Co. In its $37.75 bid figure, Newbould had included cost of the special miraging steel to produce the locks, its labor costs, overhead, and profit.

It is interesting, if not pertinent, to note that York AMF has submitted price quotations in both biddings held this year on a contract to supply 4,500 additional breechblock locks for the Mark-12 gun. In both instances, York AMF's bid was $59.94, or far below the $97.13 unit price it had convinced the Navy was reasonable for the emergency procurement contract last May.

GAO has determined that Newbould Tool Co., as of last November when production of its 2,400-unit contract was completed, anticipated that its profit would approximate 10 percent of the $37.75 unit price. Accordingly, Newbould's actual costs for material, labor, and production totaled about $34.30 per unit. Therefore, if AMF's production capabilities were equal to those of Newbould, the AMF unit price of $97.13 should have netted AMF a profit of approximately 200 percent, or 20 times higher than Newbould's profit.

On the other hand, even if AMF's profit actually was within the 10-to-15-percent range it has claimed, the Navy Department and all other Defense procurement agencies should immediately halt all noncompetitive purchases from AMF in the public interest. The American taxpayer frankly cannot afford to underwrite inefficiency or high overhead or whatever else might be offered as justification for its high-cost products.

For the record, I want to point out that on the basis of its investigation GAO reported to me it "could not conclude York AMF's emergency procurement contract was an illegal" contract award. AMF has received precisely such notification from GAO in writing. It must be pointed out, however, that GAO has not by any stretch of the imagination issued any commendations to either the Navy or York AMF in connection with this investigation.

It is a simple and obvious fact that by the time GAO had concluded its investigation, York AMF had completed production of 2,000 breechblock locks and the Navy had accepted delivery of most of them and probably had already subjected many of them to actual service in the combat area in Southeast Asia. To declare the contract illegal would have been a paper victory at best and would have served no useful purpose for the public good nor the national interest.

It is enough to say that the Navy needlessly wasted about $120,000 when it awarded the emergency procurement contract to York AMF last May.

UNBELIEVABLE PROCUREMENT BUNGLING BY THE NAVY

The file in my office which contains the lengthy and detailed record of the Navy Department's procurement of breechblock locks for the Mark-12 aircraft gun is nearly 2 inches thick. The incredible information it contains places this Navy Department procurement on a par with a Keystone Cops comedy.

Unfortunately, the gross abuse of sound procurement procedures involved here is not a laughing matter. I cannot dismiss this matter lightly because I cannot state with any degree of confidence that this case of bungling has not cost American lives in Southeast Asia or that it has not resulted in any loss of American aircraft.

I do know that for a period beginning in March of 1968 and continuing for approximately 6 months and possibly much longer, a critical nonsupport condition existed within the Navy's supply pipeline because the stockpile of breechblock locks for the Mark-12 aircraft gun was depleted. Neither GAO nor I has determined up to this point whether this supply depletion had a direct impact in the Southeast Asian combat zone in terms of aircraft rendered defenseless because supplies of spare parts for the Mark-12 were exhausted. I hope to get that information.

I do know that breechblock locks produced by the Navy at the naval ordnance plant at York, Pa., prior to its 1964 sale to York AMF failed to perform according to the Navy's own specifications of a service life of 2,000 gun firings. GAO's investigation report shows that the Navy-produced locks of pre-1964 vintage frequently failed after fewer than 300 rounds were fired.

These premature failures caused the destruction of Mark-12 aircraft guns both in the United States during test firings and in the combat area. In some instances, aircraft were damaged by the resultant explosions of the Mark-12 guns.

The decision to find a material capable of providing a longer service life for the breechblock lock led to the awarding of the high-profit design contract to York AMF. Changes in specifications for the breechblock lock have resulted from the premature failures.

Many circumstances which have come to light are extremely disconcerting. Among them are the following:

It took the Navy more than 3 years, from the first warning in June of 1965 that its stockpile of breechblock locks was failing prematurely, to pinpoint the cause of the failures, take steps to correct the specifications and achieve production of the first replacement parts in August of 1968.

Repeated warnings that the existing stockpile of spare breechblock locks was being exhausted rapidly were ignored.

A request from the Naval Air Systems Command in June of 1967 to proceed with a priority No. 2—second highest priority rating—procurement of spare parts for the Mark-12 was ignored until almost a year later.

The Navy Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg, Pa., initiated a routine supply replenishment—priority No. 20—procurement on December 29, 1967, 6 months after Navair requested emergency procurement, and exactly 7 days after SPCC was advised that only 166 spare breechblock locks remained in supply.

Still ignoring the 8-month-old request of Navair for an emergency procurement of breechblock locks, SPCC on February 13, 1968, issued a solicitation of bid proposal—noncompetitive—to York AMF for a routine supply replenishment procurement of 2,400 locks, setting a March 5 deadline for bid proposals.

By the March 5 bid deadline, which found two other firms submitting unrequested bid proposals in addition to that solicited from AMF, the supply of breechblock locks was exhausted and a "critical nonsupport condition existed."

Suddenly, on March 21, 1968, or 9 months after an emergency procurement had been requested and more than 2 weeks after SPCC learned that York AMF apparently had lost out on the routine procurement of the spare gun part, SPCC generated a priority No. 2

XUM

"emergency procurement" request for 2,000 additional locks.

Ignoring Newbould Tool Co.'s low bid of $37.75 on the routine procurement contract less than 3 weeks earlier, SPCC on or after March 22, 1968, entered into negotiation with York AMF for a bid proposal on the emergency procurement contract.

On May 13, 1968, 1 month after Newbould had been awarded the routine procurement contract to manufacture 2,400 breechblock locks at $37.75 each, SPCC awarded the noncompetitive emergency contract to York AMF to produce 2,000 locks at $97.13 each, still without inquiring whether Newbould would accept the additional contract work at its far more favorable cost figure.

Despite repeated claims by SPCC that its decision to negotiate the emergency contract price with York AMF was intended to save vital production time because of the part shortage, SPCC ultimately approved a contract delivery schedule for the emergency contract with a later delivery deadline than the routine contract awarded Newbould.

I could list point after point, Mr. Speaker. Instead, I invite my colleagues to read the incredible details in the GAO report itself. It will substantiate the fantastic pyramid of delay, inaction, misjudgment, indecision and lack of communication which characterize this entire case.

To assist anyone who wants to study this Navy "classic," I will include in the Record with the GAO report a chronology of the pertinent development dating from the introduction of the Mark-12 aircraft gun in 1951 up to and including the oral briefing in my office on March 19, 1969, by members of the GAO staff directly associated with the investigation.

As I stated, I am seeking additional details from GAO, GSA, and the Navy Department to fill the information gaps which still remain. As this becomes available, I shall enter it in the Record as well, in an effort to complete the documentation of the critical need for overhaul of policies and procedures affecting billions and billions of dollars worth of defense spending.

It is obvious that we can make significant strides to cut Government spending if we simply adopt sound, businesslike procurement procedures throughout the Federal Government.

Incidentally, it might also be possible to make substantial reductions in defense spending if we could simply learn how to keep track of the supplies we have contracted for.

On March 19, the date GAO representatives reviewed the GAO report orally in my office, they reported they had learned from Navy earlier in the day that a number of the breechblock locks produced by both Newbould and AMF were "lost."

According to GAO, a shipment of 300 locks from York AMF which failed to meet the specified 2,000 test-firings service life were to be returned to AMF for reworking. Of that number, GAO learned, 69 had been returned to AMF for correction and 231 were unaccounted for.

As of the same date, all Newbould locks had been accepted after two lots were reworked. However, the Navy was not able to locate one lot of 761 locks which had passed specification tests and were accepted by the Navy on December 3, 1968.

And, yes, I have urged the Comptroller General to make every possible effort to expedite the Defense-wide investigation of emergency procurement to such a degree that will not sacrifice accuracy and maximum public and national benefit. We cannot afford to lose time in correcting such incredible procurement practices

Chronology of Events Relating to Development of Mark–12 Aircraft Gun Including Those Actions Associated Directly With 1968 Emergency Procurement of Mark–12 Breechblock Locks From York Division of AMF

Approximately 1951: Mark–12 Aircraft gun designed by Navy.

Years 1951 to 1957: Mark–12 produced by Navy Gun Factory, Washington, D.C., and Naval Ordnance Plant (NOP), York, Pa.

Years 1957 to 1963: Mark–12 spare parts produced at NOP, York, Pa.

Years 1963 to 1964: NOP, York, Pa., deactivated and sold to AMF. (This facility now known as York Division, AMF.)

January 1964: Bureau of Naval Weapons received report from Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit concerning failure of breechblock lock during air gunnery flight at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla. Failure occurred after firing of 600 rounds rather than life-expectancy of 2,000 firings or more based on Navy specifications.

Years 1964 to 1965: Navy recorded additional reports of breechblock lock malfunctions, including resultant destruction of Mark–12 guns and damage to aircraft.

June 1965: Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va., (NWL) reported failure of locks was common and occurred in some cases after fewer than 300 rounds were fired.

July–August 1965: Fighter squadrons reported open-breech explosions had occurred which resulted in damage to both the gun and aircraft. Explosions were attributed to breechblock lock malfunctions and corrective action was requested.

September 1965: Bureau of Naval Weapons directed Naval Weapons Laboratory to investigate lock failures and recommend changes to assure satisfactory service life.

November 1965: Naval Weapons Laboratory decided to have a number of experimental locks manufactured of new materials and new finishes. NWL also decided to obtain the locks on noncompetitive basis from York AMF, justifying this sole-source procurement on stipulation of 1964 Naval Ordnance Plant sales agreement that AMF maintain gun production capabilities for a period of 10 years.

June 3, 1966: NWL awarded noncompetitive negotiated fixed-price ($33,000) contract to York AMF for manufacture of 45 experimental locks. August 12, 1966 was initially specified as delivery schedule but was subsequently changed to March, 1967, a delay of seven months.

July 1, 1966: Consolidated Stock Status Report obtained from Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa., showed that Navy had about 3,090 breechblock locks on hand as of this date.

April 12, 1967: Navy Ships Parts Control Center initiated processing of purchase request for 188 breechblock locks for stock replenishment based on routine supply demand review.

May 4, 1967: Naval Weapons Laboratory advised SPCC that evaluation of experimental locks was completed and recommended that no purchase action be taken since revised specifications would be available in a short time.

June 1967: Naval Air Systems Command notified SPCC that spare parts to support gun system problems on aircraft in Southeast Asia (SEA) should be procured on Priority 2 (second highest priority) basis from York AMF.

August 1, 1967: Inventory records showed that number of locks on hand had diminished to 340 units in ready-for-issue condition. On basis of supply-demand review conducted then, processing of procurement of 2,220 units was initiated, and subsequently deferred "apparently in anticipation of . . . new specifications," according to GAO.

August 29, 1967: Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) approved design drawing for new breechblock lock.

December 7, 1967: After nearly 18 months of research and development, and eight months after the experimental locks were obtained, Naval Weapons Laboratory notified SPCC that locks manufactured from 18 percent nickel maraging steel would satisfactorily meet service life requirements.

—In same communication, NWL also recommended SPCC immediately award contract for new locks to meet urgent fleet needs.

December 22, 1967: SPCC received letter from NAVAIR stating that stock had diminished to 166 units and recommending that contract for 2,400 of the new breechblock locks be awarded to AMF (American Machine & Foundry Company), York, Pa.

December 29, 1967: SPCC cancelled two procurement requests in process at that time (180 units and 2,220 units) and prepared purchase request for 2,400 locks of new type.

Purchase request was designated Priority 20 routine stock replenishment action, despite NAVAIR request six months earlier for Priority 2 procurement.

January 18, 1968: SPCC prepared purchase recommendation stating it was impractical to develop either a limited or unlimited purchase description for this new breechblock lock.

January 30, 1968: SPCC's Contract Review Board granted authority to negotiate procurement on basis "it is impractical to secure competition."

February 13, 1968: More than two months after Dec. 7 notice of new lock's approval, SPCC prepared solicitation for 2,400 breechblock locks and mailed copy to AMF. March 5, 1968 was specified as closing date for receipt of proposals. Solicitation was synopsized in Commerce Business Daily. Synopsis in Commerce Business Daily stated that drawings (approved by NAVAIR Aug. 29, 1967) and specifications could not be furnished by the government.

February 23, 1968: Newbould Tool Co., York, Pa., contacted SPCC, Mechanicsburg and requested drawings for the lock. Newbould was told drawings were not available and if they were, the procurement probably would be advertised.

February 26, 1968: Milo Components, Inc. contacted SPCC and requested drawing. Milo was told drawings were not available.

February 27, 1968: At insistence of Newbould and Milo, it was determined drawings were available at SPCC, Mechanicsburg, at least since January 19, 1968, almost a month prior to issuance of the solicitation of a bid from AMF. Drawings were supplied both Newbould and Milo this date.

March 5, 1968: Bids were received from Newbould at $37.75 per lock, Milo at $89.90 per lock, and York AMF at $99.79 per lock.

March 7–8, 1968: Conference held at SPCC received report that despite 2,400-unit procurement already underway, *stock of breechblock locks for the Mark-12 had been depleted thereby causing a non-support condition to exist.*

March 8, 1968: SPCC requested pre-award survey of Newbould and Milo including evaluation of technical, productive and financial capabilities, past performance record and ability to meet required delivery schedules, by Defense Contract Administration Services District (DCASD), Garden City, N.Y.

March 1968: SPCC received notice from NAVAIR (exact date uncertain) that Mark-12 gun spare parts support remained critical and that it was imperative additional action be taken to provide improved quantities of failing parts. SPCC officials informed GAO investigators that NAVAIR was concerned about November 25, 1968 delivery schedule for 2,400-unit procurement although at this point in time that contract had not been awarded and delivery schedule was not firmly established.

March 21, 1968: SPCC generated a Priority 2 purchase request for an additional 2,000 breechblock locks and established a "desired" delivery date of May 30, 1968. GAO confirmed during investigation that "not by any stretch of the imagination" could SPCC expect delivery of any quantity of breechblock locks by the desired delivery date.

March 22, 1968: SPCC purchase division received purchase request for 2,000 locks under Priority 2 procurement. Because AMF, by virtue of its earlier development contract for the new locks, was considered by SPCC to be the only proven manufacturer at this point. SPCC officials contended this fact could advance delivery by 120 days, and therefore did not contact Newbould regarding its possible capability to perform both contracts at its low bid price.

March 29, 1968: AMF submitted proposal to manufacture 2,000 locks at a unit price of $100.31, claiming the figure provided a profit of $10.03 per unit, or 11.1 percent.

March–April 1968: Upon completion of the pre-award survey at Newbould, DCASD of Reading, Pa., recommended complete award of 2,400-unit routine procurement contract to Newbould.

April 12, 1968: Routine contract awarded Newbould for 2,400 locks at $37.75 each, or a total of $90,600. Contract required delivery of two pre-production sample locks to NWL, Dahlgren, Va., for testing by July 11, 1968. The contract schedule allowed 30 days for government testing of the samples, with delivery of the 2,400 units 120 days after approval of the samples.

April 1968: During this month, DCASD, Reading, Pa., conducted review and evaluation of the $100.31 unit price quoted by AMF for the 2,000-unit emergency procurement of breechblock locks.

May 1, 1968: DCASD Reading audit report recommended acceptance of a unit price of $94.068 for AMF production of 2,000 breechblock locks.

May 1 and 2, 1968: DCASD Reading conducted negotiations with AMF on the unit price variances and ultimately reached a compromise unit price of $97.13 for the emergency contract work, including an estimated profit of $8.83 per unit, or 10 percent profit.

May 9, 1968: York AMF requested priority assistance (assignment of special "DX" rating to contract) to expedite procurement of raw materials for production.

May 13, 1968: Contract, specifying September 11, 1968, delivery date for 2,000 locks at total price of $194,260, was issued by SPCC to AMF. Delivery date represented a period of 120 days from contract award, as specified in the solicitation, or more than three months later than the "desired delivery date" of May 30 which had been established on March 21, 1968.

May 29, 1968: York AMF acknowledged receipt of the contract and took exception to the delivery schedule. AMF contended that according to the request for proposal and subsequent negotiation, deliveries were not required to be completed until December 10, 1968, and asked that the contract be so modified.

June 10, 1968: SPCC advised AMF that the contract delivery schedule was in accord with the request for proposal to which AMF had responded with its bid and that the requested modification was not acceptable.

June 21, 1968: Newbould Tool Co., Inc. delivered to Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va., three sample locks for testing. Specifications required that they pass 2,000 test firings. The tests conducted submitted the samples to 3,000 firings and Newbould officials were advised orally the samples were approved and that written approval would follow.

Newbould, during manufacture of its samples for testing, discovered an error in the specified design and manufactured one of its three samples to correct that error. It was the sample based on Newbould's correction of the design error which was selected for subsequent manufacture.

On this date, Newbould also formally protested award of the 2,000 unit contract to AMF and advised SPCC that Newbould was prepared to enter a bid.

July 1 (Approximately), 1968: GAO found that NWL, Dahlgren, this week notified SPCC by phone that Newbould's sample lock had passed tests. SPCC indicated no knowledge of having received such message.

July 3, 1968: DCASD Reading advised SPCC that AMF could not produce its 2,000 units at necessary rate to complete contract by September 11, 1968. AMF contended their offer was based on the fact that 98 days was required prior to first delivery on August 10 and that thereafter AMF would deliver at the rate of 125 units per week, completing the contract December 10, 1968.

July 19, 1968: NWL confirmed telephone approval by speedletter to SPCC.

July 22, 1968: SPCC formally agreed to AMF's delivery schedule including December 10, 1968 final delivery. The delivery date for AMF which SPCC finally accepted represented a contract execution period of 211 days as compared with the 120 days specified in the contract. Further, the AMF contract completion date of December 10, 1968 actually exceeded the completion date for Newbould's routine procurement contract which was November 25, 1968.

July 26, 1968: SPCC issued Modification No. 1 to Newbould contract, advising that samples met specifications and that firm delivery date for 2,400 units was November 25, 1968. Time delay since initial approval—three weeks.

August 1–15, 1968: AMF requested waivers for dimensional variations on 1,190 breechblock locks including Lots 1 of 600 units, Lot 2 of 40 units and Lot 3 of 550 units.

August 16, 1968: SPCC recommended that requests for waiver be rejected due to critical application and current status of subject lock. Congressman Rooney formally requested Navy Department and GAO investigations under date of August 1, 1968.

August 19, 1968: Naval Weapon Service Office (NWSO) advised SPCC it agreed with rejection of waiver No. 1 but approved waiver No. 2.

August 23, 1968: NAVAIR approved waivers noting that urgency to secure Mark-12 gun spare parts dictates most expeditious production.

NWSO notified SPCC this date that due to critical supply problem, approval was given to waiver No. 3 as well.

August 28, 1968: SPCC notified AMF that all three waivers had been granted.

October 29–November 1, 1968: Newbould forwarded two sample locks from each of three production lots for test and evaluation by NWL, Dahlgren, Va. The three lots represented total production of 2,400 locks constituting Newbould contract.

November 26, 1968: York AMF made final shipment of locks under its emergency procurement contract for 2,000 units.

November 1968: NWL notified SPCC that test samples of lots 5 and 8 from AMF (300 units) did not meet specification of 2,000 round firing life requirement.

December 3, 1968: NWL notified Newbould that its Lots 1 and 3 (1,639 units) failed to meet necessary requirements. Newbould's Lot 2 (761 units) was accepted.

January 1, 1969: SPCC considered Newbould contract delinquent as of November 25, 1968, because 2,400 acceptable locks had not been delivered under contract. The problem of 1,639 unacceptable locks had not been resolved as of this date.

SPCC had taken no action as of this date regarding 300 locks produced by AMF which were unacceptable. NWL, Dahlgren, had not determined cause of test sample failure as of this date. SPCC did not, at this time, declare AMF contract delinquent, despite passage of December 10, 1968 delivery deadline for all 2,000 of AMF breechblock locks.

January 3, 1969: SPCC received "competitive" bids to supply 4,500 additional breechblock locks for the Mark-12 aircraft gun. In this instance, nine bids were reported ranging from a low of $15.29 per unit to $98.00 per unit. Newbould ranked as fifth lower bidder at $37.65 each while AMF ranked eighth at $59.94, or approximately $37 lower than its unit price under the negotiated emergency procurement of 2,000 units.

February 7, 1969: NWL, Dahlgren, Va., requested change of specifications for breechblock lock in advance of 4,500 unit procurement. As a result, bids received January 3, 1969 were rejected.

February 20, 1969: SPCC issued new invitations for bids on 4,500-unit procurement of breechblock lock based on new specifications involving dimensional changes to make the breechblock lock more reliable and durable in performance.

March 11, 1969: GAO investigation report concluded that AMF contract award was not "illegal" under existing Navy procurement procedures. However, GAO was critical of Navy procurement procedures in this instance and concurred with Congressman Rooney that broader investigation of emergency procurement was in order. GAO suggested that Rooney's request for Navy-wide investigation of emergency procurement be expanded to review such procurement on Defense-wide basis.

March 13, 1969: SPCC received bids from 12 companies on new specifications for breechblock lock, ranging upward from low of $22.80. Newbould was sixth lowest bidder at $33.70 per unit while AMF was farther from contention at $59.94.

March 19, 1969: GAO investigators conferred with Administrative Assistant to U.S. Rep. Fred B. Rooney, to review investigative report and respond to 29 comments and questions submitted by Congressman after report was received from GAO March 11, 1969.

GAO reported this date that 1,639 unacceptable locks produced by Newbould had been returned to manufacturer for adjustment and were accepted upon re-testing. However, GAO was advised this date by telephone, Navy had "lost" Lot 2 (761 units) of Newbould contract which were accepted as of December 3, 1968.

GAO reported this date that Navy had returned to AMF for adjustment 69 of its 300 units which were declared unacceptable. By telephone conversation with GAO this date, Navy also had "lost" the remaining 231 AMF locks which were unacceptable.

GAO reported this date that both Newbould and AMF were being charged for additional testing required by failure of certain lots to meet test firing specifications.

GAO, asked if this AMF contract investigation indicated the Navy Department had utilized good procurement procedures, responded with a firm "No."

GAO concluded that the SPCC contracting officer should have considered negotiations with Newbould or others for performance of the emergency contract at lower cost per unit.

GAO, asked if this emergency procurement investigation indicated possible substantial waste of public funds within Defense contracts because of neglect, unnecessary delay, poor judgment, defective business sense or other factors involving limited competence or incompetence responded with an emphatic

"Yes." Specifically because of the evidence of tax dollar waste in this contract, GAO will conduct investigation of emergency procurements totaling $5 billion annually on Defense-wide basis, with special emphasis on 70 percent of such spending which involves supposed "sole-source suppliers" such as York AMF.

[B-164978]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1969.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: We refer to your letters of August 1 and September 6, 1968, requesting that the General Accounting Office investigate the circumstances spelled out in enclosures pertaining to the award of a contract on May 13, 1968, for 2,000 breechblock locks, and an apparent abuse of sound emergency procurement procedures by the Department of the Navy involving two contracts awarded at widely divergent per-unit prices to two different firms by the Navy Ships Parts Control Center.

In addition, you asked in your letter of August 1, 1968, that we seek answers to 14 questions contained in a letter which you sent to the Secretary of the Navy. In your letter of September 6, 1968, you advised us that you had received a copy of the Navy's report of its findings. You also asked that we consider issues which pertain to the Ships Parts Control Center (SPCC) comments.

Subsequently, on October 8, 1968, we met with Mr. Huber, your staff assistant, who agreed that the requests could be reviewed and reported as two separate assignments; the first, a review of the procurement of breechblock locks and the second, a review of the Navy's emergency procurement procedures.

We therefore directed our review to the procurement of breechblock locks taking into consideration related questions and comments which were made in your letters of August 1 and September 6, 1968. Our review also covered the Navy's use of emergency procedures in the instant procurement, but did not cover the Navy's general use of emergency procedures in other procurements. We plan to examine into this matter on a Defense-wide basis shortly after July 1, 1969.

On May 13, 1968, Navy awarded a sole-source negotiated contract to the American Machine and Foundry Company (AMF), York, Pennsylvania, for 2,000 breechblock locks at $97.13 each. The unit price for the locks to be fabricated by AMF was about three times the unit price of $37.75 for 2,400 of the same kind of locks to be fabricated under a competitively negotiated contract awarded on April 12, 1968, to the Newbould Tool Company (Newbould), York, Pennsylvania. A summary of the circumstances pertaining to the award of these contracts follows.

PREDECESSOR LOCKS

The breechblock lock is one of five components of the Mark 12 20mm aircraft gun breechblock assembly. The breechblock assembly is that part which loads a round into the barrel chamber, closes the breech, fires the round, and removes the empty cartridge case. Failure of any one of the five components may cause the breechblock assembly to function improperly, thereby resulting in firing failure or shell explosion outside of the barrel chamber.

This aircraft gun was designed by the Navy about 1951, and was produced until about 1957, primarily by the Navy Gun Factory, Washington, D.C., and the Naval Ordnance Plant (NOP), York, Pennsylvania. The NOP continued to produce spare parts for the gun until 1963, when the plant was deactivated and sold to AMF.

Although produced in significant quantities, this gun apparently saw limited service until the conflict in Southeast Asia (SEA) was expanded. The gun is currently being used in three different types of combat aircraft, and many of these aircraft are based in SEA.

In January 1964, the Bureau of Naval Weapons (BuWeps) received a technical report from the Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit concerning the failure of a breechblock lock during an air gunnery flight at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida. The report stated that a breechblock had prematurely unlocked causing it to be blown to the rear of the gun receiver with great force. The incident was attributed to a shattered breechblock lock that had failed after approximately 600 rounds of ammunition had been fired from the gun. Military specifications applicable to the gun provided that all parts should have a life expectancy of at least 2,000 rounds. The report further pointed out that although damage to the aircraft was slight, damage to the gun was sufficient to require replacement and the premature failure of the breechblock lock was considered indicative of a material deficiency.

During 1965, additional reports were received pertaining to malfunctions of breechblock locks. In June 1965, the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia (NWL), pointed out that failure of the locks was common and had occurred in some cases after less than 300 rounds had been fired. In July and August 1965, fighter squadrons reported that open-breech explosions had occurred which resulted in damage to both the gun and the aircraft. The reports indicated that the explosions were attributable to breechblock lock malfunctions and recommended that action be taken to prevent recurrence of such incidents. In September 1965, as a result of these reports, BuWeps directed NWL to investigate the causes of the breechblock lock failures and recommend changes that would assure a satisfactory service life.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW LOCK

In order to obtain a satisfactory part, the NWL, in November 1965, decided to have a number of experimental locks manufactured with various types of new finishes and materials. The NWL further decided to obtain the experimental locks on a noncompetitive basis from AMF. Justification for this sole-source procurement was based on the fact that NOP, York, where the locks had been previously manufactured, was sold to AMF in 1964 with the stipulation that the company maintain gun production capabilities for a period of 10 years. Moreover, the special tooling to be furnished by the Government had been designed specifically for the NOP equipment acquired by AMF and many former NOP, York, personnel involved in the manufacture of the locks were employed by AMF. It was thus believed that the "know-how" to produce the locks was available at AMF.

NWL awarded a noncompetitive negotiated fixed-price contract to AMF on June 3, 1966, for the manufacture of 45 experimental locks. The delivery schedule was initially established as August 12, 1966, but was subsequently changed to March 1967, or a delay of approximately 7 months.

A Consolidated Stock Status Report (CSSR) obtained at SPCC showed that the Navy had about 3,090 breechblock locks on hand as of July 1, 1966. On April 12, 1967, prior to receiving notice of the status of the new lock, SPCC initiated action to process a purchase request for a quantity of 188 breechblock locks for stock replenishment. We were advised by an SPCC official that the quantity to be purchased was determined on the basis of a routine supply demand review conducted to determine future needs for items under SPCC cognizance. Shortly thereafter, on May 4, 1967, NWL advised SPCC that evaluation of the experimental locks had been completed and recommended that no purchase action be taken since revised specifications would be available in a short time. On August 1, 1967, inventory records indicated that the number of locks on hand had diminished to 340 units in ready-for-issue condition and on the basis of a supply demand review conducted at that time, a system stock replenishment action for an additional quantity of 2,220 units was initiated. This action also was deferred, apparently in anticipation of receiving the new specifications.

The drawing for the new breechblock lock was approved by the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) on August 29, 1967. However, it was not until December 7, 1967, after nearly 18 months of research and development and about 8 months after the experimental locks were obtained, that NWL notified SPCC that breechblock locks manufactured from 18 percent nickel maraging steel would satisfactorily meet service life requirements. The NWL also recommended that all future locks be fabricated in accordance with the revised drawing. We were informed that 18 percent nickel maraging steel generally provides a steel product of superior strength and durability.

PROCUREMENT OF 2,400 LOCKS FROM NEWBOULD

NWL, in its December 7, 1967, communication, recommended that SPCC immediately award a contract for the new locks in order to meet urgent fleet needs. On December 22, 1967, SPCC received a letter from NAVAIR, stating in part:

"The In-Service Breechblock Lock Buweps Dwg 851500 is to be replaced by the new procurement item. Current stock status shows 166 on hand and that a contract is in process of being awarded for 2,400. It is recommended that this contract be changed to procure 2,400 of the new Breechblock Locks, NASC–NAVAIR 2518518 and that this contract be awarded to AMF (American Machine and Foundry Company), York, Pennsylvania * * *."

On December 29, 1967, SPCC cancelled the two procurement requests in process at that time and prepared a new purchase request for a quantity of 2,400 locks to be manufactured in accordance with the revised drawing. The new purchase request was designated priority 20, stock replenishment action, even though NAVAIR had notified SPCC in June 1967 that spare parts to support gun system problems on aircraft in SEA should be procured on a priority 2 basis. The request further indicated that AMF, York, was the recommended source of supply.

During January 1968, SPCC accomplished the necessary internal processing of the purchase request and on January 30 its Contract Review Board granted authority to negotiate the procurement, because it was impracticable to obtain competition. The purchase recommendation prepared on January 18, 1968, stated that it was impracticable to develop either a limited or unlimited purchase description for this item.

SPCC made a solicitation for the 2,400 locks on February 13, 1968, more than 2 months after being notified of approval of the new lock, with March 5, 1968, established as the closing date for receipt of proposals. On the basis that AMF was the only source, a copy of the solicitation was mailed to AMF and the proposed procurement was synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily. The synopsis stated that drawings and specifications for the breechblock lock could not be furnished by the Government.

At their request, Milo Components, Inc., Newbould, and other companies were provided copies of the proposal. However, drawings were not furnished with copies of the proposal. On February 23 and 26, 1968, respectively, Newbould and Milo contacted the SPCC buyer and requested drawings for the lock. Both companies were informed that drawings were not available and that if they were, the porcurement would probably be advertised. At the insistence of Newbould and Milo, it was determined that drawings were available and had been available at SPCC since at least January 19, 1968. The lock

XUM

drawings were furnished to both Newbould and Milo on February 27, 1968.

AMF, Milo, and Newbould proposed unit prices for the 2,400 locks of $99.79, $89.90, and $37.75, respectively. On March 8, 1968, SPCC requested the cognizant Defense Contract Administration Services District (DCASD), Garden City, New York, to perform a preaward survey of these companies and evaluate their technical, productive, and financial capabilities in view of the contract requirements. This request included an evaluation of the companies' performance record and ability to meet required delivery schedules. Upon completion of the survey at Newbould, the DCASD, Reading, Pennsylvania, recommended a complete award to Newbould.

A contract was awarded to Newbould on April 12, 1968, for a quantity of 2,400 locks at a unit price of $37.75, or a total of $90,600. Delivery of two preproduction sample locks were to be submited to NWL by July 11, 1968, for first article approval. A period of 30 days was provided in the contract schedule for first article testing by the Government; delivery of the 2,400 locks was to be completed 120 days after first article approval.

On June 21, 1968, a Newbould official took the two required preproduction sample locks to the NWL and test firings were conducted from June 24 to July 1, 1968. NWL personnel informed us that the period required to complete testing of the locks was extended because of their procedure of testing several articles concurrently, thereby reducing the cost of testing. However, we were informed that if time was of the essence on any particular item, it could be tested alone.

NWL, by letter of August 16, 1968, notified SPCC that the sample locks were subsequently subjected to metallurgical examination and that SPCC had been notified by telephone, during the week of July 1, 1968, that the two sample locks had satisfactorily met test requirements. An SPCC official advised us that he had no knowledge of the telephone notice nor any information concerning the test results until receipt of written notification from the NWL on July 19, 1968. NWL officials informed us that the delay in preparation of a written notification was due to a large volume of reports under preparation at the time, a number of which were for items of a higher priority. However, they stated they considered the telephone message to be proper notification of the test results to SPCC.

On July 26, 1968, or about 3 weeks after testing was completed, SPCC advised Newbould that the first article test samples had been approved by NWL and that production units should be delivered in about 120 days, or by November 25, 1968.

PROCUREMENT OF 2,000 LOCKS FROM AMF

At a conference held at SPCC on March 7 and 8, 1968, it was reported that although a procurement for 2,400 breechblock locks was underway, stocks of the original lock had been depleted, thereby causing a nonsupport condition to exist. SPCC was also notified by NAVAIR, during March 1968, that Mark 12 gun spare parts support remained critical and that it was imperative that additional action be taken to provide improved quantities of failing parts. SPCC officials informed us that NAVAIR was concerned about the November 25, 1968, delivery schedule proposed for the procurement of the 2,400 locks, as these locks were needed as soon as possible.

SPCC on March 21, 1968, generated a priority 2 purchase request for an additional 2,000 of the new breechblock locks. SPCC officials informed us that they purchased 2,000 locks because it was an economical order quantity. A desired delivery date of May 30, 1968, was established, or about 6 months prior to the scheduled delivery of the 2,400 locks already under contract.

SPCC officials stated that when the purchase request for the 2,000 locks was received by the SPCC purchase division on March 22, 1968, AMF was the only proven manufacturer and accordingly the only manufacturer for whom first article test requirements could be waived. It was expected that waiver of first article testing would advance delivery by 120 days. SPCC officials stated, therefore, Newbould was not contacted for the additional procurement. Accordingly, the cognizant buyer recommended that SPCC negotiate solely with AMF.

Following authorization from the review board, AMF was requested to submit proposed pricing data for a quantity of 2,000 breechblock locks. In response to the request for proposal, AMF on March 29, 1968, submitted a proposal to manufacture 2,000 locks. After a review and evaluation of the pricing data included in AMF's proposal by DCASD, Reading, negotiations were conducted on May 1 and May 2, 1968, and agreement was reached on a unit price of $97.13 for the contract.

During the week of May 3, 1968, negotiation proceedings were completed and AMF, although prior to receipt of the formal award, recognized the effective date of the contract as May 1, 1968. To assure that raw material would be available to meet the required delivery dates, AMF, on May 9, 1968, requested priority assistance in expediting procurement of raw materials required by their forging vendor. DCASD, Reading, advised AMF that the receipt of materials for the forgings was only part of the vendor's problem and special priority assistance to effect earlier delivery was not recommended unless other vendor problems could be resolved.

Subsequently, the SPCC Contract Review Board approved the award to AMF for the 2,000 locks for a total price of $194,260. A contract providing for delivery by September 11, 1968, was issued to AMF on May 13, 1968. This delivery date represented a period of 120 days from the date of award, which was the required delivery stated in the request for proposal, or more than 3 months later than the desired delivery date of May 30, 1968, established by the purchase request issued in March.

In a letter dated May 29, 1968, AMF acknowledged receipt of the contract and at the same time took exception to the delivery schedule. The letter stated that according to the request for proposal submitted by AMF and discussions held during negotiations, deliveries were not required to be completed until December 10, 1968. Accordingly, AMF requested that the contract be modified. SPCC notified AMF on June 10, 1968, that the contract delivery schedule was in accordance with the RFP and that the requested change was not acceptable. Two weeks later SPCC advised AMF that failure to deliver in accordance with the contract would result in the initiation of default action.

On July 3, 1968, DCASD, Reading, forwarded a delay in delivery notice advising SPCC that AMF could not produce at the necessary rate to complete the contract by September 11, 1968. DCASD added that AMF officials stated that the delivery schedule contained in the contract was not the schedule negotiated. In order to clarify the misunderstanding regarding the contract delivery schedule AMF noted that their offer was based on the fact that 98 days would be required prior to first delivery on August 10, 1968. Thereafter, AMF would deliver at a rate of 125 units per week which would complete the contract by December 10, 1968.

AMF stated this schedule was predicated on a 10-week leadtime for the material and 4 weeks in-process time prior to first delivery. The leadtime of 10 weeks for delivery of material was apparently based on quotes from suppliers. These quotes were available at the time of negotiations. Accordingly, on July 22, 1968, SPCC formally agreed to AMF's delivery schedule.

The delivery schedule finally accepted by SPCC represented a time frame of 211 days for total delivery compared to the 120 days originally specified in the contract. Also, the December 10, 1968, completion date exceeded the completion date of November 25, 1968, established for the Newbould contract by 15 days. Although Newbould's preproduction locks had passed all testing requirements as early as the first week of July 1968, we found no evidence that SPCC contacted Newbould in an attempt to determine whether Newbould could phase delivery of the 2,400 locks over a time frame similar to the revised AMF schedule. Newbould had, on June 21, 1968, formally protested the award to AMF and advised SPCC that they were willing to bid on the 2,000 breechblock locks. SPCC officials indicated that something less than 2,000 locks were required to satisfy emergency requirements.

PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY BOTH NEWBOULD AND AMF

Waivers requested by AMF

During August 1968, AMF requested waivers for dimensional variations in 1,190 completed units. Waiver number one covered 600 units, waiver number two 40 units, and waiver number three 550 units. SPCC recommended to the Naval Weapon Service Office (NWSO) on August 16, 1968, that due to the critical application and current status of subject lock, AMF's request for waiver be rejected. On August 19, 1968, NWSO informed SPCC that they concurred with rejection of waiver number one but approved waiver number two. On August 23, 1968, NAVAIR approved the waivers stating that urgency of Mark 12 gun spare parts dictates the most expeditious production of parts. Further, NWSO notified SPCC on August 23, 1968, that due to the critical supply problem, approval was given to AMF's waiver request number three. SPCC notified AMF of acceptance of their waiver requests on August 28, 1968.

AMF lot samples fail to meet 2,000 round life

On November 26, 1968, AMF made the final shipment of breechblock locks under the subject contract. The NWL notified SPCC in November 1968 that test samples submitted for AMF's lots 5 and 8 (300) units did not meet the 2,000 round minimum life requirement for acceptance by the Navy. As of January 1, 1969, the NWL had not determined the exact cause for the test sample failures. Therefore, no action had been taken by SPCC at that time.

Newbould lot samples fail to meet 2,000 round life

On October 29 and November 1, 1968, Newbould forwarded two sample breechblock locks from each of three production lots to the NWL for test and evaluation. On December 3, 1968, the NWL notified SPCC that samples from production lots 1 and 3 failed to meet the necessary requirements. On the basis of the test results the NWL recommended acceptance of production lot 2 (761 units) and rejection of lots 1 and 3 (1,639 units). As a result of Newbould's inability to deliver the entire 2,400 acceptable locks by November 25, 1968, the contract was considered delinquent by SPCC; however, Newbould was not notified. As of January 1, 1969, SPCC had not resolved the problem of the 1,639 units.

PROCUREMENT OF 4,500 ADDITIONAL BREECHBLOCK LOCKS ON AN ADVERTISED BASIS

On July 22, 1968, NWSO notified SPCC that in addition to the 4,400 units currently under contract, approximately 4,500 units were required to provide for 100 percent retrofit. Accordingly, during the latter part of 1968, SPCC advertised for 4,500 breechblock locks. Nine bids were recorded on the opening date of January 3, 1969. These bids ranged from a high of $98.00 per unit to a low of $15.29 per unit. Newbould was fifth low bidder with a bid of $37.65 and AMF was eighth low bidder with a bid of $59.94.

We were informed that the Navy rejected all bids and has changed specifications for the lock.

XUM

While we believe it to be questionable that Navy gave adequate consideration to soliciting Newbould and other manufacturers prior to the award to AMF, it should be noted that the need for the locks was critical and the procurement was assigned an 02 priority designator. At the time of the award to AMF (May 13, 1968) the scheduled delivery of preproduction sample locks by NWL was still approximately 2 months away (July 11, 1968), and Navy could not be certain that such samples would satisfactorily meet the test requirements so that production runs could commence immediately thereafter, whereas AMF had produced satisfactory locks under its development contract and preproduction test requirements could therefore be waived for that firm.

Paragraph 3–202.3 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation states that a determination and findings by the contracting officer, justifying use of the public exigency exception to formal advertising under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2), need only state the existence of a priority designator of 1 through 6 in order to justify use of that exception. Further, findings in support of a determination to negotiate under the public exigency exception are made final by 10 U.S.C. 2310(b), and are therefore not subject to question by our Office. While the exception does not, in and of itself, authorize sole-source procurement, a considerable amount of discretion with respect to the use of that exception must be reserved to the contracting officer, and this Office will not overturn the contracting officer's decision to negotiate a sole-source award pursuant to the public exigency exception unless it is clear that he has abused the discretion vested in him in an arbitrary or capricious manner. See 44 Comp. Gen. 590.

It is our view that the circumstances surrounding the award to AMF do not disclose such a clear abuse of discretion by the contracting officer as to affect the legality of the contract awarded to that firm, and that there is no basis for any imputation of bad faith on his part.

The 14 questions presented in your letters, the SPCC answers, and our comments thereto are contained in appendix I to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER.

For the Comptroller General of the United States.

APPENDIX 1

YOUR ORIGINAL 14 QUESTIONS, SPCC COMMENTS AND GAO COMMENTS

QUESTION NO. 1

Why has the Navy not purchased any breechblock locks for the MK–12, 20mm Aircraft Guns for a period of more than five years preceding the contract awards of April and May of 1968? Did the Navy have an inventory of these pieces sufficient to carry it through this period.

SPCC COMMENT

Until December 1967 the Navy had adequate stocks of the original Breechblock lock (FSN 1005–713–9407, BUWEPS Drawing 851500) either on hand or under procurement to satisfy its known requirements.

In December 1967, based upon an evaluation of tests performed on a number of Locks manufactured from different materials with different finishes by the American Machine and Foundry Company (AMF), York, Pa., under contract with the Naval Weapons Laboratory (NWL), Dahlgren, Va., new specifications covering the Breechblock Locks were approved and released. The objective of this effort was to develop a Lock which would possess greater reliability and have a longer service life. A history of the design and engineering work performed to achieve this objective is contained in Attachment A.

Upon approval of the new specifications (NASC–NAVAIR Drawing 2518518), the Naval Air Systems Command on 22 December 1967 (Attachment B) recommended that a stock procurement for 2,400 Breechblock Locks then in process at SPCC be revised to obtain Locks manufactured to the new design and that AMF York be awarded the production contract.

GAO COMMENT

On April 12, 1967, SPCC initiated a purchase request for 188 locks based on a routine supply demand. However, in anticipation of receiving revised specifications, the procurement was not made. Further, on August 1, 1967, when lock inventories had diminished to 340 units in a ready to issue condition, a stock replenishment action for 2,220 locks was initiated. However, this action was also deferred, apparently in anticipation of receiving the new specifications. A contract for 2,400 locks to be built in accordance with the new specification was awarded on April 12, 1968, or one year after it was determined that additional lock supplies were required. Details of the stock status of the locks are presented on pages 3 and 4 of our letter.

ADDENDUM

In response to SPCC's comments, you questioned in your letter of September 6, 1968, the Navy's procedure of specifying a desired contractor without regard to possible cost factors. We agreed that as a general rule it is not sound policy to specify a specific contractor without giving adequate consideration to cost differentials involved.

QUESTION NO. 2

What inventory of the breechblock locks for the MK–12 does the Navy have at the present time?

SPCC COMMENT

At the present time the Navy has none of the newly designed Locks in its inventory; it still has 95 of the original Locks on hand. Contracts with the Newbould Tool Company, York, Pa., for 2,400 of the new Locks and with AMF York covering 2,000 of the new Locks are currently outstanding.

GAO COMMENT

AMF started delivery of the new locks on August 27, 1968.

QUESTION NO. 3

When was the original requisition for 2,400 breechblock locks issued by the Navy Air Systems Command? (Please supply a copy of the requisition order.)

SPCC COMMENT

Upon receipt of the NAVAIRSYSCOM letter of 22 December 1967 (Attachment B) a procurement request for 2,400 of the newly approved Breechblock Locks (NASC-NAVAIR Drawing 2158518) was prepared by the Stock Control Division of SPCC on 29 December 1967. Attachment C is a copy of this procurement request.

GAO COMMENT

Initial procurement of the new lock is covered on pages 4 through 6 of our letter.

QUESTION NO. 4

When was the requisition for emergency procurement of 2,000 breechblock locks issued and by whom? (Please supply a copy of that requisition order.) What prompted this emergency need to develop 30 days after award of a routine contract for the same item?

SPCC COMMENT

During the early months of 1968 there developed within the Navy concern over the status of repair parts for the MK12 20mm Gun, generally, and of the Breechblock Locks especially. In the case of the latter, an increasing number of the original-design Locks were failing in combat aircraft (F8, A4 and A7) operating in Southeast Asia. According to the Naval Weapons Service Office, Philadelphia, some Locks were failing after firing only 200 rounds instead of their design expectancy of 2,000 rounds. Even worse, however, was the fact that when a Lock failed, leaving an open 20mm Gun chamber, continued operation of the gun could cause extensive damage to or even loss of the aircraft. Thus the Locks became a safety-of-flight item, and early replacement with the newly designed Lock became most important.

On 20 March 1968, the NAVAIRSYSCOMHQ called SPCC to express that Headquarters' growing concern over the condition of repair parts support for the MK12 20mm Gun. Much of the information and direction provided in that call was contained also in NAVAIR message 272218Z March 68 (Attachment E). Among other things, SPCC was told that MK12 Gun spare parts support and reliability were critical, that additional action to provide improved quantities of the parts was imperative, and that the NAVAIR Program Manager intended to obtain a "DX" rating for the parts in critical supply.

On 21 March 1968, the day following the afore-mentioned telephone call from NAVAIRSYSCOMHQ, SPCC prepared and commenced processing a Priority 02 (SEASIA) purchase request for a quantity of 2,000 of the new-design Breechblock Locks. Attachment D is a copy of this purchase request. It should be noted that the contract for the stock replenishment quantity of 2,400 Locks had not yet been awarded as alleged.

As outlined by the Naval Weapons Services Office, Philadelphia, in Attachment F, in addition to the 4,400 Breechblock Locks presently under contract, approximately 4,500 more will be required to completely replace all of the original-design Locks in service use, a step which has been recommended in view of the current safety-of-flight classification of this item. It is expected that circumstances will permit future procurements of this item to be made on a competitive basis.

GAO COMMENT

We believe the procurement of the 2,400 locks could have been classified as a priority 2 action. NAVAIR had notified SPCC in June 1967 that spare parts to support gun system problems on F–8 aircraft in SEA should be procured on a priority 2 basis. This matter is discussed on pages 4 and 5 of our letter.

SPCC officials informed us that NAVAIR, in March 1968, became concerned about the November 25, 1968, delivery schedule proposed for the procurement of the 2,400 locks, as the locks were needed as soon as possible. It was further stated that stocks of the original lock had been depleted, thereby causing a nonsupport condition. Based on these conditions, a priority 2 action was generated for 2,000 additional locks. This matter is discussed on page 7 of our letter.

ADDENDUM

In response to SPCC comments, you questioned in your letter of September 6, 1968, whether the old stock of breechblock locks were defective in terms of the specifications. Our review disclosed this to undoubtedly be true. However, these locks had been primarily produced by Navy plants. This matter is discussed on page 2 of our letter.

You also questioned the SPCC statement that at the time the emergency requirement developed a contract had not been awarded to Newbould. You pointed out that SPCC was well aware of the bid of $37.75 made by Newbould on the 2,400 locks and concluded that because of this exceptionally favorable price Newbould should have been contacted to determine whether they were prepared to take on the additional 2,000 items at that same price and on delivery terms in keeping with the Navy's emergency.

The award to AMF for 2,000 locks was not made until May 13, 1968, about 30 days after the award to Newbould on April 12, 1968, for 2,400 locks. In view of the possibility of obtaining a substantially lower price, we question whether the Navy gave adequate consideration to soliciting Newbould or other interested suppliers prior to the award of the emergency procurement to AMF. Our position

XUM

on this matter is stated on pages 10 and 11 of our letter.

QUESTION NO. 5

If emergency procurement of the additional 2,000 pieces was justifiable, why did the Navy not cooperate with the original contractor, who was willing to produce these items for only $37.75, to expedite production of the order? This could have been done by (1) amending the original contract to cover the 2,000 additional pieces, (2) by assuring that pre-prod approval was given promptly in writing after the June 21 test-firing at Dahlgren, Virginia, and (3) by assigning "DX" status to the original contract in order to secure prompt delivery of the material for production. (Newbould could be in production now, meeting the Navy's emergency need if one exists, at the $37.75 price.)

SPCC COMMENT

At the time the high priority requirement for the additional 2,000 Breechblock Locks was generated (3/21/68), there *was no* "original contractor" other than AMF York. The SPCC stock contract for 2,400 units was not awarded to the Newbould Tool Company until 12 April 1968, some three weeks later.

At the time the important basic procurement decisions had to be made for the 2,000 Lock purchase, decisions such as the procurement method to be utilized and the sources to be solicited, every fact then available to the Contracting Officer indicated that certain delivery and earliest delivery could only be obtained from the one supplier who had previously produced the item, namely, AMF York. Only for this supplier could the First Article Test requirements of the specifications be waived, thus permitting an advancement of 120 days in the commencement date for deliveries. Not until 1 April 1968 was the DCAS report of the pre-award survey of the Newbould Tool Company to be forwarded to the SPCC Contracting Officer recommending award of the 2,400 units to that company. And not for another three months was Newbould able to demonstrate its ability to actually produce three sample Locks. Consequently, on 23 March 1968, the day after the purchase request was received in the SPCC Purchase Division, the SPCC Contract Review Board, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2), authorized negotiation of a contract with AMF York for the production of the 2,000 urgently required units.

Later amendment of Newbould's contract (after it *was* awarded on 12 April 1968) to include the additional 2,000 units, as suggested in Question No. 5, would not have assured any earlier delivery than was possible from AMF York. The 2,400 units already covered by Newbould's contract were not then scheduled to be delivered until early December 1968. There is no reason now, nor was there in March, to believe that by increasing the quantity covered by Newbould's contract from 2,400 to 4,400 earlier deliveries would have been assured.

Contract N00104-68-C-4695 required that two sample Breechblock Locks be submitted to the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va., by 11 July 1968 for First Article Testing. The contract also provided that the Contracting Officer would by written notice advise the Contractor of the results of the tests within 30 calendar days after receipt of the samples by the Government. NWL Dahlgren has advised that three sample Breechblock Locks were received from the Newbould Tool Company on 21 June 1968, that firing tests were completed on 28 June—not 21 June—and that these tests were then followed by further evaluations and metallurgical tests. By speedletter dated 19 July 1968 NWL advised SPCC that Newbould's samples had passed the required tests and recommended that the Contractor be permitted to commence production; a recommendation was also made that the method of marking the Locks with an identification number be changed. On 26 July 1968 Mod. No. 1 to the contract was issued to advise that the First Article samples submitted had passed the tests, to establish a firm delivery date for the 2,400 units of 25 November 1968, and to revise the method of marking the Locks with identification numbers.

With regard to the assignment of a "DX" rating to the two contracts for Breechblock Locks, such a rating was requested by SPCC from the NAVAIRSYSCOMHQ on 3 April 1968 (Attachment G) but not authorized. Whether or not the assignment of a "DX" rating would in fact have shortened production leadtimes for these procurements would now be largely speculation. Some information available to the Contracting Officer indicates that a limiting factor in any attempt to reduce production leadtimes would be the time to obtain the required forging dies, and that this time (six weeks) would not be affected by a "DX" rating.

GAO COMMENT

Although, because of other manufacturing problems, it is doubtful that a "DX" rating would have improved delivery schedules, we believe that the contracting officer should have cooperated with Newbould in expediting their first article testing and in arranging for a phased delivery schedule.

These matters are discussed in greater detail on pages 4 through 9 of our letter.

ADDENDUM

In response to SPCC comments, you raised questions about delivery schedules and "DX" ratings, responses for which are covered in addendum under Question No. 4 and in our comments to Question No. 5 above.

QUESTION NO. 6

How was it possible for the Navy Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg to "audit" both the Newbould and York AMF prices for the same item and declare both prices "appropriate" when the latter was more than 250 percent higher than the former?

SPCC COMMENT

The SPCC did *not* "audit" both the Newbould and the AMF York prices for the Breechblock Lock.

The award of Contract N00104-68-C-4695 to the Newbould Tool Company on 12 April 1968 followed receipt and evaluation of three competitive proposals, under which prices were offered for 2,400 units as follows:

Offeror	U/P	Total
American Machine & Foundry Co	$99.79	$239,496
Milo Components, Inc	89.90	213,600
Newbold Tool Co	37.75	90,600

In view of the significant difference between the estimated unit price of $100.00 furnished on the basic purchase request, the next low offer of $89.90 from Milo, and Newbould's price of $37.75, the Newbould Tool Company was requested by the buyer to confirm its offered price. This was done by Newbould on 18 March 1968 (Attachment H).

The Contracting Officer's determination of price reasonableness in the case of the AMF York contract for 2,000 units was based on an audit conducted by the Defense Contract Administration Services District, Reading, Pa. AMF York initially proposed a unit price of $100.31; the DCASD Reading audit report dated 1 May 1968 (Attachment I) recommended acceptance of a unit price of $94.068; and, a unit price of $97.13 was ultimately negotiated and agreed to by SPCC.

GAO COMMENT

Although settlement of the contract was not complete, it appeared at the time of our audit that AMF would make approximately 15 percent profit as opposed to the 10 percent established during negotiations. In November 1968 Newbould still expected to make a profit of about 10 percent.

QUESTION NO. 7

Why, when NSPCC began negotiations with York AMF for the original 2,400 piece contract, were Newbould and at least one other prospective bidder refused copies of the design drawing which was necessary in order to submit bids?

SPCC COMMENT

The Newbould Tool Co. and other prospective suppliers were *not* "refused" copies of drawings necessary to prepare offers to supply the 2,400 Breechblock Locks being procured by SPCC, initially to satisfy system stock requirements.

At the outset, Request for Proposals N00104-68-R-0722 dated 13 February 1968 was mailed only to AMF, in accordance with the instructions provided in Attachments B, C, and J. Attachment J indicates that, from a technical standpoint, it was then considered impracticable to develop either a limited or an unlimited purchase description of the desired Breechblock Locks but that AMF York possessed the required drawings, specifications, etc. to produce the Locks. The solicitation applicable to this procurement was publicized in the Department of Commerce *Commerce Business Daily,* with a notation pointing out that a complete tech data package was not available. A copy of the solicitation was also posted in the SPCC Bid Room.

Prior to the closing date for offers under this solicitation, namely, 5 March 1968, numerous copies of the solicitation were requested by, and were furnished to, interested suppliers. Two such suppliers were the Newbould Tool Company, and Milo Components, Inc. While the contract file is not clear as to exactly when copies of NASC-NAVAIR Drawing 2518518 were first made available to the purchasing office for distribution to interested suppliers, it was apparently some time after 23 February 1967. The record does indicate that copies of this drawing were in fact furnished by the buyer to Mr. Newbould of the Newbould Tool Company during a visit to SPCC on 27 February 1968 and to Milo Components, Inc., by mail, also on 27 February 1968.

GAO COMMENT

The drawing for the new breechblock locks was approved by the Navy on August 29, 1967, and was available at SPCC by at least January 19, 1968. However, when the request for proposals was issued on February 13, 1968, the lock drawing was unavailable. Upon insistence by representatives of the Newbould and Milo companies the buyer located the drawings and furnished copies to both Newbould and Milo. This matter is discussed on page 5 of our letter.

QUESTION NO. 8

When the emergency procurement requisition was issued, why did Capt. Larson and his staff not seek to negotiate for the production of the 2,000 additional units by the lowest bidder on the original contract?

SPCC COMMENT

As has been previously stated in response to Question No. 5, when the purchase request for the urgently required 2,000 Locks was generated in SPCC on 21 March 1968 the only previous producer/contractor was AMF York. The Newbould contract was not awarded until 12 April 1968, with the two First Article Test samples due for delivery for testing by 11 July 1968.

Based upon all the facts that were known to the contracting personnel at the time purchase action was initiated to satisfy this very critical and very urgent requirement, a judgment was made that the interests of the Government would best be served by negotiating a contract with the only supplier who had previously produced a satisfactory Breechblock Lock and for whom, therefore, First Article testing requirements could be waived and 120 days saved in obtaining first deliveries. This supplier was AMF York.

GAO COMMENT

We believe the contracting officer should have considered negotiation with the previous low bidder or others who may have been interested in the procurement. While Newbould had not met first article testing requirements by the date of the award to AMF, they had been judged under the pre-award survey to be capable of producing the locks and had been awarded a contract.

QUESTION NO. 9

What is the current status of the multi-million dollar defense contracts now held by American Machine and Foundry for the manufacture of bomb casings? How many such contracts are currently being performed or have been awarded to AMF and is AMF in default on any of these contracts and to what degree?

SPCC COMMENT

AMF York currently is performing under SPCC Contract N00104–68–C–0715 covering the manufacture of MK–82 Bomb Bodies. This contract is not delinquent or in default; deliveries are ahead of schedule. AMF previously produced MK–82 Bomb Bodies under Contract N104–8358A. That contract was completed on 30 October 1967, which was 30 days ahead of schedule.

GAO COMMENT

Our review disclosed that AMF was not in default on the bomb casing contracts.

QUESTION NO. 10

If AMF is in default on contracts to supply bomb casings, and I am advised that it is, how could York AMF pass the production capability and financial stability tests to secure this additional contract?

SPCC COMMENT

As noted under Question No. 9, AMF is not delinquent or in default under any SPCC contract for Bomb Bodies.

GAO COMMENT

See Navy reply.

QUESTION NO. 11

If AMF is in default on contracts to supply bomb casings, what penalties are being applied by the Navy Department or any other federal agency or department?

SPCC COMMENT

As noted under Question No. 9, AMF is not delinquent or in default under any SPCC Bomb Body contracts.

GAO COMMENT

See Navy reply.

QUESTION NO. 12

Does York AMF have the production capability to meet the delivery terms of this breechblock lock contract without defaulting on it or on any of the other existing AMF contracts?

SPCC COMMENT

At the time of contract award, the SPCC Contracting Officer made the required (ASPR 1–904) affirmative determination that AMF was a responsible prospective contractor and could comply with the delivery schedule offered in its proposal. Such determination was based in part on an assessment of AMF's production capabilities and its existing business commitments.

GAO COMMENT

AMF met the required delivery schedule. However, the Navy granted AMF certain waivers and as of January 1, 1969, 300 units had not been accepted by the Navy. These matters are discussed on pages 9 and 10 of our letter.

QUESTION NO. 13

Capt. Larson has advised Newbould that he "deliberately" excluded them from his consideration for the emergency procurement because York AMF already had pre-production approval for its item on the basis of the earlier design contract. He contended that he was saving 120 days by negotiating with York AMF. But the fact is, no time whatever has been saved and a great deal of public money is to be lost.

SPCC COMMENT

The basis for the decision made in late March 1968 to negotiate solely with AMF York for the supply of 2,000 Breechblock Locks, which negotiations led to the award of Contract N00104–68–C–4759 on 13 May 1968, has already been covered. As of 22 August 1968 AMF had produced and offered for acceptance 391 of the 2,000 units covered by this contract.

As of 22 August 1968, the Newbould Tool Company, under Contract N00104–68–C–4695 dated 12 April 1968, had offered no units for Government acceptance. Delivery of the 2,400 units covered by this contract is not, in fact, due until 25 November 1968.

GAO COMMENT

The 120 days mentioned in SPCC's reply is that time provided Newbould for obtaining first article testing. However, the Navy made no attempt to expedite Newbould's first article testing. Further, because of the time required to negotiate with AMF and the approximately 10-week lead time AMF required before starting production, AMF's initial delivery was not required until August 10, 1968, Newbould was notified of successful first article testing on July 26, 1968. These matters are discussed in further detail on pages 6 through 9 of our letter.

Why has formal written notice of approval for Newbould's preprod samples been delayed when three sample pieces performed considerably better than contract requirements on June 21st and were orally approved at that time?

SPCC COMMENT

As has been previously stated in response to Question No. 5, by speedletter dated 19 July 1968 NWL Dahlgren notified SPCC that Newbould's First Article Test samples had satisfactorily passed the required tests and recommended authorization to commence production. The NWL speedletter also recommended a change in the marking specifications for the Locks. Following receipt of the speedletter in SPCC on or about 25 July, the technical question relative to the marking requirements was resolved and formal written notice in the form of Modification No. 1 to the contract was issued on 26 July 1968.

GAO COMMENT

NWL, Dahlgren, notified SPCC by telephone during the week of July 1, 1968, that Newbould's sample locks met test requirements. An SPCC official advised us that he had no knowledge of this telephone message nor any information concerning the test results until receipt of the July 19, 1968, letter referred to above. NWL officials advised us that preparation of the letter was delayed because of higher priority work. This matter is discussed on page 6 of our letter.

FAMILY EMERGENCY SMALL LOAN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Emergency Consumer Small Loan Act of 1969. This act would make the emergency small loan program a separate program under the community action program and provide separate appropriations under the Economic Opportunity Act, thus returning it to its pre-1968 status.

I am privileged to have initiated and been instrumental in the adoption of the family emergency small loan program which first appeared as section 206(b) of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. Under this program, individuals may borrow up to $300 at 2-percent interest without collateral and with a minimum investigation.

In 15 areas throughout the country where the program is now in effect, it has proven a boon to those low-income individuals who have resorted thereto for assistance. It is not a giveaway program. It is a program which permits the individual to meet an emergency without loss of dignity. Repayments have ranged up to 75 or 80 percent although the median figure is closer to 45 percent. While this rate of repayment may not, at first glance, appear to be particularly good, it must be remembered the recipients are the abject poor who do not meet normal credit requirements. If we would compare the repayment rates of the categories of clients served by the various Small Business Administration loan programs, the repayment figures of the family emergency loan program are quite good. The comparable loss rate figures for the Small Business Administration business loans—section 7a—which serves the regular business community is 3.3 percent, while the loss rate for the Small Business Administration economic opportunity loan program which serves minority group members with limited collateral, based on character, represents a greater risk at 11.8 percent.

Administrative expenses are quite low since most of the program is administered as part of existing poverty agencies.

This is probably the only poverty program which actually returns money to the U.S. Treasury. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota, for example, returned $159.47 last year in interest payment on $15,000 in loan capital. Small as this amount may be, the 2-percent interest not only returns money to the Treasury, but the repaid principal is kept by the local agency and is used to make new loans—thus the principal becomes a revolving fund permitting the same appropriations to serve for many times the quantity in loaned dollars.

The types of areas served by the emergency loan program range from the urban ghettos of New York, Detroit, St. Louis, and Boston to a South Dakota Indian reservation; from seasonal farm workers in Tennessee, Alabama, and California, to Mexican-Americans in San Antonio, Tex.

Loan purposes vary, and include money for rent and utilities, house repair and reconstruction, medical expenses, job training and education, temporary unemployment, relief from high-interest-rate lenders, food stamps and emergency sustenance, tools or transportation for maintenance of employment, nonreceipt of pension, welfare or social security checks—when a primary source of income—and debt consolidation.

The best testimony to the needs served by this program is a description of the areas where it is at work. A woman in Texas, for example, obtained a loan with which to buy a special pair of shoes so that she could go to work as a nurse.

Loans in the amount of $240,000 were provided to families suffering income and property losses due to the Roxbury, Mass., riots. A lady in Jasper, Ala., obtained a loan to purchase windows, doors, and other materials for a home to replace one burnt down. And, a blind lady who was supporting five children on $176 a month, and who was living without water because of rusted pipes, was able to have work done on the pipes to restore her source of water with an emergency loan.

Incidental to the operation of the program has also been the effects of personal contact with those seeking loans in terms of counseling potential applicants regarding eligibility for other programs of which they might be unaware, finding them jobs, and providing financial counseling. The record of repayment that is established by the recipient also allows him to obtain credit in the future from regular commercial sources without having to go back to the finance company.

This is the kind of program that makes a lot of practical sense to me, for it fulfills a real basic need for small consumer loans for emergency needs. The small investment made in this program has paid many times its worth in helping the poor stand on their own two feet with personal dignity.

Unfortunately, it has run into difficulty, as a consequence of the financial squeeze on the Office of Economic Opportunity. Appropriations were provided at OEO's request for only 1 year, fiscal year 1968, after which time the program was made a discretionary function of the community action program—section 221(a)(7) by Public Law 90–222—and was provided with no separate funds. The consequence was that, except in one or two notable cases, no additional loan programs were established beyond the initial 15 "demonstration programs." After the initial funding ran out, these programs continued to operate on loan repayments and limited administrative funds. The expiration of OEO's authorization in June means that the future of this effort is at stake.

I have introduced this legislation in the hope that the program will not only be maintained and funded, but that it will be expanded to allow it to meet more of the demand that exists for small emergency consumer loans. I hope that the honorable chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor will have an opportunity, during the committee's extensive hearings on the Office of Economic Opportunity, to examine the emergency small loan program in some detail, for I am sure that he will conclude, as I have, that it has been one of the most worthwhile OEO programs.

Text of my bill follows:

H.R. 9643

A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to establish an emergency family loan program as a national emphasis program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding to the end thereof the following:

"(8) An 'emergency family loan' program for making small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. The total outstanding balance of such loans made to an individual may not at any time exceed $300. Loans under this program shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve and make available not less than $15,000,000 for each fiscal year for carrying out programs under this title."

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include charts and tables.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the only point I want to make with reference to the colloquy that was just concluded is that I do not ever impugn anyone's integrity or good judgment. Each Member of this House and each Member of the other body is his own best judge of his own good judgment and far be it from me to try ever to question the validity or the integrity of anyone's positions or statements.

But, unfortunately, there are in our midst many wonderful people who fail to realize that we do not have the options in this great world struggle. The United States is inherently and historically and ethnically and culturally a peace-loving nation.

We do not seek foreign territories. We do not seek foreign wars. We do not seek anyone's territory or anyone's liberty. We do not impose our own beliefs on other people. We help other nations because this is the generous spirit of the American people.

It has been the Soviet Union which has in the last 20 years kept this world in turmoil and every effort that has been made to try to solve the problem whether it has been in the Far East or whether it has been in Europe or whether it has been in the Middle East, we see the Soviet Union exercising her options of intrigue, subversion, and aggression.

We need look no farther than the Middle East. The Middle East problem could have been resolved years ago if the Arabs and Israeli were permitted to alone sit down and work the problem out. But it has been the Soviet Union that has rearmed every one of the Arab States and today is turning up the seeds of war in the Middle East and trying to keep that country in turmoil. It has been the Soviet Union that moved through the Dardanelles into the Mediterranean and is now challenging the peace of the world in that part of the world.

It has been the Soviet Union that has been supplying the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese with sinews to carry on aggression against South Vietnam and against American soldiers.

So I say that those who are pleading this cause today tragically and regretfully fail to recognize that we do not have the options; the Soviet Union is the one that has been pushing the button for world intrigue, and until the day comes when the options for freedom are on our side, we obviously are going to have to do everything humanly possible to defend ourselves.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I just wish to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois as to whether or not he is against disarmament talks with the Soviet Union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am for all sorts of talks. But I learned one thing: When you deal with the Soviet Union, you had better keep your powder dry.

Mr. PELLY. I agree, but I want to know next whether you are opposed to talking with the Soviet Union and other nations about peace in the Middle East. We have got to sit down and talk.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am opposed, I am unalterably opposed to any four-power conferences regarding the settlement of the Middle East for this reason: I do not want to see Israel become another victim of a Yalta, and that is what is going to happen. The great powers cut up Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, and all the "captive" nations after World War II at Yalta and Potsdam. I do not want to see Israel become another victim of a Yalta.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman will recall, I said with other nations. I did not limit it to three others besides the Soviet Union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the four powers would permit the Arab States and Israel to sit as coequal partners and have an equal voice in the determination of their destiny, I would be for such talks.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Again, I repeat, the gentleman is clouding the issue.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Oh, no.

Mr. YATES. Let the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) proceed for just one moment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Be my guest.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, I, too, am opposed to the proposed four-power talks in the Middle East. I believe the Israel and the Arab nations are the ones to settle this controversy if lasting peace is to come to the Near East. I, too, recognize the role the Soviet Union has played since the end of World War II, and it is a perfidious role, in creating dissension throughout the world. But these are peripheral issues to the subject on which the gentleman from Washington got up to speak. That was the question of the validity of the proposed ABM at this time, question, not the motives of the gentle- and the question whether or not it should be deployed. There are a number of reasons why it should not be deployed, and that was the subject of the debate in which we were engaged.

It seems to me the point the gentleman raised—and I have no illusions about what the Soviet Union is doing in the Middle East and throughout the world for that matter, the question under discussion is the ABM system, good or bad, for our country. It will not help our national strength. It may contribute to the contrary. I say to the gentleman that you and I can debate the merits and the demerits of the ABM, as we have in the past. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski) is for the ABM. I am opposed to the ABM, and that is the basis on which we should debate the question, not the motives of the gentleman from Washington or the motives of the gentleman from Illinois. I think that is the way the debate ought to be.

Mr. PUCINSKI. My colleague has been here for the last 10 years that I have been here——

Mr. YATES. I have been here 20 years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With a brief interlude, he has been here longer. In that period my colleague has never heard me question or challenge the motives of another Member of this Congress, and I am not about to start that now. But I believe that if you are going to discuss the relevancy of the ABM, the necessity of the ABM, whether or not this country ought to proceed forward, we do have to put it into total perspective.

All I say is that it is rather ironic that many of the same voices we hear today being raised against the ABM are the same voices which were a year ago pleading to stop the bombing of the Vietnam, because once we do that the whole thing will be over and the Communists will roll over and lie down and give in and everything will be sweet and glorious and the war will be over. These are the same voices which a few years ago were denouncing us for taking a position in Elisabethville to save the Congo from Communist domination. These are the same voices which, when we see this great debate going on—and I do not challenge the patriotism or the motives of my colleagues who are Americans as I am, but I submit unfortunately they have been wrong and time and time again history has proven them wrong.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I point out something to the gentleman which was said by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly)? The gentleman from Washington supported the ABM last year, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski) knows, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Yates) appeared before the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Sikes). The gentleman from Washington at that time said he supported the ABM and was opposed to the particular site that had been selected for the city of Seattle. The gentleman at the time appeared and stated he was in opposition to the position I had taken. At that time I suggested the possibility of having the site away from the city of Chicago and perhaps near the airbase, because I did not think it should be near the city and would not be effective in protecting the city. The gentleman took the position that he wanted it close to the city where it would protect the people.

The gentleman knows very well, of what President Nixon said recently, that the ABM would not protect the people of the cities, neither a thin system nor a thick system would protect them. The President recommended deployment around our ICBM sites in two places.

The Congress has never considered that. This was the recommendation of the President. What I am arguing for and what the gentleman from Washington is arguing for is that the Congress go into this question very, very carefully.

I think the arguments in opposition are as valid insofar as the missile sites are concerned and insofar as the effectiveness of the system is concerned as they might have been against the cities. But that point is something we have to investigate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman well knows the President has stated that this program, under the revised plan he submitted, will be under continuing review.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee here. The gentleman plans to hold hearings shortly. The Senate is now holding hearings. The program is under constant review and that is as it should be, because that is the whole story of our Defense Establishment. Every one of the programs we have has that history.

This Nation has spent in the last 20 years, in the two decades, well over a trillion dollars on all sorts of defense hardware.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is the price we Americans have had to pay to contain the Soviet Union from trying to take over this country and this world. Each one of these programs has been under continual review. Some we accept and some we reject.

Much of the hardware we buy, understandably, is obsolete at the time it is delivered, but at the point in time when we buy it, it is the best piece of hardware available.

If we follow the gentleman's rationale and thinking, we ought not to buy anything in defense procurement simply because each of these things has a certain built-in period of effectiveness and then technology makes them obsolete.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is totally incorrect when he makes that statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will permit me to finish, I do not yield, but I will yield when I have completed, and I have been yielding right along.

The fact of the matter is, if we were to break ground on the ABM system tomorrow, we would not have one unit operational for at least 4 years, assuming there will be no major breakdowns in construction—and we cannot make that assumption under today's conditions. But assuming that everything went well, we would have an ABM that would be operational in 48 months at the minimum.

Now, we have hard intelligence—not speculation, not washroom rumor or gossip, but hard intelligence that Red China, which has no regard for the peace of this world and has no regard for or fear of America's offensive or retaliatory power, is going to have 30 deliverable nuclear warhead missiles in 48 months, and has a potential industrial capability of churning them out at the rate of 200 a year thereafter.

I say to you, it is playing Russian roulette with the future of this country for us to delay a single day on this development.

That is why I am not happy with the compromise the President proposed, but I learned a long time ago, as a legislator in this body, if every one of the Members here were to wait for perfection in legislation, Government would come to a grinding halt. So I accept this compromise.

I would prefer that we move along on a greater scale. I have confidence in the system. I believe that in the next 4 years, by the time we complete the installation, we ourselves will have made tremendous progress. We ourselves will continue to improve this system. We ourselves are going to have a much more effective system.

But I say to you, the greatest tragedy the United States could ever commit is to do nothing at this crucial time, when we know that the Soviet Union is moving forward and we know that Red China is moving forward.

Where is there an iota of evidence anywhere in this world that either the Chinese Communists or the Russian Communists are ready to start living in this world with any degree of decency?

So I say to you, this debate, which has taken on monumental proportions, needs for those of us who support this program to speak out. Up to now, for the most part, it has been the opponents who have had the floor and the great exposure. It has been the opponents who have gone to the American people to say, "It is no good. You ought not do it. You ought to spend this money on schools."

I have a speech over here on schools, which I originally prepared, but I will say this: We do not have to worry about schools, and we do not have to worry about model cities, because the Soviets can have the greatest urban renewal program this country could ever have if we do not continue to check them.

There is not an iota of evidence the Soviet Union has given up its aspirations for the ultimate conquest of and domination of the world.

If I am to err, I would rather err on the side of the safety of the American people. I would rather move ahead. This $3 billion or $4 billion we are talking about is not the first time we have engaged in a program that was not pluperfect.

But at this point in time, in March of 1969, this ABM system is the best system devised by the human mind anywhere in the world. I say that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird are to be congratulated for having the courage to stand up against this opposition and to say, "We are going to move forward."

I say to you, by 1972, we Americans are going to say a prayer of thanks that somewhere along the line there were people who decided to move forward.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish that the other distinguished gentleman from Illinois were possessed of the same intelligence on Russia that I am. I believe even he might change his position. We had better get onto this ABM while time remains.

You are getting this from the horse's mouth.

The gentleman in the well is to be congratulated.

Once William Jennings Bryan said:

> The humblest citizen of all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause is stronger than all the hosts of Error.

We are going to get this ABM system and save America. Stick on your course. You have plenty of help.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Of course the chairman of the committee is entitled to his opinion on the ABM as I am entitled to mine. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) had advanced the argument as though there were no weapons of any kind in our arsenal, that the ABM is the only weapon with which we were facing the aggressiveness of the Soviets and, of course, that is untrue. The facts are that we are spending $80 billion for military purposes. There is no question about that. We are buying planes, arms, guns, and ships and all of the weapons of war. As the gentleman knows, we have spent over a trillion dollars in the last 20 years. The ABM is not the only weapon that must be considered. Should it be deployed? Upon the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, during the tenure of President Eisenhower, it was recommended that the Nike-Zeus be deployed. This was the predecessor of the Sentinel ABM. President Eisenhower turned down the Nike-Zeus. History showed that President Eisenhower was quite right. Had the Nike-Zeus been deployed at that time——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me interject at that point it is only fair to keep the record correct that he turned it down because he saw what was coming up on the drawing boards with relation to ABM's. This ABM did not develop yesterday. We have spent $4 billion——

Mr. YATES. I know that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have spent $4 billion on research over 14 years.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is why President Eisenhower decided not to move with the Nike-Zeus. It was because he saw the Sentinel system on the drawing board.

Mr. YATES. I question whether the Sentinel was that far advanced at that time, but that is the point. But there is a time for research and development and a time for deployment. This is not the time for deployment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Tell me this——

Mr. YATES. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What is on the drawing boards at this point in time, right now?

Mr. YATES. With respect to the ABM?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now.

Mr. YATES. I will tell you what Dr. Foster said with respect to the primitive Chinese threat for which he wants to deploy the ABM.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Wait a minute. Do not say "primitive." I am talking about 1972 and not 1968.

Mr. YATES. I am telling you what Dr. Foster said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to know where you will be in 1972 when the Chinese do have deliverable missiles.

Mr. YATES. Let me finish my statement, and I will tell you. Dr. Foster said two things. First of all, he said that he wanted an ABM in order to protect our cities from a primitive Chinese threat. The second thing he said is that we will not have an ABM for 4 years. Therefore, in 1972, when there is an ABM, presumably you will have a primitive Chinese threat at that time against which the ABM might be countered. Today you do not have an ABM to protect you against the primitive Chinese threat because there is none yet. They do not have an ICBM threat in being now.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is aware, though, that, of course, of the 10 nuclear explosions and detonations that the Chinese have had, three of them were in the form of deliverable missiles. The gentleman is aware of that; is he not?

Mr. YATES. What do you mean by "explosions"?

Mr. PUCINSKI. There were 10 nuclear detonations.

Mr. YATES. They have nuclear warheads, but they do not have the means of delivering them yet.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Three of the ten were in deliverable missiles, and the gentleman ought to know that if he does not know it now.

Mr. YATES. But the gentleman does know what the Department of Defense said about that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. But let me tell you——

Mr. YATES. Let me finish my statement. You asked me about the developments in relation to the ABM. Dr. Foster also said in response to a question on what would happen if the Chinese threat became more sophisticated, that the United States will be making progress, too, in respect to sophisticating the ABM. Hopefully, it will be able to cope wtih the Chinese advances, but that is still a hope. The point that I make is that just as the gentleman himself has pointed out, the Nike-Zeus was a primitive ABM by comparison to the present Sentinel system. The present ABM, according to Dr. Foster, will be improved as time goes on. I suggest that there are eminent scientists who have said that we ought to wait, to still engage in research and development. Yes, there is a time for deployment and there is a time for research. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and I continue to vote for the funds for research which will perfect and better the ABM. We are for research but against deployment at the present time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And you do not want to do anything now?

Mr. YATES. On the ABM.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact that the military have said——

Mr. YATES. The gentleman makes these sweeping statements—these grand statements, these huge and sweeping statements——

Mr. PUCINSKI. You do not want to build any ABM's now.

Mr. YATES. You do not say that. You say you do not want to do anything now. We told you we favored continued research, not deployment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) wants to do is study this thing and to study the country to death. I have studied this thing for 14 years and it has been at a cost of $4 billion thus far.

Mr. YATES. That is correct; but we do not have to deploy them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have reached the point in time where our very able and distinguished scientists state that this Sentinel system is necessary; that it was not developed by some cigar-smoking general in the basement of the Pentagon. It was developed by the Atomic Energy Commission and on that Commission we have some of the finest scientific brains in the world. These men have said that at this point in time, seeing what the potential is going to be of the Red Chinese 4 years from now—and I think I know the time it is going to take us to build a unit if we start it at this time. We cannot wait any longer, when on eight different occasions this Congress has voted for this program. So what has happened in the last 8 or 9 months to change the mind of the gentleman?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington, because he was so generous in yielding to me.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks which I made under my own special order and also in the colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) during his special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman asked me what event has transpired that would have changed anything. I would tell the gentleman there has been a significant change. Had the deployment proceeded under last years concept, it would have been the wrong step. The President of the United States said that himself. He said the Sentinel system would not have protected the cities of this Nation. He said it must be changed. The sites selected by the Army were designed to protect the cities. Now they are to be placed in position to protect missile sites. So it would have been a mistake to proceed with that deployment. It would have been a waste of funds. It would have been a premature deployment, for a mission that according to President Nixon could not be accomplished.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Some of the people in my district come from Germany and the Scandanavian countries who state that we grow old too soon and get smart too late. What you are saying is that this has been the tragic story of defense for 20 years, but we do not stop long enough to rationalize and reason this thing through. We should not buy anything except that for our immediate needs, because a lot of the things we buy this year—because of the fantastic technological surge which is now present with us and which I envision, but when we start building these installations and pouring the mortar and start putting together the electronics hardware, this does not mean we have stopped our pace at all. It means we have accelerated that pace.

The scientists and our military people are a lot wiser than some of us in Congress give them credit for being. They know it will not do us an iota of good to have the best system in the world in 1972 on the drawing board if it cannot be put into operation within the period of 4 months against the Chinese whom I believe will have a capability of delivering warheads upon our principal cities. In my opinion that is our basic difference of views.

Mr. YATES. If we had proceeded last year the Army would have purchased the Libertyville site.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman ought to make clear one thing. While President Nixon has announced for the time being the development and deployment of two ABM sites along the border of Canada, the fact of the matter is that the Defense Department has selected eight other sites.

Mr. YATES. Where?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Across the entire United States.

Mr. YATES. They have not selected them, but they have them under contemplation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I did not rule out, and I dare say that I give the American people credit for being a lot smarter than a lot of the people around here, because 66 out of 100 of the American people are certainly in support of the President's position.

These people know what the stakes are, and they will support the President. I would not rule out the fact that at some point in time we may very well have to put up defenses around the big cities of this country if we fail to reach any kind of an agreement with the Soviet Union for a mutual inspection treaty.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the gentleman has dwelled at length here on the threat posed by the Red Chinese. I wonder if the gentleman recognizes that Secretary of Defense McNamara pointed out that by the time the Red Chinese get these missiles, between 1972 and 1975, we will still have second-strike capacity. So that if they ever launched any missiles at us, we could wipe their whole nation off the face of the earth. That should deter Red China.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The argument posed by the gentleman from Washington is totally fallacious, because Red China, with 800 million people, and with the population growing by leaps and bounds, the last thing in the world that the Red Chinese leaders are concerned about is nuclear retaliation. They have publicly stated—publicly stated—that perhaps the answer to their problem is to have three to four hundred million of their people destroyed by nuclear exchanges. And that is certainly no consolation to my constituents. And this Member is going to stand in the well of this House and argue as long as he can.

If we are to follow the rationale that we have a second-strike capacity, I do not want that.

I do not even want the first rocket to hit this country.

Mr. PELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not want the first missile to strike our Nation.

So those who argue that we have some 1,000 or 2,000 missiles, as I heard a distinguished Member of the other body the other day, with big charts, point out how we could destroy each other, I will say to the Members that the logic for such reasoning totally escapes me.

It is my belief that it is our responsibility as duly elected Representatives of the people to make sure that we have a Defense Establishment which will preclude any missile coming to this country, first, second, or third.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying that the Red Chinese are so foolish that they would commit mass suicide?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Illinois is saying that; yes, sir.

Mr. PELLY. That 800 million Chinese would be killed?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. In that case, there would be no Chinese remaining any longer, because we can literally wipe them entirely off the face of the earth.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would say to the gentleman, no.

Mr. PELLY. That is what Secretary McNamara said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Because if they had 30 deliverable missiles, as our intelligence assures us that they will have by 1972, any one of those 30 missiles is enough to destroy the city of Chicago, the city of New York, the city of Washington, D.C., or any other city.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to play Russian roulette with the security and the future of my country.

I will tell the Members that anyone who believes that we have got a second-strike capacity, as we have been hearing on occasion, and that has been the thing that has contained the Soviet Union from expanding their reign of terror, is in error. We have this huge arsenal of missiles, and they have a huge arsenal of missiles, and we both realize the complete folly of trying to knock each other out of the picture, if we could. But do not believe for 1 second that the Soviet Union will hesitate for one moment if they had the advantage, and Czechoslovakia proves that.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

FEDERAL AID TO HELP MEET THE COST OF EDUCATING CHILDREN LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING—AN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 514

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend at this point in the RECORD my original remarks on the subject relative to Federal aid for the school program, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all across America, school districts are faced with the gravest financial crisis in their existence. In Youngstown, Ohio, the public schools were shut down last fall because of insufficient operating revenue. In Chicago, the superintendent of schools has announced that unless he receives massive State and Federal aid, he may have to shut down the entire school system. This pattern of school closures will spread across our Nation unless the State and Federal governments substantially increase their support of education.

Last week, the Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill which would give this type of meaningful assistance to our schools. H.R. 514 would extend for 5 years the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Impacted Aid Act. These public laws, the major commitments by the Federal Government to elementary and secondary education, provide vital support at a cost of approximately $1.5 billion to many of the school districts in our country.

But the committee in H.R. 514 went beyond a simple extension of these two laws. By a vote of 28 to 2 with broad bipartisan support, the committee initiated a major new program which would extend the benefits of the impacted aid laws to children residing in public housing projects. Under this program, local school districts would be reimbursed approximately one-half of the local cost of education for each pupil in the school district who lives in a public housing unit.

A total of 381 congressional districts would receive direct benefits for their local school districts because these congressional districts actually have public housing in their districts. But even those few districts that do not have public housing would benefit by bringing more school funds into their States.

This aid would not be earmarked for any specific programs, rather, it would go into the general operating budget of the local school district. I believe that this type of aid is vitally needed now if our school systems are to survive.

The committee added this amendment to the impacted aid laws because it believed that the Federal Government has unintentionally created a severe impact in many school districts through the public housing laws. These housing acts have as their purpose the guaranteeing of a decent home for every American regardless of income. As a direct consequence, today more than 670,000 families occupy low-rent housing constructed with the financial assistance of the Federal Government.

But this Federal housing policy has also resulted in inadvertantly placing a crushing burden upon many school systems. Frequently, the existence of this attractive low-rent housing has lured poor, uneducated families from rural areas into our cities, both large and small. While the results of this migration are frequently most dramatically seen in our larger cities, they are, nonetheless, also present in the semirural areas of Alabama, North Carolina, and almost all other States, often causing a greater strain on these schools because of the more limited tax bases. Thus, many of our school systems across the Nation have been weighted with large numbers of disadvantaged children drawn into the school districts by the construction of federally financed public housing.

Since Federal laws exempt all public housing from State and local taxation, schools serving children from public housing are deprived of tax revenue which would make possible funds for adequate education for these children. Recognizing this gross inequity unintentionally caused by the housing acts, the Federal Government presently makes a token payment in lieu of property taxes to the local school districts.

The national annual average of this Federal payment in lieu of taxes is only $11 per child for each schoolchild. This amount is shamefully inadequate to offset the revenue lost by exempting public housing from State and local taxation. The results of this insufficient compensation by the Federal Government are inadequate education for all children within the school districts affected and an excessive burden placed upon the property owners within these school districts.

The Federal Government must assume a greater financial responsibility for the education of these children from public housing projects. Testimony presented before the General Subcommittee on Education, which I chair, has shown that enrollments in certain surveyed areas have doubled with the construction of federally financed public housing. This suddent concentration of large numbers of disadvantaged students has placed a great stress on already strained school systems.

Testimony has also shown that the property tax revenue per nonpublic housing pupil attending public schools averages $415 and that if the payment in lieu of taxes per low-rent housing pupil were deducted, an amount of $404 would be needed to close the gap between the cost of education per public housing student and the revenue produced by the housing projects. This difference of $404 per child is now being borne by other property owners in the school districts causing an excessive burden on these property owners.

Testimony presented before the Committee on Education and Labor has shown wide support from a great number of witnesses for this amendment. I would like to insert a few of their statements:

Dr. Gary N. Pottorff, board of education, Wichita, Kans.: "Our board would be in favor (of the amendment) since the Federal Government is taking existing properties from the tax rolls."

Dr. William Kottmeyer, superintendent of schools, St. Louis, Mo.: "In return for the loss of local tax revenue (which theoretically is compensated for by the in-lieu-of taxes payments) and a local cost of $15 million, the St. Louis School Board must struggle with five times the number of children massed into a highly undesirable environment and gets $11.56 per pupil instead of the $182 paid for an impact aid pupil."

Dr. William Simmons, deputy superintendent of schools, Detroit, Mich.: "This type of program would reinforce the impacted area legislation."

Dr. Joseph Manch, superintendent of schools, Buffalo, N.Y.: "I would urge the committee to extend Public Law 874 to include children from public housing. The virtual loss of public housing property from school tax rolls is one reason for such legislation. Equally important, the provision of low-rent public housing inadvertently creates high rise ghettoes wherein the cycle of cultural disadvantage is strengthened."

These witnesses and many others have demonstrated the urgent need for this legislation. The leading national educational associations have also endorsed my amendment. These associations include the following:

The National School Boards Association.

The Chief State School Officers.

The National Education Association.

The National Association of State Boards of Education.

The American Association of School Administrators.

The National Congress of Parent-Teachers Associations.

The Research Council of the Great Cities.

Some may argue that although the principle of this amendment is worthy, it should not be included under the impacted aid laws. I think that I have demonstrated that the Federal housing policy has indeed created an impact in many school districts. In fact, this impact in many instances is much greater than that caused by other Federal activity in the same community.

But let me emphasize that this amendment creates a new authorization of funds for public housing children. This separate authorization will insure that the appropriations for "A" and "B" children under the present laws will in no way be decreased.

Finally, I would urge my colleagues to consider carefully the following two tables which I am inserting into the RECORD. The first table lists the number of public housing units under operation in each congressional district in the country as of June 30, 1968.

The second table is a listing of the amount of money which each congressional district would receive if my amendment is enacted into law. These amounts were derived from a national average of the number of public school pupils in each public housing unit and the national average of half the local tax contribution for education. Since many school districts spend more than the national average on education, the amount which they would receive under my amendment would be more. And since the present law provides that no school district may receive less than either the State or National average expenditure for education, no congressional district would receive less than the amount in this table. Please note that in those congressional districts where there is no public housing, we have included either the city or the State total. The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Number of public housing units in each congressional district as of June 30, 1968*

[By congressional district]

Alabama:	
1st	3,870
2d	2,941
3d	3,513
4th	2,662
5th	3,371
6th	5,857
7th	3,807
8th	3,511
Alaska (at large)	532
Arizona:	
1st	1,954
2d	497
3d	981
Arkansas:	
1st	2,274
2d	2,198
3d	1,801
4th	956
California:	
1st	496
2d	170
3d	1,328
4th	505
5th	5,382
6th	1,354
7th	1,272
8th	650
11th	40
12th	326
13th	1,060
14th	2,155
15th	1,460
16th	1,761
17th	1,564
18th	938
21st	3,326
22d	448
26th	601
29th	489
30th	2,421
32d	712
33d	1,131
38th	491
Colorado:	
1st	3,596
3d	660
4th	54
Connecticut:	
1st	3,184
2d	827
3d	2,770
4th	4,373
5th	855
6th	1,050
Delaware (at large)	1,614
District of Columbia (no district)	9,665
Florida:	
1st	1,436
2d	902
3d	1,827
4th	1,447
5th	2,245
6th	3,892
7th	1,190
8th	612
9th	1,554
10th	540
11th	3,616
12th	1,232
Georgia:	
1st	4,032
2d	3,317
3d	3,313
4th	3,186
5th	7,188

TABLE I.—*Number of public housing units in each congressional district as of June 30, 1968*—Continued

[By congressional district]

Georgia—Continued	
6th	3, 391
7th	2, 816
8th	2, 903
9th	2, 220
10th	4, 147
Hawaii (at large)	3, 124
Idaho:	
1st	95
2d	164
Illinois:	
1st	13, 122
2d	2, 479
3d	2, 395
4th	563
5th	912
6th	151
7th	9, 784
8th	1, 039
9th	4, 382
10th	127
12th	455
14th	749
15th	576
16th	660
17th	1, 010
18th	2, 149
19th	1, 070
20th	1, 831
21st	3, 302
22d	1, 191
23d	1, 359
24th	3, 609
Indiana:	
1st	1, 819
3d	612
4th	423
5th	200
7th	496
8th	1, 932
9th	300
10th	464
11th	1, 196
Iowa:	
1st	20
3d	80
4th	230
6th	40
7th	134
Kansas:	
1st	60
2d	229
3d	574
4th	500
Kentucky:	
1st	2, 299
2d	1, 198
3d	5, 297
4th	1, 483
5th	1, 106
6th	3, 109
7th	622
Louisiana:	
1st	6, 900
2d	5, 856
3d	1, 263
4th	977
5th	786
6th	820
7th	2, 291
8th	596
Maine:	
1st	270
2d	126
Maryland:	
1st	753
3d	6, 533
4th	3, 160
6th	1, 246
7th	587
8th	140
Massachusetts:	
1st	927
2d	1, 107
3th	100
4th	1, 315
5th	2, 183
Massachusetts—Continued	
6th	776
7th	1, 149
8th	3, 502
9th	10, 428
10th	1, 722
11th	480
12th	900
Michigan:	
1st	200
2d	120
3d	240
4th	510
5th	60
6th	23
7th	32
8th	883
9th	200
10th	170
11th	432
12th	362
13th	4, 244
14th	1, 820
15th	540
16th	698
17th	2, 316
18th	163
19th	400
Minnesota:	
1st	199
3d	245
4th	2, 718
5th	3, 003
7th	379
8th	1, 009
Mississippi:	
1st	1, 009
2d	906
3d	700
4th	1, 250
5th	2, 300
Missouri:	
1st	5, 077
3d	3, 055
4th	200
5th	2, 376
8th	543
9th	432
10th	754
Montana:	
1st	634
2d	435
Nebraska:	
1st	833
2d	2, 358
3d	963
Nevada (at large)	1, 815
New Hampshire:	
1st	1, 470
2d	280
New Jersey:	
1st	2, 134
2d	1, 533
3d	1, 831
4th	2, 407
5th	424
6th	211
8th	2, 890
9th	784
10th	5, 109
11th	6, 886
12th	248
13th	5, 674
14th	4, 025
15th	2, 126
New Mexico (at large)	1, 187
New York:	
2d	40
3d	40
5th	295
7th	1, 447
9th	3, 149
10th	4, 235
11th	8, 117
12th	8
13th	1, 402
14th	7, 516
New York—Continued	
16th	2, 100
17th	2, 324
18th	15, 029
19th	6, 333
20th	1, 153
21st	7, 007
22d	5, 007
24th	3, 762
25th	2, 253
26th	511
27th	12
28th	215
29th	2, 975
30th	475
31st	572
32d	405
33d	549
34th	1, 659
35th	170
36th	178
38th	34
39th	26
40th	1, 309
41st	4, 334
North Carolina:	
1st	1, 253
2d	1, 362
3d	1, 195
4th	1, 699
5th	2, 690
6th	2, 237
7th	2, 130
8th	2, 195
9th	542
10th	226
11th	880
North Dakota:	
1st	356
2d	180
Ohio:	
1st	423
2d	5, 676
3d	2, 334
6th	475
7th	330
9th	1, 953
10th	190
12th	1, 903
13th	651
14th	968
15th	1, 396
16th	196
17th	324
18th	500
19th	1, 376
20th	2, 822
21st	4, 830
22d	272
24th	533
Oklahoma:	
1st	80
2d	51
3d	28
5th	423
Oregon:	
1st	640
2d	68
3d	748
4th	872
Pennsylvania:	
1st	4, 407
2d	3, 854
3d	4, 525
4th	1, 036
5th	1, 253
6th	1, 328
7th	424
8th	239
9th	1, 786
10th	1, 214
11th	150
12th	580
13th	307
14th	6, 264
15th	2, 524
16th	199

XUM

TABLE I.—*Number of public housing units in each congressional district as of June 30, 1968*—Continued

[By congressional district]

Pennsylvania—Continued	
17th	2,130
18th	246
19th	400
20th	5,263
21st	688
22d	1,241
23d	98
24th	1,702
25th	1,674
26th	1,854
27th	1,456
Rhode Island:	
1st	3,719
2d	2,798
South Carolina:	
1st	2,033
2d	1,409
3d	875
4th	1,906
5th	528
6th	200
South Dakota:	
2d	526
Tennessee:	
1st	1,867
2d	3,002
3d	3,303
4th	2,677
5th	4,904
6th	1,556
7th	1,153
Tennessee—Continued	
8th	1,554
9th	5,063
Texas:	
1st	1,754
2d	1,166
3d	4,105
4th	1,374
5th	2,267
6th	758
7th	1,990
8th	210
9th	2,120
10th	1,494
11th	1,853
12th	1,184
13th	1,335
14th	2,087
15th	2,349
16th	1,684
17th	1,286
18th	352
19th	424
20th	5,829
21st	382
22d	564
23d	1,409
Utah: 1st	30
Vermont (at large)	178
Virginia:	
1st	1,802
2d	5,627
3d	2,885
Virginia—Continued	
4th	466
5th	500
6th	700
7th	226
9th	431
10th	1,134
Washington:	
1st	3,220
2d	500
3d	422
4th	501
6th	1,510
7th	1,846
West Virginia:	
1st	757
2d	250
3d	574
4th	550
5th	180
Wisconsin:	
2d	368
3d	150
4th	180
5th	2,946
6th	50
7th	97
8th	26
10th	732
Wyoming	30
Puerto Rico (no district)	32,455
Virgin Islands (no district)	1,354

ABLE II.—ESTIMATED PAYMENTS TO EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WERE TO REIMBURSE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR THE COST OF EDUCATING CHILDREN LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING

State	Congressional district	Estimated number of pupils residing in low-rent housing attending public schools	National average of Federal payment to local school districts under impacted aid legislation (½ the local tax contribution)	Estimated payment per district (col. 3 × col. 4)
Alabama	1	7,740	$182	$1,408,680
Do	2	5,882	182	1,070,524
Do	3	7,026	182	1,278,732
Do	4	5,324	182	968,968
Do	5	6,742	182	1,227,044
Do	6	11,714	182	2,131,948
Do	7	7,614	182	1,385,748
Do	8	7,022	182	1,278,004
Alaska	(*)	1,064	182	193,648
Arizona	1	3,908	182	711,256
Do	2	994	182	180,908
Do	3	1,962	182	357,084
Arkansas	1	4,548	182	827,736
Do	2	4,396	182	800,072
Do	3	3,602	182	655,564
Do	4	1,912	182	347,984
California	1	992	182	180,544
Do	2	340	182	61,880
Do	3	2,656	182	483,392
Do	4	1,010	182	183,820
Do	[1] 5	12,354	182	2,248,428
Do	[1] 6	12,354	182	2,248,428
Do	7	2,544	182	463,008
Do	8	1,300	182	326,600
Do	[2] 9	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[2] 10	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	11	80	182	14,560
Do	12	652	182	118,664
Do	13	2,120	182	385,840
Do	14	4,310	182	784,420
Do	15	2,920	182	531,440
Do	16	3,522	182	641,004
Do	17	3,128	182	569,296
Do	18	1,876	182	341,432
Do	[2] 19	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[2] 20	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[1] 21	19,503	182	3,549,546
Do	22	896	182	163,072
Do	[2] 23	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[1] 24	19,503	182	3,549,546
Do	[2] 25	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	26	1,202	182	218,764
Do	[2] 27		182	10,707,424
Do	[1] 28	19,503	182	3,549,546
Do	29	978	182	177,996
Do	[1] 30	19,503	182	3,549,546
California—Continued	[1] 31	19,503	$182	$3,549,546
Do	32	1,424	182	259,168
Do	33	2,262	182	411,684
Do	[2] 34	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[2] 35	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[2] 36	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	[2] 37	58,832	182	10,707,424
Do	38	982	182	178,724
Colorado	1	7,192	182	1,308,944
Do	2	8,620	182	1,568,840
Do	3	1,320	182	240,240
Do	4	108	182	19,656
Connecticut	1	6,368	182	1,158,976
Do	2	1,654	182	301,028
Do	3	5,540	182	1,008,280
Do	4	8,746	182	1,591,772
Do	5	1,710	182	311,220
Do	6	2,100	182	382,200
Delaware	(*)	3,228	182	587,496
District of Columbia	(**)	19,330	182	3,518,060
Florida	1	2,872	182	522,704
Do	2	1,804	182	328,328
Do	3	3,654	182	665,028
Do	4	2,894	182	526,708
Do	5	4,490	182	817,180
Do	6	7,784	182	1,416,688
Do	7	2,380	182	433,160
Do	8	1,224	182	222,768
Do	9	3,108	182	565,656
Do	10	1,080	182	196,560
Do	11	7,232	182	1,316,224
Do	12	2,464	182	448,448
Georgia	1	8,064	182	1,467,648
Do	2	6,634	182	1,207,388
Do	3	6,626	182	1,205,932
Do	4	6,372	182	1,159,704
Do	5	14,376	182	2,616,432
Do	6	6,782	182	1,234,324
Do	7	5,632	182	1,025,024
Do	8	5,806	182	1,056,692
Do	9	4,440	182	808,080
Do	10	8,294	182	1,509,508
Hawaii	(*)	8,696	182	1,582,672
Idaho	1	190	182	34,580
Do	2	344	182	62,608

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED PAYMENTS TO EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WERE TO REIMBURSE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR THE COST OF EDUCATING CHILDREN LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING—Continued

State	Congressional district	Estimated number of pupils residing in low-rent housing attending public schools	National average of Federal payment to local school districts under impacted aid legislation (½ the local tax contribution)	Estimated payment per district (col. 3 × col. 4)
Illinois	(1)1	69,216	$182	$12,597,312
Do	(1)2	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)3	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)4	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)5	1,824	182	331,968
Do	(1)6	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)7	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)8	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	(1)9	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	10	254	182	46,228
Do	[1] 11	69,216	182	12,597,312
Do	12	910	182	165,620
Do	[2] 13	105,830	182	19,261,060
Do	14	1,573	182	286,286
Do	15	1,152	182	209,664
Do	16	1,320	182	240,240
Do	17	2,020	182	367,640
Do	18	4,298	182	782,236
Do	19	2,140	182	389,480
Do	20	3,662	182	782,236
Do	21	6,604	182	1,201,928
Do	22	2,382	182	433,524
Do	23	2,718	182	494,676
Do	24	7,218	182	1,313,676
Indiana	1	3,638	182	662,116
Do	[2] 2	14,684	182	2,672,488
Do	3	2,388	182	434,616
Do	4	846	182	153,972
Do	5	400	182	72,800
Do	[2] 6	14,684	182	2,672,488
Do	7	992	182	180,544
Do	8	3,864	182	703,248
Do	9	600	182	109,200
Do	10	928	182	168,896
Do	11	2,392	182	435,344
Iowa	1	40	182	7,280
Do	[2] 2	1,008	182	183,456
Do	3	160	182	29,120
Do	4	460	182	83,720
Do	[2] 5	1,008	182	183,456
Do	6	80	$182	14,560
Do	7	491	182	89,362
Kansas	1	120	182	21,840
Do	2	458	182	83,356
Do	3	1,148	182	208,936
Do	4	1,000	182	182,000
Kentucky	1	4,598	182	836,836
Do	2	2,396	182	436,072
Do	3	10,594	182	1,928,108
Do	4	2,966	182	539,812
Do	5	2,212	182	402,584
Do	6	6,218	182	1,131,676
Do	7	2,555	182	465,010
Louisiana	1	13,800	182	2,511,600
Do	2	11,712	182	2,131,584
Do	3	2,526	182	459,732
Do	4	1,954	182	355,628
Do	5	1,572	182	286,104
Do	6	1,640	182	298,480
Do	7	4,582	182	833,924
Do	8	1,192	182	216,944
Maine	1	540	182	98,280
Do	2	252	182	127,218
Maryland	1	1,506	182	274,092
Do	[2] 2	16,828	182	3,062,696
Do	[1] 8	13,066	182	2,378,012
Do	4	6,320	182	1,150,240
Do	[2] 5	16,828	182	3,062,696
Do	6	2,492	182	453,544
Do	7	1,174	182	213,668
Do	8	280	182	50,960
Massachusetts	1	1,854	182	337,428
Do	2	2,214	182	402,948
Do	3	200	182	36,400
Do	4	2,630	182	478.660
Do	5	4,366	182	794,612
Do	6	1,552	182	282,464
Do	7	2,298	182	418,236
Do	8	7,004	182	1,274,728
Do	9	20,856	182	3,795,792
Do	10	3,444	182	626,808
Do	11	960	182	174,720
Do	12	1,800	182	327,600
Michigan	1	400	182	72,800
Do	2	252	182	45,864
Do	3	480	182	87,360
Do	4	1,020	182	185,640
Do	5	120	182	21,840
Do	6	46	182	8,372
Do	7	64	182	11,648
Do	8	1,766	182	321,412
Do	9	400	182	72,800
Do	10	340	182	61,880
Do	11	864	182	157,248
Do	12	724	182	131,768
Michigan—Continued	13	8,488	$182	$1,544,816
Do	14	3,640	182	662,480
Do	15	1,080	182	196,560
Do	16	1,396	182	254,072
Do	17	4,632	182	843,024
Do	18	326	182	59,332
Do	19	800	182	145,600
Minnesota	1	691	182	125,762
Do	[2] 2	15,106	182	2,749,292
Do	3	490	182	89,180
Do	4	5,436	182	987,352
Do	5	6,006	182	1,093,092
Do	[2] 6	15,106	182	2,749,292
Do	7	758	182	137,956
Do	8	2,018	182	367,276
Mississippi	1	2,018	182	367,276
Do	2	1,812	182	329,784
Do	3	1,400	182	254,800
Do	4	2,500	182	455,000
Do	5	4,600	182	837,200
Missouri	[1] 1	15,215	182	2.769,130
Do	[2] 2	24,874	182	4,527,068
Do	[1] 3	15,215	182	2,769,130
Do	4	400	182	72,800
Do	5	4,752	182	864,864
Do	[2] 6	24,874	182	4,527,068
Do	[2] 7	24,874	182	4,527,068
Do	8	1,086	182	197,652
Do	9	864	182	157,248
Do	10	1,508	182	274,456
Montana	1	1,268	182	230,776
Do	2	870	182	158,340
Nebraska	1	1,666	182	303,212
Do	2	4,716	182	858,312
Do	3	1,926	182	350,532
Nevada	(*)	3,630	182	660,660
New Hampshire	1	2,940	182	535,080
Do	2	480	182	87,360
New Jersey	1	4,268	182	776,776
Do	2	3,066	182	558,012
Do	3	3,662	182	666,484
Do	4	4,655	182	847,210
Do	5	848	182	154,336
Do	6	422	182	76,804
Do	[2] 7	72,264	182	13,152,048
Do	8	5,780	182	1,051,960
Do	9	1,568	182	285,376
Do	10	10,218	182	1,859,676
Do	11	13,772	182	2,506,504
Do	12	496	182	90,272
Do	13	11,348	182	2,065,336
Do	14	8,453	182	1,538,446
Do	15	4,252	182	773,864
New Mexico	(*)	2,374	182	432,068
New York	[2] 1	169,282	182	30,809,324
Do	2	80	182	14,560
Do	3	80	182	14,560
Do	[2] 4	169,282	182	30,809,324
Do	5	590	182	107,380
Do	[2] 6	169,282	182	30,809,324
Do	7	2,294	182	417,508
Do	[2] 8	169,282	182	30,809,324
Do	9	6,298	182	1,146,236
Do	[1] 10	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 11	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 12	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 13	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 14	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 15	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 16	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 17	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 18	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 19	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 20	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 21	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 22	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 23	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	[1] 24	135,729	182	24,701,678
Do	25	4,500	182	820,092
Do	26	1,073	182	195,285
Do	27	24	182	4,368
Do	28	430	182	78,260
Do	29	5,950	182	1,082,900
Do	30	950	182	172,900
Do	31	1,144	182	208,208
Do	32	810	182	147,420
Do	33	1,098	182	198,836
Do	34	3,318	182	603,876
Do	35	340	182	61,880
Do	36	356	182	64,792
Do	37	157,844	182	28,836,808
Do	38	68	182	12,376
Do	39	52	182	9,464
Do	40	2,618	182	476,476
Do	41	8,668	182	1,577,576

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED PAYMENTS TO EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WERE TO REIMBURSE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR THE COST OF EDUCATING CHILDREN LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING—Continued

State	Congressional district	Estimated number of pupils residing in low-rent housing attending public schools	National average of Federal payment to local school districts under impacted aid legislation (½ the local tax contribution)	Estimated payment per district (col. 3 × col. 4)
North Carolina	1	2,506	$182	$456,092
Do	2	2,724	182	495,768
Do	3	2,390	182	434,980
Do	4	2,398	182	618,436
Do	5	5,380	182	979,160
Do	6	4,474	182	814,268
Do	7	4,260	182	775,320
Do	8	4,610	182	859,020
Do	9	1,084	182	197,288
Do	10	452	182	82,264
Do	11	1,760	182	320,320
North Dakota	1	712	182	129,584
Do	2	360	182	65,520
Ohio	1	846	182	153,972
Do	2	11,352	182	2,066,064
Do	3	4,668	182	849,576
Do	[2] 4	54,304	182	9,883,328
Do	[2] 5	54,304	182	9,883,328
Do	6	950	182	172,900
Do	7	660	182	120,120
Do	[2] 8	54,304	182	9,883,328
Do	9	3,806	182	710,892
Do	10	380	182	69,160
Do	[2] 11	54,304	182	9,883,328
Do	12	3,806	182	692,692
Do	13	1,302	182	236,964
Do	14	3,209	182	584,038
Do	15	2,792	182	508,144
Do	16	392	182	71,344
Do	17	953	182	173,446
Do	18	1,000	182	182,000
Do	19	2,752	182	500,864
Do	[1] 20	15,662	182	2,850,484
Do	[1] 21	15,662	182	2,850,484
Do	[1] 22	15,662	182	2,850,484
Do	[2] 23	54,304	182	9,883,328
Do	24	1,066	182	194,012
Oklahoma	1	160	182	29,120
Do	2	102	182	18,564
Do	3	56	182	10,192
Do	[2] 4	1,164	182	211,848
Do	5	846	182	153,972
Oregon	1	1,280	182	232,960
Do	2	138	182	25,116
Do	3	1,571	182	285,922
Do	4	2,117	182	385,294
Pennsylvania	[1] 1	31,438	182	5,721,716
Do	[1] 2	31,438	182	5,721,716
Do	[1] 3	31,438	182	5,721,716
Do	[1] 4	31,438	182	5,721,716
Do	[1] 5	31,438	182	5,721,716
Do	6	2,656	182	483,392
Do	7	848	182	154,336
Do	8	478	182	86,996
Do	9	3,572	182	650,104
Do	10	2,428	182	441,896
Do	11	300	182	54,600
Do	12	1,160	182	211,120
Do	13	614	182	111,748
Do	14	12,528	182	2,280,096
Do	15	5,048	182	918,736
Do	16	1,134	182	206,388
Do	17	4,260	182	775,320
Do	18	492	182	89,544
Do	19	800	182	145,600
Do	20	11,052	182	2,011,464
Do	21	1,445	182	262,990
Do	22	2,482	182	451,724
Do	23	196	182	35,672
Do	24	3,404	182	619,528
Do	25	1,674	182	304,668
Do	26	3,708	182	674,856
Do	27	2,912	182	529,984
Rhode Island	1	7,438	182	1,353,716
Do	2	5,596	182	1,018,472
South Carolina	1	4,066	$182	$740,012
Do	2	2,818	182	512,876
Do	3	1,750	182	318,500
Do	4	3,812	182	693,784
Do	5	1,056	182	192,192
Do	6	400	182	72,800
South Dakota	[2] 1	1,052	182	191,464
Do	[2] 2	1,052	182	191,464
Tennessee	1	3,734	182	679,588
Do	2	6,004	182	1,092,728
Do	3	6,604	182	1,201,928
Do	4	5,354	182	974,428
Do	5	9,808	182	1,785,056
Do	6	3,112	182	566,384
Do	7	2,306	182	419,692
Do	8	3,108	182	565,656
Do	9	10,126	182	1,842,932
Texas	1	3,508	182	638,456
Do	2	2,332	182	424,424
Do	3	8,621	182	1,569,022
Do	4	2,748	182	500,136
Do	5	4,534	182	825,188
Do	6	1,516	182	275,912
Do	7	3,980	182	724,360
Do	8	420	182	76,440
Do	9	4,240	182	771,680
Do	10	2,988	182	534,816
Do	11	3,706	182	674,492
Do	12	2,368	182	430,976
Do	13	2,670	182	485,940
Do	14	4,174	182	759,668
Do	15	4,698	182	855,036
Do	16	3,368	182	612,976
Do	17	2,572	182	468,104
Do	18	702	182	127,764
Do	19	848	182	154,336
Do	20	11,658	182	2,121,756
Do	21	764	182	139,048
Do	22	1,128	182	205,296
Do	23	2,819	182	513,058
Utah	1	60	182	10,920
Do	[2] 2	60	182	10,920
Vermont	(*)	356	182	67,792
Virginia	1	3,604	182	655,928
Do	2	11,254	182	2,048,228
Do	3	5,770	182	1,050,140
Do	4	932	182	169,624
Do	5	1,000	182	182,000
Do	6	1,400	182	254,800
Do	7	452	182	82,264
Do	[2] 8	27,542	182	5,012,644
Do	9	862	182	156,884
Do	10	2,268	182	412,726
Washington	1	6,440	182	1,172,080
Do	2	2,747	182	499,954
Do	3	844	182	153,608
Do	4	1,002	182	182,364
Do	[2] 5	15,998	182	2,911,636
Do	6	3,020	182	549,640
Do	7	3,692	182	671,944
West Virginia	1	1,514	182	275,548
Do	2	500	182	91,000
Do	3	1,148	182	208,936
Do	4	1,100	182	200,200
Do	5	360	182	65,520
Wisconsin	[2] 1	9,098	182	1,655,836
Do	2	736	182	133,952
Do	3	300	182	54,600
Do	4	360	182	65,520
Do	5	5,892	182	1,072,344
Do	6	100	182	18,200
Do	7	194	182	35,308
Do	8	52	182	9,464
Do	[2] 9	9,098	182	1 655,836
Do	10	1,464	182	266,448
Wyoming	(*)	60	182	10,920

[1] City total.
[2] No public housing units in district; substituted State totals.

*At large.
**No district.

HOMEOWNER SWINDLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this distinguished body about a constituent of mine.

He sold his house. He did not mean to, and at the time, he did not know he was doing it, but nevertheless—legally, he did sell his house.

It all started when a gentleman appeared at the front door and announced that he represented a home improvement firm. He asked if the homeowner would be interested in having some obviously needed work done on his house.

The deal sounded good, so my constituent signed what he thought was a contract for the work, only briefly thinking that it was a little strange that the date, total amount of money owed, and interest charges were left blank. However, the man assured my constituent that it was standard procedure and so he signed anyway.

What happened next is one of the oldest swindles on the books.

After leaving his victim, the salesman

filled in an amount for the cost of the work which was approximately twice the price that he had quoted. Then he took the contract, and another paper that he had also asked my constituent to sign, and had them "falsely" notarized by a notary public out of the presence of the homeowner.

This other paper which had been represented to him as an application for a title search, was actually a mortgage on the man's home.

The salesman then "transferred" the note and mortgage to a credit firm for less than 60 percent of each note's face value, and the firm set up a "balloon" payment schedule, which works like this: The note calls for a total of $7,000 to be repaid at $50 a month in 60 months. Sixty months times $50 equals $3,000.

This leaves $4,000 yet to be paid. The clause in the fine print says that the full note is due and payable on the same day as the final payment.

In other words, if the victim cannot come up with the extra $4,000 on the 60th month, he will lose his home. My constituent could not and he is now homeless.

Mr. Speaker, this man is just one of many who have been preyed upon by these swindlers. Most of them have been getting away with their crooked practices for too long. Consumer losses as a result of these frauds cost the American public an estimated $750 million each year and represent roughly between 4 and 8 percent of the entire home improvement business. And invariably, home improvement frauds tend to focus upon these persons least able to afford them: the poor, the uneducated, the unsophisticated and the elderly.

I have today introduced legislation which would permit a stepped up nationwide drive against the home improvement racketeering.

The measure would provide more funds and wider authority to the Federal Trade Commission in its conduct of a 1-year comprehensive investigation of unfair practices within the home improvement industry. Further, it would enable the commission to obtain an immediate court order temporarily halting the practices while pursuing a permanent "cease and desist" order through further judicial action.

Under present law such deceptive practices cannot be stopped when they are discovered, because litigation of these cases generally takes years. In the meantime, countless more consumers are swindled.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we had tough and meaningful laws to deal with these people. I am today introducing legislation to do so, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Nixon administration is going to reorganize the manpower programs in the executive branch. This is welcome news, because economy and efficiency can be brought about by the elimination of duplicating and overlapping manpower activities.

I have gone through the budget that President Johnson sent to the Congress shortly before he left the White House and am astonished and amazed at the size of the manpower programs that are administered by the various departments and agencies of the executive branch. Over $2½ billion has been allotted for manpower programs for fiscal year 1970. This huge sum does not include money to be spent by the Veterans' Administration on behalf of ex-servicemen. The actual amount will be even larger, as much of the money to be spent for retraining the unemployed cannot easily be separated from unemployment compensation, just as it is difficult to break down many of the funds to be spent for rehabilitation so as to show how much would go for manpower activities.

As many of my colleagues will be looking for places to cut when the various appropriations bills come to the floor for consideration by this body, I am inserting in the RECORD a tabulation that shows the sums obligated for manpower programs for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
Office of Economic Opportunity			
Economic opportunity program:			
Work and training programs:			
Job Corps	318,329	277,000	283,000
School and summer work program	197,700	181,400	181,400
Comprehensive employment programs	241,912	424,800	486,400
Special impact (industry incentive)	6,306	12,000	14,500
Work experience program	98,477	46,700	
Total	862,724	941,900	965,300

Job Corps. This provides work and training in residential centers for young people aged 14 through 21 who are out of school and out of work. The objective of conservation centers, located in rural areas and managed by the Interior and Agriculture Departments and by State governments, is to raise the enrollee's level of basic education while improving prevocational and basic work skills. Urban centers are operated under contract by private businesses, universities, and State and local nonprofit organizations. Young men and women urban center enrollees receive specialized vocational training as well as general education, counseling, and help in improving work attitudes and habits. Inner-city skill centers allow young men and women to be trained away from home while remaining in an urban environment.

School and summer work program. This assists disadvantaged students of high school age to remain in school by providing part-time and summer work experience.

Comprehensive employment programs. These programs, which the Office of Economic Opportunity delegates to the Department of Labor, offer a wide range of manpower services which include work experience, counseling, remedial education, on-the-job training, and jobs leading to career opportunities. Individuals served, in both urban and rural areas, are unemployed and underemployed low-income people needing special assistance to develop their occupational potential. Job Opportunities in the Business Sector encourages private industry to hire the hard-core unemployed by reimbursing participating firms for the extraordinary expenses connected with on-the-job training of disadvantaged persons. The Concentrated Employment Program brings together manpower programs and necessary supportive services such as day care and medical examinations in cities and rural areas with unusually heavy concentrations of poverty. Other programs provide work experience and training opportunities in Operation Mainstream, New Careers, and Out-of-School activities.

Special Impact (industry incentive). This provides monetary incentives to attract private industry to relocate plant facilities and creating additional employment opportunities in selected urban and rural depressed areas. It emphasizes hiring, training, and retraining disadvantaged workers through job promotion and stock-sharing.

Work experience program. This is being replaced by the Work Incentive Program in 1970.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Promotion of industry and commerce:			
Business and Defense Services Administration:			
Advances and reimbursements:			
Department of Labor (manpower)	42	22	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service:			
Air pollution control:			
Manpower training:			
Grants	2,706	3,159	3,500
Direct operations	1,251	1,900	1,990

Grants. Fellowship awards support individual postgraduate training in air pollution research and control activities; training grants are awarded to universities to support the development and improvement of, primarily, graduate-level air pollution curricula and to provide student stipends.

Direct operations. Training of technical personnel for Federal, State, and local government research and control operations is carried out.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION			
Mental Health			
Manpower development:			
Grants:			
Training	96,518	109,046	112,500
Fellowships	10,155	10,641	10,866
Direct operations	2,532	3,094	4,583
Total	109,205	122,781	127,949

Manpower development. Grants, Training. Grants are made to training institutions for training in psychiatry, behavioral sciences, psychiatric nursing, psychiatric social work, and other mental health disciplines. Experimental and special programs and continuing education in the mental health field are included as well as special training in such areas as alcoholism, drug abuse, and suicide prevention. *Fellowships.* Awards are made on the basis of excellence to individuals involved in mental health research.

Direct operations. Analytic studies of manpower are undertaken and the national mental health training program is coordinated and supported. Emphasis is given to the full range of manpower requirements in the field of mental health including the disciplines of psychiatry, behavioral sciences, psychiatric nursing, and social work. Also funded in this subactivity are the training activities of the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research and a program for training psychiatrists for careers in the Public Health Service.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH			
Health Manpower:			
Institutional support:			
Medical, dental, and related	32,588	66,000	96,400
Nursing	5,657	7,000	7,000
Public health	6,558	9,471	9,471
Allied health professions	8,123	10,975	10,988
Student assistance:			
Traineeships	17,135	30,958	25,620
Scholarships and opportunity grants	16,636	24,636	48,800
Loans	38,680	41,979	30,500
Manpower requirements and utilization:			
Grants	2,992	4,195	4,425
Direct operations	5,955	10,107	10,870
Program direction and management services	1,261	1,339	1,390
Total program costs, funded	135,586	206,659	245,464
Change in selected resources	25,059		
Total obligations	160,645	206,659	245,464

Institutional support. The principal agents of this activity are grant programs directed toward enhancing the educational experience of students entering the health and allied health profession. Improving the utilization of limited resources of health professionals requires appraisal of how various types of personnel are being utilized and the identification of new categories of allied health professionals and technicians for more effective team practice.

Student assistance. This includes graduate and specialized, comprising traineeships and research fellowship; and undergraduate, comprising scholarships and student loans. Research fellowships support candidates at the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels for research training in special fields related to studies for improving nursing care. Traineeships support the graduate and specialized preparation of teachers needed to expand and improve curriculum offerings, and the advanced training needed by supervisors, administrators, and other specialists in nursing, public health, and the allied health professions. Nursing and health professions scholarships enable deserving students from low-income families to pursue their education. Schools make scholarship awards to students who, in the judgment of the school, have an exceptional financial need. The student loan programs for the health professions, including nurses, are also designed to help provide an adequate supply of health manpower and to assure that the needed supply of health professions and nursing manpower is drawn from the most capable individuals, but particularly to assure that students from low-income families can enroll for health professions training. The 1970 program concentrates these loans to students from families with annual incomes under $10,000.

Manpower requirements and utilization. Grants. Research grants support studies in the areas of the physician methods and techniques, continuing physician education, effective use of health manpower, nursing care, and methods to deliver nursing care to patients. Research training grants enable institutions to establish training programs in fields where there is unusual demand for researchers having skills in nursing specialties and in the field of educational research. *Direct operations.* Funds are provided for programs to assess requirements, availability, and quality of health discipline education; provide professional guidance and leadership to meet the goals of nursing care by means of research, consultation, application of research findings and administration of grants; develop, administer, and support grant and operational programs to increase the supply and improve the education, utilization, and effectiveness of manpower in the health occupations; for servicing training and construction grants, student loans, scholarships, and operational programs for training of personnel.

Program direction and management services. The Bureau of Health Manpower provides a national focus for health manpower activities. It guides and supports health manpower programs, designs proposals to meet needs for new or revised health manpower programs, coordinates research and program reporting activities, and provides technical guidance and coordination to Bureau activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Health, manpower, education, and utilization	1,810	1,979	2,110
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			
Work incentives:			
Training and incentives:			
On-the-job training		13,469	33,746
Institutional and work experience training		48,131	93,254
Program direction and evaluation		4,819	8,000

On-the-job training. This provides costs of on-the-job training both coupled and full cost as well as followup (regular, intensive, and employer). Included in this activity are program service costs related to on-the-job training programs.

Institutional and work experience training. This provides for the costs of orientation of participants in priority 1 and 2 activities of the Work Incentives program. Through the orientation process, each person will be given training in basic employment skills along wtih vocational counseling and testing. Upon completion of the orientation period, some persons will go directly into employment, with the remainder going into some phase of training. This activity also provides for the classroom and/or work experience training which will be needed by the majority of persons served in this program. In addition to the categories of orientation, work sampling and internship, basic education and general development, institutional and vocational training, work experience, and relocation, in 1970, three new categories will be introduced to the program. They are: vestibule training—utilizing "company schools"; para-professional—classroom vocational training aimed toward entry in public service employment; and employment preparation—to be used for participants who have completed training but lack motivational and social behavior necessary to "sell" themselves to employers.

Program direction and evaluation. This provides for the program development, evaluation, and administration of the Work Incentives program by the Department of Labor.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Juvenile delinquency prevention and control: Training		1,300	2,600

Training. Funds are for the purpose of training personnel employed in or preparing for employment in fields related to the diagnosis, treatment, or rehabilitation of youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent. This training will be accomplished through curriculum development, short-term institutes, and traineeship grants and projects.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Rehabilitation research and training: Training	31,177	31,717	31,700

Training. Grants and contracts support the training of personnel in professional and technical fields relating to vocational rehabilitation, including teaching grants and traineeship grants to educational institutions, and research fellowships to individuals.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Work incentives		85	302

Work incentives. This develops comprehensive work and training programs and related child care arrangements for appropriate members of families with dependent children, who are referred to manpower agencies for work and training, to foster self-sufficiency. This includes referral through followup after placement in the labor market, work plans, policy standards, procedures development, and technical assistance to State and local agencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Grants for correctional rehabilitation study: Study of correctional manpower needs	800		
Departmental management:			
Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, manpower study	39		
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Administrative operations fund:			
Special manpower programs			2,607
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Public land management:			
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Education and welfare services:			
Relocation and adult vocational training	21,454	24,376	44,026

Relocation and adult vocational training. Indians are aided in securing employment or enrolling in training which will qualify them for employment either locally or in industrial areas away from the reservations.

XUM

The services provided include financial assistance, as well as counseling and guidance services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Basic education and vocational training	470		

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, manpower development and training activities:			
Training and allowance payments:			
Job opportunities in the business sector	44,600	48,000	240,000
Concentrated employment program	22,100	31,800	105,000
Other	260,775	270,926	254,492
Program services:			
Employment security service	33,495	33,521	42,976
State institutional training services	7,995	8,000	8,000
On-the-job training services	3,998	1,500	1,500
Comprehensive manpower program planning		8,725	33,979
Federal institutional training services	2,452	2,560	2,449
Disadvantaged youth programs		13,000	
Total program costs, funded	375,415	418,032	688,396
Change in selected resources	5,374		
Total obligations	380,789	418,032	688,396

Training and allowance payments. Direct program costs for occupational and basic education training programs are provided to equip the Nation's unemployed and underemployed workers with skills that will enable them to participate in productive employment. Institutional training projects are conducted by State and local vocational education agencies and on-the-job training projects are conducted by employers and other organizations. This activity provides for the costs of conducting the training and for the payment of trainee allowances to those trainees who are heads of households or who meet other provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. The Concentrated Employment Program is designed to insure that disadvantaged individuals receive proper training and manpower supportive services, enabling them to obtain permanent employment. The Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program is operated in conjunction with the promotional efforts of the National Association of Businessmen and is a cooperative business-Government venture to hire and train disadvantaged individuals.

Program services. This provides for services provided by the State employment security agencies in the overall development and administration of employment service activities including the identification of occupations in which shortages or potential demand exists, the selection, referral, and placement of trainees and the paying of trainee allowances. Overall supervision of the institutional program is provided by the State vocational education agencies. On-the-job project promotion, development, and supervision are also provided by cooperating State agencies and by employers, associations, and other organizations. Manpower Development and Training Activities and other manpower programs are coordinated by utilizing the Interagency Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. This activity also provides technical assistance for all manpower programs and furnishes training for all personnel involved in the administration, direction, and performance of these programs. It likewise provides for a comprehensive system of labor market information and a job matching program on a national, State, local, or other appropriate basis.

Federal institutional training services. This provides for the program development and administration of the institutional training programs by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
OFFICE OF MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR, SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
Experimental, demonstration, and research programs	27,567	18,918	21,030
Planning, research, and evaluation	4,703	4,708	4,809
Federal on-the-job training services	1,642	2,164	2,688
Federal employment security services	2,359	2,407	2,521
Executive direction:			
Office of the Administrator	823	889	920
Financial and management services	1,905	2,074	2,117
Manpower management data systems	2,518	2,975	3,546
Reports to the public on manpower programs	612	774	779
Total program costs, funded	42,129	34,909	38,410
Change in selected resources	−4,880		
Total obligations	37,249	24,909	38,410

Experimental, demonstration, and research programs. Experimental and demonstration training projects are conducted through contracts and/or grants with public or private nonprofit organizations. They are intended to improve techniques and demonstrate effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups, such as long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, handicapped, minority groups, and others. The program provides for labor mobility demonstration and placement assistance (bonding). A wide-range manpower research program is carried on to investigate and study programs which give promise of furthering activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act and its amendments. Areas of study include appraisal of manpower requirements and resources, unemployment resulting from automation and technological advances, mobility of workers, adequacy of manpower development efforts, and manpower utilization.

Planning, research, and evaluation. The Office of the Manpower Administrator is responsible for the planning, research, and evaluation necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive manpower program. It provides leadership, coordination, and direction to the manpower research program. It provides continuing review and appraisal of operating programs. It identifies, through experimental and demonstration programs, special needs and problems of various groups of potential trainees and develops methods of solving the problems.

Federal on-the-job training services. A program of on-the-job training is administered through employers, associations, community and civic groups, and unions. Assistance is provided in the operation of inplant training programs intended to facilitate hiring of disadvantaged job applicants and to upgrade skills. Contracts are negotiated with employers to partially reimburse them for training costs. State apprenticeship agencies are called on to assist in the programs, and in turn are reimbursed for expenses incurred in developing and administering training programs. During 1969 and 1970, firms located in the ghetto areas will be offered on-the-job training contracts, and efforts will be made through the Concentrated Employment Program to place ghetto residents in the on-the-job training programs.

Federal employment security services. The Manpower Administration furnishes guidance and assistance to the States in developing, administering, and evaluating a manpower program which provides: (1) payment of relocation assistance allowances to workers who must move to new areas to find employment; (2) payment of training, travel, and subsistence training allowances to persons found to need such assistance during their training under the Manpower Development and Training Act; (3) giving basic educational and occupational training to unemployed and underemployed persons; (4) counseling and testing services to such persons before, during, and after their training, whenever needed; (5) specialized services to jobseekers who have especially difficult placement problems, such as youth, older workers, handicapped, minority groups, hardcore unemployed, and workers displaced by automation or technological change; (6) improvement in mobility of labor by providing guidance when workers must shift between geographical areas and across occupational lines; (7) surveys of characteristics of jobs to determine types of training programs needed; (8) placement services that will satisfy the need of both trainees and employers; (9) active participation in community affairs to stimulate and support expanded educational and job opportunities.

Executive direction. Office of the Administrator. This provides for the executive direction, supervision, and coordination of the manpower programs of the Department of Labor. *Financial and management services*. This furnishes the Manpower Administrator with administrative staff support. It provides budgetary, fiscal management, audit, administrative and management services, personnel, and contract services for all organizations of the Manpower Administration. *Manpower management data systems*. This designs, maintains, and operates all data systems for the work and training programs of the Manpower Administration, including (in partnership with the Office of Financial and Management Services) combined reports on finances and performance. It develops a central data bank for all Manpower Administration work-training programs, determines standards and procedures for and functional supervision of all Manpower Administration data reporting systems, and provides statistical and technical services to the Manpower Administration. *Reports to the public on manpower programs*. This office, working with the Office of Information, Publications, and Reports in the Office of the Secretary, prepares and disseminates all news of Manpower Administration activities. It fills requests for publications and provides other information concerning manpower programs. It also is the headquarters for a manpower community relations program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
OFFICE OF MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR			
Salaries and expenses (proposed for separate transmittal, existing legislation):			
Labor mobility demonstration program		2,000	
Placement assistance (bonding)		143	
Total obligations		2,143	

Labor mobility demonstration program. This provides for assistance to meet reloca-

XUM

tion expenses in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment) and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

Placement assistance (bonding). This provides for payment to or contracts with employers or institutions to cover losses incurred by employees who have successfully completed or participated in federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience programs and have been found to be qualified for employment but may be denied employment for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses:			
Training promotion and service to industry	5,931	6,464	6,247
Administration and management services	343	382	382
Total program costs, funded	6,274	6,846	6,629
Change in selected resources	8		
Total obligations	6,282	6,846	6,629

Training promotion and service to industry. Industrial management and labor organizations are encouraged and aided to conduct apprenticeship, training, and retraining programs which will help individual workers attain and improve skill, competence, and adaptability. Apprenticeship and training programs are promoted by direct contact at national and local levels with employers and unions by use of informational media and by cooperation with State and community agencies. Such programs provide, on a nondiscriminatory basis, employee development opportunities for new labor market entrants and workers who need greater skills. Technical assistance is provided to employers directly or through labor management committees. Apprentices and journeymen participate. Skill requirements and training needs within particular industries are identified. Information is provided on training methods, apprenticeship labor standards, and basic principles applicable to training in the apprenticeable and nonapprenticeable occupations. Training programs are evaluated and pamphlets, articles, and reprints are published annually to call attention to skill needs, to indicate trends, and to describe superior apprenticeship and training programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
Trust fund limitation: U.S. Employment Service	10,397	11,987	11,887

United States Employment Service. This assists and guides State agencies in the management of their employment service in order to provide an effective and efficient manpower service for all workers and employers by: (1) furnishing all activities related to identifying and reaching out to disadvantaged individuals not readily employable and providing the kinds of assistance necessary for them to become productive members of the work force and of our society; (2) giving specialized counseling and providing job development, and placements services to youth, older workers, handicapped, minority groups, and workers displaced by automation and technological change; (3) offering counseling and placement services to veterans and stimulating employers to hire veterans; (4) counseling and testing services to assist both ready-to-work jobseekers and employers in meeting their employment needs; and (5) improving mobility of labor by guiding necessary shifts of workers between geographical areas and across occupational and industrial lines. The Employment Service also provides occupational information and support services such as: the development of various forms of foreign language and culturally unbiased occupational tests, labor area information analyses, estimates of area employment and the occupational characteristics of job opportunities, occupational analyses for employers and unions, and stimulation and support for community action to develop expanded job opportunities and to stabilize employment. Special assistance is furnished to the Nation's agricultural workers and employers by: implementing special recruitment and farm placement programs to help unemployed and underemployed farmworkers achieve maximum employment and to meet agriculture's needs for year-round and seasonal workers, providing greater job continuity by maintaining and expanding interstate migratory routes, providing assistance to local migratory committees for the extension of community services to migratory farmworkers and their families, and investigating farm and nonfarm employment offered aliens seeking permanent entry into the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Job Corps: Office of Economic Opportunity	7,585	7,946	7,976
Work experience and training program: Title V—Economic Opportunity Act	2,235	540	
Limitation on grants to States for Employment Service administration:			
Employment Service	283,607	305,993	316,341

Employment service. The Federal-State employment service system is a nationwide network of local employment offices financed by Federal grants and administered by the State employment security agencies. The local offices provide a community manpower service for the areas served by developing the employability of disadvantaged persons; obtaining jobs for those who are job-ready; providing workers for employers having jobs to offer; developing or carrying out programs designed to resolve the employment, unemployment, and manpower utilization problems of an area; and providing special services to employers, individuals, and community agencies or groups requiring or seeking them. These functions are supplemented by counseling and testing services to assist applicants to obtain suitable jobs or to upgrade their skills through further training; by assisting employers in analyzing their skill requirements by solving problems of recruitment and turnover; and through development of labor area information. Specialized services are offered the disadvantaged and others who are presently unsuited for available employment. These specialized services are grouped together under the Human Resources Development concept. Programs are carried on to aid communities in developing employment opportunities and to provide necessary employment services to workers and employers in areas where the establishment of full-time offices is not economically feasible. Statistical and survey operations are carried out to assist employers, local offices, and other government agencies in their considerations of manpower needs. The services outlined above are provided for both farm and nonfarm workers.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Wage and labor standards: Promoting employment of the handicapped	497	533	540

Promoting employment of the handicapped. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped conducts a continuing program of public information and education to advance employment of the handicapped citizen and cooperates with all national groups interested in this field, including the Governors' Committees and local communities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Total cost, all programs listed above	1,920,964	2,191,226	2,632,727

HONEY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the honey producers of America have not enjoyed the expanded markets for their product which should have resulted from the burgeoning population in the United States. As a matter of fact, the per capita consumption of honey has been cut in half since the early 1940's. At that time, per capita consumption was close to 2 pounds per person, but this dropped to 1.1 pounds per person in 1967.

Facing this adverse market situation, many of the honey producers decided that a self-help promotion project is the best answer to their situation. Consequently, I am today introducing the Honey Promotion and Research Act of 1969. The bill is considerably revised over last year's proposal.

This act authorizes the establishment of a National Honey Promotion and Research Board to develop marketing research and promotion programs. It is obvious in this day of mass media and the very effective advertising techniques used to appeal to the millions of today's consumers that promotion is an essential component of marketing procedures. The failure of the honey industry to promote its excellent product has resulted in declined per capita consumption.

This board would be comprised of nine members. Six members would be selected from persons nominated by honey producers from regions established by the Secretary of Agriculture based on honey production statistics. Three handler members would be appointed at large.

The board members would serve 3-year terms, with the exception of six members originally appointed, three of whom would serve 1 year and three of whom serve 2 years.

Funds for marketing research and promotion would come from assessments placed on honey produced and sold through commercial handlers. Beekeeping hobbyists and small producers would be excluded from the assessment procedure. The assessment rate could be no more than 15 cents per 60-pound can or equivalent.

Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to hold hearings on a proposed order establishing the Board and its functions. Before the order could be enforced, a referendum among honey producers would be held. Approval of the order would be given if either two-thirds of the producers favored it or at least one-half of the producers voted for it and they produced two-thirds of the honey in the representative period. If the order proved ineffective or producers later decided to discontinue the program, an election could be called by the Secretary or upon request of 10 percent of the producers. The order would be terminated by majority vote if that majority produced at least 50 percent of the honey in the representative period.

The bill also permits individual producers who do not wish to participate to have the assessments made against their honey refunded.

The bill would prohibit proxy voting.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill represents an honest effort by honey producers to improve the market for honey and I applaud this self-help approach. I welcome support from the House, and hope that the bill will soon be reported favorably for consideration by this body.

To provide additional details, I submit a section-by-section analysis for printing in the Record:

Honey Promotion and Research Act of 1969: Section-by-Section Analysis

Sec. 1. Short Title, cites act as the Honey Promotion and Research Act of 1969.

Sec. 2. Findings and Declaration of Policy. Declares it in the public interest to establish an orderly procedure for financing, through assessments on honey marketed in the U.S., marketing research and promotion to strengthen the competitive position of honey.

Sec. 3. Authority to Issue an Order. Gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to issue orders pertaining to the collection of assessments and use of such assessments.

Sec. 4. Notice and Hearing. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to hold a hearing on a proposed order when it appears it would effectuate the policy of the Act.

Sec. 5. Finding and Issuance of an Order. Directs the Secretary to issue the order, after hearings, if it will effectuate the policy of the Act.

Sec. 6. Regulations. Authorizes the Secretary to make regulations to carry out the Act.

Sec. 7. Required Terms. Defines the composition, selection, powers and duties of the National Honey Promotion and Research Board. The Board is given authority to administer the order, to make rules and regulations effectuating the order, to investigate complaints, and to recommend amendments of the order to the Secretary. The Board will be composed of nine members: six producers and three handlers. The producers shall be named from nominees selected by producers from six districts, determined by the Secretary on the basis of 1966 honey production. Handler representatives shall be at large. The terms of office shall be three years, except that initial membership shall be staggered to allow one third of the Board's membership to change each year. The Board will prepare a budget to cover marketing research, development, advertising, and promotion and present it to the Secretary. The Board will fix the assessment rate not exceeding 15¢ per sixty pound can of honey produced. Prohibits use of funds for influencing governmental policy. The Board will develop advertising or research and development plans for presentation to the Secretary. Authorizes refund of assessments upon request of producer. Requires the Board to keep records and submit report to the Secretary. Authorizes the Secretary to maintain suits for collection of unpaid assessments.

Sec. 8. Permissive Terms and Provisions. Authorizes issuance of an order containing following terms: exemption from assessment on exported honey. Reducing assessment in states where state-run programs duplicate efforts of National Board. Promoting honey on a nationwide basis or in surplus-producing area without reference to specific brand names. Providing for marketing research and development, processing, distribution, or utilization of honey projects.

Sec. 9. Assessments. Directs honey handlers to pay assessments to the Board. The handlers are authorized to collect the assessments from the producers.

Sec. 10. Petition and Review. Authorizes individuals to petition the Secretary for changes in any order. Authorizes Secretary to rule on petition. Gives district courts jurisdiction to review such ruling.

Sec. 11. Enforcement. Gives the district courts jurisdiction to enforce any order or regulation under this Act. Violation of any order subject to fine between $100 and $1,000 upon conviction.

Sec. 12. Investigation and Power to Subpoena. Authorizes Secretary to investigate possible violations of law, to issue subpoenas and compel attendance of witnesses, to invoke aid of courts to carry out this authority.

Sec. 13. Amendments. Applies provisions of this Act on orders to amendments to orders.

Sec. 14. Requirement of Referendum. Requires Secretary to hold a referendum on order among honey producers. Order would become effective only if ⅔rds of producers voting favored it or if a majority of the voters favored it and produced not less than ⅔rds of the honey in the representative period. Proxy voting would be prohibited.

Sec. 15. Suspension and Termination. Authorizes Secretary to terminate or suspend operation of an order or portion thereof which does not effectuate policy of the Act. Authorizes a referendum on request of the Board or 10% of the producers to determine if the order should be terminated. Order would be terminated by majority vote in such referendum if they produced more than 50% of the honey in the representative period.

Sec. 16. Delegation. Authorizes delegation of Secretary's authority to any officer of the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 17. Definitions. Several definitions, the following two of which are verbatim: "Handler" means any person (except a common or contract carrier of honey owned by other persons) who handles honey, either of his own production or that of another producer or of foreign production, in a manner specified in the order or in rules and regulations issued thereunder.

"Producer" means any person within the marketing area engaged in a proprietary capacity in the production of honey for delivery to a handler or for sale by that person as a handler but excludes beekeeping hobbyists, persons who make only occasional deliveries to handlers, and such other persons as may be excluded by the order or any rules and regulations issued thereunder.

Sec. 18. Modification. Authorizes Secretary to change definitions upon basis of hearing evidence, recommendation of the Board or other information, whenever change would effectuate the Act.

Sec. 19. Separability. Retains validity of remainder of Act if any provision is held invalid.

Sec. 20. Authorization. Provides authority for appropriations.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of Newsweek magazine, March 31, 1969, contains an article by the distinguished economist Paul Samuelson in which he recommends suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

I have been joined by 31 of my colleagues (Mr. Meeds, of Washington; Mr. Rees, of California; Mr. William D. Ford, of Michigan; Mr. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Adams, of Washington; Mr. Bingham, of New York; Mr. Brown, of California; Mr. Zablocki, of Wisconsin; Mr. Edwards, of California; Mr. Gibbons, of Florida; Mr. Conyers, of Michigan; Mr. Long, of Maryland; Mr. St. Onge, of Connecticut; Mr. Farbstein, of New York; Mr. Podell, of New York; Mr. Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey; Mr. Mikva, of Illinois; Mr. Eilberg, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Yatron, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Rosenthal, of New York; Mr. Vigorito, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Koch, of New York; Mr. Nedzi, of Michigan; Mr. Dingell, of Michigan; Mr. Macdonald, of Massachusetts; Mr. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Mr. Karth, of Minnesota; Mr. Roybal, of California; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; and Mr. Madden, of Indiana) in sponsoring H.R. 5250 and identical bills, designed to raise $9 billion annually in additional revenue by closing off 13 tax loopholes. One of the loopholes H.R. 5250 would close is the 7-percent investment tax credit Paul Samuelson discusses.

I commend this column to my colleagues and include it at this point in the Record:

Investment Tax Credit

(By Paul A. Samuelson)

Inflation watchers were rocked last week by news from the SEC and Commerce Department that businessmen intend to increase their plant and equipment investments by almost 14 per cent.

The new outlook for excessive investment spending should, in my opinion, cause President Nixon to suspend the 7 per cent investment credit temporarily. Here's why:

1. The economy is still on an inflationary binge. To bring the rate of price increase down from 4 per cent toward a more moderate figure of, say, 3 per cent, some actions are going to be needed. Every weapon counts.

2. Already the Federal Reserve is being called upon to take Draconian measures to fight inflation. This will mean not only painfully higher interest rates; it will also bring in most of the discomforts associated with the money crunch of 1966—uneven rationing of credit between new and old business, growing and stagnant business, small and large business.

3. Experience demonstrates that tight money takes for its principal casually the housing industry. When there is a scramble for more resources than the total resouces available, it is right that housing should share in the restraint. But it is not, in my judgment, good national policy to have housing starts cut by 40 to 50 per cent as happened in 1966. In the 1970s, with their bumper crop of young marrieds, we shall pay in higher rents and zooming residential costs for any serious diminution of home construction in the waning years of the Vietnam war.

4. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by adding onto the present surcharge another 5 or 10 per cent tax. But I see no evidence that this would be politically popular or feasible. Nor is it clear that consumer spending is the prime villain in the present inflationary scenario.

5. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by still further tightening of the Federal Reserve money screw. And the impact of such tightness on the housing industry could be alleviated by special financial subsidies to home construction through the Federal housing agencies, through the U.S. Treasury, or through the Federal Reserve. Since all such measures will add to the nominal public debt, I don't expect that anything but tokenism would, in fact, be politically feasible in this area.

Even if it were possible to cushion the impact of tight money on residential housing, to get the same restriction of aggregate demand from enforced reductions on plant and equipment spending would, I suspect, require very high interest rates. These will cause difficulties for our partners abroad. And they may hang on to plague us in the years to come when the winds may be blowing up deflation rather than inflation.

6. In September of 1966, to alleviate the money crunch and moderate what looked like an excessive fixed investment boom, the Johnson Administration did suspend the 7 per cent investment tax credit. Almost at once relief was felt in the money markets of the country. On the whole (despite the protests of the Treasury, which naturally found it a headache), the operation seems to have been a successful one in accomplishing its purpose—namely, ensuring against an overexuberant fixed investment boom.

So historical experience, as well as the common-sense view that firms will invest less when their returns from doing so are reduced, justifies suspending the tax credit.

What are the possible arguments against suspension of the tax credit?

1. The Nixon Administration might be regarded as a pro-business Administration. Why should it take from business this accustomed source of profit?

2. Perhaps the inflationary danger is being exaggerated. Perhaps it will involve overkill if suspension of the investment tax credit reduces investment severely.

3. Vigorous growth requires as much capital formation as we can get. Adjusting to inflation by reducing investment will reduce our future capacity to produce an enlarged total of real national product.

4. It is a bad thing to use variations in the investment tax credit as a deliberate weapon of stabilization. Why? Because it is plain immoral. Because it involves discretion by government, which is wicked. Because it disturbs business planning.

5. Suspension creates administrative problems for the Treasury.

In economics, every decision involves pros and cons. Judgment is necessary. My advice to Mr. Nixon: suspend the investment tax credit.

RURAL-URBAN IMBALANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIPLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, some of our Nation's most pressing problems have their roots in the recent massive migration of rural people into our already overcrowded cities. The result is frequently referred to as "rural-urban imbalance," and while to some it may not seem as important as the "urban crisis" nor as immediate as "crime in the streets," it is a significant contributing factor to many of our domestic problems.

Much has been written and said about the problems of rural America, and a number of programs have been suggested and legislation proposed to solve these problems. But while there has been progress in some areas, the overall situation remains unchanged.

Why has there been so little progress? Is there general understanding of the problems of rural America? What kind of programs will do the job that needs to be done?

The National Rural Electric Co-op Association, which is the service organization of the Nation's nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives, sought the answers to these complex questions in a survey conducted for NRECA by an independent research organization. The survey covered a representative sample of the adult American public, with interviews conducted in major central cities, suburban areas, small towns, and rural areas. The results shed considerable light on the questions I have just raised.

For instance, the survey finds that on the whole, Americans feel there are few if any problems within rural America. In fact, the survey states that the American public—

> Looks upon rural America in very favorable terms, assigning to rural life and rural people most of the classic virtues, and few, if any, faults. These feelings extend directly to the mistaken impression that rural America faces few problems.

According to the survey findings, American citizenry believes that people who live in rural areas are much friendlier, healthier, and more honest and hard working than city dwellers. It is interesting to note that most people believe poverty and poor housing to be more prevalent in the big city than in rural areas, and that rural educational facilities are better than urban ones.

The survey report states:

> The average American does not believe rural problems to be as important as others that face the nation. He ranks them lowest in priority among seven major issues and tends to set the problems of the cities at a significantly higher level. Residents in the rural areas themselves tend to view rural problems as secondary in the national context and consider them only slightly more critical than those of the cities.

In probing for publicly acceptable solutions for rural-urban imbalance and for the problems confronting both rural and urban areas, the survey found that the average citizen believes, first, in the concept of self-help. Only slightly below this in acceptability are solutions that, although sponsored by either government or industry, involve the citizenry and become self-help projects.

The solution to rural-urban imbalance and its attendant problems is twofold. First of all, since the general public does not understand the relationship between rural and urban problems, we must exert every effort to tell that story in vivid and meaningful terms. Second, in developing programs to solve the problems of rural America, we must begin with the idea that people would rather help themselves than be the recipients of outside help. We must concentrate on helping to build a rural leadership capable of developing an economically sound and productive rural America—the kind of rural America which many city dwellers already think exists outside the city limits.

Most rural areas lack the readymade organizations of urban areas through which developmental work can be carried out. However, many of them have rural electric cooperatives, which are self-help organizations capable of providing the kind of leadership required for self-help rural development programs. Since its beginning in the depression-ridden 1930's, the rural electric program has been one of the most successful self-help programs ever undertaken in this Nation. During its 34 years, this Federal and local self-help partnership has brought not only lights and power to the farm, but economic and social benefits to all of rural America.

The NRECA survey points out that while the average American does not know very much about rural electric cooperatives, he does have sympathy for the concept and for the rural electric program.

The survey report observes:

> There is a general feeling that the rural electric cooperatives have been quite successful in electrifying rural areas and apparently consumers believe that there is little reason to change a successful formula.

Specifically, the average American believes that the Government-cooperative relationship is a good one. Seventy-six percent of those polled indicated that the Federal Government should continue loan money at a 2-percent interest rate to the rural electric systems. Seventy-three percent felt that the rural electric systems should continue, and only 13 percent believed they should be eventually taken over by the private power companies.

I would say from this that the rural electric cooperatives enjoy a high degree of national popularity as well as local trust.

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize that we must look to rural America as a means of alleviating some of our urban ills. We must establish a national awareness of the fact that while rural America has the potential of being the ideal place to live and work, which most people think it to be, the present situation there is far from ideal. We must carefully plan and implement self-help rural community development programs through which rural people can help themselves to achieve a better and more abundant life. Once the quality of life and the opportunities offered by rural America have been upgraded, we can look to a reversal of the current outmigration from rural areas.

I congratulate NRECA for sponsoring this enlightening survey on the Nation's view of rural America and rural electrification, and I salute the members, directors, and employees of our rural electric cooperatives for their continuing effort to improve rural America for the benefit of all Americans.

BROADER ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is time America faced up to the realization that its future well-being depends upon making available to all its citizens a full range of educational opportunity. Many today in our country are unable to help themselves because financial requirements close doors of educational opportunity to them. Tuition costs are appallingly high and constantly increasing. Steadily it becomes obvious that the wealthy and middle-class child gets the best educational opportunity. As the poor are left further behind, they remain uneducated and untrained, taking from society all their lives, in the form of unemployment and welfare payments, which give them a subsistence level of existence.

Today I am introducing a measure aimed at providing a chance for higher education to poorer youngsters in our society. I do this on the premise that a chance for such education in our kind of society is not a privilege, but a right.

My bill amends the educational opportunity grants program of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by expanding its grant provisions in section 402. It doubles the amount of grant money available to the student from $1,000 to $2,000 yearly, removing the stipulation from the present program that the student may receive only half the amount as a grant and the remainder as a repayable loan. Under my measure the student may receive the full amount as a grant.

Many of these youngsters avoid the challenge of college because of fear of being unable to repay the loan. We must realize that coming from underprivileged backgrounds, they have little formal understanding of the college world. A little generosity on our part would pay large dividends to our country. This would be provided for under this bill.

The bill is designed to cover tuition, student fees, and book costs up to $2,000 a year. It also cuts in half the minimum amount which may be granted from $200 to $100 a year.

It is an attempt to institutionalize the American principle of equality of opportunity for all. In these times, it is particularly apropo that we extend a tangible sign of our desire to help these young people help themselves.

ANOTHER TECHNICAL MILITARY DISASTER, THE ARMY'S MBT–70 "DREAM TANK"

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have seen fit to call into question the ABM, TFX–F–111 and other wasteful extravagances which now pass under the humorous title of new military defense systems. This has brought forth indignation and patriotic protestations from some quarters. It is precisely my love of country and capacity for indignation that requires me to call into question another massive military expenditure which has expended so much and produced so little. I have reference to the Army's proposed new main battle tank—the MBT–70 "Dream Tank."

We are now informed by press reports and congressional hearings that the Government has spent between $1 and $2 billion over the past 8 years on this project without passing beyond the prototype stage. These are figures emanating from the General Accounting Office, which has been monitoring the project. The Comptroller General gives us a $1.3 billion figure.

Mr. Stratton, of New York, has rendered a public service to the Nation by deriding the Army's desperate attempts to hide its ineptness through calling for closed hearings and refusing to testify in public.

The armored vehicle in question was supposed to maintain a high speed while being able to fire its main armament on the move. Conditioned against fallout, it was to be able to fire missiles and conventional shells with disposable casings through the same tube. Unit cost, exclusive of research and development, was to be between $500,000 and $1 million. In tandem with West Germany, we would develop this sophisticated answer to Russian tank strength.

Obviously, German and American standards did not mesh. A powerful enough engine has defied efforts at development. The Germans dropped out, seeing how futile it was to continue. We are left holding the bag, which the Army refuses to drop. In fact, even if we had this tank in being, ready for combat, it would be questionable if it could perform effectively against what the Russians already possess in Europe on a combat-ready basis.

Presently we possess about a dozen pilot models of the MBT–70. Doubts are strong as to whether it will ever be brought to fruition as a weapons system. Now we are told that disposable ammunition casings are not disposable, and that, despite all these difficulties, the Army has continued procurement of this system.

Right now the Army is still building Sheridan training simulators that do not work. Each would cost $500 to be made workable. So far, $1 million would have to be spent on modifications, but they are still rolling off the assembly line.

The Army itself admitted to Congressman Stratton that it put the tank into production knowing it had basic flaws, a violation of its own regulations on the subject.

So we see the Army throwing away hundreds of millions on a weapons system it knows is faulty in order to prevent loss of appropriations. This is why our cities are collapsing before our eyes and the taxpayer groans under a staggering weight.

What excuses shall we be given this time? Or shall we be called unpatriotic because we dare ask what in Heaven's name the Pentagon and America's defense industry are doing with these awesome sums of money.

I passionately believe in an adequate defense for our Nation. Yet if a mortal challenge is ever delivered, I doubt if our defense would be able to meet it. I do not begrudge profits to any contractor—even massive profit. But for the sake of all that is holy, can we not obtain weapons systems from these corporations that will function? They seem to be incapable of performance, yet the Soviets seem to quickly produce first-rate weapons in many fields.

It is becoming damningly obvious that a few major defense contractors are increasingly milking America for skyrocketing sums on the excuse that they can and will produce effective military hardware in reasonable spans of time. Never was so much taken from so many by so few, and so little given in return. Meanwhile, our social problems grow from sores to cancers, while this mad dance of death mounts to a wild crescendo of spending, profiteering, excuses, and closed hearings.

Mr. Speaker, this is not to be suffered any longer in silence. The American public not only has a right to be defended, it has a right to know what is being done with its money. People pay taxes in return for security and protection. That is the first duty of government. America's citizenry also possesses the right to demand prosecution and punishment of those who take vast sums and return us nothing. If the small thief is sent off to reform school or prison, what is to be done in the case of the major malfeasor?

THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS SHOW DISREGARD FOR PUBLIC INTEREST

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, that Supreme Court decisions are hampering law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice is hardly a debatable issue any longer. The more pertinent question these days is how far the Court will go to protect individual rights, convicted criminals no less, as against the collective rights of society and, to be sure, the ultimate right of any society, that of its own self-preservation.

One of the basic responsibilities of government is to protect the lives and property of those for whom its existence depends. Laws are enacted as binding rules of social conduct to insure the adequacy of this protection. But no law will secure to every person the unalienable rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" at the hands of the elite tribunal of nine men, the majority of whom appear to be bent on achieving the utopian way of life wherein laws would not be necessary.

No one denies or doubts that a criminal, too, has rights protected by the Constitution, but it is high time the Supreme Court deals in realities, viewing muck and mire of crime in the streets and realizing that the victim of crime also has rights, significantly, his

XUM

unalienable rights. No law can revive the life of a victim or erase the agonizing experience of a vicious assault against his life or property. But laws can bring to justice those who defiantly violate the laws of society, providing the courts identify the realities rather than becoming preoccupied with the abstractions of impractical idealism. There can be no more convincing evidence than the phenomenal increase in the incidence of crime which strikes at the very existence of our society.

Decisions of the Court will undoubtedly stand so long as the public and the representatives of the people have respect for its logic and reasoning. I find cause to believe, however, that such respect is diminishing, and inevitably, the Court must concede to a persistent public will lest it risk the dilution of its powers. One can only hope that day is near.

A very pertinent editorial appeared in the March 21, 1969, Wall Street Journal in which are reiterated the remarks of Chief Justice Weintraub of the New Jersey Supreme Court concerning two significant anomalies of recent Supreme Court procedural decisions. The first is the impractically ideal and abstract reasoning of the Court:

> If the judiciary exerts its undoubted power to create new Constitutional doctrines, it must first learn what authority the other departments (executive and legislative) must have. The need must be found, not in abstract contemplation, but in the tumult of the streets. Clichés and slogans will not do.

The second concerns the suppression of truth in the courtroom:

> It is an unhappy fact that the capacity of the judicial process to deal with the demands of law enforcement is doubted by a substantial body of responsible men. The reasons are several. One is the lengthening line of decisions which suppress the truth or block access to it.

According to the editorial:

> In the case before the New Jersey court . . . no one contested the truth of the evidence the defense sought to suppress. The argument was that since the evidence had been acquired in a manner the Supreme Court has since disapproved, it should not be admitted to the courtroom. Since the police had broken the rules, the criminal should go free.

The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 21, 1969]

A Regard for Truth

An impressive number of prominent jurists have joined the complaints about the recent string of Supreme Court decisions on criminal procedure, which have made life easier for defendants and tougher for police and prosecutors. Some especially penetrating comments were offered recently by Chief Justice Weintraub of the New Jersey Supreme Court.

Justice Weintraub's court got its back up about a Supreme Court case declaring that requiring gamblers to buy Federal gambling stamps infringes on the Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination. In a 6–0 decision, the New Jersey court refused to suppress evidence arising from the law the High Court had struck down. There are troublesome aspects to such acts of judicial defiance, but Justice Weintraub's opinion certainly put a finger on two of the biggest anomalies in the recent procedural decisions.

The first of these is the ivory-tower reasoning behind most of the Supreme Court decisions. Remarking that the first duty of all branches of government is to insure the peace, Justice Weintraub added, "If the judiciary exerts its undoubted power to create new Constitutional doctrines, it must first learn what authority the other departments must have. The need must be found, not in abstract contemplation, but in the tumult of the streets. Cliches and slogans will not do."

It's bad enough that the High Court's abstract decisions may have very concrete effects in hampering law enforcement. But the decisions' contact with reality is equally tenuous with regard to the need for the reforms they proclaim. The cases before the Court have seldom if ever concerned innocent people unjustly convicted; they have concerned criminals whose guilt was mortally certain. The Court has been changing the rules not to correct demonstrated injustice, but in pursuit of some other-worldly ideal.

The second and more central anomaly is that the changes in the rules have hampered rather than advanced the search for truth in the courtroom. As Justice Weintraub puts it, "It is an unhappy fact that the capacity of the judicial process to deal with the demands of law enforcement is doubted by a substantial body of responsible men. The reasons are several. One is the lengthening line of decisions which suppress the truth or block access to it."

In the case before the New Jersey court, for example, no one contested the truth of the evidence the defense sought to suppress. The argument was that since the evidence had been acquired in a manner the Supreme Court has since disapproved, it should not be admitted to the courtroom. Since the police had broken the rules, the criminal should go free.

This is of course a standard argument in U.S. appellate courts. Reversing the criminal's conviction, or sending the case back for a new trial with access to vital evidence barred, is how the courts discipline the police. Presumably this does control police behavior. But its unhappy side effect is that so often the highly rarified rules of the game, not the objective facts of guilt or innocence, determine the outcome in the courtroom.

Now, some critics of the Supreme Court's recent procedural decisions are talking about very sweeping remedies. One prominent judge has proposed a lengthy Constitutional Amendment detailing what protection from self incrimination does and does not encompass. If remedies of this scope are being discussed, a far more elegant and penetrating solution might be an Amendment guaranteeing that courts may consider whatever relevant evidence is available.

This suggestion, we recognize, will leave many lawyers aghast. But while it is foreign to their traditions, it remains highly commended by common sense. Freeing guilty criminals is scarcely the only way to discipline transgressing policemen; they can, for one alternative, be treated like other lawbreakers. A complete end to suppression of evidence might not prove a practical or even desirable reform, of course, but serious discussion of it would starkly illustrate the problems bothering Justice Weintraub and a good many others.

To wit, the new proliferation of abstract rules is making the criminal process an increasingly stylized and therefore increasingly empty ritual. Somehow or other, it needs to be infused with a sound regard for simple truth.

Another timely report on the suppression of evidence secured through electronic eavesdropping appeared in the Evening Star on March 24 under the byline of Lyle Denniston. Contrary to existing law, which deliberately took care to guard the rights of individuals to privacy to the maximum extent feasible, while still insuring the public interest, the Supreme Court ruled in effect "that the Government will have to turn over to defense lawyers and criminal suspects all logs of eavesdropping done—without a judge's permission—whether the snooping was done for security purposes or for any other reason." Despite a rare plea by the Justice Department to have the Court review its decision, considering that it would immeasurably impair prosecution in certain criminal cases, the Court refused in a brief six words. It takes no stretch of the imagination to feel this decision will further weigh the balance of justice in favor of the criminal, suspected or convicted.

As these developments, reported in the article, the full text following, and editorialized in the preceding editorial, are most relevant to our legislative responsibilities and prerogatives, I commend them to your close attention:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1969]

(By Lyle Denniston)

The Supreme Court today flatly rejected the Justice Department's plea for unrestricted permission to use secret listening devices in "foreign intelligence spying."

With no dissent and with no explanation, the justices refused to reconsider their controversial March 10 ruling that any electronic snooping that was done without a judge's permission, in any kind of case, is forbidden by the Constitution's Fourth Amendment.

Last Wednesday, Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold urged an exemption from the amendment when government agents use wiretaps or hidden microphones to gather foreign intelligence.

Griswold had argued that eavesdropping for that sole purpose was necessary "in the interest of self-preservation" for the nation.

The effect of today's six-word order denying reconsideration is that the government will have to turn over to defense lawyers and criminal suspects all logs of eavesdropping done illegally, whether the snooping was done for security purposes or for any other reason.

The Justice Department will be left with the option of giving up its criminal cases in which illegal bugging has been done, rather than hand over its secret files of bugging transcripts.

The high court, in a separate ruling today, may have eased somewhat the impact of its March 10 decision on past federal cases.

By a vote of 5–3, the court said that a key 1967 decision broadening the Fourth Amendment coverage of electronic eavesdropping will not apply to any bugging done before Dec. 18, 1967—the date of the previous decision.

This action will mean that some government eavesdropping that would be considered illegal is not unlawful because pre-1967 decision approved of it.

Thus, a suspect and his defense lawyer seeking access to government eavesdropping transcripts will not be able, at least in some cases, to claim the monitoring was illegal. Unless they can make that claim, they have no right under the March 10 decision to look at government bugging transcripts.

RECONSIDERATION ASKED

Whatever gain the Justice Department may have made because the 1967 decision was not applied retroactively is not likely to make up for its disappointment at the court's refusal to reconsider its March 10 decision.

That ruling seriously upset key department officials and resulted in the rare request by the government for the court to take another look at the decision.

Department officials were particularly disturbed that disclosure of some tapes of illegal eavesdropping would betray government secrets about the location of foreign intelligence bugs, including bugs and wiretaps of foreign embassy telephones.

The government also was concerned that some persons under suspicion for purely domestic crimes would "stumble into" foreign intelligence bugs and be overheard.

Because the government would not be willing to reveal the tapes of that overhearing the suspect would have gained "immunity from prosecution for all crimes, present or future," Griswold contended.

He asked the justices to modify their decision so that the Fourth Amendment did not apply to any use of electronic devices that had been expressly approved by the U.S. attorney general for foreign intelligence operations.

By refusing to reconsider, the court declined to make such an exception—at least for the time being. At some point in the future, the justices could take up that issue.

In the meantime, however, the March 10 decision will stand without the constitutional immunity which the government had insisted was necessary.

Following up the March 10 ruling, the high court today ordered federal judges in Chattanooga, Tenn., and Chicago to look again at two federal criminal convictions of former Teamster Union president James R. Hoffa.

The Chattanooga conviction in 1964 of jury-tampering sent Hoffa to federal prison for an eight-year term. The Chicago conviction, also in 1964, could increase his prison stay five more years.

Demonstrating further that the new decision could have a widespread impact on federal cases, the justices also returned nearly two dozen other cases to be re-examined under the March 10 decision.

Among these others was the draft-evasion conviction of former boxing champion Cassious Clay. The Justice Department has admitted that one of the five instances in which it electronically eavesdropped on Clay's conversations came when he "stumbled into" a foreign intelligence probe.

Clay is free on bail pending outcome of his appeal.

The court action in the Hoffa cases gave his lawyers at least a temporary victory. For two years, they have been attempting to get reconsideration of the jury-tampering conviction on the grounds that federal agents used illegal eavesdropping. Before today, the high court had turned aside such pleas three times.

Two years ago, the justices did require the lower court to re-examine the Chicago fraud case, because of a government admission of eavesdropping but the scope of that review was limited, since it came before the new decision widening defense lawyers' access to government bugging transcripts.

Federal judges re-examining criminal cases under the March 10 decision must go through two steps:

First, they must decide if the eavesdropping was done illegally—that is, without advance permission from a court to invade a private conversation.

Second, if the eavesdropping was illegal, the defense lawyers and their clients are to be shown all transcripts of conversations involving the defendant himself or conversations that took place on his "premises" but involving other persons.

The Supreme Court's decision today on the issue of retroactive use of the 1967 decision will figure in the first of these two steps.

Under the 1967 ruling, the justices said for the first time that it was illegal to use hidden devices to listen in on private conversation, no matter where the conversation took place, if the monitoring had not been approved in advance by a judge.

Prior to that ruling, eavesdropping was illegal only if the hidden device had intruded physically into a private place. The 1967 decision said that privacy did not belong to physical locations, but to persons.

NEW PROTECTION

This decision gave new constitutional protection to private conversations even in such places as public telephone booths.

But the court said today that it would not apply that protection to eavesdropping prior to Dec. 18, 1967. Therefore, any bugging done before that day that did not physically intrude into a private place is not considered illegal, even if it was done without the judge's approval.

The court expressly refused to apply the 1967 ruling to a criminal case in which a microphone had been placed in a hotel but did not actually penetrate the room in which the overheard conversation took place. The case involved a group of five people convicted of taking part in a $100 million heroin deal.

In a second case, the court refused to apply the 1967 decision to a New York bar owner who was overheard on a police wiretap of a public telephone. Evidence gathered by the wiretap helped police convict the man of an extortion conspiracy.

OVERSEAS MILITARY CREDIT UNIONS STILL BEST METHOD OF FIGHTING LOAN SHARKS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have placed in the RECORD the reports of the progress being made by U.S. military credit unions operating in Germany.

These credit unions were brought about because of investigations conducted by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee which revealed that servicemen stationed overseas were paying interest rates as high as 60 and 70 percent to obtain loans.

A majority of the credit unions in Germany were opened about 15 months ago. Last November, a credit union was opened at Lakenheath Air Base in England and in December, a credit union was opened at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines.

On the first of April, a military credit union will open in Seoul, Korea. Arrangements have also been made to provide a specialized type of credit union service in Rota, Spain, and in the near future, credit union facilities will be operating in Naples and Aviano, Italy.

At the end of February, the eight overseas credit unions had signed up more than 43,000 members, had received share deposits in the amount of nearly $5 million and made loans amounting to nearly $26 million. The reason the loans are higher than the shares is that the credit unions are suboffices of existing U.S. credit unions and the excess funds of the stateside credit unions are being put to use by the overseas facilities.

It should be noted that the credit unions, in addition to saving servicemen from $200 to $500 on the financing costs of a new automobile, are also helping to fight our balance-of-payments problem since the servicemen borrow money that is returned to the United States as it is repaid rather than borrowing from a foreign finance company. This availability of credit also encourages servicemen to purchase large ticket items at the military exchange facilities rather than buying such items on the economy. Formerly, these items had to be purchased on the economy if they were to be financed.

The following is a letter from Brig. Gen. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., retired, executive secretary of the Defense Credit Union Council reporting the activities of the eight credit unions now in operation. It should be noted that a vast majority of the loans are made to enlisted men, particularly those at the bottom of the pay scale. These were the servicemen who were formerly the No. 1 victims of the loan sharks. Before any serviceman receives a loan from one of the credit unions, he is fully counseled about the wise use of credit and the loan is tailored to his income.

Although it is still too early to obtain any extremely accurate loss experience on these loans, preliminary indications show that writeoffs are extremely low and in many cases are far below the average of all credit unions.

DEFENSE CREDIT UNION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following progress report concerning the operations of credit union suboffices in Germany, England, and the Philippine Islands is submitted for your information.

Andrews Federal Credit Union began operations at Wiesbaden on 11 March 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Frankfurt. As of 28 February these sub-offices had acquired 8,897 members, made loans in the amount of $8,051,132.62, and had received share deposits in the total amount of $2,599,886.91. During the month of February, 761 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

	No. of loans
E–2	4
E–3	70
E–4	175
E–5	198
E–6	136
E–7	47
E–8	10
E–9	5
W–1	2
W–2	7
O–1	19
O–2	31
O–3	34
O–4	12
O–5	11

Fort Belvoir Federal Credit Union began operations at Wurzburg on 1 February 1968. As of 28 February this sub-office had 2,614 members, made loans in the amount of $1,561,878.27, and received share deposits in the total amount of $135,303.71. During the month of February, 284 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

	No. of loans
E–1	3
E–2	9
E–3	43
E–4	76
E–5	82
E–6	41
E–7	17
E–8	2
W–O	3
O–1	1
O–2	7

XUM

Pease AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Ramstein on 15 January 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Baumholder. As of 28 February these sub-offices had acquired 11,691 members, made loans in the total amount of $5,725,728.59, and received share deposits in the amount of $561,331.68. During the month of February these sub-offices made 694 loans to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

	No. of loans
E–2	12
E–3	95
E–4	214
E–5	178
E–6	115
E–7	28
E–8	10
E–9	4
O–1	7
O–2	13
O–3	13
O–4	2
O–5	3

Lackland AFB Federal Credit Union began operations in Berlin on 26 December 1967. As of 28 February this sub-office had acquired 2,021 members, made loans in the total amount of $1,606,672.46, and received share deposits in the amount of $326,114.61. During the month of February this sub-office made 113 loans to military personnel distributed by pay grades as follows:

	No. of loans
E–3	10
E–4	31
E–5	32
E–6	23
E–7	4
E–8	1
W–0	1
O–1	5
O–2	2
O–3	3
O–4	1

Redstone Federal Credit Union began operations in the Mannheim-Stuttgart area on 15 February 1968. As of 28 February this sub-office had acquired 8,655 members, made loans in the total amount of $5,528,826.67, and received share deposits in the amount of $371,827.11. During the month of February this sub-office made 1,107 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

	No. of loans
E–1	1
E–2	9
E–3	64
E–4	268
E–5	341
E–6	240
E–7	63
E–8	11
E–9	5
W–1	3
W–2	11
W–3	3
O–1	15
O–2	33
O–3	28
O–4	5
O–5	6
O–6	1

Finance Center Federal Credit Union began operations at Furth on 15 February 1968. As of 28 February this sub-office had acquired 4,191 members, made loans in the amount of $1,552,635.02, and had received share deposits in the amount of $417,058.65. During the month of February this sub-office made 256 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

	No. of loans
E–2	2
E–3	23
E–4	69
E–5	69
E–6	53
E–7	13
WO–1	1
WO–2	3
O–1	8
O–2	8
O–3	7

Keesler AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Lakenheath, England on 15 November 1968. As of 28 February this credit union had acquired 1,616 members, made loans in the amount of $627,933.44, and received share deposits in the amount of $167,114.73. During the month of February this sub-office made 230 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

	No. of loans
E–2	2
E–3	29
E–4	94
E–5	57
E–6	21
E–7	7
E–8	1
E–9	1
O–1	3
O–2	2
O–3	10
O–5	2
O–6	1

Barksdale AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Clark Air Base in the Philippine Islands on 20 December 1968. As of 28 February this credit union had acquired 3,490 members, made loans in the amount of $1,333,012.62, and received share deposits in the amount of $407,663.74. During the month of February this sub-office made 1,340 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

	No. of loans
E–2	196
E–3	193
E–4	387
E–5	350
E–6	111
E–7	78
E–8	14
E–9	3
O–1	3
O–2	12
O–3	24
O–4	5
O–5	3
O–6	1

As of 28 February the sub-offices had signed up 43,175 members, received share deposits in the amount of $4,986,301.14, and made loans in the amount of $25,987,819.69.

Respectfully,

EVERT S. THOMAS, Jr.,
Brigadier General, U.S.A. (retired),
Executive Secretary.

THE EXPERTS DISCOVER THAT THE FEDERAL RESERVE IS NOT INFALLIBLE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is slowly coming to realize that our Federal Reserve System is an unworkable hodge podge of creaking machinery that is doing tremendous damage to the entire economy.

We now have major commentators from all shades of political opinion facing the fact that the Federal Reserve and its illustrious chairman, William McChesney Martin, are not infallible.

It has taken many crises and near economic disasters to bring this realization home. It is coming none too early. The American public has long recognized the evils and the misguided policies of this ancient institution, but these facts have only recently filtered up to the leaders and the news columnists.

Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably great disagreement about what kind of changes should be made at the Federal Reserve, but there seems to be a growing unanimity of opinion that there must be change. Fewer and fewer economists and writers are willing to suggest any longer that the Federal Reserve and William McChesney Martin have all the answers. The fallacy of allowing a monetary system to operate on its own without coordination with general economic policies is sinking home in high places. I hope that we do not have to face a general economic collapse before this administration and the Congress do something about the Federal Reserve System.

While I do not agree with all of the statements, I do urge my colleagues to read the Evans and Novak column in today's Washington Post, March 27. The Evans and Novak column outlines some of the recent criticisms which are being voiced about the collapse of our monetary policymaking.

Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of this column in the RECORD:

OVERZEALOUS FIGHT ON INFLATION BY FED FEARED

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Even though the fires of inflation still roar with no sign they will diminish, economic policymakers in the Nixon Administration are afraid that the Federal Reserve Board will go too far in battling inflation and do grave damage to the economy.

Specifically, they fear that the brakes put on the money supply by the Fed—the Nation's central bank—might late this year trigger a business decline and rising unemployment that President Nixon feels would doom his Administration.

Nobody in the Administration is even faintly considering anything so disruptive as an open bid to bring the Federal Reserve Board under control of the White House and Treasury. Rather, they are just hoping for better coordination of future Fed moves with Administration economic policy.

The irony is that the harsh words are coming from a Republican Administration. Economic offcials in the Democratic Administrations of the past eight years were circumspect in dealing with the Fed and its much respected chairman, William McChesney Martin—sacred cows of the financial establishment. The Nixon officials, supposedly the friends of the Fed, are less wary of sniping at the Fed (at least in private).

Such sniping has been growing outside Government, particularly in commercial banking circles, on grounds that the Fed has zigged when it should have zagged in recent years. A favorite target is the Fed's supertight money policy of 1966, which produced a credit crunch of nearly calamitous proportions.

> Furthermore, some Administration officials feel Chairman Martin overstepped himself into politics by loudly championing President Johnson's 10 per cent surtax and then made an economic blooper by depending unduly on that tax increase to curb inflation. According to this analysis, Martin was so confident that the surtax would apply the economic brakes that the Fed let the money supply grow too rapidly last fall—inadvertently feeding inflation.
>
> Other Nixon officials, particularly at the Treasury, share the Johnson Administration's high confidence in Martin personally and work with him harmoniously. But confidence in the other six members of the Reserve Board is considerably lower in official Washington today than it was before Jan. 20. Some Nixon policymakers view the Fed as a Tower of Babel, its members spreading a bewildering variety of political gospel about the Nation in innumerable speeches.
>
> Thus, in February, top Administration officials read with great interest an issue of the high-priced economic report written by consultant Carter H. Golembe, a former official of the American Bankers Association, severely criticizing the operations and policies of the Federal Reserve Board.
>
> Even if these officials did not fully concur in the scope of Golembe's criticism, they agreed with the general tenor of the memorandum that the central banking system devised in Woodrow Wilson's day is overdue for revamping. For example, one Nixon policymaker passed the Golembe report to another with this memo attached to it: "Extreme, but interesting."
>
> Since the Golembe report, official concern about the Fed has risen. Nixon officials were basically in sympathy with a recent lead editorial of the New York Times suggesting that the Fed's crackdown on any growth in the money supply since last December has lasted too long and should now be replaced by reinforcing money reserves of the Nation's commercial banks.
>
> The problem of the Nixon men is manifest. Attempting to kill the inflationary psychology and promote anti-inflation by every word and deed, they can scarcely take the Fed to task—in public—for adjusting the money screws too tight.
>
> In fact, however, the Nixon economists believe that neither higher taxes nor a tight money policy can stop inflation. Only greatly reduced Federal spending is the answer, and that may prove impossible, while the Vietnam war still rages. The worry on Pennsylvania Avenue now is whether the independent Federal Reserve Board has the subtlety and expertise to weather this most difficult economic period.

Mr. Speaker, we need broad structural reforms of the Federal Reserve System. It is something that cannot be delayed. In January, I introduced H.R. 11 which is designed to bring about these reforms and to assure the fullest coordination of monetary policy with economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11 would:

First. Coordinate our economic policy. This would require that the Federal Reserve Board consult and work with other agencies of the Government as provided for in the Full Employment Act of 1946. In other words, the Federal Reserve would no longer be allowed to ride off in one direction while the rest of the country was moving in the opposite direction. This is basic to providing a stable economy without the disruptive ups and downs created by a "go it alone" Federal Reserve policy.

Two. Shorten the terms of the members of the Federal Reserve Board from 14 years to 5 years. This would enable the President to appoint a majority during his first term of office and would thereby make the Board more responsive to the will of the people. At the present time, the 14-year terms are staggered in such a manner as to prevent the President from appointing a majority until his very last year in office. This prevents a President from ever effectively controlling the Board at any time.

Third. Enable the President to appoint a Chairman of his own choosing. H.R. 11 would provide that the term of the Chairman be coterminous with that of the President of the United States. It would also allow the President to appoint any qualified person as Chairman. At present, the President is required to pick the Chairman from among the existing members of the Federal Reserve Board, thus narrowing his choice drastically.

Fourth. Require that the Federal Reserve seek appropriations from Congress. At the present time, the Federal Reserve does not come to Congress for appropriations. This prevents the Congress from exercising any kind of meaningful annual review of the activities of the Federal Reserve, or from checking any of its expenditures. The appropriations processes are essential to our democratic system and, in the past, have prevented bureaucrats and Federal agencies from ignoring the public interest.

Fifth. Require the Federal Reserve to submit to independent audits. The Federal Reserve's books are not audited. The General Accounting Office, which inspects the records of other Government agencies, is not allowed to look at any of the Federal Reserve's activities. As a result, there is no real knowledge of what the Federal Reserve does with all of its money.

Sixth. Abolish the Federal Open Market Committee and turn its functions over solely to the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the basic highlights of H.R. 11. Overall, the bill is designed to bring the Federal Reserve System in line with the principles of our democratic government. This means designing the Federal Reserve System in such a manner that it will respond to the desires and the needs of the people and not just to the wishes of the bankers. This is not a revolutionary bill by any means. It simply makes the Federal Reserve conform to the rules and operating procedures followed by other Government agencies.

NATION MAGAZINE DENOUNCES UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, there has been much confusion—some of it generated in the press—about the so-called Uniform Consumer Credit Code which is being pushed in 48 of the 50 State legislatures this year.

Therefore, I am happy to see that at least one national publication, the Nation magazine, has clearly laid out the facts in an editorial in its issue dated March 31.

The Nation magazine gives some excellent advice when it says:

> It would be much wiser for all States now covered by their own consumer credit laws to reject this package that has only one easily detectable virtue—uniformity, if indeed that is a virtue.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation magazine is to be commended for so forthrightly setting out the issues in this very important controversy. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this excellent editorial:

REVOLVING CREDIT

> When Congress passed the Truth in Lending Act last year, it quieted the States' rights advocates by including a provision that would exempt from federal jurisdiction any state that passed its own law offering the consumer as much protection as the federal statute. Now in a majority of states a bill called the Uniform Consumer Credit Code is being pushed. Some of its consumer protection features are pust as good as the federal law.
>
> But buried among these positive features one finds that the proposed Code would permit 36 per cent interest on revolving bank credit-card sales and 24 per cent interest on regular department store revolving credit sales. While that is high, it does not violate the exemption requirements, because the Truth in Lending Act leaves interest rates to the states. The federal law requires only that the charges be spelled out so that people can more clearly see when and how they are being gypped.
>
> The goal of the lobbyists for this Code sounds very plausible—equal charges throughout the land. But in fact it would be regressive to make all states adjust to this Code. Its provisions might actually improve debtors' lives in some of the more backward states, where 36 per cent and 24 per cent would sound like progress, but the Code would raise interest rates on loans in California, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and a good many other states. In fact, in the states where revolving credit is regulated—which is about half the states—not one permits an interest rate as high as the Uniform Code's proposed 24 per cent.
>
> In the first round of legislative votes, the Code has been defeated four times, but three of these losses were in thinly populated states—Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico—and the other state legislature. Indiana's, did not permanently turn it down but only put off the decision for two years. So the bulk of the arguing is still to be done, and it will come in the heavily populated states where lies the big pay-off in the $100 billion consumer credit business.
>
> The best chance the consumer has for seeing the Code turned down is the infighting now going on between the bankers and the loan companies.
>
> Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking Committee, has traced $297,000 of the money (there may be more he hasn't found) that went into the drafting-lobbying campaign behind the Code. At least $75,000 of that, he says, came from the bankers. (That's why the Code gives them 36 per cent interest on purchases made with bank credit cards, while department stores get 12 per cent less for their own credit-card sales.) But when a "free entry provision" was written into the Code to allow loan companies to muscle into some of the dealings previously reserved solely for the banks, the bankers reversed themselves and opposed the Code. At least on that point. In two states where the "free entry" provision was knocked out by the legislatures, the bankers reversed themselves again and supported the Code.
>
> Since it is a little difficult to take sides with

XUM

either the banks or the loan companies, and since, as Judge George Brunn of Berkeley has said, "this is one of the most technical and difficult to understand pieces of legislation I have ever seen, difficult even for lawyers, let alone laymen," it would be much wiser for all states now covered by their own consumer credit laws to reject this package that has only one easily detectable virtue—uniformity, if indeed that is a virtue.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, early in this session of Congress the Atomic Energy Commission submitted to the Congress a number of proposed bills which had been cleared by the outgoing administration in its final weeks in office. Neither Senator PASTORE, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, nor I, as chairman of the committee, introduced these measures at the time of their submission because the new administration had not had the opportunity to review and approve the Commission's legislative proposals.

We have now received a communication from Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Commission, informing the committee that most of these bills have received clearance from the new administration. I am therefore introducing these legislative proposals today by request, and ask unanimous consent that Dr. Seaborg's letter and the AEC's analysis of each of these measures be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

One other measure submitted to the Congress in the waning hours of the last administration—namely, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Commission in fiscal year 1970—has not yet received the approval of the new administration. I will therefore continue to refrain from introducing this bill, and perforce the committee will continue to defer hearings on this measure, until we have received word that the new administration has completed its review of the Commission's proposed fiscal year 1970 budget and either supports the request or has specific amendments which it wishes to recommend.

I believe it would be helpful to include in the RECORD at this point correspondence which Senator PASTORE and I exchanged with the Honorable Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget on this matter.

U.S. CONGRESS,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
January 24, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYO: As you know, the Atomic Energy Commission on January 15,, 1969 submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives its proposed bill to authorize appropriations to the Commission in fiscal year 1970. The proposed bills have been referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

We fully expect that in the coming weeks the new Administration will wish to review the budget requests of the various Federal agencies and departments with a view to possibly revising some of them in accordance with the policies of the new Administration. In view of this, we believe it might well be a futile and meaningless exercise for the Joint Committee to perform its customary early, in-depth review of the Commission's authorization proposal prior to word from the new Administration that it concurs in the Commission's budget request or plans to modify the pending request. Therefore, we plan to defer hearings on this matter until we hear from you or some other appropriate person in the Executive Branch that the AEC's present budget request has been reviewed and is supported by the new Administration, or, alternatively, that the new Administration has specific amendments to the AEC request which it would like to recommend.

We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to hearing from you at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD.
JOHN O. PASTORE.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1969.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: I am writing separately to both you and Senator Pastore to thank you for your joint letter of January 24, 1969.

I appreciate both the substance and the spirit of your offer to defer hearings on the AEC authorization until we have had a chance to review the budget requests.

Although I cannot yet give you an exact date for completion of our review, I can assure that we will try to work as quickly as possible. As soon as I do know the date, I will be in touch with both you and Senator Pastore.

Again many thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: The Bureau of the Budget on March 7, 1969, advised us that there would be no objection to continued support by the Atomic Energy Commission of the following draft bills:

(1) "To amend the Atomic Energy Act to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, and to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and other offenses." (Submitted to the Joint Committee by my letter of January 10, 1969.)

(2) "To amend the Atomic Energy Act to authorize the Commission to enter into agreements of indemnification for ocean transport of materials." (Submitted to the Joint Committee by my letter of January 16, 1969.)

(3) "To amend Subsection 182 b. of the Atomic Energy Act modifying the requirement for mandatory review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of certain facility license applications." (Submitted to the Joint Committee by my letter of January 3, 1969.)

(4) "To amend the Atomic Energy Act to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial and certain research and development licenses for facilities." (Submitted to the Joint Committee by my letter of January 16, 1969.)

(5) "To amend the Atomic Energy Act, to provide for civil monetary penalties." (Submitted to the Joint Committee by my letter of January 17, 1969.)

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

I sincerely hope that the administration can complete its review of this portion of the fiscal year 1970 budget in the very near future. Otherwise, I strongly suspect that appropriations for the AEC in fiscal 1970, which are of course dependent upon the prior enactment by Congress of legislation authorizing appropriations to the AEC, will be delayed until well into the new fiscal year which begins on July 1, 1969.

The AEC's analysis of the legislative proposals follow:

AEC ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE THAT LIFE IMPRISONMENT SHALL BE MAXIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

Sections 1 through 4 of the proposed legislation would restore life imprisonment as the maximum criminal penalty for violations of Sections 222, 224 a., 225, and 226 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Section 1 would also amend Section 222 of the Act to increase the maximum criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses to imprisonment for ten years and a fine of $10,000, when the offense is committed without the intent to injure the United States or secure an advantage to any foreign nation.

Section 222 of the Atomic Energy Act provides criminal sanctions for violations of Sections 57, 92, and 101 and for unlawful interference with the Commission's recapture of special nuclear material or entry into any plant or facility under Section 108. Section 57 prohibits possession of or dealing in special nuclear material without a general or specific license issued by the Commission. Under Section 92, the unauthorized possession, manufacture or transfer of an atomic weapon is unlawful. Section 101 requires a Commission license for the possession, manufacture or transfer of a production or utilization facility. Section 108 authorizes the Commission, when a state of war or national emergency exists, to order the recapture of special nuclear material or the operation of any licensed facility and to enter any plant or facility to carry out these orders.

In the absence of intent to injure the United States or secure an advantage to any foreign nation, the maximum penalty for a violation of Section 222 is imprisonment for five years and a fine of $10,000. With such an intent, the penalty is death or imprisonment for life (if recommended by a jury) or a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.

Sections 224 a., 225, and 226 of the Atomic Energy Act provide criminal penalties, respectively, for the unlawful communication of Restricted Data, the unlawful acquisition of Restricted Data, and removal or concealment of or tampering with Restricted Data. With intent to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, the penalty for violation of each of these sections is death or imprisonment for life (if recommended by a jury) or a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.

On April 8, 1968, the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *United States* v. *Jackson*, 390 U.S. 570, held unconstitutional the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnaping Act. Because the language of the Kidnaping Act is comparable to the death and life imprisonment penalty provisions of Sections 222, 224 a., 225, and 226 of the Act, it is believed that these provisions might be subject to a similar constitutional attack. The maximum penalties which may now be imposed therefore appear to be imprisonment for 20 years and a fine of $20,000.

It is proposed that life imprisonment be made the maximum penalty for violating each of these sections, without regard to a jury recommendation. The Commission has concluded that the death penalty may properly be deleted and that a maximum penalty of life imprisonment is sufficiently severe, in view of the trend of opinion away from the use of capital punishment, doubt whether the death penalty serves as a substantial deterrent, the very small number of executions for any crimes in the United States during the past decade, and the views of some legal scholars and penologists that capital punishment has a harmful effect upon the administration of justice.

One of the most significant crimes punishable under section 222 is unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material, which is a violation of section 57. An unauthorized diversion by a thief or even a terrorist, insurrectionist, or criminal group might conceivably be found to lack intent to injure the United States or secure an advantage to any foreign nation. An Ad Hoc Advisory Panel on Safeguarding Special Nuclear Material recently recommended that the maximum penalty for diversion lacking the specific intent be increased. The Panel felt that the existing penalties "may not be a sufficient deterrent to illicit transactions involving materials valued in excess of millions of dollars."

An increase in the maximum penalties for a violation of Section 222 to imprisonment for ten years and a fine of $10,000 would perhaps increase the deterrent effect on a potential diverter. The increased penalties would also be comparable to those for crimes of similar gravity, such as theft of Government property (ten years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine) and theft of property in interstate or foreign commerce (ten years' imprisonment and a $5,000 fine). No increase in the maximum fine is proposed. Because of the intrinsic value of special nuclear material, imprisonment would seem to be a more suitable deterrent than a fine.

The proposed amendments would have no budgetary effect. Enactment is not expected to result in additional man-years of employment during the first five years following its passage.

AEC Analysis of Proposed Legislation To Amend Section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act

Section 1(a) of the draft bill amends subsection 11 q. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended [hereinafter "Act"] by adding to the definition of "nuclear incident" appropriate language broadening the scope of the definition so that it will encompass incidents to be covered by indemnity agreements authorized under new subsection 170 p. As the term "nuclear incident" is used in new subsection 170 p. it shall mean those occurrences which arise out of the transportation of source, special nuclear or byproduct material on vessels of United States registry and which take place in the course of such transportation and outside the territorial limits of the United States or any other nation, i.e., on the high seas or within some international zone not belonging to a particular government or nation, such as Antarctica. The occurrence, of course, in accordance with the present definition of nuclear incident must cause, within or outside the United States, bodily injury, sickness, disease, or death, or loss of or damage to property, or loss of use of property, arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of the source, special nuclear, or byproduct material, in order to qualify as a nuclear incident.

While the language of subsection 11 q. is susceptible of the interpretation that the term "nuclear incident" as used in subsection 170 p. includes "extraordinary nuclear occurrence", it is the intent of the Commission that the language shall not be so interpreted. The Commission does not intend to make the concept of "extraordinary nuclear occurrence" and the waiver of defenses provisions applicable to incidents on the high seas.

Section 1(b) amends subsection 11 t. by setting forth those persons who would be indemnified under agreements entered into pursuant to subsection 170 p. The term "person indemnified" in such agreements has a more limited meaning than it does generally under Price-Anderson. As that system operates domestically, any one who may be liable is a person indemnified. With respect to indemnity agreements under subsection 170 p., the term "person indemnified" is to be limited to the person with whom an indemnity agreement is executed (licensee or contractor) and any other person who may be liable for public liability by reason of his activities within the United States (e.g., U.S. cask designer and manufacturer, a stevedore in an American port); or on board the vessel transporting the nuclear material while such vessel is on the high seas (e.g., seaman); or who may be liable in connection with his ownership or operation of such vessel (e.g., the owner or master of the vessel); and any other person who has his principal place of business in the United States or who is the agent or employee of such other person and who may be liable for public liability (e.g., employee of American cask manufacturer who may supervise loading at the foreign port).

Section 1(c) amends subsection 11 w. of the Act which defines the term "public liability". As used in new subsection 170 p. that term will not include certain liabilities. Comparable to the domestic Price-Anderson coverage which does not indemnify for the loss of the transporting vehicle, the indemnity would not cover the vessel transporting the nuclear material and its equipment, fuel and stores—which are covered by hull insurance. Also, the nuclear material being transported and the containers used would not be covered.

Section 2 amends subsection 170 e. by providing for a limitation of liability in the amount of $100 million together with the amount of financial protection (underlying commercial insurance) for nuclear incidents covered by an agreement of indemnification pursuant to a new subsection 170 p. The aggregate liability, however, shall not exceed $115 million.

Section 3 amends subsection 170 f. of the Act. That subsection authorizes the Commission to collect a fee from all persons with whom an indemnification agreement is executed. It gives some guidance as to what fee amounts should be for certain licensed activities. The amendment authorizes the Commission to establish criteria for determining an additional fee for entering into an indemnification agreement under new subsection 170 p.

Section 4 amends section 170 of the Act by adding new subsection 170 p. The new subsection would authorize the Commission until August 1, 1977 to enter into additional agreements of indemnification with its licensees and contractors engaged in activities in the United States covered by an indemnity agreement. The new agreement would indemnify and hold harmless the licensee, contractor, and other persons indemnified, from public liability in excess of the level of financial protection required, arising from nuclear incidents which arise out of the transportation of source, special nuclear or byproduct material to or from the site of such activities on a vessel of United States registry and which take place in the course of such transportation and outside the territorial limits of the United States or any other nation.

Following the pattern of domestic arrangements, with respect to licensees the Commission must, and with respect to contractors the Commission may, require that financial protection be provided. The amount of financial protection to be required would be $15 million (the amount which appears to be presently available). The Commission may establish a greater or lesser amount of financial protection, taking into consideration the amount of liability insurance available from private sources (domestic and foreign), and the cost and terms of such insurance.

The amount of indemnity for persons indemnified in connection with each nuclear incident would be $100 million including the reasonable costs of investigating and settling claims and defending suits for damage.

The amount of indemnity would be reduced by the amount that the financial protection required exceeds $15 million.

AEC Bill Analysis of Proposed Legislation To Amend Section 1825 of Atomic Energy Act

The Atomic Energy Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards was established by Section 29 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to review safety studies and facility license applications, advise the Commission with regard to the hazards of proposed or existing reactor facilities and the adequacy of proposed reactor safety standards, and perform such other duties as the Commission may request. At present, Subsection 182 b. of the Act requires that the ACRS shall review each application under Section 103 or Subsection 104 b. for a construction permit or an operating license for a facility, any application under Subsection 104 c. for a construction permit or an operating license for a testing facility, any application under Subsections 104 a. or c. specifically referred to it by the Commission and any application for an amendment to a construction permit or an amendment to an operating license under Sections 103 or 104 a., b. or c. specifically referred to it by the Commission, and shall submit a report thereon. Thus, a mandatory review and reporting requirement exists for all power and test reactor applications for construction permits and operating licenses.

The legislation proposed would modify the mandatory review requirement of Subsection 182 b. by providing in effect that unless the Commission specifically requests a review and report on an application, the ACRS may dispense therewith by notifying the Commission in writing that ACRS review is not warranted. The proposed legislation would require that any notice from the ACRS to the effect that review is not warranted in a given case be made a part of the record of the application.

Relaxation of the mandatory review and reporting requirements will enable the Committee to concentrate its activities on the more novel and difficult questions of reactor safety. It would, moreover, place the ACRS in a better position to deal with the increasing volume of reactor applications by giving them the flexibility to review certain features of a reactor rather than the whole application. Neither the Commission nor the ACRS has felt that reactor cases coming in during the past and current year would include those for which ACRS review would not be desirable. However, as reactors are becoming more standardized, it seems appropriate and desirable to have the statutory flexibility to omit ACRS review if and when such omission appears warranted to both the Commission and the ACRS.

XUM

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE REQUIREMENT OF FINDING OF PRACTICAL VALUE

INTRODUCTION

The basic approach of the draft amendments to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and to in effect abolish the distinction between "commercial" licenses and "demonstration" licenses is relatively simple in concept. Essentially two amending actions are proposed: first, revocation of section 102 (providing for the finding of practical value), section 103 (authorizing "commercial" licenses), and subsection 104 b. (authorizing "demonstration" licenses); second, substitution of a new section (numbered "102") in place of the revoked sections and covering commercial and demonstration licenses as a single class. The new section 102 retains essentially all of the statutory qualifications and limitations applicable under present law to section 103 licenses.

While the basic concept of the amendments is simple, many different sections of the Act require revision, owing to the fact that the present Act contains numerous cross references to sections 103 and 104.

The draft amendments are contained in a proposed bill having forty separate sections. Of these forty sections, twenty-five of them [1] (and a portion of a twenty-sixth [2]) are fairly characterized as providing for no substantive changes in the Act.

Having in mind the basic scheme, the analysis of each amendatory section is as follows:

Sec. 1. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 11 b.

Sec. 2. This section constitutes a substantive amendment to the research provisions of section 31 a.(4) to delete the concept of authorizing AEC to make research arrangements to demonstrate "practical value" of reactors and to substitute in lieu thereof authority to make research arrangements to demonstrate "advances in the application of atomic energy" for industrial or commercial purposes.

Sec. 3. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 41 a.

Sec. 4. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 53 a.(3).

Sec. 5. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 53 c.(1).

Sec. 6. This section constitutes a substantive amendment to 53 c.(4) qualifying the flat requirement now contained in the Act that the Commission *shall* make a charge for special nuclear material distributed for use under a section 103 license (per 57 a.(3), which, as amended by section 4 of this draft bill now refers to a license under 102). As qualified, AEC must make the charge under a 102 license, "unless otherwise authorized by law." To unqualifiedly prevent any waiver of charges under new 102 (which, in effect, combines 103 and 104 b. facilities) would not be consistent with present 53 c.(1) which, in pertinent part provides that unless "otherwise authorized by law, the Commission shall not after December 31, 1970, distribute special nuclear material except by sale to any person who possesses or operates a utilization facility under a license issued pursuant to [103 or 104 b.] 102". In effect, Congress would be retaining authority to authorize waiver of charges on a case-by-case basis.

Sec. 7. Technical (cross reference) amendments in opening of subsection 53 d. and 53 d.(4), plus substantive (but conforming) amendment in 53 d.(4) and 53 d.(5) to recognize that with respect to 102 facilities the waiver of use and burn-up charges could be "otherwise authorized".

Sec. 8. Substantive (but conforming) amendment to section 54 to recognize substantive amendment to section 56 (made by section 9 of this draft bill) which extends guaranteed purchase prices to plutonium and uranium enriched in the isotope 233 produced in 102 reactors.

Sec. 9. (See explanation under section 8.)

Sec. 10. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 63 a.(3).

Sec. 11. Substantive amendment to 63 c. to permit case-by-case waiver by Congress of otherwise unqualified requirement to charge for source material distributed under a 102 license.

Sec. 12. Technical (cross reference) amendment to section 101.

Sec. 13. This section, together with sections 14 and 15, comprise the substantive core of the bill: namely, an entirely new section 102 combining old 103 and old 104 b. and removing reference to the old "practical value" concept formerly contained in old 102 and 103. The other features of this amendment are:

A. The concept of issuance of licenses "on a non-exclusive basis" is preserved.

B. The injunction to the Commission under old 104 b. to "impose the minimum amount of such regulations and terms of license as will permit the Commission to fulfill its obligations under this Act to promote the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public and will be compatible with the regulations and terms of license which would apply in the event that a commercial license were later to be issued pursuant to section 103 for that type of facility", has been deleted as unnecesary in view of the abolition of the distinction between 103 and 104 b. type facilities.

C. The requirement under old 104 b. that "priority shall be given [in the issuing of licenses] to those activities which will, in the opinion of the Commission, lead to major advances in the application of atomic energy for industrial or commercial purposes", no longer has any significance because of the uranium supply picture. It has been deleted.

D. The concept of a 40-year term (under old 103) is retained.

E. The concept of requiring information for health and safety purposes (under old 103) is retained with a clarifying proviso assuring that if AEC wants to pay extra it can use the information for such other purposes as would be specified by contract.

F. Any existing 104 b. and 103 licenses are statutorily converted to 102 licenses, as are any pending applications for such licenses. One of the purposes of this amendment is to make clear that holders of operating licenses already granted are not subject to the provisions of 105(c). Pending applications for construction permits and holders of construction permits are subject to 105(c).

Sec. 14. Substantive—revokes section 103.

Sec. 15. Substantive—revokes subsection 104 b.

Sec. 16. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 104 c. (which subsection has been redesignated "104 b." in view of revocation of present 104 b.).

Sec. 17. This section makes a substantive change to the antitrust review requirement of 105 c. It requires that all applications for a construction permit under section 102 be sent to the Attorney General for antitrust review. In the proposal, as under present law, an exception would be provided for those types or classes of licenses which would not significantly affect the application's activities under the antitrust laws. The period during which the Attorney General would conduct his antitrust review is also changed. Under present law the AEC is to notify the Attorney General when it proposes to issue any license and the Attorney General has up to 90 days within which to advice AEC whether or not the proposed license is consistent with the antitrust laws. By the time AEC proposes to issue a license, however, the application has been under health and safety review within the AEC for at least six months. In the proposal, the Attorney General is to be notified promptly of the receipt by the Commission of a license application so that his review will be simultaneous with the AEC's health and safety review. The new amendment requires that the Attorney General's advice be transmitted to the AEC not later than fifteen days after the date the Commission issues a notice of hearing (or notice of opportunity for hearing) on the license application. In addition to providing an earlier opportunity to the Attorney General to begin his antitrust review, as well as a longer period in which to do it, the proposed revision makes it possible for the parties to the licensing proceeding to receive early notification as to whether antitrust matters are to become an issue in the proceedings. In effect, the 90-day extension to the regulatory process under the present law is reduced by 75 days.

Sec. 18. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 106 a.

Sec. 19. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 108.

Sec. 20. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 123.

Sec. 21. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 124.

Sec. 22. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 125.

Sec. 23. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 145 a.

Sec. 24. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 153 c.(1).

Sec. 25. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 161 m.

Sec. 26. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 161 n.

Sec. 27. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 161 o.

Sec. 28. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 161 t.

Sec. 29. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 161 v.

Sec. 30. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 169.

Sec. 31. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 170 a.

Sec. 32. Partially-substantive amendment to subsection 170 f. to provide that fee shall be $30 per year per kwth "for facilities licensed under section [103] 102." The amendment is substantive in that by making a straight substitution of "102" for "103", former 104 b.-type licenses are now covered by section 170 f. and no reduction in the amount can be made (as it can be under existing law for 104 b.-types).

Sec. 33. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 170 k.

Sec. 34. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 182 a.

Sec. 35. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 182 b.

Sec. 36. Partially-substantive amendment to subsection 182 c. extending the notification requirements of that subsection to facilities licensed under new section 102 (which covers former 103-type licenses, as well as former 104 b.-type licenses). Formerly, the notification requirements applied only to section 103 facilities.

Sec. 37. Partially-substantive amendment to the preference provisions of subsection 182 d. extending them to facilities licensed under new section 102 (which covers former 103-type licenses, as well as former 104 b.-type licenses). Formerly, the requirements of subsection 182 d. applied only to section 103 facilities.

Sec. 38. Technical (cross reference) amendment to 189 a.

Sec. 39. Partially-substantive amendment to section 272 extending applicability of that section (which pertains to the coverage of the Federal Power Act) to facilities licensed under new section 102 (which covers former

---

[1] Sections 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35 and 38.

[2] Section 7.

103-type facilities, as well as former 104 b.-type facilities). Formerly, the provisions of section 272 applied only to section 103 facilities. This amendment also clarifies that no additional jurisdiction is intended to be given to the Federal Power Commission as a result of this bill.

SEC. 40. Partially-substantive amendment to section 273 (which pertains to licensing of government agencies) extending the provisions thereof to facilities licensed under new section 102 (which covers former 103-type facilities, as well as former 104 b.-type facilities). Formerly, the provisions of section 273 applied only to section 103 facilities.

AEC ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND CHAPTER 18 OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The proposed legislation would amend the Atomic Energy Act by adding thereto a new Section 234 entitled "Civil Monetary Penalties for Violations of Licensing Requirements" and by changing Section 221 to make clear that "actions" to be instituted by the Attorney General do not include administrative actions by the Commission. Section 234 would authorize the Commission to impose fines of not in excess of $5,000 for each single violation and not in excess of $10,000 for continuing violations by any person licensed pursuant to sections 53, 62, 81, or 101 of the Act, of any regulations, orders or licenses issued under such sections. The same remedial authority has been conferred by statute upon other regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission and Federal Aviation Agency, to assist them in carrying out their regulatory functions. The proposed legislation is modeled upon similar provisions in the Federal Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 503, 504) and the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1471). Such authority is civil only and would not bar criminal prosecution where appropriate. It would not apply to the Commission contractors or other persons who are exempt from licensing.

In accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Commission's regulations, the Commission issues notices of violation to any licensee who appears to have violated any of the Commission's regulations, orders or conditions of licenses, except in cases where the public health interests or safety require the omission of such notice or where the violations are found to be willful. Notice of the proposed imposition of a civil penalty would be made as part of this existing notification procedure or by special notice. In cases where the notice of violation is omitted, a special notice of the imposition of a civil penalty would be provided to assure that the licensee is given an opportunity to explain his conduct prior to a determination by the Commission of whether the penalty should be imposed.

If after the Commission determines that the penalty should be imposed, the licensee fails to pay the amount, the matter will be referred to the Attorney General. The Attorney General will determine whether a civil action in Federal District Court would be instituted to collect the penalty. After the Commission has referred the matter to the Attorney General for collection, he shall have full authority to compromise, mitigate or remit the civil penalty.

In addition the proposed legislation would amend Section 221 c. of the Act to make clear that this section does not require the approval of the Attorney General prior to the initiation of administrative action by the Commission not only with respect to the imposition of civil penalties, but also for any other enforcement action the Commission is now authorized to bring. Section 221 c. now provides that:

"No action shall be brought against any individual or person for any violation under this Act unless and until the Attorney General of the United States has advised the Commission with respect to such action and no such action shall be commenced except by the Attorney General of the United States . . ."

A legislative history of the Act indicates that "action" within the purview of Section 221 c. means "court action" and does not apply to administrative action by the Commission. However, the proposed amendment to Section 221 c. will prevent any possible misinterpretation of the scope of the Commission's authority to take appropriate administrative action.

WAYNE MORSE CALLS FOR A NEW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, every year since I have been in Congress, I have sponsored an annual conference on major issues confronting the United States. On March 22, the Ninth Annual West Side Community Conference was held at Riverside Church in New York City.

The topic of this year's conference was "World Problems and American Power." During the course of the panels and the plenary session, public figures of experience and stature in foreign affairs discussed the nature and extent of U.S. present international commitments. The substance of those discussions included an examination of our role in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Europe as well as the present crisis in the Middle East.

At the plenary session in the afternoon, we were fortunate to have as one of our principal speakers former Oregon Senator Wayne Morse. Senator Morse, who spent 24 years in the Senate and many years on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, spoke on the dangers that the extent of America's wealth and power pose for the future conduct of our foreign affairs, and on the need—as he put it—"for the American people to demand a foreign policy that commits us to a military withdrawal from Asia and elsewhere in the world where we are maintaining a unilateral military posture of dominance."

Senator Morse's call for a new foreign policy—one which rejects the view that America can or should manipulate events around the world to its own liking—is the kind of foreign policy for which I have long fought as a Member of Congress. If we are to prevent future Vietnams, we must heed the warning of Senator Morse to "bring the American military under the control and checks of our constitutional system based upon government by law rather than by the exercise of arbitrary power" by the multiple facets of the executive branch.

So that my colleagues may also profit from Senator Morse's counsel, I am today placing the text of his speech before the Ninth Annual West Side Community Conference in the RECORD. I commend the views expressed by Senator Morse to my colleagues and urge them to take steps to create the kind of foreign policy for which Senator Morse so persuasively argues in this speech, which follows:

THE U.S. ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY IN RESPECT TO OUR FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

(Address by Hon. Wayne Morse)

In the closing months of the 90th Congress, there was building up in the United States Senate a clear-cut constitutional issue over the formulation and control of American foreign policy. Entwined with the constitutional part of this issue was the political ramifications of it, which saw a President elected only 3 and ½ years earlier with one of the largest margins in history, compelled to withdraw from further candidacy.

The situation in which the Johnson Administration found itself in March, 1968, was exactly the situation the framers of the Constitution had planned to avoid when they gave the war power to Congress, rather than to the President. Under Constitutional design, war is embarked upon only through joint resolution passed by both houses and signed into law by the President. It is a legislative process, not an administrative one. Its purposes and scope are plainly stated. The war policy thus becomes the law of the land, the national policy—as fully and completely as we can establish a national policy.

War waged by administrative decision leaves every aspect of that war an arguable matter. Its purpose, its scope, as well as its day to day prosecution, are left to individual discretion. All are subject to second-guessing and public dispute.

The bombing of North Vietnam has been a good example of the inadequacy of administrative war. When we began bombing North Vietnam in February of 1965, we attacked a country that had not attacked United States territory, and which had no apparent intentions of doing so. The first explanation for the bombing was that it was in retaliation for a Vietcong assault upon the barracks of U.S. troops at Pleiku in the central highlands of South Vietnam 12 hours earlier. Its purpose was explained at that time as one of "showing" the Vietcong and their friends in North Vietnam that we could levy far greater destruction upon them than they could upon us.

Within a few months, however, the Secretary of Defense began to justify the continuation of the bombing as necessary for cutting supply lines from the North into the South. Lengthy descriptions were made available to the press of infiltration routes, of bridges destroyed, of key passes closed by massive explosions delivered by our B-52's.

But the trickle of infiltration that was going on when the bombing started grew to large proportions. There were explanations that without the bombing, infiltration would have been even heavier, and not as costly to Hanoi. Yet the level of manpower and equipment that went South seems to have been determined essentially by North Vietnam and not by American airpower.

It was not until the bombing policy had been in operation for a matter of years that it was then said to have been undertaken to bolster the morale of the South Vietnamese government, which was at a low ebb in the early months of 1965.

What the real reason for the bombing may have been cannot be known yet by the American people. It is not really known by Congress. But the carrying of armed attack into the territory and population of another country, and at levels of intensity unsurpassed even in World War II, was not undertaken as a matter of a unified national policy to conduct war against North Vietnam. It was undertaken, stopped and started up again for reasons that only a few administrators knew then and even now.

These reasons for bombing, and for the various bombing pauses, were typical of our entire adventure in southeast Asia They are not a war policy. They are a use of military force to buttress and enforce a diplomatic policy that cannot succeed on its own. With a wealth of money, manpower, and weapons that no doubt seems limitless to policymakers, we have seen the United States come readily and easily to practice the old dictum that war is but the pursuit of diplomacy by different means.

The system is often advertised and described now as something new—a necessity in a different kind of world than Americans knew in the good old days when military force was used only to defend American territory and then upon declaration of war.

But there really is nothing new about it all. For nearly three centuries Great Britain practiced the same tactic, using military power from one end of the world to another to gain this political end and to enforce that aspect of diplomacy that could not succeed on its own.

Thus was an empire created. And then it was said that being the world's leading power, the burdens of leadership and responsibility called for even more massive involvements, in the Crimea, in South Africa, in France

Britain saw great value in sending her military forces abroad, using them to enforce her foreign policies. Part of the theory held that it was better to fight abroad on someone else's territory than to let warfare come to the British Isles. But the policy brought the expenditure of such blood and wealth in World War I that the collapse of the Empire was but a matter of years. And the technology of war brought destruction to British territory in World War II even without the landing of hostile forces.

Far from being a new concept, the amalgamation of armed forces with diplomacy is as old as the nation-state. Its merger under the executive is as old as kings. Indeed, in explaining the assignment of the war power to Congress rather than to the President, the Federalist Papers mention that in this respect our Constitution is quite different from the British Constitution, denying to the American president a power held and exercised by British kings.

Most countries are saved from the easy use of military force abroad by a scarcity of means The country that cannot afford to enforce its foreign political objectives by use of military power, does not find it necessary to do so. The country that can afford to send and maintain armies and navies around the world, seems to find reason why it must do so.

Fear of change is usually the reason that is found. Fear of a vacuum of power, fear that where America does not dominate, someone else will, fear that if we do not enforce our stated will in one part of the world it will be ignored everywhere.

The cost of our policy is considerable. National defense costs run over $80 billion a year. Weaponry is the largest single activity of our national government. In the case of Vietnam, since 1954 when we first began aiding South Vietnam in an effort to create a country where none existed, we have spent a grand total of $90 billion, first on economic aid, then on military aid as well and finally to sustain the fourth biggest war in American history

The availability of so much power has, in my opinion, sadly corrupted the administrative judgment of what is sound policy for the United States to pursue. Perhaps Vietnam is a good example of the difficulty the military establishment has in trying to make an unsound policy work through the application of force. Half a million men and the dropping of more explosives than were used in western Europe throughout World War II have not compelled North Vietnam, in the words of the Secretary of State, Rusk, to "stop doing what she is doing," which has been to aid guerrillas in the South.

But at the outset, it undoubtedly looks easier to call in the troops and send over the planes than too assess whether a pro-American government can be created to govern an area that never was a nation before.

But in addition to the warping of judgment is the loss of support at home that such use of military power entails. I think Vietnam is rightly called the most unpopular war in American history, ranking alongside of Korea in that unpopularity. Both were undeclared, foreign wars. Both were fought for what their administrators called "limited purposes." Both are described as not lending themselves to declarations of war, because our purposes in fighting did not include the destruction or occupation of either North Korea or North Vietnam. Rather, they are described as designed to force another country to stop doing something we want stopped.

It is not usually mentioned, but both of these most unpopular wars not only were undeclared by the United States but they were waged against countries that had not attacked the United States and showed no sign of doing so. They were interventions on behalf of another country.

It is, I think, the fact that the war is fought to defend someone else that American public opinion has such a hard time following. When the object of our protection changes as often as the governments in Saigon have changed, when corruption and profiteering are among their foremost qualities, it is not easy for the American people to believe for long that they deserve the American blood and money that goes into their support.

It was the expectation of the framers of the Constitution that by placing the war power in Congress, these disadvantages would not occur. For the Congress to commit the military forces would, so the Constitution assumes, require a widespread, general realization that the basic safety and interests of the nation were at stake. The object and purpose of the war would be exposed to Congressional debate and therefore to public discussion. Enactment of a resolution of war would give expression to a national unity of purpose. Despite the objections raised to a declaration of war in the current Vietnam conflict, it could set forth a limited purpose and objection that still would establish a unified national policy.

Remember that even the Administration that embarks upon the use of armed force abroad without a declaration of war is still involving the Congress. What an administration cannot do without money it cannot do without Congress. For a president to give the commands that set the fighting in motion, and then come to Congress and ask it to appropriate the money needed to pay for the fighting is simply an effort to exclude Congress from the formulation of the policy.

It has often succeeded. Congress has indeed been excluded from the formulation of the policy, and has only paid the cost of putting it into effect. But the price has been high. The price has been a Congress that quickly comes to reflect public dissatisfactions and disenchantment. It is a Congress that feels no need or obligation to explain and defend a policy it had no hand in making. But if the war contnues for long without an end in sight, the angry public dissatisfaction will become evident quickly.

On the face of it, at least, the Administration now coming into office has nothing to gain and much to lose by letting this undeclared war continue indefinitely. If it continues, the Nixon Administration stands to inherit the renewed dissension and the political turmoil that forced the Johnson Administration to forego another term. Any plans it may have for domestic programs will be lost in the competition for funds and the welter of political conflict.

A return to Constitutionalism in foreign policy and the use of military power is in the interest of both people and government. It should be sought at once.

The major role of our international relations in recent years has been in Asia. The stabilization of affairs in Europe, in spite of the invasion of Czechoslovakia, has induced the State Department—Defense Department complex that runs our international relations to turn its attention to Asia.

It has done so with no clear rationale, and with no showing of where American security interests in Asia actually lie. In fact, events, particularly military events, have dictated policy at critical turning points and have been responsible for our having backed into a full scale war in Vietnam that no policymaker would have advised or recommended in advance.

The formal rationale of our policy in Asia was formulated at the close of World War II, when we regarded as vital to our interests certain islands in the Pacific which had served as stepping stones for Japan in launching her war against us. We sought and obtained trusteeship over them. But mainland Asia was put beyond our immediate security needs. The attitude of the United States toward Indo-China, for example, was in keeping with our attitude toward the rest of colonial Asia: Burma, the Dutch Indies, Malaya, had been easy pickings for Japan largely because they were colonies of western powers. Elliott Roosevelt quotes his father as saying of the future of Indo-China, en route to the Casablanca conference:

"The native Indochinese have been so flagrantly downtrodden that they thought to themselves: Anything must be better than to live under French colonial rule!"

Cordell Hull quotes FDR as favoring a trusteeship for Indo-China.

During World War II our ally in Indo-China was none other than Ho Chi Minh, who was supported and supplied by American intelligence units.

Roosevelt's death and the surge of the Communist Chinese across the Chinese mainland brought about a radical change in American policy, not only toward Indo-China but toward Asia generally. It is hard to say how much of the change was due to the elements of world politics and how much due to the facts of American domestic politics. Certainly the American people were shocked by the Communist takeover in China. Chiang Kai-shek had been a wartime ally. He and his family had been highly romanticized by the American press. Billions worth of American weapons and war material had been given to China to keep her in the war against Japan, and thousands of Americans had served in the Chinese theater.

Having just finished a war, the United States had no taste for going back to Asia for another. There was no American military intervention on behalf of Chiang.

The shock of China's fall to Communism was taken out instead in the domestic political arena. Probably few in this audience recall the violence of the charges that flew, blaming the Communist takeover not on the Communists, nor on the failures of the Nationalists, but upon American diplomats. It was the height of the postwar era, when we believed our military and financial power was so supreme in the world that nothing could happen anywhere without having been willed to happen, and probably planned and executed, by American authorities.

By 1950 the Democratic Administration that had been in office during the fall of China, was in headlong retreat. The Secretary of State was daily accused of sympathy and even compliance with Communist objectives. He finally found it desirable to become as royal as the king. In February of 1950 the United States recognized the French arrangement of the Bao Dai government in Indo-China, whereby France gave Indo-China the form of sovereignty without any of its substance. In May of 1950 the Secretary of State announced that we would furnish arms and money to the French to put down the independence movement led by Ho Chi Minh.

THE WAR IN KOREA

Even so, Secretary of State Acheson drew for the press a line enclosing the string of islands lying off the Asian mainland and described it as the new perimeter of the American security interest. It embraced Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. That chain, he said, was part of our security, the clear inference being that what lay beyond was not. It was widely assumed at the time that this press conference description served as an invitation to North Korea to invade the South, on the assumption that because Korea lay outside the Acheson line, the United States would not act.

The United States did act, of course. But we did so under our obligations as a signatory of the United Nations Charter. Like all signatories, we have obligations under it that exceed our own national security interests.

But here again, events began to dictate a change in policy. Once the United States became heavily involved in a war undertaken under the aegis of the United Nations, we began to justify it in terms of our own national interest. In a speech a few weeks ago to the National Press Club, Averill Harriman chided Americans for their bad habit of escalating their objectives in mid-war. He was talking about Vietnam. But he could well have been talking about Korea.

American apprehensions about Communist China were in control. U.S. military and financial aid to France to pursue the Indo-China war was stepped up. It would add up to $2.6 billion before France finally gave up. The announcement of increased aid to France in 1950 was combined with an announcement that the Seventh Fleet would be stationed in the Formosa Strait to protect Chiang Kai-shek.

As happened with China, no amount of U.S. aid could salvage the French cause in Indo-China. Even so, there still was no American intervention. President Eisenhower vetoed all such suggestions on the ground that they would be more costly than anticipated, and secondly, because he was not willing to act without the support and participation of other allies.

What we did instead in 1954 was to set out upon a new salvage effort in South Vietnam. We installed as President a man who had sat out the war in the United States; we financed his government, equipped his army, and encouraged him to ignore the requirements of the Geneva Agreement that North and South Vietnam be united under a single government.

THE FORMOSA RESOLUTION

At almost the same time China's bombardment of islands within artillery range of the mainland induced the Administration to seek advance approval from Congress for military action against China.

The Formosa Resolution is a direct forebear of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. It authorized the President, and I quote:

"To employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.

"This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he (the President) judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

At issue were not Formosa and the Pescadores. They were not under assault, and China had no means of bringing them under assault. At issue were two tiny islands of Quemoy and Matsu within 3 miles of the mainland.

Senator George of Georgia presented the Resolution to the Senate. "We must commit American military power to the defense of these islands", he said, "because their abandonment would dishearten the Nationalists on Formosa." Then he said:

"If Formosa falls into unfriendly hands, it would be with the greatest difficulty that we could defend not merely Japan, nor merely the Philippines, which lie a relatively short distance from Formosa and Okinawa, but the whole of Southeast Asia clear down to the end of the great countries that lie under the Equator would be endangered. That is clear."

What is clear now from the Formosa Resolution is that American security interests were seen all across the mainland of Asia where they never had been, and an obligation to defend countries was seen where it never had been seen before. Senator Smith of New Jersey, a ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was also explicit in moving the American defense line onto the Asian mainland:

"Let us first consider a line drawn from Korea, down through China, and down through Indo-China. We see three danger spots which might well result in the entire Asiatic world being engulfed in Communism, and if that should happen, the security of the United States and the western free world would be seriously threatened . . . Unless we maintain and strengthen the defenses and solidarity of our allies, unless the program of the Administration under President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles is carried out, *so that the defense of those areas is maintained*, we shall face one of the most critical periods in our history."

What was not foreseen was that the price and futility of defending those areas would itself cause one of the most critical periods in our history. In Asia, we have worked a "domino theory" in reverse. To defend the United States, we needed Pacific Islands like the Marianas put under our trusteeship; then to protect those islands, we needed Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines; then to defend Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines we needed the islands immediately off the mainland, plus Korea and South Vietnam.

It seems likely that in Asia, there is still not an end to what more we must contest in order to keep what we have. Whether or not the Vietnam war ends, this trend in our Asian policy will draw us deeper into war in Asia. Unless we repudiate the Eisenhower, Nixon, Dulles military containment policy vis a vis China initiated in 1953 we may very well become the greatest threat to peace in the world. We cannot militarily contain China without eventual war with China in 10, 25, 35, 50 years. Such a war will produce an empty victory at best and a sure loss of our constitutional system of self-government.

Now is the time to bring the American military under the control and checks of our constitutional system based upon government by law rather than by the exercise of arbitrary power by Presidents, Secretaries of State and Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staffs, CIAs, Formosa and Tonkin Bay Resolution and our blood money military industrial complex.

Now is the time for the American people to demand a foreign policy that commits us to a military withdrawal from Asia and elsewhere in the world where we are maintaining a unilateral military posture of dominance.

Now is the time for us to return to the foreign policy role of offering to abide by the binding jurisdiction of adjudication through multilateral negotiations of threats to the peace of the world conducted under the aegis of international tribunals and treaties such as the United Nations.

Yes, now is the time for us to practice our professed ideals of believing in the reinstitution of the Rules of Law, the United Nations Treaty for the Jungle Law of the Military Claw as we have come to practice it in Vietnam and threaten to practice it elsewhere in Asia.

Unless the killing of American troops in Southeast Asia is stopped quickly, domestic disunity is certain to increase because a foreign policy that conscripts our youth into military fodder to be consumed in an immoral and unjustifiable war will be repudiated by our people. It is being repudiated by increasing tens of thousands of our citizens, as it should be.

President Nixon's announcement to leave our troops in Vietnam for an indefinite time resulting in thousands more being slaughtered and wounded in further escalation of the war, his attempt to justify a scientifically unsound ABM monstrosity by playing upon the fears of our people, his military approach to foreign policy in general, bodes ill for his Administration and catastrophic for the Nation.

It would appear that on the basis of what we have seen this far from the new Administration in respect it its role in foreign policy and the military commitments we can expect from it, the only thing that will stop the military from marching our youth into a greater war is for our citizens to start marching across the country for peace.

THE NEW YORKER AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion about the proposed change in the existing electoral college method of selecting our President and Vice President includes suggestions that the electoral college be abolished entirely.

A thoughtful defense of the retention of the electoral college appeared in the February 8 issue of the New Yorker.

We are accustomed to thinking of the New Yorker as a humorous magazine, but this carefully considered article presented substantial arguments for the retention of the electoral college.

Although I have not come to a final conclusion about this question and my inclination is to favor direct popular election, nevertheless I feel that the New Yorker's suggestions are worthy of careful consideration and for that reason I place them in the RECORD today:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN: NOTES AND COMMENT

Last December, as they have done every fourth year since the beginning of the Republic, the newly elected members of the electoral college assembled in every state to choose the President of the United States. This forty-sixth meeting will have been the last if those who advocate the abolition of one of our most venerable institutions win the current battle for electoral change.

The Founding Fathers provided in the Constitution that each state should elect a small group of men who, in turn, would exercise their independent judgment in selecting a President. Each of these men, called an elector, was given one vote, and each state was entitled to a number of electors equal to the combined number of its senators and representatives. As a result, representation in the electoral college, as in the Congress, was roughly proportional to population. And if no candidate received an absolute majority of electoral votes, the President was to be chosen by the House of Representatives. This system has survived to the present day, with one all-important difference. It rapidly became an established custom that all the electors of a state would automatically vote for the candidate receiving most of the state's popular vote. Today, a separate slate of candidates for the post of elector is pledged to each Presidential candidate in every state. When you vote for

XUM

President, you are in fact voting for the slate committed to your favorite. For example, any New Yorker who voted for Vice-President Humphrey was really voting for the forty-three electors of the Democratic Party. And even though Humphrey received a bare majority of New York's popular vote, he won all forty-three of its electoral votes. (Legally, of course, any of these electors could have voted for someone else, and on a few rare occasions an individual elector has dishonored his commitment.)

Under this system, it is theoretically possible for a Presidential candidate to receive a majority of the electoral votes even though his opponent is the popular victor. To see how this might happen, assume, for a perhaps uncomfortable moment, that the President was chosen by New York and California alone. If Humphrey won New York by fifty thousand votes, and Nixon won California by one hundred thousand votes, then New York's forty-three electors would go to him, and Nixon would receive California's forty. Thus, even though Nixon was fifty thousand popular votes ahead, Humphrey would be elected President, by forty-three electors to forty. The fear that this might happen on a national scale is behind the present demand to eliminate the electoral college and select a President by direct nationwide popular vote. Such a change, which is superficially appealing as a call to democratic principle, might have consequences for the practical operation of our democracy far beyond the intentions of its sponsors. There are some aspects of our present system, of course, that clearly threaten the legitimacy of the democratic process. Certainly electors should not be free to defy the electorate, nor should the House of Representatives under any circumstances be allowed to select a President, being a small group of men susceptible to deals and private pressures. Electors have sometimes acted independently, and the House has on occasion ignored both the popular and the electoral vote in selecting a President. Yet it would be relatively simple to eliminate these possibilities—by, for example, not having individuals as candidates for electors but automatically counting all of a state's electoral votes for the winner of its popular vote, and by providing that the candidate with the most electoral votes would win even if he did not have a majority. Or a runoff popular election would be held if the winning candidate received less than a certain fixed percentage of the electoral votes—say, thirty-five per cent or forty per cent.

However, eliminating the electoral college altogether is another matter. In so doing, we would exchange a clumsy mechanism, but one that has worked, for an ideal construction whose effects are conjectural. Only once in our history has the man who received the most popular votes failed to receive the highest number of electoral votes. That was in 1888, when Grover Cleveland lost the election although he ran a hundred thousand votes ahead of Benjamin Harrison. Andrew Jackson in 1824 and Samuel Tilden in 1876 were deprived of the Presidency despite a popular plurality, but Jackson's defeat came about by the decision of the House (Jackson had a plurality of electoral votes as well), and Tilden lost because disputed electoral votes were taken from him by a hostile Congress. Thus, the electoral college has failed to conform to the popular will only once in almost two centuries, and that in a contest so close that it's almost a technical quibble to say that the people's choice was defeated.

Nor do considerations of abstract democratic theory dictate a change to direct popular vote. If democracy requires that those who govern the country be chosen by a national constituency in which all citizens have equal weight, then both the Supreme Court and the Senate fail the test. Yet, on the whole, they help maintain a necessary balance between minority or regional interests and the majority will; the Senate is often more conscious of national needs than the more representative House. Therefore, before changing a system that has worked remarkably well, the American people should be fairly certain that the results will be beneficial. As we see it, the consequences of eliminating the electoral college not only are highly speculative but might be unfortunate.

First, such a reform, as Professor Ernest Brown, of Harvard, has pointed out, could well transform the frequent charges of election irregularity and fraud into demands for a nationwide recount. Since voting is now by states, such charges are usually allowed to lapse, for even if the result in a particular state should be changed, the winner would rarely lose his electoral majority. But if the popular vote alone were decisive, and the election close, there would be every incentive to demand investigations and recounts, and these would inevitably precipitate counter-demands, while the country waited to see who its leaders would be. In addition, a direct popular vote would powerfuly tempt the states to compete in lowering voting ages, liberalizing registration requirements, and so in, in order to increase their relative influence on the election.

Another, and perhaps more serious, objection to abolishing the electoral college is the threat to the stability of the two-party system, which has been a key element in the endurance of American democracy. Most third-party efforts either have never got off the ground or have proved transient, because, as Professor Alexander Bickel, of Yale, has noted, they have been unable to win electoral votes unless they operated from a regional base. In 1948, for example, Strom Thurmond and Henry Wallace received approximately the same popular vote, but Thurmond got thirty-nine electoral votes and Wallace none. Individuals with a common interest or conviction are restrained from forming an independent party by the knowledge that they cannot carry any states and therefore will not receive any electoral votes, while their activities will tend to subtract votes from the major-party candidate who is ideologically closest to them. With only the popular vote at issue, however, regional roots are irrelevant, and groups united by belief or need—from blacks and those opposed to the war in Vietnam to the John Birch Society—might fragment the electorate into new parties in search of maximum political power. They could, as the Liberal Party has done in New York, bargain with one of the major parties for concessions in return for its endorsement, or offer to withdraw in the midst of a campaign in return for concessions. Such a party might also run candidates in the hope of forcing a runoff election in which its support would be eagerly sought. Most of the election-reform proposals require at least forty per cent of the popular vote for election, with a runoff between the two top candidates if no one gets that much. And although only Harrison received a popular minority and an electoral majority, fifteen Presidents have been elected with less than a majority of the total popular vote. Therefore, almost half of our elections have been contests in which, theoretically, a third party could have held the balance of power. In two of our three last Presidential elections, the popular margin was less than a half-million votes, and in America it is possible—with money and energy—to organize a half-million people for almost anything.

Still another objection centers on the impact that eliminating the electoral college would have on the relative importance of large and small states. Both the advocates and the opponents of reform have assumed that direct popular vote would reduce the emphasis on the large states with the most electoral votes. Yet reform might well have the opposite effect. Usually, campaigns are directed at a swing vote of from ten to twenty per cent of the population, on the assumption that the rest of the voters are pretty firmly committed. Under the reform system, any candidate in search of those votes would have to concentrate his energies and his strategy on the large states, for that is where the people are, and also where the most volatile vote can be found. For example, Richard Nixon, Southern strategy and all, received about the same number of popular votes in California alone that he received in all nine states of the once solid South (roughly three and a half million). Even though Nixon ran well ahead of Vice-President Humphrey in the South, a change of little more than two per cent of his vote in favor of Humphrey in the four largest states, or a change of less than one and a half per cent in the seven largest, would have cancelled out his entire Southern margin. In fact, about half the popular vote for the two major candidates came from only seven states. No political strategist, therefore, could wisely counsel a candidate to take the slightest risk in the big states in the hope of picking up a few more Southern or border states. (In fact, exactly this kind of risk-taking helped defeat Nixon in 1960.) It is just as likely, and far more economical in terms of energy and expense, that under the new system a candidate would assume a basic minimum of Southern and border votes and shape his campaign to the demands of large-state politics. Why should a Presidential hopeful take positions calculated to win Southern states if those same positions might lose him the two or three per cent of the vote in California, New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania that would be enough to cancel out all his gains? All this, of course, reflects only the psychology of campaigns, since in fact the electoral vote has followed the popular vote. Yet once political strategists stopped thinking in terms of states and the intricate arithmetic for the electoral college; they would tend to focus on areas where the population is concentrated and on the large television "market areas." (After all, in the nine Southern states Nixon received forty-seven electoral votes and helped keep twenty-eight more from Humphrey, while California gave him only forty electoral votes. Thus, the Southerner who voted for Nixon actually had more influence on the electoral majority than did the Californian who went Republican.)

None of these are certain consequences of change. Yet they are all possibilities, as are other results, which we cannot now foresee. (Our history is strewn with discarded democratic reforms, such as the initiative and the referendum, that frequently defeated expectations and sometimes became the instruments of those special interests they were designed to protect the country from.) In return, we will be guarded against the possibility that the popular loser will be the electoral winner. Not only is this highly unlikely (in most close elections the electoral-vote majority has far exceeded the popular margin, thus strengthening the position of a President-elect) but even if it should happen it would be in a contest so close that one would be hard put to it to claim that a firm or decisively expressed popular desire had been thwarted. One of the sources of our national stability has been our unwillingness to change the Constitution except when abuses or malfunctions have already manifested themselves. It has never been amended simply because we feared that something might go wrong at some future date. Yet that is what is now being proposed. We will find, however, no system of choosing leaders that is guaranteed to work perfectly. Certainly a great deal of skepticism and prudent hesitation should attend any effort to "perfect" a system that has worked as well as ours.

REVIEW OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has kindly furnished me with copies of communications from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary, commenting upon the preliminary draft of the review of economic opportunity programs made by the General Accounting Office and submitted in report form to Congress on March 18, 1969. I would like to submit, for the information of the Members, these communications which are addressed to Mr. Henry Eschwege, Associate Director, Civil Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.:

FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C. March 14, 1969.

Mr. HENRY ESCHWEGE,
Associate Director, Civil Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ESCHWEGE: On March 6, the General Accounting Office audit of the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act was reviewed with the concerned agencies. We participated in that review. I understand that comments on the audit should be sent to you for consideration. We would like to offer some suggestions to you regarding the overall evaluation of the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center program.

First, I want to express our sincere appreciation for the constructive evaluation which was made of our Cispus Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center. We regret that it was not possible to inspect some of our other Centers. As expressed in our April 5, 1968 letter to Civil Division Assistant Director Richard W. Kelley, we were apprehensive that only one Forest Service Center out of the 45 we operate would not give a representative picture of our Civilian Conservation Center program. This apprehension appears to have been justified on the basis of your overall findings related to Civilian Conservation Centers.

The purpose of your evaluation of the Job Corps program was to determine its effectiveness in carrying out the intent of Congress. The Job Corps section of the Economic Opportunity Act states, "It's purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State and community resources. . . ." The Act states, "enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities. . . ."

We have reviewed your findings, conclusions, and recommendations in relation to the defined purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act. We would like to discuss the findings in each of these areas and offer suggestions toward strengthening the report.

A highly important factor in helping disadvantaged young men become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens is to bring about social and emotional adjustment. As you know, the population we serve are from poverty backgrounds, 90 percent school dropouts, 60 percent from broken families, 61 percent functionally illiterate on enrollment and 33 percent with records of juvenile delinquency. About one-third of the staff at Civilian Conservation Centers is engaged in group living and professional counselling activities. Attitudinal and behavioral adjustment in Civilian Conservation Centers is relatively rapid, partly because the Centers are small in size, the staff has personal knowledge of each Corpsman and he receives individualized attention. Your report states that "such benefits are generally intangible, however, and not subject to precise measurements".

We believe your evaluation of the Job Corps program could be considerably strengthened by searching out indices of such intangible benefits. For instance, it is noteworthy that Conservation Centers have had little problem in maintaining Corpsman discipline and Center control during a period when youth are rioting at other institutions throughout the country. Another index of social adjustment might be found in data which indicates that Job Corpsmen have a substantially lower arrest rate than the average youth of the same age. Improvement in self-confidence which is essential to motivation is readily accomplished at Civilian Conservation Centers and has been measured through study.

Basic education is a highly important facet of the youth renewal program at Civilian Conservation Centers. As you know, the assignment policy until November, 1968 provided that enrollees with less than fifth grade reading ability be sent to Civilian Conservation Centers and the upper half be sent to Men's Urban Centers. During 1967 and 1968, about two-thirds of the new enrollees at Civilian Conservation Centers were reading at or below the third grade level upon admission. Your finding was that few Corpsmen achieved the program goals established for Conservation Centers which were equivalent to about seventh grade public school level. The short average length-of-stay was cited as one factor which precluded them from advancing to the desired level.

You may wish to update your data on education gains. Latest data shows average reading gains per terminee to be 2.8 levels as compared with 1.9 in Fiscal Year 1968. Such gains are verified by the Stanford Achievement Test. Corresponding improvements in mathematics gains have been experienced. During this time, the average length-of-stay increased from 5.3 months to 6.1 months. While we are still working to increase the average length-of-stay and educational gains, the current gains can be considered remarkable when viewed in the perspective of the group of low educational achievers assigned to Civilian Conservation Centers.

The inference that emphasis placed on accomplishing work projects adversely affected training programs and the instance cited that Corpsmen were often excused from academic courses to work on the projects is definitely not representative of the program. Training is given priority over work project accomplishment. Beginning readers are given daily reading instruction both during the education and work weeks.

The audit report puts primary emphasis on the vocational training and work experience aspect of the Job Corps Conservation Center program. In this activity it has findings and opinions and states conclusions which are grossly erroneous. In its present form the report presents a completely inaccurate picture of vocational training and work experience in Forest Service Conservation Centers. It portrays work skills training at Conservation Centers as generally projects which require the use of the most basic hand tools such as axes and shovels, providing only limited marketable skill development training. This is not factual.

We have made an analysis of work program accomplishment reported by Forest Service Centers in FY 1968 which includes the period of the audit. From this reported $12,085,000 of project value, $9,339,000 of which was conservation work, we have arrived at the following breakdown of training value:

Training value of project	Dollar value of project	Percentage
High	$9,482,000	79
Some	660,000	5
Little	1,943,000	16
Total	12,085,000	100

Examples of high training value projects include:

Type of project	Training offered	Dollar value
Road construction and reconstruction	Heavy equipment operation	$2,214,000
Bridge construction and reconstruction	Heavy equipment operation, masonry, carpentry, welding.	236,000
Building construction and reconstruction	Carpentry, masonry, painting	3,109,000
Recreation facility construction and reconstruction	Carpentry, masonry, welding, painting	2,922,000

Examples of projects with only some or little training value are:

Type of project	Training offered	Dollar value
Soil erosion control	Some heavy equipment but largely hand labor	$161,000
Reforestation and timber stand improvement	Handtools, power saws	220,000
Fence construction	Power saws, handtools, and limited heavy equipment.	209,000
Landscaping and site development	Limited heavy equipment, handtools, and masonry	977,000

Enrollees are initially assigned to general work projects to learn work habits, to provide time for them to make a selection for vocational training, and to provide time to raise their reading and math ability so they can participate in higher level training.

The report recognizes that the May 2, 1968 Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers Program Task Force Report revised some program concepts and policies for operation of academic and vocational training programs at Centers. It also states the opinion that implementation of the requirements as they relate to vocational training would have a beneficial effect on the training program. I am pleased to report that during the ten months which have elapsed since the issuance of that Task Force Report the program revisions have been implemented. Staff vocational training capabilities have been adjusted, the work program revised to offer maximum training opportunities, precise and detailed curriculums provided and a system for documenting performance achievements of Corpsmen implemented. We have not found these program improvements to increase Center operating costs.

Forest Service Job Corps Conservation Centers have a well defined work skills training program operating succesfully. This program provides skills training to the apprentice level in the occupations of carpentry, heavy equipment operation, welding, automotive service mechanic, bricklayer apprenticecement mason, cook, and painter. Training has been further strengthened by arrangements with national labor unions for training instruction and placement assistance for heavy equipment training programs at two Centers, carpentry training programs at six Centers, and painter training programs at 20 Centers. The Civilian Conservation Center training program has the additional advantage of teaching work skills in an on-the-job

XUM

situation which makes the learned skills easily transferable to later employment.

Two other points may be worth considering which relate to the emphasis the report places on the vocational training component of the Job Corps program. The first is the finding cited in the report that only 25 percent of working terminees were working in areas in which they had received training and 75 percent were working in other areas. If this is so, then experience would indicate that social adjustment and work habits may be at least as important as vocational training. The second is that according to your sample and other more extensive studies, Civilian Conservation Center terminees are working at an average of about 10 cents per hour less than Urban Men's Center terminees. When one considers that the top half of the enrollees, educationally speaking, have been assigned to Urban Centers and the lower half to Conservation Centers, it is difficult to establish that one program is more successful than the other in the area of making Corpsmen employable.

We hope that these comments will be helpful to you in preparing your report to Congress. If possible, we would like them included in your report.

Sincerely,

EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. HENRY ESCHWEGE,
Associate Director, Civil Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ESCHWEGE: This Department, as a participant in the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center Program, has been informally advised of the conclusions and recommendations concerning the Civilian Conservation Center Program contained in the draft report of the audit of the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. On the basis of the information available to us, we are prompted to offer the following comments in the belief that they are necessary to a full and fair understanding of degree to which the Program has achieved success in filling its primary purpose; that of assisting young men to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens in a way that contributes to the development of National, State and community resources.

We believe that it is important at the outset to understand that this program in its conception, and as it has existed since its inception, has been essentially a research and development effort, one which is directed toward discovering the ways and means by which a society could redeem not only its failure to a segment of its population—the uneducated, unskilled, underemployed young men—but also to redeem the individual failures of the members of that population. It has, and will continue to have, an orientation and an urgency not found in the more traditional Federal, State and local programs. This program directs its orientation toward a human resource that is multiplying itself in our ghettos, our urban and rural areas at a rate that far exceeds the availability of the dollars or the knowledge necessary to deal with it. As such, it has incurred the relatively higher costs that are attendant with research and development programs. We believe that any judgments with respect to program costs must be viewed in this light.

Further, we believe that it is essential in viewing the work experience aspects of the program to understand that we are dealing with an element of our population that has neither the aptitudes nor the attitudes that are necessary to make them employable. We know from the statistics provided to us by the Office of Economic Opportunity that upwards of 60% of our Corpsmen come from homes where the head of the household is unemployed; nearly 40% come from families on relief. Within the Conservation Center Program, we are concerned with *work skills* and *attitudes*. The report states that the work experience aspects of our program call largely for the use of common labor and basic hand tools and questions whether intensive vocational training can be provided. This statement ignores the fact that highly complex work projects offering a variety of marketable skills are being conducted in our centers. We want to say more about this, but feel it is essential at this point to draw your attention first to the values derived in terms of Corpsmen attitudes from the work experience aspects of our program. We believe that "employability" for our type of enrollee is comprised of equal parts of work skills and attitudes that are most readily acquired through the actual on-the-job training at Civilian Conservation Centers. Countless potential employees have told us "give us a boy who knows what it is to work and who is willing to work and we will provide the additional specialized training necessary so that he can hold down a job with us." For young men who come to us from backgrounds of the unemployed and the relief rolls, a realization and an acceptance of what it means to do an honest day's work for an honest wage is essential. Even if our program was largely one of basic hand tools and common labor—which it is not—the realization and acceptance of these values which take place in our Corpsmen is of immeasurable value to the Nation.

More specifically, we want to point out that our program does offer meaningful vocational training in skilled areas recognized in, and in fact based on, the Department of Labor's *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* for: Automobile-service mechanic, carpenter (construction); cook; bricklayer-cement mason; production line welder; operating engineer (heavy equipment operator). These training standards were developed with the assistance, cooperation and advice of the recognized governing bodies of the trades and crafts involved, and were issued with their endorsement. At the present time, training in automotive skills is offered in 23 of our 30 centers with a program to be implemented in 3 additional centers by July 1. Carpentry skills are offered in 27 centers with 3 additions planned. Bricklayer-cement mason skills are offered in 20 centers with 4 additions planned. Heavy equipment operator skills are offered in every center. Welding skills are offered in 19 centers with 5 additions planned. Cooking skills are offered in 24 centers with 4 additions planned.

In addition, we are conducting programs at one of our centers in cooperation with the Kentucky State Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL–CIO, and we have recently joined with the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America in offering meaningful vocational training in painting skills at 18 of our centers. This training is accomplished through our work programs which provide for the teaching of work skills in an on-the-job situation. The work projects through which the skills are acquired are directed toward the conservation mission of each of the Conservation Agencies and are reviewed at the Departmental level to insure that they provide maximum skill exposure.

Thus, while acquiring skills in an occupational area, the Corpsmen contribute to the conservation of the Nation's resources and recreational areas. Our analysis of the work program accomplishment within this Department's centers from the inception of the program through FY 1969 indicates that millions of dollars worth of improvements to our natural resources and recreational areas have been returned to the public through this program. While the report questions the validity of the appraised values within the program, we believe that these values are objective. These values are determined by highly-qualified agency personnel who are not directly associated with the Conservation Center Program.

In order to provide the Corpsmen with the complete requirements for employability, the academic portion of the program is equally as important as skills and attitude training. From its inception the Civilian Conservation Center educational program was tailored to remediate the needs and/or deficiencies of the target population. The latest data indicates that the average reading gains per terminee is 2.8 levels of academic achievement. These gains are verified by the Stanford Achievement tests. Corresponding improvements in mathematics and other educational areas have been experienced. These improvements are considered remarkable in view of the low educational achievers assigned to the Conservation Center Program.

We understand that the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service has also written to you with regard to the report. We have endeavored to present additional thoughts for your consideration; however, we fully subscribe to the comments made by the Forest Service.

We feel proud of the achievements of the Civilian Conservation Center Program of the Department of the Interior and believe that it is accomplishing the purpose and intent of the Congress. We hope that these comments prove to be of benefit to you in preparing your report to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SHOOSHAN,
Deputy Under Secretary for Programs.

THE 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF ESEA

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I feel this is an appropriate time to call some pertinent facts to the attention of the House with regard to the legislation which has been reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor. This legislation, H.R. 514, would extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a 5-year period.

The House will shortly have to act on this legislation, and these facts relate directly to the impact which this legislation has had, is having, and will continue to have—on the vast complex of educational systems throughout the Nation—an educational system which is as efficient, effective, and capable as any in the world.

It is this same education system which we hope to make even more meaningful to every individual who becomes part of it—at the State level, local level, in the school, and in the home—and the Federal role to be played in this drama is a very vital and significant one. The Federal Government has, as a result of the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and related legislation, made great progress in its effort to come to grips with a problem ignored for too long—that is, becoming a very active partner in the job of providing adequate educational assistance to our State and local school systems throughout the country.

If there is any doubt in the minds of some of my colleagues as to why the Committee on Education and Labor has reported out a bill which extends elementary and secondary education legislation for 5 additional years, I would like to refer them to the list of witnesses who have testified before the committee this year endorsing the provisions of H.R. 514, which, among other things, does just that. This list is a representative cross-section of the Nation's school officials from State and local systems, the professional educational associations, and many others.

As I am sure you are aware, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and related legislation has proven to be one of the most valuable and influential pieces of educational legislation which any Congress has enacted. As I have stated in other RECORD inserts, many school superintendents attested to this fact in their comments regarding the effectiveness of this legislation. The original act, Public Law 89–10, and the amendments that have been enacted in subsequent Congresses, has had the total effect of reaching into every school in the country—making possible new and needed programs, additional facilities, more qualified personnel, new and more sophisticated equipment and materials, and professional guidance, if desired, to assist in developing new programs and curriculum.

These people traveled to Washington because they had things to say regarding the programs and activities under the ESEA which were of importance and value with their States.

The meaning and impact which this legislation has had can best be understood with the statement that the witnesses who testified on this legislation all endorsed a 5-year extension of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, so that they may see the extent to which the Committee on Education and Labor wanted views from every geographic sector of the country—as well as all the various interests in the educational community—I would like to insert in the RECORD a partial listing of the people who appeared before the committee—all of whom, I repeat, asked that the legislation which so vitally affects our elementary and secondary schools, be extended for 5 years. The list follows:

Dr. Graham Sullivan, Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, Los Angeles City Schools.

Don Richardson, District Coordinator of Compensatory Education Programs.

Dr. Tom Lawson, Office of Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles.

Henry Boas, Administrative Analyst, Los Angeles School District.

Dr. William Kottmeyer, Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Dr. E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent of Schools, Memphis, Tenn. Accompanied by: Dr. O. Z. Stephens, Director of Research and Publications; Maurice E. Roach, Director of Federal and State Projects.

Dr. Mark R. Shedd, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. William H. Ohrenberger, Supt., Boston Public Schools, accompanied by: Mr. Paul Kennedy, Administrative Asst. to the Superintendent; Mr. Joseph F. Carey, Director, Educational Planning Center; Mr. Victor A. McInnis, Director, Title I Programs.

Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent, Buffalo Public Schools, accompanied by: Mr. Claude D. Clapp, Asst. Supt. for Finance & Research.

Dr. Norman Drachler, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan accompanied by: Dr. Louis Monacel, Asst. Superintendent, Federal & State Relations; Dr. William Simmons, Deputy Supt., Federal & State Relations for Fiscal Planning.

Miss Cora Bomar, Director, Division of Educational Media, State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N.C.

Miss Frances Hatfield, Supervisor of Instructional Materials, Board of Public Instruction, Broward County, Fla. Broward Co. Public Schools, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.

Miss Ingrid O. Miller, School Library Consultant, Independent Schools District No. 273, Edina, Minn.

Miss Germaine Krettek, Associate Executive Director, American Library Assn.

Dr. Paul Briggs, Superintendent of Schools, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Bernard Donovan, Superintendent of Schools, New York City.

William N. Ryan, Coordinator, ES–70, Breathitt County, Bd. of Educ., Jackson, Ky.

Austin H. Armitstead, Chairman, National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, accompanied by: Miss Cassandra Stockburger, Director, Natl Committee on the Educ. of Migrant Children.

James R. Dorland, Associate Executive Secretary, National Association for Public School Adult Education.

Francis D. Murnaghan, Jr., President, Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners, also representing National School Boards Association.

Mrs. G. Theodore Mitau, Vice Chairman of the Board of Education for Independent School District No. 625, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Dr. Edward Palmason, Seattle, Washington.

Dr. Richard Ando, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dr. Gary N. Pottorff, Vice President, Board of Education, Wichita, Kansas.

John Wagner, South Bend Community School Corporation, South Bend, Indiana.

Hazen Schumacher, Board Member and Past President, Board of Education, Ann Arbor Public Schools, Michigan.

Mrs. Michael Spicer, Member School Board, Lawrence Township, Mercer Co., N.J.

Mr. R. Winfield Smith, President, National School Boards Association and Director Upper Perikomen Board of School Directors, Pennsburg, Pa.

Mrs. Margaret Nielsen, President, Board of Education, West Bend, Wisconsin.

Mrs. Frances M. Carnochan, Chairman, NEA Legislative Commission, Trenton, N.J., accompanied by: Dr. John M. Lumley, Executive Secretary, NEA Legislative Commission and NEA Assistant Executive Secretary for Legislation and Federal Relations, Washington, D.C.

Mr. David Tankel, Director, ESEA Title I, Trenton Public Schools.

Mrs. Carol Belt, Art Coordinator, Trenton Public Schools.

Mr. William Raymond, Director ESEA Title III, Tempe Elementary School District, Tempe, Arizona.

Mr. G. Warren Phillips, Superintendent of Schools, Valparaiso, Indiana and Chairman, American Association of School Administrators, Federal Policy and Legislation Committee accompanied by: Mr. James Kirpatrick, Secretary, American Association of School Administrators; Dr. Harold H. Eibling, Superintendent, Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio.

Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, President, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Mr. William C. Geer, Executive Secretary, The Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association.

Dr. John Melcher, Assistant State Superintendent and Director of the Bureau for Handicapped Children, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mr. Fred Weintraub, on behalf of Dr. Leo Connor, Superintendent, Lexington School for the Deaf, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Maynard Reynolds, Chairman of the Department of Special Education of the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Elizabeth M. Boggs, Chairman, Committee on Government Affairs, The National Association for Retarded Children.

Mr. Irvin P. Schloss, Legislative Analyst, American Foundation for the Blind.

Dr. W. H. Moore, Associate Commissioner of Federal Programs, ESEA, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas, accompanied by: Mr. Jeff D. McGehee, Chairman, Arkansas Advisory Council on Policy.

Dr. James F. Redmond, General Superintendent, Chicago Board of Education, Chicago, Illinois, accompanied by: Dr. George Balling, Assistant Superintendent for Federal Relations and Dr. Arthur Lehne, Assistant Superintendent for Federal-State Funded Programs.

Dr. John O'Neill, President, American Speech and Hearing Association, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, University of Illinois, accompanied by: Dr. Kenneth O. Johnson, Executive Secretary, American Speech and Hearing Association.

Dr. William Simmons, Deputy Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools.

Dr. Ralph Hood, Superintendent of Schools, Brunswick, Georgia.

Dr. Bluford Minor, Assistant Superintendent of Schools and Business Manager, City of San Diego, California.

Dr. J. M. Hanks, Superintendent, Ysleta Public Schools, El Paso, Texas.

Dr. Reid Ross, Superintendent of Schools, Fayetteville, North Carolina.

Dr. George Membrino, Superintendent of Schools, Chicopee, Mass.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Dr. Jack P. Nix, Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh, State Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.

Dr. George Thomas, Director, Extended School Year Program, New York State Dept. of Education, New York.

Mr. John Doyle, Area Director, New Haven Public Schools, Hamden, Conn.

Mr. Donald Merryman, Project Director, Title III ESEA, Board of Education, Baltimore County, Upperco, Maryland.

Mr. Harvey Granite, Administrator, Title I, Rochester Public Schools, N.Y.

Mr. Donald E. Snodderly, Project Director, Title I ESEA, Board of Education, Baltimore County, Baltimore, Maryland.

Dr. Richard Vanhoose, Superintendent, Jefferson Co. Public Schools, Louisville, Ky.

Dr. J. O. Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky.

Mr. Fred S. Rosengarden, Director of Visual Education, Chicago Public Schools.

Mr. Jack L. Perlin, Principal, Wadsworth Elementary School, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Leo Lopez, Chief of Bureau Community Services & Migrant Education, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. Westry Horne, Director, Education Program for Seasonal and Migrant Families, New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton, N.J.

Professor Adalberto Guerrero, Tucson, Arizona.

Mr. Nathaniel Dixon, Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Reed P. Wahlquist, Principal, Kearns High School, Salt Lake City, Utah, accompanied by: Dr. Norman D. Riggs, Assistant Principal, Kearns High School; Mr. C. Michael Newman, Director, Project I.D.E.A., Kearns High School.

Dr. Charles C. Holt, Superintendent, South Bend Community Schools Corporation, South Bend, Indiana.

Mr. Morton L. Linder, President, Board of School Trustees, South Bend Community School Board, South Bend, Indiana.

Mr. Julius Truelson, Superintendent of Schools, Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, Texas.

Dr. Fred W. Kirby, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Columbus, Ga.

Mr. Archie F. Simmons, Administrative Assistant and Coordinator of Federal Pro-

XUM

grams, Leflore County School District, Greenwood, Mississippi.

Mr. Julian D. Prince, Sr., Superintendent of Schools, McComb Municipal Separate School District, McComb, Mississippi.

Mr. Ray Brackett, Director, Title I, ESEA, Floyd County Schools, Prestonsburg, Kentucky.

Mr. Foster Meade, Superintendent, Lewis County Schools, Vanceburg, Kentucky.

Mr. Bueford Risner, Superintendent of Schools, Bath County, Owingsville, Kentucky.

Mr. Charles Straub, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Mason County Schools, Maysville, Kentucky.

Very Rev. Msgr. James C. Donohue, Ph.D., Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.

Reverend Louis F. Generes, Superintendent, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana.

Reverend Franklin E. Fitzpatrick, Superintendent of Schools, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn.

Reverend Harold J. Ide, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Reverend Emmet Harrington, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Portland, Oregon.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward T. Hughes, Superintendent for Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mr. C. P. Callahan, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education, Diocese of San Diego, California.

Very Rev. Msgr. Henry Gardner, Superintendent for Archdiocese of Kansas City, Kansas.

Professor James V. Powell, Elkhorn City, Kentucky.

Dr. Ira Polley, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

Dr. Wilson C. Riles, Director of Compensatory Education, State Department of Education, Sacramento, California.

Raymond A. Horn, Director, Division of Federal Assistance, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.

Dr. Austin Haddock, Director, Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon.

Mr. Fred Williams, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky.

Dr. Alexander J. Plante, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

Dr. Joseph Johnston, Coordinator, Title I, ESEA, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Mr. Jack Hanson, Title I Administrator, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Louis A. Dughi, Assistant Coordinator, Federal Assistance Programs, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

V. P. Horne, Director, Public Relations, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville, Kentucky.

Dr. Irving Ratchick, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York.

Mr. Frank N. Brown, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin.

Dr. Noah S. Neace, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, Illinois.

Mr. Frank H. Vittetow, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction of State and Federal Relations, Department of Education, The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frankfort, Kentucky.

CRISIS IN THE LUMBER ECONOMY

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, last year, California was proud to provide the Nation with another gem for its string of superlative national parks. Now we want to do more about meeting the Nation's need for wood for new homes at a reasonable cost. Also, what I am suggesting today, I hope will shed some light on the current lumber price situation and offer some constructive suggestions that will lead to a stabilization of lumber prices throughout the Nation.

At the outset let me say, that I believe we must now demonstrate that we can house our growing population while we preserve and enjoy our new Redwood National Park. Information that has recently come to my attention shows that this can be done if the Congress meets its responsibilities to assure sound management of our national forests. The information to which I refer is a statement presented in December of last year by Mr. Paul E. Neff at the Western Forestry and Conservation Association meeting in San Francisco; a copy of which is offered herewith for the RECORD.

Mr. Neff's statement, in my judgment, suggests specific opportunities for increasing the harvest of commercial timber from that area located in the counties of Humboldt, Del Norte, and Mendocino which are contiguous to the site of the Redwood National Park in California. It provides some of the details not available in the Forest Service's statement made earlier this week to the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Very briefly, Mr. Neff points out that, with the addition of just 12 employees, the Forest Service could increase the annual cut in three national forests by more than 73 million board feet. This timber would come from the salvage of dead trees that are normally lost to use and can be reached now without major road construction.

With the completion of needed access roads, these three forests could provide each year more than 400 million board feet of mortality salvage. This timber, alone, would accommodate the building of more than 40,000 new homes each year!

Such timber losses as we are now experiencing are intolerable and our performance as the custodians of this great renewable natural resource leaves much to be desired. For this reason, I believe the Congress should promptly give the Forest Service the tools it needs to expedite the movement of this lumber into the construction of homes.

Over the years, we who represent major timber regions have been urging Congress and the executive branch to accelerate the Forest Service access road development program to permit intensified timber harvest and forest management programs to go forward. As a member of the House Roads Subcommittee, I can report that my colleagues have supported our request to the $170 million level, as recommended by the Forest Service as the required amount.

Regrettably, the previous administration and the Appropriations Committee funded only $100 million toward this goal. I was also the principal author of the log export restriction bill that ultimately cleared the 90th Congress as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. I say this only to remind my colleagues that those of us familiar with forestry and lumber products, have done everything possible to alleviate the log supply problem which is partially responsible for the excessively high lumber prices. Had our recommendations been followed fully, I do not believe we would have this problem today.

For several years, however, the forest products industry and the economy of most lumber regions have been in a very depressed condition—it's either "feast or famine." Many are just now recovering from some very lean years, and this is particularly true of the small mill owners and lumber operations. Now for the first time in years, we have the opportunity to recover following a long period of adjustment.

We can now look forward, I believe, to a leveling off of lumber prices and this, of course, will greatly benefit everyone concerned.

Therefore, I urge this Congress and the administration to do everything possible to avoid a decline in our lumber economy at this crucial time.

In summary, our goal must be:

First, to construct more forest access roads;

Second, to institute better forest management practices on public lands; and

Third, to create and maintain firm and stable timber prices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the tight lumber prices of the past have contributed to the tight money policies of the present.

If this Nation is to adequately house its people, supply the jobs needed in forested areas, and properly manage our national forests—we, in the Congress, must first make additional funds available for forest roads and other forest management practices and, secondly, develop a long-range method of finance and funding for the managers of our national forests that is sound, feasible, and certain to yield the revenues needed to constitute an "investment" in this great natural resource.

The statement mentioned follows:

TIMBER MORTALITY: FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPECTED RESULTS, LIMITATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES

A high proportion of the commercial forest land in Federal Ownership in the West supports mature or overmature timber. Such stands characteristically have higher mortality rates in merchantable stems than young growth. Unless preventive measures are carried out on a current basis, high mortality rates will continue until such time as the old growth stands are liquidated, in some cases over 60 years hence.

One of the first steps in reducing pest impacts is detection. Finding where the insects and diseases are before they become epidemic. By recognizing potential outbreaks early they often can be suppressed through timber sales or by cultural manipulation. Detection is a continuing job by State, private and Federal forest entomologists and pathologists covering all forested lands of all ownerships.

Evaluation surveys are made to appraise the significance of outbreaks and to determine whether they will be allowed to run their normal course unchecked or whether

XUM

direct suppression measures should be employed to reduce the outbreak to an endemic level.

Detection and evaluation surveys are varied; most are a combination of aerial surveys followed by ground checks. Detection and evaluation surveys are continually being refined. There have been a considerable number of changes in recent years through the development of aerial photo techniques, bark X-ray and electronic data processing. There are other improvements on the drawing board. In a few years through sensor techniques, it may become possible to detect sick trees before there are any outward symptoms.

The prevention of insect and disease outbreaks through silvicultural and biological practices will become more important in reducing pest impacts as we develop fully managed forests. Miller and Keen, years ago, pointed out in USDA Pub. #800 that "All results from applied control indicate that the killing of beetles, no matter by what method, has only a limited effect in reducing tree mortality. The trend of epidemics is only temporarily altered by direct control measures."

Present inventory statistics are inadequate to accurately pinpoint the total annual losses to mortality. Neither are accurate data available as to the exact amount of current mortality salvaged each year. Forest Service records combine the timber cut as salvage with other unregulated material cut, including thinnings and species such as lodgepole pine that have not had a dependable market in the past.

Up to now the available supply of National Forest timber sold in California has exceeded utilization. Not until fiscal year 1966 was the utilization of National Forest timber equal to the allowable cut. Between 1962 and 1968, the back log of uncut timber climbed rapidly. The present back log is two and one-half times the allowable cut. Forest Service emphasis has been aimed at marketing large quantities of timber to provide the timber industry the opportunity to cut at allowable cut levels.

It now appears that this aim has been achieved and interest in additional supplies of timber including mortality salvage will be stronger. In Region 6, the volume of timber under contract is much less in proportion to the annual allowable cut. Consequently a more vigorous salvage program has been under way in recent years.

The Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management are committed to sell available unregulated material, including salvage, to the extent funds will permit and market demands can utilize it.

Funds and man-power for sale preparation have not been sufficiently high to market all of the material available from federal timber lands. Perhaps they never will be. This has necessitated the establishment of priorities in programming of the various categories of timber products. These priorities for federal ownerships in the west are:

1. Market insect epidemic losses and fire salvageable material.
2. Market the regulated cut. This would include intermediate cutting where such cutting is included in the allowable cut. (Siuslaw in R–6)
3. Market thinnings in locations where small-log harvesting has become an established practice.
4. Market dead and down salvage material.
5. Market thinnings in new areas.

Large catastrophic losses from insects, wind, floods and fires have generally been successfully salvaged as a part of the regulated sale program by regular operators. For example, the Douglas-fir bark beetle attack following the Christmas floods of 1964 in California was estimated to have killed about a billion board feet during 1966 and 1967. By the end of 1968 close to 500MM board feet will have been sold. Most of the remainder is inaccessible and may not be salvaged.

The Columbus Day windstorm in 1962 damaged 2.1 billion feet of timber on the National Forests of Oregon and Washington. A good part of this was salvaged, over 1.8 billion feet.

The normal annual mortality, scattered throughout the forest areas, is another matter. Such mortality results in light volumes per acre and may or may not be attractive from a logging standpoint. This depends upon its accessibility, the economics of removal, the availability of timber from regular sales, and the availability of operators with small, highly mobile equipment needed to operate scattered salvage shows.

The three Douglas-fir Forests in northwestern California, Six Rivers, Shasta-Trinity and Klamath have studied their mortality salvage situation. The situation on these Forests is illustrative of what might be expected on other Region Five Forests.

Current inventories show the unregulated cutting objectives for these three Forests to be 28 million board feet. The average unregulated volume cut for the last three fiscal years is 9 million board feet.

New inventories and allowable cuts are in process on all three of these Forests. These will produce drastically better figures than we now have to work with.

As an interim step, pending completion of additional new inventory data, salvage opportunities have been classified into three accessibility categories and tabulated below:

Forest	Annual volume, mm. board feet, by accessibility category		
	1	2	3
Six Rivers	9.0	2.0	160.0
Klamath	7.5	25.0	32.5
Shasta-Trinity	20.0	10.0	140.0
Total	36.5	37.0	332.5

Category 1 is that dead and down sawtimber which is currently accessible without construction of specified or permanent roads.

Category 2 is reasonably accessible with the construction of additional specified roads by timber purchasers, including normal amounts of supplemental funding.

Category 3 is inaccessible and would require major government construction.

Categories 1 and 2 can be looked upon as an opportunity for increasing salvage sales during the next 10 years. Category 3 is considered completely impractical during the next 10 years.

Manning and financing for an accelerated salvage program, including categories 1 and 2 would require these increases:

Forest	Funds M dollars	Ceilings man-years
Six Rivers	58	2
Klamath	172	4
Shasta-Trinity	158	6
Total	388	12

In addition, it is impractical to believe that the above increases would result in selling the full additional volume unless the regular sale program is fully financed. For example, during the past three fiscal years all Region 5 Forests have been financed to sell, on the average 68MM board feet of unregulated material. However, they were only given 82 percent of the finances needed to sell the regular program. It would be unrealistic to reduce the regular program since more volume in more desirable sales can be prepared per dollar than is the case with unregulated sales. Also, the allowable regulated cut is considered the first priority commitment to sell, therefore, underfinancing the regular program has tended to reduce accomplishment in the unregulated program.

Long run plans for the future place major emphasis on establishing intermediate cutting in all merchantable sized stands that are accessible each decade. This will include category 1 and 2 and gradually extend to category 3. The principal difference between this approach and a salvage sale approach is that it is designed to remove in addition to accumulated dead and down trees those live trees that are expected to die withing 10 years. The major improvement expected is three fold. First, very much more attractive sales will result, including heavier cut volumes per acre and better average quality timber. Second, by removing anticipated mortality actual future mortality will be greatly reduced. Third, some relief from competition will occur in the remaining trees improving their general thrift and resistance to insects and diseases.

Implementation of this program is underway on the Six Rivers and Klamath Forests in the recalculation of allowable cut. This is a necessary first step since such a program will influence the yield from regeneration cutting.

Provisions for increased funding and manpower is a key second step and remains yet to be answered.

Let me conclude by outlining what we need to do in California:

A. Continue and improve insect detection and evaluation surveys.

B. Develop a large operational intermediate cutting program, tending each accessible commercial forest area on the National Forests including landscape management units at least once each 10 years. By this, I mean (1) thinning in young stands to improve thrift and resistance to insects and diseases. (2) In old growth Douglas-fir stands, we need to take live high risk trees in addition to dead and down to reduce or prevent mortality while the stand's turn for harvest approaches. (3) In intervening areas between release groups in the Sierras, we need to take out high risk as well as dead and down trees so that mortality is reduced during the necessary intervals between major silvicultural treatments.

C. We need a financing and man power program that will consistently make it possible to plan for and put crews in the field to prepare and administer such an intermediate program. Preparatory work must often begin three years ahead of sale date. We can't start and stop intermittently if the intermediate program is to become a part of our standard timber program.

D. To make intermediate cutting a standard operational part of our timber program, we need to include this kind of cutting in our allowable cut statements and five-year action plans. We are working on such calculations on the Six Rivers and Klamath Forests now.

E. We also need to develop logging methods for this practice with industry. Additional highly mobile tractor and cable skidding will be needed. We need to perfect equipment capable of harvesting intermediate cuts on very steep slopes.

Both the timber industry and the Federal timber selling agencies stand to benefit greatly from such a program. To be most successful a good bit of cooperation will be needed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of death in family.

Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr.

Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Fish (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), indefinitely, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Michel, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Conte, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Quie, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Daniel of Virginia) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reuss, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Shipley, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McCormack (at the request of Mr. Burke of Massachusetts) to extend his remarks following the statement by Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.

Mr. Keith to extend his remarks following those of Mr. McCormack.

Mr. Madden and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Yates to revise and extend his remarks in connection with special order of Mr. Pelly.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Mailliard in two instances.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Morton.

Mr. Quie.

Mr. Grover.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. Miller of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. McClure.

Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Córdova.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Daniel of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fraser in three instances.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.

Mr. Hays in two instances.

Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mr. Jarman in two instances.

Mr. Pickle in two instances.

Mr. Rarick in four instances.

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Dorn in two instances.

Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Olsen in two instances.

Mr. Hawkins in two instances.

Mr. Kee.

Mr. Pepper in two instances.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Baring.

Mr. Ryan in four instances.

Mr. Hagan in two instances.

Mr. Feighan in three instances.

Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Philbin in four instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 714. An act to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

629. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budgets and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

630. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Medical care," for the fiscal year 1969, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a further supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

631. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, withdrawing a previous recommendation for prompt and favorable consideration of a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of platinum from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

632. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the payment of expenses of preparing and transporting to his home or place of interment the remains of a Federal employee who dies while performing official duties in Alaska or Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9599. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9600. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9601. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9602. A bill to authorize the filling of vacant positions in the National Park Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9603. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which benefits may be paid thereunder to an individual on account of posthospital extended-care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9604. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities, to provide loans and loan guarantees for construction and modernization of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9605. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for certain motor vehicle maintenance employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9606. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 9607. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9608. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to safeguard consumers in connection with trading stamp practices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9609. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Nix, and Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 9610. A bill for the elimination of health dangers to coal miners resulting from the inhalation of coal dust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9611. A bill to improve the safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers and single persons who have attained age 30 and maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9613. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder to widows and widowers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9614. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 9615. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9616. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and their auxiliaries the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 9617. A bill to give farmers an additional month in which to meet the requirement of filing a declaration of estimated tax by filing an income tax return for the taxable year for which the declaration is required; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9618. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9619. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 9620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9621. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9624. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9625. A bill to permit the President to authorize the sale of savings bonds yielding not more than 5 percent per annum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9626. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to base the amount of an educational opportunity grant on the student's expenses for tuition and books, to increase the maximum annual grant to $2,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9629. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9630. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9631. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9632. A bill to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 to provide for an additional period of amnesty during which certain firearms may be registered with the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9633. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9634. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9635. A bill to equalize the presumptions applicable to, and the rates of, disability compensation in the case of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9637. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 9638. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNIS:

H.R. 9639. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Indianapolis Division of the Southern District of Indiana also shall be held at Richmond, Ind., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9640. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9641. A bill to increase the maximum rate of travel allowance for postal employees assigned to road duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 9642. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9643. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to establish an emergency family loan program as a national emphasis program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 9644. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 9645. A bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 9646. A bill to amend section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 9647. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial licenses for facilities and certain research and development licenses for facilities, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 9648. A bill to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9649. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9650. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9651. A bill to provide a mechanism for equitable adjustments in the price of gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9652. A bill to increase the penalties for the illegal use or possession of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 9653. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits, to increase the minimum survivor's benefit, and to liberalize the retirement test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 9654. A bill to authorize subsistence, without charge, to certain air evacuation patients; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. de la Garza, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Kleppe, Mr. Nelsen, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Stuckey, Mr. Teague of Texas, and Mr. Zwach):

H.R. 9655. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself and Mr. Gibbons) (by request):

H.R. 9656. A bill to provide for orderly

XUM

trade in fresh fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9657. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9658. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain actions, and make an investigation and study, with respect to drilling and oil production under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 9659. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9660. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to eliminate the 4-day waiting period applicable to sickness benefits during an individual's second or subsequent registration period within any benefit year, and to waive the 7-day waiting period applicable to sickness benefits during an individual's first such period where sickness (and any required waiting period) began in the preceding benefit year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Symington, Mr. Tiernan, and Mr. Waldie):

H.R. 9661. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 608. Join resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a comprehensive investigation of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the home improvement industry, to expand its enforcement activities in this area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution consenting to the Susquehanna River Basin compact, enacting the same into law thereby making the United States a signatory party, making certain reservations on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a national preferential primary election to select candidates for the office of the President and Vice President and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by the popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution recognizing the courage of Apollo 8 astronauts and the appropriateness of their expressions of faith in Almighty God on their moon-circling mission, and encouraging the President of the United States and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to allow similar freedoms on future space flights; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 349. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Albert, Mr. Mills, Mr. Rivers, Mr. Holifield, Mr. Madden, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Hays, Mr. Flood, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Dent, Mr. McFall, Mr. Ullman, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Matsunaga, and Mr. Pepper):

H. Res. 350. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

94. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress to repeal all recently passed legislation which restricts the constitutional right of a citizen to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the interest rate of Federal moneys utilized for water-related projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

96. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts, relative to oil imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9662. A bill for the relief of Josephat Ahing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9663. A bill for the relief of the city of Port Allen, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 9664. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade of a certain officer in the U.S. Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9665. A bill for the relief of Angero and Theophilos Kamperides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9666. A bill for the relief of Dr. Toshiyuki Ando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9667. A bill for the relief of Enrique G. Balart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9668. A bill for the relief of Fernando Domenicale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9669. A bill for the relief of Enzio Enrico Bertoldi, his wife, Teresa Bertoldi, and their daughter, Maria Bertoldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9670. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe La Placa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9671. A bill for the relief of Daniel Brower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9672. A bill for the relief of Georgina Infantino and son, Giovanni Infantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tai Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

83. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the narcotics and drugs traffic at the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—*Thursday, March 27, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the world about us, and for that deeper world within us which Thou hast made for Thy habitation. Remove from our lives all that corrupts or tarnishes the divine image or that is alien to Thee, may Thy spirit indwell and reign over us.

We thank Thee that once in the man of Nazareth Thou didst enter our fleeting life and make the pilgrimage in human flesh from the manger to the cross and beyond. And by Him and through Him we know the way we ought to journey. Grant us then a measure of His spirit that we may think as He thought, work as He worked, live as He lived, serve as He served, for the welfare of this Nation and the betterment of all mankind.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 26, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, March 27, 1969, the President had approved and signed the act

(S. 1058) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next, March 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following the close of business today until noon on Monday, March 31, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that it be ordered that such messages be referred to the appropriate committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following the close of business today until noon on Monday, March 31, 1969, all committees be authorized to file their reports, including minority, supplemental, additional, and individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill clerk read the nomination of Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The bill clerk read the nomination of John A. Nevius to be a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut to be lieutenant general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The bill clerk read the nomination of John A. Hanna, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United Nations representatives.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21

XUM

of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the payment of the expenses of preparing and transporting to his home or place of interment the remains of a Federal employee who dies while performing official duties in Alaska or Hawaii, and for other purposes, which (with an accompanying paper) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the Governor of the State of Alaska, informing the Senate that he had signed Senate Joint Resolution 29 of that legislature, recommending the confirmation of Charles Meacham as Commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PERCY:

S. 1701. A bill to remove the limitations on the rates of interest or investment yield on Government savings bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Percy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1702. A bill for the relief of Nicola Galotto;

S. 1703. A bill for the relief of Rosa Pintabona; and

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of Lillian Biazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. Eastland, and Mr. McClellan):

S. 1705. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of eighteen years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cook, Mr. Dole, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1706. A bill to strengthen the antiobscenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce, to establish the Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1707. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1708. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shean-Ming Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1710. A bill to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1711. A bill to establish the position of court executive in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. Eagleton):

S. 1712. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Western District of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Symington when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 1713. A bill for the relief of Florentino Adona, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1714. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to authorize additional medical and dental care and other related benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. Montoya):

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Kong Wing Sik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Byrd of West Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia):

S. 1716. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HANSEN:

S. 1718. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. Tydings):

S. 1719. A bill to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hatfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1720. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize certain reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fong when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 1721. A bill to promote the orderly adjustment of tobacco production and marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1722. A bill for the relief of Nam Minh Doan Bouchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brooke when he introduced the first above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1723. A bill for the relief of Yan Sin Po, Tsang Kwai Yau, Ling Shing, Yung Wah Hap, and Li Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1724. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hussain I Saba, and his wife, Dr. Sabiha R. Saba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1701—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RAISE INTEREST RATES ON U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am introducing proposed legislation today to raise the interest rates on savings bonds to reflect actual market rates of interest.

Millions of Americans have invested in savings bonds over the years in the faith that the Government would deal fairly with them. This faith has been betrayed in recent years as inflation has driven the cost of living up above the 4¼-percent yield of series E savings bonds. Inflation was at a 4.5-percent rate in 1968; thus, a savings bond holder failed to even match the cost-of-living increase by one-quarter of 1 percent. The larger investor who can afford to invest in units of $1,000 can avoid this problem as the Treasury will pay competitive market rates of interest for his money. The investor in savings bonds is actually losing money at current rates of interest.

Present rates of interest on U.S. savings bonds are clearly unfair. They are not good investments. Their interest yield should be raised. By depositing funds in savings and loan associations, an investor can obtain 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent or even more in some cases.

An investor with over $1,000 can buy 3-month Treasury bills which currently have more than a 6-percent return. Or he can invest in Federal Agencies bills

XUM

which last week returned a yield of 6.38 percent.

The increase in "E" bond interest rate last year from 4.15 percent to 4.25 percent does not in any way compensate for the rapid increase in inflation which erodes those yields.

The legislation I am introducing today will permit the Secretary of the Treasury to set interest rates on savings bonds at a level consistent with market rates of interest. The small investor should no longer be asked to lose money on his Government investments but should be able to obtain interest yields more commensurate with those who have larger sums to place in other investments.

Many business leaders have informed me they have pangs of conscience in trying to persuade their employees to buy savings bonds as they know they are asking their employees to put money in an uncompetitive investment.

Many Americans have invested in savings bonds as a convenient way to save with the faith that their investment would remain sound. Let us help keep these investments sound by raising interest rates on series E savings bonds to a fair market level.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1701) to remove the limitations on the rates of interest or investment yield on Government savings bonds, introduced by Mr. PERCY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S.1705 AND S. 1706—INTRODUCTION OF ANTIOBSCENITY BILLS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills designed to further protect minors against the harmful effects stemming from distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails and by means of interstate commerce.

Before introducing these bills it may be helpful to clarify the nature of the problem to which the bills are addressed. In this connection we need to recognize the magnitude of the problem and clearly understand the harmful consequences which flow from it.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a serious nationwide problem represented by an uninhibited traffic in smut conducted by unscrupulous individuals. This traffic utilizes mail and the instruments of interstate commerce to invade the privacy of homes with unwanted, obnoxious, obscene materials. This traffic has intruded into small towns and hamlets and even public schools throughout the Nation. Much of this traffic involves high school students and has become so widespread that J. Edgar Hoover has said that it amounts to "a wholesale invasion of America's schoolyards and playgrounds." In support of that conclusion, U.S. postal officials estimate that over $500 million worth of obscene material is sold to youth through the mail each year.

Mr. President, these facts indicate the magnitude of the problem. Now let us consider some of the harmful effects which can reasonably be attributed to this unrestrained traffic in smut and obscenity.

In the March 1968 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Mr. Hoover said:

> The publication and sale of obscene material is big business in America today . . . It is impossible to estimate the amount of harm to impressionable teenagers and to assess the volume of sex crimes attributable to pornography, but its influence is extensive.
>
> Sexual violence is increasing at an alarming pace. Many parents are deeply concerned about conditions which involve young boys and girls in sex parties and illicit relations . . . Pornography in all its forms, is one major cause of sex crimes, sexual abberations and perversions.

Substantial evidence is available to indicate a direct relationship between the shocking increase in youthful crime and violence and the corresponding increase in the volume of traffic in pornography. The effects are measurable in the increased involvement of youth in serious crimes such as criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and automobile theft.

There is yet another aspect of the problem. Federal, State, and local antiobscenity laws are in a large measure ineffective due to current disarray and uncertainly in the law occasioned by U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the area of antiobscenity legislation. State legislatures do not know, and the U.S. Supreme Court has not stated with an essential degree of certainty, what legislative regulations of the trade will be permitted. Obviously, something less than unanimity of opinion exists among members of the Supreme Court.

However, since obscenity is not protected by the first amendment of the Constitution and since Congress has an unquestioned power to protect the public interest in this area, and particularly as it relates to interstate commerce and use of U.S. mail, there would seem to be compelling reasons for Congress to take the initiative and tackle the problem. We can enact legislation consistent with Supreme Court standards to the extent that such standards can be ascertained and we can also go on record with an expression of unequivocal intent to suppress illegal traffic in obscenity.

Mr. President, we recognize that the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography created by Congress last year can contribute much information and opinion of value to Congress. Its investigations, presentations of fact, conclusions, and recommendations will doubtless prove helpful when completed and presented to Congress some time in 1970. We believe, however, that creation of the Commission was not intended to be an equivalent to a moratorium or a ceasefire in the war waged against this evil. To the contrary, we believe that at this time a clear-cut indication by Congress of a determination to eradicate this pox on the body politic would provide the Commission with needed guidance and encouragement. Certainly a refinement of existing Federal antiobscenity laws is needed and will prove helpful to law enforcement personnel on the State and Federal levels. More importantly, congressional concern for evil influences of obscene materials upon the youth of our Nation cannot, in my judgment, safely be shelved or postponed until 1970 or 1971.

Mr. President, with the above considerations in mind, I now introduce the first of two antiobscenity bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1705) to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons, introduced by Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the first bill is a companion bill to H.R. 5171 introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT, of the Third District of Florida, with 40 cosponsors. This bill is patterned after a New York State statute, the provisions of which were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Ginsberg *v.* United States (383 U.S. 629).

In substance this bill makes it unlawful for any person knowingly to sell, offer for sale, or deliver in interstate commerce or through mails certain materials to minors. The bill states with clarity and preciseness the nature of proscribed materials and sets forth legal criteria for judging the harmfulness of such material. The criteria provided has been approved by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Ginsberg case.

In addition, the bill provides that the Supreme Court and the courts of appeals of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to review any factual determination made in Federal district courts on the question of materials considered harmful to minors.

At this point, Mr. President, it is necessary that we briefly comment on the last provision. I personally believe that Congress has the power, in proper cases, to limit or exclude U.S. Supreme Court jurisdiction as it relates to the procedural right to review on appeal determinations of factual issues made in State and in Federal district courts. Moreover, I believe that there is a genuine need for Congress to impose such limitations in cases involving issues arising from enforcement of State and local laws against obscenity and in other areas involving the exercise of police powers of State governments.

In summary, I wholeheartedly agree that the jurisdictional provision of section 2 of this bill is valid and an appropriate exercise of power by Congress.

On the other hand, we are dealing with Federal laws and not State laws and while a strong case can be made for limiting appellate jurisdiction in this case, we are persuaded that the purpose of this bill can be accomplished without the added precaution represented by the jurisdictional provision. Moreover, we are concerned that a confrontation on the jurisdictional issue might needlessly jeopardize adequate consideration of the main features of the bill.

These considerations are offered in explanation of the second antiobscenity bill which I now introduce on behalf of myself, and Senators GOLDWATER, BENNETT, COOK, DOLE, FANNIN, GURNEY, HANSEN, MANSFIELD, MCCLELLAN, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SPARKMAN, STEVENS, TAL-

XUM

MADGE, THURMOND, TOWER, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1706) to strengthen the antiobscenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce, to establish the Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. ALLEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN. This second bill, Mr. President, retains the substantive provisions of the first bill. However, it deletes the procedural provision relating to appellate jurisdiction. This important deletion is not the only difference between the bills. The bill now under consideration supplements the first in several other important particulars. For one thing we believe that the nature and magnitude of the problem suggests the desirability of extraordinary law enforcement efforts by the Department of Justice. We suggest the need for "war on obscenity" to be conducted with the same fervor and same degree of Executive concern as demonstrated in the "war on poverty."

With this last object in mind, the instant bill establishes a Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice. The Division is charged with the responsibility of administration of Federal antiobscenity statutes throughout the United States and in the District of Columbia, and it is charged with responsibility for providing technical assistance to the States and local governments in the administration of their laws relating to the illegal trade in obscene matter. In addition the Division shall conduct nationwide education and information programs on obscenity and its serious consequences.

Mr. President, we can do better in the area of law enforcement of existing antiobscenity laws. We have the know-how, the intelligence, and the resources to stamp out this monstrous evil in our midst. What is needed is a determination, a commitment, a marshaling of resources and talents under competent leadership and supervision to meet this challenge. Such is the purpose of the Division of Obscenity contemplated by the last-mentioned provision.

There are other differences in the revised bill which are designed to strengthen and expand the scope of the criminal provisions. The revised version includes a provision designed to reach individuals who might print, publish, create, or manufacture proscribed materials harmful to minors and it establishes procedures for mailing certain materials which might be harmful to minors. Among other things, the prescribed procedure requires a signed receipt indicating the age of the addressee as a condition of delivery by the Post Office.

Provisions are also included in this bill to recognize an exception for materials disseminated to persons or institutions having scientific, educational, or other special justifications for possession of such material and a provision which defines the term "interstate commerce" as used for purposes of this law. These are major differences. There are also minor differences of a nature designed to meet what we consider to be valid technical objections to the first bill.

Mr. President, we believe that the bills under discussion form the basis for effecting a compromise which hopefully can gather support sufficient for enactment of a new law in this area. We are encouraged in this belief by reason of the long standing and continuing concern of the Senate with the problem of obscenity and by reason of the careful study already given the subject by many Senators. Furthermore, we believe that support of the instant bill may be significant not only as a reflection of geographic representation indicating the pervasiveness of the problem but also as an indication of a general desire to reconcile differences in approaches and to hammer out a new antiobscenity law.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) has been most generous with helpful suggestions and encouragement in preparation of the revised bill. A debt of gratitude is owed to him for his determination and dedication to the worthy cause of providing a solution to this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement of Mr. GOLDWATER is as follows:

Today Senator Allen and I, together with 17 other Senators, offer a bill which I believe this country needs and demands in order to protect our youth from the degrading, outrageous filth which is being sent through the mails and other channels of interstate commerce.

In short, our bill will make it unlawful to pander obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce to children or to produce such materials knowing or intending they will be so disseminated to children. Further, it will place all Federal enforcement powers regarding obscenity into one division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I believe this bill is in response to a national menace. To me the present situation represents a clear and present danger to the American people. The exposure of minors to the kind of trash that is being sent through the mails and other means of commerce can only result in the impairment of the ethical and moral development of our youth.

As far as the citizens of my State are concerned, there must be prompt and effective action taken at the highest levels of Government to stop the purveying of obscenity to minors. There is something terribly wrong in this land, when in a single morning's mail I have received as many as six letters from parents and concerned citizens of my State who plead that steps be taken to eliminate the unsolicited smut being sent to their homes through the mail.

Mr. President, I believe there is one decisive action we can take to answer the American public—and that is to pass a strong new law aimed squarely at the protection of minors. Strangely enough, there is no such law now on the books.

There is no question that the Government has an interest and an obligation to protect the welfare of our children. To this end our bill has been prepared with deliberation. We realize the measure must be strong to succeed in its purpose. But at the same time it must be safeguarded against the attacks of those knee-jerk civil libertarians who will see more social value in the output of smutmakers than in the protection of minors from exposure to materials which are undermining to their normal development.

Mr. President, every effort has been made to make this measure Constitutional. The United States Supreme Court has offered a guide in a recent decision upholding a statute of New York State designed to protect minors from obscene matter. This case, *Ginsberg* v. *New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968) has served as an aid in framing our bill. Also, the bill is patterned after the provisions of a revised law adopted by Congress only sixteen months ago for the District of Columbia (D.C. Code 22–2001). Thus, most of the provisions of our bill have already been tested and approved in the courts and by the Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to one feature of the bill which we believe is original and is likely to offer a very practical means to prevent obscene materials from reaching children. Due to the problem that some persons will be able to evade the purposes of the law because of the difficulty of proving that they knowingly sent obscenity to a child, we determined that some of the burden should be shifted to the purveyors of filth to keep their trash out of the hands of minors. Therefore, our bill includes the requirement that any publisher or seller who knows or has reasonable cause to know that any matter which he intends to mail is obscene and harmful to minors must indicate on the cover of such mail that the contents are harmful if exposed to minors. This provision further requires that any matter sent through the mails which shows such an indication shall not be delivered unless the postman obtains a receipt signed by an adult. Of course, there will be no penalty inflicted on the mailman in case he should make a mistake.

But the purveyor of filth will be guilty if he sends prohibited material through the mails in unmarked containers. On the other hand, if the sender does use the required indication, the matter will not be delivered indiscriminately to whomever opens the mail first, but will only be handed over in person by the mailman to an adult.

Hopefully, any adult receiving such material—which likely was unsolicited in the first place—will destroy it. At the very least, he will be able to keep it away from any minors in his family. As a further step, he will be in a position to notify his post office that all mail with such a marking is objectionable and should not be delivered at all to his residence. I should point out that nothing in this provision will make lawful any conduct which is otherwise prohibited. If the seller "knowingly" mails obscene matter directly to a minor he will be guilty of violating the major purpose of the law whether or not he indicates that the matter is harmful. Or if a seller forwards matter in the mails which is obscene both to minors and adults, he will run afoul of the criminal code regardless of whether the cover included a warning to children.

Mr. President, I believe there are precedents for this type of provision in many areas of the law. For one, the Gun Control Act of 1968 requires that firearms cannot be sold to anyone who does not appear in person at the dealer's place of business unless the dealer first forwards a prescribed statement by registered or certified mail with a return receipt requested to the chief local law enforcement officer. The parallel is clear. In both cases an additional burden is imposed on the seller because of the over-riding interest of the Congress in protecting the public safety. Consequently, lest any weeping towels be brought out because of the slight fee the makers and purveyors of smut will have to pay as handling charges to the

XUM

postal service, I point out that the procedure is clearly reasonable in light of the objectives of our bill and is a practice that Congress has used before. As to the requirement that a designation be made to identify the nature of the contents, we are all familiar with precedents such as the laws which require warning messages on the labels of cigarettes and notices on the face of advertisements that look like bills but in fact are only offers to sell.

Mr. President, in summary I urge that action be taken on legislation along these lines as soon as possible. If anyone wishes this problem to be studied further, I make an appeal to pass this law or one with a similar purpose first and then to focus any study on ways to strengthen the law or add to it. The American people deserve the most effective laws we can conceive to eliminate this danger to our youth. We must act now.

S. 1703—INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL LANDS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Federal Lands for Parks and Recreation Act of 1969.

The purpose of this measure is to make surplus Federal property available to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at prices which reflect the important role recreation and open spaces play in our contemporary life. This bill is in accord with and in furtherance of our longstanding national policy as expressed in the land and water conservation fund and other measures designed to encourage State and local governments to acquire and develop lands for parks and outdoor recreation.

This bill is of special importance to many of our major metropolitan areas where the need for parks and open spaces is greatly increasing while at the same time the limited land available is being dedicated to other, often incompatible, purposes. If we are to improve the quality of life and surroundings for the residents of our major cities, we will have to take advantage of every future opportunity to acquire land adjacent to where people live for recreational and park purposes.

In spite of our longstanding national policy to encourage and assist State and local governments in the acquisition of open spaces we are not coming close to meeting the need. A recent report of the National League of Cities on "Recreation in the Nation's Cities: Problems and Approaches" concludes:

> Land acquisition (for parks and recreation facilities) has become difficult, if not impossible, in most of the Nation's cities. Except in outlying areas land is very scarce and even in outlying areas it is extremely valuable. Even when there is land available the need for new acreage far outstrips available funds.

As a result of the high price of potential park and recreation areas which are located where they are needed most—where the people are—many cities are unable to meet the demand. The League of Cities report notes, for example, that San Antonio, Tex., a city of 722,000 people has been able to acquire an average of only 6 acres of park land per year between 1945 and 1961. It is estimated that 170 acres should have been added each year if the needs of city residents were to be met. This same picture of inadequate revenues to meet the public need for open space is repeated in city after city.

One way to meet this need for city parks and recreation areas is to take advantage of every available opportunity to see that appropriate parcels of surplus Federal property are dedicated to the highest and best use of the American public. The crowding, the congestion and the growing pressures of modern life make it clear that one of the highest and best uses of land in the last one-third of the 20th century is for parks and open spaces.

Today, there are over 30 million acres of land presently held in fee ownership and used by the Department of Defense alone. Periodically, portions of this property are declared surplus. Many of these surplus military installations are located in or near major metropolitan areas and afford a great opportunity for urban park and recreational complexes. Surplus property held by other departments of the Federal Government afford similar opportunities.

Mr. President, passage of the measure I propose today will make it possible for the Congress to insure that the States and units of local government in this Nation have a chance—a financially realistic chance—to acquire these lands for park and recreational purposes.

The Federal Lands for Parks and Recreation Act of 1969 would amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act by providing that for a period of 5 years after the date of enactment, surplus Federal property could be conveyed to State and local governments for park and recreational use at less than the 50 percent of fair-market value required under present law.

The bill provides three methods by which a State or its political subdivision may acquire surplus Federal property for park and recreational purposes. First, if the State or its political subdivision originally donated the property to the Federal Government, it may be reacquired at no cost. Second, the property may be acquired at the purchase price which the Federal Government paid for the property. Third, where the State or its political subdivision so elects, surplus property may be acquired at 0 to 50 percent of fair-market value. The price is to be determined on the basis of standards relating to suitability, accessibility, need and the highest and best use of the property.

One of the most significant features of this measure is that it does not require the use of condemnation powers. As a result, it provides a means whereby needed open space may be made available without having to move people out of established neighborhoods.

Mr. President, I became aware of the urgent need for legislation on this subject when it became apparent that Fort Lawton—a military installation of over 1,100 acres in the city of Seattle—would soon be declared surplus to Federal needs. Acquisition of this area by the city for park and recreation purposes is in the national interest. The problem Seattle and many other units of local government face, however, is that paying 50 percent of fair-market value may be financially impossible. This is especially true when the property is located in or near a major metropolitan area and the land appraisals are based on commercial, industrial or high density residential development.

The problem posed is national in scope. The Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty recommended that legislative action be taken in its June 1968 annual report to the President and to the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. The Citizens Committee stated at page 5 of the report:

> OUTDOOR RECREATION AND FEDERAL SURPLUS LANDS
>
> Each year vast amounts of land become surplus to the operating needs of the Federal government. Some of the land is disposed of through sale to public or private entities while other acreages are held for future disposition. We are interested in assuring that the public outdoor recreational needs will be served in the sale or disposition of these lands, and that the eventual use of such lands is compatible with the land use plans and objectives of the public jurisdiction in that area. We recommend that the Administration seek legislation to permit the disposal of surplus lands at no cost to public bodies for park and recreation purposes. We recommend that, where possible, military lands be made available for public outdoor recreational use.

Enactment of this legislation would benefit every State and every area of the country which has Federal property and installations which may someday be surplus to Federal needs. It is imperative that we act and act now to insure that these lands are available for public use.

As Members of the Senate are aware, under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act the proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property are paid into the fund for use by Federal, State, and local government for recreational land acquisition and development. My bill would result in some reduction in revenues paid into the fund. This small reduction would, however, be offset many times by the value of new park and recreational lands made directly available to the Nation. Very often, the sale price realized from many of these properties is relatively small when compared with the overall receipts to the land and water fund. To local government, however, the 50-percent-of-fair-market-value requirement under present law can be too much for overextended and limited budgets. When this is the case, the land may be forever lost to public use.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that a report entitled "Utilization and Disposition of Federal Lands for Recreation" was prepared last summer which also recommends legislation on this subject. This report was prepared by the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty at the request of the

XUM

Vice President of the United States, who serves as Chairman of the Council.

This report has not been released and I do not know what specific legislative recommendations it proposes. I would, however, urge Vice President AGNEW to release the report and to see that the administration's proposed legislation be transmitted so that it may be considered together with my bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1708) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1708

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Lands For Parks and Recreation Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Section 2(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (effective March 31, 1970, Section 2(b) becomes Section 2(a) pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–401, July 15, 1968), is further amended by deleting the last sentence and adding the following new paragraphs:

"*Provided, however,* that notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, States and their political subdivisions shall have the right, for a period of five years from the date of enactment of this Act, to acquire from the United States surplus Federal real and personal property for park and recreation purposes by the following methods:

(1) Where the State or its political subdivision originally donated the property to the United States, the surplus Federal property may be reacquired at no cost;

(2) Where the United States paid valuable consideration for the property to the State, its political subdivisions, an association, or to an individual, the State or its political subdivision may acquire the surplus Federal property at the original cost of purchase; or

(3) Where a State or its political subdivision so elects, it may acquire surplus Federal property at 0 to 50 percent of the fair-market value as determined by the General Services Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior based on the following standards:

(i) the suitability of the property for park and recreational uses;

(ii) the accessibility of the property to major population centers;

(iii) the need for park and recreational facilities in the immediate geographical area;

(iv) the highest and best use of the property taking into consideration the need of future generations for parks, open spaces and recreational opportunities.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to prepare and publish guidelines and regulations for implementing these standards in making the price discount determinations set out in this section.

Except as provided in this section, nothing in this Act shall affect existing laws or regulations concerning disposal of real or personal surplus Federal property to schools, hospitals, States and their political subdivisions.

S. 1710—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DONATE CERTAIN LANDS TO THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE, WHITE EARTH INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing legislation which I first introduced on May 23, 1967. This bill, identical to S. 1830 of the 90th Congress, restores to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Reservation, certain submarginal lands of the United States and makes such lands part of the reservation. These properties consist of approximately 28,700 acres purchased by the Federal Government during the mid-1930's under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act. The lands were so acquired in order to retire them from private ownership, to correct maladjustments in land use, and with the expectation that they would be made available for tribal use.

Mr. President, these lands were originally owned by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. Unfortunately, they were allotted under the allotment act and subsequently passed from Indian ownership. The Government acquired the lands at a cost of $175,664. In 1963, when similar legislation was introduced in the Congress, their market value was placed at $474,000 by appropriate governmental agencies.

Similar legislation has already been enacted, Mr. President, restoring property to the Seminoles of Florida and to the Pueblos and other tribes in New Mexico. I am, therefore, most hopeful that this legislation will receive favorable consideration during the present session. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1710) to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in the lands, and the improvements thereon, that were acquired under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and section 55 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), and that are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for the administration of the benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Reservation, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for this Indian tribe, and the lands shall be parts of the reservation heretofore established for the tribe.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of possession contract right, interest, or title he may have in the land involved.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

S. 1712—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my own behalf and that of my colleague, Senator EAGLETON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an additional Federal judge for the western district of Missouri.

The U.S. Judicial Conference has recognized the need for an additional Federal judge in the eastern district of Missouri. However, because of an unfortunate series of circumstances, consideration was not given to the approved recommendation for an additional judge for the western district of Missouri by the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit.

It is my understanding that an additional judge in the western district is justified by the workload experience of that district, and this is, of course, reflected by the request of the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit.

I support the provision in S. 952 for an additional Federal judge for the eastern district of Missouri as well as an additional judge for the western district of Missouri, as provided under the terms of the separate bill we introduce today.

I would hope for early and favorable action in this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1712) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Western District of Missouri, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1719—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING JUST COMPENSATION IN FEDERAL CONDEMNATION CASES

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the measure is to give full effect to the provision of the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution, ensuring that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. The bill seeks to correct a longstanding inequity by making available to defendants certain legal resources commensurate in degree to those of the Government.

Currently, in Federal land condemnation proceedings, the owner of condemned property who believes the proffered price to be less than his estimate of the value of the property must, after other measures fail, go to court to have the fair value determined. The costs of bringing this legal action are borne by the property holder alone. Thus, even if a court determines that the land in question is more valuable than the Government offer indicated, the property owner must assume the costs of the litigation. His judgment then is discounted by the costs which he has incurred in pursuit of his constitutional right to just compensation.

For a small property owner, assuming costs of attorneys' and appraisers' fees may effectively preclude pursuit of legal remedy. Even if the remedy is pursued, the costs may prove especially burdensome. An individual who owns a small tract of land—which he values at $5,700 or $5,800—may be offered only $5,000 by the Government. If the property holder decides to take the case to court and wins, he is then saddled with considerable fees for an attorney and professional appraisers. These costs may well exceed the difference between his estimate and the Government's estimate of the property's value. The result is that the landowner, who has valiantly protected the value of his property, ultimately receives less than fair compensation for his property. The net receipt to the landowner, then, is the fair value of the property minus legal and other fees—expenses incurred solely in order to prove that the Government was wrong and parsimonious in its offer.

Not only is the end result unfair. Throughout the proceedings the Government has an unjust advantage in attempting to convince property holders to accept the initial offer. Government officials can argue that the legal and other costs incurred by the landowner in court action would bring no appreciable financial benefit. Yet to better insure justice, the Government's offer should stand on its own financial merits; the condemnor should not have the added coercive advantage which now exists.

Further, the landowner must not only use his own resources to defend against an apparently inadequate offer, but he is faced with the prospect that the Government may simply drop its condemnation proceedings after court action has begun. This results generally from the fact that the Government can, after reassessing the situation, decide that the need for the land is not as great as initially presumed. The landowner, again, is the ultimate loser; he must still pay legal and other fees incurred up until that point. He keeps his land, but has suffered substantially from the Government's action. For this governmental wrong, no remedy now exists.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced provides that the costs and expenses incurred by the defendant in legal action shall be paid by the U.S. Government, if it is determined that just compensation for the landowner's interest exceeds by 10 percent the maximum amount offered by the United States before the institution of the action. The measure also provides that where the United States dismisses the action before the judgment, the court is to enter judgment requiring the United States to pay the defendant landowner a sum equal to the costs and expenses incurred.

This legislation benefits from and draws upon the successful experience of Oregon legislation dealing with condemnation proceedings. Oregon statutes provide that in land condemnation cases property owners can recover reasonable attorneys' fees as determined by the court. These fees are recovered if the jury makes an award higher than the initial Government offer. Because of this legal remedy the guarantee of just compensation is thus better insured. The Federal Government, Mr. President, must similarly insure this protection.

Considerable support for this measure has come from the Oregon bar. The bill's predecessor, introduced in the 89th Congress, enjoyed the support of the board of governors of the Oregon State bar, the judicial committee of the Oregon State bar, the Bar Asociation of Union and Lane Counties, and others.

It is my feeling that this bill, if enacted, would guarantee that the protection of just compensation would be truly secured. I urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1719) to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 161 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2415. Actions for the condemnation or taking of real property

"(a) If, in any action brought by the United States for the acquisition of any interest in real property through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, it is determined that just compensation for such interest exceeds the maximum amount offered by the United States for such interest before the institution of that action, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the United States with respect to that interest shall provide for the payment to the defendant having the title to that interest of (1) the amount determined to constitute just compensation for that interest, and (2) a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by such defendant incident to that action: *Provided,* That no payment for costs and expenses shall be made unless the judgment awarded exceeds the maximum amount offered by the United States before the institution of the action by ten percent. If, after the institution of any such action, the United States dismisses such action before compensation has been determined and paid, or such action is dismissed upon motion of the defendant having title to that interest for failure of prosecution of such action, the court shall enter in that action, upon application made by such defendant, judgment requiring the payment by the United States to such defendant of a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by such defendant incident to that action.

"(b) If, in any such action brought by the United States with respect to any interest in real property, it is determined that the United States is without lawful authority to acquire that interest through the exercise of any power of eminent domain, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the defendant shall provide for the payment to the defendant by the United States of a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by the defendant incident to that action.

"(c) If, in any action brought against the United States for the recovery of just compensation for the taking of any interest in real property, it is determined that such taking occurred without a tender of compensation to the plaintiff for such interest or that just compensation for the interest taken exceeds the maximum amount tendered to the plaintiff for such interest by or on behalf of the United States before the institution of that action, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the plaintiff with respect to that interest shall provide for the payment to the plaintiff of (1) the amount determined to constitute just compensation for that interest, and (2) a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by the plaintiff incident to that action: *Provided,* That where a tender has been made to the plaintiff for such interest by or on behalf of the United States before the institution of action, no payment for costs and expenses shall be made unless the judgment awarded exceeds the maximum amount offered by the United States before the institution of the action by ten percent.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'United States' means the United States Government, any department, agency, instrumentality, or officer thereof, and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States Government; and

"(2) the term 'expenses' includes, but is not limited to, expenses reasonably incurred for appraisal and other expert services incident to the preparation and trial of a civil action, and a reasonable attorney's fee incurred incident to the preparation and trial of such action and the review of any judgment or decree entered therein, as determined by the court in that action."

(b) The chapter analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2415. Actions for the condemnation or taking of real property."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to all actions brought on and after the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act (1) by or on behalf of any department, agency, instrumentality, or officer of the United States or any corporation owned or controlled by the United States Government for the acquisition of any interest in real property through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or (2) by any party for the recovery of just compensation for the taking of any interest in real property by or on behalf of any such department, agency, instrumentality, officer, or corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor with the distin-

XUM

guished senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) a bill to provide the payment of costs and fees of litigants in certain property condemnation proceedings.

This bill is similar, in large measure, to S. 1351, introduced during the 90th Congress by Senators MORSE and HATFIELD. That bill would have allowed payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees by the Government to defendants in condemnation actions brought by the United States, if the defendant was awarded any judgment in excess of the Government's initial offer.

The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery held hearings on this bill on April 5 and May 7, 1968, and heard representatives of the American Bar Association, various Oregon attorneys, and other interested parties. During the course of these hearings concern was expressed that S. 1351, as introduced, had the potential of stimulating litigation and causing expense to the Government in cases where the ultimate jury award was not substantially greater than the last Government offer. Under these circumstances, even though the Government's offer might be reasonable, an intransigent property owner could resist condemnation, win a jury verdict only a few dollars more than the best Government offer, and, under S. 1351, receive all expenses of litigation.

The main thrust of this legislation is to protect the just compensation provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and to protect a property owner from being forced to accept an unreasonable offer by the Government because of the weight of expenses attached to defending a land condemnation suit. It is not meant to stimulate needless litigation. Consequently, I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, suggested that the Government be liable for reasonable costs and attorneys' fees only when the jury award exceeded by 10 percent the amount offered by the United States prior to suit. Such a provision will assure that this legislation will not stimulate needless litigation but will protect the just compensation of a litigant whose property has been grossly undervalued by the Government. I am pleased that Senator HATFIELD has adopted this 10-percent provision in the bill he introduces today.

This legislation is needed and will correct a serious deficiency in existing law. It will not only better assure the protection of just compensation, but it will encourage the Government to make a fair offer initially in order to avoid the costs of litigation. It will give the property owner an opportunity to secure a more equitable price for his property through negotiation than he would have obtained previously. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon on his introduction of this legislation and look forward to working with him to secure its passage.

S. 1720—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by the initial decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board hearing examiner with respect to standby youth fares. If accepted by the Board, his recommendation to eliminate these fares would have a very detrimental effect on the Nation and on my own State of Hawaii. I believe that such fares provide vast benefits to our youth in terms of education experience and safety; they also strengthen our domestic airline industry.

The hearing examiner has recommended that these reduced rates should be discontinued because they are "unjustly discriminatory." His recommendation to the CAB is understandable in light of a recent circuit court ruling that these fares were unjustly discriminatory under existing law and remanded the case to the CAB for a decision not inconsistent with that court's ruling.

I believe the court interpreted the law under too narrow a construction. I concur with the CAB position in its argument before the circuit court that all factors related to the tariff, such as competition, public welfare, public safety, and airline profit have a bearing on whether this rate is unjustly discriminatory.

Let me review some of the reasons that I feel are important in considering the value of these fares.

One of the major factors the examiner did not emphasize in his initial decision is the "blackout" characteristics of these student fares. The majority of the airlines which offer these reduced rates restrict their use to offpeak hours or days. In other words, the youth fare can be utilized on major airlines only during periods that are unpopular with the general public. They are used to fill up seats that might otherwise remain empty.

The students or young adults who use this plan are subject to restrictions not imposed on the general air traveler. In addition to restrictions on days and time period in which they may travel, they have no assurance that they can get on a plane of their choice or that they will not be "bumped off" by a passenger who has a reserved seat somewhere along the line. I, for one, do not believe that these young people are receiving "substantially equal service," for they are not allowed the primary luxury of travel—the ability to leave or arrive as fits your schedule. It is conceivable that they might wait hours, or even days, before they are allowed to board a plane.

The CAB examiner stated that youth alone is not enough to allow this reduced rate to continue. Under present law, narrowly construed, he may be correct. However, I should like to point out that our country has a history of using arbitrary ages as a qualification for various discounts. All we need to do is look around us to see student rates at hotels, movie theaters, plays, and public transportation systems. We are a society which places a high priority on our youth and I feel that the youth fare is another valuable method of doing so.

Many of the airline representatives who testified before the examiner indicated that the "youth market" is very elastic. They felt that the cost of travel had much more impact on the 12-to-21 age group than it did on the population above that level. The airlines, therefore, conceived this plan which would increase the traffic by our youth and increase the profit of the airline industry.

Mr. Brenner of American Airlines made this statement when queried if there were sound transportation reasons behind the youth fares:

> Well, yes. This goes to the fundamental concept of the youth fare. The youth fare, of course, had one purpose, one main purpose, to provide this—by providing this discount to an elastic market, to generate in our opinion, and we believe it has succeeded, more revenue than it would cost to handle this. The businessman's market is not an elastic market.

Again, in response to a question by the CAB examiner as to why American does not offer a standby fare to all passengers, Mr. Brenner replied:

> The test of a sound promotional policy should rest with the elasticity of the market you are dealing with . . . .

Statistics provided by American Airlines indicate that only 9.4 percent of the youth passengers were on some type of business trip, while over 60 percent of their regular passengers were on a business trip. United and TWA statistics indicated that less than 5 percent of their youth-fare passengers were on business trips. Continental statistics indicate that between 35 and 45 percent of their current youth-fare passengers would not have made the trip by air had the discount not been in effect. These statistics indicate beyond any doubt that the elimination of these fares would severely limit the amount of air travel by our youth. If they did not travel by air, Continental's statistics indicate that over 50 percent of those students would travel by automobile.

When the CAB approved the military standby fares, the Board noted the contention by the Department of Defense that there is a safety factor involved in encouraging many servicemen "who would otherwise travel by automobile over great distances or hitch-hike to their destinations to avoid the risks of the highway by utilizing the military fares." I feel that this contention applies to the youth fares. Any automobile insurance company will affirm the high degree of risk involved in the under-25 age group of drivers. I am sure that anyone who has children of driving age is aware of this fact. It is translated into the cost of our automobile insurance. Therefore, I think that this contention of safety should apply with more vigor in this situation.

I should also like to point out to the Senate that these same hearings indicated the fact that these fares were very profitable to the airline industry. Every airline that kept statistics in this area affirmed that these reduced fares promoted traffic by our youth and brought profit to the industry.

I should now like to address myself to a specific situation—Hawaii. As you know, Hawaii is a State surrounded by water. We are an island community and we are forced, therefore, to travel from island to island by air. It is the only efficient and practical method of travel. Airplanes are our lifeline to the continental United States.

We also have a disadvantage that is prevalent in many small States; we have

XUM

only one university in our State and only several small colleges. Consequently, many of our residents must send their children long distances to mainland colleges. We are separated from the continental United States by 2,500 miles and from the east coast by about 5,000 miles.

This distance places great hardship on the parents of college students in our State. Transportation costs alone are a heavy burden. In this situation, I feel that the elimination of these student fares may make the difference in whether or not a student from Hawaii can afford to attend a mainland college. At the very least, it will prevent many of our students who are away at school on low budgets from returning to their families during vacations.

The student fare is also important to Hawaii for the education of our youth. Since the only method of travel between our islands is by air, our students cannot visit different cities, monuments, or historic places on the various islands without flying. The student fare provides them with an opportunity to visit and learn about areas of our State which they otherwise might not have.

For these reasons, and because I feel so strongly about the necessity of retaining these fares, I introduce today legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger.

My bill would amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1968 to include youth 21 years of age or younger. These exemptions already include airline directors, officers, employees, and members of their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending legal investigations in which the air carrier is interested; persons injured in aircraft accidents; doctors and nurses attending such persons; and ministers of religion under such conditions as the Board may prescribe. I propose to include our youth in this group of persons who are exempted from the statutory rule against unjust discrimination.

I should like to emphasize to my colleagues that my amendment is enabling legislation. The airlines will not be forced to retain these fares if they are not profitable or feasible. It will provide, however, the statutory authority for the CAB to approve youth fares proposed by any of the airlines.

I hope the Senate Commerce Committee will schedule early hearings on youth air fares and report legislation for prompt Senate action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1720) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize certain reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger, introduced by Mr. Fong, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1721—INTRODUCTION OF THE TOBACCO MARKET ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to be known as the Tobacco Market Adjustment Act of 1969. This bill would have the effect of phasing out price supports for tobacco production over a 4-year period, beginning in 1970, and prohibiting use of government funds to advertise or promote this product.

As a legislator, a parent, and a concerned citizen, I find it appalling and totally unacceptable that the Federal Government presently has more than $750 million in loans outstanding from the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of tobacco. Tobacco has been shown, in numerous Government and private studies, to be highly injurious to health. It is known to be a major factor in causing cancer of the throat and lungs. Heavy smokers can expect, on an average to lose 6 minutes of their lives for every cigarette they smoke. The overall effect can be to cut as much as 8 years off the life of an average smoker, and to reduce his productive capacity over a much longer timespan.

Congress has already indicated its deep concern with this problem by requiring a warning to be posted on all packages of cigarettes indicating that the contents may be injurious to health. And various proposals have been made which would prohibit the advertising of cigarettes through the mass media.

Despite these concerns, however, price supports for many different kinds of tobacco continue. And what is more, our Government spends large sums of money to advertise this product in foreign countries.

I am well aware of the contribution which tobacco makes to our economy and to our balance of payments. Some 650,000 families are engaged in the production of this crop. The annual value of this cash crop is roughly $1.3 billion. In addition, tobacco exports, valued at $686 million in 1968, make a significant contribution to our balance of payments.

I am well aware that this legislation will not end the production of tobacco, or to prohibit its sales. Tobacco will still be grown and sold at competitive market prices as long as people insist on its dubious pleasures. But I believe very strongly that Federal tax dollars should not be used to support the price of a product which has been proven by agencies of our own government to be injurious to health.

I believe this is an area in which economies can wisely and well be made, while at the same time helping to improve the health of our people. Surely there are more constructive uses for these hundreds of millions of dollars than continued subsidies for a "nonessential" product which has been proven harmful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed at this point in the Record, and I invite the cosponsorship of my colleagues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1721) to promote the orderly adjustment of tobacco production and marketing, introduced by Mr. Brooke, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Tobacco Market Adjustment Act".

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that medical evidence of the harmful effects of smoking on personal health has been amply developed and analyzed by the Surgeon General of the United States and other qualified authorities;

(2) that the United States Government and the governments of many other nations have published detailed scientific evaluations demonstrating the adverse effects of smoking on health and have undertaken information campaigns to acquaint the public with the hazards associated with the use of tobacco;

(3) that the widespread use of such harmful substances constitutes a danger not only to personal but to public health, in view of the epidemic proportions of illnesses associated with the use of tobacco in our society and of the particularly grave implications of continued habituation of the youth of our country; and

(4) that continued governmental support of tobacco production and marketing is incompatible with the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect the health of American citizens.

Sec. 3. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1970 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco during the 1970 crop year not less than 25 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(2) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1971 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1971 crop year not less than 33⅓ per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(3) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1972 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1972 crop year not less than 50 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(4) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1973 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1973 crop year not less than 75 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(5) Beginning with the 1974 crop, no price support shall be made available under this or any other Act for any crop of tobacco.

"(6) Any acreage withheld from the production of tobacco in any crop year pursuant to the provisions of this section may be devoted, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to the production of crops other than tobacco; and any such acreage so withheld from the production of tobacco in any crop year shall, for the purposes of determining tobacco acreage allotments for any future years, be deemed to have been planted to tobacco in such crop year.

"(7) No Federal funds may be expended on or after July 1, 1970, for the purpose of advertising or promoting the sale or use of any kind of tobacco or tobacco product; and no Federal funds may be expended for the purpose of subsidizing in any way the export of tobacco to any foreign country. The foregoing provision shall in no way affect the export of tobacco for use by members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries.

XUM

"(8) The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this section."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 845) the ammunition redefinition bill. This makes a total of 35 cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 765) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 811) to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as cosponsors of S. 1189, a bill I introduced February 28, 1969, which would improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), I ask unanimous consent that, at their next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 472) to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn under title II of the Social Security Act without suffering deductions, and of the bill (S. 1209) to eliminate in certain cases the requirement that an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for extended medical care services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1223) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1689), the Toy Safety Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 173—RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution calling upon the President to order the immediate deactivation of the men of the 29th Infantry Brigade who were called to active duty in May 1968.

Of the 24,500 men called to active duty at that time, 4,070 men were from the State of Hawaii. The men from Hawaii constituted 17 percent of the total number recalled nationally.

For the size of the State of Hawaii which has a population of less than one-half of 1 percent of the national population, this callup of 17 percent from Hawaii was most unjust and inequitable. It forced upon Hawaii a burden 45 times larger than her just share.

Immediately upon hearing the announcement of the activation of the 29th Brigade I sent a telegram to President Johnson and the Secretary of Defense, urging that the order for the 29th Brigade be canceled. I pointed out that Hawaii was being directed to furnish a much higher number of men, based on population, than any other State in the Union, and also that this large levy on a small State imposed a serious burden on the Honolulu Police Department which lost 40 men in the callup, on Hawaii's building industry, and on many other groups in Hawaii who lost many of their highly trained employees because of this recall.

The initial reason given for calling up so many men from one unit was that they had been trained together to accomplish a specific military mission and should be kept together. They were also needed to fill an emergency need.

Since these men were called to active duty they have been sent to Vietnam individually and in small groups. Immediately upon hearing that the 29th Brigade was being broken up in this manner I again telegramed the Department of the Army urging the deactivation of the 29th Brigade. I pointed out that the men of the 29th were being sent to Vietnam on a piecemeal basis and were being assigned to different units there. Since they were not being utilized together, the reason given for their recall was no longer valid and they should be returned to civilian life.

I regret that the Department of the Army and the Defense Department have not seen fit to correct this grave injustice done to Hawaii.

We in Hawaii are patriotic citizens. We have responded to the utmost in time of war and have compiled one of the most outstanding records of war service. Hawaii suffered disproportionately high fatalities in Korea and in Vietnam. Today, as always, Hawaii's men continue to serve in combat with exemplary courage.

As no affirmative response has been given to our appeals for justice and equity I am compelled to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. Already more than Hawaii's fair share of men called to active duty last May have been assigned to duty in Vietnam.

I urge that the Senate do justice and equity to Hawaii by seeking correction of the disproportionate number of Hawaii Army reservists and national guardsmen called to active duty last year.

The reasons given for their recall that they were trained together and should be kept together in service and that they were needed in an emergency are no longer valid as they have been sent to Vietnam on a piecemeal basis and the emergency in manpower shortage does not now exist.

I urge the Senate Armed Services Committee to take quick favorable action on this resolution conveying to the President that it is the sense of the Senate that justice and equity be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 173), which

XUM

reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. Res. 173

Resolved, That the President is hereby urged and requested to release immediately from active duty members of the 29th Infantry Brigade, United States Army, who were ordered to active duty as an emergency measure in May of 1968.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 91–8

Mr. **FULBRIGHT** submitted an amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. Fulbright, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 11, THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL ACT OF 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations will hold 1 additional day of hearings on S. 11, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1969, on April 1.

It is the purpose of S. 11 to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation and the administration of grant-in-aid programs; to extend State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds; to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration; to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees; to provide grants to State and local governments for training their employees; to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities; and to facilitate the interchange of Federal, State and local personnel.

S. 11 embodies, with some modifications, the provisions of S. 699, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1967, which was passed by the Senate on November 7, 1967, and is based on investigations made by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations over the past 3 years, and on many suggestions offered by witnesses in hearings held on S. 699 and other legislation.

The hearings will be held in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. Previous hearings on this legislation were held March 24, 25, and 26.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, the establishment of a workable relationship with the government of mainland China is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today. The facts are that from late 1965 to this good hour I have advocated that the United States follow the example of Mexico, the United Kingdom, France, and other nations, and recognize the Government of Communist China, instead of relying on Hong Kong as a listening post and observatory into the vast area of mainland China with its population of one-quarter of the inhabitants of the entire world. Following recognition, we should invite that nation to open an embassy in Washington and we then open and maintain an Embassy in Peking. The time for such diplomatic exchange is long past due.

On April 20, 1966, I spoke in the Senate, as recorded in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 7, page 8644, urging that our Government recognize the Government of Communist China.

Nations, like individuals, should not ignore the facts of life. Recognition of one nation by another never means approval of the ruling regime of that country. For example, early in the first term of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt the United States recognized the Government of the Soviet Union. It was stated at that time and well understood that our recognition of the Soviet Government would not imply any approval of the political structure of that nation. Our acknowledgement by official action that the Peking government exists and has been for many years the government of China is only a matter of stating the obvious. It does not imply our approval of that regime any more than our recognition of the Soviet Union, Spain, Greece, or any one of a number of nations ruled by Communist or Fascist dictatorships or military juntas indicates our approval of these regimes or their ideological bases.

Our embassy in the Soviet Union provided a valuable listening post and furnished us with much information during the Stalin regime when Russia was a closed society. Yet there were, and are, rightwing extremists who all along denounced our recognition of the Soviet Union. We are, and have been over recent years, greatly handicapped in acquiring information about, and in dealing with, Communist China, being dependent upon our consul general in Hong Kong for intelligence reports.

With Red China exploding crude nuclear weapons and engaging in serious border fighting with the Soviet Union along their 6,500-mile common border, a U.S. Embassy in Red China would undoubtedly be of great value to us. If the administration is seriously interested in normalizing relations with China, it should take steps toward entering into meaningful diplomatic and economic relations with the Peking government. Should the arrogant Communist dictators of China rebuff that effort, their refusal would result in a propaganda victory for the United States.

The Peking government has been the duly constituted and permanent government of mainland China for 20 years. It has governing authority over some 750 million men, women, and children—nearly one-fourth of the world's population. Red China unquestionably exists and just as unquestionably it will exist, immensely more powerful, 5 years from now. In spite of this fact, we continue to pretend that Red China is not there and that perchance some miracle will happen to solve this perplexing problem.

Furthermore, it is folly to believe that mainland China is ever going to be conquered by Chiang Kai-shek's little army of many generals and no combat experience, in virtual exile on Formosa, protected by our airpower and 7th Fleet. We have for 19 years been supporting that corrupt and boastful old warlord, Chiang Kai-shek. When he was driven from the Chinese mainland in the civil war, he sought a haven in Formosa for himself and his beaten army. Almost immediately his army massacred some 17,000 unarmed people. With our help he then established himself in power. His government is a puppet government of the United States.

Despite the boasts in the mid-1950's of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and those in the China lobby about unleashing Chiang-Kai-shek to reconquer the mainland, it has been and is our 7th Fleet and airpower and more than $10 billion of American taxpayers' money that has maintained this Nationalist Chinese Government, so-called, on the island of Taiwan. Ardent supporters of Chiang Kai-shek remind one of Mississippi extremists who are still waving the Confederate flag a century after the Civil War ended. Chiang is a tiger without any teeth. He has an over-age army of 600,000 at Taiwan. Over the years he has boasted of invading the Chinese mainland. This, of course, with the proviso, and he does not mention this, that the United States furnish all-out support from our Air Force and 7th Fleet, and that our warships and warplanes protect the convoy of American transports necessary to transport this invasion force. The time is long past due that we should withdraw all support from Chiang Kai-shek and cease pretending that the small island he dominates is a nation deserving of our support and of any prominence whatsoever in the United Nations. It is true that he has an army of 600,000 which is capable of parading in competition with the Shriners and would probably be about as good in combat.

Chiang Kai-shek has been making the empty boasts for years of his intent to invade the Chinese mainland. He is a braggart and a faker and it is high time our State Department officials stop catering to him.

I advocate that the United States should withdraw immediately all our soldiers in Taiwan serving as military advisers. I urge that without delay we open negotiations with Communist China and that Chang Kai-shek be denied any further support from us, not only as far as Asia is concerned but in the United Nations. It is fakery that this corrupt warlord with his little island, where Madam Chiang has taken over the ownership of the Grand Hotel and most of the worthwhile real estate, should be regarded as a nation worthy of a seat in the General Assembly.

Leaders of Communist China have in the past expressed disinterest in joining the United Nations. However, the United States should urge the chiefs of state of those nations which have heretofore recognized Red China and are presently enjoying lucrative trade with that huge nation to join with us in offering a place in the United Nations to this huge na-

XUM

tion which we have been so myopic as to disregard altogether or treat as an outlaw.

Ambassador Edwin Reischauer, former Ambassador to Japan and one of our great Asiatic experts, has been proposing for some years that our Government accord recognition to Communist China and sponsor its admission to the United Nations.

Of course this corrupt warlord, Chiang Kai-shek, who has been subsidized over the years by our taxpayers, will cry out in rage against our recognition of Red China; against reopening trade channels with Red China; against any attempt whatever by the United States to improve relations with the Peking government. In 1959 I was in Taiwan, and after listening to the bombastic statements of Chiang Kai-shek and questioning him, Madam Chiang interjected herself, ranting about the imminent invasion of mainland China by Chiang's forces. She disregarded the fact that except for our airpower and 7th Fleet and our taxpayers' money, the Red Chinese would have crushed the forces of Chiang Kai-shek long before then, and very likely she and Chiang would have been residing in the United States at that time.

Mr. President, of course, any change in our China policy should recognize the right of self-determination for the people of Taiwan, including safeguards for all minorities. A solution for the future status of Taiwan, the Pescadores, and the offshore islands should be sought within the framework of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, since 1950 the United States and the Government of mainland China have adopted policies which stand like a great wall between the two nations preventing all normal contacts. We do not speak to one another, except occasionally at the ambassadorial level at Warsaw. In the meantime, the world moves on and there are tremendous changes everywhere.

Mr. President, a mature society, like a mature man, faces its problems squarely. It does not bury its head in the sand and dream that its problems will disappear when it lifts its head. Such fantasy fools no one, and all the while precious time is lost that could be devoted to solving these problems.

There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the Red Chinese dictators. They are arrogant, hostile, and apparently devoid of mercy or desire for cooperation. They are violent Communists in the Stalin pattern. Time and time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western World, including czarist Russia, that oppressed China during the 18th, 19th, and around the turn of the 20th century. The European powers in particular humiliated the Chinese and helped themselves by merciless military action to vast parcels of Chinese territory, often under the guise of 99-year leases. Recent border clashes between Soviet and Chinese troops stem directly from border disputes arising from that period of colonialism.

China, with her 750 million disciplined, hard-working and dedicated people will be incapable for many years of developing the weapons necessary to challenge our security. Mao Tse-tung has stated his nation needs 30 years of peace and development. Nonetheless, it is the most powerful nation in Asia. Notwithstanding occasional economic setbacks, China is a formidable fighting opponent for any nation. We should face reality. As her industrial economy advances, more and more nations will expand trading relations with her.

In spite of occasional serious reverses, due in large part by drought, her agricultural economy is progressing and all reports indicate that she has managed to overcome widespread starvation, heretofore so common in China and India and other hugely populated countries in the Far East in times of crop failure and other national disasters. Illiteracy in China will soon be a thing of the past. Education, however biased, is progressing at an unprecedented rate.

The reality of China of 1969 is that, having survived the fires of adversity, it is an awakened giant that for better or worse will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which we and our children's children will be living.

National interests can be accommodated when the will to reconcile them exists on both sides. By and large, the United States and the Soviet Union have learned after more than 20 years of the cold war that their conflicts must be reconciled peacefully in this nuclear age. We should apply the lessons of the past to our future with China. It will be a National tragedy if we continue this period of conflict with that nation—a period in which vast amounts of our Nation's energies are devoted to military power at the expense of our social and cultural development. We have many times over the military force necessary to defend ourselves. We would do better to use our energies to help free people everywhere create a way of life that would lead them to utterly reject the lure of communism.

The facts are that from a military standpoint Red China today is a paper dragon if and when the ability to wage a prolonged offensive war on land, at sea, and in the air is considered. It is overrated as a great military power. It has crude nuclear capability, that is true. However, it will take at least 5 or 10 years before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo boats and gunboats—no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85 percent of its population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air over the Pacific, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet, and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Furthermore, there is certainly no inevitability of a war between us and China. We live in such different political and economic environments that like land and sea animals, we hardly meet. We have no real reason to tangle with each other.

Just as we have learned at great cost and hazard to live at peace with the Soviet Union, we should make up our minds to accept Red China's existence, to respect her legitimate interests, and to meet her challenge other than by military containment. Let us hope that we will do so before another 20 years of the cold war and the arms race elapse.

Mr. President, there is no assurance nor certainty that were we to recognize Red China the attitude of its leaders toward us would become any less intransigent or more cooperative than at present. However, it seems highly advisable that we face up to the problem of recognition if we hope to restrain the expansion of Red China without war and if we are to have a direct assessment and judgment of Chinese interests and intentions, so vital in this grim period of international anarchy.

In addition to recognition, there are other steps that we can take to help reduce tensions between our Nation and the people of mainland China. We should unilaterally take steps in the direction of free travel between the United States and mainland China. We should explore the possibilities for cultural and student exchanges. We should show our concern for the well-being of the people of China by examining areas of technical cooperation such as exchange of information on food production, family planning, irrigation and water development.

We should permit the sale to Communist China of food and other nonstrategic items through commercial channels as do many other nations of the free world. Our allies, including neighbors such as Canada, are prospering by their trade with that country for which the Chinese are paying in gold at the world price. The Canadian Government has sold almost $1 billion worth of Canadian wheat for gold, cash on the barrelhead, to Red China. Australia has sold Communist China more than $500 million worth of wheat.

Very definitely, American producers and manufacturers should be permitted to sell to Red China at world prices whatever the nationals of that nation may wear, eat, drink, or smoke, and in turn, buy the products and handicrafts of the Chinese. We have farmers and industrialists who would like to sell their surplus products in the markets of the world. Obviously, this also would be a step toward world peace. Nations, like individuals, are unlikely to fight with their customers.

Every effort must be made to involve the Red Chinese Government in international negotiations regarding such issues such as disarmament, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the limited nuclear test ban. The cooperation of a nation numbering one-fourth of the inhabitants of the globe is absolutely vital to the establishment of workable disarmament agreements. Toward that end, it is imperative that Red China join the community of nations and be admitted to the United Nations.

The United Nations is not an honor society, membership in which is a reward for "being good." It appears sometimes to be a debating society. If so, a forum where representatives of nations keep talking rather than start bombing has a definite advantage. As matters now

XUM

stand China, with her many millions who solidly support their government, is excluded. Being outside the U.N., Red China is not constrained to keep its actions in harmony with any web of collective agreements. It can keep on ignoring, insulting, and defying world opinion.

The absence of Peking has been a critical element blocking effective U.N. consideration of the Vietnam problem and other Asian security issues. Absence from the U.N. leaves China out of arms-control agreements on nuclear weapons that have been arrived at and are now being negotiated.

Our decision years ago not to accord diplomatic recognition to the Red Chinese was based in part on the belief that failure to do so would somehow inhibit the success of that regime. Actually, the reverse has proven to be the case. Our refusal to recognize China and our attempt to exclude it from the world community has relieved it from the responsibilities of United Nations participation, has deepened our ignorance of Chinese internal development, and has allowed Red China's nuclear weapons capacity to emerge unchallenged and unfettered by international obligations. It has allowed us to become a convenient hate symbol in a period of dynamic Chinese growth and development. It has impaired the United Nations' ability to deal effectively with problems affecting world peace.

Mr. President, there is nothing to indicate that recognition at this time would either change Red China's attitude toward the United States or her dedication to the promotion of world revolution and the ultimate destruction of the capitalistic system. However, time is a great healer. There should be a basic rethinking by our citizens, the Congress, and among officials of the executive branch of our Government regarding Asia in general, and China in particular.

Any attempt to reach an understanding for peaceful coexistence with the Peking regime will demand great patience, understanding, good will and a readiness to enter into honorable compromises. Both sides must be willing to take a hard look at the charges hurled at each other over the years in an effort to understand and clarify the issues dividing them. I urge that a proper policy for our country would be to offer the olive branch of coexistence and peace in the future to China. The time has past when this Nation could afford to adhere to that rigid idea that it is unthinkable to permit the very thought of recognition of Communist China or of its admission into the United Nations. China has a great history, tradition, and culture going back thousands of years. Nevertheless, by reason of technological superiority and weapons of war, the European nations throughout the 19th century seized vast areas of China, oppressed the Chinese, contemptuously regarded them as inferior and humiliated them. For example, England fought a war and killed many Chinese in the 1840's because the Chinese governing authorities tried to suppress opium traffic which was extremely lucrative to English merchants. This is known to the shame of the British as the opium war. It resulted in the seizure of the island of Hong Kong and other areas that had been Chinese for thousands of years.

In speaking out for diplomatic recognition of China, I recognize the facts of international life. In fact, I speak today for the generation of Americans who did not participate in framing our present Chinese policy. We all condemn the outrageous actions and aggressions of Chinese Communist leaders, but here is a de facto government stronger than ever before. We would do well to consider actions that would encourage more responsible behavior rather than to seek to crush a people as the British Empire did in the opium war.

Mr. President, I make these remarks today because I am thinking of tomorrow and of many tomorrows. I am thinking of generations of Americans yet to come. In fact, I am thinking of my four granddaughters and of other children and grandchildren of today who in a comparatively few years will become the guardians, keepers, and trustees of this Nation. We want them to have a nation that is the last best hope for permanent peace in this world, a nation not only supreme in power but one that is solvent whose citizens, fully protected in all their civil rights and civil liberties, enjoy contentment and comfort in a peaceful world free from hardship, aggression, and the sorrows of war. I am thinking of our great Nation in a peaceful world. Let us strive to do our utmost that future generations in our United States of America may live in peace and happiness in a peaceful world instead of in fear and terror and then eye hath not witnessed nor finite mind conceived the future grandeur, glory, contentment, and happiness of our people.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING IN VIENNA, AUSTRIA—APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the provisions of Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, appoints the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting, to be held at Vienna, Austria, on April 7 to 13, 1969.

THE NINTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in accordance with Public Law 86–420, appoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) to attend the Ninth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, to be held in Mexico on April 2–8, 1969 to replace Senators BAYH and MURPHY, who are unable to attend.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77–250, appoints the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures vice Senator ALLOTT, resigned.

XXX—GENOCIDE CONVENTION: MORE IMPORTANT THAN FISH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is a unique body. Only the Senate can approve certain executive appointments, and only the Senate can ratify treaties made with other countries. This is a very important power—it gives this body the opportunity to work with the President to map out general foreign policy for the Nation. Over the years, the Senate has unreservedly exercised this power, forming hundreds of official agreements with other countries.

Since the Genocide Convention was introduced to the Senate by President Truman in 1949, the Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings on over 100 treaties. Also during this time, the Senate has given its advice and consent to more than 100 treaties.

A random sampling of some of these treaties can only raise serious doubt as to their historical and practical importance. We have a Tuna Convention with Costa Rica, a Halibut Convention with Canada, a Shrimp Convention with Cuba, and, of course, we cannot forget the "Pink Salmon Protocol." It took a treaty to build a bridge across the Rainy River, and another to allow licensed American drivers to drive on European highways. To expedite the importation of advertising samples, we have the Commercial Samples Convention. Our national security is guaranteed by our treaties of amity with Muscat and Oman.

It is not my intention to suggest that any of these treaties should not have been ratified by the Senate. I am certain that they are all in the national interest and necessary to us.

But each of these treaties is very limited in scope. In every case, they promote either profit or pleasure. Mr. President, I fail to see why a treaty to save wild geese should be given precedence over a treaty to save human beings.

The Genocide Convention was drawn up neither for pleasure nor for profit. It was adopted by the United Nations in order to guarantee the life, the rights, and the dignity of man. Therefore, Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to look beyond the screens of obstruction to perceive its obligation to mankind.

Let us now ratify the Genocide Convention.

After 20 years, after three Presidents of the United States during that period have warmly recommended the Genocide Convention, it is time for the Senate to act to ratify it.

THE APOLLO 8 MISSION—THREE BRAVE MEN

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on December 27, the world watched as our three astronauts splashed down in the Pacific after their historic flight around the moon. Since the Apollo 8 mission, much has been written about this magnificent feat in space exploration.

A letter to the "three brave men" which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin expresses very simply but with great feeling the significance of this mission for all Americans.

I wish to share with Senators this tribute to our three astronauts who have realized our dreams. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO THREE BRAVE MEN

(By Jim Becker)

GENTLEMEN: You have done a brave thing. An amazing thing. A thing that boggles the mind.

You have flown to the moon. And you have flown back again.

A journey to the moon! It stuns us to read those words, displayed on the front page of a newspaper as routinely as the holiday traffic toll or the latest peace talk snarl.

You are going to hear today and on many days to come many things about your brave journey. All of what you hear will be sincere, and some of it may even be eloquent.

You are going to hear about how you have lifted the horizons and taken a giant scientific step and raised the dawn of a new era. All of that will be true.

But would you like to hear about how you have made some of your fellow earthlings feel?

Those of us who frankly don't understand very much about giant scientific steps and who aren't sure how it is possible to put a big space ship with three men inside into an orbit or send it whirling around at 25,000 miles an hour without even a motor running.

And never will understand it, for that matter, despite all the well-meaning efforts to explain it to us?

Would you like to know what you have done for us?

Well, gentlemen, we live in times that try men's souls and their nerves and even their will to get up and go out and face the daily traffic jam and the weekly wipeout and the monthly mugging at the hands of fate's fickle fist.

It is a tough world, gentlemen, as you know, and the only light a man sees at the end of most tunnels is liable to come from an explosion of some kind or other.

It is a world in which the neighbor you are supposed to love—and would really like to, sometimes, when you think of it—is liable to blow his car horn at you or cut you off at the intersection, or play his radio in your ear or grab your parking place before you even get a chance to love him.

It is a world in which some people would rather burn our cities down than live in them, and in which the easiest thing is to sit around and blame "them" for everything.

And when you battle that often, your spirits sag and your sights get lower and even to think of flying to a world you know not of, as Hamlet said, is enough to paralyze the will, and lose the name of action.

And soon you wonder if all is paralyzed, and no one will gain the name of action.

And then you three came along, men who dare to dream and to fly to those worlds one knows not of, with the name of action written clear.

And we think back to a fellow named Shepard, sitting alone, completely alone—in the tip of that fantastic rocket on the Florida launching pad, seven years ago, waiting to be shot off into a world he knew not of.

And a fellow named Glenn, who was cast into an orbit around the earth, and, circled it, unparalyzed, in action.

(Yes, and of the Russians, too, Gagarin, wasn't it?, and Titov, they were men who dared to dream. Brave men. Human beings.)

There have been these brave men before you, some now dead for their bravery, and bravery is not a commodity you can measure on a chart.

Some men are brave who only serve at Sears, and put clothes on their kids and umpire at the Little League.

But there are none so brave as those who fly to worlds they know not of, as those who do not lose the name of action.

And because you have done it, because you three had that kind of bravery, those of us who have more mundane struggles to face in a world we know well of, are helped to find the name of action, too.

And because you three are our countrymen, sons of our soil, we are helped to find that action in the land we know of.

And the first Good Earth you touched after your journey to the moon was our earth, Hawaii's earth.

You are welcome to it, men from the moon. You have made it a little easier to struggle along upon it.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK: FOCUS ON POSITIVE ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the period of time between March 23 and March 29 has been set aside to observe National Future Homemakers of America Week and its theme, "Focus on Positive Action." Some 600,000 members of 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico are at this moment engaged in service projects, and in activities to promote good will and the principles of positive citizenship.

My home State of Wisconsin is fortunate to have the national vice president of the central region, Marilyn Drew of Rice Lake. This central region has 175,000 FHA members in 13 States. Miss Drew attends Rice Lake High School, where she is the editor of the school paper and a member of the student council, the National Honor Society, and the forensics squad. The State's own 15,000 members are led by Beth Monson of Hammond, Wis., president of the Wisconsin State FHA Association, and Mrs. Esther Brown of Madison, Wis., State FHA adviser.

As Estelle Hunter, national president of the FHA, so aptly put it:

> The overall objective of Future Homemakers of America is to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living. . . . During this week FHA members across the country will stress constructive activities.

These members assist in local Headstart programs, help the mentally retarded and the handicapped, organize tutorial programs for underprivileged children, visit the elderly, assist in the March of Dimes, serve as hospital candy stripers, and carry out many other projects which give practical application to their classroom learning.

Founded as a nonprofit organization in 1945, the FHA has served more than 12 million high school youth. The members themselves have always set their own goals and planned their own activities and projects, developing the opportunity for leadership and creativity. It is an organization, according to one member "in which common interests in home economics values are realized, friends are made, and family bonds are strengthened."

Mr. President, in an age when we hear in the news only about the young people participating in riots, illegal protests, and other forms of rebellion, it is comforting to find that these dissenters are but a small minority of the total youth population. The 600,000 teenagers of the FHA do not get into trouble with the law—they are too busy organizing worthwhile projects with constructive results. And while the hippies, the yippies, and the malcontents may continue to burn American flags, they will never eclipse the good citizenship and positive action of the responsible majority in such organizations as the Future Homemakers of America.

THE SCOURGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was scheduled to deliver a speech before the Women's National Democratic Club this noon, but was unable to appear because he was called away from Washington by the death of his mother.

I know that all of Senator CRANSTON's colleagues join me in expressing our sorrow at his loss.

Mr. President, the remarks which Senator CRANSTON was to deliver today are so timely that I have requested his permission to place them in the RECORD. I particularly call the attention of this body to a sentiment which I share completely:

> I find unacceptable the notion that there is any such thing as an acceptable increase in unemployment. Acceptable to whom? I want to know! And callous, total indifference to how many millions of men and women may be unemployed is, of course, an even worse attitude.

The Senator goes on to say of the relationship between unemployment and inflation:

> That is the bitter paradox: those who already suffer the most from inflation will be the same people who will suffer most from efforts to curb inflation. . . . Unemployment is not a private inconvenience to be kept at acceptable levels. It is a national scourge to be wiped out altogether.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRANSTON's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON BEFORE THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 27, 1969

A not-so-funny thing happened to the Nixon administration on its way to developing a program to fight inflation.

It seems to have been stopped by some long-standing hang-ups. Because it is understandably up-tight over using the power and the money of the federal government in ways that might drastically increase unemployment, it doesn't appear even to be thinking about steps it might take to reduce unemployment. And that is less understandable.

No one is sure that the anti-inflation steps the administration is contemplating—"tight" money and a so-called "tight" budget with continued high taxes and increasingly higher interest rates—will, in fact, curb inflation.

I've heard some top administration officials privately express serious doubts about their effectiveness. And publicly, some economists, like Leon Keyserling, think restricting the flow of money actually causes inflation instead of stopping it.

But there is one thing of which nearly everyone, in or out of the administration, does seem certain: that conventional anti-inflationary measures will increase unemployment.

Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the Economic Council, tells Congress he wishes prices could be stabilized without any affect at all on unemployment, but he doesn't believe it can be done without a substantial increase in joblessness.

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy says that to cool off the economy, a one percent increase in unemployment "would not be too much".

Counselor to the President Arthur F. Burns says unemployment, now at an all-time low of 3.3 percent, may have to rise to 3.5 percent or more. Even with 4.5 percent of our work force out of jobs, Mr. Burns says, he would still consider us to be in an economy of "full employment."

And the Business Council, made up mostly of leaders of large corporations sympathetic to President Nixon, declares that steps taken to curb inflation might have to push the unemployment rate up to 5.5 or perhaps a full 6 percent—double the present number.

For very good reasons, political and humanitarian, the administration has been frightened off by the prospect. And rather than bring about an abrupt, high rise in unemployment by an all-out assault against high prices, the administration talks about taking a cautious approach which, it hopes, will keep unemployment down to something the President calls an "acceptable" level.

Meanwhile, however, prices and wages continue surging upward on all fronts. The latest sorry bulletin just came from Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney, who disclosed skyrocketing prices for the lumber we so desperately need to meet our critical housing shortages.

Softwood lumber prices have gone up 30 percent since last year, Secretary Romney noted, with plywood prices soaring a startling 77 percent!

Protests are mounting not only from labor and consumer groups, but from businessmen as well. Particularly those who by temperament would have no truck with gradualism.

Some members of the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, scorn the pussy-footing pusillanimity of the President's advisers. The NAM's chief economist, George G. Hagedorn, wants Mr. Nixon to plow right in and slash federal spending, with "no time to lose."

As for the increased unemployment such a rash and thoughtless move would bring: Forget it! Full employment, says Mr. Hagedorn, is a "myth" anyway, so why get strung-out on such nonsense?

Besides, a substantial labor pool of unemployed workers is still deemed desirable by a few economists who continue to cling to a vestigial brand of conscienceless capitalism that is long gone but, unfortunately, not forgotten.

Actually, there will always be a labor pool—unless the pill cuts the birth rate to zero and unless the march of science and technology suddenly stops putting so many jobs out of style.

There would even be new sources of labor if we could extricate ourselves from Vietnam. Or end the arms race.

I reject all approaches—Mr. Hagedorn's and everybody else's—that are based upon the notion that any level of unemployment is proper.

I find unacceptable the notion that there is any such thing as an acceptable increase in unemployment. Acceptable to whom? I want to know! And callous, total indifference to how many millions of men and women may be unemployed is, of course, an even worse attitude.

Mr. Hagedorn told the Joint Economic Committee that trying to stop inflation gradually, as the Nixon administration is trying to do, is "like saying if you pull a tooth gradually it will hurt you less".

As an economist, Mr. Hagedorn would make a good dentist. Maybe. What he said about dental extractions may or may not be correct. I don't know.

But nobody's talking about puling teeth; we're talking about throwing men out of work, of cutting off families from their life-sustaining source of income.

Any man who has ever been out of work or has compassion enough to imagine how it might feel to be thrown out of work, would be able to explain to Mr. Hagedorn the obvious: that the longer your job lasts, and the less the cut in income you ultimately have to take, the better.

Still on his irrelevant dentistry kick, Mr. Hagedorn also warned the Congress that there is no painless way to fight inflation. But he never made clear, nor did he show much concern over, whom he expects to bear the pain.

Those unemployment percentages Mr. Hagedorn and others throw about so easily represent people, thousands, even millions, of people. Take those percentages and transpose them into human beings, and what do you get?

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz concedes that the administration's anti-inflation program could cause an increase of 300,000 to 500,000 jobless by the end of this year. The AFL–CIO thinks the number of lay-offs will be closer to 780,000. A Wall Street Journal article suggests it could be 1,000,000.

They would come in addition to the 2,600000 Americans already listed among the ranks of the unemployed and the countless numbers of the under-employed who, as Senator Walter F. Mondale has pointed out, "live in pockets of poverty in the midst of unprecedented plenty".

Who are these unhappy Americans, these fellow citizens of ours who are either already unemployed or are likely to lose their precarious hold on their jobs if work becomes more scarce?

We all know who they are. They are those among us who traditionally are the last to be hired when times are good and the first to be fired when things get tough. They are the unskilled and semi-skilled workers, especially, but by no means entirely, those from minority groups; women, working part-time to help support their families; elderly persons, doing odd jobs to make ends meet on pensions suffering from steadily diminishing purchasing power.

Those who are working now have proved they do not fit the stereotypes held by some affluent Americans. They have disproved the theory that they are shiftless, idle loafers who prefer welfare to work.

But though today they have jobs, tomorrow they may be out in the streets—not because of their own failure, but because of their government's anti-inflation moves.

And many who are not working now don't fit the free-loader stereotype either: youngsters who have just graduated from high school, adults who have just completed job-training courses, servicemen who have just returned from fighting in Vietnam.

A large number of them are finding we have no room for them in our economy.

Tragically and predominantly, our unhappy Americans are teenagers and blacks, whose unemployment rate already is two and three times higher than the national average. In some critical urban areas, between 30 and 40 percent of the teenagers and blacks are right now skulking the streets out of work.

The people who will be hit hardest by deflationary attempts to cool down the economy are, in a word, the very people for whom the so-called overheated economy isn't so hot to begin with; people without capital reserves who can least afford to be without an income; people who, because of a fixed and limited income—or no steady income at all—are already being mauled by the soaring cost of living.

That is the bitter paradox: those who already suffer the most from inflation will be the same people who will suffer most from efforts to curb inflation.

That is, unless we show enough imagination and creativity to keep it from happening.

Unemployment is not a private inconvenience to be kept at acceptable levels. It is a national scourge to be wiped out altogether.

I believe that every man and woman willing to work and physically and mentally able to work is entitled to work. I believe that every American who wants productive, gainful employment has a right to productive, gainful employment.

And if, at any moment and for any reason, private industry is not able to provide full employment for our people, then I believe the government has the responsibility to step into the gap as the employer or investor of last resort.

That is especially true, it seems to me, if people lose their jobs in private industry because of deliberate governmental action. Like slowing down our economic growth in order to protect the stability of the dollar.

Let us pause and think this through carefully.

Isn't it unwise, improper and utterly unjust for our government to act to protect the value of some people's dollars—and then do nothing when, as a consequence, other people are deprived of their dollars altogether?

I simply cannot accept the view that the government can stand idly by while our lowest and most vulnerable wage earners pay for the cost of our economic stability with their livelihoods.

It is particularly outrageous for us even to contemplate letting that happen in view of the fact that our so-called anti-inflationary measures are still in their experimental stage: though we know they will cause unemployment, we do not know that they will really cure inflation.

If the national interest demands a policy that puts people out of work, however unintentionally and however temporarily, then the nation owes a special responsibility to those people. If private industry cannot give them employment, the government must.

No measure that will cause a rise in unemployment is acceptable, in my view, unless it is offset by a positive, constructive program to eliminate that unemployment. I believe the President has a responsibility, and I believe we in Congress have a responsibility, to formulate such a program.

I suggest we look into new ways by which the government can create meaningful jobs to absorb the unemployed. More than that, we must explore, more imaginatively than we have in the past, ways by which the government can stimulate new jobs in private industry and the proper training of workers to fill those jobs.

XUM

The new administration's plans for tax incentives to business for those purposes may well prove to be part of the answer to the problem. They cannot, however, be the whole answer.

Crying out to us at this time, for example, is the urgency to begin now to plan and program industrial conversion to a peacetime economy. That means manpower conversion as well.

We must find better ways to teach our young men and women how to live and earn a living in our speedily changing, computer-directed society. We need to develop more effective methods of retraining our older workers whose skills, if any, have been rendered obsolete by our never-exhausted technological ingenuity.

Already, in two of our oldest industries—construction and farming—labor-saving machines and time-saving techniques have radically changed the nature of our manpower needs, thus creating all sorts of new problems. But changes of comparable magnitude have not taken place in our thinking about how to go about solving those problems.

I am convinced that the social harm that unadjusted unemployment will surely bring will more than offset whatever benefits we may derive from an artificially imposed economic slowdown.

More crime and more riots are only the more obvious, notorious and violent manifestations of the social ills that will inevitably occur if we don't take preventive measures.

We need a program that will create jobs and tool-up workers for those jobs.

Without such a work-creating, job-filling program, we will always be timid in tackling inflation for we will always be held back by the spectre of unrestrained unemployment. We will take half-measures that will only half-halt inflation if indeed they halt it at all.

And there, finally, is unearthed the essence of a very sensible message that had been hiding all along behind Mr. Hagedorn's extravagant stance. It is a message the administration might well heed.

The President irks the NAM because he hesitates to take more aggressive measures to counter inflation for fear of bringing about a severe upturn in unemployment. For his compassion, I commend him.

But would not the President feel free to deal more forcefully with inflation if he knew that he had at his command a program by which he could eliminate unemployment almost as rapidly as it occurs?

I believe he would, I believe the country would be better for it. And I believe we can do no less.

What I have suggested will inevitably raise the question: If we guarantee every able-bodied American a job, won't that keep too much money in circulation and hence nullify the effects of whatever anti-inflation measures the government takes?

The answer is: No.

Unemployment is not the real aim of anti-inflationary moves, it is only an unintentional by-product. The additional money full employment would put into circulation might partially diminish the effects of anti-inflationary steps. But the alternative—increased unemployment compensation and welfare payments—would have the same general effect, and would be more costly.

On the other hand, aggressive anti-inflation measures, which a full-employment policy would at long last permit, would—hopefully—make a substantial contribution toward stabilizing our dollars.

I was discussing this the other day with a friend who is involved in compensatory education programs for under-privileged children out in California. Here's what he said:

"The greatest thing about keeping an able-bodied man out of the ranks of the unemployed and off welfare isn't what it does for that man's self-esteem. It's what it does for his kids."

He told me he's watched child after child "goof off, get into trouble and drop out while their fathers were idle. But when their fathers landed jobs—and held those jobs—they start to stand up straighter and look at their parents, and themselves, with new respect."

My friend concluded by saying he's noticed that these same youngsters start studying seriously "and begin feeling new hope and confidence in their futures".

That about sums up what for me is probably the best reason for pursuing—and achieving—full employment.

Certainly we have learned enough through job-training programs to know that a great many Americans, who were once written off as unemployable, are perfectly capable of standing on their own feet and earning their own living. If only we help them get started.

Let us set to the task of guaranteeing a job for every able-bodied American.

The result will be good not only for the men and women of today, it will be good for the men and women of tomorrow; it will be good not only for our dollars, it will be good for our souls.

SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, additional editorials in praise of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL have been published in a number of Georgia newspapers. They express their hope, and indeed the hopes of all Georgians, for his full, speedy recovery from the tumor on his lung that he announced last week.

I bring these editorials to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Athens (Ga.) Daily News, Mar. 22, 1969]

BEST WISHES, SENATOR

Georgians and most of their counterparts throughout the country felt a sense of grief Thursday in hearing of the illness of U.S. Senator Richard B. Russell.

With the same dogged determination he has demonstrated in numerous battles in the Senate, Mr. Russell announced the illness himself and went to great length to explain the treatment he will begin undergoing for the lung tumor. Many people were as stunned by his straightforward announcement as by the illness itself.

All Georgians should be proud that a man of Richard Russell's stature serves this state in the federal government. Many times over, the state has been all the better and richer because of his representation in Washington.

The senior senator has indicated he will continue to serve at least through his present term. This statement in itself is gratifying.

We sincerely express to Senator Russell our heartfelt wishes for successful treatment and for the strength to recover.

All of Georgia will be thinking of him and wishing him well in the coming weeks and months.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Mar. 22, 1969]

OUR PRAYERS WITH RUSSELL

It goes without saying, of course, that we read with deep regret the news that Sen. Richard Russell has cancer.

During the past few years his health has indeed been a serious problem. But despite the great discomfort emphysema has caused him, he has performed his substantial duties amazingly well.

The senator will immediately start cobalt treatments which we pray will be effective. Great strides have been made in the area of nuclear medicine in recent years. And Columbus itself is blessed with one of the most modern nuclear medicine facilities at the Medical Center.

We wish the senior senator, who has served his state and nation so well for so long, Godspeed and every hope for a full recovery.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, Mar. 22, 1969]

GEORGIANS JOIN IN HOPE FOR RUSSELL'S RECOVERY

Georgians of all political viewpoints are saddened by the announcement of the serious illness of Sen. Richard B. Russell, widely regarded as the most influential member of the United States Congress.

The Russell announcement has triggered considerable speculation as to what moves Georgia politicians may make if the state's senior U.S. senator is forced to retire before his term expires in January 1973.

Any conjectures must include the name of Gov. Lester Maddox, who might in a "gentleman's agreement" with Lt. Gov. George T. Smith resign and be appointed to the Senate for the unexpired term. There is nothing novel about such procedure when vacancies occur in the Senate.

If such events did, in fact, occur, Maddox would almost certainly face opposition from at least former Gov. Carl Sanders in the 1972 elections. It is probable the Republicans would also field a candidate.

Meanwhile, Sen. Russell says he will undergo treatment for his lung condition and hopes he will be able to continue to serve out at least his present term. Citizens from every part of Georgia hope Sen. Russell's disease will be arrested and that he will add many more years of public service to his already illustrious career.

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, Mar. 22, 1969]

SENATOR RUSSELL'S ILLNESS A MATTER OF CONCERN

The illness of Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, is a matter of serious concern to the people of this country and especially of his home state.

His long and outstanding service in the Senate has made him a national figure, and he is held in high esteem by his colleagues, who recognize him as the best parliamentarian in the Senate, and one of the most powerful figures in the Congress.

As chairman of the appropriations committee he is today fourth in line for the Presidency in event the President should die. He has also served as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, a position he gave up to head the Senate Appropriations committee.

Suffering from emphysema, Sen. Russell is said to have a lung tumor, for which the cobalt treatment will be applied, an operation having been ruled out. The hope is that the treatment, will be effective and his general condition will improve to the end that he may be spared for many more years as one of the nations leading and most influential statesmen.

The senator has many warm friends in his home state. The Times-Enterprise throughout his long career has been one of his most loved supporters. In turn the Senator has proven himself a true friend of this community, as well as of the entire state.

[From the Waycross (Ga.) Journal Herald, Mar. 22, 1969]

PRAYERS FOR SENATOR RUSSELL

Georgians and the people of the nation are distressed and concerned over the news that Sen. Richard B. Russell will undergo treatment for lung cancer.

It is not necessary to say for those familiar with the Washington political scene that Russell is a powerful and influential man.

He has been a key figure in Congress since he left the office of governor of Georgia in 1933.

Not long ago the senior senator of our state gave up his post as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, itself a key office, to take over the chairmanship of the equally important Senate Appropriations Committee.

His counsel has been sought by several Presidents and he was especially close to former President Lyndon B. Johnson who referred to the Georgian in his valedictory address to Congress.

Although Russell has always been clearly identified with Georgia and the South, his ability, dignity and fairness have won him friends from all parts of the nation.

For several years the senator, who calls Winder home, has been suffering from emphysema but he has continued to assume his heavy responsibilities.

It can only be hoped that the treatments he will now undergo will be successful and that the services of this outstanding public servant may not be lost.

Meanwhile, people everywhere and particularly those of us who are his Georgia constituents and friends, pray for his recovery.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 23, 1969]

The Senator's Toughest Fight

Sen. Richard B. Russell's disclosure that he is suffering from a serious and inoperable illness weighs heavily on the thoughts of his fellow Georgians, who love and respect him as they have few men in public life.

The concern of Georgians is shared by many outside Sen. Russell's native state. Southerners have come to look upon Dick Russell as the voice of the South in Washington. And during his 36 years in the Senate officials of both parties have come to rely on his counsel as well as his ability to lead and persuade. One of his visitors at the hospital before he announced his illness was President Richard Nixon.

Sen. Russell has said he will undergo cobalt treatment for a malignant lung tumor. Lung damage caused by emphysema, from which he has suffered for some time, rules out surgery. He hopes to serve out the remainder of his term, which expires in 1972, and to continue his duties while undergoing treatment.

In Sen. Russell's words, he is "hoping this treatment will enable me to serve out my term. It is too early to make a decision on whether to seek a new term in 1972."

Sen. Russell's illness could have a profound influence on Georgia politics. He is 71 years old, has served in the Senate longer than any other member, and has been considered unbeatable at the polls. His stature and influence in Washington are such that his illness also could have powerful effects there.

Sen. Russell has said that he will be out of his office only for several days and that his treatment is now expected to last six weeks. Medical specialists have told him, he said, that "as of now I am as well qualified and able to carry on my work as I have been for the past seven months."

For the moment, the overriding consideration is that Dick Russell is undertaking what may be his toughest struggle. Georgians who have supported him through many struggles in the past will be supporting him in this one with their prayers and hopes for his recovery.

[Mar. 24, 1969]

Senator Russell

One of the saddest things to hit Georgia—and the nation—was the announcement from Senator Russell's office that he was being treated for a potentially cancerous condition.

For many, many years Senator Russell has been a dominant figure on the national scene, and for Georgians he was the epitome of a Senator that should be sent to the nation's Congress.

Amid the sadness of the physical condition of Georgia's Senior Senator there comes the hope that modern medicine can stop the condition and save the Senator for service for the remainder of his term at least.

Georgia has done itself proud in sending Senator Russell back to the Senate time and again, and we are convinced that were his health such, the people of Georgia would continue to return him to the place in the Senate because of the honor and the prestige that he has brought to the State and its people.

The Senator has realized, we are sure, one ambition that he had: he is now the oldest Senator in term of service in the U.S. Senate and is serving as President pro tempore of the Senate.

Other honors have come to the Georgian as he compiled a record of service to his state and nation that is the envy of many of his contemporaries in the Senate.

Just last week Senator Russell was honored as the first member of the Congress ever to receive the James B. Forrestal Award of the National Security Industrial Association. This latest recognition was merely the continuation of the many awards and recognitions that he has been given over the years.

The fondest hope of most Georgians, as well as many people over the nation, is that the treatments the Senator is now undergoing will be successful, and that for four more years at least, Senator Russell will grace the scene of the U.S. Senate.

[From the Gwinnett (Ga.) Daily News, Mar. 24, 1969]

Senator Russell's Illness

All Georgians were saddened by the news Thursday that a malignant tumor has been found on the lung of Sen. Richard Russell. No man is as widely respected in Georgia than the state's senior senator and president pro tem of the Senate.

His constituents join Russell in the hope that he not only can serve out the rest of his present term, but that treatment can arrest the cancer sufficiently to prolong his life and his usefulness for years beyond that. Physicians plan to begin cobalt treatments immediately, and they will know more about this condition after they can see how he responds to the treatment.

Meanwhile, Russell plans to continue his regular Senate duties.

Speculation inevitably will begin on what might happen if the illness forces Russell to resign before the end of his present term. But that is premature at this point. The senator made it clear he has no present intention of stepping down.

Georgia and the nation need his service. He is the dean of the Senate, not only in terms of seniority, but in distinction, contribution and knowledge as well. He has served his state and the cause of sound government exceedingly well.

For our sake as well as for his, we pray that he will remain able to serve for many months to come.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Mar. 24, 1969]

Good Luck, Senator Russell

Young man and old, Richard Brevard Russell has served the people of Georgia as a State legislator, a Governor and United States Senator for well over 40 years, 36 of them in Washington. Consequently, a man of his ability, character and stature must be reflecting ruefully, as he undergoes therapy for a lung tumor which he has good reason to believe is malignant, on how eager so many of his political colleagues back home seem to be to dispose of him. This reaction has not represented any expression of anguish; rather it has been profoundly political.

As Georgians, we can say what Senator Russell never would: We resent these comments. They are in the worst possible taste. Senator Russell is by no means dead. His health, at 71 years of age, is not of the best, admittedly. But like any other human being anywhere, he is entitled to seek and receive medical attention for his infirmities without being consigned, however prematurely, to the grave that awaits not only him, but most assuredly each and every one of us.

Fortunately, none of us, as individuals, knows that day and hour, as an all-wise Providence has planned it. And who really knows? Richard Brevard Russell just might out-live many of those who now deal in shabby speculation about his successor. Permit us to so hope. And good luck, Senator Russell.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 24, 1969]

Senator Russell's Illness Makes Many People Say, "I Remember"

(By Celestine Sibley)

The illness of Richard Russell has, I feel sure, set all his friends and neighbors in Georgia and probably people in all parts of the world thinking about him with special warmth and concern. The day the word that he had cancer reached the Georgia capitol you could hear people all over the place beginning sentences with, "I remember . . ." They remember all kinds of things about him, important and trivial, funny and solemn. So many of them were inspired to run for public office by his example back in the 1930s when he stumped the state as a bright young reform candidate for governor.

He was my first Georgia politician. I had worked for the paper only a little while when I was sent to Winder to cover a speech by Senator Russell at a barbecue. I don't remember the speech now but I remember the feeling I had about the tall, slender man who moved easily and comfortably among his old neighbors and friends. The smell of smoke from the barbecue pit was rich and pungent with the blend of oak and hickory and succulent roast pork. Hound dogs flapped their tails from beneath parked cars and shade trees. Little children cried out and were hushed by an absent pat of the hand from a listening mother or a father. At the time I was impressed by the fact that Senator Russell arrived without a retinue of aides and flunkies and that he was so approachable.

There were times later when I was to approach him for favors for friends and the marvel to me was that he received each small-seeming request as if it were of the greatest importance and dealt with it with speed and efficiency.

There was the time the teen-age daughter of a friend of mine was missing in Europe. She had been in school in Florence and had told her parents that she had just enough money to get to Paris for a holiday. They told her they would send money to her in care of American Express in Paris and to let them know that she had arrived there safely and collected it.

Days passed and they didn't hear from their daughter. They telephoned American Express in Paris to find that the money still waited for her there, uncollected. They didn't know a soul in Paris to whom they could appeal for help and finally the mother called me, assuming that newspaper friends would have connections in almost every corner of the world.

Oddly enough my newspaper friends who might have had Paris connections didn't take the problem seriously. They had the

XUM

"Oh, she's having a good time, she'll turn up," approach.

Incensed because she was a child dear to me too, I stalked to the telephone and called Senator Russell at his home in Winder. He might have sighed a little to himself but he didn't laugh. He said, "Celestine, there are probably three million Americans in Paris this summer but we wouldn't want one little Georgia girl to be lost. I'll see what I can do."

Within 12 hours Senator Russell's "connections" in Paris had had her telephone her frantic parents.

It was a small thing to take to so powerful and important a man, I realize now. But Senator Russell didn't belittle it. He dealt with it. The picture of a great man is built of such little bits and pieces. No wonder so many of us grieve that he is ill and pray for his recovery.

[From the Rome (Ga.) News Tribune, Mar. 21, 1969]

RUSSELL ILLNESS

Not only Georgia, but the entire nation, has cause to regret the serious illness which afflicts Sen. Richard B. Russell.

Although he has faithfully represented his state for more than 30 years, Senator Russell is far from being a partisan servitor of either state or party. His service encompasses the entire range of United States interests.

Never, in its long history has the U.S. Senate had a more able and informed member. Senator Russell has been a valued advisor to five American presidents. We all hope that such a career will not be untimely interrupted by illness.

GENERAL SHOUP ASSAILS NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Gen. David M. Shoup, one of our Nation's greatest fighting men and former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, has written an extremely important article, "The New American Militarism," which appears in the April 1969 edition of the Atlantic. General Shoup's article is without doubt the most damning indictment of the Military Establishment and of the military-industrial complex ever written by one who was so intimately involved in the Defense Establishment.

General Shoup was a heroic leader in the victorious invasion of Tarawa in 1943 and rose to become Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps for 4 years until his retirement in December 1963. He has been one of the most vociferous critics of our involvement in the ugly civil war in Vietnam, and in 1966 stated:

> In my judgment, the whole of Southeast Asia as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the American people is not worth the life of a single American.

General Shoup has charged that an ambitious elite of high-ranking officers from all branches of our Armed Forces prefer war to peace and are turning the United States into "a militaristic and aggressive nation." He has asserted that the search for promotion, interservice rivalry, and an eagerness to test military doctrines were the prime factors behind our involvement in Vietnam and the top-heavy invasion of the Dominican Republic with more than 20,000 marines and infantry. He condemns the bombing of Vietnam, including North Vietnam, as "one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people."

General Shoup charges that military, naval, Marine, and Air Force leaders were so eager and so obsessed to test new equipment and tactics in Vietnam that they encouraged the Johnson administration to mire the United States in the quagmire of Vietnam.

This former Commandant of the Marine Corps assails the warlike propensities of high-ranking officers as a natural product of their training, selection, and code. He writes:

> Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.
>
> Since the end of World War II—

The general wrote—

> these officers have gained a new respect and the voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent.
>
> Their position—

General Shoup stated—

> was enhanced by the millions of veterans from that and succeeding wars for whom the military indoctrination may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had.

Mr. President, General Shoup's relentless and sweeping comments should be read by every American concerned with the future security and well-being of our Nation. In my view it should be "must" reading in every home, in every high school and college classroom in the Nation.

General Shoup, who will undoubtedly now be assailed by some rightwing extremists and apologists for the military-industrial complex such as members of the Liberty Lobby, so called, has performed a very great public service in bringing the views as he sees them and as he lived them to the attention of his countrymen. He is indeed a hero in peace as well as in war and deserves the thanks of all Americans for his efforts to stem the rampant trend toward militarism in our Nation. I commend his article to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM

(By Gen. David M. Shoup)

(NOTE.—Its roots are in the experience of World War II. The burgeoning military establishment and associated industries fuel it. Anti-Communism provides the climate which nurtures it. "It" is a "new American militarism." General Shoup, a hero of the Battle of Tarawa in 1943, who rose to become Commandant of the United States Marine Corps for four years until his retirement in December, 1963, doesn't like it. He has written this essay in collaboration with another retired Marine officer, Colonel James A. Donovan.)

America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation. Our massive and swift invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, concurrent with the rapid buildup of U.S. military power in Vietnam, constituted an impressive demonstration of America's readiness to execute military contingency plans and to seek military solutions to problems of political disorder and potential Communist threats in the areas of our interest.

This "military task force" type of diplomacy is in the tradition of our more primitive, pre-World War II "gunboat diplomacy," in which we landed small forces of Marines to protect American lives and property from the perils of native bandits and revolutionaries. In those days the U.S. Navy and its Marine landing forces were our chief means, short of war, for showing the flag, exercising American power, and protecting U.S. interests abroad. The Navy, enjoying the freedom of the seas, was a visible and effective representative of the nation's sovereign power. The Marines could be employed ashore "on such other duties as the President might direct" without congressional approval or a declaration of war. The U.S. Army was not then used so freely because it was rarely ready for expeditionary service without some degree of mobilization, and its use overseas normally required a declaration of emergency or war. Now, however, we have numerous contingency plans involving large joint Air Force-Army-Navy-Marine task forces to defend U.S. interests and to safeguard our allies wherever and whenever we suspect Communist aggression. We maintain more than 1,517,000 Americans in uniform overseas in 119 countries. We have 8 treaties to help defend 48 nations if they ask us to—or if we choose to intervene in their affairs. We have an immense and expensive military establishment, fueled by a gigantic defense industry, and millions of proud, patriotic, and frequently bellicose and militaristic citizens. How did this militarist culture evolve? How did this militarism steer us into the tragic military and political morass of Vietnam?

Prior to World War II, American attitudes were typically isolationist, pacifist, and generally antimilitary. The regular peacetime military establishment enjoyed small prestige and limited influence upon national affairs. The public knew little about the armed forces, and only a few thousand men were attracted to military service and careers. In 1940 there were but 428,000 officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy. The scale of the war, and the world's power relationships which resulted, created the American military giant. Today the active armed forces contain over 3.4 million men and women, with an additional 1.6 million ready reserves and National Guardsmen.

America's vastly expanded world role after World War II hinged upon military power. The voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent. During the postwar period, distinguished military leaders from the war years filled many top positions in government. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Taylor, Ridgeway, LeMay, and others were not only popular heroes but respected opinion-makers. It was a time of international readjustment; military minds offered the benefits of firm views and problem-solving experience to the management of the nation's affairs. Military procedures—including the general staff system, briefings, estimates of the situation, and the organizational and operational techniques of the highly schooled, confident military professionals—spread throughout American culture.

World War II had been a long war. Millions of young American men had matured, been educated, and gained rank and stature during their years in uniform. In spite of themselves, many returned to civilian life as indoctrinated, combat-experienced military professionals. They were veterans, and for better or worse would never be the same again. America will never be the same either. We are now a nation of veterans. To the 14.9 million veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees, and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968 the total living veterans of U.S. military service numbered over 23 million, or about 20 percent of the adult population.

Today most middle-aged men, most business, government, civic, and professional leaders, have served some time in uniform. Whether they liked it or not, their military training and experience have affected them, for the creeds and attitudes of the armed forces are powerful medicine, and can become habit-forming. The military codes include all the virtues and beliefs used to motivate men of high principle: patriotism, duty and service to country, honor among fellowmen, courage in the face of danger, loyalty to organization and leaders, self-sacrifice for comrades, leadership, discipline, and physical fitness. For many veterans the military's efforts to train and indoctrinate them may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had—especially so for the young and less educated.

In addition, each of the armed forces has its own special doctrinal beliefs and well-catalogued customs, traditions, rituals, and folklore upon which it strives to build a fiercely loyal military character and esprit de corps. All ranks are taught that their unit and their branch of the military service are the most elite, important, efficient, or effective in the military establishment. By believing in the superiority and importance of their own service they also provide themselves a degree of personal status, pride, and self-confidence.

As they get older, many veterans seem to romanticize and exaggerate their own military experience and loyalties. The policies, attitudes, and positions of the powerful veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS, totaling over 4 million men, frequently reflect this pugnacious and chauvinistic tendency. Their memberships generally favor military solutions to world problems in the pattern of their own earlier experience, and often assert that their military service and sacrifice should be repeated by the younger generations.

Closely related to the attitudes and influence of America's millions of veterans is the vast and powerful complex of the defense industries, which have been described in detail many times in the eight years since General Eisenhower first warned of the military-industrial power complex in his farewell address as President. The relationship between the defense industry and the military establishment is closer than many citizens realize. Together they form a powerful public opinion lobby. The several military service associations provide both a forum and a meeting ground for the military and its industries. The associations also provide each of the armed services with a means of fostering their respective roles, objectives, and propaganda.

Each of the four services has its own association, and there are also additional military function associations, for ordnance, management, defense industry, and defense transportation, to name some of the more prominent. The Air Force Association and the Association of the U.S. Army are the largest, best organized, and most effective of the service associations. The Navy League, typical of the "silent service" traditions, is not as well coordinated in its public relations efforts, and the small Marine Corps Association is not even in the same arena with the other contenders, the Marine Association's main activity being the publication of a semiofficial monthly magazine. Actually, the service associations' respective magazines, with an estimated combined circulation of over 270,000, are the primary medium serving the several associations' purposes.

Air Force and Space Digest, to cite one example, is the magazine of the Air Force Association and the unofficial mouthpiece of the U.S. Air Force doctrine, "party line," and propaganda. It frequently promotes Air Force policy that has been officially frustrated or suppressed within the Department of Defense. It beats the tub for strength through aerospace power, interprets diplomatic, strategic, and tactical problems in terms of airpower, stresses the requirements for quantities of every type of aircraft, and frequently perpetuates the extravagant fictions about the effectiveness of bombing. This, of course, is well coordinated with and supported by the multibillion-dollar aerospace industry, which thrives upon the boundless desires of the Air Force. They reciprocate with lavish and expensive ads in every issue of *Air Force*. Over 96,000 members of the Air Force Association receive the magazine. Members include active, reserve, retired personnel, and veterans of the U.S. Air Force. Additional thousands of copies go to people engaged in the defense industry. The thick mixture of advertising, propaganda, and Air Force doctrine continuously repeated in this publication provides its readers and writers with a form of intellectual hypnosis, and they are prone to believe their own propaganda because they read it in *Air Force*.

The American people have also become more and more accustomed to militarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun, and to the violence of combat. Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth. Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.

It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism. There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals, and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion. How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exert so much martial influence upon the government and life of the American people?

The military will disclaim any excess of power or influence on their part. They will point to their small numbers, low pay, and subordination to civilian masters as proof of their modest status and innocence. Nevertheless, the professional military, as a group, is probably one of the best organized and most influential of the various segments of the American scene. Three wars and six major contingencies since 1940 have forced the American people to become abnormally aware of the armed forces and their leaders. In turn the military services have produced an unending supply of distinguished, capable, articulate, and effective leaders. The sheer skill, energy, and dedication of America's military officers make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from the federal Cabinet to the local PTA.

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter for the rest of their careers they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions, or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques, or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others. Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions, and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The men who rise to the top of the military heirarchy have usually demonstrated their effectiveness as leaders, planners, and organization managers. They have perhaps performed heroically in combat, but most of all they have demonstrated, their loyalty as proponents of their own service's doctrine and their dedication to the defense establishment. The paramount sense of duty to follow orders is at the root of the military professional's performance. As a result the military often operate more efficiently and effectively in the arena of defense policy planning than do their civilian counterparts in the State Department. The military planners have their doctrinal beliefs, their loyalties, their discipline, and their typical desire to compete and win. The civilians in government can scarcely play the same policy-planning game. In general the military are better organized, they work harder, they think straighter, and they keep their eyes on the objective, which is to be instantly ready to solve the problem through military action while ensuring that their respective service gets its proper mission, role, and recognition in the operation. In an emergency the military usually have a ready plan; if not, their numerous doctrinal manuals provide firm guidelines for action. Politicians, civilian appointees, and diplomats do not normally have the same confidence about how to react to threats and violence as do the military.

The motivations behind these endeavors are difficult for civilians to understand. For example, military professionals cannot measure the success of their individual efforts in terms of personal financial gain. The armed forces are not profit-making organizations, and the rewards for excellence in the military profession are acquired in less tangible forms. Thus it is that promotion and the responsibilities of higher command, with the related fringe benefits of quarters, servants, privileges, and prestige, motivate most career officers. Promotions and choice job opportunities are attained by constantly performing well, conforming to the expected patterns, and pleasing the senior officers. Promotions and awards also frequently result from heroic and distinguished performance in combat, and it takes a war to become a military hero. Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.

The professional military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures. Unlike some of the civilian policy-makers, the military has not been obsessed with the

XUM

threat of Communism per se. Most military people know very little about Communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government. But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil. When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the armed forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from Communism. In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The armed forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its *General Purpose Forces* in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances. To do this it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the Unified Commands, and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Important features of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sea-lift forces and the Army-Air Force team of air-mobility proponents. At the senior command levels parochial pride in service, personal ambitions, and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe. The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the "first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves. This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the Marines, and to attain overall command of "U.S. Forces Dom. Rep." Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82nd Airborne Division to the scene, included a lieutenant general, and took charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965 the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Viet Cong and North Vietnamese aggression. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!) So by early 1965 the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims, and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause. Much of the reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes. In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in both North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people. Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots, and opportunity for career officers.

The highly trained professional and aggressive career officers of the Army and Marine Corps played a similar game. Prior to the decision to send combat units to South Vietnam in early 1965, both services were striving to increase their involvement. The Army already had over 16,000 military aid personnel serving in South Vietnam in the military adviser role, in training missions, logistic services, supporting helicopter companies, and in Special Forces teams. This investment of men and materiel justified a requirement for additional U.S. combat units to provide local security and to help protect our growing commitment of aid to the South Vietnam regime.

There were also top-ranking Army officers who wanted to project Army ground combat units into the Vietnam struggle for a variety of other reasons; to test plans and new equipment, to test the new air-mobile theories and tactics, to try the tactics and techniques of counterinsurgency, and to gain combat experience for young officers and noncommissioned officers. It also appeared to be a case of the military's duty to stop "Communist aggression" in Vietnam.

The Marines had somewhat similar motivations, the least of which was any real concern about the political or social problems of the Vietnamese people. In early 1965 there was a shooting war going on and the Marines were being left out of it, contrary to all their traditions. The Army's military advisory people were hogging American participation—except for a Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron at Danang which was helping the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. For several years young Marine officers had been going to South Vietnam from the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa for short tours of "on-the-job training" with the small South Vietnam Marine Corps. There was a growing concern, however, among some senior Marines that the Corps should get involved on a larger scale and be the "first to fight" in keeping with the Corps' traditions. This would help justify the Corps' continued existence, which many Marines seem to consider to be in constant jeopardy.

The Corps had also spent several years exploring the theories of counterinsurgency and as early as 1961 had developed an elaborate lecture-demonstration called OPERATION CORMORANT, for school and Marine Corps promotion purposes, which depicted the Marines conducting a large-scale amphibious operation on the coast of Vietnam and thereby helping resolve a hypothetical aggressor-insurgency problem. As always it was important to Marine planners and doctrinaires to apply an amphibious operation to the Vietnam situation and provide justification for this special Marine functional responsibility. So Marine planners were seeking an acceptable excuse to thrust a landing force over the beaches of Vietnam when the Viet Cong attacked the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at Pleiku in February, 1965. It was considered unacceptable aggression, and the President was thereby prompted to put U.S. ground combat units into the war. Elements of the 3rd Marine Division at Okinawa were already aboard ship and eager to go, for the Marines also intended to get to Vietnam before their neighbor on Okinawa, the Army's 173rd Airborne Brigade, arrived. (Actually the initial Marine unit to deploy was an airlifted antiaircraft missile battalion which arrived to protect the Danang air base.) With these initial deployments the Army-Marine race to build forces in Vietnam began in earnest and did not slow down until both became overextended, overcommitted, and depleted at home.

For years up to 1964 the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was then one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia. In 1964 there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what has become the quagmire of Vietnam. The intention at the time was that the war effort be kept small and "limited." But as the momentum and involvement built up, the military leaders rationalized a case that this was not a limited-objective exercise, but was a proper war in defense of the United States against "Communist aggression" and in honor of our area commitments.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery, and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders. Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam, they have managed the details of its conduct; and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to question the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Some of the credibility difficulties experienced by the Johnson Administration over its war situation reports and Vietnam policy can also be blamed in part upon the military advisers. By its very nature most military activity falls under various degrees of security classification. Much that the military plans or does must be kept from the enemy. Thus the military is indoctrinated to be secretive, devious, and misleading in its plans and operations. It does not, however, always confine its security restrictions to purely military operations. Each of the services and all of the major commands practice techniques of controlling the news and the release of self-serving propaganda: in "the interests of national defense," to make the service look good, to cover up mistakes, to build up and publicize a distinguished military personality, or to win a round in the continuous gamesmanship of the interservice contest. If the Johnson Administration suffered from lack of credibility in its reporting of the war, the truth would reveal that much of the hocus-pocus stemmed from schemers in the military services, both at home and abroad.

Our militaristic culture was born of the necessities of World War II, nurtured by the Korean War, and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc. Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope, and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives. The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and materiel development, and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts, and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single service doctrinaires, to create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

XUM

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anti-Communism, national defense, and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow, and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines, and to self-maintenance and management. Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field tests. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals. Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action. Being recognized public figures in a nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician. Flag officers are considered "experts," and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obligated not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive, and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems. Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them are the rich and powerful defense industries. Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons, and lapel emblems, is a nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic, and well intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.

THE PRESIDENT'S OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, when the President first announced that he was taking it upon himself to decide all future questions of oil import policy, I expressed the hope that the new study he was ordering would not be used as an excuse for delay. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the press release I issued on February 20 be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Edward M. Kennedy

Today's announcement by President Nixon that he is assuming personal responsibility for all decisions in the area of oil import controls is a welcome one to the extent that fact-finding and decisions regarding the oil import program will be taken out of the Interior Department where they tend to be most vulnerable to the importunings of the oil industry.

On the other hand, the oil industry's response to all proposals for the long overdue rethinking of the oil import program has always been "further study", i.e., delay. I hope President Nixon will give us assurance that "extensive review in detail" does not mean indefinite delay. Congressional committees, executive agencies, and other groups have developed sufficient information, statistics, and testimony over the past decade to enable the President and Congress to move immediately to the action stage. I, for one, have expressed my intention to introduce legislation to change the oil import program, and I am proceeding on this course.

I do not think appointment of a Cabinet level or non-Government study group is necessary or justified. However, if the President appoints such a group, it should be fully representative of consumer and citizen interests, with a strictly limited representation from the petroleum-petrochemical industry. It should have a mandate to report quickly, certainly within 90 days.

I am also hopeful that today's announcement will not presage any delay in two pending actions affecting New England's access to reasonably priced oil products. Both the Machiasport free trade zone proposal and the pending regulation regarding independent oil terminal operators constitute relief which should and must be granted in any event as long as the present system of controls continues. Thus these should be implemented immediately, regardless of what major overhauls in the system may eventually take place.

I am communicating these suggestions directly to the President in a telegram tonight, and am asking for an early opportunity to meet with the person in his office who will have responsibility for this area.

Mr. **KENNEDY**. Mr. President, I also indicated that I thought that it would be a waste of time and effort to appoint a Cabinet-level committee to study this problem. Yesterday, 1 month and 6 days after his original announcement, the President revealed that he is convening such a Cabinet-level committee. Thus not only will we have the additional delay which working through such a committee will engender, but we have also presumably had 5 weeks of inaction before the Cabinet committee has even begun its work. During those 5 weeks, I would have thought that the entire machinery of the Federal Government could have assembled all the conceivable information necessary to make an enlightened decision. In our recent hearings before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, I asked the expert witnesses who are experienced in this field how long it should take to make the necessary decisions once the available information was assembled, and they indicated that 2 or 3 months would certainly be sufficient time. The entire Nation has suffered for 10 years now under the yoke of the oil import program, and it has cost consumers and businessmen some $40 to $70 billion. Every week that goes by means more millions of dollars of unnecessary expense to the American public.

The people of the Nation, especially the people of my section of the country, deserve relief, and deserve it immediately.

President Nixon owes them an explanation for the delays, and he owes them action.

SENATOR RICHARD RUSSELL HAS OUR HOPES FOR COMPLETE RECOVERY

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I join with Senators in wishing the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, Richard B. Russell, a speedy and complete recovery.

I was shocked and disturbed to learn of his illness this past weekend. It is my fervent hope that the miracles of modern medical science will provide a cure for his illness.

Since he came into the Senate in 1933, Senator Richard Russell has eptomized integrity, dignity, fairness, and all of the great qualities that make him the Senators' Senator. His illness has stunned this body. We all look to him as the premier parliamentarian among us. Any Senator could approach him and could ask for counsel or advice on parliamentary procedure. He always gave it freely, accurately, and truly.

It has been my privilege this past 4 years to serve with Senator Russell as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, after 36 years in the Senate, Senator Russell has become President pro tempore and also chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has compiled a record of dedication and service to his constituents and to this country which brings credit to his name, to his State, and to the Senate as a body.

Even though he is away for treatment for only a short period of time, we miss his wisdom and counsel from day to day. All Members of this body wish him well and look forward to his return from the hospital soon.

COAL MINER'S PNEUMOCONIOSIS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier today I sent to the desk a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal-mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law. The bill is being cosponsored by my senior colleague, Mr. Randolph, and myself, and we hope that other Senators will join in cosponsoring the bill. We would welcome additional names in support of this measure.

The purpose of the bill is to provide compensation to disabled coal miners suffering from "black lung," and other forms of pneumoconiosis, who are not covered by State laws.

My colleague and I believe that here is a legislative gap which should be bridged, and it seems to us that the only way to do it is through the enactment of Federal legislation.

For example, the West Virginia Legislature recently enacted a new compensation law covering pneumoconiosis, but I am advised that some of the "black lung" sufferers may not benefit from it because such workmen's compensation legislation cannot be retroactive.

So, unless a Federal law is enacted to include those who may have retired before the new State law goes into effect, or for whom the statute of limitations may have expired, I am told that some of these people may have no recourse to compensation. Therefore, the bill which my colleague and I are sponsoring would authorize compensation in such cases on a Federal-State matching basis. The legislation would only affect those miners disabled from pulmonary diseases contracted through exposure to coal dust,

XUM

silica, et cetera, and who are not covered by State laws.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to enter into an agreement with any State for the purpose of assisting that State in providing compensation to disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, are suffering from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to receive compensation under any workmen's compensation law.

The State agency administering the workmen's compensation law of the State would be responsible for administering the act which we are proposing. The amount of compensation payable to any individual would be $25 per week. This amount would be lower than the benefits to which miners would be entitled under the compensation laws of any State, but the amount would at least provide an income from $100 to perhaps $115 per month, which would prevent many families from having to depend on public welfare. The $25 benefit payment, being lower, I am told, than that provided by any compensation law of any State would encourage miners to explore eligibility before a State's statute of limitations expires rather than take the chance of receiving benefits under the Federal-State program at a level lower than the benefits provided in a State's workmen's compensation program.

Under this bill the State of West Virginia would not have to bear the burden of paying compensation under the Federal-State program to a former West Virginian who would now be living, let us say, in the State of California or Ohio or Kentucky. An individual would have to be a resident of West Virginia in order to qualify under this program in West Virginia.

This legislation would leave the definition of pneumoconiosis to the respective State laws, but a person entitled to benefits under this act would have to be unable, by reason of pneumoconiosis contracted as a result of employment in or in connection with the mining of coal, to engage in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The act would expire in 20 years—specifically with the close of December 31, 1989. The Federal Government would provide 100 percent of compensation and administrative costs in the first calendar year, commencing on January 1, 1970. The Federal share, for both compensation and administrative costs, would be reduced 5 percent for each calendar year thereafter. This would gradually shift the burden to the States. The justification for the Federal Government's bearing 100 percent of the burden during the first year is based partly on the fact that many claims would have to be processed during the first year of operation of the act. Consequently, it would be extremely burdensome upon a State to have to deal with the congestion of such claims which would be bound to occur at the beginning of the 20-year period. Moreover, many of the State legislatures would not meet until a year after the program had begun, and unless the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the costs during that first year, those same States would be prevented from participation because their legislatures would not have authorized the expenditure of State matching funds.

The act requires that, in order for a State to qualify for benefits under this program, the pertinent statute of limitations could not be less than 3 years.

In fine, Mr. President, the bill which is being introduced by my colleague and myself has as its purpose the compensating of miners disabled because of pneumoconiosis who cannot qualify under State laws because the statute of limitations may have run or because of the prohibition on retroaction of State laws, and so forth. This program would serve as an adjunct to, not as a substitute for, the workmen's compensation program in a particular State. It is not meant to displace a State's workmen's compensation program, and, of course, it is to be funded in a different manner, as I have already described.

My colleague and I believe that this is a good bill. Indubitably, it can be altered and improved by the committee to which it will be referred. For example, the committee may wish to make it applicable also to other types of mining. Senator RANDOLPH and I are not wedded to any particular provision in the measure, and we would both like to see it improved in whatever way the Labor Committee deems advisable. But we do feel that the basic idea embraced by this bill is one which, through necessity, must be implemented and we hope that the committee will consider the bill, make whatever changes may appear to be advisable, and favorably report the resulting legislation for action by the Senate. As I said in the beginning, there is a gap in the workmen's compensation laws of the States, and it is hoped that this bill will be the instrument whereby this gap will be closed.

FARMERS' TAX INEQUITIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on January 22 I reintroduced, as S. 500, a bill designed to remove the inequities between legitimate farm operators and taxpayers who are in the business of farming mainly because of the tax advantages that serve to put their nonfarm income in a lower tax bracket. The problem is that liberal tax rules designed for the benefit of the ordinary farmer are being abused by tax-dodge farmers—people who engage in farming for the purpose of creating artificial losses which can be used to offset substantial amounts of their nonfarm income. Collectively, a bipartisan group of members from at least 30 different State congressional delegations have specifically endorsed this legislation.

One of the finest statements discussing the whole question of tax-dodge farming was the statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 10 by John W. Scott, master of the National Grange. In his statement, Mr. Scott points out that as early as 1939 the Grange adopted a resolution in opposition to the practice of tax-dodge farming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exhaustive analysis made by the Grange in support of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. SCOTT, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am John W. Scott, Master of the National Grange, with offices at 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. The National Grange is a farm and rural-urban community and family organization, representing 7,000 community Granges located in rural America. Our membership lives in rural-urban areas in 40 of the 50 states and has a vital interest in the matter being considered by this Committee over a long period of our 102 years.

We are in support of H.R. 4257, and identical bills, to eliminate existing tax loopholes which benefit wealthy nonfarmers who enter farm loss operations and distort the agricultural economy at the expense of legitimate farmers and the average taxpayer.

The Grange has a long history of interest in this particular area of income tax revision, as it has been of vital concern to our members since 1939. At the 73rd Annual Session of the National Grange, held in Peoria, Illinois, the delegate body adopted the following resolution:

"In order to discourage corporation farming and capitalists acquiring large acreage of farm land, we recommend that the Federal income tax be amended to provide that losses on agricultural operations can be deducted only from incomes derived from agricultural operations."

The policy of the National Grange, adopted 28 years ago, was a lone voice against the inequities contained in the Internal Revenue Code. The continuing validity of this objective has been subsequently recognized by action of the Delegate Body taken in 1963, 1964, 1965 and again in 1967 at the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the National Grange.

At our 102nd Annual Session held in Peoria, Illinois, in November 1968, as we started our second century of service to rural America, the Delegate Body once more reaffirmed Grange position on this important and vital matter of great concern to family farms and rural communities.

The Taxation and Fiscal Policy Committee that considered tax revision resolutions made the following statement:

"The mounting concern of the family farm operator over the accelerating acquisition of agricultural lands by individuals and organizations for the purpose of building up a loss position from farming operations conducted on the lands acquired and deducting such losses from income tax liability is indicated by the fact that resolutions to prevent this practice have been received at this Annual Session of the National Grange from eighteen of the 38 State Granges.

"Farmers and their families engaged in bona fide farming operations are being forced to leave the farm, as a result of net income being at a depressed level.

"Competition of non-farm investors inflating the price of agricultural land and using loss on farming operations as a deduction against non-farm income is a factor in this lower net farm income.

"Resolved, that the National Grange vigorously support amending the Internal Revenue Code to prohibit any substantial portion of farm operating losses being used as a tax deduction or write-off against non-farm income."

The Delegate Body adopted the above statement and resolution, once more raising their voices against the unfair competition such tax advantages provide for those non-

XUM

farm interests engaged in agricultural production, for the family and commercial farmers who are dependent upon the profit from agriculture for their livelihood.

We welcome and commend Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana for taking the leadership in introducing legislation to close the "loophole" in the Internal Revenue Code that makes "tax-loss" farming possible and profitable for non-farm interests. We also are appreciative of the efforts of Representative John Culver of Iowa for his sponsorship of identical legislation in the House of Representatives. We further appreciate the 26 other Senators and 29 additional Representatives that have co-sponsored this important legislation. For 25 years the Grange was the lone voice speaking out for tax reforms pertaining to "tax-loss" farming. We are grateful that our voices have been joined by the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury and some additional 11 farm organizations as well as the AFL–CIO. To paraphrase a statement made by President Nixon in his inaugural address on January 20, 1969, "We hope now that our words will be heard as well as our voices", as we speak out for tax reforms to help preserve the family farm structure in American agriculture.

THE PROBLEM OF TAX-LOSS FARMING

We do not presume to be tax specialists and we do not want to fill the record with information that is not based on pertinent data, therefore, we would like to quote from Part 2 "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals, U.S. Treasury Department", which outlines the tax rules that encourage "tax-loss farming" and defines the problem far better than we would be able to do with our limited knowledge of the Internal Revenue Code.

"*Methods of Accounting.*—There are two principal methods of accounting used in reporting business income for tax purposes. In general, those businesses which do not involve the production or sale of merchandise may use the cash method. Under it, income is reported when received in cash or its equivalent, and expenses are deducted when paid in cash or its equivalent.

"On the other hand, in businesses where the production or sale of merchandise is a significant factor, income can be properly reflected only if the costs of the merchandise are deducted in the accounting period in which the income from its sale is realized. This is accomplished by recording costs when incurred and sales when made, and including in inventory those costs attributable to unsold goods on hand at year's end. Deduction of the costs included in inventory must be deferred until the goods to which they relate are sold, and deduction is not permitted when the costs are incurred. Thus, under this method of accounting, income from sales of inventory and the costs of producing or purchasing such inventory are matched in the same accounting period, thereby properly reflecting income.

"Farmers, however, have been excepted from these general rules. Even in those cases where inventories are a material factor, they have historically been permitted to use the cash accounting method and ignore their year-end inventories of crops, cattle, et cetera. This results in an inaccurate reflection of annual income in situations when expenditures are fully deducted in the year incurred, but the assets produced by those expenditures (inventories) are not sold, and the income not reported, until a later year.

"*Capitalization of Costs.*—Farmers are also permitted another liberal tax accounting rule. In most businesses, the costs of constructing an asset (including maintenance of the asset prior to its being used in the business) is a capital expenditure which may not be deducted as incurerd but may be recovered only by depreciation over the useful life of the asset. In this manner, the cost of the asset is matched with the income earned by the asset. Farmers, however, have been permitted to deduct some admittedly capital costs as they are incurred. For example, a citrus grove may not bear a commercial crop until 6 or 7 years after it has been planted. Yet, the farmer may elect to deduct as incurred all costs of raising the grove to a producing state even though such expenditures are capital in nature. Similarly, the capital nature of expenditures associated with the raising of livestock held for breeding may be ignored, and the expenditures may be deducted currently.

"*The Problem.*—These liberal deviations from good accounting practices were permitted for farm operations in order to spare the ordinary farmer the bookkeeping chores associated with inventories and accrual accounting.

"However, some high-bracket taxpayers whose primary economic activity is other than farming, carry on limited farming activities such as citrus farming or cattle raising. By electing the special farm accounting rules which allow premature deductions, many of these high-bracket taxpayers show farm losses which are not true economic losses. These 'tax losses' are then deducted from their high bracket non-farm income, resulting in large tax savings. Moreover, these 'tax losses' which arise from deductions taken because of capital costs or inventory costs usually thus represent an investment in farm assets rather than funds actually lost. This investment quite often will ultimately be sold and taxed only at low capital gains rates. Thus, deductions are set off against ordinary income while the sale price of the resulting assets represents capital gain. The gain is usually the entire sales price since the full cost of creating the asset has previously been deducted against ordinary income.

"The existing 'hobby loss' provision of the Internal Revenue Code is ineffectual in dealing with this problem. While that provision disallows deductions for continuing heavy losses in a trade or business over a period of at least 5 consecutive years, the fact of a loss and its extent are measured by comparing the expenses of the business with the total income from the business including the full amount of capital gain income although only one-half of that income is subject to tax. Thus, to escape the hobby loss provision, it is merely necessary that the taxpayer realize capital gain farm income at least once every 5 years. If the capital gain income just equals the farm expenses for a year, the hobby loss provision is inapplicable for 5 years even though the taxpayer will show a tax loss for that year equal to one-half his farm expenses.

"*Effect of tax benefits on farm economy.*—When a taxpayer purchases and operates a farm for its tax benefits, the transaction leads to a distortion of the farm economy. The tax benefits allow an individual to operate a farm at an economic breakeven or even a loss and still realize an overall profit. For example, for a top-bracket taxpayer, where a deduction is associated with eventual capital gains income, each $1 of deduction means an immediate tax savings of 70 cents to be offset in the future by only 25 cents of tax. This cannot help but result in a distortion of the farm economy, and is harmful to the ordinary farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support him and his family.

"This distortion may be evidenced in various ways: For one, the attractive farm tax benefits available to wealthy persons have caused them to bid up the price of farmland beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy. Furthermore, because of the present tax rules, the ordinary farmer must compete in the marketplace with these wealthy farmowners who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes."

We believe that this clearly demonstrates what has caused the problem and the scope and serious effect our tax laws have spawned in distorting the farm economy. In addition it pinpoints the competition this outside interest that *farms for tax dollars* presents to the family farm.

CORRECTION OF THE PROBLEM

The correction of the problem lies in eliminating the tax advantage high-bracket, part-time farmers have in using the generous farm accounting rules to reduce their tax liability on their nonfarm incomes.

It is our belief that the provisions of H.R. 4257 and H.R. 7575, introduced by Rep. Culver and 28 other Representatives in the House of Representatives, and S. 500, introduced by Senator Metcalf and 26 other Senators, will correct the abuse of the liberal tax rules provided in the Internal Revenue Code for the use of bona fide farmers.

This corrective legislation will affect only non-farmers with large amounts of non-farm income who invest in farming in order to secure tax losses which may be set off against their non-farm income.

There are numerous safeguards in the bill to protect the family farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support his family.

There is an important exception to the dollar limitation in the bill. This legislation in no event prevents the deduction of farm losses to the extent they relate to taxes, interest, casualty losses, losses from drought, and losses from the sale of farm property. An exception is made for those deductions, since they are in general deductions which would be allowed to anyone holding property without regard to whether it was being used in farming or because they represent deductions which are clearly beyond the control of the farmer; such as losses from casualty and drought. Under provisions of the bill, if the total of these deductions is higher than fifteen thousand dollars then the higher figure may be used without any reduction because of nonfarm income above fifteen thousand dollars. In other words, the fifteen thousand dollar limitation is directed solely at the type of deductions that are artificially created through the abuse of the special accounting rules designed for ordinary farmers.

We are confident that the legislation will not have a detrimental effect on *legitimate farmers or non-farmers who invest in farming to earn farm profits*. The legislation is unique, in that it is pointed directly at the abuse of the liberal tax accounting rules of the Internal Revenue Code, provided by Congress for ordinary farmers or those interests outside of agriculture that make investments in farming for a profit.

The legislation also provides for the large commercial farming interests in cattle, citrus and other farm specialty crops to be exempt from the provisions of the Act if they follow standard accrual accounting methods. Surely, such large privately-owned agricultural interests or investors in agriculture that use either grove management firms or cattle management firms have available to them the accounting expertise to follow such accounting methods.

The National Grange would be the last organization to support legislation to prohibit persons outside of agriculture from entering agriculture as full-time farmers or as investors supplying capital for those already engaged in agricultural production. We have insisted, however, and will continue to insist, that the rules for playing the game be the same. The enactment of H.R. 4257 will equalize the rules and make farming a fair game for all interested in agriculture for profit.

INVASION BY CONGLOMERATES

We realize that the elimination of tax loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code as it applies to individuals and corporations investing or engaged in agriculture will not stop the conglomerate corporation invasion. It will, however, eliminate the financing of such mergers and take-overs by the American

XUM

taxpayer by the use of "tax shelter" windfalls.

The real control over conglomerate corporate invasion can be done by tightening of the anti-trust laws, which we realize does not come under the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, we feel that this intrusion into agriculture is part of the same kind of problem which the Committee is considering today and perhaps is a far greater danger to the family farm structure of American agriculture. Curtailing tax abuse is the first step, and a necessary step, in controlling conglomerate corporation invasion of agriculture. We welcome this and similar tax legislation to take the "tax profit" out of such acquisitions by non-farm interests.

BENEFITS FROM TAX SHELTERS

We, as responsible members of the agricultural society, would be amiss if we did not consider any possible economic benefit to agriculture and rural America of the so-called "tax incentives" provided in the Internal Revenue Code.

Those who are in opposition to plugging the Internal Revenue loopholes that permit "tax-loss" farming present the following arguments in favor of a continuation of the laissez faire:

1. They are not tax loopholes but are tax incentives to attract into agriculture outside "risk" money;

2. That outside capital investments in agriculture have assisted in improvement in livestock breeds;

3. That farmers have benefited by outside capital in that they can expand their operations, buy more cattle, more land, which in turn benefits rural America.

We cannot help but agree that outside capital has benefited *certain individuals in agriculture* as well as *certain specific rural communities*. However, we hasten to ask, is it worth the total cost to the *Federal Treasury of approximately $145 million in lost revenue?* The total increase in Federal revenue would be much higher since farm operations carried on by corporations usually are not separately reported on the corporation tax return. Consequently, data concerning the number of corporations and revenue effect with respect thereto are not available.

Thousands upon thousands of family farms, the backbone of rural communities, are adversely affected by the activity of a small percentage of individuals who are lucky enough to have benefited directly from outside "risk" capital.

Improvement in livestock breeds has been and continues to be a major research function of our land grant colleges. These institutions are supported by public funds and devote time, money and labor into herd improvement by breeding as well as scientific feeding. We suggest that these laboratories of animal research have made major contributions to breed improvement, feeding improvement and similar advancements in the livestock industry far in excess of contributions made from outside "risk" capital.

We submit to this Committee that the interest of American agriculture and rural communities will be best served if the family farm structure does not have to compete with a select few individuals who are deriving direct benefit from the loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code.

Three categories of people receive direct benefit from the abuse of the liberal provisions in the Internal Revenue Code created for the use of the ordinary farmer: the investor, the financial manager and the farmer who manages the livestock or agricultural crops in which outside risk capital is invested, this at a tremendous loss to the Federal Treasury and the further economic loss to the family farm structure that is dependent upon profit for its very existence. Gentlemen, can we afford this kind of "Cowboy Economics"?

CONCLUSIONS

The National Grange recognizes the importance of preserving and protecting the integrity of the owner-operator-manager farm, as a guarantee to the Nation of the efficient and abundant production of high-quality food and fiber at reasonable prices for the domestic and world market.

We seek to obtain for American farmers a return for their labor, management, risk and investment which bears a reasonable relationship to that received for these same economic factors in any other segment of our economy, as well as adequate compensation for their contribution to the general welfare.

The activities of conglomerate corporations and other nonfarm interests in agriculture are not consistent with long-range Grange objectives and have resulted in commodity market price manipulation, unrealistically high prices for farm land and increased farm real estate taxes, (which have made it increasingly difficult to pass farms on to heirs). The net result has been a loss in rural America of farm families. These farm families are frequently forced to migrate to urban centers and into situations for which they are ill-prepared, which further aggravates the explosive problem of our central cities and urban areas, including flooding of the labor market with additional unskilled workers.

If large corporations and non-farm interests become predominant in agriculture, the need for many Main Street businesses, schools, churches and municipal facilities will be eliminated. It will destroy job opportunities in rural America and will not be in the best interest of long-term national objectives.

This impact on community life makes the non-agricultural corporate farm invasion a human as well as an economic problem. It is a problem that should concern all Americans and demand their immediate attention.

We again express our thanks to the Chairman and this Committee for allowing the National Grange to present our views on this problem that is so vital to rural America and the preservation of the family farm structure of American Agriculture.

DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY, PASTOR OF THE MORNINGSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the State of Georgia's most beloved and respected pastors, Dr. James P. Wesberry, observed his 25th anniversary on March 1 as pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Dr. Wesberry was honored at special services on that occasion by his congregation and his many friends and associates in Atlanta, throughout Georgia, and from across the Nation. Dr. Wesberry's ministry has carried him all over the world and for a time in 1949 he served as Acting Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

On March 4, the Georgia State Senate adopted a resolution commending and congratulating Dr. Wesberry on his long and distinguished service. Jim Wesberry is a great man, and a great pastor. I am proud to count him as one of my warmest friends.

I ask unanimous consent that the Georgia State Senate resolution, along with portions of Dr. Wesberry's biographical profile, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 87

A resolution commending and congratulating Dr. James Pickett Wesberry; and for other purposes

Whereas, on Saturday, March 1, 1969, Dr. James Pickett Wesberry will celebrate his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta; and

Whereas, Dr. Wesberry is one of Georgia's most highly respected citizens who is loved by thousands of people throughout the world; and

Whereas, he has dedicated himself to the betterment of his fellowman and is an outstanding representative of the great principles of Christianity; and

Whereas, his remarkable ability and devotion to the improvement of mankind have been widely recognized for many years as demonstrated by the numerous positions of honor, trust and responsibility which have been placed upon him; and

Whereas, in recognition of the great contributions he has made to his City, State and Nation, many honors have been bestowed upon him; and

Whereas, he is the father of a distinguished former member of the State Senate, Honorable James P. Wesberry, Jr.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate that the members of this body do hereby commend Dr. James Pickett Wesberry for his many years of dedicated service to his fellowman and congratulate him on the occasion of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this Resolution to Dr. James Picket Wesberry.

Adopted in Senate March 4, 1969.

GEO. G. SMITH,
President of the Senate.
HAMILTON MCWHORTER, Jr.
Secretary of the Senate.

DR. JAMES PICKETT WESBERRY

Dr. Wesberry is known and loved by thousands of people throughout the world. He is in his twenty-fifth year as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta. . . . He was born in the little town of Bishopville, South Carolina, and reared in Columbia, the state's capital. He was destined to walk in paths of service as a humble, devoted Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—Preacher, Pastor, Teacher, Counselor, Author, Statesman, and Friend—keenly sensitive to the heart throbs of humanity, a devoted lover of souls, and a true zealot for the cause of righteousness.

On September 5, 1929, he was married to Ruby Lee Perry of Columbia who died Christmas Day, 1941. To this union was born one son, James Pickett, Jr., who is a Certified Public Accountant and former Georgia State Senator, now Financial Consultant to the Government of Peru in Lima. He later married Mary Sue Latimer, of Greenville, South Carolina, a graduate of Furman and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (M.R.E. Degree), the daughter of the late Dr. and Mrs. Leon M. Latimer.

As a boy Dr. Wesberry attended public schools in his hometown of Columbia. During his high school years, except for the time he was manager of student athletics, he was employed by the Federal Land Bank of Columbia, working before and after school hours. He holds the A.B. and M.A. Degrees from his beloved Alma Mater, Mercer University; the B.D. and S.T.M., from Andover Newton Theological School; and has received four honorary Doctor's Degrees: LL.D., D.D., L.H.D., and Lit.D. He was a special student at Harvard in 1931; attended summer conferences at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, 1935 and 1965, Yale

XUM

School of Alcohol Studies in 1946, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1957, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1958. While at Mercer University he received the highest honor accorded a student in 1931 by both faculty and fellow students, that of Master Mercerian.

On June 4, 1962 Dr. Westberry was signally honored by LaGrange College by being the first minister outside the Methodist denomination to receive an honorary degree from this 137-year-old institution. The citation read by President Waites Henry said: "LaGrange College takes note of the qualities of life and contribution that have brought honor to your name," and referred to him as a "faithful servant of the Church." "In particular," it read, "we hereby recognize your special service to the people of Georgia in the report of this Commission (State Literature) and, in token of our appreciation, confer on you the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities." Dr. Wesberry cherishes his friendships with those of all denominations, and has contributed much to the ecumenical spirit of Atlanta.

At the age of 20 Dr. Wesberry was ordained to the Gospel Ministry by his home church, Park Street Baptist, Columbia, South Carolina, J. Dean Crain, Pastor, while a sophomore at Mercer University serving country churches in Georgia. From 1928 to 1931 during his last three years at Mercer he was Pastor at Soperton, where he led his people in the erection of a beautiful new church and made many lasting influential friends. He later served as Pastor of the South Medford Baptist Church, Medford, Massachusetts; the Kingstree Baptist Church, Kingstree, South Carolina; and the Bamberg Baptist Church, Bamberg, South Carolina for eleven years before coming to Morningside.

Dr. Wesberry has distinguished himself as a true statesman, extending his influence beyond denominational lines into many other avenues of life. From July 27 to August 25, 1949 he served as Acting Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, receiving the confidence and esteem of every member. In his book of *Prayers* published by Congress, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, wrote this tribute: "His daily ministrations were helpful and inspiring, lifting all who heard him to a deeper realization of their need for divine guidance." Since 1953 as Chairman of the Georgia Commission on Literature, his voice has been no uncertain sound regarding the evils of obscene literature, arousing and stimulating similar action throughout the nation. And, he has just completed an appointment on the Governor's Citizens Penal Reform Commission in which he served as Chairman of the Editorial Committee to compile and write its Report to the Governor, The General Assembly and The People of Georgia.

In addition to his Book of *Prayers*, he is the author of the *Life and Work of William Screven; Every Citizen Has a Right to Know,* a Report of the Georgia Literature Commission, 1954; *The Georgia Literature Commission,* 1957 Report; *Rainbow Over Russia;* and *Baptists in South Carolina Before the War Between the States* which was published in 1968. In 1962–63 he published a newspaper column, The People's Pulpit, in forty-five county weeklies in Georgia and South Carolina. He has contributed editorials, articles, and sermons to various sources, including the Young People's Training Union Quarterly of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. Andrew W. Blackwood's latest *Special-Day Sermons for Evangelicals* carries his sermon, "Beating Swords into Plowshares."

Dr. Wesberry has traveled extensively to at least thirty-five different countries of our world including the Holy Land (twice), the Pacific (twice), and Soviet Russia. On five different occasions he has been chosen by the Department of Chaplains, United States Air Force, Washington, as Missioner for Preaching Missions or as a Special Representative of the Chief of Chaplains visiting some thirty odd Air Bases in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, Newfoundland, Labrador, Spain, and also as a Co-Ordinator for a Spiritual Life Conference at Lake Tahoe, Nevada, such engagements being in 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1966.

In 1962, he was Protestant Chaplain on the M.S. Bergensfjord 45-day summer North Cape Cruise to eleven countries, including Russia. More recently, in 1967 and 1968, he visited his son in Peru, conducted the first Revival meeting ever held in English in the First Baptist Church in Lima, and served as a missionary to the missionaries there. . . .

On March 1, 1969 Dr. Wesberry celebrated his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church, becoming the third Baptist minister in Atlanta in terms of years of service.

THE PACIFIC: TOO BIG TO SEE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is somewhat paradoxical that the largest ocean on this planet—the Pacific—should be the one often overlooked by Americans.

Traditionally, America has looked eastward to the Atlantic, and understandably so. For the roots of the Nation were largely transplanted from that side of the globe.

But to those who live in the Pacific, like the people of Hawaii, it is both painful and annoying to continue to see instances of oversight concerning the importance of that vast ocean area.

I invite attention to an article aptly titled, "The Pacific: Too Big to See," written by William H. Ewing, editor emeritus of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Pacific: Too Big to See

(By William H. Ewing)

Those of us who live in the middle of the Pacific world and comprehend its basic dynamism and potential are sometimes jolted by the almost subconscious manner in which some of our most important opinion-makers ignore it.

The case in point is a new book by the Lowell Thomases, father and son, called "Famous First Flights That Changed History." It lists these as 16 aviation achievements beginning with Louis Bleriot's flight across the English Channel in 1909 and ends with a jet's circuling the globe by way of the Poles in 1965. The Thomases were aboard the latter flight.

Nowhere does the book mention the John Rodgers flight of 1925, in which a Navy seaplane flew 1,870 (nautical) miles from San Francisco toward Hawaii, ran out of gasoline and literally sailed the remaining 450 miles to Kauai.

The first successful flight from California to Hawaii, that of Army Air Corps Lts. Lester J. Maitland and Albert F. Hegenberger, in June, 1927, is likewise ignored. So is the first civilian flight over the same route by Ernest Smith and Emory Bronte in July that year.

The Dole Air Derby, which followed in August, is mentioned mainly as a tragedy, though two of the eight planes entered made the flight successfully, those flown by Art Goebel and Martin Jensen. Crashes and loss of life were no novelty in those early days of overloaded airplanes trying to cross oceans.

Interestingly enough, the Dole flight came about because of the circumstance mentioned in the first paragraph above—the widespread disposition on the Mainland to look eastward toward the Atlantic.

In 1927 the managing editor of the Star-Bulletin was Joseph R. Farrington. His father, Wallace R. Farrington, was publisher and also Governor. The Star-Bulletin was the then Territory's most vocal advocate of Statehood, an often lonely distinction at the time.

The attention concentrated on the Atlantic by air crossings such as Lindbergh's and Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd's prompted the younger Farrington to seek a sponsor who could attract the same interest in the Pacific. He found one in James D. Dole, founder and then president of the company bearing his name. Dole offered a $25,000 first prize and $10,000 second prize for a flight to Hawaii.

The winning team was Goebel and his navigator, Navy Lt. William Davis, who arrived at Wheeler Field Aug. 17. Jensen came in second.

Years later, on one of a number of trips to Honolulu, Goebel told a group of friends how he happened to get into the Dole Derby and how it had affected his life.

"I was in the business of testing airplanes," he said. "One of the planes was a fighter for the Navy. No matter how I tried I couldn't get it into a spin." A spin was considered a necessary test of airworthiness.

"Somebody came up with the idea of weighting the tail with a couple of hundred pounds of sand packed in sacks. I took her up and kicked her into a spin. She spun, all right, but I was almost to the ground before I could get it out.

"After that sort of work the danger of flying to Honolulu seemed hardly worth considering. Actually I never doubted for a minute that we could make it."

In 1927, $25,000 was a nice slug of cash to come by. Goebel didn't say how he split with Davis, but he kept enough to invest for himself in ventures which later made him a relatively wealthy man.

The only Pacific flights included in the Thomas top 16 were those of the Southern Cross, manned by two Australians and two Americans, which flew from Oakland to Brisbane in 1928 by way of Honolulu and Fiji; and that of Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr., who flew 4,558 miles nonstop from Japan to the United States over the northern route in 1931.

These were unquestionably outstanding achievements in the early days of flight, especially that of the Southern Cross led by Charles Kingsford-Smith. Pangborn and Herndon barely preceded the first exploratory commercial flights by Pan American in the Pacific.

The preoccupation of the authors with parts of the world other than the Pacific is perhaps best demonstrated by their allotting a chapter to the non-stop cross-country flight of Army Air Corps Lts. Oakley Kelly and John Macready in 1922 while overlooking the Maitland-Hegenberger crossing from California to Hawaii. Kelly and Macready hardly made history; Maitland and Hegenberger certainly did.

SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, crisis and challenge are no new experiences to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell). During his many years of distinguished service in the Senate, Richard Russell has put his substantial energies and skills into meeting and resolving a great many serious problems that have plagued his own State and the United States.

It is with these qualities of stouthearted and dauntless courage and fortitude that Senator Russell now faces his

XUM

own personal test. He has my prayers, and my family's prayers, for a complete recovery, and we are confident that his health will be fully restored.

Senator Russell has long been the leading statesman of the South, and an influential and much respected public figure throughout the country. I have been privileged to serve under his committee chairmanship for a decade. He has always acted out of devotion to the Senate, loyalty to his State, and love of country.

I salute Richard Russell as a great Senator and public servant, and one who has been a model and inspiration to me. My petitions for his recovery will include the hope that he will be serving many more years in this institution to which he has given so much.

BIRTH RATES CANCEL ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS GAINS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, a recent report by the Agency for International Development to Congress reveals the disturbing fact that the high hopes of North and South Americans alike for economic growth through the Alliance for Progress have been largely disappointing. According to the report, the average annual increase in gross national product has been about 4.5 percent, but the annual increase in population has been 3 percent. As a result, the actual increase in the gross national product, when computed on a per capita basis, was only 1.5 percent in the first 7 years of the Alliance. This is well below the Alliance goals of an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent per capita.

As one specific example of the way population growth has thwarted economic development, it is calculated that enrollment in primary schools has increased from 24 million in 1960 to 36 million in 1967. But at the same time, there were 27 million children not enrolled in 1967 which represents an increase of nearly 1 million over the children not enrolled in 1960. Even by running forward full speed in the education field, many of the Latin American countries are slipping backwards because of the exceedingly high birth rates. A substantial number of children are therefore deprived of the opportunity for adequate education largely because their parents have been deprived of access to modern methods of family planning. The blame for not providing adequate family planning facilities must rest upon the policies of many Latin American governments as well as our own programs which have in fact impeded economic development which is their ultimate object.

Mr. President, the report further indicates that population control has not been considered one of the goals of the Alliance for Progress. At the same time it is clear that "until these problems are better recognized and addressed in most of the hemisphere countries, the question of attaining a satisfactory level of development remains uncertain."

Mr. President, I believe this report has significant implications for the total AID program in Latin America as well as other parts of the world. It indicates increased needs to focus our efforts in the field of population and family planning to increase the funds, staff, and activities of AID in this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a New York Times article on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Aid Agency Reports Birth Rate Offsets Latin Alliance Gains

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

Washington, March 15.—The Agency for International Development reported to Congress today that the goals of the Alliance for Progress with Latin-American countries were neither realistic nor attainable until the people of the region took steps to control population growth.

In a report to a House "watchdog" committee, the Agency said that although there had been substantial progress toward economic, political and social objectives of the Alliance since its inception in 1961, such gains had been "largely canceled out" in per-capita terms because of "staggeringly high" birth rates.

The United States provided $9.2-billion in the Alliance through loans and grants and other economic aid through last June 30, with $4.1-billion of it coming from the aid agency. Other assistance was provided through the Peace Corps, the Food and Peace programs, the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Total United States economic aid since 1949 to the Latin-American countries has been about $13.2-billion. Project loans and technical assistance grants from 1949 through 1960 totaled $3.9-billion.

One of the chief goals of the Alliance set forth in the Declaration of Punta del Este, named for the meeting in 1961 at which the Alliance was created, was an annual increase of 2.5 per cent in the combined gross national product of the 18 member nations. All citizens and social groups were to share in this economic advance through high income and living standards.

In the first seven years of the Alliance, the combined gross national product of member countries actually showed an average annual increase of 4.5 per cent. But on a per-capita basis, this was an increase of only 1.5 per cent, because birth rates in those countries were among the world's highest, the agency reported.

"It is evident that Latin-American nations, with population increasing at some of the fastest rates in the world, must attain total growth rates of 5.5 per cent and more—higher than the United States average of 5.1 per cent for the same seven-year period—to attain the Alliance goals of 2.5 per cent per capital," the agency's report said.

The agency noted that population control, "because of its political volatility," was not mentioned among the goals of the Alliance. It said that "while there are growing signs of growing recognition of the population issue throughout the hemisphere, there are few countries in which the issue is yet being squarely met." The report added:

"Until these problems are better recognized and addressed in most of the hemisphere countries, the question of attaining a satisfactory level of development remains uncertain."

The report came in response to a demand from the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information that the agency reassess Alliance goals in the light of the last seven years' experience.

The report said at the outset that realization of Alliance goals was not possible in the 10 years originally contemplated. It said "the framers of the charter erected a goal structure which anticipated too much too soon and in recognition of this, the time frame of the Alliance has been extended beyond 1971."

The House subcommittee noted in a report last August that United States administrators of the Alliance had extended the time period to 18 years, or three six-year periods. The first was described as an organization and mobilization phase, the second as one of social and political development and the third as one of integration of the market economies of member countries.

The subcommittee chairman, Representative John E. Moss, Democrat of California, said he welcomed the agency's report as "an honest evaluation of performance toward Alliance objectives and of the need to restate its goals."

"Unquestionably real progress has been made toward these goals," said Mr. Moss, "but I feel that Congress and the people are weary of financing programs that fall short of stated goals. I want to be able to say for once that our objectives have been achieved, but this requires their restatement in more realistic terms.

The agency's report said that "despite the initial unrealistic 10-year time frame, the goal structure still affords an attainable set of priority guideposts for development of the hemisphere." It added that "the development progress and momentum generated under the alliance justify promise for the future and merit continued United States support."

On the other hand, the report made it clear that if the Alliance's goals were to be attained even in the extended 18-year period, the population issue must be made a matter of priority concern by all major governments.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE CITED

Illustrative of the impact of birth rates on other Alliance goals, the report said:

"The number of school-age children not in school tends to grow at the very moment when new schools are being built at a record rate. Substantially increased food production and remarkably expanded educational facilities barely keep pace with population increase."

The report made the following points regarding progress toward other Alliance goals:

Taxation: Although tax collections have increased by 30 per cent since 1961 for all Latin America, there is need for more effective enforcement.

Public Health: There has been "dramatic progress" in this area but much remains to be done. The target of providing potable water to 70 per cent of the urban populations will be achieved by 1971. New or improved water supplies already have been provided for 43 million city dwellers, or 69 per cent of the total, but only 19 million out of a rural population of 128 million have been so benefited.

Deaths from communicable diseases have been reduced markedly since 1961, but still are 10 times the rate for North America.

Agrarian reform: The member nations with some exceptions, such as Mexico, Venezuela and Chile, have not yet effectively "tackled this major issue." The reason is that the breaking up of large land holdings immediately brings "a confrontation with an element of the power structure well represented in national government."

Monetary and Fiscal Stability: Most countries have managed to keep a reasonable degree of price stability despite increased public expenditures. Nine countries had inflation of less than 3 per cent annually. In three others, price increases amounted to about 6 per cent a year. But stabilization is still "precarious" in Brazil, Chile and Colombia.

Income Distribution: The only indicators available show little change from 1960. A study showed remarkably similar income structures, with the top 10 per cent of the population receiving 40 per cent of the income in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico. The bottom 40 per cent of the population received 10 to 14 per cent of total income in those countries.

Education: Enrollment of school-age children in primary schools increased by about 50 per cent between 1960 and 1967, or from 24 million to 36 million. But there were 27 million children not enrolled in primary schools in 1967—740,000 more than in 1960.

With an expansion by 1979 of primary education facilities sufficient to give all school-age children six years of schooling before their 15th birthday, the adult illiteracy rate would be reduced to about 37 per cent or some three-fifths of the 1964 rate, which was 62.1 per cent.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY GEORGIA ASSEMBLY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Georgia General Assembly meeting in Atlanta be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.R. 181–470

A resolution expressing opposition to the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television; and for other purposes

Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission plans to ban all cigarette advertising on radio and television unless the United States Congress intervenes to prevent said Commission from carrying out said plan; and

Whereas, if carried out, this proposed ban on cigarette advertising would do violence to the principles of free enterprise which have been the source of the greatness of our country; and

Whereas, the tobacco industry has always been and still is of fundamental importance to the economy of the South; and

Whereas, the importance of the tobacco industry to our own State is demonstrated by the fact that Georgia growers produced an average of over 78 million dollars worth of tobacco per annum during the past three years; and

Whereas, the impact that tobacco has on the Georgia economy is further demonstrated by the fact that there are over 26,000 tobacco growers in this State, and many times that number of people depend on the tobacco industry, either directly or indirectly, for their livelihood; and

Whereas, at a time when further taxation of our citizens is being considered, it should be noted that over thirty-seven and one-half million dollars in cigarette and tobacco taxes was collected by the State of Georgia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968; and

Whereas, cigarette advertising is directed toward people who already smoke and amounts to competition among brands rather than an inducement to people to begin smoking; and

Whereas, while convincing evidence has been presented to show that cigarette smoking is harmful to health, the alleged impact of cigarette advertising on actual smoking is sheer speculation which has not been backed up by objective and factual information; and

Whereas, since no reasonable justification for banning cigarette advertising on radio and television has been demonstrated and such a ban could have far-reaching adverse effects on the economy of our county, the Federal Communication Commission's plan to implement such a ban should be abandoned.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that the members of this body do hereby express their firm opposition to the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that all members of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress are hereby requested and urged to use their power and influence in prohibiting the implementation of the proposed ban of cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this resolution to Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; Honorable Phil Campbell, Undersecretary of Agriculture; each member of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress; the Federal Communications Commission; Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia and Honorable Thomas T. Irvin, Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture.

In House, read and adopted March 3, 1969.

Glenn W. Ellard,
Clerk.

In Senate, read and adopted March 17, 1969.

Hamilton McWhorter, Jr.
Secretary.

PARTICIPATION AND ALIENATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on several occasions in the past I have spoken about "Toward a Social Report" and its relation to the Full Opportunity Act of 1969—S. 5. Today I invite attention to the last chapter of that report: "Participation and Alienation." Some of the other chapters of this report have dealt with relatively more simple topics. This is one area where, at present, it is more intelligent to concentrate on the formulation of the proper questions than it is to seek answers to irrelevant questions. The seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report" does precisely this.

This chapter attempts to pose questions which will enable us to judge not simply whether our institutions accomplish their tasks but, equally important, how they accomplish their tasks. Such questioning will "remind us of the range of considerations we should keep in mind when setting public policy, and encourage the collection of needed data in the future." In time, perhaps, we will be in a position to know how to reform our institutions so as make certain that they respect the rights of individuals; facilitate democratic participation; provide congenial group affiliations, and insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

The chapter asks questions in three major areas. We can all agree that our institutions should function in a manner which will not unduly infringe on our individual liberties. Accordingly, the first section of the chapter "asks questions about the degree of freedom and constraint in American life." The report suggests:

> We need to develop survey data that can discern any major changes in the degree of tolerance and in the willingness to state unpopular points of view, as well as information about the legal enforcement of constitutional guarantees.

We can also agree that the protection of the individual liberties of only a selected few is not sufficient. It is necessary that every American's civil liberties are protected. Therefore, the second section of this chapter "raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of equality and justice is realized." Once again we are faced with the situation where those who are least educated and who have the least income often have the least chance to make their interests known. We must ask, How can the groups with the least organized power assert their interests against those with the most? This question urgently needs to be answered.

Finally, we can agree that even if people "enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system" they can still lack a "sense of community." That is, they can still feel alienated: from their family, neighborhood, Nation, or any other social group. It is in this section where we come face to face with a problem which most Americans are deeply concerned about: the problem of a nation divided against itself. We desperately need to know how deep or serious "are the divisions in our society." It is only after we have such information that we will be able to act intelligently to eliminate the divisions which are not socially advantageous.

I wish to stress one other point which is highlighted in "Toward a Social Report." Social reporting in not a panacea. The difficult policy decisions we face will not be solved automatically by social reporting. As the report notes:

> Social Reporting cannot make the hard choices the Nation must make any easier, but ultimately it can help to insure that they are not made in ignorance of the Nation's needs.

What social reporting can do is to keep us from continually "stumbling into the future."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Participation and Alienation," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chapter VII. Participation and Alienation

WHAT DO WE NEED TO LEARN?

The preceding chapters neglect many of the Nation's major concerns. They have, for example, scarcely mentioned the divisions in our society which separate young and old, black and white, left and right. Yet these divisions trouble many Americans, and help explain the demonstrations at universities, the disorders in cities, and the manifestations of racist and extremist strength. The preceding chapters have similarly neglected the controversies about court decisions defining our individual liberties, demands for "democratic participation" in the organizational life of the society, and the concern some Americans have about the viability and stability of family life.

The most notable of the problems that have been neglected are those that concern the functioning of our social and political institutions. To the extent that these institutions have promoted health, deterred crime, and the like, their achievements belong in preceding chapters. But we also care about *how* we combine our efforts to achieve our goals, about our loyalty toward our institutions, about our attitudes toward each other, and about the implications of our social and

XUM

political institutions for the future of the Nation, However good our health or high our incomes, we would not be satisfied with institutions that failed to respect individual rights, allow democratic participation, provide congenial group affiliations, or insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

Unfortunately, it is concerns such as these that we know least about. It is more difficult to assess the extent to which our political and social institutions satisfy democratic values, or prevent alienation, than it is to assess the level of health, income, or crime.

Therefore, we can do little more than ask the right questions. Yet it is important that these questions be asked. If assessments of the state of the Nation take account only of those variables that are readily measurable, our social priorities and public policies will be distorted. It will not be possible to obtain the needed information in the future unless the questions are asked now.

Since the primary purpose of this report is to examine the condition of American society, the questions should pertain to the basic functions our social and political institutions perform, rather than to their structures or characteristics.

One purpose our institutions should surely serve is that of protecting our individual liberties—one of the first ideals of our Nation. Democratic processes are meaningless if citizens do not have a large measure of freedom, particularly freedom to dissent from the policy of the Government and the views of the majority. Thus the first section of this chapter asks questions about the degrees of "Freedom and Constraint" in American life.

In a modern democracy, individual liberty cannot be the privilege of a few: It must be available on an equal basis to every law-abiding citizen. A system in which some stand above the law, while others are denied its protection, is repugnant to the idea of justice. Equality before the law in turn implies that every citizen have access to public services on an equal basis according to law. The citizens must also be able to influence public policy, and in the aggregate influence it decisively, or they are not truly free. There must be meaningful voting, and the vote of each citizen must count equally. The second section of this chapter therefore raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of "Equality and Justice" is being realized.

A people may enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system, yet lack any sense of community. Many may be alienated, not only from the Nation, but also from their families, neighborhoods, and other social groups. Some degree of alienation and disunity is acceptable in a society that values individual freedom, and the alienated may be creative and bring about reforms which benefit society as a whole. But if alienation becomes so pervasive that all sense of community is lost, the result can be disaster.

The degree of alienation also depends on the functioning of all the social groups in the society. A person may be alienated because of the failure of his family, the shortcomings of his neighborhood, the lack of a congenial club, or the policies of the National Government.

Thus the third section of this chapter, on "Community and Alienation," asks how strong are the bonds which maintain our relationships to social institutions, from the family to the National Government. Here we encounter what many Americans find the most worrisome questions of contemporary life: How serious are the divisions in our society? How can we bridge the generation gap that divides families and universities, and the racial and ideological differences that divide neighborhood and Nation?

QUESTIONS ABOUT FREEDOM AND CONSTRAINT

It is a sign of the profound value placed on freedom that many use this word to describe a great many of the things they want. Better education, more goods and services, and higher incomes give people the freedom to do things they could not have done before. But we are discussing freedom here in its most ancient and basic sense: those rights that allow an individual to use his time, talents, and resources in whatever way he pleases, so long as this does not interfere with the rights of others.

Freedom of expression

Democracy cannot be meaningful if those who disagree with the policy of the government have no opportunity to persuade their fellow citizens to vote it out of office. Thus freedom of expression, both for individuals and for groups, is absolutely indispensable to a democratic society.[1] We must therefore ask particularly about the freedom to express dissenting and unpopular views.

There can be little doubt that court decisions in the recent past have expanded the legal protection for free speech. Important as these legal developments have been, they are by no means the whole story. Freedom of expression can be restricted not only by government officials, but also by popular intolerance. However, the extent of such intolerance is not known.

There is some evidence that a majority of Americans on occasion have wanted to deny free speech to their fellow citizens, and that this disposition has been more prevalent among the rank and file than among community leaders. In the period of the Red scare of the early fifties, only 27 percent of Americans thought that an admitted Communist should be allowed to make a speech in their communities; but 51 percent of community leaders felt such a speech should be permitted. Among the general population, only about 37 percent thought that a person who wanted to speak against religion should be allowed to speak in their communities. Again, community leaders were more tolerant; 64 percent of them believed such a speech should be allowed.[2]

There is a need for tolerance not only in national political forums, but also in daily life. How much tolerance of dissent is there in our schools, factories, and offices? We do not know, but some approximate answers could be obtained, as one study shows.

In this study, representative samples of persons in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Mexico were asked about the extent to which they had as students felt free to discuss unfair treatment in school or disagree with the teacher, and whether they had participated in school debates on political and social issues. As tables 1 and 2 reveal, American respondents were more likely than those in any of the other countries surveyed to say that they had felt free to disagree with their teachers, discuss unfair treatment with them, and participate in school discussions and debates. Americans were also more likely to be consulted about job decisions and to protest job decisions than those in most of the countries surveyed.

The lack of information about the extent of our liberties may suggest that we are not as vigilant about the state of our freedom as we purport to be. Here we can do little more than pose the question of how well the Nation is protecting the individual rights its rhetoric emphasizes. But the question is itself important. If it is asked more often, we will in time be able to provide better answers.

TABLE 1.—FREEDOM TO DISCUSS UNFAIR TREATMENT IN SCHOOL OR TO DISAGREE WITH TEACHER. BY NATION

[In percent]

Percent who remember they felt—	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Free	45	35	34	29	40
Uneasy	23	18	24	19	16
Better not to talk to teacher	25	41	30	36	39
Don't know, don't remember, and other	8	6	12	16	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total number	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 332.

TABLE 2.—FREEDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN SCHOOL DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES, BY NATION

[In percent]

Percent who remember they felt—	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Could and did participate	40	16	12	11	15
Could but did not participate	15	8	5	4	21
Could not participate	34	68	68	56	54
Don't know and other	11	8	15	29	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total number	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 333.

QUESTIONS ABOUT EQUALITY AND JUSTICE

Equal treatment is a cornerstone of our society. We believe in equality before the law: The judicial system must deal equally with the great and the small, or there is no justice. We believe in the right to equal access to public services: The administrative apparatus should treat all citizens in the same way, according to law. We believe in the one-man-one-vote ideal: The political system should give each citizen equal access to the electoral process so that no group can wield political power disproportionate to its numbers. These ideas of equality and justice are not only enshrined in our rhetoric; they are essential to the viability and integrity of our democratic processes. If those who oppose the existing leadership cannot depend on the protection of the courts, or equal access to public services, or voting power comparable to their numbers, democracy is threatened.

---

[1] If there is freedom of expression and organization, there is automatically a good deal of religious freedom as well.

[2] Samuel Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954), pp. 26–44.

XUM

Justice in the courts

A democratic society must always ask whether everyone accused has a right to counsel and all of the other requisites of a fair trial; whether justice is so long delayed it is in effect denied; whether every citizen has equal access to publicly provided services.

The American system of justice with its ancient roots in the common law, its elaborate rights of appeal, and thoroughgoing system of judicial review, is properly a source of national pride. Yet there is evidence that some suffer rough and ready justice at the hands of the police; that some are tried without adequate counsel; that publicity and prejudice may sometimes prevent a jury from rendering justice. In some parts of the country, the punishment of those accused of rape has varied with their race and the race of their victims.

One reason why so little is known about the exact extent of such inequities in our system of justice is that virtually *any* such wrong is a matter of great seriousness. It can result in the impeachment of a judge, or the expulsion or loss of pay of a policeman. Because so much is at stake, it is extremely difficult to collect information on shortcomings as a matter of statistical routine. Yet, if we believe in justice, we are obliged to ask to whom it has been denied.

Access and redress in large organizations

A growing group of Americans, especially among the young and the black, are intensely concerned about the relationship between the individual and the large bureaucracies. They are concerned about the relationship between the citizen and the police force, the student and the university, the claimant and the insurance company, the welfare client and the public assistance office, the tenant and the housing authority, the employee and the hierarchy.

The concern about the relationship between the individual and the bureaucracy is coming from diverse segments of the political spectrum. Historically, those on the right have been most anxious about the evils of bureaucracy and most enthusiastic about decentralization. But recently, the "new left" seems on its way to putting democratic participation in large organizations, including some forms of decentralization, above the left's traditional advocacy of central planning and the nationalization of industry.

The problem is this: How can the individual citizen, especially the citizen who is lacking in education, influence, and self-confidence, get the services he should expect from large bureaucracies, or get redress from the wrongs they may commit against him? The person accused of a crime has recourse to an elaborate system of justice replete with features designed to protect those unjustly accused. But the citizen who cannot get the police protection he needs, or who suffers rude treatment from the police, may find that the courts are irrelevant, or so costly and cumbersome that they are of no use. The man who can't get a license to work, or get a public utility bill corrected, or have an insurance claim processed promptly, may not have the option of turning to the courts. He may know that "you can't fight city hall," or influence a large corporation.

It is always possible to complain, and complaints sometimes help. Yet all too often complaints get lost in a snarl of red tape. This is especially true for the person who lacks education, or experience with large organizations, or who lacks the stamina, resources, and gall needed to make a large issue out of what the bureaucracy may take to be a small matter.

Today, as never before in our history, people seem to be at the mercy of huge, impersonal bureaucracies. Even when large bureaucracies function efficiently, there still may be resistance and resentment. People want to be treated personally and humanely. They do not want to be only a cog in a machine. The courtesy of an explanation, or a sympathetic ear, may make all the difference.

The expansion of government services, both at Federal and local levels, has increased the multiplicity of offices and agencies with which the citizen must deal. Millions of Americans think of their government as distant and unresponsive, though paradoxically many seem to think the city government more remote than the Federal.

The decline of the political machine typical of the 19th century city may also be a factor. Corrupt as these machines were, they nonetheless were responsive to the needs of many of the immigrants from Europe, and helped assimilate them into American life. The mid-20th century immigrants to the city are mainly Negroes from rural areas of the South who have not been assimilated into the political structure nor had the personal relationships with the city government that the political machines afforded earlier immigrants.

The difficulty of the relationships between bureaucracies and Negroes is illustrated in table 3. Whereas 87 percent of the whites expect "equal treatment" by administrative officials, only 49 percent of the Negroes do. Negroes are also less likely to feel that administrative officials will pay attention to their point of view, less likely to expect equal treatment from the police, and less likely to think the Government or the Congress pays much attention to what people think.

TABLE 3.—RESPONSIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

	Total	White	Negro
Percent who expect equal treatment in administrative office [1]	83 (970)	87 (866)	49 (100)
Percent who expect equal treatment from the police [1]	85 (970)	88 (866)	60 (100)
Percent who expect administrative official to pay attention to their point of view [1]	48 (970)	50 (856)	30 (100)
Percent who expect police to pay attention to their point of view [1]	56 (970)	58 (866)	36 (100)
Percent who feel elections make the Government pay much or some attention [2]	89.2 (1,450)	90 (1,291)	83.8 (148)
Percent who feel most Congressmen pay much or some attention to what people think [2]	79.2 (1,450)	79.3 (1,291)	78.4 (148)

Note: Numbers in parentheses refer to the bases upon which percentages are calculated.

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," 1960.

[2] Source: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Election Survey, 1964.

A study of the attitudes of Southern whites and Negroes, on what they would do about the problem of a dangerous school crossing, again shows the Negro's sense of uneasiness in dealing with officialdom. Though Negro responses indicated they would be about as likely to take action about a dangerous school crossing as whites, they were less likely to deal with the official directly, and more likely to speak to "influential" private persons. Whereas 49 percent of the whites would talk to the school officials, only 33 percent of the Negroes would. Though only 1 percent of the whites would talk to an influential private person, 8 percent of the Negroes would.

We need to consider a wide variety of new options that will improve participation and help individuals to deal with bureaucracies. Many things can be done. We must consider the merits of ombudsmen or independent investigators who can look into citizen complaints against administrative actions; neighborhood city halls that can bring local government closer to the people; neighborhood service centers that help people find their way to the right agency; consumer protection units; expanded legal aid for the poor; improvement in administrative law, so that the protection of the courts can be broadened; decentralization of police forces, schools, and other governmental functions; effective employee grievance procedures; councils of student representation in university communities, so that student reactions can effectively reach faculty and administration; and informal networks of communication that tell the administrator what his clients are thinking.

Large organizations are a fixture in today's world. How to keep them from colliding with the individual need for identity and participation is a complex problem. It will take a great deal of study to understand this problem, and probably a wide variety of policies to deal with it.

Political inequities

Universal suffrage, with one vote for each citizen, is one of the requisites of a system in which every individual, whatever his economic or social status, has an equal voice. As recent Supreme Court decisions about "reapportionment" suggest, there is in our constitutional and democratic ethic a concern that each group of citizens have the opportunity to play a role proportionate to its numbers.

Are any groups denied the role in the political system to which their numbers should entitle them?

In some Southern States, most Negroes have historically been denied the right to vote, and the proportion of Negroes registered in these States is still often a great deal smaller than the proportion of whites that are registered. Such inequities are an affront to democracy. Yet it is also significant that these differences in registration rates are steadily getting smaller, partly because of the Civil Rights Acts of recent years, and that in the Northern States Negro registration rates are not much different from those of whites.

There are also distinct differences in the proportion of the *total* population that is registered in the Nation's major cities. A study of 104 major cities showed that rates of voter registration were greater than 90 percent in some cities (such as Detroit, Seattle, and Minneapolis), and less than 70 percent in others (such as Baltimore, Newark, and New York). If literacy tests, methods of purging registration rolls, and inconvenient arrangements for registration are among the factors that account for these differences, they have distinct implications for the distribution of power among different socioeconomic groups.

There is also the question of the fairness of the apportionment of state legislatures and state congressional delegations, but again there is a clear trend toward more equal representation. Gerrymandering also appears to be declining, though this defies accurate measurement.

Insofar as the right to vote and apportionment are concerned, the situation is one of distinct, if not rapid, improvement.

Political power, however, involves more than the right to vote. It can require, among other things, money to finance campaigns, effective political organization, and lobbying or other pressure on the officeholder between elections. In many cases a group will have a major influence on public policy only if it is organized.

Although America has been called a nation of joiners, the fact remains that most Amer-

XUM

icans do not belong to any organization that represents them in the political system. Only one American in 25 reports membership in an explicitly political club or organization, and only 24 percent report belonging to any organization that they consider to be involved in political or governmental affairs. Only 57 percent report belonging to a voluntary association of any kind, including religious groups. A number of surveys indicate that less than 8 percent attend any political meetings or rallies.

Thus most Americans are without any organizational affiliations that would give them an organized voice in the governmental process.

The frequent lack of significant organized representation for major groups should not be surprising. When a large group of citizens has some common interest of purpose to seek in the political arena, the typical *individual* in that group often finds that it is *not* in his self-interest to contribute his money or time to an organization that attempts to further that common interest. He would get the benefits of any legislation that the organization succeeded in getting passed whether he contributed to that organization or not. And the typical individual in a large group could not by himself be decisive in determining whether or not the desired legislation would be passed. Thus he has little incentive to support an organization working in his political interest, and may very well not do so. The voluntary association seeking favorable legislation for a large group is in a position analogous to that of a government, in that it produces a service that cannot usually be sold in the market, yet it lacks the power to collect taxes, which governments (however popular their policies) require. Accordingly, we cannot assume that every large group of citizens will organize whenever its interests are threatened.

Industries with a small number of large firms will, because the resources are great and the number that need to be organized is small, usually be able to establish trade associations to further their political and other interests. Similarly, some professions, such as medicine, are well organized in part because each doctor can get professional advantages from joining his medical association. Labor unions can sometimes confer some similar benefits through grievance procedures and shop stewards, and often have the benefit of "union shop" provisions as well. Some farm organizations restrict the benefits of their cooperatives and mutual insurance companies to their members, thereby making it more advantageous for farmers to join.

Whereas some groups have the benefit of organization for reasons such as these, other groups, whose interests should have as much claim to attention, do not have these organizational advantages. This introduces an important inequality into our political system, which explains some of the unevenness in governmental attention to different problems.

This inequality particularly affects those with the least income and education. A survey by the National Opinion Research Center found that 52 percent of those with an income over $7,000 belonged to some voluntary association, but only 24 percent of those with an income under $2,000 did Some 53 percent of the professionals, proprietors, managers, and officials belonged to voluntary associations, but only 32 percent of the skilled laborers, and 21 percent of the unskilled. Forty-two percent of farm owners, belonged to such organizations but only 13 percent of farm laborers.

Organizational inequities such as these help us understand the paradoxical strength of "special interests" in a democratic system formally designed to treat everyone alike.

How can the groups with the least organized power assert their interests against those with the most? Enlightened public officials can help. A government can set up an office of consumer affairs, or an agency for migrant workers, and so on. But, in the end, can the problem be solved unless we organize the weak, or weaken the strong?

QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMUNITY AND ALIENATION

The concern about social division and alienation in American society seems greater now than it has been for some time. The rising tempo of protest, especially among the young and the Negro, and the recent manifestations of right-wing discontent, have prompted some Americans to ask why the Nation faces these divisions now.

There are undoubtedly many reasons. The sharp differences about the war probably explain some of the division. Another factor is our growing affluence and new social legislation which lift the expectations of some people and, at the same time, arouse resentment and fear of change among others. A complete analysis of social cohesion would also have to consider, among other things, the ways children are brought up and educated, and the effectiveness of society's mechanisms for mediating and resolving disputes. It would also have to do justice to the positive functions of alienation and division, as sources of innovation and reform.

The alienation from the university, neighborhood, and family may well be of greater concern than the national political divisions. This alienation suggests one of the most fundamental causes of national division—the lack of satsifactory group relationships. People need a sense of belonging, a feeling of community, in some small social group. If such associations are lacking, they will feel alienated; they will have a tendency either to "cop out" of the central life of the society, or else try to reverse the direction of the society by extreme or even violent methods. The more numerous and stronger the social ties that bind an individual to the social order, the more likely he is to feel an attachment to the society, and work within existing rules to improve it.

We then need to ask questions about some of the principal social relationships in the society, and particularly the family, the neighborhood, and the voluntary association.

The effects of marital status

The need for social relationships may be seen in the association between marital status and health. Married people have distinctly lower death rates and lower rates of suicide, alcoholism, and mental illness than those who have never married or whose marriages have been disrupted by death or divorce.

With the important factors of age, race, and sex accounted for, differentials in death rates by marital status are very great. For every age, race, and sex, married persons have the lowest death rates. This cannot be explained by any difficulties those who are ill might have in getting or keeping a spouse, for the death rates for widowed persons, at all ages and for both sexes, exceed those of the married. Nor are the differences in suicide rates large enough to account for the differences in mortality rates.

Such statistical associations are particularly important here because they illustrate the pervasive and far-reaching consequences close social relationships can have. They add plausibility to the observations which suggest that alienation from society often reflects a lack of satisfactory relationships in small, primary groups, rather than solely global or national developments, and they show the need to inquire into the functioning of all types of social groups.

The condition of the family

The family has undergone profound changes in modern times. It was once the basic unit of society—the source of cohesion and security, the unit of economic activity, the means of education and recreation. Today, many of the functions of the family are performed by other institutions, from the Social Security Administration to the school.

The change in the structure and role of the family has had two important consequences. First, young but unmarried adults have had less family affiliation in recent times than in earlier periods. For many Americans now between 18 and 22, the college or university is *in loco parentis*. For some others, a hippie community may play the role the extended family served in earlier periods. Neither the college nor the communities of drop-outs bring different generations together on the intimate terms the extended family once did, nor do they provide the same kind of emotional security and support.

The second consequence is that changes in the family as an institution are sometimes read as signs of the collapse of family life. Thus, increases in divorce rates suggest to some that the value put upon family life is declining, yet the proportion of the population that is married has been increasing.

Between 1940 and 1965 the proportion of the population, after age-adjustment, that is married increased by 7.5 percent, but the proportion divorced increased only 1.3 percent. Those with disrupted marriages tend to marry again, and fewer stay single. Longer life expectancy means that marriage partners have a longer life together, much of it without the obligations of young children. We need much better information on what such changes mean for our well-being and the strength of our institutions.

The Negro family has suffered adversities going back to the days of slavery. A large percentage of Negro children live in disrupted families. In 1965, about 38 percent of the Nation's Negro children did not live with both parents, whereas only 10 percent of white children were in that situation. About twice as many nonwhite children were living with their fathers only, four times as many with their mothers only, and five times as many with neither parent.

A substantial part of this difference is due to the greater rate of illegitimacy in the Negro population. In 1965, 1.2 percent of single white women had a child, but 9.8 percent, over eight times as large a proportion, of the nonwhite women did. This difference can, however, easily be misinterpreted because white couples are more likely to use contraceptive techniques, or to marry after the discovery of a premarital conception. Moreover, the illegitimacy rate among whites appears to be increasing, whereas that of nonwhites is, if anything, going down.

Still, Negroes are much less likely to belong to intact families than whites. This fact adds interest to the question of whether there is more alienation among the Negro population than the white.

Voluntary associations

There is some evidence that membership in voluntary associations reduces an individual's sense of powerlessness and alienation. One survey[3] attempted to measure the extent to which a sample group felt they had control over the events that affected them. The responses, especially those of manual workers, suggested that members of a labor organization consistently had lower "powerlessness" scores than those who did not belong to any organization. The results are given in table 4.

---

[3] From A. Neal and M. Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," *American Sociological Review* (1964), 29, 216–226.

TABLE 4.—MEAN SCORES ON POWERLESSNESS FOR UNORGANIZED AND ORGANIZED MANUAL WORKERS, WITH INCOME CONTROLLED (N EQUALS 244)

Income	Unorganized	Organized
Under $3,000	2.50 (14)	2.20 (5)
$3,000 to $4,999	3.20 (46)	2.81 (52)
$5,000 to $6,999	3.20 (25)	2.55 (75)
Over $7,000	3.00 (4)	2.65 (20)
Total (mean)	3.08 (89)	2.64 (153)
S.D	1.5	1.8

Note: Scores on the powerlessness scale ranged from 0 to 7

Though the evidence is ambiguous, those with the most pronounced sense of powerlessness and alienation often seem to display an ambivalent attitude toward political participation. On the one hand, they are less likely to vote, keep track of political issues, and the like. On the other hand, there is also some evidence that they are disproportionately active in particular circumstances. Some studies have suggested, for example, that alienated and powerless voters are especially likely to be vigorous opponents of fluoridation and school bond issues.[4]

These results are consistent with a theory advanced by a number of sociologists: alienation usually leads to political apathy; yet alienated people become easily aroused in certain circumstances, such as when extremist and totalitarian forces are gaining strength. We need to continue seeking further evidence on this and other explanations.

The neighborhood

The immediate neighborhood, though not so important as a social unit as it once was, still has some significance. The slum neighborhool is of particular interest, since it generally has less organization and social structure. Slums have disproportionate numbers of people who suffer from social pathologies, and slum communities lack the internal structure to deal with these problems.

In fact, social problems—from family disruption to suicide—cluster in the slum. This does not necessarily mean that the problems could disappear if there were no slums. It is logically possible that people with problems gravitate to the slum.

However, there is evidence that suggests that personal and social pathologies are contagious, and that slums *generate* many problems which they have no way of controlling.

If the probability of falling victim to a social pathology is greatly increased if one is brought up in a slum, then the slum is more than a private problem. It is a public and social problem. Private action cannot be expected to cure the social contagions of the slum environment any more than it can deal adequately with contagious diseases. They demand organized action, and organization is what many slums above all lack.

The lack of organization and social structure in the Negro slum therefore appears to be a major problem, and probably one that is related to the recent civil disorders. Cohesion or solidarity would be a great asset for it would give Negroes collective strength both in making external demands (e.g., on city government, or employers), and in enforcing internal constraints (e.g., against delinquency and crime). Its relative absence leaves the individual Negro particularly vulnerable to the unrestrained predations of persons within his community or outside it. The examples of the solidarity of other ethnic groups, such as Jews and Chinese, indicate the tangible assets community solidarity provides: political power, aid to those in trouble, and lending arrangements for those establishing or expanding businesses.

Alienation

The net effect of an individual's praticipation can be partially revealed by surveys which seek to find out whether the individual feels he has control over his own destiny, an intelligible part to play in social life, and values he shares with others. According to such surveys the degree of alienation is substantially different for different groups.

Negroes are much more likely to feel powerless and alienated than whites. A comparison of white and Negro employed men in Los Angeles, for example, showed the following results:

[In percent]

	Negro choices (N=312)	White choices (N=390)
1a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it	58	77
1b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time	42	23
2a. By studying the world situation, one can greatly improve his political effectiveness	58	70
2b. Whether one likes it or not, chance plays an awfully large part in world events	42	30
3a. Wars between countries seem inevitable despite the efforts of men to prevent them	69	66
3b. Wars between countries can be avoided	31	34

Studies have also indicated that the difference in the sense of powerlessness between Negroes and whites is not explained solely by differences in education. When a sample of whites and Negroes were asked to react to the statement that "There is not much I can do about most of the important problems that we face today," the proportions responding affirmatively, at different educational levels, were as follows:

	Percent
Negroes:	
Less than 12 years education	73
12 years or more	60
Whites:	
Less than 12 years education	57
12 years or more	34

Most other minorities also show a high degree of powerlessness, though the Jewish minority appears to be an exception.

Some surveys have suggested that Negroes in integrated areas, or with relatively integrated life styles, tend to feel less powerlessness than Negroes in highly segregated circumstances. The willingness to use violence, by contrast, appears to be greater among Negroes with a high degree of powerlessness, at least according to one survey of the Watts area of Los Angeles.

Among white Americans, alienation is apparently less likely to show up as a feeling of powerlessness and more likely to show up as a conviction that socially disapproved means must be used to attain objectives. Alienation in this sense is greatest among those with lower socioeconomic status. Those who are the most alienated, moreover, tend to have considerable prejudice against members of minority groups.

Alienation accordingly appears to play a role both in the discontents of the black minority, especially those who feel violent means are necessary, and also among those in the white population who show most prejudice against minority groups. Its importance among disaffected young people is not in dispute.

Conclusion

A sense of community, which would do a great deal to lessen alienation, is only one of our social and political objectives. We also cherish individual freedom and equality which too much cohesion in our social groups can sometimes restrict. Some alienation may also be related to intellectual and artistic creativity, and thus socially desirable. Moreover, it often strengthens the forces of reform, and enables the society to change with the times.

Thus a sense of community is not the only good. But, as the present divisions in our society reveal, it is very much worth asking whether we have as much as we need.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN SPECIES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have joined the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) in cosponsoring S. 335, a bill to prohibit the importation of species which are in danger of extinction and to protect certain species in the United States.

Mr. President, this is a good piece of proposed legislation. We in Alaska know and value the beauty and pleasure that are derived from our wild animals, and anything the Federal Government can do to help to preserve this priceless natural heritage is for the better.

I hope that S. 335 can be passed quickly; every day of delay will mean further loss to the world's dwindling irreplaceable supply of wild creatures.

RELOCATION FROM KANSAS CITY NOT JUSTIFIED

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for some time rumors have been circulating that the administration was considering reorganization in several of the most important departments, with a possible relocation of regional offices. We had heard reports that this relocation would involve moving the regional offices of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity from Kansas City, with a consequent transfer of hundreds, if not thousands, of career employees from that community, all for the commendable objective of improved service.

The possibility of transferring these offices from Kansas City has been advanced several times in the past, but was always tabled after careful study revealed the superb transportation and communication facilities at Kansas City, as well as its central location for the majority of the people to be served.

Only yesterday, the Kansas City Star, in a story by Mr. Joe Lastelic of the Washington bureau of that newspaper, gave what appeared to be a more authoritative report than we had previously been able to obtain from the administration about this possible relocation.

Immediately, Senator EAGLETON, Representatives BOLLING, HULL, RANDALL, and I joined in a telegram to the President asking that before any such change is made, the civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City, representing both Missouri and Kansas, be given an opportunity to present the facts as to what that metropolitan area has provided over the years and will continue to provide in outstanding services for these Government functions. I ask unanimous consent that our telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD.

---

[4] J. S. Coleman, *Community Conflict* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957); W. A. Eamson, "The Fluoridation Dialogue," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1961, 24, pp. 527–537; J. E. Horton and W. E. Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Negativism," *American Journal of Sociology* 1962, pp. 485–493.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 26, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The Kansas City Times this morning reports the administration is considering reorganization of Labor, HEW and OEO regional offices with transfer of 825 employees from that community.

With its central location and unexcelled transportation and communications facilities centered in the Kansas City area, it is impossible for us to understand how such a move would add to Government efficiency or save money.

Before any such change is made we would appreciate opportuntiy for civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, to present the facts as to what this metropolitan area provides and will continue to provide in outstanding services for these Government functions.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
Congressman RICHARD BOLLING,
Fifth District.
Congressman W. R. HULL, Jr.,
Sixth District.
Congressman WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
Fourth District.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we understand that members of the Kansas delegation who represent the western part of Metropolitan Kansas City area have made a similar request to the President.

This morning, however, we learn that the President does plan to issue a directive to the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity to move their regional offices from Kansas City.

A telegram yesterday afternoon from the mayors of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., and the presidents of the chambers of commerce of the two cities reports they also wired the President offering their cooperation in further study of the facts. I ask unanimous consent that that telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
March 26, 1969.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram has been sent to the President, White House, Washington, D.C.

"We are concerned in the national interest at local press reports this date alleging relocation in Denver of regional offices of Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity.

"We commend your desire to effect economy in government and increase efficiency. Respectfully urge delay in final decision by Budget Bureau and your personal study of all facts. Some factors for consideration follow.

"Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight task force studying same proposal found it more economical to operate from Kansas City than from Denver. Subsequent transfer of some Department of Labor operations from Denver to Kansas City and recommendation that regional office of HUD be located in Kansas City are consistent with task force findings.

"States involved are Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Wyoming. Functions of all offices are concerned basically with people and population center are found mainly in States of Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota and Missouri.

"Strong orientation of Department to urban problems suggests better service may be provided from Kansas City's closer proximity to population centers than in Denver nearer to more sparsely populated States.

"Travel costs and time of Department employees traveling from Denver back through Kansas City to population centers certain to increase with proposed relocation.

"Kansas City air service superior and current development of Kansas City International Airport sure to achieve cost and time reductions in future.

"Departments now located in Federal facilities in Kansas City. Denver relocation would require Federal Government leasing space from private sector. Estimate eight hundred employees at one hundred and thirty square feet per employee at Denver rate of four dollars and fifty cents per square foot indicates conservative estimate of four hundred and sixty eight thousand dollars per year continuing additional cost to Federal Government for space alone.

"Relocation of Federal employees and families taking into account number of homes owned and inevitable commission on sale of homes, actual movement of individuals and personal belongings estimated conservatively at four thousand dollars per employee resulting in additional three million, two hundred thousand dollar cost to Federal Government.

"No estimate of moving supplies in equipment of various offices available at present but again certain to be additional cost to Federal Government.

"Relocation constitutes personal hardships to many competent, dedicated and loyal Federal employees.

"Once again respectfully urge reconsideration and further study. We stand ready to assist.

"Appreciate all immediate assistance you can give.

"ILUS W. DAVIS,
"Mayor, Kansas City, Mo.
"JOSPEH H. MCDOWELL,
"Mayor, Kansas City, Kansas.
"BERT BERKELEY,
"President, Chamber of Commerce, Greater Kansas City.
"JAY DILLINGHAM,
"President, Kansas City, Kansas Area Chamber of Commerce."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the purported objective of this proposed relocation is decentralization of authority from Washington through centralization in eight cities away from Washington. It is our understanding that the headquarters for our region would serve 11 States—Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming—and would be located in Denver, Colo.

On a map of this region, without any consideration for the distribution of population, Denver would appear to be centrally located, at least geographically. In that the mission of these Federal agencies is to serve people, however, we believe the greatest service at the lowest cost can be given by continuing these offices in the city nearest the center of population. According to 1967 census estimates, 11 million people reside in Missouri and the three States adjacent to Missouri in the proposed 11-State region, whereas 6 million people reside in the other seven States.

It is difficult to understand how relocation of the regional offices to a point more distant from the major concentration of population is going to aid the quality and promptness of service. Surely it would be better to keep these three regional offices where they are and put the proposed subregional offices at the point of lower population density.

According to newspaper reports, city mayors have been asking for this relocation. This would not appear to hold true in our region, as I have received wires from the mayors of the two largest metropolitan areas, from affected Federal employees, and from business groups served through these offices. They are uniform in expressing their opposition to removal of the regional offices from Kansas City and their belief that such a move would, in fact, impair the services that can be rendered our region.

The largest metropolitan area to be served in this region is also disturbed about this possible move. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram received this morning from Mayor A. J. Cervantes of St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
March 26, 1969.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you to assist in delaying any decision regarding the moving from Kansas City, Missouri, to Denver of the regional offices of the Department of Labor, HEW and OEO. Kansas City business and civic leaders are preparing economic and professional facts and figures concerning this matter. The move would be a severe blow to St. Louis programs.

ALFONSO J. CERVANTES,
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Efton A. Stanfield, manager of the National Electrical Contractors Association of Kansas City, expressing the views of that organization.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
March 27, 1969.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re proposed relocation of regional offices of U.S. Department of Labor, HEW and OEO from Kansas City, Missouri to Denver, Colorado. Urgently request that you oppose the proposed relocation of regional offices, U.S. Department of Labor, HEW, and OEO, from Kansas City. Cost of such relocation would, in opinion of membership of this large trade association, result in exorbitant expenditures in these austere times. Furthermore, due to mid America location of Kansas City, relocation would, obviously, result in added travel and per diem expenditures above and beyond that now in force. Relocation expenses of families, per diem and travel wise, shall, obviously, result in unnecessary expenditures of tax payers money. Finally, such relocation shall drastically affect the economic welfare of the greater Kansas City area. Due to untimeliness of this announcement, together with reported imminent decision of the President, your opposition to this relocation effort is urgently requested.

Respectfully yours,
EFTON A. STANFIELD,
Manager, National Electrical Contractors Association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before Congress is asked to appropriate funds to pay for this relocation, it is to be hoped we will be given the facts and figures upon which this recommendation is based, and working with the State and local officials to be served, we will also be given the opportunity to present the facts as to why we believe these agencies have best been able to serve the people by the maintenance of their regional offices in Kansas City.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AWARD TO LEO WEISFIELD, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last fall, a distinguished citizen of the State of Washington received the American Jewish Committee Award at the Jewelry Industry Dinner of the American Jewish Committee Appeal for Human Relations at the Hotel Plaza in New York City.

This gentleman is Mr. Leo Weisfield, a prominent businessman of Seattle, Wash.

I have just received a transcript of that meeting which was highlighted by an excellent address by Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, former Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A wire that I sent to Dinner Chairman M. Fred Cartoun was read. It said:

> It is indeed fitting that the Jewelry Industry Human Relations Award sponsored by the American Jewish Committee Appeal for Human Relations should be given to Leo Weisfield. It has been my honor to have known and worked with Leo Weisfield over a period of 30 years. He is not only a distinguished Northwest businessman, honored and respected by our people, but he has been able to find the time to give of himself in behalf of those causes that have been for the betterment of mankind. He is a kind and gentlemanly man, who has never hesitated to come to the aid of the poor and the oppressed. He has been a firm defender of civil liberties and civil rights. He has never hesitated to speak out, no matter how unpopular the cause. As he is a man of integrity, his influence for good has made our own area a much better place in which to live. I am honored to salute my long-time good personal friend Leo Weisfield, and extend to him my warmest congratulations on this occasion.

Among those gathering for this outstanding event were Walter Karlan, Tobias Stern, Irving Abel, Simon C. Gershey, Milton Weill, Norman M. Morris, Arthur B. Sinkler, Henry Peterson, Julian Lazrus, Ben Natchez and Henry M. Margolis. Mr. Ben Lazrus, in making the presentation to Mr. Weisfield said:

> Leo has done much to improve the lives of others. He is a busy man. Leo is chairman of the Weisfield chain of some 43 stores, yet he's devoted to many civic and philanthropic endeavors. The list is too long to remember, so let me read a few of his community achievements. He is Chairman of the Washington State Committee for the Handicapped, President of the Jewish National Fund for the Pacific Northwest Region; a Board member and former President of the Jewish Federation in Seattle; Treasurer of Greater Seattle, Inc.; and a former regent of Washington State University. He holds the Jewish National Fund's John F. Kennedy Peace Award.

Leo Weisfield's career has been a contributing one, and we of the Northwest who know him best, are especially pleased on his receiving this high award which had most recently been given to General of the Army Omar Bradley.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Weisfield's acceptance remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. LEO WEISFIELD ON RECEIVING HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 9, 1968

Thank you very much. I was first advised that this was merely a group of the American Jewish Committee. I did not know until I arrived in New York that I was being honored. I accept it in this manner more graciously and with more enthusiasm and with more love, because it's from my fellow jewelers.

Now, I know from experience that one who receives an award should stand up and be trembling and nervous and accept every statement made about him as being factual and thanking the person and telling him how humble he is and how much he appreciates all these comments that were made about him.

I asked for the privilege of making a few comments when I found out that this was really a group of friends. I haven't had the pleasure of meeting all of you but I know most of you. I never leave a meeting or accept an award without trying to leave one thought. By the way, before I get started, I cried a little bit this evening because, without my knowing it, my daughter and my grandson—and we are that type of a family—flew in without telling me. When I saw them coming here to be part of this meeting and sharing with me the pleasure of receiving this award, tears came to my eyes. Then my nephew, whom I love so much and is part of our business and who is the local chairman of the American Jewish Committee in Seattle, surprised me as well, and so that added more to the historical event of this particular evening. I want to tell you that I really feel honored and flattered that the Jewelry Division selected me to receive this honor. And I do accept it in the spirit in which it was presented. I accept it in this spirit. I want to tell the Committee that I have never accepted an award in my life for what I did in the past. It is true that one likes to be respected for what he did in the past, and in accepting an award, as I do, I accept it for what I shall do in the future for the American Jewish Committee, not for the past. That has been my life and that will always be my life. I shall merit this award when I prove that statement to the Committee.

I couldn't help looking over the Committee's activities of the years 1967 and 1968. I don't know who drew up the AJC pamphlet; it's marvelous; it's wonderful; and although I haven't been too active in this particular organization, I have been a dedicated Jew since the day I could say, "Mother" and "Father." I was brought up that way, and I shall always be.

This is the thought that I want to leave with each and every one of you and for how long you will carry it in your mind, I don't know. I am not only speaking as a representative of a Jewish organization, but I am also speaking in the broad terms of all religions. I was looking very carefully to the future. Who would carry on the work of the American Jewish Committee? At a glance, I can see there are some young men in this audience; I, too, am a young man of 76; and I shall remain young as God gives me life. I am challenging the American Jewish Committee to accept as a responsibility the carrying on of their work to the youth—the Jewish youth. By Jewish youth, I mean Jews mostly in the religious sense. This can apply to any religion, because, in my humble opinion, most of the problems today must be decided by future generations; and even you, sir, as a public relations man, know that.

We have many problems, and we are going to solve them. The majority of the young men are good Americans and will be as good as anyone in this audience. But there are problems that must be solved, and we as Jews have one of the most serious problems in relation to that particular phase of life. We are not teaching our youth, the Jewish youth, the proper respect for their religion and love, as some of us were taught. I can dare to say to the world, as well as to you, that the foundation of religion was created by the Jews, and I can dare to say to you that one of the most important gifts to the world was religion.

I can make a personal confession; recently my wife was ill for a few months, and I prayed every moment of my life at that time for her recovery. God answered my prayer, and I shall never forget it as long as I live. That's the reason I chose that particular thought to leave with you this evening. Yes, it's true that everyone sitting at this front table and most of those sitting around listening to us are good Jews and dedicated Jews; but I dare to stand before you this evening and say to you, you are neglecting one of your most important responsibilities. I know it from experience and by every-day action. You are not inculcating in the lives of your children what you were taught in respect to what Judaism really means. What is the good if every part of this particular program of 1967 and 1968 was developed? What is the good of it all if it cannot be carried from generation to generation? I defy anyone to tell me what good it is if it will die with the Jewish religion. I dare to say "die," and I have talked with many a rabbi on this particular problem.

I am not going to abuse the program by taking more time than I said I would, but this is the thought I want to leave with you tonight. When you think of anti-Semitism, when you think of the help you are giving the American Jewish Committee, don't think of it as a personal matter as it relates to you or your wife or, casually, to your children. Think of it for the future generations of the Jewish people, and you will get a different concept and accept that responsibility in a different matter.

In conclusion, with all my heart, I accept this award and appreciate the thought behind it. With all my heart, I consider this as one of the great evenings of my life, because I have not only my friends, not only the members—a good many members and leaders of the jewelry industry, to which I have dedicated my most precious possession, my life—sitting around these tables and sharing with me this pleasure and this hour, and my family. I pledge you, through my family and myself, my dedication and my willingness to accept any responsibility that the American Jewish Committee gives to me or asks me to do. I want to thank each one of you for coming here this evening. I more than thank you, because I know you so well, for sharing with me this honor.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, with the coming of spring, millions of par-

XUM

ents will turn their thoughts toward finding a suitable summer camp for their children. They will talk to neighbors. Fancy brochures will come in the mail. Perhaps, on rare occasions, they will find it possible to actually travel to a campsite. But in the end, it is likely that a son or daughter will be sent off to a camp when in fact very little is known about the place, its personnel or its safety record.

The real tragedy is that far too many camps in America are not very safe or healthy places for children. Less than half the States have comprehensive safety regulations to govern the establishment and operation of camps. Many fail to set standards for the type and ability of the staff who will act as "summer parents" for periods ranging from 1 week to 2 months.

Mr. President, I recently reintroduced a bill (S. 809), to establish Federal minimum safety standards for camps. Under this bill, all the States would be encouraged to set up programs to insure compliance with the standards. It is a reasonable and commonsense way of providing a safer environment for our children. It will allow parents to ask one simple question of camps: "Do you meet Federal standards?"

On March 24, the New York Times published an editorial supporting the proposed legislation. In the spring issue of Family Safety, a publication of the National Safety Council, an article on the subject of camp safety, written by Harris Edward Dark, also discusses this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1969]

WAITING FOR DISASTER

If twenty or thirty children were to die at a summer camp, the public outcry would probably force Congress to approve a bill establishing minimum Federal standards for camps. Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut believes that it should not be necessary to wait for a disaster to occur before Congress takes action. We agree.

Between seven and eight million children go to camp in the summer. The exact number is not known and neither is the number of camps in existence. What is known is that camping is a booming business, and that most camps operate totally without Government supervision. Nearly half of the states have no regulations governing camps at all, and most of the rest have no training requirements of counselors, no regulations about the condition of buses and trucks used to transport children or the qualifications of the drivers and no annual camp inspection.

Information about injuries and deaths at camps is hard to come by. Astonishingly, the only survey of camp safety was made back in 1929. That study concluded that two-thirds of all accidents at camp could have been prevented by better supervision or higher standards of camp maintenance. Even the most conscientious parents cannot be expected to know that a camp's bridle path follows a hazardous route or that all of the water sports counselors are not fully trained in life-saving techniques or that any one of a hundred other conditions at camp may in some way be deficient.

The Ribicoff bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to establish minimum standards and would reimburse each state that adopted those standards for one-half of the administrative costs. A dozen co-sponsors from both parties have joined in support of the bill. Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, the new chairman of Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee ought to begin moving this bill toward final enactment before another summer camping season begins.

[From Family Safety, spring, 1969]

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT YOUR KID'S CAMP?

(By Harris Edward Dark)

The accident prevention specialist for the U.S. Public Health Service was making a spot check of children's summer camps for research purposes. He was appalled by what he found at one camp.

The camp's director said that hazardous equipment and substances were carefully kept in his living quarters under lock and key at all times. But in walking across the cluttered yard to the director's door, the PHS man tripped over a can of gasoline. Nearby were two beat-up power mowers and other equipment, just the kinds of things that curious children get in trouble with.

This wasn't all. The camp director spoke very positively about how a camp's staff should continually look for hazards around the grounds and make necessary corrections immediately. Yet the inspector, who could not restrain himself from sarcasm, wrote in his report, "I know he feels deeply about this because the broken steps going down to the bathing area are going to get fixed one of these years."

In the same vein, the inspector commented on the "very unique garbage disposal" system at the camp: "I found out, much to the director's embarrassment, that when the cooks think the meat is spoiled, they throw it out the window for the stray dogs and other animals around the camp."

But perhaps worst of all from the standpoint of danger was this camp's poor security system. The director told the inspector that a strict policy of the camp made it mandatory for each counselor to know where the children were at all times. At the swimming and dock area the director displayed a board on which the children's numbered badges were placed; the badges indicated whether the children were in a canoe or rowboat or in swimming. At that time, the canoes and rowboats were in, and there was apparently no one in swimming. Yet the badges indicated that three children were in a canoe. The lifeguard remembered seeing the missing children bring in the canoe and walk into the woods. No one seemed alarmed, reported the inspector, since "the children always show up at mealtime."

Children don't "always show up at mealtime." In the unfamiliar setting of a summer camp, every child needs special instruction and a kind of super-supervision—compared to what he is used to at home—until he becomes thoroughly familiar with the new environment. Most children never get enough camping experience to reach that point. So they will always need alert supervision. Without it, a child can get lost, suffer a serious injury or even be killed while at camp.

Only a small minority of states have regulations specifically pertaining to resident camping. There are public-health laws that deal with such things as water supply and sewage disposal, but in most of our states there's no check, for example, on the age or physical, mental or moral qualifications of the camp director or any of the counselors. Often, the only person who has had to qualify for his or her job is the lifeguard.

Yet simple incompetence is only part of the problem. There's ample evidence that many camp counselors can be woefully ill-equipped to take on the responsibility of safe-guarding the activities of young folk.

The fancy brochures published as sales promotion pieces by many camps don't always tell the whole story. As an isolated case in point, a camp that published a folder extolling its excellent safety record continued to mail them, even though a season with several accidents made the claim untruthful.

A parent may use the brochures as a general guide, but there's no reason to accept them as gospel. The only really good way to judge a camp is to go there yourself—fore-armed with the right questions to ask.

About 6 million American children go to camp each year—that's about 1 in 7 of the 6-to-16-year age group. There are no national figures on how many campers and counselors are injured each year but the number would be in the thousands if all injuries were reported.

Certain patterns do show up in surveys made of camping accidents. Continental National American Group's commercial special risks division, the insurer that handles the nation's largest load of camping children, found that the 11-year-old age group—both boys and girls—is the most accident-plagued. But the insurance company says that boys have far more accidents than girls do. Professor Arthur E. Gjertsen, a member of the faculty at the State University of New York, conducted a study of accidents that occurred in 69 camps in a midwestern state. His survey showed that of all camping accidents, 41 per cent occurred during supervised periods of the day, including waterfront and game times. Collisions of the people-to-people type were high on the list of injury causes. Older children, ages 10 to 14, are more likely to be involved, and their accidents tend to be more serious, probably because of their greater physical venturesomeness.

Far and away the greatest cause of death at camp is drowning, in spite of the fact that the waterfront of the average camp is the best supervised area. This points up the risks in swimming, boating and canoeing that every parent should keep in mind when checking on a prospective camp for a child.

No one knows this better than Mitch Kurman, a furniture dealer of Westport, Connecticut, whose 15-year-old son, David, drowned in what the father considers a senseless camping-trip accident about four years ago. The Kurmans had picked the camp in upstate New York because it offered canoe trips into Maine, New Hampshire and Ontario. Kurman says the family simply assumed the camp and its side trips were safe.

But after checking into the death of his son, spilled from a canoe on the west branch of the Penobscot River in Maine, Kurman realized his assumption was tragically wrong. He learned from other campers on the trip and from Ontario and Maine police that the young counselor guiding the boys had previously had a narrow escape on a river he had been warned against, and that a forest ranger had specifically warned the same counselor not to try the river where David was lost (described as "wilder than the Niagara Gorge"). Yet the counselor had rashly led his boys into danger in canoes that lacked fast-water safety equipment—life preservers, ropes or snubbing poles.

"If David hadn't been able to swim, if he had wandered off by himself, if he had been ill, it would have been one thing. But this was too raw to let (camps) get away with."

Transformed by tragedy into a crusader, Kurman carried his case to Washington and then virtually all over the country at his own expense. His dead son, a Connecticut resident, had been sent to camp in New York and had suffered his fatal accident in Maine. So Kurman went to Washington first to explore the possibility of national legislation to insure the safety of the estimated 10,000 summer camps from coast to coast. At

XUM

Washington, he was told that camp safety is a state matter.

At the New York attorney general's office, it was explained to Kurman that the state's camp safety is governed by the sanitation code—in Kurman's words, "safe food and safe water." There are no regulations for screening camp personnel in most states, Kurman found.

Also, Kurman found that camps do not have to record publicly any accidents or injuries except fatal ones. Thus, as he puts it, "A kid breaks his arms, gets first aid, is sent home and only the camp and parents know it." This accounts in large part for the dearth of camp-accident information.

With so little regulation and inspection, what assurance does a parent have for the reasonable safety of his children? This—and more specific questions—have been pondered by the American Camping Association for a long time.

The ACA has developed a set of specifications over the years that must be met and adhered to by its 3,000 member camps, roughly one to every three or four camps in the nation. A camp requesting membership is first visited by a pair of inspector-advisors who spend a couple of days, sometimes longer, looking over the facilities and observing how activities are managed.

Seldom does a camp come up with a perfect record. The ACA has no police power; the consultants who visit the camp make recommendations for improvement, and in most cases the camp management is anxious to comply. In the rare case of a flagrant defect and a refusal of cooperation on the part of the management, the camp can only be denied ACA membership.

Of the 10,000 to 11,000 youth camps across the nation, less than one-third are accredited by the ACA. And 14 to 17 percent of the camps that apply for accreditation do not meet the ACA standards the first time around. Some camps, of course, could meet the standards but do not choose to apply for ACA accreditation and membership. Organizations such as the YMCA and Boy Scouts of America have their own standards, though many such camps are also ACA members. The ACA has the only set of standards that call for on-the-spot inspection. There is no way to determine how many of the thousands of non-ACA-member camps could meet ACA standards.

Well aware of this, Kurman wrote to Connecticut Senator Abraham Ribicoff, whom he knew to be a grandfather: "Would you, with all your power and resources as a senator, have any better way of determining a camp's safety than I have?"

That letter started the legislative ball rolling, but both Senate and House bills died in committee last year. The type of bill that's most likely to become federal law is one which defines the safety standards and encourages the 50 state governments to enforce them. There may be a provision allowing complying camps to advertise that they meet federal and state standards.

This type of federal-state cooperation takes time—years. In the meantime, late figures show that only 17 states require that a camp operator be licensed; only 26 states have general regulatory guidelines of any sort; only four states prescribe age requirements for counselors.

If you have a child to send to camp this summer, how can you possibly select a camp that will be relatively safe?

First, an important "don't"—don't attempt to judge any camp merely by its literature. You must visit the camp and make up your mind from personal observation, or rely on the recommendation of someone in whom you have implicit confidence. This pertains to day camps as well as resident camps, and it is as important for sports, music, religious and other specialized camps as for general camps.

But merely inspecting a camp will have limited value unless you know what to look for. Use the following guidelines, extracted from detailed information from various camping authorities:

PERSONNEL

Is the camp director at least 25 years of age, with camping education or training within the past three years and at least 16 weeks of active experience in administration or supervision of an organized camp?

Does the camp have a carefully written job description for each position, to be used in selecting the staff?

Are the minimum age levels for counselors maintained, according to type of camp; day camp, 18; family and resident camp, 19; travel camp, 21. Do the travel counselors have the extra qualifications in age and experience prescribed by the ACA?

Does the counselor/camper ratio meet recommendations? In a resident camp this should be one counselor to eight campers who are 8 years old and over, and one to six campers under 8.

SITE, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Is the waterfront area shelving safe, adequately roped and free from treacherous currents and underwater hazards?

Are foot trails kept separate from vehicular roads to the greatest possible extent?

Are there unusual natural hazards (cliffs, swamps) that require special protective measures?

Are all sleeping accommodations on the ground level or, alternatively, are fire escapes and protective devices provided on all other floors?

HEALTH

Is a physical examination by a physician and a medical history required for all people at the camp within three months before camp starts? Is a physical checkup also given to each person, either immediately before departure to camp or upon arrival, by a doctor or registered nurse? Does the camp require all innoculations stipulated by public health authorities? Is a daily record of all first aid and other medical treatment kept by the doctor, nurse or director?

If a family or resident camp, is there a doctor or registered nurse in residence at all times? If a day camp, is a doctor or registered nurse on call at all times, and is there a person on the camp site who holds a current ARC certificate in advanced first aid?

Are all staff members drilled on standard procedures to follow in event of health emergencies?

Is a night patrol operated after hours?

GENERAL SAFETY

Is the waterfront program at all times under the direction of an experienced person over 21 who holds a current American Red Cross water safety instructor's certificate? In addition to the waterfront director, is there on duty a *minimum* ratio of one *senior* lifesaver for every 25 persons in the water? Do all waterfront practices and equipment, including watercraft, comply with American Red Cross and U.S. Coast Guard standards or equivalent? For example, can all watercraft be locked up when not in use, and are they always locked at night? Is the swimming pool fenced?

Does the riflery program comply with National Rifle Association standards? Are the archery and riding programs planned and conducted in a manner to ensure the safety of all participants?

Are tools, including power tools, as well as their safety devices such as guards, used and maintained in good repair, and are they operated only under qualified supervision? Are gasoline, kerosene, explosives and inflammables stored away from inhabited buildings and kept away from children, under lock and key?

Is firefighting equipment adequate, are all staff members knowledgeable and practiced in its use, and have arrangements been made with the nearest local fire department or with fire wardens or forest rangers for special help if needed? Are disaster procedures planned and regularly practiced in the form of drills?

SANITATION

Does the camp comply with all applicable sanitation laws? Has it been recently verified that the water supply is approved as safe? Is the milk pasteurized or certified? Is storage for milk and perishable foods adequate and safe? Do dishwashing procedures and care of equipment comply with all applicable laws? Are waste disposal and toilet facilities adequate and in compliance with all applicable laws?

TRANSPORTATION

Is all equipment maintained in top condition? Is there a program of safety education for all camp personnel that is properly adjusted to the transportation practices of the camp? Are all persons who operate vehicles qualified under law to do so? Are all transportation units covered by adequate liability insurance? Do units provide safe seating for all passengers? Do chartered transportation units meet ACA transportation standards?

Concern shown by you and other parents will alert camp directors to the fact that the public is interested in first-class standards. A camp that is spending time and money to meet top standards should be anxious to answer questions, and personnel will make arrangements to show you around. Evasiveness may be a sign that all is not high-caliber.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO IRANIAN AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION FOR CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission on March 17, 1969, submitted to the Joint Committee proposed amendments to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Iran in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that such proposed amendments lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while the Congress is in session before becoming effective.

The main purpose of the proposed amendments is to extend the period of the existing Agreement for Cooperation due to expire on April 26, 1969, for an additional 10 years. In addition, various provisions of the Agreement for Cooperation are being updated in order to reflect changes that have been made in the Atomic Energy Act relating to private ownership of nuclear materials. Moreover, the provisions providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency are being updated to reflect the fact that such transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and that that agency will continue to apply the safeguards.

In keeping with the committee's general practice of including such agree-

XUM

ments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of interested Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the proposed amendments to the civilian Agreement for Cooperation with Iran, together with supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1969.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter copies of the following:

a. a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment has been negotiated by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It will revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Iran which was signed on March 5, 1957, as amended by the agreement signed on June 8, 1964.

The two most significant aspects of the amendment are the extension of the term of the agreement and changes occasioned by the 1964 "private ownership" legislation. The present agreement is scheduled to expire on April 26, 1969. It will be extended for ten years, pursuant to Article VI of the amendment. Pursuant to Article II thereof, authority will be incorporated for authorized persons in either the United States or Iran to make arrangements directly with authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of special nuclear material; such transactions would also be permitted between either government and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other.

The purpose of the remaining articles of the amendment is to update the aspects of the agreement, as discussed below.

Article I modifies the fuel article, Article IV, to (a) permit fueling of reactor experiments in addition to research reactors; (b) discontinue the obsolete requirement that title to enriched uranium, purchased from the Commission, be retained by the Government of Iran until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material; and (c) discontinue the present options of the United States to retain special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin leased material, following reprocessing, and to purchase special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin material which Iran acquired by means other than lease. The United States, however, will have the right to approve transfers of such produced special nuclear material from Iran to any other nation or group of nations. The formulation governing the quantity of material, which may be transferred under Article IV of the current agreement, will be retained under the amended article. Also, the authority to provide this material enriched to greater than 20% in the isotope U-235 will be continued, subject to a finding of technical or economic justification for such enrichment.

Article III brings the present comprehensive safeguards article, Article VIII, into conformity with the similar provision in current agreements and incorporates changes in cross-references necessitated by the new fuel article.

Article IV extends Iran's "peaceful uses" guarantee in the present Article IX to cover special nuclear material produced through the use of material, equipment and devices transferred under the agreement.

Article V updates the article providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency [Article IX(A)] to reflect that such a transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and to provide for the continued application of safeguards by the Agency.

The amendment will enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for entry into force.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1969.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy" and has recommended that I approve the proposed Amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

a. Approve the proposed Amendment, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America.

b. Authorize the execution of the proposed Amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing of your deep interest in furthering the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, I am pleased to enclose for your consideration a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

In submitting to you for the first time an action relating to our program of Agreements for Cooperation, I should like to note that other such submissions will be forwarded to you from time to time pursuant to Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Some, as in the case of the agreement with Iran, will pertain to cooperation in the research aspects of nuclear energy; others will include not only research but power applications as well and will provide for the supply of uranium enriched in U-235 to fuel power reactors over periods of up to thirty years. The purpose of these agreements will be to extend and develop, on a peaceful basis, the humanitarian and economic benefits of scientific and technological advances in nuclear energy. They will also serve to help keep the United States in the forefront of international developments of both an economic and scientific nature in the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment has been negotiated by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It would revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Iran which was signed at Washington on March 5, 1957, as amended by the agreement signed on June 8, 1964.

The present agreement is scheduled to expire on April 26, 1969. Accordingly, the main purpose of the amendment is to extend the agreement; an additional period of ten years would be established pursuant to proposed Article VI.

In extending the agreement, the opportunity has been taken to bring other aspects of the agreement up to date. As regularly reflected in other recent amendments and agreements, changes have been occasioned by the 1964 "private ownership" legislation. Pursuant to proposed Article II, therefore, authorized persons in either the United States or Iran would be permitted to make arrangements directly with authorized persons in the other country to transfer special nuclear material; such transactions would also be permitted between either government and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other.

The other articles of the amendment would update the aspects of the current agreement as noted below.

Article I of the amendment would modify the fuel article, Article IV of the agreement, to (a) permit fueling of reactor experiments in addition to research reactors; (b) discontinue the obsolete requirement that title to enriched uranium, purchased from the Commission, be retained by the Government of Iran until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material; and (c) discontinue the present option of the United States to retain special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin leased material, following reprocessing, and to purchase special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin material which Iran acquired by means other than lease. The United States, however, would have the right to approve transfers of such produced special nuclear material from Iran to any other nation or group of nations. The formulation governing the quantity of material, which may be transferred under Article IV of the current agreement, would be retained under the amended article. Also, the authority to provide this material enriched to greater than 20% in the isotope U-235 would be continued, subject to a finding of technical or economic justification for such enrichment.

Article III would bring the present comprehensive safeguards article, Article VIII, into conformity with the similar provision in

XUM

current agreements and incorporate changes in cross-references necessitated by the new fuel article. At Iran's request, proposed Article III would also amend the safeguards article to make the present U.S. right to consult with Iran on health and safety matters a mutual right.

Article IV would expressly extend Iran's "peaceful uses" guarantee in the present Article IX to cover special nuclear material produced through the use of material, equipment and devices transferred under the agreement.

Article V would update the article providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency [Article IX(A)] to reflect that such a transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and to provide for the continued application of safeguards by the Agency.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on March 5, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), which was amended by the Agreement signed on June 8, 1964,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. As may be agreed, the Commission will transfer to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 for use as fuel in defined research applications, including research reactors and reactor experiments, which the Government of Iran decides to construct or operate or authorizes private persons to construct or operate in Iran. Contracts setting forth the terms, conditions, and delivery schedule of each transfer shall be agreed upon in advance.

"2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred under this Article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran shall not at any time be in excess of six (6) kilograms of contained U–235 in enriched uranium plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Iran or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the six (6) kilograms of said material.

"3. The enriched uranium supplied hereunder may contain up to twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U–235. All or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material may be made available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U–235 when the Commission finds there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in research reactors and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed six (6) kilograms of the isotope U–235 contained in such uranium.

"4. When any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after removal from a reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

"5. Special nuclear material produced as a result of irradiation processes in any part of fuel leased by the Commission hereunder shall be for the account of the lessee and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph 4 of this Article, shall be returned to the lessee, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to the lessee.

"6. No special nuclear material produced through the use of material transferred to the Government of Iran or to authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this Agreement, will be transferred to any other nation or group of nations, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer.

"7. Some atomic energy materials which the Commission may be requested to provide in accordance with this Agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials, the Government of Iran shall bear all responsibility insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any source material or special nuclear material or reactor materials which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Iran shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever rising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such source material or special nuclear material or reactor materials after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE II

Article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. With respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party for the transfer of equipment and devices and materials other than special nuclear material and for the performance of services with respect thereto.

"2. With respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party for the transfer of special nuclear material and for the performance of services with respect thereto for the uses specified in articles IV and V and subject to the limitations of Article IV, paragraph 2.

"3. The Parties agree that the activities referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall be subject to the limitations in Article II, to the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Parties, and to the policies of the Parties with regard to transactions involving the authorized persons referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2."

ARTICLE III

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment or devices made available to the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"2. Except to the extent that the safeguards rights provided for in this Agreement are suspended by virtue of the application of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as provided in Article IX(A), the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

"(A) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

"(1) reactor, and

"(2) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available under this Agreement to the Government of Iran or to any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

"(B) With respect to any source material or special nuclear material made available under this Agreement to the Government of Iran or to any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source material or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment or devices so made available:

"(1) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

"(2) reactors, and

"(3) any other equipment or devices designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this paragraph 2 (B) will apply,

"(i) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials, and

"(ii) to require that any such materials in the custody of the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guarantees set forth in Article IX;

"(C) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in paragraph 2 (B) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Iran and which is not transferred pursuant to Article IV or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

"(D) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Iran, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Iran, shall have access in Iran to all places and data necessary to account for the source material and special nuclear material which are subject to paragraph 2 (B) of this Arti-

XUM

cle, to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

"(E) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article or the guarantees set forth in Article IX and the failure of the Government of Iran to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment and devices referred to in paragraph 2 (B) of this Article.

"3. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran shall have the right to consult one with the other in the matter of health and safety.

"4. The Government of Iran undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article."

ARTICLE IV

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"The Government of Iran guarantees that:

"(1) Safeguards provided in Article VIII shall be maintained.

"(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement and no special nuclear material produced through the use of such material, equipment or devices, shall be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purposes.

"(3) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation or group of nations, and then only if, in the opinion of the Commission, the transfer of the material is within the scope of an Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation or group of nations."

ARTICLE V

Article IX (A) of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran note that, by an agreement signed by them and the International Atomic Energy Agency on December 4, 1964, the Agency has been applying safeguards to materials, equipment and facilities transferred to the Government of Iran under this Agreement for Cooperation. The Parties agree that Agency safeguards either as provided in the trilateral agreement, as it may be amended from time to time, or as provided in a new supplanting trilateral agreement shall continue to apply to such materials, equipment and facilities transferred under this Agreement, recognizing that the safeguards rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America by Article VIII of this Agreement are suspended during the time and to the extent that Agency safeguards apply to such materials, equipment and facilities.

"2. In the event that the applicable trilateral agreement referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article should be terminated prior to the expiration of this Agreement and the Parties should fail to agree promptly upon a resumption of Agency safeguards, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Iran shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Iran or the persons under its jurisdiction for their interest in such material so returned at the Commission's schedule of prices then in effect in the United States of America."

ARTICLE VI

Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of twenty years."

ARTICLE VII

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this ——— day of ———, 1969.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Director, Office of Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

BARBARA H. THOMAS,
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Iran:
His Excellency HUSHANG ANSARY,
Ambassador E and P from Iran.

Initialed: February 17, 1969.

Certified to be a true copy:
BARBARA H. THOMAS.

FELLOWSHIP AWARD TO GARY H. LAMBERT, SALT LAKE CITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have received word that a junior medical student from the University of Utah has received a fellowship for 10 weeks of study at a mission hospital in the West Indies.

I am proud of the fact that Gary H. Lambert and his wife, the former Jane Barber, will be participating in this very worthwhile project.

I ask unanimous consent that the report announcing the fellowship be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 21, 1969.—Gary H. Lambert, a junior at the University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, has been awarded a $555 Fellowship which will permit him to assist for 10 weeks this summer at a mission hospital in the West Indies.

Lambert, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Norval H. Lambert, of 3787 Springhollow Drive, Salt Lake City, is one of 31 American medical students selected to receive Smith Kline & French Foreign Fellowships from the Association of American Medical Colleges. The fellowships are supported by a grant from the Philadelphia manufacturer of prescription medicines and other health-related products.

Lambert, accompanied by his wife and two sons, will leave May 1 for L'Hospital Bon Samaritain, in Limbe, Haiti. The medical student will work under the supervision of William H. Hodges, M.D.

The hospital at Limbe serves the rural tropical area of northern Haiti which has a population of about 20,000. The usual number of in-patients is 90, and the outpatient clinic is visited by some 3,000 persons monthly. Lambert will assist with all of the work of the hospital, including complicated maternity cases and surgery.

Lambert's wife, the former Jane Barber, plans to assist in the hospital laboratory. Mrs. Lambert has a Bachelor of Science degree in medical technology and three years of experience as a registered technician at the University of Utah Medical Center.

Lambert was graduated magna cum laude from the University of Utah, where he was a three-year letterman on the track and cross-country teams. In 1962 and 1963 he served a mission in England for the Latter Day Saints church.

The Lamberts live at 3787 Springhollow Drive, Salt Lake City.

Now entering its tenth year, the Smith Kline & French Foreign Fellowships program was established to permit American medical students to widen their medical horizons in cultures different from their own.

In the past nine years, 277 Fellows representing 80 medical schools have served in 52 countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania.

JUVENILE DECENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, juvenile delinquency is a phrase with which Americans are all too familiar. Hardly a day goes by when our newspapers and broadcasters fail to tell us about the juvenile delinquents and the trouble they have caused and are causing.

Therefore, it was indeed a refreshing and welcome relief to read of the recent Teenage Rally for Decency at the Orange Bowl in Miami. According to the reports, there were some 30,000 young Americans gathered together to voice their support of the cause of decency in America, their support of their country, and their belief in God.

These young Americans, 30,000 strong, decided it was time to stand up and be heard. They told it like it is, Mr. President. They spoke up, not for juvenile delinquency, but for juvenile decency. They gathered not to protest something, or to be against something, but to be for something.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the demonstration in Miami last Sunday could be duplicated in virtually every city in America overnight, and it is my hope that it will. Because an overwhelming majority of our young people are good people. I believe that our youth has taken a bum rap for the few misfits and malcontents in their midst.

Let us all take a closer look at our young people and let us all gain a new perspective by which to judge their conduct. In many ways, the actions of our young are mere reflections of our own youth. Let us not be so eager to condemn so many because of the misdeeds of so few.

To the thousands of young people in Miami, and to the many adults and personalities who took part in Sunday's

XUM

rally, we owe our thanks for restoring our faith in the young people of America, who are the future caretakers of the greatest heritage known to mankind.

THE AIR TAXI

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, as many of us here know, the aviation industry is one of the most dynamic segments of our economy today. The air industry far outpaces the growth of our national economy and transportation in general. One indication of the health and maturity of this industry, I think, has been its ability to broaden and diversify its scope of activity. Within the aviation community new areas of economic activity are springing to life, and this activity is creating intense competition for the transportation dollar.

An article written by Guy Halverson and published in the Christian Science Monitor describes one area of aviation which is booming—the air taxi business. The article points out that the air taxi business has jumped from 12 operators in late 1965 to 185 today—nearly 15 times over in a period of 3 years. Many other favorable trends in this business are also discussed.

The need for air taxi operation exists because there are nearly 8,000 airports in this Nation which are not served by the airlines. The air taxi makes it possible to go anywhere in the Nation or in the world which has a legal airstrip. When there is no airline to a particular destination, you can take the air taxi. Routes develop where demands exist; they grow as the need and traffic does.

Air taxi companies generally fly light or medium sized aircraft, and their operators are licensed by the FAA. But I think their operators would be quick to point out that they meet standards even higher than those required by the FAA.

I am particularly proud that the Kansas aviation industry provides aircraft which are helping to meet this public demand.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Guy Halverson)

CHICAGO.—Paul G. Delman, president of Chicago-based Commuter Airlines, is "flying high."

For not only is Commuter (the nation's largest "third-level," or air-taxi service) now entering its fourth year of operation, but in that time it has established 11 routes (all but one direct), built a hefty fleet of modern Beechcraft propeller and turboprop all-weather aircraft, cracked the $1.5 million barrier in operating revenues, and trail-blazed an entirely new approach in air service.

"The 'hub approach,'" says Mr. Delman, a former Sioux City, Iowa, insurance man and World War II B–26 bomber pilot. "I saw that most third-level lines were starting with inadequate capital, poor equipment, and maybe one or two multistop routes. What we did was to start with strong capitalization, a first-rate fleet, and, using a central city—Chicago—as a hub, extended nonstop direct routes outward."

For time-conscious businessmen who balk at often seemingly interminable taxi rides to outlying big-city jet airports as well as for residents of towns of 50,000 or less whose limited airports have been virtually by-passed by the national and regional carriers like United, American, Western, and Ozark, third-level lines have filled a crucial need.

NET LOSS RECORDED

Under federal regulations, however, third-level airlines need not adhere to their published schedules. Passengers with reservations on smaller lines have occasionally come out to airports only to find the operator refusing to fly with just one or two passengers because he would lose money on the run.

Well-established lines such as Commuter and Executive Airlines in New England do stick to their schedules, though. In Commuters' case, Illinois is one of the few states to require it.

Since the first nine-passenger Commuter Beechcraft Queen lifted into the Iowa sky in November, 1965, the industry has galloped from 12 to 185 companies, including such other established carriers as Cable Commuter Airways in California and Suburban Airlines in the mid-Atlantic states. Industrywise 1968 revenues are expected to pass $40 million, up from $35 million in 1967.

For the investor, the publicly listed third-level carrier represents a long shot indeed. Many lines remain poorly financed and equipped. Few expect to turn a profit during their first half-decade. And yet the mere growth of the industry, as well as the professional performance of the larger third-level carriers, suggests the eventual profit potential.

Commuter was capitalized at $2.75 million, most of that sold in Iowa by Mr. Delman, who, after an initial $250,000 investment by associates, issued 1,250,000 shares of stock at $2 a share. (A 1967 public offering of 400,000 shares by McCormick & Co. went for $4.75 per share. The stock has been traded over the counter since November 1966.)

Though operating revenues, like passenger miles, continue to soar (projected at $2.5 million for the 1969 fiscal year ending May 31, compared to $1.5 million in fiscal 1968), Commuter officers don't expect to post a profit for another two years. The company had a net loss of $770,000, or 50 cents a share, for fiscal 1968, compared with a loss of $181,000 or 14 cents a share for the year-earlier period.

A net loss is again expected for fiscal 1969, mainly reflecting changeover costs in converting to an all turbo-prop fleet.

Still, the company expects that the smaller break-even load factor of the newer 15-passenger Beechcraft 99's—40 to 45 percent, compared to 60 to 65 percent for the present older nine-passenger aircraft—will substantially speed that expected fiscal 1970 profit.

As with most third-level carriers, Commuter's main growth potential is still its businessman passenger traffic, though students and housewives plus charter tours are being actively courted through extensive newspaper advertising.

CARGO RUN DROPPED

Cargo traffic, which currently accounts for only 5 percent of sales, is expected to reach 10 percent next year. (One test-run nighttime all-cargo flight between Chicago and Sheboygan, Wisc., was scuttled due to poor volume.)

The carrier presently operates flights to Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, as well as within Illinois. Under the "hub concept," each two-man crew and plane will fly back and forth along the same route. All told, 112 flights are made daily between Chicago and a dozen midwest cities.

Mr. Delman says that Commuter's main problem at this time is what he feels to be lack of adequate instrument-approach and landing facilities at Chicago's downtown Meig's Field.

Mr. Delman predicts that as many as 500 third-level lines will be established within the next few years. By 1980, however, through mergers, or surprise tender offers by growth-conscious conglomerates, he expects that number to be chopped to about 50.

The prospect of such heavy consolidation is prompting many carriers to snap up new routes as quickly as possible—both to forestall competition, and as an "asset" in any possible merger negotiations. Commuter, for example, opened six routes in a three-month period earlier this year (even while closing off an unprofitable route to Milwaukee).

But there remains another reason explaining such feverish activity. While equipment and pilot standards for third-level carriers are certified under federal regulation, there is no pesent Civil Aeronautics Board control over routes or fares. Congressional pressures continue to mount for regulation, however, and it's believed that when the CAB does eventually establish jurisdiction, it will honor most established routes.

Whatever the case, Mr. Delman expects Commuter to continue to be "first among the remaining few," just as it's now first among the almost 200 third-level air-carriers.

SEABED ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the midst of the ABM controversy, I am compelled to draw attention to the reopening of the 18-nation disarmament conference and the momentous pronouncement from Geneva during the last week. After a delay of almost 2 weeks, the conference reopened on Tuesday last, and the news was well worth waiting for: both the United States and the Soviet Union recommended the formulation of a treaty prohibiting the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the ocean floor. When one considers that the area under discussion encompasses approximately 70 percent of the globe, the significance of such a joint recommendation is readily apparent. Moreover, to those of us who have an awareness of the weapons systems which are possible for this vast, virgin area, the discussions now going on in Geneva take on an even greater meaning, if not a sense of the utmost urgency. As chairman of the Consultative Subcommittee on Ocean Space of the Foreign Relations Committee, I applaud President Nixon's decision to move this country toward a seabed arms control agreement.

At my request and based on prior commitments to the Foreign Relations Committee, I have been in close contact during the past week with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and I am convinced that serious negotiations toward such an agreement are now underway. Although I am personally disappointed that the United States was unable to table a draft treaty, such as the Soviet Union has done, I fully appreciate the variety of views within the executive branch which thus far have precluded our doing so. But, now is the time for a harmonization of views within the administration; our negotiators must be allowed to respond meaningfully to the Soviet proposal, as I am informed was

XUM

done today on at least three of the Soviet's four major points. On the fourth point, the boundary issue, I myself would urge acceptance of the broadest zone possible to be devoid of mass destruction weaponry.

I can assure Senators that the Subcommittee on Ocean Space will keep close watch on the developments in Geneva. If an early agreement can be reached on the arms control aspect of the seabed issue, I am certain that progress in fashioning a new regime for the international marine environment will be accelerated. As one of the U.S. congressional advisers to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed, I urge the United States and the Soviet Union to fulfill their commitment to this Committee by reaching as soon as possible a viable, workable seabed arms control arrangement.

Mr. President we all owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Gerard Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for his unswerving perseverance in moving this country toward banning the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the ocean floor. Mr. Smith and his fine staff certainly deserve our full support on this crucial arms control issue.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, during this week the national youth organization, Future Homemakers of America, is observing National FHA Week. More than 600,000 members in over 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the country are carrying out projects and activities to give exposure to what youth is doing in a positive way to promote the principles of good citizenship.

I rise to commend this organization on its endeavors. FHA members continually stress constructive activities indicating that they are dedicated to improving life for all citizens of our country. They are proving that youth is aware, that youth does care, and that youth can contribute constructively.

I am most pleased that there are 35,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America in the State of Tennessee, located in 415 high school chapters. I am particularly proud of Miss Carolyn Walker, of Greenbrier, Tenn., who is the national secretary of this organization.

CIGARETTE CURBS IN CANADA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, since we have under consideration in this country proposed regulations of cigarette advertising on radio and TV, it is interesting to note that our neighbor to the north—Canada—is also moving toward curbing the promotion of cigarette smoking.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject which was written by James Post for the Christian Science Monitor be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 18, 1969]

CIGARETTE-PROMOTION CURB GAINS IMPETUS IN CANADA

(By James Post)

OTTAWA.—The Canadian Government is moving inexorably toward introduction of legislation curbing promotion of cigarette smoking. This move has the recently avowed support or organized medicine.

Legislation could be ready for presentation to Parliament before the end of the year and is seen as a direct result of the growing strength of antismoking forces.

The Canadian Medical Association (CMA), official voice of the country's doctors, recently abandoned its guarded role on the subject of smoking health hazards.

It told a parliamentary committee conducting a smoking inquiry that prevention of smoking is an important preventive measure.

The CMA suggested the federal government ban outright cigarette advertising and cigarette packages be labeled to warn of health hazards.

It is not yet certain whether the Liberal government will seek an outright ban on the advertising of smoking which it considers to be a social and health problem.

CONTROLS SOUGHT

Health Minister John Munro says that cigarettes must come under legislative control, especially in regard to their advertising and labeling.

At the moment, the administration of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau is in the conflicting position of spending about $200,000 a year on a public antismoking campaign while spending more than double that amount (through the Agriculture Department) on tobacco-crop research.

Although the tobacco-growing industry in Canada and the cigarette manufacturers are not strong enough to prevent antismoking legislation, it is thought possible that they could have some success in weakening the proposed legislation.

The government still has a number of alternatives. These include partial rather than complete bans on advertising, as well as no ban at all.

But partial bans are not viewed with much favor because of the likelihood that tobacco companies will merely switch their advertising emphasis to the permitted avenues.

A Health Department study notes that in Britain "the elimination of cigarette advertising on television was followed by increases in overall promotional budgets and in coupon gift schemes."

Despite its modest $200,000 budget, the government's public-education campaign seems to be having some effect in curbing of smoking. But it is only marginal.

A study shows that the proportion of regular cigarette smokers among men 15 and over decreased from 55 percent in September, 1965, to 52 percent in October, 1968. The program has been in effect for four years.

DATA PUBLISHED

One contradictory note is that the trend does not apply to women. In the same period, regular smokers among women increased from 31 to 33 percent of the female population over 15.

During the same time, smoking among girls 15 to 19 increased at the same rate. Smoking among boys in the same age group has remained unchanged.

The study was conducted by the Federal Health Department, which does many things to convince people to stop. There is a fairly extensive television advertising campaign.

Periodically, the Federal Health Department publishes a list of the nicotine and tar levels of various cigarette brands for people who feel they cannot quit but want to reduce their intake of these substances.

Mr. Munro recognizes the inequality of the completion between the tobacco industry and the antismoking forces. The advertising budgets of the manufacturers total millions of dollars, but he feels some progress has been made.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS CRIME CLOCK

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Daily News "Crime Clock" for March 27, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME CLOCK

Here is the Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today.

1:30 p.m.: Thomas Clark, 79, Negro, was in the rear of his Northwest home when two Negro men, one armed with a knife, walked up to him and took his wallet containing $15.

2:15 p.m.: Franklin L. Pergerof, 29, white, Carroll Durkitt, 65, white, and Edward J. Woodrow, 25, white, were painting a building behind 1413 5th-st nw when three Negro men, one armed with a knife, demanded money. The bandits escaped with $6.

2:20 p.m.: James Clemens, 68, Negro, was standing near Fifth and Kennedy streets nw when three Negro men walked up to him, one grabbing him while the other two took $21 from his pockets.

2:30 p.m.: A Negro gunman walked into the St. Vincent DePaul's Store, 1432 U-st nw, and forced clerk Beatrice Jordan, 63, Negro, to hand over $160 in cash and checks.

3:55 p.m.: A Negro man walked into the High's Store, 4601 Sheriff Road ne, and demanded money at gunpoint from clerk Evelyn Douglas, 51, Negro. The bandit escaped with an undetermined amount of money.

5:25 p.m.: Maxine Huff, 20, Negro, of Northeast was at Seventh and U streets nw, when she was robbed of $3 by a lone Negro bandit.

6:25 p.m.: Two Negro men, one with his hand in his pocket as tho he had a gun, walked into Helen's Grocery, 1418 12th-st nw and took $130 from owner Helen Nakahara, 49.

6:30 p.m.: Jesse James, 15, Negro, was riding his bicycle near 14th-st and Rhode Island-av nw when three Negro youths took $10 from him.

6:50 p.m.: William B. Boswell, 56, white, was held up in the 1600 block of Lamont-st nw by a Negro man who had his hand in his pocket, as tho he had a gun.

7:25 p.m.: Alice Tally, 25, Negro, a cashier at the Central Cardozo Credit Union, 2418 14th-st nw, lost $1,000 to a Negro man, who asked if he could join the credit union and pulled a gun.

8 p.m.: Jesse White, 20, Negro, of Northwest, was at 15th and Belmont streets nw, when he was robbed at knifepoint of $5 and his leather coat by a Negro man.

9:15 p.m.: Charles Anderson, 17, Negro, a clerk at Campbell's Drug Store, 4730 14th-st nw, said a Negro man and Negro woman took an undetermined amount of money. The woman had a .45 caliber automatic pistol.

8:40 p.m.: Joan Francis Gardfall, 33, white, said two Negro teenagers, about 15 years old forced her into her car in the 1500 block of Ogden-st nw, and took $15 and her purse at gunpoint.

9 p.m.: Jennifer Butler, 12, Negro, was near her home near 14th and Euclid streets

XUM

nw, when she was struck in the head with a bottle by a 15-year-old Negro youth, who took $4.

10:45 p.m.: Lewis Sharp, manager of the Hot Shoppe at 1400 Rhode Island-av ne, said two Negroes walked up to the cash register and one pointed a revolver at him. Mr. Sharp walked to the back of the store, the men ran out with no money.

11:30 p.m.: Margaret Gilbert, 23, Negro, cashier at the Hot Shoppe, 2230 New York-av ne, refused to give any money to one of two Negro bandits, who pointed a gun at her. The bandits left with no money.

2:25 a.m.: Luther Whitaker, 24, Negro, a clerk at the Macke Vending Company, 12th and O streets nw, was robbed at gunpoint of an undetermined amount of money by two white bandits.

TWENTY-FOUR TEXAS CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT S. 4, BILL TO ESTABLISH A BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public support for the preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket area in Southeast Texas has been growing steadily since I introduced the first Big Thicket bill in Congress in 1966. Many persons, groups, and organizations have endorsed my bill, S. 4, which calls for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. They have recognized the value of this beautiful and unique land, and are working diligently to preserve the remaining forest lands, river bottoms, and wildlife habitat areas.

The preservation of the Big Thicket has now gained national support and recognition. The National Park Service has made a thorough study of the area, and has made two different recommendations regarding its future development. Such prestigeous groups as the Sierra Club, the Isaac Walton League and the Wilderness Society have also endorsed the project, and are lending their support to my efforts to establish a national park in the area. In addition, President Johnson called for the protection of the Big Thicket in a statement issued on January 18, 1969.

Mr. President, since the publication of the National Park Service proposals and the introduction of my bill, S. 4, 24 different Texas conservation organizations have endorsed a policy statement on the preservation of the Big Thicket. These groups have called for broadening of the Park Service proposals, and are supporting my bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the "Policy Statement on Big Thicket National Monument" and a list of the organizations supporting this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT ON BIG THICKET NATIONAL MONUMENT

We favor a Big Thicket National Park or Monument which would include a minimum of the 35,500 acres proposed in the Preliminary Report by the National Park Service study team, with the following modifications and additions:

1. Extend the Pine Island Bayou section southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River.

2. Extend the Neches Bottom Unit to cover a strip, a maximum of three miles, but not less than four hundred feet, wide on both sides of the Neches River from Highway 1746, just below Dam B, down to the confluence of Pine Island Bayou.

3. Extend the Beaumont Unit northward to include all the area between the LNVA Canal and the Neches.

4. Incorporate a Village Creek Unit, comprising a strip up to one mile wide where feasible, and no less than 400 feet wide on each side of Big Sandy-Village Creek from the proposed Profile Unit down to the Neches confluence. Wherever residences have already been constructed, an effort should be made to reach agreement with the owners for scenic easements, limiting further development on such tracts and preserving the natural environment. Pioneer architecture within these areas should also be preserved.

5. Incorporate a squarish area of at least 20,000 acres so that larger species such as black bear, puma and red wolf may survive there. An ideal area for this purpose would be the area southeast of Saratoga, surrounded by Highways 770, 326 and 105. Although there are pipeline crossing in this area, they do not destroy the ecosystem; therefore the National Park Service should revise its standards pertaining to such incumbrances, in this case, leaving them under scenic easement rules instead of acquiring them.

6. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but without new public roads cutting any forest. A portion of Menard Creek would be good for one such corridor. The entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent for another.

Such additions would form a connected two-looped green belt of about 100,000 acres (there are more than 3 million acres in the overall Big Thicket area) through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than 100 miles.

We recommend that the headquarters be in or near the line of the Profile Unit.

We are absolutely opposed to any trading or cession of any National Forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park or Monument.

In addition, but not as a part of the Big Thicket National Monument, we recommend: (a) the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge comprising the lands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers around Dam B, (b) a state historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, etc., such as that between Beech and Theuvenins Creeks off Road 1943 in Tyler County, and (c) other state parks to supplement the national reserve.

Adopted by the following organizations: Texas Committee on Natural Resources; Conservation Federation of Texas; Texas Ornithological Society; Texas Explorers Club; Northeast Texas Nature and Wildlife Association; Tyler Audubon Society; Travis County Audubon Society; San Antonio Audubon Society; Fort Worth Audubon Society; Fort Worth Conservation Council; the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Outdoor Nature Club of Houston, Tex.; Houston Sportsman's Club; Dallas County Audubon Society; East Texas Nature Club; Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club; Waco Ornithological Society; Texoma Outdoor Club; Stephen F. Austin Ornithological Society; Isaak Walton League of America; the Texas Academy of Science; the Magnolia Garden Club of Beaumont, Tex.; Texas Federation of Women's Clubs; Marianne Scroogs Garden Club of Dallas, Tex.

SUPPORT FOR ABM FROM WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL PAGE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, today the Washington Post editorial page contained a letter of support concerning the current ABM controversy that I think is worthy of being included in the record of debate.

This correspondent's thinking, I believe, coincides with that of the vast majority of Americans. He calls the anti-ABM arguments "balderdash."

Mr. Frederick Ayer obviously has more knowledge in this area, because of his experience in the intelligence profession, than most Americans. The logic he applies, with the publicly revealed facts to back them up, is sound. To quote just one paragraph from his letter:

> To restate the obvious but often forgotten—an anti-ballistic missile missile is not an offensive weapon any more than were city walls, bronze shields or drawbridges. The earth is deep with the dust of civilizations which believed when it was said to them "you have no need for those defenses, we will never attack you"—or who were too slothful, corrupted or misguided to look to their own defense.

The speech which I made in this Chamber on Monday, March 24, puts me squarely in agreement with Mr. Ayer's conclusion:

> President Nixon has looked to the best advice obtainable and, acting thereon, has taken a reasoned, balanced, and courageous stand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous conconsent that a letter by Mr. Frederick Ayer, Jr., published in the Washington Post of March 27, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKING THE PRESIDENT'S ABM DECISION

As a former *civilian* inmate of the Pentagon for eight years as assistant for intelligence matters to a series of secretaries of the Air Force, I protest.

And, as a citizen I protest the spate of spurious logic pouring into print and inundating the airwaves on the subject of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Missile. Setting up a Sentinel system will provoke the Russians and escalate the arms race and, likewise the presence of ABM sites will imperil the neighboring residents, furthermore, it will do no good. The scientists, the social commentators and the political hacks all say so. Therefore these things must be so.

To use a good old-fashioned epithet, balderdash! There are presently 83 reported ABM sites around Moscow alone. Has this provoked us into escalation? If missile interceptor systems are valueless, why has Russia with far less economic riches than have we wasted their substance on useless toys? Has the presence of hundreds of Nike Zeus missiles and launchers surrounding our population centers visibly endangered the residents or provoked the Soviets. The Nike Zeus has a thermonuclear warhead, but most people I know were glad to see them around—just as an honest citizen walking a darkly ominous street is cheered at the sight of an armed patrolman.

Probably one reason for the vocal distrust of the present ABM plan was the ridiculous justification given for its predecessor under the Johnson Administration—that it would

XUM

be built to counter any Chinese threat. That really was balderdash.

The Nixon-Laird Sentinel system is designed to protect our own ICBM launching sites and nothing more. And it is essential. The Russians have pinpointed our sites as we have theirs. If the Soviets know that they can knock out our retaliatory weapons on their first strike we have obviously lost all deterrent power. If they know that they cannot do so, the stalemate remains. Admittedly, the situation may reasonably be designated a balance of terror, but this is better than no balance at all.

It is obvious that with a power balance between nations, and if there be good will, negotiation is always possible and can become ever more likely. If, however, one nation holds all the cards, it can say "Now we will negotiate, but on our terms and ours alone." History has surely demonstrated that such a sentence is not unknown in the Russian lexicon. What one can wonder would have been the situation had the Soviets been successful in installing a concentration of ICBM launchers and warheads in Cuba?

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer once likened Russia and the United States, with their potentials for thermonuclear destruction, to two scorpions in a glass jar each with the power simultaneously to sting each other to death. I venture to say that if one scorpion knew that he could, with impunity, destroy the stinger of his rival he would not hesitate to strike. On the other hand, if these two scorpions were capable of reason, as we must assume Americans and Russians still are, they might become wearied of this endless confrontation of terror and agree gradually to empty their poison sacks and move around more happily in their narrow glassed-in world.

To restate the obvious but often forgotten—an anti-ballistic missile missile is not an offensive weapon any more than were city walls, bronze shields or drawbridges. The earth is deep with the dust of civilizations which believed when it was said to them "you have no need for those defenses, we will never attack you"—or who were too slothful, corrupted or misguided to look to their own defense.

It is my considered opinion that President Nixon has looked to the best advice obtainable and, acting thereon, has taken a reasoned, balanced, and courageous stand.

FREDERICK AYER Jr.,

WASHINGTON.

PENN CENTRAL NONSTOP METROLINER SERVICE BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Penn Central Railroad yesterday announced that it will initiate nonstop service between Washington and New York next week utilizing the new high-speed Metroliners. The nonstop service will reduce running time between the two cities to two and a half hours.

Mr. President, this is another significant advance in providing modern and convenient high-speed ground transportation between these two major centers in the congested northeast urban complex.

It is an important addition to the existing limited Metroliner service which makes the Washington-New York run in 2 hours and 59 minutes.

I bring this development to the attention of Senators because the Metroliner demonstration is a direct product of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act which the Senate approved in 1965. I ask unanimous consent that articles, published in yesterday's Washington Star and today's Washington Post on the new nonstop service be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Metroliner service, even in its initial limited offering of two round trips a day, has been an outstanding success. The public has responded enthusiastically. The Metroliners have been running at near capacity, and because of the limited number of trains now running and the public demand for tickets, the Penn Central has placed the service on an advance-reservation basis.

The success of the Metroliner has brought with it new problems. I refer particularly to the inconveniences required in obtaining reservations. I have personally received many complaints about the problem from individuals, businessmen, and government officials who are eager to use the Metroliner service.

In the not-too-distant future, I would expect this difficulty to be largely resolved by the implementation of a full schedule of Metroliner service. When the Metroliner is running 11 round trips a day between New York and Washington, I would hope that advance reservations, at least for coach accommodations, would not be required.

In addition, I have been informed by the Penn Central that plans are underway to install in the very near future a new ticket system that will improve the handling of ticket sales and eliminate much of the inconvenience and confusion that now exists.

It is regrettable that these ticket sales problems have occurred. I take some comfort, however, in the fact that these are problems of success, and that the Penn Central has focused its attention on providing an early solution.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 27, 1969]

METROLINER'S NONSTOP RUNS DUE IN WEEK

Nonstop Metroliner train service between Washington and New York will start next Wednesday, cutting the travel time to 2½ hours and putting rail schedules for the first time into direct competition with those of the airlines.

The first nonstop trains will operate from New York to Washington in the early morning and return to New York in the late afternoon Mondays through Fridays. This will permit New Yorkers to spend a full business day in the Nation's Capital and return home the same night.

Present Metroliners, which began service Jan. 16, take 2 hours and 59 minutes and make two round trips a day with five stops. Standard trains take from 3 hours 35 minutes to 4 hours.

Alfred E. Perlman, president of the Penn Central Co., announced the new service yesterday at the railroad's Philadelphia headquarters.

"This is an important breakthrough in rail passenger transportation," Perlman said. "It is designed to provide an all-weather 'ground shuttle' that will be competitive with other modes of travel from center city to center city in this crowded corridor."

The nonstop trains will average 90.6 miles per hour for the 227-mile trip.

The new trains will leave Pennsylvania Station in New York at 7:10 a.m. and arrive at Union Station in Washington at 9:40 a.m. They will leave Washington at 4:30 p.m. and arrive at New York at 7 p.m., just 1 minute before the Metroliner that leaves Washington at 3:55.

The other existing New York-bound Metroliner leaves Washington at 8:30 a.m. The trains leave New York at 8:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1969]

METROLINER TO SLASH NEW YORK TRIP TO 2½ HOURS

(By Lee Flor)

The Penn Central Railroad announced today it is adding nonstop, 2½-hour Metroliner service between New York and Washington on April 2, cutting its present fastest schedule time by 29 minutes and placing the Metroliner in direct competition with the air shuttle.

Alfred E. Perlman, the railroad president, said the special nonstop service, at the present fare, would provide "the fastest service ever to operate on the 226-mile New York to Washington route."

The new trains will leave New York at 7:10 a.m. and arrive here in Washington at 9:40 a.m. The return service will leave Washington's Union Station at 4:30 p.m. and arrive at the Penn Central station in New York at 7 p.m.

Perlman said the new service was started in prime travel time so it could be directly competitive with the air shuttle now offered by airlines between Washington and New York. The "ground shuttle" will run in all kinds of weather, from center city to center city, he noted.

ALLOCATION OF IMPORTED NO. 2 FUEL OIL TO NEW ENGLAND AND ESTABLISHMENT OF OIL REFINERY AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the President of the United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging the President of United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine

Whereas, The consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Whereas, According to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas, Said Consumers' Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas, There has been no decision to

rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall during his term of office reportedly indicated a willingness to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas, The proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the #2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by (allowing) making available an addition 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of #2 fuel oil in New England at reduced prices; and

Whereas, The establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of #2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Nixon to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of additional oil imports to New England; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, March 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

FRONTIER ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article from the February 24 U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT THE "LAST FRONTIER"

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—If Alaska seems to be out of step with the rest of the U.S., there is a reason.

This is America's last frontier. Its people think in the same terms as the rough-and-ready pioneers who pushed the boundaries of the U.S. westward to the Pacific Ocean by the end of the nineteenth century.

Up here, the drive is to open land for development, rather than fence it off for parks and recreation as in the "lower 48" States. That is understandable when you learn that 97 per cent of Alaska's land still is owned by the Federal Government. Most of it remains untouched by the plow, bulldozer, chain saw or drilling tool.

Though more than twice as big as Texas, Alaska has fewer highway miles than Massachusetts. Along the Alaska Railroad, which runs 481 miles from Seward to Fairbanks, live two thirds of the State's people. The pack horse and the dog sled still are common means of transportation.

ROOM FOR FREEWHEELERS

Alaska's rugged scenery, its forbidding climate and its vastness are a magnet for the frontier breed. It is the land of the freewheeler, a term of approval in the 49th State. Men with "git-up-and-go" are drawn here by the opportunity to branch out on their own. Up here, the fellow who is first with a new product or a new idea can make it big.

Don't be fooled by the veneer of sophistication in Alaska's cities. In Anchorage and in Fairbanks, there are posh hotels, high-rise apartment buildings, fancy supermarkets. But you don't have to go far to find the sights and hear the sounds of the frontier. Dress is casual, often rough, dictated by climate rather than fashion. Bars are crowded, noisy and sometimes disorderly.

The airplane has replaced the cow pony of the nineteenth-century West. Alaskans are the most air-minded of all Americans. They have to be, with so few highways. The State has 749 airports and seaplane facilities, a total of 4,500 licensed pilots, and nearly 3,000 aircraft—one for every 100 people.

You see small planes parked in front yards, blocks from any landing field. An Alaskan explains:

"One of the great attractions of living up here is the freedom to move about. We can jump in a plane, go where we want, and when we want, for fishing or hunting, or just to get away from the crowds."

That last is a shocker. What crowds? Anchorage, with 50,000 population, is Alaska's largest city. The people of the State, if spread out over its 586,000 square miles, would have 2 square miles apiece.

Here you can rear a family without facing problems that proliferate in cities and suburbs of the "lower 48" States. Theodore F. Stevens, one of Alaska's two new U.S. Senators, plans to have his five children go to school back home at least half the time "so they can grow up loving it as much as I do."

A 20-minute flight in a bush plane from Anchorage, says Senator Stevens, "will put you in wilderness where you probably won't see another person." After only a few weeks in Washington, he says with deep feeling:

"When you see that sun come up over the snow-capped Chugach Range on a clear winter morning, then you know what it means to be in Alaska."

THE INDIVIDUALISTS

This country draws all kinds of people. Along with the frontier builders come the misfits. "We have our share of them," says a federal official with long experience in Alaska. He adds:

"They are people who by temperament are unable to adjust to the demands of big-city life, or of the more settled community. Many of them find their place, become useful citizens. Some are crackpots, and some give us endless trouble. But they are the sure mark of the frontier."

Business—like life—tends to be free and easy. Says an Alaskan official:

"We have our so-called robber barons. They are the ones who get the things done that must be done. If these fellows were hedged in too tightly, they wouldn't stay and Alaska wouldn't be growing at the rate it is."

YOUNG AND TOUGH

Youth dominates for the most part. Median age is 23.3 years, compared to 27.7 years for the U.S. as a whole. Most of the young frontiersmen are skilled workers, lured by high wages in oil, mining, lumbering and construction.

The harsh climate, the isolation, the sometimes primitive housing send about half the immigrants back to the "lower 48."

"If you sweat it out for a year, you'll never leave, or if you do, you'll come back," says Paul Choquette, a broker in Juneau. "If the wife can last it, you've got it made."

RIDING THE BOOM

Alaska's growth in recent years has been based largely on mineral and forest development. Advances in fishing methods, however, have brought rich new fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and Bristol Bay.

The future of the oil boom that is giving new thrust to the Alaskan economy is said by officials to depend upon opening more of the federally owned lands for leasing and drilling.

For the 800 or so men involved in the oil boom on the North Slope, cold down to minus 50 degrees is compensated by earnings of $15,000 to $25,000 a year. In addition the men get free room and board and transportation to and from Fairbanks for two weeks' rest after four weeks of work.

Another boom is in tourism.

"This is the most beautiful place I have ever seen," said a California businessman visiting Fairbanks. "Up here you can look as far as you can see."

Nature is on a lavish scale. In spring, there is a wild profusion of flowers. In summer daylight lasts almost 24 hours a day. For hunters and fishermen, there is every kind of quarry.

FACING THE FUTURE

Perhaps Alaska was best described by a young serviceman who chided "U.S. News & World Report" for failing to mention his home State in an article about wilderness areas. He wrote:

"I would like to say that the author of that article must be unaware that Alaska has been a part of the union since 1959. . . . Alaska is the only State left with wildlife and habitat untouched by civilization. Alaska is the next wonder of the world."

Alaskans are determined that this wondrous State is not going to be ruined by the debris of twentieth-century technology. Says Senator Stevens:

"Alaska is a land where conservation is a watchword. There is no smog and little pollution, and if humanly possible there never will be more because Alaskans know and value pure air, pure water, and virgin country."

THIS IS ALASKA: ONE-SIXTH OF THE ENTIRE UNITED STATES

Population: Smallest State. 280,000 people, or 1 person for every 2 square miles.

Largest city: Anchorage, with 50,000 people. Juneau, State capital, has 8,000 people.

Size: Largest State. 375 million acres. More than twice as big as Texas.

Airplanes: Flyingest State in the union, with 1 airplane for every 100 Alaskans.

Statehood: Became 49th State on Jan. 3, 1959.

Highest mountain: McKinley. 20,320 feet, highest peak in North America.

Coastline: 6,640 miles, or more than that of all the rest of the U.S. combined.

Railroads: Two, with 500 miles of track.

Economy: Fishing, mining, lumbering are biggest industries. Oil boom is under way. Tourist trade growing fast. Federal Government owns 97 per cent of land, but State is promised 104 million acres by 1984.

Acquired by U.S.: 1867. Bought from Russia for 7.2 million dollars, or about 2 cents an acre.

Highways: 6,042 miles. Less than Massachusetts has.

A TRIBUTE TO NORTH CAROLINA'S MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in carrying out our function of legislative oversight, there is a natural and proper concern—especially with respect to experimental social welfare programs—which leads us to speak largely of the failures and the debacles, leaving the successes to speak for themselves. This is much as it should be. But there are some local success stories of such far-reaching significance for the Nation at large as to mandate their telling in the national forum.

One such story has been unfolding over

XUM

the past year in my State—that is the story of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp.

MDC is a private, nonprofit corporation with a statewide board of directors elected to represent industry, the public sector, and the population to be served. Luther H. Hodges, Jr., senior vice president of North Carolina National Bank and son of the former Secretary of Commerce, serves as chairman of the board. The corporation's staff is directed by George B. Autry, formerly chief counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Using both Federal and private financial support and the technical assistance of the National Association of Manufacturers, MDC is moving toward its objective of increasing productivity and improving per capita income through the fullest possible development of our State's neglected manpower resources. MDC is, in effect, working toward the establishment of the Nation's first technology-based, statewide manpower model. If this goal is reached, other models, including perhaps a national one, can be fashioned after it.

Mr. President, in order that Senators and other interested parties may acquaint themselves with the accomplishments of MDC and with the corporation's plans for the future, I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of articles and editorials dealing with the various facets of MDC's program be printed in the RECORD:

"North Carolina's Dire Waste of Manpower," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., December 1, 1967.

"Opening More Job Opportunities," from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N.C., December 11, 1967.

"NAM-OEO 'Marriage of Convenience' Bears Promise of Cure for Jobless," by Don Riding, from the Carolina Financial Times, Chapel Hill, N.C., March 18, 1968.

An editorial by C. A. McKnight, from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N.C., March 24, 1968.

"A Promising Tool Blunted by the Poverty of Policy," from the Greensboro Record, Greensboro, N.C., March 30, 1968.

"Training Key to Stemming Manpower Loss," by Luther H. Hodges, Jr., from the American Banker, May 3, 1968.

"Manpower Center Reaches Goal," by Rick Gray, from the Greensboro Daily News," Greensboro, N.C., July 11, 1968.

"Moving People to Jobs," by Charles B. Garnett, from the Employment Service Review, September 1968.

"Computer Matches Workers and Jobs," by Stacie Steele, from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N.C., September 10, 1968.

"To Find the Jobless, To Find the Jobs," from the North Carolina magazine, published by the North Carolina Citizens Association, November 1968.

"He 'Freshed Up' on Schooling, Got Job," by Dwayne Walls, from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N.C., November 24, 1968.

"Manpower Project Looks at Results, They're Impressive," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., November 30, 1968.

"At MDC—Success Stories," by Owen Lewis, from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N.C., January 1, 1969.

"Labor Pool Going Dry, Hodges Says," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., February 6, 1969.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte. (N.C.) News, Dec. 1, 1967]

NORTH CAROLINA'S DIRE WASTE OF MANPOWER

(EDITORS' NOTE.—Following are excerpts from a speech made by Luther H. Hodges, Jr., chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation's board of directors, in Winston Salem yesterday.)

In our industrialized society with much capital going into new plants and equipment, we require an increasingly skilled manpower pool, in fact, manpower resources, in terms of availability and skill have become almost the single most important economic and industrial development ingredient.

The question, then, is whether or not, in this kind of society, our manpower is being properly developed and efficiently allocated. I would like to suggest that, not only because it is necessary, but because it is right, we must make a 180 degree turn and face the handicapped, disadvantaged, citizen of our country, and more specifically, our own state. He has been excluded, in most cases through no fault of his own, from participating in a full society, from realizing what we have come to think of as the American Dream—namely a job, decent housing, education for himself and for his children, and a place in the decision making processes which affect his life.

ARBITRARY STANDARDS

This person has been excluded from employment offices entirely on a middle-class frame of reference, by job descriptions which set arbitrary standards without regard to aptitudes and potential for training; by the economics of poverty which forces him to become a school drop-out; and by the inferiority of education offered in slum and poor rural schools.

I hope that our society has made a decision that America cannot afford the luxury of poverty in its midst and that we are moving toward what Kruger calls a policy of inclusion. I hope that what the economist Norton E. Long wrote in his monograph on the reduction of poverty isn't true. He has said, "We are in danger of drifting into cosmetic cures. We already have a model for how an affluent society might deal with surplus people the way we deal with surplus grain . . . store it and keep it off the market so it won't hurt the price. We do the same with the poor—we store them in slums and public housing to keep them off the labor market so they won't reduce wage rates or otherwise complete in the only way they can . . . the evil of this agricultural storage policy for dealing with people is not simply that of keeping needed resources from meeting human wants but that of creating traditions by which the evil multiplies rather than diminishes."

WITHIN A PROBLEM

In all of this there is a problem within a problem which cannot be ignored; namely, that of our disadvantaged minority citizens. The Negro will not live as long, be housed as well, nor earn as much as his white counterpart no matter what level he achieves. I decry the irresponsiblity of those in the public eye and elsewhere who invoke convenient "whipping boys" to explain our difficult society while making no analysis of causes and no constructive suggestions for our country or our state.

What about North Carolina? What is our situation in regard to manpower and human resource development and all the ramifications of these problems? Let me quote some statistics which I have quoted before, but which bear repeating:

Nearly a million and a half adult North Carolinians cannot read well enough to qualify for jobs paying a living wage.

One-third of our work force is below an eighth-grade level of education, Many of the persons presently employed cannot advance past entry-level jobs because of lack of education.

Diversification of industry is not proceeding as rapidly as it could because we lack a skilled manpower pool.

Past development has not benefited all North Carolina citizens equally. For example, there were 37,000 fewer jobs for nonwhite males in 1960 than there were in 1950

We are 44th in per capita income and 49th for average hourly industrial wages.

LOSE FEDERAL MONEY

In spite of this situation, hardly a year goes by that we do not lose federal money allocated to this state. For example, in 1966, we failed to apply for our total guideline allocations under the Economic Opportunity Act and the Applachia Bill.

We know that one of our major resources in North Carolina is our manpower. The problem is that we have failed to develop this valuable resource.

What is the answer to all of these problems? If there is one answer, it is jobs. Jobs to upgrade our economy, jobs to reduce the burden of the taxpayer, jobs to keep families together, jobs to provide dignity and decent standards of living. The November 20th Newsweek magazine said, "If Negroes alone among the poor had been full participants in the economy last year, the President's Council of Economic Advisors has calculated they would have added $23.7 billion to the gross national product."

If you are poor, how do you get a job? Training—literacy training and skill training, along with essential supportive services. Who is going to attack and solve this massive problem? And why haven't we succeeded before?

AMERICAN DREAM

Dick Cornuelle, executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, in his book "Reclaiming The American Dream," has two chapters entitled: "Why the Liberals Can't Win" and "Why the Conservatives Can't Win." He says, "As the conservative is losing his battle because he has no program at all, the liberal is coming to a different dead end. He finds out he can't achieve his ideal—that of a society that solves social problems—with the program he has." I would like to suggest that we discard these nomenclatures, for as applied to this problem they are unrealistic. Instead of right and left, liberal or conservative, we are either outside or inside, a participant or a spectator, and we can't afford many spectators.

No one segment of our society can solve these problems alone. The federal government, state and local governments, the whole public sector must join the private sector or else we will be licked.

INDUSTRY MOVES

Within our economy, industry can move the quickest; it is geared to pragmatic and efficient problem-solving and to getting a job done. In addition there is not only great interest on the part of industry in these problems, but characteristically, industry has already moved. You probably read in the paper a few weeks ago about Ford Motor Company's setting up two employment offices in ghetto areas in Detroit. In this experiment, seven hundred disadvantaged have been employed—without written tests. Aerojet General has a plant in Watts; and Honeywell is also ready to build in a slum area;

XUM

Corn Products has instituted inplant literacy training in locations all over the country; and Xerox is employing hard-core unemployed. Moreover some 300 insurance companies in the country have participated in a billion dollar financing program for ghetto housing. The National Association of Manufacturers, which helped start the ball rolling in this effort, has so many calls from companies asking for help in reaching the hard-core unemployed that they are unable to meet the demands.

Is all this consistent with the profit motive? Here is one quote recently reported in the press: Gerald L. Phillippe, Chairman of General Electric, said: "We have to say to our shareholders that we just have to deal with this problem, or in five or 10 years there will be nothing left."

Now, at last, we come to the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation. As a solution to the problems of our economy, this particular project is meaningless unless we are all aware of, and committed to accepting the challenges I have been discussing. This corporation was not developed to create administrative jobs or bring money into North Carolina, rather it was planned with a single goal in mind—to provide the unemployed and unemployable with jobs, and to stay with them until they are productive.

MDC'S PLAN

MDC, as I shall call our corporation, is a sophisticated program. We are contracting for a series of action-oriented studies and surveys relevant to the problems of manpower development. These studies include: Outreach techniques, supportive services, job-development, post-employment followup, a survey of North Carolina training capacity, basic education innovations—that is to say, what are the best literacy systems in existence and how is new technology being applied to this training; vocational skill training, with the same applications, economic development studies and the surveys which lead to the computer match project.

There are two current action components. First, computer match. This involves the development of a whole new system of computer technology as applied to the disadvantaged. With it we hope to match the unemployed either to training or to jobs . . .

TO STORE DATA

MDC will also use the computer to store data. For example, in addition to training available in the public sector, we will feed in data on vocational skill and on the job training available from private industry. We may use the computer for a talent bank—that is to say, to locate human resources, technical and otherwise. We may use it to match low income high school graduates to jobs or vocational training, and thus help prevent the top level youngsters in this group from searching for opportunity outside our state, as so many do now.

The second action component currently funded calls for the establishment of two Manpower Development Centers. These centers will offer basic literacy training through a system called Mind, developed by the National Association of Manufacturers. Mind uses technological equipment and programmed learning. It has been extremely successful so far, with early experiments revealing a gain of four grade levels in 180 hours. . .

PEOPLE ORIENTED

What we seek is a manpower training model which is both industry and people oriented. We think our industrialists will insure a practical problem solving approach and we are confident that our community action agency representatives will not let us forget or neglect the hard problems of the disadvantaged.

May I close with a few recommendations:

1. The industrial sector must become more involved in solving the employment problems of the hard core poor. Industry must work with the community, as indeed it is doing right here in Winston-Salem.

2. The business community must temper its policies of excluding the disadvantaged and attempt to reach and train this population. Let us face the fact that many job standards are arbitrarily set and often bear little resemblance to the characteristics and backgrounds of persons who are successfully performing a given job.

3. There must be vigorous community leadership. Leadership which is willing to become involved in complicated social problems. Leadership which is willing to face what it finds, whether it likes it or not. This leadership must establish the fact that local control is required to effectively handle local problems.

4. Much money is required to meet our manpower development needs. We must stop fighting the federal government and become partners, for we need all its financing and then some to solve our problems. If we don't like the terms, let's have the leadership to change the terms.

5. We need a citizenry aware of our problems and willing to face them.

We must remember too that manpower and employment are not isolated problems and that we must also solve housing, race relations, health, educational and other problems.

Certainly I have not answered the questions I have raised. But for the time being my solution has to do with the effort in which I am engaged: namely, the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation. I am impressed with the commitment of our staff and of our board of directors. May I ask a similar commitment from you in your work.

In a nation where the gross national product approaches $800 billion a year, there is little justification for the poverty and unemployment in our midst. It has been said that we in North Carolina are leading the way with our Manpower Development Corporation. Clearly it is in our own best interest to do so.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Dec. 11, 1967]

OPENING MORE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

One of North Carolina's major resources, as long recognized, is its manpower supply. One of the state's major failures, as shown in its 44th ranking in per capita income and 49th place in average hourly industrial wages, is proper development of manpower resources.

That the state, in a several-pronged attack, is attempting to remedy the situation stands to its credit. But that progress often is slow, as the several approaches mesh gears, is apparent and understandable. The total task, in relationship to the total need, presents formidable problems.

How to speed improvements that will lead to more and better job opportunities has concerned itself, perhaps out of necessity, primarily with teaching skills to the large work force potential readily available for employment. Important as that phase is, however, it stands as only part of the total problem.

Luther H. Hodges Jr., chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation's Board of Directors, points to another vital area with his suggestion that "we must take a 180-degree turn and face the handicapped, disadvantaged citizen. He has been excluded, in most cases through no fault of his own, from participating in a full society, from realizing what we have come to think of as the American Dream—namely a job, decent housing, education for himself and for his children, and a place in the decision making processes which affect his life."

Mr. Hodges, son of the former governor, speaks both as a business executive and as a person familiar, through personal observation, with problems in the area of concern he has cited. He, in fact, grew up with them around him when his father served as a textile executive. In later years, through association with the state's efforts to pull itself up by its own bootstraps, he has witnessed the needs of the many who have been denied, through various reasons, full opportunity to participate in the state's economic fortune.

The handicapped, disadvantaged citizen, as cited by Mr. Hodges, deserves every consideration, indeed extra effort, on the part of those who can help make him an asset instead of a liability in the economic and social community. He is, without regard to race, an important part in North Carolina's manpower potential so vital to the state's total development.

[From the Carolina Financial Times, Mar. 18, 1968]

NAM-OEO "MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE" BEARS PROMISE OF CURE FOR JOBLESS

(By Don Ridings)

With the Great Society's alphabet agencies almost as plentiful as Carolina basketball fans these days, it's tough coming up with an attention-getting gimmick. But a new organization with headquarters in Chapel Hill has one that just might succeed.

MDC—that stands for Manpower Development Corporation—is hard to miss because of an unlikely parentage: the National Association of Manufacturers and the Office of Economic Opportunity—what MDC Executive Director George B. Autry referred to in a Sea Island, Ga., speech recently as a "marriage of convenience," as well as a "marriage of logic."

As Autry sees it, the well-publicized differences of style between NAM and OEO have obscured some fundamental agreements concerning ends: productive people filling productive jobs.

MDC's corporate charge is broad enough to encompass both the poverty-fighters and the businessmen: "To plan and implement a comprehensive manpower development program for North Carolina. To experiment with and develop new systems for job training, job placement, and job upgrading . . . To carry on activities of whatever nature which have as their objective the improvement of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, including conditions of employment of persons employed in North Carolina."

Any mandate that large, of course, is easier to recite than to implement, and it is the implementation—or program development—that MDC is busily concerned with now.

MDC was incorporated in August, 1967, but Autry didn't leave his job as chief counsel and staff director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights until December, and the last of four directors working under Autry arrived only this month.

So the homework that has piled up on MDC desks—in the form of various consultants' studies—was assigned before the current MDC staff came on the scene. The North Carolina Fund, which through Director George Esser was instrumental in interesting NAM in the state manpower program, contracted for the studies.

The last director to join the staff, former Associate Editor Bob Smith of the Charlotte News, is responsible for developing programs with the help of the studies and is in the process of reviewing the early arrivals.

Originally, 15 studies were scheduled. These were reduced to nine, the general purposes of which are to reveal ways of finding people who need jobs and training, finding jobs

XUM

that need employees, giving skills and basic literacy training to the unskilled and developing basic facilities (such as transportation and housing) needed by the unskilled, and matching the jobs and the people.

More specifically, the studies break down this way:

Outreach techniques: ways of reaching and motivating the poor so as to attract them into manpower development programs and give them the attitude of success.

Job development (computer match): relating job vacancies to job potentials by use of computer techniques to determine what kind of training and upgrading to provide.

Supportive services: studying what sort of services must be supplied to make it possible for poor rural-oriented people to make the transition to an urban job market. One particular phase of the study will concentrate on experimental uses of transportation.

Basic education-skill training: how to tie literacy and skill training to the needs of the state's poor and the manpower demands of the state's industry.

Job development: ways of opening new avenues to employment for the poor through indentification of the real job potential in the state and encouragement of industry to report vacancies and restructure qualifications.

New careers: studying the actual and potential effect of developing new careers on the employment of the poor. For example, such career opportunities as police patrolman assistant and caseworker aide are being studied.

Housing: ways of making low-income housing available to the poor being brought into job areas, including an effort to tie training to housing by providing a would-be worker on-the-job training in constructing homes for himself and his fellow workers.

Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPFS): how to modify these techniques (made famous by former Secretary McNamara at the Department of Defense) to MDC's needs in providing precise information on educational and training costs and thereby alternatives and their costs.

Survey of industrial training capacity: an in-depth study of what capacity now exists in North Carolina, actual and potential, for training the unemployed and underemployed. This includes both public and private.

Using the studies as a starting point, Smith hopes MDC can build a program that will "get the most out of the people and out of industry," as well as out of public agencies at all levels. He doesn't see MDC as a "super coordinator"—it has no legal authority—but as a method of generalizing methods that can be exported to other states.

In Smith's view, MDC should concern itself not only with training people for existing jobs, but for jobs not yet available—"but within practical limits, something that can be put to use."

One aspect of this approach is the new careers study described above, which will attempt to define new sub-professional jobs that now sometimes occupy the time of high-priced personnel with time-consuming detail work.

What has just been described is the broad framework for MDC, which mostly is in the study and development phase.

But there is something "on the ground" already: the first of two experimental manpower development centers, located in Greensboro, turns out its first "graduates" on the last day of this month. With the active participation of industry representatives and the backing of Greensboro Mayor Carson Bain, the center enrolled 70 people for the 10-week cycle.

The primary purpose of the cram course is to prepare "entry-level" people—that's the jargon for unskilled workers—for jobs by moving them up four grade levels in 10 weeks and acclimating them to the industrial job environment.

Day-class students spend four hours a day on literacy training and two hours on "H.R.D."—human resources development. This last piece of jargon refers to an effort to inject into people a worker's attitude: the importance of being at work on time, how to deal with personnel people and supervisors, etc.

Autry spoke of the manpower development center idea in that Sea Island speech:

"They will teach the functionally illiterate to read and write, not how to read sonnets or write plays . . . but that level of literacy only which is necessary to get and hold a job.

"They will teach country people who want to work in the city how to live in the city and how to do a new kind of job.

"This concept is not theoretical, but practical. . . . It has been worked out by private industry. . . . The literacy program was developed not by some English department trying to create Shakespearean scholars, but by the National Association of Manufacturers."

Night-class students, many of whom work during the day, spend two hours on literacy, one on H.R.D.

The day students get a weekly stipend of $20, the night students $10.

Greensboro's training program doesn't have a skill component. Industry personnel representatives, who will interview the students during the last days of the cycle, say they will provide their own skill training.

MDC's computer match program also will be tested in Greensboro, in conjunction with the manpower development center.

A second experimental center for Eastern North Carolina currently is being planned by MDC.

The people around MDC seem to think that an effective manpower development program is a continuing thing, which has to adapt to changing economic conditions, technology and the life—a job of continuous fitting, involving all levels of public agencies, as well as the private sector.

Funding being what it is, however, MDC's existence presently is guaranteed only through December, 1968. The money comes from OEO ($1.182 million), the North Carolina Fund ($73,000), and the Department of Labor ($892,000). That last item is to finance the mobility program, which MDC expects to pick up from the North Carolina Fund. This has been an effort to transplant workers from job-short Eastern North Carolina to job-plentiful Piedmont North Carolina.

MDC came about because of the state's well-publicized position near the bottom of the nation in per capita income, industrial wages, and disturbing above-the-national-average unemployment and underemployment rates. Much of the impetus for the creation of the agency came from a North Carolina Fund Report, "The State We're In," published in June, 1967, which focused on these economic conditions.

Autry himself, who at 30 held an enviable position as well as respect in the U.S. Senate, said in an interview last fall that correcting this situation "was so important" that he had decided to leave Washington and return to his native state as executive director of MDC.

After graduating from Duke University Law School in 1961, Autry had gone to Washington as a Richardson Foundation Congressional Fellow and was assigned to the office of N.C. Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

When he left Washington late last year, it was as chief counsel and staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. He trailed elaborate praise from his former boss, Sen. Edvin, tribute in the Congressional Record from other senators, and complimentary press reports.

Autry's boss MDC's Board of Directors, is heavily larded with businessmen, including Chairman Luther Hodges, Jr., as well as such people as educators representatives of other agencies, and the state NAACP president. This composition reflects what NAM Vice President A. Wright Elliott said in a Chapel Hill speech in January should be the stance of MDC: "We . . . envision the MDC as an effective interface between the public and private sectors, thereby enabling them to work together toward a goal desirable for both."

"Interface," of course, is another bit of jargon that means close-fitting coordination. It recalls President Johnson's first references to "creative federalism," when he talked about increasing private involvement in "public" matters—such as manpower development.

All of which demonstrates that even if the NAM-OEO marriages at MDC came as a surprise to some—it was only after a proper courtship.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 28, 1968]

(By C. A. McKnight, editor)

I have been listening attentively but I have yet to hear our candidates for state offices speak out on one of the most urgent and distressing problems of the day, i.e., the nature and extent of rural poverty in North Carolina.

I made mention recently of the "scores of thousands of eastern North Carolina Negroes who will lose their jobs in the next five years through the mechanization of tobacco growing."

I also found fault with the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders because it looked only at the nation's urban ghettoes and ignored the rural impoverishment and despair that forced the migration of poor whites and Negroes to congested urban areas.

Bob Smith, who recently left the associate editorship of The Charlotte News to join the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation, points out that the Johnson administration also doesn't seem to understand the nature of our manpower problem and the underlying cause of urban riots.

Smith notes that the President's manpower message of January 23 put all its emphasis on attacking unemployment in the big cities.

"Not many reporters picked this up, but while the administration took on the unemployment problems of 45 of the biggest cities it dropped plans to conduct two rural unemployment programs. . . . In brief, by setting up the National Alliance of Businessmen, the administration opted for $350 million for urban unemployment and not a cent for rural unemployment."

FROM POVERTY TO POVERTY

"You know where those angry people in the cities came from and so do I," Smith writes.

"They came from deprived mountain-locked Appalachia and tobacco-poor towns like the one I saw in the course of a recent day's visit with as much bedrock poverty as I ever care to see in one place.

"Whites, Negroes, Indians—they are all out there waiting for farm mechanization to strip them of their last feeble excuse for staying. And they are leaving without skills, without realizable hope, with the blind unreason of a man sure that things can be no worse where he is going. Three hundred thousand North Carolinians got on that northern migration route in the 1950's, and we understand th half of those left on the farms may be off in the next five years.

"If they follow mindlessly the old migration pattern it will be in part because we as a nation helped convince them that jobs would be there. But it is precisely because jobs aren't there and the welfare rolls are swollen that trouble plagues these cities.

"So North Carolina's manpower oozes away and so the ghettos bloat and the thermostat rises and pretty soon some other President has to come up with an even bigger and more expensive program for employment in the poor, sick, big cities. Can this be sound national policy?"

MODEL MANPOWER PROGRAM

Smith's Manpower Development Corporation was spun off by the North Carolina Fund, which pioneered several experimental manpower programs in this state. The Fund is to end its five-year existence in October and its directors saw a need for a continuing manpower program.

Like the Fund, MDC sees North Carolina as America in miniscule. Our state has shrinking manpower needs in rural areas and small towns and growing manpower needs in urban centers, thus duplicating the national pattern.

Is it possible to establish a model manpower program for North Carolina that will be useful in developing the national policy of the future?

And in lieu of such a national policy, which would either make it possible for Americans to remain in rural areas or at least give them employable skills to take with them in the cities, is it possible to put out the fires that smoulder in the ghettos, ready to be fanned into hot blazes?

In sum, if MDC, in Smith's words, "can demonstrate how a semi-literate, marginally productive tobacco farmer in Robeson County can become a skilled manufacturing worker in Fayetteville, the worker profits, industry profits, and we all have a national manpower model that just might work."

ONE OF THE GUT ISSUES

I don't want to hit this subject so frequently that you readers become bored with it, but I feel very strongly that rural poverty is one of the gut issues in North Carolina today.

I believe that the people of North Carolina ought to know more about the nature and extent of rural poverty.

I beiieve, also, that the State of North Carolina ought to involve itself deeply in a program to improve income and living conditions in our rural areas, instead of standing by while our undereducated, undertrained, underskilled rural residents pack their belongings and head toward an even more dismal fate in the Urban ghettoes.

To that end, The Observer is making its own study of rural poverty in this state. The undertaking is complex and time-consuming but the results, I am quite confident, will shock the people of our state.

I hope they will also prompt candidates for state office to stop uttering banalities and address themselves to one of the basic issues of our day.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Record, Mar. 30, 1968]

A PROMISING TOOL BLUNTED BY THE POVERTY OF POLICY

It must have been with feelings mixed of "amen" and "so what?" that leaders of North Carolina's Manpower Development Corporation received the vice president's Thursday message.

Hubert Humphrey came to the state to shore up the farm vote for his superior. As is his custom, he said things both wise and true. He spoke primarily to the businessman farmer handicapped at the marketplace—the one able to sell products and buy supplies.

He also had something to say about a problem which weighs more heavily on that farmer's laborer than on that farmer.

Rural poverty has led to much of the poverty in city slums, said the vice president. "Rural trouble means city trouble. And, until rural America—all of it—becomes a rewarding and inviting place to live, until we can make rural America worthy of America, we will be that much further from stopping the costly human and material waste in our cities today."

ACCURATE BUT OLD

The problems of deprivation in the countryside and rebellion in the cities are one. Mr. Humphrey accurately stated an issue; he did not define a new one.

Last October, President Johnson acknowledged it with the announcement of a test program to develop job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed. Initially, he said, $40 million would be used to work with industry in salvaging the jobless who in hopelessness flee farms and choke cities. The experiments, he said, would be concentrated in five cities and in several centers of rural growth.

The secretary of commerce dutifully mailed out notices of the breakthrough. One went to the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation whose assignment it is to learn how a state can refine and use "the precious raw resource of its working people."

By January 23, the lessons of a cataclysmic summer having been more fully digested, the President turned again to the issue. Giving it place of highest priority after his State of the Union address, he delivered to the Congress his manpower message.

The sights, said he, were being raised. The objective was to prepare 100,000 men and women for jobs by June, 1969, and 500,000 by June, 1971. A National Alliance of Businessmen, headed by Henry Ford II, would direct the effort in the nation's 50 largest cities. The outlay would be $350 million.

It was an assignment no more challenging than essential. It was a plan rooted less in Christian charity than in sound economics. It was also too little.

There was no call to expand the attack on rural seedbeds of poverty. There was no mention of rural centers promised in October.

The omission, MDC officials are by now convinced, was not one of oversight. The January goals have superseded those of October; the administration has made its choice—$350 million to allay the cities' fever, nothing to treat the rural virus.

A director, sending up distress signals, judges that we are "missing a critical turn nationally in understanding the nature of our manpower problem and the underlying causes of urban riots". Subsequent to the President's restrictive message, he notes, the Civil Disorders Commission—for all its perceptive analysis of the dilemma—disclosed scant comprehension of "where all those angry people in the cities came from."

MDC—working in a state which sent 300,000 out on the trail north in the 1950s—believes it knows. And, it discerns, as many as half of those left on Tar Heel farms may depart in the next five years.

Ruefully contemplating a continuing flight to the urban ghettos, a director writes:

"They came from deprived, mountain-locked Appalachian and tobacco-poor towns like Lumberton where I saw in the course of a recent day's visit as much bedrock poverty as I ever care to see in one place. White, Negroes, Indians—they are all out there waiting for farm mechanization to strip them of their last feeble excuse for staying. And they are leaving without skills, without realizable hope, with the blind unreason of a man sure that things can be no worse where he is going.

"With shrinking manpower needs in farm and small town and expanding needs in cities, North Carolina is America in minuscule. If we can't keep our potential work force or at least give them skills to take away with them, no fire extinguisher program will be big enough to salve the woes that will be heaped on the cities. And if it comes to fire extinguishers all round, we shall probably need some right here in North Carolina where it is surely not lost on the poor that they lack a fire visible from Washington."

MDC'S STAKE

MDC is not merely concerned with principle wounded. It has a very real stake in challenge denied.

Its leaders—and they are men of vision and substance—believe that North Carolina is the ideal state for a test battle with rural unemployment and that their organization is ideally equipped to conduct it. They want to "demonstrate how a semi-literate, marginally productive tobacco farmer in Robeson County can become a skilled manufacturing worker in Fayetteville." They want to show that industry profits as worker profits. They want to provide for the nation a "manpower model that just might work."

In competition with the clamor from the cities—and that clamor must be heeded—their's is a small voice, of course. But reinforced by those of all who know treatment of a disease requires more than a soothing of symptoms that voice can carry to the White House and to the Congress.

We hope Mr. Humphrey hears it and moves to undergird with substance some persuasive ideals. We hope Mr. Johnson hears and applies the economy of foresight in healing the cities. We hope MDC gets the chance to prove its point. It is the best chance not alone for the Robeson sharecropper but for all of us.

[From the American Banker, May 3, 1968]

AMERICAN BANKERS TRAINING KEY TO STEMMING MANPOWER LOSS

(By Luther H. Hodges, Jr., senior vice president, North Carolina National Bank, Charlotte, and chairman, North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., Chapel Hill)

While other states try to lure industry inside their borders with promises of sunny economic skies, North Carolina is turning, through the auspices of a unique organization, to a comprehensive program for developing a trained manpower pool.

The North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. is unique in having sprung from an unusual parentage—the National Association of Manufacturers and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

For the first time businessmen and poverty fighters have united under one corporate charge to plan and implement a comprehensive manpower development program on a state-wide basis.

In North Carolina, manpower resources have become the single most important ingredient of economic and industrial development. MDC proposes to refine and replenish the supply of this ingredient with training.

By demonstrating that North Carolina can meet the manpower needs of presently existing industries, the state hopes to increase its attraction for out-of-state industry. Only through the combined efforts of industry, government, and the affected communities can this program succeed.

North Carolina, like most southern states, is in a period of transition. We are experiencing the pains as well as the rewards of industrialization. Three million of our five million people still live in rural settings. Many of these people have become victims rather than beneficiaries of industrial development. Mechanization has stripped them of their only livelihood—farming.

In the 1950s, 155,000 farm workers fled unproductive rural life for northern urban centers. Impending tobacco mechanization has spurred dire predictions for the future—80,000 farmers in North Carolina may be displaced in the next five years. Many of them will follow ancient migration patterns to northern ghettos.

XUM

Meanwhile North Carolina loses manpower very crucial to its industrial development. North Carolina is a state industrially on the go. In the 10-year period 1958–1967, investments for new and expanding industry totaled $3.75 billion, more than any other state in the South. Industrial expansion in 1967 alone created jobs for 24,774 people.

Employers are frantic for competent help, yet thousands of workers leave the state for jobs that prove to be merely mirages on the northern landscape. The economic future of this state depends on its ability to stop wasting this manpower.

The North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. is initiating innovative methods to treat the ills of both the employer and the unemployed. The manpower development process is alive, but none too well, in this state. There are people and there are jobs, but in far too many cases the twain never meet.

MDC has to first answer these questions: What are the gaps in the present manpower process and how can we plug them? MDC is pinpointing the gaps, a few of which are locating and effectively contacting the hardcore poor, coordinating the efforts of supportive services, providing training (pre-vocational and skill), promoting nondiscriminatory hiring practices, and developing jobs and placement on a man-to-job match basis.

To plug these gaps, MDC has contracted a series of action-oriented studies:

Outreach to discover techniques to contact and motivate the poor; job development, a computer match of job potential to job vacancies; supportive services, especially in the areas of transportation and housing; basic education and skill training, applying new technology; a planning, programming, budgeting system to provide precise information about education and training costs; a survey of industrial training capacity; the development of new careers; post-employment follow-up, and techniques for promoting nondiscriminatory practices.

The results of these studies, many of which are near completion, should place MDC in a strategic position to remedy the manpower problems of North Carolina.

The initial program of MDC also calls for two pilot demonstration projects: the computer job match and two manpower development centers.

The job match project uses computer science technology to match specific factors about people to specified requirements of jobs or job-training. For the purpose of demonstration, this system will operate on a small scale, but is capable of expanding to serve the entire state.

The computer data system will resolve optimally the geographical imbalance of people and jobs. Piedmont industries will be supplied with a data pool of men and their job potential from all over the state.

Relocating industries will be able to obtain valid information about labor supply and demand in an area in question.

The computer shows additional promise for the corporation; it will be used to mobilize other necessary resources, supportive services for instance. It may also help place low-income high school graduates in vocational training or on jobs, or place college graduates of minority groups in high-level jobs, thus curbing the "brain drain" that this state suffers through the loss of talented citizens who seek out-of-state employment.

The second pilot project calls for the establishment of two manpower development training centers. These centers apply a new system of teaching basic literacy.

This system, called "MIND," developed by the National Association of Manufacturers, utilizes technological equipment and programmed instruction. It has a reputation of high success in upgrading the target population.

A human resource development component accompanies classroom work at the center. An experienced instructor leads sessions of sensitivity training in an effort to change attitudes and create self-esteem.

The importance of good employee-employer relations is stressed, as well as personal hygiene, punctuality, and overall conscientiousness. Human resources development, it is felt, contributes significantly toward the development of a productive worker.

The first training center, established in Guilford County of the Piedmont, has completed its first cycle. It graduated 57 trainees. Basic education test results show that average class improvement was as high as a 2.1 grade level increase in some cases.

Apathy, muteness and fear marked the general trainee attitudes at the beginning of the cycle. By the end, these had been displaced by confidence and assuredness reflected in the increased trainee involvement in center activities. The majority of these trainees have been placed on jobs or in advanced training, or have appointments pending.

The second center will be located in the eastern part of the state. These two centers, it is hoped, will demonstrate the need for a rapid establishment of a network of centers to serve all parts of the state.

The MDC centers so envisioned would be sophisticated operations capable of supplying flexible training to meet specific manpower needs. Newly trained rural farmers in the East would be able to find productive employment in their home state. Small businesses would surely benefit, since they cannot afford to do their own training. They must count on outside services, and in North Carolina, that service will be the Manpower Development Corp.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, July 11, 1968]

Facility Unique in State: Manpower Center Reaches Goal

(By Rick Gray)

The object of the Manpower Development Center in Greensboro is to train people to get jobs, and after the first cycle of classes, the center has obtained its objective.

The center, the only such center in the state and one of eight in the nation, graduated 57 trainees from its first 10-week program and placed 52 of those graduates in jobs. Of the five that were not placed in jobs, two left town and three are pregnant.

"The purpose of the center," says Training Director Al Varn, "is to train people so that they can either get jobs or progress in jobs they already have."

The 57 who graduated in March were all but 18 who began the first cycle of classes in January. Of the 18 who did not complete the program, according to Al Boyles, director of the center, five found jobs before the program was completed, four had family problems, three had illnesses which caused them to miss more than a tenth of the program, three moved out of town and three dropped out for miscellaneous reasons.

The average wage of the graduating class, according to Boyles is $1.65 per hour (five cents an hour above the minimum), but some of the new workers are earning as high as $2.50 per hour. The average weekly income is $66.

If the graduates earn the national annual wage, Boyles says, the class will earn over $170,000 per year, pay a total of $16,000 in federal income taxes, pay over $2,800 in state income taxes and approximately $4,000 in sales taxes.

These payments by the graduating class would give the equivalent of a 25 per cent annual return on the costs of the school expended by the Office of Economic Opportunity, according to Varn.

"After four years (with total employment of the class) it's all free," he says.

When the graduates of this first class began the program, most were unemployed; however, a majority of the 44 women in the group had, at one time or another, Boyles says, been employed as domestic help, earning $25–30 a week.

The training program concentrates on basic education and motivation training, Varn says. The trainees are tested for placement level when they begin classes, and they are then placed in individual education programs.

Varn stresses that advancement is on an individual basis with no competition for grades or the like among trainees. Educational programs include math, reading and English training.

The math program, for example, begins with elementary addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. The upper level combines these four processes into more difficult problems: "Twenty-seven divided by nine plus two times five plus seven divided by four minus seven plus nine. Write your answer."

In the motivation training, Varn says, "We use role-playing situations that enable the trainees to see both sides of the fence.

"In our civics class, for example, we pick out someone who says that the mayor has an easy job and let him be the mayor. Then we confront him with two people—one representing churches and the other grocers. Then, after listening to both representatives present their views on blue laws, he has to decide which would be best for the city.

"Sometimes the trainee will go through the rest of the day thinking about whether he did the right thing."

And that, Varn says, is the point of the motivation training—to get the trainees to think and to see both sides of a question.

The center uses tape recordings and video tapes of classroom proceedings to allow the trainees to see themselves as a personnel manager would, and then as a class they criticize the way that classmates play their roles.

"We try to show them that the man interviewing them has to hire qualified personnel to keep his own job," Varn says.

He concludes that when the trainees realize that the personnel manager is trying to keep his own job, they are motivated to prove that they are qualified so that they can get, and keep, the job.

[From the Employment Service Review, September 1968]

A North Carolina Study: Moving People to Jobs

(By Charles B. Garnett)

In an economy capable of sustaining high employment, how can we assure every American who is willing and able to work the right to earn a good living?

This is an era of prosperity and affluence for this Nation, yet there are many Americans for whom the right to earn a living has never been a reality.

There may be jobs available which require specific skills or training, but for the man who lacks those skills or that training they mean nothing. Those jobs may be in certain places, but for the man who isn't there and does not have the know-how or the means to get there, the "right to earn a living" does not exist.

This article is concerned with the man who isn't there. It deals wtih a group of jobless people—rural people—whose opportunity for employment was lost as mechanization and modern technology replaced manpower in agricultural production. It is about rural areas of one State where few, if any, nonagricultural jobs can be found.

It is a story about an experimental and demonstration project, financed by the U.S. Department of Labor, designed to find out if moving people to places where there are jobs is feasible. It is based on a monograph prepared by the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., to describe a mobility project it is conducting.[1]

There are, in North Carolina, a great many people for whom society has not made a place. These are the people who have been displaced by mechanization or for whom there has never been a solid place in society. Among them are Negroes, Caucasians, and Indians, and they have one common bond—a great need of help in the solution of their economic problems.

The basic concept of mobility is to identify and recruit individuals from an area which offers them little or nothing and to place them in an area which can provide them with a new chance in life. This does not involve a mass movement of persons from one area to another, but rather a selective movement based on natural migratory patterns from rural to urban areas which will afford the people concerned the opportunity to become productive, self-sustaining citizens.

This effort is designed to equip a man and his family with the tools they need to effect that change. The objective of the person to be relocated is to find a job which means survival for himself and his family. Mobility provides him with help in securing the job, financial aid while looking for the job, assistance in locating a house that will afford him more than minimum shelter, and counseling.

To find a job in an urban environment is not exceedingly difficult—to keep it is. Finding a house to live is not the biggest problem—adapting to a new type of living is. The purpose of the mobility project is to offer the many supportive services necessary to equip the family to make the adjustments. The accomplishment of that task requires extensive counsel through every step of the mobility process.

Counseling begins in the recruiting or supply area, where the counselor must determine the problems and prepare the person to be relocated for the transition to city life. Here he learns about the goals of the project and what it can mean to him.

Not every applicant will move; some are skeptical, some are apathetic, some will be eager to move, and still others will require a great deal of convincing.

THE NUMBERS INVOLVED

The many problems which are encountered during the convincing period can be best illustrated by citing the number of persons involved. In the areas of North Carolina covered in the report (Oct. 1, 1967, through Mar. 31, 1968) some 2,310 people were identified and contacted. Among those, 1,061 were found to be initially eligible for mobility services. Some 224 of those eligible actually were referred to specific out-of-area jobs and 190 individuals and their families were relocated.

It is obvious from the original number of persons contacted that time alone would prohibit too much concentration on the unconvinced, since available funds necessarily limit the number of counselors. Yet each of the individuals must be given the opportunity for participation.

Counselors must use many different approaches in the convincing process, including a full discussion of the benefits mobility will offer. For some people, a visit to the demand area is necessary. For others, supportive services from existing agencies are required to help with social, physical, economic, or psychological problems. In this particular mobility project, all of those initially eligible received some service from the counselors.

Family ties often make people hesitant to move. In such a situation the counselor must make every effort to move several members of a family to the new location, or to move people to a place where there will be someone they know. An additional incentive for those who are reluctant to leave their families is the fact that assistance will be offered to get the family back together again once the move has been accomplished.

Some persons may have prison records or be on probation. In themselves, these are not disqualifying factors but do require more concerted effort on the part of a counselor. Because of legal considerations, the applicant must have permission from his probation or parole officer before he is able to move. If permission is granted, the whereabouts and the employer of the parolee must be reported to the responsible officer.

In addition, many seemingly trivial duties must be performed by counselors—checking on or helping to secure draft status or social security cards, and school records for children. As unimportant as those tasks may seem, they may make the difference between success and failure of the mobility program.

Many times, in his eagerness for a job, the applicant will insist that he is 1–Y or 4–F; that he has completed his military service; or that he has a social security number. A check of the facts may disclose that he is not registered at all or that his draft status is not updated. Upon the applicant's arrival in a demand area, employers request registration cards, discharge papers, and other documents. If they are not available, it is difficult to place the job seeker. Long delays are encountered in obtaining the papers. Therefore, the work should be completed before the individual leaves the supply area.

Once the decision to relocate has been made, the second step in the mobility process begins—preparation for the move. Again there is a great need for counseling and assistance.

The rural poor do not have the conveniences available in the urban area, nor do they even have most of the necessities. They have not been concerned with the social amenities which exist in urban situations. They are primarily concerned with getting a job and "doing better," but they must be made aware of the differences in attitude and of the style of life in the city.

Counselors are often faced with a fear, a negativism that has been inculcated since birth which must be overcome. Although the workers may have had earnings far below the poverty level, and perhaps been allowed to rent cheaply or live rent-free in a substandard shack, loyalties to landlords or employers may be strong. Counselors are frequently told that "He promised me it would be better this year; besides, he's been good to me and mine." Tactful counsel is required to change this attitude of acceptance and defeat and to prepare the individual for a new way of life.

As the person leaves his home area, he becomes more reliant upon the counselor. More often than not, he has never been to the big city. He often leaves his old home with the deep and abiding fear that his family will not be provided for adequately. Although this wrenching away from the loved ones is only temporary, it is a traumatic situation for many. This is a critical stage in the mobility process, for it is a period of transition from the known to the unknown.

Success or failure at this point is dependent upon how effectively the previous counselors have instilled confidence in the individuals concerned. While it is a time of greater reliance upon counsel, the individual is now asked to transfer both faith and trust to a strange counselor. The newcomer brings with him largely unknown problems which must be met with the greatest tact and diplomacy on the part of the new counselor.

The person who has just moved to a new area is in the kind of place that he may have seen only in pictures before. He seeks a familiar face or just a familiar expression. He must be given a painstakingly detailed orientation period, yet he cannot be treated like a child. He needs and deserves the dignity afforded to all men, yet he must learn certain rudimentary things that are second nature to most urban children.

He may have been told about flush toilets, but many rural people have never used one, or in some cases, have never seen one. Simple tasks that many take for granted can be new and frightening experiences for the uninitiated.

The counselor must now attempt to reach a common ground of understanding with the new arrival in order to acclimate him to the total urban situation. This covers a broad spectrum ranging from the advantages and disadvantages of urban living to demands made upon workers by industrial employers.

The relocated worker is generally unaware of the demands that industry will make of him. He is used to the relatively bucolic existence of rural areas. He does not recognize the 8-hour day or the necessity for working on designated days. If the sun shines he feels it is a workday, and if it rains he considers it an automatic day off. It is as simple as that. He cannot comprehend the close working relationships that exist; he is not used to being told what to do in every step. He does not understand industry, and industry does not understand him.

All areas of living must be covered by the counselor. How to budget for the higher cost of living in the city and knowledge of the transportation and communication systems of the city must be passed on. It is not unusual to find newcomers who do not know the basic "niceties" of urban living—garbage pickup is often an unheard of thing. Old habits are hard to break, yet they must be broken.

As the newcomer is taught to participate in the system, he will be made aware of what the system can do for him. If he is in need, he should be able to draw upon the system for aid. He is mostly unaware of such things as police, fire, and medical services, and it is often difficult for him to comprehend them.

Then there are the necessary preparations for the future in the job itself. Education and training are things about which he has little or no understanding, nor will he participate in such programs unless they are prerequisites for his job. Since he feels that a job meets all his needs, he has little concern for the future. He has been in want for so long that the needs of the present are paramount and he tends to answer only them.

A motivational process must start with the counselor and culminate with the relocated worker. It is a slow, tedious, wearing-away type of situation that is slow in showing results. It is not an integral part of the mobility program; nonetheless, it is a necessity for the long-term betterment of the man and the program.

Up to this point, discussion has centered primarily on the counseling needs of the individual worker. Next must come consideration of the needs of his family. Before they can join him in his new location he must have a job and a place for them to live. Once he has been assisted in reaching those goals, attention must be turned to assisting him in bringing his family to the city. Once again intensive counseling is needed.

This aid to the family can take many forms, from actual shopping trips to information on how to use supportive services available in the city from other agencies. Selecting what and where to buy are important items to the family, but not everyone is amenable to suggestions. Buying is a personal thing and each person acts or reacts in a different manner. Some reject any advice. They feel that a few extra dollars can buy the world, and they make every attempt to do so. They soon are disillusioned and many become the target of a stream of bill collectors. That situation calls for a new type of counseling if serious trouble is to be avoided.

---

[1] Copies of pamphlet titled "Mobility" can be obtained by writing North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., Post Office Box 435, Durham, N.C. 27702.

The children of the families involved also present counseling demands. Among the 190 relocated families in the mobility project under discussion, 43 had school-age children. The parents were assisted in getting these youngsters enrolled in appropriate schools and advised of the other requirements that must be met in an urban area.

In many rural areas, children frequently take "crop vacations"—time out from school to help tend and harvest the crops. In some isolated areas, absences from school often do not warrant the attention of the truant officer. Regular attendance must be encouraged in the new situation. In the city imposition of penalties for unexcused absences and the ultimate threat of court action are real possibilities.

CARE OF CHILDREN

Many relocated families have little conception of how children should be cared for in an urban environment. In the country, a child is not in much danger of being hit by a car on a busy street. A child in the country is not much of an annoyance to neighbors, for there are few neighbors. In the city there are many busy streets and many other dangers, and children can easily be an annoyance to the many nearby residents. In some instances, those neighbors may be able to turn to the law for recourse to children's activities.

Mention of court action and laws brings up another task for the counselor. Although he must refrain from interfering with any due process of law or with law officers in the conduct of their duty, he does have the responsibility of advising the family as to how and where they can receive legal assistance to protect their rights.

There are countless other tasks which fall into the category of counseling. All are important, but there are far too many to be listed here. Each situation demands particcular action on the part of the responsible counselor. There has been a measure of success in the North Carolina experimental mobility project, certainly enough to demonstrate that mobility may be one of the answers to how some disadvantaged Americans can be assured the "right to earn a living."

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Sept. 10, 1968]

COMPUTER MATCHES WORKERS AND JOBS

(By Stacie Steele)

CHAPEL HILL.—A uniquely advanced computer match program has been developed by the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. as part of an effort to devise a high-speed system to pinpoint by computer potential workers across the state and match them with jobs available to them.

George Autry, director of the corporation, said objectives of the organization are to "increase productivity and improve per capita income through the fullest possible development of the state's manpower resources."

The computer match project is still in the experimental stages and is being funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A computer demonstration using live data acquired during a pilot installation in Greensboro will be conducted here Wednesday for Republican presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon.

In the Greensboro installation approximately 300 hardcore unemployed people were matched by computer for job opportunities in the area.

Erwin M. Danziger, director of administrative data processing at the University of North Carolina, is acting as consultant to Manpower Development Corp. Working with him is Leonard Stroebel, manager of systems, software and scientific programming at UNC.

Danziger, who says that the program here is unique because "we have reached a more advanced stage in the use of modern technology, the computer, in attempting to match jobs and the unemployed," stresses that the most important part of the total project is outreach.

"I think we ought to place the greatest emphasis of the program, not on the computer match portion," Danziger said, "but rather on getting the unemployed, making them aware of job opportunities, and getting them to fill out information about themselves on forms which can then be keypunched and put into the computer system."

The most difficult part of the project, Danziger said, "is finding the practically unlocatable people, the underemployed and unemployed, and once having the computer assist in matching these individuals to job requests which are provided by North Carolina industry, helping them to move to a job which may have been offered to him, getting him oriented to a new work situation and keeping him on that job."

Practical difficulties present themselves in attempting to do these things, Danziger said, because of the lack of the preparedness of the unemployed.

"Many of our unemployed in North Carolina are not in a position to accept jobs because they simply do not know in large cities how to use a bus system, what to wear to go to a job or how to use a telephone."

Stroebel, working with Danziger on the project, sees a wide range of uses for the experiment.

"The real potential of this system lies not only in matching people to jobs," Stroebel said, "but in utilizing the wealth of information gathered by the outreach people to do correlation studies on skills and interests of the hard core unemployed people, and perhaps determining some factors for motivating them so that they may become better equipped to handle life, and to contribute somewhat more to the society in which they live."

Autry noted that the computer match program is only one of several related projects which are being conducted simultaneously by his organization.

It is operating a model training center in Greensboro where the chronically unemployed are given a combination of basic educational and motivational training to provide them with a running start toward useful and productive working lives.

That center is to be the model for several others to be established around the state, directly tied to the job needs of industry.

It is operating Project Mobility under the auspices of the Labor Department—a statewide effort to move the unemployed individuals from job scarce areas and find them work and housing in job surplus areas.

It is sorting through the results of more than a dozen operational studies of how the manpower process presently works in North Carolina.

[From North Carolina magazine, November 1968]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT CORP: TO FIND THE JOBLESS, TO FIND THE JOBS

The first time that many North Carolinians had heard of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation was the sunny September day that Republican presidential candidate Richard Nixon came to have a look at the corporation's people-to-jobs computer matching program in Chapel Hill.

MDC is scarcely a year old, but the purpose and scope of its operations have already been circulated about the country; word of the computer experiment had reached Nixon. He came to watch and listen and he was impressed.

The private, nonprofit corporation owes its existence to a tripartite alliance of the North Carolina Fund, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Association of Manufacturers. The N.C. Fund provided the idea; the OEO provided funding grants and the NAM provided additional finances and advice from its Urban Affairs Division.

Business and governmental leaders of North Carolina occupy the organization's directorships. Its staff is headed by Executive Director George Autry, former chief counsel and staff director of Senator Sam Ervin's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. Its programs, proposed and in progress, are many and ambitious. Its goal is to discover the full extent and fundamental causes of the state's manpower problems and the means of solving them.

Behind the creation of MDC was the North Carolina Fund's assertion, made after considerable study of North Carolina's economic structure and society, that conditions of poverty, unemployment and educational lack in many parts of the state were far more serious than anyone had hitherto recognized.

MDC came into being as a result of the Fund's studies. It was incorporated in August of last year with North Carolina National Bank Senior Vice President Luther H. Hodges, Jr., as chairman of the board of directors. A program embracing 15 separate studies and projects was originally envisioned; it was later reduced to ten. They include:

1. The computer match program. Using computer equipment owned by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the program is an experiment to determine whether the aptitudes and basic skills of a person can be accurately matched up to job requirements through the data process method. Factual data was obtained from a group of chronically unemployed people who were recruited for a pilot training program in Greensboro. The data was keypunched in New York and returned to Chapel Hill. Requirements for various types of industrial positions were also reduced to computer language and the matchup process began. The experiment, though not yet complete, already shows considerable promise in some day providing a high-speed method of matching people to jobs. It is also expected to provide information as to why certain people do not match to jobs, and how their skills might be improved to make them a part of the work force. Eventually, MDC hopes to establish computer information centers in various parts of the state.

2. Prevocational training. The first of these programs was begun earlier this year in Greensboro. Subcontracted to a New York agency and directed by Al Boyles, formerly with H. L. Coble Construction Company, the center is training chronically unemployed people in basic literacy and job readiness. The first ten-week session began with 75 trainees; 57 completed the course and most of them improved their literacy at least one grade level while others advanced as many as five grade levels. Nearly half the trainees were placed in jobs soon after graduation; others later found work or embarked on advanced skill training.

The program is purely experimental but MDC officials are delighted at the progress of the trainees and the information that has been gathered from the experience. Other such training centers are planned as MDC's funds and priorities permit, including one at Rocky Mount scheduled to open late this year.

3. Mobility project. MDC took over from the North Carolina Fund a project of moving people to where the jobs are located. Reception centers for the relocated jobless are located in Charlotte, Greensboro and High Point, but housing availability remains a serious obstacle in the mobility process. A staff member of the State Employment Security Commission works full-time in this phase of MDC's operations.

Those are MDC projects already fully operational. Others in the start-up stage include:

1. Development of what are called "outreach" techniques—finding means of communicating with the poor, motivating them into wanting to become useful members of society and to prepare themselves for success in holding jobs.

2. Supportive services. This involves learning the kind of services that will be needed to help the rural poor and unemployed in their painful transition to urban living and occupation.

3. Basic education and training. How to relate education and training to the poor and jobless and vice versa.

4. Development of jobs: The idea here basically is to learn through comprehensive study just what North Carolina's job potential for the poor really is and how to assemble and report the available jobs.

5. Job development careers. This would involve development of career work in helping the unemployed and the underemployed.

6. Housing. Finding low-income housing for the jobless being uprooted from rural environments; possibly even training workers for building their own dwellings is the concern of this program.

7. Determining North Carolina's industrial training capacity, both public and private, and determining what in the way of additional programs are needed and where.

The Manpower Development Corporation does not envision a permanent existence. Its long-range goal is to develop effective programs for dealing with the manpower problem that will be assumed by the appropriate public and private agencies. Its year-to-year existence depends upon the amount of government and private funds that will be made available to it, but the recognition it has already received would seem to guarantee continued operation for the foreseeable future.

Although the organization does not enjoy universal approbation of all those working in the same general areas, it has the genuine official approval of the State of North Carolina and most of its higher officials. Many of the heads of state agencies which are working on the same problems are members of MDC's board, including Employment Security Commission Chairman Henry E. Kendall and Department of Community Colleges Director I. E. Ready. Among leading businessmen on the board are Burlington Industries Vice President William H. Ruffin of Durham and Duke Power Company President William B. McGuire of Charlotte and many others.

The organization's staff includes, in addition to Autry, Dewitt Sullivan, director of finance and administration; John L. Allen, Jr., director of operations; Lionel H. Aselton, director of industry relations and technical assistance; and Robert C. Smith, director of program development and public relations.

MDC hopes to answer all the questions of manpower development, but in so doing, an important primary part of the job is to learn how to ask the questions. While the problem's broad outlines are easily discernible, its many details are far from clear. The unemployed, the unemployable and the underemployed are not all known. Still in the unanswered category is the question of why they are the way they are. The most complicated and elusive scientific study of all is the study of human beings and their motivations and lack of same.

. No one can guarantee that the Manpower Development Corporation will find the answers, or, if it does, that they will be accepted and used by the public and private agencies to which they will be offered. Today's answers may not be applicable to the changing situations of tomorrow.

But the agency is busy seeking to define the questions and go after the answers. It has the blessings of government and of private business. There is a deepening pool of concern over the manpower problem and a quickening eagerness to discover the solutions. What MDC may find will be of direct help not only to North Carolina, but to every area of the country where the problem exists.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Nov. 24, 1968]

He Freshed Up on Schooling, Got Job—Different Poverty War Breaking the Cycle

(By Dwayne Walls)

GREENSBORO.—Grover Saunders, a gentle man not accustomed to asserting himself, walked through a light snowfall to put in his application and then he never heard anything from it.

So he asserted himself.

"I didn't hear anything and I didn't hear anything," he said, "so I went up there and I told them I hadn't gone up there just to be a-going."

And he told the Manpower Development people something else, too.

"Now, I want to know something," he told them. "Am I a-going to get in or am I not a-going to get in?"

He got in. He began training that very day, and he went to class for 10 weeks.

"I learned a lot of things I didn't learn in school," he said, "and I freshed up on a lot that I did learn."

Grover Saunders had worked briefly as a shipping clerk in a warehouse years ago. But for most of his 44 years he had been a practical nurse, working for low pay in a risky market.

"You had to keep a-scratching," he said "Now and then I would make $70 a week when I was lucky."

He completed one of the 10-week training courses at Greensboro's Manpower Development Center and got a job as a shipping clerk at $1.85 an hour.

He got his first raise a few weeks ago and eventually will qualify for a retirement program.

When Grover Saunders made out his application for employment, he left one question blank, the one that asked what kind of wage he expected. "I don't know how much I'm worth," he said.

But now his outlook has changed.

"Why, you know," he said. "They've already got me in training to be head of the shipping department some day."

Grover Saunders' sudden rise to steady employment is a modest success story.

Thousands of other North Carolinians have done as well in climbing out of steady unemployment or grinding under-employment since the war on poverty began five years ago.

But the Saunders journey is noteworthy because he and about 200 other graduates of the Manpower Development Center here are the early products of a new stage in the poverty war.

The Manpower Development Center is the first and fairest child in a houseful of experiments spawned in the past year by the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation (MDC) of Chapel Hill.

This non-profit corporation is seen by some observers as the new kind of poverty program—that is, one dominated by hardnosed businessmen and industrialists instead of idealistic dogooders.

MDC sees itself differently, preferring to describe itself as a collaboration of industry and government to attack unemployment and labor turnover across the nation.

One MDC official likes to think of it as "a way out of the endless, ceaseless poverty programs of the past."

Whatever its generic description—poverty program or economic development program—MDC clearly is the strongest indication yet that private industry is willing—even determined—to do more than criticize the poverty war.

MDC is the brainchild of the North Carolina Fund. Its major source of funds so far is the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

But the rock-ribbed National Association of Manufacturers has bestowed its blessing and some technical assistance, and MDC is banking heavily on private industry for its success.

The organization was born last fall at a time when the war on poverty was beginning to fall apart or to settle down, depending on who viewed it and where and how it was viewed.

In North Carolina alone half a million people—about one-fourth of the state's labor force—still need jobs or better jobs, even after millions of dollars have been spent to break the cycle of poverty.

That was roughly the time also when the nation's business and industry began awakening fully to a critical shortage of labor.

Employers in North Carolina were scrambling to find help—skilled or unskilled—and thousands of jobs were going unfilled.

That situation still exists. MDC's goal is to develop some way to eliminate both the labor surplus and a job surplus by bringing the two together.

The organization has given itself three years to develop what it calls a "manpower model" on the state level and hopefully to come up with the workings of a national model or at least a national policy.

MDC Director George B. Autry and his staff have completed a three-year plan which attacks the problem broadside.

In North Carolina, as it is elsewhere in the nation, the situation is one of distance.

Unemployment is mostly in rural areas while available jobs are mostly in the cities.

Even when the two exist together in the urban areas there is a gulf between what industry wants and what the labor force can supply.

Sometime within the coming year the corporation will launch several experimental programs intended to put people where the jobs are.

These include an experimental transportation program in the eastern part of the state, possibly a low-cost housing program, and a statewide computer system to identify the jobs and the jobless and match them.

Through the N.C. Mobility project inherited from the N.C. Fund, the corporation also will continue moving whole families out of rural areas into several Piedmont cities.

But the heart of the whole project will be a network of training centers like the one in Greensboro that produced Grover Saunders.

Three additional centers will be established—two in the East and one in the West—and operated initially by the corporation.

But MDC Program Director Bob Smith says the plan is "to work the centers so thoroughly into the fabric of the community that eventually the community will take over from MDC."

MDC also will set up similar training centers for individual industries, and two of the state's largest firms already have contracted for in-plant centers.

The Greensboro center is not a school in the traditional sense of the word, although its trainees do get some basic education and improve their education level an average of about two grades.

XUM

"We don't give them a heck of a lot of education," says Al Varn, MDC's training director. "The important thing is to teach them how to use the education they've got. We're there to train people to get a job or a better job, to show them how to make themselves more attractive to an employer."

To do this the center curriculum leans heavily on a course called Human Resources Development which, as one graduate put it, makes the student take a good look at himself.

Trainees are required to deliver impromptu talks to fellow trainees while a video-tape records the performance.

They go through mock job interviews, playing the roles of both applicant and employer, and then criticize their mistakes on a video playback.

The classes include even instructions in personal grooming and medical self-help.

The results have been dramatic in some cases.

Sylvia Dunlap was a high school drop-out who came in the center from the Neighborhood Youth Corp. She now works regularly as a machine operator at $1.60 an hour.

One graduate that Center Director Al Boyles likes to talk about is Mrs. Alease Galloway.

Mrs. Galloway, the mother of four children, formerly worked as a maid. Even with her husband's regular income the family was barely making it.

Mrs. Galloway had more intelligence than her grade-school education indicated and enough ambition to do something about it. Graduating from the center with a perfect attendance record she took a third-shift textile job and worked straight through rest breaks until the company slowed her down.

She now spends part of her spare time recruiting friends into the training center.

Not all of the center's graduates are whopping successes. A few of the recruits do not even stick long enough to complete the 10 weeks of training, and one of the recent star graduates left a high-paying job to return to welfare rolls, and now seems content to stay there.

The center's follow-up study of the 76 graduates in the second training cycle shows a measure of the program's success.

When they came to the center 55 per cent of the trainees were unemployed and 11 percent were employed only part time.

Three months after they graduated 65 per cent of the class was found to be employed full time, almost all of them on the first job taken after graduation.

Eight per cent was employed part-time and seven per cent were working part-time while taking additional training.

Nineteen per cent of the graduates were found to be unemployed.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Nov. 30, 1968]

EDITOR'S LETTER: MANPOWER PROJECT LOOKS AT RESULTS, THEY'RE IMPRESSIVE

DEAR READERS: When Bob Smith was associate editor of The News, he used to plow through long government reports larded with gobbledegook with a patience almost painful to watch. But when enough became too much he would phone through the Washington maze until he found the man who wrote the report and say: "I've read your report, and if you've a minute or so, I'd like to know what you are trying to say."

That kind of intellectual precision made Bob a superb editorial writer. It also prompted the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation, when it was formed little more than a year ago, to ask him to join the corporation as director of program development.

Out of a deep conviction that an anti-poverty program could be made to work and that MDC had a better-than-average chance to prove it, Bob bid farewell to newspaper work. We talked about the new corporation's joint sponsorship by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Association of Manufacturers and the willingness of tough-minded leaders like Luther Hodges Jr. to provide leadership and policy direction. And Bob agreed that "I'll write you when I know something."

He wrote this week and I thought you might be interested in his observations:

"I know, I know," Bob writes. "The last thing you need is something to read. Something that looks complicated and long of wind. Still you might try this one for size.

"SOMETHING EXTRAORDINARY

"We've run three cycles of trainees through our Greensboro center and the first two cycles are far enough off now to make assessment possible. We've bird-dogged graduates, drop-outs, employers—everybody who fits into the puzzle one way or another. The results are here. They are real, not theoretical. There are enough failures to make the modest successes look pretty good . . . You will see (in reports enclosed) our mistakes glaring through, but you will also see that something rather extraordinary has been happening . . . we think a door has been chinked open and a few rays of light let through . . ."

The report tracked 133 persons either totally unemployed or having only part-time jobs below the poverty level, who had received MDC'c ten-week program of basic education and motivational training. Of the 133, 122 were located and of these 85 (or 69.7 percent) were employed full-time. Twenty-three were unemployed.

"These are all people," Bob reports, "with a long and continuous experience of unemployment and underemployment. As you can see almost 70 per cent of them have full-time jobs now, the majority working with the first employer they joined after graduation from the training center . . . Only 20 seem at this point still to be losers . . . I'm personally impressed with the average wage of the full-time workers. It is $1.85 an hour. That's nicely above the federal minimum. It isn't enough money, Lord knows, but it is a start. Many of these people are getting skills training from their new employers and will move on up the wage ladder.

"A MAID IS NOW A WEAVER

"If you can look at nothing else in the reports, please check the summary which shows what the people were doing when they came into the training center and what they are doing now. It makes all the failing worthwhile. . . ."

I saw the reason for Bob's optimism quickly. A domestic earning 75 cents an hour is now making $1.99 as a weaver. Another person, unemployed since 1962, earns $1.60 an hour, in a hosiery operation, and an unemployed domestic whose top salary had been 87 cents an hour is now making $1.32 as a nurse's aide. A part-time laborer has become a production worker at $2.33 an hour. An unemployed truck driver has become a forklift operator at $2.15 an hour.

The MDC's reports are thorough, clear and convincing, and they offer reason to hope that the corporation will be able to find funding for other training centers around the state.

Though still experimental, the development of human skills among those impoverished in spirit, ability and means is the most pressing business confronting North Carolina and the nation. And it is difficult to think of a more sensible approach than that of MDC which weds the resources of government with the problem-solving abilities of business.

Sincerely,

PERRY MORGAN.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Jan. 1, 1969]

AT MDC, SUCCESS STORIES: UNLIKELY ALLIANCE HELPS TRAIN UNEMPLOYED

(By Owen Lewis)

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Office of Economic Opportunity and a private contractor running a poverty program?

This unlikely alliance has produced Manpower Development Center on South Edgeworth Street, an outfit for hard-core unemployed and underemployed persons who go through a stiff 10-week course and come out better motivated and better able to cope with the world of private industry.

The center is a part of the Manpower Development Corp., which has headquarters in Chapel Hill, and has instituted a broad range three-year program of experiments dedicated to breaking the cycle of poverty in the state.

The center began operation in March, and has graduated three cycles of trainees who were given courses in basic education and human-resource development—development of motivation and attitude, how to dress, how to look for employment, how to fill out an application, how to prepare for an interview.

"One of the most basic things the center does is to familiarize the trainees with industry. We are not do-gooders. The trainees are expected to find jobs on their own. But if they have major problems, real excuses, we try to help them again. We try to change their attitudes," said Jim Bobbitt, MDC placement developer.

The basic education is programmed instruction, broken down by levels, in such fundamental areas as reading, mathematics and manual dexterity. In the human-resource development field, closed-circuit television is used to let the trainees see themselves as they go through mock sessions of job-seeking.

"Eighty-nine per cent of the employers say that our trainees are better than the average employee off the street," said Bobbitt. Of the last cycle, 81 of 89 of those who entered graduated. "If they stick it out the first week, you can't run them off," Bobbitt said. "This is security for them, and most of the trainees find they have something in common."

Most of the trainees at MDC have more than one of these criteria: poor economically, a school dropout, a member of a minority, under 22, over 45, or handicapped.

Kay Waddell, 22, was unemployed, and had just moved to town, when she heard an announcement of MDC's program on the radio. She applied and was accepted. "The basic math and English refreshed everything I had learned before. Before I had problems expressing myself, but now I feel I can communicate better with other people, understand them better and hold a job."

Miss Waddell, having completed the MDC cycle, is at Guilford Technical Institute on a Manpower Development Training Act program, studying to be a general office clerk.

Blondie Williams, who describes herself as "a middle-aged woman who didn't have as good a chance as the younger ones of getting a job," was a waitress before, and now has a job finishing cabinets at Burlington Distributors. She makes more money, and has regular daytime hours, Mondays through Fridays.

"The training at the center helped me to know how to go about looking for a job. How you act, your personality and your appearance mean a lot. We were taught these things. I think the center is wonderful for the people who didn't get to go to school, or who had to leave school like I did."

Horace Sturdivant, 24, said, "Before I had a job as a shipping and receiving clerk. Now

I have a position with the city in the building inspection department. My pay has improved, and I like the work better.

"My experience at the center was wonderful with the basic education and the human resources development courses. You learn how to get along better with your coworkers and with your employer. You learn what to expect of your employer in time of problems, in time of need."

Not all of the stories are success stories, but most of them are. One who hasn't succeeded yet is Sally Bledsoe. Mrs. Bledsoe said, "I completed the course, but I haven't got a job. The center is helping me try to find one, but it seems like all the jobs are filled." Mrs. Bledsoe is looking for a factory production job, "but it looks doubtful. I guess my height is my biggest problem. I'm not but five-feet, one-inch tall."

But from the first two cycles, more than 65 percent of the trainees have upgraded their job status, many of them spectacularly. The record of the third cycle, not yet complete, is expected to be even more impressive.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Feb. 6, 1969]

Labor Pool Going Dry, Hodges Says

The chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. says businesses should recruit manpower in areas they have previously ignored—the Negro colleges, the poor and men with arrest records.

"Business involvement in poverty and unemployment may be a simple matter of survival," Luther H. Hodges Jr. said today at a Johnson C. Smith University forum.

"Here in North Carolina established industries are discovering that the labor pool is drying up," he said. "They must either tap the manpower resources at the poverty level or lose production for lack of workers."

Hodges, son of the former governor, said business should look critically at its personnel tests "to see if they really do what they're supposed to do."

Hodges, whose agency is one of the first to match persons with jobs via computer, said more than a dozen North Carolina industries have approached MDC for help. The agency, he said, will establish in-plant training programs for industrial managers and the unemployed.

"It's all very well to motivate the chronically unemployed to come to work on time," he said, "but what good will that do if they are discriminated against or looked down upon when they get to work?"

Hodges said also business should experiment with new ways of providing "high support" for disadvantaged employees, "By this I mean most of all an attitude of acceptance by the employing company," he said.

"I mean on-the-job training. I mean going the extra mile to help the individual make the difficult transition from rural to urban life, from the society of the street corner to the community of work. And from the world of failure to the world of success."

Hodges said he is hopeful the agency will be able to establish a number of training centers throughout the state this year.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, of all the problems facing our inner cities today, none is more crucial than lack of employment opportunity. Although significant progress has been made, the solution to inner city unemployment still looms large ahead of us.

The Federal Government has recognized this problem and responded to it by instituting a variety of manpower programs, vocational training programs, and others too numerous to mention.

Private industry has also recognized the extent and social significance of inner city unemployment, and has responded to it in various ways. Individuals and giant corporations have wedded their efforts for the purpose of finding new possibilities, exploring new alternatives, and providing new hope to the unemployed residents of our inner cities.

One such union was created in 1957 when James F. Oates, Jr., of Chicago, Ill., combined his creative talents with the substantial resources of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. The achievements born of this union bear witness to the ability of the dedicated, to affect significant improvements in the quality of American life.

James F. Oates, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Equitable Life, will retire at the end of this year. I would like to share with my colleagues in the Senate, a record of some of his more important community and human achievements. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record, the following article, which appeared in the March 8, 1969, edition of the Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Affirmative Action

It has often been said that the successful magazine is the lengthened shadow of one man. This certainly was true of Harold Ross's *New Yorker*, Henry Luce's *Time, Life*, and *Fortune*, and is still true of De Witt Wallace's *Reader's Digest*. It was also true of American business in the post-Civil War period when the corporation was largely the creature of one man and he alone directed his company, often in a dictatorial fashion. But today, with the stock of corporations so widely held, and with the larger ones working in such complex fields, often in as many as a hundred lands, no individual can make all the decisions that demand such a wide variety of skills and an abundance of diverse knowledge. Corporate decisions of major import are now group decisions and of necessity must be so.

In keeping with these slow processes, it seems to take an interminable time before decisions made at the top are implemented throughout a company. This has been particularly evident in the adjustment of the larger corporation to its new social obligations. Yet despite this ponderous procedure of decision-making, the chief executive of a major company can provide leadership and give impetus to the movement of even the largest empires. Where one finds a corporation moving with urgency in seeking new means of meeting the crisis of the inner cities, for example, one is almost certain to find a chief executive riding herd to make sure that the company's policies are being carried out with utmost speed.

One such case highlights the theory. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States is one of the largest insurance companies in the country. Equitable is in a highly regulated business and must be cautious. All life insurance companies have had a poor history of employment of minorities. Some of them not only refused to hire Negroes or other deprived groups, but often they were even reluctant to sell insurance to blacks. The changes that have come about in all the better-run insurance companies are due not alone to public pressures, but to a realization by management that a tremendous part of their investments is in the cities and unless the cities are healthy the insurance companies will not be. As a result, hiring policies, for example, changed several years ago.

Some have been slow to implement those policies. But not Equitable Life. James F. Oates, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer, has made it his own direct business to see that there is not a letup in the pressure to alter old habits, to hire members of minority groups, to open doors to those previously barred from jobs. Mr. Oates retires from Equitable at the end of this year, and to examine the changes he has wrought, it is worth looking at his record before he came to the company. In 1945, as president of the Chicago YMCA, he decided it was time to end the debates on admission of Negroes to membership. As a result of his pressure, all facilities at the Y were opened to Negroes. There was no falling off in Y membership, and there were no outcries.

In 1946, as president of the Chicago Bar Association, Oates opened another door. Again, there were no Negro members. He brought in Negro lawyers, the first one a judge. In 1948, as head of The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company, he found that Negroes held only the most menial jobs, and precious few of them. He changed the hiring policies of his company and as a beginning sought out, with the aid of the judge he brought into the Bar Association, twenty well-qualified Negro youngsters. And he did it despite warnings from company executives that white girl employees would leave if black girls used the same washrooms; that it would be the ruination of Peoples Gas if young Negro men were allowed to work in the same offices with white men.

It was with this background that Oates arrived at Equitable in 1957. He found that his new company did not turn away Negroes when they sought jobs, but there was no initiative in hiring minority groups. The result was that there were hardly any Negro, Oriental, American Indian, or Spanish Americans working for Equitable. Oates made it his special province to change that picture.

Oates found that it is not easy to change the thinking of executives. As late as 1960, there were still very few minority group salaried employees at Equitable. Now, nationwide, some 13.5 per cent belong to minority groups. In the New York office, the figure is about 20 per cent and this is certain to rise. Of those being hired now in New York, 60 per cent are Negro and Puerto Rican. Every Equitable office throughout the country is integrated, including the South.

At present more than 200 agents out of a sales force of 7,000 are from a minority group. There are twenty Negro district managers out of some 400. The manager of one of the Philadelphia agencies is a Negro, as are the managers of agencies in Los Angeles and Chicago. And before 1969 is over, there will be more, for the vigorous recruiting campaign is being accelerated.

In addition, Equitable is now in its sixth year of training high school drop-outs, largely Negroes in New York, for jobs. The program is not a complete success, but there have been accomplishments that make the program worth the effort. "On balance," says Oates, "we are more than satisfied that it has been and continues to be a relative success." To Oates, a job "is an essential badge of membership in the larger society and a pay check is a passport to self-respect and self-sufficiency." But jobs alone are not enough. The entire environment of the inner cities must be changed, and that, Oates believes, involves schools, housing, recreational facilities, as it does job opportunities.

But that is not all. Equitable for some time has been one of the leaders among insurance companies in substantial corporate philanthropy, including aid to higher education. In

XUM

1954, Equitable's contribution program totaled $375,000. Last year it was $775,000, and it will be roughly the same in 1969. In addition, $200,000 more has been budgeted for urban programs. Equitable's Division of Community Services encourages company employees and agents to become active in civic causes.

The Equitable effort is part of the life insurance industry's pledge to invest $1 billion in urban core areas throughout the country to improve housing conditions and finance enterprises that will create jobs. And while the Federal Housing Administration guarantees the good use of these funds, the companies could invest them in other areas and get a better return of from 1 per cent to 1.5 per cent more. Oates was one of the leaders who proposed this industry wide program, which will in all likelihood be extended as soon as the original $1 billion is invested.

And if one more example is needed to show that a busy chief executive can still find time for what are usually called external responsibilities, there is Oates's activity as general chairman of Princeton University's capital campaign, which from 1959 to 1962 raised $53,000,000.

L. L. L. GOLDEN.

JERRIS LEONARD AND CIVIL RIGHTS: AN AUSPICIOUS BEGINNING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the new administration has been in office a little over 2 months now. Most of the Presidential appointees have just begun to acquaint themselves with their responsibilities, proceeding cautiously and gingerly in their new posts. But in the area of civil rights enforcement I am pleased to see that there has been no hiatus, no waiting. The forceful policy of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations is being carried forward in this administration by the new civil rights chief in the Justice Department, Jerris Leonard.

When he took office last January, Jerry Leonard inherited a docket of some 400 civil rights cases from his predecessor, Stephen Pollack. He has carried them forward, enforcing the civil rights laws enacted during the last decade. Vigorous and impartial enforcement is essential if these laws are to be given real meaning and substance.

This past Tuesday, Jerry Leonard completed oral argument in the case of Daniel against Paul, now pending in the Supreme Court. The case is on appeal from a ruling by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, and involves the question whether discrimination by a private club violates the public accommodations section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Although the United States is not directly involved as a party, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department intervened to insure that the Civil Rights Act would be properly applied by the Court. Jerry Leonard briefed and argued the case—a case which may result in a far-reaching interpretation of the civil rights laws.

But Leonard's functions have by no means been limited to carrying out existing cases, or intervening in disputes between private litigants. He has recently filed a motion in a Texas Federal district court challenging the Houston school system's method of complying with the school desegregation guidelines. Last May, the Supreme Court had ruled that the free choice plans adopted by Houston and other communities in the South are not an effective means of desegregating the schools; Leonard's motion seeks to implement that decision.

Finally, Jerry Leonard has been active in the area of open housing. In a recent speech to the Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations, he indicated that the Justice Department intends to enforce vigorously the congressional mandate on open housing. Local housing and urban development agencies will be encouraged to bring legal action against persons who discriminate against Negroes in real estate dealings. Chicago is to be one of the targets of his drive.

These achievements in so brief a period of time are impressive. They augur well for civil rights.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 584.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations without amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we now have under consideration House Joint Resolution 584, making supplemental appropriations to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. House Document 91–76, transmitted to the Congress on February 20, 1969, proposed supplemental appropriations of $1 billion for this purpose for fiscal year 1969, and a corresponding reduction of $1 billion from the fiscal year 1970 budget. The House of Representatives has approved the full budget estimate. House Joint Resolution 584 was reported from the House Appropriations Committee on March 24, 1969, and passed the House of Representatives on March 25, 1969. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported the resolution without amendment on March 26.

Mr. President, when the Congress processed the regular agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1969 last year, the budget request for this item was $3,648,506,000. The House reduced this amount by $460,393,500, and the Department did not appeal the House reduction. The Senate concurred in the House action inasmuch as the Department stated at that time that it felt this amount was sufficient to meet the financing requirements for all of the various CCC programs—which are mandatory and uncontrollable—and still have remaining an operating margin of approximately $1 billion.

Since that time, however, there have been large and unexpected demands upon the Corporation's borrowing authority totaling $1,686 million.

These unanticipated increases have been caused by extremely large increases in crop production—particularly feed grains, wheat, and soybeans—and decreases in exports. These increased supplies of commodities, coupled with lower prices and decreased exports, have resulted in higher quantities of commodities going under loan, and also loan repayments.

The dock strike, which has not been settled in the gulf ports from New Orleans westward, has further aggravated the situation by slackening the demand for agricultural commodities.

These factors have caused producers who have commodities under loan with the CCC to postpone repaying these loans and reclaiming the commodities until a future date when the prices will be firmer.

All of these developments have combined to cause this total program increase of $1,686 million above what was estimated in the fiscal year 1969 budget. Of this amount, $973 million occurred prior to the submission of the 1970 budget and $713 million occurred since that time. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a table which shows when these increases occurred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1

Commodity	1969 Budget to 1970 budget	Since 1970 budget	Total
Feed grains	$76	$405	$481
Wheat	246	141	387
Cotton	135	80	215
Soybeans	238	137	375
All other	278	−50	228
Total	973	713	1,686

XUM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last fall it became necessary to exempt the CCC from the effects of Public Law 90-364, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. This action, while exempting the CCC from the overall ceiling established under that act, did not increase the Corporation's borrowing authority.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a table which also appears in the printed hearings on page 7. This table details all of the changes which have occurred since the fiscal year 1969 budget was formulated.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Commodity Credit Corporation—Analysis of Changes in Borrowing Authority Available*

[Millions of dollars; fiscal year 1969]

Estimated borrowing authority available June 30, 1969, included in 1969 budget	$1,963.4
PRICE SUPPORT AND RELATED EXPENDITURES	
Increases from 1969 budget to 1970 budget:	
Feed grains (increased production)	$76.1
Wheat (more production and less exports)	246.5
Cotton (lower exports and domestic use)	134.6
Soybeans (more production and less use)	237.9
Storage facility loans (more space needed)	58.0
Rice (more production and less exports)	43.1
Tobacco (shift from "free" stocks to CCC)	75.1
Oils, edible (less exports)	20.0
Interest and all other	112.4
Total increases	1,003.7
Decreases from 1969 budget to 1970 budget:	
Peanuts (less production)	−13.3
Dairy products (less production)	−3.2
All other (dry beans, tung oil, long-staple cotton, etc.)	−14.1
Total decreases	−30.6
Net increases from 1969 budget, reducing availability of funds	−973.1
Increases since 1970 budget:	
Feed grains (less exports and $168 million more advance payment)	404.7
Wheat (less exports)	141.1
Cotton (more production and less total use)	80.0
Soybeans (trade holding off purchases in anticipation of lower prices)	137.5
Storage facility loans (more space needed)	40.0
Tobacco (shift from "free" stocks to CCC)	34.8
Rice (export payments)	5.0
Interest (higher rates)	38.9
Total increases since 1970 budget	882.0
Decreases since 1970 budget:	
Dairy products (less production and sales to section 32)	−163.9
Cottonseed meal (more use)	−5.3
Total increases since 1970 budget	−169.2
1969 appropriation (included in 1969 budget $918.1 million) (enacted $300 million)	618.1
Net increases since 1970 budget, decreasing availability of funds	−$712.8
Total net increases since 1969 budget	−1,685.9
Net available	277.5
1969 appropriation for realized losses:	
Included in 1969 budget $3,648.5 million; enacted $3,188.1 million	−460.4
Net deficit in borrowing authority after price support and related	−182.9
PUBLIC LAW 480 AND OTHER	
Public Law 480:	
1969 appropriation (included in 1969 budget $918.1 million) (enacted $300 million)	618.1
Decrease in expenditures (from $1,444.4 to $1,036.7 million)	407.7
Difference, financed by borrowing authority	−210.4
Advance to Farmers Home Administration (Public Law 90-328)—Not in 1969 budget	−30.0
Other net changes in special activities (mostly less short-term export credit sales)	+42.3
Total, Public Law 480 and other	−198.1
Revised estimate of borrowing authority available June 30, 1969 (deficit)	−381.0

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to summarize the major factors which have caused this increase of $1,696 million:

First. The production of feed grains, wheat, and soybeans has increased substantially above the levels anticipated in both the 1969 budget and the 1970 budget. As an example, feed grains have increased 1.1 million tons, while exports are down 3.1 million tons, resulting in an additional investment of $481 million by the CCC.

Second. Moreover, wheat is 60 million bushels over the expectation, while exports are expected to be down 190 million bushels, resulting in an increased investment of $387 million.

Third. Additionally, soybeans are 30 million bushels over the amount estimated earlier, while domestic use and exports are expected to be down 59 million bushels, which has resulted in an additional investment of $375 million by the CCC.

Fourth. Other programs account for increased funds; mainly, tobacco, which is up $110 million; rice, $48 million more; oils up $20 million.

Then, too, repayments have been much lower than anticipated when the 1969 budget was prepared. Repayments last year, through January 31, 1968, totaled $477 million, or 47 percent of the year's total of $1,021 million. However, this year, based on preliminary data, the $465 million collected through January 31, 1969, amounts to only 37 percent of the projected total of $1,246 million.

In the case of cotton, production is down 2.1 million bales from that which was earlier predicted. However, both domestic and foreign demands have decreased and no price increase is expected for cotton. This has resulted in placing an additional 2.3 million bales of cotton under loan at an additional cost of $215 million.

These large crop productions are also causing farmers to take greater advantage of the storage facilities loan program. This accounts for an additional $98 million in CCC loans.

Also, additional interest charges have amounted to $62 million.

When the 1969 budget was formulated, it was proposed that the advance payments to the participants in the feed grains program be reduced from 50 to 25 percent. However, the Department, after considering this proposal, concluded that the participants had not been given adequate notice of this proposed action, and decided to continue the 50-percent rate as in the past several years. This adds $168 million to CCC expenditures for fiscal year 1969. This increase will, of course, show a proportionate decrease in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. President, I have tried to detail some of the major items comprising this total increase of $1,686 million which was not anticipated when the fiscal year 1969 budget was formulated.

As I stated on March 24, during the hearings on this item, I am pleased to note that the Department is requesting, in its 1970 budget, restoration of all prior year losses except for $250 million, which applies to fiscal year 1968. Had this course been followed in the past—as has been recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations—the Department would not now be asking for this supplemental appropriation of $1 billion. Previous years' hearings have brought out that both the agency and the Department officials have requested full restoration of the prior year losses of the Corporation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the budget request, the appropriation, and the remaining unrestored losses from fiscal year 1961 to the present.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION NET REALIZED LOSSES AND APPROPRIATIONS TO RESTORE SUCH LOSSES, FISCAL YEARS 1961-68

[All amounts in millions]

Year incurred	Losses	Restoration	Act or estimate	Unrestored after appropriation	
				Year	Cumulative
1961:					
Regular	$2,067.0	$2,067.0			
Inventory revaluation	1,268.5	211.5	1963 Appropriation Act, $2,278.5	$1,057.0	$1,057.0
1962	2,799.4	2,699.4	1964 Appropriation Act, $2,699.4	100.0	1,157.0
	2,654.9	1,574.0	1965 Appropriation Act, $1,574		1,137.9
1963		100.0			1,057.0
		1,000.0	1965 supplemental, $1,100	1,080.9	2,237.9
		80.9			1,057.0
1964	3,226.9	2,719.1	1966 Appropriation Act, $2,800	507.8	1,564.8
		507.8			1,057.0
1965	3,048.0	3,048.0	1967 Appropriation Act, $3,555.8		1,057.0
1966	2,984.9	1,399.7	1968 Appropriation Act, $1,400 [1]	1,585.2	2,642.2
		1,585.2			1,057.0
1967	3,813.6	1,602.9	1969 Appropriation Act, $3,188.1	2,210.7	3,267.7
1968	3,198.2			3,198.2	6,465.9
		1,000.0	1969 supplemental request, $1,000		5,465.9
		[2] 5,215.9	1970 budget amendment, $5,215.9		250.0
1969 through Dec. 31, 1968	[3] 2,567.2				

[1] $275,000 was transferred to ARS for cotton research.

[2] Consists of:

1961	$1,057.0
1967	2,210.7
1968	2,948.2
Subtotal	6,215.9
1969 supplemental	−1,000.0
1970 Budget	5,215.9

[3] Law authorizes appropriations for actual amounts recorded in the accounts only as of June 30, of each fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is one other item I wish to mention; the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation has reached such a precariously low level that $219 million has been advanced to the Corporation from section 32 funds. I was assured, however, in the hearings by officials of the Department that sufficient amounts would be repaid to this fund to enable it to carry forward $300 million into fiscal year 1970, as authorized by law. The Senate report also includes language to this effect. Section 32 funds are used to remove surpluses of perishable agricultural commodities from the market when necessary. It is the only source of relief to which the producers of these non-price-supported commodities may turn when they have large surpluses. Therefore, it is imperative that sufficient funds be kept in the account for these surplus removal operations.

As I pointed out earlier in my statement, expenditures for the CCC are mandatory and uncontrollable. They administer and fund the various programs which have been authorized by law. A list of all of the programs administered by the CCC can be found on page 15 of the hearings.

Mr. President, let me turn for a moment to enumerate some of the effects on farmers and others if CCC should have to cease operations; and in this connection I have prepared mimeographed memorandums, which have been distributed in the Chamber, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator. This memorandum indicates the effect of our not providing this supplemental appropriation.

Public Law 480 shipments would have to stop, thus aggravating the adverse effect on international trade already felt as a result of the dock strike, and commitments to foreign governments could not be met. This would be detrimental to our international image and good will to the extent that importers would make purchases elsewhere, and those sales would likely be lost permanently because importing countries would look to our competition to meet their needs.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would have to stop making price support loans to farmers.

Advance payments would have to be stopped for feed grain producers who may still enroll in this year's program in the 11 States where the sign-up was extended for 2 weeks. The 11 States are: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska.

The corporation would not be able to pay bills that normally come due between now and July 1. Examples are wool payments normally due farmers and ranchers in early April; payments to warehousemen and others for storing CCC-owned grain or grain under extended loans; payments to railroads for freight costs due.

Additionally, the CCC could not make firm storage facility loans and drying equipment loans, an exceedingly popular and necessary program for farmers who must improve their marketing practices.

With the current tight money situation, farmers and others who are due payments or loans from CCC would be forced to borrow elsewhere at increased interest rates to replace this source of funds.

In other words, Mr. President, the consequence of failure to pass the appropriation requested by the administration would be serious, not only for agriculture but also for our entire economy.

Mr. President, I have tried to briefly summarize the urgent need and necessity for approving this supplemental request of $1 billion, none of which, by the way, will be used for administrative costs.

I shall now be happy to respond to questions from Senators, and I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, this appropriation of $1 billion is to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for previously incurred losses?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These are losses which, in earlier years, several years back, should have been recognized as such by Congress but were not recognized as losses for the purpose of reimbursement in appropriation form?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct in stating that. These losses go back to 1961, in the amount of $1,057,000,000; to 1967, in the amount of $2,002,000,000; and to 1968, in the amount of $3,002,000,000 and they have not been reimbursed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; to a total extent of about $6.5 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. $6.5 billion is the total for those 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. The Senator from Florida on numerous occasions, and I have supported him, in earlier years has tried to get Congress to recognize these losses as they were being incurred over the years in order that the taxpayers, the American people, could realize and have called forcibly to their attention the true extent of the cost of this agricultural program.

As a result of that belated recognition of the losses and under this new bookkeeping system, which I mentioned yesterday, the Government can in effect report a surplus when we are actually running at a deficit of several billion a year.

To further emphasize the point, I ask this question: Is it not a fact that under this new system of reporting, while this bill calls for $1 billion, an amendment could be offered raising that amount to $2 billion, $3 billion, $4 billion, $5 billion, or $6 billion, and if Congress were to adopt it it would never change by one iota the final figures as to the surplus or deficit reported at the end of this year?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) on this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator will find I am correct in saying that whether we appropriate $1 billion, $2 billion, $5 billion, or the entire $6.5 billion, it would not change the final figure one iota. What we are doing is recognizing this year and seeking to restore losses incurred between 1961 and 1968. Furthermore; these are losses which were not recorded at the time.

The point I am making is that the actual cost of these programs will never show up to the taxpayers.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Florida, I do want to make two points.

First, I should like to emphasize what I said earlier, that the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), and others, have endeavored in prior years to have these reimbursements requested and appropriated for on a current basis. Second, the fact that they were not made on a current basis was not the fault of the Congress, nor of the Department of Agriculture but was the fault of the Bureau of the Budget of the previous administration. The Bureau of the Budget, in those years, as I understand it, insisted upon a reduction of the requests of the former Secretary of Agriculture for complete reimbursement of these losses, to the CCC.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The fault lies in the previous actions of the Bureau of the Budget; and I think the Senator is exactly right when he says that this procedure was just a juggling of the books. If they had acted in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, we would not be confronted with this problem today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I made a statement to that effect earlier, and I wish to reemphasize it. I am not criticizing the Senate Appropriations Committee, because its chairman, the Senator from Florida, has consistently pointed out this false method of accounting. I have supported him in that contention.

But the net effect was that in prior years the Congress and the administration would claim that it was reducing the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture by *x* billion dollars, which made it look good to the taxpayers; when in reality it was not reducing expenditures at all. Now we are asked to belatedly restore these funds, and under this new accounting system it will still not show up as a loss.

It is comparable to a situation where a private taxpayer, reporting to the Government, can very properly report on a cash basis the income from his year-to-year operation, or he can report it and pay his income taxes to the Government on an accrual basis. Either method is acceptable and proper for reporting his income to the Federal Government.

But if a taxpayer wants to change from the accrual reporting system to the cash reporting system or from the cash system to the accrual system he has to make a request to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, obtain its permission, and then be subject to an audit to make sure that he eliminates the so-called notch so that the Government would not lose any revenue as the result of this changeover.

What I am pointing out here is that the Government, in changing over from the old administrative budget to this new unified budget, is dropping about $6.5 billion that will never be reported to the American taxpayers as a cost of the agricultural program. I think we are giving them an unrealistic appraisal of the cost of administering the agricultural program.

I think there is something wrong with any operating system wherein the appropriating of $1 billion, $2 billion, or $5 billion does not change the answer at the end of the year. I think it requires an explanation on the part of the administration that this notch exists and that we are not actually saving money for the American taxpayers as we claim. These represent previously incurred losses which can only be made up by direct payments from the taxpayers.

I say again, the Government is practicing a system of bookkeeping which it would not approve for any private individual to use in reporting his income to the Federal Government.

I support the committee today, and I am not criticizing it because we do have to restore this loss. We are going to have to restore all of the $6.5 billion eventually because at some point we are going to have to reckon these losses that have been sustained.

I only wish Congress had followed the advice of the Senator from Florida and the committee in earlier years, but now that we are making this changeover we should make this clear to the American taxpayers. It should be emphasized so that they may really understand the delicate financial picture with which we are confronted.

Under this new system we raised the debt ceiling $12 billion yesterday for what purpose? To finance some imaginary surpluses. That is ridiculous.

Who ever heard of a proposal of going to the bank to negotiate a larger line of credit in order to borrow money with which to finance a surplus? We do not have a surplus. We are operating the Government at a deficit today and at a projected deficit for the next 18 months that will average $500 million a month.

That should be admitted and brought home to the American taxpayers.

The only way that we can bring the deficit under control and check the inflationary spiral is by making bona fide reductions in expenditures. I think the sooner we realize that, the better off we will be. We cannot check the inflationary spiral by any fancy manipulation of the books to make them look good.

I again emphasize that my remarks are not meant in any way as criticism of the committee.

The Senator from Florida has been pointing this out for years, but for years the Congress and the administration has not followed the recommendations of the committee. This manipulation gave the previous administration a chance to spend $6.5 billion and to cover up the expenditure so that the American taxpayers would not know what was going on.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I also thank the Senator from Delaware for his insistence throughout the years that these matters should be handled honestly so as to give accurate and current information to the people of this Nation from year to year regarding the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If the Senator from Delaware will listen to me for a moment, I want to recite what I understand the facts to be.

First, in previous years the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury of the United States representing what was advanced by the Treasury to the Commodity Credit Corporation from year to year and what was expended in carrying out the functions of the CCC were canceled at the end of each year without any real recognition of the fact that a certain amount of money had been spent.

I have no complaint with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because those operating it were merely carrying out the mandates of Congress and the laws passed by Congress. I have no complaint to make of the Department of Agriculture, because from year to year, both under the previous administration and under the present administration, the Department of Agriculture has been requesting full restoration of prior year losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Senator from Delaware some years ago asked Congress to pass—and it did pass and it had the strong support of the Senator from Florida and many other Senators—legislation requiring reimbursement of these losses by appropriations. This procedure shows affirmatively what had been spent by the CCC in its operations and what is needed for reimbursement to restore their total borrowing capacity to $14.5 billion, which is their authorized amount.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget has always felt that if it just asked for enough restoration to carry out what in its opinion would be required to carry out the next year's operation, everything would be all right.

The Senator from Florida has stoutly insisted for 5 years prior to last year—or perhaps it was 6 years prior to last year—that the mandate of the legislation offered by the Senator from Delaware and passed by Congress should be carried out and that there should be restoration yearly through the appropriations process of all prior year losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Unfortunately, that has not been done.

Year after year the Senate has stood by the Senator from Florida in his attempt to have this done. However, with the Bureau of the Budget—and, unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget was backed up by the administration during that time—insisting that all they needed was a partial restoration, that was all we have been able to get.

So, last year for the first time, the Senator from Florida decided to abandon that effort. These facts have been stated ably by the Senator from West Virginia. I predicted at that time on the floor—and the RECORD will show it—that the Commodity Credit Corporation was going to come to a day of reckoning by reason of the following of that very improper practice.

XUM

That day has come. We are now at the point where, in order to get through this year's operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation has to have restored to it $1 billion.

As a matter of fact, the CCC has not only exhausted its own resources, but it has also borrowed $219 million, as stated so ably and properly by the Senator from West Virginia, from section 32 funds.

Section 32 funds are derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts. Their primary purpose is to assure that producers of perishable commodities, who comprise much more than half of the agricultural producers in the Nation who do not have price supports, will be protected. These perishables include beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other crops—none of which have price supports.

When there is a surplus today—which destroys the value of the full production—the Commodity Credit Corporation through the use of section 32 funds can remove that surplus from the market and use it for the school lunch program, the direct distribution program, and other institutional programs, in connection with feeding our poor people. This creates a situation under which the rest of that commodity can be sold at least for some small profit.

Officials of the Department testified during the supplemental hearings that if this supplemental request is granted sufficient amounts will be repaid to section 32 to enable the section 32 permanent appropriation to carry forward $300 million into fiscal year 1970, as provided by law. The Senate report states that the committee expects this action to be carried out. Since this is the only relief afforded these producers of perishable commodities, it is vitally important that necessary funds be carried forward to provide an adequate amount for these surplus removal operations.

The Senator from West Virginia has fully covered this matter in his statement.

I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for so sympathetically handling the problem. I also pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware for stating his understanding of the problem and his understanding of the facts—that this crisis exists because we have not followed the law and made full reimbursement from year to year of the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Those losses are sure to occur because of the storage costs and other cost associated with acquiring these commodities.

There has to be paid the transportation, including a large part of the ocean transportation under our Public Law 480 operations, the cost of the food-for-peace program and many other items which I do not need to mention because they have been so well covered by the Senator from West Virginia.

I am glad that this crisis has developed because it has shown the utter folly of continuing to operate as we have operated now for so many years.

As a result of this crisis, there has finally been brought to bear the proof of the soundness of the position taken by the Senator from Delaware heretofore and by the entire Committee on Appropriations of the Senate year after year. I have had the privilege of leading the debate on the floor when we have taken this position for a good many years.

Finally comes the proof of the pudding. Finally there has come a payday when we have to pay for these improper and incorrect practices which have been followed in contravention of existing law. We are arriving at the point of partially meeting that payday now. We will have to meet it in much greater measure when the annual appropriations bill comes up.

Mr. President, I strongly support the position of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), chairman of the Deficiencies and Supplemental Subcommittee, regarding the urgency of this request and the necessity for passing House Joint Resolution 584, which will restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of $1 billion.

On March 18, 1969, when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I am chairman, the Secretary and other officials testified as to the reasons and the necessity for early passage of this supplemental request. On March 24, 1969, Senator BYRD held full and complete hearings on this subject with officials of the Department. These printed hearings are available on the desk of each Senator.

I shall not detail the factors which have caused these extraordinary large borrowing demands upon the Corporation since the Senator from West Virginia has already covered these in his statement.

At the present time these unreimbursed losses for previous years are as follows: for fiscal year 1961, $1,057 million; for fiscal year 1967, $2,210.7 million; and, for fiscal year 1968, $3,198.2 million—totaling $6,465.9 million. The fiscal year 1970 budget proposed $6,215,934,000 for restoration of these losses. This was to restore all prior year losses except for $250 million of those losses which occurred in fiscal year 1968. House Document 91–76, in which the supplemental estimate of $1 billion was transmitted to the Congress on February 20, 1969, also proposed a $1 billion reduction in the fiscal year 1970 estimate. Officials of the Department stated on page 30 of the hearings that if this supplemental was granted they would apply these funds toward the earliest unreimbursed losses; namely, the $1,057 million which goes back to fiscal year 1961. This will leave a balance of only $57 million remaining of the deficit for that fiscal year. The Senate report states that the supplemental funds will be so applied.

Mr. President, I again state that I fully support this resolution.

I thank the Senators for their cooperation, and I again thank the Senator from West Virginia for his understanding of the need for protecting section 32 funds.

I support this bill, and I am glad that at last the emergency which now exists has brought out how unsound, unsafe—and I think not completely forthright—have been the methods that have prevailed for too many years, beginning with 1961.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks. He is correct.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Florida, the Senator from West Virginia, and their committee for having tried to correct this in earlier years.

They are now placed in a position in which they have to recognize this belatedly, but in recognizing it and in correcting this mistake. I did not want it to go by unnoticed. We will ultimately be reimbursing $6.5 billion of losses that have previously been incurred, and the taxpayers have never been told.

We are operating under a type of bookkeeping system today in which the Government can report surpluses when it actually is operating under a deficit. There is something wrong with that system. We should change it and tell the American people where their money is going.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator for his comments. He has made a great contribution to this subject.

The day of reckoning is at hand. We are making a reimbursement in this bill of $1 billion, and when the fiscal year 1970 bill comes before the Senate, we will make further reimbursements in the amount of approximately $5.2 billion. This will leave only about $250 million of the 1968 losses that are unreimbursed.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOK. Would the Senator refer to the memorandum that was placed on each Senator's desk?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOK. Item 6 reads:

> The decision to continue the advance payments at 50 percent has also increased the expenditures of the Corporation by $168 million.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I explain that?

Mr. COOK. May I ask the Senator if it is not true that in the executive budget that was presented to us, the advance payments were arbitrarily cut to 25 percent, and this really does not constitute an increased expenditure, but, really, last year the expenditure was somewhere in the vicinity of $330 million, and this is merely raising it to the 50 percent figure?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct in that no advance notice was given to farmers that these advance payments, which for a period of approximately 8 years, have been at the rate of 50 percent, would be reduced. The first intimation of that reduction came when the President's budget was submitted on January 15, at which time it was indicated that the advance payments would no longer amount to 50 percent, but would be reduced to 25 percent.

Mr. COOK. But is this not in essence

XUM

also part of the $168 million that could be considered as part of the surplus of this fiscal year's budget?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I indicated how this came about. The difference in the 25 percent and the 50 percent is $168 million. So we are paying it now because the department felt that it had a moral obligation to the farmers to give them notice in ample time before such reductions should be made, and, consequently, it is going to continue—at this point, at least—the making of 50 percent of the payments at the time the agreements are entered into. The $168 million will have to be paid now, but it will be deducted from the 1970 budget.

Mr. COOK. It will come off totally in the 1970 budget, will it not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, the additional amount we are paying in this fiscal year will be taken off the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. COOK. As a matter of fact, in the next fiscal year no funds are available in the budget for advance payments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Are you referring to the 1970 budget?

Mr. COOK. Yes. In other words, it was cut to 25 percent this year, and it was cut to zero for next year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. The Department has not reached any decision on payments for next year's program yet.

Mr. COOK. I am talking about the executive budget. I believe the Senator will find that it was cut from 50 percent to 25 percent in this fiscal year and that in the next fiscal year it was cut from 25 percent to zero.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are dealing here with advance payments for the current year's program.

Mr. COOK. And in the 1970 budget, it is cut from 25 percent to zero.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We have not reached that point yet.

In the 1970 budget, it is cut from 50 percent to 25 percent under the Johnson budget. The Department intends, however, to leave it at 50 percent, which means we will have to come up with an additional $168 million.

Mr. COOK. This is not an increase. This is merely keeping it at the same level as the previous year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is an increase over what would have been allocated had the Department gone along with the Johnson administration's proposal that these advance payments be cut from 50 percent to 25 percent. The Department is not going to do that, and that means we will have to spend $168 million more now, and this amount will be deducted from the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think there may be some misunderstanding.

As a matter of fact, these advance payments do not increase obligations at all. It means we are merely prepaying our obligations to the participants in this program. This bill does not change the picture of what will happen under the 1965 authorization act, which we extended last year, to the end of 1970.

I just want to make it clear that under that act, CCC is authorized to make these payments. Whether they are advanced as 50 percent in the beginning or 25 percent in the beginning. CCC's duties are mandatorily put upon them by the 1965 act, as extended, and there will be no difference in the final expenditure of CCC funds.

I say to my distinguished friend that the operation of CCC always calls for reimbursement of their losses. We will reach the time later when, whatever they pay out and whenever they pay it out, in the course of this year, we will have to reimburse any losses they sustain.

I do not believe any change in the program is accomplished by this, except that instead of paying off only 25 percent in advance, as was proposed by the Johnson budget for this year, CCC will be able to do—if this bill is passed—what it has done for years and what, in my opinion, it should continue to do until Congress itself has the chance to review the 1965 act, as extended.

We will have to review this act either this year or next, because it expires at the end of next year.

I see the Senator from South Dakota on his feet. He has been a stanch supporter of the 1965 act and of its extension. The Senator from Florida has not been a supporter of that act, but he believes it should be honestly administered after it is enacted and that the funds must be provided for its honest administration. The Senator from Florida will continue to take that position, and he sees no fault at all in the present Department of Agriculture or the present CCC in wishing to continue what has been the practice since the 1965 act was passed. We will have to either extend that act or supplant it, and I hope we will supplant it, by different legislation, but that will be something for the entire Congress to pass upon.

I see no reason why the practice as initiated when the act was passed should not be continued into this year.

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir. The only point I wanted to make was that this shifted $168 million out of the budget for this fiscal year into the next fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We will deduct the $168 million while we are currently paying for the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Shifting it out of the operation of the CCC from the fall of this calendar year, which would be within fiscal year 1970, to the first part of this year, which would be within fiscal 1969. But there is no change in the total amount. There is no change in the mandate of this Congress. We are not asked to change the legislation. We are asked simply to allow CCC and the Department of Agriculture to continue without interruption the program that has been carried on under the 1965 act into this year, just as it has been in earlier years.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think this colloquy has clarified the problem which bothered some Senators. Perhaps if the Senator had added in item 6 on this sheet two more words the situation would have been made more clear for those who have not followed the act carefully. I think item No. 6 should read:

> 6. The decision to continue the advance payments at 50 percent has also increased "the immediate" expenditures of the corporation by $168 million.

It would not be total expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I accept that suggestion.

Mr. MUNDT. It is a reason why we have to have this before us; and one of many reasons for emergency action now.

Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to salute our new chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals. This is his first bill in that capacity. He has handled it with his customary efficiency. As one interested in the constructive service CCC has rendered through the years, I wish to congratulate him for expediting the hearings and action on the floor of the Senate because time is rapidly running out. We have until tomorrow to meet this obligation. I hope the Senate will ratify the action of our subcommittee, on which I serve as the ranking Republican member.

I believe the colloquy which we have had and the explanations which have taken place are factual and proper because the public should be fully informed of the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able Senator from South Dakota for his comments. I also express appreciation to the Senator from Kentucky for raising the question with regard to the ambiguity which appears in item 6 on the memorandum which I had prepared.

Mr. President, I wish to insert the words "the immediate" between the words "increased" and "expenditures" so as to clarify the meaning of this item. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorandum by Senator Byrd of West Virginia, March 27, 1969

There is an urgent need for this supplemental of $1 billion for restoration of losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The expenditures for the CCC are mandatory and largely uncontrollable. *The borrowing capital of the Corporation will be exhausted by March 28.* Since the fiscal year 1969 bill was enacted, and even since the 1970 budget was formulated and presented, there have been large unprecedented borrowing demands on the Corporation and net program increases of $1,686 million. Briefly, the major factors causing these increases are:

1. *Large unanticipated increases in crop production*, particularly wheat, feed grains, and soybeans, and *decreases in exports*.

2. The *nationwide dock strike*, which has

XUM

not yet been settled on the Gulf Coast, further adds uncertainty to the commodity market and has *slackened the demand for agricultural commodities.*

3. *Repayments* on loans are far behind those of last year. The uncertainty in the commodity markets is causing producers to leave their commodities under loan until prices are firmer.

4. Farmers have taken further advantage of *storage facility loans* due to increased crop production.

5. There are *additional interest charges* on CCC borrowings.

6. The decision to continue the *advance payments at 50 percent* has also increased the immediate expenditures of the Corporation by $168 million.

EFFECTS OF NOT PROVIDING SUPPLEMENTAL

1. CCC will be forced to suspend operations.

2. All price support loans to producers will be halted.

3. Advance payments for feed grains program will be suspended.

4. Public Law 480 shipments will be suspended and this would:

(a) have a further weakening effect on the market, and

(b) force foreign buyers to seek new sources for their commodities.

5. Wool payments will be suspended.

6. Warehouse storage, transportation, freight, and other necessary costs of the Corporation could not be paid.

7. Farmers will be forced to borrow funds in the open market at the prevailing higher interest rates.

Mr. PEARSON and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very laudatory comments made by the Senator from South Dakota to the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership and most able presentation of this supplemental appropriation which means so much to Kansas.

I wish to emphasize one point, and I am sure the Senator has covered this matter in his prepared statement. Unfortunately, I came to the Chamber a little late today. I wish to emphasize the real reasons for taking up this matter today. I thank the Senator for inserting the memorandum in the RECORD because not only is it useful to Senators but I think it will prove very useful for the public understanding of this particular measure.

I recall that in committee hearings the Senator from Florida quite properly indicated he hoped the additional interest charge on CCC would apply to the oldest loans, going back to about 1961.

At that time I had some question about interest rates that would be applied. I understand this is borrowing from the Government itself and as the Senator has pointed out it is merely taking money from one pocket and putting it in another pocket. The qualms I had at that time no longer prevail. I wanted to make that statement a part of the RECORD.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator. Do I understand he wishes the $1 billion to be applied to the earliest losses; namely, 1961.

Mr. PEARSON. I think that was the suggestion of the Senator from Florida in committee hearings.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, I believe that was his suggestion.

Mr. PEARSON. That is part of the report rather than the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Officials of the Department stated in the hearings that the $1 billion would be applied against the earliest losses, namely those going back to 1961. I questioned these officials regarding interest charges and they stated that interest does not run against losses incurred in prior years but only against current losses.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his handling of this matter as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals of the Committee on Appropriations, and for his handling of the matter on the floor of the Senate. I congratulate him on the clarity of the memorandum he prepared containing the six points that have been referred to. A seventh point should be added setting forth the inestimable benefit to the Senate and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the communication from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives requesting this item and the accompanying statement by Robert Mayo, Director of the Budget, as to reason for it.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 20, 1969.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I transmit for the consideration of the Congress proposed changes in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970. These changes would involve a supplemental appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1969 and a reduction of the same amount in the request for appropriation for the Department for fiscal year 1970.

The reasons for proposing these changes at this time are discussed in detail in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I concur with his recommendations.

Respectfully yours,
RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1969 in the amount of $1,000,000,000, and an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 involving a decrease of a like amount for the Department of Agriculture.

The proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1969 is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Commodity Credit Corporation

"Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses

"For an additional amount for 'Reimbursement for net realized losses', to partially reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12), $1,000,000,000."

The amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Commodity Credit Corporation

"Budget appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
150	Reimbursement for net realized losses............	$6,215,934,000	–$1,000,000,000	$5,215,934,000"

The additional amount proposed for the fiscal year 1969 is needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its mandatory price-support and related program operations. Large unanticipated increases in crop production, particularly in feed grains, wheat, and soybeans, and decreases in exports have resulted in substantially greater present demands for Commodity Credit Corporation loan funds. Without the additional funds, the Corporation will be unable to make the price-support loans necessary for the orderly marketing of farm commodities.

Since the total of the amounts appropriated to date and requested in the 1970 budget will provide sufficient funds, the amount requested for 1970 is being reduced by the amount of the 1969 supplemental request. The combined effect for the 2 fiscal years will be the same as contemplated in the 1970 budget document.

I recommend that the foregoing be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the following paragraph:

> Since the total of the amounts appropriated to date and requested in the 1970 budget will provide sufficient funds, the amount requested for 1970 is being reduced by the amount of the 1969 supplemental request. The combined effect for the 2 fiscal years will be the same as contemplated in the 1970 budget document.

While the position of the administration is that without this supplemental appropriation these payments will stop—they are the executive and they can stop them—I point out that it seems to me to take $1 billion off of next year's budget, add it to the deficit of the outgoing administration, and thus leave this administration $1 billion better off budgetarilly. I thank the Senator for yielding. I am for the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. President, with respect to the expression of concern by the Senator from Florida with respect to the repayment of section 32 funds, I indicated earlier it was at his insistence that the committee wrote into its report words which would exert great pressure and influence upon the Department of Agriculture to proceed in that direction. I think it would be well to include in the RECORD also at this point excerpts from the colloquy which occurred during committee hearings. The excerpts are brief and they should be in the RECORD as legislative history.

During the hearings conducted by the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) on Department of Agriculture and related agency appropriations for fiscal year 1970, Mr. Charles L. Grant, who is Director of Finance for the Department of Agriculture, had this to say:

TRANSFER OF SECTION 32 FUNDS TO CCC

> Mr. GRANT. To alleviate the situation, Mr. Chairman, we have taken steps to transfer $219 million of section 32 funds to the CCC primarily for the purchase of dairy products. This is an interim measure and we anticipate that before the year is over at least $108 million of that will be returned to section 32 in order that we can carry over the full $300 million of section 32 funds at the end of this fiscal year.

Then in the hearings which I conducted as chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, Mr. Clarence D. Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, had this to say in regard to the question of repayment to section 32 for the funds which have been advanced in this crisis:

> Mr. PALMBY. It is our intention to repay or to make complete the section 32 fund account to the extent the funds are not expended for the purchase of dairy products.

Then Mr. Grant went on to say:

> We would take steps to repay section 32 in the amount that has not been used for dairy products, to be sure to carry over at the end of the year $300 million. Section 32 funds would be available for section 32 purposes next year.

When he was asked whether the repayment would amount to $111 million plus $108 million, he answered in this way:

> It will probably be 108 million or more. It will be at least $108 million. $108 million is the amount necessary to protect the $300 million carry-over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to make it clear that those primarily interested in section 32 funds—and I admit that I am one of them—have no right as to the use of such funds above $300 million at the end of the fiscal year, except to have the carryover of $300 million, because section 32 legislation itself provides that any excess above $300 million at the end of the fiscal year in section 32 shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Of course, we would expect that to be done this year, as it is any year. All we want to be sure of is that, notwithstanding the heavy draft which they have made upon section 32 funds for this emergency use by the CCC, we want $300 million to be carried over into the next fiscal year. We are perfectly willing to help out in the general problems of CCC, to the degree that we can, and still carry over the $300 million.

We thank the Senator for having stated the matter in the report of the committee, as he has. It has been brought out now effectively on the floor, and I am sure that that objective will be honored by the CCC and by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) much earlier. Then I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> On page 1, after line 11, insert the following:
>
> "EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND
>
> "For an additional amount for the 'Emergency Credit Revolving Fund', $30,000,000.
>
> "OPERATING LOANS
>
> "For an additional amount from funds available in the 'Direct Loan Account' of the Farmers Home Administration, for operating loans, $100,000,000."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to provide the Farmers Home Administration $100 million for regular operating loans and $30 million for emergency loans. These funds are urgently needed.

Emergency loans are made to established farmers and ranchers in areas designated for this purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture upon his finding that a natural disaster has caused a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met by local sources. There are 1,108 designated counties in 38 States in which farmers are eligible for emergency loans.

These loans are not made from annually appropriated funds. Instead, they are made out of the emergency credit revolving fund in amounts apportioned for this purpose annually by the Bureau of the Budget. Loans are made out of this fund and collections go back into it for making additional loans. Apportionments for this fiscal year total $104 million and this amount has already been loaned.

After apportioned funds were exhausted, it was necessary for the agency to return without loan checks, the approved loan applications of about 3,000 farmers totaling $17 million—100 of these farmers are in my State of Arkansas.

Let me say that during this past year, Arkansas has experienced very bad weather, about the worst rains and local flooding, especially in the northern and eastern parts, that I can remember. The large rivers, such as the Arkansas River, were not affected in the way that the local areas were. It was disastrous.

Counties in the following States have been designated for emergency loans:

Designated Emergency Loan Areas, March 25, 1969

	Number of counties
Alabama	60
Arkansas	36
California	15
Colorado	9
Delaware	3
Georgia	80
Idaho	8
Illinois	60
Indiana	79
Iowa	43
Kansas	36
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	20
Maine	1
Maryland	9
Michigan	16
Minnesota	9
Mississippi	31
Missouri	9
Montana	1
Nebraska	85
Nevada	4
New Jersey	13
New York	30
North Carolina	60
North Dakota	10
Ohio	67
Oklahoma	24
Oregon	6
South Carolina	46
South Dakota	18
Tennessee	32
Texas	101
Utah	2
Virginia	63
Washington	8
Wisconsin	2
Wyoming	4
Counties in 38 States	1,108

Mr. President, let me say also that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has sent me word and asked that I express for him his concurrence in this matter, that he is unable to be in the Chamber because of his committee meeting now going on, but that the relief which will be brought by adoption of my amendment would mean a great deal to his State and he wishes to be associated with me in this matter.

Mr. President, the apportioned funds for emergency loans are exhausted and $17 million is needed for loans already approved. It is estimated that at least $13 million will be needed for approvable emergency loans over the next 3 months. Consequently, my amendment would increase the fund by $30 million.

Mr. President, earlier this week officials of the Department of Agriculture testified before the Appropriations Committee concerning the need for additional operating loan funds. I will quote pertinent portions of this testimony, which excerpts, Mr. President, give a very good description of the operation of the amendment and its justification:

XUM

Operating loans are used to purchase needed livestock, machinery, feed, seed, fertilizer and other farm and home needs. These are crucial needs which farm families cannot postpone to some future time when credit may be more readily available. These needs must be met in the appropriate season every year in order to continue farming.

Without necessary credit inputs, needy and underfinanced farm families cannot obtain the production and income essential to support their families, meet other expenses, pay their rent, taxes and the installments falling due on their debts.

In our opinion, operating credit should not be severely rationed to needy and underfinanced farm families. The availability or lack of operating credit is far too often the final deciding factor in determining whether farm families continue to live and work in rural areas where they desire to remain, or whether they become economic and welfare casualties in the slums.

In addition to providing the inputs essential for the continuance of families in farming, operating loans provide other significant benefits in rural areas. Purchases made with such loan funds and the increased income of borrower families contribute significantly to rural business and employment opportunities in rural areas.

Without adequate operating credit, established operators of small farms and young farm families who desire to take over the operations of retiring farmers are unable to compete with large-scale commercial operators. Some of the large operators desire to purchase additional family farms which become available into their holdings. This results in further reduction in the (1) number of family farms, (2) number of people remaining in rural areas, and (3) need for rural businesses to serve them. This in turn is reflected in deterioration in small towns, local schools, churches, other rural facilities and community organizations.

Operating loan borrowers repay their loans. Between November 1, 1946, when the Farmers Home Administration Act became operative and June 30, 1968, needy and underfinanced farm families received over $4.0 billion in operating loans. Principal repayments totaled over $3.2 billion which represents approximately 96 percent of the amount which had fallen due on these loans. The outstanding balance of approximately $728 million represented for the most part, loans which were not yet due. In addition to principal repayments, operating loan borrowers had repaid $333 million in interest which is more than six times the amount of principal charged off.

Families receiving operating loans repay those loans on the average in approximately 6 years and graduate to other credit sources. They are self-supporting, pay taxes and are not a continuing burden upon the taxpayer.

This repayable investment by the Government is in vivid contrast to the high continuing monetary and moral costs incurred when needy and underfinanced farm families are not helped in rural areas, are forced off the land, and congregate in slum sections of the cities.

The following excerpt from the 1969 Agricultural Finance Outlook published by the Economic Research Service and released on February 3, 1969, reflects an increasing need for operating loans:

"Reporters agreed that certain groups of operators were having increasing difficulty obtaining adequate loans. Many young or beginning farmers with low capital reserves or equities, operators of small farm units, and farmers who were marginal in one or more respects were being caught in tight financial situations. With demand for relatively low-risk loans continuing strong, many lenders are not interested in putting a lot of money in what they consider to be comparatively high-risk loans."

For a number of years the amount of funds available to new applicants for operating loans has been exhausted well in advance of the end of each fiscal year. In each of the last two fiscal years allocations for initial operating loans were exhausted in a substantial number of states in February. This has been true even though maximum efforts have been made each year to participate with, and supplement, other credit sources in order to reach as many needy farm families as possible with the limited funds available.

Mr. President, the fund for operating loans is now exhausted. I have obtained estimates that over $100 million will be required to satisfy legitimate needs between now and June 30, 1969. These estimates are as follows:

Applications for initial loans on hand (Dec. 31, 1968)	7,107
New applications to be received, estimated Dec. 31, 1968, to June 30, 1969	15,000
Total	22,107
Based on previous experience 70% of these applications would be expected to result in loans if funds are available	15,475
The average initial operating loan is now	$8,100
Total initial operating loan needs for the remainder of 1969 fiscal year	$125,347,500
Estimated amount required for subsequent loans, remainder of fiscal year 1969, to keep present borrowers in business	$93,000,000
Total requirements	$218,347,500
Amount OL funds remaining on hand (Dec. 31, 1968)	$118,294,695
Total need Dec. 31, 1968 to June 30, 1969	$100,052,805

Mr. President, the people who need these loans are farm families who desire to remain in farming and have the ability to succeed if properly financed. They are generally unskilled in occupations other than farming and will be unable to successfully move into industrial employment. Without credit assistance from FHA, most of them may be forced from their farms.

The record shows that borrowers have paid about 96 percent of the principal maturities on their operating loans. In addition, they have paid interest which is more than six times the amount of writeoffs and judgments on such loans.

This need for loan funds is urgent in every State of the Union, and $100 million should be made available as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I have received many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from Arkansas farmers urging that these funds be made available. I will not burden the RECORD by inserting these communications, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of letters which I have written to the Senate Appropriations Committee and to the Bureau of the Budget.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, rainfall of disastrous proportions has made many counties in Arkansas eligible for emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration. This eligibility is meaningless, however, because the revolving fund for FHA emergency loans is exhausted and approved loans cannot be disbursed. Moreover, regular operating loans also are being denied for the same reason.

I am advised that over 100 emergency loans, aggregating over $1 million, are being withheld from Arkansas farmers at the present time. Nationwide, I understand that there may be more than 3,000 such loans totaling about $17 million. I am obtaining more detailed information from the Farmers Home Administration and when it is received, I will furnish it to the Committee.

During your hearings on appropriations for the FHA, I hope you will explore this situation with agency officials and take whatever action may be necessary to provide as soon as possible more adequate funds for both emergency and operating loans.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYO: Enclosed for your information is a copy of my letter to Senator Holland, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. This letter concerns the urgent need for additional funds to permit disbursement of approved emergency and operating loans by the Farmers Home Administration. I understand that as much as $25 million for operating loans and $6 million for emergency loans could be released to the agency to meet these urgent needs. I hope that you may act promptly to provide these funds, and I would appreciate a report upon the matter at your convenience.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment has a most worthy purpose, especially when I read in the press that an increase of several million dollars in funds has already been agreed to for Apollo 10, and how much the missiles cost. To me, it is absurd and utterly indefensible that the farmers of this country, who need this money and who will repay the loans, cannot get this kind of financial assistance at the present time, even when the loans are already approved. I repeat, it is utterly indefensible for this country not to give some priority to this kind of need for our farmers.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has yielded to me because I have some information which I should like to place in the RECORD and which I hope will persuade my distinguished friends to withdraw the amendment.

I am as much interested in meeting emergency loans now as any Senator in this Chamber. I am also as much interested as any Senator in this Chamber, including my good friend from North Dakota, whom I see in his seat, who is always interested in the subject of meeting the operating loan needs of the Farmers Home Administration. I have some information on these two subjects which I should like to communicate at this time, if I may.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) supplied to the subcommittee now engaged in hearings on the annual bill a communication, several days ago, which was placed in the RECORD, which showed the facts which he has stated here upon the record today as to the need in his own State—and it exists in some other States—for emergency loans.

He also stated in that letter the need for an increase in the operating loan funds.

Following that time, the Senator from Florida, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations which handles these matters, communicated this need of the State of Arkansas, and other States, for emergency loans and communicated the general exhaustion of operating loan funds in several States to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Department of Agriculture.

The Department has replied and I ask unanimous consent that the first four paragraphs of their reply be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMERGENCY LOANS

1. Status of emergency credit revolving fund:

Through March 20, 1969, the Bureau of the Budget had apportioned $104 million from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund for use in fiscal year 1969. Virtually all of these funds have been spent. Also as of March 20, 1969, the Fund had $5,495,308 which could be apportioned for use in this fiscal year. An additional $7.5 million in receipts to the Fund is anticipated during the remainder of the year. These could also be made available for emergency loans, if apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. Number emergency loans which cannot be funded:

After apportioned funds were exhausted it was necessary for the Farmers Home Administration Finance Office to return approximately 3,000 approved emergency loan applications for which checks could not be issued. Counties are no longer accepting applications for emergency loans.

3. Where are the designated emergency loan areas?

Attached is a schedule by states showing 1,108 designated emergency loan counties in 38 states.

4. Efforts to increase the emergency credit revolving fund:

The Bureau of the Budget originally approved the apportionment of $64 million for Emergency Credit Revolving Fund for fiscal year 1969. On January 21, the Department requested that an additional $36 million be apportioned for use in this Fund. The Bureau of the Budget did not act on this request. On February 3, the Department requested the release of $15 million (from $64 million to $79 million). This was approved on February 6. On February 12, the Department requested an increase of $12 million. No action was taken on this request. On February 24, the Department requested an increase of $41 million (from $79 million to $120 million). At that time it was expected that receipts would be sufficient to carry out an emergency program at the $120 million level. On March 4, the Bureau of the Budget released $25 million of the $41 million requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the first thing I would like to deal with is the emergency loans. The information transmitted to me by the Department of Agriculture states that, as of March 20, 1969, the fund now has $5,495,308 in funds which can be apportioned for use in this fiscal year for the emergency program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much was it?

Mr. HOLLAND. $5,495,308. At the same time they stated that, by the end of this fiscal year, unless there is a complete failure of the practices heretofore followed, there will be an additional $7.5 million, or more, of collections from emergency loans heretofore made.

The Senator knows—in fact, I think he has already stated—that this fund is a revolving fund, which will thereby, by the receipt of this $7.5 million or more, come to approximately $13 million which will be available during the remainder of this year.

The Department stated that it has not made a request because of this fact, and because it believes $13 million will cover its needs. Attention is called to the fact, however, that we will hold hearings on the large second supplemental appropriation bill, very shortly.

I want to assure the Senator that, having been through these emergencies when I was Governor, and later, I have very great sympathy for the filling immediately of emergency needs. I do not believe the handling of those emergency needs in the Department was understated in that statement furnished to me, and according to that information, there will be $13 million, or perhaps more, in funds for use during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has it been apportioned? I was told it was not apportioned and not available by the Budget Bureau. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department has not yet requested it, but it will do so at once. We have told them it is needed and they must request it at once.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why do they turn down an approved loan? Several men have called me on the phone and said they were turned down and had been told the agency had no money.

Mr. HOLLAND. I must say we must have some charity toward a new administration and the head of the new administration's agency handling the fund. I have no reason at all, after having discussed it, to believe that there will be any further delay in requesting this fund.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think they both will be handled at once. The Senator from Florida has already requested the apportionment of the $25 million for the operating funds which was withheld out of the total appropriation of $275 million which we made last year. The budget at that time was only $250 million. Our committee stepped it up to $300 million. I think the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) was one of those most interested in that increase. In conference it had to be stepped down to $275 million. Of that amount the Bureau of the Budget withheld $25 million under Public Law 90-364, the act which we passed—calling for budgetary reductions and reductions in expenditures.

I was sorry that $25 million was withheld from the $275 million. I have already requested that it be reinstated.

I want to make it clear that this request is not in any way political. The members of my subcommittee who are members of the Republican Party, which is now in power so far as the executive is concerned, but not so far as the legislative is concerned, are joining in this effort with just as much zeal in this respect as are members of the Democratic Party, which happens to be in the majority in the legislative body but not in control of the executive.

I think this will be accomplished very shortly. If it is not, I want to say to my distinguished friend that I shall be in favor of putting new funds in the second supplemental appropriation bill; but I much prefer to have the appropriation of the Congress already made and outstanding to be made immediately available. I am doing everything I can toward that end.

I invite my distinguished friend and his able colleague, and others who are adversely affected locally right now by the fact that the emergency loan funds are impaired or exhausted temporarily, to join me and to join other members of our subcommittee who are requesting immediate action on this matter. I think immediate action will be taken.

I would hope that my distinguished friend would either withdraw or withhold his amendment, because these funds for the CCC are so badly needed. These funds affect his State vastly more than they affect mine, because it has to do with the operation of the CCC in the field of staples, of which we produce very few in my State. I would hope he would withhold his amendment, because we need this measure to go in effect at once. Not only are the assets of the CCC exhausted, but they have had to reach over into section 32 and borrow $219 million. As I understand it, they are practically exhausted. If we do not pass the measure, various operations so ably described in the memorandum of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), which has been placed in the RECORD, will all have to stop. They are operations which will adversely affect not only the agriculture of this country, but our relations with other, poor countries whom we are helping under the Food for Freedom Act. I

XUM

know of my friend's interest in that worthy objective throughout the years.

So I hope he will not press his amendment. It will just hold up this bill in conference. We are coming to the Easter vacation. I do not know whether we could dispose of this measure before that time, and I do not want to see stopped the very important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. Now I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the word "emergency," with respect to these emergency funds, has great significance. It describes the situation which is confronting many farmers in Arkansas, today. Also speaking of being charitable toward this administration, I certainly want to be, and have been; but the delay in the releasing of these funds is not charitable toward the farmers of this country who are suffering. If these funds can be released and made available, that should be done now—not next week or 2 weeks from now. This is the 27th of March. It is the planting season. The farmers cannot proceed with their plans for making a crop this year without these funds and without knowing whether they can get them or not. At this moment the farmers are completely at a standstill.

Perhaps the amendment would delay the releasing of the funds. I do not know. But the administration must act on whatever power it has and give the farmers some relief. If the administration does so, it will indicate an intent to meet the responsibility of the Government in this area and relieve the distressed condition which now prevails. Much of it is not due to the farmer. Much of it has been aggravated by the longshoremen's strike which the Government has tolerated and to which it has taken no positive action to terminate. The farmers in my State have suffered by reason of conditions over which they have no control.

As my distinguished colleague points out, these loans have been approved, and upon approval of them, the farmers have the right to make their plans accordingly, and to anticipate that the funds will be available to make their crop this year.

I thank my distinguished colleague, and I commend him for offering the amendment. I realize there is a problem; but how can we make the administration understand that an emergency is an emergency, and get them to act accordingly?

I can see no reason for delay. The administration has already procrastinated entirely too long. These funds should have been released and as much of them as possible put into the hands of our farmers long before now.

I again thank my distinguished colleague and commend him for offering the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may have stated, and if I did not I wish to state it now, because I want to be completely fair to the Department of Agriculture. The Department has already requested the release of the $25 million, and in fact has requested it three different times; this slowdown or holdup is in the Bureau of the Budget.

My own feeling is that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet really understood what its responsibility is in the handling of all of the fund requests pending in this Government. I am bringing to their attention as urgently as I can the fact that this $25 million should be released. I am asking the Department to make the same request as to the emergency fund, and I know that it is going to be made.

What I am asking here is that my fellow Senators bring their influence, much greater than mine, to bear upon the Bureau of the Budget in this matter, because I do not think that anyone is so inhuman as to wish to hold up the availability of emergency funds for people who have been drowned out, and that is what has happened in the great State so ably represented by my two friends from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I have already written a letter, and expect to follow that up. We may be able to persuade the Bureau of the Budget. I did not realize exactly what the situation was that the Senator mentioned.

I yield now to the Senator from Texas, who has been standing on his feet for a good while.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me, because I wish to be associated with his remarks on this matter.

I approve whatever course he takes, whether he withdraws or wishes to push his amendment, because he has had the benefit of long study.

This is, I suggest, an emergency situation. Out of the 254 counties in my State, 101 have been declared eligible for emergency loans, mainly because of weather conditions. The disparate nature of the weather in the different parts of my State, stretching from the cold area of the northwest to the subtropical area of the southwest, makes it an area of conflicting air currents, which sometimes cause great damage.

Many approved loans are unfunded. We have called down to the Department of Agriculture today, and the Acting Assistant Administrator for Operating Loans says there is no money for this purpose available this fiscal year. That is what they told us today: No money available for this purpose this fiscal year. That means the 30th of June. That means ruination for these farmers.

I am glad that the senior Senator from Arkansas has come into the Chamber, because I have just reported here that we called the Department of Agriculture today, and the Acting Assistant Administrator for these operating loans told us that there is no money available for this purpose for this fiscal year. There are many approved loans in my State; 101 counties of the 254 have been declared eligible counties.

The modest amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is for $130 million. We spend about $3 billion a month on the war in South Vietnam, with 17 million people there. There are about that many farmers in the United States; I think we ought to be willing to spend $130 million on those who are potentially in a disaster status.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are not even spending it, just lending it to them, and they have a very good record of repayment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator mentioned that. This is not giving away anything; this is a loan program, there has been a profit of $330 million on these FHA loans—six times the losses on that kind of loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is about 95 percent repayment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are only asking the Government to loan some money to the farmers in areas that have been declared disaster areas. I think the freezing of this money is wholly inexcusable—this modest amount of money, with its importance to the whole farm economy of America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one brief insertion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator, how does he explain this? The Senator from Texas says this morning the Department of Agriculture said there are no funds available this fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. They have not been approved for that use by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why did they not tell the Senator from Texas the expenditure has not been approved, but the money is available, instead of just leaving the impression there is not any?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Of course, Mr. President, I did not know all the technical considerations. They just told us there was no more money for this fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood them, because I have already placed in the RECORD their statement to me, that as of March 20 they had between $5 and $6 million available, and that other receipts were coming in—in the amount of $7.5 million or more before the end of the year.

May I, at this time, place in the RECORD a list——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I did not misunderstand what they told me. They may have told the Senator something else.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have placed in the RECORD the written statement furnished by them to me, which I know they would not make in writing unless that was the fact.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the complete list of counties, by States, where emergencies exist, as furnished to me by the Department of Agriculture. It shows there are 101 such counties in Texas.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

XUM

Designated emergency loan areas, Mar. 25, 1969

Alabama	60
Arkansas	36
California	15
Colorado	9
Delaware	3
Georgia	80
Idaho	8
Illinois	60
Indiana	79
Iowa	43
Kansas	36
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	20
Maine	1
Maryland	9
Michigan	16
Minnesota	9
Mississippi	31
Missouri	9
Montana	1
Nebraska	85
Nevada	4
New Jersey	13
New York	30
North Carolina	60
North Dakota	10
Ohio	67
Oklahoma	24
Oregon	6
South Carolina	46
South Dakota	18
Tennessee	32
Texas	101
Utah	2
Virginia	63
Washington	8
Wisconsin	2
Wyoming	4
Counties in 38 States	1,108

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator from Florida, with these repayments in the emergency fund, is it the Department's view, even though they are repaid, that they are frozen and not available until the Budget Bureau takes further action?

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, the law which we all voted for makes that provision. The Bureau of the Budget has to approve the expenditure of funds that come in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it is discretionary with them; they do not have to freeze it?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is discretionary with them, and that is why I want my distinguished friends and others to bear down upon the Bureau of the Budget, so they can make it immediately available. I am sure this is the quickest way to get relief; I would not suggest it if I did not think it would get results.

I do not think the Senator would be justified in bringing about a possible impasse, on the pending bill in conference, or the possible absence of a conference until after Easter. Let us try this out, and use our very best efforts. I do not believe the Director of the Budget is an inhuman man. This is the first test we have to discover just how far he will go in meeting human needs of this kind. I am satisfied that he will act, and act favorably, and I want to give him that opportunity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one moment, to clarify a point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think the statement the distinguished Senator from Florida just made verifies the accuracy of what the Department of Agriculture told me this morning, that this money was not available for this fiscal year, because the Senator has now said it would take action by the Bureau of the Budget to unfreeze this money.

That is all I have been contending. I think that the prior intimation that my information was wrong is now shown by the statement of the Senator from Florida to be false. These loans have been frozen; they have been approved, but they are unfunded. Hundreds of unfunded loans are approved right now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of counties in Texas which are eligible for FHA emergency loans.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTIES IN TEXAS ELIGIBLE FOR FHA EMERGENCY LOANS

Aransas
Armstrong
Austin
Bastrop
Baylor
Brazoria
Brazos
Brooks
Burleson
Caldwell
Calhoun
Cameron
Carson
Castro
Chambers
Childress
Cochran
Collin
Collingsworth
Colorado
Comanche
Coryell
Crosby
Dallam
Dawson
Deaf Smith
Delta
Dickens
Donley
Duval
Ellis
Falls
Fannin
Fayette
Floyd
Foard
Fort Bend
Gaines
Galveston
Garza
Goliad
Gonzales
Gray
Grimes
Hale
Hall
Hansford
Hardeman
Hardin
Harris
Hartley
Haskell
Hays
Hidalgo
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jackson
Jefferson
Jim Wells
Karnes
Kaufman
Kleberg
Knox
Lamar
Lamb
Lavaca
Lee
Liberty
Lipscomb
Live Oak
Lubbock
Lynn
McLennan
Madison
Matagorda
Mitchell
Montgomery
Moore
Motley
Nacogdoches
Navarro
Nueces
Ochiltree
Oldham
Orange
Parmer
Red River
Refugio
San Patricio
Sherman
Swisher
Terry
Throckmorton
Victoria
Waller
Washington
Wharton
Wilbarger
Willacy
Wilson

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the fight he is making for funds for farmers under the emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration. These loans can only be made, in the first place, to farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere. There is a greater need for funds for this program now than at any other time in the past 10 or 15 years. Operating costs are high—the highest ever—and people are leaving the farms at a rate of 500,000 a year.

This is the equivalent of establishing five new cities of 100,000 population each. The best way and the surest way to keep the farmers on the farm, where they want to be, is to make them loans of 30 percent so that they can stay there and continue to operate their farms.

The record reflects a remarkable record of repayment. It is approximately 96 percent.

I do share the feelings of my friend, the Senator from Florida, however, that we should put this provision in a later supplemental bill and in the meantime we should work with the Bureau of the Budget to release the funds for this purpose which they are holding up now. A supplemental bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation is being considered now. This amendment would delay this important measure.

This restoration of Commodity Credit Corporation funds is needed for the food-for-peace program and to permit loans to be made to farmers under commodity programs, or these loans and payments should be made and are very necessary.

I would hope that my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment introduced by the Senator from Arkansas to provide $30 million in additional funds for the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration.

For years the emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration has been hampered by the inadequacy of its loan fund. The situation has grown worse and it now is, in fact, desperate.

The very name of the program—"emergency loan"—underscores its importance. A farmer is not eligible for a loan under this program unless, because of crop failure or disaster, he is in dire and immediate need of assistance. The program is designed to save farmers who are in real and great need. Yet, there are farmers in Alabama and throughout America for whom emergency loans have been approved, but the Farmers Home Administration tells them there is no money to lend. This situation makes a mockery of the program. It is indefensible and intolerable.

The needed $30 million should be voted for this program. Unless we act now, more of our farmers will be forced out of farming.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for operating loans, under the Farmers Home Administration, the authorization for fiscal year 1969 is in the amount of $275 million. This amount was authorized in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, signed into law August 8, 1968.

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1969 was in the amount of $250 million and the House bill last summer recommended this amount. However, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations the sum was increased to $300 million, and the compromise in conference authorized the sum of $275 million.

The committee has been advised that under the mandate to the administration ordered last summer by the Congress, $25 million of this sum of $275 million has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget and is not available for the purpose for which Congress authorized this sum.

These loans are made to farmers and ranchers for costs incident to reorganizing a farming system for more profitable operations and for a variety of essential farm expenses.

For many years, the Congress has provided sums in excess of the amount made available for the current fiscal year. In 1968, $300 million was available. In 1967, $350 million was made available. In 1966, 1965, and 1964, $300 million was made available.

In view of the case which has been made for this additional sum, I would hope that the administration would release the $25 million which has been placed in reserve. I can see nothing to be gained by placing additional funds in this emergency resolution since the administration already has funds if it will only release them.

With reference to the emergency credit revolving funds, the budget contains an estimate of $31,918,000 for fiscal year 1970. This sum is to be used to reimburse the Commodit Credit Corporation for a $30 million loan from that Corporation to the revolving fund, which was authorized by Congress last year, plus the interest charges on the loan. There is no request pending before the Congress for additional funds for revolving fund for fiscal year 1969. Through March 20, 1969, the Bureau of the Budget has apportioned $104 million from the emergency credit revolving fund for use in fiscal year 1969. The Department of Agriculture has advised the committee that virtually all of these funds have been expended. As of March 20, the fund had a balance of $5,495,308, which could be apportioned for use in this fiscal year plus receipts of some estimated $7½ million.

Again, I would express the hope that the administration would release this approximate $13 million so that it can be utilized for these worthy emergency cases—and, to repeat, I can see nothing to be gained by placing additional funds in this emergency resolution since there are funds available now if the administration will only release them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT). I feel that the emergency loan program and the operating loans program administered by the Farmers Home Administration are vital, and that it is important that these programs be adequately funded to meet the needs of farmers. Indications are that emergency loans are going to be in great demand this spring due to the increased snowfall in the northern States, and the operating loan program is already short of funds and is unable to meet the present demands. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget is withholding some $38 million which could be expended in these two programs if funds were released by the Bureau of the Budget. I feel that in view of the fact that these funds have been frozen, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas should be adopted. In my own State of Oklahoma, farmers must have operating loans and emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration in order to meet year-to-year operating expenses, as well as to overcome economic pressures of natural disasters such as rain, floods, tornadoes, and the like. I therefore hope that the amendment will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senators from North Dakota, Florida, Texas, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Mississippi for joining in this matter.

I believe that in view of what has been said, especially by the Senator from Florida—who is the best authority I know really on this subject—that it might be wiser to follow the course he suggests.

I am reluctant to withdraw the amendment. However, I shall pursue the matter with the Bureau of the Budget. As the Senator said, this would be a quicker method than if we were to go to conference on the bill because of the inclusion of the amendment.

With that understanding and that explanation which I am very pleased to have this morning, I will not formally offer and press the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I will continue my efforts and will see to it that the other Senators do the same to get the two funds released.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas for not pressing the amendment.

The Senator has made a fine case, and I hope that the administration will release the $25 million which has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget. As I stated earlier, I see nothing to be gained by placing the additional funds in the emergency resolution. The administration has the funds already, if they will release them.

The bill will not have to go to conference if there is no amendment.

I join the Senator from Florida and the other Senators in urging that the Bureau of the Budget release those funds.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I support the administration's request for a supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The appropriation is necessary simply because the price support programs are mandatory. CCC expenditures are fixed charges, and funds are so low, they will be depleted by the middle of April.

I applaud Secretary Hardin's decision to maintain advance payments to farmers at the customary 50-percent level which prevailed for the past 8 years. That decision accounts, in part, for the need for a supplemental request at this time.

During consideration of this bill, we should recognize the importance to the farmer of the attitude of the new administration toward agriculture.

President Johnson's budget, submitted in January, proposed to slash advance payments to farmers to 25 percent instead of the 50 percent which was customary and which had been expected. There had been no advance notice of this decision, not even during the announcement of the 1969 feed grains program in December.

President Nixon and Secretary Hardin quickly concluded the obvious: the farmer had not been given sufficient notice and the Government had a moral obligation to continue the rate without abrupt change. Therefore, Secretary Hardin restored the 50-percent advance payment.

It must be recognized, Mr. President, that this supplemental appropriation will not increase expenditures. By advancing 1969 crop payments in this fiscal year, the 1970 budget will be reduced by a similar amount. This was a necessary and wise step.

I commend President Nixon and Secretary Hardin for taking a commonsense look at the problems of the farmer. It indicates that this administration truly is concerned with assisting our agricultural industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, OR ACTING PRESIDENT PROTEMPORE TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTION DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President, President pro tempore, or Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign any duly enrolled bill or joint resolution during the adjournment of the Senate until March 31, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1715—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF KONG WING SIK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to introduce on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MON-

XUM

Toya) a bill for the relief of Kong Wing Sik.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1715) for the relief of Kong Wing Sik, introduced by Mr. Byrd of West Virginia (for Mr. Montoya), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1717—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION FROM $600 TO $1,200

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,200. The present $600 exemption was provided by the Revenue Act of 1948. In the 21 years that have passed since its adoption, the cost of living has increased 48.1 percent—based on the level of consumer price indexes in 1948, average, and in January 1969—so that the $600 would have to be raised to $889 merely to equal the purchasing power of the $600 exemption 21 years ago.

Our standard of living has changed substantially over this period of time, also. Life in the 1960's is quite different from that in the 1940's. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just published a study which attempts to answer the question: How much does it cost to live for an urban family of four in the spring of 1967 for three standards of living? The resulting three budgets share the basic assumption that maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities are desirable and necessary social goals.

For the moderate budget, the U.S. urban average family cost was $9,076 in spring of 1967. The cost for the lower budget was $5,915, and the higher budget amounted to $13,050. The personal exemptions for a family of four today total $2,400 which does not even approach the total of the lower budget. Certainly exemptions totaling $4,800, which my bill will provide, would be far more equitable.

A study by the Social Security Administration in 1966 showed the "poverty line" for a nonfarm family of four was $3,335. Anyone who falls below the poverty line will have less than a minimum diet for health or will have to choose between necessities. Under present tax law a family of four with an adjusted gross income of $3,335 has to pay $46 in Federal income taxes. My proposal would exempt a family of four from Federal income taxation until their adjusted gross income exceeded $4,800.

The most frequently heard argument against increasing the personal exemption is the revenue that would be lost to the Government. But we can regain this revenue by enacting measures of tax reform to close at least some of the loopholes through which billions of dollars escape the Treasury each year. In addition, the tax savings to individuals resulting from an increase in the personal exemption to $1,200 will come back to the Government in the form of higher taxes because of higher profits of those in the food processing industries who will sell more goods if the poor have money to buy it. Personal expenditures represent over 60 percent of the gross national product. These additional funds in the hands of consumers will increase the incomes and the profits of grocery stores, appliance dealers, clothing manufacturers, and others, which will result in a correspondingly larger tax base for the Federal Government, and increased revenues.

We cannot continue to ignore the plight of the low- and middle-income taxpayer. In addition to the burden of Federal income taxes and inflation that I have outlined above, he is also being subjected to rapidly increasing State and local taxes and the recently effected increase in social security taxes.

We must remove the glaring inequity of the present personal exemption from our tax structure. Since February 18, the House Ways and Means Committee has been conducting extensive tax reform hearings. It is to be hoped that resulting legislation will assure greater equity and fairness in the tax system so that some wealthy tax-dodging individuals and special-interest groups will no longer be able to avoid their fair share of taxation. But we cannot wait for this time-consuming process to be concluded. We must give the low- and middle-income taxpayer relief now. And immediate increase in the personal exemption to $1,200, in my opinion, is the best way to accomplish this objective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1717) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,200":

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions):

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,400":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

Sec. 2. (a) Section 3(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "After December 31, 1964" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1967, 1968, and 1969";

(2) by striking out "beginning after December 31, 1964," and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning on or after January 1, 1967, and before January 1, 1970,"; and

(3) by striking out "After December 31, 1964" each place it appears in the tables and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1967, 1968, and 1969".

(b) Section 3 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 1969.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall correspond in form to the tables in subsection (b) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 if the taxable income were computed by taking either the 10-percent standard deduction or the minimum standard deduction."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code (relating to number of exemptions) is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables in sections 3(a) and 3(b) and the tables prescribed under section 3(c)".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code (relating to husband or wife filing separate return) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return the tax imposed by section 3 shall be—

"(A) for taxable years beginning in 1964, the lesser of the tax shown in table IV or table V of section 3(a),

"(B) for taxable years beginning in 1965, the lesser of the tax shown in table IV or table V of section 3(b), and

"(C) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, the lesser of the taxes shown in the corresponding tables prescribed under section 3(c).

"(3) Neither table V of section 3(a) nor table V of section 3(b), nor the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), shall apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in table V of section 3(a), table V of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) in lieu of the tax shown in table IV of section 3(a), table IV of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), as the case may be. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

XUM

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code (cross references) is amended by striking out "and table V in section 3(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "table V in section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended by inserting after "nor table V in section 3(b)" the following: ", nor the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c),".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4302(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

"Payroll period	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$27.00
Biweekly	55.80
Semimonthly	58.60
Monthly	116.00
Quarterly	350.00
Semiannual	700.00
Annual	1,400.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	3.80"

(b) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) At the election of the employer and with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee after December 31, 1969, a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a).

"(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before January 1, 1970, a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a):".

(c) Section 3402(m)(1) (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended by striking out "$700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,400".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid on and after January 1, 1970.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to file during the Easter recess reports on various bills that have been pending and on which action will culminate during the Easter recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 170 to have printed as a Senate document, a report entitled "Review of the United States Foreign Policy and Operation."

I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate meets on Monday next, I be recognized at the conclusion of morning business for a period of 1 hour so that I may make my report to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOMEBUILDERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, largely as a result of the civil disorders in the cities, the Congress and administration last year set as a new national housing goal the construction or rehabilitation of 26 million homes in the next 10 years. This is an average of 2.6 million a year, and it compares with the 1.6 million or so we have been building and rehabilitating annually.

It was a great regret to many of us to hear the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, describe this goal as "unrealistic." I enthusiastically supported the Housing Act of 1968 and its intent to increase greatly the construction of low-income housing. I think what happened in our cities, and what will happen in the future if we do not correct widespread slum conditions, is a lot more "unrealistic" than this Housing Act objective.

We all know we cannot build all the homes we did in 1968 plus 63 percent more each year unless we assure the availability of materials, labor, and other elements that go into their construction. Doing this should be a primary activity of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Apparently it will have to be taken up by Congress, and I welcome the hearings that will be held this month in the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees on one of the bottlenecks: lumber and plywood supplies and prices.

A few days ago, the President of the National Association of Homebuilders addressed the annual meeting of the Western Wood Products Association on this very subject. He is Mr. Eugene Gulledge of Greensboro, N.C. His remarks outline the picture very clearly. They also remind us that Congress is joint manager, along with the Department of Agriculture, of over half the Nation's supply of wood for housing.

His speech should be read by all Members of Congress. Those of us on the Appropriations Committees have a special responsibility to make sure the investment is made in the national forests to produce the wood the Nation needs.

I also call this speech to the attention of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Urban Affairs Council in the White House. The country is waiting to see what leadership these agencies will offer for the realization of a decent home for the 6 million households that do not have one.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gulledge's speech of March 6, in San Francisco, Calif., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH GIVEN BY EUGENE A. GULLEDGE, OF GREENSBORO, N.C., PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS, MARCH 6, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

It is a great pleasure to me to be with you, *my fellow members of the home building industry*. If we didn't have lumber, I can assure you in this country we wouldn't have any homes. The National Association of Home Builders intends to do its part to see to it that there is available enough timber in this country to build the homes of this nation. Our objectives are parallel with yours in all respects in this quest. We have, as an organization, the responsibility of trying to make certain that the people of this nation of ours are properly housed.

In 1949 the Congress enacted a Housing Act. In the preamble to that it established the concept that every American family should be housed in a decent home in a decent environment. That was a concept. There was no implementation of that concept, however, in legislation until the 1968 Housing Act which translated that concept to some tangible goals. Those tangible goals have caused a lot of concern in the minds of a lot of people.

Statistically speaking, this nation produced its greatest number of living units in 1950 when we reached a production of approximately 1,950,000 living units. At that time, less than 10 per cent of that production was multi-family and 90 per cent was single family. At that time, we used approximately 4.9 per cent of our Gross National Product in producing those living units.

Our country has grown since then. Our demand for housing has grown. It is anticipated that by the end of this century, another 31 years, our population will have grown from 200 million to about 335 million people, a 67.5% increase. In order to satisfy the housing demands of those people and all the other demands which housing requires, the housing and construction industry in effect will have to rebuild America.

We have the responsibility to do it—to rebuild America—to duplicate again every existing thing we've got—all the homes and all the churches, and all the shopping centers and all the hotels, and all the sewage treatment facilities and all the schools, and all the water plants. Not only do we face a near-doubling of our population, but continuing obsolescence is taking away thousands of housing units from the market. The attrition rate is two-thirds of a million units a year—

some 665,000 living units a year disappear by reason of hurricanes, flood and fire, and by reason of bulldozer and the termite, and a change in use. We then have a challenge given to this industry to rebuild America. We are going to have to do it *not* by technological break-throughs, so hoped-for and so highly touted by people who are *not* knowledgeable in the field. We are going to do it by methods which the industry has the capability of using right now today.

HOUSING TASTES CHANGE LITTLE

We are going to house the traditional American family in the traditional American house in the year 2000 as well as we are doing it in the year 1969. There's a very simple reason why. People are quite willing to come to a "modern" hotel. They are quite willing to live in a "modern" apartment. They couldn't care less whether it is made of stone, or whether it is made of fiberglass, or whether it is made of plastic or wood. But when it comes round to building their house in which they are going to raise their families and in which they are going to put their money—*without fail,* and I emphasize *without fail,* every market survey going shows that people want a house quite similar to the house in which they grew up. As a consequence, you and I were raised in traditional homes and we, today, in the main want traditional homes for ourselves. Our children are being raised in traditional homes and they are going to be the people who will be buying the homes and living in those homes at the end of this century.

There have been numerous efforts made by interested entrepreneurs, homebuilders if you will, to try to create a new concept of living, a new way in which people can live, a new type of house. Unfortunately, this has been done by too many people who could not learn from the other fellow's mistakes. Industry and individuals literally have dropped millions of dollars in the failure of these efforts.

All surveys which are aimed at trying to find out what people want to live in, what they'll pay their money for—and there's a vast difference—inevitably come to the conclusion that they want a house pretty much like the one Mom and Dad had, assuming it was a decent house. So I say to you, as we rebuild America, we are going to be doing it with traditional materials. To you, of course, that means wood and to us, as home builders, it means wood. To the nation, we hope it means wood.

Let's be realistic about it. We in the industry have been going through a rather traumatic experience since 1966. At that time we were suffering from what is known as "tight money". The money was not there. Because it wasn't there, a lot of homes weren't built and the rate of production of housing in this country in October of 1966 got down to 848,000 units, about half the normal rate which we had expected. As a result, we had a terrible housing shortage.

In trying to recover from that housing shortage, we produced in 1967 some 1.3 million units. In 1968 we produced 1.54 million units. In 1968 a Housing Bill was enacted that said the national objective and goal shall be to build 2.6 million units per year for each of the next 10 years. And that's what will be needed in order to get our people to the point where most of them are living in decent homes. Because that goal is so much higher than we have been doing, (and we should produce about 1.55 million units this year) a lot of sensible people say it is impossible to achieve.

LUMBER BOTTLENECK IN ACHIEVING HOUSING GOALS

A lot of people say that under generally normal conditions we could have been producing 1,750,000 housing units this year. But because of the scarcity of lumber and plywood and its price, and because of the scarcity of money and its price, plans are being scaled down. The American public will be denied the opportunity of having some 200,000 units of housing produced that should have been produced. This throws us that much farther behind in national objectives.

Now, if in this period of time, 1968 and 1969, when we are producing 1.5 million units in round figures we are having lumber scarcities, how are we going to get the lumber and plywood to build another 1 million units more?

SOCIAL NECESSITY FOR MORE HOUSING

It is not enough to say to the home builder, "You've got all the housing produced that you can possibly produce so don't worry if you can't produce enough". If we fail to produce enough, there are people out there who will not have a decent home because we didn't produce it, and they'll get mighty disturbed.

Otto Kerner, a former Governor of Illinois, was appointed by President Johnson in 1967 to head the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. It became known as the Kerner Riot Commission. Among the three principal reasons which the Kerner Commission determined were the causes of riots in 1967 was the inadequate supply of housing. It has been estimated by the experts that there are somewhere between 6 to 7 million substandard occupied living units in this country today. More are being created every day.

People living in substandard homes do not have the opportunity of feeling that they, in many cases, are participating in the economic progress of this country. Social progress is held back, and this country simply cannot afford to have a sizable segment of its population so dissatisfied with the neighborhoods in which they live that they are willing to burn them down.

That is what has been happening. They're so disgusted with the situation in which they find themselves they are simply willing to burn it down. We've got to do something about that. This nation cannot afford the riots; it cannot afford the civil disorders and all that spring from it.

We must find solutions to these problems, and it will not be sufficient for you and me to have a comfortable level of business. We cannot be fat cats, we cannot be satisfied people. We've got to be people who are concerned, who are involved, and who are committed to the idea of producing enough housing for the people of this nation so that that national goal will be realized—that every American family will have the opportunity of being housed in a decent home in a decent environment. We've got to become really seriously concerned about how we solve it.

The home builders were greatly concerned last year, as they are this year, with lumber from the standpoint of supply and price. It is a legitimate concern. You cannot expect them not to be disturbed over the price situation. Many of you who may be distributors, as well as the producers, are getting it from both ends. Customers are complaining, boiling, and crying. Of course, the mills are, too, and you are probably in a position where you can satisfy nobody, and everybody is wanting to blame everybody else—and that's the name of the game, too. Nobody really wants to say, "It's our fault." I can tell you this, it is not sufficient for anybody to blame anybody.

COMMON EFFORT REQUIRED

Home builders are not satisfied with trying to pin the donkey's tail on any part of the industry. Home builders, and I'm sure you, too, are interested in solving the problem. How do we make certain that the housing needs of this nation may be met in order that the nation may be spared the trials which accompanied the riots and disorders in the past?

Let me assure you that if we fail, we are going to reap a far greater harvest of terror and destruction than we have ever had in the past. It's a challenging proposition, it's a sobering thing which makes us get in and dig and commit ourselves through our Association activities, yours and mine, to start finding some solution to these things. That's our overall concern.

You'll recall astronaut Anders who went around the moon with two companions last Christmas season. He said, "Whatever the mind of man can conceive, man can achieve." It is purely a question of dedication.

When President Kennedy was approached in 1960 with the concept that in this decade we would put a man on the moon, he became convinced that we could. He convinced the Congress that we could. Subsequent Congresses appropriated the funds. I don't believe there is a person in this room today who doesn't think that we will have a man on the moon before the end of this decade. Yet, how many people thought we really could in 1960. Very few. The goal will be achieved because there is dedication to achieving that goal. Simply that!

You and I as citizens first and all of this country, and as businessmen, can make certain that there is enough dedication on the part of public officials at all levels of government—City Hall, State Legislatures, and Federal Legislative circles—that we achieve our objective. But we've got to show them how.

Representatives of the forest products industry and the home building industry met with HUD Secretary Romney on Monday, February 24. We spent 2½ hours with the Secretary. We discussed fully with him the problems of lumber supply and price, indicated to him the areas in which we thought the Administration could be effective, areas in which we thought the bureaus could be effective, and areas in which we thought legislative actions were needed. There was no differences of opinion between the home builders and the forest products people on those points. As far as I can tell, there will be no variance between the opinions of home builders and the opinions of the forest products people on achieving those points. But we home builders happen to be a little more restless than are the lumber people. We are the ones who are not being helped, if you will, (I am trying to choose the words carefully and I see some smiles)—we are the ones who are not being helped by the current price situation. As a consequence we would like to see something done about it, and we are going to do our "doggonedest" to see that something is done about it.

We're not going to try to tell you or your industry what sort of profits you ought to have or what the price of lumber really ought to be. Some smarter people than we are, have got to figure that out. But I think that we have a vast experience in dealing with the Congress and dealing with the Administration to try to help interpret to them the consequence and the results of certain actions and what they mean.

We had a meeting with President Johnson in July, 1967. I was present in his office, along with my fellow officers of NAHB. We were dealing at that time with the Congress on a very, very important matter to us. The President told us then, in effect: "Remember one thing, gentlemen, the duty of every member of Congress on the Hill is to serve his people. So, he is first looking at everything in the light of how it is going to affect the people back home. The people back home are going to pass judgment on him." That was very sage, basic advice.

Therefore, we, meaning the home builders and you jointly, will have to make certain that the Congress understands that we do have a legitimate interest—that's for sure—because we are in this business to house those who are going to be the voters for those Congressmen.

XUM

NEED TO INCREASE FEDERAL TIMBER SUPPLY

Now, at the beginning I addressed you as "Fellow Members of the Housing Industry" because we are in this business to house those to present the case to the Congress and to the Administration for achieving a number of objectives. We are going to have to persuade the Congress that the amount of timber which is harvested from Federal timberlands should be increased sufficiently to be able to meet the demand for timber in this country. There appears to be currently something on the order of a 10 per cent shortage between the amount of timber being produced and the amount of timber needed. This demand will increase and the objective is to reduce the shortage, hopefully to nil—a balance between supply and demand.

In order to increase the supply of timber, you can only get timber from two places. You can either grow it or import it—one of the two. Our imports show little hope of being dramatically improved. Our growing then becomes our principal way of increasing our supply of timber. The timber which we use for residential construction is roughly balanced about half between what comes off Federal lands and half of what comes off of so-called private lands. The figures are not exact but close enough for the point. The acreage involved on private lands is considerably less than the average involved on the public lands.

Therefore, it is a matter of fact, not opinion, that the public lands are being rather mismanaged in comparison with the private lands. Private holders of forests are doing a good job of professional management. Public managers of public lands, by comparison, are doing worse.

We have got to convince the Congress that the supply of lumber can be most effectively increased in this country by increasing the amount of managerial skill and talent they are willing to allow the Forest Service to use in managing that business enterprise.

FINANCIAL INVESTMENT REQUIRED

Some Forest Service policies will need a close examination. Frankly, I think we need a method of funding the Forest Services business endeavors in order that they, too, might be working on long-range plans. We need a different concept, if you will, really of what a perpetual yield amounts to, what an allowable cut amounts to, and what all the other terms that are germane to the subject amount to in order that we might reach a level of sophistication of forest management in our public lands that is commensurate with the management of our private lands. It can be done—it must be done because it is only through these sources that we can expect to be able to increase effectively the supply of lumber. It is the intention of the National Association of Home Builders to assist in each and every way to achieve these objectives.

We see no way in which the American people will be housed, according to the established goals of the Congress, except through the continued and ever-increasing use of wood products. The timber supply for these products, to a large degree, is in the hands of the Federal government. It is administered under policies which currently preclude those policies from giving a yield from those lands commensurate with what private management does. As a consequence, you will find no departure between our objectives and yours in that respect.

PUBLICLY OWNED RESOURCES BELONG TO ALL THE PEOPLE

There are, however, a few public policy questions to which the lumber industry and the forest products industry must address themselves. I want to tell you some of the areas in which you are going to have to furnish satisfactory answers. You are going to have to recognize first of all that the American public owns those lands. I am not going to talk about the Sierra Club, and I am not going to talk about recreation. I am not going to talk about the conservationists for conservation's sake. I am going to talk about the fact that the American public wants to make sure that it gets the best value for the dollar received and expended etc. in seeing that our trees—mine and yours—that are sold to lumber producers which produce lumber and forest products—are used wisely.

PRICE RISE FUELS INFLATION

Let me emphasize one thing—the gravest, I repeat—the gravest threat to America today is not Vietnam, the threat of riots in the cities, or unrest on the campuses. It is not the so-called decaying moral attitude of people in college—it is none of those; the gravest threat to America today is the threat of inflation—the psychology which says that if we don't build it today or buy it today it'll cost us more tomorrow; so we had better buy it today. It is the concept that no matter what price I pay for it today, it will be less than I'll have to pay tomorrow.

That threat of inflation becomes the greatest danger to you and me—to all of the nation. It becomes evident, therefore, that those are the factors which are working to produce the most harm in this nation today. It is because of this that you and I have got to address ourselves to the whole problem—what is it that can create within the lumber and forest products industry a situation where a 10 per cent shortage of supply can result in such a drastic increase in price?

I'm not arguing with you whether the price you are selling at is right or wrong. I'm saying that the rapid increase in price is in, and of its own very nature, regardless of merit, inflationary. It has vastly fueled the demand for commensurate increases in the prices of other materials. The brick people want more money for their product, the cement people want more money for their product, and the asphalt shingle people want more money for their product. Labor wants more money for its product, and the labor negotiators are quite aware what's happened to the price of forest products. Whenever you go into negotiations on renewal of your labor contracts don't you think that those people aren't aware of what has happened to the industry prices and the industry profits.

Regardless of your position that they are fair and right, the inflationary aspect of it is what is the most dangerous thing. So you and I—we've got a problem. How are we going to use effectively the national forests which belong to the people and channel the harvest through a private enterprise distribution system without allowing that system to become a principal factor in stimulating inflation? In turn, such a system works against the best interest of the people who own that product. It is an involved statement but this is our problem.

Frankly, neither home builders nor the lumber interests have been successful in addressing ourselves to an appropriate solution but we must work on it. If my good friend, Masud Mehran of Livermore and Diablo, California, will forgive me for telling a story twice, I'd like to close with this: We have a tremendous job ahead of us. It is not short range only; it is not long range only. I'm concerned with how I'm going to get the lumber to build my houses this year, as well as in 1975.

A retired French Marshal was walking through his garden with his gardener and discussing what they could be doing to improve it. The Marshal suggested he'd like to see such and such a tree planted over in a corner, and the gardener replied, "Sir, the tree that you mentioned will take fully 100 years to mature and do the job you want it to do."

The Marshal replied, "In that case, let's plant it this afternoon."

You and I have a big job to do—let's get started this afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT'S STUDY OF THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, yesterday, President Nixon announced the establishment of a so-called task force to review the Nation's oil import policies. The need for critical review of this program is obvious in light of the inequities of the program and the growing public demand for substantial reform. No region of the country bears the hardship and high price of the oil import program more than New England and there are no more vigorous proponents of reform than the representatives of that region. It is interesting to note, however, that the President's decision to review this program comes at a time when there is pending before the Federal Government a proposal for an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine, which would give New England, for the first time, its fair share of imports under the present mandatory oil import program. The proposal for a Maine refinery is vigorously opposed by the oil companies who are advocates of the oil import quota system. The direct result of the President's announcement of a study is the indefinite delay of the refinery project. For the moment, the only interests served by the review are those in conflict with the consumer interests of New England.

I am seriously concerned that the only interests served in the long run by President Nixon's study will be those in conflict with the consumer interests of the Nation. My concern stems from the nature of President Nixon's announcement.

The "appointment" of this study group is a repetition of the process which bequeathed the oil import program to the Nation in the first place. In 1957 a Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports was appointed by President Eisenhower. This Committee was composed of the same Cabinet-level posts which have been named by President Nixon. The 1957 group held no public hearings, took no public testimony, issued no public report justifying their recommendations. Their study resulted in the present mandatory oil import program which has cost the American economy and the consumer over $40 billion in 10 years.

In light of this result it is no surprise that the President of the American Petroleum Institute in a letter to Arthur Burns on February 5, 1969, stated:

> It would be highly desirable to establish another Cabinet-level committee to conduct a study.

The original Cabinet-level group arrived at its recommendations by negotiating with the industry. No consumer groups were consulted. No representatives of consumer interests were included.

What is required at this time is a fresh look at the oil import program.

The Cabinet officers and the Director of Emergency Planning named by Mr. Nixon to a so-called task force already have the specific responsibility for constant surveilliance of this program as well as the responsibility to recommend action to the President. This is their responsibility under section 6(a) of Presidential Proclamation No. 3279, as amended. This responsibility has existed in the Office of Emergency Planning, the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor for a decade, yet no recommendations for change have been forthcoming. In fact, the Oil Import Administration of the Department of the Interior is a strong defender of the present system.

I do not question the capability and integrity of our new Cabinet officials, but they are busy men and the oil import program is a minor part of their responsibilities and it is complex. It is simple commonsense to assume that Secretary Rogers, Secretary Laird, Secretary Kennedy, Secretary Hickel, Secretary Stans, and Secretary Shultz cannot personally devote a great amount of time to this review. It is simple commonsense to assume that unnamed individuals within their departments will carry out this study, perhaps some of the same people who have seen no need for action in a decade.

The concerns of the departments represented in Mr. Nixon's study group legitimately relate to the oil import program and should be represented on a panel charged with reviewing the program. But they are not the only concerns and they certainly have not been vigorously voiced in the past as part of the constant surveillance these departments were supposed to have maintained.

The push for reform has come from Congress and the public. It comes belatedly from the oil industry only because of the threat they see posed to the program by projects such as Machiasport. The industry should not be permitted to huddle behind closed doors with Government to decide the public fate.

What is essential to the public interest at this time is an effective and objective review of the oil import program undertaken, not by anonymous staff members, but by a publicly identifiable group which will have the time to study this program, to take public testimony and include representatives of consumer interests. The questions being raised about the oil import program are not minor. They go to the wisdom of the program's very existence. A program which costs the American consumer $4 billion a year should be publicly debated and scrutinized, not shunted off for an in-house review. We are at a point in the life of American Government where an educated citizenry is laying claim to its right to know, its right to be included in the decisions which touch its life and its pocketbook. If we are willing to publicly debate the national need for an anti-ballistic-missile system, we should be willing to provide a public forum for debate of the oil import program which has already proved more costly than that military proposal.

Under the law, the President has complete authority for deciding upon an oil import control program. There will be no opportunity for his decisions to be considered and voted upon by Congress. The very least the President can provide is the opportunity for all views about this program to be considered before he reaches his decision. I hope the President will reconsider the composition of his study group, provide for open hearings and public reports, and by doing so take the public into his confidence.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas F. Turley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years vice Thomas L. Robinson.

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years vice Claude V. Spratley, Jr.

Bill Carnes Murray, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years vice Elmer J. Hardegree.

Harold M. Grindle, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years vice Charles B. Bendlage, Jr.

Royal K. Buttars, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years vice Ellis Maylett.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1969:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Nevius to be a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in the grade of lieutenant general:

Maj. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named Reserve officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Don C. Bowman, Jr.
Robert P. Owens
William H. Longley
Edwin J. Zimmermann, Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

George H. Reifenstein

SUPPLY CORPS

George F. Baughman
Heinz H. Loeffler

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Arthur H. Padula

DENTAL CORPS

Harry G. Ewart

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Harvey P. Lanham
Lawrence G. Bernard
Lester E. Hubbell
Eugene G. Fairfax
Means Johnston, Jr.
Alexander S. Goodfellow, Jr.
Horace H. Epes, Jr.
Thomas R. Weschler
Malcolm W. Cagle
Pierre N. Charbonnet, Jr.
Gene R. La Rocque
Percival W. Jackson
Victor A. Dybdal
George R. Muse
Roger W. Paine, Jr.
James A. Dare
Harry L. Harty, Jr.
James L. Abbott, Jr.
Francis J. Fitzpatrick
Emmett P. Bonner
John P. Weinel
Sheldon H. Kinney
Herman J. Trum III
William R. McKinney
Julian T. Burke, Jr.
George S. Morrison
Roderick O. Middleton
Herbert H. Anderson
Damon W. Cooper
Frank B. Stone
Harold E. Shear
William D. Houser
Raymond E. Peet
Mark W. Woods
Paul L. Lacy, Jr.
James L. Holloway III
Daniel K. Weitzenfeld
Norbert Frankenberger
Albert J. Clancy, Jr.
Thomas B. Owen

MEDICAL CORPS

Felix P. Ballenger

SUPPLY CORPS

Paul F. Cosgrove, Jr.
Grover C. Heffner
Elliott Bloxom
Roland Rieve
Stuart H. Smith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Paul E. Seufer
Spencer R. Smith
James V. Bartlett

DENTAL CORPS

Myron G. Turner

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Eugene T. Rossides, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Paul W. Eggers, of Texas, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

Randolph W. Thrower, of Georgia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Nathaniel Samuels, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

Charles A. Meyer, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

William B. Buffum, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Christopher H. Phillips, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Bennett W. Alford, to be colonel, and ending James A. Zahn, to be chief warrant officer (W-2), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 6, 1969.

XUM

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ROSS LEFFLER SCHOOL OF CONSERVATION

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month graduation exercises were held for the 13th class to complete study and training at the Ross Leffler School of Conservation near Brockway in Jefferson County, Pa.

The ceremony marked the start of a most difficult but highly satisfying career for 25 young men who, as Pennsylvania game protectors, will become a part of the forces responsible for keeping the Commonwealth the outstanding outdoor recreation area of the East. Having survived the rigid 10-month course, each of the new alumni will, for the next 9 months, work under the direct supervision and guidance of an experienced game protector and a field division supervisor to round out what is considered the Nation's most thorough and effective training program in this rugged profession.

The Punxsutawney Spirit has presented an excellent description of the Ross Leffler School and its requirements. Because this unique institution contributes so substantially to Pennsylvania's established conservation program, I include the article in the RECORD.

My colleagues may want to make this information available to those agencies in their own States which are designed to serve in the same capacity as the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

The article follows:

GAME PROTECTORS GRADUATE SOON: JEFFERSON COUNTY HAS STATE'S BIGGEST CAMPUS

What school has the largest campus in Pennsylvania?

The surprising answer to that question is found nestled in the northeastern corner of Jefferson County, approximately seven miles from Brockway.

The Ross Leffler School of Conservation, the training grounds for Pennsylvania's Game Protectors since 1936, has the largest campus of any school in the commonwealth, boasting 45,000 acres in Jefferson and Elk counties.

"We may not have many buildings but we have a heck of a big campus," admitted Donald Miller, supervisor of the school.

The thirteenth class to graduate from the school will receive diplomas this month, following ten months of gruelling training—training that has been called the toughest in the nation for conservation personnel and game protectors.

The members of the class follow a rigorous schedule of classroom and field work, beginning each day at 6 a.m. and going nonstop until 10:15 in the evening.

A typical day at the Ross Leffler School begins with physical exercises (including running a mile) at 6:10 a.m. followed by breakfast at 7. Four 50-minute class periods are scheduled for the morning and, after lunch, three more classes are held. Dinner is served at 5:30 and still another class is held at night. All students live at the school while training.

The 25 men who have been selected from more than 250 applicants are exposed to many areas of instruction to prepare them as game protectors in the commonwealth. Included in the course of study are: law enforcement, land management, game management, predator control, public relations, public administration, firearms instruction, first aid, water safety and numerous others.

Two resident instructors—Mr. Miller and Charles Laird—handle much of the teaching at the school but specialists are brought in to enrich the training program.

Members of the Game Commission research division lecture the candidates about new developments in the fields of biology, forestry and other areas while state police, fish commission personnel, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and others add specialized instruction to the game school program.

Classroom instruction is only a part of the education received by the members of the class. Field work, given under actual outdoor conditions, is perhaps the most important segment of instruction for the candidates.

"We may have a member of the class who has done well in the classroom and scored high on all exams," said Mr. Miller. "But it is in the field work that his true potential as a successful game protector comes out."

Each class member spends almost three months in training throughout the state learning how to conduct himself in the field. Each game school member spends two or three weeks with each of four different game protectors to learn the difficulties of the job and the approach taken by different men in the performances of their duties.

Such field training is extremely valuable because every graduate of the game school is assured a job—and a big one. Following graduation each new game protector is given his own territory, often as large as 350 square miles, to enforce the laws, inform the public of Game Commission activities and perform the one hundred and one tasks expected of game protectors—from conducting gun safety clinics to capturing squirrels in attics.

Mr. Miller, who was a member of the second class to graduate from the game school, thinks the extensive training program is highly effective.

"This training is twice as long as most states and is much more thorough. Anyone who graduates from the school has to be dedicated. That's one reason the Game Commission retains 85 percent of all officers who graduate until they retire."

Before the inception of the game school, a game protector was selected by a competitive exam conducted for applicants from the county where the vacancy existed, then given a badge and game law book and expected to enforce the law and carry out public relations.

Although excellent, hard-working game protectors developed through this system, it took many years for the average officer to become familiar with the laws and know his many duties.

The Ross Leffler School has solved that problem. By matriculating a new class every two or three years as the need arises, the Game Commission is assured adequate replacements for retiring game protectors.

When replacements are needed, the Game Commission announces the formation of a new class and usually receives approximately 250 applications for each class.

All applicants must meet certain physical requirements. They must be between 23 and 35 years of age, not less than 5'8" or 140 pounds in weight and must be able to pass a 20/30 vision and color test without corrective lenses and a normal hearing test without the aid of a hearing device.

In addition, the applicants must be residents of Pennsylvania and high school graduates.

All applicants meeting physical and residential requirements are required to take Civil Service tests and the 50 students scoring highest are given oral examinations and interviews to select the final class.

Graduates of the school will look forward to one of the toughest jobs in the commonwealth. Game protectors do not work a fixed schedule and often work 70-or-80-hour weeks. The training at the Ross Leffler School is tailored to get them used to such a schedule and weeds out any students who are not prepared for such a life.

Dedication to duty and love of the job is a tradition in the Game Commission with three members of the present class having relatives in the Commission program, including one who is the third brother to attend the school.

The members of the 13th class who will graduate this month include: D. A. Bernhardy, Schuylkill County; W. A. Bower, Dauphin County; L. L. Everett, Carbon County; J. P. Filkosky, Chester County; E. W. Gallew, Bradford County; G. E. Gibson, Elk County; L. L. Harshbarger, Mifflin County; D. W. Jenkins, Allegheny County; J. M. Kazakavage, Schuylkill County; C. L. Keller, Lebanon County; F. D. King, Centre County; J. A. Lukas, Lawrence County; D. A. McDowell, Cambria County; R. W. Oliver, Butler County; A. N. Pedder, Westmoreland County; P. G. Piechoski, Philadelphia County; J. E. Rankin, Allegheny County; B. K. Ray, Westmoreland County; J. F. Serfass, Carbon County; J. P. Shook, Lycoming County; G. B. Thomas, Venango County; J. K. Weaver, Clinton County; H. D. Wetzel. Bradford County; L. C. Yahner, Cambria County, and G. J. Zeidler, Philadelphia County.

Anyone who would like to visit the game school is welcome—if he can find the school in the middle of the 45,000-acre game land campus.

A DREAM

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the United Cerebral Palsy conducted its annual telethon in Nashville, Tenn.

It has been my privilege during the past 10 years to serve as president of the middle Tennessee affiliate and president of United Cerebral Palsy of Tennessee. The chairman for this year's event was my wife who has also been most active in our community effort to provide care, services, and education to those unfortunate individuals afflicted with cerebral palsy.

Each year the telethon viewers in middle Tennessee, northern Alabama, and southern Kentucky have responded with great generosity—gifts this year exceeded $210,000. Some of our most active participants are the parents of cerebral palsy children and during the telethon I had the opportunity to recite a poem written by one of these dedicated parents, Mr. Lawrence Halliburton, the father of one of the sweetest young ladies I have had the privilege to meet, Terri Lynn.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert into the

Congressional Record this poem and direct the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives to this. Certainly those that have witnessed friends and loved ones who have, with courage, fought almost overwhelming handicaps will appreciate this message:

A Dream

(By Mr. Lawrence Halliburton, Terri Lynn's father)

A dream I'll remember forever,
That opened thoughts this mind can't sever.

I saw the hands of God displayed,
I saw my child get down and play.
A miracle that can't be explained,
I saw one walk who was born lame.

I saw her run a child across the floor,
A view I may never see any more
I saw her play as others do,
I saw her bend over to tie her shoe.

She looks so happy and clever
I wish that dream could have lasted forever.

The dream was short but gave me a view.
Of my little girl whom I never knew.

A word of thanks to whom guides the mind
Of this little girl who is mine.

AMARILLO GLOBE-TIMES PAYS TRIBUTE TO DR. EVELYN POWERS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the medical profession in America is looked upon as a difficult profession for which to qualify and a difficult profession in which to practice with its many years of educational requirements, its high code of ethics, and the great good judgment required with human life hanging on instantaneous decisions. For some reason few American women have entered the profession of medicine, while some European countries have more women doctors than men.

That American women are capable of being outstanding doctors, physicians, and surgeons is shown by the record of Dr. Evelyn Powers of Amarillo, Tex., who decided at the age of 3 that she would become a doctor and she made good by graduating from the Baylor College of Medicine in 1925, the only woman in her class. While she has been a very active practitioner of medicine in Amarillo, Tex., Dr. Powers has not forgotten her obligations as a citizen and she mixed with this practice a dedicated work for better government in our time to all levels of government: local, State, and national.

The Amarillo Globe-Times, of March 20, 1969, paid tribute to her learning, her ability, her dedication, her success, and, above all, her service to people, in an article entitled "World of Medicine Wide Open: Longtime Woman Doctor Practices What She Preaches." I ask consent that the tribute, ably written by Anna Catherine Day, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times, Mar. 20, 1969]

World of Medicine Wide Open: Longtime Woman Doctor Here Preaches What She Practiced

(By Anna Catherine Day)

America is wasting its woman power.

"There is no reason why we can't have as many women doctors as men doctors," said Dr. Evelyn Powers of 3208 S. Hayden.

Dr. Powers is one of six women among the 150 physicians in the Potter-Randall County Medical Society.

The women's association of the American Medical Association says only 6.5 per cent of the nation's physicians are women.

In comparison, 75 per cent of the physicians in Russia are women.

At the age of 3, Dr. Powers decided she would become a doctor.

"My hand was badly cut. Of course, I kicked and screamed like any other child each time it was dressed, but it fascinated me that it would get well."

She graduated from the Baylor College of Medicine in 1925, the only woman in her class.

During her 43 years of medical practice, Dr. Powers encountered only one doctor who resented her because she was woman.

"He said he would quit the case if I were called in for consultation," she said.

The family did not insist, but the patient and many of her relatives later switched to Dr. Powers for treatment.

Dr. Powers retired from medical practice five years ago after 40 years in Amarillo and almost three years in Chillicothe.

"I was the senior partner in our firm," she said. "I received my diploma one minute before my husband."

Dr. Powers, the former Miss Evelyn Gass, and her husband, George Powers, married during their freshman year in medical school. They graduated in the same class, and practiced medicine in the same firm for more than four decades. She specialized in obstetrics and gynecology. He was a general practitioner.

Dr. Powers was born in Tulia, a daughter of Charles L. and Beulah Yeary Gass. Her grandfather, D. L. Gass, was the first merchant in Hereford just before the turn of the century.

"I wasn't very old when I decided I wasn't going to stay around the house and wash dishes. I couldn't see anything so glamorous about that," Dr. Powers said.

She never had any qualms about entering the field of medicine "because the doctor image was male."

"I want to tell you that in my child life the doctor image was female—my mother was our physician except on rare occasions," she said.

Dr. Powers' mother was interested in medicine, and her older brother, a physician, encouraged that interest.

Dr. Powers, the middle child in a family of three children, was usually the accident victim who had occasion to visit the doctor across the street more often than her brother and sister.

"I was more active and was always experimenting with new things," Dr. Powers said.

She remembers that her mother often treated the children's illnesses herself rather than call the family physician who always gave calomel, the most popular drug of that day.

When Dr. Powers entered medical school, the dean called her into his office.

"He told me that they wanted women in the school and that if anything offended me I should come and tell him," Dr. Powers said.

She had only one occasion to visit the dean in regard to those instructions.

"The offender was a lawyer who taught us medical jurisprudence. He had told a very vulgar joke which had nothing to do with medicine. The lawyer was not a member of the faculty the next year," Dr. Powers said.

During her freshman year, one of her male classmates said to Dr. Powers:

"You girls are such fools. You could stay home and play the piano and no one would think anything about it."

He dropped out the first year, Dr. Powers said.

"And I've always hoped he played the piano."

Dr. Powers feels that women are often advised, for one reason or another, not to enter the medical field.

"It is a downright sin that certain occupations have become set aside for men and others for women," she said.

"Once a high school girl told me that she wanted to study medicine but her teacher adviser told her no one had confidence in a woman doctor. I told the girl if any more women had confidence in me they would kill me," she said.

Dr. Powers has delivered two boys and a girl who are now doctors.

"Years ago," she said, "I delivered a girl and a boy to an Amarillo couple. The girl was older. She graduated from Oklahoma University and told me that she was going to become a medical technican."

"Why sell yourself short?" Dr. Powers inquired and advised the girl to study medicine.

She is Dr. Audrey Fern Posey McIntyre of Houston, who graduated from Baylor College of Medicine in 1960. Her brother, Dr. Randall Posey, a graduate of Texas University Medical School, is now in public health work in Philadelphia. They are the children of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Posey, now of Houston.

Mrs. McIntyre is an anesthesiologist in Houston.

Dr. Hugh Bob Currie of Amarillo was also graduated from Baylor College of Medicine. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Currie of 2204 S. Lipscomb.

Dr. Powers had been in every kind of home in Amarillo on house calls.

She has delivered many babies at home, and has traveled in below-zero weather to treat the ill.

Back in 1926 in Chillicothe, she and her husband did a tracheotomy by the light of a kerosene lamp with a trunk as the operating table.

The patient, a 5-year-old boy, recovered.

Dr. George Powers delivered a baby in a covered wagon during their early days of practice. The Drs. Powers opened their practice here in the Fisk Building in November, 1928, after almost three years in Chillicothe.

"She built her practice a little faster than I did," said her husband.

Dr. Evelyn's memories of her medical practice are many, but some stand out above the others.

One expectant mother visited Dr. Powers to retain her services.

"And Dr. Powers, I want twins," the expectant mother said.

"I'm sorry, you've come to the wrong doctor. I don't have many twins. My patients are too stingy to have twins," the doctor replied.

"Why, do you charge more for twins?" the patient inquired.

Dr. Powers interned at Baylor Hospital in Dallas, and is a Founding Fellow of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. She is also a fifth generation Texan.

The five other women physicians in the Potter-Randall County Medical Society are Dr. Leta Boswell of Canyon, Dr. Ernestine Smith, Dr. Betty Cooper, Dr. Frances Davis and Dr. Margaret Davis, all of Amarillo.

XUM

FOCUS ON FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART III

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the attempt of the students at Federal City College to communicate their views to the community should have been distorted in the newspapers. Headlines such as "Student Leaders Defend Black Studies" are attention-grabbing, but fail to express the real educational goals and aspirations of the students.

In an effort to provide a more complete delineation of student desires, and to clarify a number of questions that have arisen as a result of recent publicity concerning Federal City College, I urge my colleagues to read the following statement by the Student Government Association of the College:

STATEMENT FROM THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE

One of the principal responsibilities of the Student Government is to take those actions that will result in benefits for the students and that will enable the College and community to act in accordance with the needs and aspiration of the students.

This statement is issued to announce a student position on the state of the College and to respond to the number of questions that have been directed to the Student Government.

There are three basic statements that the Student Government Association wishes to make: (1) the students attend Federal City College to obtain a high quality education; this is our basic and primary purpose, (2) the students accept the need for several different types of educational programs to co-exist as part of the urban higher educational experiment, with the qualification that all such programs must be academically sound in content, philosophy, and instructional method, and (3) the students remain dedicated to the growth and development of the College and consider as irresponsible any discussion of the need to terminate or restrict the growth of the College.

The students have indicated and demonstrated their responsible participation in the affairs of the College. While students on other campuses have been engaged in various types of action projects, some helpful and some destructive, the students at FCC have maintained a focus on those actions which contribute to the success and development of FCC.

We recognize a need for this educational opportunity and for the employment and life opportunities that success in college affords; however, we insist that the education given at FCC be relevant to the needs of the students, their families, their communities and the total District population. An educational program that meets these requirements, urban higher education, does not exist; it must be developed. The students at FCC are part of this developmental project and seek to participate in responsible and effective ways.

There are several alleged issues that deserve comment. Do the students believe in the College and feel that they are receiving a meaningful education? This question assumes that education anywhere in the nation has met some standard that precludes further investigation. At FCC the students admit that we are in the process of finding answers and view participation in this process as a meaningful and rewarding form of education.

How are the students affected by the disagreements among and between administration and faculty? In a developing program consensus not disagreement is to be avoided. The disagreement as stated in the press (the outsiders), is vastly different from the disagreements as experienced within the College. There are different programs being advocated by different faculty members; different programs are being supported and enrolled in by various students; some of these differences are related to sharply different premises about what is a relevant education. The debate can be solved by permitting various programs, as long as they are academically sound and within the province of a public institution, to demonstrate their effectiveness. What one student needs to learn is always different from what another student may need. In order to meet individual needs, different types of programs and learning experiences are desirable.

Do the students support a Black Studies Program? The answer to this question depends upon which of the Black Studies Programs is being discussed. The one that is available within the College already has the support of a large number of students; the one that is reflected in the news accounts has little or no support, except from those who wish to use this inaccurate view as a means of causing additional confusion and to achieve some objective other than support of the institutions. A Black Studies Program that meets the needs of students, that is academically sound, and that does not violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is an important and necessary part of higher education. This type of Black Studies Program exists and has support at the College. It deserves the total support of the Washington Community.

Do the students want a change in organizational and administrative procedures? Yes, and when those changes are instituted there will be additional changes desired and required. The question is not whether or not change is needed but the reaction to this need and the means by which changes can be obtained quickly and effective. Students at FCC participate in bringing about these changes. Sometimes we cooperate and sometimes we take actions that intensify the debate; at all times we have the best interest of the College and the students as our principal objective.

Most of the students at FCC work full or part time jobs and attend College because they know the importance of a good education. This objective is number one on their list of priorities. The opportunities provided by FCC are important to the thousands of other District residents who need the opportunities made available by FCC.

The Student Government Association, recognizing that there are many differences and that participation in the development of an institution is not an easy task, pledges its support to the following:

1. The continued growth and development of Federal City College as an institution that is academically and philosophically relevant to the needs of an urban community.
2. The use of student resources in responsible, if not always cooperative, ways to achieve improved opportunities for student learning and achievement.
3. The continued participation on committees, commissions, and council of the College to insure that students are effective participants on the decision-making process.
4. The use of this educational opportunity to better prepare themselves for positions of leadership with government, both District and Federal.
5. The use of this educational opportunity to better prepare themselves for effective performance as both employers and employees within the private sector.
6. The use of this educational opportunity to enable the students, now and in the future, to serve as a community resource.
7. The unity of students in support of the College and against those whose interests and activities are not in the best interest of FCC. This includes persons within and outside the College community.
8. The use of student resources to enable other residents of the District, especially poverty families, an opportunity to benefit from our knowledge and the College's capabilities.

The Student Government Association views the present state of affairs at the College as one of challenge, finding new answers to old problems, finding ways to deal with educational and social problems, and finding ways to use individual resources to solve community problems.

The College has difficulties and disagreements and differences—this should be—it is part of the challenge. Our problems are not a cause for despair and our commitment is to solve them on the one hand while educating those who question the integrity of the College on the other.

FCC is our opportunity, our vehicle, our resource. We hold it in the public trust for ourselves and our brothers and will pass on to our fellow students an institution of high standing.

In cooperation with the College administration, faculty, staff, District Government, D.C. residents, and Congress, we intend to insure that a one hundred year late opportunity does in fact have an immediate payoff.

SALUTE TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LEADERS

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I feel certain that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), my cochairman for the seventh annual Senate youth program, will join me in a salute to the high school student leaders who were recently our guests. There were 102 representing all of the States and the District of Columbia.

These young delegates who visited us in early February exemplified the highest qualities of American youth today.

While here, they visited with their Senators, questioning us on the key issues of the day. Their questions were bright—and direct.

Such were the delegates to the 1969 Senate youth program brought to Washington by the Hearst Foundation. They were winners not only of the week-long trip but also of $1,000 scholarships. We, of the Senate Advisory Committee, were able to derive great satisfaction from being able to assist them during their stay.

During their stay in Washington, the students were greeted by a number of dignitaries of Government agencies and departments, highlighted by a visit with the President of the United States. He met them at the White House and made a point of shaking every hand. Also welcoming the visitors were Vice President SPIRO AGNEW, Secretary of State William Rogers, Speaker of the House JOHN McCORMACK, Supreme Court Justice Byron White, Army Chief of Staff William Westmoreland, and FBI Director J. Edgar

Hoover, as well as numerous distinguished men and women in Government.

Members of the Hearst family personally supervised the stay in Washington. Mr. and Mrs. George Hearst have never missed being on hand for the program since its start in 1961. Mr. Randolph A. Hearst similarly takes a great interest in the overall effort which is under the direction of Ira P. Walsh whose original idea it was to make such an opportunity available to qualified contenders. Others responsible for the overall success of the indoctrination were Lt. Col. Robert E. Keener, of OSA-PA, who supervised the military escort officers, planned the Defense Department briefing and arranged for participation of musical groups from the various services which played at official functions; Mr. Stephen King, briefings officer of the Department of State, who arranged a top-level briefing by high Department officials, followed by a buffet luncheon in the Ben Franklin Room of the State Department, and many more representatives of governmental agencies and departments who lent their talents to the success of the program. We thank them all.

On behalf of the Senate, we are grateful to the Hearst Foundation for their generous contribution to education and encouragement to learning. We deeply appreciate the cooperation of our colleagues in the Senate and their staffs who made the delegates welcome.

I ask unanimous consent that the lists of students who participated, and their escort officers, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM, 1969—WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST FOUNDATION

ALABAMA

Judy Joy Hester, Russellville.
Stephen Turner Hardin, Helena.

ALASKA

Phillip Robert Wyman, Sitka.
Gerritt James VanKommer, Spenard.

ARIZONA

Nicholas John Sakis, Phoenix.
Barry Becker, Phoenix.

ARKANSAS

Robert Mitman Mason, Jr., Little Rock.
Russell B. Chitwood, Lake Village.

CALIFORNIA

Michael P. Woodard, Costa Mesa.
Esther L. Valadez, Baldwin Park.

COLORADO

Pamela Fitting, Denver.
James T. Burghardt, Littleton.

CONNECTICUT

John S. Carusone, Glastonbury.
Stephen L. Nightingale, Darien.

DELAWARE

Angelo J. Accetta, Dover.
Brenda Lynn Higdon, Townsend.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Patrica Marian Eanet, Washington.
William M. McNeil, Washington.

FLORIDA

Bernard Cheeseman, Tampa.
Jose Perez, Miami.

GEORGIA

Kenneth Lowell Shigley, Douglasville.
Melanie Thompson, Atlanta.

HAWAII

Bruce Seaman, Aiea.
Yvonne Yarber, Waianae.

IDAHO

John Sage, Naples.
Claudia Williams, Midvale.

ILLINOIS

Shelby Jean Hoover, Hettick.
Stanley Palder, Chicago.

INDIANA

Patricia Jane Purser, Jeffersonville.
Dean H. Robb, Hobart.

IOWA

Steven Dale Adams, Bettendorf.
Daniel Bookin, Ottumwa.

KANSAS

Gwen E. Adams, Osage City.
Jere LeRoy Totten, Jewell.

KENTUCKY

Benjamin Jones, Campbellsville.
Chris Horvay, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Peter K. Allain, Jeanerette.
Robert Daigle, Paincourtville.

MAINE

Lisbeth E. Shurman, Dexter.
Estelle R. Beauchesne, Biddeford.

MARYLAND

David Hankin, Baltimore.
Donna Hogans, Rock Hall.

MASSACHUSETTS

C. Robert DelTorchio, Magnolia.
Maureen Curley, Hudson.

MICHIGAN

Antonio Garcia, Farmington.
Lani June Chichester, Grand Rapids.

MINNESOTA

Eugene Richie, Winona.
William Marsh, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI

Gregory Lee Berry, Jackson.
David Palmer Jaqua, Meridian.

MISSOURI

Michael Sundermeyer, Raytown.
Burleigh Leonard, St. Louis.

MONTANA

Allan Karell, Ballantine.
Robert Brown, Great Falls.

NEBRASKA

William Bystrom, North Platte.
Tamara Gay Hathaway, Lincoln.

NEVADA

Charles Ross, Reno.
Jackie Hood, Elko.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bonnie B. Butler, Durham.
John W. Carr, East Kingston.

NEW JERSEY

Roderick G. Dorman, Mendham.
Kathleen M. Yaskiw, Clifton.

NEW MEXICO

Catherine A. Clark, Hobs.
Fred Raymond Vigil, Los Alamos.

NEW YORK

Paul F. Wendelglass, Rochester.
Susan Szurley, Whitesboro.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jeff Wood, Tobaccoville.
Vicky Gordon, Zebulon.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bradley W. Leben, Devils Lake.
Thomas Dahlstrom, Lisbon.

OHIO

Gregory F. Rose, Hamilton.
Dail Hollopeter, Wooster.

OKLAHOMA

Bruce D. Gaither, Tulsa.
Pamalyn Kay McEver, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

Reitha Jane Simpson, Newberg.
H. Hadley McCann, Klamath Falls.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph Anthony Gent, Franklin.
Leslie Anne Miller, Mechanicsburg.

RHODE ISLAND

Ann-Marie Harkins, Providence.
Stephen Paul Erickson, Middletown.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John Spearman, Summerville.
Jack Griffeth, Greenville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mary Patricia Bierle, Yankton.
Stephen Carl Hunt, Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Keith Lundin, Oak Ridge.
Wendell L. Hartzog, Memphis.

TEXAS

Marilyn Rueping, Beaumont.
Charles E. McCloud, Houston.

UTAH

John Harold Steed, Clearfield.
Karl Christian Rove, Salt Lake City.

VERMONT

Richard F. Pulling, Rutland.
Janet R. Houghton, Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Christopher Howard, Richmond.
Michael S. Wheeler, Blacksburg.

WASHINGTON

Elizabeth D. Lindsay, Spokane.
Robert A. Caplan, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

James R. Fleenor, Martinsburg.
Elizabeth Ann High, Fairmont.

WISCONSIN

Judith A. Wenzel, Marshfield.
Scott G. Swanson, Wausau.

WYOMING

Daniel Lee Wright, Wheatland.
Kandace Einbeck, Cheyenne.

ESCORT OFFICERS—1969 SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

U.S. NAVY

Senior escort officers

Lieutenant Commander Beverly F. Sheppard, USN, Office of the Chief of Information, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Lieutenant Raymond J. Kukulski, USN, Defense Atomic Support Agency, Washington, D.C.

Escort officers

Lieutenant (jg) Gunnar A. Askeland, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2716, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Ensign Donald L. Bach, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2735, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Ensign Nathan K. Harimoto, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 1836, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Ensign Wilfred P. Van Loben Sels, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2721, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Ensign Cecilia M. Brown, USNR, Naval Security Station, 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Ensign Rosemary L. Berner, USNR, Naval Air Systems Command Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Escort officers

First Lieutenant James P. Dusenbury, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

XUM

First Lieutenant Richard J. Muller, USMC, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant Robert W. Riordan, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant William B. Zimmerman, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant Lorraine M. Garcia, USMCR, Education Center (Language Branch), MCB, Quantico, Va.

Second Lieutenant Sandra Mahoney, USMCR, Marine Corps Exchange, MCB, Quantico, Va.

U.S. ARMY

Escort officers

First Lieutenant Charles W. Bowens, USA, Executive Officer, D Company, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

Second Lieutenant James F. Flint, USA, Assistant S–1, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

Second Lieutenant Ronald W. Frost, USA, Community Relations Officer, Headquarters, MDW, IO, Tempo B, 3800 Newark, NW., Washington, D.C.

Second Lieutenant David R. Holdridge, USA, Public Information Office, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

First Lieutenant Charlene C. Haas, USA, US Women's Army Corps Detachment, US Army Garrison, Fort George G. Meade, Md.

Second Lieutenant Sybil J. Lawless, USA, Headquarters Company, US Army WAC, Fort Myer, Va.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Escort officers

First Lieutenant Malkon C. Baboyian, USAF, 1001 Field Maintenance Squadron, Andrews AFB, Md.

Second Lieutenant Berry T. Cox, USAF, 1100 Support Group, Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

First Lieutenant Robert J. Hertler, USAF, 1001 Composite Wing, Andrews AFB, Md.

Second Lieutenant Michael F. Nealis, USAF, HQ COMD USAF (ODC), Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

First Lieutenant Cyrena M. Gilman, USAF, Malcolm Grow USAF Hospital, Andrews AFB, Md.

First Lieutenant Karen L. Miller, USAF, 1100 AB Wing, Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

THE CAMPUS DISORDERS SHOULD BRING SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I share the mounting concern of those who see the current force of anarchy and violence on America's campuses as a possible prelude to anarchy and violence in America's streets where, already, there is too much.

I share the mounting concern of those who see the current campus actions in the name of "freedom," "rights," and "progress" as an abuse of "freedom" and "rights" via the crude, rude, violent tactics of the savage.

I share the mounting concern of those who see the campus agitators and revolutionaries leading their minority followers in a massive, grotesque transgression of the "freedom," "rights," and "progress" of the majority.

In recent years, we have heard a lot of high-sounding oratory about how every American has the "right" to a college education. Personally, I have felt that every American had the right to the opportunity to gain a college education, if he wanted it, if he qualified with the prerequisites, and if he continued to qualify after gaining admission to an institution of higher education.

Ever since the current rash of nationwide campus disruption, violence, anarchy, and revolution began in 1963, I have found increasingly greater cause to ponder whether those whose "major" subject seems to be protest, have not confused their claimed "right" to education with "license" through which education must be achieved.

I have found increasingly greater cause to ponder whether these individuals who hop from claim to claim, charge to charge, cause to cause, complaint to complaint, protest and demonstration to protest and demonstration, disruption and violence to disruption and violence, have not foreclosed upon their claim to certain "rights," whether real or imagined.

Again and again, we see those who cry the loudest for "understanding," "liberality," and "respect" demonstrating little "understanding" of the subject against which they complain, illiberality toward anyone who seeks to rebut their argumentation, and a conduct which strongly suggests little respect for anyone, themselves included.

Again and again, we hear them cry for more and more financial aid from State and Federal Governments, even as they continue to reflect a conduct which suggests loyalty to neither echelon of government.

Again and again, we hear them cry for peace and love and unity even as they deliver warfare and hatred and division.

Again and again, we hear their shouts of abuse and obscenities against law and order and anything and everything representing and reflecting law and order; and, though their cries are raised in the name of a new order, we see within their ranks little semblance of anything but old disarray.

This, I believe, may strike at the heart of the problem which these young people, both malcontent and revolutionary, have foisted upon our society; for order is the essence of national and social establishment, survival, growth, and progress. Without order, there is no freedom, only anarchy. Without order, there is no tranquillity, only confusion. Without order, there is no progress, only retrogression. Yet, in this much proclaimed age of space and era of progress, we have seen, again and again, the components of our educational community delivering their institutions, their community, and this Nation back toward the age of stone and the era of the primative.

Some students have demonstrated greater interest in delivering their own personally opinionated undergraduate lectures and harangues on socio-political-ideological matters than in attending classes in accordance with their ostensible purpose: gaining an education in the field of their proclaimed choice. Worse, some students have demonstrated greater interest in substituting violence for academic reason in trying to impose their minority views, ultimata, and threats upon the institution and the majority of their fellow students.

Educational administrators have failed in their responsibility to protect the majority, and to protect law, order, and the academic process. By this failure, such administrators have betrayed the hundreds of thousands of earnest, law-abiding students whose right and desire to exist in the essential atmosphere of peace, and to gain their education, have been frustrated and violated by that rebel minority which has ordered strikes, seized classrooms and buildings, interrupted and closed classes, and intimidated, threatened and attacked those students who have chosen to dissent from their violent version of dissent.

By failing to invoke the most expeditious legitimate and legal remedy required for restoration of order and punishment of the guilty, such academic administrators have, in effect, cooperated in the coercion of serious students by the minority-led mob. In so doing, they have intensified the threat and damage suffered by the majority which, as an innocent third-party victim, has, in fact, been denied their right and means of prompt recourse.

It is time that, if those immediately responsible for infusing some old-fashioned American horse sense into this psychedelic nonsense continue unwilling or unable to do so, the Congress must have little choice but to do so. Congress has the responsibility to protect the Federal interest, represented by the gigantic investment of taxpayers' dollars in programs, grants and moneys which Congress, itself, has poured into such institutions. Congress also has the responsibility to protect the rights of the majority of students who are sincere in their efforts to obtain an education and abide by the lawful established processes within this Nation.

The young rebels make great pretense to demands that spokesmen for what they so derisively call, "the establishment," speak with candor, "tell it like it is."

Well, this is "like it is" as far as this Member of the Congress is concerned; let the young rebels, student and teacher alike, get it straight:

Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for even the indirect subsidization of a student nor a teacher who demonstrates disloyalty to this Nation, disobedience to its laws, violation of its order, contempt and animosity to the source of the subsidy, and transgression against the rights of the majority of the students.

In short, Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for even the indirect subsidization of a student or a teacher whose conduct, activities, demands, and threats default upon the very rights, freedoms, and opportunities to which they lay claim.

Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for academic institutions which permit such conduct and which, in doing so, foreclose upon their claimed objectives and upon their claims to congressional monetary consideration, support, and subsidization. These colleges and universities are chartered and accredited—as academic institutions; not as institutions which function to tolerate, encourage, and reward revolutionary and/or criminal conduct.

These colleges and universities are institutions of academic nature, character, interest, and pursuit; not institutions for political and criminal misconduct and asylum. Academic freedom does not extend to license to violate a specific nor implicit contract with the source of Federal funds. Academic freedom does not extend to license to violate and deny the rights of peaceful students or faculty.

Academic freedom does not extend to license to destroy the academy and, therefore, academic freedom.

I, for one, have no desire to infringe upon any freedom, including that seemingly ever-expanding condition known, a bit too loosely, as academic freedom. But I do believe, in light of what this Nation is now reaping from institution after institution into which multibillions of public moneys have been poured that, however reluctantly, the Congress of the United States is compelled to take a long look at what, precisely, its established procedure of "funding but not questioning" has really wrought.

The release of the text of the letter on the campus disorder problem which, on instructions of President Nixon, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch has dispatched to college and university administrators has only punctuated this fact; so has the release of President Nixon's own commentary thereon.

Clearly, the message of the Finch letter and the Nixon commentary is that, between the Government and the school administrators, neither the 1968 law nor the 1969 law which Congress passed in an extremely mild and highly restrictive effort to protect Federal interests has ever been invoked.

The 1968 law—section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968—specifies that if any student is convicted of a crime in a court, or if he has committed what his college or university regards as a "serious" violation of its own regulations, he is to be declared ineligible for 2 years to receive Federal scholarships or loans.

The 1969 law—section 411 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1969—specifies that any student convicted of a crime related to a campus disorder becomes ineligible to receive Federal loans and scholarships.

The 1968 law puts the burden of enforcement on the colleges and the universities; the initiative for enforcement of the 1969 law is thought to lie with the Federal Government—principally, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We are told that the Department's failure to enforce this rather simple, basic 1969 law is principally because the Department finds it difficult to know which students receive the funds it doles out for student loans and scholarships. The alibi for this is that, as a rule, these Federal funds for students are distributed to colleges and universities in lump sums, and the colleges and universities take command of the selection of the recipients.

This alibi is either a sorry admission of a woeful inadequacy, ineptitude, indolence, and incompetency on the part of academic administrators and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or it is a monumental insult to the intelligence of the Congress and the people.

It certainly suggests if nothing more, that, even though the Government people may be willing to enforce the law, the academic people are unwilling and, therefore, frustratingly uncooperative. For now, I shall pass the logical question: Why has the Government permitted this? To raise the more basic question: What else should we expect but this apparent unwillingness, if not refusal, of academic administrators to punish students convicted of lawbreaking as set forth in the 1969 law, when they have proved unwillingness, if not refusal, to punish students who break their own regulations as set forth by the 1968 law?

This failure, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the academic administrators to invoke these two simple, modest efforts to end, at least for a time, the Federal subsidization of no more than 1 percent of the students actually involved in campus disorders is, in reality, the most revealing and shocking aspect of the Finch letter and the Nixon commentary. It could be made no clearer if it were handed down in a special message to Congress. Certainly, the point is clear: Something even more basic, more simplistic, is required—not just to get the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare moving, but to relieve the academic administrators of what, to them, quite obviously, is the unhappy, perhaps impossible, burden of helping the Federal Government enforce the law. Furthermore, it is now admitted that, even if this pair of mild, bland laws had been enforced, the real problem of campus disorder would not have been ended, for they would have punished all too few of those responsible, and would have done so all too late, even without consideration of the time required for the modern appellate process.

I suggest, therefore, that the Congress give serious consideration to conducting something of an audit of its expenditures in the name of education and of the gains therefrom. There would be no better, more natural, opportunity for such an audit than any condition on any campus wherein the educational process to which the Congress has contributed taxpayers' moneys is disrupted and interrupted by disorder, building seizure, student and faculty strike and, certainly, violence.

As soon as such condition develops, I suggest that, within 5 days, all Federal funds already appropriated for that institution or any program therein be frozen, and remain frozen until that institution's administration restores law and order to that campus, if necessary, with the assistance of the full impact of whatever agency or agents of law and order are required; and, that accomplished, that said funds remain frozen until that administration prosecutes all violations of law, and submits to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a program which would fully assure that repetition will not occur.

I suggest further that any teacher or instructor or lecturer found guilty of violating any law in connection therewith shall forfeit all Federal subsidy, stipend, or payment of any kind from Federal sources.

Toward that end of establishment of commonsense, propriety and balance in taxpayer-supported educational institutions; toward that end of restoration of law and order; toward the end of protecting the rights of the majority of the students, and toward the end of putting some needed backbone into academic administrations, I will introduce legislation to provide such remedies.

DR. EDWIN MITCHELL, A LEADING RESIDENT OF NASHVILLE, TENN.

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the March issue of the Nashville magazine contains an excellent article about Dr. Edwin Mitchell, a leading resident of the city of Nashville. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. EDWIN MITCHELL: GENTLEMAN FROM THE GHETTO

(By Pat Harris)

On October 12, 1967—just a few weeks after North Nashville erupted into a riot—a slim, bespectacled doctor stood before some 400 people at a Chamber of Commerce breakfast meeting and called them "brave and unthinking men!" Dr. Edwin H. Mitchell, who walked the riot area in an attempt to avert the violence brewing along Jefferson Street and who was struck down by a hurled rock, had been asked by David K. Wilson, then president of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, to address the group.

His talk stunned an audience which included U.S. Rep. Richard Fulton and Metro's Mayor Beverly Briley, both seated at the speaker's table.

"Tall buildings," Dr. Mitchell told them, "which allow you to gaze out upon the green grass of suburbia cannot long shelter you from the desperate frustration and pettiness that continues to build around you."

Then he added:

"There is something wrong with a community that unites its government but divides its people."

Warning of "a giant step backward," he charged that their plans for a "forward Nashville" were a mockery in the midst of poverty that rings the city.

The Nashville Tennessean called Dr. Mitchell's talk "a broad indictment of both the private and public sector of local community leadership and thoughtless planning, wholesale job discrimination and inferior segregated housing patterns."

What manner of man stands up for his beliefs where it counts when he could so easily look the other way and enjoy his own personal success in life without becoming involved? In this instance, an almost self-effacing individual who sees nothing at all unusual about himself.

In his small office at Meharry Medical College is a sign:

"Before you ask, the answer is No!"

Actually, Dr. Mitchell finds it difficult to turn anyone down. His home phone, as well

XUM

as his office phone, rings with requests from people needing help, which keeps him a thoroughly busy man. In addition to his fulltime job as associate professor of radiology at Meharry, he is president of the Davidson County Independent Political Council and chairman of the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission.

Established by Metro Council in December of 1965, the Commission replaced Mayor Briley's bi-racial advisory committee on human relations launched in the spring of 1963. It was set up under an ordinance introduced by Councilman Z. Alexander Looby to investigate complaints of discrimination, recommend legislation and promote fair treatment of citizens. In 1966, Dr. Mitchell was elected the first chairman of the Commission. Its members are appointed by the mayor subject to council confirmation.

Dr. Mitchell's main interest, however, appears to be the Davidson County Independent Political Council, a group formed in 1962 to advance the rights of the Negro through political means. Within a short time, he was elected president succeeding State Senator Avon Williams.

"We formed the Council," he explains, "because the NAACP could not engage in political activity. A similar group in Shelby County approached us and asked us to become affiliated on a statewide basis with the Tennessee Voters Council. Then we enlarged to include eastern Tennessee."

During the political campaign of 1962, Attorney Looby ran for the State Supreme Court, was endorsed by the Council and polled well over 100,000 votes although he was defeated. "This really got us off the ground, however," says Dr. Mitchell. "And by the way, we don't zero in on race. We're an integrated effort addressing ourselves to the problem of poverty—and the problem of the Negro is inseparable from the poor of any group except that the black man has the additional problem of being black."

Specifically, what does Dr. Mitchell's Council want?

"We want to see minority representation in government at policymaking levels," he responds, "as well as in jobs throughout government. We want to be able to make our case before government and have some reasonable assurance that we're going to get an equitable hearing."

And he adds:

"I think we're making progress. I think people follow us because they trust our board. We ran an appeal to them. I believe that we have kept the faith with them."

Dr. Mitchell's background dictates no particular reason for becoming embroiled in civil rights. He had a middle class upbringing, he has utilized his intelligence to take advantage of opportunities available and, in the parlance of our age, he has "made it."

In short, he had nothing to gain in a material sense and a lot to lose two years ago when he went into the heart of the impending riot and tried to mediate the conflict. He still bears a scar on his back from the rock that struck him.

Born in Norfolk, Virginia, on December 21, 1921, he and his family moved to Yonkers, New York when he was five years old. His father had been working as a laborer at the Norfolk naval base and his mother was a teacher. In Yonkers, his father joined a brother in a small business which went bankrupt during the depression of the 'thirties, and then became a Pullman porter whose main run was to Buffalo and Sarasota. The elder Mitchell died in January of this year. Dr. Mitchell's mother has retired and now lives in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Mitchell grew up in what he describes as a "lower middle class neighborhood," attended public high school there, was a member of the National Honor Society and did a little daydreaming about becoming a doctor.

"I just didn't see how it would be possible financially for me to study medicine," he says.

Winning a scholarship to Brockport State Normal, Mitchell won his varsity letter in basketball his first year, then transferred to Albany State Teachers College in 1941. Once more he considered studying medicine—this time at the suggestions of both his coach and the school physician. And once more he decided he couldn't swing it financially.

"The draft was pending," he says, "so I went into the Army in August of 1942 in Chemical Warfare Service."

Mitchell was assigned to a replacement training depot at Camp Sibert in Gadsden, Alabama, where he taught illiterates and trained recruits. Rising to the rank of sergeant in 1943, he took exams for the Army Specialized Training Program and was transferred to basic engineering at Prairie View State College in Texas (near Houston) for three months. While there he took the army exams for pre-med training and in December entered Meharry Medical College.

During his sophomore year at Meharry, Dr. Mitchell received his honorable discharge from the Army, and in April of 1947 he was married to Noella Pajaud, a pretty young medical student from New Orleans. She was the only child of parents who had hoped she would continue in a small family business they operated and who were disappointed that she chose medicine instead. She had her choice of entering medical school at Howard University in Washington ("for some reason, my parents opposed the idea of my living in Washington"), Women's Medical School in Chicago ("I hated the idea of an all-woman school"), and Meharry.

Upon graduation in 1948, the couple interned together at Harlem Hospital in New York City where some of the grimmer facts of life among the poverty-stricken confronted them.

"At the time," he says, "we looked on it as real 'scut' work, but one of the most rewarding assignments we had was to ride ambulances. The things we saw were unbelievable. We went into Puerto Rican neighborhoods, for example, where coal bins and basements with no lights were rented to the poor. Bedrooms were partitioned off with sheets. There was hardly breathing space to be found."

In addition, the Mitchells had arrived in New York during one of the city's perennial garbage strikes and "my wife wasn't too impressed with garbage strewn all over."

After his interneship, Dr. Mitchell became director of out patient clinics at Sydenham Hospital and his wife joined the pediatrics clinical staff, where the two worked from July of 1949 until February of 1951.

Re-entering the Army (this time as a first lieutenant), Dr. Mitchell was sent to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas, for medical officer training. When he was transferred to Fort Jackson in Columbia, South Carolina, his wife joined him along with their two small daughters, Tresa, who was born December 27, 1947, and Cheryl, born December 20, 1950. After six months there, he was sent to Japan. His wife elected to remain in Columbia where she almost casually managed to combine the rigorous duties of motherhood with those of physician.

"One of the doctors went on a three-month fellowship," she says, "and I handled his medical practice. After he returned, I opened my own office. It was great! I enjoyed it!"

Mrs. Mitchell's subsequent retirement from the practice of medicine was not just because of the demands of her growing family.

"There was a sort of personal disillusionment involved," she says. "I have never been impressed with the growing isolation of the doctor from the patient."

After his Army stint, Dr. Mitchell and his wife opened a joint medical practice in Camden, South Carolina, until 1956 when they returned to Nashville where he took specialty training in radiology at Meharry. By that time, the family numbered two more children—Edwin, Jr., born April 22, 1954 (the only member of the family whose birthday does not fall in December), and Kathryn, born December 7, 1958. Mrs. Mitchell's birthday is December 25.

Upon completion of his course, during which he was a National Institutes of Health trainee, Dr. Mitchell became a Commonwealth Fellow in radiology at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center in New York in 1959. Returning to Nashville in July of 1960, Dr. Mitchell joined the staff of Meharry as assistant professor of radiology.

He teaches a formal course in radiology, reads X-rays and treats patients. The school has a training program for residents and a school of X-ray technology plus year-round student electives. Add to this the inter-departmental conferences and the obligations of staff membership committees and administrative functions, and Dr. Mitchell has little free time. What he has is often spent reading books and articles on sociology and politics.

He gives the impression of being a thoughtful person who is not only attempting to define the problems of his race but is also seeking practical solutions—without too much hope of success in his lifetime. Expressing his view of "black power," he asks:

"Black or white—why does the adjective make it different? I think that it implies the inconvenience of not having all that cheap labor, which is frightening to some people."

He also thinks that black power is "an effort to express the realization that the black man has a heritage of which he can be proud and to try to create out of this a positive force for correcting the inequities which the black man has suffered."

Hardly a week goes by, he says, that he does not get a phone call from somebody with job problems or difficulties relocating because of urban renewal or highway projects. He says he gets frequent calls, also, alleging abuse by the police. Such calls he refers to the Human Relations Commission for follow through.

The Mitchell family is pretty firmly settled down now after all their moving around. Tresa, a senior at Fisk University, is interested in entomology. Cheryl is a freshman there and her interests are divided between psychiatric social work and writing. Edwin is a ninth grader at Father Ryan and Kathryn is in the fifth grade at St. Vincent de Paul.

They live at 2403 Underwood in North Nashville. Mrs. Mitchell, who is as outgoing and impulsive as her husband is quiet, directs an Opportunities Industrialization Center office on Jefferson Street not far from Meharry. Almost every day the Doctors Mitchell meet for lunch at their home.

On one such day, he was forced to interrupt his lunch to confer with a plumber in the front yard investigating a large leak in a water pipe. Several blocks away, the sounds of construction work on Interstate 40 punctuated the air.

"He's generally rather shy," she said while he was gone.

"But one thing about that type—when they do get mad, you really listen!"

Although different in personality, Dr. Mitchell and his wife are much alike in intellect, humor and sensitivity. And they are both firm in their commitment to justice and equality of opportunity for all, no matter what the personal cost. Flight to the more affluent suburbs does not interest them.

They have added two bedrooms to their original three-bedroom house and have acquired a couple of collie dogs. And in Dr. Mitchell's words, "It looks like we've added a swimming pool, too."

Standing in the front yard surveying the gaping hole in which muddy water was bubbling up from the broken pipe, he explained that the plumber had told him the damage was caused by the blasting on Interstate 40. Then he added succinctly:

"Progress!"

As his wife described Dr. Mitchell, he is "a very quiet and gentle person, and sometimes people mistake his gentleness for no firm conviction . . . and they couldn't be more wrong."

TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS ROWE

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we recently received the sad news that another of Idaho's finest young men, Douglas Rowe, of Blackfoot, Idaho, has lost his life in Vietnam. This is another grim reminder of the tragedy of the war and of the urgent necessity to give the highest national priority to our efforts to bring the war to an end and to build an enduring world peace.

In an eloquent tribute to Pfc. Douglas Rowe, one of Idaho's most distinguished editors, Mr. Drury Brown, of the Blackfoot News, has raised some questions that are deserving of answers. I include Mr. Brown's editorial as a part of my remarks:

PRIVATE DOUGLAS ROWE DIES

(By Drury Brown)

Word was received by his parents yesterday that on March 9, 1969, Private First Class Douglas Noel Rowe died in battle in Vietnam. The notification did not reveal the place of his death. Neither was it revealed when his body may be returned to Idaho.

Private Rowe was born Nov. 13, 1946 in Rupert, Idaho. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Noel F. Rowe, 706 South Fourth Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho. He is survived by his parents; by two brothers; Alvin Rowe, Washington, D.C., and Airman First Class Steven Rowe, now stationed in Thailand, and by a sister, Elaine, Pocatello.

Private Rowe attended school in Blackfoot, graduating from Blackfoot High School with the Class of 1965, and thereafter attended Idaho State University, Pocatello, for two years.

He was a member of The First Baptist Church of Blackfoot. Time of funeral services cannot be established until the family has been notified by the Army when his body will be returned. But it is announced by his parents that the funeral will be held in The First Baptist Church of Pocatello and burial in the Blackfoot City Cemetery.

This is the sort of simple war statistic that has appeared thousands of times in American newspapers since the beginning of our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

But Doug Rowe is much more than a war statistic. Doug is the little boy grown to man. He is the son and brother who, through his entire lifetime, was a source of extreme pride to his family. He was intelligent and fun-loving yet always unassuming. He was clean-cut and fastidious. He was the thoughtful and dependable boy that carried a newspaper route. In so doing, he won the affection and esteem of the people to whom he delivered the newspaper. He was the young man who for four years worked part time in the office of the Blackfoot News and who was mature and competent enough in his last summer of employment to act as its circulation manager.

He was the talented guitar player who with Nancy Edison, Julie Hutchings and Joe Evans, made up one of the most entertaining and delightful singing groups ever formed in Blackfoot High School.

Doug Rowe became one of the group of young American men who were unable to plan their careers because conscription to military service was hanging over their heads. Doug thought the war in Vietnam was wrong—that it was a waste of the nation's energy and resources—he believed that most of the people in the little nation of Vietnam wished that we had not come there and that we would leave—that it was immoral for us to be fighting there.

With such thoughts in mind, perhaps it was natural that Doug found it impossible to finish his college work while waiting for the draft to reach him. He dropped out of school and, while waiting, he took a job selling encyclopedias in Torrance, Calif. He reported to his family that he had met with startling success in the field of selling—that such would be the career he would pursue when his service to his country was completed.

He received his draft call in August, 1968.

In one of the last letters received by his family from Doug in Vietnam, he wrote that he had just returned from a 10-day military operation in the jungle. During that period there had been no time to bathe, shave nor change clothing.

Doug's family had every reason to be proud of him in life. They may find little solace in the assurance of military authorities that their son and brother died in Vietnam as a hero, nor in the flying of the flag over Blackfoot High School at halfmast the day that he will be buried. We can grieve with them as we remember there was every reason to think he could have made a very real contribution to his world.

There are many of us who knew Doug Rowe who believe, as he did, that the war in Vietnam is a tragic mistake into which the nation was dragged by an ill-conceived foreign policy.

Perhaps the greatest tribute such of us could pay to his memory is to demand without ceasing that the old men who make wars in which young men fight and die shall cease dragging their feet in the pursuit of the peace to which they say they are committed, and that saving the lives of both American and Asian boys has a much higher priority than saving the faces of political and military leaders.

THE DRUG PROBLEM

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the shocking testimony before the Senate District Committee concerning the use of narcotics in Washington, D.C., should be thoroughly examined for the variety of implications to be found within the contentions of the witnesses. The growth of dope traffic and addiction in the Nation's Capital is one example of an escalating trend across the United States. If the pattern in Washington is an indication of what is happening in other areas of the country, our young people are the foremost victims of the fast spread of drug abuse.

Of particular importance, I think, is the identification of the ultimate source of the narcotics traffic in Washington. Supplies are shipped into the metropolitan area by organized crime wholesalers in New York. We know that past evidence shows that organized crime is trafficking drugs into all other sections of the country. The crime syndicates take substantial profit from the narcotics trade that conservative estimates indicate amounts to more than $350 million annually.

While the thought of vast sums of illicit money going into the pockets of racketeers as a result of dope distribution, is disturbing the effects on society wrought by criminal promotion of addiction are appalling. The Washington situation points out that ghetto youths are becoming addicts in junior high school. These children are being pushed into a habit that ranges in cost from $50 to $200 a day. Since they come from the most economically deprived families imaginable, it is obvious that they must turn to crime for the money to support their use of drugs.

Dope pushing, prostitution, armed robbery, shoplifting and any other criminal means of obtaining dollars for drugs are resorted to by young people who have fallen into the narcotics habit. They therefore become pawns for racketeers who use young addicts to service many aspects of big crime operations.

While we must not ignore the tragedy of the drug problem among middle- and upper-class youths and must resolve to combat the narcotics traffic on all fronts, the indications that great numbers of ghetto youths are turning to drugs should be particularly alarming to the Congress. We have established as a national priority aid to disadvantaged people within our inner cities. Yet, no financial help we could possibly afford to appropriate could meet the needs of a generation hooked on hard drugs. Perhaps, our priority has been aimed in the wrong direction. The Washington example convinces me that we have not done nearly enough to stem the ravages of criminal activity which prey daily on our citizens in the ghetto.

INQUIRY WELCOMED

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is looking into the rising costs of lumber and plywood and the effect of high prices on the Nation's housing program, it is gratifying to see a newspaper give its wholehearted support to this important investigation. The Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard recently outlined some of the problems and suggested possible solutions which might be considered by the Congress.

I commend this responsible editorial to my colleagues as a fair and definitive explanation of the problems of the forest products industry:

INQUIRY WELCOMED

Leaders in most industries cringe and complain when the government launches investigations to determine why product prices are going up. But lumber and plywood industry manufacturers are responding most enthusiastically to the inquiry President Nixon has ordered to identify reasons their prices are zooming.

This is no put-on. Lumber and plywood mill operators are delighted to have this chance to prove long-ignored contentions that government actions have caused imbalance between their raw material supplies and their market opportunities. They want the nation, and especially the Congress, to know why plywood prices have skyrocketed 92 per cent in the past year and why Douglas fir lumber items have been marked up some 30 per cent.

These manufacturers are anxious to have President Nixon's Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy prying into their cost-price affairs. They hope a committee task force will recommend that executive and legislative branches of the federal government act to: 1. facilitate harvesting of more ripe timber from federally owned forests, thus dampening mills' raw material costs, and; 2. promote more even year-to-year building construction rates, thus reducing wild fluctuations in demand for lumber and plywood and permitting more efficient operation of their mills.

Forest product industry leaders see possibilities of profit opportunities that, in the long run, will be better than they've enjoyed in alternating periods of light and heavy demand for their products. They are quite aware that high prices on lumber and plywood will induce the construction industry to use less expensive substitute materials wherever possible.

So there's really no mystery about the lumber and plywood manufacturers' response to the investigation being made of their prices. They figure this can only lead to full disclosure of log supply cost problems and of the effects of feast-or-famine demand cycles in marketing their finished wares. As they see it, Uncle Sam should understand that he can promote lower lumber and plywood prices by permitting more realistic utilization of the tremendous tree farms he controls and by fostering greater steadiness in national building rates.

FIFTY YEARS FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1969, will be marked nationwide by observances of the golden anniversary of the American Legion.

In my home county of Suffolk in New York State the golden anniversary will be celebrated by a series of events.

Outstanding Legionnaires of our county, led by Committee Chairman James Heneghan and county Commander Joseph J. Stinsman, will organize the golden anniversary celebrations.

A convention parade will be held in Patchogue, N.Y., on June 13–14, with gaily decorated floats depicting all phases of American Legion programs and activities.

The golden anniversary observances will culminate in a memorial presentation to Suffolk County on Veterans Day—November 11, 1969.

The memorial will consist of 10 trees to be planted on the site of the county seat. Each tree will be in tribute to the memory of those citizens of our 10 towns who have given their lives for our great country in her military service.

The Legionnaires of Suffolk are to be complimented for their observance of the golden anniversary in this memorable manner, and they are to be congratulated and honored for their great and lasting contributions to our community, State, and Nation.

AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY: NEW HOPE

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, Mr. Edward M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, spoke before the annual meeting of the Western Shipbuilding Association in San Francisco. On that occasion, Mr. Hood took particular note of the change in the administration, and based upon earlier statements of the President concerning the deterioration in our maritime posture—a factor well known and appreciated by most Members of Congress—he expressed an optimism or new hope for the future of the American maritime industry.

I join with Mr. Hood in looking to the future somewhat optimistically with the view that we in the Congress may be able to act in greater consonance with the current administration than has been the case in the past. I would only point out, however, that the monumental task of bringing about a resurgence in our maritime posture cannot be accomplished by the Government alone.

On October 11, 1968, I addressed the 42d annual convention of the Propeller Club in St. Louis, Mo. Like Mr. Hood, I, too, referred to the statements concerning our maritime posture made by now President Nixon, and specifically the following comment that "the time has come for new departures, new solutions, and a new vitality for American ships and American crews on the high seas of the world."

A similar note was struck by the President in the issuance of his recently executed proclamation setting aside May 22d as National Maritime Day 1969, when he observed the following:

> Through the cooperation of business, labor and Government, and with prudent use of advancing technology, the American Merchant Marine must become capable of providing modern, productive service to the Nation's commerce as an integral part of transportation.

It is in this spirit of recognition of necessary action to restore the preeminence of the United States upon the high seas that I insert the following remarks made by Mr. Hood on January 31 for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Let me begin by expressing again the appreciation of the Shipbuilders Council of America for the endeavors of the Western Shipbuilding Association, in 1968 and earlier years, to improve the environment for shipbuilding and ship repairing not only on the Pacific Coast but in other sections of the country. On problems and issues of common interest a special spirit of harmony has developed between us, and I look forward to a continuance of this cooperation as a new era in American history unfolds.

As a change in political administration takes place in Washington, D.C., there is inevitably much conjecture as to the tone of government that will evolve. There is considerable speculation as to the direction Federal policies and programs will from henceforth take. The establishment of priorities, the extent to which emphasis is applied to areas of critical need, and the structure of the policy-making processes will thus be followed with more than casual interest by most citizens, including those of us in this audience and elsewhere who derive their livelihoods, either directly or indirectly, from shipyard activities.

Few Presidents of the United States have entered The White House with a detailed exposition of their thinking with regard to shipbuilding already contained on the public record. But President Nixon has! His positions on maritime and naval affairs were rather extensively defined in statements released during the 1968 campaign on September 24 and October 25 respectively.

In these appeals to the American people, President Nixon pledged his efforts to these two important objectives, among others: the constant availability of a United States Navy second to none and the prompt restoration of the United States as a first-rate maritime power.

He also called for: a higher level of coordination between naval and merchant shipbuilding to create a climate in which shipyards cans attract investment capital and retain stable labor forces . . . better use of credit facilities, amortization procedures and long-term government cargo commitments to stimulate U.S. shipbuilding . . . and tax incentives and cargo assistance for domestic shipping operations. In addition, he promised support for a domestic shipbuilding program to produce a fleet of American-flag merchant ships capable of carrying 30 percent of the nation's trade and commerce instead of the present 5 percent. And, he urged vigorous research and development programs to harness the latest technology to the needs of the maritime fleet.

Throughout history, unusual circumstances have often frustrated good intentions, but more frequently lofty aspirations have been fruitful. If our new President can achieve the goals I have just summarized, he will have succeeded in an area where his immediate predecessors have been eminently unsuccessful. Though there is much optimism favoring full achievement, even partial accomplishment will result in a greater magnitude of naval and merchant shipbuilding than has been the case during the past eight years.

The optimism to which I have referred is not the hand-rubbing, gleeful variety; it stems from the solemn hope that the priorities and policies of the new Administration will, at long last, take into account a very grave condition. The ships in our naval fleet . . . the ships in our oceangoing merchant fleet have grown older and older; our fishing fleet, our Great Lakes fleet and our domestic shipping fleet are plagued with antiquity; in short, our shipbuilding effort has not been equal to overcoming the reality of galloping obsolescence.

While successive national Administrations, over the last decade, have dealt with this obsolescence problem only minimally, it is generally believed that the point of further expediency has long since passed and that further procrastination in the reconstruction of U.S. sea power resources could endanger the national security. Many pages of Congressional testimony and several authoritative reports put this danger in the context of the Soviet Union's growing strength on the oceans and sound the alarm "loud and clear."

The emergence of communist sea power has graphically defined—and demonstrated—the role and importance of ships as functions of domestic and international policy. Since the end of World War II, however, the Soviet Union and the United States have viewed the role and importance in spectacularly different ways. A national purpose of fixed determination to move ahead has prevailed in Russia. Conversely, to this point, the United States has had schizophrenia as to what our overall posture on the oceans should be.

In the last decade, the Russians have advanced to a position of sea power strength from which the interests of the United States and the entire Free World can now very definitely be challenged. As Russia has moved ahead, the United States has dropped from first to fifth position as a maritime power; as a shipbuilding power we have dropped from first to ninth position; and the Soviet Navy is presently second only to that of the United States. In the vacuum created by American lethargy and the retreat of the British Navy on all fronts, the Kremlin obviously hopes to use the oceans for exploitation of Soviet geopolitical objectives.

The Russians have been building many more merchant ships than we have. At mid-1968, they were constructing 448 ships compared to our 58. There are other startling statistics; for the past several years new ship deliveries to the Russian merchant fleet have outpaced U.S. deliveries by a ratio of nearly 8 to 1 . . . about 80 percent of the Soviet shipping fleet today is less than 10 years of age, while approximately 80 percent of the American merchant marine is 20 years of age or older . . . in the past 20 years, more than 1,000 ships have been added to the Russian merchant marine, while in the same period our shipping fleet has contracted by about 1,000 vessels . . . 58 percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy are at least 20 years of age and less than one percent of the Soviet Navy's surface combatant ships and submarines are 20 years old or older.

While the Russians have been putting together a formidable merchant marine and naval force, which in the words of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, represents a "threat to the United States' supremacy at sea," those responsible for our maritime policy have seemingly been oblivious to all that has been taking place.

There have, in the past four years, been those in high Government posts who have regularly downgraded the aggressive, steadily expanding, buildup of Russian strength on the oceans. There have been those, in high places, who have invoked the hallucination that the United States—and the Free World—have nothing to fear from the Russians on the high seas. They have derided the supposition that the Soviets have any ulterior motives of using sea power to enhance foreign policy objectives or to support psychological, political and economic warfare.

Last September, here on the West Coast, in Seattle, President Nixon deplored, in his words, this "shocking de-emphasis on our national maritime efforts" and added "if we permit this decay to continue we will find that we have abdicated our maritime position to none other than the Soviet Union." In that same statement, he also had this to say:

"To overcome the present maritime crises, I recognize that we have an opportunity and an obligation to reverse the gross deficiencies that have marked the present (Johnson) administration's performance in this field.

". . . the leadership for national policy can and will come from a new Administration."

Compared with the litany of the Johnson years, these are refreshing words. They would seem to constitute a more favorable prospect for a more constructive and comprehensive approach to the nation's maritime and naval shipbuilding needs than has heretofore prevailed.

These needs, I have emphasized from the standpoint of programs coming within the purview of the Nixon Administration. But, there are other non-government requirements for ships which could quickly multiply. For example, the discovery of oil on the North Slope of Alaska will require a means of waterborne transportation not only to move equipment and supplies to Alaska but to haul crude oil from Alaska to West Coast or East Coast refineries. This could involve barges as well as tankers. Estimates range to as many as 50 large size oceangoing tankers to service this new oil field. Some of these could no doubt be built on the West Coast, and many, once in operation, would surely be repaired and overhauled by shipyards represented in the membership of the Western Shipbuilding Association. And, this activity could portend a revival of many coastal and intercoastal trades and a restructuring of traditional patterns in the movement of oil.

By any scale of measurement, the prospective work volume from governmental as well as commercial sources could well place U.S. shipbuilding on the brink of unprecedented growth. Translation of President Nixon's objectives into action programs could result in the greatest peacetime shipbuilding effort under Federal auspices the nation has ever seen, presenting vast new challenges for our shipyards. It could shape an entirely new environment for the procurement of ships in which manpower, facilities and productivity will be crucial in the cost equation.

Fortunately, every major shipyard in the United States is "gearing up" for this prospect. Through management skills, capital improvements, new techniques and cost reductions, a significant renaissance in U.S. shipbuilding is taking place. It holds great promise for the future in terms of work stability, employment for craftsmen and shipyard profits, and more dramatically, as an expression of declared national intention that the aspirations of free men and women everywhere will not be subjugated de facto through Soviet expansionism on the seas.

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN PUERTO RICO

HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, the 22d day of March 1873, was one of jubilant celebration in Puerto Rico, then a colony of Spain. On that day—after decades of tireless efforts on the part of Puerto Rican patriots such as Dr. Ramón Emeterio Betances, lawyer Segundo Ruiz Belvis, and newspaperman Julio Vizcarrondo Coronado, who had the valuable cooperation of his American wife Harriet Brewster—the abolition of slavery was proclaimed, and some 29,000 human beings were freed from their pitiful condition of servitude. In San Juan, the capital city, and other island towns, people rejoiced in parks, streets, market places, and churches, with since demonstrations that lasted well into the evening.

There was good reason to be happy. The institution of slavery, which dated back to July 22, 1513, when it was made legal by royal decree of King Ferdinand, was only adopted as an urgent measure to provide a working force in a rapidly sinking economy, but along the years it had become truly repugnant to the Puerto Ricans.

By the middle of the 19th century there was already a general feeling against the inhuman practice which made some men the property of others, and a secret abolitionist society was organized to buy and liberate the newly born children of slaves at $25 each. This was followed by proposals submitted to the Spanish Cortes for the elimination of slavery, with or without any idemnity.

In a rapidly changing society, Puerto Rico was anxious to follow the liberal currents born of the French Revolution a few decades before; but what really triggered some positive action was the Emancipation Proclamation, signed January 1, 1863, by the martyred President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.

Puerto Rican leaders met in Madrid and talked to ministers, legislators, newspapermen, lectured in literary clubs, moved public opinion in every possible way to no avail. They were praised for their efforts, but officialdom was slow to move.

It took the military coup which dethroned Queen Isabella in 1869, and the proclamation of the Spanish Republic in February 11, 1873, to change apathy into action, and turn indifference into sympathy. The new National Assembly of Spain finally passed, by an almost unanimous vote, the Abolition Act of which all Puerto Ricans are justly proud.

On March 30, 1873, a solemn high Mass was held at the San Juan Cathedral, and in a balcony speech delivered to the crowd in front of the Fortaleza—Governor's mansion—Governor Martinez Plowes said:

> This date will be engraved on our hearts with love and gratitude . . . to celebrate the moment when . . . Puerto Rico entered fully into Christian civilization.

BIG SKY VISTA REFLECTS "CAVEAT EMPTOR"

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker—

> We must make sure that every family in America lives in a home of dignity and a neighborhood of pride and a community of opportunity and a city of promise and hope.

These words of President Johnson should instill hope, should foster confidence, and should encourage determination in the people across this land seeking to own or at least rent suitable and adequate living quarters. But there is a small community in my State of Montana where hope, confidence, and determination have all but dwindled. These people have run headlong into the quicksand of bureaucratic ineptness. It is time that their story is told so that others may not follow this bleak trail. Especially must it be told to my colleagues so that when I ask your help, you will be aware of the magnitude of this tragedy.

Some six families purchased homes in a subdivision called Big Sky Vista near Vaughn, Mont., in the spring of 1965. This was subsequent to the great Sun River floods of 1964, when this area was

XUM

inundated. Because of the emergency prevailing then they were eligible for Small Business Administration loans. The Federal Housing Administration inspected the houses. The FHA reported that the houses and the "life-systems" of the homes were adequate. Subsequently, the sewers, foundations, and the house structures have deteriorated to such an extent that it is questionable whether the occupants should remain in the development.

Where do these people go for help? First they approached the FHA and the SBA people. Both agencies absolved themselves of responsibility and extended their regrets. For the past several months, I have worked with Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF in an attempt to help these people. We, too, have been rebuffed by a bureaucratic brick wall. But we are determined to achieve justice, and I do not admit defeat in presenting this expose, as I mentioned previously this story must be told so that others will not walk into the same pitfalls.

Unless one of these two agencies—the Federal Housing Administration or the Small Business Administration—assumes responsibility, it is my intention to direct these homeowners to legal recourse. The demon of "Caveat Emptor"—"Buyer Beware" does not belong in this day. It cannot be tolerated, particularly not in a transaction involving a citizen and his government. The commercial codes of most States have placed the burden on the seller who is more knowledgeable about his product. Tht seller's "puffing" cannot be the buyer's deflation. I sincerely hope that the FHA, especially, will exercise more discretion in the future when evaluating housing projects, and that it will accept its responsibility when tragedies like Big Sky Vista happen.

A POLITICAL ERA DIES

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week in New Orleans a political era died. Judge Leander H. Perez, Sr., long recognized as one of the most brilliant political leaders in this Nation, passed to his eternal rewards. At the time of his death I issued the following statement:

STATEMENT BY HÉBERT

U.S. Representative F. Edw. Hébert, who is recuperating from eye surgery at Hotel Dieu, issued the following statement upon learning of the death of Judge Leander Perez:

"Another great American now belongs to the ages. For over 30 years Judge Perez has been my political and personal friend. It has been an association of which I have been proud and never hesitated to boast. He was a man in whom there was unlimited determination and a fiery tenacity for the things in which he believed. He asked no quarter and gave no quarter. Even those who did not understand him were compelled to respect him. I was one of those privileged to have known his many sides and facets. No matter by what name he was called or how he was described by either enemy or friend, he loved the people who loved him and they did love him. He brought into a community a loyalty and a devotion, a duty and a service that is seldom found anywhere.

He leaves many monuments and he leaves a memory of a man who contributed to his community and built it up into a great family. He hands the torch to two sons in whom he was justly proud. The memory of Judge Perez must be a fuel that keeps that torch lighted and I am sure his people will renew their determination to continue his work which he outlined for them and to carry out his plans which he had for Plaquemines Parish.

He was the most model family man I have ever known, a devoted husband, a tender father and an enthusiastic grandfather. There is no doubt that the death of Mrs. Perez left a void in his life which has never and could never be filled.

There were those who did not agree with him but there were none who denied his capacity and ability. There were those who fought him but there were none who did not respect the valor of his shield. There were those who attempted to thwart him in what he believed to be right but there were none to whom he ever surrendered.

I consider his loss indeed a most personal loss for I have lost one of the dearest and best friends I ever had.

Not only I, but everyone, friend and foe, will miss him. As I so often said in his lifetime and again say on his death, he was the "noblest Roman of them all."

For a more graphic and vivid description of Judge Perez and his eventful life, I urge you to read the following article written by Clarence Doucet, one of the New Orleans Times-Picayune's promising young writers who, in this piece, has done a serviceable job and has captured the tone of the moment:

LEANDER PEREZ RETURNS TO WIFE'S SIDE AT IDLEWILD: CASKET BROUGHT TO FINAL RESTING PLACE

(By Clarence Doucet)

Leander H. Perez Sr. returned to Idlewild Friday to the side of his wife.

There, amid surroundings reminiscent of the gracious plantation life of the Old South, his rose-covered casket was brought to its final resting place in the family mausoleum.

Several hundred friends and associates lined the 150-foot stone walk leading from the Perez home to the mausoleum as the final prayers for the dead were recited by a Catholic priest, and as holy water and incense were sprinkled on the casket.

A fiery advocate of segregation and states rights and the political chieftain of Plaquemines Parish for nearly half a century, the 77-year-old Perez died of a heart attack Wednesday night, a few days after having been released from a hospital after suffering another heart attack earlier this year.

RELIGIOUS RITES

The services at Idlewild, the Perez family ranch located about three miles below Belle Chasse, were preceded by religious services in the Holy Name of Jesus Church on the Loyola University campus.

Although he was excommunicated from the Catholic Church in the early 1960s because of his vocal opposition to the integration of Catholic schools, it was disclosed Thursday that some 18 months ago Mr. Perez had reached a reconciliation with the church and that he had been receiving the sacraments since that reconciliation.

Holy Name of Jesus Church, with a seating capacity of nearly 1,000, was packed to overflowing with family, friends, political dignitaries, and a handful of curious.

Among the dignitaries paying their last respects were former Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama; Gov. John Bell Williams of Mississippi; Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, U.S. Sen. James O. Eastland, D-Miss.; Louisiana Lt. Gov. C. C. "Taddy" Aycock; Associate Justice Tom Brady of the Mississippi Supreme Court; Louisiana Appeals Court Judge Louis Yarrut; former Louisiana adjutant general Raymond F. Hufft; scores of state representatives and senators and virtually every public official from both Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes.

Gov. McKeithen was not at the funeral home, the House of Bultman, or at the church, but he did attend the services at Idlewild.

OTHERS PRESENT

But it was not dignitaries alone who filled the church. College students, many carrying books, could be seen among the hundreds of persons paying their last respects, and one taxicab driver, after dropping off his fare (who was attending the funeral Mass) said that he, too, was going to church. He locked the doors of the taxicab and made his way inside.

The funeral procession from the House of Bultman to the church was composed of more than 200 automobiles that followed the black hearse which carried the silver casket along St. Charles Ave.

At the funeral home, a group of children from the Prytania Private School entered in procession carrying a heart-shaped flower display of red and white carnations.

A short set of prayers was recited there before the casket was closed and the covering of roses placed over it.

St. Bernard Parish motorcycles led the police escort from the House of Bultman to the church. They were followed by motorcycles from the city and state police.

The casket was rolled to the steps of the church, and there the grandchildren of Mr. Perez took their places on each side to serve as pallbearers.

WALKING BEHIND CASKET

Walking directly behind the casket were Mr. Perez' two sons, Leander H. Perez Jr., the district attorney of Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes, and Chalin O. Perez, who took over as president of the Plaquemines Commission Council when his father stepped down, and his two daughters, Mrs. J. Douglas Eustis and Mrs. Richard J. Carrere.

Former Gov. Wallace, for whom Mr. Perez had campaigned in his race for the presidency last year, followed them into church with a contingent of other Alabamians.

Celebrant of the Mass was the Rev. Peter Boerding of St. Thomas Church in Pointe a la Hache. He was assisted by the Rev. Stanley Goote of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Belle Chasse. Both priests also officiated at the services at Idlewild.

The casket was carried to the front of the church with three lighted candles on each side and a crucifix on a stand behind it.

"We humbly pray," said Father Boerding as the services began, "You . . . do not hand him over to the powers of evil but command his soul to be taken up by the Holy Angels."

Preceding the Mass Father Boerding recited the traditional prayers before the casket.

READS FROM JOHN

During the Gospel, he read from John who tells of Martha's conversation with Jesus, whom Jesus told: "He who believes in Me, even if he die, will come to Me."

Frequently during the Mass, Father Boerding intoned: "Hear us, Oh Lord . . . answer our prayers for Leander," and "O, Lord, listen to our prayers for Leander."

At the Offertory, he asked God to "deliver the souls of the departed from the pains of hell," and later added, "O Lord, be merciful and grant them eternal rest."

The funeral Mass was concluded at approximately 11 a.m., and by 11:05 a.m. the church bells were rung, signifying that the body was leaving the church.

The procession arrived at Idlewild shortly before 11:30 a.m., and again the casket was removed from the hearse and carried to the brick mausoleum.

VIRTUAL SILENCE

Except for the rustle of leaves, caused as the hundreds of friends followed the procession to the mausoleum, walking alongside the stone path, there was virtual silence.

Father Boerding, sprinkling the casket with holy water, said of Mr. Perez: "God has taken him to Himself from the trials of this world," and he again prayed that God would not punish the deceased for his deeds, but, rather, "make him a companion of Your saints," and "grant to him everlasting rest and happiness."

He then led the mourners in the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary for Mr. Perez, and these prayers were then recited again for those persons who will die in the future.

The simple ceremony concluded, the casket was then moved into the brick mausoleum and placed in the open crypt alongside the crypt in which rests the body of Mrs. Perez.

BUILT MAUSOLEUM

Mr. Perez built the mausoleum only a few months after the death of his wife in 1967. He confided to friends that her burial place was "too far away from home."

It sits amid a grove of giant live oak trees draped with Spanish moss. Two magnolias grace the front of the mausoleum, and four white columns adorn the facility built in an architectural style that complements the rambling red brick Perez home.

A close friend of the late Mr. Perez said a day seldom passed after the body of Mrs. Perez was placed in the mausoleum that "The Judge," as he was known to his many associates, did not visit the serene resting place of his wife, and upon leaving show visible signs of his bereavement.

Near the mausoleum is the white frame building in which Mr. and Mrs. Perez spent their weekends over several years prior to the construction of the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge. It was after the bridge was constructed that Mr. Perez built the impressive home he called Idlewild.

His close friend said the serenity of the spacious Perez ranch was a great joy to both Mr. Perez and his wife.

And it is there, in the land they both loved so well, that they are again by each other's side.

In life Mr. Perez had many admirers and many detractors, but in death, as the priest reminded, it is God alone who passes judgment on man regarding his eternal life.

"OF MINING, AND RUGGED INDIVIDUALS"

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, being the Representative from Nevada, my colleagues quickly can associate with the Nevada names of Reno, Las Vegas, and Lake Tahoe and a few other cities where citizens of our country have visited to vacation, hunt, gamble, ski, or soak up some good old Western sunshine.

But there are other names in Nevada that are not known perhaps as well to Americans and those are the old cattle and mining towns that formed the basis for the State of Nevada and first put her on the Union map.

The names of those towns are included, for the most part, in a book that a very good friend of mine sent me a few days ago. My friend, Don Emigh, of St. Louis, Mo., must have known how much I would enjoy the book, "Mining Camp Days," by Emil W. Billeb, who lived and participated in our Western life as it was known back in the mining days of Nevada and parts of eastern California. One very real reason I have enjoyed the book is that I am from one of the mining camps that Mr. Billeb writes about, Goldfield, Nev., where I was born and lived until I was 5.

Mr. Billeb's yarns and collection of photos perfectly portray life and the ruggedness required by the men and women of those days to exist and succeed.

Mr. Billeb narrates the book and stories he lived and heard. One such story depicts that our early days miners had time for a bit of "horseplay" too. Mr. Billeb writes "An Unhappy 'Corpse' ":

> There was one old character who had developed a great liking for hard liquor and in his later years was under the weather quite a bit of the time. Once after a spree he was found lying in the sagebrush and some of the town's gentlemen decided to try to teach him a lesson and perhaps get him on the water wagon.
>
> From a dry goods store they obtained a large packing box and took it over to the drunk's resting place. As the box was too short to cover him, they knocked out one end and placed it over him with his feet sticking out.
>
> When he started to move and mumble in the box, the group gathered around and conducted a funeral service. Some commented how sad they were at the passing of the deceased. They all ignored the fact that by now the victim was pounding on the box and shouting, I ain't dead! I ain't dead! The services concluded with dropping earth on the box and intoning, Ashes to ashes, dust to dust. . . . Then the mourners departed and adjourned to a nearby store.
>
> It was some time before the deceased came sufficiently to life to crawl out of the open end of the box. Excited and sobered, he came to the store wanting to know who was responsible. He was referred to a paper posted in the store window announcing his demise and the sale of his possessions at public auction the following day. He assured everyone that he was very much alive and that there would be no sale of his belongings. He remained on the water wagon for some time after this experience.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS FOR MINERS AFFLICTED WITH BLACK LUNG DISEASE

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks, considerable publicity has been given to an occupational disease of coal miners which has become a substantially increasing problem, resulting from the development of new and more efficient mining machinery. This dread disease, which is known technically as pneumoconiosis, or more popularly known as black lung disease, is afflicting more and more coal miners as more powerful and efficient mechanized equipment is being used in the operation of the Nation's coal mines. The fact is that this new and improved type of equipment, in addition to producing more coal per man-hour, also produces coal dust for our coal miners to breathe. This coal dust is inhaled by our underground coal miners and develops within their bodies a lifelong and fatal infliction.

Many of our patriotic underground coal miners who have come down with black lung disease have been determined to be disabled under the social security disability insurance program. The cash benefits that they receive help them to some extent in meeting their living expenses. However, these cash benefits are entirely inadequate for those afflicted to meet their medical care needs which, in so many cases, include the use of a continuing supply of oxygen at costs ranging up to $200 or more per afflicted individual each month.

The legislature of my home State of West Virginia recently enacted an amendment to its Workmen's Compensation Act, providing for compensation for persons afflicted with this disease for the first time. This legislation, so I understand, does not apply to the many hundreds of coal miners who have come down with this disease in the past years and have been no longer able to work and obtain coverage under the State workmen's compensation system. To me, I strongly believe that the most logical place to turn to provide these coal miners with the medical care they so urgently and desperately need is the presently existing medicare program. I am in the process of drafting a logical and workable bill which would extend the existing medicare program to persons, regardless of age, who are eligible for a disability insurance benefit under present law. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to extend medicare benefits to most of the disabled miners who are presently afflicted with black lung disease who are ineligible for any type of medical care under present law and would also supplement the medical care received by miners who will be found qualified under the recently enacted amendments to the West Virginia Workmen's Compensation Act.

In addition to providing medicare benefits to those who qualify for social security disability benefits, another purpose of my proposed bill would also make it easier for persons who are afflicted with black lung disease to receive a social security disability cash benefit regardless of age.

It is proposed to do this by having the provision written into the Social Security Act which will extend the same treatment to victims, regardless of age, of pneumoconiosis, as blind persons now receive under the law. Under this amendment, these persons would benefit in two ways in receiving a disability determination, just as the blind are now eligible under present law.

First, the physical tests of disability would be met without the need for any additional medical evidence once a per-

XUM

son is determined to have pneumoconiosis, which would be defined in the legislation.

Second, my legislative proposal would provide that any person, age 55 and over, afflicted with pneumoconiosis, shall be entitled to a disability insurance benefit if he is unable to engage in his usual occupation—that is, if he is unable to work as a coal miner—regardless of his ability to engage in some other occupation.

It is my firm belief that these amendments, as a whole, will be a tremendous help in providing more of our coal miners who are afflicted with this dreaded black lung disease with financial and medical assistance that they so rightfully and desperately deserve and are not now receiving. These amendments will not take care of all of the problems facing these miners and their families and because of this fact, I am in the process of drafting additional legislation to complement these social security amendments.

With favorable approval by the Congress, these proposed amendments will provide significant and substantial support which is so richly deserved by our coal miners who are now denied these justly due benefits.

As a nation, we have an obligation to these dedicated workers and, as such, we can do no less than to provide these essential benefits.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that much of the philosophy behind my proposed legislation emanates from W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, who has long urged that legislative action be taken to aid these forgotten and neglected victims of black lung disease.

AMENDING RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, major steps are being taken by the Congress and the administration to help curb inflation.

Last year a 10-percent surcharge on personal and corporate income taxes was made in an effort to halt inflation. The Congress has now been asked to extend that surcharge.

Vital programs are being held to a minimum in funds—again in an effort to fight inflation.

While we are seeking ways to curb inflation, we must also be concerned about those who must live on fixed salaries or fixed retirement incomes.

They have watched their dollars shrink in purchasing power.

For those who are retired, their earning years are all but over.

One group of retired persons who have been consistently overlooked are those receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and particularly the widows of retired railroad workers.

Under present law a widow receives approximately 80 percent of her husband's annuity and loses her spouse's benefits. This amount is but a few dollars more than one-half of the joint amount they received prior to his death. This amount fails to meet the needs of the widow.

The loss of one person does not cut living expenses in half. Many overhead costs, such as property taxes, remain the same regardless of the number of persons.

It has been my feeling that the man and wife were partners and jointly earned the family income, and jointly contributed to the family retirement plan.

In far too many cases the widow, trying to survive on the reduced railroad retirement benefits must seek public welfare assistance to have the bare necessities of life.

In 1967 a 7-percent increase was granted to those under the Railroad Retirement Act. This was the first increase since 1959. Some of the widows received this increase a year ago under the social security increase, and as a result in some States, the public welfare was reduced by the same amount. As a result, they received no increase in benefits at all. Others, who tried to supplement their income by working under social security, likewise had their benefits reduced.

Because of this inequity, I have introduced legislation which would change the Railroad Retirement Act, Under this legislation, provisions would be made so that the surviving spouse of a deceased principal beneficiary under the Railroad Retirement Act would receive the same amount of basic retirement benefits that he or she would draw at the time of the spouse's death, but in no case less than $104 a month. In addition, the surviving sponse would also be granted any increase in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act which may be made effective at any time following the death of the principal beneficiary.

My concern is not only for retired railroad employees, but also for those who are currently employed on our Nation's railways.

I have reintroduced legislation designed to promote employee and traveler safety on our railroads.

This legislation is designed to promote railway safety through the reduction of consecutive hours which certain operating employees may remain on duty. That maximum is now 16 hours and this legislation would make the maximum 12 hours.

Essentially this legislation would lower the hours of continuous service which certain operating railway personnel would be permitted or required to undertake.

It makes it unlawful for any common carrier, its agents, or officers subject to the act to require or permit an employee to continue on duty or go on duty when he has not had at least 8 consecutive hours off duty during the preceding 24 hours.

Other provisions of the bill deal with computation of rest periods, intrastate crews working on interstate carrier tracks, crews of wreck and/or relief trains and for violations.

COMMUNICATION ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from a constituent, who has a daughter attending the Pennsylvania State University, a letter that President Eric A. Walker sent to all parents concerning the "almost" disorders at the university. The letter is a good example of a university meeting its responsibilities to the public, the parents, and the students, in this age when irresponsibility seems to be on the upswing. We have heard a good deal about the "lack of communication"; I think President Walker's approach is the kind of communication all college presidents should be engaged in.

President Walker's letter establishes the proper response to those who would attempt to disrupt the education of students at Pennsylvania State. The president was not bullied, nor did he panic, when a so-called "reform group" attempted to tell the university how to run an educational institution. Instead, he responded with dignity, firmness, fairness, and with dispatch, and a potentially explosive situation was averted.

President Walker obtained an injunction against an illegal use of the university. That action, followed up with the establishment of a "special judiciary board to hear staff charges and evidence against students who destroy university property, unreasonably disturb or interfere with the orderly conduct of the university, or advocate active disruption or violence," put those who would tamper with the educational processes at Pennsylvania State University on notice that such tampering would not be tolerated.

President Walker, in writing to the parents, included the text of the statement made by the Honorable A. H. Lipez, judge of the Centre County court, upon the issuance of the injunction. The judge's remarks bear close reading and I would like to have both President Walker's letter and Judge Lipez' statements appear in the RECORD following my comments:

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
University Park, Pa., March 14, 1969.

To Parents of Penn State Undergraduate Students: I am sure you, as parents of a Penn State student, are concerned over reports of potentially disruptive activities at the University Park campus of the University. I share your concern, and through this letter I would like to comment on the situation.

Since the beginning of Winter Term, the University Park campus has been faced with many difficult problems in relating with and communicating with some of the students. I will not detail each situation, but will state simply that the problems have been related to three occurrences—a list of demands presented to me by the black Frederick Douglass Association; the publication of an "underground" newspaper, known as the *Water Tunnel;* and a list of nine "non-negotiable" demands presented to me by a non-chartered group calling itself the "Steer-

XUM

ing Committee to Reform the University." It was over these latter nine demands that a sit-in resulted in Old Main on February 24, 1969.

On February 17, a letter containing the aforementioned list of nine demands was delivered to my secretary while I was out of the office. The letter stated that the demands were "non-negotiable" and that I had until Monday, February 24 to respond. Since the letter did not contain student names, and since the Steering Committee to Reform the University is not a chartered student organization with known officers, I responded to the demands by a general press release. That release was printed in the *Centre Daily Times* on Saturday, February 22, 1969. The *Daily Collegian* reports my statement was read at a Students for a Democratic Society rally in the Student Union, Saturday, February 22. I stated that to respond to demands which were termed "non-negotiable" would be in direct conflict with the very spirit of the academic community.

At approximately 3 p.m. Monday, February 24, a group of several hundred students entered the main lobby and balcony area of Old Main and determined they would remain there after the normal closing hours for the building and until such time that police came to request them to leave. Members of the administrative staff read the press release described above, and told the students that the building closed at 5:15 p.m. They were advised to leave the building by 5:15 p.m. and that if they did not, legal action would be taken. None of these warnings were heeded and the University sought a court injunction prohibiting occupation of the building.

At approximately 9:45 p.m. a temporary injunction from the Centre County Court was served by the County Sheriff. However, before the injunction was served, a larger group of students, estimated in excess of 1,000, gathered outside Old Main threatening to remove those inside. Concerned student leaders, staff members, and faculty talked to and calmed both groups and physical injury and violence was avoided, except that one student reporter was struck by a thrown object and injured on the cheek. The students inside Old Main left the building peacefully by 10 p.m. after the injunction was served and the students outside opened a path for them to leave.

I am most concerned that a situation similar to this, which has the potential for severe disruption and violence, does not again occur on this campus. To help assure this, the University obtained a continuance of the injunction at a hearing held on Friday, February 28, in Centre County Court. I think you should be aware of the continuance, and I am including a copy of the remarks of Judge A. H. Lipez, when he announced the decision of the Court.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of our students and you, their parents, support the University administration in its determination that no class shall be interrupted, nor action tolerated that threatens others, or interferes with the educational programs of the University. I can assure you, too, that a majority of the University faculty feels a similar obligation. This is reflected in the action of the University Faculty Senate which adopted the following temporary resolution at its meeting March 3, 1969:

"Recognizing that some changes in university procedures and policies are necessary, the senate endorses the constructive resolution of problems through free discussion among all groups in the academic community, and rejects the ideas of ultimata or arbitrary action as a solution to campus problems.

"The senate supports maintenance of the inviolability of the educational process and the right of students to continue their access to class and to academic instruction unimpeded.

"Further, the senate supports the exercise of legal action to prevent personal injury or the destruction of private or public property by any groups or individuals."

Many others have expressed their support for our efforts. Letters from parents, faculty, alumni, and others carry similar messages.

I am confident that The Pennsylvania State University, through the joint efforts of responsible students, faculty, administrators, parents, and other interested and concerned parties, will continue to meet its educational responsibilities to your sons and daughters. However, we must face the real possibility that there are some within the University who would disrupt its normal functions. To assure that we are able to continue to fulfill our responsibilities, I have established a Special Judiciary Board to hear staff charges and evidence against students who destroy University property, unreasonably disturb or interfere with the orderly conduct of the University, or advocate active disruption or violence. This is a temporary Board which will make disciplinary recommendations to me regarding individuals found guilty or responsible for such acts. Disruptive activity is regarded as a serious matter which can result in dismissal of a student.

I hope that all parents accept this letter in the spirit in which it was written—a communication to parents to keep them informed.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC A. WALKER,
President.

STATEMENT OF JUDGE A. H. LIPEZ IN CENTRE COUNTY COURT, FEBRUARY 28, 1969

The evidence here indicates that more than 250 students entered Old Main on the afternoon of February 24 and refused all requests to leave until after the service of the injunction around 10:00 p.m. The requests were met with jeers, obscenity, as well as threats. It is apparent also that had not the injunction been issued, the defendants would have continued to occupy this administration building which would have materially interfered with the proper administration of this large University having some 7,000 employees and approximately 25,000 resident students.

We have no doubt that some of you, at least, in so occupying Old Main, were carried away by the belief in your cause. Some of you may even have believed you had the right to take possession of Old Main in this manner and in effect hold it as hostage to enforce your demands. Let me tell you at the outset that no matter how pure your motives, or laudable your objectives, your actions were unlawful and the law does not countenance illegal acts.

Perhaps what was done here was inspired by similar actions at other universities and colleges, and perhaps some of these institutions felt compelled to make some accommodation notwithstanding the coercive methods used. The plaintiff here, The Pennsylvania State University, properly under the evidence, decided not to submit to what amounted to a seizure of its property and hence brought this action before us.

The law is clear. No one—students or others—has the right, forcibly or otherwise, to take possession of the property of an educational institution and thereby interfere—actually or potentially—with its right to carry on its activities. Anyone doing so is subject to the injunctive process of the equity court.

You—the defendants—have rights. You have the right to meet peaceably in mass meetings on the campus in proper places—you have the right to organized demonstrations and protest meetings—you have the right to petition the University officials to redress your grievances. All these are recognized under the First Amendment of the Constitution and there is nothing to indicate that the University sought to deny these to you. But the University—its officials—and all the other students—have rights too, and you cannot act in a manner as to interfere with their rights. The moment large numbers of you went into Old Main for the purpose of remaining there until your demands were met, and certainly after you were requested to leave—from that moment, you were trampling on the rights of the University—your actions then became illegal.

We have long prided ourselves on having a government under a rule of law—a system that has made possible human achievement unmatched by any other nation. Implicit therein is the belief and the understanding that there is a duty to obey the law. Only by doing so are we able to have an ordered society and a government which protects the rights of all of us. Where we believe government is wrong, our Bill of Rights allows dissent and disagreement, but in peaceable and orderly ways. Experience has shown that lawless protests breed lawless counter protests as in fact happened here. The power of a mob today for noble and constructive ends may tomorrow be for ignoble and destructive purposes. No government can submit to mob rule and survive. Nor can any educational institution.

EARTHQUAKES

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today a catastrophic earthquake shattered southcentral Alaska.

As the earth twisted and rolled, huge landslides sheared away. Tidal waves, generated by undersea slides, sent walls of water smashing into coastal communities, carrying away people, boats, and buildings.

What later came to be known as Alaska's "Good Friday Earthquake" registered 8.5 on the Richter scale.

One hundred and fourteen persons lost their lives, $300 million in property was destroyed, and the State's economy suffered a crippling blow.

Hundreds of homes and other buildings were shattered. Water mains and sewerlines burst. Great cracks in the earth slashed across highways and railroad lines and bridges collapsed. Airfields, so important in Alaska with its limited system of roads, were temporarily rendered useless. Telephone and powerlines snapped as the earth rocked.

Considering the massive destruction, it was surprising that the death toll was not higher. This was due to a number of fortuitous circumstances. Southcentral Alaska is relatively sparsely populated. The earthquake took place in the early evening of a holiday when schools and most offices were empty. The weather was mild for that time of year and the sea was at low tide.

XUM

Geologists tell us that should an earthquake of such magnitude and duration as the 1964 Alaskan earthquake take place in a densely populated region, it might easily cause thousands of deaths and billions of dollars in damage.

Help was not long in coming to Alaska. While the earth still rocked, the military—itself badly hurt—moved magnificently to aid the stunned civilian population. The President speedily declared southcentral Alaska a disaster area opening the door to massive Federal assistance. Messages of encouragement and offers of aid came to us from across the Nation.

In Alaska, the people rose to the crisis with indomitable spirit and fighting courage. They showed a considerable unity of purpose in facing the major problems and a willingness to assist others and a determination to overcome crushing misfortune to start over again.

Although economic patterns have changed in southcentral Alaska because of the earthquake, we have almost recovered from the blow of 5 years ago. Almost. At least one community—the city of Seward—was so badly hurt that it still is fighting for its life. Valdez, which was entirely relocated, looks forward to a bright economic future. In Whittier, Anchorage, Kodiak, Cordova, Seldovia the scars still show but their edges are becoming blurred.

Alaska's earthquake and following tidal waves spurred a series of coordinated Federal-State plans to cope with such hazards in the future.

Tidal wave warning systems have been improved. Possible geological hazards to building and settlement are assuming increasing importance in planning. Earthquakes and crustal movements are being monitored and a variety of techniques are being used to probe deep into the earth to learn its structure and the forces that effect it.

With increased knowledge, techniques may be developed that will prove the basis for an earthquake prediction system that could benefit all earthquake-prone areas of the country, geologists tell us.

TIMBER SUPPLY CAN BE INCREASED IMMEDIATELY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, public concern about the impact of lumber and plywood prices on the availability of new homes is being reflected in the Congress. The Banking and Currency Committee is reviewing this vital issue this week. There is reason to believe that this review can lead to immediate improvement in the situation.

The key problem appears to be the supply of standing timber that is available for processing in our western mills. Most of that timber is on the national forests under the careful stewardship of the Forest Service.

The chief of the Forest Service has testified that "in all forest regions supplies of timber could be substantially increased by such measures as planting, thinning, stand improvement, increased protection against destructive agents, and access road construction."

I am hopeful that the Congress will soon provide the Forest Service with the funds and personnel necessary to accomplish this intensification of management. We should. Besides helping to meet our housing needs, such an investment will result in substantial returns to the Treasury in the form of timber-sale receipts.

While very important, these practices are not the most promising possibility that has come to our attention for increasing availability of Federal timber for home construction. Among other things, the University of California at Berkeley is noted for its outstanding school of forestry and conservation. John A. Zivnuska, the dean of that school, told the Senate last week that there can be an immediate increase in the cut on the Federal forests. This can come with recognition of present wood utilization practices, the use of appropriate units of measurement and the recognition of the increases in timber growth that are achieved under improved forest management.

This increase in the availability of timber would come because of what is technically known as a shortening in rotations—a reduction in the planned time needed to grow a new crop of timber. Dean Zivnuska explained this opportunity in his testimony last week to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. A copy of his explanation is offered herewith for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of this body at this time because Dean Zivnuska is scheduled to appear before our Committee on Banking and Currency tomorrow, Friday, March 28. Dean Zivnuska's well-qualified technical answers to our timber shortage deserves our careful attention. They offer a real hope for meeting this Nation's needs for construction materials and homes at reasonable prices.

The above-mentioned material follows:

PRESENTATION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 21, 1969

My name is John A. Zivnuska. I am Dean of the School of Forestry and Conservation, University of California, Berkeley, but I do not speak for the University in this matter. I appear simply as an individual citizen with 25 years of experience in teaching and research in the economics of forestry. Much of my work has been devoted to the interactions between forest conditions and the forest products industries.

The very sharp rise in lumber and plywood prices which has occurred in the last year is in many respects simply a repetition in accentuated form of an event which has taken place frequently in the past. Essentially this price rise reflects the inability of the lumber and plywood industries to achieve large increases in output over a short period of time in response to sharp increases in demand. This in turn is related to the availability of timber for the mills. Since the industries are highly competitive among both buyers and sellers, the demand increase combined with the inelastic supply response results in a rapid rise in prices with very little increase in the quantity supplied.

HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE PRESENT PROBLEM

This kind of relationship can be traced back for more than a century. From 1860 to 1947, the wholesale price index for lumber increased nearly threefold relative to wholesale prices generally. This price increase did not occur as a steady upward trend. Instead, it took place through a series of sharp rises over short periods, typically followed by longer periods of stable or declining prices.

A very pronounced instance of such a period of sharply rising prices with only limited increase in volume supplied took place after the removal of price controls following World War II. The pattern was of serious concern at the time, which was also a period of high demand for housing. In an analysis of supply and demand trends in the lumber industry from 1921 through 1953 which was published in 1955 (John A. Zivnuska, "Supply, Demand and the Lumber Market," Journal of Forestry 53(8):547–553), I pointed out that lumber production shows "an inelastic response to price in expansion at high levels of prosperity" and that over the years "the supply schedule is becoming more inelastic." The current price experience reflects this pattern.

The bottleneck explaining the persistent pattern of inelastic supply response to high demand levels does not rest in the mills, which typically have had capacity well in excess of actual production. Instead, the limiting factor is the availability of timber adapted to processing under established technology within the operating radius of the established mills.

Historically the production of lumber and plywood has been based on the availability of old-growth timber. Even today, these industries are predominantly based on old-growth, although the utilization of the young-growth stands which have followed the initial cutting has increased rapidly. For three centuries the lumber industry of North America was a migratory industry, following a retreating frontier of virgin forests. Exhaustion of timber in current operating areas led to higher prices, which in turn enabled shifting to new production areas, typically more distant from the main consuming centers.

By World War II, this historical process had largely run its course. In recent years, the forest products industries have been settling down and becoming permanent. Production has been greatly diversified, with lumber and plywood production being increasingly integrated with pulp and paper, wood chemicals, and other products. Some major segments of the forest products industries such as pulp and paper are now based dominantly on young-growth forests, with the geographic center of such production being in the South rather than the West. Lumber and plywood, however, continue in their traditional dependence on old-growth. Thus, as the nation now moves into the final stage of its use of old-growth forests, such production faces major difficulties.

A comparison of the periods just before and shortly after World War II is illustrative of the nature of the problem. In 1940–42, U.S. lumber production averaged 34.6 billion board feet annually. In 1949–51, the index of wholesale lumber prices in constant dollar terms was 53 percent higher than in the earlier period, yet production averaged only 35.8 billion board feet—an increase of only 4 percent in quantity. Even more striking, with the exception of the six southwestern counties of Oregon and the three northwestern counties of California, lumber production in the balance of the nation actually declined by nearly 10 percent in the face of this 53 percent price increase. It was only the very rapid increase of production in this nine county area that enabled the nation to maintain and slightly increase the quantity of

XUM

lumber production under conditions of rapidly increasing lumber prices. These nine counties represented the last major block of old-growth timber remaining in private ownership in small- and medium-sized holdings.

IMMEDIATE CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

The current situation of sharply rising prices in lumber and plywood must be interpreted in the light of this historical perspective.

Following the post-World War II building boom and the pronounced rise in prices, lumber prices moved into a prolonged period of relative stability, while plywood prices showed a remarkable downward trend. From 1951 to 1967 the wholesale price index of lumber in constant dollar terms showed a slight decline, averaging 5 or 6 percent lower in the later years than in the earlier years of the period. Softwood plywood prices were cut nearly in half over this period, with the softwood plywood price index in constant dollar terms (1957–59=100) dropping from 134 in 1951 to a low of 75 in June, 1967. Lumber production fluctuated modestly over this period, with a very minor downward trend. In contrast, softwood plywood production in 1967 was three times as high as in 1951. Through the combined effect of these two patterns, the total volume of logs consumed for lumber and plywood consumption was about 8 percent higher in 1967 than in 1951.

By 1967 signs of pressure on the available timber were beginning to appear. This was most evident in the Pacific Northwest, with the immediate cause being the rapidly growing Japanese demand for export logs. This upward trend in the export demand on U.S. timber became evident in 1963, when the volume of log exports to Japan doubled from the level of the preceding years. By 1967 the export volume from the three Pacific Coast states had reached 1.5 billion board feet. While this represents only about 4 percent of the log volume used in lumber production in the same year, two-thirds of the export logs came from the State of Washington, with most of the balance coming from Oregon. Within these heavily affected regions, there was increasingly general concern about the impact of this new source of demand on the price of stumpage and on the availability of logs for some domestic mills.

The log export demand continued its rapid rise in 1968, with a down-turn emerging toward the end of the year. In April, 1968, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior issued orders restricting the sale of federal timber to the export market from Western Washington and Western Oregon to approximately the 1966 level of exports of logs from federal lands. Last October the Congress acted to make this limitation effective for 1969, 1970, and 1971, extending the area covered by the restriction to the federal lands of the entire Western forest region.

With demand already pressing hard on the upper limits of the range of elastic supply response in lumber and plywood production, 1968 also brought an increase in demand for housing construction. There was also growing recognition that the nation was moving into a new period of high housing demand with promise of greatly expanded levels of home construction—a recognition which was given additional substance by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

Thus the nation once again moved into a period in which a sharp rise in demand could only bring forth an inelastic supply response in lumber and plywood production, with rapid rises in price and only small increases in quantity of production being the result.

REASONS FOR THE INTENSITY OF THE PRICE REACTION

During the seventeen or eighteen years since the last such experience, a number of changes had taken place in the nation's timber situation, particularly in old-growth timber, most of which have acted to intensify this problem of inelasticity of supply.

The most obvious of these changes in the effect of the additional years of cutting in further reducing the remaining reserves of old-growth timber. By 1963 old-growth sawtimber stands occupied 43 million acres, or approximately 8 percent of the nation's commercial sawtimber area. Two-thirds of this area and a larger proportion of the old-growth volume was concentrated in the Pacific Coast states.

Further, the impact of this cutting has not been uniformly distributed among the various forms of ownership. The cutting was heavily concentrated on small and medium sized private ownerships as long as appreciable volumes of such timber were available. For example, in 1953, approximately 70 percent of the total cut in California came from small and medium private holdings, which represented less than 30 percent of the state's forest area. Such concentrated cutting has largely depleted old-growth in these ownerships, from which the quantity of timber supplied has traditionally been highly responsive to market demand.

Today the federal government is the primary holder of the nation's old-growth timber, with most of the balance being in large industrial ownerships. Such ownerships are characterized by a commitment to sustained-yield forest management. Here it must be recognized that such forest management greatly intensifies the short-run inelasticity of timber supplies. Current cutting decisions are restricted by the need to maintain or develop a distribution of volumes and age-classes of timber such that harvesting can be carried on continuously in the future. "Allowable cut" limits are established on the basis of technical considerations including the nature of the present timber inventory, the length of rotation over which it is planned to grow future crops of timber, the growth potential of the sites, and the intensity of management and degree of reliance on thinnings and other intermediate cuttings considered to be feasible.

With such constraints being established on allowable cutting levels through technical considerations, the responsiveness of current cutting levels to market demands is severely limited. This is particularly the case on the federal forest lands from which the level of cut is determined almost entirely by tightly-enforced allowable cutting limits and the level of appropriations for timber operations. The response in volume of sales offerings to market demand is highly inelastic.

However, the impact of this extreme inelasticity of federal timber supplies has not been felt in full until recent years. Twenty-five years ago, the demand for public timber was relatively limited, since private timber could commonly be obtained under more advantageous conditions. Thus actual cutting levels on the federal forests were far below the allowable cutting limits. As a result, for a number of years following World War II the level of cut from federal lands could be increased in response to rising demands. Today such federal timber sales provide the primary basis for open-market timber operations in the West.

Within recent years, however, the actual cut has reached the allowable cut limits on most operating areas in federal ownership. In short, the situation is now one in which short-run expansion of lumber and plywood production is heavily dependent on federal timber, while established allowable cut standards and operating policies make the short-run supply of such timber almost wholly inelastic. Under such conditions, a price spiral is the inevitable result of any sharp increase in demand. When the quantity offered is essentially fixed, the full response to the demand increase will be in price.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Some other aspects of the situation might be noted. In the past small sawmills operating on timber from small holdings have played a significant, though limited, role in the adjustment of production to cyclical shifts in demand. Periods of rising prices have been marked by a rapid increase in the number of such mills, while declining prices have brought an equally rapid closure of such operations. In this regard, the present experience differs from the past. The small mill segment of the industry has not responded to the degree typical in the past. This appears to reflect several factors, including:

(a) Changes in the timber supply, particularly in the availability of timber from small holdings.

(b) Changes in utilization practices in lumber manufacture, with returns from the utilization of mill residues and bark being increasingly essential for profitable operation. Thus the low investment small mill which manufactures only rough-cut lumber is at an increasing disadvantage.

(c) Shortages of low cost labor, which has been basic to such operations in the past. This reflects both good alternate employment opportunities and the effects of minimum wage legislation.

While inelasticity of short-run timber supplies appears to be the primary cause of the inelastic supply response in lumber and plywood which has led to sharply rising prices, there are some short-term factors which intensify the situation. In a basically unstable situation such as the present balance of supply and demand in lumber and plywood, any interruptions or inefficiencies in operations can be expected to have unusually pronounced effects. The repeated problem of freight car shortages which has plagued relationships between the producers and the railroads for many years is one such example. Logging closures because of the severity of the 1967 fire season is another. Severe winter weather has also been adverse to production in some areas, while the timing of full expansion of operations this spring is still to be determined. The recent dock strike has also disrupted supplies at the retail level. However, although such factors can aggravate the situation, they do not appear to be fundamental causes of the problem.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL TIMBER IN MEETING THE PROBLEM

To the extent that this analysis of the causes of the sudden increases in lumber and plywood prices has been correct, any actions taken to improve the situation must be responsive to the forces which have been reviewed. Thus the balance of my presentation will be devoted to a consideration of actions which might be taken to increase lumber and plywood supplies and thus reduce the pressure on prices.

As the preceding analysis has shown, the basic cause rests in the inelastic supply of timber of suitable characteristics to the lumber and plywood mills in the face of a marked rise in demand. Inevitably, attention must be focused on the supply of sawtimber and veneer logs. The small and medium sized private owners who have provided a major element in the flexibility of timber supplies in the past no longer have significant volumes of old-growth timber. The large private owners have already moved in most instances toward the intensification of their forest management programs and appropriate increases in cutting levels. The main opportunity for increases in timber supplies today clearly rests in the federal forest lands, and primarily in the lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. These lands are the dominant supply source for open-market timber operations to support lumber and

XUM

plywood production and they are the only forest lands which can currently sustain major increases in cut without sacrifice of future yields of timber.

Some excerpts from the statement of Mr. E. P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, before the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices of the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, on November 26, 1968, are highly pertinent here:

"On National Forest lands in the Douglas-fir region, for example, preliminary results of a study now underway indicate that the annual allowable cut could be substantially increased gradually over the years. This might be done through an annual program of investing funds to intensify management practices such as commercial thinning, pre-logging, salvage, reforestation, and timber stand improvement. Much of this would depend on an access road system. . .

"Allowable cuts could be increased by shortening rotations. However, much of such increase from shorter rotations would be derived merely from faster liquidation of the residual old-growth timber accompanied by falloff in levels of annual cut at the end of the rotations . . .

"The study to date clearly indicates that there are some measures which are essential to support increases in allowable cut. These include better utilization, more thinning, cultural treatments of young growth, reforestation of nonstocked land, better protection, and more complete salvage. The allowable cut on the national forests should be increased, we feel, *only when we earn the right to do so by performing these forest management activities.* (Italic added.)

". . . Other studies have been made of investment opportunities on national forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased by about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of national forest commercial timberlands . . ."

The U.S. Forest Service has long held the position of leadership in forestry in the United States and it continues to be marked by a high level of professional competence. With its responsibilities for managing forest lands for many purposes in addition to timber and for providing timber for future generations as well as for the present, it is naturally and appropriately conservative in its management philosophies.

In the present instance, however, there is a clear opportunity to increase greatly the contribution of the federal forests to meeting the nation's housing needs over the next few years without any sacrifice of future benefits from these lands. Rather than waiting until intensified management practices have "earned the right" to increase allowable cutting levels, there is an opportunity and need to increase the allowable cut in the immediate future with a *simultaneous* intensification of forest management practices. Indeed, the nature of forest management is such that certain of the intensified management practices can be put into effect only through the medium of expanded timber cutting.

Expanded thinnings, salvage cuttings, and pre-harvest cuttings are examples of this, with any substantial progress in this direction being dependent on expanded support for timber sales administration and with full realization of this potential also being dependent on further development of access roads. There is substantial agreement both within and external to the Forest Service as to the desirability of such a program. It is a logical first step toward expansion of the cut of federal timber and should be implemented immediately. However, it must be recognized that this is essentially the "easy" increase in cut which can be achieved—an increase which involves no re-evaluation of established Forest Service policy and which is more a matter of taking advantage of high prices to cut previously sub-marginal timber than it is a positive program of expanded cutting to meet the nation's critical housing need.

THE POLICY ISSUE OF LENGTH OF ROTATION

The really central question is that of the current policy in establishing rotations—the period of years planned for the establishment and growth to merchantable size of new stands of timber on the lands now being brought under management. These rotations serve as a primary constraint on timber management and allowable cut planning. Any decision involving shortening of the rotations would enable immediate increases in the allowable cut from the predominantly old-growth forests managed by the Forest Service. This immediate increase would be derived from a shortening of the period for liquidation of the remaining old-growth timber, as Mr. Cliff has pointed out. However, even if this were the full story, such a policy decision would deserve careful consideration since such a change would in itself help to meet the current housing need and to protect future markets for building materials based on renewable forest resources from inroads by alternate materials which typically come from nonrenewable resources.

However, this is by no means the full story. Current rotations used in setting allowable cutting limits on federal forests are based on utilization practices of the past. They do not reflect current utilization standards, to say nothing of reflecting the utilization standards which must be expected to prevail at the time several decades in the future when these new stands will be utilized. As a consequence, they involve larger future crop trees, lower growth rates, and substantially longer periods than they should to meet the requirements of the future. Neither present markets nor future markets are well served by the present planning standards.

The extent of the falldown in cut which would occur at the end of this first rotation tends to be greatly exaggerated by the reliance on obsolete units of measurement in making the management calculations and by failure to consider the potential of intensified management practices within the context of shortened rotations. The conventional practice of federal agencies is to base such calculations on board foot volumes above some minimum diameter limit such as eleven inches which the trees must reach before being included in the management calculations. Thus these calculations totally ignore the volume in trees less than this minimum diameter limit; additionally ignore all the wood volume in trees above the diameter limit which is in shapes and sizes not adapted to the manufacture of conventional lumber sizes; and do not even recognize that actual sawmill recovery of lumber typically runs higher than the log scale estimate by an appreciable margin, with this percentage overrun tending to be greater for small trees than for large trees. Thus the system is one of partial and biased measurement which wholly fails to reflect current practices and trends in forest utilization. One result of this is to lead to the establishment of rotations substantially longer than those appropriate to maximize the growth of total wood material. A second result is to show a falldown in future cutting levels from shortened rotations which in fact does not apply to the total wood volume available, but only to a limited and peculiarly-measured portion of it. A third and particularly significant result is to hold current cutting levels below those now feasible and appropriate.

If forest volumes were measured in terms of cubic foot volumes of all trees four inches and above in diameter instead of board foot log scale volumes of trees eleven inches and larger in diameter, the calculations would commonly show little or no falldown in wood availability in the second rotation, and in some instances an actual increase would be shown.

Further, estimates of the cutting level in the second rotation are also dependent on the estimates used of the growth to be achieved by the new stands. Current management planning is commonly based on results actually achieved under the extensive management practices of the past. If allowance is made for the increases in growth which can be achieved by intensified management, shortened rotations would often show little or no falldown in cut even when expressed in the archaic standards of measurement now in use.

While these points may seem excessively technical in nature, they actually reflect broad and fundamental issues in the concepts used in forest management planning. They deserve the most careful analysis and full explanation. The present assumptions, reflecting past practice, clearly constitute the primary block to expanded rates of cutting of federal timber of the sizes and characteristics required for the immediate construction needs of the nation.

A POLICY PROPOSAL

Thus the appropriate responses to the current problems of high prices related to shortage of lumber and plywood as well as to the needs of the nation for such materials for the housing program of the next decade appears to be as follows: The Secretary of Agriculture should be requested to submit promptly an analysis of the possibilities for several alternate levels of increase in the allowable cut from the national forests, ranging from increases possible simply through expanded thinnings and salvage cuttings to increases requiring re-examination and reduction of present rotation requirements. Each level of possible increase should be supported by documentation of the increases in funds and personnel required to achieve this level of cut. The analysis should be presented not only in terms of board foot volumes log scale to reflect past practices but also in terms of cubic foot volumes to reflect future utilization potentials

Immediate increases in cut through intensified thinning and salvage sales obviously need not await this full analysis. With careful study and review of such an analysis, however, appropriate policies could be developed expeditiously so that the federal forests could make their full contribution to the needs of the nation.

Any expansion in the rate of cutting of federal timber will require an increase in funding of Forest Service programs in timber management and timber sales administration. However, the increase in timber sale revenues will more than offset these cost increases. On balance, such a program can represent a contribution to, rather than a net drain on, the Treasury.

In this regard, consideration might well be given to the possibility of funding such an intensification of federal timber management by earmarking a portion of the timber sale receipts for re-appropriation back to the management program. Such a tieing of the financing of intensification of the program to the level of sales should increase the responsiveness of the federal timber management program to national needs.

OTHER POSSIBLE ACTIONS

(a) Another possible area for action to relieve the domestic demand situation might be through control of log exports. The action taken by the Congress last fall in the foreign aid bill placed exports limits solely on logs cut from federal lands. Further, it tended to freeze the level of such exports for 1969, 1970, and 1971 at established levels rather than to impose a major reduction in such exports. While there are provisions in this legislation

XUM

to prevent substitution of logs from federal forests for logs exported from private lands, there is no direct control on exports from private lands or on the total volume of exports. Clearly, any such restriction imposed only on federal timber must be expected to concentrate further increases in export demands on the private timber and thus to be only partially effective.

Only the establishment of an overall quota or flat embargo on export of logs, whether from public or private forests, would be effective in reducing or eliminating this source of pressure on timber supplies. However, neither the effectiveness of such restriction in increasing the quantity of timber supplied at lower prices in the domestic market nor the general economic and political desirability of such restrictions is clear.

The initial expansion into this export market was largely in species and sizes of logs for which no domestic market then existed. Rising Japanese prices brought out additional quantities and a wider range of species and sizes. In the current strong domestic market, the major part of the present export volume would probably be marketable in the U.S., although only at lower prices than in the export market. When U.S. demand justifies a price equal to the export demand, there is no problem in diverting the flow to domestic use. The real question is the extent to which the present export volume would be available at reduced prices.

Furthermore, export trade also contributes to national goals through a favorable influence on the balance of payments problem, while arbitrary disruption of such trade must be expected to lead to reprisals in other areas of trade relationships. Any progress toward meeting an internal problem through such a policy of trade restriction would involve an offsetting adverse effect on external relationships of the nation.

Thus any such intensified restrictions on the log export trade would be at best a negative and inherently undesirable approach to the problem, justifiable only under conditions of extreme economic hardship.

(b) Another approach which might be considered is the expansion of wood imports. Such imports are already of substantial importance in the U.S. market. In 1962, for example, net imports of wood products into the U.S. represented about 14 percent of the nation's total forest products consumption. In fact, the U.S. is today the world's largest importer of forest products. In addition, it ranks fourth among the nations as an exporter of forest products. The imports run heavily to softwood lumber and newsprint paper, with wood pulp, pulpwood, and hardwood plywood and veneer providing most of the remainder. Exports are somewhat more diversified, including softwood lumber, softwood logs, wood pulp, and paper and paperboard products.

A highly significant aspect of the imports is that the softwood lumber, newsprint, and other products with the exception of hardwood plywood and veneer come almost entirely from Canada. The other forest regions of the world have little potential for supplying our construction materials needs in forest products, again with the exception of hardwood plywood and veneer.

Canadian exports of softwood lumber to the U.S. are directly responsive to price levels in the U.S. as compared to price levels in other export markets served by Canada. Rises in U.S. demand are typically met by increases in shipments from Canada. Tariffs on softwood lumber shipments from Canada to the U.S. are low and do not appear to be a significant barrier to such trade flow. Thus there is little opportunity here for federal policies to reduce barriers to such imports.

In the case of softwood plywood, there is a mutual 20 percent tariff between the two nations. Little Canadian plywood comes to the U.S., and U.S. plywood shipments to Canada have also been limited. The effect of a mutual reduction in this tariff level on the volume and direction of trade flow is difficult to estimate, since in the past Canadian plywood prices have often been higher than U.S. prices. Canadian plywood capacity is limited and any large flow of Canadian plywood to the U.S. would be dependent upon an increase in Canadian capacity as a result of tariff changes.

(c) As noted in the first half of this presentation, various short term problems such as freight car shortages and interruptions of logging by weather conditions have intensified the price effects resulting from the inelasticity of the timber supply for the sawmills and plywood mills. Action has already been taken to increase the availability of freight cars to the producing regions. Similar actions to improve efficiency in other problem areas involving interruptions in production can be helpful. However, while such actions may help to temper price extremes, they cannot be expected to solve the basic problem since they are not responsive to the basic cause.

CONCLUSION

To summarize, I believe we must recognize that the current problem of sharp increases in lumber and plywood prices is not a new phenomenon. Instead, it is repetition in particularly intense form of an experience which has been repeated a number of times over the last one hundred years. The basic cause in each such instance has been the inelasticity of the supply of timber of characteristics appropriate to the technology of the period within operating radius of established mill capacity. Changes in the nature of the national timber inventory and the concentration of the remaining old-growth timber in federal ownership largely explains the increasing intensity of the price responses to periods of sharp increases in demand.

While various actions can be and are being taken to reduce the extremes of the current price situation, the only far-reaching opportunity appears to be through intensified management and rapidly expanded cutting levels on the federal forests. While the immediate concern is with the price rises which have been experienced since last summer, the problem and its solution must be viewed in broader terms. Realization of the national goals in housing will require a very rapid increase in home construction over the next two or three years, rising to an average rate much greater than that in prospect for the current year. The real issue is that of providing an adequate supply of building materials to meet this need. The policy appropriate to the federal forests must be reviewed and changed in response to this need.

IS THE FCC PUFFING OR BLUFFING?

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the editorials from the Asheville Citizen and the Asheville Times concerning the threatened ban of radio and television cigarette advertising:

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Feb. 8, 1969]

IS THE FCC PUFFING OR BLUFFING?

In threatening a complete ban on radio-television advertising of cigarettes, the Federal Communications Commission is seemingly attempting to ursurp a prerogative it doesn't have—certainly not without the concurrence of Congress.

Harmful or not (and the point has never been established to the satisfaction of many research scientists) cigarettes are a lawful product, sanctioned for sale on the open market. If they "May Be Hazardous To Health" as the wrappers must now proclaim, it is possible they are no more hazardous than automobiles, motorcycles, chain saws, certain types of toothpastes, extra-strength detergents, and various other commercial items that are widely promoted on the air. As long as cigarettes are accepted as safe enough to sell, the advertising of competitive brands, within the limits of truth and decency, should not be restricted.

Congress isn't likely to permit the FCC to carry out its threat, which would amount to bureaucratic suppression. Perhaps the agency realizes that; but the fact that such an edict is contemplated seems to reflect the distorted self-image of power this federal commission has assumed and apparently seeks to exercise.

Not that we advocate the smoking of cigarettes; they *MAY* well be, as the labels maintain, a potential menace. But so, in this instance, is the FCC.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Feb. 10, 1969]

BANNING CIGARETTE ADS

The Federal Communications Commission, by moving for the prohibition of cigarette advertising on television and radio, is getting into a chancy area. Regulation of the personal habits of the nation by executive decree has little to recommend it and much to look askance at.

In its regulations to date, the FCC has been anything but consistent. There is no advertising of hard liquor on the airwaves, but beer and wine have a free hand and bring in their millions to the networks and the advertising agencies. All are intoxicating, and there is little logic in excluding one form of intoxicant and permitting others.

Further, some medical experts still dispute the claim that cigarettes are a direct cause of lung cancer. Until all controversy has been settled, the FCC is infringing on private rights in seeking to forbid the advertising of cigarettes on the air.

FOCUS ON FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART IV

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the board of higher education is charged by the Congress with the ultimate responsibility to establish requirements governing programs for Federal City College. The criteria which the board expects the college administration to use, and which the board will apply in determining whether a proposed program of study shall be adopted, are outlined in the following statement by the board of higher education:

STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

On February 4, 1969 the Board of Higher Education gave its tentative approval to a statement entitled "The Purpose of Federal City College," which had been recommended to it by the Interim College Commission, which is composed of elected representatives from College administration, faculty, staff, and students. That statement sought to make it clear that it has been, and will be, the policy of the Board of Higher Education and the College administration to create and operate a college of excellence in a manner consistent with the hopes of the community and those in Congress who worked to establish in the District of Columbia a publicly supported institution of higher education.

That statement of purpose, it now appears, has not been adequately understood by persons within the College and within the community. This further statement, it is hoped, will correct misunderstandings, and elaborate some of the policies heretofore stated only in more general terms.

1. At the outset the Board wishes to make clear that the Federal City College is already an institution in which the District of Columbia and the Congress can take justifiable pride. Many hundreds of students who would otherwise have had no opportunity to attend college are receiving from many highly competent teachers the higher education to which they are entitled. Several thousand additional students who will graduate from high school next year, or who have already graduated, have applied for admission next September. The College continues to attract faculty candidates of high quality. The funds made available for community programs through the status of the College as a Land Grant institution are already providing needed and welcome community educational programs. That there should have been a lack of understanding of some of the policies of the College and of its proper procedures is unfortunate, but this should not obscure the solid achievements which have occurred, nor the potential of the College for a much greater contribution to the community as it continues to grow. The goal of the Board, and of the College community as a whole, is to direct the College toward becoming the "institution of excellence" to which its students and the communities which it serves are entitled.

The Board is aware that this excellence must in the last analysis depend on the quality of the College's faculty and professional and other staff. The Board is also aware, as set out in its statement of purpose, that the College will constantly be seeking innovative improvements and that there will and should be diversity of opinion within the College community on academic and other issues. The Board's duty under the law to make all appointments thus imposes on it a heavy responsibility. It therefore proposes, on the recommendation of its Personnel Committee, to establish by resolution a procedure that will enable the Board to make decisions on appointments and reappointments with the fullest consideration and the greatest care to see that it acts fairly and with full information at its disposal.

2. The Board of Higher Education is charged by the Congress with the ultimate responsibility "to establish policies, standards, and requirements governing . . . programs, graduation (including the award of degrees) . . . of the Federal City College." This responsibility the Board has up to now, exercised only to the extent of an approval of the general program for the freshman year. As programs for second and later years, and for degrees are recommended by the Administration, the Board will review each of them with such assistance from the College community and other sources as it may need and find appropriate, to ensure that the programs are consistent with the overall policies of the College.

Among the criteria which the Board expects the Administration to use, and which the Board will apply in determining whether a proposed program of study shall be adopted, are the following:

(a) The program must be academically sound, and based on relevant academic standards appropriate to college work.

(b) The program must be designed to meet the needs of a student body that will be largely composed of residents of the District of Columbia.

(c) The program must, of course, be consistent with legal requirements, both those contained in the law creating the College and those required by the Constitution and other laws of the United States.

(d) The program must have a proper relationship to the remaining programs in the College.

The allocation of faculty among the several programs of the College will be determined, of course, as the programs themselves are approved by the Board and by the extent of student interest and value to the community in the several programs and courses involved.

Because Black Studies at the College has apparently been the subject of much of the misunderstanding as to the purpose and policies of the College, a further word on that matter is appropriate.

First, the Board believes it highly appropriate that in Federal City College there be courses of sufficient academic depth and diversity to warrant designation of Black Studies as an appropriate major field of academic credit. While the whole matter of Black Studies is a relatively new and evolving one, the goal of the Board will be to have the best program of Black Studies that is offered anywhere.

Second, no program for a course of study in this field has been presented to the Board and no program has been approved by the Board, tentatively or otherwise.

Third, the Board will apply to the course of study in this field the criteria already stated above. *The Board will not approve a program which is designed to encourage separation between the black and white races, or which would increase rather than seek to eliminate racial antagonism and conflict, or which would encourage or condone violence as a means of resolving issues.*

Fourth, the course of study leading to a degree with a major in Black Studies will be a program of the College, and neither in form nor in substance a separate school, and will be related to and integrated with the other programs of the College.

Fifth, the allocation of faculty to the program will, as in all other programs of study, be based on the nature of the program and the extent to which there is student interest and value to the community in the particular courses to be offered.

3. Many colleges and universities with long-standing reputations of academic and administrative excellence are finding new patterns of governance. *Federal City College, as a new institution, has sought also to find patterns of administration and governance that are relevant to the present time.* In general, and with the full approval of the Board, the decision-making procedures have followed the tradition of democratic participation that is desirable in an academic institution which seeks to meet the new challenges of the present.

The Board recognizes, however, that due to misunderstandings, to the state of flux in which a newly-organized institution must operate, to a lack of clearly defined processes of decision or recommendation, and in some instances to a disregard of established procedures, the administrative structure of the College has not always functioned either in accordance with normal processes or effectively and properly.

The Board, consequently, directs that the President, with the advice of the College community, prepare and present to the Board a clear statement of the procedures which are to be established to arrive at recommendations or decisions on all matters of College policy. The Board expects the presentation to be made to the Board no later than April 30, 1969.

4. The Board is aware of the charges recently made that some members of the faculty and staff have not accepted their assigned work load, have failed, without good cause, to meet their classes, or have not performed their work in a manner consistent with professional standards and their assigned responsibilities. The Board believes that to the extent this has occurred, it has been confined to a very small number of persons. Nevertheless, no unprofessional conduct can be condoned.

The Board has instructed the President to make an immediate and thorough investigation of these charges, and to include in his report to the Board not later than April 30, 1969, the procedures which are to be established to ensure that unprofessional conduct on the part of any member of the College community will be promptly and effectively eliminated. *The Board will not approve for reappointment faculty or staff who are unable or unwilling to conduct themselves in a professional manner.*

HAWAII BUILDER E. E. BLACK, "A BULLDOZER WITH A HEART," CELEBRATES HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the saga of Hawaii's Everett Earl Black is one of humility and hard work, and has its beginnings in a log cabin in Vigo County, Ind. It is the saga steeped in the American tradition of the crusty fist-wheeling builder who carved an empire out of the wilderness. To many old-time islanders, E. E. Black has become the symbol of the hard-driving force which slashed a wide swath through the rugged terrain of a half century of Hawaiian history, and with a business empire which today encompasses Guam, the Philippines and the trust territories.

In a recent interview with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, just prior to his 80th birthday last week, Mr. Black noted one of his favorite bits of advice to youngsters:

> Remember, nobody attains success on a 40-hour week.

It is this driving, almost classic, Eric Hoffer philosophy which has governed Mr. Black's life and business. From the founding in 1930 of the construction company which bears his name to the day he surrendered its presidency to his son in 1962, Mr. Black has always been the first man on the job at 5:30 a.m. and the last to quit.

But his beliefs in community service go far beyond just being a good boss and a good friend. It is best expressed in his "my debt to the community" philosophy:

> This community (Honolulu) made possible what I am and what I have today. The only way I know how to pay back my debt is through community service.

His days and energies are now directed in serving as the chairman of the Honolulu Gas Co.'s board of directors, as a director of the First Hawaiian Bank, Health Facilities Planning Council of Hawaii, and the Junior Achievement, and

XUM

as the chairman of the Queen's Medical Center's board of trustees. With the latter Mr. Black served as its president for 20 consecutive years, and was responsible for pulling the hospital out of the red.

Mr. Black, who has five grandchildren, was honored last year as Honolulu's "old fashioned" Father of the Year.

This, then, is the saga of Everett Earl Black, one of the leading builders in the Pacific. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii views with pride the many accomplishments of the dean of its construction industry. In order that others may know of the remarkable story of E. E. Black's success, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the informative article by reporter Tomi Knaefler which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of March 15, 1969:

BUILDER E. E. BLACK'S 80 YEARS

(By Tomi Knaefler)

I thought he was a tough old so-and-so.

But he isn't. Not a bit.

He is E. E. Black, one of the leading builders in the Pacific, whose very name became a kamaaina symbol of tough-talking, hard-driving success as he slashed a wide swath through the rugged terrain of a half century of Hawaiian history.

The Simon Legree image of Black crumpled—as will any image ill-founded on prejudice—under the weight of truth that revealed itself in an interview with him shortly before his 80th birthday next Friday.

What happened, you might say, was simply a matter of one human being getting to know another human being.

Or, as a long-time associate of Black's put it:

"From a distance, E. E. Black is a bulldozer. See him up close, he's a bulldozer with heart."

ORIGIN OF A NICKNAME

Heart, or is it soul, or is it humility that never goes out of style? Whatever it be, it came through during the interview as the essence of Everett Earl Black, known to his friends as "Johnny."

The nickname goes back to the first date he had with Ruth Ailene Emens, his wife of 56 years who had promptly dubbed him Johnny Jones.

The cigar-smoking (dozen a day) contractor has been called many more colorful names over the years, but they've left no visible scars.

This is, perhaps, because Black has that rare quality of humor that laughs best at himself.

An oldtimer at the Queen's Medical Center, which Black serves as president for the 20th consecutive year, illustrated that quality often obscured from public view:

"He's tough. He gives in hard, but he does give in if it's for the good of the organization, regardless of how strongly he personally feels about an idea.

"When he makes a mistake, he's the first one to admit it and he'll laugh at himself as loudly as the guy next to him."

WIT, COMPASSION, CANDIDNESS

The first hint of the Black humor was in his laugh-splashed response to this reporter's request for a pre-birthday interview.

"You people must be in pretty bad shape to want a story about an old battered-down engineer."

He provoked another round of laughter with a recitation of that old saying: 'Fools' names are like their faces; always seen in public places.' "

Along with his wit, within the essence of Black is a depth of compassion and remarkable candidness.

The crusty contractor, who was born in a log cabin in Vigo County, Ind., formed the company that bears his name in 1930. He served as its president until 1962 when he turned the job over to his son, Robert Emens Black, and has since served as chairman of the board.

At first, Black said, the switch in title didn't keep him from bounding about where the action was, just as always. A classic inner-directed man, he had worked hard since childhood and took pride in the fact that he expected no more of others than he did of himself.

GOOD BOSS AND GOOD FRIEND

One worker who was with Black from the start and has since retired recalled how his boss pitched in whatever the job—from lugging cement, picking and shoveling to operating a crane.

Furthermore, said the worker, Black—"a good boss and a good friend"—was always the first man on the job at 5:30 a.m. and the last to quit.

Black said: "It wasn't easy to step aside from active involvement. It was a hard thing to quit from something that took all that work to build up.

"But I knew it was time for me to stay away that day I stopped at one of the projects and asked the men 'what's going on?'

"They were doing the job completely contrary to our accepted practice.

"The superintendent shook his head. He said that my son Bob, the new president, wanted it done that way.

"This superintendent, who had worked with me for a long time, said: 'I told Bob that if your father ever saw this, I'd be fired.' "

DIFFERENT MEN, DIFFERENT IDEAS

Black blew out a huge puff of cigar smoke before continuing:

"I knew right then that I had to quit coming around. People have different ideas. I have mine. Bob has his. And it was his turn to be in charge, without any meddling from me.

"But it wasn't easy to stay away," Black said.

As he paused, the reporter recalled the E. E. Black, Ltd., signs seen over the years at countless building and construction sites and, too, the Wilson Tunnel site, where five workers were killed in the last of three cave-ins in 1954.

The tragedy, which occurred during the construction of the first of the two Wilson tunnels, is a "closed subject" for Black.

"I don't want to belittle anyone," he said, noting as he has in the past that the design of the tunnel was blueprinted by the City.

He said, "On the second tunnel, they let us do what we had wanted to do and everything went OK."

While he has apparently steeled himself regarding that remembrance, edges of pain seem still to be there.

TAKES PRIDE IN CHILDREN

His expression picked up again as he spoke about his son's progress with loads of fatherly pride:

"Bob's done exceptionally well. The jobs are bigger today. With the value of the dollar down the way it is, he has to work harder.

"The company's grown and expanded to the forward areas—Guam, the Philippines and now the Trust Territories. That credit belongs to my son.

"I'm very proud of him."

It was also with pride and respect that he spoke of his second son, Everett Emens, and his daughter, Jane Anna, both of whom are also in business for themselves; the former in Honolulu and the latter in San Francisco.

Black, who was chosen as Honolulu's ("old-fashioned") Father of the Year last year, "always tried to spend as much time as I could with my family."

His inward appreciation of his family showed in the facial lines that crept and then creased into the gentlest of smiles.

"Jane," he said, "still calls me every Sunday morning—just about 10 minutes to 8—even when she's traveling," which she does extensively for her epoxy resin formulating business.

SUNDAY CALL MEANS A LOT

The Sunday call "means a good deal to her father," Black said, particularly since his wife has been succumbing gradually to the toll of aging.

Mrs. Black was formerly active in "just about every woman's activity in town." She was a member of the University of Hawaii's Board of Regents.

"It means a good deal to me," he said, "to have a good relationship with my children.

"It's marvelous that Jane does call. Her business is a big responsibility. She needs someone to confide in. So do I."

For his 80th birthday, Jane, who was born on the same day, will return here to host a luau fit for "a very magnificent man" and some 175 friends who "have had a deep influence on his life."

The luau will be held at 6 pm. Friday at the Willows. Among the guests will be a number of his original crew, old-timers he worked in previous jobs as a "cub engineer" and business and civic leaders with whom he has tussled on numerous boards.

At another luau a few years back, Black was honored for his role in founding the General Contractors Association of Hawaii. The dean of the local construction industry rose to the occasion in expected form:

"It's wonderful to get flowers while you can still smell 'em."

Black cherishes that tribute from his colleagues. Another among other honors that tickled him was receiving an honorary doctor of engineering degree from his alma mater, the Rose Polytechnic Institute in Terre Haute, Ind.

WORK IN COMMUNITY CAUSES

Black has probably donated to more causes than there are causes. Right now, his energies are directed to the following:

Chairman of the Honolulu Gas Co.'s board of directors, director of the First Hawaiian Bank, Health Facilities Planning Council of Hawaii and the Junior Achievement and the chairmanship of the Queen's Medical Center's board of trustees.

The last two are his special pets, For JA, which helps youngsters to learn business principles by doing, Black persuaded an impressive group—architects to labor union officials—to put up a new $100,000 building for nothing.

Black's pitch to them as to himself: "We all owe it to our community to help as much as we can."

He has often expressed "my debt to the community. I came here as a young man of 24 on June 10, 1913, with my new bride and $250 in borrowed money. This community made possible what I am and what I have today. The only way I know to pay back my debt is through community service."

Black, who has five grandchildren, strongly supports the Junior Achievement because he believes in the gospel of hard work. He feels youngsters are happier when they know the satisfaction of work well done.

He thinks parents hurt youngsters today by trying to make it too easy by doing "too much" for them.

VALUES OF WORK

He believes higher education would be more meaningful if a youngster had to work for it and if a youngster took advantage of in-service work offered in cooperative education.

XUM

That, he notes, would help youngsters find their niche earlier and prevent them from getting stuck with ill-suited careers.

One of his favorite bits of advice to youngsters is: "Remember, nobody attains success on a 40-hour week."

His service to Queen's dates back to a severe heart attack 21 years ago. While confined, he was appalled to learn "what a bad shape the hospital was in financially."

No sooner back on his feet, Black volunteered to be on the hospital's board and won the first of an unbroken chain of 20 elections as board president a year later.

MUCH WORK FOR QUEEN'S

He has poured thousands of dollars and sense into the organization over the years. It was Black who pulled the hospital out of the red, thereby enabling continuing programs to expand and upgrade services.

A long-time Queen's associate remembers this scene: "Our president would walk through the hospital before noon each Wednesday to conduct his board meeting wearing khaki pants, workshirt and workshoes, carrying his lunch in a little brown paper sack."

Alas, sighed the associate, "he wears a suit like the others now."

Black has powerful feelings about Queen's.

"It isn't the biggest hospital in the country, but it's just as good as any of 'em.

"Tourists from all over who are unexpectedly hospitalized are constantly flabbergasted at the service and the wonderful job of nursing we offer. This community is very fortunate, too, in having a very competent group of doctors."

While Black has "very little to do with the company's business anymore," he still keeps his 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. hours at his Kakaako office.

GREATEST SATISFACTION

Without business pressures and without active Republican Party demands, Black, who supported Goldwater in 1964, fills his days with community work.

He said: "The most exciting thing for me was forming my own company. But the thing that gives me the greatest satisfaction is my community work."

And then he said:

"It's good of the community to let me do what I can.

"I need the community more than it needs me."

He continued:

"So many people become senile as they grow old. I told Malcolm MacNaughton that he should get me to climb off as president of the hospital board when he has reason to believe that I'm getting senile.

"I am sincere. The hospital is too important to the community. I don't want, and I shouldn't be allowed, to stay on if I'm a detriment."

Then, as a company official stepped into the office for his signature on a wad of business papers, Black laughingly explained the reporter's mission:

"The Star-Bulletin is updating their obituaries."

COLORFUL LANGUAGE

As Black shook hands heartily, the reporter noted the absence throughout the long chat of his well-known command of "old English," such as *!?& *!?& *!?&.

"Guess I'm just mellowing with age," he grinned, picking up a fresh "1886" cigar, which he buys six boxes at a time.

The matter of salty "old English" brought to mind one of Black's funniest stories:

Many years ago, he had hired an electrical subcontractor as a favor to a friend. When he discovered the man's extremely inferior work, Black tossed him off the job with an assortment of choice words.

The man sued for breach of contract and slander.

When Black's lawyer, J. Garner Anthony, read the plaintiff's complaint that the defendant had called him a blankety-blank, he asked:

"Did you say all this, Mr. Black?"

"That wasn't the half of it," was his client's reply.

Black recalls giving Anthony two instructions on the case: 1—"I don't want to pay that blankety-blank a red cent. 2—I don't want to go to court and lose."

Anthony's job in the slander case was to convince the jury that the subcontractor was, indeed, a blankety-blank.

The jury found in Black's favor on both counts.

Black's tribute to Anthony: "He has succeeded in keeping me out of jail all these years."

CURRENT HEAD OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SEES SERIOUS FLAWS IN MAGAZINE SALES INDUSTRY'S SELF-REGULATIONS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the past month I have been discussing the subject of magazine subscription sales fraud and deception. During that period, I have received numerous letters from around the country which support my position that such sales frauds must be wiped out.

Almost without exception, these letters are written by American consumers who have, themselves, fallen victims to the high-pressure sales pitch which often involves offers of prizes, free gifts, free magazines, and so forth, to secure a signature on a contract form.

There is nothing free about "magazine subscription sales," not even when the salesman or telephone solicitor insists that all you have to pay is the "postage and handling charges." The so-called "postage and handling" fee of a small sum weekly, when computed over a 5-year period as most magazine subscription sales are, quickly adds up to a huge debt of $150 or $180, payable in monthly installments over a period of about 2 years.

To receive a supporting letter from someone who has not "been taken," someone who is a national representative of business interests, and who is willing to state that "voluntary self-regulation has not been as effective as it should be" in the magazine sales industry, is a most refreshing experience.

I have received just such a letter from the current acting head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Arch N. Booth, executive vice president. Mr. Booth has been serving as chief executive of the national chamber since the national president accepted the position of Postmaster General of the United States in the administration of President Nixon.

Mr. Booth and I do not concur on the need for strong Federal legislation to clean up the magazine subscription sales industry and several other direct sales industries like it—encyclopedias as a prime example—which have blatantly used every scheme in the books to deceive consumers. I believe legislation is the only solution which will do the job effectively. Mr. Booth feels self-policing within the direct sales industry can succeed with more teeth and offers some suggestions.

One of his proposals would expand central registry, which now is composed entirely of magazine publisher representatives, to include representation for the chambers of commerce, the Better Business Bureau and consumer groups. Certainly, this is a suggestion which should not be overlooked.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to enter in the RECORD the comments of Mr. Booth, executive vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as one more strong argument for broad congressional hearings on the sales practices of magazine subscription sales companies and possible means to clean up the industry:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1969.

HON. FRED B. ROONEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: Thank you for sending me copies of the two recent statements you made in the House of Representatives regarding fraudulent sales practices of magazine subscription sales companies.

There is much merit in what you had to say—I congratulate you. There are some severe abuses by subscription selling organizations.

You are entirely right that voluntary self-regulation has not been as effective as it should be. However, we continue to believe that it's the best remedy. Self-regulation should be strengthened rather than abandoned and replaced with government regulation.

In the magazine field, for example, the Central Registry, set up by the Magazine Publishers Association, should put some teeth into its rules. Publishers who deal with unscrupulous subscription sales companies should be penalized in some fashion. Perhaps this could take the form of some sort of fine or perhaps it could simply be publicizing the fact of their dealings with these people.

Another constructive suggestion would be to include groups other than publishers in Central Registry. These could include perhaps local chambers of commerce, better business bureaus, consumer groups, and the like. They could let Central Registry know about some of the unscrupulous practices and who is perpetrating them.

These and other constructive ideas may help the legitimate door-to-door sales organizations.

I congratulate you on your efforts to be helpful. It's a pleasure to work with you.

Cordially yours,

ARCH N. BOOTH,
Executive Vice President.

ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, much controversy has been generated over the Federal Communications Commission's

XUM

recent decision to ban cigarette advertising on television.

The Portland Oregonian recently featured an editorial on this subject which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

Smoke Ad Ban Off Base

The Federal Communications Commission's proposed ban on television and radio advertising of cigarettes is not only unprecedented; it is also beyond the authority of the FCC and is probably unconstitutional.

The FCC has regulatory power over broadcasting because channels are limited and must therefore be assigned by responsible authority. But its commission gives it no power to say what must or must not be broadcast. Moreover, it is clearly out of its field in making a judgment on the dangers in smoking cigarettes. This is the kind of judgment that is entrusted by statute to the Food and Drug Administration. But it is out of place in an agency created for the limited regulation of communication media protected by the First Amendment's provisions of freedom of speech and press.

The majority of the commission bases its action on findings that some 50,000 deaths a year can be traced to lung cancer, which has been linked to heavy smoking of cigarettes. It so happens that about the same number of people die each year as a result of automobile accidents. Does the commission, therefore, have authority to ban automobile advertising, or the advertising of other killers such as sleeping pills and alcohol? It apparently believes it does.

American public opinion recognized the injurious personal and public effects of alcoholic beverages by writing their prohibition into the Constitution, later relenting. A constitutional amendment is the proper course if cigarette smoking is to be controlled.

The FCC might get away with its fiat for a time, if Congress does not act, for broadcasters are beholden to the agency. But surely the enforcement of such a ruling would be attacked in the courts, and the FCC's legal grounds appear to be nonexistent.

The moral grounds of such a federal government edict are certainly null. The government not only sanctions cigarettes by taxation; it actually encourages their manufacture and sale through support of tobacco crop prices.

The issue here is not the morbidity that may be assigned to smoking cigarettes. It is whether a federal agency may, by decree, say what may or may not be advertised to the public when there is no question of fraud or other crime being involved. Such authority cannot be tolerated in a free society.

GREEK DEMOCRACY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 148 years ago, on March 25, the Greek people, after a long and fierce struggle won their well deserved independence. On that date in 1821 the brave and long-suffering people of Greece threw off the yoke of the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed liberty throughout their land. Greece, the birthplace of democracy, had suffered under the cruel oppression of the Ottoman Empire. With civil liberties destroyed and with the oppressor's attempts to suppress the magnificent culture of the Greek people, it was surprising to many that the flames of liberty could not be quenched. But the Greeks are a freedom-loving people and often extraordinarily patient. They suffered under foreign domination but never lost the hope nor the determination that they would one day be free.

Under the leadership of and inspired by that great patriot Venizelos, the Greek people achieved their long-sought independence. Many times since 1821 obstacles have fallen in the path of the continued growth and protection of Greek liberty, but each time the determination of the Greek people to be truly free has prevailed. In every generation Greece has faced a threat to her democratic ideals, but as in the case of the Ottoman Empire, the oppressor is vanquished.

I am hopeful that Greek democracy, which has contributed so much to our own system of liberty, will continue to prevail so that that nation, which gave democracy to the world, will share in the fruits of her own contribution.

DR. BRUNO BETTELHEIM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, one of the world's noted psychologists, has brought a new dimension into the entire discussion of campus unrest in America.

In his testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by the distinguished lady from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), Dr. Bettelheim has called our attention to the fact that some of those participating in campus disorders are emotionally disturbed and need professional help in the treatment of their personal problems.

I believe it is extremely important that we recognize this aspect of the unrest phenomena sweeping this country.

I am mindful that some of those participating in such unrest are exercising their constitutional right of dissent. I am also aware that some of the young people are genuinely concerned about the lack of relevency in much of the curricula being offered by American institutions of higher learning and express their concern in these demonstrations.

I am also aware that some of the young people belong to minority groups and feel genuinely left out from the mainstream of university life, both in the curriculum, the social activity, and employment opportunities.

But I believe that Dr. Bettelheim quite properly points out that we ought also to recognize the fact that some of those participating in campus unrest are nothing more than emotionally disturbed young people seriously in need of professional assistance.

It is high time that we recognized that not all of the turmoil on the university campus is directly associated with constitutional rights of dissent.

No one can convince me that a young college student who disrobes on a university campus and cavorts around in the nude is participating in some constitutional right of dissent. Obviously, we are dealing with a sick individual who ought to be identified as such and then given professional help.

It should come as no surprise to us that young people on the university campus should suffer emotional disturbances when we consider the enormous pressures that bear on the young people of today.

I believe that Dr. Bettelheim has performed a notable public service by applying his vast experience in addressing himself to this subject.

I hope that university educators will read his testimony with care and not dismiss it, but rather garner from this testimony some meaningful guidelines for dealing with the problem of campus unrest.

Very shortly I intend to offer legislation which would make funds available to universities for the establishment of psychiatric, outpatient clinics which would be made available to those young people who feel they need professional assistance with their personal problems.

It is not uncommon that people who may be extremely gifted in their intellectual pursuits may suffer to a lesser or greater degree, emotional problems which can be helped by professional assistance.

I believe Dr. Bettelheim's analogy of the situation on our campus today and those events which led to the collapse of freedom in Germany is most timely and offers to us for the first time some professional guidance of dealing with this problem.

In my judgment, we ought to make available on the campus meaningful professional help to those young people, and perhaps those members of the faculty who feel it necessary, some professional help.

I hope no one will read into my remarks a suggestion that everyone who engages in dissent is in need for psychiatric help because this is not the point I am making at all. But I do believe that there are some among the dissenters who could be given more meaningful assistance than venting their emotions in needless destruction as we so often witness now.

Dr. Bettelheim's excellent statement to the committee follows:

Statement of Dr. Bruno Bettelheim Before the House Special Subcommittee on Education, March 20, 1969

The problems to society which originate in the students' rebellions are so manifold and have such far reaching implications that in a short presentation only a very small selection of them can be alluded to. I shall, therefore, concentrate (1) on the parallels to the German situation before Hitler; (2) on a few of the factors which contribute to the widespread unrest among relatively large numbers of students, black and white; (3) on the small group of leaders who, by making skillful use of the general unrest succeed in doing damage way beyond the importance of this group because of their tactics of intimidation and coercion and due to the publicity they receive; (4) the particular difficulties of some black students which are

XUM

exploited by the SDS; (5) the fascination with extreme positions, and (6) what all this does to the universities and higher education.

(1) While history does not repeat itself, and while the present U.S. situation is radically different from that of pre-Hitler Germany, given these vast differences, some of the similarities between the present student rebellion and what happened in the German universities which spearheaded Hitler's rise to power are striking. Of course, the German student rebels embraced politically the extreme right, while here they are of the extreme left, but what is parallel is the determination to bring down the establishment. In Germany the philosophy which gained them a mass following was racist and directed against a discriminated minority (the Jews), while here the radical students intend to help a discriminated minority. While this is an important difference, it does not change the parallel that universities then and now were forced to make decisions in respect to the race of students, rather than on the basis of disregard of racial origin. To use only one example, German universities began to cave in when students coerced faculties to appoint professorships in *Rassenwissenschaft,* that is, professorships devoted to teaching the special aspects, merits, achievements, of one race versus others, rather than concentrating in their teaching on contributions to knowledge, whatever the origin of the person who made the contribution.

Professor Laqueur[2] says, "National Socialism came to power as the party of youth." Its cult of youth was as pronounced as that of Italian facism whose very hymn was called "Youth" (*Giovinezza*). Hitler insisted all along that his movement was a revolt "of the coming generation against all that was senile and rotten with decay in German democratic society." Professor Gay[1] stresses the prevalence in pre-Hitler days of an ideology that pitted the sons against the fathers, an insistence that the generations cannot understand each other, are deadly enemies; in short, in this respect they said exactly the same as do our rebellious students who insist that nobody over thirty is trustworthy.

Thus, then as now, these rebellious students were pictured as the new generation, disgusted with the complacency of their parents, fighting courageously for a better world. And what were then the mass media often depicted them as idealists, as young people concerned with the real issues of society. In short, they were in their time the wave of the future. And leftist student activists in 1968 burned books they did not like in the same manner and at the same place, Berlin, as did Hitler's equally youthful followers in 1933.

After having stressed these parallels, and some others which I shall mention at the end, one must recognize the vast differences between the present student rebelliousness, and that of pre-Hitler Germany. It is these differences which should permit us to work towards an entirely different outcome.

If I read the signs of the time correctly, I do not think that the rebellious students in and by themselves are a serious danger to the country, though they are a real danger to the universities.

The danger I fear is rather an opposite one: that the disgusting behavior of a very small group of students—the overwhelming majority of our students are sound, and wish nothing more than to take advantage of the opportunities higher education offers them—will arouse a severe counter-reaction, so much so that their left radicalism may lead to a fascist type of backlash. This I believe is the greatest danger inherent in their efforts to create chaos. In desperation—and they try to test and exhaust the patience of what they call the establishment and thus do succeed in creating desperation—and to prevent such chaos, repressive measures might be embraced which would be dangerous to our democratic institutions. It is because of this danger that I believe the student rebellions must be dealt with in the best interest of all of society, including that of the rebelling students themselves. But they can be dealt with intelligently and constructively only if the measures taken are designed to do away with the causes of the widespread discontent of college students.

(2) In order to understand this discontent one has to realize that so many more go to college than ever before, and hence many more are much less well prepared for this experience. Taking advantage of college, and being satisfied with this experience rather than being defeated by it, requires a considerable amount of self-discipline, and a high degree of satisfaction with what can be derived from developing one's intellect. Present day education both in home and school teaches very little self-discipline compared to even very recent times. The expectation is that education can hand over knowledge and skills, and this nearly instantly. There is widespread feeling that if students do not do well in school, this is the failing of the educational system, not due to their lack of application. With each year in school, this feeling becomes stronger in those who do not do well academically. And with it, the system becomes the enemy which deliberately withholds from them which they believe could so easily be given to them by it, hence the hatred of the system.

To understand why pressures erupt in adolescence on a growing scale nowadays, and why controls seem to grow weaker, we must recognize that adolescent revolt is not a stage of development that follows automatically from our natural makeup. What makes for adolescent revolt is the fact that a society keeps the next generation too long dependent in terms of mature responsibility and a striving for independence.

Years ago, when schooling ended for the vast majority at fourteen or fifteen, and thereafter one became self-supporting, got married and had children, there was no need for adolescent revolt. Because while puberty is a biological given, adolescent as we know it with its identity crises, is not. All children grow up and become pubertal. By no means do they all become adolescents. To be adolescent means that one has reached and even passed the age of puberty, is at the very height of one's physical development—healthier, stronger, even handsomer than one has been, or will be, for the rest of one's life—but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood till long beyond what any other period in history has considered reasonable. And their educational experiences in the home and school prepare only a small minority well for such a prolonged waiting, for being able to control their angry impatience while engaged in such waiting.

And it is this waiting for things—for the real life to come—which creates a climate in which a sizeable segment of students can, at least temporarily, be seduced into following the lead of the small group of militants. It seems to give them a chance to prove themselves as real men. Thus it is an empty waiting for real life to come, which makes for student rebellions. This can be seen from the fact that most rebellious students, here and abroad, are either undergraduates, or those studying the social sciences and humanities. There are no militants among students of medicine, engineering, the natural sciences. They are busy with doing things that are important to them, they are working in the laboratory and at their studies. It is those students who do not quite know what they are preparing themselves for, and why, the students who sit around waiting for examinations rather than doing active work, which form the cadres of the student rebellion.

One example may stand for many: In a class I am presently teaching, a student was close to the activists. He gave me a very hard time in class at first. Two months later he was one of the most interested, cooperating students. I asked him what happened. He answered: "A few weeks ago I got a job which interests me, and I also began to be interested in my classes; that did it."

In my opinion there are, today, far too many students in the colleges who essentially have no business to be there. Some are there to evade the draft, many others out of a vague idea that it will help them to find better paying jobs, though they do not know what jobs they want. And again many go to college because they do not know what better to do and because it is expected of them. Their deep dissatisfaction with themselves and their inner confusion is projected against the institution of the university first, and against all institutions of society secondarily, which are blamed for their own inner weakness.

To make matters worse, our institutions of higher learning have expanded much too fast, have under public pressure for more education for everybody increased enrollment beyond reason. The result is far too large classes. Many classes in our large universities are taught by teaching assistants some of whom, out of their own inner dissatisfaction and insecurity, tend to side with the rebellion. All this led to the anonymity, the impersonal nature of student faculty contacts about which many students rightly complain. And since many of them are essentially not interested in the intellectual adventure, the knowledge which the faculty can convey to them is not what they want. They want essentially group therapeutic experiences which will help them to become mature, secure, to find themselves. But colleges are not mass therapeutic institutions, and hence disappoint the students where the greatest need lies.

In addition because of such vast expansion in numbers, the old methods to give coherence to the college experience, and to offer students a life geared to the needs of the late adolescent age group have disintegrated. This the fraternities and sororities used to do, which were group homes easing the transition from home to society at large. They no longer can contain the vast number of students. And here the demands of some black students for separate black housing, etc. has to be understood as the consequence of their feeling lost in the anonymous mass of students. Only most of the white students are similarly lost until such time as they find themselves in their work and study experience.

Also, the old rituals which enhanced student life and bound them to each other, and to their college, such as football rallies, homecomings etc., all have lost most of their meaning and have not been replaced by anything but the excitement the sit-ins and rebellions provide. The spirit of intimate comradeship that used to prevail in a fraternity house is now found by all too many students in their sit-ins, where they feel closely bound together, important as at no other time, doing things together which they deep down know they do also for the emotional satisfactions they derive from such being together, whatever high sounding issues they think are motivating their actions.

In this context, the symbolic meaning should not be overlooked of students' invading the dean's or president's office, violently, or by means of sit-ins, big in age and size, who inwardly feel like little boys, and hence need to play big by sitting in papa's big chair. They want to have a say in how things are run, want to sit in the driver's seat, not because they feel competent to do so, but because they cannot bear to feel incompetent.

---

[2] Laqueur, Walter Z. *Young Germany.* New York: Basic Books, 1962.

[1] Gay, Peter. *Weimar Culture; the Outsider as Insider.* New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1968.

I think it is unnatural to keep a young person for some 20 years in dependency, and attending school. This might be a way of life for that small elite which always in the past went to universities. They were those who could go to school for 20 years. But they were never more than a small percentage of the population. In the past, the vast majority of young people were actively meeting life, proving themselves as men or women. And in this way they found themselves as real, strong human beings. Now the tremendous push that everybody should go to college has brought an incredibly large number into the university who do not find their self-realization through study, or through the intellectual adventure. But they still need to find their early manhood. They try to change the university to something where they can find it through engaging in an active, sometimes even violent battle against the existing order or all of society. Only that would change the university so that it would be no longer an institution dedicated to the intellectual virtues, to the frontiers of knowledge, but one dedicated to a belligerent reshaping of society. And this is exactly what the militants want—not to engage in study and research, but in political battles.

The reason we didn't have student revolts before is partly because only those went to college who wanted to be educated, and partly because those students who had to put themselves through school, by the very fact that they could do that, of their own strengths, could prove their early manhood—at least to some degree.

I think many of the rebellious students are essentially guilt-ridden individuals. They feel terribly guilty about all the advantages they had. And there's also the guilt of their exemption from the draft, which is a serious guilt. Only again, they cannot bear to live with their guilt. They try to destroy society or certain institutions rather than deal with their own inner guilt, because they have it so good.

I think, from these remarks, it should be obvious which, I believe, may be some of the remedies. Firstly, all too many who now go to college have little interest, ability, and use for what constitutes a college education. They would be better off with a high level vocational education which is closely linked to a work program which gives scope to their needs for physical activity and visible, tangible achievement. The complaint of many of these students is that nobody needs them. They feel parasites of society, and hence come to hate a society which they think makes them feel this way. Here we should not be beyond learning from the communist countries where studies are combined with work in factories and in the fields. I believe this to be a much better arrangement for all those who do not feel a deep commitment to the intellectual enterprise, that is to study and research, and these will always be only a relatively small segment of this age group.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest a youth service program (civilian peace corps, or such) of a couple of years' duration where young people work on socially significant projects while earning pay for it, and receiving at the same time, higher vocational training. After this period only those would go to universities who really wish to do so, while the rest would feel a much greater stake in a society that they helped rebuild. At the least, because of the training they received, they would be well prepared for permanent jobs.

While a need for an army draft exists, such program should be an alternative to it: only those young men who wish to do so should serve in the armed forces, which then would be a voluntary army. And I am convinced if every able-bodied person would have to serve two years in some such program, there would be no scarcity of those who wish to spend these two years in the armed forces instead, particularly if they would, for example, receive some advantages in pay, or other special advantages such as at the end of armed service. This would also do away with the exemption of college students which, in connection with the war in Vietnam, is behind so much of the student unrest. For example, if I am exempt from service when others are not, I can live in peace with myself only if I am convinced this is a vile war.

(3) I feel I can be shorter about the very small group of leaders of the student rebellion because were it not for the widespread student discontent which I discussed above, they would find scant following, and if they should break the law, without such followers, they could be readily dealt with. It is the mass following they can arouse because of the widespread discontent which alone makes them dangerous. I therefore think we should concentrate in our thinking and planning not on these very few, but on what needs to be done so that they won't find ready followers.

There were always a small percentage of persons bent on destroying society, and on fomenting a revolution. In previous generations they were the Wobblies, later there were the campus communists. The reason why the present brand of campus revolutionaries, who are of anarchist and nihilist persuasion, are so much more dangerous is that they can point to success after success of their disrupting tactics. Here, too, nothing succeeds like success. As early as 200 years ago Immanuel Kant warned that we shall never be able to control violence if it is rewarded. "It is far more convenient," he wrote, "to commit an act of violence, and afterwards excuse it, then laboriously to consider convincing arguments and lose time in listening to objections. This very boldness itself indicates a sort of conviction of the legitimacy of the action, and the God of success is afterwards the best advocate." The greatest danger, then, is presently the readiness with which violence is afterward excused, and the seemingly convincing arguments which are brought forth to justify it before and after the act. Worst and most dangerous of all, there seems to be a tendency in our society to legitimize the results of violence so that, as Kant puts it, the God of success afterwards serves as advocate for the violent action that preceded it and suggests its future use. On our campuses those committed to violence (to quote Kant again), "lose no time on considering arguments, or on listening to objections." They simply refuse to be rational about their grievances and through using violent means insist on having their way, no matter what. And if they get their way, as Kant already knew, their success then legitimizes their disruptive actions.

And they gain their success by arousing a sizeable number of students through the tactics of confrontations, and by universities' fear of such confrontations. Confrontations have one important aim—to use the reaction of those they provoke to generate a feeling of new unity among the demonstrators. This has been used in its most direct form by militants, who stand in front of policemen and denounce them as pigs and wait until the man in uniform hits out. The art of demonstrating then lies in seeing that the blows are directed against the less committed demonstrators and, if possible, against completely uninvolved persons. This then provides the mass following they need for their success. A whole system of provocations has been worked out for this purpose.

Speaking of the small group of leaders of the radical left, it has been observed that most of them come from well educated, very liberal families. From my own observations I would like to add that those whom I got to know might be characterized by having had their intellectual abilities developed very highly at much too early an age, but at the expense of their emotional development. Very bright as they often are, emotionally some of them remained fixated at the age of the temper tantrum. It is this discrepancy between great intellectual maturity and utter emotional immaturity which is so baffling, often even to the universities, where some members of the faculty fail to see behind the obvious intelligence the inability to act rationally, and most of all, the inability to act responsibly. It is one of the weaknesses of university faculties that, as persons committed to value most highly intellectual abilities, they are captivated by the intelligence of these students to the degree as to be ready to excuse, or make little, of their disruptiveness and intellectual arrogance.

As for these students themselves, psychologically I always found them hating themselves as intensely as they hate the establishment, a self-hatred they try to escape by fighting any establishment. Obviously they need help in overcoming their emotional difficulties, and punishing them is hardly the way to do it. If we bring them to the universities, we should provide facilities for helping them. I believe it is their emotional immaturity that explains both their call for immediate action, and the retreat of the dropout and the hippy into utter non-action, because each one masks an inability of these very intelligent young people to take time to think things out first. Essentially these militants must want to destroy the universities because they do not want to be students. Because to be a sudent means to prepare oneself to do something more worthwhile in the future. The militant student's cry is for action now, not preparation for action later. In this real sense he is no longer a student at all, since he clearly rejects knowledge as a precondition of any meaningful activity. Truth, moreover, is no longer sought, but "revealed"; the contempt for free speech and free thought is demonstrated as much in his actions as in his words. Were he ever to capture the university, it would cease to be a university at all.

In their inability to think things out because they cannot delay action for thought, both right and left extremists, the militants of all colors, are brothers under the skin. This is among the reasons why in history it happened that the young followers of the extreme right can very easily become those of the extreme left, or the other way round. Because the mainspring of their action is their wish to prove themselves strong, and less any particular political conviction, which is super-imposed on their self-doubt and a hatred of a society that they feel left them out in the cold. There were reasons why, in Germany, the National Socialists and the Communists voted together, worked together to bring down the democratic Weimar government. There is a reason why former Nazis could easily become active in the Communistic government of Eastern Germany.

But there is also reason why mainly the children of leftist parents become hippies, or student revolutionaries in our society, as in other places or times the children of conservative parents, when the similar emotional conditions prevailed in their families, spearheaded rightwing radicalism. It was the children of conservative German parents, for example, who first embraced the Emperor's War and enthusiastically went to their death, because they felt a need to lay "their bodies on the line," as it were, for ideas their parents had only lukewarmly held. This way they could prove themselves strong, while at the same time proving their parents weak, wishy washy, not worthy of true respect. They felt, too, this was a re-

XUM

birth, a way to revitalize an ossified society, to create a new society, one of true authenticity and confrontation. All these were the main tenets of academic Hitler youth, as they are now those of our student left.

Thus, while the emotional constellations which make for very different student revolts are strangely familiar, the specific political content of a student revolt depends to a very large degree on the beliefs of their parents. Because in many ways, it is a desperate wish to do better than the parent, exactly where he seemed weak in his beliefs. In this sense it is also a desparate desire for parental approval. But even more it is a desperate wish that the parent should have been strong in his convictions that motivate many of their actions. This is the reason why so many of our radicals embrace Maoism, why they chant in their demonstrations "Ho Ho Chi Minh" exactly as another generation of students chanted at their football rallies. These are strong fathers, with strong convictions, who powerfully coerce their children to follow their commands. While consciously they demand freedom and participation, unconsciously their commitment to Mao and other dictatorships suggests their desperate need for controls from the outside, since without it they are unable to bring order into their inner chaos.

Thus while these militant students need controls, such controls must not be imposed punitively, nor for the benefit of others. They must be controls that clearly and definitely benefit the person himself, so that he will eventually make them become his own inner controls.

It is this, their inability to wait and work hard for long range goals, which marks these militants as emotionally disturbed, as does their hatred for their parents who failed to give them direction, set them against the world, by exposing their immature minds to criticism of all that could have given meaning to their lives.

It is their hatred of society that makes it so easy for the small group of militant leaders to make common cause with another small group that provides temporary leadership for some of the rebellions: outright paranoid individuals. I do not believe the number of paranoids among students is greater than their number would be in any comparable group of the population. They become dangerous again because of their high intelligence, which permits them to hide more successfully the degree of their disturbance from the nonexperts. Having worked professionally with some of them for years, I know that student revolt permits them to act out their paranoia to a degree that no other position in society would permit them. How understandable, then, that all paranoids who can, do flock into the ranks of these militants. Unfortunately, most nonexperts do not know how persuasive paranoics can be, at least for a time, until they are recognized as such. The persuasiveness of a Hitler or Stalin is now recognized as the consequence of their own paranoia, and their unconscious appeal to the vague paranoid tendencies that can be found among the immature and disgruntled. I have no doubt that the ranks of the militants contain some would-be Hitlers and Stalins, hence again their dangerousness.

(4) Paranoics always make a persuasive appeal to any group of the population who rightly or wrongly feel persecuted, and they seek out such groups because they are most likely to view their paranoia as true understanding of this group's particular predicament. Which brings me to the particular problems of some of the black students who, fortunately, seem to recognize ever more than the SDS is using them, rather than helping them. They are not quite as successfully to see through the motives of some of the paranoid student leaders. Their feeling persecuted because of their emotional disturbance "feels" more congenial because of the black students' experience with discrimination.

Still, the overwhelming majority of the black students desire exactly the same for themselves as does the overwhelming majority of the white students; a rightful place in this society. And only a very small minority of them wishes to destroy it, as do the few rebellious white students. Thus if they could be convinced that there is a good place for them in society, their attitude would change and they all would part ways with the SDS, as many of them have already done. But here the difficulty is that many of the black students, just because of the nature of the commitment of the university, do not feel that being a student is necessarily the best way for them to find their rightful place in society. Here our wish, and theirs, that they should become part of the elite, runs afoul of what for many of them is their reality. Many of the black students who are brought into our colleges are often ill-prepared academically, and lacking in the skills required for making a go in college. At the same time they have been imbued with the notion that it is the fault of the establishment that they are disadvantaged. While this is true to some degree, being aware of such truth is an easy way out if one does not succeed.

All students find the transition from home to college difficult. In past times this was blamed by the student on himself, and most of them therefore tried to do something about themselves and sooner or later succeeded. Today both white and black students tend to blame the faculty for the difficulties they encounter in adjusting to a different way of life and study.

The demand for black study programs originated not only in the justified feeling that one must be familiar, and proud of one's own background, but to a large degree in the feeling that such studies would be easier, that such faculty would have greater understanding for this difficulty.

The fact is that some black students are induced to go to college whose preparation for it is inferior to that of the majority of the college population. While the faculty is ready to make allowances for this, it runs counter to the self-respect of the black student, who rightly does not wish to be made to feel like a second class citizen. But if he cannot compete successfully with those students who had had so many advantages educationally and socially, he is in a terrible conflict. He was brought to college to do as well as the others, but if he fails to do so, his background does not permit him to accept that this is because of his lack of preparation, because this would make him feel second class, while he is in college to get out of such a position. So when because of lack of background and preparation—though intellectually able to make the grade— he has difficulty in adjusting, he feels that the very place that promised to make him equal fails to do so. Disappointed, he rages against the institution that makes him once more feel inferior. And efforts to help him by means of special programs only makes this inferiority even more obvious. The many black students who are well able to hold their own with the best of the rest feel they must not desert their fellow black comrades and hence feel obliged to make their burden their very own.

I believe the answer to this problem does not rest with the colleges and universities. If we want to bring a large number of black students into our universities, as we should, I am convinced we have to start much earlier. I believe from high school age on, it would be necessary to educate a larger number of them, together with white youngsters from culturally deprived background, in true prep schools, so that they will enter college in every respect as well prepared academically and socially as the rest of the college population.

(5) There is a fascination in society at large with sex and violence, with drugs and insanity which both influences the student militants and provides them with a noteworthiness which they exploit to the full. If students protest because of an idea or position and do so in orderly and rational form, they do not receive much public attention. But if they shed all their clothes and walk around naked, this makes news all over the nation, whatever the case they may, or may not have had. It is part of a dangerous fascination with youth and its extreme positions. What passes for modern literature which these youngsters read already in junior high school intoxicates their minds with the appeal of drug induced madness, with sexual acting out and with violence.

The universities, because of their intellectual prestige, give the student activists a prestige for their revolutionary claims which they otherwise could never achieve. For example, for days not more than some 20 to 30 students occupied the administration building of the University of Chicago. They got headlines every day, and were prominently featured on radio and TV. If some 30 people would have demonstrated in any other place, they would have found no attention whatsoever. This the SDS knows, that is why it concentrates on the universities. The contrast between an institution devoted to the highest achievements of reason, and the obscenity and violence perpetrated there, makes it all the more fascinating. It is this fascination on which they try to build their revolutionary success. An idea in itself may be next to nothing, but it becomes news by interfering with something else which is considered, for one reason or another, to be of public importance. In themselves a couple of hundred demonstrators, somewhere in New York or Chicago would mean very little, but if some fifty students march into a large lecture hall, take control of the podium, and broadcast their ideas to people who came to hear something quite different, then they have made news.

Here, too, is where the function of political phraseology becomes operative. If someone advocates urinating on graves as the Fugs did, or if a few girls dress up as witches and put curses on professors, as they did in Chicago, if they would do so without reference to politics, people would rightly wonder about their sanity; but if they do so as a condemnation of the Viet Nam war, or take clothes off while claiming to be demonstrating for some good progressive cause, they have the support of many of the older liberals and enlightened radicals, who will inevitably consider it all to be very socially significant. If you are a teenager wrestling with the police and you say you are doing it because of the moral superiority of a future social order, you cannot fail to get the sympathetic attention of the editors of radio and TV stations rather than psychiatrists. The ritualistic invocation of ideology is thus both an alibi and a defense.

(6) Perhaps it all has made too many headlines, perhaps it has been talked about too much for people to accept the fact: but the truth of the matter is that these rebellions can and do paralyze the universities.

And they do this not only because classes are interrupted and buildings occupied, not only because faculty must devote all their energies to calming things down, but much more so because all the time and energy which should be devoted to more lasting achievements has to be concentrated on preparing for and on forestalling new confrontations. Here at last comparison with pre-Hitler days: Then in Germany, as Professor Mosse[3] puts it "professors tended to be either scholars who withdrew into their own speciality, taking scant notice of the world around them, or men who attempted to play the role of prophets. The first kind of academic wanted only to be left in peace . . . The professor as prophet, with very few exceptions indeed, was to be found on the side of the revolting students." Of the students he says, "They had found a basis for action that opposed existing authority yet remained independent of any political movement directed by their elders." And of the faculties that they "failed to provide any opposition, failed to use administrative powers, and failed to organize effective alternative groups of students. At best they displaced a detached passivity . . . at worst they joined in the harassment."

---

[3] Mose, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

Like in pre-Hitler faculties, so in our universities today we can see efforts of faculty members to remain aloof from it all, while others try to anticipate even the most radical student demands, so as to avoid confrontations. Worse, there are no efforts made to organize effective alternative groups of students. And most of all, many are so intimidated that they cave in even before the students exercise any pressures. It is the continuous worry about what the militant students may do next, the anxious efforts to give them no offense, which saps the universities of their strength so that they become paralyzed. This anxious avoidance of taking a firm stand gives not only these militants, but also many non-committed students the feeling that they have the faculty on the run, because these adults are not sure about their values.

If the colleges and universities would feel sure about themselves, take a determined stand against any coercion and intimidation—though always not only open to, but inviting, reasonable, non-coercive discussion about how things could be improved (and much improvement is needed, as I suggested all along)—then I believe student rebellions could be so reduced as to no longer threaten the universities and, because of the consequences, possibly even all of society.

Thus I believe efforts should be concentrated on strengthening the will of the colleges and universities to resist disruption and coercion. If we succeed in doing so, I believe we shall have little need to take recourse to punitive measures; beyond setting into practice that those who do not wish to have any part of our universities should have their will: they should not be permitted to be, live and work at a place they hate, not as a punishment, but because to remain at a place they hate and despise serves no good purpose, and is detrimental to their emotional well being.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL, OF VIRGINIA, IN SUPPORT OF HIS BILL TO AUTHORIZE FILLING OF VACANT POSITIONS IN THE U.S. PARK POLICE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 27, 1969

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the filling of vacant positions in the National Park Service, which are now vacant as a result of restrictions imposed by section 201 of Public Law 90–364, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The impact of this act has been to prevent the hiring of U.S. Park Police to fill vacancies that exist and are urgently needed to patrol our parks, where serious crimes have risen sharply over the past year.

In a letter written yesterday, I have informed the President of this situation and have solicited his energy and his office to expedite this bill and to take such other action required in the executive branch to fill these vacancies. My letter reads as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since you have taken office, I have had the privilege of bringing several matters of concern to the citizens of Washington and nearby Virginia to your attention. Of primary and continued concern to me, as a Member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives and as the Representative of the Congressional District in Northern Virginia immediately adjacent to the District of Columbia, is the high crime rate in the Federal city of Washington.

Notwithstanding glowing reports appearing recently in the news media of a slight reduction in crime in the past month, I find an overall increase in crime in the District of 43.9 percent in January 1969 over January a year ago. The specific crimes of criminal homicide increased 100 percent and rape increased 64.3 percent during the same period. Based on the statistics released by the Metropolitan Police Department on March 12, 1969, there are no signs that we are winning this war to make our streets and parks safe for our citizens and visitors. On the contrary, we hardly appear to be holding our own against the criminals, and this is tragic.

For these reasons, I would like to offer another suggestion as to one way in which we might gain quick assistance in our war against the criminals of the Washington area. As you may know, the United States Park Police are still 80 men below their authorized strength, and representatives have stated that due to the large waiting list of applicants they can fill these vacancies in short order if permitted to do so.

In order to fill these vacancies, it will be necessary for you to direct the Bureau of the Budget to remove their economy in government guidelines with respect to the hiring of field operations personnel of the National Park Service. Then it will be necessary to effect early enactment of legislation which I am introducing in Congress to exempt field operations personnel of the National Park Service from the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

While I am aware that the blame for not filling these positions has been laid at the doorstep of the Congress, I am also sure that an announced intent by the Executive Branch to exert its full influence in this matter would be met with enthusiasm from the great majority of the Congress and the people of these United States. This is particularly true since your proposal for increasing the number of metropolitan policemen seems to have become a controversial matter on which the District of Columbia City Council seems afraid to act favorably.

I cannot guarantee that you will not receive a loud clatter of opposition to my proposal from the same militant and left-wing crowd attempting to run the District of Columbia to suit themselves. But I will assure you that there will be fewer rapes in the parks under the jurisdiction of the Park Police if this course is followed. I urge you to seek the full authorization for the United States Park Police from the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget without delay.

With warmest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the President, the need for more park policemen in the Washington area is urgent. I am confident he will recognize this need and take the necessary action with the Bureau of the Budget. Meantime, however, I believe we in the House must act with great haste to enact this legislation, so that the additional protection we must have can be obtained without delay.

NATIONAL EYE BANK MONTH: "SO OTHERS MAY SEE"

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the month of March has been set aside as National Eye Bank Month, and I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the vital effort which is going on in every part of the country, "so others may see."

It is this program which has helped make possible over the past 20 years the success of corneal transplants to improve defective vision or restore vision for persons with corneal defects caused by disease or accident.

National attention is currently focussed on the dramatic progress in areas like heart and kidney transplants, but until recently, the cornea was the only part of the human body which could be replaced by tissue from another person.

The first eye bank was established in this country in 1945, as corneal transplants became an established part of ophthalmic surgery. Under the sponsorship of the Lions Club, the Iowa Eye Bank was established in 1955, and since that time 505 corneal transplants have been conducted in our State alone.

In addition, the medical director of the Iowa bank, Dr. Alson E. Braley, has been instrumental in encouraging similar programs in other parts of the country, and in organizing a national eye bank network.

With the development of new methods to preserve eyes, it has been possible to establish an International Eye Bank to make tissues available to surgeons in foreign countries lacking donor eyes, as well as to send teams of ophthalmologists abroad to teach and provide services.

The eye bank program operates through voluntary donation of eyes after death by individuals, who do so by filing a notarized donor card with the eye bank, which in Iowa is located at the University Hospitals in Iowa City. More than 21,159 such donor cards are now on file in our State.

A waiting list of individuals in need of corneal transplants is also maintained at the eye bank. There are presently 13 names on the Iowa waiting list, which is relatively typical, although it sometimes reaches as many as 35 individuals awaiting transplants.

Upon the death of a donor, the eye bank is notified and as soon as practical, the eyes are removed by a local physi-

XUM

cian and delivered in specially equipped containers by the Iowa Highway Patrol to wherever the transplant is to take place.

In the meantime, the eye bank locates the recipient from its waiting list, and arrangements are made for transplant surgery.

In addition to its function as a clearinghouse between donor and recipient, the eye bank conducts an extensive public education campaign in conjunction with the local Lions Clubs. The eye bank in Iowa has prepared an excellent brochure explaining the program, "What You Should Know So Others May See," and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW SO OTHERS MAY SEE: QUESTIONS MOST ASKED ABOUT THE LIONS EYE BANK

1. What is the purpose of an Eye Bank?

Its main purpose is to act as a clearinghouse between the person donating his eyes after death and the person needing a corneal transplant.

2. How can I donate my eyes to the Eye Bank to be used after death?

By writing to the Iowa Lions Eye Bank, University Hospitals, Iowa City, Iowa, and requesting a donor card. This card should be signed and notarized. Section A is returned to the Eye Bank office and an identification card will be sent to you. Section B may be kept by the next of kin or your family physician.

3. Does age make a difference?

Under three years of age eyes are not used, but all other eyes are acceptable.

4. Does the cause of death have any effect on the use of the cornea?

The cause of death is usually of little significance.

5. Does it matter if the donor wears glasses?

No. Previous eye surgery or diseases of the eye do not affect the donation of eyes.

6. How soon should eyes be removed and when must they be used for surgery?

Eyes should be removed as soon as practical, generally within four hours after death. Eyes for corneal transplants are usually used within 36 hours after they are removed.

7. Do eyes donated to the Eye Bank serve other useful purposes than grafts?

The research program is very important and all parts of the eye not used for surgery are used for research and teaching.

8. Are there any charges for the Eye Bank services?

No. Eyes are furnished to surgeons and there is no cost for the eye to the patient. The removal of the eye is done as a service. It is not possible to buy or sell eyes.

9. Is there disfigurement after removal of donor eyes?

There is no disfigurement whatsoever.

10. Can eyes be left to specific individuals?

No. This is not practical. As soon as the physician decides a person is a candidate for a corneal transplant his name is put on the waiting list. It is not necessary for him to wait until an acquaintance dies to receive his transplant.

11. Who can be helped by a corneal graft?

Those people who have defective vision or no vision due to corneal defects caused by disease or accident may be helped by a corneal graft.

12. Can whole eyes be replaced?

No. Only the cornea or surface tissue of the eye can be replaced.

13. Who removes the eyes from deceased donor and where does he get the necessary equipment?

Sixty-eight Eye Bank Kits with all the sterile equipment for removing eyes are placed in strategic places over the state. The eyes are removed by physicians and if the doctor needs the equipment he calls the County Sheriff, who contacts the Highway Patrol. The equipment located nearest the doctor is immediately taken to him and as soon as the eyes are removed they are delivered to the University Hospital or where-ever needed, in the ice filled container, by the Highway Patrol.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the eye bank program in Iowa and throughout the country is due to the combined cooperative efforts of dedicated ophthalmologists, service organizations like the Lions Clubs, public officials like the highway patrol, and the thousands of individuals who donate their eyes.

The impact of the program is perhaps most dramatically evidenced in the lives of the individual recipients. An article recently appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette describing the experience of one such recipient, and I include it at this point in the RECORD as testimony of the importance of this national effort:

EYE BANK CORNEAS PROVIDE SIGHT FOR YOUNG CEDAR RAPIDS MAN

(By Ken Sullivan)

Robert Rush, Jr., 2201 Birchwood drive NE, is an unusual young man.

Unusual in the sense that, at 22, he contracted an eye disease more common to older persons and more prevalent among women.

Unusual in the sense that he has undergone surgery three times to correct the problem, although such corrective surgery normally is better than 90 percent successful after the first operation.

Bob, a 1962 graduate of Washington high school, was a junior at Northwestern university in Evanston when he first became aware of the eye defect, keratoconus. It's a disease which causes the cornea to protrude—conical fashion—rather than gently rounded as on unaffected eyes.

LITTLE KNOWN

Little is known about the causes of the disease other than it almost always requires surgical corrective procedures. The alternative to corneal transplant is eventual blindness. In Bob's opinion, a transplant was "the only alternative."

Surgical replacement of the cornea from Bob's left eye with one supplied through the Iowa Lions Eye Bank at the University of Iowa hospitals was first conducted last June.

By the time his appointment with surgery rolled around, Bob had overcome his anxiety . . . and "was excited" about the operation and what it would accomplish.

The transplant procedure, he said, lasted about 60 minutes. Bob had been given a local anesthetic and was aware of what was going on around him. His right eye had been covered, but he could hear the doctor's instructions to his assistants and he could feel pressure, but not pain, when the actual transplant was taking place.

LASTED 7 WEEKS

That cornea lasted about seven weeks. Then, apparently because of infection, the transplant failed. Bob underwent an emergency operation to substitute the original transplant with a second.

The second proved to be only a temporary measure. Fewer sutures were used in placement of the cornea and, in Bob's opinion, his body eventually rejected it.

The third cornea, however, has been in place eight weeks. All indications currently are optimistic, Bob relates. He returned early last week from a three-week vacation in Florida. While there, he visited Dr. Alson E. Braley, medical director of the U. of I. eye bank. Braley, too, passed on an optimistic word.

The young man, anticipating a return to his U. of I. law school studies possibly next year, said there is no discomfort in his left eye; although vision remains "fuzzy."

INACTIVITY

His primary discomfort during the entire sequence of transplants has been the inactivity. Doctors cautioned him against any strenuous physical activity for three months after surgery.

A handball enthusiast, he has been kept off the courts since last November. He was permitted to play then only because it had been determined the second transplant was a failure.

He worked last summer in Linn county's newly created legal assistance office and hopes to return there again this year; summer school, "not at Iowa," is a possibility, however.

Bob's semi-invalid state—not permitted to indulge in recreational activities, lift heavy objects, etc.—has been, he said, "harder on my parents than me."

UNOFFICIAL SPOKESMAN

His experiences over the last nine months have turned young Rush into an unofficial spokesman for the eye bank and its program of soliciting eye donations.

During his inactivity he sent off letters to half a dozen newspapers (including The Gazette) relating the need for eye pledges. Additionally, he said, most of his visitors leave with donor registration cards and a small brochure entitled, "What You Should Know So Others May See", distributed by the Iowa Lions Eye Bank.

Bob will continue, he said, "by word of mouth to point up the needs of the eye bank."

Two of the new corneas transplanted to Bob's left eye have been supplied by Iowans who pledged their eyes before death. Those were the first, which became infected and were removed, and the third, which is functioning well after more than eight weeks.

The second cornea was secured through the national eye bank network because it was needed in a hurry for the emergency surgery.

Dr. Braley and T. A. Hunter of Iowa City were instigators of the eye network.

SEVENTY-SIX 1967 TRANSPLANTS

Ruth Fisher, public relations assistant in the department of ophthalmology at University hospitals, and herself a recipient of transplanted corneas, said 76 corneal transplants were conducted in Iowa last year; 66 of them using corneas donated by Iowans, and ten with corneas from the national network. In addition, she said, three corneas were sent to other locations—via the net—from Iowa.

At the time of a donor's death, she said, the eyes are removed . . . usually by the family physician . . . and relayed to Iowa City by the highway patrol.

She was especially complimentary of the patrol's part in the project, citing the dependability of the relay in making sure the vital organ arrives quickly and undamaged.

The eye bank was established in September 1955. Between then and March 1, 1968, Miss Fisher said, 454 corneal transplants have been conducted.

The search for eye donors is a continuing program. The Lions clubs of Iowa are the only perpetual sponsors of the project; although the university, itself, provides assistance, and some eyes are donated independently.

Recipients do not pay for the corneas. They are provided free. The patient must, of course, bear the other expenses, except in charity cases.

THOUGHTFULNESS

For Bob Rush, Jr., the thoughtfulness of some unknown Iowan means continuing sight; the sight which will be so important to him as he continues his studies toward a career in law.

He has another eye operation in store; his right eye also will need corrective surgery. This, however, will be put off a year or so if Bob has his say. Nine months of inactivity are enough.

POPE PAUL VI ST. CYRIL MASS CELEBRANT IN ROME—BISHOP ANDREW G. GRUTKA, OF GARY, IND., CONCELEBRANT

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 of this year in Rome, thousands from Slavonic nations assembled in honor of St. Cyril, apostle of the Slavonic nations. This assembly of the faithful participated in a 3-day celebration from February 14 to February 16.

Bishop Andrew G. Grutka of Gary, Ind., assisted Pope Paul VI as concelebrant in this religious tribute in honor of St. Cyril. Two Slavonic cardinals who visited the diocese of Gary 2 years ago as guests of Bishop Grutka; namely, Jozef Cardinal Beran, of Prague, Czechoslovakia, and Franjo Cardinal Seper, of Yugoslavia, a Croatian prelate, also participated in the mass. Both cardinals occupy important Vatican positions.

Another happy coincident was that while the 3-day celebrations from February 14 to February 16 were in the Vatican, our American astronaut, Colonel Borman, a native of Gary, Ind., and his wife and two sons were received by Pope Paul in special audience in the Vatican.

The students of Andrean High School and the parochial schools in Gary and Whiting were happy that the Reverend Mother M. Bernard, with two sisters of the congregations of SS. Cyril and Methodius who teach in these schools, took part in these historical ceremonies.

The Slovak Catholic Federation of America will meet for its 45th national convention the week of April 20, 1969, in Youngstown, Ohio. I am informed by Editor John C. Sciranka, press director of the federation, that in honor and tribute to St. Cyril, Pope Paul issued an apostolic letter which calls for unity of all Slavonic nations. Considering that they number close to 400 million—of which over 40 million live in the United States—we are indeed happy about this unity as a sign for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial from the newspaper Good Shepherd-Dobry Pastier, narrating detailed information regarding the historic gathering of the Slovak faithful in Rome:

ST. CYRIL'S CELEBRATION IN ROME SPELLED UNITY OF SLAVONIC NATIONS

The ancient unity of the Slavic peoples blazed into life in St. Peter's basilica in Vatican at a multilingual Mass concelebrated by Pope Paul VI and 14 Slavic prelates on February 14, 1969.

The Pope, prelates and Slavic pilgrims, including 1,000 from Czecho-Slovakia, were making the 11th centenary of the death of St. Cyril who gave a large part of the Slavic peoples a common alphabet and the Christian faith.

Slavic languages, both ancient and modern, echoed through the Basilica and the colors of sundry national costumes flashed from the pilgrim ranks.

Pope Paul, surrounded by bishops representing almost all the modern nations, reminded the Slavs that fidelity to the Holy See was at the heart of St. Cyril's enduring achievement of the Christianization and culturalization of the Slavic peoples.

"He always professed the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and submitted to the judgment of the Apostolic See his liturgical innovations, his literacy, work, and the problems of his missionary activity," the Pope said. Here as elsewhere in his sermon and his address later that day to an audience of Czech and Slovak pilgrims, his historical references had overtones of present-day problems.

He told a pilgrimage audience: "Today as in all your history, you have known how to bear witness, often by hard suffering borne with dignity, to your deep conviction, your Cyrillian and Methodian faith, that is a faith that is authentically Catholic." The word "Methodian" was a reference to St. Cyril's brother and fellow apostle to the Slavs, St. Methodius.

The Pope said St. Cyril's greatest merit lies in having "invented an alphabet for the Slavic language and having begun the Slavic version of the Holy Scriptures and of the liturgy."

He pointed out that St. Cyril had put both the Byzantine and Roman Liturgies into Slavic "because he desired the fully aware participation of the people in divine worship."

The Mass he was concelebrating was in the Roman rite but it was sung not only in Latin and Greek but also in Slovak and Czech. Hymns were sung in the latter languages and prayers were by laymen in various modern Slavic languages. The Lord's Prayer was sung in ancient Liturgical Slavonic.

The Pope called love for Christ's universal Church under the Pope's guidance "the fulcrum of the work and teachings of St. Cyril."

He noted that St. Cyril regarded all as equal in Christ and so strove to integrate the Slavs into the universal Church. At that time there was a serious crisis between the Byzantine Church and Rome. "In those difficult upheavals in the Church's history," the Pope said, "St. Cyril, notwithstanding his Byzantine patriotism and his personal friendships followed the right path both in doctrine and practice."

Here, the Pope made his observation that St. Cyril always professed the pope's primacy. In the basilica were representatives of various Orthodox churches not in communion with the Holy See.

The Pope continued: "Only in communion with the Apostolic See will you be able to find the right solution to your religious problems. Closely united to the successor of St. Peter, you will be able to open yourselves always more to a healthy ecclesial ecumenism toward your separated brothers, as you have already done in the past."

Among concelebrants of the Mass were the exiled archbishop of Prague, Czecho-Slovakia Jozef Cardinal Beran; the present apostolic administrator of that see, Bishop Frantisek Tomasek; Franjo Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Vatican's Doctrinal Congregation, at Croat; and Bishop Andrew Grutka of Gary, Ind., an American of Slovak ancestry. Also among the concelebrants were five Bishops of Czecho-Slovakia, including Bishop Ambroz Lazik and Bishop Robert Pobozny. Also Slovak-Byzantine Bishop Michale Rusnak of Toronto, Canada, and Bishop Ladislaw Rubin, a Pole who is secretary general of the Synod of Bishops.

L'Osservatore Romano, Vatican City daily, reported that an official delegation from the Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia was present, along with three representatives of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. Also at the Mass, in a place apart, was a representative of Metropolitan Chrysostom of the Orthodox ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople, Archimandrite Gennadios Zervos.

At the audience for pilgrims from Czecho-Slovakia shortly after noon, Pope Paul observed that they constituted "the first official pilgrimage" from their country for 30 years.

He said Czechs and Slovaks were characterized by love of truth, justice, freedom, and peace. But, he said, "these goods are indivisible. Nobody can be free if there is no religious freedom. Culture is incomplete when transcendental values are denied. There is no genuine justice when it is not applied equally to all."

The Pope said he could read in their eyes that they wanted no privileges but only their natural rights. And here he cited the rights to have a bishop govern each diocese freely, to have seminaries, religious orders and congregations, a Catholic press and religious instruction.

The Ambassador of Czecho-Slovakia in Italy took part in the ceremonies.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT IN WILMINGTON, DEL.

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Junior Achievement is a most promising, but little publicized, privately sponsored job experience program. Each year it offers thousands of young Americans of all races and backgrounds experience in business and practical economics. When we talk of ways to foster greater economic participation by all segments of our society, the example set by Junior Achievement would be a good one to follow and build upon.

Bill Frank, in a recent edition of the Wilmington, Del., Morning News, wrote an excellent editorial on the fine work being done in Delaware's largest city by Junior Achievers under the guidance of George Freytag, Jr. I would like to place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT ACHIEVES QUIETLY

(By Bill Frank)

George A. Freytag Jr. turns out to be so utterly right.

One of the most important non-racial youth programs in Wilmington today is the Junior Achievement.

Freytag, executive director of Junior Achievement in the Wilmington area, says:

"We read, hear and watch on television all kinds of reports of young men and women who are ready to tear apart existing organizations and institutions. We hear this kind of thinking and action is filtering down to high school students.

"But what about Junior Achievement?"

So, what about it?

Freytag says: "In the past 13 years in Delaware, more than 7,000 young people, blacks and whites, have worked together in complete harmony. We have never had an unpleasant incident. This experience can be multiplied by the hundreds of Junior Achievement programs in operation all over the United States and other parts of the world."

Okay, so what makes Freytag so utterly right?

XUM

Simply this. He says:

"Despite the 13 years' existence of Junior Achievement here, it is suspected that many businessmen, educators, parents, community leaders and others don't really appreciate the job Junior Achievement is doing. For some reason, it has been difficult to communicate and motivate enough adults to visit Junior Achievement operations to see what takes place."

According to Freytag, Junior Achievement in Delaware, with a most modest budget, brings together an average of 600 young men and women of both races each year to teach them practical economics and the potentials of the free enterprise system—or capitalism, if you want to call it that.

Unfortunately, Junior Achievement hasn't gotten the headlines it deserves, because it appears to be a positive program. No conflict; no name-calling; no mugging; no "stick 'em up" business.

Junior Achievement in Wilmington is located at 227–A. W. 9th St., right in the heart of downtown Wilmington. Or, hadn't you known about it?

Junior Achievement is a long story. Let me be brief:

It is a nationwide "learn by doing" practical economic education program in which high school students organize and manage their own small-scale businesses under the guidance of adult advisers from business and industry.

Each Junior Achievement company is organized in the fall as a corporate structure. About 20 youngsters are in each company, with a board of directors, working force and sales staff.

They select the product they are going to make or the service they will render. They capitalize their business through public sale of capital stock at $1 a share.

They pay dividends, pay rent, etc., and at the end of each program year, they liquidate their company and issue stockholder reports.

What do the youngsters think of their Junior Achievement experiences? Freytag recently took a poll. As I give some of their experiences, it is important to designate who is white and who is black because therein you get an idea of the compatibility among the youngsters.

I'm selecting the youngsters from a fat file Freytag has shown me:

Mike Chivis, Wilmington High School (black): "Junior Achievement gives me the chance to work with people of different ethnic backgrounds. We are all here for one purpose and that is to work for unity."

Nadine Brainard, Mt. Pleasant High School (white): "J.A. can be described as an ice breaker between different ethnic and racial groups. Teen-agers from different backgrounds meet with each other once a week and work together as a team. No one is judged by his race or creed."

Tom Burns, P.S. du Pont High School (white): "Before I joined J. A. I thought a company just earned money from products it had sold and then it paid its workers with some of that money. Now that I have joined J.A. I have realized that our business system is very complicated. I now have a fairly good idea of how a company operates. I also know that it makes no difference who you are, or what race, nationality or religion you are a member of, as long as you do your job in the company."

Debbie Burke, Howard High School (black): "I signed up for J.A. to learn more about the business world. I have never been involved in the manufacture of any products, so I decided to learn all I could by coming to J.A. To date, it has been a very fulfilling experience."

Henry Brookins, Wilmington High School (black): "One of the main requirements I think that makes a J.A. company a success is brotherhood, each and every member working together in unison and cooperation."

Bernadette Brown, Wilmington High School (black): "I think that being together and forgetting the outside problems of the world brings us all together.. Having fun and learning to work together is one of the J.A. purposes. . . ."

Kathie Ritchie, Padua (white): "I don't feel that there is a color barrier in J.A. It provides an opportunity for teen-agers of all races and creeds to work together in fellowship and harmony—with lots of fun involved."

I don't hear of television panel moderators rushing over to interview Junior Achievement tycoons. Maybe the peaceful constructive life isn't as appealing as the violent restless, turbulent one. Too bad.

This Nation has grown wealthy and powerful, Mr. Speaker, on the enterprise of its people. That some today are denied full opportunity to participate in the economic life of this country is not only wrong, it is wasteful. I have been privileged to visit the Wilmington Junior Achievement Center on several occasions and each time have come away more impressed than ever with the job Junior Achievement is doing and the potential of this program.

Undoubtedly, there are and will continue to be problems in helping undereducated Americans achieve their full potential, but the Junior Achievement program of offering practical training and experience is a sound approach that merits study.

CLEAN WATER NEEDS BIG U.S. AID

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the lack of clear water affects many communities in the United States. Cognizant of this problem, Cleveland citizens have voted to tax themselves in the enormous amount of $100 million toward an effort to provide clear water for their people. Cleveland cannot attain their objective of clear water unless there is Federal financial participation to assist them.

It is fair to assume that some other communities may likewise need Federal assistance. The problem affecting Cleveland as well as other cities is presented in a very sound editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 26, as follows:

CLEAN WATER NEEDS BIG U.S. AID

Massive federal assistance will be required if Cleveland is to achieve the total program of water quality control sought by Dr. Edward J. Martin, chief of the city's Clean Water Task Force.

Clevelanders have agreed to spend $100 million for the program, but it will cost 10 or 15 times more than that.

Industry will help by paying fees for city services in removing industrial pollutants and providing clean water for industrial processes.

The state must help, too: It has $100 million to spend on pollution control.

But the federal government will have to come through with some really big money.

Congress has long recognized—in theory, at least—that the federal government has important responsibilities for halting water pollution.

In its Clean Water Act, Congress authorized ever-increasing expenditures for water pollution control (they were supposed to reach $1 billion for the year 1970). But Congress reneged when the time came for appropriations, which were small in relation to the need.

This is a serious default on the congressional commitment to help the pollution battle. It is shameful guardianship of the nation's water resources.

What is really needed to achieve a total program of water quality control, here and throughout the nation, is a federal aid program of the magnitude suggested by former Mayor Ralph S. Locher.

He proposed that the federal government help cities build treatment works as it helps states build highways, by providing 90% of the construction costs.

Under such a program, Cleveland would already have in hand the local money required for Dr. Martin's grand design.

Is it hopeless to expect the federal funds will be available for such a program?

Not at all. The March issue of Fortune magazine points out that federal tax revenues in the years ahead will rise with the steady climb of the gross national product.

This will provide a "fiscal dividend" that can be used for stepped-up spending on domestic problems: pollution control, better medical care and education, rebuilding the inner city, and welfare reforms. Plugging tax loopholes and ending boondoggles could enlarge the dividend.

The nation has the wealth. It is high time that a decent share of it is applied to making life more livable.

REPRESSION IN GREECE: AN ARTIST ON THE SPIRITUAL RACK

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this is the week that Greece observes the 148th anniversary of its War of Independence, which began on March 25, 1821.

Greece's experiment in parliamentary democracy began in the 1820's. Despite many setbacks, including the imposition of a king upon them by the great powers in 1842, and a number of brief dictatorships, the fact remains that Greece is one of the oldest democracies in the world.

This is preface to the melancholy observation that a repressive dictatorship exists in Athens today. Freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, political parties, and due process of law are all prohibited.

Postwar Greece benefiting from the fruit of Greek individualism and increased educational opportunities, had begun to produce a brilliant array of musical composers, actors and actresses, film directors, poets, designers, and city planners. Some Hellenophiles even began to talk hopefully of a "Second Golden Age."

Now the lights are going out for this new wave of creative people. Isolation inside Greece or exile is their lot, for the military junta, emphasizing characteristics of dictatorships, made the creative arts one of the first targets of repression.

As we know, one of the most popular films of recent years was "Zorba," starring Anthony Quinn, based on a novel written by the late Nikos Kazantzakis.

Three Greeks played prominent roles in "Zorba." They were Irene Papas, the accomplished actress, Michael Cacoyannis, the brilliant young director, and Mikis Theodorakis, who composed the music.

Today, Irene Papas and Michael Cacoyannis, critics of the regime, remain abroad. Mikis Theodorakis is in bitter exile within Greece, assigned by the junta to the remote village of Zatouna, located in the highest reaches of the mountains of central Pelloponnesos.

Theodorakis was a parliamentary deputy for EDA, a party dominated by Communists and fellow travelers and representing perhaps 12 percent of the vote. In Greek political circles he was regarded as more of a decorative figure than a serious tactician. Politically, he was more naive than sinister.

In any event, Theodorakis the composer represents an enormous natural resource for Greece. He is one of the greatest composers in the world, and it would be a tragedy if his career ended in mis-passage.

The measure of the man is suggested in a tribute written by Michael Cacoyannis in the LP album, "Irene Papas Sings Theodorakis." He writes:

> Mikis Theodorakis is best-known outside Greece as the composer of "Zorba the Greek." What is more important, if less widely known, is that in the last ten years Theodorakis has reshaped and dominated the musical life of his country in a way that has no parallel in the world today. His songs which number well over a hundred, have sprung from the enormously rich soil of Greek traditional music with a fresh, individual and often very sophisticated vigour. Many of them are extremely difficult to sing and their complex tempi rule out any possibility of orchestral dance arrangements. And yet, one after another, they have risen to the top of the popularity lists, invading everyday life with the obsessive appeal of hit tunes, though clearly stamped with a quality that transcends fashion.
>
> A new Theodorakis song does not replace an old one. It becomes part of an ever-growing cycle, a vibrant tradition that has taken firm root in the country's cultural life. There is no doubt that this is due, in no small measure, to the quality of the lyrics, which express the problems and passions of the Greek people through the vision of our best living poets, among them Nobel-prize winner Seferis, Elytis, Ritsos, Gatsos, Christodoulou, and others. It is a startling and stirring experience to see poetry break loose from the printed page and become a living voice in the street, the way it was in ancient times when people sang the verses of Homer.

The Washington Post Outlook section of Sunday, March 23, 1969, carried a powerful story, written by John Barry, of the London Sunday Times. Datelined Zatouna, Greece, it tells of the fate which has befallen Theodorakis. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article follows:

GREEK MAN OF MUSIC FACES DEATH BY EXILE

(By John Barry)

ZATOUNA, GREECE.—The coffee house at Zatouna doubles as the village barbershop. Here, most afternoons between 3 and 5, Mikis Theodorakis comes to while away a little more of his exile in this desolate place. And it was here that a smuggled message had arranged for me to meet him.

I had walked for two days to reach this coffee house.

Just out of sight of the window, round the bend in front of the church was Mikis Theodorakis's home. For seven months, all thru the last bitter winter, Theodorakis, the greatest composer in Greece, has been confined to this mountain village with his wife and two young children.

The regime in Athens says this is necessary because he is a dangerous Communist (he was a Marxist deputy in the last freely elected assembly). But the more potent reason for his banishment is that above and beyond politics, Theodorakis and his music have become a symbol of resistance to the military rule.

The symbol is fading. Theodorakis is dying in Zatouna. In the inclement climate of this village, the tuberculosis he contracted in his previous exile during the civil war 20 years ago has returned worse than ever. Now he is coughing blood.

He finds movement increasingly painful, too; a weak heart has given him poor circulation, and in the mountain cold his hands and feet swell. There is no doctor in Zatouna and Theodorakis refused to be taken to a prison hospital, defiantly demanding the right to go to an ordinary hospital in Athens. But those who see him are convinced that unless he is brought down from Zatouna soon, he will die.

I learned this from the villagers of Zatouna and its neighbors. Theodorakis himself was too ill, or too well guarded, or perhaps just too despairing, to meet me.

All I saw was his white, ill face—much thinner than in the photographs I knew—looking down from an upstairs window of his house. But Zatouna, the journey to it and my brief encounter with the village itself revealed perhaps more than Theodorakis could have about the everyday life of a dictatorship and the nature of exile and repression.

I got to this desolate spot by the relatively simple expedient of avoiding the Greek police for a week. No journalist has been allowed here officially, and the guards in the village have orders to turn away all outsiders. So I decided to go by a devious route.

To enter the country, I took the Orient Express from Belgrade. (Security police concentrate on airports.) A local train took me on from Athens to Tripolis, the railhead for the central Peloponnese. And at dusk in Tripolis, I boarded a village bus carrying peasants home from a day at market.

Zatouna is approachable only from the south, east and west; to the north, the way is barred by almost impassable mountains. But from the south and east, it would be obvious to police that a traveler could be heading only for Zatouna.

Thus I resigned myself to a long march to Zatouna from the west. A dirt track leads into the village from that direction, then—turning into the only road out of Zatouna—heads east to the village of Dimitsana.

Once I had hit the dirt track, I had a valid reason for passing through Zatouna. I could say I was heading for Dimitsana on my way back to Tripolis.

I got off the bus at Langadia, the nearest village to the start of this makeshift route. Next morning, after a night's sleep above a butcher's shop, I set out on my two-day hike.

I stuck to the rocky paths winding along the mountain contours. At each little hamlet along the way, while the pot of Turkish coffee brewed on the shallow charcoal brazier, I was politely interrogated.

WELL SUITED FOR EXILE

New posters glared down from the coffeehouse walls. They showed a blue arrow winding its way through a maze, the evils of decay, the old politics and communism lying in wait. But the arrow emerged triumphant, pointing to a new start for Greece. I wondered how much the regime was spending on propaganda.

Too much, the peasants seemed to think. No peasant has ever admitted to good times, of course, but the woes of the Peloponnese were consistent enough. Everything was going up in price—shoes, tools, even the bus fare to Tripolis.

Over large glasses of ouzo, a village headman estimated that the cost of staples like flour had gone up by one-fourth. The rest of the room nodded in agreement.

Shortly before 3 p.m. on the second day, I swung around the final bend in the track and Zatouna lay below me. It was siesta time; nothing stirred. I headed down toward the village square.

What I learned in Zatouna was disquieting. It is widely believed—even in Athens, by those personally acquainted with the regime's less amusing aspects—that Theodorakis, within the boundaries of his exile, is allowed to live a normal life. The regime has encouraged this belief. Exile, the colonels have said, is more merciful than prison.

But the truth is less happy. To his banishment, Theodorakis's captors have added refinements of unpleasantness.

A FLOODLIT HOUSE

Theodorakis himself has virtually no freedom. He may not travel beyond the bounds of Zatouna, and his guards have decided that these lie 300 yards either way along the village road.

Even within these, he is accompanied wherever he goes. His one luxury is a small upright piano, and his neighbors say he plays almost incessantly.

His wife Myrto does have more freedom: she may travel to Dimitsana to shop. But to discourage this, and to search for hidden messages, the police undress her twice on each occasion—once before she leaves and again when she returns.

The village schoolmistress actually inspects her, while a policeman examines her pants, brassiere and garter belt. When Myrto has dressed again, the policeman accompanies her to Dimitsana and back.

Nor are their two children, Margaret and George, spared the smaller humiliations. They are 8 and 10, respectively, and they go to the village school just by the church. But to prevent them from smuggling messages, they are segregated from the other children most of the time.

The family has no visitors. Contact with the outside world is reduced to a telephone call once a week from relatives in Athens. Mikis also used to be allowed to consult his lawyer every Friday, but this is now forbidden.

Day and night, a guard stands by the door of the Theodorakis house. At night the guards floodlight the house from all four corners.

Theodorakis remained a face at the window. But in spite of all the precautions the ten guards in Zatouna could take, he still found it possible to give me what he wanted to say. I left bearing letters as well as a tape of Theodorakis playing and singing the last nine songs he has composed in Zatouna.

TESTIMONY TO DESPAIR

There are two letters—an appeal to U Thant at the United Nations and a plea to the Council of Europe, whose subcommission on human rights is now taking evidence in Athens on allegations of torture and the suspension of civil liberties in Greece.

"I ask to be examined as a witness by the commission," Theodorakis says, "so that I may produce evidence documenting my denunciation of the regime."

"From the isolated village where I am detained," he tells U Thant, "I have been following your attempts toward the consolidation of world peace and respect for human rights . . . I should like to submit to

XUM

your consideration my own case as an example of how a man's dignity can be humiliated in Greece today . . .

"But despite all this," he says, "I do want to hope that all those 20 or more centuries of civilized life have convinced at least a large part of mankind that the assassination of the intellect of a regime's political opponent is as hideous and intolerable a crime as the physical liquidation of that opponent."

Nine songs in seven months is a pitiful fraction of his former output (more than 200 popular songs, ten symphonic pieces and other works, including ballets and film scores). But even the little music he can write is still banned in Greece.

The ending of the last song he has written in Zatouna expresses his mood:

The laws have taken our dreams away,
And our songs have turned to smoke.
The roads have taken our lives away,
And the joy of us all.

They search among the trees and in the soil.
They search in my heart.
But they still find my wound in my eyes
And in my tears.

COASTAL WATERS AND THE NATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people an excellent address by Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources Engineering Development, given at the National Meeting on Water Resources Engineering of the American Society of Civil Engineers in New Orleans, La., on February 3, 1969.

Mr. Wenk sets forth in his address a few principles which could provide a basis for achieving more rational use of coastal resources and meet the problems and the conflicts involved. The address follows:

COASTAL WATERS AND THE NATION

(Address by Edward Wenk, Jr., for the national meeting on Water Resources Engineering of the American Society of Civil Engineers in New Orleans, La., February 3, 1969)

Although it is a high compliment for any speaker to be invited to address the American Society of Civil Engineers, it is a special privilege for me because this is the second time in recent years that I have been asked to discuss the questions:

"What stake does this nation have in the oceans?" and "What is the role of our engineering profession in transforming that promise into reality?"

In the first paper delivered in 1964, I pointed out how maritime and exploration development contribute to our country's security, to its economic development and to benefits for an increasingly urbanized society.

Today, I want to go beyond generalities. For one thing, since 1964, our understanding of the marine environment has sharply improved. There have been advances by the scientific and engineering communities, key developments in the Congress, and further involvement of industry and State Governments. Finally, there have been new steps toward Federal policy planning. We have begun to set goals and priorities, and we have begun to mobilize the necessary knowledge, capital, talent, and institutions to translate aspirations into reality.

Secondly, I feel we must differentiate between sectors of marine environment that differ markedly in physical characteristics and in use: the deep ocean, the deep seabed, the continental shelf and the coastal zone.

This paper is concerned with the coastal zone—that sector of our marine environment where the sea and the land meet, and where the sea and the people meet. It is that part of our marine environment that is most familiar, and which unfortunately we tend to take for granted. I speak here neither as an ecologist nor as a coastal engineer. Rather, I want to share views as one responsible for helping identify the ways and means by which our coastal zone may more effectively serve a people. That will be the theme of this paper.

I shall try to:

Define the challenge presented to the nation to use its coastal resources wisely;

Highlight the issues which should be brought into the forum of public consensus and; finally,

Suggest the engineering content of our future decisions that should engage the attention and the leadership of your profession.

It is especially appropriate to discuss these issues in this gracious city. Nature endowed New Orleans and our Gulf Coast with a beautiful and prolific maritime geography which in the last two decades has been intensively utilized—for transport and trade, for fishing, for oil and gas production and for recreation. As our population mounts, the same waters become used for disposal of liquid and solid wastes, the inevitable products of a technological society. New Orleans and the Gulf have discovered the benefits of the Coastal Zone. And they are fast discovering the problems created by conflicts among these uses.

THE COASTAL ZONE—DEFINITION BY USE

What do we mean by the Coastal Zone? Much of our nation's history, and indeed much of its future, is derived from the narrow, irregular band of shallow ocean and coastal land that comprise some 17,000 miles of our country's boundary. The 30 coastal and Great Lakes States contain more than 75 percent of our population. A preponderance of this country's investment by heavy industry is located there. The proximity of land and ocean makes this zone a gateway for a maritime trade of 500 million tons annually, valued at $40 billion; a staging area for harvesting $500 million of fish and crustaceans; a locus for shipbuilding, a base for our naval strength and for our seaward thrust for offshore oil and gas that today involve over 6000 wells producing fuel valued at over a billion dollars.

The concentration of population along the coast translates to a growing concentration of markets and of labor. These in turn attract other non-maritime industries, and in turn, more people. All the megalopoli projected for the year 2000 lie in this band. And with the increasing utilization pressure on the coastal zone in its natural form, we also seek to modify it to suit new purposes: offshore airports, offshore oil terminals; offshore nuclear power generation plants.

Beyond economic significance, the coastal zone is a refuge for a busy people—a mecca for the vacationer: 30 million people turn annually to the sea to swim; 11 million to fish; 8 million to sail. The salubrious climate and aesthetic pleasures of our shores are the targets for the fast growing leisure time and money in an affluent society. Tens of millions patronize coastal resorts, and an increasing number select this region for retirement homes.

We could define limits of this zone in terms of ecology, or of geology, or in terms of legal boundaries. But with this diversity of uses, we first require a definition that is meaningful operationally.

In terms of physical geography, the area is punctuated by estuaries and lagoons, wetlands and beaches, peninsulas and coastal lands. It is characterized by a dynamic interaction of wind, tides, currents, waves, storms and the land. It supports a rich variety of flora and fauna; provides a wintering habitat for most North American waterfowl and nursery grounds for most coastal fisheries.

Conceptually, the coastal zone is a band of water and land surrounding the continent in which the sea exerts a measurable influence on uses of the land and on its ecology; and the land exerts a measurable influence on the uses of the sea and on its ecology. It extends offshore at least to the outer edge of the continental shelf and onshore at least to the upper reaches of lunar tide and adjacent shore areas. Although the characteristics and problems of the Great Lakes may differ considerably from those of a seacoast, they may be appropriately included in our definition.

While united by ecology and use, this region is almost hopefully fragmented by political subdivisions. Coastal lands involve a mix of municipal, county, State and multistate legal jurisdictions.

At the sea-land interface, there is a complex legal involvement of the Federal Government and the States. Seaward, jurisdiction is largely Federal but much of the coastal zone lies even beyond boundaries of national sovereignty.

Superimposed on the legal boundaries of public jurisdiction is a further tapestry of private ownership, ranging from individual homes to industrial plants, from marinas to shipyards, from resort hotels to private clubs.

THE PROBLEM

To complicate this maze of functions and jurisdictions, we deliberately encourage private uses of waters and submerged lands that are themselves in the public domain, while endeavoring to balance and protect both public and private interests. On top of this, we know that certain uses of the water may so alter its natural state as to potentially degrade the resource or deny its use to others having equal rights to access. Moreover, fish and wildlife held in trust by States freely cross State boundaries. So does pollution.

The competition for such resources inevitably stimulates conflict. But to make matters worse, the resource itself is shrinking and subject to natural and man-induced degradation. Coastal waters have often become convenient sinks into which waste products are ultimately deposited. We have filled wetlands; exhausted sites for dredging spoil; lost 10 percent of our coastal waters for shellfish culture because of pollution; wiped out breeding grounds for shad and other anadromous species. We have seen the catastrophe of an oil tanker wreck and a runaway underwater oil well. And coastal regions are visted by some of the nation's most fearsome ravages; hurricane's over the past 15 years have wrought $5 billion damage to our economy.

Simply stated, the problem we face is an increasing pressure for more intense, more rational and more variegated use of a scarce resource—a resource that is itself perishable.

PLANNING FOR MULTIPLE VERSUS SINGLE USE

In this confusion, we have neglected one essential function—planning. Thoreau once admonished "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on." Unless we consider rational alternatives among competing uses, we will continue to move toward single purpose use, motivated by short-term advantages to individuals, industry or local governments. Such short term or single use orientation—apart from inhibiting the greater advantage of multiple uses—may actually dissipate the resource itself: Private beach development restricts public access; dredging and filling may downgrade commercial fishing: offshore drilling rigs may limit freedom of navigation. Each single-purpose use may be justified on its own, but the complete effect of piecemeal development can be chaos.

In this technological age, man can do many more of the things he wished to do. What then, should be our goal? *I would suggest that we begin to plan for a harmony of compatible multiple uses, for only by this means can we maintain options for the future.*

Science and technology become tools to accomplish this goal.

Basic scientific information enables us to define the ecological base from which we operate; to understand the natural forces at work, to predict the consequence of man's insults to his environment. From this comprehension, we can then employ better engineering to maintain water quality, inhibit beach erosion; create modern ports and harbors. An entirely new field of biological engineering is emerging—to stabilize beaches with grass; move anadromous fish over dams, utilize offshore platforms as fish havens; employ estuaries for intensive aquaculture. With such information, we can generate criteria to illuminate choices and bolster political courage. Finally, we can offer remedial measures to correct problems triggered long ago in the absence of information or occuring in the future from inadvertence or accident.

But science and engineering are only tools. Their wise and prudent use involves planning and management of bays, estuaries and coastal lands—shaped by an administrative and legal framework to promote an optimal balance among uses and conservation.

Here lie major decisions of public policy.

FEDERAL CONCERN FOR MARINE AFFAIRS

The Federal Government has long been concerned about the Coastal Zone. A number of laws have been passed to deal with individual problems, and missions assigned to numerous different agencies.

Heavily involved are ESSA, U.S. Coast Guard, Maritime Administration, U.S. Navy, FWPCA, Geological Survey, Bureau of Sport Fisheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, Public Health Service, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. Functions (not listed in any priority order) include provision of nautical charts and sea and storm prediction, conservation, acquisition and development of recreational lands and waters, enforcement of maritime safety, control of beach erosion, improvement of ports, harbors and waterways, water quality planning and enforcement, waste management, shellfish culture, sanitation, assisting commercial and sport fishing, development of scientific understanding of the coastal ecology, etc.

To meet the obvious problem of developing coherent policy and direction with so many different entities involved, a major step was taken at the Federal level with passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. The Act did three things:

1. It enunciated a national determination to mobilize science, engineering, capital, public and private institutions for a long-term, systematic and coordinated effort to utilize the seas for man's needs;

2. It vested responsibility directly in the President for providing momentum, direction and leadership to this program spread among 23 Federal bureaus;

3. It called for an annual report by the President on policies, programs and funding requirements, and

4. It provided the President with two temporary instrumentalities of assistance—a cabinet-level, policy planning Council chaired by the Vice President, and a public advisory Commission to recommend major next steps and a national plan for their achievement, including consideration of Federal organization.

Both the Marine Sciences Council and the Commission have been hard at work.

MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL

The Council has endeavored to identify unmet national needs to which marine sciences can be more fruitfully directed to: set goals and priorities of Federal actions; clarify agency responsibilities; and improve communication with State and local interests. The Council has met 15 times since it was activated, and dealt with some 60 issues for the President, including such policies and programs as extracting marine protein to meet worldwide malnutrition, expanding ocean exploration, and developing initial steps toward international legal regimes to guide future deep seabed exploitation.

From its very inception, however, the Council has placed strong emphasis on the importance of the Coastal Zone.

It began pilot studies of the Chesapeake Bay, Seattle Harbor and the Great Lakes to provide guidance to broader policies;

It prepared government-wide plans to meet coastal disasters resulting from spillage of oil or hazardous cargo;

It supported the Sea Grant Program to strengthen the base of manpower, engineering research and information services with particular emphasis on local or regional problems;

It initiated plans for a cooperative study of regional port and harbor systems, taking note of new patterns and technologies of cargo transfer;

It appointed an interagency committee to begin drafting guidelines for all the participating agencies to work together on common problems; and

It sponsored a seminar with non-Federal participants from State governments and private interests to examine these problems and reach solutions—recognizing that State and local governments will have a major role to play in resolving the coastal margin conflicts.

An analysis of Federal budgets proposed for Fiscal Year 1970, just released in the President's Third Annual Report, shows $30.6 million for marine exploration, science and engineering for coastal estauarine problems, $11.6 million for the Great Lakes, and $56.8 million for the Continental Shelves.

MARINE SCIENCES COMMISSION

The Marine Sciences Commission transmitted its comprehensive report on "The Nation and the Sea" to the President and to the Congress on January 9. The Coastal Zone was also one of the primary areas of their concern, with recommendations that—

Management of the Coastal Zone should continue to be vested in the States; but as backup to State initiatives, Federal legislation should be enacted to encourage and support creation of State Coastal Zone authorities to carry out national objectives. These authorities would have powers to plan and regulate land and water use, and to acquire and develop land in the coastal zone for public purposes;

University affiliated Coastal Zone laboratories should be designated and supported, functioning similar to agricultural research stations and extension services;

Representative coastal and estuarine sites should be set aside as natural preserves to establish a base for studies necessary to assess effects of man's activities on the environment;

Monitoring and research on coastal pollution should be intensified; and

A national research project focused on Great Lakes restoration should be initiated.

The Commission also recommended that these functions be lodged in a new, independent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency—created by consolidation of a number of marine science oriented activities, now parts of the Departments of Transportation, Interior, Commerce and the National Science Foundation.

In addition, the Commission urged that—

State procedures be developed for leasing of submerged lands for such new uses as aquaculture—an industry quite new to this country but having significant potential;

U.S. Corps of Engineers authority be expanded to deny permits for coastal engineering projects if recreational opportunities were jeopardized or other uses degraded;

AEC be authorized to consider environmental effects of projects under its licensing authority.

Their report, submitted in the final days of the Johnson Administration, is now under study, although it is too soon for the new Administration to develop a position as to their findings.

ROLE OF STATES

The Council and Commission agree on the key role of the States in dealing with coastal zone problems.

Under existing law, individual States have jurisdiction over most coastal resources: they decide how mineral resources beneath coastal lands and waters are to be exploited; and how coastal fisheries resources are to be harvested. They decide how coastal land and waters may be altered and which uses should receive preference in tradeoffs.

Nevertheless, present State authority over Coastal Zone activities frequently lags behind the problems—

In most States, there is no single focus for guiding rational development, because conservation, economic promotion, pollution control, tourism, highways and community planning are considered separately.

Funds for land acquisition are hard to come by.

Legal control over land use is complex and ineffectual.

Ambiguous and overlapping jurisdiction between local State and the Federal Governments create serious problems because the marine environment is a continuum.

The answer to these problems, in my view, is not to turn to increased Federal regulation, except as a last resort. Rather, it is necessary to buttress the State role and strengthen coordination so as to protect the public interest.

Zoning of land and water, permits for explicit projects, and coastal planning all have a place, but none will be effective unless States are prepared to enforce decisions.

Local government also must be involved—in zoning, advising on water quality, land use, taxation, and compatibility between future and existing coastal uses.

THE ISSUE

Let us be sure we understand the goal mentioned earlier:

The issue is *not* how to preserve our coastal resources in pristine purity, nor how to exploit them for greatest, fastest, economic return. Either of these objectives would be easy to achieve if acceptable to the people (which they are not). Rather, *the issue is how to provide for many diverse and often conflicting coastal demands, public and private, and still obtain the greatest long-term social and economic benefits.*

Similar conflicts occur on land. We know they have never been simple to resolve. Along the coasts, the challenge is all the greater because we have an ecologically sensitive environment of limited size; a complex mixture of public and private ownership; a confusion of legal jurisdictions. And to top it off, we are dealing with an area in which fish, water, ships and people freely cross political boundaries, yet few, if any people reside there.

XUM

The users are transients with other regional loyalties. We thus encounter a special question as to who will represent their interests in the normal political process?

Let us consider some of the objectives—

To attract industry and foster real estate development while maintaining wetlands, fisheries, and natural beauty of the seashore for all to enjoy;

To extract oil and gas, or mine seabed minerals from the shelf without suffocating marine life, and endangering trawler operations and safe ship navigation;

To provide deeper channels for the next generation of ships without covering the estuaries with spoil;

To protect our beaches and harbors from accidental oil pollution and still profit by economies of scale offered by larger ships.

If I am accused of sustaining a "have your cake and eat it too," attitude, I plead guilty, for I think these goals are attainable—but only (1) if we actively pursue more and broader scientific and engineering solutions to these problems and make the information available to those responsible for policy and decision-making; and (2) if we engage the cooperation and interest of all levels of government involved—local, State and Federal—the private sector and the citizen so as to provide an effective institutional articulation between social goals and engineering opportunities.

ROLE OF THE ENGINEER

This discussion of coastal zone affairs may be a disappointment to those who expected a shopping list of potential engineering projects. The civil engineer has distinguished himself in dealing with natural forces to meet requirements of service to human needs. But the engineers should be a partner as well in *setting those requirements:*

In articulating their vision as to ways and means to satisfy our national goals;

In understanding the economic-social-legal institutional framework in which action takes place for public or private investment;

In seeking knowledge to foster better decisions—knowledge as to our environment and consequences of our tampering with it; knowledge of our society and its processes;

In breaking down narrow technical specialization or parochial self-interests, to see the forest rather than the trees, to couple together better the producers of technical knowledge and the consumers.

In dealing with these issues, every skill of your profession will be needed. But so will its leadership.

C. P. Snow has written that the engineer "the people who made the hardware, who used existing knowledge to make things go, were—interested in making their machine work but indifferent to long-term social consequences." James Killian, President Eisenhower's science advisor, has written "The engineer's concern for social problems must grow steadily as his work affects society more profoundly." And Whitlock and Edington before the ASEE have said the problems are those whose answers are not found in engineering courses but concern people, sociological needs, aesthetic judgments, political decision—"The complexity of our society today makes an engineer who cannot handle such problems not only limited but dangerous." Our society does not seem to appreciate that its affluence now permits collective political decisions in applying science and technology to our major social problems, but that we don't have a way yet of doing it. For a long time, for example, we used engineering to protect man against his environment. Now we must also consider how to protect the environment against man. Engineers must increasingly become a partner in making national decisions—decision making formerly dominated by men of commerce, law and finance.

I ask that every member of this audience and in the Society begin to consider the possibilities available to make effective and intelligent use of our marine environment; review the recommendations of the Marine Sciences Commission and articulate their views to this Administration. The Nation needs your help.

LOOKING AHEAD

Fortunately, initiatives for recognizing our opportunities as a coastal nation have been free of political partisanship. Both parties supported this enterprise in their platform.

President Nixon has stated that he would make full use of the Marine Sciences Act; that the new Administration would consider an integrated program in oceanography a first priority and would give immediate attention to the Commission Report; and that Vice President Agnew, statutory Chairman of the Council, will take an active part in defining our national interests in the many uses of the sea.

The Coastal Zone evokes a challenge to the nation.

This profession has an opportunity to assist in responding to that challenge.

RECORD OF PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE STIMULATES PATRIOTISM

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a recording of Red Skelton's interpretation of the Pledge of Allegiance is being played by local radio stations in Baltimore, and I understand it is also extremely popular in many other cities. This response is gratifying proof that good, old-fashioned patriotism is far from being dead or passe.

Red Skelton has combined the deft touch of the superb showman with the deep feelings of the patriot to produce a masterpiece with his recitation of the pledge. As Americans, we should be grateful to him for having the eloquence to so aptly express what so many of us feel, but which so few are capable of translating effectively into words.

I hope other successful people—not only those in show business, but leaders from all walks of life—will follow this inspiring example and find the courage and pride to publicly voice their patriotism at every opportunity. It is time for the millions of silent, flag-loving Americans to stand up and let the rest of the world know that the dissenters, the extremists and the malcontents are truly an insignificant minority.

Americans everywhere have been touched and impressed by the Red Skelton recording, and I think a national campaign should be launched to carry the words and the spirit of that recording into every home in our great Nation. To help achieve that goal, Mr. Speaker, I submit the following transcript for insertion into the RECORD:

[From the Red Skelton Show, Jan. 14, 1969]

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I remember this one teacher. To me, he was the greatest teacher, a real sage in my time. He had wisdom.

We were all reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he walked over. Mr. Lasswell was his name. He said:

"I've been listening to you boys and girls recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester and it seems as though it is becoming monotonous to you. If I may, may I recite it and try to explain to you the meaning of each word?" This is what he said:

"I—me, an individual, a committee of one.

"Pledge—dedicate all my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

"Allegiance—my love and my devotion.

"To the flag—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

"Of the United—that means we have all come together.

"States—individual communities that have united into 48 great states, 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, all that's love of country.

"Of America—

"And to the Republic—A state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

"For which it stands—

"One nation—meaning, so blessed by God.

"Indivisible—incapable of being divided.

"With liberty—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats or fear or some sort of retaliation.

"And justice—the principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

"For all—which means it's as much your country as mine."

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance—"Under God."

Wouldn't it be a pity if some one said, "That's a prayer," and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

FEDERAL LOAN TO A FIRM IN AN INDUSTRY SUBJECT TO OVERCAPACITY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in a time of general prosperity, it is more important than ever to take vigorous action to eliminate the pockets of poverty that are a disgrace to the Nation and a blight in our economy. I applaud many of the actions that government at all levels has taken to get at the root causes of such poverty, particularly the efforts of help—help that communities all over this Nation have taken. That a Federal agency, such as the Economic Development Administration, exists to assist these communities is commendable. What is not commendable, indeed what is most reprehensible, however, is a situation in which such an agency uses its authority to take an action that has no economic justification, one which gives every indication of both costing the Federal Government a substantial sum, and of failing to help the area where it has agreed to make a loan. Let me be specific. On January 28 of this year, the Economic Development Administration announced that it was making a 20-year

XUM

loan of nearly $1.5 million at 5¼ percent interest—quite a bargain at a time when the prime rate was 7 percent; it is now 7½ percent—to Television Electronics, Inc., of Newport, Tenn., to help it set up a color television tube manufacturing plant. The loan was granted, reportedly, because that part of Tennessee suffers from chronic high unemployment. But less than 3 weeks later, one of the leading manufacturers of color tubes, National Video Corp., filed for reorganization under chapter X of the Federal Bankruptcy Act because of, as it claimed, "continuing excess tube-manufacturing capacity in the industry and the resulting competitive pressure."

It seems highly questionable to me that by any stretch of the imagination the EDA can be excused for lending money to a firm for the purpose of producing a product which, as repeated observers in the trade have pointed out, is in oversupply. The president of the Television Manufacturers of America, for example, noted last month that tube manufacturers of the Nation now have a capacity of around 10 million tubes a year while current production lags at the level of 6 million tubes a year. Leading business advisory services reflect the same opinion. Under these circumstances it seems uncalled for for the Government to encourage production in this already glutted field. I do not wish to suggest that I am opposed to programs that are designed to help areas with high chronic unemployment help themselves. But the least that we can expect is that such help will be intelligent and economically sound in the long run. It may well be that eastern Tennessee needs and can make a go of certain new industries. But it is unwise in the extreme to foster production in an overcrowded field. This is an action that both Newport, Tenn., and the Federal Government, not to mention the overburdened U.S. taxpayer, may have grave cause to regret. I would urge that all lending programs of the Federal Government be scrutinized with added care and expert economic counsel so that this kind of fiasco will not be repeated.

HANDLOADER DENIED CHANCE TO BE HEARD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, having received permission I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing recently in the Handloader of January–February 1969 discussing not only the evils of the recent firearms control legislation, but some of the heavy-handed and unfair administration which has accompanied that regrettable piece of legislation.

The article follows:

HANDLOADER DENIED CHANCE TO BE HEARD

During the Senate hearings on the less-restrictive Administration firearms bill that preceded the one which became law, someone (Franklin Orth of the NRA as we recall) noted with approval that the Administration had eliminated ammunition controls. Sen. Thomas Dodd acidly replied that he was glad there was *something* in the bill of which gun owner organizations approved.

But other advocates of maximum firearms restrictions were quite displeased that ammunition had not been included. Treasury Department officials explained to them that ammunition had not been included in the bill for the simple reason that controls upon ammunition were impractical and unenforceable, as proven by their experience with the old Federal Firearms Act, which included certain controls upon ammunition. The Treasury officials pointed out that ammunition bears no serial number or other identifying mark, making it impossible to trace.

Nevertheless, when the Administration introduced the new law in the aftermath of the assassination of Sen. Robert Kennedy, its earlier position had been reversed. And how! Dealers were required by the proposed regulations under the law to inventory all ammunition in their business on the effective date of the law and to record all future acquisitions, showing "the serial number or other identifying marks of the ammunition."

Ammunition, as defined in the law, includes "ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in any firearm." "Bullets," we have been told, is a generic term which includes lead shot.

How is a dealer to record the "serial number or other identifying marks" of a bag of shot? We've seen plenty of ammunition and components, but we've never seen a cartridge, bullet, primer or can of powder with a serial number. The lot number found on some ammo and component boxes is for quality control purposes only and is useless for identification, since thousands of cans or boxes may bear the identical number.

With each sale of "ammunition," including a box of bullets, can of powder or box of primers, the dealer must record the name, address and date of birth of the handloader buying it. Because "ammunition" can no longer be sold by mail order, handloaders no longer may buy bullets by mail from small manufacturers whose products are too specialized to be economically stocked by dealers. Handloaders won't even be able to buy once-fired rifle or shotgun cases from out-of-state suppliers!

The effect of all this will be to reduce the number of dealers handling components, and to increase the cost of those who do continue, thus increasing the costs to individual handloaders. The result could be fewer handloaders.

Although the stated purpose of the law was to reduce crime, does anyone envision some hardened criminal learning the intricacies of handloading ammunition in order to pursue his "trade"? We doubt it.

The Treasury Department, by its own testimony, is aware that the requirement to record sales of ammunition and components can serve no useful purpose. So are the sponsors of the bill. But most of Congress was not even aware that these punitive provisions existed in the law.

Although there were a series of hearings on various firearms bills, there was never a hearing on the bill which became law. And there were no hearings of *any* bill which included provisions for controls upon ammunition and components.

It may seem incredible, but we know for a fact that 16 members of the House Judiciary Committee voted for this law the same morning copies were distributed—without the committee even having read it!

Another 16 members who voted to delay consideration for a week so the bill could be read were subjected to a furious tirade from the press and the Administration. As one of the members of the committee told us privately, "I'm an old country lawyer and I wouldn't let one of my farmer-clients sign a five-acre land lease without at least reading it. But they blistered us because we felt the nation's business should be conducted with the same common sense."

It is astonishing to think that any law could be rammed through with such disregard for sensible deliberation. But that's the way our new gun law came into being—and the reason it contains such travesties as the reloading component restrictions.

Every handloader and shooter is entirely within his rights to insist that the new Congress hold hearings on a bill to remove reloading components from the law. Unless some relationship can be shown between reloading and crime—and we defy anyone to produce evidence of such a relationship—there is no legitimate reason for Congress to refuse to repeal the reloading components section.

Admittedly we would prefer to see the entire bill substituted by a law which would cure the defects of the old Federal Firearms Act without pointlessly penalizing law-abiding citizens. But we see little hope of making substantive changes in the law at the present time.

However, although the new law was passed in a state of near hysteria, all of its major provisions had at least been discussed in open hearings concerning other bills. All, that is, except one—the ridiculous reloading components restrictions. And we handloaders should at least be given the right to object to those provisions in a formal hearing.—Neal Knox

---

THE NEW VIETNAM POLICY?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, can this be the new U.S. policy in Vietnam to appease the Communists or a surrender-type peace at the cost of additional millions of unfortunate victims? Can any thinking human being feel for 1 minute that if all the troops are removed and the National Liberation Front terrorists allowed to remain, that South Vietnam will be anything but a slaughterhouse for their people?

The report yesterday that the Saigon Government of free Vietnam would confer with the Communist liberation front causes many Americans to raise their eyebrows to question—is this the new administration's new Vietnam policy?

I place the reported Kissinger plan, contained in a report by David Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service, on March 26 and headline from this afternoon's lead story from the Evening Star at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 26, 1969]

KISSINGER PLAN RECALLED

This kind of talk, plus Thieu's proposal, reinforces the view that President Nixon has fully subscribed to the proposals of Henry A. Kissinger, which called for the United States and North Vietnam to settle the military problems, centered on the mutual withdrawal of forces, while leaving the political future of the South to be settled by the rival Vietnamese groups.

American officials here, in attempting to place Thieu's move in line with previous

XUM

South Vietnamese statements, pointed to Vice President Ky's remarks last Dec. 22. On a television program in Paris, Ky then advocated direct talks with the Front.

But at that time Ky drew a distinction between the Front as a "reality" with which his government would have to deal and as an "entity" which he said he would never accept.

Thieu's proposal has the effect of accepting the Front as an entity at least for the purposes of the Paris peace talks.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 27, 1969]

Says President Does Not Seek Military Win—Stresses Peace by Private Talks, Troop Withdrawal

---

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this week the League of Women Voters is celebrating its 50th anniversary. This outstanding and great organization has my congratulations for 50 years of dedicated and devoted service to our country.

A splendid article appeared in the South Carolina State and Columbia Record about a beloved constituent of Aiken, and a dear friend, Mrs. Eulalie Chafee Salley.

Mrs. Salley worked tirelessly for woman suffrage and for the League of Women Voters. She was a national leader in organizing both great movements. I commend these excellent articles about a great lady and the League of Women Voters to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of the entire Nation:

League of Women Voters To Celebrate 50th Year

Beginning this week, 150,000 members of the League of Women Voters will celebrate the organization's 50th anniversary.

It was on March 24, 1919, that Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, proposed the formation of the League of Women Voters.

Once the women who had worked so hard for suffrage had their goal in sight, they wanted a means of educating feminine voters about government.

The 19th amendment giving women the right to vote was passed in 1919 and ratified in 1920.

All over South Carolina, the 700 state members are celebrating the anniversary. The Columbia-Richland County group will kick off its 50th anniversary campaign drive Thursday with a 12:45 p.m. luncheon at Shandon United Methodist Church.

On a national level, the league hopes to raise $11 million during the anniversary year for its varied programs.

The league's interests through the years have changed but the organization has consistently supported those policies which the majority of members felt were for the good of the country.

In the 1920s members were working for the Child Labor Amendment and campaigning on disarmament.

In the 1930s they were behind the Lame Duck amendment and the TVA Act.

Support of the UN charter and the Marshall Plan were projects in the 1940s.

Members in the 1950s were behind the extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements and beginning their work on the conservation of water resources.

Among the national league's programs today is the support of equality of opportunity in education, employment and housing.

The state league, which is celebrating its 20th anniversary this year, was recently commended by Gov. Robert E. McNair for its work on compulsory education, constitutional revision, election and registration laws, jury service for women and water pollution control.

Organized in 1947, the Columbia league has worked for county-wide equitable tax assessment, minimal housing standards, fluoridation of water and a new Columbia Hospital.

Local members are currently supporting the consolidation of the county-city governments and increased personnel and adequate financing of the Juvenile Domestic Relations Court of Richland County.

Mrs. Sherrod L. Bumgardner is president of the state league and Mrs. Robert K. Moxon is the 50th Anniversary chairman. Mrs. Nelson Jensen is the Columbia league president.

Mrs. Jensen notes that women are attracted to the league today for the same reason they organized it in 1920—the desire to actively participate in the governments around them and to do so as informed citizens.

"Our purpose, though, goes beyond simply educating ourselves," said Mrs. Jensen. "On the one hand we select timely governmental issues for concentrated study with the objective of finding solutions members agree on. We then work to accomplish these solutions by convincing the electorate and public officials of the validity of our position.

"The other phase of league purpose we call 'voters' service.' We supply unbiased information on candidates' qualifications and views on issues, registrations and voting, and explanations of constitutional amendments."

Friend's Plight Prompted Women's Rights Interest

(By Betty Sadler)

At 85, Eulalie Chafee Salley would like to live to see two things—South Carolina ratify the 19th amendment and a woman elected president.

An ardent feminist all her adult life, Mrs. Salley is, as far as she knows, the only living member of the League of Women Voters' first national board.

Though she's worked for women's rights for over half a century, and has seen many accomplishments, she thinks her sex still has a long way to go.

One thing that rankles her is that South Carolina women have never been able to get the state legislature to ratify the amendment giving women the right to vote.

"It's been brought before the legislature time and time again—the last time was 1963—and it gets voted down every time," she said.

(As of 1968, South Carolina was one of only seven states—according to the U.S. Code Annotated—which have never ratified the amendment.)

She doesn't expect to be around when a woman runs the United States but does think it will eventually happen.

NEVER RAN FOR OFFICE

As for herself, Mrs. Salley never got around to running for office.

"I had a husband (the late Julian B. Salley) who was very much opposed to publicity and I hurt him enough with all the fool things I did for women's suffrage," she said.

"I told him if he'd just let me alone with my suffrage work, I'd never run for office," she remembered fondly.

"The worst thing I ever did was in a play we were putting on to raise some money," she reminisced.

"One of the acts was a prize fight and this cousin and I agreed to do it. We wore black tights and were billed as the 'Gold Dust Twins.'

"I didn't tell my family about it, but when we came out on stage my son, who was 9 at the time, shouted, 'Hey, mother, mother' and gave me away.

"I almost got a divorce. My husband didn't speak to me for days.

"But I did it all for suffrage," she said philosophically.

Eventually, Mr. Salley discovered the suffrage work was taking more money than she "could get out of my husband's pocket before daylight."

So she decided to go into business for herself. Mr. Salley told her she "couldn't make $6 in six months" and bet her $100 she wouldn't show a profit the first month.

She went to city hall, got the clerk to read her a list of the licenses available and chose the real estate license.

She paid $25 for the license (this was 1916) and sold one house that month for a profit of $1,000. She was the first woman in real estate in the state and still runs her own business. Through the years she's handled many sales for Aiken's wealthy winter colony.

FRIEND'S PLIGHT

Mrs. Salley got involved in the woman's suffrage movement because of the plight of a friend.

Lucy Tillman, the granddaughter of Gov. Francis W. Pickens, was divorced from B. R. Tillman Jr., the son of Sen. Ben Tillman.

Under South Carolina law of that time, a man had a right to deed away his children without his wife's consent. Mr. Tillman gave his children to his parents.

"I thought that if there were such laws in my state, I should work for women to have the right to vote," she said.

"There was also a law that allowed a man to beat his wife with a stick, provided the stick was no bigger in diameter than his thumb," she recalled.

One woman was beaten almost to death by her husband for joining the suffrage movement. Fellow members felt, however, that she probably had her revenge.

One day the man inexplicably dropped dead after his wife brought him a glass of buttermilk. She left town shortly thereafter and was never seen again.

Members of the movement had to make their own arrangements and pay their own way as they traveled around. Mrs. Salley traveled a great deal of the time—once arriving in a hearse.

"I went as far as I could on the trolley and got off at the closest station where people from the place I was going to speak in were supposed to meet me," she said.

"When they didn't appear, I hired the only conveyance in town—the hearse—for the last eight miles.

"They listened to me when I got there," she remembered.

One of the unhappiest aspects of suffrage work was the opposition of many women.

"There were more women in the anti-suffrage league than in the suffrage league," said Mrs. Salley. "Many women thought we were some kind of wild animals until they got used to the idea."

The amendment was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in May, 1919, by the Senate in June, 1919, and finally on Aug. 26, 1920, was proclaimed law.

BIG PARADE

"That was a day," said Mrs. Salley. "We had a big parade and the officers of the Aiken County Suffrage League (she was president) led on big black horses.

"There were autos and buggies and we rang all the church bells and fire bells in town."

Once they got the right to vote, members of the suffrage leagues went to work for the newly formed League of Women Voters to educate women in the use of the ballot.

Mrs. Salley spoke in 41 states in 18 months encouraging women to join. She was regional director of the seventh district in charge of organizing the league in seven states and the District of Columbia.

She's still active on a local level but believes it's time for younger women to carry on. "I go to their meetings sometimes and tell them what to do—but they never do it," she smiled.

Mrs. Salley still thinks the league made a mistake in choosing to be nonpartisan.

"At our first three national meetings there were big fights between those who wanted to be nonpartisan and those who wanted to be partisan. The nonpartisans won and I think this has been a weakness of the league ever since.

"I'm not nonpartisan. I want to say whether I want to vote Republican or Democrat—I don't want to be bound to one party, though I was born a Democrat and I guess I'll always be one. But I want to be able to vote independently."

Mrs. Salley thinks all women should do more than just keep house, though she readily admits she had an ideal situation with both her mother and her childhood nurse at home to raise her son and daughter. (Her son, Julian B. Salley, is a lawyer in Aiken; her daughter, Eulalie Rutledge, runs her own real estate office.)

"Just housework and children isn't enough," Mrs. Salley said emphatically. "It's dreadful to waste that much on house work.

"My husband used to say, 'Why don't you stay home and just take care of the children and the house.' I would tell him that giving me that job was like plowing a race horse . . . you can get any old mule to plow."

FISCAL ENLIGHTENMENT: MODERN REPUBLICAN WONDER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week this House raised the national debt limit, after vast heavings and profound soul searching. I was much moved by these spasms of patriotism and expressions of altruism. The tornadic blasts of rhetoric made a hurricane seem like a playful zephyr.

Suddenly, honorable Members who had manned frontline trenches in wars against Government spending emerged as shining knights-errant of a higher national debt limit. I would have sooner expected to see the Joint Chiefs put on hair shirts and open a cooperative pants pressing parlor than to observe what transpired here.

What was a national crime under the Democrats has suddenly received a Republican imprimatur. Previously, whenever a Democratic administration asked for permission to raise the national debt, our brethren across the aisle acted as if we were proposing to throw the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Revised Statutes into the fire. This is why I was so amazed last week that I next expected to hear the second coming was imminent, and had caused this change of heart.

Even Mr. Nixon asked for our poor Democratic assistance in putting this raise into effect. Enlightment rages through Republican congressional and executive halls like a veritable pestilence these days. Refreshing change.

Has light dawned? Will the leopard change his spots? Was Bluebeard really a tambourine player for the Salvation Army? Will the Republican Party stay in this state of enlightened stupefaction? I would sooner hope that an alcoholic in a distillery would take the pledge.

Yet in humble hope but scant expectation, I await the next entertaining episode.

HISTORY OF HOSPITALS AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein the text of a very interesting, informative press release on the history of hospitals at Fort Devens, Mass., a famous Army installation in my district, prepared by the information office of that great post.

This splendid, very well-done recital of the long, illustrious history of hospitals at Fort Devens is all the more timely because of the recent groundbreaking there for a new, ultramodern hospital facility at the post, filling a real need in providing the best possible treatment for the members of the armed services and their dependents.

I want to compliment the information office of the post for its fine piece of work, which I regard as so important that I will forward the text of the release, together with these remarks, to the Library of Congress and the State library at Boston.

The press release follows:

HISTORY OF HOSPITALS AT FORT DEVENS

FORT DEVENS, MASS.—When the War Department decided to erect a cantonment in the Northeastern part of the United States for training conscripted soldiers to fight in Europe in World War I, the town of Ayer was selected for the site, because of the contour of the land, the abundance of good water, the accessibility of modern railroad facilities, and the proximity of the coast in the event of an enemy attack.

The contractor (Fred T. Ley Company, Springfield, Mass.) began clearing the scrub oak and pine from the cantonment site on June 19, 1917.

One week later, there were 1489 workmen at the site ready to erect living quarters for the men who were to be assigned to the cantonment for training as soldiers.

On June 25, 1917, the first medical officer arrived at the camp site to work with the contractor. His name was Captain Glen I. Jones, and he had the title of "Sanitation Officer".

On Tuesday, Aug. 28, 1917, the first large group of medical personnel arrived at the site from Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. They were members of a sanitary corps detachment and there were 38 officers and 240 enlisted men in the unit. The commanding officer was Captain George Waters.

On Sunday July 15, 1917, the cantonment site was named Camp Devens, after a native son, Major General Charles Devens, a hero of the Civil War, Attorney General of the United States in President Rutherford B. Hayes' cabinet.

The first permanent Army hospital at Camp Devens opened on Sept. 1, 1917 with 46 of its 59 ward buildings completed. It was designated Camp Base Hospital and was commanded by Major Glen I. Jones. (The first medical officer assigned to the camp in June.)

It was originally planned as a 1600 bed hospital, but by December 1917, it had grown to a 2740 bed hospital making it the 7th largest of the 35 camp hospitals then in existence in the United States, and the 12th largest of all the U.S. Army hospitals throughout the country.

The first patient admitted to the hospital with the dreaded "flu", occurred on Tuesday, Aug. 27, 1918. By the end of the day, six more men were admitted with the same symptoms.

By Sept. 14, there were 1765 cases of flu in the hospital and four days later the number had climbed to 7400 with 68 deaths.

The hospital was staffed with 210 nurses at the start of the flu epidemic, but as the number of patients increased, the Army rushed nurses and doctors to Devens from Army posts all over the country.

12,707 cases were reported by Sept. 30, with 593 deaths attributed to the flu.

The disease had disabled 14,280 servicemen by Oct. 8 and the death toll had risen to 775, including two doctors and five nurses. Camp Devens was the hardest hit of all the military installations in the United States.

The flu started to wane on Oct. 8, and two days later, the post lifted all quarantines and restrictions.

Wounded soldiers from the fighting in France began arriving at Devens on Dec. 1 for treatment and rehabilitation.

The Camp Base Hospital at Devens was staffed with 940 medical corpsmen making it 5th in numbers of enlisted personnel assigned of all 35 camp base hospitals in the United States. With 146 officers on the hospital staff, Devens hospital rated number 2 in the country in the number of medical officers assigned.

On Jan. 2, 1927, the House Committee on Military Affairs authorized expenditures of $300,000 for a permanent hospital at Camp Devens.

The hospital was to have 105 beds and its total cost would have been over $400,000, with the extra money to be appropriated before the hospital was completed. Nothing came of the above proposal.

In July 1930, 10 bids were received for the construction of a new hospital. The lowest bidder was the Shawmut Construction Company of Boston who submitted a bid of $115,284. The bids were forwarded to the War Department for final action.

In October 1930, construction began on the new hospital. It was completed May 10, 1931 at a cost of $118,708. The hospital contained 35 beds, a dental lab; an operating room; a narcotics vault; an x-ray room, and a diet kitchen. The commanding officer of the hospital was Major William T. Fisher. He had 18 corpsmen assigned to the hospital to care for the patients' needs.

Contracts were drawn up between the U.S. Army and civilian doctors from the immediate area, who would come to the hospital at specified times to assist in medical diagnosis and/or operations that may be required.

On Oct. 7, 1931 Devens was designated a permanent post and referred to as Fort Devens.

When the first peace time draft in our nation's history was instituted in 1940, Fort Devens was given an A–1 priority for new construction.

One of the projects in the construction program was the erection of two hospitals—both to contain 1,000 beds. In the fall of

XUM

1940, construction of the two hospitals began, and both were completed in early 1941.

On Feb. 16, 1941, the first of these two hospitals was dedicated and designated Lovell General Hospital, in honor of Surgeon General Joseph Lovell, a native of Mass., who served as an Army Surgeon with the 9th U.S. Infantry during the War of 1812. He was appointed the first Surgeon General of the U.S. Army on April 18, 1818, a post he held until his death on Oct. 17, 1836.

The first commanding officer of Lovell General Hospital was Brigadier General Henry G. Pillsbury, a native of Lowell, Mass. The hospital consisted of 83 buildings housing 32 wards. The first patient was admitted to the hospital on June 15, 1941.

Lovell General served the needs of all the Army posts throughout New England (except Fort Devens), and New York state.

The other 1,000 bed hospital was designated New Station Hospital and was for the care of military personnel and their dependents stationed at Fort Devens. Lieutenant Colonel Miner F. Felch was the first commanding officer of the New Station Hospital.

Both hospitals at Devens were merged in July 1944, and Lovell General Hospital became Lovell General South and the former New Station Hospital became Lovell General North.

On June 24, 1946 both hospitals were inactivated when Fort Devens was slated to be closed. The patients still in the hospitals at the time, were transferred to Murphy General Hospital, Waltham.

The Fort was officially inactivated June 30, 1946.

After the closing of the post, Lovell General North (formerly New Station Hospital) was converted into 400 family units by the Federal Public Housing Authority for use of married veterans who were attending Harvard University, and who were unable to acquire housing facilities near the university due to the heavy influx of veterans returning to college.

As the veterans who lived in the old Lovell General North area were all attending Harvard University, the housing area itself became known as Harvard-Devens.

On July 15, 1948 Fort Devens was once again reactivated, and on Oct. 1, 1948, Lovell General South (the original Lovell General Hospital) was re-opened with 100 beds to care for the needs of the 2200 troops who were then stationed at Fort Devens. The hospital was designated Lovell section of the Murphy General Hospital. Fort Devens.

On May 1, 1950, the hospital was redesignated Station Hospital, Fort Devens and in 1956 was redesignated U.S. Army Hospital, Fort Devens.

The hospital which is now slated to be built on Fort Devens, had its origin back in February 1963, when plans were submitted to the Defense Department for inclusion of the hospital construction in Fiscal Year 1966.

DR. WILLIAM S. SHIELDS HONORED

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Service Academies rank among the finest educational institutions in the country. We can be proud of the young graduates who, through their training and experience, make valuable contributions to both the civilian as well as the military way of life. We owe a great debt to those who devote their lives to training these young men.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to one such devoted educator, Dr. William S. Shields, the dean of admissions at the U.S. Naval Academy. Dr. Shields began his career teaching romance languages at Western Reserve in 1937. In 1940 he was commissioned in the U.S. Navy and was assigned to the modern languages department at the Naval Academy. In 1949 he returned to civilian life and was named educational adviser to the Superintendent of the Academy. He acted in the capacity of adviser until 1962 at which time he was appointed to his present position, dean of admissions.

Dr. Shields was honored recently by the Naval Association of New York. They presented him with their annual award for outstanding service to the Naval Academy. I would like to take this opportunity to add my congratulations and thanks to Dr. Shields and to the many other fine Academy educators, who give invaluable service to this country.

SOUTH SHORE HOSPITAL MOVES AHEAD

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1969, I had the distinct pleasure to hear the speech of Col. Harry Zubkoff, U.S. Air Force, retired, who is performing a distinctive and outstanding service as executive director of the South Shore Hospital and Medical Center of Miami Beach, Fla.

It was my good fortune to be on hand as Colonel Kubkoff reviewed the amazing rapid growth of this community-serving hospital and its ambitious and worthwhile objective to expand from 50 to 200 beds.

It was my pleasure to address the fundraising dinner and join with all in paying tribute to Dr. David K. Pinks, founder and inspirational leader of the hospital.

So that we might all better understand the difficulties and triumphs of a progressive hospital such as South Shore Hospital and Medical Center, I would like at this point to insert into the RECORD the text of Colonel Zubkoff's speech:

Tonight you see before you an envious man. I have been asked to tell you how reality has caught up with a man's dream. To bring substance to a man's dream may be some measure of achievement but I would much prefer to have been the individual with the dream and that someone other than I had been given the job of describing to you the brick and mortar.

Other speakers who follow—far more qualified and competent than I—will pay earned homage to our honored guest of the evening. I must content myself with cold realities of statistics and brick and mortar.

South Shore Hospital is a reality. It is here. It is completely filled with patients. It is bulging at the seams. It now belongs to you. Its future belongs to you.

Our non-profit—I repeat, non-profit—to dispel an old wives tale perhaps spread by one or more groups of "haves" who with perhaps suspect motives may have resisted normal growth of medical activities to the detriment of Dade County and Miami Beach, in particular—our non-profit hospital is accomplishing its one and only function; namely, good patient care.

I am sorry that I must use the word "suspect" when referring to the motives of the "haves" but I have no choice when I recall five or six years ago our guest of honor initially tried to build this hospital. The city of Miami Beach council was told by the "haves", we need no more beds in Miami Beach. Since that date, over 50% more beds have been added by those same people and today they probably would again allege "we need no more beds". You people here, especially the physicians whose hearts and backs are perpetually burdened with the chore of no place to take care of the sick and injured people who look to you for actual medical salvation, know this allegation of "enough beds" to be a falsehood.

It is you physicians who must lead the way if you agree with what is said here tonight. It is you physicians who must give materially and always remember to tell each and every patient you care for "support south shore hospital—we all need it".

Every dollar invested in our hospital will buy only one commodity. Good patient care.

No money will be spent on research. No money will be spent on formal education. Unlike some hospital administrators I feel that school systems know more about formal education than do hospitals. Like the old Greek restaurateur cliche, "We cash no checks and the bank serves no soup". So I say, let the schools do the education.

At south shore no money will be spent on experimental equipment. We will provide the very latest tested and accepted equipment. We will not purchase each new fad in cardiac monitoring devices that hits the market only to fade in a short time, or sometimes, even before it is fully installed. To repeat, we will put every ounce of our dedication, ability and dollars into kind and competent concern and care for our patients.

I do not take issue with the medical complexes that have developed across our country.

There are medical schools and there should be medical schools to educate the student and do research.

There are university hospitals and there should be university hospitals to expose the students to some on-the-job experience and to train interns and residents.

There are non-affiliated large hospitals and there should be non-affiliated large hospitals which, unfettered by inbred academic restrictions that may be present in schools and university hospitals, can bridge the gap between research and training at the medical schools and the practitioners in the community.

But the problem is that none of these want to stick to their own knitting.

The school wants to get into the hospital business; the hospital wants to get into the school business. The result is a hodge podge where the patient and "good patient care" are almost forgotten.

For instance, if medical schools had stuck to their knitting of educating students, these schools would have been more successful over the past 20 years in responding to the request and heavy outlay of funds by the people and the Government to produce increased numbers of physicians that this country needs so desperately. This inability to produce in my mind is directly proportionate to their desire to spread into any and all areas of health, perhaps at worst financially motivated or at best overestimating their capabilities in their desire to serve humanity.

What about the large nonaffiliated or quasi-affiliated hospital? Why have they historically turned their backs on the very

XUM

communities from which they sprang and where they still are situated?

For some unknown reason, it is almost a dirty word to be a small or moderate size hospital—let's say arbitrarily 250 beds or less. Hospitals that reach this size, for some unknown reason, do not turn their efforts to refine and improve patient care—they try instead to get bigger and bigger, they play at doing research and believe me it is frequently only play which doesn't fool skilled field representatives from our Government who must judge before authorizing grants. These institutions fly off in all directions—education, new equipment evaluations, home care programs, full time staffing, product evaluations, etc. The fact that good patient care may be the loser seems not to concern the semi-large hospital or should I call it the large semi-hospital that has been bitten by the growth, research and education bug.

These large hospitals lose sight of the benefits that come from a patient staying with his hospital family during his stay; the same room, the same nurses, the same orderlies, the same food service people and the same surroundings. It loses sight of laboratory reports that don't catch up with the patient and his doctor until too late to be of diagnostic use: it loses sight of the radiology reports that somehow take second place to the alleged research being conducted, (sometimes nothing more than getting someone's name in print).

There is no doubt that at some indefinable number of beds these are the things that happen. I think the magic number is 250 beds. At this size hospital we can have the benefits that size does bring and I hope none of the disadvantages that real bigness brings.

Already the government is concerned about what it is buying with its Medicare dollar. With the advent of Medicaid which is almost upon us in Florida, the State government is even more concerned about what it will be buying for its dollar.

Recently at a South Florida hospital council meeting I heard Dr. Flipsee make a statement that the Government is concerned because it wants all of the medical benefits possible for its scarce dollar but that the triad or should I say the bigamist marriage of education, research, and large medical complexes make it impossible to relate the costs with the exact benefits. And well Dr. Flipsee and other government agencies should be concerned. The February 18th, 1969 issue of the hospital administrators bible "Hospitals" published by the American Hospital Association states that the same procedure—identical mind you—costs $17.40 at a small hospital and $57.77 at a hospital with over 400 beds. I do not suggest that the $17.40 hospital is the one I recommend. There is no doubt that at this price many basic services and precautions probably were missing. However, on the other end of the pendulum's arc I am sure that the $57.77 hospital included many "tie-in sales" which were either superfluous or not essential. I would recommend some middle range where the price would be consistent with the needed services.

It is my view that the Federal Government had its chance and muffed it but maybe it is not too late. With the advent of medicare the Government should have frozen the expansion of any hospital of over 250 beds in size and then supported the creation of principal and satellite hospitals. Existing large hospitals could have improved their capability to perform their primary functions. They, in turn, would be equitably surrounded by smaller hospitals not to exceed 250 beds.

As I have visited large hospitals I have never found a single one that has not been devoting its major thoughts and energies to expansion, expansion, expansion. Never have I found one that was concentrating on improving the things that were their primary reason for being and never, never, never did I find one that was really giving its major efforts to simply improving patient care. Federal grants for special projects or bed expansion including intensive care complexes seemed to be their sole reason for being.

This should not be.

I say, let's stop the numerical bed growth of these expensive non-oriented to patient care medical institutions. Let us start supporting our communities with a type of health facilities that can best provide for our needs in a personal and competent manner. Let us here in Florida let the rest of the Nation know that we are not only thinking but are doing something about it.

On two occasions I have heard a former president of the South Florida Hospital Council emphasize that hospitals are a "business" with no qualifying, amplifying or explanatory footnotes. Except that it is extremely important to bear in mind that hospitals are primarily a humane endeavor undertaken by a dedicated people who have a passion for compassion, I agree with him. However, if there are more who agree with him it is not sufficiently evidenced in their practices nor in their planning. If it is a business, then it would follow that competition upon which all business is based should be the accepted practice. Competition should be the leveller not some magic bureaucratic formula that is more interested to protect the "haves" than provide the finest and most economical health services through economic competition. "Figures are foolers." For instance, Florida is in group 3 for almost all medical geographical studies done by the American Hospital Association. Thus, Florida is included in the same group as Georgia for certain hospital studies. With no anthropology background and no statistics but only my eyes, ears and mind to make a judgment, I maintain this is absurd. Statistics are misleading. Again—an example. The State of Florida health plan states that 11.7% of the people in Dade County are over the age of 65. This may or may not be so but again when applied to my observation of a sample of the 75,000 individuals in South Beach, I would question whether our planning should be on the 11.7 percentage.

Too, statistics reflect the past and frequently are a poor barometer for the future. I would much rather rely on healthy American competition even when it means that an older medical institution may close its doors or curtail some of its activities because a younger and more competent health activity has managed to provide better health services. It should not and must not be a matter of which came first. Caliber of services delivered should be the criterion. Only competition will rid us of inefficiencies and wastefulness.

At South Shore Hospital our next phase will give us 150 beds and our final phase, I emphasize final phase, will give us 250 beds.

If and when more hospital beds are needed, and the daily replacement of individual homes by condominiums that significantly increase the population density per square foot of land that makes this a certainty on Miami Beach, I vow to support anyone who embarks upon construction of another small independent hospital where youth and vigor will make South Shore Hospital stay on its toes, knowing full well it is in a competitive field whose aim must always be "good patient care".

It is to this philosophy that I ask you to subscribe with both your spiritual and material assistance. To find within each of you the ability to give. To provide both for your community, yourselves and your family a most precious gift—the comfort of knowing that when illness strikes there is in your community the ability to give good patient care.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor was privileged today to hear from Secretary of Labor, George Shultz, and Under Secretary of Labor, James Hodgson, on H.R. 3290, the construction safety legislation which is currently being considered by our committee.

For the benefit of my colleagues I include their statements as part of my remarks:

Statement of George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor, Before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 3290, Construction Safety and Health, March 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: It is a pleasure for us to be here today. I am accompanied by the Under Secretary of Labor, Mr. James D. Hodgson, who will stay following my brief opening remarks, to answer any questions you may have.

It is fitting, Mr. Chairman, that our first meeting with you concerns, generally, the subject of occupational safety and health, and, specifically, H.R. 3290 which is related to this subject to the extent that the bill recognizes the Federal Government's obligation to promote the safe and healthful working conditions of those employees who work under Federal contracting authorities.

The safety and health aspects of working conditions are already protected under Federal law in the case of those employed on Government supply and service contracts. The extension of such protection to the one group of workers presently unprotected; that is, to the construction workers employed under Federal and federally assisted construction projects, strikes us as wise.

I favor the enactment of legislation along the general lines of H.R. 3290 which recognizes that the Federal Government has a special obligation to those who work on Government contracts and extends safety and health protections to the one remaining class of workers who do not now have the benefit of those protections.

Mr. Hodgson will, I'm sure, expand on the Labor Department's views on this subject and answer your questions.

Statement of James D. Hodgson, Under Secretary of Labor Before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 3290, Construction and Health, March 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Since I first assumed my duties as Under Secretary of Labor last month I have looked forward to the opportunity to discuss with you important legislative matters bearing upon the welfare of the working men and women of this country.

Therefore, I am pleased that H.R. 3290 reflects an interest in the broad subject of occupational safety and health, even though its provisions deal only with the working conditions and practices of the building and construction industry when Federal contracting is involved.

H.R. 3290 would promote safe and healthful working conditions for those employed in one segment of a single industry. The measure recognizes that the Federal Govern-

XUM

ment has a special responsibility toward those persons who work on contracts entered into under authority of the Federal Government.

Before going into the particulars of H.R. 3290, I believe it might be best to first examine the broad picture of industrial safety and health. In this way, we can gain some perspective on how H.R. 3290 fits into the more general view of industrial safety matters.

We have figures based on the year 1967 covering all industries, grouped into six major categories, which give us a fair overall picture of the workplace hazards for American employees. In industry as a whole, 14,200 persons are killed on the job every year; and over two million are disabled by injuries at work. Our figures show that these total deaths, approximately 20 percent occur in the construction industry. Of the total disabling injuries, the construction industry accounts for about 11 percent.

National Safety Council figures for the same year, but in a more detailed grouping of 41 industries, show an all-industry injury frequency rate of 7.22 disabling injuries for every one million man hours worked, the highest since 1954. That same rate for the construction industry is nearly double; that is, 13.21 disabling injuries. However, among the 41 industries, 22 of them have higher incidences of disabling injuries than the all-industry rate. And 8 of these industries, Mr. Chairman, have injury frequency rates that are higher than that of the construction industry.

In terms of accident *severity* rates, instead of frequency rates we see from the National Safety Council data more or less the same picture. There are 20 industries which have higher severity rates than the all-industry rate. Five of these have severity rates higher than that of the construction industry.

I want to digress a moment to say that we realize that our statistics on work-related deaths and injuries are not what they should be. One of the major problems in the field of occupational safety and health is the insufficient and inadequate reporting of such fatalities and injuries. But, incomplete as they are, the figures add up this way.

First, we see over 14,000 people killed and over two million injured every year while earning their living.

Secondly, we can conclude that the construction industry involves a more than normally hazardous type of employment. Indeed that industry is one of the most hazardous in the Nation. And it is a sizeable industry employing millions of workers, and involving the investment of billions of dollars annually.

At the same time, we might observe that while construction represents one of our most hazardous occupations, it is, in perspective, only a part of a general problem; it does not represent the whole problem. The construction industry accounts in statistical terms for a little less than a fifth of the overall National workers safety problem.

In the view of the Department, it would thus appear that some sort of comprehensive approach toward improving the working conditions and practices of all industries, including, of course, the building and construction industry, as a whole would be desirable.

However, legislation along the lines of H.R. 3290, which is confined to providing safe and healthful working conditions for the one group of employees working under Government contracting authorities who are not presently protected by Federal law, would be a step forward. The Federal Government would thus round out its safety coverage of those who work under its contracting authorities.

The purpose of H.R. 3290 is to extend to Federal construction contracts the same health and safety protections already provided under other Federal laws to those who work under Government contracts for the procurement of services and of supplies. Those other laws are the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

We are not yet prepared to speak to the specific provisions of this construction safety bill, or of a general bill. I am sure you appreciate that we will need more time to work out the details of such legislation.

I would like to note, however, that as we see it, H.R. 3290 would operate as follows:

The new safety and health protection would operate as follows:

The new safety and health protection would take the form of a condition in a contract. The condition would be inserted in the types of contracts specified in the Contract Work Hours Act.

In the event the Secretary of Labor should find a violation of a contract condition relating to worker safety and health, the Government agency for which the work is being done could, after full due process of law, cancel the contract and enter into other contracts charging the additional cost to the original contractor.

H.R. 3290 would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enforce the bill's provisions in the same manner as the safety and health provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act are enforced. The Secretary would hold hearings, make decisions based on findings, make rules and regulations, and take other appropriate actions.

Finally, the bill substantially adopts the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act authorizing the Secretary of Labor, following carefully defined procedures, to debar contract violators for 3 years.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that we have a strong interest in a comprehensive occupational safety and health coverage for all industries, including the building and construction industry. However, we endorse the idea of legislation which is especially designed for the building and construction industry—thus filling a gap in Federal coverage of on-the-job safety and health of those employees who work under Federal contracting authorities.

WHOSE HAND

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a poem entitled "Whose Hand" written by Mr. Ted Cook, of Brilliant, Ohio:

Whose Hand

(By Ted Cook)

Whose hand has shaped the firmament?
And placed the sky the lightning rent?
Who put the stars up in the sky?
And made the moon to shine on high?

Whose hand has caused a flower to grow?
To make the gentle breezes blow?
Who makes the cooling rain to fall?
And grows a tree so green and tall?

Who makes the bird's song sound so sweet?
And grows the green grass 'neath our feet?
The autumn leaves with colors gay?
The sunset glow at close of day?

Whose ear has heard a baby's cry?
And heard a mother's lullaby?
And made the softly falling snow?
To blanket earth so far below?

Who made the oceans vast and wide?
And caused the ever changing tide?
Who rules the destiny of man?
The one o'er all since time began?

So, men in space look up to God,
For they have risen from the clod,
And give their thanks to Him on high,
Who guides them safely through the sky.

So, atheists may rant and rave,
And say there's nothing but the grave.
But Christians know a peace of mind,
That infidels will never find.

So, people live and people love,
For they must look to God above,
Beyond the grave for you and me,
There is no death there's immortality.

CHINESE EMBASSY IN WARSAW ACCUSES SOVIET UNION OF KATYN MASSACRE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared in the Polish Daily Zgoda which reflects the growing intensity of the conflict between the Soviet Union and her neighbor Red China.

It is most interesting that the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw is showing a film which clearly establishes that Soviet police murdered 15,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia in 1940.

This is the first time that a Communist nation has formally accused the Soviet Union of perpetrating this monstrous crime and I do not believe the world should remain aloof to this charge by Red China.

May I remind this House that in 1952 a congressional committee headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman Madden, conducted a very exhaustive investigation of the Katyn massacre and concluded that it was the Soviet Union which was responsible for the murder of these Polish officers in Katyn.

The Soviet Union has denied these charges, but I believe it is extremely significant that its one-time stanch ally, the Republic of China, now brands the Soviet Union as the perpetrator of this crime against Polish soldiers.

It is also most significant, Mr. Speaker, that if this article is correct, members of the Polish Armed Forces apparently are now admitting that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Katyn massacre and is now trying to alibi that the Russians were justified in the brutal assassination of these Polish officers.

If this is indeed true, then this is also the first time that spokesmen for the present regime in Poland acknowledge Russian guilt for this hideous crime against the people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be the chief investigator for the congressional committee which in 1952 investigated this international crime.

I said then and I say now that this horrible atrocity against the Polish officers committed by the Communists shall come back to haunt them time and time again.

Make no mistake. The ghost of Katyn hangs heavy over the Communist heads in Russia. I have every reason to believe that some day the souls of those 15,000 Polish Army officers, so brutally murdered by the Communists in Katyn, will come back and provide the very impetus which will bring the collapse of communism in Poland and the Soviet Union.

While I have spoken in the sharpest tones against Red China and did not want any of my remarks ever to be misconstrued as in any way condoning the Chinese Communist Government, one cannot help but acknowledge the fact that the Communist Chinese have performed a notable public service by again bringing into sharp perspective this infamous crime by the Soviet Union against the people of Poland.

In 1940, the Katyn massacre was suppressed because American authorities and Soviet authorities did not want to drive a wedge between the allies in World War II.

This was one of the most tragic decisions of modern history. Had the people of the world been told about this Soviet infamy against Poland, the whole course of history could have been changed.

I do not believe that in 1969 we Americans should again make this mistake. I believe that it is important for the free world to again reflect upon the full details of Katyn, for in the brutal massacre of these 15,000 Polish officers we see a true picture of Soviet treachery and brutality.

Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia and the wanton destruction of those brave Czechs who dared stand up to Soviet rule clearly shows that nothing has changed in the Soviet Union. The same forces of evil that engineered the Katyn massacre are still in command and Katyn stands as an everlasting monument to Communist treachery and infamy.

I hope the free world will never forget Katyn.

The article to which I have referred, and which appeared in the Polish Daily Zgoda in Chicago, follows:

CHINESE EMBASSY IN WARSAW SHOWED THE FILM OF KATYN

On the premises of the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw the film on Katyn, charging the Russians with the responsibility for the murder of Polish officers, was shown again. The show was accessible to the public which appeared in throngs.

The [Polish] regime's Ministry of Foreign Affairs submitted an official sharp protest to which the Chinese replied that this film was being shown for the employees of the Embassy to facilitate their study of the Polish language.

As a side effect of this film showing, a special meeting was called of higher officers of all branches of the Armed Forces at the General Staff office.

At this meeting the responsibility of the Russians for the "Katyn case" was not denied, but it was maintained that "this action was justified at that time" because, it was alleged, one of Beria's deputies prepared a false evidence to the effect that the Polish officers had been in contact with anti-Stalin opposition in Russia and tried to organize a mass escape.

On the basis of such "false charges" which "the Soviet Government had no opportunity to verify", an order was issued to liquidate the Polish officers.

The Chinese maintain the biggest embassy in Warsaw. Many of their members are fluent in the Polish language. They are very active and try to maintain as extensive as possible social contacts with the Poles.

This is rather easy to do because, according to the information from Poland, there are people there who see in China a potential destroyer of Russian imperialism.

So far, the Poles are not afraid to visit the Chinese Embassy. In summertime one can see many Polish families in the gardens of the Embassy. The children play and their parents have conversations with the members of the Embassy.

"MR. BASKETBALL" LEAVES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, Mr. Basketball, Bob Cousy, has retired as coach of the Boston College team. The Boston College basketball, its fans and the entire Boston area have known with Bob Cousy the great joy of victory and the extreme happiness of consistently playing well.

When Cooz retired from the Celtics and No. 14 retired with him, part of an era was over. The Boston Celtics under the direction of Red Auerbach was I think the finest team in pro basketball but when Bob Cousy left something more than just one player left with him, and I am sure we will never forget that St. Patrick's Day in 1963 when Bob Cousy was honored at Boston Garden.

We all knew that great things were going to happen at Boston College when Mr. Basketball took over the coaching job and we were not disappointed. Cousy's first team had a 10–11 record. After 1 year working with the kids Cousy's club was 22 to 7 and Boston College was invited to the National Invitational Tournament for the first time. The following year came another National Invitational Tournament invitation followed by two NCAA tournaments. This year Boston College made the finals in the NIT and a beautiful, superb finish to Bob Cousy's coaching career.

It is almost impossible to describe the change that came over the Boston College team and its loyal fans. Every team wants to win but this team wanted to win not only for themselves and their school but for their beloved coach, and Mr. Speaker, they did win. The explanation for this lies primarily with Bob Cousy the man. He was a great player and a great coach but more than that he is an extraordinary human being and a dedicated athlete. He understands the joys and the benefits of team play and exalts in a good hard and fast competition.

Bob Monahan, staff writer for the Boston Globe, has described Bob Cousy the man and his effect on teammates, on players better than anyone else I have ever read. Under unanimous consent I place his article of March 9, 1969, in the RECORD.

One of the great stars of our day is entering a new phase of life and in order to pay tribute to him it helps to understand him. I know Mr. Monahan's article will contribute to that understanding:

HAPPY MEMORIES LINGER AS COOZ LEAVES

(By Bob Monahan)

Thank you, Bob Cousy . . . for the memories by the dozens. You made your last official Boston appearance Thursday night at Boston College. You left a void that will take this town some time to get over.

Cousy, alias Mr. Basketball, still is the Boston College basketball coach. He announced his retirement 16 games ago and it becomes official when his Eagles either win or are eliminated from the National Invitational Tournament in New York.

He has been a figurehead in this area for 23 years. Four of them were at Holy Cross where he earned All-America honors. Thirteen of them were with the Boston Celtics. The last six were with Boston College.

Bob is more than an out-going coach. He's a gentleman with a magic touch, former college great, ex-N.B.A. super star and he's in a class of his own.

His career at Boston College started with an ending. He took the B.C. job in 1963 after the Celtics won their fifth straight N.B.A. championship. It was during those years he earned the Mr. Basketball tag which he still owns.

He was a floor general who came through in the clutch. He made the Celtics fast break go. He thrilled thousands with his playmaking ability. No one who ever saw his behind-the-back dribbles or his pin point "blind" passes ever will forget them.

Cousy was unique. He still is.

On Mar. 17, 1963, the Celtics played their last regular season home game against the Syracuse Nationals at Boston Garden. It was a Sunday afternoon and it was Bob Cousy Day . . . a day to remember.

Cousy was on the court before more than 15,000 fans. His wife, Missy, and daughters, Mary Patricia and Marie Colette, were with him. He kept his head bowed and swallowed hard as people praised him. Red Auerbach and Bill Russell were close by. The plaudits were great, but they started to get to him. He swallowed hard again and again as did people in the stands. They knew one of the greatest athletes ever was leaving the game.

For a moment there was complete quiet . . . no yelling . . . no talking . . . not even a whisper or a cough.

Then it happened like a bolt of lightning. The silence was broken by a yell that touched everyone.

A young man in the balcony said it all with five words. He hollered: "We all love ya, Cooz." That did it. The words echoed throughout the Garden.

Those five words hit Cousy right in the heart. He wept. He wasn't ashamed and he need not have been. He couldn't fight off the tears any more. Over half the spectators wept with him as Cousy rubbed tears from his face.

Hard-nosed men cried with him . . . it was too much. But what a tribute. And he deserved it. Cousy, who flashed up and down the court with his now retired number 14 . . . who made the impossible play . . . who kept Boston basketball alive until the arrival of Russell was leaving and it hurt . . . it hurt deeply.

Then came the final playoffs against Los Angeles. The Celts were up three points when Cousy sprained an ankle. He left the game. L.A. made a charge and it looked as though they would take command. Coach Auerbach looked at Cousy. Number 14 limped back to the court.

He lifted the team even though in pain. He made the big play and kept control. With seconds remaining he hurled the ball into the air. The final buzzer sounded before it hit the court. Teammates hugged him. Mr. Basketball went out a winner which was in keeping with his style.

XUM

Bob displayed a great deal of emotion as a player. He carried that with him into coaching.

Cousy played pro ball to win. He carried that philosophy to B.C. where he was to launch a sensational basketball tradition. It didn't take long to catch on and he started to mold a top notch club. Great players wanted to play for him. Mr. Basketball was Mr. Magic. Kids looked at him in awe. To play for the Cooz . . . well, it was almost unreal.

His aim at B.C. was to install, build and retain the Celtics' winning tradition. He wanted a team which would feature the fast break. He wanted aggressive players who would excel at man to man defense. He did it.

"Playing the game is one thing," said Cousy. "Coaching is another. College ball was new to me.

"At first you expect too much from the kids. After a while I adjusted and knew what I was doing. It took a few years before I considered myself any kind of coach. I've been in it all my life and I'm still learning."

Two friends helped Cousy in his early coaching stages. They were Dee Rowe, new UConn coach, and former Assumption College coach Andy Laska who was a teammate at Holy Cross.

"I knew what I wanted but it was a bit slow coming," said Cousy. "But it did come . . . fast break . . . man to man and pressure ball. Of the six clubs I've had this current one does all those things the best."

Cousy's first team had a 10–11 record. The 1964–'65 club was 22–7 and the Eagles were invited to the N.I.T. for the first time. The following year they were 21–5 and again played in the N.I.T. Cousy did breathe life into what was the corpse of B.C. basketball.

The 1966–'67 team was 23–3 and last year's was 17–8. Both played in the N.C.A.A. tournament.

Cousy, one of the most dapper looking guys in the business, has many mannerisms of his ex-coach Auerbach. He always rolls up a program and holds it during a game. He's not the fire eater Auerbach was and is, but Cooz has been known to take the heat now and then. Most of the time he plays it cool. He keeps most of it inside.

"When I was playing I always felt sick before a game," said Cousy. "This happens to a lot of athletes. But I still get that feeling before a game now."

He's ultra emotional and that's one of the reasons why he'll quit at the end of this season.

"When I started coaching I knew it wouldn't be a life-long deal," he said. I'll miss Boston College and the wonderful kids, but I'm doing what I feel in my heart I have to do."

Bob, who never lost his New York accent, is easy going. No matter where he goes he's the center of attraction. At times he doesn't like it, but he doesn't show it.

He can be emotionally drained and physically tired, but he'll manage a smile and honor requests for autographs before or after a game or even while he's having dinner.

In December of 1966 he took his team to New Orleans to play in the Sugar Bowl classic. It was held several days before the Alabama-Nebraska Sugar Bowl football game.

Coaches and players from all the teams were invited to a luncheon. Cousy was sought after more than Alabama coach Bear Bryant. He's just magic no matter where he goes.

Cousy demands all out efforts from his players and gets it. The kids are loyal to him and vice versa. He more than proved his loyalty two years ago at a breakup dinner in Boston.

The dinner was planned for 6 p.m. and Cousy was grounded in New York. He rented a car and started to speed to Boston. The dinner started without him. The players knew he would make it. Dinner ended and there was a call from Hartford. Cousy said, "I'm still coming . . . I'll make it."

The program was stalled. Players who were not scheduled to talk, did. Some kids stumbled over words just to give Cooz more time. It appeared he wouldn't make it and the crowd of 250 was disappointed.

All of a sudden he was there. He was greeted with a wild standing ovation. All knew he went all out to be with his players. Not many coaches would do what he did. He did it because he's class. Players put out for him and he puts out for them. That's his way.

The man is loved and respected. This year's team proved it when he said he was going to resign. They were crushed at first.

Capt. Terry Driscoll called for a team meeting. The players agreed to try to prove their feeling for the coach by winning all their remaining games. They had won 15 in a row before meeting Duquesne two days ago.

The woman behind this man is something, too. Missy, the former Marie Ritterbusch, met Bob when he was 13. She followed his All-Scholastic career through Andrew Jackson High in St. Albans, Long Island, and at Holy Cross.

"I've known him since I was just a kid, but we never dated until he was in college," said Missy. "I've seen most of his games and I'd never trade a minute of what we've had together.

"He's had a lot of big moments and I enjoyed them with him. Two of my biggest thrills were the Celtics' first playoff championship and this year's B.C. team. And there are a hundred others."

You can't sum up Bob Cousy with several hundred words. You have to admire him for the goals he set for himself and how he attained them . . . that touch of class which is always there . . . the way he is respected . . . the many ways people went out of their way to honor him.

Thank you, Bob Cousy . . . thanks for the memories. And that guy in the balcony was so right. We all love ya, Cooz.

FREEDOM NOT POSSESSED

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by the Reverend L. Milton Hankins, of New Matamoras, Ohio. The Reverend Mr. Hankins is a member of the American Poets Fellowship Society. His work has been published in the following periodicals and journals: Christian Century, the Baptist Leader, Tangent, the American Poet, United Poets, Major Poetry—an anthology—Prairie Poets, the Marietta Times, and St. Mary's Oracle. His latest poems appeared in "Field of Daisies," Nina Brewer Henry, editor, Prairie Press Books, 1968.

The poem follows:

FREEDOM NOT POSSESSED

(By L. Milton Hankins)

While malignant scars remain upon our flesh
And festers threaten to deface
Our pride in grandest freedom for our race
Let us not boast in shallow salves
And glibly swear the swollen sore
Has vanished to appear no more.
Health is not restored until the wound is done.
Can it be said in truth that race is free
Though statutes grants the freedom's not possessed
Until the man can measure to the rest
In every word and deed.
Freedom not till every man is pressed
By a choice response to every call
Not till liberty means the same to one and all.

THE POWER OF NATIONAL POLITICAL REPORTERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Calumet is a Chicago-based newspaper which provides its readers the latest in community developments and, through its able columnists, informs on national issues as well. In the February 7 issue, Calumet columnist William Rentschler commented on a fascinating essay by nationally known David Broder of the Washington Post on the power of political reporters. The Broder offering appeared in the first issue of the Washington Monthly, a political-affairs publication newly born to the Washington scene.

Upon inspection, sections of the Broder account proved to be interesting indeed. Reporter Broder observes:

> At any given time in this country, there are several hundred persons who are potentially candidates for nomination as President or Vice President.

He continues:

> They are Senators, Representatives, Governors, Administration officials, mayors, military men, scientists, businessmen, educators, astronauts, and other assorted celebrities. Who is it that winnows this field down to manageable size? The press—and particularly that small segment of the press called the national political reporters.

Who comprises "that small segment of the press called the national political reporters?"

According to Broder, a member of the coterie:

> The group is small. It probably includes a couple of dozen members, representing news organizations with a commitment to coverage of national politics year in and year out, in dull seasons as well as exciting times.
>
> These organizations include: the three news magazines, the two wire services, the three radio-television networks and The New York Times, the Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, the Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Baltimore Sun, the Knight newspapers, the Field papers, and the Gannett, Newhouse, Scripps-Howard, and Hearst chains. The political reporters for these organizations, plus a few syndicated columnists who cover politics along with other subjects, comprise the screening committee.

Broder then proceeds to give a general rundown of the characteristics of the select group:

> Not only is the group small, but its characteristics make it a highly atypical group of Americans. Its members are all Easterners, by residence if not by birth. They are all college graduates. They all enjoy, despite the low-paying reputation of newspapers, in-

> comes well over the national median. Not one of them is a Negro. Only two are women.

The listing continues:

> More of them vote Democratic and fewer of them regularly attend church. I would guess, than in a random sample of the population. None is under 30 and few, except for the columnists, are over 45.

Finally, we get a fleeting glimpse of the group in action:

> I often thought, for example, as I saw Romney during his Presidential campaign, surrounded by our circle—men a generation younger than he, many of us with cigarettes in our mouths, drinks in our hands, and cynicism in our hearts—that he must have felt as helpless with us as I would feel if my fate or future as a journalist were being decided by a committee of Romney's colleagues among the elders of the Mormon church.

There are other aspects to the Broder piece which, all in all, merit the "strong stuff" classification, to quote William Rentschler of the Daily Calumet. And I agree with Rentschler that—

> David Broder, at the risk of alienating his clubmates, raises hard questions. He rates praise for raising them.

Let us hope that Mr. Broder is not "expelled from the press bus for life."

Under unanimous consent I submit the article, "Political Reporters in Presidential Politics," by David S. Broder for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF THE PRESS: POLITICAL REPORTERS IN PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

(By David S. Broder [1])

("Views of the Press," in which various contributors will discuss the handling of news on American politics and government, will be a regular feature of The Washington Monthly.)

It is nine o'clock in the morning—almost any morning of the Presidential campaign—and one of the great unpublicized rituals of American political journalism is about to begin.

The reporters, sleepy-eyed, file aboard the chartered 727 jet, many of them reaching for Bloody Marys to steady their nerves, then slump into their seats to grab some extra sleep while the candidate and his entourage are transported westward across the country to begin another day's stumping.

There is silence aboard the plane, except for the click-clack of a single typewriter in the staff section up front, where one of the candidate's speechwriters is putting the finishing touches on the advance text for tonight's speech.

He is working under pressure, with his portable typewriter in his lap, because he knows that when breakfasts and naps have been concluded, the reporters will be demanding the speech that should furnish the lead for their stories for the next morning's papers.

As the speechwriter finishes each page of the text, it is taken from his typewriter and handed to a staff secretary, who cuts a mimeograph stencil. A few more minutes, and 100 copies have been run off on the airborne mimeograph machine, and shortly thereafter the whole speech has been distributed to the reporters.

Now their sloth disappears, as they quickly read through the offering. "Where's the lead?" someone asks. "Bottom of page six!" shouts a wire-service man, who took a course in speedreading. Everyone underlines the designated passage.

In a trice, the click-clack of the speechwriter's portable has been replaced by the amplified chatter of 100 typewriters, as every reporter on the plane struggles to rephrase the speechwriter's prose in a fashion that will meet the demands of his own journal.

By the time the plane lands, 100 versions of The Speech will be in the hands of the Western Union man aboard. He will, if he is forehanded, have a dozen teletype operators at the airport, ready to punch tapes that will carry the stories into the newsrooms and wire service headquarters, and thence to the presses, where millions of copies of the papers will be printed.

As often as I have seen and participated in this ritual of campaign journalism, the artificiality of the process never ceases to amaze me.

If the speech is, let us say, prepared for delivery at an evening rally in Los Angeles, the stories in the Eastern morning papers will be on the newsstands long before the event itself takes place. Indeed, the candidate may not—if he is as harassed as candidates often are—even have seen the speech on which the stories have been based; he may not deliver it when the time arrives; but he will, as his press secretary assures the reporters, stand behind every word of the prepared text.

There is an element of essential phoniness to the whole procedure, in which all parties agree to delude the reader into thinking he has read something the candidate has said and to conceal from him the reality—that nothing has happened more significant than the passage of words from typewriter to mimeograph machine to typewriter to printing press. From beginning to end, the process has a life of its own, unrelated to reality, as the word moves from the speechwriter's typewriter to the newspaper headlines almost untouched by human minds.

Yet, ironically, it is when he is performing this almost-imbecile function of digesting and regurgitating someone else's thought that the political writer or campaign reporter is in his least controversial role. Almost anything else he attempts—and he does attempt other roles—will land him in some sort of difficulty.

These days political reporters are in increasingly hot water—both with the politicians and with the public. Their particular controversy is but part of the larger fight enveloping the press and the communications media. The fact is that the press as an institution in American life is under attack just as much as the universities, the churches, the labor unions, the businesses, and the agencies of government. Like these other institutions, the newspapers are being hard-pressed to adapt to the changing demands of their clientele. And the measure of their failure is the open skepticism and even derision with which they are viewed by their customers. The press has as big a credibility gap as any institution in this society—a vulnerability which other elements of the power structure have recognized and exploited.

That tiny undercurrent of anti-press emotion which General Eisenhower tapped when he invited the 1964 Republican convention delegates to express their scorn of "sensation-seeking columnists and commentators" has quickly become a flood. George Wallace found that newspaper editorial writers ranked right up there with those "pointy-headed guideline-writers who can't even park their bikes straight" as sure-fire targets for his oratorical fire. In Chicago at the Democratic convention, the press became—in quite literal terms—the favorite target of Mayor Daley's men.

The press is caught up in what John Gardner has called the crisis of our times—the necessity for institutional adaptation to the forces of change unleashed by the population explosion and the simultaneous revolutions of education, technology, and economics. It is my impression that the adaptive response from the press has been perhaps more sluggish than that of any other major institution. The practice of journalism has changed less than the practice of medicine or law or education or even politics in the past generation.

There are at least two reasons for this sluggishness of response, I believe. One is the comforting rationalization which all journalists—myself included—employ to convert outside criticism from a measure of our failure into a measure of our success. A political reporter who gets complaints about his work from both Republicans and Democrats is apt to say to himself, "Good, I'm catching hell from both sides, so I must be writing it right down the middle." There is, of course, another possibility—that his reporting is so far off-base that it outrages anybody of either party who understands what is really happening. But that is a possibility he does not usually examine.

The other reason that the press is so laggard in responding to criticisms of its performance is that most of us in journalism have not really taken a very reflective view of our own functions and responsibilities. We are in the habit of asking politicians and businessmen, labor leaders and generals to justify their actions and policies, but we do not often make the same demand of ourselves.

This essay is an effort by one political reporter to set forth some observations on the way he and his colleagues behave in their work—to describe the roles we play. They are personal observations and probably none of my colleagues would agree with the description. It is intended as a description of the behavior only of this one segment of the press—not of the press as a whole. It is not an effort to grade the reporting we do. I risk expulsion from the lodge in even attempting to describe what political reporters do; it would take a lot more nerve than I have to try to evaluate how well we do it.

My excuse for taking up the subject, under these limitations, is twofold: I think the political reporters are at the eye of the storm of controversy enveloping the press; there is, I suspect, a good deal more public concern over the impact of journalism on campaigns, elections, and government than there is over the press' influence on science or the economy.

Second, I have been persuaded by hours of bull sessions with my colleagues in the press, with politicians, and with political scientists concerned about the interaction of politics and journalism, that there is a real gap in the three groups' understanding of the role or roles the political reporter plays.

So, with apologies to those who will find much of what follows elementary and obvious, let me lay down what I consider a descriptive basis on which the discussion of the impact of the press on campaigns might proceed.

There would, at first glance, not seem to be much doubt about what a political reporter's job is. Most people think of him as the public's unseen proxy, the trained observer, dispassionately setting down what the candidates do and say. In this conception, the candidate is real and the public is real, but the reporter is the invisible man. His role is as insignificant as that of the telescope tube by which light from a distant star (the candidate) is captured and conveyed to the eye of the astronomer (the reader).

The classic plea for the reporter to act as a neutral observer was given by Richard Nixon in his famous "last press conference" after his 1962 campaign for Governor of California. Employing that delicacy of phrase for which he was noted, Nixon said he recognized the right of newspapers, "if they're

---

[1] David S. Broder covers national politics for the Washington Post.

XUM

against the candidate, to give him the shaft," but asked plaintively if they could not "put one lonely reporter on the campaign who will report what the candidate says now and then."

Well, what is wrong with that? Why shouldn't the reporter just tell his readers what the candidate is saying? Doesn't a candidate have the right to that kind of coverage?

There are two problems with the kind of political journalism that President Nixon—and dozens of other politicians—have recommended.

The first problem is this. The same Richard Nixon who made that earnest plea to have his words set down as he uttered them went around the country last fall systematically bending the truth to his own advantage. In this he was, of course, behaving no differently from any other candidate. Take the simple—and essentially inconsequential—matter of crowdmanship. Nixon's crowds were fine, but they were rarely as big as Nixon made them out to be. A reporter who followed the Nixon Rule of Political Journalism and quoted Nixon's own crowd estimates would no longer have been informing his readers but systematically misleading them.

So what does the reporter do? He checks Nixon's crowd estimates with an "independent authority," i.e., the local police chief. That is a fine method until you reach a place like Philadelphia, say, where the redoubtable Frank Rizzo, a stalwart of Mayor James H. J. Tate's Democratic regime in City Hall, deliberately underestimates the size of Nixon's crowd.

Faced with this sort of double duplicity, the reporter who has seen both Humphrey's and Nixon's crowds in Philadelphia is forced to make a judgment of his own. And as soon as he does so, he is on the way to becoming the controversial character that General Eisenhower, George Wallace, Mayor Daley, and so many others complain of.

The second problem with the Nixon Theory of Political Journalism—"Just write what I say"—is that he (and every other politician) says more than anyone in his right mind cares to read. Moreover, in a campaign, much of what he says today is the same thing he said yesterday, and the day before that, and the day before that. Moreover, his words are only part of the story of his campaign day. It is also important where he went, what he did, who he did it to, and what they did to him. Some days, what he does not say is more important than any words he utters. When Eisenhower campaigned with Joe McCarthy and said nothing about General George C. Marshall—the man who had sponsored his military career and whose reputation McCarthy had defamed—that was a story. When Hubert Humphrey walked arm in arm with Lester Maddox and said nothing about the racial views that had made Maddox the Governor of Georgia, that was a story. What the candidate says is only part of the picture of his campaign day—and sometimes the least significant part.

It is the job of the political reporter to cull from the thousands of words and the hundreds of incidents that comprise each day on the road with a Presidential contender those few words, incidents, and impressions that convey the flavor, the mood, and the significance of what occurred.

Here we can broaden the frame of our discussion, for the process of covering a campaign is no different from covering any story.

Selectivity is the essence of all contemporary journalism. And selectivity implies criteria. Criteria depend on value judgments, which is a fancy word for opinions, preconceptions, and prejudices. There is no neutral journalism.

Now, it happens that a great deal of a political reporter's time is spent in doing what Mr. Nixon recommended: summarizing the candidate's own statements. The anecdote at the beginning of this article gave only a slightly exaggerated picture of a typical campaign day. Obviously, the stories filed from the campaign plane contain more than just excerpts from an undelivered speech. But it is a rare day in the campaign that the candidate's words do not comprise a substantial portion of the story.

Even here, however, we find that the values or prejudices of the reporters play a part. Reporters are—or at least fancy themselves—literary fellows. They pride themselves on their "feel for words." Thus literary values, graceful phrases, balanced sentences, have an importance to them that is hardly reflective of the value the general public attaches to eloquence. A candidate like John F. Kennedy whose writers can turn a phrase will enjoy an advantage over those, like Humphrey and Goldwater, whose writers are pedestrian. There is very little justice in this, but a wise politician recognizes the premium on literary values and seeks to equip himself accordingly. Nixon, for example, reaped great publicity mileage from the series of radio speeches he gave in the past campaign—not because very many people heard them on the radio, but because the quality of the writing that went into them—much of it by Raymond K. Price, Jr., former editorial page editor of the late, lamented *New York Herald-Tribune*—was so extraordinarily high that papers like *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post* were often urged by the reporters covering Nixon to print full texts or extended excerpts of these addresses.

So, the reporter's first role is that of a summarizer of the candidate's positions. As we have seen, his own prejudices—at least his literary taste—enter into even this role, but nonetheless, of all his functions, it is probably the least controversial.

In a sense, I have leaped ahead of my own story in talking of this role. Serious attention to the man's words implies that he is worth paying attention to. And who decides that? The political reporters do—in their second role, that of talent scouts.

At any given time in this country, there are several hundred persons who are potentially candidates for nomination as President or Vice President. They are Senators, Representatives, Governors, Administration officials, mayors, military men, scientists, businessmen, educators, astronauts, and other assorted celebrities. Who is it that winnows this field down to manageable size? The press—and particularly that small segment of the press called the national political reporters.

Russell Baker has given us the concept of The Great Mentioner, that mysterious Someone whose existence is implied when we read that so-and-so "is being mentioned for President or Vice President." He works in clandestine ways. The Great Mentioner mentioned George Romney as a Presidential possibility before Romney made his first race for Governor of Michigan. The Great Mentioner has mentioned Mark Hatfield for Vice President every four years since Hatfield turned 30, and he never seems discouraged by Hatfield's failure to win the job. On the other hand, The Great Mentioner never mentioned Edmund S. Muskie for anything until just a few days before he was actually nominated for Vice President.

Just why The Great Mentioner mentions some names and not others is very puzzling. It has something to do with personality, but more, probably, to do with the black arts of public relations. George Romney, for example, became known through those big Rambler ads showing him, square-jawed and shirt-sleeved, addressing the workers on the joys of profit-sharing and the evils of big cars. His image was further enhanced by some controversial testimony to Senate committees on the dangers of concentration in the auto industry. But it takes something more than the arts of advertising to rate a mention from The Great Mentioner. It takes some special break. In the case of Romney, it is interesting to recall that the nudge to The Great Mentioner came from none other than Richard Nixon who tabbed Romney as a comer at several of those infamous Washington backgrounders in 1960 and 1961.

The function the political reporters perform in their role as talent scouts is one that most people would regard as a positive service. After all, the individual citizen can hardly be expected to discover for himself all the able people who feel a calling to public service. The reporter's job makes him a constant traveler in the political community; he is uniquely well positioned to detect the early intimations of greatness, to discover these statesmen in embryo and bring their rare qualities to the attention of a wider public.

But, alas, it is not quite that simple—or non-controversial. In his function as a talent scout, the political reporter not only puts some men forward, he rather ruthlessly bars the door to advancement for other men. Martin F. Nolan of the Boston Globe has compared the national political reporters to a band of traveling drama critics, covering the new political acts at their out-of-town openings in Sacramento or Lansing or Harrisburg. Their reports, like those in Variety, are frequently make-or-break. "No talent," they will say of one man, and his name is forgotten. "Promising," they'll say of another, and he is booked into the Gridiron Dinner or "Meet the Press." It's a formidable power, and one that the screening committee of reporters is thoroughly conscious of possessing.

It is important at this point to say something about the members of this screening committee. Obviously I am not the one to describe their shortcomings, since as a member of the group I probably have more than my own share of the characteristic failings, but I think I can give some description of the fraternity.

The group is small. It probably includes a couple of dozen members, representing news organizations with a commitment to coverage of national politics year in and year out, in dull seasons as well as exciting times. Those organizations would include the three news magazines, the two wire services, the three radio-television networks and The New York Times, the Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, the Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Baltimore Sun, the Knight newspapers, the Field papers, and the Gannett, Newhouse, Scripps-Howard, and Hearst chains. The political reporters for these organizations, plus a few syndicated columnists who cover politics along with other subjects, comprise the screening committee.

Not only is the group small, but its characteristics make it a highly atypical group of Americans. Its members are all Easterners, by residence if not by birth. They are all college graduates. They all enjoy, despite the low-paying reputation of newspapers, incomes well over the national median. Not one of them is a Negro. Only two are women. More of them vote Democratic and fewer of them regularly attend church, I would guess, than in a random sample of the population. None is under 30 and few, except for the columnists, are over 45. I am deliberately not commenting on their school, political, or ethical views, but I think I have said enough to indicate that they—or we, I should say—represent a narrow and rather peculiar slice of this society.

I often thought, for example, as I saw Romney during his Presidential campaign, surrounded by our circle—men a generation younger than he, many of us with cigarettes in our mouths, drinks in our hands, and cynicism in our hearts—that he must have felt as helpless with us as I would feel if my fate or future as a journalist were

XUM

being decided by a committee of Romney's colleagues among the elders of the Mormon church.

Nontheless, the fact is that the reporters do function as a screening committee for aspirants to national office. (Other reporters do the same thing at state and local levels.) And whether their standards are good or bad, whether they are characteristic or eccentric so far as the society is concerned, they make their standards stick.

Thus, the same George Romney who was touted as a Presidential possibility before he ever ran for Governor was discarded as a Presidential possibility (by the press) before he ever got around to declaring his candidacy in late 1967. "I was the victim of the Teddy White syndrome," Romney has said, referring to the influence the author of The Making of the President books has had in impelling reporters to start covering Presidential possibilities long before they formally enter the race. There's not much doubt in my mind that the Governor is right—he was the victim of serious, sustained scrutiny at a point when he was not prepared for that kind of critical cross-examination. Whether the reporters performed a national service or caused a great wrong in eliminating Romney as a contender is an arguable proposition. What is not debatable is that the reporters have this power and regularly exercise it.

Closely related to the function of talent scouts is the political reporter's third role, that of race caller or handicapper. He is supposed to tell his public, every day, how the Presidential (or gubernatorial or senatorial) sweepstakes stands.

Here is a point where serious problems enter. Much of the reading and viewing public really doesn't care much about what happened yesterday in politics or in the campaign. Still less are these readers enamored of weighty analyses of why something happened. What they want to know is: What's going to happen tomorow? Who's going to win or lose? And if the reporter has even a vestige of conscience, he knows that that is the one question he can never answer with any confidence.

Yet much of political journalism is an artful effort to disguise prediction as reporting. Look at the use of public opinion polls by newspapers. A public opinion poll, when properly conducted and presented, is a perfectly legitimate tool for measuring opinion at a point in the past, i.e., the period of several days when the questions were actually being asked. But if the significance of the poll were accepted in those limited terms, few newspapers would give polls the prominence they now accord them. There is, let's face it, almost nothing as insignificant as a measure of how people would have decided last May a question that we know will not come to them for decision until November. Newspapers print and give prominence to the polls because they know their readers will take the poll to be exactly what it is not—a predictive device for guessing how the actual vote will come out.

A lot of political reporting is in the newspapers under exactly the same false pretenses, i.e., the assumption that a description of the standing of the race in May has some relevance to the actual order of finish in November. Indeed, we have now so far advanced this pseudo-science of political handicapping that all of us, myself included, write two or three years in advance of a Presidential election that so-and-so is the front-runner.

And what is the basis on which the political reporter makes these judgments? What are the landmarks we rely on in calling the race?

There are four types of evidence that go into the reporters' judgments, and I will list them in descending order of reliability.

First, there are the nationally-known public opinion polls—Gallup and Harris—which give periodic reports on the standing of the Presidential contenders. These polls are not without their problems, but they do offer the journalist a relatively standardized set of measurements, made by reputable practitioners whose methods of operation are open to scrutiny and whose full results are disclosed.

Far more often, the reporter bases his judgment, in part, on a private poll someone has given him. These may or may not be as carefully prepared as the Gallup and Harris polls, but they are much less reliable from the reporter's point of view. Rarely is he informed how the poll was made; rarely does he see the full results. Typically, a private poll on the standing of the Presidential (or other) race in some state is "leaked" to him by an interested party—often the candidate who is favored by the poll or one of his managers. If the reporter is properly skeptical, he will let his readers know that his information is second-hand and tainted by the possible bias of his source. But however he qualifies it, his reporting of the poll lends it an air of authority.

There are literally dozens of examples of inaccurate private polls distorting the journalists' and the public's judgment of a political race. Do such misjudgments have an effect on the outcome? Obviously, in many cases they do. The candidate reported trailing in these polls has a substantially harder time raising money, building an organization, or attracting publicity than the presumed front-runner.

To guard against the multiple distortion implicit in the "leaked poll" procedure, reporters have two other sources of information. Unfortunately, these two sources are even flimsier, in most cases, as a basis for handicapping the race.

He can consult the judgment of so-called informed politicians. Typically, a reporter making a political survey of a state will begin by asking, say, the Democratic chairman what he thinks of the situation—"I mean really, not for attribution, I want to know what you really think." The chairman hems and haws for a few minutes and finally allows as how his candidate just might win by 10,000 votes if he got all the breaks the rest of the way. The reporter thanks him, phones his Republican counterpart, and goes through the same procedure with him, eliciting the view that if they can manage to keep the candidate's alcoholic wife from making too many more public appearances, he ought to win by 40,000 votes.

Now, the scientific method, journalistic style, comes into play. The Democratic chairman has—sort of—claimed victory for his man by 10,000 votes. The Republican chairman has—with a shade more confidence—claimed victory for his man by 40,000 votes. The reporter cogitates and composes the following sentence: "While informed observers do not discount the possibility of a Democratic upset, the betting favors Republican candidate so-and-so to carry the state, perhaps by less than 40,000 votes.

That description is something of a caricature, I confess. The reporter will talk to more than two people, and he will weigh the words of each source according to his own past experience with the quality of the man's judgments. He will attempt to find some witnesses with no particular ax to grind. But in the end, he will attempt to construct some kind of consensus of informed judgment. Almost every one of the news organizations I listed earlier goes through this kind of process for its pre-election surveys, contacting party officials, informed citizens and newspapermen in all 50 states in order to make an "educated guess" in advance on the election results.

The enterprise of that sort I happened to be involved in this past fall was notably successful. Not only did we hit very close to Nixon's actual electoral vote, but we were equally on target in our estimates of changes in Congress and the governorships. But using exactly the same methodology in 1966, we managed to be off by a factor of 100 per cent on the size of the Republican gain in the House. We said 24 seats; they gained 47. What I would like to know, and what no one has told me, is how we could be so smart one year and so dumb the other, when the procedure was exactly the same?

Many veteran newsmen would say that all this is stuff and nonsense. They scorn the polls, published or private; they have only minimum trust in the judgment of politicians. What they rely on is their own "feel" of the situation.

Reporters of this school are easy to identify in the campaign. They are the ones who stand on their chairs to stare intently at the faces in the crowd when the candidate makes his entrance. I have never known what they see in those faces, just as I have never known how the emotions in a crowd at a political rally give you any clue to the likely voting behavior of the city or state in which the rally is taking place. I have yet to see the first bit of evidence establishing a positive correlation between the size of the crowd a candidate draws in a city and the number of votes he later receives there. But, like everyone else, I count the crowds and measure their reaction as "friendly" or "cool." Just because an old method has no validity is no reason to get rid of it.

The reporter as summarizer, as talent scout, and as handicapper has his problems, but he is behaving in a role that recognizably has some relation to the demands of his newspaper and, presumably, his readers.

In his fourth role, however, the political reporter tends to carve out for himself a function just a bit more glorious than any that his employer or his readers ever envisaged for him. He becomes, in his own eyes, the Public Defender.

Reporters—unless they are highly-opinionated columnists to begin with—really don't start the campaign with this role in mind. They couldn't care less who wins, they assure each other. There are no heroes or bad guys in the political drama they see, just mortals struggling with terribly complex problems.

But for months on end, they are locked up covering one of these mortals, engaged in an endless discussion of his personality, his mentality, his strategy, and his tactics. They become, in short, monomaniacs on the subject of the man they are covering. And eventually, some of them, at least, will discover that The Candidate Is Trying to Pull Something We Don't Like. The candidate and his men are artful manipulators, propagandists, slick Madison Avenue operators. The reporter is the truth-seeker. And he resolves, "I'm not going to let him (the candidate) get away with it. He's duping the poor voter and it's up to me to see that the poor little sap isn't conned by This Slicker."

Now in any setting less irrational than a campaign plane, the reporter would probably recognize that the charge of "duping the voter" really involves no more than the customary trimming of issues to suit the public mood. And the companion charge of "deliberately obscuring his stand" rarely indicates more than bafflement by the candidate on how to solve such essentially insoluble problems as the rise in crime or the decline in the dollar.

But, no matter. A wave of moral outrage sweeps over the reporters. It is expressed in the declaration, "We're not going to let him get away with this." Demands are sounded for press conferences. Questions are plotted that will cut off every avenue of escape or

XUM

evasion for the candidate. The trap is carefully set and, unless he is very wary, the candidate sooner or later walks into it.

Now, the serious point I would make about this mode of behavior is that once the reporter appoints himself Public Defender he abandons almost all pretense of being anything less than an arbiter of the outcome of the election. There is no consistency and no predictability as to when or whether he will adopt the role of Public Defender. Usually, he is provoked into it by the candidate's repeated use of an argument that is offensive to the reporter's own prejudices. Nixon, for example, "got away with" his Law and Order argument all year, even though many of the reporters thought there was an element of demogoguery in it. What finally provoked the reporters covering Nixon to become Public Defenders was a day in late October when he delivered a dozen whistle-stop speeches in Ohio (six times the usual number for a single day) and managed at each successive stop to give a more lurid description of the dangers that stalked the city streets under the unconcerned Democrats. That night, for the first time, a wave of "we-can't-let-him-get-away-with-it" talk swept the Nixon press corps, and the toughest stories of the campaign went whizzing out over the wires.

Nixon averted a new press crisis by softening his tone on that issue in succeeding days, a response that was in itself a measure of the power of the press when it goes on the warpath.

But it doesn't always go on the warpath. Often it is strangely passive. In 1960, for example, when John F. Kennedy promised day after day to get the country moving again, no petitions were passed in the press car demanding that he spell out how. When he spoke of a missile gap, no proof of evidence was demanded. When he spoke of America's falling prestige, no one pressed him on the definition and relevance of that word.

By contrast, Humphrey last year was hounded at almost every press conference to spell out his differences on Vietnam policy with the Johnson Administration. First Romney and then Nixon were pressed unceasingly to specify their program for ending the war. Innumerable other examples could be cited. The point is simply that with some candidates and on some issues—but not others—the press will "bore in." And in choosing when to push and when not, we are responding almost exclusively to our own values and prejudices and opinions.

Fifth and finally, I am constrained to report that from time to time the political reporter will so far forget himself that he becomes a volunteer, unpaid assistant campaign manager for the candidate he is covering.

This is the opposite of the Public Defender syndrome, and in every respect more obnoxious. When he is playing Public Defender, the reporter at least is living up to the stereotype of the hard-nosed, independent, aggressive news hound—even though his motives may have precious little to do with the pursuit of news.

But when he appoints himself Assistant Campaign Manager, he becomes a fawning lackey of the candidate, waiting on him with bits of advice, reveling in the supposed intimacy of his relationship. He takes to defending the candidate in the press bus, and may even go so far as to remonstrate with his colleagues who are writing "unfriendly" pieces about his new hero. He is a sad spectacle, but there is no blinking the fact that on every campaign I have seen, one or more of our colleagues have strayed from the paths of righteous skepticism and become avowed, active promoters of the candidacy of the man they are covering.

There is a subtle revenge, however, for the candidate who allows this to happen. Invariably, the advice that newspapermen give candidates is the worst claptrap imaginable. I could cite examples, but I will not. I have probably said enough already to be expelled from the press bus for life.

RAILROAD REDEVELOPMENT

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, having received permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a recent very able address by my distinguished friend, former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Honorable William H. Tucker, now New England vice president of Penn Central Railroad.

This fine speech was delivered before the chamber of commerce in Providence, R.I., on March 5, and I was so much impressed with it that I thought it should be placed in the RECORD.

It is most encouraging to note Commissioner Tucker's statement that Penn Central must be a dynamic force for improvement in regional railroading.

Our great railroad system was one of the principal contributing factors to the growth, power, wealth, and fabulous success of the American free enterprise system and the growth and prosperity of the Nation. It is truly a pity that leaders at every level apparently did not have the vision, or the will, nor were they prepared to assume the responsibilities and risks entailed, to keep this great system, or most of it, intact, operational and useful to American industry and the American people.

The collapse suffered by railroad transportation has adversely affected our economy and our way of life. Not only have we lost much of an extraordinary, efficient system of transportation but American life has also been largely stripped of one of the most colorful, engaging, fascinating and interesting of all modes of transportation.

If we spent half of the money to retain our railroad system, both freight and passenger, that we spend sometimes rather casually, in other areas of transportation, we would have reaped fantastic results in the form of improved carriage of commodities, industrial and agricultural products, and in fact, virtually everything transportable. We would have also been assured of comfortable, speedy service for the traveling public and the people, including service for many communities now isolated from any type of transportation.

I want to compliment and laud Commissioner Tucker for his able and vigorous speech. He said many things that should be said about the revival and rehabilitation of our great railroad system, and I certainly would continue to welcome the chance to move in this direction, to strengthen our rail system so that it is able to modernize, equip, and streamline many of the splendid services that it rendered the people in other years.

I am very anxious to join in reviving, rehabilitating, modernizing, rejuvenating, and strengthening the railroads for broader service in this space jet age. Comparable to what they once rendered the American people.

It is good to know that we have an experienced, dedicated and highly trained able leader like Commissioner Tucker, with his knowledge of transportation systems and their problems, engaged at high levels in bringing the railroad system back to its former glories and services in certain areas that would now find the rails truly indispensable.

Commissioner Tucker's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM H. TUCKER

I am pleased to have been invited to address you. I know what an important role the members of the Chamber's Down Town Council and Transportation Committee and, of course, the Board of Directors, play in the economic life of Providence and the entire state.

Some of you may be aware that I was to have delivered an address before a meeting in Boston a week ago. Due to the near blizzard, which I'm sure you remember well, the meeting was called off. Thus, this is my first opportunity to voice my thoughts on the inclusion, its problems and its meaning. And I'm glad to be doing so with you. Rhode Island's contribution to regional railroading—in interest and in revenue—far outstrips its population or geographic rank.

I'd like, therefore, to devote much of the few minutes I have, to talking about Penn Central and its relation to Rhode Island. And first, I'd like to make a major announcement. I think it's major, because it concerns something that, according to your papers, is one of the most vital issues of the day in Providence.

Gentlemen—we are going to fix the clock atop our Providence Station!

I may seem a bit facetious about its importance, but I'm not kidding about our pledge to repair it. As you know, the pigeons and starlings loved to roost on the hands. And their weight, especially at a quarter to three, was so great as to stop the clock completely. We had to stop the clock with the hands at noon.

Our building engineers tell me they expect shortly to install an electric mechanism which will be capable of making the birds, as well as time, fly.

I've mentioned this first because, in a way, it symbolizes the Penn Central inclusion of the New Haven.

What happened at the first of the year was not just a simple change of ownership of the New Haven operations. There's been a complete revision of attitude, morale, direction and spirit.

Penn Central knows that it must be a dynamic force for improvement in regional railroading. And it is going to be.

I hope that this has become evident in the recent discussions involving the possible relocation of the railroad in downtown Providence.

A week ago today, as you know, I met with Governor Licht, Mayor Dorley, and our associates at the Capitol.

Mayor Dorley told us that he had been disheartened for years by the lack of progress on numerous plans for relocating the main-line tracks of the railroad. He referred to these tracks, and the viaduct which carries them as a "Chinese Wall" dividing the heart of Providence.

Now, within two months of the inclusion, the Penn Central has gone to work on this—and at this time we are working on an engineering study. But, since it is still in the

XUM

study stage, I cannot be as definitive as I, or you, would like. I can say that what we do or propose will be that which we feel promotes the best interests of city, state and railroad.

I hope it can be seen that any effort we make to remove the Chinese Wall will be clear evidence of Penn Central's willingness to face the realities of the present and the responsibilities of the future.

We did not wait to be perssured by events. We realized that the construction of the next segment of I-95 would have a serious effect upon the railroad and its facilities. We instituted planning to deal with that effect. And we did so with the welfare of the public, as well as the railroad, in mind.

If this can be worked out, the relocation of track and facilities will make available prime downtown land. It will consolidate our various operations such as engine maintenance, freight forwarding, etc., in a much more efficient location. It will provide the best solution to the overall problem of the bisection of our downtown Providence tracks.

There are a number of alternatives being studied by state and city. A number of proposals have been made. We hope that what is now essentially a sketch plan will become in 60 days a blueprint upon which we and the city can build.

I would like to pay special tribute to Governor Licht for the role he has played, first in acknowledging the importance of the concept involved and, second, in galvanizing the various state and city agencies into quick constructive action with us.

There should be one word of caution, however. I'm sure you are aware that there are three railroads involved here—Penn Central, Boston and Providence and Providence and Worcester. Naturally, there are attendant legal complications. I can speak, at this time, only for Penn Central. But we do not regard any foreseeable problems as being insurmountable.

I spoke earlier of the role Rhode Island has been playing in the survival of rail service in this region. It is not a role that can be abandoned now.

Frankly, one of the greatest concerns to us in the past two months has been a public attitude that the Penn Central has an obligation to maintain, and underwrite, the same rail operations which dragged the New Haven down into bankruptcy.

When the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads were allowed to merge, it was for the economic benefit of the people in regions they served. It was never ordered, nor was it ever intended, that the savings from the Penn Central merger were to be siphoned off into the near-bottomless pit of New Haven deficits.

At a time when airlines have been earning a rate of return of over nine percent, Penn Central and other eastern roads have been earning less than two percent.

And last year, Penn Central suffered a passenger deficit of about one hundred million dollars.

This year, we began with the New Haven inclusion, and absorbed a line which in 1968 had its own passenger deficit of more than ten million dollars and a freight deficit to match. To heap deficits upon deficits—as of the first of the year, changes in post office transportation resulted in a loss of postal revenues on the New Haven region of more than one million dollars.

Thus, when we took on the New Haven, it became even more of a liability for Penn Central than it had been under Trusteeship!

This serious financial problem was recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission when it approved the inclusion. In fact, the I.C.C. specifically called the New Haven operations a "burden" for Penn Central . . . a burden that the states should share.

I quote the I.C.C. report: "Part of the burden falling to Penn Central consists of its common carrier obligation to sustain essential service in the New Haven territory. Since we find that the operations involved are likely to be at a continuing deficit, there is a concomitant obligation on the part of the state and local governments to help sustain the service."

You note that the I.C.C. said that we have an obligation to continue *essential* services. Penn Central plans to meet that obligation. But we can not do it alone.

Much of our current planning and our policies involve the restructuring of the New Haven's freight and passenger services—streamlining the New Haven operation down to essential operations. In cooperation with representatives of the states, we have begun—but not completed—the restructuring of our long haul passenger service.

We are pruning the low-revenue, high-cost branch freight lines. Again, where appropriate, this is being done in cooperation with public or private representatives.

A good example of this is our freight line between East Providence and Bristol. As you know, we are planning to abandon this branch. But we have initiated discussions with your State on what public use might be made of the line after rail service is withdrawn.

We are meeting our obligations in another way, too. We have begun extensive improvement programs in both freight and passenger services.

Single line freight service will save one to three days from Chicago, St. Louis and other midwest points. New special purpose equipment is being made available. We're preparing for the construction of ten additional tracks at the huge electronic classification yard at Selkirk, N.Y. These will be used for the assembly of fast-moving freight trains direct to Providence and other major centers in the region.

About a dozen renovated passenger coaches have already rolled out of our shop at New Haven. Car washing facilities have been reopened. We've repaired more than half of the big backlog of broken windows. An inspection team project has been started with supervisors riding our trains every day to check on the performance of equipment and crews.

It is going to be a long, hard job. It is impossible to catch up overnight with the years of deferred maintenance on the New Haven.

And, as I said, it is not a job we can do alone. Currently, we are meeting with representatives of the states, including your very able Public Utilities Administrator and Deputy Administrator, Archie Smith and George McLaughlin, and Director of Business Regulation, Francis J. Fazzano. Beyond our immediate needs to keep things going, we want to arrive at a permanent program by which the states can assume their fair share of the burden of continuing essential services.

The basic principles of our passenger service program can be summarized in this way—we plan improvement and upgrading of that passenger service for which there is a public need, a phasing out of little-used or unnecessary service, and public underwriting of the deficits of the service required to be continued.

Thus, you can see that there will be a continuing, and even permanent, role for Rhode Island and the other states in the maintenance of rail service in Southern New England.

Penn Central does not want year-to-year subsidies. It seeks permanent support programs, as I outlined, under which the states would join us in a continuing partnership, an investment in reliable, efficient railroad service.

What would Rhode Island's fair share be? This has not yet been determined, because our discussions with the states have not yet finalized what the permanent service will be.

Perhaps the states will decide that fewer trains are required to handle passenger demand, that the present level of service is not truly essential. We don't know. But we are making all of our information available so that everything is on the table.

In another area of State-Penn Central relations, we have stressed that tax relief for the railroad has no direct connection with the state's responsibilities concerning the continuation of long-haul passenger service.

Tax relief recognizes the facts of our economic life today—that to pile burdensome taxes upon a public utility simply results in higher costs to patrons of that utility or a drain of badly needed capital and assets. In the case of railroads, taxation has also become grossly unfair and inequitable.

Highways are constructed for the auto and bus with the use of Federal and state funds. Airports, air signal, communication and weather reporting systems are paid for by the government. In the face of such heavily-subsidized competition, is it any wonder that rail traffic has been dwindling?

The magnitude of the mistreatment of railroads is readily apparent in comparing the aid given transportation facilities. As Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey points out, the Federal government spent approximately four and one-half billion dollars for highways. In contrast, the eleven million dollars committed to the Washington-New York Northeast Corridor project represents the first major public funds allocated to the rails in this century.

Tax relief is an effort on the part of fair-minded governments and their officials to make up for—even to partly remedy—past unfair treatment of the railroads. We anticipate that this enlightened attitude will continue to be displayed by Rhode Island in the future.

And I am hopeful that I have been able to convince you that there's a different, and enlightened, attitude at Penn Central.

We're glad that Mayor Dorley has said so. So has Mayor Burns of Pawtucket. As you may know, he met with us last week in Governor Licht's office in a discussion of the future of the empty, dilapidated Pawtucket station. Much to his evident pleasure, he found that we already had assigned an assistant vice president to study the station problem. The two met the following day and are now reviewing proposals developed at that session. We hope to seek bids on demolition and have expressed our willingness to investigate the city's own plans for municipal use of the area.

Yes, there is a new attitude now in regional railroading. Penn Central is ready to meet the obligations and the challenges imposed by the inclusion of the New Haven. It is moving ahead, making more than a reasonable effort to improve freight operations, to upgrade passenger equipment and restructure the service. It is not waiting for the states to act first on the matching reasonable level of support directed by the I.C.C.

But Penn Central cannot do the job alone. If it becomes apparent that public representatives are looking for a way to avoid, rather than to implement, their fair share of the task that lies ahead, we will be forced to reappraise our plans.

But at the moment I'm confident and optimistic. Like the clock atop the Providence station, the whole New Haven situation has been stopped at the desperation hour of high noon far too long.

Let's make sure that the clock will start to move again—and keep moving.

Thank you.

XUM

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of our youth today are too often submerged by the tidal wave of headlines about demonstrations and other displays of discontentment. Yet, some of us are likely to overlook the deep insight and keen interest our youth shares with certain problems existing in our present-day society. In this respect, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to one particular young girl who has given serious thought to the problem of the handicapped person and his desire to be employed.

Becky Schumacher of Oklahoma City is one of this year's Ability Counts Contest entrants, and for her theme, entitled "What Every Employer Should Know About the Handicapped," Becky received top honors. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD this outstanding essay:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE HANDICAPPED

(By Becky Schumacher)

The American way of life is taking on new dimensions. The canopy of opportunity is spreading over segments of human life which previously knew only the oppression of despair and prejudice. We are becoming an enlightened people; yet corners of darkness remain—shadows cast by fallacious information and conceptions. One of these shadows is the prejudice against the handicapped. To dispel this shadow, many must know the facts now available about the handicapped.

Otherwise-willing employers hesitate to hire the handicapped because of misinformation. Some hesitate because they believe the handicapped worker to be accident prone and thus assume that the company's workmen's compensation rates will rise. However, neither premise is true. Handicapped persons have about the same accident rate as that of the average work force. The handicapped are acutely aware of the results of accidents; consequently, their accident rate, in fact, is frequently lower. Since they are not accident prone, hiring handicapped workers does not raise the workmen's compensation rates. Only two factors determine these rates: the relative hazards of a company's work and its actual accident rate. The physical disability of the personnel is not a determining factor. Other employers hesitate because they believe that insurance company regulations prohibit their hiring handicapped persons. This, too, is untrue. The insurance contract says nothing whatsoever about the physical condition of workers whom an employer may hire. These premises, if true, would form valid barriers to the employment of the handicapped. However, none of them are true. Thus, the light of truth should eradicate these barriers.

Many of yesterday's reasons for reluctance to employ the handicapped are no longer sound. In today's society there are many jobs to be filled; and with automation, fewer of these required physical dexterity. The United States Department of Labor found that in a single ten-year period, thirteen million jobs disappeared and twenty million new jobs became available, creating a net gain of seven million new jobs; most of which were less physically demanding. We know that handicapped workers can perform these jobs with competence. Evidence that disabled persons are effective and productive employees has increased over the years. Recent studies made by the Veterans' Administration and the Rehabilitation Services Administration show that the quality and quantity of work by the handicapped compared favorably with that of able-bodied persons, as did their rates of accidents and absenteeism. These studies also show that handicapped persons help stabilize the work force. When properly placed, they tend to stick to their jobs because they know the difficulty of finding employment.

Knowledge can dispel many misconceptions about the handicapped, and this knowledge must include facts about the mentally retarded also. Those handicapped mentally show two strong points: a desire to perform well and the initiative to work hard. The mentally retarded are co-operative workers who stay with the numerous jobs which require repetitive, routine tasks. These people have known much failure and, like all other human beings, yearn for an experience of success which will allow them to retain their self-respect. The repetitive nature of these jobs provides the opportunity for such success.

Prejudice concerning the handicapped is often fostered by the image many have when they hear the word *handicapped*, an image of a completely dependent person, unable to perform the basic functions of life. However, some employers know from experience that this picture is distorted, that the handicapped individual when matched to job requirements is no longer "handicapped." In fact, employers have found it advantageous to give certain jobs requiring sharpened sensibilities to handicapped persons. These employers know that the image of the handicapped as a useless, dependent member of society is a false one, that exactly the contary is true. The handicapped worker seeks to command respect; he wants no preferential treatment. The greatest service an employer can render the handicapped is to treat him as he would any other employee.

Ironic, is it not, that in the twentieth century, when enlightenment is our crowning virtue, our knowledge of things far outstrips our knowledge of people. However, a new force is stirring in our country, and this force consists of kinetic energy, a desire to know more about people and to provide each of them a place where he can know self-respect and have assurance of his worth to mankind. The handicapped will share in the results of this new force. They will soon find that for which they seek, a product of our new dimension.

IDAHO STUDENTS BACK EDUCATOR

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, University of Idaho students were told in mid-March that students all over the country will rebel because that is the only thing left to do. The speaker was leftist leader Thomas Hayden, a cofounder of the Students for a Democratic Society and a guest speaker at the university's annual Borah Foundation Symposium. His subject was "Violence and War," and Hayden predicted:

> A person who is in every respect a normal American will become a warrior.

Two days after his fiery speech and grim predictions, university students—4,500 strong—gathered in torrents of rain before the house of University President Ernest W. Hartung. They were not there as warriors, and they did not carry protest signs. They were simply there expressing their support for Hartung and his policies.

Student body president Larry Craig of Midvale, Idaho, summed it up well:

> President Ernest Hartung has moved the University of Idaho forward in three years as it has not been moved in 50 years. He has given to education and to the State of Idaho progressive leadership. Through his leadership, we have seen change without the violence seen at many other universities throughout the country.

Civic and educational leaders joined the students in their rally. The remarks of Moscow, Idaho Chamber of Commerce president Philip Guilfoy were particularly appropriate:

> I see here tonight thousands of salesmen doing a great job for the University of Idaho. This is probably the first time a college demonstration has ever been held for and not against a president.

Mr. Speaker and my honorable colleagues, I am proud of those students and I want to take this opportunity to pay my greatest respect to a fine university and its leader. All too often, American students are guilty of destruction and pointless dissent.

I think the students at the University of Idaho have proven that they can work in close cooperation with the educational administration to achieve common goals and intellectual freedom.

MONEY LASTS LONGER IN AUSTIN, TEX.

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made official what I have been championing all along. According to statistics compiled in "Three Standards of Living" issued last week, it costs less for a family of four to live in Austin, Tex., than any other urban area in the Nation.

The model budgets set forth by the Department of Labor are designed for high, moderate, and low family incomes. In each instance, it takes less money to live in Austin than anywhere else. Specifically: the "high" budget on the national average is $13,050—in Austin, to maintain the same standards requires only $11,299; the "moderate" budget nationally is $9,076—in Austin it is $7,952; and the "low" budget nationally is $5,915—in Austin, $5,237. All budgets include taxes.

Statistics are useful only to statisticians and are not very meaningful to individuals; but it is comforting to know that dollars can go farther in Austin. Especially when we read that the consumer price index rose 0.4 percent in

February and is up 4.7 percent in the past 12 months.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics explains that the printed budgets are not especially "typical" or "average"—but they are liveable. The family used by definition is: a 38-year-old husband working full time, a nonemployed wife, a boy of 13, and a girl of 8.

It is no accident that Austin ranks first. As Texas chronology goes, Austin is an old city; but nationally, it is young, and Austin has been blessed with leadership which kept the city abreast of development through the lean years and the boom years. Austin does not have the decay which is evident in some of the older cities of this Nation. It is still vibrant, moving and desirable. The tax base is broad enough to pay the way without imposing excessive burdens upon the taxpayers. Proof of this is easily illustrated. Just a few months ago, Austin became the first city in the State to receive an AAA rating on revenue bonds issued by the city. This resulted in a tremendous savings to the people who foot the tax bill, especially in light of the rising interest rates.

I am not advocating mass migration to Austin, but I would like to point out a few of the "reasons why" Austin is such a delightful place to live. My remarks are factual and without prejudice.

The population of 225,000 has a wealth of cultural and educational benefits at their fingertips: The University of Texas, St. Edwards University, Maryhill College, Huston-Tillotson College, Concordia College. These are available, too, for the men stationed at Bergstrom Air Force Base.

There are over 80 State and over 50 Federal agencies in Austin with over $94 million in payrolls. Being the State capital, Austin has attracted over 200 statewide association offices, 35 insurance offices, 300 manufacturing plants, medical centers, and many State schools and institutions. Total payrolls are in excess of $130 billion.

Then there is the sheer, natural beauty of the hill country and the highland lakes, and the weather, and the mood and atmosphere of the people—and most of all the people, for they are the daily writers of Austin's success story.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Arab world are largely illiterate, wracked by disease and poverty, without the education and organization to enrich their harsh desert land. For decades, even the wealth of their oil fields has gone into palaces and Cadillacs, and above all into the armaments and trappings of war. For decades, irresponsible leaders have turned their people's frustration outward—toward the West, and to that tiny outpost of Western culture and ideals which is the State of Israel.

Israel has been fighting for her very existence too long. Only her arms and courage have allowed this tiny nation, with less than the population of New York City's Queens County, to defeat the armies of nations with total populations of tens of millions.

This gallant democracy, this nation of survivors from history's greatest example of man's capacity for senseless cruelty to his fellow man, cannot be allowed to succumb to the threats and assaults of her neighbors. And while this period of danger continues—until lasting peace settlement is achieved—we must maintain our vigilance in her behalf.

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East has been the setting for three bloody wars linked by border skirmishes and verbal threats. These conflicts have been both the flame and the fuel of an intense level of hatred in the area.

The loathing and hatred between Arab and Jew is an all consuming thing. Why has such mutual hostilities developed?

As many of us know, the story goes back nearly 2,000 years to the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine by the Romans in the year A.D. 70. This Diaspora marked the birth of a dream harbored by Jews throughout the world that someday they would be able to return as a people to the promised land. At last, in 1917, their chance came. Britain consented to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

However, the Jews who immigrated to Palestine in the 1920's and 1930's, to buy land and to create a new state, were regarded as unwanted outsiders by many of the Arabs, who had been living in this barren land since the days of Christ. Under the yoke of foreign oppressors themselves for centuries, these Arabs dreamed too of an independent Palestine. Increasingly, growing Arab nationalism and Zionism clashed, often violently.

After World War II, under mounting pressure, the British proposed dividing Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish. The Arabs protested that they wanted nothing less than one Palestine under Arab control. It might be true, they argued, that the Jews had been persecuted terribly in Europe. But then let Europe bear the cost of solving its own conscience, not the Arab world.

Without first reconciling these grave differences, the United Nations adopted the British partition plan, and in May 1948 Israel formally became a state. Outraged, the Arab armies attacked the new nation, vowing to drive the Jews into the sea. But, Israel, even in its infancy, had much more spirit and zest and determination and discipline than the Arabs. They were tougher inwardly and outwardly than the Arabs.

Israel did win the 1948 war, but peace in the Middle East was not realized. The Arab nations steadfastly refused to sign a peace treaty for this would have amounted to an unpalatable concession—recognition of the State of Israel. Instead, they declared they would not rest until our Jewish brethren were destroyed.

In less than a decade, the Middle East was ablaze again.

Following Egyptian President Nasser's nationalism of the Suez Canal in 1956 at which time he barred the passage of all Israeli ships, and his blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba—Israel's only remaining outlet to the East—Britain, France, and Israel together invaded Egypt.

Within a matter of days, Israel had routed Nasser's Army and driven across the Sinai Peninsula to the Suez. But again victory did not result in a peace treaty. A cease fire was arranged which called for Israel to withdraw her armies, and the situation remained as explosive as before.

Since then, the Egyptian Army has grown in power—and continues to grow in power. Unified Arab command has forced Jordan to double the size of its army. Sophisticated weapons—jets, guided missiles and submarines—continue to flow in from the Soviet bloc.

These arms are a threat to peace. They waste valuable development capital; they threaten the only near Eastern state with traditions of democracy.

The irresponsible and dangerous nature of the course chosen by Israel's enemies is becoming more clear to the world every day. And our commitment to Israel must be equally clear; it must be a total one. We owe our Jewish brethren nothing less.

JOHNS HOPKINS PROFESSOR SAYS RISKS OF STARTING ON "SAFEGUARD" ABM OUTWEIGH ANY BENEFITS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Robert Rothstein, in a second article on the ABM in the March 29, 1969, New Republic, says:

> The risks of doing without a new weapons system may be much less than the costs of learning how to live with it.

I commend his perceptive observations on the so-called Safeguard ABM system to my colleagues. The text of the article follows:

NIXON'S ABM: VERY THIN INDEED

(By Robert Rothstein)

All that was missing from Mr. Nixon's virtuoso performance, when he announced his intention to begin deployment of a modified ABM system primarily designed to protect our land-based retaliatory forces, was the invocation of Eisenhower's name, or at least his benediction by telephone "consultation." Perhaps the omission is explained by the fact that several of Eisenhower's leading scientific advisers had spent a good deal of time that very week blasting the system as ineffective, unnecessary and provocative. Not at all, replied the President; instead, it will protect us from accidental attacks, from a Chinese attack within the next decade, and from a direct Soviet attack against our land-based retaliatory forces. He also assured us that the Russians will not regard the ABM as provocative, for its defensive intent is "unmistakable."

The contention that an ABM system would save lives in the event of an accidental missile strike, presumably involving only a handful of missiles, makes some sense in the abstract, but loses most of its force when placed in context. We cannot protect our-

XUM

selves from every conceivable danger; we do not keep to our bed because we are fearful of being killed in the streets. When we are thinking about survival, we make some rational judgment about probabilities. How probable is it that an accidental strike—released somehow without anyone's intending it, or by a mad commander hoping to trigger a third world war—will hit those missile sites? Mr. Nixon plans to "safeguard"? The chances are what? One in a hundred, a thousand, a million? It's an unanswerable question.

If an accident were to occur, we would want to protect our cities, not missile sites. Protecting two missile complexes and areas around them means that the rest of the country goes unprotected—unless, of course, the system is expanded into a countrywide area defense, plus point defense of missile sites. In the interim (after 1973 but before more sites are protected), the notion that we are safe against accidents is something of a joke, except in regard to the metropolitan areas of Montana and North Dakota. Finally, there are technical questions about the degree to which the ABM system *itself* is accident-prone.

We have to choose between insurance against every possible contingency, in which case we simultaneously create more dangerous strategic instabilities; and an action (forestalling ABM deployment) which may leave us somewhat more exposed if the improbable occurs, but which also offers one of the last hopes we may have of maintaining a stable deterrent.

Most professional students of Communist China believe that Peking's international behavior is not nearly as provocative as Peking's rhetoric. Mao and his colleagues know that they could be annihilated in any nuclear war with the United States. The probability that they will threaten or attack the U.S. with their rudimentary nuclear force is extremely low. If we have been able to deter a much stronger Soviet force without an ABM, why do we need one against the Chinese within the next decade?

If we could treat the Chinese threat in isolation from our other strategic concerns, it just might be worth trying to buy some insurance against it. But unless all informed current estimates are wildly off the mark, the Chinese nuclear force will be small in number and fairly unsophisticated for the foreseeable future. I can hardly imagine a situation in which the Chinese would attack our missile sites. If they did strike, it would surely be at our cities, so as to assure maximum destruction. Finally, no matter what the Chinese did, no matter where they might aim their missiles, they could not prevent us from retaliating, thus inviting their own demise. The ABM deployment Mr. Nixon has outlined not only does not protect our cities, but also fails to provide a missile area defense for the whole country—unless, of course, it is expanded well beyond the two sites.

Suppose we expand it? In terms of the assumed Chinese threat, the Chinese could counter that expansion by various tactics—for example, by a saturation attack on a city inadequately protected by an area system. We would then have to begin protecting our cities. But that of course begins to undermine the Soviet Union's retaliatory capacity, and could be very destabilizing, as Mr. Nixon himself explicitly noted. In sum, even if we decide we have to do something about a Chinese nuclear threat, the deployment contemplated by the President is thoroughly inadequate, and a "thicker"' deployment threatens the Soviet Union, forcing them and us into more costly, dangerous and inadequate counter measures.

The essential rationale for the current ABM proposal is the capacity of a "thin" system to "safeguard" our land-based missile forces against a Soviet first strike; "to protect," in Under Secretary Packard's words, "our second strike capability." But if the Soviets want to maintain a first-strike capability against us—and it is not sure that they do—they have it within their power to do so, simply by increasing their offensive capability substantially: by investing in MIRV's (missiles with multiple warheads) for example, or penetration devices. If, on the other hand, the Russians settle for a second-strike capability, our ABM would be protecting the wrong targets—missile sites instead of cities—because the Soviets would reply to any first strike against them by retaliating against our population centers, not military targets.

It is extremely hard, therefore, to understand exactly what Mr. Nixon and his advisers have in mind, and why they are doing what they are doing. If the Russians chose to attack our missile sites, the ABM system proposed by the President would at best only complicate their efforts marginally. The system might be effective against a very light Soviet attack launched against a few of the sites, *after* we have completed full deployment of the ABM system recommended. But given the risk they would be taking against a strategically superior opponent, a light Soviet nuclear attack is almost beyond belief. Surely it would be all or nothing, and if it is all, Nixon's system is worthless.

I can only conclude that the Administration is tying "thin" deployment to a parallel effort to freeze current offensive missile levels; it's a bargaining counter. But that makes little sense either. If the Russians are willing to go along with such an agreement, we do not need the ABM at all. For it is designed to protect our retaliatory forces, and if the Soviets agree not to raise their offensive missile level substantially, our retaliatory force is not in jeopardy in the first place.

The bargaining thesis simply cannot be taken seriously. After all, the Russians know what we can do; they know too that we do not tend to underreact to their arms deployment. If they want an agreement, we hardly need initiate something which we may have to tear down. The best time to control the spread of arms is before they are deployed, not after. Once in place, they develop a role of their own, as well as a band of supporters. Consider the difficulty we had in extricating our useless and provocative missiles from Greece and Turkey, even after President Kennedy ordered it done! Their initial emplacement has to be justified on both political and strategic grounds; removing them also requires a complex and sophisticated justification. Inevitably, there are delays while political comprehension catches up to the notion of strategic obsolescence.

Anyway, Mr. Nixon has no intention of abandoning the ABM system, an arms agreement with the Russians notwithstanding. He said at his press conference that "the abandoning of the entire system, particularly as long as the Chinese threat is there, I think neither country would look upon with much favor." It is absurd to discuss the ABM as a bargaining ploy; once set in motion, the system is going to be with us permanently in one form or another.

Mr. Nixon argues that ABM's defensive intent is "unmistakable," primarily because the system he's recommending (sites, not cities) does not undermine the Soviet's capacity to retaliate against cities. ABM only improves our ability, the President says, to ride out a Soviet first strike and to strike back. In part, this reasoning appears to rest on the contention that the distinction between different kinds of ABM systems is hard and fast. Any system, however, can be seen as a preface to another, for the components and techniques are very similar. "Thickening" the system is primarily a matter of our willingness to spend more money. If the Russians do not trust Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird, they may very well "read" this deployment as the beginning of a larger and more threatening one, which they can counter by greater investment in MIRV's and so forth. An ABM system *plus* larger investment in offensive missiles as destabilizing as the MIRV offers less security at a higher price. Parenthetically, Mr. Nixon's allusion to the possibility of reexamining the question of civil defense in this country could also be regarded as provocative; for that is a development which certainly would undermine the Soviet's second strike capability.

The President suggests that one reason his "safeguard" system is preferable to the Johnson Administration's alternative is that it is easier to defend missile sites than cities: for one thing, one need not worry very much about the fallout problem. However, Mr. Nixon's statement does not squarely face two other issues. First, though I agree that a city system requires virtually perfect defense, it is not clear that a missile site defense needs *only* a high percentage of kills to be effective. Missile site defense, for various reasons, may require a more accurate performance than the contemplated system promises. Second, once Mr. Nixon's system is installed, are there problems involved in getting *our* ICBM's off the ground during an attack, if there are Sprints exploding in the path of Soviet missiles in the immediate environment? I don't know the answers to these questions, but it is very important that they be asked.

There is, in my opinion, at least one other explanation for the deployment, to which I referred last week: the military wants an ABM system primarily because it would, they think, give them greater offensive flexibility in situations that are less than total confrontations (a third world war). What if the Russians theaten our "vital interests" in Europe, or the Chinese in Asia, the military asks? What response should we and could we make? One answer has been, in effect, that we ought to respond with equivalent force, in kind and degree. What happens, however, if the threat or the attack involves large numbers of ground troops and we are unable to meet in kind? In this instance, so the argument runs, we should contemplate *initiating limited nuclear strikes*, not necessarily against the attacking forces but against the enemy's *missile sites or airfields* in an effort to dissuade him from continuing his attack for fear of further limited strikes by us. This is *not* the same as Secretary McNamara's efforts to create some elements of control during a major nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union. Mr. Laird has something different in mind, something that would occur at a level of provocation well below general war; it would involve, to borrow Mr. Laird's phrase, "limited nuclear reprisals."

Secretary Laird is not the only one who favors such a response. Harold Brown, formerly a top Pentagon official, said two weeks ago that we must anticipate nuclear confrontations in which each side fires a limited number of ICBM's at the other side's missile sites. So, Mr. Brown argued, our missile sites need ABM protection. I have also seen this argument raised in terms of a Chinese ground threat in Asia, but with the difference that in this instance our cities would need ABM protection, because the Chinese could not hit much else. I doubt that these advocates of "limited nuclear reprisals" really believe the Chinese would hit us; what they hope is that our President would not be deterred from a limited use of our nuclear force against the Chinese, if he was confident that the Chinese could not hurt us in turn. The "shadow of incertitude" which has kept the nuclear trigger from being pulled, might finally be lifted; no more need to step back from the brink, and no more need to ignore military advice as was done during the Cuban missile crisis.

This "limited nuclear reprisals" strategy tries to deal with a problem for which we have no solution, but by means which are incredibly dangerous. If we are seriously contemplating this kind of action, its justification ought to be thoroughly debated.

The drawbacks to this strategy of limited nuclear reprisal are identifiable. It presumes that both sides will maintain control during a series of escalating nuclear exchanges, an eventuality which the Russians at any rate regard with considerable skepticism. Its advocates tend to act as if only we can protect our missile sites. But if the Soviets get an ABM as effective as ours, how will our small "limited" attacks get through? And what will they do in response, if our missile sites are protected but they feel the need to retaliate? Will they, like the Chinese, then aim at our cities? In effect, if both sides invest in ABM defenses, the "limited" exchanges may have to be very powerful to get through, and the chances of control are nil.

Underlying this strategy is an assumption about continued American strategic superiority. Thoughout the strategic debates that have gone on in this country—over massive retaliation, the use of tactical nuclear weapons, limited nuclear war—we have presumed that our superiority will not be challenged. That may be true today, but it will not be true for very long. A strategy that allows for limited nuclear retaliation not only tries to compensate for political deficiencies by technical virtuosity, but makes sense only if you think that you are superior enough at the nuclear level so that rational opponents will pull back in time. Let me repeat: this would require circumstances in which the Russians, in theory, would be firing only a limited number of missiles at our missile sites. It as almost the only conceivable circumstance in which the contemplated ABM deployment would make any military sense. I would be delighted to be convinced that my assumptions about the attractiveness of this strategy in certain quarters are wrong.

Most of us accept the fact that we must protect our retaliatory forces. But since ballistic missile defense, in the current state of the art, can neither guarantee that it will do that job better than other alternatives, nor guarantee that it will save lives, the critical question is how the other side would respond. What it *can* guarantee is that it will cost the aggressor more to mount an attack, and the defender more to meet it (especially if payloads go up to compensate for the possible kill rate of the ABM system), which is small consolation. No one knows what will happen once ABM deployment begins to take shape. The worst that *might* happen is much worse than the best that *might* happen if we go ahead.

The Soviets are still considerably weaker than we are in strategic terms. Understanding that, one understands their reliance on terror weapons, their desperate gamble in Cuba, their frenetic rhetoric and persistent fear of inspection. They *must* react to our actions, because it has been so difficult for them to maintain even the appearance of near equality. It is a grave risk for them to gamble that our purposes are wholly defensive, for their margin of error has been very, very narrow. They are, inevitably, more concerned with problems of defense. Finally, they are beset from all sides by problems and conflicts which must appear increasingly ominous to them. The prospects for reaching some serious arms control agreements with them are said to be substantial. If that is so, any development that appears potentially threatening to them could be very foolish. It would be especially foolish to overreact to defensive measures on their part, for their response to yet another such challenge could be destabilizing.

A plea for underreaction at this time is also justified because the Soviet ABM system has done nothing beyond "complicating our effort" (according to our own officials). We should resist the desire to complicate their effort, in turn. We can stand the marginal complications without undue strain. If we are ever going to achieve some control over these dangerous cycles of innovation, exploitation and obsolescence, it is by taking the short-run risk of foregoing development of something well within our means. This is a world in which stability is tenuous, and in which we are uncertain about how to maintain it. It may be a good rule of thumb—and we have nothing else—that the risks of doing without a new weapons system may be much less than the costs of learning how to live with it. Taking that risk now might yield nothing; but it would be a prudent gamble, for we are strong enough to survive any interim challenge, and the Soviets may be ready to recognize the futility of persisting in a weapons race that yields ever more insecurity at ever higher costs.

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of riot and unrest in and around our various institutions of learning, it is heartening to know that Dublin High School in the First District of Georgia is taking steps to instill in its senior class sensible, progressive thinking, and voting prerogatives which will help so much in making these young people good and responsible citizens.

The following is an opinion questionnaire and the tabulated results of 131 senior students at Dublin High School, and I am truly gratified that 26 of these young people are already registered to vote.

I am indeed proud that the State of Georgia is a leader in allowing the registration of 17-year-olds and granting the voting privilege to 18-year-olds. I believe that this right-to-vote to our 18-year-olds is the first and most logical step in preventing further student unrest. With a voting privilege, our young people of Georgia and, hopefully, across the Nation will be able to voice their opinions and earn an expression of their views through their Representatives in Congress, rather than through disruptive influences and methods evidenced today in our universities and colleges. Because of frustration, bewilderment, and lack of a feeling of belonging to and having a voice in our Government, they choose the more radical methods of expressing their discontent.

I am sure that you agree with me that only praise should go to this group of high-school students and their teacher, Mr. Edward B. Martin, for such active interest in government:

DUBLIN, GA.,
March 13, 1969.

Congressman G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGAN: Enclosed is an opinion questionnaire administered by a United States Government Class to the senior high students. There were 131 respondents, all of whom are to graduate in June of this year.

The results are as follows:

Question No.	Yes	No	Undecided
1	107	14	10
2	99	7	25
3	53	60	18
4	79	30	18
5	100	14	16
6	75	29	25
7	79	33	11

Enclosed also are the ballots for each person. You may note that of the 131 persons responding, 26 are already registered to vote. Almost all of this group will be registered within the year.

Highest regards,
EDWARD B. MARTIN,
Teacher, Social Studies,
Dublin High School.

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE: UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CLASS, DUBLIN HIGH SCHOOL

1. If the Paris Peace talks fail to produce positive results within a reasonable time, would you favor an all-out conventional effort by the United States to end the war in Vietnam?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

2. In the U.S.S. *Pueblo* incident, do you feel Navy Commander Lloyd Bucher acted in the best interest of his crew and his country?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

3. Would you favor a separate congressional investigation of the *Pueblo* incident?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

4. Are you in favor of President Nixon's proposal to eliminate the Draft System and have a Volunteer Army?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

5. Would you favor any change in the Draft System?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

6. In your opinion, is the Electoral College System outdated?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

7. Do you think Congress should move to eliminate the Electoral College System, so that the President of the United States would be elected by popular vote?

Yes ☐. No ☐. Undecided ☐.

Are you registered to vote?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

MORE ON THE PRESIDIO

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise my colleagues in the House of the sentiments of some members of the legal fraternity, and in particular, members of the law faculty of New York University School of Law and Harvard Law School. I trust you will find their statement of interest.

A large portion of the NYU law faculty, including Dean Robert B. McKay, signed the statement, as did three-fourths of the Harvard law faculty. The names of the signators from the New York University School of Law have been made available to me and are also included:

STATEMENT BY NYU LAW SCHOOL FACULTY

As members of the legal community, we feel an obligation to express our concern over the court martial trials which are now being conducted at Fort Presidio, California. 27 soldiers, most of them under 21, are being

XUM

tried on charges of mutiny for staging a brief sit-down strike at the Presidio Stockade on October 14, 1968. The soldiers linked arms, sang "America the Beautiful" and "We Shall Overcome" and presented three demands asking for elimination of shotgun-type work details, psychological evaluation of stockade personnel prior to assignment, and better sanitary facilities.

An investigating officer, appointed as required by the Uniform Code of Military Justice, described the stockade grievance procedures as "shoddy and inefficient" and recommended that the mutiny charges be dropped and the soldiers be tried by special court martial (the maximum punishment is 6 months) or administratively discharged. The Commander of the 6th Army, Lt. Gen. Stanley R. Larsen, disregarded the recommendation and referred all cases to a general court martial on charges of mutiny. Last week the first three soldiers tried were convicted and sentences of 16, 16 and 14 years were adjudged.

We believe that serious questions have been raised by these courts martial concerning the administration of criminal law in our armed forces and the capacity of the present military justice system to insure basic due process rights to members of the military.

First, it must be asked whether the use of the serious charge of mutiny is appropriate in cases such as these. A peaceful and passive sit-down strike by prisoners is sometimes the only method for dramatizing and expressing grievances, and such demonstrations have not usually resulted in prosecutions when they have taken place in civilian prisons. It has been alleged that conditions at the Presidio Stockade were unsatisfactory and that there were 33 attempts at suicide during the 6 months preceding the sit-down strike.

Second, it must be asked whether the intense command interest in prosecuting these soldiers for serious crimes and the unusually severe sentences indicate that the court martial proceedings did not result in a fair and impartial trial.

The Presidio courts martial do not do credit to the Army or the American judicial system. We urge the Army authorities to give consideration to stopping the courts martial of the remaining soldiers and remedying the sentences already imposed. We also ask that serious consideration be given by the Department of Defense, the departments of the services, and Congress as to what steps can be taken to prevent a recurrence in the future of this type of proceeding.

Thomas G. S. Christensen, Leroy D. Clark, Daniel G. Collins, Norman Dorsen, Carr M. Ferguson, Thomas M. Franck, James B. Gambrell, Albert H. Garretson, Gideon A. Gottlieb, James Graham, Hyman Gross, Jerome R. Hellerstein, Graham Hughes, William D. Hutton, Carol Katz, Lawrence P. King.

James C. Kirby, Charles L. Knapp, Homer Kripke, Jack L. Kroner, Andrew F. Lowenfeld, Robert B. McKay, Gerhard O. W. Mueller, John Peschel, Robert Pitofsky, John R. Reid, Charles Seligson, Lois Sheinfeld, John Y. Taggart, Peter A. Winograd, George E. Zeitlin, Stanley A. Zimmerman.

RADIO HAVANA PAYS DR. MANOLO REYES A "COMPLIMENT"

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Radio Havana recently paid the highest possible compliment to Dr. Manolo Reyes, Miami's respected television news commentator and Cuban patriot. In a verbal attack seldom heard before, Radio Havana denounced Dr. Reyes for 15 minutes in reply to an interview Dr. Reyes gave to the Associated Press on the occasion of the anniversary of the "Declaration of Freedom" adopted by the Cuban people in exile.

Following is the Associated Press interview of Dr. Reyes along with Radio Havana's invective reply:

RADIO HAVANA PAYS DR. MANOLO REYES A "COMPLIMENT"

(By Theodore A. Ediger, Associated Press Writer, Miami, AP)

On February 14, 1969, Dr. Manolo Reyes gave an interview to the Associated Press in reference to his Declaration of Freedom which was proclaimed on January 23, 1966 at Key West, Florida at which time the entire audience of one thousand, five hundred people assembled on the streets of Key West, in front of the place where Jose Marti had his headquarters, to hear Dr. Reyes' speech.

The interview was broadcast by Associated Press International through its news service and reads as follows:

Cuban exiles, using secret channels, are flooding their homeland with copies of a "Declaration of Freedom."

"More than 10,000 copies of the document proclaiming a 'Revolution for Independence' have been infiltrated into Cuba," said Manolo Reyes. He uttered the declaration three years ago, and 1500 fellow exiles signed it. The paper invasion of Cuba is accelerating, Reyes reported.

"We can't disclose how we get the copies into Cuba because that would tip off Fidel Castro," said Reyes. "But I can say that some get in cloak and dagger methods . . ."

The Declaration says "the present Cuban regime is guilty of high treason." It pledges a fight to death "to free Cubans from communism."

The objective is to stimulate people inside Cuba to rise up against Castro, Reyes said.

"This is going into the hands of people of the regime as well as other persons," he reported.

The exile television commentator exhibited a cautiously worded letter recently arrived from Cuba. It said: "Some who are in the Castro regime and some who are not have received papers and copies of the declaration. Certain things have happened here and this is attributed to the type of propaganda coming from your city." Reyes interpreted "happenings" as sabotage acts. Exiles call the paper invasion "ideological warfare."

"It is bringing up a mystique among people inside Cuba, not for a leader but for an ideology," Reyes said.

The declaration of freedom calls God, country and family the cornerstones of the anti-Castro revolution. It calls for freedom of worship, teaching, press and enterprise. "One day Fidel is going to see the declaration of freedom plastered inside the windshield of his car," Reyes said. "It already is on walls of cities in Cuba."

Assisting in various ways in the paper invasion program, Reyes said, are exiles in New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and elsewhere as well as in Miami.

The password is "family", said Reyes. "The workers remain anonymous—names don't matter, just ideology. We have no organization. We just say, 'we are part of the family'." A joint resolution commending the declaration of freedom has been introduced in Washington by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla. The resolution is before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Reyes has put aside a giant copy of the declaration "for signing inside Cuba some day."

Four days later specifically on February 18, 1969, radio Havana in a broadcast in short wave, in the Spanish language to the Americas picked up at 1300 GMT—responded violently to the Associated Press item with a feature story entitled "Cuba Replies to Aggression." (Observers believe that this is the first time that Red Radio Havana, the official voice of the Fidel Castro regime devoted an entire program of fifteen minutes to attack an individual Cuban exile.)

The Communist broadcast from Cuba stated as follows:

"A News Release from the AP U.S. News Agency, from Miami, devotes special attention to a terrible and threatening ideological campaign against Cuba started by Manolo Reyes.

The Cuban Exiles, using secret means, are sending to their country copies of a freedom declaration. The News Release said that more than 10,000 copies of a document titled "Revolution for Freedom" had been infiltrated into Cuba, according to Manolo Reyes.

"Reyes said that its delivery to Cuba is being rushed."

According to statements of this impudent person, the objective is to stimulate the people in Cuba to rise against the revolutionary regime. The news agency reported that the exiled television commentator said that the preparation of the declaration began three years ago and that 1500 (fifteen hundred) exiles had signed it. As we see it, the job is a difficult one, to get 1500 exiled Cubans in Miami to sign the Declaration, you do not need that much time. Reyes is a very slow man even though he seems to be happy about the results attained. Reyes, after casting furtive glances to his right and left, showed the AP newsmen a letter which, according to him, arrived recently from Cuba and which says "some who are here and some who are not have more papers. Certain things have taken place here and that can be attributed to the type of propaganda coming out of this city." Reyes explained the meaning of that mysterious letter. Those who are here are people from the revolutionary regime, those who are not here are enemies of the revolution. The papers are copies of the Declaration and the phrase 'certain things have taken place here' are evidently sabotage actions against the Revolution."

Manolo Reyes affirmed that the Declaration is now posted on walls in Cuban cities and said that very soon it will be posted on the windows of the cars used by the revolution's leaders. As we can see it, the imagination of a worm has no limit. Reyes said that he has the support of exiles in U.S., Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia. Quick calculations tells us that either there are too many worms in those places or there are not enough signatures or Manolo Reyes is kidding the AP newsmen.

Manolo Reyes was very popular in Cuba a few years ago when he was a small boy and advertised cafe pilon. Later the small boy grew, his pants are longer but everything indicates that his brain did not develop normally. "Manolo Reyes promises to fight until Death." This is a theatrical phrase, because for those who try to fight the new Cuba, an inglorious end and death awaits. Manolo Reyes will not take that step; he prefers to win battles from Miami, make statements to press agencies, dream about sabotage, and chatter about the terrible ideological war which he will unleash in Cuba which we learned about from the Association Press.

Manolo Reyes considers that it is necessary to fight in Cuba to achieve religious education, and freedom of the press and enterprise. To achieve the first three freedoms we do not need declarations of worms. We have had complete religious freedom in Cuba since 1959: we have free education, which means anyone can study whatever he or she wants.

XUM

depending entirely on their wishes. In the past only the sons of rich people could study. We have freedom of the press because the press here fulfills its obligation to inform and orient the people. Manolo Reyes has other concepts of freedom; for him it is the freedom of the people who try to exploit the poor and the humble, the freedom of Yankee monopolies to loot the country, the freedom of the large landowner to condemn the landless farmer to die of hunger, and the freedom of the politicians to steal from the national treasury and later, in the newspaper, to appear as a benefactor. That type of freedom has disappeared forever from Cuba.

As far as freedom of enterprise is concerned, our people do not need promoters, They are self sufficient and are capable of organizing and developing the economy. The revolution has elevated the dignity of man and for those like Reyes the present is gloomy and there is no hope of returning to the past.

IRRATIONAL PATTERN DISCERNED IN STUDENT REVOLTS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nearly 60 percent of the Nation's high schools are being plagued by student unrest. These protests have ranged from the usual student murmuring to actual student rioting. The contested issues have included prohibitions against long hair and short dresses, teachers' qualifications, racial composition, and academic credits.

As are many of my colleagues, I am bewildered by the riots on our college campuses within the last year. But I am even more perplexed and concerned with the unrest in our high schools. In an effort to increase awareness of these protests I am inserting in the RECORD three newspaper articles.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1969]

IRRATIONAL PATTERN DISCERNED IN STUDENT REVOLTS

(By John Leo)

A study of 19th- and 20th-century student movements has concluded that all student uprisings are "symbolic parricide," in which a young generation tries to humiliate and overthrow the institutions of its parents, regardless of the political issues or consequence.

Because of this "irrational element," says the author of the study, Lewis Feuer, professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, student revolts are almost always counter-productive, leading to a period of reaction or repression.

The study will be published on Feb. 28 by Basic Books under the title "The Conflict of Generations."

"Student movements are the most sincerely selfless and altruistic the world has seen," Professor Feuer said in an interview. "But they are distorted and pulled toward extreme and amoral means because the driving energy comes from unconscious sources."

TWENTY NATIONS INCLUDED

The book surveys student movements in more than 20 nations, with particular attention to Russia, Bosnia and Germany in the 19th century and Japan and the United States in the 20th.

"The pattern is the same in practically every country," said Professor Feuer. "The movement is rooted in altruism, a concern for establishing community and overcoming alienation. It begins by celebrating liberal democratic values and usually ends by discrediting those values for the whole society.

"In Prussia, the great student movement of 1819 postponed the liberalization of Germany for 30 years. In Russia, as Kropotkin wrote, a liberal constitution could have been achieved in 1881 if the students hadn't polarized the society. In Bosnia, the universal acceptance of assassination by the student movement produced the murder of the Archduke and touched off World War I.

"Student movements commonly escalate to terrorism, and sometimes assassination, not because these tactics are politically wise, but because they satisfy the needs of generational hatred on the latent, unconscious level. This symbolic parricide runs through every student movement I studied."

TYPE OF LEADER

The movements, he said, are typically led by young men who have had particular problems with their fathers.

"You can see this," he went on, "in one movement after another: Karl Follen, the key figure in the Prussian movement; Gavrilo Princip, who assassinated the Archduke; down to Mao Tse-tung and leaders of American movements.

"These leaders reach out to students in whom the problem is much more attenuated. Then at some crisis—let's say the arrival of police on campus—the leaders appeal to generational solidarity, and the struggle is finally revealed in its true aspect."

At this point, he continued, the desire to punish the older generation can easily override rational politics and the initial goals of the movement.

ALWAYS THE IRRATIONAL

"I think this was true of the student movement in the thirties that I was part of at City College," he said. "We accomplished certain things and brought life to the campus, but there was always that irrational element. We all circulated the Oxford pledge not to fight in another war at the moment Hitler was arming to the teeth. The anti-generational drive was stronger than reason.

"If we can make this irrational element overt, then perhaps student altruism won't flow into the same self-destructive channels. That's my whole purpose in writing the book."

Referring to the student uprisings at Berkeley and Columbia, he said: "Berkeley led to a remarkable rise in crime in the area, the election of Ronald Reagan, and created a climate for what happened in Watts. Columbia set the stage for the New York school strike.

"If we don't want it to happen again and again, it's important to get moderates, liberals and conservatives to assert themselves on campus. If the whole campus can be involved in electing a student government willing to take over disciplinary matters in case of an outbreak, a rational position may be worked out."

Professor Feuer, who formerly taught philosophy at the University of Vermont, was professor of sociology at Berkeley when that campus erupted in 1964. He was a favorite target for student activists who considered his comments on their movement, both on campus and in national magazines, inaccurate and unsympathetic. He moved to Toronto in 1966.

STUDY SEES A RISE IN YOUTH PROTEST

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 15—Student demonstrations in more than 50 countries during 1968 represent only a warning rumble of bigger and bolder protests to be expected from youth in the future, according to United Nations sociologists.

Estimating that those in the 12-to-25 age group number 750 million and will reach a billion by 1980, the experts predict in a report made public yesterday that "youth of the world will begin to predominate in world affairs."

"World opinion is going to become increasingly the opinion of the world's youth and the generational conflict will assume proportions not previously imagined," they add.

"Young people of all walks of life are prepared to march, to demonstrate and to riot if necessary in support of views which may not be those of the electorate, nor of the majority nor yet those of government."

MORE THAN IMPATIENCE

The sociologists also see prospects for converting youthful impatience into a positive force. They call for immediate steps by governments to prepare national youth policies and programs at the very highest levels and they recommend that those policies be drawn up not as a response to fears or sudden crises but as comprehensive and lasting undertakings.

Such programs might be coordinated by a single ministry of youth or under the aegis of a prime minister or high authority, the report suggested.

The first detailed review of youth problems by the United Nations, it was made for a two-week session of the 32-member Commission for Social Development that will open here Monday.

The 80-page study is based on an anaylsis of reports, interviews with youth leaders and field trips conducted in 40 countries over a two-year period, but not for this study alone. The emphasis was on the poorer countries of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. No in-depth study of the situation in the Soviet Union or the United States was attempted.

THE DEVELOPED AND THE POOR

Three sociologists—two Britons and an American youth expert—prepared the report. In keeping with United Nations practice, they were not named. The countries discussed are not identified, but the writers draw broad distinctions between the developed—meaning prosperous—countries and the poorer countries.

They report the existence of a "youth culture" that has cut across frontiers and linked young people in rich and poor countries because of mutual aspirations, tastes and drives. The report finds a strong sense of unity among young people, "whatever the cause of their campaigns may be."

Educated youth vie with trade unions as an effective nonparty force in politics, the study said. This clamor for attention can be expected to continue as young people begin to realize their strength in world affairs.

"The younger generation seems to have lost confidence in the capacity of the older generation to guide affairs without some assistance and planning from young people," the report found.

In the poorer countries, beset by economic difficulties, the report saw prospects that youth could help stimulate national growth. It also pointed out that youthful dissidents could pose a "recurrent political threat."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1969]

STUDY FINDS PROTESTS WIDESPREAD

SAN FRANCISCO, March 2.—Student protests, which range in intensity from vocal complaints to riots, have occurred recently at nearly 60 per cent of the Nation's high schools, a survey of principals showed today.

Results of the survey, which involved a random sample of 1026 principals, were reported at the 53rd annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. It was made by the association staff.

"The basic message is clear. Student activism is here,' said J. Loyd Trump, associate secretary.

"Sixty-seven per cent of the city schools surveyed are experiencing protests. For schools in the suburbs, the number with protests is also 67 per cent. In rural areas, it drops to 53 per cent, still more than half of the respondents.

"One of the surprises of the survey was the fact that protest is almost as likely to occur in junior high schools as in senior high schools. Among the junior high schools, 56 per cent report protest activities, as compared to 59 per cent of all senior high schools."

Trump said young people are becoming vocal on every topic from glue-sniffing to the vote for 18-year-olds. He said it was hard to discern a pattern because so many subjects were mentioned.

But dress and hair requirements head the list of complaints, followed by smoking rules, cafeteria and assembly fare, censorship of student papers and scheduling of sporting events.

Forty-five per cent of the schools with protests reported activism regarding the way pupils are educated. Complaints included poor teachers, curriculum content, scheduling, grades and exams.

Protests over racial relations problems were reported by 10 per cent of the schools. Three per cent of the protests involved Vietnam and 2 per cent the draft.

SENATE—*Monday, March 31, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Reverend EDWARD L. R. ELSON, D.D., Chaplain of the Senate. On the day of his first inauguration, January 20, 1953, President Dwight David Eisenhower attended a brief preinaugural church service in the National Presbyterian Church, after which he went to to his rooms and wrote a prayer of his own. Several hours later, in front of this Capitol Building, when he began his inaugural address, he asked everyone to join him as he offered his own prayer. In the words of his prayer, let us pray today:

"Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment, my future associates in the executive branch of the Government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng and their fellow citizens everywhere.

"Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby and by the laws of this land.

"Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people, regardless of station, race, or calling. May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concept of our Constitution, hold to differing political beliefs—so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and for Thy glory. Amen."

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 oclock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 27, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate on March 28, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States informing the Senate of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

DEATH OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—INFORMAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE SENATE CHAMBER AND FUNERAL SERVICE IN THE ROTUNDA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of the proceedings of the informal meeting of Senators in connection with the funeral ceremonies for the former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, held in the Senate Chamber yesterday, Sunday, March 30, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD the eulogy delivered by the President of the United States and the benediction by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Chaplain of the Senate, at the memorial service on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The transcript of the proceedings, the eulogy, and the benediction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER, SUNDAY, MARCH 30, 1969

An informal meeting of Senators, called by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), was held at 3:30 p.m. in connection with arrangements for the funeral ceremonies for the former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The meeting was called to order by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), as Presiding Officer.

FUNERAL SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an informal meeting of the Senate, and I wish to make the following announcement on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself:

Funeral services for the late President at the Washington National Cathedral will be held tomorrow at 4:30 p.m.

Buses will depart under escort from First Street NE., between the Senate Office Buildings, at 3:30 p.m. and return immediately after the services. Those going in private cars are advised to enter the cathedral grounds from Woodley Road and proceed to the north transept entrance.

Tickets for the services for Senators and wives will be delivered by the Sergeant at Arms. Members of the Senate delegation are scheduled to be seated in the cathedral at 4:15 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The minority leader and I have discussed schedules for the next several days. It is our thought that tomorrow ought to be devoted to eulogies by all Members of the Senate who desire to deliver them, but that on Tuesday we will have regular business.

Unanimous-consent agreements have been asked for and granted. As I recall, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) asked for 1 hour at the conclusion of morning business on Monday. That time will be taken on Tuesday. According to the secretary for the minority, Mr. Mark Trice, several Republican Senators have made similar requests for Monday, and they will be heard on Tuesday.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will there be any votes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no votes that I know of.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will there be any objection to our having committee hearings on Tuesday? I have postponed hearings previously scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be appreciated if no hearings were held tomorrow, Monday; but from Tuesday on, hearings may be held.

EASTER RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership has been discussing the Easter recess, which was planned to expire on April 9. In view of the fact that the calendar is fairly clear and because of our desire not to call the Senate back when there is nothing to be done except to be in attendance, we shall join the House in seeking to adopt a resolution—which no doubt will be agreed to—which will extend the recess to the 14th of April. Senators should keep that in mind and make plans accordingly. We are doing this because the calendar, like Mother Hubbard's cupboard, is bare.

FUNERAL SERVICES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we were in some doubt as to whether an official delegation from the House and Senate should attend the funeral at Abilene, Kans. At the last minute, however, it developed that it was not desired to have the formal attendance of a House delegation, and therefore those concerned were not particularly happy about having a Senate delegation.

There are two reasons for that. There will be an outdoor service on the Eisenhower Library steps. Then a private service will take place in the little chapel. The chapel holds 50 persons. The service will be brief. So the idea of sending a delegation was discouraged. Therefore, there will not be a delegation from the House or the Senate. That, however, does not preclude any individual Member of the Senate who desires to do so from attending the funeral. Moreover, I am advised that Senators probably will not find any accommodations in Abilene, because military personnel from all over the country are already there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should think it would be most appropriate for the Senators from Kansas to go, if they desire to do so, because the funeral will take place in their State, and it is personally important to them.

Mr. PEARSON. My colleague from Kansas, Mr. DOLE, and I intend to go.

ADJOURNMENT OF INFORMAL MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as previously ordered, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I now move that this informal meeting of Members of the Senate be adjourned. I suggest that the distinguished Senators from Kansas both meet directly behind the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the informal meeting of the Senate was adjourned.

The Senate proceeded in a body to the rotunda and the bier of the former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, headed by the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL); the Senators from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON and Mr. DOLE); the majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD); and the minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN).

PRESIDENT NIXON'S EULOGY TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

We gather today in mourning but also in gratitude. We mourn Dwight Eisenhower's death, but we are grateful for his life. We gather also conscious of the fact that in paying tribute to Dwight Eisenhower we celebrate greatness. When we think of his place in history, we think inevitably of those other giants of World War II. And we think of the qualities of greatness and what his were that made his unique among all.

Once, perhaps without intending to do so, he himself put his finger on it. It was 1945 shortly after V–E Day at a ceremony in London's historic Guildhall. The triumphant Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe was officially given the freedom of the city of London. In an eloquent address that day, Dwight Eisenhower said:

> I come from the heart of America.

Perhaps no one sentence could better sum up what Dwight Eisenhower meant to a whole generation of Americans.

He did come from the heart of America, not only from the geographical heart but from its spiritual heart. He exemplified what millions of parents hoped that their sons would be—strong and courageous and honest and compassionate. And with his own great qualities of heart, he personified the best in America. It is, I think, a special tribute to Dwight Eisenhower that despite all of his honors, despite all of his great deeds and triumphs, we find ourselves today speaking first not of his deeds but of his character.

It was the character of the man—not what he did, but what he was—that so captured the trust and faith and affection of his own people and of the people of the world. Dwight Eisenhower touched something fundamental in America, which only a man of immense force of mind and spirit could have brought so vibrantly alive. He was a product of America's soil and of its ideals, driven by a compulsion to do right and to do well. A man of deep faith who believed in God and trusted in His will. A man who truly loved his country and for whom words like "freedom" and "democracy" were not cliches. But they were living truths. I know Mrs. Eisenhower would permit me to share with you the last words he spoke to her on the day he died. He said:

> I've always loved my wife, I've always loved my children, I've always loved my grandchildren and I've always loved my country.

That was Dwight Eisenhower.

A MAN WHO GAVE ENORMOUSLY

He was a man who gave enormously. His way of relaxing from the intense pressures of office or command was to do something else intensely, whether as a fierce competitor on the golf course or executing one of those hauntingly beautiful paintings that he did with such meticulous care.

But even more than this, he gave enormously of himself to people.

People loved Dwight Eisenhower. But the other side of this coin was that he loved people. He had the great leader's capacity to bring out the best in people. He had the great humanist's capacity to inspire people, to cheer them, to give them lift. I remember, for example, just a few months ago when I asked all of the members of the Cabinet to go out and call on him, each of them returned with wonder and admiration and said, "You know, I went out there to cheer him up and instead I found he cheered me up."

His great love of people was rooted in his faith. He had a deep faith in the goodness of God and in the essential goodness of man as a creature of God. This feeling toward people had another side.

In the political world, strong passions are the norm. And all too often these turn toward personal vindictiveness. People often disagreed with Dwight Eisenhower but almost nobody ever hated him. And this I think was because he himself was a man who did not know how to hate. Oh, he could be aroused by a cause. But he could not hate a person. He could disagree strongly, even passionately, but never personally. When people disagreed with him, he never thought of them as enemies. He simply thought, "Well, they don't agree with me." I remember time after time when critics of one sort or another were misrepresenting him or reviling him, he would sit back in his chair with that wonderful half-smile and half-frown, he would say, "I'm puzzled by those fellows." And he was genuinely puzzled by frenzy and by hate and because he was inescapable of it himself, he could never understand it in others.

The last time I saw him, that was what he talked about. He was puzzled by the hatred he had seen in our times. And he said the thing the world needs most today is understanding, an ability to see the other person's point of view. And not to hate him because he disagrees. That was Dwight Eisenhower.

And yet, of course he was more than all that. He had a side more evident to those of us who worked with him than to the rest of the world. He was a strong man, he was shrewd, he was decisive. Time and again, I have seen him make decisions that probably made the difference between war and peace for America and the world. That was always when he was at his best. No matter how heated the arguments were, he was always then the coolest man in the room.

Dwight Eisenhower was that rarest of men, an authentic hero. Wars bring the names of many men into the headlines and of those some few become national or even international heroes. But as the years then pass, their fame goes down. But not so with Dwight Eisenhower. As the years passed, his stature grew. Commander of the mightiest expeditionary force ever assembled, receiver of the surrender of the German armies of World War II, president of Columbia University, supreme commander of NATO, 34th President of the United States, the honors and offices were there in abundance, every trust that the American people had it in their power to bestow he was given.

And yet he always retained a saving humility. His was the humility not of fear but of confidence. He walked with the great of the world and he knew that the great was human. His was the humility of man before God and before the truth. His was the humility of a man too proud to be arrogant.

The pursuit of peace was uppermost of his mind when he ran for the Presidency and it was uppermost in his conduct of that office. And it is a tribute to his skill and determination that not since the 1930's has the Nation enjoyed so long a period of peace, both at home and abroad, as the one that began in 1953 and continued through his Presidency. As commander of the mightiest allied force ever assembled, he was the right man at the right place at the right time. And as President, once again he was the right man at the right place at the right time. He restored calm to a divided Nation. He gave Americans a new measure of self-respect. He invested his office with dignity and respect and trust. He made Americans proud of their President, proud of their country, proud of themselves.

And if we in America were proud of Dwight Eisenhower, it was partly because he made us proud of America. He came from the heart of America and he gave expression of the heart of America

XUM

and he touched the hearts of the world. Many leaders are known and respected outside their own country. Very few are loved outside their own country. Dwight Eisenhower was one of those few.

CAPTURED DEEPEST FEELINGS

He was probably loved by more people in more parts of the world than any President America has ever had. He captured the deepest feelings of free men everywhere. The principles he believed in, the ideals he stood for, these were bigger than his own country. Perhaps he himself put it best again in that Guildhall speech in 1945. He said then:

> Kinship among nations is not determined in such measurements as proximity, size and age. Rather, we should turn to those inner things, call them what you will, I mean those intangibles that are the treasures that free men possess. To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before the law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit, subject only to provisions that he not trespass upon similar rights of others, a Londoner will fight—and so will a citizen of Abilene. When we consider these things, then the valley of the Thames draws closer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas.

Some men are considered great because they lead great armies, or they lead powerful nations. For 8 years now Dwight Eisenhower has neither commanded an army nor led a nation. And yet he remained to his final days the world's most admired and respected man, truly the first citizen of the world. As we marvel at this, it leads us once again to ponder the mysteries of greatness. Dwight Eisenhower's greatness derived not from his office but from his character, from a unique moral force that transcended national boundaries even as his own deep concern for humanity transcended national boundaries.

HIS LIFE REMINDS US

His life reminds us that there is a moral force in this world more powerful than the might of arms or the wealth of nations. This man who led the most powerful armies that the world has ever seen; this man who led the most powerful nation in the world; this essentially good, and gentle, and kind man; that moral force was his greatness. For a quarter of a century to the very end of his life Dwight Eisenhower exercised a moral authority without parallel in America and in the world. And America and the world are better because of it.

And so today we render our final salute. It is a fond salute to a man we love and cherish. It is a grateful salute to a man whose whole extraordinary life was consecrated to service. It is a profoundly respectful salute to a man larger than life, who by any standards was one of the giants of our times. Each of us here will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower. I can see him now standing erect, straight, proud, and tall 16 years ago as he took the oath of office as the 34th President of the United States of America.

We salute Dwight David Eisenhower standing there in our memory—first in war, first in peace, and wherever freedom is cherished, first in the hearts of his fellow men.

BENEDICTION

The Reverend EDWARD L. R. ELSON, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. Unto God's most gracious care and protection, we commit you.

The Lord bless you and keep you.

The Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, the Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace, now and evermore.

And now may the God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work, to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ our Lord to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

(This marks the end of the proceedings, of Sunday, March 30, 1969.)

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—IN MEMORIAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 174

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to purchase a floral wreath to be placed by the catafalque bearing the remains of former President of the United States and General of the Army of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, while lying in state in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States, the expenses of which shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. 174) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

THE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States on the death of Dwight David Eisenhower which will be read and laid on the table.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my sad duty to inform you officially of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the thirty-fourth President of the United States.

We have lost a great leader, a great friend and a great man. I know there are many members of the Congress who had the privilege of serving under his military leadership, and who later, during his eight years, as President, shared with him in the building of a better America. He had a profound respect for the traditions, the institutions and the instruments of our nation. He leaves to the Congress and to all Americans the spirit of patriotism and statesmanship beyond party which marked his entire career. As we grieve at his death, we all will recall that spirit, which can guide and sustain us in our tasks ahead. He has been an inspiration to us all, and ours is a better government because he walked among us.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 28, 1969.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, beloved former President of the United States of America. The message, ordered to be laid on the table, is as follows:

H. RES. 351

Resolved, That the House of Representatives had learned with profound regret and sorrow of the death of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, beloved former President of the United States of America.

Resolved, That in recognition of the many virtues, public and private, of the illustrious soldier and statesman, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public stations, the Speaker shall appoint a committee of the House to join with such Members of the Senate as may be designated, to attend the funeral services of the former President.

Resolved, That the House tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the former President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the former President, this House do now adjourn.

A RESOLUTION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), I send to the desk Senate Resolution 175 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 175

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, a former President of the United States and General of the Army of the United States.

Resolved, That as a token of honor to his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, his distinguished public service to his nation, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public station in life, the Senate hereby expresses its deep sensibility of the loss the nation has sustained by his death, and its sympathy with the family in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the two Senators from Kansas be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased, to be held at Abilene, Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Sen-

XUM

ate transmit these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, when the inevitable and expected word came, I believe that all of us thought of the life rather than the death of Dwight David Eisenhower.

As a soldier, as a President, and as a citizen, he constantly occupied a great place. Solomon said, "The place showeth the man." And the great places that Eisenhower held, by offer of a free people, did indeed show the man. It revealed that he understood that the high ground of command was useless unless it represented the power to do good. The places he held persuaded him that progress was essential and that good thoughts are no more than good dreams unless action follows.

As a soldier, he believed in peace.

As a President, he gave confidence and stability and a calmness to our people to the end that our acts were brighter and our institutions stronger. Somehow, Eisenhower, befuddled by the world of politics, found strength and truth that the career practitioners of government never learn nor understand.

And now, in his last years as a citizen, he served as an example of what is great in our people and good in our time. One example we might find of greatest comfort is that he was proof once again that in a free society difficult events and hard circumstances will produce the right man at the right time.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

> If I went West, I think I would go to Kansas.

Ike now goes west to Kansas, from whence he came, and to the rewards that God assures all mankind.

THE PEACEMAKER

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today the world mourns Dwight David Eisenhower, and while there is a sense of profound loss, there is not despair. After a full life of service, his memory is unquestionably forever secure in the affections of his fellow men everywhere. He was truly a leader of men and of nations in war and in peace.

His dreams as a boy in Abilene, Kans., could never have envisioned the heights he was to scale in his lifetime From a family of humble origins in the heartland of America, General Eisenhower rose to command successfully the largest military force ever assembled.

The honesty and sincerity so characteristic of this man throughout his life can be traced to the spiritual heritage of his ancestors and strong guidance from his mother. His broad grin and good humor that reflected these qualities made him a popular idol and were part of his magic. Wherever seen throughout the world, people reacted to the special qualities exuded by this man. Winston Churchill understood these qualities and once commented that Ike "was a great commander, who not only can lead an army, but can stir men's hearts."

The contributions made by General Eisenhower are legend. His success in time of war marked him as a great leader of men. Thereafter his unparalleled success in politics underscored the respect and confidence he enjoyed in America.

It is only natural that those of us from Kansas have always exhibited special pride in General Eisenhower, for as President Nixon so eloquently stated yesterday, General Eisenhower "did come from the heart of America—the geographical and spiritual heart."

General Eisenhower once said:

> I come from the people, the ordinary people.

Kansas are proud to be termed ordinary people and especially proud and honored that the people from whence he came were Kansas people.

His great triumphs and deeds were always marked by the extra dimensions of his personality, his character, and his humanity.

On behalf of all Kansans, I proudly salute General Eisenhower as we pause to commemorate his greatness.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of 23 accomplishments which former President Eisenhower thought were most significant in his term, and also a prayer for a friend which President Eisenhower read at Morningside Heights, N.Y., on the morning of his election day which I had prepared for him the night before.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Prayer for a Friend

(By Hugh Scott)

Dear God, in all things Thy will be done. If it please Thee that Thou shalt give to us the victory, help him to judge that which is surely good, to turn aside from all unworthiness.

Help him to share and to hold that faith shown bright in the eyes of the little children along the many places of his going.

Help him to follow after the ways that lead to peace, that by Thy grace the sounds of battle may be stilled, our sons returned to field or marketplace.

Help him, by high example, to bring our people together in friendly amity and tolerant accord that each may, in his own fashion, freely enjoy the fruits of a peaceful, happy land.

Help him, above all, O Lord, to be himself. Amen.

(Prepared on election eve in November 1952 and read by General Eisenhower on the morning of election day while standing by the fireside mantel in his home in Morningside Heights in New York City.)

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 31, 1969]

Eisenhower Listed 23 Top Accomplishments in 8 Years As President

Washington, March 30.—In a heretofore unpublicized letter, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower listed the end of the Korean War, the first civil rights law in 80 years and 21 other events as principal accomplishments of his Administration.

And he wrote critically of those who take deportment and words rather than achievements as the measure of people in responsible positions.

The letter was written Oct. 18, 1966, from Eisenhower's Gettysburg, Pa., farm to James C. Hagerty, press secretary during the Eisenhower presidency.

Hagerty read it Sunday on television during coverage of memorial ceremonies for Gen. Eisenhower, who died Friday. Hagerty is an ABC executive.

In the letter, Eisenhower said: "A few days ago when asked for a list of accomplishments of the Republican Administration I dashed these off from the 'top of my head' along with a few comments."

The list:

Statehood of Alaska and Hawaii.

Building of St. Lawrence Seaway.

End of Korean War; thereafter no American killed in combat.

Largest reduction of taxes to that time.

First civil rights law in 80 years.

Prevention of Communistic efforts to dominate Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, Taiwan, South Vietnam.

Reorganization of the Defense Department.

Initiation, and great progress in, most ambitious road program by any nation in all history.

Slowing up and practical elimination of inflation.

Initiation of space program with successful orbit in less than three years, starting from scratch.

Initiating a strong ballistic missile program.

Conceiving and building the Polaris program, with ships operating at sea within a single administration.

Starting federal Medical Care for the aged (Kerr-Mills).

Desegregation in Washington, D.C., and Armed Forces even without laws.

Fighting for responsible fiscal and financial policies throughout eight years.

Extension of OASI (Social Security) coverage to over 10 million persons.

Intelligent application of federal aid to education (Defense Education Bill).

Preservation, for the first time in American history, of adequate military establishment after cessation of war.

Using federal power to enforce orders of a federal court in Arkansas, with no loss of life (Little Rock school crisis).

Good will journeys to more than score of nations in Europe, Asia, Africa, South Africa and in the Pacific.

Establishment of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Initiation of plan for social progress in Latin America after obtaining necessary authorization from Congress for $500 million—later called Alliance for Progress.

Atoms for Peace proposal.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may have 21 days to include in the Record their remarks on the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower, and that remarks at the desk prepared by Senators who are absent be printed in the Record as if delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allen in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to all that is mortal comes the day of dissolution. What comfort there is in the fact that to the moment when the shadow of death hovered over him, he was lucid, peaceful, and ready. What counts now is the lesson of his life.

We refer to Washington as the Father of our Country. Eisenhower was a father to the country. He came at a time when concern and ferment were everywhere. He came when an uneasy Nation needed

XUM

him. In his touch was that magic balm to dissipate fear, to restore confidence, and to set the Nation on the high road again.

What words or what phrase best describes his impact on the people? I would have to say from my friendship with him that it was the "wholesome touch." Perhaps there are times when a Nation needs brilliance in diplomacy, skill in administration, in-depth background on legislative needs. But there are also times when a Nation needs an abiding father with the wholesome approach of a national leader, and this is precisely what he brought when it was needed.

Years ago, a Senator said to me:

> If there were no third-term limit, Eisenhower could be elected and reelected as long as he lived, because people believe in him.

To that I replied:

> And because he believes in people.

Prior to World War II, he might have been considered just another among many officers in the U.S. Army. But there was a difference. He did his homework and he did it well. And when the time came to find a grand captain for the vast and serious task which confronted the world, he was ready. The military hierarchy, whose task it was to find an outstanding planner and tactician, made no mistake.

First, he became the commander in chief of the U.S. forces in Europe. Later he became commander in chief of the Allied forces in Africa. Later he became supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces.

It was all done with so little personal publicity. It was done without propaganda. It was not glory but victory that he sought.

How comparatively little we heard about his rescue of Africa from British disaster. How little we heard about his healing touch in dissipating the fear and gloom in Britain after the tragic retreat to Dunkirk. Only when he mounted the grand assault from the beaches of Normandy did we hear much of him. Eleven months later the enemy surrendered.

I was privileged to be present at the Thanksgiving service in Rheims, France. It was the day after victory. I saw him there. But I also saw something else—humble people, kneeling in church, expressing their gratitude for victory and their appreciation for his service and leadership.

It was not so strange that a grateful people in this land should turn to him in time of peace for guidance and leadership. They felt that one who could meet the challenge of Hitler could also meet the challenges and complexities of the postwar period. So from supreme commander he became President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. It was not so much some vast, undisclosed, administrative talent which endeared him to the people, but the rightness of his outlook, his humane views, his compassionate heart, and his dedication to the cause of peace.

In his day, many things were contrived to serve the cause of continuing peace. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being. The U.S. Information Agency was created. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was ratified. An International Finance Corporation was created. An International Atomic Energy Agency was approved. A U.S. Development Loan Fund was established. A mutual security pact with Japan was consummated. There were many others—all of them designed to serve the cause of peace.

As this effort to serve the cause of peace and understanding continued, he was always mindful of the inescapable fact that to give effective leadership to the free world we ourselves must always be strong and secure. There were many things to attest that fact.

The first nuclear submarine was approved. The U.S. Air Force Academy was established. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created. The Defense Reorganization Act came into being. The National Defense Education Act was consummated. These and others were designed to maintain a military posture which would command respect.

But even as he sought to serve the cause of peace and security, he was equally mindful of the needs of the Nation at home. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established, the better to coordinate the services of the Federal Government in this field. Social security benefits were broadened. The research and assistance program on air pollution was enacted. The minimum wage increase was approved. The Interstate Highway Act came into being. The basic Civil Rights Act—the first in more than 80 years—was consummated. There were so many others, including medical care for the aged, small business investment, poultry products inspection, library service, water facilities, the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, return to the States of their rights to submerged lands, the Korean GI bill of rights, and the Great Plains program.

This—all this—is a monument to the universality of mind and heart and spirit of one who in our time achieved greatness without losing his humility, who was loyally served because he was esteemed, and who found a place deep in the throbbing hearts of Americans and the world because they loved him.

A TRIBUTE FROM MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received from the Honorable Luis M. Farias, President, Gran Commission of the Congress of the United Mexican States.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAN COMMISSION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mexico City, Mexico, March 29, 1969.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Once more I must address you in mourning. A great American has died leaving a feeling of emtpiness. Courageous in war, firm in his handling of public affairs, full of warmth in personal relations, Dwight D. Eisenhower left many friends in all corners of the world. To my country he always showed his fondness. Please accept my condolences.

HON. LUIS M. FARIAS,
President.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we were a nation at war; Dwight David Eisenhower, general, did much to end it.

We were of an Atlantic community on the verge of a second great war; Dwight David Eisenhower, Supreme Commander, NATO, did much to prevent it.

We were a people torn by political dissension and ideological confusion; Dwight D. Eisenhower, President, did much to calm it.

We were of a world divided by ideology into hostile camps; Dwight D. Eisenhower, statesman, threw across the chasm the lines of human contact.

This man entered into the service of his country as a young lieutenant of the armies; he left its service as President of the United States. Until his death, his counsel remained at the call of his successors; it was sought, in turn, by President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon.

Why is it that the trust which he had from friends in his earliest years enlarged into a trust of countless millions in this country and throughout the world? Was it because Dwight D. Eisenhower was a friendly man, warm with the strengths and weaknesses of his humanity? Was it because he was a wise man with a folk wisdom of rural America, enriched by an ever-widening experience in the affairs of the Nation and the world? Was it because he was a dependable man, with a determined but dogmatic-free dedication to his duties, his country, and the ideals of freedom?

It was for all these reasons and more that Dwight D. Eisenhower was trusted. He was trusted, in the end, because he was the personification of a trusted America. He incarnated America's revulsion with the Nazi-racism of his era and America's compassion for all those who suffered under its ruthless political-militarism. He expressed America's simple hope for a world of peace and order. His smile spoke vividly of America's friendship for all peoples.

The era which he personified is gone; Dwight D. Eisenhower is gone. Yet, they are not gone. They are tied together—the man and his times. Together, they are woven into the Nation's continuing effort to give full meaning to the Constitution's promise for all citizens. Together, they are forever a part of the world's search for a peaceful order of life for all peoples.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1890–1969, boy from Abilene, soldier, general, President, and before all else, decent American.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower whom I knew well before he had achieved the rank of general and long before he sought the Presidency. I met him when he was G-5 at the Pentagon in 1941, when I first came to Washington and became a civilian aide to the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service.

I had occasion to see the general in that service before Pearl Harbor and then had occasion to serve under him when he was in command in the European Theater both in the United Kingdom and in Algiers, North Africa.

After the war, I had the privilege, I think, of being among the first to suggest that he should seek the Presidency in 1948. I then joined with 18 or 19 other Members of the House, at the end of 1951, in urging him to stand for the Presidency as the nominee of the Republican Party. Then, of course, I had the great privilege of working for his election in 1952 and in running with him in 1956 when I first sought election to the Senate from New York.

Over the years I have seen a great deal of General Eisenhower. I saw him, of course, while he was President. Thereafter, as he gradually withdrew from activities, I saw him again in Palm Springs, Calif., and at Gettysburg, Pa.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was one of America's really genuine heroes in the eyes of its people. As so many have said—and as President Nixon said so beautifully yesterday—he was a man of tremendous warmth and sentiment, a very personable man, one with a great sense of humor, deep feeling, and passionate conviction. He could get very angry, but anger never controlled his actions. He could be the warmest, the dearest, the most special human being on earth. Just to see him with Mamie in his later years would make anyone understand that.

I heard stories from a wide range of individuals—from the generals who served under him, like Al Gruenther, and the dressmakers who served Mamie, like those in New York—which proved that to them he was, uniformly, the greatest human being.

Our Nation and the world have lost a great leader in war and a great champion of peace. For Dwight D. Eisenhower was that rare military captain who genuinely renounced the very calling which put him among the historic greats.

Dwight David Eisenhower was one of the greatest friends the people of the world ever had. A commanding personality, he inspired trust and confidence through his warmth, compassion, and simple lack of pretension. These unique qualities of leadership enabled him to bring together the clashing interests of many nations into the greatest wartime alliance in Western civilization. He, as much as any man in history, represented the aspirations of free people the world over to defeat tyranny and maintain peace through the collective strength of the free.

Mr. President, the evaluations of history are always interesting, especially for one, like myself, who has lived with a man—as so many others have—like Dwight D. Eisenhower. I had the rather interesting opportunity to try that out. The New York Times' Sunday magazine, some years ago, published an interesting and informative piece evaluating Presidents, and where they stood in the hierarchy of greatness in the eyes of their countrymen. They did not rate President Eisenhower very high. They put others ahead of him.

I protested that. The general got a great kick out of my protest. The New York Times printed my letter in which I stated that I thought he was a great President. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, greatness consists not only of great achievements—and I think it is only fair to say that Dwight Eisenhower's greatest achievement was in leading the forces of victory in World War II—but also lies in the good sense and the wit, even the brilliance, not to do some things, to keep the Nation from doing them.

I think that General Eisenhower could just as easily have gotten into the Vietnam trap as his successors, but he did not. I think that it was just as hard to make peace in Korea as it will prove to be in Vietnam; but he managed to carry it off. It took a very long time to do so. It posed great difficulties.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first President of my party since 1932 after 20 years out of power. It would have been possible for President Eisenhower to pursue a negative course. The party had been in opposition for a very long time, under a conservative, perhaps an isolationist influence. He did not pursue that course. On the contrary.

Although I had many differences with him, especially in the field of civil rights and economics, he brought the Republican Party into the mainstream of modern American political thought. Even in such areas as health, it is too often forgotten that President Eisenhower's administration produced the first medical care plan which had really seriously been put before Congress. It was defeated in the other body, where I was serving at that time; but, nonetheless, President Eisenhower's administration produced it. And so with a whole host of other developments. The Republican tradition on civil rights was extended by the first breakthrough on civil rights legislation since Reconstruction days, desegregation in the District of Columbia, and the will to use Federal troops in order to sustain Federal safeguards for the individual American.

But above all, President Eisenhower made his greatest contribution in foreign policy, confirming and extending America's role as a world power concerned with the development of free societies everywhere, but ever cautious to avoid precipitating a conflict in such troubled areas as Berlin and Vietnam. As historian Henry Steele Commager has written:

> History will accord Eisenhower a major part of the credit for the generosity and maturity with which the United States accepted and discharged her obligations during the Fifties; it will accord him credit for preventing the Republican Party—and perhaps the country—from going down the dusty road to a sterile isolationism at a crucial moment in history.

Thus, Mr. President, I rise to join the leadership and my colleagues in paying tribute to a great, a warm, and a happy American.

Interestingly enough, because of his temperament, his tremendous optimism, and his unflagging will to live, I think that he will be an inspiration to our youth, in spite of their changing and rather restless character. Those of us who remember him as the immensely popular wartime commander and peacetime Chief Executive will always think of him as a great champion of peace. He knew war well but renounced it. We all know of his "open skies" proposal and his goals in disarmament and arms control, and we hope that they will guide our own actions today.

For Mrs. Javits and myself I extend our warmest sympathies to Mamie Eisenhower, whom we both know, and to John and his children, whom the President loved so much. The comfort of that family is in the fact that Dwight Eisenhower was a man who kept the light of faith in America's traditions and institutions more brightly and inspiringly lit than any other man in modern history. He will always remain a beautiful, inspiring, warm figure for that reason, as well as a most pleasant memory in my heart and the hearts of a whole host of Americans who, like myself, had the privilege of warm personal contact with him.

EXHIBIT 1

EISENHOWER GREAT

To the EDITOR:

With reference to your article by Arthur M. Schlesinger, "Our Presidents: A Rating by 75 Historians" (July 29), I have no desire to quarrel with such an eminent group but I found their evaluation of Dwight D. Eisenhower as an "average" President extraordinary.

Perhaps Professor Schlesinger did, too, for he found it necessary to at least offer a defense for their surprising evaluation: "* * * Eisenhower, the most recent, and consequently, the hardest of the Presidents to evaluate. * * *"

I believe that as history is evaluated in the perspective of time even this same group of historians would come to agree that President Eisenhower deserves the label of "great" for his achievements in the cause of peace (Korea, United Nations, Middle East, etc.); for his impact on the course of the Republican Party (decisively putting it on the road in favor of a reasonable Government role in the country's welfare and preventing a resurgence of isolationism); and for giving the nation an unparalleled sense of moral dedication and unity when it was most needed.

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: A GOOD MAN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower was a good man. A military strategist, a statesman, leader of his political party, a humanitarian, an educator—all of these accomplishments marked his fruitful life. But ask the average citizen of the world how he would describe Dwight David Eisenhower in a few words and chances are he would simply say: "He was a good man."

How many leaders of men would qualify for such a description? He achieved great power without ever really grasping for it. He was disappointed when friends disagreed with him but he never personalized opposition. His temper flared on occasion, but his aim was only to assure excellence.

The "man from Abilene" probably was

XUM

liked by a broader cross section of Americans than any other public figure of his times and this in fact served as the basis of his wide appeal. It was his inner spiritual force that caused his outward radiation of goodness and charm and gained him acceptance at home and abroad as a man of profound good will. He always preferred to conciliate opposing points of view rather than to demand strict obedience to his orders. And his manifest sincerity disarmed even those who opposed him.

As a friend of both generals and captains of industry, he left as his legacy a warning of the dangers inherent in the military-industrial complex. As a military man, he desired above all else and worked without cessation for one goal—a lasting peace in his time.

In fact, the choice of every means, the foundation of every decision made by Dwight Eisenhower during his long service to our country, has been a judgment whether the cause of peace would thereby be served. Several years ago, looking back on his career, Dwight Eisenhower said that he regarded the greatest achievement in which he had participated to have been the defeat of Nazi Germany only 11 months after the Normandy invasion and an 8-year Presidency without war. Typically, he felt his greatest disappointment was our inability to bring about a lasting accord with the Soviet Union, for he had hoped the years of his Presidency would bring us to a place where we could say that a just and permanent peace was in sight.

The affection for him knows no boundaries among men. His appeal is universal and his lifetime of service to his fellow man had some impact on virtually every person on the face of the globe.

Dwight David Eisenhower marched through the history of his times with other great men—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Sir Winston Churchill, George C. Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Charles de Gaulle, and all of the others in the world's capitals and on its battlefields. And his warmth as a man, let alone his military and diplomatic skills, was the equal of any of his contemporaries and superior to most.

Let us not forget on this day what Dwight Eisenhower said to us at the end of his 8 years in the White House:

> To all of the peoples of the world I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration. We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease, and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth; and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

Today, leaders of the world have come to Washington to pay tribute to our 34th President. We are grateful for their display of affection and high regard for this truly great man. But the eulogy that would have meant most to him, however, would not come from such great figures, but from that citizen of the world whose simple but profound tribute today would be: "Dwight David Eisenhower was a good man."

Just before he died, Dwight Eisenhower said that he had always loved his wife, his children, his grandchildren, and his country.

I should like to express the deepest sorrow to Mamie Eisenhower, who had stood by his side for so many years, and who, in recent months, had borne the greatest part of the burden of the Nation and the world as the general's health failed. Her accomplishments, her dignity, and her greatness in what she had contributed to him through his lifetime should never be underestimated.

A very special relationship also existed between Dwight Eisenhower and his brother Milton. Often, during the course of his Presidency, he told me that Milton Eisenhower should have really been President. That showed the respect he had for his brother, to whom he turned many times for guidance and judgment.

Though he had a great respect for all the members of his family, there was a very special affection between Dwight Eisenhower and his brother Milton. I think every Member of this body would recognize the wonderful relationship those two men had.

So I extend particularly to my friend Milton Eisenhower my deep sorrow, but also a sense of gratitude in knowing how much he had been able to contribute to his brother.

On this day, when we join with his family in mourning their loss, we can say that his family, his friends, and his country will always love Dwight Eisenhower.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join Senators in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower. I first met General Eisenhower during the maneuvers in the Carolinas in the days before we became involved in the Second World War. Then I visited his headquarters in Belgium during the war. I visited him in Paris when he was in command of the newly established NATO forces. And, of course, I knew him here at home.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was an unusual person. To my way of thinking, he is one of the really great men of America. He had unusually great achievements in the military service, both as commanding officer of the Allied forces during the great crusade in Europe—a successful crusade, a crusade that was a victory not only for our country but for many of the countries that had been overrun and for many of the countries that had little hope of ever attaining freedom—and as Chief of Staff of the Army, after his assignment was over in the expeditions in Europe.

Then he became commander of the first NATO forces in Europe; and I think to him must go a great deal of credit for welding together the forces of the different countries participating in NATO.

Finally in that connection, I saw General Montgomery, on television, make a short statement in which he paid tribute to General Eisenhower. In spite of the differences that they sometimes had and the difficulties that they encountered in working together, he paid high tribute to General Eisenhower for the masterly job that he did in welding together the forces of the various countries in the Allied effort during World War II.

I was impressed by a statement that I heard made on TV last night when the representative of the Tunisian Government came to the microphones at Dulles Airport. He said that Tunis and all Tunisians were grateful to President Eisenhower because he had brought freedom to their country; and he said that, as a matter of fact, every freedom-loving person in the world owed a debt of gratitude to Dwight D. Eisenhower, because he had opened up so many countries that had little hope prior thereto.

President Eisenhower, after completing his service as head of the NATO forces, became President of the United States. I have said, in answer to questions put to me with reference to the 1952 campaign, that I felt that President Eisenhower was destined almost from the time he was nominated to be elected President, and that I believed it was because of the great, warm place that he had in the hearts of Americans, particularly the parents of American boys whom he had commanded in the crusade in Europe.

President Nixon, yesterday, in paying his eulogy to President Eisenhower, referred to something that was first said of President Washington—and, you know, when we think of the two, there are many similarities that can be drawn. He said that Dwight D. Eisenhower occupied the unusual place of being first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of the freedom-loving people all over the world for whom he had done so much.

I think that was a very fitting statement regarding President Eisenhower. I join with those who say that he was a man of great kindness, gentleness, and firmness in his convictions. He was a man of big heart, whom the American people came to love and whom, with hearts full of gratitude, they will always remember.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my fellow Senators in paying my respects to General Eisenhower and to the members of his family.

Volumes have been and will continue to be written about the achievements of this great American, Dwight David Eisenhower, but if it were all to be summed up in just a few words it would be to say: "General Eisenhower was a good man, a man of integrity, a man dedicated to the cause of peace, and one who took great pride in serving his country and his fellow man."

With his passing, free men everywhere have lost a good friend, but we can take comfort in the knowledge that our country and the world are better places in which to live as the result of his life.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a very solemn occasion we observe today, as the Nation prepares to bury one of the outstanding citizens of this century, General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower. It is fitting that every one of us pay tribute to him; for in thinking back over his remarkable life and reflecting upon his personal qualities, there is much we can learn as well as admire.

XUM

I believe that the words of a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., spoken about Theodore Roosevelt, can be said as well of Dwight Eisenhower:

> He was a great patriot, a great man; above all a great American. His country was the ruling mastering passion of his life from the beginning even unto the end.

General Eisenhower first became known to the American people when he was named Supreme Allied Commander in the European Theater in World War II. For those any younger than myself it is almost impossible to recreate the tension and the drama of those days. World War II was perhaps the last time when the unity of this Nation was complete and the private interests of our citizens subordinate to an overriding national cause. Many of us lost brothers, sons, and fathers in that war. But no one had any doubt about why these sacrifices had to be made. As the ships set out across the English Channel, bearing with them the hopes of free civilization; and as the President of the United States raised a simple prayer for their success to Almighty God, the Nation knew that the responsibility for developing and coordinating and seeing through what still stands as the most massive and difficult military operation in the history of the world, was in the hands of one man—Dwight Eisenhower.

What he did in those years made him a hero to all Americans and a liberator to many of the nations of the world. This gave him the overriding respect and popularity that allowed him to be a force for peace and world leadership.

General Eisenhower was a career soldier. He embodied the best qualities of the military as those qualities are expressed in the motto of the West Point he loved so much—in the words "duty, honor, country."

It is said that Americans neglect their military in times of peace and rush for its protection in time of danger. Watching the change from what the Armed Forces were in 1939 to what they became in 1942, General Eisenhower could certainly see merit in that view. But he believed—and he made it very clear in his actions and statements as President—that the Armed Forces, just as the executive and legislative branches of the Government, are servants of the people and that their preparations and activities must stay within the confines of public policy, even if that policy later turns out to be wrong. This is their duty to their country and it is what distinguishes a nation directed by its people from a people directed by their state.

As President of the United States for 8 years, General Eisenhower made significant accomplishments. He was the American President who negotiated an end to a war without insisting on capitulation. He made the first approaches toward a reduction of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union through his atoms-for-peace proposal. He created the first program for economic aid to Latin America. On major foreign policy decisions, like the reaction to the French defeat in Indochina and the military action in Suez, he exercised a wholesome restraint on our use of power.

Here at home he was the first President forced to use the power of the Federal Government to enforce the law of the land on equal opportunity in education, and he was instrumental in bringing about the acceptance by all political parties of the most basic domestic reforms accomplished since 1933. But in many ways his major accomplishment was that he helped to unify the United States and helped to calm it after a period of intense domestic conflict and bitterness. He led us through a useful period of tranquillity in which we prepared for new assaults upon our country's problems.

Many look back upon the Eisenhower years as a period of calm that will never again be with us. Perhaps, as Abraham Lincoln said:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are not adequate for the stormy present.

But certainly the qualities of personality that Dwight Eisenhower had—which had so much to do with his success—his religious faith, his humility and his candor, his ability to bring men together—certainly these examples can help us in the stormy present. And as Ralph Waldo Emerson said of Abraham Lincoln:

> His heart was as great as the world, there was no room in it to hold the memory of the wrongs.

And of course, Dwight Eisenhower's great personal courage in the face of declining health in the last few years stands as a great testimony to all his personal qualities—all of his courage.

It is in reflecting on these qualities, as well as on his life, that every American, on this solemn day of memory and prayer, can draw strength and hope from the life and example of Dwight David Eisenhower for the future.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today I sadly join the millions of mourners throughout the world who are paying tribute to the memory of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

From out of the volumes that have been written and from the new comments that are sure to be made, one single thread in the life of Dwight Eisenhower seems to me to have endured beyond all the other outstanding characteristics of this great man: That was his continuing contribution to world peace.

Many men have sought this elusive goal, but few have added so much to this massive effort that has consumed the talents and energies of so many over the ages.

I hope these remarks are free of vanity or are not too highly personalized—they are meant to be neither—when I point out that my generation is uniquely a product of the Eisenhower age.

I entered the Navy in World War II at the age of 17, in the midst of General Eisenhower's preparations for ultimate victory in Europe. I returned from the service to enter law school in the midst of the Korean war. Then followed his election to the Presidency and the end of the Korean hostilities.

My beginning years as a practicing lawyer were during the stability of the Eisenhower administration, and the focus of much of my effort and attention since coming to the U.S. Senate has been an effort to implement the Eisenhower-Strauss plan for a series of nuclear desalting plants to reach the root causes of conflict in the strife-torn Middle East.

I recall with pride and satisfaction my conversations with the former President Eisenhower, at his office at Gettysburg, about the philosophy and form of his grand proposal for the Middle East and his counsel and advice on measures calculated to bring about its implementation.

My store of experience and knowledge is richer, as is the country's and the world's, for the talents and the time of Dwight David Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family on my own behalf, on behalf of my wife, and on behalf of my mother, who served in Congress and was a friend of the Eisenhower family.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower's great strength as a leader was that the people had confidence in him.

He was trusted by the people of the United States as few men ever have been.

Virginia lays claim to a special relationship to Dwight Eisenhower. His mother, Ida Stover, was born and reared in Augusta County, about 10 miles south of Harrisonburg. It is interesting to note in passing that Abraham Lincoln's father was born about 10 miles north of Harrisonburg, in Rockingham County.

Ida Stover was born 107 years ago in a small white frame farm house near Fort Defiance, Augusta County. She lived the first 21 years of her life in that area. It was after the death of her parents that she went West and was one of the first women admitted to Lane College, Lecompton, Kans. It was there that she meet David Eisenhower, the general's father.

General Eisenhower was proud of his mother having been a Virginian. Addressing the Virginia Legislature in 1946, he opened his brief remarks with these words:

> It is one of the high honors of my life to return to a joint meeting of the Legislature of the State in which my mother was born and reared.

Virginians responded with affection to Dwight David Eisenhower. He was enormously popular in our State.

In the summer of 1948, the Democratic State convention called on General Eisenhower to seek the Democratic nomination for President—and the State convention pledged to the general its delegates' support at the Democratic National Convention to be held in Philadelphia.

Four years later, when Dwight Eisenhower was the presidential nominee of the Republican Party, he carried Virginia handily, and 4 years later increased his majority.

While he became the supreme commander of the greatest army in the history of the world and later President of the United States, the most powerful position in the world, he remained to

XUM

the end the same approachable, lovable "Ike."

Freeman Gosden, a native of Richmond, Va., who reached fame and fortune in California and was a neighbor and constant companion to General Eisenhower in Palm Springs, Calif., during recent years, gave me, last night, this interesting insight into the late President.

The former President, said Mr. Gosden, liked to shop in the supermarkets. Frequently he would gather his golfing companions, Mr. Gosden, Mr. George Allen, and sometimes Mr. Randolph Scott—who has many family connections in Jefferson County, W. Va.—and **would go to the local market to buy** groceries. He would pick out a cart, push it himself, make his purchases and instruct the butcher how to cut the beef. When he would be recognized and spoken to, he always would take off his hat with a bow to the lady speaking to him.

Yes; Dwight David Eisenhower walked with kings, but he never lost the common touch.

On Saturday, March 29, 1969, the Richmond Times-Dispatch published an editorial captioned: "Dwight David Eisenhower: A Greatly Beloved Leader." It was written by the longtime editor of the Times-Dispatch, now retired, Virginius Dabney.

It is so beautifully written, and it captures so well the spirit of our late President, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dwight David Eisenhower: A Greatly Beloved Leader

The world's most beloved man is dead. Dwight D. Eisenhower was not the most brilliant man of his time or the most erudite or the most widely read. But he had a personality which inspired affection throughout the globe. Wherever he went in the years after World War II, cries of "Ike" resounded on every hand, and signs bearing the words "We Like Ike" were widely displayed.

It was the affection and trust which he inspired, no less than the admiration, which made him an unbeatable Republican candidate for president in 1952 and 1956. The Democrats had been in power for 20 years, and they seemed destined to stay there for 20 more when General Eisenhower was persuaded to become a candidate.

His two terms gave the country a period of stability and orderly progress, free from wars and riots, which were in happy contrast to the hectic era in which we find ourselves today. So-called intellectuals were never happier than when ridiculing President Eisenhower—for his sometimes confused sentences at press conferences, his fondness for golf, and so on. But he gave the United States a welcome interlude from hopelessly unbalanced budgets and colossal and continuing deficit spending, from grafting "five percenters" and other chiselers, from perpetual catering to this or that bloc of voters.

HE CRUSHED HITLER

General Eisenhower's career in World War II made him one of the great military figures in American annals. His role as supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe imposed upon him the duty of deciding when to invade Hitler's "Festung Europa," in the face of German mines, bombs, shells, and machine guns.

Storms along the English Channel in early June, 1944, made the invasion potentially disastrous. But General Eisenhower got all the expert advice he could from every quarter, and then he alone decided, despite the obvious risks, to send the vast Allied armada through the channel fogs against the heavily fortified coast of Normandy on the early morning of June 6. The rest, the saying goes, is history.

Eisenhower was a world figure after the war, and both political parties wanted him to run for the presidency. After much pressure from numerous directions, he finally consented—primarily as a public duty. He had taken practically no part in politics up to that time. He decided to join the Republican party and to let his name be placed in nomination at the Republican National Convention of 1952. Once he got the nomination, he was unbeatable for two terms.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a "good" man, in the best sense of the word. His face bespoke honesty and integrity, and he looked you in the eye when he talked to you. His flashing smile was of well-nigh incredible dimensions, and lit up a room like a giant electric bulb.

He was never stuffy, never impressed with his own importance. He was considerate of the feelings of others, no matter how humble they might be. The latter trait is illustrated in an episode which occurred during "Ike's" presidency, at a dinner in the grand ballroom of the Statler Hotel in Washington.

A GENEROUS GESTURE

As the waiters were removing the dishes, one ill-fated waiter dropped an entire tray within a few feet of Mr. Eisenhower at the speaker's table. The tray hit the floor with a noise that sounded like an exploding bomb. Secret Service men leaped from behind potted palms, and the poor waiter stood there amid the debris, looking as though the end of the world had come.

"Ike" reached into his pocket, took out a couple of bills, and pressed them into the waiter's hand. Nobody saw him do it except the lady who was seated next him. It was a generous and characteristic gesture.

The jibes at President Eisenhower because he played golf fairly frequently were entirely uncalled for. Other Presidents have been similarly careful of their health, and they had to be, in order not to break themselves down.

In a conversation in 1947, when he was Army Chief of Staff, he revealed that whereas the bursitis in his left shoulder was much better, he had developed an arthritic condition in both forearms. The doctors had told him, he said, that if he didn't use them actively, the arms would atrophy.

So he said he had just taken golfing lessons in Florida from "Joe" Kirkwood, the professional, and added: "As soon as the weather opens up it'll be nine holes a day, or at least twice a week."

He did not seem alarmed over the prospect that his forearms might atrophy, and as matters turned out, they never did, presumably because he followed the advice of his doctors and played golf regularly from that time on.

The facts as to his arthritic forearms have never been published before, as far as we are aware. Why he did not make them known, and thereby avoid much unfair criticism is a mystery. We reveal them now in justice to General Eisenhower.

Statistics showed that he was not absent from his office any more than President John F. Kennedy, for example, if as much. Yet he was sneered at regularly and over the years because of his fondness for golf.

HE KNEW U.S. HISTORY

As for the charge that Mr. Eisenhower seldom read anything, he was more widely read than he got credit for. One expects a president of the United States to be well acquainted with American history, and especially with the administrations of predecessors in office. But when "Ike" was Army Chief of Staff, soon after World War II, with no thought of becoming president, he was nevertheless well versed in the history of the men who had occupied the White House. This was obvious to persons who talked with him informally at the time.

Virginia lays claim to a special relationship to Dwight Eisenhower, since his mother, Ida Stover, was born and grew up in Augusta County. Ida Stover's birth on May 1, 1862, took place in a small white frame farmhouse at the bottom of a hill near a creek in the area of Fort Defiance, 10 miles from Staunton. She lived there or nearby for the first 21 years of her life.

Ida Stover went West after the death of her parents, and was one of the first women admitted to Lane College, Lecompton, Kan. It was there that she met David Eisenhower, to whom she was later married. They moved to Texas, and seven sons were born to them. Dwight David was the most eminent, but each of the six who lived to manhood made his mark.

Many Virginians were not aware that Dwight Eisenhower's mother was a Virginian until 1946, when the General came to Richmond as aide to Winston Churchill, who addressed the Virginia General Assembly. Mr. Churchill made the principal address, but "Ike" almost stole the show with a brief talk made in response to repeated cries from the audience that he say something.

HIS VIRGINIA MOTHER

"Ladies and gentlemen," said General Eisenhower in opening his impromptu remarks, "it is one of the high honors of my life to return to a joint meeting of the legislature of the state in which my mother was born and reared." A few other equally simple and sincere sentences followed. The talk made as deep an impression as the more formal address of Mr. Churchill.

Dwight Eisenhower's early days in Denison, Tex., and Abilene, Kan., where his mother and father strove to rear and educate their six sons, influenced his future life for the better. The parents had difficulty making ends meet. The father was a railroad mechanic, a creamery worker, etc. The boys had to find jobs, help with the family chores, and so on. They came up the hard way, but they made it.

Dwight David Eisenhower became not only supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe in World War II, but president of the United States. None of these honors "went to his head" or caused him to "lose the common touch." He remained to the end, the same approachable, lovable "Ike," the man whom millions looked up to, and who left an indelible mark on American and world history.

V.D.

WE LOVED "IKE"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Nation has lost a great and dearly beloved citizen—one whose death seems to have taken a piece from each of our hearts. History will record that the people of the United States—of all political faiths—respected and trusted him more than any President of recent memory. He and his good wife and family maintained dignity, wholesomeness, and understanding in the White House and wherever they went.

Perhaps the most memorable day in my life occurred on May 13, 1965, when I spent an entire day with this great man. We flew out from Gettysburg together to Grinnell, Iowa, where he spent the day at Grinnell College, visiting the classrooms and answering questions, and capping it with a fine address to the entire student body that evening. He made similar campus visits on several occasions in his later years, because he had a deep affection for young people and wished to do what he could to help them face the responsibilities of good citizenship which would soon be theirs.

Our country is the better for what will be known as the Eisenhower years—years which have now ended but which should inspire all of us to be better citizens.

It will be written that we not only "liked Ike, but that we loved him."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, teeming and uncounted millions of people, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world, have a sense of genuine loss in the passing of the 34th President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

As I have listened to the tributes being paid to President Eisenhower in the Senate today, I have found wholehearted agreement with the eloquent references made to his greatness in war, his ennobling characteristics as a domestic leader, and his qualities of character.

By what strange circumstances do men rise to possess great leadership, great trust, and great affection in the hearts of their countrymen? One cannot prescribe a set formula. Life is not that simple. Political fortunes are not so achieved. It is, rather, by a strange and fortuitous combination of qualities, circumstances, and character.

President Eisenhower possessed qualities which endeared him to people. It was said eloquently by the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) today that Dwight David Eisenhower was a father to the country. I think he did have a father image to the country. But he also had a big brother image. He also had an image of companionship and friendship. If it would not be termed disrespectful, I would say he had the image of a jolly good fellow. He was a forthright man—nothing devious, deceptive, or dissembling about Mr. Eisenhower. People instinctively trusted him and identified themselves with the admirable attributes he exemplified.

Possibly, historians will not characterize him as an activist President, but I think it should be noted that he brought to the White House a conception of staff performance and a willingness and an ability to select good men, to vest confidence in those men, and to delegate to those men genuine responsibility. Perhaps more than any other President to his time, he institutionalized the office of the Presidency. Throughout his term he had keen disappointments but also notable successes. It would take a book adequately to treat with this man.

Permit me to close, Mr. President, by saying that in my opinion he was one of the most beloved Americans of all time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in expressing my great grief at the passing of our beloved friend, great general, and great President.

In periods of deep grief, such as we are experiencing today, we mortals are often inclined to compensate for our sorrow by allowing our thoughts to revert to happier times.

Like many of my fellow Americans, I, too, have found much needed consolation in the personal memories I associate with our former President's halcyon days.

In particular, I have found a measure of solace in reminiscing about the particularly cheerful periods when I had the privilege of serving him during the inaugural ceremonies for the newly elected President in 1952, and again for the reelected President 4 years later—the Lincoln Birthday celebrations, the closed-circuit dinners, the informal gatherings at the White House. Those were the happier days, and I shall always cherish them as being among the most enjoyable moments of my life.

I recall a luncheon at Palm Springs, where the host at the luncheon was General Eisenhower. Also present was the son of a former President, Herbert Hoover, Jr.

A group of 10 friends met for lunch to decide whether I should become a candidate for the Senate or not.

One of my friends at the luncheon pointed out, "You have never run for office before. You'll have no chance."

General Eisenhower, pointing to Herbert Hoover, Jr., said, "His father had never run for elective office, and I had never run for elective office. We both got elected President of the United States. Therefore, that should be no objection. Now, what's the next order of business?"

I am pleased to say that it was on that day I decided to become a candidate.

I mention these things today because my recollections, I think, are typical of the reactions of people from San Diego to Bangor, and from Seattle to Miami, all of whom felt a rare and inspiring closeness with this understanding and compassionate man.

For each of us, General Eisenhower was something special—something deeply and intensely personal.

In my case, as I have said, I like to think of those happier inaugural days, especially in 1952.

At the same time, I cannot help remember that those were also days in which we were engaged in a long, bloody war in Korea, and we were weary of the long casualty lists and the apparent failure of our efforts to obtain a timely, just, honorable peace.

These days we sometimes hear people say, "Beware of the judgment of military men." I would remind them that this was a man whose life was dedicated to the military, and who brought us more peace than any other man during my lifetime.

On the domestic scene, there was the restless uncertainty that always accompanies wartime stresses and tensions.

If ever in our history there was a need for a man of heroic principles and inflexible strength, it was in those bleak days of late 1952 and early 1953; and we, as a nation, turned to the man we had just elected as our President to provide us with the leadership and example we so sorely needed.

History has long since written the formal record of his foreign and domestic successes.

But somehow the factual accounts of the archives seem today to be strangely out of place, cold and insufficient.

For example, we remember mainly in this hour how "I like Ike" was transformed from a political slogan into a personal expression of the national spirit—a spirit based on trust, hope, and integrity.

We remember, too, the Eisenhower years of peace, but within our souls we recognize that the legacy of that era is not only a devotion to the cause of peace, but also, and just as important, a national dedication to the principle that international tranquillity must be accompanied by honor and justice.

In addition, we remember the important domestic progress of the Eisenhower years. But once again the official transcripts fail to tell the entire story; for what we have today, which is even more important than the laws and precedents themselves, is a renewed conviction that social advances must be based on the dignity of the individual rather than the enhancement of the State.

Yes, the most enduring record of General Eisenhower's greatness has been indelibly inscribed, not only in our tomes and records, but also in our hearts and souls and minds, for all time.

For each of us, it is a most personal heritage.

For the Nation as a whole, it is a priceless gift, for he reminded us as no other man has ever done that the State is only as strong as the individuals who compose it.

This was a great, beloved, courageous, kind man.

May he enjoy that special peace reserved for the soldier who has fought the gallant fight and returned to his rightful home.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the entire family in this period of national grief. This is a sad day for our Nation, but it should be a day of rejoicing, because once again we have sent a man to history in whom we can all take great pride.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as I recall Dwight David Eisenhower, I can best recall special qualities of him, as a man, which I believe were basic to his greatness as a world leader.

One of these was his ability to inspire others to have confidence in him and to respect him as a man of integrity and a true disciple of peace, both in his own time and in future time, for the people of his Nation and of the world. Another very great quality of his—his inner strength—made it possible for him to marshal his inner resources to meet the demands upon his thoughts and his physical self, so often heavily placed upon him.

As supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force in World War II, as president of Columbia University, and ultimately as Chief Executive of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower believed in peace throughout the world; and in his leadership in the interests of peace, he became, as he has been often titled, "truly a citizen of the world."

Although a professional soldier, an expert in the direction of armies, he by his nature was first and foremost a humani-

XUM

tarian devoted to the well-being of his fellow man.

This attitude, so basic to his character, was demonstrated in March 1945, just before American Forces crossed the Rhine.

On the particular occasion about which the anecdote has been told and retold, General Eisenhower noted a young soldier who appeared worried and despondent. He approached him and asked, "How are you feeling, son?"

"General," came back the answer, "I'm awful nervous. I was wounded 2 months ago and just got back from the hospital yesterday. I don't feel so good," said the soldier.

"Well," said Eisenhower, "You and I are a good pair, because I am nervous, too. Maybe if we just walk along together to the river we will be good for each other."

This humility, this common bond with those who served under him, was to endear him to millions, and was to become one of the most widely recognized attributes of this very great soldier and dedicated public servant.

Yet, although Dwight Eisenhower had great compassion for others, his own character allowed him no self-pity. When he was only 16, this self-discipline was to serve him well. Blood poisoning developed in his left leg and, as it spread, doctors urged amputation, saying that it was his leg or his life. But this future commander of armies, this future great leader of men and nations, from the depth of his own inborn discipline, refused to have the operation and through his determination and faith was able to walk out of his room on two healthy legs just 3 weeks later.

This same inner strength was exhibited time and again during World War II, when his decisions were responsible for the success of campaigns against the Germans.

It was exhibited when President Eisenhower, in pursuit of peace, flew to Paris for the North Atlantic Council meeting after having suffered a stroke only days before. Although this determined gesture could very probably have brought on another siege of illness, Eisenhower ignored the possible consequences, shouldered his burdens, and applied decisive and imaginative leadership to the critical affairs of state at that period.

Yet Eisenhower was never known, apparently, to be overly imbued with his personal importance. It is said that he approached his tasks as president of Columbia University in a vein of humility and some anxiety as to his ability to do a job so very different from that to which he had devoted his long military career. Having accepted the appointment because of his conviction that he could do a great service for the youth of America through the advancement of education, he nonetheless felt concerned as to his ability to do justice to his new tasks.

At one time, it is reported that this early anxiety which he had felt was mentioned to him after a reception at one of Columbia's affiliated colleges. A professor confided:

> You know, General, when we heard you were coming here, some of the faculty were downright scared of you.

General Eisenhower is reported to have replied:

> The faculty would have been reassured to know I was scared to death of them.

It is a matter of history now that General Eisenhower, unsure though he might have been about his new position, nonetheless turned in a good performance. He has been credited with being a superb administrator who supported orderly academic freedom and campus democracy.

I have on occasions during recent months thought that had General Eisenhower been president of Columbia University during these times of student unrest, current on our Nation's campuses and universities, he would have set a tone of self-discipline and responsible leadership which might well have provided a model for similar behavior in our Nation's academic councils.

Eisenhower is gone. Myriad legends about him will be told and retold. The Eisenhower legend will last as long as our country does—a country which is better and nobler for his having lived, and served, and died as an American.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's passing has saddened the hearts of all Americans. As a general, he occupied one of the most important military assignments in the history of the Nation, that of commander of all Allied European forces in World War II. His superb handling of this difficult assignment made him a hero to people everywhere.

As President of the United States, he had a way about him that commanded the respect and admiration of people in every walk of life. No President was more loved and respected than he. He will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents.

It was when he was President that I came to know Dwight Eisenhower best. As one of the Republican leadership of the Senate, I met with him quite often on important national and international matters. It was always a great inspiration to meet with him.

Dwight Eisenhower had a way about him that in the eyes of most people he could do no wrong. There was a reason for this. Besides having a wonderful personality, he was a very honest and courageous man who had natural good judgment and good sense. It was these qualities that people all over the world recognized and appreciated.

Because of the great respect and esteem the American people had for him, he was probably the only President in our history who could have been elected on either the Republican or the Democratic ticket.

It was a great tribute to him that his popularity, and the esteem in which people everywhere held him, continued long after he left public office and until his death.

He will be remembered through history as a beloved, great leader of a great nation. This is a sad day for all of us. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and all of his wonderful family.

(At this point, Mr. PEARSON assumed the chair.)

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the foremost military leader of his time, had many great attributes. But his greatest achievement was peace. He was a five-star general; yet he accomplished more peace in his 8 years as President than did his civilian predecessors and successors at the White House.

He was a man of peace. He was a leader of peace. He was an achiever of peace. What greater achievement can any mortal being have given to his fellow human beings.

It was on this note of peace that my association with him first started. He asked me in August 1952, to write an article for the Woman's Home Companion on why he should be elected President. I did, and in it stressed his desire and capability for peace.

He made other requests of me. I granted every request he made. The only one I now regret and feel that I made a mistake on was when he called me from Camp David and asked me to vote for the Dixon-Yates contract and said that my vote would mean a great deal to him personally.

I am sure that I cast many votes that displeased him. It has been widely reported that two of my votes greatly disappointed and displeased him. But he never expressed his displeasure to me and did not contact me either before or after those two votes.

Such was a measure of this man of peace who refrained from giving vent to his feelings concerning those who disappointed him and those who attacked him.

This morning on the NBC-TV "Today" program, William Monroe observed that while George Washington could not tell a lie about cutting down the cherry tree, Dwight Eisenhower would not tell a lie about the U-2 spy plane flying over Russia.

His honesty in this crisis brought down on his head the sharpest political attacks ever made on him. Some persons apparently felt that at long last he had made a serious political error that could be greatly politically exploited.

There were those who charged Dwight D. Eisenhower with being senile, lazy, and having disgraced the United States in this matter; and there were those who publicized such charges and represented them as documentation of the thinking of the people at the grassroots.

Dwight D. Eisenhower never defended himself against such slurs. He never replied in kind.

Yet there were those critics who charged that he was unduly sensitive to criticism—that he was hypersensitive. If he was, he never displayed such hypersensitivity.

But he was sensitive—and I am proud that he was—because that very sensitivity made him the thoughtful, responsive, and warm human being that he was.

Last September and October I was a

fellow patient in ward 8 at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center with him. Through the attending doctors and nurses we kept informed on each other's respective progress and exchanged messages of cheer and encouragement.

On his birthday I gave him some of the new super solid state golf balls to symbolize my confidence that he would recover enough to return to his favorite pastime. He gave me some of his birthday cake.

During these 2 months it was my privilege to get to know Mrs. Eisenhower better. Very thoughtfully she would stop by my room to cheer me. We had some most enjoyable conversations, and in getting to know her better I could certainly have a greater appreciation of the saying that behind every great man there is a woman.

I came to know Mamie Eisenhower for the great woman that she is. I saw her, day by day, maintain her constant and dedicated vigil. I saw her maintain an undaunted courage and cheerfulness that lifted the spirit of the entire ward 8. I know that her spirit and her kindness helped to accelerate my own mending and recovery.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's will to live was a medical marvel—almost a medical miracle. But I am sure that one reason his brave, but weakening, heart wondrously rallied so many times was that his devoted wife at his bedside gave so much of her own heart to him to help carry the necessary strength of heart for recovery.

Yes, Dwight D. Eisenhower was a man of peace. He planned and fought for peace. He lived for peace. And he died in peace—in the peace of the mind that he had not only fought the good fight for peace but that few mortals had ever achieved as much peace for as many people as he did.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the great things a President does are repeated a thousand times over after his death but I have always felt that it was the everyday things of life and the attention paid to smaller matters which characterize a man.

President Eisenhower's deeds which affected the Nation and the world will be repeated for generations to come and his praises will be sung by all people and all nations, so I would like to recite a few small events which I believe portrayed his character as much as the invasion of Germany, as much as the end of World War II, or the 8 years of peace and progress for which his administration is so well remembered.

It was after the war and before he became a candidate for President that I was driving along the road in northern Vermont with my radio tuned to the Canadian Broadcasting System.

General Eisenhower was making a speech, as I recall, in Toronto.

Where he made it does not matter, but what he said has remained in my mind ever since.

He said in effect that his greatest ambition in life was to put men in his line of work out of business.

After he was elected President and had been inaugurated, I wrote him a note which said in effect that I would not attempt to tell him how to run the Government of the United States, but that I would be available if I could help him at any time.

I did not call at the White House very often, and then only when matters of importance required the President's attention.

At the time he took office, the agricultural attachés of our embassies abroad were used largely as guides for very important persons visiting those countries.

Some of them knew very little about agriculture and were not expected to.

Representative Hope, of Kansas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I called on the President one morning to tell him that a change should be made in this system.

He listened to us and without hesitation called the State Department and stated that from then on he wanted the agricultural attachés to have the same standing as the military attachés in foreign countries.

Since that time they have been among our most effective representatives abroad.

At another time a serious agricultural problem arose. At this time, I cannot even remember what the problem was, but I do remember well the circumstances. It was Saturday noon when I learned of it, and action had to be taken before 9 o'clock Monday morning. The Secretary of Agriculture had gone to the mountains to spend a weekend.

Ordinarily, one would not have expected to find top officials at the White House or even in Washington on Saturday afternoon.

I took a chance and called the White House. The President responded almost immediately. I told him the problem.

He said, in characteristic fashion, "I will look after it myself."

Secretary Benson was called back from his weekend vacation and the problem was solved by 8 o'clock Monday morning.

On only one occasion did I see President Eisenhower lose his poise.

At that time he literally went through the ceiling expressing his opinion of the war contractors who were currently exerting great pressure upon the Defense Department.

By his actions at that time he clearly expressed himself as believing human life to be of greater value than war contracts.

These are some of the incidents which characterize the man Dwight Eisenhower.

The pages of history will not record them, but to me they were of marked significance.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for more than a quarter of a century, Dwight Eisenhower has been a familiar and well-loved name in American homes and in distant lands around the globe.

It is a name associated with historic events and historic achievements; with great leadership; with the skills which led us to victory in war; and with a deep-seated urge to lead mankind toward peace.

Above all, however, he was a man and a human being whose quality and character made a deep and lasting impact upon each of us.

To those of us who served in World War II, he was more than a superlative military leader. He was a man whose warmth, simplicity, and sturdiness were reassuring, inspiring, and comforting.

To all of us, his postwar leadership in Europe, as the first commander of NATO, represented an appropriate conversion of his talent for leadership from war to his unceasing search for peace.

It was understandable and inevitable, notwithstanding the frustration of his political opposition, that he should be called to the Presidency.

And again, in the 8 years of his Presidency, it was the quality of the man which we remember most—his capacity to inspire the trust and confidence of his people.

It was because his countrymen believed him to be a good man that they entrusted him with leadership and responded to it.

And it is thus that we will remember him—a good man who loved his countrymen and who was loved by them.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we shall long remember Dwight David Eisenhower as a soldier whose victories won the peace; as a President whose abilities brought confidence in a time of increasing fear; and as a man whose entire life was characterized by integrity, courage, and, above all, faith. We have all shared in the warmth of his personality and in the depth of his spirit. In a time of growing impersonalization, he brought to the Office of President a personal vitality and singular devotion which were a constant source of inspiration for all Americans. Just 17 years ago, General Eisenhower spoke to the Republican National Convention and the Nation in words which are a fitting tribute to his own life as well as a guideline for our future.

> None of us—

He said:

> has known of a time that has placed a higher premium on statesmanship—on courage, competence, and leadership—on solid commonsense, on willingness to subordinate self to the general good.

And so it was with Ike.

During his service as supreme commander of the Allied Forces during World War II, our servicemen, including myself, discovered in the general a continual source of reassurance and confidence. We placed our faith in Eisenhower—faith in his judgment, faith in his wisdom, and faith in his courage.

In the years following that war, America found itself wandering, doubting, and unsure of its future. Destiny called Dwight Eisenhower again; it called him because he was worthy of the people's faith. Our Nation knew that Eisenhower as President would bring wise, calm leadership and reassurance during that crucial decade. The accomplishments of those years are often overlooked with the rapidly increasing pace of change in our world. But let us recall that it was President Eisenhower who ended the Korean war; promoted desegregation in our Armed Forces; won passage of the first civil rights bill in 80 years; enforced the orders of the Federal courts to desegregate our school system; established the Department of Health, Education,

XUM

and Welfare; initiated efforts to encourage social progress in Latin America; and proposed the Atoms for Peace program to the U.N.

Yet the true contribution of Dwight Eisenhower is to be found not in these significant accomplishments of administration, but in his qualities of character.

The faith that the people of our land placed in President Eisenhower was matched by his faith in the people of the world. In his good will trips throughout the globe, President Eisenhower conveyed the warmth and openness of the American people to the citizens of the world community. His originating of the people-to-people programs demonstrated his belief that the bond of mankind can overcome the barriers of nation, race, and ideology.

In his farewell address to the Nation in January of 1961, President Eisenhower demonstrated wisdom and foresight which must be carefully pondered by our Nation today. As an academic leader and former President of Columbia University, it was President Eisenhower who cautioned us about the threat to academic freedom posed by the Government's growing involvement in university research. As our greatest military leader of the century, it was President Eisenhower who first warned against the alarming growth and influence of our defense industry.

But again, let us remember Dwight Eisenhower as a man of faith. The citizens of our Nation found him worthy of their faith, and he constantly demonstrated his faith in his fellowmen. But these qualities were rooted in a far more fundamental commitment. Dwight Eisenhower placed a quiet, confident, and firm faith in God. It was Eisenhower's spirit which we shall remember. His personal devotion and trust in his Creator is his greatest and most lasting quality.

Today the general lies in the Capitol as thousands pass by to pay their tribute. On January 20, 1953, Dwight Eisenhower was also at the Capitol. He rose to give his inaugural address. Before he began, he asked for the privilege of offering his own personal prayer. Let us always remember him standing there and steadfastly praying these words:

> Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment my future associates in the Executive branch of Government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng, and their fellow citizens everywhere.
>
> Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby, and by the laws of this land. Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people regardless of station, race or calling.
>
> May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political faiths; so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and Thy glory. Amen.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Nation mourns the passing of President Dwight David Eisenhower.

Today I speak for myself as an American, as an individual citizen, and as a representative in this august body of the State of Alabama and her people.

The people loved, admired, and respected President Eisenhower. They had confidence in him. They trusted him. They felt that they knew him; that he was their friend; that he stood for all that was best for them and their country.

They felt that to him a public office was truly a public trust.

He was a man above partisanship; above sectionalism. He was a man from the people, a man of the people, a man for the people—all of the people.

Let us all profit by the example that he set, by the high road that he followed throughout life.

Of him it can truly be said—in the words of Rudyard Kipling in setting some of the attributes of a real man—he could "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch."

Americans and the free world are poorer because of his passing, but richer because of his life among us.

On behalf of the people of Alabama and of Mrs. Allen and myself, I extend heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the Eisenhower family.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, General Eisenhower will long be remembered for many things. His long and distinguished career as a soldier and as a statesman leaves a legacy of noteworthy accomplishments. In my judgment, however, one quality of General Eisenhower's stood out. That quality was his ability to win the affection of people—both of those who knew him and of the public. "I like Ike" was more than a political slogan. It summed up the warmth and respect which people had for General Eisenhower and which was his greatest strength.

In political life all men aspire to a certain degree of popularity. It is, of course, a prerequisite to even limited success in service in government, but General Eisenhower's popularity was more significant and deeper than that which comes to most political figures. It characterized his distinguished military career. During World War II, I served in the First Army in Europe under General Eisenhower. There is no question that he was held in great esteem by the soldiers and that this was a tremendous asset to him. Later when I served as national president of the Reserve Officers Association, I had the privilege of having a number of conferences with President Eisenhower at the White House. He was courteous, friendly, and helpful. From his own personal experience he realized the importance of the Reserves to the Nation. During World War II, 98 percent of the Army and 85 percent of the Navy consisted of citizen soldiers. He favored the Reserve program because he knew firsthand of its importance to the Nation.

Mr. President, the popularity which General Eisenhower enjoyed was important to the Nation when he served as President. The personal qualities of General Eisenhower—his warmth, his dignity, his integrity, and the response these qualities inspired in the public—were of great importance in unifying the American people. The personal bitterness and abusive language which unfortunately have become more a part of political life in the last few years, were largely absent during Dwight Eisenhower's tenure as President, and much of this must be due to the kind of man that President Eisenhower was. His political enemies might disagree with him but nevertheless they liked him.

Mr. President, more than any other American in the 20th century, General Eisenhower commanded the affection and respect of all the people of the United States. All of us are saddened by the passing of this brave soldier, great statesman, and renowned world figure. All through his career he was supported, fortified, and encouraged by his lovely wife, Mamie Eisenhower, who was an inspiration to him—in every activity in which he engaged. My sympathy is with Mrs. Eisenhower and the other members of the family in this time of sorrow. I know that they are comforted by the knowledge that President Eisenhower gave so much of himself to his God, his country, and his fellow man.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, A GENERAL OF PEACE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower was a general at war, but a man of peace. He was a man who worked to end wars and to prevent wars.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, after World War II, sought the world to follow the Biblical injunction to beat swords into plowshares and spears into pruninghooks. After World War II, he followed the advice of Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Though he admonished this, it fell to Eisenhower to lead a great army in the biggest war in the history of mankind. History records the great battles of World War II won under the leadership of Eisenhower in the crusade in Europe. People have recorded in their hearts the memory of Eisenhower, the supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe, taking time to visit the men who would do the fighting, just before the invasion forces started to France, and of his visits to them across Europe as the lines of battle advanced. It was this humaneness that set him apart and above the average man. It was evident to all who knew Eisenhower as a soldier, that his quest was peace, not military victories only.

It was my privilege and honor and duty to serve under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the crusade in Europe. I was a staff officer of the 97th Infantry Division in that war, serving in several different armies and corps, as we were transferred from sector to sector of the fighting front, ending up on V-E Day on the road to Pilsen, in Czechoslovakia. All

XUM

who served in the vast Allied armies in the crusade in Europe for the freedom of mankind felt the impact of the Eisenhower personality. Perhaps the greatest of all of his accomplishments was his ability to get men of different nations and languages to work harmoniously together in a common cause. As one admirer said:

> Eisenhower knew how to work with people and he knew how to get people to work together.

He had the knack of tact, to hold divergent forces together and to keep them working together.

The author John Gunther visited General Eisenhower in France in 1951, when Eisenhower was head of supreme headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe. Gunther came from that meeting and wrote, not of great war plans, but of Eisenhower the man, saying:

> He has been a soldier all his life, but believes in peace. He does not stand for war, but for defense against war.

Eisenhower achieved a great victory in Europe in World War II. He later went back to Europe to build forces which would preserve peace, preserve it without fighting.

As a newly elected President, Eisenhower brought about a settlement of a shooting war in Korea.

Through all of this, moments of great strain and moments of great triumph, Eisenhower remained a man of the people.

He never forgot or ignored his birthplace in Texas or his home in Kansas where he grew to manhood. It was this tie to the heartland of America which kept President Eisenhower first in the esteem of his countrymen. People instinctively liked General Eisenhower. All were touched by his ready smile.

It was this fondness which people felt for Eisenhower which has made his death such a sad, personal event for the people of this country. People admired him for his achievements, but they loved him for himself.

No man could ask for a greater tribute than the love and esteem the people of this country have for Dwight David Eisenhower.

The love of his fellow man is the tribute to Eisenhower, the man. The peace he won and preserved is the tribute to President Eisenhower, the soldier-statesman.

The Bible says, "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God." While his critics were screaming for a war with China, and accusing him of a no-win policy, Eisenhower had the judgment, the wisdom, the humaneness, the greatness to save America and the world from a long, bloody war in Asia. For this, the American people should and will love him always.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I think that all of us at this time, for reasons that run very deep, are saddened by the death of General Eisenhower. However, it seems to me that the overriding fact that comes to the minds of all of us when we think about the life of President Eisenhower is the strange and providential way in which man seems to be called by our country and by the world for leadership when he is desperately needed.

This has been true throughout the history of our country, and throughout the history of the world—else, probably mankind would not have survived as long as it has.

If ever the world needed a leader, if ever our country in its history needed a leader, it was at the time we discovered how to destroy all mankind, including ourselves.

I do not believe anyone could have come to the helm of government in the United States more profoundly qualified for leadership in the transition from what we might call the world of innocence to a world in which man's survival lay in his own hands and better fulfill the role which was demanded of him than General Eisenhower.

He was not a deeply intellectual man, and he was often derided by sophisticates as an amiable buffoon, which only goes to prove how inadequate sophisticates are in dealing with the great problems of the world and of society.

President Eisenhower had a kind of intuitive sense of what was necessary in the gravest matters that put him uniquely into a position of world leadership as well as, of course, the leadership of our country. He articulated and made it acceptable to the people of this country and, I think, of the world, too, that atomic war could no longer be tolerated, that confrontation between the great powers in the direct sense would no longer be possible, that that sort of war unthinkable.

He sensed this, and he made it stick. It is now accepted doctrine. And men have found that they can live in such a world.

We will always be blessed with the guidance which he gave us on that issue which, I think, was the greatest contribution any man could possibly have given any nation or the world.

It is for this intuitive understanding of what human respect required and his ability to make that understanding common property that I think he will go down in history.

We are lucky in our time to have found the leader that our time required.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower has removed from this earthly scene a man who possessed to an unprecedented degree the love and confidence of the American people and the respect of the entire world. His services as President have been greatly underrated and with the passing time his stature will loom larger and larger among the 37 who have served in that position.

The confidence of the average citizen in Dwight Eisenhower should renew the hopes of every American for the future of our country. His faith in the patriotism and judgment of our people in the mass was probably greater than that of any President since Jefferson. He sought and held our highest political office without being a politician. His sincerity and integrity were so transparent that he did not find it necessary to come up with a new program every day in the effort to buy the good will and support of some special group.

Being human, he made mistakes and, being too trusting, he was at times betrayed by those whom he had trusted. But his great decency and honesty shone through the miasma of demagoguery and promises of "something for nothing" which mark politicians of this period and were completely comprehended by the vast majority of our people.

It was my high privilege to know President Eisenhower personally over a long span of years. I admired him as a man and was grateful for his friendship. I share the sorrow that is common to all who knew him and worked with him, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my first memory of General Eisenhower was when as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, I visited NATO headquarters in 1951. We were briefed by him over a period of days. I returned from Paris convinced that the Nation needed him as its President. I was one of the 19 Members of the House who joined in a letter asking him to return and be a candidate. After he consented, I became one of the delegates from New Hampshire pledged to his cause.

It was my privilege to serve, first in the House and then in the Senate, during those 8 years when nations that had long before learned the firmness of his purpose and felt the magic of his name remained at peace. No American boy perished under gunfire anywhere in the world.

Like President Nixon, my most vivid memory of General Eisenhower is his first inauguration. In my scrapbook, where I keep the utterances I have heard and will never forget, are the words he spoke that day:

> The peace we seek signifies more than stilling the guns, easing the sorrow of war. More than an escape from death, it is a way of life. More than a haven for the weary, it is a hope for the brave.
>
> This is the hope that beckons us onward in this century of trial. This is the work that awaits us all to be done with bravery, with charity—and with a prayer to Almighty God.

He was a great soldier, but a far greater apostle of peace.

Now he is at peace. May peace come to the country he loved and led.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a great man moves on to immortality as Dwight David Eisenhower passes from history's living page.

From a life crowded with service for others, he will be remembered under many names—President, general, edu-

XUM

cator, author, family man, and by the universal and affectionate title of "Ike."

This seems to personify the humble and democratic heart of a man who walked with kings.

I would turn back the pages of time to December 8, 1953, for an Eisenhower date and deed I shall always remember.

On that day President Eisenhower gave an astonished General Assembly of the United Nations his proposal of "atoms for peace." He assured them that the United States would join with all interested nations—including Communist Russia—in cooperative research into the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Out of this proposal came the International Atomic Energy Agency within whose framework we have studied and striven for effective nuclear restraints.

Dwight Eisenhower—a man of highest military stature, a man of deepest humanity—was essentially a man of peace.

A worried world sought his counsel.

His judgment will be missed.

Mr. **ALLOTT.** Mr. President, the last battle for a great general has ended and our Nation has suffered the loss. All of us, young and old, mourn the passing of General Eisenhower.

He stood for so much that has made America what it is today: dedication, public service, military bravery, commonsense, and devotion to God and country.

Like all men of his stature, his service to his Nation is appreciated more today than it was while he occupied the important positions of responsibility which filled his lifespan. History will appreciate Ike even more.

I knew him well, and with all who served with him in government I respected him and his principles, just as he respected the principles which made America great.

That he lived as long as he did is a final tribute to his spirit for life. Many a weaker man would have given up long ago. Ike was a fighter and he fought until the end.

While his passing was not unexpected, it nevertheless is a trial to all those who knew and loved him. Welda and I join the whole Nation in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife, Mamie, and the whole Eisenhower family.

Mr. **RANDOLPH.** Mr. President, shortly after the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower on Friday, March 28, I issued the following statement:

> Former President Dwight Eisenhower was a soldier and statesman who served our Republic in war and in peace.
>
> Americans admired the general for his fortitude and faith.
>
> I recall his personal and official kindness and consideration during the years I was in the Senate during his administration.

IKE—A HERO FOR ALL TIME

Mr. **MUNDT.** Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the President of the United States shared with the world the moving last words of Dwight Eisenhower as spoken to his wife on the day he died:

> I've always loved my wife, I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren and I've always loved my country.

Less than two dozen words are contained in those brief sentences.

But what immense sweep these words have, for they tell us all that we need ever know about the man and what he has meant to this country and what the people of this country—all humanity, in fact—meant to him.

Virtually every trust of leadership that could be demanded of a man was given him.

And because of that victorious leadership in war, bringing us victory and peace, and his successfully ending yet another war in far-off Korea—virtually every honor that could be bestowed upon Dwight Eisenhower was his.

We knew him as the general who directed the greatest military operation of all time in bringing to defeat the forces of oppression and tyranny which had enveloped Europe.

We knew him as the supreme commander of NATO who brought the Western nations together again as the impenetrable shield to prevent another massive, destructive war.

We knew him as the President who brought an end to another war in Korea and then kept the peace—an era of peace longer than any this Nation has known for three decades.

But we all knew—and the world knew—Dwight Eisenhower best as "Ike."

And those last words of Dwight Eisenhower—telling of his great love—define for us more clearly than all of the books written about him, all of the articles devoted to his life, and all of the eulogies spoken of him, why "Ike" will remain in the hearts of Americans a hero for all time.

When Dr. Billy Graham learned of the death of General Eisenhower, he described the former President as the greatest American since Abraham Lincoln.

I think Dr. Graham has captured in his description exactly the sentiments felt by the citizens of this country, as well as those of free peoples everywhere, who believe Dwight Eisenhower personified the American ideal of the love of liberty which has stood continually as a beacon to the oppressed and a barrier to the oppressor.

Mr. President, those of us who have had the honor to serve in one capacity or another with Dwight Eisenhower have been privileged beyond expectation. I shall always cherish my days in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in which I had the opportunity to be a member of those committees which conferred with him during his years of military service, and during those years in which he served as our President.

Mr. President, Mrs. Mundt joins with me today in extending our sympathies to the family of Dwight Eisenhower, the great man, who, as President Nixon said, came from both the geographical and the spiritual heart of America.

Because of him, truly, we are the richer in spirit.

Mr. **McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, when I learned that General Eisenhower had passed on, Mrs. McClellan and I promptly dispatched a wire to Mrs. Eisenhower extending to her and members of the family our deepest sympathy and prayerful expression that they would be comforted and sustained in this time of their greatest bereavement. Some excerpts from that message of condolence can be appropriately repeated in my remarks today.

I stated to her that "General Eisenhower was a patriotic, courageous, and valiant soldier who led the mighty forces of the free world to victory over aggression and conquest" in World War II. I also said that "he was a statesman of understanding, patience, and wisdom who brought calmness and hope to a troubled world." And that "the exemplary and forceful qualities of leadership that he provided as President instilled confidence and inspired peoples and nations to exert greater and more dedicated efforts in the cause of peace and tranquillity among nations."

I further emphasized that he "earned and received the respect and esteem of the American people and was admired and beloved by them to a degree unexcelled by any other great leader or President of this generation."

Mr. President, his passing is a great loss to humanity. He contributed much to the social and cultural progress of our people and steered the ship of state, when he was at the helm, in the direction of a higher civilization and a better and safer world. These sentiments I record with deepest sincerity and out of a reverent respect and esteem for him as a man, as a citizen, and as one of America's greatest leaders of our time and generation.

Mr. **JORDAN** of Idaho. Mr. President, because of his long and grave illness the news of General Eisenhower's death comes as no surprise. Even so, the acute sense of loss is not lessened for the respect he had is universal.

The world has lost a great soldier and statesman, our Nation has lost a beloved leader, and all of us have lost a wise counselor and friend.

The life of General Eisenhower is a splendid example of American achievement. Perhaps only in America can a boy, born of humble, God-fearing parents, rise to such heights of leadership in war and in peace.

I shall always prize my personal contacts with him, starting with the kickoff of his 1952 presidential campaign from the capitol steps in Boise when I was Governor. On his invitation I came to Washington, D.C., to be Chairman of the International Joint Commission and to work in related problems in natural resources.

He has made a great contribution to the world he served in time of crisis, and to the country he loved with such fervor and served with utmost dedication. He will be remembered, not only for his record which speaks for itself, but for the fact that for all his work with national and world leaders, and the tremendous power he wielded over the course of history, he still kept the humility and the common touch and the sense of humor of the smalltown boy from Kansas.

"I LIKE IKE" WAS THE SENTIMENT OF A NATION

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, no American in this century inspired in people all over the world the love and trust General Eisenhower inspired. He was a good and gentle man, a man of

XUM

peace and compassion, a man of monumental integrity and honesty.

Ike had a genius for unifying disparate personalities into a working and effective team. This was his great strength as commander of the largest military force in history, a force which liberated half a continent from the Nazi tyranny. It was one of his great strengths as President.

He brought to the White House a dignity and a sense of honor that elevated the Presidency in the eyes of the people.

He had nothing but scorn for those public men who engaged in demagoguery and character assassination.

Ike did not regard the Presidency as a bully pulpit. He did not believe the President should dominate the other coequal branches of the Government in making national policy. Many disagreed with that view. But one must pay it high respect.

The man who led allied forces against the blackest example of one-man rule in modern history surely had ample reason to mistrust the concentration of political power in the hands of one individual.

President Eisenhower's warning against the influence of the military-industrial complex in his farewell address as President was never more relevant than it is today as we are about to move ahead with expensive new weapons systems.

"I like Ike" was not merely a narrow party slogan. It was, to the end, the sentiment of a nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, standing in the rotunda of the Capitol yesterday as President Nixon eulogized former President Eisenhower, the thought came to me that while many men who had served our country well and with valor had gone to rest with the flag draped over their coffins, very few had so richly deserved and won that honor as had General Eisenhower. The flag means more to us because of him, and our country will forever be better through the great example he set of devotion to it and love for it.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a great leader of the American people has passed away, and the Nation is in mourning. Our hearts go out in sympathy to his beloved widow and family.

I was privileged to serve in both the House of Representatives and the Senate during his term as President. I shall always remember his unfailing courtesy, consideration, and kindness.

Great men are able to rise to distinguished positions within a certain field or a certain career. But it is the extraordinary man who achieves comparable greatness in more than one realm. The late Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower was such a man.

General Eisenhower was a military genius of the first order. His thoughts and actions were characterized by discipline, decisiveness, and deep courage.

As President, General Eisenhower helped the American people to maintain a sense of balance and to view events in proper perspective. He fostered among us a spirit of security and hope.

Our grief at the death of General Eisenhower is magnified by the knowledge that we shall not soon see his like again. He represented an America for which we feel nostalgia, an America where our values were clear and there was no compromising with one's duty to one's country.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, our Nation mourns the loss of a great soldier, statesman, and President. I feel the deep personal loss of a good friend with the death of former President Eisenhower. To the very last day of his life he was a symbol of strength and honor for the people of the United States and the world.

General Eisenhower was a frequent visitor to our State of Colorado and often said he considered it his second home. I first met Ike in 1951, when he was president of Columbia University. He was a guest in our Colorado home in 1954 and 1956. He was one of the major reasons that I first entered politics back in the early fifties.

Our thoughts are with Mrs. Eisenhower, who has always shown such courage during the many episodes of illness endured by the general over the past several years.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever there was a man who epitomized the word "good," who possessed the quality of goodness to an infinite degree, it was Dwight David Eisenhower. He was a man of peace who proved himself unsurpassed in war. He was a man of gentleness who lived a life of high adventure. He was a gentle man who vested some of the most bestial fighters of our century. He was a simple man whose goodness, kindness, and humility helped him overcome obstacles and achieve his objectives. His services to our country as soldier and leader of armies, as president of a great university, as a man of inspiration, and as President of the United States were all of the highest order.

Most important, he was a man of truth, incapable of duplicity. Our country and our world trusted him. Finally, he was a man of wisdom and vision, whose farewell words as President, warning us of the dangers of the industrial-military complex, should be heeded by the Nation that now mourns the passing of this great and good man.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the death of General Eisenhower, the world has lost one of its towering figures, one whom history will regard among the truly great.

Born and raised against a humble, midwestern background, this remarkable man led the forces of freedom to victory in a great world war and, at the end of that career, answered a further call to serve his country in its highest office. Again, he demonstrated an inspired ability to unify and to lead the Nation at a particularly critical time in its history. As we look back on the 8 years of his administration we recognize the great stability, firmness, and progress which marked that time.

Even after he had laid down the burdens of the Presidency, he continued to play a constructive and effective role as a true elder statesman, spurning petty partisan considerations and concerning himself only with the welfare of the country he loved and served so long and so well.

It is amazing that one generation could produce both an Eisenhower and a Churchill, two mighty and beloved leaders who will be revered as long as men prize freedom.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we mourn today the loss of Dwight David Eisenhower. We mourn his passing, and we remember his contributions to this world.

He was a leader—a man who led great armies to victory in the Second World War. Because he knew the horrors of war, he worked unceasingly for peace. Few men have left a more significant imprint on the 20th century.

In his lifetime, he won high office and held imposing titles—General of the Armies—president of a great university—President of the United States. But our memories of Dwight Eisenhower are not related to pomp and ceremony. We remember him as a warm, outgoing person—a man of character, integrity, and good will.

He battled in the arena of politics—and won. And he won more than the Presidency. He won the affection and respect of the American people.

Now he is gone, and we will miss him. But his words and deeds will live on in our history and influence our Nation for generations to come.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Nation, and indeed all of the free world, mourns the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower. His absence will be lamented not only by free men everywhere but also by those who long to be free, for Dwight Eisenhower epitomized the fight for freedom in all aspects of his life.

From a Kansas farm boy to Supreme Allied Commander in Europe to President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower symbolized all that is good about America. His life bounded all elements of the American ideal and wrapped them in reality.

Now we are all much poorer because he is gone.

To say that he was a great American is inadequate.

To say he was a great statesman lacks completeness.

To outline his accomplishments in war and peace as a protector of the free world ignores the foundations for domestic progress he laid here at home.

It remains for history to indelibly inscribe upon the tables of time the unique and continuing contributions made by Dwight Eisenhower, not only through his public service but by his private example of integrity, courage, and devotion to duty.

Though we grieve over his death and sorrow at his passing, our lives are enriched by the record of the life he lived in service to his fellow man, his nation, and his God.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower is gone, and Americans everywhere mourn his passing.

What he did is engraved in the national consciousness: at Normandy; at Bastonge; on the Elbe; in 8 years as one of the most beloved Presidents with which the Nation has been blessed.

XUM

I would speak of Dwight Eisenhower the man, for, in many ways, what he was, was even more important than his deeds, great though they were.

He was a uniquely American product: A soldier who had seen the face of war, and who turned his country away from it. He was perhaps the most beloved man of this time, yet a man who never lost his humility.

We asked of him perhaps more than we should ask of any man. It was his decision, and his alone, that determined the life or death of hundreds of thousands of American men on that June 6 D-Day more than two decades ago. It was his decision, more than once in his 8 years in the White House, that meant the difference between peace and war.

A small incident, unknown at the time, illumines his character. On the eve of D-Day, when the greatest invasion force in man's history moved toward Omaha, Juneau, and the other beaches of Normandy, Dwight Eisenhower, in the loneliness of his command post, wrote two communiques. In the first he foretold a great victory for American arms. In the second—should that happen—he wrote of a bloody defeat, and in the communique he wrote that the defeat was his alone, that he had made the decision, that the blame was his alone.

He was, above all, a good man, in the best sense of that most overused word. We knew that he was, and we gave him our love; he gave to us his all.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe I can add anything to the tributes which have been paid to Dwight David Eisenhower. Certainly nothing can be added to the record of his life.

I can only voice my own appreciation of his life, and for having known him and having served under him in the Army of the United States in Europe in 1944 and 1945, as Ambassador of the United States to India and Nepal by his appointment, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate when he was President.

Although I am sure these following articles have been placed in the RECORD by other Senators, I feel that they, added to the magnificent eulogy by President Nixon, have expressed the admiration and the affection of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published by the New York Times on Sunday, March 30, and the article by Mr. Arthur Krock published by the Times on Saturday, March 29, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I emphasize President Eisenhower's initiative toward ending the cold war, and toward the achievement of peace. I quote the last two paragraphs of an editorial in the New York Times of March 31, entitled "Guests at the Funeral":

> The passage of time has only added importance to the beginnings toward ending the cold war that were made when Eisenhower and Khrushchev met in Geneva in 1955 and then in this country in 1959. Their meetings broke the ice of the Stalinist era and—despite the U-2 flareup in 1960—helped pave the way for the limited but important progress that has been made this decade.
>
> The world leaders at this funeral of a soldier for peace could render him no more significant tribute than to advance the spirit of reconciliation he set in motion.

Finally, I take the liberty of using that part of the eulogy of President Nixon when he quoted the last words of President Eisenhower to Mrs. Eisenhower:

> I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren. And I've always loved my country.

To Mrs. Eisenhower, who shared his trials and triumphs and who contributed to his life, we offer our admiration and sympathy.

We shall miss him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1969]

A PEACEMAKER REMEMBERED

On this day of national mourning for Dwight Eisenhower, there is everywhere a sense of loss but not of tragedy. It is a time of sorrow but not of desolation, of nostalgia but not of despair. After a full, active life of service to his nation and mankind he died rich in honors and secure in the affections of his countrymen.

In war, he had known moments such as the North African invasion and the Normandy D-Day when daring and high resolve were rewarded. In peace, he had labored with patience and insight for better international relationships and helped bring about a significant change in the cold war. As party leader and President he was no stranger to controversy. Like all men he had some failures of understanding and made some mistakes of judgment, but he left the White House after eight years still retaining the confidence of the nation.

Even in the last year of his life when pain and distress were often his unwelcome companions, he had also occasions for satisfaction—the political party of his choice restored to power, a political protege elected to the White House, a grandson married. As with the lives of General George C. Marshall, his close military colleague, and Winston Churchill, his great wartime ally, there is about Eisenhower's life a sense of fullfillment, of missions accomplished.

He played a historic military role in a warlike age but it is as a peacemaker he will be remembered. He had a sure instinct for popular sentiment. In a television talk in 1959 with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, President Eisenhower said, "I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of their way and let them have it."

Tendered a dinner in his honor by New York City in June 1945, he early defined the philosophy that guided his peace-keeping efforts: "I believe we should be strong, but we should be tolerant. We should be ready to defend our rights but we should be considerate and recognize the rights of the other man."

His tolerance, his fairmindedness, his ability to put himself in the other man's shoes and see the problem from another viewpoint won the confidence of his fellow Americans, ignited the hopes of his contemporaries and earned the respect of his adversaries. Regardless of provocation and pressure he never lost sight of his essential goal. He overruled military advisers and refused to intervene in French Indo-China in 1954. He broke with the nation's oldest allies, France and Britain, to oppose the Suez invasion of 1956. He incurred the political risks of inviting Premier Khrushchev for a tour of this country in 1959 and did not lose faith in eventual Soviet-American accommodation despite the Premier's tirades at the unsuccessful Paris summit conference in 1960. His farewell message to the American people upon leaving the White House the following year was a warning against the power of the military-industrial complex.

"He is great who is what he is from nature, and who never reminds us of others," Emerson wrote in his Essay on Great Men. Eisenhower met this definition. As a famous general, he was as unlike Napoleon or Wellington in his personal style as any man could be, and just as dissimilar to his American predecessors of past wars—Washington, Jackson, Grant, Pershing. He was unique.

Yet, from another vantage point, Eisenhower could, like Lincoln, say that he was a common man but God must like common people because he makes so many of them. "Ike" looked like everybody's grandfather. In his simple tastes, plain dress and easy manner, he could have been an obscure country doctor or another Midwestern businessman. Of his generation, he was the typical American writ large, and so countless millions whom he had never met could think of him as a neighbor and a friend. Born in Texas, reared in Kansas, educated in New York, on duty at Army posts across the country, and retiring at last to a farm in Pennsylvania, Dwight Eisenhower belonged to all Americans. They honor him today, neighbor, friend, peacemaker.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1969]

TOPICS: "AN UNCOMPLICATED MAN"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—"To mold, to balance and to integrate" the forces contending, designedly or inherently, to undermine "the principles of our democratic system"—this was the lifetime mission of Dwight D. Eisenhower as he saw and practiced it. In many conversations with him before, during and after his Presidency, his sense of this mission invariably emerged. So it was wholly in character that his fixed dedication dominated Eisenhower's Farewell Presidential Address to the American people on the night of Jan. 17, 1961.

A BASIC DOCUMENT

To schoolboys the best-known examples of state papers in this particular field are Washington's Farewell Address and the peroration of Lincoln's Second Inaugural. Indeed, they are the only ones with which schoolboys are familiar. But as time recedes into eternity from the day of Eisenhower's death on March 28, 1969, the extraordinary combination in his Farewell stress on his lifetime principle, and foresight of the threat to which it was being increasingly exposed, will establish this document also as fundamental to the basic education of Americans.

He cited two forces in particular as comprising the threat to "the very structure of our society": A military-industrial complex and a "scientific-technological élite," both born of another new threat. And this he described as "a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method." In other words, the Bolshevist design to impose Communism by force throughout the world.

CARICATURE REFUTED

If there were room here for additional extracts, they could only serve to support the point I am seeking to make. It is, that not only does Eisenhower's Farewell reflect and maintain the purpose which guided him as President, as soldier and as a private person: the Address refutes the caricature drawn of Eisenhower by variously motivated critics as a chief magistrate who let his subordinates do the governing because he had no original ideas, no passion for the advancement of humanity and a distaste for mental concentration on the problems confronting the President as steward of the nation.

But the refutation of this appraisal has much more material to produce than the Eisenhower speech of Jan. 17, 1961. The records of the crisis meetings of the National Security Council, 1953–61, are now under seal at Camp Ritchie, Maryland. When these papers are released for publication they will, according to a common judgment expressed to me by participants in the discussions, reveal that the President:

Made all the final decisions; firmly and fully enforced them; that his reliance on the staff system stopped at the deciding line; that his grasp of complex issues was profound; and that his expositions of his own views were both forceful and clear.

SOURCE OF POPULARITY

But, since a large part of the public incessantly read the contrary in the press, and heard it on the air and in the political arena, what were the sources of a popular sentiment that, the political professionals generally agreed, would have elected Eisenhower to a third term if he had been legally eligible—and willing?

He has been a victorious American commander of the largest armies ever assembled. But victory in war, even a war that preserved the Union, did not save Grant from the political obloquy in which his Presidency ended. And Washington left the Presidency amid a rising tide of malice and slander.

GOOD AND UNSELFISH

The sources of Eisenhower's unbroken hold on the American people were probably that few could see, hear or talk with him and not come away with the conviction that here was a good man, an uncomplicated man, unselfish in his patriotism—the kind of man who has risen from simple beginnings to the possession of great power without impairment of integrity.

This certainly was my feeling in conversations, intimate and otherwise, in Paris, in the Pentagon, at the White House and thereafter. And, aside from the foresight, perception and passion for the traditional concept of "the democratic system" in the Farewell Address, Eisenhower was the kind of President the nation wanted in his time, a time that may come again.

(NOTE.—Through all the years of the Eisenhower Presidency, Arthur Krock wrote the "In The Nation" column in The Times.)

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. President, death has taken from us Dwight David Eisenhower who dominated the middle of the 20th century as a soldier, statesman, and humanitarian.

We all are diminished by the loss.

My deepest sympathies go to Mrs. Eisenhower and their wonderful family.

People throughout the world had great faith and confidence in General and President Eisenhower. And he, in turn, had great faith in the goodness of man and in the simple virtues.

In 1952, before his election, he put some of the tenets of his faith down on paper, and I believe they have great relevance for us here today. He said:

> If each of us in his own mind would dwell upon the simple virtues—integrity, courage, self-confidence, and unshakeable belief in the Bible—would not some of our problems tend to simplify themselves?
>
> Would not we, after having done our best with them be content to leave the rest with the Almighty? I think it is possible that a contemplation, a study, a belief in those simple virtues would help us mightily.

General Eisenhower's great faith in this country and its people was reciprocated fully by the people.

My personal faith in this great man springs from the dark days of World War II when I served under him in Europe. I recall we had absolute confidence in his command leadership. But he was more than a military leader. He was beloved by the men in the ranks, to whom his infectious grin and willingness to consider their problems symbolized a great moral leader.

It was my privilege to get to know the general better in later years. In 1952 and 1956 I campaigned for him as I was running for Governor of Delaware. His visits to our State were memorable occasions to me.

He frequently held briefing sessions for the Governors in those days, and it was my privilege as Governor of the First State to be seated at his side. He was always well prepared at those sessions and brisk in matters of business. But he also liked to talk about his golf game and tell of the pleasure he found in doing his own cooking.

President Eisenhower's years of prominence served his country well. He answered every call—to the military, to education, to his Nation's highest office—but, above all, to his fellow man.

It may well be said, as Louisa May Alcott wrote:

> For such as he there is no death;
> His life the eternal life commands;
> Above man's aims his nature rose.
> The wisdom of a just content
> Made one small spot a continent,
> And tuned to poetry Life's prose.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, it will be many, many years before the Nation is again blessed with a man such as Dwight David Eisenhower. Many others have chronicled his historic achievements, which were very great indeed, and I can add little to that. The thing that I best recollect about the general, however, is his strong sense of humanism and his dedication to the morality that has pervaded the American people and made them able to endure all the hardships that befall a great nation.

Soldier, statesman, writer that he was, I believe that he will be best remembered in the history of our Nation as the guiding light for America during years of peril and an inspiration to us all in rebuilding the world and leading it from devastation to unprecedented growth. The general lived as he died, always fighting against overwhelming odds and seeking out the best of all possible solutions.

The years 1952–60 are already looked back upon in nostalgic terms for our Nation. During that time, we were a nation unified for a common purpose, seeking a common goal, hand in hand. The Eisenhower years were a Periclean age when we were recovering from nearly 12 years of warfare and international strife. The leadership provided during those years enabled us to bind up our wounds, rebuild much of the world, and chart a course for growth unknown before in the world.

As easy as it is to heap praise upon someone with General Eisenhower's stature, I am certain that he would want to be remembered as a man of the people, an American Cincinattus, who heeded the call of his Nation when it needed him even at the risk of great personal sacrifice. When the former President suffered his first heart attack which brought him so close to death some 14 years ago, it would have been easy for him to have retired from public life, which was the advice of many physicians. However, in the true Eisenhowerian sense, he put his personal considerations aside to serve his country that he loved so dearly.

Mr. Eisenhower spoke often of his country and the people who comprised it during his colorful and spiritually rewarding service to his nation, but I believe that one of his most poignant statements came from him just after he had assumed his Presidential office in 1953 and was proceeding on his work. When he spoke, he captured what must be considered as one of the finest thoughts on the essence of what is America. As always with the general, it was short, simple, and to the heart of the matter:

> But never let us forget that the deep things that are America are the soul and the spirit. The Statue of Liberty is not tired, and not because it is made of bronze. It is because no matter what happens, here the individual is dignified because he is created in the image of God. Let us never forget it.

Mr. **SAXBE**. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower was a man for all seasons and all peoples. America has lost a great patriot and a great leader. The sadness of this time is even deeper because America has also lost a great man.

This soldier-statesman, a man of peace and love of country, was a fighter to the end. He was a marvelous fighter who lived like a general and died like a general.

Yet even in war, Mr. Eisenhower was a messiah of peace. On a 20th-century day of apprehension, June 6, 1944, for example, he messaged the people of Western Europe while Allied troops were storming ashore in Normandy:

> This landing is part of the concerted United Nations plan for the liberation of Europe, made in conjunction with our great Russian allies . . . I call upon all who love freedom to stand with us now. Together we shall achieve victory.

In all of my personal contacts with Mr. Eisenhower, I was always impressed with his outgoing, warm personality and attitude. Even when he ascended to the two highest positions of his twin caceers—General of the Army and President of the United States—this plain-talking man from Abilene never lost the humility and touch that bonded him to his people. Perhaps his greatest appeal, in fact, rested in the way even the most humble of Americans was able to identify with the man we all called "Ike."

Mr. Eisenhower's view of humility may have been best expressed late in World War II, in an address at Guildhall, London. He said that day:

> Humility must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned in the blood of his followers and the sacrifices of his friends,

Dwight David Eisenhower, our 34th President, was born October 14, 1890, in Denison, Tex. He was the third son of David and Ida Elizabeth Stover Eisenhower. A year later the family moved to Abilene, Kans., where the young "Ike" earned both academic and scholastic honors at Abilene High School. Eisenhower entered West Point in July 1911, where, 4 years later, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Infan-

XUM

try and assigned to Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

It was there that he met Mamie Geneva Doud, a gentle lady who would spend the next 52 years at his side. They were married July 1, 1916, at Denver, Colo.

General Eisenhower's military career is known today to nearly all Americans: It spanned two world wars and a number of lesser crises in our history. His ability as a master planner and tactician were quickly recognized by his superiors.

The general was named commander in chief of Allied forces in North Africa in 1942, and directed the successful campaigns in Africa, Sicily, and Italy.

Later, he was named supreme commander of all Allied Forces in Europe and directed the "great invasion" that eventually brought the enemy to his knees.

I do not intend to recount Mr. Eisenhower's political career here, except to note that he was elected President in November 1952, and took office January 20, 1953. He was reelected President in 1956.

It was typical of Mr. Eisenhower that, for a man who spent more than half of his life in the uniform of a warrior, he was always a highly religious and devout man. Shortly after World War II, when he had directed the most awesome military machine ever assembled, Mr. Eisenhower was asked about his religious beliefs. He replied:

> I am the most intensely religious man I know. Nobody goes through six years of war without faith.

His inner beliefs were perhaps best expressed for all time in a message to the American people in 1953. He said:

> The things that make us proud to be Americans are of the soul and spirit. They are not the jewels we wear, or the furs we buy, the house we live in, the standard of living, even, that we have. All these things are wonderful to the esthetic and to the physical senses.
>
> But never let us forget that the deep things that are America are the soul and the spirit. The Statue of Liberty is not tired, and not because it is made of bronze. It is because no matter what happens, here the individual is dignified because he is created in the image of his God . . .

That was Dwight David Eisenhower.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, millions of words, in many languages, have been written and spoken in tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower through the years and over this sad weekend. As heads of state, prominent men and women, and ordinary citizens have expressed their admiration and respect for General Eisenhower, one remarkable theme has been that of simple, universal affection for this extraordinary man.

Americans can say of Dwight Eisenhower, more than of any other man, that he was their friend. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him only share in a richer sense this conviction that he was a genuinely warm and sincerely dedicated human being.

It was this human quality that gave an extra dimension to General Eisenhower's dramatic career as a soldier. He directed the greatest Allied Expeditionary Force in history, and in the course to that victory he was able to shape a grand alliance of free men which reached and endured far beyond the formal accords of governments.

It was this human quality that gave the Eisenhower Presidency its emphasis on peace and on humane concerns, an emphasis which met a deep national need, steadied the country, and brought the free world to new, lasting confidence and energy.

It was this human quality that produced the great sense of friendship and regard for Dwight Eisenhower which we have witnessed among those far too young to have served in World War II or voted in the national elections of the 1950's.

It was this human quality which made him, as President Nixon stated in his moving eulogy of yesterday, "an authentic hero"—not only recognized for his heroic deeds, but loved for his authentic faith and personal commitment.

To some, General Eisenhower's death marks the further disappearance of those grand figures and historic leaders who made the free world a reality. To many, his death has brought a sadness and nostalgia for a somehow simpler world in which there were great men who could lead peoples in great causes, live rich and full lives, and pass on peacefully.

Yet, in the respectful quietness of national mourning, we have all felt a return to those qualities of humanity and decency which are at the heart of America. We have felt a sense of community which, although evoked by sorrow, gives us hope.

Dwight David Eisenhower is mourned and will be remembered above all else because he had a vision of a world in which men would be guided by their higher ideals, a world in which the selfishness and folly of nations would be submerged in the greater desire and willingness of people to act together in the cause of peace and freedom. It is this vision, grounded in faith and infused with compassion, which will be his legacy and should be our guide.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, many words have been spoken and written in the hours since Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower lost his gallant fight for life on Friday, even though words are inadequate to express America's loss of a great man. His dedication to freedom and his service to his country as a soldier and as a statesman to maintain that freedom have been widely praised. His strength of character, which in turn gave moral strength to millions of Americans for two decades, has been widely honored.

I should like to add a short personal tribute to General Eisenhower, as one who was honored to have known him as a friend and adviser. I am particularly moved to be able to make my tribute in this historic Senate Chamber, because it was General Eisenhower's early support and encouragement over a year and a half ago, that contributed to my decision to become a candidate for the U.S. Senate seat I presently hold.

General Eisenhower lived in, and loved, Gettysburg, Pa., and we in turn, from Pennsylvania, gained the honor of calling him a neighbor. He brought the same high sense of personal honor and integrity to his activities in Pennsylvania, as he did to the affairs of state as President of the United States. He brought the same love of his fellow man to the town of Gettysburg, as he did across the world, in the many stirring trips as President we still remember.

As a general, he united allied countries to wage a fight against oppression. As President, he united our country in an unprecedented time of peace and prosperity, to improve the lot of all mankind. As a man, he represented the highest qualities of what has made America great, and he served his country long and selflessly to make it great. I can think of no better eulogy than to recount his life of service, and his love of humanity, and the inspiring example that his life provided for us all.

We have lost a great leader, and the Eisenhower family has lost a great man. He was, is, and will be one of America's most beloved Presidents.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for a large portion of my life, Dwight David Eisenhower was my Commander in Chief, in peace and in war. Today, millions of Americans feel, as we do, the sense of loss that somes from losing not only a leader, but a friend.

No President in our memories has so firm a place in the hearts of our Nation. Fathers fought under his command, and their sons grew up to know him as a man of peace. All Americans mourn him today. But it is mourning that covers a deep sense of gratitude. America is a better place for his having been here; Americans know this and are thankful for it. He led his countrymen through some of the most difficult years the United States has ever known—and he led them later to peace, strength, and prosperity at home and abroad.

President Eisenhower held a special place in the hearts of Alaskans, over and above that which exists so completely throughout the country. For it was under his administration that Alaska became our 49th State. It was with President Eisenhower's support that Alaskans were granted the full rights and privileges of American citizenship. In a speech in Denver in 1950, recognizing the unjustness of territorial status, he said:

> Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches.

For our 34th President, statehood for Alaska was a matter of simple justice. And in January, 1959, this hope of equality for Alaska became a reality with his proclamation of January 3, 1959, that Alaska was a fullfledged member of the Union. In a very real sense he was a "50-star" general—for he was the first President to serve as the leader of our Union of 50 States. Alaskans mourn his passing with special sorrow. He gave us so much; indeed, without Dwight David Eisenhower, I doubt seriously whether many of us would be here today.

A nation should always mourn the passing of a leader. But many of us today not only mourn; we grieve the passing of an era. It seems only a short time ago that, as supreme commander, Gen.

XUM

Dwight Eisenhower's firm voice commanded the Allied Armies in Europe; and an even shorter time ago that he steered this great country through crisis and change. He conceived of Atoms for Peace and started the process by which we shall achieve our ageless dream of reaching the stars. His strengths, ideals, and accomplishments will be landmarks for use and all American in times to come.

Mr. President, as Dwight D. Eisenhower gave unstintingly to America, America in return gave him its love and respect. He had many honors, the love of his country, and the respect of the world. But when he listed the accomplishments of his administration, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii appeared first on the long list of achievements of the Nation under his leadership.

To Alaskans, he was a man who matched our mountains—a man who stood above the crowd, a man firm in purpose, devout in his heart, and true to the ideals he espoused.

Dwight Eisenhower loved his country—he served it well.

He would ask no greater epitaph than that.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am deeply grieved by the death of our beloved leader Dwight David Eisenhower. Hoping against hope, I had prayed that this gallant soldier would once again conquer physical adversity.

There is no question that America has lost one of its greatest heroes—a brilliant general, a skilled statesman, an outstanding leader.

We—and the world—will sorely miss one of our foremost citizens, a man of upright convictions who throughout his entire life was a force for goodness and justice for all mankind.

It is sad indeed that his wise counsel is lost to us particularly at a time when the winds of dissension tear at the fabric of our civilization and moral confusion corrodes a growing segment of society. We need so much his calm and reasoned counsel and his dignity and faith and inspiration.

His passing is a real loss, not only to the American people but to peoples in far-flung lands around the globe, who recall his magnificent record in ending war and in building peace.

Millions of Americans remember General Eisenhower in his capacity as World War II commander in chief of the Allied Forces in Europe, and their gratitude to him for his leadership is personal.

Millions of Americans remember his strength and ability as supreme commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which served to keep the hard-won peace in Europe after World War II.

Millions recall his tenure as president of Columbia University, a magnificent institution of higher education, to which he imparted great prestige and honor.

Millions of Americans lived during the 8 years of his Presidency, and they know from personal experience the peace and tranquility and progress of the years 1953 through 1960—and their gratitude to him is personal.

Other millions are two young to remember most of the deeds and the accomplishments of Dwight David Eisenhower in his long life of service to the American people and to freedom-loving people everywhere. They only know from history books of his wartime record and his performance as 34th President of the United States.

In these eulogies, we hope to recall and convey as best we can something of the greatness and the goodness of Dwight Eisenhower and to preserve for posterity the fundamental precepts for which he stood.

Trained as a soldier, he left military service after reaching the pinnacle of success to enter civilian life, where he also reached the pinnacle of success—success measured not alone by his winning two terms as President of the greatest Nation on earth, but success measured by his ability to keep the peace.

A soldier of war became one of America's greatest peacemakers. Surely his skill at maintaining peace is one of the greatest monuments to his memory.

Others will chronicle the triumphs, the milestones, and the contributions of Dwight Eisenhower to his country and to the world. Today I should like to emphasize his major achievements as two-term President of the United States—"major" as he himself assessed his tenure in office. For his own evaluation of his record reveals, better than my words can do, his sense of values and his concern and compassion for people.

Called upon in October 1966 to defend his record as President, General Eisenhower enumerated 23 accomplishments.

We see Dwight Eisenhower's passionate devotion to peace in these achievements on his list:

End of the Korean war—thereafter no American killed in combat while he was President.

Good will journeys to more than a score of nations in Europe, Asia, Africa, South Africa, and in the Pacific.

Prevention of Communist efforts to dominate Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, Formosa, South Vietnam.

Atoms-for-peace program.

Preservation for the first time in American history of adequate military establishment after cessation of war.

Initiating a strong ballistic missile program.

Conceiving and building the Polaris program, with submarines operating at sea within a single administration.

Reorganization of the Defense Department.

Initiation of a plan for social progress in Latin America after obtaining necessary authorization from Congress for $500 million.

We see Dwight Eisenhower's compassion for people in these accomplishments on his list:

Intelligent application of Federal aid to education—National Defense Education Act.

Extension of social security old-age and survivors insurance to over 10 million persons.

Starting Federal medical care for the aged—Kerr-Mills program.

Establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We see Dwight Eisenhower's firm adherence to Government's obligation to maintain a sound currency and monetary system in the following achievements he listed:

Slowing up and practical elimination of inflation.

Largest reduction in taxes to that time.

Fighting for responsible fiscal and financial policies throughout 8 years.

We see Dwight Eisenhower's awareness of the need for resource development and technological progress in the following achievements on his list:

Building of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Initiation of the Nation's space program with successful orbits in less than 3 years, starting from scratch.

Initiation of, and great progress in, the most ambitious road program by any nation in all history.

We see Dwight Eisenhower's deep passion for justice, fairplay, and equal rights in these accomplishments on his list:

The first civil rights law in 80 years.

Using Federal power to enforce orders of a Federal court in Arkansas, with no loss of life.

Desegregation in Washington, D.C., and in the Armed Forces by administrative action.

And last, but not least, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

It is significant that Dwight Eisenhower mentioned statehood first in his listing. But I mention it last because I want to say a few words about Dwight Eisenhower's vital role in statehood.

We of Hawaii owe a special debt of gratitude to him, for he made it possible for Hawaii to become a State of the Union, a status for which we had struggled for more than half a century.

As President he was an ardent champion of statehood for Hawaii. In his state of the Union message on January 5, 1956, President Eisenhower spoke of "one particular challenge" confronting Americans. He said:

> In the Hawaiian Islands, East meets West. To the Islands, Asia and Europe and the Western Hemisphere, all the continents, have contributed their peoples and their cultures to display a unique example of a community that is a successful laboratory in human brotherhood.
>
> Statehood, supported by the repeatedly expressed desire of the Islands' people and by our traditions, would be a shining example of the American way to the entire earth. Consequently, I urgently request this Congress to grant statehood for Hawaii.

Never before had any Chief Executive called for statehood for Hawaii with such enthusiasm or urgency. Within 4 years, the issue was resolved on the side of justice and fairplay.

Congress passed the Hawaii statehood bill in March 1959, and President Eisenhower promptly signed it into law. It was a glorious victory in Hawaii's struggle for equal rights that began more than a half a century earlier.

The long and arduous campaign for statehood came to a final end on August 21, 1959, when President Eisenhower signed a proclamation which declared, in part, that "admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union on equal footing with the other States of the Union is now accomplished."

XUM

I remember so clearly the day Dwight Eisenhower invited me, one of Hawaii's first two U.S. Senators, to the White House to accept the first 50-star flag representing the addition of Hawaii to the Union. Ike's pleasure and pride in Hawaii statehood were genuinely evident, and we all realized a wonderful new chapter in our Nation's history was beginning.

So, on this 10th anniversary of statehood, the people of Hawaii salute Dwight Eisenhower with a grateful "Thank you" and with the warmest aloha from our hearts. We are indeed deeply touched that he listed statehood for Hawaii as one of the great achievements of his Presidency.

Just as Hawaii has special reason to be grateful to Dwight Eisenhower, so billions of freedom-loving human beings on this planet have good reason for gratitude. As an outstanding and victorious soldier, he captured the affection and respect of his countrymen and of the peoples saved and liberated through his brilliant leadership.

And as a soldier of peace in the decades following, he increased their affection and respect. Dwight Eisenhower became the most popular President since George Washington and, although he had been out of public office for 9 years, he remained the most admired man in the world to his final days.

As President Nixon so aptly said yesterday in his moving eulogy, Dwight Eisenhower "was probably loved by more people in more parts of the world than any President America has ever had."

When future generations of America ask "Why was this so?" we want them to know the qualities of mind and spirit that so endeared Dwight Eisenhower to his fellow man.

He personified the essential goodness and greatness of the American Nation and the American people. He came from humble beginnings and he was taught to revere God, to love his country, and to honor his fellow man.

He was taught to distinguish right from wrong and to persevere in behalf of what is right.

Raised in the heartland of America, among plain, God-loving, dignified people, Dwight Eisenhower personified those enduring qualities that are universally admired and respected—gentle kindness, inherent decency, human compassion, unquestioned honesty, integrity, courage, strength in adversity, self-respect, humble confidence, and unfailing faith in God and in men, the children of God.

These but barely sketch the true dimensions of this giant among men. Ordinary standards and ordinary words inadequately measure the extraordinary man that Dwight Eisenhower was.

Perhaps the simplest and best way to describe the stature of Dwight Eisenhower is to say that he was a man who loved people and his love was so all embracing that billions of human beings here and abroad reciprocated.

In many lands, among many races, and in many tongues, the feeling is, and for years has been, expressed in the same way: "I like Ike." No higher tribute can be paid the memory of Dwight Eisenhower.

My wife Ellyn joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower, John Eisenhower, and all the members of the Eisenhower family. We shall always cherish the memory of their beloved "Ike."

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. President, today this Nation mourns not only a former President and general, but a man.

It is a cliche to say that Dwight David Eisenhower was admired; how much more fitting to his memory it is to say "we like Ike."

It might be worth noting in passing that all the political slogans in American history—"Fifty-four forty or fight," "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," "Back to normalcy," "Chicken in every pot," and many many others were slogans about an issue or about a man and an issue. "I like Ike" was the only slogan that expressed America's feeling about a man.

There is a deeper reason for this mass affection than the fact of his military genius or his infectious grin.

I think President Nixon put his finger on it when he said in yesterday's eulogy:

> We find ourselves, thinking today, not of his deeds, but of his character.

I think that no finer tribute to Ike can be made than that we resolve today to rededicate ourselves, not only as a people but as individuals, to the basic values that went to make up that character.

Ethics, morality, courage, integrity, honor, decency, faith.

Dwight David Eisenhower possessed and used these simple homely virtues each day of his life.

We would do well to reassess our outlook on what these values mean in our society today.

We have, to all too great extent, relinquished much of our self-control as well as our public control. There has been a loss of resolve, a lessening of the built-in deterrents that are such an essential part of the human psyche.

We have become a nation of people that is increasingly more permissive and increasingly less prohibitive in its critique of the scene in which we are involved.

Our sense of proportion seems to have undergone a not too subtle erosion.

It is my earnest belief that the basis of decent human conduct is still to be found in the fabric of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

Today, unfortunately, it has become somewhat "square" to refer to the values of the spirit—and yet there is not one of us, who deep in his heart does not desire for his children that they grow up with a deep sense of spiritual value.

Let us therefore on this day of sadness, pause to reflect and to make use of the lesson of Ike's career and how he conducted himself personally.

Let us each in our hearts, resolve to be unafraid and unashamed to proclaim that the quiet dignity of good character, is a virtue to be praised, rather than to be ridiculed as "out of date."

And let us see to it—each of us—that we never let this concept die, that we follow the words of the passage from Deuteronomy that say:

> And these words which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart. Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shalt speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou rises up . . . that ye may remember and do all my Commandments and be holy unto your God.

Dwight Eisenhower was "holy unto his God." People realized this; it was an unspoken understanding.

In the words of President Nixon:

> We are grateful for the life of Dwight David Eisenhower. He truly came from the heart of America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 175

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, a former President of the United States and General of the Army of the United States.

Resolved, That as a token of honor to his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, his distinguished public service to his nation, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public station in life, the Senate hereby expresses its deep sensibility of the loss the nation has sustained by his death, and its sympathy with the family in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the two Senators from Kansas be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased, to be held at Abilene, Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolution (S. Res. 175) was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The **PRESIDING OFICER**. In accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 175, under the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, the Senate will now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock p.m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 31, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me.—Psalm 23: 4.

Almighty and Eternal God, the comforter of Thy children and the strength of those who put their trust in Thee, we assemble this day with sorrow in our hearts at the passing of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, our beloved 34th President. Even in the sadness of farewell we think fondly of him who walked so worthily in our midst and who served so well as the leader of our country.

We mourn his passing because he reflected in his own personality the tradition of a free people and revealed in his life the shrine of our Nation's faith and hope.

We thank Thee for him, for his courage of mind and heart, for his strength of character, for his desire to do what he firmly believed to be right and for his devotion to his family and to his country. Certainly our United States is a better nation—stronger and freer—because he lived and led us in war and in peace.

So we honor the memory of this great and good man, "who more than self his country loved," and in so doing we dedicate ourselves anew to Thee and to our Nation in the global struggle between democracy and dictatorship.

Comfort the family with Thy sustaining spirit and strengthen them for these hours and for the days to come. Keep them and us, steady and strong, this day and forever more. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. BAYH as a delegate on the part of the Senate to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting to be held in Vienna, Austria, April 7 through April 13, 1969.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 77-250, appointed Mr. HRUSKA to be a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in lieu of Mr. ALLOTT, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-420, appointed Mr. BYRD of West Virginia and Mr. JAVITS to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in three cities in Mexico from April 2 through April 8, 1969, in lieu of Mr. BAYH and Mr. MURPHY, excused.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for Wednesday may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders scheduled for today be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND—AND GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, without establishing a precedent, all Members may have the privilege of inserting their remarks and including extraneous material therewith in the body of the RECORD today, and that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of our former President, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 28, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives:

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:35 p.m., on Friday, March 28, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he informs the Congress of the death of former President Eisenhower.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS, *Clerk*.

OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF THE DEATH OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, THE 34TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my sad duty to inform you officially of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the thirty-fourth President of the United States.

We have lost a great leader, a great friend and a great man. I know there are many members of the Congress who had the privilege of serving under his military leadership, and who later, during his eight years as President, shared with him in the building of a better America. He had a profound respect for the traditions, the institutions and the instruments of our Nation. He leaves to the Congress and to all Americans the spirit of patriotism and statesmanship beyond party which marked his entire career. As we grieve at his death, we all will recall that spirit, which can guide and sustain us in our tasks ahead. He has been an inspiration to us all, and ours is a better government because he walked among us.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 28, 1969.*

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will assume the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORGAN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the eulogy delivered on President Eisenhower yesterday in the rotunda by President Nixon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The President's eulogy to Dwight David Eisenhower follows:

PRESIDENT'S EULOGY TO EISENHOWER AT RITES IN CAPITOL'S ROTUNDA

Mrs. Eisenhower, your excellencies, friends of Dwight David Eisenhower in America and throughout the world.

We gather today in mourning but also in gratitude. We mourn Dwight Eisenhower's death. But we are grateful for his life.

We gather also conscious of the fact that, in paying tribute to Dwight Eisenhower, we celebrate greatness. When we think of his place in history, we think inevitably of the other giants of those days of World War II.

And we think of the qualities of greatness and what his were that made his unique among all.

Once, perhaps without intending to do so, he himself put his finger on it.

It was 1945, shortly after VE Day at a ceremony in London's historic Guildhall. The triumphant Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe was officially given the freedom of the city of London.

In an eloquent address that day, Dwight Eisenhower said:

"I come from the heart of America."

MEANING FOR AMERICANS

Perhaps no one sentence could better sum up what Dwight Eisenhower meant to a whole generation of Americans. He did come from the heart of America, not only from its geographical heart but from its spiritual heart. He exemplified what millions of parents hoped that their sons would be—strong

XUM

and courageous and honest and compassionate.

And with his own great qualities of heart, he personified the best in America. It is, I think, a special tribute to Dwight Eisenhower that, despite all of his great deeds and his triumphs, we find ourselves today thinking first, not of his deeds, but of his character.

It was the character of the man—not what he did, but what he was—that so captured the trust and faith and affection of his own people and of the people of the world.

Dwight Eisenhower touched something fundamental in America which only a man of immense force of mind and spirit could have brought so vibrantly alive. He was a product of America's soil, and of its ideals, driven by a compulsion to do right and to do well, a man of deep faith who believed in God and trusted in his will, a man who truly loved his country and for whom words like freedom and democracy were not clichés—but they were living truths.

I know Mrs. Eisenhower would permit me to share with you the last words she spoke to him on the day he died.

He said, "I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren. And I have always loved my country." That was Dwight Eisenhower.

LAST WORDS QUOTED

He was a man who gave enormously of himself. His way of relaxing from the intense pressures of office or command was to do something else intensely—whether as a fierce competitor on the golf course or executing one of those hauntingly beautiful paintings that he did with such meticulous care.

People loved Dwight Eisenhower. But the other side of this coin was that he loved people. He had the great leader's capacity to bring out the best in people. He had the great humanist's capacity to inspire people, to cheer them, to give them lift. I remember for example, just a few months ago when I asked all of the members of the Cabinet to go out and call on him. And each of them returned with wonder and admiration and said, "You know, I went out there to cheer him up and instead I found he cheered me up."

His great love of people was rooted in his faith. He had a deep faith in the goodness of God and in the essential goodness of man as a creature of God. This feeling toward people had another side. In the political world strong passions are the norm. And all too often these turn toward personal vindictiveness. People often disagreed with Dwight Eisenhower, but almost nobody ever hated him. And this, I think, was because he himself was a man who did not know how to hate. Oh, he could be aroused by a cause—but he could not hate a person. He could disagree strongly, even passionately, but never personally.

When people disagreed with him, he never thought of them as enemies. He simply thought, they don't agree with me.

I remember, time after time, when critics of one sort or another were misrepresenting him or reviling him, he would sit back in his chair, and with that wonderful half-smile and half-frown, he'd say: "I'm puzzled by those fellows."

And he was genuinely puzzled by frenzy and by hate; because he was incapable of it himself, he couldn't ever quite understand it in others.

AN AUTHENTIC HERO

The last time I saw him that was what he talked about. He was puzzled by the hatreds he had seen in our times. And he said the thing the world needs most today is understanding, and ability to see the other person's point of view, and not to hate him because he disagrees. That was Dwight Eisenhower.

And, yet, of course, he was more than all that. He had a side more evident to those of us who worked with him than to the rest of the world. He was a strong man. He was shrewd. He was decisive. Time and again I have seen him make decisions that probably made the difference between war and peace for America and the world.

That was always when he was at his best.

No matter how heated the arguments were, he was always then the coolest man in the room. Dwight Eisenhower was that rarest of men—an authentic hero. Wars bring the names of many men into the headlines and of those some few become national or even international heroes, but as the years then pass their fame goes down.

STATURE CONTINUED TO GROW

But not so with Dwight Eisenhower. As the years passed his stature grew. Commander of the mightiest expeditionary force ever assembled, receiver of the surrender of the German armies in World War II, president of Columbia University, Supreme Commander of NATO, 34th President of the United States—the honors, the offices, were there in abundance. Every trust that the American people had it in their power to bestow, he was given.

And, yet, he always retained a saving humility.

His was the humility not of fear but of confidence. He walked with the great of the world and he knew that the great are human. His was the humility of a man too proud to be arrogant.

The pursuit of peace was uppermost in his mind when he ran for the Presidency, and it was uppermost in his conduct of that office.

And it is a tribute to his skill and determination that not since the 1930's has the nation enjoyed so long a period of peace both at home and abroad as the one that began in 1953 and continued through his Presidency.

As commander of the mightiest allied force ever assembled, he was the right man at the right place at the right time. And as President once again, he was the right man at the right place and at the right time.

He restored calm to a divided nation. He gave Americans a new measure of self-respect. He invested his office with dignity and respect and trust. He made Americans proud of their President, proud of their country, proud of themselves.

And if we in America were proud of Dwight Eisenhower it was partly because he made us proud of America. He came from the heart of America and he gave expression to the heart of America and he touched the hearts of the world.

Many leaders are known and respected outside their own countries. Very few are loved outside their own countries. Dwight Eisenhower was one of those few.

He was probably loved by more people in more parts of the world than any President America has ever had. He captured the deepest feelings of free men everywhere.

PRINCIPLES HE STOOD FOR

The principles he believed in, the ideals he stood for, these were bigger than his own country. Perhaps he himself put it best again in that Guildhall speech in 1945.

He said then:

"Kinship among nations is not determined in such measurements as proximity, size and age. Rather, we should turn to those inner things—call them what you will—I mean those intangibles that are the real treasures that free men possess. To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before the law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit, subject only to provisions that he not trespass upon similar rights of others, a Londoner will fight and so will a citizen of Abilene.

"When we consider these things, then the valley of the Thames draws closer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas."

Some men are considered great because they lead great armies, or they lead powerful nations. For eight years now, Dwight Eisenhower has neither commanded an army nor led a nation. And yet he remained through his final days the world's most admired and respected man, truly the first citizen of the world.

SOURCE OF HIS GREATNESS

As we marvel at this, it leads us again to ponder the mysteries of greatness. Dwight Eisenhower's greatness derived not from his office but from his character, from a unique moral force that transcended national boundaries, even as his own deep concern for humanity transcended national boundaries.

His life reminds us that there is a moral force in this world more powerful than the might of arms, or the wealth of nations. This man who led the most powerful armies that the world has ever seen; this man who led the most powerful nation in the world; this essentially good and gentle and kind man—that moral force was his greatness.

For a quarter of a century to the very end of his life, Dwight Eisenhower exercised a moral authority without parallel in America and in the world.

And America and the world is better because of him.

And, so, today we render our final salute. It is a fond salute to a man we loved and cherished. It is a grateful salute to a man whose whole extraordinary life was consecrated to service.

It is a profoundly respectful salute to a man larger than life who by any standard was one of the giants of our time.

Each of us here will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower.

I can see him now standing erect, straight, proud and tall 16 years ago as he took the oath of office as the 34th President of the United States of America.

We salute Dwight David Eisenhower standing there in our memories—first in war, first in peace and, wherever freedom is cherished, first in the hearts of his fellow men.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the sense of loss that afflicts this great Nation when a man who has occupied its Chief Magistracy passes to his eternal reward has a profound and touching effect upon us. In the death of Dwight David Eisenhower we see once again how deeply run the feelings of Americans, how fervently wells in their hearts a love of country, and how measureless is their fundamental respect for their greatest leaders. Has any monarch of the kingdoms of old, has any tyrant of the totalitarianisms of yesterday or of today, ever evoked by his demise the grief that has been experienced by all of us at President Eisenhower's passing?

The forebears of the man who was to lead the most massive invasion in the history of the world left Germany because of religious persecution. They settled, during the eighties of the 18th century, in Pennsylvania. General Eisenhower's grandfather migrated to Kansas in 1878, and in Kansas the young American who was to be his country's 34th President grew to manhood. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1915 and pursued one of the most distinguished military careers in this country's history. He led the invasion of north Africa and the invasion of Europe, both with stunning success. His overwhelming personal popularity among his admiring countrymen brought him to the Presidency for two terms.

His life is an example for all Amer-

XUM

icans, particularly of the younger generation to follow.

The policies that he followed as President of the United States were enunciated forcefully and unambiguously in his first state of the Union message on February 2, 1953, and never once did he waver from them. Down the long years those words of his return to our recollections as an apotheosis of the man, the soldier, the statesman, the humanitarian, the leader in peace and war, the President whom we have lost in death:

> As our heart summons our strength, our wisdom must direct it. There is, in world affairs, a steady course to be followed between an assertion of strength that is truculent and a confession of helplessness that is cowardly. There is, in our affairs at home, a middle way between untrammeled freedom of the individual and the demands for the welfare of the whole nation. This way must avoid government by bureaucracy as carefully as it avoids neglect of the helpless. In every area of political action, free men must think before they can expect to win. In this spirit must we live and labor: confident of our strength, compassionate in our heart, clear in our mind. In this spirit, let us together turn to the great tasks before us.

In the sunset of his years, this great American has recounted for us how, as a West Point plebe, he experienced a sudden sense of pride in his country's flag and commenced the lifetime of devotion to its causes that made him one of the bright and shining heroes of our national life.

The plebes assembled toward evening of that long-ago day of June 14, 1911, and, as a member of that group whom we knew best has told us:

> With the American flag floating majestically above us, we were sworn in as cadets of the U.S. Military Academy. It was an impressive ceremony. As I looked up at our national colors and swore my allegiance, I realized humbly that now I belonged to the flag. It is a moment I have never forgotten.

Dwight David Eisenhower's devotion to his country was the motivation of a lifetime in its service. His belief in his country's ideals led him to its Presidency. His belief in the worth of his fellow man, his religious idealism, his unaffected ways, his natural leadership, his magnetic smile, his stanch courage, endeared him to his countrymen who always had a special place for him in their affections. That special place, now vacant, is full of sorrow.

On March 29, 1969, I sent the following telegram:

> Mrs. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER,
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> DEAR MRS. EISENHOWER: In the passing of your beloved and distinguished husband, the Nation has lost one of its most outstanding statesman and military leader who served his country with sound judgment and courage in peace and in war. Your dear husband will always occupy a foremost position in American and in world history. For myself personally and as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and for the Members thereof I extend to you and your beloved ones our deep sympathy in your bereavement.
>
> JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.*

We are all deeply touched. Not only the country but the world stops and pauses to pay tribute to one who took the journey of life, one who took it with vision and foresight, and who took it with courage and determination. This was a man of indomitable will, a man of extraordinary courage, who always kept foremost in his mind the flag of our country and, as he referred to it on past occasions, everything that our flag stands for. He has taken the journey into the great beyond, but the memory of Dwight David Eisenhower as citizen, soldier, statesman, and as a human being with great love for his fellow men will always live in the minds of men and women everywhere, particularly those who want to be free under their own law.

Again, for myself and all of my colleagues, and for Mrs. McCormack, I extend to Mrs. Eisenhower and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the tributes that already have been given in memory of Dwight David Eisenhower have been so heartfelt and so moving that it is difficult to say more. This was my feeling after hearing President Nixon's eulogy in the rotunda on Sunday. I feel the same way now after hearing the fine and kind words of our beloved Speaker.

There is, however, one aspect of the late President's remarkable character on which I would like to comment. It is the great interest he had in the warm confidence he showed in America's young people. As commander of allied forces in World War II, he had led hundreds of thousands of young men in battle; he knew what they could do and the dedication and sacrifice of which youth is capable, so it is no wonder that he believed in them as he did. Because he had seen firsthand the sacrifices of youth and the struggle for peace he had no doubts about the youth of the past nor those of the coming generation. He was not dismayed by the ill-advised activities of the small minority among our youth because he knew the overwhelming majority were as dedicated to America as he himself. Frequently he called the youth of the past and particularly the youth of the future the finest generations of young Americans this Nation has ever produced.

It is curious that although he was older in years than any of our other Presidents when he left the White House, General Eisenhower was younger in spirit and attitude than many men half his age. He once observed that no man is truly a man who does not have something of a boy in him, and he never lost his competitive drive, his enthusiasm, and his great capacity for friendship

One day, after the general had laid down the burdens of the Presidency, Mrs. Ford and I visited Gettysburg with our two oldest boys, Mike and Jack. I had arranged an appointment with the general because we wanted them to have an opportunity to shake hands with and see at close range this great American, but we had not expected in this courtesy call to take but a few minutes of his time. Instead, General Eisenhower kept us for almost 2 hours, detailing for our two sons the Battle of Gettysburg and recalling for them some of the fascinating highlights of his full career. He had a way with young people, and Mike and Jack were drawn to him because he never talked down to them and because he was so clearly interested in them and their opinions. I have often thought that if General Eisenhower had not become President, we would be eulogizing him for his great service on behalf of all mankind and for his leadership as a great university president or for some other conspicuous and dedicated service in the postwar years.

As President for 8 years, he was always mindful of the younger men in Government, always attentive to their views and conscious of his duty to bring them along the path of future service. He made the once ceremonial office of the Vice Presidency into an important adjunct of the Chief Executive, and those of us who were younger Members of Congress during his days in the White House will remember how closely he watched our performance and how sympathetically he considered our problems.

In recent years it was my privilege to serve with him on the national Republican coordinating committee, and there was no man of this group more faithful in attendance or more spirited in debate than the former President. Yet he never sought to dominate our discussion. What stands out in my mind most vividly with regard to General Eisenhower's contributions were the times when we on the committee were tempted by an excess of partisan zeal to swing a haymaker at the current occupant of the White House. In such circumstances the general would gently remind the rest of us:

> Well, gentlemen, if I were sitting in that chair I wouldn't like that one bit. Remember, he is the President of the United States.

It is the true measure of General Eisenhower's greatness that he cannot easily be compared with any of our other national heroes. He had the dignity and integrity of General Washington, but his beginnings were as humble as Lincoln's. His dedication to free government was as deep as Jefferson's and his vision of a world at peace as profound as Wilson's. But an authentic hero must be unique, and Dwight David Eisenhower was, above all, himself. Those who once complained he was no politician now know that this, being true to one's own best self, is the best politics of all.

Mrs. Ford and I express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family. America has lost one of its greatest sons and all mankind one of its finest leaders.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, when word reached us on Friday last that President Eisenhower had died I think my reaction must have been similiar to that of just about every man, woman, and child in this country. I felt a sense of deep personal grief. I felt that someone close to me had gone. A strong pillar which for so long had helped to support the genera-

XUM

tion to which I belonged had been pulled down.

Now that his last days on earth have ended we see Dwight David Eisenhower in the total spectrum.

We see Eisenhower, the President—Eisenhower, the general—and Eisenhower, the man.

It is difficult at this point in history to assess the Eisenhower Presidency. In my opinion, given the perspective of time, Dwight D. Eisenhower as President will be rated much higher than many contemporary historians have seen fit to rate him in his lifetime. It is true that on the domestic front there were not spectacular new developments during the Eisenhower years comparable to those of the Roosevelt-Truman period before him, and the Kennedy-Johnson period after him. Nor can it be said that there were major changes in the broad outlines of President Truman's foreign policy. However, it must be said of President Eisenhower that he presided over the longest period of peace which our people have enjoyed since the late 1930's

As a military leader General Eisenhower earned a unique place in the history of the Nation and in the history of warfare. It may be that other generals have been greater strategists and tacticians, more capable field commanders, but in the overpowering job of organizing, consolidating, and leading diverse interests and nationalities to sure and final victory against nazism, he stands in my opinion without peer in modern history.

From D-day to V–E Day he took personal responsibility and is entitled to personal credit for the success of every major decision.

It was General Eisenhower, the soldier, who, in the face of threatening weather reports, personally made the decision to cross the channel on June 6, 1944.

It was Eisenhower, the military leader, who shaped concerted and effective action from the work of many great field commanders of highly different views and talents.

It was Eisenhower, the statesman, who could win effective cooperation from the hands of all the Allied governments. His weapons were those of persuasion, patience, and firmness.

With it all he had total assurance in his own competence and in his own authority.

Surely it can be said of Dwight Eisenhower, even more surely than Byron said of Napoleon, that "he was the Cincinnatus of the West."

It is to Eisenhower, the man, that we must turn to get a glimpse of the total impact of his life and character. Born on the Texas frontier, just 6 miles from Indian territory, reared on the plains of Kansas, midst pioneer environment, into a family of little wealth but high ideals, his rise to fame and power was as sure and certain as that of Abraham Lincoln. As Walt Whitman said of Lincoln, we can say of him: One "never sees that man without feeling that he is one to become personally attached to, for his combination of purest, heartiest tenderness and native western form of manliness."

Here was a man to whom people almost instinctively turned. Though patient and unassuming, he was uniformly successful in accomplishing every important job he ever undertook, and very important jobs, indeed, did he undertake: supreme Allied commander in Europe in World War II, Chief of Staff, supreme commander and organizer of NATO, and President of the United States. He had attributes of character and experience which engendered confidence in everyone who ever saw him.

First of all, he was likable. Everybody liked Ike. He was probably the most beloved President since Washington. In the second place, he was never a petty partisan. Although he was finally convinced that he could best serve his country by running for President on the Republican ticket, he seemed to abhor traditional party politics. In his splendid essay on the American Presidency Harold J. Laski pointed out in substance that the American people disliked extreme partisanship in their Presidents. Mr. Eisenhower was probably the least partisan President since George Washington. More significant than all those facts perhaps, is the fact that the American people, and indeed the people of all the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain, had confidence in the judgment and competence of General Eisenhower. From his broad experiences in war and in NATO, as a result of his unparalleled knowledge of military and political leaders around the world, General Eisenhower had developed a vast reserve of knowledge which gave him unique qualifications to make proper decisions when questions of war and peace were hanging in the balance. This, in my opinion, caused the American people to trust him, and it caused the leaders of every nation to respect him. This, it seems to me, was a most important factor in Eisenhower's Presidency and one that historians will have to take into account in assessing his total contributions to America and to the world.

Until the day he died, President Eisenhower was beloved across his native land. We still cherish and will long cherish his memory. He still lives in the hearts of his countrymen.

We in this Chamber now salute this great and noble man who sleeps today in honor and glory beneath the historic dome of this magnificent building within which we meet.

To Mrs. Eisenhower and her son and his family, the whole Nation extends its deepest sympathy as it mourns the loss of one of its greatest and noblest sons.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, to all the wonderful words that have been said about former President and General Dwight David Eisenhower, I shall say, Amen.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has lost its most beloved leader. I have lost a personal friend.

Not since Gen. George Washington has America known a servant of the people, both in war and in peace, more dedicated to his country than Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

His leadership, and the deep sincerity of his devotion to the cause of freedom, engendered a faith in him among men everywhere and assures him a foremost place in history. His nobility of character and sincerity of purpose—that all men are born equal and endowed by their Maker with a right to be free—endeared him to the peoples of the world and earned for him their lasting gratitude.

He exemplified the finest qualities of America and of all Americans. His contribution to a better America and a better world was not solely on the field of battle nor in the councils of government, but also in the high quality of his moral leadership.

It is not we alone who mourn his loss. The humblest and the highest everywhere, around the globe, share our national grief.

He was a constant inspiration to me and to all of us who were privileged to work with him as our President.

For 8 years during his Presidency I was privileged to work closely with him. I looked forward to the weekly leadership meetings at the White House. However grave the matters discussed, he instilled in us confidence that what needs be done could be done. He was always understanding of different points of view and always objective as to what he hoped and desired to do legislatively. He sought to do only that which was in the best interests of our great country.

I was also privileged to play golf with him many, many times. Golf is a game he loved. It is often in a game, such as golf, that one gets to know his friend or adversary under the best and worst of circumstances, when one's skill and perseverance is being tested. He was a terrific competitor. He was one who always with every shot attempted to do his best. He played the game both hard and fair. And this is how he played the game of life, always fairly, with determination and purpose. For President Eisenhower I had the greatest respect, admiration, and love. He was one of the greatest men I have ever known. We are all the richer from having known him and for having had him as our leader.

Mrs. Arends joins me in extending our most sincere sympathy to the family.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues—and indeed the people of the world—in mourning the loss of a great American leader, Dwight David Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower once said, "I come from the heart of America." Today, as we mourn his passing, I think it is appropriate to say that it is in the heart of America that his memory will forever reside.

For during his lifetime, General Eisenhower affirmed America—he was committed to our goals—and because of his devotion to our country, he rose from humble origins to her highest office.

Bismarck once observed that genuinely great men are known by three signs—generosity in the design, humanity in the execution, moderation in success. These, I believe, were the hallmarks of General Eisenhower's long and productive life.

XUM

The natural grief we feel on the loss of this great leader is, I think, tempered by our knowledge that few men live such long and accomplished lives.

In times of peace, in times of war—in all times of great national need—Dwight Eisenhower gave fully and generously of his rich resources of leadership. For his fellow man, he defended freedom, won victory, brought peace, and established security. No one, it would seem, could presume to do more.

He was, indeed, one of the great men of modern times, and I consider it one of the high honors of my life to have known him.

To his widow and his family, I join my colleagues in expressing our sorrow on his passing and our gratitude for having shared him with us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE).

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, March 28, 1969, Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, the 34th President of the United States, loving husband and gentle father, the beloved leader of his people in war and peace, passed from this life.

His death saddens free men everywhere, for he did as much as any man to protect and perpetuate human freedom. He dedicated his entire life to it.

Dwight Eisenhower carried our burdens upon his strong, broad back. He was bigger than life, and he cared. His work for freedom was done willingly—eagerly—and done exceedingly well.

We pay tribute to his accomplishments today, and our tributes are fond tributes. The affection which Americans held for Ike was genuine, and the loss we suffer with his passing is the loss of a good friend. That is the most grievous loss that anyone can sustain.

THE YEARS IN ABILENE

Eisenhower naturally liked people and respected them. He enjoyed the company of kings, of presidents, and prime ministers, and was at home with the lions of industry. He sought no less the companionship of students, farmers, workers, schoolteachers, small businessmen, and the troops. He gained strength from all of them.

In his youth, he knew no social stratification, no class distinction. No one was his "better"—no one was held in low esteem for want of proper heritage or current position. Each man had unique opportunity to prove himself, and each man deserved every success that came to him, for he had earned it.

That is the way it was in Abilene.

Abilene, at the turn of the century, was not a place for the habitually idle or frivolous. The unpaved, rutted, dusty streets, the hand-sawn lumber sidewalks, the sparse shops, the unrelenting challenge of the farms, and the wind-whipped outdoors in the dead of winter were enough to deter the faint of heart or weak of will from settling there.

Men came to Abilene for a decent chance to earn an honorable living, and most came with little more than a few chattels. The only avenue to achievement was bone-crushing hard work.

There were few charities and virtually no government programs of relief. No one was called to Abilene by special privilege, and practically no one was ever asked to leave. Men came there for better opportunity than they had ever known, and they stayed because that opportunity came to them if they worked.

Men were respected for what they did themselves, and the lessons of Eisenhower's youth were practical lessons.

Frugality, good commonsense, hard work, respect for knowledge, and attention to the teachings of the Bible were hallmarks of human dignity in Abilene those days.

In 1890, the year Dwight Eisenhower was born, the Populist movement was strong in the Midwest. Five Members of Congress and one U.S. Senator were elected from Kansas on the Populist ticket that year. The party achieved a clear majority in the lower house of the State legislature, and courthouses were well staffed with adherents to the cause.

Prevailing adverse economic conditions could not be squared with the abundance of rich Kansas farmland, the competence of the people, and their commitment to fair dealing and hard work.

Most Kansans fervently believed that low farm prices were unconscionable, that the railroads and bankers held too much power, and that foreclosures were unsufferable and had to be regulated for the protection of small businessmen and farmers.

By the time Eisenhower was a teenager, the political movement had waned. But the code of Populist idealism—reverence for work and respect for the people who did the work—was firmly established.

Those views that had swept Kansas like a prairie fire were widely debated during Eisenhower's youth—albeit with some restraint by that time—at the Chautauquas, the meeting halls, the husking bees, and no doubt at the creamery where he worked after school.

Walter T. K. Nugent, in his study of Kansas populism, gave this description of the prevalent notions of the time:

> The Populist belief consisted of a feeling that the United States was a different *kind* of political society from any that had ever existed before and therefore more worth preserving than any previous one. America was not just another nation-state but an embodiment of certain ideals. It was an embodiment of democratic republicanism: a society where the people rule, where the governed consent to their governors, where the rights of life, liberty, and property are protected because this very protection is the object of their own self-government. It was the embodiment, too, of economic democracy: where resources wanted only honest labor to be translated into the reality of abundance, where opportunity was equal, where the distribution of the nation's wealth was equitable. It was the antithesis of Europe. . . . It was a place, in short, where the people rule for themselves and for the protection of their natural rights.

This, then, was the heritage which Dwight David Eisenhower carried with him to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. His roots were firmly implanted in the nourishing earth that was Abilene. His parents were representative of the finest citizens of Abilene, and he was their own true son.

He never severed those early ties. The lessons he had learned in youth helped him achieve good works throughout his distinguished career of public service.

THE YEARS IN UNIFORM

From the time he boarded the train at Abilene bound for West Point until he resigned as Allied commander in Europe to seek the Presidency, Eisenhower was throughout an Army man. During 2 intervening years as president of Columbia University, he had been restive. President Truman's call for his return to active duty had been welcome.

He was an Army man in the finest tradition, and yet his style of command was somehow distinctive. Nobody ever dared wave at any other five-star general and shout, "Hi, there, Pal," yet everybody yelled, "Hi , there, Ike." He always grinned at them and waved back. Perhaps that was the difference.

Early in his "yearling" or sophomore year at West Point, he was revolted at the humiliation he had inflicted upon an unfortunate plebe and vowed to refrain from harshly reprimanding any other victim of West Point's indoctrination system. For his 3 remaining years at the Academy, he kept the resolution.

While a junior officer, Eisenhower preferred assignments with the troops rather than prized staff positions that carried certain promotion with them.

Throughout his military career, he had an almost mystical capacity to capture the affection of his subordinates—whether a platoon or an entire army—as well as their respect and allegiance. This affection, which he returned and appreciated, was perhaps not unusual for the man whose roots were so deeply imbedded in the mainstream of humanity.

He viewed that stream as many, many individuals, working together for a common goal. He never regarded a regiment or a republic as a "mass of people," but rather as a very special selection of unique and important individuals. No wonder his troops, and later his countrymen, were so unstinting and unswerving in their loyalty to him, their affection for him.

He, of all the professionals in the U.S. Army, was the logical choice to lead that force of citizen-soldiers, that force of workers and farmers and clerks and businessmen, that was to liberate Europe from the Nazis and the Prussian officer-elite.

Ike's men knew that he was one of them, for all his training and high professional skill. They loved him—they followed him. Together they conquered.

THE YEARS IN THE WHITE HOUSE

General Eisenhower came to the White House a popular man, and he left it a popular man. Through 8 years of difficult decisions, through successes and reversals, he held the confidence of those that had selected him for their leader.

He was a brilliant administrator at the White House, just as he had been in Europe. The people wanted a respite from the agonies of war in Europe and war in Korea. They wanted quiet efficiency. He gave it to them.

Americans are like other peoples—they genuinely want to have confidence in

XUM

their President. Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States, provided a lifetime of leadership which inspired confidence.

No man will ever be called upon to render higher service to America—if she lasts 10,000 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Rivers).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the noble sentiments of our beloved Speaker of the House. I would just like to observe about this great man Eisenhower a statement of Edwin Markham:

When he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

I doubt if we can think of one in the country who found as deep a place in the hearts and the love of America. He was truly a great man, a kindly man, a humble man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Saylor).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, no finer tribute to the memory of our fallen leader can surpass the knowledge that whatever history says of his leadership—in war and peace—the people will affectionately remember him as "Ike."

He was never the textbook picture of the tough and austere military man; nor did he surround his presidency with the trappings of power as he could have. He was at heart a sincere, gregarious, and selfless public servant; and what he was at heart shown through to the American people. They knew that the man called "Ike" could be trusted implicitly.

The aura of power surrounded the man but it did not affect his presence. The feeling of command was there and yet no one could have divined to have been ordered. What sage could define the qualities of such leadership and charisma?

The country and the world will miss the man, but he left behind a memory of something more precious than a simple recall of his legion of accomplishments; he left us with a memory of an infectious smile.

The loss of that smile, with its ability to calm our fears, renew our strength, and uplift our spirits, is the greatest loss we suffer on the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. It was a smile that came from the heart of a man who epitomized the great American dream. There was the knowledge from Ike's smile that he trusted people, and they returned that trust without bounds. It was, according to one writer, "the smile of sincerity in an age of contrivance."

That smile is physically gone now, but the place it holds in the hearts of the countrymen of Dwight David Eisenhower can never be replaced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Wylie).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, as we today pay honor to a great American, I welcome the opportunity to record a personal experience with Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. In it we find further evidence of those great qualities which made him beloved as a leader in war as in peace.

This incident took place on March 23, 1945. The 30th Infantry Division, of which I was a member, was moving into position in preparation for a night attack across the Rhine River at Wessel, Germany. We had spent many hours practicing with assault crossings of the Maas River in Holland. We knew what we were to do. But the Rhine River was wider and the attack was to be at night under cover of darkness. In practise no one was trying to keep us from landing. Still assault boats had capsized and in one instance the occupants had drowned. So, we approached our task afraid that we might never see loved ones again. Then, the paratroopers started dropping behind enemy lines in great numbers from the sky. We sensed their mission was much more dangerous than ours but would certainly increase our chances of reaching the other side. Sporadic shell fire made us ill at ease and attested to the presence of the enemy and his intention to see that our mission failed. While we were there, marching gloomily in combat column, a staff car approached and stopped beside where I was walking. General Eisenhower stepped out. For a moment, I froze with apprehension. Then, I made a poor attempt to salute, which seemed the thing to do. The General extended his hand to shake mine, flashed his warm smile, and said—I think, "Hi soldier," although in the dramatics of the moment I cannot now be certain of his exact words. The general walked up and down the column shaking hands and encouraging his troops. He came, too, I am sure, to get a better look at the tactical situation. I remember distinctly saying to a buddy, "He shouldn't be here. Doesn't he know he is liable to be killed?" General Eisenhower was up with the troops risking his life but the inspiration his presence gave cannot be imagined. Later, I was to receive the Silver Star because our battalion commander, Lt. Col. Ernest Frankland, thought I performed my small part of that battle with extraordinary heroism. As I reflect, I am not inclined to acts which would warrant any such honor. If I deserve it, General Eisenhower deserved, at least, some of the credit. Two years ago many of us as freshman Congressmen visited with President Eisenhower at Camp David. We talked briefly about the Rhine River crossing.

Our Nation is sad because of the death of our great general and President. He was loved for his courage, warmth, and understanding. Yes; we are saddened, as a nation by his passing. Yet in his death, as in his life, we are caused to reflect on the heritage of our great country, the outstanding contributions of the great Dwight David Eisenhower and the necessity just now, as perhaps never before, for an extra effort to preserve our freedoms.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Smith).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for the past several decades, it seems that fame and notoriety has gone principally to those who accumulate great material wealth, commit some hideous crime, or have a reputation for abusing power or do the unusual. Many millions of Americans are honest and have a great desire to see justice but few become famous for having those attributes. General Eisenhower was one of those few. The loss of a man with worldwide fame for such characteristics is a great loss and the whole Nation and world suffers from such loss.

As Dwight David Eisenhower sleeps in the rotunda a few steps from here, the Nation mourns the loss of a truly great American, and I join those who extend their condolences to his family.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINN. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

All the world is saddened by the death of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, a truly great yet humble man. The former President—who preferred to be called General after his retirement—probably will not go down in history as a politician's President, but rather as a true statesman, highly respected by the leaders of all nations of the world.

As a young Kansas Congressman, I was fortunate enough to meet personally with this great man, who grew up on the western prairie of Kansas, at his peaceful Gettysburg farm. His knowledge of both national and international affairs proved to be most helpful to me as a new Congressman.

Men of all political philosophies sought his counsel and guidance on matters of importance. And all succeeding Presidents have at one time or another turned to him for help.

To the end, this uncommon man was characterized by uncommon strength.

Mr. Speaker, at the Capitol today are 50 Kansas schoolchildren who are here to pay tribute to Dwight D. Eisenhower. They have brought with them a beautiful box of long-stemmed wheat from the great State of Kansas, as a symbol of their love for our wonderful former President. They are here in person to add this wheat to the many beautiful flowers covering the rotunda of this Capitol.

One of the sponsors of this Kansas group has written a poem which I should like to read to this distinguished body today. This poem was written by Barbara Hanna Gray and endorsed by the 50 schoolchildren from Kansas.

This poem reads as follows:

Wheat: In Memory of Dwight David Eisenhower

(By Barbara Hanna Gray)

A shock of wheat—Ripened in the sun of a
Kansas prairie, tendered gently there
from small green sprout until tall and
golden—unbent by the winds that
blow hard.
A shock of wheat—Filled with the grain of a
Kansas youth, harvested by God to
feed His flocks with the bread of his
life—unbent by the winds that blow
hard.
A shock of wheat—Having borne its fruit
must die to live anew, returning now
to the promised land of everlasting
life—unbent by the winds that blow
hard.

Mr. McCORMACK. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I brought my family to the Nation's Capital in January of 1953, at the beginning of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

As a freshman in the 83d Congress, I became acquainted for the first time with the warm, friendly, and genuine American who was to lead our country through most of the 1950's.

The impression I then received—of a man with a deep love for our country and a great respect for all his fellow citizens—was to continue for the 17 years which followed.

The opportunity to know the man and to appreciate his great character was one of the real treasures of my own years of public service.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its finest sons in the death of our beloved former President, Dwight David Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower was a soldier-patriot in the great American tradition—a worthy successor to George Washington and Andrew Jackson.

As commander of the Allied forces who liberated Europe from the tyranny of Nazi armed conquest, he was a crusader for freedom in one of history's most trying challenges to freedom.

Eisenhower leadership for freedom continued in the tumultuous years which followed World War II, as he united the NATO powers to halt the westward drive of another tyranny—that of Soviet communism lead by Stalin.

As President of the United States during the cold war years of the 1950's, Dwight Eisenhower continued to lead the free world in the quest for both freedom and peace.

As the acknowledged leader of free nations throughout the 1950's, President Eisenhower pledged the terrible power of the atom to the search for peace, in an address to the United Nations which inspired all the world.

When he completed his second term as President, he continued to serve his country, providing wise counsel and assistance to the three Presidents who have followed him—regardless of party affiliation.

A man who loved and served his country well, a man who was above partisan politics on the major questions of peace and war at all times, a man who was loved and respected by all Americans—that was Dwight David Eisenhower.

America has lost a great champion and a great leader. I join my colleagues in mourning our great loss.

Mr. McCORMACK. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker for yielding.

In the death of General Eisenhower America has lost our most widely loved public figure. General Eisenhower had very special qualities of humility, sincerity, spiritual conviction, and great human warmth. All of these animated his long service to his country.

I remember on more than one occasion his turning to friends and saying, "Well, the really educated member of the family is Milton." He always thought of the other person first, such as when he knew almost a year ago that his chances for the future were perhaps not the brightest. Then, he looked death in the face and he found it preferable. He said to a friend:

> I have a pretty good idea as to what my chances are. I would like to go on living for as long as I can be useful to somebody, even though I know I am not going to set the world on fire at my age. But I had just as soon the end came now if to go on living means that I will be a burden to my family and tie up all those doctors who could be taking care of guys with a full life ahead of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think this deep and ingrained humility was uniquely characteristic of General Eisenhower.

Few will ever forget his broad smile and his capacity to inspire confidence and accomplishment—among both men and nations—whether it was before Normandy or during Europe's troubled days while NATO was being formed or in his dramatic "open skies" proposal at the Geneva summit, which no other American could have put forward with the same effectiveness. Indeed, his smile was capable of lighting up a nation here or overseas, as the great throngs that turned out to greet him illustrated so vividly. We felt better when we saw that smile—it was unique—it was a personal one, it was a humble one, and it called forth our deepest trust.

I also remember the period during the late 1940's and early 1950's when General Eisenhower had several opportunities to consider the nomination for the Presidency. Perhaps no other American in public life turned down such clear offers for the presidential nomination as forthrightly as he did.

I think the point that finally motivated him to accept the Republican nomination was his concern over the war in Korea and his desire to work for peace. He could not have forgiven himself had he sacrificed an opportunity to save the lives of young men and to truly serve the people of the country he so deeply loved; but it was not in his nature to seek the power of the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower certainly was one of the most successful commanders of a multinational alliance. He revitalized the Republican Party and thereby strengthened the two-party system. His character and ability certainly put to rest many thoughts of isolationism of prewar America.

He was responsible for many progressive steps to strengthen our domestic policies, whether they involved the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or increases in social security. Neither will America forget that it was President Eisenhower who succeeded in passing the first civil rights bill since Reconstruction and warned of the dangers of the military-industrial complex.

All remember, I believe, his achievement in bringing peace to Korea. Surely history will record the unifying leadership he brought to America in the Presidency following the divisive years of war overseas.

But his overriding concern in the Presidency was to work for a world of universal peace with justice. His unqualified support of the U.N. was fundamental. His leadership in the "atoms-for-peace" program in the Alliance for Progress, in progress toward a nonproliferation treaty, and for a détente with the Soviet Union remains basic to the future.

I was at the White House one day when the subject of nuclear weapons was raised. He looked out the window and said very simply that he was opposed to their use, and that there would be no such thing as the use of one tactical nuclear weapon, for any such action would inevitably invite a full nuclear exchange.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower had a real spiritual quality, character and judgment, steadiness under pressure, and a complete honesty and sincerity about him. He inspired men to work together; he had total disdain for personal public comment; he was contemptuous of narrow partisan motives, and more than once rejected temporary political gain for the greater good of our country. Such a man brought stature and trust to the White House. He represented Americans, perhaps, more faithfully than any in our time. Certainly, he was loved and trusted both overseas and here. In a unique way his life will stand as an inspiration for all those who believe in character in government.

He was a great human being, and he will be judged kindly by future historians, not only for his positive accomplishments but indeed for those decisions which did not make the headlines, such as his refusal to be stampeded into any commitment to Vietnam.

His life is a testament to public service, and of the highest traditions of America, and General Eisenhower now clearly belongs to the ages.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all of the Members of the House in expressing our grief upon the passing of General Eisenhower, and I wish to express our deepest sympathy, that of Mrs. Reid and my mother, Helen Rogers Reid, to Mrs. Eisenhower, John Eisenhower, and all members of the family.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, America today mourns the loss of one of her most noble sons. I deem it a great privilege to join with the Speaker and others in paying tribute to the memory of Dwight David Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, I like to think of Dwight D. Eisenhower in terms of three plateaus: first, as a military leader, he was without a peer. His greatest strength was his ability to bring people together. It was his genius as an organizer, as a persuader, as a mediator, and as a military tactician that helped put together the fantastic military machine that frustrated the designs of the Axis Powers upon the freedom of this country and the rest of the world.

I do not believe that even at this day

XUM

we realize the enormity of his accomplishments in pulling together divergent military views, in pulling together divergent military concepts, different equipment, different ideas, and welding them into one successful effort which brought victory and freedom to the world.

I believe that Dwight Eisenhower today deserves to be called the greatest military genius of our time.

Second, as President of the United States he had abiding faith in the rugged spirit of American individualism. Many of his critics have erroneously interpreted his stubborn refusal to plunge Government controls into every facet of our American life as a record of inaction. President Eisenhower in my judgment reflected the true spirit of Thomas Jefferson. He had a social consciousness. He realized things had to be done, and he wanted to move forward, but he also realized that the dignity of an individual is supreme in a free nation, and he wanted to let the individual do as much for himself as humanly possible.

President Eisenhower gave the country a great record to build on. In the ensuing years his successors have built upon that record. There is no question but that Mr. Eisenhower has made great contributions as President of this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe his third great achievement was as an American in his farewell address when he warned the Nation against the military-industrial complex. Here was a man who had had occasion to observe first-handedly as a military leader and as the President of the United States the inherent dangers of permitting that sort of a combination to get out of hand. The enormity of his warning is best exemplified as we look today and see that some 200 American corporations have more than $30 billion worth of Government contracts. The warning given us by President Eisenhower cannot go unheeded.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the political leaders of my own party exerted every effort to induce and persuade General Eisenhower to run on the Democratic ticket. Mr. Eisenhower would have been a great President on either party's ticket.

Nor am I at all surprised to learn that President Truman had designated him as his heir apparent, because we all have recognized Mr. Eisenhower's genius and his great dedication and his abiding faith in America.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute today to Dwight Eisenhower I would say that he gave majesty and nobility to the cause of public service. His conduct in public affairs leaves all of us in public office with a legacy we can proudly emulate.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending and expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower, the entire Eisenhower family, and, yes, to all Americans who today mourn his passing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues today in paying respect to the memory of General Eisenhower. Many of us in this body had the honor of serving under his command in Europe during World War II, and I recall those days as well. I was division headquarters company commander of the 83d Division.

The first time I saw the general was shortly after the invasion when he visited our division headquarters and on several occasions after that he visited our division.

As a junior officer I had the privilege of being in the division war room when he was conferring with the senior officers of the division. At no time did he ever fail to inquire about the troops of the division. He always was concerned about their welfare—were they getting enough food, were they getting the proper clothes. This was a man who was not only a great general but also a great humanitarian.

Then shortly after the war, many of us had the honor of entering into public service in the Congress at the same time he became President of the United States. We still have a number here on both sides of the aisle who came in as Members of the 83d Congress in 1953. We can recall our visits with him during those years. He understood the role of the Congress and respected it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that when history writes the record of General Eisenhower, that record is going to be one of great achievement both in war and in peace. He was a man who really cherished freedom—and a man who hated war.

He never hesitated to take such action as was necessary to preserve our Nation. The world has lost a great leader but his inspiration will live on forever.

Mrs. Cederberg and I extend our deepest sympathy to the Eisenhower family.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), and others have called attention to the large number of Members of Congress who served under General Eisenhower when he was commander of the European theater of operations during World War II.

The qualities of General Eisenhower's leadership as commander were manifest in the planning and launching of the great invasion of Normandy as well as in many other ways.

I would like to call attention to something that General Eisenhower wrote in "Crusade in Europe" and what he described as "one of my happy moments of the war." When he received the news of the first crossing of the Rhine at Remagen, Germany, General Eisenhower capitalized on this great event which materially shortened the war in Europe. He wrote this about the Remagen Bridge capture:

> This news was reported to Bradley. It happened that a SHAEF staff officer was in Bradley's headquarters when the news arrived, and a discussion at once took place as to the amount of force that should be pushed across the bridge. If the bridgehead force was too small it would be destroyed through a quick concentration of German strength on the east side of the river. On the other hand, Bradley realized that if he threw a large force across he might interfere with further development of my basic plan. Bradley instantly telephoned me.
>
> I was at dinner in my Reims headquarters with the corps and division commanders of the American airborne forces when Bradley's call came through. When he reported that we had a permanent bridge across the Rhine I could scarcely believe my ears. He and I had frequently discussed such a development as a remote possibility but never as a well-founded hope.
>
> I fairly shouted into the telephone: "How much have you got in that vicinity that you can throw across the river?"
>
> He said, "I have more than four divisions but I called you to make sure that pushing them over would not interfere with your plans."
>
> I replied, "Well, Brad, we expected to have that many divisions tied up around Cologne and now those are free. Go ahead and shove over at least five divisions instantly, and anything else that is necessary to make certain of our hold."
>
> His answer came over the phone with a distinct tone of glee: "That's exactly what I wanted to do but the question had been raised here about conflict with your plans, and I wanted to check with you."
>
> That was one of my happy moments of the war. Broad success in war is usually foreseen by days or weeks, with the result that when it actually arrives higher commanders and staffs have discounted it and are immersed in plans for the future. This was completely unforeseen. We were across the Rhine, on a permanent bridge; the traditional defensive barrier to the heart of Germany was pierced. The final defeat of the enemy, which we had long calculated would be accomplished in the spring and summer campaigning of 1945, was suddenly now in our minds, just around the corner.
>
> My guests at the dinner table were infected by my enthusiasm. Among them were veterans of successful aerial jumps against the enemy and of hard fighting in every kind of situation. They were unanimous in their happy predictions of an early end to the war. I am sure that from that moment every one of them went into battle with the élan that comes from the joyous certainty of smashing victory.

Ten years after that event, President Eisenhower assembled at the White House the heroes of that event and he told them on March 7, 1955:

> Gentlemen, I have asked you to come here this morning because you know old soldiers' minds are bound to turn back once in a while to dramatic events of war—particularly of the kind that took place at the Remagen bridgehead.
>
> Now, of course, that was not the biggest battle that ever was, but for me it always typified one thing; the dash, the ingenuity, the readiness at the first opportunity that characterizes the American soldier.

That was one of the qualities of leadership of General Eisenhower when he commanded our troops in Europe.

I would like to quote also briefly from the very last words in General Eisenhower's book "Crusade in Europe," words that mean a great deal in terms of his basic philosophy:

> We believe in individual liberty, rooted in human dignity, is man's greatest treasure.
>
> If the men and women of America face this issue as squarely and bravely as their soldiers faced the terrors of battle in World War II, we would have no fear of the outcome. If they will unite themselves as firmly as they did when they provided, with their allies in Europe, the mightiest fighting force of all time, there is no temporal power that can dare challenge them. If they can retain the moral integrity, the clarity of comprehension, and the readiness to sacrifice that finally crushed the Axis, then the Free World will live and prosper, and all peoples, even-

tually will reach a level of culture, contentment, and security that has never before been achieved.

That was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune also to serve under the leadership of General Eisenhower, both militarily and in civilian life; first as an infantryman from Omaha Beach to the Ruhr River in Germany during World War II and subsequently in Congress during his Presidency.

Among the exchanges of correspondence I have had with General Eisenhower, the first was a letter dating back nearly 20 years, which I have prized very much, for it was written at a time when there was considerable talk of his running for President while serving as President of Columbia University.

President Nixon in his eulogy made several references to Dwight Eisenhower's coming from the "heart of America" and the subject of my first exchange of letters with General Eisenhower had to do with my hope in any political ambitions he might have that he would never forget his midwest heritage.

While his first letter to me dated November 16, 1949, said in part:

> So far as any personal politics may be concerned . . . I have not changed my mind in the slightest degree.

We are all so grateful and so much better off for his having reassessed the situation and changed his mind.

His 8-year administration was indeed a period of calm and tranquillity accompanied by significant progress in all levels of national life. We long and yearn for similar days in the new administration.

Of all the millions of words written about General Eisenhower I believe the true measure of the man was captured as well as anything I have seen by Mr. Hugh Sidey, writing in the August 17, 1968, edition of Life magazine. He said:

> There are even those who dare to suggest that his soothing spirit, the innate goodness of the man himself, did more to lift up the hearts of Americans and hold them together in a reasonable state of public happiness than many of the social reforms that have been propounded since.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Dwight Eisenhower, referred to before, and Mr. Hugh Sidey's article be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

I extend our profound sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and all the members of the family whom he loved so much as he always loved his country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORGAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The letter and article are as follows:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., November 16, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Representative in Congress,
Peoria, Ill.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: It is always nice to hear from an old soldier, particularly one who served in the Infantry, my old arm. Additionally, of course, I must thank you for the very great compliments paid me in your letter of the 12th.

While it is obviously necessary that, so long as I am connected with Columbia University, I be officially classed as an "Easterner," it is equally true that the roots of my family and my life are buried too deep in the West for me to ever think of myself as anything but a mid-Westerner.

I assure you, though, that these facts have no implications of any kind in the political world—at least so far as any personal politics may be concerned. I have earnestly and honestly tried to make my own position clear about these matters, and I assure you I have not changed my mind in the slightest degree.

With best wishes to a former comrade of ETO.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PRESIDENCY—THE SMILE OF SINCERITY IN AN AGE OF CONTRIVANCE

(By Hugh Sidey)

Dwight Eisenhower came into the living rooms of 30 million Americans the other night, and he was old and bald and he used a TelePrompTer and still flubbed a few of his lines, but there was more power in his 10-minute appeal than in any of the presidential political oratory of the past 12 months. And it may be that the effort to make his talk brought on the heart attack that has him seriously ill.

It has been one of those mysteries of national life why all the would-be Presidents (and President) who have been frantically searching for some formula to catapult them to the heights of popularity have failed to study the example of Eisenhower. Perhaps in this age of contrivance it is too simple to be believed—decency, sincerity and honesty. It shines out of Ike like a beacon, and it should give those in the political business some pause. Because it illustrates anew that all the programs espoused and the bills passed and the billions spent are only a part of this thing of being President and maybe even the lesser part in a time of dispirited affluence.

It should be of some significance that while almost everybody else was engaged in a season of shifting views, cloaked opinions, denials of internal trouble and even espousal of the right of a government to lie to its people, the steady virtue of Eisenhower raised him to a new pedestal while all those others fell lower. He was polled the most admired man in the nation last year and probably ranks as high today. There is some kind of hunger there. Even among the unwashed and on the campus, the cry is for candor and compassion, which is the same thing.

Lyndon Johnson has used an inordinate amount of his time and energy raising monuments to his own greatness, and all the while his esteem has slipped. Ike's self-promotion runs at such a low voltage as to be undiscernible. He still acts a little embarrassed at new honors. He still wonders why people care—and that only intensifies the phenomenon. A while back in his modest office on the corner of the Gettysburg College campus he marveled at this public. He didn't have an unusually big nose or extraordinary ears or any other physical features that made him easily identifiable, he explained. Yet, there he had been in New York in the back of an unmarked limousine, almost out of sight, and as he drove down the street, "the darndest thing happened. People leaned out and yelled, 'Hello, Ike.' How did they know who I was?"

While all the candidates from Reagan to McCarthy diagnosed in detail the national ailments, Ike maintained a hearty belief that it was a fever, and the body was fundamentally sound. He could beat any of them in a runoff. While the scowl has become the symbol of this season's stump (with the exception of Hubert Humphrey), there has been that enduring smile of Eisenhower's that reached more men's hearts than social security. There is the feeling from Ike that he trusts people and they return it in spades. He has confessed that it would be nice sometime to take Mamie and go to the Metropolitan Museum and "just drift through it without having to shake hands or sign an autograph." But, says Ike, with a chuckle, whenever he brings up that complaint (one of the few anybody has heard him make about his lot in life), Mamie turns to him and says, "How would you like it if they all disliked you?"

In these days of rebellion against order, Ike has been more than ever conscious of the example he must set, which is another of those unmeasurable qualities that go into leadership and has been missing on occasion with the men now in the ring. Eisenhower confesses a liking for horses and horse racing, and yet he has scrupulously limited himself to one appearance at the track each year, simply because he believes that that is enough for a man who is held in the public gaze.

There are a lot of people who still feel that Ike never really understood his job of being President. Yet today his commonsense observations about the Presidency are more cogent than a lot of the other talk. He, for instance, does not like the disuse of the Cabinet and the National Security Council in the executive branch and the resulting deep personalization of the Presidency. "You need," he says, "bitterly debated advice and conflicting considerations." The frantic pace of today's Presidency has also disturbed him. He played golf, yes, but the business was never out of his mind." A President has got to have time to think about his main problems." There are a growing number of presidential observers who endorse that need.

He feels that the heads of the great Federal departments, should have more far-reaching power in setting up their staffs. He feels that the momentum of the big bureaucracies tends to sweep the Cabinet officers right along with them, and these men are often almost powerless to combat the system which grows bigger when it is obvious that in some ways it should grow smaller. This is the theme song now of all the candidates.

So far the historians have not ranked Eisenhower very high in the presidential legend. But there is growing conviction that the measure of the man himself may be more of a factor in the national life than anyone has been willing to admit before. Ike has not been referred to as a top-drawer expediter, one who knew the machinery of government, but there are hints that the tradtional assessment of those qualities may be outdated and inaccurate. The eight years of relative world calm under Ike, achieved without losing any territory or much prestige, have taken on new importance. There are even those who dare suggest that his soothing spirit, the innate goodness of the man himself, did more to lift up the hearts of Americans and hold them together in a reasonable state of public happiness than many of the social reforms that have been propounded since.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished Speaker yielding to me so I may join with other Members in mourning the passing of our late President and general, Dwight David Eisenhower.

This is a significant day in which to pay tribute to a man who had his roots in my congressional district. In fact, he was married to Mamie in Denver, Colo., and after that Denver was his second home. Throughout the years before he became prominent as a forthright leader of the Nation, he spent many years and days in the city and county of Denver. It was

XUM

during that period of time that those he came in contact with learned to know and love him. They appreciated the fact that he had the spirit and the fairness and the understanding that are not as well attributed to all men as they were to Ike.

After he became famous, so to speak, when he led our armies in Western Europe to victory and then he returned to the United States, he came back to Denver, Colo. Once again, General Eisenhower enjoyed the respect and honor and leadership that he so well deserves.

We in Denver express our thoughts this moment to the family and mourn the loss of his leadership. I express my sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family. I know his death is a great loss to the Nation, and particularly it is a great loss to the people of my district.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I express my gratitude to the Speaker for yielding to me, and also for taking the lead in expressing eulogies and giving us the opportunity to express our personal eulogies for our former President, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Dwight David Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States and General of the Armies, is dead, and like millions of Americans and people throughout the world, I deeply mourn his passing.

Whenever I think of President Eisenhower, the words "warm" and "human" immediately come to my mind. Will Americans ever forget that big grin—the smile, known around the world, which genuinely reflected his warm personality.

When I first met this great, dedicated, and devoted American, I was overwhelmed by his down-to-earth sincerity. Being in his presence gave me renewed confidence and faith in the goodness of unselfish public service. Having met him in person, one soon realized that he had just met greatness.

Now America has lost its most distinguished elder statesman and the world has lost one of the truly great men of the 20th century.

Dwight Eisenhower was a professional, career soldier who spoke of war as "this damnable thing." He led a great military crusade that saved Western Europe and the free world from tyranny, yet warned of the creation of a "military-industrial complex" in America.

President Eisenhower always spoke of the "greatness of America" and the "strength of the American people." He was not a flamboyant man or a great wit, but he was genuinely liked—even by his political and philosophical opponents.

Dwight Eisenhower has been called a national hero, a leader in war, a crusader for peace—and it is true; he was all of these things. But more important, he was a humble man who was called to greatness by those who recognized in him that rare quality of leadership that makes some men stand taller than others.

As a military figure, he was not a great authoritarian, or a disciplinarian. Instead, he inspired men by his example and by his logic. He had a unique ability for drawing people together in a common cause and welding them into the most awesome and proficient military armada ever assembled.

As our President, he brought to this great Nation something it desperately needed—unity, purpose, and a sense of direction. Whether they voted for him or not, most Americans were proud of Dwight Eisenhower and felt a measure of security while he was in the White House.

In the twilight of his life, "Ike" displayed the same courage and tenacity that he had reflected on the battlefield and in the quiet counsels of the Presidency. I have never known a man to survive seven heart attacks and so many other medical complications and still maintain that keen insight into the future or that illuminating awareness of history that "Ike" held to the end.

In my judgment, leadership is the ability to influence human behavior, and it was for this reason, I believe, that people trusted "Ike." They trusted him with the lives of their sons in war, and with their own destinies as our President.

Though he was trained as a soldier, "Ike" was truly a man of peace.

Dwight David Eisenhower will go down in history as a humble man who responded to the call of his country in its time of greatest need—not once or twice, but whenever the need arose.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower helped us win a war that could not be avoided and kept us out of several that could. In this dangerous world, no public service could be more beneficial nor earn higher marks in history. General Eisenhower has earned his greatness.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker for yielding to me.

The people of Idaho join with the millions of Americans across this land and, indeed, the millions in other lands in mourning the death of a great leader, Dwight David Eisenhower, and in paying tribute to his memory.

I shall never forget the first time I met General Eisenhower. It was at the convention in Chicago in 1952, a short time before he was nominated to be President of the United States. I had the feeling at the time that I was meeting one of the great men of history. General Eisenhower had completed a career of distinguished service to his country as a soldier. He was about to enter upon the period of his greatest service to our country as one of its most beloved statesmen. On the occasion of this first meeting, General Eisenhower's personal warmth, his infectious smile, and the twinkle in his eye made a profound impression on me.

The pleasure of my first meeting with General Eisenhower was matched by the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Eisenhower on the same occasion. Her friendliness, her warmth, and great charm are among the qualities that have marked Mrs. Eisenhower as one of the truly great ladies of American history.

President Eisenhower honored the people of the State of Idaho by paying us a visit in 1962, when he was accorded a welcome that reflected the depth of the love and respect that the people of Idaho bear for him.

General Eisenhower was a distinguished soldier and military leader, but was also passionately devoted to the cause of peace. He dedicated all of the energy and strength he could command to the task of building an enduring world peace.

General Eisenhower's life exemplified the best in America. Because of him, all Americans stand a bit taller. All of us feel prouder of ourselves and of our country. He had a deep belief in the American dream, a faith in God and in the future of our country.

He was a leader of great strength and toughness. Yet, he was kind, gentle, compassionate, and understanding.

The high principles and purposes that motivated General Eisenhower are reflected in his speech to the men and women of the Allied Expeditionary Force at the end of his great crusade in Europe. I quote from the closing sentences of his address:

> Each of the fallen died as a member of the team to which you belong, bound together by a common love of liberty and a refusal to submit to enslavement. No monument of stone, no memorial of whatever magnitude could so well express our respect and veneration for their sacrifice as would perpetuation of the spirit of comradeship in which they died. As we celebrate victory in Europe, let us remind ourselves that our common problems of the immediate and distant future can be best solved in the same conceptions of cooperation and devotion to the cause of human freedom as have made this Expeditionary Force such a mighty engine of righteous destruction. Let us have no part in the profitless quarrels in which other men will inevitably engage as to what country, what service, won the European war.
>
> Every man, every woman of every nation here represented has served according to his or her ability, and the efforts of each have contributed to the outcome. This we shall remember—and in doing so we shall be revering each honored grave and be sending comfort to the loved ones of comrades who could not live to see this day.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great leader. But as we face the challenge of the future to carry on the work which was so effectively advanced by Dwight David Eisenhower during his lifetime we can, if we will, continue to draw strength, inspiration, and guidance from the life and service of this dedicated American. We can best honor his memory by learning and applying in our own public service the great lessons he has taught us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL).

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the death of that great American, former President Dwight David Eisen-

XUM

hower. I join all Americans and citizens throughout the world in extending my deepest sympathy to the Eisenhower family.

The light of liberty burns brighter and the strength of our Nation is far more secure today because we were fortunate enough to have had the services of General Eisenhower.

There are no words adequate to express the love and admiration held in the hearts of all Americans for the general. Many of us were privileged to serve under General Eisenhower in the European theater during World War II.

Occasionally an individual comes along who possesses a rare quality of leadership, an insight into life, and the needs and aspirations of our people. General Eisenhower was such a man.

An individual destined to take his place as one of the great military leaders of all times, General Eisenhower was a man of peace, an individual destined to become one of his country's greatest Presidents, General Eisenhower knew when to stand strong and firm for freedom.

He brought to public life a spirit of American know-how and dedication unexcelled in our generation.

A man of the people, General Eisenhower was raised in the simple, dignified tradition which molded the life of another great American, Abraham Lincoln. He lived close to the earth, and like Lincoln, received strength from it.

From the beginning, General Eisenhower was destined to carry on his shoulders the responsibilities of a growing, thriving, sometimes troubled nation. And he never shirked these responsibilities.

Throughout his illustrious career, General Eisenhower maintained the bearing of a patient, persistent worker for every American. Indeed, he leaves behind a legacy of service to his country which will enrich the lives of generations to come.

Perhaps no greater tribute can be paid to General Eisenhower than to say that "Ike" will be missed by those who love freedom and believe in the dignity of man.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. LLOYD).

Mr. LLOYD. I thank the Speaker for yielding to me.

In behalf of the citizens of my Second Congressional District in Utah, I rise to pay tribute to one of the greatest of all Americans.

Dwight Eisenhower represented the American ideal. As someone has said over this weekend, he was the kind of man the American father wants his son to grow up to be.

Except for the far left or pretentiously sophisticated writers, who find something "square" about traditional virtues, the tributes to this authentic American hero have expressed the heart of America, as President Nixon said yesterday, that General Eisenhower himself represented the heart of America.

I was privileged to visit with our former President on two occasions in 1967. The first with the 90th Club of Republican freshmen. He greeted us at his home in Gettysburg from where we went to a quiet picnic grove adjacent to a canyon stream. There the general sat down with us and ate a steak and baked bean lunch from a paper plate, showing his personal consideration for our welfare by his every move and expression, and then we had the rare privilege of listening to him answering our questions for nearly an hour. I was struck by the clarity of his mind and by the clarity of his words and by his intellectual articulation of basic knowledge and basic truth.

Later with a Republican task force on Western alliances, we visited with him in his office on the campus at Gettysburg College. Around luncheon tables, he discussed with us his convictions in the field of foreign relations. Again I was struck by his modesty, the simplicity of his movements, the clarity and force of his expressions, and his constant consideration for those of us around him.

It is said that he was not a politician. However, he believed and expressed something very basic which the Members of this Congress and the American people should remember. He said that what was best for this country would prove to be the best politics. So, in a day when some use the word "statesman" in derision and glorify political cleverness, the constancy and the patriotism of Dwight David Eisenhower stands out monumentally.

It was our good fortune as Americans, that Dwight Eisenhower was granted the years to complete his work and he passes to eternal glory with the love, the gratitude, the reverence, and the eternal respect of the American people.

Sentiments of Utahans are expressed in editorials from the Salt Lake Tribune and the Deseret News, which follow:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, Mar. 28, 1969]

Why Americans Will Always Like Ike

As a sorrowing nation mourns the passing of one of its greatest and most beloved leaders, there is little to be said about Dwight David Eisenhower that has not only been said before but repeated frequently.

From his early years as a Kansas farm boy to his rise from an obscure lieutenant to become supreme commander of the Allied forces that smashed Hitler's "fortress Europe," from his stint as President of Columbia University to his accomplishments as the first Republican President of the United States in 20 years, and his public services after leaving the White House, the life of Ike Eisenhower has been thoroughly chronicled as have few others.

No words can add or detract from his accomplishments, or the honors bestowed upon him all over the world. Nor can words enhance the love or ease the sadness that his countrymen feel at his demise.

As Americans reflect upon the life and works of this remarkable soldier, statesman, and leader, they would do well to ask why he won not only the admiration but also the respect of so many people in all walks of life.

Was it because Dwight D. Eisenhower was a fatherly figure to the entire country—firm but kind? Was it because he had the "common touch," being a man of simple tastes? Was it because he genuinely liked people—and they responded in kind? Was it because of his undeniable sincerity as a man of peace? Was it his clear-cut integrity?

No doubt these and many other well known aspects of Dwight Eisenhower's personality help explain his amazingly intense, widespread and enduring popularity.

But there is one facet of his character that has been generally neglected, but which speaks volumes about the man. It was a facet that was touched on in a thumbnail sketch written two years ago by Bryce N. Harlow, one of Eisenhower's closest aides during his eight years in the White House who observed:

"Take the attributes you consider the most admirable in the people you know, put them in a mixer, and you'll come up with the Eisenhower blend.

"He is vitality and power and force—yet he is profoundly sensitive to the needs and feelings of others. He dominates the people around him—yet eagerly solicits their advice and readily acknowledges error. He has great dignity and reserve, reflecting a quarter century of command and association with world leaders—yet he transforms instantly into 'Ike of Kansas' with a school-boy grin radiating amiability and warmth and the friendliness of a cocker spaniel.

"He has had the adulation of people all over the world for two decades and more—yet is humble to the point of being self-effacing. He detests the perpendicular pronoun, and has scratched out hundreds of 'I's' from speech drafts. Many of his political speeches have ended up almost sterile because of his dislike of blowing his own horn.

"During all of his White House days he forbade the use of the word 'my' before 'Cabinet,' insisting that the prestigious institution should always be called 'The Cabinet.'

"One of his favorite admonitions is, 'Always consider your job important, never yourself.' In 1942 in North Africa, General Marshall asked him what is the most important attribute of a leader. His answer was selflessness."

Whatever history records of Dwight David Eisenhower's accomplishments as a soldier and statesman, the record will not be complete without his accomplishments as a man and the inspiration he provided in helping Americans live better lives of service and devotion to their country.

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 29, 1969]

A Man for His Times

Often in this fortunate country's history the right man has come forth in times of national need. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was such a man.

During World War II he rose from relative obscurity to plan, then execute, the invasion of Hitler's Fortress Europe. In 1952, when Americans were frustrated and bogged down in a seemingly fruitless and unwanted war in Korea, he agreed to seek the Presidency if given a "clear call to political duty." Republican leaders saw to it that the call was forthcoming and General Eisenhower, then serving as Supreme Commander of the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, answered without further hesitation.

Americans of all political persuasions turned to the former general in hope that his international prestige could restore and preserve peace and bring on the good life. To a remarkable degree these hopes were realized. The 8 Eisenhower years, though frayed at times by tense international incidents, were, in the overall, good ones.

His death Friday at the age of 78 will be mourned as one mourns the passing of a kindly relative who saw the family through troubled times in other years that now seem almost placid by comparison.

Though he was coaxed into politics and never practiced that art in the usual fashion, General Eisenhower was nevertheless reluctant to cut political ties after stepping

XUM

down. He continued active in Republican affairs and spoke out frequently in criticism—and sometimes support—of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations that followed. He took a hand in reknitting the Republican Party, which strayed from his more liberal concepts and came to disaster in the Goldwater debacle of 1964. His last public utterance was addressed to the party, revitalized and then meeting in convention in Miami Beach, last August.

History has yet to pronounce its verdict on Eisenhower the general or on Eisenhower the President. Criticisms of both roles have been made by knowledgeable persons of high repute and these must be weighed. But Eisenhower of the infectious grin and fatherly aura must be audited in the abstract.

His greatness lay in his ability to instill in millions of people here and abroad the feeling that the world's mightiest power was in responsible hands and that all was well. Though hampered by illness and pressed by mounting crises that eventually eroded some confidence in his leadership, Dwight Eisenhower made good that trust. The America he handed over to John F. Kennedy was by no means perfect, but it had been calmed and rested and made ready to withstand the upheavals that have visited it since.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's work has been finished. He has written his record. It is a brilliant and moving record. The Nation and the world are now appending the closing chapters to the biography of Dwight David Eisenhower who, in the eloquent words of President Nixon on yesterday, was one of the giants of our time. Thomas Carlyle said that the history of the world is but the biography of its great men.

It was not my good fortune to know the late President as intimately as some, but I had the privilege of many interesting associations with him, and I counted him as my personal friend. My official relations with him often came about through my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. He was always forthright and cooperative. He had a genius for getting to the heart of the proposition and making his views clearly understood.

The late President Eisenhower was blessed with a richness of personal qualities that make great men greater—qualities that find a permanent home not only in the hearts of his countrymen but of people everywhere. Unimpeachable character and integrity, great depth of sincerity, love of liberty and country, and devotion to the service of the common good were among the shining precepts of the personal coat of arms of this unpretentious man.

A victor in so many battles even in the last days, it is hard to realize that the late President is no longer here. He was so permanent, so enduring, so indestructible throughout his long years.

All of us who have been associated with him in official matters, on the golf course, and otherwise will treasure the memory of our experiences and be glad that we had the opportunity of knowing a man of his stature. Surely his life and work will be widely noted and long remembered by this and coming generations.

May the Lord bless his memory and give strength and comfort to Mrs. Eisenhower and family and others of his loved ones.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dwight D. Eisenhower one of our greatest statesmen and national heroes has joined the ranks of the immortals. The pages of our history as a people and a nation have a special luster imparted by his life and deeds.

I shall always cherish the memories of my association and friendship with Dwight Eisenhower. He was a man to inspire respect, confidence, and admiration as well as friendship. These he won in large measure from me and from my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the days when he used to testify and assist us obtaining information we needed on foreign policy matters involving military aid to our allies.

These sentiments were confirmed and strengthened when he became our President. His stature as a dedicated public servant transcended politics and he retained the affection and esteem he had won during his military career.

It is sad to meditate on his passing, because it is a deep and grievous loss to his family and friends, and also in a very real way to all of us. At the same time, our grief is tempered by our gratitude and deep sense of appreciation for all that Dwight Eisenhower accomplished for his country and his fellow man.

During the war, Dwight Eisenhower led the greatest forces in mankind's history. In peace, he held the highest office in our land. His true greatness did not stem from holding these high posts. I agree with those who knew him best, that his real greatness was due to his unique personal qualities which fitted him to be the gretest hero of our time. In making these brief remarks I join my fellow Americans in saluting and paying tribute to a patriot whose devotion to our well-being has helped shape the course of war and of peace so that our Nation could survive and prosper.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly saddened by the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, one of this Nation's greatest leaders and one of its most acclaimed public figures.

I had the honor of being elected to Congress in 1952, the year General Eisenhower was elected President. My admiration of him increased during these years as I witnessed Dwight Eisenhower's unyielding courage, high integrity, abiding faith in his fellow man, and his quest for world peace.

General Eisenhower's historic record of achievement is, in a sense, this Nation's record of achievement for the past three decades.

Chief architect of the Allied effort that rescued Europe in World War II, leader of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 34th President of the United States for two terms, counselor to succeeding Presidents, Dwight David Eisenhower led our Nation through one of the stormiest periods in its history.

He was not afraid to show hope instead of despair, faith instead of cynicism, honest toil instead of idle talk. He was a good and compassionate man whose words and deeds were an inspiration to all Americans and millions of people throughout the free world.

Dwight David Eisenhower embodied all that is best in American life. Through sheer hard work and determination he brought himself from humble beginnings to the pinnacle of success.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower, and son, Ambassador John Eisenhower.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower occupied, even before his death, a very special position in the hearts of his countrymen, and now that his gallant soul has reached the haven of eternal peace, it is our duty and our right to claim him for posterity as the very symbol of what it means to be an American. It is necessary to use the phrase, "a self-made man," in the best possible sense of that term because he rose to great position from a home of average circumstances through the application of hard work and the intelligent use of the opportunity afforded to all young men in our democratic society—remember that his career in the public service started with a highly competitive examination for the military academies. His character was well nurtured and formed in the midst of a family that believed deeply in God Almighty, in what we have come to call the American dream, and in the power, dignity, and integrity of the individual person, in that order though dependent one upon the other. This noble character was the source from which Dwight Eisenhower derived his strength and the abilities that were later to lead his Nation through years of strife, when our future as a free people was in critical balance.

Let us not forget that Dwight Eisenhower gave superior and loyal service and invaluable advice and counsel to Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and that under their administrations he became a legend in his lifetime. As President for 8 succeeding years, he achieved a serenity and balance which enabled him to implement his basic belief and faith in our democratic institutions. Indeed his wisdom and thorough experience in every facet of the administrative process, and his tremendous gift for leadership, engendered a trust and confidence among all Americans that is unique in the history of our Presidents. Almost to the hour of his passing, his inspired guidance was significant to the course of our Government.

Possibly the most sincere indication of his concern for the continued well-being of his fellow citizens was the admonition in his farewell address that—

> We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

Coming from a man who had spent so many years with the military his warning was indeed a splendidly independent and objective guidepost—in itself it was a great and significant service to his fellow Americans; a statement worthy of the respect, admiration, and affection given to him without stint by millions of Americans and by the many millions in other countries who revere his memory as the architect of world peace and stability.

In this time of deep sadness, I join with my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to his wonderful and gracious wife, Mamie, who shared his burdens and his triumphs, and to the other much beloved members of his family. For them the sharp pain of personal loss is greatest, but all Americans share in their grief, for this was a man much loved by all people. He, more than any man of our century, fits the often-quoted description of our first President, George Washington, for in his time, Dwight David Eisenhower was also "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Truly, we shall miss this great American champion whose spirit is now and forever with all people and all lands as a resplendent symbol of the United States of America.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor of the House of Representatives as a spokesman for all the people of Summit County. On the subject of the qualities of Dwight David Eisenhower, we are unanimous in our homage. We well understood this great man of our own Midwest. As often as I met with him, I told him of the support our people gave his successful efforts to make us a land of peace.

The great man that he chose to succeed him in the Presidency, President Nixon, closed his eulogy of General Eisenhower by stating:

> We salute Dwight David Eisenhower standing there in our memory—first in war, first in peace and wherever freedom is cherished, first in the hearts of his fellow men.

As the Representative of the 14th Ohio District, to Mamie Eisenhower and her family, I wish to express our deepest sorrow at their great loss. We are grateful to them for having shared Dwight David Eisenhower with us.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Americans and the world in mourning the death of General Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

Dwight D. Eisenhower will return to his midwestern plains boyhood home after a full life, but, as described in his own words, one with "his work unfinished." Indeed, the work of the world is unfinished. His death reminds us all of the test we have before us and stresses the point that each of us must become involved if we are to count our accomplishments to this end. He was involved. He encouraged not only those around him, but all people to do the same.

Throughout his endeavors in war, peace, and politics, he was not one to lose sight of his beginnings. He had grown to appreciate the honesty and integrity of those who had surrounded his boyhood life. He was a man to be trusted and he served as an example of the virtue of our way of life. He was typically American, and yet perhaps as Rev. Billy Graham recently said, "the greatest American since Lincoln."

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly great American.

On Friday, March 28, 1969, at 12:25 p.m. the world suffered a great loss—former President Dwight David Eisenhower became history.

There will be many eulogies and documentaries as well as perhaps a few books. Yet, in all this, it will be nearly impossible to express the true nature of this beloved mortal. A man of great dignity who had the respect of his fellow man, he rarely found it necessary to command it. Although greatly respected, we warmly referred to him as "Ike" as readily as if he were our closest acquaintance. Surely, "Ike" felt this way about the people who chose him as their leader, as well as the rest of the human race which was also captivated and influenced by his statesmanship.

Dwight Eisenhower was a warrior but also a peace-loving man, a political leader and a statesman, an intellectual and a firm believer in his fellow man. He was a Christian who had a keen sense of justice and who would act in a just manner; he had unlimited courage.

He will be remembered for his controversial directing of Federal forces into a city of this country to enforce what he considered to be justice. This demanded a tremendous amount of courage. As general he used every ounce of courage, physical strength, and mentality to defend this country and all people of the world from an aggressive nation. As supreme commander of Allied Expeditionary Forces, he accepted the unconditional surrender of Germany. As President he alone brought peace in Korea. History now shows that he was at this very time fully prepared to again defend this Nation and the world if necessary.

At a time when the military leadership of this Nation is coming under heavier and heavier attack, it is well to remember that one of the greatest military geniuses of our time was a proven man of peace. For eight years under his administration we experienced our longest period of peace since World War II.

Throughout his life he practiced strength and proper use of strength which was clearly illustrated when he ordered our marines into Lebanon to maintain the peace in the Middle East.

A warrior and a fighter to the end, he loved life so much that he fought for weeks grasping onto that thread of life. As with Winston Churchill and the other greats of this era, he belongs to the ages. Now, surely, he has found peace.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this day of national mourning for President Eisenhower, I would like to convey condolences on behalf of myself and the Buffalo, N.Y., area which I represent.

As I said upon learning of the general's passing last Friday:

> I, along wtih millions of Americans have offered my prayers during the illness of President Eisenhower. Although aware of the gravity of his illness, I was profoundly shocked and grieved at the news of his death. During my earlier terms in Congress, I came to know him, respect, and revere him as a soldier and as President. The influence for good which he exerted, the high ideals which were voiced by him and his noble examples, all combine to stamp him as a man among men. My wife and I have conveyed our condolences to his immediate family and I shall return to Washington to pay my personal respects.

The feelings of Buffalonians are well expressed in editorials appearing in our two daily newspapers, as follows:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Mar. 29, 1969]

UNITED STATES MOURNS SOLDIER-STATESMAN

A grief-stricken nation mourns the death of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a man beloved and esteemed by the American people. His deeds as a military commander will be enshrined in history as long as Western civilization endures. It was he who directed "Operation Overlord," the invasion of the European Continent, which resulted in the defeat of the Nazis. When he became President, the energy and zeal which he had displayed in war were devoted to the objective of bringing about lasting world peace.

Probably no other President in this century was as universally popular as Gen. Eisenhower. Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge came close, but each profoundly displeased a minority. The two Roosevelts were disliked by conservatives and Coolidge by the progressives. President Eisenhower, who pursued a middle-of-the-road policy toward national problems, was disliked by few Americans—a fact emphatically attested to in his 1956 reelection.

Mr. Eisenhower possessed the qualities that Americans seem to admire most in their chief executive. A pleasant and photogenic man, Mr. Eisenhower possessed a personality that radiated confidence. As a soldier, he had risen to prominence through his own brilliance. As an educator, he championed academic freedom. And as a statesman, he represented the United States with dignity and honor.

The president came to the occupancy of the highest office in the land with no experience in politics and little in government. No one realized it more than he did. Hence, he did not rush into a legislative program, but permitted his first year, 1953, to pass by without major recommendations. In 1954, he submitted a comprehensive program to Congress which was designed to cover his entire term. This included tax revision and reduction, based on curbing expenditures.

Perhaps the American people felt most indebted to him for a victory scored outside the legislative realm. That was the ending of the Korean War.

The United States and the free world have lost one of the noble and justly revered soldier-statesmen of history.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

However history ranks him among Presidents or among generals, Dwight D. Eisenhower has already been ranked in the hearts of his countrymen among the best-loved Americans of all time.

Ike had that special magic of personal warmth, that glow of inner decency and dignity, that won him an all-but-universal affection—evidenced not only by the familiar "I Like Ike" buttons of his two spectacularly successful presidential campaigns, but by the millions who served under his command in World War II and the tens of millions who later greeted him wherever he traveled abroad.

As President, he could be bracketed with Washington but not with Lincoln—as an inspired unifier and team captain, but not a driving leader. His eight-year presidency was a success by the standards of those who believed deeply, with him, in a government of restraint and rigidly limited use of its vast powers—but not by those who prefer to see the Presidency played, a la FDR or LBJ, as a virtuoso performer plays a great organ.

As a general, too, Eisenhower can be ranked

XUM

with history's great team captains, but not among its brilliant strategists or dashing warriors. The MacArthur style was not for him, nor the Marshall command of over-all organization. His was a kind of generalship that could keep a prima donna Montgomery, a brilliant Bradley and a swashbuckling Patton all working for the same winning team.

His greatest single contribution—indeed the very theme of his life from the "Crusade in Europe" through the organization of NATO, his eight-year presidency and on into his eight years of retirement—was his dedication to the concept of the collective self-defense of the free world.

In World War II, his triumph was the effective captaining of a multi-nation coalition of armies to defeat the most evil tyranny of modern times. In organizing NATO, he was the logical one man in all the free world to be brought back into uniform to put the free nations of the North Atlantic Community into another effective coalition against the danger of Communist aggression.

In leaving NATO to fight for the Republican presidential nomination, his main motivation once again was his devotion to the concept of collective security and his fear that America might revert to isolationism or to go-it-alonism. And throughout his presidency and on to his final illness, he never wavered in support of this nation's commitment to defend its friends and maintain a strong set of globe-girdling alliances to keep the free world free.

Looking back over his whole career, what sticks out is a passionate devotion to three words: Freedom, security, peace—and in that order.

The first he formed into this virtual credo, in a 1949 speech while president of Columbia University: "To men who have lived in freedom, there is nothing in life so valuable as freedom—not even life itself."

To the second, his nation's and the free world's security, he not only devoted his whole career as a soldier, but his deepest concern as a statesman—right up to last summer's ominous warning to the Republican national convention: "Abroad, in every major sector, we confront a formidable foe—an expansionist tyranny which respects only toughness and strength and still displays little interest in traveling the pathways to peace, with honor and justice. . . . To call for retreat by America is the best way I know to stockpile tragedy for our children."

Yet this is the same Ike who warned us in his presidential farewell speech eight years ago to be wary—in a time when our security depended on a vast military-industrial complex—of letting "the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes." And his greatest pride in looking back on his own presidency was simply that it had kept us at peace and secure for eight years, while his bitterest disappointment, as he himself sized it up, was his inability, despite a massive peacewaging effort, to bring about a trustworthy accord with Soviet Russia.

What the world will best remember about Ike, however, is not his speeches or his sometimes fractured syntax but that marvelous Eisenhower grin and the infectiously optimistic faith in human decency that it punctuated. Rank him where you will in greatness among the unforgettable free world leaders of his momentously historic times—Churchill, Roosevelt, MacArthur, Marshall, DeGaulle, Adenauer—and Eisenhower will be remembered as long as any and probably with more sheer affection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker—

> So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

A man of unfaltering kingly bearing that was complemented by a genuine native warmth and humility, he was by nature and by character as open and as free as the western plains and prairies of his youth. Few men ever sought less; he asked for nothing more than the opportunity to serve, when called and where ordered. Few men ever received more; he is one of the scant handful of men in the history of our American Republic whose fellow citizens spontaneously and overwhelmingly elevated him to be a symbol in his own lifetime. And the symbol was not merely of an era, but of the country itself, and of its people, and of the ideals and the good in the two that were both existing and hoped for.

As soldier, as general, he directed the most awesome array of military might ever entrusted to one man. It was his duty to order entire armies into some of the bloodiest combat in the history of warfare.

As statesman, as President, he gave to his country a Chief Executive with a commitment to peace that can only be known by one like himself who had carried the heaviest of the burdens and agonies of war. Six months after his first inaugural in 1953, the guns of the Korean war fell silent. For the next 7½ years of his Presidency, not one American combat death occurred.

His call to serve—first as soldier, then as statesman—came from his own country, yet the scope of this service was truly worldwide. As soldier, millions in this country and abroad looked to him in time of war for the hope of victory and of liberation. As statesman, these same millions looked to him in time of peace as that symbol of the forces of good that had gained victory, and would strive to preserve the peace so dearly won.

Measure him, in part, by the nature of his critics, that small band of petty men whose stock in trade is the supercilious condemnation, the mocking jest, and arrogant condescension. Such trivia, such meanness, only made more clear the true nobility of his own character, and exposed more glaringly the shallowness of theirs.

The legacies he leaves to his fellow men are rich and many. But perhaps the greatest of them all is this: In a day when it sometimes seems that "image" is all, and that character counts for nothing, this man lived and practiced, openly and unashamedly, the old, simple precepts of "The Gods of the Copybook Headings."

The love, honor, and respect that millions gave him has proven beyond any doubt that mankind is, and always will be, more receptive to, influenced by, and appreciative of a basic, simple code of honor and decency such as this man practiced than all the false glitter and manufactured rhetoric that so quicky loses its luster.

The roll of the muffled drums, the rumble of the caisson wheels, and the clear, high notes of "Taps" will now mark the passing of one who carried and fulfilled some of the most momentous and difficult tasks ever placed upon one man. He passes into history, but he passes as one whose part in the constantly unfolding drama of human existence and civilization will be forever remembered. And the example he set by his life will be forever called to mind, wherever and whenever men lift up their eyes unto the hills, and seek from a power beyond themselves that inner strength and support that man must have to prevail.

Soldier from the wars returning
Spoiler of the taken town,
Here is ease that asks not earning;
Turn you in and sit you down.

Peace is come and wars are over,
Welcome you and welcome all,
While the charger crops the clover,
And his bridle hangs in stall.

Now no more of winters biting,
Filth in trench from fall to spring,
Summers full of sweat and fighting
For the Kesar or the King.

Rest you, charger, rust you, bridle;
Kings and Kesars, keep your pay;
Soldier, sit you down and idle
At the inn of night for aye.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower. Americans have lost one of their greatest leaders of all time.

Dwight David Eisenhower was a leader of soldiers; he was the leader of a distinguished university; and he was a leader of the greatest nation on earth.

A distinguished military career followed his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy in 1915, and the greatest tribute that could be paid to his services to this Nation was given by the American public in 1952 when he was elected President of the United States.

When the American public returned him to that office in 1956, there could be no higher honor, no higher tribute to the inspiration and the dedication of this great man.

History will record this man's lengthy list of outstanding contributions, taking note that he always was sought after by his fellow man. He always ascended to the highest positions of leadership, and dispatched his offices in a gentlemanly fashion with dignity and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Smith joins me in extending our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Eisenhower and the members of the family.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, Mrs. Shriver, and myself, I want to express the feeling of deep sorrow over the passing of a beloved and great American, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his beloved wife, Mamie; his son, John; and the entire Eisenhower family.

Dwight Eisenhower's fight for life, his physical and mental strength in the face of suffering, was an inspiration to all of us. America has lost one of its great statesmen and soldiers. We, from Kansas, are especially proud of the heritage and accomplishments left behind by this native son of Abilene.

Every World War II GI who served under Ike will forever treasure his military leadership and organizational genius. Free men everywhere will long remember his leadership in bringing peace and stability to the world as 34th President of the United States.

We are all the beneficiaries of his

lifelong devotion, dedication, and service to America and free men everywhere.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to President Eisenhower and to underscore the deep sense of loss felt throughout the country at the death of this gallant and remarkable person.

Dwight David Eisenhower has rightly been called a great general and a great President. But, mostly, I would call him simply a great man.

The key to his greatness was the warmth and sincerity of his personality, which were reflected in his compassion and regard for his fellow men. The measure of his greatness was the strong hold he so easily retained throughout his entire career on the confidence, respect, and affection of the people of this Nation; indeed, throughout the world community.

General Eisenhower has left to America a legacy of bravery, integrity, courage, and devotion to country and to democratic principles as a way of life. He was a man of essential decency and kindness, the traits which endeared him to the Nation.

His place in history is firmly established by his many services to his country. In the dark days of World War II, he emerged as the strong commander of the Allied forces to win for the millions of Europeans their freedom from Nazi tyranny. Who of us can forget D-day and the extreme courage the general displayed in executing the invasion, which was the only hope of stemming the Nazi onslaught? The remarkable trust he instilled in the men who crossed the channel and went on to the beachheads on that June day was the hallmark of his ability to command and to lead. He sent the Allied forces on to a glorious victory that gave Western Europe its freedom, and he stayed to watch over the liberated lands and helped to rebuild them. He returned to America a "conquering hero" in the true sense of the word, and it was his just due.

His two terms as President was a grateful nation's recognition of qualities of leadership. In his person, he represented what America is—in war and in peace.

Dwight David Eisenhower will always be remembered and revered by every American now living and for all generations to come. His page in history is a shining example of a truly wonderful man and a great American.

Mrs. Corman and I extend our deep sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family. We hope they will find solace in the knowledge that the Nation mourns with them.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Dwight Eisenhower was one of those rare leaders with a genius for bringing people together. He was a maker of friends, not a maker of enemies—for himself, for his political party, for his point of view, for his country, and for the people of the world.

His administration was a time of healing, of peacemaking, and of peacekeeping. His life was devoted to goodness and mercy.

His greatness as a man overshadows his greatness as a general or as a President; and yet, his ready smile and his well-known temper marked him as being made of the same stuff as the rest of us.

Samuel Butler, the great English novelist of the 19th century wrote a line at about the time Dwight Eisenhower was born:

> A virtue, to be serviceable, must, like gold, be alloyed with some commoner but more serviceable metal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dwight Eisenhower was a marvelous alloy. Millions of people around the world today are repeating a famous phrase: "I like Ike."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would authorize the minting of all quarter-dollar pieces with a likeness of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

This tribute to President Eisenhower is only fitting when one considers his dedicated service to his country. Our country and the world are more secure because of his efforts in times of war and peace. He was a man of courage; a man of integrity, and above all, a man of kindness. Even in death, President Eisenhower's spirit of dedication to his countrymen and his Nation will remain as an inspiration to all.

The people of Iowa have had a special feeling in their hearts for President Eisenhower throughout his career, because his beloved wife was reared in our State. I know the people of Iowa will join me in extending our prayers and sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family in this time of sorrow.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, with the dignity befitting his entire lifetime, and with the respect he always earned and enjoyed, the American people have been saying their personal farewells to a great and good man who served them well.

We salute his fine family for the admirable manner in which they have borne the long and trying months of General Eisenhower's final illness, and for the inspiration they have given all of us to bear our own burdens with similar courage and fortitude.

Mr. Speaker, there are unlimited tributes one could pay to our former President and great wartime leader. When I heard of his death on Friday, and the newspapers in my district asked me for my comments, I made the following statement:

Statement by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan Upon the Death of Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Friday, March 28, 1969

I don't think there was ever any narrow partisanship in the character of Dwight D. Eisenhower during his eight years as President of the United States, which was one of the reasons why he could serve as effectively as he did as a Republican President with a predominantly Democratic Congress during six of those eight years. I think every Member of Congress recognized in him a man of decency and of great dedication to the cause of freedom, and even when we disagreed with him—as we frequently did—on domestic issues, there was never any bitterness or attacks on his personal integrity.

Few Americans have ever left the White House with as much genuine good will and warm feeling of approval as a person. History may not regard him as one of our greatest Presidents, but it is certain to include him among the greatest Americans. And considering the fact that his entire adult life was spent in the military service until just a few years before he became President of the United States, his performance as President was indeed remarkable in many respects, particularly in recognizing the supremacy of the civilian authority over our national destiny.

Even when I was fighting him vigorously on some issues in the Congress—on food stamps, medicare, and some of the other domestic issues—I never doubted for a moment the sincerity of his views or the honesty of his approach. He was, in all respects, a man to be admired and respected. I join all of my fellow citizens in sorrow over his death following such a magnificent and dignified and courageous life of service to his country.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, my family joins with the millions of others throughout the world who will mourn the loss of Dwight David Eisenhower—a great and good man.

His death, after his prolonged illness and almost miraculous recovery from prior heart attacks, comes as no great shock but it is, nevertheless, a personally difficult thing to accept the fact that his wise counsel and always-encouraging presence has been removed from us.

Dwight Eisenhower's place in history was assured long before he assumed the Presidency, but there have been some who have questioned whether or not his tenure in that most difficult of all offices added anything to his stature. I have never understood nor shared those questions. To my mind, back then and now, today, as I review the tumult and the trouble of these past 8 years, General Eisenhower was—and will forever remain—one of our great Presidents. He brought peace and a respite from both domestic and international tensions to a nation badly in need of such relief; he proved, if such needed proving, that we could have prosperity without war, a steadily rising standard of living without crippling inflation, and that true progress could be made in the field of human rights without recourse to public confrontation in city streets.

God grant that Richard Nixon, under today's worsened circumstances, can do half as well—and God grant, too, that as Dwight Eisenhower leaves us, we, the American people, will be so inspired by his precept and example as to prove worthy of the trust he always had in us.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply moved by the eulogies today on the life and career of General Eisenhower. It was not my privilege to have served in Congress during the years of his Presidency. In those years I served in the legislature of my State. But on two occasions, once before his election as our Chief Magistrate, and once afterward I met him, and his personal warmth I have always remembered. When he was campaigning for the Republican nomination, before the Republican Convention in 1952, he came to Detroit. It was my privilege to sit on the platform with him at that time, and to meet him on that occasion. After the close of his presidential years, during the Michigan Constitutional Convention in the spring of 1962, General Eisenhower came to that convention in Lansing. A few of us who were delegates at that convention were

XUM

privileged to have luncheon with him at the home of Dr. John Hannah, then president of Michigan State University. I sat across the table from him then, and for an hour and a half he kept us enraptured by his experiences, his philosophy, and his life as a retired President living at Gettysburg and his interest in Eisenhower College. The occasion impressed me deeply, and I shall remember him vividly as long as I live.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound sorrow of the people of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey at the passing of our 34th President, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Because in the later years of his life he was involved in the world of partisan politics, his was to some extent a controversial figure. There were those who agreed with him on particular policies and those who differed with him. Yet, while there might have been disagreement about Eisenhower the President, there was no disagreement about Eisenhower the man. I know that there has been no man who in my lifetime has enjoyed the trust and confidence of his fellow citizens to the extent that General Eisenhower did.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower was a professional military man and indeed one of the great military figures of our history. He ranks with Washington, Grant, Lee, Sherman, Sheridan, Pershing, and MacArthur in our glossary of military leaders. He possessed military virtues in abundance. He was always an enlisted man's general, humble and self effacing. And it was General Eisenhower who had spent almost all his adult life as a professional soldier who warned his fellow citizens about the dangers of the military-industrial complex in a free society.

Dwight David Eisenhower brought to public life a sense of decency, a sense of propriety, and above all, a deep devotion to this Nation and its ideals. His virtues were perhaps the virtues of an earlier America, an America which was not ashamed to wear its patriotism on its sleeve, an America which believed in God and the family as the basic unit of a free and just society. At this critical time these seem to be the virtues that this Nation needs most.

His contributions to this Nation and to the free world will live after him. Of him it may be said, as Richard Henry Lee said of an earlier military man, George Washington, who served as President during trying times, he was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, every American and every freedom-loving person on this globe has lost a dear friend in the passing of General and President Eisenhower. At the end of World War II, as I was a patient in Army-Navy hospital in Arkansas, I wrote to General Eisenhower and urged him to run for the Presidency, as I felt he was just the man who was needed to lead our country in those troubled times. I was never sorry that I had made that judgment and that in the years that followed that he went to the White House and led our country so well in peace as he had in war. In the years since General Washington, no one has better earned the phrase that he was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." He had the uncommon quality of understanding the common man and helping him to achieve his finest potentialities. No President in our history has been better loved and it will always be one of the treasures of my life that fortune gave me the opportunity to know him personally. Our country will always be his debtor, as in fact so will we and all of humanity.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the life of Dwight Eisenhower was a very special gift of the Almighty to our contemporary world. Few men have been endowed with the personal qualities to make them, all at the same time, effective, objective, resolute, and compassionate. Few men have been able to encompass in one life the roles of warrior, statesman and peacemaker. Few men have been able to inspire, at the same time, love from their friends, respect from their enemies, and confidence from their fellow men. Yet, he did all of these things.

General Eisenhower was a true moderate. In one of the first utterances he ever made in my presence, he said, "No progress can be made by walking in the gutter to the far right, or the far left. It can only be made by walking resolutely down the middle of the road. This is where I plan to walk."

The world is today a poorer place than it was yesterday because President Eisenhower is no longer in it. We thank God for his life, we express our sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the Eisenhower family, and we pray that Almighty God will give his great soul rest and eternal peace.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with Americans everywhere and people the world over in mourning the passing of our 34th President—who in death as in life will be remembered among our country's greatest statesmen and patriots. He was one of those individuals who had the rare privilege of seeing himself become a living legend—hailed and admired by peoples around the world. He won the love, respect, and devotion of his fellow man. In our Nation's darkest hour of need, he came forward to lead the free world to victory.

Dwight David Eisenhower began his service to his people as a soldier of war. He ended as a crusader for peace. For both he will be long remembered by a world that knew and loved him. He believed superbly in the motto of West Point, his alma mater—"Duty, honor, country"—and he dedicated his life to these high principles. He was a man of great strength, wisdom, and compassion.

As we mourn the passing of General Eisenhower, we think first of the loss of a man who stood for America, a man whose courage, personality, and integrity lifted the Nation in times of crisis—a pillar of strength who could be relied upon for wise counsel and leadership. We think of all he exemplified, of all he did—as commanding general in World War II, as an educator, serving as president of Columbia University, as the organizer and first supreme commander of Allied Powers in Europe within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as our President, twice elected by landslide majorities, and as a man still revered after he left office. But aside from all this, General Eisenhower has left our Nation a legacy to which to cling—to live by, to build on—basic principles and basic commonsense good in any circumstances.

There was his essential decency as a man, his humility as a leader, his readiness to make deicsions, and his willingness to take the blame if the decisions went wrong. President Nixon, in a statement, pointed out that the one key to the character of General Eisenhower was revealed in a message the general had prepared in case the landings in France on D-day had failed. This message—never issued because the landings were a success and led directly to the end of the war—included these sentences:

> The troops, the air and the Navy, did all that bravery and devotion could do. If any blame or fault attaches to the attempt it is mine alone.

This was typcial of General Eisenhower—a man ready to take the consequences of decision.

The convictions which led to his decisions were bolstered by the thoroughness with which he made them, and one of the fundamentals in his planning was to consider the consequences if they proved wrong—what to do next—what alternatives. These were the qualities which made him a great general, and the qualities maintained through the major decisions of his years as the Nation's Chief Executive. They are qualities that too often have been lacking in Washington when great plans were pushed through with little or no thought to the possiblity of failure, or to the alternatives. But these qualities are essential to the leadership of the future—and they are General Eisenhower's most enduring legacy.

In death Dwight Eisenhower becomes no longer a man of the 20th century but a man of immortality who will live on through the ages in the hearts of his countrymen—along with Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others who have made our Nation great. This generation and those to come will never forget the legend of Eisenhower the general, Eisenhower the President, and "Ike" the citizen.

At this time, I want to extend my deep sympathy to the Eisenhower family.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of its finest citizens in the passing of former President Dwight David Eisenhower. The President leaves an outstanding record as a military tactician and former commander of all Allied forces in Europe during World War II. He was a distinguished military graduate of West Point and had the distinction of leading this country both in time of war and peace.

His 8 years as President of our country saw America prospering and under his able leadership our country was recognized world wide for the strength of our military forces, and for our industrial growth. Also our abilities to negotiate and work with other nations of the free world were well known. During the last

8 years of his life, he sought retirement to the serenity of a small farm in Gettysburg, Pa., on lands which ironically join to the great military battlefield between the North and South during the War Between the States.

As I silently walked past the body of this great American lying in state in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol, which traditionally is reserved exclusively for outstanding Americans, my mind went back some quarter of a century ago when the general was my own military commander just prior to the invasion of Normandy in World War II. I still treasure the individual letter which he wrote each man taking part in the invasion of France. It was a warm, personal sort of message from a leader whom we all had great confidence in and whom we would follow without question in carrying out his orders for the long-awaited and much-planned landing in Normandy.

It was a solemn hour going across on the old Navy LST's on the morning of June 6, 1944, but somehow every GI felt better about whatever he might face during the days and weeks ahead, because he carried that special letter from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in his pocket or tucked away under his steel helmet.

In the after years, we may not have always agreed wholeheartedly with some of the President's decisions nor necessarily all of his political views, but make no mistake about it, he was indeed a great American. General Eisenhower will be missed, for a man of his stature does not come along every day. I am confident that both his spirit and his influence over the men he commanded in battle and over those who served with him during his 8 years as President of our country will long be remembered. His influence will be felt in this country and throughout the world for many, many years to come.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest monument to a public figure is the esteem in which he is held by his fellow man. If that is the measure, then Dwight Eisenhower was truly the man of his time.

His service to his country, to the world, and to the cause of freedom is unmatched in this century. He marshaled the greatest force for war in the history of mankind. After that, he marshaled the greatest force for peace the world has seen—the spirit of the American people. There is a certain irony in the fact that this man of war gave us the longest sustained period of peace in the last three decades.

Those of us from Idaho have always felt a special fondness for Dwight Eisenhower. We recall that the first speech he gave in his quest for the Presidency was delivered on the steps of the State capitol in Boise. From that point in 1952 to his final resting place in Abilene, Ike traveled the path of peace and freedom. It is a journey that will be remembered throughout history.

On behalf of the citizens of the First District of Idaho, I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the other members of the Eisenhower family.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, as we assembled in the rotunda of the Capitol Sunday to pay our respects to the great President of peace, Dwight David Eisenhower, my thoughts went back to my earlier discussions with the President.

Serving him as Regional Chairman of the White House Conference on Youth, I recall how often he would urge our Nation's youth to use "commonsense." Every single individual was unique, and had something special to offer to America. Every single individual was important to "Ike," and he would often speak of the great need to provide better educational opportunities for America's youth. I remember how he outlined the "way" for our youth.

We must not look for the simple way—the easy way—but we must understand and know that the best way is so often the hardest way. Many men put forth their ideas to simplify a youngster's education and growth. "Ike" would pause a moment, then more deliberately and more thoughtfully restate his belief that America's youth could—and would—respond to the call for individual responsibility and individual development.

And because "Ike" believed in you—you believed in yourself. And you believed in the others who struggled daily beside you in the bettering of an often-troubled world. "Ike" understood Emerson's phrase:

> The only way to have a friend is to be one.

General Eisenhower was my leader during the war as this Nation forsook the easy way for the grueling, hard way that brought us the one true victory that men call peace. Dwight David Eisenhower was my leader again as he paced us as the great President for peace and prosperity. "Ike" was my friend as he befriended our Nation, and as he issued the call for individual leadership on the part of all Americans.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, everything in the life of Dwight David Eisenhower became him like the leaving it.

The accomplishments of Dwight Eisenhower as soldier and statesman, as general and President, richly deserve the praise and admiration they have received. But I would like to focus upon another of his great achievements; the courage of Dwight Eisenhower in the face of death.

Many times during 1968 the dark solemnity of the death watch settled over Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington; just as many times the bright light of the famous grin of Ike was shed yet again upon a relieved world. The fact that we mourn him in 1969 rather than 1968 is a tribute to more than the miracles of medical science. It is a tribute to the unquenchable spirit of man—surely the greatest glory of God's earth.

Dwight Eisenhower has left us many legacies. To my mind, perhaps the greatest is the memory of his unbroken will and transcendent character when his body was at its weakest. For his refusal to slip easily into death is an enduring inspiration to all who must undergo adversity.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what they may have been in life, many men have died well. Shakespeare celebrated that fact in the famous speech in Macbeth which begins:

> Nothing in his life became him like the leaving it.

In the case of Dwight David Eisenhower, however, everything in his life became him like the leaving it.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a friend. People of all ages, all political ideologies and all nations respected and revered Dwight D. Eisenhower. He was a great military leader in times of war. But more important, he was the President who united this Nation and led it to peace. A deeply religious man, his strong spirit and will were evident even in these last days and hours. Dwight Eisenhower's mission in life was to chart a course toward permanent world peace and human benefit. The greatest tribute we can pay him is to do everything in our power to fulfill this mission.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Soldier and statesman, his life was one of distinguished and disciplined devotion to service.

As the general commanding the greatest military force ever assembled, he led American and Allied armies to victory in Europe.

Called by his countrymen to the highest office in this Republic, he brought an end to the Korean conflict and maintained the peace during his years as our President.

For his great leadership in these accomplishments, he received the deep and continuing appreciation of a grateful people. For his dignity, humility, and warmth of personality, he was held in affection by all.

To Mrs. Eisenhower and his family, I extend my deepest sympathy as we all share in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, because of the universal esteem with which General Eisenhower was held, I deem it appropriate for Congress to take immediate action to preserve the memory of this honored American by renaming the District of Columbia Stadium, the "Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial Stadium."

Therefore, in order to pay this initial tribute to this distinguished American, I plan to introduce a resolution to attain just such a goal.

This magnificent stadium was built during the administration of President Eisenhower. As we all know, he was a sports enthusiast. His example of courage, fair play, devotion to duty, and deep humility are the attributes of a great athlete and it was this example which inspired untold millions to conquer life's adversities.

I know that all my colleagues will want to join in this worthy endeavor.

Few men of history have ever received the universal love, respect, and acclaim during their own lifetime as that accorded to General Eisenhower. His continuing strength and abiding faith were an inspiration to people everywhere, and when he finally succumbed to an illness which had plagued him for so long, we could not help but be exalted by the tenacity with which a man his age clung

XUM

to life. His universal appeal as soldier, statesman, humanitarian and those other accomplishments of such a great and noble spirit will be forever enshrined in the hearts of all who aspire to make this earth of ours a better place to live. There will be countless ways in which Ike will be remembered in the years ahead. While I am certain that each of us will recall him in a different way, I shall remember most of all his indomitable courage and boundless optimism during the dark days of World War II. Just as his contemporary, the great Sir Winston Churchill, Dwight David Eisenhower stands as one of the giants of the 20th century, because he and Churchill played such an important role in leading us through the most monumental crisis that our century has thus far been confronted with—the Second World War. The Nation, indeed the world, stands a little sadder today because of his passing. But, we can take heart. His life made it possible for us to stand taller as we face the future with renewed purpose, direction, and above all, hope.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, twelve hundred miles of railroad track tie Washington to Abilene.

America's heart is on the train carrying home the body of Dwight David Eisenhower from the Capital of the Nation he served so devotedly to the vast golden wheat fields of the Kansas he loved.

Soldier, statesman, he epitomized all that we like to think is best in the American character. He was friend to the world, and the world responded to his warmth. "I like Ike" probably has been repeated in nearly every language spoken on the globe.

As President Nixon said in his beautiful eulogy yesterday in the rotunda, General Eisenhower undoubtedly was loved by more people in more parts of the world than any other American President.

Each of us who had the privilege of calling him friend has his own special memories of the 34th President of the United States.

Mine extend back to World War II when I first met him in the European Theater. He was a soldier's soldier, a commander who inspired confidence, devotion, courage, the will to win.

Yet Great Britain's Lord Moran, who knew him well, sensed even then the real Dwight Eisenhower, the man of peace. In the bleak days of 1943 Lord Moran wrote of the general that—

> Could he have had his way he would have spent a quiet life in the country stillness, near some tree-reflecting stream, but that was not to be his lot. He loathed war.

It was precisely because he knew the horrors of war and the blessings of peace, that as Commander in Chief he was able to give our Nation the only virtually untroubled 8 years this country has known since the end of World War II. The times were no less demanding, the decisions he made during his two terms in office were as critical as any during the European campaign. But while he was President not one drop of American blood was shed in battle, not one inch of free world soil lost.

First and foremost his objective was a world in which free men could live in harmony together. This was his crusade. It was his fervent prayer during the years after he left the White House.

The last time I visited General Eisenhower, a little more than a year ago, at Gettysburg, the famous grin was as infectious as ever, the twinkle in his blue eyes seemed to mock at time. It came with a stab of pain to realize that he was, indeed, growing old.

We who fought under him in Europe and shared his victories, we who worked with him to carry out his programs in Congress, we who were privileged to counsel with him at Gettysburg in later years—we had grown accustomed to Eisenhower victories over impossible odds, even those posed by his failing health.

After so many victories, it was hard to accept the inevitable, that one day he would fight his last great battle and would lose, as all men must. We are grateful that death came to him quietly and gently.

His long life was filled with mighty and heroic struggles. His valiant spirit endures to inspire all men who love freedom.

Dwight David Eisenhower combined the best qualities of ordinary Americans and thereby became the most extraordinary American our country has produced. He was a man's man who loved the outdoors, who once wistfully remarked, of the squirrels on the White House lawn:

> They have a freedom I would personally dearly love.

And now, after so many years of striving to bring new understanding of the words freedom and brotherhood to the world, his work is finished.

Abilene was little more than a frontier town when young Dwight Eisenhower moved there as a boy. The names of Bat Masterson, Wyatt Earp, and other Kansas heroes were not mere legends to him, they were vivid memories on the lips of his elders. He grew up on stories of pioneers, hardships, of the right and wrong of the western frontier. He was taught, and believed, and proved, that a man can be anything he aspires to be, if he is honest, willing to work hard, has courage and faith in his Creator.

Speaking of his childhood, General Eisenhower once said:

> I found out in later years that we were very poor, but the glory of America is that we didn't know it then.

The boy from Abilene now is part of the glory of America. He has left a heritage neither time nor death can extinguish.

After a life of devotion to his country, to the cause of freedom throughout the world, he is going home to what he always called "the heart of America." Not far from his resting place flows the "tree-reflecting stream," the Smoky Hill River. Spring is a burst of loveliness on the Kansas plains, summer a blaze of heat and ripening grain, fall a triumph of harvest, winter harsh and cold and a time for fireside stories of the days when Kansas was young, stories Dwight Eisenhower loved all his life.

And he can say, with Benet's "William Sycamore":

> My youth returns, like the rains of Spring
> And my sons, like the wild geese flying,
> And I lie and hear the meadow-lark sing,
> And have much content in my dying.
>
> Go play with the towns you have built of blocks,
> The towns where you would have bound me.
> I sleep in my earth like a tired fox,
> And my buffalo have found me.

Godspeed the train to Abilene.

Mr. ZION. Ike is gone. The courageous heart is finally stilled. The grand old soldier whose life and career were so closely entwined with the destiny of his country has been permitted to rest at last.

Dwight David Eisenhower was never a quitter. He fought his way from the poverty of a prairie farm boyhood to the ranks of West Point. His career sent him to the summit of military achievement as commander of Allied forces in World War II. A grateful nation refused, as they had refused General Washington, the opportunity of a quiet retirement following the conclusion of his military career and bestowed upon General Eisenhower the Presidency of the United States. His tenure as President marked one of the great eras of prosperity and peace in the national history.

Ike was no speechmaker. He had little familiarity with the clever turn of phrase that characterizes the experienced politician. His own formal politics were, at best, uncertain. But his philosophy of living, of duty, of loyalty to country, of honor—these were firmly rooted in the great traditions of America. From these he never swerved. Successful politics involves the art of compromise. And history will thus not record Dwight Eisenhower as a master politician. For the principles of decency and honor learned in midwest farm upbringing simply would not be compromised by this man.

Americans sensed the character of which Ike was made. He was elected and reelected to the Presidency by overwhelming majorities. The Nation that he had served so well for so long was strangely moved by this kind, good President who cared little for the entrapments of power. He left the Presidency in 1961 enjoying a pinnacle of esteem that few men in the history of this world have enjoyed.

His greatest battle was yet before him. The ravages of world wars and 8 years in the Presidency had taken their toll. His weary heart began to fail. A nation waited and prayed with the family of Dwight Eisenhower through each new crisis—each terrible onslaught on the gallant heart.

Now, kind providence has stilled his suffering and a nation remains to mourn the passing of her faithful son. I may only hope that the collective memory of what he was will remind all of our people of what we, as a nation, have been and what we still can be.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in General Eisenhower's death our entire Nation, regardless of our individual views and perspectives, mourns the passing of one of our great leaders.

I join all Americans in mourning the passing of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. His page in history will indeed be an

XUM

illustrious one and his contributions to the free world and his search for lasting peace have endeared him to all people.

General Eisenhower was in many ways the embodiment of the virtues which have sustained our Nation through the nearly 200 years of our existence.

Some people said that he projected a "father image." This to me is a high compliment. For in times of stress and uncertainty he was the man in whom the Nation placed its highest trust, and he lived up to that trust to the best of his ability.

He was a good soldier, an outstanding general, and above all, in a time of tension and division, a unifying force for a nation surrounded by a world of peril and trouble.

General Eisenhower's influence went beyond the years of his Presidency. Nearly to his dying day, he was a leader who provided counsel and guidance to the men who have been and are responsible for carrying on the highest responsibilities of this Nation.

Although he was elected as a Republican, he was not at heart a partisan man. He championed causes which he believed were good for this Nation and the cause of freedom. And he did it at times by rallying some fragments of his political party to the support of the undertakings of Democratic administrations.

General Eisenhower came from the Midwest, the heartland of our Nation. All of us mourn him. My wife joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife and family. May they be comforted in the knowledge of the love and hope he inspired throughout the world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower was a strong man, physically and morally.

I admired, as did all Americans, his courageous fight for life through a long series of operations and heart attacks.

History will probably record as the two greatest accomplishments of his life the fact that during the 8 years in which he served as President he kept the United States at peace, and his administration was untouched by the scandals that tarnished preceding and subsequent administrations.

In the most respected sense of the word, President Eisenhower was a simple man, uncomplicated and unpretentious in his great affection for his country.

I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and members of the famliy.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, tributes can hardly do justice to the service that Dwight D. Eisenhower gave to his country and the entire free world. His kind does not often pass among us.

He was surely one of our greatest generals and one of our truly peace-loving Presidents. His successful leadership of the United States in war and peace made every home in our Nation safer and many times contributed to the protection of our free Western civilization.

He was both a great man and a good man who was possessed of moral courage and genuine kindness; a man you would be proud to call your friend.

Though he has fallen, his greatness and his deeds will never die.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of America—indeed the people of the world—mourn the death of a great man, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. He gained the affection and respect of all men as a hero of peace as well as a hero of war.

As President he brought us a peaceful end to the Korean conflict. Just as he ended the war with Germany by military action. Rarely has a military leader so completely earned the world's attention and trust as a statesman. The sympathy of our Nation and the world goes out to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family in their hour of grief. Their loss is truly our loss.

Great men need no eulogies. Their character and deeds require no external illumination and in fact none is possible.

They shine out of the past unaided or not at all.

Through them the world is permanently changed and goes on changing.

Their truth, we may imperfectly understand and express, neglect and forget, but it remains unalterably part of our history.

It falls upon us, the living, however, to preserve that past in the living memory of each new generation. It is this duty particularly that prompts us to offer our thoughts at a time when a reverent and grateful silence would speak best our deepest feelings.

Many have noted the presence of many young people amidst the thousands that have come to pay their final respects to General Eisenhower. Many of these were born since the end of his final term as President and a great many more did not live through the trials and triumphs of World War II. It is for these new citizens of our country that we should direct our praise for the man we honor today.

Yesterday President Nixon eloquently stated the essential quality of General Eisenhower, saying:

> It was the character of the man, not what he did but what he was.

It is the example of this simple, honest man that commends itself to us today as our Nation strives to heal the wounds of discord that have come to trouble its spirit. The challenges that Dwight D. Eisenhower faced in his day, while perhaps different, were no less difficult than those we face today or will face tomorrow. He met and conquered them without fear or malice in the finest tradition of "duty, honor, country."

In his death by reminding us all of the immortality of these truths General Eisenhower has served his country as he served it in his lifetime.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, my country, and the world in mourning the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States. The world has lost a leader; the country has lost a devoted servant; and all Americans have lost a man that was a source of courage and inspiration to them.

President Eisenhower will long be remembered for his leadership during the Second World War and later during the Korean conflict. He will long be remembered for his courage and determination in his long battle with death.

The Newark Evening News and Star Ledger has both captured the spirit and the bond between General Eisenhower and the people. They are words well and justly spoken, and I include them herewith:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 31, 1969]

NATION IN MOURNING

A great American has died and no presidential proclamation was required to impel the nation to mourn his passing. His countrymen gave Dwight David Eisenhower honors and gratitude. And they gave him the greatest office within their power to give. But more than acclaim and reward, they gave him their affection.

To the people he was no remote hero, no aloof statesman. To the people he was Ike.

What special quality did he possess that evoked this bond? It was, it seems, a national response to a man of warmth and simplicity to whom it gave its confidence and votes in unprecedented degree. And with the presidency went a personal affection that few Americans have attained.

Dwight Eisenhower had gained world fame. He was the man who, having led an army to victory in the greatest of all wars, hated war as a "damnable thing." He hated it for what it meant in hardship and sacrifice to the countless young men he had to commit to the hazards of battle. A compassionate man, it was this bitter experience which had its origin in the fires of war that inspired his deep devotion to peace so manifest during his eight years in the presidency.

He was a man who wore his honors with easy dignity, born of a strain of religious humility so alien to the cynicism of today's world. He spoke often and proudly of his mother's training in his formative years and he did so without affectation or hesitation. He grew up in simpler, if harder, times and for today's young there is a lesson in the disciplines that he accepted without question in his youth.

Now the general of the army, the two-time president, the man from Abilene is dead, and his mourning country is diminished by the loss.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Mar. 29, 1969]

IKE: SOLDIER, POLITICIAN

For Dwight David Eisenhower, it was a full, productive and eventful life; it was a life divided into two diverse, distinct worlds, the military and politics, and profoundly influenced the life and times of hundreds of millions, in war and in peace.

Ironically, it seemed Eisenhower was never completely at ease in either pursuit that occupied his adult life . . . one for which he was trained, the other for which he was drafted to resuscitate a long mordant Republican Party.

Millions of Americans had a deep and abiding affection for the Kansas farm boy; they cast him in a heroic mold as a military leader and as a reassuring father image in political life.

Like other world leaders before him, Gen. Eisenhower was a product of his times. His early military life could hardly be described as distinguished; as a professional soldier he was resigned to rounding out his career as a colonel, but cataclysmic events dramatically decreed otherwise.

And later in private life, when he was content to live out the years in the tranquility of the academe, he was thrust into the political arena, a reluctant candidate who only four years earlier had observed that a military man should not run for President unless there were exceptional circumstances to make it necessary.

In both spheres of his life there were personal conflicts, close to the surface of this leader, that occasionally broke through the characteristic Eisenhower grin, a lifelong trait that established a warm relationship with Americans and foreigners alike.

XUM

Born of pacifist origins, he chose the Army as a profession and was later to lead three million men into battle in history's greatest military operation. But he was intrinsically a man of peace who never really strayed far afield from the pacificist teachings of a mother who frowned on his choice of a career.

As a militarist who knew on an intimate level the essential evil of war, Gen. Eisenhower was avowedly dedicated to peace in his private and political lives after he left the Army. He was a world leader who made a number of fateful decisions, including one that assured his election as President when he declared that he would go to Korea to seek an armistice.

But while there was unrestrained praise for Gen. Eisenhower, there were detractors for President Eisenhower who never seemed to get over an elemental distaste for the rough-and-tumble milieu of politics. His reluctance to exert his immense popularity as a potent lever in the civil rights area, after this volatile social issue drew an unprecedented constitutional vitality from Supreme Court landmark decision on school desegregation in 1954, was deplored in a number of quarters.

He was a caretaker President at a time when the nation was at the height of its power and vigor, determined to keep the ship of state on an even keel in foreign and domestic waters. It was a sense of caution that marked his early military life and carried over into his tenure as President.

In World War II, as commander of the Euorpean theater, the general established his niche in military history; he did not come up quite as well as the nation's peacetime commander-in-chief. He was not a social innovator like President Roosevelt before him and President Johnson after him; nor did he display the combative personal stamp that marked the Administration of President Truman.

As President, Mr. Eisenhower was a chief executive who chose to remain aloof from the fires of partisan conflict, nor was he a strong influence on Congress. It is likely that when his Administration is reviewed in historical terms, Ike will likely be categorized as a good president, not a great one.

It was an Administration largely influenced by the so-called Assistant President, Sherman Adams, a stern, implacable New Englander who became embroiled in an unsavory episode involving a Boston industrialist, and John Foster Dulles, the architect of a foreign policy that was blamed for much of America's present difficulties overseas.

Eisenhower had misgivings about running for the presidency, and there were periods when he was neither comfortable nor happy in this most demanding and lonely citadel of power. It was in one of these moments of self doubts that the President once told the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn that historians would probably rank him with George Washington and Robert E. Lee as one of the great military leaders of the nation. As President, he wasn't sure how he would be graded in history.

It was a perceptive self-appraisal that could stand as an objective accounting of this leader's life in war and peace, a dominant, influential figure whose stature never diminished in the eyes and hearts of his grateful countrymen.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly touched and deeply grieved by the passing of President Eisenhower. He was one of our greatest Presidents and one of our greatest Americans.

His entire life was unselfishly and brilliantly devoted to our country. He was a superb military leader, who won the hearts of his men and the gratitude of our country and allies, by his inspiring, victorious leadership of our united military forces in a most crucial war.

This great American stood out for his truly illustrious service to our country and the American people as President for 8 long critical years in our history.

His motivations were always lofty; his principles were based on solid American values; and his concerns and contributions encompassed the Nation, the world, and all mankind.

He was a personal friend, and I looked upon him with highest regard, admiration, and affection.

He was kindly, generous, and humane, instinctively dedicated to the highest concepts of duty, not only in his career as a soldier but in the Presidency and throughout his entire life.

He will be greatly missed by all of us, the American people he served so well, and peoples everywhere whom he was so eager to help toward prosperity, freedom, and peace. He has left a great legacy of honest, distinguished, loyal service to our country, which will always be gratefully remembered.

I extend my prayers and most heartfelt sympathy to his wonderful, devoted wife and all his dear ones, and join them in mourning him.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, regardless of political persuasion, mourn the passing of former President and General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower. He was a singularly beloved President and a great military leader. Born in Texas and raised in Kansas, his achievements have made a profound mark on the history of this Nation.

Not only was "Ike" one of our most loved Presidents and a great leader of the Allied military effort in World War II, but he was prophetic in his farewell address as President in his assessment of the risks inherent in a growing military-industrial complex in a democratic society. As one who has drawn inspiration from his valedictory address before it became currently popular to do so, I have long been impressed with his perception. Nothing indicates the greatness of this fine old soldier more than his respect for rule by the people and for the due process of democracy.

San Antonio is proud of its connection with the career of this great American during his years of service at Fort Sam Houston. It was on our historic Army base in 1915 that First Lieutenant Eisenhower first met Miss Mamie Doud, and where they started their married life. "Ike" was reassigned from Fort Sam in 1917, preparatory to fighting in World War I, and it was not until 1941 that the Eisenhowers were again in residence at Fort Sam. But certainly this assignment was again a most memorable one for them, because it was at Fort Sam that "Ike" was promoted to brigadier general, receiving his first star. A recent article from the San Antonio Light which I am inserting at the end of my remarks contains interesting details of General Eisenhower's tours of duty at Fort Sam Houston.

The sympathy of the Nation goes out to Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower and the Eisenhower family. Their personal loss is shared in a very real sense by the entire country.

The article referred to follows:

EISENHOWER, MAMIE, AND FORT SAM HOUSTON

(Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who died Friday, felt a special attachment to Fort Sam Houston and San Antonio. So did his widow, the former Mamie Doud. Here is the story about the couple's close affiliation to historic Fort Sam Houston.)

The most distinguished military leaders of this nation have served tours of duty at historic Fort Sam Houston.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. John J. "Black Jack" Pershing, Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, Gen. Walter Krueger, were all men in whom the U.S. Army and Fort Sam Houston personnel take great pride. But for Dwight David Eisenhower, President of the United States, General of the Army, this feeling of pride and admiration has always been a little special.

Perhaps this feeling of kinship and affection for Gen. Eisenhower stems from the fact that he began his career at Fort Sam Houston as a young second lieutenant fresh from West Point, in September 1915, while assigned to the 19th Infantry, that he brought his 20-year-old bride to Fort Sam Houston on July 11, 1916, 10 days after their marriage.

He received his first star in ceremonies held at Fort Sam Houston in 1941 and from here he departed at the onset of World War II, to make military history as one of our greatest soldiers.

In his book "At Ease—Stories I Tell My Friends," the general said: "One Sunday afternoon after I'd been in Texas for some months, I walked out of the bachelor officer quarters to make a guard post inspection as Officer of the Day.

MAJOR'S WIFE

"On the sidewalk across the street was a small group of people, one of whom was Lulu Harris, wife of a major.

" 'Ike,' she called, 'won't you come over here? I have some people I'd like you to meet.'

" 'Sorry, Mrs. Harris,' I called back, 'I'm on guard duty and have to start an inspection trip.'

"She then turned to one young girl, as I discovered later, and said, 'Humph! The woman hater of the post.'

"The girl said something to Mrs. Harris that caused her to call once more. 'We didn't ask you to come over to stay. Just come over and meet these friends of mine.' "

CROSSED STREET

Lt. Eisenhower did cross the street in front of Bldg. 688, on Infantry Post Road and was introduced to the Doud family of Denver, Colo., who were spending the winter in San Antonio.

This was the first meeting of Ike and his beloved Mamie. And it did not end with a simple introduction. The young officer promptly asked the attractive and captivating 18-year-old Miss Doud if she would care to walk along with him on his rounds of the guard posts. She just as promptly accepted the invitation, although she admitted in later years that walking was not one of her favorite forms of exercise.

On Valentine's Day, 1916, Ike gave Mamie his West Point class ring and formally asked her father for her hand in marriage. He almost didn't get it.

Only his deep love for little Mamie kept Dwight D. Eisenhower from becoming one of this nation's first pioneer pilots. He desperately wanted to join the aviation section of the Signal Corps, as the Air Force was called in those days. However, Mr. Doud considered flying the sign of an irresponsible character and threatened to withdraw his consent to the marriage, Ike stayed on the ground.

XUM

On July 1, 1916, the Eisenhowers were married in Denver, Colo., at the Central Presbyterian Church. The bride received a wedding ring purchased from Hertzberg's Jewelry Store in San Antonio and the groom received a promotion to first lieutenant.

Following a 10-day honeymoon, the couple returned to Ft. Sam Houston to take up life in Ike's old quarters at 688 Infantry Post.

BRIEF VISIT

In February, 1959, Mrs. Eisenhower paid a brief visit to San Antonio. Asked about her first home at Ft. Sam Houston she was most explicit in describing the quarters. She said that she and the general had started their married life in "the building to the left hand entrance of Infantry Post, the second stairway, the first floor, the apartment on the left."

With this information officials of the Army post were able to place a historical marker over the entrance to the quarters.

Shortly after their marriage, Lt. Eisenhower was made Ft. Sam Houston provost marshal, a job he held until the spring of 1917 when his unit, the 19th Infantry, was detailed to Camp Wilson adjacent to the main post. Ike went to Camp Wilson as regimental supply officer and assistant mustering officer for the Southern Department.

LEON SPRINGS

When the 19th Infantry formed the 57th Infantry and moved to Leon Springs for training, Ike went along with the unit. It was at Leon Springs that one of the most unusual experiences of his life occurred. He was struck by lightning while standing under a tree in front of his tent.

Not only was Eisenhower knocked unconscious by the bolt, but the 57th's adjutant, Capt. Walton Walker, was also hit. Neither man suffered any permanent damage and, in fact, received a certain amount of local acclaim after their commanding officer Col. David J. Baker, made it known that he was the only regimental commander in the Army whose entire staff had been struck by lightning and lived to tell the tale.

On Sept. 18, 1917, promoted to captain, Ike left Ft. Sam Houston for Ft. Ogelthorpe, Ga., here he served as an instructor in the officer training camp. The Eisenhower family did not return to Ft. Sam Houston for almost 25 years.

YEAR BETWEEN

The years between World War I and the fall of 1941 were years of peace and years in which a career Army officer moved slowly up through the ranks while serving in various positions within the military establishment. Eisenhower was a tank corps commander, an executive officer and a recreation officer, at different times and places during this period of time.

He was promoted to major on June 17, 1918 and to lieutenant colonel on Oct. 14, 1918. These were temporary ranks however, and it was not until July 2, 1920 that he was given the permanent rank of major and not until 16 years later, on July 1, 1936, that he became a permanent lieutenant colonel.

On July 1, 1941, their 25th wedding anniversary, with Eisenhower newly promoted to the rank of full colonel, Mamie and Ike returned to Ft. Sam Houston, where their life together had begun. They moved into Bldg. 177 on Artillery Post Road and two months later to Bldg. 179, quarters the couple were to occupy until the outbreak of World War II, a few short months later.

CHIEF OF STAFF

On Aug. 1, 1941, Col. Eisenhower was assigned to duty as chief of staff of the 3rd Army under Gen. Walter Krueger.

In the months of August and September, 1941, Eisenhower, Gen. Krueger and the 3rd Army met the forces of Gen. Ben Lear's Second Army in the famous Louisiana Maneuvers.

At the close of the Louisiana maneuvers, Col. Eisenhower received his first star and promotion to brigadier general in ceremonies held on Ft. Sam Houston's Treat Field, directly across the street from his quarters at 179 Artillery Post.

On Dec. 7, 1941, Brig. Gen. Eisenhower ate lunch and took a nap. The nap was very brief. Shortly after he had retired his aide woke him to bring the news of the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

WEEK LATER

One week later on Dec. 14, Eisenhower, on verbal orders from Gen. George C. Marshall, chief of staff, reported to Washington, D.C. and the War Department.

He did not return to Ft. Sam Houston again. However, he and Mrs. Eisenhower remembered the old Army post where they had met and established their first home.

In September, 1967, a large package arrived at the Ft. Sam Houston Military Museum. It contained a pair of polished riding boots, one tropical worsted shirt and a pair of wool riding pants. The uniform was from Gen. Eisenhower and was one he had worn during the North African campaigns of World War II.

COLOR PHOTO

In 1968, he and Mrs. Eisenhower autographed a color photo of their quarters at 179 Artillery Post for historical purposes and Mrs. Eisenhower wrote a personal letter to the post's Historical Society, describing their experiences while serving in the house at the outbreak of World War II.

Ike did not forget Ft. Sam Houston—and Ft. Sam Houston will never forget him.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the late President Eisenhower had a close association with the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia. His mother was born in Augusta County, a short distance from Fort Defiance, a small community near Staunton, in the historic Shenandoah Valley. In fact, a number of the late President's distant kinsman are residents of that area today.

This association was a source of great pride to the citizens not only of this area but, indeed, of the entire Commonwealth of Virginia. The general received an enthusiastic welcome when, in the fall of 1960, he paid a visit to his mother's birthplace and to Staunton, Va.

His death marks the passing of one of the remaining few world figures who were the architects of allied victory in World War II. In this regard, we see the passing not only of a man, but of an era. Countless thousands have honored by word and respectful presence the virtues of this great American leader whose public service covered such a broad horizon of human endeavors ranging from military leader to college president to Chief Executive. Many can extol better than I his innumerable achievements and contributions to his country and to humanity.

In a world that is a violent one, where many governments are likely to be dictatorial and tyrannical as opposed to democratic, we see in this national loss the passing of a leader elected by the people because they respected and admired him.

When you look at the life of Eisenhower, his dedication to democracy, to the dignity of the individual, and basic decent morality, he stands as an outstanding example of leadership in a world that needs such examples.

His life is in contrast to a number of contemporary heads of government. How unlike Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin does he stand forth as a head of state.

How unlike Castro, Kosygin, Khrushchev, and Ho Chi-minh is this man who dedicated his life to the service of his country and recognized the innate worth of the individual.

To him, power came from the people and should be used on their behalf, rather than for the ambitions and whims of any individual or privileged few.

Like so many others, I had hoped for him a recovery in order that he might return to Gettysburg and continue to enjoy what was a well-earned and looked-forward-to retirement, while ready to serve his country, as he always was, with wise and straightforward counsel to younger men who acceded to the responsibilities of national leadership.

He was a fine example of what this country can produce, and the most fitting monument America can erect to him is one honoring him for this example of the greatness this country can produce for the service of humanity.

It is an example the world will miss.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as an Air Force pilot during the Korean war, the words "I like Ike" summed up for me a genuine, honest-to-goodness affection for my Commander in Chief. Although I never met him, he was a friend—one could accept this with complete assurance because of the quality of Dwight David Eisenhower, the man.

And this afternoon the bells will toll. Can we hear them?

For whom do the bells toll, Mr. Speaker? They toll for me; they toll for you; they toll for the American people; they toll for all men. We are all diminished by his passing.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and loved ones.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower was a great man in every sense of the word. He was an all-American man, universally accepted as the epitome of all that is good. Honest, able, courageous, his every act was in keeping with the highest standards of human behavior.

As I stood in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol yesterday afternoon and witnessed the placing of General Eisenhower's casket on the catafalque, I was overwhelmed by the memory of the man.

As the leader of our combat forces in the European theater in World War II, I can well remember the manner of the man, the positive nature of his remarks, the assurance he exuded to the free world on the evening of the Normandy invasion on June 6, 1944. I clearly recall the series of military successes that followed which brought about the ultimate surrender of the Axis Powers the following May.

As the elected leader of our Government, he again exhibited his ability to lead and to bring about peace to a fractured international scene. Shortly after his assumption of the Presidency in 1952, he announced the signing of an armistice in Korea, which brought to an end another era of costly conflict.

General Eisenhower's long and successful career can best be summarized by the expressions of those that come to pay their last respects to him as the lies in state this very moment in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. The people come out of admiration for a man who was loved and revered by all who knew him, who imbued in the world in which he lived a spirit of good will and cooperation. They come because "they liked Ike." We all did, and we will sadly miss him.

Mr. HORTON. "Ike" Eisenhower was a unique American hero.

He was a military leader whose biggest battle was for peace. He was a President who gave outstanding moral leadership to his people. He was an exemplary family man.

Affection for this late President transcends national boundaries. He was a world leader loved by men everywhere. His passing creates a void in our Nation that may never be filled.

The greatness of America and the promise it holds for all its citizens is exemplified in the life of President Eisenhower. He was born of parents poor in material wealth but rich in moral strength. He drove himself to fulfill every obligation he undertook.

President Eisenhower rose to world stature. His death takes from us an inspiration of a past era.

The Nation stands still at this moment. We bow our heads in a silent prayer that we may gain strength and wisdom in following the path laid down by this great man.

Mrs. Horton and I, who both served under his command in North Africa and Europe, joined the tens of thousands of people who came to the Capitol Sunday to pay last respects to the late President. I watched as the historic, black-draped caisson moved with slow and stately majesty on its sad journey to the Capitol.

Throngs of people lined the hushed streets of Washington to watch the progress of the flag-covered casket.

Despite the damp, bone-chilling cold of the afternoon, and even through snow and rain that fell briefly, the people stood patiently and respectfully. Many brought young children.

I heard one woman explain to a preschool youngster: "The old President was a great and good man. All these people have come to say goodby to him, to show that they loved him."

The love and respect in which President Eisenhower was held was reflected in many ways Palm Sunday as the Nation paid its final tribute to him.

There were the traditional rites of the funeral march, the 21-gun salute, the honor guard from all the services.

But perhaps the greatest tribute was the heartfelt one paid by great and small, old and young, rich and poor as they gathered together at the Capitol to say a sad goodby to the man they had called Ike, a man they all felt had served his country with noble self-sacrifice, far beyond what a nation could expect.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, five-star general, President, and elder statesman, was a man truly of the people. He rose from humble beginnings in a Kansas farming town to lead the Allied Armies to victory in Europe during World War II. General Eisenhower, the war hero, then became President Eisenhower, a man who searched as hard for peace in the postwar world as he had for victory during the massive conflict before.

Although he first came to fame as a war leader, I will remember him as a seeker for peace.

President Eisenhower led us through those first frightening years of history when men possessed the power to destroy civilization.

The great affection of the people for him certainly sustained him through those difficult years. I could see, in the solemn faces of those who lined Washington's streets as the funeral cortege passed by, the affection held for President Eisenhower.

To honor the late President, the heads of state from scores of countries came to Washington for the funeral services. Tens of thousands of mourners filed past the closed casket in the rotunda of the Capitol.

As if in tribute to the late President, pink buds on the magnolia trees which line many of Washington's streets started to bloom early this morning.

In a stirring eulogy, President Nixon told of the general's last words to Mrs. Eisenhower. President Eisenhower had said.

> I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. And I have always loved my country.

The people he loved and the people who loved him came in those few days to say, "Thank you, 'Ike'—and goodbye."

His life and his accomplishments should be a constant reminder that in these times of turmoil, unrest, and tension human qualities of sincerity, integrity, duty, love, and goodness are our ultimate solution.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Dwight D. Eisenhower was not only one of the most popular Presidents in American history. He was also a great patriot, whose deep love for freedom helped him achieve distinction in both military and political fields.

People of all political faiths found him a warm and sincere man, whose integrity was never questioned. Let us remember that the freedoms Americans enjoy today were preserved by his military brilliance and leadership.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's leadership qualities were so unique and strong, he was selected Supreme Commander of Allied Forces over hundreds of officers of higher rank in World War II. That decision helped America and her allies triumph over an enemy that was determined to not only rule Europe, but to subjugate the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, because of his magnificent service, he earned the permanent gratitude of not only our Nation, but the other free nations of the world. Dwight D. Eisenhower was respected for his abilities, admired for his courage, and loved for his great compassion for mankind.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower was very much an American.

As the Christian Science Monitor put it in its March 29 editorial:

> Perhaps no President in history was more deeply and recognizably American than was Dwight D. Eisenhower.
>
> It was this quality—

The Monitor continues—

> which so many millions abroad instantly felt upon meeting or seeing him. It was a quality of strength which served him admirably, not only during the Presidency but during his equally distinguished career as an Army officer.

The words so eloquently spoken by those in this Chamber today are testimony to General Eisenhower's character, ability, leadership, and humility.

I am deeply saddened by the death of General Eisenhower. Saddened in a personal sense and also because this man represents one of that group of men who brought us through some of our darkest days. The stature of an Eisenhower is not achieved without sacrifice or tribulation.

General Eisenhower was truly a hero, and this Nation can never repay its debt to his leadership of nations and people during the war, and as President of the United States.

Because I began my involvement in politics in that first Eisenhower-Nixon campaign by placing an "I Like Ike" bumper strip on my bicycle, I pause today to join the millions of people who are sad at his death. I want to express my respect for the man who today lies in state in this building.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, when I searched my thoughts and feelings to find the words of praise and commemoration appropriate for our late and beloved Dwight David Eisenhower—the one which seems to best fit is "supreme" in every sense of its meaning.

Dwight Eisenhower's service to America as a nation; to its people as citizens and, indeed, to all mankind is uniquely unparalleled in modern times. Perhaps the foundation for this supremacy was inborn at his birth; only God knows that for a certainty. However, during the course of his lifetime, from 1890 to 1969, he developed his inborn characteristics through his love of God and for his country, so as to become known and cherished by his fellow countrymen, civilian and military in every walk and rank of file. The citizens of the world—no matter whether friend or foe—came to know this man as a soldier of war who fought valiantly in the name of peace, and did just exactly that—brought peace to our world during his lifetime on it. Never before has so small a word in measure, so colloquial in sound, meant the supreme recognition of everything good in a man as "Ike."

"Ike" fought for peace, for justice, and for tranquillity.

As Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, he united the free world advocates into a victorious battle, but first he called upon Almighty God and beseeched Him to bless this crusade.

During his term as president of Columbia University, his countrymen called upon his qualities and characteristics of leadership to serve them as their President.

As the 34th President of the United States, he led America toward the goals of peace, justice, and tranquillity. He once again brought peace to the forefront—this time in Korea. He applied his tact as a general to his performance as President, and he called upon the American people to unite into a great freedom loving force and moved them along the paths of peace, progress, and a better world relationship.

Then, as "Ike" began to fight the most difficult battle of his own personal life, the world prayed and fought in heartfelt sincerity of spirit, this battle which only he could really wage alone. He now lies within the peace and tranquillity of the almighty defender of us all.

Personally, as a major in the U.S. Army, I served as one of General Eisenhower's staff during World War II.

Later, as a Member of Congress, I again had the good fortune to serve while he was our Nation's Chief Executive. He was a perceptive planner; he was a man who could reach into the hearts of people, and a man who could get people to work together. As our President, he moved our country forward in the true tradition of its Founding Fathers.

We can best honor him by striving, whether as a private citizen or a public servant, to heed our Nation's calls or causes by continuing to work for the goals which he sought during his lifetime—goals which, if realized, will make this Nation and this world a much better place in which to live.

Such peace as we have now, even in these troubled times, is to a large degree, because of the leadership of this soldier-statesman. He achieved it through his qualities of warmth and candor and because of his confidence in the essential goodness of man. His selflessness was a unique quality in this age where most men and most countries are seeking to satisfy their physical wants.

Mr. Speaker, often I have seen these past few days, the American flag flying at half mast in full dignity and honor of the man we all knew as "Ike"—I can only pray that, as the flag of this country rises once again to its full height, so also will the principles for which "Ike" stood, will rise anew in the hearts and minds of the citizens of our great country and spill over into the hearts and minds of the world, in order that peace and tranquillity may reign supreme.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I think every American feels a sense of personal loss at the death of General Eisenhower. He has been prominently identified with American history and progress since the early days of World War I, and this spans more than a generation.

During wartime he was entrusted with the highest allied command in the European theater, and subsequently a grateful country called him to the Presidency. His leadership both in peace and war was of the highest caliber and the heritage which he leaves is one of dedication to our country, to duty, and of calm acceptance of responsibility.

He knew the cost of defense, but he also knew a strong defense was essential to our Nation's security. He strove with dedication to chart a safe course for a lasting peace. No man could do more and at the time of his death a sorrowing America pays homage to a great leader and remembers him with great appreciation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower served the American Nation for more than half a century: as a great soldier who led us and the European democracies against brutal totalitarian regimes; as president of a great American university; as President of the United States through difficult and demanding years; and as an inspiring source of courage and resolve in his later years when illness never conquered the greatness of his spirit. He symbolizes the strength of our Nation which drew him to the highest seats of power and responsibility from humble origins in the prairie. In his life he enacted the ideal of America, to work with each other and with other nations with reason and compassion. Above all else, he advised against despair, against giving up on ourselves. He counseled all Americans to face the perils of our future with the courage of our fathers.

General Eisenhower lived a full and rewarding life, and his courageous struggle to live is in itself a memorial to his immense personal integrity, his joy in living and serving. His struggle was long and painful. Yet his will to live, along with his ability to live fully, provide example for all.

His own admonition to the cadets at the Air Force Academy in 1959 is an excellent comment on his own life. He said then:

> The one admonition I would give you is this; make sure you get enjoyment out of every day. Life should be a thing to enjoy. Make certain your face doesn't grown long as the day grows older. Go to bed with a smile and remember a fine day. And with that custom, I am quite sure you will find a long, happy, and fruitful life, fruitful to yourself, to your country, and to humanity.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I never had the privilege of serving in a National Government headed by Dwight David Eisenhower. Time flows quickly, and people come and go in our National Legislature. Nevertheless, I do not speak only as a citizen when I express my admiration for his contribution to the life of America. No one who has at any time served in Washington and understood the burdens of the Presidency can fail to have some special feeling about the grace with which General Eisenhower exercised the power of the greatest office in the world. He sensed the mood of the people, he understood their heartfelt thoughts, he identified with their fondest hopes in ways which permitted him to be much more than a leader in the classical sense; he was instead a friend, a kinsman, a partner in a common endeavor. Confidence is born of this feeling of identity, and confidence is the ingredient which makes democracy possible.

When such a man passes into history we feel a sense of personal loss even though we know that Government leaders must come and go, each leaving his own legacy. Who of us can judge the historic legacy of Dwight Eisenhower? Let us say, however, that we have lost a friend in whom we had confidence, a counsellor whose judgment we trusted, a warm and honest and unfettered spirit.

Mr. Speaker, may I add a special word of tribute to Mrs. Eisenhower, a lady I have never met, but of whose sympathetic contributions to her husband's career I am as sure as I am of today's sense of loss in his passing. We offer her our heartfelt best wishes at a time which must be very difficult for her.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, death came Friday to a great American. While it may have stilled one great and noble heart, it stirred anew in other hearts, including millions who fought beside him for freedom, solemn thoughts of the massive debt mankind owes to his memory.

Not since our Founding Fathers has an American soldier-statesman received the respect, reverence, and love accorded Dwight Eisenhower by the people of the world. He was a man worthy of any age. He belonged to our generation. He needs no monument, no cause, no cult. He was indeed a great American. I can think of no greater accolade—the true greatness of a humble man who responded to the call of duty from his countrymen. We shall all miss him.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower was not only a great military and political leader but he was a great moral leader, as well. History may well record him in this capacity ahead of the other two. He possessed a unique moral quality that few men possess and never failed to show it wherever and whenever he appeared. His deeds and his actions made people so aware of this quality that no one ever doubted that actions taken by him were morally right. Such a quality is indeed a rarity and it was good for America and it was good for all humanity. The world will miss his goodness.

Mrs. Latta joins with me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and members of her family.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this Congress assembled here today who have lost, with the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, more than a general and a President, more than a great man to be admired from a distance, and more than an image to which we pay respect because of his noticeable accomplishments. To us, as is the case with thousands of Americans and other citizens of the world, his death marks the passing of that rare kind of leader whose humility, energy, and understanding drew toward him our deepest confidence and highest respect. We looked to him as a man who enjoyed virtually every honor which the world could bestow on a single individual, but who remained unspoiled by the tributes. As a great soldier and hero, he was yet a man who longed only for a just and lasting peace. As a distinguished President, he was a man who used political power only to build and strengthen his country, and abhorred the weaknesses that the abuse of political power brought forth in lesser men.

His accomplishments as a military leader need not be glorified, for the fact that we are here today as free men to express ourselves in this manner is in no small part a result of his efforts. As a commander of the armies of many nations in an allied cause, his qualities of

XUM

leadership earned the praise of the leaders of the free world and the confidence of its fighting men.

His accomplishments as a President can now, in retrospect, be looked upon with longing. He successfully guided us through two terms of peace and prosperity. He served us in a time when anything short of his great knowledge of the realities of power, how it should be regarded and used, could have brought grave consequences. He brought to the Presidency a calm, quiet resolve to be guided by God and commonsense, to accomplish what he could with a humility and a trust in what is good and in what is right. And accomplish he did, for the trust was returned to him a thousandfold, and the love which he felt for his country is now and has been reflected by the love which his country feels for him, as well as the grateful thanks given to him for his role in making America mean what it does to all the people of the free world.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Dwight Eisenhower leaves us in the fullness of years, weighted with all the honors a grateful, admiring people can bestow.

Even though within the divine order of things, his loss is a grievous one. We will miss his breadth of experience, the sense of proportion and judgment which he always applied to great problems, and the smile that warmed our hearts.

We have lost one of the truly great men of American history. In war and in peace, the Eisenhower record will stand always as a testament to his enduring qualities of greatness. His courage, integrity and wisdom, his abiding faith in God and country, his humility, his uncomplicated, forthright character are qualities in the American tradition. They are the qualities which have made our Nation great and which have sustained us in hours of darkness.

They are qualities without which our Nation would be destroyed, as with other nations who have lost the faiths and strayed from the simple truths which inspired their foundings.

To have been acquainted with Dwight Eisenhower I shall always count as among the highest privileges of my life. He radiated integrity and unselfishness. He buoyed you up and lifted your spirits. One of the happiest benefits of our electronic age is that men like Eisenhower can be seen and studied by each new generation. What a tremendous advantage they have if they will but use it.

Through this wonderful medium coupled with his written word they, too, can come to know and understand the qualities of this great man. They, too, can someday sense something of the magic of his personality which no mere words in history books can quite convey.

So the sadness and loss we bear today is leavened by our sense of good fortune in having shared some portion of our life and times with Dwight Eisenhower. It is leavened, too, by our sense of triumphant pride in his human greatness. I think it is fair to say that no President except, perhaps, Washington has ever left office enjoying greater public affection. As President Nixon told us yesterday in the rotunda, that affection is worldwide, wherever freedom is cherished, deep rooted in the hearts of his fellow man.

I cannot close these heartfelt remarks without paying homage, too, to Mrs. Eisenhower. Her faith and graciousness and love for her husband have endured through these grievous days and set for us all yet another example of extreme grace under great stress.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I join in paying tribute to the life and character of Dwight David Eisenhower—one of America's foremost leaders. On March 28—last Friday—the inevitable took from our midst a patriot, a soldier, a statesmen, a gentleman. Throughout his entire life, Dwight David Eisenhower exhibited those traits of virtue and decency which are required of men who must lead men in time of war and in time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, Ike is gone; but his good deeds will linger in the memory of Americans as long as there is an America.

In an eloquent, front-page editorial, the Vicksburg, Miss., Evening Post noted the Nation's loss and recalled the occasion on July 4, 1947, when, as Army Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower was in Vicksburg to accept that city's "surrender" to the United States. As a part of my remarks, I include the editorial, which follows:

Ike Is Gone

The Word flashed around the world. One of the great figures of modern history has gone to his reward. The old soldier just "faded away". The rugged constitution which had withstood numerous heart attacks, three major surgeries, pneumonia and other ailments, finally won the victory over the stout-hearted soldier who not only won his victories in the greatest war of history, but also conquered the hearts of his countrymen and of the world. He was "Ike" to America—a military genius, a great president, but more than that, he was possessed of a wonderful personality which endeared him to his countrymen and to those who served under his various commands.

He is remembered with great affection in Vicksburg, where, twenty-two years ago he came as the featured speaker at a great July Fourth celebration here. We well remember his words—"Instead of accepting the 'surrender' of Vicksburg, I confess that I have surrendered to the warmth of your welcome and to the graciousness of your hospitality." He took Vicksburg by the force of his great personality, and this was genuinely reflected in the splendid vote he received each time he ran for the Presidency. Vicksburg voted for "Ike".

He was the greatest military figure of the century, and the manner in which he forged into a great command the armies of many nations, remains as one of his most brilliant feats. It was this ability to bring forth a united force that resulted in the fall of the German empire.

A great man, a splendid citizen, a truly great American has answered the last roll call. As the nation pays homage to his memory, the spirit of this outstanding American should rekindle in the breasts of the people of our nation, a dedication to our country, which was the foremost quality of our former President.

The drums are muffled. Taps is sounding. Ike has gone. May he gain the reward promised to all who serve, and serve well.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, while we knew of General Eisenhower's declining health we were still unprepared for his passing. We are deeply saddened that his intense personality and famous smile that radiated confidence throughout the world will no longer be with us.

General Eisenhower symbolized and typified an entire era. He played a major role in the struggle of free peoples to remain free as an officer in World War I, as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, as commander of NATO, as President in ending the Korean war, and in his decision to support South Vietnam. He encouraged the cause of freedom to stand fast when the world was threatened with total war and anarchy.

As Supreme Commander of the Allied forces during World War II in Europe, I knew firsthand of his superb accomplishments. He was unsurpassed in wielding together an invincible fighting machine from so many diverse elements. As a soldier, near General Bradley's headquarters in Normandy, I learned of his diplomacy, his tact, and his ability to inspire confidence and cooperation from all branches of the service and from the armed forces of our allies. His selection by the President, and by General Marshall, as Supreme Commander in Europe proved to be a wise choice. His name became the symbol of a great crusade. He was admired and respected and loved by the free world. He even became the hope of many of the German people who had been enslaved by the raving Hitler and who saw in Eisenhower relief from slavery and oppression. His name became synonymous with justice as opposed to infamy and oppression.

When General Eisenhower became commander of NATO, it was my privilege to visit with him there at headquarters near Paris as a young Member of the Congress. I remember General Eisenhower telling us that 95 percent of his work as Allied commander and as NATO commander was diplomatic and political. He simply had, in a magnificent way, the ability to reject jealousy and envy and get people together. He was NATO commander during a critical time. When the forces of oppression and slavery threatened to engulf Europe, he inspired the peoples of Western Europe and caused them to stand firm during those critical years.

Dwight David Eisenhower, as President of the United States, provided for the American people, and those of the free world, a fatherly image of kindness and fairness. His smile, his winning personality, his character, and his modesty led America to the heights in the postwar era. We have not had a more popular President or general. The people loved "Ike." He was the one they wanted their sons and daughters to serve under in war. He was the one they wanted to lead them in peacetime. He respected the Office of the Presidency and advised and consulted with succeeding Presidents.

As an elder statesman, he was truly great. As a general, he will rank with Douglas MacArthur, George Washington, the Duke of Marlborough, the Duke of Wellington, and Robert E. Lee. Like them, he will be noted for his integrity, compassion, and devotion to, and respect for, the individual and those less fortunate. As President of the United States he will be associated with those virtues and attributes of character associated with the greatest.

I extend on the part of my fellow South Carolinians our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower, his distinguished and devoted son, and all of their great and wonderful family.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, our former Commander in Chief, leader of the crusade in Europe, and two-term President has left us. We are all better men in a greater Nation because of our work with him.

Dwight David Eisenhower, general and President, gave his whole life to the service of his country. He led America's armies and then the whole Nation with rare strength and ability.

General Eisenhower believed strongly in the right and in the necessity of America pursuing the moral and right course. He had great spiritual faith and he tried to give that faith to America. He said that "faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource." Much of the courage and strength of America, through World War II and the darkest days of the cold war, was strength gained from the example of this leader of men.

It was my privilege to serve in the Congress for 6 of the years of President Eisenhower's two terms. He was never partisan; never a leader of part of the people. He was truly a national leader; a leader of all Americans—loved by all Americans.

No one can question that his greatest accomplishment was to lead us to peace and keep us in peace.

Yet he may be remembered even more for his spiritual accomplishment, for his integrity, for his honesty, for the moral example he gave us all. General Eisenhower's great contemporary, Sir Winston Churchill, wrote most beautifully of the place of men in history:

> History with its flickering lamp stumbles along the trail of the past, trying to reconstruct its scenes, to revive its echoes, and kindle with pale gleams the passion of former days. What is the worth of all this? The only guide to a man is his conscience; the only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions. With this shield, however the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honor.

General Eisenhower always marched in the ranks of honor; he will always live in the minds of honorable men.

Dwight David Eisenhower said that "men grow in stature only as they daily rededicate themselves to a noble faith." With the example of this leader before us, let us all rededicate ourselves to the faith which he had—to his faith in man, to his faith in America, to his faith in the right.

Again, my sympathy to his courageous family. May God bless them in this hour of grief.

Mr. McCORMACK. So we say to our dear beloved friend, Dwight David Eisenhower, not goodby, but good day.

REMOVE PROFIT FROM THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions called the attention of the House to excess profits in defense procurement. I am equally concerned that for recent months evidence has grown that there is profit in the war on poverty, too.

When I voted for the Economic Opportunity Act and its subsequent amendments, I believed that I was doing the right thing; I still believe that there is no more urgent national priority than the abolition of poverty in this country. I have, however, been disturbed by the proliferation of consultants, advisers, and other contractors who have attached themselves to the war on poverty. I have no idea of the number of instant experts available, but have every reason to believe that it is considerable. Moreover, there can be no guarantee that a consultant hired by OEO or any of its delegate agencies is in fact an expert in his field. I doubt that notwithstanding this fact there is no single community action agency of any substantial size that does not have one or more consultants working for it. A consultant can draw up project proposals, shepherd them through the bureaucracy, furnish new ideas, or redraw old proposals. He can generate a proposal at the drop of a hat and can on call advise anyone on any subject, all for a fee. What concerns me is that the profits made by these consultants are considerable, and that there is no assurance at all that a community action agency does itself any good by hiring consultants.

What is more disturbing is that OEO—and it is not unique among Federal agencies—can use a private firm to do things which it could not otherwise accomplish. Such services cost more than they otherwise would, but that is of no concern. For example, if a manpower ceiling threatens to cut off the establishment of a desired project, the agency simply hires a private firm as a funding vehicle. Then, the program is not one operated by OEO, but by a contractor, and the personnel are not chargeable to OEO. Some such projects go awry, in which case the Government agency does not have to take the blame, but can pass it on to its contractor. But the basic fact remains that in such a tactic, the contractor is essentially used as a dummy. He gets well paid for doing little or nothing, except perhaps permitting his firm to be used as a name on a bank account. I do not believe that this is a sound tactic for any Government agency, but least of all for OEO. I do not believe that the poor can afford to let their little budget be tapped for dummy accounts.

There is profit in the war on poverty. That is evident from the number of consultants and contractors around. There is nothing to show that the community action programs work any better for all the efforts of there experts, or so-called experts. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that at least some contracts would have been better off left never signed. It might have been better for profit never to have entered into the war on poverty.

COAL MINE SAFETY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Ben A. Franklin, of the New York Times, has written an outstanding analysis of coal mine safety and health issues, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine of March 28. This article deserves the thoughtful consideration of all Members in assessing the pending legislation on this subject. I trust that the facts contained in this article will stimulate all Members to take positive action in support of effective legislation to protect those who have suffered so long in the coal mines. In the name of humanity, Mr. Speaker, we must act to protect our fellow human beings who work in the coal mines.

The article follows:

THE SCANDAL OF DEATH AND INJURY IN THE MINES—MORE THAN 120,000 MINERS HAVE DIED VIOLENTLY

(By Ben A. Franklin)

"Of the 54 men in the mine, only two who happened to be in some crevices near the mouth of the shaft escaped with life. Nearly all the internal works of the mine were blown to atoms. Such was the force of the explosion that a basket then descending, containing three men, was blown nearly 100 feet into the air. Two fell out and were crushed to death, and a third remained in, and, with the basket, was thrown some 70 to 80 feet from the shaft, breaking both his legs and arms."

These sentences matter-of-factly describing the pulverization of a shift of coal miners, including the three men grotesquely orbited out of the mine shaft as if launched from a missile silo, are from the first detailed record of an American mine disaster. Antiquity probably explains the nursery rhyme quality—*"two fell down and broke their crowns . . ."* For this earliest remembered mine catastrophe, in the Black Heath pit near Richmond, Va., occurred March 18, 1839.

A primitive time, no doubt. The nation was then so new that Martin Van Buren, warming his feet at the coal-burning grates in the White House, was the first President to have been born a United States citizen. The daguerreotype was introduced here that year by Samuel F. B. Morse, while awaiting the issuance of a patent on his telegraph. Half the coal-producing states were not yet in the Union.

The coal mines, on the threshold of fueling a manufacturing explosion that was to make this country an unmatched industrial power, produced barely one million tons in 1839, less than 1/500th of the output today. In the absence of all but the crudest technology, men relying on the death flutterings of caged canaries to warn them of imminent suffocation obviously would die in the mines. Some mines employed suicidal specialists known as "cannoneers," whose mission was to crawl along the tunnel floors under a wet canvas before a shift, igniting "puffs" of mine gas near the roof with in unpraised candle. Dead miners were not even counted. Their enormous casualty rate was not archived until less than 100 years ago.

A glimpse into this dim crevice of American industrial history is necessary to put into perspective the myths and realities of the men who work in the mines today. For the real story of coal is not its multiplying inanimate statistics—tons and carloadings and days lost in strikes. It is the agony of those men—a tale as old as Black Heath and one that is so full of extravagantly evil personalities and atrocious acts that Charles Dickens would have loved to tell it. For behind and beneath the mountains of the Appalachian coalfield, miners have remained since Black Heath the most systematically exploited and expendable class of citizens (with the possible exception of the American Indian and the Negro) in this country.

The story at last may have an un-Dickensian ending. For now, coal miners can see light at the end of the tunnel. In this 1969 spring, 130 years after the Black Heath dis-

XUM

aster, the mining industry may finally agree to pay the modest cost of keeping its work force alive, of abandoning the embedded idea that men are cheaper than coal. And—small pittance—we may all be involved in helping pay what it costs to write this long delayed postscript to the industrial revolution; the price of bringing miners into the 20th century probably will appear, as we shall see, as pennies on our electric bills.

In the context of technological advancement in nearly every other area of human enterprise, very little has changed for men who go down to the mines in shafts. Only four months ago, 78 coal miners were trapped and killed below ground in West Virginia in one of the most volcanic eruptions of explosion and fire in the memory of Federal mine inspectors. As at Black Heath, the explosion at the Consolidation Coal Company's 27-square-mile No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va., almost certainly was caused by an ignition of methane gas, a volatile, highly flammable, usually odorless and invisible hydrocarbon gas liberated from virgin coal.

At Consol No. 9, a modern, "safe" mine operated by one of the wealthy giants of the industry, the daily methane emission was 8 million cubic feet, enough to supply the heating and cooking needs of a small city if it were captured and sold. The explosion hazard was dealt with there as it is generally in mining today, by only modestly more sophisticated methods than those at Black Heath.

Fresh air is drawn into the mines by giant fans and circulated and directed constantly through the honeycomb of tunnnels by means of doors, ducts or sometimes by curtains called brattices (miners call them "braddishes"). The intake air is supposed to dilute and, by law, "render harmless or carry away" the methane and hold the mine atmosphere to less than the legal limit of 1 per cent gas. Unless coal dust is mixed with it—in which case the explosion threshold drops significantly—methane will not ignite or explode in concentrations of less than 5 per cent. Miners live and die today on a margin of 4 percentage points—or less if coal dust is suspended in the air.[1]

It is known that the giant electric mining machines in use for the last 20 years—machines that chew up and claw coal from the face with rotary bits the size of railroad wheels—churn up an immense amount of dust. The machines have water sprays to settle the dust. But the machines' rapid rate of advance through the seam also liberates much methane.

The first explosion at Consol No. 9 came at 5:25 A.M., Nov. 20, during the cateye shift. It was a day after the passage over northern West Virginia of a cold front accompanied by an abrupt drop in barometric pressure. In the primitive mythology of mine safety, these natural events—the arrival of cold, dry air and a barometric low, which increases the methane liberation in a mine—have been associated for years with disasters. The legendary great mine explosions, from Monongah and Darr in 1907, Rachel & Agnes in 1908 and on up to Orient No. 2 in 1951, have occurred in November and December and in cold, dry weather. The dry air dehumidifies a mine and sets coal dust in motion.

Every fall through 1967, the United Mine Workers Journal had published a fraternal warning to union brothers to observe special precautions in "the explosion season." But, no research having been done in a century of such meteorological coincidences, the industry can and does take no account of what it, therefore, regards as a folklore factor—which might interfere with production. The U.M.W. Journal had not got around to running the 1968 warning when Consol No. 9 blew up. "We figured afterward it would be no use," a Journal editor said later.

No one yet knows what death befell the 78 men in No. 9. Miners who survive the shock wave, heat and afterdamp (carbon monoxide) of an underground explosion are instructed to barricade themselves in good air, if any, and await rescue. But during the nine days and nights that rescue teams stood by helplessly on the surface at Farmington, there were at least 16 further explosions in the mine. The first blast had burst up 600 feet through the portals and ventilation shafts, blowing the internal works of the mine to atoms and knocking out ventilation circuits. At the top, the main shaft became the muzzle of a mammouth subterranean cannon. The massive headframe, a trestled structure of bridge-size steel I-beams that supported the main hoist, was blown apart. For days, a boiling plume of poisonous black smoke alternately belched from the shaft and then unaccountably reversed its flow and inhaled, bursting forth again with renewed detonations below.

Finally, on Nov. 29, all five shafts and portals at the mine were sealed—capped and made airtight with tons of rock, steel and concrete. Not for months, until engineers are certain that restoring ventilation will not reignite coked embers and trigger the millions of cubic feet of methane collecting in the primordial atmosphere below, will Farmington's dead be disinterred from their gassy grave. The same mine was sealed for more than a year following a less violent explosion in 1954 that killed 16 men (including one, Black Heath-style, topside near the mine mouth), and fires continued to burn in sealed sections of the mine even after production was resumed.

If entombing a mine fire to control it seems primitive in this day of chemical fire fighting agents and automatic deluge sprinkler systems, it is futuristic, compared with the industry's performance in disaster *prevention*. There have been profitable technological advances in the extraction of coal from the seam, and today the industry is on the brink of such a long, secure production boom that big oil companies, with some of the sharpest eyes for markets and profits in the business world, are buying up and merging with coal companies at a rapid rate. But production economies in the past have more often than not been at the expense of human economies, and Big Oil may be surprised to find itself saddled with coal's amazing insensitivity to mayhem and death. It was the fatalistic acceptance of Farmington more than the disaster itself (President Nixon has since criticized this acceptance of death as "as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels") that finally started the mine-safety revolution.

At first, at the daily post-explosion news conferences in Consol's cinderblock company store near Farmington (many miners are *still today* in debt to their employers' merchandising subsidiaries for nearly a full paycheck before they are paid), William Poundstone, Consol's executive vice president for mining operations, insisted that the mine was "only technically gassy." W. R. Park, a senior Federal mine inspector familiar for years with the mine, insisted it was "extremely gassy," and John Roberts, a Consol public relations man, called it "excessively gassy." Roberts, a master of malapropism who greeted the news corps before one vigil news conference by asking cheerily, "Are all the bodies here?" also described the No. 9 explosion hazard as "something that we have to live with."

Then came the parade of V.I.P.'s. U.M.W. president W. A. (Tony) Boyle came to the mine head not only to congratulate Consol on being "one of the better companies as far as cooperation and safety are concerned," but to add that if this "safe" mine blew up, "you can imagine what the rest are like." "As long as we mine coal," said Boyle, the philosophical miners' ombudsman "there is always this inherent danger of explosion." The then Assistant Secretary of the Interior, J. Cordell Moore, the Department's top minerals man, flew up from Washington to add that "unfortunately—we don't understand why these things happen—but they do happen," and to venture that "the company here has done all in its power to make this a safe mine." (In fact, Moore's own Bureau of Mines had reported substandard rock dusting at Consol No. 9—the most basic of explosion-prevention measures involves rendering coal dust inert with 65 percent crushed limestone—in all 24 of its inspections there since 1963. The Bureau had cited No. 9 for 25 other safety violations since December 1966. Moore probably saw nothing unusual in that because violations are the norm in most mines.)

Hulett C. Smith, then the Governor of West Virginia, also stood before the television cameras and observed more in sadness than in anger that "we must recognize that this is a hazardous business and what has occurred here is one of the hazards of being a miner."

With that, the fuse, delayed so long, finally blew in Washington. The then Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, after eight years of more concern for California redwoods than for miners, denounced the whole system of coal mining—the technological and moral systems—as "unacceptable." As an astonished layman, Udall noted that Consol was mining "in an area that really is a low-grade gas field" and that "obviously it is not a solution that is completely adequate to dilute the gas by pumping in air." Within three weeks, Udall summoned a national coal-safety conference which turned out to be one of the most amazing gatherings in bureaucratic history. In a Soviet-style mood of confession, Udall publicly admitted that "we have accepted, even condoned an attitude of fatalism that belongs to an age darker than the deepest recess of any coal mine. At every level of responsibility, from the individual miner to the highest councils of Government, we have looked with horror on the specters of death and disease that haunt our mines. Then we have shrugged our shoulders and said to ourselves, 'Well, coal mining is an inherently hazardous business' or 'It's too bad, of course, but as long as coal is mined men inevitably will die underground.' These easy rationalizations are no longer acceptable in this time in history."

The stubborn Black Heath syndrome—so costly in human life and so profitable to the industry—finally was broken. Within a week, Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary, on the job one month, issued orders to his inspectors. They were to cease immediately giving prior notification of impending inspections to the operators, a practice known for years to encourage a sudden, temporary kind of mine housecleaning for the benefit of the inspector—"baking a cake," one inspector called it. They were to cease reviewing mine violation reports with owners. Where violations occurred involving imminent danger of explosion, they were no longer merely to write them down as before, they were to close the mine. The list was startling for what it said about past practices.

It is hard to tell which is more gripping—the penny-pinching, corner-cutting and profiteering waste of human life in mines still operated today—Black Heath-style—with bland abandon of what the U.S. Bureau of Mines calls "ordinary regard for safety," or the callous result, the history of human carnage in the mines. The record to date, even the most contemporary chapters of it, is appalling. In the 100 years that par-

---

[1] One example of the retarded technology of mine safety is that miners testing for gas still rely today on the Glame safety lamp of Sir Humphrey Davy, perfected more than 150 years ago. The safety lamp is rugged and safe if used properly, but it requires highly skilled operators to read it accurately, and then its accuracy is no more than half a percentage point—or 10 per cent of the margin between survival and explosion.

tial records of fatal mine accidents have been kept (the early figures are incomplete) more than 120,000 men have died violently in coal mines, an average of 100 every month for a century. The total does not include those who died of what passes for "natural causes" in work that is as notoriously hazardous to health as it is to life and limb. Today, among men aged 60 to 64, the "natural" death rate of miners is eight times that of workers in any other industrial occupation.

Chronic lung disease may, in fact, turn out to be a far worse killer of miners than accidents. The U.S. Public Health Service, in unfinished research that is 25 years behind completed medical findings in British mines, has recently documented that coal dust—not the rock dust associated for decades with miners' silicosis—has become perhaps the pre-eminent threat to survival in the mines.

A prevalence study completed in 1965 found that, conservatively, 100,000 active and retired American coal miners suffered from the progressive, gasping breathlessness associated with prolonged inhalation of fine coal dust, a condition known (from autopsy observation) as "black lung" or pneumoconiosis. The U.M.W. estimates that in the 20 years that electric mining machines have been churning up greater and greater clouds of dust at least one million men have been exposed to an occupational disease whose ravages do not stop with removal to a dust-free environment.

The black-lung hazard—as the coal industry and physicians in its employ constantly point out—is as yet a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain threat to life. It is real enough, however, to have caused more than 30,000 West Virginia miners, normally among the last in the industry to engage in wildcat strikes, to walk off their jobs for three weeks in February of this year to demand that the State Legislature include black lung in the list of injuries and diseases for which disabled miners are eligible to collect workmen's compensation benefits. Until then, only three coal-producing states—Alabama, Virginia and Pennsylvania—authorized workmen's compensation payments (generally financed by the industry) to black-lung victims, and only Pennsylvania has paid any claims. (In Pennsylvania, the benefits are paid for by the taxpayers, *not* the industry, which may explain how the legislation survived there. Coal has a history of very aggressive lobbying to protect its economic interest.)

In West Virginia's Statehouse last month, a doctor testifying in support of the industry's proposal of further medical studies of black lung before changing the compensation law "in haste," charged that Drs. I. E. Buff, Donald L. Rasmussen and Hawey Wells, the three crusading physicians in that state who had galvanized the miners to strike for health reform, had done more damage as "alarmists" than the disease itself. There was nothing more pathetic, the lachrymose industry witness testified, than a coal miner told to quit the only work he knows just because he is a little breathless. It was a Dickensian performance.

The coal operators, or some of them, have taken the position that pneumoconiosis does not exist. But sudden violence in the mines has been documented monotonously since Black Heath. Last year, alone, 309 miners died in accidents—"needlessly," according to O'Leary, the new and aggressively safety-conscious director of the Bureau of Mines—and miners' death and injury rates, already the highest of any industry, are on the rise this year.

The injury severity rate in mines, also the highest, is two and a half times that of lumbering, nearly four times that of trucking. Since records of nonfatal accidents began to be archived in 1930, the number of men temporarily or permanently disabled digging coal has risen to 1.5 million. Today, a miner surviving a lifetime in coal (and there is one chance in 12 that he will not) can expect three or four lost-time injuries, not counting one chance in 5 or 10 of serious and eventually fatal lung disease.

Mining, like prostitution, is one of the oldest occupations in the world and is probably as impossible to stop. From the beginning, coal has been a curse on the land from whence it came, blighting the landscape with strip mines and culm banks and polluted streams, extracting for absentee owners vast fortunes from Appalachian states that are today synonymous with poverty, and plunging generations into despair.

But the scandal of gratuitous death and injury in the mines—almost all of it recognized, as the Interior Department report put it recently, as the result of the operators' "tendency to cut safety corners when profits are low and ignore good safety practices when profits are high"—has finally reached the point at which a Republican Administration in Washington is talking about limiting coal production to save lives.

In testimony this month supporting the sudden rush of mine-safety bills in Congress following the explosion at Farmington, this radical notion was put forth by none other than Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. "It is clear that our society can no longer tolerate the cost in human life and human misery that is exacted in the mining of this essential fuel," Hickel said. "Unless we find ways to eliminate that intolerable cost, we must inevitably limit our mining of coal, which has an almost inexhaustible potential for industrial, economic and social good."

Republican coal barons must have rolled in their graves. Even from Democratic Administrations, this most destructive of industries had never received such a radical warning. In fact, Democrats in Congress have been the protectors of the industry's economic interests over the survival interests of its workers.

In 1941, at the end of three decades during which miners died at an average rate of better than 2,000 a year, a series of terrible disasters which had killed 276 men during the closing months of 1940 finally forced passage of the so-called Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act. It was conceded, as the Bureau of Mines timidly put it then, that "speed of operation and demand for maximum tonnage at a minimum cost resulted in a neglect of ordinary safety measures."

In 1941, when technology in the United States had advanced to the threshold of the atomic era, the gross and calculated neglect of ordinary prudence in the powder-house atmosphere of coal mines was evidenced by the fact that barely half the underground coal miners had been equipped with battery-powered electric cap lamps, approved by the Bureau of Mines for the absence of spark hazards. Incredibly, the rest still wore carbide lamps, which gave their light by generating acetylene gas and emitting an open, two-inch jet of flame.

In 1941, half the mines still used unstable black powder for blasting rather than the safer "permissible" explosives recommended for 30 years by the bureau. The carbide lamps were handy for lighting fuses. Some mines had advanced to the employment of "shot firers," solitary men whose job was to shoot down the drilled coal after everyone else had left the mine. It was a concession to modernity. If the mine blew up, only one man was lost.

Everyone knew that disasters could be stopped. "In view of the present knowledge of preventing explosions, disasters are inexcusable and discredit the mining industry," the Bureau of Mines said in 1940. Everyone knew that more improvements in the feeble state mining laws were being blocked than passed. But Congress heeded the industry's states' rights argument. The 1941 act gave the Bureau of Mines for the first time authority to enter and inspect mines and write reports containing noncompulsory safety recommendations, but no powers of enforcement. The states would take care of that.

Since 1910, when the Bureau of Mines was established, its engineers have been testing and recommending to the industry as approved or disapproved—as "permissible" or "nonpermissible" (words that convey more authority than the bureau had then or has today to require their use)—a whole range of mining equipment, including explosives and electric wiring, lights, drills, cutting machines and haulage devices. Such safety-designed machinery is obviously the key to disaster prevention in mines full of a mixture of inflammable methane gas and explosive coal dust.

Yet, nearly half the explosions—835 miners dead—between May, 1941, when the bureau got its authority to inspect and recommend, and July, 1952, when Congress next amended the mine-safety law, were caused by electric arcs from nonpermissible mine machinery. Most of the rest involved nonpermissible—but still not illegal—use of explosives.

Unbelievably, when the misnamed Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 finally emerged from the coal lobby's permissible cutting machine, it contained a "grandfather clause" which allowed the indefinitely continued use of knowingly dangerous nonpermissible electrical machinery "if, before the effective date of this section. . . the operator of such mine owned such equipment . . . or had ordered such equipment." The law also set up two classes of mines—gassy and nongassy—and it stretched the loophole for nonpermissible equipment even further for the 85 per cent of mine owners lucky enough to meet the nongassy standard.

In effect, Congress told the mine operators that "if you were creating an avoidable explosion hazard before we passed this law, it's all right to go on doing so until the dangerous machinery wears out." Today, this means that spark-hazard machines—some of them rebuilt twice and three times over under the same serial numbers—are still in use in some mines 17 years after the law was passed. A count by the Bureau of Mines in 1967, when the law had been on the books 15 years, showed 1,117 pieces of nonpermissible electrical equipment in use in 159 mines.

The 1952 mine-safety act may have been one of the great legislative mirages of all time. It specifically exempted small mines, those with fewer than 15 employes. Although the small mines were depicted in the industry's testimony as to inefficient and limited in capital resources to bear the cost of retooling for the most basic disaster prevention, their number immediately doubled after the law was passed. Large mines were simply separated into smaller units to evade the law. (In 1966, the small mines were finally brought in—with all "grandfather clauses" still intact.)

Moreover, the law was deliberately written to apply to, and to give Federal mine inspectors jurisdiction over, only certain kinds of "major disasters"—defined by Congress as those killing five or more miners in one stroke. More than 90 per cent of mine deaths then occurred in lonely ones, twos and threes. Far more than half were caused by rock falls from the mine roof, largely at the working face. The 1952 law established roof-control standards, but only for established tunnels used as haulageways where such accidents were least common.

Having extended Federal safety jurisdiction to the kinds of "major disasters" that made the news wires and brought discrediting publicity, Congress emphasized that the new law was *not* to protect the miners from "the lack of, or inadequacy of, guards or protective devices." It was totally silent on hazards to health.

In signing the act into law, former Presi-

XUM

dent Truman obviously did not overstate the facts in observing that "I consider it my duty to point out its defects so that the public will not be misled into believing that this is a broad-gauge accident-prevention measure . . . I am advised that loopholes in the law were provided to avoid any economic impact on the coal-mining industry."

Congress has considered mine-safety legislation only three times in the last three decades. But in the years between enactments, there was activity. In 1962, after explosions in the Robena and Compass mines had killed 59 men, President Kennedy commissioned a task force to review the situation. Its report concluded that the industry's continuing disregard of the most basic hazards to life and limb deserved Congressional attention. For one thing, the task force proposed to put a deadline—one year after enactment of an implementing amendment by Congress—on the nonpermissible machinery "grandfather clause." It also noted that Britain, producing only a fraction of the coal output of the United States, was spending more than twice as much on mine health research.

But then in a series of private conferences with Bureau of Mines and Interior Department officials, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, the union-negotiating arm of the coal industry, persuaded them to recommend to Congress a "grandfather clause" deadline of *five* years. Since Congress took no action on it, the B.C.O.A. had another opportunity last year to persuade the Bureau of Mines to propose an even further extension to *ten* years. The capitulation was so flagrant that the White House, overseeing the draftsmanship of the 1968 mine-safety bill, demanded its exclusion from the bill, which went up to Congress in September. It died without hearings.

Other capitulations to the industry have perpetuated the Bureau of Mine's reputation as the submissive captive of the industry it is supposed to police. As recently as a year ago, a long-proposed revision of the 1952 law specifically requiring diversion of a minimum flow of dust-and gas-diluting forced air ventilation to the working face of coal mines—a point beyond the last moving air current in the established workings—was dropped by the bureau upon the B.C.O.A.'s complaint that it would be too costly.

It has been known for years that progressive contamination of mine ventilation air—a pickup of dangerous amounts of methane or coal dust, or both—results from coursing air from one working section of a mine to another before routing it to the surface. The practice is known to have caused explosions and deaths. Yet a year ago the B.C.O.A. was still dickering privately with the bureau, demanding language in the bureau's proposals for tougher mine ventilation standards which would say that if it cost too much to provide a separate "split" of air to each active working place it would not be required until after "a reasonable time"—not, of course, defined.

It is not that any of these proposals were new. The industry could claim no element of surprise—except at the idea of being compelled to adopt them after so long a history of lethal *laissez-faire*. Mine technology has been equal to all of these proposed measures for at least all of this century—for 101,000 mine deaths.

The inclusive almanac of mine disasters published by the Bureau of Mines in 1960 (it is now out of print) says that the violently explosive and unpredictable characteristics of suspended coal dust in mines were known as long ago as 1886. A team of mining engineers which visited all the major coalfields in 1908, a year after the worst mine explosion in American history had killed 362 men at Monongah, W. Va., published a detailed report identifying every source of all the subsequent mine disasters (72,501 deaths from 1909 through 1968) and recommending disaster-prevention standards which are *still* not observed.

While lobbying privily against safety, the industry has publicly promoted the idea that the death and mutilation of its workers was a cost of doing business. It got a depletion allowance on its taxes. Its workers got none for their depletion. The industry reaction to disaster was in the brave tradition of "what can you expect in an inherently risky business"—*and* with some of the most effective lobbying in legislative history to perpetuate the trade-off of cheap life for cheap coal. And it has not been alone.

Even on the left in this medieval atmosphere, the miners' union, the United Mine Workers of America, has been so concerned with helping the industry survive its post-war slump and with preserving coal's low-cost competitive advantage over other basic fuels—oil, natural gas and nuclear energy—that it long ago sacrificed what could have been the leadership of a mine-safety crusade for high wages, mechanized high production, and the highest accident rate of any industry.

Some of the accidents were no accident. In 1947, the U.M.W. in Illinois was found to have voluntarily signed a labor contract with coal operators in that state whose terms forbade the union from seeking improvements in Illinois' mine-safety law, upon which the industry placed such store in opposing greater Federal control. The Federal law of 1941, then in effect, was no threat to the cheapest production economies; the 1941 act had been so considerate of the industry's faith in state regulation that Federal mine inspectors were denied enforcement powers.

Since 1946, moreover, the U.M.W. had become locked in an embrace with the operators nationally. Through the 1946 coal labor contract, which set up the U.M.W. Welfare and Retirement Fund and financed it by an industry royalty—now 40 cents a ton for all coal taken out of union mines—the U.M.W. also acquired an immense interest in production. The Welfare and Retirement Fund collects income from *operating* mines, not from those harried by mine inspectors or closed down for safety violations.

The U.M.W.'s obvious conflicts of interest are a legacy of John L. Lewis, the 89-year-old former president. Lewis's postwar decision to help the coal industry survive by sacrificing 400,000 miners' jobs to mechanization in return for the company royalties was regarded then as a modernizing act of industrial statesmanship. But it established alliances that obviously are not in the best interests—on mine safety, if nothing else—of the rank-and-file membership. For example, under Lewis the U.M.W. bought control of the National Bank of Washington, a profitable sideline that has furthered the appearance, if not the fact, of shared interests by making loans to coal companies.

Since Congress was no help, in 1946 the Interior Department, which was then operating the mines under President Truman's strike-induced Federal seizure order, negotiated with the unions (as a condition in the contract) safety standards unobtainable by other means. Compliance with the contract's so-called Mine Safety Code, which incorporates many of the reforms talked about since the early nineteen-hundreds is monitored by Federal mine inspectors. But its enforcement depends on the union, through its contractual right to withdraw men from mines in violation of the code.

Compliance, according to Bureau of Mines Director O'Leary, "leaves much to be desired." The compliance average in 20 of the largest mines is 65 per cent, O'Leary has told Congressional committees, but in some states (depending on coal operator attitudes and union militance) it is as low as 30 per cent and in one state as low as 7 per cent. The U.M.W.'s "safety division" at its headquarters in Washington consists of one man.

The Welfare and Retirement Fund is not the only loser when the men walk out of an unsafe mine. The miners lose wages. When I asked him several months ago whether the U.M.W. had considered negotiating with the companies a requirement that they pay regular wages to men who left a shift while demonstrable code violations were corrected, the U.M.W.'s Boyle, a slight, normally combative Irishman from Montana, told me that would be impossible because even among miners there were "lazy men"; there would be abuses to get pay for no work. Later, in a safety proposal prepared by the U.M.W., the union finally supported the idea that miners should be paid for time off the job if a *Federal inspector* closed a mine.

But more than any other witnesses on this year's crop of catch-up mine-safety bills, Boyle has agreed with the industry's position. On the proposed revision that Secretary Hickel and O'Leary have called the reform of "paramount importance," Boyle's stand is significantly less reformist than the industry's. In view of the miserable record of Congressional inaction and protection of the industry, the Administration this year is asking Congress to give the Secretary of the Interior the flexibility of administrative rule-making authority. After hearings, he would establish the safety standards. There would be the right of appeal. It is the system in use since 1938 in nearly every other area of Federal regulatory activity, and the coal industry now says it will go along with it if the Secretary's authority is suitably circumscribed to prevent "arbitrary" decisions. Boyle, however, has said he "would rather take our chances with Congress."

Those chances this year are very good indeed, partly because Boyle himself has underlined the unequal forces working for mine safety in the private sector. The U.M.W. is clearly embarrassed by the reformist zeal of what it calls "Johnny-come-lately experts" since Farmington, like Udall, Ralph Nader and Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia. For suggesting that the union bears some responsibility and that it has compromised and "snuggled up to" management on safety issues, the U.M.W. Journal recently labeled Nader and Hechler as "finks" in a front-page editorial. And the union magazine has engaged in such a Mao Tse-tung glorification of Boyle and his record as a safety crusader—it refers to him as a "union chieftain"—that the U.M.W. has become an embarrassment to its friends in Congress. While fulminating at the charges of collaboration with the industry. The Journal has not reported that weeks before the Consol disaster, the U.M.W. was convicted along with the Consolidation Coal Company in a Federal court in Lexington, Ky., of conspiring to create a monopoly in the soft coal industry. With the conviction, which is being appealed, went a $7,300,000 damage award, to be paid half by the union and half by the company that Boyle has praised for "cooperation." The case involved Consol's alleged withdrawal of coal marketing services from South-East Coal Company after the company went non-union.

Moreover the coal industry can hardly cry poor this year. Because of its secure grip on a growing share—now more than half—of the fuel market in the surging electric utility business, even the National Coal Association is calling the future "glittering." It turns out that local boosters who, through depression upon depression, have been calling the state of West Virginia "The Billion Dollar Coal Field" were not far from wrong.

As Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr. of New Jersey noted in starting mine-safety hearings, coal has become so profitable that since 1966 the three largest coal producers have been taken over by other giant mineral corporations—Peabody Coal Company by Kennecott Copper, Consolidation by Continental Oil Company, and Island Creek Coal Company by Occidental Oil. According to the National Coal Association, the list of oil corporations that have acquired coal-mining companies now includes at least

20 of the major petroleum producers—Gulf, Shell, Humble, Standard of Ohio, Atlantic-Richfield, Sun, Ashland and Kerr-McGee among them. It was a relief to know, Senator Williams noted, that the safety hearings would not be "complicated" by the usual coal claims of imminent bankruptcy. To the oil owners of coal, Williams pointedly observed that the spectacle of oil-well pollution of the Pacific Ocean off Santa Barbara, Calif., and new evidence of "lung pollution" in the mines "may be trying to tell us something," "In both cases," he said, "we find at the top of the ownership structure big oil companies."

Whether or not by corporate edict from these powerful new coal owners, the fact is that the National Coal Association, the largest industry group, is taking a remarkably calm and even welcoming view of the strenuous safety legislation before Congress this year. By enacting the Nixon Administration bill, which is among the strongest of the lot, Congress could close all the old loopholes at once and take—for coal—a daring new step into industrial human ecology. The Nixon bill would require mine operators to attack the black-lung epidemic among miners by reducing coal dust contamination in mine air to 4.5 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air, as a starter. The standard is a compromise of the U.S. Public Health Service's 1968 recommendation—3 milligrams. It would become effective six months after passage of the law and could be lowered later by decision of the Secretary of the Interior. The dust-control problem is publicly pictured as a cost nightmare by the industry. The Bureau of Mines estimates that the cost will be only pennies per ton.

The economics of mine safety are the one great unknown in this year's reform spree. No one knows what the cost of a century of neglect has been. Lee White, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which regulates wholesale electric power rates, opened the door a crack during Secretary Udall's post-Farmington *mea culpa* last December by observing that, as a nation, we have lost money as well as life in the mines, "and we must pay." The F.P.C. is anxious to pass on to consumers "all savings in costs that are properly made," White said. But if it takes an increase in the cost of electricity to indemnify the miners who dig the coal for steam-electric power, "I believe the American people are willing and should be willing to pay that extra case . . . . For all I know, we are not talking about increased rates but only a smaller decrease in rates."

Some but not all of coal's new 20-year and 30-year contracts to supply the huge fuel demands of electric power contain escalator clauses, which would permit certain price increases to pay for safety. But a share-the-cost program may not be as easy to work out as White made it seem; one reason that the coal industry is so mercilessly cost-conscious has been the strong downward pressure on prices exerted by the electric utilities, including the Government's own Tennessee Valley Authority, the biggest of all coal consumers. The average value per ton of coal at the mine has dropped from $4.99 in 1948 to $4.62 last year.

It may be significant that John Corcoran, the president of Consol—a moderate man to start with, by coal industry standards, and one who has been deeply affected by the Farmington disaster—also is chairman of the National Coal Association and a director of the American Mining Association and the Bituminous Coal Association. The industry does seem to be speaking with a new voice. But the coal industry is still a very loose coalition of new humanists and old buccaneers. And as one of its publicists put it recently, "We are like any association—we reflect the lowest common denominator. We have a few members who think the world is flat, so we have not publicly endorsed the use of globes."

TRIBUTE TO SERVICE OF APPALACHIAN COCHAIRMAN

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the man who has served as the Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission for the past 2 years, the Honorable Joe W. Fleming II, recently resigned, and I want to take this opportunity to commend his dedicated and exceptional service to the people of the 13-State Appalachian region.

He was appointed to the Federal cochairmanship by President Johnson in February 1967, before his 30th birthday. Prior to the appointment, he had served as a special assistant to the Commission and had worked on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Fleming, who is more generally called "Pat" by his many friends, has exhibited unique insights into the needs and problems of the Appalachian area. He used imagination in seeking solutions to problems and meeting needs. He displayed unusual skills and diplomacy in exercising his function as the Federal Cochairman of the Commission.

As chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Appalachia for the Public Works Committee, I have just concluded hearings on extension and revision of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. It would have been encouraging to every Member of the House to have heard the testimony of the Governors, our fellow Members, and private citizens concerning the advances which are being made in Appalachia, and equally important, the unusual praise for the operation and function of the Commission. This was particularly refreshing at a time when critics seem plentiful for many Federal activities. The testimony indicates a total State endorsement of the concepts and implementation of the regional development approach which is proving so beneficial to the people of Appalachia.

The Federal Cochairman, as the representative of the Federal interest in the program, is due a large measure of credit for the success and excellent relationship evident with the various States.

In his relations with the Congress, Pat Fleming was always responsive to requests for information and assistance important in preparing legislation for the program. His cooperative attitude and constructive approach to problems made my work as chairman of the ad hoc committee less burdensome.

Pat Fleming is intelligent, knowledgeable, capable, and industrious. He has amply shown this in the discharge of his responsibilities as Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission. I commend him for his service. He has a bright future, and I wish him every success in the years ahead.

A NEW CREDIBILITY GAP

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as the new administration faces its first hard decisions concerning our involvement in Vietnam, and recalls its magic plan mentioned during the presidential campaign, the administration should awaken to the ever-mounting casualties in Southeast Asia and should reevaluate its no cease-fire decision while the diplomatic talks proceed in Paris.

At the same time, I am somewhat distressed by the discussion in the Congress about the imminent release of some $30 billion now being spent in Southeast Asia. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I know what could be done to meet the challenges at home if $30 billion were suddenly made available for our domestic priorities. I also know that such talk misleads the American people. Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a recent statement pointed out that if we decided to withdraw all our troops from Vietnam tomorrow, it would take about 2 years to evacuate. In addition, billions of dollars worth of heavy equipment would remain in South Vietnam—not to mention economic aid to that Nation.

There are enough reasons to press for settlement of this war and to end the tragic death tolls, without holding out the unrealistic promise that $30 billion will suddenly be available for domestic programs.

Those who mislead the American people on that score are simply creating a new credibility gap—a practice they have condemned in the past.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 351

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has learned with profound regret and sorrow of the death of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, beloved former President of the United States of America.

Resolved, That in recognition of the many virtues, public and private, of the illustrious soldier and statesman, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public stations, the Speaker shall appoint a committee of the House to join with such Members of the Senate as may be designated, to attend the funeral services of the former President.

Resolved, That the House tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the former President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and trans-

XUM

mit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the Speaker and the entire membership of the House to attend the funeral services for former President Dwight D. Eisenhower this afternoon at the Washington National Cathedral.

Members' wives have also been invited to attend these services.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral services in Abilene, Kans., the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Fisher, and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Mize.

Transportation will be furnished to the cathedral this afternoon for Members and their wives and will also be available for the return to the Capitol at the completion of the services.

Buses will leave from New Jersey Avenue, between Independence Avenue and C Streets, promptly at 3:15 p.m. for the trip to the cathedral.

The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the former President, this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

633. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of an independent study and evaluation of the implementation of sections 210 and 211 of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, pursuant to the provisions of section 233(c) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

634. A communication from the Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to pay received by public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment during the summer vacation period; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9674. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9675. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9676. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9677. A bill to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 9679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9680. A bill to amend the Internal Reveune Code of 1954 to liberalize both the minimum standard deduction and the percentage standard deduction, and to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H.R. 9681. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 9683. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 9685. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

My Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 9686. A bill to provide public assistance to mass transit bus companies in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 9687. A bill to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9688. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9689. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9690. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 9691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase certain personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including spouses and dependents), to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing and obtaining higher education, to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by employees, to protect funds invested in series E U.S. savings bonds, to provide a credit for certain single persons, to provide a deduction for transportation and personal exemption for disabled individuals, to repeal manufacturer's excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks, to revise and improve the income tax treatment of senior Americans, to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion, to provide an incentive for corporate investment in developing countries, to provide a tax credit for certain local residential and property taxes, to modify the capital gains treatment of property acquired from a decedent, and to repeal multiple-surtax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 9692. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize mining of all new quarter-dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9693. A bill to permit civilian employees of the United States employed outside of the United States to import certain firearms and ammunition purchased abroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 611. A resolution authorizing the President to proclaim February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 612. A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 613. A resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prevent interference with, and eliminate the limitations upon, the power of the States to regulate health, morals, education, domestic relations, all property rights, transportation wholly within their borders, the election laws, with the limitations contained in this proposed amendment, and good order therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 614. A resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

97. By the **SPEAKER**: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to regulation of outdoor advertising; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9695. A bill for the relief of Carmelo DiFiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9696. A bill for the relief of Cirino Carroccetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9697. A bill for the relief of Rita Del Grosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9698. A bill for the relief of Christos G. Pappas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 9699. A bill for the relief of Catherine E. Spell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9700. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jasmine T. Dillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. The **SPEAKER** presented a petition of Mrs. Katarzyna Zerucha, Oleszyce, Poland, relative to widow's social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 1, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth with diligence; he that showeth mercy with cheerfulness.—Romans 12: 8.

O God, our Father, in whose love is our life, in whose service is our strength, and in whose will is our work, grant unto us increasing power that we may labor unceasingly for the welfare of our country and the well-being of all mankind.

Save us from discord and disunity, from pride and prejudice, from vice and violence. Fashion us into a people united in purpose and program to promote justice, to proclaim freedom, and to provide food for the hungry, housing for the ill housed, and jobs for men who will work.

May the spirit of wisdom abide in all our hearts that we may make decisions daringly, plan procedures patiently, and live with love the light in our lives.

In times of trouble let not our faith in Thee falter and in periods of prosperity let our faith find its fulfillment in humble service and a grateful spirit.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title:

S. Res. 175

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the former President of the United States and General of the Army of the United States.

Resolved, That as a token of honor to his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, his distinguished public service to his Nation, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public station in life, the Senate hereby expresses its deep sensibility of the loss the Nation has sustained by his death, and its sympathy with the family in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the two Senators from Kansas be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased, to be held at Abilene, Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Edward Jones, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE ARMY

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a shocking proposal has been brought to light in Army plans to require chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and religious philosophy in lectures designed to instill moral responsibility in our soldiers. I would hope that the Army has a greater interest in God than it has in the protests of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Apparently the Army is bowing to complaints from the American Civil Liberties Union. Fortunately, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird has ordered a high Pentagon review of Army plans and it is to be hoped that the plans will be dropped.

I find it extremely distasteful that the Army would feel a compulsion to bow to groups which object to religious teachings. The military services have an obligation to present inspiring programs of character guidance to members of the Armed Forces and this is particularly needful to the young men and women who first enter the service. Our Nation has a strong religious background and one of its principal strengths has been a firm faith in the Almighty.

I find myself completely out of patience with the Army proposal, and I have protested this action in strongest terms, both to the Army's Secretary and Chief of Staff and to Secretary Laird. America is not ready to give up religious teaching, either in or out of the Army.

CONGRESS MUST ACT NOW TO INSURE HEALTH AND SAFETY IN THE MINES

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was announced today that a fiery blast of methane gas trapped 145 to 168 men in a Mexican coal mine, located 75 miles from Eagle Pass, Tex. It may take as long as 15 days to reach all of them.

Mr. Speaker, other coal mine disasters in this Nation will surely occur unless Congress acts quickly to pass effective legislation, and the attitude of the entire coal industry changes. Every day that passes risks the danger in this Nation of a new and major tragedy in this most dangerous of all occupations.

Lots of coal mine representatives today, and even Members of Congress, are talking about the economic impact of increased safety, and the burdens that protection of health and safety may place on the coal industry. They should be talking instead of the human impact on the human beings who work in the coal mines.

Even if we pass a good law, it will not do any good unless there is a genuine will to safety on the part of the coal industry, the United Mine Workers, and the American people.

Every day that passes 28 more people are injured in the mines. Since the Farmington tragedy, 60 underground coal miners have been killed. I say in the name of humanity it is time that Congress act, and the American people back up action to clean up the coal mines and protect the safety of those who work in the mines.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S NOBLEST CHARACTERISTIC WAS HUMILITY

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend

XUM

his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, permit me to associate myself with the good and kind things which have been said here on the floor of the House about Dwight David Eisenhower.

Saturday night, March 29, I spoke to a junior chamber of commerce chapter at Clarksville, Va. A memorial service was held for General Eisenhower during the course of the meeting at which time I spoke briefly, and I should like to submit my remarks for the RECORD.

Of all the noble characteristics of General Eisenhower, perhaps his greatest was humility. Let me relate to you a personal experience that occurred during my term as national commander of the American Legion.

General Eisenhower gave me the opportunity to meet and discuss with him some of the problems with which we were faced at that time. During our discussion he evinced this humility in a remark about Gen. Omar Bradley. The general said:

> When Stonewall Jackson was killed at Chancellorsville, General Lee is reported to have said, "With the death of General Jackson, I have indeed lost my right arm."

General Eisenhower continued—

> Had I lost Bradley in Europe, I would have lost both arms.

General Eisenhower was a man of God who manifested deep feeling for his fellow beings. He served his Nation and the cause of freedom well. It is my prayer that God will grant him the peace and the rest that He has reserved for those who served Him well.

MISSILE TESTIMONY

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper reports that physicist Herbert A. York has seriously criticized Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard for trying to discredit his testimony on the anti-ballistic-missile system controversy. Mr. York startled the Senate recently when he testified before a committee that the main objections to the ABM is that the speed required to use such a weapon to knock down an oncoming enemy missile would not make it possible to bring the President in on a decision.

Apparently, what Mr. York does not understand and appreciate is the fundamental difference between the ABM Sentinel system, which is a defensive system, and the ICBM, the long-range intercontinental ballistic missile system, which is an offensive system.

Mr. York apparently is unwilling to understand that the Sentinel is designed purposely to be a quick response system so as to be able to intercept and render useless an enemy missile.

We have built into the ICBM a vast system of checks and balances to make sure that there can be no accidental launching of an ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile, because this missile could travel 6,000 to 8,000 miles over continents and involve this Nation in a nuclear war. We properly feel that only the President shall have the right to make the decision for use of our ICBM's. But such precautions are not necessary in the Sentinel, where the long-range missile, the Spartan, has only a 400-mile range and could not possibly be detonated in outer space over any country outside this continent.

It is rather appalling that a noted physicist of the stature of Mr. York has been unable to draw this distinction, and Mr. York now continues to oppose the ABM on a totally fallacious and spurious argument. I think Mr. Packard was right, and I would like him to know that some of us in the House stand behind his judgment.

THE ABM SHOULD BE RENAMED

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, my contribution to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and the whole anti-ballistic-missile controversy might be summed up very succinctly. I think they ought to change the name of it from the Sentinel to "The Civil Servant," because it would not work and you cannot fire it.

CONGRESS NOT FOR SALE

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received in the mail a check for $95 from an organization calling itself "Another Mother for Peace" along with a statement that this was a "final payment" on an "invest for peace" project. This check was sent to me, the group said, because of my vote against what it called arms appropriations. Since I have consistently voted for strong defenses for the Nation, I cannot understand where the group obtained its list of Congressmen to be so rewarded.

The activities of this group are a slur on the integrity of Congress, a petty and improper attempt at vote buying. I wonder how many other Members have received checks from this group. Also, why an odd amount such as $95?

The implication of a final payment is that other checks had been sent; however this is the first I have ever heard about this organization and in checking with the House Internal Security Committee I find that they have no records on this group. It is lobbying activity such as this that damages the cause of those sincerely interested in promoting peace, and casts aspersions on Congress. In returning this check I am informing this organization that Congress is not for sale, that its votes for peace come from conscience, not contributions, and that the surest path to peace is a strong United States.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I received one of those letters and one of those $95 checks, and I promptly sent it back advising the organization that I do not accept money for any of my votes in the House.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

CHAPLAINS ORDERED TO ELIMINATE REFERENCE TO GOD IN LECTURES

(Mr. WHITEHURST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned through the alertness of the Honorable WILLIAM G. BRAY that the Army has ordered chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and religious philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this as one more step in the steady erosion of our moral fiber. I understand that this new policy was prompted by a complaint from the American Civil Liberties Union.

Having forced a major branch of the armed services to take this step, they are now asking that the Air Force and Navy do the same. I suppose that the next move will be to pull down the words above your chair and remove the same phrase from our coins and bills. It is inconceivable to me that we should so willingly submit to such demands. We cry out in remorse over the loss of our moral values and we deplore the ungodlike behavior of so many of our citizens and particularly our youth—yet the kind of action where we voluntarily omit any reference to the Almighty in trying to instill moral responsibility in our soldiers is conclusive proof that we are engaging in the abdication of a principle on which this Nation was founded. We are saying in effect "In God we no longer trust."

TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR THE MAKING OF FINAL REPORT BY COMMISSION TO STUDY MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(g) of the Act of May 7, 1968 (Public Law 90–301) is amended by striking out "Said report of the Commission shall be made by April 1, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Commission may make an interim report not later than April 1, 1969, and shall make a final report of its study and recommendation not later than July 1, 1969,".

XUM

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress enacted Public Law 90-301, there was included in this law a 15-member Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates, with particular reference to those which apply to mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration and insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The original law provided for a report by April 1, 1969. While the Commission has been diligent in proceeding in regard to making appropriate recommendations and findings, it is obvious it will not be possible to meet this deadline. The resolution which has been passed unanimously by the Senate extends the period of time by 3 months to July 1, 1969.

I know of no opposition to the resolution and hope that it may be promptly approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas if this will require any additional appropriation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir. This will require not 1 cent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CLAIM OF JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1507) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL BENEFIT FOUNDATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN THOMAS COSBY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2401 of title 28 or any other statute of limitations or delay or laches or any prior release, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern Division of the Northern District of Alabama to hear, determine and render judgment on the claim of John Thomas Cosby, Junior, of Prattville, Alabama, based upon the injuries and disabilities suffered in an accident which occurred on or about October 28, 1955, in Birmingham, Alabama, when he was struck by a wheel which allegedly had come off a United States Post Office truck. The action provided for in this Act shall be instituted within one year of the effective date of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1721) for the relief of William J. Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Hurley of Los Altos, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $602.56 representing an overpayment of compensation as an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the period from July 21, 1964, through July 31, 1965, inclusive, which resulted from retroactive adjustment in his salary by reason of a change in the law made by Public Law 88-426.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said William J. Hurley, the sum of any amounts repaid or withheld from him by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENRICO DEMONTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2335) for the relief of Enrico DeMonte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the determination of the right of Enrico DeMonte, of Niagara Falls, New York, to widower's insurance benefits under section 202(f)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(1), as amended), the said Enrico DeMonte shall be held and considered to have been receiving at least one-half of his support from his late wife, Rose DeMonte, at the time of her death on October 15, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEASLEY ENGINEERING CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2876) for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2876

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Beasley Engineering Company, Incorporated, of Emeryville, California, the sum of $23,746.55 in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for losses sustained as the result of damage or destruction of portions of the Dalles irrigation works being constructed under Bureau of Reclamation contract numbered 14-06-D-4014, specifications numbered DC-6004, as a result of floods and high waters during December 1964 and January 1965, which destroyed or damaged work already in place and necessitated reconstruction and repair of installations covered by said contract: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6: Strike "$23,746.55" and insert "$11,873.27".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY E. DOOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2940) for the relief of Henry E. Dooley.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CLAIM OF SOLOMON S. LEVADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3213) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FRANK KLEINERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3377) for the relief of Frank Kleinerman.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF PIERRE SAMUEL DU PONT DARDEN

The Clerk called the bill H.R. 3348) for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SFC. PATRICK MARRATTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3379) for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3379

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant First Class Patrick Marratto, United States Army (retired), of Springfield, Massachusetts, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $786.46, the amount of an overpayment of compensation as a member of the United States Army in the period beginning June 1, 1950, and ending May 24, 1964, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant First Class Patrick Marratto, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated by this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike "$786.46" and insert "$786.20".

On page 1, line 8, strike "May 24, 1964" and insert "January 31, 1967".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW BEDFORD STORAGE WAREHOUSE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3480) for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3480

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Company of New Bedford, Massachusetts, the sum of $365.98 in full settlement of the claims of said company against the United States arising out of services performed for the United States Coast Guard, pursuant to Government bill of lading A-0022724. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY E. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3990) for the relief of Harvey E. Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby consents, for the purposes of the eighth clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, to the acceptance by Harvey E. Ward, United States Coast Guard, retired, of Taipei, Taiwan, from the State of Tasmania, Commonwealth of Australia, of the office and emoluments of teacher in the department of education in such State during the calendar years 1960 through 1964.

SEC. 2. Said Harvey E. Ward is relieved of any liability to the United States which the Comptroller General (in the decision numbered B-154213) held arose from his receipt of United States Coast Guard retired pay in violation of the eighth clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harvey E. Ward an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the liability to the United States specified in section 2 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

REDDICK B. STILL, JR., AND RICHARD CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6400) for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF NURSING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6583) for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of The American Journal of Nursing, New York, New York, for an advertisement placed in its August 1966 issue of The American Journal of Nursing by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to allow in full and final settlement of such claim the sum of $238.50. Such amount shall be payable from the appropriation "Hospitals and Medical Care, Public Health Service, 1970".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORBIE F. COCHRAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6584) for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3101, footnote), the advancement in grade of Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, an employee of the Department of the Army, Fort Eustis, Virginia, from GS-6 to GS-9, effective April 29, 1964, shall be deemed to have been in conformity with law, such advancement in contravention of said section 1310, having been made as a result of administrative error without fault or knowledge of its illegality on the employee's part.

SEC. 2. (a) That the said Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, is relieved of any liability to the United States arising out of the advancement described in section 1 of this Act. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this subsection.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Corbie F. Cochran, Junior, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from amounts otherwise due him in partial liquidation of his liability to the United States referred to in subsection (a) of this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on accounts of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. A. F. ELGIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6585) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

NOEL S. MARSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BASIL ROWLAND DUNCAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 165

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Basil Rowland Duncan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 13, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NGUYEN VAN HUE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 586) for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nguyen Van Hue may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Master Sergeant Norman Leon Snyder, RO 43011064, United States Army, and Muriel Guest Snyder, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COSMINA RUGGIERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1437) for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cosmina Ruggiero may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by Giovanna Martinelli, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a *colon* and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AI BOK CHUN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1708) for the relief of Ai Bok Chun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1708

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ai Bok Chun may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Carl and Gertrude Eggebeen, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 after line 10 at the end of the bill change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARJORIE J. HOTTENROTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1939) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be an immediate relative and the provisions of section 204 of the Act shall be inapplicable in her case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO SANTOS GOMES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1960) for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1960

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mario Santos Gomes shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFINA POLICAR ABUTAN FULIAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2315) for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fuliar.

XUM

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josefina Policar Abutan Fuliar shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Fuliar, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA PRESCILLA CARAMANZANA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2948) for the relief of Maria Prescilla Caramanzana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2948

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Prescilla Caramanzana shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Adolfo Caramanzana, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNG NAN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3144) for the relief of Sung Nan Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3144

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sung Nan Lee may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Frederick W. Uthe, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE OK JA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3212) for the relief of Lee Ok Ja.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3212

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Ok Ja may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by June Nelson, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA BALLUARDO FRASCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3464) for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Balluardo Frasca may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Frasca, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANGELA ZABARTE FANDINO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3539) for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3539

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Angela Zabarte Fandino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 16, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ROBERTO DE LA CARIDAD MIQUEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3548) for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miquel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Roberto de la Caridad Miquel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 8, 1961, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the date "September 8, 1961": change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANA MAE YAP-DIANGCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of Ana Mae Yap-Diangco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana Mae Yap-Diangco may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. Crisanto A. Malihan, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMETROULA GEORGIADES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5072) for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetroula Georgiades (formerly known as Demetroula Demetropoulos) may be classified as a child within the mean-

XUM

ing of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Sophia Nicholas G. Georgiades, a lawfully resident alien and a citizens of the United States, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the name "Sophia" insert the word "and,"

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZUMRUT SOOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5402) for the relief of Zumrut Sooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zumrut Sooley may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Frank N. Sooley, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided*, That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by reason of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER SLOANE (BOSMOS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6161) for the relief of Christopher Sloane (Bosmos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christopher Sloane (Bosmos) may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in his behalf by Marcia E. Sloane, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. OLGA CONCEPCION PEREZ DE LANIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6896) for the relief of Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on April 21, 1962.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6896, a private bill which provides that, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on April 21, 1962. If the legislation is enacted, the beneficiary would be eligible for immediate naturalization, provided, of course, she meets the requirements other than those relating to the period of permanent residence in the United States.

Dr. Lanio, a native and citizen of Cuba, first entered the United States as a parolee on April 21, 1962. After a 1-day journey to Canada on November 23, 1964, to obtain an immigrant visa, she was lawfully admitted to the United States as a permanent resident on that day. She now resides at 8810 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md., with her husband, Jose Antonio Lanio, an accountant, and their two children, Jose Antonio Lanio, Jr., age 16, and Maria Isabel Lanio, age 13. Both children were born in Cuba.

A dentist by profession, Dr. Lanio received her diploma from the University of Havana and gained several years of professional experience in her native country before coming to the United States. She is presently employed as a supervisor in a clinic of orthodontists located at 5010 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. She is not licensed to practice her profession in any State or in the District of Columbia.

The beneficiary believes that American citizenship, with all of its attendant rights and privileges as well as duties, would enhance her opportunities to study and work at the same time. In order to practice her profession in the United States she has determined that she would have to enter a university and take certain additional courses to satisfy curricular requirements.

As as American citizen and with a license to practice dentistry in the United States, Dr. Lanio would be able to help relieve the shortage of dentists in this country. She is aware of the many social action programs sponsored by the Federal Government which could utilize her services, and her interest at present leans heavily toward eventual employment in this field. She is convinced that she would be able to render better service to the community as an active professional, and American citizenship would help immeasurably to her early attainment of this objective.

The same legislation as H.R. 14654 was passed by this body on July 2, 1968. It was not acted upon by the Senate before the 90th Congress adjourned sine die. Favorable action today on H.R. 6896 would afford the other body sufficient time in which to act. Enactment of this legislation would be beneficial not only to Dr. Lanio, but also to the country of which she desires so much to become a citizen. I strongly urge a unanimous vote for this private bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELISABETA HORWATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2464) for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4546) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. ARANKA MLINKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6366) for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TERESINA FARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6670) for the relief of Teresina Fara.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE DeSTEFANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6931) for the relief of Giuseppe DeStefano.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

XUM

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL PAY FOR CERTAIN NUCLEAR QUALIFIED SUBMARINE OFFICERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of March 27, 1969, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (H.R. 9328) to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section:

"§312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified submarine officers extending period of active service

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, an officer of the naval service who—

"(1) is entitled to basic pay;

"(2) is currently designated 'qualified in submarines';

"(3) has the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operation and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants;

"(4) has not completed ten years of commissioned service; and

'(5) executes a written agreement to remain in active submarine service for one period of four years in addition to any other period of obligated active service,

may, upon the acceptance by the Secretary or his designee of the written agreement, in addition to all other compensation to which he is entitled, be paid a sum of money not to exceed $3,750 for each year of the active-service agreement. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine semiannually the necessity for continuance of the special pay and the rate of special pay per year for such active-service agreements accepted within each six-month period. Upon acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary or his designee, the total amount payable shall become fixed and shall be paid in four equal yearly installments, commencing at the expiration of the initial obligated service; except, the Secretary or his designee may accept the active-service agreement not more than one year in advance of the expiration of the initial obligated active service and the amount may then be paid in five yearly installments, not to exceed $3,000 per year, commencing with the date of acceptance of the agreement.

"(b) No more than one agreement for each officer shall be accepted under this section.

"(c) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy and subject to such exceptions as may be prescribed in those regulations, refunds, on a pro rata basis, of sums paid pursuant to this section may be required if the officer having received the payment fails to complete the full period of four years of active submarine service which he agreed to serve.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall alter or modify the obligation of a regular officer to perform active service at the pleasure of the President. Completion of the additional period of four years' active submarine service under this section shall in no way obligate the President to accept a resignation submitted by a regular officer at the end of the four-year period.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before July 30, 1973, execute the required written agreement to remain in active service."

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified submarine officers extending period of active service."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 9328, provides special pay to a small group of officers in the submarine service who are nuclear qualified.

This measure is urgently recommended by the executive branch as the proposed short-term solution to a serious problem confronting our nuclear submarine Navy.

RESIGNATION PROBLEM

Briefly, all of us in the Congress have heard rumors that an unprecedented number of junior officers who man our nuclear attack and Polaris submarines have submitted resignations requesting their release from active duty.

Unfortunately, these rumors are true. For example, almost half of year groups 1961 to 1964 have already submitted resignation requests.

The Committee on Armed Services was told that this officer community, that is officers who are nuclear qualified and assigned to our submarine service number fewer than 2,000. These officers currently man and operate 82 Polaris crews—41 SSBN's—and 47 nuclear attack—SSN—submarine crews. Nine more newly commissioned SSN's will require additional manning prior to June 30, 1970.

Since each of these submarines require a minimum of 11 nuclear qualified officers, it is evident that more than 1,400 officers are currently required to man these nuclear submarines presently in our inventory leaving precious few for necessary assignment to hard core shore billets and refresher training.

As a consequence of this circumstance, these officers have not been given the normal sea-to-shore rotation opportunity that is afforded their service contemporaries. Thus for example, there are officers in this program who have not been assigned to a shore billet in more than 18 years—an absolutely astounding and shameful situation.

The nuclear submarine program, by its very nature, requires officers of the highest possible quality and technical competence. Yet, the best efforts of the Navy to date have precluded the development of an adequate inventory of trained officers to meet the critical manning demands posed by our vital nuclear submarine fleet.

There are many reasons given for this unfortunate condition all of which the Navy hopes in some manner to correct or alleviate. However, one of the most critical requirements is that these young men be given an additional substantial monetary incentive. Surveys and questionnaires made by the Navy gave every evidence that a substantial monetary incentive would go a long way toward stemming the flood of resignations now being received from officers in this program.

THE BILL

The bill before you today is directed to this problem and provides authority to the Secretary of the Navy to provide a bonus of $15,000 payable in four yearly increments of $3,750 per year for its submarine officers who are nuclear qualified and agree to extend their active service for a period of 4 years beyond their obligated service.

THE COST

The estimated annual cost of this program of from $2.4 to $3.8 million is almost negligible when viewed in the perspective of the alternatives.

It costs us conservatively $124,500 to train one nuclear qualified submarine officer and bring him to the point where he is capable of becoming a department head or a commanding officer of a nuclear submarine. Therefore, if we can persuade only a few of these officers to continue their active service, we will have saved the Government a great deal of money and more importantly assured the maintenance of this absolutely indispensable strategic force capability.

VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS

I might also point out that the law presently provides a similar management tool in the case of enlisted personnel. This is the so-called variable reenlistment bonus which has been payable to enlisted personnel upon the occasion of their first reenlistment. The success of this management device in respect to enlisted personnel is eloquently demonstrated by the fact that we do not have any problem in retaining nuclear qualified enlisted personnel in our submarine program.

The Committee on Armed Services reported this bill unanimously and I therefore urge that you give it your wholehearted support and approval.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I agree with the basic purpose of this legislation, but let me ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services this question: When the men leave active duty on board nuclear submarines and become commanding officers not on such duty, would they receive the additional pay at that time?

Mr. RIVERS. No. They have got to be qualified in nuclear submarine operations and remain in the nuclear submarine service.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When the gentleman says "remain in the submarine service," does that mean actually serving on board or does it mean something else?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, they have a system of rotation from ship to shore because these men study all the time. They go through this intensive training. As the gentleman knows all of the Polaris crews are divided into two parts, one at sea and one on shore. Also a very few are rotated to hard-core shore billets or to advanced or refresher nuclear training. They would receive it during such rotation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman for his explanation and I am in favor of this extra compensation. However, when a man has previously served on active duty with a nuclear submarine and subsequently attains the rank of captain and is no longer in the nuclear submarine service would he receive this compensation?

Mr. RIVERS. Oh, no; he has got to remain in the nuclear submarine service. If he goes into the nonnuclear submarine service or the surface Navy, he loses his entitlement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, he loses his extra compensation when he leaves active duty with the nuclear submarine service program?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Now, mind you—mind you—these junior officers have 10 years or less of service. To be a captain you have to have considerably longer service, 16 to 18 years of service ordinarily.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, when they go to the Pentagon and are no longer in the nuclear submarine program, they lose the pay also; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS. The answer to the question as posed by the gentleman is that they would not receive it. I would point out, however, that there are so few of them that there would be no place in the Pentagon for them. There are only 2,000 at the most, and they are all junior officers. So again I say to the gentleman that that would not occur.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my clear understanding, then, that when they get to a higher rank and no longer serve specifically in the nuclear submarine program that the extra pay would not go to their subsequent assignment?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct. It does not follow them. Let me emphasize that this is a one-time bonus proposition. That is, in accordance with the bill, an officer is not eligible for this one-time bonus unless he has, first, less than 10 years of commissioned service; second, is currently designated qualified in submarines; third, has the current technical qualification for duty in connection with supervision, operations, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants; and finally fourth, has executed a written agreement to remain in the active submarine service for one period of 4 years in addition to any other period of obligated service.

Moreover, the law specifically provides that no more than one agreement can be made with each officer under the bill and that in the event he fails to complete the full period of 4 years of submarine service to which he agreed to serve, he is required to refund the bonus on a prorata basis.

Stated another way, the law is clearly aimed at junior officers, not captains. The Navy now has resignations from these junior officers amounting to more than 400, with new resignation requests being received at a rate of 30 per month. Thus, we have a very vital and serious problem confronting our nuclear submarine service and Congress must act immediately.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9328, and urge its unanimous adoption by the House.

The distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, has done his usual outstanding job in describing the purpose and justification for the legislation. Anything that I may say further in the way of explanation and justification would therefore be anticlimactic.

However, I think it particularly pertinent to emphasize the absolute urgency of this legislation.

On the basis of testimony received by the committee, it is abundantly clear that we may already be too late. Many of our highly trained nuclear submarine officers are disenchanted with their service life, and it is quite possible that this effort here today may not be satisfactory for some of them.

Yet, it is evident that we have no alternative. We must approve this legislation to make it possible for the Navy to attempt to persuade these young men to remain in their present profession.

All the members of the Committee on Armed Services on both sides of the aisle voted unanimously for this legislation. I am sure therefore that you will do likewise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abernethy
Alexander
Andrews, Ala.
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Bow
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Carey
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Flynt
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Harvey
Hébert
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kirwan
Kyros
Landrum
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Moorhead
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman, Tex.
Pirnie
Pollock
Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Scheuer
Schwengel
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Sullivan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watts
Wyatt
Wydler
Zwach

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91–43) on the resolution (H. Res. 270) authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 270

Resolved, That, effective February 18, 1969, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by clause 11 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $425,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

SEC. 5. Effective January 3, 1969, funds made available pursuant to this resolution shall be available for expenses incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives as in effect during the period beginning January 3, 1969, and ending February 18, 1969.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$425,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000".

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California

XUM

(Mr. Edwards) for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for giving me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if given the opportunity at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this additional appropriation—the recommittal motion to require that the House Committee on Internal Security hold open hearings on the need for this money.

I refer to this legislation as an additional appropriation because that is what it is. The Committee on Internal Security is provided sufficient funds automatically under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as a standing committee of the House. The bill you are considering today is a request for additional funds.

In 1969 the Internal Security Committee will receive automatically $166,340. To this must be added other automatic emoluments such as printing, stationery, stamps, telegrams, office equipment, furniture and office space. A modest estimate of these costs is $75,000 per year. So we see that even if you deny this bill, the Internal Security Committee should continue to survive comfortably with an income of approximately $20,000 per month.

I suggest that there is a sound legal reason why this additional $400,000 should not be appropriated. A substantial part will obviously be spent on the "public" library maintained by the Internal Security Committee. Nowhere in the authorizing resolution for the committee is there authority to create and maintain this library.

I refer to the library as "public." The information is available to all Members of Congress and their staffs. The Congressman can disseminate the information as he sees fit. In addition, more than 40 Federal agencies or departments have access to the files with no apparent restrictions regarding public distribution of the information.

The library consists of hundreds of thousands of dossiers on individual Americans and organizations. Derogatory information is collected from newspapers, magazines, letterheads, the committee's investigation files, and presumably from unsolicited letters. I do not know if attempts are made to verify what is put in the files. What is clear is that the most outrageous gossip, innuendo, and outright lies have been distributed throughout the country as official House of Representatives information.

I hold here examples—excerpts from 30 pages of the Congressional Record of July 29, 1963, purporting to prove that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is subversive and infiltrated with Communists. Among the NAACP leaders whose loyalty is impugned in the most reckless manner in these excerpts from HUAC files are Secretary Robert C. Weaver, Ambassador Ralph Bunche, Roy Wilkins, A. Philip Randolph, Clarence M. Mitchell, and Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. I have asked unanimous consent that these excerpts be included in the Record immediately following my remarks.

A recent example of the shocking methods by which these files are used took place last week in Sacremento, Calif. A subcommittee of the California State Senate was considering a resolution memorializing the tragic assassination on April 4, 1968, of Dr. Martin Luther King. One of the Senators presented to the subcommittee a file including information from the library of the House Internal Security Committee accusing Dr. King of having had Communist connections. I do not have to explain to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that all of the implications impugning the patriotism of this great American were false.

The additional money for the committee you are asked to vote for today supports this "public" library.

I recognize that the Internal Security Committee has a new chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Ichord), who is making efforts to maintain a dignity and decorum that the committee has lacked in the past. Mr. Ichord has stressed, however, that he intends to preserve "the full jurisdiction and all the power it has possessed during the almost 25 years of its operation under its present mandate" including, we must assume, the library.

It is my position that this "public" library is unauthorized and that funds should not be approved for it. If the Committee on Internal Security wants to maintain such a library, then it should proceed as would any other committee and request the appropriate legislation.

We should refuse to authorize House Resolution 270 until we get a clear understanding of how the committee intends to spend its money.

That is the purpose of my motion to recommit—to hold public hearings on the committee's need for the money.

I urge a yea vote on the motion to recommit.

The material referred to follows:

February 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D.C., as an economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on "The Federal Housing Program and the Negro" at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15–17, 1937.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes." The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: "From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the "Communist Party" (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D.C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16–18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D.C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as showing "evidence of Communist penetration or control" according to the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942 (p. 7688). The special committee in report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine.

February 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contained in the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to "attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare" was "simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20–21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

The Washington Committee for Demo-

XUM

cratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D.C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that "A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges," the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

"The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

"This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U.N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche."

Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A-1.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Thurgood Marshall, director counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Educational Fund, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, What Is the I.J.A.? The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review in the issue of May-June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the Washington Evening Star (February 8, 1948, p. A-22 and February 12, 1948, p. A-82), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D.C.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which "Is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily Worker of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H.R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party "is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H.R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come." (Public hearings, pp. 2296–2302.)

It is noted by the Daily People's World of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, "blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful." The Daily Worker of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training.

FEBRUARY, 1956.

Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1961

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that "Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself." The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Judicial Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Judicial Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12).

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm

XUM

of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; and press releases on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled "1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes," he stated: "The greatest significance undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party," Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. "It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect on the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth." This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed."

George K. Hunton, testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *."

Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D.C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *.'" (Pp. 510–512).

A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, "7½ Million * * *" (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First U.S. Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee

XUM

on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

A letter head of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; resdesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17th annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

"In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for, in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations." Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (Congressional Record, Sept. 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as "one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war)." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102.)

The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

A Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, These Americans Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, Mar. 20, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

The United May Day conference was cited as "engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations" and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. "The People Versus H.C.L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that crganization.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1958, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 9, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Sotuhern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Ryan).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House is once again asked to appropriate funds for a standing committee of the House which throughout its history has infringed upon basic civil liberties embedded in the Bill of Rights.

The Committee on House Administration is recommending $400,000. This amount is in addition to the funds automatically provided under the Legislative Reorganization Act, which for 1969 will be $166,340. This recommendation is the seventh largest request for a standing committee this year, and it is $50,000 more than was appropriated to the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1967, and $25,000 more than was appropriated to HUAC in 1968.

On March 13, 1968, when the appropriation request of $375,000 was being considered for the predecessor of the Internal Security Committee, HUAC, I said that "this committee serves no useful legislative purpose"; that its purpose is "to harass and expose"; that it "flaunts our constitutional principles"; and that "it has brought discredit on the name of the House of Representatives."

As a result of the passage of House Resolution 89 on February 18, 1969, the name and mandate of the committee have been changed. According to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Ichord), the purpose of these changes was "to strengthen the committee in every possible way, clarify its mandate and eliminate any possible misunderstanding and confusion about the specific powers and jurisdiction of the Committee"—Congressional Record, January 18, 1967.

I know that several conscientious members of the committee, who have been recently assigned, intend to guard against the kind of outrageous denial of rights and due process which characterized the proceedings of HUAC.

However, this should not prevent us from confronting the basic issues which the House Internal Security Committee still presents to the House.

First, the mandate for this committee is open-ended, giving it significantly broader powers than rule XI formerly gave to HUAC. The committee's investigatory powers are no longer limited to a determination of the "extent, character, and objects of 'un-American propaganda' activities in the United States" and to investigation of the "diffusion of 'un-American propaganda.'" Its new mandate now permits it to investigate the activities of individuals or organizations, giving it sanction to initiate new investigations into civil rights, peace, student, and other organizations.

The powers of the House Internal Security Committee encroach on the jurisdiction of other committees of the House, particularly the Judiciary Committee, the chairman of which, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler), made clear his objections to the powers assigned HISC during the House debate on House Resolution 89. Seven other members of Judiciary Committee, including myself, also outlined our reasons for opposing House Resolution 89 in a letter which we sent to our colleagues on February 13.

The Judiciary Committee has long had jurisdiction over matters of espionage, sedition, and the criminal penalties associated with these crimes. The fact that the Internal Security Committee intends to deal with these subjects as well constitutes a clear encroachment on the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee which will continue so long as the Members of this body continue to fund the House Internal Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this request for additional funds cannot be considered in isolation from the record of the predecessor committee. That committee is, of course, HUAC.

As I have pointed out whenever appropriations for HUAC were before the House, this committee serves no useful legislative purpose. It serves to harass and expose, not to investigate. Its past activities have made a mockery of the most basic guarantees of justice and due process, bringing disrepute to the name of the House of Representatives.

If a committee is to be judged by its legislative record, then the record of this committee is almost completely devoid of any accomplishment. Throughout its existence only six bills reported out of this committee have been enacted into law. During the 89th Congress not one bill reported out by this committee was enacted into law; in the 90th Congress one bill was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law.

While the Congress as a whole considered 17,180 measures during both sessions of the 90th Congress, only 32 bills were referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee, the predecessor of the House Internal Security Committee. Of these 32 bills, 23 were either identical or similar to other bills, leaving the committee with a real workload of only nine pieces of legislation. Moreover, each of these nine bills properly belonged to the jurisdiction of other standing committees of the House.

The only bill, which was reported out and actually signed into law, extended the life of the previously dormant Subversive Activities Control Board, whose record of achievement, appropriately enough, is comparable to that of HUAC.

Let me outline briefly the nature of those nine principal bills which were referred to the committee.

H.R. 8, the pool bill, was opposed by the Departments of Justice, Defense, State, Treasury, and Commerce. Although it was reported out of committee on November 11, 1967, it was not acted upon by the House.

H.R. 735, a perennial bill to establish a National Freedom Academy, which belongs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, was reported out by the committee, but no rule was granted for its consideration by the House Rules Committee.

H.R. 5942 proposed restrictions on the travel of U.S. citizens to several countries in the Communist bloc. Passport legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 7025 is the so-called Klan bill.

During the legislative hearings in the 89th Congress on a bill identical to H.R. 7025, the Attorney General of the United States expressed serious apprehension at the vagueness of the bill and about its constitutionality. The language of the bill was such that both civil rights leaders and Government law enforcement officials feared that the legislation might be used against civil rights workers. Nevertheless, 1 year later, on October 21, 1966—only hours before the adjournment of the 89th Congress—HUAC reported the bill out of committee. Due to the lateness of the session, the bill was not considered. This legislation was resubmitted in the 90th Congress, however, as H.R. 7025.

H.R. 12601, the lone HUAC bill to be approved by the 90th Congress, extended the life of the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board, which was about to expire for lack of renewal by Congress.

H.R. 11675, which proposed to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board, was obviously not reported out of the committee.

H.R. 15626 was aimed at overturning the Robel case decided by the Supreme Court in December of 1967 which declared unconstitutional certain employment restrictions embodied in the Internal Security Act. Some of its provisions, in addition, went far beyond the scope of the Robel decision in seeking to establish new restrictions on the employment of persons with controversial political affiliations in defense-related industries. Although the bill was reported out of committee, a rule was not granted.

H.R. 16030, which was introduced by former chairman Willis, proposed powers which could be used to dismiss summarily Federal employees who express or organize opposition to policies of the Government of the United States during wartime—whether or not an actual declaration of war has been officially approved by Congress. This legislation was clearly aimed at Federal employees who had organized opposition to the war in Vietnam through the peaceful and constitutionally protected dissemination of petitions and pamphlets. No provisions for due process or the right to a hearing were included.

H.R. 19646, submitted by the gentleman from California (Mr. Gubser), was to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act, which permits the incarceration of individuals for indefinite periods of time in the interest of "national security." This bill also was not reported out of committee.

In addition to the funds allocated under the Legislative Reorganization Act, which in past years have averaged more than $150,000, the Un-American Activities Committee received $725,000 in additional funds during the 90th Congress, the fifth largest sum allocated to any committee in the House. The Judiciary Committee, by contrast, received $500,000.

It also had the fourth largest staff, employing more employees—47—on its payroll through December 31, 1968, than all but the Committees on Appropriations, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

This, then, is the record of the predecessor to the House Internal Security Committee—HUAC; the committee which again is before this body asking for more money. If the recommendation of the House Administration Committee is approved, the House Internal Security Committee will receive $400,000, giving it the seventh largest budget of all of the committees in the House; larger than such important committees as the Judiciary Committee, $250,000; the Committee on Ways and Means, $50,000; the Interior Committee, $115,000; the Agriculture Committee, $250,000; and the Foreign Affairs Committee, $200,000.

Mr. Speaker, this allocation is inconsistent with the legislative workloads of the various committees in the House. As I have pointed out, HUAC considered only nine bills of differing substance during the 90th Congress. The Education and Labor Committee, by contrast, received 836 bills. The Judiciary Committee received 2,656 public bills and 7,059 private bills. The Ways and Means Committee received 3,806 bills, and the Banking and Currency Committee 668 bills.

The abysmal legislative record of HUAC is reason enough to deny this request for $400,000 in additional funds. But, in addition to that record, we must also bear in mind the discredit which the committee through the conduct of its hearings has brought upon the House. The hearings held in August of 1966—during which a member of the bar was forcibly evicted from the hearing room for protesting the sham which the committee was making of due process—is perhaps the prototype of the kind of hearings so long identified with HUAC. That spectacle led even Senator DIRKSEN, who is not noted for his opposition to HUAC, to comment: "This spectacle can do the Congress no good."

The most recent hearings of the committee, which were held last fall, provided yet another example of its singular unproductivity. Ostensibly called for the purpose of investigating the demonstrations which took place at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, hearings produced little more than acrimonious banterings between the witnesses and the committee members. The contrast between the style of investigation pursued by HUAC, and the well-reasoned and thoroughly documented report of the Walker Commission—which issued its report on the Chicago disorders a few months later—illustrates the point I am making—that there is no legislative justification for giving this committee one penny.

HUAC, it is clear, has seriously tarnished the reputation and prestige of the House of Representatives. Moreover, it has discredited the investigation processes which are so important to the formulation of meaningful and efficient legislation. Beyond this fact, however, we must consider the effect HUAC has had on the lives of the hundreds of individuals who have been called before its inquisitions during the past 30 years. Reputations have been tarnished and many lives lastingly and adversely affected by the actions of this committee. With its newly expanded mandate, the committee will be free to embark on still more witchhunts during the 91st Congress.

Since 1960, the committee has recommended that 130 individuals be cited for contempt of Congress. Despite the fact that only 10 of these citations have been upheld by higher courts, the reputations of those cited have been permanently damaged.

The House itself must accept the blame for the excesses and outrages of this committee. By its approval of funds, the House has sanctioned the actions of this committee. It is high time for the House to withdraw that sanction.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this appropriation. Although the name may have been changed, civil liberties will enjoy no more protection under this version of HUAC than they had under the last. It is time for the House to write an end to this committee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the House has before it today a request for an appropriation of $400,000 for calendar year 1969 for the House Committee on Internal Security. I do not see any reason why this appropriation should be approved by the House.

It seems to me that existing professional organizations such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation are doing as good a job now as they have done in the past of combating internal subversion of the Republic.

One of its sole aims seems to be to provide a forum for professional witnesses, glorifying in the process the very people it purports to investigate in the public interest.

Additionally, this committee in the past has played fast and loosely with the civil liberties of many individual Americans. In the name of liberty they have taken liberties which has lessened the quality of life in our country for many citizens. Such abrogation of freedom is not to be suffered any longer in silence or without opposition.

It is the duty of this House, in the name of the Republic and its institutions, to curb dictatorial excess, especially on the part of an organ of government. Approval in this case constitutes allowing license and standing mutely aside as excess masquerades under the name of legally constituted authority.

Now this body, acting as a Committee of the Whole, has the opportunity to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security. I hope and fervently ask that this appropriation be refused and voted down.

By such an act, we shall prove that we have no need for nor will we allow any star chamber proceedings, complete with conviction by publicity, of any innocent citizen. We shall also refuse a forum and glorification for those who could never hope for it in any other manner. Let us finally put a finish to the activities of this futile and grotesque parody of a congressional inquiring body.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 of this year, this House by an overwhelming vote of 306 to 80 adopted my resolution establishing the House Committee on Internal Security.

After listening to my three preceding colleagues, and with all due respect for their opinions, it appears to me today that this controversy is a manifestation of the frustrations of the more determined opposition to that resolution adopted so overwhelmingly by the House.

I recall the words of the past used to describe another frustrated group—

> Each day they pray for their daily bread and then they pray for their daily illusion.

I think these gentlemen today are praying for their daily illusion. In view of the overwhelming vote by this House of Representatives and in view of the very recent nature of the action, I do not feel that this House, at least at this early date, would, in effect, reverse itself by denying the Committee on Internal Security appropriations or by starving the committee to death.

Now I do not care to become involved in any argument as to whether or not the House changed the name of the House Committee on Un-American Activities with a clarified mandate or whether it abolished the House Committee on Un-American Activities and established a new committee, the House Committee on Internal Security. Such arguments are, in my opinion, purely semantical.

Likewise is the argument whether you increase or decrease the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security. If one makes a broad interpretation of the word "un-American," then we decreased the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security. If one makes a narrow interpretation of the word "un-American," then we increased the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Internal Security.

Members of the House, what is important is the final result—the establishment of a House Committee on Internal Security with limited legislative jurisdiction in the very important area of criminal subversion. In addition the House Committee on Internal Security has been given certain permanent and defined investigative powers in the field of criminal subversion and thus it joins the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Government Operations as one of the three permanent investigating committees of this House.

The gentleman from New York has observed that this is one of the largest appropriations in the Congress for a congressional committee. Let me again remind the House that this is a permanent investigating committee. But this appropriation is not the largest, if the figures that have been provided me are correct.

On March 26, 1969, we approved the following:

Committee on Government Operations, $850,000.

Committee on Public Works, $486,000.

Committee on Banking and Currency, $692,500.

Committee on Education and Labor, $769,600.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, $412,000.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce, $595,000.

All larger than the $400,000 requested by the House Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, since February 18 the committee has undergone a great deal of restructuring and reorganization, among which was the adoption of what I con-

XUM

sider the most comprehensive and the fairest investigating rules ever adopted by a committee of Congress.

On February 20 the committee ordered an in-depth investigation into the revolutionary violence in this Nation. On March 6 the committee ordered a full-scale investigation of certain specific organizations which were not named by the committee in the interest of an orderly and fair investigation.

Mr. Speaker, if the House desires these investigations to go forward. I ask that the previous question be voted up, and that the Committee on House Administration be supported.

Before closing, however, I would like to address myself to recent activities in opposition to my committee outside the Congress.

On March 19 my attention was directed to a meeting of the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities that was to be held on March 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C., when I received a letter from an individual stating that he was going to attend the meeting and would like to have an appointment with me afterwards. I was very intrigued about the meeting as it came so soon following the action of the House on February 18. The meeting was held and the committee is now known as the National Committee to Abolish HUAC/HCIS even though the House Committee on Internal Security is still in the organizational stage and has yet to hold a hearing. I have been impressed with the organizational ability of this organization, its apparently well-financed operations, the smoothness of its very expert lobbying activities, and was very interested in its esoteric argument that the House Committee on Un-American Activities should be retained in order that it might be abolished.

An observer who was in attendance at the open sessions has furnished me with a narrative account of the speeches and discussions which transpired. The very name of the National Committee to Abolish speaks for its primary purpose and is well known to all who are concerned with the internal security of the United States. The devices and tactics which the organization employs, and intends to employ, I feel are not well known. They are, however, of such significance to each citizen and his elected representative to Congress that they should be spread upon the RECORD. Surely each Member of this Congress has a vital interest in understanding the true nature and motivation of persons who visits his office, and in understanding the source responsible for the generation of mail in this regard. That the organization contemplates expansion of its targets to include Senate committees is also of interest. This account which follows, vividly depicts the strategy which the National Committee to Abolish intends to pursue to frustrate the House Committee on Internal Security. I am submitting this material for the RECORD in order to more fully explain the attacks that have been mounted against the committee which I head even before it begins its work. The report is very objective and reveals an extremely clever and effective lobbying activity which I admire from the organizational standpoint. The account follows:

ACCOUNT OF THE RECENT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO ABOLISH THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

At 12:00 p.m. the convention was called to order. A very brief introductory statement was given by the Chairman, Professor Robert J. Havighurst. He then turned the program over to Frank Wilkinson, Executive Director.

Mr. Wilkinson first commented on the growing oppression that HUAC is perpetrating upon the citizens of this country. He then discussed briefly the format of the afternoon session and evening session. He noted that a majority of the people present at the meeting represented new and different faces from the group that initially formed the Committee approximately ten years ago. He traced rather briefly the approximate ten year history of the Committee, beginning with a synopsis of the endeavors of James Roosevelt, California Congressman, to the present. He noted they had 79 votes against H. Res. 89.

He placed great stress, as in his remarks later in the evening session, on the practical politics that the Committee is presently following. These practical politics were first enunciated by Aubrey W. Williams. The essence of these "practical politics" is that you do not hold meetings, demonstrations, etc. in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere, *until* you have done the essential homework of education in your own congressional district. The key is educate your Congressman. In conjunction, he noted that originally the tactics of the Committee were large meetings and demonstrations, in particular in Washington, D.C. The tactics have now shifted from defensive to offensive; from protecting people to actually attacking HUAC.

He noted that they now have a hard core of the congressional urban vote (against HUAC) in the Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York urban areas. He emphasized that they were weak in rural areas and had to have the rural votes. He further noted that they are strong on both the west coast and the east coast, relatively strong in the midwest, but extremely weak in the south. He emphasized that they had to get the southern support. He suggested one tactic they should utilize is to demonstrate to people who are working in other related areas (i.e., civil rights, peace movements, anti-Vietnam, etc.) how the restrictions of HUAC hurt their cause. He emphasized that both Congressmen and their constituents must be educated to see that the First Amendment principles of freedom of speech and association comprise the fundamental underlying principles.

The next speaker was Lyle Mercer, Director, Western Regional Office. His comments traced the growth and development of both the ACLU and the Committee in the northwest. He noted that five of the seven Congressmen from Washington are Democrats and have taken some timorous steps in opposition to HUAC, in particular, voting to send the appropriations bill back to the committee. He also noted that two of the Democrats voted against H. Res. 89. He observed that there is an approximate membership of 25,000 to 30,000 members of the ACLU Chapter in the State of Washington and that this group is the backbone of the liberal movement in that State. In his opinion, the Western Region is the focal point or hub of the abolish HUAC movement.

The next speaker was Richard Criley, Director, Midwest Regional Office. His comments were largely directed toward organization of the various chapters of the Committee. He began by stating as a general premise: every Congressman can be influenced to some extent by his constituents. He then built upon this premise the various arguments for, and methods of, influencing or educating Congressmen to vote for abolition of HUAC.

The first thing that must be accomplished is the development of an office geared to work on a congressional district level. The starting place in that office is a mailing list. He commented that they shouldn't just list a group of names of people thought to be sympathetic to the movement, but that they should be selective. In particular, they should find people who can influence other people. He singled out ministers, letter writers, and members of other organizations. Create a list of people who are opinion makers. He then discussed where the names of people for such lists can be obtained. He stressed that working relationships with people working for other organizations is critical. He again noted religious organizations working on social issues. He suggested that most people working in the social area, peace area, and civil rights area are particularly receptive to the idea of abolishing HUAC when they are educated and propagandized how important the right to dissent is to their movement.

He noted that the Committee has a potential constituency ranging from the far left to the far right, each wishing to abolish HUAC for his own particular reason.

In each Congressional District they should start with people who are closest to the heart of the political district's constituency (i.e., in a largely Irish Catholic District, start with Irish Catholics) and then work to represent all groups. He noted that published documents are a good source for names. He singled out Chicago and noted that there are published names of people working in the open housing movement and that these people have, or should be contacted to work for the Committee. He also noted that another source of names is people who write, what they consider, good letters to editors of various papers.

He then discussed the problem of getting the recipients to read the literature. He suggested that the best method is personal contact—to follow up every letter, where possible, with a telephone call. The problem is to get people from the position of sympathetic agreement to the position of action for the movement. As a practical matter, he noted that many people simply do not act. He stressed that they had to make things as simple and as easy as possible. They should begin with the most prestigious names on their lists in the communities with the thought in mind that most people like to associate and work in concert with important people. He suggested giving people lists of other people in the community working on the same project—power of association. Where possible he would like to have systematically organized small group meetings to further bring in the personal element. In synopsis, his approach would be from listing names to letter writings, to telephone calls, to small group meetings.

At this juncture, the meeting was opened for general discussion from the floor. Hereinbelow set forth is a synopsis of what each individual who spoke thought important to the movement to abolish HUAC.

A. A comment that their attempts had been directed for some time toward trying to influence Congress and the Executive Branch. Forty Federal Judges are to be appointed by the President within the next sixty to ninety days. This would be a good opportunity to try to press for selection of Judges more favorable toward, not only the Committee, but all liberal organizations or groups. He suggested that they should do everything possible to bring favorable witnesses to testify before the Judiciary Committee and that all possible pressure should be brought to bear on the Senators by letter writing. He noted that the areas of Civil Rights, Vietnam, and the activities of the ACLU were the

XUM

three principal areas toward which the prospective Judges should be favorably disposed.

B. A request for the names of any sympathetic influential people from Congressman Richard Ichord's district with, presumably the thought in mind of trying to form an organization or branch of the Committee in Congressman Ichord's own district.

C. A suggestion of reorganization of the Committee. He noted that in the past the Committee was democratically orientated, but suggested more work with the Republican Party. Also the suggestion was advanced of a more closely and formally organized National Committee with branches at the state and local political subdivision level.

D. This speaker, a Puerto Rican, noted that everyone present was Caucasian and asked why and how they should, or could, relate to Negroes, Japanese, Chinese, etc. Later in the proceedings there were two or three Negroes present.

E. The question was raised with some discussion thereon, about how to relate the advocacy of the position to abolish HUAC to the best interests of a Congressman. Also the question was raised as to how they should relate to "young people."

F. A very strong plea was made toward considering state and city legislation which pressed very hard on college students and black citizens. The remark was made that there is much state and city legislation now passed, or pending, which is directed toward repressing the younger generation.

G. The suggestion was made that the Committee should oppose not only the House Committee on Internal Security but, also, the Senate Committees of Senator Eastland and Senator McClellan and any such state committees. In short, work for the abolition of Internal Security Committees wherever they arise.

H. The point was stressed that when attempting to sell the principle of abolishing HUAC to any organization, it is extremely difficult, almost impossible, to sell that organization unless HUAC is at that time "attacking" them. In short, the best time to try to line up an organization in the fight to abolish HUAC is at the time when HUAC is investigating that organization.

I. The point was made that they should not be so negative in their approach. That is, not emphasize "abolish the committee," so much; rather emphasize the affirmative aspects of free speech and right to dissent. It was also suggested that they should consider the question of freedom to speak and dissent in the military.

J. There was some discussion about how broad or how narrow an objective the Committee should pursue. The issue in discussion was whether the Committee should branch out and pursue other related activities, or whether it should stick to the rather narrow objective of working to abolish HUAC. The consensus was remain with the singular objective of abolishing HUAC and other comparable committees.

K. Noted that press releases and press conferences are effective means to educate the public. The opinion was expressed that generally, the news media is rather sympathetic to the abolition of HUAC campaign.

The format then reverted to scheduled speakers, the first being Donna Allen, Washington Representative of the Committee. She informed the group that, while talking with some unidentified Congressman, he informed her that a member of the Supreme Court had called him and requested a copy of the bill he had introduced to abolish the House Internal Security Committee and for a copy of his speech directed thereto.

She then discussed how to influence Congressmen. She began by noting that their basic purpose is to abolish HUAC. Only Congressmen can do this. She strongly emphasized that there was not enough information coming from the field to the Congressmen. She, in fact, termed it a dangerous communication gap. The Committee was doing a good job educating the public by making certain that they get appropriate material; but was not doing a good job of educating and sending material to the Congressmen.

She discussed how Congressmen should be informed. She emphasized that ridicule is one of the best weapons at their disposal. Anytime, she suggested, that a person comes across a satirical or otherwise ridiculing column, cartoon, etc., it should be clipped and sent to a Congressman. She noted that sending material to a Congressman serves three purposes: (1) It informs him. (2) He thereby knows that you know about that particular area, and (3) most important, it shows him that people aren't afraid to discuss this subject matter any more.

She then made a few comments and suggestions on what the people should do when they visit their Congressman on Monday. She suggested they ask each Congressman how his mail is "running." In her opinion, most of the mail received by the various Congressmen is anti-HUAC. A Congressman, therefore, has no justification for refusing to vote against the HUAC, if he is, in fact, against it. She suggested that if the Congressman states his mail is basically for HUAC, the individual should find out why, where it is coming from, etc. She suggested that, assuming the Congressman is against HUAC, the individual ask him what he can do to help. She noted that the individual should treat the visit to the Congressman's office not so much as an attempt to tell the Congressman what the individual thinks, but to ask him questions. Ask questions such as what do you think of the name change, of Congressman Ichord's promises of fairness, of witness procedures, etc. In short, find out what the Congressman thinks; get information.

She concluded by observing that she has detected a change in attitude from the congressional offices over the years that she has been here. When she first began her lobbying attempts, she noted that secretaries, when she showed up in an office, told her that a Congressman was pro or con and that he knew all about HUAC. She notes that now she tells the secretaries or the Administrative Assistants that she really doesn't care one way or another about HUAC, but she simply has some information for the Congressman and asks if she can come back from time to time with more information. Now the Congressmen "light up" and ask her, "What do you have for me today?" She said that the information that she carries to the Congressmen does the job, it speaks for itself.

Some of the comments that were made from the floor after Donna Allen concluded are worthy of brief mention. There was a suggestion that each individual talk to his Congressman when he returns to his district. A comment was made that Congressmen who voted in favor of HUAC are defensive about the position. Those who voted against it really love to talk about it. A suggestion was made that in any political campaign an anti-HUAC element should be injected with an argument raised that many politicians do not want it injected. A former Congressman, Charlie Porter, commented on how to "set up" a Congressman who is pro-HUAC. He suggested that individuals get the Congressman committed in writing. He said that a person should send back any form letter received from a Congressman, with comments thereon asking why he didn't bother to answer personally or actually answer the questions raised in the letter to him. Pin him down. He then stated that if the Congressman's answer is anti-HUAC that it should be taken to the newspapers, etc. If pro-HUAC, it should be given to the Congressman's opponent in the next election.

Following a break for lunch, Professor Hugh H. Wilson, Professor of Politics at Princeton University spoke. Among other things, he noted that HUAC had done its best to strengthen the anti-democratic elements, it has undermined our capacity for social discourse, and it has encouraged racist discourse. It has accomplished all this by silencing liberalism. It is more interested in destroying people than in furthering change.

The next speaker was Professor Oliver Clubb, Asian Studies, Syracuse University. The printed title of his dissertation was "On Foreign Policy." The whole dissertation was psychiatrically orientated with such theories as angelic forms overthrowing forces of darkness, forces of death and dissolution, and an interesting theory: all people have three layers—an outer layer of suppression, a second layer of violence, and an inner layer of biological functions. Since we all suppress our second layer of violence, we need some outlet. Wars form what we consider a legitimate outlet. HUAC perpetuates the war by stifling dissent directed thereto.

The next speaker was Abe Feinglass, Vice President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America. He spoke generally on the history of labor and HUAC. He was extremely derogatory to HUAC, blaming it on much of labor's ills. In particular he noted that HUAC had gone out of its way to "get" the CIO. He noted that many times HUAC had timed its hearings to coincide with strikes and organizational attempts. Further, that more than once news of subpoenas was leaked to management before they were actually issued. He alleged that HUAC played a major role in splitting the U.S. Labor Movement in the 40's and 50's. HUAC is, according to Feinglass, against everybody who wants progressive change away from, to use his terms, "rugged individualism and private enterprise." He further noted that HUAC has "destroyed" the labor leaders who today could or would have stood up and dissented in favor of the liberal movement. It was also his thought that HUAC utilizes political terrorism to stifle everything which he considers healthy to our society. He acknowledged that what he termed the "old left" through some mistakes has partially contributed to our present problems.

The next speaker was Professor Thomas I. Emerson, Yale University. His remarks centered around the new committee mandate. His initial comments were directed toward the First Amendment (freedom of speech and association) and the Fifth Amendment (due process of law as it is associated with constitutional notions of vagueness.) He gave a short lecture on the difference between the constitutionally protected right of expression and non-constitutionally protected right of action. He acknowledged that the new mandate is an improvement over the old mandate. However, in his opinion it "comes down" to much the same problem as the old mandate. He then analyzed parts of clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subparagraph (b) showing how various words or phrases run afoul, in his opinion, of the First Amendment's right of freedom of speech and association.

The concluding remarks at Saturday's session were given by Frank Wilkinson who went into a rather elaborately detailed history of the Committee. Perhaps the content of his dissertation could be summarized by his repeated emphasis that they should emphasize the First Amendment principles of freedom of speech and freedom of association to all other groups and organizations. The theory being that these other groups and organizations who are engaged in some sort of dissent, legitimate or otherwise, by whatever methods, should and would feel that any committee which could impinge or infringe upon those First Amendment principles could thereby impinge or infringe

XUM

upon their movement. This was a general tenor noted throughout the day's events, one of appealing to other groups and organizations who are engaged in dissent to show or illustrate to them that their right to dissent is impaired by the establishment and functions of the House Internal Security Committee and, therefore, it should be abolished.

The second session of the Convention was called to order on Sunday, March 23, by Chairman Phillip J. Hirschkop.

The first speaker was Lawrence Speiser, Director, Washington, D.C. American Civil Liberties Union. He spoke on "An Evaluation of the 91st Congress; What Can We Expect." In his opinion more of the same general type of legislation that emanated from the 90th Congress can be expected. In particular, general problems concerning law and order, crime, student and other demonstrations would be considered. He noted, with reference to the problem of crime in the streets, what he considered a trend to infringe on constitutional rights, rather than use the poverty program to get to the roots and cause of the crime. He discussed organized crime and attacked the wiretap laws. He pointed out that under the omnibus crime bill of last year, the states potentially have wider leeway than Federal authorities to wiretap. He discussed briefly student demonstrations and obscenity problems. In his estimation, Congress will probably legislate further in the area of obscenity. His concluding remark was: ". . . civil liberties are indivisible. What can be done to organized crime can be done to you."

The next speaker was Professor Arthur Kinoy, Rutgers University. He began by asking a question: "Is it relevant to fight to abolish HUAC today?" Citing examples from the last two weeks, particularly the Chicago indictments, he concluded that the Nixon Administration is moving, or is prepared to move, against the national leaders of all liberal radical movements. He feels there has been a major decision made to attempt to isolate and destroy the leadership of "peoples' movements." His analysis is that the Federal Government is unable to cope with the fundamental, exploding erupting problems of Vietnam, the new young generation in the universities, and the black problems; therefore their only answer is force to suppress those problems. One of the elements of the force to suppress those problems, obviously, is congressional committee investigations. Therefore, answering his initial question, the present struggle against HUAC is extremely relevant.

Mr. Kinoy noted three basic lessons which he feels have emerged from the anti-HUAC fight which should be taught to all new movements. First, and most important, don't be defensive, don't sit back and wait, fight back at the earliest possible opportunity. Take the offensive. The minute any governmental action is taken or even proposed, the group should ask the question "What are we going to do to get them back?" Second, Mr. Kinoy feels that the Committee will die without the unity of the "American peoples movements". They have a common enemy, HUAC, and should unite all peoples movements in the common fight against the common enemy. He noted that "the man" (President Nixon) is going to try to to everything within his power to prevent this unity. Third, in the "peoples' fight" there is no generation gap—the generation can be bridged. In Mr. Kinoy's opinion, the myth that there is a generation gap comes directly from "the man".

The next speaker was Jerry Gutmann who discussed rather briefly, and without much detail, the *Krebs, Davis,* and *Young,* and *Stammler* and *Cohen* cases. He noted that the Krebs case is now pending before a single District Judge in Washington, D.C. who has already indicated that he considers the question moot. There are, he noted, additional questions of mootness because of the change of the committee name and the fact that the present Congress cannot cite contempt in those cases. They will not accept a disposition of the cases based on the issue of mootness. The real issue of the case is, not the power to cite contempt, but that of inquisition and interference with peoples' lives and First Amendment rights. He inferred that they will argue that it is really the same committee with the same powers, notwithstanding the name change. He mentioned either expanding this litigation, expanding other litigation, or initiating new litigation to include an issue of disposition of the House Internal Security Committee files. He argued there is no legitimate legislative purpose served by retention of these files. Therefore, a request will be made to seal the files or records so they cannot be examined without a ocurt order.

He then discussed briefly the *Young* and *Davis* case, noting that a motion to quash the subpoenas had been overruled by the District Judge. He then discussed briefly the old HUAC motion to produce Dr. Young's bank account. He noted that when the motion was drawn, but not served, to quash, Congressman Ichord called and told them he was withdrawing the subpoena for a technical reason and, to date, no new subpoena has been issued. This was interpreted as a victory for the Committee.

He then discussed briefly the *Stammler* and *Cohen* case. He noted that these cases had been "knocked-out of court" on the constitutional theory that a Congressman cannot be sued—can't even be enjoined from pursuing unconstitutional matters.

The next speaker was William F. Kunstler, Esquire. He spoke briefly on legal problems arising in the Kentucky and Wisconsin areas. He noted that the Kentucky Un-American Activities Committee had been effectively destroyed because the Governor had cut off its funds. He emphasized the point, previously raised by Mr. Kinoy, of positive and offensive reaction at the first possible moment. He made some brief comments on the draft, noting that the draft statute was being used as an adjunct of the system in an attempt to destroy the "peoples' movement". In his opinion, the draft system is loaded with inequities and absence of due process at every level. He also made some reference to Kennedy's recent resolution with respect to the draft. He closed with the comment that "peoples' movements" must stand and fight in the most positive way. "The man" cannot be cajoled or intellectualized out of his stand, but he can be worn down. He can be tied down.

The next speaker was Donna Allen whose topic was "Pending Repressive Legislation and Hearings." She spoke briefly on S. 12 noting that it is the same as S. 2988. In her opinion, it contains every single repressive thing the authors of the bill can think of. She noted rather briefly the anti-riot bill passed as a rider to the Civil Rights bill. She then spoke briefly on six bills presently pending before HISC, all referred to it on January 3, 1969.

At this point, there was a break with some general discussion from the floor. The general tenor of the conversation was the undesirability of transferring HISC to the Judiciary. They do not want it under the respectability of the Judiciary. They want it to stand alone where they feel it is more vulnerable to attack.

The next speaker was Professor Thomas Emerson, Yale University. He began by noting that HISC is most interested at present in disorder on the campuses and demonstrations in general. He briefly discussed Congressman Ichord's bill to establish a Committee of seven Congressmen to review contempt citation requests. His only comment was that it contains nothing really objectionable. He also noted Congressman Ichord's bill to amend the statute to subject a person who "misbehaves" before a committee to contempt charges. In his opinion, this is extremely vague and he didn't think there was any reason for it. He noted that other committees have gotten along without it.

Professor Emerson then discussed Congressman Gonzalez' bill (H.R. 46). He singled out four main provisions: (1) It reduces the power of a single member of a committee to take certain actions. It, in effect, eliminates the one-man subcommittee. (2) It contains provisions regarding the right of witnesses to explain answers, read or give statements at the end of testimony, and gives the witnesses' counsel right to question certain aspects of the Committee's jurisdiction. (3) It extends rather extensive rights to people (other than the witness) mentioned in committee proceedings, including right of cross-examination and right to call witnesses on his own behalf. (4) It contains provisions which provide, in part, for a court decision whether a witness would be held in contempt if he refuses to answer a question, before he in fact does refuse. In Professor Emerson's opinion, H.R. 46 would afford more substantial right to a witness called to testify before a committee than he now has. He then asked whether the Committee should support this bill. He noted that H.R. 46 goes to form (procedure) and not substance (abolish HUAC) and, therefore, answering his own question, he felt that no formal action should be taken to support it. He suggested that while it does give a witness more protection, the position should be taken that people shouldn't have to testify at all. The comments that came from the floor at this point seemed to be in favor of endorsing the Gonzalez' bill because, basically, it applies to all committees. There was some comment that it should be strongly endorsed. The Committee will, probably, endorse and support the Gonzalez' bill as a sort of secondary measure, retaining as its first priority its continued fight to abolish HUAC. The whole issue is one of emphasis or priority.

The next speaker was Professor Douglas Dowd, Cornell University. He spoke on "Attacks On Academic Freedom." He initially remarked that we live in a very dangerous period. He was referring to people with general indifference to, or support of, those attempting to suppress dissent. He noted that all news reports of events that he personally was acquainted with were distorted; therefore he assumes the rest are. He doesn't think any news reports are really reliable. When he reached this conclusion there was a resounding round of applause from the audience.

He then observed that, at the present time, there is no problem on the campus with respect to freedom of speech. In his opinion, people are free to say, and are saying what they want. However, this freedom of speech, on the campus, is now being used as a means of preventing change, not promoting change. This was the whole basis of his remarks.

He noted that today the youthful academic world is trying to stop and break up the corporate war economy. Students are trying to change things both on and off the campuses. He feels that the universities are now turning out people who will fit into slots, who will work and perpetuate the system, and the students want to change the system. The students are saying things must be changed and, many times, the faculty say "we agree," but present procedures to effectuate that change must be respected and obeyed. The students, however, see nothing change, or if the change does come, it is too slow or only temporary. Students are saying we want to change, we will use your procedures, but if they don't work, we will build up our own. The whole point, in Professor Dowd's opinion, is that many times the faculty agrees with the students that some change must be made, that something must be done, but they don't

XUM

do anything about it. In short, there is much free speech about what should be done, but such free speech does not accomplish anything. All the free speech results in is talk, talk, talk, but no concrete results. Therefore, the observation that, in effect, free speech is preventing, not promoting, change. Professor Dowd closed with the comment that when repression comes to the campus, it will come wrapped in a cloak of free speech. Talk, while necessary, is not enough.

The next speaker was Carl Braden who talked rather briefly about the Kentucky Un-American Activities Committee and how it is presently rendered ineffectual by the Governor's denial of funds. He again emphasized the concept that the first thing to be done when a "repression measure" is instituted is to counterattack. He advocates, as did everyone else, the theory that you fight both in the courts and on the street; using the term "fight" in terms of organizing and educating people—in short, combined legal, propaganda, and organizational techniques.

The next speaker was Ginny Guild, an associate staff member of the Southern Conference Educational fund. Her very brief general comments were directed toward the problems of organizing people against repression in the South. She noted that people should look at repression in its totality—wherever and by whomever it arises.

The next speaker was Jim Rowan, Chairman, Southern Committee Against Repression. He noted that they have made advances in the South in their coordination of groups. He made some general comments about what he called "creative losing" noting that the courts make an excellent forum from which they can express their views. He also touched rather briefly on problems created by state and city agencies.

The next speaker was Juan Lopez. He commented on the black and brown people's fear of concentration camps (Title II of the McCarran Act). He again asked the National Committee how they intend to relate to the black, brown, Chinese, labor movements, etc. He suggested that every time a group of people or organization is "oppressed" by a local, state, or federal authority, that is the ideal time to educate them of the evils of the McCarran Act. He closed with a suggestion that the Committee consider hiring black and brown organizers.

The next speaker was Terry Carter, from Camden, New Jersey. She began by telling of her experiences in the Civil Rights field in Camden, New Jersey, and how "they" brought in a "red scare" to break up the group or organizations. She noted that the "HUAC tactics" of name calling is particularly effective in the black and brown communities because of (1) their lack of education and (2) they have been subjected to the same "mom and apple pie" Americanism as the rest of us and are, in her opinion, more susceptible to the concept of this Americanism because of their constant struggle for equality. She noted that if you cannot convince the white middle-class community that the HUAC-type repressive and oppressive tactics are bad, how can you expect to convince the black and brown people. She noted they are simply too busy with the mundane problems of living to intellectualize with this problem.

She recommended a full-fledged campaign designed to reach the black and brown community at their level. The type of campaign launched against the white middle-class citizenry will not be effective against the black and brown community for the simple reason that they stand on two different levels of education. She noted that letter writing, phone calls, etc. will not work in the black and brown community. In her opinion, it is necessary to actually go in and personally talk with these people—and the organizers must be black or brown people.

She commented that in her experience HUAC "oppresses" black men by repressing and oppressing the white liberal groups trying to help them. HUAC doesn't actually touch or interfere with the black people; therefore, the majority of the black community does not think that any of the HUAC action-type of activities, particularly she pointed out, the McCarran Act, Title II, pertains to them. She closed with a plea to organize the black community.

The next speaker was John Learner of the Students for a Democratic Society. He began by noting that imperialism, capitalism, and racism are the real problems in America today. He made some general comments about the present problems of the Washington Free Press, the SDS demonstrations which precluded Mayor Alioto from speaking at Georgetown University, and the Texas universities refusal to allow SDS to hold their March National Council meeting there. He also spent a few brief minutes discussing varying examples of what he considered to be repression of the SDS. Interestingly, he commented that the SDS knew the House Internal Security Committee is planning to investigate them, and made the comment that "we will learn very quickly how to respond to that form of repression."

He noted that the SDS is learning how to use the HUAC-type hearing for its own purposes, how to utilize it to show just how undemocratic and repressive those mechanisms of government really are. He further commented that history had shown them that the channels of petition for redress are not open to the SDS. He commented, "we are, in fact, a movement of people for power in this country." He concluded by noting that it is impossible to separate the attacks against SDS from attacks against any other groups and organizations for reform in this country. He made a plea for unity of all groups with the closing remark, "power to the people, by any means necessary."

The next two speakers, Wayne Holley of Utah and Scarlet Patrick, made a few brief general comments on "Defense Against Prosecutions Under HUAC's Revived Internal Security Act."

The next speaker was Milton Cohen, Social worker-executive, one of the plaintiffs in *Stammler, Hall and Cohen* v. *Willis*. It was his opinion that the "establishment" is trying to carry out a policy of [sharp] repression, because they can't solve the problems. He further noted that the change of name from HUAC to House Internal Security Committee is a sign of their strength and a sign of the Committee's weakness.

At this point, the group engaged in a rather general discussion over various issues that had been raised. The only thing of particular interest at this point was a question raised by an individual from St. Louis. He commented that when groups use more radical means to get what they want, people were asking him the question, "In pursuing your goals, you are violating my First Amendment freedoms to do what I want to, how do you justify that?" He then asked, "How do I answer a question like this?" It was extremely interesting that no one attempted to answer the question. In fact, the question was ignored with the next two people making eloquent remarks toward protection of the First Amendment freedoms, the need for a change in society, calling the Convention a victory celebration, and imploring a renewed emphasis on attacking the Nixon Administration and the House Committee on Internal Security.

There was, also, some discussion at this time regarding the direction the Committee was to take. The general question the members of the Convention discussed was how broad a front should be pursued. Should they limit themselves simply to attacking the House Internal Security Committee, or should they branch out and encompass more activities. There was really no answer given, merely much discussion.

The last speaker was Dennis J. Roberts, Esquire, Counsel, Law Center for Constitutional Rights. He noted that the Law Center has filed suit, in effect, against Title II of the McCarran Act. They are specifically after the "detention" aspect of Title II. He discussed briefly a hearing held about a week ago on the Government's motion to dismiss this suit and noted that the Judge had taken it under advisement. He inferred rather strongly that the Judge was kindly disposed toward the Plaintiff's view to declare Title II unconstitutional. He suggested that this suit be used as a unifying tool to unite all forces and all people against repression.

This concluded scheduled speakers and discussions of the assembled people.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this country is reaching fiscal extremes and the administration is attempting budget cuts across the board, I think it is incumbent on this body to closely scrutinize the pending request for a special appropriation of $400,000 for the Committee on Internal Security. This committee already receives the statutory sum of $166,340 in addition to the automatic amenities such as printing, stationery, stamps, equipment, furniture and office space allowances. There seems no reason why this committee should not be able to operate within its budget. Certainly, a special appropriation of about 250 percent in excess of the statutory allowance is unnecessary. This committee has the mandate to investigate internal subversion within the country and recommend necessary legislation. In past years, the committee operating under the title of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has indeed held many investigations. Its legislative accomplishments have not been overwhelming however.

There has been no explanation of why the committee cannot carry on its designated function within its regular budget. The only reason I can surmise for this request is to fund the extensive publishing activities of the committee. These publications do not fall within the authorized purposes of the committee, and in many cases consist of unverified allegations from dubious sources on the activities or associations of certain public figures. I can see no reason for Congress to fund the dissemination of conspiratorial theories advanced by private citizens or organizations.

For these reasons I would recommend the passage of the motion to recommit this additional appropriation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session of Congress I introduced a proposal, House Resolution 20, calling for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Recently, when the name of this committee was changed to the House Internal Security Committee, without any perceivable change in its functions or its mandate of authority, I introduced a bill, House Resolution 287, calling for the abolition of this newly named, but relatively unchanged, committee.

Today the question of appropriations for the House Internal Security Committee for this session is before us, and today I take the floor again to urge that we put an end to the activities of this committee. House Resolution 270, which we have before us today, would appro-

XUM

priate $400,000 for the committee. I am sure that my colleagues are aware this authorization is not necessary to keep the committee in existence. This funding is in addition to the funds authorized for the committee—more than $160,000 this year—under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In the 89th Congress, the Un-American Activities Committee received additional funds in the amount of $845,000 by specific House resolutions. In the 90th Congress, it received additional funding of $725,000. By comparison, the House Judiciary Committee, received an additional funding of only $500,000.

It is incredible, Mr. Speaker, that so much money should go for such little legislative accomplishment. The functions of a legislative committee are to consider, report, and oversee legislation. Since its establishment as a standing committee in 1945, the Un-American Activities Committee—predecessor of the present committee—had to its credit two acts—the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Communist Control Act of 1954—together with four amendments to the Internal Security Act. Indeed, the last of these amendments, passed by the 90th Congress, was made necessary to keep alive the Subversive Activities Control Board because the Supreme Court found that the most important part of the Internal Security Act—that which sought to compel registration of groups and individuals with the Attorney General by order of the Board—violated the fifth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this committee, by the very kinds of investigations which it conducts, necessarily invades the area of first amendment rights—speech and assembly—which are specifically exempt from congressional action and therefore from congressional investigation.

This committee, by the very kinds of investigations which it conducts, unavoidably punishes individuals without due process of law in flagrant violation of the fifth amendment as well as of the constitutional prohibition against legislative punishment.

More than this, Mr. Speaker, we must ask whether we need this committee to expose subversive activities. Not only is the Federal Bureau of Investigation eminently capable of uncovering activities aimed at overthrowing the United States by force and violence and deception, but the kinds of activities at which the committee is now taking aim—protest and dissent by New Left groups—are not masked by front groups as was Communist activity in the past. When the committee interrogates protestors and agitators like Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden, it is not drawing aside a curtain of deception and exposing subversion to public view. These people are only too eager to state their views to the country and to the committee.

Not only does the legislative record of the committee fail to justify its continuation, but even the function of exposing subversion to which it has appealed for justification is rendered less necessary by the overt character of arrest, protest, and dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against House Resolution 270, for it is obvious from the past record of the committee that its activities tend to do more to weaken our constitutional guarantees of individual rights rather than strengthen the internal security of our Nation.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1969, the House overwhelmingly approved, by a vote of 306 to 80, the duties and jurisdiction of the House Internal Security Committee. This resolution today merely authorizes the money for the committee to do the job.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. ICHORD, has outlined to those of us on the committee a very comprehensive schedule of activity. The committee intends to hold hearings on subjects such as: The protection of national defense facilities; the security of classified information released to industry; Federal employment security; vessel, ports, and harbor security; the protection of our Armed Forces during periods of undeclared war; passport security; proposals with respect to the Emergency Detention Act of 1950; and the role the Federal Government should have in helping to stem the growing tide of revolutionary activity. In addition the committee has a responsibility, as do all House committees, to conduct legislative oversight hearings to see whether the present laws are adequately achieving their purpose and whether they are properly enforced.

Because of the nature of the field in which this committee is involved the investigations must be conducted in depth to assure that the committee obtains the proper information. I urge Members of the House to support this bill.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution now under consideration for the authorization of expenditures of $400,000 by the newly named Committee on Internal Security, but the same old House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Ever since I became a Member of Congress, I have opposed this committee as one that is useless to the functions of the U.S. Congress. It has shown little for its expenditures of public moneys. But, it has been flamboyant in its conduct of committee business.

Of all the committees of this House, the House Internal Security Committee is requesting the greatest appropriation, for which we receive the least amount of legislative proposals.

I have felt that the powers of this committee could be well incorporated into the functions of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I still feel that way. Yet, in making a simple change in the name of this Internal Security Committee, we have given it the right to delve into the matters of espionage, a phase that was under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee for 42 years—and which still should be there. Are we going to chip away from the authority of the Judiciary Committee in small pieces and finally leave the committee nothing to do?

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly opposed to this resolution to provide $425,000 to the Committee on Internal Security, known until recently as the Committee on Un-American Activities. Last month we were asked to change its name, to provide it, in effect, with sheep's clothing. But the committee remains the same. If it exists at all, it should be a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, but I believe this committee is inappropriate to our constitutional system.

What upsets me, Mr. Speaker, is that we take up this resolution without regard to our own strictures for saving money. We all know the committee is notoriously unproductive of legislative proposals. We could very well begin cutting our budget right here. I am voting against House Resolution 270, Mr. Speaker, not only because I disapprove of the committee's investigatory procedures, but I believe the committee appropriately belongs under the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 270, which provides the funds for the operation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Out of habit I used the foregoing description, and I know I should refer to it as the Committee on Internal Security. While I supported the change of name, it was with some reluctance.

I have listened this afternoon to those few Members who have spoken against adequate funding for the Internal Security Committee. They are entitled to their views. I had great difficulty following their reasoning that the funding would undermine the civil liberties of everyone in America. On the contrary, the work of this committee has contributed significantly to strengthing the rights or liberties of all of us by ferreting out the enemies of this country who would destroy it.

It has just come to my attention that about a week ago there was a meeting here in the city of Washington by a group that call themselves, the Committee To Abolish HUAC.

While my information about what went on in the committee meeting is incomplete and admittedly based on hearsay, it comes from a source which is usually reliable. I believe what I have heard should be made a part of the record of this debate.

In the meeting the members of the Committee To Abolish HUAC were urged to talk to their Congressman when he returns to his district. They suggested that all Congressmen who vote in favor of HUAC are on the defensive, while those who voted against HUAC are proud to say they have opposed it. It seems that a former Congressman from Oregon, Mr. Charles Porter, was present and proceeded to point out the best way to "set up" a Congressman who is pro-HUAC. He advised those assembled in the Washington meeting to mail back to a Congressman any of his so-called pro-HUAC form letters and demand that the Congressman write a personal letter setting forth with particularity why he favored funds for the use of HUAC. The former Member from Oregon was very gleeful in telling how to hurt a Congressman. He said if the answer was anti-HUAC, take it tc the newspapers. If the answer was pro-HUAC, give it to the Congressman's opponent for use in campaign material in the next election.

XUM

Now, Mr. Speaker, had there been any doubt in my mind how I intended to vote on this resolution, it would have been erased by the knowledge that the Committee To Abolish HUAC has been in session discussing ways to embarrass those who support adequate funding for this committee. I hope we can get a rollcall vote today on this resolution. I want my constituents and future opponents to clearly understand my position on this issue.

In the years that I have been in Congress I was privileged to know the former distinguished chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the late Mr. Walter. I knew the former chairman from Louisiana, Mr. Willis. I suggest today that our colleague the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), the new chairman of this committee, will carry the tradition of the former chairmen. He will lead the committee with fairness and objectivity. He will make a record that we can all be proud of.

Yes, I suppose we will always have a few opponents of this committee, whether it is called HUAC or the Committee on Internal Security. It is my observation that with the passage of time the opponents are becoming fewer. Anyhow, a rollcall vote would enable most Members to stand up to be counted in support of a committee which over the years has conducted many important inquiries which have contributed to the security of the United States.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. REID of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REID of New York moves to recommit House Resolution 270 to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 74, nays 283, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—74

Adams
Anderson, Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Chisholm
Clay
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Diggs
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Farbstein
Fraser
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Jacobs
Karth
Kastenmeier
Koch
Leggett
Lowenstein
McCarthy
Madden
Matsunaga
Mikva
Mink
Morse
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Pike
Podell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Stokes
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Vanik
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates

NAYS—283

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Conable
Corbett
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Edmondson
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—74

Abernethy
Alexander
Andrews, Ala.
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Carey
Celler
Colmer
Conyers
Dawson
Dent
Dickinson
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Flynt
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gude
Hammerschmidt
Harvey
Hébert
Jones, Ala.
Kirwan
Kyros
Landrum
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Minshall
Moorhead
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pirnie
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Ronan
Roth
Roybal
Scheuer
Shipley
Snyder
Sullivan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watts
Wright
Wyatt

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ronan for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Scheuer for, with Mr. Griffin against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Pirnie.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. May.

Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Roth.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. McClure.

XUM

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. **MADDEN** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. **GUBSER** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. **ROUDEBUSH**. Mr. Speaker, on I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 51, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—305

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—51

Anderson, Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bingham
Bolling
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Chisholm
Clay
Cohelan
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Diggs
Dingell
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Farbstein
Fraser
Gallagher
Gilbert
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Karth
Kastenmeier
Koch
Lowenstein
McCarthy
Mikva
Mink
Morse
Nedzi
Nix
Podell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Stokes
Thompson, N.J.
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates

NOT VOTING—75

Abernethy
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Carey
Celler
Colmer
Conyers
Dawson
Dent
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Flynt
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gude
Hammerschmidt
Harvey
Hébert
Holifield
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Lukens
McClure
Macdonald, Mass.
Mathias
Meeds
Minshall
Moorhead
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Pirnie
Pollock
Powell
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Rivers
Ronan
Roth
Roybal
Scheuer
Shipley
Snyder
Sullivan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watts
Wright
Wyatt

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ronan against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Scheuer against.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Roybal against.
Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Rees against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pirnie.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Hammerschmidt with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dent.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Ottinger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 270, which has just been agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 3, TO MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 191

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1969.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from April 3 to April 14, 1969, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

XUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if there is any further business scheduled for either Wednesday or Thursday next, in view of the past resolution that we just agreed to?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have completely disposed of all of the legislative business on the program for this week, there will be no further legislative business during the remainder of the week.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

It is understood that our meetings for tomorrow and Thursday will simply be pro forma meetings, with no legislative business to address ourselves to, barring some unforeseen emergency; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I know of none, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 14, 1969, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON APRIL 16

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 16, 1969, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the last vote I was unavoidably detained on official business. I would like the Record to show that had I been here, I would have voted "nay".

TELEVISION NETWORKS

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have concerned ourselves with the television industry for some time now because we have not seen the improvement that we were promised after extensive investigations 2 years ago, and because our constituents are increasingly demanding some method of control that the industry has thus far refused to exercise over its own destiny.

I would be the last Congressman to advocate the increase of Federal control over any industry which continuously exhibits genuine concern for the public good and which implements sound judgment and constant supervision of what it considers to be in the public interest, but I must admit that I am apprehensive over the trend—when the most potent and powerful medium of communication we have yet devised seems to have directed itself toward chaos instead of any possible utopia.

There is an ancient expression, "I will not believe it until I have seen it with my own eyes." The electronic media has established a believeability that has taken full advantage of this adage. We all know that the adage itself is false; we do not always see what we think we see with our own naked eye. The captioned picture tells you what the producer wants you to see and the commentators on television interpret the moving action for you according to their own personal judgment and taste; and within the framework of their individual network policies, aims, and particular mission at the time.

I believe that in some instances the network policies must be determined by the fantastic competition: The mission of the moment therefore overrides propriety and discretion. The competition must rank among the most harsh and demanding ever known in the business world, because it is fed and nurtured by vast advertising fortunes. To keep the millions of viewers watching, this competition therefore actually challenges the rights and principles of the same audiences.

The networks have seemingly turned a deaf ear to pleas for security and propriety with their repetitious trumpeting of a questionable axiom: "the public has a right to know." I think this has formed a mandate for them which does not now recognize a governmental—or even individual—right to any degree of secrecy—for privacy. At times, it seems to me, the network disclosures and their words and their pictures border on treason.

All media thrives on controversy, but the electronic media has become so steeped in the necessity to portray controversy that they contribute to controversy, they excite controversy, they accelerate controversy, they continue controversy, and they exploit controversy—with or without all of the facts and in or out of context, depending on what will best suit the script of the moment.

While I have concern as a parent and a citizen over the portrayals of violence and the vast amounts of time allotted by the networks to rioters and dissidents, I rise now to specifically voice my concern as a U.S. Congressman over the divulgence of classified materials, the callous disregard by the networks for our national security, and actual disclosures on the battlefield, which may well have cost the lives of our soldiers.

From my experience as an Army officer, I was shocked and dismayed to witness television shots and listen to radioed reports, relayed via satellite from our embattled Marine outpost at Khesanh, describing the effect of Vietcong artillery fire on this exposed position. There they took pictures of installations and targets and broadcast information that we spent actual lives to procure in World War II. Taking advantage of the lack of wartime censorship, they broadcast the effect of enemy artillery fire so that in my opinion, the enemy artillery commander could easily consult his fire direction tables for a given day and determine his direction and azimuth for the next, after listening to the description of the effect of his fire, which he could not otherwise observe from the fog-shrouded hills he occupied.

I cannot accept the excuse that the permission of some headquarters presumes the license to operate in a battle area without restraint. We know that the military has long considered wartime censorship methods, but refrained from this imposition in light of the rather weird consideration of this conflict and the many restrictions placed upon such a tactic by various branches of the executive department. Thus, an added responsibility has been inadvertently placed on field commanders and small unit officers—to retain whatever degree of security they can amongst roving reporters and searching cameramen.

The military commander in the field is usually not prepared by training or through experience to cope with this new dimension which amounts to yet another "infiltration" of his position under friendly auspices, but with potentially disastrous results. The military commander, too, in a combat situation is a besieged individual in desperate circumstance and I think he has all he can handle with his troops, his tactics, and his strategy.

I have been to Vietnam on seven occasions and talked at great length to many of our commanders and I have heard some of their private opinions on the freewheeling camera coverage of the war there. I would rather not repeat some of their advice at this time.

I listened in despair to a network oracle as he criticized the tactics of an embattled Marine major during the battle of Hue and I listened to some of our electronic ambassadors, who seemingly lauded the effort of our enemy, questioned our policies, challenged our commanders and even misinterpreted some of the actions of our GI's in actual combat.

The straw that broke the camel's back for me was a recent airing entitled "First Tuesday in February." This televised fiasco purported to explore the mystery of the accidental death of some sheep in Skull Valley, Idaho, and utilizing this—now ancient—event as a newspeg, the network went on to clobber the Army's Chemical Warfare Service.

They delved into areas clearly marked "Secret" and ridiculed the "secrecy." They took airborne pix of storage site for so-called "nerve gasses" so that any of

XUM

our adversaries may plot these targets for future reference. They showed endless pictures of various animals struggling in death throes, supposedly from the introduction of nerve gas and they questioned people at length—without single success I might add—as to their part in chemical warfare studies. They even sought to pinpoint an island in the Pacific whereat various aspects of chemical warfare and delivery means were under study.

I doubt this exposure will rank very highly on any public opinion poll, either for the TV treatment or the contemplation of the work of our Chemical Warfare Service, but we cannot alter the fact that this weapon must be taken into consideration by our military: It is not the type of warfare we ever intend to initiate and certainly we do not broadcast our research, but we know the enemy has this capability and we must therefore consider both the potential countermeasures and the antidotes and other protective measures we may be forced to utilize for the protection of our people.

What possible public good was served by this disclosure? What might have been considered treasonable in past periods of our Nation's struggle for survival, is now seemingly accepted as an enlightenment of the masses for the good of mankind, and the hell with the United States of America.

NEXT COME BONFIRES OF BOOKS, AND OF MEN

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a report from California caught my attention. In it, the present Governor of California commented to the effect that political attitudes of applicants for teaching jobs at State colleges and universities must be considered before applicants are hired. He continued on to speak of the "one-sided ideological viewpoint" existing among college and university professors.

The good Governor contended that whether a potential teacher is a conservative or a liberal "must be a consideration in hiring of faculty." This statement was made by the chief executive of our largest State in spite of the fact that State statutes and the Federal Constitution both make it illegal to consider a person's political ideology as a criterion for employment as a State college or university teacher.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening statement, in direct contravention of America's history, her way of life and her heritage of civil liberties.

Ordinarily, I refuse to take such off-the-hip comments seriously. But coming from such a high source, I am forced to. Several years ago, the State of California was adorned by a glowing crown of education. Its most brilliant gems were professors who had won international acclaim and honor for their genius. Academic freedom flourished there, providing an atmosphere in which their efforts could be utilized to break new ground for all men. Now that atmosphere is chilling and dissipating itself, and the ugly head of negative political reaction rears its head.

How can any institution of higher learning progress or fulfill its function if its faculty members must toe a political line or be subject to political judgments of the laity?

Albert Einstein looked very much like the "hippie" so many make a profession out of criticizing today. Almost every towering mind in the groves of academe has possessed and exercised various idiosyncrasies which puzzled and perhaps disquieted his fellows. Most of these intellectually gifted people have subscribed to various ideologies which have not hewed closely to the norm. Now the present Governor of California proposes to penalize today's academics job-wise because of it. Forget excellence. Replace it with conformity. Down with genius. Forward the mundane.

Mr. Speaker, New York State will be proud to welcome any of these scholarly gentlemen to its many excellent universities and colleges, where their political ideals will not deprive them of employment. We do not fear different ideologies. Our very differences have enriched us.

If California wishes to ship them east by the carload, we shall hail their arrival with joy. In fact, we shall be proud to have them among us. We may not have a year-round mean temperature of above 70 degrees, but we do not have anyone as chief executive of our State who acts, thinks, and talks like the present chief executive of California.

Aristotle once wrote:

> The basis of a democratic state is liberty.

No greater or more precious form of liberty exists than the guarantee of academic liberty and freedom. Let us never forget that every dictator, from Phillip of Macedon to Nero; from Napoleon to Hitler; from Stalin to Mao; has begun to take freedom and liberty away by silencing and stifling the academic community.

TIRE SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide an effective and enforceable procedure for notification to purchasers and dealers of defects in automobile tires. This bill, a companion to a measure introduced in the Senate by GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, would amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 which has already established a similar system for other faulty automobile parts. My bill does what has already been done for automobile parts—and for an item which is at least as essential as any mechanical part to the safe operation of a motor vehicle. I believe it is not too much to say, Mr. Speaker, that a requirement for tire defect notification and recall is an absolute necessity to guarantee the safety of millions of Americans who travel the highways of this Nation everyday.

Senator NELSON, long an advocate of consumer protection legislation, has pointed to two recent incidents which illustrate clearly why a tire recall bill such as I am introducing here today is so vital to the safety of automobile-owning Americans. In a letter to Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, released on February 18, 1969, Senator NELSON described the all too common, and too inadequate steps which were taken by two of the Nation's major tire manufacturers today.

The first recall announcement came from Mohawk Tire and Rubber Co. Under agreement with the Department of Transportation, Mohawk originated a press release in Akron announcing that they were recalling 10,000 Airflo tires for a defect which could cause blowouts. In their release, Mohawk urged customers to return any of the suspect tires to their dealers immediately for replacement. Because Mohawk—and all other tire companies—do not keep records on where their tires go after they leave the factory, they said they had to rely on the public news media to spread this information to consumers.

It is, therefore, difficult to understand why a real attempt was not made to get this information out to as many of the media as possible. Instead, the announcement was made in Akron at noon on Saturday, January 18 by Mohawk. Copies of the release were not sent to any of the major metropolitan newspapers around the country. The timing of the release in combination with the poor distribution made it impossible to get adequate play in Sunday's newspapers. It was only the hard work of an enterprising reporter with an inside knowledge of the recall that brought the story to a prominent place in the New York Times and the Washington Post on Sunday, January 19.

On February 4, the second recall announcement was made in the same way. On that day, General Tire announced that they were recalling 40,207—the number was not disclosed in the release—General Jet Safety tires, manufactured between April 1965 and January 1969 because tests indicated that a number failed the endurance test. The fact is that 19 out of 21 tires tested blew out half-way through the test. This vital information was also not mentioned in the release.

Again with the knowledge of the Department, General Tire announced the recall in Akron at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Again no releases were sent to the major newspapers. The result was that the great majority of morning newspapers of February 5 carried no story at all. The New York Times and the Washington Post carried a totally inadequate wire service story, received late in the evening and with no mention of the blowout potential, in one edition.

Lest there be any question, Mr. Speaker, about the effectiveness of the recalls instituted by Mohawk and General Tire in the two instances described by Senator NELSON, I should complete the story. I have learned that as of last

XUM

week out of the 10,000 tires involved in the Mohawk recall, less than 200 were located in the hands of private owners. In the case of the General Tire recall, 42,000 tires were involved, but less than 500 were recovered. Mr. Speaker, those figures indicate that the present procedures for tire recall are a complete and total failure. It also means that there are many Americans riding around on defective tires, blissfully unaware of the danger they may be in. It is almost as if the tire manufacturers were saying: "Happy motoring—if you can find the flaw on your own."

The provisions of the tire-recall proposal, Mr. Speaker, are simple enough, and wherever possible are parallel to comparable procedures for notification of defective automobile parts. The Secretary of Transportation is directed to establish within 6 months of enactment of the bill procedures by which tire manufacturers shall notify within a reasonable time after discovering a defect affecting safety the last purchaser of such tire known to the manufacturer. The procedures will specify how manufacturers are to keep track of the names and addresses of purchasers of its tires. The bill provides that certified mail is the standard method of notifying purchasers of defects. Notification procedure will, wherever possible, be parallel to that required for other defective automobile parts.

Notification to the owner of the tires must contain a clear description of the defect, a reasonable evaluation of the risk to traffic safety presented by the defect, and a statement of the measures to be taken to repair such defect or to replace, if necessary, any defective tires. The manufacturer is required to furnish a copy of the notification to the Secretary of Transportation who is authorized to take such steps in publicizing the notification as he believes necessary to alert owners to the existence of the defect.

The provisions described so far, Mr. Speaker, contemplate a kind of self-enforcement system. They envision that manufacturers will in good faith notify consumers of defects which are discovered by the manufacturer in his own product. But this protection does not go far enough. The Federal Government itself carries on extensive research on the quality of automobile tires. Under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Secretary of Transportation is charged with establishing for the benefit of the consumer a quality grading system for motor vehicle tires. It would be both shortsighted and dangerous not to give American consumers the direct benefit of this quality grading program as part of the tire recall program.

For the reasons just described, Mr. Speaker, the tire recall bill I have introduced today provides that the Secretary of Transportation may, on his own initiative, inform a tire manufacturer that any or all of his products do not meet the minimum safety standard which the Secretary has established. Once the manufacturer is notified that the Secretary has found his tires defective, he is given time to reply and to prove that the tires are not defective. If the manufacturer cannot prove this, the Secretary can then direct him to initiate the notification procedure described earlier. Thus the bill contains this additional safeguard to insure that the voluntary tire recall program of manufacturers is effective and enforceable.

It might be of interest, Mr. Speaker, in light of the controversy over whether the present administration is sufficiently consumer-oriented, to examine its position on tire recall. Before President Johnson left office, then Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd sent to Congress, along with his request for DOT appropriations for fiscal 1970, a bill to establish a tire recall program very much like the one Senator Nelson and I are proposing. When the Nixon administration took office, this proposal was withdrawn "for study." So far, Mr. Speaker, it has not been resubmitted to the Congress. I would hope that this "study" period will be brief; while the tire recall proposal is being "studied," there may be millions of Americans running the risk of blowouts—a risk of which they are not even aware. I would hope that within the next several weeks Secretary Volpe would follow the example of Secretary Boyd—so that all of us can buy and use tires without the fear that the next tire we buy will be our last.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Americans owe Senator Gaylord Nelson a debt of gratitude for his initiative in proposing an effective tire recall program such as I have described. Personally, I am proud to introduce in this body the companion bill to Senator Nelson's own tire recall bill now pending in the Senate Commerce Committee, S. 661. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this long overdue piece of highway safety legislation. I know that every American who owns and drives an automobile will support it.

HALT THE ABM

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have reason to tremble at this critical juncture in history on account of the spiraling arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both of which in the past 2 years have instituted new generations of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems. By 1972, Red China is expected to become a nuclear power and thereby the existing so-called "balance of terror" between the two superpowers may be upset. As a result, yet another upward level of weapons and increased danger of a nuclear missile exchange may be in the making unless successful arms-limitation talks between us and the Soviet Union occur.

Tied in with any forthcoming negotiations and an interim policy which would contribute to the success of these talks is the pending decision by the U.S. Congress as to implementation of a new nuclear antimissile system.

At the heart of this particular controversial debate is the question of building a multibillion-dollar defense system to protect our offensive missile sites and to try to protect our capability to retaliate if we are first attacked by enemy missiles.

Secretary of Defense Laird has advanced the assumption that the Russians intend to acquire first-strike power sufficient to destroy our existing retaliation capacity.

On the other hand, other witnesses who have testified before congressional committees disagree with this assumption and say it is extremely implausible; that our retaliatory capability is not in jeopardy.

However, I think some facts should not be overlooked. One fact is that if disarmament talks fail and it becomes clear we will have to defend our missile sites, then a much better ABM than the converted Sentinel system will be needed. Testimony indicates such an improved antimissile could be built at much less than the estimated $2.1 billion estimated for the first phase of the proposed so-called "Safeguard" ABM.

Meanwhile, on the basis of the statement of Gerard Smith, Director of Arms Control and Disarmament, that a delay will not jeopardize the security of the United States, I continue to urge the Congress to halt the anti-ballistic-missile program except research to improve it, until joint nuclear disarmament talks with the Soviets have taken place. If in due course these talks fail, then let us reevaluate the need for safeguards and deterrents to enemy missile attack.

As it is, the existing U.S. retaliatory power is sufficient to deter any such attack.

COMMENDATION FOR THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us from time to time find it necessary to criticize some section of the executive branch of the Government, including the military. I am happy on this occasion to commend the Corps of Engineers for the splendid work performed during the recent major floods in my congressional district. I include herewith a resolution of commendation adopted by the Ventura County Board of Supervisors:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMMENDING CORPS OF ENGINEERS EFFORT

Whereas under the provisions of Public Law 875 and pursuant to the Declaration by the President of a disaster due to flooding in Ventura County, the Board requested and obtained the assistance of the Corps of Engineers for flood protection work; and

Whereas since its first appearance within the County in February, 1969, the personnel of the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, have effectively pursued the accomplishment of its assignment, both in flood protection and flood fighting within the watercourses of the County; and

Whereas expressions of appreciation of the Corps of Engineers' effort to date by the public at large have been made to individual members of this Board; and

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of this County desires to express its appreciation to the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District,

XUM

on behalf of all the citizens and organizations of this County: *Now, therefore,*

The Board of Supervisors hereby resolves to commend, and does commend Colonel Norman E. Pehrson, District Engineer, Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineers, and members of his Staff assigned to assist in the disaster work in Ventura County, including especially Mr. Kingsley Benham of the District Staff, for the responsive, effective, and cooperative effort expended to date to protect the citizens of this County from the dangerous effect of two consecutive disastrous floods in this area.

Passed, approved and adopted this 25th day of March, 1969.

J. N. APPLETON,
Chairman, Ventura County
Board of Supervisors.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PRIMARY CONCERN IS THE SETTLEMENT OF THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, three different articles by three highly respected journalists appeared last week in the Washington Post and I think they give testimony to the fact that the settlement of the Vietnam war is, and has been, the primary concern of the Nixon administration these past 2 months. And I think the course of action that President Nixon has adopted, while not explicitly laid out before us, is beginning to bear fruit.

There can be no question but that the President faces a highly complex and difficult situation in trying to bring a settlement to this war—a war in which it took us several years to become enmeshed, and from which it will take time and, above all, patience and self-restraint, to get out.

Don Oberdorfer's column of Thursday, March 27, indicated that Vietnam has been the major preoccupation of the new administration since shortly after Christmas. Clearly the President has been trying to use to best advantage the so-called honeymoon period to accomplish as much as possible in terms of moving the peace negotiations forward to some fruitful results. As Mr. Oberdorfer correctly points out—and I insert his article at this point in the RECORD—patience at home and a relative lack of controversy offer the President the maximum freedom of action to work out solutions. And I must say that I believe criticism at this time may inhibit the President's freedom of action and reduce the time available to him to work out those solutions. The article follows:

BASIC STRATEGY FOR SETTLING WAR DRAFTED BY MID-FEBRUARY

Three days after Christmas in the sunny screened porch of his new house on Biscayne Bay, Richard M. Nixon sat down with his chief foreign policy and defense advisers to begin to chart his course in the Vietnam War. At that meeting, Mr. Nixon and his colleagues decided on a systematic review of all practical courses of action as the basis for policy choices and new instructions to U.S. diplomats and generals.

From then until this week, a great deal of time has been devoted in high circles to this decision-making process—roughly half the time of the National Security Council staff, for example—but very little has been said about it. Mr. Nixon and his key men would rather talk about almost anything else. This grave and most important public problem, the one which brought the Administration to power and may determine its chances for success, has provided the most notable exception to its effort to establish an "open government."

In discussing war and peace in Vietnam, Mr. Nixon has faced a dilemma. Any word or sign tending to reassure the American public is considered likely to reduce U.S. pressure and hence U.S. bargaining power in the negotiations at Paris. Any word or sign tending to enhance U.S. pressure and bargaining power, on the other hand, may bring forth an alarm at home. Controversy at home saps the thin public patience with Vietnam, reducing both freedom of action and the time available in which to work out acceptable solutions. This familiar ticking Vietnam clock—which finally ran out on the Johnson Administration just a year ago—is a vital factor in the calculations of the new Administration.

Those deeply engaged in the Vietnam problem with Mr. Nixon hoped for perhaps six months of maneuver time after Inauguration Day before the clock began to run for them. They acknowledge now they were probably too optimistic. In response to public uneasiness and Senatorial challenge, Secretary of State William P. Rogers is to appear in televised session today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss Vietnam and other matters. Preparing for this encounter, Mr. Nixon and his associates have begun to appeal for patience and to open the door a crack on their deliberations to date.

One result of the initial Key Biscayne meeting about Vietnam was a day-long session of the National Security Council shortly after Jan. 20 at which intensive discussion and study was devoted to four possible military options, and five possible international political results, in the Vietnam situation. In each case, consideration was given to the costs of the course of action, to the specific instructions, which would have to be given, and to the consequences of failure.

About the same time, a series of toughly-worded questions was dispatched to the major U.S. agencies dealing with Vietnam in an effort to establish the facts on which policy could be based. In Saigon, the field headquarters of each agency—including the Embassy, the military and the CIA—was encouraged to give its own honest assessment without clearance with the other. When the answers were in, they showed that the Vietnam-related empires of the U.S. Government do not agree even on the facts, much less on the solution.

By mid-February, it is said, Mr. Nixon had settled on the basic strategy he will follow for the foreseeable future in the attempt to settle the war. As it is now being signalled and explained, that policy centers on the negotiating process—though not necessarily in the Paris forum—and is designed for serious bargaining with North Vietnam about mutual withdrawal and other issues, while the Saigon government takes a larger role in the arrangements for a political settlement. President Thieu's announcement of his willingness to talk privately to the National Liberation-Front is greeted with knowing nods and satisfaction.

The Nixon strategy is not centered on the battlefield, it is said. There is a consciousness at the White House—if not in all ranks of the Pentagon—that the enemy is not going to collapse. The kill ratios so highly valued by the Johnson Administration are not read any more in the top reaches of the White House.

Beyond this, the plan which has been formulated is not being revealed. At the moment, the prime need is time for it to work or to fail. If a little bit of public discussion can buy time, Mr. Nixon appears to be willing. Even with leeway from the clock, though, his plan to negotiate an end to the war faces trying days. Somehow he must convince the American people that he is eager to get out of Vietnam while convincing North Vietnam that he is not.

President Nixon has clearly opted for a political solution to this terribly frustrating war, understanding as he does that a military solution is both undesirable and impossible. He has thus far successfully resisted efforts to move him in the direction of military responses that might reescalate the conflict. And, while he has exercised self-restraint militarily, he has moved forward diplomatically. As Mr. Joseph Kraft pointed out in his article, the announcement by President Thieu of South Vietnam that he is willing to talk directly with the National Liberation Front is a most encouraging sign and a development for which I believe the President deserves considerable credit.

At the same time, I think we are finally making progress in Paris. Chalmers Roberts gives credence to this in his article on the Paris talks, stating that the four delegations at last appear to be in agreement on how to proceed with the talks. We must expect it will take some time for the talks to produce dramatic results but we should be encouraged by the fact that private discussions are apparently proceeding simultaneously. I believe we can be encouraged by all these developments taken together—they are certainly the most promising evidence of progress toward a settlement in Vietnam that we have seen to date.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Kraft and Chalmers articles at this point in the RECORD:

NIXON CHOOSES POLITICAL WAY OUT OF VIET WAR, NOT MILITARY WAY DOWN

(By Joseph Kraft)

The important thing about the latest Vietnamese developments is that the Nixon Administration is going for the political way out—not merely the military way down.

The President is aiming at the slow—but sure—exit of a settlement that will in some way change the nature of the South Vietnamese regime. He has, so far at least, not accepted the easy—but dubious—course of covering the mistakes of the past by going for a stalemate in the war.

The chief sign of the political emphasis lies in the press conference given Tuesday in Saigon by South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu. The mere fact that peace news was being made in Saigon was of itself significant. For the one thing Saigon can do—that no other capital, including Washington, can do—is negotiate on arrangements for the political future of South Vietnam.

That implicit fact was explicitly underlined by President Thieu. General Thieu said that he was prepared to negotiate "a political solution" in direct secret talks with the National Liberation Front—the Communist-dominated insurgency movement in South Vietnam.

That commitment takes on tremendous significance against the evolution of the past. Not very long ago, the Thieu regime was treating the Liberation Front as a gang of "bandits and terrorists" who could be dealt with only on an individual basis after they had laid down their arms—that is to say, surrendered.

It was considered a major concession only six weeks ago when Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky said the Saigon regime would deal with the Front as an entity, provided all North Vietnamese troops were pulled out of South Vietnam. Now President Thieu accepts to negotiate with the Front, without any advance condition. It is logical to suppose that in time the Saigon leaders will extend even further openings to the leaders of the Front for some kind of political collaboration.

Sooner or later, the leaders of the Front are bound to respond—and respond favorably—to this kind of evolution. That much is acknowledged by virtually everybody with Tran Buu Khiem, the chief of the Front delegation to the Paris peace talks.

Khiem told this columnist, in the midst of a violent attack on the Saigon leadership during an interview about a month ago, that the Front would accept changes by the men of the Thieu regime "even at the eleventh hour." He then added: "Even at the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute."

But the process of blocking out a compromise between Saigon and the Front is bound to be slow and full of difficult times. And in the interim it is essential to keep the goal of a political settlement firmly and clearly in mind.

For there is another prescription, seemingly most attractive, which is now being put forward by the hawks of Saigon and the Pentagon and State Department in a last effort to make it seem they were right all along. According to this view, all the United States needs to do is to build up the South Vietnamese army, and then begin the withdrawal of American troops.

The South Vietnamese forces would supposedly be strong enough to hold the other side in a kind of military stalemate. There would be no need to take the painful compromise and adjustments that a political settlement would require.

The trouble with that view, of course, is that the stalemate is no more likely to be achieved than the other military prospects put forward by the hawks. By following the hawks' prescription, the American role in the war would go down. But it would not go out, and it might have to go up again.

It is a far better thing, difficult and slow as the course ahead is bound to be, to move toward a political settlement. And it is encouraging that President Nixon has so far had the strength and confidence to resist the pressure for a quick fix that would almost certainly lead to things getting worse very soon after they got better.

PARIS TALKS CLEAR HURDLE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

PARIS, March 26.—The Paris peace conference, it now appears almost certainly has cleared its first big hurdle in the way to ending the Vietnam war. The four delegations appear in agreement on how to proceed.

This is the net result of what has been said at the last two Thursday sessions of the conference, plus some discreet private meetings and finally the public statement in Saigon by South Vietnamese President Thieu that his government is ready to talk to the National Liberation Front (Vietcong).

Thus far there has been no public reaction by either the Front or the North Vietnamese to Thieu's statement. A Front spokesman said today that newsmen could ask questions about that during the press briefing sessions after the tenth conference session Thursday.

The fact that the Front has avoided any quick reaction is being taken here tonight by the Americans and South Vietnamese as an encouraging sign. They see this as meaning the communists are seriously considering the Thieu remarks.

Assuming the agreement on how to proceed—and it would be both a surprise and a major disappointment if it collapses—a series of secret meetings under cover of the conference structure should begin shortly. It is on these meetings that President Nixon has drawn a curtain of silence.

One set of meetings likely will be between the United States and North Vietnam on the problem of mutual withdrawal of troops. The South Vietnamese are prepared to agree to such meetings on the presumption that they will be kept fully informed. It can be assumed that the Front will likewise hear from Hanoi about what is going on.

The other set of meetings will involve the more complex problem of the political future of South Vietnam. The crux of these meetings is that the Front and the Saigon government will talk to each other. This was the central point of the Thieu statement and of the Front representative's comment last Thursday that he was prepared to talk with all other delegations.

It is almost certain that neither half of such tandem talks will make prograss unless the other half is making progress. After all, as American officials put it, why should Hanoi "remove the pain"—the force of their arms—until they have used it to produce the best political settlement they think they can get.

It is possible, of course that the Communists will attempt to bargain further on the nature of the two sets of meetings before actually agreeing to sit down to them. If so, even more patience will be required on the allied side.

On the matter of patience, the South Vietnamese here take the position that an agreement by the end of the year would be quite satisfactory. The Americans want to see an agreement well before that, but they have carefully avoided mentioning any possible date other than to indicate hope that concrete results wil be discernible within six months.

It now has taken two months to create the framework for such private talks, again assuming that they will soon begin. The results on the battlefield in the coming months, as in the past two months, surely will be reflected in some way at the conference tables.

Unless there is a new hitch, the preliminary skirmishing is over and the real bargaining will begin. That, at least, marks the end of the beginning.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, after a detailed study and analysis of the Treasury Report on Tax Reform and after evaluating the various calls for tax reform from my constituents, I have this day introduced a comprehensive tax bill entitled the "Tax Reform Act of 1969."

I believe there are four important factors that must be evaluated by the Members of Congress serving on the House Ways and Means Committee relative to the merits of consideration of tax reform: namely, fairness, justice, equity, and simplicity.

The majority of people in our country today advocate tax reform and they have raised the question of whether our tax system accords each individual with a fair treatment of taxation—a loss of confidence and a system of inequity is a fair conclusion to draw from the loud voices of our constituents. In an effort to remedy this loss of confidence, and to endeavor to establish the principle of equity in our tax system, this Congress must move forward and carry out the will of the people and enact a comprehensive tax reform bill. My bill, in 12 areas of tax reform, has sought to attain the objective of the foregoing four important factors and thus remove this "crisis of confidence" among our people.

Estimates are contained subsequently that estimate the revenue effect on the U.S. Treasury relative to the enactment of each of the 12 provisions in my bill. Although the net effect of this bill would at first produce an adverse effect upon our treasury, one must evaluate the additional purchasing power that the enactment of this bill would generate which in turn would find its way into the gross income of our business enterprises and thus resulting in additional treasury collections by added Federal taxes based thereon.

Tax reform is developing as one of the major issues of the 91st Congress. Inaction in this area has taken place for nearly 10 years, ever since President John F. Kennedy advocated a comprehensive reform of our tax laws. The time for action is in this Congress.

A Nixon administration Cabinet member, Treasury Secretary Kennedy, stated a very practical analysis:

> Are all Americans in similar circumstances paying approximately the same amount of income taxes?

The answer to this question is very clearly "No"—thus advocating the need for reform. Furthermore, he stated:

> The American people are saying something and it is getting through . . . They are reading in the papers that a lot of rich people are getting away with not paying much in taxes.

My correspondence has reaffirmed this fact and also my statement herewith cites and sets forth this fact in the form of a chart of tax rates on incomes of high income individuals.

The summary of the revenue estimates which I have compiled relative to each provision in my bill and also my statement attributable to each provision follows:

Summary of revenue estimates for income tax provisions—Revenue effect on U.S. Treasury

[In billions of dollars]

Individual income tax changes:	
Increase deduction for exemptions from $600 to $900	−9.0
Relief for persons in poverty—liberalization of minimum standard deduction	−1.1
Increase standard deduction from 10 to 14 percent	−1.4
Correct abuses of farm loss deductions	+ .145
Repeal of gasoline tax deduction for individuals	+ .310
Elimination of tax abuses:	
Imposition of minimum income tax on high income individuals	+ .420
Allocation of deductions to taxable income	+ .405
Corporation tax changes:	
Elimination of more than one surtax exemption	+ .235
Extractive industries—oil and timber: Repeal oil depletion allowance and allow deduction only for costs expended	+1.600
Eliminate 7-percent investment credit	+2.300
Repeal accelerated depreciation in year of purchase	+ .800
Foundations: Imposition of a 20-percent tax on gross income exclusive of contribution income	+ .300
Total net revenue effect on U.S. Treasury	−4.985

XUM

INCREASE DEDUCTIONS FOR PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS FROM $600 TO $900

This proposal, one of the most far-reaching in its actual effect upon the taxpayer, will provide tax relief to every taxpayer and in a proportionate amount to the size of each family by providing a 50-percent increase, from $600 to $900, in the amount that may be claimed as a tax exemption.

This provision will attempt to give consideration to personal and social factors such as: The increases in costs of living, students within a family, other dependent relatives, and equitable tax relief in general.

Revenue loss—estimated at $9 billion per year.

MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

This provision would increase the minimum standard deduction by providing for an increase from $200, plus $100 for each exemption, to $600, plus $100 for each exemption, subject to a maximum of $1,000.

This area of our tax code represents the most equitable and efficient method available of directing tax relief to persons in the lowest income ranges. This provision would greatly reduce the income tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level and would completely exempt from tax the majority of those persons below the poverty level who now pay income tax. This provision would be an excellent example of the social implications and principles that are incorporated into our Federal tax system.

It is estimated that 2.2 million families living in poverty are subject to Federal income tax; about 1¼ million would become nontaxable, and the remaining 1 million would receive "tax reductions."

Revenue loss—$1.1 billion per year.

INCREASE STANDARD DEDUCTION FROM 10 TO 14 PERCENT

A liberalization of this area of the tax law would be obtained by the enactment of this provision which would increase to 14 percent, the standard deduction, with the imposition of a maximum amount of $1,800.

Major factors why this provision should be enacted are: First, it would provide a simplification in filing tax returns because more taxpayers would use this provision. Second, the increase in rate would provide some relief for the effect that inflation and the rise in the cost of living has had upon our people. In addition, wages have increased, but the present maximum amount has been retained. Third, it would reduce the number of Internal Revenue Service audit of returns and thus provide a more efficient administration of our tax laws.

The Treasury report reveals that the number of taxpayers using the standard deduction has declined from 82.2 to 57 percent during the period, 1944 to 1969. In 1944, Congress enacted this provision to simplify the tax system which then resulted in this provision being used by over 80 percent of our taxpayers. The Congress must keep up with the changing conditions of today and adopt this provision which would result in its use by about 80 percent of our taxpayers which would be equivalent to those that used it upon its original enactment. This year, there will be 65 million taxable returns filed—the simplification and efficiency of this proposal warrant its enactment into law.

The substantial impact of this provision would provide more than $1.4 billion of tax relief to taxpayers in the income range of $5,000 to $20,000. With the present, unfair tax burden—Federal, State, and local—which this economic group is encountering, this reform would provide the needed practical tax relief that is necessary if we are to have an adequate working tax system in our complicated society of today. Our people are demanding reform, and this is one area where we can provide the needed tax relief of which they should have the benefit.

Revenue loss—$1.4 billion per year.

CORRECTION OF FARM TAX RULES BY NONFARMERS

The deduction of "farm losses" against nonfarm income would be limited to $15,000 in any taxable year—carrybacks and carryforwards would not be effected. This limitation would be applicable to individually operated farms and to farms operated by a corporation or a partnership.

This proposal would effect about 14,000 taxpayers and would have little or no effect on taxpayers earning less than $15,000 of nonfarm income.

Revenue gain—about $145 million per year.

REPEAL OF GASOLINE TAX DEDUCTION FOR INDIVIDUALS

I advocate repeal of existing law which provides that State gasoline taxes are deductible in computing Federal income taxes. This item of expenditure is more closely related to a personal item and should be within the same nondeductible status as other user charges such as highway tolls, State park fees, hunting and fishing licenses, and auto registration fees and drivers licenses.

Revenue gain—$310 million per year.

MINIMUM INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Enactment of this provision is necessary so that "high-income individuals" who are not presently contributing their fair share of Federal income tax, would be required to pay an equitable share of the cost of government. The low tax rate encountered by this group of taxpayers results from various exclusions from taxable income and also from deductible expenses, thus further eroding their taxable income figure.

Current statistics reveal that "high income individuals," that is, over $100,000 per year, pay a "low effective tax rate" in comparison to other taxpayers earning from $10,000 to $30,000 per year. Illustrative of the foregoing inequity, I would like to set forth the following table which highlights the low tax rate of this group.

SCHEDULE OF LOW-TAX RATES PAID BY HIGH-INCOME INDIVIDUALS

	Income levels		In millions	
	Over $100,000	$100,000 to $500,000	$500,000 to $1,000,000	$1,000,000 and over
Amended adjusted gross income	$16,720	$12,205	$1,875	$2,640
Taxable income (after deductions and exclusions)	$9,870	$7,700	$905	$1,265
Tax as a percent of total income	28.2	29.2	26.1	25.1
Tax as a percent of taxable income	47.8	46.3	54.1	52.3

Source: Treasury Department Tax Reform Study.

An analysis of the foregoing table of income levels reveals the practical low effective tax rates actually being encountered by high-income taxpayers, when related to gross income—before exclusions and deductions. This provision would attempt to correct this tax avoidance scheme. Furthermore, it must be noted that these figures are only averages and do not reflect the real abuses which are sought to be brought more in line with the principle that every taxpayer should bear his fair share of the tax burden.

Revenue gain—$420 million per year.

ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS OF HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER

Taxpayers with excluded income enjoy an unwarranted double benefit from that income inasmuch as no tax is paid on the excluded income and personal deductions are used to offset income from taxable sources as revealed by the Treasury Department tax reform study. To remedy this inequitable situation, high-income taxpayers should be required to allocate their nonbusiness personal deductions between income from taxable sources and income from nontaxable sources.

This provision would affect about 400,000 taxpayers, and mostly, all those would be with incomes over $50,000. Allocation would not be required unless the taxpayer had excluded items of at least $5,000. The excluded items to consider would be: capital gains, State and local bond interest, percentage depletion in excess of cost, and appreciated property donated to charity.

Revenue gain—$405 million per year.

ELIMINATION OF MORE THAN ONE SURTAX EXEMPTION

This proposal calls for the elimination of the ability of a controlled group or chain of corporations to claim more than one single surtax exemption. This provision would go into full effect over a 7-year period by limiting the maximum number of surtax exemptions that could be claimed in accordance with the following schedule:

Taxable years including the first Dec. 31 after—	*Maximum number of surtax exemptions*
Jan. 1, 1970	500
Second Dec. 31	250
Third Dec. 31	100
Fourth Dec. 31	50
Fifth Dec. 31	25
Sixth Dec. 31	10
Seventh Dec. 31	5
Eighth and subsequent Dec. 31's	1

The original congressional intent was to limit this special provision to small business as was stated in 1950 when this legislation was considered. However, many large corporate organizations have established a number of separate corporate units which are so arranged so as to produce an income of less than $25,000 so that they can each qualify for the special tax savings under present law.

The value of the surtax exemption under current corporate rates is $6,500, per exemption—26 percent multiplied by $25,000.

Revenue gain—estimated $235 million per year.

EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES—OIL AND TIMBER—DEDUCTION ONLY FOR COST EXPENDED

This "special deduction," the "percentage of depletion," should be eliminated and in lieu thereof, a deduction should be allowed for these extractive expenses based on a "cost concept"—or known as "cost depletion."

It is a fact that 90 percent of the current percentage of depletion deduction allowed is not represented by any direct cost expenditure and would not be allowed under a "cost depletion" concept.

Revenue gain—adoption of the "cost depletion" provision would yield an estimated $1.3 billion annually from all extractive industries.

Extractive industries should bear their fair share of the tax burden, which presently is only 21.1 percent, whereas "all industries" pay 37.5 percent. This favorable treatment must be corrected and an equitable provision enacted into our tax laws.

Revenue gain—$1.600 billion per year.

SEVEN PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT

This special tax incentive provision should be repealed due to the inflationary circumstances confronting our economy today. The original purpose of enactment was to create increased equipment purchases and increase new construction in a lagging economy; this condition does not exist today. Ordinary accounting principles of reporting should be reverted to.

A special report, released on March 13, 1969, by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, revealed that American businesses have planned a booming 13.9-percent increase in investments in plants and equipment this year. This economic spiral of investments will not slow down one of the major domestic problems—the high increasing rate of inflation. This rate increase of nearly 14 percent in investments compares to a rate of 4 percent in 1968, and 2 percent in 1967. Planned investment in 1969 is $72.96 billion; in 1968 it was $64.08 billion.

Revenue gain—estimated $2.3 billion per year.

Furthermore, added significance to the merits which warrant repeal of the 7-percent investment credit are set forth in a column by a leading economist, Mr. Paul A. Samuelson, which appeared in the March 31, 1969, issue of Newsweek magazine, the column follows:

Investment Tax Credit

Inflation watchers were rocked last week by news from the SEC and Commerce Department that businessmen intend to increase their plant and equipment investments by almost 14 per cent.

The new outlook for excessive investment spending should, in my opinion, cause President Nixon to suspend the 7 per cent investment credit temporarily. Here's why:

1. The economy is still on an inflationary binge. To bring the rate of price increase down from 4 per cent toward a more moderate figure of, say, 3 per cent, some actions are going to be needed. Every weapon counts.

2. Already the Federal Reserve is being called upon to take Draconian measures to fight inflation. This will mean not only painfully higher interest rates; it will also bring in most of the discomforts associated with the money crunch of 1966—uneven rationing of credit between new and old business, growing and stagnant business, small and large business.

3. Experience demonstrates that tight money takes for its principal casualty the housing industry. When there is a scramble for more resources than the total resources available, it is right that housing should share in the restraint. But it is not, in my judgment, good national policy to have housing starts cut by 40 to 50 per cent as happened in 1966. In the 1970s, with their bumper crop of young marrieds, we shall pay in higher rents and zooming residential costs for any serious diminution of home construction in the waning years of the Vietnam war.

4. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by adding onto the present surcharge another 5 or 10 per cent tax. But I see no evidence that this would be politically popular or feasible. Nor is it clear that consumer spending is the prime villain in the present inflationary scenario.

5. Admittedly, inflation could be fought by still further tightening of the Federal Reserve money screw. And the impact of such tightness on the housing industry could be alleviated by special financial subsidies to home construction through the Federal housing agencies, through the U.S. Treasury, or through the Federal Reserve. Since all such measures will add to the nominal public debt, I don't expect that anything but tokenism would, in fact, be politically feasible in this area.

Even if it were possible to cushion the impact of tight money on residential housing, to get the same restriction of aggregate demand from enforced reductions on plant and equipment spending would, I suspect, require very high interest rates. These will cause difficulties for our partners abroad. And they may hang on to plague us in the years to come when the winds may be blowing up deflation rather than inflation.

6. In September of 1966, to alleviate the money crunch and moderate what looked like an excessive fixed investment boom, the Johnson Administration did suspend the 7 per cent investment tax credit. Almost at once relief was felt in the money markets of the country. On the whole (despite the protests of the Treasury, which naturally found it a headache), the operation seems to have been a successful one in accomplishing its purpose—namely, ensuring against an overexuberant fixed investment boom.

So historical experience, as well as the common-sense view that firms will invest less when their returns from doing so are reduced, justifies suspending the tax credit.

What are the possible arguments against suspension of the tax credit?

1. The Nixon Administration might be regarded as a pro-business Administration. Why should it take from business this accustomed source of profit?

2. Perhaps the inflationary danger is being exaggerated. Perhaps it will involve overkill if suspension of the investment tax credit reduces investment severely.

3. Vigorous growth requires as much capital formation as we can get. Adjusting to inflation by reducing investment will reduce our future capacity to produce an enlarged total of real national product.

4. It is a bad thing to use variations in the investment tax credit as a deliberate weapon of stabilization. Why? Because it is plain immoral. Because it involves discretion by government, which is wicked. Because it disturbs business planning.

5. Suspension creates administrative problems for the Treasury.

In economics, every decision involves pros and cons. Judgment is necessary. My advice to Mr. Nixon: suspend the investment tax credit.

SPECIAL DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS

Special depreciation deductions; namely, "accelerated depreciation" over straight line depreciation should be terminated inasmuch as the purpose for enactment of this provision has been accomplished—to stimulate new purchases of equipment and new construction. Our current rate of inflation warrants enactment of this provision.

Revenue gain—estimated $0.8 billion per year.

FOUNDATIONS

A tax of 20 percent should be imposed on the total annual gross receipts—exclusive of contributions received—of foundations income. The nature of some of the items of income that would be included in the foregoing gross receipts are: Gross profit from business activities, interest, dividends, rents and other ordinary income.

In conjunction with producing an equitable tax distribution in our society, I believe it is imperative that foundations bear a share of the tax burden and thus serve to relieve our 65 million taxpayers of a comparable amount. Furthermore, the growth in the number of foundations, to more than 30,000 today, plus an estimated ordinary income of $1.5 billion per year, exclusive of contributions, justify this provision in our tax laws. In addition, large amounts of assets have been accumulated, free of taxation, to the extent of a current value whose estimate may exceed $18–$20 billion.

Revenue gain—$300 million per year, based on estimated ordinary income for the year 1970.

THE DECENNIAL CENSUS

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, beginning April 1, 1970, the decennial census will be taken. As you know, the 1970 census questionnaire will contain 67 subjects involving 120 questions. A good number of these questions are highly personal and many of the other questions are far from pertinent to a population count. As the law now stands, a citizen's refusal to answer any of these questions could bring criminal penalties of a $100 fine, 60 days in jail or both.

The word has gotten out on this proposed census form and the newspapers are informing the people through editorials and columns of this lengthy questionnaire. The mail we are receiving in my office, and I am sure I am not alone in this, is reflecting the fact that our citizens have become aware. The folks in my district are protesting this plan, they

XUM

believe it to be an intrusion into their private affairs and are resentful of the imperative that all questions be answered under threat of fine or jail. Here are some excerpts:

> It is urgent that you limit the census taking to the way it was in the past. I do not appreciate the plan to interfere in my private affairs

Another letter said:

> There are seven questions I would answer without equivocation, name, address, age, sex, race, whether head of household, and visitors, if any, at the time of the Census.
>
> Anything of common knowledge, I will answer. Anything else is an invasion of privacy.

Another:

> Little by little we have lost our freedoms and it is a most distressing situation in this beloved country of ours. I trust you will resist vigorously any further invasion of our privacy. It is later than we think, to be sure.

And another:

> I believe this is a little too much regimentation and an invasion of privacy that is not necessary. I hope that you will do what you can to help change this penalty.

And, a final excerpt:

> Its been in the papers, also magazines, about this invasion of privacy in the 1970 Census. As the paper states, and I AGREE, there's about 7 questions that should be answered to give the information they are supposed to have, let the remaining questions be answered on a voluntary basis.

Now, we all know that the American people, on the whole, are patient and forbearing when it comes to putting up with bureaucratic plans and redtape but in these already troubled days my mail and personal conversations tell me that the people are not going to sit back and accept this compulsory demand that these prying questions be answered or else face the unduly heavy penalties, particularly, while hard-core criminals are getting the velvet-glove treatment for crimes of much greater magnitude than that of not answering a question about who shares your shower or whether you own a TV set.

I believe we must stop and recall that the original intent of the census under the Constitution is to provide an accurate population count for an equitable apportionment of the House of Representatives. And, as far as I know, this is still the intent of the census. We have to remember that this is a decennial census, not an industrial and commercial census which would be an entirely different matter.

I would further state that commonsense tells us that an unnecessarily lengthy and complex census will tend to weaken the system and bring about an inaccurate count which would ultimately affect other areas dependent upon the popoulation count for the distribution of funds and other decisions.

Because I am deeply concerned that our citizens should not be subjected to an uncalled for invasion of their privacy and to mandatory compliance should they not wish or be able to answer some of the questions, I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill which requires that only seven questions, pertinent to the decennial census, be answered with a penalty only for failing to respond to these seven questions. The remaining questions would be answered on a voluntary basis. I believe early consideration of this legislation is very important in order that the American people will not be compelled to accept this invasion of their privacy due to inaction in the House and Senate.

AMERICA'S 200TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin proposes that Congress recognize the role of historical societies in observance of America's 200th birthday, and he notes, too, the need for commemorating discovery and exploration—a century earlier—in the Mississippi Valley. I cite here, Mr. Speaker, a few such events which are today's historical legacy in nearly a fifth of the congressional districts:

First. In 1668 the Miami welcomed explorer Nicolas Perot to their village on Fox River—near present Berlin, Wis.—where the farthest French outpost toward the unknown Mississippi—St. Jacques mission—would be started.

Second. In 1669 Robert Cavalier de la Salle, led by Seneca over a portage to an Ohio River headwater in western New York, descended La Belle Riviere to the rapids—at Louisville—and was, perchance, first European on Hoosier soil.

Third. In 1673 Louis Jolliet and his expedition's Jesuit chaplain, Father Jacques Marquette, followed Miami guides over the short path—at Portage, Wis.—from Fox River and Great Lakes basin to Wisconsin River and Mississippi basin. Discovery of the Mississippi, the Indians' "Father of Waters," occurred—at Prairie du Chien—on June 17.

Fourth. In 1675 Father Marquette, now on his final journey, passed by canoe along Lake Michigan's southern shore, the first non-Indian known to reach Indiana—this, in the Gary area.

Fifth. In 1679 La Salle voyaged from Niagara across Lakes Erie, Huron, and Michigan to Green Bay, in the first sailing of these waters. In December he traversed the St. Joseph-Kankakee portage—at South Bend—his destination a suitable base on the Illinois—near Peoria. Miami—a people of the portages—were again encountered at this crossing.

Sixth. In 1682 La Salle descended Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico. His subsequent letter—from St. Ignace, Mich.—in October, indicates he had learned of still another strategic portage, which he describes as affording a shorter route from Canada to the Illinois. This ancient trail—called Glorious Gate by Miami and under their resolute guard—links Maumee River—at Fort Wayne—to Wabash River at the forks thereof—at Huntington—all within the district I am privileged to represent.

Mr. Speaker, no less than 103 Members of the House of Representatives share directly in the inspiring heritage of these achievements. On behalf of my fellow citizens in one such district and because pride permits no other course, I warmly endorse House Concurrent Resolution 161 introduced by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, believing that our general support without waiting for "pressure from home," will move the resolution to early adoption.

CHANGE IN RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of the recent change which took place in the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. The subcommittee is no longer automatically requesting departmental reports on bills for aliens who entered the United States as visitors, exchange visitors, or students. This latter group is now subject to rule 6 of the rules of procedure as are crewmen, stowaways, transits, and surreptitious entrants who evade immigration inspection. A Member introducing such a bill is required to request a waiver of rule 6 and to show the extreme hardship on which such request is based. Until a report is requested, the alien's case is handled as if there were no bill. This means that if there is an outstanding order of deportation the alien will be deported.

Since March 12 a number of bills have been referred to the subcommittee, which are subject to rule 6, and for which there was no accompanying information to show extreme hardship. The subcommittee has assumed that this oversight was a result of the newness of the change and is notifying the authors of these bills of the necessity for additional information if they wish to have the subcommittee consider a waiver of rule 6. A prompt decision will be made by the subcommittee. However, I do urge that the Members be mindful of the fact that the mere introduction of a bill and furnishing the subcommittee with identifying information as specified in rule 4 will not stay the departure of an alien who entered as a visitor, exchange visitor, student, crewman, stowaway, transit, or surreptitiously evading immigration inspection.

For the convenience of Members, I am including in my remarks the text of rule 6 of the Subcommittee Rules of Procedure:

> 6. The Subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as visitors, exchange visitors, students, stowaways, in transit, or deserting seamen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.
>
> Exemption from this rule may be granted by the Subcommittee in cases where the bill is designed to prevent extreme hardship. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the Subcommittee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his request to waive this rule.

XUM

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE: QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, early in February it was brought to my attention that I did not know very much about the chemical and biological warfare programs of the United States. Some disturbing public policy questions about the practices that govern their use, the activities of universities and public institutions, and public safety of chemical and biological activities became apparent at that time.

As a result, I asked the U.S. Army to give a briefing to interested Members of Congress on the public policy aspects of our chemical and biological warfare programs. On March 4, 1969, the U.S. Army presented a short unclassified general description of our activities in these fields and then a more detailed classified review. Although I had indicated in my request that the questions that needed to be considered did not appear to require classification, being of the same nature as the sorts of questions that we ask about deployment of our troops in Vietnam, Korea, and Germany or about the ABM or our Polaris submarines, the Army said that they believed that most of the briefing should be secret. It is my opinion, following the briefing, that the public policy questions do not require classified answers.

Nineteen Members of Congress and a number of staff attended the briefing. I indicated at the time that I did not believe that the public policy questions had been answered and that I would ask the Secretary of Defense and some of the other Department heads for their views on our policies in these fields. I will include the text of my letters to Secretary Laird and Secretary Rogers in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I have received interim replies from the Departments concerned indicating that they are preparing replies to my questions. I am pleased that the Departments of Defense and State are taking the time to give these questions the consideration they merit, for I do not believe that they should be answered hastily or without rethinking some of the policies that I believe we may have been drifting into without adequate consideration by our top officials and Congress.

Because I have not yet received answers to my letters, I do not want to go into a thorough review of the questions that I have raised. The U.S. Army has, however, asked that I place in the RECORD a copy of the unclassified presentation of March 4, 1969. This copy, of course, does not cover the questions that were asked concerning the unclassified briefing. It is not a transcript. I am glad to do this for the information of my colleagues who were unable to attend. I do, however, want to take this opportunity to point out some of the inadequacies of the presentation made by the U.S. Army and also to point up my growing concern about the safety aspects of moving poison gases around the United States by rail.

I will include the Army's unclassified presentation in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

First, one of the more glaring inaccuracies in the Army's presentation is the statement:

> Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The U.S. clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

This statement is preceded by the following statement:

> The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

In fact, the French Army used tear gas grenades fired from rifles in August 1914. The German Army also used several forms of tear gas. And the U.S. Army's tear gas, known as CN, was developed by the United States in 1918. Large quantities of tear gas, an incapacitating agent by the Army's definition, were produced in World War I. Obviously they were available for consideration at the time that the Geneva Protocol was formulated.

Not only were the incapacitating agents available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol was signed; they were specifically included in the prohibition against the use of gas. Because some confusion had arisen on the question of whether the original treaty had included incapacitating agents, the League of Nations Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference that met in Geneva on January 15, 1931, discussed the problem at some length. The nations that had ratified the Geneva Protocol generally agreed that tear gas was covered by the protocol. Ironically, even then, the United States took an equivical stand.

To briefly quote from the minutes of the Commission:

> The British Delegation: "It may be recalled that, during the first part of the sixth session, certain delegations assumed that the intention was to prohibit the use of all chemical methods of warfare of every kind. On the other hand there were some indications that this view is not shared by all States. It is at least possible that this difference in interpretation owes its origin to a serious ambiguity in the Geneva Gas Protocol of 1925, as well as in all Treaties and Conventions regulating gas warfare signed since the war. In the Geneva Protocol of June, 1925, though the relevant portion of the French text is identical with the article quoted above, in the English text the French word 'similaires' is translated by 'other.' Basing itself on this English text, the British Government has taken the view that the use in war of 'other' gases, including lachrymatory gases, was prohibited. They also considered that the intention was to incorporate the same prohibition in the present Convention."

The French then commented:

> The French Government therefore considers that the use of lachrymatory gases is covered by the prohibition arising out of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 or Chapter IV of the draft Convention.

The Yugoslavian delegation said:

> We fully agree with the interpretation given by the British delegation.

The Spanish delegate said:

> I agree with the British delegation's interpretation, because I think that the text approved at the second reading is so clear that it cannot give rise to any objections. It provides that the use in warfare of any kind of gas is prohibited—doubtless because it is very difficult to distinquish between lethal and non-lethal gases.

I will include the minutes of the Preparatory Commission relating to this question of whether tear gas was covered in the Geneva Protocol in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, second, the U.S. Army stated that herbicides have proved useful as defoliants and for use against Vietcong crops. The Army goes on to say:

> They are harmless to the soil and to life and have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

Mr. Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture, reported in Science magazine the results of a survey that he made of the U.S. defoliation program in Vietnam. He comments that the mangrove tree is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangrove trees. He does point out that this tree is more easily damaged in this way than others. And he goes on to say that it takes about 20 years to grow a mangrove tree.

More telling, however, is this comment:

> A single treatment with 3 gallons of Orange or White (the defoliants that we use) would not be expected to have a great or lasting effect on a semi-deciduous forest in Vietnam. Some trees would be killed, and the canopy would be less dense temporarily. But within several years the canopy would again be closed, and even a careful observer would be hard pressed to circumscribe the treated area. *A second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect.* (Emphasis supplied).

It is my understanding that we spray more than once. I will include Mr. Tschirley's article in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Third. Although the unclassified presentation did not include a prepared discussion of safety measures taken to protect the American public against chemical or biological testing or possible accidents during the transportation of poison gas, the problem was brought up during the question period following the unclassified portion. We were assured by the Army that it had guards on trains that carried poison gas and that every precaution was taken to protect the American public.

However, I have learned since the Army's briefing that on the night of February 18, 1969, television station KBTR–TV received a call saying that there were open railroad cars containing cylinders and marked "poison gas" located on a siding in downtown Denver, Colo. The station sent a cameraman down to the yards. The cameraman arrived at the yards at 8 p.m. and found a string of open gondola cars filled with metal containers, each car bearing a ticket marked "poison gas." There were no guards in evidence around these cars, and the KBTR–TV cameraman climbed

XUM

up on one of the cars and photographed the cylinders.

When the cameraman returned to KBTR-TV with his film the station contacted the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to ask about the shipment. The Army admitted that it had shipped the material and said that it would look into the question of why it was unguarded.

The next morning, when the station again contacted the Army, the Public Information Officer stated that the arsenal's official position was that there were guards with the train.

I, for one, am not satisfied with this answer, and it is answers of this type that raise questions about the credibility of the responses regarding German gas warfare by the U.S. Army.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. LLOYD. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to indicate in his opinion there was not a security unit attached to that train?

Mr. McCARTHY. What I said was that the television station, KBTR-TV, received a call about these uncovered cars in a siding in downtown Denver. The station dispatched the cameraman, who arrived at the scene and experienced no difficulty and no prohibition, saw no guards, and went ahead and took his film without any questions being raised by anyone. I believe we can conclude from the testimony of the television station that at that time, at least, there were no guards in evidence.

Mr. LLOYD. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his diligence in pursuing this. I may say that that chemical agent was en route to the Dugway Proving Ground, which is in my district. When that information was communicated to the public, that there were no guards attached to that train, I made an on-the-spot investigation after the chemical agent had arrived at the Dugway Proving Ground. I interrogated the military.

At this point I should like to say, at no time was there ever an effort made by the military to prevent full disclosure to my inquiries. Their assurance to me was that there was a six-man security unit attached to that train, which obviously was not within camera range at the time the television station made these pictures.

I should like to assert at this point in the gentleman's very excellent presentation the fact that as an individual, I was satisfied in my own mind that the train itself was not lacking in its security.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. He would be interested to know that what prompted me to ask this question in the unclassified portion of the briefing was the awareness which I will cite here shortly of an alarming increase in the number of railroad accidents in the United States in recent years. There has been an 85-percent increase in derailments in the United States in the period between 1961 and 1967. This rate is continuing at the present time and actually is showing a sharp increase. They advised me that they were now putting guards on the trains. I wanted to know why they thought this was necessary. It was pointed out that incidents had occurred. I asked, "Could you elucidate on those incidents?" They explained that in St. Louis apparently there was a sniping incident where apparently some deranged person had a gun and was attempting to puncture these containers containing poison gas. That is what prompted them to put guards on the train but we had no reason to dispute that until we were advised by station WTOP here in Washington, D.C., which obtained this film footage that this station in Denver took which showed there were no guards in evidence.

A further hazard to the public is brought out by the shipment of large amounts of this poison gas by railroad. The National Transportation Safety Board reports that the rate of derailments has increased 85 percent between the years 1961 and 1967. In 1967 there were 4,960 derailments. When these derailments occurred, there could have been great hazards to public safety.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the United Press International article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier Express concerning railroad accidents be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in Crete, Nebr., for example, a freight carrying anhydrous ammonia was derailed, loosing the deadly ammonia gas in the town. Five persons were killed and 35 people were injured by the fumes. In Dunreith, Ind. a derailment caused a fire and explosions that caused over $1 million in damage. However, there were more ominous aspects to this derailment.

This Dunreith derailment contained some lessons for us because of two factors. When the fire broke out on the cars that were derailed, the flames were so intense that the tickets, presumably bills of lading on the cars which described the nature of the hazardous materials in the cars, were destroyed or burned. The firefighters did not know what substances were burning and hence they could not use their equipment effectively. A similar fire might well destroy tickets on other cars carrying the Army's poison gases.

The second problem in the Dunreith incident occurred when a tank car carrying poisonous chemicals were punctured, and the liquid drained into the ground and entered the local water table. This chemical contained the poison cyanide. Local authorities became aware of the problem when dead farm animals were sighted in and along a nearby creek. This showed that the cyanide was entering the local river and that water supplies might be endangered. A total of 6,200 pounds of chemicals were added to the river in order to attempt to counteract the cyanide. Fortunately no human beings were killed as a result. The cyanide did affect the local water table, because wells had to be dug and pumps installed to take out the cyanide. Over 2 million gallons of contaminated water had to be taken from the wells. Is this a chance that we want to take?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I should point out in connection with the Geneva protocol of 1925 the record should show that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated during World War II that it is the policy of the United States to abide by the Geneva protocol of 1925, even though it had not been ratified by the U.S. Senate. And, as recently as 2 years ago the then Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance declared that it is still the policy of the United States to abide by the Geneva protocol of 1925.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem from the summary of the Disarmament Conference of 1931 that the United States is in fact not abiding by the Geneva protocol of 1925 at this time in Vietnam.

Finally, I have only touched upon a few of the questions that need to be answered with reference to a thorough examination of our chemical and biological warfare policies and I intend to discuss these questions more thoroughly when I receive answers from the departments involved.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. LLOYD. I think the distinguished gentleman from New York has made a very helpful and useful statement. It is not my intention to debate the issue in any way or to suggest that any of this information is inaccurate. I think that it would be well, however, on the record for me to state at this point that at many times since the sheep incident of about a year ago in Utah when about 6,000 sheep, or thereabouts, were involved in what the Army now admits, according to my understanding, was an accident in the spraying of this agent—in all of my inquiries of military officials I have never found any attitude except one of full disclosure.

I think it might also be well to say at this point that this chemical agent, an agent somewhat heavier than water, does not spray out into the air, unless it is sprayed by human action. It simply runs out on the ground if a container is punctured.

A six-man security unit, or more, on a 24-hour basis is assigned to take the necessary precautionary measures in dealing with the transportation of this agent. They are very carefully educated and prepared in the science of decontamination of these nerve agents.

In 1963 the then Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance while testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had this to say in justification of our chemical and biological warfare program.

> As long as other nations such as the Soviet Union maintain large chemical and biological warfare programs we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability. It is believed by many that President Roosevelt's statement in 1943, which promised—-

And this is quoting President Roosevelt—

> "to any perpetrators full and swift retaliation in kind," played a significant role in preventing gas warfare in World War II.

And, Secretary Vance went on to say:

XUM

> Until we achieve effective agreement to eliminate all stockpiles of these weapons, it may be necessary to be in a position to make such a statement again in the future.

So, I believe again that the gentleman in the well has made a very important contribution in requesting increased disclosure of all pertinent facts and in questioning whether or not so much information as is now classified should be classified.

I, myself, feel that it is in the public interest to release more of this information for the consideration of the public and for discussion by the public.

I am sure that the gentleman from New York would also agree that it is neither his intention nor certainly it would not be my intention to go beyond the statement of what the facts and reasons present and to be very careful that we do not spread unjustifiable and unnecessary alarm.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. I certainly agree with the gentleman in that I would like to see the cloak of secrecy removed from this program. I might say that the deeper we get into this the more convinced I become, anyway, that this program has been allowed to develop, especially in recent years, without serious consideration at the highest level of our Government.

We were told by one professor of biology, who is very familar with the program, that a former White House official said that he just did not care what they did in this program so long as they did it behind closed doors.

I do not believe that, really, that is going to serve our purpose. I believe this is the kind of program that has the most serious implications in terms of international agreements, in terms of a breakdown of the concensus that prevailed during World War II, and prevented the use of gas or germ warfare agents.

I believe these things should be discussed, and certainly the public policy question should be discussed openly. We are not asking the Army for secret information. I do not believe that the type of gas or the quantities of it are relevant here, but what our policy is in this field is relevant.

At present the policy is vague. In the unclassified portion of the briefing the Army actually could not give us answers to questions such as what is our policy regarding retaliation in kind to a gas or germ attack, and many other questions that arise in the public policy sphere.

We do know about the ABM system, the Polaris submarine fleet, about our troop strength in Korea, Germany and Vietnam, but in this field it is hidden from public view.

Mr. Speaker, I become more convinced that if these questions were applied to public scrutiny, if hard questions were posed by intelligent experts, that this program would not stand up under that kind of scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I should state that our purpose here is simply to get this out into the open where it can be examined by the Members of Congress, and by the executive branch, and thus reach certain basic decisions about what the policy of the United States should be in this field of chemical and biological warfare.

Mr. LLOYD. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to state that I trust that the dialog which he is continuing will be in the public interest.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material which I have referred to earlier for the information of the Members:

Hon. MELVIN LAIRD,
Department of Defense.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently my lack of knowledge of United States' programs and policies in the fields of chemical and biological warfare was brought home to me. I realized that I did not know, as I did concerning our ICBM's, our B-52 bomber force, our troops deployed in Germany or Vietnam, the basic reasons for these programs. I also did not know the policies that guide our use or non-use of weapons in these areas. And I did not know what safeguards are being taken to protect the American public from any danger from activities in these areas.

With the advice of my colleagues from New York State on the Armed Services Committee of the House, I asked the United States Army to give me and any other interested colleagues in the House and Senate a briefing on the basic reasons for, the safeguards, and the public policies that applied in the fields of chemical and biological warfare.

Apparently my interest was shared by many other members of Congress for 19 Members, 3 Senators, and 16 representatives from members' offices attended the briefing which was held on March 4, 1969. The number of staff would certainly have been larger had attendance even for the unclassified portions of the briefing, not been restricted to those with active security clearances.

In discussing the nature of the briefing with the U.S. Army, I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the nonclassified section of the briefing. I stressed that our national capabilities and policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public review, and constructive criticism as are our ICBM, Polaris fleet, F-111 bomber program, and ABM system. I deliberately refrained from raising questions which I believed would legitimately fall within the area of secrecy.

General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public policy questions remained unanswered. I am therefore sending to you for reply a list of the public policy questions, the answers to which are essential to an intelligent and rational appraisal by Members of Congress and the concerned public towards these programs. I would appreciate your considered answers to these questions:

1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fallout shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

4. We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

5. Why do wo choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

6. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

7. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

8. What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Are they inert? Are the chemicals moved in tanks under pressure? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

9. What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields. Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and research programs on ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can

XUM

be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

10. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nationwide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the fields of chemical and biological warfare?

11. Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

12. Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

13. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

14. Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently my lack of knowledge of the United States' policies in the fields of chemical and biological warfare was brought home to me. I realized that I did not know, as I did concerning our presence in Vietnam, our commitment to South Korea, our deployment in NATO, or our nuclear deterrent, the basic policies that guide our use or non-use of chemical and biological weapons.

With the advice of my colleagues from New York State on the Armed Services Committee of the House, I asked the United States Army to give me and any other interested Members of the House or Senate a briefing on the basic reasons for, and the public policies that applied in the fields of chemical and biological warfare.

Apparently, my interest was shared by many other members of Congress for 19 Members of the House, 3 Senators and 16 representatives of Members' offices attended the briefing which was held on March 4, 1969. The number of staff would certainly have been larger had attendance, even for the unclassified portions of the briefing, not been restricted to those with active security clearances.

In discussing the nature of the briefing with the Army, I asked that the basic public policies governing our activities in the chemical and biological warfare fields be covered in the non-classified section of the briefing. I stressed that our national capabilities and policy in this area should be subject to the same discussion, public review, and constructive criticism as are our strategic weapons procurement and deployment, and our foreign commitments. I deliberately refrained from raising questions which I believed would legitimately fall within the area of secrecy.

General James A. Hebbeler presented a briefing that was informative and interesting to those attending. But many of the public policy questions remained unanswered. I subsequently sent to Secretary of Defense Laird and am sending to you for reply a list of the public policy questions, the answers to which are essential to an intelligent and rational appraisal by members of Congress and the concerned public towards these programs. I would appreciate your considered answers to these questions:

1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do our civil defense policies make the statement that our efforts are purely defensive credible?

4. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

5. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

6. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

7. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nationwide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the fields of chemical and biological warfare, and do we make such a statement as a part of our foreign policy?

8. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

9. Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmament as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

10. Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

11. What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE BRIEFING BY BRIG. GEN. J. A. HEBBELER, MARCH 4, 1969, AT REQUEST OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD MCCARTHY

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen, it is my privilege to appear before you today in response to Congressman McCarthy's request for a briefing on chemical and biological warfare and the basic reasons and necessity for a chemical and biological warfare program.

ELEMENTS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

We should keep in mind that we are talking about weapon systems in the same context that we talk about any other weapon; that is, we are talking about instruments of war, weapons specifically designed for use in war. However, effects of chemical weapons differ from those of biological weapons and from other weapons just as the effects of nuclear weapons differ from those of conventional weapons. So to provide a common ground and to help us understand these differences, I shall separate chemical warfare from biological and look at each in detail.

The first thing to bring to your attention is that we are not talking one system; we are talking many systems, all with different effects and different uses. Let us look at the offense first because only by understanding the weapons and their effects are we able to determine the defensive equipment and tactics associated with each category.

Some chemical weapons are categorized as lethal weapons which are designed to kill. The modern lethal chemical agents which are components of chemical weapons include the nerve agents, two of which have the symbols GB and VX. Both are liquids which are disseminated as aerosols. GB is a non-persistent material which is relatively volatile. It is put down in heavy concentrations to catch troops before they can put on their protective masks.

VX is a persistent compound which can penetrate the skin. It is complementary to GB in that it can circumvent the protective mask. It penetrates normal combat clothing.

Both agents are odorless, tasteless, and colorless. Consequently it is practically impossible to detect them with the unaided senses. They can enter the body through the respiratory tract, the eyes, and the skin. Action within the body is rapid. Very small amounts will cause paralysis, prostration, and death. Even microscopic quantities will impair vision, and cause nausea and muscular incoordination.

Why do we have a lethal chemical program? Mr. Cyrus Vance, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1967, before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, stated: "As long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability." Let us look at the nature of the Soviet Union program which constitutes a lethal chemical threat to the US, her NATO allies and other Free World countries.

Today the Soviet Union is better equipped militarily and physiologically for chemical warfare than any other nation in the world. She has placed a great deal of emphasis on these systems in her military machine. She envisions the usage of these the same as for conventional weapons.

Her planning at all levels, from the very top to the very low echelon units, includes considerations for chemical warfare training, offensively and defensively.

XUM

She has a wide spectrum of chemical munitions. She considers chemical tactical weapons to be used in conjunction with nuclear weapons or separately as circumstances may dictate.

Her agent stockpiles includes a spectrum of agents capable of creating military effects over a wide range.

The soldier is well equipped with defensive equipment. He trains vigorously and for long periods of time with this equipment. He looks upon chemicals as a real possibility in any future conflicts, and he respects his equipment.

The research program in the Soviet Union for chemical warfare has encompassed every facet.

The basis for these comments appears in the testimony of Willis E. Black before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1968.

In addition, we know that the state of Soviet chemical science which has direct application to chemical warfare technology is unsurpassed. I have here some physical evidence of their diligent and exhaustive effort in this field.

This stack of documents contains abstracts of translations of selected Soviet scientific literature which reflects the magnitude of this effort during the past several years alone. Each of these documents also contains abstracts pertaining to biological research which has military applications.

In summary, the USSR is well equipped to wage warfare with these weapons and indications are that they would be used if this served its purpose.

Other chemical systems employ incapacitating agents designed specifically to avoid killing—approach unique among weapon systems. These weapons suggest employment where military necessity requires control of a situation, but where there is a good reason for not harming the surrounding population or even the intended target troops.

Among chemical agents in the incapacitant category are some which exert mental effects, and there are some which affect the body. There also are types which affect both the mind and the body. Physical types have some advantages over the mental types, however, since the degree of incapacitation will be more apparent to the user.

Such agents would include, for example, those which would cause loss of physical coordination, paralysis, or loss of vision. The effects would be temporary and those exposed would recover without after effects. These agents are selected for possible use because of the wide safety factor between the amount of agent which incapacitates and that which would cause lethal effects.

Actually, many compounds have some temporary effects on mental processes as well as on physical performance. For example, the ability to concentrate on a given task may be severely limited at the same time that physical tasks may become more difficult to perform.

The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

These incapacitating chemical weapons would be a marked asset to US forces in military situations where it is necessary to gain control of an area in which both civilian and insurgents are co-mingled or where civilian and enemy military troops are inter-mingled. This would be particularly true on peacekeeping missions in underdeveloped nations where insurgency is a problem and where the US is asked to assist in maintaining stability of a state.

Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The US clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925; public statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance and by Ambassador to UN Nabrit provide the basis for the US position. I will cover these later in a discussion of policy.

The riot control agents, used for control of civil disturbances and adapted for use in Vietnam operations, are designed to irritate, to cause people to move (vacate an area), with only temporary effects. The effects of CS, the standard military riot control agent, are pronounced and instantaneous—coughing, severe burning of the eyes, tightness of the chest, acute discomfort. These effects are much the same as the tear gas, CN, which has long been used by civil law enforcement agencies world wide. But CS works faster to temporarily disable and is much safer. In tests using troop volunteers, in actual riots, and in battle, there has never been a fatality attributed to CS.

In Vietnam commanders find CS a valuable weapon in combat situations when it is apparent that explosives are not the best weapon. Viet Cong have frequently forced women and children to accompany them as hostages; they do not hesitate to use them as protective shields against anyone seeking to clear their tunnel hideouts. In such situations, CS quickly proved its value. In one reported operation, 17 Viet Cong and some 400 non-combatants being held as hostages were forced from a tunnel complex by CS, with nobody wounded on either side. Again, 43 armed Viet Cong were captured with no friendly losses and one enemy killed when he tried to break away. These examples indicate that lives are frequently saved on both sides when CS is used as a weapon.

Herbicides have proved useful in Vietnam primarily as defoliants. Dense jungle, which is home to the Viet Cong, provides the enemy with effective ambush cover. Wooded areas along trails, roads, railroads, canals and powerlines have been hiding areas for Viet Cong units until the US Air Force began to spray defoliating agents. Removal of the jungle canopy and overhanging foliage permits a view for analysis of trail activity, storage site locations and targeting and exposes the ground area to photographic surveillance and direct fire. Army units use herbicides around local base areas to keep them clear for ground surveillance and fire lanes and prevent surprise. Herbicides have also been used against Viet Cong crops; they are harmless to the soil and to life and have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

The biological weapons are categorized by their effects against man, against animals and against crops. Biological weapons designed for use against man are further categorized by their effects as lethal or incapacitating. Again, lethal biological weapons are designed to kill; incapacitating to avoid killing.

Biological agents can be produced, can be stored under specific conditions, and can be disseminated effectively to cover large areas. Because of the delay between infection and symptoms, as well as the large area coverage capability, biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Biological agents, like the chemical nerve agents, cannot be detected by the senses. Being colorless, odorless and tasteless their early detection is a difficult problem, complicated by the delay which occurs before effects become evident.

There is a wide variety of bacteria, rickettsia, viruses and fungi which cause disease in man. Many of these can be used as biological agents. Examples of some that could be considered as lethal agents are plague, tularemia, anthrax, yellow fever and typhus.

In addition, it is entirely possible that mutant types of disease could be developed which would not respond to known methods of treatment. They would be difficult to diagnose. Diagnosis and treatment could be complicated by using mixtures of two or more agents.

Biological agents can be delivered in a variety of ways, such as aerosol generators and spray tanks. Generators and spray tanks could be carried in missile warheads and in manned or drone aircraft. Another possibility is the use of insect vectors, such as the mosquito, as a deliberate carrier of microorganisms.

In a different category are the biological incapacitants. They are designed to permit control of an enemy—to remove his ability and will to fight, with minimum risk of mortality. There are a number of mild diseases which will make a person very uncomfortable and make him inactive for a short period of time without serious effects.

In another category are the weapons which can be used to attack a nation's food sources—crops and livestock. These are generally considered weapons for strategic use.

Why do we have a program? We can refer back to Mr. Vance's statement which included both chemical and biological weapons and the need for a program in view of the large USSR program. We can also refer back to Mr. Black's testimony when he stated that "Today Russia is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical and biological warfare than any other nation in the world." However, it is even more important that one looks at the rapid advances being made in the bio-medical sciences. The US must keep an active and viable program in this field so that we are not technologically surprised and so that such surprise cannot threaten our national security.

From this brief review of the elements of the CB weapons program, it is evident that an increasing variety of effects have become available, with a consequent increase in variety of purposes to which they could be applied. The alternatives presented are now so many that distinctions between purposes have tended to submerge purely technical differences.

Thus, at one end of the spectrum, these forms of warfare might be no more than the small-scale use of a non-lethal chemical agent against an adversary to frustrate his purpose without maiming or causing fatalities. At the other extreme of the spectrum, it is possible to conceive of the use of a lethal biological agent against an entire nation without consideration of necessity or humanity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to weigh in a single balance situations so disparate in intent or consequences.

It appears, then, that with respect to chemical and biological systems one should look toward the *principle of proportionality,* which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind or degree of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. In this context it would appear that the norm of proportionality could require controls to prohibit certain elements of the chemical and biological field, while others of the non-lethal type would be preferred over alternatives now employed.

DEFENSE

In developing a modern defensive posture, one must recognize the threat and the toxicity of current nerve agents. With these, even very low concentrations for short periods of time can quickly produce severe symptoms. Further, one must protect against absorption of these agents through the skin as well as by inhalation. As a result, a lethal chemical protective system consist of several interrelated elements. The total chemical and biological defensive system consists of detection, warning, protection, decontamination, and preventive medicine and medical therapy. Each of these elements requires available equipment and materials (alarms, masks, etc.) which must be integrated into an overall logistics system. The defensive

XUM

equipment requires concepts and doctrines for use which must be integrated into the training cycle. The lack of any element increases the vulnerability to a chemical or biological attack.

There are two implications to the complexities of equipment and training for defense against lethal chemical weapons.

For one thing, a force against which lethal chemicals are used will be at much lower combat effectiveness than will a force not suffering the same casualty threat with its attendant requirement for protective equipment and decontamination procedures. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 recognizes this as a basis for retaliation against the initiator of lethal chemical use. In the present era, a force without the option of chemical retaliation could well be forced to an alternative option of tactical nuclear employment, if that were available to him.

The second implication is that the cost of protective equipment is high and serves as a constraint on less affluent nations against initiating use of lethal chemicals, since use carries with it the requirement for protection against retaliation.

POLICY

What is our national policy in regards to these weapons and their use? We can turn to the statements of our Presidents and their Cabinet officers to explain a basis for our current policy.

First, we can begin with President Roosevelt's statement in 1943 when he stated: "* * * we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies." President Eisenhower re-affirmed the Roosevelt policy statement. Very few public statements have been made until recently when as a result of the Vietnam conflict, questions were raised.

Secretary of State Rusk in 1965 declared with respect to U.S. use of tear gas and herbicides that the U.S. was not engaging in gas warfare in Vietnam and that the country was not using gas "that is prohibited by the Geneva Convention of 1925 or any other understandings about the use of gas."

Ambassador Nabrit before the United Nations General Assembly in 1966 stated that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 does not apply to all gases and further "It would be unreasonable to contend that any rule of international law prohibits the use in combat against an enemy, for humanitarian purposes, of agents that Governments around the world commonly use to control riots by their own people. Similarly, the Protocol does not apply to herbicides, which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those used domestically in the United States, the Soviet Union and many other countries to control weeds and other unwanted vegetation."

Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance, in his 1967 testimony before Congress indicated "That we seek international understandings to limit chemical and biological warfare and that we have not used weapons of the sort condemned by the Geneva Protocol." He pointed out that "as long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability."

In line with seeking limitations, the most significant current action which may affect policy is the United Nations study on chemical and bacteriological (biological) warfare, requested by the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference. This study, intended to provide a technical and non-political appraisal of the effects of chemical and biological weapons, is being done by experts of fourteen countries, including the U.S. and the USSR. It is to be completed by July 1969, will be unclassified and will be given wide distribution.

Our posture today is concerned first with the development of a credible and viable lethal chemical capability as a deterrent to the use of these weapons against us, and to give us the ability to fight effectively if deterrence fails. Further, it is essential that in the rapidly advancing technology of the biomedical-pharmacological sciences we not permit ourselves to be surprised by a capability in the hands of a potential enemy. And, finally, the exploitation of a chemical incapacitating capability may permit us to effectively control a critical situation while at the same time using weapons designed to avoid killing.

[Distributed to the Council and the Members of the League of Nations, Geneva, Jan. 15, 1931]

DOCUMENTS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

(Entrusted with the preparation for the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments)

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SESSION (SECOND PART) OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Memorandum by the British Delegation

The English text of the first paragraph of this Chapter, as agreed to at the second reading, is as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties undertake, subject to reciprocity, to abstain from the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases, and of all analogous liquids, substances or processes."

It may be recalled that, during the first part of the sixth session, certain delegations assumed that the intention was to prohibit the use of all chemical methods of warfare of every kind. On the other hand, there are some indications that this view is not shared by all States. It is at least possible that this difference in interpretation owes its origin to a serious ambiguity in the Geneva Gas Protocol of 1925, as well as in all Treaties and Conventions regulating gas warfare signed since the war. In the Geneva Protocol of June 1925, though the relevant portion of the French text is identical with that of the article quoted above, in the English text the French word "similaires" is translated by "other".

Basing itself on this English text, the British Government have taken the view that the use in war of 'other' gases, including lachrymatory gases, was prohibited. They also considered that the intention was to incorporate the same prohibition in the present Convention.

From every point of view it is highly desirable that a uniform construction should prevail as to whether or not the use of lachrymatory gases is considered to be contrary to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and/or to Chapter IV of the Draft Convention.

The British delegation proposes, therefore, to invite an expression of opinion on this point from all the States represented on this Commission.

Note by the French delegation regarding the British memorandum

I. All the texts at present in force or proposed in regard to the prohibition of the use *in war* of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases are identical. In the French delegation's opinion, they apply to all gases employed with a view to toxic action on the human organism, whether the effects of such action are a more or less temporary irritation of certain mucous membranes or whether they cause serious or even fatal lesions.

II. The French military regulations, which refer to the undertaking not to use gas for warfare (*gaz de combat*) subject to reciprocity, classify such gases as suffocating, blistering, *irritant* and poisonous gases in general, and define irritant gases as those causing *tears*, sneezing, etc.

III. The French Government therefore considers that the use of lachrymatory gases is covered by the prohibition arising out of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 or Chapter IV of the draft Convention.

The fact that, for the maintenance of internal order, the police, when dealing with offenders against the law, sometimes use various appliances discharging irritant gases cannot, in the French delegation's opinion, be adduced in a discussion on this point, since the Protocol or Convention in question relates only to the use of poisonous or similar gases *in war*.

[*Discussion*]

Lord Cecil (British Empire). This is not really a matter for me to make a speech about. The point is stated quite clearly. There is a little difference between the English and French text of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and there seems to be a certain difference in the practice of countries as to whether the prohibition extends or does not extend to those gases which are not dangerous to health. The French delegation have been good enough to circulate a statement in which they say that their practice is the same as ours in forbidding the use of all gases; but I do not know whether that is the case with other people, and my Government is anxious, if possible, to clear up the situation in that respect.

I have made my appeal here, and it is for each Government to say whether they feel able and disposed to make any reply to this appeal on the subject.

The President. The French delegation has already replied in writing, and Lord Cecil would like to know whether the other delegations can also state their views.

M. Antoniade (Roumania). My delegation was among those that proposed this prohibition, and I am therefore entirely in agreement with the construction which Lord Cecil has placed upon this article, which has also been explicitly confirmed in the note now submitted by the French delegation.

Dr. Markovitch (Yugoslavia). The Yugoslav delegation also urged the desirability of inserting in the Convention on the Limitation of Armaments an article dealing with the use of chemical arms. We fully agree with the interpretation given by the British deleation.

M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia). I entirely associate myself with the declarations which we have just heard, for the simple reason that it would be very difficult in warfare to make a clear distinction between gases which are lethal and gases which are not lethal.

Proposal by the United States Delegation

The Honorable Hugh Gibson (United States of America). I had hoped that it would not be necessary for me to make a statement on this subject, as I confess that I am not in a position to offer a sound and valuable opinion on the problem raised by the British delegation. However, as so many delegations have expressed their views on this subject, I feel there are certain considerations that should be laid before the commission.

The American delegation has examined with great interest and sympathy the memorandum on chemical warfare circulated by the British delegation. A very interesting and important problem is raised by this memorandum and one which it is essential to settle if we are to have the sort of clear-cut and straightforward international agreement on gas warfare which alone can be observed.

If, in the interpretation of the Gas Protocol, there is a broad border-line of doubtful cases. States, which endeavor to execute faithfully their treaty obligations, risk incurring the reproach of violation, if other States have a different conception of the scope of our agreement. I am particularly glad that the British delegation has brought this question forward now, and has asked for an expression of opinion from other del-

XUM

egations on the question of interpretation. This seems to me a distinctly useful step and I welcome the opportunity to lay certain considerations before the Commission, together with a suggestion as to how the whole problem may best be handled.

I confess that, after such study as I have been able to give to the matter, I find it extremely difficult to offer a useful opinion as to what sort of gas can be considered as falling within the scope of the text agreed to on second reading. This entire subject is so technical that I should like to lay before the Commission some of the problems involved in any decision, which, to my mind, show that any definite solution of this problem is beyond the technical competence of this body.

The primary question involved is as to the use of lachrymatory gases. While lachrymatory gases may serve some useful military purpose, for instance as harassing agencies, it is doubtless well-known to all my colleagues that the greatest use of lachrymatory gas is found, not in military service, but in police work either for controlling mobs, in which use it is certainly far more humane and probably more effective than the use of machine guns, sabres, or even truncheons, or it serves the purpose of effecting the capture of a barricaded criminal without bloodshed or loss of life.

Aside from this particular civil use of lachrymatory gas, the British document raises another far more interesting question of greater technical difficulty and wider ramifications. This question involves the use of smoke, which has a widely-accepted technical use for tactical screening purposes.

Smokes can either be chemical or mechanical in their nature and run the gamut from petroleum smoke, mechanical in character—inasmuch as it consists of particles of soot suspended in air—down the line to toxic smokes which are extremely lethal in character. In all probability, the most widely-used smoke for military screening purposes is white phosphorus, which has no chemical gas qualities, but which is a hideous and cruel agent if used against personnel before it has reached the stage of being a true smoke. Between white phosphorus and the true toxic smoke there exists an infinite number of gradations, most of which have well recognised chemical properties, and some of which are lethal in character. Logically, a statement as to the poisonous or non-poisonous or the lethal or non-lethal qualities, of smokes and gases, which might come under the terms of the text adopted of Chapter IV at second reading, would require prolonged study by technical experts with specialised knowledge of the subject, supported by expert specialised medical knowledge as to the properties and probable physical and pathological effects of these various agencies in normal and abnormal concentrations. I have sought to outline briefly some of the difficult problems with which the Commission might be faced, if we were to embark upon a general discussion of this subject now—difficulties which I fear we are quite unprepared to discuss without the backing of adequate technical knowledge. The problem before us is essentially one of doing away with agencies which cause unnecessary suffering, and it is important, if our prohibition of these inhumane agencies is to be all-inclusive and applicable, that we have definite knowledge of these various agencies and their effects, and of the ramification of any decisions we may take. On the other hand we seek a maximum prohibition of inhumane agencies, but, at the same time, we should not be led to bring into disrepute the employment of agencies which not only are free from the reproach of causing unnecessary suffering, but which achieve definite military or civil purposes by means in themselves more humane than those in use before their adoption. I think there would be considerable hesitation on the part of many Governments to bind themselves to refrain from the use in war, against an enemy, of agencies which they have adopted for peace-time use against their own population, agencies adopted on the ground that, while causing temporary inconvenience, they cause no real suffering or permanent disability, and are thereby more clearly humane than the use of weapons to which they were formerly obliged to resort to in times of emergency.

I have set forth the views of the American delegation on this subject at some length in order to lead up to a definite proposal. I think we are all in agreement as to the end in view. I hope the Commission will agree with me as to the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of our reaching a thoroughly sound agreement at this time, and of the need for mature scientific study.

I therefore venture to suggest that the British memorandum be noted in our report, that the importance of this subject be duly stressed, and that the various Governments represented at the Disarmament Conference be requested to give this entire subject careful study and consideration, with a view to arriving at that Conference equipped with adequate knowledge of the problem in all its aspects, in the hope that we may reach the sort of agreement we all desire.

[*Discussion*]

M. Sato (Japan). My Government agrees with the British interpretation.

M. Cobian (Spain). I agree with the British delegation's interpretation, because I think that the text approved at the second reading is so clear that it cannot give rise to any objections. It provides that the use in warfare of any kind of gas is prohibited—doubtless because it is very difficult to distinguish between lethal and non-lethal gases.

I entirely agree with M. Politis that it would be very dangerous to try to make war less inhumane, but I would add that we must not do anything which represents a refinement of cruelty. In my opinion, nothing is more opposed to all idea of civilization than that scientific knowledge should be used to devise methods of destruction.

M. Lounatcharsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). In 1929, the Soviet delegation proposed not only the renunciation of the use of gases in warfare, but also of their preparation in peace-time; this proposal, however, was rejected by the majority of the Commission.

We interpret this paragraph to mean that the use of all gases, including irritant gases, is prohibited.

As regards the text proposed by the French delegation, the Soviet delegation is of opinion that it is not for the Preparatory Commission to legalise the use of these gases by police forces, and it accordingly regards the third paragraph as unacceptable, particularly as one speaker referred to the use of gases by police forces for the purpose of controlling mobs.

M. Massigli (France). As the French delegation has expressed its views in writing, I need not repeat that it is in agreement with the British delegation. However, we have just heard some very interesting statements. and Mr. Gibson has touched the core of the problem. A significant silence was also observed by certain delegations, which shows that they are not at present in a position to state their views on the matter.

I therefore approve Mr. Gibson's proposal to mention the British memorandum in the report, so that it may be submitted to the Conference.

As regards the remark made by M. Lounatcharsky, I would merely point out that I have never asked this Commission to interpret the 1925 Protocol in any way, still less to unify the police regulations of the various countries. I can assure him that if this question arose, I should leave it to him to make proposals.

Dr. Woo Kaiseng (China). The Chinese delegation is entirely in sympathy with the British delegation's memorandum. It also agrees with the views of Mr. Gibson, the United States delegate, and considers that chemical warfare should be prohibited, and that these questions should be carefully examined. It is also of opinion that the manufacture of all gases, both asphyxiating and poisonous, should be prohibited, or at all events, limited.

General de Marinis (Italy). As regards Chapter IV, the Italian delegation interprets the 1925 Protocol, to mean that "other gases" include lachrymatory gases—that is to say that, subject to reciprocity, the use of lachrymatory gases is prohibited.

I gladly associate myself with Mr. Gibson's proposal to refer the examination of this question and the final decision to the Conference.

Dr. Riddell (Canada). Mr. President, I wish to thank the British delegation for giving us an opportunity of discussing this very important question. We are in entire sympathy with the interpretation given in the British memorandum. We also welcome the proposal of the United States delegation that all the delegations should come to the Disarmament Conference with as full and complete information on this subject as possible.

Munir Bey (Turkey). In reply to the British delegation, I desire to state that we also consider the use of lachrymatory gases prohibited by the Protocol. I should like to add, after hearing the statements made by previous speakers, that none of them seems to be opposed to the use of lachrymatory gases being prohibited. As certain Governments which signed the Protocol are not represented here, it is advisable that the result of this interpretation should be brought to the knowledge of those Governments, so that this Protocol may be interpreted in a uniform manner.

The President. I hope Lord Cecil is satisfied with the replies he has obtained. Judging from the discussion, I take it that Mr. Gibson's proposal, which is supported by M. Massigli, is approved by the Commission. The Governments are accordingly requested to study this question so that it may be settled at the Conference.

Lord Cecil (British Empire). I should like to say a word of thanks to my colleagues for the fullness with which many of them have replied to the question the British Government laid before them. I need not say that everything they have said will be brought to the notice of my Government and they will be as grateful as I am.

I entirely adhere to the suggestion of Mr. Gibson, and I venture to hope that those Governments whose delegations have not been able to reply on this occasion will convey especially to their Governments, and bring to their attention, all that has passed on the present occasion.

With regard to what M. Lounatcharsky and M. Woo Kaiseng said about the desirability of preventing the manufacture of these gases, I am in entire agreement with them, but they, too, will agree with me that the technical difficulties of prohibition are very great, owing to the course of science in matters which are quite removed from the manufacture of poisonous gases, but I quite agree that it is of little use to forbid the use of gases in times of war unless you can prevent their manufacture, and the preparation of their manufacture, in times of peace. The matter should be carefully studied, but it does not arise at this juncture.

The President. We can regard the discussion as closed.

I would draw your attention to one very important point—namely, that it is essential that the reservations made in regard to the various points of the report should be formu-

XUM

lated in very precise terms. I would therefore ask you to send them in this form to the Bureau, which will transmit them to the Rapporteurs.

The Commission rose at 1.20 p.m.

[From Science Magazine, Feb. 21, 1969]

DEFOLIATION IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—The author is assistant chief of the Crops Protection Research Branch, Crops Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland. The assessment and report on which this article is based were prepared by the author when he served as an adviser to the U.S. Department of State. That report was released in September 1968 by the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.)

(By Fred H. Tschirley)

An assessment of ecologic consequences of the defoliation program in Vietnam was undertaken at the request of the U.S. Department of State. This article is based on a report made as a part of an overall review of the defoliation and crop destruction programs in Vietnam.

The timetable for completion of the policy review required submittal of a report 1 month after my arrival in Vietnam on 15 March 1968. The period from mid-March to mid-April was the end of the dry season when many tree species are naturally defoliated. This added to the difficulty of determining the effects of herbicides on vegetation.

The dry season, the short time available, and the difficulty of making on-the-ground observations were restrictive for an ecologic evaluation. Thus, this report is not a detailed analysis, but an assessment based on the observations that were possible and on discussions with foresters and others knowledgeable about the local situation. The observations were supported by scientific reports and personal research experience in ecology and the effect of herbicides on vegetation in temperate and tropical America.

There were no constraints placed on what I was permitted to see in Vietnam nor on what I reported. Some areas and vegetative types could not be visited because there was not adequate time, or because safety could not be assured in areas of military activity. In other areas, inspections were limited to aerial observations because the sites were not sufficiently secure to permit ground assessments. Civilian and military elements of the U.S. mission in Vietnam gave me all the help and cooperation that was possible. The military provided aircraft for aerial surveys of defoliated and nondefoliated forests, arranged transport to Special Forces camps and a security force for observations from the ground, arranged briefings on all aspects of the defoliation program, and made available whatever records I wished to see on where and when forests were sprayed with defoliants. Civilian elements of the U.S. mission provided background information based on their experiences in Vietnam, aircraft for additional aerial surveys, introductions to Vietnamese foresters, and background material needed for writing my report. Probably the best indication of the lack of constraints on my activities was that the report which I prepared was released, without a word having been changed, by the U.S. mission in Saigon.

This article is essentially the same as the report I prepared in Vietnam. Some material has been deleted because of space limitations, but my observations and conclusions do not differ from the original report.

DEFOLIATED AREAS SURVEYED

Time did not permit a survey of all the defoliated areas in Vietnam. Therefore, my observations were limited to those areas where large blocks of forest had been sprayed with herbicides. The ecologic consequences of the defoliation program would be expected to be most evident and most readily definable in such areas.

The most intensive defoliation treatments in the mangrove vegetational complex have been applied in the Rung Sat Special Zone, an area that surrounds the shipping channel into Saigon. Defoliation of the mangrove was started in 1966, but most of the defoliation flights were made after June 1967. A block of about 460 square kilometers had been treated by the end of January 1968. The Rung Sat Special Zone was surveyed from a helicopter ranging in height from treetop level to about 1000 feet. Mangrove on the Ca Mau peninsula was surveyed from a C–123 flying at about 2000 feet. This flight also permitted a survey of a 1962 herbicidal treatment of mangrove on both sides of the Ong Doc River.

The most intensive defoliation treatments on upland semideciduous forest have been applied in war zones C and D and in the Demilitarized Zone. My efforts were limited to war zones C and D. War zone C is northwest of Saigon between the Song Be River and the Cambodian border; war zone D is northeast of Saigon between the Song Be and Song Dong Nai rivers. Blocks of about 920 and 1920 square kilometers have been sprayed in war zones C and D, respectively. Some areas withing those blocks have received two to four treatments. Defoliation in the semideciduous forest was observed from two relatively high-level flights in fixed-wing aircraft, six high- and low-level flights in helicopters, and observations from the ground in forests surrounding the four Special Forces camps of Thien Ngon, Katum, Tong Le Chon, and Bo Dop. Several hours were spent in the forest at each location to assess defoliation, refoliation, successional patterns, and to get an idea of the possible effects to the defoliation on wildlife. In addition to my own observations, men at the camps were questioned regarding the effect of defoliation on their operation, their impressions about the relative difficulty of human movement in the forest (a rough measure of the density and composition of the understory vegetation), and sightings they had made of wildlife.

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON CLIMATE

Not uncommonly one hears that large-scale modification of vegetation (forest to savanna or grassland, for example) or the vegetative denudation of an area will cause a change of climate, particularly in the amount of rainfall. The theory behind this statement is that as forest is converted to grassland or the soil is bared of vegetation, the evapotranspirational surface is reduced, and thus there is less moisture released to the atmosphere for subsequent precipitation. The fallacy of the theory is readily apparent when one considers the vast scale of atmospheric air flow, with the moisture it contains, and the relatively insignificant reduction in moisture that might be caused by reduced evapotranspiration from a small area. Some simple calculations point out the fallacy of the theory more explicitly.

By applying the reasoning used for an arid area,[1] let us apply some simple calculations to a forested area that is 100 kilometers on a side. If we assume, conservatively I think, that the total moisture in a vertical column of the atmosphere above the area has a depth of 3 centimeters and the air mass is moving over the area at a rate of 5 kilometers per hour, we can calculate that moisture is passing over the area at a rate of 4.17×10^9 grams per second. Now let us further assume that our hypothetical forest has been entirely denuded of vegetation and we reasoned that it may have been contributing 10 percent to the total atmospheric moisture. In other words, we expect a 10-percent decrease of rainfall after the vegetation is removed. Ten percent of the total atmospheric moisture would be 4.17×10^8 grams per second. In other words, our hypothetical forest would have to be contributing moisture to the atmosphere at a rate of 1.1×10^5 gallons per second. Such a figure is unreasonable. If we carry this calculation further and consider one tree with its branches in the upper or middle canopy for each 10 square meters, then evapotranspiration from each such area would have to be 417 milliliters per second. That is far beyond the measurements that have been made for salt cedar (*Tamarix pentandra*), one of the heaviest users of water.[2]

The work of Ohman and Pratt[3] also lends itself to this discussion. They measured dew point over and downwind from a desert irrigation project covering some 100,000 acres near Yuma, Arizona [annual precipitation about 3 inches]. Despite application of annual totals of from 5 to 10 feet of irrigation water on this area extending some 20 miles parallel to prevailing winds for the summer months studied, all influence of the irrigated fields upon crop-level dew points became immeasurably small only 100 feet to the lee of the downwind edge of the entire area. And at 12 feet (3.6 meters) above the crop level, dew points were not measurably increased even at points inside the irrigated acreage. These measurements were made under midday conditions in July and August when monthly totals of irrigation varied between about 0.7 and 1.5 feet of applied water. These measurements show the small effect that artificial measures have on atmosphere moisture content.

My conclusion is that defoliation in Vietnam has no significant measurable effect on atmospheric moisture and thus would have no effect on precipitation.

Another point that refutes the evapotranspiration-precipitation theory is that water molecules are not motionless in the atmosphere. Sutcliffe[4] estimated that the average time between a water molecule's evaporation into and its precipitation from the atmosphere was about 10 days. Thus, from consideration of the mean wind speed, the average water molecule must drift several hundred miles before it is precipitated.

Extensive defoliation would be expected to change temperature patterns through a forest profile simply because there would be less shielding of direct solar radiation. In addition, the average wind speed would be greater in a defoliated than in an undefoliated forest. These two factors probably would not have a great effect on higher plants and animals, but might temporarily affect lower life forms that are more dependent on specific microclimatic niches for growth and survival.

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON SOILS

One of the principal fears about exposing soil in the tropics is the possibility of increased laterization. The term laterite generally refers to an indurated concretionary deposit, high in iron or aluminum oxide content, which has formed in place by the weathering of rocks. True laterite hardens irreversibly. Laterite has been found to be best developed when the following conditions exist.[5] (i) The climate must have high rainfall and uniformly high temperatures. (ii) The topography must have been fairly gentle, peneplain in nature. (iii) A well-drained soil must have been present. This is usually an alluvial soil, but soils high in iron content may be an exception. (iv) There must have been a uniformly fluctuating water table which had a definite low level during the dry season. (v) Stable geological conditions must have existed for a long time.

About 30 percent of the soils of Vietnam have a potential for laterization.[5] Many of the red soils of Vietnam (often confused with laterite) dry out and become hard but soften again when wet. The soft doughy laterite, which hardens to a rocklike material when exposed to alternate wetting and drying, is not found in significant amounts in Vietnam.

Two kinds of laterite are found in Vietnam. Wormhole laterite is generally consolidated

---

Footnotes at end of article.

and occurs as massive beds, commonly at the bottom of a 1- to 30-foot layer of well-drained soil. It is red to brown in color, and has a slaggy appearance due to numerous holes, often interconnecting, and thus facilitate the passage of groundwater. Wormhole laterite occurs throughout most of the Mekong Terrace region, in soils of both forested and cultivated areas.

Pellet laterite is unconsolidated and occurs as small pellet-like concretions in an iron- or aluminum-rich soil. The hard concretions are usually surrounded by fine-grained material that is generally clayey when moist. The coarser particles in this fine-grained material are commonly iron-stained quartz sand. Pellet laterite occurs on the iron-rich basalt plateau soils of the Mekong Terrace, the basalt plateau of Ban Me Thuot, the extreme western edge of the high plateau west of Pleiku, and in a small area around Quang Ngai. Pellet laterite has been observed forming on the metamorphic rocks near Bong Son and on some of the rocks near Qui Nhon. It is likely that wormhole and pellet laterite could occur in the northeastern coastlands, but this has not been substantiated by field studies.

Laterization under natural conditions is a long-term process. The process is accelerated when soil is exposed to direct solar radiation and wind. I do not find it reasonable to conclude that the defoliation program in Vietnam would hasten the laterization process significantly because bare soil does not result from defoliation. It is possible, however, that laterization will be accelerated around base and Special Forces camps where the soil is maintained free of vegetation.

The amount of erosion that occurs as a consequence of defoliation depends on soil type, topography, relative degree of vegetative cover, and amount and intensity of rainfall. In general, erosion is greatest on steep slopes of bare soil, decreasing as slope decreases and as vegetation becomes more dense. It was not possible to examine defoliated forest in mountainous terrain for evidence of accelerated erosion. I did not detect such evidence during flights over the defoliated areas. Gully and sheet erosion were noted around camps where there was little or no vegetation, regardless of whether or not those areas were sprayed.

The possibilities of flooding or of changes in the water table as a result of defoliation are subjects that need careful consideration. The replacement of woody vegetation with grass in the southwestern United States has resulted in perennial flow of streams that were only intermittent before and also in the flow of springs that had been dry for many years. There are cases where harvesting trees increased stream flow[6] and where clear-cutting resulted in a marshy condition unsuitable for desirable timber species.[7] I mention these points because they have occurred elsewhere and could conceivably occur in Vietnam. But I do not know the local situation well enough to make a reasonable assessment of that probability.

Microorganisms are an essential feature of the soil system. A herbicide that killed the microorganisms would have a severe effect on soil ecology. What are the possibilities of destroying the microbial population in the soil with the chemicals being used for defoliation in Vietnam?

The code names for the defoliants used in Vietnam are Orange and White. The constituents of Orange are the normal butyl esters of (2,4-dichlorophenoxy)-acetic acid and (2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy) acetic acid, better known as 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, respectively, in a 1:1 ratio. The constituents of White are triisopropanolamine salts of 2,4-D and picloram (4 - amino - 3,5,6 - trichloropicolinic acid) in a 4:1 ratio. There seems to be no danger that any of these chemicals will kill microorganisms. Actually, numbers of soil microorganisms capable of inactivating 2,4-D apparently increase when 2,4-D is present in the soil. Thus, repeated applications of 2,4-D were less persistent in soil than the initial application.[8] There are no reports suggesting that the effect of 2,4,5-T on microorganisms is significantly different from that of 2,4-D. Picloram does not destroy soil microorganisms, but neither is the microbial population enriched as a result of picloram application. Thus, picloram cannot be considered a good energy source for microorganisms. The decomposition of picloram is an incidental process in the breakdown of soil organic matter, requiring the loss of approximately 10,000 to 100,000 pounds of organic matter per pound of herbicide.[9]

Footnotes at end of article.

EFFECT OF DEFOLIATION ON PLANT AND ANIMAL POPULATIONS

The chemicals 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are highly selective herbicides, but picloram is somewhat less selective. Not all plant species react similarly to them. The differential susceptibility may be a function of such factors as time of treatment, nature of the leaf surface, variable capacity for absorption and translocation of the herbicide, biochemistry of the plant, or the nature of the herbicide itself. Some established annual and perennial grasses are tolerant to rates of application used in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN). Thus, in any vegetative type, one would expect that some species would not be killed; some would be killed easily; others with difficulty. Most species in the mangrove association are highly susceptible to the herbicides being used for defoliation in Vietnam, and thus represent an exception to the general rule. For that reason, and because the mangrove association presents a different set of ecological considerations than the semideciduous forest does, each will be discussed separately.

MANGROVE FOREST

Botanical considerations. The mangrove association is relatively simple floristically. The principal species include: *Avicennia marina, A. intermedia, Rhizophora conjugata, Bruguiera parviflora, B. gymnorhiza, Ceriops candolleana, Nipa fruticans, Phoenix* spp., *Lumnitzera coccinea, Sonneratia acida, Melaleuca leucadendron, Excoecaria agallocha, Carapa obovata,* and *Acronychia laurifolio.*

Other plant species are represented in the mangrove type, but they are of lesser importance. Bamboo was not observed in the mangrove association.

Susceptibility to herbicides. The mangrove species seem to be almost uniformly susceptible to Orange and White, the herbicides used for their control in Vietnam. An exception is *Nipa fruticans*, which is reported to be resistant to White. Strips of mangrove on both sides of the Ong Doc River, sprayed with Orange in 1962, where of particular interest. The treated strips were still plainly visible. Thus, one must assume that the trees were not simply defoliated, but were killed.

Successful aspects. The mangrove type in the Republic of Vietnam occurs on about 2800 square kilometer.[10] *Avicennia marina* is the pioneer species of the mangrove type, colonizing on the clay accretion areas at the sea face. At the 5th and 6th year *Rhizophora conjugata, Bruguiera parviflora,* and *Ceriops candolleana* will develop where there has been partial stabilization of the soil. At about the 20th year *Rhizophora* and *Bruguiera* will dominate the site. From that point on, further succession depends on the degree of silting and the consequent decrease of water circulation. As organic matter accumulates, conditions are created for the advent of other species into the mangrove complex. The final stage in the mangrove type is the cajeput (*Melaleuca leucadendron*), found on the highest, most stable soil above high tide.

Seed production of mangrove species is annual and abundant to prolific, with seeds viviparous or otherwise, of high germinability and capable of remaining viable for long periods.[11] Germination and rooting are usually rapid and successful. In some locations, when the seeds are able to settle as a result of favorable water conditions, natural regeneration may become successfully established in less than a year. The movement of the water, however, may not only bring in seeds but may also carry them away before they can take root.

TABLE 1.—THE TOTAL CATCH, IN METRIC TONS, FOR THE PAST 3 YEARS IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Year	Fish		
	Fresh water	Marine	Others[1]
1965	57,000	289,000	29,000
1966	64,710	287,450	28,340
1967	54,300	324,700	31,700

[1] Including cuttlefish, mollusks, shrimp, crabs, and the like.

The most serious animal pest is the crab, which may entirely prevent regeneration by attacks on seedlings.[12] In Malaya two species of *Acrostichum* (a fern) may hinder the establishment of waterborne seedlings. The fern grows and spreads rapidly when the tree cover is removed. McKinley [10] mentions two ferns (Choai, a creeping form; Don, an erect form) as occurring in the climax mangrove, but does not comment on their possible interference with regeneration.

Ecological considerations. According to the timetable discussed by McKinley, about 20 years are required for the establishment of a dominant *Rhizophora-Bruguiera* association. That timetable was established for a situation in which newly silted areas were colonized by *Avicennia* and then were replaced by *Rhizophora-Bruguiera.* It is not unreasonable to suspect that the same timetable might apply to areas in which the trees had been killed by herbicides. Dead trees do not hold soil as well as living trees do. The amount of soil removed would depend on the rapidity of tidal recession, which is unknown to me. The greater the amount of soil removed, the greater would be the time required for regeneration of a mangrove stand similar to the original.

The regeneration of mangrove since the 1962 treatments along the Ong Doc River was observed from an aircraft flying at 2000 feet (600 meters). Regeneration was apparent as fingers extending into the treated strip, but I could not determine whether regeneration had occurred across the entire breadth of the treated strip.

In the mangrove areas treated in 1962, trees of the colonizing species were not yet discernible from 600 meters on all the treated area. Thus, if the information provided by McKinley is extrapolated, 20 years may be a reasonable estimate of the time needed for this forest to return to its original condition.

There is little information available on the effect of killing mangrove on animal populations. In that regard, I considered the food chain among aquatic organisms. Although it was not possible to obtain information on the many links in the food chain, phytophagous and carnivorous fish would be near the top of the food chain. Disruption of lower links in the chain might be expected to reduce fish populations.

Information on fish populations is based on fish catch statistics provided by the Fisheries Branch of U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) (Table 1). Fish catch appears to have been increasing. The drop for freshwater fish in 1967 was at first a cause for concern. But the assistant chief of

XUM

inland fisheries explained that the reduction was due to an absence of flooding in the Mekong Delta in 1967. When flooding does occur, fish are trapped in rice paddies and fishermen have no trouble catching them.

The statistics on the fish catch give a strong indication that the aquatic food chain has not been seriously disturbed. Data comparable to those available for fish were not available for birds and other animals.

The application of herbicide in strips or in a checkerboard pattern rather than large-area treatment would have an ecologic advantage. The trees remaining in untreated strips would provide a seed source for reforestation as well as a habitat for animals and lower plant forms. The ecological effects in large treated areas would be greater and recovery probably be slower.

SEMIDECIDUOUS FOREST

The Republic of Vietnam has a total area of 172,540 square kilometers, of which about 30 percent is forested [10] (Table 2). Some coniferous forest may have been treated in strips along roads, but I have no specific information on that point. I am sure that no large areas of coniferous forest have been treated.

Botanical considerations. I will not attempt to characterize all of the vegetation types of the Republic of Vietnam. There are different forest types, but except for the pine forest, the differences are ones of degree rather than substance. My discussion of the forests in III Corps can be extrapolated to other semideciduous forests of RVN. It cannot be extrapolated to the pine forests or to the small area of rain forest that probably exists in a small area of the northwestern part of RVN, along the Laotian border.

The forests of war zone C are, for the most part, secondary forests with an admixture of bamboo, and semideciduous forest of *Lagerstroemia* and legumes (General Forest map of RVN, Phan Thuong Tuu, 1966). The forests of war zone D are moist forest over most of the area, and semideciduous forest of *Lagerstroemia* and legumes over the remainder.

There are obvious differences among the three forest types. The differences are taxonomic for the most part. Physiognomically, they are similar. In terms of ecologic considerations, therefore, they will be discussed collectively.

The three forests are similarly characterized by having members of the family Dipterocarpaceae as dominant trees in the upper canopy. This does not mean necessarily that dipterocarps are numerically superior. Other well-represented families include the Leguminosae, Meliaceae, Lythraceae, Guttiferae, and Sterculiaceae.[10] [13] [14] Botanical composition, taxonomically and numerically, varies from one location to another.

The difficulty of a botanic description of the forest may be appreciated with the knowledge that about 1500 woody species occur in RVN.[10] Moreover, I saw the forests at a time when identification was most difficult. Many species are normally deciduous during the dry season; many that are normally evergreen had been defoliated by herbicides or fire.

The period from mid-March to mid-April was not an ideal time to assess the ecologic impact of the defoliation program on the semideciduous forests of the Republic of Vietnam. The combination of natural defoliation, defoliation by herbicides, and defoliation by many, many fires (civilian and military caused) made the determination of the causes of defoliation difficult. A careful delineation of the causative factors within a 1-month period was not possible. An observer making an ecologic assessment during the middle or latter part of the rainy season would not have to contend with the confounding influences of natural defoliation and fire.

Susceptibility to herbicides. Trees in the semideciduous forests of Vietnam are almost uniformly susceptible in terms of initial defoliation. But when defoliation and the percentage of plants killed are considered, the average susceptibility of the vegetative type is unknown. The best estimate I can obtain is an extrapolation of data developed in Thailand by Darrow *et al.*[15] and in Puerto Rico by Tschirley *et al.*[16]

TABLE 2.—THE TYPES OF FOREST, THEIR AREA OF COVERAGE, AND THE APPROXIMATE AREA TREATED FOR DEFOLIATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Vegetation type	Coverage (km²)	Area treated (km²)
Open forest (semideciduous forest)	50,150	8,140
Flooded area:		
Mangrove	2,800	960
Other aquatic plants	2,000	0
Coniferous forest:		
3-leaved pine	900	0
2-leaved pine	350	0

Darrow's tests in Thailand were conducted in a semievergreen monsoon forest having an annual precipitation of about 40 inches. Two hundred twenty plant species were identified from two test sites totaling 3400 acres, so species diversity was high. Darrow found that two or more gallons of Purple (same as Orange except that 20 percent of the 2,4,5,-T is an isobutyl ester rather than *n*-butyl ester) caused defoliation greater than 60 to 65 percent for a period of 6 to 8 or 9 months. Percentages of kill were not given, but they would have been considerably lower than for defoliation.

My collaborators and I worked in a semievergreen forest in Puerto Rico [16] having an annual precipitation of about 85 inches. Species diversity was high; 106 woody species were recorded on 2.4 acres, in an area adjacent to the aerial test pilots. We also worked in a tropical rain forest in Puerto Rico having an annual precipitation of about 120 inches.[16] About 88 woody species were recorded for the rain forest site. Defoliation of the semievergreen forest treated with 3 gallons of Purple was 61 percent 6 months after treatment. In the rain forest, an equivalent rate of Orange provided 66 percent defoliation 6 months after treatment and 55 percent 1 year after treatment.

Thus, the defoliation obtained in taxonomically distinct forests in opposite parts of the world was similar. It is justifiable, then, to expect that average defoliation in the semideciduous forests of Vietnam would be about the same. Actually, I would expect defoliation in Vietnam to be somewhat lower because applications are made from greater height than was the case for the experimental work in Thailand and Puerto Rico.

Multiple treatments were not made in Thailand or Puerto Rico, so the effects of two and three treatments in war zones C and D can only be inferred from extensive experience in woody plant control in temperate zones and from my experience in tropical America, instead of being extrapolated from actual research data. But the inference is necessary because the ecologic impact becomes greater with each succeeding treatment.

A single treatment with 3 gallons of Orange or White would not be expected to have a great or lasting effect on a semideciduous forest in Vietnam. Some trees would be killed, and the canopy would be less dense temporarily. But within several years the canopy would again be closed, and even a careful observer would be hard pressed to circumscribe the treated area. A second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect.

Research on a two-storied oakyaupon forest in Texas showed that the top canopy intercepted about 72 percent of the spray droplets and the understory intercepted an additional 22 percent. Only 6 percent of the droplets reached the ground.[16] Thus, one would expect that the principal effect from an initial treatment would be on trees of the top canopy. As the density of the top canopy is reduced, subsequent treatments will kill more trees in the top canopy and have a far greater effect on the understory, regenerating vegetation.

The theoretical response to multiple herbicide applications was supported by my observations on the ground. The area visited at Thien Ngon was sprayed with Orange on 19 December 1966; the area at Katum was treated with White on 9 November 1966 and with Orange on 28 October 1967. Two areas were visited at Tong Le Chon; one was treated with Orange on 23 September 1967, and the other was treated with White on 7 November 1966. There were more dead trees and a higher percentage of defoliation at Katum than at any other site. Granting the inadequacy of the sample at each location, the difference between Katum and the other sites was obvious. Despite more defoliation and more dead trees at Katum, the ground was not bare. Many established grasses are tolerant to the herbicides used. In addition, grasses, sedges, and vines quickly occupy areas that have been defoliated. Grasses were abundant in all defoliated areas observed on the ground.

Successful aspects. I can think of no better introduction to this section than a quotation from Richards: [17]

"The process of natural regeneration in tropical forests is no doubt exceedingly complex, and though its practical importance to the forester is obvious, surprisingly little is known about it. Much of what has been written about the so-called 'natural regeneration' of rain forest refers to the reproduction of a few economic species under conditions rendered more or less unnatural by the exploitation of timber. Before regeneration under these artificial conditions can be understood or controlled scientifically, we need to know what happens under undisturbed conditions, and information about this is extremely scanty."

I must emphasize the last sentence of the quotation. Data on regeneration of tropical forests is indeed scanty—and particularly scanty for Vietnam!

There is general agreement that the usual successional series in a terrestrial tropical forest is grass—shrub—secondary forest—primary forest.[14] [17] [18] The same successional series could be applied equally well to deciduous forests in temperate zones.

Because of the inadequacy of data about forest regeneration in Vietnam, perhaps an example in a different situation would be instructive. The island of Krakatau presents a good example of ecologic succession. Richards described the island as follows: [17]

"Krakatau is one of a group of small volcanic islands situated between Java and Sumatra. Early in 1883 it was about 9 km long and 5 km broad, rising to a peak 2,728 ft (822 m) above sea level. At this date the whole island was covered with luxuriant vegetation. About the nature and composition of this vegetation next to nothing is known, but there is every reason for supposing that it was mostly tropical rain forest similar to that now existing in the neighboring parts of Sumatra. In May 1883, the volcano which had long been regarded as extinct began to be active and the activity gradually increased until it reached a climax on August 26 and 27. On these two days occurred the famous eruption, the sound of which was heard as

---

Footnotes at end of article.

far away as Ceylon and Australia. More than half the island sank beneath the sea, the peak being split in two, though its highest point still remained. The surviving parts of Krakatau were covered with pumice stone and ash to an average depth of about 30 m and a new marginal belt 4.6 km^2 in area was added to the southern coast. During the period of volcanic activity the bulk of the vegetation was certainly destroyed."

For a while the island remained without any vegetation. The only living thing a visitor saw in May 1884 was one spider. In 1886 there was already a considerable amount of vegetation on the island and the succeeding seral stages have developed quite rapidly.

In 1964 Richards wrote about the ecology of Krakatau:

"The development of vegetation on Krakatau has not yet reached a stable climax stage, but the general course of future changes can be predicted with some confidence, at least for the middle and upper regions of the island. In the former it may be expected that the *Macaranga-Ficus* woodland will develop by a series of changes into a stable climax rain forest to some extent similar to the mixed primary rain forest of the neighboring parts of Sumatra and Java. How long this development will take is difficult to guess, but the study of secondary successions suggests that it will be much longer than from the great eruption to the present day."

The example of Krakatau cannot, and should not, be applied to the semideciduous forests of Vietnam for at least three reasons. (i) Defoliation does not destroy all vegetation; (ii) it does not cover the soil with pumice stone and ash; and (iii) RVN is not an island. Krakatau is merely an example of the relative time needed for the development of a mature forest when it must start from nothing. That is not the case in Vietnam.

There are a few records available for tree ages in tropical forests that give an indication of the time required for regeneration of a mature forest. An average individual of *Parashorea malaanonan* in the Philippine dipterocarp forest reaches a diameter of 80 centimeters in 197 years.[19] The average maximum age of *Shorea leprosula* in Malaya is 250 years.[20] Both are primary forest species. The fast-growing trees characteristic of secondary forest have a shorter life than do primary forest species.

The principal ecologic danger imposed by repeated treatments with herbicides is that saplings and poles present in the lower story, and then seedlings, may be killed. If that happens in large areas, natural reseeding may be a problem. Dipterocarp seeds are disseminated by the wind and thus would be expected to be among the first tree species to repopulate an area. Seeds of other species, dependent on dissemination by small mammals and rodents and by birds, would probably not spread as rapidly. Seeds of some species would undoubtedly remain viable in the soil and would germinate after the last in a series of multiple treatments. Many species in the family Leguminosae have that capability. Less is known about seed characteristics in other families. Turrill [21] reported it has been proved at Rothamstead that seeds of arable weeds remained viable in soil under pasture after 300 years in one area and 30 to 40 years in others:

"Little is known of the time scale of secondary successions in the tropics. Chevalier (1948) states that the forest on the site of the ancient town of Angkor Vat in Cambodia, destroyed probably some five or six centuries ago, now resembles the virgin tropical forest of the district, but still shows certain differences. In general, it seems clear that the longer the period between the destruction of the primary forest and the onset of the secondary succession and the greater the modification of the soil and the environment in general during this period, the longer the time needed for the re-establishment of the climax." [17]

The paragraph quoted does not apply to the forests being defoliated in Vietnam because the Vietnamese forests were not primary, but secondary, at the time of treatment. The time required for the establishment of a secondary forest is much less than for a primary forest.

The greatest danger resulting from repeated defoliation treatments in Vietnam is that such areas will be invaded by bamboo. The presence of bamboo is the most constant feature of the semi-deciduous forests I saw in Vietnam. Species of large bamboo (the most common being *Dendrocalamus strictus* and *Bambusa arundinacea* according to a local RVN forester) are particularly apparent in areas where the "rai" (slash and burn) system of agriculture has been practiced. But bamboo is not limited to areas that were previously cleared of trees. A small-stemmed bamboo is present as an understory in many forested areas and can be seen frequently where trees have been defoliated. In addition, the small bamboo *Schizostachyum sollingeri*, 10 to 15 feet high, was present in the forest at all of the camps I visited. The presence of bamboo in Asian forests is well documented.[17] [22] Aerial observations in RVN suggest that it first invades new areas along routes of more favorable mositure supply From there it can spread throughout the forest.

While making ground observations at the four Special Forces camps, I attempted to evaluate the relative density of seedling and sapling tree species in bamboo-infested sites. Although I have no quantitative data, seedlings were rare in dense bamboo, but frequent to numerous where there was no bamboo. Probably of more importance is the fact that saplings were rare in dense bamboo.

The length of time that bamboo might retard the natural successional progression is unknown, but I am certain it would cause a retardation. The following statement by Ahmed [23] may be cause for concern: "A bamboo will be the first member to colonize on a new site in a seed year and will be the last to leave it. Once established on a soil it is difficult to eradicate it."

The life history of different bamboo species varies, but usually culms die after flowering. The germination to flowering cycle may be from 30 to 50 years.[17] [24] Flowering is gregarious (whole populations flowering in 1 year) in some species and sporadic in others. Most bamboo species have very efficient vegetative reproduction from buds on creeping rhizomes.

Seedling mortality of tree species is naturally high in tropical forests. A study of *Euterpe globosa*, a palm found in the American tropics, showed that the mortality of seedlings was 95 percent, of established seedlings 12 percent, and of shrubs 64 percent. Thus, only 1.6 percent of the seedlings survived to become trees.[25] Another study [25] showed the average half-life of all seedlings in test plots to be 6 months.

If it were not for the probable invasion by bamboo of severely defoliated areas in the forests of Vietnam, I am reasonably certain that the successional progression to a secondary forest would proceed without undue retardation. A reason for feeling so is based on data I obtained from plots in Puerto Rico that were treated at the rate of 3, 9, and 27 pounds per acre as follows: picloram, 5-bromo-3-*sec*-butyl-6-methyluracil [bromacil], 3,6-dichloro-*o*-anisic acid [dicamba], 3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea [diuron]. (2,3,6-trichlorophenyl) acetic acid [fenac], and 2,4-bis(isopropylamino)-6-(methylthio)-*s*-triazine [prometone] applied to the soil. Two years after treatment, the plots were examined for the presence of seedlings. Many of the secondary forest species and several primary forest species were present as seedlings. In addition, there was no apparent differential effect of the six herbicides.

The presence of seedlings on plots treated with such high rates of herbicides is an important point. Several of the herbicides, particularly fenac and picloram, persist in soil. There is no doubt that highly susceptible plant species would be affected by herbicide residues in the soil. But experience has shown that species commonly present in forests are not so susceptible that regeneration would be prevented. The small experimental plots in Puerto Rico were treated with 27 pounds per acre of picloram; one treatment with White in Vietnam would apply only 1.5 pounds of picloram per acre.

In conclusion, the time scale for succession in a semideciduous forest in RVN is unknown. Single treatments with defoliants should not cause severe successional problems but multiple treatments probably will because of site dominance by bamboo.

Ecologic considerations. The ecologic considerations as they apply to plant populations were discussed in the previous section of this article. The effect of defoliation on animal populations is truly unknown.

Men stationed at Special Forces camps have told me of seeing deer (two reports), birds (many reports), tiger (one sighting, several sound identifications), elephant (two reports), monkey (numerous reports), and cold-blooded vertebrates (numerous reports). I saw a tiger track in the road at Katum. There were no reports of bovines. It is possible that such bovines as the kouprey, gaur, and banteng, reported to be rare,[26] are no longer present in the defoliated areas in war zones C and D. But I suspect that bombing, artillery, fire, human presence, and hunting have had a far greater effect than has defoliation.

TOXICITY OF HERBICIDES

A discussion of ecologic effects would hardly be complete without mentioning the relative toxicity of herbicides being used for defoliation and crop destruction. The herbicides used in Vietnam are only moderately toxic to warm-blooded animals. None deserve a lengthy discussion except for Agent Blue (cacodylic acid), which contains arsenic. Inorganic arsenicals such as arsenic trioxide, sodium arsenite, lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, and Paris green are extremely toxic. Organic arsenicals, such as Blue, have a low mammalian toxicity. Two series of organic arsenicals are used as herbicides. The arsonic acid series is formed by a single organic group combined directly to arsenic; the arsinic acid series have two organic groups. By varying the organic group in either series, a wide range of phytotoxicities can be obtained in products with a relatively low level of mammalian toxicity [26] (table 3).

Toxicity studies for White have shown the oral dose needed to kill 50 percent of test animals to be (LD_{50}) 3080 milligrams per kilogram for rats, 2000 for sheep, and more than 3163 for cattle.[27] The oral dose for Blue is 2600 milligrams per kilogram for rats.[28] There is no evidence to suggest that the herbicides used in Vietnam will cause toxicity problems for man or animals.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

If my assignment had been simply to determine if the defoliation program had an ecological effect, the answer would have been a simple "yes," and a trip to the country would not have been necessary. But to assess the magnitude of the ecologic effect is an entirely different matter.

TABLE 3

The LD_{50} (dose in milligrams per kilogram of body weight needed to kill 50 percent of test animals) for the herbicides used in RVN and for several other chemical compounds are as follows: [29]

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

Chemical:	LD_{50}
Sodium arsenite	10–50
Paraquat [1]	150
2,4,5-T	100–300
2,4-D	300–1000
Cacodylic acid [2]	830
Aspirin	1775
Picloram	8200

[1] 1,1′-Dimethyl-4,4′-bipyridinium salt.

[2] Active ingredient of Agent Blue.

One must realize that biologic populations, even those remote from man, are dynamic. Seasonal changes, violent weather events, fire, birth, maturation, senescence. and death cause a continuing ecologic flux. Normally, the ecologic flux operates within narrow limits in a climax community. It is only catastrophic events that cause an extreme ecologic shift and reduce the community to a lower seral stage.

The defoliation program has caused ecologic changes. I do not feel the changes are irreversible, but complete recovery may take a long time. The mangrove type is killed with a single treatment. Regeneration of the mangrove forest to its original condition is estimated to require about 20 years.

A single treatment on semideciduous forest would cause an inconsequential ecologic change. Repeated treatments will result in invasion of many sites by bamboo. Presence of dense bamboo will then retard regeneration of the forest. The time scale for regeneration of semideciduous forest is unknown. Available information is so scanty that a prediction would have no validity and certainly no real meaning. Most of the defoliation treatments in the semideciduous forests have been made in strips along lines of communication. The ecologic effect of defoliation in those areas would not be as severe as in areas where large blocks have been treated.

The effect of defoliation on animals is not known, but it does not appear to have been extreme. I hasten to add that I know far less about animals than about plants. Fish catch has increased during a period of intensive treatment for defoliation, which surprised and pleased me. Actual data were not available for population trends of other forms of animal life. Large mammals have been seen recently in war zones C and D, the areas of greatest defoliation activity. Included were tiger, monkey, elephant, and deer.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The desirability of ecologic research in Vietnam after the war ends cannot be overemphasized. The research should be administered through an institution that will provide continuity and breadth for the research program. The opportunity of establishing ecologic research under the International Biological Program should be explored.

(2) Continuing assessment of the defoliation program as it affects forestry and watershed values should be made. Ground observations are most desirable, but aerial surveys during various seasons of the year will contribute much good information.

(3) From an ecologic point of view, the concept of defoliating in strips or in a checkerboard pattern has great merit. Undefoliated areas would serve as a seed source for regeneration and as habitat for wildlife.

FOOTNOTES

[1] J. E. McDonald, *Weather* 17, 1 (1962).

[2] J. P. Decker, *Plant Physiol.* 37, 393 (1962).

[3] H. L. Ohman and R. L. Pratt, "The daytime influence of irrigation upon desert humidities," *Tech. Rep. No. EP-35* (U.S. Army Quartermasters R & D Command, 1956).

[4] R. C. Sutcliffe, *Quart. J. Meteorol.* Soc. 82, 394 (1956).

[5] J. F. Taranik and E. J. Cording, "Laterite and its engineering properties," *Mimeo Rep. 579th Engin. Detachment* (*Terrain*) (U.S. Army, A.P.O. 96491, 1967).

[6] G. R. Trimble, Jr., K. G. Reinhart, H. H. Webster, *J. Forestry* 61, 635 (1963).

[7] W. F. Johnston, *ibid.* 66, 566 (1968).

[8] T. J. Sheets and L. L. Danielson, "Herbicides in soils," *Tech. Rep. No. ARS–20–9* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Washington, D.C., 1960), p. 170.

[9] C. R. Youngson, C. A. I. Goring, R. W. Meikle, M. H. Scott, J. D. Griffith, *Biokemia* 1967 (No. 15), 19 (1967).

[10] T. W. McKinley, *The Forests of Free Vietnam* (Ministry of Agriculture, Saigon, 1957) (in English and Vietnamese).

[11] *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 129 (1958).

[12] D. S. P. Noakes, *ibid.* 2, 309 (1957).

[13] Thai Cong Tung, *Natural Environment and Land Use in South Vietnam* (Ministry of Agriculture, Saigon, 1967), p. 156.

[14] L. Williams, "Vegetation of Southeast Asia—studies of forest types," *Tech. Rep. No. CR–49–65* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1965).

[15] R. A. Darrow, G. B. Truchelut, C. M. Bartlett, "OCONUS defoliation test program," *Tech. Rep. No. 79* (U.S. Army Biology Center, Fort Dietrick, Md., 1966), p. 149.

[16] F. H. Tschirley *et al.*, "Response of tropical and subtropical woody plants to chemical treatments," *Tech. Rep. No. CR–13–67* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 197.

[17] P. W. Richards, *The Tropical Rain Forest—An Ecological Study* (Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1964), p. 450.

[18] *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 59 (1958).

[19] W. H. Brown, cited in (*15*).

[20] J. G. Watson, *Malayan Forester* 6, 146 (1937).

[21] W. B. Turrill, *Gardener's Chron.* 142, 37 (1957).

[22] L. Williams, "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico, and Texas," *Tech. Rep. No. CR–12–67* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 410; anonymous, *Trop. Silviculture* 1, 151 (1958); "Timber trends and prospects in the Asia-Pacific Region," *FAO ECAFE Publ. No. E/CN, 11/533* (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 1961), p. 224.

[23] K. J. Ahmed, *Trop. Silviculture* 2, 287 (1957).

[24] F. A. McClure, *The Bamboos, A Fresh Perspective* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966), p. 347.

[25] H. T. Odum, *Annual Report 1965* (Puerto Rico Nuclear Center, Rio Piedras, 1965), p. 220.

[26] W. B. House, L. H. Goodson, H. M. Gadberry, K. W. Docktor, "Assessment of ecological effects of extensive or repeated use of herbicides," *Midwest Research Institute Rep. No. 3103–B* (Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Mo., 1967), p. 369.

[27] G. E. Lynn, *Down Earth* 20, 9 (1965); J. T. Weimer *et al.*, *Toxicological Studies Relating to the Use of White* (*Tordon 101*) *as a defoliant* (U.S. Army Edgewood Arsenal Pharmacology Laboratories, Edgewood, Md., 1967).

[28] *Book on Organic Arsenicals* (Ansul Chemical Co., Marinette, Wis., 1965).

[29] H. M. Hull, *Herbicide Handbook of the Weed Society of America* (Humphrey Press, Geneva, N.Y., 1967), p. 293.

CHEMICAL CARGOES POSE THREAT—DERAILMENTS NOW GRAVE DANGER

WASHINGTON (UPI).—"In the past, it wasn't a big deal, but now if you have a derailment you might blow a whole town off the map."

Talking was a government safety expert investigating the growing number of disasters triggered by the derailment of railroad tank cars filled with volatile explosives, and lethal chemicals and gases.

TANK CAR SPLIT OPEN

In Crete, Neb., last month 19 cars of a Chicago, Burlington & Quincy freight jumped the track, sliced open a tank car parked on a siding, and let loose its cargo of anhydrous ammonia, an acrid fertilizer used for its high nitrogen content.

The deadly ammonia seeped into nearby homes and killed five persons. Three others who had hitched rides on the freight died in the wreck and 36 other persons suffered injuries because of the gas.

In January, 15 cars of a Southern Railway freight train derailed at Laurel, Miss., rupturing a tank car filled with propane gas and setting off a chain of explosions and fires.

TOWN EVACUATED

The blast sent chunks of the tank car whistling through the air like mammoth pieces of shrapnel and a 10-block area of Laurel was set afire, but somehow only two persons were killed.

In Dunreith, Ind., the same type of catastrophe occurred in December, 1968, when a Penn Central freight train derailed, touching off a fire in a chemical-carrying tank car.

The fire caused an explosion and the entire town was evacuated. There were no deaths but the fire destroyed the town's major industry, a cannery, seven homes, and polluted a nearby stream. The total damage: over $1 million.

The Interstate Commerce Commission says that the output of industrial chemicals has gone up 350 per cent since World War II. Nearly two billion pounds of industrial explosives are transported each year—along with a rising tide of military explosives. Added to this list of dangerous cargoes are shipments of rocket fuel, and radioactive material.

NEW POTENTIAL FOR DEATH

"It is now obvious that railroads derailment accidents, dangerous enough in themselves, have acquired a new and catastrophic potential for death and destruction previously unknown," said John H. Reed, a member of the national Transportation Safety Board.

In addition to the vastly increased number of dangerous shipments that could cause catastrophe in a derailment, there are now more derailments themselves than there have been in the past.

Between 1961 and 1967, derailment accidents increased 85 percent. In 1967, the last year for which complete figures were available, the railroads reported 4,960 derailments. Out of this total, 1,611 were caused by defective equipment.

RAIL INDUSTRY BLAMED

The Railway Labor Executives Assn. blames the railroad industry maintenance for the rising number of derailments. They are also highly critical of the lack of federal legislation to enforce rail safety.

Most railroad accidents are investigated by the railroads themselves and the results reported to the government.

"Clearly, self-policing by the railroads puts the public's safety in second place when it comes to the biggest cause of train accidents—faulty equipment and rail lines," the RLEA claims.

The National Transportation Safety Board also has warned Congress that because of the "relatively high rate of derailments, collisions and grade crossing accidents there appears to be a need for a general re-examination of existing railroad maintenance and operating procedures."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the recommittal vote on House Resolution 270, I was present and voted against recommittal. However, on final passage I was before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and therefore missed the vote on final passage of that resolution.

I would like to have the RECORD show

XUM

that had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the measure.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Price of Illinois). The gentleman's explanation will appear in the Record.

REPORT ON REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure at your direction to accompany a group of Members of the House of Representatives who visited the Republic of Korea during the first week of March. All members of our delegation found the trip to be interesting, informative, and extremely worthwhile.

In order that we may properly report to you and to the House on our visit to the free and democratic Republic of Korea, I have taken this special order.

The visit of our delegation to the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea resulted from an invitation extended to the Speaker by the distinguished Vice Speaker of the Korean National Assembly, the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang, who suggested in his invitation that an exchange of views between our two legislative bodies would be beneficial to our respective countries.

The Speaker was unable to attend and he designated me to represent him and to serve as chairman of the group. The delegation from the House was made up of 23 Members of Congress who were invited after consultation with the Speaker the minority leader, and others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert the list of members of the delegation.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Price of Illinois). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF THE KOREAN DELEGATION

DEMOCRATS

Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, chairman;
W. R. Poage, of Texas;
Melvin Price, of Illinois;
Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts;
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts;
Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey;
Joseph E. Karth, of Minnesota;
Richard T. Hanna, of California;
Edward J. Patten, of New Jersey;
Eligio de la Garza, of Texas;
Thomas S. Foley, of Washington;
Lee H. Hamilton, of Indiana;
David Pryor, of Arkansas;
Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina;

REPUBLICANS

Jackson Betts, of Ohio;
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey;
William S. Broomfield, of Michigan;
Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota;
Chester Mize, of Kansas;
J. William Stanton, of Ohio;
Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah;
Thomas S. Kleppe, of North Dakota;
John N. Camp, of Oklahoma.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, 16 committees of the House were represented in the group. The Members ranged from among the most senior to those serving their first term. There were 14 Democrats and nine Republicans.

Nearly all geographic areas of the country were represented from the east coast to the west coast and from the North to the South.

Our delegation represented, in the very truest sense of the word, a cross section of the House, reflecting very accurately, I feel, the political philosophies and the regional as well as the national interests of this body.

We left the United States on February 28 and arrived in Korea to a very warm welcome on Sunday afternoon, March 2.

We left to return to the United States early in the morning on March 7.

We had no set agenda for our meetings and discussions and selected in advance no particular topics to be discussed.

It is impossible for me adequately to decribe the enthusiastic and warm reception and hospitality accorded our group.

Never, in my experience, has any congressional delegation been given a more heartfelt welcome.

Never have any of us come away from a country with a greater appreciation and understanding for such a strong and gallant ally.

We were privileged to visit with the President of the Republic of Korea and other leaders of his government, as well as the Speaker and leaders of the majority and opposition parties in the National Assembly.

We received extensive briefings from the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defense, the Foreign Minister, the Economic Planning Board, and the CIA. We also received very informative briefings from our distinguished Ambassador to Korea, Hon. William J. Porter and from the able commander of U.S. and U.N. forces, Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel III, and their staffs.

Also, as I said, we met with the Speaker and leaders of both parties in the Korean National Assembly.

We discussed at length the great progress being made by the Republic of Korea.

Never have we seen a more energetic, more enthusiastic, more determined people than the people of the Republic of Korea.

The economic progress they are making is amazing.

On every hand we could see new construction and new development.

Private business is taking a new and very justified look at Korea for investment purposes.

The gross national product of the Republic of Korea increased over 13 percent last year; there was a 42-percent expansion in their exports and almost a 29-percent increase in manufacturing production.

Those of us on the delegation found these statistics to be most impressive.

Much of what has been done has, of course, been accomplished with the advice and assistance of the United States.

Korea is not yet to the point where it can do without our economic aid.

However, I am convinced that we can make no better investment than investing in the strength and prosperity of a friend and ally like Korea.

The country is developing rapidly and many members of the delegation had an opportunity to visit national development projects, industrial plants, educational institutions, to see for themselves the progress which has been accomplished.

We were also privileged to visit the demilitarized zone marking the northern boundary of the Republic of Korea which is jointly manned by Korean and United States troops.

We visited both American and Korean units.

I can tell you that we came away from there with a great appreciation of the tremendous job our boys are doing and the tremendous job being done by our Korean allies in holding that line against Communist expansion.

ROK soldiers are among the finest on earth.

The Republic of Korea is the second-largest contributor of armed forces to the struggle in Vietnam.

Today, there are approximately 50,000 Korean troops fighting side by side with U.S. forces in Vietnam.

I believe we have virtually unanimous agreement among those of us making this trip that our military aid to the Republic of Korea should continue and, if anything, it should be increased, in order that Korean troops manning the barrier against Communist infiltration south of the demilitarized zone might have the best quality of weapons available.

We should make a special effort to see that these people, among the very best of our friends, are given the military capability to defend themselves and the free world against the Communist menace of North Korea.

They are a great people and a great friend and we should help them in every way possible.

Our relationship with the Korean people has been tested in two wars during the last 20 years. They have not been found wanting.

The Koreans are among the most fervently anti-Communist people of the world due to their own bitter experience with the North Korean and Red Chinese Communist invasion. They are stalwart and brave supporters of U.S.-Asian policies. We have no stronger ally and no finer friend.

This is evidenced, as I have said, not only by the enormous contribution they make to their own defenses with one of the world's largest standing armies, but also by their valiant efforts in Vietnam.

The leaders of our armies in Southeast Asia have uniformly expressed the opinion that there is no finer fighting man than the Korean soldier. He is tough, courageous, brave and well-trained.

We were, as I indicated, impressed by the economic growth being made in Korea. U.S. aid and assistance has helped, but as I tried to point out earlier, the progress which has been made is most truly reflected in the industry, intelligence, and inherent vigor of the Korean people.

If we have any regrets at all about our trip to Korea it is that we did not have more of an opportunity to visit informally with the Korean man in the street.

He is representative of a strong and great people whom we are proud to call our friends.

We were impressed also by the way the Korean people have moved during the last several years to elective representative government. They have displayed an increased political maturity and have a devotion to democratic principles unsurpassed in the world.

The Koreans are alert to the dangers of international communism and they are among the most ardent supporters of regional political institutions and collective security arrangements as a means of combating Communist aggression and expansion.

I cannot conclude my remarks without commenting on the hospitality and generosity of the Korean people and their Government. We were honored to be received by the President who gave us the highest honors within the power of his great country to bestow.

We were welcomed and honored by the distinguished mayor of Seoul and by the great Seoul National University.

I was privileged to address the Korean National Assembly on behalf of the Speaker and our delegation and I will include as a part of my remarks the speech delivered at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for making this exchange with members of the National Assembly of Korea possible through your acceptance of the invitation extended by Vice Speaker Chang. This exchange with our counterparts in Korea has made it possible for all of us privileged to make this trip to obtain a much clearer view of the task faced by the Republic of Korea in the fields of economic and social development as well as in security and other defensive needs.

It has provided us with an opportunity to bring about a better understanding of problems which give rise to misunderstanding and concern between our two countries and in the views of both our legislative groups, and it has greatly and very properly enhanced the possibility of a solution to any problems which might arise.

It is, Mr. Speaker, the consensus of our group that this exchange was indeed valuable and that in the future we should from time to time exchange views with such visits as this. It would be my hope that these exchanges could be continued and that sometime soon a delegation from the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea might be invited to visit the United States.

In that regard, I would like to read to the House from a joint statement issued at the conclusion of our visit by the Vice Speaker of the Korean National Assembly and myself:

> During their visit to Korea, members of the American delegation had extensive conversations with their counterparts in the National Assembly and with many other high officials of government.
>
> This group also had an opportunity to visit other parts of Korea to see at first hand the jointly manned military defenses as well as national development projects.
>
> Both Koreans and Americans found these exchanges to be extremely informative, beneficial and meaningful.
>
> It was jointly concluded that exchanges such as this should be continued.
>
> The American group expressed the hope that a similar delegation from the Korean National Assembly might visit the United States and that future U.S. delegations might return to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it is on this note that I want to conclude my remarks.

Exchanges such as this should be continued. I hope a delegation from the Korean National Assembly can visit the United States and that future U.S. delegations might return to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that there may be inserted a copy of the speech which I made at the Korean National Assembly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. Albert's speech before Korean National Assembly follows:

Speech Delivered by Representative Carl Albert to Korean National Assembly on Behalf of Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives

Mr. Speaker and members of the Korean National Assembly: It is a great satisfaction for all of us to have this opportunity to visit Korea and to have the pleasure of seeing for ourselves the visible and tangible evidence of the political progress and economic growth of which we have heard so much.

The Twentieth Century has been very unkind to a number of nations, great and small, in Europe as well as in Asia, but few have undergone such ordeals and suffered such devastation as the ancient nation of Korea.

Yet today we see the Korean people, who have fought so many battles not of their own choosing, fighting and winning the most glorious battle of all, the battle over the old enemies of hunger, poverty, disease.

Having suffered grievously from the evils of our century, you are now beginning to enjoy the fruits which the modern age can also offer.

You are demonstrating to other peoples how these fruits can be cultivated and harvested.

And you are doing this without sacrificing the unique culture which your ancestors developed over so many hundreds and thousands of years.

Wherever one looks in Korea today, one can see how much can be accomplished under effective leadership by an intelligent, capable and courageous people.

Many of us in the United States Congress have been deeply concerned that the military and economic assistance which the United States has been able to extend to its friends has not always served the purposes for which it was intended.

But here in Korea we can see a tangible demonstration of how judicious aid, intelligently used by a skillful and determined people, can help, among other things, to produce fighting forces of extraordinary effectiveness.

Today these forces not only defend a strategic area of the free world on the mainland of Asia but are also making a valorous and indispensable contribution to the free world's struggle in Viet-Nam.

And may I assure you that the American people will not forget your willingness to sacrifice your sons for freedom in the faraway jungles of Vietnam, just as we sacrificed ours nineteen years ago in the mountains and valleys of Korea.

Moreover, Korea today is much more than a bastion on the front lines of the free world; it is a success story in the vitally important area of economic development.

We can see here how economic aid has helped to produce dramatic economic progress and a climate favorable for foreign private investment.

And finally I can see before me now the evidence of political progress and maturity, a democratically elected parliamentary body.

Twenty-four years ago, or even fifteen years ago, who would have asserted with confidence that in so short a time Korea could achieve so much in any one of these fields, let alone in all three.

The recent history of the Republic of Korea is, quite literally, the story of the transformation of a nation from devastation and despondency to economic progress, initiative, hope, and integration into the community of nations.

A visitor need be here only a few hours to sense the new, almost visible, feeling of self-confidence and self-assurance which permeates your country.

This remarkable transformation is, above all, a product of sound governmental policies and the qualities of intelligence, diligence, receptivity to advice, and openness to innovation which characterize the Korean people.

But it is also, I believe, a product reflecting the wisdom and soundness of the unique partnership for progress between the United States and the Republic of Korea, a partnership to which both countries have contributed over many years.

We now see the fruits of our joint efforts.

The United States is deeply gratified that the external resources which it has been able to provide have been used so wisely by the Korean people.

These resources have included grant aid in dollars and in agricultural commodities, development loans, technical assistance, as well as ideas and suggestions of all kinds.

Some of the ideas have been accepted. Others have been rejected as not appropriate. Almost all of what you have accepted you have modified to meet your particular requirements. And this is as it should be in the give and take of a partnership.

It is a tribute both to you and to the Americans who have worked with you that this open and genuine dialogue of ideas has never flagged.

Success would have been impossible without genuine cooperation in our efforts to solve problems of mutual concern.

All of us can remember the years when our joint programs were attacked on the grounds that the situation in Korea was hopeless, and that the infant Republic would never be able to manage its own economic and political affairs. Events have given the lie to such negative views. Today Korea is proudly fighting by the side of the United States in Viet-Nam, taking a leading role in regional cooperation in Asia, and experiencing a phenomenal rate of economic growth.

The Korean example has, indeed, had a marked effect on the rest of Asia. I am told that representatives of other Asian nations have been visiting your country with increasing frequency over the past few years, hoping to learn how your successes were achieved.

I might add that private business in the United States, in Japan, and in many European nations is taking a vastly increased interest in Korea.

This trend shows great promise for the future.

Progress on the economic front has been a major element in Korea's growing self-confidence.

I need not enumerate all the vital statistics, but I would like to mention that the growth in your Gross National Product of over thirteen percent last year, the forty-two percent expansion in your exports, and the 28.5 percent increase in your manufacturing production are statistics which I and my colleagues find most impressive.

Major developments in the political field have accompanied economic progress.

After fourteen years of negotiation, a rea-

XUM

sonable settlement was reached with Japan and normal relations restored.

This removed a constant source of irritation and uncertainty and brought both your country and Japan into closer and broader contact with the rest of Asia.

The agreement was a major achievement whose full benefits are only beginning to be felt.

The decision to send Korean troops to Viet-Nam was also a difficult decision to make, and I can well understand how carefully you had to weigh that decision in view of the aggressive forces poised to the north of you.

The fine performance of your soldiers on the battlefield in Viet-Nam has been a source of pride and satisfaction for both our countries, as well as for the Vietnamese at whose request both we and you are helping in the fight against the aggressor.

In June 1966 your government took an initiative which I particularly applaud. You invited the Foreign Ministers of seven Asian countries, including Japan, to meet in Seoul in order to form the Asian and Pacific Council. This concept of a meeting of Asian powers to discuss Asian problems was a purely Korean idea and dramatized your growing stature in international relations.

I have also been pleased to learn that there have been numerous other international meetings in Seoul, including the Asian Parliamentary Union and the 1968 Colombo Plan meeting. You are working effectively with an international Consultative Group under World Bank auspices. Korea has made the international scene. You in the south are very much a part of the larger world.

The only "Hermit Kingdom"—as our geography books used to call Korea—is the communist regime which still occupies the northern part of Korea.

All of your economic, political, and diplomatic progress has been accomplished while you were under constant threat and harassment from the North.

The response of the Korean people to the incursions from the North has been magnificent. There has been no panic in your response, only determination—determination to defend your hard-won accomplishments and to continue to build and to progress. This should truly be an inspiration to other peoples.

The primary credit for all these encouraging developments that I have talked about must go to the Korean people themselves, and I speak to them through you, their chosen representatives. It has been their intelligence, their hard work and perseverance, their interest in new ideas, and the quality of their leadership which have brought such satisfying achievements.

We, the Korean and American peoples, have travelled a difficult road since 1945.

While the focus of policy has shifted several times in both countries, there has been a constancy of commitment to our common goals. Our commitment and our partnership will continue. There is still much for us to achieve together, and together we will reach our common goals.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, who was a very strong and important member of our delegation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished majority leader for his remarks, which I thought were most appropriate and most accurate.

I think the gentleman has done a magnificent job in describing the actions of the committee, the findings of the committee, and the relations with our Korean colleagues, which I thought were most fortuitous.

I think the majority leader has done an equally magnificent job in depicting the economic recovery of the people of South Korea and the development of democratic institutions. I know of no other country in the world which, burdened with the great cost of an active military establishment, has made the economic progress which South Korea has made. Other countries who have not had that cost have made comparable progress, but they have not carried the load of economic development and of defense at the same time. It is a grievous load, but this country has done it. I congratulate the majority leader for his explanation, and I congratulate the Korean people and their leaders on their accomplishments.

At this time I wish also to add a word of commendation to the majority leader for his fine leadership of this committee. The Speaker authorized this committee and selected the leadership and did well in the selection. I think Carl Albert did an outstanding job in making it possible for this congressional group to see and to hear and to understand while we were in Korea.

I express my personal thanks and I know the thanks of all who went on this tour with the majority leader, who was also the leader of this group. Then let me compliment the members who made up this group. You selected able men, Mr. Speaker. Not one failed to measure up to the high standards you would expect of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

I would like also to point out, Mr. Speaker, as our leader has pointed out, that the whole background of Korean life is one of concern over the threat of Communist aggression from the north. The people of South Korea, or at least their leaders, full well realize what many of our people seem to be unable to realize and that is that the Communists are always probing for a weak spot and are always ready to take advantage of weakness whether it be in Vietnam, in Czechoslovakia, in Korea, or in the United States.

Most Americans apparently suppose that the war is over in Korea and that there has been 16 years of peace in that unhappy land. This is not true. There has been no peace treaty, although there is a cease-fire arrangement. That cease-fire arrangement is honored more in the breach that in the observance—at least in order to see that it is observed—both the United States and the Republic of Korea have been forced to commit thousands of men and billions of dollars and this commitment of men and resources continues. Every day there is firing along the so-called cease-fire line. Every night Korean and American troops patrol the south half of the so-called demilitarized zone. We have built no fortfications in this area because the armistice agreement prohibits it but we have fortified the line inside the Republic of Korea just south of the demilitarized zone. On the other hand, we know that the Communists have fortified the entire north half of the zone. We know that they seek to infiltrate into the Republic of Korea both through our defense areas and by sea. Communist spies are continually captured in South Korea. They are equipped with the best weapons and intelligence instruments that the Soviet Union can supply. We know that the North Korean armies are equipped with the most modern Communist-made weapons of all kinds, including the best Russian rifles. The Communists on the other hand know that only a small part of our Korean allies have the best American equipment. Many of the South Korean troops are armed with Springfield rifles and I saw with my own eyes Korean reserves training with wooden rifles.

I think the United States is making a terrible mistake in not supplying these people with weaponry at least equal in quality to that which the Russians are supplying to the Communists in the north.

The South Koreans are ready, willing, and able to fight in their own defense but to do so effectively they must have weapons equal to those of their foe. I would rather supply the weapons rather than supply more American boys.

Since the end of World War II Russian troops have not fired a shot in cooperation with any of their satellites or allies but Russian guns have been used in almost every conflict around the world. The South Koreans are anxious to fight their own battles and they have proven their willingness to help the United States. There are approximately 50,000 South Koreans troops fighting with our boys in South Vietnam and every report I have had is that they are among the toughest and best soldiers in that conflict. One cannot, however, blame South Korea for their concern when they read that respected American officials are seriously advocating a pull-out in South Vietnam. Of course, if we pull out and let the South Vietnamese be overrun either directly by the Communists or be taken over by the kind of coalition government which brought Czechoslovakia into the Communist orbit, it is but natural that the Koreans would wonder how firm are our guarantees in Korea. And not only would our friends in South Korea wonder but our enemies in North Korea would unquestionably arrive at the same inevitable conclusion—that the United States is indeed a paper tiger.

I have not the slightest doubt but what, if we begin a disgraceful retreat from South Vietnam that we would not get all of our boys as far as Honolulu before the Communists would open an attack along the demarcation line in Korea—and here might well be the opportunity for a rapprochement between the Chinese and the Russian Communists. Here might be the place where two Communist giants would cease their conflicts and join in an attack on the rear guard of the retreating American forces.

Nor can the Koreans take any comfort from the trend of American-Japanese relations. Although the United States has helped Japan effect a most remarkable economic recovery, General MacArthur wrote into the Japanese Constitution a provision so limiting their

XUM

military activities that today Japan is able to devote all of her resources to her internal development. Japan does not bear the burden of expensive armaments as does the United States and the Republic of Korea. Now Japan asks and I feel sure the United States is already committed to the return of the great fortress at Okinawa. Of course, the United States does not want the responsibility of government in Okinawa but we do need, Japan needs, Korea needs, and all of Asia needs the stabilizing influence of this great base. To remove it will, the Koreans fear, and I fear, have an effect quite similar and probably much more far reaching that the British withdrawal from Singapore.

Koreans are not unreasonable or emotional. They simply recognize the facts. They see, as many of our own people who have never been invaded by communist hordes cannot see, that the Communists never fail to occupy any lightly defended areas that they want. The Koreans understand, just as the people of Czechoslovakia must understand, that placing a Communist in a position of power in a government is tantamount to turning that country over to the Communists. They understand, as some of our people cannot seem to understand, that you cannot turn your back on a pack of dogs and run away and leave your friends without being bitten yourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we had a far better understanding of this Korean feeling after our visit to Korea. I wish it were possible for every Member of this House to visit Korea and to see what the Koreans have done. They have done a great deal but they need the assurance that the United States is not a turncoat. They need the assurance that our country will keep its pledges. They get no comfort from what they are seeing or hearing at the other end of this Capitol and I get no comfort from it, and I do not believe that any good American does.

I congratulate the Koreans on all they have done. I am proud of them as allies. They are willing to work. Their great economic progress is based on hard work. They are willing to fight. Their very national existence is dependent on their willingness to fight for their rights. I want the United States and Korea to remain good allies and good friends. They are our kind of people. I believe visits such as this one which was recently made tend to improve those relations. Mr. Majority Leader, we thank you for your leadership and for your courtesy, and through you we thank our friends in Korea for their outstanding hospitality.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), for his very splendid contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman who was the ranking minority member on our trip although I may say that if there ever was a cohesive group with not the slightest partisan interest it was this informal group that went to Korea. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS).

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me. At the outset I wish to say that I associate myself with his remarks. And that I am in complete agreement with what he has to say. I always preface any comments I make about the recent congressional trip to Korea by stating that I seldom travel. In defense of it, however, I have always felt that there has to be some benefit in seeing the world and trying to appraise some of the problems. My own experiences in connection with this trip have left some impressions which I feel will be valuable.

I certainly have only commendation for the chairman of our group, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) and I wish to express my thanks to the Speaker of the House and to Mr. ALBERT for asking me to go along.

The gentleman from Oklahoma always conducted himself with great dignity and eloquence on every occasion. I was proud to serve under him on this delegation. By necessity he had to make many appearances and many speeches and to be present on many occasions on behalf of our delegation. It just seemed to me that the Koreans felt we were representing the whole United States, so in a sense our chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), was really a representative of our country in Korea at that time.

For 4 days we were briefed by American military and Embassy officials, Korean legislative and executive leaders, and visited the demilitarized zone, including Panmunjom. In a few highlights, I can report only briefly on a few important subjects.

The people of South Korea are extremely friendly to Americans. When we landed at Kimpo Air Base, Seoul, we were met by bands, troops at attention, high Government officials, and little girls who gave each of us a huge bouquet. The streets of Seoul were decked with banners reading "Welcome U.S. Congressional Delegation." The Korean people remember the U.S. soldiers saved them from defeat at the hands of Communist troops and that U.S. taxpayers have contributed many, many dollars to the restoration of their economy. All of this was mentioned often enough to convince me that there is genuine feeling among South Koreans that there would be no Republic of Korea today, free of communism, except for the United States.

The economy of the country is progressing. I was amazed to hear high government officials say that U.S. economic aid will be phased out and that they are ready to go it alone. This was refreshing since so many foreign countries keep begging for our financial help. It is all the more amazing because South Korea is a relatively poor country. Communist North Korea is much richer with minerals and strategic hydroelectric power. Private U.S. and other foreign capital is being invested in South Korea. Super highways are being built through the mountains connecting the industrial cities with the capital and providing better means for the very poor farmers to market their products. The per capita wealth is rising, not rapidly but slowly and steadily. Of course, one is constantly reminded that all of this was made possible by the sizable contributions of U.S. taxpayers in the form of economic aid.

From a military standpoint South Korea has a tough fighting army. It has to. It is faced with a mighty and ever threatening Communist force from the north aided substantially by Soviet Russia, while across the Yellow Sea lies ominous Red China. The North Korean dictator has said that by 1970 he intends to unite all of Korea under communism. Seoul, the capital, is only 25 miles from the border separating the two countries. The present North Korean technique, in utter violation of the existing truce, is to harass South Korea with guerrilla raids. In doing this they aim, first, to terrorize the peasants into disenchantment with their own government and its ability to protect them; second, to discourage foreign capital from being invested in South Korea; and third, hopefully to force the United States to commit more troops, thereby causing withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam.

United States troops are conducting a grim and unpublicized operation. We visited with our soldiers at the frontlines, the outposts, and Panmunjom, and had lunch with them at their mess. At one of the outposts we saw U.S. soldiers patrolling the borderline on the side of snow-clad mountains, in bitter cold. Whether or not we agree with the policy, our boys are making a significant contribution to stemming the tide of communism.

To sum it up—I appreciate very much the opportunity to have made this trip. It showed me that the South Koreans are a friendly, energetic, and brave people. They love the United States and, most of all, are truly grateful for our help.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kind remarks, and for his contribution.

I now have the honor of yielding to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ethics and Standards, and one of the ranking members of the Committee on Armed Services, whose experience and knowledge were of valuable assistance to the entire delegation during our trip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to first compliment and congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma, as did our ranking minority member on the trip (Mr. BETTS), on the manner in which the gentleman from Oklahoma conducted this committee in its mission to South Korea. I felt it a privilege to serve on that committee.

I was impressed with the warmth and the genuineness of the reception we received, not only from the officials of the Republic of Korea and members of their National Assembly, but from the average South Korean with whom it was our privilege to come into contact.

I followed very closely the remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and the gentleman accurately stated the situation as we found it in that country. The gentleman also accurately stated the reception we received from the members of the National Assembly.

It was our privilege to visit with the Speaker of the National Assembly, the

Vice Speaker, the leader of the majority, and also the leader of the opposition party in their assembly. We found a stable government there. We found a good relationship between the executive and the legislative branches. We found most of all a genuine gratitude on the part of the people of South Korea for the contribution that we made in preserving their independence. We found that those people, having been assisted by us in maintaining an independent government, recognize the importance of other people lending a hand to other nations when their independence is threatened. That is the reason they have a large military force today in South Vietnam. That is the reason they understand what the problem is in South Vietnam. They understand aggression. They understand threats of aggression. They are prepared to fight not only to maintain their own independence, but to help others of their neighbors in Southeast Asia maintain their independence.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that actually the Korean war has been only a suspended war. Those of us on the committee who had the opportunity to visit the demilitarized zone and to talk with both our own forces and the forces of the Republic of Korea who are manning the demilitarized zone, understand that there is still a threat in that area of the world, and it takes watchfulness in every hour of the day to keep that threat from materializing into another all-out aggression.

I listened to the remarks of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) who was the ranking member of our committee. I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman when he suggests that we should do more in providing adequate equipment to the forces of the Republic of Korea.

We have provided those members of the ROK Army who are fighting with us in South Vietnam with the most modern of equipment, and I believe we should go further and provide the full military force of South Korea with the most modern of equipment because I know that this equipment will be used for the defense of free nations in Southeast Asia. With that strong military force maintained in South Korea, and mostly of their own personnel, we will have a bulwark of defense against further aggression in that country.

I know of nothing that will contribute more to security in Southeast Asia than providing adequate equipment and the most modern equipment to the ROK Army.

It was a distinct pleasure to go to South Korea to meet with their legislators. I might say that on the committee that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives selected to make this trip there were Members like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), who is chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and Members who sit on various committees in the House of Representatives. So it was a cross-section of committees. We found in the national assembly of South Korea almost our counterparts in government. So it appears they have used as a blueprint the democratic form of government that they find in our country and are demonstrating it throughout the Asian world. They have their Committee on Agriculture. They have their Committee on Armed Services. They have their Committee on Foreign Affairs. The members of our group who serve on those counterpart committees in our House of Representatives met with these particular groups so that there was a good working relationship between the members of the National Assembly and the Members of the Congress of the United States.

We found that parallel, but most of all we found a strong feeling of alliance between the people of South Korea and the American people. I think we would do well to expand this feeling, to improve upon it, and to continue to hold the friendship of this great and wonderful people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a privilege for me to visit Korea for the first time as a member of a delegation of House Members led by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

It was unfortunate that you, Mr. Speaker, were unable personally to lead the group. However, you could not have chosen a more suitable stand-in. As chairman, the majority leader represented the delegation with intelligence and dignity, in a completely nonpartisan fashion.

As a group, the entire delegation—diverse with respect to political viewpoint, interests, age, and standing in the House—has only the highest commendation for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that understanding can be greatly enhanced by such parliamentary exchanges, even if on an irregular basis. This was no exception.

Mr. Speaker, this was a most appropriate time to send this delegation. South Korea is rapidly moving toward economic viability, and in recent years has begun to play a positive and active role in the international community. It has become a leading advocate for regional political and economic cooperation in Asia.

At the same time, however, it is experiencing increasing security problems with North Korea, which seems bent upon renewing hostilities. Notwithstanding this immediate threat, South Korea has contributed almost 50,000 troops to the free world forces in South Vietnam.

We share with the Republic of Korea many of the same problems and responsibilities. Our soldiers, under the banner of the U.N., man battle positions, shoulder to shoulder with the South Koreans along the demilitarized zone in Korea. We are fighting side by side in Vietnam. Our objectives are the same. We both seek a stable, peaceful, and independent Asia, and the Koreans determination to resist Communist expansion and aggression is as unwavering as our own. There is a lot at stake in our relationship with South Korea. I hope our counterparts in the Korean National Assembly are reassured as to our continuing deep interest and support.

I should like briefly, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to South Korea's important economic progress. It was a great pleasure for me to visit Korea and see firsthand the tangible results of U.S. aid, which I have so long supported. In Washington it is difficult to visualize the problems facing Korea along with its development needs and defense requirements. When you can see just how much is needed and how few resources are available to meet these needs, then, and only then, can there be a true appreciation of the immense accomplishments of this small nation.

AID officials in Korea described to us in considerable detail the many gains and dramatic improvements in the key economic indicators and in the people's standard of living. They pointed out, however, that Korea still faces many economic problems. But, they believe, with well-designed policies, hard work, and continued political stability, the situation will continue to improve rapidly. By 1971, Korea should be on the verge of self-sustaining growth.

Our assistance is still required. Loans and other forms of economic aid are needed to maintain the current level of growth. Materiel and equipment to maintain and modernize the military forces are essential if they are to remain a credible deterrent. I intend to support such assistance both in committee and on the floor.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the warm reception and kind hospitality of the Korean people. I shall long remember my visit with them. Also, I want to thank the many United States and Korean Government officials who made it possible for our short stay to be so productive, and mutually beneficial. Especial recognition must be given to the tremendous efforts by Speaker Rhee and Vice Speaker Chang of the National Assembly to see that nothing was overlooked in providing for our fruitful visit.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, in discussing the exchange trip we made early last month to the Republic of Korea, a spirited young democracy modeled after the political system here in the United States. In response to an invitation extended to Speaker MCCORMACK by the Honorable Kyung Soon Chang, Vice Speaker of Korea's National Assembly, Mr. ALBERT led a delegation of 22 Congressmen to Korea the week of February 28–March 8 for an exchange of views with that nation's legislators. The trip, Mr. Speaker, far exceeded my expectations. Talking frankly with Korea's able legislators and administration officials, touring the country's cities and military bases, learning firsthand of the remarkable economic and cultural growth that has thrust Korea into the forefront of Asian nations, I found the trip one of the most meaningful and rewarding that I have ever experienced. Our talks with Korean leaders were quite unlike some informal intergovernmental conferences—conferences that, unfortunately but understandably, turn out to be little more than polite shams characterized by exchanges of affable banter and other trivialities. The Korean conferences were candid, open, and lively. I feel sure our talks with National Assembly members will help strengthen the traditional political and economic friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

My first impression of Korea was its dramatic physical beauty: timbered mountains in the east, plains that sprawl out for hundreds of miles in the southwest, cities that present a striking mixture of graceful oriental architecture and giant skyscrapers. The climate—brisk and cold during our trip—is not unlike that of our own Northeast. The phrase "land of contrasts" is, of course, a cliche so worn that even magazine editors have abandoned it. Yet the saying fits Korea aptly. There you can find poverty next to affluence, sophisticated technological installations next to peasants' hovels, kimonos next to miniskirts.

The Republic of Korea faces a double challenge in the 1970's: continuing its economic growth while defending against the constant menace posed by its Communist neighbor to the north. North Korea's terrorist assaults against the Republic of Korea have been growing more and more frequent. Rattling its sabers and flexing its muscles at every opportunity, North Korea has made plain its intent to subjugate the struggling young democracy at its southern borders. What was once routine harassment near the demilitarized zone turned into armed clashes in the 1960's. The DMZ seemed to bristle with tension when we toured it last month. In 1968—the year North Korea stepped up its strident propaganda barrage against the Republic of Korea—it staged two spectacular acts of aggression: the attempted assassination of President Park and the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. Pledged to defend South Korea against armed attack, the United States remains that country's greatest ally in this era of new North Korean belligerence.

Despite the ever-present threat from its Communist neighbor, the Republic of Korea has made truly staggering economic gains over the past decade. The economic growth rate, for example, jumped all the way from 4.2 percent in 1961 to 13.1 percent in 1968. The investment rate—the fuel of economic growth—nearly doubled from 13.1 percent to 24.5 percent in the same period. And merchandise exports swelled from $43 million to $500 million, an increase of 12 times. The single most dramatic index of Korea's economic growth is its capital city of Seoul. Its buildings reduced to rubble and its people facing starvation at the end of the Korean war, Seoul is now a booming metropolis with a modern skyline. Korea's continued growth hinges on economic aid from the United States—aid that, quite clearly, must be continued. The great strides Korea has taken in economy have been matched in health and education. Korean life expectancy, for example, increased from 33 years in 1953 to 52 years in 1967. And, as just one further example, more than 95 percent of the country's school age youngsters are now enrolled in elementary schools.

All available evidence, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the Republic of Korea will continue its striking record of economic and cultural growth in the years to come.

I would like to express my gratitude to our host for the trip, Vice Speaker Kyung Soon Chang, to President Chung Hee Park, Prime Minister Il Kwon Chung, Speaker Hyo Sang Yi, and Deputy Prime Minister Chung Hun Pak, for their many courtesies.

I include in the RECORD at this point copies of letters I have received from Vice Speaker Chang; from Young Sam Kim, National Assembly floor leader for the opposition party; from National Assemblyman Cho Han Paik, and from Howard A. Rusk, M.D., chairman of the American-Korean Foundation, Inc.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
Seoul, Korea, March 10, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
The House of Representatives,
The U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: It was indeed my pleasure and honor to have been able to invite yourself and the distinguished members of your House of Representatives to Korea and I am sure that the pleasure and honor are also those of our National Assembly and the People of Korea. I believe that you now have returned back to your country safe and sound.

I personally wonder whether the accommodations we arranged for your comfortable stay in Korea had met your satisfaction. However, as I stated sometime while you were in Seoul, I expect the next chance of extending to the even larger delegation what we would not afford during your previous visit to our country.

As anticipated by myself and by the People of our country as well, throughout the entire course of your visit we did best of our efforts to let all of the visting members look into the variety of realities we are facing with and listen to what Korea has to say about the betterment of the existing close ties between the two Countries. I firmly believe that our efforts have effectuated to a great extent in leading the occasion of the visit to the productive and fruitful result in this regard.

I sincerely hope that your recent visit will surely make a great contribution to the even closer ties between our Countries as well as to creating the most important motivation of cooperating by the legislative bodies for the interests of the two Nations. And I further believe that the visit will certainly initiate a step forward to the creation of the parliamentarians association which I proposed earlier.

Please allow me to extend my best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,
KYUNG SOON CHANG,
Vice Speaker.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
March 18, 1969.

DEAR HON. E. P. BOLAND: I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks for your visit to this country, and hope you have made a pleasant trip back homeland despite of the bad weather.

I am very sorry for that we have not had enough time to share more conversation with you due to your too heavy schedule. However, it is my great desire to get a chance to promote our friendships by opening the proposed next round table conference between the representatives of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

Hoping for your continued cooperation for the development of this nation, I remain.

Sincerely yours,
YOUNG SAM KIM,
Floor Leader, Opposition Party,
National Assembly.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLYMEN,
Seoul, Korea, March 13, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. BOLAND: It was my real pleasure to meet you when you visited Korea. It was also unforgettable opportunity that I was personally able to talk with you on various subjects including our son who is studying in the Harvard University.

Through such an occasion as your visit to Korea it will really improve our mutual understanding between the nations and will create important political relations among the democratic free world.

As our news papers have announced, it was the first and largest American Delegation we have ever received since 1882 in which we have signed a Treaty of Amity and Commerce with the United States. Your visit to Korea also emphasized that your country is the most reliable one among the friendly nations of today.

I am sorry that I was not personally able to treat you because of the heavy schedule you had. Mrs. Cho and I talked about you and we have decided to send you a small gift as a monument. This is the one I have personally ordered.

I am writing to my son, Sung Il, that he make a courtesy call to you at his convenience.

Meanwhile, I do wish you will be healthy and most prosperous in developing your political life.

Sincerely yours,
CHO, HAN PAIK.

THE AMERICAN-KOREAN
FOUNDATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 14, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Representative from Massachusetts,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was good to read of your recent visit to Korea. It occurred to me that you would be interested in the attached Annual Report of the American-Korean Foundation's activities there.

We at the Foundation are proud of our part during the past seventeen years in rehabilitating South Korea in the general areas of health, welfare, housing, agriculture and education.

If it is not too much of an intrusion in your busy schedule, I would appreciate any comments or observations regarding your trip that you may have.

Cordially,
HOWARD A. RUSK, M.D.,
Chairman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to enjoy a long association with the Republic of Korea and a close friendship with its people as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The economic growth and vitality of the Republic coupled with the patriotism of its people have been a continuing source of inspiration and encouragement to me.

I am deeply grateful for the Republic's willing contribution to the war in Vietnam and for the skillful and courageous performance of its 50,000 troops.

As a principal delegate to the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations in 1967, I assumed with special enthusiasm the responsibility of presenting the arguments of the U.S. Government in opposition to withdrawal of U.N. troops from Korea.

For these reasons and a great many more I welcomed the establishment of an interparliamentary exchange between the Congress and the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. And, I was most pleased to be invited, Mr. Speaker, to join with my colleaguges in this exchange.

Under the able leadership of our majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, our meetings with the members of the National Assembly and the other branches of the Korean Government were meaningful contributions to continued strong ties between our two nations.

The success of the exchange was due in large measure to the skillful preparation and thorough planning of our host, the Honorable Chang Kyung Soon, Vice Speaker of the National Assembly, and to the hospitality of all of the members of the Assembly.

Special contributions and insights into the goals and aspirations of the Republic were provided in meetings with the Honorable Park Chung Hee, President of the Republic, the Honorable Chung Il Kwon, Prime Minister, the Honorable Choi Kyu Hah, Foreign Minister, the Honorable Im Chung Sik, National Defense Minister, and many of the other distinguished members of the Government.

Through all of these discussions, Mr. Speaker, the reappearing themes were the Republic's remarkable economic vigor and its strong and determined defense posture.

In the midst of its second 5-year plan, the Republic is aiming for self-sufficiency in food-grain production, a doubling of international trade, and a 10-percent annual growth in gross national product through 1971.

Its economy rests on the solid foundation of a variety of major industrial enterprises including power, iron and steel, petrochemicals, and transportation. It is buttressed by rapidly expanding production of coal, fertilizer, cement, flat glass, and plywood, the latter a major export commodity.

New, large-scale harbor facilities are under construction in conjunction with the building of new petrochemical complexes, an integrated iron and steel mill, and cement plants. Multipurpose dams are being built for irrigation, electricity, and industrial water supply.

Railways are being expanded and electrified, and a massive highway construction program scheduled to be completed by 1971 will make virtually all major population centers accessible by a day's travel.

Credit for this remarkable recovery from the devastation in which the Republic found itself following the 1953 armistice belongs to the intelligent planning of the Government and the industry of its people.

Nevertheless, Americans can take a measure of satisfaction in the helpful role they played in assisting in this achievement. Like Taiwan, the Republic of Korea is one of the finest examples of the wise and prudent use of foreign aid.

As U.S. grant aid is phasing out, the Republic is turning to the Export-Import Bank, international lending institutions, and private sources for financing these projects.

The scope of economic planning and activity reflects a high degree of self-confidence and optimism.

But, the Republic's confidence and tangible accomplishments must be viewed realistically against the perpetual threat of disruption and aggression from the north.

There has been mounting evidence since 1966 that the north is organizing its population, diverting its economic resources, and stockpiling armaments toward a massive increase in infiltration and terrorism.

The dramatic and highly visible prosperity of the Republic undoubtedly has helped encourage the north to attempt to disrupt the south's economy.

Infiltration has increased steadily since the October 1966 speech by North Korean Premier Kim Il-Sung calling for stepped-up guerrilla warfare against the south.

While the United Nations Command recorded 59 significant incidents of infiltration in 1965 and 50 in 1966, the figure jumped to 338 in 1967 and a near equal number in 1968.

Most dramatic and potentially explosive of these was the abortive January 31, 1968, commando raid on the Blue House, the official residence of President Park Chung Hee.

Two days afterward the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized, and on April 14 the north launched a surprise attack against U.S. security personnel at Panmunjom.

In late October a company-sized force of 120 heavily armed and highly trained guerrillas intruded through the eastern coastal area to revolutionize secluded mountain villages.

We can take comfort and encouragement, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that all of these aggressive forays were defeated by the concerted counteractions of the Government and the people.

While planes and equipment provided the Republic by the United States are in need of replacement and modernization, North Korea has been stockpiling significant quantities of conventional and sophisticated equipment supplied by the Soviet Union.

The north has hardened its defenses and dispersed its cities to protect against heavy air attack and coastal bombardment of the sort we delivered in Vietnam.

In addition, guerrilla battalions are being trained in the north with the assignment of total harassment in each of the eight provinces that make up the Republic.

It was from this guerrilla battalion that men were drawn to form the commando team that attempted to assassinate President Park last year.

And, despite an economy that is suffering from lack of growth, the north is devoting larger proportions of its budget to military purposes.

While we can only speculate about the long-range intent of this buildup, it is clear that continued infiltration and terrorism in the countryside could interfere with the rate of foreign investment in the Republic which has grown steadily during the past several years.

At a time when the Republic is looking for alternatives to U.S. grant aid scheduled to phase out in 1970, a significant drop in foreign investment could seriously dampen its economy.

The dangers to the Republic from the north are both real and immediate. The outlook is for more infiltration and increased attempts at subversion.

The Republic faces the task of continuing to counter such dangers without jeopardizing either its economic growth rate or the measure of personal freedom its citizens now enjoy.

The Republic of Korea will require all of the material assistance and moral support that the United States, and others, can muster, if it is to be successful in this undertaking.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the first-hand look which this interparliamentary exchange provided key Members of Congress was so vital. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this type of exchange will become a regular and important part of our relations with the Government of the Republic of Korea. It is a foundation on which we can build enlightened and informed policy—policy which responds to symptoms of developing problems rather than crises.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to visit the Republic of Korea as part of the delegation headed by the distinguished majority leader. I commend him for taking his time to express our gratitude to our gracious and generous hosts and to inform our colleagues of the great strides being made in that nation. I benefited personally from this visit and am happy to have been able to add to my knowledge of Korea and Southeast Asia.

Our cooperative effort for the security of Southeast Asia makes the alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States strong and lasting, added to this, the friendship and understanding achieved by the Members of this body and our Korean hosts will, I am sure, strengthen the bonds between our two nations.

Our Government has assisted many developing nations around the world with varying degrees of success, but I am overjoyed to report to the Congress that our aid to the Republic of Korea is one of the most worthwhile investments ever made. From the ruins of the Korean war, the people and Government of Korea have developed a strong, diversified, and progressive economy. For the 5-year period, 1962 to 1967, the per capita gross national product has increased 7 percent each year. Agriculture production increased 25 percent in the 5-year period 1962 to 1967. The Central Government's domestic revenues increased 49 percent each year from 1964 to 1966, and what is definitely significant for our consideration is that the share of the Government budget supported by the U.S. aid program declined from 35.3 percent in 1964 to 11.8 percent in 1968.

I believe this is one of the finest ex-

XUM

amples of our aid assisting a nation in developing its own resources. The Republic of Korea gradually and increasingly is taking over those projects formerly dependent on U.S. aid. In truth we have helped Korea to help itself. This has been accomplished only because of the dedication and determination of the people of Korea and their chosen leaders. This former agricultural nation is developing industry and diversifying its economy and production. It is extremely gratifying to me to have seen the great economic growth of this constantly threatened nation. The Central Government hopes and is working for the day when U.S. aid will no longer be needed. They project and are planning for a date only 2 years hence.

The Republic of Korea is a bastion of strength in troubled Southeast Asia. Its Government and its economy are stable, progressive and enjoy the support of the people. They have proven themselves to be good and loyal friends. Their dedication to the cause of freedom and justice is evident. They have an open society and do not fear competition in industry, political parties, or the press. They have fought and been successful in suppressing the threat from North Korea and have withstood the constant harassment of infiltrators and terrorists. They appreciate and recognize the great need for the United Nations force within their country but are determined to bear the greatest portion of their nation's defense as they can.

We visited the demilitarized zone, and I was greatly impressed by the high morale of our troops and the Korean troops. I am sure, however, that both morale and effectiveness could be improved if the means for defense were updated. The forces of the Republic of Korea are now using to a great extent F–1 rifles. I believe it would be in our interest, as well as in the interest of Korea, to modernize the weapons.

American interests lie with a stable, progressive, and free Southeast Asia. Korea is the finest example of that wished for stable democracy. We must continue to help her help herself and must see that her need to defend herself does not negate her economic growth and political stability. What, perhaps, most impressed me was the overwhelming desire of the Korean people and their elected leaders to insure that political and economic growth were not endangered by the continuing need for defense. They are determined to remain free and democratic and are dedicated to both political and economic independence.

As varying pressures are applied to us to allocate funds for both domestic and international needs, we must set priorities. I am hopeful that continued aid to Korea will be high on the list of each Member. Korea's development is one of the finest examples of what American aid and cooperation with a dedicated and determined nation can achieve.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would like to add that every member of this delegation reflected a credit on the House of Representatives and on our country.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in thanking the Speaker for allowing me the privilege of participating in this meaningful experience.

I would like to compliment the Speaker, too, on the sensitivity that he demonstrated in making these meetings and this exchange possible. I know of no greater friend that the United States has in the world than South Korea and I know of no greater subject of greater importance that which our two countries attach to a mutual exchange of ideas and hopes.

There was a certain sadness about returning to Korea and to see, 17 years later, American troops and Korean troops still improving frontline foxhole positions, and in excess of 500,000 troops still maintaining the lines in what has been an uneasy truce for those 17 years. There is a sadness to see Korean men who have grown old maintaining the frontlines for their own freedom, a sadness also about the amount of material and expense, and the number of lives that have been poured into that area.

Yet, also, there is a sense of reality about it. There are people in our country who demonstrate for peace, yet, I know of no people who really want peace more than the South Koreans and I know of no other people who want peace more than the citizens of the United States of America. Yet the world demonstrates a different kind of reality. If those foxholes were not manned, if those lines were not patrolled night after night, day after day, terror would be streaming down from North Korea to kill our soldiers, to kill South Korea's soldiers, to assassinate their president, and to assassinate their officials. The harsh realities of the hostile world which faces the free world are summed up in Korea today.

Those people who think our presence in Vietnam is not a meaningful one, should see how meaningful our presence and the presence of troops are in maintaining the peace, the freedom and, yes, the very lives of innocent civilians in South Korea some 16 or 17 years after the firing supposedly stopped.

I know that other Members wish to participate in this discussion. But before I sit down I would like to join my colleagues in paying a high tribute to the majority leader of our party who was the chairman of our delegation. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been on many parliamentary exchanges. I know of no more important parliamentary exchange than this, and none has ever had greater leadership than our delegation had in CARL ALBERT. As a majority leader he has many roles, but I witnessed another CARL ALBERT in Korea, CARL ALBERT the sensitive diplomat, CARL ALBERT the leader of his country's delegation to one of our country's greatest allies.

I congratulate the majority leader for the way in which he was received and the way in which he responded to that reception. I can think of no one who could have conducted himself more responsibly or more responsively. Few diplomats in our State Department or in our Government who could have represented the United States in better fashion.

There was another CARL ALBERT there also, perhaps different from the one we see here in the Congress. He was the man who returned to Southeast Asia with the great knowledge he acquired there while serving his country in World War II. He was a reaffirmation of what Rhodes scholars are made of, as he met there with his fellow Rhodes scholar, his classmate in the days when he was a student at Oxford with Dean Rusk, and the Rhodes scholar in charge there, General Bonesteel, one of the splendid military commanders of our Army.

From any aspect, I think exceptionally high marks have to be given to the chairman of our delegation, and also to our Speaker, because they have made a contribution by making it possible for us to know each other better—our delegation and the Korean delegation. We have exchanged new ideas, and because once more we have reaffirmed the principle that two great nations, whose blood is spilled on the many hills and plains of Korea, have fought for freedom while seeking only peace for our people.

While we all hope for peace, there is only one way in which we will see peace in our time in South Korea as well as in Vietnam. We must be strong and vigilant. Most of all, we must be awake to the realities that the world is not populated only with people who truly desire peace.

I think all who made this journey know the harsh realities in Korea including the fact that there are people in North Korea who would trample any hope for peace and who would trample all men's freedom. Peace will only come when people on both sides of the line recognize that peace is the most desirable commodity in this world. For just the desire for peace cannot bring peace; it demands full and complete reciprocity from the other side. Until then I think people throughout the world should know that America is ready to join in any peace movement anywhere.

Certainly we could have a true peace in Korea if the other side would recognize this. Similarly we will have a true peace in Vietnam if the other side recognizes the United States of America will walk 95 percent, if not 99 percent, of the journey, but it requires the two sides to find peace and to allow hope to renew itself throughout the world.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who, of course, is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and one of the most knowledgeable members of our delegation.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as one of those privileged to be included in the delegation which visited in Korea with our counterparts in the Korean National Assembly, March 2–6, I want to commend the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), for taking this time to report to the Congress on the trip.

In assessing this unique experience, I would first want to be a part of a sincere expression of gratitude to our hosts for their gracious hospitality and their willingness to acquaint us with their plans, their aspirations and their special problems as they stand firm for freedom's cause against a constant challenge from the north.

In addition to being impressed by the friendliness and steadfastness of the Korean people, I would say one of the highlights of the trip for me was the opportunity to see firsthand the economic and industrial miracle which is taking place in South Korea.

Those with knowledge of the capital city of Seoul and the surrounding area in the strife-torn days of the Korean war between 1950 and 1953 would have to be amazed over the recovery which has been made. Seoul is now a modern, progressive city with a population of 4 million. There is little evidence of the damage and destruction inflicted when the North Koreans overran it in 1950 and the U.N. forces won it back. There are signs instead of prosperity and a business boom on every hand.

This comeback is a success story for American aid. Since 1953, the United States has extended economic assistance to the South Koreans to the extent of some $4 billion. We have also been generous with our military assistance and have made it possible for the South Koreans to build up their forces and defenses to where they can handle almost any situation.

Private capital from foreign investors has also paid handsome dividends to those companies which took a gamble on the will and the energy of the South Koreans to establish their Republic and build an economy. Five-year plans have succeeded 5-year plans and are moving South Korea toward its goal of industrialization and modernization. It is expected that the Republic of Korea will soon reach the stage when our grants in aid can be terminated. "Soft loans" will still be needed for powerplants, water development, highways, housing complexes and more industries, but underwriting these loans is good business for the United States as we help a trusted ally in Asia.

This progress and success is galling to the North Koreans across the DMZ. They will do anything to disrupt it as their plots and counterplots of the recent past have shown. Their next target is the presidential election in 1970. President Park is prevented from succeeding himself for another term unless the constitution is amended. He is popular and is given credit for the stability and phenomenal advancement of the country. The North Koreans are expected to infiltrate and provoke incidents to disrupt the election. They have vowed to reunify the country under communism by violence.

The presence of the Communists is all too near. The demilitarized zone is only 30 miles from Seoul and there are occasional skirmishes which threaten the peace. One day out of our tour was reserved for a visit to the DMZ and the truce camp near the village of Panmunjom. We visited both the Korean and American forces patrolling the zone—the 25th Republic of Korea Division at Outpost 355, and Company B, 2d Battalion of the 9th U.S. Infantry at Advance Camp H-127.

One of the highlights of the tour for me was the opportunity to sit down and have lunch with our men at this front. I was honored to be joined by two Kansans serving in these forces—Sp 4C. David A. Tarpley of Lakin, Kans., a recovery mechanic, and Pvt. Ronald C. McGoldrick of DeSoto, Kans., a track driver. We had a great time talking about Kansas and what is happening back home. I could tell they were both proud of what they are doing in the service of their country, but I was also aware that they are anxious to complete their tours of duty and get back home. I assured both of them that I would get in touch with their parents as soon as I returned to Washington.

These men of ours know they have the gratitude of the South Koreans for their help in preserving the peace so the country can grow and prosper. This outpouring of gratitude was evident to our party as well. All of the officials at all of the meetings and functions let us know how much their alliance with the United States has meant in establishing their sovereignty, in building their defenses and in developing their country. It is a unique relationship in many ways, but one built on friendship and trust and the overriding conviction that free men everywhere must join hands and take a stand against aggression.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Now I am very pleased to yield to one of the outstanding members of our group, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma very much for yielding a few moments to me. Certainly, of course, I want to join my colleagues in giving every praise possible to the majority leader for having done what I consider to be the most magnificent job in the exchange of relationships between governments that I have ever seen personally. I believe these are the sentiments that have been echoed by my colleagues as we discussed the trip we recently made to Korea.

Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say I was very meaningfully impressed by the warm, wonderful and hospitable people of South Korea. I believe for people who have suffered a devastation of their country a number of times, over a period of years, it does us good occasionally to go and meet, mingle, talk and exchange viewpoints with these kinds of people.

Here are people, Mr. Speaker, who have suffered probably like we in America have never suffered, and hopefully like we will never have to suffer. They are people who, because of their suffering, however, have learned to love their freedom in a way which is more than we as Americans can understand. They are people who have defended their nation time and time again against forces of superior strength but who in all instances and under all pressures have fought back to defend themselves against those who would suppress them.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it does one good to go to a country which over a period of years our Nation has attempted to assist, and has provided some material defenses for, and find that they really love our country; to find that they are grateful and thankful that we have in fact taken it upon ourselves to assist them in defending them against invasion from the north.

Upon receiving the invitation to join this group to visit Korea, I tried to read everything that I could. I read everything that I got from the Korean Embassy here in Washington, and everything that I could get from the State Department. I even went to the Library of Congress and read a few things that neither one of them provided me with.

I thought I understood the situation very well before I left this country, but I was so pleasantly surprised, and I might say amazed, to find that what I read did not really do justice to that vibrant people, the people of the Republic of Korea. They are people who are among the hardest working, if not the hardest working, in that part of the world. They are hard working by any measuring device we could devise, and certainly they are hard working by the standards which we recognize in this country.

They want desperately to move their country forward; they want desperately to maintain their freedom by making their mark in that part of the world as a free nation, a leader of nations in a democratic society.

And so it was a great pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to go over there and meet with the leaders of that great country, to meet with the people and find out that they truly are friendly, that they truly are allies of this great country and find out too, that they are willing to work day and night, as many hours as are necessary, to continue to move their country forward in freedom; to develop their country agriculturally to a higher degree, to develop that country's economy and to develop, industrially too, so that they can withstand the juggernaut from the north which stands there ready to seize upon them at the first available opportunity.

And so it was a real pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank you very much for having included me in the group.

I might say that I had a pleasure that none of the other members of the group had because I was privileged to meet with the Minister of Science and Technology as a result of my committee assignment here in the Congress. I was greatly pleased to have met the Minister of Science and Technology. They now have more than 1,000 able, dedicated professional people working in that area, again for the purpose of moving that country forward industrially and in every other possible way. Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to predict that as a result of this effort on the part of that great nation, yea, even though they can hardly afford to undertake that kind of an exercise, the Republic of Korea will in the not too distant future be one of the leading countries in that part of the world in total industrial and economic development for the benefit of their people and for the benefit, therefore, of that part of the world as well.

XUM

So, it was a very enjoyable trip. It was one which afforded the members of the group to learn a great many things which one could not possibly learn from a book or from a periodical or from a paper.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we have the pleasure of having their leaders over here, and as a result of that provide other of our colleagues the opportunity to meet with some of them, our colleagues, too, will better understand what we are talking about when we talk about a very great nation, a very great people. People who are to be commended for the efforts which they are putting forward today, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can participate and provide hospitality equal to or perhaps I should say half as good as that which they provided us when we visited their country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a member of the recent House of Representatives special delegation to the United States-Korean Interparliamentary Conference in Seoul, Korea.

I welcome this opportunity to publicly thank the Vice Speaker of Korea and his many colleagues for their gracious hospitality. While southern hospitality in the United States is legendary, the warmth and graciousness of our South Korean friends has never been equalled, in my experience, anywhere.

I was most impressed with the industriousness and dedication to freedom, obvious both in and out of government, by our good friends and allies, the Koreans. Their anti-Communist posture is understandable. Their love for America is most genuine and their deep appreciation for our support in the past was very evident.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express to my colleagues here in the House my admiration and respect for the leader of our delegation to Korea, the great majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT. In accepting an honorary degree from the University of Seoul and in speaking to the Korean National Assembly, CARL ALBERT made us proud that we were Americans. He did an outstanding job in representing the United States of America and I consider myself most fortunate that this trip permitted me to become better acquainted with him.

It is my firm belief that time is definitely on the side of the South Koreans. We do face a critical danger in the next couple of years due to the aggressive and hostile actions of the North Koreans in their desire to militarily take over the South. I further believe that in several more years the South Koreans will be strong enough, both militarily and economically, to defend their own land against any invasion from the north.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, whose presence certainly added to the prestige and competence of our delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) at this time.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with all the very high praise which has been so generously but very justifiably lavished on the leader of this special delegation, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, our majority leader.

I want to say, as a part of this RECORD, that those who did not travel to Korea also served. Certainly I am most personally aware, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that this delegation would not have been possible had it not been for the warm reaction which was in your heart to the request which was presented by the Korean National Assembly; and it is out of your great understanding of their particular position and their peculiar problems that you were so ready and willing, and even anxious, that we should cooperate. I know that without your interest we would not have had designated such an outstanding leader of this group as you did.

I want to say also that the Ambassador of Korea, His Excellency Kim Dong To, was very active in encouraging this exchange. While he remained in Washington, it was through his good offices that the important preparatory work was done.

I know there was a great expectation, and great interest in Korea from the President on down. There was a great interest shown by the Prime Minister. Through his efforts it was assured that the programs would be productive and that they were of the highest quality. The cooperation given by Vice Speaker Chang was of inestimable importance to the tour's success.

I bring back a rather deep and rather sober assessment of this trip. I am mindful of the history we have had with Korea. It goes back long before the Korean war, Mr. Speaker. It goes far back in years. Unfortunately it is a history which is a collage of good will on the one hand and indifference on the other. There has been intrusion of military and diplomatic interests from time to time, of economic interest from time to time, but we have not had a sustained interest in the country and in the building of its institutions.

We can defend against the exploitations from outsiders by a military stance, but we cannot build within any country—that would be our ally and which hopes to help us defend freedom—this kind of response to the needs of freedom unless we help them build the institutions which are really the bulwark of freedom.

Freedom does not rest upon the guns and battlefronts alone. They can only provide the time period for the building of the concept of freedom.

Freedom is not rested upon any particular individual, no matter how great he might be. Certainly, contributions could not be more significant than you have made to the United States, Mr. Speaker, nor greater than the contributions the majority leader made as leader of this great group. But when all is said and done, the bastion is the institution of freedom which men build and to which they will adhere and serve.

These institutions are what Korea needs now. Korea has had our affection. Korea has had our hope. Certainly on this trip there was a feeling of that warm affection. But Korea needs our respect. I think a new era is now possible between the United States and Korea, an era built not just on good will, not just on affection, but on respect—respect for the fact that they want to move ahead as a responsible unit in the free world. To do this they must have the kind of institution which lives beyond the life span of one man.

Korea in 1971 is going to meet a very demanding milestone. Can it handle the passage of power under a democratic institution in peace and in order? Their adversaries in the north do not want that to happen, Mr. Speaker. They do not want this to be a peaceful situation. Their provocative acts have picked up recently making it clear that the North Koreans will do all they can to prevent a peaceful transition.

We found this out, by being present there. We must not let them down in this immediate period, with the great burden they now face.

I certainly commend the Koreans for coming forward and initiating by their invitation this exchange, and saying to us, "Will you help us build the legal framework, as you have helped us with our military stance and as you have helped us with our economic development? Also help us to build the legal framework that will keep us a strong unit in the free world, to be sure that peace will ultimately prevail and that improvement for people will "move forward even in the face of conflict in a hostile world," as my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER) stated so well.

Our visit to Korea could not have been more propitiously timed. This is so because as David I. Steinberg put it in his book, "Korea: Nexus of Asia":

> The next few years will be crucial for the Republic of Korea. She will be sorely tested from the North. Efforts will be made at reunification. She will be subjected to internal pressures: politically during the all-important election of 1971 and before that time; socially, through economic growth unevenly shared; administratively, as she moves to meet with greater efficiency, hopefully within a democratic context, the demands of the developmental process.

The Republic of Korea's immediate political, social, and economic problems are compounded by the imminent threat from the north. They will add up to a test of both the Republic of Korea and the United States. For as Steinberg said:

> The United States must meet the tests which the Republic of Korea will undergo, for in Korean and foreign eyes as well as in our American domestic politics, our commitment extends to Korean political and social development and our record is spotty at best.

Any assessment of the extent of our commitment to the Republic of Korea must include an analysis of what reciprocal commitments we can expect from it. In this connection, we cannot overlook the Republic of Korea's record—its unique record—of unrestrained and unswerving loyalty to our country. As for the future, I would call attention to a memorandum presented by the Honorable Park Joon Kyu, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Na-

XUM

tional Assembly of Korea. In it Assemblyman Park states that—

> Korea will always stand ready to make its utmost contribution, as evidenced by our participation in the Viet Nam War. Our people did not forget the American sacrifices during the Korean War, and are keenly conscious of the value of the present United States presence and defense of Korea. Our capabilities are doubtlessly limited, but we will always act as a loyal ally of the United States, and the United States can count on it.

This definitive statement leaves no room to question Korea's commitment to our country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if this trip just concluded is to be termed "a junket," then we should have more such junkets, because this visit, in my judgment, has been a very constructive contribution that was made to the relationships which exist between nations, which was of the highest order and character and most needed at a time when the world must find a pattern for progress and a direction in which to go.

Mr. Speaker, I feel greatly honored that Mr. ALBERT asked me to go, and that I was able to be one of this outstanding group that was so ably led by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. LLOYD).

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be present here in person today to express the high regard which I feel, which has been expressed also by other of my colleagues on the floor, to the majority leader for the leadership which he gave to this most important and significant exchange and visit to the Republic of Korea by a delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives, I also express my appreciation to the Speaker for the opportunity he gave me of being a Member of this delegation.

Mr. Speaker, one must respect the diligent and responsible efforts of the leaders of the Assembly of the Republic of Korea to communicate as effectively as possible with the leaders and Members of the United States House of Representatives, for without such informed communication the investment which our two nations have made in the integrity of each other will not achieve its maximum beneficial results, and future relations might prove less relevant.

As a result of this communication in the form of a visit to the Republic of Korea in response to an invitation by the delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives there has certainly been a great input into the practical intelligence available to the Members of this House. In addition to this input of intelligence, the communication between the legislators of the two nations, has given more of us an understanding of the Korean people themselves, and of the mutuality of interest which unites our countries.

This mutuality of interest is the key in my judgment to continuing beneficial relations between us. First we have the historic fact of our joint effort, fighting side by side to save the Republic of Korea from aggression from the north and the mutual shedding of blood in that common struggle. In the sharing of that long and arduous experience under fire, our two countries and our peoples have a strong and enduring bond.

This mutuality of interest, forged in the Korean war, is now riveted closer by the common desire to protect freedom and the opportunity for the individual to live in a society which is free rather than totalitarian. The future of our common bond is tied closely to the continuing desire of our peoples to remain free. The constant threat of an invasion from the north presents the people of the Republic of Korea with this continuing challenge to their conviction and determination.

For my own part, I returned from Korea convinced of the dedication of the leaders and people of the Republic of Korea to resist the Communist threat, and deeply impressed by the good will, the buoyant enthusiasm, the desire and the capability of the Korean people and their leadership.

I was impressed too by the stability of the Government, by the quality of its leadership, by the political competition of two strong political parties, and by the unity of the people behind its form of government and resistance to the Communist threat.

In our visit to the DMZ and to Panmunjom I was again deeply impressed by the debt which we owe to the brave men of our Armed Forces under the command of Gen. Charles Bonesteel III, commanding general of the United Nations forces and of the U.S. Armed Forces and with the other members of our delegation I hold in the most high regard the performance of the ROK Army which guards the major portion of the DMZ, and it should be mentioned here again that the Republic of Korea has 50,000 troops fighting with us in South Vietnam.

I express my appreciation and respect for the distinguished majority leader who led our delegation, to our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. HANNA) and others responsible for the scheduling which provided so much intelligence in a short time, and especially do I pay my respects to those leaders and members of the Assembly and the Government of the Republic of Korea whose good will and consideration for our interests made of this visit a most fruitful experience for the benefit of our two countries.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT). Going to Korea was one of the great experiences of my life. It became obvious to me that here is a nation in the free world that is truly making use of the military and economic assistance given to them by the United States. The fact that they are 2 years ahead of their second 5-year economic growth plan indicates their dedication to these objectives. This has been accomplished in spite of a rather serious drought in agriculture.

It is apparent when you look at the young people of Korea that they are being well fed and cared for. When you add to this their high rate of literacy it is easier to understand why they are making such progress and have such dedication to their freedom. I believe the interparliamentary exchange was of very worthwhile importance. The friendship that emanated between the representatives of the two countries was certainly indicative of a joy that can come as a result of being a free people.

I want to add my commendations to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), who served as chairman for our congressional delegation on this trip to Korea. He represented our country and all of us in a very dignified and official manner. It is my honor and privilege to have been a member of this congressional group that visited Korea.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to serve as a member of the House delegation to the Republic of Korea, and I returned home with the knowledge that in that country we have a sturdy and dependable friend.

Out of the ruins left by Communist aggression the people of South Korea have built a progressive nation, an economically sound nation that is one of the outstanding success stories of our time. The ties of friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea are strong and enduring. They were strengthened still further by the exchange of views between members of our delegation and officials of the Korean Government.

Our hosts could not have been more gracious. I will never forget the spirit of hospitality with which they received us, and it is my hope that at some time in the future we will be honored by a visit from them in order that we will have an opportunity to reciprocate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with our distinguished majority leader and my colleagues in saying that the Korean trip that we made some weeks ago will hold for me a memory that will never be forgotten. To observe the advancements that have been made by the Korean people in the past few years is almost unbelievable.

The economy of their country has grown to a place that they are now holding their own under what looked like insurmountable odds a few years ago. The determination and courage of the National Assembly of Korea has brought this about.

The associations we had with the members of the National Assembly showed to us that they are a people of great courage and great determination. The spirit of the people of Korea is just unbelievable. They are imbued with a feeling of independence and liberty which is something to observe.

A country that is surrounded by nations not friendly to their thinking, under some circumstances might not have the feeling that the South Koreans have—a feeling that they want to keep their freedom and their independence.

From what I observed on the Korean trip, I feel that the Korean Government should be commended very highly for the progress that they have made over the last decade. Because of the Government's efforts, Seoul is now a city of many beautiful structures and an educational system of very high quality.

My association with the men in the Korean Government leads me to believe that they are one of our strongest allies,

XUM

and they will be a great factor in helping other countries become free nations.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Korea for their wonderful hospitality. No one could have shown us any more courtesies than we were shown by the people of South Korea.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and a pleasure to be one of the 23 Congressmen who made up the delegation which traveled to Korea last month for the purpose of participating in an interparliamentary exchange with members of the Korean National Assembly.

During my brief stay in the Republic of Korea I was immensely impressed by the great social and economic progress that this small nation has made in the space of less than two decades. Wherever we traveled in Korea, we saw evidence of the hard work that has been put forth by the Korean people in its concerted effort at nation building. In Seoul we saw new expressways being constructed to speed business and commerce, we saw streets and shops crowded with goods and people, we saw schools filled with children anxious to learn, and we saw universities making a coordinated effort to meet this developing nation's need for the highly trained manpower required to thrust it into the forefront of Asian economic development.

When visiting industrial cities, we saw, firsthand, the important part American economic assistance has played in the development of the Republic of Korea. We visited modern plants which were financed with long-term loans. We watched while grain grown on the American plains was converted into food products for Asian consumption.

All this notwithstanding, the most impressive feature of our visit to the industrial complex of Korea was not the hardware we saw, but rather the sight of what surely must be one of the most industrious people in all the world engaged in the pursuit of economic progress.

Korea melds the vibrance of a modern society on the go with the richness of a culture which is the product of centuries of existence. The beauty of Korean art and ceramics, in my experience, will admit the few equals.

Not long ago, another Asian nation touted their "great leap forward." As time passed, it became clear to us in the West that Red China's great leap forward was in fact more rhetoric than reality. As one who has visited in Korea, I can frankly say that if any nation has the right to boast of having made a great leap forward, it is the Republic of Korea. For it is the Republic of Korea which has made phenomenal social and economic progress over the past 15 years while at the same time building the constitutional democratic institutions required to insure that this economic progress will not have been made in vain.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in extending my appreciation to the people of the Republic of Korea, their President, Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Speaker, and Vice Speaker of the National Assembly, the members of the Cabinet, the National Assembly, and other officials for the hospitality extended to the U.S. congressional delegation to the Republic of Korea during our visit from March 2 to March 7 this year.

Our South Korean friends showed themselves to be gracious and thoughtful hosts and each member of the delegation was almost overwhelmed by their many courtesies to us.

We each lived an unforgettable week. From the moment we touched down at Kimpo International Airport until we departed, we made and deepened friendships, we learned of the challenges of achieving security from aggression and national economic development facing the Republic of Korea, and we observed the committed energy, discriminating intelligence and high resolve the South Koreans display as they meet those challenges.

I came away strong in the belief that one of the great dramas in the postwar period of confrontation is being played out in this divided land.

Two impressions among many stand out in my mind about our delegation's trip.

First, I was impressed with the sense of purpose and nation-building displayed by the leaders of South Korea. The leadership has the enthusiasm of a group launched upon a high adventure. Several high-ranking Government officials I encountered, for example, were educated in the United States and held attractive jobs here. They returned to South Korea, however, to participate in the exciting and exacting challenge of building a new nation. In meeting after meeting, it was strongly impressed upon me that the leadership of South Korea had their eyes firmly fixed upon the target of a free, prosperous, democratic Republic of Korea.

Second, I was impressed by the competence of the leadership of the Republic of Korea. It became very obvious to me during the course of our visit that the top leadership of the Republic of Korea is knowledgeable and skillful. The oral briefings and the printed material provided for reflected careful thought. The needs and problems of the nation were clearly defined, goals firmly established, and alternative methods of reaching the goals carefully evaluated.

So I came away from the Republic of Korea assured on one essential requirement in order for the difficult national process of development to succeed. We all know that no country can ultimately succeed in the challenges of economic and social development, except by its own efforts.

I am persuaded that the leaders of the Republic of Korea want their country to develop on many levels: political, social, economic. They are willing to exert every resource to achieve their national development goals. Without that kind of commitment, development is simply not possible. With it, development is by no means assured, but a giant hurdle toward development has been removed.

We can only wish them well in their endeavors, commend them for their remarkable progress, assist them where we can, and hope, with them, that the energies of 30 million South Koreans will be successful in achieving national economic development in order to achieve a better living for the South Korean people, and to gain a more secure position in the community of nations.

My newsletter for March 17 follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

I have just returned from an intensive study mission to South Korea, one of America's stanchest allies in Asia.

Korea today is a country of many contrasts, a harsh and rugged land inhabited by some of the most hospitable people on earth . . . a country steeped in ancient Asian traditions, yet adapting to new ways of life in order to survive in the modern world . . . a nation of fiercely proud people who have maintained their nationality despite centuries of invasions and occupations by neighboring countries . . . it is a nation which is divided at the 38th Parallel and reflects within its own borders the tragedies both personal and national, of the cold war confrontation between the Communist and free world.

South Korea exits today under continued, ominous threats of aggression from north of the 38th Parallel. The Premier of North Korea, Marshal Kim Il-Song has threatened to invade South Korea in the 1970s. He has backed these threats up with increasing efforts at infiltration into the South.

Despite these tensions, however, there is an impressive sense of purpose and nation-building among the leaders of South Korea. The leadership has the enthusiasm of a group launched on a great adventure. Several ministers were educated in the United States and held very attractive jobs in this country. They have returned to South Korea, however, to participate in the venture of building a new nation.

The major objective of the leadership is national economic development in order to achieve a better living for its people and to gain a more secure position in the community of nations. The Korean people are eager for this kind of recognition and their progress has been remarkable. Over-all growth has averaged a solid 8½ percent a year during the last five years. Industrial production has nearly doubled in that time, and almost every ecomonic indicator is climbing rapidly.

The American investment in Korea is sizeable. Today, there are 50,000 American soldiers there and 11,000 other Americans, including dependents, who live in Korea, working on economic and technical assistance programs or at the U.S. Embassy.

Large sums of American money have been invested in South Korea to maintain its integrity as a nation. The United States seeks a free, independent, democratic Korea, peacefully unified through elections under UN supervision, with a national assembly and government which is representative of the people.

We have been concerned in the past two years with increased militancy on the part of the North Korean regime. Just this week, two days after I left Korea, gun fire broke out in the demilitarized zone. During 1967, for example, there were 566 incidents involving the use of force at the DMZ.

Perhaps the most blatant exercise of force came in January, 1968, when a specially-trained team of 31 agents attempted to assassinate Chung Hee Park, the President of South Korea. This act of aggression produced little comment in the U.S. because it was followed in a few days by the capture of the Pueblo.

It is obvious that North Korea's long range objective is the unification of Korea under Communist rule. In the short term, they hope, by infiltration, to tie down South Ko-

XUM

rean forces and to disrupt the economic and political processes which are taking place.

One of my six days in Korea was spent touring the DMZ, and I was impressed by the arduous duty American and Korean forces have in protecting South Korea. It is an uninviting land, and the duty performed by American servicemen is dangerous and difficult. I was reminded of this when I visited Panmunjom, the center of communications between North and South Korea. North Korean troops were very much in evidence and along the demilitarized zone a bank of powerful loudspeakers poured out a continuous blare of Communistic propaganda.

I was one of a 23-member Congressional delegation, headed by House Majority Leader Carl Albert, who traveled 17,000 miles in eight days and spent six of them talking to South Korean leaders. Our meetings were with the President, the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the National Assembly, members of the cabinet and practically every high government official.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be among the 23 Congressmen who recently visited Korea. I can say without reservation that this was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. It is gratifying to know that we have friends such as we found throughout the Republic of Korea.

The South Koreans are an amazing people. They have used their own ingenuity in building a truly great nation. Within the last 15 years there is probably no group of people who have accepted the challenges and opportunities that lie before them as have the Koreans.

Mr. Speaker, everywhere in their country that we visited we were received with the finest and most gracious hospitality that could be imagined. It was clearly a demonstration of their friendship and the close bonds that tie our two countries together. It is our hope that not too long from now they may see fit to send their congressional delegation to our country. It was of great benefit to all of us to discuss our problems and theirs in an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation.

The untold acts of thoughtfulness and kindness extended to those of us who were a part of this mission will not soon be forgotten nor will we forget that South Korea has over 40,000 of their own sons fighting side by side with ours in Vietnam today. The South Koreans are aware, possibly more than any other nation, of the inherent and imminent dangers of Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation representing the United States reports to you and to this Congress that our mission was most successful in building bridges of friendship that will be long lasting and fruitful for generations to come.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to have been a member of the congressional delegation to the Republic of Korea. I regret that my participation in the visit was cut short by a family sorrow which required my return to the United States. However, I was in South Korea for a long enough period of time to be tremendously impressed by the energy of the Korean people—the plain, old-fashioned hard work with which they attack their problems—their warmth and courtesy and personal charm, and their bravery and courage.

I attempted to put some of this into words in an article which I sent to the newspapers in my district in North Carolina. I wanted the people of my district to know more about our good friends in South Korea. The article was widely reprinted, and I submit it here for the RECORD. Two articles were sent to the newspapers. The first article concerned the trip over and our visit to Japan.

Each one of us on the trip thanks each of you in South Korea for your great courtesy to us. Each of us hopes that some day we can once again visit the "Land of the Morning Calm."

The report follows:

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN RICHARDSON PREYER ON CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO JAPAN AND KOREA—PART II

It is only 840 miles from Tokyo to Seoul, Korea. This isn't much of a trip for a jet plane ordinarily, but it can be a long and hard flight because the worst winds in the world—as far as flying is concerned—occur between Tokyo and Korea. For example, we had a 250 m.p.h. headwind on our flight.

The reception for the United States delegation at the Kimpo Airport in Seoul made it worth the rough flight. South Koreans love America and are deeply grateful to our fighting men and our country for making a free South Korea possible. The reception showed this: cheering crowds, bands playing, full military honors. Each Congressman was given a big bouquet of flowers by some young girls. A group of children held signs welcoming each Congressman individually. I gave my bouquet to the girl and boy—they looked to be 10 to 12 years old—holding the "Welcome, Richardson Preyer of North Carolina" sign. They were very courteous and well-mannered.

The City of Seoul was a battleground during the Korean War that changed hands four times from 1950–53. At the end of the war it was a shattered shell, its one million people facing famine. Today, it is a city of four million people—one of the world's largest—and is a city completely transformed. It is one of the world's great success stories. Everywhere you turn you see bulldozers and people at work. Our delegation arrived on a Sunday afternoon, and there seemed to be as many people at work as if it were a weekday. (Incidentally, Christianity is the leading religion in Korea, Christians outnumbering the Buddhists by about ½ million. As far as I know, this is the only country in the Far East where this is even close to being the case.) There is a handsome new skyline and new highways. There is intense interest in education, and the literacy rate is nearly 90% (from about 10% earlier). All of this has been accomplished by native energy and foreign aid. (This is one foreign aid success story.)

Yet despite its boom, Seoul lives in a shadow. For only 30 miles away lies the Demilitarized Zone, separating North and South Korea. Though a truce technically prevails, there are minor skirmishes across the line which constantly threaten the uneasy peace. Some 50,000 American troops are on duty and live under combat conditions. About 10 Americans are killed each month in these skirmishes. Infiltrators are a problem. In January, 1969, 31 North Korean guerrillas infiltrated into Soeul itself with the mission of assassinating the President of South Korea. They actually charged his official residence, after throwing hand grenades at two city buses (killing three passengers), but were all shot or captured. The guerrillas make an assassination threat an ever-present possibility, but they have had no real success because they have no way to live off the country when they get into South Korea; the South Korean people are fiercely loyal to their government and to America and so report them immediately.

There are 30,410,000 people in South Korea. This is more than double that of North Korea. They live in an area roughly the size of the State of Virginia. It certainly does not *look* like Virginia, however. When you fly over it, you see ridge after ridge of barren, snow-covered mountains; you wonder how our fighting men ever fought a war there. When you find a plain—or any small flat place—it is jammed with people. The Koreans would regard the 6th District of North Carolina—with its open land and relatively mild climate (Korea is hotter in the summer and colder in the winter than North Carolina) as paradise!

South Korea throughout all its recent history has been an occupied country. The Japanese most recently ruled the country until 1945 with an iron hand. As a result, they have had no experience with a democratic form of government. Nevertheless, they have done a good job in making representative government work. One of the purposes of the visit of our delegation was to discuss with the Congress (called the National Assembly) the problems involved in government, and to strengthen the prestige of their Congress.

In addition to making progress in democracy, they have made great strides in establishing a free enterprise economy. Nevertheless, there is serious reason for concern as they look to the future. For while the South Koreans are busy developing a free enterprise economy, the North Koreans are busy arming.

The North Korean armaments are superior to South Korea in both quantity and quality. This raises the spectre of another Vietnam type involvement for our country should North Korea march across the demilitarized zone into South Korea again. The seizure of the *Pueblo*, of course, was the latest of the North Korean war-like acts. It is important, in my opinion, that we help South Korea arm itself so that it can defend itself. For example, we should help the South Koreans to set up plants to manufacture rifles *in South Korea*. It means, too, that we shall probably need to keep our base at Okinawa so that we can have an immediate sea and air response should North Korea invade South Korea by sea. (South Korea has no navy that could stop such an invasion.)

Finally, some people may say, "Is it worth the cost to send a group of Congressmen to Korea, or to any other place? Why don't they stay in Washington?" In my opinion it is very much worth the cost and effort. In running a private business, you would feel that you were not doing your duty if you did not visit your operations and see on the spot whether it is being very effectively run. In government, we are spending millions—even billions—of dollars abroad. It is worth a few thousand dollars to make sure that the millions are being properly spent. Suggestions made by U.S. delegations as a result of these trips have resulted in saving the taxpayers' amounts far in excess of the cost of these trips.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Members of the delegation to Korea may appear in the RECORD in order of their designation by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject which we have been discussing today under my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE MANDATORY OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that I was here today and had the opportunity to hear under this special order of the distinguished majority leader this dissertation on Korea.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for 10 years. We have had some bitter and bloody fights on the floor of the House with reference to these matters. The only thing I regret today is that this group could not have held off until just before we brought our appropriation bill onto the floor of the House. Some of us have lived with this problem of Korea for a great many years and have had some very difficult fights, as I mentioned earlier, with reference to the appropriations request on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I feel an obligation to respond to a lengthy and detailed presentation made on March 12. That presentation dealt with a subject with which I am greatly concerned: the proposal for a free trade subzone and oil refinery at Machiasport.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments for and against the Machiasport project are no longer new. The proposal's effects upon the consumer, the New England economy, the domestic oil industry, and the national interest have been examined by both sides, and by now the lines are rather firmly drawn. My own position in favor of Machiasport has been affirmed on several occasions and it is not my purpose today to tread the same ground again.

However, the statement that I refer to raised issues reaching far beyond the Machiasport proposal itself. As was correctly pointed out, that proposal must be seen in the context of our total Government policy toward the oil industry, and certainly in the context of our oil import program. The statement assumptions concerning the oil import program and other governmental regulations designed to protect the industry are so very different from my own, that I feel I would be remiss if I did not respond without delay and without equivocation.

Particularly because the presentation was the first major statement opposing the Machiasport project to relate that project to the total picture of Government oil policy, I feel that the time is right to present my own views and specific proposals on the future role of our Government in formulating policy toward the industry.

I would like to begin by tracing briefly the history of our Government's intervention in the oil industry. Such an examination will help us to better understand how the various regulations and subsidies developed and what their effect on the industry and the country has been over the last several years.

The first significant entrance of Government into the oil industry came when that industry was quite young, during and immediately following the First World War. To encourage the exploration and development of our oil fields, percentage depletion allowance benefits were introduced as a tax subsidy. The Revenue Act of 1918 granted to oil firms a 100 percent tax-free income equal to discovery value of their oil property. In 1924, the tax-free income flow was changed to 50 percent of the property's net income. The present system of a 27½ percent oil depletion allowance—based on gross instead of net income—was adopted in 1926. Under this allowance, up to 50 percent of the net income from a property is tax-free. Thus, if a company claims the full allowance, its tax rate is cut in half. Other tax benefits, and complex devices for minimizing tax liability, have the effect of saving the industry millions of dollars in tax bills each year. The loser is Uncle Sam—and ultimately, all of us taxpayers who carry a heavier load to make up what the oil industry is saving.

In 1967, some of the Nation's biggest oil companies—including Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Standard of New Jersey, Union, Marathon, and Sinclair—paid Federal taxes of between 2 and 8 percent of their net income. Think of their incredible saving, especially when those rates are compared with the standard corporate tax rate of 52 percent.

In fact, one company—Atlantic Refining Co.—paid no Federal taxes at all between 1962 and 1967, despite total earnings of $410 million.

Surely these tax benefits constitute the biggest windfall in our country's fiscal history.

As I indicated, the percentage depletion allowance was established to encourage discovery of our oil reserves. But a recent study has shown that at this point we are losing over $10 in revenue for every $1 of discovered oil reserves. This is insanity. It is high time that the depletion allowance be reexamined and sharply curtailed if not eliminated entirely.

To return to the historical picture, the effect of these tax subsidies after World War I was to encourage oil drilling and production at a breakneck pace. By the early thirties, the increased volume of oil available at a time when demand was declining led inevitably to a decline in the price of oil. The discovery of a vast oil field in east Texas in 1930 also contributed to depressed prices.

To check the frantic activity of oil producers which the depletion allowance encouraged, Government resorted to a second type of intervention in the form of prorationing regulations passed by the leading oil-producing States. Prorationing mechanisms function by limiting the total crude-oil production in a given State and dividing that total among the various wells and among the producers in each well. The result is to deliberatley slow down production.

Prorationing has two purposes. The first is to restrict production to the rate at which it is most efficient, in order to eliminate the waste which occurs when oil is taken from the ground too fast. The second purpose is to restrict production to that quantity which will meet current market demand at the existing price.

I believe that the first form of prorationing is justified; the second is not. Maximum efficient rate prorationing is clearly in the national interest because it conserves our oil resources. This was necessary because the drive to maximize short-term profits had driven many oil firms, especially jointly owned ones, to produce at the fastest possible rate, which, as I indicated is highly wasteful. However, market-demand prorationing has nothing to do with conservation or efficiency; its purpose is to artificially maintain the price of oil.

The reason behind market-demand prorationing is that it protects smaller and less efficient operators who otherwise would not be able to compete with higher production wells. In so doing, it compounds the problem by making those high-production wells inefficient themselves—they are held back for the benefit of the ones which cannot compete in a free market. Market-demand prorationing robs Peter to pay Paul.

Just how serious is the effect of market-demand prorationing on the economics of the industry? The average producing capacity of wells in the United States is about 14 barrels per day. This compares with over 5,000 barrels per day in the most profitable oil fields in the Middle East. Given a ratio of 14 to 5,000, it is no wonder that our domestic industry requires such massive tax subsidies and other benefits in order to compete. But here is the point: the only reason that our figure is so low is because of prorationing regulations. We have in this country wells which are capable of producing efficiently up to 1,000 barrels per day. They are restricted precisely to protect small, inefficient wells that can produce only 5 barrels per day. Given our economy, there is no excuse for this situation. If it were eliminated, the good wells would become much more efficient and profitable. Profits encourage greater exploratory activity and would in turn lead to new discoveries. The industry would in my view be far healthier if it were freed from the shackles of market-demand prorationing.

At any rate, the effect of the prorationing plans adopted by most of the oil-producing States a number of years ago led to artificially high prices for domestic oil. Naturally then, competition began to emerge from firms with foreign oil holdings, who found that their cost of producing foreign oil and shipping it to this country still enabled them to sell at prices below those charged by domestic producers. Thus, increasingly large volumes of oil were imported into the country.

The response of the domestic-based industry to this new threat was predictable: additional Government intervention was sought to protect the domestic industry from foreign competition. Thus a third governmental step was taken in the form of a protective tariff on imported crude oil. This tariff has existed at a rate of 10½ cents per barrel since 1943.

The increased petroleum needs generated by the Second World War threw into sharp focus both the growing ratio of imported oil to domestic oil, and the implications of that situation for our national security. At the conclusion of the war, the Petroleum Industry War Council recommended that—

> In the interest of maintaining national security it should be the policy of this nation to so restrict amounts of imported oil so that such quantities will not disturb or depress the producing end of the domestic petroleum industry, and only such amounts of oil should be imported into this country as is absolutely necessary to augment our domestic production when it is produced under conditions consonant with good conservation practices.

Modified to various degrees, this has been the policy of our Government regarding petroleum imports for the last 23 years.

The policy was given legislative reinforcement in 1955 when Congress wrote into the Trade Agreements Extension Act a provision known as the national security amendment. It gives the President authority to "take such action as he deems necessary" to adjust the level of imports of any article which, if imported in sufficient quantities, might "threaten to impair the national security." The national security amendment provided the machinery by which our oil import control program was established.

As soon as the act was passed, representatives of the oil industry began clamoring for its application to petroleum imports. In 1957, following the report of a Special Cabinet Committee, President Eisenhower announced establishment of a voluntary import program. The program lasted for 2 years and was a failure. Therefore, in 1959 the President created the mandatory oil import control program which remains in effect today. The voluntary program had applied only to crude oil; the mandatory one applies also to oil products and derivatives.

The mandatory program, as administered in the greater part of the country, restricts imports to 12.2 percent of domestic production. On the west coast, a deficit area, the percentage is left flexible. Import privileges are divided among participating companies, some receiving fixed allocations because of their "historical" position in the field, others using a sliding scale. While the 12.2-percent figure for controlled imports has remained constant since 1962, the program has become riddled with exceptions and special treatment situations, so that the true ratio of imports to domestic production is higher than 12.2 percent

One important exception is residual fuel oil, a low-priced byproduct of crude refining. Imports of residuals have been handled separately since controls were instituted, and residual marketers have by this time been given virtually unlimited access to foreign supplies—although, of course, the import control mechanism means that those supplies come in at artifically inflated prices. In 1966, imports of residual fuel comprised 84.4 percent of the total supply.

The reason why residual imports are so great is that the domestic industry under present circumstances is not interested in competing for the residual market, which is less profitable than the market for high-priced lighter oils such as No. 2 heating oil. I find it ironic that those who espouse the so-called "national security" argument that imports must be kept to a minimum—a very mistaken argument, as I shall demonstrate—have allowed imports of residual fuel to outnumber domestic supplies by 4 to 1.

Other exceptions to the quota limitations have been made for refiners in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for petrochemical refiners, and in situations where shortages or other unusual circumstances have occurred.

The import control program represents a fourth substantial step by government into the petroleum marketing process: and it is more complex and more controversial than any of the previous ones. It is this program that I would like to examine especially carefully today. First however, let me summarize very briefly my comments on the history of government activity in the oil industry. As we saw, it began with attractive tax subsidies designed to bolster a growing industry. These were so successful that pro-rationing plans were adopted by state governments to slow down production. Pro-rationing in turn led to inflated domestic oil prices, causing increased foreign competition. The latter led to government protection measures in the form of a tariff and, more recently, restrictions on imported oil.

It should be clear that we now have operating a vicious circle of government interventions. One form of intervention has led to another, and today we have an elaborate structure of regulations and subsidies.

THE IMPORT QUOTA SYSTEM

The "capstone," as one economist termed it, of the entire system of subsidies to the petroleum industry is the oil import quota system. It insulates the domestic industry from the free market and from the competitive impact of foreign oil. Were the quotas removed, simple economics would force the domestic industry to become efficient and meet the challenge of competition.

The cost of the protective quota system is borne by every consumer of petroleum and its products. To provide some indication of this cost, it is enough to compare the price of a barrel of crude delivered to a New England port now—about $3.50—with the cost assuming there were no quota—about $2. The exact figures vary according to whose estimate one takes, but it should be clear that there is a tremendous difference. Most persons will agree that there is a differential of at least $1.25 between the world price of a barrel delivered to the United States and the current U.S. price.

When that differential is multiplied by the number of barrels that are sold each year, we arrive at an annual cost to the consumer of over $4 billion a year. So in the 10 years of its operation, the quota system has cost us in the neighborhood of $40 to $50 billion.

In addition to this enormous financial burden, the quota system imposes another kind of hardship that cannot be calculated financially. This hardship occurs especially in New England. The New England States are heavily dependent on oil heat—78 percent of homes in the region use it, and New England's 6 percent of the Nation's population consumes over 20 percent of its heating oil. Long and rugged winters place a heavy demand on fuel oil dealers and suppliers, who are far away from major sources of supply in the southwest. As a result, the New England area has on several occasions been plagued with serious shortages of fuel.

Without the quota system, greater volumes of imported oil would be free to enter the United States at east coast ports, some of them located in New England. Supply would be able to meet demand, and the threat of further shortages would be greatly reduced.

I remember especially well the shortage we in New England experienced during January of 1968. I had repeatedly expressed concern about the possible danger of a shortage, and had testified before the Senate Finance Committee the previous fall on the problem of making adequate supplies available. It was no great surprise to me when a shortage actually occurred.

Particularly instructive was the action taken to deal with the shortage. At my request and the request of other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the Oil Import Appeals Board issued decisions allowing 12 companies to import additional No. 2 fuel oil to meet the shortage. In other words, we turned to increased imported oil to bail us out because the domestic supplies in our area were not adequate.

To my mind, the fact that our situation got so bad that the Government was forced to liberalize oil import conditions is implicit recognition of the inadequacy, indeed the ludicrousness of the oil import quota system.

Why in the world do we have to wait until we are literally running out before we admit that the present ground rules cannot do the job?

The Presidential proclamation establishing the mandatory oil import program recognized the adverse effect of limiting imports and included language clearly implying that imports might be increased if oil prices went up after controls were instituted. Despite numerous price rises—which sometimes occurred in the midst of winter months when demand was greatest—the Government has not invoked the language of the proclamation in order to increase the ratio of imports to domestic production.

This is not to say that public officials have been unaware of the hardship and injustice that accrues to New England under the present quota arrangement. Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in his last news conference before leaving office, admitted that New England has "a very strong case for some kind of action" and expressed regret that he had not acted earlier on the "nagging" regional fuel problem. Recognizing the blatantly unfair method by which quotas are now allocated, Udall proposed a plan to give independent terminal operators on the east coast a share of the import quotas—possibly to the extent of 30,000 barrels a day.

Likewise, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore has called for a close look at the import program with a view to numerous modifications.

But why attempt to continue patching up the quota system to meet each new set of needs as they come along? The plain fact is that the system is first, exorbitantly expensive; second, conducive to fuel shortages; and third, inequitable. Most important, it is unnecessary. Surely the time has come for more basic change.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The sole argument advanced to justify the import control program is that the national security requires it. Although I shall show that this argument is not valid, I want to make the point that it is the only argument that need even be discussed.

In its report on the program last year, the House Interior Committee stated:

> Three Presidents of this Nation, beginning with President Eisenhower and continuing with President Kennedy and President Johnson, together with innumerable special task forces, commissions, and study groups, as well as several congressional committees, have all been of one mind on the objective of the mandatory oil import program. Its one and only reason for being is to insure the national security of this Nation by reducing this country's dependence on foreign imports by assuring a strong and vigorous domestic petroleum industry.

Secretary Udall, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1967, stated that national security "is the paramount—the only—reason why petroleum imports are controlled." And in his remarks a few days ago, the able Senator from Louisiana acknowledged that the threat to national security was the basis of his objection to the proposed Machiasport project. He listed nine ways in which he felt the Machiasport plan would affect national security. He stated that he had no objection to the refinery itself; it was the importation of the refined oil into the country—with its consequent effect on the quota system and hence on the national security—that drew his fire.

It follows logically, then, that if national security can be assured without the mandatory oil import program, then we could—and should—dispense with that program and all of its adverse effects.

Let us acknowledge that our national security does require that two conditions be met: first, we must have enough domestic oil to meet the Nation's needs in times of crisis; and second, the industry must be capable of delivering it expeditiously.

First, then, what is the present state of our oil reserves and potential reserves? How do they compare with our anticipated needs over the next several years and decades?

One reliable estimate places our present underground oil supply at approximately 300 billion barrels now. Ten percent of this, or 30 billion barrels, is "crude reserve"—in other words, it is "on tap." The remaining 270 billion barrels have not even been touched.

It has been estimated that we will consume 50 billion barrels in the next 10 years. At that rate, we have right now enough oil for roughly the next six decades. Of course, consumption may rise, but on the other hand we have not taken into account the probability of large new discoveries in the next several years. For example, the field recently discovered on the North Slope, Alaska, is sizable, and in time could produce between 5 and 10 billion barrels, possibly more.

Finally, and perhaps most promising, there is shale. If we take into account only the richest shale—that containing 25 barrels per ton or more—we have 600 billion barrels of potential oil from shale in the United States. One estimate has indicated that, given current production rates, there is 1,000 years' supply of shale in the country. Developing our ability to extract oil from shale will be a valuable safeguard to national security as well as a sound economic decision. Once the initial investments are made, it will be only a matter of a few years before we can depend on shale for large volumes of low-cost domestic oil.

It should be clear that we are in no danger of exhausting our domestic oil supplies. Given sound planning and technological advances, we will have enough oil to meet our needs for the indefinite future.

The only remaining consideration, then, is that the domestic industry be sufficiently healthy so that it can meet increased demand should some crisis occur which would cut off foreign supplies. This is really the heart of the matter, and not surprisingly, it is surrounded by a thick veil of misunderstanding.

For too long it has been assumed that without the quota system, the domestic industry's capacity would decline, its reserves would dry up, and its profits disappear. Happily, the facts, which are finally coming to light in view of increased public concern, indicate that the opposite is true. Spearheading the effort to establish the facts and bury the misconceptions is an able group of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress. In the Senate, hearings on Government intervention in the petroleum industry are being held by Senator HART of Michigan and others including my Massachusetts colleague Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. I want to express my gratitude and support for their actions, and my hope that we can work together to bring about constructive change.

Let us suppose that import quotas were removed so that the domestic industry had to compete in a free-market situation: we have seen that crude oil prices would drop by about $1.25 per barrel. Would this decline wreck the domestic industry? Far from it. A leading economist's calculation released at the Senate hearings I mentioned—one of the first made—shows that oil prices could be reduced at least this much and that 95 percent of the oil produced in this country could still be sold at a profit.

In other words, only 5 percent of domestic production would be lost if we abandoned the costly oil import program. So under the present system, we are subsidizing 95 percent of the industry, to the tune of $4 billion a year, to protect the remaining 5 percent. Even if these pioneering calculations are only approximates, their implications are absolutely astounding. Far from wrecking the domestic industry, the removal of the oil quota system would be the best thing that has happened to it in years. We saw earlier that the industry today is operating at a very low level of efficiency.

A free market would raise efficiency to a high level, by eliminating the least efficient producers who have been acting as a drag on the rest. With fewer wells, industry operating costs would be lower. Further, the need for market-demand pro-rationing would be obviated, meaning that the remaining wells would produce at a faster and more profitable rate.

Although I think it is clear that an efficient domestic industry could handle our national petroleum needs in the event of crisis, I would like to make some further observations that may put the national security question into perspective.

First, it should be noted that some of our imports are virtually as secure as domestic sources. For example, imports from Canada which reach this country by overland pipeline are unlikely to be disturbed in the event of an international crisis. Imports from Mexico are similarly more secure than those from other countries.

Second, it is highly unlikely that all of our import sources would ever be cut off at one time. For example, the Middle East crises of 1956 and 1967 did not interfere with our sizeable imports from Venezuela. And I wonder how many of my colleagues recall the enormous extent to which our Atlantic fleet depended on Venezuelan oil during the Second World War?

Third, stoppages of oil from the Middle East, although they are likely in view of past circumstances and present unsettled conditions, are not apt to last over a prolonged period. The reason is simply that economic pressure will dictate otherwise Middle Eastern governments need the income which the sale of their greatest resource brings them—in short, they need our dollars as much, or more, than we need their oil. This would be demonstrated graphically in the event of a stoppage, because our supply patterns would shift away from the Middle East.

Fourth and finally—and I do not like to even think of such a disastrous possibility—in the event of a major global confrontation, the destruction that would take place in our urban areas and the probable elimination of much of our refining capacity would result not in a shortage but a surplus of crude oil.

I cite these considerations because I think that the national security argument has been abused and exploited. When someone suggests constructive change in our oil import policy, he is likely to be silenced with an imperious raise of the eyebrow and a reverential utterance of the sacred phrase. This should not be so, and I hope that in fu-

XUM

ture discussions reasonable men can examine the claims of national security objectively and recognize that they can be met without our present system.

If reason prevails, I am confident that others will agree that with sound planning and prudence we can go forward free from the shackles of the costly, inefficient, and inequitable mandatory oil import control program.

RECOMMENDATION

In the near future I shall introduce in the House a bill aimed at eliminating the mandatory oil import control program established in 1959. Fully realizing that abrupt change is undesirable and that the oil industry deserves time to adjust to a new marketing situation, my legislation will provide that the quota system be phased out over a 10-year period, by gradually raising the permitted ratio of imports to domestic production.

A gradual phaseout will not only soften the impact of the change on our domestic producers, it will also provide the oil industry—and all of us—with time to discuss and plan other long-overdue changes in Government policy toward the industry. I have in mind specifically Government tax laws as they apply to the industry, and Federal support of prorationing plans.

My proposal is only a beginning. But we must begin somewhere. I am happy to note that the New England congressional delegation has already taken the initiative in this area and I am hopeful that my action will provide a further stimulus to the more comprehensive change that I believe is vital to our Nation and our economy.

CONCLUSION: MACHIASPORT

I said the outset that it was not my intention to speak at length on the merits of the Machiasport proposal. Machiasport is an imaginative, viable idea, and it will provide badly needed relief for New England. As long as this country is saddled with the import quota system, then New England deserves to have that system reflect her needs and interests as well as those of the Southwestern States. That is what Machiasport is all about.

I trust that I have shown, however, that our national interest requires more than Machiasport. Machiasport is an attempt to remove one glaring inequity from an outworn and costly system. It is my hope that before much longer good sense and sound planning will prevail and that the system itself will be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following newspaper editorials as further evidence of the widespread concern of New Englanders over the high cost of fuel oil under the present import quota system:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Mar. 25, 1969]

The Oilmen Admit It's Costly Here

It took the long controversy over the proposed foreign trade zone to do it, but the high cost of energy in New England finally has been confirmed by the people in the best position to know—the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., supported by East Coast refiners and marketers.

A just-released study by the foundation shows that New England consumers pay the highest prices in the country for their heating oil, about 6 per cent above the national average. At that, said the report, it is still less expensive than natural gas or electricity.

In an attempt to explain the high rates, the foundation noted that the biggest markups are at the retail level rather than at the wholesale level where prices are more nearly comparable with those in the rest of the country. But since retail distribution costs are higher in New England, the report said, this does not necessarily mean that the retail profits here are greater than elsewhere.

However that may be, the fact is that higher-than-average fuel prices and a higher-than-average cost of living are a severe liability for New England in its attempt to compete economically with the rest of the country. As it happens, the region has other assets which are not to be found in New Mexico, let us say, or along the Gulf Coast. But higher prices for oil and gasoline, year after year, are a handicap for homeowners, businessmen and industrial developers which is hard to shrug off.

The documentation of higher prices in the Northeast was produced by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., as its contribution to the heated debate over the foreign trade zone (with an oil refinery complex) projected at Machiasport, Maine.

The same charges have been made many times before, but never officially acknowledged. It took a hassle of national magnitude to do it, but now the facts are on the record and we can go on from there to a possible solution.

[From the North Adams Transcript, Mar. 25, 1969]

New England Oil Prices in Hands of President

The winter's bitter cold has passed into history—presumably—and New Englanders perhaps will begin to feel less conscious of the high cost of fuel oil to heat their homes.

Maybe, though, they would be well-advised to remain aware of that household expense, and, more important, to watch what President Nixon does with the responsibility he has taken on himself to decide whether or not those fuel oil costs will be reduced.

He didn't put it that way, of course. What he actually did, four weeks ago, was to announce that he would review oil import policies and assume responsibility for all decisions concerning them.

He did that because of the dispute that started last September when the Maine Port Authority asked for a permit to establish a foreign trade zone at Portland and a sub-zone at Machiasport.

The Maine Port Authority planned to allow Occidental Petroleum Co. to build a 300,000-barrel-a-day plant at Machiasport to refine crude oil from Libya. The company then would send most of its product to New England, where fuel costs have been high.

If the permit is granted, and the refinery is built, authorities estimate that oil heating bills in New England would be about 10 per cent lower.

Opposition has come from a predictable source—other American oil companies. They say the competition would ruin the price structure of domestic oil (conveniently ignoring the fact that that price structure has been discriminatory in New England).

In view of all this, some facts concerning foreign trade zones may be of interest. This little-known aspect of U.S. trade policies was first authorized in 1934, during the depths of the Great Depression, when the U.S. share of world trade had dropped to less than 10 per cent.

It was hoped that the zones would encourage an expansion of U.S. foreign trade. Located on U.S. territory, but not subject to U.S. customs, a foreign trade zone allows foreign importers to have their products processed on U.S. territory before introducing them as imports to the U.S. market.

The device has proved profitable to all sides. The number in existence at a given time has varied. There were 13 at the beginning, and now there are 10. One is at New Orleans, La., for grain imports, which calls attention to the fact that Louisiana Sen. Russell B. Long has been a vigorous opponent of the Machiasport zone. Louisiana, of course, is an oil-producing state. Sen. Long has seen no danger to Middle West farmers because of the grain import zone at New Orleans.

The most recent permit granted was that given Dow Chemical Co. for a Bay County, Mich., zone. That would include a license to import oil, but there has been no outcry from the oil barons or Sen. Long.

They also have been strangely silent on the applications for zones for oil imports in Savannah, Ga., and Honolulu. Isn't it, then, a reasonable deduction that opposition to the Machiasport zone rests only on the fact that competition would lower the costs in this capitive New England market?

President Nixon's decision should be watched closely, even though winter now has left New England.

Problem of Oil Prices

Perhaps Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans was remembering former President Truman's discovery that the White House is "where the buck stops" when he decided to postpone consideration of a duty-free foreign trade zone in Maine until the administration had reviewed the oil import control program. But this time the buck could bounce right back.

At least the five Republican senators who visited President Nixon Wednesday went away hopeful that the White House would decide to separate the trade zone issue from the matter of oil import quotas for a proposed refinery in Machiasport, Me. The senators received no promises, but there was reason to believe that the administration could handle the situation in a way that would be fair to New England and to the oil industry—though the oil lobby would prefer that the whole idea be dropped.

New England has long been at a disadvantage in the matter of heating oil prices because of its distance from the refineries in this country. Not one of the 250 is located in this region, meaning that transport is a big cost factor. The oil lobby, fighting to preserve the status quo, has said its main objection is that Occidental Petroleum Corp. would get "preferential" treatment if the foreign trade zone were established.

Occidental does seek to build a $145 million refinery at Machiasport, but according to Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Me., other petroleum firms are being considered, too. In the event the federal Foreign Trade Zones Board approves the state's application for the zone, a pool operation might be set up. But the oil industry, suggesting no alternative to the predicament of New England, does not find the idea appealing. The governor of Texas, in fact, sees a threat to the "national security" in the refining of imported oil in a foreign trade zone.

Granted, there would be some significant shifting of the fuel oil market in New England; but with the overall market constantly on the increase, the industry should be able to adjust without difficulty. And a long-standing price disadvantage to heating oil users in New England would be eliminated.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES OPPOSE SUBSIDY FOR NUCLEAR FUEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a small section of a proposed amendment to the regulations under section 103(c) of the

Internal Revenue Code relating to interest on industrial development bonds would permit a very large subsidy to certain nuclear power producers for the acquisition of nuclear fuel and for the reprocessing of such fuel. This subsidy would be possible by including in the definition for facilities for which tax-free industrial development bonds could be offered "a facility which reprocesses nuclear fuel that has been used and is to be reused in the electric generating plant furnishing electric energy." This overall amendment is required to make section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code conform with the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. A public hearing on the proposed amendment was held by IRS on February 18, 1969.

The definition of a "facility" was apparently enlarged to include a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant as a result of the opinion of the New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority that tax-exempt bonds could be issued by ASDA for the purpose of meeting its commitments under any nuclear fuel arrangement under negotiation, or contemplated, with any utility company in New York State. Opposition to the ASDA interpretation, however, by electric companies outside New York State became very evident during the February 18 public hearings at IRS. On March 9, 1969, the New York Times contained an excellent discussion of this controversy.

Unless there is objection, I will include the New York Times article at this point in my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

STATE'S TAX-FREE NUCLEAR ROLE REVIVES PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER ISSUE

(By Gene Smith)

The Consolidated Edison Company of New York finds itself these days in the unaccustomed role of the knight doing battle with a many-headed dragon.

Charles E. Luce, who quit as Under Secretary of Interior in the Johnson Administration to become chairman and chief executive officer of the utility in 1967, has cast his lot behind the New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority against almost all of the nation's major utilities.

The issue stated simply is: When is a governmental subsidy not a subsidy?

POWERS EXPANDED

The Development Authority was established in 1962 with broad powers in the fields of research and development and the provision of services related to nuclear power generation. Under subsequent legislation in 1968 it was granted additional powers with respect to nuclear power generation to implement Governor Rockefeller's New York State Power Program, a joint venture of the private electric utilities, the State Power Authority and the Development Authority.

In May, 1968, the Development Authority was expressly empowered to acquire nuclear fuel and lease or otherwise make it available to others for peaceful use, including power production.

The Development Authority, acting as an instrumentality of the state, has proceeded on the belief that as such it is entitled to use tax-exempt bonds. This would have the obvious effect of making its lease prices lower than those of private companies in the nuclear fuel leasing business and that's where the battle lines have been drawn.

Oliver Townsend, chairman of the Development Authority, submitted a statement last Jan. 14 before the standing committee on public utilities of the New York State Senate that said:

"It is our understanding that it is within the intent of currently applicable Federal law to preserve and perpetuate the tax-exempt status of bonds or notes such as those that would be issued by A.S.D.A. for the purpose of meeting its commitments under any nuclear fuel arrangement now under negotiation or contemplated with any utility company in New York State."

The Internal Revenue Service specifically included "sewage or solid waste disposal facilities or facilities for the local furnishing of electric energy, gas or water (and) air or water pollution control facilities" as being qualified for tax exemption in proposed amendments under section 103 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to industrial development bonds.

Utility opposition to this interpretation became evident at public hearings last Feb. 18. The industry's leading weekly magazine, Electrical World, reported in its March 3 issue that "a proposed ruling by the I.R.S. would kill the commercial ownership of nuclear fuel before it even gets out of its infancy."

COST ESTIMATED

N. Barr Miller, attorney for Northeast Utilities, told the meeting that "under your proposed rules, you are just transferring government ownership from the Federal to the state level."

The trade magazine further reported that a consultant to the Bankers Leasing Corporation of Boston predicted that the ruling would cost the United States Treasury "about $4-billion in tax revenues over the next 10 years."

Sherman R. Knapp, chairman and chief executive officer of Northeast Utilities, said in an interview last week that this tax exemption would "give an unfair edge to New York State utilities and the result would be that Connecticut and all other states would want the same advantages for themselves."

"It would be the beginning of the end of private enterprise in the utility industry," Mr. Knapp added.

But Con Edison's Mr. Luce doesn't agree. Noting that his company was now negotiating for some $100-million in nuclear fuel leases, he said:

"Whatever we eventually have to pay for this fuel, it would be substantially less if we can lease it through A.S.D.A. It would mean savings in the millions to the company, which would benefit our customers in the long run." Company officials working on the fuel lease contract estimate the savings would amount to about $5-million a year for the company.

Mr. Luce pointed out that Governor Rockefeller's entire power program depends to a large measure on the ability of the Development Authority to issue such bonds. "It would be quite ironic if the I.R.S. ruled that A.S.D.A. was not tax exempt, which would leave the State Power Authority to continue to build entire plants tax exempt and we'd be left holding the bag. The present program, though a small step, does reduce somewhat the State Power Authority's advantages over us," Mr. Luce added.

Privately, most utility executives would concede that Mr. Luce has unusual problems in keeping down operating costs for his company. The more liberal executives would also point out that many utilities, particularly those on the Pacific Coast, have no hesitation whatsoever in partaking of the benefits that result from tax-exempt dams built for water supplies or for Government-owned flood-control and power programs.

But many executives see in this a revival of the old battle of public vs. private power.

OPPOSITION BACKED

Albert A. Cree, chairman of the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation, said he agreed 100 per cent with Mr. Knapp's opposition to the rule change. "Financing of pure business operations by tax exempts has already been overdone," he stressed. "It ought to be contracted. I hope we never have to resort to anything like the New York plan in New England."

William G. Kuhns, president of the General Public Utilities Corporation, described the use of tax exempts as "raiding the Federal treasury . . . a crazy direction for the industry to move." He pointed out that his company had under construction four large nuclear generating units with an aggregate investment of more than $600-million. It is estimated that fuel costs for these plants will be in excess of $750-million over their total service lives.

Mr. Kuhns acknowledged that such tax exemption would appear beneficial to his operating companies in both New Jersey and Pennsylvania but added that the savings would have to be made up by other taxes. In a statement opposing the rule changes of the I.R.S., Mr. Kuhns pointed out that the proposals classify facilities that reprocess nuclear fuel for an electric utility as "a facility for the furnishing of electric energy."

"The facilities that furnish electric service are the generating, transmission and distribution facilities," he went on. "They do not include, in the case of a coal-fired generating station, the mining machinery that digs the coal or the rail facilities and trucks that bring the coal from the mine to the generating station. . . . How then can a facility that reprocesses nuclear fuel be deemed to be a facility for the furnishing of electric service?"

SIMILAR LAWS EXPECTED

He warned further that it "must be anticipated" that other states would adopt statutes similar to New York's which would lead to "a Gresham's law type of competition at a time when nuclear generation can, and should, stand on its own economic feet."

The Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago also filed a statement supporting Northeast Utilities' opposition. It pointed out that more than one-fourth of the cost of the heat output of nuclear fuel stems from the cost of carrying the investment in the fuel, and added:

"Accordingly, permitting that investment to be financed with tax-free debt instruments as opposed to a normal mix of taxable debt and equity will result in a misallocation of resources and a material loss of revenues to the Treasury. The investor-owned utilities provide one of the largest sources of Federal, state and local taxes. Erosion of this tax source will have serious long-run consequences."

Representative Craig Hosmer, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, said he was "not too happy" with the proposed rule changes by the Revenue Service.

"It would be pretty poor for the Treasury," the California Republican stated, adding: "You've got an energetic hyperthyroid agency in New York working with a bunch of whiz-kid bankers. The poor people in the smaller farm states would sure have to fumble around to get something else that would benefit them when they'd be building only one-tenth what is planned for nuclear plants in the East."

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED

Publicly, all of the New York utilities back Con Edison's stand as being equally beneficial for their own future nuclear plants, but the Long Island Lighting Company noted that it was committed to purchase the first two cores for its planned atomic power plants from the General Electric Company.

Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., is not directly involved although it has a 20 per cent interest in a planned atomic plant to be built by Con Edison. However, Richard D. Wilhite, president of the upstate utility, said he felt personally that "this is a funny way to single out one single item for tax-free money. It will just transfer the bills from the back of the utilities to the public through increased taxes."

Henry Glendinning of the Walnut Leasing Company, which bid against the Development Authority for the Con Edison fuel contract, said his group "still believes that there may be certain factors that will let us be competitive even with their tax-free interest rates. Mr. Glendinning is a partner in the Philadelphia investment banking firm of Butcher & Sherred, which backs Walnut Leasing.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted from the New York Times article that William G. Kuhns, president of the General Public Utilities Corporation, described the use of tax exemptions for this purpose as "raiding the Federal Treasury" and "a crazy direction for the industry to move." I was particularly interested in Mr. Kuhns' statement because one of the subsidiary electric power companies of GPU—Pennsylvania Electric Co.—operates in my congressional district. I consider **PENELEC** to be an outstanding company which does a very commendable job of serving the electric consumers in our part of Pennsylvania reliably and at reasonable rates. It gives me personal pleasure to read a forthright statement such as this one presented by Bill Kuhns in opposition to a subsidy which might have been available to his company. In my opinion, this represents what might be called business statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I think other Members of this body will benefit from reading the entire statement submitted by Bill Kuhns to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on February 13. I will include the full text of his comments at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY W. G. KUHNS ON BEHALF OF GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORPORATION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED REGULATION SECTION 1.103-8(F) (2) (III)

DEAR SIR: General Public Utilities Corporation ("GPU") is a New York corporation registered as a holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. It has four major electric utility subsidiaries which serve an area of approximately 24,000 square miles in Pennsylvania and New Jersey from Lake Erie to the Atlantic Ocean. Those subsidiaries have under construction four large nuclear generating units involving an aggregate investment of more than $600 million. It is presently estimated that these four units will utilize over their respective service lives nuclear fuel with an aggregate cost on the order of $750 million. Moreover, at the GPU system's present rate of growth, it is probable that the nuclear generating capacity of its subsidiaries will more than treble in the three decades prior to the year 2,000 and that there will be a corresponding increase in their investment in nuclear fuel.

GPU is opposed to proposed Regulation Section 1.103-8(f) (2) (iii) even though such proposed Regulation would appear to be beneficial to GPU by providing a subsidy for the acquisition by it of nuclear fuel and the reprocessing of such fuel. In GPU's view, the proposed Regulation would tend to undermine the sound public policy embodied in Section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code; it would convert what was intended by Congress in Section 103(c) (4) (E) to be a narrow exemption from the sweeping reform provided by Section 103(c) into a new broad invasion of the Federal Treasury.

In recent years the Treasury Department has repeatedly pointed out that Federal funds can be diverted into a particular channel quite as effectively by income tax exemptions, credits and deductions as by the direct appropriation by Congress and that the exemption-credit-deduction method of diversion gives Congress much less control than direct appropriations.

For example, on January 23, 1968, the Treasury Department submitted to Congress a memorandum commenting on H.R. 11645 and a number of other bills which proposed the amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that industrial development bonds not be considered obligations of state or local governments, interest upon which would be exempt from Federal income tax. That stated in part:

"In all cases the exemption of interest on industrial development bonds from Federal income tax is simply a Federal subsidy to private corporations. The lower interest rates—which are passed on to the private corporations in the form of lower rental charges—are only possible because of the tax exempt status of the interest in the hands of the bondholders. Therefore, the full benefit derived by private industry is achieved only at the expense of a loss of Federal tax revenues. Moreover, it is a forced Federal subsidy. The amount of the subsidy, the beneficiary of the subsidy, or the use to which the borrowed funds are put are not considered in any way by the Federal Government. The sole decision as to whether or not to benefit a private corporation rests with the various State and local governments and, since industrial revenue financing imposes no direct costs on the issuing governmental units, there is no agency that has any effective interest in assessing the merits of extending Federal tax benefits to any particular private corporate beneficiary."

These comments of the Treasury Department are equally applicable to the exemption which would be provided pursuant to proposed Regulation Section 1.103-8(f) (2) (iii).

Section 103(c) was enacted in order to put an end to the cancerous growth of industrial development bond issues by state and local governments. Such bonds were being issued in rapidly increasing numbers to provide substantial economic subsidies and correspondingly competitive advantages to favored enterprises. They were resulting in economic dislocation, a waste of resources, and a wholesale invasion of the Federal Treasury.

In calling a halt to the abuse of tax exemptions by the issuance of industrial development bonds, Congress sought to provide protection to those existing areas of use of municipal bond tax exemptions which had a substantial background and historical justification. But Congress did not mean to create a brand new area of tax exemption for nuclear fuel for generating stations as the proposed regulation would do.

The language of Section 103(c) upon which the proposed Regulation purports to be based grants an exemption from the denial of tax exempt status to bonds whose proceeds are used to provide

"(E) sewage or solid waste disposal facilities or *facilities* for the *local* furnishing of electric energy, gas or water". (emphasis added)

The essential elements of this statutory language are that the proceeds of the exempt issue must be used (1) to provide "facilities", (2) that such facilities be employed for the furnishing of the specified utility services, and (3) that such services be furnished "locally". The proposed regulation ignores these elements.

Specifically, in the course of purporting to define the statutory language, the proposed Regulations use the term *"any property"* and it is our understanding that this phrase is viewed as embracing nuclear fuel itself. This stands in contrast with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which distinguish sharply between production and utilization *facilities*, on the one hand, and *special nuclear material* (i.e. *nuclear fuel*) on the other hand. Nuclear fuel is clearly property, but it is not a facility and should not be so classified.

The proposed Regulations also depart from the requirement that the facility be one employed to "furnish" the specified services. They go so far as to state explicitly that a facility which reprocesses nuclear fuel for an electric utility subject to rate regulation is a facility for the furnishing of electric energy. This is unjustified. The facilities that furnish electric service are the generating, transmission and distribution facilities. They do not include, in the case of a coal-fired generating station, the mining machinery that digs coal or the rail facilities and trucks that bring the coal from the mine to the generating station. Nor do they include, in the case of an oil or gas-fired generating station, the drilling rigs that bring oil and gas to the surface or the pipelines that transport them to generating plants. How then can a facility that reprocesses nuclear fuel be deemed to be a facility for the furnishing of electric service?

Similarly, in the Conference Committee Report discussion of the exemption provided by subparagraph (B) for bonds issued to provide sports facilities, the Committee emphasized the necessity for a direct functional relationship between the facility and service it was to provide in stating:

"Facilities constructed in connection with, but not directly related to, a sports facility, such as a ski lodge to be built in connection with the development of a ski slope, are not to be considered sports facilities."

Again, in discussing the exemption provided by paragraph (C) for bonds issued to provide convention or trade show facilities, the supplemental statement of the managers on the part of the House Report noted that the exemption "applies only with regard to special purpose buildings and structures constructed for convention or trade shows. This means, for example, that the exemption does not apply to bonds issued to finance a hotel even though the hotel expects and does a major part of its business in catering to delegates or participants at conventions or trade shows."

In the same way the statutory requirement that the facility be one for the *local* furnishing of the specified utility service is ignored. The Conference Committee Report emphasized the necessity for the *local* nature of the service by explicitly stating that:

"Facilities for the *local* furnishing of electric energy, gas or water do not include facilities for *regional* or *broader* transportation of gas or water by pipeline or long-line transmission of electric energy." (emphasis added)

A nuclear reprocessing facility is not designed to serve only a local area; it is designed to serve, at a minimum, a regional or broader area.

If the proposed Regulation is adopted, it must be anticipated that in short order many States will adopt statutes for the creation of state or local agencies that will embark on the issuance of industrial development bonds to finance nuclear fuel and nuclear fuel reprocessing plants. No state or municipality will wish to deny to its own consumers the tax exemption subsidy enjoyed by residents in a neighboring State. GPU will then find itself in the position in which it must seek for its customers the benefit of such an exemption, even though GPU believes that exemptions of this type result in the misallocation of natural resources and lead to a Gresham's law type of competition at a time when nuclear generation can, and should, stand on its own economic feet.

If the Treasury Department believes that the proposed Regulation correctly reflects the intent of the Congress, we respectfully urge that the Treasury Department seek legisla-

XUM

> tion to confirm this belief or, at a minimum, that it seek a confirmatory expression of views by the appropriate Congressional legislative committees. Unless and until such confirmation is obtained, we strongly believe that the Treasury Department should not take the step of opening the Federal Treasury as the proposed Regulation would now do.
>
> As suggested by the Notice of Proposed Rule-Making, we are submitting these comments in quintuplicate.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some individuals who are not familiar with GPU might think this statement was made because that company has no direct interest in nuclear power development. In fact, Bill Kuhns pointed out to IRS that at the present time his company has four large nuclear generating units under construction with an aggregate investment of more than $600 million. It is estimated that fuel costs for these plants will be in excess of $750 million over their total service lives. He also acknowledged that while tax exemptions which would be available under the proposed IRS amendment might appear to be beneficial to the operating companies of GPU, the savings would have to be made up by other taxes.

At the same hearing on February 13, a spokesman for Northeast Utilities, another important group of electric companies, pointed out that if the New York State plan of using tax-free industrial development bonds to finance fuel elements and nuclear fuel reprocessing is accomplished, every major industrial State in the Nation will be under great pressure to adopt similar plans. If this development were pushed to its fullest, the Federal Government could lose as much as $4 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that as a result of the sincere opposition expressed by many of the investor-owned electric companies to this proposed raid on the Federal Treasury, IRS will probably not include nuclear reprocessing plants in the definition of "facilities" eligible for tax-exempt industrial development bond financing. The new regulations, however, will not be published for a few weeks.

This is a very significant development because the long time effort to obtain commercial ownership of nuclear fuel by private industry was in danger of being killed before it ever really got out of its infancy. In 1964, the Congress adopted radical changes in the Atomic Energy Act, which since its enactment in 1946 had made mandatory the ownership by the Federal Government of all "special nuclear materials." The 1964 amendments adopted a new policy, which terminates by 1971 the ownership by the Federal Government of nuclear materials used as fuel in the electric utility industry and expressly provides for mandatory private ownership of all such nuclear materials.

The report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy at that time—Senate Report No. 1325, 88th Congress, second session—expressly declared the congressional policy of the 1964 legislation was to transfer nuclear material to private ownership and to permit "free market conditions" for its development as a competitive fuel for the production of electric energy. The Joint Committee also seems to have anticipated the New York State proposal and expressed itself for private ownership of nuclear materials by private industry by saying:

> It is generally believed that lease rather than sale of enriched uranium tends to discourage conservation of uranium and economic management of nuclear fuel inventories.
>
> Private ownership legislation can thus assist in encouraging leng-term planning for the development of nuclear power under conditions similar to those which obtain in the case of alternate sources of energy.

Thus, there exists a clear congressional mandate that nuclear fuel should be privately owned, and the further declaration that Government leasing of such fuel to the electric utilities is not desirable.

In the face of this declaration, New York State would try to get the taxing statute interpreted in such a way that the ownership of nuclear fuel for use by some electric utilities could pass from the Federal Government to State governmental units. In effect, the various States would thus be substituted for the Federal Government as the owners and lessors of nuclear fuel to private industry. It is submitted that such a result would nullify the fundamental objective of the Congress in its enactment of the 1964 amendments of the Atomic Energy Act. It is to the credit of so many of these electric companies that they opposed this section of the proposed amendment to the regulations under the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying that at this time when so many people and nations seem to have the "What's in it for me" attitude that we can have major business leaders coming forward to say, "We are opposed to receiving this additional subsidy for ourselves".

With the commercial statesmen such as William G. Kuhns, there may still be hope that our free, private enterprise system may long endure.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN REVERSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take these few minutes today to discuss two words, economy and efficiency, as they apply to a recent proposal to restructure or realine regional areas and to relocate required headquarters of several Executive Departments.

There is a difference between true economy and false economy, just as there is so-called efficiency that can be achieved only at the expense of losing sight of economy. When all is said and done both of these desirable objectives must be carefully appraised to see whether in fact economy is really achieved and what is the price tag or how high the cost of what is labeled efficiency.

The foregoing may seem somewhat complicated, but that is exactly how the proposal of the Nixon administration sounded, when on March 27 the administration through its Urban Affairs Assistant, Mr. Moynihan, and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, proposed a restructuring of all Government services systems both as to regional boundaries and regional headquarters.

These gentleman talked in abstractions about such things as a vast reshuffling of regional boundaries so that they would be "co-terminus" with each other, which I suppose means all regions will have a common boundary.

Put in simpler language, among other things they said they meant to move the regional headquarters of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and the Office of Economic Opportunity from Kansas City to Denver and to create all new regional boundaries.

Some of us have had considerable difficulty getting a copy of the actual statements made at the news conference We have had even more difficulty receiving from the Bureau of the Budget the maps which would show all the changes.

Put in simple, and I hope, clear and understandable language, the entire proposal makes no sense to move headquarters away from the population concentration these offices serve. The Kansas City Star, which is the metropolitan newspaper serving the area involved, and which it is my privilege to represent in part, was very considerate in their use of words in an editorial which suggested, "this move to reshuffle Federal offices is of doubtful merit." Some of us in the Congress who represent western Missouri and eastern Kansas believe this move is an expensive one which we can ill afford in this time of rising Government costs. Moreover, it would result in inefficiency rather than promoting efficiency because of the greater distances Federal workers would have to travel to reach the areas they serve. It is illogical to move the office away from the center of population to a remote area that is not as accessible as the present location, either as to transportation or communications. It is senseless to talk about economy or efficiency as the reason to justify these moves when in fact it can be readily and easily demonstrated that restructuring would be more expensive and, because of greater distances, be far less efficient.

A well-written editorial in the Star quite properly asks that the congressional delegation of Missouri and Kansas be given an explanation of the rationale behind the proposed moves. Try as they may, the new administration is going to find it difficult if not impossible to explain how they plan to promote better management and thus increase efficiency when the people in the offices involved will in the future have to travel about 1,000 miles from Denver to St. Louis, which is the heavy concentration of population served, rather than the present short trip from Kansas City to St. Louis.

So many things are wrong about this proposed move that I will not take time now to discuss all of them. But if we are all as interested in economy as we say, then it should be easy to recognize this proposal to restructure districts is actually moving in the opposite direction. It is economy in reverse. Moving costs alone for over 800 families could run a minimum of $1 million, and perhaps as high as $3 million. This does not take into consideration the cost of moving the offices. Furthermore, the proposal is to move away from a city that has a new Federal office building to a city that has no existing facility to house these agencies. The cost of leased space, it is estimated, will run over one-half million dollars per year.

I have asked for unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, the editorial which I commend to all who are genuinely interested in economy and efficiency in government. The editorial follows:

A Federal Office Move Is a Plan of Doubtful Merit

The projected move of Federal regional agencies from Kansas City to Denver in a general realignment that is supposed to promote economy and efficiency needs much more thought and thorough consideration. On the basis of available information, we can see neither economy nor efficiency in the move. Evidence, in fact, would point to the contrary.

Naturally, the Kansas City area, on both sides of the State line, takes a particular interest in this plan that would transfer the regional headquarters of the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from this city. No community wants to lose regional offices that directly involve 825 jobs—many of them high-level positions. The presence of the offices is a distinct advantage to Kansas City and the States of Missouri and Kansas.

Yet if this rather odd shuffling of jurisdictions could be proved to be in the interests of "better management," as the administration says, we doubt that the complaints from this area would be especially strong. Of course there would be regrets. But under the circumstances we believe there is reason to expect the entire plan to be reconsidered and any quick transfer to be deferred. Certainly the congressional delegations from Missouri and Kansas will want the fullest explanations and clear evidence that the rationale of the proposed transfers is in line with the facts.

The new region, as outlined, would contain Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming and Utah. The present regional responsibility of the Kansas City HEW headquarters is Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa and Minnesota.

It is not clear what urban problems Missouri and Montana share. And urban problems, certainly, are a primary concern of HEW, Labor and the OEO. The people of one of the offices here make more than 1,000 trips a year to St. Louis and Jefferson City—the area of heavy population concentration for both the present and proposed regions. We fail to see how the same number of trips from Denver is going to accomplish great savings and promote better management.

As for economy, there is a new Federal office building in Kansas City. Space apparently would have to be rented in Denver. Nor is the cost of moving possibly 800 families to be dismissed lightly. Any transferred employee could take his family to the new locale for six days of house hunting at Government expense and per diem pay as well. The Government would pay the full expenses of moving; reimburse the transferee for any loss on the sale of his home and pay all real estate fees. This is economy? It seems difficult to reconcile these realities with talk of savings.

But basically the new region, as outlined, appears to be badly balanced in relation to the weight of the population to be served. Kansas City—itself a metropolitan area of more than 1,300,000—is close to St. Louis and the urban centers of Kansas, Iowa and Nebraska. Kansas City has the transportation facilities and central location suited for the present region.

Kansas City also has the regional offices of HEW, Labor, and the OEO—now. Entirely aside from matters of self-interest, we believe very persuasive arguments can be made for leaving the regional alignment as it is. Surely the administration will provide Kansas City the opportunity. And certainly Congress, even if its direct approval is not required, has a very direct responsibility to ask for the facts in the true light of efficiency and economy as these desirable qualities affect future programs and appropriations.

THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, established by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, received its initial appropriation late last year and has now begun operations in earnest. In a speech on Thursday, March 27, the new president of the Corporation, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., gave a summary of CPB's current operations and plans for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Macy's remarks, especially as they relate to the Corporation's initial efforts to strengthen local public broadcasting stations, would be of interest to Members of the House.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the text of Mr. Macy's speech to the press luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif., March 27:

What's Ahead in Public Broadcasting

(Address by John W. Macy, Jr., president, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, before the press luncheon, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, March 27, 1969)

Public broadcasting is definitely moving forward. This motion is directed toward the public purposes cited by the Congress in creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in 1967. After an initial period of planning and organization the Corporation is a reality which, hopefully, can contribute motive power to all of the elements in public broadcasting.

There is now a realization on the part of people across the country that radio and television are communication assets which should be developed in the public interest. In this realization Americans are behind, not ahead, of their neighbors in other parts of the developed world. In this country the enterprise of American business has developed the commercial capacity of these communication media to a far greater degree than public leaders and educators have developed them in the public interest. There has been a tendency to believe that commercial and public broadcasting are eternal competitors or that commercial broadcasting should expand and deepen the segment of its broadcasting described as "public service." Today, however, there is an understanding that the two systems may function in a complementary fashion which provides the viewer or listener with a diversity which permits broader choice. There is an admission that there are certain public services which the commercial station should not be expected to perform and that public stations can offer more effectively.

It is the Corporation's view that public broadcasting must move forward to more nearly meet the demands of the American people for diversity and excellence in the fields where commercial broadcasting should not be expected to move. It is essential that public broadcasting have the financial, technical and programming resources to move in the direction of this public demand. It is to that objective that the Board and officers of the Corporation are committed.

The forward motion of public broadcasting necessitates broad horizontal and vertical vision by its leaders. There is need to look at the nation as a whole, at its spread of markets and its distribution of population. It is necessary through this sweeping view to identify those communities or those groups of men and women who are inadequately served by existing public broadcasting outlets. There are many blanks on the national map of television and radio stations. There are many metropolitan areas of substantial population where the existing station is not sufficiently strong to meet even the most fundamental public needs. There are shortcomings in programming and capacity limitations in facilities which place the public station in the role of an underfed, younger brother with a weak voice in the community's broadcasting spectrum. The Corporation intends to work with local leaders to fill these blanks, to overcome these deficiencies and to strengthen existing stations.

INTERCONNECTION FOR NATIONWIDE SERVICE

In the vertical view the system calls for simultaneous motion on the national front and in the individual communities. From the national vantage-point there must be programming resources available for delivery by a national network of public stations. At that level there has already been motion by the Corporation. One of its specific statutory assignments is to achieve interconnection among public television stations to permit simultaneous delivery of programs on a national basis. Through a negotiated agreement with the telephone system an interconnection was inaugurated early this year for a trial period. This arrangement has opened up two hours of prime time five nights a week for distribution of national programming. Certain problems with respect to clearances and pre-emptions have developed during this trial run which have created difficulties for the Corporation and the stations. Next month negotiations will be reopened with the Bell System and the FCC for the solution of existing problems and for the possible extension of the interconnection service.

To permit significant program delivery over the network, the Corporation made a grant of $450,000 for a special public affairs unit in National Educational Television (NET) to produce public affairs features during the trial period. This unit has been instrumental in bringing to public television audiences special coverage of such subjects as the Nixon Cabinet, the UN and the Middle East, the hearings on television violence and the debate on the ABM. But this new networking has not been for the exclusive purpose of distributing public affairs programs. It has delivered cultural and educational products of NET, the regional networks and individual stations.

MORE PROGRAMING FOR CHILDREN

In its current studies the Corporation staff is examining the present national productive activities to determine their future roles and missions and the areas where supplementary resources can be most productive in securing quality and balance. The Corporation has already decided to invest attention and resources in national programing for children. Favorably impressed with the initial work of the Children's Television Workshop, under the leadership of Joan Cooney, the Corporation will back that program which is aimed at preschool children and explore programing possibilities for providing new learning ex-

XUM

periences via television for our younger viewers.

THE LOCAL STATION—VALUABLE COMMUNITY ASSETS

But at the other end of our vertical relationship is the most important element—the local station. That station is a valuable community asset. This value should be enhanced in order to offer services to the men, women and children of that community. These individual units vary tremendously from city to city. Some are supported by a board of community leaders. Others are a unit in a state system. Still others are part of a university or board of education responsibility. Some have many years on the air. Others are preparing to deliver their first signal. Some are largely restricted to instructional broadcasting to the area's classrooms. Others provide a balanced program of public services. Some are on the very high frequency band. Many more are in the ultra high range. Some have the latest in equipment. Others are struggling with hand-me-down cameras and recording equipment. All suffer from financial anemia in striving for a goal of public service. All too many managers must devote valuable staff time to perpetual fund raising in order to pay the bills. Others find that their program planning must be shaped—sometimes distorted—to match inadequate funds.

In recognition of this common financial disability, the Corporation in one of its first actions decided to provide a $10,000 grant to each station which could demonstrate an augmented service to the community through the investment of this sum. This amount has been described as diminutive in terms of public broadcasting needs, but we must realize that the average annual expenditures of the 160 television stations is $100,000.

The first readings on the use of these grants have been reaching Corporation headquarters and they constitute a gratifying record of expanded community service.

In a number of cities this additional amount has permitted the viewing of local school boards in action; one station reports that such meetings are now known to local viewers as the "Tuesday night fights."

The station in Milwaukee has inaugurated a new program called "Project Understanding." This is a station production of one-half hour discussion of inner-city and ghetto problems tied in with 2,000 organized viewing groups across the city. After the initial presentation these groups discuss the issues and then phone in their questions for response on the screen by the experts present.

In several cities, for example, Chicago, Cleveland, New York and Boston, the grant has permitted special programming to reach the substantial black audiences. The new station in Baltimore will devote one-half hour of prime time nightly for an urban affairs series commencing in September.

In Madison the money is being applied to a vote-in program which brings to the screen the competing candidates for local office and has stimulated broader public interest in the electoral process.

These are illustrations of locally determined forms of augmented public service. They should serve to stimulate new programming in every community designed to gain the understanding and, hopefully, the participation of more citizens in community activities.

But now the Corporation and the station are entering a second phase of program consideration. Each station has been invited to present a proposal for a more extensive programming effort which will respond to local community needs. This proposal is to be shaped entirely by local judgment and using local talent and material. The subject matter may be aimed at a special group—children, young people, the disabled or the disadvantaged—or it may enrich the local offerings through music, drama or other cultural features. The Corporation has asked the station managers to design programs which may ultimately be used for distribution over the national network. It is our belief that local stations should provide a significant portion of the programming contributions to the national network. This is particularly true of the key stations, like KCET here in Los Angeles, which have already demonstrated their capacity for quality productions in the work they have done for their own audiences or for NET in the past. A significant portion of the Corporation's resources has been committed to this local programming endeavor—a total of $1,500,000.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING TALENT

If the goals of public broadcasting are to be achieved in the days ahead, there is need to encourage and stimulate the talented people already in the enterprise and to attract others to contribute their skills to this work. Broadcasting is a voracious consumer of talent. There is an ever-continuing demand for skilled men and women in engineering, management and program creation to say nothing of the performers themselves. With limited budgets public stations have been handicapped in the competition for these skills. The Corporation intends to extend a helping hand in this area. Already the Corporation has announced twelve Career Fellowships of up to $10,000 each to speed the identification and development of young talent in public broadcasting. These Fellows will be on board in twelve of the stations by next fall. Other projects of this type are under discussion with station managers and the National Association for Educational Broadcasting.

But here in the film capital, special mention should be made of the Corporation's contribution to the art of filmmaking, a major contributor to television resources. In a novel joint venture with the American Film Institute in Los Angeles, the Corporation will encourage would-be filmmakers for public broadcasting. In addition, grants have been made to KLRN in Austin and WGBH in Boston for station-based projects in filmmaking.

CONTINUING EDUCATION THROUGH PUBLIC BROADCASTING

But what of the "educational" component of public broadcasting? After all, in many areas the public station was created to fulfill educational expectations in the community. There will also be increased attention given to this area. For the first time a complete review of such continuing education activities is being conducted with a view toward sharing program information throughout the country and identifying high priority needs for additional effort in covering new educational subjects or in reaching new and different audiences. This review will unquestionably reveal a broad range of educational offerings through television. I have been impressed by program segments I have reviewed which provide instruction for law enforcement officers, para-medical personnel, as well as approaches to educating on such difficult issues as drug abuse, intergroup tensions, and the like.

The basic purpose is to recognize that education in our society can never cease and to broaden the opportunity of all citizens to broaden their own understanding through the communication media. And this educational process should be more than placing the camera in the classroom. It should be possible to use the unique techniques of television and the values of the visual experience to make the learning experience more meaningful and more entertaining.

Although I have placed primary emphasis on the Corporation's plans in the television field, let me assure you radio is not being neglected. The Corporation has just received a comprehensive and penetrating study of public radio. This study reveals that there is need for substantial assistance to the 400 public radio stations if that source is to contribute to public needs. In this day of the ubiquitous transistor the potential of radio as a public service is immense but only slightly developed. The Corporation has invited the stations to submit proposals, similar to those sought from television stations, for new programing. It has granted $65,000 to the National Educational Radio network to be used in improved program elements for distribution to stations but with the findings of the radio study in hand a new and more comprehensive program must be formulated in the future.

KEEPING PACE WITH TECHNOLOGY

But any future view of public television must take into account the rapid-fire developments in electronics technology which will influence broadcasting in the early future. The possibility of a domestic satellite with available channels for public broadcasting, the capability of community antenna and cable systems, the continuing research in solid state physics all reveal the potential of technological improvements in broadcasting. The Corporation will be working closely with public and private agencies engaged in this type of research and development so that those agencies may be aware of the technical requirements of this enterprise and may direct their research to serve these public purposes.

Throughout my report, the financial theme has recurred again and again. This is because the necessity for increased financial resources is a dominant demand upon the Corporation. In the further advances in national and local programming are to be realized, these resources must be secured. The $7 million available to the Corporation at this time constitutes only seed money. A genius of the Corporation is its ability to secure both private and public funds, but clearly the majority contributor must be the federal government. While the Corporation currently seeks funds from the Congress to support operations next year, it is moving ahead to develop with the Nixon Administration plans for long-range financing which will give the Corporation not only a rising curve of available funds but also the necessary independence to assure that public broadcasting is in no way dominated by the political process. Stability in financing will permit the Corporation to join with those engaged in the development of public broadcasting programs to realize a higher level of fulfillment in the potential of radio and television for public good. It will permit a turning of attention to the identification of citizen interest and need to be served by public broadcasting. It will permit the response to local and national community needs for public awareness and for the individual American's enriched participation in his own society.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. Cohelan) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I introduced a bill (H.R. 8515) to authorize an increase in the appropriation for acquisition of land in the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. Fellow Californians from the other side of the aisle, the Honorable Don Clausen and the Honorable William Mailliard also have sponsored this proposal and will be joined by several of their Republican colleagues in our very worthwhile, bipartisan effort.

Point Reyes is one of the few unspoiled areas on the entire Pacific coast. Its beautiful beaches and coastal property, together with its proximity to major metropolitan concentrations of population, prompted the Congress to designate it as a national seashore in 1962.

Unfortunately, even as the Congress deliberated, the value of the park land skyrocketed, preventing the National Park Service from acquiring with the original authorization all of the designated park area. Approximately two-fifths of the property is in Federal ownership.

Our proposal is to increase the authorization by $38,365,000, in order to assure that this valuable seashore property will be protected, as the Congress intended when it established the national seashore. I am pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, that the following Members from California are adding their sponsorship to this measure, and I hope that it will be the pleasure of the Congress to give its favorable consideration to completing the Point Reyes National Seashore in this session: Messrs. Glenn Anderson, George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, James Corman, Don Edwards, Richard T. Hanna, Augustus F. Hawkins, Chet Holifield, Harold T. Johnson, Robert L. Leggett, John J. McFall, George P. Miller, John E. Moss, Thomas M. Rees, Edward R. Roybal, John V. Tunney, Lionel Van Deerlin, Jerome Waldie, and Charles H. Wilson.

FAIR SHAKE FOR SAVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. Corman) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to close the gap between what the Treasury pays in interest on savings bonds and what it pays investors who buy Government bonds in the market.

A 4.25-percent rate is paid now on series H bonds and on series E bonds that are held 7 years to maturity. This is the legal ceiling set in the Liberty Bond Act, the law under which the savings bonds are issued. Yet banks and other investors buying Government bonds in the market get a much higher return. Market reports as of today show 30-day bills now yield 5.80 percent, 90-day bills yield 6.02 percent, and longer term bonds return as much as 6.3 percent.

The time has come to stop penalizing millions of small investors for their thrift and patriotism. More than $50 billion of the national debt is owed to holders of savings bonds.

For example, in 1968, approximately 10.3 million people purchased nearly $5 billion in savings bonds. Two-thirds of these bonds were purchased through the payroll savings plan.

Included among the 10.3 million small investors who were penalized for their thrift and patriotism were 1.9 million servicemen—over 60 percent of all men and women in uniform today—who purchased $353 million in savings bonds.

There are reports the Treasury is studying a modest increase in the rate paid on series H and E bonds. The Washington Post, in an editorial commenting on the reports, said the issue should be a high priority item in Congress. It also said this about the effect of the present ceiling on the savings bond system:

> Many people have continued to hold on to their savings bonds, despite the financial disadvantage, out of patriotism or for the purposes of convenience and safety. But there is doubtless a limit to their patience, as indicated by the fact that cash-ins substantially exceeded sales of such bonds during the first two months of 1969. Clinging to an interest rate that is now wholly obsolete could thus seriously impair the E and H bonds system.

It is not sufficient, however, simply to enact a small increase in the interest rate ceiling to make savings bonds more attractive to small investors. The only fair thing to do is to remove the ceiling entirely so that small or individual investors get the same return from the Government for the use of their money that banks and other big investors obtain.

This bill would strike the Liberty Bond Act provisions setting a savings bond interest ceiling and require the Government to pay comparable interest rates on bonds issued after the enactment of this bill. The yield of savings bonds, as a result, would approximate the interest rate obtainable in the open market, subject to periodic recomputation.

I include the Washington Post editorial entitled "Fair Shake for Savers" at this point in the Record:

Fair Shake for Savers

The Treasury Department is quite properly studying a raise in the interest-rate ceiling on Government savings bonds. The present rate of 4.25 is actually less than the advance in the consumer price index last year, which amounted to 4.6 per cent. In effect, then, inflation is more than eating up the interest paid to small savers for use of their money.

Many people have continued to hold on to their savings bonds, depsite the financial disadvantage, out of patriotism or for purpose of convenience and safety. But there is doubtless a limit to their patience, as indicated by the fact that cash-ins substantially exceeded sales of such bonds during the first two months of 1969. Clinging to an interest rate that is now wholly obsolete could thus seriously impair the E and H bond system.

Beyond this is the basic question of fairness. Anyone wealthy enough to purchase a 15-month Treasury note for $1000 or more can collect 6.42 per cent interest. There is no excuse for maintaining such a wide spread between the interest paid on savings bonds, many financed through payroll-deduction plans, and the rate which the Government finds it necessary to pay in the country's money markets. A fair shake for the millions of savings-bond holders is entitled to a high priority in Congress, and the recommendations of the Treasury ought not to be further delayed.

JOB CORPS: A COMMUNITY ASSET

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have two Job Corps centers in my congressional district, the Collbran Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center operated by the U.S. Forest Service.

A recent editorial in the Pagosa Springs Sun states:

> Few communities can boast of a comparable asset and certainly this community can feel fortunate that the Job Corps Center is here.

I am very pleased to note this acceptance of and praise for the Job Corps program in Colorado and I have every hope that its record of success there will continue.

At this point, under unanimous consent, I would like the editorial to be inserted in the Record:

[From the Pagosa Springs (Colo.) Sun, Feb. 27, 1969]

A Community Asset

The Pagosa Springs Job Corps Center is one of the community assets that is often taken for granted. When newly established the Center was often discussed and attracted more attention than it does at the present time.

The Job Corps Center has been good for the community in many ways. It is fairly easy to list most of the community projects accomplished that may have never been completed if the Job Corps Center had not been established here.

These projects have been numerous and they have been decided improvements. The amount of money that has accrued to the community because of the payroll, because of increased federal aid for schools, the direct sales to the Job Corps Center, and similar transactions have been very important to community progress.

There are other ways, though, that the Job Corps Center has been an asset that are a little harder to enumerate. These things are not physical things that can be measured. They are such things as community participation by Job Corps staff members; assistance with community programs such as Boy Scouts, Church, Lions Club, and the rodeo.

Then, too, there is the objective of the center to help young men better themselves and cease to be expenses to the taxpayer. The results have been very good in this Center in the program to make employable citizens of the Corpsmen. The Center has now been established long enough that there are definite records and reports that show that the Center has been successful in its program.

True, the dollar and cents statistics on the success of the program are very desirable. The human values are not listed anywhere and will never be a matter of record. There is no possible way to list, in a physical way, what it means to a young man to be able to make his own way, cease to become a burden to the taxpayers, and to have the pride that is a part of the American way of life.

Few communities can boast of a comparable asset and certainly this community can feel fortunate that the Job Corps Center is here. The community, too, can take pride in the fact that not only is the Job Corps Center here but it is operated properly, does achieve results, and is a definite benefit to the Corpsmen.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there has been renewed interest in the field of chemical and biological warfare as a result of a recent congressional hearing and subsequent discussions on the sub-

XUM

ject. I feel that it will be useful to the Members of the House to have access to an unclassified version of a statement given at the time of the hearing by General Hebbeler. To me, the significant thing is that chemical and biological weapons represent a field of warfare in which potential enemies have great capability. There is always the threat that, in the event of war, those enemies would resort to chemical and biological weapons rather than to risk mutual annihilation through atomic destruction. Consequently, I have felt that the United States dare not fail to maintain a reasonable capability for defense in this field. There are those who appear to be blandly indifferent to the terrible destruction of nuclear weapons, to the horror of burning by napalm, or even to the terrible effect of high explosives. But they evidence extreme excitement, even hysteria, at the mention of chemical and biological weapons, even when our interest is primarily in the development of a defense against them. This surpasses understanding.

I submit General Hebbeler's statement for reprinting in the Record.

Chemical and Biological Warfare Briefing by Brig. Gen. J. A. Hebbeler, March 4, 1969, at Request of Congressman Richard McCarthy

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen, it is my privilege to appear before you today in response to Congressman McCarthy's request for a briefing on chemical and biological warfare and the basic reasons and necessity for a chemical and biological warfare program.

ELEMENTS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

We should keep in mind that we are talking about weapon systems in the same context that we talk about any other weapon; that is, we are talking about instruments of war, weapons specifically designed for use in war. However, effects of chemical weapons differ from those of biological weapons and from other weapons just as the effects of nuclear weapons differ from those of conventional weapons. So to provide a common ground and to help us understand these differences, I shall separate chemical warfare from biological and look at each in detail. To assist I shall use this slide which schematically shows the elements of chemical and biological warfare.

The first thing to bring to your attention is that we are not talking one system; we are talking many systems, all with different effects and different uses. Let us look at the offense first because only by understanding the weapons and their effects are we able to determine the defensive equipment and tactics associated with each category.

Some chemical weapons are categorized as lethal weapons which are designed to kill. The modern lethal chemical agents which are components of chemical weapons include the nerve agents, two of which have the symbols GB and VX. Both are liquids which are disseminated as aerosols. GB is a nonpersistent material which is relatively volatile. It is put down in heavy concentrations to catch troops before they can put on their protective masks.

VX is a persistent compound which can penetrate the skin. It is complementary to GB in that it can circumvent the protective mask. It penetrates normal combat clothing.

Both agents are odorless, tasteless, and colorless. Consequently it is practically impossible to detect them with the unaided senses. They can enter the body through the respiratory tracts, the eyes, and the skin Action within the body is rapid. Very small amounts will cause paralysis, prostration, and death. Even microscopic quantities will impair vision, and cause nausea and muscular incoordination.

Why do we have a lethal chemical program? Mr. Cyrus Vance, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1967, before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, stated: "As long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability." Let us look at the nature of the Soviet Union program which constitutes a lethal chemical threat to the US, her NATO allies and other Free World countries.

Today the Soviet Union is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical warfare than any other nation in the world. She has placed a great deal of emphasis on these systems in her military machine. She envisions the usage of these the same as for conventional weapons.

Her planning at all levels, from the very top to the very low echelon units, includes considerations for chemical warfare training, offensively and defensively.

She has a wide spectrum of chemical munitions. She considers chemical tactical weapons to be used in conjunction with nuclear weapons or separately as circumstances may dictate.

Her agent stockpiles include a spectrum of agents capable of creating military effects over a wide range.

The soldier is well equipped with defensive equipment. He trains vigorously and for long periods of time with this equipment. He looks upon chemicals as a real possibility in any future conflicts, and he respects his equipment.

The research program in the Soviet Union for chemical warfare has encompassed every facet.

The basis for these comments appears in the testimony of Willis E. Black before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1968.

In addition, we know that the state of Soviet chemical science which has direct application to chemical warfare technology is unsurpassed. I have here some physical evidence of their diligent and exhaustive effort in this field.

This stack of documents contains abstracts of translations of selected Soviet scientific literature which reflects the magnitude of this effort during the past several years alone. Each of these documents also contains abstracts pertaining to biological research which has military applications.

In summary, the USSR is well equipped to wage warfare with these weapons and indications are that they would be used if this served its purpose.

Other chemical systems employ incapacitating agents designed specifically to avoid killing—approach unique among weapon systems. These weapons suggest employment where military necessity requires control of a situation, but where there is a good reason for not harming the surrounding population or even the intended target troops.

Among chemical agents in the incapacitant category are some which exert mental effects, and there are some which affect the body. There also are types which affect both the mind and the body. Physical types have some advantages over the mental types, however, since the degree of incapacitation will be more apparent to the user.

Such agents would include, for example, those which would cause loss of physical coordination, paralysis, or loss of vision. The effects would be temporary and those exposed would recover without after effects. These agents are selected for possible use because of the wide safety factor between the amount of agent which incapacitates and that which would cause lethal effects.

Actually, many compounds have some temporary effects on mental processes as well as on physical performance. For example, the ability to concentrate on a given task may be severely limited at the same time that physical tasks may become more difficult to perform.

The incapacitating agents were not available for consideration when the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was formulated.

These incapacitating chemical weapons would be marked assets to US forces in military situations where it is necessary to gain control of an area in which both civilian and insurgents are co-mingled or where civilian and enemy military troops are intermingled. This would be particularly true on peacekeeping missions in underdeveloped nations where insurgency is a problem and where the US is asked to assist in maintaining stability of a state.

Among chemical systems some include as chemical weapons the riot control agents, herbicides and smoke and flame. The US clearly does not consider these categories as weapons to fall within the purview of the Geneva Protocol of 1925; public statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance and by Ambassador to UN Nabrit provide the basis for the US position. I will cover these later in a discussion of policy.

The riot control agents, used for control of civil disturbances and adapted for use in Vietnam operations, are designed to irritate, to cause people to move (vacate an area), with only temporary effects. The effects of CS, the standard military riot control agent, are pronounced and instantaneous—coughing, severe burning of the eyes, tightness of the chest, acute discomfort. These effects are much the same as the tear gas, CN, which has been long used by civil law enforcement agencies world wide. But CS works faster to temporarily disable and is much safer. In tests using troop volunteers, in actual riots, and in battle, there has never been a fatality attributed to CS.

In Vietnam commanders find CS a valuable weapon in combat situations when it is apparent that explosives are not the best weapon. Viet Cong have frequently forced women and children to accompany them as hostages; they do not hesitate to use them as protective shields against anyone seeking to clear their tunnel hideouts. In such situations, CS quickly proved its value. In one reported operation, 17 Viet Cong and some 400 non-combatants being held as hostages were forced from a tunnel complex by CS, with nobody wounded on either side. Again, 43 armed Viet Cong were captured with no friendly losses and one enemy killed when he tried to break away. These examples indicate that lives are frequently saved on both sides when CS is used as a weapon.

Herbicides have proved useful in Vietnam primarily as defoliants. Dense jungle, which is home to the Viet Cong, provides the enemy with effective ambush cover. Wooded areas along trails, roads, railroads, canals and powerlines have been hiding areas for Viet Cong units until the US Air Force began to spray defolianting agents. Removal of the jungle canopy and overhanging foliage permits a view for analysis of trail activity, storage site locations and targeting and exposes the ground area to photographic surveillance and direct fire. Army units use herbicides around local base areas to keep them clear for ground surveillance and fire lanes and prevent surprise. Herbicides have also been used against Viet Cong crops; they are harmless to the soil and to life and to have no residual effect on the soil, being effective no longer than one growing season.

The biological weapons are categorized by their effects against man, against animals and against crops. Biological weapons designed for use against man are further categorized by their effects as lethal or incapacitating. Again, lethal biological weapons are designed to kill; incapacitating to avoid killing.

Biological agents can be produced, can be stored under specific conditions, and can be disseminated effectively to cover large areas. Because of the delay between infection and symptoms, as well as the large area coverage capability, biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Biological agents, like the chemical nerve agents, cannot be detected by the senses. Being colorless, odorless and tasteless their early detection is a difficult problem, complicated by the delay which occurs before effects become evident.

There is a wide variety of bacteria, rickettsia, viruses and fungi which cause disease in man. Many of these can be used as biological agents. Examples of some that could be considered as lethal agents are plague, tularemia, anthrax, yellow fever and typhus.

In addition, it is entirely possible that mutant types of disease could be developed which would not respond to known methods of treatment. They would be difficult to diagnose. Diagnosis and treatment could be complicated by using mixtures of two or more agents.

Biological agents can be delivered in a variety of ways, such as aerosol generators and spray tanks. Generators and spray tanks could be carried in missile warheads and in manned or drone aircraft. Another possibility is the use of insect vectors, such as the mosquito, as a deliberate carrier of microorganisms.

In a different category are the biological incapacitants. They are designed to permit control of an enemy—to remove his ability and will to fight, with minimum risk of mortality. There are a number of mild diseases which will make a person very uncomfortable and make him inactive for a short period of time without serious effects.

In another category are the weapons which can be used to attack a nation's food sources—crops and livestock. These are generally considered weapons for strategic use.

Why do we have a program? We can refer back to Mr. Vance's statement which included both chemical and biological weapons and the need for a program in view of the large USSR program. We can also refer back to Mr. Black's testimony when he stated that "Today Russia is better equipped militarily and psychologically for chemical and biological warfare than any other nation in the world." However, it is even more important that one looks at the rapid advances being made in the bio-medical sciences. The US must keep an active and viable program in this field so that we are not technologically surprised and so that such surprise cannot threaten our national security.

From this brief review of the elements of the CB weapons program, it is evident that an increasing variety of effects have become available, with a consequent increase in variety of purposes to which they could be applied. The alternatives presented are now so many that distinctions between purposes have tended to submerge purely technical differences.

Thus, at one end of the spectrum, these forms of warfare might be no more than the small-scale use of a non-lethal chemical agent an adversary to frustrate his purpose without maiming or causing fatalities. At the other extreme of the spectrum, it is possible to conceive of the use of a lethal biological agent against an entire nation without consideration of necessity or humanity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to weigh in a single balance situations so disparate in intent or consequences.

It appears, then, that with respect to chemical and biological systems one should look toward the *principle of proportionality*, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind or degree of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. In this context it would appear that the norm of proportionality could require controls to prohibit certain elements of the chemical and biological field, while others of the non-lethal type would be preferred over alternatives now employed.

DEFENSE

In developing a modern defensive posture, one must recognize the threat and the toxicity of current nerve agents. With these, even very low concentrations for short periods of time can quickly produce severe symptoms. Further, one must protect against absorption of these agents through the skin as well as by inhalation. As a result, a lethal chemical protective system consists of several interrelated elements. The total chemical and biological defensive system consists of detection, warning, protection, decontamination, and preventive medicine and medical therapy. Each of these elements requires available equipment and materials (alarms, masks, etc.) which must be integrated into an overall logistics system. The defensive equipment requires concepts and doctrines for use which must be integrated into the training cycle. The lack of any element increases the vulnerability to a chemical or biological attack.

There are two implications to the complexities of equipment and training for defense against lethal chemical weapons.

For one thing, a force against which lethal chemicals are used will be at much lower combat effectiveness than will a force not suffering the same casualty threat with its attendant requirement for protective equipment and decontamination procedures. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 recognizes this as a basis for retaliation against the initiator of lethal chemical use. In the present era, a force without the option of chemical retaliation could well be forced to an alternative option of tactical nuclear employment, if that were available to him.

The second implication is that the cost of protective equipment is high and serves as a constraint on less affluent nations against initiating use of lethal chemicals, since use carries with it the requirement for protection against retaliation.

POLICY

What is our national policy in regards to these weapons and their use? We can turn to the statements of our President's and their Cabinet officers to explain a basis for our current policy.

First, we can begin with President Roosevelt's statement in 1943 when he stated: "* * * we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies." President Eisenhower re-affirmed the Roosevelt policy statement. Very few public statements have been made until recently when as a result of the Vietnam conflict, questions were raised.

Secretary of State Rusk in 1965 declared with respect to US use of tear gas and herbicides that the US was not engaging in gas warfare in Vietnam and that the country was not using gas "that is prohibited by the Geneva Convention of 1925 or any other understandings about the use of gas."

Ambassador Nabrit before the United Nations General Assembly in 1966 stated that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 does not apply to all gases and further "It would be unreasonable to contend that any rule of international law prohibits the use in combat against an enemy, for humanitarian purposes, of agents that Governments around the world commonly use to control riots by their own people. Similarly, the Protocol does not apply to herbicides, which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those used domestically in the United States, the Soviet Union and many other countries to control weeds and other unwanted vegetation."

Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance, in his 1967 testimony before Congress indicated "That we seek international understandings to limit chemical and biological warfare and that we have not used weapons of the sort condemned by the Geneva Protocol." He pointed out that "as long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability."

In line with seeking limitations, the most significant current action which may affect policy is the United Nations study on chemical and bacteriological (biological) warfare, requested by the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference. This study, intended to provide a technical and non-political appraisal of the effects chemical and biological weapons, is being done by experts of fourteen countries, including the US and the USSR. It is to be completed by July 1969, will be unclassified and will be given wide distribution.

Our posture today is concerned first with the development of a credible and viable lethal chemical capability as a deterrent to the use of these weapons against us, and to give us the ability to fight effectively if deterrence fails. Further, it is essential that in the rapidly advancing technology of the bio-medical-pharmacological sciences we not permit ourselves to be surprised by a capability in the hands of a potential enemy. And, finally, the exploitation of a chemical incapacitating capability may permit us to effectively control a critical situation while at the same time using weapons designed to avoid killing.

THEY ARE NOT ALL BAD

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when one views the unlawful and repulsive actions of the vociferous minority group of peaceniks, yippies, and draft-card burners; when one reads of the abhorrent takeovers by unwashed and unruly mobs of our country's institutions of learning, the tendency is to assume a feeling of disdain toward young people in general. This feeling we must reject, of course, for we know the great majority of our young people find the actions of this minority just as repugnant as we do. We see proof of this every day in the actions of young individuals and young groups, such as the "Rally for Decency" in Miami recently; in the action of a group of students—almost the entire student body—demonstrating in support of the school's president.

We see evidence of it in heart-rending letters from young men serving their country far from home, who find it difficult to understand the actions of members of their generation back home; we see evidence of it in the patriotic plea of a young wife and mother to President Nixon, in which she asks the Chief Executive for his "pledge that our country will not be accused of slinking away from a task because of its difficulty, of renouncing several million people because they are unworthy, or of sacrificing my husband for expediency."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to number this patriotic young wife and mother among my constituents; and I am happy to have been provided with a copy of her letter so that I may share it with my colleagues, along with two other letters from members of the Armed Forces published in newspapers in my district, and

XUM

all of which point to the refreshing conclusion: They are not all bad.

I insert these letters in the Record at this point:

Danville, Va.

Dear Mr. Nixon: I am writing to you as the wife of a prisoner-of-war. My husband, Captain F. H. Kushner, was stationed with the First Air Cavalry in South Viet Nam. On November 30, 1967, the helicopter in which he was flying crashed in Quang Nagi Province. Search and rescue operations were delayed because of the weather, and when the wreck was located, no trace of my husband was found. On March 5, 1968, I was informed by the Department of the Army that according to information furnished them by prisoners released by the Viet Cong on 23 January 1968, my husband's status would be changed from missing in action to prisoner-of-war. I was further informed that although he had been wounded, his physical condition was considered good. Since that time I have had no other information concerning my husband's welfare, nor have I been able to communicate with him in any way.

I would like to impose upon your time and patience and insert here an excerpt from my husband's last letter to me. I received it after I had been informed that he was missing.

"Nothing new to add, except that I delivered a baby down in the village today. A pretty difficult breech that the local midwife couldn't handle. It was done in a filthy hovel with dirt on the floor and stirrups made of tied-together rags. We used a flashlight. Had no ergot derivatives to stop bleeding and I thought she would bleed to death after the placenta came out. But it finally stopped and mother and baby fine. It was one of the most gratifying things I've ever done.

"Everyday I do things without equipment or facilities that I used to take for granted. Things that I wouldn't have believed possible in these circumstances. The things people can make out of ammo-boxes and nails, or 55 gallon oil drums and a welding torch are just amazing—and reassuring—that Americans are just as tough and strong as they ever were. And in terrible circumstances when the chips are down, they always come through. I'm terribly proud and chauvinistic; and thank God that I come from a family and a country that can make the best out of the worst. If we can teach our children to be good Americans and to have that strength and honor, and love of freedom that Americans by their nature and inheritance have, we will have done all that we need to. If we all get killed tomorrow, or if the Russians level the U.S. with ICBM's it would really be horrible, but not as bad as living the way these people do—in constant fear and oppression and tribulation."

Now Mr. Nixon, you know some more things about my husband. He is, to use a much maligned word, a patriot. He volunteered for duty in Viet Nam because he felt that it was in the best interests of his country. You have also, I am sure, ascertained that he is an M.D. He went to heal and succor, not to kill.

As to the purpose of this letter, I want my husband home. Lord knows I want him home. He brought into this world a healthy Vietnamese baby, but he doesn't know that he has a son almost nine months old. Our daughter has progressed from sweet babyhood and in this year has become a young lady. And every night I try to make another promise to God if only I could get my husband back.

But I don't want him home as the representative of a defeated country, as a monument to the former glories of America. I want my husband to return proudly, as a man who had accomplished the goal he had set for himself. My husband went to Vietnam to serve the interests of his country, in the short time that he was there he developed a deep commitment to the people of South Vietnam. He wanted for them the same freedoms he himself enjoyed.

What I am asking for is your pledge that our country will not be accused of slinking away from a task because of its difficulty, of renouncing several million people because they are unworthy, or of sacrificing my husband for expediency.

I want to thank you for your indulgence in hearing me out, and tell you that my prayers will be with you throughout the difficult years ahead.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. Harold Kushner.

[From the Danville Register, Feb. 26, 1969]

Specialist-4 Clements Describes Soldier: What's a GI Like in Vietnam? He's Scared, a Tough Fighter—A Credit to Himself, Country

What's the GI like in Vietnam today?

In a letter to his sister, Elizabeth, at Wilmington (N.C.) College, Specialist Four Hugh T. Clements, Jr., has described the typical American soldier now fighting in that far-off Southeast Asian country.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Clements of Danville, SP4 Clements wrote:

"Well, in most cases, he's unmarried. His only material possessions of value are an old car at home and a transistor over there. His world is filled with ugly smells, and rock music, and laughter, and 105-mm. howitzers, and sometimes sobbing.

"He's just out of school, received so-so grades, played a little basketball, has a girl who promised to be true and who writes—sometimes.

"He has learned to swagger, swear, and drink beer because it's cold and it's the thing for a boy-man to do.

"He's a spec-four with one year in and one to go. Or maybe three.

"Back home he worked only when he had to; preferred waxing his own car to washing his dad's. He works now. From dawn to dark, every minute he's not fighting he's working. It beats thinking.

"He can dig a foxhole, first-aid a wounded buddy, march until he is told to stop, or stop until he is told to march.

"He has stood among hills of bodies and has helped make some of those hills.

"And when the somebody he knew was among those who died, he has cried. And cried.

"The boy who littered his back-home room with soiled stuff for mom to pick up now has two pairs of fatigues; he wears one while he washes the other.

"He sometimes forgets to clean his teeth but never his rifle.

"He keeps his socks dry, his canteen full; he can cook his own meals, fix his own rips—material and mental.

"He shares his water with anybody thirsty, splits his rations with anybody hungry, and throw you half of his ammo if you're fighting for your life.

"He does the work of three civilians, draws the pay of one, yet finds ironic humor in it all.

"He has learned to use his hands as a weapon and his weapons as his hands.

"He's pink-cheeked, tousle-haired, fight-muscled, 18 fighting to make 19, then he's 19 fighting to make 20.

"He's scared.

"He doesn't understand fighting no-win wars in unpronouncable places with less than our best weapons with fat targets off-limits. He doesn't understand killing Communists in Vietnam and tolerating them in Cuba

"Word from home is almost all about the home-front struggle among the Have-Nots and the Do-Nots and the Will-Nots and the Wash-Nots and the Work-Nots and the Nut-Nots.

"So he grumbles something.

"But then he gets a night's sleep, and a letter from home, and returns from a paddy patrol still forked-end down and figures he's lucky. And he closes his eyes and thanks God and says a prayer—for us."

[From the Gazette-Virginian, Mar. 20, 1969]

Editor,
The Gazette-Virginian.

Dear Sir: Officer candidates are concerned with the problems of man and the state of affairs of his generation. Here is an article from the home town newspaper of Officer Candidate James H. Fullbright. It is a soul searching question well worth repeating.

MY GOD . . . HOW CAN IT BE?

That one boy lies rotting from malnutrition and torture in a jungle prison camp in North Vietnam—and another boy spits and tramples on the flag of his country on the steps of a university of learning?

That one boy lies sightless in a U.S. Army hospital from Communist inflicted face wounds—and another boy uses a Communist flag to drape his body in defiance of the laws of his country?

That one man of medicine begins his thirtieth straight hour standing over an operating table in hopes of life for a man serving his country—and another man of medicine inspires crowds of young men to refuse to serve their country?

That one Negro holds the face of his dead white comrade in his arms and cries pitifully in a dirty mud hole in Vietnam—and another Negro screams with hate against his white brother in the streets of countless American cities?

That one boy lies lifeless in a rice paddy because he believed in duty to his country—and another boy lies on a dingy cot giving blood to the enemy of his country?

That one man of God shields a wounded boy from an enemy bayonet with his body and dies—and another man of God uses his cloth as a shield to preach hate, dissension and lawlessness?

My God, How Can It Be?

Pfc. Dean M. Holt,
65th, Company, 6th Student,
Bn, (TCB).

Fort Benning, Ga.

THE GREAT OIL ROBBERY—OR—HOW TAXPAYERS ARE PERSECUTING AN OIL INDUSTRY WHICH ONLY SEEKS TO SERVE THEM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor oil barons, as unjust accusations are hurled at them by taxpayers. How dare we cast aspersions upon these modern giants, who are serving us so well.

Do we boggle at new taxes piling up everywhere? Think of how much oil companies are paying. Did you pay an average tax rate of 25 percent of your income last year? Shed a tear, ungrateful wretch, for persecuted Shell Oil Co., which paid 13.1 percent of $342,022,000 in 1967 in the form of Federal taxes. Weep for Union Oil Co., which paid 6.3 percent of its income in 1967 in Federal taxes. They only made $163,820,000 before taxes. Rend your garments over how the Federal Government persecuted Marathon Oil Co. They made $138,520,000 in 1967, and paid out 2.7 percent in Federal taxes.

Or how could we forget the terrible fate which overtook Getty Oil Co. in 1967. It earned $132,762,000 and paid 2.8 percent in Federal taxes.

We ordinary taxpayers balk at the

XUM

surcharge of 10 percent, while these great altruists and public servants, the American oil industry, paid and paid and paid for the right to serve us.

Look at how the Federal Government persecutes them, hounding and asking them to explain a few pennies they manage to squeeze out in profit. For shame. Shall we not expand the food stamp program to include starving oil company executives and their ragged families, huddled in pitiful groups on the Riviera and in the Caribbean?

How can they keep polluting our beaches, killing wildlife, keeping out cheap foreign oil and taking that 27½ percent depletion allowance on a pitiful diet of filet mignon, pate de fois gras, and 10-year-old whisky? These are people who serve us. Patriots, selfless public servants, altruists, lovers of their fellow men and women.

Mr. Speaker, how can the American taxpaying public demand tax reform of these good neighbors and businessmen? So all can see how little they really earn in income after taxes, I include here a list of major oil company taxes for 1967. Another little chart here lists their profits for the first half of 1968.

Majors' profits 1968, first half

Atlantic (plus 14.1 percent)	$70, 235, 000
Amer. Petrofina (plus 14.7 percent)	7, 126, 014
Cities Service (plus 7.4 percent)	66, 500, 000
Clark (plus 11.4 percent)	5, 686, 905
Commonwealth (minus 5.5 percent)	9, 621, 629
Conoco (plus 11.3 percent)	73, 600, 000
Gulf (plus 9.8 percent)	311, 144, 000
Hess (plus 26.1 percent)	12, 290, 898
Marathon (plus 13.2 percent)	39, 740, 000
Mobil (plus 12.3 percent)	206, 600, 000
Phillips (plus 1 percent)	79, 919, 000
Shell (plus 11.3 percent)	153, 797, 000
Signal O&G (minus 2.5 percent)	23, 217, 000
Sinclair (minus 1.1 percent)	45, 800, 000
Standard (Ind.) (plus 10.2 percent)	160, 400, 000
Standard (N.J.) (plus 14.2 percent)	621, 000, 000
Standard (Ohio) (minus 5 percent)	29, 009, 000
Sun (plus 25 percent)	50, 600, 000
Texaco (plus 12.1 percent)	402, 600, 000

MAJOR OIL COMPANY TAXES, 1967

Company	Net before tax	U.S. income tax	Percent	Foreign, some states	Percent
Standard (N.J.)	$2, 098, 283, 000	$166, 000, 000	7. 9	$700, 000, 000	33. 0
Texaco	892, 986, 000	17, 500, 000	1. 9	121, 100, 000	13. 5
Gulf	955, 968, 000	74, 142, 000	7. 8	303, 539, 000	31. 8
Mobil	594, 593, 000	26, 900, 000	4. 5	182, 300, 000	30. 7
Standard (Calif.)	513, 067, 000	6, 000, 000	1. 2	85, 400, 000	16. 6
Shell	342, 022, 000	44, 940, 000	13. 1	12, 233, 000	3. 6
Standard (Ind.)	366, 847, 000	74, 021, 000	20. 2	10, 576, 000	2. 9
Phillips	227, 766, 000	52, 255, 000	22. 9	11, 496, 000	5. 0
Conoco	241, 362, 000	30, 031, 000	12. 4	62, 369, 000	25. 8
Cities Service	165, 289, 000	32, 347, 000	19. 6	5, 105, 000	3. 1
Union	163, 820, 000	10, 400, 000	6. 3	8, 457, 000	5. 2
Sun	146, 946, 000	24, 700, 000	16. 8	13, 670, 000	9. 3
Marathon	138, 520, 000	3, 700, 000	2. 7	60, 962, 000	44. 0
Atlantic	145, 259, 000	----------	----------	15, 254, 000	10. 5
Sinclair	130, 017, 000	10, 585, 000	8. 1	24, 060, 000	18. 5
Standard (Ohio)	101, 496, 000	29, 200, 000	28. 8	8, 412, 000	8. 3
Getty	132, 762, 000	3, 687, 000	2. 8	10, 909, 000	8. 2
Ashland	72, 212, 000	23, 718, 000	32. 8	3, 952, 000	5. 5
Sunray DX	74, 526, 000	17, 672, 000	23. 7	2, 390, 000	3. 2
Total	7, 503, 741, 000	647, 798, 000	8. 6	1, 642, 184, 000	21. 8

Yes, they seek to serve all of us, all right. They even carry around a book instructing them how to serve us. One odd thing, though, is that it is a cookbook.

Filet of taxpayer and haunch of householder are on every oil company's menu every day. We pay and they play. We work and they profit. We struggle and they exploit. We count pennies and they bank billions. We cut corners and they clip coupons. It is an America of the oil companies, by the oil companies, for the oil companies. Let no one ever forget that.

Congress gave the oil depletion allowance and Congress can take it away. All we have to do is act. A bill is already introduced that simply would remove it.

TAX GIMMICK—MINERAL PRODUCTION PAYMENT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to put an end to the use of a tax gimmick which is causing a serious and increasing loss to our Treasury. The gimmick is the mineral production payment. It is a sophisticated tax device by which taxpayers have substantially reduced, and in some cases have entirely eliminated, payment of Federal income taxes on profits derived from mines and from oil and gas wells. In the Treasury report on its tax reform studies, the Treasury estimated that the use of production payments results in an annual revenue loss of between $200 million and $350 million.

Carved-out production payments—sometimes called forward sales of oil or other minerals—have been used principally to obtain a greater percentage depletion allowance than Congress intended to grant. They have also been used to increase the credit for foreign taxes. In the case of percentage depletion, the statute provides that the deduction in respect to any mineral property shall not exceed 50 percent of the profit—before depletion—for the taxable year from the mineral property. That is, the maximum benefit to be derived from percentage depletion during any one year is to cut in half the taxable income from a mineral property.

The sale of carved-out production payments has made a mockery of this statutory limitation of 50 percent. In the tax reform studies prepared by the Treasury Department an example is given—on page 257 of part 2 of the Treasury report—of a corporation which derives all of its income from a lead mine which operates at an annual profit of $1 million a year, having $10 million each year from sales of concentrates and $9 million of expenses. In the absence of carved-out production payments, the company would pay a tax each year on $500,000—with a percentage depletion deduction of 50 percent of $1 million. By carving out a production payment of $8 million every other year, the company removes itself from the Federal income tax rolls. A net operating loss of $7 million results in the year of the payout which can be carried back to obtain a full refund of the tax paid in the year the production payment is sold.

During the current hearings on tax reform a spokesman for the oil industry stated that he did not know of any case in the oil industry that was comparable to the lead mine example in the Treasury report. However, he did admit that production payments are carved out in the oil industry for the purpose of reducing income tax payments.

I should like to point out that in the lead mine example given in the Treasury's report, a part of the net operating loss deduction resulting from the carved-out production payment would go to waste, since the company did not have income from any source except the lead mine. But in the oil industry it is most likely that the full tax benefit is realized from carved-out production payments.

The following example will illustrate the complete tax benefit which an oil company can obtain from carved-out production payments. Let us assume that the oil company operates lease A which produces an annual profit of $2 million, having $10 million of oil sales each year and $8 million of lifting costs and other expenses chargeable to the lease. Before applying the 50-percent limitation, the percentage depletion deduction on lease A would be $2,750,000—27½ percent of $10 million—but the 50-percent limitation in the statute limits the percentage depletion with respect to lease A to $1 million—50 percent of the net profit of $2 million. Let us also assume that the company owns lease B which has the same amount of income, expenses, and profit as lease A.

If the company operates the two leases in a normal manner, it will pay Federal income taxes each year on $2 million on account of the two leases, with the percentage depletion deductions reducing the taxable income each year from the two leases by one-half of what it would otherwise be. But if the company carves out a production payment of $8 million from lease A in every other year, and in the intervening years carves out a production payment of $8 million from lease B, no incomes taxes will be paid on the profits from lease A or lease B following the year of the first carve out.

In the year of the payout of the production payment carved out of lease A, a $6 million loss will be realized from the operation of lease A, for the expenses on lease A would remain at $8 million but the income would be only $2 million—$8 million being paid to the holder of the production payment. To utilize this $6 million loss, the company carves out a production payment of $8 million on lease B to be paid out of the following year's production. By the carve out, the percentage depletion deduction on lease B will be raised from $1 million—50 percent of a net profit of $2 million without the carve out—to $4,950,000—27½ percent of $18 million. The 50-percent limitation will not come into play because of the carve out. Thus, lease B will have a taxable income of $5,050,000—$18 million gross less $8 million expenses and the percentage depletion deduction of $4,950,000. The $6 million loss from lease A will not only wipe out the taxable income from lease B but will leave $950,000 of loss to be deducted from income from other sources.

The following year lease A will have a taxable income of $5,050,000—for there will be a new carve out from lease A—but this will be offset by the $6 million loss in that year from the operation of lease B.

Each year the company will have a book profit of $4 million from the two leases, but by use of the production payments it will pay no tax on those profits and moreover it will have an unused loss of $950,000 to deduct each year from income from some other lease or from nonmineral sources. No doubt the utilization of carved-out production payments is an important reason why Federal income taxes paid by oil companies are such a low fraction of their book profits. For example, one large oil company in its report to the SEC for the calendar year 1967 reported a net income—after all taxes—of more than $130 million and a profit of $8.56 per share. Yet the company paid no Federal income taxes for the year 1967—or for any of the preceding 5 calendar years. Its report to the SEC reveals that at the end of 1967 there were undischarged carved-out production payments of $56,125,000.

Under my bill no tax benefit could be derived from the sale of carved-out production payments for the amounts received would be treated simply as loans—not as income subject to the depletion allowance. Treating a production payment as a loan calls for the same tax treatment which is applied under existing law whenever the payout of a production payment is in any manner guaranteed by the person who created it. Under present law the taxpayer has the best of all possible worlds. If he doesn't want to report taxable income on the sale of a production payment, he merely guarantees ultimate payment and the buyer most likely—on a producing property—is completely unconcerned whether or not the guarantee is given. If for tax reasons the taxpayer wants to report the production payment as prepaid income, he refrains from giving any guarantee. My bill takes away the option.

My bill will also eliminate the tax reduction now obtained by use of the so-called ABC transaction on the purchase of a mineral property. In an ABC transaction A, the owner, sells a mineral property to B—who will own and operate the property—for a small down payment and A reserves a production payment—bearing interest—for the major portion of the purchase price. A then sells the production payment to C who is often a tax-exempt charity or pension fund. B operates the property and is not required under the court decisions to include in income the proceeds from the mineral property which are paid over in discharge of the production payment.

In a recent ABC transaction an oil company purchased all of the coal properties of another corporation, subject to a reserved production payment of $460 million payable out of a large percentage of the net profits to be derived from the operation of the coal properties by the buyer. The Internal Revenue Service ruled that the buyer would not be taxed on the $460 million of profits derived from its operation of the coal properties and paid over to the holder of the production payment. In addition, the Service ruled that all of the costs of mining the coal dedicated to discharge the production payment could be deducted by the buyer even though it capitalized those costs on its books as the cost of acquiring the coal properties. The buyer estimated that it would take 15 years to discharge the production payment out of profits derived from its operation of the coal properties and that it would capitalize on its books approximately $128 million of the mining costs attributable to the production payment. After the ruling was obtained, the Tax Court held that a buyer in an ABC transaction must capitalize a proper portion of the lifting costs incurred in discharging a retained oil production payment.

As a result of the ABC transaction described above, no Federal income taxes were imposed on the coal company on its sale of the coal properties for more than $460 million, since the company was liquidated under section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code. Moreover no income taxes at all will be paid on the $460 million of profits derived from the coal lands and paid over to the holder of the production payment, since the holder of the production payment paid face value.

My bill provides that in an ABC transaction the retained production payment is to be treated as a purchase money mortgage. As a result, the buyer of the mineral property would include in income the amount it pays over in discharge of the production payment and in such case would be entitled, of course, to deduct all of the costs of mining the mineral which is applied in discharge of the production payment. This is the same result which has been reached under existing law in those cases where the Internal Revenue Service found—in alleged ABC deals—that the buyers had in fact guaranteed the payment of the retained production payment.

My bill does not apply to past transactions, but only to mineral production payments created after the date of its enactment.

AVIATION SAFETY

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, aviation safety is a matter of growing national concern. Each year air traffic is increasing as more and more of our citizens use the national airspace system. In the next 10 years the number of revenue passengers and miles flown by air carriers is expected to triple. Virtually every area of air transportation is expected to grow at a phenomenal rate. We face a tremendous challenge to keep pace with this anticipated growth.

A modern air traffic system may well be the determining factor in the success or failure of our overall air transportation system. Since both airports and airways are already seriously overcrowded, we need to give very careful consideration to all proposals to improve aviation safety.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are moving far too slowly in establishing better facilities and equipment for air traffic control and developing new technology to keep pace with aviation growth. We are able to get the job done despite these handicaps because of the outstanding work of our Nation's air traffic controllers. These people work under great pressure. We rely heavily on their competence, but how long can we expect them to maintain control over a saturated transportation system that is growing by leaps and bounds?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) has introduced legislation to upgrade air traffic services and provide new benefits to air traffic controllers. While I think some changes in this bill should be considered, I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will take prompt steps to bring air traffic legislation before the House. I believe their hearings on this subject will make the need for action obvious.

I respectfully urge the committee and this entire body to make aviation safety, and especially better air traffic control, a top priority item for this session of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the disability insurance benefits paid under the social security program are intended to provide people who have long-term disabilities with an income when they are unable to work. In general, a disability for social security purposes is defined as an impairment which prevents a person from doing any substantially gainful work for 12 months or longer. Monthly benefits, however, are not paid until after the person has been disabled for 6 months.

The prohibition on benefit payments in the first 6 months of a disability came about because of the practical problems involved in determining the prognosis of many types of disability. There are, however, many types of illness or injury the course of which is reasonably certain from the very beginning. For example, an adult who is blinded in an accident has little or no chance of being able to

XUM

return to work within a year. In such circumstances, I believe that the 6-month waiting period in present law frustrates the purpose of the disability insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct this situation, I have introduced H.R. 9169. This bill would permit the payment of social security disability benefits without regard to the general 6-month waiting period in cases where the applicant is blind or has some other serious disability which is expected to result in his inability to perform substantially gainful work over a protracted period.

This bill is intended to provide seriously disabled people with an income at the time when their needs are greatest. It is in the first months of a disability that medical and hospital expenses are apt to be greatest, and that the expenses of adjusting to the new way of life demanded by the disability are incurred. The failure to provide disability insurance benefits in this period causes needless financial hardship and suffering. H.R. 9169 would eliminate this needless hardship and suffering and would do it for those with the most serious disabilities.

The next time the Committee on Ways and Means is considering social security legislation, I shall urge adoption of the ideas on which my bill is based. And I hope that my colleagues in the House will support me in my endeavors to speed disability insurance benefits to many people.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the 10th Missouri District are beginning to wonder what hit them. They are bogged down in confused desperation. First, the weather conditions have been so adverse that the Secretary of Agriculture declared the area eligible for disaster relief loans. Then the Department of Agriculture lowered the support price for soybeans from $2.50 to $2.25 and cottonseed from $47 to $37 further lowering the farmer's income. The only salvation for many seemed to be an emergency or operating loan from the Farmers Home Administration. After all, the Secretary of Agriculture had declared eight of the counties eligible for the disaster loans. With this financial prop they could hope to make a crop for this year. The applications were made and both the State and local offices recommended approval. On the understanding that they had a loan they began preparations for putting in a crop. Seed, fertilizer, feed, and other supplies were procured on credit, credit bolstered by the promise of a forthcoming loan. The final blow came when the "approved" applications were returned. No argument was made that the applicants did not meet the prescribed standards for approval, nor was it argued that the fund was exhausted. Instead, they were returned because the Bureau of the Budget was holding up the funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of covering the loans pending a Presidential review of the budget. Commendable as a budget analysis may be, an emergency measure to assist the farmers should not bear the brunt of it. Time is of the essence. Planting cannot be indefinitely put off. If the loans are not made many of the farmers in my district as well as in the State and Nation will be driven out of the business to which they have devoted a lifetime of effort and investment.

Three thousand applications representing $17 million have already been "approved" by the Farmers Home Administration and an estimated $13 million in approvable applications are anticipated over the next 3 months. These applications represent farmers from all over the country. A total of 1,108 counties in 38 States have been declared eligible for purposes of the emergency loans.

It cannot be emphasized too much that the enabling act provided emergency relief to those who were injured by natural and uncontrollable forces. The freeze on the funds for this purpose by the Bureau of the Budget is, therefore, totally inconsistent with the intent of Congress insofar as it precludes immediate relief for those victims of natural disaster.

It should be perfectly obvious that the recipients are not getting something for nothing. This is certainly not a giveaway program. We are talking about loans, not grants. The repayment record for these borrowers has been an absolutely remarkable 96 percent. Furthermore, the interest on the loans has provided a profit for the Government of $330 million; six times the amount of the losses.

If these farmers are allowed to go under for lack of a loan, the impact will be felt far beyond the farms directly involved. The money represented by the loans would be spent locally, thus supporting various local businesses whose profits and expenditures sustain still other businesses in a continuing upward spiral. It does not require a degree in economics to understand that the spiral can go downward as well. Farmers forced out of business are also forced out of rural areas and into urban areas where their agricultural skills are not needed, thus aggravating an already exceedingly troublesome urban problem. As was recently stated by a Department of Agriculture official:

> The availability or lack of operating credit is far too often the final deciding factor in determining whether farm families continue to live and work in rural areas where they desire to remain or whether they become economic and welfare casualties in the slums.

If there are insufficient funds to cover all the loans which have been approved, then the Farmers Home Administration has the duty to come forward with a request for supplemental appropriation. The national debt limit has been raised and there is no reason why, if necessary, money should not be appropriated for such a worthwhile purpose. Something must be done and done quickly to alleviate this alarming and potentially tragic situation. On March 17, 1969, I joined with the Missouri Senators in a letter to the President urging prompt release of the funds for emergency loans, and I again implore him to take action. Inaction by the administration is action of a most devastating sort. If the funds are held back much longer the time will have passed for putting in a crop for this year and the farmer as well as his tenants will be financially ruined.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously made vigorous pleas to the administration to reconsider its action pursuant to the reduction of the soybean and cottonseed loan supports. These pleas have been to no avail. My people in the 10th District of Missouri anxiously await the administration's response to this latest plea. We are not asking for a gift. We ask only for the exercise of prudent judgment and prompt action thereon.

At this point I include the text of the letters I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget, with copies to the appropriate congressional committees.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I can understand the President's desire to review the budget and to establish his own priorities, but I implore you not to make the victims of natural disaster suffer for it. Eight counties of my district have been declared eligible for emergency loans from the Farmers Home Administration. According to the latest information I have $660,720.00 in loans have been "approved" by the state and local offices of the Farmers Home Administration and would be made but for the action of the Bureau of the Budget. The farmers whose loans have been approved were so certain that the money would be forthcoming that many purchased fertilizer, seed, and other supplies on credit with the understanding that payment would be made from their loans. If the loans are not made these farmers will be out of business and unemployed.

I am aware of the myriad of demands on the budget, but I want to emphasize that the Farmers Home Administration Emergency Loan Fund is not a general purpose fund. It is an emergency measure designed to offer immediate assistance to farmers who have been victims of a natural disaster and cannot get credit elsewhere. A freeze of funds available obviously frustrates this purpose and thereby the intent of Congress.

It should also be pointed out that other farmers in my district had operating loans approved by the state and local authorities in the amount of $126,210.00. These people are now in the same pathetic circumstance as those described above.

On behalf of the farmers in my district, and similarly effected farmers throughout the country, I urge you to take immediate steps to free the existing funds for the Farmers Home Administration loan programs.

Respectfully yours,
BILL D. BURLISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

Hon. CLIFFORD HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am taking this means to bring to your attention a matter

XUM

of utmost urgency to the farmers in Southeast Missouri and the nation as well. I refer to the freeze by the Bureau of the Budget of funds for the Farmers Home Administration crop loan program.

According to the latest figures from my district, $660,720.00 in emergency loans and $126,210.00 in operating loans have been approved by the local and state Farmers Home Administration offices. There was no question whether these farmers met the minimum standards for the loans, and in reliance of final approval in Washington, they obligated themselves for purchases of seed, fertilizer, and other supplies in preparation for putting in a crop. Now they have been told that the loans cannot be made because the Bureau of the Budget is holding up funds which Congress appropriated specifically for that purpose.

It is imperative that action be taken at once. If not, many farmers will be driven from the business to which they have devoted their lives. If the existing funds are not sufficient to cover the loans that have been approved, then the Department should request a supplemental appropriation. Should it be shown that this is the only way the loans can be covered, I, for one, will support the request. The national debt limit has been raised, and if necessary there is no reason why money for such a worthwhile purpose should not be appropriated.

Respectfully yours,

Bill D. Burlison,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Pirnie (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the week of March 31, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Vienna, Austria.

Mr. Gude (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Blatnik (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Randall, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Collins) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Lipscomb, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, April 2.

Mr. Schwengel, for 1 hour, on April 14.

Mr. Schwengel, for 1 hour, on April 15.

Mr. Minshall, for 1 hour, on April 15.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Farbstein, today and tomorrow, for 30 minutes each.

Mr. Staggers, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Cohelan, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. Corman, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Aspinall and to include an article.

Mr. Joelson and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Saylor in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Philbin in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Madden and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. Randall during consideration of House Resolution 270, following Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Matsunaga to revise and extend his remarks immediately preceding the vote on the bill H.R. 6896, Private Calendar No. 37.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Collins) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Quillen in four instances.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. Mize.

Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Morse in two instances.

Mr. Denney in two instances.

Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Ashbrook in two instances.

Mr. Reid of New York in three instances.

Mr. Bow.

Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Conte in two instances.

Mr. Wold.

Mr. Morton.

Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Derwinski in three instances.

Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Taft in two instances.

Mr. Wyatt in six instances.

Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. Robison.

Mr. Cunningham in three instances.

Mr. Horton.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Rumsfeld in four instances.

Mr. Pelly in two instances.

Mr. Cleveland in two instances.

Mr. McClory.

Mr. Collins.

Mr. Minshall.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Kastenmeier in five instances.

Mr. Biaggi in two instances.

Mr. Murphy of New York in two instances.

Mr. Addabbo in two instances.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Jones of Alabama in three instances.

Mr. Long of Maryland in five instnces.

Mr. Gonzalez in five instances.

Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Eilberg in four instances.

Mr. Boland in two instances.

Mr. Rees.

Mr. Burton of California in two instances.

Mr. Patman in two instances.

Mr. Karth in two instances.

Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Minish.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. Natcher in two instances.

Mr. Scheuer in four instances.

Mr. McCarthy in two instances.

Mr. Montgomery in two instances.

Mr. Marsh.

Mr. Sikes in six instances.

Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Kyros in three instances.

Mr. Mikva in three instances.

Mr. de la Garza in two instances.

Mr. Mann in three instances.

Mr. Steed in three instances.

Mr. Hébert in two instances.

Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.

Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Stephens in four instances

Mr. Hawkins in two instances.

Mr. Cabell.

Mr. Galifianakis.

Mr. Fascell in two instances.

Mr. Rogers of Florida in five instances.

Mr. Roybal in five instances.

Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fountain in two instances.

Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Corman in five instances.

Mr. Ryan in three instances.

Mr. Cohelan in four instances.

Mr. Hagan in two instances.

Mr. Preyer of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. Koch in three instances.

Mr. O'Hara in two instances.

Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Dorn in two instances.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Podell in three instances.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 27, 1969:

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On April 1, 1969:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

XUM

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

635. A letter from the President and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 19th Annual Report of the Girl Scouts (H. Doc. No. 91-95); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

636. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 21st annual report on the national industrial reserve, pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

637. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees and nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. Report on the January 1969 Economic Report of the President (Rept. No. 91-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 270. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-143). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4153. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9701. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9702. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9703. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 9704. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9705. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9706. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9707. A bill to provide compensation for firemen not employed by the United States killed or injured in the performance of duty during a civil disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9708. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of youth correctional programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9709. A bill to create a position of Assistant Attorney General for Organized Crime, to provide necessary personnel to carry out his responsibilities, to provide for training of State and local law enforcement personnel in methods of dealing with organized crime, to provide Federal facilities for protective housing of witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9710. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 9711. A bill relating to the disposition of the interest of the United States in the National Guard armory and motor vehicle storage building at Ranger, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9712. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 9713. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9714. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9715. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 9716. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9718. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Corman, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Holifield, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Leggett, Mr. McFall, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Moss, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. Waldie, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):

H.R. 9719. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9720. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9721. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9722. A bill to liberalize section 351 of title 38, United States Code, relating to benefits for veterans disabled by treatment or vocational rehabilitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9724. A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 9725. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 9726. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purpose of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9728. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include drugs among the benefits provided under the supplementary medical insurance program established by part B of such title and to eliminate the $50 deductible presently imposed as a condition to the receipt of benefits under such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of interest on certain delayed payments of benefits and assessment of interest against certain unrefunded overpayments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9730. A bill to amend section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rate of percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for periodic cost-of-living increases in monthly benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 9732. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit periods of honorable service in the U.S. Armed Forces by a legal resident of an area served by a post office of the first, second, or third class to be counted in satisfying the residence requirements applicable to appointments of postmaster at such post office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 9733. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

XUM

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9734. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9735. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of mineral production payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Conte, and Mr. Burton of Utah):

H.R. 9736. A bill to amend sections 2(3) and 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Findley, and Mr. Burton of Utah):

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend 8c(2)(A) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to include Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio among the specified States which are eligible to participate in marketing agreement and order programs with respect to apples; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9739. A bill to remove time limitations on correction of military records and provide a time limitation as to payments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9740. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9741. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 9742. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9743. A bill to amend section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9744. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 9746. A bill to amend section 809(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat retrospective rate credits as return premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. Hansen of Idaho):

H.R. 9747. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 9748. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 9749. A bill to provide an improved and enforceable procedure for the notification of defects in tires; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9750. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 9751. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9753. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 9754. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the life and work of a man of peace, Martin Luther King; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9755. A bill to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department and postal field service be made on the basis of merit and fitness; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9756. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraph 11, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9757. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9758. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9760. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitations (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1969) on the payment of benefits to citizens of certain foreign countries having social insurance or pension systems of general application; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to achieve greater fairness, justice, equity, and simplicity in the Federal income tax laws through tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9763. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9764. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9766. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Wold):

H.R. 9767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the valuation of a decedent's interest in a ranch, farm, or closely held business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 9769. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9770. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9771. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that wages earned or self-employment income derived in any month by an individual who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits shall be reflected in his primary insurance amount (and all benefits based thereon) beginning with the following month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9772. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9773. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit members of the Reserves and the National Guard to receive retired pay at age 55 for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9774. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and dental care to dependents of certain members of the uniformed services for a period of 90 days after the date of separation of such members from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9775. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9776. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs, a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9777. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9779. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9780. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailing applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9781. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9782. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9783. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul carnival, circus, and allied outdoor show business equipment, materials, and personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9785. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9787. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9788. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9789. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9790. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. Collier, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Denney, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Mathias, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Roudebush, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Bob Wilson, and Mr. Wyman):

H.R. 9791. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9792. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of State-imposed restrictions on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 9793. A bill to abolish the National Capital Planning Commission and to transfer certain of its functions to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Haley, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Chappell, and Mr. Frey):

H.R. 9794. A bill to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9795. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the wrongful disclosure of certain confidential agency decisions and rulings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9796. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second- and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that industrial development bonds are not to be considered obligations of States and local governments, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9798. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9799. A bill to provide for the presentation of an award in honor of Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White II, and Roger B. Chaffee; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 9800. A bill to liberalize section 351 of title 38, United States Code, relating to benefits for veterans disabled by treatment or vocational rehabilitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9801. A bill providing for the establishment of a pilot project of assistance to veterans' organizations operating centers for disabled veterans to gain experience in the practicability of such a program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself and Mr. Fascell):

H.R. 9802. A bill to foster the exploration of outer space by providing for the presentation by the President of the United States, in the name of the Congress, of the Congressional Space Award to astronauts who contribute thereto; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9803. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9804. A bill to amend Public Law 394, 84th Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9805. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 9806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9807. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9808. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, with the cost of such increases being financed out of the general reveneus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 9809. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah (for himself and Mr. Steiger of Arizona):

H.R. 9810. A bill to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9811. A bill to improve the effectiveness of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Camp, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Hall, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Michel, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Watson, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Coughlin):

H.R. 9812. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.J. Res. 615. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 616. Joint resolution to consent to, and enter into, the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XUM

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the year 1970 as a period to honor the citizen juror and Edward Bushell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol", and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H.Res. 352. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 353. Resolution that the President should urge the governments of friendly countries to suspend air travel to and from countries which do not return hijackers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Res. 354. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

98. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to flood control and water reclamation assistance, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9813. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 9814. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Coyne, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9815. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Eaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 9816. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng Tsuau Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9817. A bill for the relief of Clarence T. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9818. A bill for the relief of Chenghuai Li; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 9819. A bill for the relief of Anoop Kumar Gupta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9820. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Ernie D. Bethea, USMC (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Takoma, Wash., relative to development of a process for the clean conversion of coal reserves in the south Puget Sound region to energy and chemicals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

86. Also, petition of the City Council of Elizabeth, N.J., relative to sending offensive literature through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE—*Tuesday, April 1, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, offered the following prayer:

O Lord of creation and redemption, while the millions of mankind keep this holy week, enable us to make each day a holy day. Grant that every duty done, every service rendered, every word uttered, every decision made may have the sanctifying touch of the divine spirit. Renew us in the depths of our being that we may have a full share in the building of a nation whose soul is cleansed and whose mind is "stayed on Thee."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 27, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 28, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on March 28, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, April 1, 1969.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. LLOYD, of Utah, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The message also informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. LUJAN, of New Mexico, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7757) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Legion on its 50th anniversary.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, on Tuesday, March 11, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States adopted resolutions: 1) saluting The American Legion on the occasion of its Fiftieth Anniversary; 2) calling on the American people to commend the Legion upon its achievements during its fifty years of service to God and Country; 3) acknowledging the need for a service organization such as The American Legion in our American society; 4) expressing the hope that the outstanding work of The American Legion will continue during the next half century; and; 5) pledging continuing cooperation with the men and women of The American Legion in their programs of service to community, state and nation; and

Whereas, many members of the Congress in recent speeches have commended and paid tribute to the Legion on its Golden Anniversary; and

Whereas, The American Legion is deeply grateful for these splendid tributes; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Executive Committee of The American Legion in special meeting assembled in Washington, D.C. on this 15th day of March 1969, that The American Legion expresses its thanks and appreciation to the Majority and Minority leadership of both the Senate and the House of Representatives and to all other members of the 91st Congress for their thoughtfulness and expressions of esteem; and, be it

Further resolved, that the National Executive Committee pledges to the Congress of the United States The American Legion's continued cooperation and its determination to remain a vibrant and stable force in American life as it charts its course for the next half century to new heights of service for God and Country.

SENATOR MANSFIELD INTERVIEWED ON "MEET THE PRESS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a transcript of a television show in which I participated, "Meet the Press," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE PRESS, MARCH 30, 1969

Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Guest: Senator Mike Mansfield (D. Mont.), Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Moderator: Bill Monroe.

Panel: William Theis, Hearst newspapers; Samuel Shaffer, Newsweek; John W. Finney, New York Times; Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member.

Mr. MONROE. Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, Majority Leader of the United States Senate since 1961. Senator Mansfield is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

We will have the first questions now from Lawrence E. Spivak, Permanent Member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator Mansfield, Tomorrow will be exactly a year since President Johnson took himself out of the race for the Presidency and stopped the bombing in order to speed negotiations for peace.

Do you think we have made any significant progress towards peace?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, not of any significance. The only significant factor that I am aware of is the statement made by President Thieu the other day that he would be willing to meet with the NLF, the political arm of the Viet Cong, and also at the same time in which he stated that he did not believe that the bombing of the North should be resumed.

Mr. SPIVAK. Have you any reason to believe that the Administration's secret negotiations are being more productive towards peace than the public negotiations suggest?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. How much I am not aware, but some progress has been made in that direction. How much I cannot say.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you have any hope that we will get a peace treaty before the end of '69?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would hope so. I think we have got to make every effort and we ought to get away from this act-react syndrome that has been developing in Vietnam since the President's announcement of a year ago, and most especially since the stopping of the bombing around the first of November last year.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, some members of Congress, including you have been pressing President Nixon for a new American initiative for peace in Vietnam. Are there many new initiatives available to him, really?

Senator MANSFIELD. None of any real consequence, because with the passage of time, with the duration of the war, his options have decreased as had President Johnson's before him, but it does appear to me that what is necessary is a move like that suggested by President Thieu by means of which the NLF and the Saigon government will get together because they are both South Vietnamese and if there is going to be peace in Vietnam, its got to be between those two elements which reside in that country. Then I think it is proper that the U.S. and Hanoi get together and try and work out questions concerning deescalation of the fighting, troop withdrawal and other related matters.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, during the campaign President Nixon said he had a plan to end the war. As far as you know, has this plan been tried and failed? Is it quietly being put into effect?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have no idea what it is.

Mr. SHAFFER. Senator Mansfield, one short follow-up on the question asked by Mr. Spivak, on President Nixon's secret plan for ending the war. Have you or any other Congressional leader been given an inkling of that plan by the President?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, and I dont think we should. If he wants privacy, he should have it. This matter is going to be concluded not in public, not by telling too many members of the Congress but by his negotiators getting into contact in a side room, a back room or somewhere in private so that a political settlement of responsible proportions can be achieved.

Mr. SHAFFER. Now, Senator, I want to ask you about what is currently the biggest fuss in Congress, and looks as if it is going to continue that way for weeks and months. The anti-missile system. How do you assess the chances of beating the ABM in the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say it is the most immediate issue being given the most overt prominence by the Senate at this time, but I would say the great issue is still Vietnam, as it is in effect underlying what we are discussing now.

As far as the ABM situation is concerned, there will be much probing into that. There will be a great debate on the subject. As far as the votes go, my best guess—and it would be only a guess—is that at the present time it would be a standoff.

Mr. SHAFFER. Do you agree with Senator Gore of Tennessee, who is one of the opponents of the ABM system, that this will cause a senseless arms race and poses a potential disaster to mankind.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, generally speaking I do, although I am trying to keep an open mind on the subject. I am personally being affected by what is going to happen because one of the sites is in my own State. I am doing this, even though my prejudice is pretty well known, not only during the course of the debate this year but even during the course of the previous Administration.

Mr. SHAFFER. But if this is something that is in the interests of mankind and you are still short of votes to beat it, you have enough Senators there who could mount a successful filibuster to stop it. Would you participate in or countenance a Senate filibuster?

Senator MANSFIELD. I don't believe much in filibusters because I think that they are counter-productive to the objective desired. I would hope that we would face up to this issue on the basis of our individual responsibility and vote according to what we think is the best way to face this particular problem, which could develop into an arms race of tremendous proportions and bring about greater internal insecurity at home.

Mr. FINNEY. Senator, don't we have a convergence developing here in the Senate between the ABM issue and the Vietnam issue, and an overall new skeptical attitude toward the military?

Senator MANSFIELD. Without question.

Mr. FINNEY. This brings us back to this question of Vietnam. Obviously one of the important factors in the Administration's thinking and approach towards negotiations in Paris is how long the doves are going to stay quiet.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, the doves, so-called, have stayed quiet since the President made his speech of renunciation a year ago tomorrow. I have been very much impressed with the discretion and understanding shown. However, rumblings are heard, discontent is spreading and while very few members have spoken up to this time, with the passage of time more and more members are going to make their views known. I am very much aware of the fact that the President is aware of this discontent, this feeling of uneasiness not only in the Senate but among the American people as a whole and I am sure that in his own way he is trying to do everything he possibly can to bring this barbarous and tragic and futile war to what he has referred to as a responsible settlement.

Mr. FINNEY. You, in an earlier answer, seemed to give a little—display a little discontent yourself. You talked about the action-reaction syndrome that has developed. Are you suggesting by that that the United States bears a share of the responsibility for the recent escalation of the military activities in Vietnam?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, because it is my understanding that once the bombing of the North stopped completely—that is, below the 20th parallel—that instructions were given to General Abrams to keep the pressure on. When you do that, they will come back and you have the act-react syndrome. It is my further understanding that within ten days of the stopping of the bombing of the North that a number of North Vietnamese regiments withdrew into Cambodia and Laos. Maybe that was the time—of course, this is hindsight on my part—that we might have been able to develop a situation which would have called for a cease-fire and standfast, which would have been helpful, in my opinion, to the negotiations at Paris.

Mr. THEIS. Senator, the Communist shelling of Saigon and other cities continues. I believe there were some more rockets, today, into Saigon.

If this continues, would you countenance a military foray into Cambodia, or Laos, as has been suggested as an option, to knock out the Communist bases, there, and you think Prince Sihanouk, for example, would go along, as has been suggested in some reports?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I would not countenance such a move and I don't think Norodom Sihanouk would go along because it would mean an invasion of his country, it would very likely mean the entrance into the war of Cambodia and instead of trying to bring about a deescalation and a possible peace. I think the war would be enlarged, more Americans would be needed and a difficult situation made more dangerous.

Mr. THEIS. You have maintained rather personal contact with Prince Sihanouk and that whole area. Do you have any personal doubt that Cambodia is being used by the

XUM

North Vietnamese, the Viet Cong, as a way station, a military way station?

Senator Mansfield. No, I have no doubt that both Cambodia and Laos are being used but I do not think the way to bring about an end to this barbaric struggle is to go through an invasion of the Kingdom of Cambodia, itself.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, I'd like to ask you one question on Viet Nam. I know you are against unilateral withdrawal of troops in Viet Nam, but do you think a token withdrawal to indicate U.S. intentions might serve a useful purpose at this time?

Senator Mansfield. I think it would show to the Saigon government that we mean business about getting out in time and turning more and more of the responsibility over to them.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, on the ABM, did I understand you to say that you had not yet made up your mind as to how you are going to vote, that you are going to wait for the debate?

Senator Mansfield. No, I did not say I hadn't made up my mind. I did say I was trying to keep an open mind in spite of my prejudices, made known during two administrations, against the ABM. But I think President Nixon ordered a review on his own responsibility, tried to look at all the options open to him in this area, with an open mind, and if he can be that responsible, I think I in turn can be just as responsible.

Mr. Spivak. Didn't the Congress vote under the Johnson administration to deploy the ABM system? Didn't they vote the money for deployment? What happened to change the situation over the last year, Senator?

Senator Mansfield. Well, I must reiterate I was one of those who voted three times against this proposal during the last year of the Johnson administration, but I think since that time there has been a greater recognition of the fact that, as in Viet Nam, where you have an act-react pattern, that here you might develop the same kind of action. If we were to build a number of bases we are told that the Russians would understand that they were defensive and would do nothing. In my opinion, the Russians will match us base for base and maybe more and the end result will not be $6.1 billion for a very thin system around missile bases to defend sites, not people, and the figure could become astronomical.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, when he left office in 1961, President Eisenhower warned the American people against the influence of the military-industrial complex. How do you appraise that influence today in the United States?

Senator Mansfield. Well, I think there is such a complex and I would add the labor unions to it, so it would be a military-industrial-labor union complex, but I do not think it is a deliberate complex. I think it is just because of the great stress placed on scientific development, technology and the like in the past twenty years, which has drawn these various elements together. I do not doubt the patriotism of these people who are in it. I do doubt their judgment.

Mr. Shaffer. Senator Mansfield, when I interviewed you in your office a few days ago, we touched on the Viet Nam war and you said, "We have to get out. We never should have gotten in."

Will you vote for appropriations to continue financing the war?

Senator Mansfield. Yes, I will, because the men who are out there should be given every protection. They are there not by choice but because they have been ordered to go there by their government and, despite my great distate for the Vietnamese war, going back to even before it began, I feel that I have an obligation to these youngsters who are carrying out their obligations as citizens of a country.

Mr. Shaffer. Senator, this has been called on the Senate Floor, McNamara's war, Johnson's war. How long, in your opinion, will it be before it is thought of and called Nixon's war?

Senator Mansfield. I hope never. I hope sincerely that the President will be able to reach a responsible settlement before that stage can be reached, but after all, it is hard to call it his war. He didn't inaugurate it, all he did was inherit it.

Mr. Shaffer. Isn't the public patience and the Congressional patience getting very thin and won't the distaste for this finally turn against the President if the war continues?

Senator Mansfield. Very likely. That is the way of politics, that is the way emotions run. It is unfortunate but that is a good assumption.

Mr. Finney. Let's try to pin you down to some time period, if we can, on this. Has the administration two months, six months? How long does it have?

Senator Mansfield. I couldn't say. It is up to each individual senator's judgment, speaking for the Senate, as to when he thinks he should speak out and make his views known. I feel just as badly as any member of the Senator who is opposed to the war but I feel just as strongly that the President ought to be given some leeway and allowed to exercise some flexibility in his great responsibility.

Mr. Finney. If we can turn to Congress, Senator, the new has been in session now for three months. During that period you have done some housekeeping legislation, you have voted yourself a pay raise, you have approved the nonproliferation treaty. Aside from that, you have done very little.

When is this new Congress going to start legislating?

Senator Mansfield. Well, we are still waiting for the President to let us have the benefit of his suggestions and proposals. We are waiting especially for the next budget to show up. We really can't get down to business until that is sent down, even though at the present time, three or four subcommittees are working on the old Johnson proposals.

It is my opinion that we haven't done much up to this time—not because we aren't eager and ready and willing but maybe it is just as good that we haven't done so much. Maybe in the past eight years we have passed too much legislation. Now it is time to get down to bedrock, see that the administrative overhead is reduced, that the intent of the Congress is carried out and the moneys are spent as the Congress intended.

I look for this Congress to be an appropriation-minded, oversight-oriented Congress and I do not anticipate much in the way of new legislation, nor do I think much is needed.

Mr. Finney. Turning to appropriations, obviously one area that can be cut—not can be cut, necessarily, but that will be subject to close scrutiny in Congress—is the military budget. Do you think it is perhaps time to revive your idea of reducing our troop strength in NATO?

Senator Mansfield. No, I do not, and I make that statement most reluctantly. I feel that in view of the situation which developed in Czechoslovakia last August that for the time being we have to stand fast. Basically, I still feel that, having 300,000 troops and 300,000 dependents in Western Europe is entirely too much, too many, too costly; that they should have been reduced years ago but in view of the Czechoslovakian situation I must, for the time being, hold my fire.

Mr. Theis. Senator, going back to the matter of budget cuts in the economy, the White House has indicated that they are being advised that inflation has peaked and it should turn down. How serious do you regard the inflation situation? Is it a temporary, passing thing?

Senator Mansfield. I am not an economist, Mr. Theis. I hope the White House is right but I think we can help in trying to bring about a ten to twelve billion dollar reduction in appropriations this year and to insist at the same time—as we did with President Johnson—that President Nixon and his people in the executive branch, with the cooperation of the Congress—not alone—bring about a five to six billion dollar reduction in expenditures, because we are spending too much money, appropriating too much money and there are many places where cuts can and should be made.

Mr. Theis. Well, traditionally in Congress when all the supplemental appropriations are added up at the end of the year, some of those cuts have not shown up in a net term.

The Democrats are still in control of Congress. Will the Democratic leadership take the lead if the Administration doesn't have the votes to see that there is a substantial reduction, and you can't have an increased surplus?

Senator Mansfield. We will.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, earlier this year you said the United States has no hard and fast commitment to go to the aid of Israel. What should our role in the Middle East be, in your judgment?

Senator Mansfield. Well, what it is now. Working together with France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and in that way see if we can't bring about a meeting between Israel and the Arab states to the end that they can work out a final solution to the difficulties which have been in existence since the Six Day War.

Mr. Spivak. Don't you think, Senator, it would be better if all the nations, the big nations, stayed out of the Middle East altogether and allowed the Arabs and the Israelis to settle their own problem?

Senator Mansfield. If it could be done, yes. The Israelis seem to think it can be done. I do not agree with them in that respect and I think it is going to take the meeting of the big powers to see if they can't collectively, and working through the Jarring mission, bring about a settlement to that tempestuous area.

Mr. Spivak. Just what do you think the big powers can do, particularly if the Arabs and the Israelis refuse to accept any kind of imposition?

Senator Mansfield. Well, there are many things that could be done. There could be an arms embargo all the way around on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States who are the two chief supplies at the present time to that area. There are certain questions, of course, which have to be considered. For example, the Israeli position in so far as the Golan Heights are concerned. Free passage of the Gulf of Aqaba, the control of Sharm el Sheik which guards the entrance, the reopening of the Suez Canal which is fast losing its economic significance. The return in some part at least, of the area on the west bank of the Jordan and the area of the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, you have said we have no commitment to go to the aid of Israel. What would we do if the Russians went to the aid of the Arabs, though, in a military way? Could we possibly stay out of the Middle East?

Senator Mansfield. It would be quite difficult, but there you are asking me a question which could better be directed to the President of the United States. I would point out that the only legal tie that we had there that I know of is the so-called Eisenhower Resolution which is applicable to all countries in the area equally and is subject, I think, to only one condition and that is a threat from the outside of communism.

Mr. Spivak. Senator, may I ask one more question: In December of this year you urged President Nixon to visit with President de Gaulle and other Western European heads of state, soon after he took office, and I think he did that. I don't know whether it was your instigation or not, but he certainly did it.

XUM

Senator MANSFIELD. Not mine; his own, I am sure.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you think the time has now come for a summit meeting with the Russians?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I think President Nixon is right that the groundwork should be laid first before there is a summit meeting. I would hope that is being done, especially in the field of disarmament, that it would not be on a linkage basis, tying in all the other questions on which there are differences. I would hope that a summit meeting would be held between Mr. Nixon and Kosygin and Brezhnev at an appropriate time—not too long, I would hope—and on the basis of results which had been achieved at a lower level and for the purpose of, in effect, putting the imprimatur of the chiefs of state on any agreements which had been reached. It is mandatory that the two countries get together for the sake of the peace of the world.

Mr. SHAFFER. Senator Mansfield, there is a lot of griping right now over the tax load people are carrying. Do you favor extending the ten percent surtax?

Senator MANSFIELD. Reluctantly, yes, but only on the basis of what I said previously, that there should be tied with it a five to six billion dollar reduction in expenditures and a $10 to $12 billion reduction in appropriations.

Mr. SHAFFER. In connection with that your colleague, Senator Teddy Kennedy, has suggested tying tax reform to the extension of a surtax.

Senator MANSFIELD. A good idea.

Mr. SHAFFER. Well, what loopholes would you like to see plugged? I understand you are against plugging the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. I come from an oil-producing state. But I would point out that there are a number—150 I believe is the figure—of people who earn one million dollars or more a year who pay no income taxes. What I would like to see is tax reforms made in all areas and at the same time an increase in the exemption from $600 per person which was put in in 1914, and is of no significance today, to at least $1,000 or $1200.

Mr. SHAFFER. But is there time for Congress to attach tax reforms to the extension of the surtax, which expires on June 30?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes. We can do it at any time if we get the proper measure before us, at least as far as the Senate is concerned, even though tax measures must originate in the House.

Mr. MONROE. We have less than three minutes, which may mean a lot of room for questions with Senator Mansfield's short, snappy answers.

Mr. FINNEY. Senator, as you mentioned earlier, one of the Minuteman bases that is going to be protected is out in your home state. I wonder what you are hearing from back home. Are you getting any pressure from this military-industrial-union complex to go ahead with this system?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, some chambers of commerce, some bankers, some contractors are for it, but the people, on the basis of what I have heard to this date, are not for it.

Mr. FINNEY. Thus far this whole ABM debate has really been a very bipartisan thing. The partisan element hasn't come into it. But as you know, Senator Kennedy is sponsoring a book on this issue which will be, presumably, against the ABM deployment.

Is there a danger, here, of a collision or confrontation in a personal political sense developing between Senator Kennedy and the Nixon administration?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there is always that danger. Senator Kennedy being who he is and President Nixon being where he is, but I would hope most devoutly that this would not develop into a partisan issue because it is too big for that and it is the welfare of the country that ought to come ahead of the welfare or the success of a party.

Mr. THEIS. Senator, as a former college professor and who, if he had his druthers, might want to go back sometime, how would you deal with the present campus unrest?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I believe in demonstrations. I believe in dissent because it is guaranteed under the Constitution, but I do not believe in violence, nor in license, and I think that a mini-minority of the students in college, today, are putting a great blot on the image of the great majority of the students. After all a student is a transitory person going through a college just like a Senator is a transitory person going through Congress. It is the institution which counts. It is the institution which must survive and if these people cannot obey the laws of the land then I think the question of suspension should be given serious consideration, as well as the question of expulsion. The educational institution must live.

Mr. THEIS. That is a local decision but would you have federal funds going to students withdrawn if they are either expelled or convicted of a serious offense—

Senator MANSFIELD. That decision has been made because the Congress passed a law last year which leaves it up to the discretion of the local administrators, the presidents or the chancellors or whatnot. They have not done anything in that respect. They say there is a Constitutional question involved. I say take it to the courts and find out.

Mr. THEIS. You would not see the present law changed?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, do you think inflation is going to be halted in this country short of wage and price controls?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I felt so a long time ago, I recommended to President Johnson as long ago as three years ago that we ought to seriously consider the imposition of wage and price controls to combat inflation and also the restoration of Regulation–W, which would cut down on credit buying which amounts to about $130 billion in this nation, today.

Mr. MONROE. I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up. Thank you, Senator Mansfield, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the funeral service for the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower at Washington Cathedral, on Monday, March 31, 1969, together with the scriptural selection and prayers by the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Chaplain of the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR THE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, 1890–1969, MARCH 31, 1969, 4:30 O'CLOCK IN THE AFTERNOON, WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE ORDER OF SERVICE

Organ prelude:

Chorale-Prelude, "Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele", *Johann Sebastian Bach;* Chorale-Prelude, "O Welt, ich muss dich lassen", *Johannes Brahms.*

The Ministers, meeting the body, and going before it, will escort it to the place of honor in the Crossing of the Cathedral, while the people stand and the choir sings:

"The Palms" by *J. Fauré:*

"O'er all the way green palms and blossoms gay
Are strewn this day in festal preparation,
Where Jesus comes to wipe our tears away,
E'en now the throng to welcome him prepare.

"Join all and sing, his Name declare,
Let ev'ry voice resound with acclamation,
Hosanna! Praised be the Lord,
Bless him who cometh to bring us salvation.

"His word goes forth and peoples by its might
Once more regain freedom from degradation,
Humanity doth give to each his right,
While those in darkness find restored the light.
"Refrain

"Sing and rejoice, O blest Jerusalem,
Of all thy sons sing the emancipation,
Through boundless love the Christ of Bethlehem
Brings faith and hope to thee for evermore.
"Refrain."

The opening sentences.

The Dean of the Cathedral will then offer the following prayer: "Remember thy servant Dwight David, O Lord, according to the favour which thou bearest unto thy people, and grant that, increasing in knowledge and love of thee, he may go from strength to strength, in the life of perfect service, in thy heavenly kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost ever, one God, world without end. *Amen."*

Minister and People: "Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever and ever. *Amen."*

Hymn (*sung by all, standing*):

"A mighty fortress is our God,
A bulwark never failing;
Our helper he amid the flood
Of mortal ills prevailing:
For still our ancient foe
Doth seek to work us woe;
His craft and power are great,
And, armed with cruel hate,
On earth is not his equal!

"Did we in our own strength confide,
Our striving would be losing;
Were not the right man on our side,
The man of God's own choosing:
Dost ask who that may be?
Christ Jesus, it is he;
Lord Sabaoth his Name,
From age to age the same,
And he must win the battle."
Martin Luther, 1529.

Psalms 46 and 121 (*read responsively*) *Led by the minister of the National Presbyterian Church:*

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.

"Therefore will we not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea;

XUM

"Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled,

"Though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof.

"There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God,

"The holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High.

"God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved:

"God will help her, and that right early.

"The nations raged, the kingdoms were moved: he uttered his voice, the earth melted.

"The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.

"Come, behold the works of the Lord,

"What desolations he hath made in the earth.

"He maketh wars to cease until the end of the earth;

"He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariots in the fire.

"Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth.

"The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills: from whence shall my help come?

"My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

"He will not suffer thy foot to be moved: he that keepeth thee will not slumber.

"Behold, he that keepeth Israel will neither slumber nor sleep.

"The Lord is thy keeper: the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand.

"The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night.

"The Lord will preserve thee from all evil: he will preserve thy soul.

"The Lord will preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore.

"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;

"As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

"The Apostles' Creed" (*said by all*): "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: And in Jesus Christ his only son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. *Amen.*"

THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES (PEOPLE SEATED)

The congregation will remain seated while Psalm 23 *is sung by the Cathedral choir to the words and music of the Scottish Psalter.*

"The Lord's my Shepherd, I'll not want;
He makes me down to lie
In pastures green; he leadeth me
The quiet waters by.

"My soul he doth restore again;
And me to walk doth make
Within the paths of righteousness,
E'en for his own Name's sake.

"Yea, though I walk in death's dark vale,
Yet will I fear none ill;
For thou are with me; and thy rod
And staff me comfort still.

"My table thou hast furnished
In presence of my foes;
My head thou dost with oil anoint,
And my cup overflows.

"Goodness and mercy all my life
Shall surely follow me;
And in God's house forevermore
My dwelling place shall be. *Amen.*"

Memorial and pastoral prayers.

Benediction by the Bishop of Washington: "Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit Dwight David. The Lord bless him and keep him. The Lord make his face to shine upon him, and be gracious unto him. The Lord lift up his countenance upon him, and give him peace, both now and evermore.

"And now may the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant; Make you perfect in every Good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight; through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*"

Hymn (*sung by all, standing*):

"Onward, Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war,
With the cross of Jesus
Going on before!
Christ, the royal Master,
Leads against the foe;
Forward into battle,
See, his banners go.

"Onward, Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war,
With the cross of Jesus
Going on before!

"Like a mighty army
Moves the Church of God;
Brothers, we are treading
Where the saints have trod;
We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity. *"Refrain.*

"Onward, then, ye people,
Join our happy throng,
Blend with ours your voices
In the triumph song;
Glory, laud, and honor
Unto Christ the King;
This through countless ages
Men and angels sing.
"Refrain Amen."

During the singing of the hymn the Minister and Honorary Pallbearers take their places around the body and at the end of the hymn they escort it to the North Entrance while the United States Marine Band, the President's Own, plays "Army Blue."

Honors to the President played by the Marine Band.

As the body is carried down the steps of the Cathedral the Marine Band will play "Lead, Kindly Light."

The congregation leaves to the tolling of the Bourdon Bell.

OFFICIATING CLERGY

The Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Minister, National Presbyterian Church

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr. Dean of Washington Cathedral

The Right Reverend William F. Creighton. Bishop of Washington

Choir of the Washington Cathedral, Paul Callaway, organist.

SCRIPTURE SELECTIONS READ BY THE REVEREND DR. EDWARD L. R. ELSON, MINISTER, THE NATIONAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE OF PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, MARCH 31, 1969

Hear the reading of God's word, being excerpts from the Letters of Paul, the Apostle, and the words of our Lord Jesus Christ.

II Timothy 4:6 and 7: ". . . the time of my departure is at hand." "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Romans 8:14, 35, 37 to 39: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come," "Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

I Thessalonians 4:13, 14, and 18: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." "Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

II Corinthians 4:5: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

I Corinthians 13: 9 to 13: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things." "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

I Corinthians 15: 57 and 58: "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

Ephesians 6: 10 to 18: "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." "Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand." "Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; "And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;" "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit."

Hear the words of our Lord Jesus Christ:

Matthew 5: 3, 4, 8, 9: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

John 14 (adapted from the Presbyterian Book of Common Worship): "Jesus said: 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many dwelling places: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way we know. I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.

'These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I

XUM

unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.' "

Prayers by the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Minister, the National Presbyterian Church, at the Funeral Service of President Dwight David Eisenhower, March 31, 1969

Almighty God, Father of mercies and Giver of all comfort, deal graciously, we pray Thee, with all those who mourn this day, that casting every care on Thee, they may know the consolation of Thy love, the healing of Thy grace, and the companionship of Thy presence. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, draw us close to Thee and let Thy light and joy fill our souls as we offer unto Thee the praise and thanksgiving of our hearts; for the mystery and wonder of life here and hereafter. We thank Thee that deep in the human heart is an unquenchable trust that life does not end with death, that the Father who made us will care for us beyond the bounds of vision even as He has cared for us in this earthly pilgrimage. We praise Thy name that our hope has been so wondrously confirmed in the life, the words and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We give Thee thanks for all the sacred memories and hallowed recollections which cluster about this hour.

We thank Thee for Thy servant Dwight David. For his goodly heritage, his godly parents, his boyhood home and early training, and for his beloved companion of the years. We thank Thee for the nobility of his manhood, the integrity of his person, the hospitality of his mind and magnanimity of his spirit; for his steadfastness under provocation, for his gifts of reconciliation, for his kindness and his firmness, for his compassion and mercy, for his warm friendship, his transparent spirituality, his patience in suffering, and for all that endeared him to the multitudes of mankind. Especially do we thank Thee for his Christian testimony, for the depth and durability of his faith, for his constant witness to the spiritual basis of our common life, for his steadfastness in seeking to know and to do Thy will, and for his daily walk with Thee.

We thank Thee too for all the human graces with which Thou didst endow him—for his sheer joy in living, for his infectious humor, his zeal as sportsman and competitor, his love of beauty and his efforts to express it on canvas and in words, for his love of family and for the sanctity of his home.

O God, in whose sovereign will is the destiny of men and nations, who art a God of history and beyond history, we give Thee special thanks for the magnitude of his public service—for his military prowess in defense of freedom; for his leadership in winning and in conserving the peace; for his high service as President of the Republic. We give Thee thanks for his vast labors transcending all parties and faction, encompassing all men and nations, for his high vision of the better world toward which all men of good will strive, and for his devotion to that higher kingdom, the ruler of which is God and the law of which is love.

O Eternal Father, suffer us not to miss the glory of this hour. May a new spirit arise in us this day. Give us eyes to see and hearts to feel the undaunted courage, the invincible faith, the unconquerable love of Thy servant, Dwight David, that we may be true as he was true, loyal as he was loyal; that we may henceforth be good enough and great enough for our times. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

And now, O Father, who doest all things well, with thankful hearts that Thou has given him to us for a season, we give Thy servant, Dwight David, back to Thy tender care, until the shadows flee away, and the brighter day dawns, when the visible and invisible are as one in Thy higher kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

TIME TO SQUELCH PETTY TYRANTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Time To Squelch Petty Tyrants," published in the Chicago Tribune on Tuesday, April 1, 1969.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time To Squelch Petty Tyrants

Sen. Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.) has said he will "go to the highest authority in this government to get somebody fired" if officials of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commismission and the office of federal contract compliance persist in their "harassment" of employers.

It was Sen. Dirksen's warning to Clifford L. Alexander Jr., chairman of the EEOC, at a hearing with which Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) made his debut as chairman of a judiciary subcommittee on administrative practices. Sen. Kennedy already had made his debut as a candidate for President in 1972 by calling for an accommodation of Red China, thus burnishing his image as a true "liberal," and the hearing on alleged discrimination in employment practices was an act of homage to another important bloc of voters: the Negroes.

Sen. Kennedy protested indignantly, therefore, when Sen. Dirksen told Alexander, a Negro, that a hearing he conducted in Los Angeles "resembled a carnival, a personal vendetta" against employers and unions, and was a travesty of the 1964 civil rights act.

Earlier Sen. Dirksen, on the Senate floor, had called for an investigation by the subcommittee of "many allegations in recent months that employers are being forced to comply with reckless and conflicting orders issued by a number of government departments under the threat that their federal contracts will be withdrawn if they do not knuckle under." He obtained consent to insert in the Congressional Record a series of articles from Barron's Weekly reviewing some of the more outrageous abuses of authority by administrative officials.

One article reported that federal road builders all over the country have warned the Senate public works committee that the federal highway program is "coming to a virtual standstill" because of the impossibility of complying with EEOC and OFCC regulations. A flagrant example of their intrusive and arbitrary meddling involved a $5,000,000 highway contract awarded on Feb. 21, 1968, to Carl M. Geupel, of Columbus, O. Five days earlier the OFCC had issued a regulation saying each federal aid construction contract of $500,000 or more must have its approval before going into effect.

Geupel was told that he would have to come up with an "affirmative action program" that would prevent discrimination in employment. He said he could not do that unless the federal agencies told him what they wanted. Later he was told to produce "manning tables by race," which would amount to a contractual undertaking to employ specific numbers of Negroes in each craft. Geupel said he could not do that because he obtained his workers thru a union hiring hall. He might have added that if he tried to get them elsewhere he would have a strike on his hands and the National Labor Relations board on his back.

On April 12 the bureau of public roads called for new bids on the job, but P. E. Hasheter, director of the Ohio public highway department, refused, protesting that it is "a matter of grave concern" when duly authorized representatives of the United States enter into a contract and other representatives of the government "then order that agreement breached."

On May 22, Frank H. Weitzel, assistant controller general of the United States, ruled that no obligations not specified in advertisements for bids may be imposed upon road contractors after contracts have been awarded, but the federal agencies still refused to honor Geupel's contract. Finally Congress adopted an amendment to the 1968 highway act incorporating Weitzel's ruling and Geupel obtained permission to go ahead with the job. He said the delay would cost him $200,000 to $300,000 in increased wage rates alone, to say nothing of higher material costs.

To get around the highway act amendment, the Federal highway administration, last Oct. 1, issued order 7-2, requiring all road contractors to be "pre-qualified" and establishing vague procedures, which have all but stopped federal highway construction. California has been unable to start work on a 700-million-dollar program for 1969 because only two of its 300 contractors have been pre-qualified. In New York, which has re-qualified none, all work is being delayed.

Another horrible example is the case of the Allen-Bradley Co., of Milwaukee, now pending before Secretary of Labor George Shultz. On Jan. 16, W. Willard Wirtz, former secretary, upheld the finding of a hearing panel that while the company had not discriminated against individual applicants, its failure to undertake special recruitment of Negroes constituted grounds for debarment from all federal contracts. The company, which has asked Shultz to overrule the Wirtz decision, reminded the government that about 18,000 applicants walk in and apply for the 1,500 or so jobs it fills each year. To go out and recruit Negroes, it said, would be discrimination on account of race, in violation of the 1964 civil rights act.

The fantastic cost of shoes, clothing, and other consumers' goods, the years of waiting required for a car or an apartment, and the dismal failure of the agriculture program in communist Russia are examples of what will happen in this country if the proliferation of idiotic regulations and orders by petty tyrants is not stopped.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Medical care," for the fiscal year 1969, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The 1969 Regular Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Program

A letter from the vice admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel, transmitting the list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1969 Regular Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps program, dated March 28, 1969 (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on the National Industrial Reserve

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

XUM

Disposal of Platinum From the National Stockpile

A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, withdrawing proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of platinum from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, submitted to the Congress on January 15, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Summer Employment of District Public School Teachers

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to pay received by public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment during the summer vacation period (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Proposed Legislation Providing for Construction and Modernization of Public Health Centers

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees for nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States

A letter from the National Executive Director of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Girl Scout organization for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity

A letter from the Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report of an independent study and evaluation of the implementation of sections 210 and 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act, as of February 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALLOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

G. Fred Steele, Jr., of North Carolina, to be Federal Cochairman of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

W. Donald Brewer, of Colorado, to be Federal Cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Concurrent resolution of the Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"S. Con. Res. 16

"A concurrent resolution petitioning the secretary of transportation to review and amend the department of transportation's internal policies regarding highway beautification, so as to afford the continued operation of the outdoor advertising industry and allied industries, and affording local enterprises the opportunity to advertise in this manner, subject to state control and whereby said industries and enterprises of North Dakota would attain equality with similar industries and enterprises located in the more densely populated and developed states

"Whereas, on October 22, 1965, the Eighty-ninth Congress of the United States of America enacted public law 89–285, whereby the regulation of outdoor advertising adjacent to the interstate system and the state primary system was made the object of federal control; and

"Whereas, the purported legislative object of public law 89–285 was that the several states provide for the effective control of the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices located within six hundred sixty feet of the nearest edge of the right of way of the respective highway systems. Provided further that such signs, displays and devices shall be consistent with customary use, with respect to size, spacing and lighting; and

"Whereas, the use of directional and other official signs, signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which the sign is located and those signs advertising the activities conducted on the property upon which the sign is located, and unzoned and zoned commercial or industrial areas were exempted from the Act as to use for advertising purposes; and

"Whereas, in 1967 the then secretary of transportation, by letter to the chairman of the house sub-committee on roads, public works committee, house of representatives, defined the meaning of the phrase unzoned commercial or industrial activity in an area to be, the existence of at least one commercial or industrial activity in an area to be considered as unzoned commercial or industrial property; and

"Whereas, the state of North Dakota, being the most rural state in the Union, under the definition of unzoned commercial and industrial prescribed by the secretary of transportation, will be thwarted not only in its efforts at economic diversification into new areas of business and industry, but also incur a severe setback to the outdoor advertising business as it presently exists with its consequential detrimental effect on those business enterprises relying upon such method of communication; and

"Whereas, within the state of North Dakota there will ultimately be approximately 560 miles of interstate system and approximately 6000 miles of primary system, for a total of 6560 miles, of which a total of 80 miles would qualify as unzoned and zoned commercial or industrial, which would constitute the total mileage available for outdoor advertising purposes of which total, approximately thirty miles are outside of the limits of municipalities; and

"Whereas, the state of North Dakota, by administrative order, on December 3, 1965, prohibited the erection of any advertising device within six hundred sixty feet of the right of way on the interstate and state primary highway systems without prior approval of the highway commissioner; and

"Whereas, the state of North Dakota has enacted enabling legislation whereby outdoor advertising can be effectively controlled and in keeping with the intent of the public law 89–285, and to that end has proposed an agreement to be entered into by the state and the federal government to provide for the effective control of outdoor advertising which agreement was subsequently rejected by the federal government; and

"Whereas, after the legislative creation of the highway corridor board, that board sought to limit outdoor advertising to the perimeter adjacent to and outlying the several cities of the state, thus providing effective control of outdoor advertising, without eliminating the industry; and

"Whereas, the only alternative to the state of North Dakota is a strict compliance with public law 89–285, as interpreted and implemented by the department of transportation, which will result in the ultimate elimination of the outdoor advertising industry as a remunerative enterprise in the state of North Dakota; and

"Whereas, the estimated cost to the state of North Dakota to comply with the administrative interpretation of public law 89–285, would be $1,800,000, not considering any loss of other forms of income and revenue inuring to the state economy.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That the Forty-first Legislative Assembly respectfully petitions the Secretary of Transportation to re-examine and re-evaluate the numerous policy memorandums and policy decisions affecting the interpretation of public law 89–285, as they pertain to the administrative definition of an unzoned commercial or industrial area and would urge the existing definition be set aside or modified so as to permit controlled advertising in those areas without defiling the amenities of nature adjacent to North Dakota highways, thus affording the motorist a clear and uncluttered corridor for his driving pleasure between urban areas while still providing the merchant the opportunity to advertise in a regulated and controlled manner.

"Be it further resolved, that a duly attested copy of this concurrent resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Transportation, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the senators and representatives in Congress from the state of North Dakota and to the governors of the states of South Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, Nebraska, Minnesota, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Idaho, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina and South Carolina.

"Richard T. Larsen,
"President of the Senate.

"Leo Leidholm,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Ernest N. Johnson,
"Speaker of the House.

"G. R. Gillmath,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

A petition of Jack Kamsler, Joliet, Ill., petitioning for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

XUM

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a deduction from gross income for expenses of one visit annually between a member of the U.S. Armed Forces and his immediate family; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1726. A bill for the relief of Melinda Batista Pachengo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1727. A bill for the relief of Col. Howell T. Walker, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Joao Fanganiello; and

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Kimball Bros. Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Au Yeung Kwai Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1732. A bill to designate certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1733. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees for nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1734. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to authorize a program of grants to strengthen local educational agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1735. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1736. A bill to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1737. A bill for the relief of Chen Yeh Chang; and

S. 1738. A bill for the relief of Wai Keung Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1739. A bill to extend the health insurance program established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act to disabled workers who have not attained age 65 but are receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in the benefits payable thereunder and to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits to which they are entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1740. A bill for the relief of Tzan Etos Melidonis;

S. 1741. A bill for the relief of Lap Wo Tsan;

S. 1742. A bill for the relief of Kei Yuen;

S. 1743. A bill for the relief of Chi Keung Ho;

S. 1744. A bill for the relief of Chau Chim;

S. 1745. A bill for the relief of Yuet Kwan Wong;

S. 1746. A bill for the relief of Wea Lum Phuan;

S. 1747. A bill for the relief of Wo Wa Cheng; and

S. 1748. A bill for the relief of Yuk Lam Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1749. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required by Federal law or State law enacted in conformity therewith; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1751. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; and

S. 1752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's natural resources, and ecological systems; to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the second above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1753. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1754. A bill to protect consumers from abuses relative to excessive charges for life, health, and accident insurance pursuant to consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 1755. A bill for the relief of Paolo Di Martino, his wife, Maria Di Martino, and their son, Agatino Di Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1756. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, in order to require packers and chain store firms to make public certain information relating to the number of cattle fed by them each week; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a child's insurance benefit received by an individual under the Social Security Act shall be disregarded in determining whether such individual is a dependent of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER):

S.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. GOODELL):

S.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning October 19 and ending October 25 of each year as "National Play Schools Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1736—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REIMBURSE UTE TRIBE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes.

I introduced a similar bill in the 89th Congress (S. 1765) but objections were made to it by the Department of Justice and the Bureau of the Budget. Since that time a complete investigation has been made and the Department of the Interior has suggested some amendments. Those amendments are included in the bill I am introducing today.

The estimated cost of the bill is about $3½ million. The amounts in the bill have been verified by the Ute Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The remedy sought by this legislation will not set a precedent for other tribes since similar remedies have already been made available, in one way or another, to the Crow, Blackfoot, Flathead, Fort Peck, and Wind River Indians.

XUM

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (1736) to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah for tribal funds that have been used for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, computed and adjusted as follows:

(a) With respect to construction charges, the tribal funds originally involved amounted to $920,112.74. From that sum there shall be deducted the amount of $275,864.25, which represents a reimbursement of tribal construction funds under a judgment of the United States Court of Claims for the portion of the construction costs chargeable against non-Indian lands. From the balance so calculated, there shall be deducted an amount equal to the construction charges against irrigable land (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) which were collected from the proceeds of sales of land and deposited in the tribal accounts. From the balance so calculated there shall be deducted $1,250, which represents the tribal funds used to purchase the following described lands, title to which was taken in the name of the United States and which hereafter shall be held by the United States in trust for the tribe:

West half southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 18, township 1 south range 1 east, containing 5 acres;

South half southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 36, township 1 south range 4 west, containing 5 acres;

Northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, township 1 north range 1 west, containing 10 acres; and

Southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 12, township 1 south range 4 west, containing 2.5 acres, all in Uinta special base and meridian, Utah.

The balance so calculated shall be increased by adding interest on the amounts that comprise the $920,112.74 from the end of the year in which each amount was originally used for the project to January 28, 1958, the date of the Court of Claims judgment, and interest from January 28, 1958, to the date of this Act on $920,112.74 adjusted by the deductions provided for in the foregoing provisions of this subsection.

(b) With respect to operation and maintenance charges, the tribal funds originally involved amounted to $529,828.20. From that sum there shall be deducted the amount of $158,856.17, which represents a reimbursement of tribal operation and maintenance funds under a judgment of the United States Court of Claims for the portion of the operation and maintenance costs chargeable against non-Indian lands. From the balance so calculated, there shall be deducted an amount equal to the operation and maintenance charges against irrigable land (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) which were collected from the proceeds of sales of land and other sources and deposited in the tribal accounts. The balance so calculated shall be increased by adding interest on the amounts that comprise the $529,828.20 from the end of the year in which each amount was originally used for the project to January 28, 1958, the date of the Court of Claims judgment, and interest on the amounts that comprise the balance calculated pursuant to the first three sentences of this subsection, from January 28, 1958, or the end of the year in which each amount was used for the project to the date of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse Indians and former members of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation terminated by the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) who sold project lands that were nonirrigable (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) for the construction, operation, and maintenance charges which were collected from the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 3. Twenty-seven and one hundred sixty-two thousandths per cent (27.162%) of the sum determined to be due the tribe under section 1 hereof shall be paid by the Secretary of the Interior directly to the Ute Distribution Corporation, a Utah corporation organized pursuant to said Act of August 27, 1954, *supra.*

S. 1739—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EXTEND THE HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in these times of drastic increases in the price level, it is imperative that appropriate steps be taken to protect those who are unable to protect themselves from the ravages of inflation. Particularly cruel hardships are being inflicted upon the elderly who are retired and subsisting on fixed and already inadequate incomes, as well as upon those whose earning power has become impaired for one reason or another. The Federal Government has a duty, it seems to me, to these citizens, especially to those who depend on social security for a major portion of their income.

Furthermore, the social security benefits package ought to be improved from time to time as we become more experienced in the administration of the various programs such as medicare, and when such improvements are financially feasible.

Today I introduced a bill which would make three major improvements in social security. These are not the only changes which should be made, but I do want to place these suggestions before the Senate and before the Finance Committee in order that they will be considered, along with others, when social security amendments are next reviewed. I hope such a review can take place before this session is too far advanced.

This bill I have just introduced would provide medicare for those who are for social security purposes permanently and totally disabled, regardless of age. The lack of such a provision constitutes a major gap in the medicare program, and one which we can and should now close. I have limited coverage to primary beneficiaries, feeling that we should enter this area one step at a time. Perhaps when the cost figures are all in and there has been a thorough examination of this proposal by the Finance Committee it will appear to be feasible to move ahead with a broader provision covering the dependents of primary beneficiaries. If such appears feasible, I shall support it.

The second major part of this bill would provide for increased cash benefits for social security beneficiaries, and would tie such benefits to a cost of living formula. The formula I have selected is a simple one. Using the first quarter of calendar year 1968 as the base period, benefits would be increased each calendar quarter by the same percentage the cost of living for that quarter had risen above the cost of living for the first quarter of 1968. Increases independent of the cost of living could still be voted as deemed desirable, and, of course, in the years ahead it might be necessary to move the base period forward. For the time being, however, and for any likely period of duration for the current wave of inflation, this formula should provide substantial relief and protection.

The third provision in this bill would allow those receiving social security benefits, to earn up to $200 per month without any loss in benefits. This seems to me to be appropriate, particularly during times of rising prices and a high degree of utilization of trained manpower.

Mr. President, I again voice the hope that the Finance Committee will soon begin active consideration of social security amendments. I am sure other Senators have offered or will offer amendments which ought to be considered and perhaps adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1739) to extend the health insurance program established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act to disabled workers who have not attained age 65 but are receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in the benefits payable thereunder and to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits to which they are entitled thereunder, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1749—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE-LABOR MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Federal Employee-Labor Management Act" and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This is the same as the bill I introduced last year on this subject.

Mr. President, a growing restlessness among public employees has characterized the Federal sector the past few years. The 3 million Federal civilian employees are actively demanding rights enjoyed by other workers in non-Government jobs.

The problem of increasing employee demands, along with increasing unionization, has caused some top Government officials to become concerned that the end result may not be in the public interest. Accordingly, some action by Congress to reconcile conflicting interests is needed. The bill I am introducing is designed to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service.

Due to the conflict between the right to strike on the part of employees and the public interest that governmental services not be interrupted, it is essential that Federal employees be provided a prompt and fair method of settling their grievances, and my bill so provides in its statement of policy. The statement of policy also provides that the right of employees of the Federal Government and the officers or representatives of a union or organization of employees to present grievances without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized and encouraged; and violation of this right on the part of any administrative official is contrary to the public interest.

One of the first steps to improving Federal employee-management relations is for the Federal agencies to develop labor-management programs. Provision is made in my bill for the Secretary of Labor, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, to promulgate rules and regulations to be followed by the executive agencies in developing and administering labor-management programs. Also, the Department of Labor, again with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, is to prepare standards of conduct for unions or organizations of Government employees and a code of fair labor practices in employee-management relations in the Federal service with a view to securing uniform and effective policies and procedures.

Arbitration of grievances exists now in many areas of Federal employment. But one observer has commented that "employers sometimes exclude certain issues from arbitration, or view a decision only as advisory, and reject it." Arbitration, however, can be time consuming, and costly. Therefore, all other efforts to settle grievances should be exhausted first. That is why I provide in the grievance procedure set forth in my bill for the invocation by either party to a dispute of the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

If the efforts of the Service are not fruitful, then a party to the controversy can invoke the services of a labor-management relations panel. This panel would consist of three members: one nominated by the union or organization of Government employees; or, if an aggrieved employee is not a member of such union or organization, then one nominated by him; one member representing the management level of the executive agency; and one member appointed by the Civil Service Commission from outside the Federal Government who has experience in the labor-management field and possesses a reputation for impartiality.

The makeup of such a panel insures that the public will be represented, that the employee or union will be represented, and that the management level of the agency will be represented. Also, the representation of both the employee or union side and the management side will be agency oriented, so that problems and conditions peculiar to the agency will be recognized and taken into consideration. This is one of the most significant points of my bill. Such a panel could be established in any Federal agency—a factor not possible under some proposals to create such a body for only one agency—but at the same time it would not be completely divorced from that particular agency.

My bill also makes appropriate exceptions in the case of Federal agencies having to do with intelligence, investigative, or security functions, and in the case of the office of the President.

Mr. President, I believe that the settlement of employee grievances and the establishment of clearly outlined procedures which are fair to employees as well as management and the public will go a long way toward averting future Federal employee-management crises. I believe that if legislation such as that embodied in my bill were acted upon favorably, it would represent a great—and long overdue—step toward improving the employee-management climate of our Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1749) to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employee Labor-Management Act."

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER III—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"§ 7161. Policy.

"(a) Due to the conflict between the right to strike on the part of employees and the public interest that governmental services not be interrupted, it is essential that Federal employees be provided a prompt and fair method of settling their grievances.

"(b) The right of employees of the Government of the United States and the officers or representatives of a union or organization of such employees to present grievances without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized and encouraged. Violation of this right on the part of any administrative official is contrary to the public interest and shall be cause for appropriate disciplinary action on the part of the executive agency concerned.

"§ 7162. Definitions.

"For the purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) 'grievance' means a complaint by any employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States against the management of an executive agency, concerning the effect, interpretation, application, claim of breach, or violation of any law, rule, or regulation governing conditions of employment, which the head of an executive agency has the authority to correct;

"(2) 'union or organization of Government employees' means any national organization or its affiliates made up in whole or in part of employees of the Government of the United States, in which the employees participate and pay dues, and which has as one of its basic and central purposes dealing with the management of an executive agency concerning conditions of employment, but shall not include any organization whose basic purpose is solely social, fraternal, or limited to a single special interest objective which is only incidentally related to conditions of employment; and shall not include any organization which, by ritualistic practice, constitutional or bylaws prescription, by tacit agreement among its members or otherwise, denies membership because of race, color, religion, national origin, preferential or nonpreferential civil service status, or any organization sponsored by a department, agency, activity, organization, or facility of the Government of the United States; and

"(3) 'conditions of employment' shall include, but not be limited to, working conditions, work schedules, work procedures, automation, safety, transfers, job classifications and assignments, details, promotional procedures, demotions, rates of pay, reassignments, reduction in force, hours of work, disciplinary actions, and such other matters as may be specified by law, rule, or regulation.

"§ 7163. Labor-management programs.

"(a) The Secretary of Labor, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, is authorized and directed to promulgate rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter to be followed by executive agencies in developing and administering labor-management programs.

"(b) Upon a finding by the Commission that an executive agency has failed to develop an adequate labor-management program or has permitted administrative violations of such program to occur, the Secretary of Labor shall, with the approval of the Commission, develop an adequate labor-management program and/or administer such a program in such agency until satisfactory evidence is produced by the agency that the deficiency has been eliminated.

"§ 7164. Fair labor practices.

"The Department of Labor, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission shall prepare (1) standards of conduct for unions or organizations of Government employees, and (2) a code of fair labor practices in employee-management relations in the Federal service appropriate to assist in securing the uniform and effective implementation of the policies, rights, and responsibilities described in this subchapter.

"§ 7165. Grievance procedure.

"In the case of disputes resulting from unresolved grievances, or from disagreement between a union or organization of Government employees and an executive agency over the policies enumerated in section 7161 (b) of this title, the following procedure shall be followed:

"(1) Any party may invoke the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service which shall immediatley assign one or more of its mediators to work with the parties using every effort to bring the parties to an agreement.

XUM

"(2) If such efforts to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation and conciliation are unsuccessful, then a party to the controversy is authorized to invoke the services of a labor-management relations panel, hereinafter provided for.

"(3) (A) The Civil Service Commission shall appoint a labor-management relations panel for each dispute which has not been settled through mediation and conciliation. The panel shall consist of the following three members:

"(i) one member nominated by the union or organization of Government employees representing the employee or employees involved in the grievance, or, if an employee is not a member of a union or organization of Government employees, one member nominated by the employee:

"(ii) one member representing the management level of the executive agency; and

"(iii) one member who is not receiving compensation from the Government of the United States and who has experience in the labor-management field and possesses a reputation for impartiality.

"(B) Each member of the panel who is appointed from private life shall receive $100 for each day (including travel-time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the panel. A member of the panel who is an officer or employee of the Government of the United States shall receive no additional compensation. All members of the panel shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and the other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(4) After its services have been invoked, the panel shall assist the parties in arriving at a settlement through whatever voluntary methods and procedures it may consider to be appropriate.

"(5) If the panel is unable to assist the parties to arrive at a settlement through other means, it shall promptly hold hearings at which both parties shall be given a full opportunity to present their case.

"(6) After the hearings have concluded, the panel shall, as soon as possible, render its decision in writing on the matters in dispute. This decision shall be promptly served upon the parties to the proceeding and shall be final and binding upon all parties.

"(7) Employees of the Government of the United States who participate on behalf of any party in any phase of the panel proceeding shall be free to do so without suffering any loss in pay. All such employees shall be free from restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal for their participation.

"§ 7166. Exemptions.

"(a) This subchapter shall not apply to—

"(1) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(2) the Central Intelligence Agency;

"(3) the office of the President of the United States; or

"(4) an executive agency, or to an office, bureau, or entity within such agency, primarily performing intelligence, investigative, or security functions, if the head of the executive agency determines that the provisions of this subchapter cannot be applied in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations.

"(b) When the head of an executive agency deems it necessary to the effective performance of the agency's duties, and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, he may suspend any provision of this subchapter with respect to any agency installation or activity which is located outside of the United States."

(b) The analysis of chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, immediately preceding section 7101, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER III—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"Sec.
"7161. Policy.
"7162. Definitions.
"7163. Labor-management programs.
"7164. Fair labor practices.
"7165. Grievance procedure.
"7166. Exemptions.".

S. 1750—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ASSIST SMALL BUSINESS FIRMS IN COMPLYING WITH FEDERAL DEADLINES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a resolution and a bill dealing with problems of small business in complying with deadlines prescribed in Federal statutes. I ask that the text of both measures be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

Great legislative strides have been made in assuring the Nation's consumer that meats and poultry offered in the marketplace will be wholesome and untainted. Major advances have been made in the critical battle against air and water pollution.

All of this is good, and the Congress must continue its efforts to assure necessary protection for the health and safety of the consuming public.

At the same time, however, another aspect of this type of legislation demands our very careful attention. I refer to the impact of such enactments on the businessman—particularly America's small businessman. The Wholesome Meat Act, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act, the Air Quality Act, and the Water Quality Act, require thousands of small businesses to comply with stricter Federal standards that often require costly modifications of their plant, equipment or procedures within fixed periods of time.

The size of the financial investment required to comply with new standards may be substantial, and may present an insurmountable burden in the case of small businesses. The need for prompt financing may arise at a time—such as now—when interest rates are at record heights, and government loan-assistance programs are hard pressed and unable to meet the need.

As a result, a great many small firms face hardship, and are threatened with serious economic injury or even extinction because of their inability to finance the required improvements within the deadlines fixed by law.

The resolution I introduce today recognizes the seriousness of this problem. It calls upon the Small Business Administration to conduct a pilot study of the needs for capital being experienced by one industry known to be of a predominant small business character—meat processing—which is under the December 15, 1969, deadline for compliance with Federal standards established in the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

The bill I am offering today, will, if financial need is demonstrated, permit the Small Business Administration, under proper safeguards established by regulation, to make emergency deadline-compliance loans to small businesses at slightly lower interest rates and for longer terms than might otherwise be available. The purpose would be to assist small business to finance capital and operating improvements needed to comply with federally imposed deadlines.

Mr. President, our consumer protection legislation was not enacted with a view to forcing honest, hardworking, long-established small business concerns to the wall or out of business. Our national policy is to encourage small enterprise, not participate in its ruin.

The measures I introduce today address themselves to difficulties flowing from prior congressional enactments. There is reason to believe the pilot study called for by this resolution will show that many small businesses are in dire need of help. I therefore urge prompt completion of the study; and then early and favorable action to authorize the deadline-compliance loans proposed by my bill, or depending on the results of the study, other suitable emergency relief.

BACKGROUND

Although we in Congress are familiar with the health and safety legislation, I have described, the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) has given this body evidence that many thousands of businesses do not yet realize the full consequences of these laws.[1] Pursuant to the Wholesome Meat Act, for instance, the U.S. Department of Agriculture must expand the scope of Federal inspection from the approximately 1,500 large-scale interstate firms now covered, to almost 15,000 processors throughout the country, the great majority of which are small businesses. It must do this before the 2-year deadline, which expires on December 15, 1969.

For those not familiar with the requirements of Federal meat inspection, I might point out that the Handbook of Federal Standards consists of 73 pages of detailed specifications, diagrams, tables, and appendixes. The chapter headings cover such topics as plans and specifications that must accompany application for inspection; water supply, plant drainage, and sewage disposal system; plant construction; lighting, ventilation, and refrigeration; equipment, design and installation; and so forth.

The newspaper report quoted in my remarks of May 1968 provides a graphic description of the problems which compliance may pose for small meat-processing firms.[2] I ask that my prior statement be inserted in the RECORD for the information of all concerned. That article concluded:

> To meat dealers, sanitation means money.

The more recent commentary of the Secretary to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, is even more specific as

---

[1] The Wholesome Meat Act, remarks on the Senate floor by Senator HOLLAND, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 4, 1969, page 5194.

[2] "Meats Plants Here Face U.S. Upgrading", *New York Times*, March 4, 1968, front page of second section.

XUM

to the scope of this problem for small meat-processing firms:[3]

> As time goes on pressure will be applied continually to improve and upgrade physical and structural facilities in increasingly stricter compliance with federal law. This could conceivably mean major alterations of small plants with respect to such things as eleven-foot heading rails, sixteen-foot bleeding rails, doors of specified widths if used for different types of traffic, totally refrigerated facilities, etc. . . .
>
> The federal program is designed for larger operations which can justify full-time inspectors. Limited funds and personnel, coupled with the supreme authority and direction given to the federal agency by the Wholesome Meat Act, could conceivably force thousands of small plants out of business. Many small slaughtering plants would not be reached for inspection due to low volume, which would preclude assignment of an inspector to the plant. The limited size of such plants makes it impossible to step up the rate of slaughter or processing to a point where an inspector could be profitably assigned.

A further complication, which I know has arisen in some of the Western States such as Nevada, relates to custom slaughtering facilities:

> A small plant operator, who heretofore did custom slaughtering and processing and augmented it through a small retail operation, may not, under the provisions of the new federal law, engage in any sale of meat whatsoever—if his business is to be classed as a custom plant. Custom slaughtering and processing alone will not sustain a business. The alternative under the federal Wholesome Meat Act is to have completely separated facilities which means dual facilities, something very few operators could afford.

A leading small business organization has informed us that—

> The Department of Agriculture is serving notice on the nation's 7000 locker-freezer plants that they have to abide by the Wholesome Meat Act regulations. More than half of these plants are in towns of 2,000 or under . . . (and) two-thirds of the operators have an annual volume of less than $50,000.[4]
>
> Yet, to construct the separate plants—one to slaughter animals for the farmers and the other to sell meat to local citizens—is estimated to cost from $60,000 to $120,000.[5]

It is well to bear in mind also that the owners of these small firms are important to their areas—not only as employers, but as leaders in the many local associations and institutions which are at the heart of community life. The closing of such businesses would thus represent far more than an economic loss.

Already we know 49 meat-processing plants have been shut down, and more than 300 others have been warned that they do not meet the new Federal standards.[6]

The future impact of new Federal standards will, of course, vary somewhat by State. At the time the Wholesome Meat Act was passed, for example, 28 States had meat inspection systems. However, nearly one-half of the States did not have any, and even the existing systems vary from the strict Federal standards. Most State inspectors visit plants only periodically; the U.S. program calls for daily or continuous inspection. So it appears that most of the 13½ thousand small meat-processing firms may have major adjustments to make by December 15 of this year.

According to this preliminary information, we know that although the Wholesome Meat Act may be administered with the best will in the world, compliance will often require outlays of capital for construction, installation of major new equipment, or changes in procedures. This may involve a considerable amount of money, especially when it must be raised upon short notice, and especially relative to the size of a small business.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution which we introduce today is similar to Senate Resolution 290, introduced during the 90th Congress.[7]

Although Senate Resolution 290 was the subject of favorable comment by both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Small Business Administration, there was not sufficient time to have the measure reported in the 90th Congress.

Following the introduction of Senate Resolution 290, the Small Business Administration responded to the situation by undertaking to design the study contemplated by the resolution. I am pleased to inform the Senate that SBA is ready to proceed with gathering the facts and figures. We are advised that the reintroduction and progress of the resolution will be helpful in securing the kind of information needed to inform our judgments in this matter.

We hope that SBA will be able to discover and assess the type and extent of the improvements necessary pursuant to the Wholesome Meat Act, as an example of the type of Federal deadline statute that concerns us. We hope the study will go on to show the nature of the financing called for, the degree to which these needs can be met by internal sources and are reasonably obtainable through commercial banking sources, and any excess requirements which do not appear to fall within the available combined resources of the private sector and present SBA-assisted financing. We want to have the agency's specialized recommendations on what may ultimately be needed, but we also want to look at the fundamental statistics so that we may be able to exercise independent congressional decisions.

The terms of our resolution call for a report as soon as practicable, and in no event later than 60 days after the resolution's approval. Since SBA is ready to proceed, and I commend the agency upon its initiative in preparing the study to this point, the approximately 6 months needed to perform this work should nearly coincide with the 60-day provision, which would take effect after the resolution is reported from committee and approved by the Senate.

The resulting information will give Congress, the Small Business Administration, and other Federal and State agencies a sounder factual basis for determining what legislative and/or administrative actions may then be appropriate. The authors of the resolution believe that the study would be most helpful to all concerned.

We are not asking SBA to extend this study beyond the meat industry because the agency's resources are limited, and the situation in this small-business industry should be indicative of the general problem. However, we hope that other industries will be encouraged to prepare their case, so that the views of small businesses in all lines of commerce which may be under Federal deadlines can be considered and weighed at any hearings which may be held on this legislation.

In the event that the study or the testimony presented by other small firms or their associations reveals that there are gaps which cannot be filled by existing institutions and under current financial and budget stringencies, I hope the Congress will proceed with the consideration of our bill, which is designed to afford one possible avenue of relief.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

This bill provides for what might be called deadline-compliance loans upon terms and conditions that the small firms seeking to bring their facilities within the law will be able to live with.

As these deadlines approach, law-enforcement agencies such as the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture, which have no particular competence in small business matters, nor any administrative procedures through which a firm slated for closing could appeal, would be in the position of closing down an undetermined number of small firms and depriving the owners and employees of their livelihood. If thousands or hundreds of these firms were suddenly faced with going out of business, conditions in the industry would be chaotic.

Mr. President, all of us welcome an improvement in the quality of the food products destined for the tables of people throughout the country, as we do safeguards on the quality of our air and water. The congressional legislation which I described represents substantial advances for the American people who will now be well protected in their purchases of meat and other products and can breathe a little easier about their environment. However, all of this desirable new cleanliness should not result in an epidemic of business closings.

The Federal Government has created a real dilemma for many thousands of small businessmen and it seems to me only justice that the Federal Government should provide some avenue of relief.

Our bill is designed to afford effective relief by providing for what might be

---

[3] See "Implications of the Wholesome Meat Act" by D. N. McDowell, Winter 1968 Quarterly edition of "State Government" Magazine, reprinted *Congressional Record,* March 4, 1969, at Page 5195.

[4] Release of December 9, 1968 on consequences of the Wholesome Meat Act by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

[5] Release, loc. cit., Page two.

[6] See "Meat Plants Closed," *Congressional Quarterly*, June 21, 1968, p. 1511.

[7] "Senate Resolution 290—Resolution to assist small meat packing companies in complying with new federal inspection requirements." *Congressional Record,* vol. 114, pt. 11, p. 13805. Accompanying remarks of Senator Bible reprinted following this statement.

XUM

called deadline-compliance loans under the disaster provisions of the Small Business Act.

By introducing this bill we do not mean to suggest that it is the only alternative, or even that the full dimensions of the problem have been marked out. We hope that the efforts of all who are affected by this legislation will develop the facts and whatever additional solutions may seem appropriate. When the full picture is before us, we hope that whatever measures may be necessary to aid, counsel, assist, and protect small business firms will be speedily adopted and put into effect.

It is our hope, however, that offering our Resolution and bill at this time, with compliance dates all too imminent, will contribute to equitable treatment for the many members of the Nation's small business community which are now imperiled by government deadlines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed technical explanation of the deadline-compliance loan bill, and its relation to other disaster provisions of the Small Business Act, also be included in the Record following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and technical explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1750) to amend the Small Business Act to authorize assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required by Federal law or State law enacted in conformity therewith, introduced by Mr. Bible, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered tᵔ be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (4) a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern in effecting additions to or alterations in its plant, facilities, or methods of operation to meet requirements imposed by Federal law or State law enacted in conformity therewith, if the Administration determines that such concern is likely to suffer substantial economic injury without assistance under this paragraph."

(b) The third sentence of section 7(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "or (5)" after "paragraph (3)".

Sec. 2. Section 4(c)(1) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting "7(b)(5)," after "7(b)(4),".

(The resolution referred to will be printed under a separate heading.)

The material presented by Mr. Bible follows:

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, over the next 2 to 3 years, thousands of meat processing and packing plants across the country will come under the Federal requirements of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.[1] This legislation amends the basic Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1907[2] and will require all local and intrastate meat plants, which were not previously subject to Federal inspection standards, to conform with either the strict U.S. rules or with an equally strict State system.

The law has one purpose.

Said one observer—

"To protect American consumers by forcing the States to tighten quality safeguards on all meat, wherever processed, wherever sold."[3]

One of the principal sponsors of the 1967 act, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale) characterized it as "one of the most significant pieces of consumer-protection legislation ever signed into law."[4]

What may have been overlooked so far is that the Wholesome Meat Act is also far reaching and significant business legislation.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have been pleased to participate in a 3-year study of the overseas market potential for the American beef industry, including its vital meat processing and packing segments.[5] We have been in touch with the associations representing the small business meatpackers and were made aware of their potentials and problems. In many cases they are small or family, independent operations. Typically they have a long record of service to their local communities.

The seriousness of this program to the business community is indicated by the estimate that in mid-1967 there were 14,832 nonfederally inspected facilities—compared with 1,969 federally inspected plants—and of these only 5,555 were subject to some form of State sanitation inspection.[6]

By July 1 of this year, 26 States will have mandatory meat inspection of animals before and after slaughter. Twenty-five States have mandatory inspection of meat processing facilities. Thirteen other States have voluntary inspection programs, while nine States presently have no laws in this area although there are many municipal and county systems in populous areas.

It is thus apparent that approximately 15,000 businesses are vitally affected. These firms are involved in producing a basic commodity. They account for about 15 or 16 percent of our entire commercial meat supply in this country, and an even higher proportion of the product in their localities.

Over the years since 1907, the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture has developed a series of requirements that must be met in order to gain Federal approval.[7] In the fields of construction and layout of plants, these are often highly specific and detailed, prescribing such things as the materials that can be used in floors and walls, the heights of ceilings and rails, spacing and disposal systems. Other requirements cover cleaning procedures, and are illustrated by the following excerpts from a recent article in the New York Times:[8]

"Part of the problem is lack of space. Many small wholesalers perform all their functions in one room. They store, cut, age and sell meat in a cooler where the temperature is 50 degrees or lower.

"Much of their equipment such as band saws and grinders, cannot be moved easily, and would have to be cleaned in place.

"If he has a cooler full of meat," said an inspector, "I know he's not going to put a 180-degree hose in there to clean his equipment."

"Often the floors are wooden and have no drains. There is no place for the waters to go, and the dealers 'go in for spring cleaning,' according to a Department of Agriculture official, by carrying their tools to the sidewalk and washing them there.

"Concrete floors with drains are the best answer, according to the department, but in any case the Federal inspector is required to check for cleanliness each morning before the plant may begin work.

"To meat dealers, sanitation means money."

As the newspaper correctly points out: "Sanitation means money."

Where construction or cleaning requirements are at issue, we are often talking about a good deal of money.

This concern prompted the Senate-House Conference on the wholesome meat bill to request assurances from the Department of Agriculture that this act was not going to be used to put thousands of meatpackers out of business. In a letter to the Senator from Florida (Mr. Holland), Deputy Assistant Secretary Leonard responded:

"The only mandatory construction requirements are set forth in general terms in the regulations. . . . For example:

"The floors, walls, ceilings, partitions, posts, doors, and other parts of the structure shall be of such materials, construction, and finish as will make them susceptible of being readily and thoroughly cleaned . . . in the light of operating procedures which are to be used in the establishment."[9]

In other words, there is some flexibility in the application of these standards, and this is desirable.

As the Senate Committee on Agriculture observed in its report:

"(S)ome of the Federal standards for plant construction may sometimes be unrealistic (for small non-federally inspected plants) and it would be unreasonable to arbitrarily apply them when the operational practices of a small facility (enable them to meet equivalent standards)"[10]

However, eventually, with the best faith in the world, decisions will be made and money will have to be invested by our small meatpackers in modifying the features in their buildings, equipment, and procedures that do not now qualify under Federal or equivalent standards.

Furthermore, they must do so in a short period of 2 years, unless an optional 1-year extension is applied for by the company and granted.

---

[1] Public Law 90–201, approved December 15, 1967.

[2] 21 U.S.C. 71–91.

[3] "States must plug it by 1970; Despite New U.S. Meat Law, Meat Inspectors Gap Exists", by Paul M. Branzburg, from U.S. Courier-Journal and Times, Reprinted Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 6, p. 7301.

[4] Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 6, p. 7301.

[5] See "Expansion of Livestock Exports", Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, Senate Report 343, 90th Congress, 1st Session, June 12, 1967.

[6] Testimony by Rep. Thomas S. Foley in Hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on Bills to Clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act etc., November 15, 1967 at page 243.

[7] These are contained in the Handbook of the Meat Inspection Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[8] "Meat Plants Here Face U.S. Upgrading", New York Times, March 4, 1968, front page of second section.

[9] Letter to Senator Holland contained in the Conference Report on the Federal Meat Inspection Act, House Report 998, 90th Congress, 1st Session, December 6, 1967, pages 21–22.

[10] S. Rept. 779, 90th Congress, 1st Session, November 21, 1967, page 3.

XUM

For these companies to comply with the standards previously applicable only to large, interstate plants, will involve substantial outlays of capital for new machinery and new construction. If they do not conform to the Federal specifications they will be out of business.

It is apparent to many of us that these firms will need a ready source of funds to finance the purchase of the new equipment and construction. The meatpacking industry traditionally is a low-profit-margin operation, as has been made clear to our Small Business Committee on several occasions.[11]

Many of these companies, of course, are in a position to take care of themselves, and will do so. Others may not be so fortunately situated. They may be in remote areas where banking resources are smaller or already strained—the expenditures may be large in relation to the current income of the firm. Or, the terms on which loans can be granted, might not match the needs created by this legislation.

I feel strongly that the 2-year deadline is a special factor which greatly increases the pressure on our smaller firms. After all, the useful life of meat-processing equipment has been declared to be 12 years.[12] I question whether the great majority of the businessmen affected can get loans on such terms.

In view of the circumstances, Senator Sparkman and I are submitting the resolution which I now send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record following my remarks.

It is in the form of a Senate resolution, calling upon the Small Business Administration to make a study of the needs for capital of small firms in the meat processing and meat packing industries as a result of the Wholesome Meat Act.

As a result of such study, we in the Senate could discover the magnitude of the need, how much of it can be met by conventional sources of funds such as local banks, the extent to which the resources of the SBA and other Government agencies could respond to the excess requirements, and what, if any, additional authority or funds the SBA might need.

It is my hope that the major trade associations and their membership, as well as the Agriculture Department and the Library of Congress, will join this preparatory inquiry which will enable us in the Congress to determine what further steps should be taken to protect the interests of small businesses in the meat industry.

A further complication is that this is an era of tight money on the part of agencies such as the Small Business Administration, which are supposed to be the lenders of last resort in emergency situations such as this.

In addition to the impact of the international situation on the budget of SBA, this agency is also being called upon to devise special programs of assistance to the small manufacturers which must meet deadlines for upgrading their equipment and processes because of new water and air pollution standards.

However, the interest of our small firms in the meatpacking industry, and of the communities they service, are also immediate and pressing. It is my hope that, with the information gathered by the Small Business Administration pursuant to this study, we will be able to fashion sound and effective measures to assist industry in meeting these needs.

The Presiding Officer. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The resolution (S. Res. 290) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

"S. Res. 290

"Whereas the Wholesome Meat Act requires all meat plants, not previously subject to Federal regulation, to conform to strict standards under Federal or State law; and

"Whereas for many small business enterprises compliance with this Act may require substantial outlays of capital for new machinery and plant facilities; and

"Whereas meeting such capital needs will be extremely difficult if not impossible for many such enterprises without assistance; and

"Whereas Federal assistance to small business concerns in the interest of preserving free competitive enterprise is a declared policy of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Small Business Administration is requested (1) to undertake a study to determine the extent to which financial assistance under statutes administered by it is available to small business concerns in effecting compliance with the requirements of the Wholesome Meat Act, and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, in no event later than 30 days after the approval of this resolution, the results of its study, together with such recommendations for additional legislation as it deems necessary."

Technical Explanation of Deadline-Compliance Loan Bill, S. 1750

The proposed financial assistance provisions would be added to Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act which contains the authorization for emergency disaster lending (Public Law 536, 86th Congress, 15 U.S.C. 631, at Section 636). In order to understand this placement, a review of the present structure of this legislation, subsection (b) (1) provides for loan assistance after major disasters such as floods or hurricanes, when such condition is declared by the SBA Administrator.

Subsection (2) covers the same kind of natural diasters, as may be declared by the President when federal facilities are damaged, or by the Secretary of Agriculture under other conditions.

Subsection (3) provides for loan assistance when small business firms are displaced by federally aided urban renewal or highway construction.

Subsection (4) allows loans to small firms who are unable to market food products because of an outbreak of disease, such as occured in the Great Lakes Region some years ago.

A more detailed explanation of these programs may be found in a statement by Logan B. Hendricks, Associate Administrator for Financial Assistance, before the Small Business Subcommittee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, February 6, 1969.

There are several analogies between these existing programs and the deadline-compliance loan concept. There is a similarity to subsections (1) and (2) in legal principal, in that nautral diasters and acts of a sovereign power have long been related in insurance law. The deadlines with which the bill is concerned are as a result of acts by the sovereign United States Government, which require action under the drastic penalty of closing the business. Both types of action are beyond the control of the individual business, and the sovereign is immune from any legal recourse, unless it consents to allowing such relief.

Subparagraph (3) is an example of an instance where the Federal Government has consented to providing a remedy for the economic injury which its actions have caused. This is quite similar to the deadline-compliance problem in terms of the source of the action. However, the nature of the injury is different because damage will be total if it is allowed to occur at all. Many of the businesses involved, under the meat and poultry processing statutes produce a staple commodity. It is likely that if such a firm is closed, its accounts will migrate to other manufacturers. To be effective, help must be preventive. The legal and financial proceedings must begin sufficiently before the deadline so that a business seeking compliance has adequate lead-time to make improvements required by the law. This prospective feature is explicit in the bill.

There is similarity at Subsection (4) also, in that food processing is involved. However, although the bill was prompted originally by complaints from firms affected by the Wholesome Meat Act, its application would be more general. For instance, if the evidence elicited in hearings so justifies, it would apply to small businesses under comparable deadlines posed by federal poultry and fish processing legislation, the Air Quality Act of 1967, the Water Quality Act of 1965, and other statutes creating national health and safety standards with which small companies must make capital improvements under short-term federal dealines.

Care has been taken that the bill provide equally for equivalent State standards pursuant to a federal deadline statute, so that States will not be discouraged from coming forward with their own programs by any possible discrimination under such a bill if it is enacted.

Because of the foregoing similarities and differences, the deadline-compliance proposal has been cast as a separate Subsection (5) which would be inserted serially after the other four subsections of 7(b) of the Small Business Act.

The terms and conditions of such loans would be under regulations established by the Small Business Administration to assure balanced standards so that the companies that are deserving are included in the program, and those which are able to take care of themselves or be serviced by commercial financing are excluded.

It is intended that the Small Business Administration would provide for administrative procedures insuring a full and fair hearing to any applicant for assistance who is threatened with going out of business under a statutory deadline of this character. The rate of interest proposed would be the "market rate", i.e., one-quarter of 1% above the actual cost to the Federal Government of borrowing the money, as is now applicable in Section 7(b)(3). The terms, to be set by regulation adopted by the Small Business Administration within the 30 year maximum applying to Section 7(b) assistance, should be long enough to allow the small firm to repay its loan out of future earnings.

S. 1752—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's natural resources, and ecological systems; to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

---

[11] See "Industry Survey—the Meat Packing Industry etc." prepared by Carl M. Loeb, Rhodes & Co. of New York; contained in hearings on the Expansion of Livestock Exports, May 18 and 19, 1966, pages 40–45. See also "The Meat Packers" from "The Exchange", magazine of the New York Stock Hearings, loc. cit. pages 341–43.

[12] Depreciation, Guidelines and Rules, Revenue Procedure 62–21, Internal Revenue Service Publication 456, page 7.

XUM

and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1752) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's natural resources, and ecological systems; to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1752

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Resources, Conservation, and Environmental Quality Act of 1969".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to produce an understanding of the Nation's natural resources and the environmental forces affecting them, to promote and foster means and measures which will prevent or effectively reduce any adverse effects on the quality of the environment in the management and development of the Nation's natural resources, and to create and maintain a national policy and conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans through a comprehensive and continuing program of study, research, review, and coordination.

TITLE I—ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), in order to carry out the purposes of this title, is authorized—

(1) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses;

(2) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(3) to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects, including reclamation projects, engineering works, and other major projects such as, but not limited to, eradication projects contemplated or planned by public or private agencies or organizations which may make significant modifications in the natural environment;

(4) to establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on ecological research and evaluations which are in progress or are planned by other public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals;

(5) to evaluate and disseminate information of an ecological nature to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals in the form of reports, publications, atlases, and maps;

(6) to initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects;

(7) to encourage other public or private agencies planning development projects to consult with the Secretary on the impact of the proposed projects on the natural environment;

(8) to encourage and assist public (non-Federal) or private agencies or organizations, including educational institutions, museums, and botanical and zoological gardens, and other scientific or conservation organizations, or individuals, to acquire, designate, and maintain representative samples of important natural environmental systems, including natural areas for observation and for manipulation, and to encourage such agencies, organizations, and individuals to utilize existing areas under their control or jurisdiction for such purposes;

(9) to establish through interagency coordination, on federally owned lands, a Federal system of natural areas for scientific purposes and develop the means and methods for withdrawal of such areas from nonconforming uses, and provide for their management and protection to serve the natural research needs of all agencies, both public and private; except that in developing standards governing any such withdrawals, the Secretary shall give due consideration to future alternative uses of such areas subject to withdrawal; and

(10) to assist and advise the Council on Environmental Quality established under title II of this Act.

Sec. 102. The Secretary is further authorized for the purposes of this title (1) to make grants and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals, (2) to accept and use donations of funds, property, personal services, or facilities, (3) to acquire selected areas of lands or interests in lands by donation, acquisition with donated funds, devise, or exchange for acquired lands or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition, (4) to administer such lands or interests for experimental purposes, including the observation and manipulation of natural areas, and (5) to issue such regulations as he deems necessary with respect to the administration of such lands.

Sec. 103. Activities authorized under this title may be carried out on lands under the jurisdiction or control of other departments or agencies of the Government only with the approval of the head of the department or agency concerned.

Sec. 104. The Secretary shall consult with and provide technical assistance to departments and agencies of the Government, and he is authorized to obtain from such departments and agencies such information, data, reports, advice, and assistance as he deems necessary or appropriate, and which can reasonably be furnished by such departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this title. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement by the Secretary.

Sec. 105. Nothing in this title is intended to give, or shall be construed as giving, the Secretary any authority over any of the authorized programs of any other department or agency of the Government, or as repealing, modifying, restricting, or amending existing authorities or responsibilities that any department or agency may have with respect to the natural environment. The Secretary shall consult with the heads of such departments and agencies for the purpose of identifying and eliminating duplication of effort.

Sec. 106. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations to him relating to the carrying out of the purposes of this title. Such advisory committees shall render advice and submit recommendations to the Secretary upon his request and may submit recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of the Interior to serve as secretaries to the committee.

(b) Members of advisory committees appointed by the Secretary may receive not to exceed $100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

Sec. 107. The Secretary is authorized to participate in environmental research in surrounding oceans and in other countries in cooperation with appropriate departments or agencies of such countries or with coordinating international organizations if he determines that such activities will contribute to the objectives and purposes of this Act.

TITLE II—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Sec. 201. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds, to appraise the environmental quality programs of Federal, State, and local governments, and to formulate and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of the quality of the environment.

(b) The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this title, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

(c) It shall be the principal duty of the Council to develop comprehensive national policies and programs to improve and maintain the quality of the environment needed to meet the emerging conservation, social, economic, material, and other requirements of the Nation.

(d) In addition to those in subsection (c), it shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report required to be transmitted under Section 202;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in environmental qualities both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal government (including proposed programs and activities), for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities affect environmental quality, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to make and furnish such studies, reports, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request; and

(5) to foster study and research in the social, technical, administrative, economic, political, and other aspects of environmental quality at institutions of higher learning throughout the Nation.

(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this title—

(1) the Council shall, on or before December 1, 1969, make a written report to the President, which report shall contain a comprehensive and detailed account of all the activities of the Council since its establishment, together with its conclusions, findings, and recommendations, and shall thereafter, on or before December 1 of each year, make such a report to the President covering any period not covered by such a report previously submitted;

(2) the Council shall consult with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation, State and local

XUM

governments, and other organizations and groups, as it deems advisable; and

(3) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

Sec. 202. The President shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 20 of each year, an Environmental Quality Report which shall set forth (1) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental systems of the Nation, including, but not limited to the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; and (3) his recommendations on the formulation and implementation of national policies to protect and enhance the quality of the environment.

TITLE III—JOINT COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Sec. 301. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee which shall be known as the Joint Committee on Environmental Quality. The joint committee shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five members and the minority party shall be represented by three members. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

(c) A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate or the House.

Sec. 302. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to—

(1) conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of appropriate matters contained in any Environmental Quality Report transmitted to the Congress pursuant to title I of this Act and of such matters related thereto as will provide means of coordinating programs in order to further the purposes of this Act, and recommend any such studies and investigations to the appropriate standing committees of the Congress; and

(2) make an annual report to the Congress and the appropriate committees of Congress on or before March 1 of each year on the Environmental Quality Report transmitted to the Congress pursuant to title I of this Act, which report shall contain the findings and recommendations of the committee with respect to the views and recommendations of the President contained in such Environmental Quality Report, and to make, from time to time, such additional reports to the Congress and the appropriate committees of Congress concerning the results of the committee's studies and investigations, together with its recommendations, as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 303. (a) In carrying out its duties under this title the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act within or outside the United States at such times and places; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedure as it deems necessary.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him or the committee, and may be served by such person as may be designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102–104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

Sec. 304. (a) The committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable.

(b) Members of the committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the committee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

Sec. 305. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member of the committee duly authorized by the chairman.

TITLE IV—APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and for each of five succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act.

S. 1753—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO IMPOSE NATIONWIDE BAN ON DDT PROPOSED

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation for appropriate reference, to establish a nationwide ban on the use of the pesticide DDT.

The accumulation of DDT in our environment and in fish and wildlife is reaching catastrophic proportions. The path of this persistent pesticide's deadly contamination has left its mark from the reindeer of Alaska to the penguin of the Antarctic.

In a single generation, DDT has polluted our environment on a worldwide basis, infiltrating the atmosphere, the water and the tissues of most of the world's creatures, pushing some, like the peregrine falcon and the bald eagle, to the brink of extinction.

The seizure of 21,000 pounds of contaminated Lake Michigan Coho salmon by the Food and Drug Administration could be the straw that breaks DDT's back. The presence of dangerous concentrations of DDT in these Lake Michigan fish indicate that the pesticide pollution of the lake has reached a critical level and immediate action is necessary.

This bill would prohibit the interstate sale or shipment of DDT in the United States.

I have also urged Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Herbert Ley to intensify his agency's inspection programs on pesticide residues for all marine life taken from the Great Lakes.

Despite the fact that the DDT traveled hundreds of miles through the air, soil, water, and the food chains of perhaps a half dozen organisms, it still had such tremendous persistence that it concentrated in very dangerous levels in the Coho salmon.

This should serve as a warning signal for all local, State, and Federal food monitoring agencies to closely review pesticide concentrations in all food products susceptible to pesticide residues.

FDA analyses have shown the concentration of DDT in the salmon to be up to 19 parts per million and have shown the concentration of a more toxic pesticide, Dieldrin, to be just short of three tenths of a part per million. The coho were taken in Michigan streams bordering the eastern side of Lake Michigan and were processed in Michigan. They are now under an embargo in storage in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

At last year's Lake Michigan Water Pollution Conference a spokesman for the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries testified that the concentration of pesticides in Lake Michigan could reach a level lethal to both man and aquatic life if the use of pesticides was continued at such a heavy rate in the Lake Michigan Watershed.

The discovery of these pesticide-contaminated coho salmon certainly substantiates that testimony. The future of all the Great Lakes will be imperiled unless action is taken soon to stop this poisoning of our waters by these pesticides.

Last spring, pesticides were also blamed for the death of nearly 1 million coho salmon fry. This finding has raised a serious question about the future of salmon reproduction in the waters of Lake Michigan.

There is also growing concern among scientists that the reproduction capabilities of other fish may be harmed. This is especially the case with the lake trout, which spend 6 or 7 years in the water before sexual maturity as compared with only about 2 years for the salmon.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1753) to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1753

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (61 Stat. 163; 7 U.S.C. 135–135k) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, after June 30, 1970, it shall be unlawful for any person to distribute, sell, or offer for sale in any territory or in the District of Columbia, or to

XUM

ship or deliver for shipment from any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or to receive in any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, from any other State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or a foreign country the chemical compound dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, commonly known as DDT."

S. 1754—INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSUMER CREDIT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, on behalf of myself and Senator Hart, to protect consumer financing from abuses relative to excessive charges for credit life, health, and accident insurance. This bill, which would amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act, may be cited as the Consumer Credit Insurance Act.

In the 90th Congress the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, chaired by Senator Hart, conducted extensive hearings on the consumer credit industry. The record of those hearings runs to four volumes and more than 3,600 pages of testimony, exhibits and articles. I want to commend Senator Hart for an outstanding job of fact-finding. This bill to establish Federal safeguards results from his discoveries in that topsy-turvy world known as the consumer credit insurance business.

Excluding home mortgages of $250 billion, outstanding consumer credit now totals about $112 billion. The cost of consumer credit and the practices of this giant industry touch virtually all American families. One of its shelf items is consumer credit insurance, whose proceeds cover the consumer's unpaid balance of indebtedness if he suffers death or disability.

This insurance is an awesome offspring of the credit industry. Born in 1917, it grew moderately for 30 years, then put on a tremendous spurt. At the end of 1947, insurance in force covered only about 10 percent of outstanding consumer debt. Now it blankets in about 67 percent. The sale of this insurance produces nearly 35 percent of finance charge income to finance companies.

Consumer credit insurance affords two-way protection. The insured debtor pays premiums to protect his family and his estate. The creditor is named beneficiary, guaranteeing his recovery of whatever is owed him should death or disability strike down his debtor. Under this arrangement a bereaved widow is spared burdensome repayment obligations, while the creditor need not entreat, sue or seize to recoup his investment. Thus his investment risk is substantially reduced.

Paradoxically, credit insurance originated in the lender's desire to protect himself in the case of a borrower's death. Self-interest motivated most lenders to pay the premiums themselves. It was good business to do so since losses could be reduced. In time it was realized that the premium cost could be passed on to the consumer whose estate also benefits. Not only that, but the lender could make a bonus profit at the same time he was insuring his own business. I emphasize that some lenders, primarily credit unions and a few banks, still pay the premiums themselves because they believe it is still good business to do so.

Today the amount of consumer credit insurance in force is estimated to exceed $70 billion. If those who pay for that enormous debt shield exerted any price influence, one would expect it to be a buyer's market. One would expect consumer competition to control prices as in other products and services. Lamentably, it does not work that way at all. Consumer credit insurance functions uniquely. This is how a State insurance commissioner has described it:

> Generally, the installment buyer or borrower pays the entire premium. The premium rate, however, is negotiated between the installment seller or lender and the insurance company. These creditors tend to bargain for the highest possible rate as the insurance companies kick back to the creditors in one way or another virtually all of the premium left after the payment of claims and expenses. The higher the rate, the more the creditor makes from the insurance and, of course, the public pays.

Mr. President, the problem is that some lenders and sellers on credit are making windfall profits at the borrower's expense, assisted by insurance companies who vie for the business by sweetening the pot. Creditors jockey for position not in a race to give the consumer the best possible buy, but to find the highest cost insurance. They get away with this because their clients are at a distinct disadvantage.

THE CASE OF THE CAPTIVE CONSUMER

Since the sale of credit insurance is incidental to the main credit transaction, what the creditor is dealing with is a captive consumer. He is using his loan or installment business to sell insurance. Success can be measured by the record of one finance company in which 95 percent of all its borrowers across the country also get its credit insurance despite its high price. In the vast majority of cases, an insured debtor has no dealings with an insurance company. The creditor not only controls the sale of insurance but often requires coverage as a condition for granting credit.

What this means to the consumer walking into his finance company or bank for a loan is that he is paying more than he would if normal competition prevailed. What it means to some finance companies or banks is that for practical purposes usury laws may be circumvented and what it means to a car buyer is that he may be paying twice the amount for credit insurance that he would if he shopped for his insurance as he shops for his car.

In too many instances, the customer walks in to buy or borrow, then, like a bridge player, finds himself end-played. He either takes the insurance or he does not get what he came for. He has no exit card. He is a captive consumer, pressured into buying credit insurance pursuant to a primary credit transaction. Boxed into an inferior bargaining position, he becomes an easy mark for the creditor. None of us should applaud the accuracy of businessmen shooting fish in a barrel.

One upshot of this captivity is that the consumer is not likely to notice how much he is paying for credit insurance. If he shops carefully and makes what he thinks is a good deal on a new car, he then may readily agree to a $90 charge for credit insurance that really should cost only $30.

A finance company's promissory note form was put in the hearing record to show how a no-choice insurance sale can ride piggyback on the primary transaction. In tiny print was noted:

> It has been explained and I fully understand that I am entitled to purchase any group credit life and accident and health insurance or any insurance on tangible personal property required by the Licensee from any insurance company, agent or broker.

Yet the name of an insurance company owned by the creditor has been preprinted in the space for designation of insurer.

Mr. President, the consumer becomes vulnerable because he has to commit himself to buy or borrow before credit insurance has any applicability. As a captive consumer his credit insurance options are, for all practical purposes, foreclosed. The excessive premium he can end up paying may be quite small in relation to the price of his primary transaction, but consider in our increasingly credit-oriented economy how many times each day this situation is reenacted. Creditors multiply their insurance profits through high volume and low overhead.

THE CURSE OF REVERSE COMPETITION

In consumer credit insurance, competition is for the business of the lender or seller—not for the business of the ultimate consumer. It is competition in reverse, and assorted methods have been devised to reward the lender-seller—captive insurance companies, reinsurance arrangements, rebates, commissions, interest-free accounts and compensating balances, to name a few. Whatever the method, the bonus to the creditor ultimately comes out of the premiums paid by the consumer. So long as this distortion of normal competition continues, inequities will persist.

A favorite technique of larger creditors is creation of subsidiary or "fronting" insurance companies whose primary purpose is the writing of consumer credit insurance on the loans granted. I ask unanimous consent to print after my remarks a list of the country's top 30 consumer creditors, ranked by capital funds, showing that 29 of them own or control or have affiliated with active insurance companies. To engage one's own underwriter, of course, makes it unnecessary to deal with independent insurance companies. It keeps the profits at home and confines cash flow to one's own backyard.

A second technique, akin to the favored-nation approach to international trade, is the reinsurance agreement, by which an underwriter lays off part of his risk. An underwriting company can limit its risk exposure by transferring part of its liability to other insurance companies. The direct writer becomes a "ceding" company and the reinsurer becomes an "assuming" company. Reinsurance typically serves to reduce liability on extraordinarily large risks, but then, consumer credit insurance is an atypical world in which reinsurance is nothing more than profit-shifting. The following from a court case tells the story:

> In the early 1950's Old Republic (Old Republic Life Insurance Company of Chicago, Ill.) found itself confronted with a worrisome development. Some of its important customers had begun to press for more commission compensation from their placing of credit life business with Old Republic, and some had even formed their own credit life insurance companies to which they shifted their credit life business. To Old Republic's management this development constituted a threat to the company's future volume of credit life insurance. However, rather than accede to the demands for larger commissions and retrospective rate adjustment, Old Republic began to suggest to its more important customers that they form their own life insurance companies, as subsidiary corporations, with which Old Republic would agree to reinsure proportionate segments of its credit life insurance. Old Republic's argument in support of its suggestion was that, in return for its customer assuming part of the risk, Old Republic could afford a more generous sharing of the premium income, the end result being "more of the pot" to its customers.

Mr. President, the other techniques—rebates, commissions, interest-free accounts and so on—serve to achieve the same basic purpose of channeling profits from consumer credit insurance back to the creditor. One of the many edifying exhibits in Senator HART's subcommittee's hearing record is a letter from a credit life insurer to a Los Angeles banker detailing some extra added attractions for marketing the company's product—among them, a 37.5 percent "service fee" and a handy cash buildup.

Reverse competition exerts a steady upward pressure on premium rates, at the consumer's expense. Creditors compete amongst themselves to maximize their profits for merchandising insurance which protects their own business. When, through an intermediary, a creditor does offer credit insurance to consumers at a reasonable price, his efforts can boomerang. If the intermediary wants a bigger insurance payoff and goes elsewhere to get it, the creditor can find his market position deteriorating. That is what happened to Ford Motor Credit Co. Robert S. Olson, chairman of the board of directors of the finance and insurance subsidiaries of Ford Motor Co., told the subcommittee:

> We still support vigorously our initial objective of offering low-cost competitive financing and insurance services to Ford Motor Co. dealers and car buyers. But in more and more of our market our credit life insurance plan has lost its value to Ford product dealers and their customers and to us because it is not being used. Worse yet, our customers are using our competitors' insurance plans and we either provide the financing that makes this possible or risk loss of our entire relationship with the customer.

The exhibits furnished by Ford for the hearing record document this point.

Reverse competition and a captive clientele characterize the consumer credit insurance business. Creditors scramble for new ways to utilize their superior bargaining position in relation to debtors. As a result, American consumers pay far too much for credit insurance.

THE BIG BITE

An industry survey for 1967 indicates to me that direct earned premiums for consumer credit insurance totaled $837 million. On this enormous volume it can be reckoned that consumers paid excessive charges of at least $220 million by using a yardstick which parallels the yields on group life insurance.

Mr. President, I shall make available a table explaining the formula used to make these computations, so that I need not go now into cumbersome detail. An overcharge of this magnitude delays repayment of proper consumer debt, thus impeding the national economy. This overcharge is a hidden component in the cost of consumer credit. It is a terribly big bite.

When challenged about their profit margins, creditors can do some pretty fancy footwork. Now, the cost factors in consumer credit insurance are death or disability expense, creditor compensation and the insurer's administrative expense and profit, of which creditor compensation is the biggest variable. As a diversion, however, creditors indulge in fantastic conjecture about their costs in selling or administering this insurance. They do not have the figures, but they are intuitively certain that their costs are quite high. At the hearings a finance company representative said:

> Well, as I indicated previously, we believe that we have about the same costs in handling the credit insurance as we have in handling the loan business, which means 70 percent of the gross is eaten up by costs. So, why not assume that 70 percent of this amount is eaten up by costs . . .

Indeed, why not assume it? The assumption is most helpful to lenders, and disposes of factual questions. Why bother to ascertain the truth if there is an assumption handy? When this finance man was confronted with figures his company filed in California as required by law, he expressed ignorance. The cost figures, extrapolated by the California Insurance Commissioner from data the firm submitted to the commissioner of corporations, showed its administrative costs for credit life insurance to be 8.9 percent of premiums received, or 6.1 cents on the 68-cent rate then applying. These 1966 figures were up from 8.38 percent and 5.7 cents in 1965. That actual range is of course, a mere pittance compared to the speculative percentage urged by the witness.

Another finance man testifying before Senator HART's subcommittee took this tack:

> As an example, assume a hypothetical fixed administrative cost of $4 for writing and recording the insurance transaction. On an $800 loan for two years, the total life premium of 75 cents per $100 per annum would be $12. The $4 administrative cost would repsent 33 percent of the total premium. On a $2,400 automobile loan for the same period and at the same rate the total life premium would be $36. In this case the $4 administrative cost would represent only 11 percent of the total premium.
>
> This example clearly demonstrates how inappropriate it is to compare small loan credit insurance transactions with large dollar volume transactions such as new car automobile financing, personal loans by banks, or employer-employee group life coverage.

Then he was informed that figures his firm filed with the commissioner of corporations in California, on a schedule called "Expenses of Licensee Related to Credit Life Insurance," made such hypothetical examples unnecessary. The figures indicated his firm's expenses in 1965 were 2.2 percent of premiums, or 1.5 cents at the 68-cent rate, and in 1966 were 2.4 percent, or 1.6 cents at the 68-cent rate. The substantiated costs being somewhat less than $4, a discussion of the disparity followed, leading to this admission by the witness:

> Well, we do not keep costs, I can tell you that frankly, and I do not think any other company does. Some attempt has been made at conducting these studies but they produce certain vagueness and inaccuracies, so that every attempt so far has been given up. We have never attempted it because we consider our business as a single business and do not try to separate these parts because it is almost impossible.

Mr. President, these cases from the hearing record should explode once and for all the myth of high costs. These costs have existed nowhere but in the imagination of industry spokesmen hard pressed to account for their excessive rates. When there is hard evidence, it indicts them. When it is lacking, we are asked on faith to accept their guesswork and supposition. Stripped of their cost camouflage, creditors are revealed as jealous guardians of their unreasonable insurance profits.

FAILURE OF STATE REGULATION

State regulation simply has not protected the public in the area of consumer credit insurance. It is true that 34 States have enacted some form of broad credit insurance law, but only one of them has done so since 1963. The pace of enactment has come to a near standstill. More importantly, these laws do not guarantee reasonable rate regulation: They merely permit it. It still falls to the regulator to establish and enforce a reasonable rate.

Now, it is argued widely that a rate is reasonable if the benefits provided amount to at least 50 cents of each premium dollar collected. This is the so-called 50-percent benchmark—which contrasts sharply, I should point out, with what ordinary group insurance policies generally pay out. Their death payments average 70 to 85 percent of premiums collected.

Without arguing the fairness of a 50-percent benchmark, what should it mean in actual rates? The National Association of Insurance Commissioners in a comprehensive study determined that the average credit life insurance benefit payment rate was 30 cents per hundred. According to the benchmark ideal, this would mean an allowable maximum premium rate of 60 cents. Actually, only a handful of States have a rate of 60 cents or less.

Furthermore, adherence to the 50-percent benchmark is not conspicuous among those who urge it. A table submitted at the hearings, summarizing the consumer credit insurance experience of the insurance subsidiaries of selected finance companies, indicated average benefit payments of only 40 percent—10 percent lower than the benchmark. These

XUM

are some of the ways in which State regulation has failed:

A new, higher rate set by insurance authorities tends to become a minimum rate. With the impetus of reverse competition, a creditor may suddenly find it desirable to honor the regulator and his more profitable premium rate. A classic example of this came to light at the hearings. A California bank had asked an insurance company to raise its rate, putting the insurer in the bind of complying or losing the account. Queried about this, an insurance company spokesman answered:

> I would say that there had been an understanding between the insurer and the bank as to what was a reasonable rate for credit insurance that was being furnished, and then there was action taken by the State in promulgating a rate which was significantly above that. This triggered the reaction. Well, we are a profit-making enterprise. The State says that this is a good rate. This rate is in compliance with all the benchmarks that have been established and is a fair and equitable rate and, therefore, in the interest of our stockholders why do we not take advantage of the profits we can make by moving to this higher rate?

On the other hand, a new, lower rate tends to be shouted down, on grounds regulatory authorities lack hard, current data to justify it, or the administrative capacity to oversee it. In 1967 the California Insurance Commissioner adopted regulations substantially reducing credit life rates and estimated that through 1969 they would save California borrowers about $25 million. Then the State legislature passed a bill severely limiting the commissioner's power to regulate rates and invalidating the lower rates adopted. Millions in borrower savings disappeared into creditor coffers.

Mr. President, the very fact some commissioners are cutting rates in States which have enacted the model bill, leads industry lobbyists to fight even harder to defeat the model bill in States not now having it. And a State commissioner last year said this about the 50-percent loss ratio benchmark:

> Yet, the pathetic fact, of which Senator Hart is all too aware, is that even this triumph of mediocrity and ambiguity has not been effectively adopted or enforced so far as I know in any state. (A few states may have achieved industrywide loss ratios higher than 50 percent, but they have done so by ignoring the 50 percent test and going to size scaled rates. It is doubtful that even the few $.60 to $.64 rates have produced a 50 percent loss ratio industrywide, due to attrition in experience caused by the cumulation of upward deviations.) To the best of my knowledge, no state seriously polices the loss ratios to require downward deviations to consistently meet the test.

A FEDERAL REMEDY

These regulatory problems should not be optimistically dismissed as simple friction between the industry and State insurance departments ultimately producing reasonable rates. It may produce them, as it has in New York and New Jersey. Where it does not, and that means most places most of the time, the loser—the heavy loser—is the consumer. Since the States have failed to act, it is time for Federal action to protect consumers from being overcharged for consumer credit insurance. My bill is based on these findings:

First, substantial increases have occurred since World War II in the volume of consumer credit—its growth rate having exceeded that of the national economy—and in the percent of family income used to repay such credit, making timely repayment of consumer debt essential to the well-being of the national economy. Thus it is in the public interest to reduce impediments to strong and effective competition among grantors of consumer credit in order that the payments required to liquidate such credit be kept to a minimum.

Second. Credit life, health, and accident insurance is an increasingly important element in the total cost of consumer credit. In the marketing of such insurance, the inferior bargaining position of the debtor prevents effective competition and results in excessive premium charges. This raises the total amounts of repayments pursuant to consumer credit transactions and, accordingly, obstructs commerce and prejudices consumers and the sound functioning of credit structure.

Third. Based on the foregoing, and in order to enhance economic stability and promote effective competition among financial institutions and others extending consumer credit, it is held to be in the national interest to regulate the maximum premiums which may be charged for credit life, health, and accident insurance when such insurance is provided or arranged by a creditor pursuant to a consumer credit transaction.

Mr. President, my bill would establish this regulatory process: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall by regulation limit the maximum premiums which consumers may be charged directly or indirectly for life, health, and accident insurance, when such insurance is provided or arranged for by a creditor pursuant to a consumer credit transaction.

In prescribing such regulations, the Board shall insure that the maximum premiums so established are reasonable in relation to the benefits conferred and that consumers are adequately protected against excessive premium charges.

In turn, the rates so established shall be based upon a ratio of losses to premiums which is reasonable and which protects consumers against excessive premium charges. In arriving at this ratio the Board shall consider:

First. The ratio of losses to premiums experienced by other lines of insurance marketed on a group basis; and

Second. The ratio of losses to premiums experienced by creditors who provide life, health, and accident insurance pursuant to consumer credit transactions in which the cost of the insurance is included in the finance charge paid by the consumer and is not a separate charge paid by him; and

Third. The actual losses and expenses experienced by insurance companies and the actual incremental administrative expenses experienced by creditors; and

Fourth. Whatever other factors the Board determines are relevant to achieving the purposes of this legislation.

The Board may prescribe such maximum premiums for particular creditors, classes of creditors, or transactions based upon the loss ratio—determined as outlined above—and actual loss experience.

The Board shall from time to time raise or lower the maximum premium charges permitted for any particular class of creditor or class of transactions whenever it determines that actual loss experience for the particular creditor, class of creditor, or class of transactions produces a loss ratio which differs substantially and systematically from the loss-ratio set by the Board. So that this provision can be implemented, creditors shall file an annual report setting forth data pertaining to actual losses in relation to premiums, and whatever other information the Board may require in furtherance of this act.

I might note, Mr. President, that no State regulatory apparatus need suffer from this. My bill provides for exemption of State regulated charges wherever the Board determines that the State has established substantially similar restrictions on such charges, with adequate provision for enforcement. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Consumer Credit Insurance Act be published after my remarks, as well as the computation of excessive charges and various exhibits from the hearing record to which I have referred.

In closing, I want to comment on the see-no-evil propensity of people from the consumer credit industry. Sometimes they refer to abuses in quotes, as if the word were unknown to them—implying, of course, that the sky's the limit in credit insurance. Or, if acknowledging abuses, they relegate them to some other time or place. They like to argue that the profit motive is basic to business nature, but choose to overlook the equally basic fact that profit can only be justified when real competition exists.

The penetrating inquiry by Senator HART's subcommittee shook up State authorities and the consumer credit industry, causing a flurry of activity. In the last few months, for example, regulatory action has been taken or proposed in California, Wyoming, Tennessee, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Indiana. Each move toward consumer protection should be lauded, but the fact indisputably remains that State action has been too little and too infrequent. Each year of hesitation costs consumers not less than $220 million in excessive charges, and they cannot afford to have their pockets picked any longer.

COMPUTING EXCESSIVE CHARGES FOR CONSUMER CREDIT INSURANCE

To determine the amount of excessive charges, I have used a formula recommended to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee by James H. Hunt, Fellow of the Society of Actuaries and then Commissioner of Banking and Insurance for the State of Vermont. I have adjusted aggregate figures taken from a monthly

XUM

magazine, the Spectator, an insurance authority since 1868, which last October summarized the experience of companies writing an estimated 90 percent or better of the consumer credit insurance in the United States.

Then I have set creditor commissions at 3 percent and profit to the insurer at 3 percent, and have pegged creditor compensation for expenses at 10 percent of premium volume, after reducing the volume by the amount of extra compensation actually paid. The result indicates excessive charges of $220 million. This is the formula:

Estimated excessive charges for consumer credit insurance, 1967

Total earned premiums	$837, 100, 000
Total losses and loss expenses	435, 000, 000
Total general expenses	71, 050, 000
Commissions (3 percent of premium volume)	25, 113, 000
Profit to insurer (3 percent of premium volume)	25, 113, 000
Total	556, 276, 000
Left after subtracting expenses from premiums	280, 824, 000
Cost figure for creditor expenses (10 percent of premium volume reduced by $229,669,440, which is the sum of commissions and dividends and retrospective rate credits paid)	60, 700, 000
Total	220, 124, 000

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record some letters, tables, and other data, as well as a copy of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill and material will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1754) to protect consumers from abuses relative to excessive charges for life, health, and accident insurance pursuant to consumer credit transactions, introduced by Mr. Proxmire, for himself and Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Consumer Credit Insurance Act".

Sec. 2. (a) Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 4—CONSUMER CREDIT INSURANCE

"Sec.
"151. Findings and declaration of purpose.
"152. Regulation of maximum premiums.
"153. Exemption of State regulated charges.

"Section 151. Findings and declaration of purpose

"(a) The Congress finds that substantial increases have occurred since World War II in the volume of consumer credit (the rate of growth of such credit having exceeded that of the national economy), and in the percent of family income used to repay such credit, making the repayment of debt by consumers on a timely basis essential to the well-being of the national economy. It is in the public interest, therefore, to reduce impediments to strong and effective competition among grantors of consumer credit in order that the payments required to liquidate such credit be kept to a minimum.

"(b) Congress further finds that life, health, and accident insurance provided or arranged for in connection with consumer credit transactions is an increasingly important element in the total cost of consumer credit and that in the marketing of such insurance the inferior bargaining position of the debtor prevents effective competition and results in excessive premium charges, thereby raising the total amounts of repayments pursuant to consumer credit transaction, and accordingly, obstructing commerce and prejudicing consumers and the sound functioning of the credit structure.

"(c) In view of the foregoing, and in order to enhance economic stability and promote effective competition among financial institutions and others extending consumer credit, the Congress declares it to be in the national interest to regulate the maximum premiums which may be charged for life, health, and accident insurance when such insurance is provided or arranged for by a creditor pursuant to a consumer credit transaction.

"Section 152. Regulation of maximum premiums

"(a) Not later than one year following the date of enactment of this chapter, the Board shall, by regulation, limit the maximum premiums which may be charged consumers directly or indirectly for life, health, and accident insurance when such insurance is provided or arranged for by a creditor pursuant to a consumer credit transaction. In prescribing such regulations, the Board shall insure that the maximum premiums so established are reasonable in relation to the benefits conferred and that consumers are adequately protected against excessive premium charges.

"(b) Maximum premiums established under this section shall be based upon a ratio of losses to premiums which is reasonable and which protests consumers against excessive premium charges as determined by the Board in determining such a ratio, the Board shall consider:

"(1) The ratio of losses to premiums experienced by other lines of insurance marketed on a group basis; and

"(2) The ratio of losses to premiums experienced by creditors who provide life, health, and accident insurance pursuant to consumer credit transactions in which the cost of such insurance is included in the finance charge paid by the consumer and is not a separate charge paid by the consumer; and

"(3) The actual losses and expenses experienced by insurance companies and the actual incremental administrative expenses experienced by creditors in the sale of such insurance; and

"(4) Such other factors as the Board determines are relevant to achieving the purposes of this Act.

"(c) The Board may prescribe such maximum premiums for particular creditors, classes of creditors, or transactions based upon the loss ratio determined under subsection (b) and actual loss experience.

"(d) The Board shall from time to time raise or lower the maximum premium charges permitted for such insurance for any particular class of creditor or class of transactions whenever the Board determines that the actual loss experience for the particular creditor, class of creditor, or class of transactions produces a ratio of losses to premiums which differs substantially and systematically from the loss ratio established by the Board under sub-section (b). In order to implement this subsection, creditors shall, under regulations of the Board, file an annual report with the Board setting forth data pertaining to actual losses in relation to premiums and such other information as may be required by the Board to further the purposes of this Act. Such information shall be made available to the general public upon request.

"Section 153. Exemption of State regulated charges

"The Board shall, by regulation, exempt from the requirements of this chapter charges for life, health, or accident insurance in any State where the Board determines that the State has established substantially similar ceilings on such charges and that such ceilings are being adequately enforced.

"Section 154. Reports

"The Board shall report annually to Congress on its responsibilities under this Act."

(b) The chapter analysis at the beginning of title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4. Consumer Credit Insurance ...... 151".

The material, presented by Mr. Proxmire, follows:

DATA SUBMITTED BY THE STANDARD LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF MISSISSIPPI, NOV. 27, 1967

CREDIT LIFE DEPARTMENT

	Premium received				Claims paid		
	Life	Dollar Rep.	A. & H.	Total	Death	A. & H.	Total
1960	$1, 670, 374. 47	$103, 030. 64	$125, 470. 12	$1, 898, 875. 23	$578, 000. 04	$27, 104. 14	$605, 104. 18
1961	1, 602, 982. 04	144, 075. 87	135, 383. 37	1, 882, 441. 28	586, 469. 57	47, 060. 29	633, 529. 86
1962	1, 696, 396. 02	203, 875. 88	172, 815. 00	2, 073, 086. 90	694, 570. 10	43, 009. 60	737, 579. 70
1963	1, 974, 488. 72	256, 008. 89	258, 070. 28	2, 488, 567. 89	699, 525. 70	47, 148. 63	746, 674. 33
1964	2, 344, 484. 62	291, 750. 33	267, 854. 10	2, 904, 089. 05	832, 212. 04	56, 999. 55	889, 211. 59
1965	2, 854, 877. 14	370, 322. 20	282, 081. 67	3, 507, 281. 01	995, 442. 57	71, 224. 76	1, 066, 667. 33
1966	3, 224, 338. 69	418, 990. 99	333, 856. 32	3, 977, 186. 00	1, 233, 344. 38	77, 862. 68	1, 311, 207. 06
1967 (through October)	2, 705, 740. 85	380, 519. 60	417, 134. 62	3, 503, 395. 07	1, 120, 298. 69	71, 730. 03	1, 192, 028. 71
Total	18, 073, 682. 55	2, 168, 574. 40	1, 992, 665. 48	22, 234, 922. 43	6, 739, 863. 09	442, 139. 68	7, 182, 002. 77

XUM

DATA SUBMITTED BY THE STANDARD LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF MISSISSIPPI, NOV. 27, 1967—Continued

COMMISSIONS

	Life	A & H	Total
1960	$849,083.69	$72,062.44	$921,146.13
1961	824,128.37	75,977.31	900,105.68
1962	869,684.86	93,946.64	963,631.50
1963	1,042,330.49	142,416.61	1,184,747.10
1964	1,225,406.21	138,111.77	1,363,517.98
1965	$1,458,975.66	$144,956.25	$1,603,931.91
1966	1,747,390.24	173,635.18	1,921,025.42
1967 (through October)	1,444,623.70	226,415.18	1,671,038.88
Total	9,461,632.22	1,067,521.38	10,529,144.60

CREDIT LIFE AND CREDIT ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE EXPERIENCE[1] OF THE LIFE INSURANCE SUBSIDIARIES OF SELECTED FINANCE COMPANIES, 1965 AND 1966

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Finance company	Year	Earned premiums	Death and accident and health benefits incurred[2]	Commissions and experience refunds	Net gain (or loss) to insurer[3]	Loss ratio (benefits to premiums) (percent)
Allied Finance of Texas	1965	[4] $5,344	$1,884	$2,060	$1,076	35.0
	1966	[5] 4,866	1,795	2,745	(143)	37.0
American Credit of North Carolina.	1965	3,900	1,142	1,797	596	31.0
	1966	3,954	1,218	1,562	816	30.0
American Investments of Missouri.	1965	8,082	2,987	3,401	927	37.0
	1966	9,243	3,377	3,253	1,675	37.0
Associates Investments of Indiana.	1965	15,828	6,969	822	7,317	44.0
	1966	17,594	7,828	2,148	7,182	44.0
Avco-Delta of New York	1965	1,640	409	----------	641	25.0
	1966	2,244	916	399	639	40.0
Beneficial Finance of New Jersey.	1965	6,666	4,086	17	2,507	61.0
	1966	8,131	4,940	18	3,194	60.0
C.I.T. Finance of New York	1965	15,709	7,072	117	7,502	44.0
	1966	17,628	8,104	104	8,386	46.0
Commerce Acceptance Corp. of Kansas.	1965	609	117	383	75	17.0
	1966	439	61	329	2	14.0
Commercial Credit Co. of Maryland.	1965	17,738	8,819	169	4,646	49.0
	1966	19,307	10,198	246	4,608	53.0
Colonial Acceptance Corp. of Illinois.	1965	1,265	790	300	170	62.0
	1966	1,545	934	388	(71)	60.0
CMC Finance Group, Inc	1965	606	133	335	124	21.0
	1966	622	179	293	88	28.0
Consolidated Credit Corp. of North Carolina.	1965	4,866	1,147	3,087	185	23.0
	1966	4,729	1,192	2,654	350	25.0
Credithrift Finance of Indiana	1965	3,823	1,349	----------	2,197	34.0
	1966	4,318	1,718	----------	2,269	39.0
Crown Finance of Missouri	1965	964	397	515	24	41.0
	1966	1,215	419	663	99	34.0
Dial Finance Co. of Iowa	1965	4,121	1,274	1,837	974	30.0
	1966	4,519	1,517	1,866	1,103	35.0
Family Finance of Delaware	1965	10,436	2,869	727	[6] 3,692	27.0
	1966	8,538	2,878	1,301	[7] 4,561	34.0
Federal Discount of Iowa	1965	848	399	265	112	47.0
	1966	754	193	117	185	25.0
Fidelity Acceptance (Minnesota)	1965	526	150	121	177	29.0
	1966	1,446	656	360	269	45.0
General Acceptance of Pennsylvania	1965	12,655	4,059	3,644	2,582	32.0
	1966	12,511	4,751	3,489	2,580	37.0
General Finance of Illinois	1965	8,162	2,997	3,736	1,048	37.0
	1966	8,688	2,998	4,027	1,221	35.0
Interstate Finance Co. of Iowa.	1965	1,000	375	591	24	37.0
	1966	(*)				
Interstate Securities Co. of Missouri	1965	11,710	3,164	3,050	941	27.0
	1966	10,369	2,634	1,702	[8] (338)	25.0
ITT Aetna Finance Co. of Missouri	1965	$3,764	$1,093	$1,329	$814	29.0
	1966	4,134	1,224	1,282	1,514	29.0
Laurentide Finance Corporation of California	1965	872	401	185	273	46.0
	1966	1,446	892	357	72	66.0
Liberty Loan of Missouri	1965	7,259	2,483	3,199	1,000	34.0
	1966	8,356	2,659	3,294	1,759	31.0
Local Finance Co. of Rhode Island	1965	841	446	155	186	53.0
	1966	848	404	175	224	47 0
Pacific Finance of California	1965	10,635	4,428	1,520	2,628	42.0
	1966	12,228	4,932	1,953	2,916	40.0
Peoples Financial Corp. of Georgia	1965	460	123	293	3	28.0
	1966	548	147	346	24	27.0
Midland Guardian Co. of Ohio	1965	1,854	804	156	702	43 0
	1966	1,572	599	143	746	38.0
Murdock Acceptance of Mississippi	1965	555	70	289	43	13.0
	1966	(*)				
Seaboard Finance Co. of California	1965	8,119	3,427	2,896	1,523	42 0
	1966	8,629	4,187	3,033	1,151	48.0
Southern Discount Co. of Georgia	1965	542	121	351	59	22.0
	1966	563	135	296	41	24.0
Southwestern Investment Co. of Texas	1965	3,138	1,033	323	659	32.0
	1966	3,012	979	358	605	32.0
State Loan & Finance of Delaware	1965	9,729	3,476	4,639	1,327	35 0
	1966	10,864	3,689	5,152	1,751	34.0
Stephenson Finance Co. of South Carolina	1965	1,442	382	902	67	26.0
	1966	1,287	329	729	143	25.0
Sun Finance & Loan Co. of Ohio	1965	837	416	257	147	26.0
	1966	853	282	301	259	25.0
Thorp Finance of Wisconsin	1965	3,051	912	15	1,368	30.0
	1966	4,634	2,356	530	616	50.0
Total (37)	1965	189,596	72,203	43,483	[9] 47,030	38.1
Total (35)	1966	201,531	81,318	45,613	[9] 49,531	40.3

---

* Data not available.

[1] On a direct and assumed credit life and credit accident and health insurance basis.

[2] Benefits paid and adjustments for changes in claim reserves.

[3] After all expenses of operation, commissions, dividends and rate credits, but before investment income and Federal income tax.

[4] $1,631,000 was ceded.

[5] $502,351 was ceded.

[6] $1,341,921 realized with respect to credit accident and health business ceded.

[7] $965,428 realized with respect to credit accident and health business ceded.

[8] Some $1,700,000 in experience refunds ceded.

[9] Excludes net gain (or less) on business ceded.

Source: Annual convention statements, including credit life and accident and health exhibits supplement thereto, for 1965 and 1966.

EXHIBIT 54

TABLE 47.—*Insurance companies owned, controlled, or affiliated with major consumer creditors ranked by total capital funds (as of April 1967)*

CONSUMER CREDITORS AND OWNED, CONTROLLED OR AFFILIATED INSURANCE COMPANIES

1. General Motors Acceptance Corp: Motors Insurance Co. of New York; GIM Insurance Co. of New York.

2. CIT Financial Corp.: North American Co. for Life, Accident and Health Insurance; Patriot Life Insurance Company; North American Accident Insurance Company; Service Casualty Co. of New York; Service Fire Insurance Co. of New York.

3. Commercial Credit Company: American Health and Life Insurance Co.; Farmers and Bankers Life Insurance Co.; American Credit Indemnity Co. of New York; Calvert Fire Insurance Co.; Cavalier Insurance Corporation; Eastern Insurance Company.

4. Beneficial Finance Co.: Guaranty Life Insurance Co. of America of Delaware; Guaranteed Equity Life Ins. Co. of Arizona.[1]

5. Associates Investment Co.: Capital Life Insurance Co. of Colorado; Emmco Insurance Co. of Indiana; Excel Insurance Company.

6. Household Finance Corporation: None.

7. Ford Motor Credit Co.: American Road Insurance Co.; Ford Life Insurance Co.

8. Sears, Roebuck and Co.: [2] Allstate Insurance Co.[3]

9. Pacific Finance Corp.: [4] Pacific Fidelity Life Ins. Co. of Cal.; Countrywide Life Ins. Co. of Texas; Mt. Beacon Ins. Co. of New York; Olympic Insurance of Cal.; Marathon Ins. Co. of Texas; Spartan Ins. Co. of Cal.

10. Avco Delta Corp.: Phoenix Life & Accident Ins. Co. of Texas.

11. General Acceptance Corp.: Stuyvesant Life Ins. Co. of Pa.; Stuyvesant Ins. Co. of Pa.; Trans-Oceanic Life Ins. Co. of Puerto Rico.

12. Seaboard Finance Co.: Provident Alliance Ins. Co., Ltd. of Hawaii; Balboa Ins. Co.

13. American Investment Co.: Charter National Life Ins. Co. of Mo.; Charter National Ins. Co.

14. Montgomery Ward and Co., Inc.: Montgomery Ward Life Ins. Co.

15. Chrysler Credit Corp.: Car City Insurance Co.

---

[1] Wholly owned by Spiegel Inc. (Mail order sales and financing of customers' receivable), which is wholly owned by Beneficial Finance Co.

[2] Wholly owns Sears Roebuck Acceptance Corp.

[3] Wholly owns Allstate Fire Insurance Co.; Allstate Life Ins. Co.; Cross Country Life Ins. Co.; National Emblem Ins. Co.; and Allstate International, S.A. (an insurance holding company).

[4] Wholly owned by Transamerica Corp. of California.

XUM

16. State Loan and Finance Corp.: General Fidelity Life Ins. Co. of Va.; Atlas Life Ins. Co. of Del.

17. Family Finance Corp.: Diamond State Life Insurance Co.

18. Liberty Loan Corp.: Personal Life Ins. Co. of Mo.; People's Standard Life Ins. Co.; Twentieth Century Life Ins. Co.

19. General Finance Corp.: Mid-State Life Ins. Co. of Fla.

20. American Credit Corp.: Citadel Life Ins. Co.; Carolina Central Life Ins. Co.; East Coast Life Ins. Co.; Southeastern Fire Insurance Co.; Twin States Ins. Co.; South State Ins. Co.

21. Midland-Guardian Co.: Main Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

22. Dial Finance Co.: Consumers Life Ins. Co. of Mo.

23. Interstate Finance Corp. (Ind.): Merit Life Ins. Co. of Ind.

24. Budget Finance Plan, Inc.: Transnational Ins. Co.; Transnational Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

25. Southwestern Investment Co.: Western National Life Ins. Co. of Texas; Commercial Ins. Co.

26. ITT Aetena Finance Co.:[5] ITT Life Ins.

27. Standard Financial Corp.: Bay Life Ins. Co. of Texas.

28. Interstate Securities Co.: Old Security Life Ins. Co. of Mo.; Old Security Casualty Ins. Co.

29. Thorp Finance Corp.: Lyndon Life Ins. Co. of Texas; Thorp Life Ins. Co. of Wisconsin; Lyndon Ins. Co. of Wisconsin.

30. Laurentide Finance Corp.: Allied Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

31. Mercantile Financial Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

32. Coburn Credit Co.: Arlington Life Ins. Co.; CIC Fire and Casualty Ins. Co.

33. Securities Investment Co.: Mercury Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

34. Thrift Interstate Corp.: Monongahela Assurance Ltd. of Nassau.

35. Industrial First Thrift Corp: Insurance company ownership not known.

36. Sun Finance and Loan Co.: Sun States Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

37. Industrial Credit Co.: Northland Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

38. Ritter Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

39. United States Finance Co.: Motor Life Ins. Co.

40. Government Employees Corp.[6]

41. Commonwealth Loan Company: Insurance company ownership not known.

42. Union Investment Co.: Guard Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

43. Murphy Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

44. Fidelity Acceptance Corp.: Admiral Life Insurance Co. of Ariz.

45. Associates Capital Corp.: Cumberland Life Ins. Co. of Tenn.

46. Consolidated Credit Corp.: Builders Life Ins. Co. of N.C.

47. Allied Finance Co.: Industrial Life Ins. Co.; Southern Ins. Co.

48. Local Finance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

49. Kentucky Finance Co.[7]

50. Approved Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

51. Interstate Finance Corp. (Iowa): Midwest Security Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

52. Texas Consumer Finance Corp.: Trans-Texas Life Ins. Co.

53. Automobile Banking Corp.: ABCO Life Ins. Co. of Pa.

54. Morris Plan Co. of Calif.: Yosemite Life Insurance Co.; Yosemite Ins. Co.

55. Commercial Securities Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

56. Northern Illinois Corp.: Protective Life Ins. Co.

57. Merchants Acceptance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

58. Century Acceptance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

59. Oxford Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

60. Stephenson Finance Co.: Superior Life Ins. Co.

61. Local Finance Finance Co. (R.I.): Imperial Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

62. Franklin Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

63. Provident Loan Security of N.Y.: Insurance company ownership not known.

64. Economy Finance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

65. Continental Commercial Co.: Gateway Life Ins. Co. of Pa.; Gateway Ins. Co.

66. Federal Discount Corp.: Life of Mid-America Ins. Co.

67. Mutual System, Inc.: Insurance company ownership not known.

68. Public Finance Service, Inc.: Insurance company ownership not known.

69. State Securities, Inc.: Insurance company ownership not known.

70. Indian Finance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

71. Colonial Acceptance Corp.: Colonial Reserve Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

72. Crown Finance Corp.: Corona National Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

73. Guardian Loan Co., Inc.: Tilden Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

74. Winter and Hirsch, Inc.: Insurance company ownership not known.

75. Atlas Finance Co.: Arbor Life Ins. Co.

76. Atlantic Discount Corp.: Atlantic Security Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

77. Commerce Acceptance Co.: Midland Empire Life Ins. Co.; Midland Empire Ins. Co.

78. Southern Discount Co.: Consumer Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

79. Murdock Acceptance Corp.: Continental-American Life Ins. Co. of Miss.

80. Investors Loan Corp.: Eastern Life Insurance Co. of Ariz.

81. Peoples Financial Corp.: National Automobile Ins. Co.; Georgia Peoples Life Ins. Co.

82. Commonwealth Finance Corp.: Lincoln National Ins. Co.

83. Girard Investment Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

84. Consumer Acceptance Corp.: Whitehall Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

85. City Finance Co. of Md.: Insurance company ownership not known.

86. M & J Finance Corp.: Southern Standard Life Ins. Co.; Beacon Fire Ins. Co.

87. CMC Finance Group, Inc.: Amity Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

88. Owners Discount Corp.: Michiana Life Ins. Co.

89. Rochester Cap. Leasing Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

90. Time Finance Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

91. Tower Finance Corp.: Tower Life Ins. Co. of Ariz.

92. Investors Commercial Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

93. Family Credit Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

94. Pioneer Credit Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

95. Town and Country Security Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

96. Southern Frontier Finance Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

97. Fairlane Finance Co.: First Carolina Ins. Co.

98. American Security Co. of Bedford: Insurance company ownership not known.

99. Town Enterprises: Insurance company ownership not known.

100. Friendly Finance, Inc.: Insurance company ownership not known.

101. Industrial Credit Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

102. Continental Acceptance Corp.: Eastern American Life Ins. Co.

103. All-State Credit Corp.: Insurance company ownership not known.

104. Security Leasing Co.: Insurance company ownership not known.

105. Finance Factors, Ltd.: Grand Pacific Life Ins. Co. of Hawaii.

106. Sterling Discount Corp.: Motor Life Ins. of Del.

Sources: *Moody's Bank and Finance Manual*, 1966 Ed.; *American Banker*, May 31 1966, pp. 11–13; 1966 Life Insurance Company or both. 1 has interlocking manage-Departments, p. 17, line 11; *Best's Insurance Reports*, 1966 (Alfred M. Best Co., of New Jersey).

Out of 106 major consumer creditors: 68 are known to own, control or be affiliated with a life, fire and casualty insurance company or both. 1 has interlocking management with a life insurance company. 2 are in an affiliated group with life and casualty insurance companies. 43 own or control a life insurance company *only*. 4 own or control a fire and casualty insurance company *only*. 21 own or control both a life and casualty insurance company.

JANUARY 9, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM R. MORRIS,
Chairman, Life, Accident and Health Insurance Committee, National Association of Insurance Commissioners, Director of Insurance, State of Ohio, 115 East Rich Street, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR BILL: As I will not be able to attend the meetings of the Life Committee at Columbus on January 11, 1968, I am forwarding to you regarding response to Senator Hart's inquiry addressed to Jim Bentley under date of December 14, 1967.

I want to address myself first to Senator Hart's specific questions, which are relatively narrow, and second to the broader issues involved.

Senator Hart poses two specific questions, relating them to the NAIC credit life mortality study and the conclusion of the Bittel-Gingery analysis indicating that on a national industrywide basis the pure mortality cost is about $.30 per hundred:

"It is the position of the NAIC that a $1.00 credit life premium level, in general, would produce at least 50 percent in benefits to borrowers and installment purchasers?"

"What are your comments with respect to a 75 cent credit life premium level producing at least 50 percent in benefits?"

The obvious simple answers to Senator Hart's questions are "No." Neither a $.75 nor a $1.00 rate will produce a 50 per cent industrywide or countrywide loss ratio on credit life.

Senator Hart's apparently naive, but really acute questions penetrate to the heart of the matter. The NAIC adopted as the guide for rate administration under the Model Bill the 50 per cent loss ratio benchmark resolution, which in itself can scarcely be held up as an example of either clarity or aggressive enforcement. For most of the business, it is a ratio substantially below what would obtain were true competition operative. Moreover, the resolution has been and is the subject of several widely variant interpretations.

Yet, the pathetic fact, of which Senator Hart is all too aware, is that even this triumph of mediocrity and ambiguity has not been effectively adopted or enforced as far as I know in any state. (A few states may have achieved industrywide loss ratios higher than

---

[5] Wholly owned by International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.
Co. of Mo.

[6] Affiliated companies: Government Employees Insurance Co.; Government Employees Life Ins. Co.; Criterion Ins. Co.

[7] Chairman of the Board of Directors and President is President and a major stockholder of Kentucky Central Life Ins. Co.

50 per cent, but they have done so by ignoring the 50 per cent test and going to size scaled rates. It is doubtful that even the few $.60 to $.64 rates have produced a 50 per cent loss ratio industrywide, due to attrition in experience caused by the cumulation of upward deviations.) To the best of my knowledge, no state seriously polices the loss ratios to require downward deviations to consistently meet the test.

At Richmond, in a fit of masochism, the NAIC adopted an industry sponsored resolution admonishing the member states to do what they had always said they should do as a minimum.

The fact then is, and this is what Hart's questions pinpoint, that after ten years the states have not regulated or been able to regulate credit life rates to even the rather minimal standards which the NAIC itself recommended. Moreover, and this even more devastating, there is ample evidence in the committee record, that the NAIC resolutions have been used to defeat or discourage more aggressive regulation in states where it has been attempted. Rarely have the commissioners gone to such lengths to become scapegoats for the idustry.

I would be most cautious about claiming that a certain amount of recent activity is evidence of any enduring trend. Passage of the Model Bill in additional states has almost come to a standstill. There has been a spate of hearings and some instances of reduction of presumptive rates in a few states. There have also been some glaring evidences of the power of creditor interests to forestall or undo more aggressive regulation. The difficulty is that the failure of state regulation to achieve any sort of consistent pattern of meaningful regulaion is going to become more, not less, evident as times goes on. The very fact that commissioners are cutting rates leads the more piratical creditors and insurers who will sacrifice all for short range continuance of high profits, to defeat the Model Bill in states not now having it. Meanwhile, among the states having the Model Bill or laws like it, there is an increasing lack of uniformity in administration. As the national rate pattern develops greater variations, the incongruities resulting from the state regulatory administration will become more apparent to Congress.

Without deprecating the sincerity of those who espouse it, I frankly think real enforcement of the 50 per cent benchmark is unlikely except in California where it is now mandated in sandwich style by the statute. The technical problems involved are such that most departments cannot cope with them from a staff standpoint and the competitive repercussions of actually applying it consistently will inevitably prevent it in most states.

Under the circumstances, I think that the most limited and candid response possible to Senator Hart's letter is desirable. This is particularly true where it is not possible for the association to pass on the matter as a whole and in light of its controversial nature, I question whether any sweeping position should be asserted on the strength of views developed in a quickie meeting of the Life Committee.

I urge a response that recognizes that the situation is not very satisfactory, points out that part of the problem is the deep involvement of creditors interests, mentions what recent activities there have been, and expresses an intent to review the whole question of implementation of the Model Bill.

The record of the NAIC and of the states on this subject is not very good. Senator Hart knows that. It is neither right nor safe to attempt an unqualified defense of that which is indefensible. In this situation, I think that the NAIC as an organization and state regulation as an institution is more apt to earn Congressional esteem from an expression of honest recognition of shortcomings and of real determination to seek effective solutions in the future than it is from a glib defense of the sorry past.

Very truly yours.

RICHARD S. L. RODDIS,
Insurance Commissioner,
State of California.

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 21, 1968.

To All Members of the E Committee and E2 Subcommittee:

I will be unable to attend the meeting of the E Committee and the E2 Subcommittee in Las Vegas on February 26–28, 1968. Before expressing my views on the subject of that meeting, I want to observe that the situation illustrates one of the serious problems confronting many of us arising from the lack of effective coordination in the scheduling of meetings. For some of us, at least, both budgetary and time pressures render frequent out of state trips very difficult. This meeting was tentatively set up following the Columbus meeting. Not long afterward, Ned Price called a meeting of the Executive Committee in March coincident with the Zone V meeting in Jackson Hole. There is no particular time pressure that requires this credit life meeting to be held three weeks earlier. It would have been possible to set the E and E2 meetings coincident with the Zone V meeting also, and many of us would have been able to cover both and better attendance would be secured.

A more systematic and determined control over the scheduling and coordination of committee meetings is going to be necessary.

I am somewhat at a loss to know what procedure is being followed. It was my understanding that what was intended at the Columbus meeting for the now scheduled Las Vegas meeting was that it was to be a workshop to prepare some sort of informational report for Senator Hart's committee or some members of it. There was no mention of a definition or redefinition of the NAIC resolutions concerning administration of the Model Credit Insurance Law. The announcement for the meeting from Commissioner Mastos indicates that this now is the purpose of the meeting. I assume that any report or resolution by the E2 Subcommittee on this subject will have to be submitted to the Convention in June or otherwise subjected to vote of the membership.

For the record, I will state my position on the subject briefly:

1. The Model Credit Insurance Law does not contain a 50% bench mark criteria, either expressly or by implication. I understand the omission was deliberate. Any suggestion that it does or that a law that incorporates it expressly is in fact an enactment of the Model Law is misleading.

2. I am opposed to any action by the NAIC that suggests that a state in the administration of the Model Law or otherwise should not require a loss ratio greater than 50% either overall or as to particular classes of business or categories of account. The 50% mark if it is to be retained at all should be regarded as a minimum acceptable level of public protection.

For the NAIC to commit itself to an organized position that a 50% loss ratio is in all events reasonable and that a state should not require a higher ratio is a suicidal position. Although perhaps reasonable for some classes of the business, for large blocks of the business a 50% ratio is not in *fact* reasonable in light of loss ratio trends in recent years on life and disability insurance business marketed and administered in ways which are comparable from an expense factor standpoint in a truly competitive market. The NAIC can pass all the resolutions it wants, but it cannot change the economic facts.

3. Having said this, I should make it equally clear that I have no desire to have the NAIC seek to impose any particular obligation on individual states to require a higher ratio than 50% either generally or as to particular classes or categories of business. My view, in other words, is that the NAIC should not permit its resolutions to be usable as a barrier or deterrent argument against a state determining that a higher than 50% ratio should be required, but that it need not be in the position of suggesting that a state should be criticized if it does not require more. This is an appropriate role for the NAIC—to suggest the minimum acceptable level of public protection which all states should require but to recognize that it is intrinsic in our concept of the federal system and of state regulation that beyond that minimum standard the determination should be made by each state for its own circumstances, needs and the desires of its people.

To have the NAIC commit to the position that it regards the 50% loss ratio bench mark as *the* test of reasonableness and its resolutions susceptible to be used as an argument against a state requiring a greater proportionate return of premium dollar to beneficiaries is intolerable and potentially disastrous.

The NAIC should either lead or get out of the way. To endorse what many within the industry, among regulators, and in Congress regard as a pallid measure at best as the ultimate which member states should require is to invite discreditation of the Association as a constructive and progressive force for the future. This is particularly true where the principal beneficiaries of the higher rates are creditor interests and the serious charge is being made that the states are tolerating the use ,of the insurance as a circumvention of laws regulating lenders.

Congress gave the states one bite at the credit insurance problem a few years ago. It is problematical whether it will give us another bite. Certainly we won't get a third.

RICHARD S. L. RODDIS,
Insurance Commissioner, State of California.

FORD MOTOR CREDIT CO. AUTOMOTIVE GROUP CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE PLAN

Mr. OLSON. In 1960, Ford Motor Credit Co.'s first full year of operation, 77 percent of the automotive finance contracts we purchased included insurance under our group policy. This figure was 79 percent in 1961, dropped to 74 percent in 1962, 69 percent in 1963, 68 percent in 1964, and 66 percent in 1965. It then deteriorated even more rapidly to 60 percent in 1966 and 53 percent during the first 10 months of 1967.

This deterioration in our market position has not been uniform throughout the United States. In some areas our market percentage has held up quite well while in other areas our group plan is used very little. Our loss of market position can be traced to areas where permissible customer rates are high enough—usually in the 60 cents to $1 range—to provide a margin over mortality costs sufficient to enable insurers to offer attractive commissions to producers (in our market, these are dealer-agents). Our Allstate plan does not provide such commissions.

Our market loss can be sudden and severe when a competitor or competitors decide to promote a commission plan vigorously. The following table illustrates what can happen to us in an area in just a 3-month period. These are our percentage of automotive retail finance contracts insured under our group policy.

(The table referred to follows:)

PERCENTAGE OF AUTOMOTIVE RETAIL FINANCE CONTRACTS INSURED UNDER OUR GROUP POLICY

Area	Base month	Percent	3 months later
Fort Wayne, Ind	January 1967	81	49
Henderson, Ky	February 1967	92	41
Huntsville, Ala	February 1966	70	43
Oklahoma City, Okla	April 1967	75	47
Philadelphia, Pa	May 1967	40	15

Mr. OLSON. Our ratio of benefits to premiums for the entire period is 82 percent. There was an indication of a rising trend in the ratio during the early years but the volume of business was relatively small then and the loss results may not have been representative. The ratio is more stable in recent years.

We would like to continue offering insurance protection at the present low price. We hope very much that our experience will permit us to do so.

APRIL 2, 1968.

Re Creditors Life and Disability (A&H).
Mr. GEORGE GRAZIADIO,
President, Imperial Bank,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. GRAZIADIO: It is with pleasure that I submit my information concerning our Creditors Life. I wish to detail and confirm some outstanding points of information for you and Mr. Eltinge to consider.

1. The final rate effective March 1, 1968, established by the Department of Insurance for our company. The Standard Life Insurance Company of Indiana, was Decreasing Life .60c per $100 per annum. Disability (Accident & Health) coverage .60¢ per $100 per annum for a 30 days elimination, which you are now using and that which is used by the majority of banks in California. The Level Term rate is $1.20 per 100 per annum.

2. *We are a direct writing company which means we supervise all the banks* using our Credit Life plan directly thru our office *and not thru agents or brokers,* mainly because we insist on maintaining our fine reputation of service, first in claims and second in simplicity in operation at the bank level.

3. This method of handling permits us to pay the highest service fee to the banks in the industry which is currently 37½% of the written premium.

4. Due to our firm handling everything for your bank at our Los Angeles office and being specialist in Credit Life for banks, your customer receives the finest, thereby creating a perfect relationship between your offices and their accounts, also eliminating the need for you to choose a new company every 2 years or so, or being shopped for a company to handle your banks, by an agent.

5. We offer the broadest program for banks of any company in this business. Under the Standard Life Insurance Company of Indiana program direct, you can insure any borrower that you loan to for either Life and A & H or Life Only, up to and including age 65 for any type loan, whether it be commercial loans, insecured loans, home improvement loans, installments and so on. We provide the facilities for your dealers tc write our coverage thru your bank at your request, thereby giving you a tremendous lever in establishing a strong relationship with them.

6. Now you may insure all borrowers up to $15,000 per person, not only individual loans, but co-partnerships, key men in corporate loans, husband and wives, co-signers, etc. In other words our plan fits all your borrowers, including Level Life.

7. Due to our orientation type installation at each office level and service directly to your 4 offices, you should develop approximately $60,000 premium annually and at 37½% of premium your earnings would be about $22,500 or $2,000 per month.

8. Standard Life deposits 55% of the written premium each month to their non-interest bearing commercial account which would develop in 12 months to about $33,000, this is carried as a reserve account and allowed to build year by year as claims are *not* paid from it. So 55% on deposit and 37½% in service fees, 92½% remains right in your community where the money should stay.

9. The finest and simplest of rating charts are supplied for your officers and dealers from 6 months thru 84 months.

10. Standard Life will also place a sizeable C. D. with your bank as well.

11. There are no doubt questions or data not covered by this letter, which I assure you I will look forward to discussing and answering.

12. We write Creditors Life and Disability for over 100 branch banks and lending institutions in California.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. HORST, *Manager.*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, first, I congratulate the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) for once again coming to the aid of consumers who are the innocent victims of excessive charges for consumer credit insurance.

As the figures he gave us demonstrate, each month the Congress delays in passing this legislation is costing consumers about $18 million in overcharges. In a period when many family budgets are pulling apart under inflationary stress, this waste of money is particularly trying.

Senator PROXMIRE has highlighted magnificently the points developed during the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearings. It would be burdensome for me to repeat them.

This bill, if enacted, will help keep rates within reasonable limits. But it will not be a cure-all for other problems growing out of consumer credit insurance. There are steps which States can take, and I urge that serious consideration be given to them—and soon.

Most important, perhaps, is a recognition that consumer credit insurance premiums may be used to bypass State usury laws.

When nearly 35 percent of the Companies' finance charge income comes from credit life and disability premiums, I do not think it unreasonable to suggest that these charges may be a slight of hand means of charging the consumer more than usury laws allow.

Certainly they are a cost of credit to the consumer. With that in mind, it would make sense to me if the States once again adopted the practice of including all credit charges as one finance charge—subject to State usury laws.

Companies told us during our hearings that they needed the credit life and disability income to stay in business. This may be so. But if it is, let them convince the State legislatures to amend the usury laws.

We fought the battle with truth-in-lending to make sure consumers would know the exact percentage of finance charges they are paying. It makes no sense to allow credit life premiums—and other tacked-on finance charges—to undermine that legislation.

The States can help the consumer in other ways:

Fifteen years ago—when the Antitrust Subcommittee first held hearings on consumer credit insurance under Senator Langer—a number of unsavory practices were turned up. Many of them are still in existence today in States with lax enforcement. These include:

First. Pyramiding: Piling of one loan on one yet unpaid in order to get the fatter interest charges on the beginning on each loan.

Second. Excessive coverage: Selling a policy for more than the loan or to run months longer than the payoff term.

Third. Not refunding unearned premiums and finance charges on early payment or refinancing of loan.

Fourth. Not passing on benefits to survivors.

Fifth. Improper handling of claims.

Sixth. Nondisclosure.

Seventh. Coercion.

As I said, these are practices the States should stop in order to assure that the consumer gets full value from his credit life policy.

Should the bill be passed, it will enable the Federal Reserve Board to do more than stop excessive charges.

The Board may consider the limitations, exceptions, and exclusions in policies in setting rate ceilings.

A number of creditors complained that some of their large competitors with low credit life and disability rates used policies containing such exclusions and limitations. They expressed the fear that unless rates took these factors into account, smaller creditors would be driven out of business.

Obviously such a limited policy is worth less to the consumer, too—and he should pay less for it.

Mr. President, in cosponsoring this bill I do so with a sense of urgency. I hope that early hearings can be arranged so that the roll can be called soon. Eighteen million dollars a month is a lot to pay for nothing.

S. 1756—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT OF 1921, AS AMENDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, many farmers have become concerned about the growing number of cattle being fed by meatpackers and large grocery chains, fearing that the packers might use their own livestock to maneuver market prices.

If a packer were to slaughter large numbers of livestock from his own feedlots in any single week, he could reduce substantially the demand for livestock in his buying area that week and thus lower the price in that area temporarily.

The best protection for farmers against meatpackers thus using their own livestock to manipulate the market is full publicity. Therefore I am introducing a bill to require each meatpacker and chain stores which slaughters its own livestock to report fully to the Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, on packer feeding and on the marketing of its own livestock—week by week—and that this information be posted in a prominent place at all stockyards and all buying points for such a packer.

Most farmers are able to select from several market outlets, so any meatpacker who carried on such an operation could soon be discriminated against by farmers if they thought that he was manipulating his own cattle or sheep to lower prices he paid to farmers.

I am suggesting also that the Economic Research Service, Department of

XUM

Agriculture subsequently use these reports to make an objective study of the actual effects of such packer feeding on market prices paid to farmers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1756) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, in order to require packers and chain store firms to make public certain information relating to the number of cattle fed by them each week, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1757—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE SOCIAL SECURITY CHILD BENEFITS AND TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a number of people in Utah have called my attention to the need to assist low-income widows or widowers who have one or more children receiving social security child benefits, and who have great difficulty in providing the 50-percent support requirement necessary to take an income tax exemption for the child or children.

Child social security benefits are considered a child's own contribution to his support, and in a low-income family they may cover a substantial part of that child's expenses. The widowed mother or father must, therefore, keep very detailed records of expenditures for each child in order to claim dependency, and this is sometimes hard to do, especially in the difficult days which immediately follow the death of the other partner.

In order to help widows or widowers in these hard circumstances, I am today introducing an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a child's insurance benefit received by an individual under the Social Security Act be disregarded in determining whether such an individual is a dependent of a taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1757) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a child's insurance benefits received by an individual under the Social Security Act shall be disregarded in determining whether such individual is a dependent of a taxpayer, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1757

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of dependent) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Child's Insurance Benefits Paid under Social Security Act.—For purposes of subsection (a), amounts received by an individual as a child's insurance benefit under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act shall not be taken into account in determining whether such individual received more than half of his support from the taxpayer."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 86—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE 7-DAY PERIOD BEGINNING OCTOBER 19 AND ENDING OCTOBER 25 OF EACH YEAR AS NATIONAL PLAY SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit for myself and my colleague from New York (Mr. Goodell) a joint resolution designating the week of October 19–25 as National Play Schools Week.

Today, play is considered an essential and powerful force in the lives of children. It is a force which helps children to learn while they are developing emotional and social maturity. As a study published in the New York Times of September 10, 1967, observed:

> With the sharpening of psychological insight, we have learned that play is the first important step in education, character development and social adjustment.

For more than five decades, play schools throughout our Nation have enabled thousands of American youngsters to become better citizens through healthy and constructive play activities. National Play Schools Week recognizes both the importance of play in promoting this development and the role of the play school in furthering it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 86) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning October 19 and ending October 25 of each year as "National Play Schools Week," submitted by Mr. Javits (for himself and Mr. Goodell), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 87—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE TO 18 YEARS.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a proposed amendment to the Constitution to extend the franchise in all elections, Federal, State, and local to citizens 18 years of age or older.

Measures to lower the voting age have been introduced in the Congress frequently ever since the First World War. I have supported a lowering of the voting age to 18 throughout my service in the Senate, and I think the adoption of a constitutional amendment to bring this about is long overdue.

Many of my colleagues in the Senate will recall that during my years as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia as we pressed for home rule here in the Nation's Capital, I actively supported legislative provisions to establish the voting age at 18 years.

In the 87th Congress, the Senate District Committee favorably reported District of Columbia elections legislation recommending that the vote be allowed at age 18. However, as passed, the bill (H.R. 8444) established the voting age at 21.

Again in 1965 in the 89th Congress the District Committee reported and the Senate approved home rule legislation calling for 18-year-old voting—but the measure failed in the House of Representatives.

To me, Mr. President, there has never been any sound argument offered in opposition to a lowering of the voting age. There is no special wisdom that is magically acquired on reaching age 21. And indeed, heavy responsibilities come to young Americans long before they reach the present magic age.

Our young men bear the grave obligation of military service. Too often they find themselves in armed combat facing death for their country nearly 3 years before they are permitted to vote.

But this "old enough to fight, old enough to vote" argument—however compelling it may be—is not by any means the sole rationale for a change in the voting age.

Our young citizens today are better educated, better informed, and better equipped to participate in our democratic form of government. The average person of 18 today undoubtedly knows more about issues, events, politics and government than his counterparts and even many of his elders did at the turn of the century.

There is the question of maturity. When does a person become mature enough to cast a wise and intelligent ballot? Again, I say, there is no magic in age 21.

When an American citizen becomes mature enough to enter into and be held to his contracts, earn his living, pay taxes, start a family, become a soldier, and take on many other responsibilities at age 18, I say he or she is mature enough to vote.

I realize that certain events in the past few years seem to work against 18-year-old voting proposals. We have heard and read about irresponsible demonstrations on our college campuses and elsewhere by militant youngsters who seem to feel they are entitled to determine higher education policies and other matters. At times some demonstrations have degenerated into rowdyism, and were not the kind of performance to inspire confidence in the maturity of our younger generation.

These occurrences do not stand as a valid argument against a lowering of the voting age. We must maintain a proper perspective, and understand that the militants and renegades who foment and fuel campus and other disruptions are but a tiny minority of our young people. For every rowdy demonstrator there are thousands of serious, responsible, hardworking youngsters going about their daily business of earning a living or getting an education. They do not make television and newspaper headlines, but they constitute legions of socially minded men and women who are eager to register their opinions and have their views made known through the orderly democratic process of the ballot box.

XUM

Mr. President, I believe a lowering of the voting age to 18 will be a tonic for the entire electoral system in the Nation. Today, I understand that on the average some 30 percent or more of our registered voters fail to get to the polls on election day. Many others do not even bother to register.

I think the injection of a younger voting element would spark more activity among the present electorate, and would bring to bear on public issues a larger and better rounded public voice.

It is high time that the Constitution recognizes that the bulk of the population of the United States is growing younger as the years pass. More and more of our younger citizens want to participate in their government. Their votes will enrich our democracy. I hope and urge that this Congress will act favorably on the necessary Constitutional amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 87) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, introduced by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1478) to establish a Commission on the Antitrust Laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 437) to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, is is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 421) to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the bill (S. 422) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER and Mr. SCOTT) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 849) to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1478) to establish a Commission on Antitrust Laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1433) the Draft Reform Act of 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1611) to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) be added as a cosponsor of the bills (S. 1482) to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act so as to permit the granting of injunctive relief in suits brought to enforce the provisions of contracts between employers and labor organizations, (S. 1483) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny tax-exempt status to labor organizations which use membership dues or assessments for political purposes, and (S. 1547) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to require an employer to pay for unnecessary services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, Friday, April 4, is the first anniversary of the tragic death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

His was a truly great life, and his ideals are worthy of our remembrance. It is for this reason that I introduced, on January 15, 1969, a resolution declaring that day, the day of his birth, a day of commemoration. At this time it gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE); the junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON); the senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD); the junior Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL); the junior Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL); the junior Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN); the senior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS); the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART); the senior Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE); the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD); the junior Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES); the junior Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE); the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON); the senior Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER); the junior Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS); the junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE); the junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON); the senior Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON); the junior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL); the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE); the junior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF); the junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER); the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS); the senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS); the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH); and the senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) designating January 15 of each year as "Martin Luther King Day."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1708) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1968 (78 Stat. 897) and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 73) to amend the Constitution to allow 18-year-olds to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15—RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF A SENATE DOCUMENT, A COMPILATION OF THE STUDIES ON THE SURVEY OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

XUM

S. CON. RES. 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on the Survey of the Alliance for Progress prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations, and the hearings held relating thereto, with illustrations.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 176—RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION TO CONDUCT A PILOT STUDY OF THE FINANCIAL NEEDS OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS WHICH MUST MODIFY PLANT, EQUIPMENT, OR PROCEDURES IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH RECENTLY ENACTED FEDERAL HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. HARRIS and Mr. METCALF) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. RES. 176

Whereas several recently enacted Federal statutes, establishing Federal standards for health and safety, require many small business concerns, not previously subject to Federal regulation in such areas, to conform to strict standards under Federal or State law; and

Whereas for many small business concerns compliance with such standards may require substantial outlays of capital for new plant facilities, equipment, or procedures; and

Whereas meeting such capital needs will be extremely difficult if not impossible for many such small business concerns without assistance; and

Whereas Federal aid, counsel, assistance, and protection to small business concerns in the interest of preserving free competitive enterprise is a declared policy of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to determine whether or not a special program to provide financial assistance under the Small Business Act may be necessary to enable small business concerns to comply with certain Federally imposed standards relating to health and safety, the Small Business Administration is hereby requested (1) to conduct a pilot study to determine the extent to which small business concerns engaged in meat processing operations need financial assistance in effecting compliance with the Wholesome Meat Act; the extent to which such financial assistance may be obtained for such purpose from commercial sources; and the extent to which such financial assistance is available under existing Federal programs; and (2) to submit the results of such study to the Senate, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems appropriate, at the earliest practicable date, but not later than sixty days after the approval of this resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON "ECONOMICS OF AGING: TOWARD A FULL SHARE IN ABUNDANCE"

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Special Committee on Aging will conduct hearings on "The Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance" at 10 a.m. on April 29 and 30 in Washington, D.C., in room G–308, auditorium, New Senate Office Building.

Testimony taken on those 2 days will continue an intensive study by the committee on many matters related to retirement income, including: the widening income gap between Americans living in retirement and those still in the labor force; effects of rising productivity and inflation upon fixed incomes; projections of future inadequacy of public and private pension systems; income maintenance of widows—a particularly disadvantaged group; effects of rising medical costs; problems associated with homeownership and taxation; and implications of early retirement trends.

It is our hope to provide a public forum for intensive discussion of matters that concern not only the present population of 20 million Americans past 65, but also on matters that should be of concern to those in middle age or younger who are encountering problems in providing adequately for their own retirement years.

As chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, I invited four experts in the field of aging to submit a working paper which would provide essential information and perspectives on subjects that will receive committee attention at hearings.

They have provided such a document, and it has been published for the use of the committee. While the findings in the working paper are tentative and subject to change by the members of the task force, I believe that the publication of the study is an important and timely event. As I said in the preface to the working paper:

> As no other document has yet done, it states a fundamental truth:
>
> The economic problems of old age are not only unsolved for today's elderly, but they will not be solved for the elderly of the future—today's workers—unless this Nation takes positive, comprehensive actions going far beyond those of recent years.

A section of the working paper entitled "Facts and Findings: The Task Force Report in Brief" provides a clear picture of the many subjects that should receive committee attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Finally, I would like to thank the task force members—Dr. Juanita Kreps, Ph. D., professor of economics, Duke University; James Schulz, assistant professor of economics, University of New Hampshire; Agnes W. Brewster, consultant on medical economics; and Harold L. Sheppard, Ph. D., staff social scientist, W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research—who enthusiastically responded to my request for their help by contributing knowledge and thought. Special gratitude goes to consultant Dorothy McCamman, whose interest in policy questions raised in the working paper is deep. She has served in Federal agencies, as a technical adviser for the White House Conference on Aging in 1961, and as a staff member of the Committee on Aging. Without her hard work and long experience, the working paper could not have been written.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMICS OF AGING: TOWARD A FULL SHARE IN ABUNDANCE—FACTS AND FINDINGS

THE TASK FORCE REPORT IN BRIEF

I. Americans living in retirement are suffering from an income gap in relation to younger people. And as the gap widens, low income continues to be the Number One problem facing most of our 20 million persons 65 years or older, as well as other millions just a few years younger.

The "gap" is widening: Median income of families with an aged head with 51 percent of that for younger families in 1961, but only 46 percent in 1967.

Three out of 10 people 65 and older—in contrast to one in nine younger people—were living in poverty in 1966, yet *many of these aged people did not become poor until they became old.*

An additional one-tenth of our aged population was on the poverty borderline.

About five in 10 families with an aged head had less than $4,000 income in 1967; about one in five was below $2,000.

Of older people living alone or with nonrelatives in 1967, half had incomes below $1,480, and one-fourth had $1,000 or less.

Even the level of living set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in its Retired Couple's Budget is well beyond the means of most older people, especially for those who retired years ago. The average social security benefit of a couple retiring in 1950 met half the BLS budget cost then, but today it meets less than one-third.

Unemployment and early retirement among the 60 to 64 population are creating problems that demand much the same attention as that required by the population aged 65 and over.

II. More Americans are spending more years in retirement periods of indeterminate length and uncertain needs, causing a mounting strain on resources they had when they began retirement. For an ever-rising proportion of women—most of them widows—the problem is especially severe.

Half of all people now 65 and over are about 73 or older. In the years ahead, the increase will be particularly great at the oldest ages. With the population 65 and older projected to rise 50 percent between 1960–85, the population 85 and older may double.

Increasingly, the rising population of widows is attempting to live independently, even if independence is purchased at the price of poverty.

Our "retirement revolution" reflects two trends: at one end an increase in the number of very old aged; at the other, earlier departure from the labor force.

III. Unless positive action is taken, the economic position of persons now old will deteriorate markedly in the years ahead.

National economic growth, while putting added dollars into pockets of the working group, increases pressures on the retiree. A rise in earnings of 4 percent annually—a not unrealistic assumption in view of recent performance—means consumption levels would approximately double in two decades, placing those on fixed income at a seriously deepening disadvantage in the marketplace.

Earnings drop as advanced age further curtails already limited earnings opportunities. (In comparison to the age group 65–72, only half as many men 73 and over and a third as many women worked in 1962, and the earnings of the oldest workers were significantly lower.)

Assets are reduced—in some cases, exhausted. Homeownership—the most important asset of the elderly—becomes—especially difficult to maintain with advanced age, mounting taxes and other rising costs.

XUM

Medical needs and the costs of meeting these needs rise with declining health. The rise in these costs is only partly met by Medicare, which covered 35 percent of health costs of the aged in 1967.

Inflation erodes already inadequate incomes over longer retirement periods. (An annual rise of only 2 percent will reduce the purchasing power of fixed incomes by 18 percent after one decade and by 33 percent after two decades.)

IV. Today's inadequacies in retirement income—and the policies and trends that perpetuate them—should be of direct concern not only to our population of aged and aging Americans, but also to those in middle age or younger. Most parents today face a common problem: How can they allocate earnings to meet current obligations to their family and still have something left over for retirement?

The margin for saving—the excess of income over consumption expenditures—has been small for most families during most years of the worklife, especially for workers in the less skilled occupations.

In addition, with an outlook for sustained economic growth, how realistic is it to expect today's workers voluntarily to forgo consumption in order to save for the years ahead when this requires that they *significantly reduce their present standard of living to provide adequately for an uncertain and "distant" old age?*

V. Projections and various studies indicate that Social Security, private pensions, and other forms of retirement income are not improving fast enough to reverse or significantly counter present economic trends.

The overwhelming proportion of people retiring today receive total pension income—from both public and private pensions—which is only 20 to 40 percent of their average earnings in the years prior to retirement.

Of families retiring in the next decade and a half, it has been projected that almost 60 percent of those with preretirement earnings between $4,000 to $8,000 will receive pension income of less than half these earnings.

Projections to 1980 indicate that about half the couples and more than three-fourths of the unmarried retirees will receive $3,000 or less in pension income. And these projections use relatively liberal assumptions with respect to increases in private and public benefit levels.

The same projection found that more than two-thirds of retired couples could be expected to receive less than $3,000 in social security benefits in 1980.

Even under earlier projections, now known to be too optimistic, only a third to two-fifths of all aged persons in 1980 were expected to have income from private group pensions.

In addition, private pensions cover less than half the work force and this coverage is concentrated among higher paid workers; those in the greatest need in old age will be least likely to receive these pensions.

Early retirement is a developing trend that could seriously impede attempts to improve the income position of future aged populations. (In recent years, more than half of the men retiring have done so before age 65.)

Among the proposed methods of raising the incomes of the aged population are various proposals for improved pensions, constant purchasing bonds, tax relief, increased public services, and improved welfare payments. No single proposal, however, can be expected to have a significant impact unless tied to broad policy decisions.

VI. Facing what must be recognized as a worsening retirement income crisis, the Nation must take positive, comprehensive actions going far beyond those taken within recent years. The Nation faces these basic policy issues:

What is an adequate level of income for retired persons?

What part in attaining this level should be played by governmental programs, by voluntary group action, and by individual effort?

Is the economic problem of aging a temporary problem that requires a different solution or a different "mix" of solutions for today's aged than for those reaching old age in the future?

CONCLUSIONS

The task force has not attempted to enumerate and evaluate the many policy alternatives that have been recommended to deal with the economic problems of the aged. There are, however, a number of important conclusions which we feel are supported by the statistics summarized here and discussed more fully in the Report:

Low income in old age is *not* a transitional problem that, given present trends, will solve itself.

Unless action is taken now, most aged will not have sufficient income to provide in retirement "A healthful, self-respecting manner of living which allows normal participation in community life."

The Social Security system has failed to keep up with the rising income needs of the aged.

To a large extent social security benefit increases in the past have resulted, not from legislation with the purposeful intent of tapping a greater part of the rising national product for old people, but rather as a secondary result of attempts to deal with the severe and potentially explosive hardship problems facing many older people. In consequence, these past efforts have been aimed primarily at maintaining the economic status of the aged at some minimal standard or subsistence level in the face of rising prices.

Sufficient evidence now exists to spotlight certain special economic problems of the aged which compound the general problem of low income. Among the areas identified for immediate congressional attention are:

(*a*) Income maintenance of widows—a particularly disadvantaged group.

(*b*) Health needs and rising medical costs.

(*c*) Problems associated with homeownership and taxation.

(*d*) Employment opportunities in old age.

(*e*) Implications of early retirement trends.

Simultaneously, congressional attention should be directed to (1) the various techniques for measuring and projecting the income needs of the aged population and to their use in decision making and (2) the appropriateness of methods now used or proposed for use in the adjustment of retirement benefits to changing conditions.

A reasonable definition of adequacy demands that the aged population, both now and in the future, be *assured* a share in the growth of the economy.

If old age is to be more than a period when people decline and die, some way must be found whereby the aged, who have helped in the past to provide the basis for rising living standards, are guaranteed a share in some of the "harvested fruits". What this requires is a substantial transfer of income from the working to the retired population in order to improve the *relative* economic status of the aged.

Such assurance can *best* be provided, or can *only* be provided, through governmental programs, particularly the social insurance system of OASDHI, which carry commitments for future older Americans—the workers of today—as well as for this generation of the aged.

The financial soundness of the Social Security system depends, essentially, on the Government's taxing powers which, in a vigorously growing economy, permit great flexibility to meet changing retirement needs. And retirement needs *are* changing as expectations rise and as American families increasingly begin to evaluate the adequacy of their retirement income in relation to their standard of living prior to retirement.

Private group pensions and personal savings—tailored as they are to individual needs, preferences, and financing ability—will continue to be essential supplements to basic social security benefits in the future. The Government should explore and lend support to various methods of promoting and encouraging such supplementary sources of retirement income.

FRANCO'S BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT MUST NOT BE TOLERATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the United States is negotiating for renewal of air and naval bases in Spain under circumstances which can be described as only extortion. It was announced last Thursday that Secretary of State Rogers and the Spanish Foreign Minister have agreed in principal on the conditions for maintaining these bases and that both governments are confident that terms for renewal can be worked out promptly.

Dictator Franco's original demand for extending the leases called for a military aid package of more than $1 billion. This was later scaled down to $700 million, and reportedly now to $300 million with a pledge that the United States will come to Spain's aid in case of attack. In other words, Franco feels that the United States should pay him for the privilege of protecting Spain.

These bases are part of the NATO defense system. I have visited our naval and air bases in Spain and conferred with our officials there. Without doubt these bases are completely unnecessary so far as the defense of the United States or Western Europe is concerned. Officials in the Pentagon have yet to produce convincing evidence that they will be in any way necessary to American and Western European security in the 1970's.

When the original agreements were signed with Franco in 1953, these air bases were crucial as forward bases for strategic bombers of limited range. Their importance diminished—in fact, disappeared—with the coming into service of B–52 bombers and intercontinental missiles based in the United States. The naval base at Rota serves our Polaris submarine fleet in the Atlantic and Mediterranean. However, the facts are that our Polaris submarines can remain under water for 300 days and nights, and they could be based on our east coast without in any way decreasing their effectiveness as a deterrent force.

Unless officials of the Defense Department can produce compelling arguments for our retaining these bases—and to date they have not done so nor can they do so—the administration should politely inform Franco's Foreign Minister that the United States no longer requires these bases and will evacuate them within the specified year.

Apart from the fact that these bases are no longer of any benefit to us whatever, the political cost of renewal is likely to be greater than the military benefit. Millions of liberty-loving Spaniards regard our tremendous aid to Franco as the most powerful factor in keeping this dic-

XUM

tator in power. The fact is that today the Spanish people are deprived of even the rudiments of civil liberty, parliamentary rule and democratic processes. We would do well to consider the wise words of John Gunther in his book, "Inside Europe Today":

> It is always dangerous for a democracy, like the United States, to become too closely involved with a dictator or semi-dictator, no matter how convenient this may seem to be. It is the people who count in the long run, and no regime is worth supporting if it keeps citizens down . . . if only for the simple reason that they will kick it out in time.

The administration should give more serious consideration as to whether retaining these useless bases is worth the growing political liability of a major American military presence in Franco's Spain. These bases will almost certainly become the focus for anti-American sentiment after the Spanish people have gained greater freedom whether it be before or after the death or retirement of Generalissimo Franco, whose coffers we have enriched by hundreds of millions of dollars. This, despite the fact that Franco has been flirting with the Soviet Union as part of his blackmail attempt on the United States, and has been one of Fidel Castro's stanchest supporters. Franco has maintained an airline to Cuba, and Spain annually purchases $40 million worth of goods from Cuba and sells Cuba about $60 million to $70 million worth of goods, some of them strategic. Nevertheless, while the United States cut off aid to other nations trading with Cuba, we continue to give military assistance to Franco.

Franco would not be dictator in Spain today except for the help he received during the Spanish Civil War from Hitler and Mussolini. In March 1946, the State Department published a "white paper" on Spain which exposed Spain's intimate relations with Nazi Germany. It contains a letter to Hitler on February 26, 1941, in which Franco states:

> I stand ready at your side, entirely and decidedly at your disposal, united in a common historical destiny.

Mr. President, in 1946 the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States agreed that so long as Franco remained in power, Spain could not participate in the United Nations. At that time it was hoped that Franco's power would collapse and a democratic government established in Spain.

In 1953, an astonishing turnabout took place when it was decided that the United States required naval and air bases in Spain. The United States signed three military aid agreements with Spain. Franco by this single act acquired international respectability. In 1955 Spain was admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Thus, the United States, the greatest democracy in the world, changed overnight from contempt to high appreciation for Franco. This development has continued.

However much American foreign policy has changed, there has certainly been no change in Franco Spain. It is still a tyrannized nation with a ruthless fascist dictator in power.

The time is long past due for our country to reexamine a policy whereby we have supported and enriched one of the world's most powerful dictators. To allow our country to be blackmailed by him must not be tolerated. We should state definitely that if Franco is willing to contribute to his own country's defense by providing bases for American warships and warplanes, that is agreeable to us. Let it be clear that we will not pay bribes. If this is not agreeable to him, we should close our bases there and get out as soon as possible.

LET BRAGGART KY LEAD THAT BOMBING MISSION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, now that the flamboyant braggart, Vice President Ky, of the Saigon militarist regime, makes public statements that he will defy the United States and resume bombing of North Vietnam and that his regime will unilaterally make the decision to bomb the north, it would be good news indeed if this tinhorn air marshal would carry out his statement. Ky says:

> Our planes are ready. There is not any reason why we can't bomb Hanoi.

He boasts he will do this "in retaliation for the nationwide Communist offensive in the south." He further threatens:

> I ask for retaliation. If they continue to shell Saigon we should go ahead and bomb Hanoi.

This arrogant pipsqueak has never been bashful about urging engagements that would cost the lives of young Americans, but he has been noticeably reticent in exposing himself to any danger whatsoever.

More Americans have been killed in combat in Vietnam than were killed in combat throughout the entire Korean war which was fought by the way, under the flag of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I urge that Air Marshal Ky personally lead South Vietnam warplanes on a bombing mission over Hanoi. American officers in Saigon should encourage Ky to undertake this mission provided he personally leads it and really makes his boast good and drops some hundreds of thousands of pounds of bombs on targets in North Vietnam.

I conclude by saying, "Good luck Vice President Ky. Make good your boast. If you are shot down and killed or captured few Americans would have any feelings of sorrow." If this braggart and phony air marshal, who was born and reared in North Vietnam, who served in the Air Force of the French Government in 1954, and fought against the forces of his own countrymen seeking national liberation until the forces of the French colonial oppressors were defeated, should lead his Air Force in a bombing mission over North Vietnam and be captured or killed, I would not experience any feeling of sorrow. Why not encourage this tinhorn air marshal to make good his boast.

Ky delayed the peace negotiations in Paris nearly 4 months. Then, the South Vietnamese delegation, brought and maintained in Paris at our taxpayers' expense, did nothing except hold lavish receptions. After Ky finally arrived with a delegation of 100, he first insulted Ambassador Harriman, making a public statement calling attention that he wore a hearing aid. While American taxpayers are bearing the expense of this social reception in Paris, we tolerate Ky preening himself, insulting Averell Harriman, a very great American, and denouncing Defense Secretary Clark Clifford.

It is a sad situation that we, a great nation, humiliate ourselves to a dictator who once said that Adolf Hitler was his hero and who, along with his cronies in the Saigon regime, has deposited many millions of American taxpayers' dollars in Swiss and Hong Kong banks.

The Saigon militarist regime is incapable of making peace. Reason: Thieu and Ky have a vital interest in continuing the war and the bloodletting. Their political and perhaps even their physical lives depend upon it. When the civil war in South Vietnam is brought to an end Thieu and Ky will rendezvous with their unlisted, but well larded by corruption, bank accounts in Hong Kong and Switzerland. They will get out fast when American GI's no longer sustain them in power in Saigon, and then no doubt leisurely join the colony of other ex-dictators on the French Riviera and Swiss Alps.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CIGARETTE HAZARD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, support for the proposal of the Federal Communications Commission to ban cigarette advertising over the air is to be found in an editorial carried recently in the Catholic Review, published in Baltimore, Md., and sent to me by its editor, Mr. A. E. P. Wall. The editorial also expresses an interesting idea on the responsibility of Government in finding other productive uses for the land now growing tobacco for cigarettes. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CIGARETTE HAZARD

If you live on the far side of the generation gap you may remember some of the old slogans: Not a cough in a carload . . . it's toasted . . . they satisfy.

Today the slogan is less soothing: "Caution: Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

Earlier this month the Federal Communications Commission proposed rules to prohibit cigarette advertising on radio and television. More recently, State Sen. Edward Azrael of Baltimore has proposed that the warning now printed on cigarette packages be included in cigarette advertising within Maryland's borders.

The Azrael proposal would apply to advertising on billboards and posters, on television and in magazines published in Maryland and having more than 60 per cent of their circulation within the state.

Because television and radio stations are granted licenses to use the public airways in the public interest, the Federal Communications Commission is acting properly in seeking an end to cigarette advertising over the air. There is reasonable evidence that the promotion of cigarette smoking is contrary to the public interest.

Cigarette commercials on radio and television today constitute a dangerous form of air pollution. The air, in this case, belongs to the public and is used under public license. It has long been obvious that harmful narcotics should not be promoted over the air, and it is becoming obvious that cigarettes should be excluded as well.

It is to be hoped, in fact, that newspapers will take a new look at cigarette advertising in terms of public service and public responsibility.

There is another obligation, however, in connection with discouraging the use of cigarettes. This is the obligation, which must be assumed by government, to find and to encourage socially productive use of lands and facilities now devoted to tobacco growing and cigarette manufacture.

A unified program to help the tobacco farmer move into a more useful form of agriculture, to prohibit all cigarette advertising on radio and television and to continue educational efforts concerning the dangers of cigarette smoking is a major national need today.

Nothing is more tragic than to see countless human lives going up in smoke.

RETIREMENT OF BRIG. GEN. RICHARD I. CRONE, NATIVE OF UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator Magnuson I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the retirement of Brig. Gen. Richard I. Crone, a native of Utah and presently the commanding general at Madigan General Hospital in Tacoma, Wash.

General Crone has had a distinguished military career. After graduating from medical school at the University of California and serving in private practice for 1 year, he was commissioned a 1st lieutenant in the Officer Reserve Corps on January 1, 1939. He served a short time as a surgeon at Letterman General Hospital and was assigned as regimental surgeon for the 38th Infantry, Fort Douglas, Utah, and afterward attended the Medical Field Service School at Carlisle Barracks, Pa. During World War II he served at various hospitals in the United States until assigned to the China-Burma-India Theater in March 1945.

He returned to the United States in June 1946 and served on the medical service staff of Madigan Army Hospital, 1 year as senior resident and then assistant chief of the medical service. After duty overseas for several years, General Crone returned to Madigan General Hospital as chief, department of medicine and director of medical education. In 1963, he left Madigan to serve as chief, department of medicine and consultant to the surgeon general on internal medicine at Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, D.C. General Crone returned to Madigan in 1965 and became commanding general.

Senator Magnuson and I wish to congratulate General Crone on his outstanding military career. We wish to thank him particularly for his efforts in reducing the incidence of child poisonings.

Under General Crone's direction, post exchanges in Tacoma, Wash., began dispensing children's aspirin and all prescription drugs in child-resistant containers. Accidental poisonings from aspirin dropped 97 percent; poisonings from prescriptions dropped from a rate of one every 5,100 to one for every 62,300 prescriptions.

Because of the initiative and foresight of General Crone and his staff, I will soon introduce legislation authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to require the child-resistant packaging of hazardous household substances. The initial protection extended to Army children in the Fort Lewis-McChord area of Washington will soon be extended to all children in the United States.

Our thanks go to General Crone for paving the way to the prevention of child poisonings and we congratulate him on his many accomplishments in his distinguished military career. We send best wishes to the general in his new role as civilian advocate for preventive medical care.

DEPLOYMENT OF ABM SYSTEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there appeared before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament, on March 28, 1969, three distinguished preeminent Americans; namely, Dr. W. K. H. Panofsky, Dr. Donald G. Brennan, and Dr. G. W. Rathjens.

These gentlemen gave very able testimony with respect to the issue of the deployment of the ABM system and I ask unanimous consent that their statements be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by W. K. H. Panofsky, Before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, March 28, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate very much having the opportunity to testify before your committee on this important issue. I am speaking to you as an individual scientist who has been interested in the ABM problem for a long time, beginning with my service on a special ABM subpanel of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Air Force in 1955, and continuing in various advisory roles.

To clarify the record I would like to state that I did not participate in any advisory capacity to any branch of the government in reviewing the decision to deploy the current modified Sentinel or Safeguard System—I appreciate having had the opportunity for an informal discussion with Mr. David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, several weeks ago prior to the Modified Sentinel decision.

I consider the arms race between the USA and the Soviet Union one of the great tragedies of our time. For this reason I very much welcomed President Nixon's statement that he had especially intended the ABM decision not to interfere with forthcoming talks between the U.S. and the Soviet Union on limiting strategic offensive and defensive forces on both sides. In particular I welcomed the President's statement that any contemplated ABM deployment should not be interpretable by the Soviets as threatening their deterrence against the U.S. Accordingly President Nixon emphasized the role of an ABM system in protecting our retaliatory force in contrast to a full city defense. In this particular connection I agree emphatically with the other testimony you have heard that a city defense would escalate the arms race because it would cause the Soviet Union serious concern about its ability to deter us from a first strike attack against them. I therefore opposed the old Sentinel deployment precisely because it could be expanded to grow into a heavy city defense and also because in my view the argument for a thin ABM against Chinese aggression lacked validity. I will say more about this particular role of Sentinel later.

My principal criticism of the modified Sentinel-or-Safeguard System therefore relates not so much to its stated purpose but rather to its present urgency and to the actual technical concept of its planned execution. The stated aims of the modified Sentinel System are both defense of the hardened Minuteman sites and of our strategic bomber bases. Additional objectives are protection against accidental launch and protection against a limited Chinese attack. The urgency of proceeding with deployment is attributed to the newly raised technical possibility that the Soviets may have developed a "first-strike" capability by 1975. What does first-strike capability mean? It means in principle that the Soviets could launch an attack so highly synchronized that it would at the same time take our Polaris fleet, our strategic bombers, and our Minuteman force out of action to the extent that they could not launch a retaliatory attack sufficient to penetrate Soviet defenses.

I would like to express considerable skepticism that an attack of the kind envisaged by the Department of Defense witnesses could be mounted by the Soviets with any confidence of success. One has to recognize that such a "first strike" implies that the Soviet decision makers would have to make a rational decision for such a fully coordinated attack and that in the absence of having carried out any operational tests involving nuclear warheads they would have confidence that such an attack would actually work. I consider this to be an extremely implausible projection of our available intelligence, including that concerning the SSG9. I can think of no better prescription for accelerating the arms race than taking the position that we must prepare a fully safe counter-measure for any technically imaginable contingency. It is this kind of planning which, from the narrow point of view of the military, may appear conservative but which can lead to disastrous consequences for the survival of the U.S., or in fact, the entire world.

Next, let me say that I specifically object to the inclusion of bomber defense in the modified Sentinel plan as an element of a defense against a first strike. Bombers can take off from their runways on very short delay. If we did imagine a coordinated attack both on our missile sites in the north by multi-megaton missile warheads, and at the same time an attack from the sea on our bomber bases, then the amount of warning available from the ICBM attack against our missiles would be adequate to get the SAC bombers into the air. On the other hand, if the bomber bases were attacked first, although part of the bomber force might not escape destruction, our missiles would be intact and the Soviet planners would know that they would be exposed to a retaliatory strike from our Minuteman force. They also know that the Minuteman force by itself far exceeds the level of destructive capability required for a retaliatory second strike. Furthermore, in a period of heightened international tension it is possible (as we have done in the past) to put our SAC bomber force on "airborne alert", that is, to keep a substantial fraction of them in the air at all times to give additional security against a successful first strike. Finally, I am very concerned that the inclusion of the bomber defense beyond Phase I in the modified Sentinel plan makes the system less easily distinguishable from a first step toward a city defense which would, as President Nixon has said, be provocative.

In short I can see no justification whatsoever for including bomber defense in an ABM system designed to protect our retaliatory force.

How is the present modified Sentinel actually configured? The first chart shows the Defense Department's presentation. As you see in Phase I which is the only decision now under consideration, only two of our Minutemen bases are to be protected but in the follow-on phases bomber bases are also to be defended, some of which are in areas fairly close to cities but not near any Minuteman launch sites. It is this component of the system which I conclude lacks validity in the context of the President's statement. I recognize that the Administration's proposal is for a phased deployment and that only Phase I is now to be authorized with further deployment to proceed on a year-by-year basis after suitable review. I note, however, that no operational experience will have originated from Phase I before the scheduled decision on Phase II is to be made.

I want to turn now to serious criticism of an engineering nature in connection with those installations which are intended to protect the Minuteman force. My point is that an economical hardpoint defense—that is a defense of sites which have already been hardened to withstand impact of megaton weapons at relatively close distances—requires a design greatly different from a defense of soft targets such as cities. The next chart tabulates this comparison. The Sentinel System was originally designed to defend "soft" targets, but now essentially the same components have been taken over for a completely different purpose (The exception is that additional faces have been added to the MSR radars for looking in all directions.) Let me elaborate on the differences.

1. A hardpoint defense radar can be much simpler and cheaper than one intended for city defense since it is permissible to intercept the incoming missiles at very much lower altitudes where the atmosphere has done most of the job in filtering out decoys or any innocuous material accompanying the warhead.

2. The defense installation should be extremely hard itself if it is going to be able to defend a set of hard targets. The MSR radars can withstand an overpressure of less than one-tenth of what can be tolerated by the missiles they are to defend. Clearly an enemy in planning a first strike would attack primarily the more vulnerable radar and thereby deny the effectiveness of defense.

3. For the hard point mission the short-range missiles required for terminal intercept could be much smaller and simpler than the Sprints which cost about two million dollars each.

Time does not permit me to elaborate on the other differences in requirements for a hard point defense and a city defense; I may only say here that they would demand different engineering solutions.

Now one can always give the usual "but it is better than nothing and we need it now" argument. Here I again disagree. The defense as described here is still very imperfect. To maintain their present threat to Minuteman the Soviets could defeat the present system with its relatively small number of anti-missiles by increasing their offensive forces correspondingly.

If one believes that the Soviets are preparing for a first strike—and if future Soviet missile deployments make this interpretation more plausible than it is now—we may need a really effective defense of our missiles and surely the cost to achieve this is far from irrelevant; inefficient design of the system for this purpose would make such a race a losing one for the United States, quite apart from the strong incentive to prevent this kind of a race at all.

Let me comment on the two additional stated objectives of the modified Sentinel System. In addition to defending the land-based bomber and missile retaliatory force, it is intended to provide protection against a single accidental launch of enemy missiles, and protection against the emergent Chinese nuclear missile threat. The modified Sentinel system does indeed give some protection against a small accidental launch and I consider this to be a valid objective. However, the degree of protection it does offer is highly limited. For one thing the chance of such an accident occurring is in itself directly related to the level of armaments and the degree of tension in the world, and therefore heightening of the arms race increases the likelihood of an accident. On a more technical level the effectiveness of the modified Sentinel in preventing damage from an accidental launch would depend very much on the nature of the accident. If it were due to some malfunction of control, the "accident" could include the dispersal of decoys or could involve multiple warheads; then in general the Sentinel System could be penetrated. It is true that a single accidental launch might be stopped by the Sentinel; however, here we have the practical problem of whether the state of alertness of the system in peacetime can be kept at a high enough level that it would be effective against a single incoming missile. In short, I agree that the modified Sentinel has some limited value in providing protection against accident.

Protection against a Chinese attack was the initial motive for proposing deployment of the original "thin" Sentinel System and it has remained one of the objectives of the modified system. The President has agreed that active city defense against a heavy Soviet attack is ineffective as well as being provocative, and that prevention of nuclear war through deterrence or other means is our only fruitful approach to safety. The proponents of an active thin city defense against Chinese attack are thus implying that deterrence would not be acceptable protection in relation to China. At present we have two forms of protection against Chinese nuclear attack: One is deterrence—we can indeed inflict enormous damage on the Chinese in case of an attack on their part. We also have preemptive capability, that is we could strike Chinese launch sites which might emerge in the 1970's without fear of substantial retaliation. At present the U.S. has an undeniable first strike capability against China, that is, we could resort, but happily have not chosen to, to a nuclear attack without fear of retaliation on their part. All the Modified Sentinel System would do is to extend by an uncertain period the time over which this country would have such a first strike potential against China.

To summarize, if the Soviet threat continues to grow rapidly I would support development of a system which would truly implement the President's decision to defend the hardened Minuteman sites. I am aware of many studies which have shown that should our Minuteman force be seriously threatened it would be cheaper to increase our Minuteman force rather than to defend it. However, I also agree that it would be less provocative to the Soviet Union to defend the force we have, rather than to increase it. Such a defense should be efficiently designed for this purpose and for this purpose only. The Modified Sentinel or Safeguard is simply a reconfiguration of the City Defense Sentinel and I consider its deployment an unwise decision from many points of view: engineering judgment, economy, and stopping of the arms race. And this last goal is more important than all others.

TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ABM

City defense—High-value target

Intercept at high altitude.
Long fly-out range.
Soft or slightly hardened Radar.
Decoy discrimination at high altitude.
Complete elimination of incoming missiles.
Cost per anti-missile may be substantial.
Number of anti-missiles related to strength of enemy force.

"Hard point" defense—Low-value target

Intercept at low altitude.
Short fly-out range.
Very hard Radar.
Atmosphere eliminates decoy.
Attrition of incoming missiles.
Anti-missiles should be inexpensive.
Number of anti-missiles related to number of retaliatory missiles protected.

STATEMENT BY DONALD G. BRENNAN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, MARCH 28, 1969

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee. It is a privilege for me to appear before you. The last time I was thus privileged was when I appeared before the sessions of the full Foreign Relations Committee in 1963 to record my support of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I appreciate your willingness to hear me in this present setting, to set forth some views I know some of you now oppose. It is encouraging that there may still be some open minds.

Let me tell you something of my background for speaking on ballistic missile defense, which I shall call BMD for short. My main professional background and training were technical, and came primarily from MIT, with which I was associated in various ways from 1951 to 1962. However, I acquired a strong interest in arms control and other aspects of national security policy beginning in about 1957. I joined Hudson Institute as its first president in 1962 and continued in that capacity to 1964, when I resigned the presidency but continued there since to conduct studies of arms control and other problems of national security policy. I edited, and wrote part of, the special issue of *Daedalus* on arms control (fall 1960) and its successor book version titled *Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security*, published by George Braziller in 1961, a book that was endorsed by Senator Fulbright among others. I have continued to write frequently on such matters and I now edit the new international journal titled *Arms Control and National Security*. I have been following the technical developments in BMD for about the past twelve years and have closely studied the strategic and political implications for about the past six years. A more detailed biographical sketch is attached at the end of my statement.

It might be useful to remark that my first widely circulated paper on missile defense was a satire written in 1958, called "Project Turnabout", that implicitly ridiculed some of the technical possibilities for missile defense then being studied. I was opposed to the deployment of BMD to protect cities until about the middle of 1964. Since then I have tended to favor such deployment, though not necessarily any possible program at any possible time.

I should like to stress that I am appearing here purely as an individual, and I do not speak for anyone else at Hudson Institute, nor for anyone in the Government or elsewhere. This is especially important to stress because I shall advocate a more substantial defense of cities than the deployment cur-

XUM

rently recommended by the Administration, and you should not blame them for my views.

Let me now turn to the substance of the issues before us. I should perhaps warn you that some of the things I shall say are quite different from the statements you have been hearing.

Broadly speaking, there are two main possible applications of ballistic missile defense: for the protection of strategic nuclear offensive forces, and for the protection of people and civil resources. The program announced by President Nixon on March 14 has elements of both kinds. The program is intended to lead to a defense of offensive forces that would protect at least some of those forces against a substantial Soviet attack. And it is intended to provide substantial protection of the population against a modest attack, of the sort the Chinese might be able to mount in the 1970's or that might result from unauthorized launch of a portion of the Soviet force. The component intended to protect people is of a kind called "area defense" and is based on the long-range Spartan missile; it would not provide very much protection against an overwhelming Soviet attack.

I shall come back to the subject of city defense, to which the bulk of my statement is devoted, but let me mention a few thoughts about protecting offensive forces. I have not reviewed all of the detailed considerations that led to the new program, but those I did review made it appear that the decision was sound. However, it has in any event been clear for some few years that Soviet offensive-force developments might at some time require improvements in the protection of our own offensive forces, and it should not be surprising if that time is now upon us. The Department of Defense has conducted major studies of alternative means of improving this protection, and it has always been clear that BMD was one of the potentially attractive alternatives. Many or most of the critics of BMD for cities—at least among those with some sophistication—have been potentially or actually willing to support BMD for offensive forces; for example, Hans Bethe, in his statement to this Committee on March 6, said that he was in favor of it.

It may be useful to separate sharply two questions about protecting offensive forces. First, to what extent in what circumstances is an increase in that protection justified? Second, what is the best means of increasing that protection? The second question is of a highly technical nature not well adapted to public, or even Congressional, inquiry, and some of the arguments being heard about BMD probably belong to the first question. For example, if someone says he is opposed to BMD for offensive forces because he would rather spend the money on social programs, it is not always clear if he would equally oppose spending perhaps even more money on super-hard silos or on a rail-mobile deployment system for Minuteman.

It is possible to conceive that the detailed scale and timing of expenditures for protecting offensive forces could properly come under Congressional scrutiny, though this would represent a new thing and I am not sure I should favor it. It would in any event have to be done in executive sessions, with sensitive information. It does not seem at all feasible to me to have such scrutiny of the decision as to the best means of providing the protection. The judgment about the best means should be based on a complex of factors that can scarcely be grasped whole by a full-time Secretary of Defense. That a Committee of the Congress could meaningfully penetrate such a judgment seems to me most unlikely.

There are, however, some very important questions that are highly appropriate for Congressional consideration, and I shall return to these.

Let me now turn to the subject of city defenses. The new Administration program is aimed at developing, in an evolutionary way, an area defense that would protect the country against light attacks. It seems to me that beginning the program in this way, at least in general terms, is eminently sensible. However, it also seems sensible to me that the program should ultimately evolve toward a system that would provide more substantial protection. The discussion of these possibilities has become polarized between the terms "thick" and "thin", which is unfortunate because there is a continuous spectrum of possibilities; however, I do favor something "thicker" than the "thin" area defense.

In this regard, I seem to some extent to be on the side of Senator Gore. Senator Gore said, in the secret Senate debate on BMD on October 14 last, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 22, page 29180:

"We have three choices: First, not to deploy; second, to deploy a thin or reasonably effective—maybe—system; or, third, to proceed to deploy vigorously what we would hope to be an effective defense.

"We have chosen here the middle course. It is, in my view, the least advisable course. I would have greater trouble in reaching a decision as between not deploying at all and deploying an effective system. I have little trouble with opposing the deployment of a reasonably effective system. I believe it carries with it many of the disadvantages—politically, militarily, and so forth—carries few of the positive advantages of an effective defense."

The main positive advantage of what Senator Gore called "an effective defense" is, of course, that it might save tens of millions of American lives in the event of a major war, and make an enormous difference in the ability of the country to recover. I have attached to my statement, for insertion in the record, a paper titled "The Case for Missile Defense", in which the arguments for an effective defense are set forth. This paper is similar to an article of mine of that title just published in the April 1969 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, but the attached version has a few more details. I shall here simply summarize in outline form the main points that seem to me to emerge from that analysis.

1. It appears that BMD systems costing less than half the cost of our present air defense system might (in the context of wars that could possibly occur in the mid-1970's and later) reduce U.S. fatalities from levels approximating half the populace to levels approximating ten per cent of the populace, and, by protecting perhaps 90 per cent or more of U.S. resources in production and transportation, facilitate much more rapid economic recovery. There is some chance the system would perform much more poorly than intended, but also some chance it would perform much better. The expected performance would be substantially more important for the country than the expected performance of the air defense system in the past would have been.

2. The Soviets could wholly nullify such a defense only by expenditures on the general order of the cost of the defense itself, or, possibly, more. Thus, quite apart from the fact that much strong evidence indicates that the Soviets are not determined to nullify any and every defense we might build, they would face substantial budgetary and bureaucratic problems in doing so. A partial offset of the defense would be less expensive, but correspondingly less of the insurance value of the defense would be nullified.

3. In view of the fact that a major research and development program on means of penetrating missile defenses has not in several years disclosed any cheap and reliable penetration technique against a good defense, the estimates of the preceding two paragraphs appear to have a stability that begins to approximate our confidence in the security of our best offensive weapons.

(As a parenthetical side remark, on purely historical grounds it should scarcely be surprising that the virtually untrammeled superiority that the offense has enjoyed in the past two decades is beginning to be somewhat trammeled.)

4. As concerns the fundamental of deterrence, it is not a basic requirement of U.S. national security that we be able to kill 74 million Soviet citizens and destroy 76 per cent of their industrial capacity, or whatever such numbers are selected, independently of the circumstances and of the Soviet ability to destroy the U.S. The perception that we have such a requirement seems to have contributed to the (apparently false) perception that the Soviets have the same requirement, and this latter idea has contributed to putting us in our present posture, which has been aptly termed a posture of "Assured Vulnerability" by Steuart Pittman. I do believe it is a U.S. requirement to be able to do at least as badly to the Soviets as they could to us, but this principle does not require a posture of "Assured Vulnerability," and would permit the deployment of defenses in both superpowers, at least with substantial limits. The original justification for the posture of the superpowers in past years—that we had to deter because we could not defend—seems to have become distorted in some minds into the false idea that, because we must deter, we cannot defend.

5. If for no other reason than that no foreseeable defense system will reliably reduce hostage levels in the superpowers below several millions, the deployment of BMD will not significantly increase the likelihood of war. Because of the complexity a defense imposes on an attack, BMD seems more likely to reduce this likelihood.

6. The propensities for offense-defense arms races would be dominated by prevailing U.S. and Soviet attitudes as long as defense appears to be sufficiently effective as to require comparable expenditure to nullify it. U.S. attitudes at present are mixed, with some favoring deployment of defenses and some opposed. Soviet attitudes seem much less mixed, indeed they seem almost universally to favor emphasis on defenses. Thus it appears that similar U.S. emphasis on defense would probably be the most stable way of avoiding an offense-defense arms race as well as being most desirable from other points of view. The U.S. should stop responding to Soviet defenses with major increases in its own offensive forces, and respond instead with damage-limiting programs of its own; and senior U.S. spokesmen should most certainly stop trying to persuade the Soviets that they must respond to a U.S. defense by increasing Soviet offensive forces. The possibility of an offense-defense race could be further reduced with explicit if informal U.S.-Soviet understandings about strategic forces, giving first priority to controls on offensive forces, with second priority to constraints on defenses, or perhaps no limitation on defenses. However, as long as Soviet offensive forces remain at or above present levels, I do not believe the possibility of a substantial U.S. defense should be excluded by such an understanding.

The United States and the Soviet Union clearly have a large common interest in reducing the scale of potential damage that could result from a war. This common interest is at the heart of arms control. We do *not* have a common interest in *precluding* the possibility of limiting damage.

That completes my summary of the strategic issues as I see them.

I should like now to return to the matter of which questions in major defense policy seem to be appropriate for Congressional consideration. I have already indicated that some

XUM

do not seem appropriate, such as the selection between alternative weapon systems that would accomplish similar objectives. You may occasionally wish to review the Department of Defense for their general competence in handling such matters, but you cannot generally do that kind of work for them.

There are of course several kinds of decisions where it has long been recognized that a Congressional role is vital. These generally involve important interactions between the Defense Department and the citizenry as a whole. For example, the overall level of the defense budget is a major factor in how heavily we are all taxed; draft policies influence which of our young men shall serve, and for how long; and the general kinds of forces we maintain will relate to the foreign policies the Administration is permitted or encouraged to pursue. Such examples are easy to multiply.

I should like to suggest to you that there is one area of decision that has not previously been recognized explicitly as one of Congressional concern, but which seems to me at least potentially appropriate. One of the two most important points I wish to make to you in this statement is to suggest that explicit consideration might well be given within the Congress to the relative emphasis to be given to strategic offensive forces, on the one hand, and strategic defenses on the other. From the early 1950's until five or six years ago, the technical prospects for an effective defense did not seem very bright, and we became accustomed to protecting ourselves primarily by deterrence—the threat to destroy others if we were attacked. Now, however, it begins to appear feasible to shift an increasing degree of our protection to active defense—the ability to reduce the consequences or an attack. It will not be possible for the foreseeable future to shift complete reliance to defense, but important differences of degree appear quite possible. The strategic debate of the recent past has not generally been carried on in these terms, but I believe this is the proper framework.

The reasons this area may be appropriate for Congressional concern is that it involves an important interaction between the Defense Department and the citizenry as a whole, namely, what fraction of the population and the resources of the society should be at risk in the unlikely event deterrence fails and there is a major war. Stated another way, one may view the procurement of defenses as something like insurance, and the question of how much insurance is enough, in view of the costs and risks involved, is one that is plainly appropriate for a political process. Of course, it will be clear to you that, as an expert. I have my own views on this matter. But it will also be clear to you that, as an expert, I have found the quality of the treatment of this problem by the Administration in recent years very disappointing.

There would be some potential difficulties in attempting to address this problem directly in a political framework. However, I believe that untutored public opionion in this area may be at least as reliable a guide for general policy direction as more sophisticated but basically superficial theories that are sometimes compounded with false information. For example, although the overwhelming majority of public statements concerning BMD in recent months have opposed deployment, the Harris Survey released February 3 reported that people favor a buildup of a system of anti-missile defenses by 61 to 23 percent, or almost three to one. It is not clear, but presumably likely, that the people interviewed were thinking at least implicity of city defenses.

The other of the two most important points I wish to make here concerns disarmament. I have read most of the other statements presented to you in these hearings, and I do not find that there has been much discussion before this Subcommittee on Disarmament Affairs of the subject of disarmament. The reason for this may well be that, as the only witness you have heard who is advocating what Senator Gore called an effective defense, I may be the only one you have heard who has a plausible theory of how you can do a lot of strategic disarmament. You can do it with defenses. Let me sketch roughly how it might go, complete with a possible timetable.

We might begin at once with a Soviet-American understanding about a ceiling on offensive forces, expressed in inspectable terms such as gross weight, and an understanding that we might both build up defenses. Such an agreement is clearly in the common interest of both the United States and the Soviet Union and should prove realizable. By the mid-1970's, if the defenses are in place and appear to have the capabilities now expected of them, there should be enough confidence in them to begin some gradual reductions of the offensive forces on both sides, reductions which would require only modest inspection because the defenses would (if suitably deployed) sharply diminish the effectiveness of clandestine missiles. The defenses would then become even more effective against the then-reduced offensive-force threat, which would facilitate further relations in offensive forces. Just how far this process might go would depend on the technological and political circumstances then prevailing, but I should not be surprised to find that by 1980 one might reduce the risk of Soviet-American strategic nuclear war to negligible proportions. The defensive forces themselves might, of course, be reduced along the route, but not eliminated. It should be clear that there would be some effective "disarmament" of the offensive-force potentials as soon as the defenses were working, even before direct reductions of the offensive forces.

In contrast, I do not believe any of the distinguished witnesses who preceded me have even the beginning of a plausible program for achieving major disarmament of the offensive forces by 1980. I believe it can be virtually guaranteed that it will not prove possible in this time period without substantial defenses. I should mention that following the program sketched here might lead to a strategic situation outside the range analyzed in my appended paper, but presumably it would actually go that far only if it appeared feasible, as I believe would be likely.

In addition to my own paper, I have attached below a very recent paper by my colleague Mr. Johan Holst, who has translated a recent article from *Izvestia* on American BMD and provided a brief but very persuasive commentary on current Soviet perspectives on the subject.

That completes my prepared statement. I shall, of course, be delighted to respond to questions and discussion. While I am fairly familiar with technical details, and willing to answer technical questions as far as I can, my primary expertise is in the strategic, political, and arms-control aspects of missile defense, and suggest that we should emphasize these areas if possible.

Statement of Donald G. Brennan

Donald G. Brennan is a mathematician and student of national security problems. His special interests are in advanced military policy, alliance relationships in Europe, and selected areas of arms control, such as policy issues relating to ballistic missile defense.

Prior to joining Hudson Institute, of which he was President from July, 1962 until May, 1964 and where he now conducts research studies, Dr. Brennan worked for nine years as a research mathematician and communication theorist at Lincoln Laboratory of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, engaged in technical studies for the Government. In addition to his technical research there, he devoted substantial time to studies of arms control and national security problems.

Dr. Brennan's serious interest in arms control began in 1957, when he was organizer of a group that led to the 1958 Summer Study on Arms Control held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, under the auspices of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In 1960 he was an organizer and co-director of the Summer Study on Arms Control, again held in Cambridge under American Academy auspices, in which some sixty experts participated. He was a member of the Academy's Committee on International Studies of Arms Control in 1961–66, serving as its chairman in 1961–62, and has been a frequent participant in international conferences relating to arms control.

Dr. Brennan has served as consultant to the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Executive Office of the President, and is a member of a Task Force on the Defense Science Board. He is editor of the well-known anthology, *Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security* (New York, George Braziller, 1961), sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and guest editor of its predecessor, the special (fall 1960) issue of *Daedalus* on "Arms Control". He is editor of the new international journal *Arms Control and National Security* and has edited studies of future military technology. He has contributed articles on arms control to a number of journals, and has lectured on national security subjects at Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of California, and defense study centers in London, Bonn, Paris, and Oslo, among others, and has given seminars on arms control in Moscow.

Born in 1926, Dr. Brennan received the B.S. (1955) and Ph.D. (1959) degrees in mathematics from Massachusetts Institute of Technology), where he was a Gerard Swope Fellow and received other graduate and undergraduate prizes and awards. Prior to entering M.I.T., he was engaged in radio engineering as a registered professional engineer in the State of Connecticut. He is a Senior Member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers and a member of Sigma Xi, the American Mathematical Society, and the Institute for Strategic Studies, London. He was a member of the President's National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation Year in 1965.

Statement by G. W. Rathjens, Before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U.S. Senate, March 28, 1969

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity, and am honored, to appear before you to comment on the question of our deployment of an antiballistic missile defense system. I have an advantage over most of the other opposition witnesses whom you have heard in that since they have appeared the President and members of his Administration have spoken on the subject. The nature of the new deployment is now known in a least its broad outlines as are the President's views about the objectives and implications. I will focus my attention mainly on that deployment, and on some of the Administration statements regarding it.

Before doing so, however, I should like to make it clear that I share many of the views and reservations of other witnesses whom you have heard. I do not believe the ABM question can be intelligently considered apart from other aspects of our strategic policy. Thus, it seems to me that Dr. Killian's suggestion of a thorough, independent review of our whole strategic posture and the objec-

XUM

tives to be served by it is an excellent one. And, I share the concerns of Drs. Bethe, Kistiakowsky, Ruina, and York about the possibility of a catastrophic failure of the defense; about the need to delegate responsibility for launch of interceptor missiles to low command echelons or the computer if there is to be any chance that the system will be effective, especially in coping with accidents; and about the unrealism of assuming that the system could provide anything like a damage denial capability against a Chinese threat. Their statements regarding these points apply just as forcefully to the new deployment plan as they did to the old.

Because the President and particularly Messrs. Laird and Packard have placed such emphasis on Minuteman defense in the new plan, and because that subject has not been dealt with very fully by other witnesses, I would like to devote a major portion of my testimony to it. Two questions must be asked:

1. Are our strategic retaliatory forces likely to be so vulnerable to preemptive attack in the near future that a decision must be made now to remedy that vulnerability?

2. If so, is the deployment of the proposed Sentinel ABM defense for Minuteman the preferred way of dealing with the problem?

The Administration's decision implies an affirmative answer to both questions. In my judgment the answer to both is almost certainly negative.

I would first note that our strategic forces now have the capability to deliver over four thousand nuclear warheads against an adversary. Less than one tenth of that force could, according to former Secretary of Defense MacNamara, destroy over 75% of the industry and 30% of the population of the Soviet Union, the latter figure being almost certainly a low estimate since it is based on immediate and easily calculable fatalities with those that are delayed and difficult to quantify being neglected. During the time when Sentinel is being deployed the number of warheads our strategic force can deliver will be increased to ten thousand or so assuming implementation of present plans to replace large fractions of our Minuteman and Polaris force with new missiles carrying several warheads each. Even without adding to this the fact that we also have several thousand nuclear warheads in Europe, some of which could be delivered by tactical force against the USSR, a preemptive strike against us in the mid-70's would seem like madness on the part of the Soviet leadership unless they could have extremely high confidence of being able to destroy at least 95%, and more likely 98%, of our retaliatory force.

I would not claim that the development by the Soviet Union of such a first strike capability is impossible, but it is at worst a distant prospect. It could come about through the development of *all* of the following: (1) a capability to deliver very large numbers of warheads with extreme accuracy, (2) an extraordinarily effective anti-submarine warfare capability, (3) a considerably improved air defense capability, including the ability to cope with the air-to-surface missiles we will introduce into the bomber force, and (4) a large-scale nationwide ABM system to intercept U.S. missiles that might have escaped destruction before launch. The development of such capabilities would be exceedingly time consuming, costly, and difficult, particularly considering the Soviet need to have a capability of destroying virtually all of our land and sea-based missiles *nearly simultaneously* since they could hardly count on our delaying retaliation very long after the first few of our missiles were destroyed. Clearly the Soviet Union has *none* of these capabilities at present. Development of most of them should be evident to us through our intelligence collection well before they are operational.

Thus, the determination that action is now needed to cope with a potential mid-70 threat to our retaliatory capability seems decidedly premature. I know of no basis for believing that the concatenation of events required to place our retaliatory forces in jeopardy by the mid-70's is even a remote possibility.

Though the President did not, in his Sentinel announcement, refer to Soviet *intentions* to develop a first-strike force, Secretary Laird has made much of that possibility. Indeed, he has claimed it as an absolute fact, apparently based not so much on Soviet capabilities or even hard estimates of future capabilities as on his conclusion that there can be no other rational explanation for the Soviet SS–9 program. To me, there would seem to be at least two others that are plausible: the desire to have some ICBM's that can carry warheads that are well-matched to the size of American cities (which are much larger in area than those of the USSR); and a possible Soviet desire to have a large number of boosters that could be efficient carriers of multiple warheads or other aids to facilitate the penetration of a possible large-scale U.S. ABM deployment.

It is probably worth considering briefly the actual SS–9 capabilities for attacking our Minuteman force. According to Mr. Packard the SS–9 force might number 500 by 1975. Clearly a force of that size would not be a serious threat unless multiple individually targettable reentry vehicles (MIRV's) were employed since even with perfect reliability and accuracy it could destroy at most half the Minuteman force. With realistic degradation to take account of reliability, even a force two to three times as large as Mr. Packard has suggested would not suffice to destroy enough Minutemen so that the survivors alone could not inflict unacceptable damage on the USSR.

If one assumes that highly accurate MIRV's are developed by the Soviet Union and deployed on the SS–9's they might pose a greater threat. If the Soviets can do as well in achieving high accuracy as we apparently expect to do (according to the figures released in late 1967 by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Nitze), then a 500 missile Soviet SS–9 force might destroy three quarters of the Minuteman force. Again, the survivors alone would be more than enough to inflict unacceptable damage on the USSR.

Thus, one must assume a much larger force than Mr. Packard estimates, a more advanced MIRV technology than we expect to have ourselves (and so far we are probably leading the USSR), or both if the SS–9 is to be a critical threat to Minuteman.

But, however tenuous the basis for the argument, the Administration has clearly decided that our retaliatory capability may be threatened in the mid-70's, and that action is now required to insure that it will not be. If indeed such an essential element of American strength as our retaliatory posture may be in jeopardy, I would suggest that defense of Minuteman using Sentinel components is hardly a high confidence solution.

Other witnesses who have appeared before you have testified on the question of the reliability of such complex systems as ABM's Their testimony in itself should cause us all to have serious doubts about the wisdom of the decision. The Administration is asking great forebearance on the part of the American public when it attempts to persuade them that our retaliatory capability is in jeopardy, and then offers as a solution to the problem a system in which they can have no more confidence than in Sentinel.

However, even if Sentinel could be counted on with high confidence to perform exactly in conformance with specifications, there would still be reason to doubt that it would be a good solution to the question of possible Minuteman vulnerability.

It would be surprising if such a design were optimal or even close to it considering that the interceptor missiles and radars were designed to defend very vulnerable cities rather than very invulnerable missile sites. The problems of the two kinds of defense are fundamentally different. One can tolerate near misses in the case of a defense of Minuteman that would be catastrophic if they occurred near large cities. The design of the defense should take advantage of that fact.

The missile site radar (MSR) is probably particularly badly matched to a defense of missile sites. It will be highly vulnerable compared to the ICBM sites themselves, and hence will be a prime target for the attacker. Furthermore, it is so very expensive that redundancy is likely to be quite impractical. A "leaky" defense that might be quite satisfactory for protecting ICBM's themselves will hardly be satisfactory. Rather one must have the same kind of perfect defense of the radars that would normally be required for cities, for if the radars are destroyed the whole defense collapses and the missile sites are as vulnerable as if there had been no defense at all. Thus, the defense *must* allocate a very large fraction of its efforts to defending radars. This is particularly awkward with the components proposed because of the very great geographic expanse of the Minuteman bases and the short (25 mile) range of the Sprint missile. This means that Sprints that are deployed to defend the radar cannot be used to defend the Minuteman that are on the periphery of the complex, and the Sprints near the periphery of the complex cannot defend the radars. Indeed, such Sprints would almost certainly never be of any use whatever since the offense would presumably not attack ICBM's near them until the radar had been destroyed.

Assuming the offense will know the Sprint deployment, it can calculate with high confidence exactly the number of warheads required to overwhelm the defense by simply exhausting the interceptors. If it does so, and delivers that number in an attack against the radar, it is clear that with the defense deployment being considered, the cost of saving a single Minuteman missile is likely to be at least in the 25 to 100 million dollar range (compared to its procurement cost of perhaps 4 million dollars).[1] Slightly less conservative offensive tactics may make the results very much more unfavorable to the defense.

But that is not all. The foregoing assumes the Soviets use missiles to attack the radars that could otherwise be used to knock out Minuteman. They hardly need do that. Instead they could effectively attack the vulnerable radars with whatever number of the more numerous, less expensive, smaller missiles would be required to exhaust the interceptors, conserving their more accurate, higher yield weapons for use against our ICBM's. If the Soviets chose such an attack option, and if the threat to Minuteman is, as alleged, from a Soviet SS–9 missile force, the defense would not be effective *at all* in saving Minuteman.

Before concluding my discussion of the defense of Minuteman, I should emphasize that I would not necessarily oppose a defense if it should appear that at a future date our retaliatory forces would indeed be in jeopardy, and if a defense could be built with components better tailored to the job required of them. A defense might well be preferable to some of the other options for strengthening our retaliatory capability such as simply multiplying the size of our ICBM force.

I would favor research on such an optimized defense, and I believe there is time for it. I would also like to see a vigorous program on other means of insuring the invulnerability of our retaliatory capabilities such as reducing the noise level and extending the range of our sea-based forces if they are

---

[1] Since such estimates have been regarded with some incredulity I have included a brief appendix in an effort to show that they are plausible.

XUM

indeed as threatened as Secretary Laird leads us to believe.

But above all, I believe the most effective, and I might say the cheapest, means of insuring that we can maintain an adequate retaliatory force is through the earliest conclusion of an agreement with the Soviet Union to curtail the strategic arms race.

In concluding, I should like to comment briefly on two other aspects of the proposed Sentinel deployment, and I have in mind the effect of the 12 site nationwide deployment, in contrast to the initial defense of Minuteman. I am concerned that the nationwide deployment could well lead to an escalation in the Soviet-American strategic arms race, and that it could serve as an impediment to terminating that race.

First, it is to be pointed out that the history of the strategic arms race has been one of each side reacting not so much to adversary capabilities as to fears of possible adversary developments. Thus, our original Sentinel decision appears to have been triggered not by the development of a Chinese ICBM capability, but rather by concern that such a capability might appear in the 1970's; and the President's decision to include a defense of Minuteman as a component of Sentinel is clearly being made in *anticipation* of the possibility that our retaliatory forces might some day become vulnerable. Two factors dominate this action-reaction phenomenon: The need to react in an anticipatory way because of the lead time required to deploy modern weapons systems; and the fact that the greater the uncertainty about adversary intentions and capabilities, the more likely will be an overreaction.

With these observations in mind, it would seem unlikely that the Soviet Union could totally discount the possibility that despite our statements to the contrary, the U.S. might later attempt to expand its ABM system into one designed to blunt the effects of a Soviet Retaliatory strike. Implementation of the announced plan would reduce the lead time and facilitate such a deployment particularly as the components we propose to use for the modified Sentinel defense are for the most part identical to those proposed by the Army for the Nike X deployment. Parenthetically, it is to be noted that there would be much less ambiguity about a defense specifically designed for defending hardened IBCM's; it would be far less likely to provoke an escalation of the arms race.

The determination that we should attempt to maintain a capability to defend against a possible Chinese attack will clearly be a further stimulus to the Soviet Union to increase its offensive capabilities for it implies a rapid and continuous upgrading of Sentinel on a nationwide basis as the Chinese threat evolves, and as technology changes.

In this connection, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that perhaps the most disturbing quality of an ABM system is the extraordinary uncertainty that must apply to estimates of its performance. This has been well brought out in the testimony you have heard, and by comparison of that testimony with Administration and contractor claims about expected performance. The sad fact is that while we can have almost no confidence in an ABM system's working, an adversary can have almost no confidence that it will not work. Thus, we must expect the Soviet Union to react to even a "light" or "thin" deployment as we have to their Moscow defenses by very substantially improving offensive capabilities, not because an ABM system *will* be effective and not because it *will* be expanded, but simply as a conservative hedge against those possibilities. The result will almost certainly be an expensive expansion in the arms race with no increase in protection, and, indeed, possibly with a diminution in security for both sides.

The deployment of the proposed ABM system is also likely to impair our efforts to limit the arms race by mutual agreement. The difficulties lie in a formulation of a definition of "thinness" that might be applied to systems that would be permitted under any agreement, and in the establishment of mutually acceptable procedures for verifying that systems were not being dangerously upgraded in their capabilities. Without verification arrangements that would probably be unacceptably intrusive, I doubt whether we could ever have adequate confidence that a nationwide Soviet ABM system was of such limited capability that we could accept a lengthy freeze on our strategic offensive capabilities. The point is well-illustrated by our experience with the Soviet Tallinn system. For years there was dispute in the U.S. intelligence community about whether that system had an ABM capability at all. How much more difficult it will be to establish limits on the capability of a system that is clearly designed as an ABM system.

In summary, I believe that if we go ahead with the Sentinel deployment, as modified by the new Administration, we will be acting unwisely.

Inclusion of a defense for Minuteman seems to be based on a much exaggerated view of the threat to our retaliatory capabilities, and is definitely premature. Moreover, the defense proposed would be *at best* marginally effective in saving Minuteman.

The nationwide defense is hardly one in which we can have much confidence. Accordingly, it will be of little, if any, utility in expanding the range of options we will have for dealing with Chinese bellicosity. And because of the command and control problem it would be very likely of little utility in preventing damage to us from accidental nuclear attack.

Thus, we will be buying very little if anything in the way of increased security, but we will be paying a very great price, both in dollars when they are sorely needed for other purposes, and in complicating our efforts to curtail the Soviet-American arms race by mutual agreement. We will very likely have missed a great, and I might say, probably fleeting opportunity to take a new direction in dealing with that problem.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you.

APPENDIX: DEFENDING MINUTEMAN MISSILES WITH THE MODIFIED SENTINEL SYSTEM

The Administration has stated that the total cost of its modified twelve-site Sentinel plan will be 6.6 billion dollars. Seven of the sites, including the first two at Great Falls, Montana, and Grand Forks, North Dakota, will have perimeter acquisition radars (PAR's) and will therefore be more expensive than the five that will not. The Montana and the North Dakota sites are likely to be the most expensive of all not only because they will have PAR radars but because they and two other Minuteman defense sites to be installed later will, according to Secretary Laird, have a considerably larger number of Sprint missiles than the others. Thus, it is probably reasonable to assume that the costs to be allocated to the first two sites should be 700 to one billion dollars each.

It is unlikely that either will have more than 75 Sprint missiles considering that the Administration has announced that the number of Sprints would not be increased significantly over the earlier plan, and that all twelve sites are now to have Sprint defenses.

If our interceptors could be counted on to work perfectly, the largest number of incoming warheads that could be intercepted would then be 75 at each base. Because the missile site radars (MSR's) are not likely to be more than one tenth as hard as our Minuteman silos, the adversary could destroy an MSR using warheads of one tenth (or less) of whatever yield would be required to destroy a Minuteman missile, assuming the same accuracy for both the small and large warheads. This means that an adversary booster carrying multiple warheads could carry about three times as many "radar-killing" warheads as it could "ICBM-killing" warheads.

If the interceptors at each base could destroy at most 75 incoming warheads, then at most 25 Minutemen would have been saved if the adversary were to use some of its missiles to attack the MSR. This follows because the boosters carrying the 75 "radar-killing" warheads could be used to destroy at most 25 ICBM's.

Thus, the cost per Minuteman saved will be 28 to 40 million dollars.

There are many reasons why this estimate is likely to be much too low.

1. If some of the Sprints are deployed too far away from the MSR to defend it, or if there are fewer than 75 Sprints per base, the costs per Minuteman saved could go up sharply—perhaps several-fold.

2. If the Sprints are believed to be less than 100% reliable, at least two would probably have to be allocated to intercept each incoming warhead that might destroy the radar, the effect being to double the cost per Minuteman saved.

3. If the adversary warheads did not have a kill probability of one against the Minuteman (or the radar), the number of Minutemen saved will be decreased, assuming, as is likely, that at least some warheads that would have gone wide of their marks would nevertheless have been intercepted.

4. If, after review, the Administration should decide to terminate the program after completing only the Montana and North Dakota bases, then all of the development and production tooling costs would have to be written off against just the two sites.

5. While we might hope that the Administration's $6.6 billion estimate is correct, costs of similar programs have generally escalated upon implementation.

Considering these reasons, the 28 to 40 million dollar figure above should be multiplied—perhaps by a factor of three to ten. Obviously then, an estimate of 25 to 100 million dollars per Minuteman saved is very conservative.

Two arguments can be made against the foregoing line of reasoning:

1. It can be said that the discussion neglects the effects of Spartan missiles in degrading an adversary attack. On technical grounds this seems like a reasonable approximation. While the offense would of course have to allocate some effort to insuring penetration of Spartan defenses, it would hardly be enough to change significantly the above estimates. In any case, the Administration can scarcely argue otherwise since, in claiming as it has that the Soviet Union need not react to a nationwide Spartan defense by improving its offensive forces, it has implicitly acknowledged Spartan's in-utility as a defense against a sophisticated attack.

2. It can be argued that the discussion fails to consider the bonus effect implicit in the fact that the sites at Grand Forks and Malstrom would offer protection of population against Chinese attack. It is probably reasonable to neglect this considering that the relatively small cities in this area, particularly in the area protected by the Malstrom site, would be unlikely to be hit by the Chinese, in view of the fact that they could as easily attack other far more populous targets, which initially would not be defended at all.

XUM

FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—ORDER FOR PRINTING EULOGIES AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe we are all agreed that April 20, 1969, will be the terminal date for printing in the RECORD the eulogies by Senators to the late Dwight Eisenhower.

I ask unanimous consent that after that date there be printed as a Senate document all of the eulogies delivered by Senators; the eulogy delivered by President Nixon and the benediction by the Reverend Dr. Elson in the rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday, March 30; and the text of the funeral service, including scriptural selections and prayers read by the Reverend Dr. Elson, at Washington Cathedral, on Monday, March 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY: A CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we are all becoming increasingly aware that advances in technology can have a broad and unforeseen impact on the quality of our lives. It was not too long ago that advances in science were hailed almost universally and without reservation as progress, and the application of new discoveries through technology was assumed to be an unmitigated good.

We now have a more sophisticated view of the role of science and technology in our society. We still anticipate the benefits of scientific research and technological development, but through experience we have learned that science and technology will serve us well only to the extent that we insist that it do so. We are gaining a new appreciation of the need to evaluate the long-range impact of technological development.

Mr. President, Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, on March 26 addressed himself to the potential conflict between technology and society in a speech before the Chicago Chapter of the Institute of Management Sciences. Representative GALLAGHER spoke specifically of the threat to human privacy posed by the new technology of information handling. I commend his remarks to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY: A CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

(Speech of Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER before the Institute of Management Sciences, Chicago Chapter, March 26, 1969)

America has produced the richest and most complex society the world has ever known. The major impetus toward our unparalleled prosperity has been our ability to harness our resources and to use the gifts we have received as a nation for the benefit of our citizens. It is not an overstatement to say that technology has created America; at least in the sense that the applications of science have created the life led by most Americans. The fundamental premise of this speech is that technology should be morally neutral—it should have no values itself other than the manner in which society chooses to apply it.

Immediately, however, there can be seen numerous objections to such a premise. For example, it has often been stated that technology opens doors for man, but does not compel him to enter. Yet, it must be realized that in the real world of free enterprise, a logic is imposed which strips such technological advance of its ideal neutrality. The first application of a new technology—the first organization through the door—is likely to make the most money while the last is likely to find it slammed in its face. Risktaking by industry is motivated by the profit factor: thus, whatever neutrality a technology may have is already diluted by the financial facts of its development and the rush for its deployment.

When the decision is made to exploit a new technology, major social and institutional change follows. It is impossible to predict the range or the character of that change. A development and deployment decision is made solely upon the first-order effects, which are customarily profit, institutional advantage, or national policy in the case of federally inspired innovation. The evaluation of the second or third-order effects, such as social costs and value dislocations, only takes place after a technology has been established.

What occurs then is a virtually dictated application of an innovation and the impact upon the rest of society only becomes visible after the technology has become operative. It is only by the time a sizable investment of money, resources, and commitment have coalesced that society can know what it has really done. The innovation itself becomes a powerful reason for continuing in that direction and the difficulties and the dangers must be, in large measure, either ignored or rationalized. To put it bluntly, the problems have been transferred from ones of engineering to ones of public relations.

To illustrate the current status of technology in America, let us imagine that technology is a heathen idol and that Americans are primitives. What have we, as a society, offered this God in the way of sacrifice?

First, we have given him our air. Our cities form the bottom of an airborne cesspool. Our atmosphere is now so polluted that natural temperature inversions threaten every single person living in large metropolitan areas. For that simplest and freest of commodities—a breath of fresh air—we must depart from our homes and our jobs. The pilgrimage to Mecca for the infidels of America is the summer vacation to a place where man has not despoiled his heritage.

It is interesting to note in this connection that we have saved the whooping crane by creating wild-life sanctuaries and imposing the strictest rules and regulations for the preservation of this species. But man, who emulates the cry that gives the whooping crane its name by his pollution inspired cough, has not been so fortunate. As columnist Arthur Hoppe has suggested, it may be necessary to establish human-life sanctuaries to assure the continuation of Homo Sapiens.

The next sacrifice we have made to the God of technology is our water. All forms of pollution are dumped into our rivers and lakes, and a fresh, pure stream near an urban area is as rare today as a polluted one was earlier in our history. Raw sewage is dumped into rivers from which downstream communities take their drinking water. Lake Erie, according to many observers, can never be reclaimed from technology's abuse. Bodies of water which have existed practically since time began, are now being ruined in a few years.

I would like to call your attention to the recent problem with offshore oil drilling near Santa Barbara. To the best of my knowledge, the crucial social question was never asked: did America need this source of oil? Was it essential to deploy such a risky procedure at this time or could the development stage have continued without deployment? It is my hope that we will learn a great deal from this catastrophic experience. But if past history is an indication, the only lesson will be to cast doubt on the validity of the old cliche: "To spread oil on troubled waters."

In addition to our air and our water, we have not hesitated to make human sacrifices to the idol of voracious technology. Our nation's highways are nourished by the blood of our children and the reports of the mangled victims of auto accidents make even the carnage of Vietnam seem insignificant. In sheer numbers, slaughter on the highways was approximately five times as great last year as were our losses in the tragic Vietnam conflict. In theory, we commit our youth to Vietnam in pursuit of a noble ideal; we destroy our young men and young women on their way to the neighborhood drive-in.

Over all the world hangs the ultimate symbol of the God of technology—the mushroom cloud of atomic holocaust. Mankind genuflects to that God every time we say we coexist on our planet because of a "balance of terror."

I have never felt that there is any true balance of terror, it is only the product of a universe that is out of balance.

How truly irrational we have become may be seen in the following hypothetical example. It is a basic assumption of the cold war, at least in some quarters, that should the American way of life be fatally threatened, we should incinerate those who oppose us. This would, of course, result in our own incineration and quite probably the fallout would make our globe uninhabitable. Yet, those who advocate this course of future action are acclaimed as realists and patriots.

But any man who would propose that all industry stop and all autos be taken from the highways in order to make our atmosphere habitable, would immediately be branded as insane.

So it is sane to destroy the whole world and yet it is crazy to take extreme action to make the world livable. The "balance of terror" has certainly unbalanced something.

The bomb, as terrifying as it is, merely promises the extinction of life All men, be they free or enslaved, have come to some individual understanding with the fact of eventual death. But the latest visitation from the God of technology promises to make us less than human and threatens to make us slaves.

The computer demands that we poor dumb savages offer up our individuality, our dignity, and our privacy.

It provides a new priesthood with a tool to drive us to our knees, to manipulate our actions, to petrify our past mistakes, and makes the sword of Damocles dangle, gleaming with its promise of eventual destruction, in every American's future.

It is extremely important to emphasize that the computer and its applications not only threaten those who are guilty or who wish to conceal their past. The computer threatens us all; yes even that man who must exist somewhere who has never done anything he could not put on his résumé.

The computer is not only a super fast adding machine; it is more than an automated filing cabinet; it is even more than the heart of far-flung communication systems. The application of computer technology, in its most frightening aspect, has perhaps best been described by Erich Fromm in his recently published *The Revolution of Hope; Toward a Humanized Technology:*

"A specter is stalking in our midst . . . A completely mechanized society, devoted to maximal material output and consumption, directed by computers: and in this social process, man himself is being transformed into a part of the total machine, well fed and entertained, yet passive, unalive, and

XUM

with little feeling. With the victory of the new society, individualism and privacy will have disappeared . . ."

The shattered schemes of all the dewy-eyed utopians which litter the shores of history are now conceivable. All the beautiful idealisms which so quickly turned into ugly forms of fascism can now be engineered and implemented. Technology has made the world so small and the computer has given men such a powerful instrument of social control, that individual dreams, which became local nightmares, can now be worldwide catastrophies.

Dr. Ida Hoos, of the Space Sciences Laboratory at the University of California, has called my attention to a poem by Martyn Skinner which says it all:

"Gone are the days when madness was confined
By seas or hills from spreading through mankind;
When, though a Nero fooled upon a string,
Wisdom still reigned unruffled in Peking;
And God in welcome smiled upon Buddha's face
Though Calvin in Geneva preached of grace,
For now our linked-up globe has shrunk so small,
One Hitler in it means mad days for all."

To put it bluntly, all our eggs are in one basket. We can describe where we are by borrowing the terms of one of man's truly great technological triumphs: we are all passengers on 'Spaceship Earth,' following a most uncertain orbit.

This then is the context in which we must consider technology and American society. Ramifications of our actions reverberate in the Capitols of the world; we truly live in a 'Global Village'.

Understanding that we are talking about all men, let us consider what has already happened to many among us who have surrendered totally to the machine and inhuman value systems. Fromm described technological man in these chilling terms: ". . . (H)aving lost compassion and empathy, they do not touch anybody—nor can they be touched. Their triumph in life is not to need anybody. They take pride in their untouchability and pleasure in being able to hurt . . . Whether this is done in criminal or legitimate ways depends more on social factors than on psychological ones."

With the reins of computer technology in such hands, we may very well be racing to our own destruction. Certainly a free spirit is the most obvious victim of such breathing robots, and free government is not far behind.

Dr. F. A. Hayek, who was professor of moral and social science at the University of Chicago from 1950 to 1962, puts the ultimate threat in these terms:

"Man owes some of his greatest success to the fact that he has not been able to control social life. In the past the spontaneous forces of growth asserted themselves against the organized coercion of the state. With the technical means of control now at the disposal of Government, such assertion may soon become impossible."

The assertion of which Dr. Hayek speaks is not only that of organized groups striving to control policy; it is also individual man himself yearning to be a part of the world and to influence the course of events which affect and alter his times. Fromm makes the extremely valuable point that if man were infinitely malleable, if social pressures could force man into any mold, there would never have been any revolutions. Man, however, simply is not made that way. Fromm describes man in these terms:

"The dynamism of human nature inasmuch as it is human in primarily rooted in this need of man to express his faculties in relation to the world rather than in his need to use the world for satisfaction of his phsysiological necessities. This means: because I have eyes, I have the need to see . . . because I have a heart, I have the need to feel . . . in short, because I am a man, I am in need of man and of the world."

The countervailing force which technology and the computer put at the service of repressive interests has been described by a New Left critic of the American scene. I certainly do not endorse the totality of Paul Goodman's ideas, but he does make a number of provocative points. In *Like a Conquered Province*, Goodman says:.

"Human beings tend to be excluded when a logistic" (that is, a computer-oriented) "style becomes universally pervasive, so that values and data that cannot be standardized and programed are excluded, when function is adjusted to the technology rather than technology to function . . . when there develops an establishment of managers and experts who license and allot resources, and which deludes itself that it alone knows the only right method . . . then common folk become docile clients, maintained by sufferance, or they are treated as deviant."

Fromm and Goodman are suggesting a crucial point to those of us in this room. We all have a sizable stake in America as it is today; while we do not oppose change and are undoubtedly not reactionaries, yet we are all, I would suspect, conservatives in the sense that we believe we must build upon the past. Riot and rebellion are obnoxious to us all and we would unite in condemning violence as an instrument of social change. But the question must be asked: does our emphasis on the manipulations of technological culture deny man the opportunity to express himself? Has the erection of intricate social systems which demand, at the very least, the acquiescence of the minority, placed roadblocks in the way of the rational use of human beings? In my view, Fromm and Goodman are implying that imposing a mechanistic culture between man and his needs to affect the world creates rebellion.

Here may indeed be the roots of the violence we see around us. Articulate and aggressive segments of our society are clamoring for increased participation in the decision-making process. Blacks, hippies, students, ghetto parents, and members of the dissenting academy are united in demanding a greater piece of the action or, at the very least, a heightened sense of personal involvement in and control over their own destinies. All around us we see real anger, spreading disenchantment with the political process, and a frequently hysterical assault against the bastions of orthodoxy. Let me make it clear: I believe there is no validity in violence, but in condemning the action of others we must ask ourselves if we do not bear some of the responsibility for creating an environment which, by its inhuman systems approach, contributes to the creation of violence.

When I began my studies of privacy over five years ago, I felt that the reaction of man to a depersonalized atmosphere could be expressed by a quotation from Alfred North Whitehead:

"Men might sink into mere routine repetition of habitual acts and accustomed social processes at a fairly low level, almost brainless, as certain insects can run a stable society though they have no brains."

But seeing problems by the light of the burning ghettos must force a re-examination of all our concepts and a re-evaluation of social and political modes. In any event, it is perfectly apparent that not all "common folk" have become the "docile clients" envisioned by Goodman.

Robert Theobald is concerned with the impact of science and technology on society and the economy. He has written extensively on the problems of modernization, technological change, and economic growth patterns. In 1964, he made a statement which I feel is quite relevant to the issues I am discussing with you this evening:

"Whether increasing violence and social disorder can fairly be laid at the door of the computer is, however, peripheral to the possibility of the development of a police state . . . the generalized use of the computer as a means of societal control threatens to destroy at least the right of privacy, and very probably *all* the present rights, of the individual . . ."

Theobald is not given to making such statements lightly and it is interesting to note that he underlined the "all" in that quotation.

Two years later, in July 1966, my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy was presented with a proposal which probably would have done exactly what Theobald warned might happen. This was the Bureau of the Budget suggestions for a National Data Bank. Those hearings have been so widely discussed that I do not feel I should go into the full story now.

Privacy and Freedom, a brilliant 1967 book by Dr. Alan Westin, and the soon to be published *The Death of Privacy*, by Dr. Jerry Rosenberg have lengthy sections which describe the ramifications of our hearings.

The general problem of computer privacy is now receiving influential attention. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences' Committee on the year 2000 has a working party on "The Social Implications of the Computer." The Director, Dr. R. M. Fano of M.I.T., has informed me that at least a dozen papers will be published this year. The National Academy of Science recently formed a Computer Science and Engineering Board. One of its major undertakings will be to conduct a heavily financed study of computers, data banks, and privacy. Finally, the Harvard University Program on Technology and Society will publish a collection of papers this summer under the title *Information Systems and Democratic Politics*. My 1966 speech, "Science, Privacy, and Law—The Need For a Balance" is to be included.

There is one point I made at the 1966 hearings on "The Computer and Invasion of Privacy," which seems generally misunderstood. I said that we could not be sure that the data contained in such a National Data Bank system would always be used by benevolent men or for benevolent purposes.

Some people felt I was questioning the integrity of officials connected with federal statistical programs: that is certainly not true. In fact, I have a great deal of respect for federal officers involved in data collection and publication but my point was, and continues to be, that we cannot guarantee the level of responsibility of the future users of federally compiled dossiers on Americans.

In addition, it is certainly not a matter solely of integrity. Let me quote a statement made by Supreme Court Justice Brandeis in 1928:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficient. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evilminded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

Erich Fromm provides yet another insight about decently motivated social planners:

"Precisely because the more conventionally minded managers do not lack good will, but rather imagination and vision of a fully human life, they are even more dangerous, from the standpoint of humanistic planning . . . in fact, their personal decency makes them more immune to doubts about the methods of their planning."

A viable democracy depends on an atmosphere in which people can go their own way for the vast majority of their daily experiences and satisfactions. Freedom from either subtle or overt coercion is the birthright of our citizens. In a nation as large and

XUM

as complex as America, which contains so many different ethnic and cultural heritages, no one class of men—no matter how well educated or how nobly motivated—can impose the standards of their group on the remainder of American society.

I would like to illustrate this from first hearings conducted by my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy. In 1965, we investigated in-depth the premises, principles, and procedures of those who create and administer psychological tests. These were decent liberal men whose goal was to understand our society and to move toward a sound, scientific explanation of interpersonal relationships. Yet, they created tests which virtually mirrored their own preconceptions. To prove you were adjusted, you had to prove it on their terms.

For example, in one widely used test, a preference for Lincoln over Washington is marked as an exhibition of a feminine characteristic. When I put the question to the experts who were testifying that Sonny Liston would undoubtedly prefer Lincoln because he had freed the Negro people from slavery, I was met with a stunning lack of understanding. I pressed the question and innocently inquired which of the experts before me would care to be the one who informed Sonny Liston that he was unmasculine; there were no volunteers.

Another question which was asked on this test was "Do you believe in the second coming of Christ?" This was placed in the test, I was informed, to determine the depth of religious feeling in the person taking the test. I inquired if this question were removed from tests administered to Jews and other religious groups, since they did not accept Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. It was hardly conceivable to my expert witnesses that anyone could have values totally different from their own and I was met with all sorts of stylish evasions.

This points up a very real danger of standardization and social rigidity which might flow from such a powerful instrument as a National Data Bank. The very same people who are actively lobbying for a truly effective statistical center, containing individual identifying information, are those who devised tests which characterize Sonny Liston effeminate and Rabbi Wise irreligious.

I would now like to describe a plan I heard proposed in absolute sincerity by some of the most respected social scientists in our nation.

It is widely believed that successful Americans must know how and why some Americans have failed. Perhaps I should put that a little differently and say that some Americans just cannot understand why other Americans are not carbon copies of themselves.

Be that as it may, one way in which America is meeting the problem of poverty is to assist in the construction of low-cost housing. This is certainly socially beneficial and I have cast many votes in the Congress to attempt to insure each American a decent place to live. Yet, the social scientists, in their zeal to discover more and more about the disadvantaged citizen, proposed to use low cost housing as a great pool of research and those who lived in it as guinea pigs. They seriously proposed to bug each room in each apartment of a federally sponsored low-rent project. They would then feed every single sentence uttered by the apartment dwellers into a computer. This computer would then deliver a profile of these Americans and their habits and compare the statistical profiles to Americans who have "made it."

I was outraged when I heard this suggestion and it was not carried out. The casual willingness to turn a citizen's life into a fishbowl did not concern these social scientists; valuable research could be gained and, while the Bill of Rights certainly protected their privacy, it was not relevent to the subjects of the research.

This brings to mind the words of Aldous Huxley: "Who will mount guard over our guardians, who will engineer the engineers? The answer is a bland denial that they need any supervision . . . PH. D.'s in sociology will never be corrupted by power. Like Sir Galahad's their strength is as the strength of ten because their heart is pure; and their heart is pure because they are scientists and have taken six thousand hours of social studies."

No matter from what source they may come, unwarranted invasions of privacy must be identified and resisted. Liberty under law is our foundation as a stable nation and it is my conviction that a suffocating sense of surveillance will restrict liberty and, ultimately, undermine law.

Let me speak briefly about the Bill of Rights and praise, yet again, the brillance of those who drafted it. While privacy is not mentioned by name, the first ten amendments to our Constitution contain provisions guaranteeing rights to the individual which covered completely the range of privacy invasion known in the 18th century. A man cannot be compelled to give up his home to quarter troops; a man cannot be forced to give testimony against himself; a man has the right to face his accuser in an adversary proceeding with the advice of legal counsel. Most important, is one of the most beautiful concepts rendered into the English language. The Fourth Amendment states simply: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause . . ."

In perhaps its most powerful recent manifestation, Justice Douglas, speaking for the Supreme Court in the *Griswold* Case in 1965, cites a number of constitutional guarantees and proclaims; ". . . The Bill of Rights have penumbras formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance." Sections of the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Amendments create "Zones of Privacy," according to Justice Douglas.

Commenting on the *Griswold* Case in *The Wisconsin Law Review* in 1966, Princeton's Cromwell Professor of Law, William Beaney, states: ". . . It should be made clear that the privacy to which all persons may lay claim is not a sterile or outmoded individual assertion. It is not a claim restricted to an aristocratic class, or to a few eccentrics who might prefer to resign from the human race . . . A freedom to determine the extent to which others may share in one's spiritual nature, and the ability to protect one's beliefs, thoughts, emotions, and sensations from unreasonable intrusions are of the very essence of life in a free society."

We see then that the Constitution of the United States provides a bulwark against those who would turn America into a total surveillance society. But there are always forces at work to invade privacy in an allegedly noble pursuit or for other less admirable reasons. At the very beginning of the American experience, many saw a threat to our infant free republic in the proposed Alien and Sedition Laws. In the debate over those laws in the 5th Congress, Representative Edward Livingston made a ringing declaration of what would happen to society should the Federal Government be empowered to strip away protections of the individual. In a passionate speech, he made one of the most accurate predictions of the consequences of future actions against freedom. In *1798,* Livingston said:

"The system of espionage being thus established, the country will swarm with informers, spies, delators, and all the odious reptile tribe that breed in the sunshine of despotic power. The hours of the most unsuspected confidence, the intimacies of friendship or the recesses of domestic retirement will afford no security. The companion whom you most trust, the friend in whom you must confide, are tempted to betray your imprudence; to misrepresent your words; to convey them, distorted by calumny, to the secret tribunal where suspicion is the only evidence that is heard."

Let me repeat; that was *1798,* not *1984!*

To make the Bill of Rights a living entity in a technologically sophisticated world requires unceasing vigilence. The dangers described by Representative Livingston in the 5th Congress are still facing those of us in the 91st Congress. For the United States now has the capacity to establish a system of strict records surveillance which was, and is, the hallmark of European totalitarian states and which was specifically rejected by our Founding Fathers. The files of federal, state, local and private agencies bulge with dossiers on Americans. A perfectly understandable thrust toward making the operation of these agencies more efficient and economical has encouraged the use of computerized information systems. The most recent investigation of my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy brought forth the statement that one private credit organization confidently expects to have the record of every man, woman, and child in the country within its computerized system in five years. An individual's credit history can be retrieved and read anywhere in the country within two minutes after the request is initiated.

This tremendous ability to store and retrieve data has a basic effect on America. Throughout history, we have been known as the nation of the second chance. Immigrants flocked to our shores because we offered a new beginning for people who found other societies frustrating and repressive. Yet, the ability to weave a web of data around each individual, to recall every event of a person's past, threatens to make this a one chance society.

In the same sense, we witnessed an internal migration in the 19th century. Our growing population could expand throughout our unused lands within the borders of America. The concept of a frontier was an essential precondition to the expansiveness of the American society and, as Frederick Jackson Turner pointed out, helped shape the American character.

New space for the body created a new life for the mind.

This brings me to the final portion of my speech this evening and to what I would regard as its most significant section. The argument over privacy is frequently confused by the belief that it is space alone that is the subject under discussion. This narrow emphasis permits the legitimate objection that man is a social creature and that he demands interaction with his fellows.

If privacy merely refers to a physical area, this view is perfectly correct. Everyone knows that city life lacks many of the comforts and graces of rural life, and yet urbanization is perhaps the central fact of population movement throughout history. So it would be foolish indeed to ignore the absolute necessity for man to seek the company of neighbors. Yet, most observers have found an equally powerful counterforce and that is withdrawal from society for certain periods.

In 1961, Sociologist Erving Goffman described this basic conflict in these terms:

"Our sense of being a person can come from being drawn into a wider social unit; our sense of selfhood can arise through the little ways in which we resist the pull. Our status is backed by the solid buildings of the world, while our sense of personal identity often resides in the cracks."

The concept of space for the health of the societies of lower animals was the subject of a brilliant book by Robert Ardrey. Published in 1966, *The Territorial Imperative* sets forth example after example of animal behavior which suggests that the physical ordering and control over space is a basic drive. This powerful instinct in lower animals is shown to precede mating and is demonstrated as the major way in which one individual differentiates itself from the rest of his species.

XUM

Ardrey makes a compelling argument that demands the conclusion that what operates so universally in animals is relevant to understanding human nature as well.

I would like to suggest to you that the personality needs a psychological living space just as the body insists upon an area of physical autonomy. I believe that The Territorial Imperative in lower animals has a counterpart in man which I call The Intellectual Imperative. The Intellectual Imperative is as essential to mental health as The Territorial Imperative is to a sense of physical security. In my view, psychological integrity is as important as bodily integrity. A stable society cannot be constructed or maintained if illegal searches and seizures are permitted through a man's ideas and beliefs while his papers and effects are protected by law.

When I first raised questions about the validity of the use of the polygraph five years ago, I called it "mental wiretapping." Of course, the fact that lie detectors just did not work at any reliable level of accuracy was important to my opposition as well as the fact that the training of the polygraph operator was frequently so incredibly sloppy. But, basically, what I objected to was that there is a portion of man that no one can invade without the full approval of the individual. In no case should it be a precondition for employment at lower or clerical levels, which was the situation I uncovered in certain federal agencies in 1964.

In 1958, Pope Pius XII made this statement: "And just as it is illicit to appropriate another's goods or to make an attempt on his bodily integrity without his consent, so it is not permissible to enter into his inner domain against his will, whatever the technique or method used."

Similarly, the spread of information about a man must be under his control. Naturally, in the pursuit of a stable society, law must be maintained and the tools that science and technology have provided us must be used to preserve the rights of those who obey the law. But, as I believe I have demonstrated, technology frequently operates by its own laws which are occasionally peripheral, at best, to the purposes of society. To conduct a normal, healthy life a man must have privacy and this means that he must have areas where he is assured of protection from what Livingston called "the odious reptile tribe."

Professor Charles Fried of the Harvard Law School puts the need for privacy in extreme terms. He says:

"Privacy is the necessary context for relationships we would hardly be human if we had to do without—the relationships of love, friendship, and trust. Intimacy is the sharing of information about one's actions, beliefs, or emotions which one does not share with all and which one has the right not to share with anyone. By conferring this right, privacy creates the moral capital which we spend in friendship and love."

In my concept of The Intellectual Imperative, man may choose those in whom he wishes to confide. He may discuss any issue in any terms he may desire and be assured that an indiscretion of phrase or even an indecency of thought will remain private. A space of psychological control permits ideas to be discussed freely and openly within his territory and with the guarantee that strict public accountability will not follow. It is just this blurring of the public and the private which makes invasion of privacy so obnoxious to personal integrity and to civilized society. No idea springs, like Athena from the head of Zeus, fully formed. The translation of idea into insight, of knowledge into wisdom, follows as many different courses as there are individuals who think. It is impossible to produce a flow chart which can predict or channel the maturation of a thought.

This leads to the psychological truth that the betrayal of intimacy is, in essence, the greatest invasion of privacy. But it is equally harmful to society if the experiences of private life become shallow. If you cannot reside in an atmosphere of security, if you must remain guarded—suspicious of those in whom you confide—you diminish the commitments of private life. And without something to defend, without relationships of trust and love in your private life, you are going to have little reason to strongly defend the public welfare.

What I am saying is that The Intellectual Imperative permits man to strengthen his belief in abstractions like patriotism by creating personal realities like friendship and trust. I believe that my concept of the Intellectual Imperative leads to the point that you cannot love anything, if you are afraid to reveal yourself to another.

The control of the flow of information about yourself, about your actions, about your beliefs, is then seen as a crucial aspect of a dynamic society. Urban mass culture has destroyed for most of us the opportunity to exercise freely The Territorial Imperative; the advance of computer and other technologies threatens The Intellectual Imperative. Physically, we are constantly in a crowd; intellectually, technology has provided devices to make our forgotten actions and our unacknowledged thoughts known to the crowd. This is, I believe, what is meant by depersonalization and dehumanization and, as I have tried to suggest earlier, may be a root cause for the violence in our nation.

The American use of technology has made man immense—within the next few months, a human footstep will be on the surface of the moon. Yet technology has also diminished man and threatens to make him less than human. While every computer card received from a large organization as a bill, a financial statement, or a summation of personal history carries the warning "Do not fold, mutilate, or spindle," individual man receives little assurance from the sender that he himself will not be folded, mutilated, and spindled.

There are those who say that anyone who criticizes the forms taken by the new technology is somehow against technology and, therefore, progress. There is the implication that the expression of some of the views I have given you this evening would have caused me to oppose the use of indoor plumbing because it destroyed a society based around the village pump. This is simply not true. To paraphrase Shakespeare, I come to praise the new technology, not to bury it. But at the same time, we must praise man and see that he is not buried under computer-generated data. Computer professionals by and large know the limitations of their machines and they know that the output of a computer is dependent on the quality of the data fed in. The standard acronym is GIGO: Garbage In: Garbage Out. My purpose is to disabuse nonprofessionals of the notion that it really means Garbage In, *Gospel* Out.

At the beginning of this speech, I constructed a slightly facetious example of technology as God and man as humble penitent. Some of the most vocal defenders of the unevaluated use of technology sound very much as if they truly believe they are theologians and that they are justifying the operations immutable laws, which are unchangeable because they are the dicta of divinity.

I take quite the opposite view. Tools are for the use of man and their valid use does not harm man; only their abuse does. Although I may be widely known as a computer critic, I firmly believe that the forceful assertion of privacy need not be contradictory to the fullest exploitation of the miracle of electronic data processing. The computer is as vital to efficient government as civil liberties are to the citizen's confidence in democratic government. This search for a balance, the attempt to isolate and control the toxic elements in the tonic of technology, is now a major challenge. For, basically, it challenges our faith in ourselves, it challenges our ability to use our skills in the service of man.

John Diebold has probably coined more money from the new technology than any other man; he even coined the word "automation." In 1964, he made the statement with which I would like to close my speech.

"The problem of identifying and understanding goals to match the new means that technology provides us is the central problem of our time—one of the greatest problems in human history. Its solution can be one of the most exciting and one of the most important areas for human activity. And the time is now."

In 1969, even more than ever, the time *is* now.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination at the desk, as reported earlier today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ABM AND MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 14, President Nixon presented a new concept of an ABM system to the Nation. Since then, his proposal has been elaborated on by the executive branch. Committees of the Senate are now engaged in trying to clarify what it is that has been suggested. The examination of the proposal may be expected to continue at least for several weeks.

In due course the issue of the ABM should emerge in legislative form on the floor of the Senate. It would be my expectation that when that time comes, ambiguities and obscurities will have been removed. By then, hopefully, scientific fact will have been separated from science fiction. By then, substantial dangers from abroad and practicable defenses against them should be distinguishable from the paranoid possibilities. By then, we should have a more accurate measure of the cost of the newly proposed system. By then, too, we should better be able to understand the prospects of breaking the action-reaction pattern of two decades—the nuclear arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union which, while pursued in the name of security by each nation, has lead to greater insecurity for both nations and the world.

In short, when the issue reaches the Senate floor, we should have a clear idea not only of the reliability of the ABM but also of the relevance or redundance of its deployment. We will then be in a position to weigh the priorities of the ABM in the external security structure of the Nation against urgent requirements for internal stability and progress.

It has been said that it would profit us little to concentrate on internal national needs only to have the Nation fall victim to an external aggressor. That is true; but would it profit us more to build another massive ring of nuclear defense of questionable value around decaying cities and impoverished rural areas? Would it profit us more, in an obsessive concentration on potential threats from abroad, to overlook the actual threat from within—the threat of a society confused by inner strife and racked by violence, crime, and disorder?

These questions are appropriate to the Senate's consideration of the ABM because there are grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the proposed missile system. There are grave doubts as to its costs—if not its initial costs, its ultimate costs—and may I say once again, the day of automatic acceptance of expenditures in the name of security—however superfluous, duplicative, or wasteful the expenditures—that day is over in the Senate. There are grave doubts as to the necessity of the Safeguard system, as there were with the Sentinel. There are grave doubts as to its effect on Soviet-United States arms competition. There are grave doubts as to the urgency of its deployment in the light of other national needs. All of these uncertainties should be explored in full in the Senate; and they will be explored.

By contrast, there is one matter which, it would be my hope, will not enter into consideration. I refer to the economic benefit which presumably will flow to certain States in the form of Federal expenditures for the missile system. It is particularly appropriate that I address myself to this question. One of the two sites at which ABM's would be located initially is the Malmstrom Minuteman installation in central-northern Montana; the other is in North Dakota. While these two States are immediately involved, the situation is not without its analogies elsewhere since it seems clear that the extension of the system to many other States is already expected.

Insofar as the people of Montana are concerned they have been willing to assume an equitable share of the responsibility for the Nation's military defense. The families of Montana, as have other American families, have suffered the personal grief of dead and wounded in the conflict in Vietnam.

We have also welcomed to the State, in the past, various military installations which have been deemed essential to the defense of the Nation. To be sure, these installations have resulted in some expenditures of wealth in the State but they have also brought burdens in the form of increased loads on the services of local governments—police, fire, public education, and the like. The people of the State have accepted these burdens along with the benefits since they have accepted the national necessity for the installations.

Similarly, an ABM deployment at Malmstrom would undoubtedly provide some economic stimulus to the region, even though the benefits would be small and they would dwindle rapidly once the initial construction were complete. Such was the experience on a much greater scale at Glasgow Air Force Base. The building of this most modern of jet facilities brought a convergence of several thousand persons to provide skills and labor for construction. After 10 years, however, that costly effort has been scrapped; the field has been closed as obsolete and unnecessary. Its closing leaves a swollen population in the Glasgow region, filled with an understandable concern about their personal futures and the future of the community.

May I say that the decision to establish the Glasgow base was strictly that of the Department of Defense. The people of Montana did not seek this installation. The Senators from Montana did not seek it. I had nothing whatever to do with its placement even though I am now doing whatever I can to have the base converted to a useful civilian function.

I am doing so because, as a Senator, I have a valid concern in the welfare of the people of my State, particularly as they are affected by decisions of the Federal Government. I have said it many times, and I say it again: I am, before all else, a Senator of Montana and of the United States.

I make no apologies, therefore, for working to try to find some civilian usefulness for the Glasgow base. Neither do I apologize for having helped to bring to Montana a Hungry Horse Dam on the Flathead or a Libby Dam on the Kootenai. Nor do I regret resisting, a few years ago, the cavernous impersonality of this Government which would have brought about the closing of a desperately needed veterans hospital at Miles City.

We have—all of us in the Senate—sought, in one way or another, to enhance the welfare of our States. It is neither petty nor irrelevant to make that effort. It is one of the reasons why we are here. It is one of the ways in which this Nation moves toward a greater unity and equity among all of its citizens, because out of the progress of the several States has come a substantial contribution to the general progress of the United States.

By the same token, out of programs for the benefit of the people of the Nation as a whole have come benefits to the people of our States. I refer to the Federal highway program, medicare, educational aid, programs to curb water and air pollution, and countless other social measures which have been of benefit to the people of Montana as well as to tens of millions of other Americans.

In the end, gains for the Nation are gains for the people of the States. In the end, gains for the people of the States will be gains for the Nation. If this proposed ABM missile system, therefore, is right for the Nation, it will be right for Montana. If it is wrong for the Nation, however, the location of one site at Malmstrom cannot make it right.

What economic benefit to a Montana community will equal the additional tax burdens and the new inflation which will weigh on all the people of Montana and the Nation if the cost of the ABM proposal runs to many billions of dollars? If the system becomes an insatiable maw for the consumption of public resources, who will pay for the neglect of other urgent national needs, if not all the people of the Nation, including Montanans?

The ABM proposal is not just another public works project. It is not some trivial boondoggle, a minor item out of the military pork barrel. It touches questions which go to the structure of a free society and to the civilized survival of this Nation, the Soviet Union, and, perhaps, of all nations. What local economic benefit can take precedence over these life and death issues? If the proposal is wasteful, dangerous, defective, and counterproductive to the peace of the Nation, of what lasting value can it be to the State of Montana?

To permit considerations of some local monetary gain to enter into the ABM decision would be tantamount to deciding to continue the Vietnamese war because it has kept the helicopter industry prosperous. May I say to the Senate that I regard this issue as so serious that if I thought I might be influenced by such considerations, I would not participate in deciding this question in the Senate.

The people of Montana have permitted me to represent them in the Congress and in the Senate for many years. They have stayed with me through many decisions—some of which they have approved, some of which they have disapproved. They have been most tolerant and understanding. I do not believe their tolerance is such, however, that they would understand a vote by me on this question on the basis of some ephemeral economic benefit. They are not that cynical; I am not that cynical.

Whatever factors may enter into my conclusions on the ABM, let it be clearly understood, now, that the proposed Malmstrom location is not one of them. The people of Montana do not put profits before peace. As a Senator from Montana, I will not put profits before peace.

S. 1732—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DESIGNATE A CRATER OF THE MOON WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to designate certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho as wilderness.

This proposed legislation, Mr. President, has been submitted to Congress in accordance with the requirements of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890).

XUM

The Craters of the Moon National Monument has been a major attraction in my State of Idaho since it was established by Presidential proclamation in 1924. As now constituted, the monument includes 53,545 acres, and contains a remarkable fissure eruption with its associated volcanic cones, craters, rifts, lava flows, caves, natural bridges as well as other scientific phenomena characteristic of volcanic action.

This bill would designate 40,785 acres within the monument as wilderness, all of which is federally owned.

The area is located in Butte and Blaine Counties in south-central Idaho. Combined U.S. Highway 20, 26 and 93A passes through the monument.

Mr. President, the monument landscape is stark and awesome. From fissures in the earth's crust, broad sheets and flows of lava have spread across the nearly level Snake River plain. In places the lava has a ropelike appearance. Elsewhere it forms rough, jagged masses in many strange contours. A series of cinder cones rise as high as 800 feet above the plain, and are a magnet for visitors.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that this is one of the most astonishing landscapes in America. Although the lava floods destroyed all vegetation in their path, leaving a barren and sterile land, more than 200 varieties of hardy plants eventually established themselves. Visitors in the spring are often astonished to see bright pink and yellow pompon flowers on the open slopes, and dwarf monkeyflowers giving a magenta cast to wide areas of cinder in June and July.

I think one of the most descriptive articles ever written on the Craters of the Moon National Monument was that by Roger J. Contor, a former superintendent of the monument, in the 1966–67 winter edition of the Living Wilderness, a publication of the Wilderness Society. I request unanimous consent that the article, and the text of the bill, appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I think it highly appropriate that in this year of 1969, when American astronauts plan an actual landing on the moon, that the Congress take action to preserve as wilderness a large portion of this fabulous lunar-like landscape on our own planet.

It is not difficult to forecast, that because of these lunar expeditions, increasing thousands of visitors will be drawn to the Craters of the Moon National Monument—and therefore the added protection of wilderness classification for this unique phenomenon may well be urgent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled, "The Proposed Tutimaba Wilderness of Craters of the Moon National Monument," written by Roger J. Contor, and published in the 1966–67 winter edition of the Living Wilderness, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the article to which the Senator has referred will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1732) to designate certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho as wilderness, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890, 892; 16 U.S.C. 1132(c)), certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument, which comprise about 40,785 acres and which are depicted on a map entitled "Recommended Wilderness, Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho," numbered NM–CRA–9011 and dated August 1967, are hereby designated as wilderness. The map and a description of the boundary of such land shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. (a) The area designated by this Act as wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented and the applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act.

(b) Only those commercial services may be authorized and performed within the wilderness area designated by this Act as are necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purpose thereof. There shall be no permanent road therein and, except as necessary to meet minimum management requirements in connection with the purposes for which the area is administered (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or other form of mechanical transport, no structure or installation and no landing of aircraft within the area designated as wilderness by this Act.

The material, presented by Mr. CHURCH, follows:

THE PROPOSED TUTIMABA WILDERNESS OF CRATERS OF THE MOON NATIONAL MONUMENT

(By Roger J. Contor)

Sit sometime in the middle of the Black Flow of Craters of the Moon. Though only three miles from a paved road, you will be a half day's journey into a wilderness. And a century into the past. The mood is unmistakably wild and remote. It is like being in a motionless black ocean.

The lava is an ocean of rhythmic flow patterns, of beauty. Under the midday sun much of it glistens like rippled water. Sparkling basalt fragments display textures of tiny iridescent blue, green, and yellow bubbles. Billowing pahoehoe swirls sometimes wear a glaze or porcelain blue. Red-orange vents of lava tubes, seared smooth by superheated gases, appear deceptively new.

In this exciting environment, my family and I have spent many pleasant hours. Less than a hundred miles to the west of us is a fine alpine wilderness, the White Clouds. Yet our spare time was repeatedly spent in the fascinating volcanic terrain. Two summers passed before snow-fed lakes and alpine gardens could lure us away.

Craters of the Moon National Monument is a compact chronicle of the forces which created Idaho's vast lava sheet—the Snake River Plain. Compressed within the area's 83 square miles are nearly all known features of basaltic volcanism, including cinder cones, lava domes, pahoehoe flows, aa flows, tree molds, fissure caves, lava tubes, ice caves, collapse depressions, pressure ridges, transported crater walls, lava bombs, and kipukas. This stark area of suspended violence is the most recent product of the 25 million-year-old Snake River Plain.

Established in 1924, the Monument now hosts over 200,000 visitors per year, despite its remote location. These visitors largely confine themselves to the loop drive in the northwestern section, an area of about 5,000 acres. Here roads, trails, and interpretive developments offer them a close acquaintance with most types of volcanic features. Outside the semi-developed zone, approximately 90 per cent of the area remains unchanged by man. Much is unexplored. It is not uncommon for hikers into remote sections to discover new caves, tree molds, or archeological sites.

The National Park Service has proposed that some 40,800 acres of the total 53,545 (about three-fourths of the Monument) be managed as a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Approximately 96 per cent of the land eligible for wilderness status is included in the proposed Tutimaba area. The small section left out will permit future development of a loop road circling around Big Cinder Butte. This road will ultimately give automobile-oriented visitors an opportunity to observe tree molds in place. This is the only major geologic feature the average visitor cannot now see.

The proposed wilderness offers geologic curiosities, archeological structures and sites, a surprisingly rich fauna, and vegetative cover of special importance to science. The setting is fresh and clean. Because access is limited to hikers, and because there are no attractions which lack counterparts in the more accessible parts of the Monument, human use has been scant.

About half of the Monument's prime geologic features will be included in the wilderness. These are nearly all products of small eruptions along the Great Rift. The genesis is clearly seen at a cinder cone called the Watchman. Here a fissure in the earth gave vent to a fire fountain of cinders, producing the cone. Later, heavy lava welling up inside the cone broke through the weak walls, leaving a gaping hole from which poured the Little Prairie AA Flow. Though many centuries old, this flow appears to have cooled only yesterday. Nine other cones within the wilderness area show the same general history. Echo Crater was the source of a more violent eruption. Only a partial cone remains; huge monolithic fragments of the ruptured walls have been swept eastward, marking the path of the flow.

At Vermillion Chasm, one of the most remote features in the wilderness, are a pair of lava walls built up on both sides of a sputtering crack in the earth. Termed a spatter rampart, this colorful trough is several hundred feet in length. A sheer delight to students of volcanism.

In the heart of the wilderness area is Little Prairie, an ancient flow now covered by sagebrush and grass. On its western edge are fresh flows enclosing the Monument's largest tree molds. One, presumably a mold of a limber pine, is three feet in diameter. Most molds in this area resemble postholes bored vertically down into the lava as deep as fifteen feet. They show where a mature forest was swept over by a wage of pahoehoe lava.

Newcomers to the lavas are puzzled to find waterholes and ice caves scattered in depressions and fissures. Because of many internal gas bubbles, lava is a good insulating material. Ice which collects in the winter and spring months persists in a number of locations. Yellowjacket, Bearsden, Little Prairie and Vermillion Waterholes usually provide melting ice water to birds and other wildlife throughout the summer. Because their existence is precarious, the waterholes may need protection as human use increases.

XUM

Near Bearsden Waterhole we find the best evidence of use by Shoshoni Indians. Bearsden is a fissure ice cave sunken perhaps twenty feet below the surface. Bighorn sheep or other animals using this waterhole could have been trapped by a Shoshoni hunter blocking the narrow access. Crude stone blinds a short distance away testify to such attempts. A quarter mile away a more eloborate blind on a tall crater wall fragment gives a view of approaching animals across a mile of grassland. This lookout was discovered when our 8-year-old son decided to climb "that rock." An adult would not have had the energy!

Campsites and artifacts indicate that Indian activity in the Rift Zone was oriented northwesterly in the Pioneer Mountains. The Shoshonis undoubtedly made short trips into the area to dig bitterroot plant from the cinder gardens. Perhaps nowhere in Idaho were bitterroots more profuse or as easy to dig as in the soft cinderbeds of Craters of the Moon. Also important to the Indians were lava tubes, where structures and artifacts are relatively numerous.

Tu'timaba (rhymes with shoot-him-papa) is the Shoshoni term for "Black Rock Overpass." The area held this meaning to nomadic bands traveling across the Snake River Plain between the Fort Hall-Pocatello area and the rich camas meadows at Fairfield. Though it appears flat, the broad plain is actually a huge lava dome, a thousand feet higher than valleys on either side. To someone crossing it in moccasined feet it was probably a very noticeable "overpass."

Like most desert areas. Tutimaba hosts more wild animals than the average person would suspect. The wanderer in the vegetated part of the Rift Zone can scarcely avoid seeing a few deer, perhaps a coyote, and a variety of smaller animals. It is the summertime home of sage grouse, which use parts of it for nesting and brood grounds. A special delight to my family are the golden eagles. We never failed to see at least one on trips into the wilderness. Protection from domestic stock grazing and human activity has maintained rich habitats of grass and shrubs. Birds and animals adapted to such an environment have flourished. Limber pine forests are pockmarked with beds of the Monument's 300 deer. A flurry of mourning doves can be found at all the waterholes. Marmots, chipmunks, ground squirrels, and badgers are also common. Snakes are rather rare, but a few rattlers, gopher snakes, and racers are occasionally reported.

Of special interest to botanists and range management experts are the two *kipukas* harbored within the proposed wilderness boundaries. Named from similar features in Hawaii, these are ancient cinder mounds surrounded by recent lava flows like islands in the sea. Their accumulated soil mantle and vegetative cover remained unchanged by the last eruptions. Protected by large areas of extremely rough lava, they have been little disturbed by hoofed animals. Thus they are rare remnants of original climax plant communities in this region. The 180-acre Carey Kipuka has already been the subject of three scientific publications. First identified by staff members of the University of Idaho, it was added to the Monument in 1962. The other kipuka, called Round Knoll, has been in the area since 1928. As items of scientific value, these "islands in time" will continue to be protected.

An acquaintance with the "Craters" creates fondness in most people. The geologic authority of the Monument, Dr. Harold T. Stearns, has studied the area since 1921. You must read his booklet, *Geology of Craters of the Moon,* before you know much at all about the area. His writings betray a love for the harsh environment over which he has trod so many miles. We cannot improve on his description of "yawning crater pits which are especially beautiful under the lengthened purple shadows of evening" or "to the east stretches barren black lava until it fades into the desert haze." Perhaps the best is his description of the hills which "toward evening become pale and soft and velvety, like a staghorn in spring." A visit to the area in late May or early June, when ragged crowds of wildflowers color the area, can be very memorable.

The Tutimaba Wilderness has nothing to attract the mountaineer, a thirty-day pack trip party, or a fisherman. Its appreciation must rest on other things. Until now very few people have come to know it well. Yet it remains the most interesting and least disturbed segment of the entire Snake River Plain. Those who spend some time here will soon feel its lonely and unusual charm.

(NOTE.—Mr. Contor, when writing this article, was Superintendent of Craters of the Moon National Monument. He has since transferred to the Canyonlands Complex, which includes the Canyonlands National Park, Arches National Monument, and Natural Bridges National Monument. He entered the Park Service as a permanent ranger in 1955 at Yellowstone National Park, after studying zoology and wildlife management at the University of Idaho and Montana State College. He has also worked in the Rocky Mountains and Bryce Canyon National Parks, and in the Oregon Caves National Monument.)

THE DOMINICAN FAILURE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the futility of military intervention in the internal affairs of other lands is being borne out quietly in the Dominican Republic, even as it is being demonstrated violently in Vietnam.

What the Russians are learning to their dismay in Czechoslovakia, we ourselves are being taught in the Dominican Republic. The lesson is simple: over the long pull, military occupation of another country does not pay, neither for the Russians nor for ourselves.

I commend to the attention of every open-minded reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Lewis H. Diuguid, foreign correspondent for the Washington Post, which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, March 30, 1969. The article is entitled "Occupation Increased Dominican Dependence." I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCUPATION INCREASED DOMINICAN DEPENDENCE

(By Lewis H. Diuguid)

SANTO DOMINGO, March 20.—After U.S. Marines broke up the Dominican civil war, and worldwide criticism was at a peak, President Johnson passed the word that the intervention must be a success.

An army of technicians soon replaced the Marines and aid money flowed in at unprecedented rates.

Four years later, this is still a divided nation. Now it is also obsessively dependent. Democracy is only a catchword in the remarkably cynical Dominican game of politics.

The causes of this situation are found more in the country's troubled history than in recent events, but U.S. intervention was a big part of that history long before the Marines landed April 28, 1965.

Interviews with Dominican scholars, politicians and technicians, as well as their U.S. counterparts at nearly every level, belie the general assumption heard in Washington—that, as one State Department official put it, "Despite the criticism at the time, the intervention has turned out for the best."

Economically, there is some improvement and prospects for more. But politically, the always tenuous sense of national purpose has weakened. By most accounts, the probability of the civil war resuming is great. The main deterrents so far are division within the army and the belief that the U.S. Marines would surely land again.

U.S. officials challenge that latter assumption, but few Dominicans do. Many Dominicans continue to believe that all important decisions are American-made.

When a minor politician decided recently to run for the presidency next year, he made his declaration and in the next breath announced that he was departing for Washington. In virtually any other Latin American country, that sequence would have meant political suicide. Here it is considered good politics.

This attitude is reflected in the inability of AID to find Dominicans willing to undertake development projects. The attitude seems to be, "Let the Americans do it." Often they do, thus increasing the dependency. Businessmen admit that when they conceive an investment, their first thought is the need for a foreign loan.

Nationalism seldom appears, although it is growing in a negative form among the youth. They show some anti-American frustration, but surprisingly little given the virtual occupation four years ago. Perhaps more damning than a jeer is the reaction when many Santo Domingo youths see an American tourist on the street: they salute.

The scarcity of national culture, and the administrative weakness of the highly centralized and statist government make this a nation only in the broadest sense.

This is attributable mainly to the 30-year Trujillo dictatorship. Before he came to power in 1930, the republic was a set of barely connected sugar communities. The U.S. Marines ran things from 1916 to 1924, and when Rafael Trujillo took over he unified the land by centralizing all power and most property in himself.

Potential leaders learned during those years to keep their heads down. To a large extent they still do. After Trujillo's assassination in 1961, the United States intervened to prevent his family from retaining power.

The demoralization that Trujillo imposed is well-characterized by one of his latter-day public works projects. He built a massive artillery emplacement atop a mountain overlooking Puerto Plata, a city known to house some resistance to Trujillo. To this day the citizenry there debates whether the guns where fixed to defend the city or to destroy it.

A succession of provisional regimes followed the dictator, punctuated by two coups and two elections. The accompanying politics were dominated by a few familiar personages, many of whom moved left and right along the ideological spectrum when opportunity called.

The second post-Trujillo election, in 1966, was the culmination of the U.S. occupation that suspended the civil war. Joaquin Balaguer, who had served under Trujillo and who succeeded him, was elected.

Balaguer has maintained quiet while working long hours at administrative decisions. Whether he purposely surrounded himself with weak administrators, or whether no other sort was available, the result has been to defer all initiative to Balaguer.

His efforts to revive the all-important sugar industry are praised even by his political enemies, but Balaguer is widely criticized for using his power to enhance himself politically. In 1961, Balaguer was saying that he wanted to retire from politics and devote himself to literature.

Balaguer has used government income to build scenic city overlooks, mercury-lit boulevards and apartment projects rising at the entrance to the capital.

Balaguer supporters say visible projects are a political necessity here, and AID loans to improve education or agricultural output are not very photogenic. Local funds for such efforts are not often forthcoming, while Dominican revenues go to build an extra bridge or a money-losing hotel in a critical voting area.

Lately, opposition parties have been joined by the normally reticent Catholic Church hierarchy in more basic charges against the government that the police and army exercise arbitrary authority over the countryside with impunity and that the concentration of land in the hands of the government and large holders is crushing the peasantry.

Francisco Pena Gomez, secretary general of Juan Bosch's important Dominican Revolutionary Party, charges that Trujillo-style terrorism has revived and that the government has failed to prosecute the perpetrators.

Some of the current unrest is based on an enigmatic statement by Balaguer suggesting he might take his constitutional option to run again.

Questioned about this, most Dominicans recalled the events that brought in Trujillo—a president propped up by the Americans so that they could leave in 1924 defied broad public distaste for reelection and engineered a victory. Soon thereafter a coup brought in the dictator.

Many Dominicans say that if Balaguer is re-elected—as incumbents usually manage to be—he will not last a year. But they also add that Balaguer is no Trujillo.

The future may be decided by the effect of all this on the 2.5 million Dominicans, out of the total 4 million, who are under 25. But when the youth looks to its elders for political traditions, it sees the electorate polarized by the '65 civil war. Many, including moderate politicians opposed to violence, are convinced that the two sides are waiting to resume conflict, and that the U.S. intervention merely postponed it.

Despite the postwar attempt to collect arms, civilians are said to be heavily armed and the incidence of violent crime tends to support this.

The American influence, real and imagined, is pervasive and is a contributing factor to politics so chaotic that if true stability is achieved it will be a surprise to both Dominicans and the representatives of their big neighbor.

Most Dominicans say that in polarizing the politics the intervention created more Communists than existed before. It also provided a graphic lesson in the politics of power.

S. 1733—INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for the administration, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1969 to extend and redirect the long-established Hill-Burton hospital construction program. This bill reflects the new administration's efforts to assure the most effective and most efficient support of the Federal Government in the development of facilities to meet the burgeoning health needs of the American people. Hearings are already underway before the House Commerce Committee on legislation to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act and I am hopeful for timely hearings in the Senate on this important proposal.

The legislation has two prime objectives: First, to assure the availability and accessibility of modern health care facilities to the entire population, and, second, to encourage a more rationalized health facility system capable of delivering the highest quality health services at the least possible cost. To accomplish these objectives, the Hill-Burton program is redirected so that our limited Federal dollars will achieve the maximum health benefits for the American people. Today's most urgent health facility needs are the modernization of existing urban hospitals and modernization and expansion of long-term care facilities. We must also redouble our efforts to provide reasonable alternatives to costly inpatient care through ambulatory care facilities and the newly developing neighborhood health centers.

No program of Federal grants could possibly meet our modernization backlog of over $11 billion. This bill proposes, therefore, the establishment of a Federal loan guarantee program which would stimulate the private capital necessary to substantially reduce this tremendous modernization backlog. The maximum principal of guaranteed loans could not exceed $500 million for fiscal year 1970—increased by $500 million in each of the next 2 years. The amount guaranteed could not exceed 90 percent of any single loan, nor could the amount guaranteed, when added to any grant awarded under the bill's grant program, exceed 90 percent of the total cost of the project.

Since the application of grant funds to projects within the existing Hill-Burton categories results in a diversion of these limited grant funds away from areas of greater need, the bill provides for a grant authorization of $150 million to be allotted to the States as a block, rather than earmarked for specific categories as under the present Hill-Burton program. The grant authorization would be limited to construction, replacement, or modernization of the most urgently needed health facilities: ambulatory care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, extended care facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, neighborhood health centers, and the like. Grant funds would not be available for construction or modernization of acute care hospital beds.

Both grants and loan guarantees would be allotted to the States on the basis of population, per capita income, and need for construction of modernization of facilities. The bill provides however, with respect to the grant program, that 20 percent of the funds appropriated by the Congress be reserved for direct project grants by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for up to 90 percent of the cost of public or nonprofit private projects of national significance.

Health facility needs and other needs of the health care system must draw upon the large but ultimately limited resources for health that are available to the community and to the Nation as a whole. Therefore it is imperative that these resources be invested wisely and used efficiently. This requirement imposes upon the health enterprise the need for thorough and coordinated planning. The planning processes must involve all elements of our complex public-private health care system. And they must relate, not only to those resources destined for health care facilities but also to the many other resources which interact in the delivery of health care. Because the maximum utilization of local planning agencies is deemed vital to the efficiency and more rational organization of health facilities and services, the bill would add the requirements that the State health planning agency and that each project be submitted for review and comment to the appropriate areawide health planning agency created under the provisions of section 314(b) of the Public Health Service Act.

Finally, the bill would provide greater freedom to the States by elimination of the present rural area priority requirement and by permitting the States to establish their own methods for determining need for facilities and determining the priority of projects to be assisted.

Mr. President, it is unlikely that we will meet all our health facility construction, modernization, or replacement needs over the next 3 years, but this legislation will go a long way toward that goal. We are committed to providing urgently needed health care to all our citizens and it is therefore vital that we not delay enactment of health legislation designed to achieve this goal in the most effective manner. For this reason, the bill I have introduced today would not await the expiration of the current Hill-Burton authorization, but would become effective with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1969. Only with this type of redirected Federal effort can we adequately meet our health commitment to the American people.

I point out that the States have been encouraged to innovate, but the localities have not. We believe that the appropriations requested here are modest—a total of $25 million over a period of the first 2 years—and that this is an extremely desirable bill.

I ask that a summary of the bill be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1733) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees for nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary, introduced by Mr. Javits, follows:

SUMMARY OF MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

LOAN GUARANTEE FOR MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION

Provides for guarantee of loans to nonprofit private agencies for modernization or construction of hospitals, facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers.

a. Amount guaranteed, when added to any grant or loan under the program, may not exceed 90% of the cost of the project; guarantee may not apply to over 90% of loss of principal and interest.

b. The maximum on the principal of loans with respect to which guarantees may be issued could not exceed amount specified in appropriation Acts and in no event could it exceed $500,000,000 for FY 1970 (increased by $500,000,000 in each of the next 2 years); total available for any year allocated among States on basis of population, financial need, need for modernization of facilities, and need for construction of facilities.

c. Fund established to make the payments called for under the program; includes borrowing authority.

d. Applications for loan guarantees must be approved as in the case of applications for grants under existing program, but with the requirements modified as indicated below.

e. Up to ½% of unpaid principal of loan imposed as premium for guarantee.

f. HUD hospital mortgage insurance program terminated.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OR MODERNIZATION OF FACILITIES

Authorizes appropriations of $150,000,000 for FY 1970 and such sums as necessary for next 2 years, for grants for construction or modernization of medical facilities (including diagnostic or treatment centers).

a. Appropriations divided into 2 parts.

(1) 80% of appropriation allotted among States for grants for projects for modernization or construction of public health centers and public or nonprofit private long-term care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers; allotment to be made on basis of relative population, financial need, need for modernization of above facilities, and need for construction thereof; also provides for reallotment of portions remaining unobligated after specified period.

(2) Provides Federal share determined by State with a maximum of 66⅔% or State's allotment percentage (based on relative State per capita income), if lower, except that if the allotment percentage is less than 50% (it could be as low as 33⅓%), it is presumed to be 50%; also in cases of rural or urban poverty areas or other specifically justified cases the maximum is 90%.

(3) Applications for grants must be approved as in the case of applications for grants under existing program, but with the requirements modified as indicated below.

b. 20% of appropriation available for direct grants by Secretary for up to 90% of cost of modernization or construction of public health centers and public or other nonprofit long-term care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers which are of special national significance because they meet needs of disadvantaged or demonstrate new or particularly effective or efficient methods of delivery of health care.

(1) State Hill-Burton agency has 30 days to disapprove project in its State.

c. Existing Hill-Burton program of separate allotments to States for 5 different categories of public or nonprofit private facilities—4 are for construction or (i) hospitals and public health centers, (ii) facilities for long-term care, (iii) rehabilitation facilities, and (iv) diagnostic or treatment centers, and the fifth is for modernization of the aforementioned facilities—ended with close of FY 1969 instead of, as now in the law, the close of FY 1970.

MODIFICATIONS IN REQUIREMENTS OF EXISTING LAW

a. State plan must be approved by the comprehensive health planning agency of the State (designated under the Partnership for Health program, Sec. 314(a) of the Public Health Service Act).

b. Instead of requirement that State plan provisions on determination of need and priority of projects be subject to criteria set forth in regulations of Secretary, including special priority consideration for rural area hospitals, State plan must merely show methods of determining need and priority which provide reasonable assurance of approval of projects in order of relative need and in furtherance of purposes of the new legislation.

c. State agency must consider recommendations of area-wide planning agency before approving project.

OTHER MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING LAW

a. Extends program to Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

b. Makes authority to waive Federal right of recovery in case a project ceases to be a public health center or a public or other nonprofit hospital, diagnostic or treatment center, facility for long term care, or rehabilitation facility—which waiver authority may be exercised if there is good cause for so doing—applicable to cases which arose before the 1964 amendments, which first authorized this waiver.

c. Amends definition to make it clear that diagnostic or treatment centers (including community health centers) may be for ambulatory patients whether they are inpatients or outpatients. Also broadens this category to include nonprofit private center serving poverty area, as well as center which is run by a hospital or is publicly operated.

d. Provides that maximum on the portion of any allotment for grants which may be used for paying up to ½ the cost of State plan administration shall be the lesser of 4 per cent or $100,000 (present maximum is 2 per cent or $50,000).

e. Non-Federal share of cost of project under loan guarantee program, special need cases under the program of State allotments from which grants for projects are made, and under the direct Federal grants program can be met by contributions of materials, facilities, equipment, and services.

S. 1734—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO STRENGTHEN LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), all members of the Subcommittee on Education, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen local education agencies, with the principal stress on innovation.

Under this proposal, grants will be made to local education agencies for technical assistance to individual schools on such programs as education of the disadvantaged and the handicapped; school social work; utilization of modern instructional materials and equipment; and school health. The grants are to be used for research and demonstration projects, including testing new educational ideas; planning and evaluation; experimental projects for developing local leadership; training school board members; improving the quality of teacher preparation; encouragement of the use of auxiliary personnel such as instructional assistants and teacher aides; and statistical services, including automatic data processing services and for the establishment of special services. Interchange of local education personnel with State agencies is also authorized.

In addition, a 12-member Advisory Council on Local Educational Agencies is established to review activities under the statute and to make recommendations for programs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would be transmitted to the President and to the Congress with his recommendations.

Authorizations are $10 million for fiscal year 1970 and $15 million for each of fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972.

It is anticipated that this legislation will have the active support of the National School Boards Association.

In enacting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, the Congress included Title V providing for a program of grants to strengthen State departments of education. This bill rounds out that concept by providing a similar program for local educational agencies, because it is at the local level where education is directly administered to the child. In addition, local governments provide, on a national average, an estimated 51.9 percent of all revenue expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools. This ranges from 86 percent in New Hampshire to 5.2 percent in Hawaii, with a local contribution at 50 percent or more in 28 of the States. It is evident, therefore, that the local agencies require the type of support this bill contemplates, especially in view of the fact that many of these agencies are tightly limited as to their sources of revenue.

There is a timelag of 4 to 5 years between discovery and application of a new concept or invention in military technology; in education, it is estimated that the timelag between discovery and application is as much as 30 years. The legislation I propose will make it possible for local school districts to shorten this period and enjoy the benefits of innovation before such new concepts become outmoded.

So much of current dialog is directed at "where it is at" or "like it is." In education, we must also be concerned with "where it is going" and "what it will be." The legislation which I am introducing today with four of my colleagues on the Education Subcommittee is directed at the future of education. There is just so much that we can do at the Federal and State levels to advance education. In the final analysis, it is at the local level where the product of our efforts is delivered to the ultimate consumer, the American child. He is "where it is at" and it is because of him that we are concerned as to "where it is going" and "what it will be."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

XUM

The bill (S. 1734) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to authorize a program of grants to strengthen local educational agencies introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1735—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION FROM $600 to $1,000

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This bill will increase the exemption presently allowed individuals for themselves and their dependents from $600 to $1,000. The current $600 exemption was provided by the Revenue Act of 1948. In the 21 intervening years the cost of living has risen by 48.5 percent—based on the average level of consumer price indexes in 1948 when compared to the February, 1969 figures. Thus, the $600 figure must be raised to $891 if it is to match the purchasing power that the $600 exemption had in 1948.

The years since the enactment of the income tax law have seen a number of adjustments made in the amount of exemption allowed. During the 1942–47 period the exemption was $500 per person. It was admittedly inadequate, but the demands of a wartime budget upon a strained Federal Treasury necessitated its continuance until 1948. It is my feeling that the $600 figure may have been more realistic when it was instituted in 1948 than it is today, but the probability is that it was not adequate even then. Today, it is grossly inadequate. Thus, for a family of four, the personal exemption would have to be raised to $3,564—$891 times four—to provide the same purchasing power as the $2,400 figure—$600 times four—provided in 1948.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently published a research study in which it indicated what it cost an urban family of four to live in the spring of 1967. The study shows that for the middle-income family the urban average family cost was $9,076. The cost for the lower-income family was $5,915 and the higher-income family budget amounted to $13,050. Certainly these figures indicate, on their face, the basic inadequacy of the $2,400 exemption for a family of four in view of the ever-increasing cost of living.

It is generally accepted that the poverty line for a nonfarm family of four is slightly less than $3,300. Yet, it is today possible for such a family to fall just below that line and still have to pay Federal income tax on as much as $1,100 of income. My proposal would have the effect of exempting a family of four from Federal income taxation until their adjusted gross income exceeded $4,000.

The most frequently heard objection to the bill that I submit today is not that it is not needed, but that it would decrease Federal revenue out of proportion to the social gain to be achieved. But the resultant increase in purchasing power will, in fact, have the effect of increasing tax revenues. It has been estimated that personal expenditures represent over 60 percent of the gross national product. Thus, it can be expected that when these additional funds are put in the hands of consumers the incomes and profits of the grocer, clothier, appliance dealer and other small businessmen will be increased, thereby allowing the Treasury to recoup its initial loss.

The economic well-being of the family unit should be of vital concern, not only to the breadwinner of the family but also to the entire Nation. The average family is today beset by increases not only in Federal taxes but also State and local levies. Moreover, inflation is rapidly eating into the fixed incomes of all families. The purpose of my proposal is to increase the economic stability of the all-important family unit by permitting it a realistic level of tax-free income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1735) to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness), introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the great privileges of serving in the U.S. Senate—the greatest legislative body in the history of the world—has been to associate with truly great leaders—statesmen whose deeds and wisdom and courage have deeply inspired so many.

I am very fortunate to be serving in my 21st year in the Senate—and my 17th year on both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, for which I feel doubly fortunate because of my association during these years with the man who now chairs the Appropriations Committee after chairing the Armed Services Committee so brilliantly and wisely for many years.

Yes, the Senate has had several great leaders in its history. But I think that to most of us there are only three or four or maybe five who stand out above all others—who are truly the giants of integrity, wisdom, achievement, and dedication—during our respective tenures in the Senate—the giants who really inspire their colleagues.

One way that an outsider can identify a giant in the Senate from a viewpoint in the Senate gallery is to watch the Senate floor to see the turnout of Senators to listen to a giant speak and the hushed silence when a giant speaks. An extremely reliable measurement within the Senate itself is whether the individual Senator can really sway votes when he rises to speak and voice his respected, often revered, views.

To me, Richard Brevard Russell, the senior Senator from Georgia, the senior Senator of the Senate, and the President pro tempore of the Senate, has been, and is, one of the rare few giants of the Senate during my tenure. I know that many, many Senators share my view.

I agree with those who say that Richard Brevard Russell should have been President of the United States. I wish he had—not only because he has been one of the most eminently qualified to be President—not only because he so richly deserved to be President—but even more important, because our Nation would be a better nation had he been President.

But in a selfish manner as far as the Senate is concerned—and in a less selfish manner as far as the people of America are concerned—there has been a very meaningful advantage in his not becoming President.

For had he been elected President in 1948 or 1952, our Nation would have been without his leadership since 1956 or 1960 when he might have retired after 8 years as President. Thus, the people of America would have been deprived of his leadership in the Senate for the past 8 or 12 years—and we of the Senate would have been deprived of his sage advice, counsel, and leadership. An unfillable void in the Senate would have been created.

Richard Brevard Russell has been an inspiration to me in many ways. He has been a shining example to follow. I now reveal a secret with respect to one very specific way in which I have tried to emulate him. Despite his brilliant record of innumerable achievements, his biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory year after year after year by his own choice has simply read "Richard Brevard Russell, Democrat, of Winder, Ga." Such is the modesty of this tremendous giant of the Senate.

Dick Russell has a quality of human kindness and warm gentleness that is not known as much as it should be. He is, indeed, a gentleman in the fullest sense of the word.

He has so many attributes of greatness that I hesitate to single out any two or three of them to the exclusion of the many others—integrity, intellect, wisdom, patience, forbearance, courage, and many more.

When he was honored recently as the recipient of the James Forrestal Memorial Award, in accepting the award, he displayed many of these attributes, but none of them any more than his great attribute of courage to speak up and to speak out.

He said what has been in desperate need of being said—in my opinion, he spoke the heart and the mind of the majority of a deeply troubled America. He made a declaration of conviction that needs to be repeated again and again and again.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his declaration as recorded by the National Broadcasting Co. be placed in the body of the Record at this point, and I urge all Americans to read and study and ponder on what he said.

May the good people of Georgia, in their great wisdom, continue to give Richard Brevard Russell to the people of America and send him to the U.S. Senate for as long as he is willing to serve in the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Senator Richard B. Russell on Receiving the James Forrestal Memorial Award for 1968 of the National Security Industrial Association at the Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969

Mr. Toastmaster, my fellow Americans: Thank you for the warmth of your greetings and for the very kind and extravagant words spoken by the Toastmaster. I see he felt it necessary to fortify his words with three different gifts and I appreciate them all.

I knew Jim Forrestal intimately. I respected his unquestioned ability. I admired his devotion to duty, and I was moved by the depth and sincerity of his patriotism. It is, therefore, with a sense of humility and deep appreciation that I accept the memorial award that is tendered in his name and I hope that I may deserve it.

While I may question your judgment in your choice of the recipient tonight, I have no doubts whatever as to the values of the purposes of your organization. You provide a vital link between government and industry in areas of national security. Only through close cooperation and coordination between those who make the tools of defense and those who use them can we be certain that our country is secure.

James Forrestal was right in believing a close working relationship between government and industry is essential to the security of the nation and upon these principles, this organization was founded.

We owe much to the inventiveness, the resourcefulness, the skill and—most of all—to the dogged determination of American industry. This is particularly true in times of crisis, when the chips are down and the dangers are greatest.

I remember vividly that day in May, 1940, when President Roosevelt called for the production of 50,000 aircraft a year for our Army Air Corps and Naval aviation forces. Many knowledgeable people thought this was nothing more than propaganda or patriotic rhetoric. Yet, only two years later, in 1942, industry produced 48,000 aircraft and in the following year almost doubled that number. By the end of the war, industry and labor had turned out around 275,000 airplanes—a truly fantastic record.

It should give all Americans a feeling of reassurance to know that industry, if called on today or tomorrow, stands ready to perform other such great feats.

However, advanced technology has brought a radical change in the concept of military preparedness. In colonial times, it was no great feat for gunsmiths who produced the weapons used by the earliest settler to provide meat for his table and protect his cabin to likewise produce the standardized muskets or rifles for the organized armies.

Even during World War I, large segments of existing industry were quickly adapted to military requirements. And as late as World War II, that was the case.

Today, however, the sophistication of both military and civilian technology has brought about a diversification of the production base. Even the manufacture and marketing of consumer goods has become complicated, and the production of weapons of global reach, instant delivery and incredible destructiveness is infinitely complex. Lead times of five or seven or ten years are sometimes required for many of our weapons.

Coupled with this there is a need for instant preparedness in today's uncertain and troubled world. The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that so long served as protective moats around our homeland have—defensively at least—shrunk to mere puddles and the once friendly skies are now broad avenues of approach for massive missiles of destruction.

We talk of peace; we pray for peace, but incidents such as the invasion of Czechovakia afford us proof that the doctrine that might makes right is still the canon law of Communism, whether it be the Russian brand or the Red Chinese version. Nor should we be lulled into any false sense of security because they may be momentarily diverted to our other problems. It is imperative to maintain a defensive posture so strong as to make any potential aggressor deliberate long before he strikes the first blow. [Applause.]

The part that the industrial group plays in this military capability has increased tremendously during our lifetimes. But there are some people in this country who look upon that growth as unhealthy without really considering the alternative. Some are earnest seekers of peace, who believe, however illogically, that by weakening our defenses we shall somehow encourage a better nature in the breasts and minds of aggressor nations.

There are some others who would redirect our national emphasis into other programs of national importance. And there are still others who express a fear of a gigantic industrial-military complex controlling our country. I find nothing inherently wrong in close coordination between defense and the industrial complex. (Applause) In fact, it is essential if we are to maintain our defense at optimum levels of preparedness.

However, I would be less than frank if I did not express a word of caution. I am sure all of you realize that with power comes responsibility. It remains for industry to recognize that responsibility and to bulwark this, the government must continue to maintain close supervision and control over operations involving the military and defense oriented industry. Big industry should welcome this supervision as their first and best line of defense against irresponsible and unfounded charges. And I have no doubts in my own mind as to the innate patriotism of those who direct the industry of this country.

Now let me speak for a moment about the growth of a disturbing element in our society which I view as very dangerous if allowed to go unchecked.

It is the attitude of many Americans—some of them old enough to know better, but many young Americans—toward our participation in the Vietnam War and the maintenance of a military posture generally. When it was first proposed that we participate in Southeast Asia militarily, I opposed it as ill-advised. That is past. We are in it. And American boys are out there dying in large numbers.

I may say that this war has not been fought as I would have liked to have fought it. But this country has a Commander-in-Chief who is a civilian chosen by the people of this country and we have laws to govern our participation in wars. And I am not to be guilty of insubordination. (Applause) I will say that there are times when I feel that figuratively, at least, our boys are out there fighting with one hand tied behind their backs and with a feather pillow tied to the other hand. (Applause)

It is understandable that the youth of our country would prefer to carry on their civilian occupations, to study, to make progress in life, to take part in the good life that goes on about us. But this is still a country of laws and not of men and this desire does not justify the waves of desertions, the draft card burning, the sit-in protests, and the hosts of other activities that to my mind border on sedition. (Applause)

I do not intend for this to be a flag waving speech, but when the flag came down the aisle this evening, I had a feeling of pride as I always do. I am sure you get the same thrill as I do when I see it unfurled and feel the same hurt when it is desecrated with offal and burned in defiant mockery.

Recently I watched a group of protesters parading with flags and banners. The banners read "Ho Chi Minh will win" and other such tripe. These people apparently hold the land of their birth in absolute scorn and derision. They constantly question and belie our real aims, while they attribute to our enemies in every case the noblest purposes and the loftiest motives.

They donate blood to the Viet Cong. They are silent when the North Vietnamese brutally torture men, women and children but are virulent when we defend ourselves. It is difficult for me to understand why Hanoi can be argued to be a sanctuary while it is always open season in Saigon. (Applause)

I hope such people, if they are truly Americans, will reexamine their motives as well as their actions. Let them ask themselves how much they have contributed to our country's welfare; (applause) how much they have worked to make this the greatest land on earth.

Were they to go to these countries they support so vigorously and violently—China, Russia, North Vietnam—or to their captives—Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia to mention only a few—I wonder if their reactions might not be different. And let me say in passing that I don't think it would be any insuperable loss to their country if they stayed there from now on. (applause and laughter)

We do not realize often enough how fortunate we are to have been born Americans (applause) and to condone, to excuse and permit such actions certainly violates all that this country stands for and even the best interests of those who do these deeds.

We have other problems related to defense. One is the soaring costs of weapons, equipment, and other material. Defense costs have just about doubled in the past ten years. Total appropriations requested for Defense in fiscal year 1970 amount to a little over $80 billion.

The basic reasons for this mushrooming cost are not hard to find. We are fighting a war that costs at least $25 billion a year. We have a great deal of inflation in this country that has reduced our purchasing power so that today's dollar will buy only slightly more than what 80 cents would buy in 1958 and less than half of what it would buy in 1938.

And we are also experiencing revolution after revolution in our weapons systems that are adding greatly to our costs. Something new develops almost each day.

An M-1 rifle cost $31 to produce in 1946. An M-16 today costs $150. The *Forrestal* aircraft carrier cost $190 million to build in 1951. The nuclear powered *Nimitz* today has a price tag of $545 million. The F-84 fighter aircraft which was used during the Korean war, was built for about $465 thousand. Today's F-111A has a current price of $6.8 million.

Other costs of government have increased similarly. In addition, the government has taken on many new commitments in recent years. All of them are laudable in purpose, but they are not inexpensive. For just one of these, the War on Poverty, the budget request for this coming year totals over $27 billion.

This tremendous increase in the cost of government has caused the average taxpayer to keenly feel the pinch in his pocketbook. Because of its magnitude, much of his reaction centers on defense expenditures. An unpopular war is a prime target. I have regretted to notice a ground swell of public opinion reflecting a growing unwillingness of people to pay the essential, though increasingly burdensome, costs of providing for the defense of this country in this modern and revolutionary world.

This all demands hard thinking on every level of our citizenry, leading to the hope that we will find the solutions.

XUM

There are those among us who, at the hoped for conclusion of the war in Vietnam—and I would that I might have an optimistic note as to any foreseeable end to that war—are expecting a $25 billion windfall of "free assets." Many people would urge the elimination of the 10% tax surcharge and I would certainly be happy if that were possible.

However, with my close connection with military preparedness, I am not unmindful of the future demands of our defense establishment. Partly as a result of our Vietnam operation, defense stocks of materiel and hardware have been drawn down markedly in the recent past. The replacement of these, the introduction of new weapons, and the modernization of those now in use will all call for expenditures of large sums if we are to defend ourselves and our homes.

There would be very little gained if we win a war against poverty or any other social evil in our own backyards only to turn victory and the homes of all of us over to some hungry enemy. (Applause.)

I will not deal with any more of our many problems. They are all closely linked to your own livelihood, and I know that they are receiving your studied thought and response. Only through the concerted cooperation of our best minds can we hope to realize our collective aspirations.

Without optimism in the future, however, life would be a poor play indeed. Thus we owe it to ourselves and to succeeding generations to continue to work fervently and prayerfully toward peace and understanding among nations.

History has a curious way of pulling some tricks out of the bag. Perhaps economic and social progress and a greater atmosphere of freedom among the other peoples of the earth will act as a great deterrent toward aggression. Perhaps enlightened leadership will lead to greater understanding, will be able to quell suspicion, and provide a lasting *detente* or even friendship among nations.

This is our dream; this is our hope; and this is our longing in this land of freedom. (Applause.)

We are so fortunate we do not envy any other people their possessions. It may be a dream, but working for the realization of dreams has been the source of all progress of mankind, and it must continue if civilization is to survive on this globe.

And so, to the members of the National Security Industrial Association, I wish you continued success in developing America's production and in seeing that the sons of this country who go forth to war do not have inferior equipment of any kind or character. (Applause.)

As was said in the invocation opening this occasion, ours in this land is a precious heritage. No other people in all of history, anywhere else under the canopy of heaven, have ever enjoyed the blessings that we call the American way of life. (Applause.)

It did not come easily. Men somewhere have made great sacrifices for it; not always in blood, but in sweat and in effort and in courage. And I could but think when I heard the Star Spangled Banner here tonight, the land of the free and the home of the brave will only endure—free—as long as our people are brave, and so may they stay brave. (Applause.)

And again, I want to express my heartfelt thanks for the honor that you have bestowed upon me tonight. (Extended applause.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thoroughly concur in all she said about Senator RICHARD RUSSELL. I express the hope that he gets well soon and that he will be able to resume all of his duties.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, America again pauses to pay tribute to one of its great leaders. Dwight David Eisenhower, general of the Army, Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, 34th President of the United States, and a man beloved of all of us, is dead. We mourn his passing, but we are encouraged and inspired by the example of lifelong service he has given us.

"Ike" Eisenhower, Mr. President, embodied much of what is the spirit of America, becoming for a generation of Americans a symbol. Though many of us were cast as opponents in the political scheme which is the great strength of our country, the whole world knows that we all liked Ike. Largely this is because it was so apparent that Ike liked us. He liked all men. He was a soldier always, but a soldier in the cause of peace, a crusader. He has left our heritage richer.

As always, Mr. President, Ike gave us inspiration even in his final days. His indomitable spirit fought against the ravages of disease and his spirits remained high to the end. Through that final struggle, also, his devoted wife Mamie and son John, as well as other members of his family, bore their burdens with strength and courage. I know all Americans have compassion for them. We all assuredly share their bereavement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of this tribute to General Eisenhower, the comments of my hometown newspaper, the Laramie Daily Boomerang, and of the Wyoming Eagle be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Daily Boomerang, Mar. 29, 1969]

A SALUTE TO AN AMERICAN

Dwight D. Eisenhower is dead.

Perhaps nothing is more symbolic of the Eisenhower spirit than the fight he waged against a losing cause for nearly one year. Throughout that time "Ike," as most people will remember him, fought back time and time again to overcome each current crisis. The spell of crisis after crisis finally proved to be too much.

A nation, its people and the people around the world mourn his death. Most probably we were aware after the series of heart attacks last year that the former president and supreme commander of allied forces very likely would never leave the hospital again.

History will judge Mr. Eisenhower on two counts. He will be judged as a general on the first of these, and here he should go down in history as one of the greatest. It will take time for judgment on his role as president, but he came to the Republican party as a candidate when the Republican party was seriously in danger of becoming non-existent and when it had no candidate who could really lead it to victory.

Since Eisenhower's announcement that he would run for office, the party managed to come back to the point that the two-party system was no longer in danger of becoming a thing of the past.

Loss of Eisenhower's wisdom on things military and as leader of the Republican party are going to be felt strongly. He became an image of great things in America and that image will remain.

Eisenhower, the man, is dead. His spirit and his courage will ever be on the American scene. The country and the world are certainly better for his having been present to deal with the problems and needs of both.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Morning Eagle, Mar. 29, 1969]

MILLIONS MOURN

The United States and much of the world are mourning the death of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower today.

General Eisenhower wrote an important chapter in history—and occupied a special place in the hearts of millions.

He was a symbol of courage and dedication.

A great many Americans are remembering General Eisenhower today as the great and widely respected leader of allied forces in Africa and Western Europe during World War II.

With his familiar Ike smile, he had the trust, confidence and respect of millions in the armed services as well as outside. He had the special qualities that made him a great military leader under the most difficult circumstances, involving the armed forces of more than one nation.

At the close of World War II he was perhaps the most popular man in all America.

Political leaders of the United States may remember just how unpolitical Ike was during the years immediately following the war.

During this period, he was constantly confronted by ardent admirers who wanted to push him for political office.

He once asked, in exasperation: "How many times does a fellow have to say 'no?' "

In May, 1948, he retired as chief of staff and a month later became president of Columbia university.

He was called back to the Pentagon for temporary service as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to help get the service unification program going. In December, 1950, he was sent to Paris to be supreme commander of the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

He continued to be the center of speculation as a possible candidate for President, although few, indeed, really knew whether he was a Republican or Democrat. It was recalled that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had named him—then a relative unknown outside of military circles—as supreme commander of allied forces for the invasion of Africa.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, twice defeated GOP presidential candidate, and others were backing an "Ike for President" move on the Republican side.

It wasn't until Jan. 7, 1952, the year of the election, that Eisenhower finally proclaimed himself a Republican and said he would be a candidate for President if he "got a clear-cut call to political duty."

The very popular general, of course, was elected President in the 1952 general election—by a landslide.

Four years later, in 1956, he was reelected by an even bigger majority.

General Eisenhower continued to demonstrate his courage, strength and determination to the end.

He waged a tremendous battle against illness dating back to his first heart attack in 1955. He had been in Walter Reed Army Medical Center almost a year, with a string of four heart attacks, surgery and pneumonia in February, and congestive heart failure earlier this month.

He died at 10:25 yesterday morning (MST) at the age of 78.

And, today, millions are remembering . . .

DRAFT STUDY APPLAUDED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted with President Nixon's announcement that he is appointing a Presidential Commission to study the concept of an all-volunteer armed force. This follows, almost exactly, the procedure which I advocated on January 31 in introducing my bill, S. 781, to estab-

XUM

lish a Commission to consider the feasibility of ending the draft.

I welcome the appointment of the distinguished former Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., as the Chairman of this Commission. I am pleased also that the President has decided to appoint primarily eminent members from related civilian fields, including business management and the academic community. I proposed similar guidelines in my bill.

While other Commission studies of the draft have been aimed primarily at the inequities of selective service, they have tended to look on the question of a volunteer armed force—if indeed they have looked on it at all—only as one of a number of alternatives to the present system. I join in hoping that this new Commission will deal with a volunteer armed force exclusively so that it may devote its full energies to the President's directive asking this Commission to develop a comprehensive plan for eliminating the draft and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force.

DESIRE FOR REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES FOR WAR, DEFENSE, AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an editorial published in the Janesville, Wis., Daily Gazette of March 14, 1969. The editorial relates the results of a poll by Senator William Proxmire in which the people of Wisconsin voice their strong desire for a reduction in Federal expenditures for war, defense, the space program, and foreign aid.

The poll is particularly timely, Mr. President, because we will soon be asked to vote more billions of dollars for an anti-ballistic-missile system of dubious value and necessity. I believe that the people of Arkansas would concur wholeheartedly in the results of Senator Proxmire's poll.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Taxpayers Have Had It

Sen. William Proxmire recently set out to learn what the people were thinking. Now the results are in, and the message of the taxpayers comes through loud and clear—hold down government spending.

About 11,000 Wisconsinites from all parts of the state responded to Proxmire's questionnaire. By a margin of 24 to 1, they asked that all government spending be held down. The taxpayers also favored, by 2 to 1, letting the 10 per cent surtax expire as scheduled July 1.

"The message I read in the results of my latest constituent poll is that the long-talked-about taxpayers' revolt is upon us. It's here! The Congress and the administration can ignore it only at their own peril," Proxmire said.

The Democratic senator said the response to his poll was the largest he had ever received, and it contained some surprises. Fifteen months ago a similar questionnaire was sent out which listed areas where spending should be cut. Those responding put defense-spending nearly at the bottom.

The latest poll, however, lists foreign aid, space and defense as the prime areas where spending should be cut. Proxmire said 9 out of 10 opposed further increases in military spending.

"Even popular areas such as education and health are not immune this year from the taxpayers' wrath," Proxmire said. "In both these categories, respondents to my questionnaire favored holding down spending by 3 to 2 margins. Social security was the only federal program to come close to winning support, but even here about 51 per cent were opposed to an increase."

Proxmire's poll clearly shows what we have been saying all along—people have had it with mammoth federal spending programs. They are fed up with the staggering cost of the Vietnam War, the foreign aid program and the space program. The government dares not submit these issues to a national referendum, because they know the result would be overwhelming repudiation by the American people.

Anyone who doubts the mood of the people need look no further than Youngstown, Ohio, where voters closed the schools for four weeks rather than vote for higher taxes. Did the people of Youngstown do this because they don't care what kind of education their children get? Any parent knows better than that.

No, they did it because it was the only chance they had for a direct vote against raising taxes. If taxpayers are willing to vote down increased spending for educating their children, it is not hard to imagine how overwhelmingly they would have voted down any other proposal.

The tragic thing here is that state and local governments are being forced to pay for the spending excesses of the federal government, which gets the lion's share of the tax dollar and expends it with a free hand. And money spent on overseas wars and foreign aid programs is money that cannot be returned to state and local governments.

Proxmire has gauged the mood of the public correctly when he says the taxpayers are ready to revolt, and he is even more correct in saying Congress and the administration may ignore it at their own peril.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, as a young county executive of 36 I was invited to attend a meeting at Gettysburg, Pa., on the farm of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. One of my most prized possessions is a picture taken of the two of us while I was there.

It was my privilege to be a precinct worker in 1952 when we worked so hard for the election of the great general. Probably more individuals than at any other time in history got out and worked for the man who had led us once before as Commander of Allied Forces during World War II. It was, in fact, an easy task to labor for such a hero whose accomplishments all Americans felt so much a part of.

Mr. President, knowing that immortality is no part of mortal man, I can only say that to be a Member of this body and be privileged to have my remarks be a part of history as a tribute to our former President is an honor which defies explanation. To have been a part in some small way in having had such a man as President of our country for 8 years shall always be a cherished part of my political endeavors.

This was a man the Republicans wanted in 1952, not because he was a party man, but because he could salvage a two-party system that some apparently had little concern to salvage. For those of us in our middle twenties he was to be the one man who could pull the Republican Party kicking and screaming into the 20th century. This he did, and for this we shall be forever grateful—not just as a party but as a nation.

To meet him was to know a kind man. To hear him was to listen to an honest man. No such words as "credibility gap" could have been uttered by the most contrary newswriter in those 8 years. Security was President Eisenhower. Confidence was President Eisenhower. And the abiding faith of this man reflected itself in a people who saw no dishonor or disrespect in referring to their President as "Ike" anywhere in the world. He was a man we all knew intimately in the true tradition of America.

He said during an interview at Gettysburg that he wanted to take worn-out land and through hard work and revitalization leave it far better land when he died. Through his efforts he has done for America that same job of revitalization and has indeed left for us a far better land.

CONNECTICUT OPERATING ENGINEERS TAKE LEAD IN TRAINING HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I invite the attention of Senators to a project currently underway in Connecticut that is in the best tradition of the American labor movement.

It is called the Camp Dempsey training program and is sponsored and directed by the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 478, Hamden, Conn., in cooperation with several State and Federal agencies and some independent organizations.

In brief, this is an on-the-job training program for heavy equipment operators. Among those taking part in the program are 50 of the hard-core unemployed recruited by the Connecticut community affairs department.

At Camp Dempsey, these trainees are not only learning new skills, but are actually taking part in the construction of an airfield.

I salute the officers and men of Local 478, particularly Sonny Metz, business manager, and Quinton Hinton, project director, for taking the initiative in opening the door of opportunity to their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record several articles and a letter from John A. Hansen, regional Federal highway administrator to Gov. John N. Dempsey that appear in the March issue of the record of Local 478, Operating Engineers.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

XUM

FEBRUARY 6, 1969.

Hon. JOHN N. DEMPSEY,
Governor of Connecticut,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR GOVERNOR DEMPSEY: On January 30, 1969, I accompanied several of my staff representatives on a visit to the training program being conducted at Camp Dempsey sponsored and directed by the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 478, Hamden, Connecticut in cooperation with several State and Federal agencies and some independent organizations. Others participating in the visit included Mr. William L. Huntington and Mr. John F. Hogan of the Connecticut State Highway Department representing Commissioner Howard S. Ives.

Our particular interest in the Training program, along with the representatives of the Connecticut State Highway Department, was in relationship to the equal employment provisions enacted by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968. More recently, our Federal Highway Administration issued implementing policies and procedures governing the required prequalification of Federal-aid highway contractors and subcontractors relative to this equal employment requirement. One of the most significant and important features in the individual contractors prequalification statement is related to assisting minority member to enter preapprenticeship and apprenticeship training programs including active participation in such programs.

We are all particularly impressed by the very professional manner in which the training program had been planned and organized, and the very effective quality of the on-the-job type of training being conducted. From my discussion with several of the trainees, the immediate goal of the program to provide training to disadvantaged members of minority groups in the operation of heavy duty equipment, will be very successfully realized.

In realizing this important program goal, commendable credit must be given to the Business Manager, Project Directors, and Instructors from the Connecticut Local Union 478 for their outstanding work in organizing, managing and conducting the training. They in turn are the first to suggest that it could not have been realized without the cooperative support and assistance provided by the other participating agencies, and particularly the importance of the facilities made available by the State of Connecticut at Camp Dempsey.

I thought you would be interested in learning of our visit to the project and the very favorable impression we have of it. We are much interested in programs of this type and will work with the Connecticut State Highway Department in any manner possible in implementing and advancing this particular feature of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HANSEN,
Regional Federal Highway Administrator.

CAMP DEMPSEY TRAINING PROGRAM

(By Quinton Hinton)

On February 24, 1969 Local 478 reached the half way mark of the training school.

The first group of fifty upgrades from Local 478 finished six weeks of school on February 24, 1969.

Each upgrade felt this school was one of the most productive programs they ever had an opportunity to be part of. The fifty new trainees that were selected by the Connecticut Community Affairs Department are doing an outstanding job in the program. Their interest has been so great in wanting to learn the operation of heavy equipment that one class learning the Grader operation went to the Instructor and requested extra hours to be added to their schedule so they could have more operating machine time.

Our project director and assistant project director plus each instructor is doing an outstanding job for the program.

Some Contractors have done outstanding things in helping us with equipment needed for training, but several large contractors contributed nothing in equipment or interest to the program. We have had some bad weather conditions but with a little good luck we should land a plane on the Airport on April 4, 1969.

On February 27, 1969, Sonny Metz held a meeting with several contractors also State and Federal groups to discuss prequalifying the contractors for bidding heavy highway work in Connecticut. Sonny told John Mullins and his staff from the Federal Highway Administration, Delmar, N.Y. and State Senator Paul Amenta, Chairman of Roads and Bridges, that he felt that the only contractors that could qualify for bidding work on Highways in Connecticut should be the contractors that have showed interest in helping the training program at Camp Dempsey. After the meeting all groups went to Camp Dempsey and reviewed the Program.

STONE'S RANCH MILITARY RESERVATION

(By Harry T. Jarrett, project engineer)

The Stone's Ranch Military Reservation and Camp Dempsey, Niantic, Conn. are being used for on-the-job training program for heavy equipment operators during the period of 13 January to 4 April, 1969.

Through the cooperation of various State and Federal agencies, and local contractors who supply the machines and equipment, the International Union of Operating Engineers, local 478, Connecticut, is conducting a school for new trainees (fifty hard-core unemployed) and to upgrade the skills of other union members (one hundred). The machines that are being taught are (1) the bulldozer (Walt Tedford), (2) scraper (Bill Gibson), (3) front end loader (Joe Frattarola), (4) hydraulic backhoe (Al Caswell), (5) cable back-hoe (Larry Cain), (6) grader (Dave Phillips), and (7) Gradall (Ted Stack). In addition a heavy maintenance and mechanics course (General Smith) is being given.

The program consists primarily of practical work in the actual construction of an airfield. The former airstrip was only in the pioneer classification. As a result of the discontinuance of the O–IE (Bird Dog) aircraft and the introduction of the heavier U–6A (Beaver) aircraft in the Connecticut Army National Guard that old airstrip (less than 1000 feet of the original 1250 feet was still usable) has become inadequate for training and unsafe for fully loaded U–6A aircraft. A new Army airfield was designed providing for a combined runway and overrun length of 1900 feet with a separate taxiway and parking apron to accommodate up to fifteen aircraft of the Beaver type. This new airfield will be in the next higher classification, up to that of "hasty" type primarily because it is as yet unpaved.

These trainees and upgrades are for the most part young men whose skills in the event of a national emergency would be valuable to any of the uniformed armed services. Some of them will undoubtedly be employed in some future civil works program of the Corps of Engineers, such as the flood control dams built in Connecticut after the disastrous floods of 1955. It is hoped that this type of program will expand and be successful, for it will certainly be of benefit to the construction industry and also in the national interest.

WHAT FUTURE OPERATORS SAY

Particularly interesting are the comments of veterans, who are numerous among the trainees.

Abel Perry, Preston: "I ran a bulldozer some in the Army, handled some other equipment too. The Army doesn't really teach you anything, just puts you on the machine and you do what you can."

"I couldn't get a job on machinery when I got out, wasn't qualified. I worked as a laborer. This is a wonderful program; I wish other Unions would do the same thing."

Philip Carrier Jr., New London: "I was a rifleman with the 10th Infantry in Vietnam. When I got back there was nothing for me. Grub work that didn't pay anything and wasn't going anywhere. This is wonderful for me, but what about the other guys. There must be thousands like me."

William Mock, Waterbury: "I put in 13 months with the 101 Airborne in the Nam. The only job I could get was a baker's assistant at minimum wages.

"I went to the veteran's office at the employment office, told him I didn't want any more mickey mouse. I wanted something with some sort of future, a job where you can earn a decent living and get ahead. This is just great."

THE SANDPIPERS, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the youth of America is one of the most often talked about subjects of the day. Some say that there is a noneconomic revolution in which the youth of our great country is intolerant of our institutions, government, and traditions. There have been references to a generation gap. Too frequently we hear only the bad side of a vocal minority and nothing of the dedicated, diligent majority who are truly indicative of our youth of today.

Here in our Nation's Capital a noteworthy effort involving the youth of our country is just concluding. Over 1,000 high school seniors from all of the 50 States and Puerto Rico have attended the "Presidential Classroom for Young Americans." These dedicated youths have had a concentrated series of academic seminars in the study of our Government. They have been enlightened through personal involvement, showing them what the Government is doing in various fields, to encourage dedication to, and understanding of, the American system. As a tribute to these youths, three of their fellow American youths from the Golden State of California, the Sandpipers, volunteered to come at their own expense to entertain the students at the conclusion of the series as a gesture of appreciation for their interest in our Government and its institutions. The Sandpipers, who have become nationally famous recording and entertainment stars, are Jim Brady, Michael Piano, and Richard Shoff. These young men were raised in California and are residents of our State, at an early age, sang with their church choirs. They met when they joined the famous Mitchell Boys Choir group. They leapt into national fame with their best-selling recording, "Guantanamera." Their music has truly bridged the generation gap and has been a source of inspiration not only to Americans but to our friends throughout the world. The Sandpipers are omnilingual and sing in 11 different languages. In addition to their personal appearances through the United States, they have appeared throughout South America and Europe. It is said that the youth of today are the leaders of tomorrow. It is reassuring to see such representatives of today's American youth as the students who have attended a "Presidential Classroom for Young Americans," as well as the Sandpipers.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, all the Nation and the world mourn the loss of Dwight David Eisenhower, whom history will remember as one of the truly great Americans of all times. General Eisenhower served his country with distinction in time of war and peace. He directed the course of this Nation and our allies to victory over tyranny in a time when the freedom and dignity of man were put to its most severe test. His courage and devotion to duty earned him the eternal gratitude of his fellow countrymen and all the people of Europe.

As President of the United States, Eisenhower was again called to lead our Nation and the free world through war against totalitarianism, and to guide our people through economic and social crisis.

He was a great general. He was a fine man and one of the most popular Presidents in American history. He will be sorely missed.

FLOOD CONTROL IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has been estimated that the projects now in being to help control floods in California prevented approximately $1.25 billion in damages during the heavy storms in my State in January alone, and that they provided similar benefits during last month's rainfalls. In fact, I am told that in some areas, the amount of damage prevention was more than the entire contribution which the Federal Government has made to date to help protect these regions from such natural disasters.

Many of the projects which were so important to California during the recent disaster period are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. They will also play a vital role in the months ahead, when record snowpacks in the area begin to melt.

An interesting and informative news release on this matter was issued recently by the Department of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After preventing millions of dollars worth of damage from runoff following the heavy storms in January and February, Federal Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs in northern and central California are now being programmed to catch the record runoffs expected from snowmelt this spring and summer.

"Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs operated magnificently to prevent flood damage during the unusually heavy storms this winter," said Robert J. Pafford, Jr., the Bureau's Regional Director in Sacramento.

"Now most of them are ready—or are being made ready—to control the expected onslaught from the melting snows in the mountains." Pafford noted that in addition to the snowpack being the deepest in history in many spots, it is also the wettest. "In the watershed above Friant Dam, for example," he said, "the snow is 12 feet deep at Huntington Lake and contains about 4 feet of water. When the snow melts and that water starts pouring down into the valley, we have to be ready to control it."

To meet the threat of the expected record runoffs from the upper San Joaquin River watershed, Millerton Lake behind Friant Dam is being brought down rapidly to its minimum pool for the first time in history. Ordinarily the storage would be about 300,000 acre-feet at the end of March, but this year we are evacuating to about 130,000 acre-feet.

Flood control releases so far this year from Friant Dam have kept the flow below the 8,000 cubic foot per second capacity of the channel downstream from the dam, except for a brief period when tributary inflows downstream from Friant caused the San Joaquin River flow to exceed 9,000 c.f.s., despite inflow into the reservoir which at one time reached 37,000 c.f.s.

The Madera and Friant-Kern Canals will be used to help control flood releases. Both canals were damaged by floods last month, the Friant-Kern quite severely. Both canals are expected to be ready for use by the end of this month.

In the northern part of the state, Shasta Dam served as the flood control anchor on the Sacramento River during the heavy storm period.

When the storms began, Shasta Lake held 2,850,000 acre-feet of water. More than 2,750,000 acre-feet of water poured into Shasta Lake during January and February, at one time at a rate of flow in excess of 100,000 c.f.s. Releases from Keswick Reservoir—the regulatory dam and reservoir below Shasta Dam—were held to 50,000 c.f.s.

There is now enough storage space available in Shasta Lake, 1,300,000 acre-feet, to handle the anticipated runoff from additional rainfall and the snows piled high in the Cascade Mountains. Given normal rainfall for the remainder of the year, and the above-normal runoff expected from the snowpack, Shasta Lake should fill this spring.

West of Shasta, across the Trinity Mountains, Clair Engle Lake behind Trinity Dam has room to store 850,000 acre-feet of runoff and should be easily able to handle snowmelt from the Trinity Alps. During the past 2 months, 290,000 acre-feet of runoff has flowed into Clair Engle Lake and the water level has risen 20 feet. It, too, has an excellent chance of filling this year.

Just northeast of Sacramento on the American River, Folsom Lake has been dropped down to 573,000 acre-feet after climbing to 790,000 acre-feet during the peak of the runoff from the January-February storms. The heaviest runoff into Folsom Lake during the storms was 85,000 c.f.s. Maximum releases were held to 70,000 c.f.s.

Folsom is expected to fill sometime in June, but barring unusual warm weather early in the runoff season or further storms, the Bureau anticipates little difficulty in handling the snowmelt in the Folsom watershed through controlled releases into the American River.

West of Sacramento, Lake Berryessa behind Monticello Dam has been doing its usual unheralded flood control chore, just as Bureau engineers designed it. Monticello has a glory hole spillway. The lip of the spillway is 16 feet below the design maximum water surface.

When the water level reaches the lip of the spillway, it begins to pour out just as water pours out from the bottom of a bathtub when the plug is pulled. But if water is coming into Berryessa faster than it is going out the water level will climb, just as water does in a bathtub, even if the plug has been pulled, when the inflow is greater than the outflow.

The 16 feet above the glory hole spillway at Berryessa provide over 300,000 acre-feet of flood control storage space. The water level in Berryessa reached the lip of the spillway on January 22. Since then, nearly 250,000 acre-feet of water, which on two occasions entered the reservoir at rates of over 20,000 c.f.s., has been released harmlessly at rates no greater than about 6,000 c.f.s.

To the southwest of the Region, the water level in Twitchell Reservoir in the Santa Maria Project has reached the flood control zone of the reservoir for the first time in its history. The upper 89,000 acre-feet of space were designed into the reservoir for flood control purposes. After water reaches a storage of 150,000 acre-feet, as it did on February 25, it is released as rapidly as possible so the reservoir can be ready to control the runoff from the next storm.

SHASTA-TRINITY-RED BLUFF AREA

At the end of February, Shasta Lake held 3,197,300 acre-feet of water in storage. Clair Engle Lake contained 1,585,210 acre-feet; Whiskeytown Lake, 184,800 acre-feet; Lake Red Bluff, 3,220; East Park Reservoir, 49,710; Stony Gorge, 40,170; and Black Butte, 37,340. Deliveries through the Corning Canal during February were 200 acre-feet.

AMERICAN RIVER AREA

Folsom Lake held 598,800 acre-feet in storage at the end of February, while Jenkinson Lake contained 41,180 acre-feet.

LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER-DELTA AREA

Storage in Lake Berryessa at the end of the month was 1,661,560 acre-feet. Putah South Canal moved 1,370 acre-feet. The Contra Costa Canal carried 3,330 acre-feet and the Delta-Mendota Canal, 166,450 acre-feet. Delta outflow during the month averaged 97,300 cubic feet per second.

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

San Luis Reservoir storage increased to 1,600,780 acre-feet during February, a gain of 255,640 acre-feet. O'Neill Forebay stood at 52,170 acre-feet at month's end and Los Banos Detention Reservoir held 23,200 acre-feet. Storage at Millerton Lake stood at 359,700 acre-feet at the end of the month. New Hogan Reservoir contained 184,340 acre-feet at month's end. The Friant-Kern Canal delivered 21,540 acre-feet during February. Deliveries through Madera Canal were 16,010 acre-feet.

SOUTHERN COASTAL AREA

Twitchell Reservoir held 186,060 acre-feet on February 28; Lake Cachuma held 199,700 acre-feet at the end of the month; and Lake Casitas, 186,290 acre-feet.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a little bit of each of us died last Friday when General Eisenhower passed away at Walter Reed Hospital. A little bit of each of us will be buried on Wednesday when Ike is laid to rest in his boyhood town of Abilene, Kans.

To offer eulogy to a man of General Eisenhower's stature is in many ways difficult and perhaps futile. A spoken word with but few exceptions will not outlive a lifetime of greatness, deeds, and service. Few will remember what is said of President Eisenhower during this time of mourning. Almost no one who knew him or who will study his life will forget his deeds and lifetime of service. General Eisenhower was the epitome of modesty. He had almost no concern for the image which he made and this indeed is a rare trait at a time when image is often considered more important than performance. As the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Eisenhower commanded the largest war machine ever created. To assemble it was difficult, but to land it successfully on the coast of France at Omaha and Utah beaches was perhaps asking too much. Yet General

XUM

Eisenhower succeeded, and we will always remember that success. But what if the Normandy landings had failed? Prior to D-Day Ike had prepared a statement personally assuming all responsibility for the failure, should it come. Mr. President, I submit that like the men he commanded, uncommon courage was a common virtue to the Supreme Commander.

He conducted the Presidency of the United States with a rare and honorable dignity. He acted and formulated his policies in a way that he believed best for the American people and the world. It was a refreshing 8 years when candor, honesty, and decency each had a fountainhead at the White House. The most severe test of any man's performance is the test of time, and General Eisenhower is passing that test remarkably well. He will be buried in Abilene adjudged by most as a great President and in retrospect the people of America and the people of the world have come to appreciate that fact.

It can be safely said of the man who left his hometown to attend West Point that, wherever he went, greatness pursued him. He was indeed the antithesis of the fact that most men seek greatness. In the life of Dwight Eisenhower, greatness sought the man. Certainly General Eisenhower proved perhaps more than any man in American history that simplicity and greatness are not incompatible.

Wrapped up in President Eisenhower were all of the virtues that made and still make America great. He understood and lived, as few men have, the concept of duty. He believed in and practiced honor. There were no pomp and pretense in him because simplicity was as much a part of him as was his contagious smile. President Eisenhower had also mastered the first and great Commandment of the New Testament, which was so beautifully pointed out by President Nixon on Sunday. One of the greatest tributes that can be given to any man is to say that he hated no one. He could disagree, but that disagreement was with ideas, with policies, and with thoughts.

I was also very impressed by the comments of President Nixon when he said that "Mr. Eisenhower was the right man at the right time in the right place." Not since the Civil War has the Nation been so confused, so torn, and so divided in its national life. The virtues that made this country great are undergoing criticism and reevaluation. I cannot help thinking that with the passing of this great American, we can pause in this crisis and reexamine his life and by so doing rediscover and hopefully rededicate ourselves to the principles of national greatness. We truly need in America a rededication and a new determination to live by the principles for which President Eisenhower stood.

To the people of Utah, Ike was a special man. In the 1952 and 1956 elections they gave him an overwhelming majority. They loved him and respected him. They knew they had a friend in Washington when he fought for and helped win the battle for the Upper Colorado River project. I speak for all of our citizens when I say that he will be long remembered and forever respected.

One cannot bid farewell to General Eisenhower, nor pay a truly fitting tribute to him without expressing appreciation, love, and respect for the courageous and wonderful lady that stood by him throughout his years of public service. One can probably never measure nor really know the sustaining power and influence that Mrs. Eisenhower had on her husband. She understood and knew him better than anyone else and we can only say that her role as wife and companion is deeply appreciated by all Americans. She invokes in my mind the Scripture from the Book of Ruth where if she did not say it in words, she performed it in deeds. Whither he went she went, and her people and his people and his causes were hers. We offer to Mamie Eisenhower at this time our love, our respect, and our deepest sympathies.

In closing, may I repeat once again a thought from President Nixon's eulogy: not since the time of George Washington has this Nation been able to say about a President or any public figure that he was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. But perhaps the greatest tributes that will ever be paid Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower are the silent ones, or those unspoken or unwritten, in which mothers and fathers throughout America and the world are saying to their sons, or perhaps even silently wishing in their hearts, that they hope they might grow up to be like Ike.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from leading Utah newspapers praising General Eisenhower be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret (Utah) News, Mar. 28, 1969]

WHY AMERICANS WILL ALWAYS LIKE IKE

As a sorrowing nation mourns the passing of one of its greatest and most beloved leaders there is little to be said about Dwight David Eisenhower that has not only been said before, but repeated frequently.

From his early years as a Kansas farmboy to his rise from an obscure lieutenant to become Supreme Commander of the allied forces that smashed Hitler's "Fortress Europe" from his stint as President of Columbia University to his accomplishments as the first Republican President of the United States in twenty years and his public service after leaving the White House the life of "Ike" Eisenhower has been thoroughly chronicled as for few others.

No words can add or detract from his accomplishments or the honor bestowed upon him all over the world, nor can words enhance the love or ease the sadness that his countrymen feel at his demise.

As Americans reflect upon the life and works of this remarkable soldier, statesman, and leader, they would do well to ask why he won the admiration, but also the respect of so many people in all walks of life.

Was it because Dwight David Eisenhower was a fatherly figure to the entire country—firm but kind? Was it because he had the "common touch" being a man of simple tastes? Was it because he genuinely liked people—and they responded in kind? Was it because of his undeniable sincerity as a man of peace? Was it clean cut integrity?

No doubt these and many other well known aspects of Dwight Eisenhower's personality help explain his amazingly widespread and enduring popularity.

But there is one facet of his character that has been generally neglected which speaks volumes about the man. It is a facet that was touched on in a thumbnail sketch written two years ago by Bryce N. Harlow, one of Eisenhower's closest aides during his eight years in the White House who observed:

"Take the attributes you consider the most admirable in the people you know, put them in a mixer and you'll come up with the Eisenhower blend."

He is vitality and power and force—yet he is profoundly sensitive to the needs and feelings of others. He dominates the people around him—yet eagerly solicits and advises and readily acknowledges error. He has great dignity and reserve reflecting a quarter century of command and association with world leaders—yet he transforms instantly in "Ike of Kansas" with the school boy grin radiating amiability and warmth and a friendliness of a cocker spaniel.

He had had the adulation of people all over the world for two decades and more—yet is humble to the point of being self-effacing. He detests the personal pronoun and has scratched out hundreds of I's from speechcrafts. Many of his political speeches have ended up almost sterile because of his dislike of blowing his own horn.

During all of his White House days, he forbade the use of the word *"my"* before the *cabinet* insisting that the prestigious institution should always be called "the cabinet."

One of his favorite admonitions is "always consider your job important, never yourself." In 1942 in North Africa General Marshall asked him what is the most important attribute of a leader, his anwer was "selflessness."

Whatever history records of Dwight D. Eisenhower's accomplishments as a soldier and statesman, the record will not be complete without his accomplishments as a man and the inspiration he provided his helping Americans live better lives of service and devotion to their country.

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 29, 1969]

A MAN FOR HIS TIMES

Often in this fortunate country's history the right man has come forth in times of national need. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was such a man.

During World War II he rose from relative obscurity to plan, then execute, the invasion of Hitler's Fortress Europe. In 1952 when Americans were frustrated and bogged down in a seemingly fruitless and unwanted war in Korea, he agreed to seek the presidency if given "a clear call to political duty." Republican leaders saw to it that the call was forthcoming and Gen. Eisenhower, then serving as supreme commander of the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, answered without further hesitation.

Americans of all political persuasions turned to the former general in hope that his international prestige could restore and preserve peace and bring on the good life. To a remarkable degree these hopes were realized. The eight Eisenhower years, though frayed at times by tense international incidents, were, in the overall, good ones.

His death Friday at the age of 78 will be mourned as one mourns the passing of a kindly relative who saw the family through troubled times in other years that now seem almost placid by comparison.

Though he was coaxed into politics and never practiced that art in the usual fashion, Gen. Eisenhower was nevertheless reluctant to cut political ties after stepping down. He continued active in Republican affairs and

XUM

spoke out frequently in criticism—and sometimes support—of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations that followed. He took a hand in reknitting the Republican Party which strayed from his more liberal concepts and came to disaster in the Goldwater debacle of 1964. His last public utterance was addressed to the party, revitalized and then meeting in convention in Miami Beach last August.

History has yet to pronounce its verdict on Eisenhower the general or on Eisenhower the President. Criticisms of both roles have been made by knowledgeable persons of high repute and these must be weighed. But Eisenhower of the infectious grin and fatherly aura must be audited in the abstract.

His greatness lay in his ability to instill in millions of people here and abroad the feeling that the world's mightiest power was in responsible hands and that all was well. Though hampered by illness and pressed by mounting crises that eventually eroded some confidence in his leadership, Dwight Eisenhower made good that trust. The America he handed over to John F. Kennedy was by no means perfect, but it had been calmed and rested and made ready to withstand the upheavals that have visited it since.

HIGH-INTEREST RATES FOR HOUSING—A NATIONAL DISGRACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Friday's Wall Street Journal contains an article which clearly and dramatically shows the effects of high-interest rates on our Nation's middle- and lower-income home buyers.

These interest rates coupled with the higher initial downpayments now required by banks and other financial institutions have made it almost impossible for our Nation's citizens to purchase even moderate-priced homes. High-interest rates—which in some areas reach 8 percent—in a tight money market would be bad enough; what makes it a national disgrace is, as the Wall Street Journal clearly points out:

> The mortgage squeeze doesn't reflect a severe money shortage; most banks say they have a normal supply of funds to lend. The problem is that demand for all types of loans is strong and that even with home mortgage interest rates at high levels, banks can earn higher returns on their money elsewhere.

Even where middle-income families are able to scrape up enough money to meet these high downpayments, the problems do not end. This is due to the skyrocketing monthly mortgage payments caused not only by rising interest rates, but by ever increasing property taxes and homebuilding costs. This point is excellently illustrated by the Wall Street Journal when it states:

> Home prices are about 10% higher than last year, and so an individual would need a $22,000 loan to buy the same house. In addition, property taxes have risen about 5%. At the current going rate of 7.5% interest, the monthly payments on a 30-year, $22,000 mortgage on the home would be $206.33—$153.83 for principal and interest and $52.50 for taxes and insurance—a 15% increase.
>
> * * * * *
>
> **A sergeant at Warner Robins Air Force Base near Macon, Ga., can't get a home loan because his pay isn't high enough to meet monthly payments required by the current 7.5% interest rate; he would have qualified at last year's 6.75% level.**
>
> **In Boise, Idaho, public relations man David Hedges is living in a rented home while his** family remains in Portland, Oreg., trying to sell their home. Mr. Hedges took a job with Boise Cascade Corp. last December, confident he could sell his house quickly, but it hasn't worked that way. "We've had dozens and dozens of people who said they liked the place and thought the price ($20,900) was right," he says, but financing problems have prevented a sale.
>
> Elsewhere families in search of homes are finding their choice limited by the relatively small number of houses up for sale. People who own homes are showing a growing reluctance to part with them and trade their present, cheaper mortgages for the uncertainties of the current market.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, recently held 2 days of hearings on this subject matter. I, for one, am shocked by the administration's position as stated by Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Preston Martin, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and Charles E. Walker, Under Secretary of the Treasury. These gentlemen have all echoed the same tune, just trust us and everything will take care of itself. The Nixon administration's lack of imagination, innovation, and positive solutions to this most pressing problem shows a distinct lack of leadership.

At our hearings, the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, suggested the following proposed policies to help alleviate the situation. They were:

First. Precluding banks from borrowing Euro-dollars.

Second. Preventing commercial banks from selling Government securities.

Third. Using the discount window to encourage banks to cut business lending.

Fourth. Sending letters to banks from the Federal Reserve Board urging a reduction in business lending.

Fifth. Using the moral leadership of President Nixon to persuade businessmen to cut back their planned investment spending.

While many of us may not agree with all of these items, they were positive proposals which could reduce the interest rates now charged to home buyers. Amazingly enough, Mr. Walker without offering any positive suggestions summarily dismissed all five.

Apparently President Nixon and his administration are of one mind—that the building of an antiballistic system of doubtful value is more important and has greater priority than creating decent housing at reasonable prices for the American people.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly recommend the Wall Street Journal article of March 28, entitled "Mortgage Squeeze—Would-Be Home Buyers Face Growing Difficulty in Arranging for Loans," to all Senators who are interested in establishing true national priorities. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTGAGE SQUEEZE: WOULD-BE HOME BUYERS FACE GROWING DIFFICULTY IN ARRANGING FOR LOANS—DOWN PAYMENTS AND INTEREST RATES RISE—LENDERS FIND HIGHER RETURNS ELSEWHERE—A SERGEANT CANNOT SWING IT

The middle-income home buyer is losing out in the current scramble for loan funds, and his plight probably will get worse before it gets better.

That's the conclusion emerging from Wall Street Journal interviews with bankers, economists, real estate brokers and people shopping for homes in or near major cities around the country.

In some states, legal ceilings on home-loan interest rates have all but dried up the mortgage market. Even where funds are more readily available, many banks have made it tough for individuals to get loans by hiking interest rates and down-payment requirements and reducing the duration of their commitments. These factors, coupled with soaring home prices, are putting even moderate-priced homes out of the reach of many Americans.

"It's come to be very difficult for a person to finance his first home unless he has a wealthy relative to stake him," says John F. Hollman, senior vice president of Wells Fargo Bank in San Francisco. The bank now makes home loans for a maximum of 20 years, requires a 30% down payment and charges interest of 8% to 8.25%; a year ago it made 25-year loans at 6.5% to 6.75% on a down payment of 20% of the home purchase price.

ALLTIME HIGH RATES

The Federal Home Loan Bank recently reported that the national average effective interest rate on conventional new-home loans last month was 7.39%, the highest figure ever. That's up from 6.62% in February 1968 and 6.58% in November and December of 1966, the height of that year's "credit crunch."

The mortgage squeeze doesn't reflect a severe money shortage; most banks say they have a normal supply of funds to lend. The problem is that demand for all types of loans is strong and that even with home mortgage interest rates at high levels, banks can earn higher returns on their money elsewhere.

The commercial bank prime rate—the interest charged the most credit-worthy customers—officially stands at 7.5% with the actual rate close to 9% because banks are requiring that a portion of such loans be kept on deposit.

Top-rate corporations also have been finding money expensive on the bond markets, another outlet for bank funds. This week Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co., whose credit standing is only slightly lower than the best-rated firms, had to accept an interest rate of 8.425% to sell $60 million of 20 year debentures, the highest rate of this century for the type of offering.

In New York and New Jersey, where the home-loan interest ceiling is set at 7.5%, bankers can lend money to apartment builders for a return of 8.5% plus a share in the building's profits.

Such a return is proving "extremely attractive to long-term lenders," says James O'Leary, vice president of U.S. Trust Co. in New York. He adds that apartment building in the New York metropolitan area promises to be "very, very strong" this year, while the availability of funds for single-family homes is "uncertain."

USURY LAWS' IMPACT

The mortgage money pinch is tightest in states where so-called usury laws have pegged the home loan interest rate well below present returns on other types of loans. Illinois, Michigan and Pennsylvania won't let banks charge more than 7% annual interest

XUM

on conventional mortgage loans (although they can get 7.5% on loans underwritten by the Federal Housing Administration).

Earlier this year, some lending institutions in Illinois and Pennsylvania began circumventing the 7% ceiling by tacking service fees known as "points" on home loans they approved; these "points" usually amounted to 1% or 2% of the face amount of the loan and had to be paid in cash by the borrower as a condition of getting a mortgage.

But more recently even that hasn't been enough to entice some institutions in those states into making conventional mortgage loans, the type through which most home purchases are financed. What's more, bankers make it clear they won't return to the market until the ceilings are raised substantially.

A "TRICKLE" OF LOANS

"We no longer consider conventional mortgages profitable," declares Jacob Gross, president of Bell Savings & Loan Associates in Philadelphia. In Chicago, Charles C. Barrett, vice president of Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co., the city's largest bank, says his institution's home-loan activity is "down to a trickle." Loans are being made only to good commercial customers "who twist our arm a little," he adds.

The loan pinch isn't felt with equal severity everywhere, of course, but banks all over the country have been making it tougher for individuals to qualify for home loans. To get a home loan at Orange Savings Bank in Orange, N.J., for instance, "you have to be a depositor of ours or a customer of a realtor or attorney who in the past regularly provided us with mortgages," says president James McCracken III. "They took care of us; now we're taking care of them." Down payments in some sections of the country now run as high as 33⅓%.

Prospective home owners who can come up with a large chuck of down payment cash then must cope with the high monthly payments caused by rising interest and property tax rates and higher home prices. Many banks won't make a loan where monthly mortgage payments plus taxes and insurance total more than one-fourth the applicants salary. Thus, the increases have priced some shoppers out of the home market.

Advance Mortgage Corp. of Detroit, a major mortgage lender that periodically surveys the housing market nationwide, says that about a year ago, when home-loan interest rates averaged 6.75% nationally, a typical new borrower's monthly payment on a 30-year, $20,000 home loan came to $179.72—$129.72 a month for principal and interest and $50 for taxes.

Today, the company reports, home prices are about 10% higher than last year, so an individual would need a $22,000 loan to buy the same house. In addition, property taxes have risen about 5%. At the current going rate of 7.5% interest, the monthly payments on a 30-year, $22,000 mortgage on the home would be $206.33—$153.83 for principal and interest and $52.50 for taxes and insurance—a 15% increase.

Such requirements haven't slowed the pace of home sales in many areas of the country. "People are going ahead and buying" despite effective interest rates pushing 8% locally, says Jerry Smith, a real estate man in Mar Vista, Calif., a suburb of Los Angeles. "It's crazy . . . I can't figure it out . . . but things are moving."

Nevertheless, cases of hardship caused by the tight mortgage market abound. A sergeant at Warner Robin Air Force Base near Macon, Ga., can't get a home loan because his pay isn't high enough to meet monthly payments required by the current 7.5% interest rate; he would have qualified at last year's 6.75% level.

In Boise, Idaho, public relations man David Hedges is living in a rented home while his family remains in Portland, Ore., trying to sell their home. Mr. Hedges took a job with Boise Cascade Corp. last December, confident he could sell his house quickly, but it hasn't worked that way. "We've had dozens and dozens of people who said they liked the place and thought the price ($20,900) was right," he says, but financing problems have prevented a sale.

Elsewhere, families in search of homes are finding their choice limited by the relatively small number of houses up for sale. People who own homes are showing a growing reluctance to part with them and trade their present, cheaper mortgages for the uncertainties of the current market.

"People are less inclined to move up to a better house; they're saying 'Let's stay put,' " says and officer of Glendale Federal Savings & Loan in California.

When housing has to be obtained, however, some people find a way to do it. One executive of Scott Paper Co., recently transferred to Philadelphia from Pittsburgh, discovered that the only way he could get a 7% mortgage was to make a 50% down payment, or $25,000 on a $50,000 home. He did. "We decided to blow everything. We figured we have only a few more years while our teen-age children are still at home, so we extended ourselves."

But he adds that the decision hasn't been a comfortable one. "We've tied up everything in that house, and we're sunk if the market goes down," he says.

TRADE POLICY WITH JAPAN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the close relationship between California and Japan is nowhere more evident than in the field of trade. California agricultural products find a welcome place in Japan and Japanese industrial products find strong markets in this country.

At the recent meeting of the Agricultural Council of California held in Sacramento on March 4, 1969, the Honorable Bunroku Yoshino, Minister, Embassy of Japan, spoke to the leaders of California agricultural cooperatives on mutually profitable trade policies. He said, for example:

> You men as leading agriculturalists can be proud of your growth record. Many of your nation's statesmen cite the great record of agriculture exports as one of your proudest national accomplishments. While your agricultural sales to Japan in 1968 were down slightly from the prior year they were the second highest on record, totalling approximately 900 million dollars. I know that we all share the belief that sales will turn upward again.

In view of the great progress being made in economic development in Japan, and the great importance of a satisfactory trade policy to American and particularly California farmers, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of Mr. Yoshino's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

I invite particular attention to the portion of Mr. Yoshino's remarks which deals with the import restriction bills which have been offered in Congress during the past few years.

Of course, numerous considerations are involved in this matter; therefore, I find it encouraging to find that Mr. Yoshino recognizes these factors and realizes that they are concerns which must be dealt with. It is my hope that such understanding can lead to solutions of certain problems which will do away with the need for any restrictive legislation.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. BUNROKU YOSHINO, MINISTER, EMBASSY OF JAPAN, BEFORE THE AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., MARCH 4, 1969

It is indeed an honor to appear on your program and speak to you today on a subject of vital importance to all of us—the potential for agriculture in Pacific area trade.

As a diplomat assigned twice to Washington, D.C., I have had several occasions to fly over the State of California. But this is the first time I have had the opportunity for a real visit in the Golden State. California is known to us as a state with a rapid growth rate comparable to that of my own country.

We have many things in common and that makes me feel at home here. Indeed, Wakamatsu, a short distance from here, founded as a center of Japanese immigration, will be holding its centenary celebration in June. I, as a national of those immigrants' mother country, should like to pay homage to these people, whose contribution to the vitality of this state has enriched both our countries.

This prosperous atmosphere on the West Coast, and especially in the State of California is the basis for my reflections on the potential of trade in the Pacific Basin.

The two-way trade between the United States and Japan has continued its unparalleled growth, with your sales to us exceeding 3.5 billion dollars and our exports to you slightly over 4 billion dollars in 1968. As a result of the uninterrupted period of fast growth in the American economy, Japan in recent years has reversed the traditional trade balance and enjoyed a surplus.

But it is becoming increasingly apparent that trade in the Pacific Basin cannot be viewed in a bilateral context. As an illustration, we all recognize that American investment is developing resources in Australia that are used to fuel the industries in Japan that supply American consumers with products made on American machinery by Japanese workmen who feast on American agricultural products.

Let us focus on the agricultural sector of this trade. The volume and growth of this trade is determined by U.S. supplies and sales efforts, by changes in Japan's own agriculture sector, and by the trade policies pursued by both our countries.

You men, as leading agriculturalists, can be proud of your growth record. In fact, many of your nation's statesmen cite the great record of agricultural exports as one of your proudest national accomplishments.

While your agricultural sales to Japan in 1968 were down slightly from the prior year, they were the second highest on record, totaling approximately 900 million dollars. I know we all share the belief that sales will turn upward again.

I believe it significant to note that these sales to Japan are equivalent to 32 percent of all U.S. exports to my country.

Corn and soybeans showed substantial gains. Wheat, grain, and sorghums, and raw cotton fell off somewhat.

One of the many interesting things I have discovered about the United States is the pride in which you hold your communities and your states. That is why I am sure you are well aware that California is the nation's leading exporter to Japan. Indeed, I was impressed to learn that eight out of the top ten agricultural income-producing counties in the whole United States are located here in California.

I think it is particularly significant that a major share of the cotton exported to Japan comes from California. It is one of California's major exports, returning some 65 million dollars and ranks third in the State's foreign sales after fruits and vegetables at 114 million dollars and rice at 67 million dollars.

This performance has been supported by a strong sales effort, including the continued visitation to Japan of U.S. technical trade missions in the agricultural field. Certainly, the increased competitiveness of the world cash markets is a signal for all sellers to be keenly aware of the influence of quality, grade, dependability of supply and delivery, and the many other factors which lead to satisfaction and trade growth between buyer and seller.

Your sales efforts, of course, must take account of the fundamental nature of Japan's agricultural sector, and the Government policies and technological changes that affect that sector. A similar broad view was taken by the Commodity Price Stabilization Promotion Council in its recent report to the Prime Minister in reference to measures my Government should take to stabilize domestic food prices and to increase productivity of Japanese agriculture and fisheries. The central theme of the Council's report is that Japanese agriculture, production, and trade policy must reflect consumer interest as well as the interest of the farmer.

This report was made in the context of a rapidly changing situation in Japan. The average Japanese urban household spent 38 percent of its monthly income for food in 1966. While this was an improvement of 10 percent compared with a decade earlier, I believe you can see the great opportunity for further development when you compare this with the 18 percent spent for food by the average wage earner here in the United States.

We are most pleased at the tremendous improvement in the quality of the Japanese diet. Even so, the major portion of Japanese food is of vegetable origin with animal foodstuffs accounting for a small percentage of the calorie intake. While intake of meat has increased nearly fourfold in the last two decades, our per capita supply of meat is still only about 1/13 of that in the United States. During the same period, our increase in consumption of eggs has been six-fold; milk and dairy products, ten-fold; citrus fruits and tomatoes, four-fold; and that of other fruits, more than double.

Consequently, you can quickly see how the logistics of the Japanese market provide excellent opportunities for increasing the sales of agricultural products from the United States and from California in particular.

All these developments must take place within the context of Government policy in both the United States and Japan. The report to the Prime Minister I referred to a moment ago pointed out that the liberalization of agriculture import policy could be an impulse toward improving both the efficiency and total production of Japanese agriculture. Food imports not only help stabilize prices by easing supply-demand pressures, but also tend to increase domestic efficiency.

Japan has, in fact, liberalized more than 90 percent of its trade; and we have strongly supported tariff cutting negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Nonetheless, we still have over 100 items on the so-called residual import restriction list, which is the source of a growing controversy not only among our trading partners but in Japan as well.

Many of the items on the list are unimportant to you but there are others such as fresh grapefruits and oranges, and lemon juice and tomato juice and beans. These are of immediate interest to you and you deserve my candid appraisal of the situation.

Why, you must ask, in the face of the obvious benefits of liberalization, is Japan still hesitating to open up her market to these relatively few imports? The answer would involve the whole long history of Japan's economic development, a success story in hindsight, but by no means an easy and comfortable process along the way.

In short, this past development was accomplished mainly through Government control and leadership, and, in spite of having started late in industrialization, in spite of a shortage of capital and technical know-how, and in spite of tremendous efforts lost or wasted in war and defeat. Thus, the tight-knit control and leadership, the isolation from the prosperous markets of Europe and America, the access only to surrounding markets less developed than our own, and most importantly, the belief that a policy successful in the past was adequate for the future—all these contributed to a psychology of protectionism in Japan.

With the emergence of Japan as the third largest industrial power, this psychology has been eroded but not completely displaced. Given the vested interests and involved relations of agribusiness and industry, politics and bureaucracy, it will take more time for Japan to fully and effectively embrace the dictates of liberal trade throughout our economy.

But we shall accomplish this, and the only question is one of timing.

For industrialization and urbanization are proceeding at a ruthless speed in Japan. More and more labor forces are being drawn to industrial centers and more and more farm population is attracted to urban life. This is a familiar phenomenon for you. For us, when combined with the rising standard of living of all our people, it cannot help but immensely increase our requirements for agricultural products from abroad. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to believe that Japan will pursue a liberal policy that will enhance our already favorable market for your agricultural supplies.

I hope I am wrong but I do not believe we can see such an optimistic direction in U.S. trade policy. In returning to this country after two years' absence, I was surprised and disappointed by the rash of import restriction bills being presented to the Congress. Limitations, in one form or another, are being sought on virtually all major Japanese exports to this country.

Bills are even being introduced in Congress to further cut back steel imports, even though the Japanese and European steel industries already agreed to substantial cutbacks under severe pressure from protectionist interests. Elaborate reasons were put forth to justify the limitations in what was characterized as the "special" steel situation.

But no sooner was the ink dry on that "voluntary" agreement than your Government announced the intention of seeking another so-called "voluntary" agreement, this time in textiles.

Let me make it quite clear that we do not automatically and without any examination condemn any and every suggestion for orderly adjustment in international trade. And it is not solely from the viewpoint of Japan's export interests that we find the plea for additional protection for textile and apparel to be completely unjustified.

An exhaustive and comprehensive report by the U.S. Tariff Commission, released last year, concluded that the U.S. textile and apparel industries "enjoyed a period of unparalleled growth since the early 1960's." To bring that up to date, the U.S. textile industry's sales increased by 11 percent and its profits by 45 percent for the first three quarters of 1968 compared to the same period in 1967. Similarly, the apparel industry's sales were up 10 percent and profits 28 percent.

A point that must be clearly understood, I believe, is that the so-called "voluntary" agreements are burdened with the same liabilities as mandatory quotas. And this is true with respect to both the exporting country and the importing country. For example, is consumer choice limited any less or price competition weakened any less because imports are excluded from your market by "voluntary" rather than mandatory agreements? In short, we must not let these semantics blind us to the equally bad effects of quotas, however imposed.

Of particular importance to those of you here are the effects of U.S. restrictions on trade policy in Japan. I said earlier that there is no question that we will achieve liberalization on items of interest to you: the only question is one of timing.

The position of those in Japanese Government and industry who wish the liberalization to be sooner rather than later is undercut by protectionism in the United States. I am sure that you can understand this just as we recognize that restrictions in Japan are used as an excuse by those seeking protection in the United States.

Therefore, it is evident that for us to achieve growth in agricultural trade in the Pacific area, it will be necessary to work together to maintain and expand liberal trade policies in the area.

In this context, you and your fellow agricultural leaders throughout the United States have a great responsibility for you have considerable influence upon the course of events in this country.

Last October, I had the opportunity of addressing the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture at its annual meeting in Sun Valley, Idaho. I had the pleasure of meeting there your distinguished Director of Agriculture, Richard Lyng, who you have contributed to the National Government where, as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, he will be directing efforts to tasks of not only commercial value but also great humanitarian significance.

During that Sun Valley meeting, I closed my remarks by thanking directly "those United States agricultural interests that have worked so hard to prevent the imposition of arbitrary restrictions on our trade." I would like again to extend my thanks to those here today and to those organizations that work so hard for the growth of trade.

This is a time of difficulty in trade policy. Let us approach this time with foresight, so that in the years ahead, we will look back and see how our steadfast adherence to the policies of growth was after all the wisest course for those on both sides of the Pacific to follow.

I thank you.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—POEM BY VIRGINIA LOUISE DORIS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, supplementary to the remarks that I made on the floor of the Senate yesterday in tribute to our beloved former President, Dwight David Eisenhower, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point of my remarks a very lovely poem written by Virginia Louise Doris, of Rhode Island, on the occasion of President Eisenhower's second inauguration.

It exemplifies in beautiful language the spirit that this great soldier-hero brought to the Nation as a gallant and revered statesman.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARRIOR

(In honor of President Eisenhower's inauguration, January 20, 1957)

Stalwart breed, of freedom's dream,
A force imbedded far beyond
The blast of martial drum, bears in
Arms, a birth of manly strength.

Pattern, formed in bone of youth,
Springing to excessive courage
By his vision of country, fair and
Green; the American vista.

XUM

Sound the bugle, with its golden
Victory, for the heritage we share
Is proud, in its invincible plan,
Fulfilled by exacting balance.

The conqueror's blood flows fast, and
Heady, through a brave heart;
Never faltering at burden of duty,
Nor trembling in affairs of state.

Wisdom, matched by knowledge, and
Justice, is his role as he scans,
With sleepless orbit, the flux of tensions,
In this liberty-loving nation.

Salute, each citizen, our Leader!
March in solid affirmation, along
The adventurous road of future; spirit
Aflame, this hour, in our soldier's honor!

VIRGINIA LOUISE DORIS.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION—EVERY HUMAN LIFE IS VALUABLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this age of technology and the computer we can lose sight of the value of a human life. When we speak of nuclear weapons systems, it is in terms of kill and overkill capacity—that is, how many millions can be annihilated at one time. It is asked which system can push past a mere 40 or 50 percent population extermination to one that can penetrate the enemy's defenses so well as to insure 70 percent destruction? Some speak of such mass murder of human beings in the same tone as they do a farm subsidy or a credit rate. When the neat charts are made, human lives are reduced to small red lines extending up just so many spaces.

For the 33,000 young men who have died fighting a war in Vietnam, a life laid down is too often just another number added to the total dead. It appears at times that the statistics are put in the newspapers for the apparent purpose of comparing favorably with the reported enemy dead for the week.

We hear that more than 6,000 people starve every day in Biafra, and too often they are just that—6,000 people and not 6,000 living, breathing, talking human beings. Mr. President, just what is a human life?

A life is the miracle of birth, the glee a satisfied infant brings to all who surround him, and the vivaciousness of a mischievous 10-year-old. As a child grows up, he begins to use his brain productively and makes a genuine contribution to his own society. And let us make no mistake—the life of one directly affects those of 10 around him.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to reduce a life to a mere number or a human being to a chart. The Genocide Convention of the United Nations seeks to guarantee the right to live for all people. It seems almost incredible, when we think of the value of a single human life, that the Senate has procrastinated 20 years in ratifying this convention. Therefore, let us delay no longer, let us look beyond our imagined objections, and let us at this time ratify the Genocide Convention.

UTAH TOPS NATION IN VOTING TURNOUT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I join with pride in saluting citizens and civic-minded groups in Utah who last year worked to make our State tops in the Nation in voting percentage turnout.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, in a newly published report, shows that 76.1 percent of the eligible voters of Utah went to the polls in the general election last year. This continues a great tradition which, since 1920, has seen the Beehive State lead the Nation in three presidential elections and be among the top three States eight times.

Voting citizens generally are good citizens, and we believe this holds true in Utah, where "patriotism" is a word still very much in vogue, and keen interest is taken in civic and political affairs at every level of government.

Potential voters who fail to exercise their precious right are, in essence, just as disfranchised as millions of persons abroad who live under tyranny and have no such option. Utahans understand this well, and both invite and challenge citizens throughout the Nation to excel the 1968 voting percentage high and thus strengthen the bonds of democracy.

An editorial published in the Salt Lake Tribune of March 29, 1969, details Utah's consistently high voting record. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIG "BRAVO" AND "ENCORE"

It's always nice to be No. 1, especially when the effort is in behalf of a highly worthwhile purpose. And if the achievement is statewide, the satisfaction is that much more enhanced. Utahans can be proud their state ranks No. 1 in the turnout at last November's election.

The result became official this week when the U.S. Bureau of Census announced the ratings. In the 1968 presidential election, 76.1 percent of Utah's eligible voters went to the polls. That led the next best state performance, Minnesota's, by one-tenth of a percentage point. And the Democratic presidential candidate, Hubert H. Humphrey, is a longtime Minnesota resident!

Utah's record for voter turnout has been consistently good. Since 1920, the state has held the top spot in three presidential elections and has been one of the first three states eight times. Distracting from last year's otherwise high mark was the drop of 2.8 points from the Utah turnout in 1964.

Utah's 1968 record did not "just happen." Many public spirited groups and individuals worked long and hard to keep the challenge of voter participation alive and meaningful. They deserve special congratulations.

The most appropriate response to a success of this kind is the resolve to do even better next time. Every election, whether local, statewide or national, deserves the fullest possible participation by eligible voters. Even with 76.1 percent, there is still room for improvement. Utah is equal to the task.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to add my own thoughts to the eloquent expressions of respect and admiration that already have been offered to the memory of General Eisenhower in this Chamber, across the land, and throughout the capitals of the free world.

Few Americans have ever served their Nation with the devotion and dedication of Dwight David Eisenhower. From the time of his early boyhood in Kansas, he was totally committed to the perpetuation of the American ideal.

He was born to command. As a young second lieutenant leading a company, as a general leading the mightiest army in all history, and as a President leading a great people he was destined to shape the course of human events.

We admired him for his strength and wisdom and we loved him for his warm good humor and modesty. He embodied the highest of human virtues.

Few of us will ever forget the final words he spoke to his wife on the day of his passing:

> I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. I have always loved my country.

Mr. President, that tender expression may well prove the most enduring memorial to a man who revered everything decent and noble because, instinctively, he was a warm and gentle human being with an infinite capacity for love.

The enormity of his contribution to the American people and to all the free nations of the earth can never be adequately measured. Perhaps it is enough to say that we are immeasurably in his debt, just as our children and their children and countless generations to come will be in his debt. Soldier, statesman, patriot—he left his imprint on the ages.

THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Senate last week approved a measure to raise the public debt limit through fiscal 1970 from $365 to $377 billion and to provide for a permanent limit of $365 billion thereafter. I believe this action was demanded both by necessity and by the public interest.

Without an immediate increase of this magnitude, the Treasury would have been forced to operate with a perilously small cash balance for the remainder of fiscal 1969. Had we not passed this act, our Government might have been forced by the operation of the previous limit to withdraw financial responsibilities already undertaken. Our operations in Vietnam, the farm program and public assistance grants to States are only some of the obligations that would have been imperiled had we refused to increase the debt limit.

Furthermore, the limit had to be raised during fiscal 1970 because we face an increased deficit for that period, using the realistic method of calculating the budget by excluding social security and other trust funds. Any surpluses in these funds are held in trust by the Federal Government and are not available to balance deficits in the administrative budget. Therefore, it is only realistic to calculate the budget without these funds; and by doing so, we are again faced with an increase in the national debt during fiscal 1970. I believe the American public deserves to have a straightforward picture of the Federal budget, in spite of deficits it might contain. Congress has acted to provide that such a picture will be available.

Finally, Congress has acted to bring down to $365 billion the permanent debt

XUM

limit after fiscal 1970. This is a clear manifestation of the interest of Congress in real and continuing limitations on public spending in the future, and I am confident the administration will heed it.

THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, ending poverty is an irreversible national commitment. America can and must provide to every citizen the fullest possible opportunity for a life of dignity and justice. In his final report on the Fair Labor Standards Act, former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz convincingly demonstrated that the act itself, if improved and strengthened—and extended to protect all workers—can be the best single weapon in the war against poverty. Organized labor's view on Secretary Wirtz's position was well expressed in a recent AFL–CIO News editorial. Calling attention to a decent wage as the most effective way to end poverty, the editorial quoted these salient facts from Secretary Wirtz's findings:

> Poverty is erroneously identified, in loose thinking, with unemployment. . . . The number of people who have been out of work for more than five weeks is never more at any one time than about 1¼ million.
>
> Yet there are between 22 and 26 million people living in this country under "poverty" conditions. This number includes family members, and so is not directly comparable with the unemployment figures. But even when the necessary adjustment is made, it becomes obvious that considerably more than half of those living in poverty live there not because the head of the family is unemployed but because he doesn't get a decent living wage for the work he does.
>
> It is a conservative estimate that if every worker in the country received $2 an hour for his labor, the number of people living "in poverty"—presently estimated at 22 to 26 million—would be more than cut in half.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Wirtz Points the Way," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIRTZ POINTS THE WAY

One of the final actions of Labor Sec. Willard Wirtz before leaving office was to file with the 91st Congress the required annual report on the operations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That report may well go down in the annals of legislative history. It brushed aside all the rhetoric of the obstructionists and the "conventional wisdom" of the economists in a sweeping call for a universal minimum wage.

The characteristic that will mark the 1960s, Wirtz said, is the "national determination to eliminate poverty in the United States." While there have been "magnificent and incomparable achievements in this area," the job has not been completed, he said, and continued:

"I urge consideration of the view that the appropriate and feasible next step is to assure—through amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act—that every person who works in this country receives at least enough for his labor to maintain himself and his family decently."

Spelling out the specifics of his proposal—full coverage of all workers and a step up to $2 an hour—Wirtz directed the attention of Congress to the problems of the working poor.

"Poverty is erroneously identified, in loose thinking, with unemployment. The monthly unemployment figures show between 2 and 3 million people unemployed; and about half of them are just entering the work force (and are looking for their first job) or are between jobs and only briefly out of work. The number of people who have been out of work for more than five weeks is never more at any one time than about 1¼ million.

"Yet there are between 22 and 26 million people living in this country under 'poverty' conditions. This number includes family members, and so is not directly comparable with the unemployment figures. But even when the necessary adjustment is made, it becomes obvious that considerably more than half of those living in poverty live there not because the head of the family is unemployed but because he doesn't get a decent living wage for the work he does.

"It is a conservative estimate that if every worker in the country received $2 an hour for his labor, the number of people living 'in poverty'—presently estimated at 22 to 26 million—would be more than cut in half."

Wirtz goes on to say that "there is significant coincidence today between the groups of people in this country who work at jobs not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and those who are still earning less than 'poverty-level' incomes."

His report notes that there is discussion currently of anti-poverty efforts to increase the incomes of the poor through a "guaranteed annual income" and a "negative income tax." He comments that whatever basis there is in any of these proposals "commands strongly a first step of seeing to it that when a person does work he gets enough for it to support himself and his family."

AFL–CIO Pres. George Meany noted that the Wirtz report and recommendations are "a fitting climax to his term in office. He is a compassionate man, a true humanitarian and his recommendations are a demonstration of those qualities."

Now it's up to Congress. If the drive to eliminate poverty is to have any meaning, Willard Wirtz's call for a universal $2 minimum wage must become a reality.

NARCOTICS IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, a serious narcotics problem is plaguing New York City, and it is rapidly assuming the proportions of an epidemic. More than half of the known addicts in this country live in New York. Estimates of the number of "hard" drug users in the city range from 50,000 to 200,000.

Narcotics addiction in New York is not a new affliction. However, up to now, the Federal Government has stood idly by—studying the problem, recommending proposals for action, and then failing to act. New York State and New York City have had to try to step into this void, but they cannot do the job alone. Only the Federal Government has the enforcement powers and the financial resources to attack the root of the problem; to cut down on the supply of illegal narcotics and reduce the demand for drugs. I have recently proposed a five-point Federal narcotics program to launch this attack immediately.

One of the most tragic aspects of the narcotics scourge is its growing hold over children. A tremendous number of kids today are taking drugs and are on their way to becoming hardcore addicts. They are an easy mark for vicious drug pushers adept at exploitation. Junior and senior high schools are literally becoming drug markets.

This situation in one New York City high school was graphically described by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post on March 28. It is a story which probably could be told about far too many of our urban high schools.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Alsop's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE SCHOOL'S DRUG PROBLEM PREDICTS THE FUTURE IN CITIES

(By Joseph Alsop)

NEW YORK.—"Since we ran the pushers out of Hughes, maybe two in fifteen of the kids have given up heroin. All the rest are due to become hard-core addicts, unless they can find some sort of cure. And man, I'm talking about forty to fifty per cent of the kids in the whole damn school."

The tone, understandably, was a mite bleak, yet the horrifying sentences were uttered in the matter-of-fact manner that is normally reserved for such statements as, "It's raining today." The speaker was a handsome, earnest young black, Casey Sapp, who has left the Post Office to work in the New York high schools under the auspices of the Urban League and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Elliott Shapiro, the wise and gentle superintendent of the Southern Manhattan School District that contains Hughes High School, had arranged the meeting with Sapp, Robert Gales and a few more of the Hughes Streetworkers, as they are called. The surreal horror lay in the harsh fact that the young Streetworkers and Elliott Shapiro were actually telling a success story of sorts, in which they took quite genuine pride. It was the story of how they got the drug traffic out of the school building—"anyway 95 per cent," said the stocky, careful Gales.

"Man, you shoulda seen this place last January," said Sapp. "Why this school was known all over town as one of the best places to make a connection. The entrance vestibule was a regular dope-market, and the big pushers used to drive right up to the main entrance in their Cadillacs."

Three things have happened since then. Double sessions have been abolished by some transfers out of the school and by the opening of an annex by the hard-working school principal, George Shirkey.

The Urban League streetworkers have been given a quasi official status and a badge to indicate it, by authority of the Mayor. And, they have been provided with allies, paid for with money obtained by Shapiro from the Ford Foundation—tough young men recruited in Harlem, who have the main "security" duty.

"Security" may seem an odd word, in connection with a public high school, but at Hughes they use it all the time. Principal Shirkey explained that when his school opens at 8:30 a.m., all entrances are now guarded, all the boys and girls are now required to come in by the main entrance, and all must show identity cards.

"That way," he said, "we're now able to keep out all the outsiders—which means the dope pushers; but with double sessions, it was hopeless."

Two-thirds of the Hughes High School boys and girls come all the way from Harlem to West Eighteenth Street; for Harlem has been left with no high school of its own, in the name of desegregation. And, the Streetworkers and Elliott Shapiro were quick to admit that they had only expelled the dope problem from the school's front doors—"when they get home to Harlem, there it is

XUM

again, all around the kids," one of them said.

When the Streetworkers said that 40 to 50 per cent of the kids were "on" heroin—an estimate agreed to by Shirkey and Shapiro—they did not mean, of course, that they were already the hard core addicts that Sapp so grimly predicted they would finally become. They meant, rather, that they were already experimenting.

"Just for school kids," said Gales bitterly, "the damn pushers break the regular five-dollar bags down to two-dollar bags. Then four kids pool their lunch money—fifty cents apiece—and share the bag between them instead of eating lunch."

The Streetworkers further said—and Shapiro again agreed—that use of hard drugs in the schools is now a city-wide problem, though at its worst, perhaps, in Manhattan. One of the Streetworkers remarked that "the pushers we ran out of Hughes just went on to other high schools." And Elliott Shapiro sadly added, "or maybe to intermediate schools, for we're finding drug use at younger and younger ages."

"You gotta remember," Sapp added, "that the heroin pusher is probably the biggest man on the block, in the neighborhoods these kids come from. He's got the car; he's got the clothes; he's *somebody*, Man!"

So there is one part of the story of what can only be called the incipient breakdown of the public school system in this Nation's largest city. And remember, please, that New York merely predicts the future in just about all our other cities, in which 70 per cent of our people now live or work—unless something is done to change that future!

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, with the death of General Eisenhower, the Nation loses one of the great heroes and genuine leaders this century has produced. As a military leader, he provided direction when the free world demanded a calm and deliberate leadership. As President, he produced a stability which every American yearns for today. General Eisenhower truly put country before self and, in so doing, left a great legacy for those who direct this Nation today.

As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in World War II, as president of Columbia University, and as President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower exhibited an unequaled sense of duty that has been forever inscribed in our history and in the hearts of millions throughout the world. His record of public service will stand as an inspiration for those who believe in character and government. We shall all be better for the life of dedication he led.

GUIDELINES TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at a time when Congress and the executive branch of the Government are making serious efforts to promise full employment, I am seriously concerned with the situation just brought to my attention by one of the largest employment agencies in the country. A highly controversial guideline of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has disrupted the employment of this agency which has been trying earnestly to comply. The message I have received follows:

GREENSBORO, N.C.

We have complied with EEOC Advertising Guidelines in spite of general absence of compliance by other agencies or employers. Due to drastic drop in traffic from ads in neuter columns, if wholesale local enforcement is not immediate, we must for economic survival return to sex columns. Please help and either have this Guideline enforced, suspended, or repealed. Ironically the greatest drop in traffic is from normally female occupations as secretary, etc.

JOE D. KYLE,
Senior President, Snelling & Snelling of Greensboro, Inc.
PAUL B. GOEFORTH,
President, American Personnel, Inc.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's guideline in question relates to the legality of placing help-wanted advertising under separate male and female headings established by the newspaper publishers for the arrangement of the classified advertising pages. This guideline has been challenged in the Federal courts by the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the Washington Evening Star. They contend that such classification of the help-wanted advertising is for the convenience of readers and actually benefits both sexes as well as employers and agencies such as Snelling & Snelling.

This experience of Snelling & Snelling seems to cast serious doubt on the wisdom of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's interpretation. I am bringing this situation to the attention of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and other Members of the Senate because of my great concern over any action of our Government which harms the employment efforts of those seeking jobs or those seeking to hire persons of any race, color, creed, or sex.

As evidenced by the telegram above, females particularly are not inclined to laborious searching through help-wanted ads which are, in the words of Messrs. Kyle and Goeforth, "in neuter columns."

Could it be that most individuals are unashamed of their sex and do not actually view the headings "Help Wanted, Male" and "Help Wanted, Female" as discriminatory, but only as a convenience? I think that definitely is the case.

DISAPPOINTMENT OVER FAILURE TO RESTORE MILK PRICE SUPPORT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I understand that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has announced that the price support for manufacturing milk will be maintained at $4.28 per hundred pounds for the marketing year, beginning April 1, 1969.

I am shocked by this refusal of the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the milk price support for dairy farmers.

It is especially disappointing that one of the first agricultural decisions of the new administration hits our dairy farmers in Wisconsin the hardest. The failure to restore the milk price support to 90 percent of parity authorized by Congress has the effect of depriving every dairy farmer of up to 30 cents for every 100 pounds of milk that he produces.

With production costs increasing by more than 6 percent over the past year, a price support increase to 90 percent of parity was rightfully expected by all dairy farmers, especially those in Wisconsin who are entirely dependent upon the price support for the exact price that they receive for their milk.

Former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman faced a similar decision a year ago when the price support had dropped below the authorized figure. He did restore the price support to the full 90 percent of parity.

With the parity level now at 84 percent, conditions are no different than they were a year ago. Dairy farmers deserved the price support increase and the fact now that they will not get it is very disappointing for the entire dairy industry.

THE ROLE OF BUSINESS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, late last year H. I. Romnes, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., delivered a most challenging speech on the role of business in community development. This lecture, sponsored by Colorado College under a grant by Shepard's Citations, was part of the H. Chase Stone Memorial Lecture series.

In his speech, Mr. Romnes emphasized the role which business must play in creating a sense of community in our urban society. In particular, he referred to the obligation of business to sponsor and encourage employee volunteer efforts and to train and hire underqualified people. I especially invite attention to Mr. Romnes' statement that:

> Business has much to offer in management skills that can help solve administrative problems in educational systems and other municipal affairs.

I have long urged private enterprise to make available its managerial and technical skills in meeting urban problems, and I am pleased that so distinguished a leader of the business community has advocated this in a most forceful and persuasive manner.

I ask unanimous consent that this provocative statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF BUSINESS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Inaugural H. Chase Stone Memorial Lecture by H. I. Romnes, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo., November 21, 1968)

(NOTE.—The H. Chase Stone Memorial Lectures are designed to promote and publicize the initiatives of private enterprise in community development in the tradition of H. Chase Stone's contribution to Colorado Springs, Colorado. The Lecture will be delivered annually by an outstanding man or woman, American or foreign, who by personal example has demonstrated that great social enterprise requires the best of enterprise private and public.)

Thank you for that generous introduction. I appreciate it. I also appreciate the honor of being invited to give the first of these lectures, although their general theme or topic—the role of business in community development—is not an easy one to discuss.

If I am conscious of that now, I can assure you I felt it just as keenly (or even more) some weeks ago, when I first really came to grips with the question of what I should say tonight. For at that time in New York, where I spend most of my days, we were even then in the midst of a school strike marked by strong currents of racial tension; while police and firemen, rivalling each other for higher wages, were also testing their muscle in planned slowdowns, "sickness" absences, and the like. The sense of community, in short, was notable mainly for its absence. And while some (yet not all) of the immediate crises have been patched over for the moment, the basic problems that provoke dissension and threaten civic calamity are still very much with us.

I am unable, therefore, to discuss this subject in any spirit of bland confidence. I do speak, however, out of a deep concern and conviction that the re-creation of a sense of community is vital to our society; a conviction also that business must share in the responsibility for bringing this about.

What I have just said probably makes clear what I mean when I use the word "community." The dictionary defines it first as "a body of people having common organization and interests," and then says they may be people living in the same place or region under the same laws or regulations. However, the dictionary doesn't say anything about the community problem, which is to bring together the interests of people who live together. And it is this that I shall be talking about, with particular reference to big cities.

Many people today have a nostalgia for the small community where life seemed simpler and more pleasant. They deplore the loss of small-town values and regard the quality of life in the big, impersonal city as poorer and less satisfying. However, I do not think there is anything to be gained by being wistful about small-town life. There can be no doubt that we have become an urban society and that city influences predominate in our national life.

This point was strongly made, I thought, in a TV program sponsored by the Bell System a couple of months ago.

This was the first of three programs we are putting on this year under the general title, "The Ordeal of the Cities." The purport of this first one was that in their influence on people, cities really have no limits. For even in remote rural areas, much of our manner of living, the very quality of our lives, is shaped by the cities and the activities that center in them.

For example, the cars and highways and ships and planes that take us away from city streets are devised in city offices and factories. So too are the tractors and plows and seeders and harvesters that displace agricultural workers and send them off from the farms to the cities. And the arts and sciences that shape our culture are mainly generated under the stimulus of city life. There is a sort of centrifugal force that is born in the cities and that whirls ideas and artifacts outward—the propositions that engage us, our vocations and avocations, our homes and furnishings, our styles and tastes, our golf balls and our tennis rackets, the boots we wear when we walk in the woods to "get away from it all."

So—cities have no limits. They reach out and touch everyone. They mould our civilization with all its resources, its amenities, its perils.

One can also say, perhaps, that the true age of the city is over—that in the very process of urban expansion, many cities are losing their geographic identity; and further, that as city populations grow, they are more and more composed, not of an urbane citizenry, but of people to whom the urban experience is new.

This concept, however, simply emphasizes the need—and also the difficulty—of building the sense of community in the face of rapid technological and social change. It also emphasizes the most important aspect of the theme that cities have no limits, which I have not yet stated. This is that all of us, regardless of where we live, are not only beholden to the city for all its cultural and material achievements—we are also, every one of us, involved in the city's troubles. City problems are our problems—yours, mine, everybody's—and there is no escaping this.

We may agree, I take it, that the first civic responsibility of business centers in its economic role of organizing work and generating goods and services. However, this has been discussed so many times that tonight I shall just take it for granted and concentrate, as I have already indicated, on our effort to help ameliorate city problems and build the sense of community.

Where then shall such effort begin? Where can it begin?

I believe it can and must begin in the work atmosphere of the business itself. This must be of a kind that will nourish the sense of community among the members of the business. It must help to build among employees the vitality, the awareness of personal responsibility, that are the necessary foundation for community spirit.

Perhaps this sounds elementary. I emphasize it, however, because I do not think we in business can accomplish much in community development if business people do not have attributes of character and responsibility.

Must we not ask—

Do we really provide the sort of work atmosphere that helps people grow?

Do our business practices encourage the sense of responsibility?

Do we stimulate people to respond to common problems with interest and concern?

In the context of differences in race that have intensified problems of poverty, housing, and work opportunity—are we doing everything we can to foster a spirit of helpfulness and mutual respect?

And—most importantly—do the actions of the company as a company, toward meeting social problems, demonstrate its sincerity and reinforce its expectations of employees?

Now, I know of no business that would care to answer questions like these in a complacent spirit. Certainly the business I am in would not. And if I speak now of some of the efforts we are making, this is not to advertise the Bell System. However, in order to discuss areas of activity that I consider important I have to refer to examples with which I am familiar.

I have several kinds of activities in mind.

One is an expanding effort to redesign many jobs to make them more satisfying.

Another is the encouragement of voluntary community services by employees.

Another is the commitment to provide equal opportunity in employment and, beyond that, to hire, train, and develop men and women who are not qualified according to traditional or conventional employment standards.

These will bring me, a bit later, to discuss several aspects of what I consider the growing responsibility of business to exert management skills and influence to help solve urban problems of education, administration and planning.

The first activity, the redesign of work, I wanted to mention simply as an example of effort toward building human attitudes of lively interest and concern.

Let's face it—in modern industry many methods for organizing and supervising work do blunt the human spirit. Bureaucratic routines tend to take over. They take the joy out of life. They induce negative habits of mind and this is deadly.

So we have been doing a lot of experimenting to see if we can't load more personal, individual responsibility into a number of basic telephone company jobs—I mean jobs like selling service to customers, taking care of equipment in central offices, handling billing matters, and the like.

What have been the results so far? Well—better work, first of all. But underlying this, we are sure, is the fact that the people concerned have a much better feeling about what they are doing. Given responsibility, they enjoy measuring up to it.

Now, you may consider that this is fairly obvious and fairly simple. To that I would answer that it may be obvious, but we have found it far from simple. In fact, it is clear that to accomplish fruitful changes of this kind it is necessary to think radically about the way work is to be performed.

This then is what we are trying to do, in many different kinds of work situations. And in the course of—by now—quite a few such trials, the people deeply engaged have been persuaded that in one situation after another, the natural module of the work, as they call it, centers on the individual. They say:

Find out how to give each person a place, a customer, a set of customers all his own. Do not let the individual be lost in the generalities of group responsibility, group standards, group ratings. Bridge from the general to the specific, then let each person know how he is performing. Time after time after time, the results will be vastly rewarding.

Now, all work of course can not be enriched, all jobs can not be individualized. But—ever so many can be. And as I said, I report this effort as one instance of how alertness in management can help to build attitudes that are not only important inside a business but will also contribute to the quality of community life.

Let me turn now to the second kind of undertaking I mentioned a moment ago—that is, the encouragement and growth of voluntary services.

In a recent essay Professor Adam Yarmolinsky of the Harvard Law School comments on the value of such services in a way I find illuminating. He speaks of the modern complex system of urban society as making it difficult for many people, especially those who live in poverty, to find the services they need. In countless instances the services of volunteers are essential to help baffled people break out of the bounds of the system and find answers to deep personal need.

These voluntary services today, he also observes, are "at the opposite pole from the Lady Bountiful role of the social service volunteer of a previous generation. That role was an expression of privilege and inequality. The future service role is at best an expression of mutuality, or mutual recognition of human capacities and human needs. As urban society makes possible greater mutuality of service among its citizens, it enables them to fulfill their possibilities as men."

Admittedly there is nothing new in the theme of volunteer community service. However that doesn't make it any less important. In my view it is enormously important and I believe business leadership should do everything it possibly can to foster and encourage it.

In the telephone industry much of what is being done—although certainly not all—has been generated through a group we call The Telephone Pioneers. This is an organization of telephone people who have had relatively long experience in the business. There are now more than 300,000 Pioneers in the United States and Canada, including some 120,000 who have retired from active duty. They are well organized and the nature and extent of their volunteer services, which were established as a definite part of Pioneer activity about ten years ago, are becoming impressive.

XUM

The other day I was looking through a summary of this voluntary service during the past year or so and I couldn't help thinking that you too might be interested. Let me give you a bit of the flavor of it.

One activity is tutoring. Pioneers work with preschool children in the Head Start program. They tutor others in reading and arithmetic. They show youngsters unaccustomed to books how to use reference material. They give speech courses that help job-seekers gain confidence. They teach adults how to read newspapers and want ads. They conduct classes in grooming manners, handicrafts, and safe repair of electrical appliances.

In Denver Pioneers serve as lay probation officers. In New York they counsel Job Corps graduates on how to use their vocational training. In Washington they work with self-help committees trying to improve life in slum streets. In other places they repair toys, distribute shoes that make it possible for children to go to school, and collect old eyeglasses for redistribution.

Pioneers work in hospitals and nursing homes, where they take care of radios and electronic medical equipment, give shampoos and sets to physically handicapped children, put on shows, and make hospital gowns.

For retarded children, Pioneers make "self-help" articles that accelerate learning—toy animals, for example, that a child enjoys taking apart and buttoning together again. They have developed portable stop-and-go lights to help teach safety. They make devices that enable retarded and blind children to identify and count money. They teach vocational skills at workshops for retarded young adults. They take children bowling. They recondition ice-skates.

For physically handicapped children, Pioneers rebuild and install old telephone switchboards, which are wonderful tools for physical therapy. They design and build handrails, wheelchair trays, bed backrests, exercise ladders, walkers, mechanical page turners, looms and hobby horses.

In work for the blind, Pioneers maintain and repair 70,000 talking book machines each year. They also make records and since 1951 have produced more than 60,000 talking book records and tapes. Dozens of Pioneer groups have mastered the art of braille writing and each year fill requests that range from a play script to a sonata to a medical dictionary to calendars, cookbooks, and major major league baseball schedules. Some of the braille books for children contain three-dimensional illustrations young readers can "see" with their fingers.

Many other projects might be mentioned—and other groups as well, for the Pioneers are not the only organization of telephone people to devote much energy to community service. I haven't touched on the civic responsibilities that people in business take on as individuals, for you are just as familiar with those as I am. The point I make here is that organization for community service, through associations of employees encouraged and in fact sponsored by a business, seems to add something significant. Aside from the benefit and exhilaration experienced by the volunteers themselves, when they are active by the tens of thousands the overall accomplishment is really very large.

And we can go further—quite a lot further. In fact, should not the company itself, the corporation, make people and facilities available, even at some considerable cost, when doing so helps to meet important community needs? I think yes, by all means. I shall say more about this later, in the context of what business management, as such, can do with respect to problems of urban education, administration, and planning, but a few comments now may also be appropriate.

For instance, when employee volunteers help students with their homework, should rooms in company buildings be opened as homework centers, if that will help further the project? I think so, yes.

And if the high schools ask our cooperation in developing safety programs for students, do we answer "Yes"? I think we do indeed.

Along these lines, looking over some current examples of community services that involve company participation, I find, for instance:

Organized liaison with area associations of school superintendents.

Partnership programs with schools and school systems that include counseling of students, combination work-study arrangements, furnishing substitute teachers when needed, modernization of adult education curriculums, and workshops that show the relevance of school work to careers.

Leadership in statewide research effort to improve highway safety.

Leadership in local and regional committees coordinating training and employment programs.

Participation in a community council on alcoholism.

Cooperative work in black communities to help independent small businesses get going.

Leadership, in cooperation with community agencies, in developing a "Suppliers Opportunity Mart" that recently brought 170 black businessmen together with representatives and purchasing agents of more than 50 corporations.

Organized clerical and janitorial assistance to local hospitals.

One Bell System General Manager sums up by saying, "Almost any group or agency connected with community development would contact us for aid, assistance, and counselling in its formative stages and well into the later stages of its development and functioning."

To this I might add one other comment: "I think any business can contribute something important to the community just by setting a good example in appearance, in maintaining its property well, in showing that it cares about doing all things well. The feeling for quality can have great influence: a good neighbor makes more good neighbors.

I come now to the vitally important subject of employment opportunity—in particular, opportunity for black people and, in this part of the country. Mexican-Americans, including many who are unable to meet the standards by which, in the past, applicants for employment have been tested.

Now, I think we are beginning to make some progress here. Many businesses, including my own, are greatly widening employment opportunities. In the Bell System, for example, we have committed ourselves to hire, during the next year or so, several thousand people who will need special consideration and training to qualify.

Certainly a meaningful job commensurate with ability is the backbone of community life. And the role of creating and providing jobs—organizing useful work that meets the needs of the individual and the community as well—this is the traditional and basic role that business has naturally performed.

But in the modern city, now and in the foreseeable future, we are faced with significant numbers of people whose skills are insufficient, or whose past conduct has made them ineligible for most jobs. I believe businessmen must tackle the problem of helping these people qualify to earn a living. I want to say too that projects we now have going indicate strongly that this can be done.

For example, the Western Electric Company some months ago organized a shop adjoining a ghetto area and undertook to employ and train several hundred underqualified people to work on simple assembly jobs. So far, the evidence here, as in the case of other underqualified people employed by the telephone companies, is that most of them are able to make it. Quite a number have qualified for regular work in another plant and only a quarter or so of those hired have left, either on their own volition or because it became clear to the company that they couldn't make the grade.

Of course we wish that the loss or failure rate were lower. Yet the measure of success is still very considerable. In fact, I have a feeling that this particular candle will throw its beam a long, long way.

Efforts of this kind call for much patience and understanding. And we had better have plenty of both. I am struck by the acute necessity that all of us in business—managers and employees alike—should educate and adapt ourselves to the realities of opening employment opportunities to all conditions and races of men. I realize there is much more to the problem of building the sense of community than the breaking down of racial barriers. But if we do not succeed in this, all our efforts will be flawed—and some would say nullified. The experience of working together must, therefore, be fully exploited to help bring barriers down.

Actually I believe the shared work experience is doing this, step by step. This is a process of indescribable complexity and I do not want to overstate the progress made. Yet within my own business, recognizing all the difficulties that still persist, nevertheless it is impossible to look back over the last decade or so without recognizing that great change for the better has been accomplished. In saying this, I also want to make particular note of the fact that the unions in the telephone industry—unlike some other unions—have acted in a manner that has done much, in my judgment, to promote equal opportunity and, also, a growing sense of community among employees of different race.

The necessity to train underqualified people for employment emphasizes dramatically the great need for better education. For we must have people who can work effectively in the dynamic modern environment. Our whole future is wrapped up in the future of the cities and this depends on education of a quality and character that are relevant to changing city-community needs. It seems to me essential, therefore, that business should actively support efforts to improve education and it is no accident that several of the instances of community service that I have already mentioned are education-oriented.

I do not imply that business has special capacities for coping with educational problems. We simply share the well-nigh universal public recognition that the city schools, particularly, are beset by enormous difficulties. We know at first hand that grave problems exist and that their solution is critically important to the cities—and to us.

What then shall we do? What can we do to help?

This is by no means obvious. As I have said, we in the Bell System in recent years have tried to help the schools in modest ways. We have consulted with teachers and students—when invited to do so—on what is taught. We have given counsel and part-time instruction of students in topics related to communications. We have worked cooperatively with various learning resource centers. Bell Laboratories mathematicians, scientists and engineers have made considerable contributions, I believe, toward the development of modern curricula in the "new math" and also in physics and engineering. We have provided materials and teaching aids now widely used in high school science courses. Techniques in programmed learning developed at our Laboratories have also had useful application in teaching disadvantaged children. And we have of course participated, as citizens, on many school boards.

However, in the light of today's gigantic school problems in the cities, these activities hardly seem to have the kind of impact that is required. We are therefore wrestling with the question of how we can extend more effective help. And as we move into closer and closer association with school authorities in many cities, we are more and more struck by the tremendous opportunity to apply management skills to administrative problems.

Certainly administrative skills alone will never solve educational problems. On the other hand, school systems today are beset by the overwhelming difficulties of teaching new millions of children who bring with them all the handicaps born of poverty—and when school systems so confronted are also plagued by monumental administrative difficulties, their ability to carry out their fundamental responsibility is seriously threatened. Good educational performance can hardly be expected.

Now, I do not suggest that managers in business are inherently smarter than administrators in public education and in other civic and municipal departments. I am saying however that we in business management have experience and skills to offer that could be of great value and just might be of decisive value. I am saying also that in my judgment we have a responsibility not merely to offer our help but to urge its acceptance.

I reflect for example on what might be the impact on a big-city department if a team of purchasing agents from the major corporations in the area were put in charge of purchasing methods for, let us say, one year.

I wonder what a team of cost-reduction engineers might accomplish if, over a suitable period, they were invited to analyze construction procedures.

And what would happen, I wonder, if payroll and other disbursement procedures were put in the hands of the banks?

Now someone will say, "But think of the political problems!" I haven't forgotten those. Nor do I minimize them. And I shall say something about them before I finish. But first it is necessary to point out that in order even to think about business putting its skills at the service of the cities, business must be willing to make skilled people available. It must say outright, "We will lend them." And government, in my view, must also recognize the need for such action, and its public value, and take this into account when it comes to matters of taxation, regulation, and the like.

In my business we have seen a few beginnings of the kind of enterprise I am suggesting here. For example, a telephone company lends people to analyze the administrative routines, the paper and work flow, of a large high school. Another telephone company, jointly with another corporation, lends people to help improve administrative techniques throughout a municipal school system. In addition, this same team has been introducing to school administrators training in "participative management," so-called—a technique for bringing together people at different levels in the organization, improving communication among them, and making the best use of administrative time.

In sum, I seriously suggest that business skills not only can but should be used to help pump life-saving innovations into the procedures of municipal government. To quote from an interim report on the project I have just mentioned, "Education is big business. The art and science of management have applications in this as in any other enterprise. By equipping school administrators with practical management skills, we can help promote the businesslike operation of the community's biggest business."

With regard to business participation in urban planning, I shall simply say that in my estimation there ought to be a lot more careful planning and also more participation by business to help bring that about.

Planning of course is no substitute for action. We can't put out today's fires by simulating how we would prevent tomorrow's. Nevertheless, if we are to find a reasonable road to a decent urban life for most people, it seems to me we have to make better plans for the future than we have made for the present.

We have such a tradition of individualism in this country that planning, with its implication of systems and situations that require some conformity, tends to be looked at askance. The fact that we wander into unplanned constrictive systems, where a little better planning might have produced more freedom for more people, is forgotten.

The aim of planning in my judgment is certainly not to prepare some technological brave new world in 1984. It is the human condition that concerns us. But today we do have better instruments for measuring future alternatives than we ever had before and if we do not use them to measure and weigh we shall have missed a great opportunity. At the risk of sounding over-paradoxical, I could say that the opportunity is perhaps to use some of the sophisticated techniques technology has given us to help prevent future technological disasters—such as, for example, the current disaster of city traffic jams.

In my view business should support and in fact press for more effort of this kind. It should do this so far as possible in concert with government, labor, and the academic community. Urban coalitions, while not limited to planning activities, can contribute to their effectiveness and business participation is essential to whatever success the urban coalition movement can achieve.

The involvement of trade association is another potential means for progress. Regarding them, Mr. William C. Stolk, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, recently had this to say:

"All we have to do," he said, "is turn them around: convert them from defenders of the status quo into instrumentalities for collective action in the public interest."

That may prove to be quite an order. Nevertheless it points in the right direction. I would think the trade associations could do a lot, among other things, to help foster intelligent long-range planning. Not, be it said, just to make the world and the city a better place for this business or that business, but a better place for everyone.

Still another avenue for business encouragement of intelligent urban planning is offered by independent institutes and by university projects as they develop. I think business should interest itself in these efforts and help to suggest opportunities for useful work.

Now I am almost at the end of my story. But there is one more point. I have said in substance that there is considerable public business that needs better management and that the skills of private business ought to be more engaged to help bring that about. But the management of public business is far more difficult and complex because the problems are not merely managerial—they are also political.

City after city suffers from the power struggles of separate groups. Each is intent on its own interest and the capacity for pursuing segmented and sometimes conflicting objectives outruns our human ability to bring them together.

Also, the very machinery of city government is often beset by the traditions of vested political interests. If business is really to make a contribution, therefore, it cannot do so by being—what shall I say?—naively managerial in its approach. It must also be political and not fear to take political positions.

The movement for urban coalition is one avenue. In this, I believe, business can and should take an active part—not as a means of trying to resolve problems on its own terms, but to help bring together people who hold genuine influence in all the main sectors of civic life; who can, therefore, reach decisions that will be respected and will permit true leadership action.

I doubt however that coalition efforts will be the full answer. It will also be necessary for business to take positions flat out. If we believe in a housing bill, or a school bond issue, or something else, whatever it is, let us say so—and let us push for it. And if we don't believe in it, let us push against. But always the criterion must be, "What do we sincerely believe will best serve the community welfare?"

Now, in summary, I have suggested that the first requirement on a business that seeks to contribute to the quality of community life is to foster personal growth and the sense of responsibility among its own people; that business should sponsor and encourage employee organizations that are concerned to render voluntary services; that we should do all we reasonably can to train and hire underqualified people; and that we should exploit the increasing experience of work shared among people of all races and ethnic origin to help minimize aspects of discrimination throughout the community.

I have also emphasized that company commitment to help meet urban problems is vital. I have indicated that in the Bell System, problems of education are among our first concerns. I have suggested that business has much to offer in management skills that can help solve administrative problems in educational systems and other municipal affairs. I have urged business support of qualified projects in urban planning. Finally, I have asserted my belief that business should take clear-cut positions in community affairs, not only in coalition movements but also independently when it is judged that the community welfare requires it.

Please let me say in conclusion that I am grateful indeed for the opportunity that this occasion, and your patience, have given me to review some of my concerns. Thank you.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I share with a grateful nation and the entire free world a deep feeling of grief and loss in the death of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in every sense a great and gallant leader in war and a distinguished and revered President in the years of peace which he did so much to win.

As one privileged to serve in the Senate during the closing years of his administration, I came to know and respect him for his warm humanity, his insight and perception of people and problems, and his unswerving dedication to his country and its welfare.

Although we were of different political parties, I found myself during those years in frequent agreement with his policies and proposals primarily because they semed so attuned to American traditions, ideals, and goals on which the country had been founded and which had brought it to its position of world leadership.

One of the things most often said about General Eisenhower by those seeking to detract was that he lacked political skill. This may in a sense be true, but I think it was one of the greatest sources of his strength rather than a weakness in his armor.

XUM

I think it was the very fact that he was not regarded as a master politician that best explains the trust, belief, and loyalty which he inspired not only among his fellow countrymen but in much of the rest of the world.

The "I Like Ike" slogan which served as the trademark of his campaigns was not just a catchy phrase. It was true to a degree seldom matched in the history of electioneering.

People did, indeed, like Ike. They liked him for his honesty, his courage, his integrity, his humanity and his simplicity.

They liked—even loved—him through two terms in office and the more than 8 years which ensued after he left the White House and there was more than ample proof of that in the outpouring of a world's genuine sorrow in his passing.

The general once told a London audience that "I am from the heart of America."

And whatever other verdict history may render, it will say that is where he remains enshrined.

COMMISSION ON TAX SHARING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, last week I introduced proposed legislation to create a commission to study proposals for Federal-State tax sharing.

I have obtained the most recent available figures of tax receipts in my State of Wisconsin which show the need to set up a commission. In 1964, a total of $1.246 billion was collected in State and local taxes. By June 30, 1968, this had risen to $1.758 billion. In each of the past 3 years the State and local taxes rose by over 10 percent over the previous year. Federal taxes collected in Wisconsin rose from $1.9 billion in 1964, to $3.079 billion in 1968. Property taxes levied by school districts, municipal taxes transferred for school purposes, and State aids for local schools totaled $824 million, or 47 percent of the tax receipts.

The current gross national product of close to $800 billion is expected to rise to almost $1,476 billion in 15 years. Government spending will increase by 86 percent. But while Federal spending is estimated to rise only 33 percent, State and local expenditures will increase by 142 percent. New ways must be devised for State and local governments to be financed if our system of government is to continue in its present form.

This incredibly complex issue must be studied at length, and the various proposals analyzed before Congress can take any action. Such a study can best be accomplished by a tax sharing commission.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from a report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be printed in the Record. The excerpt describes briefly some aspects of tax sharing in foreign countries.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Experience With Revenue Sharing

Several foreign countries have used the general support device and the same general considerations (equalization and local responsibility issues), were also relevant issues abroad. The lessons of foreign experience, however, are not clear-cut and therefore may not be of general applicability to the United States either now or in the future. Nonetheless, one of the more general findings that does emerge rather strikingly, is the adoption of the income tax as a revenue source for the central government, thereby shutting off or constraining its use by lower governmental levels. This situation of fiscal imbalance, therefore, generated pressures for devices to channel money from the Federal to the State sector involving the complex political problems of creating a sharing arrangement acceptable to several competing governmental units. In India, however, tax sharing avoids this political confrontation, since this is written into the Constitution, with a statutory body—the Finance Commission—appointed every five years to determine the actual tax shares for each region or State.

Although the tax sharing debate in the United States is most generally linked solely to the sharing on the individual income tax, the general support programs of both Canada and Germany include additional taxes as well. In the latter, for example, the corporate income tax is also shared between the Federal and State governments and the 1966 Commission on Financial Reform recommended including also the turnover tax (a sales levy on successive stages of production) as well as the gasoline tax, provided the State use the receipts only for urban road construction.

By and large, equalization has been the objective of tax sharing arrangements in other countries. Canada goes quite far in this direction, providing grants in the amounts necessary to bring the per capita yield from the various taxes included in the base up to the average level in the two wealthiest Provinces. Germany also has equalization features built in to its system with the interesting feature that States are obliged to grant a part of their receipts to municipalities; this share, however, is determined by State—rather than—Federal law.

The experience in India is different. Although some attention is given to equalization, the results are rather mixed because some of the taxes that are returned are done so on the basis of origin of collection. Thus, the more efficient tax administration powers of the Federal sector are called into play specifically. Some observers read the past experience in India as a demonstration that under tax sharing, State governments do not seem to make an adequate tax effort or carefully scrutinize their public expenditures, and that tax sharing obligations tend to erode the counter cyclical powers of the central Government.

NAVAHO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on January 20, as President Nixon took his oath of office signifying the orderly change of the political administration of our country, a significant event was also taking place on the Navajo Indian Reservation at Many Farms, Ariz. January 20 marked the opening of Navaho Community College, an institution without peer in America. That date initiated a new concept in education, bringing community college classes to the Navajo people for the first time on their own land. It is a great tribute to the Navajo people that they undertook the creation of this college themselves.

Navaho Community College is the first institution of higher learning ever located on an Indian reservation and the first to be controlled and operated by an Indian tribe. Its regents are members of the Navajo tribe. It fulfills a dream held by the Navajo people for decades.

As early as 1959, members of the Navajo Education Committee were considering the possibilities of a junior college for their reservation. That such an institution was needed was clearly evident. The Navajo Reservation, comprising some 25,000 square miles in three States, was home to over 100,000 Navajos.

The land contained great productive potential but was largely undeveloped. The Navajos, long famous for their weaving, stone and metal craft skills, were generally poor, uneducated, and unemployed. Job opportunities were scarce and job skills less prevalent. Many inhabited areas of the reservation were practically inaccessible during long periods of each year, and numerous Navajos spoke no English. While American prosperity avoided the Navajo people, the Navajo birthrate was running double that of the rest of the United States. One Navajo out of 100 who graduated from high school was going on to college.

The Navajo Tribal Council was out to reverse that devastating trend, and by the early 1960's had set aside $10 million in a trust fund so that Navajo high school graduates might go to college. While this fund greatly aided Navajo college students, the $400,000 interest generated annually is clearly inadequate to meet the tribe's present needs. Last year some 550 students received scholarship money from the tribe. But thousands of other eager college aspirants were deprived of any post-high-school education because of the lack of sufficient financial resources. It is estimated that by 1972 the number of high school graduates on the reservation will exceed 3,000 students per year. The present figure is about 1,600 per year. Navaho Community College is a vital institution for its young Navajo students who might otherwise be prohibited from pursuing a college course of study.

In 1965, when OEO money was made available to the Navajo community action project, a detailed study of the proposed junior college was made possible for the first time. The tribe, in cooperation with Arizona State University, decided that a community college in the Window Rock-Fort Defiance area was the best location. Window Rock is the capital of the Navajo nation, the center of its tribal government, and the hub for many Federal activities which serve the reservation, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Public Health Service. This geographic area, it was felt, would provide the greatest potential for educational programs due to expanding job opportunities in the vicinity.

The tribe rejected suggestions to seek location of a junior college for Indians off the reservation. The Navajo population, approaching 125,000, has over 40,000 children attending school on the reservation. Yet the closest college facility is in Flagstaff, many miles away, and life at the other State Universities located in the Phoenix and Tucson areas is completely foreign to anything most Navajo youngsters have ever experienced. The Navajos love their land and most want to remain and live on the reservation. It is their home. Their desire is to live in harmony with nature and their fellow man in the community of mountains, painted desert, forests, and beautiful landscapes. These factors have led the Navajo Education Committee to the conclusion that a college on the reservation would be best for the people. The potential of the reservation must be developed, and it is expected that location of the college on the reservation will greatly generate and enhance economic and social progress for the Navajo community.

Mr. President, Navaho Community College is a prototype of the schools that must be developed to serve the disadvantaged minorities of our country. The college is a model of curriculum innovation. It offers both terminal and transfer courses, catering to the unique needs of the Navajo people. The curriculum is designed to meet individual needs, and programs have been developed to assist both English and non-English speaking students, high school graduates, and high school dropouts, and students who transfer from other colleges and universities. The college offers classes both day and night in order to reach as many people in the Navajo community as possible.

The curriculum presents the Navajo viewpoint in courses such as history, anthropology, philosophy, political science, and sociology. Courses in Navajo culture and language are designed to help the Indian student understand who he is, where he is going, and why he ought to be proud of his place in society. Because of the English language deficiency among many Navajo students, English language and literature are an important part of the curriculum. In addition, business and management skills, vital to development of the reservation's economic structure, are stressed.

Besides the academic programs offered, a full range of vocational-technical subjects and arts and crafts classes are being taught. These are open to students who did not graduate from high school; and even those Navajos who never attended school at all. Industries on and near the reservation are cooperating with the Navaho Community College to develop meaningful, practical job training courses. Students following this course of study advance at their own pace.

The college has developed a National Indian leadership training program, with an advisory board of Indian leaders throughout the country, including Mrs. Fred Harris, Cato Valandra, Roger Jordain, Jimmy Hend, and others. The board's purpose is to encourage outstanding Indian youth to attend the Navaho Community College for the 2-year leadership program prior to transferring to a 4-year institution to complete their undergraduate training.

Navaho Community College presently enrolls 300 students and is temporarily occupying the facilities of a Bureau of Indian Affairs high school at Many Farms loaned to the tribe through the end of the 1969–70 school year. For the 300 available spots, 5,000 students wanted to enroll this year, a further indication of the great need for an institution of this type on the reservation. The present enrollment includes students from 10 different Indian tribes, including a few Anglo students. Approximately 10 percent of the students are non-Navajo. The school is coeducational.

The Navaho Community College has sought accreditation, and has already received correspondent status by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In 3 years the college will be ready for the next step toward full accreditation. In addition, the three State universities, Northern Arizona University, Arizona State University, and the University of Arizona, have given assurance that credits will be transferable.

The board of regents, established by a resolution of the Navajo Tribal Council, is comprised of five at-large members representing the five agencies of the reservation, as well as the Navajo tribal chairman and the student body president of the college. The regents make all major decisions regarding the college, including hiring of staff and instructors, operation, and admission standards. I have personally met with each of the gentlemen who sit on the board of regents, and am very favorably impressed with their capacity and skill to govern the affairs of the college.

Operational expenses, some half-million dollars for the current fiscal year, come from two principal sources: OEO, which has contributed $450,000 this year, and the Donner Foundation, with an initial donation of $60,000. The Navajo Tribe will soon vote on a resolution to contribute $250,000 annually for operational expenses. The tribe has also donated 2,000 acres for a permanent college site, as well as 500 additional acres at Many Farms for an agricultural program. The value of these lands have been appraised at $350,000.

The board is now undertaking an aggressive campaign to solicit construction funds for the permanent college facilities at Tsaile Lake, a beautifully wooded, rolling area north of Window Rock. Architects roughly estimate that permanent facilities accommodating 1,500 students will cost $13 million. These facilities would include administration and classroom building, a science laboratory, an auditorium, a gymnasium, student center, vocational-technical shops, dormitories, and a Navajo Culture Center, which will be the hub of the campus. In addition, funds are being sought for scholarships, endowed chairs, vehicles, and library materials.

The initial results of these solicitations are most encouraging. The Donner Foundation is making available $100,000 for next year, and a recent gift from Mrs. Henry Moses of $50,000 for library materials has been matched by the Donner Foundation. The Navajo Tribe will provide $70,000 in scholarship aid for 1969–70, and many private businesses have indicated their intent to contribute to that scholarship fund. OEO has made a 3-year commitment of operational expenses of approximately $450,000 per year. The regents have approached numerous industries and foundations for contributions to the construction of the permanent facility, and are optimistic that at least $2 million will be pledged from these sources.

The regents are also currently negotiating with organizations such as FHA, HUD, and EDA for development loans for low-cost housing for faculty and staff. Private investment capital is being sought for the development of a shopping center near the college.

Mr. President, the young history of Navaho Community College is already a magnificent success. It is a tribute to the Indian people as to what they can accomplish when given the opportunity. As the college's first president, the noted educator, Dr. Robert Roessel recently stated:

> Many people feel that the Navaho Community College is perhaps one of the most important things that ever happened in terms of growth on the Navajo Reservation.

These are very compelling reasons for the continuation of his vital institution and the construction of a permanent college facility.

Construction of a permanent facility at the Tsaile Lake site is the most pressing immediate need. There will simply be no place for the college to go once it is dispossessed from the Many Farms location, which will be in June 1970. In order for a new facility to be available by the fall semester of 1970, construction of the new buildings must begin this year. The Navajo Tribe is currently supporting the college to the maximum possible extent of its financial ability. While private contributions are being received in significant amounts, it is highly doubtful that these funds will even approach the amount needed to construct the permanent facility. Federal financial assistance is necessary.

The Federal Government has had primary control over the education of our Indian people for many decades. Yet as late as 1968, no college facility existed in this country which catered specifically to the unique needs of Indian students. The Navajo people, through their own initiative and hard work, are creating such an institution on their own reservation.

I urgently request that Congress support this vital project with whatever financial assistance is necessary to assure construction of the permanent college facility, so that the Navajo people may realize that their monumental efforts are not in vain.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the United States mourns the death of Dwight David Eisenhower—soldier, statesman, patriot.

This selfless person, devoted to the common cause of humanity, to his country, to his family, was truly a man among men. I was proud to have known him and to serve with him as an officer under his command in World War II and to be a Member of the Senate in 1959 and 1960, during his second term

XUM

of office as President of the United States.

As a man who had never lost his capacity to lead, he was an inspiration to me in my efforts to serve my country and represent my fellow citizens of the State of Nevada.

The respect and affection which Dwight Eisenhower enjoyed among all men reflected the deep faith in his candor, his integrity, his simplicity, his natural dignity, and the warmth of his personality.

Our Nation will not forget his service to his country and to the free world. He will be long and gratefully remembered.

A REVIEW OF SENATE CORPORATION FARM HEARINGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to review the Senate Small Business Monopoly Subcommittee's investigation of the effects of corporation farming on small businesses and family farms that I announced 11 months ago.

Since that time, our subcommittee has held field hearings in Nebraska and Wisconsin. The testimony that we received documented the fact that large conglomerate corporations and other absentee interests are acquiring vast tracts of agricultural land across the Great Plains and the upper Midwest once owned and farmed by family farmers. Rural communities and local small businesses are suffering and family farmers are being pushed off the land. Water resources are being depleted by massive irrigated farming operations.

It should be made very clear that our investigation is not concerned about the incorporation of family farms by their owner-operators. Instead, the focus of our hearings are on the large conglomerate corporations and the vertically integrating firms that pose a threat to the foundation of American agriculture as we have known it throughout the history of our country.

It is a very real possibility that corporate ownership of the land could lead to corporate control over our country's food production with food prices dictated to consumers by syndicates and not determined by competition.

The subcommittee wants to resolve these issues now before corporation farming becomes an irreversible trend in American agriculture.

One of the initial findings of our investigation indicates that the agriculture establishment has failed to give sufficient attention to the threat of corporation farming.

Most of the statements and research on current changes in agriculture made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, land-grant colleges, and general farm organizations have been devoted to counting disappearing cows and deserted farmhouses. They have failed to give any significant consideration to the causes and consequences of these changes.

Our Senate investigation has uncovered an embarrassing absence of any substantial research on corporation farming or its implications. It seems that those in the agricultural establishment usually involved in farm research have not had the inspiration or the interest to do work in this area.

An initial Agriculture Department survey on land ownership has indicated that corporation farming has grown rapidly in the past 8 years. Fifty-seven percent of the nonfamily corporation farms in the 22-State survey were set up since 1960. They now control more than 7 million acres in those 22 States.

It would be an unjustified gamble to permit large conglomerate corporations to continue to move into agriculture without a full investigation of the consequences.

It is my hope that Federal agencies will spend less time counting farm-to-city migrants and more time finding out why they leave and what effect it has. This should include an exhaustive study of the effect of corporation farming on the movement of farm and rural people to the cities.

Our Senate Monopoly Subcommittee will continue its investigation of corporation farming this year by focusing its attention on the rural communities which are now being affected by the concentration of landownership and agricultural production in the hands of a few companies.

Some agricultural observers still seem to doubt the grim implications of the rapid movement of large conglomerate corporations into agriculture. But testimony that our subcommittee has already obtained from economists, sociologists, and farm leaders indicates great concern over the prospect of giant food monopolies gaining control of American agriculture.

The unhindered growth of corporation farming is certain to lead to the end of family farms and destruction of rural communities.

Now we want to talk directly with the small businessman, the rural minister, and the local family farmer, and determine what effect corporation farming is having on their communities and the citizens living there.

We plan to go to those communities where large rubber and chemical companies have established massive cattle and egg enterprises and where other widely diversified companies have created huge feed-grain operations, covering tens of thousands of acres of America's best farmland.

Our goal is to learn what corporation farming means to the marketing of food and fiber, to the future of rural America and local small businesses and to the use of our natural resources.

Mr. Roger Blobaum, who has served as the editor of the Chicago bureau of United Press International and as the editor of the National Union Farmer newspaper, has written an extensive analysis of the subcommittee's activities over the first year. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SECOND LOOK AT HEARINGS—CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE SPOTLIGHTS NONFARM INVADERS

(By Roger Blobaum)

Corporation farming's impact on farmers and ranchers is finally getting serious attention in Washington in the first Congressional investigation of the issue in more than 20 years.

The inquiry is disclosing how farming companies avoid taxes, inflate land prices, exploit underground water, use secrecy in acquiring land, destroy farm markets, and manipulate local government.

It is showing how the government, through unfair tax writeoff policies and unsound surplus land sales practices, helps company farming spread.

It is raising questions about the kind of citizen, or the kind of neighbor as one witness put it, that farming companies would be. "Company towns" and the local government control that goes with them are likely.

And it is making clear how little is known (and how many people in high places could care less) about economic and social consequences of the rapid movement of conglomerate and other non-farm interests into agriculture.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, an investigator who doesn't let go when he gets his teeth into a problem, launched the corporate farming probe last year. He is using the Monopoly subcommittee he has chaired so effectively in exposing scandalous profits of big drug companies.

"It would be a dangerous gamble," he insists, "to permit large conglomerate corporations to continue to move into agriculture without a full investigation of the consequences."

Nelson has pushed ahead on the issue in spite of lack of support from most politicians, building an impressive 446-page record and giving the issue badly-needed national exposure.

Twenty corporations, including some of the nation's biggest conglomerates, have been tied to farming or ranching so far in the investigation.

The subcommittee found, as expected, that bankers, implement dealers, insurance agencies, and other Main Street businesses will be hard hit when big farming corporations start up in their trade areas.

It also turned up evidence implicating the so-called "agricultural establishment." It appears most land grant universities, agribusiness firms and government agencies now stand aside, or actually provide help, as outside interests move into farming and ranching.

Nelson is deeply concerned over how little is known, either in or out of government, about corporation farming's impact. This basic change in agriculture appears to be going on with almost no debate or questioning of its consequences.

"Important policy issues, involving both small business and related economic and social elements in rural America, are involved," he says.

"These public interest questions should be resolved before corporate farming becomes an irreversible trend."

The record shows there has been no recent in-depth, comprehensive investigation of either corporation farming or its implication. Questioning of witnesses about current research, whether by organizations or universities or individuals, clearly shows this.

It appears, Nelson says, that those in the agricultural establishment who usually do farm research have had neither the inspiration nor the interest to do any work on corporation farming.

Lack of interest also was hit hard in testimony by Howard Bertsch, former administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. He

XUM

was disturbed at public apathy toward corporation farming's social implications.

"The whole dialog of the social virtues and social values of family farming in this country has died," he complained.

UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

"And I believe the most important outcome of these hearings . . . will be the renewal of this dialog because if we ever get the American people talking about this issue and understanding it, I have the greatest faith in the ultimate outcome."

The subcommittee held hearings last year in Omaha and Eau Claire, Wis., with 34 witnesses appearing. Not a single representative showed up to defend corporation farming.

Considerable testimony dealt with corporation farming's impact on soil and water resources. Several witnesses suggested farming companies would "mine" both land and water to take big profits, then move on to areas not yet exploited.

Most water problems cited involved the Ogallala Basin, a vast underground reservoir underlying parts of Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas. Pumping from the basin was limited until recently, for the most part, to water needed for livestock and household use.

Several witnesses emphatically opposed heavy withdrawal from the Ogallala, a closed basin that could be pumped dry in a generation or less. It is not fed by surface streams or lakes and is recharged solely from rain water seeping through the soil.

Amer Lehman, a Colorado rancher, testified that non-farm interests are sinking wells in sagebrush-covered sand dunes, making the land productive by heavy fertilizer application and irrigation.

SIFTING SOILS

"However, these soils under row-crop production will sift during the winter months without fall cover crops," he told the subcommittee.

"If the water resource is exhausted, these fields will have to be abandoned and they will become barren, blowing desert."

Similar testimony came in a report on Central Wisconsin's sandy soil area, where company farmers attracted by underground water have bulldozed out shelter belts and exposed large sandy stretches to wind erosion.

Soil and water conservationists, in going through these reports and others in the hearing record, can get a sobering look at the resource nightmare that large-scale corporation farming represents.

Small businesses also are in for trouble from corporation farming. Several months ago the daily newspaper in Wellington, Kan., published an editorial alerting readers to its dangers.

"The thought of one giant corporation controlling all of the agricultural wealth of Sumner County would provide a lifetime of nightmares for our merchants," the *Wellington Daily News* said.

"Small town insurance firms wouldn't have anyone to insure. Realtors wouldn't have anyhing to sell to anyone. Implement dealers could forget it. Petroleum dealers would go out of business or out of town, or like most of us, both."

KILL SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate subcommittee was told repeatedly that this is the likely impact of widespread company farming in the trade area of any small town or city directly tied to agriculture.

There is ample evidence that large farming companies, as a general practice, buy equipment and production supplies discounted and direct from either wholesalers or the factory.

One example cited was purchase of $250,000 in farm equipment by Shinrone Inc., operator of a huge farm in Sac County, Iowa. The equipment was purchased from manufacturing plants in Brantford, Canada, and in Detroit, Mich., and Algoma, Wis.

There was testimony that many farming companies are directly affiliated with big oil, tire and other makers of farm supplies and thus find it doubly profitable to buy direct.

Several witnesses also discussed the impact on service establishments, highly important in farm-rural trade areas. A substantial drop in local demand will force banks, medical clinics, law offices, and similar service institutions to cut back or close entirely.

"Because towns and banks are in the business of serving people, the banker sees that the disappearance of these families would cause his town and his bank to disappear, Pat DuBois, spokesman for the Independent Bankers Association, told the subcommittee.

FARMERS NEEDED

"The fact remains that the small town cannot exist without people on the land, no matter how productive a vast corporation farm may be."

Buying and financing practices of company farms also work against Main Street attempts to keep locally-earned money in the community. William Pickering, a Chippewa Falls, Wis., banker, outlined the problem for the subcommittee.

"They (company farms) hurt us in our business of banking particularly in that financing automatically comes from the bank at their head office," he said.

"In turn, any excess deposits eventually will drift back into the home office and circulate in that monetary system . . ."

The testimony of Howard Bertsch also emphasized the close relationship between farm families and local business firms and direct purchase practices of farming corporations.

"In an area where corporation farms dominate there is no place for the village farm supply dealers, the co-op grain elevator, the small banker," he said.

"You simply cannot have corporation farms and small business enterprises cheek by jowl . . . (but) where family farms thrive, small businesses flourish, too."

A disturbing long-term outlook from John A. Hopkins, an expert in finance at the University of Illinois, was entered in the record. He concludes, the subcommittee was told, that corporate farms eventually will either tie themselves to selected suppliers or set up supply subsidiaries.

INFLATE LAND VALUES

The subcommittee found prices well above those justified by normal investment returns are paid in assembling large holdings, some of 10,000 acres or more. The testimony shows non-farm investors pay $25 to $100 an acre over going prices to put together large tracts.

Data on this situation was submitted to the subcommittee by Arnold Onstad of Spring Grove, Minn., chairman of a task force investigating corporations farming in Minnesota.

Task force researchers found, in analyzing hundreds of questionnaire returns, that 27 real estate dealers knew of standing offers by outside companies or investors to buy large tracts of Minnesota farm land. All involved higher-than-market quotations.

Eleven real estate dealers reported a $25-an-acre premium offered for land in big tracts. Three reported a premium of $50 an acre. Five said the standing offer was $100 or more over going market prices.

A shocking land acquisition story was told by Amer Lehman during his report on a corporation's secrecy-shrouded land deals and related scrambling by farmers to save valuable water rights. The transactions took place in northeastern Colorado.

Lehman told how a real estate broker optioned land for an undisclosed buyer, using contracts requiring sellers to obtain state ground water permits and to prove their wells would pump at least 1,000 gallons a minute.

"When the options were exercised, the undisclosed principal was identified as Gates Farms, a subsidiary of the Gates Rubber Co., a substantial conglomerate corporation," Lehman testified.

"The already disordered development at this point began showing signs of panic . . . some farmers obtained permits, drilled wells, and capped them to protect their water rights."

FARMER BARRED

The water commission clamped down after the Gates buying spree, barring many farmers from sinking wells. The irony of it is that those denied permits included several who sold part of their land, complete with high-flow wells, to Gates Farms.

Edwin Christianson, Farmers Union's vice president, hit corporate land buying as poor public policy. He told the subcommittee that land, once company owned, is off the market indefinitely. This contrasts with individual ownership where death, poor health, retirement or other personal considerations force sales about once a generation.

"Since a corporation never dies, the land tends to remain in corporate hands even though some of the stockholders may change from time to time," he testified.

"Land swallowed up by corporations is likely to be gone for good as far as family-type operators are concerned."

GOVERNMENT HELPS CORPORATIONS

Criticism of the government's role in assisting farming companies came in testimony by Elton Berck, president of Nebraska Farmers Union. He told the subcommittee how this developed in a transaction involving a federal agency and the sprawling Hastings (Neb.) Naval Ammunition Depot.

A sizeable portion of the depot area was obtained as surplus by the City of Hastings with help from Nebraska's industrial development act. The city, to the surprise of the area's farmers, immediately entered a lease-purchase agreement that gave the land to a corporation for a huge hog feeding operation.

Although this involved the Defense Department, it is reported the Atomic Energy Commission and other federal agencies also transfer large-acreage installations to farming companies.

The subcommittee was told these unused installations attract farming companies because they involve huge land tracts, clear in most cases of farm buildings, hedgerows, terraces, and other obstructions to big operations. They also are usually free of public road and other rights-of-way.

It is clear from the testimony that federal tax policy is a major factor, possibly the most important, in attracting heavily-financed outsiders into agriculture. Substantial capital gains, favorable depreciation rates on machinery and equipment, and tax loss writeoffs against nonfarm income return sizeable tax savings.

TAX LOSS FARMING

Widespread incidence of "tax loss farming" was clearly shown in the hearings, both for wealthy individuals using farm investments as a tax haven and for corporations whose principal business is farming.

Internal Revenue Service figures submitted show that 680,000 of the 3 million farm income tax returns filed in 1965 had farm losses offsetting nonfarm income. The subcommittee was told that much of this "loss," estimated at up to $400 million a year, would appear later as capital gain taxed at a reduced rate.

Witnesses leveled a sharp attack on the 25% ceiling on the tax on long-term capital gains. One expert, singling out this area of tax favoritism, called it a "graduated and progressive subsidy" to wealthy non-farm investors moving into agriculture.

"It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that much of the recent interest in farm investments by non-farm investors would fall away if the capital gains tax ceiling were raised to, say, 40 to 50%," he testified.

"This 25% limit . . . is inconsistent with the principle of the progressive income tax and is distorting captial flows, with no clear benefit to the public interest."

One interesting aspect of the hearings was testimony dealing with "low visibility" corporation farming—the kind that doesn't require large-acreage farm and ranch operations. This includes such things as contract farming and control of the output of huge feedlots and egg factories.

The subcommittee was told that the big corporations using this approach can control sizeable volumes of farm products without acquiring large land tracts, investing in farm machinery, or setting up farming subsidiaries. Most companies involved are either processors, mainly packers and canners, or farm supply manufacturers.

It was estimated, for example, that nonfarm corporations now control 98% of U.S. broiler production. Companies also are involved in production of feed cattle, hogs, lambs, turkeys, eggs and vegetables.

BY-PASS COMPETITION

It is clear from the testimony that corporation-controlled production bypasses the regular market system, upsetting supply-demand factors that set prices. The result is a breakdown, or even total destruction, of markets since there no longer are enough buyers and sellers to provide competition.

One expert told the subcommittee that corporate attempts to control agricultural production will gradually dry up open markets, with price levels less and less responsive to supply-demand conditions.

Paul L. Farris, a prominent Purdue University economist, testified that another result will be gravitation of management from the hands of farmers to those of processors and suppliers with the farmer ending up as a laborer.

"Integrating companies may not completely take over the production of food and fiber by owning the land and capital and hiring the labor so long as they can earn more with their resources in other uses," he testified.

"Also, by using contract, integrating companies may be able to avoid some employee costs, such as Social Security, workmen's compensation, and possibly union wages, which would likely come with complete ownership . . ."

COMMUNITY STUDY

One of the most significant corporation farming studies ever made was a comparison of two California farm communities, one surrounded by family-type farms and the other dominated by farming companies. One conclusion was that the family farm community had more and better schools, churches, recreational facilities, civic organizations and public services.

The hearings reflected concern that these same things will be undermined by any community where company farming becomes dominant. Witnesses also expressed concern over prospects of "company town" situations with local government and public services eroded by absentee owner influence.

Threat of an eroded tax base, coupled with corporate demands for lower tax rates and fewer services, were expressed repeatedly. A drop in value of taxable property, the subcommittee was told, would follow removal of family farm buildings from large tracts cleared by company farmers and small business closeouts resulting when these corporations bought supplies from distributors and manufacturers.

There was testimony, too, that changes in the farm-rural population that would accompany corporation farming—hired managers and migrant workers becoming predominant—would undermine local government. *Prof. Douglas G. Marshall, a University of Wisconsin sociologist, said one likely result is local political apathy.*

THREAT TO GOVERNMENT

"The new farm employes may not see that they have much of a stake in local political participation," he testified.

"Moreover they will be few in number and are likely to be pressured by companies that employ them."

The larger question of the kind of "citizen" a farming company becomes in a community also was posed. One witness told the subcommittee that most corporations entering agriculture are likely to fail this important social test.

"I see corporations appearing in agriculture that are not large enough to be socially responsible but are large enough to ignore the wishes of their communities," he testified.

"And I am afraid that we may emerge from this period of change having gotten the worst of both possible worlds, having traded effective and efficient small units of production which were not growing rapidly enough to keep pace with technological change for larger corporate units of production which were not large enough and well financed enough to be socially responsible and financially flexible."

SENATOR ROBERT BYRD'S ANALYSIS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) approaches his duties conscientiously. He does not shirk work in the conduct of his assignments from the taxpayers and the Congress.

Last year, in the 90th Congress, Senator Byrd was chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations. Last year, 1968, was a time of great trial for the District of Columbia. We recall especially the tragedy of the April riots.

As a consequence of those April riots, and because of Senator Byrd's long and sincere interest in having our Nation's Capital City be the ideal model for the world, he undertook a monumental task to analyze what is wrong in Washington, D.C. We all know that our Capital City, Washington, is not a model city for the world, although it is the seat of government for the greatest nation on earth, and quite often is the only part of our beautiful Nation ever viewed by the heads of state of the other nations.

On the contrary, Washington is viewed by most people in our Nation as one of the worst possible cities in which to live. And this opinion is shared by many throughout the world. Yet, Washington has great beauty—in its parks, its architecture, and its monuments.

The problem with Washington, D.C., is as Senator Byrd analyzed it after weeks of study—in its lawlessness. Senator Byrd did a major part of his work at night, interviewing, in his own words, many Washington business men and women, police officers, bus drivers, firemen, and other individuals. He took from them 1,418 pages of testimony concerning their personal knowledge of the crime situation in the District. He had to assure these people that they would remain anonymous, for the protection of themselves, their families and their businesses, if they had a business left after the April riots. Senator Byrd placed in the Record of October 10, October 12, and November 1, last year, for our enlightenment, a part of the testimony he received.

Any Senator who has read that testimony, or any portion of it, realizes the validity of Senator Byrd's analysis that the fear in Washington, D.C., is directly attributable to a lack of law and order. I think it would be appropriate to here enter in the Record again, for emphasis, some excerpts from Senator Byrd's remarks last October 10:

> Mr. President, many and varied are the suggestions advanced regarding the causes of crime.
>
> Some say poverty. Yet, there is probably less real poverty today in America than ever before, but crime is more rampant.
>
> Some say injustice. Yet, the U.S. Supreme Court and some of the Federal circuit courts of appeals have weighted the balance in favor of the criminal and against society, but crime is more rampant.
>
> Some say joblessness is the cause of crime. But the unemployment statistics of today are at a record low. Yet, crime is more rampant.
>
> Some say racial discrimination is the cause of crime. However, more steps have been taken in the past 15 years to eradicate discrimination, both real and imagined, than at any time since the adoption of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Federal Constitution. There have been numerous court decisions and countless Federal and State and municipal laws enacted prohibiting discrimination. Yet, crime is more rampant.
>
> Many circumstances may contribute to crime, but one key factor will always be present—the individual himself, his temperament, his attitude, his level of mentality.
>
> Some people argue that criminals are made, not born; others maintain that the reverse is true. But one thing is sure: something must be done to restore law and order and a respect for authority, and to renew a sense of individual responsibility in the Nation's Capital and throughout the land, or this Republic will succumb to anarchy.
>
> There are some who say today that "social justice" must take precedence over law and order.
>
> They seem to be arguing that individuals or groups who contend they have not received justice, if they do not actually have the right to plunder and burn and to shoot policemen, at least can be excused for doing so. I cannot agree.

As Senator Byrd cannot agree that criminals can be excused for plundering, burning, and killing, neither can I agree. There has been too much concern for the rights of criminals to the detriment of the rights of the victims of their crimes.

I therefore applaud President Nixon for making the problem of crime in this Capital City and in this Nation a matter of major concern for his administration.

We would hope that along with the various reports made on crime and riots that this analytical testimony put together by Senator Byrd will count considerably in our thoughts on this serious matter. And, we would hope that consideration will be given this testimony, for reasons that should be obvious from the story told by the typical small businessmen of Washington. That testimony should be read and considered as we map plans to come to grips with the problem.

If the people in what are called the ghetto areas are ever to improve themselves, they have got to find work. Yet,

XUM

the businesses which could provide job opportunities for many are leaving these areas because law and order is not preserved, and therefore their businesses have been destroyed, or they have reason to believe they will be destroyed.

At the same time, when a business closes and moves out, competition is restricted—and prices almost inevitably are going to rise in these areas. The best way to help the people in the so-called ghetto areas is to see that there is law and order. Further, when businesses close, taxes so essential to schools, and other adequate governmental services are diminished. It is a vicious cycle in more ways than one.

Quite frankly, many of my constituents in Wyoming are shocked by what happens daily in Washington, D.C. I have received hundreds of letters asking whether the acts of crime in Washington reported to them by the news media are myths. The problems of this city defy their imaginations. Those who have been able to visit with me here in Washington are jolted by the local newspaper, radio, and television reports of violent crimes. One of the first questions I am asked by a visiting constituent, and I am reasonably confident the same is true of many of your own guests, is which areas of this city they can safely visit without having their lives endangered. This is a harsh question to hear asked by the men and women and children of this Nation, in their own Capital City. They tell me that when they check into their respective hotels the desk clerks immediately begin warning them against venturing into certain areas of the city, and against going anywhere alone.

This spell of fear hanging over this city would not exist if there were adequate law and order. Senator BYRD has done much to bring us the facts. It is our job, and that of the President and of Mayor Washington, to help to abate the plague of lawlessness. We can hope for success if we understand all the facts.

EISENHOWER—A MAN OF PEACE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Nation grieves at the loss of one of its truly great statesmen and leaders, Dwight David Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower was a man of peace and personal charm, a man who embodied the most noble and honorable qualities of the American character. His warmth as an individual and his ability as a statesman have left a profound mark of appreciation on the memories of all those at home and abroad who knew and loved him.

Our Nation is indebted to the generosity of his spirit. He gave of himself in selfless manner as he led this country with its allies through the dark struggle against the forces of Nazi tyranny. General Eisenhower was both competent and compassionate as a military commander. He moved decisively toward ending the conflict and destruction of war, yet never lost sight of the personal needs and sorrows of those men who fought under him. He carried within him the burden of every soldier who suffered death and hardship on the battlefield.

General Eisenhower was a man of international stature. He sought the interests of all men, above and beyond the personal devices and desires of the few. He looked forward with anticipation to the day when peace and tranquillity would be a permanent reality fostered by the counsel of those who had learned from the bitter lessons of the past.

Retaining a constant distaste for war, and having had a firsthand knowledge of its cost, he warned against the growing influence of the institutions of war, lest they purchase the future of the world at the expense of human civilization.

We pay tribute to Dwight Eisenhower for the unswerving loyalty and commitment he had to his country. He served us all well, remaining cheerful to the end, calling forth in us the best that we could give.

As President his popularity attested to the trust and love which the American people gratefully afforded him.

America and the world are better for having known Dwight Eisenhower. His presence will be greatly missed. Yet his memory will never diminish.

As a Nation, we strive to honor him by living those qualities of life which to Dwight Eisenhower were his creed and his manner.

THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it appears that in the matter of seeing the will of the people carried out, through their expression of intent by their elected representatives, we have gotten into an extremely thorny thicket. I am referring to reports of the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader in his questioning of the chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Clifford Alexander, before a judiciary subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) has, I think, an exemplary record on what has of late become an almost "sacred cow" subject—civil rights. Certainly no one who examines the voting record of our minority leader can accuse him of legislative bias or unfairness in this area. As a matter of fact, he has come under attack for being too "liberal" in the civil rights field. I say all that simply as background, Mr. President.

It seems to me that in our present situation we have come very close to the fantastic scene described in the Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes." I am sure most of us are familiar with that story in which a group of unscrupulous tailors "sold" the Emperor some new clothes by saying that only those worthy of their position could see them. Since no one was willing to admit he could not see the nonexistent clothes the hoax worked until a child pointed out that the Emperor simply had no clothes on at all.

This is the impasse to which we have come in the matter of Government-enforced equal opportunity.

Some Americans have undertaken to set themselves up as judge and jury and decide, ex cathedra, what does and what does not constitute discrimination. Unfortunately this tendency extends even to high public officials and is, I think, particularly unbecoming when the robes of self-righteousness very thinly conceal the uniform of partisan political ambition.

Now we are in the perplexing situation of being almost unable to raise one word of criticism—even constructive criticism such as the minority leader was engaged in—without suddenly and certainly being labeled as opposed to equal employment opportunity. Perhaps we are in need of a childlike national voice to call attention to the fact that the "equal employment emperor" is going about without his clothes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has a duty to speak out when he learns that a governmental agency is abusing its authority. He would be remiss in his duty if he failed to do so. And believe me, Mr. President, the EEOC and its sister agency, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, have far exceeded their authority of trying to eliminate discrimination in employment. I know something about these agencies because I have been following their activities for some time. Both employers and unions have been in touch with me and from time to time I have pointed out in the RECORD the outrageous manner in which the personnel of these agencies have conducted themselves. Mr. President, the EEOC should have been censured for its actions in many cases and if the chairman cannot control his own personnel, he should be removed.

The same would be true of any other agency or agency head, whether involved in the area of civil rights or not.

Mr. President, as I stated on the floor on March 24:

> So far as I have been able to determine from many sources, the personnel of these agencies are not concerned with seeing that the law is complied with; rather, they see their duty as one to belittle, embarrass, bully and abuse American industry for failure to make up for alleged past misdeeds. As time goes on, these people are becoming increasingly arrogant and insulting. I think that it is high time that the personnel of these agencies learn that there are limitations on their power. Judging from recent reports, they might also learn simple manners.

Mr. President, by way of verification of these charges let me refer to recent hearings held by the EEOC in Los Angeles on the question of discrimination in the aerospace, movie, and television industries. A number of observers in the audience recounted what took place.

Mr. President, listen to this account of the hearings and see whether this can be called an objective hearing:

> The temper and attitude of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was different from a similar hearing held in New York City in January, 1968. Although the questions were unnecessarily tough at the New York Hearing, and even at times caustic, neither the Chairman nor the staff engaged in continuous harrassment in New York. Unfortunately, from March 12 through the 14th the Los Angeles Hearing was conducted in such a manner as to negate any sense of objectivity by the Commission and staff. In fact, at times the so-called Hearing resembled a carnival atmosphere rather than a government hearing. There seemed to be an attitude of personal vendetta by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with the representatives of the business community

XUM

> and the unions. Most of the questions asked of those testifying were not asked to either elicit information or to help those testifying, but were asked merely to be punitive or to show that minority persons could "dish it out" to the so called establishment.

Then consider some of the questions and the manner of interrogation. I find particularly objectionable the questions and sarcastic comments of the chairman and his protege Commissioner Brown who I might observe has not yet been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I am not merely speaking from a casual acquaintance with this problem. I have documented these problems before. I ask unanimous consent that an article which I prepared for Nation's Business magazine be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FANNING. Furthermore, Mr. President, on March 24 of this year I placed in the Record on page E2279, an example of the type of harassment which the Senator from Illinois has described to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. That case deals with Southwest Forest Industries and their problems with the many investigations they have had to undergo from the Agriculture Department, the Post Office Department, the Small Business Administration, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. These multitudinous and overlapping investigations should be halted, the conflicting regulations and ambiguity cleared up, and some order brought out of this chaos.

This has been my purpose, Mr. President, in the introduction of S. 931 on February 7 this year, which would restore a measure of congressional control to these activities and remove the conflict, doubt, and recriminations that presently exist. I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will schedule hearings on the bill soon.

On the heels of all this press criticism of Senator Dirksen for daring to speak out about this, comes one of the most flagrant examples of what he has been talking about. Within the past week I received the file on this case from Motorola executives in Arizona. I know the Senator from Illinois is interested in this because he, too, has Motorola plants in his State and knows of the excellent efforts they make to be a part of the community in which they are located as well as the important contributions they make to the economy of their locale.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter and memorandum to which I refer be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record exhibit 3, relating to Arizona Public Service Co.'s dealing with the OFCC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there is little doubt in my mind that much is amiss in the present administration of the equal employment laws in the Nation. Some have tried to make this simply into a regional problem, yet we have employers from all over the Nation who are affected. We have had companies with outstanding records, such as Allen-Bradley of Milwaukee, which are not even remotely connected with the South; they have been practically vilified by public pronouncements of the EEOC.

We have had the entire TV and movie industry branded as—and I am quoting exactly—"racist dogs," and the EEOC Chairman has not spoken a moderating word.

I ask unanimous consent to have an account of these hearings inserted at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. FANNIN. In my opinion, Mr. President, it is time for us to get down to cases. It is time for courage, yes and even temper, to be exhibited in this matter. It is time for Americans of all races to grow up and drop some of this "supersensitivity" that has been fostered over this race issue.

It has always seemed strange to me, Mr. President, that those who have appealed the loudest for a "colorblind" society, are in the forefront of the mob claiming they have been mistreated on the basis of color. I say, if you want treatment without regard to race, sex, national origin, and all the rest of it, then you are going to have to quit asking for special treatment because of those same factors.

There is no question but that discrimination—and unfair discrimination—has existed in all parts of the country at various times. We are all concerned with that. The thrust of every major legislative effort has been to insure, so far as is possible, that such legally perpetuated discrimination does not continue. I know of no reasonable man that will quarrel with that aim.

At the same time, to claim special treatment—discriminatory treatment, if you will—in an attempt to redress past wrongs, real or imagined, is plainly unfair and un-American. I cannot redress the wrongs which my great, great grandfather may have committed against your great, great grandfather; and I suggest that if the situation is reversed, you are just as helpless as I. So let us leave this quibbling about past differences. We are in the present—the here and now—let us move on.

To those who are so prone to criticize, so quick to speak with absolute infallibility, so quick to jump into the fray without benefit of the facts—to those I quote these words from the book of Job; words quoted to his very critical friends who were so sure Job had committed some sin simply because of his circumstances. Job said:

> No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.

EXHIBIT 1

DOES WASHINGTON FORCE RACIAL BIAS?

(By PAUL FANNIN, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

Jimmy Lee never got his promotion. His skin is the wrong color. Jimmy had to stand aside and let someone less qualified be promoted in his place because the federal government threatened to cancel contracts with his employer unless someone of another race got Jimmy's job.

Jimmy Lee is white.

His case is not uncommon—not since the advent of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The names here are changed to protect the individuals, but the circumstances and details are shockingly real.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission came into being in mid-1965 as a result of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The five-man Commission was created to prevent unlawful employment practices. Instead it has undermined some of the most basic relationships between employer and employee. Now it seeks more power of enforcement to spread its influence even wider. I don't think it can be trusted with more authority.

EEOC's record is clear: Misuse of power, violation of the spirit and letter of the law, disruption of labor-management-union relationships. Let me be plain. I'm not against equal employment opportunities. I'm against granting EEOC, or anyone else, arbitrary powers over workingmen and their jobs.

So-called civil rights groups have wrapped themselves around this EEOC issue to the extent that any discussion of the problem immediately brings forth the cry of "racist."

To my mind there is no more basic right than that of a man to provide for himself and those he loves with the smallest interference possible from government. That's what is involved in this issue.

I am disturbed that the EEOC has associated itself with extremist groups. One of the EEOC's former consultants (Timothy L. Jenkins) bills himself as a member of the staff of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—an associate of H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael.

If this is the kind of person insuring equality of employment opportunities—then I want to be very careful about granting any additional powers.

The Commission got off to a rather shaky start under the chairmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. who assured me and other members of the Senate Labor Committee that he would devote his full time and resources to the job. He wrote a letter to Senator Javits of New York stating that he had asked specifically for a two-year appointment taking him beyond June 1 1967 so as to allay any fears Senators Javits and Winston Prouty might have that he would quit to go politicking.

"I will have to leave the day-to-day political activity to such eminent practitioners of the art as you, Congressman Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller" Roosevelt said.

Ten months later he quit to run for the governorship of New York. It was a bad beginning.

PICKING A TARGET

During its first year of operations the EEOC singled out the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. as a likely target for its maiden effort. The company is located in the South. A defense contractor—the nation's sole supplier of capital ships—it had well-developed program of apprentice training

Jimmy Lee and other old hands at the shipyard heard news that the EEOC boys were knocking on doors soliciting complaints about the company. They didn't think much of it. Of the 22,000 employees 41 said they were willing to complain. It later narrowed down to only four. Armed with this "evidence" EEOC notified the company it was in violation of the Civil Rights Act and sat down to negotiate an agreement to stop the alleged discrimination.

Because it is a defense supplier, Newport News had already signed an agreement to take "affirmative action" in eliminating discrimination.

Soon the full array of federal power was focused on one company

The Department of Justice notified the company it was holding up a pending case awaiting outcome of the negotiations.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance under the Department of Labor notified the company all its defense contracts would be suspended pending the outcome of the talks.

The Defense Department was made a party to, and inspector of, the enforcement proceedings.

Small wonder that Newport News Shipbuilding "voluntarily" agreed to the compact which Commission spokesmen called a "landmark" case and a "model" for future agreements.

Jimmy Lee was soon to find out that his career in the shipyard, despite the fact that he belonged to a union, was out of his hands. He had exchanged the quiet of the southwest Virginia hills for the roar and excitement of heavy industry and progressed right out of high school through the shipyard's training program. He thought he was ready to go somewhere. He was next in line for promotion to quarterman. But he had reckoned without the EEOC.

SETTING BLACK AGAINST WHITE

The agreement between EEOC and the company substituted favoritism as a goal. And in the words of one veteran welder, "did everything possible to set black against white."

Jimmy found that a preferential promotion list had been created with 100 Negroes on it. This list had to be exhausted before he could be promoted. Any exceptions to the order of placement had to be cleared with the Commission.

Jimmy got mad.

Others got mad, too. One of Jimmy's friends who had gone through the apprentice school with him says, "They've ruined the school. It used to be there were more boys wanting to get in than they could take—boys who couldn't go to college, but wanted more training. Now they've lowered the requirements so much the teachers are quitting. They've converted the dormitory space back to offices and are having trouble getting enough to fill out the class."

Bone-cracking violence erupted at the main gate of the yard last summer and a score of people were injured. What caused these passionate outbursts in a placid town where the shipyard had operated for 81 years without disturbance?

Listen to these words in the EEOC agreement pertaining to enrollment in the apprentice school:

"The ratio of Negro to white apprentices in any given year should approach the ratio . . . of Negro to whites in the labor area."

And this about promotions:

"Vacancies will be filled by qualified Negro employees."

And this about training opportunities:

"Employees in predominantly Negro departments shall be given the first opportunity to enter training programs in which they are qualified to enter."

Did you wonder that Jimmy Lee and his white friends got mad?

One of the first to protest the agreement was the union representing the 22,000 employees. Their position in employee representation had been entirely preempted.

Co-managers of the independent union, one a white and the other a Negro, have both been very critical of the EEOC's action.

At one time the union threatened to sue the Labor Department unless it set the record straight on the number of raises and promotions. The Labor Department claimed 3,890. The union and the company both contend raises amounted to about 155 as a result of the agreement and 250 Negroes put on preferential promotion lists.

"Any time the Secretary of Labor will claim 3,890 promotions under an agreement that actually produced 155," said one of the union leaders, "I've got a lot of reservations about whether he should be Secretary of Labor."

The unions have a right to be upset about extending the powers of EEOC. The pattern of agreements emanating from the EEOC offices generally bears these four stipulations directly relating to union interests:

WOULD YOU FLY IN THIS ROCKET?

First, most of the EEOC agreements call for abolition of job seniority arrangements in labor agreements. They generally take plant seniority as the only nondiscriminatory yardstick. The practical effect is that a sweeper, for example, who has been in the plant a long time, must be promoted to the next supervisory opening in the rocket assembly shop, regardless of his training or job preparedness.

The commission attitude is, "You must try him, even if he isn't trained."

How would you like a trip to the moon on one of those rockets?

Second, special treatment must be given to Negro employees who are found to be unqualified in their training or advancement.

Third, the EEOC generally calls for an end to all testing. It makes no difference if it is related to the job—the test must be "culturally validated." Ask any sociologist if you can culturally validate a test with less than a 100-man sample equally divided as to race and job experience.

Fourth, and most important to unions, the agreements usually call for a unilateral change in any union contract which is in conflict with any of the above proposals.

POSE LEGAL PROBLEM

This creates a nice legal question.

Does an employer have the right to break one law (the Taft-Hartley protections of collective bargaining agreements) and subject himself to NLRB action in order to obey the orders of the EEOC?

One company tells me it spends over $1 million a year just trying to be in compliance with the multitude of often contradicting decrees handed down by government antidiscrimination agencies.

One federal agency, in existence by executive order, is taking a completely dictatorial attitude with defense contractors. It is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) which hands down ironclad regulations to those doing business with the government.

The really frightening thing here is the lack of Congressional restraint upon their operations, plus the fact that there is no appeal from an OFCC ruling. All this is even more fantastic when considered in the light of what the law actually says the Commission may and may not do.

Congress debated loud and long on the question of having an EEOC in the first place. There are plenty of statements on both sides of the aisle where both supporters and detractors agreed on things the law would not do.

Everyone agreed that setting employment quotas is not the right way to go about eliminating discrimination. Language specifically prohibited hiring or firing, promoting or holding back, just on the basis of race to fill out a percentage quota. Yet practically every agreement coming out of EEOC has some mention of the local area's Negro population and relates the employer's performance to that quota.

Setting quotas, while probably the most frequent violation the EEOC commits, is not its only sin. Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan spoke out plainly on the floor of the House after the EEOC had been in operation for about a year.

She roundly castigated the Commission for failing to enforce the antidiscrimination provisions in regard to sex and said:

"These EEOC officials are completely out of step with the President, the rest of the Administration, the courts and, indeed, the country as a whole."

She charged the executive director of the Commission with saying the sex provision of title VII was a "fluke" and "conceived out of wedlock." Mrs. Griffiths reminded the Commission that "they took an oath to uphold the law—not just the part of it that they are interested in."

You can get a better idea of the haphazard, hot-eyed approach to the law taken by representatives of the Commission if you'll follow this chain of events that occurred during an actual case. Names, places and dates have been changed.

HOW EEOC OPERATES

Joseph Bedford operates a small manufacturing concern in the Midwest. He was on vacation last June when Jefferson Rank, a Negro, came in to ask about a job. So far as can be determined, he received courteous treatment from the receptionist in the personnel department, was told there were no openings at present either for employees or trainees, but offered an employment application to fill out and leave if he cared to. He didn't.

Now it's February and Mr. Bedford gets a call from his receptionist that a Mr. Sperlin of the EEOC is waiting to see him. He meets Mr. Sperlin and is promptly served a charge of discrimination dated the day before. It is signed by Jefferson Rank and sworn to before Mr. Sperlin. It's the first time Joe knows he's been charged with an unfair discrimination practice alleged to have happened last June.

Upon request he shows Mr. Sperlin around the plant and lets him talk to the personnel people. The manufacturer finds out he should be keeping records of applications, terminations, promotions, raises and the like for 180 days. He'd been throwing them away after 90 days. So far that's the only EEOC regulation he's been found negligent in. However, even if he had been keeping records for the stipulated time, Jefferson's application would not have been on file, since almost 270 days have passed.

Mr. Sperlin asks Negro employees if they are treated the same as white employees. He asks if the canteen areas or restrooms are segregated. Asked if personnel like working for their supervisor and Mr. Bedford. When they say, "Yes," he says, "Oh, that's too bad. I like to find people who aren't happy in their jobs.

Mr. Bedford contains himself. Mr. Sperlin leaves saying he has found nothing wrong except the record-keeping time limit. Joe Bedford sighs.

Seven and a half weeks later he gets an EEOC decision. It finds an unfair employment practice occurred in June, the charge filed in September and served on him in February.

The Commission is squeezing the law a bit. A three-month limitation on making a charge is written into the law. Its supposed to be signed and sworn to. So the Commission says under questioning from Mr. Bedford's attorney (by now he's decided he needs one) that they've "adopted" the attitude that a written complaint fulfills the requirements of the law even though it was not sworn to.

Just like that—change the law.

A couple of months go by before an EEOC conciliator makes contact and arranges a meeting. Now its a little over a year since Jefferson Rank first entered the manufacturers reception room.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney face the conciliator. Most of the agreement he wants Joe Bedford to sign is standard civil rights language—but there are some real stunners.

XUM

THE LIST OF DEMANDS

EEOC wants Mr. Bedford to hire Jefferson Rank as a trainee and pay him minimum wage back pay from the time of his alleged application.

EEOC wants him to employ, train and accept the applications of the next 75 Negroes referred to him by a civil rights organization. The figure is determined by taking the percentage of Joe's work force thats Negro and comparing it with an (inflated) percentage of the areas Negro population in the labor market.

EEOC wants Joe Bedford to agree to hire Negroes for the next five white-collar jobs. And he must upgrade at least three Negroes to supervisory positions within three months of the agreement.

On top of this, for two years Mr. Bedford has to report, quarterly, to the Commission everything he's doing that pertains to both his white and Negro workers. He can't promote anybody who is not a Negro unless he gets prior EEOC approval. All refusals of Negroes to take higher jobs must be documented in writing and sent to the Commission.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney managed to trim some of the rough edges off these demands, but he signed an agreement—even though he had done nothing wrong. The plant is located in a town that has lots of militant civil rights activity and he decided he didn't want pickets pounding on his door.

Whether Mr. Bedford got off lucky or not, we don't know. If proponents of additional enforcement teeth for the EEOC get their way, he probably did.

Reasonable negotiations would be harder to come by. The Commission will get the power to enforce its decisions based on "evidence" which it chooses to credit.

Could the same thing happen to you as an employer, or employee?

It not only could—it probably will.

Under the proposed setup for EEOC, the practical effect would be presumptions of guilt. An examiner's "evidence" is deemed to be conclusive. You'll have to prove yourself innocent. The roles of policeman and judge are combined, and a single EEOC employee could conceivably issue his own cease and desist orders.

We've probably made a mistake in describing EEOC desired enforcement powers as "NLRB-like." The National Labor Relations Board has an independent General Counsel who must apply to the courts for authority to issue cease and desist orders. Under the new setup, EEOC appeal procedures would be practically useless. The NLRB was originally set up along the lines proposed for the EEOC. The ensuing mess was atrocious and the present limitations on the NLRB were devised.

Granting cease and desist powers to the EEOC, as the present legislative proposal would do, will deprive you of your day in court. The Commission may find you in violation, issue an order for you to cease and desist.

No testimony need be taken. No independent investigation to establish "substantial evidence" of violation need be conducted. The full power of the Commission may be delegated to a single Commissioner, or even to an individual employee.

This amazing concentration of power is without precedent.

The Commission has made much of the plans it has for submitting all types of job employment "patterns"—quotas on a large scale—to the computer. Already it has held a fishing expedition down South into the textile industry and received criticism from conservative and liberal alike.

The EEOC trotted out the familiar percentage figures again and flogged the industry, causing the liberally oriented *Charlotte Observer* to comment editorially:

"If the larger purpose was actually to get something accomplished about equalizing employment in textiles, we are persuaded this was not the best way to go about it."

TRIAL BY HEADLINES

EEOC's public forum in New York in January, headed by Chairman C. L. Alexander, produced much more heat (and headlines) than light.

Blue-chip corporations were disdainfully put under the public microscope and, of course, found lacking as EEOC denunciations about "tokenism" and other catch phrases flew through the air.

At one point Mr. Alexander asked the president of one of our major airlines how many pilots were Negro. When told that only one out of 420 stationed in New York was, the EEOC spokesman demanded, "Are you satisfied with that?"

I would like to ask that Commissioner if he would care to fly on a plane in which the crew had been selected by race rather than ability? I'll take my flight crews promoted on the basis of skill.

The discouraging thing is that, even for those who have no civil rights ax to grind and would genuinely seek to live up to the Commission's wishes, it becomes impossible under the present approach, for the rules are changed so often.

If you get your total work force in balance with some particular percentage figure, then you find your managerial staff is out of line. Should you get that taken care of, the base of your percentage population figure is changed to make your quota still higher. It's a game nobody wins.

Let there be no mistake, I am for equal employment opportunity. But in substituting favoritism, we are not correcting anything.

Thomas Jefferson said, "All men are created equal." We cannot then come along with legislation and make some men more equal than others.

THE OUTLOOK

What is our legislative situation now?

Senator Clark of Pennsylvania has introduced a bill that would give broad enforcement powers to the EEOC or an individual employee of the Commission. Basically these would be the same type powers residing in the National Labor Relations Board, with only limited appeal.

The bill is cosponsored by Senator Javits of New York. It is before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on which I serve.

It is almost impossible to keep the bill from seeing floor action, unless the public really expresses itself to the Congress.

If people become aware of the strong influence that militant elements will have over their businesses and their jobs should this bill pass—then we can muster the strength to stop its extension.

Otherwise we are forging another link in the chain that can ultimately enslave this republic.

EXHIBIT 2

MOTOROLA INC.,
March 28, 1969.

CHAIRMAN,
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a statement prepared by Mr. Rufus Coulter, Director of Human Relations, Motorola, Inc., Scottsdale, Arizona, concerning the conduct of Mr. John J. Sanchez during an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission investigation at Phoenix, Arizona on March 6 and 7, 1969.

The conduct and statements of Mr. Sanchez on this occasion as a representative of the United States government were so unfortunate as to reflect derogatorily on the program of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. If this conduct goes unreported, I feel certain that your enforcement activity will suffer irreparably.

I have been involved, as have others in my capacity in industry, in cooperating with federal, state, local and private agencies in the fair employment field. I have never had representatives of our company exposed to such unprovoked abuse as that from Mr. Sanchez. I believe that you will agree that this approach to our company is unforgiveable and should be summarily disciplined. This letter is my notice to you as the head of your Commission that no one at Motorola with authority to represent our company on Equal Employment Opportunity Commission matters will meet or communicate or cooperate in any manner in the future with Mr. Sanchez. If he comes to our premises, he will not be permitted to enter. If he communicates, we shall not respond.

However, we shall be glad to cooperate with other representatives of your agency on appropriate business which your Commission may have with us. I believe that the purpose of the Congress in legislating the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the purpose of the President in issuing the pertinent Executive Orders can be served only by men of good will and high integrity.

Sincerely,

K. M. PIPER,
Vice President.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGE BY EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION ON COMPLAINT OF HARRY RUBINSTEIN

Pursuant to a date set in early February 1969 for an investigation of the above charge by the Albuquerque office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Robert Nystrom, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois, attorney for Motorola, Inc., flew to Phoenix, Arizona to meet in my office with Mr. John J. Sanchez of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for an arranged date during the day of March 6, 1969. Mr. Nystrom and I were ready at 8:30 a.m. to proceed with the meeting with Mr. Sanchez. However, he was not present. After waiting for more than an hour, I called the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission office and was assured by the receptionist who answered the telephone that Mr. Sanchez was in Phoenix and at the Westward Ho Hotel. I advised the receptionist that he had an appointment that morning in my office and that our attorney, with the knowledge of Mr. Sanchez, had come all the way from Chicago to participate in the meeting. I subsequently telephoned the Westward Ho Hotel in an effort to locate Mr. Sanchez and was advised that he was not registered at this hotel. I again called the Equal Employment Opportunity office and reported to the receptionist that I had been unable to locate Mr. Sanchez at the Westward Ho Hotel. I asked that she report to him that I had called concerning our appointment that morning and I requested that she ask him to communicate with me at the earliest opportunity. At 10:15 a.m., Mr. Sanchez appeared in my office. I told him that Mr. Nystrom and I had been waiting for him since 8:30 a.m. He responded that he had difficulty in arranging transportation.

Mr. Nystrom inquired of Mr. John Sanchez as to the nature of the information he desired that we submit to him in connection with the charge filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by Mr. Harry Rubinstein, a job applicant. A discussion followed as to the wording of the charge with an observation by Mr. Nystrom that it did not appear to be a valid statement. However, Mr. Nystrom indicated quite clearly that Motorola desired to furnish all the pertinent facts concerning the matter. In this discussion, Mr. Nystrom exhibited to Mr. Sanchez a list of the officers of Motorola,

XUM

pointing out the names of those who were Jewish and at the request of Mr. Sanchez, Mr. Nystrom gave to him a list of three officers who were of Jewish extraction. Mr. Nystrom, at the request of Mr. Sanchez, also gave to Mr. Sanchez the names of principal department heads in the Semi-conductor Products Division (the division against which the charge was filed) who are of Jewish origin. The names were those of Mr. Arnie Lesk, Mr. David Metz and Mr. Gerald Fried. Mr. Sanchez was advised that he was at liberty to interview any of these employees concerning the nature of the charge brought by Mr. Rubinstein. The latest EEOC form and three employee booklets on Motorola were furnished to Mr. Sanchez at his request. Additionally, Mr. Sanchez, at his request, was furnished a copy of Mr. Rubinstein's application received on November 18, 1968; a letter from Mr. LeRoy Maready (Mr. Maready is a former Motorola employee and professional recruitment interviewer who allegedly interviewed Mr. Rubinstein concerning the latter's technical qualifications); and a copy of a memorandum dated December 13, 1968 by Mr. Maready regarding his employment interview with Mr. Rubinstein. Mr. Sanchez requested to see closed cases of job applicants who had been interviewed by Mr. Maready. Mr. Nystrom advised him that these were apparently not at issue and his investigation should be limited to the charge brought by Mr. Rubinstein.

In response to a question from Mr. Sanchez, he was advised that Mr. Maready was of the Mormon faith. Upon the furnishing of the information to Mr. Sanchez as to the religious faith of Maready, Mr. Sanchez charged that Mormons were prejudiced against Negroes and that Mormons were also prejudiced against Jews. Mr. Sanchez stated that Mormons interpreted their version of the Bible to mean that Negroes are second-class citizens. He added that at the University of New Mexico one of the athletic teams had refused to play in a scheduled contest with a team from Brigham Young University because of the known attitude of the Mormons about Negroes. Mr. Nystrom interrupted Mr. Sanchez to remind him that the meeting was for the purpose of investigating the charge of Mr. Rubinstein and in order to accomplish the objective of the meeting, he would appreciate it if the inquiry were restricted to subject matter which was pertinent. Mr. Nystrom advised Mr. Sanchez that based upon the reactions which he gratuitously expressed, he was raising a question in his mind as to his attitude about persons affirming the Mormon religion.

Mr. Paul Abele, Employment Manager at the Semiconductor Products Division, was interviewed by Mr. Sanchez and in response to the questions directed at Mr. Abele, he outlined the procedures by which applications for employment were processed.

After lunch, Mr. LeRoy Maready came to my office where he was questioned by Mr. Sanchez as to the details of Mr. Maready's purported interview with Rubinstein. Mr. Maready told Mr. Sanchez that in his opinion the charge that Motorola had discriminated against Mr. Rubinstein because of religion was ridiculous. Mr. Maready stated he had worked as a missionary for his church in Germany and had assumed Mr. Rubinstein was of German origin because he had known many Germans with that name. Mr. Maready stated that he had no recollection of having interviewed Mr. Rubinstein. He stated that his only contact with Mr. Rubinstein as reflected by the file information was one telephone conversation. In response to questions from Mr. Sanchez as to the reason for not hiring Mr. Rubinstein, Mr. Maready pointed out that there had not been much need for technicians at the time Mr. Rubinstein applied. Mr. Maready stated that in reviewing the file he would conclude that Mr. Rubinstein was a job hopper because of his many short-tenure jobs and that he would have rejected him on his work record which was spotty and showed excessive job changes. Mr. Sanchez asked Mr. Maready if he was prejudiced against Mr. Rubinstein because he was a Jew. Mr. Maready claimed that he was not prejudiced against Mr. Rubinstein. Mr. Sanchez asked Mr. Maready what his religious beliefs were with respect to Negroes. Mr. Nystrom interrupted and stated, "I have told you we are not going into that matter because it is irrelevant to the Rubinstein case. You cannot come in here and ask questions which are not pertinent." Mr. Sanchez apparently lost his composure at this point. Mr. Sanchez stood up and waved his arms in a provocative manner as if to challenge in physical combat and started talking in a very loud manner while pointing to Mr. Nystrom. Mr. Sanchez said, "You are a typical Minnesota Catholic bigot. You should see your priest because you are prejudiced against Mexicans. I have three college degrees and a better background than both of you. Neither of you have more than one degree. I know all about you and Motorola." At this point, I told Mr. Sanchez that I had to admit that I was not very smart. Mr. Sanchez replied, "I am, and I am a tough Mexican." Mr. Sanchez, with his standing physical pose maintained, indicated he was willing to enter into a fist fight. Mr. Sanchez stated to Mr. Nystrom, "You are fat and soft." Mr. Sanchez complained that, "You stalled me for a month in getting together in this meeting." Mr. Nystrom said, "I am sorry but I have been on a vacation for two weeks in Mexico." Mr. Sanchez stated, "Oh, seeing how the peons live, I suppose?" Mr. Nystrom stated, "In my opinion, we are not getting any place in this meeting. Therefore, I am suggesting that the investigation cease and if Mr. Sanchez feels the way he has expressed himself, he is free to leave the meeting." At this juncture, Mr. Sanchez calmed down and took his seat.

Without any preliminary warning or basis for making the request, Mr. Sanchez asked Mr. Nystrom to leave the room. Mr. Nystrom replied, "Not a chance. If you do not like what is going on in this meeting, I should like for you to know that you are free to leave if you so desire." Mr. Sanchez said, "I have a right to be here." Mr. Nystrom replied, "You are here at our invitation." At the conclusion of this exchange of remarks, Mr. Sanchez appeared to regain his composure and the questioning of Mr. Maready by Mr. Sanchez continued with Mr. Sanchez stating his preference that he would like to meet with Mr. Maready at some other place. Mr. Maready who had remained silent and witnessed the conduct of Mr. Sanchez, then said, "I am late to another appointment and would like to get this over with. For your information, I am not prejudiced against any race." Mr. Maready then wrote a statement for Mr. Sanchez that he was not prejudiced against any race. He submitted a pamphlet to Mr. Sanchez with regard to the position of the Mormon Church's favorable attitude towards Jews. Mr. Sanchez stated that since Mr. Maready was not at this point an employee of Motorola, he had no obligation whatsoever to furnish to Motorola a copy of the statement. I asked Mr. Mareaday if he would give me a copy. He replied, "Yes." Thereafter, two copies were made.

Arrangements were then made for Mr. Sanchez to interview the engineers from the Mesa, Arizona plant of Motorola who had had some contact with Mr. Rubinstein. These engineers were Mr. Joe Chapley and Mr. Lawrence McMillan. They agreed to submit statements. The questioning by Mr. Sanchez was concluded at 4:27 p.m. on March 6, 1969. At the conclusion of the meeting, Mr. Nystrom stated to Mr. Sanchez, "So that you will know that I am not the bigot you think I am, a young Mexican girl has lived in my home for the past year, and my daughters have visited the home of her parents in Mexico on an exchange during the same period."

Mr. Sanchez advised me and Mr. Nystrom that he would return to my office at 2:00 p.m. on March 7, 1969 to pick up the typewritten and signed statements of Mr. Chapley and Mr. McMillan. Mr. Sanchez asked me to write Mr. McMillan urging him to find a job at Motorola for Mr. Rubinstein. He stated that if I would do this, and furnish to him a copy of my letter to Mr. McMillan, he would approach Mr. Rubinstein to request that the latter dismiss the complaint.

At 2:00 p.m. on March 7, 1969, Mr. Sanchez came to my office where he met with Mr. Joseph Levang, Personnel Director for the Government Electronics Division of Motorola, Mr. Nystrom and me. I furnished to Mr. Sanchez the written statements of Mr. Abele and Mr. McMillan. Mr. Sanchez requested that the company submit a position paper on its activities in the minority employment field in which Motorola was engaged.

Mr. Sanchez stated that Motorola was under no compulsion to submit such a paper and that it would be a voluntary response to his request. I told him, "Mr. Sanchez, you have all the facts you have requested that we furnish to you and I believe that this should be adequate." Mr. Sanchez advised me that I was highly prejudiced against Indians. He stated that he did not like my attitude. Mr. Sanchez said, "You are a bigot. You are working against everything we are trying to accomplish." I asked Mr. Sanchez what my attitude was since I did not recall having expressed it. Mr. Sanchez stated, "I know what you said about Indians yesterday." I replied, "I simply advised you what an Indian had told me about Indians. I have made no independent statement of my own about Indians."

Mr. Sanchez then charged me with having been insulting to the girl at the Equal Employment Opportunity office when I had called on the prior day when Mr. Nystrom and I were waiting for Mr. Sanchez. I told Mr. Sanchez plainly that I was irritated with having our lawyer sit in my office and waste our time and money.

During the course of the days of March 6 and 7, 1969, Mr. Sanchez did not take one note. However, he asked persons interviewed to submit a statement as to what they had said.

At 4:15 p.m. on March 7, 1969, which was only a few minutes after Mr. Sanchez had left the office, Mr. Harry Rubinstein telephoned me. Mr. Rubinstein stated that he understood the investigation resulting from his filing the complaint had been embarrassing to me. I said, "Yes, and the cost to the company is a needless consideration." He said, "I cannot indict Motorola on the basis of the facts. Actually, I do not practice the religion of my ethnic group. I am trying to be objective. I had no intention of using the complaint as a leverage to get into Motorola." He stated that he was against government interference and believed that Motorola had done a lot for the country and a great deal for the community. He stated Motorola actually owed him nothing.

I would infer that Mr. Sanchez had called Mr. Rubinstein regarding his investigation of Mr. Rubinstein's charge since Mr. Rubinstein seemed to have information bearing upon it which could have come only from an individual who had participated in the meetings on March 6 and 7, 1969.

RUFUS COULTER,
Director of Human Relations, Motorola, Inc.

EXHIBIT 3

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

The following are some of the problems that we encountered in attempting to provide the information requested by Mr. Oroz of the

XUM

Office of Federal Contract Compliance. Please understand that any figures quoted are estimates and we have no figure on the cost incurred in the Data Processing Department.

First of all, as you recall, we only had two days to research our records to give him the information he requested which of course meant dropping other routine work. There is no way of knowing the cost of postponing these other projects. To the best of our recollection, there were close to ninety man hours spent, part of it at overtime. (This ninety hours includes time spent on the project after Mr. Oroz arrived.) We first had to review the weekly personnel letters to get a list of employees hired, terminated or transferred. From this list each employee's personnel file had to be reviewed in an attempt to find out: (1) previous job title and pay rate, (2) in the case of terminations we had to look for a reason (some of this we had to obtain from the exit interviews), (3) personnel files and/or E.E.O.C. files were researched to determine each employee's race.

After these records had been reviewed it then became necessary to compile the information in legible form and special 808's had to be prepared to code for race in the master history.

Since that time it has become necessary to make an extra copy of 808's of all new hires, terminations and transfers to eliminate going through the same steps again in May and November.

As I mentioned before, we don't have any figures on man hours or costs in the Data Processing Department. As I understand it, it required a slight revision in the master history program to incorporate the race code and the special form that was prepared in Wage and Salary indicating the race code of each employee other than Caucasian had to be typed by Data Processing in order to get it into the permanent master history. In addition to the above, it required redesigning our 808 form to provide a space for the race code.

Hope this will be of some use to you.

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO.—VISIT OF OFCC OFFICIAL, NOVEMBER 1968

On November 4, 1968, Mr. Oroz of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance called and notified our company that he would be visiting us on November 6–7, 1968, to review our company for compliance with Executive Order 11246. He dictated to my secretary, over the telephone, a list of items which he asked be made available to him upon his arrival which are as follows:

1. Specific steps to guarantee employment opportunity keyed to the problems and needs of members of minority groups, including, when there are deficiencies, the development of specific goals and time tables for the prompt achievement of full and equal employment opportunity.

2. A table of job classifications showing job titles, a clear statement of principal and auxiliary duties, rates of pay, and where more than one rate of pay applies, due to longevity or other factors, the applicable rates.

3. An evaluation of the utilization of minority group personnel which includes:

a. An analysis of minority group representation in all job categories.

b. An analysis of hiring practices for the past year, including recruitment sources and testing, to determine whether equal employment opportunity is being afforded in all job categories.

c. An analysis of upgrading, transfer and promotion for the past year to determine whether equal employment opportunity is being afforded.

A written Affirmative Action Compliance Program, signed by an executive official of the company, is required for each of the contractor's establishments. Each must be evaluated and updated annually.

We immediately began to try to get this information, and worked nights to have most of it ready for him. When Mr. Oroz arrived on November 6, we entered into two days of the most frustrating discussions I have ever been exposed to. Some examples of this are as follows:

1. He insisted on talking to the President of the company instead of a Vice President, as he said that was his instruction. Finally, he agreed to work with me after talking to Mr. Forman.

2. I told Mr. Oroz we had been working closely with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and had been visited by Mr. Ximines (a commissioner), who seemed very happy with Arizona Public Service Company. Mr. Oroz told me his office had nothing to do with EEOC—it was another department and he was not concerned with them, and that I was now talking to the OFCC.

3. In reviewing the many figures that we presented, he continually probed into them as to their basis in fact. I was continually given examples of how other companies evaded the requirements.

4. When our Executive Vice President was in a session with Mr. Oroz and others, explaining to him some of the outstanding contributions APS had made in the area of human relations, Mr. Oroz stated that the group he was using as an example was a social group and was doing no good for the Mexican-American community; this in spite of testimonials, etc., as to past results.

5. When I was presenting statistics that our Mexican-American employment was 7 percent of the work force, and that the supervisory force was 10.5 percent Mexican-American, he said this didn't necessarily indicate good progress. When I asked him why, he replied that some companies have a policy of holding back minorities at certain supervisory levels. What he was interested in, was did we have a Mexican Vice President?

6. He insisted on visiting many of our facilities which are scattered throughout the area and we had to send him along with a company guide while he visited employee areas and examined our bulletin boards, etc., in minute detail.

7. At one point in his suggested action for compliance, he recommended that we should go to SER (Mexican-American employment group) for *all* job openings before we went to any other source. I might add Mr. Oroz didn't seem particularly interested in minority groups other than Mexican-American.

8. Mr. Oroz overhead me discussing a speech I was to give at the Mexican-American Club that day. He invited himself to go along with me. I made him welcome, of course; after calling the State Civil Rights Commission, who had invited me as a speaker. Mr. Oroz came to the meeting *late*, and questioned me in the meeting on several items that I had presented in my speech.

As I mentioned to you previously, we have had to completely revise our records and reestablish the minority group numbers and ratios, because as a result of the original Civil Rights Act, we *destroyed* all this information in compliance with the government order of Title 7.

We had to work employees overtime and borrow employees from other departments in order to bring this information into compliance with the new requirements. We are still working on various items that conflict between EEOC and OFCC.

EXHIBIT 4

NEW DIRECTIONS AND ATTITUDES OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, MARCH, 1969: AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, MARCH 12, 1969, MOVIE INDUSTRY, MARCH 13, 1969, BANKS AND T.V., MARCH 14, 1969

GENERAL CLIMATE

The temper and attitude of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was different from a similar hearing held in New York City in January, 1968. Although the questions were unnecessarily tough at the New York Hearing, and even at times caustic, the Chairman nor the staff engaged in continuous harrassment in New York. Unfortunately, from March 12 through the 14th the Los Angeles Hearing was conducted in such a manner as to negate any sense of objectivity by the commission and staff. In fact, at times the so-called Hearing resembled a carnival atmosphere rather than a government hearing. There seemed to be an attitude of personal vendetta by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with the representatives of the business community and the unions. Most of the questions asked of those testifying were not asked to either elicit information or to help those testifying, but were asked merely to be punitive or to show that minority persons could "dish it out" to the so-called establishment.

The following are questions representative of the attitude that has just been described. These questions were asked through the hearing and are *not* isolated examples:

(1) One of the first questions asked McDonnell-Douglas Corporation and repeated to every aerospace company testifying, "Do you have a plan when you build planes? Do you fire the supervisors or those in charge if they do not meet the specifications of those plans? Do you fire supervisors for not living up to your "plan" of equal opportunity? Shouldn't people be fired for not meeting the specifications of plans in regard to equal opportunity the same as they are fired for not meeting a plan or a specification for the building of an airplane?"

(2) Every company testifying during the three day Hearing was asked the following question, "Do you have any blacks, Mexican Americans, women, Indians, Orientals or other minorities on your Board of Directors, as President or at the Vice Presidential level?"

(3) The second company testifying was Lockheed. After a few minutes of their testimony, 20 or 30 rude and ugly signs began appearing at the back of the room about brown power, chicano power and against the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Commissioner Vicente Ximenes, the only Mexican American member of the Commission. Mr. Steiner, the General Counsel made the Group Vice President of Lockheed testify about the special efforts needed to prepare minorities during this interruption.

(4) At the beginning of Lockheed's testimony the following question was asked, *"Do you have regular top management reviews of your employment policy?" When the answer was given that they had semi-annual meetings with all Lockheed vice presidents. Mr. Steiner then asked, "Isn't the great white father image presented in these semi-annual meetings when all of the persons present are all white and all vice presidents?"*

(5) The Chairman then asked Lockheed to tell the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the exact number of dollars spent on their total equal opportunity program. (Throughout Lockheed's testimony, persons in the audience rumbled and made noise if they did not like the answers.)

(6) A further question was asked Lockheed, "Maybe you need training programs for hard-core management instead of training for hard-core minorities?"

(7) Then the Chairman stated that perhaps the "exotic behavior of minorities was perhaps the direct fault of the company's testifying because of their lack of success in the field of equal opportunity."

(8) The Chairman then lectured Lockheed, "How a person wears his hair, or clothes, or speaks should not make a difference."

(9) When North American Rockwell appeared, they were really grilled by the

Commission. After Mr. Wohl, representative of North American Rockwell, said something the Chairman disliked, the Chairman would reply sarcastically, "Very interesting," and the audience would laugh. The Chairman also said, very sarcastically, "At the rate you are going maybe in 20 years you will have 3% minorities in your work force."

(10) Rockwell was then asked, "What are the salaries of the 10 highest paid minorities in the Company? And the highest 10 paid whites? (This of course included the President)"

(11) At this time, many persons in the audience started screaming obscenities and cursing the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the companies, and Commissioner Ximenes. The Chairman did not try very hard to put a stop to this demonstration. During the questioning of North American Rockwell, the audience (black) clapped the questions of the General Counsel five times (Because the General Counsel put the company down) Thirty persons got up and clapped against the company (black) and one person even screamed "damn liar" at Mr. Wohl when he was trying to speak. The Chairman was soundly cheered by the audience when he donounced the company for not trying.

(12) Then the question was asked of Rockwell, "What percent of your sales are made to the government?" The Chairman then said, "In view of that kind of data, don't you think you had better improve, lest the government do something about your inadequate compliance?"

(13) Rockwell was then asked, "Why not let minorities come into the company on a favored basis because of the lack of 100 years of equal opportunity?"

(14) Commissioner Kuck accused Rockwell of having a "credibility gap." The audience cheered.

(15) Commissioner Brown then asked several questions, like a prosecuting attorney. The Chairman concluded the questioning of North American Rockwell by stating, "The employment picture will get worse. This is because of the employment projections in Washington. And those who are hired last, (minorities) will be thrown out of jobs first. Do you believe that anybody who talks about unemployment has another motive? To throw minorities out of jobs? (He was hinting that this was a Nixon policy)."

(16) Mr. Steiner, General Counsel, then discussed *Weeks v Southern Bell,* decided in the 5th circuit on March 4, 1969 which determined that the BFOQ (Bonna Fide Occupation Qualification) exception of 703(e) of Title VII was to be interpreted narrowly. In order to rely on the BFOQ exception, the burden was on the employer to prove that women could not do a certain task. It stated that Title VII precludes romantic paternalism and now women are on equal footing and must be judged on individual merit and not a traditional sterotype.

Mr. Steiner stated that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's opinions will have a lot of weight with the courts during the following year.

(17) When the international representative of the International Association of Machinists (IAM) appeared, the Commission humiliated him. It was most embarrassing because the man was black and had worked himself up through the ranks of Lockheed and had finally become an international representative of a union. Commissioner Brown's comments are particularly interesting, "I am not only surprised at your testimony, I am appalled." Commissioner Brown then asked, "Are you willing to strike because of discriminatory employment policies by companies?"

(18) The Chairman asked the representative of IAM, "How much money does your union give the Urban League? How in good conscience can you ask help from the Urban League if you don't give money to it?"

(19) TRW Systems was admonished by the Chairman, "Don't talk about the NAB, that is not important here and it is another whole thing." Then he said at the rate you are going it will take another 50 years before there are any minorities employer at your company. Then the company was asked what contributions have you made to organizations that need help like the Mexican American Foundation? Other contributions?"

MOVIE INDUSTRY

The testimony and questions regarding the motion picture was so horrid that it was a nightmare. Both the questions asked and the answers received were unbelievable. The following are a few examples of questions asked and responses received:

(1) A minority witness for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Ray Martel, a striving actor, was allowed to call the entire motion picture industry "dogs" and to say that they were "racist pigs" and that they should be tried like the nazi's at a world tribunal. The Chairman let him go on like this totally unrestrained.

(2) Warner Brothers was asked by the Chairman, "Do you know that two thirds of the world is brown or black? So you better do something about hiring some of them."

The Chairman also asked Warners', "You have done such a poor job in employment of minorities, do you even know what title the EEOC is under in the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Commissioner Brown asked Warners', "In light of your terrible figures and your size, number two in the industry, maybe you should try a little harder?"

The Chairman then asked, "When is your company going to take this law seriously? Is it going to take another 100 years?"

Then the Chairman asked what the highest salary of a black employee was and then asked the man to supply the salary of Darrel Zanuck, the president of Warners.

(3) Commissioner Brown asked Walt Disney Productions, "After Walt Disney died, you demoted the only black secretary in the executive office. Why? I think that Walt Disney would turn over in his grave if he read your figures." When the man objected to this line of questioning, Commissioner Brown tore into him and said, "I will do the questioning, not you."

(4) The Chairman summed up the day by addressing his comments to the Walt Disney representatives, "Your attitude is indicative of your industry. You find the questions funny and the lack of progress funny. I trust you change very fast to comply with the law."

(5) The General Counsel closed the hearing with the attached indictment that was given to the press after he read it to the hearing.

TELEVISION NETWORKS

The final testimony was heard from the three major networks. The Los Angeles Times article read, "U.S. Hearing Assails Networks on Minority Hiring Practices" and the subheading read, "TV Portrayals of Blacks, Mexican-Americans also Draw Fire From Equal Employment Opportunity Commissioners". Following are representative questions asked the networks:

(1) "Are any Mexican-Americans or blacks used in roles as Doctors, Lawyers, or D.A.'s? Why are Mexican-Americans always used in the role of a heavy (bad guy)?" The Chairman demanded to know how the companies could put on all those documentaries (about minority problems) when you don't have any minority employees?" Commissioner Ximenes asked all the networks, "We have heard from Ray Martel and in the Los Angeles Times this morning an article appeared about Gilbert Roland. Both state that the television and movie industry is racists and bigoted. With your figures, I would have to agree that they have something."

(2) The Chairman asked for a report at the end of 6 months on the number of TV shows where Mexican-Americans appeared and in what type of roles.

(3) Commissioner Kuck made the following statement after all the networks had testified and during the question and answer period of ABC. "The television programs concentrate on the hard-core unemployed. Could it be that the programs concentrate on the hard-core unemployed too much? Maybe they should concentrate on discrimination in employment?"

(4) Commissioner Brown stated to ABC, "You have not done a good job. Candidly, I'll have to say that if your figures speak for the country, we are in terrible shape."

(5) The Chairman ended the questioning as follows: "Not to praise your competition you have the worst figures of all the networks. (ABC)" "Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard from the three networks, they bring you the news." (The audience broke out in gales of laughter). He pointed out that none has had a "black or brown vice president." He called the attitude of the networks "callous" and said that there was little improvement since the EEOC hearings in New York fifteen months ago where the networks were quizzed. He then stated, "I would remind the networks that equal opportunity is the law of the land and we are telling you that you are potential lawbreakers. You have a greater responsibility than anyone else we have heard from this week, and with your figures you can't bring the news fairly to America. It is an awful situation. I think America will worry about what was heard here today."

BANKING INDUSTRY

The Commission seemed fairly pleased with the minority employment figures of Occidental Life Insurance, 39% minorities and did not quiz them very much. In the case of Bank of America, numerous questions were asked about the Bank's reluctance to put black or brown bank managers into all-white areas. Bank of America was also asked, "Do you use the Los Angeles Times for Advertising? Do you know that they use separate heading by sex? Do you know that this violates Title VII for you to use the separate headings?"

As for Security Pacific National Bank, the Commission asked many questions in regard to their difficulty in recruiting from colleges and one Commissioner stated, "I do not think that you are sending recruiters out really looking for minorities." The Chairman asked them "Do you give the Wonderlic test or the California Maturity Test to your board of directors? Why not? You give them to all other persons entering the company." The Chairman ended the questioning of Pacific with the following, "Why should blacks or browns bother to get an education? They will never get on the board of directors or on the vice presidential level. Who needs high falutin education when you can't make the grade? Do you have any average whites at the bank? Do you hire average blacks or browns? Or only super blacks?"

GENERAL COMMENTS MADE BY CHAIRMAN ALEXANDER

The EEOC will hold hearings with the Textile Industry soon as a follow up to the hearings held in 1967 with the Textile Industry.

The Chairman made numerous references to the New York Hearing held in January of 1968 and implied that the EEOC will be returning soon to hold follow up hearings in New York in order to determine if substantial changes have occurred during the last 15 months.

The Chairman stated a number of times that the EEOC discovered during the New York hearings that Plans for Progress companies were the greatest underutilizers of minority persons. He further stated that this continues to be the case for Plans for Progress companies throughout the nation.

XUM

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, one of America's greatest sons has returned to the plains of the Midwest, having concluded a lifetime of service to his country. Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, 34th President of the United States, one of the most beloved men in America, is laid to rest in the heartland of the Nation he served and led.

Future historians will write what his deeds and accomplishments meant to the world. We of this generation were too close to the many events he helped shape. His leadership of the diverse elements in the Allied armies against the common aggressor brought victory in the largest war in history. His later leadership as President brought us through a difficult time of readjustment. He ended a bloody war in Asia; he made the first stand for civil rights when the order of our Highest Court was ignored. Now the work for his fellow men is done and Dwight David Eisenhower has returned to the native Kansas he loved.

Not only does every American feel a personal loss at his passing, but the whole world mourns the death of this good man. His name and good works will live in history.

REQUEST FOR FUNDS FOR NAVAHO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), I ask unanimous consent that remarks which he had prepared for delivery in the Senate today be printed in the RECORD. He greatly desired to be here to deliver this speech on behalf of a most worthy undertaking and regrets that he is unable to do so.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVAHO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(Statement by Senator GOLDWATER)

The purpose of my remarks on this occasion is to acquaint Congress and the people of the country with one of the most constructive and inspiring educational projects ever undertaken by a minority group in the United States.

The subject which I bring to your attention is that of the Navaho Community College, a unique and extremely promising enterprise which was launched in January of this year with the best wishes and prayers of all Americans concerned with the present plight and future condition of the American Indian. This college was established by the Navajo Indians themselves on a dream and a shoestring. It is a courageous undertaking which contains many of the aspirations of a very proud and deserving segment of our population.

The Navaho Community College is the first college ever located on an Indian reservation. It is the first college ever to be controlled by an Indian board of regents. And it is the first college which is totally sensitive to the needs of Indian students.

The college is located temporarily at Many Farms, Arizona, the geographical center of the vast Navajo reservation which compares in size with the state of West Virginia. The college has the support and endorsement of the Navajo Tribal Council which has given both land and money to the new institution of higher education. And although the Navajo tribe is supporting the college to the full extent of its financial capacity, the project requires additional help from government, private foundations, business and industry and interested individuals.

Before I go any further, Mr. President, let me emphasize that the Navaho Community College, while it will be designed primarily to serve the needs of the Navajos, will also be open to any qualified non-Indians who wish to enroll.

I mentioned earlier that the college was a courageous undertaking launched on a dream and a shoestring. The dream goes back many years and can best be summed up as the yearning of our Indian residents for a clear and positive self-image, and a clear and positive sense of identity. It represents the Indians' great desire for the full development of their individual capacities so that they can function in their own culture and in the complex of varied cultures which comprise the larger society of man.

The shoestring is, of course, financial in nature. I am sure I do not have to emphasize here the fact that it requires large sums of money under the circumstances existing today to sustain an educational undertaking of this magnitude. The fact that the Navaho Community College came into being this year is due in large part to the determination and help of the Navajo Indians themselves, two grants from the Donner Foundation and a two-year financial commitment by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I might state here, Mr. President, that while I am not an admirer of everything done by the OEO in this country, its assistance to the Navaho Community College, I believe, is one of its worthiest endeavors.

With the above mentioned help, a president was named and a staff assembled to permit the college to open its doors on January 20 of this year. It is situated presently in temporary quarters obtained in the new Bureau of Indian Affairs High School at Many Farms. The college will share this facility until June, 1970, when, hopefully, it will move to a permanent campus on a 2,000 acre site near the beautiful Tsaile Lake, located about a thirty-mile drive from Window Rock, capital of the Navajo reservation.

At the present time the college has 350 students. A university study shows that this number will increase by at least four times in the next few years. But direct financial help is needed in the very near future if the new college is to make the most of its fine beginning and start construction on a permanent installation.

Mr. President, those most directly interested in this very worthwhile and extremely necessary project have surveyed many suggestions on ways to provide adequate financing. It is generally understood that the Navajo Tribe cannot begin to meet this heavy financial obligation itself, particularly while it continues to provide for the Navajo reservation—often referred to as "a nation within a nation." Consequently, we believe that the requirements will be for financial from the Federal Government as well as from private sources.

The college currently is engaged in presenting a request to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for a "line item" appropriation to permit it to start construction at Tsaile Lake this summer. I am sure this body is well acquainted with my long-held views in opposition to federal aid to education. However, room has always existed for exceptions to this opposition, particularly in the realm of higher education and construction costs. Added to this is my firm belief that the Indians represent a special case for consideration by the Federal Government. A deep and lasting obligation is involved here, having to do with the dignity and the honor of a very proud and worthy people. These people, the American Indians, need leadership to help them to better help themselves in a changing world. And in this connection I can think of nothing that is better designed to provide such leadership than projects such as the Navaho Community College. I might point out that a National Indian Leadership-Service Institute has been established in the Navaho Community College to serve this very need.

Therefore, I should like to state my firm belief in the merits of the Navaho Community College and go on record in support of an appropriation by the Federal Government to assist it in its quest for permanency.

A MIRV MORATORIUM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, although the country and the Congress are legitimately concerned about the antiballistic missile, another weapon, soon to be added to America's arsenal, can bring mankind beyond the point of no return, too.

MIRV—multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles—are currently being tested and soon will be deployed.

The troublesome feature of MIRV's is that they may have a dangerous effect on the strategic nuclear balance. The use of MIRV missiles by the United States may cause a Soviet reaction that will further exacerbate the already spiraling armaments race.

This is because once MIRV is deployed the Soviets will not know how many independently retargetable missiles loaded with nuclear warheads we will have. This uncertainty could lead the Russians to escalate their missile building to offset our new advancements. In turn, the Russians might develop MIRV's causing the United States to be unsure of the Soviet potential, leading us to build more weapons to combat the added Russian threat—and so we will go around the merry-go-round, continuing to aggravate the already delicate balance of power.

Last year, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY) called for an international moratorium on all testing and deployment of new offensive and defensive weapon systems. It seems to me that Senator McCARTHY's proposal has a great deal of persuasiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that this proposal and several newspaper articles explaining why MIRV's should not be deployed now be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM POSITION PAPER OF EUGENE McCARTHY, JULY 10, 1968

We must seek an immediate international moratorium—a freeze—on the number and characteristics of strategic weapons, both offensive and defensive. Such a moratorium would prevent ABM deployments by the United States and the Soviet Union. It would mean there would be no deployment by the United States of new offensive missiles, for example the multiple warhead missiles, Minuteman III and Poseidon. The Soviet Union in turn would terminate the very considerable expansion of its offensive strategic program that is now underway. It is particularly important that this moratorium come into effect before there is any major ABM deployment by the United States and before the Soviet ABM is extended.

So long as the moratorium is effective there should also be an agreement that there shall be no flight testing of new ICBMs,

XUM

or new submarine-launched missiles. Fortunately it appears feasible to verify compliance with all these prohibitions—on ABM deployment, on significant new offensive missile deployment and on flight testing of new offensive missiles—without there being any need for intrusive verification procedures. Both sides now have other verification capabilities, including observation satellites, which are sufficiently dependable to minimize the risks of significant undetected evasions even in the absence of specific inspection agreements.

As an initial step toward reaching agreements to limit strategic armaments we should announce that we are delaying deployment of the Sentinel ABM system and the Poseidon and Minuteman III ICBM pending speedy agreement with the U.S.S.R. We can do this without putting our security in jeopardy, since neither the Chinese nuclear threat against which we are deploying Sentinel, nor the Soviet ABM which is the rationale for the Poseidon and Minuteman III developments, are moving ahead perceptibly. At the very least we would be deferring expenditures in a year when our economy is seriously strained; and if our restraint should promote an agreement on strategic forces we would have gained greatly from our unilaterial initiatives in this area.

As part of a freeze on strategic offensive and defensive systems, we should also seek an international agreement to prohibit both development and deployment of new intercontinental bombers. Compliance in this case too could be easily verified.

Following a freeze on strategic offensive systems and ABMs, there should be an agreement to reduce the number of strategic weapons. Reaching agreement on this point may be more difficult because of the problems of establishing the levels to be retained, and balancing dissimilar weapons systems. Reductions of strategic systems to very low levels will be extremely difficult and we should not make the mistake of believing otherwise. It will be necessary but not easy to persuade all countries having nuclear weapon capabilities to accede to such agreements. It will also be difficult to secure agreement on the intrusive inspection procedures that will be necessary when the retained levels are so low that small evasions could affect the strategic balance. These problems, however, are not beyond solution if they are not beyond political will.

A freeze on strategic delivery systems and ABMs should significantly reduce the military demand for production of additional nuclear warheads, and encourage the Soviets to agree finally to prohibit further production of fissionable material for military purposes. Such an agreement too could be verified without intrusive inspection. It would require merely the same International Atomic Energy Agency controls on reactors and on the facilities that are used for peaceful purposes.

[From the New York Times, August 1968]

DECISION ON THE MIRV

Twenty-three years ago this week the world entered the nuclear weapons era at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Ever since, Washington has been torn between the temptation to maintain and exploit its lead and the knowledge that nuclear superiority would become meaningless when both Russia and the United States had the capability to destroy each other regardless of which attacked first.

That moment has long since arrived. Yet, just as momentous talks to curb nuclear missiles impend between Moscow and Washington, President Johnson is under pressure from his military advisers to initiate a vast new expansion of American nuclear delivery vehicles. And no one doubts that the Soviet Union would follow suit.

The trigger for this new venture into overkill would be provided by going ahead on schedule this month with the first full-systems flight-test of the revolutionary nuclear warheads known as MIRV (Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicles). Prototype versions of the two new missiles developed as MIRV carriers for the nineteen-seventies—the submarine-launched Poseidon and silo-based Minuteman III—will get their initial flight tests at Cape Kennedy next week. But whether MIRV will also be tested on these flights has now been classified secret.

Even without the expansion that MIRV would represent, the action-reaction phenomenon of the arms race already has given both the United States and the Soviet Union nuclear forces that former Defense Secretary McNamara describes as "greatly in excess" of security needs. More serious still, nuclear escalation has foreclosed, one by one, the possibilities of ever getting the atom under control.

The failure to agree to ban tests of H-bombs before 1952–54 and of intercontinental missiles before 1958–60 has not only increased the nuclear danger but—by shortening reaction time from many hours to a few minutes—has also made arms control far more difficult. A major watershed was passed in 1955 when defense scientists of East and West conceded that no means of international inspection any longer could find concealed stockpiles of nuclear warheads. Ever since, it has been possible to control only delivery systems.

Now, Russia's reaction to American testing and deployment of MIRV could make control of delivery systems as difficult as control of nuclear bombs. In the MIRV era, no satellite will be able to count whether a Soviet missile carries five or fifty warheads. And there is a greater risk.

Small and highly accurate, MIRV warheads will be far more effective against enemy missile silos than existing weapons. This quality, plus MIRV's ability to overwhelm missile defenses, could lead the Soviet Union to turn away from underground silos toward mobile land-based ICBMs. These would be about as invulnerable to MIRV attack as Polaris submarines, but cheaper to build and easier to deploy.

And that would be the end of the line. Satellites can count Polaris submarines at sea. But even with on-site inspection in the Soviet Union, the number of mobile missiles on land could never be known with certainty. With no realizable means to turn down the arms race.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 5, 1968]

DELAY THE MIRV TESTS

There is a kind of "mad momentum" intrinsic in the development of all new nuclear weaponry, former Defense Secretary McNamara said not long ago. "If a weapons system works and works well," he added, "there is strong pressure from many directions to procure and deploy the weapon"—whether or not it is needed.

Perhaps this is the only explanation for the danger, discussed elsewhere on this page, that the United States this month may take itself and Russia into a "MIRV era" that would multiply nuclear delivery vehicles manyfold on both sides—just as Soviet-American talks to curb the missile race are about to open.

The revolutionary nuclear warheads known as MIRV—Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicles—were developed to enable the United States to overwhelm a heavy nationwide Soviet anti-missile system. But Russia so far is limiting its missile defense construction to the Moscow area, where it is proceeding at a snail's pace. It may have decided that neither Russia nor the U.S. can build an effective missile defense that the other could overcome. Yet America's $4-billion MIRV program is moving ahead unchanged.

The United States, Mr. McNamara has revealed, already has a nuclear arsenal "greatly in excess" of prudent security need because it overestimated Soviet missile plans. It has 2,200 separately deliverable warheads in its alert forces and a total of 4,200 in all, three to four times as many as the Soviet Union. Delivery of only 400 warheads on Soviet targets would inflict 74 million fatalities and wipe out three-fourths of Soviet industry.

There clearly is no need right now to take the irreversible steps that the first MIRV flight-test this month would represent. The American lead in MIRV development of two years or more, the slowdown in Soviet antimissile deployment and the imminent Soviet-American talks cry out for a few months delay.

The MIRV era would have a dangerous destabilizing effect on the strategic nuclear balance—one that would be distinctly unfavorable to America as well as world security interests. It would rule out an early missile freeze. And it would enormously complicate arms control inspection problems, making a comprehensive agreement with the Soviet Union far more difficult, if not impossible, for the next Administration to achieve. History will not easily forgive such a mindless acceleration of the arms race.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1968]

HALTING MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

Senator McCarthy's proposal that the United States delay deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic missiles pending "speedy agreement" on a mutual moratorium with the Soviet Union places the problem in proper perspective.

The objective would be to achieve the missile freeze, which Washington and Moscow have agreed to negotiate, before rather than after a vast new expansion of nuclear delivery systems on both sides. Such expansion would be both expensive and dangerous, and it would greatly complicate the projected Soviet-American negotiations. It is therefore highly desirable in the initial talks with Moscow to seek a quick agreement on mutual restraint while the comprehensive negotiations go forward.

A delay in American missile deployment until this approach can be explored with the Soviet Union would dramatize the need for a rapid reciprocal move by Moscow; a unilateral American standstill obviously could not continue indefinitely.

The McCarthy position paper, which was prepared by two former Presidential science advisers—Dr. George Kistiakowsky of Harvard and Dr. Jerome Wiesner, provost of Massachusetts Institute of Technology—argues that such a standstill would not jeopardize American security. It would apply to the Sentinel antimissile system and the Poseidon and Minuteman III offensive missiles. The fact that the House has now followed the Senate in approving funds for Sentinel deployment does not obligate the Administration to begin construction immediately.

Neither the Chinese nuclear threat against which we are deploying Sentinel nor the Soviet antiballistic-missile, which is the rationale for the Poseidon and Minuteman III deployments, are moving ahead perceptibly," the McCarthy paper observes.

The danger in letting the missile race go on during a prolonged negotiation is evident. The introduction of sophisticated missile defense systems and new offensive missiles equipped with multiple warheads could destroy the strategic stability that now exists. That stability results from the presence on both sides of invulnerable deterrent forces capable of absorbing a surprise attack, then striking back in retaliation with devastating effect. The new weapons systems, on the contrary, would raise fears on both sides that the other may be achieving a capability for a preemptive attack. In crises, there would be the temptation to launch a first strike.

The mutual moratorium Senator McCarthy proposes to head off this danger would freeze the number and characteristics of strategic offensive and defensive weapons at their present level. Both sides would halt antimissile deployments. The United States would cease deployment and flight-testing of new offensive missiles, such as Poseidon and Minuteman III. The Soviet Union would do the same, terminating the considerable expansion of its offensive strategic program that has been underway. Development and deployment of new intercontinental bombers would also be prohibited.

Subsequent reduction of strategic weapons would be more difficult to achieve, since intrusive inspection would be needed and agreement on retained levels of arms would not be easy. But a freeze of present weapons could be monitored by satellite reconnaissance without intrusive onsite verification.

Would the Soviet Union respond to this proposal for quick agreement on a mutual moratorium as a prelude to a comprehensive treaty? No one can say. But an attempt should be made to find out before another upward spiral in the missile race is initiated.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 5, 1968]

MIRV's First Test and the Missile Freeze

(By Robert Kleiman)

Impending talks with Moscow on the curbing of nuclear missiles confront President Johnson with a conundrum as complex as any he has faced in the White House: Can the arms race be slowed down by speeding it up?

The Joint Chiefs of Staff want to go ahead this month as scheduled with the first flight-tests of the revolutionary MIRV (Multiple Independently-Targeted Re-entry Vehicles) warheads.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, with some military as well as civilian support in the Defense and State Departments, favors a delay. Postponement of the test series is urged until talks with the Russians reveal whether a missile freeze before, rather than after, entry into the "MIRV era" is possible.

President Johnson reportedly is convinced that MIRV development and moves to deploy the "thin" Sentinel antiballistic missile (ABM) system are what have brought Moscow, after a 17-month delay, to accept negotiations. But the MIRV test-series would take the world past a point of no return in the arms race that would certainly complicate, probably delay and possibly doom attempts to negotiate missile ceilings.

At present, many experts believe, a missile freeze could be verified by satellite reconnaissance and other unilateral intelligence means. ABMs, offensive missile silos and Polaris submarines at sea could be counted with sufficient accuracy to detect large-scale evasion that might seriously upset the stratagic balance.

But satellite observation could not tell whether a MIRV-tipped missile carried five or fifty nuclear warheads. In the MIRV era—if it cannot be headed off—verification of a missile freeze might require on-site inspection far more intrusive than any the Soviet Union has been willing to contemplate.

The negotiations would also be hindered by the rapidly spiraling missile race, which would threaten the stability of mutual deterrence that now exists. MIRV would enable the new silo-based Minuteman III and submarine-launched Poseidon missiles, each to deliver 3 to 12 nuclear warheads on 3 to 12 widely separated targets.

On the average, by one calculation, the number of separately targeted warheads mounted on the 1,710 American strategic offensive missiles could be multiplied perhaps sixfold to over 10,000. A similar expansion of Russia's deliverable warheads would be possible. With missile accuracy increasing and missile defenses introducing other uncertainties, fear on both sides that the other was achieving a pre-emptive capability could lead in a crisis to a shoot-first psychology.

What risk is there in holding up the MIRV tests? MIRV was developed to overwhelm a heavy nationwide Soviet missile defense. But the Soviet ABM system is still limited to the Moscow area and is proceeding very slowly there.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff reportedly argue that Moscow might drag out the missile talks for the two years it would need to prepare its own MIRV tests. Meanwhile, the tripling of Russia's land-based offensive missile force that has been under way could be completed. That would give the Soviet Union parity with America's 1,054 Minuteman and Titan II missiles, but not with the U.S. Polaris force of 656 missiles.

Essentially, the Joint Chiefs feel that the United States should maintain its arms lead by going ahead with MIRV and a heavy missile defense. They ask rigorous on-site inspection for any missile-freeze pact.

How will President Johnson decide? His arms control advisers would seek agreement with Moscow first on measures they feel can be verified adequately, despite JCS objections, without intrusive on-site inspections. That might permit an early mutual moratorium on further deployment of ABMs and offensive missiles.

There is more controversy over the adequacy of satellite and peripheral radar verification of a MIRV test-ban; a small amount of inspection could increase confidence. But Russia is believed to be two years or more from a MIRV test and this question could well be left for the next Administration to decide.

What must be decided now is whether to foreclose options for the next President—and for future generations of Americans—by flight-testing MIRV before exploring the issue with the Russians. To do so would probably assure Moscow's decision to develop and test its own MIRV before accepting a missile freeze. Soviet development of mobile land-based intercontinental missiles—safe from American MIRV attack but far more difficult than MIRV for arms control inspection—might also be stimulated. And chances undoubtedly would be ended for President Johnson before leaving office to obtain—or at least prepare—a moratorium that would freeze missile deployment at present levels pending negotiated reductions.

ROGER L. STEVENS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Roger Stevens was named Chairman of the National Council on the Arts on March 11, 1965, and Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts on September 29, 1965. Many are the complaints today that he has not been renamed.

To say his original appointment to these posts was a wise decision is an understatement. Roger Stevens has devoted enormous effort to the development of the Federal arts program. And more importantly, he has achieved remarkable results despite the fact that the funds needed to launch the kind of program many of us envisaged when the legislation was passed, have not been forthcoming. Those of us who worked closely with Roger Stevens in developing these programs, in the words of Robert E. Lee, bid him an affectionate farewell, but only as a full-time Federal administrator. For, I have no doubt that his creativity and force will continue to be felt, perhaps even more strongly, by those engaged in artistic activity in this country now that he is a private citizen and not bound by administrative and bureaucratic considerations.

Many outstanding programs were administered by the National Council on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts under the chairmanship of Roger Stevens. His track record is an enviable one. I would like to note some of it:

First. During fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968, the Endowment made approximately 800 grants for a total Federal investment of $13.3 million; moreover, this $13.3 million in Endowment moneys directly encouraged the investment of over $32 million from other sources for support of the arts.

Second. As a result of the Endowment's activities, the first major national artists' housing center in the United States and the largest in the world will open next year.

Third. Forty-nine States and four territories have now established arts councils with the assistance of Federal funds provided on a matching basis. These State councils are now engaged in support of projects and productions which bring the arts to all sections of the country. This program, which was provided for in the basic legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Arts, has proved to be one of the most valuable partnerships that could be imagined. The degree of interest it has engendered has been remarkable and for the first time the arts are being supported in States and communities on a fully cooperative basis with the Federal Government. To my mind, no current program of the Federal Government has achieved such widespread results at such a minimal Federal investment.

Fourth. There has been established an American Film Institute. This organization was proposed by President Lyndon B. Johnson when he signed the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. Until its creation, the United States was the only "civilized" nation without such a film organization. As the result of $2.6 million provided by the Ford Foundation and the Endowment, an additional $2.6 million was raised from film companies, distributors, and other corporations allied with the film industry. The institute is artictively engaged in: Film preservation activities; the development of the film audience; improving the quality of professional training opportunities for filmmakers in the United States; the production of short films which provide an outlet for experimentation and change by film artists; the publication of additional film literature; and the production of feature motion pictures whereby new filmmakers can create motion pictures that might not ordinarily be made.

Fifth. Readings in poetry have been brought to students and teachers throughout the country. This program has been received with extraordinary enthusiasm. The response on the part of students has been little short of remarkable. Poets visiting the high schools have been mobbed by students who want more of the readings and resultant discussions.

Sixth. The Endowment has entered into a partnership with the American

XUM

National Theater and Academy—ANTA—which has made available to the Federal Government a first-class fully operational Broadway theater which will be used by nonprofit theatrical organizations throughout the country. Before this facility became available, such groups did not have an opportunity to meet the severe tests of critics and audiences to be found only in New York City.

Seventh. Laboratory theaters have been established in Providence, New Orleans, and Los Angeles. This project, conceived in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education has enabled professional theater companies to perform classics of dramatic literature in productions of the highest quality for secondary school students; at the same time the plays are being studied in the classrooms. Over a 3-year period, approximately 302,500 high school students in Providence, Los Angeles, and New Orleans have been brought to the theaters—more than 90 percent of the students in one of these cities had never seen live theater—and the impact of the stage productions had brought to life the plays which, without the excitement provided by live theater, might have remained nothing more than words on a page. Enthusiastic reactions of both the teenagers and their teachers to the productions have led to altered attitudes and unprecedented enthusiasm toward dramatic literature among these "exposed" individuals.

Eighth. In the summer of 1968, the Endowment made grants to 16 cities for inner city arts programs with matching funds being provided by the cities themselves. Two hundred thousand dollars in private contributions generated a Federal investment of a like amount which in turn resulted in a $1.2 million program in those cities. The Endowment, in cooperation with the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, played a part in drawing into active participation thousands of America's inner-city residents who were involved in numerous arts activities and workshops, many for the first time in their lives. This Endowment program, when mentioned together with another pilot project which is stimulating arts activities in five small rural communities with populations ranging from 1,150 to 8,800, illustrates the Council's and the Endowment's determination that the arts not be the province of the urban wealthy alone, but that they reach into and enrich the lives of all Americans.

Ninth. The individual grants program of the Endowment has been truly outstanding. Hundreds of visual artists, writers, choreographers, and other young artists of high potential have received financial assistance to encourage them to keep working in their areas of interest. The Nation's artistic future depends on the encouragement and assistance of such individuals. If they are forced to find financial support outside the area of their artistic interests, they will be lost to us forever. One fact has become clear, without the assistance provided by the WPA during the depression to our artists this country today would be far, far poorer culturally than it is.

Tenth. Another exciting new partnership on the part of the arts has been entered into by the Endowment and the AFL–CIO's Council for Scientific, Professional, and Cultural Employees. Funds are used to establish arts demonstration projects in four major American cities in cooperation with union locals and community arts organizations. Whole new segments of the population will be involved. Another project along these lines will enable Oakland University in Rochester, Mich., to cooperate with the United Automobile Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in an experimental audience development program.

The foregoing was a short recitation of some of the activities and programs sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, under the chairmanship of Roger Stevens. His work has been truly outstanding. I am sorry that its value has not been really recognized in his own country. Abroad, the name of Roger Stevens is equated with farseeing vision in aesthetic endeavors. However, on Capitol Hill he has been vilified as well as praised. Our Nation gained a dedicated and wise public servant and a debt has accrued which has been neither acknowledged and can never be repaid.

On a more personal note, Roger Stevens has been and is an honored counselor and trusted friend. I hope some day his fellow citizens again may enjoy and benefit from his services. On the occasion of his departure from public service, I say a heartfelt thank you and all best wishes for the future.

THE APPOINTMENT OF LEON PANETTA AS HEW CIVIL RIGHTS CHIEF

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was pleased to read, over the weekend, that Mr. Leon Panetta, formerly a legislative assistant on the staff of our distinguished former colleague from the State of California, Senator Tom Kuchel, had been appointed Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Office for Civil Rights is the agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is responsible for the administration of the compliance program authorized by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI, of course, is the section of the Civil Rights Act prohibiting the use of Federal funds to support programs or activities which discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The HEW title VI compliance activities—particularly the school desegregation program—have been the center of considerable controversy in recent weeks. I think much of the controversy might well have been avoided if the new administration had been clear at the outset about its commitment to carry out the title VI compliance program in the area of elementary and secondary education. There remains today a great deal of confusion among Members of Congress and others interested in this program about the intentions of this administration.

I hope I am correct in interpreting the appointment of Mr. Panetta, who worked as a member of Senator Kuchel's staff on civil rights legislation, as an affirmative sign that the administration does intend to carry out an effective title VI school desegregation program. It is good to know that the Director of this program will be a man with the background of Mr. Panetta.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times article on Mr. Panetta's appointment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERAL IS GIVEN CIVIL RIGHTS POST—FINCH AIDE NEGOTIATES PLAN FOR MISSISSIPPI INTEGRATION

(By Roy Reed)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Leon E. Panetta, a California liberal, has been named director of the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Panetta, who is white, will replace Dr. Lloyd R. Henderson, who has been acting director since the resignation of Mrs. Ruby Martin, a Negro, March 10.

The new director has been special assistant for civil rights to Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

In that role, he has been involved in negotiations with Southern school officials on knotty desegregation problems.

His first action as director was to negotiate a desegregation plan for the South Panola School District at Batesville, Miss.

South Panola was one of five Southern districts that won 60 extra days from Mr. Finch to produce an acceptable plan before finally losing Federal funds for noncompliance with the 1964 civil rights law.

Only one other district, Martin County, N.C., among the five have developed an acceptable plan. It was accepted Feb. 27, over the objection of some department officials that it was of questionable educational value.

South Panola, in intense last-minute negotiations with Mr. Panetta, agreed to integrate all its schools beginning with 1970–71 school year.

SINGLE HIGH SCHOOL

All high school students are to attend a single school, elementary and junior high schools are to be zoned to require students go to the schools nearest their homes, and faculties are to be desegregated.

For the 1969–70 school year, the school board agreed to assign at least 20 per cent of the Negro students to formerly all-white schools.

The board agreed not to dismiss any Negro teachers because of the desegregation. It also agreed to "take steps" toward faculty desegregation next fall.

Mr. Panetta was pleased with the plan. He said the South Panola school board had a difficult problem because the district has a 56 per cent Negro enrollment. Southern whites have been particularly reluctant to integrate where they are outnumbered by Negroes.

Three other districts will apparently forfeit their funds either because of inadequate plans or because they have submitted no plans at all. They are Barnwell County District No. 45 in South Carolina, Abreville, S.C., and Water Valley, Miss.

DEEP COMMITMENT

Mr. Finch said in announcing Mr. Panetta's appointment that the new director had "clearly demonstrated his deep commitment to strong, fair and rational enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act."

Mr. Finch has been under pressure from some liberals to make clear his own commitment to the enforcement of the civil

XUM

rights law, which prohibits discrimination in schools and other areas. His granting of a 60-day grace period to the five Southern districts—the first major civil rights action of the Nixon Administration—was denounced by liberals as a relaxation of the enforcement procedure.

Mr. Panetta, 30 years old, was legal counsel and legislative aide to former Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, the liberal California Republican, until this year.

He worked in the civil rights area in Mr. Kuchel's office, and he helped draft the 1968 open housing bill.

He grew up in southern California. He was graduated with honors in 1963 from the University of Santa Clara Law School, where he was editor of The Law Review.

CAROLINA PLAN IN TROUBLE

In North Carolina, the Martin County desegregation plan seems to be in trouble. Negroes are complaining that all the integration is one-way, with Negro students going to predominantly white schools and no white students going to predominantly Negro schools.

Whites are unhappy with it, too. Martin County has an active Ku Klux Klan. A white private school is being formed.

A proposed bond issue designed to build two new public schools is under attack from segregationists and antitax elements.

Desegregation can continue without the two new buildings, but the process would be simplified with them.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE ENDORSES BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Izaak Walton League of America is a well-known and highly respected organization that is deeply concerned with the preservation of our natural resources. In July 1968, at its national convention in Denver, Colo., the Izaak Walton League adopted a resolution supporting the "establishment of a Big Thicket National Reserve of approximately 100,000 acres." This prestigious organization has seen the significance of the unique and beautiful Big Thicket area in southeast Texas, and has lent its support to S. 4, my bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution entitled "Big Thicket National Reserve," adopted by the Izaak Walton League of America on July 12, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG THICKET NATIONAL PRESERVE

Whereas, the Big Thicket region of southeast Texas contains a number of outstanding natural areas of great scientific value, including rare and endangered species such as the ivory-billed woodpecker, and great recreational potential, if established in a comprehensive and contiguous environmental system; and

Whereas, separate tracts and interconnecting land and water systems are now proposed as a national preserve, but are threatened by logging operations, housing developments and drainage projects which would spoil highly desirable recreational resources and irreplaceable natural areas, and which would create problems of siltation in the waterways of the area; and,

Whereas, a number of private interests have expressed favor for supplementing the several preserve areas in the Big Thicket with recreational waterways and forested corridors connecting those areas, thereby setting aside a more complete land and water system than isolated and vulnerable parcels could provide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Denver, Colorado, this 12th day of July, 1968, That support is hereby expressed for establishment of a Big Thicket national preserve of approximately 100,000 acres, based upon a plan which will preserve the most ecologically significant natural areas; create public riverway and recreational interconnecting corridors between the nature preserves along the Neches River, Village Creek and Pine Island Bay, and which would establish a national wildlife refuge in a selected area of the Big Thicket now operated by the Army Corps of Engineers.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in the past few days I think all of us have come to realize more fully just how much our 34th President, Dwight David Eisenhower, was respected and revered by the people of this Nation, and for that matter, the peoples of all nations. America is mourning the death of one of its most distinguished citizens and one of its best loved Presidents. Thousands came to pay their last respects—to join in a final salute—to this gallant soldier whose leadership in time of war and later in quest of a lasting peace has had great impact on our Democracy. The tragedy of President Eisenhower's death has touched many nations, for he was really a citizen of the world.

Born in Texas and reared in Kansas, he was a neighbor in a very real sense to the State of Oklahoma and to Oklahomans. He visited with us a number of times, always friendly, courteous, and helpful, and we shared the pride in his achievements.

The bravery and unfailing good humor that he displayed in his last days was a reflection of the great courage and dedication that marked his entire life.

Dwight Eisenhower was trusted and respected by his fellow men because he was decent and upright and honorable, and because he trusted and respected his fellow men. We will miss him deeply.

THE NEED FOR A STRONG COAL MINE SAFETY LAW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Labor has almost completed its hearings on various bills which have been introduced to strengthen the Coal Mine Safety Act. I am proud to be the sponsor of S. 1300, the administration bill. I hope and believe that within a very short time the subcommittee will complete its deliberations on this important legislation, so necessary to protect the lives and health of thousands of coal miners throughout the Nation. For my part, I shall certainly do all I can to see that the committee reports out a bill which will, at long last, give the Government the tools it needs to remedy a century of neglect, neglect which has caused death to thousands upon thousands of coal miners and injury and crippling disability from coal workers' pneumoconiosis, commonly called black lung, to thousands more.

Mr. President, the New York Times Sunday magazine of March 31, 1969, contains an article written by Ben A. Franklin, the Appalachian regional correspondent of the Times, which states the case, in the strongest possible terms, for an effective Federal coal mine safety law. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE THAN 120,000 MINERS HAVE DIED VIOLENTLY—THE SCANDAL OF DEATH AND INJURY IN THE MINES

(By Ben A. Franklin)

"Of the 54 men in the mine, only two who happened to be in some crevices near the mouth of the shaft escaped with life. Nearly all the internal works of the mine were blown to atoms. Such was the force of the explosion that a basket then descending, containing three men, was blown nearly 100 feet into the air. Two fell out and were crushed to death, and a third remained in, and, with the basket, was thrown some 70 to 80 feet from the shaft, breaking both his legs and arms."

These sentences matter-of-factly describing the pulverization of a shift of coal miners, including the three men grotesquely orbited out of the mine shaft as if launched from a missile silo, are from the first detailed record of an American mine disaster. Antiquity probably explains the nursery rhyme quality—"*two fell down and broke their crowns . . .*" For this earliest remembered mine catastrophe, in the Black Heath pit near Richmond, Va., occurred March 18, 1839.

A primitive time, no doubt. The nation was then so new that Martin Van Buren, warming his feet at the coal-burning grates in the White House, was the first President to have been born a United States citizen. The daguerreotype was introduced here that year by Samuel F. B. Morse, while awaiting the issuance of a patent on his telegraph. Half the coal-producing states were not yet in the Union.

The coal mines, on the threshold of fueling a manufacturing explosion that was to make this country an unmatched industrial power, produced barely one million tons in 1839, less than 1/500th of the output today. In the absence of all but the crudest technology, men relying on the death flutterings of caged canaries to warn them of imminent suffocation obviously would die in the mines. Some mines employed suicidal specialists known as "cannoneers," whose mission was to crawl along the tunnel floors under a wet canvas before a shift, igniting "puffs" of mine gas near the roof with an upraised candle. Dead miners were not even counted. Their enormous casualty rate was not archived until less than 100 years ago.

A glimpse into this dim crevice of American industrial history is necessary to put into perspective the myths and realities of the men who work in the mines today. For the real story of coal is not its multiplying inanimate statistics—tons and carloadings and days lost in strikes. It is the agony of those men—a tale as old as Black Heath and one that is so full of extravagantly evil personalities and atrocious acts that Charles Dickens would have loved to tell it. For behind and beneath the mountains of the Appalachian coalfield, miners have remained since Black Heath the most systematically exploited and expendable class of citizens (with the possible exception of the American Indian and the Negro) in this country.

The story at last may have an un-Dickensian ending. For now, coal miners can see light at the end of the tunnel. In this 1969 spring, 130 years after the Black Heath disaster, the mining industry may finally agree to pay the modest cost of keeping its work force alive, of abandoning the embedded idea that men are cheaper than coal. And—small pittance—we may all be involved in helping pay what it costs to write this long delayed postscript to the industrial revolution; the price of bringing miners into the 20th century probably will appear, as we shall see, as pennies on our electric bills.

In the context of technological advancement in nearly every other area of human enterprise, very little has changed for men who go down to the mines in shafts. Only four months ago, 78 coal miners were trapped and killed below ground in West Virginia in one of the most volcanic eruptions of explosion and fire in the memory of Federal mine inspectors. As at Black Heath, the explosion at the Consolidation Coal Company's 27-square-mile No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va., almost certainly was caused by an ignition of methane gas, a volatile, highly flammable, usually odorless and invisible hydrocarbon gas liberated from virgin coal.

At Consol No. 9, a modern, "safe" mine operated by one of the wealthy giants of the industry, the daily methane emission was 8 million cubic feet, enough to supply the heating and cooking needs of a small city if it were captured and sold. The explosion hazard was dealt with there as it is generally in mining today, by only modestly more sophisticated methods than those at Black Heath.

Fresh air is drawn into the mines by giant fans and circulated and directed constantly through the honeycomb of tunnels by means of doors, ducts or sometimes by curtains called brattices (miners call them "braddishes"). The intake air is supposed to dilute and, by law, "render harmless or carry away" the methane and hold the mine atmosphere to less than the legal limit of 1 per cent gas. Unless coal dust is mixed with it—in which case the explosion threshold drops significantly—methane will not ignite or explode in concentrations of less than 5 per cent. Miners live and die today on a margin of 4 percentage points—or less if coal dust is suspended in the air.[1]

It is known that the giant electric mining machines in use for the last 20 years—machines that chew up and claw coal from the face with rotary bits the size of railroad wheels—churn up an immense amount of dust. The machines have water sprays to settle the dust. But the machines' rapid rate of advance through the seam also liberates much methane.

The first explosion at Consol No. 9 came at 5:25 A.M., Nov. 20, during the cateye shift. It was a day after the passage over northern West Virginia of a cold front accompanied by an abrupt drop in barometric pressure. In the primitive mythology of mine safety, these natural events—the arrival of cold, dry air and a barometric low, which increases the methane liberation in a mine—have been associated for years with disasters. The legendary great mine explosions from Monongah and Darr in 1907, Rachel & Agnes in 1908 and on up to Orient No. 2 in 1951, have occurred in November and December and in cold, dry weather. The dry air dehumidifies a mine and sets coal dust in motion.

Every fall through 1967, the United Mine Workers Journal had published a fraternal warning to union brothers to observe special pecautions in "the explosion season." But, no research having been done in a century of such meteorological coincidences, the industry can and does take no account of what it, therefore, regards as a folklore factor—which might interfere with production. The U.M.W. Journal had not got around to running the 1968 warning when Consol No. 9 blew up. "We figured afterward it would be no use," a Journal editor said later.

No one yet knows what death befell the 78 men in No. 9. Miners who survive the shock wave, heat and afterdamp (carbon monoxide) of an underground explosion are instructed to barricade themselves in good air, if any, and await rescue. But during the nine days and nights that rescue teams stood by helplessly on the surface at Farmington, there were at least 16 further explosions in the mine. The first blast had burst up 600 feet through the portals and ventilation shafts, blowing the internal works of the mine to atoms and knocking out ventilation circuits. At the top, the main shaft became the muzzle of a mammoth subterranean cannon. The massive headframe, a trestled structure of bridge-size steel I-beams that supported the main hoist, was blown apart. For days, a boiling plume of poisonous black smoke alternately belched from the shaft and then unaccountably reversed its flow and inhaled, bursting forth again with renewed detonations below.

Finally, on Nov. 29, all five shafts and portals at the mine were sealed—capped and made airtight with tons of rock, steel and concrete. Not for months, until engineers are certain that restoring ventilation will not reignite coked embers and trigger the millions of cubic feet of methane collecting in the primordial atmosphere below, will Farmington's dead be disinterred from their gassy grave. The same mine was sealed for more than a year following a less violent explosion in 1954 that killed 16 men (including one, Black Heath-style, topside near the mine mouth), the fires continued to burn in sealed sections of the mine even after production was resumed.

If entombing a mine fire to control it seems primitive in this day of chemical fire fighting agents and automatic deluge sprinkler systems, it is futuristic, compared with the industry's performance in disaster *prevention*. There have been profitable technological advances in the extraction of coal from the seam, and today the industry is on the brink of such a long, secure production boom that big oil companies, with some of the sharpest eyes for markets and profits in the business world, are buying up and merging with coal companies at a rapid rate. But production economies in the past have more often than not been at the expense of human economies, and Big Oil may be surprised to find itself saddled with coal's amazing insensitivity to mayhem and death. It was the fatalistic acceptance of Farmington more than the disaster itself (President Nixon has since criticized this acceptance of death as "as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels") that finally started the mine-safety revolution.

At first, at the daily post-explosion news conferences in Consol's cinderblock company store near Farmington (many miners are *still today* in debt to their employers' merchandising subsidiaries for nearly a full paycheck before they are paid), William Poundstone, Consol's executive vice president for mining operations, insisted that the mine was "only technically gassy." W. R. Park, a senior Federal mine inspector familiar for years with the mine, insisted it was "extremely gassy," and John Roberts, a Consol public relations man, called it "excessively gassy." Roberts, a master of malapropism who greeted the news corps before one vigil news conference by asking cheerily, "Are all the bodies here?" also described the No. 9 explosion hazard as "something that we have to live with."

Then came the parade of V.I.P.'s. U.M.W. president W. A. (Tony) Boyle came to the mine head not only to congratulate Consol on being "one of the better companies as far as cooperation and safety are concerned," but to add that if this "safe" mine blew up, "you can imagine what the rest are like." "As long as we mine coal," said Boyle, the philosophical miners' ombudsman, "there is always this inherent danger of explosion." The then assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore, the department's top minerals man, flew up from Washington to add that "unfortunately—we don't understand why these things happen—but they do happen," and to venture that "the company here has done all in its power to make this a safe mine." (In fact, Moore's own Bureau of Mines had reported substandard rock dusting at Consol No. 9—the most basic of explosion-prevention measures involves rendering coal dust inert with 65 per cent crushed limestone—in all 24 of its inspections there since 1963. The bureau had cited No. 9 for 25 other safety violations since December, 1966. Moore probably saw nothing unusual in that because violations are the norm in most mines.)

Hulett C. Smith, then the Governor of West Virginia, also stood before the television cameras and observed more in sadness than in anger that "we must recognize that this is a hazardous business and what has occurred here is one of the hazards of being a miner."

With that, the fuse, delayed so long, finally blew in Washington. The then Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, after eight years of more concern for California redwoods than for miners, denounced the whole system of coal mining—the technological *and* moral systems—as "unacceptable." As an astonished layman, Udall noted that Consol was mining "in an area that really is a low-grade gas field" and that "obviously it is not a solution that is completely adequate to dilute the gas by pumping in air." Within three weeks, Udall summoned a national coal-safety conference which turned out to be one of the most amazing gatherings in bureaucratic history. In a Soviet-style mood of confession, Udall publicly admitted that "we have accepted, even condoned, an attitude of fatalism that belongs to an age darker than the deepest recess of any coal mine. At every level of responsibility, from the individual miner to the highest councils of Government, we have looked with horror on the specters of death and disease that haunt our mines. Then we have shrugged our shoulders and said to ourselves, 'Well, coal mining is an inherently hazardous business' or 'It's too bad, of course, but as long as coal is mined men inevitably will die underground.' These easy rationalizations are no longer acceptable in this time in history."

The stubborn Black Heath syndrome—so costly in human life and so profitable to the industry—finally was broken. Within a week, Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary, on the job one month, issued orders to his inspectors. They were to cease immediately giving prior notification of impending inspections to the operators, a practice known for years to encourage a sudden, temporary kind of mine housecleaning for the benefit of the inspector—"baking a cake," one inspector called it. They were to cease reviewing mine violation reports with owners. Where violations occurred involving imminent danger of explosion, they were no longer merely to write them down as before, they were to close the mine. The list was startling for what it said about past practices.

It is hard to tell which is more gripping—the penny-pinching, corner-cutting and profiteering waste of human life in mines still operated today—Black Heath-style—with bland abandon of what the U.S. Bureau of Mines calls "ordinary regard for safety," or the callous result, the history of human carnage in the mines. The record to date, even the most contemporary chapters of it, is appalling. In the 100 years that partial records of fatal mine accidents have been kept

---

[1] One example of the retarded technology of mine safety is that miners testing for gas still rely today on the Glame safety lamp of Sir Humphrey Davy, perfected more than 150 years ago. The safety lamp is rugged and safe if used properly, but it requires highly skilled operators to read it accurately, and then its accuracy is no more than half a percentage point—or 10 per cent of the margin between survival and explosion.

(the early figures are incomplete) more than 120,000 men have died violently in coal mines, an average of 100 every month for a century. The total does not include those who died of what passes for "natural causes" in work that is as notoriously hazardous to health as it is to life and limb. Today, among men aged 60 to 64, the "natural" death rate of miners is eight times that of workers in any other industrial occupation.

Chronic lung disease may, in fact, turn out to be a far worse killer of miners than accidents. The U.S. Public Health Service, in unfinished research that is 25 years behind completed medical findings in British mines, has recently documented that coal dust—not the rock dust associated for decades with miners' silicosis—has become perhaps the pre-eminent threat to survival in the mines.

A prevalence study completed in 1965 found that, conservatively, 100,000 active and retired American coal miners suffered from the progressive, gasping breathlessness associated with prolonged inhalation of fine coal dust, a condition known (from autopsy observation) as "black lung" or pneumoconiosis. The U.M.W. estimates that in the 20 years that electric mining machines have been churning up greater and greater clouds of dust at least one million men have been exposed to an occupational disease whose ravages do not stop with removal to a dust-free environment.

The black-lung hazard—as the coal industry and physicians in its employ constantly point out—is as yet a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain threat to life. It is real enough however to have caused more than 30,000 West Virginia miners, normally among the last in the industry to engage in wildcat strikes, to walk off their jobs for three weeks in February of this year to demand that the State Legislature include black lung in the list of injuries and diseases for which disabled miners are eligible to collect workmen's compensation benefits. Until then, only three coal-producing states—Alabama, Virginia and Pennsylvania—authorized workmen's compensation payments (generally financed by the industry) to black-lung victims, and only Pennsylvania has paid any claims. (In Pennsylvania, the benefits are paid for by the taxpayers, *not* the industry, which may explain how the legislation survived there. Coal has a history of very aggressive lobbying to protect its economic interest.)

In West Virginia's Statehouse last month, a doctor testifying in support of the industry's proposal of further medical studies of black lung before changing the compensation law "in haste," charged that Drs. I. E. Buff, Donald L. Rasmussen and Hawey Wells, the three crusading physicians in that state who had galvanized the miners to strike for health reform, had done more damage as "alarmists" than the disease itself. There was nothing more pathetic, the lachrymose industry witness testified, than a coal miner told to quit the only work he knows just because he is a little breathless. It was a Dickensian performance.

The coal operators, or some of them, have taken the position that pneumoconiosis does not exist. But sudden violence in the mines has been documental monotonously since Black Heath. Last year, alone, 309 miners died in accidents—"needlessly," according to O'Leary, the new and aggressively safety-conscious director of the Bureau of Mines—and the miners' death and injury rates, already the highest of any industry, are on the rise this year.

The injury *severity* rate in mines, also the highest, is two and a half times that of lumbering, nearly four times that of trucking. Since records of nonfatal accidents began to be archived in 1930, the number of men temporarily or permanently disabled digging coal has risen to 1.5 million. Today, a miner surviving a lifetime in coal (and there is one chance in 12 that he will not) can expect three or four lost-time injuries, not counting one chance in 5 or 10 serious and eventually fatal lung disease.

Mining, like prostitution, is one of the oldest occupations in the world and is probably as impossible to stop. From the beginning, coal has been a curse on the land from whence it came, blighting the landscape with strip mines and culm banks and polluted streams, extracting for absentee owners vast fortunes from Appalachian states that are today synonymous with poverty, and plunging generations into despair.

But the scandal of gratuitous death and injury in the mines—almost all of it recognized, as the Interior Department report put it recently, as the result of the operators' "tendency to cut safety corners when profits are low and ignore good safety practices when profits are high"—has finally reached the point at which a Republican Administration in Washington is talking about limiting coal production to save lives.

In testimony this month supporting the sudden rush of mine-safety bills in Congress following the explosion at Farmington, this radical notion was put forth by none other than Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. "It is clear that our society can no longer tolerate the cost in human life and human misery that is exacted in the mining of this essential fuel," Hickel said. "Unless we find ways to eliminate that intolerable cost, we must inevitably limit our mining of coal, which has an almost inexhaustible potential for industrial, economic and social good."

Republican coal barons must have rolled in their graves. Even from Democratic Administrations, this most destructive of industries had never received such a radical warning. In fact, Democrats in Congress have been the protectors of the industry's economic interests over the survival interests of its workers.

In 1941, at the end of three decades during which miners died at an average rate of better than 2,000 a year, a series of terrible disasters which had killed 276 men during the closing months of 1940 finally forced passage of the so-called Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act. It was conceded, as the Bureau of Mines timidly put it then, that "speed of operation and demand for maximum tonnage at a minimum cost resulted in a neglect of ordinary safety measures."

In 1941, when technology in the United States had advanced to the threshold of the atomic era, the gross and calculated neglect of ordinary prudence in the powder-house atmosphere of coal mines was evidenced by the fact that barely half the underground coal miners had been equipped with battery-powered electric cap lamps, approved by the Bureau of Mines for the absence of spark hazards. Incredibly, the rest still wore carbide lamps, which gave their light by generating acetylene gas and emitting an open, two-inch jet of flame.

In 1941, half the mines still used unstable black powder for blasting rather than the safer "permissible" explosives recommended for 30 years by the bureau. The carbide lamps were handy for lighting fuses. Some mines had advanced to the employment of "shot firers," solitary men whose job was to shoot down the drilled coal after everyone else had left the mine. It was a concession to modernity. If the mine blew up, only one man was lost.

Everyone knew that disasters could be stopped. "In view of the present knowledge of preventing explosions, disasters are inexcusable and discredit the mining industry," the Bureau of Mines said in 1940. Everyone knew that more improvements in the feeble state mining laws were being blocked than passed. But Congress heeded the industry's states' rights argument. The 1941 act gave the Bureau of Mines for the first time authority to enter and inspect mines and write reports containing noncompulsory safety recommendations, but no powers of enforcement. The states would take care of that.

Since 1910, when the Bureau of Mines was established, its engineers have been testing and recommending to the industry as approved or disapproved—as "permissible" or "nonpermissible" (words that convey more authority than the bureau had then or has today to require their use)—a whole range of mining equipment, including explosives and electric wiring, lights, drills, cutting machines and haulage devices. Such safety-designed machinery is obviously the key to disaster prevention in mines full of a mixture of inflammable methane gas and explosive coal dust.

Yet, nearly half the explosions—835 miners dead—between May, 1941, when the bureau got its authority to inspect and recommend, and July, 1952, when Congress next amended the mine-safety law, were caused by electric arcs from nonpermissible mine machinery. Most of the rest involved nonpermissible—but still not illegal—use of explosives.

Unbelievably, when the misnamed Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 finally emerged from the coal lobby's permissible cutting machine, it contained a "grandfather clause" which allowed the indefinitely continued use of knowingly dangerous nonpermissible electrical machinery "if, before the effective date of this section . . . the operator of such mine owned such equipment . . . or had ordered such equipment." The law also set up two classes of mines—gassy and nongassy—and it stretched the loophole for nonpermissible equipment even further for the 85 per cent of mine owners lucky enough to meet the nongassy standard.

In effect, Congress told the mine operators that "if you were creating an avoidable explosion hazard before we passed this law, it's all right to go on doing so until the dangerous machinery wears out." Today, this means that spark-hazard machines—some of them rebuilt twice and three times over under the same serial numbers—are still in use in some mines 17 years after the law was passed. A count by the Bureau of Mines in 1967, when the law had been on the books 15 years, showed 1,117 pieces of nonpermissible electrical equipment in use in 159 mines.

The 1952 mine-safety act may have been one of the great legislative mirages of all time. It specifically exempted small mines, those with fewer than 15 employes. Although the small mines were depicted in the industry's testimony as too inefficient and limited in capital resources to bear the cost of retooling for the most basic disaster prevention, their number immediately doubled after the law was passed. Large mines were simply separated into smaller units to evade the law. (In 1966, the small mines were finally brought in—with all "grandfather clauses" still intact.)

Moreover, the law was deliberately written to apply to, and to give Federal mine inspectors jurisdiction over, only certain kinds of "major disasters"—defined by Congress as those killing five or more miners in one stroke. More than 90 per cent of mine deaths then occurred in lonely ones, twos and threes. Far more than half were caused by rock falls from the mine roof, largely at the working face. The 1952 law established roof-control standards, but only for established tunnels used as haulageways where such accidents were least common.

Having extended Federal safety jurisdiction to the kinds of "major disasters" that made the news wires and brought discrediting publicity, Congress emphasized that the new law was *not* to protect the miners from "the lack of, or inadequacy of, guards or protective devices." It was totally silent on hazards to health.

In signing the act into law, former President Truman obviously did not overstate the

XUM

facts in observing that "I consider it my duty to point out its defects so that the public will not be misled into believing that this is a broad-gauge accident-prevention measure . . . I am advised that loopholes in the law were provided to avoid any economic impact on the coal-mining industry."

Congress has considered mine-safety legislation only three times in the last three decades. But in the years between enactments, there was activity. In 1962, after explosions in the Robena and Compass mines had killed 59 men, President Kennedy commissioned a task force to review the situation. Its report concluded that the industry's continuing disregard of the most basic hazards to life and limb deserved Congressional attention. For one thing, the task force proposed to put a deadline—one year after enactment of an implementing amendment by Congress—on the nonpermissible machinery "grandfather clause." It also noted that Britain, producing only a fraction of the coal output of the United States, was spending more than twice as much on mine health research.

But then in a series of private conferences with Bureau of Mines and Interior Department officials, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, the union-negotiating arm of the coal industry, persuaded them to recommend to Congress a "grandfather clause" deadline of *five* years. Since Congress took no action on it, the B.C.O.A. had another opportunity last year to persuade the Bureau of Mines to propose an even further extension to *ten* years. The capitulation was so flagrant that the White House, overseeing the draftsmanship of the 1968 mine-safety bill, demanded its exclusion from the bill, which went up to Congress in September. It died without hearings.

Other capitulations to the industry have perpetuated the Bureau of Mines's reputation as the submissive captive of the industry it is supposed to police. As recently as a year ago, a long-proposed revision of the 1952 law specifically requiring diversion of a minimum flow of dust- and gas-diluting forced air ventilation to the working face of coal mines—a point beyond the last moving air current in the established workings—was dropped by the bureau upon the B.C.O.A.'s complaint that it would be too costly.

It has been known for years that progressive contamination of mine ventilation air—a pickup of dangerous amounts of methane or coal dust, or both—results from coursing air from one working section of a mine to another before routing it to the surface. The practice is known to have caused explosions and deaths. Yet a year ago the B.C.O.A. was still dickering privately with the bureau, demanding language in the bureau's proposals for tougher mine ventilation standards which would say that if it cost too much to provide a separate "split" of air to each active working place it would not be required until after "a reasonable time"—not, of course, defined.

It is not that any of these proposals were new. The industry could claim no element of surprise—except at the idea of being compelled to adopt them after so long a history of lethal *laissez-faire*. Mine technology has been equal to all of these proposed measures for at least all of this century—for 101,000 mine deaths.

The inclusive almanac of mine disasters published by the Bureau of Mines in 1960 (it is now out of print) says that the violently explosive and unpredictable characteristics of suspended coal dust in mines were known as long ago as 1886. A team of mining engineers which visited all the major coalfields in 1908, a year after the worst mine explosion in American history had killed 362 men at Monongah, W. Va., published a detailed report identifying every source of all the subsequent mine disasters (72,501 deaths—1909 through 1968) and recommending disaster-prevention standards which are *still* not observed.

While lobbying privily against safety, the industry has publicly promoted the idea that the death and mutilation of its workers was a cost of doing business. It got a depletion allowance on its taxes. Its workers got none for their depletion. The industry reaction to disaster was in the brave tradition of "what can you expect in an inherently risky business"—*and* with some of the most effective lobbying in legislative history to perpetuate the trade-off of cheap life for cheap coal. And it has not been alone.

Even on the left in this medieval atmosphere, the miners' union, the United Mine Workers of America, has been so concerned with helping the industry survive its postwar slump and with preserving coal's low-cost competitive advantage over other basic fuels—oil, natural gas and nuclear energy—that it long ago sacrificed what could have been the leadership of a mine-safety crusade for high wages, mechanized high production, and the highest accident rate of any industry.

Some of the accidents were no accident. In 1947, the U.M.W. in Illinois was found to have voluntarily signed a labor contract with coal operators in that state whose terms forbade the union from seeking improvements in Illinois' mine-safety law, upon which the industry placed such store in opposing greater Federal control. The Federal law of 1941, then in effect, was no threat to the cheapest production economies; the 1941 act had been so considerate of the industry's faith in state regulation that Federal mine inspectors were denied enforcement powers.

Since 1946, moreover, the U.M.W. had become locked in an embrace with the operators nationally. Through the 1946 coal labor contract, which set up the U.M.W. Welfare and Retirement Fund and financed it by an industry royalty—now 40 cents a ton for all coal taken out of union mines—the U.M.W. also acquired an immense interest in production. The Welfare and Retirement Fund collects income from *operating* mines, not from those harried by mine inspectors or closed down for safety violations.

The U.M.W.'s obvious conflicts of interest are a legacy of John L. Lewis, the 89-year-old former president. Lewis' postwar decision to help the coal industry survive by sacrificing 400,000 miners' jobs to mechanization in return for the company royalties was regarded then as a modernizing act of industrial statesmanship. But it established alliances that obviously are not in the best interests—on mine safety, if nothing else—of the rank-and-file membership. For example, under Lewis the U.M.W. bought control of the National Bank of Washington, a profitable sideline that has furthered the appearance, if not the fact, of shared interests by making loans to coal companies.

Since Congress was no help, in 1946 the Interior Department, which was then operating the mines under President Truman's strike-induced Federal seizure order, negotiated with the unions (as a condition in the contract) safety standards unobtainable by other means. Compliance with the contract's so-called Mine Safety Code, which incorporates many of the reforms talked about since the early nineteen-hundreds, is monitored by Federal mine inspectors. But its enforcement depends on the union, through its contractual right to withdraw men from mines in violation of the code.

Compliance, according to Bureau of Mines Director O'Leary, "leaves much to be desired." The compliance average in 20 of the largest mines is 65 per cent, O'Leary has told Congressional committees, but in some states (depending on coal operator attitudes and union militance) it is as low as 30 per cent and in one state as low as 7 per cent. The U.M.W.'s "safety division" at its headquarters in Washington consists of one man.

The Welfare and Retirement Fund is not the only loser when the men walk out of an unsafe mine. The miners lose wages. When I asked him several months ago whether the U.M.W. had considered negotiating with the companies a requirement that they pay regular wages to men who left a shift while demonstrable code violations were corrected, the U.M.W.'s Boyle, a slight, normally combative Irishman from Montana, told me that that would be impossible because even among miners there were "lazy men"; there would be abuses to get pay for no work. Later, in a safety proposal prepared by the U.M.W., the union finally supported the idea that miners should be paid for time off the job if a *Federal inspector* closed a mine.

But more than any other witnesses on this year's crop of catch-up mine-safety bills, Boyle has agreed with the industry's position. On the proposed revision that Secretary Hickel and O'Leary have called the reform of "paramount importance," Boyle's stand is significantly less reformist than the industry's. In view of the miserable record of Congressional inaction and protection of the industry, the Administration this year is asking Congress to give the Secretary of the Interior the flexibility of administrative rule-making authority. After hearings, he would establish the safety standards. There would be the right of appeal. It is the system in use since 1938 in nearly every other area of Federal regulatory activity, and the coal industry now says it will go along with it if the Secretary's authority is suitably circumscribed to prevent "arbitrary" decisions. Boyle, however, has said he "would rather take our chances with Congress."

Those chances this year are very good indeed, partly because Boyle himself has underlined the unequal forces working for mine safety in the private sector. The U.M.W. is clearly embarrassed by the reformist zeal of what it calls "Johnny-come-lately experts" since Farmington, like Udall, Ralph Nader and Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia. For suggesting that the union bears some responsibility and that it has compromised and "snuggled up to" management on safety issues, the U.M.W. Journal recently labeled Nader and Hechler as "finks" in a front-page editorial. And the union magazine has engaged in such a Mao Tse-tung glorification of Boyle and his record as a safety crusader—it refers to him as a "union chieftain"—that the U.M.W. has become an embarrassment to its friends in Congress. While fulminating at the charges of collaboration with the industry, The Journal has not reported that weeks before the Consol disaster, the U.M.W. was convicted along with the Consolidation Coal Company in a Federal court in Lexington, Ky., of conspiring to create a monopoly in the soft coal industry. With the conviction, which is being appealed, went a $7,300,000 damage award, to be paid half by the union and half by the company that Boyle has praised for "cooperation." The case involved Consol's alleged withdrawel of coal marketing services from South-East Coal Company after the company went non-union.

Moreover the coal industry can hardly cry poor this year. Because of its secure grip on a growing share—now more than half—of the fuel market in the surging electric utility business, even the National Coal Association is calling the future "glittering." It turns out that local boosters who, through depression upon depression, have been calling the state of West Virginia "The Billion Dollar Coal Field" were not far from wrong.

As Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr. of New Jersey noted in starting mine-safety hearings, coal has become so profitable that since 1966 the three largest coal producers

XUM

have been taken over by other giant mineral corporations—Peabody Coal Company by Knnecott Copper, Consolidation by Continental Oil Company, and Island Creek Coal Company by Occidental Oil. According to the National Coal Association, the list of oil corporations that have acquired coal-mining companies now includes at least 20 of the major petroleum producers—Gulf, Shell, Humble, Standard of Ohio, Atlantic-Richfield, Sun, Ashland and Kerr-McGee among them. It was a relief to know, Senator Williams noted, that the safety hearings would not be "complicated" by the usual coal claims of imminent bankruptcy. To the oil owners of coal, Williams pointedly observed that the spectacle of oil-well pollution of the Pacific Ocean off Santa Barbara, Calif., and new evidence of "lung pollution" in the mines "may be trying to tell us something." "In both cases," he said "we find at the top of the ownership structure big oil companies."

Whether or not by corporate edict from these powerful new coal owners, the fact is that the National Coal Association, the largest industry group, is taking a remarkably calm and even welcoming view of the strenuous safety legislation before Congress this year. By enacting the Nixon Administration bill, which is among the strongest of the lot, Congress could close all the old loopholes at once and take—for coal—a daring new step into industrial human ecology. The Nixon bill would require mine operators to attack the black-lung epidemic among miners by reducing coal dust contamination in mine air to 4.5 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air, as a starter. The standard is a compromise of the U.S. Public Health Service's 1968 recommendation—3 milligrams. It would become effective six months after passage of the law and could be lowered later by decision of the Secretary of the Interior. The dust-control problem is publicly pictured as a cost nightmare by the industry. The Bureau of Mines estimates that the cost will be only pennies per ton.

The economics of mine safety are the one great unknown in this year's reform spree. No one knows what the cost of a century of neglect has been. Lee White, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which regulates wholesale electric power rates, opened the door a crack during Secretary Udall's post-Farmington *mea culpa* last December by observing that, as as nation, we have lost money as well as life in the mines, "and we must pay." The F.P.C. is anxious to pass on to consumers "all savings in costs that are properly made," White said. But if it takes an increase in the cost of electricity to indemnify the miners who dig the coal for steam-electric power, "I believe the American people are willing and should be willing to pay that extra cost . . . For all I know, we are not talking about increased rates but only a smaller decrease in rates."

Some but not all of coal's new 20-year and 30-year contracts to supply the huge fuel demands of electric power contain escalator clauses, which would permit certain price increases to pay for safety. But a share-the-cost program may not be as easy to work out as White made it seem; one reason that the coal industry is so mercilessly cost-conscious has been the strong downward pressure on prices exerted by the electric utilities, including the Government's own Tennessee Valley Authority, the biggest of all coal consumers. The average value per ton of coal at the mine has dropped from $4.99 in 1948 to $4.62 last year.

It may be significant that John Corcoran, the president of Consol—a moderate man to start with, by coal industry standards, and one who has been deeply affected by the Farmington disaster—also is chairman of the National Coal Association and a director of the American Mining Association and the Bituminous Coal Association. The Industry does seem to be speaking with a new voice. But the coal industry is still a very loose coalition of new humanists and old buccaneers. And as one of its publicists put it recently, "We are like any association—we reflect the lowest common denominator. We have a few members who think the world is flat, so we have not publicly endorsed the use of globes."

PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, FIRST PRESIDENT BORN IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday we heard many fine tributes by Members of the Senate to Dwight David Eisenhower. Today, I would like to add to those tributes with the words of the editorial writers of some of the newspapers in Texas.

President Eisenhower was born in Texas, at Denison, Tex., on October 14, 1890. He was the first person born in Texas ever to be President of this Nation. It was in Texas that President Eisenhower met Mamie Geneva Doud, who was later to become Mrs. Dwight Eisenhower, First Lady of America.

Texans have felt especially close to the Eisenhowers through the years. Because of the close ties of Texas with Dwight Eisenhower, I think it appropriate that the tributes to that great general of peace include these remarks from newspapers in Texas. I add these in addition to my personal tribute to President Eisenhower on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD: "Ike Was a Leader Who Inspired Trust," Fort Worth Star Telegram of March 29; "General Ike One of Best Loved and Most Selfless of Americans," San Antonio Express and News of March 29; "Dwight D. Eisenhower," Dallas Morning News of March 29; "Dwight David Eisenhower," Beaumont Enterprise of March 29; "Eisenhower," San Antonio Light of March 29; "Dwight D. Eisenhower," Houston Chronicle of March 29, and "He Served Our Nation Ably in War and Peace," the Houston Post, March 29.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Mar. 29, 1969]

Ike Was a Leader Who Inspired Trust

Dwight D. Eisenhower was the kind of man who inspired America's trust, whether at peace or at war. This was because Ike carried with him, into the White House as upon the Normandy beachhead, the sort of personal integrity and character that built confidence into those whom he led.

It was this force of character that brought him out of the ranks—for 25 years he failed to rise above lieutenant colonel—to lead the great World War II Crusade in Europe. At West Point, where his first love was athletics, he ranked 61st in grades and 95th in conduct among 163 fellow classmen. Never mind that; when the free world needed a leader, he was there.

Mr. Eisenhower viewed war with the abhorrence of a man who had seen it firsthand, yet he thought it could be avoided only if the United States remained mighty both militarily and economically. When he became President in 1953, he said in his first inaugural address that the nation's goal must be peace with honor. There must be no appeasement, he warned, for a "soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chain."

As we look back now upon those presidential years, they might appear to be extraordinarily tranquil, almost an idyllic interlude between the great conflagrations of world war and those of society's crises of the 1960s. Yet the Eisenhower years were beset with issues that stirred the nation: The alarms during his first administration over Communist infiltration into government and, later, the historic beginnings of true racial integration, Sputnik's smashing psychological and propaganda victory for the Soviets, the paralyzing U-2 spy plane incident, crises at the Suez Canal, in Lebanon, Matsu and Quemoy, the severing of diplomatic relations with Castro's Cuba.

Problems enough for any President, they were, and not even Ike's famous grin or his spirit of optimism could hide his deep concern over America's future and that of the world.

Although Mr. Eisenhower came very close to being a consensus President, he had his detractors. There were those who differed with his concepts of security in a nuclear age. Others complained about his aloofness from the rough-and-tumble of politics, or his sometimes rambling syntax, or even his brave efforts to break 80 on the golf course.

Yet few figures in American public life have commanded the love and respect that were showered upon Mr. Eisenhower. It was almost impossible to dislike him as a man, or to question his unyielding desire to do what was right. He gave of himself unstintingly to build a more peaceful and decent world, and for his own country he nurtured a love that will remain a model through the years.

"There is nothing wrong with America that faith, love of freedom, intelligence and the energy of her citizens cannot cure," Mr. Eisenhower declared.

There could be no more fitting an epitaph.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express and News, Mar. 29, 1969]

General Ike One of Best Loved and Most Selfless of Americans

The remarkable career of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Texas-born, Kansas-reared farm boy who became supreme commander of allied armies in World War II and president of the United States, ended with courage and that fairly typified his life.

The general survived the dangers of modern war, the pressures of the presidency, the atttacks of disease when it seemed probable that he couldn't. History will record him as a candid and unusual citizen. His candor brought professional diplomats down in scorn upon him at times. Some critics say he was an inept president. Jokes about his hours on the golf courses were legion.

The truth is that he presided over the nation at a time when the country was sick of war, afraid of aggressive communism and riding a tidal wave of prosperity. He tried to reverse the trend toward more-powerful central government and he tried to make the staff system of the Army work in the White House. Whatever failures there were in each effort were due to historical and traditional momentum in society and government that greater politicians than he failed to master.

Gen. Eisenhower was held in special regard in San Antonio. He began his career here and he met Mamie here. He also started his rapid rise to the top of his military service here, as chief of staff of Gen. Walter Krueger's Third Army.

He had the happy warrior look but he never acquired the reputation for being a willing warrior. He was a civilized man, one of the most-loved of his era and a gallant soldier-citizen.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Of all his virtues, the word stability best describes the nature and contribution of Dwight David Eisenhower, military leader and 34th president of the United States. He died as he had lived, tenacious but firm and calm in time of crisis.

Few in our history have stepped forward even once as the man of the hour. But twice the time and the circumstances converged upon this native son of Texas.

A grim, resolute but troubled free world, engulfed in the uncertainties of global conflict, turned to Gen. Eisenhower for leadership. That overwide mouth pulled to one side in determination, he led the crusade that was to salvage from bombed-out rubble a Europe with new leases on freedom and self-confidence.

In 1952 a nation reeling from "corruption, communism and Korea" sought him out once again. America did more than just like Ike, it loved him as an older brother. The broad grin promised that things would turn out all right despite the mistakes of the moment. His lack of polish, by professional political standards, marked him as a man of the people.

Most of all, the nation in that worrisome hour longed for the stability born of battlefield judgment and command decision. It craved a leader who would station himself at the front gate and defend the family against one and all—a counselor whose unembroidered advice was steeped in experience.

Not long ago Eisenhower gazed back into what for him was the recent past and told his old running mate, Richard Nixon, that 1968 resembled 1952. "The people of this country genuinely want a change. They're tired of the way the Democrats have been running the government. I think they want the Republicans to have a chance at things now."

When Eisenhower, the military victor, was called upon to be Eisenhower, the political savior, the nation was dizzy from the New Deal, the Fair Deal and their legislative binges. The voters wanted a breather—a time to sit down and assess what had come to pass.

The activists, who see legislation as the one and only cure-all, impatiently labeled Eisenhower a do-nothing president. The label is patently ridiculous.

Eisenhower's service as president is best symbolized by the painting which hangs in many a doctor's office. The dim light is casting long shadows. The young patient lies gravely ill, and the doctor sits at bedside, ostensibly doing nothing.

But to view this picture is to believe instinctively that the patient will recover. The strong hand extended in comfort can be all-conquering therapy.

Eisenhower sat up with America, and when morning dawned health had prevailed over sickness. Inner strength had triumphed over fatigue.

Stability is strength. Stability was Eisenhower.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Soldier, statesman, president, paragon of homely virtues . . .

Above all, Dwight David Eisenhower was a designer and defender of freedom: For all the people in his own broad and beloved land and for human souls everywhere who seek self-determination and vow vengeance upon the despot's heel.

No man in modern times has been a greater scourge of political systems and military machines that ravage the God-given rights of others.

As supreme commander of the Allied invasion forces in Europe in World War II, he met and licked the Nazi legions on many a bloody battlefield. As supreme commander of the Atlantic pact forces after the war, he became a symbol of worldwide resistance to the expansion of communism, Hitler's successor in infamy and oppression.

Then as president of the United States for eight years, he held firm, in policies and practices, to the conviction that national weakness is an invitation to enslavement, that eternal vigilance is only an exercise in common sense, that freedom is insured only for a people willing to defend it with their lives.

The good general's last advice for his country came in the form of an address to last year's Republican National Convention in which he warned that communism hasn't changed its spots, that at this very moment its technicians of totalitarianism are mapping new assaults on American ideals and influence around the globe.

In his last days, the old warrior harbored the fear that his country would become party to a Vietnam agreement amounting, in his words, to "camouflaged surrender." He reminded that many of the years of his life had been spent in resisting such scoundrels as those we now oppose in Southeast Asia.

Eisenhower sought with equal passion paths of peace and understanding between nations. He was an internationalist in the fullest sense, gave strong support to the United Nations, and recognized the urgency of measures aimed at easing the awesome threat to civilization inherent in the nuclear arms race.

But to the general's way of thinking, appeasement became, in the final analysis, an instrument of war and further oppression, not independence and understanding and mutual respect.

Eisenhower was not without loyalty to the Republican Party. Still, he never was quite comfortable in the role of the partisan. He found especially irritating the pettiness, piddling personality clashes, and favor seeking that are built-in party patterns.

The same nonpartisan feeling was reflected by the American people. From the beginning of his political venture, he was looked upon as a leader peculiarly above partisanship.

The image of elder statesman was bestowed naturally and affectionately soon after he left the White House.

His love of country—and countrymen—was uninhibited and uncomplicated. To him, there never could be as much wrong with this nation as was right with it. He was an old-fashioned patriot in an age of almost traumatic change.

But the deep divisions in our society sorely wounded the general's spirit, especially the growing disrespect for law and order. Living hard by the Gettysburg battlefield, he had a constant reminder of the most tragic fruit of division in American history.

Texans' affection for Eisenhower was mixed with deep pride, for he was a native of this state. It will be recalled that in both his races for the presidency he carried Texas handily.

This newspaper joins the nation and the Free World in a fond farewell to a great man and a great friend.

It won't be the same without Ike.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Mar. 29, 1969]

EISENHOWER

It can truly be said that he gave his life to his beloved country—and was beloved in return. His death is a personal thing, bringing sadness into every home.

Few thought of him as "Gen." Eisenhower, or "President" Eisenhower, or "Mr." Eisenhower. To his shining credit as a human being, the people thought of him simply as "Ike," a nickname in which he took satisfaction.

Only a few of the greatest men are ever genuinely humble, but it glowed in the warmth of his unaffected and infectious smile as it glowed in these revealing words he once spoke:

"Humility must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned in the blood of his followers and the sacrifices of his friends."

Those words were uttered in 1945 at the glorious climax of a long career as a professional warrior. The former West Point cadet had just achieved victory as commander of the greatest amalgamation of military forces ever mustered in the world

Thus it was never the role of hero or leader which gave satisfaction to Dwight David Eisenhower. To him the most important thing in life was to do one's duty in accordance with one's principles and to the best of one's abilities.

The people sensed and responded to this, electing him to a second term in the White House although he would have preferred to retire to the Gettysburg farm which he and Mrs. Eisenhower had lovingly established as their first permanent home.

As President he labored unceasingly for the peace and world stability he had sought to assure on the battlefields of Europe. His disappointments were profound, thanks to Communist hostility, but steady and patient persistence in his chosen course avoided open conflict for eight years while shoring up the strength and unity of the free world.

At home, meanwhile, he gave his devotion and energies to further the constitutional system in which he so passionately believed. A whole new era of justice for the underprivileged was opened when he sent troops to Little Rock, Ark., to enforce court-ordered school integration.

But this is not the place to enumerate the manifold achievements of a man who, even in retirement and plagued by repeated heart attacks, continued to serve his country and his political party with the valued and trusted advice of an elder statesman.

Instead this is the place to give thanks for the towering example set by the devotion of Dwight David Eisenhower, a great American and a great human being—and to mourn his loss.

It would be wrong to call his death a tragedy. He had a long and richly useful life and he lived it with grace. Our sorrow is in having to say goodbye to such a good, true friend.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Soldier, educator, author, President, peacemaker, great American. These are the roles that Dwight D. Eisenhower lived with honor and distinction.

Almost a decade has passed since he left the White House and moved out of the world spotlight. It was 24 years ago that he retired as a five-star general from the Army. Inevitably, his moments of crisis and triumph have dimmed in the public mind. But one thing stands out as clear as ever: Gen. Eisenhower was one of the most beloved and trusted men of his time.

Had he not been elevated to the presidency, he still would have left his mark on history. As supreme commander of the World War II Allied Expeditionary Forces, he commanded the greatest land-air-naval invasion force the world has ever known.

First in North Africa, then in Sicily and Italy, and finally in Europe he displayed the planning ability and the strategic daring which ultimately destroyed a powerful German Army.

Friend and foe alike hailed his military genius. He was a stern commander, but even

XUM

the enemy respected him. To his own troops he was Ike, perhaps the most civilian-minded professional soldier this nation has ever produced.

He was trained as a military man, but he hated war, and as President he dedicated himself to the promotion of world peace and friendship under freedom.

Both political parties sought him as a presidential candidate. At first he wasn't interested. He had a soldier's disdain for politics. As a soldier he didn't vote and he did not affiliate with any political organization.

In the White House he remained aloof from partisan politics as best he could. Party affairs bored him, to the dismay of his fellow Republicans and to the delight of the American people who tend to share that view.

As President, he declined to assume the strong presidential role of his predecessors. He relegated much of the foreign responsibilities to John Foster Dulles, his trusted secretary of state. On the domestic side, leaders of the Democratically controlled Congress—such as Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson—assumed important leadership responsibilities.

Critics said Ike abdicated too much responsibility. Yet he remained true to his own idea of the presidency. He declined to project himself into many public issues because he felt the federal government was assuming too large a share of national decision-making.

Arguments over that aspect of his leadership will continue for years to come. In retrospect, he perhaps was a product of the nation's needs. His White House years followed a great war and all the turbulence and agony that goes with war; before that a great depression which produced the New Deal reforms of Franklin Roosevelt.

The nation needed a man like Eisenhower in the 50s. His was not a time of dynamic leadership but rather of surcease and stability. The whole free world looked to Eisenhower for confidence, for he was a man the whole word respected and trusted.

Perhaps his greatest political achievement was in bringing the Republican Party up to date. He was a moderate Republican himself, and he forced a stubborn GOP to accept the achievements of the New Deal, then he pulled the party toward the broad middle ground where it remains today.

Here in the South, it will be remembered that President Eisenhower in 1957 ordered federal troops into Little Rock, Ark., to enforce a court-ordered plan of school integration. It was the first such use of federal power since the days of Reconstruction. "Mob rule," he said, "cannot be allowed to override the decisions of the courts."

It was Eisenhower, the soldier-statesman, who brought peace in Korea after three harsh years of war.

It was Eisenhower, the peacemaker, who used his farewell address to warn of the potentially dangerous influence on the nation of the burgeoning industrial-military complex. That farewell warning rivals in wisdom the farewell address of the first President, George Washington, to whom President Eisenhower has often and aptly been compared.

Gen. Eisenhower will not go down in history as the greatest among Presidents. Rather, he will be remembered as the greatest among Americans: A man beloved by first his troops and then his countrymen, whose honesty, integrity, dedication and good will were never questioned.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post,
Mar. 29, 1969]

HE SERVED OUR NATION ABLY IN WAR AND PEACE

They called him Ike.

American war hero, 34th President of the United States, historian, private citizen whose retirement from public life was never quite complete, all these things he was, but to the man on the street he was Ike.

And of all the accomplishments of this remarkable man, his greatest was probably the place he won in the hearts of the American people.

A man trained in war, he dedicated his public life to the pursuit of reason. Frequently under intense criticism, he always sought to find a way to talk, to discuss, to reason. He believed intensely that the strength of America was in its historic refusal to go the easy way of extreme measures. And the people understood this, and so responded in great numbers to the man Dwight David Eisenhower.

His life was like a blueprint for an American success story.

He was born on Oct. 14, 1890 in Denison, Texas, the first President to be born in Texas. He was about a year old when his parents moved to Abilene, Kansas. His boyhood was typical of the youth of his time and place. He tended garden, took care of the chickens, sold eggs, milked the cow, delivered chickens and vegetables, did odd jobs, helped his father.

He became a soldier almost by chance. His first choice was Annapolis, but he discovered he would be past the age limit of 20 when the term started.

Instead, he went to West Point, and the course of American history was changed.

Graduating 61st in a class of 164 in 1915, he began a historic military career. It would be years, however, before the focus of world attention would turn toward the soldier named Ike.

In the Louisiana maneuvers of 1941, Ike was singled out for his tactical brilliance. Thus began a series of Army assignments that would lead a heretofore obscure officer to a five-star generalcy and supreme command of the great "Crusade in Europe."

The story of that crusade is well known.

Ike's personality helped forge the victory.

He possessed unexampled powers to weld diverse forces, and at times, in the handling of individualistic and temperamental commanders, he needed them to their fullest.

The Germans regarded his ability as a fighting commander highly. One German general was later to say that the German general staff regarded him as the greatest general of the war, because of his able planning, his daring and the extent of his authority.

"He took great gambles, as in Africa and later on the French beaches, but he won and that justified his daring," the former enemy said.

With the war won, Ike hoped to retire to the peace of a quiet life. Presidential offers were dangled before him, but they were spurned.

After the war, he served as president of Columbia University, and then was called back into the service of his country by President Truman to become commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces.

In 1952, he yielded to the constant calls that he turn to politics. In a dramatic return to the United States, he campaigned and won the Republican presidential nomination. He went on to serve two terms as President, both times winning by overwhelming majorities.

On Jan. 20, 1953, at the age of 62, he became the 34th President of the United States, the first Republican to occupy the White House in 20 years.

If there is any single way to describe the Eisenhower presidency it is in the phrase "peace with honor." (He was later to name the second part of the history of his presidential years "Waging Peace.")

Ike served in tense times, with the threat of nuclear disaster ever present. The Korean War ended in his term. Josef Stalin died, and a new regime emerged in Moscow. The Geneva summit of 1955 eased world tensions, but later they were heightened in the U-2 affair.

On the home front, Ike was deeply committed to governmental fiscal responsibility.

The two themes—peace and prosperity—brought reelection in 1956 by the greatest popular vote ever recorded, despite recurring worries about his health.

He worked hard at molding a united GOP around his philosophy of "Modern Republicanism." He was, however, disappointed when Richard Nixon failed in his bid to succeed him. He continued to urge unity within the party. In retirement, his advice was constantly sought by his two Democratic successors, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Unity and its strength meant much to Ike.

Later, reminiscing on his term as President, he was to say, "When I came to the presidency, the country was rather in an unhappy state. There was bitterness and there was quarreling and so on . . . I tried to create an atmosphere of greater serenity and mutual confidence, and I think that it . . . was noticeable over those eight years that that was brought about . . ."

His legacy to the American people was his life of service and his realization of the importance of peace, justice and mutual confidence.

REDUCTION IN COST OF MEDICINE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, some critics of American labor unions have stated from time to time that these institutions are devoted exclusively to matters directly pertaining to such collective bargaining issues as wages, hours, and working conditions. Those of us who are more familiar with labor organizations have long been aware that their interests are far broader, and we have one more indication of that fact at hand.

The Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, which represents nearly a half a million men and women in the telephone and other industries, describes itself as a "community-minded union." Its president, Joseph A. Beirne, has distinguished himself as a civic-minded man with a broad range of interests.

Thus, it was not at all surprising to learn that the international executive board of the CWA, meeting this week in Washington, had once again spoken out on behalf of the consumers' interest. In endorsing two bills—S. 950 and S. 1612—introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, the members of the CWA leadership panel have shown a significant understanding of what is needed to reduce the cost of medicine for the working men and women of this country.

The CWA statement points out that these two bills give the American people "another chance," first, to get a single course of information on the drugs which a doctor prescribes for his patients, thus bringing the doctor greater opportunity to prescribe by generic rather than brand names, at a saving to the patient; and, second, to make mandatory that all labels on containers of prescriptions bear the generic names of the drugs being dispensed, so that the consumer himself can identify these generic names.

I invite particular attention to that part of the Communications Workers statement which declares:

> We recognize the great savings that could be made by the American public if the filler of the prescriptions was aware of the equivalent substitute or generic name of any and

all prescribed brand name drugs. This would enable the druggist to fill the prescription for a consumer under the cheaper generic name.

As the CWA points out, under present procedures—and because of the lack of broadly dispensed knowledge—"advertisements all too often are the only source of information quickly available to the doctor;" and as a result he is "likely to prescribe a highly advertised drug when a 'generic' drug is available at four, five or even 10 times less cost."

These are sound observations. The CWA leadership people serve their members well in adopting this statement. Those of us who have a keen interest in protecting the consumers of medicine in this country are most grateful that a lively and forward-looking organization like the Communications Workers of America has lent the strength of its brains and voice to this effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of CWA's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS—BRAND AND GENERIC NAMES

A healthy step forward in the control of rising drug prices is at last possible, thanks to the introduction of two important new bills into Congress by Senator Gaylord Nelson. Support from broad areas of the American public, however, is a critical part of the needed treatment for what now ails the pharmaceutical industry's unique pricing practices.

For years, Dr. James L. Goddard, as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, recommended a drug compendium providing doctors, on a reliable and ready basis, the "generic" names for drugs which the manufacturers too often package and sell at nearly prohibitive prices under highly-advertised brand names.

Advertisements, all too often, are the only source of information quickly available to the doctor—and doctors, like the rest of us, can be confused by advertising.

Hence, a doctor is likely to prescribe a highly advertised drug when a "generic" drug is available—at four, five or even ten times less cost.

Dr. Goddard's suggestion for a compendium on drugs would have set aside the problem of confusion—a problem that affects both doctor and patient. But, nothing happened.

Now we have another chance.

In January Senator Nelson introduced S. 950 calling for the publication of a single source of information on drugs which the doctor prescribes for his patients. This bill if enacted would protect both the health and pocketbook of the American public. It would make available to the doctor information that would give to him the names of the cheaper drugs under the generic names that would be equivalent to those that carry a brand name.

Senator Nelson's second bill, S–1612, is called a generic labeling bill. This bill would make it mandatory that all labels on containers of prescriptions bear the generic name of the drug or drugs being dispensed. *This would enable the consumer himself* to identify the official generic name of the drug prescribed for him.

We must expect, and be prepared for, a counterattack from the drug industry. It will argue that only those drugs produced by "research-oriented, quality-conscious" drug companies are "safe and effective." Anything else, particularly anything made by the smaller drug companies, is "potentially dangerous."

The facts speak differently, however, because all drugs, whether sold under brand names or generic names, have to meet certain chemical standards set by two national agencies, the United States Pharmacopeia and the National Formulary. These standards cannot guarantee equivalency, but they do insure that the drugs are pure and potent.

In addition, the cheaper "generics" appear to be good enough to pass the vigorous tests laid down by Federal agencies, such as the Department of Defense, which form the major part of the smaller firms' market, buying larger quantities of drugs on bid basis. Small companies with lower production and distribution costs and no advertising and research overhead, often outbid the big drug firms for such contracts.

Based on the facts, the Communications Workers of America recognizes the urgent need for the adoption of S–950 and S–1612 and adds its full support to the adoption of such measures.

Further, we recognize the great savings that could be made by the American public if the filler of the prescriptions was aware of the equivalent substitute or generic name of any and all prescribed brand name drugs. This would enable the druggist to fill the prescription for a consumer under the cheaper generic name.

Therefore, the Communications Workers of America goes a step further than bills S–950 and S–1612, by calling on Congress to enact legislation that would require a physician when writing a prescription for a patient, to write into the prescription along with the brand name, the official (generic) name of the drug or drugs that he is prescribing.

THE NEED FOR GREEN-CARD LEGISLATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this year, as last year, I was pleased to join as a cosponsor of the measure introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), S. 1694, which would require commuter aliens—the so-called green carders—to be regularly certified every 6 months by the Department of Labor. The certification is to indicate that the worker's presence in this country to seek work does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American workers.

Last year hearings were held on this problem by Senator KENNEDY and also by the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration. These hearings have disclosed a wide range of opinion regarding the benefits, or lack thereof, of the system of employing commuter aliens.

My State has faced a long history of poverty and disadvantage along the Texas-Mexico border. Unfortunately, my State has not enacted a minimum wage law and many of the jobs along the border are not covered by the Federal minimum wage law. Some of the wages paid in this area are astonishingly low and because of this fact the area is very poor in many instances.

The alien commuter system has aggravated this unfortunate situation by creating extensive unemployment among American workers who are displaced by commuters willing to work for lower wages because they do not live in this country.

This often causes bitter feelings along the border—a bitterness which we cannot diplomatically afford. Great progress has been made in our relations with Mexico. I mention the Chamizal Treaty as one example. This progress should not be upset with bitterness among the local people because their jobs are taken away by alien commuters who live in Mexico and freely cross the river and get the jobs of American citizens with green cards.

Also, it should be emphasized that we are not ending the commuter system. We will still allow workers to come across the border. All the amendment seeks to do is prevent such commuters from causing unemployment in this country, because the commuters are taking American jobs. Furthermore, it is to give an accurate inventory of how many green cardholders there are and where they are.

BUREAUCRATIC DECEIT IN WEATHER STATION CLOSURES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Science Services Administration, and the U.S. Weather Bureau recently displayed the most unfortunate example of bureaucratic doubletalk, evasion, and outright deception that I have witnessed in many years.

I am referring to the mismanaged propaganda campaign last month that launched the Department's effort to close down 13 weather stations across the Nation. It has left me with the feeling that concerned Members of Congress and the people they represent have been betrayed.

One thing is clear to me: the Environmental Science Services Administration has deliberately misrepresented personnel cutbacks to Congress and to the public.

ESSA advised my office 2 months ago that it was forced to close down the 13 stations, including a two-man reporting station in Elko, Nev. The ESSA people told me they hated to do it but they just did not have any other choice under the personnel restrictions imposed by the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968. I ask unanimous consent that letters in point from the Deputy Administrator and then the Administrator be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Rockville, Md., March 12, 1969.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Recently, Mr. Eberly of my office informed your staff of plans to close the two-man ESSA Weather Bureau Office located in the Post Office Building at Elko, Nevada, before June 30, 1969. This action is one of 13 similar actions being taken throughout the country to enable us to live within the personnel constraints imposed by P.L. 90–364, the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968. Both employees will be offered positions elsewhere within the Weather Bureau without loss of grade.

Our present office is open eight hours per day and in addition to making three direct radio broadcasts, disseminates public weather forecasts for Elko and vicinity. Meteorological support to aviation interests is provided by the Federal Aviation Administration office at the airport. In the future the forecasts and warnings for Elko and eastern Nevada will be available to the local news media in Elko via the press wire service from our office at Salt Lake City. The direct radio broadcast will be discontinued.

Officials of our Regional Office in Salt Lake have discussed the pending closure with our personnel in Elko and will follow up with respect to appropriate assignments and provision of essential services to user groups. We shall be glad to provide any additional information you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Townsend, Jr.,
Deputy Administrator.

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Environmental Science Services
Administration, Washington
Science Center,
Rockville, Md., March 21, 1969.

Hon. Alan Bible,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bible: This is in response to your letter of March 10, 1969, and enclosed correspondence, concerning the Weather Bureau Office in Elko, Nevada.

We recognize the benefits which accrue to a community through the services of a local Weather Bureau office and we regret that we must proceed with plans to close the Elko facility.

Elko is one of 13 additional Weather Bureau installations which we plan to close before June 30, 1969, to enable us to live within the constraints imposed by Public Law 90–364, the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968, which requires reductions in both employment and expenditures. Four other offices were closed recently for this reason.

The offices which we have closed, and plan to close, were selected on the basis of their contribution in the Bureau's overall program. We felt that the services provided by these offices, although valuable, were of lower priority than those of other offices or installations.

The Elko office was selected for closure instead of the Wendover, Utah, office because of the existence of the Federal Aviation Administration Flight Service Station (FAA/FSS) at Elko. This facility has been taking weather observations and providing pilot weather briefing services for some time, so the closure of our Elko office will not affect these important services. There is no FSS at Wendover. Although we have automatic meteorological observing equipment at Wendover this equipment does not observe or measure certain weather elements or parameters, such as sky condition and visibility. This important information is added to the observations by our personnel. Thus, closure of the Wendover office would result in the further loss of important weather data in an area which is only sparsely covered at present.

While there is no complete substitute for a local office, the more important weather service needs in the Elko area can be met by other means. Severe weather warnings for Elko County will be issued by our Winnemucca facility which is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Public and aviation weather forecasts for eastern Nevada are presently prepared by our Salt Lake City office and this procedure will continue. Public forecasts and warnings covering northeastern Nevada will be available to the Elko news media through the press wire services.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. White,
Administrator.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I told the ESSA officials at the outset that I would have to object to closing the Elko station, but I promised to be fair about it since I could easily understand their problems under the congressional mandate. Obvously, we cannot cut Federal spending without some cutback in Federal services.

Now—without notice or explanation to me—it has suddenly been decided that four of the 13 offices with 16 of the 29 positions will remain open. I had to learn of this development through a news story published in the Salt Lake Tribune and circulated in Elko. I ask unanimous consent that the news item be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU REPRIEVE MISSES CLOSED ELKO OFFICE

Washington.—The Weather Bureau said Friday it is granting reprieve to 4 of 13 weather stations the bureau closed for economy reasons.

The stations escaping the shutdown order are at Houghton Lake, Mich., with six employes; Stockton, Calif., five; Mansfield, Ohio, three, and La Cross, Wis., two. They account for 16 of the 29 jobs that were to be trimmed from the Weather Bureau's payroll by the closing of the 13 stations.

Stations still facing elimination include the one at Elko, Nev. It has two employes.

Public and congressional response to the announcement that the bureau will have to snuff out some stations has been rather emphatic, a spokesman said.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it appears a magic solution to the Weather Bureau's personnel limitations was discovered, and I suggest it was a political one. I have been advised that the turnaround was ordered directly by the new Secretary of Commerce. I can only assume the Secretary had also ordered the closures, since ESSA and the Weather Bureau under it are both in his Department.

At any rate, the reversal on closing four offices completely discredits the statements supporting any closure elsewhere. If the Secretary can keep four offices open, I have no doubt that he could keep the remaining nine open as well since they contain less than half the personnel positions. I think now that the whole affair has been nothing more than a smokescreen, and I intend to fight the remaining closure all the way, from the floor of the Senate to the dais of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve.

The Department of Commerce and its agencies not only misrepresented the personnel situation, they broke faith with the people of Elko County who have depended on the Elko County weather reporting station services. For it was implied that essential services would be maintained by other means.

Exactly nothing is planned. The isolated Elko County region, a ranching area heavily dependent on weather forecasts, has been told to get its forecast from Salt Lake City, 200 miles away in Utah. And how will the people get them? Not by any Weather Bureau service. They will get them only as they are provided in occasional and abbreviated fashion by the press service wire to Elko's single radio station.

This whole affair has been nothing more than a mismanaged propaganda campaign and a string of broken promises. I am calling now on the Secretary of Commerce to order it all dropped and to direct ESSA and the Weather Bureau to begin again—on the right foot. I am certain the necessary personnel reductions can be accomplished without closing important weather stations since the capability has already been demonstrated in four instances.

Mr. President, when I stated the weather station serving northeastern Nevada was important, I spoke from my own experiences when traveling and visiting in the region. But I also reflected the views of many concerned citizens who wrote me to protest the announced closure of the station. I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of these letters be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nevada Legislature,
March 3, 1969.

Hon. Alan Bible,
Senator From Nevada,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alan: Those mean old Washington bureaucrats are trying to save money again and have given notice that the ESSA weather station in Elko will be closed effective in June.

With one of the biggest winters on record still in progress the services provided by the local weather station have been highlighted during the past several months and the dependency of the local populace upon the weather information provided by the station has never been more greatly appreciated or needed.

If the station is closed our entire area will be without accurate daily weather reports and the public will be greatly inconvenienced and, in the case of our livestock people, may even be subject to unnecessary damage through lack of weather information.

Information from the FAA station located in Elko is to the effect that the personnel there does not have the time nor facilities to disperse weather information to the general public.

The ESSA station is presently providing regular broadcasts by radio at stated intervals during the day and is also providing weather information for the newspapers, all of which is greatly followed by the public.

I would urge that you look into this matter for the people of northeastern Nevada and that you exert your every influence to put a halt to the plans of the federal people to close this important weather reporting station.

With sincere best regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

City of Elko,
Elko, Nev., March 5, 1969.

Hon. Alan Bible,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bible: I would like to voice as strong a protest as I possibly can to the Weather Bureau's announced intention of closing the Environmental Science Services Administration Weather Station in Elko, Nevada. I will try to be as objective as I can; however, you should know that I speak from a background of some knowledge of the operations of the FAA and the Weather Bureau, having worked with both for over fifteen years.

For your information the Elko ESSA office is operated by two technicians from 7 A.M. to 4 P.M., daily. During this time period these men, in addition to their regular functions, disseminate weather reports three times each day via our local radio station. The area encompassed by this service includes all of Elko County, the northern half of Eureka County, and the northeastern and eastern portion of Lander County. The Elko office is the only Weather Bureau service outlet in northeastern Nevada, the next closest offices being Winnemucca (125 miles west) and Ely (180 miles south). During the more severe weather season (October through May) about ten weather alerts are issued. These are warnings of heavy snow to stockmen and warnings of hazardous travel conditions for the traveling public. Direct calls are made to City and State Police, the State Highway Department, to some ranching interests, and the local offices of the Southern Pacific and Western Pacific Railroads. The Weather Bureau network of stations, both observing and service outlets, is extremely sparse in Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico, with perhaps fewer stations in Nevada than in any other section of the United States.

The services rendered by the Elko ESSA station are of prime importance to our livestock industry. It may be argued that the Elko FAA Flight Service Station would be a suitable substitute for the ESSA station, but this is patently not true. If this argument had any merit, ergo we could do away with all ESSA stations and let the FAA stations take over this job. Being an old FAA man I know that the FAA is geared to the aviation industry primarily, and it does not have the manpower or the time to handle the personalized service required by the stockmen and the traveling public.

I have only one other point to argue. Back in 1959 the Weather Bureau determined there was insufficient activity at Wendover, Utah, to warrant the continued operation of the Weather Bureau Station at that site; and they actually closed that facility. Within a short time thereafter, and after the enactment of a "special appropriation", the Wendover, Utah, weather station was reopened and is open to this date. They, too, have two technicians; but in addition they have automatic weather reporting facilities which are "remoted" to Salt Lake City, and this automatic equipment reports directly to Salt Lake City sixteen hours a day. Now the question necessarily arises, "What sort of a workload does Wendover, Utah, have that justifies its retention as compared to Elko, Nevada?" Elko has an average high of 390 direct telephone calls in January to a low average of 210 calls in July and August. In addition the Elko automatic telephone answering system has been called on an average of 270 times in December to a low of 63 times in July.

The writer is in full sympathy with the new administration's desire to economize, but in my considered opinion this move would be false economy. The community of Elko is growing, and this growth warrants the retention of this facility. I would urge you, with whatever means you have available to you, to prevail upon the Weather Bureau to reconsider and rescind its order closing the Elko ESSA station or, at the very least, to substitute the Wendover, Utah, ESSA station in the stead of Elko, Nevada, for its so-called planned program of closures.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

FRAN WEINRAUCH, *Mayor*.

CHILTON ENGINEERING,
Elko, Nev., March 6, 1968.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: It has been announced that the Weather Bureau has plans to close the Reporting Station here in Elko.

I wish to express our concern over this announcement and to state we are very much opposed to this proposed action.

We, as engineers, surveyors and aerial photographers, rely greatly upon weather forecasts and many times it could mean serious consequences were a weather report not available at Elko.

Please do what you can to keep our weather station operating.

Yours very truly,

MARK CHILTON.

ELKO, NEV.,
March 7, 1969.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: An announcement has been made to the effect that the Elko Weather Bureau office will be closed sometime prior to June 30, 1969.

The weather bureau office performs an essential service to this community and outlying areas. This service is used by ranchers, tourists, air travelers and local residents in all activities ranging from shearing, lambing and calving to planning a trip.

I would like to register a protest to the closing of this office and I hope that you will do all that you can to prevent this action.

Sincerely,

PHILIP M. BALDWIN.

GIL'S CHEVRON SERVICE,
Elko, Nev., March 10, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: I am writing to you not only for myself, but on behalf of other pilots of light planes, who depend on the Weather Bureau for planning personal and charter flights.

My plane is equipped for VFR (Visual Flight Rules) only; therefore, in order to fly to various places requiring several days flight it is necessary to obtain weather briefing from the Weather Bureau. Many of the flights are with passengers. True FAA has pilot weather briefing, but only for a 24 hour period. I have called on the Elko Weather Bureau office many times for the projected outlook covering up to and including a four day period. Not only have they given me the desired information but also the best time for making the trip. They have yet to fail in giving me the correct conditions.

I urge you to do everything in your power to rescind the order for closing the Elko ESSA Weather Bureau office. Not only would owners of VFR equipped plants suffer but it could be disastrous for the Ranchers of Elko, Eureka, and Lander Counties who depend on the service of the Elko Weather Bureau office.

Respectfully,

GIL STATES,
Secretary-Treasurer, Elko Pilots Association.

THE ELKO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Elko, Nev., March 11, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The Elko Chamber of Commerce wishes to strongly protest the proposed closing of the Environmental Science Services Administration weather station in Elko, Nevada.

A special committee of the chamber has met with Mr. Lloyd H. Magar, User Service Representative in the Weather Bureau Regional Office in Salt Lake City; Mr. Charles Inskip, Aviation Service Representative from the same office, and Mr. Omar Sinclair, Official-in-charge at the Elko Station, and has studied the effect the closing of this station would have on the economy of the area.

Although the Weather Bureau announcement stated that "the affected communities' most urgent weather service needs will be met by other means", we find that the only service to be provided is area-wide reports and predictions from Salt Lake City transmitted to Elko newspapers and radio station KELK by the wire press services. This information would be neither as complete nor current as that now being broadcast over KELK three times a day by the local Weather Station and furnished by telephone of personal inquiry.

As you know, Elko is the heart of the livestock industry in Nevada. It is one of the three largest producers of red meat protein in the United States. The vastness of this sparsely populated area and the hugeness of sprawling ranges requires that ranchers receive the latest possible information via radio.

While this information is vital to the ranching industry the year around, it is of critical importance during February and March when the cows are calving and mid-April and May when sheep are lambing. The local Weather Bureau issues an average of ten alerts a year, telephoning ranchers about forthcoming severe local storms, as well as alerting the local radio station. Since lambing and calving is done on the open range, lack of this information could be disastrous to the livestock growers. This advance warning of severe conditions, which would be eliminated if the local station is closed, can allow the livestock operators to move livestock to more sheltered areas. This results in thousands of lamb chops and T-bone steaks getting to market which otherwise would not have survived the first hours of life.

According to State Statistician R. M. Pallesen, Elko County accounts for 206,000 of the 591,000 head of cattle in Nevada, and 80,000 of the 231,000 sheep in the state. Elko County cattle are valued at over $30,000,000 and sheep at over $2,000,000. Elko County also accounts for $13,500,000 in cattle, sheep and wool sales. This is 35% of the entire state's $38,500,000 income from livestock products.

By continuing to serve this basic industry of producing food for a hungry world, which can only be done by continuing the operation of the Elko station, the United States Weather Bureau has the unique opportunity to continue service to a rural area and simultaneously benefit urban areas to a greater degree than would be possible if the present local service were discontinued. Almost everyone would agree that this would be a most gratifying turn of events in Federal Affairs.

If the local station is closed, it would no longer be possible to issue warnings to city and state police, the state highway department or the traveling public when weather changes create hazardous travel conditions. Due to the mountainous terrain, weather can change very rapidly, creating treacherous driving conditions in mountain passes and canyons.

Further importance of the station is shown by the local telephone and personal inquiries received, ranging from an average low of 210 in July and August to a high of 390 in December. In addition, an average of up to 270 telephone inquiries a month receive taped local forecasts during the hours the station is closed.

The Elko Weather Bureau serves all of Elko County, the northern half of Eureka County and the northeastern and eastern portion of Lander County, an area approximately 25% greater than the combined areas of Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island and New Jersey, with the District of Columbia thrown in for good measure. Connecticut, one-fourth the area served by the Elko station, has four Weather Bureau stations, each offering the same service as is offered by the Elko station. New Jersey, one-third the area served by the Elko station, also has four stations. Even Rhode Island, one-sixteenth the area of that served by the Elko station, has a station. It might be argued that the greater population warrants this number of stations. Such arguments are not valid, however, inasmuch as variations in weather take place not in relation to population, but rather, in relation to area.

Further, communication is much more difficult in an area as sparsely settled as that served by the Elko station than it is in the thickly populated centers of the eastern seaboard. If a station were closed in one of the above mentioned states, the area could be served by another station located within 10 to 20 miles. If the Weather Bureau office in Elko is closed, the closest service offices would be Winnemucca, 125 miles west, and Ely, 180 miles south.

The Elko Chamber of Commerce is in full agreement with the need for economy in government. We are also aware that communities are often inclined to want economy as long as it takes place somewhere else. For this reason we investigated the possibility that the Weather Bureau could provide these services in another manner. We have found that this is not possible. Therefore, we must protest the complete elimination of such a vital service to an area greater than Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island and New Jersey combined while those and other sections of the United States retain an overabundance of such services.

We respectfully urge you to prevail upon the Weather Bureau, by whatever means you have available to you, to reconsider and rescind its order closing the Elko ESSA station.

Respectfully,

Ervin H. Schulz,
Manager.

Weather Bureau Has No Plans for Elko Area

Elko.—A regional Weather Bureau representative says the Weather Bureau does not have plans to provide for this area's weather service needs after closing the local station.

Lloyd H. Magar, user service representative of the Weather Bureau regional office in Salt Lake City, told this to members of a special committee of the Elko Chamber of Commerce.

He also said he didn't think there was much that the weather bureau could do to provide those services. He ruled out the possibility of direct telephone lines to another station, such as Salt Lake City, as no funds are available.

An announcement was recently made by the U.S. Weather Bureau that the Weather Bureau here would be closed before July 1 because of cutbacks in government employment.

The announcement stated that affected employes in the federal cutback would be placed in other positions within the organization as vacancies occur.

Elko Bottling Co.,
Elko, Nev., March 12, 1969.

Senator Alan Bible,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bible: As a citizen of the City of Elko, I wish to protest the proposed closing of the Environmental Science Weather Station in Elko, Nevada.

This facility has long been a vital asset to the livestock industry in northeastern Nevada, to the local law enforcement agencies and the State and County Highway Departments.

The apparent reason for the proposed discontinuance of the above is to curtail expenses. In view of this reasoning, it is my understanding that some areas in the eastern part of the country with a square mile area much less than the area served by the Elko station are served by as many as four weather stations. My thinking is that area should have precedence over population density with a facility such as this.

I sincerely hope you will exert all possible effort to convince the Weather Bureau of the need to continue the operation of the Weather Station in Elko.

Respectfully,

C. B. Handwright,
Manager.

Elko, Nev.,
March 20, 1969.

Senator Alan Bible,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Lamoille Soil Conservation District strongly opposed the planned closure of the Essa Weather Bureau in Elko.

Dave Secrist,
Chairman.

City of Wells,
Wells, Nev., March 20, 1969.

Senator Alan Bible,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alan: It has been brought to my attention by numerous individuals that great harm will be done to Elko and vicinity by the closing of the U.S. Weather Bureau. It is critical for many persons in the Elko area, including ranchers, travelers, police, highway crews, pilots and others.

Not only will the removal of the Weather Bureau affect Elko, but surrounding communities such as Wells have depended greatly on the bureau to supply them with much needed information.

The City Council, the Wells Chamber of Commerce and the very interested citizens of Wells join with me in asking you to do all in your power to retain the weather station in Elko. We feel it poor economy to discontinue such a badly needed and much used service.

Sincerely,

John Di Grazia,
Mayor.

Lamoille, Nev.,
March 21, 1969.

Dear Senator Bible: We are very concerned about the planned closure of the ESSA Weather Bureau office in Elko and hope that you will be able to have the people who have directed the closing of this office to reverse their decision.

The livestock warnings and travelers warnings that we receive from this office are very vital to us and we fear a detrimental effect on the Northeastern Nevada area if these services are no longer available.

Yours truly,

Eldon Westlund.

Elko, Nev.,
March 23, 1969.

Senator Alan Bible,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bible: As a resident of Elko Co., Nev., I would like to protest the possible closing of the E.S.S.A. weather station here. As you are aware this station covers many square miles and gives us weather coverage that we will be deprived of otherwise.

I would appreciate any help you can give so that it can remain in operation.

Sincerely,

Ernest E. Wilson.

Elko, Nev.,
March 25, 1969.

Dear Senator Bible: I am voicing a protest felt by many, against the closing of the Environmental Science Service Administration weather station in Elko, Nevada.

It seems a bit ridiculous to expect an accurate weather picture or forecast made in Salt Lake City over 250 miles away. This is where the information would come from were Elko discontinued.

I would appreciate your support in this matter.

Don Griswold.

Elko Chamber of Commerce,
Elko, Nev., March 26, 1969.

Hon. Alan Bible,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Stockton, La Crosse, Houghton Lake, Mansfield weather stations reinstated by Secretary of Commerce. What is the outlook for Elko?

Ervin H. Schultz.

[From the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press
Mar. 12, 1969]

Forecast for Weather Bureau: "?"

(By Catherine Tate)

Forecast for the Elko Weather Bureau: deteriorating high pressure area with slight chance of recovery.

A terse announcement from the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) noting that "13 Weather Bureau stations will be closed between now and June 30," apparently heralds the end of an 81-year-old tradition established locally by the Elko bureau.

That tradition has seen distribution of vital—and occasionally perhaps not so vital—information concerning anything from crops and from picnics to flying.

The bureau has provided a valued service for ranchers, farmers, pilots and builders whose livelihood depends in some part on an accurate forecast of coming weather conditions.

Precisely, in the words of the New Standard Encyclopedia, Weather Bureaus provide a more or less satisfactory service for forecasting weather conditions; and such service is maintained by all civilized nations.

The services of the bureau are supported by a national network of surface and upper-air observing stations, aircraft, satellite systems, communications and computers. Some 300 bureau field offices in cities across the nation maintain close contact with the general public, "to insure" prompt and useful dissemination of weather information," according to an ESSA publication.

The local office handles nearly 700 telephone and office inquiries during peak months, provides emergency weather warnings to state anl local police, the sheriff's office, state highway department and the railroads and provides ranchers and farmers with critical warnings during lambing and calving seasons.

The largest portion handled by Elko's two weathermen—Omar Sinclair and George Bostic—is the gathering and maintaining of records useful in forecasting and used in painting a general picture of the Elko climate.

Sinclair and Bostic prepare three daily broadcasts for the local radio station, draw weather maps indicating pressure centers and fronts for use in forecasting, digest reams of material from teletype machines, cut tapes for the bureau's answering service and answer calls from tourists, ranchers, housewives, businessmen and a hundred other people who find weather information useful.

Elko has had a weather bureau of some sort since 1888, and talk of closing the bureau has been common for the last 15 years.

A reduction of the bureau's staff—from six to five—was the result of one such effort 13 years ago. A second reduction, assignment of observation duties to the Federal Aviation administration, another reduction and a move from the airport to the Post Office have left the bureau at its present stage.

The first substantial threat of closure came in 1957, but a hue and cry from the Elko populace thwarted the move.

"The Weather Bureau here is relied on more than in other parts of the country because a large part of the economy is dependent on weather forecasts," Bostic noted.

The only weather services to be provided Elko after the bureau closes will be area-wide reports and predictions over the wire press services leased by the Free Press and radio station KELK.

The Chamber of Commerce is heading what may be an ill-fated effort to forestall closure of the Elko bureau by contacting the Nevada Congressional delegation and spearheading other local opposition.

The Department of Commerce, which operated ESSA and the U.S. Weather Bureau, has pointed out the closure order is in compliance with Public Law 903–364 which requires reduction in federal employment and expenditures.

"Having exhausted all practical alternatives, the agency is now reluctantly moving to close additional Weather Bureau offices so that other higher priority programs and services can be continued," a press release from the department notes.

In the meantime, the forecast for local weather watchers remains "cool, with definitely raging temperatures."

NEVADA CIVIC CLUB,
Elko, Nev., March 28, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The Nevada Civic Club of Elko wishes to strongly protest the proposed closing of the Environmental Science Services Administration Weather Station in Elko, Nevada.

Elko County, the Nation's second largest county and the State's largest producer of livestock is serviced by the Elko weather station. Sudden changes in weather can be disastrous to cattlemen and woolgrowers unless warned by a local forecast.

Neither highway nor police radio networks would be able to receive local weather bureau reports. The nearest weather bureau forecast, which would come from Reno, Nevada or Salt Lake City, Utah, could not give our local conditions. The weather through this part of Nevada can change within a fifty mile radius from a fair to hazardous condition. This will leave almost three hundred miles of interstate 80 without adequate weather forecasts.

The Nevada Civic Club of Elko is in full agreement with the need for economy in government. We are also aware that communities are often inclined to want economy as long as it takes place elsewhere. For this reason, we investigated the possibility that the Weather Bureau could provide their service in another satisfactory manner. We have found this is not possible. Therefore, we must protest the complete elimination of such a vital service to such a large area when other smaller areas in the United States retain an over abundance of such service.

We request your aid and cooperation and ask that you do your utmost to prevent the complete closing of the Elko Weather Bureau.

Respectfully,
R. C. HARRINGTON,
President.

KELK,
Elko, Nev., March 27, 1969.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: I am writing to you, in my capacity of station manager of Radio Station KELK, to urge you to do everything you can to prevent the closing of the Elko ESSA Weather Bureau Office.

In support of this request I am enclosing some cards and letters that have been received here at the radio station protesting the closing of this vital and necessary service. Copies of these messages are also being forwarded to Senator Cannon and Congressman Baring.

As you are well aware, Senator, Elko County is one of the largest counties in the United States. Because of the size of our county, the farms and ranches are quite isolated. In the majority of cases there is no television to these remote areas, and radio station KELK is the only means these ranchers and farmers have of obtaining current news and, more importantly, weather. The owners and operators of the radio station have, for many years, felt that it was a duty to supply these people with factual, reliable, up-to-the-minute weather information. This will be impossible if the Elko ESSA Weather Bureau Office is closed and we are forced to rely on information from the Salt Lake City, Utah ESSA Weather Bureau office.

I can think of no other area in these United States where the rapidly changing, and often, severe weather conditions have more effect upon the lives and property of cattle ranchers and sheep raisers than in Elko County, Nevada.

I, therefore, urgently request that you use your office to urge reconsideration, of the Department of Commerce, to the planned closing of this office.

Respectfully,
D. RAY GARDNER,
Station Manager.

CARLIN, NEV.,
March 14, 1969.

MANAGER,
Elko Radio Station KELK,
Elko, Nev.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your Radio request, we, the undersigned, who have been citizens and taxpayers in Carlin, Nev., since 1920, are most certainly opposed to the closing of the Elko weather station for the following reasons: It would appear to us that there are many things in Washington, that could be curtailed drastically instead of cutting out vital services to the community, state and nation, as is the case with the Elko weather station.

Fundamentally the City of Elko and the surrounding area of Elko County, is a ranching community and is absolutely vital that these ranchers know what the weather is going to be. I point out also that the two nearest stations on which we get any weather data, are Salt Lake City and Reno. Neither one are equipped to give us the local data on storms, water content, and especially the local conditions of highways and roads. For the above stated reasons, we like many other local citizens are opposed to the Government taking away a vital source of information from us. I am also addressing Senator Alan Bible and Senator Howard Cannon, and Representative Walter Baring.

Trusting that letters of this kind may bring pressure enough to bear on the matter in Washington, D.C., we remain.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. C. T. HURD.

ROUNDS SERVICE STATION,
Battle Mountain, Nev., March 17, 1969.

RADIO STATION KELK,
Elko, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I oppose the discontinuance of the ESSA weather bureau station in Elko.

The station is a great benefit to this entire part of Nevada and should not be allowed to be closed.

If you could talk to everyone in and around this area, you would find the opposition to be unanimous.

Very truly yours,
S. S. ROUNDS.

ELKO INDEPENDENT,
Elko, Nev., March 4, 1969.

ELKO BROADCASTING CO.,
Radio Station KELK,
Elko, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: We are very anxious to have the U.S. ESSA station maintained as it is now in Elko, and to have Radio Station continue the daily merchant-sponsored weather reports.

Thank you for the opportunity to express an opinion.

Sincerely,
Mrs. WARREN L. MONROE.

OLIN INSURANCE &
REAL ESTATE AGENCY,
Elko, Nev., March 27, 1969.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am quite concerned with the announcement of the closing of the Weather Bureau Office here in Elko and of the great harm and inconvenience it will be to the ranchers, travelers, law-enforcement officials and the public.

As the Representative for northeastern Nevada for the Federal Land Bank Association of Reno, which is affiliated with the Federal Land Bank of Berkeley, who make real estate loans to the ranchers and I also represent the Nevada Livestock Production Credit Association, who lend funds for capital improvements and operating expenses on livestock to ranchers, I must visit the ranchers frequently and at all times of the year. I service approximately 65 accounts in this area. I have found that the services of the Weather Bureau are used and depended upon by all.

When making inspections, appraisals or cattle counts at these ranches they always insist upon having a radio in the automobile or not leaving until after they have heard the Weather Bureau report from KELK, the local radio station. The information is very beneficial to them in their operations.

It is also a must for travelers in this remote area to check on weather conditions, especially in the winter time, before making a trip. The reports that are given from Reno or Salt Lake City do not apply to the Elko area.

For your additional information I enclose a page from the Elko Daily Free Press which I hope will give you additional information.

Do hope that you will be able to prevent the closing of the Weather Bureau here in Elko as it is a very necessary service.

Very truly yours,
JIM OLIN.

CARLIN, NEV.,
March 21, 1969.

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to protest the closing of the Elko Weather Bureau. It is the only one in this part of Nevada and many of the people especially ranchers depend on it. I'm sure that there is a Weather Bureau somewhere else that is a little less essential to the welfare of the people.

Mr. and Mr. J. W. WILKINS.

WELLS, NEV.,
March 7, 1969.

RADIO KELK:

A weather report to a rancher is a vital part of his day.

We hope that this service will not be discontinued.

The KNUDSEN RANCH.

WELLS, NEV.,
March 12, 1969.

KELK
Elko, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: Hope the weather forecast can continue, as it would be a great disadvantage to cattle and sheep men and people living in country, who depend on hearing weather forecast for working cattle, and road conditions for travel to town for supplies etc.

Yours truly,

The John F. Murphy's.

March 6, 1969.

Radio Station KELK,
Elko, Nev.

Dear Sirs: I would like to say that we really do look forward to the 12:15—SL Weather Bureau weather report daily. Some of our neighbors in the Independence Valley do not get KELK some days and they phone me to find out what the weather report is.

I feel that it would be a real loss to the residents of Elko County to discontinue our local weather reports.

I do hope something can be done to keep the good service coming daily.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nelo Mori.

Battle Mountain, Nev.,
March 7, 1969.

KELK,
Elko, Nev.

Sirs: I was shocked to hear the government was closing the S. O. Weather Station as we people here in Eastern Nev. need this service as the Reno station doesn't cover this part of the state.

I hope they will reconsider and hope this note will help in some small way.

Sincerely,

Ruth A. Bennett.

Elko, Nev.

We depend on the weather forecast and will be lost without it. We do not have T.V. and enjoy the radio so very much it really keeps us up with the news.

Thank you so much.

Lawrence and Clara Reed.

February 5, 1969.

Radio Station KELK,
Elko, Nev.

Dear Sir: This is to advise you that we live at the Bullion mine, and depend on your weather report nearly all year, in fact one of your reports saved us from being snowed in, in the month of December. It would be a shame to see a service so valuable as this taken off the air.

Very truly yours,

Jack Sutherland.
John Barne.

Elko, Nev.,
March 4, 1969.

KELK Radio Station,
Elko, Nev.

Gentlemen: I believe the local "Weather Bureau" office *should not* be closed in Elko. The daily weather forecast is a very important and valuable service to all of our citizens—local, all travelers, tourists and the ranchers in our area. Each one of us depends upon the weather forecast every day of the year.

Certainly the government should cut spending—everyone is for this—but let us not close our local weather bureau when it is giving such an essential service to all of us.

Very truly yours,

Kathleen L. Romans.

P.S.—You may use the comments in this letter any way you wish.

Elko, Nev.,
March 25, 1969.

Please, let's keep the weather report here in Elko.

Mr. and Mrs. Richard A. Baker.
Mrs. Gladys Jensen.

We would like to sign our names with those who protest the closing of Elko's weather bureau—It has made such a contribution to the entire community we do want to keep it operating!

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. Ward Swain.

March 9, 1969.

Dear Sir: I wish to protest the closing of the U.S. Weather Bureau at Elko.

As a rural area mail carrier, year a round, I depend on the W. B.'s Radio broadcasts each day. It helps to go prepared.

Anyone living here for any length of time, knows the weather can change from one extreme to another in a very short time. Thank you. I remain.

Mrs. Betty L. Taylor.

March 5, 1969.

I am opposed to closing the Elko Weather Station. There is no station between Salt Lake and Reno.

Floyd Newton.

Elko, Nev.

I wish to protest the closing of the U.S. Weather Bureau Station in Elko. We need this service in Elko County badly.

Mrs. B. M. Fairchild.

Elko, Nev.

We are greatly in favor of keeping the weather station open. It is a valuable asset to our community.

Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Daniels.

Elko, Nev.,
March 14, 1969.

To Whom It May Concern:

It would be a serious mistake to close the Weather Bureau office at Elko. Agriculture, the traveling public, aviation and recreation are served and depend on the reports from this station which serves a large isolated area.

Grant W. Turner.

Gentlemen: This is to request that you continue to broadcast the weather through the facilities of the E.S.S.A. There is no other service like this in this area.

Also, please do everything in your power to prevent the closing down of the Weather Bureau here.

Max Wignall.

Gentlemen: Will you please keep the weather broadcasts on the air. Also, do what you can to stop the government from closing the local weather station.

Norman L. Brown.

March 17, 1969.

We wish to protest the closing of the Elko Weather Bureau. We are ranchers in the Ruby Valley area and find the reports are beneficial in our business.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Blaine Sharp.

March 20, 1969.

I would like to protest the closing of the Weather Station here in Elko. The service provided by them is extremely important to our operation at the QU Ranch, Lee in calving, feeding-etc. Our losses could be much more severe without their weather forecasts.

George Fairchild.

Box 525,
Carlin, Nev.

If they take our weather reports away we will not be able to know what to expect weather wise.

We always listen to the weather report 3 times a day.

Mrs. Mary Roose.

Elko, Nev.

Please don't let the U.S. Weather Bureau close in Elko, Nevada. We need it very badly.

T. T. Fairchild, Jr.

March 23, 1969.

Dear Sirs: Please add my name to the list asking that the Essel Weather Bureau remain in Elko.

It's been a ritual in our family to listen to the weather news . . . it's not only helped local families but is a necessity to our stockmen and out in the country ranchers.

Both Mr. Bostic and Omar Sinclair have been accommodating and a help to our community.

Thank you,

Ruth S. Toral.

Elko, Nev.
March 8, 1969.

KELK:

We hope and pray, Weather report will not be closed down.

Living on a ranch, we surely rely on daily reports. It's a wonderful service.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Moore.

Petition

To: U.S. Department of Commerce, ESSA Weather Bureau.

Gentlemen: The undersigned directors of the Davis County, Utah, Horticultural Society, having been instructed by its membership to submit this petition, hereby respectfully urge the expansion, rather than reduction, of weather reporting stations and forecasting facilities at Elko, Nevada, and the general area feeding weather to west central Utah.

We have experienced severe, damaging winds and frosts which have escaped forecast by reason of the limited facilities in this front. Our efforts at fruit crop protection are wasted when we are surprised by such weather from our blind side.

Your early attention to this matter will be most helpful and appreciated.

Respectfully,

J. Lloyd Mullis,
President.
Chester P. Call,
Alden Burton,
Ellis R. Wilson,
Glenn B. Manning,
Directors.

Dated March 24, 1969.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we commemorate this week, on April 4, the tragic death of a man who devoted his entire life to the cause of humanity.

The history of our Nation and of the world shall long mourn that day.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a man of heroic dimensions. His every word and deed attested to a wholehearted faith in the dignity and equality of men.

His faith in these ideals was unshakable.

His courage in denouncing injustice was dauntless.

His efforts to bring about change were tireless.

His method of achieving change was nonviolence.

It is primarily in the field of human rights for black Americans that the late Dr. King is remembered. But his efforts were by no means confined by racial boundaries.

Martin Luther King's love and compassion were extended to all mankind. His struggle was carried on for the oppressed everywhere, espousing the philosophy of Frederick Douglass:

I know of no rights of race superior to the rights of humanity.

On the first anniversary of Dr. King's violent and untimely death, let us honor the memory of this great American with a firm resolve that his dream shall be a reality, and that his life's efforts shall not have been in vain.

A SYSTEMATIC LOOK AT COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the past two decades the U.S. Government has spent over $2 billion of the taxpayers' money in a massive research and development program to enlarge the Nation's energy supply by creating a whole new industry—nuclear power. Today, however, that industry supplies only a fraction of a percent of the Nation's energy demand, and additional billions in public funds will have to be spent to increase its share.

Over this same 20-year period, Federal preoccupation with nuclear energy has resulted in relative official indifference toward the potential of our most abundant resource, coal. Losing its transportation market after the war the coal industry, in the shadow of this indifference, struggled almost alone through its own private depression. With practically no Government help, it captured an important share of a fast-growing market—electric power generation—solely by virtue of the low cost of its product. Today coal has regained a precarious economic security through its ability to meet over half the Nation's demand for cheap electricity, and one-fourth of the total energy demand.

And what of tomorrow? There is every indication that the Government will continue to lavish money on the golden calf of atomic power—money that could better be spent in developing the potential of coal. America's energy demands are swelling; consumption patterns are changing; only coal is capable of supplying unlimited energy in any form that the shifting market needs.

This capability rests on two factors. The first is coal's abundance. By the most conservative definition, America's coal reserves total three-quarters of a trillion tons—enough to last several centuries at present rates of consumption. Improved mining technology or higher prices could substantially increase the reserve figure. For all practical purposes, then, our coal resources are unlimited. By contrast, substantial new discoveries of oil, gas, and uranium will have to be made if the supply of these fuels is to last even through the next 30 years.

The second factor underlying coal's unique capability to supply any energy market is its versatility. Although most coal is today consumed in solid form, it can be converted to liquid and gaseous fuels as well. Consequently, whatever changes in energy consumption the future may bring—from the emergence of an all-electric economy to the development of individual fuel cells for private homes—coal can be relied on to supply the demand. True, coal-conversion processes are uneconomic at present. But diligent research could reduce the costs, and the research would be directed toward the broader utilization of a virtually unlimited resource. Surely it makes sense to divert, to this cause, some of the millions now being spent on broadening the market for our limited resources of nuclear fuels.

Coal's potential versatility contrasts sharply with the narrow uses actually being made of this fuel. Over half of the coal mined today is consumed in a single application, power generation, by a single method, combustion, to create steam that spins turbines. It is not surprising that the use of coal is so restricted; the industry's return from the brink of economic extinction could only have been accomplished by securing a significant part of an extremely high tonnage market. Of coal's many possibilities, industry correctly chose the one for which demand was greatest and growing fastest.

The demand for energy, however, is constantly changing. Projections for energy consumption show an increase of 50 percent by 1980, and 300 percent by the end of this century. Changes in technology could drastically alter the form in which we consume energy—whether as electric power, liquid fuels, or gases. In anticipation of such changes—and history tells us that they must, indeed, be anticipated—let us examine the ability of our present fuel resources to meet tomorrow's demands.

Petroleum is the "high prestige" fuel source in today's markets. Its products are widely favored for their ease of transportation and convenience of use, and America is dependent on petroleum for a full third of its energy needs. There are clear signs, however, that this dependency may entail risks. The Nation's "proved reserves" of petroleum total only about one-third of the projected demand between now and 1980. This means that, to guarantee an adequate supply of petroleum for the next decade alone, the industry will have to insure the availability of nearly three times the crude oil now known to be available.

Two ways of attempting such a guarantee are being pursued. The first is to increase the precentage of petroleum recovered from known underground reservoirs; the second is to find new reservoirs. Both are expensive. Neither can give certainty of success. Nevertheless, outstanding successes in both areas will be required to eliminate the possibility of a petroleum shortage, based on today's consumption habits. Although it is true that the industry is increasing its recovery rate, and adds to its reserves yearly, it cannot guarantee that these activities will add the necessary quantity to America's petroleum reserves through the end of the century, or even in the next 10 years. For coal, however, with its unlimited reserves, no such efforts are required; no such guarantee is necessary. The recent acquisition of large coal deposits by several major oil firms is eloquent testimony to these facts.

For natural gas, the situation is much the same as for petroleum. The known supply of gas is adequate to meet the total expected demand for this fuel for approximately the next two decades. Like petroleum, however, gas accounts for a full third of the Nation's energy use, and the gas industry's ability to continue supplying such a large share of the market rests on its ability to greatly increase proved reserves by the year 2000. Although gas reserves, like those of oil, can be expected to grow by a certain percentage yearly, the industry cannot give assurance that the growth will be great enough to meet the projected demand. This is not to say that very large increases in gas reserves are impossible; merely that they are not certain. The uncertainty could be eliminated by development of an economic process for making a substitute pipeline gas from coal.

The potential of atomic power, the "glamour fuel," to satisfy a significant share of America's growing energy demands is at present uncertain. The capital costs of installing reactors are high, and growing faster than the installation costs of other power sources. Increased reactor efficiency would help offset this trend, but recent experience has shown how difficult and expensive is the research needed to make reactors more efficient. Indeed, "the promise of the atom" has been broken more than once. For example, development of the highly touted breeder reactor, which is supposed to create more fuel than it consumes, has been long delayed by unforeseen technical problems. Solving them will cost many hundreds of millions of dollars beyond the sums already spent on nuclear power. A lesser amount spent on coal research would assure a much bigger and more versatile source of energy—and would assure it sooner.

The future of oil shale as an energy source is even more tenuous than that of atomic power. Although oil shale reserves are larger, in terms of energy content, then reserves of any other fuel except coal, no industry exists to exploit this resource. And none is likely to appear in the foreseeable future, judging by the negative industrial response to the Interior Department's recent offer of shale lands for production leases. At present, therefore, we cannot depend on oil shale as a resource—only as a resource potential.

And that brings us to coal: the most dependable, as well as the most abundant, energy resource of all. As we have seen, coal reserves are practically unlimited, and can supply energy in any form. Used in a rather primitive way, coal already supplies about one-fourth of the Nation's energy. Research could make it possible for coal to be used in many other ways, however, supplying markets now dependent on far less abundant fuels.

Now, I am not arguing that coal is an "ideal fuel," or that it should be used in place of all others. It is desirable that the Nation's energy consumers should be able to select among alternative fuels, if only to spur the competition between industries that plays such an important role in keeping prices down. This freedom of choice, however, is limited today by the failure of technology to make coal available in more than one form. Furthermore, coal alone can serve as a "backstop," or energy reserve, in the event that our soaring energy consumption depletes the reserves of one or more other fuels. Experts agree that a truly

XUM

serious shortage of oil, say, or natural gas, is unlikely in the foreseeable future; nevertheless, it could happen, particularly as the result of an unforeseen emergency. If it did happen, the consequences would be disastrous for the Nation. And our only present assurance that it will not happen is the industry's confidence that enormous supplies of oil and gas remain to be discovered and tapped. While the industry may stake its own future economic security on such assumptions, the Nation must be more conservative. Commercially feasible ways of converting coal to oil and gas must be developed as insurance against a long-term decline in oil and gas reserves. Likewise, more sophisticated and efficient methods of turning coal into electricity must be perfected, if only to be available while nuclear physicists and engineers attempt to justify their faith in atomic power.

Accepting coal's abundance, then, as an invitation to make better use of this resource in the national interest—what needs to be done? The answer is research. A broad and intensified research effort must be undertaken to propel the technology of mining, processing, and using coal into a position of equivalence with the advanced technologies of the other fuel resources. Oil, gas, and uranium have all benefited from research programs much more intensive than any ever devoted to coal; it is time to correct the imbalance.

The cost of correction will be high, but not as high as the cost of some less rewarding, more glamorous research programs now underway. For example, the Government spends at least $150 million yearly on development of civilian nuclear reactors; no more than one-third to half of that amount would be required, over a 10- or 15-year period, to fully develop the energy potential of coal.

This expense, furthermore, should be borne by the Federal Government, on the same grounds that it now supports nuclear power research: that the Nation benefits from a wider choice of possible energy sources. This principle, though a good one, has never been pursued with consistency by the Federal research establishment, which has long scanted coal to spend more money on nuclear power and even oil and gas research. An exhaustive 1964 report on "Energy Research and Development and National Progress," submitted to Donald Hornig, then Presidential science adviser, revealed the extent of the imbalance. Although oil and gas are well-established and wealthy industries, the Government spent nearly four times as much on oil and gas research in 1963—the year under study—as on coal.

This pattern of mistaken priorities continues today. The coal industry cannot correct the balance; it is not prosperous enough to afford the research expenditures. This becomes clear when you consider the structure of today's coal industry. It is composed largely of relatively small companies that supply relatively minor portions of the total domestic output. Only a very few of our coal producing firms are large enough to support effective research efforts. So, if a research job that will benefit the entire industry and the public is to be done, it will have to be done by the Federal Government.

In doing it, however, the Government will encounter a remarkable opportunity. An adequate coal research program will have to cover so many different areas—from mining through treatment to end use, and even waste disposal—that the modern concepts of "systems technology" can be applied for the first time on a broad industrial scale.

Using the "systems" approach, the mining, processing and use of coal would be seen as a single continuum in which every operation is linked to all the others. The goals of the system would be to produce adequate quantities of low-cost fuel while minimizing hazards to the health and safety of those employed in the industry, as well as the environmental pollution associated with coal. Every operation in the system would be designed with these goals in mind. For example, mining methods would be selected, not merely for high productivity, but to reduce mine safety and health hazards as well. Today, by contrast, many hazards are actually caused by the mining methods used, and techniques have had to be developed to cope with problems that need not ever have arisen.

The systems concept has been most spectacularly applied to the Nation's space program, and the recent flights of Apollo 8 and 9 show how well systems engineering can work. It is time we applied it on and under the earth to solve problems that are rooted in the haphazard and undirected growth of today's technology. Problems like mine safety are not the inevitable results of industrialization; they are instead the undesirable byproducts of an unsystematic technology.

Let me point out that the idea of a "coal system" does not imply the ultimate merger of all the industries concerned, in one way or another, with coal. It only means that all would accept, as common goals, the need to produce, transport and use coal at low cost, in high volume, and with minimal threats to the Nation's environment and the industry's own workers. From such acceptance can flow the cooperative adoption of new technology systems that actually cross industry lines to permit the more effective use of America's coal. Indeed, the need for such inter-industry cooperation has already been recognized, and has spurred such developments as the unit-train. The railroads have adapted their service more closely to the requirements of both coal producers and coal users, and as a result all three benefit.

Systems engineering would provide an effective way to deal with the major problems facing the coal industry today. In the field of coal mine health and safety, effective mining systems could be developed to minimize or eliminate most of the so-called "inherent hazards of coal mining." Systems technology could also provide methods of eliminating the environmental pollution problems now associated with coal, from acid mine water to fly ash and sulfur dioxide. Such problems are typical side-effects of technologies whose full implications have not been thought out by those who designed them. Finally, a full-fledged "coal utilization system" would be able to meet rapidly shifting demands for any kind of energy, from electric power to liquid fuels, with a flexibility unknown to industry today.

To realize all those benefits, however, work must begin now. I recommend that research toward an all-inclusive coal utilization system be undertaken in the Department of the Interior, where the Bureau of Mines has been working on research that will lead to development of new and improved mining systems for several years. The Bureau's mining and coal research facilities, together with Interior's Office of Coal Research, would serve as a nucleus for this advanced program.

The research would cover three broad areas. First, improvement of the methods by which coal is currently mined, transported, processed and used. Incorporating such existing programs as the Bureau of Mines' mine systems effort, this phase would concentrate on reducing the cost of coal for conventional applications, improving the industry's safety record, and dealing with environmental problems. The objective would be to introduce systems technology to the industry as it now exists.

The second area of research, directed toward the coal industry of tomorrow, would concentrate on unconventional methods of converting coal to electricity. One of the most promising—and formidably named—is magneto-hydrodynamic power, or MHD for short. This system burns coal at about 4,000 degrees Fahrenheit, creating a plasma which generates an electric current when passed through a magnetic field. A workable MHD generator would be able to extract much more electricity from a ton of coal than the best of today's steam turbines, which have reached the limits of their efficiency with current technology.

In addition, pollution from an MHD generator could be greatly reduced, compared to pollution levels associated with today's powerplants. The sulfur and nitrogen compounds that constitute the most common air pollutants from conventional coal-fired powerplants would be recoverable, in an MHD plant, as commercially valuable chemicals. Thus, when such generators are developed for industrial use, the coal consumption subsystem will incorporate a pollution control subsystem. MHD power is the subject of a modest Bureau of Mines research program which should be substantially and quickly enlarged.

The final broad area of research, under the coal utilization systems program, would cover conversion of coal to liquid and gaseous fuels. Coal conversion is not only theoretically possible; at one time or another it has provided liquid and gaseous fuels to nations cut off from conventional supplies. Although none of the known processes is economic in America today, some research is underway on reducing costs. Much of this research is being conducted by the Department of the Interior, and serious consideration

XUM

should be given to expansion of the work in this field.

In the Bureau of Mines, basic research is attacking the fundamental problem of coal conversion, adding hydrogen to the coal molecule. A Bureau-discovered process using electrochemical hydrogenation offers a possible breakthrough in coal conversion, and the project deserves all possible support. Also noteworthy are two Bureau efforts in the more conventional field of catalytic hydrogenation: one employing unusually low temperatures and pressures, and the other using catalysts in massive quantities.

In the Office of Coal Research, contracts are awarded to qualified organizations outside the Federal Government for work on coal. Several current awards involve conversion of coal to liquids and gases by methods considered promising enough to justify work on a pilot-plant, or even demonstration-plant, scale.

These are only a few examples of the farsighted coal conversion research efforts in the Department of the Interior. Such efforts do not in themselves, however, constitute a systems approach to coal utilization; they must be carefully coordinated with all other phases of the coal-utilization program. This means that the Department will have to exercise a more centralized control over its various coal projects, from mining research to the award of contracts for pilot plants. I would hope to see the Department submit, in the reasonably near future, an overall plan for conducting its coal utilization systems program, including clear assignments of responsibility for the coordination and conduct of the various subsystem projects.

Finally, in drawing up such a plan, I hope the Department will make adequate provision for employing the substantial resources of both industry and the academic community. Although the coal industry cannot fund the entire effort on its own, it can supply both talented manpower, and the field facilities needed to test new developments once they pass out of the laboratory stage. The intimate involvement of industry scientists and engineers will insure the speedier adoption of systems technology as it becomes available. Similarly, the academic community should be able to provide important help in the research and development stages through such mechanisms as grant and contract awards. The current functions of the Office of Coal Research provide a pattern on which the Department could base an expanded effort of this type.

We are talking about no small job—the development of a wholly new coal utilization system. All available capabilities, both Government and private, must be used to the fullest if this revolutionary idea is to become a reality. When it does, though—I say when, not if—the Nation will have, for the first time, a wholly dependable source of energy to meet whatever demands the future may bring. And perhaps even more important, we will have demonstrated effectively that the exploitation of natural resources is not incompatible with the preservation of a healthful, undamaged environment, or the health and safety of workers in our vital resources industries.

I am glad to see, from testimony presented by Secretary Hickel recently, that he recognizes the potential inherent in a strong research effort on coal and that his Department is committed to such an effort to the extent of its resources. I urge that we here in the Congress do all in our power to see that those resources are adequate.

CRUIKSHANK SUCCEEDS EDELMAN AS LEADER OF NATIONAL COUNSEL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Council of Senior Citizens has been fortunate in its choice of men to serve as its president. Aime Forand, a distinguished Congressman and one of the pioneers in the fight for medicare, was its first leader. He was succeeded by John Edelman, one of the great spokesmen for labor and for other worthy causes of deep meaning for all Americans.

Mr. Edelman has now been advised by his physicians that he must retire from his duties as president, but he will remain as chairman of the NCSC National Advisory Committee. Even though the friends of NCSC will miss Mr. Edelman's day-to-day presence, they will still benefit from his wisdom and experience.

An announcement in today's issue of the Senior Citizens News—the monthly publication of NCSC—gives the welcome news that a worthy successor has been found for Mr. Edelman.

He is Nelson H. Cruikshank, former Director of the Social Security Department of the American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations, and a world-renowned expert on social insurance. Mr. Cruikshank comes to his new position with many qualifications and a multitude of honors. I ask unanimous consent to have the Senior Citizens News printed to provide information about the new acting president of NCSC, and I wish to extend my own personal welcome, as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, to an old friend who is taking on new and very important responsibilities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C., Senior Citizens News, April 1969]

CRUIKSHANK SUCCEEDS EDELMAN AS NATIONAL COUNCIL PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 1.—A distinguished former American labor official who is a world expert on social insurance is the new leader of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Nelson H. Cruikshank of Washington, D.C., former Director of the Social Security Department of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, has accepted the invitation of retiring President J. W. Edelman and the officers of the National Council of Senior Citizens to serve immediately as Acting President of the 2,500,000-member organization until NCSC's Eighth Annual Convention June 5-6-7 when Cruikshank's name will be formally placed in nomination for convention approval.

Edelman told the members of the National Council's Executive Board that his doctors had advised his immediate retirement from the heavy duties of National President. As a President Emeritus, he will continue to serve the National Council as chairman of its National Advisory Committee, though no longer able to devote full time to the day-to-day operations of the National Council. "At this moment when the National Council is needed more than ever before to stimulate nationwide effort to bring a better life for our older people, we are extremely fortunate that there is an outstanding national leader, a long time supporter of the National Council, to take the helm," said Edelman.

GIFTED SPEAKER

Cruikshank is one of the earliest supporters of the National Council of Senior Citizens and has served as chairman of its National Advisory Committee. He is well-known to NCSC convention delegates for he has not missed attending an NCSC convention since 1962. He is a gifted public speaker whose services have been sought after for conferences and conventions of many national organizations.

Cruikshank has been one of the principal architects of progressive social legislation supported by the organized labor movement over many years. His wise counsel in this area of legislation has been sought by the leadership of both political parties in the U.S. Congress and his testimony before the standing committees of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives has been much valued and widely circulated.

Cruikshank coordinated the AFL–CIO campaign for Medicare and was a key strategist in labor's successful campaign to add disability benefits to the Social Security system.

He was appointed a member of the Government's statutory advisory councils on social security in 1948–49, 1958–59 and 1964. He was a member of a special consultant's group to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on social security in 1954.

EXPERT ON MEDICARE

Cruikshank was the receipient of NCSC's Aime J. Forand Award in 1965—along with colleague Andy Biemiller, legislative representative of AFL–CIO—for his efforts in the Medicare fight.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965, which authorized the Medicare program, also established the Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council (HIBAC) which was charged with advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters of general policy in the formulation of regulations and the administration of the Medicare program.

Cruikshank has served on this committee since its inception as a spokesman for the general public and last Fall he was reappointed for a further four years. Since April, 1968, one of his colleagues on that committee has been National Council Executive Director William R. Hutton.

The new leader of the National Council of Senior Citizens was born in Bradner, Ohio, in 1902. He attended public schools at Fostoria, Ohio, and graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1925. He attended Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1929.

As a youth Cruikshank worked in automobile factories in and around the Toledo, Ohio, area and he was employed for three seasons on Great Lakes steamships.

From 1930 to 1933 he directed a relief program at Brooklyn, New York, for the Federation of Churches.

He directed a workers' educational program at Yale University for the Connecticut Central Labor Union and was organizer for the American Federation of Labor in Connecticut from 1933 to 1935.

XUM

The next year he directed a WPA Workers Education Program at New York University, New York City.

Between 1937 and 1942, Cruikshank was a labor relations expert for the Farm Security Administration, being director of the Administration's Migratory Labor Camp Program for the last two years of this period.

He was Executive Assistant to the Labor Members of the Management-Labor Advisory Committee, War Manpower Administration, and Deputy Vice Chairman of the Commission in charge of labor relations in 1943 and 1944.

In 1944, he served as Director of Social Insurance Activities of the American Federation of Labor.

INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Then, he moved to Paris, France, where he was Director of the Labor Division of the U.S. Economic Cooperation Administration in 1951 and 1952.

Returning to the U.S. in 1953, he was named Director of the AFL–CIO Social Security Department, the position he held until his retirement in 1965.

Cruikshank was a member of the U.S. Delegation to the First General Assembly of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission (UNESCO) in 1946 and a member of the U.S. Delegation of the First General Assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1948.

Since 1966 he has been a member of the Committee of Experts in Social Security, International Labor Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Cruikshank served three terms as a member of the Advisory Council on Employment Security, reporting to the Secretary of Labor.

He is a member of the Board of Visitors for Duke University's Divinity School.

During the 1969 Spring term, he is a Visiting Professor of Social Science at Pennsylvania State University. Since his retirement from AFL–CIO, he has also served as Visiting Professor, School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, and has been a lecturer at the School of Social Work, University of Michigan.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

A REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, today, our country stands at crossroads. The choices we make now and as we enter the 1970's will shape our policies for many years to come. They will affect the character of the world as well.

As we look about us, we see a world in turmoil, both within states and in relations between states. Transitions are all about us and it is clear that we are coming to the end of an era, if we are not already there. For that reason, I think it is absolutely mandatory that we review our present policies to bring them in line with current trends and the realities which are developing in the world at large. As I survey the scope of our foreign affairs and foreign involvements it is clear to me that too many policies, both domestic and foreign, are rooted in the Second World War, and in the years just following that mammoth conflict. The world is not the same as it was in the late 1940's and early 1950's. It has changed greatly and significantly. Our policies unfortunately seem not to reflect these changes. As I have said before, events have bypassed policy, and it is imperative in my judgment that we move to a new basis for the conduct of our foreign relations.

This is the import of Senate Document No. 13 of this Congress, which has been placed on the desks of all Senators. It is a report prepared by me for the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and after an 89-day tour I made of Russia and the Far East from September 27 to December 24, 1968.

Fifty-three days of that tour were spent inside the vast territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This tour represented my fifth visit to the U.S.S.R., and, for the first time, in one trip, I was able to visit the capitals of each of the 15 Soviet Republics, as well as 16 other major cities.

One cannot travel through and over the Russian domain without being impressed by the changes and growth that have taken place in that sprawling territory. Everywhere I went material progress was discernible. The people were living in a prosperity unknown to them, although still far behind the standards of America or even some of the Western democracies. The construction of vast housing complexes was proceeding apace in every city I visited. The development of natural resources, such as the oil and gas fields, mining of various minerals and the construction of tremendous hydroelectric facilities must be seen to be believed.

All over the country from the Ukraine to the reaches of Asia and Siberia, industrialization has been pushed at full speed. One cannot help being impressed by this progress. Although all of us abhor communism, it is plain that as an ideology it has been successful in marshaling forth unprecedented efforts by the people themselves in building a viable and mighty national economy. The fact that it has been so successful holds important implications for the foreign policy of our Nation. I shall return to this question in a moment.

But this very success also holds important implications for the internal operations and administration of the U.S.S.R. as well. It will be recalled that Stalin, who grew to power in the midst of ignorance and poverty, ruled Russia with an iron hand from the death of V. I. Lenin in 1924 until his own death in 1953. During that entire period, there was no place for dissent except among the highest bureaucratic circles within the Communist Party headed by Joseph Stalin. As a matter of fact, after the Stalinist purges there was very little dissent at all and Stalin's word became law.

This was a period where the Russian leaders saw as their overriding concern the building of Russia into a mighty world power. Such a base of national power was needed, according to Russian lights, to protect the U.S.S.R. from external attack and give it a strong voice in world affairs. All national efforts were aimed at providing a heavy industrial base for the economy and Stalin saw this as the quickest and surest road to attain Russian national power. In this effort, he brooked no argument or dissent and the overriding need of his country acted to reinforce his hand among the people.

Under the impetus of the Stalinist ideology and its 5-year plans, Russia was turned from an agrarian, semi-industrial state into one of the major powers of the world. This brought severe stresses and changes within the Russian society; it brought to the surface, among other things on the part of the Russian people—the consumers, the workers, the farmers, in other words, the man in the street—a yearning for a better way of life. Without a doubt, this yearning had existed for many years, but for the first time, the resources with which to satisfy these desires became available to the leadership. The people began to exert pressure upon the leaders who were forced to seek ways and means of answering these demands. With the attainment of a great power status and industrial might, pressures for social and economic changes began to develop. Diversity of viewpoint began to make itself felt and the death of Stalin in 1953 signaled a change in domestic policy of far-reaching consequences.

I first visited Russia in 1955, 2 years after Stalin's death. I believe it was Tocqueville, while touring the United States in the mid-19th century, who first stated that the questions of the next century would be decided between the United States and Russia. This European saw that in terms of inherent national power, only Russia could match the United States. In 1955, it was clear to me that his point of reference had been reached.

Thirteen years ago, the cold war, as an extension of World War II, was very much in evidence. In spite of the so-called spirit of Geneva, which grew up for a time after the late President Eisenhower's meeting with Khrushchev in that year, only two states felt themselves locked in deadly conflict. Even at the time of my first visit, I was very much concerned with the implications this held for the future of the world. It seemed to me that there was a great deal of pettiness marking the relations on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and until the question of a basic approach could be solved, no progress could be made toward the construction of a peaceful world community. Although I had no desire to defend the Russians or Russian actions, it seemed to me that our policy planners were making a basic mistake in allowing Russian attitudes to control their own.

XUM

Fight communism with military might became the war cry and Congress followed through with more funds to meet the Communist threat. Our diplomatic channels were almost closed. We were engaging in a child's play of reacting to each Russian move in the cold war. I felt that it would be much better for our Nation to assume a magnanimous attitude in an effort to lay the groundwork for a more cooperative attitude in the future. To cite one example, I will recall the following instance which occurred while I was visiting in Moscow in 1955:

Mr. Bohlen was our Ambassador at that time. Prior to my visit, I had sent him a questionnaire to be answered, followed by a letter. In the letter I asked all the embassies which I visited that year to make appointments for me with ranking members of the government in their countries.

When I reached Moscow, I went to the American Embassy and Mr. Bohlen received me. In the course of our conversation I asked him whether he had made an appointment for me with any members of the Politburo. His answer was in the negative. I asked him had he received my letter asking that it be done, and he said yes, he had received the letter, but said he had strict instructions to make no appointments for me with any member of the Russian Government.

I was kind of amazed at that and asked him where did he get his orders. He said they came from the State Department. I told him that if I had known that earlier, I might have been able to arrange things before I left. I asked him would he send a cable to the State Department asking that I be allowed to make my own appointments. He replied that he would, but that it would serve no purpose. He said, "If you meet with any of them you might speak 5 minutes, but you will never get anything out of them."

"Well," I said, "Mr. Bohlen, let me be the judge of that."

Mr. Bohlen sent the cable to Washington and within approximately 3 hours he received a cable back consenting to my making my own appointments.

After receiving that information from Washington, I called on the secretary to Mr. Bohlen and asked her to get the telephone number of the Foreign Office in Moscow so that I could telephone there. In time, she gave me the telephone number. When I reached over to use a telephone in the Embassy which was on Mr. Bohlen's desk, he said, "Don't touch that. You cannot use a telephone in any part of this Embassy to telephone the Foreign Office. Those are orders of long standing."

I said, "What has become of us? What is the trouble here? I came here to get information and to speak to these people to see if we can get together."

"Well," he said, "you won't gain anything by doing that."

He reached down in his pocket and gave me two or three coins so that I could go downstairs and use a pay telephone. Why he did not want me to telephone from the Embassy to the Foreign Office I could never say, except that he had strict orders from the State Department.

I went downstairs to the pay telephone and called up the Foreign Office in Moscow. In a matter of less than 30 minutes I had made an appointment for the next day with none other than Mr. Mikoyan, who was then serving as the chief economist for the Soviet Union—a very capable man.

When I returned to Mr. Bohlen's office, I told him what I had done. He was very much disturbed, for some reason or other. He reiterated that I would be wasting my time by going to see Mr. Mikoyan. I repeated that I was going to be the judge of that.

In the meantime, I visited several cooperatives in the environs of Moscow, and in speaking to the heads of the collective farms, I found that there was much dissatisfaction on the collective farms because they were not allowed to own their own machinery to work the land assigned to them. They also had to sign a contract for the sale of whatever they produced before the planting of any commodity. Of course, they were very much disturbed about that. So, the next day, when I visited Mr. Mikoyan, I opened up the conversation with him on that subject.

Before I left the embassy, Mr. Bohlen had asked if I would object to having one of his men come with me. I told him that I would not object at all, if it would not disturb me in making my appointment with Mr. Mikoyan. I said, "If he agrees, it will be agreeable to me." I told Mr. Bohlen that what I could do was merely to let one of the Embassy staff come along with me. At the Kremlin, permission was granted for the Embassy representative to accompany me to the meeting.

So I began to discuss with Mr. Mikoyan the conditions I found on the collective farms. He was very interested. Mr. Mikoyan talked with me, not 4 or 5 minutes, but 2 hours. I actually ran out of questions.

I got up, and Mr. Mikoyan asked me, "Where are you going from here?" I said, "My itinerary calls for me to go from Moscow to Rumania. I would like to visit Russia, but I understand that I cannot." He asked, "Who told you that?" I said, "The State Department"—which was true. He said, "Name the places, and I will give you permission to go."

I told him that I was at the every end of my trip, and it was getting cold—it was in November—and I asked him if he would permit me to come the next year, which was 1956. He said, "Yes. All you need do is write me, tell me where you want to go, and I will give you permission to go wherever you want."

I asked him if I could carry a camera with me. He said I could.

I asked him if I could have my own interpreter. He said I could.

So when I went in 1956, those conditions were met.

After leaving Mr. Mikoyan, the State Department representative and I got into the car to go back to the Embassy. There were 2 or 3 minutes of absolute silence in the car. Finally, he said to me, "Senator, I have been here in Moscow for about a year. I learned more from the conversation that you had with Mr. Mikoyan in 2 hours than I have in the last 12 months."

I said to him, "The trouble with you fellows is that whenever you want to discuss matters with these people, you have chips on your shoulders. He never hesitated to answer any questions; did he?"

Mr. Guthrie said, "No. He impressed me."

I said, "You could do the same thing, if only you acted as I did."

We reached the Embassy. Mr. Bohlen was very interested in what I had to say. He expected me back within 4 or 5 minutes after I reached there, and when I stayed over 2 hours, he became concerned. So when I went back to the Embassy, Mr. Bohlen was quite excited. He asked me what had taken place. I said, "I am not going to tell you. You ask your own man, and whatever he tells you I will vouch for."

So on leaving the Embassy, I jokingly told Mr. Bohlen—although I meant it—that, in his book, the only good Russian was a dead one. I left and continued my tour of Moscow and its environs.

When I returned from the Soviet Union, it appeared clearly to me that every possible step should be taken to break down the walls between the peoples of Russia and the peoples of America. I felt that more people-to-people contact would redound to our benefit many times over if the people of Russia could be brought into contact with the Western World to see what we had accomplished and how we had accomplished it. It would have an immense effect upon the domestic considerations of the Russian leadership. As I said, the trend toward social and political diversity was already developing and making itself felt among the Russian people. I felt this was a trend which we should make every effort to encourage. Instead, the State and Defense Departments were wedded to the idea that Russia could be isolated and that she could not develop her resources, prepare for war, and feed and clothe her people at one and the same time.

I do not believe it can ever or should ever be forgotten how greatly the history of Russia differs from our own. With our beginnings as an open democratic society, with the insulation that two great oceans and friendly neighbors have provided, and with the tradition of free speech and free political activity, it is always difficult for the American people to acknowledge that none of these factors have been present in Russian society. Since its inception under the czars and under the rule of a hierarchial church, Russian society has been marked by a suppression of all dissent. Personal freedom was virtually unknown, particularly among the serfs and peasants and the urban masses. When revolts occurred, as in the late 19th century and in 1905, they were put down ruthlessly. Political agitators were either driven underground, or to Siberia, or to the wall.

Russia is bordered by potential enemies; she has always lived in fear. Her present-day attitude must be viewed in the light of the Tatar invasion of the past and of the more recent invasions from the West. Western leaders from Napoleon to Hitler have sought to ex-

XUM

tend their power to Russian soil. The fact that American troops were among the western forces seeking to overturn the 1917 Revolution has not been forgotten. As a matter of fact, I doubt that the American people in general are aware that between 1918 and 1920, American soldiers were occupying Siberian soil. We can only imagine what a state our national consciousness would be in if a similar situation had prevailed within our borders only 50 years ago, or if our cities had been besieged by Hitler's hordes. I viewed areas of Russia where wanton carnage and willful destruction of homes led to much grief, sorrow, and suffering.

I have pointed out that communism, or at least the leaders of communism, has been successful in turning Russia from the stepchild of Europe into a mighty world power. Make no mistake about it, the Russian people themselves appreciate this change, for as I have said, they are living better today than they have ever lived before. This was true in 1955 and it is even more apparent today. Therefore, I recommended that in addition to establishing the widest possible personal contacts with the Russian people, all of our information and propaganda programs should aim at extolling the virtues of democracy and free enterprise and make no effort to attack the accomplishments of communism. These accomplishments were real, they were there for all to see and they were appreciated by the people; and such attacks would only make the people more suspicious of our intentions.

I again visited Russia in 1956 and 1957, as well as in 1961. By 1961, the changing tendencies obvious 6 years before were becoming more and more evident. Much decentralization of the economy had taken place. A form of local control in both agriculture and industry was making itself known.

More emphasis was being placed on the production of consumer goods as opposed to heavy industry. It should be emphasized that these changes were forced upon the Russian leadership. Although Khrushchev inaugurated many reforms, he was in fact doing little more than riding with the tide. The liberalizing trends which economic progress brings to any society were being acknowledged. Scholars have come to point out that economic progress means more liberalism in social and political spheres—a point which I made on my first visit to Russia in 1955.

This brings me to a second point, which I first sensed in 1957 but which I brought out forcibly in 1961; namely, that our policy of containment was working at cross purposes with our long-range interests vis-a-vis Russia. In my estimation, even at that time containment had served its purpose. The expansionist tendencies in the U.S.S.R. had been checked. On the other hand, the hopes of other exponents of containment had not been realized. Russia had not been isolated and weakened; the reverse was true. The U.S.S.R. was stronger than ever. The industrial base had been broadened, and its people were better off and more contented than before. It seemed to me at the time, and this view has become stronger in the last 8 years, that our proper course was to aim at removing the suspicions existing between the Russian people and the American people. Certainly containment did not do anything in this direction. The construction of a ring of steel around Russia from Japan, to the Philippines, to North Africa, to Western Europe, sponsored by the Defense Department, had the reverse effect. Under these conditions, there was no way to make the Russians believe they were not threatened by American military men and American military power. On my first visit, as well as subsequent ones, I was asked, "Why surround our country with such might." My answer was, for defense, which did not impress the people at all.

This was particularly true after the decision was made to rearm West Germany and admit it to NATO in 1955. The Russians looked upon this action as a fundamental threat to their security in light of past history. The inclusion of West Germany in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization lead to the creation of the Warsaw Pact and the line between East and West is still drawn today. The rehabilitation of Japan by us did not help the situation. More fear of us was engendered. At the time, we were told, in effect, that all of this was necessary because of greater dangers lurking ahead—the spread of Russian communism.

At the conclusion of my 1968 tour of Russia, I became convinced more than ever that our policies needed drastic changes if we really intended to set the stage for world peace.

The Russian people plainly do not want war; their leaders must realize that the continued economic progress has been made and both light industry and the production of consumer goods has been pushed ahead full speed. The system of workers incentives based on quantity of production has been replaced. It was found, as I commented in 1957 and again in 1961, that the system led to the production of shoddy goods and brought forth much criticism from the people. A new system of incentives was adopted in 1963. It is based on the quality of the goods produced and their acceptance in the marketplace. Rates of pay are based on those two features and not on their quality alone. The views of the people who purchase these goods are being sought more and more by the managers of the various plants within the country.

With the adoption of the new economic system, workers and managers are in effect practicing a form of free enterprise. Their income is now based on meeting the needs of the people as well as the government. To this end both managers and workers have been given more authority at the local level. They can buy new machines, from profits made on goods produced beyond the norm set, without having to bow to Moscow. Without a doubt this will increase the trend toward diversity, that I noted earlier. To encourage this trend, we should go further than before to bring about meaningful contacts with the people through commercial and cultural channels.

Similar changes are taking place in agriculture. The managers of cooperative farms are enjoying more authority in the operations. The structures that tied the cooperatives to state control have been, in large degree, dismantled, and the farmers can now sow and sell what they desire in a much freer market. Even communism cannot control prices when supply does not meet demand. Agricultural production is increasing. It is my belief that this is largely because of the emphasis on local control as opposed to the dictates of collectivism.

It now remains for us to devise ways and means of taking advantage of these domestic changes in our own foreign policies. For almost 20 years now, many of us in the Congress have more or less blindly followed our military spokesmen. Some have become captives of the military. We are on the verge of turning into a militaristic nation. Since the end of the Second World War we have been operating under a cold war psychology. The attention of the country has been turned abroad and the problems of our domestic life have been neglected. We have forgotten many of the traditions and values which made this country great, and we have flung men, arms, and material almost heedlessly about the world.

Mr. President, an article by Gen. David M. Shoup, entitled "The New American Militarism," in the latest edition of the Atlantic, bears out what I have been saying. General Shoup is a past Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps. Speaking of the new American militarism, he points out:

> The American people have also become more and more accustomed to miltarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun, and to the violence of combat. Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth. Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.
>
> It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism. There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals, and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion. How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exert so much martial influence upon the government and life of the American people?

XUM

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter for the rest of their careers they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions, or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques, or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others. Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions, and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The professional military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures. Unlike some of the civilian policymakers, the military has not been obsessed with the threat of Communism per se. Most military people know very little about Communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government. But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil. When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the armed forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from Communism. In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The armed forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its *General Purpose Forces* in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances. To do this it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the Unified Commands, and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Important featuers of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sea-lift forces and the Army Air Force team of air-mobility proponents. At the senior command levels parochial pride in service, personal ambitions, and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe. The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the "first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves. This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the Marines, and to attain overall command of "U.S. Forces Dominican Republic." Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82nd Airborne Division to the scene, included a lieutenant general, and took charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965 the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Viet Cong and North Vietnamese aggression. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!) So by early 1965, the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims, and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause. Much of the reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes. In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people. Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots, and opportunity for career officers.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery, and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders. Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam, they have managed the details of its conduct; and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to question the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Our militaristic culture was born of the necessities of World War, nurtured by the Korean War, and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc. Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope, and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives. The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and materiel development, and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts, and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single service doctrinaires to create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anti-Communism, national defense, and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow, and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines, and to self-maintenance and management. Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field tests. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals. Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action. Being recognized public figures in a nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician.

Flag officers are considered "experts", and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obliged not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive, and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems. Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them, are the rich and powerful defense industries. Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons, and lapel emblems, is a nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic, and well intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Viet Nam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.

Mr. President, I feel that it is time to reexamine our national interest in the light of world conditions. I have long questioned the need for us to maintain large contingents of American men about the globe, particularly in Western Europe. We say that our posture is one of defense against Russia. Russia says that its posture is for defense against the United States. As a result, we have each other in the sights of our respective atomic missiles.

As in my stated report, our military assistance to other governments has amounted to $31.4 billion from 1950 through 1968. A table in the document on each Senator's desk shows that we have 5,748 personnel still stationed throughout the world in a variety of military assistance missions. I do not think the continued maintenance of our military presence in almost every free nation of the world can be justified. It serves to increase the effect of Russian propaganda which aims at portraying the United States as a militaristic nation. I know that we are not such a nation, yet our defense expenditures since the end of World War II are not reassuring.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a document entitled "New Obligational Authority in Department of Defense."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

XUM

New obligational authority in Department of Defense

[In billions]

Year:	*Amount*
1948	$9.993
1949	10.427
1950	13.128
1951	48.248
1952	61.919
1953	49.336
1954	34.587
1955	29.665
1956	33.149
1957	36.181
1958	36.699
1959	41.233
1960	40.599
1961	41.293
1962	47.654
1963	49.797
1964	49.921
1965	49.359
1966	61.839
1967	71.935
1968	76.332
1969	[1] 73.689

[1] Does not include $2.871 proposed supplemental.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, as I point out in my report, NATO should not be extended. The ABM should not be constructed in the light of proposed talks with Russia for disarmament. We should not engage in efforts that will further broaden the suspicions and fears that now exist between us and the U.S.S.R. It is unrealistic for us to advocate peace and at the same time prepare for war.

Unless and until we can dispell the fear and suspicion between the United States and the U.S.S.R., no meaningful progress can be made in the search for world peace. I recognize that any effort on our part should be reciprocated by the Russian leaders. Certainly, the responsibility for peace does not and cannot rest on our shoulders alone. But I do believe that we can afford to make the first meaningful move. Because of the power we have as a nation, we can afford to be magnanimous. It will no doubt require the patience of Job, but we must learn to approach the Russians on a realistic diplomatic basis and extend to them the same recognition we extend to other states.

Mr. President, in my report, I have several pages devoted exclusively to conclusions and recommendations. At this point I wish to read several paragraphs from the report:

> Looking back over the perspective of 13 years, to 1955, I cannot help feeling reinforced in my original thinking; namely, that we should make every effort to give the peoples of the U.S.S.R. objective knowledge of life in the West and the United States. Furthermore, we should begin to look for actions that our nation might take to reduce the tensions between our two countries and dissipate the suspicions between our governments. Many areas suggest themselves in this regard. Our structure of foreign bases should be reexamined, to decide if all are absolutely necessary to the national interest. Under the changing world conditions, and with the advent of nuclear missiles, many of them can be dispensed with. Last year alone, our foreign military installations cost us more than $5.8 billion. (See table 1 below.) Our foreign bases are fast becoming more of an economic and political liability than military asset.
>
> Our NATO posture should be reexamined. As a collective security mechanism has it any real value after the withdrawal of France's military cooperation? It serves to give propaganda advantages to the Soviet leaders and economic advantages to our erstwhile allies. Its military advantages face to face with the Soviet Union are more questionable.
>
> We are maintaining 300,000 men in Western Europe at a cost of approximately $2.6 billion per year. If it had been left to me, I would have pulled back a majority, if not all, of our American forces from the area when President de Gaulle made it plain that we were no longer welcome on French soil. We missed a golden opportunity at the time to take action fundamentally in our interest from an economic standpoint; from the standpoint of international politics, a withdrawal would remove what the Russians cannot help seeing as a threat to their security.
>
> Directly related to the above is the fact that we are maintaining military assistance advisory groups or milgroups in 48 countries around the globe—from Belgium to Venezuela and from the Congo to Saudi Arabia. As of the end of 1968, we had 4,056 officers and men scattered among these various military groups throughout the world. These were supported by 1,692 U.S. and foreign civilians for a total military complement of 5,748. Table 2 shows the disposition of these MAAG missions and milgroups.
>
> In my opinion, from what I have seen in foreign capitals, this program should be dispensed with entirely and as soon as possible. In my view, where a U.S. military presence is advisable and indeed in our interest and the interest of the host country, the representation should be made through the regular personnel attached to our Embassy and directly responsible to our Ambassador. Should situations arise requiring special assistance, it should be made available strictly for that purpose and then withdrawn. It is foolish for us to maintain these military personnel at great expense all over the world on a continuing basis.
>
> I have two main objections to the continued overseas presence of large numbers of U.S. military personnel. First, to see officers and men moving about in foreign capitals in uniform cannot help emphasizing the military aspects of American life. In the minds of many, this presence marks us as warmongers.
>
> Second, I am convinced that the personnel attached to these military missions are instrumental in influencing host governments to build up their armed forces and weaponry at our expense. From fiscal 1950 through fiscal 1968, we have spent $31.4 billion on military assistance programs throughout the world. An expenditure of $406.7 million for such programs has been projected for fiscal 1969. Not only should we cut back on this expenditure, but the first step should be the reduction and recall of the forces which generate them.
>
> Provided that we could do so in a way which would positively demonstrate to the Russian people the advantages of the American system of agriculture, we might go so far as to extend Russia technological assistance with its agricultural problems. I would make every effort to have the Russians cooperate with us in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, rather than war. Perhaps the offers would be rejected out of hand, but that would be up to the Russian leadership. The point is that, so long as a nation such as our remains strong by keeping its internal affairs and economic house in order, we need fear no outside force from any quarter and can afford to be magnanimous.
>
> The American people should know that we cannot win over communism by military attack, any more than we could destroy religion by force of arms, nor can we incite the Russians to revolt against their Government. We can win out in the long run only by concentrating in our own society so that it can be held up as a banner for the rest of the world.
>
> In pursuing this course, we must remember, as I believe it has been forgotten, that the military is only an instrument of our foreign policy. I believe that the distinction has been neglected in this country over the past 20 years. The Congress has been misled by the combination of our Defense and State Departments on many important policy questions, both domestic and foreign. I cannot escape the feeling that the military horse has been allowed to get ahead of the diplomatic cart.
>
> To illustrate the influence of the military, we are now hearing fears expressed that because only a very few of the present Russian leadership have firsthand knowledge of the Western World, the chances are increased for miscalculation in its foreign affairs. I can personally recall hearing a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tell me that nothing had changed in the quality of Russian life, that no decentralization or loosening of any controls had taken place over the last two decades. The spokesman admitted that he had never been inside Russia. It seems to me that we have as much to fear from ignorance, prejudice, selfishness, and bias in our own Nation as we have from a similar condition on the part of the Russian leadership.
>
> For the past 20 years, I have heard experts on both sides of the Iron Curtain refer to the cold war struggle as a "battle for men's minds." Although we have tried to adjust some aspects of our foreign policy to the demands of this kind of warfare and have paid lip service to the concept, we have in most instances tended to act as though this were not, in fact, the fundamental nature of the struggle. As a result, our policy has continued to place predominant emphasis on the military aspects rather than, broadly speaking, the psychological aspects of the competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R.
>
> In our battle for men's minds, we ought to be concentrating on winning over the minds and the sentiments of the Russian people. However, not only are we failing at present to give proper emphasis to this factor, we seem, instead, to follow policies which tend to isolate and even alienate the Russian people from the influences of Western civilization. In this fashion, we play into the hands of the Communist apparatus whose principal source of power stems from the people's lack of contact with and lack of knowledge of the mainstream of history and of current events.
>
> In short, I am not saying that we should embrace communism or any part of its concepts. I abhor that godless philosophy as much as any American citizen, but we cannot prevail over it by military action or military threat. We can only win by acting through the Russian people themselves. This is the only way anticommunism can prevail in the long run.

Mr. President, we must get the military out of the diplomatic picture and return it to its rightful place as the handmaiden of our foreign policy. I think that too often in the last 20 years we have allowed the military cart to get in front of the diplomatic horse. I am convinced that Russia's foreign policy is basically defensive, as we hold ours to be. If that is true, there is no inherent reason why we cannot get together and settle the differences between us. I believe firmly that if agreements and understandings between the United States and Russia

XUM

can be arrived at through realistic diplomatic measures, peace will come to the whole world. But I repeat, we must get the mailed fist of the military out of the diplomatic picture.

Turning now to areas other than Russia, I also toured Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Okinawa, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand. I discussed my findings in each of these areas in detail in my written report, and Senators may wish to turn to them for further information.

The primary problem facing us in Asia, besides Vietnam, is the future of Okinawa and the relationship between Okinawa and the United States and Japan. I point out this relationship is going to be a difficult one for the new administration to deal with. Frankly, I question the seriousness of those political leaders in Japan who are agitating for the return of the island to Japanese control. It is proving a rich source of foreign exchange for the Japanese. All in all, I think that in the future it will be in our best interest to come to an agreement with the Japanese over the status of Okinawa, allowing the withdrawal of some American control. Perhaps base rights could be maintained for some time in the future. In any event, I expect that if we make it known that we desire to be compensated for those improvements we have made on the island, it may dampen the ardor of some of those advocating its reversion. Concerning our other activities such as the operations of our Embassies, our information program, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the various attachés, Senators will find all of these discussed in detail in my report.

It may be recalled that on January 18 of 1968, President Johnson issued a directive that employment overseas be cut back in an effort to improve our balance-of-payments position. I was particularly interested to note the results of this Executive order, and found that some reductions in overseas employment had been made. In my opinion, the cutback has not yet gone far enough and there is still room for improvement. I express the hope that the new administration will follow through with this effort to reduce the cost of our foreign operations.

All in all, however, I am most concerned with the importance that our future policies toward the Soviet Union hold for world peace throughout the world, and our own place in it. I have proposed a set of conclusions and recommendations as a part of my report, based on my 13 years of ground-level experience with the Russian people and leaders. I think these recommendations represent a realistic analysis of the problems confronting us, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the conclusions and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. PERSPECTIVES

It was more than 13 years ago, in 1955, that I made my first tour of the Soviet Union. Stalin had died in 1953, and the state of Russian leadership was still very much in flux. Khrushchev was not to emerge until mid-1957 as the undisputed leader of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

What was known as the cold war was very much in evidence. The North Atlantic Treaty Alliance Organization was in full swing, or at least we considered it to be. Vital and deep disagreement between the then great powers of the world—the United States, France, Great Britain, and Russia—had led to the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany as a free and independent state and to its inclusion as a member of the NATO alliance. This, in turn, led to the creation of the Warsaw Treaty organization with Russia and the Eastern European states it controlled as members. The lines of East-West conflict drawn by Stalin were still clearly evident.

I returned from my visit of 1955 deeply concerned at the state of relations existing between the two mightiest countries in the world. Even at that time, before the threat of intercontinental ballistic missiles tipped with atomic and hydrogen warheads was dangling over the world, it was obvious that our two governments were looking at each other in a manner that a later writer would describe as "two tarantulas trapped in a bottle."

From my observations of the progress being made in Russian fields and factories, it was plain to me that a base was being laid, supported by ample natural resources, for the development of a productive and industrial economy much like our own. It was also plain to me that no society or system could have a growth of economic prosperity without a corresponding increase in political and social development.

I was certain that as time progressed the Russian people would demand more freedom and that they would press these demands upon the leadership. It therefore appeared that the best interests of the United States and the Western World lay in providing a groundwork for more normal relations in the future. Accordingly, I recommended that we work out means to promote people-to-people contacts between the two systems. I felt that such contacts could not help but heighten the trends which were obvious inside Russia at that time.

Even so, certain developments during my visit caused me great concern for the future. I was aware, as I indicated, that the cold war was in full bloom, if that expression may be used, and that our Government and that of the Soviet Union were at loggerheads. I did not believe, however, that we had any good substantive or long-range reasons for retaining what I might describe as a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude. To cite only one example: when in Moscow for the first time, I asked whether arrangements had been made for me to meet with some of the members of the Russian leadership as I had requested. I was told by Mr. Bohlen, our Nation's chief representative in Moscow, that such a meeting was not arranged by him because of strict objections at the Washington level. I persisted with the request that an attempt be made, but was told that no help would be forthcoming from our Embassy.

I asked that a cable be sent to Washington asking that I be permitted to make my own appointments. Within a few hours, I was granted permission. I obtained the telephone number of the Foreign Office of the U.S.S.R., and reached over to use the telephone in our Ambassador's office. I was told that I could not use any telephone connected with our Embassy. I was given a few coins so that I could use a pay telephone station not far away. I placed a call with the Foreign Office and, within an hour, I was able to arrange a meeting with Mr. Anastas Mikoyan, the architect of Khrushchev's economic reforms and one of the rulers of the Russian heirarchy. Our Ambassador was not too happy and said to me that I was wasting my time and that I would be unable to obtain much information. He said that I might be able to talk to Mr. Mikoyan for not more than 5 minutes. The next day, I came back to our Embassy to fulfill my appointment and Mr. Bohlen asked if I would object to taking one of his men with me. I replied that I would not object if it was agreeable to Mr. Mikoyan.

I met with Mr. Mikoyan and spent almost 2 hours with him. I was accompanied by a representative of our Embassy, after permission from the Kremlin was obtained. Before our conversation started I asked if it was agreeable for my companion to take notes as we spoke and permission was granted. To be frank, I ran out of questions. I got up to take my leave and I was asked where was I going from Moscow. I told Mr. Mikoyan that I was going to Rumania but that I would prefer to visit more within Russia. I told him that I was informed by the State Department that I could not visit Russia. He promised to give me permission to visit any part of Russia. I told him that, since I was more or less on the tailend of my trip, I could not accept his kind offer. I asked if I could come next year. He asked me to write to him when I desired to come and said that he would make the arrangements for me. I thanked him and returned to my car. Absolute silence prevailed for about 2 minutes and then my Embassy companion said to me, "Senator, I have been here almost 1 year now and I have learned more about Russia in 2 hours than during my stay." I replied by saying, "The trouble with you fellows is that when you talk to Russian leaders, you always have chips on your shoulders."

The point of this example is that here we were, at that time unquestionably the most powerful nation in the world, hardly able to speak to our chief adversary. I am not saying that all the fault was ours by any means; certainly, the Russians bear more than a fair share of the blame. The cooperation that President Roosevelt had hoped for with the Soviet Union had been dashed away by Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe, in the United Nations, by the invasion of North Korea and by numerous other instances not designed to reassure the Western World concerning Russia's intentions. Restrictions were no doubt placed on the American Embassy personnel so that they could not leave Moscow and travel freely about the country, even if they had so desired. We had and have similar restrictions on Russian diplomatic travel in this country. Nevertheless, the point is valid, for if the situation of the middle 1950's was a hangover from the Stalin era, the situation today in 1969 represents a hangover from the cold war era.

In 1956, pursuant to his (Mr. Mikoyan's) promise and with my own guide and camera in hand, I traveled more extensively throughout the U.S.S.R. I toured the agricultural areas and also visited many industrial centers. My report to the Senate of that year made it clear that serious difficulties were besetting Russian agriculture. It was plain to me that efforts aimed at collectivism and state control were not working. If production was to be increased in any meaningful terms, it would require efforts lying outside the most important and traditional tenets of Communist ideology. In short, I felt that real and personal incentives of one kind or another would have to be introduced in the agricultural areas. It would be necessary, I thought, to restore some of the principles of private ownership to the farm workers. The vital need of the Soviet leadersip to show results would make them responsive to such changes. To some extent, this has come about over the last 12 years, but I am convinced that we can look for further progress in this field.

I also reported at the end of my tour that great changes were taking place in the Russian industrial base. In 1956, I wrote as follows:

XUM

"As to Russian industry, I saw some modern processes (such as a most unique shoe production line), along with great evidence of expansion, but for the most part, Russian industry seems to be crude and backward when compared to our own. I saw only five different models of passenger cars, two models of passenger buses, one for short and the other long haul, two models of refrigerators, one standard model of trucks. I do not desire to leave the impression that this status may long remain, for great efforts are being made to modernize Russian industry, and to expand production—particularly in the area of heavy industry. Dams both for navigation and power generation, are being constructed. More factories are rising. The industrial base is being widened, and within the next 5 to 10 years, Russia will undoubtedly become a mighty industrial power. That will come about by the increasing demand for more and more consumer goods."

Needless to say, those changes referred to 12 years ago have now come to pass and I am convinced the trend will continue. Again I repeat, increasing economic prosperity cannot help but bring about greater political and social development. As a matter of fact, the beginnings of that corresponding development were in evidence even then. I visited many Russian schools in that year, from the elementary level to institutions of higher learning. When I saw what was going on and the attention that was being turned to education, I wrote as follows:

"As more Russians become educated, they will become less and less prone to accept at face value the propaganda-loaded description of life in the United States which the Red propaganda system dins insistently into their ears. The Russian people are curious by nature; they are becoming increasingly more curious about Americans, about life in America, and about the freedoms we enjoy."

It seemed to me that the changes amongst the Russian people were of the utmost importance for the drafting of fundamental, long-term U.S. foreign policy. It appeared to me that the factors of increased education, natural curiosity, and a desire for self-improvement which were evident among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. should be capitalized upon. * * * more use of in our own approach to relations with the Russian Government and the problems of securing world peace. In light of this, I again recommended that every effort be made to broaden our exchange of persons program with the Soviet Union. I was convinced and I remain convinced today that widespread exchanges would have to redound to our benefit.

I am aware that the so-called cultural approach to international affairs which this represents is not the answer to international problems which are long and deep rooted, but we are dealing here with trends, not ultimate solutions. It is time for us to follow the paths which are available.

My third tour through Russian territory was made the next year, in 1957, by the invitation of Mr. Khrushchev who by then was firmly ensconced in power. Revolts and resistance to Russian ideological control had successfully brought a liberalization of Polish industry and agriculture. The Hungarian revolution, with somewhat similar beginnings, had gone out of control and led to the attempted withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact. It had been brutally suppressed. These events seemed to have been accepted on the one hand, and forgotten on the other, by the Russian people. No doubt they had not been told the facts of either situation. In any event, I found their attention was elsewhere. At the conclusion of my tour, I wrote as follows concerning my general impressions:

"Perhaps the most significant aspect of my findings on this visit was change and, with respect to the various goods and services available to the Russian consumer, the change was invariably for the better. Also, people are more talkative—they were more prone to assert themselves. Generally speaking, I found a much higher degree of contentment among the peoples of Russia than on my previous visits. In addition, I found considerable pride—a pride which was visibly increased when the people learned of the successful firing of the first space satellite. I was in Russia when the event occurred and the news was made public, and there was much jubilation among the Russian masses."

There was apparent domestic contentment, but a rising curiosity about America and an urge to forge ahead of us. I felt that this was all to the good, for competition means contact, and the economic progress this competitive spirit would necessarily produce would bring development in other spheres. I also wrote that:

"The Soviet Union today is undergoing a process of evolution—not revolution, but evolution. There is a great surge of decentralization taking place. The people are demanding more and more autonomy in the hope of attaining more voice in their local affairs. Sparked by increased emphasis upon universal education—an emphasis which carries with it a growing desire for individual leadership, an eagerness for information, and an abundant curiosity regarding events, developments, and peoples outside the Soviet borders—the present Russian leadership is taking a calculated, but evidently necessary, risk."

Looking back, history was to show that this calculated risk did not pay off for Mr. Khrushchev and his leadership. It is generally considered that he found himself unable to control the liberalizing processes and so was removed from power. His removal, however, did not mean that the processes would not continue and that they should not be used to our benefit.

At the conclusion of my 1957 tour I recommended that our policymakers reexamine our approach to the waging of the cold war. A new approach in light of changing conditions was necessary to dispel the fear which the Russian people felt toward Westerners and Western intentions. It was absolutely necessary, I thought, to begin building a base for mutual confidence. I pointed out that our Government's information program should not be directed into a frontal attack against either Russia or communism, but should aim toward a positive exposition of American life and accomplishments.

I again stated the belief that every effort should be made to bring in Russian delegations from all walks of life. We should have permitted as many as the Russians would allow to come and should have paid their expenses, if necessary, in the same manner as we did for visitors from other countries throughout the world. I felt it of utmost importance for the people of Russia to see at first hand the boundless advantages which a free enterprise system, based on representative government, had to offer. The necessary steps for military security could be taken and, in any event, we had little to hide that was not available to our press and the travelers of other nations.

I also felt that the leaders of our Government should meet with the leaders of the Russian Government as often as possible whenever there was a chance of agreement on any issue.

At the same time, I began to call into question the effectiveness of our so-called containment policy.

As part of this latter effort, we had established bases ringing the Soviet Union and were attempting to create full-fledged modern armies in small underdeveloped countries. The beginnings of the missile age were on us and I did not feel that these bases would be effective in relation to their cost and to the anti-American propaganda advantage they gave to the Russian leadership. I felt that many of our military assistance programs were putting us in an untenable and illogical position. We were supporting governments of questionable legitimacy and giving the Communists within and without Russia ammunition against us.

In 1961, I again had the opportunity of making observations within the Soviet Union. I found that, again, liberalizing changes had been made in both the industrial and agricultural management techniques. Assembly lines were becoming widespread. Decentralization of production was occurring and local management in charge of actual production had been granted more power. Steps had been taken to make collective farming more autonomous, at least by Soviet standards. The farms could purchase their own equipment and their products were being sold on the open market. I found that prices fluctuated considerably, depending on supply and demand. More consumer goods were available and it was obvious that the changes in the making would have important implications. I wrote in 1961 as follows:

"I find that no effort is made to assist the individual worker by providing wage incentives, luxury items, and the like. He is helped in a collective way, as in the past, by providing for general benefits such as better schools, more hospitals, elaborate cultural centers, spacious parks, and the like. Few workers, I am informed, are enthusiastically or, really, interested in 10- and 20-year plans. As I pointed out in my diary, and as I have stated many times before, even though it is true that the lot of the average Russian has been greatly enhanced in a physical sense, still he desires more improvement in his standard of living and I doubt that he will continue to be satisfied with promises of a better life years hence. He has been hearing that tune for many years now, and I doubt that he will much longer be reconciled by it. In short, it is my belief that unless the Russian leadership takes steps now to provide higher pay for factory workers, or in the alternative to lower the price of consumer goods, including food and clothing, discontent will become more and more apparent."

Because of my findings and experiences, I again recommended a greatly expanded exchange program, together with elimination of unnecessary travel restrictions upon Russians stationed in the United States. What we were doing, I felt, was basing our diplomatic actions on what the Russians did. Actually, we were reacting and not acting at all. I repeated my view that such child's play had no place in the relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and that we should take the initiative in breaking down barriers wherever possible.

To cite another example of the cold war psychology that was in force, I can well remember that, in 1961, I had been scheduled to visit some of the high Russian dams which surpass our own in hydroelectric capacity. The inspections had been approved by the Russian authorities. Yet, when the time came, approval was withdrawn. Upon inquiring, I learned that, some time previously, a party of American experts in the field headed by Senator Moss, of Utah, had toured the facilities of the U.S.S.R. with the understanding that the visit would be made on a reciprocal basis. The similar Russian visit to America became bogged down in political bungling for one reason or another, with the result that it was not allowed. Thereafter, it was stated that it would be impossible for me to inspect the facilities. This is only one example among many where needless friction can develop, and I ask, if we could not get results in such small areas, how could we expect cooperation in the major and more important questions.

I also recommended, on my return to the United States, that some nonstrategic and commercial contacts be restored between our

XUM

two nations. I pointed out that the U.S.S.R. by 1961, was no longer in short supply of virtually any goods needed by the industrial economy and that all other countries of the free world were trading with her, including our erstwhile allies. It seemed to me that we were hurting ourselves as much as the Russians and aiding the development of friction in the meantime.

I also pointed out that, if we expected results in Russian dealings our diplomats would be required to exercise the "patience of Job." The Russian leadership from the czars to the Soviets have always been suspicious of foreigners and difficult to reach. Objective observers will agree that the Russians had almost as good reasons for fearing America and Western intentions as we did to fear theirs.

Finally, it seemed to me that our containment policy had been successful only insofar as it had halted any supposed Russian efforts to expand.

It was plain to me that we had not been successful in "isolating" Russia by trying to cut off her trade and contacts with the Western World. She was not suffering. She had become militarily, scientifically, and industrially stronger than ever, as was easily obvious to anyone traveling within her borders. Meanwhile the United States had gone deep into debt, had flung dollars, arms, and men about the world to support our anti-Communist posture. Our collective security alliances were proving hollow, and were beginning to fall apart.

Before leaving this area of discussion, I do not think it would be amiss to point out that I held and voiced these opinions in the mid-1950's when they represented distinct political liabilities. I was vociferously denounced in Louisiana and elsewhere for my views, by many spokesmen who would not admit that communism had brought relative prosperity to the Russian people, and that it had to be dealt with realistically if its goal was to be defeated by Western governments. Nevertheless, the last 13 years have shown that my comments and predictions of changes within the Russian society have come about.

II. THE PRESENT

At the conclusion of my latest tour, in 1968, I was able to view the changes in Russian society over a period of 13 years. In my five trips through it, I believe it is safe to say that I have traveled more miles through Russian-controlled territory than perhaps any other Western observer. I have talked with countless Russians and representatives of Russian minority groups—in English and French, as well as through interpreters. I have, by and large, been able to go where I wanted to go and was shown what I asked to see * * * the farms and factories * * * the high dams * * * the schools. I was accorded freedom of movement and was accompanied only by an interpreter provided by our American Embassy; and my visits and passages among the people were not interfered with. The restrictions and troubles that I experienced occasionally, I mark down as much to bureaucratic bungling as to ideological fervor.

In the past 13 years, I have seen Russia move from a war-torn economy and absolutely controlled society to a position of industrial and scientific leadership. The U.S.S.R. is today second only to the United States in manufacturing output. Its people, like our own, have become almost universally literate. In some areas, as in the construction and successful operation of massive hydroelectric facilities, Russia surpasses our own accomplishments by far.

In other areas, such as agriculture, light industry, and the production of consumer goods, the Soviet Union continues to lag far behind. Even here, I find great progress being made. More resources are being put into the agriculture sector, new fertilizer plants are being brought into operation, and unwise policies such as the reckless plowing of Khrushchev's "virgin lands" have been slowed down. The agricultural techniques which we developed and proved so successful are being put more and more into practice. I was told that the leadership has plans to develop an extension service along the lines of our own. A system of local and regional agriculture research stations, such as we have in each State, is already in being. The effort that was carried on under Stalin to apply the principles of Communist philosophy to the biological improvement of plants and animals has been forgotten. The only real drawbacks now facing the development of Russian agriculture are the problems of collectivization and the rigors of the climate over much of the land area.

As I have mentioned earlier, the problem of increasing crop yields must yield sooner or later to the introduction of principles that contradict Communist ideology.

Even now, the farmers have been granted more freedom and a system of incentives has been developed to allow the collectivized farmers to feel a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for the land.

Industrial production has also seen the introduction of a new system of economic incentives designed to make the worker's reward more closely dependent on his output. It appears that working for the "common good" is not sufficient to motivate the Russian individual any more than anyone else—even after years of a controlled and propagandized society. The emphasis is no longer on the quantity of goods produced, but on the quality. Management has been allowed more control over the production of each plant. Bonuses are now paid, to both management and workers, based upon the salability of the goods in the marketplace—in other words, the profit motive is operating. If this form of incentives is not a keystone of private enterprise, I do not know what it is. The provision of economic incentives to the individual farmers and workers is tied more closely to Western ideals than it is to Communist thought and there are those who say that under the impact of trade and industrial technology, the U.S.S.R.'s European satellites will become more Western than Communist. After my experiences inside the U.S.S.R. last year, I wonder if the same thing could not be said of Russia itself, in the long run.

This is not to say by any means that I consider it likely that the Soviet citizens will turn upon their leadership. This is certainly not the case. Whatever the faults of present Russian society, its people are living incomparably better than at any time in their history. In every city, there are hundreds of apartment buildings being constructed, and industry is booming in all parts of the country. The people are flocking to the cities in Russia for the same reason that they are doing so all over the world—in search of a better life. By and large, they are finding it. I saw more consumer goods available than at any time in the past and it was easily apparent that the people were well fed and content. No one expressed any desire to turn against the Government.

It must not be forgotten that they are told only what the Government desires them to hear. They have no standards of comparison with the Western way of life. I am convinced, however, that the people themselves like and respect Americans, even if they have no knowledge of our form of government.

I did notice some signs of unrest in the population, particularly among the students and the younger groups. It seems to me that the present system of Russian education operates very inefficiently for a state of its size and considering the needs for industrial manpower that must be met. It is a very stratified system and a great deal of time and effort is consumed in teaching students to operate machines in textile or metalworking plants. After a student chooses his field, he is more or less confined within it, even though he may be years away from realizing any benefits, and may decide that he would prefer pursuing some other course of study. After completion of training, I was told that the graduates possibly find themselves no better off economically than other workers, and I heard that many were wondering why the effort was necessary at all. I suggest that the entire system is in for a revamping in the years ahead.

III. THE FUTURE

It seems to me that a realistic analysis of our position in the world today and our hopes for tomorrow can be summed up as follows:

(1) For the foreseeable future, the Soviet Union is the only country which can threaten the territory and institutions of the United States. It follows from this that we must provide against any danger from this quarter and must keep our defense strong enough to protect our way of life.

(2) The problem of world peace boils down to the problem of overall relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. If we cannot come to grips with this reality, there is no possibility of reducing the overall tension of the world. A pullback from those areas where we are confronting the Soviet Union without good reason is absolutely necessary if our negotiators are to have room to seek accommodations and long-range understandings with the other great power in the world.

(3) It follows from the first two points that we must be more concerned with the establishment of workable relations with our foremost adversary than with various other nations in the world. Under no condition should we allow our allies to tell us what to do. This is not to say that we should not cooperate with them in broad areas of international affairs, but we should recognize that all of Western Europe has increased its economic strength and can develop whatever military capabilities necessary for its own protection. The countries of Western Europe need rely no longer on Uncle Sam and they should not do so.

(4) Under the economic progress that has been made within Russia and the satellite states, a social and political liberalization is developing. The people are becoming more educated and will not be satisfied to hear only propaganda day in and day out. They will desire to exercise more control over their own affairs and the Government cannot remain deaf to these influences. It follows from this that we should do all possible to help this trend develop. We should encourage more open-trade relationships and all the person-to-person contacts and exchange programs that the Eastern bloc will allow.

(5) The efforts of Stalin and his successors in office to give their country a heavy industrial base and to turn it into a world power have been successful. Quite aside from the threat it poses to our position, that very success has had important implications within Russia. While it has provided more resources to the Government, it has also given rise to heated competition between science, agriculture, consumers, the military and other interest groups for priorities in the use of these resources. The Party, itself, and certainly the Government, is divided over the future use of national resources. As a result the Communist Party is finding it ever more difficult to exercise its monolithic control over the Russian economy. This to me is an indication that proper trade policies, increased economic contacts and Western influences in general might help create an ever stronger trend toward diversity within the U.S.S.R.—if we will only spend some effort and imagination in bring-

ing the Russian people back into contact with the world community.

(6) The monolithic control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union over other parties and governments abroad has been shattered by the tides of change, some of which were noted above. Moscow no longer dominates the Communist movement. Indeed, Moscow cannot even control those Communist states along its borders, Czechoslovakia notwithstanding. This represents another advantage to the West. It means that our peoples and governments need not be so fearful of ideological plans for world domination, and can return to more traditional relationships between states.

From the above, it should be plain that it is time, indeed past time, for a reidentification of our national interests. Events of the last decade have bypassed policies still rooted in World War II. We may ask ourselves what practical purposes are served by the presence of hundreds of thousands of American men in Western Europe. The answer is always for defense against Russia. The Russian leaders will say that their military establishment is also for defense—against the United States. As a result, our two countries are at dagger point.

Looking back over the perspective of 13 years, to 1955, I cannot help feeling reinforced in my original thinking; namely, that we should make every effort to give the people of the U.S.S.R. objective knowledge of life in the West and the United States. Furthermore, we should begin to look for actions that our nation might take to reduce the tensions between our two countries and dissipate the suspicions between our governments. Many areas suggest themselves in this regard. Our structure of foreign bases should be reexamined, to decide if all are absolutely necessary to the national interest. Under the changing world conditions, and with the advent of nuclear missiles, many of them can be dispensed with. Last year alone, our foreign military installations cost us more than $5.8 billion. (See table 1 below.) Our foreign bases are fast becoming more of an economic and political liability than military asset.

Our NATO posture should be reexamined. As a collective security mechanism has it any real value after the withdrawal of France's military cooperation? It serves to give propaganda advantages to the Soviet leaders and economic advantages to our erstwhile allies. Its military advantages face to face with the Soviet Union are more questionable.

We are maintaining 300,000 men in Western Europe at a cost of approximately $2.6 billion per year. If it had been left to me, I would have pulled back a majority, if not all, of our American forces from the area when President de Gaulle made it plain that we were no longer welcome on French soil. We missed a golden opportunity at the time to take action fundamentally in our interest, from an economic standpoint; from the standpoint of international politics, a withdrawal would remove what the Russians cannot help seeing as a threat to their security.

Directly related to the above is the fact that we are maintaining military assistance advisory groups or milgroups in 48 countries around the globe—from Belgium to Venezuela and from the Congo to Saudi Arabia. As of the end of 1968, we had 4,056 officers and men scattered among these various military groups throughout the world. These were supported by 1,692 U.S. and foreign civilians for a total military complement of 5,748. Table 2 shows the disposition of these MAAG missions and milgroups.

In my opinion, from what I have seen in foreign capitals, this program should be dispensed with entirely and as soon as possible. In my view, where a U.S. military presence is advisable and indeed in our interest and the interest of the host country, the representation should be made through the regular personnel attached to our Embassy and directly responsible to our Ambassador. Should situations arise requiring special assistance, it should be made available strictly for that purpose and then withdrawn. It is foolish for us to maintain these military personnel at great expense all over the world on a continuing basis.

I have two main objections to the continued overseas presence of large numbers of U.S. military personnel. First, to see officers and men moving about in foreign capitals in uniform cannot help emphasizing the military aspects of American life. In the minds of many, this presence marks us as warmongers.

Second, I am convinced that the personnel attached to these military missions are instrumental in influencing host governments to build up their armed forces and weaponry at our expense. From fiscal 1950 through fiscal 1968, we have spent $31.4 billion on military assistance programs throughout the world. An expenditure of $406.7 million for such programs has been projected for fiscal 1969. Not only should we cut back on this expenditure, but the first step should be the reduction and recall of the forces which generate them.

Provided that we could do so in a way which would positively demonstrate to the Russian people the advantages of the American system of agriculture, we might go so far as to extend Russia technological assistance with its agricultural problems. I would make every effort to have the Russians cooperate with us in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, rather than war. Perhaps the offers would be rejected out of hand, but that would be up to the Russian leadership. The point is that, so long as a nation such as ours remains strong by keeping its internal affairs and economic house in order, we need fear no outside force from any quarter and can afford to be magnanimous.

The American people should know that we cannot win over communism by military attack, any more than we could destroy religion by force of arms, nor can we incite the Russians to revolt against their Government. We can win out in the long run only by concentrating on our own society so that it can be held up as a banner for the rest of the world.

In pursuing this course, we must remember, as I believe it has been forgotten, that the military is only an instrument of our foreign policy. I believe that the distinction has been neglected in this country over the past 20 years. The Congress has been misled by the combination of our Defense and State Departments on many important policy questions, both domestic and foreign. I cannot escape the feeling that the military horse has been allowed to get ahead of the diplomatic cart.

To illustrate the influence of the military, we are now hearing fears expressed that because only a very few of the present Russian leadership have firsthand knowledge of the Western World, the chances are increased for miscalculation in its foreign affairs. I can personally recall hearing a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tell me that nothing had changed in the quality of Russian life, that no decentralization or loosening of any controls had taken place over the last two decades. The spokesman admitted that he had never been inside Russia. It seems to me that we have as much to fear from ignorance, prejudice, selfishness, and bias in our own Nation as we have from a similar condition on the part of the Russian leadership.

For the past 20 years, I have heard experts on both sides of the Iron Curtain refer to the cold war struggle as a "battle for men's minds." Although we have tried to adjust some aspects of our foreign policy to the demands of this kind of warfare and have paid lip service to the concept, we have in most instances tended to act as though this were not, in fact, the fundamental nature of the struggle. As a result, our policy has continued to place predominant emphasis on the military aspects rather than, broadly speaking, the psychological aspects of the competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

In our battle for men's minds, we ought to be concentrating on winning over the minds and the sentiments of the Russian people. However, not only are we failing at present to give proper emphasis to this factor, we seem, instead, to follow policies which tend to isolate and even alienate the Russian people from the influences of Western civilization. In this fashion, we play into the hands of the Communist apparatus whose principal source of power stems from the people's lack of contact with and lack of knowledge of the mainstream of history and of current events.

In short, I am not saying that we should embrace communism or any part of its concepts. I abhor that godless philosophy as much as any American citizen, but we cannot prevail over it by military action or military threat. We can only win by acting through the Russian people themselves. This is the only way anticommunism can prevail in the long run.

TABLE 1

[In millions of dollars]

Country or area	U.S. operating costs and military construction costs for bases	Military assistance		Economic aid	USIA	Grand total
		Government aid	Credit sales			
Western Europe [1]	[1] 2,600.0					
6th Fleet	[1] 300.0					
7th Fleet	[1] 700.0					
Greece	33.1	40.9		1.4	1.6	
Turkey	108.9	99.1		87.1	1.2	
Pakistan	16.0			361.9	4.0	
India	.6			690.4	7.6	
Iran	7.6	21.9	100.0	43.9	1.5	
Korea	740.5	259.5		188.5	1.3	
Okinawa	467.2			17.5	.8	
Japan	491.9			[2] 93.1	3.2	
Indonesia	.2	5.2		97.1	.8	
Philippines	330.0	21.5		20.1	4.3	
Libya	34.0	1.1		1.0	.6	
Morocco	20.0	2.0		78.6	1.0	
Tunisia	(3)	2.6		48.8	.7	
Total	5,850.0	453.8	105.0	1,729.4	28.6	
Grand total						8,166.0

[1] Does not include military construction costs.

[2] Export-Import Bank loan.

[3] Less than $50,000.

TABLE 2.—PERSONNEL STRENGTHS—MAAGS, MISSIONS, AND MILITARY GROUPS

	Authorized, as of Jan. 1, 1968			Actual, as of Dec. 31, 1968				Authorized, as of Oct. 1, 1969			Authorized, as of July 1, 1970		
	United States	Foreign	Total	U.S. military	U.S. civilian	Foreign	Total	United States	Foreign	Total	United States	Foreign	Tota
Eucom:													
Bellux	31	15	46	19	5	7	31	21	10	31	20	7	27
Denmark	24	7	31	19	3	6	28	20	6	26	20	6	26
France	10	10	20	8	1	9	18	10	7	17	10	7	17
Germany	110	22	132	61	16	16	93	54	12	66	54	12	66
Greece	99	56	155	71	10	46	127	80	43	123	80	37	117
Italy	40	6	46	27	7	4	38	29	4	33	26	4	30
Libya	34	12	46	23	1	7	31	28	7	35	28	7	35
Morocco	76	7	83	44	2	7	53	48	7	55	47	7	54
Netherlands	23	5	28	20	1	5	26	20	4	24	20	4	24
Norway	30	11	41	22	4	10	36	20	10	30	20	8	28
Portugal	21	9	30	18	4	9	31	20	9	29	14	7	21
Spain	101	31	132	71	20	28	119	78	24	102	56	21	77
Tunisia	4	0	4	8	0	2	10	4	0	4	16	2	18
Turkey	319	160	479	220	43	140	403	235	118	353	213	107	320
Total, Encom	922	351	1,273	631	117	296	1,044	667	261	928	624	236	860
Stricom:													
Congo	64	5	69	50	0	5	55	42	5	47	42	5	47
Ethiopia	178	62	240	117	3	61	181	119	44	163	113	39	152
India	12	7	19	8	1	7	16	9	6	15	9	6	15
Iran	447	262	709	337	27	184	548	377	201	578	335	157	492
Jordan	15	6	21	14	0	4	18	15	6	21	15	6	21
Liberia	31	9	40	22	0	5	27	20	5	25	20	5	25
Nepal	3	4	7	2	0	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	0
Nigeria	2	1	3	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
Pakistan	5	2	7	6	1	7	14	7	4	11	7	4	11
Saudi Arabia	206	5	211	135	0	4	139	137	4	141	137	4	141
Total, Stricom	963	363	1,326	692	32	281	1,005	728	276	1,004	679	227	906
Southcom:													
Argentina	65	9	74	45	2	7	54	37	7	44	33	6	39
Bolivia	51	10	61	39	2	9	50	45	10	55	40	7	47
Brazil	116	49	165	70	11	44	125	75	40	115	69	33	102
Chile	49	8	57	35	0	7	42	32	5	37	32	5	37
Colombia	62	6	68	55	1	6	62	51	6	57	48	5	53
Costa Rica	11	2	13	4	0	1	5	4	1	5	4	1	5
Dominican Republic	59	3	62	40	0	1	41	43	2	45	39	2	41
Ecuador	69	9	78	54	1	8	63	39	5	44	39	5	44
El Salvador	25	3	28	20	0	3	23	19	3	22	15	2	17
Guatemala	30	4	34	28	0	4	32	30	3	33	26	3	29
Honduras	21	3	24	19	0	3	22	16	3	19	14	2	16
Nicaragua	23	2	25	18	0	1	19	19	2	21	15	2	17
Panama	5	1	6	6	0	1	7	5	1	6	5	1	6
Paraguay	25	4	29	25	0	3	28	20	3	23	17	3	20
Peru	70	5	75	49	1	5	55	38	5	43	38	4	42
Uruguay	28	7	35	22	1	7	30	22	6	28	20	5	25
Venezuela	82	2	84	57	1	2	60	51	2	53	51	2	53
Total, Southcom	791	127	918	586	20	112	718	546	104	650	505	88	593
Pacom:													
Burma	20	49	69	17	0	46	63	18	46	64	16	22	38
China	633	94	727	452	47	79	578	429	58	487	393	55	448
Indonesia	14	0	14	12	0	14	26	13	11	24	13	11	24
Japan	45	75	120	23	16	0	39	10	75	85	10	6	16
Philippines	97	16	113	82	9	14	105	74	10	84	66	6	72
Korea	1,306	557	1,863	1,215	75	527	1,817	1,061	349	1,410	1,048	349	1,397
Thailand	421	3	424	346	4	3	353	436	58	494	379	3	382
Total, Pacom	2,536	794	3,330	2,147	151	683	2,981	2,041	607	2,648	1,925	452	2,377
Worldwide total	5,212	1,635	6,847	4,056	320	1,372	5,748	3,982	1,248	5,230	3,733	1,003	4,736

(The following colloquy, which occurred during the delivery of the address by Mr. ELLENDER, is printed at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I am interested in the Senator's statement. Does the Senator feel that the position and policy of the United States vis-a-vis the suggested and announced policy of Russia are one and the same? Does the Senator believe this when the Soviet Government has said continuously for the last 30 years that they intend to bury us and destroy our system? Does the Senator believe we do not need protection against them?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend that I realize those statements have been made and they have been repeated from time to time by some of Stalin's successors.

However, as I have pointed out in my speech and in my report, things have changed in Russia. We are no longer dealing with the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin and the monolithic control he exercised over the Communist Party inside and outside the U.S.S.R. The people are demanding more and more from their leaders. I know of my own personal knowledge that much of the change that took place did not come about because the leaders desired it, but it came about because the people demanded it. As I pointed out in my speech as well as in my report, we should encourage such a trend. The incentive system that has taken root in Russia is the cornerstone of our private enterprise system and we should use all means at our command to help strengthen it. Economic progress will work to bring about social and political progress.

In my opinion, today Russia is veering toward capitalism. We should try to reinforce that trend; that is, we should show the people how they could have a better living if only they would continue to demand more local authority.

Mr. MURPHY. I point out to my colleague that this is not a new approach on the part of the United States. I recall many years ago that we sent entire factories to Russia to help them understand that we did not mean to be an aggressor but that we meant to be a friend. In some satellite nations we built factories. My brother was instrumental in building steel mills in Czechoslovakia some years ago. The people of Czechoslovakia thought and hoped they were going to gain some small measure of freedom, but they found out to their dismay that that was not permitted by Russia. We had an example of a Russian maneuver that was so quick, showing a capability of the military so far surpassing anything we imagined, that it surprised all NATO nations and all military experts.

Incidentally, I recall stating in this Chamber yesterday that I disagree on occasion with General Shoup in regard to the military. We had the sad experience of attending the funeral of a great military leader and commander of the largest army of the greatest power ever assembled, former President Eisenhower, who urged the United States to build a just peace. When he became President we were at war. He was able to bring that war to negotiation. It was certainly not complete but at least we stopped the fighting in Korea. He gave us 8 years of peace.

I do not always accept the statement that the military people are perpetuating themselves for the purpose of making war. On the contrary the record would show that during the time when we had an outstanding and superior military power in this country we never used it in an imperialistic fashion or to impose our methods or desires or characteristics on other nations. On the contrary we have used our power to guarantee peace since the conclusion of World War II.

I have risen today to express my thoughts on this matter. I know my colleague will forgive me for disagreeing with such an expert as General Shoup. At the same time, I have studied these matters carefully. Because of my former position in the motion picture industry. I had to become acquainted with the political pressures of the Soviet Union and the use of Russian propaganda. I became familiar with Russian propaganda policies in America, laid down first by Lenin and then by Stalin. They thought control of the motion picture industry was the best method and means of propaganda that existed. I have been an interested student of these matters for a long time.

I wish I could enthusiastically agree there has been this great change in Russia. There is no question that there is a desire on the part of the people for freedom. There is no question that they need to go away from their socialistic system toward the capitalistic system to receive sufficient products at home, but as to how far this will be permitted by the leaders and the military we do not know. I would suggest that in Russia everything is politically motivated. I have just finished reading several of their latest military pamphlets and documents. There is no question about their designs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Their designs for what?

Mr. MURPHY. For world conquest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I disagree with the Senator. The Senator has a right to his own views. However, I have been in Russia five times since 1955, and I know what has taken place. I do not blame the Russians at all, the Russian people, for being fearful of America.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree, because they have been propagandized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because of the fact that we embrace their former worst enemy, Germany, and that we embraced Japan, once their worst enemy in Asia.

When one goes through Russia and sees the carnage that was committed by Hitler's troops, the destruction of property, I do not blame the Russians for fearing us, because we embraced Germany, the country that was instrumental in doing all of this damage to the people. What I am suggesting is that we recognize the changes that have taken place inside Russia and over the rest of the world. The great need now is for us to develop new approaches. We have spent in excess of $150 billion to isolate Russia and that has not worked. The peoples of Russia, I am certain, are anxious to promote permanent peace and we should lean backwards in our efforts to accommodate them. I believe that if we can now show them that we are not desirous of taking their country over we can restore good relationships that will completely dispel such fears as they now entertain against us.

Mr. MURPHY. Would my colleague concede that never in history has one nation given as much in materiel and assistance as the United States of America gave to the Soviet Union during World War II?

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with that. There is no doubt about that. But times have changed since the late 1940's and 1950's. Nuclear energy has imposed a peace, of sorts, and the Soviet Union realizes this as much as we do.

Mr. MURPHY. Now also would not my colleague concede that in the matter of Germany and Japan, I do not find any evidence that they had any intentions of forcibly changing our kind of government, which has been the threat and the promise of the Soviet Union for many years, particularly since we were the first nation to recognize the Soviet Union and actually put them in business?

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be true, but the fact that we assisted the two countries that did the most damage to Russia made the Russian leadership more fearful of our intentions. Would the Senator agree with my statement that unless and until we can dispel the suspicions that now exist between this country and Russia, there is no chance for us to agree on some method of promoting world peace?

Mr. MURPHY. I agree, as long as that kind of propaganda exists unchallenged.

Now, my distinguished colleague may remember that I stood in this Chamber a year ago in June, when the 6-day war between Egypt and Israel took place, and I said that the night before I had listened for 1 hour to the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations accusing the United States of America of being guilty of perpetrating practically every aggression of the past 30 years.

I said at that time that if what the Russian Ambassador said was true, then the United States should be expelled from the United Nations, and if what he said was not true, then he should be expelled from the United Nations.

Now, I think that both my colleague and I know the recitation the Russian Ambassador made had no basis in fact or in truth. I think that my colleague will agree that this is but a straw man, a bogeyman.

I recall, for instance, that we have heard about the necessity to take the first step in international relations. I said the other day, "Would it not be fine if the Soviet Union would take the first step and decide it would not supply any more armaments to the North Vietnamese?" I feel certain that if they would do that, the fighting in Vietnam would be over within a week.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my conclusion in my report. But that cannot come about unless and until the suspicions are dispelled as between the United States and Russia.

Mr. MURPHY. If my distinguished colleague will forgive me, I have dealt in negotiations with the Russians. For many years I dealt in cultural exchanges. I know the whole history of the cultural exchange matter. It seems to me to be characteristic of the Russians that if we put it on a 1-for-1 basis, they insist on getting it on a 3-to-1 basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would be for making it 1,000 to 1. Let them come over here and see what we have. That is the trouble. When I came back from Russia in 1955 I made suggestions for a realistic exchange program. I went to the late John Foster Dulles and asked him to promote a realistic exchange program. He said, "Oh, we cannot hope for more than one American for one Russian." I said, "Don't start it in that manner because it won't be effective. Let as many Russians come over here and visit us and see what we have here, even if we have to have them followed by FBI men. Let them see our productive capacity and let them become envious of what we have. In that way the Russian people will be tempted to force their leaders to work with us, and that would contribute much toward world peace."

Mr. MURPHY. Would my distinguished colleague be interested in knowing that some years ago, as a director of the Hollywood Bowl Association, I was instrumental in making the contract which brought the Bolshoi Ballet to this country for that very purpose? Some objected to the contract, but I arranged their schedule so that every day these young Russian artists, while they were in Los Angeles, would have lunch in a different area, they would be driven by different areas of Los Angeles and southern California, so that they would have opportunities to see our country and its people, with the hope that they would do exactly what my colleague has suggested; namely, return to Russia and tell their people what they had seen and heard.

The hope was that one day the people of Russia would say to their leaders, "Look here, we would like to accept the help of America. We would like to have a free society in Russia, an open society, such as they have in America."

As I said, Russian visitors to Hollywood were shown through our plants, our steel mills, and they were invited to see what we were doing. However, something seems to happen when they get home. The iron curtain drops down. There is a control over their minds and their freedoms.

We all remember the three outstanding Russian writers who were sent to Siberia, one sentenced to 5 years there, merely for suggesting a freedom which we take for granted in America that exists for all to see.

On the other hand, I would suggest to my distinguished colleague that in our dealings, in the times when we have been successful in the negotiations, we have always dealt from a position of strength, such as when President Truman went to Potsdam, as President Eisenhower did in Lebanon, and as President Kennedy did in the Cuban crisis. So that I think, once again, we have the example of negotiating from a position of strength, which is something they recognize and respect. Weakness or friendship is something which sometimes they refuse to recognize in its true character.

I would hate very much to have our President going into new negotiations with the Soviet Union, without having some basis of strength from which to bargain.

I have said this often: As a young man, I remember Neville Chamberlain when he went to Munich, and folks were poking fun at him for going with his umbrella. The fact is that that umbrella was all the government of his country had. Britain had so weakened its military position at that time to the point it had nothing to talk with or to bargain with. He was in a weakened position when he talked with Hitler.

That is the only reason I rose to speak today, not to disagree with my distinguished colleague because I know that his urge for peace and understanding is certainly as great, if not greater than mine; but merely to let the record show that, in some instances, the military are not of one mind; nor do some of us always agree with the views of the military—which has been quite vocal lately, such as General Shoup and his approach. The record is replete with the kind of approach which has been unsuccessful.

Another fact remains, that our problem is greater today than it was 5 years ago, and greater 5 years ago than it was 40 years ago. That is why I sometimes worry and perhaps consider that we have been taking the soft approach, which is the wrong approach and that instead, we should have an equal meeting of the minds to get a quid pro quo, which seems to be normal. I am hopeful that eventually the leaders of the Russian Government will understand, and thereby the two most powerful nations on earth, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, can finally come to an agreement which will reflect itself in peace and economic prosperity for the whole world.

I thank my distinguished colleague for permitting me this interruption in order to make these remarks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I welcome the Senator's views. They are not a reflection of what I have in mind, as I have made a very close study of matters in Russia since 1955. I have gone right to the Russian people. There is no area in Russia that I have not visited. The Senator cannot name a large city which I have not visited there. I have talked to the people in all walks of life. I never visited any finer people anywhere in the world than I saw in Siberia. They remind me of the people who discovered the American West, who made our West what it is today. They are the same kind of people. They come from Latvia, the Ukraine, and from all over the Soviet Union.

I have no doubt in my mind that if we can dispel that fear which exists between our two countries, peace will not be too far off. Let me remind my friend that the Russian people are now speaking out. They have been successful in obtaining more and more decentralized authority from Moscow in favor of the local managers and workers. I invite my distinguished colleague to read my report.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment further, it may be of interest to the Senator to know that I have a proposal based upon my belief that this fear is a synthetic fear. It should not exist. I believe that we in the United States should set up a massive educational program in order to render to the people of Western Europe, the satellite nations, and the people of Russia, insofar as we are able, the true story of the people of America.

My colleague may be interested to know that a few years ago there was a great Trade Fair in New Delhi, India. At that time we had not provided very much money for the American exhibit at the Trade Fair. I was asked if I had a suggestion. I said I thought we could arrange to have shown at the Trade Fair in New Delhi the original motion picture, "Cinerama," which gave a true picture of the United States from the great port of New York, to New England in the Fall, to the great Ohio Valley with its great manufacturing complex, to the wheat fields of the great Northwest, to the Grand Canyon, to the great slopes of the Mississippi, and the great highways and superhighways. I am pleased to report exactly what my esteemed colleague has said—that everybody there was so interested in seeing this simple, true depiction of America—the America we take for granted—that actually, for long periods of time, the Russians could not be kept in their own exhibits, because the people who had been sent there from Russia to run the Russian exhibits were so interested in looking at pictures of America.

I hope my colleague will join me in the effort to get a massive educational program going to tell the true story of America and the characteristics of her people, the things we want to acomplish, and refute the propaganda which has been so falsely, but nevertheless so effectively, spread about us in the last 20 years.

I thank my colleague for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, was the Senator from California present in the Chamber a while ago when I discussed the incident at which our Ambassador refused to make appointments for me?

Mr. MURPHY. No; I was not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are things I bring out in my remarks. I hope the Senator will read them.

Mr. MURPHY. I will read the speech very carefully.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such treatment as that is uncalled for. I had no trouble visiting Mr. Mikoyan. The second time I went there was by invitation. I spoke with Mr. Khrushchev for 4 hours. I obtained such information from him, which I brought to the Senate. There is no doubt in my own mind that during the time Mr. Khrushchev was in power he laid the foundation of capitalism—believe it or not—in Russia.

Mr. MURPHY. I believe it.

Mr. ELLENDER. We did it by promoting a system of incentives, the corner stone of capitalism. That is why the industries are producing more goods, the farms are yielding more food and fibers. What we ought to do, I repeat, is encourage the trend, instead of building up our military as has been proposed, and thereby further widen the gap of suspicion and fear that now exists between us and Russia.

(This marks the end of the colloquy that occurred during the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's address which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before I delivered my speech, I had placed on the desk of each Senator a copy of my printed report. I now ask unanimous consent that the pages be ordered to deliver those reports to the offices of all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, nothing can be added to what has already been said and felt by the people of this Nation and the world on the death of our great President and wartime leader, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The world mourns his death, at the same time that it marvels at the fullness of his life. For President Eisenhower truly exemplified the best that is America, and was, in the eloquent words and drawing of the incomparable Herblock, a "50 star general." He will be sorely missed; but what is more, he will be remembered with the love and gratitude of all men.

THE LAWRENCE EAGLE-TRIBUNE: 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this past weekend I was privileged to speak at the dedication of a new building for the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune.

For 100 years this newspaper has served the community of Lawrence, Mass., and the surrounding area of Essex County. Now, as it moves into its next hundred years, the Eagle-Tribune will operate from the most modern plant, with the most modern equipment available to any newspaper in the country. I was truly impressed with the vast array of computers and textmasters which will handle the layout and type, with the phototypesetting machines for advertising duplication, with the automated six-unit press which can print a 96-page newspaper at a rate of 100,000 pages per minute.

These new facilities will truly help the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune to meet its goals for the community: "To provide our readers with accurate, comprehensive information and honest, intelligent interpretation, to foster the moral, material and cultural well-being of our

XUM

community and our State, to encourage honest and efficient government, to fight injustice and wrong doing, and continually to strive to illuminate our country's noblest ideals of human freedom."

I congratulate Irving E. Rogers, Sr., publisher of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, and Irving E. Rogers, Jr., general manager of the paper and extend to them and their staff my very deepest best wishes for continued and fruitful years of service.

MAINE ACTION ON ELECTORAL REFORM IMPORTANT STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is an old political saying, fairly reliable, which says, "As Maine goes, so goes the Nation."

Once again Maine has taken the lead, this time in electoral college reform. The Maine Legislature has adopted the so-called district plan. Under the law now in effect in Maine, one elector would be chosen from each of the two congressional districts and the remaining two electoral votes will be chosen from the State at large. The electors representing the congressional districts would be required to vote for the party ticket which carried the district, and at-large electors would cast their ballots for the ticket winning the State's popular vote.

Mr. President, this is the basic plan encompassed in Senate Joint Resolution 12 which I have introduced along with 18 cosponsors.

It is possible under the present wording of the Constitution for the individual States to change the method of choosing electors. The courageous members of the Maine Legislature have done so, just last week, in an effort to break up the present winner-take-all method that prevails. Should the other 49 States take similar action, adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 12 would not be necessary. A basic electoral college reform would have been achieved.

While I salute the farsighted members of the legislature, I am somewhat puzzled at statements attributed to the Governor of that State who allowed the bill to become law without his signature. In the press reports, he is quoted as saying he opposes the new system because it will require candidates to "tailor their arguments to many regional and local interests."

Mr. President, I would hope so. This is one of the reasons the district plan should be adopted. Any national candidate for President should be forced to give equal weight to the interests of all regions, rather than concentrating his appeal and his programs on one segment of our society, for example, the great masses of votes in our large cities, as is presently the case.

The action taken by the State of Maine illustrates a second reason why Congress should now adopt Senate Joint Resolution 12. The district plan can be adopted. The States will ratify such a plan. This independent action of the State of Maine proves that point beyond any doubt.

Mr. President, as one who has labored in this area of reform for well over 15 years, I want to have electoral college reform, and I want it to work. I am not interested in continuing theoretical debates or in great forensic fireworks about the preferential points of one plan or another.

I want a plan approved by Congress which will be adopted by the States, because it takes only 13 State legislatures to defeat any plan we adopt. So, I hope that Members of Congress will give the proper weight to what they have now seen happen in the State of Maine, where a State legislature, acting on its own, has taken action to approve the district plan for itself, regardless of what is done in the other 49 States. It is much easier, of course, to win approval for a plan for all States than it is to approve it for one.

Mr. President, there are many additional reasons why the district plan as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12 is the proper answer to our electoral college problems. In addition to the two already mentioned, let me now discuss some of these additional reasons.

Reason number three is that Senate Joint Resolution 12 breaks up the general ticket, winner-take-all system which is the primary fault in the existing method.

Someone has said that that system of the winner take all in terms of electoral college voting is the taproot of most of the social, economic, and political problems which have plagued our country during the past three or four decades. Under the electoral college as it now operates, it is possible for a President to be elected with the support of only 12 States, and in effect the support of only those voters inhabiting the main city or cities of those States.

In fact, some 15 major American cities in only 12 States, voting with a predominancy for one candidate or another, can now control and determine the election of a President. This would be put to an end permanently by Senate Joint Resolution 12, the so-called district plan.

Fourth, the district plan brings the electoral vote more into line with the popular vote. Under the existing system a candidate receives the entire electoral vote of a State no matter how narrow his margin of popular votes may have been, producing a final electoral vote entirely out of proportion to his popular vote.

In fact, a single voter in New York State breaking a tie vote among the popular votes cast for President puts 43 electoral votes into the hopper in favor of the candidate winning his individual, tie-breaking vote.

He gets not only the votes of all of those who voted in favor of the successful candidate for President, but he also gets all of the votes of the people who voted against him, wrapped up in one ball of wax and delivered to the one who received that tie-breaking vote. That vote alone would more than offset the unanimous vote cast for another candidate by the people of some 10 or 12 or more other States of the Union, depending upon which States are selected. Obviously, something is wrong with a system that makes such a mockery of majority rule.

Fifth. It binds the elector so we no longer have the problem of the "faithless elector." Under Senate Joint Resolution 12, each elector must sign an oath before the election, swearing to support the candidate that carried his district. Should he later attempt to vote otherwise his vote would, nevertheless, be counted in accordance with his oath. So, he is bound and has no alternative except to have his vote counted as he pledged it would be when he placed his name as an elector before his constituents.

The sixth reason is that the district plan is a preferential plan, a workable plan, a plan tested in three early national elections in the history of this Republic, and a plan that can be adopted. It equalizes the power of the respective States in the event of a contingent election. The present method is undemocratic and unfair to the large States, because each State, no matter how large, can cast but a single vote in the contingent election in Congress. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides for a joint session of Congress, with each Member voting individually instead of having the issue decided in the House of Representatives, with each State voting individually—New York, for example, would have its 43 votes, while Maine and South Dakota would have only the four to which they are entitled, rather than the one-State, one-vote formula now prevailing should a presidential choice now be made in the House of Representatives.

The seventh reason why those of us who have supported Senate Joint Resolution 12 for many, many years support it now with greater confidence and greater enthusiasm is that it requires the minimum of change in constitutional language to achieve the maximum degree of required reform. Our system, after all, has functioned well—we have had 41 presidential elections since the 12th amendment was added—and any change proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired or necessary results.

Eighth. It makes the presidential election a national election in fact as well as in name. Because each voter has the same voting power, the authority to vote for three electors, the President will be elected nationally, rather than the choice of just some isolated area or segment of our society or that of some special pressure group.

Ninth. The district plan deserves the support of Congress because it retains the Federal Republic concept. Under this system, each State is allocated two electors corresponding to its Senators. It is the allocation of these two "bonus" electoral votes that preserves our Federal system and at the same time keeps faith with our Founding Fathers.

Tenth. It preserves for the States the right to establish their own election laws, as they presently do, thus avoiding the specter of Federal control of our election process and machinery. It does not require the nationalization of all the elec-

XUM

tion laws of this country, as would inevitably have to be done if the direct election or popular vote were being adopted. It allows States to lower the voting age if they wish, but places no pressure on their neighboring States to do likewise, in self-protection.

Eleventh. It maintains the principle of majority rule. The candidate who receives a majority of the electoral vote wins; if not, the contingent election process is utilized, in which again a majority vote is required in the joint session of Congress. None of this business of electing a President with a 35-percent or a 40-percent minority vote. None of the prospects of having a runoff election during the Christmas holiday season to determine who the President might be. It provides the basic requirements and machinery for making a majority decision on the basis of the way the votes are cast for President and for Congress on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November.

Twelfth. It, more than any other plan, tends to encourage retention of our two-party system. A splinter, or third party, to have any effect, would have to be truly national in scope. Isolated pockets of strength are recognized, and a third party candidate might pick up a district or two—three or four electoral votes—but these power centers cannot be combined with minuscule minorities in other districts whose cumulative power in the final vote tally would be out of proportion to their actual strength.

Thirteenth. It opens up the office of President to all men and women in America, no matter how small their home constituency may be. Under the present system, the general ticket system virtually excludes from office all candidates, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

Fourteenth. It reduces the impact of fraud and therefore the likelihood and the temptation of fraud in a presidential election. With the present system, fraudulent votes can affect the outcome in the entire State. By utilizing the district system, if fraud would still prevail, it could influence simply the electors coming from that specific electoral district—to wit, three electors and no more.

Fifteenth. It is fast and sure. When the votes are counted, in all probability we will have a decision and will not have to wait out the long process of recounts in close States. If the general election does not provide a victor, the contingent congressional process goes into effect and we do not have to wind up our cumbersome, expensive election machinery again to enter a new era of acrimony and uncertainty while the whole presidential campaign is operated all over again for a second time.

Sixteenth. It appeals to both big and small States because it gives the smaller States a more equal vote in the general election but restores the rightful vote of the larger States in the contingent election should the decision be referred to Congress.

Seventeenth. It corrects every serious problem in the present system both in the general election and, when necessary, in the contingent election.

Eighteenth. It clears up gaps in our election process should either the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect die before they actually assume office.

Mr. President, once again, I salute the State of Maine, and I sincerely hope that "as Maine goes so goes—or should go—the Nation."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article I referred to be printed in the RECORD at this time along with the statement that I delivered before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary last week on the subject of electoral college reform and in support of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAINE ALTERS RULES ON ELECTOR FUNCTIONS

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 26.—Maine adopted a new method of choosing and binding presidential electors yesterday.

The new law, which Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis opposed and allowed to pass without his signature, provides that one of the states four presidential electors shall be chosen from each of Maines two congressional districts and the other two from the state at large.

District electors would be required to vote for the Party ticket which carried the district, and at-large electors would cast their ballots for the ticket winning the states popular vote. Current law requires all electors to vote for the statewide winner.

Curtis, who believes the President should be chosen by Nationwide popular vote, said the new system will require candidates to "tailor their arguments to many regional and local interests."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KARL MUNDT, IN BEHALF OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12—PROPOSING THE "DISTRICT SYSTEM" ELECTORAL PLAN

Mr. Chairman, I welcome once again this opportunity to appear before this subcommittee. It is the third time in a little over three years that I have done so. In fact, for fifteen years I have been urging a reform of the Electoral College to make it constitutionally representative of our people in electing our chief executive and this is the 7th or 8th time in all that I have testified before the Judiciary Committee of the House or the Senate on this proposed reform.

During all these years the principles of the Constitutional Amendment I have urged have remained the same, although the language has varied somewhat. What it all boils down to, in non-constitutional language, is to provide within the context of what is possible, the most fair, accurate, certain, and democratic method of electing our President, while maintaining the deep moral, if indeed not legal commitment, we have to our Constitutional forefathers and those who hold to their basic concepts.

There is in such a situation a temptation to shrug our collective shoulders and quote the famous saying that "the more things change, the more they remain the same" and yet we all know deep in our heart that things are not the same. This is the year of change because things are not the same. We have a country heavily united behind an alteration in the present system. We have a country acutely aware of what could happen should the present method of electing the president remain in effect in future years.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, the fruit is ripe—if we pluck it we will have our prize. If we rudely shake the tree, we face two alternatives. One, it will fall unattainable over the neighbor's fence, or, two, it will be bruised and not worthy of our victory.

To take it out of this allegorical concept, we are faced with these alternatives, given the present propensity for change: we could achieve our objectives—a more realistic and democratic method of electing our president; or, we could (1) see a proposed constitutional amendment, approved by the Congress of the United States, fail to achieve the necessary ratification by state legislatures or (2) we could experience a "victory" in which we approved a constitutional amendment, attained ratification of it, and then had to deal with the unhappy consequence of it.

I am neither willing nor ready to accept either of the latter alternatives. I quite frankly want meaningful reform now, not in the remote future. I have fought this battle for almost two decades, sometimes with many allies, sometimes almost alone. I do not set myself as an expert in this field but I have been on this battlefield before, both before the committee and on the floor of the Senate. We have, in my estimation, a golden opportunity to obtain reform—let us not, so to speak "blow it".

Mr. Chairman, what I speak for is reason not rationalization, reform not refutation, sense not sensationalism, decentralization destruction, improvement not impediment and probability not possibility. In short, I support the so-called District Plan.

I would be the first to admit that the perfect plan of today is the modified plan of tomorrow. One must accept basic and political facts of life even when you are pursuing a principle. What we must never overlook is the principle. The principle here is Federalism and we cannot, nor should not, forget or forsake it. We can, however, bring principle and political practicality together. That union can produce a constitutional amendment.

As an example, let me cite the progress of what has become to be known as Senate Joint Resolution 12, the District Plan. What, as some might say, started as an exercise in principle, has evolved into a politically possible plan simply because we were able to adapt to present-day requirements while retaining its basic thrust.

Before the debate on the Senate floor in March 1956, the language of our Amendment was for the election of Electors of President and Vice President "in the same manner" as Senators and Representatives in Congress are elected. The main thrust of the opponents in that Senate debate was that Congressional Districts were unequal and gerrymandered and would continue to be unequal and gerrymandered because the State Legislatures were unequal and gerrymandered. Although the Congressional Districts did differ substantially in population, and that is an important element in gerrymandering, gerrymandering by districts is in miniature, as compared with no districts at all. Even so gerrymandered, the minority in a closely divided state could elect some members of the Electoral College, as against none under the present general ticket system. No districts at all—our present electoral system—is gerrymandering at its worst—perpetuated and glorified.

Nevertheless, to counteract this objection we replaced this language with the description of our districts in words such as these:

The districts should be composed of "compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the states to one Representative in Congress."

This, in my estimation, accomplished all of our basic purposes. It placed in the Constitution the objectives of Districts being compact, contiguous, and equal.

The question was raised, however, as to

XUM

whether the court would accept a case in which inequality of population was the main complaint. If this were in the Constitution, there would be no question as to its decision but as it turned out, we did not need the protection of written words. In a series of decisions, the Court not only decided it would accept such cases, but it ruled on the equality of the districts.

Next, and this has come to a head since my last appearance, was the continued nagging doubt on the part of those who have reservations as to the court enforcing the "non-gerrymandering" provisions. I still maintain that once it is in the Constitution, it has no choice but it appears the Court may be moving without this backstop. In a little noted case, the Supreme Court on January 13th of this year heard arguments on *Wells* v. *Rockefeller*. This case alleges that gerrymandering of legislative districts is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this point and the legal background of the judicial enforceability of the so-called "district plan" is well-documented in my testimony on February 28, 1966 before this subcommittee. I would rather move to another point regarding electoral college reform and illustrate how we have compromised between principle and politics to produce the possible.

Much has been said about "faithless" or "errant" electors. The subject is not new. After 1960 when a Republican Elector in Oklahoma failed to vote for the Republican candidate for President, we added a provision binding the elector to vote for the candidates of his party.

The 1968 election indicated that this was not quite strong enough. After the last election when Dr. Bailey voted for Wallace, who carried this Congressional District, and against Nixon who carried the state of North Carolina, our amendment now further binds the elector by oath and provides that his vote must be counted according to his oath. In effect, we have made a neuter factor out of the elector, retaining him for his ceremonial, rewardable, and symbolic function, but for all intents and purposes relegating him to the position of a unit vote, capable of carrying out his constitutional function but incapable of disregarding the will of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee can now recognize what I am talking about when I use the terms principle, politics, and possible, and that they add up to an acceptable and adoptable constitutional amendment. It is something we have preached and practiced. I have been discussing for the last few minutes some of the points of my plan and how I have improved them over the years to correct what I considered to be inequities. I feel, however, that we should now turn to what I believe is the real question before us, namely what is basically wrong with the present system.

This unfortunately is one of our major faults as an over-anxious legislative body. We tend to forget the primary target—the present system—and what is wrong with it. We rush ahead with cures before we isolate the illness. What is then wrong with the existing method of electing our President? I would point out these five factors.

(1) The winner-take-all system under which the Presidential candidate losing a state by even a close margin forfeits all of that state's electoral votes and the votes cast for him are actually reported in favor of his opponent.

(2) The winner's electoral votes are not representative of his popular vote.

(3) Electors can vote for anyone they please.

(4) In the case of a contingent election the decision is made by members of the House of Representatives voting not as individual members but in units as state delegations no matter how large or for that matter how small.

(5) A vagueness in prescribing what procedure would govern should either the President-elect or Vice President-elect die before they assume office.

Mr. Chairman, my testimony of February 28, 1966 adequately covers, I believe, point number one. Because this is so important to the discussion of electoral college reform, however, I would like to reiterate some of it.

The primary objection of course is the captive voter. Millions of citizens each year are literally disenfranchised, their votes not only taken from their own candidate but given to the opposition as they get reported in his electoral vote total.

The general ticket system has also produced these adverse effects:

(1) It virtually excludes from the Office of President of the United States all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

(2) By the same token, the dominant forces in the large, pivotal states which are responsible for the nomination and election of our Presidents have inordinate influences at the White House and in the executive branch of our government.

(3) It invites fraud in the large states that are crucial and where the vote is expected to be close. The effect of such vote fraud is statewide under the general ticket. A fraudulent vote, undetected, counts just as much as a valid vote in the statewide total. This invitation to fraud in key or pivotal states works hand-in-hand with another evil of our political system—the large campaign contributions that gravitate to the big cities in the heavily populated states. Where the stake is some forty electoral votes, which is just over one-sixth of the number necessary to elect a President, the temptation to make sure that the money achieves its objective is alarmingly strong.

By utilizing the district system, if fraud would still prevail, it could influence simply the electors coming from that specific electoral district. It would, therefore, minimize the impact of fraud. At worst, fraud or corruption in any specific area or election constituency could influence only three electoral votes not 30 or 40 as can now occur.

(4) Although the Constitution gives each state the same numerical representation in the electoral college that it has in the two House of Congress by using the general ticket for electors, we have formed a constituency for the President which is altogether different from that which elects the Congress. The great difference between these two constituencies is that almost all Representatives are elected in single member districts while their counterparts in the electoral college are elected in multimember districts consisting of entire states. This situation permits voters of a state to produce one result in the electoral college and an altogether different result in the House of Representatives at the same election. The effect of all this is that we have what I have called a "presidential United States" and a "congressional United States" that are, politically speaking, two different countries within one national boundary.

The questions regarding the relationship of the electoral votes to the popular vote and the possibility of electors voting independently have also been covered in previous testimony or earlier today. Point number four, dealing with contingent elections, requires some amplification.

The contingent election is a question beyond the Electoral College. It comes on when the Electoral College fails to give a majority for President to one person. Our amendment has always placed a contingent election in a joint session of Congress with each member having one vote. The provision not only extends the federal-national principle of representation of the Electoral College to a contingent election, but it insures a prompt and representative decision on the election of a President.

This meets head on the objection to the present provision whereby if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes when they are counted in Congress that the House of Representatives shall choose immediately a President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. The vote in such a case—the last time it occurred was in 1824—is by state; each state delegation having one vote. In the event a state's House delegation is evenly divided, its vote is not recorded. A majority of the states is required for election.

The objection to this system is that it is grossly unfair to the larger states, giving New York, California, and Pennsylvania no greater voice than Alaska, Delaware, and Nevada despite the great population disparities.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 corrects this situation. It provides that in the event no presidenial candidate has a majority of the electoral vote that—

"If no person voted for as President has such a majority, then from the persons having the three highest numbers of votes for President, the Senate and House of Representatives together, each member having one vote, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. If an additional ballot is necessary, the choice on the second ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest numbers of votes on the first ballot."

The Constitution also provides that if no candidate for Vice President has a majority that the Senate shall choose him from among the two candidates with the highest electoral vote total. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides that both Houses in joint session and voting by the head, as for President, shall select the Vice President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. This provision would also guard against the possibility of electing a President and Vice President from different parties.

So I point out that while we equalize the rights of individual citizens to vote for President, we recognize the validity that bigger states should have more authority if it comes to be decided in the House of Representatives, so that we also are fair and equitable to the big states by giving them more authority than they have now. We do not attempt to simply take power from one or the other but rather to equalize the power of both and to recognize that mere accident of geographical residence should not give one American citizen more than 14 times as much significance, stature, and authority in the voting booth as another American citizen, and this is what occurs today.

We believe that the large states should have their proportionate power—no one is advocating taking away 43 votes of New York—but we do believe that this power should be registered in the electoral college on the basis in which the people voted it. To do otherwise, or in other words, to continue the present system of general ticket, winner-take-all voting with its cumulative effect which produces second-, third-, and even fifteenth-class voting citizens, would be to give some individuals a greater voting power than they deserve.

This type of a contingent election is far superior to a run-off between the two candidates in a nationwide race. It is simple, accurate, and quick. A run-off on the other hand requires cranking up our complicated election machinery once again, something that will not be easy to accomplish in a short time period.

In addition, there is the question of expense and sheer physical fatigue. Political campaigns have reached the ridiculous state as far as finances are concerned, primarily because of television costs. The temptation to saturate the airways in a last attempt to gain victory during a run-off will be impossible to avoid. Both the political parties and the voters, who by this time would be sick and tired of politics, will be poorer for it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on point five. President Nixon, in his message on electoral reform, pointed out that there are gaps in our election process should either the President-elect or the Vice President-elect die before they actually assume office.

I have introduced an amendment to S.J. Res. 12 that would correct all of these deficiencies.

Under my amendment, should the person who received sufficient electoral votes to become President die before the electoral votes are counted, the person who would be his Vice President would succeed. Should the Vice President die before taking office, the office will remain vacant, but the new President, upon taking office, shall nominate a Vice President in conformity with Section 2 of the Twenty-fifth Amendment.

This then is the updated version of S.J. Res. 12. It will get the job done. It will accomplish the needed reforms and not do damage to our Federal system of government. Above all it has that appealing virtue of being capable of achieving ratification.

As you know, any 13 states can defeat ratification. A plan that diminishes the power of certain states has to overcome this hurdle, and it is a big one.

As an example of the logic arguing against such a move, let me cite statistics from the 1968 election. Official returns now show that Massachusetts produced a majority of 702,379 votes for Hubert Humphrey. On the other hand, 17 states ranging in size from Alaska to Wisconsin all went decisively for Richard Nixon and yet their total majority for Nixon was only 691,156. In practical political terms this means that states with an aggregate electoral vote of 84 would be completely cancelled out by one state representing only 14 electoral votes. The legislatures of these 17 states can readily recognize the fact that their influence would be diminished by a direct vote plan and for the most part vote accordingly.

The district plan on the other hand hurts no one. It equalizes all and can and should be adopted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PACKWOOD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DOLE ON MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business on Monday, April 14, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT FERDINAND MARCOS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Members of the Senate have been honored today with a visit by a distinguished statesman, soldier, and chief of state. I refer to President Ferdinand Marcos of the Republic of the Philippines. It was a pleasure to see this outstanding leader, to have him discuss matters of mutual interest with so many Members of the Senate, matters which pertain to the situation as it exists in the world and to the relations between our two countries.

It is regrettable that President Marcos will not be here longer but we consider ourselves fortunate that he took time out of an extraordinary and exhausting schedule to come to the Capitol. We were delighted also to have the opportunity to see again the First Lady of the Philippines, Imelda Marcos, and that country's Foreign Minister, Carlos Romulo, a friend of many years.

The Senate is highly honored by this visit of President Marcos. We hope it will not be too long before we will have a chance, once again, to see him.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basin Rowland Duncan;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue; and

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1969.

THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES FROM APRIL 3, 1969, TO APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate a message received today from the House of Representatives, on House Concurrent Resolution 191, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution, which will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 191

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) was considered and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28, 1969, under authority of the order of March 27, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Dorothy A. Elston, of Delaware, to be Treasurer of the United States.

U.S. MINT

Mary Brooks, of Idaho, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, of Illinois, to be Director of Public Roads.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, 018359, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated Rear Adm. Arthur R. Gralla, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Ray C. Needham for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the physical presence of Dwight David Eisenhower has departed from this earth but if we would only follow the principles and beliefs he exemplified, this world would at long last know once again that peace which marked his 8 years as President of the United States.

While we mourn his passing with a sorrow that is usually reserved for members of one's immediate family, we must be grateful for the long life granted to him so that not only this Nation, but also the free world might benefit from his wisdom and guidance.

We who served under him in World War II developed not only great confidence in his military leadership but also a great sense of affection for the man himself. As I donned my issue Eisenhower jacket, I can well remember my great sense of pride in becoming a part of the Eisenhower team. Even as an enlisted man, I could sense that his leadership would bring us victory over the mighty Hitler hordes.

Although we were a heterogeneous force when he took command, he soon knit us into a united team whose sole purpose was to bring freedom to all. It was only through this unification that Hitler's nefarious effort to enchain the entire world in slavery went down to permanent defeat.

No man has led armies into a more purposeful victory. All freedom-loving people called him "savior."

Upon my discharge, I, as well as all ex-servicemen, followed his career with great interest. We were pleased when he turned to the field of education, since we felt that he could instill in our sons that great sense of humanity and responsibility that characterized his own life.

When the Nation called on him to resume a military role as the leader of an international army to maintain the peace, we gained the feeling that free Europe would be secure. Time has justified our feelings.

We who knew him well, realized that this man, trained for war, was truly a man of peace.

Once more, I had this same sense of security when he became President of these United States. Though many, during his campaign for that office, had expressed fears that he would lead us into wars abroad, we who had followed his every word knew differently. Again, our faith was justified. His two terms were periods of peace.

As he took over the Presidency, those of us who had served under him were immensely pleased that we were once more to become members of "Ike's" team. Although I was only a one-term Congressman when he assumed office, he accorded me the privilege of a lengthy, private discussion in order that I might make known to him my legislative views.

Here I learned of the similarity in our upbringing. We both came from families that not only lived by the Bible but raised their children to govern their actions by its teachings.

If only the parents of today would read the story of the early life of Dwight D. Eisenhower, as he himself told it, I believe that they would learn a method of child raising that would lead to a fuller and more meaningful life for their children. His parents impressed upon him that service to his fellow man was a law of God. They also told him that such a service was futile unless it was accompanied by love.

It will be noted that even on the last day of his life, he spoke of his love for others. President Nixon has told us of the words that he spoke to his lovely wife from his deathbed.

He said:

> I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren and I've always loved my country.

I realize that I cannot speak for our Nation, but I can and do speak for the people of the 14th Ohio District when I say that we return the love of General Eisenhower from the depths of our being.

God was not dead to this man, and we know that he is now under His mantle.

To his beloved wife of 52 years, we can only say that the love that we felt for him encompassed the rest of those so dear to him. No tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower would be complete without the inclusion of Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower. She still remains in our hearts. Our hearts go out to her and the family in this hour of her greatest sorrow. All of our tears are intermingled with hers.

We are indeed fortunate that a man of Ike's own choosing and training occupies the White House. I am certain that he shares the dedication of Dwight Eisenhower for the welfare of all the people. Again we have a leader in whom we can have total confidence. We know that we will strive for that peace with justice that characterized the Eisenhower administration.

The Akron Beacon Journal recently ran an editorial about General Eisenhower's passing. That newspaper's president and editor, who is the chairman of the board of all Knight newspapers, was a personal friend and adviser of our late President. Excerpts from that editorial follow:

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

> "Stand firmly for America."
>
> This is Ike's legacy to the American people.
>
> These are his final words, his final exhortation to those he loved and served and to those who loved him.
>
> "Stand firmly for America" on the battlefields, in the halls of Congress, in our courts, in our schools, at the polling places and, most of all, in our homes.
>
> Teach our children to love, respect and honor the principles of true American patriotism that Ike made the guideposts of his entire life. Teach our people that the only route to dignity, to prosperity, to individual greatness is the American way.
>
> In the image of Washington, Lincoln and all the others who have built this nation to greatness, President-General Ike Eisenhower dedicated his life to standing firm for America in war and in peace.
>
> He led us safely and well along the dangerous routes during war and peace. The inspiration and leadership he has given do not die with him.
>
> While history must hand down the final verdict on the stature of this soldier, this statesman and this patriot, all of us must recognize the fact that General Eisenhower, as President during a critical period, inspired the American people to greater unity and confidence and courage.
>
> As a leader in peace and war, we liked Ike. We shall treasure his memory.

Another good friend and confidant of General Eisenhower was Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., national chairman of the United Service Organization—USO—and retired chairman of the board of Firestone. I include, Mr. Speaker, his message to Mrs. Eisenhower:

> The world has lost a leader and the nation mourns a friend. The valor, leadership, love of country and humanity of your gallant husband will keep his memory alive in the hearts of men for the ages and will be a continuing inspiration to those of us who counted ourselves among his friends.
>
> As a statesman and as a soldier, he heard the drums of history and marched to them as the liberator of the free world.

REYNOLDS METALS CO. ATTACKS LITTER

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been greatly concerned with litter, trash, and pollution which seems increasingly to mar almost every place man is found, I read with extreme interest a recent article on the recycling of aluminum by Mr. David P. Reynolds, executive vice president of Reynolds Metals Co.

Mr. Reynolds mentions several unique aspects of the aluminum industry regarding the wide extent to which recycling is already being practiced. For this the industry is to be commended.

But Reynolds Metals is going an additional step. The company is sponsoring experimental programs in the reclamation and recycling of aluminum beverage and food cans such as can be seen along with the tons of other litter on many of the Nation's highways, parks, and beaches.

The Reynolds approach to this problem, particularly in view of the abundant supplies of aluminum from natural

sources, is commendable as an exemplary act of responsible citizenship. I hope the Reynolds example will be widely imitated by other firms and industries.

So that my colleagues will know of this important activity, I include the article by Mr. Reynolds as printed in the Reynolds Review as a part of my remarks at this point:

Recycling of Aluminum: One Answer to Litter and Conservation Challenges

(By David P. Reynolds, executive vice president)

In a spaceship journeying to the moon, efficiency and economy are vital. The space traveler has limited fuel, water, food and other essentials. He also has limited facilities for waste disposal. As a means of solving both problems, he tries to include systems for converting wastes into usable materials. The word for this process is recycling.

In recent years we have come to realize that our planet Earth is a giant spaceship orbiting the sun. Mankind's supply of breathable air, water, foods and important minerals and fuels is not boundless. Our environment is not a limitless receptacle for wastes. Earth's expanding population is aggravating the problem. We cannot go on indefinitely clogging our atmosphere, our waters or our land with increasing quantities of waste.

For the problem of solid wastes, incineration, land fill and other disposal techniques do not offer satisfactory long-term solutions. Like the astronauts, we have to develop recycling systems.

Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado, Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has said, "We must learn how to mine our scrap heaps and junk yards for the valuable metals they contain."

Aluminum has been called the most versatile metal because it combines so many advantages and serves thousands of human needs. Many of aluminum's basic properties were not fully exploited until a problem or a crisis arose which propelled them into prominence. For instance, the need for thousands of aircraft in World War II brought aluminum's combination of lightweight and high-strength dramatically to the attention of millions. Historical circumstances, combined with technological advances, brought aluminum's advantages to the fore.

The problems of solid waste disposal and preservation of natural resources which confront us today are highlighting another basic property of aluminum—its ability to be recycled. The National Association of Secondary Material Industries reports that about 30 to 35 per cent of the world's aluminum comes from secondary sources—indicating that about a third of the aluminum produced in the world already is being recycled.

Not that the world is in any danger of running out of aluminum in the foreseeable future. Far from it. Our planet has been generously endowed with aluminum. (More than 1/12 of the earth's surface is aluminum.) There should be abundant supplies for many generations to come despite the fact that the volume of aluminum being used by man has been doubling roughly every ten years.

Countless products that we use today—from automobiles and appliances to packages and cans—contain aluminum. As these products are discarded, increasing amounts of aluminum will be included in the waste materials which our municipalities must dispose of. To some people who are only partly familiar with the properties of aluminum or the economics of the aluminum industry, our metal is a source of particular concern. And it needn't be.

I have heard some people voice their apprehension in this way: "At least a steel can will rust away, but an aluminum can thrown on a park or highway will lay there for years." But it is precisely this indestructible quality of aluminum which gives it its high salvage value and which will result in its being picked up, while the steel can may lie there for years.

It is this quality of aluminum which makes possible a recycling system which will both inhibit litter and stretch out the supply of aluminum almost indefinitely.

Aluminum has certain basic qualities that make it attractive to salvage and reclaim:

1. Aluminum is immune to rust and resists corrosion.
2. Because of its light weight, it is easy to handle.
3. It is in demand for thousands of uses and new uses are being found daily.
4. It can be remelted readily, re-alloyed and used again.

Sir George P. Thompson, Nobel prize winning physicist and author of "The Foreseeable Future," has said that "What we should do is to recover used metals even when not economic at present prices—a process rather like planting oak trees for future generations."

The happy fact about aluminum is that it is economical to recover—at present prices.

When it comes to cans and containers, aluminum is the only metal being used today which is economically attractive to reclaim. The scrap value of aluminum is substantial compared with most materials and metals. Some have virtually no value as scrap. For example, a ton of aluminum will bring $200 from dealers, compared with $20 for steel or $16 for waste paper.

So economically sound is the concept of aluminum's reclaimability that larger users of aluminum take it into account in their purchasing decisions. Take the railroad industry. Railroads have invested in aluminum railroad cars primarily because the metal makes possible larger cars, greater payloads and lower maintenance. But in some instances the deciding factor in selecting aluminum has been the guarantee that after extra years of service, an aluminum railroad car still will bring substantial scrap prices.

Reynolds Metals Company has been studying various approaches to recycling aluminum to eliminate waste and litter. We have been concentrating in the area of aluminum cans and containers since this is of most immediate concern to consumers. Our company is sponsoring can reclamation programs in Miami, Fla., and Los Angeles, Calif.

We are taking a different approach in each program and will be experimenting with other approaches in other cities. We hope that these programs are the forerunners of recycling systems which will keep aluminum beverage and food cans off the nation's highways, parks and beaches and flowing back to the smelter.

Our aluminum can reclamation programs are only a beginning. In the years to come a nationwide aluminum recycling system may be built within our industrial and economic structure. Such a system would reclaim all forms of aluminum scrap, greatly reducing the solid waste disposal problem and stretching out the supply of aluminum to serve the world's increasing demand.

PROGRESS REPORT AND ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to incorporate in the Congressional Record my most recent progress report and my annual questionnaire to the citizens of Nebraska's First Congressional District.

In my second newsletter of this session, I include a brief summary of several bills that I have introduced in this session, and also write about the California oil spillage disaster and the proposed Common Market soybean tax.

My questionnaire asks the opinion of First District constituents on matters ranging from election reform to limitation of agriculture subsidy payments.

I hope that these publications might be of use to any of my colleagues considering these methods of communicating with those whom they represent.

The material referred to follows:

Progress Report From Washington to Nebraska's First District From Congressman Robert V. Denney

Dear Friend: Introducing bills, studying a national disaster, and protecting domestic agriculture have been of major concern to me since my last Progress Report.

So far this session, I have introduced 25 bills in Congress. Several are:

H. Res. 33: A resolution to establish a congressional Crime Investigation and Study Committee.

H.R. 8041: A bill to establish a Countryside Development Commission to seek ways to further develop smaller urban areas in order to reverse the overcrowding in major cities.

H. Res. 126: A resolution, called Truth in Legislation, to require that an estimate of the costs of proposed programs be included in newly-introduced legislation.

H.R. 3528: A bill to provide insured operating loans, including loans to low-income farmers and ranchers.

H.R. 4258: A bill, called the Human Investment Act, to allow private businesses tax credits to help cover the expenses of giving job training to the under privileged.

CALIFORNIA OIL CONCERNS PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Last month some of my colleagues on the House Public Works Committee and I flew to California during March recess to assess the damage to the Santa Barbara coast. The disaster was caused by oil spilling from a ruptured off-shore drilling rig.

The water pollution resulting from the spillage has caused extensive destruction of marine life and birds, as well as endangering the rivers that flow into that part of the Pacific.

Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, testifying before the Public Works Committee, spoke of several bills that would set criminal liability on companies who knowingly, or through negligence, pollute our waters. As yet, there is no law on the books that requires a guilty firm to provide the necessary cleanup operations or to reimburse injured parties for damages sustained as a result of their operations.

MY 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

I will be sending out my 1969 questionnaire soon to learn your opinion on matters of concern for the nation.

This will be your chance to register your views. Last year it helped considerably and this year I again look forward to your assistance.

DENNEY FIGHTS SOYBEAN TAX

European Common Market countries are quietly working on a plan to place a "consumption" tax on soybean products imported into their countries. The U.S. produces 72% of all exported soybeans, and last year our state alone exported $13.5 million in soybean products.

XUM

The proposed tax is aimed at edging us out of competition with Europe's locally-grown livestock feed, and would work a hardship on our agricultural community as well as adversely affecting our balance of payments situation.

Because of this, I have written a letter to Secretary of State William Rogers requesting him to express disapproval of the proposed tax. I hope our official dissent will encourage them to abandon this project, which, incidentally, violates their treaty obligations.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
The Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROGERS: I ask that you express concern and disapproval to those European countries that are considering the imposition of consumption taxes on soybean products imported from the United States. We must continue to maintain heavy pressure on the Common Market countries to protect our domestic soybean industry.

Sales of U.S. farm exports in foreign markets are absolutely essential to the maintenance of our balance of payments and for the good of our farmers. Last year, Nebraska exported $13.5 million worth of soybean products, and to allow the imposition of this tax would certainly work a hardship on our agricultural community.

These countries would like nothing better than to restrict commercial use of our soybean exports. Our exports, which are presently being used for oil cake in the feeding of livestock for example, would be replaced by soft wheat and corn that they grow. Such practice is clearly "protective" and would bring this action within the prohibition of the GATT.

Specifically, I believe that the suggested tax would be in clear violation of Art. 3 of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs which prohibits use of a tax for "protective" purposes but allows such a tax if it is for "revenue" purposes.

I have been in contact with Nebraskans interested in the development of soybean markets. They are of course strongly opposed to such practices. The President of the Nebraska Soybean Association, R. L. Wagner of Hartington, Nebraska, has indicated general opposition by his group to the restricting of our European market for example.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
ROBERT V. DENNEY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

Without a doubt, the major subject of letters coming into my office in the last several months has been on the congressional pay raise. I certainly agree with the bulk of these letters that the increase is unwarranted at this time.

I do want to explain to you my position on this matter and how the raise was put into effect. In 1967, the Congress (controlled by the Democratic Party) pushed through a bill delegating authority for setting congressional salaries to a commission. I strongly opposed and voted against the formation of that commission.

After the President recommended that congressional salaries be raised, partially following the recommendation of the commission, the pay raise was to automatically go into effect UNLESS the Congress vetoed it. Legislation that I favored was introduced to veto President Johnson's recommendation, but it was tied up in the Rules Committee (again controlled by Democratic members). I will continue to work against this type of legislation.

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT V. DENNEY WANTS YOUR OPINION

DEAR FELLOW NEBRASKAN: Nearly every day, Washington makes decisions affecting your life. As your congressman, I want to represent your views in this decisionmaking. It will only take a few minutes and a stamp to let me know what you think, and it will help me in better representing you.

Previous questionnaires have proven very helpful, and I again welcome your assistance.

Sincerely,
ROBERT V. DENNEY,
Member of Congress.

Instructions: Please read each question carefully; then punch out the appropriate box with a sharp pencil. Remove punched tabs from the back of the card. Place questionnaire in an envelope, mark it "poll" and return to:

If you are not already receiving my progress report, but would like to, please punch out this box and place your return address on the reverse side				☐
		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should the $600 Federal income tax exemption for dependents be increased?		☐	☐	☐
2. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States and local governments for use as they see fit a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?		☐	☐	☐
3. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate as a self-supporting operation?		☐	☐	☐
4. On election reform, should the electoral college system: (a) remain as is; (b) be abolished and replaced by national popular vote; (c) be modified to allow the winner of each congressional district to receive 1 electoral vote with the winner of the State an additional 2 electoral votes; or (d) be modified to automatically award the winner of the State all its electoral votes	(a) ☐	(b) ☐	(c) ☐	(d) ☐
		Yes	No	Undecided
5. Red China—Do you favor U.S. support for admission of Peking to the United Nations?		☐	☐	☐
6. Which farm policy do you favor: (a) continued present feed grain program: (b) eliminate Government restrictions and price supports on feed grain; (c) establish a grain reserve with no release at less than 105 percent parity		(a) ☐	(b) ☐	(c) ☐
		Yes	No	Undecided
7. Should the Federal Government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees?		☐	☐	☐
8. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?		☐	☐	☐
9. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee and annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?		☐	☐	☐
10. Do you favor a volunteer military with comparable pay to private industry following a conclusion of Vietnam war?		☐	☐	☐
11. Do you favor limiting agriculture subsidy payments?		☐	☐	☐
12. Should the United States construct a limited anti-ballistic-missile system?		☐	☐	☐
13. In the following programs, do you think Government spending should be: (a) reduced, (b) kept at present level, (c) increased.		(a)	(b)	(c)
Foreign aid		☐	☐	☐
Crime prevention and control		☐	☐	☐
Education		☐	☐	☐
Public works and highways		☐	☐	☐
Space		☐	☐	☐
Air and water pollution control		☐	☐	☐

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report and questionnaire to my constituents of the Fourth District of Kentucky:

APRIL 1969.

DEAR FRIENDS: Hello again from Washington. As we move along into the legislative year it appears that this session may see no proposals for giant new programs, but will probably be recorded in history as a period of consolidation. As the President said in his inaugural address, during the last third of this century, government has "passed more laws, spent more money, initiated more programs" than ever before in our history. I agree with the apparent temperament of this Congress—that it is time to pause and review some of the programs passed in previous sessions and hopefully to make some improvements.

TAX REFORM

The Ways and Means Committee is already holding hearings. The last major tax reform was in 1954 and took two years to write because of the complications involved. There is a 50/50 chance it can be done in one year this time. Special targets for tax loophole closing appear to be tax-free foundations, depletion allowances, hobby farming, etc.— a job long overdue.

STOCKPILE

The Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures regularly issues a report on the condition of the national stockpile. This stockpile is the repository of allegedly strategic and critical materials, and the latest report is just out.

Taxpayers, I am sure, will be delighted to know that Uncle Sam has accumulated 1,480,997 pounds of feathers. That's right, feathers. This is about a half-million pounds more feathers than the people who set up the feather quota think this country needs.

We have also approximately 49 million more pounds of cobalt than anybody needs or wants; 8 million more pounds of cadmium than the government has any business with; almost 18 million excess carats of industrial diamonds and nearly 69 million surplus pounds of cord fiber.

However, as I have pointed out before, if these figures make you slightly ill, just remember that your government has a firm grip on 63,430,201 more pounds of castor oil than it needs. Which is just about par for the course.

As we begin the 1st session of this Congress, I seek your cooperation in answering the following questions. I can best represent all our 4th District people if I know their views on these and other important issues:

1. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States for use as they see fit, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal Income Tax?

Yes ☐; No ☐.

2. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?

Yes ☐; No ☐.

3. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?

Yes ☐; No ☐.

4. Viewing the economy as it now stands, do you favor renewing the 10% surtax when it expires on June 30?

Yes ☐; No ☐.

XUM

5. Do you favor a comprehensive study to determine the advisability of replacing the draft with a voluntary army and a ready reserve?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
6. Should the United States continue its membership in the United Nations?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
7. Generally speaking, are you favorably impressed with the first three months of the Nixon Administration?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
8. Do you believe that Foreign Aid should be reduced or eliminated?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
9. Do you believe the "war on poverty" has been worth the cost?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
10. Do you favor a resumption of bombing in North Vietnam by the United States?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
11. Should the U.S. stay out of the Middle East conflict between Israel and the Arab States?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
12. Do you favor holding spending within revenues and a real effort to reduce the public debt even if it means cutting expenditures in *your* favorite government program?
Yes ☐; No ☐.
13. Do you favor repeal of the 1968 "gun law" as it applies to long guns (rifles and shot guns)?
Yes ☐; No ☐.

THE NATION'S STAKE IN AN IMPROVED AIRPORTS SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, few cities in the country have built or are building airports capable of handling the soaring air traffic demands of the 1970's. Jacksonville, Tampa, and Miami are notable exceptions. Florida's leadership in airport development was noted recently by Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, in an address to a statewide transportation conference in Jacksonville.

In his address, however, Mr. Tipton said:

> Even that select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970's will see their investment partly wasted if artificial schedule restraints at major air hubs are permitted to take the place of new runways and radar really needed nationwide.

Mr. Tipton maintains that the only meaningful answer is to get on with the job building more airports and airways.

I believe the timely subject matter of Mr. Tipton's speech will be of interest to my colleagues. Under the leave to extend my remarks, I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE PRICE THE PUBLIC PAYS FOR INADEQUATE AIRPORTS AND AIRWAYS

(An address by Stuart G. Tipton, president, the Air Transport Association of America, before the Florida State Transportation Conference, Jacksonville, Fla.)

I am an airlines spokesman invited to speak at a Florida State Transportation Conference in Jacksonville.

I like the combination. It gives me the opportunity, on behalf of the airlines, to pay a well deserved compliment to a city and state preparing for the air travel demands of the 1970's.

Here in Jacksonville you have opened a $27 million airport. And you accomplished the entire project—from public approval of the airport bond issue to opening of the airport last October—in less than five years. This is considerably better than the national average of seven to ten years for such projects.

In Tampa, the airport has been completely modernized, including construction of a new terminal.

And in the Everglades, 50 miles West of Miami, work is nearing completion on an airport big enough to accommodate several airports the size of Kennedy International Airport in New York.

Late this year, the new Miami area field will begin handling the 200,000 yearly airline training flights now operating out of Miami International, thus relieving pressure on that important gateway.

Such progress places the cities of Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami in rather select company, as the following figures will demonstrate:

The Federal Aviation Administration, in the 1968 edition of its National Airport Plan, concluded that 800 new airports must be built in the next five years to "relieve present congestion and accommodate future growth". This would include, of course, both airline-used airports and smaller fields for general aviation.

Our own studies at ATA show beyond any doubt that all of the major air hubs need present airports expanded or new airports built by 1975.

But even if we include the airline-served cities of all sizes, only about a dozen have tackled the job. The Florida cities of Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami account for a fourth of these.

You realize the importance of your air links. You have acted to expand them.

Yet your air links, like those of other airport-building cities like Dallas-Ft. Worth, Houston and Kansas City, will be seriously clogged if we don't get moving soon on a meaningful national program to provide adequate airports and airways throughout the country.

Even that select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970's will see their investment partly wasted if artificial schedule restraints at major air hubs are permitted to take the place of new runways and radar really needed nationwide.

I would like to discuss with you for a moment or so the inherent dangers in pursuing artificial schedule restraints in place of meaningful national programs for adequate airport and airways.

Then I will outline for you the airlines program to revamp these systems.

And after I'm finished, I believe I will have given you the reasons—both community and national reasons—why you should support a needed massive program of airports and airways development.

I believe this goes directly to the heart of your program today.

Your statewide transportation conference is exploring the outlook for each of the major transport modes. From the standpoint of the airline industry, I could cite the $10 billion the airlines will be investing in 1,000 or more new planes over the next six years. I could cite also the $2 billion or more the industry will be spending during this same period for passenger and cargo terminals and for maintenance and overhaul facilities.

I could then dwell upon the industry's projections which see last year's 150 million airline passengers growing to 330 million annually by 1975.

But along with the investment and the projections on traffic demand, the airlines' future will be influenced by other factors. And I can think of none more important than the airways upon which we are dependent for safe, efficient navigation and air traffic control and the airports we must use to meet rising demand for our passenger and cargo services.

Both of the latter systems are clearly inadequate. Both have been the victims of inadequate resources in the face of clearly demonstrated public need. As a consequence, the industry has just emerged from one of the most remarkable and strangest exercises in our history.

In a very real sense we have been closing the door to potential business.

For 32 days of nearly continuous sessions the airlines using the three New York area airports, and Washington's National and Chicago's O'Hare have been deciding how to reduce service to comply with hourly flight restrictions imposed by the FAA.

In an era when rising costs of capital, wages and material force every profit-conscious industry to reach out for new market-expansion opportunities, the fact that the airlines, on their own, could cut their own schedules to arrive at a formula within the FAA restrictions is a remarkable accomplishment—even against the backdrop of last Summer's congestion crisis at major air hubs.

It is made even the more remarkable because it is an approach the airlines believe shortsighted and inherently harmful not only to themselves, but to the public.

No other segment of aviation has made such a sacrifice.

Fortunately, however, there is evidence of an increasing awareness in government that artificial schedules restraints are not the answer.

The new Secretary of Transportation, as did the new President before him, has emphasized the need for a new national effort to improve the airports and airways systems, most probably through a trust fund concept. And the FAA has postponed the date for the start of schedule curtailment at New York, Washington, and Chicago area airports from late April to June. Let's hope that in the interim a way is found to abandon the idea altogether.

It might serve as a spur in this direction to delineate the impact on other cities.

Let's start right here in Jacksonville.

As you know many other cities last Summer were on the brink of the same type of congestion experienced by La Guardia, Newark, Kennedy International, Washington National and O'Hare.

At a conference on congestion called by the FAA in Washington last August the FAA cited a number of cities in which it said "delays of varying magnitudes are encountered". These included—in addition to New York, Washington and Chicago—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami, Boston and Atlanta.

In September, when the FAA issued its proposed rule limiting schedules at New York, Washington and Chicago, the proposal contained the following comment: "However, as congestion and delay increase in other areas, regulatory control of demand will be extended as appropriate."

How would a spread of the philosophy of artificial schedule restriction, in place of a program of adequate airports/airways development, affect Jacksonville?

Of the one million or so people arriving at or departing from Jacksonville last year, 340,000 or 34 per cent were travelers between your city and Boston, New York, Washington, Chicago and Atlanta.

Jacksonville has long attracted visitors who enjoyed its beaches and its climate. Now you are building upon this base to attract major companies to make Jacksonville a banking and insurance center of the Southeast.

At a time when most cities are losing ground economically and in terms of popula-

XUM

tion growth to their surburbs, Jacksonville has consolidated its city and county governments to create a new city encompassing 827 square miles—the largest city in terms of space in the United States, according to the World Almanac. I'm told that even in a jet airliner, it takes 30 minutes to travel around the new city limits.

You have packaged all of your recent accomplishments and hopes for the future into a phrase I like very much—"Jacksonville—the bold new city of the South."

But at a time when there is every natural evidence that air traffic nationwide will double within the next six years—and quite possibly more than double on major air routes—how bold can be the outlook for any city, North or South, if those sources representing a third or more of travel to it are artificially repressed?

I have concentrated on Jacksonville as an example close at hand. I could just as well have cited Miami where 46 per cent of the arriving passengers last year came from New York, Boston, Washington, Chicago and Atlanta—all restriction-threatened cities.

Earlier this year I made the same point in New York which could lose $54 million next year and $205 million annually by 1975 through lack of adequate airport airways facilities.

I have made the same point in Los Angeles and I will make the same point later this year in other cities. Take each of the 500 or so airports in this country served by the airlines and add up the dismal impact of artificial schedule restraints on people who want to get to and from major air hubs at their convenience and you have the public price of inadequate airport airways development.

This needn't be. For years now, everybody in aviation has had a rather realistic idea of what is needed for adequate airport airways development.

Here is the airline industry program. It realizes the need for development of both the airways system and the airports system; but it recognizes essential differences in each system.

Airports are a local or regional responsibility, usually supported by revenue bonds which are, in turn, backed up by the rentals, landing fees and other airport revenue generated by the airlines. Consequently most airline-used airports are highly productive economic entities.

But the major problem in achieving adequate airports is, quite simply, a lack of time.

We must do within the next five years what we should have been doing on airport development over the last 20 years. The job is one of achieving massive improvement, nationwide and nearly simultaneously.

The airlines propose that this be accomplished through an Airport Development trust fund supported by a two per cent increase in the current tax on domestic airline passenger tickets and a new charge of $2 on tickets bought for travel from the United States to points abroad. The Fund would support development not only at airline-used airports, but also at general aviation airports, to the extent that these were designed to relieve pressure on airline-served fields.

The airlines proposal differs in one very important respect from other airport trust fund proposals which would use trust fund money directly for construction costs.

Costs are simply too high for such an old fashioned approach. A single runway, including supporting taxiways, for today's jets costs between $4 million and $5 million. Consequently, even if the Trust Fund produces $120 million in its first year—as it is quite likely to do—we could not build very many runways at one time. And even over five years, direct funding of airport projects would enable us to accomplish little more than patchwork.

But there is a way of using the Trust Fund money to get moving on many more times as much work during the same five year period. This could be done by using most of the Trust Fund money to meet 75 percent of debt service costs on locally issued airport bonds, repayable over periods of up to 40 years.

Such an approach would permit the issuance of $3 billion in airport bonds during the first five years of the program. By comparison, direct grants for airport development would produce only about $600 million over the same period.

This is exactly what the airlines propose. We say of such an approach that it achieves the multiplier effect because it multiplies the amount of airport work that can get moving all over the country simultaneously.

The airways system for safe, efficient navigation and air traffic control requires a different approach. It is a federal responsibility and has been since 1926.

All beneficiaries of this system should contribute their fair share to its support.

Airline-users do this through the five per cent tax on passenger tickets, officially designated by Congress as a user charge for support of the airways system. The airlines would welcome further congressional inquiry to determine an equitable formula whereby all users of the airways—including general aviation and the government, through the use the military makes of the airways—contribute their fair share of adequate airways development.

Action at this point is up to the new Congress and the new Administration. The airlines are exerting every effort to win support of their airports/airways program.

We ask your solid support.

Providing all cities with the air links they need in the face of growing demand is in your interest as well as our own.

Thank you.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying last respects to a great American, general of the Army and former President, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a gallant and courageous man who gained the affection and respect of his countrymen and of all humanity.

His contributions, in war and in peace, are without measure. As the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, as Supreme Commander of NATO, and as our 34th President, Dwight D. Eisenhower served his Nation well. As a former member of the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers to President Eisenhower, I had opportunity to observe the dignity and strength that he brought to that Office.

In a letter written in 1966, Dwight Eisenhower listed what he felt were 23 of the chief accomplishments of his administration. First among these in all our hearts was the peace that the Nation enjoyed under his leadership. And, as much as any other President of the United States, he unified the Nation.

With what a deep sense of loss we mourn his passing.

HOW TO FIGHT DRUGS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the relationship to drug use to trouble and violence in the schools is undeniable. Something has got to be done to get the word to our young people that it is stupid, not smart, to use drugs; that it is their own lives that will be damaged, if not destroyed, in the process.

Girls can help here too—if they will show their contempt of boys who take to pot and speed instead of helping with the problems of society that seem so insurmountable at this hour. Youngsters who run away to the dream world of drugs set the stage for hard narcotic use when the kick of the lesser pot becomes tame. Hard stuff destroys the body and the mind as well as being habit forming. The agonies of withdrawal are among the worst pains known to civilized mankind.

If anything like 40 percent of the young people in high school—no less—have reached the heroin stage as reported in the following Alsop column, Congress had better view this situation as requiring a crash program for solution.

I urge parents, teachers, and those responsible for the schools across the land to give the students themselves a measure of responsibility for dealing with their own. We should encourage the young people to help their friends understand the menace and save themselves before they are hooked. Give young people—even in the high schools—a piece of the action here and I believe all concerned would be pleasantly surprised at the results.

The column referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 31, 1969]

Drug Use in New York City Schools Appalling Solution to Violence

(By Joseph Alsop)

New York.—"More drugs, less violence, less drugs, more violence, that's about the size of it."

The fairly hair-raising equation was quietly offered by one of this city's most humanely wise school superintendents, Elliott Shapiro. It was in fact his explanation of the relative calm at Hughes High School, in lower Manhattan, where more than 40 per cent of students have reached the stage of heroin-use, or at least of heroin experiments.

The terrifying increase in hard drug-use in the New York schools (which merely predict the future in other big city schools) is in truth only one side of the medal. The medal's other side is the steady increase of violence, born of racial tension. The violence is rather clearly stimulated and even orchestrated by external organizations like the SDS and the Maoist-learning Afro-American Association.

Here a good case in point is Franklin K. Lane High School, on the Brooklyn Queens border. Lane's huge and handsome building is the focal point of a white middle class neighborhood, but gerrymandering to produce integration has given Lane a high proportion of black students.

When this reporter went to Lane, it was supposed to be "Black Monday"—the final deadline, in other words for meeting the "non-negotiable demands" of the school's handful of black militants. The demands were not being met; but it was all as quiet as a May morning, no doubt because of the presence of no less than 75 uniformed police, both inside the school itself and on all the routes of access.

The Lane story, it turned out, was classic. It began, as troubles in the big city high schools always do, with acute over-crowding. This led to double sessions, and to the breakdown of the discipline and security that double sessions always tend to cause. In this case, the breakdown of security was very grave.

In a fairly short space of time, there were over a dozen assaults; and all were assaults on white teachers by black students. These culminated in an attack on still another teacher, Frank Siracusa, by three students acting in concert, who cornered him in a stairwell. One held him. One sprayed him with something like lighter fluid. The third ignited his clothes. It was lucky (and Siracusa's assailants were also lucky) that he escaped without serious harm.

The Teachers Union thereupon rather understandably demanded police protection inside the school; and this was provided. Meanwhile the school principal, Morton Selub, moved to restore the school to a single session-schedule by the simple expedient of dropping about 700 persistent truants absent 30 days or more out of 50—from Lane's enrollment.

This supposedly tyrannical act led to much turmoil, including the "non-negotiable demands" of the school's black militants. Certain concessions were made, but in the main, the demands had to be rejected.

Since then, Lane High School has remained under siege, with something like 30 uniformed officers regularly on duty. And the whites of the Cypress-Woodhaven Community Council have now begun to demonstrate in their turn, demanding that the lines of the school district be redrawn once again, so that Lane will be mainly white.

The point of telling this grisly story is, quite simply, that there is nothing very exceptional about it, barring the Siracusa episode. Dr. Nathan Brown, the able assistant school superintendent of New York City, gave me the estimate that there were at least five other New York high schools in the same state as Lane. Ten more, he added, were also threatened with comparable outbreaks of violence.

These are all high schools with important Negro-Puerto Rican student populations. In other schools where whites predominate—most importantly in the nationally famous Bronx High School of Science—the SDS is also especially active. Here, "confrontations" in the best Columbia-Berkeley style may soon occur.

There is plenty of tinder here, to touch matches to, of course. The simplest proof that a good many of the matches are externally supplied is the well-edited, rather expensively printed "High School Free Press." This highly obscene propaganda sheet, crammed with every kind of appeal to violence, now circulates widely throughout the New York High schools. It is certainly not the sort of publication school boys and girls could either produce or finance.

Such, then, is the present state of this city's school system, which was once the best that any American big city boasted. The decent, hard-working chairman of the school board, John Doar, hopes that "we'll be able to control it—but that means using all the needed measures to meet this level of siege." One must pray Doar is right.

THOMAS MERTON—1915-68

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the most interesting literary figures of our day was a cloistered monk serving in a Kentucky monastery. Thomas Merton, who gave us "The Seven Storey Mountain," and other memorable works of literature, was known as Father M. Louis, of the Trappist Monastery at Gethsemani, Ky.

Upon the occasion of his death, the New York Times published a most interesting and detailed account of Thomas Merton's unusual career. I ask unanimous consent that the account be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS MERTON IS DEAD AT 53—MONK WROTE OF SEARCH FOR GOD

(By Israel Shenker)

Thomas Merton, the Trappist monk who spoke from the world of silence to questing millions who sought God, died on Monday in Bangkok, Thailand. He was 53 years old.

Author of an autobiography entitled "The Seven Storey Mountain," which became an immediate best-seller on publication in 1948, he was a writer of singular grace about the City of God and an essayist of penetrating originality on the City of Man.

The Trappist Abbey of Gethsemani, at Bardstown, Ky., announced the death of its best-known member. A spokesman for the abbey said a cable with the news had arrived from the American Embassy in Bangkok. There was no indication of the cause of death.

Father M. Louis—the religious name Merton adopted at the monastery—left for the Far East several months ago to attend a number of religious conferences. He was an expert on the contemplative life of the East, having written on a variety of Asian religious experiences.

In the history of recent Roman Catholic letters, Merton occupied a place of unusual prominence. He wrote of ageless spiritual life and religious devotion with the knowledge of a modern. And in the perspective of one who sought to increase his distance from the clangor of the age, he was beset by the demands of those who found him a prophet of that withdrawal.

As the leading light of his monastery, he found himself all but condemned by his abbot to sit at the typewriter and produce wisdom of the ages. It was a sign of his two minds about his role that he was ironically resigned and yet enthusiastically committed to it.

OBJECT OF PILGRIMAGES

In the wake of the fame that descended on him as a result of his writings, he was the object of pilgrimages to the monastery. Though Trappists follow a regimen of silence—in conditions of sometimes severe privation—Merton was permitted, even encouraged, to propagate his thoughts. This he did in poetry, in a stream of books, in reviews of books by others, and in letters to editors.

The vogue that attended his prominence in the late nineteen-forties and fifties declined somewhat as the years progressed. For some avant-garde Catholic intellectuals Merton was partly stranded in the medieval-garde, though his concern for the problems of life extended to contemporary man. Even when Merton wrote about the justice of demands by Negroes, or the injustice of duties imposed by governments, he seemed a far echo of the message that was clear to others before him.

Thomas Merton was born on Jan. 31, 1915 in Prades, a French town that nestles below the Pyrenees near Spain. Today the town is best known for having served as the site of the Prades music festival, organized by Pablo Casals, the Spanish exile cellist.

Merton's father was English (Church of England), his mother American (Quaker). He grew up and studied in France, Bermuda, England, and the United States. He was graduated from Columbia University and earned a master's degree there.

After teaching English briefly at Columbia, he became so upset about the injustices of life that he joined a young Communist group. At the same time, he served at a Catholic settlement house in Harlem.

His reading was bringing him closer and closer to Catholicism. He later wrote in "The Seven Storey Mountain" that his "mind was taken up with this one thought: of getting baptized [he was Church of England] and entering at last into the supernatural life of the Church."

He added:

"I was about to set foot on the shore at the foot of the high, seven-circled mountain of a Purgatory steeper and more arduous than I was able to imagine, and I was not at all aware of the climbing I was about to have to do."

"The essential thing," he noted, "was to begin the climb."

From then—1938—until his death, the climb was a search for the perfection of the vision that filled mystics with wonder and realists with apprehension.

"The whole work of man in this life is to find God," Merton wrote.

In 1941 Merton entered the Trappist monastery of Gethsemani. The full title is Order of Cistercians of the Strict Observance, and the aim of this observance is sainthood.

Curious about the kind of life that awaited him, Merton consulted an encyclopedia, and his reading there convinced him that in earlier days the world and the order were vastly different.

"What wonderful happiness there was, then," he wrote. "There were still men on this miserable, noisy, cruel earth, who tasted the marvelous joy of silence and solitude, who dwelt in forgotten mountain cells, in secluded monasteries, where the news and desires and appetites and conflicts of the world no longer reached them."

Where others saw only the rigors of discipline, Merton perceived the joys of opportunity.

"A man is a man who has given up everything to possess everything," he wrote. "He is one who has abandoned desire in order to achieve the highest fulfillment of all desire. He has renounced his liberty in order to become free."

As the vagaries of literary favor would have it, Merton's autobiography, describing the spiritual pilgrimage leading from the lilt of French to the silence of Kentucky, had to negotiate past unlikely obstacles.

On the nonfiction best-seller list for 1949, No. 1 was "White Collar Zoo," a book of animal photographs with humorous captions, No. 2 dealt with canasta, and No. 3 was "The Seven Storey Mountain," which moved many to new views of the old virtues of piety and prayer, and of the temptations of the flesh.

Merton was a practiced literary hand by the time his most popular book emerged from

XUM

the monastery. He wrote his first book at the age of 10, and followed it with 10 more unpublished novels.

Though he noted that he had destroyed all of them, one novel from his youth is to be published by Doubleday in July—"My Argument with the Gestapo: a Macaronic Journal." It tells of a young poet's attempt to report the World War II from London. "Macaronic" means verse written in two or more languages.

The book was written in 1940, and leans heavily on the author's imagination. He did not cover the fighting nor argue personally with the Gestapo.

Merton's devotion to severe ideals did not prevent him from seeing humor in life. "Can we recover from the titanic humorlessness of our civilization?" he wondered.

Since he had little hair left, he did not have to bother shaving his head to make him a fit member of the order.

"You have got me kneeling behind that pillar," he complained to God, "with my mind making a noise like a bank. Is that contemplation?"

Among his earlier works are: "Thirty Poems" (1944), "The Waters of Siloe" (1949), "Seeds of Contemplation" (1949), "The Sign of Jonas" (1952) and "No Man Is an Island" (1955).

More recently, "Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander" (1966) and "Mystics and Zen Masters" (1967).

Too complete an intellectual to accept faith blindly, he expressed his doubts—and also his fulfillment.

"You have given me peace," he said, and in the second person he meant the first person in the thoughts he put on paper: God.

After resignedly acting as master of novices at Gethsemani, he withdrew to a hermitage on abbey property, to gain more distance for contemplation.

His trip to the Far East was a rupture in this effort to glimpse more of the universe by seeing less of the world. But it was a characteristic move for the man who was no less concerned by the sinfulness of the world than a pusuit of what could put it right.

The monk who wandered in out of the world and then back into the world concluded his most popular book with an epitaph that he imagined to be the words of God.

"And when you have been praised a little and loved a little." God was saying to Merton, "I will take away all your gifts and all your love and all your praise and you will be utterly forgotten and abandoned and you will be nothing, a dead thing, a rejection. And in that day you shall begin to possess the solitude you have so long desired."

QUOTATIONS FROM MERTON'S WRITINGS

On man's relation to God: We cannot arrive at the perfect possession of God in this life, and that is why we are traveling and in darkness. But we already possess Him by grace, and therefore in that sense we have arrived and are dwelling in the light.

Addressing God, after taking his Trappist vows: For now, oh my God, it is to You alone that I can talk, because nobody else will understand. I cannot bring any other man on this earth into the cloud where I dwell in Your light, that is, Your darkness, where I am lost and abashed. I cannot explain to any other man the anguish which is Your joy nor the loss which is the Possession of You, nor the distance from all things which is the arrival in You, nor the death that is the birth in You because I do not know anything about it myself and all I know is that I wish it were over—I wish it were begun.

On man's responsibility to man: Einstein was a great prophet of the now dead age of liberalism. He emerged with the disconcerting kindness and innocence of the liberal, came forth from the confusions of his day to produce for us all a little moment of clarity, and also, as an afterthought, he left us the atomic bomb. But we cannot take the bomb as pretext for looking down on his liberalism, or doubting his benevolence.

On the Generation Gap: Yesterday I offered Mass for the new generation, the new poets, the fighters for peace and for civil rights, and for my own novices. There is in many of them a peculiar quality of truth that older squares have rinsed out of themselves in hours of secure right-thinking and noncommitment. May God prevent us from becoming "right-thinking men—that is to say men who agree perfectly with their own police.

POETRY

"Trappists, working

"Now all our saws sing holy sonnets in this world of timber
Where oaks go off like guns, and fall like cataracts,
Pouring their roar into the wood's green well.

Walk to us, Jesus, through the wall of trees,
And find us still adorers in these airy churches,
Singing our other Office with our saws and axes.
Still teach your children in the busy forest,
And let some little sunlight reach us, in our mental shades, and leafy studies.

When time has turned the country white with grain
And filled our regions with the thrashing sun,
Walk to us, Jesus, through the walls of wheat
When our two tractors come to cut them down:

Sow some light winds upon the acres of our spirit,
And cool the regions where our prayers are reapers,
And slake us, Heaven, with Your living rivers."

"Wisdom

"I studied it and it taught me nothing.

I learned it and soon forgot everything else:
Having forgotten, I was burdened with knowledge—
The insupportable knowledge of nothing.

How sweet my life would be, if I were wise!
Wisdom is well known
When it is no longer seen or thought of,
Only then is understanding bearable."

SPIRITUAL AND MORAL DISINTEGRATION?

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article by Willard F. Rockwell, board chairman of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., which appeared in a recent issue of that firm's quarterly publication, Flow Line. I include the article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

SPIRITUAL AND MORAL DISINTEGRATION?

(By Willard F. Rockwell, Board Chairman, Rockwell Manufacturing Co.)

Time after time, the great leaders of history have pointed out that all who do not learn lessons from the mistakes of the past are doomed to repeat them. In his 1935 State of the Union message, President Franklin D. Roosevelt included a warning of welfarism's effects in destroying human character, with cumulative effects on the entire community and state. He said: "The lessons of history . . . show conclusively . . . that continued dependence on relief induces a spiritual and *moral disintegration* fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief . . . is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit . . ."

In quoting these remarks, the editor of the *Wall Street Journal* continued:

"History's lessons are just as plain now as they were in 1935, when Franklin D. Roosevelt thus warned of welfarism's effects in his State of the Union message. Yet many *well-meaning Americans* largely ignored those lessons now, just as Mr. Roosevelt himself did later on.

"Confronted by the failures of the existing welfare system, nearly everyone would like to supplement it or replace it with something else. Three of the proposals—all very much alive as a new Administration nears office—were discussed in a recent speech by Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University."

One can only assume that President Roosevelt found that, having started the welfare system, it might be impossible to be re-elected unless he continued it, and he hoped to increase his popularity by increasing the so-called benefits. It has been noted that the greatest subsequent welfare increases have passed in Congress just before national elections, until it now becomes the greatest peacetime threat to our nation's future financial strength and moral fiber.

Henry Hazlitt, the economist who is known over the world for his comments on international economics and finance, has recently written a book entitled *Life and Death of the Welfare State*. This book clearly shows the way in which our professional politicians have led this nation into its present perilous position. As self-preservation is said to be the first law of nature, we can see why pandering politicians throughout history have had no scruples about seeking election and successive re-elections by offering personal *security* which, throughout the world's history, has resulted in national insecurity. If they know history, they know it will bring disaster, but they expect that the disaster will occur after their departure from this life. *Apres nous, le deluge!*

It has been clearly demonstrated in recent years that a strong nation can use its strength wisely and increase the national welfare if its manpower and money power are used wisely. However, when the ruling politicians reduced manpower and financial resources by wars against other nations or by futile promises to its own people to wipe out poverty to the point where its people can reduce their labors and at the same time increase their leisure, the only result has been destructive impairment of its national welfare. When Britain's rulers adopted the Keynesian plan, its citizens were assured the country would increase and maintain its position as the most powerful nation in the world. Today, some of the most powerful voices which promoted the Keynesian theories have had to admit it has reduced Britain from the top world power to a third-rate power and has contributed to the rise of other nations which took advantage of British political mistakes. To many good people, the politicians' promise to eliminate poverty through adopting their nostrums is downright blasphemy!

The involvement of our great nation in wars, the ever-increasing crime rates due to softness shown to criminals by courts which give them greater and greater protection against just punishment, the frightening inroads of inflation, and the disrespect for all police and military powers in our country all came about through weakening—and sometimes abandoning—our original constitutional protection. It is only confusing to seek to find whether foreign countries having similar troubles copied our mistakes, or vice versa.

While he was the governor of New York, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, "Our nation has been a successful experiment in democratic government because the individual states have waived in only a few instances their sovereign rights . . . But there is a tendency, and to my mind a dangerous tendency, on the part of our national government, to encroach, on one excuse or another, more and more upon state supremacy. The elastic theory of interstate commerce, for instance, has been stretched almost to the breaking point to cover certain regulatory powers desired by Washington."

Roosevelt became President in 1932 on a strong platform pledging himself and his party to uphold states rights and to reduce federal expenditures by cutting both the number of federal agencies and powers and the vast number of employees, all in accordance with our Constitution. When these party planks were rapidly revoked, the first protest by a big group of businessmen in Washington was followed immediately by the threat that every individual attending that protest meeting was to be subjected to a new scrutiny of their income tax returns by the Internal Revenue Department. That improper pressure effectively suppressed publicized protest meetings and was believed by many good citizens to have obliterated the rights of free speech.

Speaker Byrd of the Virginia House of Delegates, prophesied in 1910 that passage of the Income Tax Amendment would permit federal and state politicians to build up a system of spying and snooping by ever expanding bureaucracies. Time has proven that forecast to be only too correct. Individuals and agencies do pry into every individual's private affairs just as it was done under Communist and Nazi regimes in other countries.

Dan Smoot, a former FBI agent and a fearless commentator on political evasions and invasions of our constitutional freedoms, reminds us that Frederic Bastiat, a 19th Century French philosopher, said: "Life, liberty, and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place."

Mr. Smoot regards the Constitution of the United States as "a solemn agreement which every officer of government is under a sacred duty to obey." He believes that "It is treason as defined by the Constitution to give aid and comfort to international communism . . ." He states that our freedom is in danger because of federal activities not authorized under the Constitution as a proper sphere of government. He declares government has no authority "to grant powers for welfare programs, for schemes to redistribute wealth, and for activities which coerce people into acting in accordance with a prescribed code of social planning."

In his opinion, when our government steps over the line and assumes "the aggressive role of redistributing wealth and providing so-called 'benefits' for some of its citizens, it then becomes an instrument for what Frederic Bastiat called *legalized plunder*. 'How is this legal plunder to be identified?' asks Bastiat.

" 'See if the law takes from some persons what belongs to them, and gives it to other persons to whom it does not belong. See if the law benefits one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself cannot do without committing a crime.' " Bastiat prophesied that such legalized plunder was the greatest threat then to our greatly admired Republic.

How many of our solid citizens can fail to see that our government has assumed greater and greater authority over every citizen's private life, his liberty, and his property? It has truly been extended to cover his life from womb to tomb, with inheritance tax laws to pursue his heirs for years after his death.

PROFESSIONAL DO-GOODERS

In the same article, Mr. Smoot offers a quotation from the writings of Henry Grady Weaver:

"Most of the major ills of the world have been caused by well-meaning people . . . obsessed with fanatical zeal to improve the lot of mankind-in-the-mass through some pet formula of their own . . . The harm done by ordinary criminals, murderers, gangsters, and thieves is negligible in comparison with the agony inflicted upon human beings by the professional 'do-gooders,' who attempt to set themselves up as gods on earth and who would ruthlessly force their views on all others—with the abiding assurance that the end justified the means."

How true!

When Henry Weaver made these remarks, the crime rates were being reduced, and he could not foresee that those "well-meaning" people would also be responsible for the present frightening and frightful increase in crimes from which this nation is now suffering. Some "well-meaning" people believed that people accused of crime needed protection from overzealous policing authorities, but some of the "well-meaning" people were the judges in our courts who made new rules so favorable to criminals that it is difficult and occassionally impossible to convict known felons. The leniency was applauded by the worst kind of citizens—ranging from sneak thieves to criminal gang leaders.

The powers given to labor leaders extended in some cases to gangsters who had seized labor union control, some of whom are now more powerful than the President of the United States and Congress. These people demonstrate their power by closing down entire industries, regardless of national interest. They have closed entire public utility systems and kept them closed until they were granted some utterly inequitable demands. The politicians gathered votes for themselves when they refused to prevent the seizure of private property by union men until the inordinate demands of union racketeers were met, even when such demands led to bankruptcy and vast losses to both investors and customers, including hospital patients. The politicians did not foresee the time when labor leaders would use the same methods to invoke strikes among organized government employees who would shut down everything from schools to sanitation districts and even obstruct our military defenses and operations of our courts. The pandering politicians have been hoisted now by their own petard!

President Lyndon Johnson used the Taft-Hartley Act to delay the recent Maritime strike. One hour before the strike was declared, he called on both parties in the dispute "to resolve this matter and to do so immediately." He stated that a 55-day port strike four years ago cost the nation almost $1 billion in export losses, and said, "We cannot pay that price again, or even risk being exposed to the danger."

When the President of the United States is powerless to stop a group of men who take such actions against the public welfare, regardless of the President's declaration of the danger which had cost our country so much in a previous strike, who can say what may happen next? How long will the public suffer such savagely ruthless punishment without demanding that there be a return to constitutional power and abolishment of these shameful malpractices?

In New York City, public welfare recipients now approach 10 per cent of the population; more money is spent on welfarism than is spent to support education, health, housing, policing, and the courts—just as President Roosevelt predicted when discussing welfarism in 1935.

As predicted for many years, welfarism in the United States has been extended by our politicians to welfarism for the entire world—to our former allies, our former enemies, and neutrals. There is no doubt that in the last election, 57 per cent of our citizens who voted were opposed to the welfarism which leads to local, state, and national bankruptcy. The Presidential candidate who said that if we were worried about the federal spending up to now he would show us some new records received the votes of "well-meaning" people, and every beneficiary of the welfare votes and the leniency toward the criminal elements. And there is no doubt that many good citizens did not vote because they felt it has become impossible to obtain a conservative and constitutional victory in view of the socialistic promises of the opposition.

CRIMINALS ARE GROWING YOUNGER

Congressman Glenn C. Cunningham of Nebraska, addressing the Speaker and the House of Representatives, gave this shocking report on crime based on the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and recent F.B.I. and Public Health Service figures:

"Three-quarters of all arrests for crime in the United States each year are people under 25 years of age. The greatest class of criminals in the United States are 15 years of age, and the second greatest class are 16 year olds. One thousand and five hundred teenagers a day are afflicted with venereal disease. Rape in the United States has increased 61 per cent since 1960, and this rate rose 7 per cent from 1966 to 1967 nationwide. What is worse, the rate of forcible rape in our major cities increased 12 per cent from 1966 to 1967. This is a fire, and obscenity and pornography are gasoline that is splashed on this fire at the rate of 100 million pieces of objectionable material a year through the Post Office Department.

"Crime is then largely a youth problem and becoming more so. The 15-to-24-year-old group is the fastest growing part of the population. The growth of crime is much faster than the growth of our population, but the problems that our youth are having are part of the nationwide crime problem. If we are to start solving the crime problem we must start with the problems young people have. The problem of adolescence is for the most part adjusting relationships to the opposite sex and these relationships are being twisted by the free distribution of obscenity and the greed of smut merchants. The curse of very young lives is 'obscenity.'

'Obscenity inflames the curiosity of the young and their imagination. Most obscene materials are directed at the very young. Smut mailers pay a very high price for the names of youngsters in the 12 to 14 age bracket. It is a great wrong because it presents members of the opposite sex as subjects for physical satisfaction only. In addition, members of the opposite sex are presented as masochistic creatures who can only respond to cruelty."

After hearing such a well-documented indictment of increasing juvenile crime, what good citizen would believe that Congress did not take prompt action?

The Federal Government has subsidized the mothers of illegitimate children, but many of such mothers have shown no interest in and take no care of their children. Federal minimum wage laws have wiped out opportunities for young untrained people to take jobs, and many capable men are kept from obtaining employment because of union restrictions, from which there is no sure appeal. The most powerful newspaper in the country reports millions of dollars are stolen by collusion between government employees and jobless people in New York City, which could not continue if politicians did not benefit from the chicanery. A few years ago, there were many unions in New York City

XUM

which did not have a single black or Puerto Rican member; there are still many which have none. And yet the politicians try to blame this condition on employers—who are barred from employing non-union workers. The fact that such monopolistic powers are unconstitutional seems to be overlooked by the "well-meaning" friends of the people.

Boys from wealthy families whose parents forbid them to drive cars have found out how easy it is to steal one—and often cannot resist the temptation to do so. After stealing cars, it is inevitable that they are started on the way to a criminal career. People on relief, because they do not want to work, spend their time searching for homes to rob, and use every other possible means of acquiring other people's property. There are actually thousands of welfarers who, in the jargon of the criminals, spend their time "casing joints."

WELFARE ABUSES

Men with large families working for low salaries are urged by government employees to get a divorce. In this way they are told how they can keep all their earnings, and their wives and children will be immediately put on relief. They also tell them that if they live in a different place, they can continue their relations with their wives. And the government employees who urge such actions are seldom brought to task for their part in such illicit and pernicious practices.

Some state legislatures passing welfare laws wanted to make sure that payments were restricted to bona fide citizens, and so provided that new residents in the state would receive no payments until a stated period of residence had been established. One court decided that this was not constitutional, that any new resident could immediately receive the maximum benefits. That decision started a big migration, even though the case has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court where it is pending.

On January 21st of this year, newspapers reported that a Mississippi woman with twelve children had moved to New York "solely to take advantage of high relief payments." She expected to receive $745 a month—$640 more than the $105 a month she received in Mississippi. She appealed to a trial examiner appointed by the State Department of Welfare, but her claim was rejected under the State Social Service Law because she "came into the state for the purpose of receiving public assistance," and therefore, was "undeserving and ineligible for welfare."

The woman is living with a daughter who has two children and is receiving $462 a month in emergency aid. When the lawyers get through arguing, and if welfare is refused, the woman will continue to receive aid until plans can be made for her return to Mississippi.

In addition to the welfare payments, the state has to pay legal fees for legal counsel to the indigents. No information is given about the fathers of the children involved in this case. It is, however, a well known fact that many men desert their families, which then become supported by welfarism. The added tax burdens to honest people who earnestly work for a living become discouraging to many, who finally switch from work to welfare. When children are abandoned by their legally responsible parents, they slip into slums and ghettos faster than "well-meaning" people can wipe out such blots on our community's conscience.

Henry Taylor tells us that, although 1968's crimes increased 16 per cent over 1967, arrests increased only 4 per cent, and convictions decreased 8 per cent. Do we need more proof that our nation is going rapidly from bad to worse? Is there any hope of change for the better?

Yes, there is hope! In his Inaugural Address, President Richard Nixon did not advocate more welfarism. He spoke only of an honest, untiring effort to return to peace in all the world, to reduce our crime rate, and to bring our people together regardless of race, religion, or any other condition. If we don't hang together this time, remember Ben Franklin's warning that we may all eventually hang separately.

PREACHING DOCTRINES OF HATE, VIOLENCE, BURNING, AND KILLING ALLEGED TO BE FINANCIALLY PROFITABLE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Stokely Carmichaels, Eldridge Cleavers—and other preachers of hate and violence—are reported to be finding it extremely rewarding financially to pursue these doctrines.

It has been said that a wide variety of student clubs, organizations, and well-to-do and middle-class citizens are contributing sizable amounts of money to further these activists' causes.

Ray Cromley, of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, has written a syndicated column, "Ray Cromley Says Spouting Hate Is Now Profitable Career," in the Raleigh Register, Beckley, W. Va., on March 24, 1969.

I request unanimous consent to have Mr. Cromley's remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOUTING HATE IS NOW PROFITABLE CAREER

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—One of the anomalies of American life is that it is sometimes very profitable indeed—financially—to be a shouting, cursing, rabble-rousing enemy of The Establishment.

For some time now, men studying the most violent of the campus confrontations have noted that time and again the same men and women are present as organizers and agit-prop leaders. These inevitably seem to have the funds they need.

The same ability to come by money is seen among some men who travel from slum to slum preaching violence and riots.

Because of this coincidence, detailed studies are being undertaken to determine how these promoters secure the sizable amounts of money that some of them seem to spend.

These studies have already brought some curious facts to light.

Take the case of Stokely Carmichael, who in 1967 moved from slum to slum, preaching a doctrine of hate, violence, burning and killing.

Carmichael spoke at one Texas university for a $5,000 fee, at another for $2,500. For a round of appearances in Honolulu he was paid $1,000. A talk in Chicago netted him $500. Students at a university in Massachusetts paid Carmichael $1,000 for a talk.

For periods in 1967, Carmichael spoke from three to four times a week. In the first five months of that year he spoke at more than 40 colleges for fees which frequently ran from $500 to $1,500 and more. On one occasion at least, as noted above, he drew $5,000.

Or take Eldridge Cleaver, who also has preached a doctrine of hate.

Cleaver, a leader of the Black Panthers and notorious for his assaults on women, has received upward of $75,000 for his writings.

In a number of universities, student hate groups have captured control of student association funds, used them as pay-offs for their "troops."

Some of these men have acquired an expertise in securing funds from a wide variety of student clubs and organizations.

There is a fourth source of funds for the professional student activist and "burn, baby, burn" racial hater.

Sizable amounts of money in total are donated by wealthy, well-to-do and upper-middle-class men and women to activists who want to "Tear the system down," sometimes with no idea of what they want in its place.

Some of the donors are themselves members of The Establishment and personally hold positions of considered political, economic or social power.

Others have inherited fortunes, big or small.

Some among the activist groups have found a way to gain funds for themselves and their followers in the loose controls resulting from the skyrocketing growth of government and private experimental social programs.

It is now quite clear from the studies to date that some participants have profited considerably from the campus and slum riots which have caused disruption and suffering for so many.

This is in no way to imply that any except a small minority of students and slum rioters falls in this category. This column is about a hard core of rather cynical men.

A BILL TO EASE THE UNEQUAL TAX BURDEN AND CLOSE TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a comprehensive tax reform bill entitled the Wage Earner's Economic Independence Act. At a time when the average lower and middle-income families are feeling the pressures of the rising cost of living, spiraling inflation, high interest rates, and a possible surtax extension, we need a comprehensive legislative program designed to correct present inequities in the Federal tax system by redistributing the burden of taxation.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, I receive dozens of thoughtful letters from concerned citizens in the Seventh District of Michigan. They are law-abiding citizens who work hard, pay their taxes, and support their Government's efforts both to improve conditions in this Nation and to assist the welfare of our citizenry. They do not mind paying their fair share in taxes but feel the unfair weight of an unequal tax burden when the Government slaps on a surtax to "raise needed revenue and arrest inflation," yet continues to let many extremely wealthy people and businesses slip through existing loopholes in the tax laws to escape paying their share in taxes.

This is one reason why, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would both help to ease this unequal tax burden now carried by low- to middle-income families and single persons and would close several special-interest tax loopholes.

When the House Ways and Means Committee announced that it was going to conduct hearings on tax reform proposals in preparation for introducing widespread tax reform legislation, I hailed this decision as a major breakthrough for the average American family. At that time, I urge the committee to expedite its action because I believe that the 10-percent surtax was, and still is, a poor, stopgap substitute for long overdue tax reform. After speaking with several of our colleagues who sit on that committee, I was pleased to learn that it is likely that we will see some tax reform legislation come out of the committee this year. I strongly support the committee's efforts and merely wish to add my own proposals to the ones they are now considering. Mr. Speaker, a digest of my bill follows:

Wage-Earners Economic Independence Act

Title I. (An increase in personal annual exemptions to $1,000, for taxpayer, spouse, and dependents; and blindness of taxpayer and spouse) from the present $600. The present annual exemption is grossly inadequate to meet the needs of those attempting to provide selves and family with the necessities of life.

(Exclusion from taxable income of certain reimbursed moving expenses) in addition to present deductions relative to expenses of moving household goods and personal effects, this provision would provide deductions for house-hunting expenses, temporary living expenses, costs of selling the former residence at the old work location, and attorney fees and other expenses incident to the purchase of the new residence.

(Exclusion from taxable income of interest on series E U.S. savings bonds) where the purchasing power of the aggregate of such interest and the price paid for such bond is less than the purchasing power of the price paid for such bond.

Title II. (Education tax credit) designed to help cope with the rising cost of college education. The maximum credit would be $325 in the case of an individual paying $1,500 annually for tuition, fees, books, equipment and supplies.

(Tax credit to ease the burden of local property taxes on homeowners) and the equivalent liability of rentpayers. Credit would be given for a percentage of local property taxes which exceed five percent of a taxpayer's net income and a similar credit for tenants based on 25 percent of their rent.

Title II. (Extends head of household benefits to certain single persons), to help alleviate the present inequitable tax burden on these persons.

Title IV. (Provides a deduction for the cost of transportation required as a result of a physically handicapping disability, and a personal exemption for the disabled). Offsets the inequities in income taxation which discriminate against the severely handicapped.

Title V. (Repeal of the manufacturers' excise tax) on passenger automobiles, trucks, buses, and trailers.

Title VI. (Tax relief for senior Americans), to make tax exempt the first $5,000 in income for people 65 and over.

Title VII. (Reduction of the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas) wells (presently 27½%) to 15 percent.

Title VIII. (Elimination of the 14-point Western Hemisphere deduction), a tax privilege utilized primarily by the oil and gas industry. A tax incentive program designed to infuse capital into emerging countries is substituted.

Title IX. (Modification of the capital gains treatment of property acquired from a decedent.) Under the present law, considerable capital gain escapes income tax completely when transferred from one generation to another through bequests. This provision would tax such transfers as gifts as transfers in trust are currently taxed.

Title X. (Repeal of the multiple surtax exemption.) The multiple exemption is used by single enterprises and their subsidiaries to avoid tax liability.

Title XI. (Effective date.) This bill will become effective six months after enactment or at the start of a new Fiscal Year, whichever time occurs first.

PESACH: YEAR 5729

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Wednesday night, when the sun goes down, the observance of the festival of Passover will begin for the Jewish people all over the world. The youngest member of the Jewish family, gathered together for the traditional Passover service and meal, called the seder—which literally means order—will ask the first question:

> Why is this night different from all other nights?

The oldest member of the group will then supply the answers which are faithfully recorded in the Haggadah. The Haggadah is the book which tells the ancient story of the Exodus in which Moses, following the orders of God, led the Israelites, who were slaves in Egypt, out of the land of bondage through the desert and into the Promised Land.

In the ceremonial seder, it is explained that bitter herbs are dipped into sundry mixtures and eaten as a reminder of the bitterness that the ancient Israelites were subjected to while they were slaves in the Egyptian land. To remind the participants of the haste with which the Israelites were forced to flee from Egypt, matzoh is served. Matzoh is flat, unleavened bread similar to that which the Israelites baked on a flat stone in the sun and were compelled to subsist on.

In our modern world of today, the message of Passover is still a relevant one. Today, the descendants of the ancient Israelites are still struggling to maintain both their identity and their being in the face of Arab hostility and terrorist activity. What more poignant example of the modern day lack of freedom can be exhibited than the intolerable way the Iraqi Jews are presently being treated. These people are virtual hostages in a country which will not allow them freedom and peace in other lands. They have been denied their civil liberties, boycotted by their fellow countrymen, deprived of their jobs and sources of income, and denied their right to attend universities. It is for this reason that I recently introduced a resolution which would urge the Iraqi Government to allow their Jewish people the right to emigrate from their hostile homeland into any of the various countries which openly welcome them. Thus racism and oppression still haunt mankind and on the holiday of Passover the meaning of freedom must once again be re-examined.

It is with a great sense of respect that I extend to the brave, tenacious members of the Jewish faith a happy and a healthy Passover. Let us pray that in years to come, the Jewish people and those all over the world will finally be free of oppression and repression. Hag Same' ah!

CONGLOMERATE MERGER INVESTIGATIONS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address on conglomerate merger investigations before the section of antitrust law of the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 27, 1969. My address follows:

Conglomerate Merger Investigations

The opportunity to speak at this Spring Meeting of the Antitrust Law Section of the American Bar Association is most welcome. Change is in the air in antitrust. Forty seven years in Congress has taught me to expect change. Change in fact may be our only constant. I never thought that I would see the day, however, when the business community would be pleading with the Federal Government for an investigation of business. But that is exactly what has resulted from the merger practices of some of our leading corporations, particularly the tactics of some of the so-called conglomerate corporations.

From all sides we hear complaints about corporate "raiders" and "buccaneers." There are even worse adjectives used to describe take-over's from nonwilling managements.

The reasons are not hard to find. In 1968 there were 4,462 merger announcements, and this was a 50 percent increase from the 2,975 announcements in 1967. There were 2,442 manufacturing and mining mergers consummated in 1968, which was 1½ times the 1967 level and 3 times the 1960 level. These mergers and proposals to merge involved hundreds of cities across the length and breadth of the United States.

But not only has the rate of merger activity assumed massive proportions, the force of the merger movement comes from our largest corporations. In 1966, 101 corporations with assets of $10 million or more, involving a total of $4.1 billion, were acquired. In 1967, there were 169 such large corporations acquired, accounting for total assets of $8.2 billion. In 1968, 192 corporations of this size, totaling assets of $12.6 billion were acquired. According to the Federal Trade Commission, 82 percent of the mergers in 1968 were product extension conglomerate or other conglomerate.

Now what happens in these mergers? Frequently corporate headquarters are moved from a small or medium sized city to a metropolis. Local management is removed or subordinated to outside interests. Civic leaders familiar with community needs may be replaced with professional managers whose concern is with the problems of a profit and loss statement, and who have little time or interest for the problems of local school boards, municipal and county government,

XUM

community charity, local real estate taxes, adequate policing of crime, and to solutions to other civic disruptions manifest throughout the land.

Employees may find unfamiliar faces across the bargaining table. Their opponents may be strangers, unsympathetic to local conditions, who attempt to resolve all differences in a corporate mold made for other unions in other sections of the country.

Local banks lose long standing accounts as a distant corporate headquarters assumes financial direction. Local law firms and accounting firms that have served the acquired company for years find they have lost irretrievable business.

These effects are nationwide. They generate complaints in every Senator's State and in every Representative's District. News media throughout the land find subject matter for stories that fall upon a sympathetic audience. Is there any wonder why corporate mergers, particularly conglomerate mergers, have sparked an unprecedented number of investigations, which involve many functions of the Government, at the national level?

There are a total of eight investigations underway. Before the elections in 1968, conglomerate merger investigations had been announced by three antitrust groups—the Federal Trade Commission, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, and the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

Since July 1, 1964, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, under Senator Hart, and with the assistance of Senator Hruska, has collected a wealth of information on mergers and other factors that contributed to the growth of economic concentration in American industry since World War II. Senator Hart's longstanding study comprised seven volumes of hearings up to April 7, 1968, and it is continuing.

On March 18, 1968, the Federal Trade Commission's annual merger report noted that "Merger activity in 1967 experienced the sharpest increase in modern industrial history." As a result, under the able leadership of my good friend Paul Rand Dixon, the FTC on July 2, 1968, adopted a resolution to investigate the long-run consequences of the merger movement, particularly, in regard to the growth of conglomerate mergers. The FTC's investigation into what many fear is a pervasive restructuring of basic American industry has been underway since that date.

On October 9, 1968, I announced that the House Antitrust Subcommittee, under my direction, in the 91st Congress would undertake a comprehensive study into the economic significance of the current conglomerate merger wave. My press release notes that although the Subcommittee is not committed to any particular economic or legislative conclusion, it may be that the traditional standards of the antitrust laws against mergers and combinations may need reevaluation in the light of the economic and political effects of conglomerate mergers.

Since the first of this year, apprehensions concerning the significance of conglomerate mergers have come to a head. There are criticisms from every side and investigations have proliferated.

1. The Federal Communications Commission on February 8, 1969, announced an inquiry into conglomerate ownership of broadcasting stations.

2. On March 6, 1969, Hamer H. Budge, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission stated that the merger movement in the last four years had developed strong financial implications that were of increasing concern to his agency, particularly the use of debt securities and bank loans to finance acquisitions. Mr. Budge stated that the wave of conglomerate mergers, and the financial methods used in company takeover's involved long term risks that, if uncontrolled, could possibly bring about an economic collapse.

These views were endorsed by his predecessor at the SEC, Emanuel F. Cohen. Mr. Cohen supports advance filing of take-over bids and asked for amendments which would require corporations making take-over bids to disclose their identity, corporate intention, and sources of funds.

3. President Robert W. Haack, of the New York Stock Exchange has issued warnings against the use of long term warrants, debt securities and bank loans in mergers and corporate takeovers. On February 21, 1969, a letter advised all presidents of listed companies that the NYSE would examine proposed issues even more intensively and under certain circumstances would deny the application, and might even consider delisting the company. On February 26, 1969, Mr. Haack emphasized this concern and pointed out that in January 1969, a total of 106 companies, almost all of which were listed on the NYSE, were involved in one way or another in tender and exchange offers. Trading activities in these issues aggregated over 40 million shares in January, some 15 percent of the overall activity for the month.

4. The House Ways and Means Committee, under Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, in its extensive hearings on tax revision, has paid particular attention to tax law provisions that encourage conglomerate mergers. On March 12, 1969, the Ways and Means Committee heard representatives of the SEC, the Department of Justice, the FTC, and numerous private witnesses, on the need for tax reform that would change the deductibility of interest payments on debentures used in mergers, and to limit the tax deferral permitted in installment reporting of gain. I understand the Ways and Means Committee will report a bill that will reduce tax benefits that encourage corporate mergers. I endorse this objective. Over the years I have sought changes in tax law so that antitrust objectives would be reinforced and not diminished. Adjustments, at this time, to reduce tax benefits that encourage corporate mergers, I feel, necessarily would be beneficial.

5. While corporate mergers, including conglomerates, have ranked high in the Antitrust Division's continuing enforcement program, in February the Antitrust Division became more actively concerned with "pure" conglomerates. The new Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust, Richard W. McLaren, has announced an intention to challenge these mergers under the Celler-Kefauver Act. This development is one that I have long encouraged. Failure to use its force against conglomerates neglects the Celler-Kefauver Act's objective to preserve a competitive system. From its inception, the Celler-Kefauver Act was conceived as an instrument to stem the rising tide of economic concentration. Its purpose was to forestall the evil of undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few—to retain local control over the forces of industry.

The Report of the Judiciary Committee (H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Congress, 1st session) is explicit. It states the law "applies to all types of mergers and acquisitions, vertical and conglomerate as well as horizontal, which have the specified effects of substantially lessening competition . . . or tending to create a monopoly." The House acted first, and passed Celler-Kefauver on August 15, 1949. In all the time until final passage on December 29, 1950, it was always clear that the amendment was not limited to horizontal mergers of competitors or vertical mergers between suppliers and customers. The Celler-Kefauver Act reaches all mergers that may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section of the country. What could be more deadening to competition than a "basic restructuring of American industry" in which absentee managers determine the destiny of thousands of workers in hundreds of communities by analysis of monthly profit and loss reports?

Restructuring of American industry by definition will substantially affect competition; in some cases it must necessarily substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. Some corporate leaders aver as much. *Fortune* magazine reports that Fred Sullivan, Chairman of Walter Kidde & Co. has stated that going conglomerate is "the American way of business" and will soon be "obligatory" for all United States business. Indeed, Nicholas Salgo, head of the Bangor Punta conglomerate is quoted as predicting that "in ten years there will be only 200 major industrial companies in the United States, all conglomerates." [1]

While I believe it is clear that the Celler-Kaufauver Act in an appropriate case applies to a pure conglomerate acquisition—it is not clear that the Act is adequate to correct all conditions that may result in public injury. That is the reason for the House Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation.

We aim to find out the answer to this question: If a multi-industry company merger does not violate the antitrust laws, is there any effect that nonetheless needs to be corrected by legislation?

To answer this question, a wide spectrum of information is required. Each of the eight investigations now underway will provide insight on the basis of its own specialty and responsibilities. The results from each will be mutually useful and complementary.

The technique used in the House Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation is to examine in detail specific merger transactions of a selected sample of conglomerate corporations. This technique will produce factual case studies that illustrate (1) motivation for the merger transaction and (2) management effects and efficiencies after the merger transaction.

A problem that arose early in the investigation—and which still persists—is an adequate definition of the term "conglomerate." The term once was an accolade for modernity, innovation, and success. Now it seems to be a term of opprobrium. At least all of the companies in our sample are taking pains to establish that they are something else. Maybe that is because someone facetiously said: "Conglomerate has become a dirty word."

Conglomerates commonly are identified as companies that encompass a variety of industrial activities that serve more or less separate and distinct markets. Many companies that are not popularly considered to be conglomerate, however, are diversified multi-industry operations. General Motors, for example, in addition to automobiles, makes locomotives, refrigerators and washing machines. General Electric, according to *Fortune* magazine, is engaged in 14 business categories in the *Standard Industrial Classification Manual*, IBM is in 8, and Dupont is in 9. These corporations, however, are not in the normal course thought of as conglomerate corporations.

Diversity alone does not sufficiently identify a conglomerate. It seems to me that it is important to distinguish between concepts and practices. Conglomerate corporations have good features that may provide important benefits to the public as well as bad practices that need to be curtailed.

Harvey H. Segal, of the *New York Times*, suggests that the distinguishing characteristic may be found in the manner of recent growth.[2] Corporations popularly considered to be conglomerate appear to be corporations where mergers have accounted for a substantial percentage of recent asset growth. International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, for example, had assets that grew by more than $2 billion in the period 1960–1967, and mergers accounted for more than a third of that total. Mr. Segal points out that in 1966–1967, mergers accounted for approximately 46 percent of Litton Industries' growth, 47 percent of Gulf & Western's, 69 percent of Textron's, nearly 100 percent of Martin Marietta's, and 95 percent of Glen Alden's. Mr. Segal's refinement appears to be reasonable. Perhaps other definitions may disclose themselves as appropriate during the course of the investigation.

---

[1] *Fortune*, February 1969, p. 80.

[2] *New York Times* magazine, Oct. 27, 1968, p. 33.

The Antitrust Subcommittee's sample was selected on the basis of diversification considered in conjunction with popular reputation. The sample consists of the following six companies:

International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc.

Litton Industries, Inc.

Gulf & Western Industries, Inc.

National General Corporation.

Leasco Data Processing Equipment Corporation.

ITT, 21st on Fortune's Largest Corporations list, Ling-Temco, 38th on the list, and Litton, 44th, and Gulf & Western, 135th, are widely recognized as leading examples of the conglomerate pattern. Omission of these companies would make an investigation incomplete.

The other two companies are much smaller, and younger. They are the products of imaginative and aggressive managements and were selected from a number of likely prospects because of their acquisition of insurance companies and banking functions. Treatment of insurance company reserves and assets demand special attention. Stability in insurance operations must not be jeopardized by a financier's enthusiasm.

The Subcommittee's sample should provide a representative cross section of the good as well as the bad features of conglomerate organization. Each company has developed variances in policy and techniques in their growth. There are wide differences in their post-acquisition management controls.

In one respect, the companies in the sample are similar. In all, the top management central figures have a characteristic youth and aggressive vitality. They seek innovation, and the application of new management concepts. In one sense, they lead an assault against much which is outmoded, inefficient, and timid. They disturb the status quo—and to the extent the business world has lagged behind modern technology—this should be beneficial. In some instances minnows have sought to swallow whales. Such a process is not beneficial.

A final word about our investigation. Letters of inquiry were sent to the sample companies on February 18, 1969. In essence these letters sought cooperation in the production of documents. The Subcommittee's schedule plans for receipt of documents by March 31, 1969, with public hearings commencing in May. This may be ambitious, but the importance of this subject requires extraordinary effort and attention. We are assured full cooperation by the companies.

The Subcommittee's request for information seeks documentation to be found in the files of the companies. Generation of new materials is to be avoided. The letter to ITT, for example, states:

"It is the Subcommittee's intention to conduct this study in a manner to avoid to the maximum extent practicable interference with the normal routine of ITT and to impose a minimum burden on the time and effort of its officials, personnel and facilities. It is hoped that virtually all of the information requested may be assembled from materials presently existent and available in the files of ITT. In your response to the Subcommittee's requests, we wish to avoid wherever possible the necessity to prepare new documents or materials, or to prepare elaborate presentations that duplicate information presently available in another format."

In general, the file materials sought are the internal records that the top management officials utilized in decision making in merger transactions during the period January 1, 1964 through January 1, 1969. These records will provide an objective record of motivating forces at work in each transaction.

To evaluate management techniques and post acquisition efficiencies, the Subcommittee will look at financial records and performance evaluation records of management officials responsible for operations that were acquired. Government contracts transferred by the acquisition will be examined to evaluate post acquisition experience.

After examination of these matters in public hearings, and analysis of the information developed in the other investigations, we will be in a much better position to deal with the conglomerate problem. If needed, meaningful amendments to tne antitrust laws will be able to be presented to Congress.

ADDRESS BY HON. KENNETH KEATING TO FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a statement by the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and, at the request of the Senator from Arizona, the text of a speech delivered by Hon. Kenneth Keating, of New York, at the annual meeting of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on St. Patrick's Day.

There being no objection, the statement and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

A number of years ago it was my extreme honor to be asked to address the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on the occasion of their annual meeting on St. Patrick's Day. It marked one of the most enjoyable evenings of my life, and ever since then I have welcomed the opportunity of joining with these fine people in paying honor to their patron saint. It might seem strange to Senators that a fellow by the name of Goldwater should be so enamored of the Irish. I can explain by pointing out that I had the good fortune to have a mother who had some Irish blood in her veins.

At the recent celebration of this annual event, one of our former colleagues and a great son of St. Patrick himself, Hon. Kenneth Keating, of New York, addressed the dinner. His remarks were so entertaining and to the point that I asked him to let me place them in the Record.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks:

"Judge Curran, Reverend Clergy, Mr. Chief Justice, Your Excellencies, my former colleagues of the Senate and House, former and present distinguished members of the Establishment, distinguished guests—all Irish or would-be Irish, a few days ago I was telling a lighthearted Irish friend of mine about my forthcoming speech before the Friendly Sons down here in Washington. 'Ken', he said, 'I can see the scene as you stand up to speak. All your fine Irish friends stand, give you a big hand, and start singing "Stranger in Paradise!"'

" 'Well,' I said, 'I have news for you. I'm a card-carrying, dues-paying member of the Friendly Sons in New York and I have no less valid a right to be there in that goodly company than has my friend Bill Fay, the distinguished Irish Ambassador whom I hope to see there.'

"For it is County Wexford, that blessed little enclave of the Irish heaven, that is the ancient tribal homeland of the Keatings. And there today, in a spirit of pity rather than of anger, my own branch of the family is known as the Lost Souls. And all because one of my Keating ancestors perversely took a left turn when all the traffic on the road to salvation was moving straight ahead!

"Otherwise, my name today might be Kevin instead of Kenneth, and I might well be celebrating the annual Red Mass instead of attending it. In this connection, let me tell you that I was flattered by a prominent Catholic layman here in Washington who once told me that he was impressed by my close facial resemblance to my deeply esteemed friend, Cardinal O'Boyle. 'In fact', he said, 'if you two changed clothes, I'd be willing to bet that you could pass for the Cardinal and he for the Senator.'

" 'Well,' I told my friend, 'that might be so up to a certain point. But I'll tell you when the exposé would come . . . on the day that Cardinal Keating celebrated his first pontifical high mass!'

"As a matter of fact, I was once indeed a priest. At least for a fleeting second or two. Even if only in the imagination of a child. And all because United States Senators are given to wearing black homburgs, somber dark overcoats, and white scarves. It was in a New York upstate city that the transmogrification took place. I was there to deliver a speech, and was taking a brisk walk down the city's main street to get the blood coursing through my veins, when a little boy of nine or ten passed me by, raised his cap respectfully, and said, "Good evening Father." Now that's what I call "instant ordination'!

"And I must tell you the story of little Dennis, age 8, one of my staunchest supporters in my more political days, etc. After my election to the Courts of Appeals his mother wrote me the story of Dennis' devotion to my cause, etc.

"Mention of the Red Mass a moment ago reminds me that there are in this country, as you know, certain persons who have committed themselves with a missionary zeal to what might be called the de-valuation of God. It seems two of these theologians of doom were present at a Washington cocktail party (one of those highball-to-highball confrontations): Well, anyway, these two devaluators were sad-faced as they drank. Finally, one turned to the other and said: 'I tell you, I just can't figure it out. The harder we fight in our cause, the more we seem to lose. After years of effort, we finally managed through the court to get God out of the schools . . . but now look where He is for consultations! . . . In the East Room of the White House every Sunday.'

"As you know, New York City, so plagued with problems, so hard pressed to remain a viable urban entity, is like Washington—looking for salvation in home rule. Indeed, a move is already afoot to give the city home rule in the grand manner . . . by having it break away from the State of New York and become itself a State . . . the 51st in the Union. But I have an Irish friend in New York who goes even further in this separatist movement. The Irish imagination always flies at a higher ceiling, of course, so he has come up with the original and provocative nction of establishing the five boroughs of New York as a separate nation . . . sovereign and independent. As I say, the Irish think big. And I must con-

XUM

fess that the more he detailed the advantages of such a move, the more exciting and attractive it appeared to be.

"Now, the first problem was to find a suitable name for the new nation. My friend gave some consideration to the name Funlandia . . . but this seemed a bit too whimsical . . . so he picked the sober, more dignified, yet wholly fitting name of Atlantica.

"Just to cite an opening advantage . . . this new nation of Atlantica would instantly require the appointment of some 115 ambassadors and other diplomatic officials. Think, said my Irish friend, how this would cut down unemployment among the very rich!

"Still on the diplomatic level, it is certain that Pope Paul would be among the first to recognize the infant nation, and to send a Papal Nuncio to Manhattan. As for the present clergy of New York City, many would enjoy a sudden mass elevation to the purple upper altitudes.

"But since New York's chief troubles are economic, it is in this area that nationhood would really pay off. The conceiver of Atlantica tells me that the first policy move would be to put the bite on our great, rich and powerful neighbor to the west . . . the United States of America. This would involve a visit of state to Washington on the part of President Lindsay . . . or King John . . . depending on what form the new government takes. And after President Nixon greets him at the airport . . . and after the parade down Pennsylvania Avenue . . . the two-power conference could convene over a friendly drink and discuss the prime item on the agenda: Aid to over-developed nations.

"And once on its fiscal feet, think what a rosy future would lie in store for the new nation. Defense budget? What for? Whether they liked it or not, Atlantica's powerful neighbor, the USA, would have to guarantee its defense in the event of threats from without. Although my Irish friend does concede that there might be need of a token army . . . in case of any attempted takeover by Governor Rockefeller!

"And one last point that he brought to my attention was the inviting prospect of reciprocal tariff agreements with other powers. Think, he said, of a trade arrangement with Ireland that would cut the price of Old Bushmill's in half . . . and bring the liquid therapy of Guinness to those in direst need of it.

"Now that I've mentioned Old Bushmill's, it's only fair that I give equal time to John Jameson, so let me tell you the story of Shaemas O'Donnell.

"Most men lift a glass now and then . . . in response to the demands of sociability or thirst . . . but Shaemas literally drank for a living. He was a whiskey taster for that fine old firm of John Jameson. Now, it's an understatement to say that Shaemas loved his work.

"He was the first man at the task in the morning, and the last to leave the distillery at night. And Shaemas was one of those rare creatures who make their work a hobby. In brief, he tasted whiskey above and beyond the call of John Jameson. The charitable might say of Shaemas that his imbibing wasn't so much a vice, as a virtue that got a little out of hand.

"Well, as one might suspect, with the passing years of both curricular and extracurricular whiskey drinking, Shaemas died a sudden death. A beautiful death, some tender souls called it, for at the time the glass was at his lips, and he had the beatific look on his face. Now his widow, Ellen, was a most sensitive woman, and she was deeply worried about how Shaemas' obituary would read. She wanted to send copies of the newspaper account to Shaemas' close relatives in America, and it would be an eternal shame if the obituary came out with the truth . . . that Shaemas had died of the drink. So she sought out a newspaper reporter who was an old pub companion of Shaemas, and confided to him her problem. 'Have no fear, Ellen,' said the reporter, 'I'm writing the obit myself. I'll have Shaemas going out in glory, and with no taint whatever on his proud name.' And so it was. When Shaemas' friends read the obituary, they could hardly recognize their old pal.

"His passing sounded like a loss not just to his family and John Jameson, but to the nation. A funeral wreath of praise, the story was . . . bedecked with fine words like dedication, assiduity, loyalty, and devotion to family and friends. And Shaemas was identified not as a whiskey taster, but, euphemistically, as a member of John Jameson's quality control staff. However, what gratified and comforted his widow, Ellen, the most was the final line of the story . . . the final, beautiful line: Mr. O'Donnell's death was attributed to overwork.

"We live today in an age of communication. The world has been wired for sound, if not understanding. Words and images even fall like rain from the sky . . . from the satellites in space . . . to let peoples talk to peoples on a kind of cosmic party line. But the great paradox and pity is that the science of communicating has so far outstripped the art of communicating . . . that the means of conveying thoughts are so much more sophisticated and inspiring than the thoughts themselves. In a word, the medium shames the message. For we are so often served an electronic menu of banalities . . . platitudes, and carefully phrased nothings. Fatuity and poor taste debase the coinage of expression . . . and in kind of a linguistic Gresham's Law bad talk drives out the good. Now I mention this only because I want to dwell a moment on one of the manifold gifts that the good Lord bestowed on the Irish. I speak of their wondrously rare genius for ennobling, gracing and vivifying the art of communication . . . for making words sing and dance as no other people can. In fact, it is completely true . . . and no blarney . . . to say that the Irish don't speak in black and white . . . they speak in living color. Even when they teach the truth to do the twist, it turns out to be a lovely dance!

"And their way with words, is a wealth that the Irish never hoard . . . so that our *life,* no less than our language, has been enriched by the tongues and pens of Eire.

"Of course, there's sometimes mischief and malice in Irish humor . . . but what good's a fine, sharp rapier, if you don't give a thrust with it now and then. You'll think of many examples . . . but I myself am thinking now of the old Irishman Sean O'Sullivan being consoled on his deathbed by his parish priest. 'Father', said Sean, 'it's too late now to change the record. It's all marked down. Either I'm going to heaven or I'm going to hell'. Then he sighed, and a soft light came into his eyes. 'But whether it's heaven or hell, Father, there's the one great consolation. I've got friends in both places!'

"And let us not forget that the Irish have brought their wit no less than their skill to the field of sports. I'm reminded of the New York football coach of Irish ancestry who spoke in an upstate New York city before a woman's club on the subject of football. The ladies were eager to learn the fine points . . . so they could at least understand their husbands and assure domestic tranquility. As a result the speaker was asked many questions. Finally, one lady got up and asked him if he would be so kind as to explain the difference between a split end and a tight end. The answer came like a crack of a pistol: 'About five martinis!'

"An Irish-born sports reporter was covering the spring training camps. There was a Baseball Players Golf Tournament, and our reporter walked around with one foursome of well-known baseball players. Now in the foursome was a certain star outfielder . . . we'll call him Clarence to protect him . . . who was a novice at golf, as his game clearly showed. He was as wild as a hawk, and seemed unable to do anything right. Except for one thing. When his shots came out of the woods . . . and he spent most of his time there . . . they were things of beauty . . . amazing recovery shots. Finally, on the last hole, as the others stood waiting on the green, Clarence's ball came high and hard out of the woods and landed within a foot of the hole. At this the Irish sports reporter threw out his hands and broke into a broad grin.

" 'What a man, that Clarence! His drives are swinging bunts . . . his irons are terrible . . . and he can't putt . . . but I'll say this for the guy . . . He's got the greatest throwing arm in golf!'

"Now if it is true that the Irish art of communication is distinguished above all others by its verbal felicity and its wit, this is by no means the full story. Let us not mistake the bouquet for the brandy . . . nor the fragrance for the rose. For in their centuries-long dialogue with the world, the Irish have contributed something deeper than words . . . something richer than humor . . . something rarer than charm. I speak of the sacred concept that has run like a thread of gold through the tapestry of Irish history . . . the concept of the dignity of man.

"It is a concept that grows as naturally out of the faith implanted by Saint Patrick as the shamrock grows out of the grass he once trod. For what is the dignity of man but a reflection of the glory of his Maker . . . a reflection in faces and hearts of the eternal truth that man is a unique creation on this earth . . . a spark in its darkness . . . an immortal among mortal creatures.

"Since the days of the sainted Patrick, Ireland has held this truth before the world like a banner. Beaten to its knees so long by the hammering fists of adversity and oppression, it found deep in its soul the strength to rise again . . . to rise and make come true a deathless dream.

"Yes, history tried to shape Ireland from without . . . but Ireland shaped history from within . . . and it was in its sense of the innate dignity of man that its greatest force lay.

"This is what I mean when I speak of Ireland's dialogue with the world . . . of what a land so small has communicated to a world so vast. Yes, it may well be said that in freedom's long story the Irish have done more than write their own pages. Indeed, they have illuminated the manuscript of human history . . . made it glow with their God-granted gifts of soul and heart, mind and muscle.

"In this context let me say that one could not read our dear friend Eddie Folliard's story of the Friendly Sons—a story done so beautifully . . . with Eddie's rare touch . . . and fail to be impressed by the immense and indelible contributions of the Irish to the creation and growth of our own United States. Ireland was there with Washington . . . when the bleeding was done . . . when freedom was won. And just as they were present at the birth of the nation, so have the sons of Eire been among the great builders of the dream that is America . . . a part of its spirit and sinew for two hundred years.

"And so, tonight, we Friendly Sons gather here . . . as the nation's Friendly Sons have gathered since 1781 . . . to remember who we are . . . to remember the saints and heroes and poets who have made us proud of who we are . . . proud of a little emerald homeland that puts a mist in your eye at the mention . . . and proud of a people who have given this world so much . . . why? Because they had so much to give."

XUM

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NO EASY SHORTCUTS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are deeply concerned over our Nation's continued involvement in Vietnam, we must not overlook the potential and growing danger of U.S. overcommitment elsewhere.

We have, according to reliable reports, slowly built up our military forces in Thailand to 50,000 men. It should be recalled that our entanglement in Vietnam began with much fewer American personnel. It will be futile to welcome the end of hostilities in Vietnam if, at the same time, we have been sowing the seeds of an equally tragic conflagration elsewhere.

The following article in the New York Times, by C. L. Sulzberger, points up the depth of our commitment to Thailand, and the Thai Government's expectation that a considerable number of U.S. troops will remain on its soil, if and when peace comes to Vietnam:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NO EASY SHORTCUTS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BANGKOK.—The process of American military disengagement from Southeast Asia may take fully as long as the process of American military engagement. An example why is Thailand.

This country has been our ally fifteen years. It feels Washington's obligations here represent a separate undertaking from the commitment in Vietnam. No matter what settlement is eventually achieved at the Paris talks, Bangkok expects continuation of American responsibilities to Thailand.

There was no local exultation when Washington began negotiations with Hanoi on a basis plainly removed from any position of all-out strength. Nevertheless, Bangkok prefers to believe assurances that no Southeast Asian peace will be accepted which doesn't provide for this country's security.

UNGER'S STATEMENT

Ambassador Leonard Unger recently stated: "We want not only to re-establish peace in Vietnam but to end Communist violations of the 1962 settlement in Laos. We insist that the North Vietnamese cease their policy of aggression against their neighbors, and leave in peace the peoples of continued U.S. umbrella toward Laos and Thailand as well as South Vietnam."

The Thais interpret this statement and the tenor of their conversations with Washington as implying that any Paris agreement should transcend Vietnam and insure regional guarantees. Bangkok fears that Hanoi, relieved of heavy commitments in South Vietnam, might redirect its military thrust across Laos to Thailand.

AMERICAN PRESENCE

Certainly there isn't yet the slightest hint that Washington wants to reduce U.S. forces stationed here—despite the prospect of a cut in war-torn Vietnam. There are approximtely 50,000 American soldiers in Thailand where some $200 million have been invested in bases operating under the Thai flag but used against Communists in Vietnam. At least half of the U.S. air missions in South Vietnam—including immense B-52 bombers—fly from Thailand.

Some Americans argue that its expensive military presence here could involve the United States in "another Vietnam" because of counter-insurgency operations by Thai forces against their own small guerrilla movement. But Bangkok insists it can handle this problem by itself and only wishes off the danger of direct foreign invasion.

If a Vietnam accord finally comes, Bangkok wants to feel protected while it studies the way peace is applied by both Hanoi and Peking. It sees this need for protection as especially desirable when Communist dynamism now dammed up in South Vietnam could suddenly be released.

Depending on how a postwar period in Vietnam might go, there is talk of initially keeping a maximum of perhaps 40,000 Americans here and possibly paring the figure down to 5,000 should regional stability develop. The 5,000 would care for Thai bases under the SEATO alliance.

Thus, despite discussion in the U.S.A. of total withdrawal from the Asian mainland—as ultimately desirable in the minds of a large "dove" faction—there is no such discussion here. Indeed, Thailand hopes no drive by an emotional American public opinion will penalize this country by eventually depriving it of protection after it had risked Chinese and North Vietnamese anger by joining the U.S. war effort in Vietnam.

Even the vague thought of such a pullout would have immense political repercussions in this country. Being wary and experienced, Bangkok is clearly considering minimal contingency plans of its own. It has indicated to neighboring Cambodia—neutral but hostile and a reluctant host to Hanoi's troops—a readiness to renew diplomatic relations and abandon previous territorial claims. It has also expressed willingness to meet with representatives of Peking.

FAITH IN WASHINGTON

Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman acknowledges the wisdom of reassessing Thailand's world position so that it need no longer necessarily "reckon with possible U.S. commitments." But it is simply not believed that Washington would abandon the formal undertakings it has assumed here. Unlike some other capitals, Bangkok thinks America meant the pledges it underwrote on the Asian mainland through SEATO.

Thailand is therefore not only ready but eager to have U.S. troops stay on its soil even if and when peace comes to Vietnam. This doesn't mean on the present large scale, but at least a symbolic caretaker force until it is certain Southeast Asia's political storms have blown past. Americans who wish we had never stumbled onto this continent are discovering there is no shortcut out that is both easy and honorable.

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Don't Expand National," published in the Staunton, Va., Leader, of March 21, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va., is undoubtedly right in his opposition to expansion of National Airport, which carries most of the air traffic in and out of Washington. It lies on the Virginia side of the Potomac and offers somewhat faster access to the capital than Dulles International Airport once the passenger is on the ground.

Dulles is also in Virginia, As Sen. Byrd said in a Senate speech, it "was built specifically to provide for the day when National became overcrowded, and it is clear that day has arrived".

It arrived some time ago, as many Stauntonians and others residing in the Upper Valley who fly out of Shenandoah Valley Airport to Washington have been saying.

Airline demands for expansion of National won some support last year. But as Sen. Byrd told his colleagues, architects can provide workable plans for expanding terminal facilities but "are powerless to create more air space, and that air space is alarmingly full". That it is, as any airline passenger with National as his destination, departure or transfer port could tell the government.

Why the big airlines have persisted in using National rather than Dulles has been a puzzle for some time. The Dulles facilities are thoroughly modern, the skies are not crowded, and neither are the runways or loading bays. Good highways and fast public transport have been provided. But refusal to make the shift from National has resulted in the handling there last year of 10 million passengers, although the rated capacity is four million.

Congress should not appropriate funds for expansion of National Airport, especially when huge public funds went into construction of Dulles to accommodate the increased traffic foreseen. There are grave risks to life in the crowded skies over National—a fact which, coupled with a turndown by Congress, the expense and public dissatisfaction, should force airlines to restudy their traffic patterns and transfer a heavy volume of their business to Dulles.

INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE, MARCH 25, 1821

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Greek origin are among our most valued fellow citizens. They have contributed substantially to our economy and our civilization.

Greek ideals of liberty, Greek thought, Greek literature, and Greek art, are foundation stones of American civilization. The people of Hellenic extraction among us today are: our esteemed Vice-President, SPIRO T. AGNEW; the Representative from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS; the Representative from North Carolina, NICHOLAS GALIFIANAKIS; the Representative from Maine, PETER KYROS; and the Representative from Pennsylvania, GUS YATRON; friends, neighbors, associates, and colleagues.

Greece, the land of their forefathers, was a valiant defender of freedom and democracy with the United States and our allies during World War II and during the critical period thereafter when the threats of totalitarian oppression within Greece were repulsed.

Greece stands ready today as always, to deter the imperialistic designs of Communist forces in order to preserve liberty and democracy and it is appropriate that we fittingly honor the Greek people who

XUM

in modern times won their independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821.

In New York City, the annual Greek parade commemorating the 148th anniversary of the independence of Greece, will take place Sunday afternoon, May 18.

Seated in the gallery of Congress, on Tuesday, March 25, was Miss Greek Independence of 1969, Eugenia Bookas from Hempstead, N.Y., the general chairman of the Greek parade and president of the Federation of American-Hellenic Societies of Greater New York, Pericles J. Lantzounis, and president of the St. Paul's Society, Eastern Orthodox of the Police Department, City of New York, Lt. Peter L. Philios.

RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE SUBSIDIES

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of March 8 is addressed to the recent request of the railroad industry for subsidies to operate passenger service.

The Star editorial writer refers to the "highly inflated" losses claimed by the railroads and to the fundamental need, prior to deciding the subsidy issue, of a "definitive study to determine the role rail passenger service should play in the Nation's overall transportation program—a study of the type proposed to Congress by the ICC last year."

Mr. President, I endorse the Star's position and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rail Passenger Service

The nation's railroads have suggested a plan under which the taxpayers would subsidize money-losing passenger trains which the railroads are forced to operate under orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The railroads once fought hard for the right to call upon the ICC to eliminate their hopelessly unprofitable and unused passenger trains. That authority, won in 1958, enabled the railroads to avoid continual battles with state regulatory agencies every time a little-used train was to be discontinued.

Now the ICC has gotten tough, and wants the railroads to put forth more persuasive proof when they seek to end passenger service. And when some railroads found that the ICC wouldn't always accede to their requests to discontinue passenger trains, they proceeded to downgrade those trains to the point where only the hardiest travelers would use them.

To further complicate matters, even the cost of operating passenger trains remains a mystery—and this is a key point in the railroads' proposal. The industry would have the present low level of passenger service subsidized on what appears to be the so-called fully allocated method of figuring costs. Under this complicated accounting procedure part of all railroad operating costs is allocated to the passenger service and highly inflated losses result.

Thus what the railroads really are saying is that either the taxpayer should subsidize service which often, though not in all cases, is shoddy on the basis of highly inflated loss claims—about $500 million a year—or the industry should be allowed to end whatever passenger services it chooses.

Obviously, neither is an acceptable solution.

One part of the railroads' proposal makes sense: that the Department of Transportation be empowered to buy new passenger equipment and maintain a pool from which railroads could rent it. This would enable the railroads to scrap much of their present equipment and offer the public a smoother ride on newer cars. But far more is needed.

What is necessary first is a definitive study to determine the role rail passenger service should play in the nation's over-all transportation program—a study of the type proposed to Congress by the ICC last year. It was lobbied to death by the railroads because it would have included a moratorium of sorts on discontinuing the last passenger trains between major cities pending completion of the study.

If the study is made and if it shows that efficient, economical service will draw passengers to the railroads, the way should be opened for a cooperative government-industry plan that ideally would include not only new equipment but government aid in subsidizing losses to some extent on what would then be truly a public service.

SELECTED READING LIST CONCERNING BLACK SOCIAL REVOLUTION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Library Student Association of the University of Wisconsin has drawn up a selected list of paperback literature concerning the black social revolution. The association has done this in the hope of providing a basis for better understanding of one of the most vital issues facing our country today.

The list follows:

The Nature of Prejudice, by Gordon W. Allport. Doubleday, 1958.

Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America, by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton. Random House, 1967.

Soul on Ice, by Eldridge Cleaver. Dover, 1968.

The Souls of Black Folk, by W. E. DuBois. Essays and short stories. Fawcett, 1961. (Originally written in 1903.)

Invisible Man, by Ralph Ellison. Novel. Signet, 1952.

The Wretched of the Earth, by Frantz Fanon. Grove, 1968.

Nigger, by Dick Gregory. Autobiography. E. P. Dutton, 1964.

Black Rage, by William H. Grier and Price M. Cobbs. Banton, 1968.

The Shadow That Scares Me, by Dick Gregory. Short comments. Pocket book, 1968.

Rebellion in Newark: Official Violence and Ghetto Response, by Tom Hayden. Ventage, 1967.

Where Do We Go From Here, Chaos or Community, by Martin Luther King, Jr. Beacon, 1968.

Death at an Early Age, by Jonathan Kozol. Bantam Books, 1967.

Malcolm X Speaks, by Malcolm X. Speeches. Grove, 1965.

The Autobiography of Malcolm X. Grove, 1965.

SPIRIT OF "1776"

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Americans express their patriotism and respect for the heroism in American history in many ways. On Sunday, March 16, the play "1776" opened its doors to the public. As reported by the New York Times, the audience gratefully responded with pathos and emotion, not only to the musical and lyrical talents of its author, but to the story of our Nation's birth.

The play "1776" is a historic account of the men who signed and constructed the Declaration of Independence. It portrays these men as they really were—not lofty statesmen who were simply performing an academic task, but men with ordinary shortcomings united in their heroism, love and desire for these united states.

The State of New Jersey has a legion of historic monuments to remind us of the days of 1776. It is becoming, and gratifying to me, that the man who gave birth to this play is a resident of Boonton Manor, N.J. His name is Sherman Edwards. Mr. Edwards combined musical talents with his academic background to produce "1776."

Mr. President, in tribute to this special American and the spirit which he will hopefully create, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the New York Times which comment on the play and the man be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1969]

Theater: Spirited "1776"—Founding Fathers' Tale Is a Happy Musical

(By Clive Barnes)

THE CAST

"1776," a musical. Music and lyrics by Sherman Edwards; book by Peter Stone; based on a conception of Sherman Edwards; setting and lighting by Jo Mielziner; costumes by Patricia Zipprodt; musical direction by Peter Howard; orchestrations by Eddie Sauter; musical numbers staged by Onna White; associate to Miss White, Martin Allen; hairstyles by Ernest Adler; staged by Peter Hunt; production stage manager, Peter Stern. Presented by Stuart Ostrow. At the 46th Street Theater.

John Hancock, David Ford.
Dr. Josiah Bartlett, Dal Richards.
John Adams, William Daniels.
Stephen Hopkins, Roy Poole.
Roger Sherman, David Vosburgh.
Lewis Morris, Ronald Kross.
Robert Livingston, Henry Le Clair.
Rev. Jonathan Witherspoon, Edmund Lyndeck.
Benjamin Franklin, Howard Da Silva.
John Dickinson, Paul Hecht.
James Wilson, Emory Bass.
Caesar Rodney, Robert Gaus.
Col. Thomas McKean, Bruce Mac Kay.
George Read, Duane Bodin.
Samuel Chase, Philip Polito.
Richard Henry Lee, Ronald Holgate.
Thomas Jefferson, Ken Howard.
Joseph Hewes, Charles Rule.
Edward Rutledge, Clifford David.
Dr. Lyman Hall, Jonathan Moore.
Charles Thomson, Ralston Hill.

XUM

Andrew McNair, William Duell.
A Leather Apron, B. J. Slater.
Courier, Scott Jarvis.
Abigail Adams, Virginia Vestoff.
Martha Jefferson, Betty Buckley.

On the face of it, few historic incidents seem more unlikely to spawn a Broadway musical than that solemn moment in the history of mankind, the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Yet "1776," which opened Sunday at the 46th Street Theater, most handsomely demonstrated that people who merely go "on the face of it" are occasionally outrageously wrong. Come to think of it, that was also what the Declaration of Independence demonstrated, so there is a ready precedent at hand.

"1776," which I saw at one of its critics' previews on Saturday afternoon, is a most striking, most gripping musical. I recommend it without reservation. It makes even an Englishman's heart beat a little bit faster. This is a musical with style, humanity, wit and passion.

The credit for the idea of the musical belongs to Sherman Edwards, who has also contributed the music and lyrics. The book is by Peter Stone, best known as a Hollywood screenwriter. The two of them have done a fine job.

Mr. Edwards and Mr. Stone have found a wonderful story for themselves in the birth pangs of a nation. Here is John Adams ("obnoxious and disliked," as everyone is agreed) fighting for his dream of freedom, the avuncular Franklin, full of aphorisms plagued by gout and confident of the good report of history, and then the laconic Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, the great drafter of independence, who, even though he sometimes plagiarized John Locke, wrote with the eloquence of justice. It is a great cast and a great story.

In fairness, my personal comprehension of American history is probably as profound as was that of General Burgoyne. However, it should perhaps be noted that the authors have, on occasion, bent history just a little. The general thrust of their story is undoubtedly honest, but here and there one or two parries have been perhaps exaggerated in the interest of histrionic accuracy.

As even a European schoolboy knows, there were 56 signatures to the Declaration of Independence, not the dozen or so represented here. Assuredly the economics of the theater are to blame, and this is a license, if not poetic at least practical.

Then again—my memory could be wrong here—I believe that historians consider that Congress's resolution of July 2—all signatures, amendments and holidays to the contrary—was the really vital event. Also I wonder about the authors' treatment of Richard Henry Lee, the Virginia patriarch. They present him as a charming ass, and the pawn of Franklin who sends him, in May, back to Virginia to get a resolution through the Virginia Legislature proposing independence. In fairness to the reputation of Mr. Lee, I think it is true that even a month before that he had already written to Patrick Henry suggesting that independence was absolutely essential.

What only is important however, is that the authors have really captured the Spirit of '76. The characterizations are most unusually full for a musical, and even though the outcome of the story is never in any very serious doubt, "1776" is consistently exciting and entertaining, for Mr. Stone's book is literate, urbane and, on occasion, very amusing.

For the music it would have been easy for Mr. Edwards to have produced a pastiche of Revolutionary tunes, but this he has studiously avoided. There is admittedly a flavor here, but the music is absolutely modern in its sound, and it is apt, convincing and enjoyable.

The authors have, bravely perhaps although in the event it seems perfectly natural, omitted any chorus, so that absolutely everyone in the cast has a significant part to play. This offers a great challenge to the actors and to the people responsible for the staging. In almost every respect this is excellent, although personally I felt that the settings by Jo Mielziner were very disappointing and old-fashioned. Here, with such an adventurous musical was an opportunity for some outstanding design, but it was an opportunity missed.

Fortunately the costumes by Patricia Zipprodt were stylishly appropriate—although, as a matter of accuracy, virtually everyone should have been in white wigs, certainly at the signing—and the direction by Peter Hunt and the musical staging by Onna White were both faultless. Mr. Hunt has encouraged his actors to behave precisely as if they were in a play rather than a musical, and Miss White has most adroitly done the rest. Both are helped by a great cast.

William Daniels has given many persuasive performances in the past, but nothing, I think, can have been so effective as his John Adams here. This is a beautiful mixture of pride, ambition, an almost priggish sense of justice and yet—the saving grace in the character—an ironic self-awareness. Mr. Stone and Mr. Edwards provided Mr. Daniels with the character to play, but Mr. Daniels plays it to the hilt. Also, notably, he still remains perfectly in character when he sings.

The other star performance is provided by Howard Da Silva as Ben Franklin. Mr. Da Silva has a voice as sweet as molasses and as mellow as rum, and his humor and good nature are a constant delight. But this is a cast without a weak link. I must mention Clifford David's rapier-sharp arrogance as the Southern Edward Rutledge, Paul Hecht's aristocratic elegance as the loyalist John Dickinson—the Pennsylvanian who, though unable to vote for Independence, did join the Continental Army as a private—Ronald Holgate's brilliantly extrovert and showstopping performance of Richard Henry Lee, and the aptly clumsy poise of Ken Howard as Thomas Jefferson. And then there were the ladies, the beautiful Virginia Vestoff as Abigail Adams, and Betty Buckley as the spirited Martha Jefferson.

But enough, I cannot mention all 26 of the actors, and yet utter fairness would demand no less. The musical will, I suspect, prove to be the sleeper of the season. Who knows, it might even run until the celebration of the bicentenary in 1976. I rather hope so. Certainly you don't have to be a historian to love "1776."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1969]

"1776" Reaps Fruit of Long Research

(By Lewis Funke)

Some day in Morristown, N.J., where Gen. George Washington made his headquarters in the Ford Mansion and wrote a lot of American history fighting the British, a plaque may be placed on a wall of the local library, reading: "Sherman Edwards Worked Here."

It would commemorate the fact that within its quiet rooms, a 20th-century songwriter, did most of his research for a musical, "1776," depicting the men and events involved in the writing and signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The musical opened at the 46th Street Theater on Sunday night before an audience that, when the curtain came down, repeated a performance that had been going on through the preliminary previews. They rose, cheered, applauded and whistled, moved by a sense of reaffirmation emanating from the story of the nation's birth—a reaffirmation that was not achieved by sentimental flag-waving but in recognition of the shortcomings, bumblings and actual heroism of the men who fathered the country.

"I didn't have any special pleading in mind when I set out to create this show," Mr. Edwards, an ex-history teacher, remarked yesterday afternoon as he tried to relax and consume some sausage and eggs, his first food since 4 A.M. Aware that patriotism in this country appears to be old-fashioned in some quarters, Mr. Sherman said, "I didn't set out to answer any one. My concept simply was to show what men and events of the time with honesty and respect for reportage of the facts. I wanted to show these men at their outermost limits.

"These men were the cream of their colonies. Some were very erudite and others were simple, honest men. They were moved by self-interest, of course. But they were non-neurotic, the kind of people I've always liked. They form a diverse group. They disagreed and fought with each other. But they understood commitment, and though they fought they fought affirmatively. They didn't fight negatively and leave it at that.

"They were struggling toward a goal, though each had his own ideas of what that should be. And they came up with something, something that never was perfect. But it was as good as they could make it at the time."

Mr. Edwards, who is 49 years old, married and the father of two children, began working on his idea about seven years ago. He majored in history at New York University and did graduate work at Cornell, with his original interest being in ancient and Mediterranean history. "I gravitated to American history," he recalled, "and I was grabbed by this thing, this story of the Declaration of Independence. It excited me and I wanted to do it."

The hazel-eyed Mr. Edwards, a resident of Boonton Manor, N.J., began frequenting the library in Morristown. He had taught briefly after getting out of college, but gave that up because he also was a musician and had been working with such bandleaders as Benny Goodman, Tommy Dorsey and Louis Armstrong. Among the song hits he has written are "Wonderful, Wonderful," "See You in September," "Johnny Get Angry" and "Broken-Hearted Melody."

But the trips to the library began crowding out the music. One day Mr. Edwards went home to his wife, Ingrid, former Swiss ballet dancer and said, "We have to have a meeting." He explained that he wanted to take off two years, perhaps three, to work on his idea: doing the books and lyrics besides the music "And we could go broke," he said. There was no need for a meeting, Mrs. Edwards said. He had to do what he had to do. Mr. Edwards recalls the incident with a gulp in his throat. "She's been wonderful," he said.

Also very helpful was Mrs. Marian Gearhart, the Morristown librarian, who turned over the John Adams room and everything else to get what Mr. Edwards wanted.

PROBLEM OF ACCEPTANCE

"They were lonely hours," the composer observed, taking off his glasses. "Getting into that car and going to the library, leaving my wife and children. But I couldn't let go. I had to go through with it." He made copious notes from his reading. "With minor exceptions," he said, "everything in this show was said, these things were done."

Early rebuffs greeted Mr. Edwards, after he had finished his work. "I can't mention names, some of the biggest in the theater," he said. "They looked at me and said, "What, a costume musical? A costume, historical musical?" But Stuart Ostrow, who had produced "The Apple Tree," bought the concept for "1776." He agreed that nothing would be done to alter the aim. But he didn't like the book. Mr. Edwards agreed to call in Peter Stone, a successful screenwriter.

Mr. Stone has written the Broadway shows, "Kean" and "Skyscraper." But his real marks had been made in films, where, for example, with Frank Tarloff, he won an Oscar for "Father Goose." Mr. Stone agreed to undertake the job of rewriting the book on one condition that there would be no cutting of the information in the musical when it began its tryouts.

"I was fascinated with the idea," Mr. Stone said yesterday. "But more than that; I was astonished at what I didn't know about American history, especially that period. I spent seven years in college. I didn't shirk history. But as Sherman told me about what went on I found myself appalled at my ignorance. Of the 56 men involved in the momentous decision I knew four or five and they were only cardboard figures. I didn't know the dates, the compromises, the sellouts. This is a national legend and it's not really taught in the schools. That's why I insisted that all the information remain.

"It's been a most rewarding experience. We're in a period of groping in this country. We're trying to find out if and where we went wrong. I think our show is going to help."

"1776" VICTORY CONFIRMED BY SALES AT BOX OFFICE

The musical "1776" which opened Sunday night had an estimated sale of $25,000 at the 46th Street Theater boxoffice window yesterday and about five times that amount in telephone orders.

The show's advance sale was $60,000, compared with $1.3-million for another recent hit, "Promises, Promises." so there were racks full of seats for this week and on through May.

A line that numbered from 30 to 100 moved by the box office all day.

"It's the utter chaos of a smash hit," commented Edward Lynch, the theater treasurer. "We haven't had anything like this since 'How to Succeed' back in 1961."

Among the leading investors in "1776," which was capitalized at $500,000, are Edgar M. Bronfman, head of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., who put in $250,000; William J. Green, board chairman of the Clevepac Company, and CBS Records, $100,000 each, and Roger L. Stevens, former head of the National Endowment of the Arts, $10,000.

TAX RELIEF FOR MIDDLE- AND LOWER-INCOME PEOPLE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, despite the progressive nature of our Federal income tax system, the tax burden is not distributed equitably among all income groups. Middle- and lower-income people are overburdened with taxes while high-income people are paying less than their fair share.

Earlier this session, I introduced legislation to close many of the loopholes available to people in the upper brackets. Today I am introducing a bill to provide tax relief for the vast majority of families and single people in the middle-income range and below.

This legislation will do the following:

First. Increase the minimum standard deduction from $200 plus $100 for each allowable exemption to $600 plus $100 for each exemption.

This provision will bring tax relief to individuals and families who are living below the poverty line. The increased deduction will provide complete exemption to 1¼ million impoverished families who now must pay taxes. It will also reduce the tax liability of another 1 million low-income families.

Second. Increase the standard deduction percentage from 10 percent to 14 percent and increase the maximum allowable deduction from $1,000 to $1,800.

The middle-income taxpayer will benefit significantly from this provision, which will streamline processing of tax returns. The Treasury Department estimates that a 14-percent standard deduction will encourage 80 percent of all taxpayers to use the standard form. Currently only 57 percent of all returns are computed using the standard deduction. With so many less people itemizing deductions, the auditing problems confronting the Internal Revenue Service each year will be significantly reduced.

Third. Increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000.

This provision will benefit all taxpayers. It represents a long overdue effort to bring the personal exemption more in line with the cost of living. The current exemption provides only $2,400 in deductions for a family of four, yet a recent Labor Department study shows that a family of this size needs at least a $9,191 annual income to maintain a moderate standard of living. The last time the personal exemption was increased was in 1948. Since then the cost of living has increased 44.6 percent.

Most taxpayers will find that this legislation reduces their taxes by at least 10 percent. For a family of four with an annual income of $12,000 the tax cut will be as high as 30 percent.

The total cost of my tax relief program—about $15 billion—equals the revenue that will be raised by my earlier bill, H.R. 7980, which closes loopholes and establishes a minimum tax on all incomes over $50,000.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9680

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize both the minimum standard deduction and the percentage standard deduction, and to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of the taxpayer

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 141 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to standard deduction) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Standard Deduction.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the standard deduction referred to in this title is the larger of the 14-percent standard deduction or the minimum standard deduction.

"(b) 14-Percent Standard Deduction.—The 14-percent standard deduction is an amount equal to 14 percent of the adjusted gross income. The 14-percent standard deduction shall not exceed $1,800, except that in the case of a separate return by a married individual the 14-percent standard deduction shall not exceed $900.

"(c) Minimum Standard Deduction.—The minimum standard deduction is an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) $100, multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed for the taxable year as a deduction under section 151, plus

"(2) (A) $600, in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife under section 6013,

"(B) $600, in the case of a return of an individual who is not married, or

"(C) $300, in the case of a separate return by a married individual.

The minimum standard deduction shall not exceed $1,000, except that in the case of a separate return by a married individual the minimum standard deduction shall not exceed $500."

(b) Section 141(d) of such Code (relating to married individuals filing separate returns) is amended by striking out "10-percent" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "14-percent".

(c) Section 141 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Dependents of Other Taxpayers.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the minimum standard deduction shall not apply in the case of a return of an individual, if a deduction with respect to such individual is allowed under section 151(e) to any other taxpayer for any period which overlaps in whole or in part the taxable year of such individual."

SEC. 2. (a) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000";

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain return of husband and wife).

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964) is amended—

(1) by inserting in the heading before the period the following: "And Before January 1, 1969";

(2) by inserting "and before January 1, 1969," after "beginning after December 31, 1964,", and

(3) by inserting after "After December 31, 1964" each place it appears in the tables the following: "And Before January 1, 1969".

(b) Section 3 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1968.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall correspond in form to the tables in subsection (b) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 if the taxable income were computed by taking the standard deduction."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code (relating to number of exemptions, is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables in section 3(a) and 3(b) and the tables prescribed under section 3(c)".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code (relating to husband or wife filing separate return) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return, the tax imposed by section 3 shall be—

"(A) for taxable years beginning in 1964, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(a),

"(B) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964, and before January 1, 1969, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(b), and

"(C) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968, the lesser of the taxes shown in the corresponding tables prescribed under section 3(c).

"(3) Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) in lieu of the tax shown in Table IV of section 3(a), Table IV of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), as the case may be. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code (cross references) is amended by striking out "and Table V in section 3(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", Table V in section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended to read as follows: "In the case of a married individual filing a separate return and electing the benefits of this subsection Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3402(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"*Percentage method withholding table*

"Payroll period:	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$21.20
Biweekly	42.30
Semimonthly	45.80
Monthly	91.70
Quarterly	275.00
Semiannual	550.00
Annual	1,100.00
Annual or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	3.00"

(b)(1) Section 3402(c)(1) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this paragraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables contained in this paragraph prior to 1969 and shall provide for deducting and withholding at any time amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the tax were deducted and withheld under subsection (a) at such time."

(2) Section 3402(c)(6) of such Code (authorizing the Secretary to prescribe certain withholding tables) is repealed.

(c) Section 3402(m)(1) of such Code (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended by striking out "$700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,100".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by sections 1, 2, and 3 of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid on and after the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

WORLD WAR ON HUNGER

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently, Dr. Herbert E. Striner, director of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, invited my attention to an excellent speech entitled "World Food Development—Its Challenges and Opportunities." Its author is Mr. Emil A. Malick, president and chief executive officer of the Provesta Corp., a firm created by the General Mills, Inc., and Phillips Petroleum Co. to combine their technologies in the manufacture of a synthetic protein designed for mass consumption in an effort to deal more effectively with the world's nutrition crisis.

Mr. Malick discusses this crisis both in terms of the pitfalls which have been encountered in man's past attempts to deal with it and, more important, in terms of his hope for the future that the world's armies fighting hunger will move as one in a concerted effort to win this battle. Because of the interest which I know others share in this crucial matter, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD FOOD DEVELOPMENT—ITS CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

(Address by Emil A. Malick)

When it was suggested that I address CCDA on world food development, I pointed out that Provesta Corporation was less than six months old at the time and could not yet reinforce its statements with any great past achievements—this despite the strength of General Mills in food and Phillips Petroleum internationally in other fields. As you may known General Mills and Phillips Petroleum are the present shareholders in Provesta and have brought various advanced technologies into the new company.

I suggested the CCDA might be better off to get a more authoritative speaker with demonstrated muscle rather than a gleam in the eye. Your meeting programmer disagreed, pointing out that CCDA is itself a group with a built-in gleam in the eye—which I guess is one way of defining market development.

It is on this basis that I address you, in terms of futures rather than pasts. I shall speak only in broad terms, because it is in the area of management philosophies rather than technologies that the real world food crisis lies.

There are two words which characterize the present world food picture—*contradictions* and *confusion*. We read and hear that, on the one hand, there is a world food crisis that may bring civilization down to its knees and, on the other hand, that the crisis is not really a crisis, even though it looks like one to some, because better agriculture and other new technologies can cope with the crisis in time to avert worldwide disaster.

Just a few weeks ago a headline read "World Doom Is Forecast By Biological Scientist." The scientist—well-qualified academically, a professor and director of graduate study in biology at a major U.S. university—painted the picture with "broad strokes of black." He stated at the meeting at which his remarks were made that "the chances of holding a meeting like this twenty years from now I'd say are almost zero." The scientist went on to repeat the usual dire pronouncements: That populations are rising faster than food production, that the answer to the problem, horrible to conceive, may lie in a thermonuclear war decimating populations, or a worldwide viral plague that would thin out the ranks.

Sharing this view, an article appeared in the New York Times toward the end of 1968 captioned "C. P. Snow Fearful That Rich Nations Won't Bar Famine." The eminent Britisher is said to have stated that he was nearer to despair than ever in his life and now has very little reason to hope that countries will ever cooperate enough to head off "staggering famine" which will spread into "a sea of hunger" beginning in the 1975–80 period. He is said to have added that a few years ago there seemed to be a chance to avert famine but that now the chance has become remote and that "everything that has happened in this dark year had pushed it further away." His prediction was not aimed just at underdeveloped countries, feeling that the "sea of famine" will also engulf "rich" countries by century's end unless energetic efforts are made immediately to avoid it.

There is nothing new about such pronouncements. They have been kicking around since 1798 when, you will recall, the Reverend Thomas Malthus, an economist of sorts, published his famous essay saying there was no hope for the world because population rises geometrically while food rises arithmetically. His answer to the dilemma, as in the case of the scientist just mentioned, was war, famine and disease to keep things in balance. Later Malthus softened, suggesting another alternate: Marry later in life and abstain. Incidentally it was this Malthusian Doctrine that prompted Thomas Carlyle to name economics "the dismal science." Malthus could not see, nor can many prophets today, almost 200 years later, the tremendous impact technology would make on food production.

Last month, almost on the heels of these pronouncements a wire service appeared captioned, "World Marts Won't Dent Growing U.S. Wheat Crop." It stated that wheat now on hand in the United States, when piled on that accumulated in other grain-growing nations, poses the probability that world wheat trade in 1969 may be the smallest in seven years or more. In contrast to the early 60's, it was stated that *less of the immediate surplus is located in the U.S.* The article added that our record crops comprise "the most important problem *plaguing* U.S. wheat exports." You will note the choice of words—reference to the abundance of an important food commodity as a curse rather than blessing, at a time when others warn of hunger and famine.

On the same day another press article appeared stating, "Red Meat Supplies Continue To Climb." It worriedly asked, "can the citizens of this country continue to eat the increased meat production turned out by the cattle and livestock industry?" It added that "if livestock prices are to be maintained, cattle and swine numbers must be reduced or people are going to have to eat a lot more meat." It is significant that this report appeared while studies of certain countries—and, I might add, studies of "pockets" in the U.S.—show startling protein "gaps," and at the same time that a Washington expert was averring that world food production per capita in 1968 points to deeper trouble for the hungry people who make up the vast majority of the world's population.

We could go on with other examples but we don't have to beat the point to death. You have yourselves been exposed to this fantastic war of words, distortion of facts, and disagreement on objectives. You too have noted the lack of definition of priorities, and built-in "body English" applied through political or other biases. You too have been troubled by the evidences of ineffectual efforts on the part of scientists, sociologists, and *government and industry* to work together and act decisively, in ways that would cope with social degradation, apathy, mental retardation, and potentially the mass debilitation of mankind through poor and inadequate diets.

It *is* true. The specter *does* loom closer. And it may exert its toll, not just in the form of starvation, but through many other side effects that starvation creates. These include social instability and greater susceptibility by the hungry to manipulation by those who would use hunger as a political weapon. Of concern to industry is also the prospect of potentiallly irreparable disorder and setback that mass hunger and attendant intellectual decline could create for future worldwide industrial growth.

The greatest tragedy, however, is none of this. It is that *there is no reason for the world to lack food.* The tragedy is not that industry lacks the ability to create vastly greater supplies of food, and with startling speed. It is that *we are still floundering on how to get the job done.* The greatest tragedy is the current lack of a hardhitting, single-minded, systems-oriented programming of effort to eradicate food shortages in all corners of the earth. Working together, industry and government could without question assure an ample world food supply that can keep up with any presently projected growth in world population.

In business terms, food, in contrast to industries that at times go through traumatic upheavals, is a highly stable, assured and growing market. For while science has done many astounding things it has yet to find a substitute for food. This market may rise 100% in 30 years and perhaps 300% in 80 years. Roughly one million more food customers are apparently being added to the "market" *each week*—I repeat *each week.*

What the world is also starved for is innovative management and pragmatic programming of food development on a global scale. I use the word "management" to include both government and industry, each operating in its own sphere and planning broadly rather than piecemeal. Up to now food groups here and abroad have been largely occupied with putting together reports of studies that demonstrate *potential* nutritional benefits and *theoretical* feasibility of one or another undertaking. These reports are being put out in large numbers by dozens of study groups, agencies and investigating committees. They make impressive reading. But reports have low caloric value. They do not in themselves provide or even delineate the operating programs that are needed to bridge the chasm between theory and fact.

This chasm is deep and rocky and difficult to traverse. It can be bridged only by an industry that is ready to apply bold new management insights that will result in programs as yet unconceived—programs that reflect integrated short and long range considerations. And these must be built on the rock of economically viable enterprises rather than the sands of short-range problem solving and free and subsidies that in the long run weaken the recipients and dissipate the strength of the providers.

In such new programs industry will not be able to get by with conventional market development thinking regardless of how effective such patterns have been in the past in developed marketplaces. World food development is far more complex and is not susceptible to a same-song-second-verse approach. Of course, many of the variables are the same—financing, operations, promotion, marketing, distribution and the like. But these take on new forms in the case of world food development. Superimposed upon them in the case of food are new variables as well, the weighting of which may differ from program to program. Penetration of developed markets with products and services is one thing. Penetration of new food markets with new technologies, particularly underdeveloped areas, is a horse of another color.

Each situation must be searched out and developed for itself—not by rote—*and we, rather than the customer, must adjust to fit.* Failure to realize this has accounted for frustrations suffered in the past by some who have tried to move forward in this market.

What do we have to sell? The list is long but we cannot equate the market with one or another pet product or technology, whether these be new agricultural tools, protein from sea, crops or petroleum, hydroponics, algae, fertilizers, insecticides or other know-how. Each is useful. Each has its place. But *somewhere,* not *everywhere.* Each is only a tool, and to insure successful application of these particular tools innovative thinking is essential. Lack of such innovative programs, custom fitted to each job, is what has made this market appear to many to be like punching a rubber bag.

In addition, programming has been badly fragmented. There are too many overlapping groups involved, each with a small piece of the action and each with a different angle—political, social, or economic. Governments everywhere must remodel their thinking to produce effective broad-spectrum programs, adopting viable economic patterns conceived by industry, rather than trying to have industry adapt itself to the varied, shifting and at times disoriented policies of momentary expediencies.

The potential sources of supply of new food are great. Advanced agricultural technologies, for one, can do much more. Provesta is itself involved in one agricultural discovery that has shown magnitude increases in yields of various crops on test acreage, all other factors such as rain, wind, fertilizers, birds and insects being held constant. New strains of rice are said to increase yields as much as fifteen times; new corn hybrids produce crops of greater protein content; the ocean is a vast new source of food with only a moderate part of the potential "crop" now being harvested; fish protein concentrate and other protein made by "farming" the tiniest of protein producers, select strains of microorganisms, using hydrocarbons as nutrients, have been widely publicized and plants are being built in the case of some.

Protein from oil seeds has already moved out way ahead yielding many nutritious and tasty food products that can be modelled to the palates of individual consumer and ethnic groups. There are also algae that could in some places yield useful feed for animals, in time, even though this may be of poorer quality than the other protein sources named.

Looking ahead a few generations we may also see direct synthesis of protein from elemental materials. And today we also have chemicals that dramatically reduce the ravages of birds on grain crops, thereby increasing net harvested yields in a humane fashion with very low bird mortality.

A crystal ball study recently completed by one study team forecasts that for the year 2000—only about 30 years from now—wheat harvests may reach 300 bushels per acre; corn may reach 500 bushels per acre; a single cow may through hormones produce many times more calves in a lifetime; and farm fields may be covered by huge plastic domes or other devices controlling environment and crop growth. Even if the crystal ball of the authors of this particular study is assumed to be somewhat cracked, these potential magnitudes of gain should be reassuring even to the most skeptical.

But crystal balls, like study reports, have low caloric value in themselves. Only industry, working with government, can translate them into digestible results.

Altogether, such technologies could, according to some, support a world population of 50 billion people compared to the world's present 3½ billion or so. Here again, the accuracy of the projection is not important. What is important *is that a great deal more can be done, even with today's know-how.*

These technological advances can be brought into highly developed countries as well as underdeveloped ones in a smooth, evolutionary manner, although the time scales and phasing for the two types of markets will differ. New sources of agricultural protein do not displace farming. They augment it. Protein from the sea and microorganisms does not displace livestock and poultry. It adds to it, providing new sources of feed to more animals as well as directly to humans in time. Farming, animal growing and new technologies therefore phase together harmoniously.

Where does the chemical industry fit into all this? *Everywhere.* In what forms? Some should be apparent. Others may require a little thought. But the opportunities are there. Provesta is finding some important ones in several fields, using several technologies. You also can. This does not imply you have overlooked the opportunities. I know you haven't. But I also know that many companies have been perplexed and thus inhibited about tackling them, because of their many unconventional aspects and the seeming obstacles to making them profitable, particularly in underdeveloped countries. There are many critical questions such markets pose: Corporate restraints on doing business; price controls; restrictions on choice of raw materials; poorly developed marketing and distributing; low per capita income; lack of domestic investment capital; body english by government groups, and others.

But the job can be done. Certainly, a mankind that could go from its first feeble efforts to fly to orbiting the moon in only about 50 years, and also unharness the energy of the atom, can under the proper conditions cope with the world's food problem. But it must creatively devise ways to set programs up in a sound, businesslike manner that will prove profitable to all concerned—profitable in terms of dollars, improved industrial and community developments, stabilized societies, and healthier, more intelligent resources of people which will in time flow into other growing industries—as happened in the United States in its history of mass movement of people from farms to urban areas as agricultural technologies improved.

The potential is there for a good return to stockholders if business management takes the initiative, devises the modus operandi, and government management helps to clear the path. Both industry and government must accept these complementary roles. Government is concerned with social problems, education, nutrition, food, economics and the like. Industry also has these problems, except that industry must cope with them under an additional rigorous and demanding premise ordinarily absent in governmental thinking: Industry must do the job in a manner that will create *economically sound industrial development*.

So far, governments have in the main part failed to adopt this posture and industry has not been too clear on its own posture. But there are now encouraging signs that both see the light. Industry must bear the child. Government, as the sire, can benefit from the counsel the U.S. Navy gave expectant fathers when they asked for leave to attend the birth of their offspring: The father is necessary only at the laying of the keel—not at the launching.

Actually, government and industry have very similar fiduciary responsibilities. Government must always, in principle at least, use the money of its stockholders, the taxpayers, to obtain good social and economic returns of investment of funds. Business works the same way. Each segment has the responsibility to its own stockholders to use its money to get a good return.

Government must relate to business. Business must relate to government. And both have to bend. Both have to help architect new vehicles to get the job done.

We flew to the moon and unlocked the atom—despite technical challenges far greater than those posed by food, because *objectives* were set, organizations for execution were rigidly defined and not dissipated widely among many agencies, *latitude of performance* was permitted; and *necessary funds* were made available. In dealing with the food crisis, however, broad and concrete end-objectives have not yet been set, integrated timetables are non-existent, organization is not pinpointed, and lines of responsibility are not clearly delineated and not delegated—at least not to the degree needed. Finally, only a fraction of the money that was committed to space and nuclear efforts has been allotted to get the food "crisis" behind us once and for all.

Truly, this is tragic. Survival of a healthy, productive and stable mankind is infinitely more important than flying to the moon.

There is growing awareness of the "organizational gap." But *there are as yet no strong signs that such a globally planned effort will be put into being on the scale needed in time to avoid severe social and human disorder.*

Industry must apply all its skills of persuasion and capability for efficient performance to the task if for no reason other than to assure its own continued health and growth. It cannot flourish without a healthy, alert, energetic and intelligent humanity. In nutrition, as in no other field, we now know that unless humans receive adequate and balanced diets early in life, actually starting prenatally, they will suffer to one degree or another irreparable damage to their brain cells. If the diet is grossly deficient at early stages, as it now is for large and growing numbers throughout the world, the net result will be people who throughout their lives will be underproductive to society. Neither industry nor government could support or thrive under the burden of such an incapacitated mankind.

Today, one or two small, starving nations can be the focal point of worldwide political unrest and manipulation affecting us all, making action critically urgent for political as well as humanitarian and economic reasons.

The course of the human race may well depend upon industry's leadership in this most critical field.

THE MILITARY IN THE FREE SOCIETY

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there is now being heard across the land, a clamor for setting aside the draft law and substituting an "all volunteer" military establishment.

It is my view that most of the proponents of this philosophy know precious little about the military and military life. If they had some deeper and more abiding understanding of the "chemistry" of the military profession, they would then be aware that what they recommend is anathema to our society.

The February 1969 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings contains an excellent and scholarly article concerning the military institution, its character, and its values.

Because of the pertinency of this article to the growing dialog on this subject matter, I urge that every Member of the House familiarize himself with it.

I wish to particularly congratulate the authors of this article, Col. S. H. Hays, U.S. Army, and Lt. Col. Thomas A. Rehm, U.S. Army, as well as the publishers of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for their excellent contribution to our store of knowledge on this important subject.

I include the article in its entirety in my remarks:

THE MILITARY IN THE FREE SOCIETY

(By Col. S. H. Hays, U.S. Army, and Lt. Col. Thomas A. Rehm, U.S. Army)

Contemporary attitudes toward the war in Vietnam and toward the employment of force in the Dominican Republic are only the most recent manifestations of a trend which has been gaining momentum for some time. The dialectic on freedom and security continues to raise questions of means and ends.

In the face of these strains, military forces must continue to induct and train recruits, trying to assimilate them into an institution that requires their wholehearted commitment.

The military institution has a distinctive character which makes a binding set of norms and values at once desirable and essential. Its basic mandate gives the military a near monopoly of those means of violence available that can be employed in a manner dangerous to society.

Its critical nature is emphasized by the fact that it manages or employs a substantial percentage of the national wealth, economic production, and manpower. The actual and potential relationships between the military and industrial institutions hold many possibilities which, under conceivable circumstances, could prove disadvantageous to society as a whole.

In addition, the members of the military services have committed themselves to the national service to fulfill a social need. Military service is not pursued for self-interest or profit nor does it produce a product which can be assigned an economic value. The military contract, as Sir John Hackett reminds us, has an "unlimited liability clause" committing the military member to unlimited service and sacrifice. Self-interest, family, and even life itself, are committed to the welfare of society. The terrors, perils, and pressures of combat require a motivation and group solidarity of an order well beyond that required in almost any other pursuit.

While it must be understood that military values articulate rather than clash with the general American system of values, there is a distinct core of norms, roughly definable as the "military ethic," that clearly contrasts with those prevalent in the civilian community. This military ethic provides the rules of behavior that make it possible for the military to function effectively internally, as well as to operate within the civilian social system. This ethic, which tends to be viewed by many as authoritarian and archaic, is in fact highly functional in nature and essential to a viable and efficient military structure.

One function of the military ethic is to provide for society's protection. It assures that the monopoly of the means of violence possessed by the military institution is not directed toward over-turning the civilian institutions it is pledged to support.

A second function is to provide for proper relationships with other social institutions and to assure that military positions of authority are not used to the advantage of the individuals who occupy them.

A final function is to support the internal operation of the military organization as such in the conduct of its interpersonal and intergroup relationships and in pursuit of the objectives set for it.

The military ethic, in short supports group solidarity and provides common expectations that are essential to an organization that has the size, nature, complexity, and critical social importance of our military establishment.

In order to understand the military ethics, it is necessary to examine its several components. First, can we enunicate those values which not only protect the social group against its external and internal enemies but also protect the military from wrongful acts by its own members? We frequently refer to these values as Patriotism, Loyalty, Integrity. Obedience, and Sense of Duty. But words alone do not convey adequately the entire substance of the concept as it is felt by the military man himself. Patriotism, for instance, described as loyalty to an abstract set of social, political, and economic beliefs, personified in the state, is more central in importance for the military than for the average citizen. It provides the basic reason for institutional existence. Hence, the values held by military men that concern the observance of fealty to the symbols of nationality and to the national purpose and interest can be expected to be of somewhat higher order than those that might reasonably be expected of his civilian contemporary.

Military discipline, involving a more general sense of loyalty toward military and civilian superiors, and obedience to the will of duly constituted authority, has long been recognized as the *sine qua non* of a successful military organization. The successful inculcation of discipline in members of military organizations is essential. The fear of undisciplined soldiery has been a primary factor of the citizen's long-standing suspicion of large military forces, and has made mutiny second only to treason in the hierarchy of offenses against society.

The soldier inevitably places discipline and obedience high in his value system, since they establish the guideposts for his conduct. He recognizes them as the basis for the trust and confidence which the public has confided in officers and which they in turn place in subordinates. This discipline in our democratic society does not, as some profess to believe, stifle independent thought or imply any reduction in the legitimacy of discussion, argument or dissent. The American soldier knows that he can vigorously argue a point up to—but not beyond—the final decision. As De Tocqueville pointed out a century ago:

"A democratic people must despair of ever obtaining from soldiers that blind, minute, submissive, and invariable obedience which an aristocratic people may impose on them without difficulty. The state of society does not prepare them for it, and the nation might be in danger of losing its natural advantages if it sought artificially to acquire advantages of this particular kind. Among democratic communities, military discipline ought not to attempt to annihilate the free spring of the faculties; all that can be done by discipline is to direct it; the obedience thus inculcated is less exact, but it is more eager and more intelligent. It has its root in the will of him who obeys it; it rests not only on his instinct, but on his reason; and consequently, it will often spontaneously become more strict as danger requires it. The discipline of an aristocratic army is apt to be relaxed in war because that discipline is founded upon habits, and war disturbs those habits. The discipline of a democratic army, on the contrary is strengthened in sight of the enemy,—because every soldier then clearly perceives that he must be silent and obedient in order to conquer."

As one views American military institutions there is little danger of them acquiring a "blind, minute, submissive and invariable obedience . . ."

A sense of duty, of social responsibility, on the part of those in positions of command or leadership is another part of the military ethic. In assuming, in a sense, custodianship for the nation's security and a large part of its wealth and young manpower, the military man sees a moral obligation to ensure this security, safeguard the wealth, and look after the men confided to his care to the best of his ability. The unlimited commitment that he has made tends to cause him to view national security problems as his problems, problems which he could be required to devote his life to solving. It also causes him to take a very paternalistic view of his subordinates, who, like himself, have confided their lives and welfare to the service of the state, and for whose effective use he is personally responsible. In practically no other segment of society does the exercise of leadership or management encompass the total relationship included in the term "command." Command responsibility to the soldier in all-encompassing, a total commitment of responsibility, whether for ship, plane or unit. The commander is responsible for all his unit does or fails to do, and for its welfare, readiness, morale, and condition.

Among those values that concern the interrelationships between the military institution and other social institutions, there exists another cluster of values related to loyalty, impartiality, integrity, and responsibility. Here, again, virtues that are common to the general society have been reinforced with somewhat more specific meaning and import. Political institutions are perhaps those that are most closely associated with the military. Political institutions generate a public consensus on issues, resolve problems, and develop general policies and plans for community action. The political institutions are the mechanism by which society creates its military forces and gives them substance and direction. Loyalty requires the soldier to be obedient and responsive to his political institutions, to obey their dictates and to carry out their bidding. Since political institutions in democracies are partisan in nature, with political parties tending to replace each other in office periodically, the military, both individually and collectively, must eschew political positions and cultivate a posture of neutrality on political issues.

Military issues of national security are not always easy to separate from political issues. Problems of weapons procurement, base location, and reserve force structure, which are essentially military in nature, tend to become entangled in partisan political controversy. While on one hand the perils of political involvement appear to threaten the objectivity of the military man, political non-involvement provides an equal peril on the other. The Nuremberg trials and other war crimes trials point out that unquestioning obedience to the political institution was not always the right answer. Thus, while the soldier is not in a position to question the wisdom or rightness of an order, he is expected to be personally responsible for its legality and morality, particularly if he loses the war in which the question arose.

In practical terms, since the military men must serve political parties in different administrations, they should not do for one administration that which they might regret should its opponent get into office. Hence, the ideal of political neutrality is highly regarded in the military code. This some principle is involved in the many restrictions on the public utterances of military leaders and in the troop indoctrination programs of the services. In a democracy, military leaders are frequently called upon to make public statements. Since their role is that of public servants, they must not make statements that conflict with the position of the current administration. Personal opinions that disagree with established official policy should be kept within the institutional family as long as the individual is a member.

Business and industrial institutions are second only to political institutions in importance of their contact with the military. Contracts amounting to many millions of dollars are involved in the purchase, repair, and maintenance of weapons, weapons systems, equipment, and military installations. To a large extent, the contract negotiations involving these operations are handled by military men. In the management of these contracts and in the development of major weapons systems, there are many temptations for individuals or military services to seek personal or group advantage from firms vying eagerly for their favor and attention. Yet, in the military code, many of the normal business practices become threats to his integrity. The military procurement officer is expected; both by his peers and the public, to retain an integrity and objectivity in his financial dealings that would not be expected of the corner grocer. Military men are not supposed to be motivated by private financial gain or even future job opportunities. Even the appearance of collusion is regarded unfavorably.

This ideal of integrity and professional objectivity is presumed to be the rule in the development of weapons systems in which billions of dollars are involved. The opportunities for developing mutual influence and interests between industrial corporations, political leaders, and military research and development officers demand the safeguards of the highest degree of personal integrity and professional judgment. The stakes, in terms of national security and public interest, are much too high to permit the normal standards of the market place to govern. As in many other areas, the responsibility the military man must carry demands a level of integrity that will ensure that positions of great authority are not employed for the private gain of the occupant or his associates.

Finally, we have said that the value system of the military institution serves to support the internal operation of its organizations in their interpersonal and intergroup relations, and in fitting them to perform their primary mission of combat. The stresses of combat place high premiums on discipline, group solidarity, mutual trust, and predictable behavior. Discipline is a precondition of military effectiveness since the mutual faith and trust between members of a military team are only too often paid off in blood. Group loyalty connotes placing one's military group and immediate fellows above all others. Lying, stealing, and engaging in any other negative act that might disrupt the group are punishable offenses. Subordinating oneself, working selflessly for and evidencing pride in the group are correspondingly praised and rewarded. Thus the code is highly functional in maintaining the group under stressful conditions, as well as providing a powerful motivational force for its members in normal times.

Group solidarity and unit effectiveness are rooted to a considerable extent in continuity, tradition, and legitimized leadership. Tradition and continuity reduce confusion and uncertainty and assist the individual in identifying with group standards and goals. The military has always depended heavily on ceremonies that emphasize tradition and continuity. Military insistence on ceremony, distinctive badges, and traditional procedures is primarily justified on the basis of building group solidarity and cohesiveness. High standards of appearance and uniformity of dress, frequently castigated as "spit and polish," are equally related to the creation of pride in unit and the development of strong unit solidarity.

The military value system is geared to a complex set of motivations that are largely intrinsic and internal to the institution. Constrained by the many restrictions of the code, by law and regulation, subjected to frequent hardship, and expected to give total commitment to the institution, the soldier seeks his satisfactions within the institution. The status, reputation, and camaraderie resulting from group solidarity, organizational *esprit*, and common expectations provide some of the greatest appeals. Living within an ethical system that sustains mutual faith and confidence is another. Above all, there is the sense of devotion to the cause of the general community and the feeling that this service is of vital importance. The sense of vocation is common with that prevailing in the ministry, medicine, law and the field of education—the so-called professions. The military, then, differs from the professions primarily in the amount of individual sacrifice involved and the degree of commitment demanded.

Few would assert that the idealized value system of the military institution is followed by all its members on all occasions. Neither are the Ten Commandments. However, the system does establish a scale of values that influence the attitudes, behavior and performance of military men. It is this value system that must be accepted by new members of the military in order to properly assimilate them.

The total social environment in which our modern military establishment must operate is one characterized by rapid change. Society shows the many signs of stress that such periods of change generate. Bureaucracies as social institutions—with their complex managerial techniques—are becoming increasingly more significant in the study of contemporary human behavior. As Dr. Paul Kurtz stated in *The New York Times* recently, "The power to make moral decisions is shifting from the individual to the large organization."

The upper strata of organizations appear to demonstrate many of the characteristics of military organizations. They are hierarchical, governed by rules, and encompass a wide spectrum of skills and professions. At the lower levels of social organization, however, there appear to be rather pronounced distinctions between civil organizations and those of the military. Whereas the lower level social groups of military organizations tend to be cohesive, encompassing most of the activities of the members and exerting substantial influence over their action and behavior, in the civilian sector the work community, play community and living community have become increasingly separate. Furthermore, the living community as a force exerting social control over the behavior and attitudes of its members has declined sharply in influence over the last half century.

The basic family unit has changed from the three-generation, patriarchal family of the turn of the century, to a two-generation family more characterized by mobility and instability than by continuity and strength. In addition, urbanization and the decline of the rural and small community is weakening the influence of the community on the attitudes and behavior of our youth. Thus, with substantially greater economic security, increased academic standards and less opportunity to engage in gainful employment, young men are arriving at military age with considerably more education and substantially less influenced by the norms that derive from parental and community discipline, or experience in the labor force. As social change magnifies the generation gap, youth has been turning in increasing numbers to his peers for guidance. This in turn adds to the reduced degree of general consensus being exhibited by increasing numbers of today's youth. Much of the enthusiasm, idealism, energy, and increased intellectual preparation of youth seems to be focused on experimentation, protest, and various forms of revolt against existing social standards.

It is commonplace to note that elders have always complained of the rebelliousness and disrespect of youth. It is perhaps equally trite to observe that conservatism tends to increase with age, affluence, and social commitment. Yet, looking at the temper and customs of our society over a half-century or more, there has been a gradual and perceptible change in our attitudes and opinions and the values which underlie them. To describe a general set of values for American society or its younger generation would go well beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, some generalization can be made concerning the outline of those values that have specific bearing on the socialization of military recruits.

Despite the bureaucratic nature of our organizational structure and the socially oriented philosophy that has developed with it, the loosening of social controls at the lower organizational levels has led to a progressive increase in individualism. Permissiveness in education and child rearing has led toward a self-centered emphasis on individual autonomy and choice. Self-actualization, self-achievement, self-satisfaction, self-development have been taking on increasing importance in the spectrum of values over those of obligation, duty, and responsibility. As Richard Flacks has stated in a recent paper, "The only really worthwhile goal of an affluent society with respect to its youth is to promote the maximum possible freedom and opportunity for self-development." The President's Commission on National Goals expressed this point in a slightly different way when it stated that "The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice . . ." Any comparison of this kind of emphasis on the individual contrasts sharply with the group-centered value of the military ethic.

Admittedly, Americans have always been highly individualistic. The basic conditions of frontier life, immigration, free land, and social mobility fostered freedom of inquiry, individual decision-making, and dissent. Yet, this individualism was tempered by the strong family and community ties of a largely rural and agrarian society and by the necessity for group solidarity in the struggle against economic failure and the adversities of the frontier. Highly integrated economic machinery, coupled with the rising affluence of our current society, has added an entirely new dimension to the problem.

The emphasis on individualism has been accompanied by a growing skepticism towards existing standards and mores. The canons of religion, philosophy, art, and literature have been under progressively increasing attack. Absolute standards have successively given way to highly relative and situational ones. Freedom of expression has gained an increasing ascendency over restraint. This raises immediate problems in a military environment. The importance of the public utterances of military personnel in civil-military relations demands that social control be exerted over military self-expression in many of its forms. The individual recruit finds most irksome such restraints, which he rarely encountered in civil life.

Another facet of the growing individualism is the declining respect for authority. The patriarchal family and the growing class consciousness of early industrial America fostered a substantial respect for authority, both in the home and in the community. Two world wars and several decades of cultural revolution later, the perceived value of regard for authority is substantially reduced. Rank, age, and position are afforded few of the outward signs of respect considered normal two generations ago. Even the law is a restraint to be flouted if it appears to obstruct some desired moral end. The civil disobedience techniques of the civil rights movement are but one of the examples of the reduced value given to institutionalized authority in our general society. The structured authority pattern of the military establishment exists in almost complete opposition to this developing trend. To the young man accustomed to granting scant respect to his elders or their standards, the expected responses to military authority provide substantial difficulty.

Equality has long been associated with individualism in the American hierarchy of values. Since the days of the American Revolution there has been a strong element of egalitarianism in American thought. Fostered by the frontier and Jacksonian Democracy, there has always been a suspicion and distaste for aristocratic pretensions and class privilege. An emotional involvement with equality can be detected in most segments of American society. Much of the recent outcry against the draft has been based upon its unequal treatment of individuals. As the over-all affluence of society has increased, the rationale for differential privilege and inequailty of treatment has had progressively less support. Thus, the innate sense of equality and the demand for equal privilege is substantially affronted by the hierarchy of rank and privilege in the military services.

Where the divergence of rank and skill is the greatest, as in the young officers and soldiers with professional education who feel their expertise is not properly recognized, the problem is the greatest. There is a continuing strain in a learning society that generates substantial intergenerational variations in educational levels. When immediate supervisors are seen as being less well educated than those they control, the strain on interpersonal relationships and individual adaptation is obvious. Few would deny that this problem has grown steadily in scope over the past 50 years and it gives no immediate promise of declining.

The attitude of citizens toward their government and nation—patriotism—has also been subject to a steady, if almost imperceptible, change. As the preoccupation of the country in world affairs and the importance of international institutions has grown, so, too, have the attitudes of citizens become less parochial, somewhat less nationalistic. Under many influences that tend to emphasize the world scene and to de-emphasize the traditional focus on American patriots and historic virtues, the outspoken sentiment of patriotism has declined in its general acceptance. While, in absolute terms, the feelings of loyalty of the citizen for his government may not have declined substantially, public celebrations and public behavior supporting those feelings have. Compare, if you will, the attitudes with which the nation faced the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Korean War, and now the war in Vietnam. The substantial decline in patriotic utterances, rallying to the flag, and public volunteering in the sense of "my country, right or wrong," is noteworthy, while the social acceptability of draft evasions, criticizing national interests and policies has made increasing gains. Similarly, the respect and veneration with which generations held the veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic have not been replaced by similar public attitudes toward the members of the more modern veterans' organizations.

The government appears to be assuming a much different place in the regard of its citizens. The willingness of the individual to support the national welfare and will, as expressed by his elected leaders, appears to be increasingly replaced by a feeling of subordination to an arbitrary and distant authority over which one can exercise little control. Similarly, the feeling that our nation should act directly to support our interests or citizens abroad is being replaced by the feeling that such actions should be referred to an impartial international agency. In view of the requirement for basing military action on the loyal support of the nation, and the importance of patriotism in developing the necessary group cohesion always required by a military organization, the weakening of patriotic nationalism adds to the problem of socializing military recruits.

The threat of external danger to a social group has long been recognized as a potent force in creating strong group solidarity. Patriotism and support for national purposes is strongest when the danger to its welfare and institutions can be popularly perceived as clear and urgent. The American has rallied most enthusiastically to his country's call for a moral crusade against the enemies who threaten his liberty, his way of life, or his democratic ideals. When the United States is cast in the role of supporting world order, of supporting anti-Communist government and viable economies in underdeveloped countries far from its shores, and when the clear and present danger to American society is far from obvious, the lag in enthusiasm for the sacrifices entailed its pronounced. Short of an all-out confrontation between atomic powers or the creation of strong supranational police agencies, the United States is likely to continue to be required to provide constabulary forces in far-off areas in order to reduce the likelihood of global conflict and to maintain some reasonable semblance of a world order it can live with. Developing enthusiasm for such tasks among soldiers, some of whom were reluctantly inducted in the first place, provides a substantial and continuing challenge in the fact of public apathy or outright opposition from many people.

In an achieving society wherein individual goals have increasingly been measured in terms of economic returns, the intrinsic motivations of the military services are widely misunderstood. All too frequently the civilian critic tends to measure the attractions of military service in terms of pay and financial reward. Because these rewards appear modest such critics tend to downgrade the ambition of those who seek to serve and they themselves find little attraction in such

XUM

service. As financial rewards increasingly provide the status symbols and measure the prestige of an occupation, the task of reorienting the military recruit toward the intrinsic satisfactions of the service becomes more and more difficult. Even those people who have devoted some time to military service tend to become dissatisfied as they compare their working hours, responsibility, and pay with those of a comparable position in some civil pursuit. Yet, it is highly doubtful that an effective military force can be built solely upon the basis of a financial motivation.

The character and qualities of a military establishment are intimately related to the society that provides it. The value systems of that society provide the basis upon which the more demanding value system of the military ethic is developed. The current absence of value consensus in society at the local community level creates problems for military socialization. These problems stem from the strains between the increasingly socialized nature of our larger structures and the atomized individuality at the base. They may be solved in time as new social structures develop the ability to handle functions of older, local structures—the family and the community. As men learn to live and adapt themselves, their ideals, and their objectives to the restraints imposed by larger social organizations, the differences between the military organizations and their counterparts in civil life may be expected to diminish. As Allen Guttman has pointed out, the military organizations represent a major working example of the complete welfare society. It may be that the continued extension into lower organizational strata of the "organization man" phenomenon may presocialize our future military inductees. On the other hand, any substantial reorientation away from the present emphasis on individualism would appear to be a long way in the future.

A second trend tending to alleviate the problem lies in the changing nature of the military institutions themselves. The changing skill and job structure of military organizations creates an increasing percentage of positions for highly trained specialists, reducing the distinction between the nature of military and civilian jobs. Thus, the transition from civilian occupations to their military counterparts can be eased for an increasing number of military members. The lack of articulation between the skill structure and the rank structure appears to be in the process of reduction through variable pay schemes, the increasing development of career specialization and the expanded use of technical staff communication channels. These factors will change the formal expression but not the content of the basic military value system. Although leadership in modern military forces employs manipulative techniques to the maximum extent possible, the emphasis on the need to respect authority and rank are still inherent in military organizations. The question of how best to indoctrinate recruits steeped in egalitarianism and resentful of authority with the needful sense of subordination to superiors remains an open one.

Military organizations have relied on instruction, ceremonies, and symbolic rituals of various types to focus the attention of their inductees on the primary importance of loyalty to the nation. This process has become increasingly more complicated as the recruit has become more sophisticated and less impressed with the emotional patriotism common to older generations. Ceremonies and rituals thus tend to be less effective. As the patriotic values tend to diminish, other values will have to be relied on to take their place. Experience generally indicates that organizational or unit loyalties provide a substantial focus for highly professionalized groups. If loyalty to unit or service transcends the importance of loyalty to country and government, our national society can expect to face much the same type of difficulty with its armed forces that other nations have encountered in the past.

If our educational system beginning at primary levels were to place more emphasis on individual responsibilities and duties to others and on the obligations of citizenship, it might be possible to reverse or at least halt the trend. After all, we can hardly expect a young man to assume willingly a responsibility that has been largely explained as a burden rather than a privilege. Increased attention toward training in self-government and citizenship might in time bear fruit and assist in finding solutions to a number of our social problems.

American civilians are strongly bound up with secondary associations rather than with a single dominant primary group. In the military, as we have seen, the reverse is true. The group rather than the individual, is the unit of action. The focus is on the primary group rather than on a multiplicity of secondary associations. The inductee must understand and accept this group culture. The need to maintain intact the primary group sense developed in initial basic training should be fostered to the maximum extent. The proliferation in the military of new kinds of units tailored to a specific type of task makes it more difficult to identify a common group culture. As specific rules become less defined, personnel shifts require more adjustment on the part of the individual. Any actions that can be taken within the organization to retain common skill components and to maintain continuity among primary groups would assist in the task of cultivating unit solidarity and group identification.

The process of group identification is substantially assisted by the phenomena of "other-directedness" of our current youth. Their peer group orientation makes it substantially easier for them to accept the standards and norms of the group in which they find themselves, even if it happens to be a military one. This indicates that the maintenance of strong organizational norms and continuity in military units is a critical factor in the socialization processes. If the group has adopted institutional standards and traditions into its value system, the new arrival has less resources to hold out against his peers than may have been true in the past. To that extent the process of assimilating the individual into an existing military unit may be somewhat easier than assimilation into the temporary small group or replacement packet.

The final problem of generating support from a crusading society for intermittent crises and police actions, of various sizes, over prolonged periods of time, far from home, is not an easy one. Already, as in the time of Marius, voices are in full cry demanding the creations of a fully professional force in order to relieve the citizen of this onerous duty. The dangers in this line of action stem from the degree of separation of such a force from its supporting society and the eventual effect such a policy would have on the motivations and attitudes of both the society and its military forces. Civil-military relationships could be expected to take on a much different caste and the systems of recruitment and socialization into the military would rely less on the sanctions and social pressures of the community and more on the attractive power of the military forces themselves. Experience suggests that military establishments with high prestige, status and attracting power are not always willing to accept the dictates of the social organization which seeks to control them.

The wiser course may well be in shouldering our responsibilities as a nation, and in training our youth to accept them. Just as the individual must show responsibility for his community and his nation, so also is the nation responsible to the extent of its capabilities for the welfare of the international community. If we are to avoid the ultimate catastrophe, our nation must use its power wisely and with restraint. It does not have a viable alternative in avoiding international responsibility.

We have argued that the existence of an effective military force in contemporary America is affected by the articulation of the military value system with that of the larger society. We see—as others before us have seen—areas of significant strain. The proper resolution of these strains is contingent upon recognition by both the military and the larger society of all the factors involved. A dialogue requires two participants, and it has been the purpose of this paper to develop and present the issues from a soldier's point of view.

The military does not feel inadequate in coping with the problems of socialization we have presented. Indeed, the trends of social change appear to support solutions in many areas. On the other hand, the burden of resolution has been placed principally upon the military when in fact the problems are those of the community at large. Society must in the long run seek to break away from simplistic stereotypes, ideological viewpoints and rationalizations and see the military as a social institution of its own creation which can only operate effectively if it is permitted to retain its place as an integral part of the American community.

DEATH OF BEN SHAHN

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the world has suffered a deep loss with the death of Ben Shahn, the highly respected painter. His death has greatly saddened his friends and admirers who have faithfully followed and marveled at Mr. Shahn's unique contributions to the artistic world. Ben Shahn was a deeply committed human being. He was committed to arresting man's inhumanity to man through violence and injustice. He was committed to ideals which centered attention on the social and humanitarian issues of our day. He was committed to the task of stimulating people's interest in the arts. He was committed to the people who were fortunate enough to know him personally and to those whom he would never know. His work always expressed these concerns and it is because of his empathetic artwork that he will be remembered so vividly.

Mr. Shahn expressed his feelings both on canvas and with eloquent words on the subject. In 1956, while he was a Charles Eliot Norton Professor at Harvard College, he described his feeling about the source of art when he said:

> Thus it is not unimaginable that art arises from something stronger than stimulation or even inspiration—that it may take fire from something closer to provocation, that it may not just turn to life, but that it may at

certain times be compelled by life. Art almost always has its ingredient of impudence, its flouting of established authority, so that it may substitute its own authority, and its own enlightenment.

Mr. Shahn served on the New Jersey State Council on the Arts and the Commission to Study the Arts in New Jersey. We in New Jersey are indeed fortunate that the New Jersey State Museum will display his murals later this year.

Ben Shahn has left a legacy which will not soon be forgotten. Peggy Lewis, of the Trenton Times of Sunday, March 23, 1969, has written a beautiful farewell to Mr. Shahn and I believe this excellent tribute will be of interest to my colleagues and to all whose lives were touched by Mr. Shahn's art and his concern for people.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALOM, BEN SHAHN

(By Peggy Lewis)

"I have hoped, in some small way, to help monumentalize those days so that we may not so soon become inured to an unacceptable violence, a failure, a profound sadness."

Ben Shahn, of Roosevelt, wrote those words in the introduction to a poem he illustrated, "November Twenty Six Nineteen Hundred Sixty Three," written by Wendell Berry (N.Y.: Praziller, 1964). They fit as well much of the huge body of work he left when he died late Friday night, March 14, at Mt. Sinai Hospital, in New York.

For Ben Shahn made a poignant and profound record of the blight of the thirties and the forties in a language that forces us to remember those times. It was first with the language of flat gouache (opaque watercolor) and then with nervous lines and lonesome spaces that he battled injustice, violence and exploitation. In the same language he endowed the degraded and the deprived with dignity.

Although many artists had committed themselves to "social art," no one else made his statements as uniquely or as well.

By his own admission, Shahn painted two things: ". . . what I love and what I abhor." And, in 1956, he put his feeling about the source of art in a nutshell. It was at one of his lectures at Harvard the year the University named him Charles Eliot Norton Professor, and it appeared in print the following year when Harvard published the series of Norton lectures under the title, "The Shape of Content."

"Thus it is not unimaginable that art arises from something stronger than stimulation or even inspiration—that it may take fire from something closer to provocation, that it may not just turn to life, but that it may at certain times be compelled by life. Art almost always has its ingredient of impudence, its flouting of established authority, so that it may substitute its own authority, and its own enlightenment."

When a giant dies—in this case a man of international renown and one of America's most popular artists—the fact always comes as a shock.

As I sit here trying to piece together the fragments of a man from what I can remember about him, and from what I have collected, the fragments unite like the tesserae of that brilliant Shahn mosaic, once a mural in the S.S. Shalom and soon to become a permanent part of the New Jersey State Museum, some time in September when his Retrospective Exhibit becomes a memorial to this great artist.

Part of the mosaic of Shahn, the man, consists of the bare biographical facts so often stated in the past week—and worth repeating.

Shahn was born in Kovno, Lithuania, in 1898, the son of a carpenter. In 1906 his family emigrated to America and settled in Brooklyn. From 1913 to 1917 he attended high school at night and spent his days as a lithographer's apprentice.

Until 1930 he worked off and on as a lithographer while he furthered his schooling at New York University; City College of New York; the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, and the National Academy of Design. After two trips abroad to France, Italy, Spain and North Africa, he had his first one-man show at The Downtown Gallery, New York (April 8–27, 1930.)

In 1931 Shahn completed 23 small gouache paintings and two large panels on the Sacco-Venzetti case. The large panels were exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art, in New York. From that point, Shahn's career as artist, photographer, writer and teacher brought him ever-increasing recognition as a major American artist of international importance, known for his focus on social and humanitarian issues.

His reputation as a graphic artist grew to equal his reputation as a painter. Commissions from such companies as the Columbia Broadcasting System; mass-produced posters announcing cultural events or soliciting public support for favored causes or candidates; illustrations for books or specialty journals, all served to familiarize people who rarely visit museums or galleries with Shahn's images.

His aficionados know many of these images as peculiarly American, for the ideas they incorporate, in Shahn's words, ". . . are among the abiding symbols of American daily life, to be celebrated and brought into awareness."

Another facet of Shahn's essence was his delight at the discovery of humor in some small detail and his eagerness to share it. When "The Shape of Content," for example, was translated into Japanese, he found tremendous satisfaction in the fact that the title, once translated into Japanese and then retranslated into English, came out to be "The Outside of the Inside."

Shahn was extraordinarily articulate, and he possessed great, spontaneous wit. Once, during a TV interview with a panel of doctors who were weekend painters, the moderator asked him if he had a hobby.

He hesitated only a second and then answered, "Certainly."

"What is it?"

"Well," he said, "I'm a Sunday surgeon."

Shahn was gregarious. On a Sunday, his home burgeoned with a steady stream of friends and neighbors, and his table was heaped with delicacies which he urged everyone to sample.

If he went to an event in a nearby town, he was accompanied by half of Roosevelt. They traveled in a caravan of cars, appeared en masse and brought with them an unforgettable elan.

When the American Israeli Shipping Company sold its ship, "Shalom" (Peace), to a German shipping company four years after she sailed on her maiden voyage between New York and Haifa, the $300,000 worth of art that made her a floating museum was not included in the transaction.

Mainly through the efforts of Dr. Kenneth W. Prescott, two of the Shalom's 30-by-6-foot mosaic murals by Shahn, one based on the periodic tables of the elements, the other, "The Tree of Life," became the property of the New Jersey State Museum.

But dock strikes and the complexity of assembling and reassembling the huge panels have delayed their installation. The murals are now in Trenton, and the firm of Gabriel Loire, in Chartres, has informed Dr. Prescott that their specialist, Mr. Di Valentin, will leave for the United States in the middle of August to oversee the job.

The installation will be completed at an appropriate time, for the Museum will open a Shahn Retrospective exhibition on September 20. Many of the graphics to be shown will come from their own collection, one of the most complete, for the Museum owns some 50 graphics and posters as well as the recent portfolio based on "Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge" by Rainer Maria Rilke, the German poet whom Shahn admired and with whom he identified.

This memorial exhibit planned for August and, by Shahn's wishes rescheduled for September, comes 71 years after his birth in Kovno on September 10, 1898. Aside from works from the Museum Collection, the exhibition will include numerous borrowed works. Over the past year, Mrs. Leah Sloshberg, Curator of Arts and Assistant Director, has spent many hours at the Kennedy Galleries, in New York, researching available Shahns.

Shahn, who was on the board of the New Jersey State Council on the Arts, was an invaluable member of The Commission to Study the Arts in New Jersey. His enthusiasm and drive to stimulate interest in the arts in his State was not academic, but personal. He had the same driving enthusiasm about the State Museum.

So the forthcoming State Museum Retrospective assumes tremendous importance. It gives the residents of New Jersey the opportunity to see Ben Shahn's intense concern for justice and humanity among all peoples expressed in his strikingly personal and unforgettable images.

Ben Shahn, Shalom!

FCC REACHES FOR POWER

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in the present controversy over cigarette advertising on radio and television, I feel the points made in a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., State Journal are worthy of note. I direct them to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

FCC REACHES FOR POWER

At this point, it is difficult to determine whether the Federal Communications Commission is attempting to pressure Congress into continuing the health warning on cigarette packages, or is trying to break new ground in censorship of radio and television advertising.

Either effort falls beyond the legal and ethical authority of the FCC, and will certainly draw plenty of fire from interested congressmen and senators.

A 1965 law, which requires cigarette manufacturers to print the warning, "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May be Hazardous to Your Health," on every pack, expires June 30 this year unless Congress re-enacts it.

That same law, possibly anticipating the FCC, prohibits it from imposing any change on cigarette advertising on radio and television, which, an industry spokesman reported, produces about $215 million annually in advertising income.

Wednesday, FCC members voted 6 to 1 to ban all cigarette advertising on radio and television if Congress allows the 1965 statute to lapse.

Although the FCC now lacks the authority for its action, Rosel H. Hyde, FCC chairman,

XUM

said the action amounts to giving notice to Congress of the FCC's intentions should the law be allowed to die.

Apparently the FCC selected this sensitive area to test its authority to regulate, change or prohibit certain types of advertising from radio and television. FCC members were aware adversaries on the question of cigarette advertising and smoking are both powerful and articulate.

If the FCC, moving behind the sound and fury of the controversy over cigarette advertising, should succeed in establishing its authority to control all radio and television advertising, it truly would be the czar of the industry.

Already there are controls which prohibit fraudulent, misleading and dishonest advertising. This is as it shoud be. Federal agencies concerned, aided strongly by advertising industry organizations, are constantly scrutinizing advertising in all media, including the press, to make certain it meets minimum standards.

Congress may simply re-enact the 1955 statute which, beyond opposition by tobacco interests, drew no public criticism or attention.

It appears the FCC, like the cold camel, is attempting to get its nose under the tent.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, each year, Americans of Lithuanian origin commemorate the day the Republic of Lithuania became independent—February 16. Although the freedom of this brave nation was short lived because of Communist oppression, the flame of freedom still burns in the hearts and minds of Lithuanian Americans all over the Nation.

With the hope that Lithuanian and her sister captive nations behind the iron curtain may some day again be truly free, I ask unanimous consent that the Independence Day resolution of the Lithuanian American Club of Phoenix, Ariz., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Resolution was presented and adopted at an observance of Lithuania Independence Day Commemoration, held on Sunday, February 16th, 1969 at Lithuanian-American Club, 3720 W. Greenway Road, Arizona, by Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and their friends, commemorating the 718th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force of arms in June of 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom loving country into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Committee of the House of Representatives created by *H. Res. 346* of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international laws; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resoultion 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of World opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles Yost, United States Senators from Arizona, Members of the U.S. Congress, Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., and Lithuanian Consuls in New York City, Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles, Calif., and Boston, Mass., and the press.

Lithuanian - American Commemoration Day Committee of Phoenix, Ariz.: Felicia Kezes, Justin Saulys, Edward Gozawskas, Emily Josen, Kostancija Rudaityte.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1969, Mr. Charles Y. Lazarus, a distinguished Ohioan and president of the American Retail Federation, made an important address to the California Retailers Association and the Central City Association entitled "Let The Consumer Decide." In that address he dealt with the American consumer's interest in international trade policies and its relation to our national goals. Since this subject is one with which this Congress and the President will probably concern themselves, I am asking that it be included in the RECORD, and suggesting that all Members give it careful consideration in establishing future criteria for our trade policies. Mr. Lazarus' remarks follow:

LET THE CONSUMER DECIDE

(By Charles Y. Lazarus, president, American Retail Federation; president, The F. & R. Lazarus & Co., Columbus, Ohio; vice president, Federated Department Stores, Inc.)

Somewhat to my surprise, I found the timeliest thesis for these remarks in a document that is almost ten years old.

The document is called "Goals for Americans, Programs for Action in the 1960's." You may remember it as the title for a report by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals.

Some time ago, prompted first by my appointment to the Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy under a Democratic administration and then by the election of a new Republican administration, I began rereading this report, curious to know how much of it might still be relevant. By way of cuing us to the main points I hope to make today, I would like to read a few excerpts. I quote:

"The paramount goal of the United States was set long ago. It is to guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity . . . Our enduring aim is to build a nation and help build a *world* in which *every human being* shall be free to develop his capacities to the fullest. We must rededicate ourselves to this principle and thereby strengthen its appeal to a world in political, social, economic, and technological revolution.

"The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities . . . and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice. From this concern . . . comes our insistence on a widely distributed political and economic power, on the greatest range of free choice in our economy, and on the fair and democratic exercise of public and private power."

I hardly need to tell you things have changed since 1960. As you in Los Angeles have special reason to know, it has been a decade marked by protest and violence. Our cities have exploded in riots. Our campuses have been rocked by student revolts. All our institutions, as the price of survival, have been shocked into what in a different context the late John Foster Dulles called and "agonizing reappraisal."

So general has been the discontent and so shrill the conflicting cries for attention—and yes, so incoherent and frequently terrifying have been the demands of the outraged—as to pose a deep and perplexing question:

Does all this add up to a petition from history that the American system be discarded and some new system, as yet undefined, be put in its place?

Or do these events merely represent an insistence, largely on the part of those whom society has heretofore neglected or ignored, that the system be made to work better . . . that its imbalances be corrected . . . that the rights of citizenship and the rewards of participation in the system be extended to *all* Americans . . . that, in short, we reorganize for the fulfillment of the promise implicit in the very basic idea of America?

Granted that we are in crisis; granted that whatever one does in times like these is necessarily an act of faith. *What we have been seeing is not evidence of a revolt against the American system but only a new episode in what began at Lexington in 1775 and has been evolving ever since.*

What we have been seeing, I insist, is not the submergence of individuals but, on the contrary, an enlargement of the very concept of the individual.

What has happened, quite simply, is that more and more individuals have organized to stake their claim in the democratic process. Sometime during the 1930's, so the story goes, a Labor Department official is supposed to have said, when confronted by Eleanor Roosevelt, "But Mrs. Roosevelt! It's not that we've *discriminated* against women. We just never *thought* about women." Simply put, our society and the men we have made leaders have now been forced to think about *everybody*. And for this new reality we have to thank the American Negro, the American poor, and that remarkable abstraction, the American consumer.

It is mostly about this American consumer, and with the importance of the consumer movement to us as retailers, businessmen, and citizens, that I want to speak today.

To most retailers, the consumer movement figures as a series of quite specific bits of Federal legislation—Truth-in-Packaging, Truth-in-Lending, the Flammable Fabrics Act, for example—the intent of which is to protect or inform our customers. "I hope that this Congress will go down in history as the consumer-conscious Congress," President Johnson said in his message to Congress a year ago. And indeed it did. Ten months later, 28 pieces of major consumer-oriented legislation became law.

Now, in case any of us is inclined to dismiss this impressive performance as an act of Congressional catharsis that ended with the retirement of Lyndon Johnson, a moment's reflection on events since January 20th should set us straight.

A raft of new consumer bills has been introduced. One would establish a Department of Consumer Affairs at cabinet level. Of perhaps equal significance, the year-old Consumer Federation of America has now established a secure claim to having achieved what President Eisenhower's Commission recommended ten years ago: "There is need for more private interest groups which represent broader interests such as consumers." At its second annual Consumer Assembly, the Federation reported an increase in membership from 56 to 136 organizations. What's more, its opening-night reception attracted 150 Congressmen. On the floor above, a trade association was holding a similar reception—and, I might add, a much more lavish one. In attendance were all of five Congressmen.

So, consumerism is much more than so many skeptical ladies with shopping lists. Though Senator Warren Magnuson was undoubtedly right when he wrote, "Politicians have 'discovered' the American consumer," consumerism is also considerably more than a body of Congressmen who know a good thing when they see it.

It is important, I think, that we try to understand some of its deeper implications.

For one thing, the emergence of consumerism as a phenomenon of the sixties clearly reflects the shift from a producer-oriented to a service-oriented economy. The technological revolution has created vast numbers of new service-type jobs, in occupational settings far removed from factories and the traditional symbols of production. The effect of this has been to increase enormously the numbers of Americans who identify psychologically with the processes of distribution and consumption, and to de-emphasize, comparatively, those who are still emotionally tied to the assembly line. The effect has also been to expose far greater numbers to the frustrations of a marketplace that is too often impersonal.

It would be a serious error to assume that consumerism will have an impact only on legislative programs to improve the quality and safety of merchandise. It will be felt, inevitably, on marketing operations as well.

Of more fundamental importance, the consumer interest has now become the new standard for public policy. After centuries of being lost and unidentified in the loud traffic of special interests, the consumer has now appeared not merely as a new element in the political mix but as the symbol of the common interest. As one Washington editorialist recently said, "The thing about consumers is that everybody is one." Suddenly, the American consumer is Everyman. For the "individual" whose advancement has always been our paramount national goal, you can now write "consumer," for in the new language of Washington they have become one and the same.

It would be naive to believe that this new focus on the individual-consumer will put an end to special-interest thinking. I am, however, encouraged to believe that if the trend continues, social problems will soon be pushed to a new and higher level of visibility. The result will be not only a more generally comprehensive approach to problem-solving. Policymakers operating at this new level will be almost forced to take into account all the cause-and-effect, life-and-death relationships that are likely to be disturbed or set in motion if a proposed action is taken. With the new knowledge to be gained from this higher and broader point of view, I think it only natural to assume that one's immediate, short-range interests will come to be seen in a different and less persuasive perspective.

On a somewhat modest scale, I saw something like this process at work last year as one of 34 members of the President's Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy.

Our committee represented a fair cross-section of those private interests normally presumed to be affected by the import-export business. Our purpose was to confer with the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in the conduct of a study of long-range U.S. foreign trade policy. From the beginning, this effort was marked by an insistence that the problem be viewed in its entirety and as a retailer I took it as my natural responsibility to represent the consumer.

As you know, debate on U.S. trade has traditionally centered on the broad issues of economic growth and foreign relations. To my knowledge, this was the first time that any formal analysis of our trade policies ever took seriously into account the effect of these policies on the purchasing power of the American consumer.

I'd like to share with you a few of the things I learned in the course of this study, drawing on two position papers that I wrote for consideration of the President's Special Representative. First, a statement of rationale.

It seems elementary to me that foreign trade policy recommendations should be developed in a way that would advance our primary national goal. In terms of trade, this means necessarily those policies that offer the individual a high standard of living, with a maxmium freedom of choice. It seems only logical therefore that what America should seek is to accommodate—not negate—worldwide enjoyment of the fruits of worldwide economic opportunities. Not to recognize this in long-range foreign trade policy recommendations could result in legislated self-interest for special groups, and thus do violence to our main national goal. That goal, let me remind you, is not to enrich a few individuals but to do the greatest good for the greatest number of all individual Americans.

A trade policy that shields special-interest groups is not in our best national interest, long-range. Imports and exports move in such precarious balance that it is virtually impossible for the United States to protect a single industry through tariffs or quotas without inviting retaliation from foreign governments, to the inevitable detriment of some other American industry. I believe, therefore, that the individual citizen, that is the consumer, should be the final decision-maker on the amount of goods we import. Neither tariff barriers nor non-tariff barriers should be allowed to protect producers indefinitely at the expense of the individual citizen.

To me, it seems self-evident that the consumer's interest in international trade is best served by policies which

1. Save him money.
2. Bring him a larger selection of fashions and styles.
3. Satisfy his demands for merchandise not otherwise available from domestic suppliers; and
4. Maintain the competitive impact of imports on domestic prices, product efficiency, innovation, and fashion.

But to what extent tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers might be inimical to the consumer interest on these four points is something we do not yet know. Therefore, in an effort to fix some guidelines for future research, last fall I asked a few associates to examine the sales records on a group of selected apparel lines and to talk with key executives in three department stores—one in New York, one in Washington, and a third in Chicago.

What they found was that on some of our most in-demand imports present trade barriers are costing the consumer in sheer dollars and cents as much as 40 percent on price.

For example, a man can buy an imported cashmere sweater for $25. He would have to pay $35 for a comparable U.S.-manufactured product. With present trade barriers removed, the retail price of the imported sweater would be roughly $21.

An imported boy's winter coat made of synthetic fiber retails for $28. If we had no trade barriers, that same coat would cost $23.00. (The price for a comparable U.S.-manufactured coat is $30.00).

A lady's cotton dress glove costs $3 under present trade barriers; without them it would cost $2. A comparable glove manufactured in the United States sell for $5.

And so on.

But the value of imports, as we will know, does not lie in price alone. Of the senior department store buyers interviewed, all agreed that imports make an equally important contribution by giving consumers a wider choice of styles, fashions, and craftsmanship. In fact, many imported items (for example high-fashion dresses and gowns, high quality furniture or housewares, rugs and tapestries) are higher priced than their U.S. counterparts. In an expanding economy like ours, however, they find ready buyers among upper and middle income Americans because of their distinctive fashion and design features.

Our study focused also on the *indirect* costs to the consumer of tariffs and quotas. There is, for instance, the very real, though as yet imprecisely measured, effect of *increased capital costs* for plant and equipment because of tariffs and quotas, costs that are compounded and passed on to the retailer and consumer in increased distribution costs of finished goods.

It is clear, too, that the consumer suffers indirectly from government *Buy America* policies. While no one questions the need to keep those industries efficient that are essential to our national defense, there is, it seems to me, a reasonable question as to whether all the industries protected by this policy are in that category. In any event, there is no doubt that the Defense Department's procurement policies have increased the cost of government operations by billions of dollars since passage of the Buy America law in 1933 and the administration's action of the early 1960's. Statistics tell us the inflationary effect of increased government costs. Hence, increased taxes amount to many billions of dollars a year to American consumers.

XUM

Our research, admittedly, was spotty and incomplete. Our main contribution to the Committee's deliberations was to introduce the consumer's stake as a valid and largely unexplored subject of inquiry, in all aspects of world trade. More specifically, we identified the need for more thorough research into the effect on the consumer or restrictive trade practices on 1) direct imports, 2) capital costs, and 3) government procurement. I earnestly hope that the Nixon administration will undertake such research and present its findings to the appropriate government agencies for action.

All of this, it seems to me, assumes special relevance in the light of the recent move by the new administration to negotiate with foreign governments for the imposition of quotas on the import of textiles and apparel items.

For the past four years, we have been increasing imports of all textiles and apparel items at an average rate of 25 percent a year. Under the proposed "voluntary" quotas—assuming they follow the textile industry's recommendations of last year—this growth rate would be reduced to 5 percent a year and kept there, regardless of the continuing increase in consumer demand.

I think it most important that before the administration consummates any agreements it take into account the serious inflationary effect of quotas on consumer purchasing power. I think it equally important that whatever relief may be necessary by industry, or by company within industry, be very temporary in nature.

We're talking about added costs to the consumer that would run into hundreds of millions of dollars!

Plainly, if we're going to protect the consumer's purchasing power—which now represents 60 percent of our Gross National Product—we retailers have to be able to buy the right goods at the right price at the right time in a global economy, regardless of where these goods are produced. This should be our long-range goal, and we should not forget it.

This does not mean, however, that we should be indifferent to companies and workers that might actually be experiencing injury due to imports. All of us are having to learn how to adapt mobility in capital and labor to the demands of a global economy, and in the process some of us will undoubtedly be hurt. I personally favor a more liberalized escape clause in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act that would provide meaningful *temporary* relief in such cases—but only to those who actually have been injured. I also favor adjustment assistance—re-training, low-cost loans, moving expenses—that would enable companies and workers to adapt to competition from imports. Such assistance would be used whenever feasible, not only to maintain competitive world trade, but as a way of preventing windfalls to those larger companies that are in no need of relief, and of insuring that benefits go to those smaller companies who may in fact be in real trouble.

All this acknowledged, I remain convinced that in the long run the best policy for both retailers and consumers is the one advanced in 1960 by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals: "The healthiest world economy is attained when trade is at its freest."

There is, I am more than ever persuaded after my service on the Advisory Committee, a direct connection between free men and free trade. I was especially encouraged, therefore, when President Nixon told one of his earliest press conferences: "I believe that the interests of the United States and the interests of the whole world will best be served by moving toward freer trade rather than toward protection. I take a dim view of this tendency to move toward quotas and other methods that may become permanent, whether they are applied here or by nations abroad."

I began these remarks with an emphasis on the individual. Yet I have been talking mostly, and on the whole optimistically, about policy-making in Washington and the power of big and diverse organizations—things that are commonly thought to diminish the utility of individual action. As contradictory as it may appear, what I have in fact been trying to do is to make clear the need for increased individual involvement—particularly at the level of the local community, and post particularly by businessmen. Let me explain.

I am convinced that the processes by which national policy is now being formed, though still woefully inefficient, are nevertheless more likely than ever before to accommodate the needs and concerns of all our citizens. From the evidence of the past 51 days, I would judge that Mr. Nixon means to encourage these processes. Everything considered, the President has indicated that he is a man who intends to look at all the levers before he pulls any one of them. For this he deserves our commendation and support.

But, it must be recognized, policies are one thing and effective administration is quite another. To make policies work, programs are required. Regrettably, the intent of some of our most enlightened policies is often defeated by the overlap in functions, the corrosive jealousies, and the institutionalized resistance to change that characterize so many of the organizations on which the administration of these programs depends. One example will illustrate: According to the National Commission on Urban Problems, as of 1967 our metropolitan areas were served by 20,745 local governments. Chicago has 1,113 different and often competing local authorities; in the Philadelphia metropolitan area there are 876 separate municipal governments.

If I knew nothing about the problems of getting things done in my home town, these figures alone would convince me of the need for basic institutional change.

Now, the simple and inescapable fact is that if this needed change is to occur—which is almost to say, if the American system is to endure—it is absolutely imperative that there be more local initiative, as well as more enlightened local response to Federal initiative and more enlightened Federal response to local initiative. Reforms must take place at the level where people are.

There is no hope that such needed reforms can be accomplished—certainly no hope that they can be accomplished rationally and orderly—unless businessmen like those of us in this room today participate ever more personally and ever more positively in the affairs of our communities.

I take issue with those among us who argue that the responsibility of business is only to make a profit for our shareholders and who would delegate to others—mostly others in government and to paid professionals in our trade associations—the problems of housing, employment, transportation, education, civil rights, and politics. It should be clear beyond doubt by now that our failure to solve our social problems has added directly to the cost of doing business and that these costs cannot be reduced merely by attending to the internal affairs of corporate management. We must, more and more, assume responsibility for the environment in which business operates.

In today's world, like it or not, it is through big organizations that Americans get things done. Over the past several years, however, we have learned that the job to be done is too big even for our biggest organizations, public or private, acting alone and apart. As a consequence, we are seeing the formation of new alliances, particularly between business and government, of such potential as to constitute a new kind of federalism.

These new coalitions offer great promise but they also pose a great challenge. The challenge is to keep them responsive both to the people who created them and the people they are supposed to serve. And the fact is, the only way this challenge can be met is for the people affected by these big coalitions to participate thoughtfully and actively in the policies and programs of their member organizations.

Which gets me around to the job that we retailers have been doing through our own organizations.

I am pleased to report that our record is improving. I have been especially heartened by your performance in California. You have, as a matter of fact, set a standard for the rest of us, particularly when it comes to getting your top leaders to accept a personal responsibility to work with government.

We now have fifty state retail organizations, whereas only three years ago we had thirty-seven. We've begun to act more concertedly and more positively, with a result that doors are opening to us, not only in Washington but in state houses all over the country. In short, we have set the stage for the fulfillment of what I have come to regard as the retailer's logical mission in an increasingly urban society—to be one of the consumer's respected and most effective advocates in the highest councils of government.

But, obviously, we need to do more. I would urge you to give more support to your agents in Washington, meaning the American Retail Federation. During my tenure as president, I have been particularly impressed with the need for more substantive research and for more sustained communications, to our membership as well as to key policymakers. Without these, our staff finds it extremely difficult to develop, and offer to Congress at the opportune time, recommendations for action that are both innovative and feasible.

Too often in the past, because we have had time and resources only to react to threats of damaging legislation, we have been forced on the defensive, leaving a distinctly negative impression in the minds of our most influential Congressmen. We now need to move into a secure position of advocacy. To do this, and thereby create a more positive image, we definitely need to expand our programs in research and communications.

We retailers have the knowledge, the money, and the numbers to become an important presence in Washington.

Tackling the problems in our own communities, we can also make an important contribution to the solution of the all-pervasive urban crisis.

Finally, I suggest that we will be most effective, at both the national and local levels, if we bear this constantly in mind: within the American system our job as retailers is to preserve and improve the economic position of our customers—collectively, the consumers of America who constitute our rightful constituency.

If we do this, we can be confident that our activities as an association of retailers are in step with what has always been this nation's paramount goal—"To guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity."

Thank you.

THE CONSUMER'S STAKE IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(NOTE.—The table that follows is drawn from a study initiated last fall by Charles Y. Lazarus, president of the F & R Lazarus & Company, of Columbus, Ohio, while serving as a member of the President's Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy. The findings are based on an examination of sales records for selected apparel lines in three typical U.S. department stores—one in New York, one in Washington, and a third in Chicago.)

PRICES PAID BY THE AMERICAN CONSUMER AS A RESULT OF IMPORT BARRIERS

Merchandise	Retail prices to the consumer with no trade barriers (1)	Retail prices to the consumer with present trade barriers (2)	Retail prices today of a comparable U.S. manufactured product (3)
Boys' wear:			
Boys' winter coat, wool	$16.15	$20.00	$22.50
Boys' winter coat, synthetic fiber	23.00	28.00	30.00
Boys' winter wool coat, pile lining (English or German)	28.85	35.00	40.00
Boys' winter wool coat, ornamental tufted construction	37.45	45.00	(1)
Boys' hooded terrycloth robe, quality fabric	14.00	15.00	20.00
Boys' Helenca fabric stretch ski trousers	13.60	18.00	(1)
Boys' Helenca velour fabric shirt, stretch collar	8.60	11.00	(1)
Boys' fisherman's sweater, individually hand knit	8.50	11.00	(1)
Boys' cardigan (individually hand knit)	9.20	12.00	(1)
Boys' wool ski sweater, bulky type weave	10.60	14.00	(1)
Ladies' shoes:			
Pumu, 16/8 leather upper, leather sole, bow trim	$14.60	$17.00	$24.00
Sandal, 4/8 stack heel, leather upper, leather sole	8.70	10.00	14.00
Sandal stripping, 12/8 covered heel, leather upper, leather sole	14.80	17.00	21.00
Men's sportswear:			
Men's cashmere sweater (English)	20.85	25.00	35.00
Men's V neck lambs wool sweater (English)	14.00	17.00	21.00
Men's cowhide leather coat (Swedish)	138.00	150.00	200.00
Men's fisherman's wool sweater, individually handknit (Italian)	14.85	18.00	(1)
Men's hand loom wool coat (English)	29.40	35.50	(1)
Ladies' gloves:			
Ladies' cotton dress gloves	2.50	3.00	5.00
Ladies' kid leather gloves, fabric lined	12.50	15.00	(1)

[1] Not available in United States or supply of comparable product inadequate to meet consumer demands.

TRIBUTES TO MRS. BUN "LUCILE" RALEY

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 2, 1969, a tragic accident in Waco, Tex., removed from a life of very active and beneficial service to the people of Texas, Mrs. Bun "Lucile" Raley of Waco, Tex.

Mrs. Raley was a librarian, teacher, scholar, author, civic worker, and good citizen. Her husband, Bun Raley, was known to many people in the Nation's Capitol, as he was twice national president of the Rural Mail Carriers of America and served in a high position in the Post Office Department of the United States until his retirement approximately 7 years ago.

Mrs. Raley was coauthor of the book entitled "Texas: Wilderness to Space Age," published in 1962. It is now a textbook used in Texas schools.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, in the Extensions of Remarks, a short sketch of Mrs. Raley's life as printed in the Lone Star Postmaster of February 15, 1969, and Senate Resolution 57, adopted January 29, 1969, in the State Senate of Texas and signed by the Lieutenant Governor and the secretary of the Texas Senate on the original copy of the resolution.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lone Star Postmaster,
Feb. 15, 1969]

MRS. BUN RALEY DIES IN JANUARY AUTO ACCIDENT

Mrs. Bun (Lucile) Raley of Waco, formerly of Valley Mills, died Thursday of last week after she was injured in an automobile accident.

The two-car accident occurred in Waco. Mrs. Raley was rushed to a Waco hospital, where she died the same afternoon.

Mrs. Raley had been with the Waco Independent School District since 1936. She held the title of consultant in library services for more than 20 years with offices in the school administration building.

Mrs. Raley was a member of the U.S. President's Library Consulting Committee.

She was a member of Cogdell Memorial Methodist Church in Waco; a member and past-president of the Waco branch of the American Association of University Women; lifetime member of the National Education Association; member of the Texas State Teachers Association; member of the Current Events Club; member of La Societe De Beauxarts; former member and past president of the Altrusa Club; past-regent of the Henry Downs chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution; charter member and past president of the Zeta Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma society; and others.

Surviving are her husband; one daughter, Mrs. Werner H. Barth of Lock Haven, Pa.; her mother, Mrs. John C. Williamson of Waco.

Letters of condolences included one from President and Mrs. Johnson, longtime friends of the Raleys. Texas Senate Resolution No. 57 praised Mrs. Raley for her "national recognition for her outstanding ability in library science with her appointment as a member of the Library Consulting Committee of the President of the United States . . ."

Mr. Raley—who is well known to Texas Postmasters has the true sympathy of all.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 57—IN MEMORY OF MRS. BUN "LUCILE" RALEY

Whereas, Citizens of Waco and the Central Texas area, were saddened by the tragic death on January 2, 1969, of Mrs. Bun (Lucile) Raley, who was loved and admired for bringing library service on a personal level to Waco school children for more than 30 years; and

Whereas, Mrs. Raley had been with the Waco Independent School District since 1936, and held the title of consultant in library services for more than 20 years; and

Whereas, All the schools in the Waco system relied heavily on Mrs. Raley for library services, and she had the responsibility of approving all library purchases and book selections; and

Whereas, When North Junior High School in Waco opened its doors, she was the librarian and, later, she held this position at Waco High School before becoming system consultant; and

Whereas, Mrs. Raley received national recognition for her outstanding ability in library science with her appointment as a member of the Library Consulting Committee of the President of the United States; and

Whereas, Administrators of the Waco School System expressed for all the teachers and school children of Waco their deep regreat and sense of loss at her untimely death, and said that it would be exceedingly difficult to find anyone to replace her in ability and dedicated service to the Waco schools; and

Whereas, Mrs. Raley was born in Moody, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Williamson; she attended Moody schools and Mary Hardin-Baylor College in Belton, receiving a degree in library science from Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, Louisiana; and

Whereas, She was a member of Cogdell Memorial Methodist Church in Waco, a member and past-president of the Waco branch of the American Association of University Women, life member of the National Education Association, member of the Texas State Teachers Association, member of the Current Events Club and La Societe De Beauxarts, and a former member and past-president of the Altrusa Club; she was past-regent of the Henry Downs Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, charter member and past-president of Zeta Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma society, and recipient of the Alpha State achievement award; and she was a member of the Drama Group, which met frequently in her home; and

Whereas, She is survived by husband; one daughter, Mrs. Werner H. Barth of Lock Haven, Pennsylvania; her mother, Mrs. Etta Williamson of Stilwell Memorial Residence in Waco; two brothers, Albert Williamson of Groesbeck, and Robert Williamson of Midland; and two grandchildren; and

Whereas, It is appropriate that the Senate of the State of Texas pay tribute to this outstanding educator, who gave so generously of herself in the service of her community and, particularly, the school children of Waco; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 61st Legislature by this Resolution show honor and respect to Mrs. Lucile Raley, and extend sympathy to the members of her family in their great loss; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be prepared, under the seal of the Senate, for members of her family; and that when the Senate adjourns this day it do so in her memory.

BEN BARNES,
Lieutenant Governor.

I hereby certify that the above Resolution was adopted by the Senate on January 29, 1969, by a rising vote.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT OPERATING NEWSPAPERS

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a copy of remarks de-

XUM

livered by Harold W. Andersen, president, World Publishing Co., during a recent convention of the American Newspapers Publishers Association. His remarks speak in favor of legislation exempting from antitrust laws certain arrangements for the survival of joint operating newspapers. He feels strongly that such legislation is vitally important to a significant segment of the Nation's press. Having received permission, I insert the following portion of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JOINT OPERATING NEWSPAPERS

I feel a community can be well served by a single newspaper—two editorial voices are not an absolute essential for good journalistic service to a community. I believe our paper—and hundreds of other single-ownership, individual newspapers—are doing a good, responsible job of meeting the daily newspaper needs of the community.

But if the people of a community are willing to support *two* newspapers by buying copies of each paper, and if the only way two newspapers can survive in this community is through an agency agreement, or through publication of morning and evening newspapers under single ownership, as is the case in 158 cities, then I submit that such an arrangement is *not* against public policy. It gives the reading public in that particular community what it wants and is willing to pay for.

I am among those who feel the newspaper business in general is in healthy condition. And one reason that it *is* in healthy condition in a good many cities is because it has been possible to effect essential economies through agency operations or through mergers.

The "failing company doctrine. . . . is not new to American anti-trust law. Nor are limited exemptions a new thing. Some have said newspapers should not ask special consideration. Well, if special consideration is justified by the facts, if the public interest is not damaged thereby, then special consideration is entirely appropriate. Special consideration is very much a legitimate part of the legislative process—designing or amending laws to fit special needs.

There has been a good deal of concern expressed over "predatory" practices that might be possible . . . . Sponsors . . . . have proposed amendments designed to remove any doubts in this area and to make it unequivocally clear that the prohibitions of the anti-trust laws remain applicable except for the narrow exemptions specified . . . . Such amendments would make clear that the bill would not exempt conduct by a newspaper combination or joint arrangement that would be unlawful if undertaken by a single firm.

We should keep in mind, too, that if a particular joint arrangement or merger is challenged by the government or a private party, the newspaper would have the burden of proving it meets the bill's definition of a failing newspaper and once it is established that a merger or agency agreement is legally exempt, the two newspapers would continue to be fully responsible for their conduct under anti-trust law.

I am inclined to pass rather quickly over the argument that if a failing newspaper goes out of business, leaving only one newspaper in the community, the door is thereby opened for new, vigorous journalistic entrepreneurs to start a second newspaper. The history of American journalism over the past half a century or more indicates clearly that there is virtually no chance of this happening. This "new blood" argument, in short, is answered very convincingly by the economic facts of daily newspaper life—facts known well to all of us in this room.

The anti-trust laws are intended to preserve competition. (This legislation) is intended to preserve competition. Thus we have a case in which a carefully-limited exemption actually serves to further the basic purpose and philosophy of anti-trust law.

In addition to the philosophical arguments that can be advanced, there is this very practical consideration:

Where is the justice in suddenly calling into question agency or merged operations which were entered into in good faith and which have become so necessarily a part of the two papers' way of life that to require separation now would, it seems to me, very likely mean the death of one or the other of the papers?

ADDRESS BY NAJEEB E. HALABY

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, each of us is aware of the efforts of the U.S. Travel Service to encourage more of our foreign friends to visit the United States since the creation of the USTS in the early days of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, recently delivered an address before the European Travel Commission in Amsterdam in which he spoke of the new techniques and the new equipment which Pan American and other U.S.-flag carriers will have available in the 1970's to lure more and more foreigners—Europeans, particularly—to come to our great country and take part in the "Visit America" program. We all remember Jeeb Halaby when he was the late President Kennedy's appointee as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. He has lost none of his incisiveness or sense of public service since becoming president of Pan American.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN TRAVEL PROMOTION

(An address by Najeeb E. Halaby, president, Pan American World Airways, prepared for delivery before the European Travel Commission, March 13, 1969, Amsterdam)

This is my first and your third transatlantic travel congress, and I am happy to be here, as I have long been an admirer of the European Travel Commission.

I admire first of all your longevity. In these days of burgeoning regional travel and trade groups, yours is the grandfather of them all. You have led the way.

More than that, so many years of harmony between 21 countries in pursuit of a common cause, I am sure must have encouraged and even inspired the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association.

You have not only worked well on your side of the Atlantic, but you haven't done so badly on our side either. I congratulate you and your North American counterparts for your efforts in co-sponsoring this travel congress.

But why am I your particular admirer? It's gratitude that's all. The January before last was our winter of discontent in the U.S. travel industry. We barely had time to recover from celebrating New Year's eve before President Johnson was warning us that travel restrictions should be imposed to improve our unfavorable balance of payments. In effect "Americans, stay home" was painted on the U.S. fence.

Then, ETC leaders like Tim O'Driscoll, Leonard Lickorish and Arthur Haulot did something for which their portraits will hang in my personal travel hall of fame. They came to Washington and helped convince our legislators that by removing one spoke in the wheel, that is, the American tourist, the whole mechanism of world travel could slow to a snail's pace.

Have you ever heard a more graceful way of suggesting that our travel restrictions could, in turn, breed retaliation?

We have a new administration in Washington, and indications are that Messieurs O'Driscoll, Lickorish, and Haulot should be able to store, but not unpack their flight bags. There hopefully will be in 1969 fewer threats to travel—the single greatest item in international trade—contributing $21 billion to world commerce in 1968 alone.

But let's face it. 1968 despite some increases was not the best of all possible travel years. Travel wasn't so much cut back as it was distorted and redirected. For example, influenced by gloomy recommendations from Washington, Pan Am showed only a modest increase on its Atlantic routes while passenger miles to the Caribbean and South America showed a dramatic increase.

Prospects are that 1969 and 1970 will tell a more positive and profitable story. The Atlantic community still represents the biggest, the most profitable chunk of the world's travel business. And it's going to keep on that way. Some 80 per cent of all international tourists and their expenditures come from the United States, Canada and 10 ETC countries.

This audience, of course, represents the cream of the European and North American travel industry. You are experts at what draws and makes a tourist happy on the ground and in the air. Chances are if he isn't satisfied with one, he won't be so keen about the other.

But you know all this. So if I gave you my standard Pan Am presidential speech of the past year—and it feels like I have given it at least 747 times—I would only be educating the already educated.

Therefore I will only say a few, I hope, well-chosen words about the 747. You know what a catalyst this 362-passenger plane can be as means to stimulate travel. For this new bird, you know what ground support facilities are ready, what should be ready—and what, unfortunately, will not be ready.

Pan Am, by the way, will be investing more than one billion dollars in its 747 program by 1972. We're not asking anyone to match this but a little help on the ground, here and there, wouldn't hurt.

The 747 is after all a giant step forward to meet our industry's immediate future—the changing and expanding environment for travel.

What do I mean by environment? The jet has changed man's physical environment by shrinking the world to manageable proportions in terms of time and distance. I use the word environment, however, not to measure a physical relationship, but an economic one.

If we attempt to match our resources to fit our opportunities, we will have come to grips with our particular environment. In terms of another industry, IBM is the classic case of a firm that took advantage of its environment. It could have gone on happily making bigger and better card-type data sorting equipment. But Tom Watson, seeing the business information explosion decided the time was ripe to step up into electronic computers. He did not regret the decision.

Nor will we regret the decision to step up to the 747. Bold decisions, however, cause concern, especially among those who view change as a threat instead of an opportunity. You will recall, of course, that there were many who viewed the introduction of the 707 in the late fifties as a flight from reality.

Today, there are many who fail to see the 747 as the gigantic opportunity it is sure to be—a chance to direct and mold the tourist explosion into an efficient and profitable travel market.

IATA has just taken two steps that recognize the true potential of the 747 as the vehicle of super-jet transportation:

1. No surcharge on the 747.

2. Bulk fare proposals: Tour operators will now be able to buy in advance at discount seats in blocks of 40 eastbound or 20 west. Such wholesaling at fares less than half normal economy levels will pay a crucial role in closing the gap between annual traffic growth and increased capacity.

These are important steps, but let me stress that the mass market we seek is already there. It just needs to be tapped—and the time is ripe for new methods of promoting and selling travel on both sides of the Atlantic—by industry and by governments.

First we have to face a few facts squarely. In the summer of 1970, Pan Am's 747s will have added a 45 per cent seating capacity to our North Atlantic routes, over and above what we would normally offer with our 707s. And by the summer of 1971, totalling up not only ours but the 747s of our worthy competitors, world airlines will have room for 30 million more passengers than the current 150 million flying internationally today.

Can we fill these seats? I believe the potential customers are waiting to be tugged into them. And if you don't believe it, here are some figures that will make you sit up and take notice. We estimate some 25 million Americans have the leisure money to cross the Atlantic; while 18 million Europeans have both the time and money to do the same. (Perhaps, in a few years, with our rising standard of living we will all get the annual vacation time Sweden and Poland now have by law—24 working days not including official holidays.)

Can we coax these 43 million potentials onto the planes? This is our challenge—our opportunity. If we fail, we could very well wind up with unfilled capacities in the air and on the ground and serious losses in our countries' economies. So I repeat—we can, we must develop more effective ways of promoting travel to the peoples of the Atlantic community.

Let's look for a moment at a major difference between the two sides of the Atlantic. Western Europe is broken up into 21 separate states, each of which concentrates on promoting its own attractions. However, because of this diversity, no unified on continent-wide official effort can be effective for promotion of European travel to the U.S.A.

The United States, on the other hand, is homogeneous and its regional attractions—from the igloos of Alaska to the bikinis of Palm Beach—are hard to promote on an individual basis. However, because of its unity of interest, language, and currency, one firm like American Express in a single nationwide effort can easily promote American travel to Europe.

Let's examine a supposition. Suppose you had decided to rebuild after the war as a United States of Europe. What would your travel promotion be to my side of the Atlantic?

There would probably be only one or two European airlines serving the Atlantic routes rather than the 15 we have today, and—I wouldn't mind that!

There would most likely be just one E.T.C. advertisement in Holiday, Venture, or the New York Sunday Times rather than 21 separate ads which currently grace the leading American consumer media.

Europe did not take the route I have just outlined. With such a limited approach to travel promotion, the odds are that travel to Europe would be only a fraction of what it is today.

Let's flip the travel promotion coin. Suppose each U.S. State opted for an individual approach to the European travel market.

Then it's possible each State would have its own trans-Atlantic airline—or perhaps groups of States could combine for this purpose—much like SAS. Individual States—or regions—would do their own advertising and maintain their own information offices abroad. Think of the blast air Texas would be having in the Pacific!

This fragmented approach would certainly attract more European visitors than we have now. Perhaps 50 per cent more considering 50 States in the Union!

So we have a curious economic paradox that may only fit travel promotion. Fragmentation works best to promote regional attractions; unification works best to reach the overall or mass market.

Economic nationalism begins to fail as the jet shrinks the world. But we need as much cultural nationalism as we can get. For cultural diversity is the vision and variety of the travel experience—which after all is based on seeing things that can't be seen in your own backyard.

Europe has great cultural diversity, as does America. But, America, unlike Europe, has never been able to effectively tap—for tourist development—its cultural resources or rely on the power of regional enthusiasm.

President Nixon in his inaugural address pinpointed this lack of regional response: "We need the energies of our people, enlisted not only in grand enterprises, but more importantly, in these small splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journals."

Now may be time for a few suggestions on how the U.S. can tap those "small splendid efforts" on a regional basis in the promotion of world travel, as well as improving our broad national approach to encouraging visitors to our shores. Earlier, I advised Tim O'Driscoll to set aside his emergency flight bag and come to America the next few times only on the call of pleasure or of someone singing "Take Me Along." I was encouraged to do so by the re-assurance given the day before yesterday by Maurice Stans, our Secretary of Commerce, to the newly merged discover America travel organizations that this administration had no intentions of imposing any taxes on those Americans who wished to travel abroad.

Representing the Secretary, we have among us today C. Langhorne Washburn, new Director of the U.S. Travel Service. A friend of our President, a great campaigner and a man of vigorous and far-reaching enthusiasm, he will bring new and realistic thrust to all visit U.S.A. efforts.

I am sure that Mr. Washburn will be the first to agree with me that no official U.S. travel promotion program can find success unless it makes sense to the Congress of the United States. It is from the Congress that has come the setting of policy, in the U.S. Travel Act of 1961, and must come the provision of funds for any expanded U.S. Government program and it is with the Congress that such a program must be discussed and formulated to implement more vigorously the policy already crystallized.

I am sure that Congress, having refused last year to take the negative, restrictive step of taxing Americans on their overseas travel, will not fail soon to take the step of providing more funds to sell the U.S.A. as a travel destination. Certainly, the United States should rank higher than we do in the Olympic games of government tourist promotion. But the burden of convincing our legislators is ours. We must produce proof—in our research, in our programs, in the power of our private efforts—that a greater Federal fund will yield a greater return on the investment of our taxpayers.

In discussing the American effort, may I say that we in the private sector of the American economy do not rely and do not intend to rely on the Federal government to do our job for us. Such companies as TWA and Pan Am have been accustomed to spending larger sums than our government has spent on the development of travel. You experts in the field will surely agree that the respective tasks of government and private enterprise are separate and distinct and that history has proven that the satisfactory marriage of the two frequently raises a healthy family of productive progeny.

We have learned in the highly competitive airline business—a business in which we admire our competitors, but do not wish to share all our secrets with them—that we can work together better and more effectively when a government establishes and invests in a basic travel development program, than when one of us attempts to serve as chieftian for the others.

With adequate funds the U.S. Travel Service could not only improve its performance of this essential task but could coordinate the activities of all government agencies affecting this enormous international industry and underpin all efforts, both public and private, with timely and accurate data—and assure that the U.S.A. presents its views and programs articulately and persuasively in the world's councils of trade and travel.

It seems reasonable to suggest that the head of this service should have the rank of assistant secretary in our department of commerce.

Such recommendations on the first tier, of our international travel activities would be sadly incomplete without supporting it with a secondary and, if my earlier remarks were true, a tertiary level of action.

We need a strong private, non-profit institution, which could well be the discover America travel organizations, merged into one incorporation two days ago in Washington, financed by the public, as well as by private industry. This should function as the semi-official arm of the U.S. Travel Service and actively promote travel to and within the United States.

Regional organizations—my third tier—would spark those splendid local efforts we discussed earlier and be advisors to the non-profit foundation, keeping watchful and anxious eyes on how their sectional interests were being promoted in the market of the world.

We can envision at least six: the far west, the deep south, the Caribbean, the midwest, New England and the megalopolis of the mid-Atlantic seaboard.

Parenthetically, may I point out—strongly—that the European travel industry has a vested interest, and I mean a vested, financial, profit-seeking interest in the development of more travel by Europeans to America.

Now that I have discussed America, perhaps I may be forgiven for offering a few suggestions to Europeans. And my first suggestion—now that I have proposed the diversification of America—is that perhaps Europeans could use a more unified effort than exists today.

National boundaries protect your distinctive cultures: But they hinder development

XUM

of a mass travel market to the world, mass merchandising and the applications of modern technology.

Perhaps an international travel organization such as IUOTO could take the leadership in encouraging cooperation on an industry-to-industry basis across national boundaries. IUOTO, of course, is to be commended for the efforts it has already made in this area.

Tour operators and travel wholesalers should be assisted and encouraged to sell to a Europe-wide market, instead of customers of travel agents in one country.

Various segments of your travel industry might benefit from a study exploring how Europe-wide combinations can be formed using computer technology to reduce costs and improve efficiency.

Last, but certainly not least, you can be the link in the great tourist migration from eastern Europe and North America. It's beginning to build up now. There is perhaps no better proof than the quality and quantity of eastern European promotions aimed at American travel writers as well as the frequency of their advertising in U.S. periodicals.

Of course, there are certain common problems on both sides of the Atlantic. One of the most interesting and most difficult to solve is how to convince the public at large and our governments that tourism is not only important, but for many a national economy tourism means the difference between profit and loss.

Our case is not always an easy one to prove. When we deal with travel, we deal with an invisible giant of an industry—an industry without smoke stacks. One without organized constituencies and therefore with few members of parliaments. We know the impact, the importance, but our arguments never strike me as particularly dramatic, or politically dynamic.

Your own E.T.C. promotional material discusses this very point when you say tourism is "the most complex of export commodities."

Statistics show that one out of every six jobs in America today can be attributed to the economic activity created by travel. This is a fascinating and vital statistic, but it has nowhere near the emotional impact created by the loss of jobs on a production line when a visible manufacturing plant closes down. In my country, it's the loss of jobs that agitates legislators, converts nervous energy into action. Loss of jobs translates into loss of votes—and no politician in his right mind sweeps that under the congressional carpet.

What I am looking for is not someone to convince legislators, but to convince others as well of travel's importance. We need, for example, to convince that group of students charging the barricades that their actions are bad for tourism. I am not asking them to chicken out, but we need a minister of tourism to designate a nice off-beat spot, not as yet discovered by the jet set for all good old fashioned riots.

Aside from helping the students, I'd like to do something for the tour operator—an important element in the pleasure travel market. We're trying to solve problems in the United States as they affect and impede European tour operators.

This year, for example, the International Committee of Discover America Travel Organizations Inc. is bringing in a group of European tour packagers to meet with the American providers of ground services.

Any of you who attended Discover America's Brussels meeting last June heard, as we say in the States, a mouthful from European tour operators and travel agents concerning the state of the art of tourism in the United States.

Their complaints were legitimate. And what we need in the United States is an organization which will somehow take responsibility for filling the requirements of European operators and travel agents. The U.S.T.S. can't do it. Airlines would not be the proper choice either. Perhaps this could be the function of the proposed second-tier non-profit organization that I described earlier under contract to Uncle Sam.

For what is apparently needed is U.S. Government assistance for the tourist reception industry—providing guides, interpreters, and a coordinating office to help match accommodations and attractions with demand from overseas tour operators.

I wish I knew the man who said: "the task of statesmanship in our time is not to keep nations peacefully apart, but to bring them actively together." Using that premise, organizations like E.T.C., Canmexus, and the rest have a defense mechanism even more powerful than N.A.T.O., for if anything makes light of political and national prejudice—if anything reduces the significance of national frontiers, if anything is the most direct path to world peace—it is eye to eye, nose to nose, hand to hand tourism.

JOB CORPS STAFF TOLD: HARASS FOE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy in my congressional district, specifically within the city of Omaha where the Burroughs Corp. has taken over two of our major downtown hotels for use for the Women's Job Corps training program. I feel that the people of Omaha are not specifically against the Job Corps per se but they object strenuously to the location of the Job Corps Center in the downtown business district. They are anxious that when the Burroughs Corp.'s contract expires the latter part of June it not be renewed for continued operation in the two downtown hotels.

I believe the pulse of the people of Omaha—and particularly the business community—is that the Center should be moved to some other location outside of the downtown business district because Omaha has a tremendous redevelopment program going on in the downtown district. Furthermore, since Omaha is in the center of the Nation it has been a major site for regional and national conventions. I can speak with some authority on this subject as I was manager of the convention bureau of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce in 1940. Conventions constitute a major industry so far as Omaha is concerned and we were limited at that time to conventions drawing around 2,500 to 3,000 delegates whom we could house comfortably because of a shortage of hotel space. Now that the Burroughs Corp. has taken these two major hotels out of circulation, conventions have been severely restricted, resulting in a tremendous loss of income and in effect crippling a major industry of our city. I have explained this to representatives of the Burroughs Corp.

I supported funds for this program in the past, but I and the business community and the vast majority of our citizens feel that it is only the location that is involved. When I discussed this matter with representatives of the Burroughs Corp. I thought they were understanding of our concern. But I was very disappointed to find that in my opinion following our visit they entered into an intrigue and the paid employees of the Women's Job Corps Center have conducted a harassment campaign against anyone who feels that the Center should be transferred from the downtown business area. I certainly do not feel that the taxpayers' money should be used for such lobbying purposes and I urgently recommend that because of what I believe to be a doublecross, the contract of the Burroughs Corp. not be renewed unless and until they agree to vacate these two major downtown hotels so that the tremendous influx of conventioneers might resume. The loss of these conventions compares to the loss of a huge industry, as mentioned above.

As an example of the Burroughs Corp.'s harassment tactics, there follows a newspaper article from the Omaha World-Herald describing in greater detail what they have done and are doing. Having been sympathetic to the training of these girls, I strongly object to this harassment, as do other substantial organizations, groups, and individuals. The story from the Omaha World-Herald follows:

JOB CORPS STAFF TOLD: HARASS FOE

(By David Tishendorf)

A memorandum instructing staff members of the Omaha Women's Job Corps Center to seek support for keeping the center in downtown Omaha and to "harass" persons who feel the center should be moved drew fire Tuesday from City Councilman Al Veys.

At the same time, L. H. Glaab, director of the center, said he saw "nothing wrong, professionally or ethically," with the memo.

He said the use of the word "harass" was "unfortunate," but he defended the memo as a "normal reaction" to "some pretty strong things that have been said about the Job Corps."

The memo, written by Brandon M. Whistler, director of public relations for the Job Corps, was dated March 10.

The memo said a "task force" of nine staff members had been formed to "establish a few links." Each of the staff members was assigned to call upon persons in various segments in the community. The memo continued:

"In your efforts to do your part, we request that you inform a member of the task force of the list of people you plan to contact, and then later the results of the contact, and any general information pertinent to the situation.

TWO-FOLD REQUEST

"The reason for request is two-fold. First, we do not wish to harass anyone unnecessarily if a contact has already been made with positive results.

"On the other hand, if the result is negative, then please harass. Second, we would like to record results of all efforts."

Councilman Veys, who said he obtained a copy of the memo from "an employe of the Job Corps," had the document read into the record at the council's meeting Tuesday.

"Isn't that great, that the people in the Job Corps are going to start harassing everybody in Omaha?" Veys said.

"That's the only comment I have. It's not worth further comment."

Glaab said he approved the memo before it was issued to the staff members and he takes "full responsibility for it."

"The memo is not meant the way it sounds," he said. "I know there hasn't been any harassment.

"We have had people contacting their friends. We wanted to see if everybody in the community felt the same way (that the center should be moved).

"We've found that that isn't true. We've found that we have a lot of friends.

WE EXPLAIN

"We've asked people if they support the program. If the answer is 'no,' then we explain the program and leave it go at that."

Glaab said the staff members have "gone about this thing in a very gentlemanly way."

"What Mr. Veys is forgetting is that employes of the center are members of the community. They are citizens, they vote and pay taxes and they have opinions too," he said.

"They can very well do what they feel is necessary if they feel something is wrong."

Glaab said "one of the gratifying things" during the current debate over the Job Corps has been "the way the staff has responded to criticism of their job, their livelihood."

"How is a person supposed to react when you threaten to take his livelihood away from him? Roll over and play dead? I don't think so.

"If there had been any other reaction, I would have been disappointed. I want dedicated people working for me."

Glaab said although the morale of the staff has "been hard to maintain, the person that is going to be affected and hurt the most is the girl."

"That's wrong, very wrong," he said.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there follows a statement by the Omaha Chamber of Commerce which was issued a few days ago and which very candidly and without bias reflects the view of the majority of the people in the city of Omaha. If the Burroughs Corp. thinks it has made friends using these tactics it is sadly mistaken. Rather, most of us who feel another location is more desirable will work even harder to see that this is accomplished.

STATEMENT OF OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The Omaha Chamber of Commerce highly endorses the training and education of disadvantaged persons as a part of society's responsibility to solve many of its most pressing problems. However, it does not believe the downtown area of Omaha is a desirable location for the Women's Job Corps Training Center. The present location must be considered a disruptive influence, hampering the continued business development and orderly growth of the principal business area of our city.

Approximately five years ago a concentrated program was started by business, government, and other community leaders and investors to revitalize downtown Omaha. Today more than $100 million in new construction has either been completed, is under construction, or is being planned in this concentrated area, effectively demonstrating the desire of business and the community at large to rebuild and maintain a healthy, growing downtown. The continued operation of the Job Corps in the two downtown hotels is incompatible with this development plan.

In a sincere effort to help relocate the Job Corps in Omaha, a Chamber committee has worked with the Burroughs Corporation by suggesting a number of alternate sites away from the business core area of the city. Unfortunately these were found to be inadequate.

It is the position of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce that the present Job Corps contract covering the operations in the two downtown hotels should not be extended for an indefinite period. Instead, the Chamber recommends that the Job Corps operations at these hotels be "phased out" by the end of 1969.

The Chamber recognizes the future of the present Job Corps program is uncertain. The task of training the disadvantaged is currently being reviewed by the Nixon Administration. The Job Corps operations are being transferred to the Department of Labor in July and Secretary of Labor George Shultz has promised a definitive statement on the future of the Job Corps in the near future. New and innovative programs for training the disadvantaged are expected to be developed soon and we sincerely hope that Omaha will be able to participate in such programs in order to meet the specific needs of the underprivileged people living in Omaha.

The recommended "phasing out" by the end of 1969 would appear to be fair to the Burroughs Corporation. We believe they have done a good job of operating the training center and have been a good corporate citizen. Continuing these centers to the end of the year will enable Burroughs to maintain its training capability here, at which time the new direction of the Labor Department and its new programs should be known. This should enable Burroughs to respond promptly to such new training programs and it is to be hoped they will want to use this capability at that time to help Omaha meet its training needs.

DR. LOUIS W. ALLARD, BILLINGS, MONT.

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in an age such as ours, when most men measure their lives by what they have been able to accomplish for themselves, it is refreshing and heartwarming to know a man whose life has been measured by what he has done for others.

> I shall pass through this world but once. Any good, therefore, that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any fellow human being, let me do it now, for I shall not pass this way again.

The words are those of Dr. Louis W. Allard, of Billings, Mont., now 82 years old and a resident, with his wife, in a Billings retirement home.

Dr. Allard's long life has been singularly devoted to service to his fellow human beings, particularly to crippled children, for whom he started a special school in Billings in 1914.

It is notable, perhaps, that Dr. Allard had as a patient Ernest Hemingway, and that the famous author was a friend of the Allard family and an admirer of Dr. Allard.

An article written by Addison Bragg and published in the Billings Gazette expresses better than I can the accomplishments of this great humanitarian. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIFE OF GIVING

(By Addison Bragg)

The reporter who years ago interviewed Dr. Louis W. Allard for a national magazine drew on tradition for words to sum up what he considered the Laurel-born physician's philosophy of life.

"I shall pass through this world but once. Any good, therefore, that I can do or any kindness I can show to any fellow human being, let me do it now, for I shall not pass this way again," he wrote.

Those who know the white-haired, quiet to the point of retiring physician who celebrated his 82nd birthday last November agree there's no one the expression fits better.

An ex-Helenan—who never knew Dr. Allard but who had heard of his work with polio patients—recalls vividly the way in which the longtime Billings physician's name first came to his attention.

"I guess there's a thousand or so people walking around today who owe their lives and their legs to that guy," he growled, "and he wouldn't take a dime for helping them."

In the sunny room in New Western Manor, where Dr. and Mrs. Allard have lived for the last three years or so, one of Yellowstone County's best known and best loved doctors puffed on the stub of his cigar, brushed ashes from his white shirt and smiled, eyes warm behind the thick-lensed glasses.

"You know, my father was a farmer out by Laurel where I was born in 1887," he said, "so I guess it was a doctor uncle of mine back in Wisconsin who sort of influenced me into making a career of medicine."

After attending the University of Wisconsin and Brush Medical School in Chicago, Dr. Allard turned down offers from eastern hospitals and more metropolitan communities to come back to Montana where he started practice in 1914.

This was when he married the former Harriett Thorpe of Bozeman who he had met while they were students at Montana Agricultural College (now MSU) there. And Dr. Allard's collection of mementoes still includes a photograph of the 1907 state champions—with him among basketball players wearing a huge "A" on his shirt.

Though he'd be first to turn praise or credit from himself to others, Dr. Allard—those who are in a position to know declare—is a major reason why St. Vincent's Hospital in Billings is what it is today.

"The cornerstone of St. Vincent's," the Leavenworth, Kan., nuns who staff the hospital called him—and still do.

And he was an honored guest in 1956 at ceremonies dedicating a new wing at the hospital, a doctor described in the souvenir program as "a man who spent all his adult life helping others."

Dr. Allard—always too busy with and too concerned for the children who were his patients as well as others who sought his help—sought neither recognition nor honor.

But recogniton and honor sought him—persistently.

He was commissioned a colonel in the Montana National Guard and cited for citizenship by Gov. Roy Ayers. In 1953 he won the medical association's Physician's Award for his work in rehabilitation. (Dr. Allard helped to start the Crippled Children's Hospital School in Billings in 1914, the Montana Association for Rehabilitation, the Midland Rehabilitation Association, the Missoula Polio Commission, the Butte-Anaconda Auxiliaries for Crippled Children and, most recently, Handicapped, Inc., in Billings.)

Gonzaga University presented him its DeSmet medal for services to crippled children in 1932.

But the highest honor came in 1930 when the Montana physician, who at 71 told a

XUM

friend he intended to continue serving people "as long as God permits," was made a Knight of the Order of St. Gregory.

Pope Pius XI, in announcing the conferral of papal knighthood on the Billings doctor, said it was awarded "for service to humanity." The medal is kept in the Allard safety deposit box in a Billings bank.

Only one of Dr. Allard's four children—his son, Clayton—has followed in his father's footsteps. A second son, Joe, works at the First National Bank, and a third, Edwin, is a retired Marine colonel in California. The Allards' daughter, Katherine, is married to Cale Crowley, Billings lawyer.

"When you move from a house the way we did," said Mrs. Allard, "you lose a lot of things like pictures, scrapbooks and souvenirs—but every once in a while you turn something up you didn't even know you had."

One thing that "turned up" after moving was the 1937 edition of Time Magazine featuring Ernest Hemingway on the cover.

Dr. Allard was the man who set the arm Hemingway broke in an accident on a Wyoming dude ranch and who took care of him when he was a patient at St. Vincent's.

(It was from his Billings stay that Hemingway drew for his story "The Gambler, The Nun and The Radio.")

The two pages of pictures Time editors used to illustrate their Hemingway piece included one shot of the famous writer, arm in a sling, supplied them by Amateur Photographer Allard.

"One thing about him," said Dr. Allard, "was his friendliness—and the way he liked people. Once he heard about my family nothing would do but that he come out and visit them—which he did, several times."

Mrs. Allard apologizes good naturedly for lack of a scrapbook which—did one exist—would surely bulge with stories of a man who spent his life the way Louis Allard has.

"I guess," she said, "I was too busy raising a family to keep a scrapbook."

And her husband—a man who is among thousands who count service to man as equalling in dignity and honor as service to God—was also busy. Helping people.

A BILL TO INCORPORATE THE COLLEGE BENEFIT SYSTEM OF AMERICA

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to incorporate the college benefit system of America. This measure has already been introduced in the other body and in the House by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

In 1906, when pensions were extremely rare, Andrew Carnegie sought to aid higher education by establishing a retirement system for college professors. This, he conjectured, would enable universities to attract able faculty members without shouldering the financial burden of pensions.

To assist Mr. Carnegie's project, Congress chartered the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Working with a group of educators, the foundation devised principles for a nationwide contributory pension system. Both institutions and individuals were to participate; reserves were to remain intact until retirement; benefits were fully vested in the individual and freely transferable when the recipient moved from college to college. These provisions still guide the college pension system.

Ultimately, Mr. Carnegie endowed the foundation with $26 million, but these funds soon proved inadequate. As a result, in 1918, the State of New York chartered the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association—a nonprofit corporation to offer contributory pensions to the faculties and staffs of institutions of higher learning. Provided by the Carnegie Corp. with working capital, TIAA went into full operation. Its principles of full funding, vesting, and portability were later incorporated into the Federal social security system.

A TIAA study conducted after World War II revealed that through American history, the dollar had never remained stable during one individual's working and retirement period. Thus, in 1952, the New York Legislature sanctioned the College Retirement Equities Fund to offer variables annuities to college faculty and staff members.

The TIAA–CREF pension system currently has over 300,000 members from more than 2,000 institutions. Its funds total over $3 billion. It is one of the few retirement systems which "provide equal services and benefits at equal cost to any college and to any participant in any of the 50 States."

Unfortunately, TIAA–CREF is now jeopardized by possible State taxation. The very vesting and portability provisions which have proved beneficial have rendered college pension contributions subject to State insurance codes. As it is presently chartered, TIAA–CREF will eventually become ensnarled in 50 separate sets of insurance regulations designed for profitmaking companies.

Pensions sponsored by corporations, labor unions, and public employees organizations all are exempt from State and Federal taxation, yet a pension system which greatly assists higher education is now threatened by State tax laws.

The constitutional basis for incorporating the college benefit system is not in question. In 1944, the Supreme Court explicitly ruled that Congress has jurisdiction over interstate insurance business under the commerce clause. Thus Federal action is entirely justified.

In a period in which American colleges are beset with financial problems, they should not also have to assume responsibility for new pension plans or face the resignation of skilled professors. The incorporation of the college benefit system would avert this threat and leave colleges free to concentrate their efforts and funds on more urgent problems of education.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY: LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this week marks the 50th anniversary of the original proposal for a League of Women Voters. Of course, the early crusade was for suffrage, but since those days a half-century ago, the league has moved energetically into the area of public debate and political action.

Those of us who work at the business of drafting public policy are well aware of the invaluable contributions the League of Women Voters has made, and will continue to make, in a wide variety of problem areas. I am grateful for the many fine contributions of the New Jersey league and the national organization, and I want to take this opportunity to extend a salute on the 50th anniversary of this remarkable movement.

The Trenton Times of March 28 gives the league a well-earned tribute and endorsement. The editorial is clear evidence of New Jersey's respect and admiration for the League of Women Voters. Because it says so well what millions of Americans want to say in thanks to the league, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS ANNIVERSARY

Organization of a league of women voters was proposed 50 years ago this week, and the League of Women Voters was organized a year later. Its initial aim was to finish the fight for woman suffrage and to help the newly enfranchised voters achieve the political goals for which they had sought the vote. In the half century since, the League has become a recognized force for civic education and constructive political action.

In addition to providing nonpartisan information about voting, candidates and issues, the League—now organized in 1,250 communities in 50 states—has advocated innumerable causes it conceived to be in the public interest.

In the early years, these causes were chiefly those concerned with protection of women and children, broadened social insurance, improved civil service and food and drug legislation. Nowadays, the emphasis is on an end to water pollution and the advancement of equality of opportunity in education, employment and housing. And throughout the years, the League has done much to provide information and promote action in such fields as charter reform, constitutional revision, fair apportionment, court reform, fiscal reform, and planning.

Now, as it moves into its 50th year, the League is seeking $11 million nationally to expand its efforts and its effectiveness. The organization deserves every support for a continuation of what has been for so long and in so many ways an important contribution to the civic well-being of all.

NO RETREAT

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the tense situation in the Middle East holds the center of world concern. While there has been relative peace since the 6-day war, there is a potential for swift and sudden resumption of hostilities at any time.

Many proposals have been set forth to settle the differences in the Middle

East, but some of them ignore certain basic issues which must be a part of any settlement.

For example, some parties feel that the big four powers should meet and develop a settlement for the Middle East. I do not agree with this proposal. I feel that the settlement must come from negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, and it must begin with the acknowledgement by the Arabs that Israel is a nation, entitled to the same rights and privileges of any other nation.

I do not feel that the United States should in any way be involved in a four-power settlement imposed on the Middle East.

A second proposal often voiced is for the United Nations to assume the responsibility for negotiating peace in the area. This, too, is the wrong approach.

In the first place, the United Nations is not an effective organization for settling this type of dispute. Any proposal which might be acceptable to Israel is vetoed either by Russia, or by the Arab block of votes, representing the Arab States and those states under the influence of the Arab's oil-based economic power.

Furthermore, I reject the concept and theory of the United Nations peacekeeping force, for the simple reason that it has not worked.

A recent pamphlet published by the United Zionists-Revisionists of America entitled "No Retreat" spells out quite clearly the factors which cannot be compromised in a Middle East settlement. I think this document will be of interest to my colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of that pamphlet:

BEWARE OF "MORAL PRESSURE" BY BIG POWERS
WATCH OVER ISRAEL'S INTEGRITY

An unholy alliance is shaping up to put "moral pressure" on Israel to withdraw from the areas which came under its control in the wake of the Six-Day War and, in exchange for vague promises of a "peaceful settlement," retreat to the long obsolete armistice lines of 1949.

The original twin promoters of this anti-Israel plot have been Soviet Russia and Egypt. They have been recently joined by General de Gaulle of France and by Mr. Thant of Burma, the meddlesome Secretary General of the United Nations. The attitude of the new U.S. Administration is still uncertain. There are, however, persistent reports that it is lending an attentive ear to some form of the Soviet-French scheme. There is thus sufficient cause for concern.

Soviet Russia and de Gaulle took up the Arab cry that Israel must withdraw from what they call "occupied Arab territories."

The entire concept of such a scheme is wrong and dangerous on all counts. It is based on a triple set of premises, which are both false and distorted.

I

One is the claim that "Israel should not be permitted to retain the fruits of its aggression."

Even the United Nations bodies, whose anti-Israel bias is now reaching its peak, have never labeled Israel an "aggressor." The Soviet, Arab and French U.N. delegations had tried hard to induce the Security Council and the General Assembly to include the "aggression" charge into the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967. They failed ignominiously. In the eyes of the international community Israel is not an "aggressor state". The aggressors are Egypt, Jordan and Syria whose military moves had triggered the Six-Day War.

II

Another faulty premise is an out-of-context quotation from a sanctimonious U.N. resolution which speaks of "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war." This sweeping and blatantly arbitrary adage is given the lie by the entire history of mankind. Since time immemorial and in our own times, territorial changes resulting from war have repeatedly served as the basis for a peace settlement.

Large areas conquered by the victorious Allied Powers in World War II in defense against German and Japanese aggression, have become firmly established "acquisition" of Soviet Russia, Poland and the United States. Nobody pleads for the "inadmissibility" of this state of affairs. And surely, nobody suggests the "return" of such territories to their former owners. Nor is anybody advocating the restoration to Germany of Alsace-Lorraine by France or of the Sudetenland by Czechoslovakia.

There is not a shred of evidence and justice for applying to Israel's victory over Arab aggression any kind of the artificially concocted and historically inexistent "inadmissibility".

III

The biggest lie of them all is the loose talk of "Israel-occupied Arab territories".

The areas that have come under Israeli control in the wake of the Six-Day War are not "Arab territories".

The West Bank of the Jordan River has been for two decades illegally ruled by the "Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan" whose Arab Legion had in 1948 overran the historically Jewish regions of Judea and Samaria. Both areas had been provinces of King Solomon's realm and, later, part of the territory of Palestine under the Mandate conferred on Britain by the League of Nations—an area destined to become the National Home for the Jewish people.

Acquired by conquest, the West Bank was in 1950 unilaterally annexed by the Amman regime. The annexation was never recognized by the United Nations, the United States or any other country, with the exception of Britain and Pakistan. It was opposed and decried by the entire Arab League.

This background of conquest and annexation certainly does not provide the Hashemite Kingdom with any legal and/or moral title to the West Bank as "Arab territory" to be "returned" to its sovereignty. Israel did not "conquer" Judea and Samaria. They have been liberated from the Arab occupiers and restored to the sovereignty of Israel as part of the integral historical patrimony of the Jewish people.

The very heart of Israel and world Jewry is the nation's eternal capital, Jerusalem. The Eastern part of it was occupied by the Arab Legion in 1948 and became a provincial town in the area annexed by Amman. The artificially divided City of David is now reunited—never to be torn again.

IV

Egypt has no title whatsoever to the tiny Gaza Strip—the sole gain of the Egyptian invation in 1948. Cairo never claimed sovereignty to Gaza. Throughout two decades the Strip has been treated as an occupied territory. Its inhabitants were treated as foreigners in Egypt and were not permitted to settle there. Administered by Egyptian military authorities, the Gaza enclave served as a base for terrorist attacks against Israel.

After the liberation by the Israel Defense Army, the Strip has reverted to the heritage of the Jewish nation, shaped by history and geo-political realities.

V

Jewish roots in the Sinai Peninsula are deep and meaningful.

It was in the Sinai desert that the Israelites had encamped after the Exodus from Egypt, on the way to the Promised Land, and received the Pentateuchal legislation.

Egypt has no roots in the Sinai. The Peninsula belonged to the Ottoman Empire until 1840 when its Western part was, under the pressure of the European Power, turned over to the Egyptian Khedive; the Eastern part was turned over to Egyptian administration not until 1906 by the British who had ruled the Sinai under a condominium with the Ottoman Empire. In the peace treaty between Great Britain and Turkey there was no mention of the Sinai. Under nominal Egyptian rule, the Sinai Peninsula remained—as in Biblical times—"The Wilderness of Sin."

The Sinai Operation of 1956 brought the entire area under Israel's control. It was relinquished under a twin Soviet-American pressure. Recovered during the Six-Day War, Sinai now looks forward to an era of development and progress.

VI

Deep are also Jewish roots in the Golan Heights liberated from Syrian rule.

It was in the Biblical Golan and Bashan that had settled the half-tribe of Manasseh. The Golan region flourished in the times of the Second Temple. Jews continued to live there until the end of the Middle Ages. A very recent accretion to the Syrian domain, the Golan Heights served as a base for constant shelling of the Jewish frontier settlements, rendering life in the valley below untenable.

It would be suicidal for Israel to revert to the borders of the 1949 armistice. They were unnatural, overlong, strategically indefensible, and a constant invitation to terrorist incursions.

The cease-fire territorial delineation which emerged in June 1967 is the only one that gives Israel a measure of protection against invasion.

The Jordan River is Israel's natural frontier and defense line in the East. So are the Golan Heights in the North. The Israeli-controlled Sinai Peninsula gives Israel sufficient time and warning to ward off a "Pearl Harbor"-type attack by Russian Migs piloted by Egyptians.

None of the areas liberated by Israel in June 1967 is "Arab territory". Nor are any of them essential to the existence and well-being of the Arab states. They are, yet, essential for the existence and development of Israel. They are part and parcel of the national territory of the Reborn Jewish State, which is an organic entity. Israel's integrity must not and will not be frittered away under any "moral pressure" from the Big Powers, whose motivation is anything but moral.

Jews the world over must serve notice to their respective governments that they stand firmly by the Whole of Israel.

RAY MARTIN ON COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on prior occasions, I have called attention to the excellent interpretive series of articles on coal mine health and safety written by Ray Martin, city editor of the Dominion-News, of Morgantown,

XUM

W. Va. There follows the text of additional articles written by Ray Martin on this subject:

MOORE ENDORSES LUNG LAW

(By Ray Martin)

MOUNDSVILLE.—Gov. Arch A. Moore, Jr., Saturday renewed his State of the State plea to the State Legislature to enact meaningful coal mine health and safety legislation.

The governor made his views known as word reached his home county that pending "black lung" legislation faces new delays.

Moore stressed that the full meaning of his January statement still stands, and that he will preempt action in this field, should the Legislature fail to act.

Presumably, the governor would utilize executive orders directing the Workmen's Compensation Commission to broaden its interpretation of respiratory ailments and the State Department of Mines to promulgate new, stringent rules affecting mine safety.

As the work stoppage by the state's coal miners continued to spread, Del. Gust G. Brenda Jr., D-Weirton, expressed fear that the miners' current action might cause some legislators to react adversely to their cause.

Delegate Brenda said the House will hold its second hearing Tuesday on the monetary phase of the amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. No action can be taken until that hearing is completed, the Weirton Democrat said.

He predicted it would be at least Thursday or Friday before the House Judiciary Committee completes the writing of a committee bill which would encompass some phases of each of the six bills now before the committee.

Delegate Brenda said he thought the House might suspend rules to allow the committee measure to go to the floor for a prompt vote.

On the basis of the current timetable, this means the House could vote on the bill March 4. The Legislature is due to adjourn March 8.

The governor was in Moundsville to attend the Americanism Conference and Past Commanders' Banquet of the American Legion.

More than 200 persons witnessed the presentation of a life membership to Moore in the Legion's Earl Francis Post No. 3 here.

Moore also said he will send State Road Commissioner William Ritchie, to Washington this week to confer with officials of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads on a new completion date for Interstate 70. The governor said he was making available $13.9 million for improvements on W. Va. 2.

He said he was pleased with the Senate's action on the tax bill. Upon learning the House rejected the Senate-passed bill on Saturday, Moore said he would not comment until he sees the House version of the tax bill, but said he foresees no great difficulty in getting the tax bill through the Legislature.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 25, 1969]

"NO LAW, NO COAL," AREA MINERS VOW—CAPITAL JOURNEY PLANNED

(By Ray Martin)

Coal miners normally employed at the Christopher Coal Co. mines at Humphrey, Osage, Arkwright, Pursglove and Blacksville unanimously agreed last night to adopt a position of "no law, no coal." The reference was to the State Legislature's adoption of amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act to provide for compensation payments to miners found to be suffering from pneumoconiosis (black lung) and other occupational diseases.

The meeting which attracted an overflow crowd at the Cougar Club, formerly the Dallas Pine Room, in Pursglove was arranged by an Ad Hoc Committee for Miners' Health and Safety.

Miners attending the rally called to compare the bills sponsored before the Legislature by the United Mine Workers and by the Black Lung Association voted to support Senate Bill 216, the measure endorsed by the latter group.

The Monongalia County coal miners agreed to meet in smaller groups today and prepare petitions calling for the passage of Senate Bill 216. The petitions would be taken to Charleston by representatives of the miners and handed to members of the House of Delegates and State Senate from the county. It was suggested that plans be made to charter buses to take a large group of miners to the State Capital on Wednesday to participate in a rally at the Municipal Auditorium in Charleston and to pay personal calls on legislators.

Elijah Wolford, a miner from Humphrey No. 7, acted as chairman for the meeting. The Morgantown resident is a member of the mine safety committee at the Mt. Morris, Pa., mine.

Basil Callen, one of two delegates from Local 1058, UMW, who attended the Feb. 11 hearing on black lung bills in Charleston, said:

"We are not only here to talk about black lung alone, for it has far reaching effects greater than the disease.

"To pass a bill, a bill on black lung alone, certainly would be a great mistake. We the coal miners are not selfish, but what we are seeking is a law that will cover black lung disease and that is known as an occupational disease.

"Occupational disease," Mr. Callen said, "would cover many industrial workers—likewise occupational disease would include many poisons in the coal field such as excessive cable smoke, smoke from fire and sand, carbon monoxide gases from motors.

"There are many free riders," the speaker declared. "The factory workers should speak up for their own protection."

Mr. Callen recalled the words of Dr. Jethro Gough, the Welsh lung specialist, who said that when the compensation law was passed in England in 1943 this was followed in a short time by the coal mines' utilization of measures to reduce coal dust in the mines.

"When you reduce dust in the coal mines, you measurably reduce the chances for an explosion or fire," Mr. Callen said.

"Far be it for me to seek regimentation in the coal mines, but we do want safety regulations and the true compliance thereof. Most any conscientious employe knows full well that his employer must make a profit. But that profit should not be at the expense of human disability or even death," he said.

Mr. Callen described the plight that a miner faces when he is faced with going on county welfare rolls. It breaks up a family, he said, and this, in turn, leads to other community problems.

In an urgent plea, the miner said, "I urge you to support the occupational disease law, not only for yourself, but also because in the long run it will be better for the employer, as well as our society as a whole."

Wayne Lee, another miner who attended the Charleston hearing, recited statistics showing the number of miners in the state and nation reportedly suffering from black lung.

Sam Campbell, a miner who is said to be suffering from coal workers' pneumoconiosis, was interviewed by Mr. Callen. Mr. Campbell told of his experiences with visits to Project Alford at West Virginia University.

"They guaranteed my compensation if I would agree to be a guinea pig," said Mr. Campbell. "They wanted me to stay in the hospital and sign a statement relieving them of all responsibility for my life.

"I said no, when they could offer no assurance that I would ever be able to walk out of the hospital," Mr. Campbell said.

Dr. H. A. Wells of Johnstown, Pa., a member of the Physicians' Committee for Miners' Health and Safety, was scheduled to appear at the Pursglove meeting. Poor flying weather prevented his trip to Morgantown.

Arrangements are being made for another meeting of the miners at which Dr. Wells will speak.

Several persons presented reports on the contents of the two bills in the absence of Dr. Wells.

At one point during the meeting tempers flared when a UMW official who had allegedly identified a member of the union who was picketing at Arkwright mine was seen in the audience and asked to explain his action.

The chairman quickly restored order and said that the incident was one for the proper concern of the particular local union involved.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 26, 1969]

COAL OPERATORS CHALLENGE BOYLE TO FORCE MINERS BACK TO WORK

CHARLESTON.—W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, has been challenged to use the powers available to him under the UMW Constitution and Bylaws to force West Virginia coal miners back to their jobs.

The challenge was laid down Tuesday by five southern West Virginia coal operators associations. In making public their action, the operators said they would regard the current contract as "meaningless and ineffectual" if the UMW is unable to control the actions of its members.

A spokesman for the coal operators said that thousands of miners striking in support of "black lung" legislation are doing so in violation of the industry contract with the UMWA.

Branding the strike unlawful, the coal operators sent telegrams to Boyle at international headquarters in Washington and to two UMW District presidents—stating that UMWA should make an all-out effort to control the actions of its members and thereby uphold the contract.

Tuesday's action was taken by Southern Coal Producers Association, Greenbrier Coal Operators Association, Kanawha Coal Operators Association, Smokeless Operators Association, and the Logan Coal Operators Association.

A spokesman for the five operator groups said members provide employment for an estimated 20,000 miners.

In addition to the telegrams to UMW at Washington, similar telegrams were sent to R. R. Humphreys, president of UMW District 17 in Charleston, and Larkin S. Philpott, president of UMW District 29 in Beckley.

"This strike does not arise from any labor disputes between operators and employes who are members of UMWA, but arises from efforts of employe members of that organization and others to influence, by pressure tactics, the passage of black lung legislation now pending in and under consideration by the West Virginia Legislature," the telegrams read.

"The National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement between the operators and UMWA obligates the operators to afford specified liberal wages and benefits amounting to a total of more than $50 a day to employes."

"The signatory operators have performed and are performing their obligations under that contract. The contract likewise obligates the employe members of the UMWA to work and not to engage in work stoppages in violation of the contract," the telegrams continued.

"If the mine workers are unwilling to perform their obligation under the contract and the UMWA is either willing or unable to control the actions of its members—and to maintain the integrity of the contract—the contract is rendered meaningless and ineffectual.

"West Virginia coal operators signatory to the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement with UMWA call upon the mine workers of West Virginia to stop this unlawful strike and upon the UMWA to use immediately all means at its disposal including all powers available to it under the constitution and bylaws of that organizations—to fulfill the UMWA obligations under the contract and to maintain the integrity of that contract.

"West Virginia coal operators have stated publicly, and now reiterate that they favor legislative action which would clarify—and make it indisputable—coal workers' pneumoconiosis under the West Virginia Workmen's Compensation Law and which would assure a fair and equitable procedure for determining existence of, and providing for, the compensation of disability resulting from that disease.

"Any differences which may exist between the operators and UMWA and its members concerning the form of such legislation," the telegrams concluded, "can be no possible justification for the unlawful strike being engaged in throughout West Virginia."

The southern coal operators made no reference to the other two UMW Districts in the state whose members are participating in the work stoppage to draw attention to the black lung legislation.

Some of the state's miners say that they are also away from their jobs to focus attention on the desirability of having President Nixon reappoint John O'Leary as director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

A mass rally of miners is set here Wednesday to bring the miners' call for a liberalization of workmen's compensation benefits to the State Legislature.

The mass meeting will include busloads of miners from all over the state wearing the traditional hard hat and the black lung movement's symbol—a skull and crossbones inscribed with the words "black lung."

The miners are seeking legislation with a presumptive clause that a miner suffering from pneumoconiosis, commonly called "black lung," may presume he contracted the disease while working in a mine. The clause carriers a five year work stipulation. The burden of proving the disease was the result of mining, now lies with the miner.

Several bills are now before the Legislature on black lung and House of Delegates Speaker Iver Boiarsky has said one of the bills will come to the floor this week for consideration.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 26, 1969]

CONSOL EXECUTIVE STATES COMPANY'S BLACK LUNG POSITION

(By Ray Martin)

An official corporate position on black lung legislation pending in the West Virginia State Legislature has been stated by William N. Poundstone, executive vice president of the Consolidation Coal Co.

Mr. Poundstone made the Pittsburgh-based corporation's views known through telegrams sent to John L. Rozance, Christopher Coal Co. president, and other Consol officials. Copies of the telegram were distributed to United Mine Workers locals whose members are employed by Consol subsidiaries.

The text of Mr. Poundstone's telegram was as follows:

The following is Consol's position regarding pneumoconiosis legislation: We feel that disability due to pneumoconiosis or 'black lung' should be made compensable. We believe that it has been included in our existing legislation, but feel that since some doubt exists, we support a definition of 'black lung' in proposed legislation to insure that men with the disease are compensated. We further believe that present benefits are not sufficient under present conditions and should be raised. We would like to work with the UMW and the Legislature to accomplish these needed revisions."

Earlier this month the West Virginia Coal Association, of which Consol is a member, attacked what it called the "sideshow antics" of advocates of "black lung" legislation and called for an impartial evaluation of medical facts about the pulmonary condition by physicians qualified to make such determinations.

"At that time—and only then—will the Legislature of the State of West Virginia be competently equipped to make an intelligent decision concerning the many different bills now before it on pneumoconiosis," said the Association's vice president, Stephen G. Young.

Mr. Young referred to a resolution adopted by the West Virginia State Medical Association which called on the Legislature to appoint a panel of experts in pulmonary disease "to conduct a thorough objective study."

Mr. Young stressed that the Legislature shouldn't enact any legislation on pneumoconiosis until such a medical study, was completed. Legislators did not respond to the Medical Association resolution.

David D. Johnson, a Charleston lawyer representing the Coal Association, told the Senate Judiciary Committee that "if a substantial part of the proposed increases in Workmen's Compensation are enacted, the end result will be a lot of now-active coal miners being unemployed."

At the Feb. 11 public hearing before the joint meeting of Senate and House Judiciary Committees, Mr. Johnson voiced his opposition to the various black lung proposals. He joined George Burnette, an attorney for four UMW Districts, in asserting the black lung had been subject to the state's laws since 1949.

The lawyer explained that the reason that no miner had received compensation for black lung was the inability to provide X-ray evidence of the disease.

Tom Whyte, Consol's general counsel and representative in the Coal Association said he believed there was no disagreement between his firm and the position taken by the association "We're traveling the same path," he said.

Despite the fact that no miner has ever received a compensation award for coal workers' pneumoconiosis, Mr. Whyte reiterated the view that state law already covered the disease, adding that Consol was agreeable to spelling out a definition of the disease in the law.

Mr. Whyte said Consol was opposed to adoption of the presumption clause contained in some of the pending bills. He said the company strongly supports a requirement that X-ray evidence of the disease be present before a compensation award is made.

Proponents of Black Lung Association legislation assert that X-rays do not reveal every incidence of pneumonconiosis and that pulmonary tests be used as well.

Autopsy and biopsy are the only sure ways to detection of black lung according to proponents of the pending legislation. Many doctors look with disfavor on the biopsy procedure, labeling it as painful and sometimes harmful. Autopsies come only after a man's death.

The Consol representative said that increases in some of the compensation payments (now ranging from $16 to $47 a week) are required in view of escalated costs of living.

Bills relative to black lung and general workmen's compensation are bottled up in the Legislature. Speculation as to when legislative action will come on black lung ranges from today through March 4, four days before the session ends.

Meanwhile, Sen. Neal A. Kinsolving, R-Kanawha, announced renewal of an effort to give the state mines director authority to make rules and regulations affecting the health and safety of miners. He will seek to amend a bill now before the committee on mines and mining. An earlier proposal of the Charleston Republican was buried in committee.

The House Judiciary Committee has scheduled a hearing Friday on H.B. 842, sponsored by Dels. Cleo Jones, R-Charleston and Albert L. Sommerville Jr., D-Webster Springs, which would make employers subject to law suits under certain circumstances in industrial accident and death cases.

Existing state law prohibits legal recourse against an employer who carries Workmen's Compensation and pays the required premiums.

Some Capitol observers regard the Jones-Sommerville proposal as compromise legislation to the pending black lung bills.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 27, 1969]

CHARMBURY EXPLAINS WHY HE REJECTED MINES POST

(By Ray Martin)

After a fiery blast at U.S. Department of Interior attitudes and actions, Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury, secretary of mines and mineral industries in Pennsylvania, rejected a possible appointment as director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Before announcing his rejection of the director's post. Dr. Charmbury was told by an aide to Secretary Walter J. Hickel there was no assurance he would get the post.

In view of the various actions which preceded the Feb. 14 telephone call to Washington from Harrisburg, Dr. Charmbury told the aide in effect that "this is one helluva way to run a railroad."

In announcing his decision not to accept the federal post, Dr. Charmbury made a reference to the infighting that went on after it was learned he was being considered for a top spot in the Interior Department.

He said that he was honored by "being the first Pennsylvanian to be offered a post," in the Nixon Administration.

"I have given this (offer) very serious consideration and discussed it with a great many people but in view of our new concepts of mine safety and conversation programs which have been instituted in Pennsylvania, I want to see the programs completed," he said.

"The programs are already benefitting not only the men working in the mines but also the people living in the coal producing areas," he added.

"We are leading the nation in coal mine safety and conservation and I am certainly proud of our accomplishments."

This was as close as the Pennsylvanian came to revealing just what actually happened to cause him to change his mind about transferring his activities from Harrisburg to Washington.

Dr. Charmbury originally had been designated by the White House as one of two top-ranked candidates for appointment as assistant secretary in charge of minerals.

In that post, Dr. Charmbury would have directed the activities of the Bureau of Mines, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Office of Coal Research, the Oil and Gas Division and oil imports.

Washington sources said the Interior Department caved in to industry pressure and withdrew Dr. Charmbury's proposed appointment as assistant secretary.

XUM

Industry thinks he's too tough.

The coal and oil industries, these sources said, immediately protested the proposed appointment. They did not want to take the chance that the Pennsylvania official would insist that the Keystone state's strong regulation on mine safety, water and air pollution and strip mine restoration be implemented as the federal level.

The success of Pennsylvania's mines and conservation program has been played down at the national level.

Dr. Charmbury was called to Washington two weeks ago and urged to take the assistant secretary post immediately. He declined on the grounds he had to discuss the offer with Pennsylvania's Gov. Raymond P. Shafer and other political leaders, including the two U.S. senators from the state.

The Pennsylvania mines secretary left for Arizona on vacation. He was called back to Washington Feb. 14—two days later—and told that he no longer was being considered for the assistant secretaryship and was urged to take the $36,000 a year post as Bureau of Mines director.

Dr. Charmbury posed a number of questions about just how broad his authority would be as director and to whom he would be responsible.

He returned to Pennsylvania's capital city and discussed the switch with aides and others. Late on Friday, Feb. 14, Dr. Charmbury called Secretary Hickel's office to say he would take the job as director of the mines bureau.

It was then that he was told that even the director's job was "merely a recommendation" and there was no assurance he would get the appointment. He then washed his hands of the Interior Department and commented on its methods.

Secretary Hickel's office said that Dr. Charmbury's withdrawal and the "strong support" for John O'Leary's reappointment as Bureau of Mines director obviously increases Mr. O'Leary's chances."

A spokesman for the secretary referred to the incumbent mine director as "a pretty outstanding man."

But there was no firm decision yet to retain him, officials said.

It was learned that three key Bureau of Mines officials now have left their posts: Elmer L. Hoen, administrator of the controversial oil program; Rear Adm. Onnie P. Lattu, director of the office of Gas and Oil; and William S. Flory, director of the Office of Minerals and Solids.

The secretary's office said Mr. Hoen had resigned while the other two officials had been asked to leave.

The Interior Department announced the appointment of Thomas P. Holley as an assistant to the secretary.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 27, 1969]

ALL LEGISLATORS FROM AREA BACK LAWS FOR MINERS

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—Members of the Legislature from Monongalia and Barion Counties today voiced support for strong coal mine health and safety legislation.

Del. Clifford B. Hoard, D.-Monongalia, said that the county's three-man delegation in the House of Delegates is firmly committed to the passage of the strongest possible laws concerning the miners.

Mr. Hoard said he had not yet had an opportunity to examine House Bill 1040, reported to the House Wednesday. Printed copies of the bill were to be distributed today.

Dels. Robert W. Dinsmore and Harry U. Howell, both Monongalia County Democrats, served on the committee which fashioned House Bill 1040. The measure includes some of the proposals contained in bills sponsored by the Black Lung Association and the United Mine Workers as well as seven other bills dealing with "black lung" or coal workers pneumoconiosis.

Mr. Dinsmore was an advocate of the so-called presumptive clause concerning the miner's lung disease. The Morgantown attorney served as a member of the subcommittee which prepared the bill subsequently adopted by the House Judiciary Committee.

The freshman legislator also supported a provision which would have spelled out that X-ray evidence of the disease was not necessarily conclusive proof for proving compensation claims. This provision was abandoned late Wednesday.

The bill as reported to the House contains no reference to X-rays and simply refers to medical diagnosis of occupational pneumoconiosis.

Mr. Dinsmore said efforts would probably be made Friday to insert additional provisions of House Bill 814, the Black Lung Association proposal, which was omitted in the preparation of House Bill 1040.

Del. J. E. (Ned) Watson, D-Fairmont, who serves as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said he would seek a suspension of House rules Friday to permit prompt passage of the new bill.

Del. Nick Fantasia, D-Kingmont, whose father was injured in a coal mine accident said, "There's no question of where I stand. We need a strong law. While we may not get everything we want, we must take a start somewhere."

Del. William J. Parker, D-Fairmont, said that he has shown his feelings about the need for strong legislation in several ways already. The Fairmont delegate is pressing for a legislative committee study of the administration and enforcement of the state's mine laws. He plans to renew his battle for this study on the floor of the House today.

Sens. William Morland, D-Morgantown and O. G. Hedrick, D-Fairmont have both sponsored mine health and safety measures in the Senate and have pledged adoption of the best attainable law.

Mr. Moreland, who serves on the Senate's Judiciary Committee, made several attempts this week to force committee action on black lung bills referred to that committee. The committee's chairman, Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D-Charleston, remains firm in his announced position of waiting until the house-passed bill reaches the Senate before taking any action.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News, Feb. 27, 1969]

MINERS OF COUNTY JOIN MOVE—OPINIONS ARE AIRED IN MOORE'S OFFICE

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—A delegation of Monongalia County Coal miners took part in a series of activities here Wednesday designed to focus attention on the need for occupational disease legislation.

Elijah Wolford of Morgantown was chosen as the official spokesman for northern West Virginia coal miners and as such was the first speaker at a meeting held in Gov. Arch A. Moore's office.

Wolford told the governor that the miners came to Charleston to "impress upon you the need" for new legislation. "If coal is going to be produced in West Virginia," he said, "the laws as well as the machines used in productions will have to be improved."

The Morgantown miner and member of the Safety Committee at Humphrey No. 7 mine at Mt. Morris, Pa., cited several conflicting provisions of the state's mine law.

"We want laws with teeth, not words," Wolford declared.

Governor Moore expressed his concern about the inconsistencies in the law and said that he has directed John Ashcraft, his appointee as head of the State Department of Mines, to conduct a thorough review of the law and its administration.

The governor then read a portion of his State of the State message relative to mine safety and health. All of the miners present in his office were given a copy of the January message to the legislature.

When the governor completed the reading of his previous message, Wolford reminded him that the miners were not only interested in compensation, but "we're here to stop the cause of black lung."

Governor Moore expressed his concern over Social Security Administration policies which penalize workers who get workmen's compensation awards and who also get disability payments under social security.

The Federal government deducts the amount paid by the state from its checks to the disabled worker.

While in Congress, Moore sponsored legislation to remedy the situation. He said that the worker pays for the federal benefit and is entitled to it, irrespective of any awards he gets under the employer paid injury program.

The governor renewed his promise to call the legislature into special session to enact black lung legislation if it failed to do so before the session ends March 8.

He questioned the miners about their failure to bring up the problem at either the January, 1968, or Sept., 1968 sessions of the legislature.

Charles E. Brooks of Winifred, president of the Black Lung Association, told the governor the state's miners had looked to the leadership in the UMW to keep their promises in seeking such legislation in the states, including West Virginia.

That promise Brooks said, was renewed at the Denver, Colo convention in September, 1968.

"When it became evident that the UMW wasn't going to do anything, we, as individual miners, formed the Black Lung Association. We hurriedly got a lawyer and told him to hurry up with some legislation on black lung."

Brooks described the UMW-sponsored bill in the legislature as "good, but that, too, is weak."

He observed that all of the bills introduced sought to do something for the miner but asserted that the Black Lung Association bill, while not perfect, came closer to meeting the miners' needs.

Miners from all areas of the state made brief statements of their positions to the governor, including a delegation from the disabled Miners and widows organization. That group has 17 units in the state and is in the process of extending this organization beyond the state's borders.

The governor told the miners that he could not and would not fault them for the tactics they employed to bring their problems to public attention.

Wolford also addressed the miners assembled in Municipal Auditorium who had gathered there to hear a progress report on the drive to secure occupational disease legislation.

"In the early hours of the morning a small group of miners set out on a journey from a northern county to come here to Charleston to give our meager support to our fellow mine workers from the southern part of the state, who are giving their all in support of good, strong black lung legislation," the Morgantown resident said.

"Being a native of Kentucky and working in mines in the southern part of West Virginia, I can easily understand why miners in the southern part of the state are more intent on getting a good mine health and safety bill passed.

"Miners who have worked in the northern counties only do not know that there is a difference in the dust conditions in mines in the north and in the south.

"Let's have some representatives from the southern part of the state go into the northern part of the state and educate their brothers," he said.

After a reference to meetings held in Morgantown, at which he served as chairman, Wolford said, "Several times I have been asked why I have become involved. I have a two-part answer to this question.

No. 1—I am obligated to help a brother in adversity. No. 2—Because I am sick and tired of all of us being called dumb coal miners. The sad part of this is that up until 1968 the people who have been calling us dumb have been proving the point by cheating and killing us with inadequate mine health and safety laws.

"When this meeting is adjourned, we are going to march out of here and show the world that we are not dumb and that we will no longer be cheated or die because of poor mine legislation in the State of West Virginia," Wolford said.

The three leaders of the Physician's Committee for miners' health and safety—Drs. I. E. Buff, Donald Rasmussen and H. A. Wells—made brief remarks at the auditorium rally.

Former State Sen. Paul Kaufman an attorney retained by the Black Lung Association, explained the differences in the various bills which had been introduced by legislators.

In addition to Wolford, miners from other sections of the state also spoke briefly at the rally.

Rep. Ken Hechler, a Huntington Democrat, drew a resounding wave of applause when he told the assembled miners that "no longer are we going to sit back and meekly accept the mouldy crumbs of compromise, grudgingly thrust forward by those who are more concerned with production and profits.

"No longer are we going to let them ignore the human values which mean life itself: the right to breathe, the right to work where conditions are safe, the right to speak without fear of punishment and, yes, the right to strike when conditions become intolerable," the Fourth District Congressman said.

Admitting that he was "wrong" when he had earlier advised the miners to return to their jobs, Hechler said he was still behind the miners 100 percent.

"Don't forget, I am the original 'fink' labeled by the UMW national leadership because I had suggested the UMW wasn't doing enough.

"By the way," Hechler asked, "how much is the UMW national leadership helping you with this strike and the efforts to get good tough legislation?"

Continuing, the Huntington democrat said, "I was talking with a member of the Safety Committee of the Humphrey mine at Mt. Morris where they had the fire and narrow escape recently. He put it very eloquently when he said that he had read about democracy in the school history books, but raised the question: Why is it that democracy is a good thing for all the American people except the coal miner?

"That's a good question. Once we win this fight for black lung, we might start asking whether you have democracy in the UMW, too," Hechler said.

The Congressman ended his remarks with the presentation of a $1,000 check to the Black Lung Association.

After the meeting adjourned, several hundred miners marched from the auditorium down the Kanawha Boulevard to the State Capitol. They were given a police escort and traffic was rerouted from one side of the divided highway.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News, Feb. 27, 1969]

Panel Ends Its Work on Bill

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTOWN.—Ten minutes before the scheduled beginning of a miners' rally in the Municipal Auditorium here Tuesday—about three miles from the Capitol—Del. J.E. Ned Watson, D-Fairmont, emerged from the House Judiciary Committee room to announce that the committee had completed its work on a "black lung" bill.

The news traveled fast, although the actual contents of the 32-page bill were not revealed until nearly four o'clock, two hours later. In the interim the committee reassembled and made further changes in the bill which is now numbered House Bill 1040.

After the bill was reported to the House by its Judiciary Committee chairman, the Fairmont Democrat explained that no action could be taken on the bill until Friday.

In response to questions posed by Del. Warren McGraw, D-Pineville, Chairman Watson said that the bill could not get its first reading until Thursday. The bill was scheduled to be printed over night. House rules preclude any action until each member has a printed copy of a bill on his desk.

Miners who had filled the House galleries left when Watson explained that the bill would get its first reading Thursday and then be open to amendment on Friday.

The Fairmont Democrat said that once amendments are acted upon, a motion will be made Friday to suspend the rules to enable passage of the bill and its subsequent transmittal to the Senate.

Senate sources continue to hold to the previously stated position of Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D-Charleston, that the Senate would take no action on black lung legislation until it receives the House-passed bill.

The committee-drafted bill provides a presumptive clause for "occupational pneumoconiosis," which was bitterly attacked by representatives of the state's coal industry.

The clause reads as follows:

"If it be shown that the claimant or deceased employee has been exposed to the hazard of inhaling minute particles of dust in the course of and resulting from his employment for a period of 10 years during the 15 years immediately preceding the date of his last exposure to such hazard and that such claimant or deceased employee has sustained a respiratory disability consistent with a diagnosis of occupational pneumoconiosis, then it shall be presumed that such claimant or deceased employee is suffering from occupational pneumonconiosis which arose out of and in the course of his employment. This presumption shall not be conclusive."

The latter phrase leaves the door open for an employer to prove, if he can, that the worker didn't contract the disease in the course of his work.

The bill amending the Workmen's Compensation Act states that the terms "injury" and "personal injury" shall include occupational pneumoconiosis and any other occupational disease.

Occupational pneumonoconiosis is defined as a disease of the lung caused by the inhalation of minute particles of dust over a period of time and in which the dust is due to causes and conditions arising out of and in the course of employment.

The term occupational pneumonoconiosis includes but is not limited to silicosis, coal workers pneumoconiosis (commonly known as black lung), silico-tuberculosis, and anthraco-silicosis and any and all other diseases of the lungs not specifically designated but which result from the inhalation of minute particles of dust.

Eligibility for compensation is based on the requirement that the West Virginia worker has been exposed to the hazards of occupational pneumonconiosis over a period of not less than 10 years during the 15 years immediately preceding the date of the worker's last exposure to such hazards.

One of the proposals dropped by the committee after its initial announcement would have provided that X-rays alone are not the conclusive evidence factor in determining the presence of the disease.

As now proposed, the bill removes a cardinal point which the coal industry insisted be contained in any such legislation. Industry wanted X-ray evidence to be the controlling factor.

The bill contains provisions for excluding a worker from benefits if he fails to wear a safety device or violated posted safety rules. Supporters of the Black Lung Association bill wanted this provision dropped from the bill.

Missing from the bill is a clause pertaining to attorney's fees, which was contained in the United Mine Workers' proposed legislation.

It contains provisions, however, for denying benefits to a widow found to be engaging in prostitution. The same principle is applied to widows or widowers found to be living under a common law marriage situation.

The bill provides a schedule of payments for certain medical and hospital expenses and abolishes the present Silicosis Medical Board and replaces it with an Occupational Pneumoconiosis Board. An Occupational Diseases Medical Board would also be created under the bill prepared by the House Judiciary Committee.

The first stage silicosis payment provided in existing law is eliminated. Under that provision a worker who accepted $1,000 payment automatically waived his rights to further compensation.

House Bill 1040 provides that no additional award shall be made to any claimant for compensation for occupational pneumoconiosis who has been exposed to the dust hazard subsequent to his initial award.

The bill unveiled Wednesday apparently makes no change in the statute of limitations contained in the Workmen's Compensation Act. This allows a worker to seek compensation within three years of his last exposure to the hazard.

The proposal pegs compensation payments to the average weekly wage paid in West Virginia, a figure which is computed annually. The Black Lung Association proposal called for payments based on the individual workers average wage.

If a person is disabled by occupational pneumoconiosis, his minimum weekly benefits would be $26 and the maximum benefits would be computed—after July 1970—at 66 and two thirds per cent of the average weekly wage in West Virginia.

At present, the average wage in the state is $117. At 66 and two thirds per cent this would make the maximum benefit $78.

Until July 1970, however, the maximum would not exceed 43 per cent of the average wage, or $50.31. The current maximum payment under the compensation law is $47.

All workmen's compensation claims are paid out of a fund contributed to by employers whose employes are covered by the compensation plan.

Because workmen's compensation is not compulsory in West Virginia, the proposed law stipulates that the employer must have paid his premium for the quarter in which the worker was injured in order for the employee to get benefits.

The UMW contract provides that all coal operators signatories must carry workmen's compensation.

The Judiciary Committee chairman said

XUM

the bill "is as strong as can be supported by any responsible body of medical opinion.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Feb. 28, 1969]

Boyle Raps Hechler At Public Hearing—Randolph Defends Coal Companies

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, Thursday used a public hearing on coal mine health and safety legislation to conduct an unprecedented and continuous attack on a member of Congress.

Despite long standing rules which forbid personal attacks on a member of one body of the Congress by a member of the other body and repeated attempts by senators to change the subject, the UMW president persisted in a series of attacks against Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va. At one point, Boyle threatened to stuff a bologna down Hechler's throat.

He charged that Hechler got attention at meetings on black lung because the Huntington Democrat was talking to persons who contracted black lung before he (Boyle) was born.

The UMW president also vilified a critic to such an extent that Sen. Harrison Williams, D-N.J., chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, said that the man would have to be afforded an opportunity to appear before the committee.

Senator Williams told Boyle that he had not considered consumer critic Ralph Nader as an "expert" on mining and mine safety. Because of this reasoning, the New Jersey Democrat said, Nader would not have appeared before this committee.

Boyle, after several generalized verbal attacks on Nader, said he "would fight him in the back alleys or anywhere he could find him."

Williams then announced that in fairness and as a result of Boyle's attack, the committee would have to extend an opportunity to Nader to present his views.

After asserting that Boyle had been deficient in union leadership functions, Nader, in a message read to West Virginia coal miners in Charleston on Jan. 26, said, "The time has come for you to invite Mr. Boyle to West Virginia and have him exercise his right of replying to these facts. You may conclude that he is no longer worthy of being your leader, that you need new leadership that will fight for your rights and not snuggle up close to the coal operators and forget about the men who are paying the dues and paying the price."

The miners at the Charleston Civic Center rally responded with a unanimous resolution inviting the UMW president to be in Charleston when the West Virginia Legislature held hearings on black lung legislation and to present the miners' case. The hearing was held Feb. 11 and Boyle was absent.

UMW Vice President George Titler released the text of a statement which he had intended to make at the Feb. 11 hearing. He did not, however, address the committee.

After asserting that Nader had never been inside a coal mine, Boyle told the Senate committee that 2,000 UMW delegates who attended the organization's convention last year in Denver, Colo., wanted him to violate the UMW constitution and accept the union's presidency for life.

Boyle said he rejected the proposal.

He said he also turned down an offer of the convention delegates to double his salary.

With reference to the salary statement, Senator Williams said, "We (the senators) would do the same thing."

Boyle then made an oblique reference to President Nixon's acceptance of a pay increase under legislation initiated by former President Johnson. He also attacked the Johnson Administration's mine safety bill which was sent to Congress in January by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall.

Because Hechler served as a White House aide to former President Truman, Boyle tried to link him with the nearly $4 million fine assessed against John L. Lewis, then the UMW president, and the UMW in the 1950s.

Boyle said he never heard of West Virginia's Fourth District congressman until after November, 1968, and the Farmington No. 9 mine disaster.

During a portion of Thursday's hearing, Hechler was seated next to Boyle on a front row seat in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building. George Titler, a West Virginian and UMW vice president, had been active in previous election campaigns of the Huntington Democrat.

The greater portion of Boyle's two-hour appearance before the Senate committee was utilized to justify his position as the leader of the country's coal miners and in attacks on critics of the UMW.

"There is nothing new about those who try to jump on the bandwagon or those who attempt to carry the flag when it presents an opportunity for personal publicity or to become a Pied Piper. Such false prophets lead people astray by distorting the truth, indulging in falsification and distorting every facet of the truth in order to create evidence of self-importance," Boyle said.

"During that long and lonesome struggle, from the creation of the union in 1890, until 1966, we did not receive any support from anyone until one coal company, of all the coal companies in the United States, was found to be in our corner in the strategy to improve the health and safety of the coal miners," the UMW chief said.

He identified the one coal firm as Consolidation Coal Co.

Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., asked Boyle if all of West Virginia's coal companies didn't support the UMW position in 1966. The legislation concerned the applicability of federal mine laws to companies employing less than 15 miners.

Boyle said Randolph was correct.

The UMW president told the committee the union had spent $2 billion for the rehabilitation of miners who had been injured. He said that they had been sent to clinics and hospitals in all parts of the country.

Randolph asked about the source of the money.

Boyle told West Virginia's senior senator the funds had come from the royalty which the UMW gets on every ton of coal mined.

Randolph told the committee members he was trying to point out that the union didn't engage in the project alone.

After reiterating the union's opposition to legislation which would penalize miners for violation of safety rules or laws, Boyle said, "Several states do provide for penalties against coal operators and miners.

"However, our research has determined that the penalties are invariably applied against the coal miners, but rarely against the coal operator."

Sen. Winston Prouty, R-Vt., pressed Boyle for details of the union's research.

After the question was rephrased in several ways without getting a reply, Prouty thundered. "You've said it on Page 14 of your prepared statement. You shouldn't make statements you can't back up."

Boyle said the research consisted of verbal conversations with miners who had been fired.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 1, 1969]

Panel Launches Inquiry

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Labor Subcommittee will seek information about industry or union reprisals against coal miners who complain about unsafe health and working conditions in mines, it was announced Friday.

The information will be sought as part of a committee investigation which began Thursday on four mine health and safety bills.

Two members of the Senate panel headed by Sen. Harrison Williams, D.-N.J., asked United Mine Workers President W. A. (Tony) Boyle Thursday what job protection the union afforded miners who complained or protested about unsafe working conditions.

Following his objection to inclusion of penalties against coal miners who violate safety rules and regulations, Boyle said. "Several states do provide for penalties against coal operators and miners. However, our research has determined that the penalties are invariably applied against the coal miner, but rarely against the coal operator. For these reasons, we reiterate our opposition to financial penalties being imposed upon coal miners."

Sen. Winston L. Prouty, R-Vt., asked Boyle to provide the committee with the results of the UMW's research.

After the Vermont Republican asked the question in several different ways without getting a direct response from the UMW president, Boyle acknowledged the union didn't have any research findings in the generally accepted sense.

"We never wrote it down," Boyle said.

Turning to another area, the UMW president told the Senate committee that a number of safety committee members had been fired.

Williams asked for details on this point.

The union leader said he didn't have the records.

"As a union, aren't you supposed to protect your members? Don't you have records of grievances?" the committee chairman asked.

Boyle said grievances are handled in accordance with a set procedure and indicated to the committee that the UMW generally supports the company's action because mine management is responsible for the mine's operation.

"The UMW will not abridge rights of mine operators in running the mines," Boyle said. "We follow the judgment of the coal operators, right of wrong," he added.

The committee chairman then asked about job protection for the thousands of coal miners who are pressing the West Virginia State Legislature for better health laws.

The House of Delegates of the State Legislature Friday passed an amended version of the so-called black lung bill reported out by the House Judiciary Committee Wednesday.

The U.S. District Court in Charleston will hear arguments Saturday morning on a suit brought against the UMW International union, Districts 17 and 29 and the 49 locals within the districts. The suit filed by the Eastern Associated Coal Corp., Youngstown Mines Corp., United States Steel Corp., Olga Coal Corp., Kanawa Coal Operators Association and the Logan Coal Operators Association seeks to halt the miners' work stoppage and asks damages of $1.1 million per day for the duration of the stoppage.

Boyle didn't respond to Chairman Williams' question directly.

"If I thought a national strike would bring about new laws from Congress, I would do it now. But, I know legislators won't be blackjacked into taking action," Boyle said.

The New Jersey Democrat said it appeared to him that the West Virginia miners were protesting an unsafe working condition and were seeking a remedy, particularly for the future.

Senator Prouty said Friday he would continue his effort to get documented informa-

XUM

tion about charges that miners have been fired for protesting unsafe working conditions.

The Vermont Republican said he would ask for information about the number and frequency of mine safety committee inspections. Coupled with this, he said, is the number of times mines have been closed by the action of mine safety committees.

Fred Blackwell, committee counsel, Friday said the committee's staff could be "profitably used" in seeking the information raised by the questions of Chairman Williams and Senator Prouty.

Blackwell said that he expected that questions of a similiar nature would be asked of Bureau of Mines personnel when they appear before the committee in a later session.

The UMW contract calls for a mine safety committee selected by the local union at each mine.

When committee members conduct an investigation of an explosion or disaster they are paid their regular rates of pay by the employer. On other occasions they are paid by the local union.

The contract states: "The mine safety committee may inspect any mine development or equipment used in producing coal. If the committee believes conditions found endanger the life and bodies of the mine workers, it shall report its findings and recommendations to the management. In those special instances where the committee believes an immediate danger exists and the committee recommends that the management remove all mine workers from the unsafe area, the operator is required to follow the recommendation of the committee."

The UMW contract also states: "If the safety committee in closing down an unsafe area acts arbitrarily and capriciously. members of such committee may be removed from the committee. Grievances that may arise as a result of a request for removal of a member of the safety committee under this section shall be handled in accordance with the provisions providing for settlement of disputes."

Chairman Williams said the present hearings should not be "complicated by the bankruptcy arguments so frequently leveled at this type legislation" in the past.

He cited recent statements of the National Coal Association which predict a bright future for coal.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 2, 1969]

INJUNCTION AGAINST STATE MINERS DENIED

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—Federal Judge John A. Field Jr. Saturday denied an injunction to 27 West Virginia coal operators, who sought to get striking miners back on the job, on the grounds that U.S. District Courts have no authority to grant such relief.

The authenticity of the United Mine Workers of America contract, submitted by the operators, was challenged.

Judge Field's ruling came after nearly two hours of argument by attorneys representing coal operators in the southern West Virginia field and counsel for the UMWA.

Attorneys said northern coal operators didn't take part in the court action or name union locals in districts because they were of the opinion that that area's miners would return to work Sunday. This has been disputed by many miners, who have maintained a vigil at the State Capitol in support of black lung legislation.

David M. Johnson, a Charleston attorney who represented the West Virginia Coal Association ir. opposing black lung bills before the State Legislature, acted as counsel for the coal operators.

Mose Boirasky of Charleston represented the UMWA as attorney of record. Willard P. Owens, a Washington UMWA lawyer, was admitted to practice before the court in the proceeding.

Johnson contended the action of the miners in walking off their jobs Feb. 19 was a breach of contract.

Owens insisted the black lung legislation, sought by coal miners, actually was a result of "working conditions under existing contracts."

The coal operators sought a damage award of $1.1 million per day for each day of the walkout's duration.

While Judge Field denied the temporary restraining order sought by the operators, he left open the question of damages. He said that that would have to be taken up as a separate matter.

Johnson claimed officials of mine union locals had "systematically and methodically" participated in actual direction of the walkout.

He said UMWA leadership had not taken positive steps to restrain the locals.

Owens countered by saying that while UMWA had admitted the walkout was not a proper method of pressing claims of miners, it had no authority to order back the men who were seeking improvement of working conditions.

The UMWA lawyer said the organization's contract didn't cover all conditions of employment, adding that UMWA had no right to stop the miners' efforts to get legislation to improve their working conditions and would not do so.

Owens told the court that neither the UMWA, its districts 17 and 29 or the 49 locals had been served with legal papers pertaining to the case.

The union attorney said that local UMWA unions are not a party signatory to the contract.

On the basis of this, he said, neither the local unions nor district officers could be held accountable for any alleged breaches of contract.

Owens said that the no-strike clause cited by the coal operators was not contained in the most recent UMWA contract.

The union lawyer said the strike was being encouraged by "a member of Congress, certain doctors and certain lawyers."

"We advise against black-jacking legislators," he said.

The plaintiffs filed a printed copy of the October, 1968, contract between the UMWA and the several coal operators' associations as an exhibit with their petition.

Owens told the court this was not a complete copy of the contract. He said the complete copy would have shown that the no-strike clause is no longer in existence. After the court had handed down its ruling Owens was asked whether he would have insisted that the plaintiffs file an exact copy of the UMWA contract if the case had continued.

Owens said he would have taken this action.

Sources at the Department of Labor in Washington told the Sunday Dominion-Post that the contract reportedly signed October 4, 1968, has not yet been filed with that agency. The federal agency used the contract copy for checking on compliance with an assortment of laws concerning collective bargaining agreements, as well as welfare and pension programs.

Miners received a printed copy of the contract in October, indicating that it was to be signed Oct. 14. Last week they received another printed copy and that copy contained the printed names of persons purportedly signing the agreement.

No area miner has been able to see a copy of the actual agreement, although several have gone to Washington for that purpose.

The Labor Department also pointed out that there is no way of knowing what coal companies are covered by the respective contracts.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 3, 1969]

MINES STILL OUT—STRIKE SPREADING

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—As word reached the State Capitol this morning that the miners work, stoppage in support of stronger health and safety laws had spread to neighboring Pennsylvania, the Senate Judiciary Committee was putting the finishing touches on its "black lung" bill.

Duquesne Light and Power Company's Warwick No. 3 mine was idled this morning by a group of roving pickets. The mine is located between Bobtown and Greensboro.

Miners are still out in Monongalia County, according to the Christopher Coal Company office there.

Last week John Kelly, president of United Mine Workers Local 5159 at Bobtown, said after citing the difference between Pennsylvania and West Virginia laws, that the situation had not reached a critical stage in his state. He acknowledged, however, that more could be done in Pennsylvania to reduce dust levels in mines.

Members of the Senate committee headed by Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D-Charleston, worked until midnight yesterday at the Capitol hammering out the committee's black lung bill.

Sens. William Moreland, D-Morgantown, and O. G. Hedrick, D.-Fairmont, are members of the committee.

Technical changes were still being made to the Senate measure early today.

It differs from House Bill 1040 on several key points. The House passed its bill Friday by a 95–0 vote after adoption of both committee and floor amendments.

The Senate bill, it was learned, contains a more definitive description of pneumoconiosis (black lung) than approved in the House-approved bill. The measure also would prohibit subsequent claims for aggravated forms of the lung disease with the exception of the massive fibrosis stage.

The House bill provided compensation payment on the basis of 43 per cent of the average state salary this year and 46 per cent next year.

The Senate measure also redefines the so-called presumptive clause. It says simply that if the worker shows the tangible signs of pneumoconiosis, it will be presumed that he contracted it in the course of his employment.

Methods of proving that the worker has the lung ailment are more restrictive in the Brotherton Committee bill. The House-passed bill permits a show of the claimant's ability to function normally or to undergo normal prolonged exertion when compared to average men of same age and general physical condition as a factor in determining eligibility in addition to x-rays. These examinations are regarded as pulmonary function tests.

The Senate version of the black lung bill calls for x-ray and "other scientific tests." Some members of the committee expressed the belief that the term "scientific tests" would rule out the pulmonary test allowed in the House bill.

Present plans, it was learned, call for Senator Brotherton to report the committee's bill to the floor of the Senate today as an amendment to House Bill 1040.

At that point, the House-passed bill would come before the Senate on a first reading and be printed in the Senate Journal for the amendment stage tomorrow. Technical amendments would be introduced from the Senate floor.

Passage of the bill in the Senate could come tomorrow or Wednesday and is dependent upon whether rules are suspended requiring a second and third reading on successive days.

Miners from the Morgantown area were

XUM

again in evidence at the State Capital today, shifting their scene of operation from the House gallery to the Senate gallery.

Elijah Wolford, official spokesman for northern area miners, said today that members of UMW Local 1058 as individuals, Sunday presented the miners from that local some money to help cover the cost of their frequent trips to Charleston in support of the black lung bill.

Local 1058 is comprised of miners who work at Christopher Coal Company's Humphrey No. 7 mine at Mt. Morris, Pa.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 2, 1969]

Black Lung Deadlock Is Predicted in Senate

Charleston.—A deadlock on "black lung" legislation may develop in the State Senate Monday when its Judiciary Committee unveils its version of a black lung bill.

Sen. William T. Brotherton, D-Charleston, Judiciary Committee chairman, said Saturday his committee has drafted a bill which is entirely different from the measure passed by the House Friday. The House bill has been referred to Brotherton's committee.

The Charleston Democrat said his committee will recommend Monday that its bill be substituted for the House bill. If the Senate approves this action and passes the bill it would set up a deadlock between the Senate and House over which bill to enact into law.

If the Senate passes its own bill it would require the appointment of a conference committee representing the House and Senate to attempt to agree on a compromise bill acceptable to both branches of the State Legislature before next Saturday's adjournment of the current 60-day session.

Miners maintaining a vigil in the State Capitol said Saturday they had no intention of returning to the mines until the legislature passes a black lung bill containing the provisions they support.

Meetings were scheduled Sunday in the northern panhandle and the Morgantown area by the United Mine workers in an effort to get the miners back on the job. Miners here said telephone calls were being made to miners in the northern part of the state, indicating that since the House had passed an amended version of the black lung bill Friday the battle had been won.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for the coal operators sharply criticized the bill which was approved by the House in a 95–0 vote.

Paul Morton, president of West Virginia Coal Association, said the action of the House is "a dire warning to all business and industry in the state.

"It has opened the Pandora's box," he said.

Morton said "The bill is not just social legislation, but galloping socialism in purest form."

He said the bill was a "classic example of bowing to pressure from mass demonstrators with total disregard for sound reasoning and medical facts.

He asserted the legislation approved by the House would allow "every miner to almost automatically file for benefits under the bill upon his retirement whether he is disabled or not."

Nagman Foster, a Lookout miner, said "We're not going back until that law is passed. It's 'no law, no work.' We'll go back when the governor signs it."

Another miner who is a member of local 750 at Cabin Creek said "We can't return to work until this goes through the Senate. It has some good points now . . . I'm satisfied, but we think there should be some improvement to the bill."

The man asked that his name not be used because " the company laid me off for working in the black lung crusade."

A Boone County miner said, "We don't know the sentiment of the Senate . . . all our hard work could be done away with the Senate floor. We certainly hope we'll have the support of the Senate . . . it might ease the pressure around here. We don't want to miss any more work . . . but we're not going back until we get a good law."

Another miner added "Kanawha County won't be back . . . not until we get what we want."

A large sign decorated a column in the rotunda of the capitol. Made by the wife of a disabled miner from Gallagher, it proclaimed: "I am physically, mentally and sexually disabled. I have black lung."

Del. Robert Dinsmore, D-Monongalia, played a key role in getting amendments to the measure adopted in the House Judiciary Committee before Del. J. E. Ned Watson's committee reported additional amendments to House Bill 1040, the committee-written bill.

Del. Warren McGraw, D-Wyoming, hailed house passage of the bill as the "most significant piece of labor legislation in this century."

A new mine safety bill which one Kanawha County senator has labeled "meaningless" has been reported out and recommended for passage in the State Senate.

Sen. O. G. Hedrick, D-Fairmont, chairman of the Mines and Mining Committee, said the bill will "tighten up safety procedures in mining." Hedrick said the bill would "straighten and clarify existing laws but not change them too much."

Kanawha County Sen. Neil A. Kinsolving, a Republican, failed to get the committee to adopt his amendment to the Hedrick bill which would give the state Mines director power to promulgate rules and regulations for deep mining.

Kinsolving said he was baffled as to why his move had gathered no support, either from miners or the UMW.

Hedrick suggested the chances of additional mine safety bills coming out in the Senate were practically nil. He said his committee probably would not meet again this session.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 4, 1969]

Miners' Demands for Compensation More Than Justified

Black lung and coal mine disasters are symptoms of a social disease. As long as they continue needlessly they will diminish our claim to be a civilized nation.

The soft coal miners of West Virginia are currently involved in what can be construed as an open revolt against a system which has brutalized them for generations. They are up against some mighty tough adversaries, and they deserve all the help they can get.

The miners have shucked their customary fatalism to become political activists and an estimated 42,000 miners in the state have walked off the job in the biggest outpouring of indignation and anger in decades.

Their immediate target is the West Virginia State Legislature, where a strengthened Workmen's Compensation Act that would make life more nearly bearable for the victims of black lung—the notorious miner's disease—is under consideration.

The House of Delegates has passed a bill which will go a long way toward easing the disgrace which the miners of West Virginia have been subjected to over the course of years. That body of the Legislature passed the measure by a 95–0 vote.

We would hope—and indeed, insist, that the State Senate respond in a similar vein and adopt the House-passed bill rather than engage in legislative trickery designed to cheat the miners once again.

Some quarters have been critical of the tactics utilized by the miners to make their presence felt in the legislative chambers of the State Capitol. Most of the critics have been advocates of the status quo concept and this means a continuance of the second-class citizenship which the miners of this state have endured for generations.

Legislatures of this state have been generally influenced by interests such as the coal operators and other big business. The tide has turned somewhat. And it turned because the miners made their presence felt in Charleston and in a way the miners, to use an old adage, put their money where their mouths are.

It is recognized that business entities spend large sums of money to influence the course of legislation and engage polished lobbyists, often in the form of legislators, and the miners lacked such degrees of expertise. However, the miners exercised their rights as citizens under the United States Constitution as well as the Constitution of West Virginia to coax a good law out of the Legislature. In doing so, the miners endured an added hardship by failing to report to their customary jobs at the mines.

This action has inconvenienced some who are not miners, but little real progress has ever been made in this country by acquiescence to injustice without the discomfiture of the comfortable few.

The stakes for the miners were high and they were willing to pay that price. They should be lauded rather than scorned. Their ardor and diligence will yield ultimate benefits for every man who toils for a living in this state and who is injured in the course of that toil.

The miners of West Virginia will doubtless be supported by miners of the other 28 coal mining states as Congress goes through the periodic motions of seeking new mining safety and health laws. This effort should get the enthusiastic support of the entire nation. It doesn't take too much manipulation of the slide rule to determine that the price of safety is ultimately a lot less expensive than the cost of misery, death and a slag pile heaped high with the bodies of wasted men.

An essential ingredient from the federal level is the sincere and effective enforcement of appropriate laws dealing with the mines. Coal miners and others have called upon President Nixon to reappoint John O'Leary as director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines in recognition of the outstanding job he has done in the past four months to make America's mines safer and healthier places in which to work.

We think the reappointment of Mr. O'Leary is an excellent idea and implore the President to act promptly in this matter, thus reassuring all Americans that he favors the most safe and healthy climate in our mines that man is capable of devising.

Although forsaken in many instances by their logical leaders, the miners of America are to be commended for their effort to bring the 18th century health and safety standards under which they work to the level of the 20th century methods of coal production. We wish them complete success and at the same time renew this newspaper's vow that it will not forget the horror in Mountaineer Mine No. 9 between Nov. 20 and Nov. 29, 1968, and we do not intend to permit the Federal Government, State Government, operators, union and miners or the voters to forget about it and accept half-way measures that have followed previous accidents.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 4, 1969]

Injunction To Require Miners To Work Nixed

(By Ray Martin)

Charleston.—New light was shed on the relationship between the state's coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America

XUM

and the UMW's relationship with coal miners as the result of a hearing in the U.S. District Court for Southern West Virginia here Saturday.

The culmination of the two-hour hearing before Judge John A. Field Jr. was that the 27 coal operators acting through their several associations were denied an injunction to force coal miners back to their jobs. The court rejected the operators' plea on the ground that the Norris-LaGuardia Act barred the issuance of such injunctive relief.

The suit was filed on behalf of United States Steel Corp., Youngstown Mines Corp., Olga Coal Co., Eastern Associated Coal Corp., Kanawha Coal Operators Association and Logan Coal Operators Association by the Charleston law firms of Dayton, Campbell & Love and Jackson, Kelly, Holt & O'Farrell.

David D. Johnson of the latter law firm argued the case before Judge Field. His first step was to have Attorney Ernest H. Gilbert Jr. ask the court's permission to remove two of the plaintiffs from the proceeding because they were entered erroneously. The two were Youngstown Mines Corp. and Olga Coal Co.

Mose E. Boiarsky of Charleston represented the UMWA with Willard P. Owens, a UMW attorney from Washington, presenting the union's case to the court.

Initially, Owens raised the point that the court was without jurisdiction in the case because that no service or process, the complaint, or notice of hearing had been effected on the defendants.

After citing Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 and Section 4 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which prohibits injunctions of the nature sought by the coal operators, Owen said:

"Any temporary restraining order limiting the right of employes to picket at or about plaintiffs' mines and facilities would be in conflict with the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Federal Constitution's First Amendment and by West Virginia Constitution, Article III, Section 7."

The union attorney also told the court that the restraining order sought by the employers would violate the right of employes peaceably to assembly and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, guaranteed them by the federal and state constitutions.

"The National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1968 does not contain a no-strike clause and does not deny to plaintiffs' employes the right to engage in a work stoppage, he said.

The Washington lawyer asserted that the plaintiff's Exhibit A was "not a full or complete copy of the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1968."

He said the 1968 agreement expressly repealed the no-strike clauses contained in earlier labor-management agreements. The plaintiffs were basing their case, in part, on the argument that the no-strike clause had been violated and hence this was a breach of the contract.

The UMWA attorney stressed that individual UMWA locals are not parties to the contract. Identification of individual companies is impossible to ascertain according to the U.S. Department of Labor. The UMWA International signs the agreement with the several coal associations.

The court was told that the unions have not authorized, engaged in or encouraged any work stoppage or strike, nor have said unions authorized, engaged in or encouraged and picketing of any of plaintiffs' mines.

"Unions' Constitution does not give them either the authority or control to require their members to comply with and perform said contract, or to compel them to work for plaintiffs against their will," Owens said.

"The National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1968 does not require employes of any plaintiff to work or perform services for any plaintiff, as work is scheduled by the plaintiffs. The unions deny that they have engaged in, encouraged, ratified or approved any work stoppages at any of the said mines, but aver that any such work stoppages are a result of the voluntary action of the employes of the plaintiffs in petitioning the Legislature of the State of West Virginia to enact legislation to protect them and to compensate them for respiratory injuries commonly known or referred to as 'black lung', and that any such work stoppages, on information and belief, are the result of activities of an association known as the 'Black Lung Association'.

"Unions further state that plaintiffs, and each of them, are fully aware of these facts and that such work stoppages are not the result of any grievance arising under the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1968."

The union attorney said since plaintiff companies seek money damages against unions, plaintiffs admit they are not suffering irreparable injury. He also disputed the plaintiffs' contention that District 17 and District 29 of UMWA were "labor organizations." He called them "administrative divisions" of UMWA.

Owens stressed that the wage agreement doesn't cover all conditions of employment of the miners and that the State of West Virginia has held that workmen's compensation is part of the contract of employment.

He said the miners were engaging in a constitutional right to petition the Legislature for an improvement in working conditions and the "UMWA has no right to stop this and won't."

The court was told that unions have advised their members, through local union officers and members, to cease the work stoppage and return to work, and further have disavowed any strike action and have verbally and in writing so notified representatives of the plaintiffs.

Meetings held by UMWA locals throughout the state Sunday failed to spark a return to work movement among the idled coal miners. Acting independently of the union, miners have adopted a "No Law, No Coal" slogan and spokesmen for the miners said there will be no return to work until the State Senate passes the House-approved black lung bill and Gov. Arch A. Moore Jr. signs it into law. The new legislation would become effective July 1.

After telling the court that the UMWA advised its members against "blackjacking legislators," Owens said the strike was being encouraged by a member of Congress, certain doctors and certain lawyers."

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 5, 1969]

JOURNAL MIXES UP HECHLER'S QUOTES

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The United Mine Workers Journal got its quotations a bit mixed up in its latest effort to impugn the motives of Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va.

Writing in the March 1 issue of the UMW Journal, Rex Lauck, assistant editor, said:

"We found it hard to understand the reasoning behind Rep. Ken Hechler's sudden attacks on the United Mine Workers and its leadership until a friend with a long memory and a good filing system called our attention to an article in the defunct Pageant Magazine.

"In its April, 1959, issue the magazine described with Hechler's consent: How to Get Elected to Congress.

He advised:

"First you pop off to get attention, regardless of the merit of your ideas.

"Then you pose as the champion of the average man against the 'interests'.

"Then after you are rebutted, no matter how strong the facts against you you reply at once as the 'lonely campaigner' seeking the sympathetic support traditionally given the underdog.

"The truth of your statement or the merit of your argument has nothing to do with your response or your conduct.

"Finally, you adopt the imaginary 'we' as the shining knight defending the oppressed people against the imaginary brutalities of the interests.

"That explains much about how this man Hechler operates. Shades of Joe McCarthy!"

Asked about the latest UMW Journal charge, the Huntington, W. Va., Democrat said, "Hrumph! I never wrote or said anything like that in my life."

The annals of the Library of Congress not only unmistakably put the lie to the UMW Journal article but allow the Fourth District Congressman to bask in some reflected glory.

It was on March 24, 1959, that former Vice-President Hubert Humphery, then a member of the U.S. Senate, said, "There were a good many highly interesting political campaigns last fall. One in particular was that of Ken Hechler, who was elected to Congress from West Virginia's Fourth District. Ken Hechler, in winning, had to overcome the distinct handicap of having lived in the state for little more than a year when he announced as a candidate in the Democratic primary against two native-born sons.

"The story of Ken Hechler's campaign to victory appears in the April issue of Pageant magazine. It is fascinating reading and should give encouargement to others who have wanted to take an active role in politics."

The former vice-president talked of a visit he had made to Charleston, W.Va., for a Democratic Women's Day program and then said, "West Virginia can be proud of the men and women who have represented the state in the Congress throughout the years. They can take special pride in our colleagues, Senator Byrd and Senator Randolph, and men in the House such as Rep. Ken Hechler."

The late Sen. Estes Kefauver, D-Tenn., said on the floor of the U.S. Senate on that day in March 1959, "I join with the distinguished member from Minnesota (Senator Humphrey) in congratulating Rep. Ken Hechler and to commend the fine article about him published in Pageant magazine. It was most fitting that Mr. Hechler be recognized in this fashion, because he represents what a real citizen should be in this country of ours.

"Ken Hechler, before he was elected to Congress from West Virginia, gained widespread recognition as a stimulating and outstanding professor in the field of political science," Kefauver said.

The late President John F. Kennedy while serving as a senator from Massachusetts also heralded the magazine article about Hechler.

The April, 1959, issue of Pageant contains an article written by Howard Cohn entitled "How to Get Elected to Congress."

The closest thing to the "credo" reported by UMW Journal and contained in the Cohn article is "Ken Heckler's 10 rules for Campaigners."

They are:

"1. Pay Attention to the average person.

"2. Be true to your own personality.

"3. Be constructive and campaign cleanly.

"4. Turn every attack on you into an asset. Couple an immediate answer with your own constructive approach to the problem.

"5. Remember—your most effective workers are under 20 (they're enthusiastic) and over 60 (their word is respected).

"6. Avoid 'strategy meetings' that cause dissension waste time.

"7. Venture forth around the district every day. Don't be deskbound."

"8. Don't tie your hands with job promises.

"9. Don't promise the moon to pressure groups.

"10. Be able to laugh at yourself and enjoy it."

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 5, 1969]

HICKEL DOESN'T TAKE POSITION—SUPPORT LAGGING ON COMPENSATION—SAFETY BILL BACKED

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel Tuesday refused to take a position on a Congressional proposal designed to encourage states to improve their Workmen's Compensation laws.

Under persistent questioning by Rep. Carl D. Perkins, D–Ky., Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Hickel finally agreed that coal miners are exposed to occupational hazards equally as those faced by uranium miners.

A bill introduced by Perkins and six other members of the House would extend the existing Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to employes not covered by state workmen's compensation laws. The Perkins plan specifies that any employe who suffers death or disability as the result of pneumoconiosis in a state whose compensation laws don't cover the disease would be eligible for coverage under the federal statute.

Assuming it enacts the so-called black lung bill, the West Virginia Legislature would be the fourth legislature in the nation to include pneumoconiosis as a disease compensable under workmen's compensation.

The Hickel-Perkins exchange came during the course of Hickel's appearance before the House Labor Subcommittee which began hearings on mine health and safety legislation. Rep. John Dent, D–Pa., chairs the subcommittee.

John F. O'Leary, U.S. Bureau of Mines director, joined Hickel in testifying before the committee in support of the Nixon Administration's mine safety and health bill which was sent to Capitol Hill late Monday.

Rep. Ken Hechler, D–W. Va., said he was gratified by the strong statements on behalf of mine health and safety made Tuesday by Hickel and O'Leary.

"In general, the Nixon administration bill is a good one, although there are a number of improvements which should be made," the Huntington Democrat said. "For example, the standard of three milligrams, of respirable dust per cubic meter of air recommended by the Public Health Service should be attainable at an earlier date than the bill recommends.

"We ought to stop putting the emphasis exclusively on the industry's definition of 'technology,' and put the emphasis instead on what level of coal dust is injurious to the coal miner.

"Any law will be meaningless without a good administrator. It is obvious from his outstanding record of enforcing the law since taking office on Oct. 20, 1968, that John O'Leary has become a symbol of coal mine health and safety throughout the nation. A clearcut announcement that John F. O'Leary will be retained as mines director will do more to reassure the coal miners of the nation that their safety will be protected than any amount of legislation.

"I am disturbed by retention of the Board of Review in the administration's legislation. This would mean more delay and possible blocking of effective health and safety regulations," the West Virginia Congressman said.

In sending the bill to Congress, President Nixon said, "The workers in the coal mining industry and their families have too long endured the constant threat and often sudden reality of disaster, disease and death. This great industry has strengthened our nation with the raw material of power. But it has also frequently saddened our nation with news of crippled men, grieving widows and fatherless children.

"Death in the mines can be as sudden as an explosion or a collapse of a roof and ribs, or it comes insidiously from pneumoconiosis or black lung disease. When a miner leaves his home for work, he and his family must live with the unspoken but always present fear that before the working day is over, he may be crushed or burned to death or suffocated. This acceptance of the possibility of death in the mines has become almost as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels.

"The time has come to replace this fatalism with hope by substituting action for words. Catastrophes in the coal mines are not inevitable. They can be prevented, and they must be prevented," the President said.

The White House suggested a number of actions which could be taken under existing laws and proposed strengthening the law in other aspects.

Nixon's proposals for legislation have bipartisan support in the House of Representatives.

A copy of the President's legislative proposal was not available as the House subcommittee began its hearing.

Hickel said, however, "The need for this legislation is unmistakable—there has been no improvement in the overall fatality rate since 1947."

The cabinet officer said he considered the bill's single most important feature to be a provision which would require the secretary to develop and promulgate regulations for mandatory health and safety standards for all coal mines.

Hickel proposed a dust standard of 4.5 milligrams which would become effective 60 days after passage of the law. He would have the Bureau of Mines determine it eventually could be lowered to three milligrams, the standard recommended December by the Public Health Service.

Taking a page from British mine procedure, Hickel said the Nixon proposal would require that each miner be given an annual chest x-ray. Any miner who shows substantial evidence of development of black lung would be assigned at the miner's option, either to another area of the mine where the respirable dust concentrations do not exceed two milligrams per cubic meter of air or to an area in excess of two milligrams if the miner continuously wears a respirator.

Noting that the White House measure embodied health and safety in a single bill, Hickel said, "In my opinion, those who oppose health legislation are the same people who oppose safety legislation. I firmly believe that the Congress, like the Executive branch, can consider both subjects simultaneously and enact one bill covering both health and safety. I urge that you do so. We must avoid the 'divide and conquer' approach."

The UMWA supports a separate bill for health and another for safety. The union contends that those who favor the single-bill approach want to kill all the legislative proposals.

"No longer can there be a claim that the safety and health of the workers in one of our major industries are luxuries that we can afford. . . . Yet, the way we mine coal today is not humanitarian, resourceful, or efficient. It is inexcusably wasteful of our most precious asset—the human being," Hickel said in concluding his testimony.

The Bureau of Mines director readily agreed with Chairman Dent's assessment that the bureau had not been fulfilling many of the requirements of existing law, particularly those health responsibilities outlined in Title I of the law.

He pointed out that except for the disasters most of the injuries and fatalities in the mines come from actions over which mine inspectors have no jurisdiction.

O'Leary told the committee that 44 miners had died in mine accidents since the Farmington disaster in November, 1968.

The mine agency director reviewed the steps he has taken since the West Virginia mine tragedy.

He said that the inspection staff had to be upgraded. He noted that only 20 members of the 250-man force had degrees in engineering. He said he favors scrapping the present requirement that mine inspectors have five years experience in the mines before establishing knowledgability for appointment. He would use the term "adequate" instead of a specified number of years, thus enabling him to utilize more college-trained personnel.

Noting that this was only the third piece of mine legislation in 47 years, Chairman Dent said today's mechanized mines are working under laws and rules established in the days of manual mining.

The Pennsylvanian said he visited a mine two weeks ago which he had helped to open during the Depression days and found the electrical wiring installed then was still in use.

The committee chairman asked the Department of Interior to supply the committee with details about dust standards and state-federal cooperation agreements.

Dent said the latter was included in the last effort to obtain meaningful legislation as a compromise tactic. He said he didn't think such agreements were satisfactory and perhaps the federal government should have total responsibility for mine health and safety and the required inspections.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 6, 1969]

A 10-DAY MOURNING PERIOD SOUGHT BY MINERS

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—A group of Monongalia County soft coal miners Wednesday responded to the State Senate's emasculation of House Bill 1040, the so-called "black lung" bill, with an appeal to United Mine Workers President W. A. (Tony) Boyle.

Another group of miners made an appeal to President Richard Nixon, asking that the state be declared a "disaster area."

Elijah Wolford of Morgantown, official spokesman for northern area miners supporting passage of the House-passed pneumoconiosis bill, said a telegram had been sent to Boyle asking him to declare a 10-day mourning period for the 78 miners who were killed in the Farmington No. 9 mine disaster last November.

The telegram will be followed by a petition signed by the state's miners.

Wolford said the appeal, supported by many miners from the state's southern coal fields, asked that the UMW president make the period one of national mourning.

The union's wage agreement provides for "memorial periods." That section of the contract reads as follows:

"The international union, United Mine Workers of America, may designate memorial periods not exceeding a total of 10 days during the term of this agreement at any mine or operation, provided it shall give reasonable notice to the coal company."

There was no immediate reaction as to what Boyle's response might be in support of the group of miners.

UMWA Vice President George Titler reportedly conferred with Senate president Lloyd G. Jackson, D-Hamlin, and Sen. William T. Brotherton, Jr., D-Charleston, Senate Judiciary Committee chairman, prior to the Senate's action Wednesday.

Miners supporting black lung legislation invited Boyle to come to the State Capitol in February to testify in their behalf. He did not come and Titler—although he had a prepared statement—did not testify before the hearing held Feb. 11 by the Senate and House Judiciary committees.

The telegram sent to President Nixon said: "The coal miners of West Virginia, who are seeking the adoption of a meaningful law to provide compensation for miners who suffer from pneumoconiosis, need your help. Some of the miners who already suffer from this dread disease and who have received no help and mighty little solace from the state over the years are actually in a state of poverty in its real meaning. We ask that you declare the state of West Virginia a disaster area so that the federal government, if necessary, can take action to bring this needless and careless disregard of human life to an immediate end."

Sen. Neal Kinsolving, R.-Kanawha, led an unsuccessful fight to have the more comprehensive House Bill 1040 adopted by the Senate, but his measure failed by 28–5.

Kinsolving, who has worked in the mines, asserted that until the mine operators have to pay monetary damages, the "Miners will have neither help nor safety in the mines."

The Charleston Republican sought unsuccessfully to include an amendment to the bill which would have permitted damage suits against mine operators in accidents involving gross negligence.

He said the concept of workmen's compensation had outlived its usefulness and hoped that the next session of the Legislature would review this subject.

Kinsolving said the present dilemma facing the Legislature "is the result of many years of neglect."

Coal miners scattered around the State Capitol remained resolute in their stand of "no law, no coal."

The Black Lung Association said, in a statement, "The West Virginia Coal Association accuses the West Virginia Black Lung Association of 'emotionalism' and the State Legislature is accused of bowing to the 'pressure' tactics of 42,000 frustrated coal miners. Let him who is without sin throw the first lump of coal.

"Surely, the 'pressure' of the miners' presence in Charleston at this time is no greater that the pressures exerted long and continuously by the tremendous economic forces arrayed against them. The 'emotionalism' charged against the West Virginia Black Lung Association appears to be the heart of the Coal Association's case.

"Conveniently ignoring the expert testimony given at the full legislative hearing, the Coal Association and those writers sympathetic to the Coal Association position against decent black lung legislation, can see little merit in the case for the coal miner," the statement said.

The Black Lung Association statement went on to list some of the conclusions reached by medical witnesses who appeared at the Feb. 11 hearing.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 6, 1969]

UMW JOURNAL IGNORES STATE MINERS' STRIKE

(By Ray Martin)

The current issue of the United Mine Workers Journal takes no recognition of the fact that nearly 40,000 coal miners were off their jobs in support of black lung legislation.

The March 1 issue takes note of the West Virginia House of Delegates Judiciary Committee black lung compensation bill, but does not report the suit filed against the union in the U.S. District Court at Charleston, which was dismissed last Saturday.

Justin McCarthy, Journal editor, wrote:

"The fight at the federal and state levels will not be easy and many of our new found supporters in the continuing battle for health and safety in America's coal mines can be expected to desert us along the way. The public interest is at a high pitch right now and has been since the Consol No. 9 mine disaster of last November. We would hope that his public interest could be sustained. But the history of such battles makes us skeptical that public interest will be maintained.

"In the long pull ahead to get constructive legislation at the state and federal levels it will be the United Mine Workers of America that, as always, will be the shock troops and will carry on the battle until legislation is signed into law by the President of the United States and by the various coal state governors.

"UMWA members should not be confused by superficial coverage on television and in some newspapers. The 'instant experts' who like to see their pictures on the television screens and see their names in the newspapers as new found friends of the coal miners will stop sounding off when the television cameras and the reporters pencils have found more exciting stories to record.

"Then it will be up to you coal miners and the union that has represented you for nearly 80 years to carry on the fight to a successful conclusion.

"Better health and safety in America's coal mines will be won in the long run as it always has been won; through the untiring, determined, constructive efforts of the coal miners' union, the United Mine Workers of America . . ."

Rep. John M. Slack Jr., D-W.Va., is quoted in the Journal as saying, "It is my own personal conviction that stronger federal mine safety legislation alone will not bring completely acceptable conditions of work underground. We must look farther afield for that, and only prolonged research will assure us of suitable end results.

"I am dismayed by the trend of recent publicity—by the callous, heartless, self promotional antics of the few who have appointed themselves arbiters of mine safety standards." The West Virginia Democrat said.

Representative Slack assailed proposals to fine coal miners for violations of federal safety standards.

Noting that the budget provides for less than 300 federal coal mine inspectors, Representative Slack said, "It is unlikely that any news aimed at improving mine safety and health conditions can muster significant impact on present conditions without the active support and dedicated leadership of the UMWA as part of its continuing program to improve working conditions in all respects."

He said there is no qualified spokesman for any mining interest who is opposed to safer working conditions, "if it can be established that new regulations will mitigate an identified danger without destructive cost increases."

The Journal concludes its reporting of the West Virginia congressman's words in this fashion:

"Meanwhile, let there be a moratorium on silly charges against 'the interest' and a pause in the finger pointing at UMWA President W. A. Boyle, Vice President George Titler, Secretary Treasurer John Owens, and their colleagues.

"Let us have law, based on fact, and let us define by law what must be done. Having passed a good law, we can be confident that Mr. Boyle, Mr. Titler, Mr. Owens, and the knowledgeable leadership of the United Mine Workers of America will claim their usual position in the van (sic) of a vigorous drive for safer conditions in coal mining."

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 7, 1969]

BLACK LUNG SESSION SLATED TO BEGIN TODAY

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—Del. Robert Dinsmore, D.-Morgantown, Thursday was named chairman of a five-man House committee to meet with a like number of Senators in an effort to iron out differences between the "black lung" bills passed by the two houses of the Legislature.

Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D.-Charleston, will head the Senate members of the conference committee. Only one of the Senate conferees supported House Bill 1040 in that body.

The conferees are slated to meet today at an unspecified hour.

There are two principal differences in the measures passed by the Senate and House. One is the so-called presumption clause and the other is the definition of pneumoconiosis and the need to show x-ray evidence of the lung ailment.

When the Senate substituted its bill for the House-passed measure, pneumoconiosis was described in this fashion:

"Pneumoconiosis is defined as a disease of the lungs caused by the inhalation of minute particles of dust over a period of time which has produced pinhead or larger nodulation which can be identified by x-rays or other like objective medical evidence of equal diagnostic value, and a pneumoconiosis shall be considered to be an occupational pneumoconiosis when the pneumoconiosis results from causes and conditions arising out of and in the course of the employment. The term 'occupational pneumoconiosis' shall include, but shall not be limited to, such diseases as silicosis, antharco-silicosis, coal-workers' pneumoconiosis commonly known as black lung or miners asthma, silico-tuberculosis (silicosis accompanied by active tuberculosis of the lungs), coal-workers' pneumoconiosis accompanied by active tuberculosis of the lungs, tuberculosilicosis, asbestosis, siderosis, anthrax and any and all other dust diseases of the lungs not specifically designated herein . . ."

The House-passed bill contains this language:

"Occupational pneumoconiosis is defined as a disease of the lungs caused by the inhalation of minute particles of dust over a period of time and which said dust is due to causes and conditions arising out of and in the course of employment. The term 'occupational pneumoconiosis' shall include, but shall not be limited to silicosis, coal workers' pneumoconiosis (commonly known as black lung), silicotuberculosis (silicosis accompanied by active tuberculosis of the lungs), anthraco-silicosis and any and all other diseases of the lungs and conditions and diseases secondary to occupational pneumoconiosis which are not specifically designated herein . . ."

Another section of the House bill states:

"Impairment of the claimant's ability to function normally or to undergo normal prolonged exertion when compared with an average man of his age and like general physical condition shall be considered in the determination of claimants disability from occupational pneumoconiosis."

The House conferees are expected to insist that any compromise bill contain the broad presumption clause contained in the House bill as well as the definition of pneumoconiosis. House members are reported ready to accept some of the Senate amendments which actually strengthen the House measure.

In appointing conferees, Senate President Lloyd G. Jackson, D-Hamlin, did not select any senators from southern counties, where the "black lung" problem is reportedly the worst.

In addition to Brotherton, a Charleston attorney who introduced Senate Bill 216 from which the House took its presumption clause, Jackson named two other Kanawha County senators: Mario J. Palumbo, a Democrat, and John T. Poffenbarger, a Republican. Both men are attorneys.

XUM

William Tompas, a Weirton Democrat, was the sole senate supporter of House Bill 1040 who was named to the conference committee. The Senate roster lists Tompas as a "clerical-investigator."

Chester R. Hubbard, a Wheeling Republican and attorney, was the fifth senator named to the conference committee.

In addition to Dinsmore, who is an attorney, House Speaker Ivor F. Boiarsky, D-Charleston, named three other freshman legislators to the conference committee. All of the House participants are lawyers.

Cleo S. Jones, Charleston Republican, is the only delegate with previous service on the conference committee. He was in the 58th Session of the Legislature.

Other House conferees are Odell H. Huffman, D-Princeton, Orton A. Jones, R-Spencer, and Anthony J. Sparacino, D. Beckley.

The conferees are all members of the Judiciary Committee of their respective legislative bodies.

Miners from all parts of the state continued their vigil in the State Capitol, reiterating their slogan, "No law, no coal."

Widows and surviving children from last November's mine disaster at Mannington are expected to join the miners here.

Saturday night is the deadline for the regular 60-day session of the Legislature. The session has been extended through Tuesday by Gov. Arch A. Moore Jr., but only to consider the budget.

If no acceptable "black lung" measure comes out of the session, Moore has told miners in a face-to-face meeting on the Statehouse steps that he would have legislation introduced at a special session of the Legislature he has scheduled for July.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 6, 1969]

SENATE FURTHER DILUTES BLACK LUNG MEASURE—CONTESTED ISSUE STILL "UP IN AIR"

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—The State Senate Wednesday passed a "watered-down" version of a "black lung" compensation law, leaving the measure without the sought presumptive clause and the controversial issue still up in the air.

The Senate on a vote of 34–0 approved an even weaker version of the bill brought to the floor this week by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The committee earlier had emasculated a strong House of Delegates measure by diluting a presumptive clause and recommending X-ray diagnosis of the hard-to-identify disease.

The House will be asked to accede to the Senate amendments Thursday, but this may fail and the bill would go to a conference committee. Del. Robert Dinsmore, D-Monongalia, may get the chairmanship of the conference group.

Dinsmore, a freshman legislator, worked on a House Judiciary Subcommittee that came up with the bill containing a strong presumptive clause and no other requirements of proof of the disease. That bill, a blending of six measures submitted to the House, passed the lower body 95–0.

Sen. William Brotherton, D-Kanawha, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, guided the bill through the upper body Wednesday.

Brotherton had been sponsor of a bill supported by the West Virginia Black Lung Association, a lobby organized to push the legislation. He said the senators must choose between "social legislation" and laws based on "medical evidence." He said the House passed "social legislation."

The Senate accepted the amended version of the bill yesterday, only after an effort to pass the House bill—numbered 1040—without any differences. Sen. William Moreland, D-Monongalia, led this effort, which was beaten 28–5.

Then came the amendments. The most important allows methods other than x-rays to be used as proof of "black lung." But the definition of "black lung" in the bill itself requires x-ray proof.

Sources around the Capitol indicated that House members likely will push for their version of the "black lung" definition—which does not require an X-ray.

The same sources indicated there will be a fight by the delegates to put some type of presumptive clause back into the measure.

Action on the bill is expected to be quick, because the Legislature ends its regular session at midnight Saturday.

Rule suspensions on each side would make it possible to introduce, amend and approve the bill the same day. Normal processes require three days for action.

The Senate bill provides that pneumoconiosis must be diagnosed in any case and, if a person with that diagnosis has worked two of the previous 10 years in a mine, it is presumed he got the disease in his employment.

This was nearly identical to the House bill for that period, but the Senate did not go into the clear presumption after 10 years.

The Senate committee's definition of pneumoconiosis, claimed by the West Virginia Black Lung Association to restrict diagnosis specifically to X-rays, was amended.

As the bill passed, pneumoconiosis was defined as a disease of the lungs caused by inhalation of dust over a period of time which has produced pin-head or larger nodulation that can be identified by X-rays or "other medical evidence."

By comparison, Brotherton said the Senate bill "allows greater benefits" and contained no statute of limitation on reopening of claims after an initial award.

The judiciary chairman said afterward that he thought it was "a good bill," but said he expected the House to refuse to accept it—which would force it into conference committee.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 6, 1969]

HOW THEY VOTED

CHARLESTON.—Sen. Neal Kinsolving, R-Kanawha, Wednesday tried to amend the Senate Judiciary Committee's version of a "black lung" bill by striking it and inserting the strong House of Delegates bill in full.

The motion was defeated 28–5, and the Senate later adopted a "watered-down" version.

The five who voted for adoption of the tough House version were:

Sens. William Moreland, D-Morgantown; Neal A. Kinsolving, R.-Charleston; Robert K. Holiday, D.-Oak Hill; V. K. Knapp, R.-Hurricane; and William Tempas, D.-Weirton.

Voting against:

R. E. Barnett, D.-Bluefield; Theodore M. Bowers, R.-New Martinsville; John H. Bowling Jr., D.-White Sulphur Springs; William T. Brotherton Jr., D.-Charleston; Robert W. Burk Jr., R.-Vienna; John E. Carrigan, R.-Moundsville; Bernard L. Crawford, D.-Beckley; J. Frank Deem, R.-St. Marys; John Pat Fanning, D.-Iaeger; Noah E. Floyd, D.-Williamson; Carl E. Gainer, D.-Richmood; O. G. Hedrick, D.-Fairmont; Walter A. Holden, D.-Clarksburg; Chester R. Hubbard, R.-Wheeling; Tracy W. Hylton, D.-Mullens; J. Kenton Lambert, R.-Parsons; Clarence E. Martin Jr., D.-Martinsburg; E. Hans McCourt, D.-Webster Springs; C. H. McKown, D.-Wayne; Mario J. Palumbo, D.-Charleston; John T. Poffenbarger, R–Charleston; Ray E. Sawyers, D.-Hinton; Brad Sayer, R.-Gay; William Sharpe, Jr., D.-Weston; Lyle A. Smith, D.-Huntington; W. Bernard Smith, D.-Logan; Dallas Wolfe, R.-Rowelsburg; and Senate President Lloyd G. Jackson, D.-Hamlin.

Sen. John I. Rogers, R.-Keyser, was absent when the roll-call vote was taken.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 7, 1969]

POLICY EXPLAINED BY MCNUTT

CHARLESTON.—West Virginia University at Morgantown, the largest user of soft coal among state agencies, is the first government agency to feel the effect of the miner's work stoppage, Charles F. McNutt, director of the state purchasing division, said Thursday.

WVU arranged to have coal trucked in from Pennsylvania under an emergency purchase order, McNutt said.

The state official said he had not received reports from other government agencies which would indicate the need to make special purchase of coal.

The usual contract, McNutt said, does not penalize the vendor when he is unable to perform under the terms of his contract. Fire, floods and other natural hazards over which the vendor has no control are recognized as mitigating circumstances.

Strikes fall into that category, state officials said. "If the strike continues," McNutt said, "I expect to be faced with requests for emergency purchase orders from other state agencies."

Asked whether the state would turn to out-of-state coal companies for its coal as WVU did," McNutt said, "We'll probably arrange to buy it from non-union strip or truck mines in the state."

He said that such coal would be purchased at prevailing contract prices. In some cases, he added, it might be necessary to pay 10 percent more, particularly if the coal has to be brought in from another state.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 8, 1969]

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS, WIDOWS BACK BLACK LUNG BILL—TIMETABLE IMPERILS SAFETY PROPOSAL

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—West Virginia's soft coal miners drew support in the corridors of the State Capitol and the governor's office Friday from two different groups in their fight for liberalization of the state's workmen's compensation law.

About 60 West Virginia University students under the name "Emergency Black Lung Committee" joined miners at the Capitol lobbying for passage of a so-called black lung bill. Three women whose husbands died in the Mannington mine disaster last November also came to the Capitol.

Virtually all United Mine Workers of America members in the state have left the pits in a massive lobbying action in support of a measure initially proposed by the Black Lung Association. Hundreds of miners have been present at the Capitol daily since mid-February.

The number of miners, who started leaving their jobs Feb. 18, now numbers more than 40,000, according to spokesmen for the coal miners.

Spokesman for miners supporting the West Virginia Black Lung Association have vowed they will not return to work until the law is changed.

The House of Delegates last Friday passed an amended black lung bill including many of the provisions sought by the miners. The vote was 95–0.

On Wednesday the State Senate passed its version of a black lung bill by a 34–0 vote. The action came after the Senate rejected a move to replace its Judiciary Committee-written bill with the House-passed bill. The vote was 28-5, with one senator absent at the time of the roll call.

A joint Senate-House conference committee, comprised of five senators and five delegates, met three times Friday in an effort to reach agreement on differences between the two bills. Late Friday night it was reported that the conference had made no progress toward settlement of those differences.

House conferees are led by Del. Robert Dinsmore, D-Morgantown, and Senate conferees are under the chairmanship of Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D-Charleston.

The regular session of the Legislature comes to an end at midnight Saturday.

The black lung bill conference committee will resume its deliberations Saturday and many Capitol observers have expressed fear that it well may be in the last hour of the legislative session that the fate of the bill is known.

Although Governor Moore extended the current legislative session by three days the additional time can only be used for budgetary matters.

Key issues of contention before the conference committee surround the so-called presumptive clause and the definition of pneumoconiosis. The miners support the language contained in House Bill 1040 on these points.

Many members of the House regard these two points as the "guts" of the bill and have asked that their conferees not yield to the somewhat weaker Senate provisions.

The WVU students raised $600 on the campus Thursday to finance their 200-mile trip to Charleston. They paraded around the Capitol rotunda and outside the governor's office carrying signs in support of the black lung movement.

The three widows, Mrs. Sara L. Kaznoski, Mrs. Mary K. Rogers and Mrs. Nora Snyder had a brief meeting with Governor Moore. They also watched the Senate session.

They were introduced in the Senate by Sen. William A. Moreland, D-Morgantown, who said they were three women who since last November have become concerned about mine safety and health.

Seventy-eight men died in the explosions and fire inside the Mountaineer Coal Co. No. 9 mine at Mannington last November. The women's husbands are still entombed in the mine.

The governor told the women he stands for improved mine safety and health legislation. He said if the Legislature does not pass a satisfactory bill for black lung compensation, he would include it in his "call" to the Legislature at a planned special session in July.

It was learned that most, if not all, of the local unions of the United Mine Workers in Monongalia County will hold special meetings Sunday, concerning the present walkout.

Andrew Morris, UMW field representative, said he had received numerous calls from union members concerning future action to be taken by the locals regarding the black lung legislation before the Legislature.

The union representative said it would be necessary to wait for information from Charleston on the outcome of the pending legislation.

When this information is at hand, Morris said, the local unions will be able to consider their course of action.

Morris said he had told local union leaders that the membership would have to decide the future course of action.

While the fate of the black lung bill is argued by the Senate and House conferees, question arose over the passage of Senate Bill 301 by the House of Delegates.

Passed by the Senate Thursday, the bill sponsored by Sen. O. G. Hedrick, D-Fairmont, and Senate President Lloyd G. Jackson, D-Hamlin, provides for pay increases for mine safety instructors, mine inspectors, mine rescue teams and amends the existing mining law.

As of late Friday the Senate-passed bill had not yet arrived in the House. Several members of the House indicated that the bill might be killed in the legislative timetable.

Rules call for referral to a committee after it has been reported to the House. The committee would have to give its approval of the bill before it is placed on the first reading in the House.

Second and third readings could be waived, members said, but time would not allow a committee to act on the Senate bill and arrange for its printing so that every delegate would have a copy of the measure.

In addition to the increases in salary authorized in the bill, the measure would require that members of mine rescue teams be restricted to men who are 50 years of age or less.

The Hedrick-Jackson measure would reduce the length of service required prior to designation of a miner as a foreman. Present law requires five years experience in the mines. The bill would reduce the time to three years.

It also states that an applicant for a foreman's position in a gassy mine must have had prior experience in such a mine.

The Senate bill adds two safety measures to the existing law.

It calls for inspection of mine escapeways weekly. The present statute specifies that such inspections are to take place every two weeks.

The Hedrick-Jackson bill would require all unattended permanent belt conveyors to be equipped with automatic sprinkler systems as a fire protection measure.

The bill calls for new mine mapping procedures, including that mine maps be filed semi-annually.

Efforts made by Preston County's land surveyor to allow surveyors as well as engineers to make the maps was defeated by the Senate.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 9, 1969]

DELEGATE BLASTS MOORE AND QUITS

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—Del. John M. Bobbitt, a Huntington Republican and physician, Saturday night resigned as a member of the House of Delegates after a bitter attack on Gov. Arch Moore's tax policies and actions of the Legislature, including passage of the Black Lung bill.

Bobbitt charged that the Legislature, prodded by the Governor, had seen fit to double the tax on manufacturers again and that some legislators supported the move as a matter of political expediency.

When the House passed its black lung bill last Friday, Bobbitt was the only delegate voting against it. He changed his vote to "aye" after becoming the target of jeers from miners in the gallery.

"If the Governor dealt a blow to the solar plexus of the West Virginia economy, then the Legislature supplied its own karate punch when it acquiesced to the executive will," Bobbitt asserted.

The two-term delegate said the State had suffered a net loss of industrial jobs over the past two years as a result of its tax policy.

"This Legislature compounded the felony when it knuckled down before the onslaught of a somewhat hysterical special interest group," he said. "The hysteria generated by a mere handful of rabble rousers was enough to dictate policy to the House of Delegates. Equally frightening was the sight of a few delegates supposedly voting on a workmen's compensation bill, actually boasting of the bill as 'social legislation.'

"The fact that this House would capitulate so quickly has struck fear into the very heart of most industries. The psychological impact of our action may well be felt for many months to come."

Bobbitt told the House, "I find the philosophy and direction of current state government inconsistent with my own beliefs and ideals. My personal sense of intellectual honesty, my understanding of what is best for my native West Virginia are both in conflict with the events of these past few weeks."

He then put on his coat and walked out.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 9, 1969]

BLACK LUNG BILL PASSES WITH PRESUMPTIVE CLAUSE

(By Ray Martin)

CHARLESTON.—West Virginia has a black lung law with a presumption clause.

Acting 10 minutes before the final gavel would have fallen on the regular 60-day session of the Legislature at midnight Saturday, the State Senate accepted the conference report on the black lung bill and voted to enact it by a vote of 32-2.

Sens. Brad Sayre, R-Gay, William R. Sharpe, D-Weston, voted against the bill.

Sen. William T. Brotherton Jr., D-Charleston, chairman of the Senate conferees, said the bill was "not the best bill in the world" but it would benefit all those who suffer from pneumoconiosis.

"Many on strike may feel that they didn't get what they wanted," Brotherton said.

Sen. William A. Moreland, D-Morgantown, noting that time precluded a reading of the conference committee report, said he hoped that the people of West Virginia would recognize the effort as an improvement on existing law, "which has done many injustices."

He appealed to the miners to give the new law a chance to see if it solves the problems they have faced.

Moreland was one of five senators who had a fight in the Senate earlier this week to accept House Bill 1040 intact.

The bill authorizes a minimum of $26 weekly compensation for black lung or on industrial accidents and a maximum of 45 per cent of the average weekly wage of all state workers as computed annually. After July 1, 1970 the maximum would go up to 50 per cent with the same minimum.

This represents an increase from 43 per cent for 1969 in House Bill 1040. The maximum in 1970 would have gone to 47 per cent in HB 1040.

Approximately 30 minutes before the Senate acted, Del. Robert Dinsmore, D-Morgantown, appeared on the House floor to report the conferees had reconciled differences over Senate and House versions of the bill.

"The proposal which we now submit to the House will, in the opinion of your conferees, provide this state with the most progressive black lung legislation in the world," Dinsmore told the House.

He said the bill "will provide a strong foundation upon which we can build as time and necessity dictate."

There were only two major areas of disharmony, Dinsmore said. First, the presumption clause, which, as it stands now is substantially the same as the House bill; and, second, the definition of the disease of pneumoconiosis was modified to include all types of medical evidence.

The House voted 93-0 in accepting the bill. There were seven absentees.

In defining black lung, the conference committee said it must produce "pinhead or other nodulations or pathological or abnormal physiological change generally accepted by recognized specialists in the field of respiratory disease."

The new law says that x-ray evidence is not necessarily conclusive.

The presumption clause follows the Senate pattern and assumes the worker contracted the disease in the mines after he proves that he has it.

In a quick review of the bill Paul Kaufman, attorney for the West Virginia Black Lung Association, said the conference committee bill eleminated medical and hospital payments for persons suffering from black lung.

Coal miners will assemble in Beckley at 2 p.m. Sunday to review the bill and determine their future course of action.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 11, 1969]

NEW BLACK LUNG LAW EXPLAINED

(By Ray Martin)

In addition to recognizing coal workers' pneumoconiosis (black lung) as a compensable disease, amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act passed by the Legislature Saturday increased payments to all injured workers and their survivors and changed some practices in the administration of the state compensation program.

The act will take effect July 1. It awaits the signature of Gov. Arch A. Moore.

The new act includes occupational pneumoconiosis as an "injury" or "personal injury" within the meaning of the workmen's compensation law. However, workers must be employed by employers who are not delinquent in the payment of the premiums to the compensation fund in order to be eligible for compensation awards.

Compensation for black lung or death therefrom will not be paid unless the worker has been subjected to the black lung hazard in West Virginia "over a continuous period of not less than two years during the 10 years immediately preceding the date of his last exposure to such hazards."

Costs of the compensation award may be divided among the employers by whom the claimant was employed for as much as 60 days during the period of three years immediately preceding the filing of the application for compensation. The allocation will be based upon the time and degree of exposure with each employer.

The disease is described in the new act in this way:

"Pneumoconiosis is a disease of the lungs caused by the inhalation of minute particles of dust over a period of time which has produced pinhead or other nodulation or pathological or abnormal physiological change generally accepted by recognized specialists in the field of respiratory diseases as supporting a diagnosis of pneumoconiosis and which can be identified by X-rays or other medical evidence and a pnemoconiosis shall be considered to be an occupational pneumoconiosis when the pneumoconiosis results from causes and conditions arising out of and in the course of the employment."

The term "occupational pneumoconiosis" includes, but is not limited to such diseases as silicosis, anthraco-silicosis, coal worker's pneumoconiosis (commonly known as black lung or miner's asthma), silico-tuberculosis (silicosis accompanied by active tuberculosis of the lungs), coal worker's pneumoconiosis accompanied by active tuberculosis of the lungs, tuberculo-silicosis, asbestosis, siderosis, anthrax and any and all other dust diseases of the lungs meeting the definition of occupational pneumoconiosis.

The act specifies that X-ray evidence shall not necessarily be held conclusive insofar as it bears upon the absence or presence of occupational pneumoconiosis.

Workers who willfully expose themselves to the hazards of pneumoconiosis through failure to use protective devices or adherence to posted safety and health standards are disqualified as compensation recipients.

Operating under the premise that occupational pneumoconiosis is permanent disability and not subject to any kind of medical or surgical rehabilitation technique, the act specifically disallows any payments for medical, surgical, dental and hospital treatment. Other workers covered by the compensation program are entitled to such coverage.

The new act provides for the payment of funeral expenses not to exceed $750 if death results from a cause recognized by the act.

Benefits under the act are based on the average weekly wage of the individual worker and the average weekly wage paid all workers in West Virginia. The latter figure is compiled annually by the state employment commissioner.

Starting July 1, 1969, and continuing until July 1, 1970, the worker will get a minimum of $26 per week and a maximum weekly benefit computed on the basis of 66 and two-thirds per cent of his average weekly earnings not to exceed 45 per cent of the state's average weekly wage. After July 1, 1970, the maximum figure would be increased to 50 per cent of the state's average weekly wage. The minimum would remain at $26.

With the exception of occupational pneumoconiosis cases, the new act provides that when an award for temporary total disability is later changed to permanent partial disability only that amount of compensation paid in excess of 10 weeks shall be considered compensation under the new category.

Impairment of the employe's ability to function normally or to undergo normal prolonged exertion when compared with an average man of his age and like general physical condition may be considered in the determination of the employe's disability from occupational pneumoconiosis.

The bill passed earlier by the House of Delegates used the word "shall" where "may" appears in the paragraph above.

The present Silicosis Medical Board will be known as the Occupational Pneumoconiosis Board after July 1.

The so-called presumption clause in the act reads as follows:

"If it can be shown that the claimant or deceased employe has been exposed to the hazard of inhaling minute particles of dust in the course of and resulting from his employment for a period of 10 years during the 15 years immediately preceding the date of his last exposure to such hazard and that such claimant or deceased employe has sustained a medically diagnosable disease of the lungs consistent with a diagnosis of occupational pneumoconiosis, then it shall be presumed that such claimant or deceased employe is suffering from occupational pneumoconiosis which arose out of and in the course of his employment. This presumption shall not be conclusive."

The new act provides for an average increase of $10 a month in payments made to widows, surviving children and dependent parents.

Although rules applicable to joint Senate-House conferees preclude inclusion of any material not covered in the bills before them, this provision emerged in the bill which was passed by the Legislature Saturday:

"In computing benefits payable on account of occupational pneumoconiosis, the commissioner shall deduct the amount of all prior workmen's compensation benefits paid to the same claimant on account of silicosis, but a prior silicosis award shall not, in any event, preclude an award for occupational pneumoconiosis otherwise payable under this article."

The new act repealed a provision which allowed a first-stage silicosis award of $1,000. That award precluded any subsequent claim for the same disease.

Under the terms of the act, the compensation commissioner, the occupational Pneumoconiosis Board and the Occupational Diseases Medical Board shall submit a report to the governor in September each year. Based on facts available as of the preceding June 30, the report is to include a statement of the causes of the injuries for which compensation awards were made, an explanation of the diagnostic techniques used by the respective medical boards and all examining physicians to determine the presence of disease and the extent of impairment attributed to the disease.

The annual report must contain a description of the scientific support for the techniques used by the various doctors and technicians. It must also contain a summary of public and private research relating to problems and prevention of occupational diseases.

The reports, which are to be made available to the Legislature and the public, will also include a detailed statement of all disbursements, and the condition of the compensation fund, together when any specific recommendation for improvements in the workmen's compensation law and for more efficient and responsive administration of the law.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar 11, 1969]

UMW JOURNAL SEEKS MORE U.S. RESEARCH

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The latest issue of the United Mine Workers Journal carries a plea for additional taxpayer funds for the Office of Coal Research, continues its attack on UMWA critics, and announces publication of a pamphlet on 'black lung.'

Joseph P. Brennan, UMWA's Research and Marketing Department director, notes that the Office of Coal Research will get $13,300,000 in the fiscal year starting July 1, 1970. This amount represents a decrease from $13,700,000 in the current fiscal year.

"It is apparent to all that the Office of Coal Research (OCR) and with it the federal research program for the coal industry has come to a moment of truth," Brennan said.

"If the budget for 1970 is any indication of the future, it is evident that OCR has arrived at a crisis!" he declared.

Six "facts" were listed by Brennan to underscore his contention of a "research crisis in coal." They were:

"Fact 1. The OCR budget has not grown to any degree for the past several years. Instead, the office has been forced to witness a cutback in funds and the elimination of worthwhile projects."

"Fact 2. As the funding has stagnated, the available money has become more and more concentrated into a relatively few projects. For the coming fiscal year, for example, five projects will receive a total of $11.5 million, or 86 per cent of the entire OCR budget.

"Fact 3. Because of the lid on spending, OCR has not been able to carry through on several promising projects that have been proven in the laboratory, but now require pilot plants to demonstrate commercial feasibility.

"Fact 4. Little new money has been available to seek out and contract for research in areas of immediate concern to the coal industry, or of long-range significance to the national welfare. When the money needed to administer OCR for fiscal 1970 is added to the $11.5 million for the five major projects mentioned above, only a little more than $1 million is left to carry on the current pre-pilot plant work of OCR and begin on other promising research programs of potential value.

"Fact 5. The budget squeeze has precluded extensive OCR work in many areas, including improved methods of electric generation, research in the field of health and safety, and a program aimed at reducing the adverse environmental impact caused by the consumption of coal.

"Fact 6. Because OCR functions by contact research, the lack of funds has driven away from OCR many research organizations which could, if funding were available, lend their talents to further the attainment of the mandate given to OCR by Congress."

Brennan then spells out the role of coal in relation to other sources of energy and concludes his thesis in these words:

"In any event, there has developed a technology crisis in the coal industry, a crisis which threatens to undercut the economic position of coal and the ability of the industry to meet the needs of American people in the years ahead. We suggest that an early resolution of this crisis is in the interest of not only the coal industry, but all of the American people. We also suggest that the funds appropriated from the Federal Treasury for coal research will return to that Treasury many times the investment and that the real winners will be the American people, who in the final analysis pay all of the bills.

"So it is, that this is in many ways a year of decision for coal. Certainly, all those with an interest in coal must strive to secure for OCR a level of funding consistent with the congressional mandate to that Office and also consistent with potential inherent in the vast coal reserves that underlie our great nation," Brennan said.

Rex Lauck, assistant Journal editor, wrote:

"On this page is an article by the UMWA's Director of Research and Marketing, Joseph P. Brennan, about the crisis in coal research. We urge our 'instant experts' to read this article. Research money for coal mine health and safety is badly needed."

The Journal's editorial page announces publication of a pocket-sized pamphlet on "Black Lung—the facts on the crippling dust disease—coal workers' pneumoconiosis—and what can be done about it." Copies of the 22-page booklet, which were distributed to congressional offices, are available by writing to the Journal's editor.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 13, 1969]

CONGRESSMAN WANTS APOLOGY FROM BOYLE, UMW CHIEF

(By Ray Martin)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., has demanded an immediate apology from W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, for an erroneous quotation appearing in the March 1 issue of UMW Journal. The Huntington Democrat also asked for an opportunity to present his views on health and safety legislation in a future issue of the Journal as well as having the Journal reprint an April, 1959, magazine article from which the quotation was reportedly taken.

He also called for a moratorium on personal attacks.

In a speech on the floor of the House, Hechler said:

"Someone has been caught redhanded. The United Mine Workers Journal issue of March 1, 1969, contains an article which purportedly quotes statements that I allegedly made. These alleged quotations are a completely false and total fabrication.

"The UMW Journal states that it obtained the quotations from a 'friend with a long memory and a good filing system.' I believe that this 'friend' ought to have the guts to step forward and identify himself.

"If it is true that he works on Capitol Hill, I pity the office in which he works because that kind of memory and that kind of filing system would produce complete chaos within a congressional office. I doubt whether he has the intestinal fortitude to identify himself.

"The UMW Journal article purports to quote from the April, 1959, issue of Pageant magazine which included a story on 'How to Get Elected to Congress.' The Pageant magazine article does contain some quotes from me which are my '10 rules for campaigns,' including such items as: Pay attention to the average person, be true to your own personality, be constructive and campaign cleanly, turn every attack on you into an asset—couple an immediate answer with your own constructive approach to the problem.

"The UMW Journal states without qualification that what I said in April 1959, was: first you pop off to get attention regardless of the merit of your ideas. Then you pose as the champion of the average man against the interests. The truth of your statement or the merit of your argument has nothing to do with your response or your conduct."

The West Virginia congressman, who has been in the forefront of the campaign for better mine safety and health legislation, told his House colleagues:

"In its desperate efforts to discredit me because of my fight for coal mine health and safety legislation, the UMW Journal has falsely fabricated ideas which I have never expressed, never entertained or ever dreamed of. The enormity of this deliberate attempt to defame my character is clearly apparent from the following text of the telegram which I have sent to W. A. Boyle."

At the conclusion of his remarks, Hechler introduced the copy of the UMW Journal article written by Rex Lauck, assistant Journal editor; the 1959 Pageant article written by Howard Cohn, along with statements made in the Congress by Sens. John F. Kennedy, Hubert H. Humphrey and Estes Kefauver. The various documents were ordered printed in the Congressional Record.

The text of Hechler's telegram to Boyle was as follows:

"Page 13 of the March 1, 1969, issue of the UMW Journal contains a false and malicious article signed by Rex Lauck and entitled 'Ken Hechler's Credo is Revealed.' This article purports to quote what are alleged to be 'Hechler's own ideas' as allegedly expressed in the April, 1959, issue of Pageant magazine. The UMW Journal article concludes: 'That explains much about how this man Hechler operates. Shades of Joe McCarthy!'

"I trust that you are aware of the fact that the article in the UMW Journal is worded in such a fashion as to be designed to defame my character. Thousands of readers of the Journal, including a large number in my Congressional District, are being fed these deliberately falsified statements which bear no resemblance whatsoever to anything I said in the Pageant article, or anything I have either said or thought before or since the appearance of this article.

"Even if you should remove the direct quotation remarks and present this material as a paraphrase instead of an allegedly direct quote, the entire article in the Journal is false, malicious and designed to defame my character.

"I trust you do not condone the printing of such malicious misinformation by a man listed on the masthead of the Journal as 'assistant editor.'

"I demand an immediate apology for this false quotation, attribution and characterization in the article, and the opportunity to present my views on health and safety legislation in a future issue of the Journal as well as a reprint of the April, 1959, Pageant article.

"The cause of health and safety legislation is far bigger than any personal differences which may have arisen between us. We cannot afford to continue to divide the forces supporting effective action to clean up the coal mines, protect the safety of thousands of coal miners and prevent the occurrence of black lung.

"We must seek out and welcome new recruits in this fight instead of condemning those who may not have carried the battle as long as others.

"Only through the aroused conscience of millions of Americans can effective legislation and a sound administration be obtained. Over 40,000 coal miners in West Virginia alone are determined to obtain the protection they have failed to enjoy, and without which they will continue to suffer the risk of being burned, buried, crushed or gassed.

"I appeal to you to declare a moratorium on these personal attacks and issue a call for all forces to join in a cooperative effort to win the fight still ahead of us."

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Mar. 14, 1969]

DR. ZINN OUTLINES FUNCTION OF CENTER

(By Ray Martin)

Dr. Raymond D. Zinn, U.S. Public Health Service Officer named as director of the Appalachian Center for Environmental Health, visualizes the new center here as "playing a vital role in the future health and environmental happiness of all the people of Appalachia."

Appointed to the post by the Environmental Control Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Zinn was in Morgantown to consult with Dr. James G. Harlow, West Virginia University president, and Dr. Charles E. Andrews, WVU provost for health sciences.

The 46-year-old native of Cairo, Ritchie County, expects to take up residence here sometime in April and just prior to the time when ground is scheduled to be broken for the new federal facility which will adjoin the WVU Medical Center.

A 1948 graduate of WVU, Dr. Zinn received his DVM degree summa cum laude from Ohio State University in 1957.

Dr. Zinn joined the U.S. Public Health Service in 1959. That career with the PHS includes two years service as epidemic intelligence officer at the National Communicable Diseases Center, Atlanta, Ga.

In 1961 he was assigned to the National Heart Institute at Bethesda, Md.

For the past six years he has been assigned to the Division of Research Services at the National Institutes of Health. During the last two years he has been chief of laboratory aids branch at NIH.

In this capacity, Dr. Zinn has been responsible for central support of all intramural research programs at NIH. He has previously assisted in the establishment of research facilities operating on a national basis.

Dr. Zinn will not be in control of the scientific aspect of the new center's programs. Each phase of the program's mission, he said, will have its own scientific chief.

His prime mission at the moment is to get the center operational at the earliest possible date. Construction is due to start within a few weeks and is scheduled for completion in 1971.

The center will be concerned with identification and resolution of human problems resulting from the interplay between man and the various facets of Appalachian environment.

Particular emphasis will be placed on health related studies in human ecology, Dr. Zinn said.

The center will, in cooperation with universities, state and local agencies, carry out research in epidemiological investigations and ecological studies to provide a clearer definition of the immediate and direct effect of environmenal conditions of health. Also of concern to the center will be the indirect and long-range effects of environmental conditions on health.

The new federal facility will direct services and provide technical assistance, including training, to the people of the region

XUM

relative to effective means of controlling environmental factors in Appalachia.

Current programs scheduled for the new center include studies of work-related respiratory diseases of coal miners, improved water supplies, solid waste disposal, community and recreational area sanitation, housing hygiene and injury control.

Dr. Zinn looks forward to the challenge which the new center will provide.

The native West Virginian has an intense desire to make a contribution to the future health of West Virginians as well as all the people who live in Appalachia.

As he puts it, it is not just enough to make sure that a man has a healthy, clean environment in which to work eight hours a day. If he goes home to a place which is just the direct opposite of the work environment, it negates the progress made in work conditions because he spends 16 hours a day in the lesser environment.

"Great emphasis has been placed on men living longer," Dr. Zinn said. "But what good is this longer life if man can't be healthy and happy?" he asked.

The Appalachian Laboratory for Occupational Respiratory Diseases (ALFORD) which is now located in space provided by WVU will be but one of the center's units. It will expand its research on black lung and other respiratory ailments, Dr. Zinn said.

He is married to the former Mary Mann of Renick and the couple have an eight-year-old son.

The center will be built on land adjacent to WVU's Medical Center and which was turned over to the federal government for this purpose.

When fully operational, it will have a staff of 200 research and administrative health personnel.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News, Mar. 16, 1969]

LEGISLATURE IGNORES MINE BILLS: 33 PROPOSALS INTRODUCED

(By Ray Martin)

Thirty-one bills and two resolutions relative to mining, mine safety and health and operations of the state department of Mines were introduced in the 1969 session of the 59th Legislature.

Of the lot, six bills ultimately cleared the hurdles posed by the State Senate and House of Delegates and wound up on Gov. Arch A. Moore Jr.'s desk.

Provisions of 10 bills, four in the Senate and six in the House, were used in one form or another to provide the basis for House Bill 1040, fashioned by the House Judiciary Committee, the so-called "black lung" bill, which has been signed into law by the governor.

Del. Robert W. Dinsmore, D-Morgantown, as chairman of House conferees on the bill, played a key role in obtaining favorable action on the legislation in the final hour of the regular session of the Legislature a week ago. Sen. William D. Moreland, D-Morgantown, was a staunch advocate of the House measure in the State Senate.

A measure introduced by Sen. O. G. Hedrick, D-Fairmont, increasing the salary scale of the supervising oil and gas inspector from a range of $5,000–$8,000 to $7,000–$11,000 has been signed by the governor. The bill also increased the pay of the regular oil and gas inspectors from a range of $5,600–$7,400 to $6,000–$9,400.

A bill sponsored by Senator Hedrick and Sen. Walter A. Holden, D-Clarksburg, has been vetoed by Governor Moore. It would have made the provisions of the state's mining laws applicable to surface mines and would have authorized the director of the Department of Mines to promulgate rules and regulations applicable to such mines.

The Hedrick-Holden proposal included this provision: "Any surface mining supervisor and surface mining inspectors who were on permanent tenure June 30, 1967, shall be reinstated under such tenure without being required to take an examination.

Sen. J. Frank Deem, R-St. Marys, sponsored a bill to increase the salary of the deputy director for oil and gas. It was sent to the governor's desk for signature.

Senator Hedrick joined Sen. Lloyd G. Jackson, D-Hamlin, the Senate president in sponsorship of another measure which found its way to Governor Moore's desk.

This measure provided for increases in the salaries of mine safety instructors, mine inspectors, mine rescue team members and electrical inspectors.

The Hedrick-Jackson bill defined "return air," required that persons examining gassy mines be certified, required that a mine foreman in a gassy mine have had previous experience in a gassy mine, changed the qualifications for a fire boss, required that escapeways be inspected weekly, permitted men and mine cars to share the same cage lift during the development of a new mine, and required the filing of mine maps showing the status of the mine as of Jan. 1 and July 1 each year.

The sixth bill sent to the governor spells out regulations for oil and gas drilling.

The Senate let a House Concurrent Resolution die which would have directed the Joint Committee on Government and Finance to make a study into the need and desirability of amending the laws of the state relating to health and safety of persons employed in underground coal mines. It was killed in the Senate Rules Committee.

Del. William J. Parker, D-Fairmont, introduced a House resolution to create a special committee to investigate causes of the Mountaineer Coal Co. disaster last November and to determine if mining laws need strengthening. It was killed in the House Judiciary Committee and its chairman, Del. J. E. Ned Watson, D-Fairmont, said that the House Concurrent Resolution, which was later killed in the Senate, would extend beyond adjournment of the Legislature. The simple resolution, he said, would lose its effect with adjournment.

A bill which would require trust funds, such as the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, to submit to the jurisdiction of West Virginia courts passed the House. It died in the Senate Rules Committee. It had been introduced by Del. Warren McGraw, D-Pineville.

Two bills which would have eliminated the immunity against legal action which employers now have in workmen's compensation cases died in House and Senate committees.

Also killed in committees of the two houses of the Legislature were two bills which would have imposed a 10-cent per ton tax on coal to pay the cost of benefits to persons contracting occupational respiratory diseases.

Several bills giving the director of the state Department of Mines authority to promulgate rules affecting safety and health died in committees.

Del. Robert Nelson, D-Huntington, introduced a bill creating a Division of Mines and Minerals in the State Department of Labor and transferring present Department of Mines functions to it. The bill was killed in committee.

Also killed in committees were proposals which would have required mine foremen and section foremen to examine all working places in a mine at least once during each coal-producing shift. When certain dangerous conditions were found during such inspections, the foreman would have to remove employes from the area and the workers would lose no pay because of their inability to work.

The bill would have prohibited the employer from firing the foreman for carrying out the action called for in the proposed law.

One bill, which died in committee, in addition to granting the Department of Mines director rule making power, would have:

Prohibited the transportation of employes on conveyor belts. And specified that no conveyor belts be in excess of 500 feet and that a series of belts would be permitted only under specific criteria.

Required methane gas readings at 15-minute intervals where machinery is used at the face of a mine.

Required reversible fans as part of the ventilating system.

Established specific rock dusting criteria.

Required that all motors and electrical appliances be totally enclosed and explosion proof and display the U.S. Bureau of Mines permissibility seal.

Required that where roof bolting near the face is impractical, timbers or light hydraulic jacks would have to be installed to protect the miners.

Required that no mining machine be approved in the future which doesn't provide an automatic canopy of armor plate to protect the machine and the workers who use it.

Required that automatic recording barometers be installed in the offices of the mine superintendent, ventilation engineer, and mine manager and that all mine officials be notified when barometric pressure falls two-tenths inch in a two-hour period and if the pressure drops three-tenths of an inch in a three-hour period all underground employes are to be evacuated.

Required that respirable dust in each mine not exceed three milligrams per cubic meter of air.

Required that no transportation moving in excess of three miles an hour be used unless approved by the Department of Mines director in writing.

Required that an adequate cache of canned foods and water be provided for emergency use in the immediate vicinity of each mine telephone.

Required escape holes of at least 30 inches in diameter be drilled at the rate of 10 per square mile or one for each 64 acres of the mine and appropriately recorded on a map filed with the Department of Mines.

Required that each mine operator provide at least two complete sets of oxygen equipment and assure the presence of two persons trained to use such equipment with each operating section of each shift.

Established a method for bleeding off methane gas.

Required that the existing communication system of each mine be augmented by drilling communication holes into short openings off from the main arteries of the mine that there be at least 25 such communication holes within each square mile of the mine; that two spare spools of two-wire lines each shall be stored in a protected place near each communication hole and that all such communication holes be connected with the outside central at least quarterly for testing by actual use.

A separate bill calling for the establishment of telephone or other communications system in the mines was passed by the House and defeated in the Senate.

CREDIT INVESTIGATIONS AND PRIVACY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, since the hearings held by our Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the Committee on Government Operations

XUM

in March and May of 1968, nationwide attention has been directed toward the practices and procedures of credit bureaus and credit reporting organizations. Influencing as they do the life of every American, such business intelligence firms are a vital segment of the American society as well as essential contributors to the prosperity of the American economy. It was their pervasive impact on our people which was the basic reason why my colleagues on the House Committee on Government Operations and I determined to bring congressional investigative tools to bear on these organizations which had received little, if any, public scrutiny.

Since our hearings, the credit bureau industry itself prepared their "Credit Bureau Guidelines to Protect Consumer Privacy." I was pleased to announce this important step of self-policing and self-regulation on January 13, 1969. While there may be some questions about the content of the guidelines and some legitimate concern about how effective the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., will be in enforcing compliance within the credit bureau industry, I feel that they represented a promising first step. As is widely known, the wheels of legislative machinery grind slowly; the guidelines provide the consumer with some protection now.

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important results of our credit industry investigations has been to generate increased public concern and knowledge. This has not only taken the form of newspaper and magazine articles; business intelligence firms and the social and constitutional questions they pose are the topic of academic interest as well. Today, for example, I received a first-rate treatment of the legal issues involved in the actions of credit bureaus and credit reporting firms. Volume 57, No. 3 of the Georgetown Law Journal contains an extensive student note entitled "Credit Investigations and the Right to Privacy: Quest for a Remedy." This discussion of the question of privacy in the context of the activities of commercial firms was chosen by the executive board of the Georgetown Law Journal as the outstanding student work of the year.

And outstanding it is. It is an excellent overview of the legal issues involved and provides a valuable source of research for those of us in the U.S. Congress, members of State legislatures around the country, and Americans whose lives can be adversely affected by errors in or misuses of credit reports.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased I was able to be of assistance in the preparation of this important work. I am delighted to enter the covering letter from the editor of the Georgetown Law Journal and the splendid student note into the RECORD at this point:

THE GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL,
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1969.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of the Georgetown Law Journal in which the article on Credit Investigations and the Right to Privacy was published. I personally consider it an important contribution to both the Journal and to an understanding of this very real social and legal problem. As a note of interest, the executive board of the Law Journal recently attested to its quality by voting it the outstanding student work of the year.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for your valuable cooperation and assistance in the preparation of the article. It certainly would have been difficult, if not impossible, to have produced a work of such quality without your help.

Again, I express my thanks for the interest you have shown in the Journal.

Sincerely,

HARRY J. STEVENS III,
Editor in Chief, Volume 58.

NOTES—CREDIT INVESTIGATIONS AND THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY: QUEST FOR A REMEDY

The United States, according to a current aphorism, has a credit-based economy,[1] and social commentators are predicting that the cash transaction will soon join the bald eagle as a vanishing American breed.[2] The phenomenal increase in both consumer installment credit[3] and the element of risk which accompanies the grant of a loan or the issuance of a credit card has fostered the growth of organizations which collect information on credit applicants. These credit bureaus and credit reporting agencies compile data on an individual's[4] financial standing, his personal life, or both. They have files on over 100 million individuals and write an additional 100 million credit reports each year.[5] The pervasive reach of the credit investigation business provoked one critic to make this observation: "If your name is not in the records of at least one credit bureau, it doesn't mean that you don't rate. What it does mean is that you are either under twenty-one or dead."[6] Despite the potential, and present, threats to privacy[7] inherent in the credit bureau industry, it is as yet virtually unregulated[8] and has managed to retain an almost complete anonymity. This Note will examine the procedures used by the credit industry to gather information, analyze their legal shortcomings, evaluate possible judicial remedies, and suggest workable legislative controls.

THE SETTING

The subscribers to credit bureau services include not only credit grantors such as oil companies and department stores, but also insurance companies and landlords.[9] A particular subscriber, before deciding whether to extend credit, write an insurance policy, or lease an apartment, will request a report from the bureau. A typical credit report contains the applicant's name, address, marital status, bank references, and a notation of his bill-paying habits.[10] It may also contain information about his employment history, present salary, approximate bank balance, a record of loans, mortgages, installment purchases, and charge accounts, as well as legal involvements including arrests, law suits, divorces, and bankruptcies.[11] Some reports, especially those on insurance applicants, may comment on the individual's character, his reputation in the community, and even his drinking habits.[12]

The information contained in a report is drawn from many sources; much of it may already be in the bureau's files.[13] Many bureaus systematically collect data on arrests, lawsuits, and divorce petitions from newspapers and court records.[14] Other public records may also be checked and an independent investigation conducted. The latter might include contacting the applicant's bank, his employer, and perhaps his neighbors.[15] Information from all these sources is coordinated by the bureau and reported to the subscriber for a fee which ranges from as little as $.22 to $25 or more depending on the type and quantity of information required.[16]

The information gathering and reporting process raises two problems. The first is one of accuracy. Reports may contain errors of identification,[17] and the information may be incomplete, misleading,[18] or simply false. While arrests, lawsuits, and convictions are collected systematically,[19] settlements and dismissed charges are often unreported;[20] and, if a claim is disputed, it is unlikely that the credit bureau will remove the "no pay" evaluation or allow the subject to present his side of the story.[21] Furthermore, the informational sources may be biased.[22] This problem is most acute in insurance investigations by firms which rely on hearsay statements from neighbors and other associates of the applicant for much of the information in their reports.[23] Damaging inaccuracies caused by these shortcomings, as well as accurate information which no longer has any relevance, may remain in a person's file indefinitely.[24]

The problem of inaccuracies is compounded because the person who is refused credit or insurance is usually not given a reason for the rejection of his application or even told that he was investigated.[25] Most contracts between credit bureaus and their subscribers state that all information shall be held in confidence and that the identity of the reporting agency shall not be revealed to the subject of the report.[26] If a credit applicant is fortunate enough to learn of the existence of a report on him and the name of the reporting agency, the bureau may apprise him, in a general sense, of the cause of his failure to obtain credit. In most instances, however, he will not be allowed to examine the record and check its accuracy.[27]

The second major problem in credit bureau investigations is the invasion of privacy. While the subjects of these reports have little or no access to them, the information can apparently be obtained quite easily by others.[28] Most credit bureaus do require a legitimate business reason before making a report;[29] however, they seem to be singularly lax in investigating their prospective customers.[30] Employees of the credit bureau[31] or of its subscribers are another source of information leakage. Although the subscriber contracts to keep its information confidential, strict control is almost impossible.[32] Moreover, access to credit bureau files is not restricted to the agency's employees. Local police and federal investigators are usually permitted to examine the records[33] and some federal agencies, acting in their capacity as credit grantors, deal directly with credit bureaus.[34]

In addition to the dangers of undue publication, the type of information that is obtained may itself constitute a threat to privacy. Although reports are usually restricted to items such as credit standing and public record information, they may also comment on an applicant's morals, sexual behavior, emotional stability, mental health, or drinking habits.[35] This information is obviously highly volatile and extremely on hearsay, it can easily be incorrect or misleading. Such data extends far beyond the public record stage and should place a heavy burden of trust and responsibility on credit investigators.

JUDICIAL REMEDIES

Accuracy

Despite the scope and nature of credit investigations and the serious inaccuracies or misinformation they may produce, the individual who is the subject of a credit report is all but unprotected in most jurisdictions. Most of the actions against credit bureaus are liberal suits;[36] they are seldom successful, however, because the majority

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

view is that a report by a credit bureau to a particular subscriber whose legitimate business interests are involved or appear to be involved is conditionally privileged.[37] Thus in the absence of malice, the subject of the report has no cause of action against the credit bureau, regardless of the falsity of the report.[38] The basis for the privilege is that the credit bureau is performing a necessary and useful business which benefits those who have a legitimate interest in the report.[39]

The privilege is only conditional, however, and may be lost in several ways. The bureau loses the privilege if it releases the report to the general public or to disinterested as well as interested subscribers.[40] The rationale for this exception is that the publication of defamatory material by a business for profit can be upheld solely on the ground of public convenience. Individual rights should not be made subservient to business exigencies more than is necessary to satisfy reasonable public interests. These public interests are "adequately served by extending the immunity of privileged communications only so far as to embrace communications to subscribers who have special interest in the information." [41] The definition of an "interested subscriber" is vague, however, and a superficial inquiry into the subscriber's motives will apparently insulate the credit bureau from liability.[42]

The qualified privilege is also vitiated if the statement is made with malice. Most courts interpret this as express or actual malice and thus require a showing of bad faith, ill will, or other improper motive.[43] The burden is on the plaintiff to prove both the falsity of the statement and that it was made with express malice.[44] A few courts hold that the privilege is lost if a report is made with a wanton and reckless disregard of the rights of another.[45] Another minority view is that the privilege is abused if the credit bureau makes a statement which it asserts to be true when it lacks probable cause or reasonable grounds for believing the truth of the statement.[46] A similar due care requirement has been laid down in several other cases,[47] but the majority of courts reject it [48] and hold that negligence will not destroy the privilege.[49]

The consequence of the present state of the case law is that the consumer is given almost no protection while the credit bureau has an all but absolute immunity. Malice rarely exists, and when it does, it is difficult to prove. A court seeking to give the subject of a report a more substantial remedy could profit from a study of cases which have denied the privilege where there were no reasonable grounds or probable cause for a credit bureau to believe the truth of a statement in a report,[50] where the credit bureau had not used due care in the collection of information,[51] or where the report had been substantially different from the information gathered.[52] Courts could also hold to a stricter definition of "interested subscriber" and deny the privilege if the credit bureau releases a report to a person who it knows has no proper interest [53] or if it fails to make an adequate investigation to confirm the interest.

Perhaps both the public interest and that of the subjects of the reports would best be protected by a denial of the qualified privilege altogether. The reasoning of two early cases which denied the privilege completely seems more valid today than the rationale of the most recent cases which have affirmed it. In *Pacific Packing Co. v. Bradstreet Co.*,[54] the court held that the only just and safe rule was one that would place a penalty on falsehood. The court believed that "the company that goes into the business of selling . . . reports about others should assume the responsibility for its acts, and must be sure that it is peddling the truth." [55] The reasoning behind the denial of the qualified privilege in Great Britain, first expressed in *MacIntosh v. Dun*,[56] is even more compelling: "Then comes the real question: Is it in the interest of the community, is it for the welfare of society, that the protection which the law throws around communications made in legitimate self-defense, or from a bona fide sense of duty, should be extended to communications made from motives of self-interest by persons who trade for profit in the characters of other people?" [57]

There is little modern precedent for holding credit bureaus liable for negligent misstatements.[58] The few courts that do allow an action for the negligent misuse of language also require privity of contract,[59] although a few have implied that liability may be found when there is a relationship that creates a duty to inform correctly. This relationship usually exists when there is reliance by the plaintiff and a foreseeability of harm if the information is false.[60] The plaintiff in a recent case [61] attempted to hold a credit reporting agency liable for a false report that she and her son were business partners. While recognizing the general rule that there is no liability for negligent misstatements, the court held that the defendant had some duty of care to the plaintiff since it knew that reports would be acted upon by its subscribers. This seeming departure from earlier precedent was negated, however, by the court's conclusion that the company still retained the qualified privilege defense.[62]

Despite contrary decisional authority, public policy would be better served if credit bureaus were held to a standard of negligence, or even strict liability. Although the typical credit contract contains a disclaimer of accuracy,[63] credit reports are taken at their face value by subscribers and the risk of harm from mistakes and misstatements is obvious. A policy decision must be made and, as the English rule explains,[64] there is a greater social value in denying the privilege.[65]

Since denial of the privilege would make credit bureaus strictly liable for defamatory statements, courts might be reluctant to take this approach. They should not balk, however, at finding liability for negligent misstatements. Because proving negligence is extremely difficult for the subject of a credit investigation, a false or misleading report should create a presumption of negligence which could be rebutted by a showing that the credit bureau had used some care in the collection and transmittal of the information. For example, the bureau could show that it had clarified hearsay information from public records if this were possible, that it had made a followup investigation into the results of lawsuits and arrests, either from public records or the parties themselves, and that it had transmitted the information correctly. While this remedy may seem harsh, it would afford greater protection for the subjects of credit reports and ensure more accurate information. The credit bureaus would not be able to complain of any resultant increases in their expenses since they would undoubtedly pass them on to the credit grantors in the form of an increased fee and then to the consumer as a higher interest rate or service charge. Thus, in the final analysis, the public would pay so that each of its members might be protected.

The danger of inaccurate data could be lessened if investigatees were given access to their files to correct mistakes and distortions before the information is disseminated among credit grantors and insurance companies. No effective method is presently available to compel such access,[66] and credit investigators are reluctant to grant it voluntary [67] Adoption by the Judiciary of Professor Alan Westin's suggestion [68] that personal information be treated as a property right, with all its due process implications, would alleviate this problem. Due process requires that protected rights cannot be infringed without such notice and opportunity to be heard as is "appropriate to the nature of the case." [69] If personal information were to be considered a property right protected as "fundamental" [70] under the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment, credit and insurance investigators would probably be compelled to notify the investigatee that an investigation is about to be commenced, allowing him to state his objections to particular types of inquiries about to be undertaken, and giving him a chance to correct or at least note his objections to particular items contained in the final report.

Treating personal information as a constitutionally protected property right is not a wholly novel concept. Courts have traditionally held that the personal information in bank records is to be treated as a "property right" of the depositor and is to be protected accordingly.[71] Moreover, while it is true that cases arising under the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment have not involved the "taking" of "personal information," [72] it is also true that courts once believed that the fourth amendment was limited to searches and seizures of physical property and rebuked attempts to extend its protection to nonphysical property—that is, evidence obtained by wiretapping and eavesdropping.[73] In *Silverman v. United States*,[74] however, the Supreme Court became aware of the extreme invasions of privacy wrought by the growing sophistication of electronic eavesdropping devices [75] and extended the protection of the fourth amendment to oral statements.[76] This expansion of the fourth amendment concept of property was a reaction to technological advancements unforeseen by the drafters of the Constitution. Similarly, the steady growth of computerized credit and insurance investigating bureaus [77] would seem to justify a further expansion of protected "property" rights.[78]

The foregoing constitutional argument for compelling the granting of access to credit files rests on an assumption that the requirements of "state action" under the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment [79] could be satisfied. To constitute state action, the involvement of the state need neither be direct nor exclusive.[80] In *Evans v. Newton*,[81] the Supreme Court noted the difficulty in distinguishing state action and private action: "What is 'private' action and what is 'state' action is not always easy to determine. . . . Conduct that is formally 'private' may become so entwined with governmental policies or so impregnated with a governmental character as to become subject to the constitutional limitations placed upon state action." [82] A "private" organization which is regulated or otherwise significantly involved with the government may become so "entwined with governmental policies" or "so impregnated with a governmental character" as to be treated as a state for the purposes of the fourteenth amendment.[83] Since insurance companies are heavily regulated by state authorities,[84] their activities are arguably state action.[85] Furthermore, an investigating agency is generally considered the "agent" of its client; [86] thus, an insurance investigating agency could likewise be held subject to the fourteenth amendment's due process limitations.[87] Whether a credit investigating agency would be held subject to constitutional limitations under this theory would, of course, depend upon whether the state was sufficiently involved in the client's business.

Likewise, it may be argued that failure to regulate credit or insurance investigating agencies [88] amounts to state inaction clothing these agencies with a measure of state authority sufficient to satisfy the fourteenth amendment.[89] It is also suggested that a corporate credit or insurance investigating

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

agency may be held to be "acting as a state" when its activities become so extensive and so intrusive as to take on a quasi-governmental character.[90] Although none of these theories of state action have ever been applied to the precise situation under discussion, the rapid expansion of the concept[91] has brought such a result well into the realm of possibility.[92]

Privacy

The right to privacy[93] has been defined as a legal concept of the power of an individual to determine the extent to which another individual or group may obtain his ideas, writings, or other indicia of his personality; obtain or reveal information about him; and intrude into his life space.[94] Inherent in this definition are two significant problems, both of which arise in a credit investigation context. One is the release of information to persons who have no legitimate business interest in it; the other is the collection of information of a highly personal nature.[95] These problems have no relation to the truth or falsity of a report, but are intimately tied to the concept of a right to privacy.

While a remedy for the first problem, the distribution of information to persons other than credit grantors, might seem to be available in the cases which have allowed a cause of action for the publication of private facts about the plaintiff,[96] this line of attack has two drawbacks. First, publicity is a prerequisite; publication of a private fact to a plaintiff's employer[97] or to a small group of people[98] is not an invasion of privacy. Second, the fact must be private; matters of public record, such as birth or marriage dates,[99] or military records,[100] are not protected. Furthermore, as in all privacy actions, the invasion must be offensive to ordinary sensibilities.[101]

These limitations on an action for the publication of private facts are unrealistic and unnecessarily harsh. The definition of publicity should be modified to include the release of information to any person or persons other than those, such as credit grantors, who have an immediate and legitimate interest in it. A release of information to one person who misuses it can have as damaging an effect on the investigatee's reputation as a general publication.[102] The requirement of private facts should be construed narrowly[103]—information should not be considered a part of the public record merely because it is published in credit bureau files or department store records. In fact, several cases have held that publicizing another's debts can lead to liability on the grounds that a person's debts are not a matter of public interest and that their publication serves only to expose the debtor to ridicule and disgrace.[104]

The second problem, the collection of particularly sensitive and personal information such as that pertaining to morals, character, emotional stability, or sexual behavior, is one which the courts have been unwilling to remedy. The intrusive nature of the collection of this kind of information makes any consideration of publicity irrelevant. There are cases holding that an intrusion into a plaintiff's personal life is an invasion of privacy, but the intrusion must be an extreme one. The courts have found a cause of action for physically intruding into a person's home,[105] peering through his windows,[106] or harassing a debtor to collect a debt.[107] In cases involving electronic eavesdropping, the courts have not been hesitant to focus on the probe into the private area of an individual's personality;[108] in at least one case involving a credit bureau, however, an action on this ground failed.[109]

When credit bureaus seek highly personal information, an investigatee might ask for an injunction against further intrusions by asserting a constitutional right to privacy based on *Griswold v. Connecticut*.[110] In *Griswold*, co-directors of a birth control clinic were convicted as accessories under a Connecticut statute[111] prohibiting the dissemination of information and devices to prevent conception. While a majority of the Supreme Court allowed the defendants to assert the constitutional rights of married couples[112] and declared the statute to be an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, the individual Justices differed as to the appropriate rationale. Justice Douglas, writing for the Court, found a violation of the penumbra of privacy emanating from the first, third, fourth, and fifth amendments.[113] Justice Goldberg, joined by Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan, rested his concurrence on the ninth amendment.[114] Yet another view was set forth by Justices Harlan[115] and White,[116] who found that the right to marital privacy is a fundamental right protected by the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment. Although the decision was widely viewed by commentators as heralding a renewed judicial concern for the protection of privacy,[117] lower courts have consistently refused to extend *Griswold* beyond its facts.[118] This disinclination to extend the privacy doctrine might be explained, in part, by language in *Griswold* implicitly requiring a court to balance the interests of the state against intrusions on the individual's right to privacy,[119] thus apparently limiting the application of the doctrine to the more extreme invasions.[120] Notwithstanding the fact that relatively few of the investigations launched by credit or insurance investigators will involve such extreme invasions of privacy,[121] the reasoning of *Griswold* might be useful where the bounds of reasonable investigation are overstepped.[122]

Credit bureaus should not escape liability for an invasion of privacy with a defense of consent. An applicant for an insurance policy is usually unaware that an investigation will be made and thus gives no consent. Furthermore, although an applicant for credit gives an implied consent to check his references, he does not consent to a full-scale investigation nor to the transmission of information to individuals unrelated to the credit transaction.[123]

LEGISLATIVE REMEDIES

The presently available judicial remedies fall far short of providing adequate protection against the dangers of inaccuracy and invasion of privacy inherent in credit investigations. Moreover, legislation regulating credit bureaus is, with one exception,[124] almost nonexistent.[125] A substantial number of states regulate investigations by detective agencies,[126] but most of the statutes specifically exempt agencies investigating applicants for credit or insurance.[127] Even if these exemptions did not exist, however, the private detective statutes would not, in most instances, provide adequate remedies for the privacy problems that arise in a credit or insurance investigation context. These statutes place no limitations on the type of information that may be gathered by private detectives, and the only limitation on the method of investigation is an occasional provision prohibiting unauthorized entrance into a home.[128] Furthermore, dissemination of information to outsiders is permitted if authorized by the licensee[129] and, in some cases, by the client of the licensee as well.[130] Provisions protecting the individual against inaccurate or distorted data gathered by the investigators are similarly of limited value. For example, while several of the statutes provide sanctions for the willful making of false reports by the investigator or his employees,[131] only two, one expressly[132] and one by implication,[133] provide sanctions for failure to exercise due care in the making of such reports. All but one private detective statute are silent on the issue of access by an investigatee to the investigator's files to correct inaccuracies before a report is given to a client.[134]

An Oklahoma statute[135] is the only legislation, state or federal, which specifically deals with the credit bureau problem. It concentrates on the issue of access and provides that "[w]henever an opinion upon the financial or credit standing of any person is about to be submitted for the purpose of establishing a financial or credit rating of customers, to be used by the retail business concerns, the person . . . submitting such opinion shall first mail a copy of such opinion to the person about whom the opinion is given."[136] It also establishes civil and criminal penalties for willfully making false credit or financial reports.[137] While the statute is a positive first step, it provides only a limited remedy for a credit bureau's refusal to correct a report[138] and does not prevent outsiders from obtaining a copy of the report without the consent of the investigatee. Moreover, since its terms are limited to retail credit situations, it would seem to exempt agencies investigating insurance applicants.

Although the regulation of businesses is considered an appropriate state function,[139] state inaction has prompted several federal proposals for the regulation of the credit investigation industry.[140] Congressman Zablocki recently introduced a limited bill[141] which would require a credit grantor to supply an applicant for credit, upon his request, with the name of any credit bureau investigating him and require the credit bureau, also upon request, to furnish the applicant with the credit report if it contained derogatory entries. This bill is inadequate because it places the burden on the applicant to request the report and does not address itself to the problem of maintaining confidentiality of the report. Senator Proxmire has stated that he will introduce, as an amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Act,[142] a bill to remedy some of the evils surrounding credit investigations.[143] His proposal attempts to avoid the compiling of inaccurate data by requiring credit bureaus to maintain the currency of their records.[144] It would resolve the access problem by providing that a credit bureau must give notice to an investigatee "whenever information is obtained . . . which is a matter of public record and bears adversely upon his credit worthiness, standing or capacity, and provide a reasonable opportunity to such individual to submit an explanatory statement with respect thereto."[145] While this latter provision is commendable because it places the burden on the credit bureau to notify the applicant, the duty of notification should not be limited to matters of public record.[146] A derogatory statement from a private source may be equally as damaging as one from a public record. Furthermore, without such notification, an applicant will be no more aware of a derogatory matter from a private source than from a public record; in fact, the reverse would be more likely. The objective of providing the investigatee an opportunity to correct the report before its dissemination would not be completely fulfilled if such a distinction is retained. Another gap in the proposal is that it fails to provide a remedy if the credit bureau refuses to correct the report after the applicant gives notice of an inaccuracy. A credit bureau should either be required to correct a false report or, if some doubt remains as to the correctness of the information, at least include the applicant's objections as part of the report to potential credit grantors.[147]

The Proxmire proposal recognizes the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of the credit report and provides a two-pronged approach to the problem. The proposal would compel credit bureaus to initiate internal procedures to assure the confidentiality of the report[148] and would require

---

Footnotes at end of article.

XUM

that the express consent of the applicant be obtained before information could be released to persons other than credit grantors.[149] This latter provision should be expanded by adding that consent by an applicant to the release of information to a specified person who is not a credit grantor should not be construed, in the absence of a clear agreement to the contrary, as a general consent.

Finally, the proposal is unclear as to whether it applies solely to credit investigations for potential credit grantors or whether it would also cover investigations of applicants for insurance. Its coverage should be made manifest and specifically extended to encompass the latter type of investigation.[150]

CONCLUSION

The needs for safeguards in the collection and transfer of personal information has increased with the advent of the computer and the resultant elimination of physical limitations on data storage.[151] While only a minority of credit bureaus presently have computerized systems in operation, many others are contemplating the future use of computers.[152] This trend portends several adverse effects. First, the purchase of a computer usually results in the collection of more information.[153] Second, it creates the danger of a rigid computer program which does not contain all significant information; individuals may be selected or rejected on certain preprogrammed criteria which leave no room for consideration of special circumstances.[154] Third, because the information is computerized, it will be presumed accurate.[155]

Perhaps the most threatening aspect of the computerization of credit bureau information is the possibility of a centralized personal information file on all citizens.[156] Credit bureau executives are discussing the merits of a national system of information sharing [157] and the president of one large credit corporation told the House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy that his company could have every American's name on its computers within five years.[158] The creation of a file on every American would have many of the dangers of a government dossier with none of the advantages.[159] While credit bureaus are needed to protect lenders and merchants and to ensure the free flow of credit, an intense scrutiny of their operations is also required. Credit bureaus operate on a national scale and affect the personal interests of millions of Americans; the most immediate need is for legislation, both at the state and federal levels, to control their practices and procedures.

Even in the absence of such legislation, however, the courts should adapt existing judicial doctrine to meet the realities of the credit bureau industry. The invasions of privacy involved are not as "shocking" as a wiretap or the unauthorized publication by a newspaper of an individual's life story replete with sordid details. They are smaller intrusions into each person's life, but the potential harm is just as great because they affect the privacy of so many. The concept of privacy held by most courts, considered revolutionary during the Warren-Brandeis era,[160] seems more fitted for the 19th century than the 20th; a "new privacy" must be formulated to protect the individual from the technological advances of the computer age.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Bazelon, *Money Must Go,* ESQUIRE, Oct. 1968, at 166.

[2] *See* Westin, *The Snooping Machine,* PLAYBOY, May 1968, at 130.

[3] Consumer installment credit has surpassed the $100 billion mark and is expected to increase by approximately $7.3 billion in 1968. Presently, an estimated 60% of the average individual's income is used to pay credit obligations. NEW REPUBLIC, Oct. 5, 1968, at 5; *Hearings on Commercial Credit Bureaus Before the Subcomm. on Invasion of Privacy of the Comm. on Government Operations* 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 5 (1968) [hereinafter cited as *Credit Bureau Hearings*].

[4] Credit bureaus are sometimes distinguished from mercantile agencies, such as Dun & Bradstreet, which collect information on the financial standing of businesses or individuals engaged in business. *See* 15 AM. JUR. 2d *Collection and Credit Agencies* § 3, at 551 (1964).

[5] The Associated Credit Bureaus of America, Inc. (ACB of A), a trade association of credit bureaus, has 2,068 member bureaus that exchange information freely. They have files on 96 million people, and serve 365,000 credit grantors to whom they issued more than 100 million consumer credit reports in 1967. *Credit Bureau Hearings* 109–21. Retail Credit Co., the largest private investigative agency in the United States, does some credit investigations, but most of its work involves insurance investigations. Insurance investigations are similar to credit checks and are used by insurance companies in deciding whether to write a policy for a prospective customer. Retail Credit Co. has "7000 investigators, maintains dossiers on 42 million people, and grosses more than $100 million annually." A. WESTIN, PRIVACY AND FREEDOM 159 (1967). Retail Credit has 62 subsidiary credit bureaus which are members of the ACB of A. NEW REPUBLIC, Apr. 27, 1968, at 11.

[6] H. BLACK, BUY NOW, PAY LATER 37 (1961).

[7] *See generally* H. BLACK *supra* note 6; M. BRENTON THE PRIVACY INVADERS (1964); V. PACKARD, THE NAKED SOCIETY (1964): Morris, *What the Credit Bureaus Know About You,* READER'S DIGEST, Nov. 1967, at 85.

[8] *See* notes 124–38 *infra* and accompanying text.

[9] *See* Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 1, col. 6.

[10] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 5.

[11] *Id.*; Morris, *supra* note 7, at 86.

[12] Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3.

[13] *See* note 5 *supra.*

[14] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 10. The Credit Bureau of Greater New York has a division which compiles the names of civil litigants and criminal defendants in the local courts. It has reports on 14 million suits, judgments, and other actions. M. BRENTON, *supra* note 7, at 26.

[15] M. BRENTON, *supra* note 7, at 26–27. Some credit bureaus, however, such as Credit Data Corp., a computerized firm which is not a member of the ACB of A, confine themselves almost exclusively to their files. *Credit Bureau Hearings* 67–69 (testimony of Harry C. Jordan, President, Credit Data Corp.). But the insurance inspection firms usually make an independent investigation of each applicant. *Hearings on the Retail Credit Co. Before the Subcomm. on Invasion of Privacy of the Comm. on Government Operations,* 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 3 (1968) (because these hearings have not been officially published, page numbers cited herein refer to the unofficial transcript) [hereinafter cited as *Retail Credit Hearings*].

[16] A. WESTIN, *supra* note 5, at 309–10.

[17] *See* Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3.

[18] An adequate statement for some recipients may become misleading if it is passed on. A man may tell his draft board that he is divorced, without adding that his former wife has remarried. The credit grantor, believing that the applicant has an obligation for alimony, may deny him credit. Karst, *"The Files:" Legal Controls Over the Accuracy and Accessibility of Stored Personal Data,* 31 LAW & CONTEMP. PROB. 342, 354 (1966).

[19] *See* note 14 *supra* and accompanying text.

[20] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 10–11. Each year approximately 780,000 derogatory items are entered in the files of the Credit Bureau of Greater New York. The great majority of them, about 550,000, are information on lawsuits taken from court records; however, one important fact, the outcome of the suits, is never recorded. The reason given for the failure to include the disposition of the suits is prohibitory expense. Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 1, col. 6.

[21] Karst, *supra* note 18, at 373.

[22] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 11.

[23] While every retail credit investigator is taught the importance of confirming unfavorable information, these inspectors average 11½ reports per day. *Retail Credit Hearings* 47–52. Since each report consists of a field investigation as well as the preparation of the formal report, little time is available for thorough research. *Id.*

[24] Even the large bureaus remove reports from their files only after five or ten years. Karst, *supra* note 18, at 372.

[25] *Retail Credit Hearings* 26, 53.

[26] *See* 15 AM. JUR. 2d *Collection and Credit Agencies* § 3, at 551–52 (1964). Retail Credit Co's. contract states that:

> [t]he undersigned desiring to use your [Retail Credit's] service at the regular prices established by you agrees that all reports will be submitted and received subject to the following conditions.
>
> All reports, whether oral or written, will be kept strictly confidential: except as required by law, no information from reports nor your identity as the reporting agency will be revealed to the persons reported on. . . .

Retail Credit Contract (copy on file with the House Subcomm. on Invasion of Privacy).

[27] *See* Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3 Retail Credit Co. will neither confirm nor deny that a report was made on an individual. This policy is designed to protect its sources of information: "[I]t would result in a suppression of information if each individual sought to correct his file in detail or sought to correct a particular report or detail. And just because the legal processes are so involved and the time factor is so involved, we feel that the whole business information process would be slowed down." *Retail Credit Hearings* 32 (testimony of W. Lee Burge, President, Retail Credit Co.).

[28] *See Credit Bureau Hearings* 6–9; Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3.

[29] A nonsubscriber can obtain information from many ACB of A credit bureaus if he pays their fees and can establish a logical business reason. Morris, *supra* note 7, at 88. The Retail Credit Co. requires the users of their services to be reputable business firms with a legitimate need for business information. *Retail Credit Hearings* 46. The President of Retail Credit admitted, however, that occasionally reports are made as "favors." *Id.*

[30] *See Credit Bureau Hearings* 64–65. Reports have allegedly been made on prospective bridegrooms and jurors. M. BRENTON, *supra* note 7, at 37.

[31] At the Credit Bureau of Greater New York, more than 500 employees have ready access to the 8.5 million files. The 14,000 employees of the other ACB of A affiliates in the United States enjoy the same freedom of access to their employers' files. Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 1, col. 6.

[32] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 112.

[33] The ACB of A even advertises this fact. Two years ago, one of their publications stated that the Washington and regional offices of the FBI are among the largest users of credit bureau services. *Credit Bureau Hearings* 6. Investigators from such federal agencies as the FBI and the State Department receive copies of more than 20,000 records from the Credit Bureau of Greater New York every year. The executive manager of the New York bureau said in an interview: "Frankly, we don't ask the government what they're doing . . . . We don't feel that's our prerogative." Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3.

[34] The FHA has credit bureau reports containing information on the applicant's marital stability. These can be purchased by pri-

vate mortgage lenders for $1.50 each. *Credit Bureau Hearings* 1–2; A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 160. A number of agencies, such as AID, the Civil Service Commission, and the Veterans Administration employ the Retail Credit Co. to make employment checks. Retail Credit's estimated annual government business is approximately $250,000 in personnel investigations and $250,000 in other business, mostly credit, annually. *Retail Credit Hearings* 56.

[35] *See* note 12 *supra* and accompanying text. Insurance investigation records are particularly troublesome because insurance companies are interested in what they call "moral hazards." This category includes extramarital affairs or heavy drinking. Some insurance companies refuse to write policies on persons suspected of being homosexual. When asked if it was fair to limit a report solely to the unconfirmed suspicions of neighbors, a representative of Hooper-Holmes, an insurance investigation company with files on over nine million people stated: "We won't say he's a homosexual . . . . We'll report, for example, that certain people feel he has homosexual tendencies." Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 16, col. 3.

[36] Libel, the written form of defamation, is an invasion of the plaintiff's interest in reputation and good name by a communications which may injure him in the eyes of others. W. Prosser, Torts § 106 (3d ed. 1964). Truth is an absolute defense in a defamation action. *Id.*

[37] *E.g.,* H. E. Crawford Co. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 241 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1957); Erber & Strickler v. R. G. Dun Co., 12 F. 526 (C.C. Ark. 1882); Wetherby v. Retail Credit Co., 235 Md. 237, 201 A.2d 344 (1963); Shore v. Retailers Commercial Agency, 342 Mass. 515, 174 N.E.2d 376 (1961); Barker v. Retail Credit Co., 8 Wis. 2d 664, 100 N.W.2d 391 (1960); Annot., 30 A.L.R.2d 776 (1953). *Contra,* Johnson v. Bradstreet Co., 77 Ga. 172 (1886); Pacific Packing Co. v. Bradstreet Co., 25 Idaho 696, 139 P. 1007 (1914). The privilege is not recognized in Great Britain. *E.g.,* MacIntosh v. Dun, [1908] 18 A.C. 390 (P.C..

[38] The conditional privilege has even been used to deny access to a report in discovery proceedings. Retail Credit Co. v. Garroway, 240 Miss. 230, 126 So. 2d 271 (1961). The court held that the plaintiff could not use discovery to obtain the reports until he proved malice in their publication even though their contents might have helped him prove his case. *Id.* at 241, 126 So. 2d at 275.

[39] "The communication related to something in which the writer [Dun & Bradstreet] had an interest or duty, to one having a corresponding interest or duty, and was made in protection of that interest or in performance of that duty." H. E. Crawford Co. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 241 F.2d 387, 393 (4th Cir. 1957). Another court felt that the harm done by credit investigations is insignificant in relation to the benefit that subscribers derive from the frank reports. Watwood v. Stone's Mercantile Agency, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 156, 194 F.2d 160 (1952).

The application of the privilege can have harsh results. *See* Wetherby v. Retail Credit Co., 235 Md. 237, 201 A.2d 344 (1963). In *Wetherby* the female plaintiffs were denied life insurance on the basis of a Retail Credit report containing accusations by neighbors of wild parties and lesbianism. After the company denied access to the reports, the plaintiffs hired a man for $400 to obtain them. He did so, apparently by breaking into the offices of Retail Credit and stealing them, *Id.* at 239, 201 A.2d at 345.

[40] *E.g.,* Watwood v. Stone's Mercantile Agency, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 156, 194 F. 2d 160 (1952); Trussel v. Scarlett, 18 F. 214 (1882); Pollasky v. Minsher, 81 Mich. 280, 46 N.W. 5 (1890); King v. Patterson, 49 N.J.L. 417, 9 A. 705 (Ct. Err. & App. 1887); *see* Calvin v. New York, N.H. & H.R.R., 341 Mass. 293, 168 N.E. 2d 263 (1960).

[41] King v. Patterson, 49 N.J.L. 417, 431, 9 A. 705, 712 (Ct. Err. & App. 1887). The court added: "Society is organized, and courts are established for the protection of the rights of individuals. Unrestrained by those legal principles, which control the acts and conduct of other persons under like circumstances, these agencies, in the vastness of their operations, might become instruments of injustice and suppression so grievous that public policy would require their entire suppression." *Id.*

[42] It has been held that the bureau need not show that the subscriber actually had a legitimate interest in the subject of the report. A publication is privileged if the person receiving it reasonably appears to have a duty, interest, or authority in connection with the subject matter of the report. Watwood v. Stone's Mercantile Agency, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 156, 194 F. 2d 160 (1952). An employer has been held to have sufficient interest in his employees to be an interested subscriber. Watwood v. Credit Bureau, 97 A. 2d 460 (D.C. 1953).

[43] *E.g.,* H. E. Crawford Co. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 241 F. 2d 387 (4th Cir. 1957); Hooper-Holmes Bureau v. Bunn, 161 F. 2d 102 (5th Cir. 1947).

[44] H. E. Crawford Co. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 241 F. 2d 387 (4th Cir. 1957).

[45] *E.g.,* Mil-Hall Textile Co. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 160 F. Supp. 778 (S.D.N.Y. 1958). *See also* Sheehan v Tobin, 326 Mass. 185, 93 N.E. 2d 524 (1950). The privilege has been lost in some instances where there has been less than express malice based on the rationale that "[t]here is no social utility in reports that are made recklessly or without reasonable grounds. The injury to the subject of the report can be great and the person receiving the report gains nothing." Shore v. Retailers Commercial Agency, 342 Mass. 515, 521, 174 N.E. 2d 376, 380 (1961).

One of the few cases to impose a responsibility to substantiate the veracity of the information received is Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Robinson, 233 Ark. 168, 345 S.D. 2d 34 (1961). In *Robinson,* a mercantile rating agency reported, without verification, that certain persons had told its investigators that the plaintiff has discontinued his business. The court held that the report was defamatory and that the privilege was lost because the defendant, by not confirming the damaging hearsay information, had acted with conscious indifference and reckless disregard of the plaintiff's rights. *Id.* at 173–74, 178, 345 S.W. 2d at 37, 40.

[46] Stationers Corp. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 62 Cal. 2d 412, 398 P. 2d 785, 42 Cal. Reptr. 449 (1965).

[47] Altoona Clay Prods., Inc. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 367 F. 2d 625 (3d Cir. 1966); Hartman Co. v. Hyman, 87 Pa. Super. 358, *aff'd,* 287 Pa. 78, 134 A. 486 (1926); *see* Locke v. Bradstreet Co., 22 F. 771 (D. Minn. 1885).

[48] *E.g.,* Pavlovsky v. Board of Trade, 171 Cal. App. 2d 110, 340 P.2d 63 (1st Dist. Ct. App. 1959).

[49] H. E. Crawford v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 241 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1957); Shore v. Retailers Commercial Agency, 342 Mass. 515, 174 N.E.2d 376 (1961); Pecue v. West, 233 N.Y. 316, 135 N.E. 515 (1922). In one early case, however, a credit bureau was held liable when it issued a report containing information which was substantially different from the information received at its office. The court said that "any right or privilege may be so carelessly used as to lose the protection which it would otherwise afford." Douglas v. Daisley, 114 F. 628, 634 (1st Cir. 1902).

[50] *See* note 46 *supra* and accompanying text.

[51] Altoona Clay Prods., Inc. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 367 F.2d 625 (3d Cir. 1966); *see* Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Robinson, 233 Ark. 168, 345 S.W.2d 34 (1961). One commentator suggests that the credit bureau should have the burden of proving due care. Note, *The Mercantile Agency and Conditional Privilege in Defamation,* 11 S.C.L.Q. 256 (1959).

[52] *See* Douglas v. Daisley, 114 F. 628, 634 (1st Cir. 1902), *discussed in* note 49 *supra.*

[53] *Cf.* Harang v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 400 S.W.2d 810 (Tex. 1966).

[54] 25 Idaho 696, 139 P. 1007 (1914).

[55] *Id.* at 704, 139 P. at 1010.

[56] [1908] 18 A.C. 390 (P.C.).

[57] *Id.* at 400.

> There is no reason to suppose that the defendants generally have acted otherwise than cautiously and discreetly. But information such as that which they offer for sale may be obtained in many ways, not all of them deserving commendation.
>
> It may be extorted from the person whose character is in question through fear of misrepresentation or misconstruction if he remains silent. It may be gathered from gossip. It may be picked up from discharged servants. It may be betrayed by disloyal employees. It is only right that those who engage in such a business, touching so closely very dangerous ground, should take the consequences if they overstep the law.

Id.

[58] One author argues that, in cases involving transfer of information, even applying the negligence standard is not enough and that such financial transactions should give rise to an absolute duty of accuracy. Green, *The Duty to Give Accurate Information,* 12 U.C.L.A. L. Rev. 464 (1965). Interestingly, in defamation the defendant who has no privilege available is held to a strict liability standard. W. Prosser, Torts § 108 (3d ed. 1964).

[59] *E.g.,* Ultramares Corp. v. Touche, 255 N.Y. 170, 174 N.E. 441 (1931).

[60] Dale System, Inc. v. General Teleradio, Inc., 105 F. Supp. 745 (S.D.N.Y. 1952); *see* Glanzer v. Shepard, 233 N.Y. 236, 135 N.E. 275 (1922). In *Walker Bank & Trust Co.* v. *First Security Corp.,* the court found a bank liable to the beneficiaries of a life insurance policy because it failed to pay the premiums in accordance with an authorization of the policyholder who had an account at the bank. 9 Utah 2d 215, 341 P.2d 944 (1959). The bank claimed it owed no duties to the beneficiaries because they were not in privity of contract, but the court rejected the argument: "It is often stated that privity of contract is a prerequisite to holding one liable for a breach of a duty thereunder. But it is also recognized that there are duties to others that the immediate parties, where from the nature of the contract, it is plainly evident to the promissor that the contract is for the benefit of third persons and that a failure to discharge his duty would adversely affect them." *Id.* at 217–18, 341 P.2d at 945–46. It is questionable whether the subjects of a credit report would qualify as third party beneficiaries of the contract between the bureau and the credit-grantor; however, many credit bureau representatives contend that the purpose of their reports is to "help" people get credit. *See Credit Bureau Hearings, supra* note 3, at 110.

Telephone companies have been held liable for negligently omitting a name from their directories, based on implied contract and the companies' duty as a public servant. *E.g.,* Masterson v. Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co., 55 App. D.C. 23, 299 F. 890 (1924). Moreover, in one case the company was held liable even though the plaintiff was not a telephone subscriber. Loridans v. Southern Bell Tel. Co., 172 So. 2d 323 (La. 1965). In *Loridans,* the plaintiff shared an office with one Thomas, a telephone subscriber. Thomas made an agreement with the plaintiff to have both their names printed in the directory. When the plaintiff sued the telephone company for omitting his name, the court held that even if the contractual relation existed solely between the company and

XUM

Thomas as subscriber, such an agreement was in the nature of a third party beneficiary contract. Although a credit bureau is not a public servant in the same sense as a telephone company, these bureaus arguably have assumed a quasi-governmental power. *Cf.* A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 325.

[61] Serino v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 267 F. Supp. 396 (D.S.C. 1967).

[62] *Id.* at 399.

[63] 15 Am. Jur. 2d *Collection and Credit Agencies* § 3 (1964).

[64] *See* notes 56–57 *supra* and accompanying text.

[65] The whole of tort law may be envisaged as a process of a protection of one man's interest at the expense of another's according to a norm of social policy. In the law of defamation, as elsewhere, we find a continuous comparison of the social value of the interests involved and the probable effect thereon of license or restraint upon statement and discussion. Immunity is granted or withheld on the principle of the residuum of social convenience deriving from the protection of one interest at the expense of another. Harper, *Privileged Defamation*, 22 Va. L. Rev. 642 (1936).

[66] *See generally*, Karst, *supra* note 18.

[67] *See* notes 25–27 *supra* and accompanying text.

[68] A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 324–25.

[69] Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 313 (1949); *accord*, Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545, 550 (1965); *see* Sigma Chi Fraternity v. Regents of Univ. of Colo., 258 F. Supp. 515, 528 (D. Colo. 1966); Halvorsen v. Grain Dealers Mut. Ins. Co., 210 F. Supp. 73, 76 (W.D. Mich. 1962).

[70] The Supreme Court has stated that in deciding whether a right is protected by the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment, a court must look to the " 'traditions and [collective] conscience of our people' to determine whether a principle is 'so rooted [there] . . . as to be ranked as fundamental.' " Snyder v. Massachusetts, 291 U.S. 97, 105 (1933), *citing* United States v. Texas, 252 F. Supp. 234, 250 (W.D. Tex.), *aff'd mem.*, 384 U.S. 155 (1966).

[71] *See, e.g.*, Zimmerman v. Wilson, 81 F.2d 847, 849 (3d Cir. 1936); Brex v. Smith, 104 N.J. Eq. 386, 390, 146 A. 34, 36 (Ch. 1929).

[72] Such cases have typically involved "takings" of either physical property rights or quasi-property rights intertwined with the economic well-being of individuals. *E.g.*, Green v. McElroy, 360 U.S. 474 (1959) (quasi-property: employee dismissed after revocation of security clearance); Nelson v. Hall, 368 F.2d 103 (9th Cir. 1966) (physical property: confiscation of prisoner's automobile); Collins v. City of Wichita, 225 F.2d 132 (10th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 350 U.S. 886 (1955) (physical property: confiscation of right of way under powers of eminent domain); Hecht v. Monaghan, 307 N.Y. 461, 121 N.E.2d 421 (1954) (quasi-property: revocation of taxi driver's license).

[73] *See, e.g.*, On Lee v. United States, 343 U.S. 747 (1952); Goldman v. United States, 316 U.S. 129 (1942); Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928). In *Olmstead*, the Court justified its refusal to exclude evidence obtained by wiretapping by drawing a distinction between "physical" and "non-physical" property: "The Amendment itself shows that the search is to be of material things—the person, the house, his papers or his effects. The description of the warrant necessary to make the proceeding lawful, is that it must specify the place to be searched and the person or *things* to be seized. . . . The language of the Amendment can not be extended and expanded to include telephone wires reaching to the whole world from the defendant's house or office." *Id.* at 464–65.

[74] 365 U.S. 505 (1961).

[75] *Id.* at 508–09, *citing* S. Dash, R. Schwartz & R. Knowlton, The Eavesdroppers (1959). *See generally* M. Brenton, *supra* note 7; V. Packard, *supra* note 7.

[76] The Court avoided the "large questions" argued by the attorneys concerning the fourth amendment "implications of . . . [the] frightening paraphernalia which the vaunted marvels of an electronic age may visit upon human society" and instead rested its decision on the fact that the eavesdropping was accomplished by a "physical penetration" and was therefore violative of the fourth amendment. 365 U.S. at 509–10. The physical penetration rule stemming from *Olmstead* and followed in *Silverman* was eventually overturned. Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347, 352–53 (1967). However, the broader concept of property under the fourth amendment established by *Silverman* has been reaffirmed. *E.g.*, Katz v. United States, *supra;* Berger v. New York, 388 U.S. 41 (1967).

[77] *See* notes 151–59 *infra* and accompanying text.

[78] A somewhat analogous argument to compel access under the due process clause may be grounded on the theory that an applicant has the right to confront the evidence against him before being denied credit or insurance. The Supreme Court has determined that due process requires that an applicant be allowed to confront persons whose statements allegedly prevented him from being accepted by his state bar association. Willner v. Committee on Character and Fitness, 373 U.S. 96 (1963). Although denial of credit or insurance will not, in most cases, be as important as denial of entrance into one's chosen profession, the need for access to the records of insurance and credit investigators to correct inaccuracies is sufficiently important to merit further protection by the courts.

[79] The fourteenth amendment provides that "[no] *State* [shall] deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . ." U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 (emphasis added). Thus, the argument that personal information should be treated as a fourteenth amendment property right must necessarily be grounded on "state action" rather than action by individuals. *See, e.g.*, United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745, 755 (1966); Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority, 365 U.S. 715, 721 (1961); Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1, 13 (1948); United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 554–55 (1875).

[80] United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745, 755 (1966).

[81] 382 U.S. 296 (1966).

[82] *Id.* at 299.

[83] The question of finding state action through state regulation or other involvement has most frequently arisen in a civil rights context. *See, e.g.*, Robinson v. Florida, 378 U.S. 153 (1964) (state health regulation requiring racially separate facilities); Peterson v. City of Greenville, 373 U.S. 244 (1963) (state regulation compelling discrimination by race in public accommodations); Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649 (1944) (state involvement in party primary elections).

[84] State governmental regulations have a substantial impact on many areas of the insurance business, including rates, terms of the insurance contract, and marketing and advertising. *See generally* Parker, *State Regulation—Today's Problems and Proposed Solutions*, 1964 ABA Insurance, Negligence & Compensation Law Section 132.

[85] In an analogous situation the Supreme Court held that a street railway was so heavily regulated by federal agencies that it was subject to the limitations of the fifth amendment. Public Util. Comm'n v. Pollak, 343 U.S. 451 (1952); *see* Boman v. Birmingham Transit Co., 280 F.2d 531 (5th Cir. 1960) (allegedly "private" bus company held to be public utility due to state regulation).

[86] *Credit Bureau Hearings, supra* note 3, at 20–21 (testimony of Alan F. Westin, Professor of Public Law and Government, Columbia University); *id.* at 108 (testimony of John L. Spafford, Executive Vice President, Associated Credit Bureaus of America, Inc.).

[87] The theory that a private organization can be an "agent" of the state for the purposes of the fourteenth amendment has been approved by the Supreme Court on several occasions. *See, e.g.*, Evans v. Newton, 382 U.S. 296, 299 (1966); Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649, 663 (1944).

[88] *See* notes 124–38 *infra* and accompanying text.

[89] Several courts have determined that a state may be held to have acted by refusing to exercise existing authority to protect the constitutional rights of individuals. *See, e.g.*, Lynch v. United States, 189 F.2d 476, 479 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 342 U.S. 831 (1951); Picking v. Pennsylvania R.R., 151 F.2d 240, 250 (3d Cir. 1945), *cert. denied*, 332 U.S. 776 (1947); Catlette v. United States, 132 F.2d 902, 907 (4th Cir. 1943). This analysis might be taken one step further to hold that failure to pass and enforce regulatory legislation to control investigating bureaus, whose methods of operation may deprive individuals of their constitutional rights, is state action, clothing these agencies with sufficient governmental authority to satisfy the state action requirement of the fourteenth amendment. *See generally* Peters, *Civil Rights and State Non-Action*, 34 Notre Dame Law. 303 (1959).

[90] The theory that "acting as a state" constitutes state action has been applied to a labor union and to a corporation running a company town. Marsh v. Alabama, 326 U.S. 501, 507 n.4 (1946) (corporation); Steele v. Louisville & N.R.R., 323 U.S. 192, 198 (1944) (dicta) (labor union). One commentator has noted that courts will hold a state-created corporation subject to the same constitutional limitations as a state upon a finding of the "existence of sufficient economic power in the vehicle to invade the constitutional right of an individual to a material degree." Berle, *Constitutional Limitations on Corporate Activity—Protection of Personal Rights from Invasion Through Economic Power*, 100 U. Pa. L. Rev. 933, 943 (1952).

[91] *See generally* Abernathy, *Expansion of the State Action Concept Under the Fourteenth Amendment*, 43 Cornell L.Q. 375 (1958); Horowitz, *The Misleading Search for "State Action" Under the Fourteenth Amendment*, 30 S. Cal. L. Rev. 208 (1957); Williams, *The Twilight of State Action*, 41 Texas L. Rev. 347 (1963).

[92] It may also be possible to hold credit agencies subject to the due process clause of the fifth amendment by asserting that their services are so widely used by the federal government as to become "public functions" and therefore subject to constitutional limitations. The Supreme Court has determined that the delegation of activities from governmental bodies to private bodies could, in some circumstances, convert these private bodies into agents of the State while performing these functions, thus making such activities "public functions" subject to constitutional limitations. Evans v. Newton, 382 U.S. 296 (1966). In *Evans*, the Court acknowledged that "the fact that government has engaged in a particular activity does not necessarily mean that an individual entrepreneur or manager of the same kind of undertaking suffers the same constitutional inhibitions," but left the determination of whether a "public function" could be found to a case by case analysis. *Id.* at 299–300; *see* Terry v. Adams, 345 U.S. 461 (1953) (party primary held to be integral part of elective process; delegation to private organization did not defeat "public function" character).

[93] *See generally* Pound, *The Fourteenth Amendment and the Right of Privacy*, 13 W. Res. L. Rev. 34 (1961); Prosser, *Privacy*, 48 Calif. L. Rev. 383 (1960); Shils, *Privacy: Its Constitution and Vicissitudes*, 31 Law & Contemp. Prob. 281 (1966); Warren & Brandeis, *The Right to Privacy*, 4 Harv. L. Rev. 193 (1890).

[94] Beaney, *The Right to Privacy and American Law*, 31 Law & Contemp. Prob. 253, 254

XUM

(1966). Despite the breadth of this definition, the right has been construed narrowly by the courts. *See* Prosser, *supra* note 93. According to Dean Prosser "invasion of privacy," as construed by the courts, embraces not one tort but four: 1) an intrusion upon a plaintiff's solitude or into his private affairs; 2) publicity which puts the plaintiff in a false light in the public eye; 3) public disclosure of embarrassing or private facts about the plaintiff; and 4) appropriation for the defendant's advantage of the plaintiff's name or likeness. *Id*. at 389.

[95] The seriousness of the intrusion is compounded by the transfer of the information, even to those with a legitimate interest in it.

[96] *E.g.*, Trammell v. Citizens News Co., 285 Ky. 529, 148 S.W.2d 708 (1941); Biederman's of Springfield, Inc. v. Wright, 322 S.W.2d 892 (Mo. 1959). These cases are similar to the defamation cases, but the defense of truth is not available. *See* note 36 *supra*.

[97] The reported cases concern the communication to the employer of his employee's debts. The rationale for denying the cause of action is that the employer has a legitimate interest in the debts of his employees. Harrison v. Humble Oil & Ref. Co., 264 F. Supp. 89 (D.S.C. 1964); Yoder v. Smith, 253 Iowa 505, 112 N.W.2d 862 (1962).

[98] *See* Gregory v. Bryan Hunt Co., 295 Ky. 345, 174 S.W. 2d 510 (1943) (oral accusation of theft).

[99] Meetze v. Associated Press, 230 S.C. 330, 95 S.E.2d 606 (1956).

[100] Stryker v. Republic Pictures Corp., 108 Cal. App. 2d 191, 238 P.2d 670 (2d Dist. Ct. App. 1951); Continental Optical Co. v. Reed, 119 Ind. App. 643, 86 N.E.2d 306 (1949).

[101] Shorter v. Retail Credit Co., 251 F. Supp. 329 (D.S.C. 1966).

[102] Courts, recognizing the dangers of the release of personal information to unauthorized persons, but hindered by the general publication rule from finding an invasion of privacy, have used other methods to protect the individual. In one case the plaintiff's employer called the bank where the employee had a checking account and asked the bank manager to inform him if his employee were to do anything that might discredit the company. The bank later notified the employer that the plaintiff's funds had been depleted and that his checks had been returned for insufficient funds. The disclosure was made without the plaintiff's consent or knowledge. Although refusing to hold the bank liable for an invasion of privacy since nothing had been communicated to the public, the court found the bank liable for breach of an implied contract not to divulge transactions with its customers. Peterson v. Idaho First Nat'l Bank, 83 Idaho 578, 367 P.2d 284 (1961).

[103] A related but unresolved question is the effect of lapse of time on public records. In *Melvin v. Reid*, the defendants' motion picture included a portrayal of the plaintiff as a prostitute, a fact which had appeared in the records of her murder trial. 112 Cal. App. 285, 297 P. 91 (4th Dist. Ct. App. 1931). The court held that such inclusion did not violate her right to privacy since the facts were contained in a public record; it concluded, however, that the publication of the facts seven years after the trial and after her subsequent reformation, coupled with the use of her real name, violated her state constitutional right to pursue happiness. *Id*. at 290–93, 297 P. at 93–94.

[104] *E.g.*, Trammell v. Citizens News Co., 285 Ky. 529, 148 S.W. 2d. 708 (1941); *see* Biederman's of Springfield, Inc. v. Wright, 322 S.W.2d 892 (Mo. 1959).

[105] Young v. Western & A.R. Co., 39 Ga. App. 761, 148 S.E. 414 (1929).

[106] Sounder v. Pentdleton Detectives, 88 So. 2d 716 (La. App. 1955).

[107] Norris v. Moskin Stores, 132 So. 2d 321 (Ala. 1961).

[108] Fowler v. Southern Bell Tel. & Co., 343 F.2d 150 (5th Cir. 1965) (wiretapping by federal employees); Hamberger v. Eastman, 106 N.H. 107, 206 A.2d 239 (1964) (landlord installed listening device in tenant's bedroom); Commonwealth v. Murray, 423 Pa. 37, 223 A.2d 102 (1966) (wiretap by private detectives).

[109] Shorter v. Retail Credit Co., 251 F. Supp. 329 (D.S.C. 1966). In *Shorter*, a retail credit investigator went to the plaintiff's home and obtained certain information from his wife concerning her age, number of children, and the plaintiff's salary and occupation. The court held that the intrusion was insufficient to constitute an invasion of privacy. There was no public surveillance, no publication of the fact that an investigation was taking place, and no constant harassment or continued trespass on the plaintiff's property. The court said that when a privacy action is for an intrusion without publication, the plaintiff must show a blatant and shocking disregard of his rights, and serious mental or physical injury or humiliation. *Id*. at 332.

[110] 381 U.S. 479 (1965).

[111] CONN. GEN. STAT. REV. §§ 53–32, 54–196 (1958).

[112] The Court determined that the clinic directors could assert the invalidity of the act as an unconstitutional imposition on marital privacy because "the rights of husband and wife . . . are likely to be diluted or adversely affected unless those rights are considered in a suit involving those who have this kind of confidential relation to them." 381 U.S. at 481.

[113] 381 U.S. at 484–86.

[114] *Id*. at 487–99. The history of the ninth amendment and its place in constitutional adjudication has been discussed by a number of commentators. *See generally* Kelsey, *The Ninth Amendment of the Federal Constitution*, 11 IND. L.J. 309 (1936); Kutner, *Neglected Ninth Amendment: The Other Rights Retained by the People*, 51 MARQ. L. REV. 121 (1967); Redlich, *Are There "Certain Rights . . . Retained by the People"?*, 37 N.Y.U.L. REV. 787 (1962).

[115] 381 U.S. at 500 (Harlan, J., concurring).

[116] *Id*. at 502 (White, J., concurring).

[117] *See generally* Beaney, *The Griswold Case and the Expanding Right to Privacy*, 1966 WIS. L. REV. 979; *Symposium on the Griswold Case and the Right to Privacy*, 64 MICH. L. REV. 197 (1965).

[118] *See, e.g.*, Lamont v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 269 F. Supp. 880 (S.D.N.Y.), *affd mem.*, 386 F.2d 449 (2d Cir. 1967) (right of privacy not applied to sale of registration records to outsiders by motor vehicle bureau); Davis v. Firment, 269 F. Supp. 24 (E.D. La. 1967) right of privacy not applied to keeping hair long in public high school); People v. Aguiar, 65 Cal. Rptr. 171 (1st Dist. Ct. App. 1968) (right of privacy not applied to smoking marihuana); People v. Frazier, 64 Cal. Rptr. 447 (1st Dist. Ct. App. 1967) (right of privacy not applied to homosexual relationship between prisoners). *But see* Nader v. General Motors Corp., 292 N.Y.S.2d 514 (Sup. Ct. 1968).

[119] 381 U.S. at 485, 497–99.

[120] One state court expressly recognized the limitations of *Griswold* by stating that its protection extends only to those intrusions which cause "mental suffering, shame or humiliation to a person of ordinary sensibilities." Pare v. Donovan, 54 Misc. 2d 194, 200, 281 N.Y.S.2d 884, 890 (Sup. Ct. 1967).

[121] *But see* Wetherby v. Retail Credit Co., 235 Md. 237, 201 A.2d 344 (1963), *discussed in* note 39 *supra*.

[122] Arguments that the "penumbra" of privacy cited by Justice Douglas or the privacy guaranteed by the ninth amendment should be applied to prevent further intrusions by credit insurance investigators must necessarily be grounded on state action because the state action requirement of the fourteenth amendment, by implication, also applies to those provisions of the Bill of Rights applied to the states through the fourteenth amendment. *See, e.g.*, Bates v. Little Rock, 361 U.S. 516, 522 (1960); NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449, 460–61 (1958); Marsh v. Alabama, 326 U.S. 501, 509 (1946); notes 79–92 *supra* and accompanying text.

[123] *Credit Bureau Hearings*, *supra* note 3, at 2. A person who names a bank as a reference probably does not know that many banks will not only confirm that he has an account but will even give a rough estimate of the average balance. Karst, *supra* note 18, at 373.

[124] OKLA. STAT. ANN. tit. 24, §§ 81–85 (1955); *see* notes 135–38 *infra* and accompanying text.

[125] Statutes specifically dealing with such businesses are usually revenue measures. *E.g.*, ALA. CODE titl. 51, §§ 450, 501 (Supp. 1967) (license tax); LA. REV. STAT. § 47–387 (Supp. 1952) (license tax); TENN. CODE ANN. § 67–4203 (item 29) (1955) (privilege tax); WASH. REV. CODE ANN. §§ 82.04.050, 82.04.220 (1962) (business and occupation tax).

[126] *E.g.*, ARK. STAT. ANN. §§ 71–2101 to –2112. (Supp. 1967); CAL. BUS & PROF. CODE §§ 7500–83 (West 1964); IND. ANN STAT. §§ 42–1207 to –1227 (1965); MD. ANN. CODE art. 56, §§ 75–99 (1968); MASS. GEN. LAWS ANN. ch. 147, §§ 22–30 (Supp. 1968); N.J. STAT. ANN. §§ 45:19–8 to –27 (1963); N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW §§ 79–89a (McKinney 1968); PA. STAT. ANN. tit. 22, §§ 11–30 (1955).

[127] *E.g.*, ARK. STAT. ANN. § 72–2110 (Supp. 1967); CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 7522(c) (West 1964); IND. ANN. STAT. § 42–1211(2) (1965); PA. STAT. ANN. tit. 22, § 25 (1955). Several of these states restrict the exemption to investigations of the personal habits and financial or credit responsibility of applicants for insurance or commercial credit. If the agency participates in other activities proscribed by the act, it will be treated as a detective agency. *E.g*. N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW § 70.3 (McKinney 1968); PA. STAT. ANN. tit. 22, § 25 (1955).

[128] *E.g.*, CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 7538(g) (West 1964); IND. ANN. STAT. § 42–1224(e) (1965).

[129] *E.g.*, CONN. GEN. STAT. ANN. § 29–161 (1960); DEL. CODE ANN. tit. 24, § 1315 (Supp. 1966); MASS. GEN. LAWS ANN. ch. 147, § 28 (Supp. 1968).

[130] *E.g.*, CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 7538(a) (West 1964); IND. ANN. STAT. § 42–1218 (1965).

[131] The Indiana statute is typical. It provides that "no licensee . . . shall knowingly make any false report to his . . . client for whom the information was obtained." IND. ANN. STAT. § 42–1218 (1965). The licensee is also civilly responsible for the acts of his employees during the course of business. *Id*. § 42–1217. Presumably, a willful making of a false report by the employee to the licensee, which is then transmitted to the client, would be a violation of the statute—the willful acts of the employee being imputed to the licensee. A detective's license may be suspended or revoked if any of the provisions of the act are violated, and the licensee is required to file a surety bond with the state to cover any damages incurred in civil suits filed by parties injured by the willful, malicious, or wrongful acts of the licensee or his employees. *Id*. §§ 42–1218, –1224(2) (b). Litigation involving private detective statutes is frequently grounded on "false report" provisions. *See* Schander v. Weiss, 274 App. Div. 940, 83 N.Y.S.2d 575 (1948) (defamation suit); Bayer v. Pinkerton's Nat'l Detective Agency, 247 App. Div. 191, 286 N.Y.S. 663, *aff'd. mem.*, 272 N.Y. 474, 3 N.E.2d 875 (1936) (malicious prosecution).

[132] The *California Business and Professions Code* provides that the investigator "submitting the report shall exercise diligence in ascertaining whether or not the facts and information in such a report are true and correct." CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 7538(c) (West 1964). Since a license may be suspended or revoked if a licensee has "violated

XUM

any of the provisions of this chapter," state officials would seem to have the discretion to revoke or suspend the investigator's license if he has failed to exercise due care. *Id.* § 7551(b).

[133] A New York court interpreted that state's applicable statute as follows: "[T]here is an imperative need on the part of a private investigator to exercise good faith and reasonable care in conducting investigations and in rendering reports and [a] lack of good faith or a failure to exercise due care would constitute 'cause' for revocation or suspension of the investigator's license." Advance Detective Bureau v. Lomenzo, 24 App. Div. 417, 418, 260 N.Y.S.2d 291, 293 (1965), *construing* N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 74 (McKinney 1957).

[134] The Kansas statute requires detective agencies to keep a file record of their activities and provides that any person can apply to the secretary of state for an order allowing him to inspect the reports of a detective agency. Kan. Stat. Ann. § 21-1704 (1964). This statute may have negative aspects as well since it allows "any person" to request permission for an inspection, not just the investigatee.

[135] Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 24, §§ 81-85 (1965).

[136] *Id.* § 82.

[137] *Id.* § 83.

[138] If the credit bureau refuses to correct the report and such refusal is found to be "willful," this may presumably be used as evidence to show that the report was "willfully" false within the meaning of the statute. *Id.*

[139] "Regulation of certain lawful trades, occupations and business activities is a question for the legislature. Its determination comes within proper exercise of the police power of the State unless affirmatively shown so unreasonably oppressive, extravagant, and arbitrary as to needlessly invade property or personal rights as protected by the Constitution." People's Appliance & Furniture, Inc. v. City of Flint, 358 Mich. 34, 45, 99 N.W.2d 522, 528 (1959); *see* Kelly v. Boyne, 239 Mich. 204, 214-15, 214 N.W. 316, 320 (1927).

[140] For example, in stating that he would introduce a bill to remedy some of the abuses involved in credit investigations, Senator Proxmire specifically noted the lack of state regulatory legislation. Congressional Record, volume 114, part 19, page 24902; *see Credit Bureau Hearings, supra* note 3, at 16 (testimony of Alan F. Westin, Professor of Public Law and Government, Columbia University).

[141] H.R. 15627, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (1968).

[142] Pub. L. No. 90-321 (May 29, 1968), 1968 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 1232.

[143] The purpose of the bill, Senator Proxmire stated, is "to protect consumers against the arbitrary or erroneous credit ratings, and the unwarranted publication of credit information." Congressional Record, volume 114, part 19, page 24902.

[144] *Id.* at 10,031 (§ 503(2) (C)).

[145] *Id.* (§ 503(2) (D)).

[146] The proposal apparently puts the burden on the applicant to request access to the files to correct any derogatory matter from a private source. *Id.* (§ 503(2) (B)).

[147] A bill introduced in California, but never enacted, took a slightly different approach to this problem. It provided that the sanction for failing to correct a false report upon notification of its falsity by the investigatee is the loss of the qualified privilege. Karst, *supra* note 18, at 375 n. 152.

[148] Congressional Record, volume 114, part 19, page 24902.

[149] *Id.* (§ 503(1)).

[150] Awareness of the problems of privacy in a technological age has not been confined to the United states; therefore, study of the comprehensive statutory schemes enacted elsewhere could be a useful aid in the drafting of legislation here. *See, e.g.,* Lehman, *Right of Privacy in Germany,* 1 N.Y.U.J. Int'l L. & Pol. 106 (1968).

[151] A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 309. A recently developed memory system can store the equivalent of 20 double-spaced pages of typed data on every person in the United States on a 4800 foot reel of one inch tape. Westin, *supra* note 2, at 132.

[152] A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 309; Los Angeles Times, June 10, 1966, at 14, col. 6; Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 6, 1966, at 14, cols. 2-3.

[153] A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 161. "The impact of computers on organizational life is to destroy practical boundaries of privacy in record keeping which were once meaningful in this area as walls and doors were to conversational privacy before the advent of the new physical surveillance technology." *Id.*

[154] Lear, *Whither Personal Privacy,* Saturday Rev., July 23, 1966, at 36. One may encounter difficulty explaining to a computer why he did not pay his bill. *See Credit Bureau Hearings, supra* note 3, at 19, *But see* Journal of Commerce, July 29, 1968.

[155] An individual trying to correct or clarify the "hard" information of a computer must have convincing evidence. With the reliance on computer tapes, written records tend to disappear, leaving the individual unable to show a past history different from that programmed. A. Westin, *supra* note 5, at 313.

[156] The expense of computers encourages sharing. Karst, *supra* note 18, at 342-60.

[157] Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 6, 1966, at 14, cols. 2-3.

[158] *Credit Bureau Hearings* 69 (testimony of Harrly C. Jordon, President, Credit Data Corp.).

[159] Congress continues to debate the desirability of a National Data Bank containing information on individuals that is now scattered through many government files. While Congress debates, private industry may be doing almost the same thing. Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968, at 1, col. 6. Professor Westin suggests that an information antitrust policy may be needed. *Credit Bureau Hearings* 19.

[160] *See* Warren & Brandeis, *supra* note 93.

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION STATEMENT OF POLICY, 1969

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force Association, a very distinguished group with highly patriotic motives, adopted at its 1969 national convention in Houston a statement of policy. This document is outstanding in its content, and it deserves wide circulation. I am pleased to present it for reprinting in the Congressional Record:

Air Force Association Statement of Policy, 1969

The new national Administration faces twin challenges which together represent a national task more complex than any within living memory. These are the Constitutionally imposed obligations of providing for the common defense while at the same time ensuring domestic tranquillity.

There are voices abroad in the land, growing in numbers and in volume, that say that these goals are incompatible, that the one can be achieved only at the expense of the other, that the United States is neither powerful enough nor wise enough to do both.

The Air Force Association rejects out of hand any such philosophy of despair. We believe the United States can do both. We believe it must do both. Peace and freedom must be viewed as an indissoluble entity, both at home and abroad. Any national effort that does not hold both goals to be attainable betrays the ideals of the Revolution in which this nation was born and from which it has taken its strength for almost two centuries.

Providing for the common defense requires a penetrating evaluation of present and potential threats to national security. Those who wish to provide for domestic tranquillity at the expense of the common defense justify their position either by saying that the external threat has somehow lessened or that it has become too great to be coped with by other than diplomatic means. The one is wishful thinking. The other represents at best apathy, at worst the prospect of appeasement.

We view the threat to our nation's security as greater than ever. At the same time, it has become more complicated. A decade ago the threat represented a simple bipolar confrontation between the world's only two nuclear superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union. Now it is three-pronged. The Soviet Union has tightened its grip on its satellites by naked force while continuing its buildup of both sophisticated advanced weaponry and conventional forces. Red China continues its domination of the landmass of Asia by sheer weight of numbers while at the same time thrusting toward full-fledged status as a nuclear superpower in its own right. Both Communist powers urge, aid, and abet so-called "wars of national liberation" in the less-developed areas of the world. Any one of these developments poses grave risks for the United States in its position as leader of the Free World. Taken together they represent a threat of greater magnitude than any this nation has faced to date.

To the Air Force Association the facts are clear. While there may be areas in which the United States can negotiate safely and with advantage to ourselves and to our adversaries, such negotiations must proceed from a basis of undefeatable strength and in concert with our Allies, who must provide a fair share of that strength. Domestic problems must be solved in ways that do not weaken our position at the international bargaining table. Our adversaries are counting on both external and internal conflicts to weaken American strength and American will. This need not happen. It cannot be permitted to happen.

At the same time, the Air Force Association recognizes that the quest for freedom and justice for all Americans at home makes equally compelling demands on our national resources and national will. There is no contradiction here. Indeed, the U.S. military has pioneered in the erasure of racial, ethnic, religious, and social discrimination. Likewise, it has succeeded in imparting educational experiences and vocational skills to those whom civil society had discarded as unteachable and unusable. The aerospace industry, on which the armed forces depend for advanced weaponry, has accumulated skills and resources which are being put to work in the solution of pressing domestic problems ranging from education to housing. Taken together, the military-industry team, which protects our national interest against foreign enemies, constitutes at the same time a vital national resource that contributes on an ever-increasing scale to solutions for many of our domestic ills.

The greatest single factor in the current debate over national purpose and national resources obviously is the war in Vietnam. The unpredicted costs and ill-defined objectives of that conflict helped to create the economic and social pressures that are now eroding the public support for essential defense measures and programs. Hence, the military and political lessons of Vietnam require the closest scrutiny. In the military

XUM

sense, Vietnam has demonstrated anew the utility and flexibility of properly managed airpower in close support of ground troops, as a highly effective tactical weapon, and as an indispensable logistic tool—all in the context of overall strategic deterrence. The impasse in Vietnam is not military. Rather, it marks the failure of a political doctrine to evoke the kind of response from our adversary that it was expected to evoke.

Out of the bitter Vietnam experience must come a broader understanding of the range and nature of military power required for the 1970s as well as the need to correlate political policies to the military facts of life. Our forces must be tailored to deter aggression across the spectrum of conflict, from subversion and guerrilla activity to the potential intercontinental exchange of massive nuclear weapons. In achieving such a posture we must take full advantage of available technology and ensure that future technological advances—whether defensive or offensive—do not become a monopoly of a potential adversary.

We must order our priorities so as to separate peripheral threats from those that are vital to our own national survival and that of our Allies. We cannot, as in the case of Vietnam, rob our strategic forces of money and technology to pay for indecisive and expensive adventures in conventional warfare. Above all, the American people must be told the truth about the price and the purpose of our military and political commitments.

American resources are vast but not unlimited. American willingness to make sacrifices and take risks in the interest of peace and freedom must be shared by those who share the benefits of that peace and that freedom. In the future, therefore, we should examine carefully any political and military involvements into which our friends and Allies are unwilling to accompany us or even support us.

The Air Force Association believes that the time for a deep and searching reassessment and evaluation of national purposes, priorities, and interests is long overdue. A new national Administration provides an ideal opportunity for such an appraisal. Parochialism, partisanship, self-interest, and self-deception have no part in it. All such narrow considerations must be swept aside in a quest for national unity in a spirit if candor and trust.

Only thus can both the common defense and domestic tranquillity best be served.

FOREIGN BUILDING STONES

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to me to receive a report indicating that for the very first time foreign building stones will be used on a government building in lieu of domestic marble or stone. The building on which foreign building stones are to be used is the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

I am concerned because the justification for the use of the foreign product, which admittedly is a very beautiful Italian marble, is that the cost to the Federal Government will be considerably less than if domestic products were used. The reason for the higher cost of domestic products primarily has been due to the higher wages the American workmen and craftsmen in the stone industry are paid when related to foreign workers in a similar industry.

This Congress has in the past years increased the minimum wage rates and, of course, this increases the cost of the final product. Now we are told our products cost too much for the Government to use.

The building, which is under construction at the present time, involves some $14,000,000 and is an extension of the Smithsonian museums.

As a basic national policy, the Federal Government should have a buy-American policy in the construction of its buildings and facilities even though we may be able to obtain materials at a lower cost from foreign producers.

The reasons for this are many:

First. We have a serious balance-of-payments problem. It is my understanding that in a report to be released shortly to the American people, we will be told that our balance of trade for the first quarter was very unfavorable to the United States and, though part of this is obviously due to the longshoremen's strike, it is aggravated by governmental agencies purchasing foreign products at the expense of the domestic products, thus sending American dollars abroad.

Second. Another reason for using American materials in Government buildings is that these buildings will stand as a monument to American ingenuity, workmanship, and our heritage. As a part of America and as a tribute to its people, these buildings should be built with domestic materials, not foreign.

Third. A third reason for using our American products is that the basic policy of the U.S. Government should be to help promote our home industries through governmental contracts, particularly when the home industries may have had the cost of their products increased due to our policy of maintaining a high standard of living and adequately compenasting the workingmen whereas foreign industries have not necessarily followed a similar policy.

It will be my purpose to try to stop the use of foreign stone in the construction of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden by all reasonable means.

MONROE KIMBREL SPEAKS ON INFLATION

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, in a major address to the Independent Bankers Association of America in Las Vegas, Nev., Monroe Kimbrel, the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta warned Tuesday, March 18, that some of American businesses are edging the country deeper into inflation by "planning for inflation" instead of "planning for production."

Mr. Kimbrel, former president of both the American and the Georgia Bankers Associations, made his remarks in a speech at the 39th annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association of America, which was held March 17–19 in Las Vegas.

His speech is highly informative, and I think it will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

WHAT DOES INFLATION COST?

(By Monroe Kimbrel, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta)

At this time of year, many of us like to look back and measure our accomplishments. I could, therefore, take the easy way and spend my allotted time reminding you of the good things we have gained.

You recognize, I am sure, that we as a nation achieved much in 1968, and the future looks very bright. You also no doubt recognize that the nation's banks shared in this growth, with deposits and earnings up sharply.

I will not, however, enlarge on these points of which you are aware, but should like to discuss the losses we suffered because of the failure to stem the acceleration of inflation during 1968.

Let us consider three developments that, although they cover only a part of the loss incurred by inflation, do merit our serious reflection.

1. At the end of 1968, the dollar—as measured by consumer prices—was worth almost 5 percent less than it was a year earlier.
2. The United States, partly because of the inflationary trend, lost the major part of its favorable position in world trade.
3. In some instances, planning for inflation was substituted for planning for production by a change of emphasis in making judgments on spending and investing. (In my opinion this is the greatest loss.)

No doubt, some businessmen are happy about their ability to charge higher prices; their financial statements look better as a result. Also, corporations may point to increased earnings per share of stock.

Businessmen may be especially happy if the increase in the prices of goods they sell is more than the increase in the prices of goods and services they buy. This happiness, however, will sour if the prices of the merchandise or services they offer do not continue to rise over the prices of their purchases.

Not everyone has been so fortunate; and as costs catch up, it is likely that the number retaining this particular type of lead will be greatly diminished. In the long run, the benefits of inflation will inevitably accrue to only a few persons.

One does not have to go far to find many persons who in 1968 lost through inflation. Consumers, as a group, found that, in the end, the major part of 1968's growth in income was an illusion. In 1967, the per capita disposable income, or average income per person after Federal taxes, was $2,744; during the year, the average income increased by $182 to reach a total of $2,926 per capita. Measured in current dollars (that is, with out allowance for deterioration in purchasing power), the increase was about 7 percent.

The consumers may not have been acquainted with the statistics, but they learned through hard experience of the attrition in their purchasing power as the year progressed.

Statisticians tell us that, when this $182 gain is deflated for the increase in prices, the per capita gain in personal disposable income during 1968 was only 3 percent.

To refute the belief that the economy gains from inflation, I call your attention to an article in the February 17 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* reviewing various case studies gathered from throughout the nation. The article concludes, "Inflation is

XUM

shattering many Americans' complacent belief that every year they are living a little better than before."

In the words of the article, many persons report "less bowling, more overtime; no cookies for the kids; retiree stops eating three times a day; and cutting out pork and veal and substituting salads."

The uneven impact of inflation extends beyond those with relatively low incomes. For example, while attending a meeting recently I talked with a businessman who is also the trustee of a preparatory school. He complained that the funds laboriously accumulated over the years for construction of a badly needed building this year fell far short of the present cost because of rising prices.

A city official attending the same meeting was acutely aware of the rising costs of government and capital improvements caused by inflationary conditions. Under inflationany conditions, the economy gets out of joint, and you as bankers, I am sure, have heard many such complaints.

Bankers well know that the price of money, like the prices of goods and services, has increased briskly. Yields on long-term government securities are the highest since the Civil War. Higher rates are charged on loans and investments, and reflect higher earnings on bank statements.

But inflated expenses cut net profits and the dollars banks earned from higher interest rates bought less. What is more, every fixed income asset on the bankers' books decreased in market value as interest rates rose—a recurring development in inflationary periods.

When the general public becomes aware of the decreased purchasing power of its money, many of its members find it more difficult to save and begin to wonder if it is even worthwhile. If curtailed saving becomes widespread, the nation will experience a weakening in one of the chief forces responsible for its economic growth and high productivity. The fact is, the savings of the American people, of consumers as well as businessmen, provide much of the capital investment funds required for economic growth.

The second loss during 1968 because of inflation was a deterioration of the country's competitive position in world trade.

Our total balance of payments for 1968 looks very good on the surface. During 1968, this nation achieved a balance of payments surplus for the first time since 1957. Balance of payments, of course, includes financial transactions and other non-trade factors.

I shall not go into the details of how this surplus was achieved except to suggest that many of the forces creating last year's surplus may not be as strong this year. The stock market boom, the repatriation of corporate funds, and the success in curtailing lending abroad by U.S. banks all played a part in achieving a substantial increase in financial flows into this country.

The total conceals the serious deterioration in the trade surplus of the United States. In prior years, we have been able to count on selling substantially more goods and services abroad than we imported. This favorable balance of trade helped carry the load of government expenditures abroad and drains through financial transactions.

The United States was competitive in world markets during the early 1960's largely because it was able to keep the prices of its exports relatively stable, whereas many foreign countries suffered internal inflation. We have lost this advantage.

In 1968, the excess of the value of this country's goods and services exported over those imported was more than $3 billion less than in either 1966 or 1967. Rising prices here have made our exports less attractive to foreigners and have attracted more imports. Most experts see little hope for improving this situation very much until we bring our rising prices under control.

The shifting of emphasis toward inflationary considerations when making decisions to spend or invest may turn out to be the greatest loss during 1968 because of inflation.

Traditionally, the American businessman analyzed economic opportunities on the basis of how they would provide the services or produce the goods to meet the demands of the public. Success or failure, reflected by his profits, has typically depended upon the businessman's astuteness in discovering these opportunities and his efficiency in producing the goods or providing the services the public wants.

In contrast, in many countries of the world decisions to invest or to launch enterprises have been based almost entirely upon inflationary considerations. Investments there are not chosen because they are most productive in meeting the demands of the public, but because it appears they will benefit most or suffer least from inflation.

Under this philosophy, instead of measuring efficiency, profits may reflect only inflation. In the short run, rising prices may conceal mistakes; in the long run, resources are misdirected. Giving rewards to the inflation-mindied destroys the very basis for the operations of a free enterprise system.

One of the things suggested in a recent review of economic history was that economists in 1834 believed the consumer, the investor, is motivated by fear when things are going down or are at the bottom. But when prices rise, as they are now, some people are motivated by greed. And this greed destroys rational judgment.

Could it be said today that a part of the American public is being motivated by greed, as shown for example by those in the stock market who disregard the current price-earnings ratio and the intrinsic value of some of their investments?

Moreover, unfortunately, there are those in the banking business who may have pursued the same misdirected goals. Some of us in the Federal Reserve would like to hear that bankers have begun to say "No" to certain of their loan applicants. We should like to see more consumers with less of this psychological fear of inflation, so that they will base fewer financial decisions on what prices may be tomorrorw, next month, or in two months.

It is generally popular to blame rising prices on someone else. Four good targets are:

1. Labor, which is accused of pushing up wages faster than productivity;

2. Business, which is often charged with being over-eager to raise prices in order to maintain profits;

3. Government spending, which we all think should be reduced except for the things we are interested in; and

4. The Federal Reserve, which some claim has not been tight enough with its monetary policies.

A strong case has been made to support each one of these charges. Labor costs have risen. Employers complain of low productivity. Average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers rose over 6 percent between the end of 1967 and the end of 1968. Some workers experienced greater gains, and some less. There is no question, however, but that inflation itself was a major spur to the push toward high wages, and the average worker can scarcely be blamed for trying to maintain his income in the face of rising prices.

On the other hand, the workers can point to higher corporate profits in 1968 than in 1967. Even after substantially higher taxes, corporate profits rose from $48.1 billion in 1967 to $51 billion in 1968. But would not some businessmen respond that this was only the normal growth required to maintain incentives?

It is, of course, true that government spending has been high. The Federal deficit for fiscal 1968 reached $25.2 billion and in the last half of calendar 1968 was $11 billion. To finance this, the U.S. Treasury had to borrow $23.1 billion from the public in fiscal 1968 and $11.3 billion in the last half of 1968. This borrowing on top of heavy demands for funds by the private sector had much influence on the high interest rates. Since a large part of the deficit was financed by additional bank credit, inflationary pressures were increased.

In early 1967, economic and financial experts pointed out that the nation was going to get into trouble if it did not increase taxes or reduce expenditures. There was no lack of warning, but Congress was slow to enact legislation to cope with the problem. Finally, with pressures having been built up for so long, the surtax program that was put into effect in mid-1968 has been slow to take effect. Ultimately, it may help.

Before condemning senators and representatives in Congress for dilatory actions, consider if it might not be true that they were reflecting pretty well the sentiments of their constituents. Is it not possible that the taxpayer hoped taxes could be reduced if the Federal Government would cut expenditures for everything but those projects which had his special approval.

How many of us wrote letters to our Congressman applauding the closing down of a local Federal facility or establishment? On the other hand, how many of us applauded our Congressman during 1967 and early 1968 if he announced he would have nothing to do with a tax increase?

Another popular whipping boy is the Federal Reserve System. Critics can point out that in the first half of 1968 bank credit rose at what they considered an excessively high seasonally adjusted annual rate of 6.5 percent. After mid-year, the annual rate of growth was even higher—about 21 percent in July and August and 15 percent in September. By the end of the year, the rate had slowed down a bit. With prices rising so rapidly, critics ask, "Why did the Federal Reserve supply the reserves to the banking system that made this growth in bank credit possible?"

You will find that I am on record as having suggested during 1968 that the bank credit growth was excessive. At the same time, it is only fair to point out that the Federal Reserve was caught in a trap that prevented it from exerting the pressures required to completely offset the effects of deficit Treasury financing. Alone, the Federal Reserve could not have held back the inflationary pressures completely without creating serious side effects.

You will recall that, because of the failure to take timely action in respect to fiscal policy, the Treasury was forced to borrow heavily during 1968, especially during the second half. Corporations and state and local governments were strongly competing for funds. Interest rates were high. How much higher they would have gone had not the Federal Reserve supplied some additional credit to the banking system no one knows. An even greater and sudden increase in rates, however, might have been disastrous, possibly including a failure in Treasury financing. Perhaps the Federal Reserve can be criticized for its policy judgments, but those who do so should remember the problem that was faced, who and what created the problem, and what might have been the consequences of a more restrictive policy posture.

In a democracy such as ours, responsibility for keeping our economic and financial affairs in order cannot be shifted to the shoulders of any one group. Neither can a democracy expect any agency it may set up, including a central bank such as the Federal Reserve System, to successfully do the job unless there is widespread public support.

Professor Reuf, the French financial expert, has stated that no democratic society can be expected to run its financial affairs successfully. "Is he right?" you may well ask.

XUM

American economic and financial history has shown that a society such as ours can manage its financial affairs when it wants to. We have made mistakes, sometimes we have refused to face reality, we have refused to accept discipline, and some special interests have at times forgotten the public interest. But the record of our American society is far better than that of most of the nations of the world.

When we have lapsed, we have eventually realized the disastrous consequences that could result unless we changed direction. We have then accepted the collective responsibility and stopped trying to shift responsibility to others. Political leaders, businessmen, and labor have responded by taking or supporting the needed steps to restore financial order.

Who is responsible for our present inflationary problem? Is labor, or business, or government, or the Federal Reserve to shoulder the blame? Perhaps all of them must accept some of the censure, but I am inclined to think we can place most of the blame on our own collective complacency—the failure of you and me and other Americans to accept the responsibility and to act.

I am confident, therefore, that we can bring inflation under control. More and more persons realize that, if the same inflationary conditions prevail in 1969 as in 1968, our losses can be compounded. The realization that these conditions must be controlled is perhaps getting our fiscal affairs in a more manageable state. With better control of our fiscal affairs, monetary policy may have more room to maneuver. Signs here and there attest that the frantic pace of the economy is abating.

Patience and determination can win the battle against inflation. Bowing to the temptation of inflationary greed and disregarding the need for discipline can make the battle much harder to win. If we all support those whose job it is to administer the discipline, victory can be ours.

A DREAM COME TRUE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is in my district a very fine example of individual involvement with society and humanity.

It is a story about a couple, the Reverend and Mrs. John McCloud of Sodus, N.Y., who are using their own money to build a church. They both have full-time jobs and do their ministering on Sundays.

The McClouds have dedicated their time to helping their fellow men, because, "We saw so much to be done. Especially with the kids. So many of them going wrong because they were poor and didn't have anyone to teach them to live right."

And so the McClouds began going around from house to house on Sunday, their only free day.

I would like to share with my colleagues the text of a story by Herman Archunde that appeared in the Times-Union, March 17:

DREAM COMING TRUE: SODUS CHURCH RISES FROM A GRAVEL PIT

(By Herman Archunde)

SODUS.—Slowly taking form in the ravaged pocket of an abandoned gravel pit close by the Buerman Road just east of here is a church.

It's a small church and it sits so low off the paved rural road that a passing motorist can almost look down on the tall and skeletal wood frame that will one day be its sharply pointed steeple.

A humble setting? Yes.

But though the elements in this scene aren't intended to be symbolic, they somehow add up to one shining word—hope.

The Rev. and Mrs. John McCloud (he's 64 years old, she's 63) have much hope; and perhaps in even greater abundance, faith. Together they are building the church. Every extra penny they earn goes into the building and into improving the scarred site on which it rests.

They have had some outside help. A few persons have donated money, others material, a stained glass window and a pulpit for instance.

But though the donations are welcome the McClouds are not soliciting.

Rev. McCloud, an ordained minister in the Church of God, believes one has to sacrifice to prove to others the sincerity of the effort. Or in his words "to show them you make the grade."

Surely, Mr. and Mrs. McCloud make the grade. Their aim is to help others make it too. That's why they're building the church.

The McClouds came to Wayne County from Florida five years ago because they needed jobs. They found them. Both work.

But here in Wayne they found a calling for another kind of work, one that pays not in dollars and cents but in spiritual satisfaction.

"We saw so much to be done," Estelle McCloud says. "Especially with the kids. So many of them going wrong 'cause they were poor and didn't have anyone to teach them to live right."

The McClouds began a sort of roving ministry, going from home to home, usually on Sunday, their only free day, and covering a territory that stretches from Ontario in the west to Wolcott in the east.

It's a lot of ground to cover, especially when there's only one day to cover it in, when your transportation is a battered '65 compact, and especially when, in the words of Mrs. McCloud, "there's so much need."

The church was the answer to bringing together their scattered flock.

They looked at a number of sites. Many of them were good. And at least once they almost nailed down a deal. But in the end either the land was too expensive or else the owner seemed unwilling to sell to a minister bent on building a church for a Negro congregation. Last April they found the gravel pit.

"It looked terrible bad when we first saw it," Rev. McCloud said. "But we saw where it could be fixed up." So they bought it.

They hired bulldozers and had the floor of the huge cavity filled and leveled. After that was done, they hired one carpenter and began building.

Today the sturdy gray brick walls of the church are up and the roof is almost complete. The frame for the steeple is in place. And the gravel pit is beginning to show signs of a gradual rejuvenation.

But there is still much work to be done.

The church needs a floor and windows; it needs seats, and light, and heat. And outside there are still holes to fill and ground to level and top soil to bring in for the lawn.

"I guess it'll be another year before it's really finished," Rev. McCloud said.

By April, however, he hopes the church will be far enough along that he can hold an Easter service. He's counting on it.

The other day Mr. and Mrs. McCloud led a visitor on a quick tour of the site.

"My son and I designed it," said Rev. McCloud with obvious pride.

Rev. McCloud is the father of 11 children by a previous marriage. He married Estelle 21 years ago after his first wife died. They have had no more children and since the others are grown and gone, the McClouds are alone now.

The son who helped design the church is a mason now living in Paterson, N.J. He and some in-laws have provided more free labor, Rev. McCloud said.

"We've been able to keep the cost down a lot that way," he noted.

Behind the church the McClouds are building on a small addition where they intend to live. They now rent a home in Ontario.

"It's going to be a real pretty church," says Estelle who can hardly contain her joy in anticipation of the day when "everything will be just right."

"We'll have swings and slides for the kids over there," she says, pointing to one side of the building. "And here in front we'll have tables and chairs where grownups can sit and talk."

The way she describes it, one can almost see the happy people gathering on a Sunday morning, talking and laughing outside, and singing a joyful song inside.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this work by the McClouds, gives us much hope for the future.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT COMPLETE REVIEW OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent newspaper stories about the effects of conglomerates and one-bank holding companies have stressed the impact that such monopolistic practices have upon small business.

The small businessman cannot compete with industrial monopolies and, in addition, the small businessman cannot hope to obtain the necessary financing through the private business sector.

These were some of the reasons that the Small Business Administration was established in 1954.

It is no secret that lately the Small Business Administration has fallen far short of the goals and ideals under which it was established.

With the exception of a few limited programs, the agency is without funds to make loans to small businessmen. As an alternative, the agency must participate with commercial banking institutions to provide economic assistance and to compound the problem, the Small Business Administration allows these financial institutions to charge the highest legal rate on these loans. The interest rates on these loans put them virtually out of reach for the average small businessman. A number of small businessmen have told me that if they pay the high interest rates, they know they will not be able to repay the loan. However, they point out, that unless they obtain the financing, they will have to go out of business. In short, either way they are doomed.

The lack of lending funds for the Small Business Administration cannot be allowed to continue. However, to compound this situation, it is the manner in which the Small Business Administration has

XUM

operated that raises grave questions about increased lending authority for that agency.

It is a cruel hoax for small businessmen to be told by the Small Business Administration that the agency has no funds with which to make loans. At the same time, the newspapers are filled with stories of mismanaged Small Business Administration loan affairs. In addition, I find it hard to believe that with all the truly deserving small businessmen in the country who are in need of financial institutions, the Small Business Administration must search out people to receive loans or other similar SBA benefits.

Legislation is presently pending before the Banking and Currency Committee that would increase the amount that the Small Business Administration may have outstanding in its various lending programs. This is an extremely important piece of legislation. However, it will be no help to small businessmen to merely increase the authorized lending capacity of the Small Business Administration without making certain that the agency operates in the best interests of all small businessmen. To this end, the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee has begun a detailed examination of the operations of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that the staff will have collected and analyzed this preliminary data before the committee opens hearings on the increased authorization for the Small Business Administration. If the preliminary investigation by the staff uncovers sufficient evidence to warrant it, I will ask that the committee undertake a full-scale study of SBA before considering the new authorizations. In short, Mr. Speaker, I want to make certain that SBA is operating properly in every respect before we extend its lending programs.

The preliminary work of the committee staff has already turned up some shocking disclosures, including an attempt by SBA to cover up some of its mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, we need a strong Small Business Administration but we must make certain that the agency is properly managed and supervised so that it can meet the goals established for it by Congress.

LOWER VOTING AGE GAINING GROUND

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed and encouraged by the appearance of a growing awareness throughout the Nation that the time has come to lower the voting age. I recently reported the actions of the Pennsylvania Legislature toward lowering the voting age; actions which auger well for an early vote by the citizens of Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania action reflects what I believe to be is a ground swell for lowering the voting age. Today I am inserting in the RECORD two editorials and one news story on this subject which I believe represents further proof of the growing trend.

The first editorial is from the Reynoldsville, Pa., Star wherein the writer notes:

> By the level of their (the young people) education, experience and exposure to the affairs of the country and the world, they are no doubt moving into an area where we cannot ignore the contribution they can make by participation in making political decisions.

The second editorial, from radio station WTOP here in Washington, deals most directly with the current Maryland situation, but I found the comment on the "maturity" of our young people of particular interest.

Turning to the national scene, the article in the March 20 edition of the Christian Science Monitor should be, I believe, "must" reading for all Members of this House. A survey by the Monitor revealed that, of 257 Members questioned, 175 were for lowering the voting age. The article also points out that there are 51 Senators in favor of lowering the voting age. It also points out some qualifications to these numbers, but I believe it cannot be denied that there is a growing tendency by Members to favorably consider the proposition, and it is my belief that that tendency will convince more of our colleagues to join in efforts to lower the voting age nationally. The editorials and news story follow:

[From the Reynoldsville (Pa.) Star]

A New Voter Bloc?

Four times in our history of politics, the Constitution has been amended to permit the inclusion of large groups of citizens in the right to vote laws. Moves are now afoot to repeat this inclusion process by granting the franchise to those over 18 years of age.

We started out early in enlarging the electorate by striking down the tests for religion and property as qualifications for voters. It took a bloody war to at least grant our black citizens the right to cast a ballot.

Another period elapsed before the suffragettes won the ladies of the country the privilege of marking their x's for the candidates of their choice. And then just four years ago another amendment retired the poll tax test for voters which had disenfranchised hundreds of thousands.

In every instance there was a pitched battle of one level or another. We don't advance the privilege to anyone until it is proved they deserve it and can handle it when they get it.

We have routinely advised going slow on letting 18 year olds visit the polls with their elders. In the first place we wanted them to be able to enjoy themselves for a while until they had to assume the obligations of being a full-fledged citizen. As the events have transpired, many of them are assuming the obligations but have received little in the way of political consideration. A great bulk of them are familiar with paying taxes, assuming family responsibilities and bearing arms in protection of the country.

To be sure, the actions of a volatile minority of those between 18 and 21 have branded the remainder with a sort of a notoriety that sort of slowed down any desires to include them in the voting ranks. Rioters and anarchists don't want to vote anyway. But fortunately, those who see the whole spectrum of youthful endeavor have made serious moves in this state to approve the age of 18 vote.

By the level of their education, experience and exposure to the affairs of the country and world, they are no doubt moving into an area where we cannot ignore the contribution they can make by participating in making political decisions.

One thing we have noticed of recent years is that you can't con them into much anymore. The goods has to be full cut, of good quality and at a good price. Maybe if they practice the same criteria on candidates, they may be a welcome addition.

[From WTOP radio and television editorial, Mar. 4 and 5, 1969]

Voting Age

The arguments being circulated in Maryland in opposition to lowering the voting age amount to a lot of illogical nonsense.

The most fraudulent among these is the implication frequently heard that all 18- and 19-year-olds are bent on violence, disruption, and other unsavory pastimes, and therefore are not to be trusted with the franchise.

This bias against all youth because of the antics of a few is patently unfair. It would make as much sense to deny the vote to all adults because a few adults have been seen to engage in murder.

As for maturity and education, the 18-to-21 group in the present day is much better prepared to be in the arena of public affairs than the same age group was 40 years ago or even 20 years ago. This is a reality which obviously makes some people uncomfortable. If you have doubts about the preparation of the typical high school graduate in 1969, just talk with the admissions officer in any university.

Even the old saw which says that the 18-year-old is handicapped by inexperience is out of touch with the reality of the electronic age. Instant, world-wide communication provides today's young people with experiences no other generation has shared at *any* age.

Two American Presidents—Eisenhower and Johnson—have supported lowering the voting age to 18. Two states—Georgia and Kentucky—have done so, with no shattering shifts in their political philosophies.

In Maryland, where a bill allowing 19-year-olds to vote is under consideration, much is being made of the possible danger to other constitutional reforms on the ballot if the voting-age question also appears. The obvious remedy is the structuring of separate votes, so that the failure of one issue need not affect others.

Some people undoubtedly feel more secure in themselves by proclaiming a lack of wisdom and maturity in the 18-to-21 group, but the facts say otherwise.

Maryland will have a stronger body politic if it broadens the electorate to include those 18 and up.

This was a WTOP Editorial . . . Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

[From Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 20, 1969]

Despite Student Upheaval: Poll in House Backs Teen Vote—A Monitor Survey

(By Lyn Shepard)

WASHINGTON.—Despite recent campus disorders, sentiment in Congress is gravitating toward lowering the national voting age to 18.

A survey of House reaction by the Christian Science Monitor shows support for this pro-

XUM

posal surpassing a 2-1 margin of approval among the 257 congressmen responding.

A two-thirds majority of both houses would be needed, as well as ratification by three-fourths of the states, to amend the Constitution.

Another Monitor study published earlier this week found roughly 4-1 backing for teen-age voting rights from 51 Senators answering questionnaires.

Yet in the House, even more than in the Senate, knowledgeable sources caution against projecting these levels of support among those not responding to the poll.

"Getting Congress to consider and act on this type of 'reform,'" warned Rep. Howard W. Robison (R) of New York, "is like the proverbial 'pulling of hens' teeth."

"Perhaps we will do it," he wrote on his questionnaire, "but only, I suspect, if there is a groundswell of public interest in and support for the proposal."

WITH 175 FOR, 76 AGAINST

The House sampling found—at least on the surface—a phalanx of opinion endorsing 18-year-old voting: 175 in favor, 76 opposed, and 6 undecided. The study also unearthed surprising support among conservatives of both parties as well as nearly solid liberal backing.

These findings would seem to disprove the recent comment of Rep. Emanuel Celler (D) of New York that "teen-age voting has made very little progress [in Congress]."

Mr. Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has refused for years to hold hearings on the issue. Yet the Monitor survey found 14 members of the 35-man panel in favor and only 4 opposed.

[Some 79 House members chose not to identify themselves on the questionnaire, so a greater number of Mr. Celler's committeemen may have actually responded.]

DIFFERENT AGE SUGGESTED

Nonetheless, House observers say, members who failed to answer the survey would be more likely to oppose lowering the voting age than those who replied. If they are right, it does not bode well for the proposal.

Even if the silent members were to divide their votes equally in a floor test, it should be noted, the measure would fall about 25 votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority. Should they tend to vote as those responding to the Monitor's straw poll did, though, it would clear the House with ease.

Interestingly, a dozen members remarked that the amendment would stand a better chance of passage were the voting age lowered to 19 or 20 rather than 18.

With others the question of the added year or two made no difference. They flatly opposed any change from the status quo.

"There is no real reason for it," contended Rep. David W. Dennis (R) of Indiana. "There has to be an age line somewhere; 21 is traditional and is generally consistent with legal majority. . . . The burden of proof is on those who want a change."

GENERATION GAP CITED

On the other hand, Rep. Robert G. Stephens Jr. (D) of Georgia argued that Congress should follow the example of his home state, which, he said, "has had confidence in the young people for many years." Georgia and Kentucky permit voting rights to 18-year-olds, Alaska to 19-year-olds, and Hawaii to 20-year-olds.

Mr. Stephens praised his state's initiative in granting what he called "an incentive for persons to take the voting privilege in a responsible position at an early age."

A new member of the Celler committee, Rep. Abner J. Mikva (D) of Illinois, also defended the proposed reform.

"One reason for the generation gap," he wrote, "is that the young people feel left out of the action. They are affected directly by too many of the consequences of an election to deny them participation in it."

Rep. William J. Randall (D) of Missouri, a conservative, said his opposition was based largely on timing.

"I am against bringing up the issue at this time," he explained, "because in my opinion it would be defeated. The recent instances of violence on our campuses have caused our mail to run very highly against 18-year-old voting."

SOME CONSERVATIVES IN FAVOR

Other unidentified critics were harsher in their judgment of the younger generation. "Immature," "irresponsible," and "radical" often popped up as adjectives describing those in the 18–21 category.

"Today a small minority of radicals and revolutionaries on college campuses can control student bodies of 10,000 to 18,000 students," one congressman charged.

"In the past," another observed, "I have felt that it might be good for 18-year-olds to be able to vote. But with all the uproar this past year I have very serious doubts as to their ability. . . ."

Yet some stalwart conservatives favor the idea of an 18-year-old voting-age minimum. Among them are Reps. John M. Ashbrook (R) of Ohio, Sam Steiger (R) of Arizona, Dan H. Kuykendall (R) of Tennessee, and William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D) of South Carolina.

In fact, New York's Mr. Robison asserts that the survey probably detected greater House enthusiasm for teen-age voting than if it had been taken a year ago.

"When we went to the campuses during the last campaign," he explained, "we found a great number of young people who felt this should have been passed by Congress years ago. But that doesn't mean their mothers and fathers feel that way."

M'CORMACK BACKS CHANGE

Speaker of the House John W. McCormack, a leader lately under attack from his party's liberal wing for allegedly losing touch with the times, wrote back a strong endorsement of the reform measure.

"To me," the Boston lawmaker reasoned, "the question is the educational ability of those 18 years old to assume with responsibility the fullness of citizenship through the exercise of suffrage. Americans 18 years of age clearly meet this test."

Despite such powerful backing, two other champions of youthful voting rights are clearly concerned about the political obstacles ahead.

"I think the bill's chances are slight," admitted Rep. Lloyd Meeds (D) of Washington, "primarily because the Congress, hopefully, will be working on 'election reform' as it relates to the Electoral College."

[Though Congress seldom has proposed more than one constitutional amendment to the states during its two-year sittings, the 87th Congress did this in 1960–62. It offered the 23d and 24th amendments, which were promptly ratified.]

Rep. James Harvey (R) of Michigan also is skeptical.

"Campus strife and disorder have created a most unfavorable atmopshere for this deserved legislation," he contends. "A handful [of student dissenters] may well block passage."

EDINBURG, TEX., ALL-AMERICA CITY

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, quite often in modern times we hear of the title, "All American," associated, of course, with sports; sometimes also associated with youth, where we call a clean-cut young man an "all-American boy." But now, Mr. Speaker, we have the title, "All-America City," an award bestowed by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

I am proud, very proud, to inform you that Edinburg, Tex., in my congressional district, has been chosen for this designation. This is the kind of an award I like to see given, Mr. Speaker, for you see no one individual, no one group is given the recognition. It is given to all the citizens of that community, rich or poor, black or white, for their contribution large or small toward making their city a better place to live. I am more proud for the citizens of Edinburg, Mr. Speaker, because this is not a rich area; it is not a prosperous metropolis; it is just an average small town, but indeed it is not average in its desire to better the lives of its citizens. This is what makes America strong; this is what makes it great: Its people, with faith in God, in their country, and in themselves, and working together they join hands and shoulder to shoulder attack mutual problems.

I am happy further to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House, that you share part of this great honor, for in some areas it was legislation which we have enacted here, under your leadership, Mr. Speaker, that aided the citizens of Edinburg along the way, and I know they would like for me to tell you this. Therefore, I very respectfully invite you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, to join me in extending a very warm "well done," and our congratulations and best wishes to the public officials and the citizens of Edinburg, Tex., All-America City.

NAZARETH COLLEGE

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the February 13, 1969, issue of the Record in Louisville, Ky., concerning Nazareth College. This outstanding college now has a new president, Charles M. Karcher, who, by the way, is establishing a splendid record.

It is a distinct honor to have Nazareth College located in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky and, along with our other universities and colleges in our district, Nazareth has a commendable educational program underway.

Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "President Karcher Reflects on Nazareth's Goals" is as follows:

PRESIDENT KARCHER REFLECTS ON NAZARETH'S GOALS

(By Joseph Duerr)

It's not unusual for Charles M. Karcher to pick up his morning mail at Nazareth College and find it addressed under the title of "Sister Superior" or "Very Reverend."

And he's accustomed to people calling him "Sister" or "Father."

Karcher was not at all used to these things more than a year and a half ago when he was the first layman to become president of the 155-year-old Nazareth College near

XUM

Bardstown. Now, he merely shrugs them off with a smile.

But titles aside, Karcher has not found that being the lay president of a predominantly all-girls college previously headed by Sisters has handicapped his work.

In his soft-spoken and thoughtful manner, he quickly points out that there is a "shared responsibility" and good rapport between the lay and Religious at the college. (Religious outnumber laymen on the faculty about 2-to-1.)

And he notes the good cooperation he receives from the Sisters of Charity, who operate the college, and the "excellent people" he can turn to for advice when problems arise.

The 56-year-old Karcher, a native of Leipsic, Ohio, did not come to the presidency without some experience in school administration. He served as executive head of two public school districts in Ohio before coming to Nazareth in 1961 as chairman of the education department.

Looking back on his year and eight months as president, he says he's "just pleased that every once in a while something goes right."

That may be a modest appraisal, because he proceeds to list a number of "right" things, like new learning programs, the role students have in college decision-making and new building plans (plans are now underway for a new dining hall and book store).

He's particularly proud of the school's new social service program, which prepares students for professional social work. ("We are one of the few private colleges in the country with this type of program," he says, "and (we) are being looked on by others as a resource college.")

With student discord plaguing some campuses around the country, Karcher cites the "immediate communication" at Nazareth between students (340 are enrolled full-time this semester) and the administration and the "voice students have in decision-making" at the college. (Students, for example, are represented on the college's top committee—the Administrative Committee.)

And he also likes to talk about the "responsible" work of the student government. "It has concerned itself with some important activities (including curriculum and discipline), which has resulted in betterment for the college," he explains.

This does not mean, though, that Karcher does not have problems. For he feels that they are basically the same problems facing larger colleges and universities but on a smaller scale.

Placing the college on a more stable financial foundation is the primary problem, he says. "All the others (including faculty recruitment and building construction) are somehow related to this."

What about the future of private church-related colleges, like Nazareth?

Karcher thinks there is a future, despite increasing financial problems, because the private college can "better innovate" than the state schools and because some parents will always be willing to pay a "premium" for their children's education in a private college.

But he also believes that the private college will have to limit its academic program "to those things which we can do well."

He says the "thrust now" in education, paralleled by the change in students, is toward the "humanitarian" fields (social work, speech therapy and teaching) and the "aesthetic" fields (music, drama and art).

Students today are "more service minded," Karcher observes. "They want more involvement and (they) seem impelled to do something. And they also have a keener appreciation for aesthetics."

Karcher and his wife live in Bardstown. They have two daughters—one is married and is living in Fort Hamilton, N.Y., and the other, a recent graduate of Nazareth College, is teaching first grade in the Jefferson County school system.

BISHOP JOHN JOSEPH WRIGHT NAMED CARDINAL BY POPE PAUL VI

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the feeling of great pride of the people of the archdiocese of Boston in learning of the elevation to cardinal of Bishop John Joseph Wright, as announced last week by Pope Paul VI.

As one who grew up in the same neighborhood as Bishop Wright, we always knew that this brilliant, dedicated young man was destined to become one of the great leaders of the world.

It was my privilege to serve with Bishop Wright as an altar boy at St. Angela's Parish in Mattapan, Mass. There, under the guidance and spiritual leadership of the late beloved Rev. Francis X Ryan, John Wright exemplified the qualities of love of neighbor and respect for his parents—qualities so essential in today's society.

Bishop Wright was born in Boston on July 18, 1909, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Wright of 698 River St., Mattapan. He is one of six children, having three brothers and two sisters. During his schoolboy days at Boston Latin School, he established himself as an outstanding scholar and debater. While attending school he worked as a stack boy at the Boston Public Library for 25 cents an hour. Another job that helped finance his education at Boston College was his work in the city room at the Boston Post newspaper.

At Boston College Bishop Wright continued in his academic achievements, graduating with a B.A. degree. From Boston College he entered St. John's Seminary at Brighton, Mass., where he remained for a year before going on to Rome to continue his studies in theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University.

Bishop Wright entered the priesthood in Rome on December 8, 1935. After his ordination he remained abroad to earn his doctorate in sacred theology, and to serve in parishes in Scotland, England, and France.

He returned to the United States in 1939 and became a professor of philosophy at his alma mater, St. John's Seminary. In 1943, he was appointed secretary to the late William Cardinal O'Connell and in 1947 he was appointed auxiliary bishop of Boston. A new Worcester, Mass., diocese was created by the Vatican in 1950 and Bishop Wright became its first bishop.

In Worcester Bishop Wright faced the challenge of instilling in Catholics of diverse ancestral backgrounds a feeling for their common religious heritage. Through Bishop Wright's dynamic efforts, 30 new parishes were established and an outstanding hospital, St. Vincent's, was created.

In a most colorful ceremony in Pittsburgh in 1959, Bishop Wright was installed by Cardinal Cushing as the new Catholic bishop of the diocese of Pittsburgh. Here he showed not only his successful administrative qualities, but also his dedication to the needs of the community—through his active leadership in the areas of ecumenism, civil rights, and education.

Bishop Wright is a true humanitarian. I commend him for his service, I pray that his work in the years ahead will be fruitful—that he will have the strength and good health to continue in God's work. May the good Lord bless him in all his efforts.

Yes, we are proud of Cardinal-designate John Joseph Wright, very proud, indeed.

We salute this new prince of the church.

OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert my March 1969 opinion poll in the RECORD:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL, MARCH 1969

This year the Minshall Opinion Poll is being sent to every home in the 23rd Congressional District. I welcome your additional comments, however I regret that time and staff limitations will not permit me to personally respond to each return. Results will be made known to the news media and in a forthcoming "Washington Report." Please mail your completed questionnaire to Minshall Opinion Poll, 2243 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515. Let me know if you need additional copies.

1. Do you favor one year of compulsory training for all young men?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

2. Do you approve of the proposed limited anti-ballistic missile system?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

3. Does the U.S. space program justify its cost?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

4. Should the voting age be lowered to 19?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

5. In cases of continued flagrant campus disorder, should federal funds for the college involved be suspended until order is restored?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

6. Should the Electoral College be replaced by a national popular vote for the Presidency?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

7. Do you favor financing the research and development of a Supersonic Transport aircraft at an estimated government cost of approximately $1.5 billion?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

8. Are you in favor of continuing the 10% income surtax?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

9. Should the government subsidize a guaranteed annual income?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

10. Do you think the Nixon Administration has made a good start?

Yes ☐. No ☐.

11. If the Paris peace talks do not succeed in ending the war in Vietnam, what alternative would you suggest? ______________

____

____

12. What do you think is the principal problem facing the nation today? ________

____

____

XUM

EDUARDO MONDLANE AND FRELIMO

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago Eduardo Mondlane, a leader in the African liberation movement, was murdered. Mondlane was president of the Mozambique Liberation Front, more commonly called FRELIMO. An editorial in the March issue of "Venture" discusses in some detail the work of Mondlane and his organization. It states:

> Mondlane's living memorial is a soundly structured movement which will be further developed. FRELIMO remains a model for other movements engaged in the struggle for self-determination in Southern Africa.

Following is the complete editorial:

EDUARDO MONDLANE

> Africa lost one of its great leaders when Eduardo Mondlane, president of the Mozambique Liberation Front was murdered in Dar-es-Salaam on 3 February.
>
> Mondlane's contribution to the struggle for African liberation and development was a vital one. FRELIMO has pioneered among the national liberation movements of Southern Africa a coherent revolutionary strategy of integrated activity in the military, political, economic, social and educational fields. Its strategy is inspired and shaped by an identifiably African political philosophy, and shares much with the thinking of Julius Nyerere and the Tanzanian example. FRELIMO shares Nyerere's ideals of non-alignment, self-reliance, socialism and democracy and is applying them to the armed struggle to replace Portuguese colonial rule in Mozambique with a new social and political order.
>
> Frelimo's political creed has developed in response to the lessons learned in applying it in the war zones and liberated areas of Mozambique. Frelimo is more than a nationalist movement; it is, in the areas it controls, a government, and no mere government in exile. Party leaders move regularly and freely through the northern provinces of Mozambique. Frelimo has brought an administrative structure, educational and welfare services (albeit rudimentary in the face of obvious handicaps) and the possibility of popular participation, to areas of Mozambique which have known only the stultifying hand of Portuguese colonial rule. More than that the movement has worked to reconstruct the economy of the liberated areas, and is tackling from the base the problems of rural underdevelopment.
>
> Mondlane from the party's beginnings recognised the importance of education, both academic and political, and the urgent need for administrative and vocational training at all levels. The work of the Mozambique Institute under the direction of his wife Janet Rae Mondlane has been a vital element in Frelimo's development. Its activities include wide-ranging educational programmes both in Tanzania and in Mozambique itself, training administrators for the liberated areas, training medical aides and directing welfare work among Mozambican refugees.
>
> This then is the legacy of Eduardo Mondlane who left the soft option of American university life and the corridors of the UN to lead his people in their fight for political and economic independence. His book *The struggle for Mozambique* will be published by the Penguin African Library in May. He wrote about Frelimo and the war in the July/August 1968 issue of *Venture*.) His intellectual energy and his enthusiastic capacity for human relationships won him many friends in all continents and he learned from many different creeds and social orders, yet his own personal contribution was distinctively African.
>
> Superficial observers tended to assume that Mondlane was Frelimo, and that Frelimo was Mondlane. Yet he had no taste for the cult of personality and constantly emphasized the collectivity of Frelimo's leadership. The ideas and institutions that Mondlane did so much to develop are the organic product of seven years of collective struggle and find their most recent embodiment in the decisions of the second Frelimo congress held in July last year in the Niassa province of Mozambique, and in the subsequent resolutions of the central committee.
>
> Mondlane's living memorial is a soundly structured movement which will be further developed. Frelimo remains a model for other movements engaged in the struggle for self-determination in Southern Africa.
>
> It has inevitably been suggested that Mondlane's death was the result of divisions within Frelimo. Of course no guerrilla movement is entirely free from internal differences, and in contemporary Africa it is easy for outside agencies, not least the principal enemy in the struggle to exploit these. In the last 18 months Frelimo has not escaped such difficulties, but sources of strain were recognised by the collective leadership which successfully worked to correct them by democratic methods. The true nature of difficulties which gave rise to disturbances at Frelimo's secondary school and more seriously in its Dar-es-Salaam office in the first half of 1968 was recognized both by the Tanzanian government and by the Oau liberation committee. The disorders were the work of elements external to Frelimo, but doubts as to Frelimo's unity were not at first easily dispelled.
>
> The July congress eliminated these doubts, and left Frelimo greatly strengthened. Delegates from all over Mozambique expressed their confidence in the policy followed during the six years since the first congress in 1962 and reaffirmed their confidence in the Frelimo leadership (and on issues where there was a division, majority votes were taken). The congress discussed in detail problems arising from the political and social structure development in the liberated areas, including the working relationship between the military and the civilian administration, methods of increasing production through agricultural and trading co-operatives and the development of local industries.
>
> Frelimo's educational and welfare programmes were also scrutinised. The congress further agreed on important structural reforms which broadened the base of the congress and of the central committee, which was re-established, with elected members and a strictly legislative function. Executive functions now rest with the executive committee, consisting of the president and the vice-president and the secretaries of the specialised departments—defence, organisation, external affairs, social affairs and so on. These are appointed by the president.
>
> At the end of August 1968 in its new character as a legislative body the central committee met to draw up new lines of action, analysing in detail the work of all departments, changing the structure of some of them and approving their programmes. (Details, which reveal the sophistication of the organisation, can be read in *Mozambique revolution*, official organ of FRELIMO, obtainable through the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, 1 Antrim Road, NW3.) In the field of external relations which was the direct responsibility of Vice-President Simango it was noted with satisfaction that committees of support for the struggle of the Mozambican people have been created in many countries, including recently in the west. The importance of improving understanding of Frelimo's position abroad was stressed.
>
> The practical support which Eduardo Mondlane and other Frelimo spokesmen have succeeded in attracting in the United States, in Scandinavia and recently in Britain are a vital element in Frelimo's struggle. The three Scandinavian governments support the Mozambique Institute's educational and welfare programmes, and a number of religious and humanitarian non-governmental organisations in Europe and the United States also make important contributions. The message that the healthy and stable development of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau lies in self-determination has made headway in the west. The shift in the Anglo-American position on the occasion of the last UN vote is some evidence of this (see *Venture*, January 1969).
>
> Indeed the most likely motive underlying the assassination of Eduardo Mondlane is the recognition on the part of the enemies of African advancement in Mozambique that Mondlane and the Frelimo leadership had successfully foiled attempts to sabotage the movement from within and were making diplomatic progress in the west. It was no doubt hoped that the death of Mondlane would check Frelimo's progress.
>
> Western supporters of the struggle for freedom in Portugal's colonies will be helping to carry on the work of Eduardo Mondlane if they continue to contribute materially to Frelimo's programmes, particularly in the field of education and welfare. They should also work for further changes in western policies towards Portugal, which continues to derive strength from her position within NATO and EFTA. It is through such channels, particularly NATO, that pressures must be exerted in favour of change. Meanwhile the African people of Mozambique will continue to bury their dead and maintain their struggle in all its aspects. In Mondlane's own words: "It is not that a change of attitude on the part of the west will alter the outcome of the struggle. But it could, we feel, help to determine the time it may take for us to win".

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, like millions of other Americans, I served under General Eisenhower in World War II, and I became a member of the Republican Party because of him. So it is no exaggeration to say that I owe him my present position in life.

But that is only a small part of the debt.

I owe him the same thing we all do—his immeasurable contribution to our Nation, and to the world.

His atoms-for-peace program; the Nation's system of superhighways begun under his guidance; the dramatic trip to Korea that laid the groundwork for the negotiations at Panmunjom—these are only a few of the items in his legacy.

There are the other things, the human things. The jokes about his golf game, at which he laughed as heartily as anyone. The charm of the photographs in the Nation's press of a proud grandfather romping with his grandchildren. And

XUM

above all, that fantastic charming grin that lit up his face like sunrise over the White House.

Rather than mourning his loss, Mr. Speaker, we should be profoundly grateful for having had him among us, at a time when we needed him so desperately. We will be remarkably lucky if we see another world leader in our lifetimes who can begin to measure up to him.

THE FIRST STEP IN DEFENSE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, peace and war in Vietnam are the preoccupation of millions of people. As issues these are not the concern of only this Nation. Rather, viewed as they must be, in broad perspective, they extend beyond national boundaries. They touch the lives and futures of all men. Yet, it is wise to approach these difficult problems in such a manner as to assure that the national interest is well served by our policy decisions. If this can be achieved, and if our position in the world community is to be maintained, it cannot but follow that benefit will flow beyond the limiting confines of national self-interest. Our problem, then, is to examine critically our policies, our goals, and our methods.

Albert Einstein once said:

> Until we are taught what our history books do not teach, that the fault is usually ours quite as much as some other nations, we have not taken the first step to that wisdom which alone can save us.

The history books do not record the full implications of nuclear power and weapons of destruction which flow from our knowledge of recent scientific applications of such power. Educated guesses can be made on such matters as deterrent effects and first and second strike capabilities. Yet, how secure are we when we base our decisions upon guesses—in the absence of knowledge? How much reliance can we place upon those who guess one way while others, equally as competent, conclude in a contrary direction? And if we follow the course of those who risk in the direction of even larger and more powerful weaponry, with escalating costs beyond those we have ever before been able or willing to bear, to what end are we being led?

Our military leaders and the scientists who support their views look only toward one objective—military supremacy. Who is there in the higher circles, where policy is determined, who listens to the scientists whose special province is the social and economic well-being of our people? Is there not need to pause and consider that the people, their hopes and dreams, are of greater importance than military power? Should the peoples' interests be sacrificed because of costs of the military? The history books cannot guide us in this specific—but a true historical perspective does reveal that the ultimate result of a total disregard of the need of the people has led many a nation and society to fall and to disappear.

Our policies relating to war and peace are influenced by those who have access to information which is classified and withheld from the people. In the absence of facts and knowledge the people judge our national intentions by what they can see and by the effect of our actions upon them. We, today, talk of peace and disarmament. Yet we continue to spend unacceptable numbers of lives and amounts of money to achieve these. In Vietnam and other areas we move in such a manner as to drain our resources in manpower, goods, and money. We justify this in a way which satisfies none of those whose loved ones are killed or whose stomachs are empty or whose opportunities to achieve a better life are denied. What is needed is a rationale which can be more easily understood. Such a rationale flows from the deeds which lessen the personal impact of massive military undertakings. That such deeds are missing from the stage is evident if we consider our casualty lists—if we view the hunger found everywhere in our Nation—if we view the denial of significant opportunities for millions of people to achieve a better share of all that is good in our economy.

One has only to look critically at the Department of Defense to understand the cause and nature of the frustrations of so many of our people. Our men fight and die for the preservation of a concept of a government. Within this concept is embodied the principle of "liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Yet these are denied in too many instances. For where is there liberty if the chains of poverty and underemployment bind individuals to the lowest levels possible in our economics structure? How can there be acceptance of the stated objectives of our national policy of defense if the Department of Defense, without good reason, grants contracts to textile mills which violate Federal law pertaining to civil rights—the right to equal opportunity in employment? This action, the flouting of equal employment laws and regulations, demonstrates that "race relations" has low priority among the considerations which lead to policy in defense matters. So, what is national policy? Is it that of the Defense Department?

Who creates the policy of the Defense Department? There are few, if any, members of the minority group included among the civilian policymakers of that vast empire. Yet we state that military policy is the role of civilian authorities. If this be so, one can only wonder how much consideration is given to the social action programs by these civilians who are less than representative of the civilian community at large. Negro manpower is heavily involved in the fighting to which our uniformed forces are committed. It is not unreasonable to expect Negro civilians to be involved in the development of policy decisions which effect the conditions under which all personnel, military and civilian, must function.

In the race to achieve superiority in weapons and a destructive capability there is no certainty that this Nation will win. As a practical matter one wonders how important the race is if in the process of testing relative strengths 50 or more American cities are wiped out in a first strike. Retaliation capability is poor consolation under such a circumstance. Even less impressive is the reasoning related to deterrent capability if we must assume that a nation is morally degraded and foolish enough to use its nuclear force.

Our only defense is some form of international control for the prevention of wars. Continued and uncontrolled expansion of our weapons systems coupled with the maintenance of military forces of great magnitude is folly of the first order. It deters only those who are not foolish enough to test our strength. But the process saps our national will as its costs mount to the point where human need is ignored because the military need is paramount. More sense is to be found in "making peace" by using our science and technology to solve the "people" problems of poverty, hunger, ill health, and the withholding of human dignity.

If it is our intent to convince the people of the world that we fight for their right to self-determination we may have a better chance of being believed if we change some of our approaches within our own Nation. Perhaps the first step is to provide clear evidence in the form of actions at home which grant to our citizens the opportunity to walk in dignity with freedom to determine their individual destinies. With the influence which its more than $80 billion annual budget generates the Department of Defense can shape the forces which will change the climate in which our minorities now live, work, and die. Let us then take a first step by changing the philosophy of the Department which spends most of our money but provides the least evidence that it has a social responsibility.

In support of my position I directed a communication to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, on March 18, 1969. I am awaiting a reply and action. A copy of my letter follows:

MARCH 18, 1969.

HON. MELVIN L. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A recently published column by Mr. Carl Rowan, appearing in the Washington *Star,* has called attention to the fact that within the Department of Defense there are currently no Negro civilian personnel who occupy policy-making positions. Such positions are defined in the column as those at and above the Deputy Assistant Secretary level. If one examines the telephone directory of the Department it is not difficult to identify by title approximately one hundred positions which may be considered to be in the category mentioned in the column.

I think it is not necessary to comment at length on the image which this situation projects to the concerned public. Negro manpower is heavily involved in the activities of the uniformed forces of our country. In view of this it is not unreasonable to expect Negro civilians to be involved in the development of the policy decisions which affect the conditions under which all personnel, military and civilian, must function.

The often stated lack of qualified individuals is no longer acceptable as a reason for the absence of Negroes in key positions.

XUM

Where there has been very real effort to identify qualified Negro personnel and where there is absent any calculated policy of exclusion, progress has been demonstrated. Thus, there exists an urgent requirement to ascertain what the factors are which have produced a situation such as now exists within your Department—a situation in which there appears to be a total exclusion of Negroes from policy-making positions.

I recall that approximately four years ago there were only five Negroes within the total Department of Defense whose grades were above GS-15. Today, I believe, the picture is worse. It is a matter of record that only one Negro has ever occupied a position in any of the military departments or the Department of Defense with a title of Deputy Assistant or higher. In view of this record, your consideration of the few Negroes now in supergrade positions for elevation to higher and more responsible roles is urged. Further, I would urge the active search for and the placement of other Negroes in policy-making positions of your Department.

In order that I may have a current picture of the utilization of Negro civilians in key positions of the Department of Defense, I request that the following information be forwarded to me:

1. The total number of supergrade positions, excluding scientific, currently allocated to the Department of Defense. (This should indicate grade and the military departments or the DOD in which the positions are to be found.)

2. The number and grade of Negro personnel currently occupying any of the above positions together with a summary description of the duties required of each of the incumbents.

3. The total number of positions, by Department or service, which are included in the Executive Level salary schedule and the title of those positions which remain to be filled.

Your personal attention to the critical nature of the problem presented by the absence of Negro personnel in key positions within the Department of Defense is imperative if significant changes are to be effected. I am certain that you join with me in seeking to assure that racial discrimination be eliminated as a factor in upgrading the role which Negroes and members of other minority groups play in providing civilian control of our military departments.

Sincerely,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
Member of Congress.

TAX REFORM SUGGESTIONS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, a very respected financial authority in Oregon has carefully noted the hearings on tax reform now proceeding in the House Committee on Ways and Means. He has written a letter to me containing some suggestions and observations which make good sense. Therefore, I now offer them for the interest of my colleagues:

Hon. WENDELL WYATT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At the present time there are several proposals for tax reform being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee. Some of these proposals appear to deserve serious consideration. However, there are some proposals that originated through Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, that propose such drastic changes and which could have such serious consequences to our basic free enterprise system that I feel compelled to write to you and express some of my views in objection to such legislation. These proposals would not affect me individually but they would certainly affect a large number of people with whom I come into contact as well as affect our economy adversely.

Those that concern me most are:

1. A proposal for unified transfer tax which would put estate and gift taxes into a single tax, giving a single $60,000 exemption adding together inter vivos gifts and death transfers to determine total transfer tax and adding the gift tax paid to gifts to determine higher estate tax brackets. This particular proposal appears to be designed for the purpose of discouraging lifetime giving. The economic consequences as well as the social consequences would be most unfortunate since it would discourage gifts to children and grandchildren, thus keeping this money out of immediate circulation where it would stimulate the economy. It would place an unbearable burden upon personal representatives, that is, executors and administrators, to discover all transfers made by a decedent during his life and would continue the present law while the new one is being developed. The result would be unbelievable complexity which would make it undoubtedly necessary to increase executor's and administrator's fees, thus further reducing the estate values and causing great hardship particularly in the smaller estates. I would hope that you would oppose such legislation.

2. Another proposed change would be to assess a capital levy on each generation by putting a transfer tax at regular rates on property going from one generation to another. This is an extremely dangerous proposal in my view in that small businesses would have to be broken up in order to provide funds to pay taxes and expenses of administration. Any estate planning to meet these changes would be almost impossible with the result that there would be a liquidation and sale of family businesses to raise the second and third taxes which would evolve. Congress has expressed a desire to preserve the small business enterprise which it the key to our system and such legislation would certainly frustrate this desire.

The incentive to accumulate estates would be destroyed since large estates in trust would be broken up by the successive tax levies with loss to our economy, of initiative and imagination.

This legislation is aimed at property left in trust and to encourage outright bequests and defeat the useful services for which trusts have previously been encouraged by tax legislation.

Even Mr. Surrey and his academic backers have been unable to come up with any solutions to the problems raised by the proposed legislation since it runs counter to long-established principles of law. As has been pointed out, Congress has never indicated a desire to levy additional taxes on transfers which put property in trust during the period of perpetuities. England has tried it and failed. We should learn from their experience.

3. To take the sting out of the first two matters, there has been purposed a 100 per cent marital deduction. This is just simply a device to try to win backing for the other two socialistic proposals. It would overdo in most cases the distributions to wives and cut out the children who could use it advantageously and put it more quickly into the general economy.

The above three proposals have no place in our system. They admittedly will not raise additional revenue but cost, according to the figures I have seen, anywhere from 400 to 900 million dollars. Therefore, having no revenue purpose in mind, the intent of the proposal is, to say the least, suspect.

The other proposals are income tax proposals and these are equally objectionable and the ones I feel the most objectionable are as follows:

4. Tax treatment of charitable contributions which would allow contributions but only to the extent that they exceed 3 per cent of gross income similar to our present medical deductions. This would discourage the small giver; thus, churches and other charitable organizations would be placed in such a precarious financial state that many could never recover. The second part of this proposal which is to assess capital gains on appreciation at the time of gift would similarly discourage charitable giving and leave our educational institutions, hospitals, etc. with no place to turn for support except the Federal Government and it appears that such proposals would be self-defeating.

5. The tax treatment of business income is proposed to be changed in one respect which would be to put sub-chapter "S" corporations in the same category as the self-employed as far as retirement benefits are concerned. One has only to look in the legislative history on the establishment of sub-chapter "S" to know that this is one of the principle reasons for it in the first place; that is, to give the share-holders and employees the same benefits as enjoyed by corporate officers and employees.

6. The last proposal which I feel is ominous is that the appreciation in the value of assets transferred at death or by gift be taxed as capital gains. The amount of the tax apparently would be allowed as a deduction from the taxable estate but not as a credit against the estate tax. Many small estates would be reduced under such a proposal by 50 percent and a much larger percentage in the more sizeable estates. Double taxation would also result since nothing has been said about the carry-over of the decedent's cost basis.

Personal representatives would also find it very difficult to establish the cost figures and, in some cases, it would be an insurmountable task, all of which would cause an increase in fees to cover the services which are already begrudged by many, and, in some States, for very good reason. This is a completely unnecessary tax as are the others. Although there has been unfortunate tax legislation in the past, never before have such proposals been quite so onerous, at least to the extent that it has shaken me from my lethargy and stimulated me to write to you.

Anything you can do in objection to these proposals would be most appreciated, not only by me but by I am sure the vast majority of the citizens of this country.

Very truly yours,
(Name withheld.)

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the long lines of people waiting outside the Capitol to pay tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower express more eloquently than words the esteem in which he was held by the people of this Nation.

General Eisenhower once said "I came from the heart of America" and so he did. He came from the vast heartland of our Nation and grew up in the open country of Kansas. In another generation there will be few men left who re-

XUM

member America as it was when Dwight David Eisenhower was a boy.

Since its inception our Nation has grown and changed and the urban Amerca of tomorrow will bear little resemblance to the land that Washington and Jefferson knew. It will bear little resemblance that is in physical characteristics. But the heart of America is not the geographical center of the Nation, but rather that enduring quality composed of a history of democratic institutions and a belief in equal opportunity for all. This is the heart of America from whence came Dwight David Eisenhower.

He will be remembered best as the 34th President of the United States not for programs or policies, but rather for an attitude and a way of looking at life. He was honest and fair. He loathed to question the motives of others. He liked people and saw the best in each man. In those dark days of the early fifties when suspicion and accusation were rampant in the land, a man like General Eisenhower was needed. He feared no one and trusted both friend and foe alike. He believed in the basic goodness of mankind and understood that good intentions could produce varying viewpoints.

In 1953 when he assumed the Presidency, the world was beset by division and mistrust. General Eisenhower brought with him the experience as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces. As such, he had brought together the military leaders of all the Allied Nations who worked with him to assure the victory of the free world. He saw no reason why that spirit of cooperation and dedication to principle could not be continued and indeed expanded during peacetime. His foreign policy reflected this attitude. He was a man of principle, a man above party. When I came to the Congress in 1953, he assumed the office of the President. I remember the spirit of cooperation that existed between both sides of the aisle and between the legislative and executive branches.

His obvious and enormous dedication to the Nation was the motive force in his life of public service. We shall miss his honesty, his integrity, his devotion to duty. We shall also miss his smile and the warmth that reflected the heart of America—the love of mankind. It was to this heart that he appealed. It was this heart from whence he came.

XUM

i-
ed
gn
a
y.
3,
I
at
le
i-

on
is
is
to
id
of
to
is

XUM